

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]



Université d'Ottawa • University of Ottawa

Prolegomenon to an Edition of the Pseudo-Virgilian *Culex*

by

Lisa L. St. Louis

Thesis submitted to
the School of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
PhD degree in Classical Studies.

University of Ottawa

© 2001 Lisa L. St. Louis



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-67998-5

Abstract

Prolegomenon to an Edition of the Pseudo-Virgilian *Culex*

Lisa L. St. Louis
University of Ottawa, 2001

Supervisor:
Professor Denis Brearley

This thesis lays the foundation for a new edition of the pseudo-Virgilian *Culex*. Fifty manuscripts containing the text are gathered along with all relevant information which would assist a scholar in locating, identifying and tracing the history of each one. The findings are presented in the form of a catalogue. Next, the manuscripts are collated in detail and their variant readings are entered into a computer program which is specifically designed to determine the relationship between manuscripts. The results prove that some manuscripts belong to the *Florilegium Gallicum* or *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* groups which have been defined by previous researchers. Others have been copied from printed books and are valuable only for conjectures as they add nothing to the construction of a stemma. The data from the manuscripts forms the basis for an *apparatus criticus* along with many readings from incunabula. The main goal of the thesis is to present late manuscripts which have not been sufficiently studied as well as incunabula and other rare books which are not readily accessible to scholars. During the composition of the apparatus, it becomes apparent that old conjectures have been improperly attributed to some scholars and that more work needs to be done to assess the contribution of certain individuals. Once the apparatus is complete, the task of editing the text begins. Professor Clausen's Oxford Classical Text serves as the starting point but original conjectures and changes proposed by other scholars are also inserted into the text. Finally, these alterations as well as issues of grammar and scansion are discussed in a commentary at the end of the work.

Acknowledgements

This thesis, although credited to one individual, is due to the efforts of many people. I wish to thank my supervisor Professor Denis Brearley as well as the Department of Classics and Religious Studies at the University of Ottawa. The Department provided me with teaching and research assistantships and the University contributed Entrance and Excellence Scholarships.

If the reader finds this thesis to be especially rich in rare material, then the credit belongs to Professor Virginia Brown of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto. Her contribution of notes, microfilms and moral support cannot be emphasized enough. In the early stages of the project, I relied upon Professor Wendell Clausen of Harvard for advice in matters related to Virgil, manuscripts and textual criticism. A fellow Virgilian scholar at Harvard, Professor Mary Louise Lord, generously searched for *Culex* manuscripts to add to my growing list. My former supervisors Professor Michael Winterbottom and Dr. Stephen Harrison of Corpus Christi College, Oxford assisted with letters of reference and introductions to scholars.

As this thesis required computing skills beyond the realm of word-processing, I must applaud my patient technical support team Dr. Stefan Hagel, Professor Pierre-Louis Malosse and my colleague Pierre Desrochers.

Joanne Potter and Frank Morrison kept me organized, on time and believing in myself. My husband Yves Boucher endured the loss of his wife's companionship for months at a time while my parents Maurice and Karen St. Louis endured the loss of every room in their house. These five people did not enrol in the program with me but for years they have been "doing the PhD." This thesis is dedicated to them.

Contents

Introduction.....	1
The <i>Culex</i> Throughout the Ages	1
A New Work on the <i>Culex</i> : Justification and Preliminary Research.....	12
Organization and Goals of the Prolegomenon	15
Chapter One: A Catalogue of <i>Culex</i> Manuscripts.....	18
Chapter Two: The Adain Program and the Relationship Between Manuscripts	75
Chapter Three: The Apparatus Criticus of the <i>Culex</i>	106
Chapter Four: Adnotationes Criticae	179
Conclusion	201
Bibliography	203

Tables

Table 1: Legend of Sigla Used in the Adain File.....	78
Table 2: Sample Page of Adain Code.....	79
Table 3: Chart of Long Excerpts and Full-length Manuscripts.....	80
Table 4: Chart of Short Excerpts.....	90
Table 5: Percentage of Correct Readings in Early and Late Manuscripts.....	98
Table 6: Chart of Late Manuscripts v. Early Printed Books.....	99

Introduction

The *Culex* Throughout the Ages

Upon first glance, the *Culex* hardly seems to be the sort of poem which would merit a second look, let alone lengthy volumes of scholarship. It is a short work of 414 lines which recounts the story of a goatherd who is nearly attacked by a snake during his afternoon nap but is saved by a mosquito. The philanthropic insect bites the elderly man in order to warn him and is dispatched to the next world by a blow from the goatherd's hand. After this rude awakening, the man notices the snake and crushes it with a tree branch. Once his animals have been cared for, the goatherd returns home and goes to sleep. In a dream, the ghost of the mosquito appears to the goatherd and berates its murderer for his lack of gratitude. It describes the horrors of the Underworld which surround it. When the goatherd wakes up the next morning, he erects a massive and magnificent tomb for the little creature.

The subject matter is decidedly lowbrow, the bucolic themes well-worn and the versification clumsy at best. The poem does not seem to have much to recommend it until one examines the literary echoes that run throughout the work. It is hardly surprising to find similarities here and there in works of authors who praised the joys of country life (Lucretius *De rerum natura* 2.24 ff. and Horace *Odes* 2.18) but on every page there are reminders of Virgil. Did the person who wrote this poem know the works of Virgil by heart and "get away with" the ultimate forgery by passing off his work as Virgil's own? That is one possibility. The other option is much more romantic, a veritable dream come true for scholars. Is it possible that this dreadful but rather charming little poem was, in fact, written by Virgil himself at a young age before he had perfected his craft?

Unfortunately, the ancient world did not unlock the mystery for us. After Virgil's death in 19 B.C., no collected edition of the poems appeared and there was silence on the matter until the second half of the first century A.D. when Martial, Statius and Lucan mentioned the poem. Martial offered a dinner guest a copy of the *Culex* as a present with these words:

Accipe facundi Culicem, studiose, Maronis,
ne nucibus positus "Arma uirumque" legas.
(Martial *Epigrams* 14.185.1-2)

In another poem he assigned the *Culex* to a time when Virgil was still an inexperienced poet:

Protinus "Italiam" concepit et "arma uirumque,"
qui modo uix Culicem fleuerat ore rudi.
(Martial *Epigrams* 8.56.19-20)

Statius decided that the *Siluae* should be published despite his concern that they had been hastily composed. He used the example of the *Culex* to show that even serious poets were allowed to have a lighter side:

Quid enim oportet me huius quoque auctoritate editionis onerari, qui
adhuc pro Thebaide mea, quamuis me reliquerit, timeo? Sed et Culicem
legimus et Batrachomachiam etiam agnoscimus, nec quisquam est
inlustrium poetarum qui non aliquid operibus suis stilo remissiore
praeluserit.
(Statius *Siluae* 1 *praefatio*)

The same author sent a poem to Lucan's widow in honour of Lucan's birthday. He pretended that Lucan was still a baby and prophesied that he would write major works before the age at which Virgil had composed the *Culex*:

haec primo iuuenis canes sub aeuo,
ante annos Culicis Maroniani.
(Statius *Siluae* 2.7.73-74)

Suetonius, writing in the second century A.D., ascribed a boastful utterance to Lucan which can be dated to the 60s A.D. when Lucan was in his twenties:

aetatem et initia sua cum Vergilio comparans ausus sit dicere: 'et quantum mihi restat ad Culicem?'
(Suetonius *Vita Lucani*)

After Suetonius, the *Culex* was not mentioned by name until the fourth century when Aelius Donatus and Maurus Seruius Honoratus, writers of two of the *Vitae Vergilianae*, listed other works which were also supposedly Virgil's. Questions such as the reliance or non-reliance of Donatus on Suetonius and what Virgil wanted his executors to do with the minor poems (if one takes the view that they were, in fact, his) are beyond the scope of this brief outline of the poem's history.¹ Some *Vitae* like the *Vita Bernensis* are used by scholars to bolster claims of Virgilian authorship by proving that Virgil was acquainted with Octavian at a young age. It is a general rule that data from ancient lives must be used with care. This is especially true since Upson has shown that all the *Vitae* are derived from Suetonius, either via St. Jerome or Donatus.² It is enough here to quote the relevant passages from the two most important works:

poeticam puer auspicatus in Ballistam ludi magistrum ob infamiam
latrociniorum coopertum lapidibus distichon fecit:
 'monte sub hoc lapidum tegitur Ballista sepultus;
 nocte die tutum carpe uiator iter';

¹ For more on the Suetonius/Donatus question see Domenico Comparetti, *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, trans. E. F. M. Benecke (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997) 138-142.

² Hollis Ritchie Upson, "Medieval Lives of Virgil," *Classical Philology* 38 (1943): 110.

deinde Catalepton et Priapea et Epigrammata et Diras, item Cirim et Culicem cum esset annorum XXVI³. . . . scripsit etiam de qua ambigitur Aetnam.
(*Vita Donati* 53-59, 67)

primum ab illo hoc distichon factum est in Ballistam latronem:
 'monte sub hoc lapidum tegitur Ballista sepultus:
 nocte die tutum carpe uiator iter.'
scripsit etiam septem siue octo libros hos: Cirin Aetnam Culicem Priapeia
Catalepton Epigrammata Copam Diras.
(*Vita Seruii* 10-15)

Nonius Marcellus in his *De Compendiosa Doctrina* added another fourth-century reference when he discussed different possible genders for the noun *labrusca*. He would have the last word on the subject until the ninth century:

LABRVSCA genere feminino. Vergilius in Bucolicis (V,7): siluestris raris
sparsit labrusca racemis. Neutro Vergilius in Culice (53): densaque
uirgultis auide labrusca petuntur.
(Nonius Marcellus *De compendiosa doctrina* 211.23-26)

Let us continue our look at authors who helped to keep the memory of our poem alive. In the ninth century, the monk Sigisimund de Meisterlin of Murbach wrote a catalogue of the manuscripts held by his monastery. The library had a manuscript, sadly now lost, which contained "Virgilius bucolicon. Georgicon. Liber Eneydos. Eiusdem

³ In Hardie's *Vitae Vergilianae antiquae* (Oxford, 1966), two elements are likely to confuse the reader. First of all, it must be noted that XXVI is an emendation and is not contained in the manuscripts of Donatus. The manuscripts give the ages XV, XVI or XVII with XVI being the most popular. Rose has also discovered that Hardie wrongly attributed XXVI to Joseph Justus Scaliger. For a complete discussion of the problem, see Kenneth Rose, "Problems of Chronology in Lucan's Career," *Classical Philology* 97 (1966): 379-396. For Scaliger's actual opinion and the source of the number XXVI, please see the appropriate sections later in this history. Further information on *Vitae Vergilianae* may be found in Karl Bayer, *Vergil-Viten* (Zurich: Artemis und Winkler Verlag, 1995); G. Brugnoli and F. Stok, "Fontes ad uitam Vergilii pertinentes," *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 5** (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1991) 427-540 and in Virginia Brown, "Vitae Vergilianae in Unpublished Virgilian Commentaries (Saec. XV and XVI)," *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honour of Wendell Clausen* ed. Peter Knox and Clive Foss (Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998) 174-198.

Dire. Culicis. Ethne. Copa. Mecenas. Ciris. Catalepion. Priapeya. Moretum.”⁴ It is interesting to note how the list of Virgil’s works has grown since the fourth-century *Vitae*. In the twelfth century, Thierry de Saint-Trond used the *Culex*, a poem about an unburied corpse, as a starting point for a poem about his dog which had disappeared and thus could never be buried.⁵ Alexander of Neckham, one century later, believed that Virgil was describing a personal encounter with a snake in the *Culex* but soon decided otherwise.⁶ Vincent of Beauvais, who died in 1264, seems to have been the first person to reject the authenticity of the poems which had been ascribed to Virgil in the *Vitae*. In his *Speculum historiale* he wrote:

Virgilius tres libros tantum creditur edidisse: ut in epitaphio eius apparet ubi dicitur:

Cecini pascua, rura, duces.

Per quae tria significantur Bucolica, Georgica, et Aeneida. Proinde Virgilius de Culice et Virgilius de Aetna . . . inter autores apocriphos separandi sunt.

(Vincent *Speculum historiale* 6.62)

Usually Carolus Ruaeus [Charles de la Rue] (1643-1725), or François Oudin, an eighteenth-century scholar, are credited with the discovery either because modern scholars are unaware of Vincent’s comments or because they do not consider him much of an expert.

⁴ Birger Munk Olsen, *L’étude des auteurs classiques au XI^e et XII^e siècles*, Tome III 1^{re} Partie (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1987) 167-169.

⁵ Jean Préaux, “Du *Culex* de Virgile à son pastiche par Thierry de Saint-Trond,” *Présence de Virgile: Actes du colloque des 9, 11 et 12 décembre*, ed. R. Chevallier (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1978) 195.

⁶ Comparetti 148, 263.

The ninth-century catalogue which was alluded to briefly above marked the start of a whole new phase in the life of the *Culex*, the manuscript tradition. Most of us have seen pictures of the famous Virgil manuscripts, particularly those from the Vatican. Unfortunately, the *Culex* was not included with them. They date back as far as the fourth century A.D., whereas the earliest *Culex* manuscripts started to appear in the ninth century and were produced, strangely enough, until the nineteenth century. It is dangerous to jump to conclusions about the authenticity of the poem solely based on the silence of fourth-century manuscripts because later the *Culex* was frequently included with the works of Virgil and every title proclaimed that it was indeed Virgil's. One is lucky, though, if it turns up in a Virgil manuscript. Often the eyes of cataloguers miss it because it has survived as a couplet, in the middle of some other author, in a manuscript unconnected with Virgil. It seems that mediaeval scribes liked certain parts of the poem such as the praise of country life (58ff.) or the mosquito's epitaph at the end (413-414). The vast range in age of the manuscripts should not mislead anyone. In any library in Europe, there are mostly fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts of the *Culex* and very few earlier or later examples. Palaeography fans may be disappointed with a steady diet of only Carolingian, Gothic and Humanistic scripts but it is, perhaps, a good thing for reasons of access that most manuscripts of the *Culex* are the "poor side of the family" and not the treasures of the world.⁷

It is possible, after one has examined *Culex* manuscripts from each century, to make a few generalizations. The text is hopelessly corrupt. Lines have fallen out or are in the wrong place. Names of mythological people or geographical places are

⁷ A notable exception to this rule is FLORENCE, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Plut. 33.31, saec. xiv which was copied by Boccaccio.

unrecognizable. Once printed books appeared, the quest to determine what was in the original manuscript of the *Culex* no longer hung on the question of which manuscripts descended from which others but also which manuscripts had been entirely or partially copied from books.

The advent of printing brought about a flurry of Virgil editions, some consisting simply of text and others enriched with commentary. Of the commentaries, most were very basic compared to the learned treatises of ancient times but they showed a movement from the passive copying of previous centuries to the active thought required for textual emendation and identification of obscure people and places. A glance at the Ascensius edition of 1529 shows that the list of works attributed to Virgil by Seruius, Donatus and the Murbach catalogue has grown to such an extent that we must wonder how our poet had time for the *Aeneid* when he was consumed by such important subjects as wine, women and the letter Y. Josse Bade Ascensius (1462-1535) and Domitius Calderinus (1447-1478) dutifully printed dozens of poems and traded comments concerning the authenticity of several of them. *Aetna* and *Elegiae in Maecenatem* were rejected outright but *Ciris* was accepted. *De rosas nascentibus* was ascribed to either Virgil or Ausonius while the *Priapea* and *De se ipso* were given to Ovid.⁸

Another commentator, Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540-1609), believed that Virgil was the author of the *Culex* but thought that it was the work of a mature man, not a boy.

⁸ While the 1529 edition was typical of its time, Virgilian content remained fluid. On this account, one must peruse several editions in order to appreciate the magnitude of the web of apocryphal poetry which surrounded the *Eclogues*, *Georgics* and *Aeneid*. Despite the charm of the rare books, the unusual spelling is troublesome and it is preferable to study the *opuscula* in a scholarly edition with explanatory notes. See Heinrich Meyer, *Anthologia ueterum latinorum epigrammatum et poematum* (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: apud Gerhardum Fleischerum, 1835).

As we have already seen in the section on Donatus, scholars tend to misquote Scaliger. He never gave Virgil's age as twenty-six and, in fact, said that he did not know how old Virgil was when he wrote the poem. In any case, he was certain that Donatus the "ignobilis grammaticus" was wrong to say fifteen.⁹ In his 1573 edition of the *Culex* and the other minor poems, he called them *Publii Vergilii Maronis Appendix* for the first time and the name stuck. Today we know them as the *Appendix Vergiliana* but we must be wary of using the term "collection" since their relationship to Virgil and to each other is tenuous at best. Each member of this unusual group has its own manuscript tradition and has been variously supported or rejected over the centuries in its claim of authenticity. Modern scholars almost unanimously agree that Virgil did not write any of the poems which accompany the *Culex*.

The seventeenth century marked the start of the modern era in the study of the *Culex*. Scaliger had raised questions about Virgil's age as transmitted in Donatus but had not questioned Virgilian authorship. New voices not only replayed the age debate but even began to discuss whether the *Culex* which had come down through the centuries was Virgil's unchanged original, the original with some interpolated sections, a forgery which had replaced the lost original, or a forgery with no Virgilian original. Charles de la Rue had Virgil writing the *Culex* at twenty-six. If an Oxford Classical Text of the *Vitae* appears in the future, it should no longer cite Scaliger as the source of that number. According to de la Rue, our *Culex* is a forgery "ab inepto aliquo posteriorum aetatum

⁹ Joseph Scaliger, *Publii Vergilii Maronis appendix cum supplemento multorum antehac nunquam excusorum poematum ueterum poetarum* (Lugduni [Lyon]: apud Guliel. Rouillium, 1573) 265-266.

scriptore fictum” intended to replace Virgil’s lost work.¹⁰ François Oudin agreed, adding that Virgil wrote a *Culex* between the ages of twenty-five and thirty. He thought that a Vandal or African could have composed our *Culex* as a kind of patchwork of Virgil’s other works.¹¹ In 1775, Christian Gottlob Heyne proposed the second of our five options, namely, that the *Culex* had a true Virgilian core which, over the years, had been surrounded by spurious verses. His *Culex probabiliter restitutus* separated (or so he believed) the true verses from the false with the result that only one-quarter of the poem remained.¹² This view was so unpopular that it was even criticized by Sillig who revised Heyne’s work in 1832.¹³

The final section of our history deals with modern times and the questions which scholars have been raising since the late 1800s and continue to grapple with in the new millennium. There tends to be an “all or nothing” approach to *Culex* authorship today and the “Yes” side still enjoys a surprising amount of support, particularly among Italian

¹⁰ I found de la Rue’s notes attached to a later edition of Vergil (London, 1750) with no indication of page numbers. They must have been taken from Carolus Ruæus, *P. V. M. opera interpretatione et notis illustravit C. Ruæus . . . ad usum serenissimi Delphini* (Paris, 1675).

¹¹ François Oudin, “Dissertation critique sur le *Culex* de Virgile,” *Continuation des mémoires de littérature de M. de Salengre* 7 (1729): 311-312.

¹² Christian Gottlob Heyne, *P. Virgilii Maronis opera uarietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustrata*, Tomus Quartus (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: Sumtibus Caspari Fritsch, 1775). I cannot supply the page numbers as I did not find that edition. I used the third edition from 1793 which has the information on pages 9-13 and 76-87. Distler states that all four volumes of the first edition appeared in 1767. See Paul Distler, *Vergil and Vergiliana* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1966) 213. That information appears to be incorrect.

¹³ Christian Gottlob Heyne and Karl Julius Sillig, *P. Virgilii Maronis opera uarietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustratus*, Volumen Quartum (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: Sumtibus Librariae Hahnianae, 1832) 12-13.

scholars.¹⁴ The “No” side generally believes that our *Culex* is a forgery and that Virgil never composed a *Culex* at all. Both sides take a keen interest in determining when the poem was written and the “Yes” side has added the number twenty-one as another possible age of Virgil.¹⁵ Those who take a negative view assign dates to the poem which range from during Virgil’s lifetime to the time of the Vandals in the sixth century A.D. Some even try to prove that it belongs to Ovid.¹⁶

The twentieth century saw the birth of different methods for assessing the probability of Virgilian authorship. These methods which are still popular today include studies of language, metre, historical evidence and the relationship between the *Culex* and the works of Greek and Latin authors. One scholar uses a scientific approach and another relies on subjective criteria like taste and sustained perfection. Statistics which appear to point to Virgil as the author in one article are shown to prove the exact opposite in another. Even the study of borrowings made by the author of the *Culex* from other authors is fraught with danger as sometimes similarities are not, in fact, borrowings at all. As Glenn Most wittily declares, “The *Culex*’s sheep eat the kinds of vines and shrubs they do, neither only because real sheep do nor necessarily because those in the first

¹⁴ For a list of all those who have voted for or against Virgilian authorship throughout the ages, see Dieter Güntzschel, *Beiträge zur Datierung des Culex* (Aschendorf: Aschendorffsche Buchdruckerei, 1972) 241-257. His bibliography of *Culex* scholarship is complete and carefully documented.

¹⁵ For the names of scholars who favour XXI, see Anthony Barrett, “The Poetry of the *Culex*,” diss., University of Toronto, 1968, 54.

¹⁶ See Güntzschel 232 (on R.S. Radford).

Eclogue do, but instead because those are the kinds of vegetation the sheep of pastoral poetry, of the sort found in the first *Eclogue*, eat.”¹⁷

It seems likely that Virgil did not write the *Culex* which has come down to us and, in fact, never wrote a *Culex* at all. Glenn Most’s work mirrors my personal assumptions. He believes that the forger “knew that Virgil had written the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics*, and the *Aeneid*, in that order and nothing else, and was making reference to that fact in the structure of his poem.” According to Most, if one defends Virgilian authorship of the *Culex*, then one is making the ludicrous claim that “Virgil . . . as a young man unknowingly anticipated his whole future career.”¹⁸ It is impossible to be certain when the poem was written but one can safely rule out the lifetimes of Virgil, his executors, and Augustus. That puts us at least in the reign of Tiberius (began A.D. 14) on the early end of the scale. *Culex* 412 may be imitating Ovid’s *Tristia* 5.13.29 which can be dated to around A.D. 12 and this would push the *terminus post quem* back slightly.¹⁹ Two years will not make much of a difference. On the opposite end, if we accept that Lucan made a statement about the *Culex*, we have to set a date of at least a few years before his death in A.D. 65. Furthermore, if Calpurnius Siculus 7.22 is imitating *Culex* 77 *fecunda Pales*, it would seem to move the *terminus ante quem* for the *Culex* to the early years of Nero’s reign (began A.D. 54) but alas, we have no definite dates for Calpurnius Siculus.²⁰ For

¹⁷ Glenn Most, “The ‘Virgilian’ *Culex*” *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, ed. Michael Whitby et al. (Bedminster, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1987; Oak Park, Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1987) 206.

¹⁸ Most 208-209.

¹⁹ E. Courtney, rev. of *Beiträge zur Datierung des Culex*, by Dieter Güntzschel, *Gnomon* 46 (1974): 811.

²⁰ Courtney 812.

the present, I ally myself with Eduard Fraenkel and others who lean towards the time of Tiberius.²¹

A New Work on the *Culex*: Justification and Preliminary Research

The incredible outpouring of literature on the authorship question has made the topic unpopular and I certainly would not volunteer to make it the focal point of my thesis. The same can, unfortunately, be said for the number of editions and anyone offering a new text to the world must provide some justification. The *Culex* has been edited many times over yet little of the work has been in English. Anthony Barrett,²² Duncan F. Kennedy²³ and Mark Edward Bailey²⁴ devoted their dissertations to the topic but gave their attention to literary issues rather than to manuscripts and textual problems. An edition is a Herculean task which involves gathering a vast array of manuscripts and rare books, collating everything in minute detail, preparing a stemma, analyzing conjectures of previous scholars and, if possible, offering new ones. It necessitates more travel than ordinary research as the material is not usually close at hand and even the best of photocopies cannot be trusted. Despite initial misgivings and thoughts about Sisyphus with his rock, I decided that it would be beneficial to scholarship to bring to light as many

²¹ For the view that the forgery needed time to gain authority and is likely to belong to the reign of Tiberius, see Eduard Fraenkel, "The *Culex*," *Journal of Roman Studies* 42 (1952): 8.

²² See note 15.

²³ Duncan F. Kennedy, "A Commentary on *Culex* 1-156," diss., Cambridge, 1980.

²⁴ Mark Edward Bailey, "The Pseudo-Virgilian *Culex*: Translation and Commentary," diss., University of Colorado, 1995.

little-known resources as possible and to correct errors in readings found in previous editions.

The ninety-eight *Culex* manuscripts which were uncovered in the course of my research caused a certain feeling of *embarras de richesse*. It was not feasible or even desirable to present them all. Although I was not the first to discover the existence of the *Culex* in any given manuscript, I can take pride in the fact that twelve manuscripts which found their way into my work had, to the best of my knowledge, never been mentioned in an edition. The fifty manuscripts in this prolegomenon were chosen for a variety of reasons. It seemed obvious to begin with those found in the editions of others. Most, I soon realized, had found favour with editors because of their age and usefulness in a stemma. Until recently, the prevailing opinion among scholars was that Renaissance manuscripts were worthless because they had been contaminated by printed books. For that reason, few have been studied in any great detail although they are widely available. While they add little to the establishment of a stemma, they are nonetheless valuable for conjectures. Editors are no longer restricting themselves to a small group of manuscripts which, while appropriate for the purposes of a stemma, yield nothing further in terms of textual ameliorations. As palaeographers we must aim for the late Father Leonard Boyle's "integral" view of palaeography and use every aid at our disposal.²⁵ One does not want to be the proverbial "odd man out" when scholars decide to give these manuscripts a second look.

Age and fame or their opposites were important factors in the selection process but there were other criteria to consider as well. In some cases, a pattern of affinity

²⁵ Leonard Boyle, *Medieval Latin Palaeography: A Bibliographical Introduction* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984) 317-318.

between certain manuscripts was already emerging and new ones were added in the hopes of forming a group. There had to be a representative sample demonstrating reliance or non-reliance of manuscripts on printed books. An attempt was made to show the poem in various states of completeness. Fragments proved to be especially interesting as one could observe from them which parts of the text particularly appealed to scribes and even the smallest samples yielded rewards such as links to the important *Florilegium Gallicum* group of manuscripts. At times, I became fascinated with the life of a historical figure such as Pomponio Leto and tracked down manuscripts and printed books associated with him. The connection of manuscripts to a geographical area such as northern France became apparent and needed to be investigated. Something which began as a simple search for variant readings grew to encompass the formation of private and public libraries, the history of printing and the biographies of the major players of European history.

Once the group of fifty manuscripts had been established, I proceeded to visit forty-four of them in person. I did not allow anyone else to assist in the collation and refused to rely upon the published collations of others.²⁶ As pre-1900 books were not always catalogued in the ordinary databases of the libraries where I carried out my research, I obtained access to ESTC, I-ISTC, the Hand-Press Book Database, RLIN, World Cat, DBI Link and the Centre for Research Libraries. I ordered photocopies of the most important rare books and even purchased those which could not be copied. At the

²⁶ I did not visit libraries in Germany, Spain, Florence or Milan and, thus, had to resort to other means for six manuscripts. In the case of manuscripts which I could not examine personally or those which were nearly illegible, I often requested several different types of copies (microfilms, microfiches, slides, photos or paper) in the hopes of seeing slight nuances.

Library of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, I was graciously permitted to use microfilms of manuscripts as well as the Cranz published and unpublished inventories.²⁷

From these sources and through the generosity of many people, I managed to find something new among the old.

Organization and Goals of the Prolegomenon

The layout of this prolegomenon to an edition requires more of an explanation than one would expect to find in a full-fledged edition. I considered the possibility of constructing a new stemma and producing a new edition of the *Culex* but decided that it was wise to do as other classicists had done and lay the foundations of the future edition in a prolegomenon. I accepted Professor Clausen's stemma and text as starting points and looked for opportunities to make improvements.²⁸ In order to compensate for the fact that I have begun *in medias res*, I have added some commentary, a feature which one does not always find in editions. It contains a detailed explanation of the changes to the text. Many entries deal with unusual scansion, gender and word order and a few cover literary theory, echoes of other authors and mythological characters. While these issues would be important in their own right in a full and complete literary commentary, they are mentioned here only in so far as they assist in the reconstruction of a given reading. In the

²⁷ Upon first glance at the shelves of a library which has a good selection of manuscript catalogues, one is likely to notice that many catalogues from the Vatican and other libraries seem to be missing. They are, in fact, available in Ferdinand Edward Cranz, *A Microfilm Corpus of Unpublished Inventories of Latin Manuscripts Through 1600 A.D.* vol. I: *Catalogue of the Microfilm Corpus*. (New London, Connecticut: n.p., 1988). See also Ferdinand Edward Cranz, *A Microfilm Corpus of the Indexes to Printed Catalogues of Latin manuscripts Before 1600 A.D.* (New London, Connecticut: n.p., 1982).

²⁸ Wendell Clausen et al., *Appendix Vergiliana* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966).

future, when a deadline no longer looms, I would like to visit the libraries which hold the other forty-eight manuscripts on my list and do a *variorum* edition in which Professor Clausen's stemma would be examined more critically.

In the course of writing this thesis, every effort was made to avoid incomplete manuscript descriptions which lead to a loss of time and money for readers. Scholars need to be able to rely on the accuracy of the shelf-marks and folio numbers when ordering costly reproductions from foreign libraries. Unfortunately, editors of classical texts are not always known for their generosity in supplying the reader with even the minimum amount of information necessary to find a manuscript or a rare book. To a neophyte, Corsinianus may either be a manuscript or a distant relative of Coriolanus. That title alone will not help anyone to find it in the Accademia dei Lincei. Furthermore, the practice of printing only latinized versions of the names of scholars who contributed conjectures over the ages causes grief to those who must surely imagine that these *docti uiri* were contemporaries of Virgil when, in fact, they lived in Renaissance France. It would take little extra time to clarify whether one means scholar x or his son and to situate them in time by the dates of their publications. The aim of this prolegomenon is to be accurate, user-friendly and to demystify the apparatus criticus as much as possible.

The thesis is divided into sections based on the evolving needs of the reader as he or she grows more familiar with the topic. Each individual section has its own detailed explanation but a brief overview now will be helpful. First, a history of the problem and preparations for this thesis are discussed. Next, a catalogue of manuscripts follows so that a scholar will have all the tools required to begin a personal study of the text. After that, the variant readings are entered into special software which determines the relationship

between manuscripts. Those variant readings together with conjectures from rare and modern editions become the basis for a new apparatus criticus. Finally, changes are made to the text where necessary and explained in the commentary.

Chapter One: A Catalogue of *Culex* Manuscripts

Birger Munk Olsen is to be commended for the clarity of the entries in his catalogue of manuscripts. Following in his footsteps, at least with regard to form, I have broken each entry down into multiple parts. First, the reader learns the siglum by which the manuscript will be known in the apparatus criticus, then the city and library where the manuscript is held and its shelf-mark. The current shelf-marks have been prepared using Fitzgerald as a guide but other designations such as familiar names or former shelf-marks have not been neglected.²⁹ If previous scholars assigned sigla to manuscripts, I have provided the scholar's name and reused the sigla where possible. Any sigla of my own invention have also been duly noted. Other information follows such as the exact date or century in which it was written, its country of origin and ownership history if known, the folio numbers where the *Culex* appears and deviations from the standard amount of 414 lines if substantial. A reference from the catalogue of the manuscript's home library rounds off each entry and is often accompanied by suggestions for further reading drawn from general catalogues or scholarly articles.

V = VATICAN CITY, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 2759

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

²⁹ Wilma Fitzgerald, *Ocelli Nominum: Names and Shelf Marks of Famous/Familiar Manuscripts* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1992).

Date: saec. xii-xiii Elisabeth Pellegrin et al., *Les manuscrits classiques de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, Tome III 1^{re} partie (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1991) 584; saec. xiii Mary Louise Lord, "Boccaccio's Virgiliana in the *Miscellanea Latina*," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 34 (1991): 196.

Country of origin: "peut-être française ou du Nord de l'Italie" Pellegrin III, 1 (1991) 585.

Ownership: "Cote d'une bibliothèque non identifiée au f. 1: 'XI'; le manuscrit a été acquis par la Bibliothèque Vaticane entre 1550 et 1556, car il porte sur une étiquette en parchemin collée au dos de la reliure la mention 'Vergilius/20', correspondant à sa description dans une liste complémentaire établie vers 1564-1566 par les Ranaldi." Pellegrin III, 1 (1991) 585.

Culex: 16v-18v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuentarium librorum latinorum Mss. Bib. Vat.*, Tomus Quartus 176; Pellegrin III, 1 (1991) 584-585.

C = CAMBRIDGE, University Library

Kk.5.34

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: saec. ix or x Charles Hardwick, *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1858)

703; saec. x Lord 196; saec. x Munk Olsen II (1985) 713. Michael Lapidge rejects such early dates on the basis of Anglo-Latin poems in the manuscript, one of which was not composed until at least 963. The result is that Kk.5.34 can be “no earlier than the late tenth century and perhaps even early eleventh.” See Michael Lapidge, “Three Latin Poems from Æthelwold’s School at Winchester,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 1 (1972): 95.

Country of origin: For the theory that the manuscript was copied at Hyde Abbey, Winchester in the late tenth century and remained there for a century or longer before moving to Glastonbury, see J. P. Carley, “Two Pre-Conquest Manuscripts from Glastonbury Abbey,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 16 (1987): 204-205, 210-211.³⁰

Ownership: John Moore (1646-1714) bishop of Norwich and Ely was the only documented owner of the manuscript and it passed from him to the Cambridge University Library.

Culex: The manuscript has one set of folio numbers by an unknown hand and a later group by Mr. Pink, former head of the manuscript department. Pink’s 84r-94v replaces the notation 20r-30v. Carley explains how Pink “began his foliation with the number 65, on the assumption that the now missing gatherings were all quires of eight.”³¹

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Hardwick 703-706; Munk Olsen II (1985) 712-713; Munk Olsen III, 2 (1989) 143; Lapidge 85, 94-95.

³⁰ As a classicist used to the finding aids for my discipline, I was pleased to have the assistance of experts in mediaeval studies during my search for bibliography on various manuscripts. Miss Jayne Ringrose of Cambridge University Library brought this article to my attention and Mr. Dominique Poirel kindly described the multitude of resources available to readers at the I.R.H.T.

³¹ Carley 205.

F = MELK, Stiftsbibliothek

717

Familiar name: For the designation cim. 2, see Clausen et al. 17 and Lord 196. The name “Viechtianus” was assigned by some scholars to a manuscript with characteristics surprisingly similar to those of Melk 717. Salvatore went so far as to include it in his edition alongside 717 as a separate entity.³² Concerning this error Courtney says, “Finally a ghost manuscript. On p. x of his Paravia text Salvatore among less important manuscripts of the *Culex* lists a Viechtianus saec. xi. As may be seen from his brief (and inaccurate) description of it, this is in fact his own F . . . Viecht and Fiecht are alternative names of its former home.”³³

Former shelf-mark: In the late nineteenth century, the manuscript was briefly known as codex 1863. After that, it became codex 1828 until 1936/1937. This information is available online. One can access Melk’s website and the sites of many other Austrian libraries through the website of the Kommission für Schrift- und Buchwesen des Mittelalters der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften www.oeaw.ac.at/~ksbm/. Although many libraries now have websites, Melk’s site is extraordinary due to its bibliographical resources and search engines which allow searches by author, incipit etc. For those who still prefer paper copies, see Christine Glassner, *Inventar der Handschriften des Benediktinerstiftes Melk. Teil I: Von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 1400* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000) 512.

³² Armando Salvatore, *Appendix Vergiliana: Ciris-Culex* (Torino: G. B. Paravia & Co., 1957) x.

³³ E. Courtney, “The Textual Transmission of the *Appendix Vergiliana*,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 15 (1968): 140.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: saec. x.

Country of origin: “Allemagne” Munk Olsen II (1985) 735.

Ownership: Codex 717 once belonged to the monastery of St. Georgenberg-Fiecht and was sold to Stift Melk in 1850. The sale was documented with these words, “Bibliothecae Mellicensi acquisitus est hic codex a. 1850.”³⁴ Pater Gottfried Glassner states that in the twentieth century the manuscript had a label which proclaimed that it was the property of the German empire but the monks removed it, fearing that the treasures of the library would be claimed by the Russians.

Culex: 223r-226r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: Lines 76-152, 204, 230-306 and 312 are missing.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Glassner *Inventar* 12, 14, 299-301, 512; Christine Glassner and Alois Haidinger, *Die Anfänge der Melker Bibliothek. Neue Erkenntnisse zu Handschriften und Fragmenten aus der Zeit vor 1200* (Melk: Verlag Stift Melk, 1996) 13 n. 18; Munk Olsen II (1985) 735; Munk Olsen III, 2 (1989) 145. The manuscript does not appear in Vinzenz Staufer, *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum qui in bibliotheca Mellicensis seruantur*, 3 vols. (Vienna, 1889).

E = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 8093

³⁴ Glassner *Inventar* 299. I am indebted to Christine Glassner for providing me with .pdf files of her work and much assistance via e mail.

Familiar name: It is a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*. Professor Clausen describes the lost *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* as “a Carolingian ‘edition’ inferior in integrity to the other MSS and much inferior to Γ, the latest and most obviously corrupt of them.”³⁵ Scholars once had five copies from which to reconstruct the original but that number is now growing. This matter will be discussed at greater length in the Adain section.

Note on familiar names in old editions: The manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and of some other libraries had a peculiar set of familiar names in works of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Authors tended to refer to manuscripts by the name of a former owner, by shape or by country of origin instead of by a shelf-mark.

Occasionally, they gave this other information in addition to the shelf-mark. The result is utter confusion. Besides the difficulty of the Latin and the length of these weighty tomes, one is faced with the unpleasant possibility that one may be missing more manuscripts than previously thought when, in fact, that is not the case. The best advice is to save any books earlier than the twentieth century until such time as one is convinced that all available manuscripts have been found and then to go back to the earlier authors and match manuscripts to descriptions. Our manuscript is “Colb. II n. 8093” i.e. Colbertinus in Heyne-Sillig 630.

Former shelf-mark: Concordances do exist for the old shelf-marks of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France but the only place where one is likely to see these numbers is on the manuscripts themselves. If the reader is not going to encounter them even in rare books, then there is little point in mentioning them.

³⁵ Wendell Clausen, “The Textual Tradition of the *Culex*,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68 (1964): 120.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: parts from saec. ix, saec. x and saec. xiv *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae regiae*, Tomus Quartus (Parisiis [Paris]: ex typographica regia, 1744) 427; saec. x Lord.

Country of origin: “Nord de la France” Munk Olsen II (1985) 761; “Lyon (?)” Bernhard Bischoff, “Frühkarolingische Handschriften und ihre Heimat,” *Scriptorium* 22 (1968): 311.

Ownership: “olim Colbertinus” *Catalogus* IV (1744) 427. Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619-1683) was a leading adviser to Louis XIV and a patron of the arts. He helped to establish the first French national library on rue Vivienne, not far from the present home of the manuscript department on rue Richelieu.

Culex: 60v-67v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Catalogus* IV (1744) 427; Munk Olsen II (1985) 761-762; Munk Olsen III, 2 (1989) 149.

A = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 7927

Familiar name: “Colb. I n. 7927” Heyne-Sillig 22, 627, 630. It is also a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelf-mark: I include it below only because it accompanied more important information.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: saec. x. “nonnulla folia manu recentiore suppleta” *Catalogus* IV (1744) 413.

Country of origin: “Sud-ouest de la France” Munk Olsen II (1985) 755.

Ownership: “olim Colbertinus” *Catalogus* IV (1744) 413; “provenant Saint-Martial de Limoges (notes de Bernard Itier), puis Colbert (n.1791)” I.R.H.T. card file. See siglum **E** for more information on Colbert.

Culex: 1r-5r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Catalogus* IV (1744) 413; Munk Olsen II (1985) 755-756.

W = TRIER, Stadtbibliothek

1086

Familiar name: “Augustanus” August Naeke, *Carmina Valerii Catonis* (Bonnae [Bonn]: apud H. B. Koenig, 1847) 356-359. It is also a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: saec. ix Gottfried Kentenich, *Die philologischen Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek zu Trier* (Trier: Selbstverlag der Stadtbibliothek, 1931) 14; saec. ix-x Lord 196.

Country of origin: “Tours” [France] Munk Olsen II (1985) 774.

Ownership: Folio 1r proclaimed, “Iste liber pertinet ad s. Mathiam, ut in ultimo inuenies folio.” On the last page, Matthias v. Saarburg, Canon of St. Simeon in Trier, wrote,

“Habui pro missali de sancto Mathia sed restituatur eidem monasterio.” This order was not carried out for later visitors saw the manuscript still at St. Simeon.³⁶

Culex: 170r-172r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Kentenich 14-15; Munk Olsen II (1985) 774-775; Léon Herrmann, “Trois poèmes de P. Valerius Cato,” *Latomus* 8 (1949): 119.

S = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 17177

Familiar name: The *Culex* is in a section which is often referred to as the “Stavelot Fragment” or “Fragmentum Stabulense.”

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: saec. ix-xv (*Culex* saec. xi) Léopold Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits latins de Notre-Dame et d'autres fonds conservés à la bibliothèque nationale sous les numéros 16719-18613* (Paris: Auguste Durand et Pedone-Lauriel, 1871) 33; saec. xi Munk Olsen II (1985) 768; saec. x Lord 196.

Country of origin: This manuscript is actually a compilation of fragments of manuscripts from several centuries. It is difficult to know for certain but the contents seem to point to origins in France and Italy.

³⁶ Kentenich 15.

Ownership: “Das Fragmentum Stabulense, Reste eines großen schönen Vergil, der einst dem alten Kloster Stavelot [Belgium] gehört hat.” Friedrich Vollmer, “P. Virgilii Maronis Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus,” *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und der historischen Klasse der K. B. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München* (1908): 28.

Culex: 99r-99v, 101r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: Lines 1-166 are lost. 167-248 are almost entirely illegible. 249-371 are just slightly cut off. For 372-414 only the beginnings of the lines remain.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Delisle 32-33; Munk Olsen II (1985) 768; Elias Avery Lowe, *Codices latini antiquiores*, Part V, *France: Paris* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950) 42; Jean Henri Bormans, “Collation des 167 premiers vers de l'*Aetna* de Lucilius Junior,” *Bulletins de l'académie royale des sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique* 21 (1854): 258-379; Emil Baehrens, *Poetae latini minores* II (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1880) 10; Charles Plésent, *Le Culex: poème pseudo-Virgilien* (Paris: Thorin, 1910) 11; Vollmer (1908) 28-31.

Important note: This manuscript is in such poor condition that readings could only be deciphered in a few places. Silence seemed preferable to the endless repetition of *legi non potuit* S or *omisit* S. Therefore, if S is missing from many parts of the apparatus, one ought to assume that in those places there was nothing to gain by mentioning it.

B = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 3252

Familiar name: The manuscript is often called “Bembinus” after its former owners the illustrious Bembo family. It is also a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelf-mark: B was Latin Manuscript 7 in Orsini’s inventory. His system of numbering his manuscripts was not continued once they became part of the Vatican Library. At the Vatican, an effort was made to arrange manuscripts according to subject matter and author.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: saec. ix Munk Olsen II (1985) 790; ix-x Vollmer (1908) 9; saec. x Pierre de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris: F. Vieweg, 1887) 239.

Country of origin: “Probablement l’Allemagne” Munk Olsen II (1985) 789.

Ownership: Bernardo Bembo (1433-1519), the distinguished Venetian diplomat passed the manuscript to his even more famous son Pietro (1470-1547), the cardinal and author. In 1579, according to de Nolhac, Fulvio Orsini (1529-1600), librarian to three Farnese cardinals, acquired it from the unscrupulous Torquato Bembo, son of the late Pietro.³⁷ Torquato broke his promises to various collectors but, by employing some deception of his own, Orsini was able to add this work to his growing personal library. He bequeathed much of his collection to the Vatican Library.³⁸

Culex: 2v-8r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

³⁷ de Nolhac 97-98.

³⁸ John Edwin Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, Volume Two (Mansfield Centre, Connecticut: Maurizio Martino, 1997) 154. Page numbers from Sandys in the “further reading” section refer to manuscript owners and scholars mentioned in the entries not to manuscripts themselves.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuentarium librorum latinorum Mss. Bib. Vat.*, Tomus Quartus 310-311; Munk Olsen II (1985) 789-790; de Nohac 3, 25, 27, 92, 95-96, 110, 166-118, 124, 126, 239-240, 276, 325, 358, 381-382; Sandys II (1997) 112-116, 153-154; Nella Giannetto, *Bernardo Bembo: Umanista e politico Veneziano* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1985) 262 n. 8, 269, 288, 297-299.

T = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 8069

Familiar names: “Thuaneus” Otto Ribbeck, *P. Vergili Maronis opera*, Vol. IV (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1868) 28; “Thuaneus siue Parisinus I” Naeke 340; “Thuaneus I” Heyne-Sillig 62 and Plésent (1910) 10. It is also a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: saec. xi

Country of origin: “France” Munk Olsen II (1985) 760; “preparato a Reims . . . utilizzato a Chartres” Claudia Villa, *La “Lectura Terentii”*, Vol. I (Padua: Antenore, 1984) 81.

Ownership: “primum Jacobi Augusti Thuani, postea Colbertinus” *Catalogus* IV (1744) 424. Jacques Auguste de Thou (1553-1617) was a French historian and librarian of the Royal Library. See siglum E for more information on Colbert.

Culex: 114v-117v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Catalogus* IV (1744) 424; Munk Olsen II (1985) 759-761; Munk Olsen III, 2 (1989) 148-149; Birger Munk Olsen, "Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIII^e siècle," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 9 (1979): 92-94; Sandys II (1997) 206-207.

Γ = ROME, Biblioteca dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana

43 F 5

Familiar name: It is sometimes called the "Corsinianus" as it was once owned by the Corsini princes.

Former shelf-mark: Rossi 64

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: As scholars were engaged in debating the date of the manuscript in various journals, the most recent official library catalogue by Petrucci appeared in which he proposed a date at the beginning of the fifteenth century. For his description, see Armando Petrucci, *Catalogo sommario dei manoscritti del fondo Rossi: Sezione Corsiniana* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1977) 33. Professor Clausen listed it as saec. xiv in his 1966 edition. In 1976, Michael Reeve called into question the date agreed upon by the OCT editors saying, "Clausen and Goodyear indeed put it in the 14th century (p.17, 39) but as it contains a text of Calpurnius descended from the copy that Poggio sent to Florence from England, it cannot be earlier than 1418." See Michael Reeve, "The Textual Tradition of the *Appendix Vergiliana*," *Maia* 28 (1976): 238. Professor Clausen consulted Reeve's 1978 article and advises me that he accepts Reeve's

hypothesis that the manuscript must be assigned to the 1420s.³⁹ See Michael Reeve, "The Textual Tradition of Calpurnius and Nemesianus," *Classical Quarterly* 28 (1978): 237.

Country of origin: "Il codice sembra essere, con tutta probabilità, di origine fiorentina."

Petrucchi 33; "Paduan origin" Reeve (1978) 237 and a similar statement in (1976) 237.

Ownership: Nicola Rossi (1711-1780) was administrative secretary to the Corsini family in Rome and lived in an apartment in the Palazzo Corsini. He built up a library which was separate from that of his employers. Upon his death, there was much wrangling over its sale. In 1786, it was sold to Bartolomeo Corsini and became part of the collection of the Biblioteca Corsiniana. In 1883, the Palazzo Corsini was bought by the Italian government as a new home for the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. At the same time, Tommaso Corsini donated the entire contents of the Biblioteca Corsiniana to the Accademia.⁴⁰

Culex: 103r-108v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Petrucci 33; Robinson Ellis, "A Roman MS of the *Culex*," *Journal of Philology* 16 (1888): 153-156 and by the same author, "The Corsini MS of the *Culex*," *Classical Review* 6 (1892) 203-205; Reeve (1978) 225, 235, 237.

ψ = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

³⁹ Professor Clausen was very kind to share his new feelings on the manuscripts and the text with me and prevented me from falling into several errors.

⁴⁰ More detailed information about Rossi and the Corsini family is available in Petrucci's introduction.

lat. 8207

Familiar name: “Colb. IV” Heyne-Sillig 630. It may be the “schedae Pithoei” in Scaliger’s edition.⁴¹

Former shelfmark: not applicable.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: parts from saec. xiii and saec. xiv *Catalogus* IV (1744) 437; saec. xiii Lord 196.

Country of origin: “una miscellanea non omogenea” Villa 402.

Ownership: “olim Colbertinus” *Catalogus* IV (1744) 437.

Culex: 6v-8r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only contains lines 1-94. Line 95 is from the *Georgics*, not the *Culex*. Referring to the large ratio of problems to verses, Michael Reeve wittily remarks, “The Parisinus should be compulsory reading for people who believe that manuscripts always transmit pretty much what the author wrote or that the 15th century produced the worst interpolations.” See Reeve (1976) 247.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Catalogus* IV (1744) 437; Reeve (1976) 241, 247; Edward Kenney, “The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid’s *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*,” *Classical Quarterly* 12 (1962): 5; Sandys II (1997) 192, 199-203.

e = EL ESCORIAL, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo del Escorial

Q.I.14

⁴¹ Scaliger (1573) 268.

Familiar name: This manuscript is a witness to the *Florilegium Gallicum* along with other manuscripts listed below. My proposed changes to the group are presented in the Adain section.

Former shelfmark: not applicable.

Siglum: Remo Giomini, *Appendix Vergiliana: testo, introduzione e traduzione* (Florence: “La Nuova Italia” Editrice, 1962). Let us say that the list of codices is on page four as they are on the fourth page after the Roman numerals.

Date: “princ. del. sigl. XIV” Guillermo Antolín, *Catálogo de los códices latinos de la Real Biblioteca del Escorial*, Vol. III (Madrid: Imprenta Helénica, 1913) 363.

Country of origin: “script French” Rosemary Burton, *Classical Poets in the Florilegium Gallicum* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1983) 52.

The copies of the *Florilegium Gallicum*: According to Vollmer, Q.I.14 belongs to a group of French manuscripts which includes Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 7647; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 17903; Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Diez. B Sant. 60 and London, British Library Harley 2745. By comparing them, he attempted to reconstruct (at least for the *Appendix Vergiliana*) the text of the twelfth-century *Florilegium Gallicum* which survived wholly or in fragmentary form in many copies. See Vollmer (1908) 17-18, 35-36. Ullman later added Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale 64 to this group. See B. L. Ullman, “Tibullus in the Mediaeval Florilegia,” *Classical Philology* 23 (1928): 130-131 and also “Classical Authors in Certain Mediaeval Florilegia,” *Classical Philology* 27 (1932): 1-2. Professor Clausen stated in an article that there were five manuscripts in Ullman’s description

when, in fact, there were six.⁴² In his OCT, he only examined Arras, El Escorial and the two manuscripts from Paris but did not reveal whether he had shortened the list due to time constraints or because he felt that some manuscripts did not belong together. The only edition which lists six manuscripts is the relatively new *Appendix Vergiliana* by Armando Salvatore and others.⁴³

The original *Florilegium Gallicum*: The original *Florilegium Gallicum* is described by Munk Olsen as being “un produit de la seconde moitié du XII^e siècle.” He observes that the oldest witnesses to it seem to indicate an origin in northern France but that it is difficult to pinpoint where it was copied.⁴⁴ R. H. Rouse offers Orléans as a likely home for the manuscript citing the fact that “the preeminence of Orléans as a school for the study of the Latin classical authors is reiterated as a *topos* or as reality by numerous late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century writers.” He goes on to lament that “no medieval booklist or library catalog survives for any monastic or collegiate institution in Orléans through which we might form a picture of what was once there.” Although unable to confirm his suspicions concerning the original, Rouse proves that the oldest surviving copy of the *Florilegium Gallicum*, Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 7647, has a link to Orléans through its former owner Pierre Daniel. Rouse’s learned and thorough article increases our knowledge of other manuscripts in the group and adds some new ones as well, thus giving reason for optimism to those of us who seek to raise the number even

⁴² Clausen (1964) 120, 136 n. 3.

⁴³ Armando Salvatore et al., *Appendix Vergiliana* (Romae [Rome]: Typis Officinae Polygraphicae, 1997) xxv. I did not have the opportunity to examine the Berlin manuscript but hope to do so at a later date.

⁴⁴ Munk Olsen (1979) 76.

higher. See R. H. Rouse, "Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Orléans," *Viator* 10 (1979) 131-160. Suggested places of origin for the manuscript besides Orléans include Corbie, Saint-Amand, Cluny, Saint-Pons de Tomières or Lobbes. It is even possible that the source was an unnamed library whose *inventaire* has come down to us or that the compiler used multiple libraries or manuscripts which are now lost. For a helpful summary of all points of view, see the article by Munk Olsen (1979): 75-77 and its continuation "Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIII^e siècle," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 10 (1980): 152.

Ownership: "Procede de la biblioteca del Conde-Duque de Olivares." Antolín III (1913) 365. This may be Gaspar de Guzmán, Conde-Duque de Olivares (1587-1645). He was known to have been unusually attached to his titles of Count and Duke and refused to choose between them. The artist Velázquez painted at least two portraits of a member of this family between 1634 and 1638.

Culex: 95r-95v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 58-85, 89-100, 154, 148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294, 340, 341, 342 and 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Antolín III (1913) 363-365; Lisardo Rubio Fernandez, *Catálogo de los manuscritos clásicos latinos existentes en España* (Madrid: Editorial de la Universidad Complutense, 1984) 186-188; Kenney (1962) 5; Robinson Ellis, "Excerpts from *Culex* in the Escorial MS," *Journal of Philology* 23 (1895) 1-4.

Esc. = EL ESCORIAL, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo del Escorial

f.I.19

Familiar name: It is a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelf-mark: "Sign. ant. II.A.2.-II.L.104." Rubio Fernandez 86.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: anno 1407.

Country of origin: "probably written at Milan" Michael Reeve quoting from comments of Dr. Albinia de la Mare. See Reeve (1976) 243.

Ownership: undetermined.

Culex: 215v-219v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Antolín II (1911) 146-147; Rubio Fernandez 86-87.

r = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 17903

Familiar name: This manuscript and lat. 7647 are called "excerpta Parisinorum" by Baehrens in his *Poetae latini minores* II 15. It is also a witness to the *Florilegium Gallicum*.

Former shelf-mark: Notre-Dame 188.

Siglum: Giomini 4.

Date: “Le manuscrit aurait été utilisé par Vincent de Beauvais pour la rédaction de son *Speculum historiale*, avant 1244.” Charles Samaran and Robert Marichal, *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste*, Tome III, *Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Latin (N^{os} 8001 à 18613)* (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1974) 719. For the view that the *Florilegium Gallicum* was almost entirely absorbed by Vincent of Beauvais in his *Speculum Historiale*, see Rouse 158.

Country of origin: “Provenienz wahrscheinlich Beauvais” Johannes Hamacher, *Florilegium Gallicum: Prolegomena und Edition der Exzerpte von Petron bis Cicero, De oratore* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1975) 27. This theory proposed by Hamacher and others is disputed by Burton who does not interpret the fact that Antoine Loisel had manuscripts from Beauvais to mean that they were all from Beauvais.⁴⁵

Ownership: According to Samaran and Marichal, Antoine Loisel owned the manuscript and his grandson Claude Joly donated it to Notre-Dame de Paris in 1680. See Samaran and Marichal III (1974) 719. On page 73 of his catalogue Delisle simply writes, “N.D.”

Culex: 72v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 58-85, 89-100, 154, 148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294, 340, 341, 342 and 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Delisle 73; Samaran and Marichal III (1974) 719; Vollmer (1908) 35; Ullman (1928) 128-174; Ullman (1932) 1-42; Clausen

⁴⁵ Burton 51.

(1964) 119-138; Kenney (1962) 5; Gustav Meyncke, "Die Pariser Tibull-Excerpte," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 25 (1870): 369-392, 452-453.

a = ARRAS, Bibliothèque Municipale (also known as Mediathèque Municipale)

64 As there seemed to be some confusion over the exact shelf-mark, I wrote to Mr. Pascal Rideau. I had often seen it used in conjunction with 65 and worried about a potential misunderstanding. He confirmed that 64 was current and correct by itself.

Familiar name: It is a witness to the *Florilegium Gallicum*.

Former shelf-mark: 65

Siglum: Salvatore et al. (1997) xxv and Ullman (1932) 2.

Date: "saec. xiii . . . daté erronément du xv^e s. par le catalogue général" Colette Jeudy and Yves-François Riou, *Les manuscrits classiques latins des bibliothèques publiques de France*, Tome I (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989) 79; "xv^e siècle" *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, Tome IV, *Arras-Avranches-Boulogne* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1872) 39; "saeculum = xiii" Thomas Phillipps, *Codices manuscripti in bibliotheca Sancti Vedasti apud Atrebatiam* (Paris: Imprimerie Pihan Delaforest, 1828) 6; "xv^e siècle" [no given name] Caron, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de la ville d'Arras* (Arras: A. Courtin, 1860) 64.⁴⁶

Country of origin: "nord de la France" Jeudy and Riou 91.

Ownership: On folio 1v, Jacques Arondel, canon of Arras Cathedral, donates this manuscript saying, "Hunc librum de flores philosophorum erogavit ecclesiae Atrebatensi

⁴⁶ Some of these catalogues were not available in Arras but were found instead at the British Library.

dominus Jacobus Arondelli ipsius ecclesiae canonicus, supplicans ut omnes in eo legentes deum deuote exorent pro anima eius et benefactoribus suis.”

Culex: 65v-66r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only has lines 58-85, 89-100, 154, 148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294, 340, 341, 342 and 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Catalogue général* IV (1872) 39; Philips 6; Caron 64; Jeudy 79; Ullman (1928) 128-174; Ullman (1932) 1-42; Clausen (1964) 119-138; Guy Cambier, “Bulletin Codicologique,” *Scriptorium* 20 (1966): 181-182.

p = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 7647

Familiar name: This manuscript and lat. 17903 are called “excerptorum Parisinorum” by Baehrens in his *Poetae latini minores* II 15. It is also a witness to the *Florilegium Gallicum*.

Former shelfmark: not applicable.

Siglum: Giomini 4.

Date: saec. xiii *Catalogus* IV (1744) 381; saec. xii-xiii Munk Olsen II (1985) 753; saec. xii² Rouse 136.

Country of origin: “Le nord de la France” Munk Olsen (1979) 77.

Ownership: Although the *Catalogus* does not record Pierre Daniel of Orléans as a sixteenth-century owner, Rouse feels that he should be added because missing leaves

from 7647 which link Daniel to the manuscript have resurfaced in Leiden's Voss. lat. Q.

2.⁴⁷ As for the *Catalogus*, it states, "codex primum Jacobi Augusti Thuani, postea Colbertinus." See *Catalogus* IV (1744) 381. Siglum T has more information on de Thou.

Culex: 112va-b.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only has lines 58-85, 89-100, 154, 148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294, 340, 341, 342 and 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Catalogus* IV (1744) 381; Munk Olsen II (1985) 753-754, 861-862 and by the same author (1979) 75-82; Kenney (1962) 5; Meyncke 369-392, 452-453.

U = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Urb. lat. 350

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: "Codex in antiquo indice urbin. n. 492 signatus" Cosimus Stornajolo, *Codices Vrbinales latini*, Tomus I *Codices 1-500* (Romae [Rome]: Typis Vaticanis, 1902) 322.

Siglum: Giomini 4.

Date: saec. xv. Michael Reeve believes that the date of the manuscript is fixed by the words "F<riderici> C<omitis> Vrbini." In a footnote, he says that the manuscript was written before 1474 but does not tell us why that date is important or why the manuscript must have been completed by then. We need to know that Federico da Montefeltro was

⁴⁷ Rouse 138.

made Duke of Urbino in 1474 by Pope Sixtus IV and that, according to Stornajolo, his coat-of-arms was added after the manuscript was finished. Reeve disavows footnote 29 the following year but he seems to imply that we should disregard the earlier part of the note concerning placement of the manuscripts on shelves rather than this section. See Michael Reeve, "The Textual Tradition of *Aetna*, *Ciris* and *Catalepton*," *Maia* 27 (1975): 237 especially n. 29 and (1976) 246 n. 60. One official exhibition catalogue claims that the manuscript was copied "between the years 1475 and 1482." See *Miniatures of the Renaissance* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1950) 26.

Country of origin: "italienne" Pellegrin II, 2 (1982) 562.

Ownership: "codices a Friderico II Vrbini duce medio fere saec. xv ac deinceps collecti" *Praefatio* of Stornajolo. Federico da Montefeltro (1422-1482) was a skilled military leader who financed his library with the profits of war.

Culex: 186r-191v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Stornajolo I (1902) 322; *Miniatures* 26; Pellegrin II, 2 (1982) 561-562; Reeve (1975) 231-247; Reeve (1976) 233-251; Vladimiro Zabughin, *Vergilio nel Rinascimento italiano da Dante a Torquato Tasso*, Volume Secondo (Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1923) 388, 435 n. 161; Pierre Courcelle, "La tradition antique dans les miniatures inédites d'un Virgile de Naples," *École française de Rome: Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 56 (1939): 249.

d = OXFORD, Bodleian Library

Auct. F.1.17

Familiar name: It is a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Giomini 4.

Date: “written in the 1st half of the 14th cent.” Falconer Madan and H.H.E. Craster, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, Vol. II Part 1, (Collections received before 1660 and miscellaneous MSS. acquired during the first half of the 17th Century), Nos. 1-3490 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922) 401.

Country of origin: England.

Ownership: The ownership history is unknown but the manuscript was probably received by the library around 1607.

Culex: 39r-41v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Madan and Craster II, 1 (1922) 401-402; Richard William Hunt, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, Vol. I, *Historical Introduction and Conspectus of Shelf-marks* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953) 8.

η = LONDON, British Library

Harley 2745

Familiar name: It is a witness to the *Florilegium Gallicum* according to many scholars but the Adain program will later show how it is not as closely related to e, r, a, p, Tr. or Q as they are to each other, at least in so far as the *Culex* is concerned. It contains some of the same lines and was written during the same time period as other members of the

group yet η's *Culex* readings show that it may belong with our Q2 rather than with the others.

Former shelfmark: The manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

Siglum: Salvatore (1957) ix.

Date: saec. xv Robert Nares et al., *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, Vol. II (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1973) 710; "14th century"

R. D. Williams and T. S. Pattie, *Virgil: His Poetry Through the Ages* (London: The British Library, 1982) 140. Personal examination of the manuscript proves that Nares is guilty of either a misprint or a mistake in judgement. See also Rouse under country of origin.

Country of origin: The manuscript was written in France "s. xiii²" according to Rouse 154.

Ownership: The Harley family figures prominently in this thesis. Before discussing the ownership of this manuscript, let us sketch out briefly the history of the collectors and how their manuscripts came into the public domain. Robert Harley (1661-1724) was a prominent British politician with a keen interest in acquiring fine books. In 1711, he became the first Earl of Oxford. Upon his death, his son Edward (1689-1741) continued to increase the collection. In 1753, the Countess of Oxford and her daughter, the Duchess of Portland, sold everything to the British government. This manuscript was purchased by Edward Harley on August 13, 1724 from bookseller Nathaniel Noel (*floruit* 1681-*circa* 1753). See Cyril Wright, *Fontes Harleiani* (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1972) 254-255.

***Culex*:** 85v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 79, 80, 81 and 84.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Nares et al. II (1973) 710; Williams and Pattie 140.

h = LONDON, British Library

Harley 2534

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelfmark: The manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

Siglum: Giomini 4.

Date: saec. xiii.

Country of origin: Dr. Justin Clegg, Curator of Manuscripts of the British Library, responded to my request for information saying, “Unfortunately, the catalogue entry for this particular volume provides little more than a description of its contents, and it does not seem to have been the subject of any detailed scholarly attention. However, a brief examination of the manuscript itself suggests that it is French, probably northern French, and that it dates from the early thirteenth century.”

Ownership: This manuscript and others belonged to the Jesuit College of Agen and then was purchased by the Harley family “but how and when the 70 MSS were acquired is perhaps the greatest puzzle of all.”⁴⁸ For information concerning Robert Harley and his heirs, please see siglum η .

Culex: 129r-129v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 1-94.

⁴⁸ Wright xvi.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Nares et al. II (1973) 698; Wright xvi, 47; Williams and Pattie 132.

Voss. = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit

Voss. lat. O. 81

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Giomini 4.

Date: second half of saec. xv.

Country of origin: "Italia" K. A. de Meyier, *Codices Vossiani latini*, Pars III, *Codices in octauo* (Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1977) 142.

Ownership: Pierre-Michon Bourdelot (1610-1685) was Queen Christina of Sweden's physician and the founder of a scientific academy. The manuscript passed from him to Queen Christina (1626-1689) who made history by abdicating and converting to Catholicism. Isaac Vossius (1618-1689), a Dutch professor, was her librarian and had a number of her manuscripts in his possession, perhaps without her consent. Upon his death, his nephew Gerardus Vossius received the manuscript and sold it along with many others to the Rijksuniversiteit in Leiden.⁴⁹

Culex: 15v-22v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial. 411 is the last verse.

Lines were ruled in after it but the scribe never completed his task.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: de Meyier III (1977) 139-142;

⁴⁹ I am grateful to Mr. John Cramer for helping me to locate the eighteenth-century catalogue of the Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit.

W. Senguerd et al., *Catalogus librorum tam impressorum quam manuscriptorum*

Bibliothecae Vniuersitatis Lugduno-Batauae (Lugduni apud Batauos [Leiden]:

Sumptibus Petri Vander Aa, 1716) 389; de Meyier *Praefatio*; Sandys II (1997) 322-323, III 339.

I = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit

Voss. lat. F. 78

Familiar name: "Vossianus II n. 78" Naeke 369.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Signum: my own invention.

Date: second half of saec. xv.

Country of origin: "Gallia" K. A. de Meyier, *Codices Vossiani latini*, Pars I, *Codices in folio* (Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1973) 171.

Ownership: It passed from Isaac Vossius to his nephew Gerardus Vossius and from him to the Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit in Leiden. For information on the Vossius family, see *siglum Voss*.

Culex: 122v-128r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: de Meyier I (1973) 167-171, Senguerd et al. 374; Edouard Galletier, *Epigrammata et Priapea* (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1920) 75.

Tr. = TROYES, Bibliothèque Municipale

2013

Familiar name: From the unusual order of the line numbers which this manuscript preserves, we may make a case that it is a witness to the *Florilegium Gallicum*. Later in the thesis, the Adain software will confirm this relationship by demonstrating how this manuscript shares a high number of readings with **e**, **r**, **a** and **p**.

Former shelf-mark: “Clairvaux, sans numéro” *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, Tome Second (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1855) 824. It is uncertain which catalogue the compiler of the *Catalogue général* was consulting. It is true that the manuscript does not appear in the catalogues of 1472 or 1521 and could lead one to conclude that it did not have a shelf-mark at Clairvaux. This is not the case according to Vernet who has found that 2013 once belonged to the “*parua bibliotheca dormitorii*” of Clairvaux. He studied a hand-written inventory of the small library (*circa* 1520) in a manuscript which is now Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale 1310. From this he deduced that 2013 was once 539 and could be tied to Clairvaux at least as far back as 1520. See André Vernet, *La Bibliothèque de l'Abbaye de Clairvaux* (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1979) 43, 618, 799.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xv.

Country of origin: If we accept **Tr.** as a member of the *Florilegium Gallicum*, then it must be of French origin. There is no way of determining where the manuscript was before 1520.

Ownership: The manuscript was at Clairvaux until the time of the French Revolution. When Dr. Jacques Hennequin, a professor at the Sorbonne, founded the

library of Troyes in 1651, the library had mostly printed books. The majority of the manuscripts came from religious organizations which had been suppressed with the chief source being Clairvaux.

Culex: 68v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 79-85, 89-93, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294 and 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Catalogue général* II (1855) 824-825.

Wu. = WÜRZBURG, Universitätsbibliothek

M.ch.f. 60

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: Parts of the manuscript are from saec. xiv and other parts are from saec. xv. The section which contains the *Culex* is from saec. xiv. Hans Thurn, *Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Würzburg, Fünfter Band, Bestand bis zur Säkularisierung Erwerbungen und Zugänge bis 1803* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 1994) 17, 23.

Country of origin: "Mittel-oder Westdeutschland" Thurn 17; "Northern hand" Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Iter Italicum. Accedunt alia itinera. A Finding List of Uncatalogued Humanistic Manuscripts of the Renaissance in Italian and other Libraries, Volume III, Australia to Germany* (London: The Warburg Institute; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983) 744.

Ownership: The manuscript bears the following inscription, "Nicolai Horn artium et medicine doctoris. Georgii Hutter nepotis, artium magistri et licentiatii sacre theologie,

canonici ecclesie Onoltzbacensis. Alles wohl von der Hand Hutters.” Georg Hutter was in charge of the Hornschen Spital in Dettelbach. He died in 1531 and his manuscripts passed to Nicolas Horn. In 1717, the collection came into the possession of Fürstbischof Johann Philipp II von Greiffenclau of Würzburg. Thurn 17, xi-xiv.

Culex: 166r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Thurn xi-xiv, 17-24; Kristeller III (1983) 744-745; Agostino Sottili, “I codici del Petrarca nella Germania occidentale,” *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 15 (1972) 411-417.

Bnf. = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 3343

Familiar name: This manuscript is a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*. It also shares several readings with the *Florilegium Gallicum* group. It is regrettable that **Bnf.** and some of the other excerpts are such small samples that one does not dare to categorize them with any degree of certainty. For more on the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* and *Florilegium Gallicum*, see the Adain results section.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xv “miscellanea uaria nullius momenti” (!) *Catalogus* III (1744) 405; saec. xv with additions from saec. xvi *Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, Tome V, *Numéros 3278 à 3535* (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1966) 248.

Country of origin: The manuscript is composed of various fragments which seem to be of French origin.

Ownership: Jacques Mentel, a Parisian scientist and contemporary of Colbert, is the only verifiable owner. The manuscript also bears a sixteenth-century signature of Jehan Petit, the associate of Josse Bade Ascensius.

Culex: 130r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 1-7 and 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Catalogus* III (1744) 405;
Bibliothèque Nationale V (1966) 236-248.

Laur. = FLORENCE, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana

Plut. 33.31

Familiar name: This manuscript is sometimes referred to as the “Miscellanea Latina.”⁵⁰
It is probably the most famous manuscript of the *Culex* as it was copied by Boccaccio. It is also a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Giomini 4.

Date: beginning of saec. xiv.

Country of origin: Italy.

Ownership: “in cuius primi folii summo margine legitur: Antonii Petrei et amicorum”
Angelus Maria Bandinius, *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, Tomus II (Florentiae [Florence], 1775) 128.

⁵⁰ Lord 127.

Culex: 17r-24r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Bandinius II (1775) 124-128; Lord 127-197; Robert Black, "Boccaccio, Reader of the *Appendix Vergiliana*: The Miscellanea Laurenziana and Fourteenth-Century Schoolbooks," *Gli Zibaldoni di Boccaccio Memoria, scrittura, riscrittura: Atti del Seminario internazionale di Firenze-Certaldo (26-28 aprile 1996)*, ed. Michelangelo Picone and Claude Cazalé Bérard (Florence: Franco Cesati Editore, 1998) 113-128.

O = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Ottob. lat. 1374

Siglum: my own invention.

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: Cardinal Sirleto referred to the manuscript as either 64 or human. 66. Pellegrin I (1975) 542.

Date: saec. xvi.

Country of origin: "italienne" Pellegrin I (1975) 542.

Ownership: Cardinal Guglielmo Sirleto (1514-1585) was a contemporary of Pope Gregory XIII and instrumental in the implementation of the Gregorian Calendar. Other owners included Giovanni Angelo duc d'Altemps and Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni (1667-1740), nephew of Pope Alexander VIII.

Culex: 72v-73r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers verses 5 (second half), 6, 7, 225, 226, 227 (first half), 413 and 414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuentarii codicum manuscryptorum latinorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae Ottoboniana*, Pars I. (no pagination); Pellegrin I (1975) 541-542.

J = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 1576

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: end of saec. xiv.

Country of origin: “italienne” Pellegrin III, 1 (1991) 145.

Ownership: Angelo Colocci (died 1549) was a wealthy patron of the humanities who had a printing press in his house. According to Pellegrin, he was also bishop of Nocera Umbra. Pellegrin III, 1 (1991) 146.

Culex: 1v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuentarium librorum latinorum Mss. Bib. Vat.*, Tomus Tertius 149; Bartholomeus Nogara, *Codices Vaticani latini*, Tomus III, *Codd. 1461-2059* (Romae: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1912) 75; Pellegrin III, 1 (1991) 144-146; S. Lattès, “Recherches sur la bibliothèque d’Angelo Colocci,” *École française de Rome: Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* 48 (1931): 326, 342.

K = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Reg. lat. 1671

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: The manuscript was shelf-mark 1655 in Queen Christina of Sweden's collection. Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 354.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: second half of saec. x.

Country of origin: "anglaise, probablement Worcester" Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 353.

Ownership: Pellegrin lists several owners whose names cannot be deciphered but we are able to trace the manuscript down through the Petau family to Queen Christina of Sweden. Sandys recounts how Isaac Vossius obtained on Christina's behalf the library of Alexander Petavius (Alexandre Petau, died 1672).⁵¹ He, in turn, had received it from Paul Petau (1568-1614). For more on Christina and the Vossius family, see siglum **Voss**.

Culex: 218v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuent. Mss. Reg.* 210; Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 352-354; Munk Olsen II (1985) 782.

M = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Ottob. lat. 1412

Familiar name: not applicable.

⁵¹ Sandys III (1997) 339.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Signum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xii with additions from saec. xiii-xv.

Country of origin: “italienne” Pellegrin I (1975) 554.

Ownership: The owners were Giovanni Angelo duc d’Altemps and Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni. For more on Cardinal Ottoboni, see signum O.

Culex: 140v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuentarii codicum manuscriptorum latinorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae Ottoboniana* I (no pagination); Pellegrin I (1975) 552-555.

N = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Ross. 503

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Signum: my own invention.

Date: “saec. xiii fol 1-88, saec. xv reliqua” *Bibliotheca Rossiana* 292; saec. xii Munk Olsen II (1985) 784.

Country of origin: “italienne, probablement pour les deux parties du manuscrit” Pellegrin II, 2 (1982) 452.

Ownership: “aucune indication” Pellegrin II, 2 (1982) 452. Although there is no mention of the Rossi family in the manuscript, we do possess some information concerning their

history. Gianfrancesco de Rossi married a wealthy widow in 1838, amassed a fine collection of manuscripts and printed books and died in 1854. His widow donated the library to the Jesuits and they kept the books in Austria for some time before finally depositing them in the Vatican in 1855. For more information on the Bibliotheca Rossiana, see Jeanne Bignami-Odier, "Guide au département des manuscrits de la bibliothèque du Vatican," *École française de Rome: Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 51 (1934): 226-227.

Culex: 24r. An old folio number of 39r is at the top of the page in the centre.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Bibliotheca Rossiana* 292; Pellegrin II, 2 (1982) 450-452; Munk Olsen II (1985) 784.

Q = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Reg. lat. 2120

Familiar name: **Q** is a witness to the *Florilegium Gallicum*.

Former shelf-mark: The manuscript once belonged to the Abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris and was known as KKK 8 in a catalogue of 1514. Elisabeth Pellegrin has discovered that parts of it are now in the Vatican Library, Bern and Paris. These unfortunate *membra disiecta* have been bound with other items and now carry shelf-marks Reg. lat 2120, Bern 327 and Paris lat. 15155. For a complete analysis, see Elisabeth Pellegrin, "Manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor et d'anciens collèges de Paris à la Bibliothèque Municipale de Berne, à la Bibliothèque Vaticane et à Paris,"

Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 103 (1942): 96. Several authors claim that it also bore shelf-mark 756 at Saint- Victor.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xii-xiii *Inuent. Mss. Reg.* 252; saec. xiii Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 513.

Country of origin: “française . . . peut-être écrit à l’abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris”

Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 517; “While MS 15155 had come to rest at Saint-Victor by the fifteenth century, it did not originate there; for in the fourteenth century it was sold to a Rouen master by one Henri François of Orléans.” Rouse 155.

Ownership: Pellegrin, in the above-mentioned reference from 1978, has determined the ownership history for the first part of the manuscript which does not contain the *Culex*.

She is reluctant to assign the second part to the same owners and leaves the matter open.

Pierre Daniel of Orléans (1530-1603), the jurist and man of letters, passed the manuscript to author Jacobus Revius of Deventer [Jakob Reefsen] (1586-1658). The next owner, scholar Nicolaas Heinsius of Leiden (1620-1681), was known for his edition of Virgil.

Queen Christina of Sweden is the last verifiable owner. After her death, the manuscript became part of the Vatican Library collection which bears her name. The reader will find more on Christina and her Dutch connections under siglum Voss.

Culex: The *Culex* appears twice in this manuscript. I have given the siglum Q to the lines on fol. 66r-66v and Q2 to the lines on 55r. This is an old foliation which is no longer valid because so many leaves are now missing. For 66r-66v, read 23r-23v and for 55r, read 12r. The double presence of the *Culex* was first noticed by Robathan in her article. See Dorothy Robathan, “The Missing Folios of the Paris Florilegium 15155,” *Classical Philology* 33 (1938): 188-197.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: Q only covers lines 79-82, 294, 342 and 414. Q2 has lines 79-82.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuent. Mss. Reg.* 252; Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 513-518; Antonio La Penna, *Ibis* (Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1957) cxi.

X = LONDON, British Library

Harley 3963

Familiar name: “Anglicanus” Naeke 346. It is also a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelfmark: The manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: “seconda metà del sec. xv” Tammaro de Marinis, *La legatura artistica in Italia nei secoli XV e XVI*, Volume II (Florence: Fratelli Alinari, Istituto di Edizione Artistiche, 1960) 79.

Country of origin: Michael Reeve assigns the manuscript to Padua. See Reeve (1978) 237. De Marinis, in the continuation of the above-mentioned reference, argues for Venetian origin based on “iniziali miniate di scuola veneta.”

Ownership: For more on Robert and Edward Harley, see siglum η . We cannot determine from the catalogue or from Wright’s book which Harley purchased the manuscript.

Culex: 254r-261v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Nares et al. III (1973) 99; Williams

and Pattie 136; de Marinis II (1960) 79; Plésent (1910) 17; Charles Plésent, "Note sur un manuscrit peu connu du *Culex*," *Revue des études anciennes* 11 (1909): 233-236.

I = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Reg. lat. 1719

Familiar name: For quite some time scholars bemoaned the loss of a "Petauianus" manuscript which earlier editors often cited. Reeve identifies **I** as the Petauianus on the basis of readings listed by Ribbeck and by knowledge of its former owners. He also adds manuscripts **I** and **d** to the **WBEAT** group. See Reeve (1976) 242. In the Adain section, it will be possible to test his theories. **I** is a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelf-mark: The manuscript bears shelf-mark M. 31 from Paul Petau's library on f.1. Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 392.

Siglum: Salvatore et al. (1997) 31.

Date: saec. x-xi.

Country of origin: "paraît française" Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 391.

Ownership: For Paul Petau, Alexandre Petau and Queen Christina of Sweden, see sigla **K** and **Voss**.

Culex: 16v-23v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuent. Mss. Reg.* 213; Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 388-392; Munk Olsen II (1985) 782-783; Eva Matthews Sanford, "The Use of Classical Authors in the *Libri Manuales*," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 55 (1924): 209; Chauncey Finch, Codex Reg. lat. 1719 in the

Manuscript Tradition of *Carmina duodecim sapientum*,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 94 (1963) 56.

Y = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit

Voss. lat. O. 96

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: “saec. xv²” de Meyier III (1977) 182.

Country of origin: “Italia” de Meyier III (1977) 186.

Ownership: Y passed from Isaac Vossius to his nephew Gerardus Vossius and finally to Leiden’s Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit. A typed description inside the manuscript reads, “Keine Namen von früheren Besitzern; wo und wann Is. Vossius den Codex erwarb, ist unbekannt.” For more on the Vossius family, see siglum Voss.

Culex: 19r-30v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: de Meyier III (1977) 182-186;

Senguerd et al. 390; Plésent (1910) 21.

Bpl. = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit

B.P.L. 35

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Signum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xi-xii Munk Olsen II (1985) 725; saec. xii P. C. Molhuysen, *Codices bibliothecae publicae latini* (Lugduni Bataurum [Leiden]: E. J. Brill, 1912) 20.

Country of origin: “Italie?” Munk Olsen II (1985) 725.

Ownership: “Codex olim uidetur fuisse J. de Mully cuius nomen est scriptum in marg. fol. 2; postea ‘Iani Rutgersii’ (f.1).” Janus Rutgersius (1589-1625), the uncle of Nicolaas Heinsius, was a Dutch scholar who worked in the Swedish diplomatic service.

Culex: 181r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers line 413.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Senguerd et al. 326; Molhuysen 19-20; *Bibliotheca Academiae Lugduno-Batauae catalogus*, Deel XIV, *Inventaris van de Handschriften, Eerste Afdeeling* (Leiden: Universiteits-Bibliotheek, 1932) 100; Munk Olsen II (1985) 725; E. Thomas, “Étude sur quelques manuscrits de Servius et de Virgile de Suisse, d’Allemagne et de Hollande,” *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires* 8 (1881) 183.

Ha. = LONDON, British Library

Harley 2701

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: The manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

Signum: my own invention.

Date: The words “Anno Domini Millesimo quadringentesimo quadragésimo septimo” [i.e. 1447] were written on folio 276v. This is also the reading in Nares et al. II (1973)

708, Wright 233 and Andrew Watson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 700-1600 in the Department of Manuscripts, The British Library* (London: The British Library, 1979) 127. It was wrongly given as 1487 in Williams and Pattie 133.

Country of origin: The manuscript was copied in Italy as proven by “Romae” on 276v.

Ownership: Humfrey Wanley wrote on folio 1v, “Hic Codex olim fuit Aldi Manutii.”

This is disputed by Watson and Wright who see no authority for the claim. See Watson 127 and Wright 233. If we look to the Adain program for help, it does not tell us conclusively that Aldus Manutius or his heirs used **Ha**. It does tell us that they were familiar with a manuscript in the **V.Voss.Ha**. group. We shall look at specific examples later in the Adain section. Wright believes that a G. Baruffaldi or Baraffaldi owned the manuscript in the seventeenth century followed by Andrew Hay (died 1754), a dealer in various antiques. Hay sold 2701 to Edward Harley on July 13, 1723. See Wright 182-183. For the history of the Harley family, see siglum **η**.

Culex: 300v-309r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Nares et al. II (1973) 708; Williams and Pattie 133; Watson 127.

Z = LONDON, British Library

Burney 273

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: The manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: “sec. xii uel xiii” Josiah Forshall, *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the British Museum: New Series*, Volume 1, Part 2, *Burney Manuscripts*. (London: British Museum, 1840) 69; “13th century” Williams and Pattie 130; “S. xii ex.” Munk Olsen II (1985) 730.

Country of origin: “France ou Angleterre” Munk Olsen II (1985) 730.

Ownership: The Reverend Charles Burney (1757-1817) was a classical scholar and schoolmaster. His manuscripts, books and prints were deposited in the British Museum in 1818. See *Index of Manuscripts in the British Library*, Volume II (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1984) 209.

Culex: 115r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413–414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Forshall *Preface*, 69; Williams and Pattie 130; Munk Olsen II (1985) 730; *Index* 209.

Fr. = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 8205

Familiar name: “Colbertinus III” Heyne-Sillig 630; “Parisinus IV” Naeke 345. It is also a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xv *Catalogus* IV (1744) 437; “fin du xv^e siècle” Samaran and Marichal III (1974) 726.

Country of origin: The copyist Iacobus Raguier signed his name on folio 26v, thus indicating French origin. Samaran and Marichal III (1974) 726.

Ownership: “olim Colbertinus” *Catalogus* IV (1744) 437. For more information about Colbert, see siglum E.

Culex: 38r-45v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Catalogus* IV (1744) 437; Samaran and Marichal III (1974) 726; Lord 141; Plésent (1910) 15-16.

Pom. = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 3255

Familiar name: not applicable

Former shelf-mark: **Pom.** was Latin Manuscript 154 in Fulvio Orsini’s library.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xv.

Country of origin: This Italian manuscript is attributed to Pomponio Leto (1428-1498) in the Vatican catalogue with these inscriptions, “Virgilii Georgica cum scholiis Pomponii Laeti” . . . eiusdem Culex cum scholiis eiusdem . . . est scriptus a Pomponio Laeto.”⁵² Nolz places it in his chapter entitled “Autographes de Pomponius Laetus.” Hunt and his colleagues reject Pomponius as the copyist. In their opinion, “Zabughin’s claim that glosses in two Vatican manuscripts of Vergil are partly in Pomponio’s hand has now been disproved, although it is true that the glosses in . . . Vat. lat. 3255 derive

⁵² *Inuentarium librorum latinorum Mss. Bib. Vat.*, Tomus Quartus 312-313.

from his lectures.”⁵³ Lunelli’s view that “il Vat. lat. 3255 . . . e scritto da discepoli” is now the prevailing one.⁵⁴

Ownership: For information on Fulvio Orsini, see siglum **B**.

Culex: 47v-56r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuentarium librorum latinorum Mss.*

Bib. Vat., Tomus Quartus 312-313; Kristeller II (1967) 317-318; de Nohac 126, 198-199, 371; Auguste Haury, *La Ciris: Poème attribué à Virgile* (Bordeaux: Éditions Bière, 1957) xxxii, “Sigla Codicum” = xxxix if one continues the existing pagination; M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis, “Questioni sulla tradizione manoscritta del poemetto Ciris,” *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 8 (1930): 259-264.

Cor. = VENICE, Museo Correr

Cicogna 886

Former shelf-marks: “precedenti segnatura: Cicogna 353; Ms. Classe VI. 216” (from the letter of the director, Professor Giandomenico Romanelli).

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: According to Professor Romanelli, the correct description is “manoscritto cartaceo del sec. XV (seconda metà) o XVI (prima metà)” but he also has in his possession the *Catalogo della biblioteca di Emmanuele Cicogna di Venezia* [v. 1:] *Codici manoscritti*

⁵³ Hunt et al. 11-12.

⁵⁴ Aldo Lunelli, “Il commento virgiliano di Pomponio Leto,” *Atti del convegno virgiliano di Brindisi nel bimillenario della morte* (Perugia: Istituto di Filologia Latina, 1983) 317.

dal numero I al mille inclusivamente, Venezia, compiuto nell'ottobre del 1841 which gives a date of "secolo XIV."

Country of origin: Mr. Piero Lucci reports that nothing is known about this manuscript's country of origin.

Ownership: "Dono del co.[nte] Lodovico Rota di S. Vito [al Tagliamento, provincia di Pordenone]; spettava alla Libreria del celebre friulano Giandomenico Bertoli (1676-1763); suo ultimo possessore privato (nel sec. XIX), l'erudito veneziano E. A. Cicogna (1789-1868) che ha scritto il suo nome sul margine alto di c.I con la data: "Ven.[ezia] 1831" dal quale il manoscritto è pervenuto alla Biblioteca insieme a ricchissime collezioni artistiche e documentarie" (Professor Romanelli). I have discovered a Cavalier Lodovico Rota (1579-1630) whose book *Il re Gernando, tragedia* was published in Venice in 1624. The time-period is possible but the identification is far from certain.

Culex: The date was not the only problem in this manuscript. The pagination also necessitated correspondence with library staff. Fearing that I had actually missed some lines of the *Culex* during my visit, I wrote to Mr. Piero Lucci who responded, "Dopo aver esaminato il manoscritto credo di capire il suo dubbio, il testo del *Culex* che lei conosce è alla carta ora indicata "c.IIr", già carta di guardia posteriore, come dalla precedente descrizione (e secondo una precedente numerazione errata scritta a matita in alto a destra -e ora corretta- che forse lei legge nel microfilm: "c. 83r"). Si tratta dunque di una sola copia."

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: I was unable to consult the above-mentioned catalogue for this manuscript but was fortunate enough to have the assistance

of the two kind gentlemen. It is rather amusing that this excerpt required more work than any of its longer cousins!

Amb. = MILAN, Biblioteca Ambrosiana

H 178 inf.

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xiii Maria Luisa Gengaro and Gemma Villa Guglielmetti, *Inventario dei codici decorati e miniati (secc. VII-XIII) della Biblioteca Ambrosiana* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1968) 105; second half of saec. xii Munk Olsen II (1985) 736.

Country of origin: “scuola francese” Gengaro and Villa Guglielmetti 105.

Ownership: “Provenienza non indicata” Gengaro and Villa Guglielmetti 105.

Culex: 117r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Antonio Ceruti, *Inventario Ceruti dei manoscritti della Biblioteca Ambrosiana*, Vol. II (Trezzano: Editrice Etimar, 1975) 355; Gengaro and Villa Guglielmetti 105; Munk Olsen (1985) 736.

Vat. = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 1586

Familiar name: It is a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xv.

Country of origin: “italienne” Pellegrin III, 1 (1991) 165.

Ownership: “Minias Pucci de Florence, fils d’Antonio d’après l’ex-libris du f. 1v”

Pellegrin III, 1 (1991) 165. For more on Bishop Angelo Colocci of Nocera Umbra, see siglum J.

Culex: 57r-64r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuentarium librorum latinorum Mss.*

Bib. Vat., Tomus Tertius 149; Nogara III (1912) 82-83; Pellegrin III, 1 (1991) 163-165.

Pie. = NEW YORK, Pierpont Morgan Library

M. 223

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: anno 1455.

Country of origin: “Written by Ventura . . . probably at Florence” Seymour de Ricci,

Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada,

Volume II (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1937) 1408.

Ownership: It passed from Ambroise Firmin-Didot (1790-1876) to D. Morgand in 1878.

Later it belonged to John Pierpont Morgan (1837-1913) and to his son of the same name (1867-1943).

Culex: 62v-69v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: de Ricci 1408.

Vi. = VIENNA, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek

3230

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: “φ. 265.” Stephanus Endlicher, *Catalogus codicum philologicorum latinorum Bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobonensis* (Vindobonae [Vienna]: apud F. Beck, 1836) 65. It is also given as “Philol. 265.” in *Tabulae codicum manuscriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asseruatorum*, Volumen II (Vindobonae [Vienna]: Caroli Geroldi Filius, 1868) 239.

Signum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xvi.

Country of origin: “Volumen totum a ludimagistro Viennensi ineuntis saeculi xv congestum fuisse uidetur.” Endlicher 66.

Ownership: no indication.

Culex: 158v-166v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Endlicher 65-66; *Tabulae codicum* II (1868) 239; Plésent (1910) 20-21.

Vla. = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 7192

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xv-xvi.

Country of origin: The manuscript is composed of various poems which appear to be of Italian origin.

Ownership: no indication.

Culex: 339v-345v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only contains lines 1-7, 78-234, then 8-77.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuentarium librorum latinorum Mss. Bib. Vat.*, Tomus Nonus 122-124; Kristeller II (1967) 383-384.

Ad. = LONDON, British Library

Add. 16562

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelfmark: This manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: Watson rejects this manuscript from his catalogue of datable manuscripts although

Ad. has two indications of date. At first, this seems to be a strange course of action but his reasons are clear. "On fol. 16 the final part of the year has been neatly erased, leaving only 'M'cccc° < . . . >'. A slip of paper pasted to fol. 1, a flyleaf, bears several post-

mediaeval numbers and 'Anno 1460'. This date may be correct but it may be no more than an approximation." See Watson 165.

Country of origin: "Written in Italy" Williams and Pattie 128.

Ownership: no indication.

Culex: 62v-69v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years 1846-1847* (London: British Museum, 1864) 278-279; Williams and Pattie 128; Watson *Introduction* 165.

Ci. = VENICE, Museo Correr

Cicogna 1775

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: "precedente segnatura: Cicogna 954" (from the letter of Professor Romanelli).

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: "Ms. del sec. XIX" (Professor Romanelli).

Country of origin: Venice, Italy.

Ownership: "Sul primo foglio del volume, titolo: *Miscellanea di scritti di vari autori*; sulla carta di guardia: 'Codice raccolto e scritto di pugno di Francesco Negri letterato veneziano = lasciato in testamento a me Emm.[anuele] Cicogna di Venezia con altri simili' come il ms. precedente Cicogna 1774 che contiene 'pezzi da lui copiati da vari mss. e libri stampati'" (Professor Romanelli).

***Culex*: 41r-48r.**

Deviation from the standard amount: 's: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Professor Romanelli again quotes from the *Catalogo della biblioteca di Emmanuele Cicogna di Venezia* [v. 1:] *Codici manuscritti dal numero I al mille inclusivamente*, Venezia, compiuto nell'ottobre del 1841. He assures me that on page 412 it states, "Il *Culex* è descritto con le stesse parole che compaiono nel testo: '4. Publii Vergilii Maronis *Culex*, cum adnotationibus ex Petri Bembi libello depromptis.'"

Important note: This manuscript is almost an exact copy of Pietro Bembo's 1530 edition of the *Culex*.⁵⁵ That fact makes it useless for any future stemma but it does have some redeeming features. The copyist is checking his work against some other manuscript(s) or printed book(s) and although guilty of *contaminatio*, he provides us with some interesting readings. As Bembo's work is a printed book, I do not give the collation in full as I would if it were a manuscript. In most cases, I only mention it when it is the first to offer a certain reading or one of few editions to do so, but when Ci. disagrees with Bembo, I shall present both readings.

Onb. = VIENNA, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek

3108

Familiar name: not applicable.

⁵⁵ Pietro Bembo, *Petri Bembi ad Herculem Strotium de Virgilii Culice et Terentii fabulis liber*. Venetiis [Venice], per Ioan. Ant. eiusque fratres de Sabio, 1530.

Former shelf-mark: “R. 922.” Endlicher 63; “Rec. 922.” *Tabulae codicum* II (1868) 198.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: “Arbeit der zweiten Hälfte des XV. Jahrhunderts” Hermann Julius Hermann, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Österreich* (Leipzig: Karl W. Hierseemann, 1930) 47.

Country of origin: “wahrscheinlich Lombardei” Franz Unterkircher, *Inventar der illuminierten Handschriften, Inkunabeln und Frühdrucke der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, Teil 1, *Die abendländischen Handschriften* (Vienna: Georg Praeger Verlag, 1957) 91.

Ownership: “In fronte codicis notatur possessoris nomen: ‘1544 Rudbertus Niuimontanus est possessor huius libri, datum a Iacobo Limitanio.’”⁵⁶ Endlicher 64.

Hermann notes that the manuscript also belonged to the Wiener Jesuitskollegiums until 1773 when it passed to the Hofbibliothek. See Hermann 47.

Culex: 221v-227v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Endlicher 63-64; *Tabulae codicum* II (1868) 198; Hermann 47-48; Unterkircher 91.

There is one final manuscript to add to the list which does not have a siglum assigned to it. This is because Canon. Class. Lat. 54 does not have enough of a text of the *Culex* to be of assistance to us in the apparatus criticus. Instead, it has a set of glosses by

⁵⁶ The same reference reveals that “Niuimontanus” indicates an inhabitant of the town of Schneeberg.

Pomponio Leto on the complete works of Virgil including the *Appendix Vergiliana*.

According to *The Survival of Ancient Literature*, “The manuscript is not autograph, as Zabughin thought, but a fair copy by a scribe. However, there is at least one added note in Pomponio’s hand (fol. 142v).”⁵⁷ The commentary on the *Culex* is almost identical to the text printed by Giovanni Oporin in his Basel edition of 1544 but on certain topics the information is more complete than that provided by Oporin. Pomponio never published his glosses yet they appear in different stages of completion, copied by his own hand or by others on manuscripts, pirated by Daniel Gaitano, reworked by Oporin and reprinted in many subsequent editions.

OXFORD, Bodleian Library

Canon. Class. Lat. 54

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: not applicable.

Date: “last third of the 15th cent.” Hunt et al.15.

Country of origin: Italy.

Ownership: On folio 1r one can read the word “est” which has been changed to “erat”, then the names “Io. Rutini et amicorum” and on the next line “Benedicti Varicensii.” In the opinion of Hunt and his colleagues, the 2 ex-libris date from the sixteenth century

⁵⁷ Richard Hunt et al., *The Survival of Ancient Literature: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Greek and Latin Classical Manuscripts Displayed on the Occasion of the Triennial Meeting of the Hellenic and Roman Societies 28 July-2 August 1975* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1975) 15-16. For more on Leto, his other work on Virgil and his repudiation of Gaitano’s 1487 Brescia edition, see pages 11 and 12 of the same catalogue.

and the second is “perhaps identifiable as Benedetto Varchi, 1503-65, the Florentine historian.”⁵⁸ The most famous owner of the manuscript was Matteo Luigi Canonici (1727-1805) who gave his name to a Bodleian collection of manuscripts. He was born in Venice and became a Jesuit in 1743. After the suppression of the Jesuit order, the Summary Catalogue reports that “he set himself to study history, and collected coins, statuary, printed books and manuscripts. Canonici’s collections passed to his brother Giuseppe, and on [Giuseppe’s] death in 1807 to Giovanni Perissinotti and Girolamo Cardina who divided them. To the former fell the manuscripts, then about 3550 in number, and, after many attempts to sell them, the Bodleian became the purchaser of the greater part in 1817.”⁵⁹

Culex: 1r-12r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not applicable.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Madan IV (1897) 318 (simply refers the reader to Coxe’s catalogue); Henricus [Henry] Coxe, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae, Pars Tertia, Codices graecos et latinos Canonicianos complectens* (Oxonii [Oxford]: e typographeo academico, 1854) 133-134. The Bodleian library website www.bodley.ac.uk is useful for information which cannot be found in the catalogues, such as the date of Canonici’s death.

⁵⁸ Hunt et al. 166.

⁵⁹ Falconer Madan, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, Vol. IV (*Collections received during the 1st half of the 19th Century*) Nos. 16670-24330 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897) 313.

Chapter Two: The Adain Program and the Relationship Between Manuscripts

As I was in the process of gathering the fifty manuscripts chosen for this study, I reviewed some scholarly articles in order to see how successful others were in making their observations on the interconnection of manuscripts clear to readers who did not have the source material in front of them. I intentionally omitted articles which dealt with my subject until after I had collated the manuscripts and jotted down any links which appeared. The authors all produced compelling evidence by quoting readings which proved that x and y came from different branches of the stemma. Often measurements and line counts per page were included as well as learned discussions of the life and library of the former owner. I had no fault to find with their results but, at the same time, I wished that I had been given a diagram other than a stemma to help me visualize the argument. There was no problem in cases where the author only described a small number of manuscripts but I shuddered at the thought of presenting fifty.

I searched for suitable software but soon realized that Excel, while useful for the neat appearance of the finished product, would not perform the necessary calculation of affinity. My mathematical and programming skills were not sufficient to create something made to measure and were already being tested to the limit by Dr. Stefan Hagel's brilliant but challenging apparatus criticus program. Fortunately, a solution in the form of a freeware program named Adain was available at the following website:

<http://pot-pourri.fltr.ucl.ac.be/files/ADAIN/>.

First of all, it should be noted that all documentation for this program is in French, including command prompts. The first page of the help file warns the reader that we must not put too much trust in machines lest we forget that we are dealing with the copying

errors of human beings. The program's creator offers it with this purpose in mind, "aider quiconque veut étudier un appareil critique, en lui fournissant des moyens propres à vérifier rapidement les hypothèses qu'il peut formuler, en lui permettant de choisir aisément les exemples les plus probants pour sa démonstration."⁶⁰ The user obtains three benefits from Adain. It permits him or her to determine the likelihood of a manuscript belonging to a given family and produces results in an easy-to-read chart. It creates a framework for asking questions about the agreement or opposition of individual manuscripts and allows quick retrieval of results which bolster the scholar's claim. Finally, these results can be downloaded to a .txt file and then printed from Word. I find that this works adequately for small files but larger ones require Excel as well as some surgery on the margins.

It soon became apparent that Professor Pierre-Louis Malosse did not have my thesis in mind when he wrote the program. He quite correctly notes that editors should only need a small number of slots for manuscripts in the program if they have done their work properly and excluded those which add nothing to the stemma. A prolegomenon, unfortunately, reflects the stage before the pruning and, like a sprawling rosebush, my fifty manuscripts were not pleased to be confined to the one hundred allotted spots. After all, what was one to do about correcting hands?

Before I describe the modifications which I made to the program, I should give a general account of what the user is expected to do in order to produce the desired results. The first task is to assign sigla to all manuscripts. This is necessary for the opening line of the apparatus's text file which the computer will read. One cannot simply cut the

⁶⁰ First page of the file entitled *Présentation*.

apparatus which one has created in Dr. Hagel's program and paste it into Adain. There are specific lines of code which must be included and certain rules observed. I shall not bore the reader with all the details but shall select those which affected my results and would lead to confusion if left unexplained. Right from the start, I noticed a problem with some of the sigla which I had taken such pains to find in the works of other scholars and reuse in my own. The program refused to accept Greek characters and would not differentiate between uppercase and lowercase versions of the same letter. It was undesirable and far too late to select different sigla for my apparatus, so I did the next best thing by changing the offending sigla slightly. An additional legend was created as a concordance of old and new sigla.

Once the sigla have been established, one has to make a decision about correcting hands. At first, I had them listed as separate manuscripts for the purposes of the program but this used up too many slots and slowed the computer's progress to a crawl. I then devised a method which allowed me to mark other hands with *2, *3 etc. while only using fifty slots. After this initial set of codes, I typed in my apparatus. I opened a new window in Dr. Hagel's program underneath the one which contained my apparatus so I could paste sigla into both windows at the same time. Let us look at some introductory material and then explain how the program turned code into charts and what the results show.

Table 1: Legend of Sigla Used in the Adain File

V = unchanged	d = unchanged	Y = unchanged
C = unchanged	η = eta.	Bpl. = unchanged
F = unchanged	h = Sh\$	Ha. = unchanged
E = unchanged	Voss. = unchanged	Z = unchanged
A = unchanged	l = unchanged	Fr. = unchanged
W = unchanged	Tr. = unchanged	Pom. = unchanged
S = unchanged	Wu. = unchanged	Cor. = unchanged
B = unchanged	Bnf. = unchanged	Amb. = unchanged
T = unchanged	Laur. = unchanged	Vat. = unchanged
Γ = G	O = unchanged	Pie. = unchanged
ψ = P	J = unchanged	Vi. = unchanged
e = Se\$	K = unchanged	Vla. = unchanged
Esc. = unchanged	M = unchanged	Ad. = unchanged
r = unchanged	N = unchanged	Ci. = unchanged
a = +a+	Q = unchanged	Onb. = unchanged
p = -p-	X = unchanged	H = Professor Clausen's
U = unchanged	I = %I%	OCT

As previously stated, Canon. Class. Lat. 54 will not be included in this section.

Printed books have had the first "1" of their year of publication removed in order to save space in the lines of code.

Table 2: Sample Page of Adain Code

```

#sigla= H, V, C, other, F, E, A, W, S, B, T, G, P, Se$, Esc., r, +a+, -
p-, U, d, eta., Sh$, Voss., l, Tr., Wu., Bnf., Laur., O, J, K, M, N, Q,
Q2, X, %I%,

#sigla=Y, Bpl., Ha., Z, Fr., Pom., Cor., Amb., Vat., Pie., Vi., Vla.,
Ad., Ci., Onb., 469., 471., 472., 473., 475., 476., 479., 487., 492.,
493., 501.,

#sigla=502., 505., 507., 517., 519., 529., 530., 534., 544., 570., 573.

#pc=*2, *3, *4

>1 lusimus
/HVCFEAWBTGEsc.UdVoss.lBnf.Laur.X%I%YHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb
.469.471.472.475.530./ scripsimus /P$H$/

>1 /H/ gracili modulante /Onb./

>1 thalia
/HVCFEAWBTGEsc.UdVoss.lBnf.Laur.X%I%YHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.469
.471.472.475.517.530.534./ camel /P/ camena /Sh$Laur.*2Onb./

>2 orsum
/HV*2WBPU$H$Voss.lBnf.Laur.YHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb.469.471.472.
475.517.530.534./ usum /VX/ ursum /CFETGEsc.d%I%Vat./ legi non potuit A

>3 /H/ hacpropter /573.*2/

>3 /H/ culici /F/ legi non potuit A

>3 sint
/HVFEWBTGPesc.U*2d$H$Voss.Bnf.Laur.X%I%Ha.Fr.Vat.Ci.469.479.517.530.534
./ sunt
/CULlaur.*2YPom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb.471.472.475.476.487.492.493.501.502.5
05.507./ legi non potuit A

>3 docta /HCFEWTGEsc.dLaur.*2%I%/ dicta
/VPUS$H$Voss.lBnf.Laur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb.471.472.475.
517.530.534./ dea /469./ legi non potuit A

>4 et /HVCFEWTGPesc.d$H$Voss.Bnf.%I%Ha.Pie.Ci.Onb.469.479.530.573./ ut
/UlLaur.XYFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Vla.Ad.471.472.475.476.487.492.493.501.517.534.
573.*2/

>4 per ludum
/HVCFEAWBTGEsc.UdVoss.lBnf.Laur.X%I%YHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb.46
9./ perludens /P$H$/ proludens /573.*2/

>4 consonet
/HVCFEAWBTGEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.X%I%YHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb.469./
consonat /P$H$Bnf./

```

Table 3: Chart of Long Excerpts and Full-length Manuscripts

S	P	V	Ha.	Voss.	Onb.	W	V	Pie.	Via.	X	Val.	E	%	F	T	Laur.	U	A	I	B	Fr.	C	Pom.	Cl.	d	Ad.	G	Exc.	Vi.	H	
\$h\$	d	1.79	1.29	1.25	1.24	0.86	0.86	0.84	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.79	0.76	0.74	0.74	0.73	0.73	0.72	0.72	0.71	0.71	0.70	0.69	0.69	0.68	0.65	0.64	0.63	0.49		
A	B	T	W	E	S	d	Exc.	C	Laur.	X	Onb.	Fr.	Val.	G	Ad.	V	Ha.	Via.	Voss.	U	Pie.	Y	Pom.	I	Cl.	Vi.	\$h\$	P	H		
%	1.90	1.87	1.82	1.80	1.72	1.72	1.68	1.59	1.58	1.44	1.33	1.32	1.23	1.21	1.20	1.13	1.10	1.04	0.96	0.94	0.93	0.92	0.91	0.87	0.83	0.81	0.78	0.74	0.65	0.58	
T	%	B	W	E	d	Exc.	C	S	F	Laur.	X	Onb.	Fr.	Val.	G	Ad.	V	Ha.	Voss.	U	Pie.	Pom.	I	Cl.	Vi.	\$h\$	P	H			
A	1.91	1.90	1.88	1.73	1.72	1.65	1.59	1.57	1.54	1.39	1.32	1.29	1.23	1.21	1.18	1.09	1.08	1.01	0.98	0.97	0.94	0.93	0.91	0.88	0.85	0.79	0.78	0.72	0.70	0.56	
U	Laur.	Pie.	Val.	Via.	Y	X	Fr.	Onb.	%	B	C	d	T	W	A	E	F	Exc.	Pom.	Vi.	S	Ha.	I	G	V	Voss.	Cl.	\$h\$	P	H	
Ad.	1.56	1.40	1.40	1.31	1.29	1.23	1.22	1.20	1.19	1.10	1.09	1.08	1.06	1.06	1.08	1.03	1.03	0.99	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.90	0.90	0.87	0.85	0.84	0.75	0.68	0.64	0.45	
B	%	A	E	S	d	T	W	Exc.	C	F	Laur.	Onb.	X	Val.	Fr.	G	Ad.	U	Via.	V	Y	Ha.	Pie.	Voss.	I	Pom.	Cl.	Vi.	\$h\$	P	H
B	1.87	1.86	1.81	1.78	1.75	1.75	1.73	1.70	1.68	1.44	1.34	1.31	1.29	1.21	1.12	1.09	0.96	0.94	0.94	0.92	0.92	0.90	0.87	0.87	0.81	0.81	0.71	0.62	0.55		
C	1.88	1.61	1.58	1.57	1.54	1.54	1.51	1.50	1.46	1.42	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.21	1.16	1.14	1.08	0.97	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.92	0.90	0.86	0.84	0.80	0.77	0.70	0.63	0.54
Vi.	I	Pom.	Onb.	Exc.	Via.	%	B	U	Ha.	V	X	A	d	E	P	Pie.	Val.	C	T	W	Laur.	Voss.	Ad.	H	Fr.	F	Y	G	\$h\$	S	
Cl.	1.14	1.11	1.10	0.87	0.86	0.82	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.76	0.76	0.75	0.74	0.73	0.72	0.71	0.69	0.66		
B	%	A	E	T	Exc.	C	S	W	F	Laur.	Onb.	X	Val.	Fr.	G	Ad.	Y	V	Via.	Pie.	U	Voss.	I	Pom.	Cl.	Vi.	\$h\$	P	H		
d	1.75	1.68	1.65	1.65	1.62	1.60	1.54	1.54	1.53	1.41	1.28	1.27	1.21	1.20	1.17	1.16	1.08	0.98	0.98	0.95	0.95	0.93	0.90	0.85	0.84	0.79	0.79	0.70	0.69	0.53	
B	T	%	A	d	Exc.	C	W	S	F	Onb.	Laur.	X	Val.	Fr.	G	Ad.	Via.	Y	U	Pie.	V	Ha.	I	Pom.	Voss.	Cl.	Vi.	\$h\$	P	H	
E	1.81	1.73	1.72	1.72	1.65	1.63	1.61	1.57	1.51	1.44	1.27	1.24	1.19	1.12	1.11	1.08	1.03	0.95	0.94	0.92	0.91	0.91	0.89	0.88	0.86	0.79	0.79	0.76	0.68	0.54	
B	E	d	%	A	T	C	S	W	F	Onb.	Laur.	X	Val.	Fr.	G	Ad.	U	Pie.	V	Ha.	Pom.	I	Y	Via.	Vi.	Voss.	Cl.	P	\$h\$	H	
Exc.	1.70	1.63	1.60	1.59	1.59	1.56	1.50	1.47	1.41	1.31	1.28	1.22	1.16	1.10	1.09	1.08	0.99	0.98	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.92	0.91	0.91	0.89	0.88	0.86	0.87	0.64	0.59	
S	T	%	B	E	C	d	A	W	Exc.	Laur.	Onb.	X	G	Val.	Ad.	Fr.	U	Ha.	Via.	Voss.	Pie.	Y	U	\$h\$	Cl.	Pom.	I	Vi.	H	P	
F	1.59	1.52	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.42	1.41	1.39	1.36	1.31	1.09	1.09	1.07	1.07	1.03	1.02	0.96	0.95	0.93	0.90	0.86	0.85	0.83	0.74	0.73	0.73	0.72	0.70	0.59	0.57	
Val.	Laur.	X	%	A	Ad.	B	W	S	T	d	C	U	Pie.	E	Via.	Exc.	Y	Onb.	F	G	Ha.	I	Voss.	Vi.	V	Pom.	Cl.	P	\$h\$	H	
Fr.	1.87	1.82	1.59	1.21	1.21	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.19	1.18	1.17	1.16	1.16	1.12	1.11	1.10	1.05	1.03	1.02	0.92	0.85	0.84	0.83	0.82	0.81	0.74	0.74	0.74	0.71	0.51	
d	C	%	B	T	A	E	Exc.	F	S	W	Val.	X	Laur.	Onb.	Fr.	U	Ha.	Pie.	Via.	Voss.	Ad.	Y	Pom.	U	I	Cl.	Vi.	H	\$h\$	P	
G	1.16	1.14	1.13	1.12	1.11	1.09	1.08	1.08	1.07	1.07	1.05	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.92	0.92	0.90	0.90	0.88	0.88	0.87	0.85	0.80	0.80	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.67	0.65	0.64	
Cl.	G	Ha.	V	Pie.	Voss.	Exc.	F	Pom.	W	%	Vi.	X	I	Val.	Via.	A	B	C	E	T	d	Laur.	U	Onb.	Fr.	Y	\$h\$	S	P	Ad.	
H	0.75	0.67	0.66	0.65	0.61	0.61	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.56	0.55	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.53	0.53	0.53	0.52	0.51	0.51	0.49	0.49	0.46	0.45	
Voss.	V	\$h\$	Pie.	P	W	Via.	Y	A	X	%	T	d	F	C	B	Exc.	Val.	Laur.	Ad.	G	E	Onb.	S	Fr.	U	Vi.	Pom.	I	Cl.	H	
Ha.	2.09	1.99	1.25	1.13	1.08	1.04	1.03	1.01	0.97	0.97	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.95	0.93	0.92	0.92	0.91	0.90	0.90	0.89	0.87	0.87	0.85	0.83	0.83	0.82	0.81	0.80	0.66	
Vi.	Pom.	Onb.	U	Cl.	Pie.	Via.	Y	Exc.	Ad.	Laur.	E	B	Val.	A	d	C	Fr.	X	%	W	Ha.	T	V	Voss.	G	S	\$h\$	F	P	H	
I	1.83	1.80	1.20	1.12	1.11	1.00	0.98	0.98	0.91	0.90	0.89	0.88	0.87	0.86	0.85	0.85	0.84	0.84	0.83	0.83	0.81	0.80	0.78	0.76	0.75	0.74	0.72	0.72	0.58	0.57	
Val.	Fr.	X	Ad.	U	B	%	A	T	d	W	C	E	S	Exc.	Pie.	Via.	Onb.	Y	F	G	Ha.	Pom.	I	V	Vi.	Voss.	Cl.	\$h\$	P	H	
Laur.	1.95	1.82	1.70	1.40	1.35	1.34	1.33	1.32	1.32	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.22	1.22	1.20	1.15	1.15	1.09	0.96	0.91	0.91	0.89	0.89	0.88	0.87	0.76	0.73	0.73	0.53	
B	Exc.	d	E	C	T	%	A	S	W	I	Ad.	Pom.	Laur.	Pie.	Val.	X	U	Vi.	F	Y	Via.	Fr.	G	V	Voss.	Cl.	Ha.	\$h\$	P	H	
Onb.	1.31	1.28	1.27	1.24	1.24	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.22	1.20	1.19	1.18	1.15	1.14	1.13	1.12	1.11	1.11	1.09	1.08	1.05	1.03	0.96	0.93	0.88	0.87	0.86	0.75	0.52		
S	\$h\$	V	Ha.	Voss.	Val.	Via.	Y	X	Cl.	Pie.	W	Onb.	Fr.	Laur.	A	d	E	Exc.	U	T	%	Ad.	G	C	B	Pom.	I	F	Vi.	H	
P	d	1.79	1.11	1.08	1.02	0.88	0.87	0.85	0.80	0.79	0.77	0.77	0.75	0.74	0.73	0.70	0.70	0.68	0.67	0.66	0.65	0.64	0.63	0.62	0.62	0.58	0.57	0.57	0.46		
Via.	U	Y	Ad.	Val.	Laur.	Onb.	Ha.	Fr.	X	Voss.	V	Pom.	Vi.	I	W	d	C	Exc.	%	B	A	E	G	T	F	\$h\$	S	Cl.	P	H	
Pie.	1.45	1.42	1.41	1.40	1.24	1.22	1.14	1.13	1.12	1.11	1.08	1.07	1.05	1.03	1.00	0.97	0.95	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.92	0.91	0.91	0.90	0.86	0.83	0.80	0.79	0.77	0.61	
I	Vi.	Onb.	Cl.	U	Pie.	Via.	Y	Ad.	Laur.	Val.	E	%	B	A	C	X	d	T	W	Ha.	Fr.	G	V	Voss.	F	S	\$h\$	P	H		
Pom.	1.80	1.71	1.18	1.10	1.08	1.05	0.96	0.96	0.93	0.92	0.91	0.89	0.88	0.87	0.87	0.86	0.86	0.84	0.84	0.83	0.82	0.81	0.80	0.79	0.77	0.73	0.73	0.70	0.62	0.59	
\$h\$	P	B	%	W	F	A	d	C	E	T	Exc.	Laur.	Onb.	Fr.	Val.	X	G	Ad.	Ha.	Voss.	Via.	U	V	Y	Pie.	I	Pom.	Vi.	Cl.	H	
S	d	d	1.78	1.72	1.67	1.59	1.54	1.54	1.51	1.51	1.49	1.47	1.24	1.23	1.19	1.16	1.14	1.07	0.92	0.87	0.86	0.85	0.84	0.84	0.80	0.74	0.73	0.70	0.60	0.49	
A	%	B	E	W	d	Exc.	C	F	S	Laur.	X	Onb.	Fr.	Val.	G	Ad.	V	Ha.	Via.	Voss.	U	Pie.	V	Pom.	I	Cl.	Vi.	\$h\$	P	H	
T	1.91	1.82	1.75	1.73	1.71	1.62	1.56	1.54	1.52	1.49	1.32	1.31	1.24	1.19	1.11	1.08	1.02	0.96	0.94	0.93	0.92	0.90	0.89	0.84	0.80	0.77	0.77	0.74	0.60	0.54	
Ad.	Pie.	Laur.	Via.	Y	Val.	Fr.	X	I	Onb.	Pom.	Vi.	Exc.	C	B	%	A	d	E	T	W	S	F	Ha.	Cl.	G	V	Voss.	\$h\$	P	H	
U	1.58	1.42	1.35	1.31	1.26	1.25	1.16	1.14	1.12	1.11	1.08	1.05	0.96	0.97	0.96	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.92	0.90	0.84	0.83	0.81	0.80	0.80	0.79	0.73	0.67	0.53	

Chart of Long Excerpts and Full-length Manuscripts

	Ha.	Voss	\$h5	P	W	Pie.	%i%	T	A	Via.	d	X	Y	F	B	Esc.	Onb.	C	G	E	Val.	Laur.	Ad.	S	Fr.	Vi.	Cl.	U	Pom.	I	H	
V	1.99	1.92	1.29	1.11	1.09	1.07	1.04	1.02	1.01	0.99	0.98	0.97	0.97	0.96	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.92	0.91	0.90	0.89	0.85	0.84	0.82	0.82	0.80	0.80	0.79	0.78	0.65	
	Laur.	Fr.	X	Ad.	U	Pie.	B	C	%i%	d	T	A	Via.	W	S	Y	Onb.	E	Esc.	F	G	Ha.	V	Pom.	Voss.	P	I	Vi.	\$h5	Cl.	H	
Val.	1.95	1.87	1.72	1.31	1.25	1.24	1.21	1.21	1.20	1.20	1.19	1.18	1.17	1.17	1.16	1.13	1.12	1.09	1.07	0.98	0.92	0.90	0.89	0.89	0.88	0.86	0.85	0.79	0.79	0.57		
I	Pom.	Cl.	Onb.	U	Pie.	Via.	Y	Ad.	Esc.	Laur.	Val.	X	Fr.	Ha.	V	B	C	A	d	E	Voss.	%i%	T	W	G	F	S	\$h5	H	P		
VI.	1.83	1.71	1.14	1.11	1.05	1.03	1.01	0.96	0.93	0.86	0.86	0.85	0.84	0.83	0.83	0.82	0.81	0.80	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.78	0.77	0.76	0.71	0.70	0.70	0.63	0.58	0.57		
	Ha.	V	Pie.	U	Ad.	Laur.	Val.	Fr.	X	Onb.	Ha.	Vi.	Voss.	W	V	A	d	I	%i%	B	Pom.	E	T	F	C	Esc.	G	P	S	\$h5	Cl.	H
Via.	1.92	1.45	1.31	1.29	1.20	1.17	1.11	1.06	1.05	1.03	1.01	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.94	0.93	0.92	0.89	0.89	0.87	0.85	0.83	0.82	0.57			
	Ha.	V	\$h5	Pie.	P	Via.	W	Y	%i%	A	T	X	B	C	d	F	Val.	Esc.	G	Onb.	Laur.	E	S	Ad.	Fr.	U	Vi.	I	Pom.	Cl.	H	
Voss.	2.09	1.92	1.24	1.08	1.02	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.89	0.88	0.88	0.87	0.86	0.86	0.84	0.84	0.79	0.79	0.78	0.77	0.76	0.61			
	%i%	A	B	T	S	E	d	C	Esc.	F	X	Laur.	Onb.	Fr.	Val.	V	Ad.	G	Ha.	Via.	Voss.	Pie.	Y	U	\$h5	I	Pom.	Cl.	P	Vi.	H	
W	1.80	1.73	1.73	1.71	1.67	1.57	1.53	1.46	1.41	1.36	1.30	1.28	1.22	1.20	1.17	1.09	1.08	1.05	1.04	1.00	0.99	0.97	0.93	0.90	0.86	0.83	0.83	0.77	0.77	0.76	0.59	
	Val.	Laur.	Fr.	%i%	T	W	A	B	C	Ad.	d	E	Esc.	S	U	Onb.	Pie.	F	Via.	Y	G	Ha.	V	Voss.	Pom.	I	Vi.	\$h5	Cl.	P	H	
X	1.72	1.70	1.59	1.32	1.31	1.30	1.29	1.28	1.26	1.22	1.21	1.19	1.16	1.14	1.14	1.12	1.11	1.09	1.06	1.00	0.98	0.97	0.97	0.93	0.85	0.84	0.84	0.83	0.80	0.80	0.58	
	Via.	Pie.	U	Ad.	Val.	Laur.	Onb.	Fr.	Ha.	X	d	Voss.	V	I	Pom.	Vi.	B	E	A	C	W	%i%	Esc.	T	F	G	P	\$h5	S	Cl.	H	
Y	1.92	1.41	1.26	1.23	1.16	1.15	1.08	1.05	1.01	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.97	0.96	0.96	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.93	0.91	0.91	0.89	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.84	0.84	0.72	0.51		

The reader will notice numbers on the code page which, clearly, are not manuscripts. It seemed like a good idea to include rare books from the hundred years after the first printed Virgil. The enormous extra work of collation had to be weighed against the possibility of making comparisons between late manuscripts and early printed books. Once the decision was made, the program was modified slightly and the printed books were treated exactly like manuscripts.

The program works, essentially, by grouping readings into two categories, those which agree with the lemma and those which do not. Thus, I had to choose a set of readings to represent the lemma. As my apparatus used Professor Clausen's OCT as a starting point, it seemed natural to use it here as well. It is possible to force the program to accept the negative method of textual criticism but I would not recommend it. The OCT of the *Culex* is the ubiquitous siglum **H** (for Harvard) at the left of each entry. Once all the code is in place, Adain races through it and crashes suddenly and without warning whenever it discovers a missing forward slash or period. The corrections last for hours until the software is satisfied.

Finally, with great fanfare, it announces that it has finished reading the file and offers to create a "tableau de coefficients de proximité" or to perform various operations on the manuscripts. If one opts for a chart and selects the manuscripts to be compared, the fifty-four pages of code transform themselves into a chart which fills one screen. One can look at **H** and discover which manuscripts were the most helpful to Professor Clausen.⁶¹ To the right of **H** are numbers in descending order which correspond to manuscripts.

⁶¹ This needs to be done in conjunction with his sigla as there are a few manuscripts on my list which would perhaps have been useful for him but were not in his edition.

Adain has arrived at these numbers by a mathematical calculation which gives more weight to incorrect readings than correct ones and more weight to uncommon readings than common ones. It does this on the grounds that manuscripts are usually assumed to present correct readings or to share an error with many others. A higher number means a higher chance that the manuscripts are related. One reads from left to right until the values dip significantly, usually after about five manuscripts.

The problem is that we are not always comparing apples with apples. Some of my manuscripts are excerpts with more decoration than words. If a fragment has even one reading in common with another manuscript, a disproportionately high number will emerge. How does one combat this phenomenon? The program does allow a “nombre minimum de lieux” to be set but in a large collection of manuscripts this is not feasible. The manuscripts must be divided into a “Short” group and a “Long” group, and even then the short ones will still be of limited value for research. Occasionally, the letters “d.i.” appear. This stands for “données insuffisantes” and occurs if manuscript x never shares a single reading with manuscript y.

If one wishes to do other sorts of comparisons between manuscripts, one can press the button marked “Recherches” and follow the options. The number of times when x agrees with y can be determined or the number of times when x and y are in opposition to z. Not only does a percentage appear but also the list of the readings themselves with their line numbers. It will even work for second hands. I am ashamed to admit that I sometimes used the program to help me spot missing sigla although I am certain that its creator never intended it as a substitute for the ability to count!

One statement is needed before the presentation of the results. Statistics must be used with caution. Articles from the early twentieth century which claim to prove that Ovid wrote the *Culex* based on the use or omission of certain words are languishing in the filing cabinet unread. I was fully prepared to throw out the Adain results, even after the indescribable expenditure of time and effort, if they did not match the reliable findings of old-fashioned collation. Fortunately, the results unfolded as expected. Armed with this new tool, let us examine textual patterns in manuscripts and early printed books of the *Culex*.

There are two possible ways to proceed. One method is to start from atoms and void like Lucretius and pretend that we have no idea how the manuscripts fit together. The other is to assume that the reader is familiar with at least a few editions or articles on the subject and to assess the conclusions of others using the Adain program. As much as one tries to keep an open mind and start with a clean slate, one cannot help but be influenced by the OCT. Its *Codices* and *Stemma Codicum* pages are a reflection of twentieth-century efforts to sort *Culex* manuscripts. In the edition, one finds not only a new stemma which is a significant departure from Vollmer's effort but also two distinct groups, Vollmer's *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* and Ullman's *Florilegium Gallicum*. In an earlier time, classification would have been done according to the manuscripts used by a certain editor, such as Sillig's list of the manuscripts used by Heyne or by owner, as in the case of Colbert's manuscripts.⁶² While we owe much to Ribbeck for a layout which is not far removed from a modern OCT, his list of sigla is simply that, a list.

⁶² Heyne-Sillig 633-634.

The *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* and *Florilegium Gallicum* will provide a good test for our software. If we are fortunate, perhaps we shall have some new members to add to the groups. Sigla **W**, **B**, **A** and **T** of the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* may be linked together even without recourse to computer wizardry. The running titles at the beginning and end of my apparatus confirm that they belong together. **E** must be added using a different method. Please consider the following examples, ignoring for the moment any additional sigla:

INCIPIT CVLIX PVBLII VIRḠ (VIRGILII **E**) MAR̄ (MARONIS **E**) **FE**: POETAREM
 (-RVM **WBTBnf.Laur.XI**) SAPIENTISSINI (-IMI **WBTBnf.Laur.XI**) PVPLII (PVB-
WBTBnf.I omiserunt Laur.X) VIRGILII MARONIS (MANTVANI **Bnf.**)
 CONDIPVLI OCTAVIANI CAESARIS (CES- **TBnf.Laur.X**) AGVSTI (AVG-
WBT.Bnf.Laur.XI) MVNDI IMPERATORIS IVVENALIS (-ILIS **B**) (IVVENILIS
 IVVENALIS (sic) **Bnf.**) LVDI LIBELLVS INCIPIT (INCIPIT *omisit* **X**) (FELICITER
X) CVLIX (-EX **WBTBnf.Laur.XI**) (INCIPIT **X**) PVBLII (P̄ **WI omiserunt Laur.X**)
 VIRGILII (V̄ **WI omiserunt Laur.X**) MARONIS (M̄ **WI omiserunt Laur.X**) INCIPIT
 (*omiserunt Laur.X*) **AWBTBnf.Laur.XI**

LIBELLVS QVI NOMINATVR CVLEX (PVBLII **BBnf.**) VIRGILII (VIRGL' **AI**)
 MARONIS (*omisit* **B**) (MARON **ATI**) FINIT **CAWBTBnf.I**: CVLEX P VIRGILII
 MARONIS EXPLICIT **E**

One now sees how the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* acquired its name from the first set of titles. Moving out of a decidedly unscientific mode of reasoning, we turn to Adain which looks at the sigla in two different ways. If one refers to the chart of full-length

manuscripts, finds A, then reads from left to right until the numbers drop noticeably, it becomes clear that B, T, W and E are related to A. According to the documentation which comes with the program, Adain has arrived at these figures by assigning points in ascending amounts for “leçons divergentes; leçon du lemme majoritaire; lemme minoritaire ou variante majoritaire; variante minoritaire” and finally “variante minoritaire parmi plus de deux variantes.” The coefficient is “le total de ces points de proximité, divisé par le nombre de lieux.”⁶³ What sort of proof besides the coefficient can Adain furnish to support our theory that E should be included? As it turns out, Adain is analyzing 490 places in the text which I have identified in my apparatus as containing a noteworthy reading from E. E appears 233 times in the lemma and 257 times in another reading. It agrees with W, B, A and T 325 times or 93% of the time. If the numbers seem meaningless by themselves, there are actual passages to back them up. There is no need to print out 325 words or phrases from the *Culex* but a short sample will be helpful:

399 purpureum /HVCFEAWBTGEsc.UdHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.X%I%Ad./ purpureo
/U*2lLaur.*2YPom.Vi.Ci.Onb.469.471.472.475.517.530.534./

399 crescent /HVCFEAWBTGEsc.UVoss.Laur.X%I%Ha.Fr.Vat.Ad./ descant /d/
crescens /Y/ crescit /U*2lPom.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb.469.471.472.475.517.530.534./

399 pudibunda /HVGVoss.Ha./ rubicunda
/CEAWBTEsc.UdlLaur.X%I%YFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb.469.471.472.475.517.530
.534./ rubicundata /F/

400 spartica
/HCFEAWBTEsc.U*2dlLaur.X%I%Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb.469.471.472.475.530.57
3./ parthica /VVoss.YHa.Fr.573.*2/ pastica /G/ spartycha /U/

401 crocus /HVCFGEsc.U*2Voss.lYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ci.469.471.472.475.517.530.534./
crosus /EAWBT%I%Ad./ grossus /ULaur.XFr.Vat./ cro /d/ cresus /Onb./

Thus it is clear that W, B, E, A and T belong together.

⁶³ Adain instructions from the section marked *Explications*.

Is it possible that the OCT has omitted any manuscripts which should also be part of the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*? In my view, it has. Siglum **I** exhibits the now familiar *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* opening title.⁶⁴ **d** reads CVLEX PVBLII VIRGILII MARONIS INCIPIT and requires additional verification. **I** agrees with **WBEAT** 97% of the time while the figure for **d** is 91%. Michael Reeve writes about these two manuscripts and his articles are usually a good place to test one's theories. The title of **I** has not escaped his notice and he does not say how he has come to a conclusion on **d**. He writes that **I** and **d** are witnesses to the lost *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* (**L** in the OCT's stemma) noting, "Editors might as well add these two manuscripts to the five from which they reconstruct **L**."⁶⁵

In **Esc.**, the *Culex* is introduced by PVBLII VIRGILII MARONIS IVVENALIS LVDI LIBELLVS DE CVLICE ET PASTORE INCIPIT and ends with PVBLII VIRGILII MARONIS IVVENALIS LVDI LIBELLVS DE CVLICE ET PASTORE EXPLICIT. It agrees with **WBEAT** 92% of the time. **Laur.** shares the most common *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* title with **AWBTI** as do **Bnf.** and **X** while **Fr.**'s title contains modified wording.⁶⁶ The percentages of agreement with **WBEAT** are **Laur.** (79%), **Bnf.** (85% but only an excerpt), **X** (81%) and **Fr.** (75%).⁶⁷ Professor Clausen suggested to me in an e mail that **Vat.** should be investigated as a potential candidate for the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*. Its titles tell us nothing but with 77% agreement, it is quite likely.

⁶⁴ **I** is one of the sigla which had to be changed to accommodate the Adain program. Please see the legend.

⁶⁵ Reeve (1976) 242. This is not to be confused with my siglum **I**.

⁶⁶ MARONIS VIRGILII IVVENILIS LVDI INCIPIT CVLEX **Fr.**

⁶⁷ For additional support of the theory that **Laur.** belongs to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* group, see Lord 133.

The *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* manuscripts divide themselves into two groups

according to age. The early manuscripts **WBEATI** range in age from saec. ix to saec. xi.

The late ones **Laur.dFr.Esc.XVat.Bnf.** start at saec. xiv and end in saec. xv/xvi. The two groups agree seven times in the following examples which all come from the lemma:

1 lusimus

/HVCFEAWBTGEsc.UdVoss.lBnf.Laur.X%l%YHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb.469.471.472.475.530./ scripsimus /P\$h\$/

1 thalia

/HVCFEAWBTGEsc.UdVoss.lBnf.Laur.X%l%YHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.469.471.472.475.517.530.534./ camel /P/ camena /\$h\$Laur.*2Onb./

413 culex /HVCFEAWSBTG\$e\$Esc.r+p-

UdTr.Wu.Bnf.Laur.OJKNX%l%YHa.ZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb.469.471.472.475.517.530.534./ cules /+a+MBpl./ omisit /Voss./

413 pecudum custos /HVCFEAWBTG\$e\$Esc.r+a+-p-

UdTr.Wu.Bnf.Laur.JKMNX%l%YBpl.Ha.ZFr.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci.Onb.530./ custos pecudum /IOVi.469.471.472.475.517.534./ custos pecorum /Pom./ omisit /Voss./

413 tibi tale merenti/HVCFEAWBTG\$e\$Esc.r+a+-p-

UdTr.Wu.Bnf.Laur.JKMNX%l%YBpl.Ha.Fr.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Ci.Onb.469.479.517.530.534./ nil t m/IO*2Pom.Vi.471.472.475.476.487.492.493.501.502.505.507.519.529./nil t timenti /O//Z//Ad./om/Voss./⁶⁸

414 uit(a)e pro /HVCEAWBTG\$e\$Esc.r+a+-p-

UdTr.Bnf.Laur.OJNQX%l%YHa.ZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb.469.471.472.475.517.530.534./ uita pro /F/ pro uitae /Wu.Pie./ uitam pro /KM/ omisit /Voss./

414 reddit

/HVCFEAWBTG\$e\$Esc.r+a+UdTr.Bnf.Laur.KNQX%l%YHa.ZFr.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci.517.530.534./reddo/U*2lWu.OJYPom.Vi.Onb.469.471.472.475.476.479.487.492.493.501.502.505.507.519.529./ deddit /-p-M/ omisit /Voss./

⁶⁸ The reader may notice occasional shorthand in the Adain file. I have left it untouched in order to show prospective users that they must not exceed 255 characters per entry. Despite that caveat, the file is an ideal place to type in thoughts during collation. The computer will not read anything except for the information inside the forward slashes. Notes may be placed underneath the entries and removed at a later date. The 255 character limit does not apply to them. For the sake of clarity, I have removed any numbers added by the program so that they will not be mistaken for line numbers.

If one omits **Bnf.** which is really too short to be of value, one finds that **WBEATI** and **Laur.dFr.Esc.XVat.** agree 168 times. **Fr.** (25%), **Vat.** (23%) and **Laur.** (20%) are the individual manuscripts most likely to disagree with **WBEATI**. **Esc.** is the least likely at just 8%. The interesting fact is that when the late *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* manuscripts disagree with their elders, they are usually wrong. Later, we shall evaluate the late manuscripts to see whether there is a general statement to be made about their quality.

Now that we have performed various tests on the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* manuscripts, we can return to our chart of full-length manuscripts and look at the coefficients of the ones which have just been discussed in order to see where they fall.⁶⁹ We know from previous experience that the first five or so from the left can be used to bolster an argument but that it is always preferable to have additional evidence. We appear to have chosen wisely as none of our sigla appear at the far right of the page. Thus, with the help of coefficients and percentages supplied by the Adain program as well as titles and shared readings, the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* group has been expanded to include **W, B, E, A, T, I, d, Esc., Laur., Bnf., X, Fr.** and **Vat.**

The *Florilegium Gallicum* manuscripts will be easier to visualize than the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* group because the witnesses to the *Florilegium Gallicum* are all short excerpts which appear on the same chart.

⁶⁹ **Bnf.** is not in this chart. It belongs in the chart of short excerpts.

Table 4: Chart of Short Excerpts

Q	Tr.	-p-	+a+	r	Bnf.	Amb.	Cor.	N	Bpl.	J	Z	H	K	Wu.	eta.	Q2	O	M
\$e\$	3.00	2.59	2.50	2.44	2.32	1.57	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.67	0.57	0.57	0.50	0.40	0.29
Q	-p-	Tr.	\$e\$	r	Bpl.	Bnf.	M	Amb.	Cor.	N	H	J	Z	eta.	Q2	K	Wu.	O
+a+	3.00	2.47	2.46	2.44	2.24	2.00	1.43	1.00	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.67	0.57	0.57	0.50	0.43	0.43	0.30
Q	Tr.	\$e\$	+a+	r	Bnf.	M	Bpl.	Amb.	Cor.	J	N	H	Wu.	Z	eta.	Q2	K	O
-p-	2.90	2.62	2.50	2.47	2.31	1.43	1.00	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.68	0.57	0.57	0.50	0.50	0.43	0.40
eta.	Q2	Cor.	H	N	\$e\$	Bnf.	J	r	Tr.	Z	Bpl.	+a+	-p-	K	Wu.	Q	O	M
Amb.	d.i	d.i	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.67	0.57	0.43
eta.	Q2	Q	\$e\$	r	Tr.	+a+	-p-	Amb.	Cor.	N	H	Bpl.	J	Z	K	Wu.	O	M
Bnf.	d.i	d.i	2.33	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.43	1.43	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.82	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.57	0.57	0.33
eta.	Q	Q2	+a+	M	\$e\$	-p-	Amb.	Bnf.	Cor.	H	J	N	r	Tr.	Wu.	K	Z	O
Bpl.	d.i	d.i	2.00	1.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.50	0.25
eta.	Q2	Amb.	H	N	\$e\$	Bnf.	J	r	Tr.	Z	Bpl.	+a+	-p-	K	Wu.	Q	O	M
Cor.	d.i	d.i	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.67	0.57	0.43
Amb.	Bnf.	Bpl.	Cor.	J	K	M	N	O	Wu.	Z	Q2	\$e\$	+a+	-p-	r	H	Q	Tr.
eta.	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	2.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
Amb.	Cor.	N	J	Z	Bnf.	Bpl.	K	Tr.	Wu.	r	-p-	\$e\$	+a+	O	Q	Q2	M	eta.
H	1.00	1.00	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.82	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.70	0.68	0.67	0.67	0.54	0.50	0.43	0.00
eta.	Q2	Wu.	O	Amb.	Cor.	H	N	Bpl.	\$e\$	-p-	Bnf.	r	Tr.	Z	+a+	K	M	Q
J	d.i	d.i	1.43	1.29	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.57	0.57	0.43	0.33
eta.	Q2	M	Amb.	Cor.	H	N	\$e\$	Bnf.	J	r	Tr.	Wu.	Z	Bpl.	+a+	-p-	Q	O
K	d.i	d.i	1.86	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.50	0.43	0.33	0.29
eta.	Q2	K	Bpl.	+a+	-p-	Amb.	Cor.	H	J	N	Wu.	\$e\$	Bnf.	r	Tr.	Z	O	Q
M	d.i	d.i	1.86	1.75	1.00	1.00	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.14	0.00	0.00
eta.	Q2	Amb.	Cor.	H	\$e\$	Bnf.	J	r	Tr.	Z	Bpl.	+a+	-p-	K	Wu.	Q	O	M
N	d.i	d.i	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.67	0.57	0.43
eta.	Q2	J	Wu.	Amb.	Cor.	N	Z	H	\$e\$	-p-	r	Tr.	Bnf.	Q	+a+	K	Bpl.	M
O	d.i	d.i	1.29	1.14	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.54	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.33	0.33	0.30	0.29	0.25	0.14
Bpl.	\$e\$	+a+	r	Tr.	-p-	Bnf.	Amb.	Cor.	N	Z	H	Q2	J	K	O	eta.	M	Wu.
Q	d.i	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.90	2.33	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.50	0.50	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
Amb.	Bnf.	Bpl.	Cor.	J	K	M	N	O	Wu.	Z	eta.	\$e\$	+a+	-p-	H	Q	r	Tr.
Q2	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	d.i	2.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Q	Tr.	\$e\$	-p-	+a+	Bnf.	Amb.	Cor.	N	Bpl.	J	Z	H	K	Wu.	eta.	Q2	O	M
r	3.00	2.41	2.32	2.31	2.24	1.57	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.70	0.57	0.57	0.50	0.40	0.29
Q	-p-	\$e\$	+a+	r	Bnf.	Amb.	Cor.	N	Bpl.	H	J	Z	K	Wu.	Q2	O	M	eta.
Tr.	3.00	2.62	2.59	2.46	2.41	1.57	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.57	0.57	0.50	0.40	0.29
eta.	Q2	J	O	Bpl.	Amb.	Cor.	H	N	\$e\$	-p-	Bnf.	K	r	Tr.	Z	+a+	M	Q
Wu.	d.i	d.i	1.43	1.14	0.75	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.43	0.43	0.00
eta.	Q2	Amb.	Cor.	H	N	\$e\$	Bnf.	J	r	Tr.	Q	+a+	-p-	K	O	Wu.	Bpl.	M
Z	d.i	d.i	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.67	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.50	0.29

We began our discussion of the group in the catalogue of manuscripts at siglum **e**. In Vollmer's 1908 article, the group had five members **e**, **r**, **p**, **η** and one manuscript which I have not seen.⁷⁰ Ullman added **a** in 1928. Before turning to Adain for help, let us examine some facts which the manuscripts reveal upon quick inspection. Running titles at the beginning and end of the *Culex* were the key to determining membership of the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* group. For the *Florilegium Gallicum*, we have titles and also verses which have been specially selected and placed in an order which conflicts with that of other manuscripts. Here are some examples:

e covers lines 58-85, 89-100, 154, 148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294, 340, 341, 342 and 413-414. **r**, **a** and **p** cover the same lines in the same order. My apparatus lists the opening title as DE BEATITVDINE PAVPERIS VITE. VIRGILIUS IN CVLICE **erap**. The coefficients in the Adain program point to a close relationship between the four but they are not next to one another. What can we say about the other manuscripts which have taken some of the prime places in our chart?

Q has crept in to the right of **e**. It covers lines 79-82, 294, 342 and 414. The line numbers are a partial match but there are no titles at all. We must resort to the readings themselves. **Q** appears 14 times in my apparatus and it agrees with **erap** 13 times. In the fourteenth example, **p** goes its own way against the others. Here are a few examples drawn from the end of the poem to illustrate agreement and disagreement:

414 funeris
/HVCFEAWSBTGEsc.UdlWu.Laur.OJKMNX%l%YHa.ZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Vi.
Ad.Ci.Onb.469.471.472.475.517.530.534./ muneris /\$e\$r+a+-p-Tr.Bnf.Q/ omisit /Voss./

⁷⁰ Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Diez. B Sant. 60 will not be discussed.

414 uit(a)e pro /HVCEAWBTG\$e\$Esc.r+a+-p-
 UdTr.Bnf.Laur.OJNQX%I%YHa.ZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb.469.471.472.47
 5.517.530.534./ uita pro /F/ pro uitae /Wu.Pie./ uitam pro /KM/ omisit /Voss./

414 reddit
 /HVCFEAWBTG\$e\$Esc.r+a+UdTr.Bnf.Laur.KNQX%I%Ha.ZFr.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Ad.C
 i.517.530.534./reddo/U*2IWu.OJYPom.Vi.Onb.469.471.472.475.476.479.487.492.493.5
 01.502.505.507.519.529./ deddit /-p-M/ omisit /Voss./

It is obvious that **Q** belongs with **erap**. Just to clarify matters, it should be repeated that **Q2** is not the same as **Q** nor is it a second hand correcting **Q**.⁷¹ **Q2** is another set of *Culex* readings in a different part of Reg. lat. 2120. In my research, this was the only manuscript with separate sets of *Culex* readings. We shall come to **Q2** shortly.

Tr. has lines 79-85, 89-93, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294 and 413-414.

The unusual line order which it shares with **erap** for some of the verses cannot be ignored. The opening title DE PETRONIO for the *Culex* is very odd indeed and does not help us. **Tr.** agrees with group **erapQ** 13 times or 100%. If played off individually against the manuscripts, it is most likely to agree with **Q** (100%) and most likely to disagree with **r** and **a** (10%). We must surely expand the *Florilegium Gallicum* to include **e**, **r**, **a**, **p**, **Q** and **Tr.** We are not finished and our task is about to become more difficult..

We must turn our attention now to the misfits **Bnf.**, **η** and **Q2**. **Bnf.** has already been classified as a *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* manuscript by means of its opening title but it is back again in this section to annoy and intrigue us with one unusual reading. It covers lines 1-7 and 413-414 and occurs in 17 places in total. This manuscript shares several readings with the *Florilegium Gallicum* group and the reading *muneris* in line 414 is only found in **e**, **r**, **a**, **p**, **Q**, **Tr.** and **Bnf.** It is possible that the scribe has read ahead and has

⁷¹ A second hand in my apparatus is marked with a superscript numeral.

munere on his mind while he is trying to write *funeris* or perhaps there is a connection here. With so little data from **Bnf.**, we cannot solve the puzzle.

Vollmer will haunt us yet with his η . It covers lines 79, 80, 81 and 84 while **Q2** which is soon to come covers 79-82. Line numbers in the seventies and eighties seem to be a common theme here. The coefficients do not suggest that it belongs with **erapTr.Q**. It is almost off the map. One is tempted to reject it from the *Florilegium Gallicum* using this example from Rouse. On an unrelated matter concerning Tibullus, Rouse happens to make the point that “*libri manuales* used in the teaching of grammar and meter” were often “added to or mixed with Tibullus excerpts taken from the *Florilegium Gallicum*.”⁷² He gives London, British Library, Harley 2745 as an example of just such a manual. Line 81 of the *Culex* either shows a split in the *Florilegium Gallicum* tradition or else it proves that η and **Q2** have been added from another source:

81 agnoui
/HCEAWBTG\$e\$Esc.r+a+-p-UdlTr.Laur.QX%I%Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb./
agnoscit /Veta.\$h\$Voss.Q2YHa.Vla./ cognoscit /P/

Q2 only appears with η in two places in the *Culex* and both manuscripts have less than ten readings so the coefficient for η and **Q2** will be abnormally high. Works other than the *Culex* must be used before one can determine whether η and **Q2** are false members of the group or part of a subgroup. The results of our investigation for this section reveal that **e, r, a, p, Tr.** and **Q** are undoubtedly *Florilegium Gallicum* manuscripts but that **Bnf., η** and **Q2** require further study.

Now that the reader is thoroughly acquainted with *Culex* manuscripts of every era and length, it is nearly time to add printed books into the equation. Before we do that, let

⁷² Rouse 153-154.

us offer some miscellaneous thoughts on manuscripts which do not fall into categories like *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* or *Florilegium Gallicum* and also answer a question which we posed earlier about the quality of the late manuscripts. For me, one of the most enjoyable aspects of work with manuscripts has been the chance to use the readings as a means of finding out which manuscripts any given scholar owned or used in his edition. The connection between manuscripts and other manuscripts is interesting but the connection between manuscripts and people is fascinating!

The example of Scaliger and ψ is one illustration of this. Scaliger frequently mentions a manuscript owned by or at least used by Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre Pithou] of Troyes (1539-1596). There is no evidence that Pithou owned ψ but an unusual reading in line 37 of the *Culex* “memorabitur et” is found only in this manuscript, in Harley 2534 (**h** in my apparatus) and in Pithou’s *Epigrammata et poematia uetera*, thus making it possible that he was familiar with lat. 8207.⁷³ Heyne and Naeke, who seem able to deduce not only which manuscripts and books scholars owned but even those which they must have consulted, unfortunately, do not give us an inventory of Pithou’s library and borrowings. Matters are further complicated by Scaliger’s choice of words. If “membrana” and “schedae” refer to different manuscripts, then the “schedae” may be lat. 8207. If the words are synonyms used interchangeably, then either Scaliger has incorrectly remembered a few readings or else we have a manuscript which cannot be

⁷³ Pierre Pithou, *Epigrammata et poematia uetera* (Lugduni [Lyon]: apud Iacobum Chouët, 1596).

equated with ψ .⁷⁴ Our interest in ψ has also yielded an unexpected benefit. With the help of Adain, we have discovered a ψh group.

In the catalogue of manuscripts, the ownership history of **Ha.** was disputed as scholars doubted Wanley's claim that **Ha.** had once belonged to Aldus Manutius (1449-1515). The printer's death falls between the first and second Aldine editions of the *Culex* (1505, 1517). Wright, who traced the Harleian manuscripts back to their origins, could find no recorded owner for Harley 2701 before the seventeenth century. While a single manuscript cannot tell us everything we need to know about the resources of the Aldine Press and any dispersal of those resources after the great man's death, a comparison between **Ha.** and the three Aldine editions may cast some light on the matter. First, a comparison of the three printed books is necessary. Those who are familiar with the Aldines know that there were many more changes in the text between 1505 and 1517 than there were between 1517 and 1534. In the examples which I typed into the Adain file, 1505 and 1517 disagree 94% of the time while 1517 and 1534 disagree only 4% of the time. How does **Ha.** fit into the mix? Once it has been compared with the printed books, some results need to be removed as they could just as easily have come from printed books. It is in cases like this that all the extra work on incunabula pays off.

Manuscript **Ci.**, a copy of the 1530 Bembo written in the nineteenth century, must be

⁷⁴ It is worth noting that Charles Plésent who was much more familiar with the inner thoughts of a Naeke, a Heyne or a Scaliger than we are today was not bothered by this apparent contradiction. He insisted that this manuscript was the one mentioned in the 1573 edition. See Plésent (1910) 11. This is not the only occasion where we feel somewhat let down by our sixteenth-century *Culex* scholar. Scaliger's frequent and maddening changes of heart over readings are fully documented in the apparatus. Numerous instances of bizarre wording which he claimed to have seen, wording which is nowhere to be found in our sample of fifty manuscripts, lead one to ask how many manuscripts he actually saw in person and how much faith he put in the recollections of others.

dropped but we are not forced to throw away the entire line. The same is true of the correcting hand in **Laur**. Examples containing multiple late manuscripts any of which could have been in the hands of the Aldine editor must be thrown away in their entirety. This is the sort of question which we would be hard-pressed to answer without the assistance of computers. Adain lightens our load by cutting down the lines which need to be checked to a somewhat bearable 237 per book. After much sifting, we are left with the following examples:

37 hoc tibi

/HVCFEAWBTGPEsc.UdSh\$ILaur.X%I%Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Onb.469.471.472.475.517./ noc ubi /Y/ haec tibi /Voss.Ha.534./ /Ad./ et tu /Ci. 530.570.573./ et tibi /544.573.*2/

237 tue ire /HVVoss.Ha.Ci.517.530.534./ tuas iras

/CEAWBTGPEsc.U*2dlLaur.X%I%Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Onb.469.471.472.475.476.479.487.492.493.501.502.505.507./ tuas aras /UYPie./ /Ad./

284 currentis

/HCEAWSBTGPEsc.UdIX%I%YPom.Pie.Vi.Onb.469.471.472.475.476.479.487.492.493.501.502.505.507.519.530./ currentes /VVoss.Ha.Ci.517.529.534.573./ torrentis /Laur.Fr.Vat.Ad./

302 in excisum /HCEAWSBTGPEsc.UdLaur.X%I%Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.479./

/VVoss.Ha.517.534./ /B*2YPom.Onb.469.471./ in excessum /Vi.472.475.476.487.492.493.501.502.505.507./ /Ci.530.573./ /573.*2/

352 ac ruere /HVVoss.Laur.*2Ha.517.534./ acuere

/CFEAWSBTGPEsc.dLaur.X%I%Fr.Vat.Ad.Onb./ aruere /G/ at ruere /UYPie./ ac uenit /Pom.Vi.Ci.469.471.472.475.476.479.487.492.493.501.502.505.507.530./

While we cannot say for certain that Aldus Manutius owned or used **Ha.**, it is apparent that he knew one of **VVoss.Ha.** or a manuscript which was very similar to them. Not only do we have a possible owner for **Ha.** but also a new group.

We have assigned a large number of the manuscripts to groups and the reader now has several charts at his or her disposal to assist in determining potential relationships.

This will prove especially useful in the case of manuscripts which have been passed over because they were too short, added little to our knowledge or could not be commented upon without a substantial review of Professor Clausen's stemma. Other groups may yet emerge among the late manuscripts when we compare them with the printed books.

Before we do that, let us revisit the late manuscripts and assess their quality.

From the example in which late *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* manuscripts did not fare well against their elders, it is logical to suppose that *recentiores* are *deteriores*. While it is true that they pose problems for anyone who attempts to trace their descent, their readings are often a rich source of conjectures for an editor. Let us look at how likely it is that each manuscript will present the reading of the lemma. Fortunately, Adain has separated the lemma from the other readings and we are left to do simple calculations. Please consider the chart on the next page.

The results are surprising but can perhaps be explained by the fact that the *recentiores* have access to a wide variety of readings from other manuscripts and printed books. One can go through the various readings which Adain divided into lemma and non-lemma and use the results to discover that some readings are only found in late manuscripts. Examples of this common phenomenon include:

4 et /HVCFEWBTGPESC.d\$h\$Voss.Bnf.%I%Ha.Pie.Ci.Onb.469.479.530.573./ ut
/UlLaur.XYFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Vla.Ad.471.472.475.476.487.492.493.501.517.534.573.*2/

5 ducum
/HVCFEAWBTGPESC.Ud\$h\$Voss.lBnf.Laur.*2YAd.Ci.Onb.469.517.530.534.570./
ductum /Laur.Fr.Vat./ ducam /573.*2/ notitiaeque ducum uoces om /O/

10 poliantur /HVWGPU*2\$h\$Voss.lYHa.Pom.Vi.Vla.Ci.469.471.472.475.530./
spoliantur /CFEABTEsc.d%I%/ **spolientur** /ULaur.XVat.Pie.Ad.Onb./ spoliatur /Fr./

Table 5: Percentage of Correct Readings in Early and Late Manuscripts

Early Manuscripts	Lemma	Other Readings	% Correct
W	247	236	51.1%
B	242	243	49.8%
E	233	257	47.5%
A	243	242	50.1%
T	237	251	48.5%
I	243	241	50.2%
V	251	235	51.6%
C	232	259	47.2%
F	164	154	51.5%
S	76	110	40.8%
ψ	42	63	40.0%
h	45	62	42.0%

Average: 47.5% correct.

Late Manuscripts	Lemma	Other Readings	% Correct
Laur.	221	249	47.0%
d	232	256	47.5%
Fr.	218	262	45.4%
Esc.	251	234	51.7%
X	245	242	50.3%
Vat.	241	244	49.6%
Γ	268	226	54.2%
U	235	257	47.7%
Voss.	237	248	48.8%
l	245	240	50.5%
Y	226	265	46.0%
Ha.	257	227	53.0%
Pom.	253	234	51.9%
Pie.	254	233	52.1%
Vi.	243	239	50.4%
Vla.	126	128	49.6%
Ad.	201	283	41.5%
Ci.	291	208	58.3%
Onb.	232	253	47.8%

Average: 49.6% correct

Table 6: Chart of Late Manuscripts v. Early Printed Books

	S	P	V	Ha.	Voss.	Onb.	Ple.	W	Via.	Y	534.	X	517.	479.	472.	Val.	475.	E	471.
\$h\$	di	1.76	1.26	1.22	1.21	0.86	0.83	0.83	0.81	0.81	0.80	0.80	0.79	0.78	0.76	0.76	0.74	0.74	0.73
%l%	A	B	T	W	S	E	d	Esc.	C	F	Laur.	X	Onb.	Fr.	Val.	G	Ad.	V	Ha.
469.	479.	1.87	1.82	1.80	1.72	1.70	1.68	1.59	1.58	1.43	1.33	1.32	1.23	1.22	1.20	1.14	1.11	1.04	0.96
469.	2.16	487.	476.	505.	471.	492.	493.	472.	502.	475.	1.82	Pom.	1.67	1.64	1.55	1.31	1.31	1.24	1.13
471.	2.33	487.	505.	492.	493.	472.	502.	469.	475.	1.84	Pom.	1.81	1.67	1.64	1.51.	534.	517.	Onb.	1.13
472.	2.68	487.	492.	2.55	505.	502.	475.	1.99	1.94	1.94	1.92	1.89	1.87	1.78	1.77	1.34	1.33	1.21	1.13
475.	3.10	487.	492.	493.	505.	502.	1	2.05	2.03	1.98	1.95	1.91	1.86	1.82	1.78	1.31	1.31	1.20	1.17
476.	3.10	3.06	2.93	2.89	2.66	2.30	2.19	2.11	2.10	2.06	1.94	1.86	1.85	1.84	1.63	1.34	1.34	1.18	1.12
476.	3.10	I	487.	2.87	493.	505.	472.	502.	471.	501.	469.	Pom.	507.	Vi.	479.	Onb.	U	B	0.83
479.	2.16	502.	471.	472.	2.85	2.83	2.68	2.34	2.30	2.08	2.07	2.07	2.06	2.03	1.60	1.11	0.90	0.88	0.83
487.	475.	1.94	1.89	1.78	1.67	1.66	1.63	1.63	Pom.	476.	492.	493.	507.	501.	Vi.	Onb.	Cl.	530.	B
487.	3.08	476.	492.	493.	I	505.	472.	471.	1.61	1.60	1.56	1.56	1.54	1.40	1.38	1.21	1.11	1.02	1.01
492.	493.	3.01	3.01	3.01	2.88	2.78	2.68	2.33	2.33	2.17	2.10	2.10	2.09	2.03	1.66	1.08	0.87	0.87	0.85
492.	3.06	487.	475.	476.	I	505.	472.	502.	471.	501.	507.	Vi.	469.	Pom.	479.	Onb.	E	Via.	A
493.	3.06	487.	2.93	2.87	2.78	2.71	2.55	2.44	2.20	2.19	2.18	2.11	1.97	1.97	1.56	1.02	0.89	0.89	0.87
501.	3.27	Vi.	505.	493.	492.	487.	475.	502.	501.	507.	471.	Vi.	469.	Pom.	479.	Onb.	U	Via.	Cl.
502.	2.45	2.44	2.38	2.37	2.34	2.33	2.30	2.17	2.03	1.94	1.88	1.86	1.84	1.77	1.77	1.08	1.00	0.93	0.91
505.	2.83	487.	492.	I	475.	493.	502.	472.	501.	Vi.	507.	471.	Pom.	469.	479.	Onb.	573.	U	Via.
507.	3.27	Vi.	505.	493.	492.	475.	487.	476.	I	472.	471.	502.	2.14	2.01	1.67	0.86	0.83	0.79	0.79
517.	2.09	1.34	1.33	I	469.	472.	Pom.	Vi.	2.06	1.98	1.87	1.86	1.83	1.64	1.54	0.93	0.82	0.82	0.81
530.	2.38	Cl.	534.	517.	Vi.	475.	Pom.	471.	1.23	1.18	1.16	1.13	1.09	1.07	1.02	1.01	0.99	0.98	Y
534.	2.09	471.	475.	I	469.	472.	Cl.	Pom.	Vi.	573.	530.	Ple.	U	Val.	Onb.	Laur.	Ha.	Fr.	X
573.	2.48	530.	534.	517.	471.	472.	Vi.	479.	1.28	1.25	1.24	1.05	1.02	1.00	0.99	0.94	0.92	0.91	0.91
A	1.91	%l%	B	W	E	d	Esc.	C	S	F	Laur.	X	Onb.	Fr.	Val.	G	Ad.	V	Ha.
	1.90	1.86	1.73	1.71	1.65	1.59	1.57	1.54	1.38	1.32	1.29	1.24	1.21	1.18	1.09	1.07	1.01	0.97	0.97

Chart of Late Manuscripts v. Early Printed Books

Ad.	U	Laur.	Pie.	Vat.	Via.	Y	X	Fr.	Onb.	%I%	B	C	d	T	W	A	E	F	Esc.
	1.56	1.40	1.40	1.31	1.29	1.23	1.22	1.21	1.20	1.11	1.10	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.07	1.03	1.03	1.00
	%I%	A	E	d	S	T	W	Esc.	C	F	Laur.	Onb.	X	Vat.	Fr.	G	Ad.	479.	U
B	1.87	1.86	1.80	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.73	1.70	1.68	1.43	1.34	1.32	1.29	1.22	1.20	1.12	1.10	1.01	0.96
	B	E	%I%	A	d	T	S	Esc.	W	F	X	Laur.	Onb.	Vat.	Fr.	G	Ad.	U	479.
C	1.68	1.60	1.56	1.57	1.55	1.54	1.51	1.50	1.47	1.41	1.26	1.24	1.24	1.21	1.17	1.15	1.09	0.97	0.95
	573.	530.	534.	517.	471.	Vi.	469.	479.	472.	I	Pom.	475.	487.	501.	Onb.	Esc.	476.	%I%	502.
Cl.	2.48	2.06	1.30	1.23	1.13	1.13	1.11	1.11	1.10	1.10	1.09	1.08	0.87	0.87	0.85	0.84	0.82	0.81	0.81
	B	%I%	A	E	T	Esc.	C	S	W	F	Laur.	Onb.	X	Vat.	Fr.	G	Ad.	Y	V
d	1.75	1.68	1.65	1.64	1.62	1.59	1.55	1.54	1.53	1.40	1.28	1.26	1.21	1.20	1.17	1.16	1.09	0.98	0.97
	B	T	A	%I%	d	Esc.	C	W	S	F	Onb.	Laur.	X	Vat.	Fr.	G	Ad.	Via.	Y
E	1.80	1.72	1.71	1.70	1.64	1.63	1.60	1.56	1.51	1.43	1.27	1.22	1.18	1.11	1.10	1.08	1.03	0.94	0.94
	B	E	%I%	A	d	T	C	S	W	F	Onb.	Laur.	X	Fr.	Vat.	G	479.	Ad.	U
Esc.	1.70	1.63	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.56	1.50	1.47	1.41	1.31	1.27	1.21	1.17	1.09	1.09	1.08	1.01	1.00	0.99
	S	T	%I%	B	E	C	d	A	W	Esc.	Onb.	Laur.	X	G	Vat.	Ad.	Fr.	V	Ha.
F	1.59	1.51	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.41	1.40	1.38	1.35	1.31	1.09	1.08	1.08	1.07	1.06	1.03	1.01	0.95	0.94
	Vat.	Laur.	X	%I%	A	Ad.	B	W	S	Esc.	Onb.	Laur.	U	Pie.	E	Esc.	Via.	Onb.	Y
Fr.	1.86	1.82	1.59	1.22	1.21	1.21	1.20	1.20	1.19	1.19	1.17	1.17	1.16	1.11	1.10	1.09	1.09	1.03	1.03
	d	C	%I%	B	T	A	E	Esc.	F	S	W	Vat.	X	Laur.	Onb.	Fr.	V	Ha.	Pie.
G	1.16	1.15	1.14	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.08	1.08	1.07	1.07	1.06	0.98	0.98	0.97	0.96	0.92	0.92	0.90	0.90
	530.	Cl.	517.	534.	G	Ha.	573.	V	469.	Pie.	Voss.	471.	479.	F	Pom.	W	%I%	475.	Esc.
H	0.77	0.74	0.72	0.72	0.67	0.66	0.64	0.64	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.60	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.58	0.58	0.58
	Voss.	V	\$h\$	Pie.	P	W	Via.	Y	A	%I%	T	X	d	F	517.	C	534.	B	Esc.
Ha.	2.09	1.99	1.22	1.13	1.05	1.04	1.02	1.01	0.97	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.92	0.92
	476.	487.	492.	493.	505.	502.	475.	507.	472.	501.	471.	469.	Vi.	Pom.	479.	534.	517.	Onb.	U
I	3.05	2.88	2.78	2.76	2.69	2.38	2.19	2.06	2.05	2.04	1.94	1.82	1.82	1.79	1.63	1.33	1.32	1.19	1.11
	Vat.	Fr.	X	Ad.	B	U	%I%	A	T	d	W	C	S	E	Pie.	Esc.	Via.	Onb.	Y
Laur.	1.95	1.82	1.70	1.40	1.34	1.34	1.33	1.32	1.32	1.28	1.28	1.24	1.23	1.22	1.22	1.21	1.19	1.15	1.14
	B	E	Esc.	d	469.	A	C	T	%I%	S	W	471.	479.	472.	Ad.	I	475.	Pom.	Laur.
Onb.	1.32	1.27	1.27	1.26	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.21	1.21	1.20	1.20	1.19	1.18	1.17	1.15
	S	\$h\$	V	Ha.	Voss.	Vat.	Via.	Y	X	Cl.	534.	517.	Pie.	W	Onb.	479.	Laur.	530.	Fr.
P	d.I	1.76	1.06	1.05	0.99	0.82	0.81	0.79	0.77	0.76	0.75	0.74	0.74	0.74	0.73	0.71	0.70	0.69	0.68
	Via.	U	Ad.	Y	Vat.	Laur.	Onb.	517.	Ha.	Fr.	X	Voss.	V	534.	Pom.	471.	472.	Vi.	469.
Pie.	1.44	1.42	1.40	1.40	1.23	1.22	1.14	1.13	1.13	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.06	1.05	1.04	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.01
	505.	476.	487.	492.	493.	471.	472.	475.	507.	469.	501.	502.	502.	Vi.	479.	534.	517.	Onb.	530.
Pom.	2.14	2.07	2.03	1.97	1.95	1.92	1.86	1.85	1.83	1.81	1.79	1.79	1.77	1.71	1.61	1.30	1.28	1.17	1.11
	\$h\$	P	B	%I%	W	F	A	d	C	E	I	Esc.	Laur.	Onb.	Fr.	Vat.	X	G	Ad.
S	d.I	%I%	1.75	1.72	1.67	1.59	1.54	1.54	1.51	1.51	1.49	1.47	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.15	1.14	1.07	0.92
	A	B	E	W	d	Esc.	C	F	S	Laur.	X	Onb.	Fr.	Vat.	G	Ad.	V	Ha.	Ha.
T	1.91	1.82	1.75	1.72	1.71	1.62	1.56	1.54	1.51	1.49	1.32	1.31	1.24	1.19	1.19	1.12	1.09	1.02	0.96

Chart of Late Manuscripts v. Early Printed Books

U	Ad. 1.56	Pie. 1.42	Laur. 1.34	Via. 1.31	Y 1.26	Val. 1.25	472. 1.17	Fr. 1.16	X 1.14	469. 1.13	475. 1.12	Onb. 1.12	471. 1.11	I 1.11	517. 1.09	Pom. 1.08	Vi. 1.04	534. 1.02	Esc. 0.99
V	Ha. 1.99	Voss. 1.92	\$h\$ 1.26	W 1.10	P 1.06	Pie. 1.06	%1% 1.04	T 1.02	A 1.01	d 0.97	Via. 0.97	X 0.96	Y 0.96	F 0.95	B 0.94	C 0.92	Esc. 0.92	G 0.92	Onb. 0.92
Val.	Laur. 1.95	Fr. 1.86	X 1.71	Ad. 1.31	U 1.25	Pie. 1.23	B 1.22	C 1.21	%1% 1.20	d 1.20	T 1.19	A 1.18	W 1.17	S 1.15	Via. 1.15	Y 1.14	Onb. 1.13	E 1.11	Esc. 1.09
Vi.	507. 3.13	501. 2.93	505. 2.34	493. 2.20	492. 2.11	487. 2.09	476. 2.03	475. 1.86	502. 1.84	472. 1.82	I 1.82	471. 1.78	Pom. 1.71	469. 1.67	479. 1.38	534. 1.28	517. 1.27	Cl. 1.13	530. 1.12
Via.	Y 1.90	Pie. 1.44	U 1.31	Ad. 1.29	Laur. 1.19	Val. 1.15	Fr. 1.09	X 1.05	Onb. 1.04	472. 1.03	Ha. 1.02	471. 1.00	475. 1.00	502. 1.00	Vi. 1.00	Voss. 0.99	I 0.98	W 0.98	A 0.97
Voss.	Ha. 2.09	V 1.92	\$h\$ 1.21	Pie. 1.29	P 0.99	Via. 0.99	W 0.99	Y 0.98	%1% 0.94	A 0.94	T 0.93	X 0.93	B 0.90	C 0.90	d 0.90	Esc. 0.89	Val. 0.89	F 0.88	G 0.88
W	%1% 1.80	A 1.73	B 1.73	T 1.71	S 1.67	E 1.56	d 1.53	C 1.47	Esc. 1.41	F 1.35	X 1.30	Laur. 1.28	Onb. 1.23	Fr. 1.20	Val. 1.17	V 1.10	Ad. 1.09	G 1.06	Ha. 1.04
X	Val. 1.71	Laur. 1.70	Fr. 1.59	%1% 1.32	T 1.31	W 1.30	A 1.29	B 1.29	C 1.26	Ad. 1.22	d 1.21	E 1.18	Esc. 1.17	S 1.14	U 1.14	Onb. 1.12	Pie. 1.11	F 1.08	Via. 1.05
Y	Via. 1.90	Pie. 1.40	U 1.26	Ad. 1.23	Laur. 1.14	Val. 1.14	Onb. 1.07	Fr. 1.03	Ha. 1.01	X 0.99	d 0.98	Voss. 0.98	471. 0.97	517. 0.97	472. 0.96	V 0.96	469. 0.95	475. 0.95	I 0.95

After the chart of early and late manuscripts is another chart which will help us to solve the age-old question of the purity of manuscripts. The first thing to notice is that the chart contains all full-length manuscripts, not just late ones. When I first designed it, I instinctively put in only late manuscripts and realized to my horror that by omitting early manuscripts I was implying that late manuscripts were only derived from other late manuscripts. The next item which I must draw to the reader's attention is the fact that the chart has been truncated horizontally. While I was able to fit all rare books and manuscripts vertically, there was not enough space horizontally and the font became smaller than a *culex*. We still have a very large sample which will be more than adequate for our purposes. A brief explanation of the correct way to read the chart is essential. In the other charts, it did not matter much whether the manuscript at the far left was earlier or later than the first one to its right as we were trying to establish links, not separate the original from the copy. For the present chart, our rule of reading five places from the left or until the numbers drop sharply cannot always stand. One obviously must cast printed books from the rows when the books are later than the one being examined. Therefore, if we read down to the third item, everything to the right of 469. must be thrown out up to **IPom.Vi.** as there were no printed Virgils before 1469.

Let us begin by isolating the full-length manuscripts which were copied in the fifteenth century or later. They are as follows:

Ad., Ci., Esc., Fr., Γ, Ha., I, Onb., Pie., Pom., U, Vat., Vi., Vla., Voss., X and Y.

Next, we should find some uncomplicated examples which best illustrate how the program works. Manuscripts **Esc., Ha.** and **Pie.** have dates which fall before the first printed Virgil and ought to proclaim that fact in their results. When we read from left to

right, we notice that the first few slots are occupied by manuscripts. This is a good sign and means that it is likely that these manuscripts were not copied from printed books. We have little to worry about except for errors in dates. Early manuscripts **A** and **T** illustrate the type of error which I find myself falling into occasionally. The *Adain* results could lead someone to state that **A** was copied from **T** when, in fact, our manuscript catalogue tells us that **A** is saec. x and **T** is saec. xi. This proves that the results must always be used in conjunction with a reliable catalogue or scholarly article. It is enough here in this prolegomenon to determine which manuscripts were copied from books. The task of deciding which manuscripts are copies of other manuscripts is better saved for an edition.

Γ bears no resemblance to printed books and the chart demonstrates that a date before the first printed Virgil is warranted. **Ci.** is known to be a copy of Bembo's work of 1530 yet it has been corrected with the help of another printed book. *Adain* shows us that the copyist of **Ci.** used Scaliger's 1573 *Culex. Ad.*'s date of 1460 has been called an approximation but it cannot be far from the mark as there are no printed books in the vicinity of the manuscript. This marks the end of the clear-cut cases and now the brain-teasers begin!

The scribe of **Vi.** shows an unnatural fondness for Ascensius Virgils. His work agrees 90% of the time with both 1501 and 1507. 1507 has a higher coefficient than 1501 due to the placement of the readings but at 94% agreement, they are really the same book. **Vi.** must be at least from 1501 and this is confirmed by the manuscript catalogue. Galletier claims in his *Epigrammata et Priapea* that our **I** has the same text as "l'édition Vicentina de l'Appendix (1479)" and also that for manuscripts such as **I** "la critique n'a pas encore, semble-t-il, réussi à déterminer s'ils ont servi de base aux éditions

contemporaines ou s'ils ont été copiés sur elles."⁷⁵ The 479. in my chart is from Parma. I have not seen the edition listed in Galletier's book but I have perused a 1476 edition from Venice which exhibits a suspiciously high (96%) rate of agreement with **I**. Plésent believes that **I** was the model for the edition of 1479 while Naeke takes the opposite view.⁷⁶ As there are almost no manuscripts in **I**'s row and only late ones at that, one must give the nod to Naeke. If the reader inspects the chart of full-length manuscripts, it will become obvious that **Pom.** is related to **I** and **Vi**. They share a high degree of agreement (86%). The first rare book to the right of **Pom.** must be crossed out as it is later than saec. xv. We are looking for an edition something like 1476 as a source for **Pom.** although we would have preferred a higher percentage of agreement (75%). There are always more incunabula to see and perhaps one will yet be found which is a closer fit. Michael Reeve suggests that our **Pom.** is "not earlier than 1473" because of Leto's journey to Moscow.⁷⁷ This is the sort of extra work which must be done when computers and even incunabula fail to answer the question. It is, I am sure, a highly rewarding process which I hope to attempt in the future when the group of manuscripts involved is not so unwieldy.

Ci., **I**, **Vi.** and **Pom.** have already been unmasked as frauds. Professor Reeve wishes to add **U** to the list of shame. He is suspicious of lines 22-23 *aerios nemorum saltus* because that reading is found in printed books; however, our collation of the fifty manuscripts tells us that **U** shares this reading with manuscripts of a respectable age such

⁷⁵ Galletier 75.

⁷⁶ Plésent (1910) 22; Naeke 369.

⁷⁷ Reeve (1975) 234-235.

as **Laur.** and **Pie.**⁷⁸ Nothing in the Adain results suggests that **U** deserves such harsh treatment. **U**², of course, dabbles very freely in printed books. **Fr.**, **Vat.** and **X** are on solid ground because of their status as *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* manuscripts. **Onb.** is a problem. It mostly stays with *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* manuscripts but occasionally strays from the path and seems to choose unreliable friends such as 1469 and **IPom.Vi.** **Voss.** is firmly established along with **Ha.** as a descendant of **V.** Finally, **Vla.** and **Y** are related to **Pie.UAd.** and were not copied from printed books.

It is my hope that this section has answered some questions and raised even more. Historical evidence, line counts per page and personal visits to libraries with incunabula may be more trustworthy than a computer program but when one cannot cover all facets of manuscript research to one's own satisfaction, Adain may prove to be a useful tool.

⁷⁸ Reeve (1975) 237 n. 29.

Chapter Three: The Apparatus Criticus of the *Culex*

The task of condensing a catalogue of manuscripts in the style of Munk Olsen and a list of printed books along the lines of Mambelli into a legend of several pages before the start of the apparatus criticus is, to say the least, a daunting prospect.⁷⁹ It has not escaped my notice that the reader cannot be expected to refer back to the manuscript descriptions; nevertheless, one does not want to repeat all the information. As for the printed books, after comparing the styles of various editions, it seemed best to follow R. P. H. Green's Oxford Classical Text of Ausonius. It was interesting and helpful to discover how another scholar dealt with the problem of giving sigla to many books without turning the "Editions Cited" page into a mini-bibliography.

Unlike the bibliography at the end of the thesis which follows M.L.A. guidelines, the present section lists editions, articles from scholarly journals and all other works relevant to the apparatus criticus according to date.⁸⁰ Many recent editions had little to add to the text but this is hardly surprising given the difficulty of finding previously unseen manuscripts and the slim chance of inventing a conjecture which can be proven to be original. It seemed unjust to exclude them for simply being "born too late" and unwise to portray the number of editions as being considerably smaller than it was. Therefore, the decision was made to list all editions consulted, but only those with something new to offer were assigned a siglum.⁸¹

⁷⁹ Giuliano Mambelli, *Gli annali delle edizioni Virgiliane* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1954).

⁸⁰ Occasionally, it was necessary to refer to specific page numbers if the work was not an edition of the *Culex* or in the case of periodicals. The reader will find page numbers with the sigla rather than in the apparatus criticus.

⁸¹ The format for editions with new readings is *siglum* = rest of entry.

It is my hope that the inclusion of so many pre-1500 editions will pleasantly surprise those who doubt that these works have anything of value to offer. We are doing a great disservice to scholarship by scoffing at material which can assist us not only in determining the earliest date of a certain reading but also whether manuscripts are being copied wholly or in part from printed books. I do not claim to have seen all extant printed Virgils but I have studied a more-than-representative sample of the earliest offerings and feel qualified to pronounce on trends in the development of the text. Every attempt has been made to include significant advances in Virgilian textual criticism from all eras up to the modern day. Many post-Renaissance editions have not been studied with the care that they deserve as copies are scarce and often inaccessible to non-Europeans. We must continuously search for new evidence, refuse to simply recopy the mistakes of others and work in a collaborative rather than competitive fashion if we are to have any chance of improving corrupt texts.

As for the layout of the apparatus criticus, I have modelled it on an Oxford Classical Text. At the top of each page, a revised version of Professor Clausen's text of the *Culex* appears. Below the text, the variant readings of all the manuscripts, early-printed books and modern editions are presented in the approved format with Latin notes. I took into account a complaint expressed in Professor Mary Louise Lord's article that "despite their valiant efforts . . . editors do not give complete readings of every manuscript in their list of *sigla*." In this prolegomenon, each manuscript was collated letter by letter. I did not select passages at random or from the two ends of the poem. Professor John Grant wishes that editors would be more clear about the date when a certain reading was first printed. He gives an example of a reading dated 1475 by

Professor Clausen which actually occurs in many editions before that date.⁸² I have tried to be as careful as possible with dates but the reader is always encouraged to examine incunabula which are absent from the bibliography. If a reading is very rare and only occurs in a few editions, I give two examples. If there is a close relationship such as the one which Professor Grant has discovered between Pietro Bembo and the Aldine Press, I list both Bembo and the Aldine edition as possible sources of the conjecture. In cases where there are many variant readings for a given entry, I note the first appearance in print of each one whenever possible. If I refer to one author as being in the edition of another, I mean that author x is reported in author y as being the inventor of a particular conjecture. This statement cannot be confirmed either because there is no sign of the conjecture in x's edition or because the edition is not available.

Unlike some Renaissance editors who printed the vulgate version of a text without corrections and then presented their changes in a commentary, my changes will be brought to the reader's attention in three ways. They will first appear in italics in the text. Next, there will be a note below indicating that Professor Clausen opted for a different solution to the problem. Finally, my choice of reading will be justified in the commentary. Although the software would have allowed me to insert the commentary on the same page underneath the text and notes, it seemed that a clear and simple layout with commentary at the end was best. Alas, few programmers have invented software to help those who strive to imitate the OCT's polished appearance. I prepared my pseudo-OCT

⁸² John Grant, "Pietro Bembo as a Critic of Classical Latin Poetry: 'Variae Lectiones' and the Text of the *Culex*," *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 35 (1992): 286 n. 73.

of pseudo-Virgil using Dr. Stefan Hagel's Classical Text Editor software which can be downloaded from the Internet and purchased from its creator.

The current practice in the Oxford Classical Text series is to give the English name of the place that holds the manuscript. I have followed recent editors in this decision. The order of the sigla in the manuscript entries is continued in the apparatus. The order has no special significance. It is simply the order in which the manuscripts were collated starting with those used by Professor Clausen in his edition. Any individual missing lines are noted in the apparatus. Running titles such as variations of the words *incipit/explicit Culex* can be found at the beginning and end of the apparatus.

Despite the large number of sigla, no symbols were used to signify a group of manuscripts. Some will argue that this notation would have simplified the apparatus. I beg to differ, citing Willis who warns that it must be made clear whether siglum β represents "the agreement of BVZ . . . the reading of the manuscript from which BVZ were derived" or "the agreement of the uncorrected reading in any two of them."⁸³ Willis then switches to a different group of manuscripts and accuses L. D. Reynolds of indiscriminate sigla-swapping. In the introduction, *a* is said to be the *fons codicum* LQg but in 12 places *a* = LQg and in 52 places *a* = LQ. Willis sees "no disadvantage in indicating the agreement of LQg by LQg" and that desire for clarity is a guiding principle in this thesis.⁸⁴

⁸³ James Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972) 38-39.

⁸⁴ Willis 40.

Sigla

- **V** = VATICAN CITY, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2759, saec. xii-xiii. (pp. 18-19)⁸⁵
- **C** = CAMBRIDGE, University Library, Kk.5.34, saec. x. (pp. 19-20)
- **F** = MELK, Stiftsbibliothek 717, saec. x. (pp. 21-22)
- **E** = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 8093, saec. x. (pp. 22-24)
- **A** = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 7927, saec. x. (pp. 24-25)
- **W** = TRIER, Stadtbibliothek 1086, saec. ix. (pp. 25-26)
- **S** = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 17177, saec. xi. (pp. 26-27)
- **B** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3252, saec. ix-x. (pp. 27-29)
- **T** = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 8069, saec. xi. (pp. 29-30)
- **Γ** = ROME, Biblioteca dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana 43 F 5, saec. xv. (pp. 30-31)
- **ψ** = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 8207, saec. xiii-xiv. (pp. 31-32)
- **e** = EL ESCORIAL, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo del Escorial Q.I.14, saec. xiv. (pp. 32-35)
- **Esc.** = EL ESCORIAL, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo del Escorial f.I.19, anno 1407. (p. 36)
- **r** = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 17903, saec. xiii. (pp. 36-38)
- **a** = ARRAS, Bibliothèque Municipale 64, saec. xiii. (pp. 38-39)
- **p** = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 7647, saec. xii-xiii. (pp. 39-40)

⁸⁵ Page numbers refer to catalogue entries in Chapter One.

- **U** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Urb. lat. 350, saec. xv.
(pp. 40-41)
- **d** = OXFORD, Bodleian Library, Auct. F.1.17, saec. xiv. (pp. 41-42)
- **η** = LONDON, British Library, Harley 2745, saec. xiii-xiv. (pp. 42-44)
- **h** = LONDON, British Library, Harley 2534, saec. xiii. (pp. 44-45)
- **Voss.** = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. O. 81, saec. xv.
(pp. 45-46)
- **l** = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. F. 78, saec. xv. (p. 46)
- **Tr.** = Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 2013, saec. xv. (pp. 46-48)
- **Wu.** = Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M.ch.f. 60, saec. xiv-xv. (pp. 48-49)
- **Bnf.** = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 3343, saec. xv. (pp. 49-50)
- **Laur.** = FLORENCE, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Plut. 33.31, saec. xiv.
(pp. 50-51)
- **O** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1374, saec. xvi.
(pp. 51-52)
- **J** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1576, saec. xiv.
(p. 52)
- **K** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1671, saec. x. (p. 53)
- **M** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1412, saec. xii.
(pp. 53-54)
- **N** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ross. 503, saec. xiii fol. 1-88,
saec. xv reliqua. (pp. 54-55)

- **Q** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 2120, saec. xii-xiii.
(pp. 55-57)
- **X** = LONDON, British Library, Harley 3963, saec. xv. (pp. 57-58)
- **I** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1719, saec. x-xi.
(pp. 58-59)
- **Y** = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. O. 96, saec. xv. (p. 59)
- **Bpl.** = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit B.P.L. 35, saec. xi-xii. (pp. 59-60)
- **Ha.** = LONDON, British Library, Harley 2701, anno 1447. (pp. 60-61)
- **Z** = LONDON, British Library, Burney 273, saec. xii-xiii. (pp. 61-62)
- **Fr.** = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 8205, saec. xv. (pp. 62-63)
- **Pom.** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3255, saec. xv.
(pp. 63-64)
- **Cor.** = VENICE, Museo Correr, Cicogna 886, saec. xv-xvi. (pp. 64-66)
- **Amb.** = MILAN, Biblioteca Ambrosiana H 178 inf., saec. xii-xiii. (p. 66)
- **Vat.** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1586, saec. xv.
(pp. 66-67)
- **Pie.** = NEW YORK, Pierpont Morgan Library M. 223, anno 1455. (pp. 67-68)
- **Vi.** = VIENNA, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 3230, saec. xvi. (p. 68)
- **Vla.** = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 7192, saec. xv-xvi.
(pp. 68-69)
- **Ad.** = LONDON, British Library, Add. 16562, saec. xv. (pp. 69-70)
- **Ci.** = VENICE, Museo Correr, Cicogna 1775, saec. xix. (pp. 70-71)
- **Onb.** = VIENNA, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 3108, saec. xv. (pp. 71-72)

- OXFORD, Bodleian Library, Canon. Class. Lat. 54, saec. xv, appears only in the commentary. (pp. 72-74)
- *ed. Rom. 1469* = Conradus Sweynheym and Arnoldus Pannartz, Rome.
- *ed. Rom. 1471* = Conradus Sweynheym and Arnoldus Pannartz, Rome.⁸⁶
- *ed. Venet. 1472* = B. H. perhaps the initials of the printer, probably Venice.
- *ed. Rom. 1473* = Vdalricus Gallus [Ulrich Han] and Simon Nicolai Chardella de Lucca, Rome.
- *ed. Venet. 1475* = Iacobus Rubeus Gallicus, Venice.
- *ed. Venet. 1476* = Antonio di Bartolommeo Miscomini, Venice.⁸⁷
- *ed. Parm. 1479* = Andreas Portilia, Parma.
- *ed. Flor. 1487* = perhaps Bernardus Nerlius, Florence.⁸⁸
- *ed. Nurem. 1492* = Anton Koberger, Nuremberg.
- *ed. Venet. 1493* = Bartholomaeus de Zanis de Portesio, Venice.
- *ed. Ascens. 1501* = commentary by Iodocus Badius [Josse Bade] Ascensius but printed by Thielmann Kerver, Jean Petit and Jean de Coblencz, Paris.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Rare Virgils are notoriously hard to search for in online databases as often the table of contents must serve as a title. It is not advisable to input the words “Virgil(ii)” or “Opera” as they will either produce a system overload error or worse, a mountain of useless information. If the database will allow a search by date, then the chances of finding an exact match improve considerably. As time goes on, thankfully, the titles become more complete. For examples of titles, see Mambelli’s work and also Martin Davies and John Goldfinch, *Vergil: A Census of Printed Editions* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1992). Mr. Goldfinch kindly endured endless cross-examination concerning the presence of the *Culex* in some editions and its exclusion from others. Subsequent verification proved that he was, indeed, correct in all cases.

⁸⁷ The date on the edition itself was erroneously given as 1486.

⁸⁸ He may not have been a printer. For more details, see Davies and Goldfinch 64.

- *ed. Grüniger. 1502* = Johannes Grüniger, Strasbourg.
- *ed. Ald. 1505* = Aldus Manutius Romanus, Venice.
- *ed. Ascens. 1507* = Iodocus Badius [Josse Bade] Ascensius for Jean Petit, Paris.
- *ed. Ascens. 1512* = Iodocus Badius [Josse Bade] Ascensius for Jean Petit, Paris.⁹⁰
- *ed. Ald. 1517* = Aldus Manutius Romanus and Andreas de Torresanis de Asula, Venice.⁹¹
- *ed. Ascens. 1519* = commentary of Ascensius but printed by Aug. de Zanis de Portesio, Venice.⁹²
- *ed. Ascens. 1529* = commentary of Ascensius but printed by Jean Crespin, Lyon.
- *Bembo* = Pietro Bembo, Venice, 1530.

⁸⁹ While I was researching later Ascensius editions with the help of Renouard's book, I came upon some interesting information concerning the first printing of the *Opuscula*. In the Oxford Classical Text, Professor Clausen refers to an *ed. Ascens.* of the *Opuscula* in the year 1500 which I have never been able to find. Perhaps he is thinking of the section on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* which was printed "8 des calendes de mai 1500." The earliest edition of the *Opuscula* is "15 mars 1501." See Ph. Renouard, *Bibliographie des impressions et des oeuvres de Josse Badius Ascensius imprimeur et humaniste*, Vol. III (New York: Burt Franklin, 1967) 357-358. Mambelli also does not distinguish between the different volumes and settles on a date of 1500. Fortunately for scholars, the *French books before 1601* microfilm series contains two different copies of the first *Opuscula*.

⁹⁰ There is no need to include the 1512 Ascensius in the Adain program as the Ascensius is well-represented by the editions of 1501, 1507, 1519 and 1529.

⁹¹ Aldus is credited with this edition but it appears after his death. The Aldine editions are less fruitful for *Culex* scholars than the Ascensius Virgils. One can usually pick up an Ascensius and expect to find the *Culex* but only the 1505, 1517 and 1534 Aldines contain the work. In order to avoid unnecessary searches, see Craig Kallendorf, *A Bibliography of Venetian Editions of Virgil, 1470-1599* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1991).

⁹² The editions which bear the commentary of Ascensius on the *Culex* all have similar text and form a group. For that reason I have chosen to use the designation *ed. Ascens.* even for editions printed outside of France. Renouard does not explain what constitutes a "real" Ascensius and simply lists all works with some connection to the man, even those which appeared after his death.

- *ed. Ald. 1534* = heirs of Aldus Manutius Romanus and Andreas de Torresanis de Asula, Venice.
- *ed. Basil. 1544* = J. Oporin, Basel.
- *Melanchthon* = Philip Melanchthon, Zurich, 1570.
- *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers., Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* = Joseph Justus Scaliger, Lyon.
- Christopher Plantin (Antwerp, 1575) reprints the 1573 Scaliger with no changes.
- *Fabricius* = Georgius Fabricius, Basel, 1575.
- *Petrus Pithoeus* = Pierre Pithou, Lyon, 1596.
- *Taubmannus, in commentario Taubmanni* = Friedrich Taubmann, Wittemberg, 1618.
- *Barthius* = Kaspar von Barth, Frankfurt, 1624.
- The editions of Daniel Heinsius (Leiden, 1636) and Nicolaas Heinsius (Amsterdam, 1676; reprinted Utrecht, 1704; Amsterdam, 1725 etc.) reproduce Pietro Bembo's text except for a few readings which follow the *editio princeps* instead.⁹³
- *Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717, Lindenbrogius in editione Masuicii 1717* = Pancratius Masuicius [Maaswyck], Leeuwarden.⁹⁴
- *Nicolaas Heinsius in libro Aduersariorum* = Nicolaas Heinsius, Harlingen, 1742, 50-51 and 617.⁹⁵

⁹³ A quick glance at the edition of 1469 reveals that the Heinsius family has borrowed readings as follows: 151 hanc, 203 aurato and 282 amara. All line numbers are those of the OCT.

⁹⁴ Some notes by Scaliger and Lindenbruch from 1595 exist, probably unchanged, in the Masuicius in my personal collection.

⁹⁵ Apart from a few conjectures in his *Aduersariorum*, *Culex* notes by Nicolaas Heinsius were not accessible to me. I suspect that they may be preserved in

- Pieter Burman the Younger's edition (Amsterdam, 1746) reprints a Nicolaas Heinsius text identical or very similar to the one from 1676.
- *Heyne in editione sua* = the main text of Christian Gottlob Heyne, Leipzig, 1775. My copy is from 1793. When I refer to the notes under the text, I write *Heyne in commentario editionis* or *in commentario editionis Heynii*.
- *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"* = Christian Gottlob Heyne, Leipzig. My copy is from 1793 but I assume that it was first printed in 1775 and included with the edition.
- *Schraderus* = Johannes Schrader, Leeuwarden, 1776.
- *Friesemannus, in editione Friesemanni* = Hendrik Frieseman, Amsterdam, 1786.
- *Nodell* = Jan Nodell, Amsterdam, 1787.
- *Wakefield* = Gilbert Wakefield, London, 1796.
- Lucius Sargent (Boston, 1807) translates the text of Masuicius and adds some notes.
- Henri de Valori, Paris, 1817.
- Christian Gottlob Heyne's edition (London, 1818) reprints the "*Culex probabiliter restitutus*" without changes.
- A. J. Valpy's edition (London, 1819) reprints Heyne's text, notes and "*Culex probabiliter restitutus*" without changes.
- *Bothe* = Friedrich Bothe, Heidelberg, 1821.
- J. Krag, Odense, 1825.
- The Virgil from the Tauchnitz series (Leipzig, 1829) does not mention the editor's name. It has a combination of readings from Bembo and Scaliger.

correspondence. The editions which I purchased (1676, 1704, 1725) did not yield any new information. In cases where many scholars have attributed conjectures to Heinsius, I write *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum*.

- *Sillig* = Sillig's revision of Heyne's edition, Leipzig, 1832.
- *Weber* = Wilhelm Ernst Weber, Frankfurt, 1833.
- *Amar* = J. A. Amar, Paris, 1838.
- Albert Forbiger, Leipzig, 1846.
- August Naeke, Bonn, 1847.
- *Jahn* = Johannes Jahn, Leipzig, 1850.
- *Hertzberg/Osiander* = Wilhelm Hertzberg and Christian Osiander, Stuttgart, 1853.
- *Paldamus* = Hermann Paldamus, Leipzig, 1854.
- *Haupt in opusculis* = *Opuscula* of Moritz Haupt written in 1858 but reprinted at Hildesheim in 1967.
- Friedrich Dubner, Paris, 1858.
- *Schenkl* = Karl Schenkl, *Zeitschrift für die Österreichischen Gymnasien* 18 (1867): 771-800.
- *Ribbeck* = Otto Ribbeck, Leipzig, 1868.
- *Maehly* = J. Maehly, *Heidelberger Jahrbücher der Literatur* 49 (1870) 830.
- *Haupt in editione* = Moritz Haupt, Leipzig, 1873.
- *Baehrens* = Emil Baehrens, Leipzig, 1880.
- William Sidney Walker's *Corpus poetarum latinorum* (London, 1881) reprints Heyne's "*Culex probabiliter restitutus*" without changes.
- E. Benoist, Paris, 1882.
- Georg Thilo, Leipzig, 1886.
- *Buecheler* = Franz Buecheler, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 45 (1890): 323-334.

- *Leo* = Friedrich Leo, Berlin, 1891.
- *Housman* = A. E. Housman, *Classical Review* 16 (1902) 339-346.
- *Ellis* = Robinson Ellis, Oxford, 1907. It was reprinted in 1927 without changes.
- *Vollmer* = Friedrich Vollmer, Leipzig, 1910.
- Charles Plésent, Paris, 1910.
- *Alton* = E. H. Alton, *Hermathena* 42 (1920) 68.
- H. Rushton Fairclough, London, 1925.
- Gaetano Curcio, Turin, 1928.
- Willy Morel, Leipzig, 1930.
- Maurice Rat, Paris, 1935.
- *Herrmann* = Léon Herrmann, Leiden, 1950.
- *Bickel* = Ernst Bickel, *Rheinisches Museum* 39 (1950) 302.
- Caterina Vassalini's edition (Florence, 1951) follows Plésent for the most part but introduces a few readings from other sources.
- *Wagenvoort* = Hendrik Wagenvoort, *Mnemosyne* 9 (1956): 29.
- *Salvatore* (1957) = Armando Salvatore, Turin, 1957.
- Tarcisio Poma (Lugano, 1957) reprints Heyne's text and offers an Italian translation.
- Ettore Bolisani, *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 116 (1958) 171-200.
- *Schmidt* = Magdalena Schmidt, Berlin, 1959.
- Remo Giomini, Florence, 1962.
- Armando Salvatore, Naples, 1964.
- *Clausen* = Wendell Clausen et al., Oxford, 1966.

- *Housman ad Manil.* = A. E. Housman, Hildesheim, 1972, 33.
- *Kershaw* = Allan Kershaw, *Classical Quarterly* 86 (1992): 566-567.
- *Salvatore et al. (1997)* = Armando Salvatore et al., Rome, 1997.

CVLEX

LVSIMVS, Octaui, gracili modulante Thalia

atque ut araneoli tenuem formauimus orsum;

Titulum omiserunt V^qhWu.KQQ2BpL.ZCor.Amb.: titulus huic operi olim erat sed hodie non superest in S: CVLEX

PVBLII VIRGILII MARONIS INCIPIT Cd: INCIPIT CVLIX PVBLII VIRG (VIRGILII E) MAR (MARONIS E) FE: POETAREM (-RVM WBTBaf.Laur.XI) SAPIENTISSINI (-IMI WBTBaf.Laur.XI) PVPLII (PVB- WBTBaf.I omiserunt Laur.X) VIRGILII MARONIS (MANTVANI Baf.) CONDISCIPVLI OCTAVIANI CAESARIS (CES- TBaf.Laur.X) AGVSTI (AVG- WBTBaf.Laur.XI) MVNDI IMPERATORIS IVVENALIS (-ILIS B) (IVVENILIS IVVENALIS (sic) Baf.) LVDI LIBELLVS INCIPIT (INCIPIT omisit X) (FELICITER X) CVLIX (-EX WBTBaf.Laur.XI) (INCIPIT X) PVBLII (P WI omiserunt Laur.X) VIRGILII (V WI omiserunt Laur.X) MARONIS (M WI omiserunt Laur.X) INCIPIT (omiserunt Laur.X) AWBTBaf.Laur.XI: P MARONIS VIRGILII CVLIX INCIPIT F: DE BEATITVDINE PAVPERIS VITE. VIRGILIUS IN CVLICE erap: PVBLII VIRGILII MARONIS IVVENALIS LVDI LIBELLVS DE CVLICE ET PASTORE INCIPIT Esc.: P (PVBLII Vat.) VIRGILII MARONIS CVLICIS LIBER INCIPIT UVoss.Vat.: PVB (P VL) VIRG (VIRGILII VL) MA (MARONIS VL) AD OCTAVIVM CVLEX IVL: DE PETRONIO. Tr: CVLEX O: VERSVS CYLICE J: ITEM DE CVLICE N: VALERIUS MARCIALIS DE CVLICE VIRGILII INQVIT. VIRGILIUS CVLICEM CONCINIT ORE RVDI INCIPIT FELICITER Y P. VIRGILII. POETAE. CLARISSIMI. AD. OCTAVIVM. DE CVLICE. LIBER. INCIPIT. Ha.: MARONIS VIRGILII IVVENILIS LVDI INCIPIT CVLEX Fr.: PVBLII VIRGILII MARONIS CVLEX Pom.: P. VIRGILII MARONIS MANTVANI CVLICIS LIBER FOELICITER INCIPIT Pie.: VIRGILIUS CVLICEM CONCINIT ORE RVDI Vla.: P. V. MARONIS OPVSCVLVM DE CVLICE LEGE FELICITER Ad. PVBLII VIRGILII MARONIS CVLEX CVM ADNOTATIONIBVS EX PETRI BEMBI LIBELLO DEPROMPTIS Ci. SEQVITVR VIRGILIUS DE CVLICE Onb. perierunt uersus 1-166 in S. codex tam desperatus erat ut tantum in locis certis aliquid scripserim. alii codices aliquando legi non poterant. in locis dubiis lectionem uel explanationem dedi.

1 lusimus VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lBnf.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: scripsimus ψh thalia (tal- VHa.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad., modulantet halia C, talya Laur.) VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lBnf.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: camel' ψ: (aliter Laur.²) camena hLaur.²Onb. 2 orsum V²WBψUhVoss.lBnf.Laur.YHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: usum VX: ursum CFETTEsc.dIVat.: legi non potuit A

lusimus: haec propter culicis sint carmina docta,
 omnis et historiae per ludum consonet ordo
 notitiaeque ducum uoces. licet inuidus adsit.
 quisquis erit culpare iocos musamque paratus,

5

3 hacpropter Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. Scaliger emendationes suas non in uersibus Culicis sed in commentario dedit. editio uulgata, id est editio Bembi, in libro Scaligeri apparuit. haec editio ab aliis uiris ante Scaligerum (et passim a Scaligero?) emendata est. culicis
 VCEAWBTT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lBnf.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: culici
 F Salvatore (1957) sed culicis laudauerunt Salvatore et al. (1997): culices Leo Friesemannus in editione scripsit, "forte culici SCHRADERVS." sint
 VFEWBTT ψ Esc.U²dhVoss.Bnf.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: sunt
 CUILaur.²YPom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1471: legi non potuit A (uel Laur.²) docta
 CFEWBTT ψ Esc.dLaur.²I Leo: dicta V ψ UhVoss.lBnf.Laur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1471: dea ed. Rom. 1469: legi non potuit A 4 et VCFEWBTT ψ Esc.dhVoss.Bnf.IHa.Pie.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers. uide notam ad uersum 3: tp A: ut
 UILaur.XYFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Vla.Ad. ed. Rom. 1471, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: at Baehrens in codice Laur. multas lectiones inter uersus sine dubio omisi incertae imaginis causa. historicae Baehrens per ludum VCFEAWBTT ψ Esc.UdVoss.lBnf.Laur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger in uers.: perludens ψ h: per lusum Fr.: proludens lectionem probauit Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. cum his uerbis, "proludens habebat membrana quaedam P. Pithoei [Pierre Pithou] Iurisc. eruditiss. ex his potes animaduertere quam inepta sit uulgaris huius loci lectio." consonet
 VCFEAWBTT ψ Esc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: consonat
 ψ hBnf. 5 notitiaeque VCFEAWBTT ψ Esc.Udh²lBnf.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: notitiam Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": non tritae Bothe: notitiae hVoss. Ellis: omisit O
 ducum VCFEAWBTT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lBnf.Laur.²XIYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: ductum Laur.Fr.Vat.: ducam Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: ducunt Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": doctumque Ellis: omisit O in commentario suo Taubmannus [Taubmann] dixit, "nec . . . difficultas est, si duces accipiamus pastores: quomodo infra v. 17[5] aduersum recubare ducem gregis." uoces, scripsit Clausen. absit Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.

pondere uel culicis leuior famaue *feratur*.

posterius grauiore sono tibi musa loquetur

nostra, dabunt cum securos mihi tempora fructus,

ut tibi digna tuo poliantur carmina sensu.

10

Latonae magnique Iouis decus, aurea proles,

Phoebus erit nostri princeps et carminis auctor

et recinente lyra fautor, siue educat illum

Arna Chimaeraeo Xanthi perfusa liquore

7 famaue VCFEAWBT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lBnf.Laur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Bembus* [*Bembo*]: famaue Fr.Laur.²Ci.: formatque *Fabricius* feratur OFr.Ad. ed. Ald. 1505, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in comm.: feretur VCFEAWBT ψ Esc.Udh²Voss.lBnf.Laur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: feritur h: dicetur h³: mordetur h⁴: uersum omisit Γ lectiones h², h³, h⁴ scriptae sunt inter uersus in litteris exiguis. feretur probauit *Clausen*. 8 loquatur h 9 uestra Laur.² maturos *Heinsius* in scriptis multorum eruditorum fructus] portus *Heyne* "probabiliter restitutus" 10 digna tuo ed. Ald. 1517, *Bembus*: dignato VCFEAWBT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 uix legi potuit Voss. poliantur VWT ψ U²hVoss.lYHa.Pom.Vi.Vla.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: spoliantur CFEABTEsc.dl: spolientur ULaur.XVat.Pie.Ad.Onb.: spoliatur Fr. uix legi potuit Voss. 13 recinente VWT ψ U²hlPom.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in uers.: recanente CFEABTEsc.ULaur.XIVat.Ad. *Scaliger* in editione *Masuii* [*Maaswyck*] 1717: rececante d: retinent Voss.: retinente Ha.: atque canente YVla.: recanete Fr. magnam similitudinem inter litteras c et t in codicibus Voss. et l inueniebam. seu *Heyne* "probabiliter restitutus" educat VCFEAWB²TT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lLaur.²IYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: ducat B: educet Laur.XVat.: ediscet Fr.: detinet *Heyne* "probabiliter restitutus" 14 arna *Haupt* in opusculis et in editione: alma VCFEAWBT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.l Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: alama Vla.: altra V²: acta *Sillig* chimereo (chy- AWBTUdLaur.Pom. ed. Rom. 1469) VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: cythareo h: cireneo ψ xan(c)t(h)i VCFEAWBT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in comm.: xanthus ed. Ald. 1517, *Bembus*, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in uers. liquore VCB Γ ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: liquorem

seu decus Asteriae seu qua Parnasia rupes

15

hinc atque hinc patula praepandit cornua fronte

Castaliaeque sonans liquido pede labitur unda.

quare, Pierii laticis decus, ite, sorores

Naides, et celebrate deum ludente chorea.

et tu, sancta Pales, ad quam uentura recurrunt

20

agrestum bona fetura – sit cura tenentis

FEAWT: uel colore B²

15 decus VCFEAWBT Ψ Esc.UdhVoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: equus Fr.: nemus Ci. ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers. asteriae (-ie F Γ) FTCi. ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: astrigerum VhVoss.Ha. ed. Basil. 1544: astrieri C: astrigeri EAWBTesc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: astriferum Ψ Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. hanc lectionem probauit dicens, "omnes antiquitus excusi, item schedae Pithoei nostri, plane habent, seu decus astriferum." 16 praepandit VCFEAWBT Ψ Esc.UdVoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: praetendent Ψ : praependit h: (uel h²) praetendit h² Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. legens membranam Pithoei. 17 castaliaeque sonans VCFEAWBT Ψ Esc.UdhVoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: castalieque sonas Γ : castalie resonant Ψ : castalique sonans ed. Rom. 1473: castaliae et resonans Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. legens membranam Pithoei 18 quare] uos quoque Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" laticis CFEAWBT Ψ Esc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: nemoris V Ψ hVoss.Ha. 19 naides CFEAWBThVoss.IIHa.Pom. ed. Venet. 1475: naiades VB² Γ Ψ Esc.U²dYFr.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: nayades ULaur.XAd. et omisit Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" plaudente Ci. Bembus corona h 20 tibi Ci. Bembus quam VFEAWBT Ψ Esc.UdhVoss.ILaur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: quem CI recurrunt UILaur.XYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad. ed. Rom. 1469: recurrit VCFEAWBT Ψ Esc.dhVoss.IHa.Vla.Ci.Onb. Bembus 21 bona VCFEAWBT Ψ Esc.UdVoss.ILaur.IYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: bona sors Ψ h² Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. legens membranam Pithoei, Taubmannus in uers.: bona sit h: dona X Fabricius fetura VT Ψ hVoss.Ha.Vla. Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": segura

aerios nemorum cultus siluasque uirentes:

te cultrice uagus saltus feror inter et antra.

at tu, cui meritis oritur fiducia chartis,

Octauī uenerande, meis adlabere coeptis,

25

sancte puer, tibi namque canit non pagina bellum

CFEAWBTesc.UdhILaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: cura ψ Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. legens membranā Pithoei. uide et Epigrammata Petri Pithoei: secuta Ad.: securaque h²: secure Vi. ed. Ascens. 1501: cura sequi Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: curae Taubmannus in uers. sit cura VCFEAWBTesc.UdhVoss.IILaur.IYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: securā ψ Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm., Taubmannus in uers.: cura h²: est cura X: tibi sit cura Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" tenentis CFEBTesc.dLaur.²IPie.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: (uel Vla.²) tenentes VAWTVoss.Ha.Vla.² Amar: tenensque ψ: tenentum ULaur.YVat.Ad. ed. Ald. 1517: tenentem h: parentis l: parentum X: tenentur Fr.: canentis Pom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1471, Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": tenes quae Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.

22 aerios nemorum cultus VCFEAWBTesc.dVoss.XIHa.Fr.Vat. ed. Ald. 1517: herbiferos saltus nemorum ψ Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: aerios nemorum saltus (aereos Y) UILaur.YPom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: aerios estus nemorum h: aerios nemorum tractus Ci. Bembus, Melanchthon, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers. uirentes VCWB²ΓψUhVoss.Laur.YHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Onb. ed. Ald. 1534: uirentis FEABTesc.dXICi. ed. Parm. 1479: uerba post nemorum usque ad saltus omiserunt lPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469 23 te tutrice uagus esse Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. sed cultrice non damnavit antra Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": astra VCFEAWBTψEsc.dhVoss.IXIHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: arua ULaur.YFr.Vat.Vla.Ad. 24 at Ci. Bembus: et VCFEAWBTψEsc.UdhVoss.IILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 et scripsit Clausen. chartis (car- VEABTψEsc.dVoss.Onb.) VFEABTTψEsc.dVoss.IYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: castis CLaur.XFr.Vat.: certis W: castris UIAd. Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 legens membranā Antonii Contii: tantis ed. Ald. 1517: legi non potuit h 25 octauī VCFEAWBTψEsc.U²dhlLaur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: o octauī T: optauī UVoss.Fr.Pie.Ad. adlabore C² 26 uersum sancte puer etc. deleuit Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"

triste Iouis ponitque [canit non pagina bellum]
 Phlegra, Giganteo sparsa est quae sanguine tellus,
 nec Centaureos Lapithas compellit in enses;
 urit Ericthonias Oriens non ignibus arces,
 non perfossus Athos nec magno uincula ponto
 iacta meo quaerent iam sera uolumine famam,
 non Hellespontus pedibus pulsatus equorum,
 Graecia cum timuit uenientis undique Persas –

30

27 triste iouis ponitque canit non pagina bellum CFEAWBTTdhLaur.XIYFr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad. Scaliger in
 editione Masuicii 1717 dixit se hanc lectionem in membrana Antonii Contii uidisse sed maluisse triste
 iouis poenique canit non pagina bellum: triste iouis coeique canit non pagina bellum Heyne "probabiliter
 restitutus": acies, quibus horruit olim Buecheler: uersum omiserunt VψEsc.UVoss.lHa.Pom.Vi.Ci.Onb.
 ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers. 28 phlegra UIPom.Pie.Vi.Ci. ed. Venet. 1475: flegra
 VCFEAWBTψdhVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Vla. ed. Rom. 1469: flegraque Γ: phlegra Esc.: phelegra Ad.:
 flagra Onb. est omisit C quae CFEABTTesc.dl Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre Pithou] Epigrammata: quo
 VWψUhVoss.lLaur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 29 lapithas (-ythas
 Fr.Pom.) EAWBIIFr.Pom.Vi.Ci. ed. Venet. 1475: laphitas (-thas T, -ytas ULaur.Onb.)
 VCFB²TTψ.Esc.UdhVoss.Laur.XYHa.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: iapithas ed. Venet. 1493 30
 uertit h erichthonias dLaur.²Ha.: erictonias VhVoss.Pie.: erichthonias C: erechthonias AWBTesc.Laur.I:
 hic thomas Γ: erithonias ψYVla.Onb.: eryrctonias U: erichthonias U²lFr.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: erechthonias
 XVat.: eryctonias Pom.: erittonias Ad.: erychthonias ed. Ascens. 1501: legi non potuerunt FE 32 iacta
 UCi. ed. Rom. 1469: iacta (le- VFAΓdVoss.Laur.XVat.Vla.Ad.Onb., loe- Vi.)
 VCFEAWBTTdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.: lecta ψhlPom. ed. Venet. 1472: letam eo Esc.:
 lacta Fr. ed. Rom. 1471 uolumine lPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469, Bembus: uolumina
 VCFEAWBTTψEsc.UdhVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. 34 non ed. Basil. 1544
 uenientis VFAWBTTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.IYHa.Fr.Pom.Vi.Vla. ed. Rom. 1469, Bembus: uenientes
 V²EA²B²Γ²ψhXVat.Pie.Ci.Onb. ed. Ald. 1517: uehementis CAD.

et tibi sede pia maneat locus, et tibi sospes

35 ollia d decurrent carmina *St. Louis sequens Calpurnium Siculum. uide commentarium.* decurrens
carmina *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum:* pede carmina currere *VWψhVoss.Ha.:* pede currere
carmina *CFEABTTesc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed.*
1573 in uers.: percurrere carmina *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.:* decurrere carmina *Ribbeck:* currentia
carmina *Schmidt* *lectionem Heinsii probauit Clausen.* uersu
VCFEAWBΓψEsc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger
ed. 1573 in uers.: uersum *T:* uersu est *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.:* uersu et *Ribbeck dicens, "uersu et*
scripsi quod in rudiore poeta tolerandum esse duco." *post 35 ". " inserui sed ", " inseruit Clausen.* 37
hoc tibi *VCFEAWBTTψEsc.UdhLaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469:* noc ubi *Y: h(a)ec*
tibi *Voss.Ha. ed. Ald. 1534:* hec ubi *Ad.:* et tu *Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:* et tibi *ed. Basil.*
1544, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. legens schedas Pithoei puer
VFEAWBTTψEsc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: pater *CPom.Pie.*
memorabilis et *VCFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.Laur.IYHa.Pom.Pie.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469:* memorabili et
Γ: memorabitur et *ψh Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm., Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre Pithou] Epigrammata:*
mortalibus et *lVi. ed. Venet. 1472:* memorabile et *XFr.Vat. ed. Ald. 1517:* uenerabilis et *Ci. Bembus,*
Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: mortalibus ut *ed. Ald. 1534:* memorabere sic *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"*
tibi constet *Wagenvoort:* tibi certet
VCFEAWBTTψEsc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: tibi
cernet *C:* sibi perstet *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum:* tibi certa est *Bothe:* tibi crescit *Sillig:*
certest *Baehrens:* tibi restet *Ellis:* tibi certe *Herrmann* tibi certet *cum codicibus scripsit Clausen.* 38
lucens *VCFEABTTψEsc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Venet. 1475,*
Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: lucis *Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:* liceat *ed. Rom. 1469* mansura
VFAWBTUdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: mensura *CEΓEsc.:*
msura ψ: uictura *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"* 39 *te ed. Ald. 1534*

debita felices memoretur uita per annos,

40

grata bonis lucens. sed nos ad coepta feramur.

igneus aetherias iam sol penetrabat in arces

candidaque aurato quatiebat lumina curru,

crinibus et roseis tenebras Aurora fugabat:

propulit e stabulis ad pabula laeta capellas

45

pastor et excelsi montis iuga summa petiuit,

uuida qua patulos uelabant gramina colles.

40 felices V²TψUhlLaur.XYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: felices
VCFEAWBTesc.dVoss.lHa.Ci. Bembus memoretur
VCFAWBTψEsc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: remoretur Γ:
legi non potuit E 41 lucens VCFEABTTψEsc.UdhVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed.
Parm. 1479: liceat lPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469: uerbum omisit W uel ferantur scripsit T² post feramur. in
T eadem manus nonnumquam duas lectiones in eodem uersu scribebat. secunda lectio fortasse
coniectura erat. in his locis secundam lectionem numero ² notauit. 42 igneus
CEAWBTesc.UdlXIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:
ignibus VψhHa.: lenibus Voss.: ingne Laur.: oeteas Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. hanc lectionem maluit
sed non damnavit aetneas in membrana Pitthoei: legi non potuerunt FT sol omisit F penetrabat
Fabricius in editione sed nusquam in codicibus: penetrarat
VCFEAWB²TTψEsc.U²dh²Voss.lLaur.XHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: penetrat BI:
penetrauerat UYPie.Vla.: penetraret h: penetrauit habeo apud me alios codices quos in dissertatione non
inserui temporis causa. unus ex his est Parisinus lat. 7939 A. 43 limina ed. Ald. 1505 44 fugabat
ETesc.lPom.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: fugarat VCFAWBTψUhVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.
ed. Ald. 1517: fugauit d fugarat dixit Clausen. 45 protulit ed. Venet. 1472 pabula
VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: pascua ψhYVla.
nota C 47 uuida Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. laudauit humida sed maluit uuida.: lurida
VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573
in uers.: humida ψh: luridas I: lucida YVla. Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 legens membranam
Antonii Contii: plurima Fridericus Lindenbrogius [Lindenbruch] in editione Masuicii 1717

iam siluis dumisque uagae, iam uallibus abdunt
 corpora, iamque omni *celebres e* parte uagantes
 tondebant tenero uiridantia gramina morsu.
 srupea desertas haerebant ad caua rupes,
 pendula proiectis carpuntur et arbuta ramis,
 densaque uirgultis auide labrusca petuntur.
 haec suspensa rapit carpente cacumina morsu

50

Taubmannus in commentario suo scripsit, "puto colorem hic non attendi: sed potius humorem." lurida
seruauit Clausen. colles CFEAWBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom.*
1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: flores VψhVoss.Ha. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.
 48 uacant Wakefield fortasse recte? 49 celebres e Vi. Wakefield: celeres e
 CEAWBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.²Vla.Ad.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469: celeres se VhVoss.Ha.: celera se*
F: sceleres se ψ: celeris e Esc.: celeres ex dOnb.: nemoris de Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" 50
 tondebant VFEAWBTTEsc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:*
 tendebant C: tundeabant h²: tondentur Ci. *Bembus* tenera F 51 *uersus 55 scriptus est post 50 in U.*
 desertas CFEBTTEsc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: desertis*
 VAWψVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.: desertae Ci. *Bembus: uersus 51-54 omisit Ad. uersum 51*
post 49 posuerunt Ci. et Bembus. haerebant (he- EWBTTEsc.lLaur.XVat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Onb., ae- l)
 CFEAWBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: errabant VψhVoss.Ha.Vla.²:*
 herebat Fr.: perrepunt Ci. *Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: repebant Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: omisit*
 Ad. ad caua VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom.*
1469: auia Nicolaas Heinsius in libro Aduersariorum: omisit Ad. rupes
 CEAWBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: rupis (-pp- ψ) VψVoss.Ha.Ci.*
Bembus: ripis (-pp- ψ²) ψ²h: omisit Ad. 52 raris Γ 53 uel brusca ed. Rom. 1473 54 nec Melanchthon
 rodente Schraderus in scriptis multorum eruditorum morsu
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: mansu*
Nic. Erythraeus in commentario Taubmanni: dente Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"

ue' felices lentae uel quae noua nascitur alnus,

55

naec ras fruticum sentes rimatur, at illa

imminet intuitu prostantis imaginis umbrae.

o bona pastoris (si quis non pauperis usum

mente prius docta fastidiat et probet illis

55 uel ψ Ci. *Bembus*: haec VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 nascitur VCFEAWBT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: uel pascitur T²Laur.² uel pascitur *scripsit* T² post nascitur. uide explanationem ad uersum 41. alni *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum* 56 haec tenerae fruticum sentis *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"* rimatur VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: miratur ψ h: ruminatur Y: rimentur Pie.: fuminatur Vla.: rimantur ed. Venet. 1475 57 intuitu St. Louis (sed fortasse *Ribbeck?*) lectionem nusquam in scriptis eruditi inueni: in riui VCFEAWBT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: intuici Γ : inrigui *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: e ripa *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"*: in riuum *Schmidt* prostantis *Ellis*: praestantis (pre- WTLaur.IVi.Vla.Ad.) VCEAWBT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: praestantes F: perstantis Γ : praestanti *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: "nescio an legendum properanti" *Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717*: prostante *Heyne in commentario editionis*: prostans *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum*: properantis *Baehrens*: praestantem et *Schmidt* imaginis (ym- Ad.) VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: (uel h²) marginis ψ h² *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: ymagines (im- Vat.) Laur.Vat. *Herrmann*: in imaginis *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum*: uallibus *Baehrens*: imaginem et *Schmidt* umbrae *Alton*: undam VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: unda ψ h: undae *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: umbram *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"*: uluae *Haupt in opusculis* imminet $\dagger$ in riui praestantis imaginis undam *scripsit Clausen ut in codicibus.* 59 docta ruris fastidiat *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"* illis VCFEAWBTTEsc.rapUdVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: illa ψ h: illi YVi.Vla. ed. *Ascens. 1501*, *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"*: illic *Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717*

somnia luxuriae spretis) incognita curis

60

quae lacerant auidas inimico pectore mentes.

si non Assyrio fuerint bis lota colore

Attalicis opibus data uellera, si nitor auri

sub laqueare domus animum non angit auarum

picturaeque decus, lapidum nec fulgor in ulla

65

cognitus utilitate manet, nec pocula gratum

Alconis *referunt* Boethique toreuma, nec Indi

conchea baca maris pretio est, at pectore puro

60 somnia *Haupt* in opusculis et in editione: omnia
VCFEAWBT ψ Esc.rapUdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*
spretis VVoss.YHa.Pie.Vla.: pretiis (-ciis ET ψ Esc.dhlXOnb.)
CEAWBT ψ Esc.UdhXIPom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:* praetus (pre-
F) FT: prauis erap *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. dicens "quam coniecturam confirmat quaedam uetus*
membrana." fortasse in animo habuit unus ex erap?: pretis Laur.: precii Fr. curis] uitans ψ *Scaliger*
legens membranam Pithoei 61 auidos Ci. pectine Wakefield 62 sic Onb. assyrio
WEsc.UhlYFr.Pom.Vi.Vla.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469:* assirio VCABTT ψ erapdVoss.Laur.XIHa.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb.:
assyrio F: assyrios E (uel C² ψ ²) lota C² Γ ψ ²rapOnb.: lauta
VCFEAWBT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469:* tuicta e: uel leta
h² uerba lauta uel lota in *margin*e scripsit ψ . 64 domus W ψ erapXFr.Pom.Vat.Ci. *ed. Ald. 1517:* domos
VCFEABTT ψ Esc.UdhVoss.lLaur.IYHa.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469* tangit Ci. *Bembus*
66 cognitus] igneus Nicolaas Heinsius in libro *Aduersariorum dicens, "perperam illic legitur cognitus*
quia . . . incognita . . . praecesserat." graium = graiorum Heinsius in *scriptis multorum eruditorum* 67
referunt ψ Pom.(?): referent VCFEAWBT ψ Esc.rapUdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vi.VlaAd.Ci.Onb.
ed. Rom. 1469: referant h referent legit Clausen. boethique Heyne "*probabiliter restitutus*": boetique
VCEAWBT ψ Esc.rapUdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:* bohetique F:
doctum ψ : bethique Pom.: rhoecique Lachmann in *editione Lucretii ut uidi in opusculis Hauptii* 68 at
V²eraph²Voss.X²YHa.Pie.Vla.Ci. *ed.* Ald. 1517: a
VCFEAWBT ψ Esc.UdhLaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:* flagrat ψ

saepe super tenero prosternit gramine corpus,
 florida cum tellus, gemmantis picta per herbas, 70
 uere notat dulci distincta coloribus arua;
 atque illum calamo laetum recinente palustri
 otiaque inuidia degentem et fraude remota
 pollentemque sibi uiridi cum palmite lucens
 Tmolia pampineo subter coma uelat amictu. 75
 illi sunt gratae rorantes lacte capellae
 et nemus et fecunda Pales et uallibus intus

70 cum CFEAWBT τ esc.rapUdhLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: tunc V:
 nunc Voss.Ha. 71 notat CFEAWBT τ esc.rapUdhLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed.
 Rom. 1469: nouo VVoss.Ha.: nouat Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum dulci
 eEsc.rapULaur.XYFr.Vat.Vla.Ad.Ci. ed. Parm. 1479: dubiis VVoss.Ha.Pie.Vla.²: dulcis
 CFEAWBT τ dIPom.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: duris ψ h: pulchris Vi. ed. Ascens. 1501, in margine Pithoei
 [Pierre Pithou] Epigrammata coloribus
 VCFEAWBT τ esc.rapUdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469:
 ligonibus ψ h 72 recanente Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 legens membranam Antonii Contii 73
 degentem VCEAWBT τ esc.rapUdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469:
 degente FAd.: degendo ψ h et ψ erap Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": ac U²dIPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469:
 omiserunt VCFEAWBT τ esc.UhVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Onb. remota ē Y 74 ludens
 Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 75 (uel Pie.²) tmolia (thm- VT ψ eraphHa.²Pie.²)
 VFETT ψ eraphLaur.XIHa.²Pom.Vat.Pie.² ed. Rom. 1469: molea C: mollia (mol- ed. Venet. 1472)
 ABEsc.lVi.Onb. ed. Venet. 1475: tmolea W: mollis ULaur.²YPie.Vla.Ad.: tollia d: thentolia Voss.:
 themolia Ha.: smolia Fr.: tempora Vla.²: uitea Ci. Bembus 76 uersus 76-152 omisit F. grat(a)e rorantes
 VCEAWBT τ esc.rapUdhVoss.lLaur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: grate
 rorante ψ : grata rorantes I: uaccae et rorantes Wakefield: grauidae roranti Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"
 77 pales V²C²EAWBT τ esc.rapUdhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom.
 1469: palus V: palles C ualle Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" intus
 VCEAWBT τ esc.rapdVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat.Onb.: imis (ym- Ad.) ULaur.²X²YPom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.

semper opaca nouis manantia fontibus antra.

quis magis optato queat esse beator aeuo

quam qui mente procul pura sensuque probando

80

non auidas agnouit opes nec tristia bella

nec funesta timet ualidae certamina classis

nec, spoliis dum sancta deum fulgentibus ornet

templa uel euectus finem transcendat habendi,

ed. Rom. 1469: yacus (iac- h) ψh: sub ima Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"

78 uersum omisit E. (ITEM r) QVAM FELICITER ET QVIETE VIVAT IN PRAESENTI QVI CONTENTVS (-TEMPTVS

p) EST MODICIS erap: QVOD FELICITER VIVAT QVI CONTENTVS EST MEDIOCRIBVS Tr. 80 puras *ed. Venet.*

1472 sensuque VCEAWBTTψeEsc.rapUdhVoss.Tr.Laur.QQ2XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb.

ed. Rom. 1469: sensusque ηlVi. ed. Venet. 1472 Reg. lat. 2120 conseruauit uersus 79-82, 294, 342 et 414 (66r-v) et iterum 79-82 (55r). in opere meo 66r-v = Q et 55r = Q2. 81 agnouit

CEAWBTTeEsc.rapUdlTr.Laur.QXIFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: agnoscit*

VηhVoss.Q2YHa.Vla.: cognoscit ψ Jahn: inhiauit Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum: adposcit

Baehrens

nec

tristia

VCEAWBTTψeEsc.rapUdηhVoss.lTr.Laur.QXIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: non*

tristia Q2Ci. Bembus 82 non funesta Q2 83 nec spoliis eEsc.rapTr.Laur.² *ed. Parm. 1479, ed.*

Grüninger. 1502: non spoliis VCEAWBTTψUdhVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Ald.*

1517: quo spoliis lPom.Vi. *ed. Rom. 1469 uerba post spoliis omisit d. dum*

VCEAWBTTeEsc.rapUdVoss.lTr.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: haec*

ψh: ut Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" puto se adeo scripsit Γ² ornet

VTerapU²hVoss.lTr.lHa.Pom.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: ornat*

CEAWBTψEsc.rUdLaur.XYFr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad. *ed. Venet. 1475 84 uel euectus Ci. Bembus: nec euectus*

VCEAWB²TTψeEsc.rapUdhVoss.lTr.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: nec*

finem transcendit habendi η nulla uerba perierunt ante nec finem. uerba templa uel euectus numquam

erant in η.: uel electus Amar: nece euectus Hertzberg/Osiander: omisit B transcendat VWTr.Ci. *ed.*

Rom.

1473,

Bembus:

transcendit

CEABTTψeEsc.rapUdηhVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*

aduersum saeuus ultro caput hostibus offert?

85

illi falce deus colitur non arte politus,

ille colit lucos, illi Panchaia tura

floribus agrestes herbae uariantibus adsunt,

illi dulcis adest requies et pura uoluptas.

liber a supplicibus curis, huic imminet, omnis

90

derigit huc sensus, haec cura est subdita cordi,

quolibet ut requie uictu contentus abundet

85 aduersum et *Paldamus* aufert Tr. 86 arte VCAB²ΓψUhVoss.IXYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: alte ETdLaur.IAd.: alta W: a te B: ante Esc.Fr.: alite Vat. 87 panc(h)aia (-ai a U) CEAWBTUIFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vla. ed. Ascens. 1507: panchasia VhVoss.Ha.: pancheia Γd: panchesia ψ: panachia Esc.: panc(h)aica lVi.²Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: panchaya Laur.XAd.: pancaina Y: panchica Vi. ed. Venet. 1493, Ascens. 1501 rura Γ Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" 88 herbae (-be VψhVoss.Vat.) VWψUhVoss.XYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ci. ed. Parm. 1479: herbis CEABTTesc.dlIPom. ed. Rom. 1469: herbas Laur.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Ascens. 1501 90 liber a supplicibus curis St. Louis: libera simplicibus curis VCEAWBTTψeEsc.rapUdhVoss.lTr.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: libera simplicitas curis Onb. Sillig: libera ab implicitis curis Schraderus in editione Friesemanni: libera sollicitis curis Schraderus in commentario editionis Heynii: libera uindicibus curis Wakefield: libera duplicibus curis Ellis Lindenbrogius [Lindenbruch] in editione Masuicii 1717 dicens, "puto mendum in his esse. nam melius meo iudicio dixisset, libera magnis uel grauibus curis." uoluptas, libera simplicibus curis scripsit Clausen. huic VEWTTU²Voss.IYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla. ed. Rom. 1469: huc CABeEsc.rapdTr.Laur.XIFr.Vat.Ad.Ci.Onb. Bembus, Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717: h' ψh: uersum omisit U sed in margine suppleuit U² mittit et . . . omnes Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 91 derigit Γ: dirigit VCEAWBTT²ψeEsc.rapUdhVoss.lTr.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 huic Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" 92 quolibet VCEAWBTTψeEsc.rapUdhVoss.Tr.Laur.IYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb.: qualibet hIPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469: quilibet X: quamlibet ed. Ald. 1505 requie VWU²hVoss.IXHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: requiem CEABTTψEsc.UdLaur.IYFr.Vat.Vla.Ad.: requie et eapTr.: requiem et r: tenui Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" uictu VWTψerapUhVoss.Tr.Laur.XYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci. Bembus, Heyne

iucundoque *leuet* languentia corpora somno.

o pecudes, o Panes et o gratissima tempe

frondis Hamadryadum, quarum non diuite cultu

95

aemulus Ascraeo pastor sibi quisque poetae

securam placido traducit pectore uitam.

talibus in studiis baculo dum nixus apricas

"probabiliter restitutus": uictus CEABTEsc.dIONb. ed. Parm. 1479: motus IPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469 uix
legi potuit t in l. contentus V²CEAWBTT²esc.apUdhVoss.Tr.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb.
ed. Ald. 1517, *Bembus*: contemptus VrY: contemptor IPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469

93 leuet erapTr. *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum*, *Schraderus in editione Friesemanni*: liget
VW^ψhVoss.Ha.Pie. Heyne *"probabiliter restitutus"*: licet CEATTEsc.dAd.: locet
B²UILaur.XFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: libet I: donat YVla.: legi non potuit B in hoc loco
rescripto. corpora] lumina Heyne *"probabiliter restitutus"* 94 et
VEAWBTT²esc.rapdhVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: et omiserunt C, ed. Flor.
1487: atque UYPie.Vi.Vla.Ad. ed. Ascens. 1501.: uos ed. Rom. 1473 omnes uersus post 94 omiserunt
ψh. ψ 95 non est uersus *Culicis*. laetissima Wakefield 95 frondis hamadryadum *Heinsius in scriptis*
multorum eruditorum: fontis hamadryadum
VCEAWBTT²esc.rapUdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: naides et
dryades Heyne *"probabiliter restitutus"*: fontis hamadryasin Sillig: hortus hamadryadum Leo: frigus
hamadryadum Housman: frondes hamadryadum Herrmann: fana et hamadryadum Schmidt †fontis†
indicaui Clausen. cultu VCWB²T²erapUVoss.lLaur.²XYHa.Pom.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469:
culte EABTEsc.dLaur.lFr.Vat.Vi.: cultum Laur.² tres lectiones dedit Laur., 1 in uersu, 2 in margine. 96
pastor sibi CEAWBTT²esc.rapUdLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: pastori
quisque VVoss.Ha.Pie. poetae XVI.Ci. ed. Ascens. 1501: poeta
VCEAWBTT²esc.rapUdVoss.lLaur.IYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 97 traducit
VW²erapUVoss.lLaur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:
traducis CEABTEsc.dIONb.: traduxit Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 98 talibus
VCEAWBTT²esc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed.
1573 in uers.: dulcibus erap Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. uersum 98 post 99 posuerunt VVoss.Ha.
apricas] agresti Heyne *"probabiliter restitutus"*

pastor agit curas et dum non arte canora
 compacta solitum modulatur harundine carmen, 100
 tendit ineuctus radios Hyperionis ardor
 lucidaque aetherio ponit discrimina mundo,
 qua iacit Oceanum flammis in utrumque rapaces.
 et iam compellente uagae pastore capellae
 ima susurrantis repetebant ad uada lymphae 105
 quae subter uiridem residebant caerulea muscum.
 iam medias operum partes euectus erat sol,

99 pastor VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469,
 Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: letus erap Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. fortasse in animo habuit unus ex erap?
 canorus Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" 100 compacta
 VC²EAWBTTEsc.rapUdVoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469:
 compacto C solitum codex ex collectione "Giannalisa Feltrinelli Collection S. N." olim in bibliotheca
 Morgan. dedit solidum, tum uerbum rescriptum est solitum. ed. Ald. 1505: solidum
 VCEAWBTTEsc.rapU²dVoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: solium
 UAd. post hunc uersum Scaliger uersus 154, 148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156,
 159, 158 posuit. hunc ordinem in codices erap inueniet lector. post uersum 158 Scaliger 101, 102 etc.
 dedit. 101 ineuctus VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Vat.Pie.Vla. Bembo: et euectus IPom.Vi.
 ed. Rom. 1469: in euentus Fr.: in euboicos Ad.: in euectos Ci.: ut euectus Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: iam
 euectus Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": legi non potuit Onb. 103 qua
 VCAWBTTEsc.dVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci. ed. Parm. 1479, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: cum
 EOnb.: quam U: dum U²IPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469: qui YVla.: et Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. iacet Γ
 oceanum VAWTUvoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: oceanus CEBTEsc.d
 ed. Parm. 1479: cete anus Onb. uix legi potuit Onb. rapaces] coruscas Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"
 105 ima] lene Schraderus in scriptis multorum eruditorum repetebant
 VEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed.
 1573 in uers.: uel repedebant V²: repedabant C: repebant Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 106 residebant]
 resonabat Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" caerulea] garrula Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum

cum densas pastor pecudes cogebat in *umbras*

et procul aspexit luco residere uirenti,

Delia diua, tuo, quo quondam uicta furore

110

uenit Nyctelium fugiens Cadmeis Agaue,

infandas scelerata manus et caede cruenta,

quae gelidis bacchata iugis requieuit in antro

posterius poenam nati de morte datura --

hic etiam uiridi ludentes Panes in herba

115

et Satyri Dryadesque chorus egere puellae

108 agebat C non interpunxi sed "umbras." scripsit Clausen. 109 et ed. Rom. 1469 ut legit Clausen. cliuo A residere] recubare Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" 110 tu A 111 nyctelium CAUdXI ed. Rom. 1469: nictelium VEWEsc.Voss.Ha.Pie.Onb.: etoliam B: in ante etoliam addidit B²: niyctelium T: nyttelum Γ: nyctileum IPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Venet. 1475, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: uictelium Laur.Vat.: nictellium Y: nitelium Fr.: nitellium Vla.: uitelium Ad.: nictelium Melanchthon: nyctilei Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. chatineis T 113 quae] et Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" 114 nati VEAWBTEsc.UdVoss.IIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: natis CΓX Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. (aliter Laur.²) de Laur.² ed. Ald. 1534: se VEAWBTEsc.UdVoss.IIYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: est C: ae Γ: e XFr.Vat. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: sorte Ad.: sibi ed. Rom. 1473 datura ed. Rom. 1473, ed. Ald. 1534: futurum VWT²Voss.Laur.²XIHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.: futuram CEABTEsc.UdLaur.YPom.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: laturam Laur.² tres lectiones dedit Laur. uix legi potuit Y. 115 herba V²CEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.IIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: herbas V: umbra ed. Parm. 1479 116 dryadesque EB²TEsc.U²IIFr.Pom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: driades V: driadesque CWBΓUdLaur.XYVat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Venet. 1472: et quaecumque A: satyriades Voss.Ha. chorus (cor- A) EABΓdVla. ed. Grüninger. 1502: chorosque VVoss.Ha.: choros (co- Laur.Vat.Pie.) CTT²Esc.UILaur.XFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: cohors Y: omisit W

Naiadum in coetu. non tantum Oeagrius Hebrum

restantem tenuit ripis siluasque canendo

quantum te, pernix, remorantem, diua, chorea

multa tuo laetae fundentes gaudia uultu,

120

ipsa loci natura domum resonante susurro

117 naiadum VCWB²TEsc.U²dVoss.IIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: naidum EB: naiaidum A: nayadum ULaur.XAd. in coetu *Wakefield*: coetu (ce- VdVoss.Pom.Vi.Onb.) VCEAWBTesc.dVoss.IIHa.Pom.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: coctum Γ: coetus (ce- Laur.Fr.Vat.Pie.) ULaur.XYFr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad. *ed. Ald. 1517*: et coetus *Heyne* "probabiliter restitutus" non tantum *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum: tantum non* VCAWBTEsc.UdVoss.IIaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: tamen non E oeagrius *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum: (id est C²) orpheus (hor- VB²Voss.) VC²B²Voss.IYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469*: (uel B³) horridus (or- CW, orr- AU) CEAWB³TEsc.UdXIAd.Onb. *ed. Ald. 1517*: horridis (or- Fr.) Laur.Fr.Vat.: *legi non potuit B in hoc loco rescripto. tres lectiones dedit B = Vat. Lat. 3252 – quas notauit B, B², B³. uide Housman ad Manil. 1.350 de uerbis trisyllabis.* 118 ripis EBTesc.UdLaur.²Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: riuis VAWTVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad. *Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 legens membranam Contianam et dicens de Orpheo, "cecinit enim siluis et riuis, et riuos restantes, siluas mobiles fecit."*: rupit C: syluas ripasque Pom. canendo] *suspectum. uide commentarium.* 119 quantum te V²EBEsc.dVoss.IYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger 1573 in uers.*: quantum V: quam te CWTULaur.XIFr.Vat.Ad.: quam tum te A: non tam te *Scaliger 1573 in comm.* pernix remorantem VVoss.YHa.Pie.Vla. *ed. Ald. 1517*: per nigre (-grae WT) (*unum uerbum in BT*) morantem CEAWBTesc.dOnb.: peneu remorantem UIPom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger 1573 in uers.*: per pigre morantem (*unum uerbum in X*) Laur.XFr.Vat.Ad.: nigre morantem I: pernix remoratae *ed. Ald. 1534*: peneu remorata est *Scaliger 1573 in comm.*: phoebe remorantem *Wakefield choreae ed. Ald. 1534* 120 tuo CIUVoss.IIaur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad. *ed. Rom. 1469*: tuae (-e VABEsc.Onb.) VEABTEsc.dIOnb.: tibi B²Ci.: *ed. Ald. 1517*: omisit W laetae (laete ATU, lete ΓEsc.dIOnb., letae Voss.Pom.Vi.) ABTEsc.UdVoss.IIHa.Pom.Vi.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: leto (laeto ECi., *Bembus*) VECi. *Bembus, ed. Ald. 1534*: late (latae *ed. Ald. 1517*) CLaur.XYFr.Vat.Vla. *ed. Ald. 1517*: lacte Pie.Ad.: omisit W 121 nomum *Wakefield*

quis dabat et dulci fessas refouebat in umbra.

nam primum prona surgebant ualle patentes

aeriae platanus, inter quas impia lotos,

impia, quae socios Ithaci maerentis abegit,

125

hospita dum nimia tenuit dulcedine captos.

at, quibus ignipedum curru proiectus equorum

ambustus Phaethon luctu mutauerat artus,

Heliades, teneris implexae bracchia truncis,

candida fundebant tentis uelamina ramis.

130

posterius cui Demophoon aeterna reliquit

122 quis] his Heyne "*probabiliter restitutus*" molli ed. Rom. 1469 antro ed. Rom. 1469 124 platanus B²ΓIPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: platani (-th- U) VAWTUVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad. ed. Ald. 1505: platanae (-e B) CB: platanos EEsc.d: pathanos Onb. inter quas impia CEABTTesc.UdVoss.IIaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: inter quas erat impia VWB²Ha.Pie. ed. Ald. 1517, ed. Ald. 1534: inter erat quas impia YVla. lucos Γ 127 ac Heinsius in *scriptis multorum eruditorum* ignipedum Heinsius in *scriptis multorum eruditorum*: insigni (-ng- Laur.) VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.IIaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: ignito Maehly: in signis Bickel 128 ambustus ULaur.XYFr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad. ed. Rom. 1473, Scaliger in *editione Masuicii* 1717: ambustos VCEAWBTTEsc.dVoss.IIHa.Pom.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger 1573 in *uers.*: ambusto Γ 129 implexae Heinsius in *scriptis multorum eruditorum*: amplexae (-xe WTEsc.UdLaur.Vat.Vla.Onb.) VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.IIaur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1471: amplexa ed. Rom. 1469: uersum omisit Fr.: annexae Wakefield 130 fundebant] pandebant Schraderus in *scriptis multorum eruditorum* tentis VCEAWBTTEsc.U²dVoss.IIHa.Pom.Pie.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: (aliter Pie.²) teneris ULaur.XYVat.Pie.²Vla.Onb.: lentis Vi. ed. Ascens. 1501 et omnes editiones Ascens.: tenera Ad.: uersum omisit Fr. 131 posteris T

perfidiam lamentandi mala – perfide multis,
 perfide Demophoon et nunc deflende puellis.
 quam comitabantur, fatalia carmina, quercus,
 quercus ante datae Cereris quam semina uitae
 (illas Triptolemi mutauit sulcus aristas).
 hic magnum Argoe naui decus addita pinus

135

132 perfidiam VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci.Onb. Scaliger 1573 in uers.:
 perfidia lPom.Vi.Vla. ed. Rom. 1469: perfidiae Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717, Heyne "probabiliter
 restitutus" lamentandi VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom.
 1469: lamenta Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": lamentanti Weber perfide VVoss.Ha.Pie. ed. Ald. 1517:
 perfida CEAWBTTEsc.UlLaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: perfidia dYAd.: perfidie Vla.:
 dolis dum lusit inultis Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" 133 perfidie Γ et nunc
 VCEAB²TTesc.dlLaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: i nunc Voss.YHa.Pie.Vla.: et tunc
 UAd.: uersum omiserunt WB sed lectionem in margine addidit B²: uersum omisit Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre
 Pithou] Epigrammata deflende Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717: defende
 VCEAB²TTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.²YHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: defide Laur.Fr.Vat.:
 definde X: deflente ed. Ald. 1505: uersum omiserunt WB sed lectionem in margine addidit B²: uersum
 omisit Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre Pithou] Epigrammata in editionibus 1573 et 1575 Scaliger nusquam
 dixit deflende. hanc lectionem in editione Masuicii 1717 cum aliis adnotationibus Scaligeri inueni. in
 animo habuit uersum Propertii "perfide, nec cuiquam melior sperande puellae." (Elegiae 4.7.11)
 puellis CATTEsc.dLaur.XIFr.Vat.: puell' V: puellam EB²UlLaur.²YHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed.
 Rom. 1469: puellas Voss.: puella ed. Ald. 1505: uersum omiserunt WB sed lectionem in margine addidit
 B²: uersum omisit Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre Pithou] Epigrammata 134 crimina Ci. 136 triptolemi
 VCAWTEsc.dlLaur.XIHa.²Fr.Pom.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: triptopoli E: triptolomi B²U²Pie.:
 tritholomi UAd.: tritolemi Voss.Ha.: tritolomi YVla.: tripholomi Vat. 137 naui
 VEAWBTTesc.dVoss.lIHa.Pom.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: uani C: nauis UlLaur.XFr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.:
 maius Y ut uidetur sed fortasse mauis? addita (ad- Voss.) VTVoss.Ha.Pie. ed. Ald. 1505: edita
 CEAWBTTEsc.U²dlLaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: dedita UAd.: abdita YVla.

proceros decorat siluas hirsuta per artus
 ac petit aeriis contingere motibus astra.
ilicis et species nigrae et lethaea cupressus
 umbrosaeque manent fagus hederaeque ligantes
 bracchia, fraternos plangat ne populus ictus,
 ipsaeque ascendunt ad summa cacumina lentae
 pinguntque aureolos uiridi pallore corymbos.

140

138 proceros *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum*: proceras
 VCEAWBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: proceratus Γ:
 procerat Vat. 139 ac petit *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum*: appetit
 VCEAWBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Venet. 1475: repperit Pom.:
 apperit ed. Rom. 1469 coniungere ed. Ald. 1517 motibus *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: montibus
 VCEAWBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed.*
 1573 in uers.: frondibus *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum* 140 ilicis et species nigrae et *St.*
Louis: ilicis et nigr(a)e species VCEAWBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb.
 ed. Rom. 1469: ilicis et nigra species Ad.: ilicis et nigrae et species *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"*
 ilicis et nigrae species *scripsit Clausen* leth(a)ea *coniectura amici Scaligeri Oberti Gisanii*: et laeta
 VCEAWBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed.*
 1573 in uers.: nec laeta *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum*: et lenta *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* nec
 in editione *Masuicii 1717*: haud laeta *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"*: et moesta *Wakefield* nec laeta
seruauit Clausen in editione sua. cupressus] *cupressus = cupressi gen. in libro Heynii sed nom. in opere*
meo et plerumque in editionibus. 141 manent] *patent Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"* ligantes
 VTUVoss.Laur.²XYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad. ed. Parm. 1479: ligantis
 CEAWBTesc.dlLaur.lPom.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 *Taubmannus affirmavit, "ligantes . . . legendum*
autumo: non, ligantis." 142 ne] quae *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"* ictus
 VCAWBdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Ald. 1517: hic tus T: ictum Γ: ictis Esc.: actus
 U: artus U²lPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469: legi non potuit E 143 ascendunt *Ribbeck*: excedunt
 VCEAWBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: accedunt ΓPom.:
 succedunt *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"* 144 palluntque E

quis aderat ueteris myrtus non nescia fati.

145

at uolucres patulis residentes dulcia ramis

carmina per uarios edunt resonantia cantus.

his suberat gelidis manans e fontibus unda,

quae leuibis placidum riuus sonat orta liquorem;

et quaqua geminas auium uox obstrepat aures,

150

hac querulae referunt uoces quis nantia limo

145 Scaliger uersu 157 iterum sed aliter usus est. uide notas ad uersum 100 et ad uersum 157. post uersum 157 Scaliger uersus 160, 161, 162, 163 etc. posuit. in libro suo Scaliger uersus transposuit sed commentarium non transposuit. magna est perturbatio lectoris! 146 ac Fabricius 148 suberat lPom.Vi.Onb.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: superat VCEAWBTTeEsc.rapUdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad. ed. Nurem. 1492: super Vla.: superet Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 149 placido Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 sonat VCEAWBTTeEsc.rUdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: sonet eap Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. orta CEAWBTTeEsc.rapUdLaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: acta VVoss.YHa.Vla liquorem VEAWBTTeEsc.rapUdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: liquorum C: liquore C²Pie. Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 150 quaqua Barthius: quamquam (quantum ABΓUOnb., duo uerba in W) VCEAWBTTeEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: hinc illi erap Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. fortasse in animo habuit unus ex erap? 151 hac VCEAWBTTeEsc.dXIYCi.Onb. Bemus: ac Voss.Ha.Pie.Vla.: hanc UlLaur.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: hinc erap Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. querulae VCEAWBTTeEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: querulas erap Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. referunt uoces CEAWBTTeEsc.rapUdLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: uoces referunt VVoss.Ha.: referant uoces Onb. quis VCEAWBTTeEsc.rUdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: qui eap: quae Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.

corpora lympha fouet; sonitus alit aeris echo,
 argutis et cuncta fremunt ardore cicadis.
 at circa passim fessae cubuere capellae
 excelsis subter dumis, quos leniter adflans
 aura susurrantis poscit confundere uenti.

155

152 omnia uerba post sonitus omisit Γ. (a)eris
 EAWBTEsc.rapUdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: (a)etheris VCVoss.Ha.:
 omisit Γ 153 cuncta VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed.
 Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: culta erap Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. ardore
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.rapUdlLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: calore Laur.²:
 arbusta Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum 154 at
 VEABTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: et
 ClPom.Vi.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: ad F: quem erap Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: ac Vla.: initia uersuum non
 superfuerunt in W 155 excelsis erapTr. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm., Heyne "probabiliter restitutus":
 excelsisque (exel- Voss.) VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb.
 ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: excelsos Broukhusius [van Broekhuizen] in scriptis multorum
 eruditorum subter Broukhusius [van Broekhuizen] in scriptis multorum eruditorum: super
 VCFEAWBTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed.
 1573 in uers.: supra ΓerapTr. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. dumis
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.rapUdVoss.lTr.LaurXIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469:
 dumos Laur.² Broukhusius [van Broekhuizen] in scriptis multorum eruditorum (uel Laur.²) quos
 erapTr.Laur.²Ci. Bembus: quae (que Voss.Laur.IVla.Ad.)
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 leniter
 FTerapUTr.Laur.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1473: leuiter
 VCEAWBTEsc.dVoss.lXIYHa.Pom.Vi.Vla. ed. Rom. 1469 156 poscit
 VCEAWBTEsc.Voss.Laur.XIHa.Vat.Onb. Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 legens membranam Contii:
 possit FTerapUdlTr.YPom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469

pastor, ut ad fontem densa requieuit in umbra,
 mitem concepit proiectus membra soporem,
 anxius insidiis nullis, sed lentus in herbis
 securo pressos somno mandauerat artus. 160
 stratus humi dulcem capiebat corde quietem,
 ni Fors incertos iussisset ducere casus.
 nam solitum uoluens ad tempus tractibus isdem
 immanis uario maculatus corpore serpens,
 mersus ut in limo magno subsideret aestu, 165

157 pastor ut ad fontem densa requieuit in umbra (demsa Ad.)
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.dVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*:
 pastor ut ad fontem densa requieuerit umbra U: pastor ut ad fontes densa requieuit in umbra IPom.Vi. *ed.*
Rom. 1469: seu libet ad fontem densa requiescere in umbra erapTr. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. haec
uerba post uersum 153 posuit.: pastor ut ad fontes densa requietis in umbra *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*
illa uerba post uersum 145 inseruit. 158 porrectus *Lindenbrogius [Lindenbruch] in editione Masuicii*
1717 159 insidius a sed VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb.
ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: et erapTr. *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* 161 quietem
 CFEAWBTTEsc.UdLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: soporem VVoss.Ha.*
 162 ni VCFAWBTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: si ET*
dicere Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 163 cum *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"* casibus U iisdem Vi.Ci.
ed. Rom. 1473: idae (ide VTdVoss.Onb., ydae EEsc.Ad.) VCFEAWBTTEsc.dVoss.IHa.Pie.Ad.Onb.:
 idem UIPom.Vla. *ed. Rom. 1469: ydr(a)e (hy- Fr., ed. Ald. 1517) Laur.XFr.Vat. ed. Ald. 1517: idra*
 YVla.²: iisde Vi. 165 subsideret Ci. *Bembus: subsideris (duo uerba in*
EATTEsc.dlLaur.Ha.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Onb., syd- IXPom.Vi. ed Venet. 1472)
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: subseditur Y: subsederit*
 Pie.Vla.Ad.

obuia uibranti carpens, grauis aere, lingua

squamosos late torquebat motibus orbes:

tollebant †aurae uenientis ad omnia uisus.

iam magis atque magis corpus reuolubile uoluens

(attollit nitidis pectus fulgoribus *et fert*

170

sublimi ceruice caput, cui crista superne

edita purpureo lucens maculatur amictu

aspectuque micant flammorum lumina toruo)

166 obuiam F aere VCEAWBTesc.dVoss.IHa. *Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre Pithou] Epigrammata: aera*
 FUILaur.XYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: ore Heyne "probabiliter restitutus":*
uerba post carpens omisit F 167 uersus 167-248 paene euanuerunt in S. latis *ed. Ald. 1505* motibus
 CB²Tesc.Ulaur.XFr.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1473: montibus VFEAWBTdVoss.IIYHa.Pom.Vla.Onb. ed.*
Rom. 1469: mortibus Ad. 168 tollebant
 VCFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.IIaur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: tollebat Fr.: pallebant*
ed. Ald. 1517, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: squallebant Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. aurae (-e
 V²Laur.Fr.Vat.) V²CFEAWBTesc.UdLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469: aute V:*
arte Voss.Ha.: aures Onb.: herbae Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": irae Leo uenientis
 VCFEAWBTesc.dVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Vla.Ci. *ed. Parm. 1479, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: (uel B²)*
uiuentis B²Onb.: uehementis UPie.Vi.Ad. ed. Ascens. 1501, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: inuentis IPom.
ed. Rom. 1469: liuentis ed. Ald. 1517 omina Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. lectionem similem adomina
inueni in Ad., Onb. 169 magnis E resolubile Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum 170 pectus
 CFEAWBTesc.UdLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: corpus VVoss.Ha. et*
fert ed. Ald. 1517: et se VCFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.IIaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed.
Rom. 1469: exit Schraderus in editione Friesemanni: effert Friesemannus: ecce olim Ribbeck sed in
editione lectionem correxit et se scripsit Clausen. 171 sublime F rapit Bembus 173 micant
 UIPom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469: micat VCFEAWBTesc.dVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Onb.*
 flammorum VCFEAWBTesc.dLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Onb.: flammantia UIPom.Vi.Ci. *ed.*
Rom. 1469: flammatum Voss.Ha. lumina AUIPom.Pie.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: lumine
 VCFEWBTesc.dVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Vla.Ad.Onb.

metabat sese circum loca, cum uidet ingens

aduersum recubare ducem gregis. acrior instat

175

lumina diffundens intendere et obuia toruus

saepius arripiens infringere, quod sua quisquam

ad uada uenisset. naturae comparat arma:

ardet mente, furit stridoribus, intonat ore,

flexibus euersis torquentur corporis orbes,

180

manant sanguineae per tractus undique guttae,

spiritibus rumpit fauces. cui cuncta parantur,

paruulus hunc prior umoris conterret alumnus

174 sese CFEAWBTTEsc.UdLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: late
 VVoss.Ha. Heyne in editione sua 176 intentus et ed. Ald. 1517 toruus Laur.²X: toruo
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.IYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: torua Γ Scaliger in
 editione Masuicii 1717 dicens "OBVIA TORVA: quaecumque ipsi toruo obuia erant": torue Onb.
 litterae us paene euanuerunt in imagine codicis Laur.² 177 saeuus Bothe infringere
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb.: infrendere UIPom.Vi. ed. Rom.
 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 178 comparat
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: computat Γ:
 comperat Ad. 179 intonat VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed.
 Rom. 1469: insonat ΓVla. 180 et uersis Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" torquentur FT: torquetur
 VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 orbes
 FTYVla. Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum: orbis
 VCEAWBTTEsc.UVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: orb' d 182 cui] quo
 Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. parantur Housman: paranti
 VCFEAWSBTTUdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed.
 1573 in uers.: parenti Esc.: parante Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 183 conterret (-er- dlI)
 VFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lIYHa.Pom.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: conterit C: continet Γ: ter(r)et
 Laur.XFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.: exterret Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"

et mortem uitare monet per acumina; namque,

qua diducta genas pandebant lumina gemmis,

185

hac senioris erat naturae pupula telo

icta leui, cum prosiluit furibundus et illum

obtritum morti misit, cui dissitus omnis

spiritus et cessit sensus. tum torua tenentem

lumina respexit serpentem comminus; inde

190

184 monet VFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.IIaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: manet C: uitam remouet Γ acumina VCFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: culmina IPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 185 pandebant VCFAWBTesc.UdVoss.IXIIHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: pendebant E ed. Nurem. 1492: patebant Laur.YFr.Vat.Vla.Ad.: ponebant ed. Ascens. 1507: obdebant Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: pingebant Wakefield gemmis VCFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.IIaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: gemmas Γ: gentis YAd. 186 hac VCFEAWBTesc.U²dVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat. Bembus: ac UIPom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: at Y senioris (in pluribus codicibus uerbum senioris scriptum est se moris) VCFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.IIaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: leuioris ed. Ald. 1517, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: seuioris Ci. Bembus pupula V²FA²BTesc.UVoss.Laur.XHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: popula VEAwdI: pabula CYAd. ed. Ald. 1505: papula I ed. Venet. 1475: pupulae Fr. 187 icta V²UVoss.IIaur.XHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: iacta VCFEABTesc.dIOnb. ed. Nurem. 1492: laeta Y: initia uersuum non superfuerunt in W cum VCFEAWBTdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Onb. Bembus: tum Esc.UIPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469 189 et cessit Housman: excessit VCFEAWSBTesc.UdVoss.IIaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 sensus CFEAWBTesc.dIIYPom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: sensim (sem- Ha.) VU²Voss.Laur.XHa.Fr.Vat. ed. Ald. 1517: sensum UAd.: sensit Fabricius tuentem Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 190 lumine Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.

impiger, exanimis, uix compos mente refugit
 et ualidum dextra detraxit ab arbore truncum
 (qui casus sociarit opem numenue deorum
 prodere sit dubium, ualuit sed uincere talis
 horrida squamosi uoluentia membra draconis)
 atque reluctantis crebris foedeque petentis

195

191 exanimis VVoss.YHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. ed. Ald. 1505, *Bembus*: exanimus
 CEAWBTesc.UdlLaur.XIFr.Vat.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: rexanimus F: exanimi Γ resurgit Scaliger ed.
 1573 in comm. 192 dextra detraxit ab arbore truncum Γ: dextra truncum detraxit ab ore (ab ore
 CEEsc.UlLaur.XHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad.) VCEAWBTesc.UVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed.
 Rom. 1469: uel aure V²: detraxit ab arbore dextera truncum FS: extra truncum detraxit ab ore d: dextra
 truncum detraxit ab ora YVla.: dextra truncum detraxit ab orno (ab orno ed. Rom. 1473, ed. Ald. 1517,
Bembus) Vat.Ci. ed. Rom. 1473, ed. Ald. 1517, *Bembus* 193 qui opem casu numenue deorum sociaret U
 qui VCFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.²Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, hanc
 lectionem laudauit Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 legens, "qui, hoc est; quo trunco": quae YVla.:
 cui Scaliger mentionem fecit in editione Masuicii 1717 sed nihil in editionibus 1573, 1575. (casus . . .
 deorum) Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 sociarit Ci. ed. Ald. 1517: sociaret
 VCFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Bembus*
 numenue CFEAWBTesc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: numen ne
 VVoss.Ha.: numerumque A: numerumue Ad. post 193 uersum nanque illi dederitne uiam casusue
 deusue inseruerunt aliquot editiones e.g. *Bembus*, *Melanchthon*, *Petrus Pithoeus* [*Pierre Pithou*]
Epigrammata sed damnauit Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 194 sic ed. Rom. 1469 ualuit Haupt in
 editione: uoluit VCFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom.
 1469 seu ed. Rom. 1473 uincere omisit Y talis Sillig: tali VVoss.Ha.: tales
 CFEAWSBTesc.dlLaur.IFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: talem UPie.Ad.: callens X: tale YVla.:
 tandem ed. Rom. 1473, ed. Grūninger. 1502 196 petentis
 VCFEAWBTesc.U²dVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Onb.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: patentis
 UYFr.Pie.Vla.Ad. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.

ictibus ossa ferit, cingunt qua tempora *cristam*;

et quod erat tardus somni languore remoti

nec prius aspiciens *timore* obcaecauerat artus,

hoc minus implicuit dira formidine mentem.

200

quem postquam uidit caesum languescere, sedit.

iam quatit et biiuges oriens Erebeis equos nox

et piger aurata procedit Vesper ab Oeta,

197 c(h)ristam VCFawBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: crist(a)e ElPom.Vi. *ed. Venet. 1475, Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717*: crista Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre Pithou] *Epigrammata* cristae scripsit Clausen. 198 somni Laur. *ed. Ald. 1517, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: omni VCfEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.IXIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.* remoti Vollmer (*sed fortasse Buecheler?*): remoto VCfEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.II.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469* 199 nec prius Sillig: nescius VCfEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.II.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: nescis T †nescius in editione habuit Clausen. de uersibus 198-199 scripsit, "nondum expediti." timore St. Louis: timor VCfEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.II.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469* timor seruauit Clausen. obcaecauerat (obcec- CFawTTEsc.dLaur.IPom.Vat.Onb., occaec- X, occec- Pie.Vi.Ad.) CFawBTTEsc.UdI.Laur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: excecauerat VVoss.Ha.: excitaueat YVla. 200 implicuit CV²FEAWBTTEsc.UILaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: impleuit VTdVoss.Ha. 201 causam Ci. 202 quatiens Scaliger *ed. 1573 in comm.* biiuges V² *ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus, Scaliger in omnibus editionibus*: biiugis (by- Vi.) VCfEAWBTTEsc.UVoss.II.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: obiugis d: abiiugis Vat.: biiugos Ci. oriens omisit U *sed suppluit* U² erebeis B² Haupt in opusculis et in editione: ereboeis (*duo uerba in* Ha.) VCfEAWBTdIIHa.Ad.: erebois TEsc. Sillig: crebo cit U: crebro cit U²: crebro eis Voss.YOnb.: (h)erebo cit IPom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: (h)erebo cis Laur.Vat.: erebo X: crebris Fr.: herebo eis Pie.: crebro eos Vla. 203 et iupiter F aurata CFawBTTEsc.UdXIYPie.Vla.Ad.Ci. Bembus: aurato VVoss.II.Laur.Ha.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*

cum grege compulso pastor duplicantibus umbris

uadit et in fessos requiem dare comparat artus.

205

cuius ut intrauit leuior per corpora somnus

languidaque effuso requierunt membra sopore,

effigies ad eum culicis deuenit et illi

tristis ab euentu cecinit conuicia mortis.

‘quis’ inquit ‘meritis *aut quo* delatus acerbis

210

cogor adire uices! tua dum mihi carior ipsa

uita fuit uita, rapior per inania uentis.

tu lentus refoues iucunda membra quiete

204 cum VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.lYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: uel et C²: tum X: uersum omisit F 205 in fessos requiem (*saepe uerba in fessos scripta sunt infessos*) VCFEAWBTTEsc.dVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: in requiem fessos UYPie.Vla.Ad. Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" (uel C²) comparat VC²FEAWBTTEsc.U²dVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: corporat C: comperat U: concuperat Fr. 207 "uel e fuso uel offuso" Wakefield 210 quis inquit Heyne in *commentario editionis*: inquit quid VFWT: inquit quid CF²EABEsc.dVoss.lIHa.Pom.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: quid inquit Γ: inquit quis ULaur.XYFr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad. ed. Ald. 1517: quis Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: en, quid, ait Heinsius in *scriptis multorum eruditorum* meritis VCFEAWBTTEsc.dVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.² ed. Rom. 1469: (uel C²) meritis C²UVla.Ad.Ci. ed. Ald. 1505, Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: meritis, inquit, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: meri/ Onb. aut quo Heinsius in *scriptis multorum eruditorum*: ad qu(a)e (unum uerbum in WVoss.Ha.) VWVoss.lHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: atque CFEABTUdLaur.XIFr.Vat.Ad.: ad quem Γ: eque Esc.: ad quam YVla.: aut quae Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. ad quae probauit Clausen. delatus VFAWTTUVoss.lIHa.Ci. ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus: dilatus CEBEsc.dIYPom.Vi.Vla.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: deletus Laur.XFr.Vat.Pie.Ad. 211 uoces E mihi ed. Ald. 1517: me VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: mi Ci. ed. Ald. 1505, Bembus

ereptus taetris e cladibus, at mea manes

uiscera Lethaeas cogunt transnare per undas.

215

praeda Charonis agor. uiden ut flagrantia taedis

limina collucent infestis omnia templis!

obuia Tisiphone, serpentibus undique compta,

et flammis et saeva quatit mihi uerbera; pone

Cerberus (ut diris flagrant latratibus ora!),

220

215 transire Onb. 216 c(h)aronis VCFAWBTTUdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pie.Vla.Ad.Onb. *Bembus*: coronis
 E: draconis Esc.: charontis U²IPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469 uiden Ci. *Bembus*: uides V: uidi
 V²CFEAWSBTTesc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: uidet I ed. Venet.
 1475: uideo ed. Ald. 1517: rudi Ad. ut
 VCFEAWSBTesc.UdVoss.II.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: et Γ: ut post uidi
 omiserunt YVla.: ut post uidet omisit ed. Nurem. 1492 217 limina (limi Fr.) ATLaur.XFr.Vat.: lumina
 VCFEWSBTesc.UdIIYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: uersum 217 omisit Voss. in
 spatio uacuo sub 217 scriptae sunt lectiones Laur.² collucent ΓUllaur.²YPom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci. ed.
 Rom. 1469: translucent VHa.: cum lucent CFAWSBTesc.dLaur.XIFr.Vat.Onb.: lucent E: omisit Voss.
 infestis VCFAWBTTesc.dII.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Ci. ed. Venet. 1475: infectis
 EULaur.²YPie.Vla.Ad.Onb.: infernis Vi. ed. Ascens. 1501: omisit Voss. omnia] horrida Wakefield
 templis CFEAWBTesc.UdII.Laur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: thelis V: telis
 V²Ha.: omisit Voss. 218 tisiphone FWBΓIIIFr.Vi.Ci. ed. Venet. 1475: tissiphone Voss ed. Rom. 1473:
 thesiphone VULaur.XPom.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: tysiphone CE: persophone A: tesiphone
 Ad.YHa.: tisonphoe T: thesyphone Esc. 219 it flammis Wakefield pone Haupt in opusculis et in
 editione: p(o)en(a)e VCFAWBTTesc.UdVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat.Ad.Ci. ed. Ald. 1517: p(o)ena
 U²IYPom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 220 ut Clausen: et
 VCFEAWSBTesc.UdVoss.II.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 flagrans
 Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. latratibus
 V²CFEAWBTesc.U²dVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: latrantibus
 TUVIPie.Vla. ed. Venet. 1472

anguibus hinc atque hinc horrent cui colla reflexis

sanguineique micant ardorem luminis orbes.

heu, quid ab officio digressa est gratia, cum te

restitui superis leti iam limine ab ipso?

praemia sunt pietatis ubi, pietatis honores?

225

in uanas abiere uices. et rure recessit

221 anguibus VCEASBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:*
 languibus F: unguibus W horrent Ci. *ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:* arent
 VCFAWBTTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed.*
1573 in comm.: cui stant E 222 sanguineique VCFTUVoss.Laur.XYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci. *ed. Ald. 1517,*
Bembus: sanguine atque EW: sanguinea que (*unum uerbum in* BTesc.dlOnb.) ABTEsc.dlOnb.:
 sanguineque S: sanguineumque lPom.Vi. *ed. Rom. 1469:* sanguineaeque Vla. ardorem
 VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.IHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:* arborem V: ardore
 FXFr.Vat.: ardores Y orbes (horbes F) VCFEsc.UVoss.lLaur.XYHa.Pom.²Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb.
ed. Rom. 1469: orbos EAWBTdI: orbem lPom.: orbe Fr. 223 ecquid Heyne "*probabiliter restitutus*"
 224 limine VCFB²TUVoss.Laur.²XHa.Pom.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:* lumine
 EAWBTTEsc.dlLaur.lYFr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad. *ed. Venet. 1475* 225 praemia sunt pietatis ubi, pietatis
 honores? VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.OXIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469,*
Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: praemia sunt deitatis ubi et pietatis honores e: praemia sunt pietatis ubi et
 pietatis honores rpTr.: praemia sunt pietatis ubi et deitatis honores ap²: praemia ubi pietatis? ubi pietatis
 honores? Scaliger *ed. 1573 in comm.* 226 uanas
 VCFEAWSBTTEsc.rapUdVoss.lLaur.OXIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:* uarias
 eTr.YPie. (uel Vla.²) abiere VCAWBTTesc.rapU²Voss.lTr.Laur.OXIHa.Pom.Vat.Vi.Vla.²Ad.Ci.Onb.
ed. Rom. 1469: abire FEdYFr.Vla.: abere S: abiere U: abite Pie. rure ULOPom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469:*
 uita VVoss.Ha: iure CFEAWBTTEsc.dLaur.XIYFr.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Onb. *ed. Ald. 1517:* omnia uerba post
 uices *omiserunt* erapTr.

Iustitia et prior illa Fides. instantia uidi
 alterius, sine respectu mea fata relinquens.
 ad pariles agor euentus: fit poena merenti.
 poena sit exitium, modo sit dum grata uoluntas.
 existat par officium. feror auia carpens,
 auia Cimmerios inter distantia lucos,
 quem circa tristes densentur in omnia poenae.
 nam uinctus sedet immanis serpentibus Otos,

230

227 iustitia et *Schraderus in commentario editionis Heynii*: iustitiae (-ciae FTesc.lFr.Pie.Vi., -cie VEWTd -tie Uvoss.Laur.Fr.Vat.Ad.Onb.)
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.OXIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469
 instantia uidi *omisit O. uici Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum* 229 fit
 VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: sit ΓPie. ed. Ald. 1517, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: sic YVla. 230 *uersus 230-306 omisit F.*
 poena sit exitium ETesc.UIYPom.Pie.Vi.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: poena fit
 exitium VCAWBTdVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat.Ad.Ci. *Bembus, Melanchthon, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: sic
 pena exitium Y: pena sic exitium Vla. sit dum
 VCEAWBTTEsc.UdLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vla.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: fit dum Voss: sit cui l: sit cum Vi. ed. Ald. 1505: si cui *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* 231 ipsa per
 officium existat feror auia carpens ed. Rom. 1473 232 cimmerios (*duo uerba in Γ*) ΓCi. ed. Rom. 1471:
 cumerios VVoss.Ha. ed. Rom. 1469: cum inmerios C: cum merios (*unum uerbum in AWI*)
 EAWBTTEsc.dIFr.: chymerios ULaur.Ad.: chimérios U²Pie.: cimerios l ed. Venet. 1472: cum meries
 (*unum uerbum in X*) XOnb.: chymereos Y: cymerios Pom.Vi. ed. Grüniger. 1502, *Bembus*: cumarios
 Vat.: chumereos Vla. ducentia *Wakefield* 233 *post quem circa etc. uersus 248, 239, 234 legit Scaliger*
 densantur Ci. *Melanchthon* 234 uinctus Ci. ed. Ald. 1517, *Bembus*: uictus
 VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 otos *Scaliger ed.*
1573 in uers.: othos VCEAWBTEsc.UdVoss.lIYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Vla.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: odios T:
 othon Γ: oethos Laur.Vat.: archus (?) Laur.²: orchus Laur.²X: octtos Fr.: oetus ed. Rom. 1473, ed. Parm.
 1479: *uerbum omisit Ad.*

deuinctum maestus procul aspiciens Ephialten, 235
 conati quondam cum sint inscendere mundum;
 et Tityos, Latona, tuae memor anxius irae
 (implacabilis ira nimis) iacet alitis esca.
 terreor, a, tantis insistere, terreor, umbris.
 ad Stygias reuocatus aquas uix ultimus amni 240
 exstat nectareas diuum qui prodidit escas,
 gutturis arenti reuolutus in omnia sensu.

235 deuinctum Ci. *ed. Parm. 1479*: deuinctus VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat. *ed. Rom. 1469*: deuictus Pom.Pie.Ad.Onb.: deuictum Vi. *ed. Ascens. 1501* ephialten EAWSBTTEsc.dlLaur.XIVat.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: ephialtem VCFU²Voss.Ha.Pom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Ascens. 1501*: ephyaltem U: ophyaltem Y: ophialtem: Fr.Ad.: ofialtem Pie. 236 conati (cogn- U) quondam cum sint (condam WY) CEAWSBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: conati cum (quom Voss.Ha.) sint quondam VVoss.Ha.: cognati quondam cum fuit Ad. inscendere EAWBTTEsc.I: rescindere VVoss.Ha.Pie. *Heyne in editione sua*: incendere CB²UdlLaur.XFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: incedere Y mundum CEAWBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: celum VVoss.Ha. 237 tit(h)yos Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1473*: ticius V: titias C: tityas EWB²T: ett tyas A: tyty S: tyas B: tytios Γ *ed. Parm. 1479*: thytias Esc.: tytius UY: etticias (*duo uerba in Onb.*) dOnb.: titius Voss.Laur.XHa.Vat.Pie.Ad.: ettytyas I: citius Fr.: titios Pom.: tycios *ed. Rom. 1469*: tityus *ed. Basil. 1544* fortasse ticius in Voss.? tu(a)e ir(a)e VVoss.Ha.Ci. *ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus*: tuas iras CEAWBTTEsc.U²dlLaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: tuas aras UYPie.: tuos aras Ad. 238 implacabilibus diuis iacet alitis esca *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* ira nimis iacet alitis VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.IYHa.Pie.Ad.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1473, ed. Parm. 1479*: ira iacet uiuus alitis lPom.Vi.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1471*: ira nimis latet alitis XFr.Vat.: ira iacet niuus alitis *ed. Rom. 1469*: ira iacet uiua alitis *ed. Ald. 1505* 240 at *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* uox *Friesemannus* amni V²CEAWBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: amni V: annus Γ: enni Voss.: anni Ad.Onb. 241 exstat *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum*: restat VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469* restat *scripsit Clausen.*

quid, saxum procul aduerso qui monte reuoluit,
 contempsisse dolor quem numina uincit acerbans
 otia quaerentem frustra sibi? ite, puellae,
 ite, quibus taedas accendit tristis Erinys.
 sicut Hymen praefata dedit conubia mortis [...]
 atque alias alio densas super agmine turmas,

245

243 quid U²IPom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: qui VCEWBΓEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb.: cui
 A: quis T aduerso (-uor- Voss.) VUVoss.II.Laur.²XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*:
 auerso CEAWBTTEsc.dLaur.I qui CEAWSBTTEsc.UdLaur.²IYPom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom.*
1469: de VVoss.XHa.: uerbum omiserunt Laur.Fr.Vat. monte
 VCEAWSBTTEsc.UVoss.II.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: morte d 244
 dolor CEAWBTTEsc.UdLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: dolet VVoss.Ha.
 quem VCEAWBTTEsc.Voss.IIHa.Pom.Vi.Ad.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: quae (-e Laur.Vat.) ULaur.XYVat.Pie.:
 q' d: qui Fr.Onb. numina CEAWBTTEsc.UdLaur.XIYPom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1471*: numen
 VVoss.Ha.: nomina Esc.: numine Fr.: minime *ed. Rom. 1469* acerbans VB²Voss.Ha.: acerba
 CULaur.²YVat.Pie.Ad.: acerbans EAWBTTEsc.dLaur.XIFr.: acerbam Γ: acerbis IPom.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom.*
1469 245 quaerentes Scaliger *ed. 1573 in comm.* sibi ite Heinsius *in scriptis multorum eruditorum*: seu
 V: seu rite V²Ha. (uerbum rite suppleuit in spatio uacuo V²): sibli(a)e (syblitae E) CEAWBTdXI:
 sublit(a)e (duo uerba in ΓUIYPom.Pie.Ad.Onb.) B²TEsc.UILaur.²YPom.Pie.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*,
 Scaliger *ed. 1573 in comm.*: ceu uite Voss.: subire Laur.Fr.Vat.: uos ite Ci. Bembus, Scaliger *ed. 1573 in*
uers.: sub ite *ed. Ald. 1505* 246 ite quibus CEAWBTTEsc.UdLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb.
ed. Rom. 1469: inquibus et VVoss.Ha. 247 sicut hymen (hi- Voss.)
 VCAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*, Scaliger *ed. 1573 in uers.*: sicuti
 mens E: sic hymen IPom.Vi. *ed. Rom. 1471*: sicui hymen Scaliger *ed. 1573 in comm.*: sicut hyemem Onb.
 post 247 lacunam unius uersus indicauit Housman, post 248 maluit Leo. 248 densas
 VCEAWBTTEsc.dVoss.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*, Ald. 1517: denso UPie.: densat IPom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Venet.*
1475, Scaliger *ed. 1573 in uers.*: dempso Y: demso Ad.: densent Scaliger *ed. 1573 in comm.*: denset
 Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"

impietate fera uecordem Colchida matrem,
 anxia sollicitis meditantem uulnera natis;
 iam Pandionia miserandas prole puellas,
 quarum uox Ityn edit Ityn, quo Bistonius rex
 orbus epops maeret uolucres euectus in auras.
 at discordantes Cadmeo semine fratres

250

249 uersus 249-371 *plerumque legi poterant in S. in locis desperatis nullam lectionem dedi.* fera
 VCEAWSBTTEsc.UVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:* sua d: feram Pom.
 uecordem VVoss.Laur.²Ha.Vat.Ci. *ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:* tu cordam
 CEAWSBTTEsc.dLaur.lFr.Onb.: tu corda Esc.: cum qcēdam U: tu quondam Laur.²XPie.: ui condam Y: cum
 cernam lPom.Vi. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.:* tu conda Ad. colchida (chol- Ha., -yda
 U) VU²lLaur.²XHa.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469:* conchida CEAWSBTTEsc.dLaur.lFr.Pie.:
 conduda Γ: colchita Voss.: colchia Y: conchita Onb. 251 pandionia Housman: pandionias
 VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469* miseranda Ci.
ed. Ald. 1505, Bembus 252 uox ityn edit ityn Sillig: uox iteratur itim (ithim Ha.) VVoss.YHa.: uexit
 inedityn C: uox it inaedytin E: uoxit inedi tyn S: uoxit inedytin B: uoxit inedytin Γd: uoxsit inedyttyn A:
 uoxsit inedytin (in ed ytyn Laur.) WLaur.: uoxsit (vox sit X) inedytin TX: uox ythyndytyn Esc.: uox
 inquit meminitque UAd.: uox querula est lPom.Vi. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.:* uoxsit
 inedityn I: uox sit in editim (?) Fr.: uox itim edidit in Vat.: nox inquit meminit Pie.: uox ityn et ityn Ci.
Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: uox ut ineditit in Onb.: uox cit ityn et ityn Heyne "probabiliter
 restitutus" quo VVoss.Laur.²YHa.Pie.: quod CEAWSBTTEsc.dlLaur.XlFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed.*
Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: que ex meminitque UAd.: superas quoque Scaliger *ed. 1573 in*
comm. bistonius (by- Esc.U) VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom.*
1469: bistonis TVi.: bistinius I: bostonius Y: bitonius Fr. 254 at dis- VAWTLaur.²XIHa.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci.
ed. Rom. 1469: addis- (*duo uerba in* ΓEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.YFr.Pie.Onb. *ed. Venet. 1472*)
 CESBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.YFr.Pie.Ad.Onb. *ed. Venet. 1472* cadmeo
 VTTEsc.UVoss.lLaur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:* catmeo CWSBdl: cathmeo
 EAT semine VEAWSBTTEsc.dVoss.XIHa. Wakefield: sanguine
 CUILaur.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:* uel femine C²: sermone Γ: carmine Y

iam truculenta ferunt infestaque lumina corpus 255
 alter in alterius, iamque auersatus uterque,
 impia germani manat quod sanguine dextra.
 eheu mutandus numquam labor! auferor ultra
 in diuersa magis, distantia nomina cerno;
 Elysiam tranandus agor delatus ad undam. 260
 obuia Persephone comites heroidas urget
 aduersas praeferre faces. Alcestis ab omni
 inuiolata uacat cura, quod saeua mariti
 in Chalcodoniis Admeti fata morata est.

255 infestaque SBF^{Esc}.UdVoss.lLaur.YHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: infectaque
 AWTTXIFr. uulnera Ci. *Bembus* 256 auersatus CEAWSBT^{Esc}.dICi. *Bembus*: aduersatus
 VTUVoss.lLaur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469* 258 eheu . . . ad undam *post uersum*
 383 *posuit Scaliger*. 259 nomina VAWTT^{Voss}.lHa.: numina CEB^{Esc}.dLaur.XYFr.Vat.Ci. *ed. Rom.*
1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: nomine S: lumina UIPom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed. Venet. 1475*: limina *ed.*
Ascens. 1501 et editiones Ascens.: flumina *ed. Ald. 1505*: limine *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* certo
Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 260 tranandus (*suspectum*)
 VCEAWSBT^{Esc}.U²dVoss.lXlHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: tradendus ULaur.²YAd.:
 tanandus Laur.Fr.: tranandam et *Sillig* delatus
 VCWASTTU^{Voss}.lLaur.XlYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: dilatus EB^{Esc}.d 261
 persephone VT^{Voss}.Ha.Ci. *ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus*: persephore C: persophone (aliter sophone *addidit C*²)
 C²EAWSBT^{Esc}.dLaur.XlVat.: tesiphone U: thesiphone (-fone Pie.) U²Laur.²YPom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed.*
Rom. 1469: tisiphone lVi. *ed. Venet. 1475*: proserpine Laur.³: sophone Fr.: tissiphone *ed. Rom. 1473*
 262 aduersum *ed. Rom. 1469* preferre Γ *Melanchthon*: perferre
 VCAWSBT^{Esc}.UdVoss.lLaur.XlYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: perfer E 264
 chalcodoniis *D'Orville in scriptis multorum eruditorum*: calcedoniis
 VWT^{Esc}.UdLaur.XHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb. *ed. Ald. 1517*: chalcodoniis CEASBI *ed. Basil. 1544*:
 calcedonis Γ: calcedoneis Voss.: hic alcedonias lPom. *ed. Rom. 1469*: calcedemoniis Y: hic calcedonias

ecce Ithaci coniunx semper decus, Icarioris,
 femineum concepta manet, manet et procul illa
 turba ferox iuuenum telis confixa procorum.
 quid, misera Eurydice, tanto maerore recesti,
 poenaeque respectus et nunc manet Orpheos in te?

265

(chalc- ed. Rom. 1473) Vi. ed. Rom. 1473: ipsa suis fatis Ci. *Bembus*, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: isthic alcyonas *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* c.f. *Hyginus Fabulae* 14.2.4-6 "Admetus Pheretis filius, matre Periclymene Min<yae> filia ex Thessalia, monte C<h>alc<o>donio, unde oppidum et flumen nomen traxit." uariae lectiones *Virgilianae depromptae sunt ex notis D'Orvillianis in codice Bodleiano D'Orville* 503 (*Catalecta* 74r-75r). *codicem examinaui sed nihil ad Culicem pertinuit.* fata Ci. *Bembus*, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: cura VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* morata VCAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: negata C²: omisit E

265 semper] fertur *Wakefield* icarioris Ci. ed. *Ald. 1517*, *Bembus*: icharioris VVoss.Ha.: decusia rotis CEsc.d: uel harentis C²: iharotis AWTIONb.: hiarethis S: decusiha rotis B: in artis Γ: ichariontis UPie.: una charontis lPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469: ychariontis Laur.Ad.: decusyha rotis X: hycariontis Y: et arotis Fr.: ha rotis Vat. ichariontis ed. Rom. 1473: uersum omisit E 266 concepta manet manet *Clausen*: concepta (concoe- C) decus manet VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: incorrupta decus manet Ci. *Bembus*, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.* illa VTVoss.Ha.Pie. ed. *Parm. 1479*: illam CEAWSBTTEsc.UdLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 268 quid VVoss.Ha.: qui CAWBTTEsc.UdLaur.XIFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb. *Bembus*: quime E: quin lPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: quae Y: cum ed. *Ald. 1505* recesti *Barthius*: recessit VCEAWSBTTEsc.UVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: decessit dVat. 269 poenane *Schenkl* orpheos in te E ed. *Ascens. 1512*: orpheus in te VCAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.²XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: orphes in te T: orfeus in te Laur.: in te manet orpheu *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*

audax ille quidem, qui mitem Cerberon umquam 270
 credidit aut ulli Ditis placabile numen,
 nec timuit Phlegethonta furentem ardentibus undis
 nec maesta obtenta Ditis ferrugine regna,
 defossasque domos ac Tartara nocte cruenta
 obsita nec faciles Ditis sine iudice sedes, 275
 iudice, qui uitae post mortem uindicat acta.

270 cerberon VUVoss.Ha.Pom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: cerbera CEABTEsc.dLaur.XFr.Vat.Onb.: cerbero
 WSGI: cerberum I: cerbara YPie.: corbora Ad. umquam (un- Voss.lPom.Vi.Ci. *Bembus*)
 VUVoss.lHa.Pom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: numquam (nun- dFr.)
 CEAWSBTTEsc.dLaur.XIYFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb. 271 aut IUlLaur.YFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed.*
Rom. 1469: haut VAWTdI: haud CESBEsc.Voss.XHa. ulli VCEAWSBTTEsc.dXIYPom.Ci.Onb. *ed.*
Rom. 1469: ullum ULaur.Ha.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.: illum Voss.: illi IVi. *ed. Venet. 1472* 272 phlegethonta I *ed.*
Venet. 1475, *Bembus*: flegetonta VSGdVoss.YHa.Vat.Pie.: flegethonta C: phlegetonta
 EABTEsc.U²Laur.XIPom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: phelegetonta W: phletonta U: phegetonta Fr.: fetonta
 Ad.: phegotonta Onb. furentem Vi.Ci. *ed. Ascens. 1501 et omnes editiones Ascens., Bembus*: furens
 VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: ferens ST 273 obtenta
 SVoss.Ha. *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: obtemptu V: obtentu
 CEAWBTU²dIXIFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: optentu Esc.: ob
 tectu (*unum uerbum in Laur.Ad.*) ULaur.Ad.: oblecta Y: obtentum *ed. Ald. 1517, ed. Ald. 1534* ditis
 VCAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in*
comm.: ditissime E: ditu T: diro et Ci. *Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.* regna
 VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: regnum *ed. Ald.*
1517, ed. Ald. 1534 274 defossasque VWB²UVoss.lLaur.²YHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*:
 nec fossasque CSBTTEsc.dLaur.XFr.Vat.: nefosososque E: nefossasque AI *Scaliger in editione Masuicii*
legens membranam Contianam 275 dicteo iudice sedes *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* 276 uindicat
 CEAWSBTTEsc.dIPom.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: iudicat VVoss.lYHa.Pie.Vi. *ed. Ascens. 1501*: uindicet
 ULaur.XFr.Vat.: uindice Ad.: indicat *ed. Venet. 1475*

sed fortuna ualens audacem fecerat ante.

iam rapidi steterant amnes et turba ferarum

blanda uoce sequax regionem insederat †orphei;

iamque imam uiridi radicem mouerat alte

280

quercus humo [steterant amnes] siluaeque sonorae

sponse sua cantus rapiebant cortice auara.

labentis biiuges etiam per sidera Lunae

pressit equos et tu currentis, menstrua uirgo,

auditura lyram tenuisti nocte relicta.

285

277 ante VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad. ed. Ald. 1517: orphea U²lPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: anthea Onb. 278 amnes CV²U²lLaur.²XFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: omnes VEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.IYHa.Ad.Onb.: uerbum omisit Pie. 279 insederat VSEsc.lHa.Pom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: insiderat CEAWBTULaur.dVoss.XIYFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb.: in sidera Γ orphei (-oei uel -aei U) VEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: arphei C: orphe S: hebri Baehrens 280 unam ed. Rom. 1469 uiridi CEBTEsc.dlPom.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: radiis VVoss.Ha.: uiri AWTXIFr.Vat.: uiride S: uiridis ULaur.YAd. alte (altae Y) VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: ante S: alta Vi. ed. Ascens. 1501 et editiones Ascens. 281 amnes CEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lXIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Bembus: annes VLaur.: omnes S: manes Ci. 282 auara VCEAWSBTTEsc.dVoss.lOnb. Bembus: amara UlLaur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469 283 labentis CEF: labentes VAWSBTTEsc.U²dVoss.lXIHa.Pom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: lambentes ULaur.YFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb. biiuges etiam (by- Vi.) CEAWSBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Bembus: etiam biiuges VVoss.Ha.: biiugos etiam ΓCi.: etiam biiuge Y: biiuge etiam Ad. lunae (-e VTdVoss.Laur.YAd.) VAWSTTdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pie.Ad. ed. Venet. 1475: luna CEBTEsc.UlLaur.²Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 284 currentis CEAWSBTTEsc.UdlXIYPom.Pie.Vi.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Bembus: currentes VVoss.Ha.Ci. ed. Ald. 1517: torrentis Laur.Fr.Vat.Ad.

haec eadem potuit, Ditis, te uincere, coniunx,
 Eurydicenque uiro ducendam reddere. non fas,
 non erat in uitam diuae exorabile mortis.
 illa quidem nimium manes experta seueros
 praeceptum signabat iter nec rettulit intus
 lumina nec diuae corrupit munera lingua;
 sed tu crudelis, crudelis tu magis, Orpheu,
 oscula cara petens rupisti iussa deorum.
 dignus amor uenia, ueniam si Tartara noscent;

290

287 uiro Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum: ultro
 VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 codex U in quo erat
 reducendam dicere correctus est manu U². ducendam reddere scripsit U². lectionem reducendam dicere
 et habuit Ad. non fas VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom.
 1469: nefas Γ²: nam fas ed. Ascens. 1507 288 dirae Lindenbrogius [Lindenbruch] in editione Masuicii
 1717 289 experte B seueras S 290 inter ed. Ald. 1505 291 limina ed. Rom. 1471 corruptit
 VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: corrumpit SI ed.
 Venet. 1475: rumpit Y munera VCEAWSBTTEsc.dVoss.lHa.Vat.Ci. ed. Parm. 1479, Scaliger ed.
 1573 in uers.: numine UAd.: limina U²IPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: munere
 XFr.: imagine Y: numinis Pie.: lumina Onb.: legi non potuit Laur. 292 crudelis crudelis
 VCEWSBTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: crudelis ATVoss.: crudelis
 credulis Γ 293 iussa VEASBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom.
 1469: iura C: rupista us sadeorum W 294 dignus amor uenia
 VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: dignus amor uenia
 est erapTr.QY ueniam Baehrens: gratum
 VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573
 in comm.: paruum Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: uerba post dignus amor uenia est omiserunt
 erapTr.Q numina Γ noscent VCEAWSBTTEsc.lLaur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1471:
 noscent UTdFr. ed. Rom. 1469: nosset Voss.: uerba post dignus amor uenia est omiserunt erapTr.Q Ad.

peccatum meminisse graue est. uos sede piorum,
 uos manet heroum contra manus. hic et uterque
 Aeacides (Peleus namque et Telamonia uirtus
 per segura patris laetantur numina, quorum
 conubiis Venus et Virtus iniunxit honorem:
 hunc rapuit *serua*, *ast* illum Nereis amauit)
 assidet, hic iuuenes, sociatae gloria sortis,

295

300

295 meminisse VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:*
 ignouisse Ci. *Bembus*, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: minus esse *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: uerbum omisit
 Fr. graue est uos? grauest uos? ?*Leo* ?*Baehrens*: graues uos VVoss.Ha.: tuos graue CX: graue tuos
 ELaur.²: tuo graue AT: graues tuos (*unum uerbum in W*) WSBdLaur.IFr.Vat.: graue et uos
 B²lYPom.Pie.Vi. *ed. Rom. 1471*: graues non Γ: grauet uos Esc.: graue et nos UAd.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:*
 sed et uos Ci. *Bembus*, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: graue: at uos *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* 298 numina
 VCEAWSBTTEsc.dVoss.lIYHa.Pom.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Venet. 1475*, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: munera
 ULaur.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad. *ed. Ald. 1517*: lumina X: minima *ed. Rom. 1469*: munia *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*
 299 iniunxit (-cxit ST, -nsit Vat.) VEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb.
ed. Rom. 1469: coniunxit C: iunxit Γ 300 *serua*, *ast* illum Ci. *Bembus*: ferit *ast* illum (*astillum* WT)
 CEAWSBTTEsc.dLaur.XIYFr.Vat.Ad.: feritas illum VUVoss.lHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: ferit
 ase illum Y: seruata, illum *Housman* †feritt†, *ast seruauit Clausen.* 301 hic Ci. *Baehrens*: hac (ha
 Voss.) VCEAWBTTEsc.dVoss.XIYHa. *Bembus*: hoc S: ac Ullaur.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi. *ed. Rom. 1469*:
 assidet et inuenit Ad.: h' Onb. iuuenes *Housman*: iuuenis
 VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: assidet et inuenit
 Ad. sociatae (-te VVi.) VHa.Pie.Vi. *ed. Ascens. 1501*, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: sociat de
 CEAWBTTEsc.dLaur.XIFr.Vat.: sociat dedoria S: sociat te UIYPom.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: societate
 Voss.: sciat te *ed. Flor. 1487*: sociat quem Ci. *Bembus*, *Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.* sortis
 VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: uirtus S: fortis Ad.Ci.
Bembus

alter †in excisum† referens a nauibus ignis

Argolicis Phrygios torua feritate repulsos –

(o quis non referat talis diuc:tia belli,

quae Troiae uidere uiri uidereque Graii,

305

Teucra cum magno manaret sanguine tellus

et Simois Xanthique liquor, Sigeaque propter

litora cum Troas saeui ducis Hectoris ira

†uidere† in classes inimica mente Pelasgas

302 acer Ci. *Bembus* in excisum (-ss- EAWBTdI) CEAWSBTTEsc.UdLaur.XIFr.Vat.Pie.Ad. ed. *Parm.* 1479: in excelsum VVoss.Ha. ed. *Ald.* 1517: in excussum B²YPom.Onb. ed. *Rom.* 1469: in excessum lVi. ed. *Venet.* 1472: inexcussus Ci. *Bembus*, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in uers.: in excursu *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in comm. 303 torua Esc.UIYPom.Pie.Vi.Ci. ed. *Rom.* 1469: turba VCEAWSBTdVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat.: torta Ad.Onb. repulsos CEBEsc.UIXPom.Vat.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. *Rom.* 1469: refusa VVoss.Ha.: refulsos AWSTTdLaur.IFr.: reuulsos Pie.Ad. 304 referet S talis VSB²TUVoss.lLaur.YHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. *Rom.* 1469: tali CEAWBTTEsc.dXI: talibus Fr.Vat. diuortia (-cia Esc.Vi.) VCTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.²YHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. *Rom.* 1469: deuortia EAWSBLaur.XI: denorcia T: duortia Vat. belli VSUVoss.IYHa.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. *Rom.* 1469: bellis (-lis ATI) CEAWBTTEsc.dLaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat. 305 troiae (-ie VABdVoss.lVat.Onb., -yae Esc.Ad., -ye Laur.) VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. *Rom.* 1469. troia SF 307 propter *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum*: praeter (pre- VTVoss.Laur.Vat.Vi.Ad.) VCFEASBTUdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. *Rom.* 1469: praetunt W: petunt Esc. 308 troas VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. *Rom.* 1469, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in comm.: troes Ci. *Bembus*, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in uers. ducis VTVoss.Ha. *Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"*: duos (se uiduos XFr.Vat.) CFEAWSBTTEsc.dXIFr.Vat.: (uel B²) uos B²Pom.Pie.Vi.Ci. ed. *Rom.* 1469, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in uers.: nos ULaur.Ad.Onb.: uox l ed. *Venet.* 1476, ed. *Grüniger.* 1502: non Y: uis *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in comm. irae *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in comm. 309 uidere in VB²TUVoss.Laur.²YHa.Pie.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. *Rom.* 1469, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in uers.: uidi in CFEAWBTTEsc.dLaur.I: uide in S: uidit et in X: uidit in Fr.Vat.: uiderit in lPom.Vi. ed. *Rom.* 1471, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in comm.: uexerit in ed. *Rom.* 1473

uulnera tela neces ignes inferre paratos? 310
 ipsa iugis namque Ida potens feritatis, ab ipsa
 Ida faces altrix cupidis praebebat alumnis,
 omnis ut in cineres Rhoetei litoris ora
 classibus ambustis flamma lacrimante daretur.
 hinc erat oppositus contra Telamonius heros 315
 obiectoque dabat clipeo certamina, et illinc
 Hector erat, Troiae summum decus, acer uterque,
 fluminibus ueluti fragor †et libet in se...

310 tela neces VB²Esc.UVoss.lLaur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: tela nece F:
 tela ne te (telane te C, tela nete BI) CEABTTI: telanec te W: tela necte S: telate d ignes
 VB²Esc.Voss.lXHa.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: signis C: signas FEAWSBTdI: signes Γ: pugnās (-ng
 Laur.) ULaur.YFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.: cedes Pom. 311 iugis Ci. *Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: uagis
 VCFEAWSBTesc.dVoss.Laur.lYHa.Onb. *ed. Ald. 1517*: uagit Γ: uadis UPie.Ad.: magis lPom.Vi. *ed.*
Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: uatis XFr.: uates Vat. ab VT²Voss.Ha.Pie.: et
 CFEAWSBTesc.UdlLaur.XIYPom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: uerbum omisit Fr. 312 ida
 VT²Voss.Ha. *ed. Ald. 1517*: daque CEAWBTesc.dIOnb.: etda S: datque
 UILaur.XYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad. *ed. Rom. 1469*: aequa Ci. *Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: acta
Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: uersum omisit F cupidis ΓU²lPom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: cupide
 VVoss.Ha.: cupidus CEAWSBTesc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb.: uersum omisit F alumnis (alump-
 V) VSΓU²Voss.lHa.Pom.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: alumnus (alump- Esc.Vat.Ad., alunn- Y)
 CEAWBTesc.UdlLaur.XYFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb.: aluminis I: uersum omisit F 318 fluminibus
 VCFEAWSBTesc.dVoss.lYHa.Onb.: fulminibus UILaur.XFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469,*
Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: fulminis ut *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* *Scaliger et lectionem fulmineus in*
comm. laudauit. sed fortasse glossa est? ueluti fragor
 VCFEAWSTTesc.UdVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb. *ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus*: uelut fragor BCi.:
 caelo ueluti fragor lPom.Vi. *ed. Rom. 1469*: uelut flagor Y: caelo uelut fragor Ci. et libet in se AΓ: est
 a turbine nise VVoss.Ha.: aedibus in se (ed- Tesc.dIOnb., inse EBI) CFEWSBTesc.dIOnb.: sonat
 aetheris in se UYPie. *ed. Ald. 1517*: editus ense Pom.: et c(a)edibus inse Laur.XFr.Vat.: editur ense lVi.

tegminibus telisque super [Sigeaque praeter]

eriperet reditus, alter Vulcania ferro

320

uulnera protectus depellere nauibus instat.)

hos erat Aeacides uultu laetatus honores,

Dardaniaeque alter fuso quod sanguine campis

Hector lustrauit deuicto corpore Troiam.

ed. Rom. 1471, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: sonat ectheris in se Ad.: (a)editur inse (in se ed. Rom. 1469)
ed. Rom. 1469, ed. Parm. 1479, ed. Grūninger. 1502: editus alto Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: intonat aetheris in se ed. Ald. 1534

319 praeter (pre- ΓdLaur.Vat.Vi.Ad.Onb.) CFEAWSBΓUdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: praetexit T: petunt Esc.: ignibus hic telis quae super si classibus Argos Ci. Bembus, Melanchthon: uersum omiserunt VVoss.Ha. 321 uulnere Melanchthon 322 hos Haupt in opusculis et in editione: hic VHa. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: hoc CFEAWSBTTEsc.dlLaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: haec UYAd.: hinc Voss. uultu VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: multum ed. Ald. 1517: alter Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: uultus Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. laetatus VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: uel celatus V²: elatus Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. honores VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb.: honore lPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469 323 alter, dardanioque fuis Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 324 hector (ec- Vat.) V²Voss.Laur.XYHa.Fr.Vat. ed. Grūninger. 1502: hectora (haec- CFAW) VCFEAWSBTTEsc.dlLaur.²lPom.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: hectora U: hector Pie. ed. Ald. 1517: hectoro Ci. Bembus lustrauit VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lIYHa.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: elustrauit Laur.XFr.Pie.: lustrarit ed. Ald. 1517: uictor lustrauit Ci. Bembus deuicto corpore troiam Housman: uictor de corpore troiam VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad. ed. Rom. 1469: uector de corpore troiam F: corpore troiam Ci. Bembus: troiam de corpore uictor Onb.: uictor de corpore troia ed. Ald. 1505 post uersum 324 uersus 337, 338 inseruit Scaliger.*

rursus acerba fremunt, Paris hunc quod letat et huius

325

†arma† dolis Ithaci uirtus quod concidit icta.

huic gerit auersos proles Laertia uultus,

et iam Strymonii Rhesi uictorque Dolonis

Pallade iam laetatur ouans rursusque tremescit:

iam Ciconas iamque horret atrox †lestrigone...;

330

325 fremunt paris hunc EAWSBTTEsc.UdLaur.XFr.Vat.Ci. ed. Ald. 1517: fremunt pars huic VVoss.YHa.Pie.: fremunt paris hinc C: fremunt patris hunc FI: fremit paris hunc IPom.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 quod letat et huius (lae- TI) CASTEsc.UdLaur.IPom.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: pars destinatus illi VVoss.YHa.Pie.: quod necat et ullus: F quod letat et humus E: quod letat et hui W: quod letat huius B: quod letatus huius Γ: hunc letat et hunc XFr.: hunc letatus et hunc Vat: quid letat et huius Ad. 326 arma VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: alta Vi. ed. Ascens. 1501, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: alma Vi.²Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers. uerba post uirtus omisit d 327 huic CFEAWSBTTLaur.XIFr.Vat.Ci.Onb. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: hinc VUdVoss.lHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: hic Y auersos Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: euersos VCEAWSBTTEsc.UVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: euersus F: euerso d lectiones auersos et euersos laudauit Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. laertia (-cia FTVi.) VFATTUVoss.lLaur.YHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: laertia (leertia S, leer- Esc.XI) CEWSB.Esc.XI: lerttia d uultus (-os T) VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: (uel B²) uirtus B²lOnb.: currus U²Pom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 329 pallade iam VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: palladio ed. Ald. 1517 330 iam ciconas VCElVoss.Ha.Ci. ed. Rom. 1473, Bembus: iam oicun F: iam oiconasiam (tria uerba in B) AWBT: (aliter Laur.³) pamoicon (-oy- Laur.³) esiamque (as- lVi.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469) SlLaur.³Vi.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: uel pamoicon B²: iam oycon asiamque Esc.: iam cythones U: iam oicon asiamque (unum uerbum in I, asiamque I) dI: iam cicones Laur.Laur.²XFr.Vat.Pie. ed. Ald. 1517: pamoychon ciconesque Laur.⁴ iam citones (cith- Ad.) YAd.: pannonicon asiamque Pom.: panionicon asiamque ed. Rom. 1471: panionicom asiamque ed. Venet. 1472 sine codice Laur. ipso plura de lectionibus in uersibus et in margine ad uersum 330 non dicendum est mihi. iamque horret atrox (orret Voss.) VCFElVoss.Laur.XHa.Vat. ed. Ald. 1517 fortasse atros in Laur.?: quae horret atrox AWBT: orret

illum Scylla rapax canibus succincta Molossis,
 Aetnaeusque Cyclops, illum metuenda Charybdis
 pallentesque lacus et squalida Tartara terrent.
 hic et Tantaleae generamen prolis Atrides
 adsidet, Argium lumen, quo flamma regente

335

atrox (horr- Esc.Onb.) SEsc.IOnb. iamque horret ULaur.²Pie.Ad.: horret lLaur.³Laur.⁴Vi. ed. Rom. 1469:
 iamque horrent Y: iamque horret artor Fr.: horrens Pom.: iamiamque horret Ci. *Bembus*: uerba post horret
 omisit d lestrigone CFEAWBTTEsc.Laur.XIFr.Vat. ed. Ald. 1517: lestrigones ipse VVoss.Ha.:
 lestrygone S: lestrigonas atros U: lestrigonas atrox U² ed. Parm. 1479: lestrygones atrox l ed. Venet.
 1475: lestrigenas atrox Laur.²Y fortasse atros in Laur.²?: lestrigonen atrox Laur.³: lestrigonas armos
 Laur.⁴: lestrygones atros Pom.: lestrigenas atros Pie.Ad.: lestrygonas atrox Vi. ed. Rom. 1473, ed. Ascens.
 1501 et editiones Ascens.: lestrigones atrox ed. Rom. 1469: l(a)estrygonas atros Ci. ed. Ald. 1505,
Bembus: lestrigione Onb.: omisit d
 331 illum metuenda CFEAWSBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Venet. 1475: illum
 zanclea V Wakefield: illum et uerida Γ: illum ranolea Voss.Ha. 332 charybdis lFr.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469:
 charibdis CVi.: caribdis FWTTdVoss.Laur.XYHa.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb.: cariddis V: carypdis EA: carydis A²:
 carybdis SBesc.UIPom. ed. Parm. 1479 334 generamen prolis VHa.Pie.: gener amplis
 CFEAWSBTTEsc.dlAd.Onb.: gener ante prolis Γ: gener eacides amplus UPom. ed. Rom. 1469: generamen
 probis Voss.: gener eacus amplus l ed. Venet. 1475: gener iam plisten Laur.XFr.Vat.: generatam prolis Y:
 gener aecus amplus Vi. ed. Ald. 1505: generis decus amplus Ci. ed. Ald. 1517, *Bembus*: gemini sunt prolis
 ed. Rom. 1473 atrides Ci. ed. Ald. 1517, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: atridae (-e
 V A S B T Γ E s c . V o s s . l L a u r . H a . P o m . V a t . P i e . A d . O n b .)
 VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: atrida Vi. ed. Ascens.
 1501 et editiones Ascens., Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: omisit d 335 quo
 VESBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Venet. 1475: quod CFW: que A
 regente VCFEAWSBTTEsc.dVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: repente Γ: tegente
 UIYVi.Ad. ed. Venet. 1472

Doris Ericthonias prostrauit funditus arces.

reddidit, heu, Graiius poenas tibi, Troia, ruenti,

Hellespontiacis obiturus reddidit undis.

illa uices hominum testata est copia quondam,

ne quisquam propriae fortunae munere diues

340

iret ineuctus caelum super: omne propinquo

336 oris *ed. Rom. 1469* erichthonias SPie.Onb. *ed. Ascens. 1501 et editiones Ascens.:* erictonias VT: herectionias C: uel herictonias C²: erychthonias EU²: erechthonias ABTEsc.: erechthonias WdLaur.XI: erhichthonias F: erychthonias U: arictonia Voss.: erichthonias IVi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469:* erithonias YVat.Ad.: arictonias Ha.: erethonias Fr.: eryctonias Pom.: erichthonias *Bembus* 337 graius T *ed. Ald. 1517:* grauius VCFEAWSBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469* troia (-ya Laur.Ad.) VCFEAWSBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:* troias Γ: troa Y ruenti Ci. *Bembus:* furenti VCFEAWSBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469:* uenti Γ 338 abiturus *Wakefield* hellespontiacis obiturus reddidit undis (redid- Voss.) VFEWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:* hellespontiacis obiturus redditur undis C: hellespontiacis obiturus reddit undis A: hellespontiacis obituros reddidit undis *ed. Rom. 1473:* reddidit, hellespontiacas obiturus ad undas *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* 340 ne quisquam propriae VB²UVoss.lHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:* neque propriae CFAWSBTI: nequo propriae E: nec quicquam proprie Γ: cur aliquis proprie erap *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.:* nequaquam proprie Esc.: req; d: neque enim proprio Laur.Fr.Vat.: neque enim propriae X: nec quisquam pruriae Y *ed. Parm. 1479:* neque enim prior Ad. *omnia uerba post req; omisit d.* 341 iret VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:* tendit erap *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* ineuctus (*duo uerba in ΓaY*) VCFEAWSBTTEsc.apVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Ci.Onb. *ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus:* inuectis r: in aeternum UIVi. *ed. Venet. 1472:* inuectus d: in aetherium Pom. *ed. Rom. 1469:* in euentus Pie.Ad.: in aetereum *ed. Grüninger. 1502*

frangitur inuidiae telo decus. ibat in altum
 uis Argea petens patriam ditataque praeda
 arcis Erichthoniae; comes huic erat aura secunda
 per placidum cursu pelagus; Nereis ab unda
 signa dabat passim flexis super alta carinis,
 cum seu caelesti fato seu sideris ortu

345

342 (aliter Laur.²) decus erapU²ILaur.²QXPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: deus
 VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.IYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb. ed. Ald. 1517 altum
 VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: alto T: uerba
 post decus omiserunt erapQ 343 uis argea petens Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum, Wakefield:
 uis argoa petens VVoss.Ha.Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: (aliter Laur.²) uis argo repetens
 CEAWSBTLaur.²XIYFr.Vat.Onb.: uis argo petens F: uis argoa appetens Γ: uis algo repetens Esc.: uix
 argo repetens UPie.Ad. ed. Ald. 1517: uix ergo repetens dLaur.Pom.: bis ergo repetens l ed. Rom. 1469:
 bis regno repetens ed. Rom. 1473: bis repetens argo Vi. ed. Ascens. 1501: uix argos repetens ed. Ald.
 1534: uis repetens argos Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. patrium Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. praeda (pre-
 SVoss.Laur.Pom.Ad.) VCFEAWSBTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom.
 1469: praedam (pre- Γ) TT 344 erichthonia(e) SCPie.Onb. ed. Ascens. 1501 et editiones Ascens.:
 erictoni(a)e VVoss.Ha.: erectoniae F: erychthoniae EU²: erecthoniae (-e AΓEsc.dLaur.)
 AWBΓEsc.dLaur.XI: erecthoniaeque T: erychthoniae U: erichthoniae lVi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: herithoniae
 Y: erethoniae Fr.: eryctoniae Pom.: erithonie Vat.Ad.: erichthoniae ed. Grüniger. 1502 secunda
 VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: secundis ΓPom.: omisit
 Ad. 345 nereides Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. ab unda Paldamus: ad undas
 VCEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed.
 1573 in uers.: adundans F: undis Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 346 dabant Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.
 passim flexis Housman: pars inflexis VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.
 ed. Rom. 1469: parsim flexis Γ: pars infelix Onb. super alta Housman: super icta VFTEsc.Voss.XHa.:
 super iacta CEAWSBdLaur.Fr.Vat.: superacta (duo uerba in B²lCi. Bembus) B²TlPom.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom.
 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: superata UYPie.Vi.Ad. ed. Nurem. 1492: super carinis iacta I: subit acta
 Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.

undique mutatur caeli nitor, omnia uentis,
omnia turbinibus sunt anxia; iam maris unda
sideribus certat consurgere, iamque superne 350
corripere et soles et sidera cuncta minatur
ac ruere in terras caeli fragor. hic modo laetans
copia nunc miseris circumdatur anxia fatis
immoriturque super fluctus et saxa Capherei,
Euboicas aut per cautes Aegaeaque late 355
litora, cum Phrygiae passim uaga praeda peremptae

351 corripere VCFAWSBTTEsc.Voss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad. ed. Rom. 1469: corripuere
ElPom.²Onb.: eripere ULaur.²: corruere Ci. *Bembus*: uersum omisit d soles ΓVoss.YHa.Pie. ed. Parm.
1479: sol' V: solis CFEAWSBTTEsc.ULaur.XIFr.Vat.Ad.Onb.: sol U²lPom.Vi.: sol iis Ci. ed. Rom. 1469,
Bembus: sol ipse Wakefield: uersum omisit d iis post sol inseruerunt Ci. et *Bembus*. minatur ed.
Ascens. 1519, Heyne in omnibus operibus: minantur
VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: uersum omisit d
352 ac ruere VVoss.Laur.²Ha. ed. Ald. 1517: acuere CFEAWSBTTEsc.dLaur.XIFr.Vat.Ad.Onb.: aruere Γ:
at ruere UYPie.: ac uenit lPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469 laetans Ellis: laetum (-e
VFEAWSBTEsc.dVoss.Laur.IFr.Vat.Vi.Ad.Onb., -oe- X)
VCFEAWSBTTEsc.dVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Ald. 1517, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:
letam Γ: l(a)eta UlPom. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 354 capherei CEWBEsc.dlOnb.:
capharei VVoss.YHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci. ed. Parm. 1479: capherea FS: capher eius A: ferei T: capheren
Γ: pherei Laur.XVat.: fati Fr.: caphareis l ed. Rom. 1469: uersum omisit U 355 (a)egaeaque
VTVoss.YHa.Pie. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: nereaque C: (h)er(a)aeque FEAWSBTTEsc.dlAd.Ci.Onb.
Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: ferreaque U: pher(a)aeque Laur.XFr.Vat.: c(a)eicaque lPom.Vi. ed.
Rom. 1469: oeteaque ed. Ald. 1517 356 litore E peremptae *Bembus*, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.:
perempta (duo uerba in E) VCFEAWSBTTEsc.dVoss.Laur.IHa.Fr.Vat.Ad.Ci. ed. Ald. 1517: parenta U:
peracta lYPom.Pie.Vi.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: pempta X

omnis in aequoreo fluitat iam naufraga fluctu.

hic alii resident pariles uirtutis honore

heroes mediisque siti sunt sedibus omnes,

omnes, Roma decus magni quos *suscipit* orbis.

360

hic Fabii Decique, hic est et Horatia uirtus,

hic et fama uetus numquam moritura Camilli,

357 omnis in (ineq- Voss., inaeq- Ha.) equoreo fluitat (fluit atia Γ) VT²Voss.Ha.: fluctuat omnis in equoreo (ae- EBUI *ed. Rom. 1469*, ineq- T, inaeq- Pie.) CEABTEsc.UdLaur.IYPom.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*, Scaliger in omnibus editionibus: omnis fluctuat in aequoreo F: fluctuant omnis in equoreo W: omnis in equoreo fluctuat S: fluctuat (a)equoreo omnis I *ed. Venet. 1472*: fluctuat omnis in aequore XFr.: fluctuat (a)equoreo nunc omnis Vi. *ed. Ascens. 1501 et editiones Ascens.* iam naufraga fluctu V²Voss.IHa.Pom. *ed. Rom. 1471*: iam naufraga luctu V: naufragia luctu CFEWSBTesc.UdLaur.IYFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: naufragi luctu A: naufrage luctu Γ: naufragia fluctu U²: naufraga luctu X: naufraga fluctu Vi. *ed. Ascens. 1501 et editiones Ascens.*: iam naufraga tractu Ci. Bembus, Scaliger *ed. 1573 in comm.*: naufraga fluctu Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 358 hic VCFEAWSBTesc.UVoss.ILaur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: hinc dYPie. *ed. Ald. 1517*: omisit T resident Ellis: sidunt VUVoss.IYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: sident CFEAWSBTesc.dLaur.XIFr.Vat.Ad.Onb. 359 omnes V *ed. Ald. 1517*: omnis CFEAWSBTesc.UdVoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Venet. 1475 et aliae editiones uersum 369 post 359 inseruit Scaliger.* 360 quos VCEAWBTesc.UdVoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: quod F: quo S suscipit VCFEASBTesc.UdVoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: suspicit Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum: suscipre W: suscipe T suspicit probauit Clausen. 361 fauii S decusque E horatia (or- VTULaur.YFr.Pom.Vat.) VTUILaur.XYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: gracia (gracch- Voss., gracc- Ha.) V²Voss.Ha.: oratio CAWSBesc.dIAd.Onb.: oracio FET 362 moritura VB²TUVoss.ILaur.²XYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: mora (moramelli unum uerbum in W) CFEAWBTesc.Laur.IFr.: morani S: uerba post numquam omisit d camilli ΓCi. Bembus, Scaliger *ed. 1573 in uers.*: metelli VVoss.XHa.: melli CEAWBTesc.Laur.IFr.: belli F: elli S: per euum (ae- UIYPom.Pie.) B²UILaur.²YPom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*, Scaliger *ed. 1573 in comm.*: uerba post numquam omisit d

Curtius et, mediis quem quondam sedibus Vrbis

deutum †bellis† consumpsit gurgis in unda,

Mucius et prudens ardorem corpore passus,

365

cui cessit Lydi timefacta potentia regis,

hic Curius clarae socius uirtutis et ille

†Flaminius, deuota dedit qui corpora flammae.

iure igitur talis sedes pietatis honores [...]

363 et VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: e ed. Ald. 1517, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* mediis
 VTUVoss.lYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: medius CFEAWSBTTEsc.dI: metius*
 Laur.XFr.Vat. 364 tellus Wakefield gurgis in unda
 VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: greges in unda I: gurgitis haustus Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: gurgis inundans Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: gurgitis unda Heyne in omnibus operibus* 365 mucius FEsc.Vi.: mutius
 VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469: mutias S: mitius Onb.* 366
 cui cessit lidithime Γ: legitime cessit (ces- Onb) cui facta (-gg- d) VAWBTEsc.dIOnb.: legitime (-gip- Vat., -itt- Vi.) cessit cui (uel V²) fracta V²UVoss.lLaur.XYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469: legitime cessit cui fata C: legitime cui cessit facta FET: legitime et cessit cui facta S: legitime cessit qui fracta Ha.* 368 flaminius (-mm- CEAWBTUIXI)
 VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469: flammineus (-m- Fr.Vi.Onb.) Laur.²Fr.Vi.Onb. ed. Rom. 1473: caecilius Loensis in scriptis multorum eruditorum flammae VCEASBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.: flantem W: flammis lYVi.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: famae Wakefield* 369 talis VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lXIYFr.Vat.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: tales Pom.Ad. Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": tal' Laur.Pie.: tali Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* honores
 VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469: sedet ad pietatis honos V²: honorat Ci. Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: honore Bembus: honore est Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*

Scipiadisque duces, quorum deuota triumphis

370

moenia †rapidis† Libycae Carthaginis horrent.

illi laude sua uigeant: ego Ditis opacos

cogor adire lacus uiduos, a, lumine Phoebi

et uastum Phlegethonta pati, quo, maxime Minos,

conscelerata pia discernis uincula sede.

375

ergo iam causam mortis, iam dicere uitae

370 scipiadisque duces VB²Voss.Ha.Vat.Vi.: istarum piadasque (py- U)
 CFEAWSBTesc.UdLaur.XIFr.Ad.Onb.: scipiatosque duces Γ: ist(h)ic scipiadisque duces (*sine* quorum)
 IPom. ed. Rom. 1469: scipiadas piadesque Y: scipiadesque duces Pie.: illic scipiadisque duces ed. Ald.
 1517: illi scipiadaeque duces *Bembus*: illic scipiadaeque duces Ci. *Melanchthon* 371 rapidis
 CFAWSBTesc.dI: romanis VT Voss.YHa.Pie.: rapidinis B²Ad.Onb.: xaphyde U: rapidos IPom.Vi.Ci. ed.
 Rom. 1469: yapidis (ia- Fr.) Laur.XFr.Vat.: uersum omisit E 372 uersuum 372-414 supersunt initia
 tantum in S. illi VC²FAWSBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom.
 1469: ille CE 373 uiduatos *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum. uide Kershaw. Heinsius lectiones*
 uiduos a et uiduatos probauit. 374 phlegethonta CAI ed. Rom. 1473: phlegetonta VTLaur.XVi.Ad.Ci.
 ed. Rom. 1469: phegethontha F: phlegeton Ed: phlegethon WI: phelegethon B: phelegethonta B²:
 flegetonta ΓYPom.Vat.Pie.Onb.: flegeton Esc.Voss.Ha.: flagetonta U: uersum omisit Fr. maxime
 ULaur.YVat.Pie. ?*Schraderus* ?*Nodell*: maxima VCFEWBTesc.U²dVoss.lXIHa.Pom.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed.
 Rom. 1469: maximinos A: uersum omisit Fr. 375 discernis . . . uincula ?*Schraderus* ?*Nodell*: discernit . . .
 uincula VCFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger* ed.
 1573 in uers.: cognita discernit scelerata piacula sede *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in comm. poene C 376 iam
 causam Ci. *Bembus*, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in uers.: quam causam
 VCFEWSBTesc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in
 comm.: qua causam A: quam clausam Γ iam VCFEAWBTesc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.
Wakefield: quam U²IPom.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in comm.: me Ci. *Bembus*,
Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers. dicere ΓUILaur.YFr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: discernere
 VCFEAWBTesc.dVoss.XIHa.Pie.Ad.Onb. uinctae *Bembus*, *Scaliger* ed. 1573 in uers.

uerberibus saeuae cogunt ab iudice Poenae,
 cum mihi tu sis causa mali nec conscius adsis;
 sed tolerabilibus curis haec immemor audis
quae tamen ut uanis dimittes omnia uentis.
 digredior numquam rediturus: tu cole fontes
 et uiridis nemorum siluas et pascua laetus,

380

377 saeuo Ci. *Bembus* ab VCFEWBTTEsc.dVoss.IIYHa.Pom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: ad A: a ULaur.XFr.Vat.Ad.Onb.: in Pie.: sub Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 378 causa mali nec VVoss.YHa.Pie.Ci. ed. Ald. 1517, *Bembus*: causa mali ne CTVi. ed. Parm. 1479: causam alme F: causa malignae (-e EEsc.dlLaur.XFr.Pom.Vat.Ad.Onb.) EAWBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIFr.Pom.Vat.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: causa mali tu ed. Ald. 1505 379 sed VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.IIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: nec Ci. *Bembus*, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers. tolerabilibus CFTPom.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: tolerabilis (toll- AVat.Ad., -ill- Ha.) VEAWBTEsc.UdVoss.IIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Ald. 1517: tolerabilis Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 380 quae tamen ut uanis Ci. *Bembus*, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: et tamen ut uadis VCFEAWSBTTEsc.dVoss.XIHa.Ad.Onb.: sed tamen ut tum ut uadas U: et tamen in uanis lPom. ed. Rom. 1469: ed tamen ut uadas Laur.Fr.Vat.Pie.: sed tamen ut uadis Y: et tamen in nauis Vi.: quae tamen in uanis *Melanchthon*: tu tamen in uanos Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. et †tamen ut uadis† *indicaui Clausen*. dimittes (-mites T) FATEsc.lPom.Pie. *Melanchthon*, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: dimittere (-mict- Voss.) VVoss.Ha.: dimitte (-cte Laur.YVat.) CEWBUDlLaur.XYFr.Vat.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: dimitteres Γ: demitte ed. Nurem. 1492: demittes Vi. ed. Ascens. 1501 et editiones Ascens.: dimittis ed. Ald. 1517: dimittens Ci. *Bembus*, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers. omnia FATTEscI.Ci. *Bembus*, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: somnia (somp- VVoss.Ad., sonn- Vat.) VCEWBUD.Voss.IIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. uentos Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. uersum 383 post 380 transposuit. deinde uersus 258-260 post 383 collocauit. post 383 uersus 381, 382 etc. legit Scaliger. 381 tanquam *Fabricius* rediturus CFEAWBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: moriturus VVoss.Ha. fontes VCFEAWTEsc.UVoss.IIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: fontis BdAd. *Bembus*: fontem Γ 382 silua F "fortasse scenas ut Aen. i. 164" Wakefield

at mea diffusas rapiantur dicta per auras.'

dixit et extrema tristis cum uoce recessit.

hunc ubi sollicitum dimisit inertia uitae

385

interius grauitur regementem, nec tulit ultra

sensibus infusum culicis de morte dolorem,

quantumcumque sibi uires tribuere seniles

(quis tamen infestum pugnans deuicerat hostem),

rium propter aquae uiridi sub fronde latentem

390

conformare locum capit impiger. hunc et in orbem

destinat ac ferri capulum repetiuit in usum,

383 at Heyne in commentario editionis: et
 VCFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 diffusa ed.
 Ald. 1505 rapiantur lPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: rapiuntur
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIYHa.Fr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Onb. ed. Gröninger. 1502: rapientur Scaliger ed.
 1573 in comm. 385 hinc Ci. ubi VFEAWSBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed.
 Rom. 1469, Bembus: mihi C: tibi Pie.: ibi Ci. 386 graditur Wakefield regementem (hoc uerbum saepe
 scriptum est rege mentem) VCFEAWBTTEsc.dVoss.lHa.Pie.Ad.: reget mentem U: regit mentem
 Laur.YFr.Pom.Vat.: spatium uacuum erat ante uerbum mentem X: mentem (a)eger lVi.Ci. ed. Rom.
 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: mentem aegret Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: rege mente Onb. 390
 propter VCEsc.U²Voss.lYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: praeter (pre- lLaur.Vat.Ad.)
 FEBTTdLaur.XIFr.Vat.Ad.Onb.: praeterea (sine aquae) A: prae tam W: proter U fronde
 VC²FEAWBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad. ed. Rom. 1469, Bembus: fronte CVoss.Fr.Vat.Onb.:
 fonte Ci. latentem VCEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: labentem
 F: latenti Fr.Vat.: latente Onb. 392 destinatus VCFABTEsc.UdVoss.lYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed.
 Rom. 1469: destinatus EWTXI: destinatus Ad. capulum VCFAWBTTEsc.Voss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat.Ad.Ci.
 ed. Rom. 1473: cumulum E: cupulum U: copulum d: (aliter Laur.²) cupidum lLaur.²YPom.Vi.Onb. ed.
 Rom. 1469: cupilum Pie.

gramineam ut uiridi foderet de caespite terram.

iam memor inceptum peragens sibi cura laborem

congestum cumulauit opus, atque aggere multo

395

telluris tumulus formatum creuit in orbem.

quem circum lapidem leui de marmore formans

conserit, assiduae curae memor. hic et acanthos

et rosa purpureum crescent pudibunda ruborem

et uiolae omne genus; hic est et Spartica myrtus

400

393 ut uiridi Ci. *Bembus*: uiridi VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.ILaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: ut post uiridi *suppleuit* V² foderet VCFEAWBTTEsc.dVoss.IIHa.Pom.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: fodiens ULaur.XFr.Vat.Pie. ed. Rom. 1473, ed. Ald. 1517: fodies Y: foueret Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers. 396 tumulus VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.IXIHa.Pom.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: tumulum Laur.YFr.Vat.Pie.: (aliter Laur.²) tumulos Laur.²: cumulus *Lindenbrogius* [*Lindenbruch*] in editione *Masucii* 1717 dicens, "nobilissimus doctissimusque iuuenis Ianus Douza legendum putat cumulus." 397 lapidem CFEAWBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: lapidum VVoss.Ha. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. formas Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 398 congerit *Heinsius* in scriptis multorum eruditorum curae omisit F acanthos EPom.Vi.Ad. ed. Rom. 1469: achantus VVoss.YHa.Pie.: achantos (eta chantos A) CFABTTEsc.UdLaur.XFr.Vat.Onb. ed. Ascens. 1519: anchantos W: achanthos B²: anchantus I: acanthus Ci. *Bembus*: legi non potuit I 399 ex A rosea Ci. purpureum VCFEAWBTTEsc.UdVoss.Laur.Ha.Fr.Vat.Pie.XIAd.: purpureo U²lLaur.²YPom.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 crescent (ces- Fr.) VCFEAWBTTEsc.UVoss.Laur.XIHa.Fr.Vat.Ad.: descant d: crescens Y: crescit U²lPom.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469 pudibunda VTVoss.Ha.: rubicunda CEAWBTTEsc.UdlLaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: rubicundata F ruborem VTVoss.Ha.: per orbem C: colorem EEsc.UYPie.: terrorem AWBdl: colore B²lLaur.²Pom.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: terrore T: rorem F: tenorem Laur.XFr.Vat. 400 sunt uiolae E spartica (-th- dPom.Onb.) CFEAWBTTEsc.U²dlLaur.XIPom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: parthica (-tica Voss.) VVoss.YHa.Fr. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: pastica Γ: spartycha U

atque hyacinthos et hic Cilici crocus editus aruo,
 laurus item Phoebi decus ingens, hic rhododaphne
 liliaque et roris non auia cura marini
 herbaque turis opes priscis imitata Sabina

401 hyacinthos Fr. *ed. Parm. 1479*: iacintos VWBVoss.XIVat.Onb.: iacinthos CHa.Ad.: iacinthos F:
 iacynctos E: iacintus ATY: acithos Γ: acinthos Γ²: iacinctos Esc.d: iacynthus U: hiacinthos I: yacintos
 Laur.: hiacynthos Pom.Vi. *ed. Rom. 1469*: iacynthus Pie.: hyacintos *ed. Rom. 1473*: hyacynthus *ed.*
Ascens. 1507: hyacinthus Ci. *ed. Ald. 1517*: hiacynthus *ed. Ascens. 1519, Bembus* cilici (cy- Laur., si-
 Y) VCEAWBTUdLaur.XIYHa.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci. *ed. Grüniger. 1502, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: culici F
Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre Pithou] Epigrammata: cylica Esc.: cilico IPom.Vi. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed.*
1573 in comm.: collici Fr.: cicili Onb. crocus VCFTEsc.U²Voss.IYHa.Pom.Pie.Vi.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*:
 crosus EAWBTIAd.: grossus ULaur.XFr.Vat.: cro d: cresus Onb. editus (edd- Y)
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.dVoss.IXIYHa.Pom.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: seditus Laur.Fr.Vat.: additus
 ULaur.²Pie. aruo VCFEAWBTUdVoss.IIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Ci.Onb.² *ed. Rom. 1469*: auro
 Esc.Vi.Ad.: aluo Onb.: antro *ed. Ald. 1517* 402 decus ingens *Schraderus in scriptis multorum*
eruditorum, Housman: decus ut sua pagina dicit VVoss.: decus surgens
 CFEABTTUdLaur.XIYFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.: surges *super surgens scripsit A*²: decus surgent W: surgens decus
 Esc.Ci. *ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus*: decus exsurgens (exur- IPom.Vi.Onb. *ed. Venet. 1475*) U²IPom.Vi.Onb.
ed. Rom. 1469: decus et sua pagina dicit Ha. rhododaphne (*duo uerba in IIaur.*) UILaur.XPom.Vi.Ci.
ed. Rom. 1469: decus ut sua pagina dicit VVoss.: rodo daphne (*unum uerbum in WBI, Bembus*)
 CEAWBTIONb. *Bembus*: oro dapnhe F: rododalphine Γ: rododaphni Esc.: roda dapne d: rododamn(a)e
 YFr.: decus et sua pagina dicit Ha.: rohdo daphne Vat.: rhodo dampne Pie.: ordo daphne Ad. 403 roris
 UILaur.XIYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: rosis
 CFEAWBTTEsc.dAd.: *incertum roris an rosis in I: uersum omiserunt VVoss.Ha.*: rores *Scaliger ed. 1573*
in comm. non auia cura CFEAWBTTEsc.UdLaur.XIYFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci.Onb.: nouania cura IPom. *ed.*
Rom. 1469: non uanida cura Pom. *ed. Rom. 1471*: nonacria tura *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*: uersum
omiserunt VVoss.Ha. (uel C²) marini C²FEBTEsc.UdLaur.XYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. *ed. Rom.*
1469: marina CWTI: ?marinec uix legi potuit in A: uersum omiserunt VVoss.Ha. 404 sabina
 CFWBΓdIAd.Ci.: sabinas VATVoss.Laur.XHa.Fr.Vat.: sabinis (-ynis U)
 EEsc.U²ILaur.²YPom.Pie.Vi.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*

chrysanthusque hederaeque nitor pallente corymbo 405
 et bocchus Libyae regis memor, hic amarantus
 bumastusque uirens et semper florida *pinus*;
 non illinc narcissus abest, cui gloria formae
 igne Cupidineo proprios exarsit in artus;
 et, quoscumque nouant uernantia tempora flores, 410
 his tumulus super inseritur. tum fronte locatur
 elogium, tacita firmat quod littera uoce:

405 chrysanthusque *ed. Rom. 1469, Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: crisantus VVoss.Ha.Ad.:
 chrysantusque (*duo uerba in Esc.*) CEABEsc.ULaur.I *ed. Venet. 1475*: chisanthusque F: chrysantus W:
 chrisantusque SFdXFr.Vat.: crhysantusque T: crysanthusque lCi. *ed. Venet. 1476*: crhysantusque Y:
 chrisanthusque Pom.: chrisantusque Pie.: crysantusque Vi. *ed. Venet. 1493*: crisantusque Onb.:
 chrysanthus *Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.* 406 bocchus Laur.XFr.Vat.Pie. *ed. Rom. 1469*: bocus
 VCFdVoss.Ha.: bochus EAWSBTTIPom.Ad.Ci.Onb. *Bembus*: boycus Esc.: bacchus (bach- U) UILaur.²
ed. Venet. 1472: baccho Y: bac(c)hi Vi. *ed. Ascens. 1501 et editiones Ascens.*: boccus *ed. Ald. 1517*
 amarantus (amm- Pie.) VLaur.YFr.Vat.Pie.Onb.: amaranthus CFEAWBTTEsc.dlXIPom.Vi.Ad.Ci. *ed.*
Rom. 1469: aramantus U: amaratus Voss.Ha. 407 bumastusque (-thusque F)
 VCFEAWTUdVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469*: bamastusque BAd.:
 humastusque SF: bulnastus Esc.: buphthalmusque Ci. *Bembus* pinus
 VCFEAWBTTEsc.dVoss.lLaur.XIYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in*
comm.: tinus *Salmasius in scriptis multorum eruditorum [de Saumaise]*: picris T²Ci. *Bembus, Scaliger ed.*
1573 in uers.: myrthus (mirt- Laur.²) ULaur.² tinus *scripsit Clausen.* 408 narcissus
 FEDlLaur.YHa.Pom.Vat.Pie.Ci. *ed. Rom. 1469*: narcisus VCAWBTTU²XIAd.Onb. *ed. Parm. 1479*:
 narciscus Esc.: narcysus U: narrissus Voss.: narcyssus Fr.: narcessus Vi. *fortasse narcissus in Voss.?*
 412 firmat VCB²TUILaur.XYHa.Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Onb. *ed. Rom. 1469, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.*:
 firma EAWBTTEsc.dlAd.: forma F: format Ci. *Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.*: omisit Voss.

PARVE CVLEX PECVDVM CVSTOS TIBI TALE MERENTI
FVNERIS OFFICIVM VITAE PRO MVNERE REDDIT.

413 EPITAPHIVM SVPER CVLICEM erap: EPITAPHIVM Tr. paru(a)e
CFEAWSBTTeEsc.rapUdlTr.Wu.Bnf.Laur.OJNXYBpl.Ha.ZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed.
Rom. 1469: parua VKMI: omisit Voss. culex
VCFEAWSBTTeEsc.rpUdlTr.Wu.Bnf.Laur.OJKNXIYHa.ZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed.
Rom. 1469: cules aMBpl.: omisit Voss. pecudum custos
VCFEAWBTTeEsc.rapUdTr.Wu.Bnf.Laur.JKMNXIYBpl.Ha.ZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci.Onb. *Bembus*:
custos pecudum IOVi. ed. Rom. 1469: custos pecorum Pom.: omisit Voss. tibi tale merenti
VCFEAWBTTeEsc.rapUdTr.Wu.Bnf.Laur.JKMNXIYBpl.Ha.Fr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom.
1469, ed. Ald. 1517, *Bembus*: nil tale merenti IO²Pom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1471: nil tale timenti O: tibi tale
merente Z: tibi tela merenti Ad.: omisit Voss. 414 funeris
VCFEAWSBTTesc.UdlWu.Laur.OJKMNXIYHa.ZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom.
1469: muneris erapTr.Bnf.Q: omisit Voss. uit(a)e pro
VCEAWBTTeEsc.rapUdlTr.Bnf.Laur.OJNQXIYHa.ZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb. ed. Rom.
1469: uita pro F: pro uitae Wu.Pie.: uitam pro KM: omisit Voss. funere O² reddit (redit FT)
VCFEAWBTTeEsc.raUdTr.Bnf.Laur.KNQXIHa.ZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Ad.Ci. ed. Ald. 1517, *Bembus*:
reddo U²IWu.OJYPom.Vi.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: ded(d)it pM: omisit Voss.

Titulum omiserunt FerapUdnhVoss.Tr.Wu.OJKMNQQ2BpLZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vi.Vla.ClOnb.: EXPLICIT VVat.:
LIBELLVS QVI NOMINATVR CVLEX (PVBLII BBnf.) VIRGILII (VIRGL' AI) MARONIS (omisit B) (MARON' ATI) FINIT
CAWBTBnf.I: CVLEX P VIRGILII MARONIS EXPLICIT E: *uerba LIBELL VIRG tantum legi potuerunt in S:* P
VIRGILII MARONIS CVLIX EXPLICIT F: EXPLICIT LIBER DE CVLICE ψ: PVBLII VIRGILII MARONIS IVVENALIS
LVDI LIBELLVS DE CVLICE ET PASTORE EXPLICIT. EX VETVSTISSIMO EXEMPLARI IAM QVASI IGNOTARVM
LITTERARVM INSCRIPTVS .1407. :PER HERMANNVM DE MVNDO: .1407. Esc.: FINIS I: CVLEX VIRGILII
MARONIS FINIT ET CETERA Laur.: FINITVR CVLEX MARONIS VIRGILII X: VIRGILIVS DE CVLICE FINIT.
THEAOZ. Y: EXPLICIT DE CVLICE Ha.: TEAOZ. FINIT CVLEX FOELICITER. Pie.

Chapter Four: Adnotationes Criticae

Anyone who embarks upon a quest to improve a text is bound to feel that his or her contributions are much work in exchange for little glory. Before we begin, a little encouragement from Pierre de Nolhac is in order. He was writing to Léopold Delisle about manuscripts and collectors but the sentiments are universal:

Ces matériaux, il est vrai, pris isolément, sont extrêmement menus et de médiocre importance; c'est de la poussière d'érudition, si on peut dire, et on me reprochera peut-être d'avoir dépensé un long travail et de sérieux efforts de critique à des questions aussi infimes . . . Un détail insignifiant pour tel lecteur rendra peut-être un jour service à tel autre. Nous n'avons le droit de rien négliger, car, suivant la belle parole d'un de nos humanistes, il n'y a rien de méprisable dans le domaine de la science, οὐδέν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης φαῦλον.
(de Nolhac *Lettre-Préface* x)

1 lusimus . . . Thalia: *scripsimus* and *camena* are glosses which have become part of the text. They need not be given serious consideration as readings.

2 orsum: Our imitator shows himself capable of *double-entendre* with the clever use of a word which can mean both “web” and “beginning.”

3 haec propter culicis: *propter* frequently appears in the second position in a sentence and must be construed with *haec* to mean “on account of this.” Scaliger’s *hacpropter* is unlikely for it is only found once in Latin in the *Menippeae* of Varro, fragment 213 verse

3. Plésent attempts to read *propter* with *culicis* on the assumption that *culicis* is accusative plural.⁹⁶ Leo, whom we must thank for rediscovering *docta*, shows less acumen here in his choice of *culices*.⁹⁷ Birt is surely correct to defend *culicis* as genitive

⁹⁶ Plésent (1910) 94. Others before Plésent were, doubtless, guilty of this as well but without explanatory notes one cannot be certain how they understood *culicis*.

⁹⁷ Friedrich Leo, *Culex carmen Vergilio ascriptum* (Berolini [Berlin]: apud Weidmannos, 1891) 26.

singular and noticing the poetic plural, he translates *culicis carmina* as “carmen quod est de culice.”⁹⁸

3 sint carmina docta: A hortatory subjunctive is necessary to convince the reader to suspend his or her disbelief concerning the subject matter and is grammatically proper given the presence of other subjunctives. Although this is not meant to be a literary commentary, one cannot help but notice words such as *gracili* and *tenuem* which conjure up images of neoteric poetry and its Greek antecedents. There is no better example of a Catullan expression than *docta*. The task of an editor is made more difficult by the fact that errors in copying Latin usually produce viable words. The question here is whether the poet would choose a word which proved that he was familiar with the works of important authors or whether he would allow his “lofty” introduction to fall flat with *dicta*. As he seems to have taken pains to reflect Virgil’s poetic output in the poem, it does not seem unusual to find other displays of *doctrina*.

4-5 omnis . . . uoces.: This is the sort of place where editors vainly try to defend the reading found in the majority of the manuscripts although it is by no means certain that it ought to be defended. Like most editors since Leo, I believe that *ducum* should be preserved but it is hardly surprising to see scholars of centuries past following Scaliger’s *ducam*. Open *a*, frequently seen in manuscripts as something approximating *u* could have been interpreted as either *a* or *u*.

It seems to be fairly clear that the poet is explaining to the reader in a convoluted manner that although he is not writing serious verse, his work has similarities to both historical and epic genres. Leo correctly notes that the mosquito will speak in a more

⁹⁸ Theodor Birt, “Vergilius scripseritne Culicem denuo quaeritur,” *Studi Virgiliani* 9 (1930): 55.

elevated style than one would expect from a humble creature. “ut heroes deique loquetur culex . . . culex queritur: *praemia sunt pietatis, ubi, pietatis honores?* locutione utitur qua Venus Vergiliana (I, 253) *hic pietatis honos?*”⁹⁹ Its words are worthy of Dido or Medea as they recount the role they played in saving their former lovers.

In this difficult passage, the most helpful advice is that of Buecheler who explains the lines as follows, “propter lusum de culice doctum carmen proponam quod concinat ordine et uocibus cum historiis et ἑπεισιν.”¹⁰⁰ Buecheler’s article shows that *consonent* must be supplied in order for *uoces* to have a verb and that *ordo* and *uoces* must be taken with both *historiae* and *notitiaeque ducum*.

Translate: “On account of this, (i.e. the fact that I have not taken my task of writing seriously) let there be learned poetry about a mosquito and let the layout and language be entirely consistent with historical and epic genres (but) in a light-hearted vein.”

5 uoces. licet inuidus adsit.: I place a period after *uoces* in order to emphasize the poet’s challenge to his critics. The clipped *licet* sentence implies “for all I care.” It is not uncommon to see *licet* at the start of a sentence. Calpurnius Siculus provides this example and, indeed, several others:

uos populi gaudete mei: licet omne uagetur
seculo custode pecus nocturnaue pastor
claudere fraxinea nolit praesaepia crate,
non tamen insidias praedator ouilibus ullas
afferet aut laxis abiget iumenta capistris.
(Calpurnius Siculus *Eclogues* 1.37-41)

⁹⁹ Leo 27.

¹⁰⁰ Franz Buecheler, “Coniectanea,” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 45 (1890): 325.

7 feratur: The decision to read *feratur* hinges on the previous decision to have the poet issue a challenge to potential critics. My choice enjoys some favour with twentieth-century editors (Plésent, Herrmann, Vassalini) and perhaps would be more popular today if others had been acquainted with a wide range of late manuscripts.¹⁰¹ It is best to follow Plésent who states, “*feretur* est la leçon traditionnelle. Elle me paraît moins bonne: le poète ne se contente pas de prévoir la confusion de ses ennemis, il les maudit.”¹⁰²

9 securos: This word has caused much speculation among editors. No one is quite certain of the cause of “Virgil’s” concern. Is it war or too much work? Heyne is probably correct to assume that *fructus* means “*fructus ingenii*.”¹⁰³ There is no evidence that *securus* ought to be replaced with *maturos* following the recommendation of Nicolaas Heinsius. Sillig advises us to leave matters alone saying, “*quibus rebus poeta illo tempore . . . uexatus fuerit, nos nunc latet.*”¹⁰⁴

Transfer the epithet slightly and translate: “when the seasons find me free from care and deliver their bounty to me.”

10 poliantur: Our poet once again uses a word with Catullan associations. Catullus literally and figuratively polished up poems which he claimed were only *nugae*. This is false modesty for we know that he had hopes of immortality for them.

Cui dono lepidum nouum libellum
arido modo pumice expolitum?
Corneli, tibi: namque tu solebas
meas esse aliquid putare nugas

¹⁰¹ Léon Herrmann, *Phèdre et ses fables* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1950); Caterina Vassalini, *La Zanzara* (Florence: Edizioni Fussi, 1951).

¹⁰² Plésent (1910) 95.

¹⁰³ Heyne (1793) 22.

¹⁰⁴ Heyne-Sillig 48.

iam tum, cum ausus es unus Italorum
 omne aeuum tribus explicare chartis,
 doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis.
 quare habe tibi quidquid hoc libelli,
 quaecumque quidem, patroni ut ergo
 plus uno maneat perenne saeclo.
 (Catullus *Carmina* 1)

The author of the *Culex* claims to be interested in writing serious poetry but not at the present time. Refusal to write epic is a common theme among Latin poets. Neoteric poets abhor the thought of a long-winded epic on the grounds that it violates their stylistic beliefs and prefer epyllion. Love poets swear that it is against their nature as they are lovers not fighters. Clever versifiers turn the refusal into a manifesto on how poetry ought to be written or compliment the ruler of the day by promising him an *Aeneid*-like account of his exploits at some future date. In the latter case, they are usually not to be believed for they are simply exploring the literary possibilities of the *recusatio*.

13 recinente: Ernout and Meillet demonstrate that *cano* changes to *cino* in compound forms which Latin authors invent as they struggle to find words for Greek concepts. See A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* (Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1994) 93. This problem is illustrated by a passage of Lucretius:

Nec me animi fallit Graiorum obscura reperta
 difficile inlustrare Latinis uersibus esse,
 multa nouis uerbis praesertim cum sit agendum
 propter egestatem linguae et rerum nouitatem.
 (Lucretius *De rerum natura* 1.136-139)

The reading of the OCT must stand.

13 educat: It is common in a long list to avoid repetition of phrases such as “the people from town X.” This is frequently replaced by something like “the men who drink river Y” or “the youths whom town Z, mother of sheep, nourishes.” Note this passage of Virgil:

tunc adiit, dextraeque datae. Sulmone creatos
 quattuor hic iuuenes, totidem quos educat Vfens,
 uiuentis rapit, inferias quos immolet umbris
 captiuoque rogi perfundat sanguine flammās.
 (Virgil *Aeneid* 10.517-520)

In our poem, Apollo is not being brought up by the town, he is simply inhabiting it.

14 Arna: Taubmann defends *alma* saying, “elegantē subintelligitur *urbs*.”¹⁰⁵ If the poet has intentionally omitted the town’s name, he surely does not deserve to have this deviation from normal style recorded as a pattern for others to follow but he is not at fault here. The scribe must be blamed for changing an unfamiliar place name to a recognizable word. We are looking for a place in Lycia (southern Asia Minor) as that is the home of the Xanthus river and the Chimaera mountain. Haupt discovered in his reading of the works of Stephen of Byzantium that “Ἄρνα, πόλις Λυκίας.” He first published this conjecture in 1858 and it became part of his edition of 1873.¹⁰⁶ Much of the confusion in this line arises from the fact that Xanthus is also the name of a town. Sillig’s conjecture *acta* “sea-shore” is unnecessary.¹⁰⁷

15 Asteriae: Asteria is another name for Delos. Pliny the Elder reports this at 4.66.8 of his *Naturalis historia*.

Our nearly-forgotten Canon. Class. Lat. 54 makes a sudden appearance in this line and must be mentioned as it disagrees with Oporin’s edition of 1544. The manuscript has *astrigeri* while *astrigerum* is found in the printed book. Both are wrong.

¹⁰⁵ Taubmann 37.

¹⁰⁶ Moritz Haupt, *Opuscula* Vol. III Part 1 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967) 64; Moritz Haupt, *Opera P. Vergilii Maronis* (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: apud S. Hirzelium, 1873). Haupt’s edition is exceedingly hard to find and I am grateful to the staff of DBI-Link for arranging photocopies for me.

¹⁰⁷ Heyne-Sillig 27.

19 Naidēs: *Naidēs* is correct. *Naiades* would scan as long-short-short-short as Quicherat shows. See L. Quicherat, *Thesaurus poeticus linguae latinae* (Paris: Hachette, 1850) 759.

21 agrestum . . . tenentis: It is clear how this line turned into a jumble of *curas* and *securas*. First of all, there were two places in the sentence which could be misunderstood as reading *secura*. *fetura* caused the common f/s and c/t errors of recognition while *sit cura* sounded like *secura*.

23 antra: Heyne must be thinking of Horace when he suggests *antra* for there is a poem among the *Odes* in which Horace is guided by Bacchus through groves and caves. Horace even provides two different words for “cave” one of which Heyne seizes upon.

Quo me, Bacche, rapis tui
 plenum? quae nemora aut quos agor in specus
 uelox mente noua? quibus
 antris egregii Caesaris audiar
 aeternum meditans decus
 stellis inserere et consilio Iouis?
 (Horace *Carmina* 3.25.1-6)

Pales is concerned with agriculture and earthly matters. “Stars” are beyond her sphere of influence.

24 at: *at* seems appropriate here as the poet has finished with the description of his divine mentor and resumed praises of his human, but hardly ordinary, patron. One can make an argument that the poet would continue the *et tu* pattern but it seems likely that along with Professor Clausen’s insertion of a new paragraph should come an indication that the poet has shifted from several addressees who may be taken together in Roman prayer formula to one who must receive separate and special treatment.

Bembo shows a great deal of sense when he proposes simple changes. He and others such as Scaliger, Heinsius and Heyne damage their own credibility when they

attempt conjectures which either improve the poem to such an extent that it becomes a different work or suggest words which cannot be justified by the available space or the shape of the letters in the manuscripts. Their reasons for doing this are obvious. If they believe that Virgil was the author of the poem at either a young, or worse, a mature age, they are unlikely to ascribe language to him which is manifestly unworthy of him. Their facility with Latin and the fact that they are all poets in their own right occasionally blinds them to the reality that even in ancient times authors could be guilty of awkward phrasing. One cannot restore something to its former glory if it was of dubious quality to begin with.

24 cui . . . chartis: Do not take *meritis* with *chartis*. Translate: “But you, because of whose merits my confidence in my writing grows.”

35-36 mollia . . . gaudet: In the introduction, a possible imitation of the *Culex* by Calpurnius Siculus came to light and we lamented the lack of information concerning his dates of birth and death for it would have assisted us in dating our poem. Calpurnius tantalizes us with another tidbit in these lines. Is the reading from *Eclogue* 4 verse 152 “olim quam tereti decurrent carmina uersu” a borrowing or a simple coincidence? Heinsius knew that *pede currere* contained the true word, some form of *decurrere*, but is a participle really necessary? There is no need to connect 35 and 36 just because the supposed adjective *apta* does not have a noun. Latin gives several examples where *apta* is used as a substantive. Pomponius Mela *De chorographia* 3.19.6-7 offers “itaque cum mortuis cremant ac defodiunt apta uiuentibus” and Tacitus *Annales* 3.31.16-17 has “Drusus apta temperandis animis disseruit.” The switch from *decurrent* (future) to *gaudet* (present) is not uncharacteristic of this poet. If one absolutely must have a connective,

Ribbeck's *uersu et* is worth a look but it produces an extremely unpleasant effect as he readily admits.

Translate: "Poems will flow down smoothly but in restrained verse.

It is pleasant to play at things which are suited to their own strength with Phoebus as teacher."

37 memorabilis: This word is awkward but there is no evidence that it is not what the author intended. This is glory that is fit to be recorded. The poet hopes that Octavian will be on the lips of men forever.

37 constet: Heyne is correct to see that the *r* of *certet* is really hiding the letter *s* but there is no reason why the *c* must also be changed. We are looking for a verb which means "let *x* continue" or "let *x* exist" and we find it in *constet*. I arrived at *constet* without consulting Wagenvoort's article but the credit for the conjecture must be given to him.¹⁰⁸

44 fugabat: This imperfect verb continues the pattern begun by *penetrabat* and *quatiebat*.

47 uuida: Sickly-yellow grass is neither a pretty picture nor very appetizing. An editor is spoiled here by the number of conjectures offered by his or her predecessors. In this sort of case, I find it helpful to write out the offending word in my worst handwriting in an attempt to see how some letters could have turned into others. If one does this, one comes to *uuida* without much difficulty as Scaliger did in his commentary.

48 uagae: I am allowing *uagae* to stand but, like Wakefield, I fear that *uagae* with the implied *sunt* has replaced an actual verb. One can make a case for *paronomasia* because

¹⁰⁸ Hendrik Wagenvoort, "Ad Vergilii *Culicis* vss. 35-38," *Mnemosyne* 9 (1956): 29.

very soon we are faced with *carpuntur* . . . *carpente* but here it is difficult to decide whether *uagae* . . . *uagantes* is the fault of an inept poet or an inept scribe.

49 celebres e: The animals are not stampeding while they eat their breakfast! They are walking very slowly crowded together in groups and grazing as they go. Wakefield steers us in the right direction yet again. Compare this passage from Cicero:

usque ad hoc tempus Syracusani
festos dies anniuersarios agunt celeberrimo uirorum mulie-
rumque conuentu.
(Cicero *In Verrem* 2.4.107.12-14)

50 tondebant: The switch from present to imperfect is jarring but its frequency shows us that it is intentional unlike the *fugarat* which we changed to *fugabat*. This odd style works well in story-telling. I have tried to invent a similar example in colloquial English to illustrate the shift in tenses. The tenses are not quite parallel to the ones in the *Culex*.

One young boy recounts a story of a fight with the neighbourhood bully to his friend:

“I had a fight with John. He tried to trip me as I was walking down the stairs.”

“So what do you do?”

“I get mad. I punch him and I kick him. Then he got scared and went home.”

53 labrusca: As previously stated in the introduction, Nonius Marcellus realized that the neuter plural form *labrusca* found in the *Culex* was odd and called the reader’s attention to the fact that it was normally feminine.

56 sentes: The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* observes that the word *sentes* is usually masculine but is feminine at *Culex* 56 and *Nux* 113. See P. G. W. Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) 1737.

57 imminet . . . undam: If it is proper to speak about the quality of a manuscript’s errors, then Γ must win the prize for its ability to write gibberish which reveals the true word or

at least gives a clue as to what the author intended. At line 366, its *lidithime* turns into *Lydi timefacta* while the other manuscripts opt for the unimaginative *legitime*. In line 57, I suspect that *intuici* is not hiding any declension of *riuus* or any form of *ripa*. The goat's position on a bank near a stream is obvious and, thus, some words can be omitted without any damage to the sense. *imminet intuitu* would literally mean "peers down upon x with its gaze." The translation needs improvement but is adequate for the moment. After that, we are in treacherous waters. Some genitive singular participle ending in *-stantis* is required and then, perhaps, the dative *umbrae*. After *at illa*, I suggest *imminet intuitu prostantis imaginis umbrae*.

Lucretius uses *prostare* in the sense of "projecting" at *De rerum natura* 2.428 "*angellis . . . prostantibus*." We use Lucretius again to assist us in translating *prostantis imaginis umbrae*. If Lucretius writes "pavements of streets" in his poetry, we understand him to mean "paved streets." Here we could say "shadow of a projecting reflection" but "shadowy projecting reflection" is more elegant. The verse now translates as "while a third peers downward intently at the shadowy projecting reflection." In a line such as this where one cannot even determine the extent of the corruption, there is little hope of a solution.

58 non: Remember to use *non* with both *fastidiat* and *probet*.

62 lota: For the choice of *lota* instead of *lauta*, see Quicherat who observes, "*lautus* s'est spécialisé dans le sens de *élégant, distingué*, par suite *riche, honorable*." Le sens de *baigné, lavé* est à peine attesté et ne dépasse pas Térence . . . *lotus* a gardé le sens de *lavé, baigné*."¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁹ Quicherat 345.

66 gratum: *gratum* is rather flat as an adjective and *gratum* beckons but before we change it, we must also consider the author's fondness for forms of *gratus*. He uses them at lines 41, 76, 94 and 230.

67 referunt: It is logical to have *referunt* as the author is fairly consistent in his usage of the present tense in this section. Only *fuert* breaks the pattern and it is not a reading to be trusted.

72 recinente: See note for verse 13.

81 agnouit: *agnouit* is a gnomic perfect. "The gnomic perfect strictly refers to past time; but its use implies that something which never *did* happen in any known case never *does* happen, and never *will*." See J. H. Allen and James Greenough, *Allen and Greenough's Latin Grammar* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1903) 299.

83-84 dum . . . ornet . . . transcendat: The subjunctive represents the imaginary soldier's wishes or intentions. There is no argument to be made for *transcendit* and Salvatore, realizing this, has not reprinted the indicative in his new 1997 edition.

87 panchaia: Scan as long-short-short. In Quicherat's day, *panchaica* was accepted as the reading at Ovid *Metamorphoses* 10.309 but has since been disallowed and does not appear as a variant in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. See Quicherat 837-838 and *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 1288.

89 uoluptas.: A period must be placed after *uoluptas* if one accepts my theory that verse 90 is the start of a new thought and should not be connected to verse 89 with a comma.

90 liber a supplicibus curis: Why does *uoluptas* require a second adjective? If an editor decides to leave *libera* untouched, he or she must answer that question. The adjective

describes the goatherd and *pastor* is easily understood from the narrative. *liber* is occasionally followed by *a/ab* and the ablative as Livy shows:

se ipsam plebem et commoda morari sua. liberam urbem
ac forum a creditoribus, liberos agros ab iniustis possessori-
bus extemplo, si uelit, habere posse.
(Livy *Ab urbe condita* 6.39.9.1-10.1)

In Virgil, gifts and prayers humbly beseech Juno so it is not inconceivable that worries should beg to be heard in a nagging manner.

Iunoni cane uota libens dominamque potentem
supplicibus supera donis: sic denique uictor
Trinacria finis Italos mittere relictas.
(Virgil *Aeneid* 3.438-440)

surge age, nate dea, primisque cadentibus astris
Iunoni fer rite preces, iramque minasque
supplicibus supera uotis. mihi uictor honorem
persolues. ego sum pleno quem flumine cernis
stringentem ripas et pingua culta secantem,
caeruleus Thybris, caelo gratissimus amnis.
(Virgil *Aeneid* 8.59-64)

I recognize that there are several places in this line where an error could have crept in. Given that fact, it seems best to offer a conjecture which preserves as many of the original letters as possible. *liber a* became *libera* through improper word division. *supplicibus curis*, if correct, is unusual and could have been changed to *simplicibus*. One cannot say that of Wakefield's *uindicibus*.

90 huic: The author of the *Culex* frequently looks to Catullus for inspiration and employs *imminere* and the dative in a manner that is similar to a construction found in poem 61 where a bridegroom is staring intently at his new wife:

aspice, intus ut accubans
uir tuus Tyrion in toro
totus immineat tibi.
(Catullus *Carmina* 61.164-166)

91 derigit: *derigit* appeared to be an alternative spelling and it seemed appropriate to change it to the more common *dirigit* but this passage in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* prevented such a course of action: “The earlier form appears to be *der-*, and no certain example of *dir-* occurs in inscriptions before the 4th century A.D. MSS. and edd. vary greatly in their practice.”¹¹⁰

92 quolibet . . . abundet: This chiasmic construction confused the scribes of excerpts **e, r, a, p** and **Tr.** who felt the need to add *et*.

93 liget: It is odd to use the verb *ligare* when speaking of the act of falling asleep and there are no examples in Latin. Instead, one generally sees a form of *dare*, *tradere* or *leuare*. Read *leuet* along with Nicolaas Heinsius and the excerpts **e, r, a, p** and **Tr.**

95 frondis: Hamadryads are wood-nymphs. They have nothing to do with springs. Read *frondis* following Nicolaas Heinsius. *gratissima frondis* translates as “most pleasant for its foliage” and is a genitive of specification.

96 sibi: Plésent explains, “*sibi se rattache à quisque* (chaque pâtre *pour son compte* cherche à rivaliser avec le poète d’Ascre).”¹¹¹

103 qua: This word is less desirable than some of the manuscript readings and conjectures but, nevertheless, is probably a reminiscence of *Aeneid* 7.100-101 “*qua sol utrumque recurrens / aspicit Oceanum.*” The Younger Seneca also uses the expression *utrumque Oceanum* at verse 1839 of his *Hercules Oetaeus*.

105 repetebant: Intransitive usage of this verb is rare but also occurs at *Aeneid* 7.241 with the words “*huc repetit.*”

¹¹⁰ *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 547.

¹¹¹ Plésent (1910) 122.

108-109 umbras . . . et: Any decision regarding lines 108-109 requires us to supply a direct object *pecudes* from 108. Although the omission is hardly glaring, it would seem less strange if *umbras* were joined to the following verse. The poet is already guilty of a run-on sentence from 109-114. Let us further incriminate him by having him start his rambling train of thought one verse earlier.

112 infandas scelerata manus: The “Greek Accusative” is a construction much loved by Virgil and, no doubt, very familiar to his imitators.

117 Oeagrius: Orpheus would appear to be the logical choice but A. E. Housman has shown in his edition of Manilius’ *Astronomicon* that Orpheus must not be scanned in three syllables.¹¹² A patronymic or a noun formed from a place name is in order. Heinsius rightly looked to Virgil for assistance and found *Oeagrius Hebrus* at Georgics 4.524.

This word was then corrupted to some form of *horridus*.

118 canendo: As it stands, this verse makes no sense. The river is behaving as it usually does in the story but the woods are rewriting the myth. Scaliger noticed this and his comments are printed in my apparatus. Efforts have been made to change *ripis* but that is not where the problem lies. The woods need a participle to express what they are doing and *canendo* is the obstacle in our path. I suspect that it is a gloss which has wormed its way into the text as an explanation of *tenuit*. The verse only works if Orpheus is “holding the attention” of the inanimate objects as he can hardly be said to be holding x motionless and holding y in motion. We are looking for something along the lines of *Eclogues* 3.36 *siluasque sequentis*.

¹¹² A. E. Housman, *Marcus Manilius: Astronomicon*, Volume I (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1972) 33.

119-120 quantum . . . uultu: Supply a feminine plural subject like “maidens” from *laetae* and a third person plural form of *tenuit*. Revisit the *quantum* of line 117 and translate: “The son of Oeagrus did not hold . . . as much as the maidens held.” Treat *chorea* as ablative “with their dancing.” *laetae tuo uultu* must be “happy at the sight of your face” but is rarely used in that sense. The only example readily available is from Lucan’s *Bellum Civile* 6.158-159 where he writes, “peterem felicior umbras Caesaris in uoltu.”

122 quis: The author of the *Culex* repeatedly uses *quis* for *quibus*. See also verses 145, 151, 210 and 389.

127 ignipedum: *insigni* as an adjective for Helios’ chariot or horses is about as lackluster as the poet’s usual favourite, *gratus*. At least here the flat adjective is the scribe’s fault, the product of improper word division. *ignipedum*, as Heinsius discovered, is a stock epithet for horses and is found at Ovid *Metamorphoses* 2.392 and Statius *Thebaid* 1.27.

132 perfide: The accuracy of this word is guaranteed by the stylistic habits of the poet at 125 where *impia* at the start of the line picks up *impia* at the end of the preceding line. This occurs again at 134-135 with *quercus . . . quercus*.

140 ilicis . . . cupressus: This conjecture is a reworking of ideas of other scholars but is somewhat original in the manner in which it attempts to restore the symmetry of the line. The manuscripts all read *et laeta* and I believe the scribes at least as far as the *et*. The copyists saw a word which confused them and which they promptly changed to *laeta*. 140 and 141 once contained *et . . . et* and *que . . . que* perhaps in imitation of the Greek love of balanced composition. If we begin with these ideas in mind, we must reject *nec*. Rearrange the first half of the sentence in such a way that *lethaea* will scan properly in

the remaining available space. Not only do we now have balance but also an adjective which the poet is known to favour as he uses it in verse 215.

140 species: Why was *species* included in this line? The “appearance of ilex” is ilex as Heyne observes when he says, “*ilicis species pro periphrasi habendum, pro ilice simpliciter dicta.*”¹¹³ A. E. Housman wrote the words “Head of a traveller” as a parody of this very type of overblown language but based on Greek tragedy rather than Latin epyllion.¹¹⁴

140 cupressus: Heyne translates this as a genitive but other scholars do not share his opinion.

141 fagus: The poet treats this tree in the same fashion as *platanus* and has *fagus –ūs*, nominative plural feminine. Varro *De gente populi Romani* 1.130 “*fagus quas φηγούς Graeci uocant*” is the only other occurrence of the word in the fourth declension.

151-152 hac . . . fouet: It is possible to translate the line as it stands if one allows a poetic usage of *referunt*. The verb is given the meaning “to reply” in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* on page 1594 under entry 12d. In Anna’s conversation with Dido at *Aeneid* 4.31, Virgil writes, “Anna refert.” In our line, the voices of the mud-bathing creatures reply.

168 †aurae: Of the available choices, Leo’s *irae* is the most likely to be correct. I had hoped to make something out of manuscript Fr.’s *aurae*, thinking that it would be in character for the snake to use all its senses but the result was either impossible scansion

¹¹³ Heyne (1793) 41.

¹¹⁴ “Fragment of a Greek Tragedy” is available in two versions. Most readers will only be familiar with the revised work. The website of Cambridge Classics offers the first attempt at <http://www.classics.cam.ac.uk/Faculty/housman.html> and a link to the final version at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/jod/texts/housman.html>.

or a fundamentally different verb. Scaliger and the 1517 Aldine recognized this difficulty but their improvements are not convincing to a student of palaeography.

170 se: The common *s/f* confusion has befallen scribes yet again and the decision rests between various forms of *ferre*. The 1517 Aldine offers *et fert* which fits the context and allows us to keep the connective. Frieseman places a colon and writes *effert*. Ribbeck ignores the shape of the letters with his *ecce* and joins Schrader's *exit* at the far right of the apparatus entry. For the record, any statement by Schrader's admirer Frieseman must be treated with the utmost caution as he routinely credits the conjectures of Heinsius and others to Schrader.

197 cristam: At verse 171 the snake is described as having a crest. Follow the majority and read *cristam*. Learned arguments about the intricacies of snake anatomy are useless here.

199 nec prius . . . artus: I cannot accept Leo's explanation that *aspiciens timor* is equivalent to "timor aspiciendo factus, aspicientis."¹¹⁵ The goatherd is the subject of *obcaecauerat*. *timor* cannot also be a subject unless we place it in parentheses as some have attempted. We want Sillig's negative *nec* with the excellent *prius* and the participle *aspiciens*. These words describe the goatherd. Has *timor* lost its *e*? Is there a trace of it in **VVoss.Ha.**'s *excecauerat*? Was it once parallel to *formidine* in the next line? It is possible.

Translate: "and he had not blinded his limbs with fear by gazing at <it> beforehand."

¹¹⁵ Leo 68.

210 aut quo: A skillful imitator would be familiar with Virgil's habit of having his characters ask one or more questions followed by one beginning with *aut*. Consider these passages:

ipsum autem sumptis Priamum iuuenalibus armis
ut uidit, 'quae mens tam dira, miserrime coniunx,
impulit his cingi telis? aut quo ruis?' inquit.
(Virgil *Aeneid* 2.518-520)

'nate, quis indomitas tantus dolor excitat iras?
quid furis? aut quonam nostri tibi cura recessit?'
(Virgil *Aeneid* 2.594-595)

216 uiden ut: The *n*, a shortened form of *-ne* before vowels and even consonants does not have to be part of a question. Here it is an indignant exclamation from an angry insect as it is being hurried along unable to properly finish its words.

222 micant ardorem: The internal accusative caused discomfort among the scribes and led some to opt for the unmetrical *ardore*.

240-241 uix ultimus amni exstat: Heyne explains, "Heins[ius] em[enda]uit *ex[s]tat* eleganter, quatenus Tantalus in flumine stat, uix summa sui parte eminens."¹¹⁶

244 acerbans: The meaning "embittering" is only found in this verse.

259 nomina: This word is the most obvious choice as the mosquito is about to recite a list of those who have become proverbial either for vice or virtue. The poet has read his Homer as well as the sixth book of the *Aeneid* and knows what is expected. He dusts off these well-worn characters but does not give them a new coat of paint. While Virgil reworks old material and uses the Underworld scene to foreshadow Rome's coming glory, there is no originality or optimism in its counterpart in the *Culex*.

¹¹⁶ Heyne (1793) 54.

264 in Chalcodoniis: Canon. Class. Lat. 54 which seemed so promising because of its association with Pomponio Leto fails us once again. On folio 9v it does provide copious commentary but for *calcedoniis* not *chalcodoniis*.

291 munera: The manuscripts exhibit the same variety of readings whenever there is a word of three syllables. At verses 217 and 259 an editor must choose between *limina*, *lumina*, *nomina*, *numina*, *nomine*, *flumina* and *limine*. In 291, the author may have in mind the words *munere diuae* from *Aeneid* 6.637 where they are used in a different context. Ironically, the word *limine* appears in 6.636 further complicating matters. *munera* is better than *limina* in terms of the plot of the Orpheus and Eurydice myth as it was hardly common for mortals to be allowed to return to the world of the living after death. *limina* is also attested by untrustworthy manuscripts which are suspiciously similar to printed books.

300 serua, ast: This is yet another example of the tendency to confuse *s* and *f*. The slave in question is Laomedon's daughter Hesione whom Hercules rescued from the sea monster and gave to Telamon as a prize. We must decide whether to read *seruata* with Housman or *serua* with Bembo.¹¹⁷ Is it more important that she was saved or that she was a slave? Ovid made much out of Greek leaders who were in love with their slaves:

Quid, quod in ancilla siquis delinquere possit,
illum ego contendi mente carere bona?
Thessalus ancillae facie Briseidos arsit;
serua Mycenaeo Phoebas amata duci.
(Ovid *Amores* 2.8.9-12)

¹¹⁷ A. E. Housman (1902) 344.

Who can forget the way in which he constantly exploited the theme of playing slave to one's slave? With the amount of literature that has accumulated comparing the *Culex* to Ovid, one would be ill-advised to bet against Bembo and Rome's *desultor amoris*.

324 Hector: A quick scan of Latin literature reveals that one is more likely to see forms of the proper name *Hector* rather than adjectives based on that name. The ratio is approximately 2:1. For a similar idea with *lustravit corpore*, compare Ovid *Ibis* 333-334 "Vel qui, quae fuerat tutatus moenia saepe, / Corpore lustravit non diuturna suo."

360 suscipit: There is no reason to read *suspicit* with Heinsius. The verse as it stands makes perfect sense in either of two possible ways. Heyne states, "*suscipit* uel pro suscepit, quorum parens fuit Roma, uel pro tenet, habet."¹¹⁸

380 quae tamen ut uanis: We are aiming to preserve the original sentence structure as much as possible with our conjecture while at the same time looking for any words which are recognizable from other authors. *uanis uentis* is a proverbial expression seen at Catullus 64.111. While Melanchthon's offering is the most pleasant to translate, it does not address the question of the *ut* which, unfortunately, appears to have been a fixture in the original. Follow Bembo but with some hesitation.

407 pinus: Courtney has found new evidence to support *pinus*. He reports, "This is usually emended to *tinus* for two reasons: (1) a pine is too large for the gnat's grave-enclosure; not very convincing, especially when one looks at some of the other things planted by the shepherd. (2) *semper florida* does not suit it." He now advises as follows:

¹¹⁸ Heyne (1793) 68-69.

“See however Paul. Nol. carm, 21.298 *pinus enim semper florente cacumine perstans*.”¹¹⁹

We can now lay the issue of *pinus* to rest along with the *culex*.

¹¹⁹ Edward Courtney, “Five Notes on the *Appendix Vergiliana*,” *Arctos* 22 (1988) 41.

Conclusion

This thesis began with a history of the text of the *Culex* and the scholars who chose this poem among so many others as the arena in which to display their considerable talents. Research on that section, while time-consuming and not instantly rewarding, later proved to have been a good investment as it revealed not only possible solutions for textual problems but also revealed much about the development of textual criticism.

The catalogue of manuscripts was an opportunity to build on the discoveries of the past and the number of manuscripts will yet reach one hundred. This is an area where there is ample room for exploration. Libraries have not yielded up their last *Culex* manuscripts and fragments will, no doubt, continue to be found in the middle of the most unlikely texts.

Along with the manuscripts, one must not forget the incunabula. Professor Grant's article on Pietro Bembo quotes from incunabula in the Rylands Library which take our text in new directions through their variant readings. Perhaps these books will help us to determine the parentage of late *Culex* manuscripts which were not discussed in this study or whose descent remains uncertain.

More work needs to be done to correct improperly assigned conjectures. This is an extremely labour-intensive process which requires the effort of more than one scholar. With the promised assistance of a professor at Leiden's Rijksuniversiteit, I shall continue to trace the contribution of Nicolaas Heinsius to *Culex* scholarship through the elusive seventeenth-century scholar's manuscripts and correspondence.

The apparatus criticus was intended as a retrospective of *Culex* editions with a particular emphasis on rare works and, for that reason, only covered the most important

articles from scholarly journals. I have created a database which matches all accessible *Culex* scholarship to the individual lines of the poem. When time permits, I shall incorporate this into the apparatus criticus and present a comprehensive bibliography.

Technology will play a large role in the study of this text and many others. The learning process involved with the Adain and Classical Text Editor programs is well worth the effort. The *Culex* will be preserved in digitization projects, online manuscript catalogues, electronic text archives and web pages devoted to Virgil. Scholars of the current generation will be judged not only on our skills as palaeographers and textual critics but also by our ability to share what we have learned with our colleagues throughout the world and by our success in promoting interest in the subject matter among current and prospective students. This will be our contribution to the classical tradition.

parvus sed similis regibus es Culex.

quod te non genuit Vergilius Maro,

nequaquam tamen est dedecori tibi,

nam gaudens coluit docta puella te.

Bibliography

- Allen, J. H. and James Greenough. *Allen and Greenough's Latin Grammar*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1903.
- Alton, E. H. "Notes on the *Culex*." *Hermathena* 42 (1920): 68-87.
- Amar, J. A. *Publii Virgilii Maronis opera quae exstant omnia*. Parisiis [Paris]: apud Lefevre bibliopolam, 1838.
- Antolín, Guillermo. *Catálogo de los códices latinos de la Real Biblioteca del Escorial*. 5 vols. Madrid: Imprenta Helénica, 1910-1923.
- Baehrens, Emil. *Poetae latini minores*. Volumen II. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1880.
- Bailey, Mark Edward. "The Pseudo-Virgilian *Culex*: Translation and Commentary." Diss. University of Colorado, 1995.
- Bandinius, Angelus Maria. *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*. Tomus II. Florentiae [Florence], 1775.
- Barrett, Anthony. "The Poetry of the *Culex*." Diss. University of Toronto, 1968.
- Barth, Kaspar von. *Aduersariorum*. Francofurti [Frankfurt]: typis Wecheliani apud D. et D. Aubrios et C. Schleichium, 1624.
- Bayer, Karl. *Vergil-Viten*. Zurich: Artemis und Winkler Verlag, 1995.
- Bembo, Pietro. *Petri Bembi ad Herculem Strotium de Virgilii Culice et Terentii fabulis liber*. Venetiis [Venice]: per Ioan. Ant. eiusque fratres de Sabio, 1530.
- Benoist, E. *Oeuvres de Virgile*. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1882.
- Bibliotheca Academiae Lugduno-Batauae catalogus*. Deel XIV. *Inventaris van de Handschriften, Eerste Afdeeling*. Leiden: Universiteits-Bibliotheek, 1932.
- Bibliotheca Rossiana*. Vatican City, n.d.
- Bibliothèque Nationale: Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*. Tome V. *Numéros 3278 à 3535*. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1966.
- Bickel, Ernst. "Syllabus indiciorum quibus Pseudouergiliana et Pseudoouidiana carmina definiantur." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 39 (1950): 289-324.
- Bignami-Odier, Jeanne. "Guide au département des manuscrits de la bibliothèque du Vatican." *École française de Rome: Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 51 (1934): 205-239.

- Birt, Theodor. "Vergilius scripseritne Culicem denuo quaeritur." *Studi Virgiliani* 9 (1930): 31-69.
- Bischoff, Bernhard. "Frühkarolingische Handschriften und ihre Heimat." *Scriptorium* 22 (1968): 306-314.
- Black, Robert. "Boccaccio, Reader of the *Appendix Vergiliana*: The Miscellanea Laurenziana and Fourteenth-Century Schoolbooks." *Gli Zibaldoni di Boccaccio Memoria, scrittura, riscrittura: Atti del Seminario internazionale di Firenze-Certaldo (26-28 aprile 1996)*. Ed. Michelangelo Picone and Claude Cazalé Bérard. Florence: Franco Cesati Editore, 1998. 113-128.
- Bolisani, Ettore. "Il *Culex* dell'*Appendix Vergiliana* e il Virgilio maggiore." *Atti Dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 116 (1958): 171-200.
- Bormans, Jean Henri. "Collation des 167 premiers vers de l'*Aetna* de Lucilius Junior." *Bulletins de l'académie royale des sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique* 21 (1854): 258-379.
- Bothe, Friedrich. *Virgilius Virgilianus*. Heidelbergae [Heidelberg]: sumtibus Augusti Oswaldi, 1821.
- Boyle, Leonard. *Medieval Latin Palaeography: A Bibliographical Introduction*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.
- Brown, Virginia. "Vitalae Vergilianae in Unpublished Virgilian Commentaries (Saec. XV and XVI)." *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honour of Wendell Clausen*. Ed. Peter Knox and Clive Foss. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. 174-198.
- Brugnoli, G. and F. Stok. "Fontes ad uitam Vergilii pertinentes." *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. Vol. 5**. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1991. 427-540.
- Buecheler, Franz. "Coniectanea." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 45 (1890): 323-334.
- Burman, Pieter and Pieter Burman Jr. *P. Virgilii Maronis opera cum integris et emendatioribus commentariis Seruii, Philargyrii, Pierii*. Amstelaedami [Amsterdam]: sumptibus Iacobi Wetstenii, 1746.
- Burton, Rosemary. *Classical Poets in the Florilegium Gallicum*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1983.
- Cambier, Guy. "Bulletin codicologique." *Scriptorium* 20 (1966): 181-182.
- Carley, J. P. "Two Pre-Conquest Manuscripts from Glastonbury Abbey." *Anglo-Saxon England* 16 (1987): 197-212.

Caron. *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de la ville d'Arras*. Arras: A. Courtin, 1860.

Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements. [Quarto Series] 7 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale; Imprimerie Nationale, 1849-1885.

Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae regiae. 4 vols. Parisiis [Paris]: ex typographica regia, 1739-1744.

Ceruti, Antonio. *Inventario Ceruti dei manoscritti della Biblioteca Ambrosiana*. Vol. II. Trezzano: Editrice Etimar, 1975.

Christophori Landini Florentini in P. Vergilii interpretationes. Florentiae [Florence]: perhaps Bernardus Nerlius, 1487.

Clausen, Wendell. "The Textual Tradition of the *Culex*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68 (1964): 119-138.

Clausen, Wendell et al. *Appendix Vergiliana*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

Comparetti, Domenico. *Vergil in the Middle Ages*. Trans. E. F. M. Benecke. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Courcelle, Pierre. "La tradition antique dans les miniatures inédites d'un Virgile de Naples." *École française de Rome: Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 56 (1939): 249-279.

Courtney, Edward. "The Textual Transmission of the *Appendix Vergiliana*." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 15 (1968): 133-141.

----- Rev. of *Beiträge zur Datierung des Culex*, by Dieter Güntzschel. *Gnomon* 46 (1974): 810-812.

----- "Five Notes on the *Appendix Vergiliana*." *Arctos* 22 (1988): 41-42.

Coxe, Henry. *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Bodleianae*. Pars Tertia. *Codices graecos et latinos Canonicianos complectens*. Oxonii [Oxford]: e typographeo academico, 1854.

Cranz, Ferdinand Edward. *A Microfilm Corpus of the Indexes to Printed Catalogues of Latin Manuscripts Before 1600 A.D.* New London, Connecticut: n.p., 1982.

----- *A Microfilm Corpus of Unpublished Inventories of Latin Manuscripts Through 1600 A.D.* Vol I. *Catalogue of the Microfilm Corpus*. New London, Connecticut: n.p., 1988.

Curcio, Gaetano. *P. Vergili Maronis: Culex-Ciris*. Turin: G. B. Paravia, 1928.

Davies, Martin and John Goldfinch. *Vergil: A Census of Printed Editions*. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1992.

Delisle, Léopold. *Inventaire des manuscrits latins de Notre-Dame et d'autres fonds conservés à la bibliothèque nationale sous les numéros 16719-18613*. Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Latin (N^{os} 8001 à 18613. Paris: Auguste Durant et Pedone-Lauriel, 1871.

Distler, Paul. *Vergil and Vergiliana*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1966.

Diuersorum ueterum poetarum in Priapum lusus. Venetiis [Venice]: in aedibus Aldi et Andreae soceri, 1517.

Diuersorum ueterum poetarum in Priapum lusus. Venetiis [Venice]: in aedibus haeredum Aldi, 1534.

Dubner, Friedrich. *Publii Virgilii Maronis carmina omnia*. Parisiis [Paris]: ex typographia Firminorum Didot, 1858.

Ellis, Robinson. "A Roman MS of the *Culex*." *Journal of Philology* 16 (1888): 153-156.

----- "The Corsini MS of the *Culex*." *Classical Review* 6 (1892): 203-205.

----- "Excerpts from *Culex* in the Escorial MS." *Journal of Philology* 23 (1895): 1-4.

----- *Appendix Vergiliana*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.

Endlicher, Stephanus. *Catalogus codicum philologicorum latinorum Bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobonensis*. Vindobonae [Vienna]: apud F. Beck, 1836.

Ernout, A. and A. Meillet. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1994.

Fabricius, Georgius. *P. Vergilii Maronis opera quae quidem extant omnia . . . a Georgio Fabricio Chemnicense emendatis*. Basileae [Basel]: ex officina Henricpetrina, 1575.

Fairclough, Henry Rushton. *Virgil: Aeneid VII-XII, The Minor Poems*. London: William Heinemann, 1925.

Finch, Chauncey. "Codex Reg. lat. 1719 in the Manuscript Tradition of *Carmina duodecim sapientum*." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 94 (1963): 55-72.

Fitzgerald, Wilma. *Ocelli Nominum: Names and Shelf Marks of Famous/Familiar Manuscripts*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1992.

Forbiger, Albert. *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera*. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: I. C. Hinrichs, 1846.

- Forshall, Josiah. *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the British Museum: New Series*. Volume 1, Part 2. *Burney Manuscripts*. London: British Museum, 1840.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. "The *Culex*." *Journal of Roman Studies* 42 (1952): 1-9.
- Friese-man, Hendrik. *Collectanea Critica*. Amstelodami [Amsterdam]: apud Petrum den Hengst, 1786.
- Galletier, Edouard. *Epigrammata et Priapea*. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1920.
- Gengaro, Maria Luisa and Gemma Villa Guglielmetti. *Inventario dei codici decorati e miniati (secc. VII-XIII) della Biblioteca Ambrosiana*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1968.
- Giannetto, Nella. *Bernardo Bembo: Umanista e politico Veneziano*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1985.
- Giomini, Remo. *Appendix Vergiliana: testo, introduzione e traduzione*. Florence: "La Nuova Italia" Editrice, 1962.
- Glare, P. G. W. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Glassner, Christine. *Inventar der Handschriften des Benediktinerstiftes Melk. Teil I: Von den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 1400*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000.
- Glassner, Christine and Alois Haidinger. *Die Anfänge der Melker Bibliothek. Neue Erkenntnisse zu Handschriften und Fragmenten aus der Zeit vor 1200*. Melk: Verlag Stift Melk, 1996.
- Grant, John. "Pietro Bembo as a Critic of Classical Latin Poetry: 'Variae Lectiones' and the Text of the *Culex*." *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 35 (1992): 253-303.
- Green, R. P. H. *Decimi Magni Ausonii opera*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Güntzschel, Dieter. *Beiträge zur Datierung des Culex*. Aschendorff: Aschendorffsche Buchdruckerei, 1972.
- Hamacher, Johannes. *Florilegium Gallicum: Prolegomena und Edition der Exzerpte von Petron bis Cicero, De oratore*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1975.
- Hardie, Colin. *Vitae Vergilianae antiquae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Hardwick, Charles. *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1858.
- Haupt, Moritz. *Opera P. Vergilii Maronis*. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: apud S. Hirzelium, 1873.
- . *Opuscula*. Vol. III Part 1. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967.

- Haury, Auguste. *La Ciris: Poème attribué à Virgile*. Bordeaux: Éditions Bière, 1957.
- Heinsius, Daniel. *P. Virgilii Maronis opera nunc emendatiora*. Lugduni Batauorum [Leiden]: ex officina Elzeviriana, 1636.
- Heinsius, Nicolaas. *P. Virgilius Maro accurante Nic. Heinsio Dan. Fil.* Amstelodami [Amsterdam]: ex officina Elzeviriana, 1676.
- , *P. Virgilii Maronis opera: Nic. Heins. Dan. Fil. e membranis compluribus iisque antiquissimis recensuit*. Vltraiecti [Utrecht]: apud Guil. vande Water, 1704.
- , *P. Virgilius Maro accurante Nic. Heinsio Dan. Fil.* Amstelodami [Amsterdam]: apud R. et G. Wetstenios, 1725.
- , *Nicolai Heinsii Dan. fil. aduersariorum libri IV*. Harlingae [Harlingen]: Folkert vander Plaats, 1742.
- Hermann, Hermann Julius. *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Österreich*. Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1930.
- Herrmann, Léon. "Trois poèmes de P. Valerius Cato." *Latomus* 8 (1949): 111-144.
- , *Phèdre et ses fables*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1950.
- Hertzberg, Wilhelm and Christian Osiander. *Die Gedichte des P. Virgilius Maro*. Stuttgart: Verlag der J. B. Metzler'schen Buchhandlung, 1853.
- Heyne, Christian Gottlob. *P. Virgilii Maronis opera uarietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustrata*. Tomus Quartus. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: Sumtibus Caspari Fritsch, 1775.
- , *P. Virgilii Maronis opera uarietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustratus*. Tomus Quartus. Londini [London]: T. Rickaby, 1793.
- , *P. Virgilii Maronis opera et nonnulla ejusdem opuscula*. Londini [London]: Sumtibus Rodwell et Martin, 1818.
- Heyne, Christian Gottlob and Karl Julius Sillig. *P. Virgilii Maronis opera uarietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustratus*. Volumen Quartum. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: Sumtibus Librariae Hahnianae, 1832.
- Housman, A. E. "Remarks on the *Culex*." *Classical Review* 16 (1902): 339-346.
- , *Marcus Manilius: Astronomicon*. Volume I. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1972.
- Hunt, Richard William. *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*. Vol. I. *Historical Introduction and Conspectus of Shelf-marks*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

Hunt, Richard William et al. *The Survival of Ancient Literature: Catalogue of an Exhibition of Greek and Latin Classical Manuscripts Displayed on the Occasion of the Triennial Meeting of the Hellenic and Roman Societies 28 July-2 August 1975*. Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1975.

Index of Manuscripts in the British Library. Volume II. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1984.

Inuent. Mss. Reg. Vatican City, n.d.

Inuentarii codicum manuscriptorum latinorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae Ottoboniana. Pars I. Vatican City, n.d.

Inuentarium librorum latinorum Mss. Bib. Vat. 13 vols. in 14. Vatican City, most volumes without date of publication.

Iulii Pomponii Sabini in omnia quae quidem extant, P. Vergilii Maronis opera commentarii nunc primum in lucem editi. Basileae [Basel]: J. Oporin, 1544.

Jahn, Johannes. *P. Virgilii Maronis opera omnia*. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: sumptibus et typis B. G. Teubneri, 1850.

Jeudy, Colette and Yves-François Riou. *Les manuscrits classiques latins des bibliothèques publiques de France*. Tome I. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989.

Kallendorf, Craig. *A Bibliography of Venetian Editions of Virgil, 1470-1599*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1991.

Kennedy, Duncan F. "A Commentary on *Culex* 1-156." Diss. Cambridge University, 1980.

Kenney, Edward John. "The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid's *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*." *Classical Quarterly* 12 (1962): 1-31.

Kentenich, Gottfried. *Die philologischen Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek zu Trier*. Trier: Selbstverlag der Stadtbibliothek, 1931.

Kershaw, Allan. "*Culex* 373 and Heinsius." *Classical Quarterly* 86 (1992): 566-567.

Krag, J. *Spicilegium observationum in Culicem*. Othinae [Odense]: ex officina Seuerini Hempel, 1825.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Iter Italicum. Accedunt alia itinera. A Finding List of Uncatalogued Humanistic Manuscripts of the Renaissance in Italian and other Libraries*. 6 vols. to date. London: The Warburg Institute; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963-.

- La Penna, Antonio. *Ibis*. Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1957.
- Lapidge, Michael. "Three Latin Poems from Æthelwold's School at Winchester." *Anglo-Saxon England* 1 (1972): 85-137.
- Lattès, S. "Recherches sur la bibliothèque d'Angelo Colocci." *École française de Rome: Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 48 (1931): 308-344.
- Lenchantin de Gubernatis, M. "Questioni sulla tradizione manoscritta del poemetto *Ciris*." *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 8 (1930): 259-264.
- Leo, Friedrich. *Culex carmen Vergilio ascriptum*. Berolini [Berlin]: apud Weidmannos, 1891.
- Lord, Mary Louise. "Boccaccio's Virgiliana in the *Miscellanea Latina*." *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 34 (1991): 127-197.
- Lowe, Elias Avery. *Codices latini antiquiores*. Part V. France: Paris. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.
- Lunelli, Aldo. "Il commento virgiliano di Pomponio Leto." *Atti del convegno virgiliano di Brindisi nel bimillenario della morte*. Perugia: Istituto di Filologia Latina, 1983. 309-322.
- Madan, Falconer et al. *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*. 7 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895-1953.
- Maehly, J. "Appendix Vergiliana recensuit et prolegomenis instruxit O. Ribbeck." *Heidelberger Jahrbücher der Literatur* 49 (1870): 769-839.
- Mambelli, Giuliano. *Gli annali delle edizioni Virgiliane*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1954.
- Marinis, Tammara de. *La legatura artistica in Italia nei secoli XV e XVI*. Vol. II. Florence: Fratelli Alinari, Istituto di Edizione Artistiche, 1960.
- Masuicius, Pancratius. *P. Virgilii Maronis opera cum integris commentariis Seruii, Philargyrii, Pierii. Accedunt Scaligeri et Lindenbrogii notae ad Culicem, Cirin et Catalecta*. Leouardiae [Leeuwarden]: Franciscus Halma, 1717.
- Matthews Sanford, Eva. "The Use of Classical Authors in the *Libri Manuales*." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 55 (1924): 190-248.
- Meyer, Heinrich. *Anthologia ueterum poetarum latinorum epigrammatum et poematum*. 2 vols. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: apud Gerhardum Fleischerum, 1835.
- Meyier, K. A. de. *Codices Vossiani latini*. Pars I. *Codices in folio*. Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1973.

- , *Codices Vossiani latini. Pars III. Codices in octauo*. Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1977.
- Meyncke, Gustav. "Die Pariser Tibull-Excerpte." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 25 (1870): 369-392, 452-453.
- Miniatures of the Renaissance*. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1950.
- Molhuysen, P. C. *Codices bibliothecae publicae latini*. Lugduni Batauorum [Leiden]: E. J. Brill, 1912.
- Morel, Willy. *Poetae latini minores. Volumen I*. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1930.
- Most, Glenn. "The 'Virgilian' *Culex*." *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*. Ed. Michael Whitby et al. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1987. 199-209.
- Munk Olsen, Birger. "Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIII^e siècle." *Revue d'histoire des textes* 9 (1979): 47-121.
- , "Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIII^e siècle." *Revue d'histoire des textes* 10 (1980): 115-164.
- , *L'étude des auteurs classiques au XI^e et XII^e siècles*. 4 vols. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1982-1989.
- Naeke, August. *Carmina Valerii Catonis*. Bonnae [Bonn]: apud H. B. Koenig, 1847.
- Nares, Robert et al. *A Catalogue of Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum*. 4 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1973.
- Nodell, Jan. *Flauii Auiani Fabulae*. Amstelodami [Amsterdam]: apud Petrum den Hengst, 1787.
- Nogara, Bartholomeus. *Codices Vaticani latini. Tomus III. Codd. 1461-2059*. Romae [Rome]: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1912.
- Nolhac, Pierre de. *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini*. Paris: F. Vieweg, 1887.
- Opera Vergiliana docte et familiariter exposita*. apud Parrhisios [Paris]: Iodocus Badius [Josse Bade] Ascensius for Jean Petit, 1507.
- Opera Vergiliana docte et familiariter exposita*. Parrhysiorum Lutecia [Paris]: Iodocus Badius [Josse Bade] Ascensius for Jean Petit, 1512.
- Opera Virgiliana cum decem commentis, docte et familiariter exposita*. Lugduni [Lyon]: in typographaria officina Ioannis Crespini [Jean Crespin], 1529.

- Oudin, François. "Dissertation critique sur le *Culex* de Virgile." *Continuation des Memoires de Littérature de M. de Salengre* 7 (1729): 295-312.
- P. Vergilii Maronis opera cum Seruii Mauri Honorati Grammatici, Aelii Donati Christophori Landini atque Domitii Calderini commentariis*. Nurembergae [Nuremberg]: Anton Koberger, 1492.
- P. Vergilius M. cum commentariis quinque uidelicet Seruii, Landini, Ant. Mancinelli Donati, Domitii*. Venetiis [Venice]: Bartholomaeus de Zanis de Portesio, 1493.
- P. Virgilii Maronis opera ad optimorum librorum fidem accurate edita*. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: Sumtibus et typis Caroli Tauchnitii, 1829.
- P. Virgilii Maronis opera omnia ex editione Heyniana*. Londini [London]: A. J. Valpy, 1819.
- P. Virgilii Maronis Partheniae Mantuani Bucolicon liber*. Parmae [Parma]: Andreas Portilia, 1479.
- Paldamus, Hermann. *P. Vergilii Maronis opera*. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: ex officina Bernhardi Tauchnitz, 1854.
- Pellegrin, Élisabeth. "Manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor et d'anciens collèges de Paris à la Bibliothèque Municipale de Berne, à la Bibliothèque Vaticane et à Paris." *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 103 (1942): 69-98.
- Pellegrin, Élisabeth et al. *Les manuscrits classiques de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*. 4 vols. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1975-1991.
- Petrucchi, Armando. *Catalogo sommario dei manoscritti del fondo Rossi: Sezione Corsiniana*. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1977.
- Phillipps, Thomas. *Codices manuscripti in bibliotheca Sancti Vedasti apud Atrebatiam*. Paris: Imprimerie Pihan Delaforest, 1828.
- Pithou, Pierre. *Epigrammata et poemata uetera*. Lugduni [Lyon]: apud Iacobum Chouët, 1596.
- Plésent, Charles. "Note sur un manuscrit peu connu du *Culex*." *Revue des études anciennes* 11 (1909): 233-236.
- , *Le Culex: poème pseudo-Virgilien*. Paris: Thorin, 1910.
- Poma, Tarcisio. *La Zanzara*. Lugano: Cenobio, 1957.
- Préaux, Jean. "Du *Culex* de Virgile à son pastiche par Thierry de Saint-Trond." *Présence de Virgile: Actes du colloque des 9, 11 et 12 décembre*. Ed. R. Chevallier. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1978. 195-208.

Pub. Vergilii Maronis opera D. Philippi Melanchthonis. Tiguri [Zurich]: probably Christopher Froschauer, 1570.

Publii Virgilii Maronis opera cum quinque uulgatis commentariis. Argenten. [Strasbourg] : Iohannis Grüninger, 1502.

Publii Virgilii Maronis opera cum Seruii Honorati commentariis et uita. Venetiis [Venice]: per Iacobum Rubeum Gallicum, 1475.

Publii Virgilii Maronis uatis eminentissimi uolumina haec una cum Seruii Honorati grammatici commentariis ac eiusdem poetae uita. Venetiis [Venice]: Antonio di Bartolommeo Miscomini, 1476.

Quicherat, L. *Thesaurus poeticus linguae latinae.* Paris: Hachette, 1850.

Rat, Maurice. *Virgile: La fille d'auberge, suivi des autres poèmes attribués à Virgile.* Paris: Librairie Garnier Frères, 1935.

Reeve, Michael. "The Textual Tradition of *Aetna*, *Ciris* and *Catalepton*." *Maia* 27 (1975): 231-247.

----- "The Textual Tradition of the *Appendix Vergiliana*." *Maia* 28 (1976): 233-251.

----- "The Textual Tradition of Calpurnius and Nemesianus." *Classical Quarterly* 28 (1978): 223-238.

Renouard, Philippe. *Bibliographie des impressions et des oeuvres de Josse Badius Ascensius imprimeur et humaniste.* 3 vols. New York: Burt Franklin, 1967.

Ribbeck, Otto. *P. Vergili Maronis opera.* Vol. IV. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1868.

Ricci, Seymour de. *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada.* New York: H. W. Wilson, 1937.

Robathan, Dorothy. "The Missing Folios of the Paris Florilegium 15155." *Classical Philology* 33 (1938): 188-197.

Rose, Kenneth. "Problems of Chronology in Lucan's Career." *Classical Philology* 97 (1966): 379-396.

Rouse, R. H. "Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Orléans." *Viator* 10 (1979): 131-160.

Ruaeus, Carolus. *P. V. M. opera interpretatione et notis illustravit C. Ruaeus . . . ad usum serenissimi Delphini.* Paris, 1675.

Rubio Fernandez, Lisardo. *Catálogo de los manuscritos clásicos latinos existentes en España.* Madrid: Editorial de la Universidad Complutense, 1984.

Salvatore, Armando. *Appendix Vergiliana: Ciris-Culex*. Turin: G. B. Paravia & Co., 1957.

-----, *Appendix Vergiliana: Testo, traduzione e note critiche*. Vol. II. Naples: Liberia Scientifica Editrice, 1964.

Salvatore, Armando et al. *Appendix Vergiliana*. Romae [Rome]: Typis Officinae Polygraphicae, 1997.

Samaran, Charles and Robert Marichal. *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste*. Tome III. *Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Latin (N^{os} 8001 à 18613)*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1974.

Sandys, John Edwin. *A History of Classical Scholarship*. 3 vols. Mansfield Centre, Connecticut: Maurizio Martino, 1997.

Sargent, Lucius. *The Culex of Virgil with a Translation into English Verse*. Boston: Emerald Press, 1807.

Scaliger, Joseph Justus. *Publii Vergilii Maronis appendix cum supplemento multorum antehac nunquam excusorum poematum ueterum poetarum*. Lugduni [Lyon]: apud Guliel. Rouillium, 1573.

-----, *P. Virgilii Maronis appendix cum Iosephi Scaligeri commentariis et castigationes*. Antuerpiae [Antwerp]: ex officina Christophori Plantini, architypographi regii, 1575.

Schenkl, Karl. "Kritische Bemerkungen zu den sogenannten Carmina minora des Vergilius." *Zeitschrift für die Österreichischen Gymnasien* 18 (1867): 771-800.

Schmidt, Magdalena. *Vergil: Die Mücke*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1959.

Schrader, Johannes. *Liber emendationum*. Leouardiae [Leeuwarden]: Chalmot, 1776.

Senguerd, W. et al. *Catalogus librorum tam impressorum quam manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Vniuersitatis Lugduno-Batauae*. Lugduni apud Batauos [Leiden]: Sumptibus Petri Vander Aa, 1716.

Sottili, Agostino. "I codici del Petrarca nella Germania occidentale." *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 15 (1972): 361-423.

Staufer, Vinzenz. *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum qui in bibliotheca Mellicensis seruantur*. Vienna, 1889.

Stornajolo, Cosimus. *Codices Vrbinales latini*. Tomus I. *Codices 1-500*. Romae [Rome]: Typis Vaticanis, 1902.

Tabulae codicum manuscriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum. Volumen II. Vindobonae [Vienna]: Caroli Geroldi Filius, 1868.

Taubmann, Friedrich. *P. Virgilio Maronis opera omnia Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis, Ciris et Culex cum commentario.* [Wittenberg]: apud Zachariam Schurerum, 1618.

Thilo, Georg. *P. Vergili Maronis carmina.* Lipsiae [Leipzig]: ex officina Bernhardi Tauchnitz, 1886.

Thomas, E. "Étude sur quelques manuscrits de Servius et de Virgile de Suisse, d'Allemagne et de Hollande." *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires* 8 (1881): 161-183.

Thurn, Hans. *Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Würzburg. Fünfter Band. Bestand bis zur Säkularisierung Erwerbungen und Zugänge bis 1803.* Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 1994.

Ullman, B. L. "Tibullus in the Mediaeval Florilegia." *Classical Philology* 23 (1928): 128-174.

-----, "Classical Authors in Certain Mediaeval Florilegia." *Classical Philology* 27 (1932): 1-42.

Unterkircher, Franz. *Inventar der illuminierten Handschriften, Inkunabeln und Frühdrucke der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Teil 1. Die abendländischen Handschriften.* Vienna: Georg Praeger Verlag, 1957.

Upson, Hollis Ritchie. "Medieval Lives of Virgil." *Classical Philology* 38 (1943): 103-111.

Valori, Henri de. *Le Moucheron: poème de Virgile traduit en vers français.* Paris: Michaud, 1817.

Vassalini, Caterina. *La Zanzara.* Florence: Edizioni Fussi, 1951.

Vergiliana opuscula familiariter exposita. Parisiis [Paris]: Thielmann Kerver, Jean Petit and Jean de Coblencz, 1501.

Vergilius. Venetiis [Venice]: in aedibus Aldi, 1505.

Vergilius cum commentariis. Venetiis [Venice]: Aug. de Zanis de Portesio, 1519.

Vernet, André. *La bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Clairvaux.* Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1979.

Villa, Claudia. *La "Lectura Terentii".* Vol. I. Padua: Antenore, 1984.

Virgilii opera. Romae [Rome]: per Conr. Sweynheym et Arnold. Pannartz in domo Petri et Francisci de Maximis, 1469.

Virgilii opera. Romae [Rome]: per Conr. Sweynheym et Arnold. Pannartz in domo Petri et Francisci de Maximis, 1471.

Virgilii opera. probably Venice: B. H. perhaps initials of the printer, 1472.

Virgilii opera. Romae [Rome]: Vdalricus Gallus [Ulrich Han] and Simon Nicolai Chardella de Lucca, 1473.

Vollmer, Friedrich. "P. Virgilii Maronis Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus." *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und der historischen Klasse der K. B. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München* (1908): 3-82.

----- . *Poetae latini minores*. Volumen I. Lipsiae [Leipzig]: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1910.

Wagenvoort, Hendrik. "Ad Vergilii *Culicis*." *Mnemosyne* 9 (1956): 29.

Wakefield, Gilbert. *P. Virgilii Maronis opera emendabat et notulis illustrabat Gilbertus Wakefield*. Londini [London]: Impensis Kearsley, 1796.

Walker, William Sidney. *Corpus poetarum latinorum*. London: George Bell and Sons, 1881.

Watson, Andrew. *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 700-1600 in the Department of Manuscripts: The British Library*. London: The British Library, 1979.

Weber, Wilhelm Ernst. *Corpus poetarum latinorum*. Francofurti ad Moenum [Frankfurt]: sumptibus et typis Henrici Ludouici Broenneri, 1833.

Williams, R. D. and T. S. Pattie. *Virgil: His Poetry Through the Ages*. London: The British Library, 1982.

Willis, James. *Latin Textual Criticism*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972.

Wright, Cyril. *Fontes Harleiani*. London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1972.

Zabughin, Vladmiro. *Vergilio nel Rinascimento italiano da Dante a Torquato Tasso*. Volume Secondo. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1923.