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ABSTRACT

Although editions of Nemesianus have been surprisingly numerous, very few of them have contributed appreciably to our understanding of this author, and most texts have been based on a very limited number of manuscripts. There has been no commentary of any length since that of Burman (1731) and there has never been one in English covering the whole corpus. The present thesis is an attempt to remedy these deficiencies. There is a text of the Eclogues and Cynegetica which is the first to have been based on an examination of all the known manuscripts, and a detailed and accurate apparatus criticus is provided. Readings of interest for which there is no room in the main body of the apparatus criticus have been included in an appendix. The textual history of both the Eclogues and the Cynegetica is thoroughly discussed. The question of the authenticity of the Eclogues is examined and Nemesianus's authorship is held to be proved. There is a commentary, mainly concerned with textual and grammatical matters, on both the Eclogues and the Cynegetica. A complete list of editions of Nemesianus to date is provided, as well as a bibliography. There is also an excursus on the scansion of final -o in Latin poetry and an Index Verborum.
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TLL Thesaurus Linguae Latinae
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Abbreviated references to periodicals usually follow the system of L'Année philologique. The editions of Nemesianus by Barth (1613), Ulitius (1645), Johnson (1699), Maittaire (1713), Burman (1731), Wernsdorf (1780), Beck (1803), Adelung (1804), Lemaire (1824), Stern (1832), Haupt (1856), Gläsner (1842), Baehrens (1881), H. Schenkl (1885), Keene (1887), Postgate (1905), Martin (1917), Giarratano (1924), Raynaud (1931), Duff (1934), Van de Woestijne (1937), Dunlop (1969), Volpilhac (1975) and Korzeniewski (1976) are cited by the authors' names. E. Löfstedt's Syntactica (Lund 1942) is referred to as Löfstedt. L. Castagna, I Bucolici Latini Minori. Una Ricerca di Critica Testuale, Florence 1976, is referred to as Castagna. Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache, Leipzig 1902, is cited as Neue. The etymological dictionary of Walde-Hofmann (third edition) is indicated by the authors' names. In the commentary, plain sets of figures (e.g. 2.14) refer to the Eclogues of Nemesianus.
THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ELOGUES

Since the early sixteenth century, as a glance at the list of editions will show, the vast majority of editors have taken the view that the eleven Elogues assigned to Calpurnius in all the V manuscripts are really the work of two different poets, and that the last four poems are in fact by Nemesianus. In their editions Wernsdorf (1780), Leméire (1824, virtually a copy of Wernsdorf) and Raynaud (1931) attempted to demonstrate Calpurnius's authorship of all eleven, but Haupt (Orpnsula 1.p.364ff), summarised by Keene in his edition (pp. 14-22), found no difficulty in refuting Wernsdorf's rather weak arguments. More recently, however, A.E. Radke (Hermes 100 (1972), 615-23) has seen fit to re-open the debate by attacking Haupt, and it is therefore necessary to examine her arguments point by point.

The attribution of all eleven Elogues to Calpurnius can be traced back as far as the twelfth century, to the Florilegium Gallicum, which includes excerpts from the eleventh eclogue, now generally attributed to Nemesianus, under the title Scalpurnius (or Calpurnius ) in bocolicis. The Elogues as a whole appear attributed to Calpurnius by the scribes of all the V manuscripts (although in several later hands have added the name Nemesianus), and by a number of early editors. On the other hand we have evidence (also dating from the twelfth century), that Elogues written by an Aurelianus existed apart from the Elogues of Calpurnius: two catalogues of the library of the monastery at Früfenig date to the twelfth century¹ include the items "Bucolica Aureliani" (no.

¹Gustav Becker (Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui, Bonn 1885), dates the catalogue to 1158 but on p215 tells us that the date 1165 is found in it.
and "IIIparia bocolica Calpurnii" (no. 173)

(see Hauz p. 373 and Castagna pp. 249-51). Again, we find in 3 before poem 3 the title Aureliani nemesiani cartasiniensis eclogae (sic) and in H Aurelii nemesiani cartasiniensis poetae illustri/ carmen bococum, while the Varma edition c. 1490 has a similar title. In Riccardianus 636, Angelius has added Aurelii nemesiani Cartas bucol Exculcit.

Thus we can trace the attribution of all eleven poems to Calpurnius back to the twelfth century, but we also seem to have evidence of the existence of eclogues by Nemesianus at this time. Also, although the vast majority of manuscripts attribute all eleven poems to Calpurnius, we have the evidence of the less-interpolated branch of the tradition that Nemesianus was responsible for the last four.

Baecke argues that if we were dealing with two poets, one from the first century and one from the third, we should expect to find scribal errors characteristic of the different scripts she alleges must have been involved, but that in fact we find the same errors throughout the corpus, suggesting a unitary tradition dating back to the first century. The examples of corruptions which she cites, however, are all either commonplace, or psychological errors, or similar to corruptions found in other manuscripts where the old Roman cursive script is not involved. As far as script is concerned, there is no evidence either way, since we cannot now know which scripts or how many were involved in the transmission of the text,

2Either the compiler of the catalogue is confusing the four Eclogues of Nemesianus with the seven of Calpurnius, or else we have a reference to a manuscript which contained only four eclogues of Calpurnius. There are two such still extant, Parisinus lat. 8049 which Reeve tells us (CC 28 (1978), 228) never left France, and Vaticanus lat. 5245. It is possible that a relative of one of these manuscripts is here referred to.
and the fact that the poems appear in some manuscripts together with Virgil's Eclogues makes it perfectly possible that we are dealing with two sets of poems originally put together for a similar reason, i.e. they are all examples of the same genre.

According to Radke, there is no evidence within the poems themselves for separation. She does not, however, comment on the fact that there is glorification of the Emperor in poems 1, 4 and 7, but none in the last four poems; that the parenthetical use of memini and fateor which is found in the first seven poems (memini - 3.11 and 4.105; fateor - 2.61; 3.28; 4.70; 6.30) is not found in the others; that etenim, which is rare in the poets generally - occurring not at all in Lucan, only once each in Virgil, Propertius and Tibullus, three times in Silius Italicus, four in Ovid, five in Valerius Flaccus and six times in Horace, occurs twice in the first seven poems, but not at all in the last four or in the Cynegitica, and, a significant point, that Statius is imitated in the last four Eclogues and in the Cynegitica (e.g. Rem. 1.84-5 imitates Theb. 12.512f and 818; 2.18, Theb. 1.452; Cyn. 18f, Theb. 7.167 etc.), but not at all in the first seven, since, as Haupt shows, Wernsdorf is wrong to compare 4.87 with Silvae 5.1.11f.

Radke also ignores the fact that some late or rare expressions and constructions appear in the last four poems (e.g. 1.28 super haec; de uoce 2.11; fluorem / laeis 3.68-9; hederatus 4.63 uamoros), which do not appear in the others. She fails, too, to comment on Haupt's conclusion that there are at the most eleven cases of elision in the first seven poems, but thirty-nine in the last four poems. All these points are worthy of consideration but Radke passes over them in silence.

Radke takes Haupt to task (p.619) for his allegedly incorrect statistics concerning the incidence of fourth foot trochaic caesura in the poems, and also for the importance which he attaches to
these statistics. Haupt puts the number in the first seven poems at over 70 and that in the last four at 6, while Radke claims that these figures should be 57 and 7. Since, however, neither Haupt nor Radke gives any indication as to how these figures are arrived at, it is impossible to account for the discrepancies with any degree of certainty. My own conclusion is that there are 72 cases of fourth foot trochaic caesura in the first seven poems, plus 4 cases of elision of short vowel at 4 s, an average of one every 9.1 lines, and in the last four poems there are 8 cases, an average of one every 39.8 lines. The proportions for the individual poems vary considerably, from one every 7.7 lines to one every 14 lines in the first seven poems, and from one every 22.5 lines to one every 87 lines in the last four, but the difference between the two sets of poems is still very substantial.

Radke wholly ignores the evidence for separate authorship which recent metrical studies of the poems have yielded. G.E. Duckworth (TAPA 98 (1967), 79-88) has analysed in detail the metrical patterns of the poems and gives on pages 81 and 84 tables of their incidence. He shows that there are a number of metrical patterns which appear several times in one group of poems and not at all in the other and comments that "Nemesianus is metrically very different from Calpurnius." His figures for the comparative frequencies of fourth foot homodyne, and repeated, opposite, and reverse patterns also show considerable differences between the two sets of poems, and he comments (p.86), "The differences between Nemesianus and Calpurnius are again very striking e.g. % of fourth foot homodyne : Nem. 41.07, Cal. 61.08; repeats Nem. 15.2, Cal. 41.33, difference from fourth foot homodyne Nem. + 16.07, Cal. - 19.75; change in repeats plus near repeats, difference from fourth foot homodyne - Nem. + 0.16, Cal. - 23.30, opposites every 29.0 lines for Nem., Cal. 23.0; reverses one every 24.4 lines in Nem., 44.6 in Cal.; favourite
"This difference in reverse patterns is of especial interest - Calpurnius's preference for ddad -ddad is typical of Ovid and some Silver Age poets (Columella, book 10, the Einsiedeln Eclogues, Valerius Flaccus, Statius, Thebaid and Ilium), but otherwise this particular reverse combination is almost never a favourite, except in Virgil's Eclogues, and in the late period in Paulinus of Nola and Arator. The reverse ssds -sdss of Nemesianus is far more frequent; it is the favourite in Catullus LVI, Virgil's Georgics and Aeneid, Horace, Grattius, Germanicus Caesar, Manilius, Aetna, the other Silver Latin poets, and in the late period, a definite majority of the poets (13 out of 18)." T.Birt (Ad Historiam Hexametri Latini Symbola, Bonn 1877 p.63) goes into much less detail, but comes to similar conclusions. W.R. Hardie (JPh 30 (1907),273) also briefly analyses the metrical patterns and comes to the conclusion that Nem. is the "weakest and least classical" of the authors he has examined: he has written his Eclogues in a vein of verse which belongs rather to didactic poetry, and his didactic poem in a vein which would be more suitable for Eclogues: Calpurnius, rather more than two centuries earlier, is better inspired."

Of the 8 elisions in the first seven poems, all but one are in the first foot. (Keene, who says that all eight are in the first foot, evidently includes in the first foot elisions in the arsis of the second foot, as at 3.82, but I have included such elisions in the second foot). In the last four poems, on the other hand, there are 39 elisions, 12 in the first foot, five in the arsis of the second foot and the rest in other feet. In the first seven poems there is no elision of a long syllable, if we except the doubtful cases 4.40, 4.134 and 7.77, whereas there are two elisions of long syllables in the last four (9.14, 9.32, doubtful - 9.16) and also
hiatus (9.48). I do not attach particular importance to the fact that there is no parallel in the first seven poems for the ending montiuarius Fan (10.17), as there is no other example of such an ending in the last four poems either.

In the first seven poems, final -o is shortened only in the case of puto (6.84) and nescio (1.21), for which parallels can be found in classical authors. (See my excursus). In the last four poems, on the other hand, the example set by later poets is followed and the scansions mulcendō (8.53), ambō (9.17), expectō (9.26), horreō (9.43), laucandō (9.80), coniungō (10.14), canō (10.18), concedō (10.42), cano (11.41) are admitted, and we find five further examples of this shortening of final -o in the Cynegitica at vv. 1, 83, 86, 194 and 260.

Radke claims that poem 9 is an earlier version of poem 2 because, she supposes, Calpurnius later felt that the former poem showed a lack of good taste, but she does not explain why, in that case, poem 9 appears in the corpus after the "improved" version or, indeed, why it was not suppressed altogether. She does not appear to notice, what must surely be a significant fact, that the beginning of the second Eclogue attributed to Nemesianus imitates both the beginning of Virgil's second Eclogue and the second of Calpurnius; this fact is lost if all eleven Eclogues are to be attributed to Calpurnius.

The fact that such a large number of lines and phrases from the first seven poems reappear in the last four, Radke dismisses as of no importance, observing that Virgil often repeats himself. There is, however, a very important difference between the way in which Virgil repeats himself and the repetitions here: there is generally a very good reason for Virgil's repetitions. He may wish to remind us of another incident in a story or of another character, to make a point about the situation in hand. In the case of the last four poems, however, there is no apparent reason for the repetitions, often of
several lines and often close to other repetitions: it is either a case of simple repetition, which would be unparalleled in Classical literature—setting aside the vexed question of Catullus 68—or one of an inferior poet stealing from another.

G, H and s preface the poems of Calpurnius with an apparent dedication to Nemesianus. Hacke, without saying which manuscripts are involved or from which manuscript she is quoting, says that the title Ad Nemesianum is to be compared with cases of poems in Horace where the person mentioned in the title is to be identified with the unnamed addressee of the poem, and that Aurelii Nemesiani poetae Carthaginensis elegiae rimae, as Jernsdorf suggests, means "the poem about Nemesianus," with Heliboenus representing Nemesianus. The fact that in poem 4 as well as poem 8, Heliboenus is a patron of poetry gives some credence to this theory, but in that case, we have to explain why Heliboenus is alive in poem 4 and dead in poem 8, and why the poet represents himself as Corydon in poem 4 and as Timetas in poem 8. The practice of attempting to identify the characters in Eclogues with real people seems to me a perilous one, however, as we have no evidence that writers of Eclogues ever used bucolic names as pseudonyms for certain of their contemporaries, no information at all about the life of Calpurnius and not a great deal about that of Nemesianus which might help us to discover who are the personalities involved. Many attempts have been made to identify the characters in Virgil's Eclogues, but there is much to be said for the view of E.V. Rieu who says (The Pastoral Poems p. 124), "I do not believe that he (sc. Virgil) wished us to take either Tityrus or Heliboenus for himself. He is their creator. If he is either, he is both of them—Tityrus singing for ever under the spreading beech and Heliboenus never ceasing to lament for his once prosperous flock."

But if we do accept that real people are concealed under bucolic names in these eleven poems, we are obliged to take one name as
referring to one person only, otherwise confusion would reign. But this is quite impossible here: Tityrus is often used in Latin poetry to indicate Virgil or his Eclogues (as at Prop. 2.34.72; Ovid Am. 1.15.25, Epist. 4.16.33) or as a direct reference to Virgil's Eclogues (as at Martial 8.55.8; Sidonius Apollinaris Epist. 8.9.5 uu. 12 and 56) and the name may represent Virgil in poems 4 and 9 of our corpus, as Radke says, but it is also used simply because it is a traditional name in pastoral poetry (as at Anth. Lat. 1.2 no. 719a (Riese) attributed to Pomponius, and Severus Sanctus Endelechius, Anth. Lat. 1.2 no. 893), and it is unlikely in the extreme that the cow-herd of poem 3 or the retired and white-haired poet of poem 8 is to be identified with Virgil. Our poet, or poets, is, or are, simply using the traditional names of bucolic poetry because they are traditional and no significance is to be attached to their use. Haupt's explanation of the alleged "dedication", that it arose from confusion of the two statements, Explicit Calpurnii bucolicon and Aurelii Nemesiani Carthaginensis bucolicon incipit, is far more likely.

Radke says that it is impossible to explain the appearance of Meliboeus as patron in both poems 4 and 8 by saying that Nemesianus is simply taking over the name from Calpurnius, as the latter poet, she alleges, did not have sufficient reputation in antiquity for this allusion to be clear to the third century audience of Nemesianus. This point could be answered in a number of ways. First, there is no reason why Nemesianus's allusions should have to be clear to his audience. Again, it is not necessary to understand the use of the name Meliboeus by Nemesianus as an allusion to Calpurnius, as the names Tityrus and Meliboeus occur together in Virgil's first Eclogue (where, however, Meliboeus is not a patron). The names may simply be intended to remind us of Virgil's poem, just as uu. 72-4 remind us of Virgil Buc. 1.5 and
1.38-9, and uu. 75f remind us of Virgil Buc. 1.59f. Then again, we have no evidence that Calpurnius was not sufficiently popular at this particular period for allusions to him to be recognised. On the other hand, Calpurnius is the only poet from whom Nemesianus takes over lines and phrases in bulk with little or no alteration which he perhaps would not have done if the work of Calpurnius was well-known at that time. It is difficult to know why Calpurnius's poems should have been so treated. Radke also asserts that it would be unlikely that Nemesianus by his use of the name Meliboeus for his patron wished to allude to Calpurnius, as by doing so, he would be representing himself as one using Calpurnius as a mediator between himself and Virgil - a very unlikely assertion, because as I said above, Meliboeus is not a patron in Virgil, and also because there is a considerable number of places where the last four poems imitate Virgil directly and cannot be echoing Calpurnius, e.g. poem 11, which is strongly influenced by Virgil's eighth Eclogue. I have answered above Radke's argument that Meliboeus in poems 4 and 8 must be the same person because Tityrus in both poems 4 (61ff, 162-3) and 9 (84), she alleges, represents Virgil. I might add that if the identification of Tityrus with Virgil were general in antiquity as Radke asserts, although I can find little evidence to support this idea, it would not be strange if two different poets were to make it independently. It does seem, however, that Tityrus was not always used to indicate Virgil or his writings, and therefore no particular significance can be attached to Nemesianus's use of the name.

Thus the majority of Radke's arguments have very little weight. While Haupt's essay has been considered by most since its appearance to have settled finally the question of the authorship of the eleven poems, other work has been done in the meantime, as might be expected in the course of a hundred years, which supports his
conclusions, but Radke is so intent upon her attack on Haupt that she totally ignores the work of Birt, Hardie and Duckworth. She has also failed to comment on a number of points which Haupt made which militate against her theories. Haupt's essay, therefore, with a few minor modifications, remains the final word on the subject.
written on parchment, it measures 261 x 189 mm., and contains 16 leaves (according to Schenkl) or 116 (according to Giarratano). There are 29 lines to a page. (Verdiere in his edition of Calpurnius, Brussels, 1954, incorrectly says 36). The manuscript contains Varro's De Agricultura (ff. 1-14v); Varro la be section (ff. 43r-102r); the Eclogues of Calpurnius (ff. 10r-11r) and those of Aem. (11r-15v). The remaining leaves are blank. Schenkl dates the section containing Var. and Calpurnius to between 1560 and 1570; Rusyan and A. Cataldus Ioncellius (Catalogus bibliothecae antiquae Verecis et Classicae manuscriptae) date it to the beginning of the fifteenth century; Naehrens dates it to the mid-fifteenth century; and Castagna dates it to the end of the fourteenth century or to the beginning of the fifteenth century. Schenkl believes that A is the manuscript referred to by Petranck in a letter to Pastrnog written between 1360 and 1370 which says, "Expecto utiam Calpurnii Bucolicum carmen et tuam Veronis agriculturam." (Var. ep. xxx, p. 570, 1606, Lug. Pat. ed.).

The scribe has made some corrections himself (\$1\$) and there are also variant readings from the V tradition and corrections made by a second hand (\$2\$) of about the same period, which are difficult to distinguish from A. There is also a very small number of good corrections by a third hand (\$3\$) in very black ink. These corrections are listed by Giarratano (pp. xiv-xvii). The poems have no titles, but a short space has been left between each, and a later hand (seventeenth century according to Rusyan) has added Veresiani eclogae. At the end is written in the same hand
Aureliani Nemesiani Cartae bocci explicat. Lucratius eun. Some of the initial letters are in red an. blue. The names of the interlocutors are sometimes given in the margin. "8" is incorrectly prefaced by Coridon.

The last leaf of the codex tells us that "Joannes Antonius Ferillus patric. neap. ac iuvenis apprime litteratus Jacobum Ferillum hoc libro donauit LVII Ibis Juniis" and also, "Antoni Seripandi ex Jacobi perilli amici opt. munere." Later it was brought, together with other books belonging to Seripandus, to the library of S. Giovanni a Carbonara and is now in the Museo Nazionale, Naples, formerly the Museo Reale Sorbonico. It was first discovered and collated by J.P. L'Orville and this collation survives as Borvillianus 199 in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. It was later collated by C. Dusian for Haupt for an edition which was never published; by Baehrens (very inaccurately according to Schenkl); by Schenkl himself; and by Giarratano.

This manuscript is referred to in some early editions as Borvillianus 1 or a.

Gaddianus pl. 90, 12 inf. (Sibiroteca Laurenziana, Florence).

Written on paper, it measures 293 x 224 mm., and contains 74 written leaves. The number of lines to a page varies between 26 and 32, but there are usually 29 for the Eclogues. The manuscript was written at the beginning of the fifteenth century (A.H. Bandini, Catalorus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae, 1775, vol. 3). It contains the twelve Eclogues of Petrarch (ff. 1-44), the Culex (ff. 45-51), the Dirae (ff. 52-5), the Eclogues of Calpurnius (ff. 55-67v) and those of Rem. (ff. 68r-73v), followed (f. 74) by an anonymous, incomplete Eclogue of 55 lines which Korzeniewski (p. 8 of his edition) dates to the fifteenth century.
The Eclogues of Nem. are prefaced by the title aureliani nemaei nemaei ortae in eclese incipit. There are numerous interventions in the text, almost all of which have been made by the scribe, in the form of corrections to the text itself or notes in the margin. A few seem to have been made by a second hand. The titles and initial letters are in red.

The manuscript was given to the library in 1755 by Francesco III. It is first mentioned by Glaeser and Haupt, and first collated, somewhat inaccurately, by Beckrens. Later Schenkl made a more accurate collation, and Giarratano examined the manuscript in 1905, and in the following year collated it and checked all the places where his version differed from Schenkl's.


Written on paper, it contains 301 leaves and 25 lines to a page. C. Schenkl in his edition of Ausonius (Berlin 1884, p. xxii) dates it to the end of the fifteenth century and so does the Catalogue of the Harleian manuscripts in the British Museum, 1808, vol. 2, p. 707, but Schenkl (id 5 (1883), 207) and Sabbadini, Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci nei secoli XIV e XV 1, p. 33 n. 52, consider it to be sixteenth century and they may well be right. The contents include a Latin translation of Hesiod's works, the Eclogues of Calpurnius (ff. 25-42), and those of Nem. (ff. 42-57) (Verdier, presumably through a misprint, says 25-26), with an index rerum et aevorum of Calpurnius and Nem. (ff. 50-56), works of Petrarch, Eclogica 1-7 of Theocritus translated into Latin, a life of Theocritus by Philieticos, Virgil's Eclogues (ff. 127-144), works of Ausonius (ff. 137v-248v), Rosella (ff. 247-260) and Frobae Faltoniae Cento et Gregorii Tiferni poetae illustris oracula. There are numerous marginal notes, mainly directions to the index.
H. Mueller-Struebing looked at H for Schenkl, and his collation has evidently been much copied, as the same few errors appear in several editions. Castagna (p. 25) thinks that this manuscript originally came from Florence. I have examined this manuscript myself.

M Magliabecchianus VII. 1195 (Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Florence).

Written on paper, it has 151 leaves and 26 lines to a page. The size of the leaves varies, but they measure on average 221 x 147 mm. It was written between the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century, and f. 77r bears the date MDXIII. The manuscript was written by at least two hands, one of which is that of Alessio Lapaccini as a note on f. 84r tells us. There are a few marginal notes in the section containing Nem. (ff. 55-61), apparently by the scribe, and also some interlinear ones. The manuscript previously belonged to the Stozziana, where it had the number 789. For the full contents see Castagna pp. 20-2.

a Ambrosianus 0 74 sup. (Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan).

Written on paper in the fifteenth century, it has 183 leaves and measures 212 x 145 mm. There are 25 lines to a page for the Eclogues. ff. 61-64; 80-86; 106-111; 173-175 are blank or scribbled on. The contents include poems attributed to Virgil; Claudian's Epigrams; Crestis fabula; the Eclogues of Calpurnius (ff. 112-127) and those of Nem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 127-133v), (Nemesiani is added by a second hand); Parthenopaues of Jovianus Fontanus; and elegy by Antonius Panormita; an Epithalamium by Janus Pannonius; Carmen in Venetae urbis laudem; Le ortu atque obitu hermaphroditii. The names of the interlocutors and also
scire variants have been added in the margin by the first hand. 1.86 is incorrectly prefaced sic etiam.

This manuscript, as D'Urville's remarks at the end of his collation show (Iorv. 202 f. 24v), is the manuscript referred to by some early editors as Dorv. 3 or c. Jokenkl used A. Ceriani's collation. Giarratano made another in 1909 and re-examined the manuscript in 1909.

b Ambrosianus 1 26 sur. (Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan).

Written on paper and dated 1465 in the colophon, it measures 24 x 18 cm. There are 62 leaves, the last blank and 20 lines to a page. ff. 31 and 34 are also blank. According to a note at the beginning of the manuscript, it was bought in Venice by Antonius Ciusius, first librarian of the Ambrosian. The manuscript contains the De Raptu Proserpinae (ff. 1-30); De cantu suave et acce
cuærreœum (ff. 32-33); the mediaeval poem Philomena; the Eclogues of Calpurnius (ff. 35-53v) and those of Nem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 53v-61v). A later hand in the margin restores the Eclogues to Nem. Giarratano collated this manuscript in 1909. b is clearly the manuscript referred to by early editors as Dorv. 2 or b as the colophon is quoted by D'Urville in his collation (Iorv. 202 f. 24v).

c Vaticanus 2110 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana).

Written on parchment in the fifteenth century when Nicolas V was pope (1447-1455). There are 128 leaves with 40-43 lines to a page. The manuscript measures 284 x 216 mm. It contains a Latin translation of Aristotle's Magna morsalia (ff. 1-56); Cicero's Topica (ff. 57-65v); the observations of Boethius on the Topica (ff. 65v-67v); the Eclogues of Calpurnius (67v-77r) and those of Nem.
attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 77r-30v); a Latin translation of the de dimittate sacerdotali dialogue by Joannes Chrysostomus (ff. 31-120) and an extract from the latter's Vita (ff. 120v-129). There is a small number of variants in the margin apparently in the same hand.

d Vaticanus 352 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana).

Written on paper in the fifteenth century, it measures 2.5 x 1.7 mm. (Verdière incorrectly says 247mm.). There are 81 leaves and 3 lines to a page. ff. 3-8v; 26-30; 52r; 81v are blank. The manuscript contains the Eclogues of Calpurnius (ff. 1-15r) and those of Nemes attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 15r-16r), followed by poems by Cyprian (19-22), the De ortu et obitu sceniosis attributed to Lactantius (ff. 23-5) and some works of Ausonius (f. 31 on). There are a few corrections in the first hand.

C. Schenkl in his edition of Ausonius dates this manuscript to the fourteenth century, but Castagna (p. 50) says it is fifteenth century.

e Vaticanus Urbinas 353, (clim 832) (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana).

Written on parchment in the fifteenth century, it has 309 leaves and 29 lines to a page. It measures 385 x 240 mm. according to the catalogue and 387 x 247mm. according to some editors. Along with many other poems, it includes the verses of Publio Greg. Tiferno and the Eclogues of Calpurnius (ff. 95r-108r) and those of Nemes attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 108r-113v). (The catalogue, followed by Verdière, incorrectly says f. 113). At the end of the codex is the note, "Federicus De Veteranis Urbinas sub diuo Federico Urbinate, duce invictis, romanae ecclesiae dictat. transcripsit" and also "quo princepe deceentes utinam et ego de
which mean that the manuscript was copied not long before the death of the Duke di Chierico (1402). Masanius (ib. loc. 1970, 222) says that this is the same manuscript as no. 474 in the "Giornale Storico d. Arch. Tosc.", 7. 41.

There are a few corrections by Viteranus and one or others by a later hand. ff. 1; 4; 5v; 9v; 22v; 39v are blank. The titles are in red and the initial letters in gold and blue, and there is some illumination.

For the full contents see Bibliotheca Apostolicae Latiae, vol. 1, pp. 526-7.

f. Vaticanus Ottobonianus 1466 (olim Altaempsianus) (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana).

"written on paper, a variety of Briquet 7699, Vicenza, Padua 1427-1432, in the fifteenth century in a humanist cursive script. The manuscript measures 193 x 35 mm. and there are 55 leaves in all, 2v-4v; 5v; 6v; 8v; 9v; 22v; 34v-37v and 52v-55v being blank. On f. 9 according to the catalogue, f. 1 according to Castagna, is written "I. N. A. T. O. I. U. I. I. I. S. I. I. I. A. C. M. C. A. C. L. A. C. A. U. S. A. C.", and "Non mihi quanl longe causa fuere vie." There are 24 lines to a page. The manuscript once belonged to the Duke Giovanni Angelo Altumes. It was acquired by Alessandro VIII Ottoboni, then by Benedetto XIV and finally by the Vatican. ff. 1-17r contain the Eclogues of Calpurnius under the title G. Calpurnii Bucolicum incipit, followed by (ff. 17r-24r) the Eclogues of Non., attributed to Calpurnius, and various other poems including excerpts from Ovid's Heroides and Virgil's Aeneid. On f. 5r is written "Ait Iuvenis / max gratias amen. / H. I. O. " For the full contents see Lexaecribtae Classicæ Latini de la Bibliothèque Vaticane, Paris, vol. 1, pp. 577-8. The names of the speakers are
in a second hand and there are also some variants in the margin, apparently in the first hand. ff. 25r and v seem to be in a third hand. ff. 156-61 are omitted and a space left, suggesting that the scribe realized that there were lines missing in his exemplar. In poem 1 of Rem., vv. 10 and 8 are prefaced by min. u. 23 by Tity, and u. 86 by Ti.

Vaticanus Palatinus 1652 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana)

Written on parchment in the fifteenth century, it measures 267 x 159 mm. It contains 129 leaves and 37 lines to a page. The contents are Tibullus (ff. 1-25r); Catullus (ff. 25v-60r); the Ecoles of Calpurnius (ff. 60r-70r) and those of Rem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 70r-74v) and Lucan (ff. 74v-123). At the end of the codex is written, "a' petro monopolianno die XXI februario 1430 pro clarissimo viro domino Jan.ozio Manetto, hrebi patriis.../... ademitum", and this is followed by two hexameters written on the death of Giannozzo Manetti, died 1439. The names of the speakers, the titles and the initials are in red. Two correcting hands have been at work. Readings from this manuscript are quoted by Garth and Gebhard, and it was considered to be the best manuscript by Hernsdorf.

Vaticanus Reginensis 1759 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana)

Written on parchment in the fifteenth century, it measures 193 x 125 mm. and has 22 leaves with 25 lines to a page. It contains only Calpurnius (ff. 1-16) and the Ecoles of Rem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 16v-22v). There are a few corrections by the scribe and a large number of marginal notes in a second hand in the text of Calpurnius. The manuscript was once in the library of J. Silvestro.
i. Laurentianus pl. 37, 14 (Biblioteca Laurenziana, Florence)

Written on parchment in the fifteenth century, the manuscript measures 323 x 195 mm. and has 224 leaves with 35 lines to a page. It contains the *Eclogues* of Jilius Italius, the *Eclogues* of Calpurnius (ff. 177v-177v) under the title *Calfurnii carmen bucolicum incipit*, and those of Rem, attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 187v-192v). (Verdière says that Calpurnius is on ff. 140-161, apparently confusing this manuscript with 1). The contents also include a Latin translation of Hesiod's *Works and Days* by Valla (f. 193v) and Claudian's *Le morte Iovis* (ff. 207-214). There are a few corrections by the scribe and a number of interventions by a second hand. In several places an original error also found in fry has been corrected. 1.1 is incorrectly prefaced by Amyntas and vv. "2", "30" and 1.8 by H. This manuscript once belonged to Pietro de' Medici, son of Cosimo.

j. Holkhamicus 334 (Library of the Earl of Leicester, Holkham Hall, Norfolk).

Written on paper in the fifteenth century, it measures 225 x 163 mm. and 46 leaves with 33 lines to a page. It contains the *Eclogues* of Calpurnius (ff. 1-12r) and those of Rem, attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 12r-17r), the *Eclogues* of Virgil (ff. 17v-29v) and the *Achilleid* of Statius (f. 30ff.). R. Fürster (Philologus 42 (1864), 158ff.) wrongly says that this manuscript is devoted to Calpurnius. There are no titles or initial letters in Rem. The manuscript was acquired in Italy about 1713.

k. Bruxellensis 20589 (Bibliothèque Royale Albert Premier, Brussels)

Written on paper, a variety of Briquet 1401 or 1402, the manuscript measures 200 x 140 mm. There are 12 leaves with 33 lines to
François Masai (Scriptorium 7 (1953), 265ff.) says that he discovered this manuscript which is a continuation of Bruxellensis 20428. It contains Cal. 6.81 - end, the Eclogues of Nem. (ff. 2-6v); Bartholomei Colonensis Egloga bucolicis carminis (ff. 7-9); De gallo (et) uulpe fabella (ff. 9-10); Panegyricorum Carmen sophie (ff. 10r-10v); De corno et uulpe fabella (ff. 10v-12v).

The manuscript is written in a strongly individualised cursive and is signed and dated very precisely by the scribe Joannes de Gorcum, midday the day before the Feast of St. Paul 1490. From this information Masai deduces that the original of the codex is to be looked for in the school of Deventer. Verdière, from his examination of microfilm of the first Deventer edition (Hague Library 170 G 33), has concluded (Scriptorium 8 (1954), 296f.) that k was copied from it.

Written on paper in the fifteenth century, the manuscript measures 225 x 155 mm. and has 188 written leaves with 25 lines to a page. The initial letters are coloured and the titles are in red. On f. 188 is written, "Georgii Ant. Vespucii Liber" and on f. 1 "Libreriae Capituli S.M. de Flore de Florentia est liber." This manuscript was formerly in the Bib. Aedilium Florentinae Ecclesiae and is now in the Biblioteca Laurenziana, not the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, as Verdière says in his edition of Calpurnius. It contains the Eclogues of Calpurnius (ff. 140r-155r) under the title Calpurnii Buccolica and those of Nem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 155r-161v), as well as Donatus's life of Virgil; the Appendix Vergiliana; the Achilleid of Statius; Claudian's De Raptu Proserpinae (ff. 81-105) and others of his poems; and poems by Lactantius, Maximian and others. For the full contents see
The coloquies are corrected here and there by a second hand. At 1.25; 1.50; 2.14 and 25; and 3.7, the scribe has omitted the whole or part of a word and left a space.

Written on paper, the manuscript contains 151 leaves with 25 lines to a page and measures 25 3/4 x 170 mm. It is signed on f. 21r with the initials of Hartmann Schedel, who says that he copied it at Padua on November 18th, 1465. ff. 1-12 and f. 151 are in Schedel's hand, f. 28 being written c. 1462, f. 94 in 1466 and f. 159 in 1467 in Lüneburg, and the manuscript as a whole was probably completed by the end of 1467. The manuscript contains the coloquies of Calpurnius (ff. 3r-13r) under the title Incipit coloquias Theocriti Calpurnii Siculi postae clarissimi, and those of Sem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 19r-26r), and also includes Nicolai Lusci Veneti ecloga ad Fr. Barbarum (f. 27); Antonii de Casto ecloga partialia (f. 3o); Francisci Hortari liber de re uxoria (ff. 43-94); Tizii Florisentini epistula ex senibus ducenda sit uxor (ff. 101-141); Plutarch's letter to Trajan (f. 142) and other works.

For a full list of the contents see Catalogus codicium latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis, O. Helm and U. Laubmann, vol. 3 part 1, p. 67. Schedel has included the number of the coloquie in the title for the first six coloquies of Calpurnius, but afterwards has left a gap. He has also left a gap in the text at 1.50 and 2.77. 1.24 is incorrectly prefaced by Tim. ff. 24 and 25 have been inverted.

Bibliotheca Leopoldiana, Cataloign Tomus primus, Florence 1791, pp. 519-621. The coloquies are corrected here and there by a second hand.

in Baccardianus 724 (olim LIII 10) (Biblioteca Riccardiana, Florence).
Written on parchment in the fifteenth century, the manuscript measures 203 x 136 mm. and has 29 leaves with 22 lines to a page. f. 27r is blank. It includes the Eclogues of Calpurnius (ff. 1-18r) and those of Nem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 18r-25r) and part of the de Magia 4 of Apuleius (f. 27v). For the full contents see Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum qui in Bibliotheca Riccardiana Florentiae Adseruantur 1756, p. 90. There are no titles to Calpurnius and Nem. There are a few corrections in a second hand.

o Borvillianus 147 (= Auct. X. 1.4.45) (Bodleian Library, Oxford).

Written on paper, the codex consists of four manuscripts bound together written between 1460 and 1465 in North Italy. It measures approximately 221 x 170 mm. and consists of iv + 195 leaves. There are some illuminated capitals. The Eclogues of Calpurnius under the title Calphurni poetae bucolica incipit feliciter (ff. 83r-99v) and those of Nem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 99v-106v) are to be found in the third manuscript which is dated 1460. At the end of the codex is the colophon, "hunc librum donauit eximius artium et medicine doctor M. Ioannes Marcho/ua de Venetijs congregationi Canonicorum Regularium s. augustini. Ita ut tamen sit / ad usum dictorum Canoniciorum commorantium / in monasterio s. Ioannis in Viridario Padue Quare / omnes pro eo pie orent MCCCC LXVIJ." For a full list of contents see A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford vol. 4, F. Madan, Oxford 1897, no. 17025, pp. 72-73. I have examined this manuscript myself.

p Quirinianus CVII I (Biblioteca Queriniana, Brescia).

Written on paper (not parchment as Verdière says) by various scribes in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it measures 207 x 140 mm. It contains 252 leaves with 23 lines to a page. ff. 36-
The manuscript contains Calpurnius (ff. 3r-97r) and the Colocles of Nep. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 97r-98v). For the full contents of the manuscript see A. Leltrani, "Index cod. class. lat. qui in Syll. quae absenrunt", 1906, 72-82, no. 35. The scribe has added a few variant readings in the margin in the text of Calpurnius. The titles have been added by a later hand, and Calpurnius bears the title E. Calpurnii ciculi et L. Aurelii/Olymii lgenesini bucolica. One of the scribes was Federicus Falatius who copied in 1455 Dei Filiis recunedi oratoris veronensis (sic) de viris illustribus. On f. 248 is written "Memoria della biancaria de ni Sic. Antonio di Colleoni."

The part of this manuscript containing Calpurnius and Nep. is datable to the period before 1460, as o is almost certainly an apograph of this manuscript and is dated 1460 in a colophon. p is almost certainly Buman's Lorv. 4 or d, cf. cohors (3.55) quoted in Lorv. 202, a reading unique to o and p.

The manuscript contains Calpurnius and Nep. is datable to the period before 1460, as o is almost certainly an apograph of this manuscript and is dated 1460 in a colophon. p is almost certainly Buman's Lorv. 4 or d, cf. cohors (3.55) quoted in Lorv. 202, a reading unique to o and p.

Written on parchment, it has 111 leaves (not 84 as Robinson Ellis says) and 35 lines to a page. It contains Petranor's libros; Claudian's De Bantu Proserrinac (ff. 52v-69v); the Psychomachia of Prudentius; the liostola Sarros poetisae ad Phaenem amasium sum feliciter (Ovid Her. 15); the Colocles of Calpurnius (ff. 87v-93r) and those of Nep. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 98r-102v); Culex and Aetna uu. 1-6. It was first described by Robinson Ellis (JPh 16 (1908), 153-56), who says it is a very tall octavo, with the titles and interlocutors' names in red. It has a large margin of more than an inch on the right of the text, and a smaller one, of about half
an inch, on the left. Ellis dates it to the late fourteenth century or early fifteenth; Clausen and Goodyear in the Oxford Classical Text of the Appendix Vergiliana (pp. 17 and 19) to the fourteenth century and Giarratano to the beginning of the fifteenth century.

R. Rehdigeranus 60 (olim Vratislaviensis 1411) (Scribentia Universitatis, 48). Written on paper with parchment fixed in front to preserve the manuscript, it measures 0.14 x 0.195 m. It was written by one scribe in the fifteenth century and has 128 leaves with 22 or 23 lines to a page for Calpurnius and .etc. The titles and names of speakers are in red, and so is the index on f. 2r. ff. 1 and 2v are blank. The poems of Calpurnius are from ff. 3r-20r under the title C. Calpurnii poetae clarissimi Tuccolicon carmen incipit. Ff. 20r-27r contain the Elogia of Cic. attributed to Calpurnius. Other poems in the manuscript include Pio II Pont. max. Nicolaus de Valle (f. 27v); Hesiod's Works and Days (ff. 28r-47v) (f. 43v is blank); the Virgilius vita of Poetus (f. 48v); Alcimus poetae de Virgili laude (f. 49r); Oulex (ff. 52r-61r); Aetna (ff. 73r-87v). For the full contents see Konrat Ziegler, Catalogus codicum latinorum classicorum.

\(^1\) As Castagna points out (p. 45), in some previous editions the manuscript meant by the symbol \(r\) has been given the number of \(s\) and vice versa. Castagna blames Giæser for this mistake as he calls Rehdigeranus secundus the manuscript which comes first in numeration, but Giæser gives no indication that he knew of any numbering of the manuscripts. It is perhaps rather Giarratano's mistake in inverting the numbers and this should have been noticed by later editors. Castagna contributes further to the confusion, in my opinion, by calling the manuscript Giarratano means by \(s\), \(r\), and vice versa. I have preferred to keep to Giarratano's designation, which is also followed by Verdière and Volpilhac.
Written on paper, the manuscript has 20 leaves, with 27, 28 or 29 lines to a page, and measures 208 x 155 mm. It contains only the *Eclogues* of Calpurnius (ff. 1-14v) under the title *Titii
Calpurnius Siculus Lucolcium Carmen and those of Hem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 4v-20). It is signed and dated 1510 at the end by Brother Stephanus Lewolter. There is one marginal correction by the first hand, at f. 4r. See also Catalogus codicum Latinorum Bibliothecae Beiae Horaceniae, U. Kain and O. Leubmann, vol. 4, part 3, p. 270 (no. 2442). This manuscript is probably a copy of the second Mercator edition. (See my section on the manuscript Tradition).

u Niccardianus 656 (cim L IV 14) (biblioteca Niccardiana, Florence).

Written on parchment in the fifteenth century, the manuscript measures 225 x 150 mm. and has 126 leaves with 26 lines to a page. f. 2v is blank. Philippus Giotti Radicundolensis wrote ff. 46-125 which bear the colophon *Hortetus fuit die exuv octubris CCCCLII exemplavit Philippus Giotti Radicundolensis. The Elegies of Calpurnius are to be found on ff. 25-59r and those of Hem. attributed to Calpurnius on ff. 59v-85r. In about 1492 the manuscript was collated by Angelius with Igoletus's codex, as the colophon shows: 'Contuli ego Nicolaus Angelius hunc codicem/ cum multisque aliae & cum illo uetustissimo codice/ quem nobis Thadeus Igoletus pannoniae regis / bibliothecae praefectus e Germania allatum/ accomodavit in quo multa carmina sunt reuerta/ Amo salutis MCCCCLXXII.' A note at the beginning of the codex shows that it was bought by Ludovicus Rogerius in 1575 and was also corrected by him. The manuscript contains many emendations and notes in different hands, both marginal and interlinear. The hand of Nicolaus Angelius, however, is easily distinguished in most places, and his readings are noted as A in the apparatus criticus.

v Vaticanus Latinus 5123 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana).

Written on paper, the manuscript has 43 leaves with 25 lines to
a page and measures 215 x 150 mm. It contains Petrus Paulus Vergerius de ingenuis moribus (ff. 1-26v) and the Eclogues of Calpurnius under the title T. Calphurnij Bucolicum carmen (ff. 27r-42r) and those of Nem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 42r-48v). According to the librarian of the Vatican, the manuscript is fifteenth century, but Dr. A.C. de la Mare considers it to be fourteenth.

w Sloanianus 777 (British Library, London)

Written on parchment in the mid-fifteenth century, the manuscript contains 91 leaves with 27 lines to a page and measures 210 x 125 mm. The names of the interlocutors are in green and red. The contents include Columella; The De Medicina of Sammonicus; the De Navigazione Drusi Germanici of Pedi; the Eclogues of Calpurnius (ff. 32-45v) under the title LUCII CALPURNIJ BUCOLICA and those of Nem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 45v-51r); the Ibis and other poems attributed to Ovid; Aetna and the De fortuna of Symphosius. For the full list of contents see Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum Bibliotecae Sloanianae, p. 144 and also Index to the Sloane Manuscripts in the British Museum, E.J.L. Scott, London 1904. The whole manuscript is written in one hand which has been identified by Dr. de la Mare as the hand of Pomponio Leto, writing for Fabio Mazza-tosta. There are a few corrections in the first hand and others in a second. I have collated this manuscript myself.

x Vindobonensis 305 (Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna)

Written on parchment according to Endlicher and Glaeser, or paper according to Verdière and Castagna, in the fifteenth century, the manuscript has 45 leaves with 21 lines to a page and measures 185 x 132 mm. It contains only Calpurnius (ff. 20r-38r) and the Eclogues of Nem. attributed to Calpurnius (ff. 38r-45v). A second
hand dated 1547 has made some alterations to the text and has also
corrected the numbering of the poems. The first hand has made a few
corrections. The manuscript is described by J. M"uller in Catal.
published a collation of this manuscript in his edition.

y Leidensis Vossianus L.t. 107 (Tilianus) (olim Vossianus lat. 191)
(Bibliotheca der Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden).

Written on paper between 1470 and 1510, the manuscript has 88
leaves and measures 227 x 150 mm. ff. 1-57v and 68-88v were
written by one hand. ff. 58-67 were left blank and used later. ff.
58-59v, which have 22-25 lines to a page, were written by the first
hand, and ff. 60-63v, which have 20-22 lines to a page are by
another hand. ff. 63v-67 are blank. The manuscript includes Corpus
Ausanianum (ff. 1-57v); Ausonii ad Paulinum er. 29 (25 418) (ff.
58r-59v); Catalori urbiun fragmenta (ff. 60r-62r); epistulae
Graccae Ausonii ad Paulinum 8, 9 (12, 14 401 402). The Eclogues of
Calpurnius are on ff. 68r-62v under the title G. Calpurnii carmen
bucolicum incipit feliciter and those of Ncm. attributed to
Calpurnius are on ff. 62v-69v. There are a few corrections by the
first hand. The titles, names of speakers and a few variants have
been added by a second hand. 1.1 is incorrectly prefaced by Amn.:
vv. 1.21, 1.30 and 1.81 by Am. and 1.86 by Ti. See also Codices
Vossiani Latini pars 2 codices in quarto, K.A. de Heyer, Leiden
1976. The manuscript once belonged to bishop Jean du Tillet de Erion,
then to Elia Vinet and was used by Scaliger and Toll. It was
collated by Boecking (1845), L. M"uller (1864), Baehrens (1875),
Schenkl (1875-1882) and Feiper (1876 and 1884), cf. Feiper,
Aueorius, Leipzig 1886, p. lxxx.
z Canonicianus Class. Lat. 126 (Bodleian Library, Oxford).

Written on paper in the fifteenth century, the manuscript has iv + 93 + iii leaves (the modern numbering starts on f. iv and goes from ff. 1-97), with 25-9 lines to a page and measures 215 x 150 (142/150 x 90/85) mm. The original text ends on f. 91. ff. 91v-94v, 95v-96v are blank. Some leaves have been lost after f. 41. According to Dr. de la Mare, the whole manuscript seems to have been written by one scribe, apart from some marginal notes and an addition on f. 95, and possibly f. iii-iiiv. The contents include works by Tibullus, Ovid, Martial, Dante, Pier Paolo Vergerio and Virgil's Eclogues. The Eclogues of Calpurnius under the title Theocritus Calpurnius poeta bucolicus incipit are on ff. 46r-59r and those of Nem. attributed to Calpurnius on ff. 59r-64v. The manuscript was owned by Dionigi Zanchi of Bergamo, as a note on f. 1v tells us, and later by Matteo Luigi Canonici and his brother Giuseppe, and then by Giovanni Perissinotti. It was acquired by the Bodleian in 1817. I have examined this manuscript myself.

THE FLORILEGIA

Parisinus latinus 17903 (olim Nostradamensis 188) (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris).

Written on parchment, the manuscript has 166 leaves written in two columns with 43 lines to a column and measures 335 x 250 mm. The manuscript contains excerpta from Prudentius, Claudian, Ovid, Tibullus, Horace, Juvenal, Persius, Martial, Petronius, Virgil, Calpurnius, Terence, Sallust, Boethius, Cicero, Quintilian, Seneca, Plautus (Querolus), Macrobius, Aulus Gellius, Caesar, Sidonius, Cassiodorus, Suetonius and Donatus. Nem. is to be found on f. 74r column 2 and 74v column 1 under the title Scalpurius in bucoliccis.
This manuscript was one of a group of manuscripts obtained by Claude Joly from his grandfather, Antoine Lejail, and presented to the Notre Dame library in 1630. It was rediscovered by H.L. Roth who collated it for Weber's text. After Roth's death, Höfflin published the collation and dated the manuscript to the first half of the thirteenth century (Philologia 17 (1861), 140-4). Leynke also dates it to the thirteenth century, but Lilian dates it to the twelfth century on the ground that this was a very Cvidian era, and Cvid is abundantly represented in Florilegia. The thirteenth century dating is, however, now generally accepted, see also Inventaire des Manusc. Latins de Notre Dame et l'Autres fonds, Léopold Lelisle, Paris 1871, p. 75. This manuscript, or one very like it, was used by Vincent de Beauvais for his Inneolus jamie (see CE 27 (1932), 9-10).

Parisinus 7647 (oin Thuanenus) (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris).

Written on parchment, the manuscript has 185 leaves written in two columns with 47 lines to a page and measures 275 x 30 mm. Ff. 1-33 contain part of an anonymous Latin lexicon. The Florilegia are contained on ff. 34r-185v. Num. 4, 19, 21-24, 32 and 33, attributed to Calpurnius, are on ff. 114r. Leynke (Abi 25 (1870), 113) who rediscovered it in 1870 dates it to the beginning of the thirteenth century, or end of the twelfth century, and the latter date is now generally agreed. Leynke considers that this manuscript is at least fifty years older than the Nostradamensis. It is carefully written, with most titles in red. There are many alterations in sixteenth and seventeenth century hands, including that of Jacques Auguste de Thou, to whom the manuscript once belonged. It also belonged to Colbert who acquired it in 1680, as a note at the beginning of the codex shows. Later it belonged to the Bibliothèque...
Script, under Louis XIV.

Ononisensis 87, 52 II n. 1 (Biblioteca Universitaria, Bologna).

Written on paper in the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries, the manuscript measures 300 x 210 mm. There are 554 leaves numbered from 5 to 559, many of which are blank. It includes excerpts from Xenophon, Sallust, Aulus Gellius, Livy, Flaccus, Flavus and Livy. For the full contents see Lodovico Frati, JIP 16 (1928), 123-138. It contains fsc. 4.20-32, 56-9 under the title Ex Calrnurnio poeta siculio and is numbered XL. Frati incorrectly says that it contains only 4.20-5. Item. is on f. 117r (or 115 according to a later numbering). The names of the interlocutors are in the margin. A note informs us that the manuscript is "Ex Bibliotheca Iacobi Bianzani Zononi."

Atrebatensis 64 (olim 65) (Bibliothèque Municipale, Arras).

Written on vellum, the manuscript contains 163 leaves, 3 having been lost, with 45 lines to a page in two columns, and measures 470 x 350 mm. The initial letters are in blue and red, and titles are in vermilion. It contains excerpts from Prudentius, Claudian, Virgil, Statius, Lucan, Tibullus, Ovid, Horace, Juvenal, Martial, Paternius, Auctor Catalecton, Calpurnius and Nem. (f. 67v) under the title Calpurnius in buccolica, Terence, Sallust, Soethius, Plato, Macrobius, Cicero, Seneca, Aulus Gellius, Caesar, Silius and Suetonius. A note on f. 1v in a fourteenth century hand tells us that "Tunc librum de floribus philosophorum erogavit Ecclesiae Atrebatensis dominus Jacobus Aronelli ipsius Ecclesiae canonicius, surplicans ut omnes in eo legentes eum devote exortem pro anima ejus et benefactoribus suis." It was formerly thought that this manuscript had been lost, as it was known only from a mention by
Hesiodus: Junius 1516 in his Animadversiones Latinae until Ullman rediscovered it in 1923. His manuscript was written at the monastery of St. Vaast (Veestur) in Aran. Ullman dates it to the fourteenth century, but the library dates it to the fifteenth century. Verdière, who publishes a photograph of it in his edition of Calpurnius, dates it to the end of the twelfth century, because the writing resembles that of a document dated 1182 (cf. J. H. Irion, Isidore's Bibliotheca historiae latinae et franciae, Paris 1924 pl. II, 2). C. J. Lall also considers that it was written c. 1230. Oatagna declines to enter the controversy.

Escorialensis 114 (Real Biblioteca del Escorial).

Written on parchment, the manuscript has 251 leaves with 80 lines to a page in 2 columns and measures 227 x 220 mm. The initials and capitals are in blue and red and the epigraphs in red. It contains excerpts from Prudentius, Claudian, Virgil, Valerius Flaccus, Statius, Lucan, Ovid, Tibullus, Horace, Juvenal, Persius, Martial, Petronius, Calpurnius and Mem. (f. 97r) under the title Calpurnus in bucolitiae, Terence, Jallust, Boethius, Plato, Marcius Crispo, Frisian, Aecrobius, Ciceron, Quintilian, Jeneca, Flautus, Aulus Gellius, Caesar, Jiconius, Cassiodorus, Justinianus, Egesipus, S. Jerome, S. Ioannes Chrysostomus and Petri Alphonsi doctrina clericalis. According to W. C. M. Horsley there is only one hand, according to Ullman, two. Hartel dates the manuscript to the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries, but G. Antolin, who describes it in the Catalago de los manuscritos latinos de la Real Biblioteca del Escorial 3 (1913), pp. 363-5, dates it to the beginning of the fourteenth century. The florilegia are on ff. 1r-216v. The manuscript was first studied seriously by Ullman.
Written on parchment, the manuscript contains 77 leaves with 60-62 lines to a page in two columns. Extracts from Calpurnius and Sen. are found on f. 23v, all attributed to Calpurnius. The lines it contains from Sen. are 4.19, 21-24, 52. The entire manuscript is written in one hand. It begins (1r) Incipit flores auctorun and ends with a six line poem. It is generally agreed that Schmidewin is correct in dating the manuscript to the fourteenth century.

Fleiner was the first to use the manuscript, for his edition of Lucræus and gives the contents in full pp. xiv-xv. Cf. also Sandström's Lucræus studier, p. 67ff. A copy of this manuscript made by A. L. Schlee in 1804-5 exists under the reference Liss. C. quart. 77.

*laurentianus Conv. Coppr. 240 (Biblioteca laurenziana, Florence)*

Written on paper, the codex is made up of various manuscripts and leaves glued together. They are written in various hands, mostly at the beginning of the sixteenth century and some are signed. The manuscript measures on average 158 x 196 mm. There are 526 leaves, many of which are damaged and illegible. Some are blank. There are 20 lines to a page. This is the only manuscript which has excerpts from the Cynegeticus of both Grattius and Sen., and the only one which separates Sen. from Calpurnius and puts Sen. first. The excerpts from Sen. are on ff. 143v-145r and for the Cynegeticus are uu. 76 (iam) to 80 (xraswvitt); uu. 157-59 (sicus init); uu. 205-21; uu. 243-250 and 261-2, and for the colptwv 1.8-20; 21-6; 32-3; 35-42; 50-2 (xrat); 56-7; 2.25-6; 14-9; 2.27-34; 43 (qindwia xetwv) to 58; 4.7-9; 24-9 (en. 25). Castagna considers, though he does not give his reasons, that the scribe who transcribed Sen.
Calvinius and Grettius probably joined the manuscripts together. 

E. G. Cowdrey, *Historical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists*, Boston 1962 identified some of the authors from whose works the excerpts are taken, and the most recent of these seems to date the compilation to the last quarter of the sixteenth century. There is a description of the manuscript in Kristeller, *Iter Italicum 1*, London-Leiden 1965, p. 75. See also Del Suris, *Suppl. ad catal. sybl. Laur.*, II, ff. 259-265.
THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE CYNEGETICA

A Parisinus 7561 (olim Baluzianus 676, Regius 4351) (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris).

The manuscript is a collection of works and fragments from the ninth to the fifteenth centuries, put together in the seventeenth century by Etienne Baluze. The manuscript of Nem. is written on vellum in two columns, most of which have 29 lines, and measures 184 x 120 mm. Fragment 10 contains the Cynegetica. C. Bursian first found this manuscript (as also B), and dated it to the tenth century, which dating is followed by Baehrens and Martin. Vollmer (preface to Liber Medicinalis, Quintus Serenus, Corpus medicorum latinorum, vol. II, fasc. 3, Leipzig 1916, p. xii) dates it ninth to tenth century. Van de Woestijne says that the hand is strikingly like that of Bernensis 366, a manuscript of Valerius Maximus written c. 860, cf. F. Steffens, Lateinische Paläographie, Berlin 1929 pl. 60; E. Châtelain Paléographie des classiques latines, Paris pl. CLXXXI. They are indeed very much alike, but the capital letters H, I, P and Q seem to me to be different and I would therefore hesitate to say that both manuscripts were written by the same hand, though they may well have been. A later hand has added the title nemesiani cynegetica. The scribe has corrected some of his own errors, and there are a number of corrections and alterations in another hand which are apparently not taken from another source, but probably made ex ope ingenii. There are also a number of corrections and conjectures in the hand of Baluze. It is difficult to tell precisely how many hands are involved. The manuscript also includes in the same section as Nem. Anonymi liber de rebus ad grammaticam pertinentibus and Testamentum Caroli Magni, Imperatoris. The text of the Cynegetica is to be found on fos. 13-
18. For the full contents see Cat. bibl. reg. IV (1745), p. 373f.

B Parisinus Lat. 4839 (olim Philbert de la Mare 440, Regius 5047) (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris).

Written on parchment, the manuscript has 51 leaves with 28 lines to a page. It contains the Periegesis of Priscian (1-20); the Cynegetica (20-26), and the Liber Medicinalis of Quintus Serenus (26-48); fos. 48v-51v are blank. There are a number of corrections, marginal notes and interlinear notes in the scribe's hand, and some others in a later hand, possibly that of Philbert de la Mare. The manuscript is carelessly written. Van de Woestijne (pp. 23-5) lists the different types of mistake. Pépin (Quintus Serenus, Liber Medicinalis, Paris 1950, p. xxviii), Van de Woestijne and Verdière date B to the ninth to the tenth century, while Bursian, Baehrens and Martin date it to the tenth. Baehrens was the first to collate this manuscript, and also A, but did the job carelessly.

C Vindobonensis 3261 (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna).

Written on paper in the sixteenth century, in or after 1503 and before 1530 by Sannazaro (see H. Schenkl, Supplementband der Jahrbücher für klass. Philol. xxiv (1898), 387-480), it has 78 leaves, according to Van de Woestijne, 72 according to Endlicher, and 19 lines to a page. It measures 200 x 120 mm. At the front of the codex is written, Ausonii, Ouidii, Nemesiani et Gratii fragmenta, Actii Sinceri manu scripta, Martirani et doctorum amicorum. The manuscript includes Loviani Pontani Epistola ad Actium Sincerus Sannazarorum. Neap. Idib. Febr. 1503 (ff. 1-2); D. Ausonii Magni Burdigalensis Carmina quaedam (ff. 3-27); Versus Ouidii de piscibus et feris (ff. 43-6); Nem.'s Cynegetica (ff. 48r-56v); Grattius (ff. 58v-72v); and the Excerpta of Paulinus of Nola. The manuscript is described by Endlicher in Catal. codd. phil. lat.
biblioth. Palat. Vind., 1836, p. 204-5 (no. cccvi); by G. Heidrich, 
Rutilius Namatianus, 1912; pp. 13-4; by C. Schenkl in his edition of 
Ausonius (p. xxxiv) and by R. Peiper, "Die handschriftl. Ueberliefer-

There is also a manuscript of the Cynegica written on paper 
c. 1600 in the Bodleian Library at Oxford (Dorvillianus 57). This 
is almost certainly a copy of the second Aldine edition: note 
especially that both read sanus for Ianus at u. 104. Full details 
of this manuscript are to be found in A Summary Catalogue of the 
Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, F. Madan, 
That the manuscripts of the Eclogues had a common archetype can be shown by the fact that all are corrupt at 1.76; 2.9; 2.51; 4.47; and that all reverse uu. 4.64-5.

The manuscripts can be divided into two main groups, NG and V.

NG agree in the following errors and omissions:

1.38 mittite si sentire datur) si sentire datur mit(t)ite
1.42 fouisti) nouisti
1.46 hinc) hic
2.6 uenerisque) ueneris
2.20 quaeque) atque
2.22 gramina) littora N: litoro G
2.42 Bacchi) uini
2.73 Fauni uates) uates fauni
4.47 ad undas) habunda(n)s
4.58 animos) annos

Both omit or corrupt the beginnings of uu. 3.6 and 3.7.

N cannot be derived from G because it does not share G's omission of 1.73, G's omission of a word at 3.17, G's collocation

---

1. I had arrived at the main body of the conclusions in this section before Volpilhac, Castagna and Reeve published their accounts of the manuscript tradition.

2. The true reading is given for comparative purposes.
of 2.49 after 2.45, nor G's repetition of 4.13 both in its place and after 4.6. It also does not repeat G's errors at, for example, 1.2 raucis) raris; 1.10 carusque) carisque; 1.82 sonas) canis; 2.27 tanquam nostri) nostri tamquam; 2.30 libarunt) sudarunt; 2.74 etiam) omnes; 3.53 saliens liquor ore) saliensque liquore; 4.8 dum) nam.

G cannot be derived from N because it does not share N's transposition of 2.81 after 3.16 and N's omissions of words at 1.23; 1.71; 2.23; 3.5; 4.60. It also does not repeat N's errors at, for example, 2.16 aevu cantuque) cantu euoque; 2.71 duco) ducas; 3.32 adstringit) affrigit; 3.59 cymbia) tibia; 4.28 squamea) sua mea; 4.36 tibi bis) tribis; 4.53 gramina) germina.

Until Glaeser's edition, not much attention had been paid to N, and Baehrens was the first to collate G. Baehrens asserts without argument that G is the more reliable manuscript (PLM 3, pp. 66-7), while Schenkl (pp. xli-xlii of his edition) prefers N, and cites a few places where G seems to him interpolated. Giarratano discusses the question in more detail (pp. x-xviii) and agrees with Schenkl that N is to be preferred to G, but for different reasons, since he detects in G the presence of emendations by the scribe, and he rightly points out that G has almost as many good readings as N. Castagna next takes up the problem and analyses the divergences between N and G in great detail (pp. 129-43). I find his arguments in some places a little difficult to follow, but he agrees with Giarratano that G has been emended by the scribe, and rightly rules out the suggestion made by Giarratano (p. xiii) that N is perhaps contaminated with V. It is presumably to be inferred from these conclusions (although Castagna does not say so), that where NV agree against G, the reading of NV ought in most cases to be
preferred, since it is likely that they are preserving the truth independently. I am not totally convinced of the validity of some of the evidence which Castagna adduces to support his theory that the scribe of G is emending, as for example in the case of G's reading at 3.7 sumersasque, which Castagna interprets as an unhappy emendation by G where N has a lacuna. G's reading looks to me more like a scribal error. (The archetype of NG was clearly damaged at this point, cf. the apparatus criticus). Again, I am not convinced that G's immunia at 1.2 is an emendation, since this reading is found also in A, and, although GA are clearly related, there is no evidence that Angelius used G. Additions to Castagna's list of probable conjectures by G where the archetype is corrupt (p. 140) may be 2.30, where N's libar is closest to the truth, and G has sudarunt, and 3.63 where G "corrects", and in fact corrupts, the metre. Overall, however, Castagna's evidence and conclusion as to the relative worth of N and G seem to me to be sound. Thus we can propose the following stemma for NG:

NG and V

Castagna (p. 238) censures Giarratano for his comment (p. xxviii) "codices secundae familiae non omnino neglegi possunt, sed cautissime adhibendi sunt" which Castagna claims implies that the readings of N and G are "infinitely" better than those of V, and he produces figures from Giarratano's own edition to show that this is by no means the case. Castagna is right not to exaggerate the fidelity of NG as witnesses to the archetype, but his evidence is by no means convincing. First, in his tables of divergences on
p. 240 and 241, Castagna does not distinguish possible readings from obvious errors, and in a number of the cases he cites, there is little to choose between the two readings. At 3.26, V's nymphae is probably an intrusion from 3.25, not lectio facilior. (See below on sub-groups in the V tradition). Secondly, Castagna uses this table of divergences to deduce the percentage of cases in which NG's reading is preferable to that of V. Kenney comments (CR 28 (1978), 44), that Castagna's remark (p. 242), "Potrei aggiungere altri esempi: ma direi comunque che α (i.e. NG) è preferibile a β (i.e. V) in non più del 20% dei casi di divergenza" ought to mean "of the remaining 86 cases," because 16+10=26, which is more than 20% of 105. I simply find Castagna's use of percentages unclear and unhelpful. Thirdly, Castagna completely ignores the fact that all the V manuscripts attribute all eleven poems to Calpurnius, which is surely a significant point against the reliability of V. Lastly, Castagna ignores the nature of some of the variants in V: obvious interpolations, such as Astacus at 2.1, which appears in all the V manuscripts but auz, and nigra at 2.44, and emendations, such as at 1.9; 1.25; 1.29. It is consequently reasonable to suppose that some of the other variants may be due to less obvious editorial interference. This is of some importance in deciding between variants in NG and V, as it always has to be borne in mind that V is more likely to be interpolating. (For interpolations in G, see above). Thus we can propose the following stemma for NG and V:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\omega \\
/ \quad \\
N \\
/ \quad \\
G \\
/ \quad \\
V
\end{array}
\]

We find in H the following colophon which has given rise to
much speculation about H's sources:

collatus accuratissime hic codex cum illo uetustissimo: / quem Thadeus ugoletus pannoniae regis bibliothecae / praefectus e germania secum attulit et cum illo/ quem Johannes boccaccius propria manu scripsiisse / traditur bibliothecae sancti spiritus florentini / dicatum, et cum plerisque aliis: ubi titulum et / operis divisionem multa etiam carmina reperimus.

There are five main problems about the sources of H: 1) Does H contain a collation of Ugoletus's German manuscript? 2) Did H know the ed. Juntina? 3) Did H know Riccardianus 636? 4) What is the source of the readings from the NG branch of the tradition which H could not have got from A, ed. Farm. or ed. Juntina? 5) Did H know the ed. Ven.?

1) Schenkl argues (WS 5 (1885), 287-91) that H knew the German codex only indirectly. He asserts (p. 288) that, "Aus dem Umstande ... dass Text und Subscription von derselben Hand berrühren, ergibt sich deutlich genug, dass der Codex Harleianus selbst keine Collation des Codex Pannonicus enthalten kann, sondern dass er aus einem anderen Exemplare, in dem die Varianten jener Handschrift verzeichnet waren, entweder mittelbar oder unmittelbar geflossen ist." He further asserts that the impersonal collatus in H as opposed to contuli ego of Angelius's colophon in Riccardianus 636, implies that the scribe of H did not himself make the collation. It is, however, possible that H might be a fair copy of a manuscript in which H's scribe had previously recorded his collations. On the other hand, the similarity of H's colophon to that of Angelius suggests that H knew Riccardianus 636 (i.e. u+u^2+A) amongst other sources: (see below) and H may perhaps have opted for the impersonal collatus because some of his readings had been taken from A and
were not the fruits of H's own collations; which particular readings it is impossible to say. Since, however, our knowledge of the manuscripts mentioned by H is confined to what we can deduce about them, and that is very little, speculation about the extent of H's knowledge of the Ugoletus manuscript seems to me to be pointless.

2) As further evidence for H's not knowing the Ugoletus manuscript directly, Schenkl mentions the fact that the titles in the ed. Juntina (1504) are almost identical with those in H, and concludes that the readings (mostly good) from the NG branch which appear in H have been taken from the ed. Juntina. Castagna also says, presumably for the same reasons as Schenkl, that H "surely knew" the ed. Juntina (p. 234). Apart from the similarity of titles, the only evidence I can find which might support this theory is 3.63, where H and the ed. Juntina have the truth while NGA and the ed. Parm. are in error. fghinruwy also have the truth here, so that this is not particularly strong evidence. As for the titles, Castagna comments that Greco-Latin coinages such as Epiphunus are reminiscent of certain titles of Boccaccio's, and I wonder if it is possible that the titles in H and the ed. Junt. originated in the Boccaccio manuscript. This is pure speculation, however. The evidence above seems to suggest that H knew the ed. Junt., but it does not appear to me nearly as strong as Schenkl and Castagna would have us believe.

3) Schenkl claims (p. 289) that H knew Ricc. 636, but as Castagna points out, his arguments are not very convincing. Schenkl quotes three places in Calpurnius where the readings seem to suggest dependence on the Riccardianus. As Castagna mentions, however, Schenkl has the wrong reading for H at Cal. 2.27 and this must therefore be discounted. At Cal. 3.24 P as well as H reads sola tu
and es, so that this is not firm evidence of H's dependence on the Riccardianus. Schenkl's third example, which is much stronger evidence for dependence on Riccardianus, Castagna ignores: at Cal. 2.66 in H liquentia has been ousted by rorantia which appears as a gloss in the Riccardianus but is found nowhere else. Further evidence, not mentioned by Schenkl, is perhaps furnished by the fact that H agrees in error with u at 3.33 and 4.44, but on both occasions a few other manuscripts (firy and fhinruwy) have the same reading. The strongest evidence is in my opinion the similarity between the colophon of H and that of Angelius in Ricc. 636.

4) There are in H quite a number of readings from the NG tradition which are not in A, ed. Farm. and ed. Junt., e.g. 1.75 pascentur; 3.47 arripit; 3.54 euomit; 4.39 iam nulla etc. Castagna says (p. 235) that we cannot now know whether the manuscript used by Ugoletus was still extant when H was written, or whether it had already been lost, and suggests that H derived his NG readings not from Ugoletus but from G. Schenkl and Giarratano, however, say that these NG readings are from the Boccaccio manuscript. Baehrens (FIM 3, p. 68), however, asserts that "sine dubio" the Boccaccio manuscript was destroyed by fire with Boccaccio's other books in 1471, see F. Bluhme, Iter Italicum 2, Halle 1824-36, p. 91, but according to H's colophon, the manuscript was in S. Spirito. Castagna concedes that in some places, such as Nem. 4.70, H alone has the genuine reading, although this could be due to conjecture. To this one might add the fact that H is nearest to the truth at 3.51. However, as Castagna says, this alone is not sufficient evidence to prove that the Boccaccio manuscript belonged to a

---

3 There appears, however, to be no other evidence that H might have known P.
different branch of the tradition from NG and V. Reeve (C£ 28 (1978), 233), while admitting that there is no manuscript in the catalogue compiled in 1451 of the library of S. Spirito where the manuscript of Boccaccio was supposed to have been which answers the description of G, nor any manuscript listed containing Nem. or Calpurnius, nevertheless suggests that G found its way to this library and is to be identified with Boccaccio's manuscript. Since we have no record of either G or a Boccaccio manuscript in this library, such speculation is pointless. I am not convinced that H knew G at all, as there are a number of cases where, if G had been used, we might have expected to find its correct reading in H but do not, nor is the correct reading to be found in A⁴ so that it is more likely that the NG readings in H came not from G, but from another source and possibly more than one (i.e. the Ugoletus manuscript, Boccaccio's manuscript or the ed. Junt.).

5) Castagna suggests (p. 236) that H is contaminated with a text from the V tradition which bears some affinity to the ed. Ven. There can be no doubt that the first part of this suggestion is true, but there is not a great deal of evidence to suggest that a text akin to the ed. Ven. was involved. H does very often give a V reading found also in the ed. Ven. but as these are mostly readings found in a number of other V manuscripts, this proves nothing. I have found only two places in Nem. where the only V member which shares H's reading is the ed. Ven., viz. 2.30 nulloque biberunt, which appears also in A, and 2.50 amet, which reading is also shared by u² (A?). At 2.40, on the other hand, H

⁴ A probably did not use G either, but a manuscript not unlike it. See my section on other sources of variant readings in A.
agrees in error with a number of V manuscripts while the ed. Ven. has the truth.

Castagna concludes that H has several subsidiary sources: the ed. Junt., probably also U and A, and at least one manuscript from the NG branch, probably the Boccaccio manuscript. My own conclusions are less definite: we know from the colophon that H was contaminated "cum plerisque aliis" and that two manuscripts which we do not now possess were also involved. It is not impossible that some of the sources hitherto suggested for H were used, but it is also not impossible that the readings which seem to suggest dependence on a particular extant source were also in one or other of the lost manuscripts, and it is therefore dangerous to speculate about the possible sources of particular readings, and to be too dogmatic about the relationship of the lost manuscripts to the extant manuscript tradition.

H, A, the ed. Farm. and the Lost Manuscript of Thadeus Ugoletus

Our information about the lost manuscript of Thadeus Ugoletus comes from three sources, the colophons of the ed. Farm.:

Impressum Parmae per Angelum ugoletum E uetustissimo atque emendatissimo Thadaei Ugoletti (sic) codice e Germania allato in quo Calphurni et Nemesiani uti impressi sunt tituli leguntur,

of H:

collatus accuratissime hic codex cum illo uetustissimo; / quem Thadeus ugoletus pannoniae regis bibliothecae / praefectus e germania secum attulit et cum illo / quem Johannes boccaccius propria manu scripsisse / traditur bibliothecae sancti spiritus florentini / dicatum, et cum plerisque aliis: ubi titulum et / operis divisionem multa
etiam carmina reperimus

and the colophon added to u by Nicolaus Angelius Ugoletus:

Contuli ego Nicolaus Angelius hunc codicem / cum multisue
alij & cum illo uetustissimo codice / quem nobis Thadeus
Ugoletus pannoniae regis / bibliothecae praefectus e
Germania allatum / accomodauit in quo multa carmina sunt
reperta / Anno salutis MCCCLXXXXII

Unfortunately, although Angelius was involved with two of these
texts, other sources have been used and a different approach to the
text has been made in each case, with the result that it is now
very difficult to come to any certain conclusions about the nature
of Ugoletus's manuscript, although there has been much speculation.

Various deductions can, however, be made about it. As Castagna tells
us (p. 216), it is clear from Angelius's foreword to the text of
Nem. in the Riccardianus:

Ex Vetustissimo codice e Germania / allato hic est transcriptus
titulus finis bucolicorum / Calpurnij Aurelij Nemesiani poeta
Cartaginensis

that in the Ugoletus manuscript, the last four Eclogues were
attributed to Nem., whereas in V and the Florilegia all eleven are
attributed to Calpurnius.

The Ugoletus manuscript did not belong to the V family.

Castagna (pp. 216-7) draws our attention to the fact that at Cal.
2.18, Angelius has added the correct reading where u has a V
variant, commenting "sic habebat emendatus codex." A further point
which Castagna does not mention is that the Ugoletus manuscript
almost certainly contained lines missing from the V branch, since
the lines which Angelius has added in u are not found in the ed.
Ven. which he probably also used (see below). It is perhaps also
possible to deduce in a few places what the reading of the Ugoletus
manuscript must have been, where H and ed. Farm. agree in a V reading and there is no sign in u that A ever added an NG reading, e.g. at 1.25 and 1.37. That the Ugoletus manuscript was closer to NG than V is shown not only by the probability that it contained lines missing from V, but also by the number of cases, too large to be due to conjecture, in which the variants which Angelius notes are readings also found in the NG branch. A few of these variants indicate a closer relationship to G than N, but as not all are found in H and ed. Farm., it is difficult to be certain whether H and ed. Farm. are taking readings from other sources, or whether A is, although the former is perhaps more probable. Castagna gives a table of agreements between A and G on p. 218 but as usual he gives both true readings and errors and not all his other examples are cogent. A and G agree in the following errors:

1.11 \textit{et calamis et uersu}, an error not shared by H and ed. Farm.

4.10 \textit{animo G^AH}, not in ed. Farm.

u. 4.6 appears twice in G and ed. Farm., once in its proper place and once after 4.6. In Riccardianus 636 by 4.6 A has added "uacat hie uersus" (not deest as Castagna says). It is doubtful whether the scribe of N would have corrected this error.

G and A are also alone in preserving the truth at 1.2. A and G's \textit{fluit} at 1.5 could conceivably be independent error, as the same reading is found also in k (1490) and q (late fourteenth or early fifteenth century) and has perhaps been caused by the influence of \textit{inflare} above. At 1.31 G reads \textit{fagosque}, not \textit{fagosue} as Castagna says.

Agreements between A and H
A and H alone agree in error in the following places:

1.14 iam) et
1.70 hie) hinc
1.81 tibi ne) tibi neu H. A's signs in u seem to indicate that this is what he wanted the text to read.

4.13 dulces cantu) cantu dulcis H: cantu dulces A

At 1.9, AH alone have the truth.

Other Sources of Variant Readings in A

It was Schenkl who first suggested (p. 287) that some of A's readings originated in the ed. Ven., and Giarratano (p. xxxv) and Castagna (p. 220) list some of these. A number of these readings, however, occur in other V manuscripts also, but there is still some evidence to support the theory that A knew ed. Ven. H agrees with A in some of these readings.

At 2.15 A and the ed. Ven. read reuelare, but as j reads reeuellare, the possibility of independent error cannot be ruled out.

2.30 nullo libarunt) nullogue biberunt AH ed. Ven.
2.48 et) tum A ed. Ven.
3.51 cymbala) cymbia A ed. Ven.
4.69 herbas) artes A ed. Ven.

In a very few cases A has errors not found elsewhere in the tradition e.g.

2.41 erro) horti
2.83 qua) qui

Castagna also mentions 1.70, but this is a reading found also in H and may possibly have appeared in the Ugoletus manuscript.

The danger of speculating about the manuscript of Ugoletus is
highlighted by Castagna when he rightly points out (p. 221) that Giarratano, Verdière and Korzeniewski are wrong to identify this manuscript with A alone, but he goes on to say that some of A's readings are also characteristic of G and of ed. Ven. and to praise Korzeniewski's statement (p. 6) that, "Die Lesarten die Nicolaus Angelius auf dem Rand des Codex Riccardianus 636 vermerkt hat (A), sind wohl grobstenanteils einem germanischen Codex...entnommen; aber da manche Lesarten mit einigen Codices der V-Klasse übereinstimmen, scheint er auch aus anderen Codices, die er nach seiner Angabe mit dem Codex Germanicus verglichen hat, Varianten mitzuteilen." The fallacy here is that since the Ugoletus manuscript is lost we cannot say with certainty that because any particular reading appears in a manuscript or edition still extant it could not have appeared in the Ugoletus manuscript also. The evidence of 1.25 might suggest that the Ugoletus manuscript had certain corruptions found in the V branch. We cannot now know. As regards the readings characteristic of G, it is in my view more probable, as Reeve suggests (p. 232), that the Ugoletus manuscript bore some resemblance to G rather than that readings were taken by A directly from G, as there are a number of places where A might have noted G's reading had he known it, e.g. at 1.85; 2.32; 3.37.

\[ Ugoletus \text{ MS} \]

\[ Boccaccio \text{ MS} \]

\[ \text{ed. Parm.} \]

\[ \text{ed. Ven.} \]


Both Schenkl (p. 287) and Castagna (p. 230) suggest that the ed. Ven. was used in the preparation of ed. Parm. as there are a number of places where ed. Parm. agrees with NG in a reading not
found in the Riccardianus 636 or agrees with ed. Ven. in a peculiar reading not found in any manuscript. Their conclusion is probably correct, but their evidence could have been more convincing. Schenkl cites resonant tua at 1.2 as a reading which probably goes back to the ed. Ven., but as he admits himself, this variant is also in u, and a number of other V manuscripts.

The ed. Parm. agrees with ed. Ven. in the following unique errors:

1.73 te pinus) te primis
2.61 quae ducit) quae non ducit

illudere in ed. Parm. at 3.42 is probably also taken from ed. Ven., and possibly also splenderet lumine at 2.76. It is possible that the interpolation of Astacus at 2.1 has also come from ed. Ven., but this is a very common interpolation in the V manuscripts.

Schenkl also suggests that the ed. Parm. used the second Deventer edition but he gives no evidence and I can see none.


There is clearly a link between the ed. Parm. and the ed. Bon. of 1504 which has notes by Guidalotti. Both refer to the first three poems as prima, secunda, tertia, but then refer to the last as undecima.

They alone offer certain errors:

2.86 uiburna) urbana
3.32 astringit) astringere
4.17 mentem) mente

Castagna tells us (p. 230) that there is only one case where Guidalotti emends the reading of ed. Parm., 2.83, but this is incorrect. At 2.87 ed. Bon. "corrects" ed. Parm.'s unmetrical at to aut and at 4.11, ed. Bon. has the true reading adederat where
ed. Parm. has the error ederat.


These two early editions are clearly related: both preserve the lines missing from the V tradition, transpose uu. 3.25 and 26, preserve many good readings from the NG class and agree in a unique error at 2.44. The ed. Juntina is not a copy of ed. Parm., however, as it sometimes has readings from the NG tradition, where ed. Parm. follows the V branch, e.g. at 1.8, 58, 67; 2.48; 3.34 etc. Schenkl suggests that these good readings in ed. Junt. are taken from the Ugoletus manuscript, as Niccolaus Angelius, whose colophon in Ricc. 636 is dated 1492, made the proof correction of the ed. Junt. at about the same time (See Bandini, De Florentina Juntarum typographia, Florence 1791, I, p. 50f.). Castagna states (p. 228) that where the ed. Junt. disagrees with the ed. Parm., it always preserves a reading from the NG tradition while ed. Parm.'s reading is from the ed. Ven. This is generally true, but not always, e.g. at 1.44 ed. Junt. agrees with NG in the truth while ed. Parm. agrees with fghinruwy. In two places where the ed. Junt. has the truth, ed. Parm. has an error of its own, 2.86 and 3.32. At 1.81, ed. Junt. has a very significant error not found in ed. Parm. (see below), and there is another unique error at 4.51. At 1.20, ed. Junt. has the truth, together with H and some V manuscripts, while ed. Parm. agrees with NG, ed. Ven. and other V manuscripts in error. At 3.9 ed. Parm. agrees with ed. Ven. in error, but ed. Junt.'s error is found in fru(in ras,)y. At 3.42, ed. Junt.'s error is shared by HV plerique while ed. Parm.'s error is also found in ed. Ven. At 4.11 ed. Junt., like Hafu2 reads the truth, while ed. Parm. agrees with NGV reliqui in error. Thus Castagna is oversimplifying the situation. In most of these cases it will be noted that ed. Junt. agrees with u or u2 while it disagrees with ed.
The source of the good readings in ed. Junt. not also found in ed. Parm. is something of a mystery. Schenkl suggests that they are taken from the Ugoletus manuscript. Castagna says simply that the ed. Junt. had a fuller knowledge of the NG tradition than ed. Parm. and I am surprised that he does not suggest the Boccaccio manuscript mentioned in the colophon of H as a possible source. We have no real evidence for the source of these good readings. It is possible that this is simply a case of Angelius experimenting with the text by adopting different readings for different editions, and that these good readings may have been in the Ugoletus manuscript.

The fact that ed. Parm. has less of the truth than ed. Junt. although Angelius possibly had access to the correct reading, parallels the state of the text of Nem. before Baehrens, when N was known but editors continued to accept the readings of V in most cases.

Ed. Parm., ed. Juntina, the Ugoletus Manuscript and Riccardianus 636

Schenkl suggests (p. 228) that the readings of the Ugoletus manuscript (i.e. readings from the NG tradition) are taken in both the ed. Parm. and the ed. Junt. from Ricc. 636. In both editions, with a few exceptions, where the truth is noted in the margin in Ricc. 636, presumably taken from the Ugoletus manuscript, ed. Parm. and ed. Junt. have this reading, whereas in the places where the V reading stands with no variant added, ed. Parm. and ed. Junt. follow the V tradition, as at 1.25; 2.71; 4.24 etc. Two examples make the use of Ricc. 636 by these editions almost certain.

At Cal. 2.18f. (Schenkl pp. 284-5) u follows the V tradition, fusing uu. 18 and 19 into one. Angelius has added in the margin the correct reading and then repeated the first two words of u. 18
omnia cessabant, which have subsequently been partially erased. In ed. Parm. this repetition has led to the appearance of both versions of these lines one after the other, first the correct NG reading and then the V.

The dependence of ed. Junt. on Ricc. 636 can be demonstrated by Nem. 1.81 (Schenkl p. 285) which appears in the manuscript thus:

\[ \text{Perge puer ceptu}^tibi \text{iam}^\text{desere carmen} \]

Angelius clearly wishes the text to read \text{ceptumque tibi neu desere}, but his marks have been misunderstood, and the line reads in the ed. Junt.:

\[ \text{Perge puer ceptum tibi neuque desere carmen} \]

There is no knowing why, if Angelius made the proof correction of the ed. Junt., he did not alter the text here. Schenkl (p. xlii) says that Angelius seems to have done the work hastily and quotes as an example Cal. 6.46 where he has not noted the reading of the manuscript against a very corrupt line, but has simply obelized. Schenkl quotes some other examples (p. 285) demonstrating ed. Junt.'s dependence on Ricc. 636.

In a few places the two editions preserve a true reading where Ricc. 636 follows the V tradition, e.g. 1.13 \text{tepuere} (which reading does not appear in the ed. Ven. or the Deventer editions which have been suggested as further sources for the texts of ed. Parm. and ed. Junt.). Schenkl wonders what the source of these readings could be, and, while he does not exclude the possibility that ed. Junt. is simply taking over readings from ed. Parm., he thinks it more probable that \text{tepuere} was originally noted by Angelius in the manuscript and was removed by later glossators, as he says happens occasionally in manuscripts, but I find it hard to believe that the reading could have been removed without any trace at all remaining.
Castagna accounts for these readings by suggesting that Ricc. 636 was not the direct source of the texts of the two editions, but that Angelius and the editor of the ed. Junt. had added the collation of Angelius to different base texts when the Ugoletus manuscript was still at Florence, one working more carefully than the other. It is the suggestion of Castagna that Angelius's other exemplar was the ed. Ven. or a text very similar, and that his collation was easier to read than the Ugoletus manuscript. Then either Ugoletus or the editors of ed. Junt. checked the manuscript and added various readings which Angelius had missed. We know, according to Castagna, that Angelius was not the only one to use Ricc. 636 as there is at least one other correcting hand. (See below). Castagna gives no evidence for these suggestions, however, and I find it particularly hard to believe that the repetition in ed. Parm. at 2.18 f. (above) in particular was not brought about by direct use of Ricc. 636.

Other Sources of the ed. Juntina

Schenkl (p. 287) doubts whether the ed. Juntina depends directly on the ed. Ven. as does the ed. Parm., since ed. Junt. agrees with ed. Parm. in a unique error found first in ed. Ven. in only four places, as for example 2.76 splenderet lumine, and he suggests that the ed. Junt. could have taken these readings directly from the ed. Parm. Castagna, on the other hand (pp. 227-8), says that the ed. Junt. is not dependent on the ed. Parm., or if it is, it is not exclusively so, and that both editions independently grafted on to a text closely affiliated to the ed. Ven. a series of NG readings. He further asserts that the ed. Junt. shows greater knowledge of the NG tradition than does ed. Parm., for which see my section on the ed. Parm. and the ed. Juntina. I cannot find any cases of the ed. Junt. agreeing with the ed. Ven. where ed. Parm.
does not also do so, and the fact that at 2.44 ed. Parm. and ed. Junt. alone read *me misero* may further suggest that the ed. Junt. is taking over readings from the ed. Parm. Schenkl also suggests that the ed. Junt. used both Deventer editions, but he gives no evidence, and I can see none.

**Sources of the Variant Readings in Riccardianus 636.**

The sources of the variant readings added in this manuscript and the number of hands involved are disputed. It is generally agreed, however, that the ed. Ven., or a very similar text was used, and variants from this text have in fact been added, for example, at 2.48; 3.26; 4.69. Castagna (p. 224) and Reeve (232) have also suggested the ed. Rom. tradition, and variants from this branch have indeed been added, for example, at 1.63; 1.69; 2.67; 3.9; 3.34. Schenkl (pp. xliii-xliv) distinguishes five different hands. Reeve, however, suggests (232) that less attention to hands and more to the sources of the variants would give a clearer picture, but this is wrong in my view, as, given a number of possible sources, it is impossible to be sure which are the sources of variants when we cannot be certain which hand has noted them. There are a number of places in this manuscript where it is quite impossible to tell which hand has made a particular alteration and these cases are often very important for increasing our knowledge of the sources. It is also impossible to be certain when these variants were added, and this can lead to difficulties. Castagna, for example, contends (p. 230), that in the ed. Parm. and often in the ed. Junt., there are readings from the NG tradition which are not added by A in Ricc. 636 and he cites 3.34 and 4.8 as examples, but in both these cases the text has been altered to the NG readings by means of erasures and it is surely impossible to state categorically either that these erasures were not already...
present in the text when Angelius saw it, or that Angelius did not make them himself.

Castagna (p. 224) suggests that the first corrector in Ricc. 636 added some readings from the ed. Ven. or a text similar to it. Angelius next added more readings from the ed. Ven. and also some from the Ugoletus manuscript. Finally, readings from the ed. Rom. were added. However, he does not explain how he arrives at these conclusions.

Reeve, unlike Schenkl (p. xliii) and Castagna (p. 49), does not believe that the readings noted from the ed. Ven. in Ricc. 636 were added first, but that readings from the ed. Rom. tradition preceded them. He quotes as an example (233) two variant readings noted in the margin at 3.25-6. Reeve is, however, simplifying the situation here, partly because he has omitted some of the evidence. He says, quite rightly, that 26 has conflated the lines, but ignores the fact that another hand has erased the part of the line which properly belongs to 26 and inserted the rest of 25, nor does he say which hand he thinks is responsible. Again, the mere fact that the ed. Rom. reading precedes that of the ed. Ven. in the margin does not necessarily prove that all the ed. Rom. readings were added first. In fact, as Reeve himself admits, the second version is not that of the ed. Ven. at all, but the same as that in 25, although this may simply be an independent error. He also does not mention the fact that Angelius has added a version of 3.26 which appears above the variants he quotes. Reeve contends that these variants are in the same hand as the colophon, i.e. that of Angelius, but this does not seem to me to be so. Reeve (233) concludes that all the notes not in the hand of Rogerius, who owned the manuscript in the sixteenth century, were entered by Angelius over a fairly long period of time from three sources: the ed. Rom. branch, ed. Ven. and the Ugoletus manuscript. In favour
of part of this theory is the fact that some of Angelius's notes are in darker and thicker ink than others, but I am not convinced that there are only two glossators involved, although as the matter of the hands is so difficult, I hesitate to state that the theory is definitely false. My own impression is that the ed. Rom. readings were added by one hand, and the ed. Ven. and Ugoletus manuscript readings by Angelius, but this is simply an impression.

Magliabecchianus VII 1195

This manuscript was first discovered by Castagna who says (p. 222) that it was written after the collation of Angelius in Ricc. 636 and before H, while he is unsure how it stands chronologically in relation to the Parma and Juntina editions. The base text is unquestionably V and it has been contaminated with the NG branch. This NG text is clearly related to A, as it agrees with it in error, for example, at 1.81; 2.18; 4.10; 4.13 post 4.6. Castagna also quotes 1.5, which as I mentioned above may possibly be an independent error, and 1.11 where he says M's et calamis uersu et appears to be an unhappy emendation of NGA's et calamis et uersu, although it is in my opinion more likely that it is simply an error.

M has more NG readings than the Parma and Juntina editions and therefore cannot simply be a copy of either except on the assumption of contamination. It preserves an NG reading where they do not, e.g. at 1.47; 2.33; 2.50; 2.79 etc. and also does not repeat their errors at 2.1; 2.44 etc.

As regards the V readings in M, Castagna (p. 223) says that M has a preference for the firuy branch and agrees with them, e.g., at 2.41; 3.41; 4.53, but this may be due to dependence on Ricc. 636 (see below). The scribe adds a variant reading at the time of copying the manuscript only once, at 2.15 where he adds Ae's variant
reuelare in the margin while he reads releuare in his text.

Castagna canvasses the possibility (p. 224) that M is derived from u + A, but rejects it. As Reeve points out (n. 31, 231-2), however, Castagna is wrong to state that the transposition of uu. 3.25-6 in M could not have been found in Ricc. 636, as in the latter manuscript Angelius has noted u. 26 in the margin, and there is a sign above u. 25 which might be interpreted as indicating that the line is to be inserted there. One might also add that Castagna is wrong to say (p. 225) that Angelius's instructions noted in Ricc. 636 are not sufficiently clear for M to have understood where dulcia was to be inserted in u. 2.37 after Idas has been ejected: the mark after cui in Ricc. 636 is perfectly plain. On the other hand, Reeve completely ignores the fact that there are a number of cases in M where M has an NG reading which is not noted by Angelius, does not appear in ed. Parm. and ed. Junt., and in one case, does not appear in H either (2.33). As with certain readings in the ed. Junt., we have a case where another member of the NG family has been involved in the constitution of the text, but we have no evidence as to which manuscript this might be.

Variant Readings in Magliabecchianus VII 1195

Castagna (p. 226) suggests that the variants and corrections in M are all in the hand of the scribe, Alesso Lapaccini. Some were made at the same time as the main text and others, in red ink, at a later date. Many of these variants are probably from the ed. Ven. (p. 227). Almost certain examples are the interventions at 2.76; 3.15; 3.42 and probably also those at 1.11; 1.31; 3.47 etc. There are also a number of readings common to the V tradition e.g. 1.9; 1.26; 1.29; 2.18; 2.23; 2.33; 3.26 etc. At 4.45 is noted the reading sed et huc which is found in a ktz (sed de huc g), but
none of these manuscripts contains all the readings after we have eliminated those found in the ed. Ven., so that there are clearly at least three sources for the variants in M, and it is impossible to identify two of them on such scanty evidence. Castagna draws our attention to two variants which may possibly be emendations by Lapaccini, *qui pando* at 3.19, which Burman conjectured much later, and *lusus adegerat* at 4.11. There is one gloss, *luscinia*, explaining *aedona* at 2.61.
CONCORDANCE OF SIGLA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Williams</th>
<th>Giarratano</th>
<th>Verdière</th>
<th>Castagna</th>
<th>Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1943 ed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>(a)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e (M1)</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f (M2)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h (M4)</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i (M2)</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x (M1)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>l (M5)</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v (M5)</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n (M4)</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p (M3)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>s (M2)</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>r (M3)</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w (M1)</td>
<td>(w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u (M2)</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>k (M4)</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The brackets signify that this manuscript has been eliminated by Reeve and the siglum used to signify another manuscript.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Williams</th>
<th>Giarratano</th>
<th>Verdière</th>
<th>Castagna</th>
<th>Reeve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y (M5)</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>m (M2)</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The V Manuscripts

All the manuscripts which constitute the V branch of the tradition were written in the fifteenth century (with the possible exception of q, see J.B. Hall, *Claudian De Raptu Proserpinae*, Cambridge 1969, p. 24, and M.D. Reeve *CQ* 28 (1978), 237, and v), and in the earliest V manuscript definitely datable (c, written 1447-55), the text already has the interpolations and lacunae which distinguish the V manuscripts.

Errors common to all V manuscripts

Omissions of whole lines

1.28; 2.83; 3.30.

Interpolations

1.9 *comam uicine Timeta* meam mihi care senectam
1.25 *aut Oearrius* modula(n)tibus
1.29 seruans) quercus
1.67 messi) campo
2.79 *iuurare* nar(r)are
3.39 fetus) fructus
3.40 primi) pueri
4.45 urere) ertito
4.47 ad undas) ab ulmis

There are many other errors common to all the V manuscripts.

The V branch of the tradition is divided into two main sub-groups, fhinruwy (α) and abcdégkłmpqstvxz (β).

fhinruwy agree in the following errors:
1.44 anni) animi fghinruwy
2.41 uiolaque) uiolisque fhinruwy
2.67 geminasque) geminosque fhinruwy
2.82 auena) auenae Hfghinruwy
3.51 uocalia) uenalia firuy : ueralia hnw (where all the other V manuscripts but a have the truth).
3.68 fluorem) liquorem fghinruwy. Reeve (228) asks whether abcddegjklmpqstvxz (A) could have taken the true reading fluorem from an outside source, implying that the archetype of the V manuscripts read liquorem, but it is surely much more likely that liquorem in fghinruwy is a gloss belonging only to this group.
4.39 iam nulla) nam nulla fhinruy (uersum om. w)
4.44 niueum) nactum Hfghinruwy
4.63 uaporo) uaporem fghinruwy

abcdjklmpqstvxz agree in error in the following places:
2.6 uenerisque) uenerique abcdjklmpqstvxz
2.11 quod) et abcdjklmpqstvxz
3.25 om. abcdjklmpstvxz
4.39 iam nulla) non ulla abcdjklmpqstvxz. uersum om. e
4.44 niueum) natum abcdjklmpstvxz: notum kt
4.68 quoque uersicoloria) qu(a)e uer(s)icoloria abcdjklmpqs tu (in ras.) vxz

g agrees sometimes with one sub-group and sometimes with another.
Reeve tells us (228) that he inclines to the view that "gnu had a common hyparchetype," but the evidence which he produces to support this theory is, at least as regards Nem., not very strong. At 2.41 and 2.59 he is obliged to admit that g's reading is not the same as
that of n and u. At 2.56 I do not agree that u reads diane; it seems to me to read dione. Of his examples, the only one which in my opinion has any weight at all is 1.44 animi, and this seems to me insufficient evidence to include g in this sub-group. Reeve also wonders (228) whether gnu found 3.25 from a source outside the group. The answer to this question is almost certainly no: n has the truth, but the beginning of the line in g is corrupt, and the first hand of u conlates uu. 3.25 and 26, which makes it highly probable that both lines were in u's exemplar. g appears to me to be contaminated:

\[
\text{habent } 3.25 \text{ fghinruwy}
\]

3.68 fluorem NGRbcdjklmpqstvxz: fluorem a: liquorem fghinruwy

but

4.39 iam nulla NGBy²: nam nulla fhirruy: non uilla bcdgjklmpqs

tvxx: non illa a: uersum om. ew

4.44 niumue um NGA: nactum Hfhirruy: natum abcdgjklmpqstvxx:

notum kt

\[\alpha\text{ can be further divided into two sub-groups, fir(u)y, first identified by Schenkl, p. lii, and hnw.}\]

\[\text{firy agree in the following errors:}^{5}\]

\[
1.7 \text{ detondent) detrudent } \quad \text{ permittere) promittere}
\]

\[
1.51 \text{ concilioque deum) consilioque deus}
\]

\[
1.69 \text{ mella) mala}
\]

\[
1.81 \text{ tibi ne) tibi iam neu}
\]

\[
2.23 \text{ prato) pacto}
\]

\[
2.32 \text{ aera) atra}
\]

\[\text{5 Unlike Giarratano, Castagna and Reeve, I mention here variants which occur only in the manuscripts in question.}\]
firuy agree in the following errors:

1.10 in) mihi firu (sub ras.)
1.61 meritae) meriti
2.50 dum Pallas) dea pallas firu (sub ras.): mea Pallas
3.51 uocalia) uenalia
om. 4.56-61 firuy
4.70 quo rumpitur) corrumpitur

u has suffered a number of erasures and in many of these places, it looks as though the original text agreed in error with firuy, but it is impossible now to be sure.

The ed. Romana 1471 and firuy

Reeve claims (p. 224) that firuy derive from the ed. Rom. and later adds (p. 226) that everything he needs to say about firuy "can be truthfully said about u." Unfortunately, neither of these claims is wholly true. There is some evidence to suggest that i is not descended from the ed. Rom. as it preserves the truth in several places where the ed. Rom. and firu are corrupt:

1.63 phoebea i: phorbea firu, ed. Rom.
2.41 erro i: atrae ry; atre u, ed. Rom.: antre f (p.c.)
3.9 suerat i: sueuit fru₂ y ed. Rom.
3.34 collidit i: sustulit fru₂ y ed. Rom.: sustolit y

u is also clearly not descended from the ed. Rom., since it agrees with i in all the cases cited above and is also not interpolated at 1.7, 74; 2.1, 52; 3.45 and 4.32. It is impossible to say whether or not u could have been the parent of ed. Rom., since there are so many alterations to the text that it is difficult to tell how many hands are involved and to distinguish one from another. Reeve (232-3) considers that certain readings were added to u from ed. Rom., which is possible, as there are a number of readings added by u² which agree with fury and ed. Rom., but this theory ignores the fact that the base text of u and ed. Rom. already had some features in common. I can find no evidence, however, that fury are not descended from the ed. Rom. and I have therefore eliminated them from the summation stemma.

```
              x
             /\
            /  \
         u   i   ed. Rom.
          /    \
         /     \
        /       \
       /         \\    y
```

Other early editions and fury

The ed. Parisina of 1495 is also closely linked to this group and agrees with fury in error, for example at 2.23 prato) pacto; 2.26 expecto) experto; 4.42 cantu) tantum; om. 4.56-61; 4.70 quo luna) colubrina; 4.71 migrant) magice.

Also linked, but less closely, are the ed. Cadomensis (1500?) and the ed. Ascensiana (1503) which agree with fury for example, at 2.32, 61; 3.1; 4.71. These editions, however, have no authority.

hnw

Giarratano (p. xxiv) first realised that h and n were related
but had not looked at w.

hnw agree in the following errors:

1.26 concinerent) concinnent
1.27 quia) quare
1.49 jaces) taces
1.69 dat) dant hn¹w
2.11 quod) qui
2.57 cura) rura
3.32 acutas) acutis
3.51 uocalia) ueralia
4.7 hos) nos

om. 4.26-37 hn, om. 4.26-43 w
4.63 quoque NGAH: qu(a)e V plerique: uerbum om. hnw
4.65 lauros) tauros

Of hnw, Reeve tells us (224) that, "If h was copied directly from n, therefore, k (i.e. w) must derive from h; but even if not, it must derive from n." I can find no evidence that h was not copied from n, but w does not repeat h's errors at 1.38, 47; 2.15, 58, 60; 3.28 and 55 and I wonder if w's relationship to n is as simple as Reeve implies. w is a very corrupt manuscript with a number of lacunae and many errors which suggest that the scribe had little idea of what he was copying (e.g. primum for pinus 1.30; defendet for dependent 4.48), but there is also evidence of conjecture (e.g. getulusque at 1.76; uagitibus at 2.32; noctiuagus at 3.17; acerbum at 4.53), which it seems unlikely that an ignorant scribe could have made, and there are also places where w has the truth and hn are in error (e.g. 2.40; 3.69). Again, at 4.5, h has the unmetrical reading muerilisque, presumably a misunderstanding of n's pilisque, while w has the metrical muerique, and at 4.64 h's unmetrical reading lustrauitque cineres has been "corrected" in w to lustrauti
cineres. All this suggests to me that if $w$ is descended from $n$, the text has undergone some degree of damage and correction in the process and its relationship to $hn$ is not that of an apograph. It has, however, no readings of importance and I have therefore eliminated it and $h$ from the summation stemma.

Thus we can propose the following stemma for the $\alpha$ branch of the $V$ tradition:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\overrightarrow{\alpha} \\
\overrightarrow{n} \\
\overrightarrow{h} \\
\overrightarrow{w}
\end{array}
\]

These manuscripts agree in omitting 3.25 and in the following errors:

2.6 $\text{uenerisque}$) $\text{uenerique}$

2.11 $\text{quod}$) $\text{et}$

4.39 $\text{iam nulla}$) $\text{non nulla}$ (except $a$, which reads $\text{non illa}$ and $v$ which has $\text{non nulla}$)

4.44 $\text{niueum}$) $\text{natum}$ (except $kt$ which have $\text{notum}$)

4.68 $\text{guoque}$) $\text{guae}$

Castagna is troubled (p. 178) because the manuscripts which omit 3.25 do not show particularly clearly their interdependence, unlike $firuy$ and $hnw$, and asserts that the omission of the line is not due to homoeoteleuton or to any other polygenetic cause. On the other hand, he can see no reason to suspect that the $V$ manuscripts which do contain this line have been contaminated with the $NG$ tradition.
or any other branch. However, the reason for this omission is not
difficult to deduce, and it is one which Castagna has rejected. At
first glance the manuscript evidence seems to be totally confused,
but a closer inspection reveals that the main confusion was
probably caused by the appearance of the word *nymphae* above the
word *nymphae*, with its similar beginning and ending, in the archetype
of V. *nymphae* came to oust *nymphae* and appears in u. 26 in all the V
manuscripts whether they have u. 25 or not. Once *nymphae* had appeared
in both lines, the omission of one or other line becomes likely and
could easily occur in different manuscript groups independently.
This omission, indeed, almost occurred in u, while the first hand
has conflated uu. 25 and 26. Thus the omission of 3.25 can be
easily accounted for, and it is not necessary to assume a common
archetype for those manuscripts which omit 3.25, i.e. abdeklmpqst
vzx. This assumption is probably justified, nevertheless, by the
evidence quoted above and by the agreements between the various sub-
groups of this branch of the tradition, although as Castagna points
out, the evidence for this branch is not nearly so strong as that
for fhinruwy.

This second branch of the V tradition is also divided into sub-
groups, lmx, cjpqs and dektv. The position of a and z is rather
more difficult to determine.

*lmx* (Castagna p. 173).

1.50 om. *dignus* (add. *x²*)
1.73 *te pinus*) *teque prius* l'mx
2.14 *pectoris*) *corporis*
2.48 *et*) *ac*
3.19 *uitea*) *uitrea*
3.47 *corripiunt*) *corrumpunt*
m and x are more closely related to one another than to l:

- 1.7 permittere) committere
- 1.12 ludebat) rumpebat
- 1.31 ulmos potius) potius ulmos
- 4.26 iuenca) iuencam
- 4.52 potabit) potabit potabit
- 4.69 micale) micale micale

x cannot be copied from m since only the former preserves 1.75 and 2.46 and it is unlikely that x got these lines from another source, since there are lacunae unique to x left unfilled in x. m is probably descended from x before certain corrections had been made to x (cf. 1.50 quoted above). There are a few places where m has the truth and x is in error:

- 1.86 demittit m: dimittit x
- 2.45 horreo m: horrea x
- 3.50 haurit m: auriit x
- 4.35 nares m: narres x
- 4.44 seue m: scaeue x
- 4.57 pacienter m: patienit (?) x

but these are minor corrections which could easily have been made one ingenii, and I think it most probable that m is descended from x.

lmx, a and z

There are a number of places where a and z agree with lmx and
with l or mx only.

**almx**

2.25 perierunt) nuxbom om. l: pellerunt x: pepulerunt amx¹
2.30 nullo libarunt) nullos lamberunt almx
2.40 heu heu) en ego a¹lmx
3.57 fugientes) cupientes a¹lmx

**lmxz**

1.83 perdusat) producat lmxz
2.77 uidi nulla tegimur) nulla tegimur teneras lz (om. uidi):
   nulla tegimur te (teniras sup.) x: uidi nulla tegimur x²
   in mg.: nulla tegimur m (teneras in mg. m¹)
3.11 cum) tunc lmxz

**mxz**

2.69 haec) hoc

**lz**

1.85 pinnis) plenae
4.10 l and z are the only manuscripts to have the truth here.

**a and z**

3.26 nosque etiam) uos etiam
   a and z (and z²) have the lines in the correct order at
3.52-3.
4.45 solet hic) sed et huc a¹z

Reeve (226) says that a is a "hybrid of M3 and M5" (i.e. ps and lmx), and this is partly true (see above, and below, p.77), but ignores the fact that at 2.1 a is one of only three manuscripts in
the V tradition (uz are the others), which is not interpolated. Similarly at 2.47 it is the only V manuscript which reads si tu rather than tu si, and is the only manuscript (besides g and z) not to transpose 3.52 and 53. a must therefore either be correcting or else it must be drawing on another, lost source, in which case we cannot know that the readings it shares with ps and Imx were not also drawn from this other source. In either case, Reeve's statement is incorrect. There are similar difficulties with z, which often agrees with Imx and a but occasionally agrees with NG, e.g. it agrees in error with NG at 1.14 against V and has the truth with GHu at 1.58.

a and z also sometimes agree with manuscripts from the cjpqs and dektv groups:

a and cjpqs and dektv

3.10 dissona sibila) sibila dissona acdekpstv: sibilla disona jq

a and cjpqs and dv

3.52 pressis) pressit

a and ps

3.59 cymbia) cymbala p: cimbala as

az and ekty

2.11 sonaret) sonarent

az and ps

1.73 te) fert
z and dev
2.86 uiburna) iuburna

z and cjq
1.44 nostrique) nostri

z and pos, dektv and Hu²
3.38 poma) dona

az and lmx, dektv and A
3.33 breue) leue Aa¹eklmtxz
3.63 prosatus) natus ab

az and ekty³, l² and Ah
3.26 nutrimus) nutristis

az, l, ps, ekty³ and A
1.32 subicit) suggestit

b

It is not possible to fit b into any particular group, but as it is not interpolated at 1.2 or 3.15, unlike acdejkpqstvz, it therefore stands closer to lmx, and probably closer to mx than l:
1.66 quod) quot bmx
cjpqs and dektv

That cdejkpqstv constitute a sub-group can be shown by 1.56:

\[ \text{blanda tibi) oscula ibi cjpqs: uerba om. dv (add. v^3). The} \]
\[ \text{fact that ekt have the truth here is no doubt due to the activity} \]
\[ \text{of the editor of the ed. Ven. (see below). v has possibly found} \]
\[ \text{nonsense in his exemplar and omitted it.} \]

These manuscripts can be further divided into groups, cjpqs and dektv.

cjpqs

3.26 nosque etiam) nos etiam
3.63 prosatus) pronatus
1.56 (above)

Some of these manuscripts also agree in the following errors:

3.32 uellicat) uellitat cjps
4.7 hos) flos cjqs
4.59 gaudia) grandia jqp

ps form a further sub-group (See Giarratano p. xxiv and Castagna pp. 166-7), and agree in the following errors:

1.9 canamque) cantabo
1.12 ludebat) laudabat
1.15 victor) uictos
1.33 nemus) genus
1.44 aeui) anni
1.66 ualet) lauet
1.81 tibi ne) tibi iam nec
2.12 sollicitumque) sollicitamque
2.34 calathos) calamos
2.45 pallentesque) pallentes
Neither manuscript is a copy of the other since each has a few slight omissions and some errors not found in the other. There is, however, a manuscript which is almost certainly an apograph of p, o. This manuscript, in a different hand from that of the text, bears the colophon: Opus absolutum ad petitionem Joannis Marcha/nonae artium et medicinae doctoris m. Bono/niae. Brixiae Anno.D.MCCCCLX. A comparison of its readings with p reveals that one is almost certainly a copy of the other.

1.73 pinus) pierus p: piorus uel pierus o
2.71 mane) nitine (?) op (reading difficult to decipher in both places).
3.33 mutilum) rutilum op
3.55 chorosque V: cohorsque op

All of these readings are unique to these two manuscripts. Furthermore, the evidence would seem to suggest that it is o which is
copied from p:

2.42 pocula p: bocula o
2.45 om. dulce o
3.39 fructus p: tuctus o
3.52 ab uuis p: ab undis o
3.65 bibenti p: bidenti o
4.29 arbor p: armor o
4.64 cinereque; mereque o

If p were copied from o, and the above differences were due to the scribe of p correcting o, he would surely also have corrected such slips as duli (2.7) and splederet (2.76) instead of repeating them. All the parts of p are normally dated by scholars as fifteenth to sixteenth century, but as o is dated 1460, it follows that for o to be a copy of p, we must assume for the text of Calpurnius in p a date prior to 1460, or else that p and o are both copied from an earlier manuscript in Brescia. A comparison of the readings of o with those in Burman's appendix shows that this is the manuscript referred to as Dorv. 4.

Neither c, j or ps can be the source of the other manuscripts in this sub-group as each has omissions not found in the others. q, on the other hand, has no omissions other than those common to this branch of the tradition. c cannot be copied from q as it has the truth where q is in error at 1.31; 3.27, 38, 47; 4.20, 46, 59 etc. ps cannot be copied from q as they have the truth where q is in error at 1.44; 3.27, 47; 4.20, 36, 46, 63. It is difficult to say with certainty whether or not j was copied from q. q is generally a much more faithful witness, but j has the truth at 3.27 where q is in error. Both share certain peculiarities of spelling, such as iddas (2.37, 52, 53), uhe (2.44); sibilla disona (3.10) and are
closely related, if \( j \) is not actually copied from \( q \).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{c} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{j} \quad \text{q} \quad \text{p} \quad \text{s} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{o}
\end{array}
\]

dektv

The relationship of these manuscripts is a little more complex as evidence of interpolation is clearly visible in each.

\( d \) and \( v \)

\( v \) was first discovered by Reeve (224) and \( d \) in all probability derives from it. The following errors are unique to \( dv \):

1.11 \text{et calamis uersus) et calamo uersus}

2.8 \text{om. non (add. v\textsuperscript{3} in mg.)}

3.26 \text{nosque etiam) nos etiam et}

3.34 \text{collidit) collit (corr. v\textsuperscript{3} in mg.)}

lacuna at 1.56 \( dv \) (filled by a later hand in \( v \))

marginal note at 2.20.

There have been two correcting hands at work in \( v \) besides the scribe and it would appear, as Reeve says, that \( d \) was copied from \( v \) after \( v\textsuperscript{2} \) had been at work, and before \( v\textsuperscript{3} \) had begun his activities, cf. 2.10 where \( v \) omits \textit{clausere}, but the word appears in the margin, and appears in its proper place in \( d \); and 1.5 where \( v \)’s error \textit{bontis} is corrected in \( v \) by \( v\textsuperscript{3} \) but is reproduced by \( d \).

\( v \) and the ed. Ven.

Reeve (224) says, "Everything that the ed. Ven. owes to tradition can be found in \( f + f\textsuperscript{2} + f\textsuperscript{3} \)" (i.e. \( v \) after all corrections had been made to it), and this appears to be partly true, e.g. \textit{uirga} in
ed. Ven. and the Deventer editions appears to be a misreading of v's iura, where d retains iura, and at 3.42 where these early editions repeat v's error illudere, corrected in v to illidere which is also the reading of d. At 1.56 the words omitted by dv, but added in v by a later hand, appear in the early editions. It is not wholly true, however, to say that everything that is traditionary in the ed. Ven. can be found in v e.g.

1.10 deos, also in ps, not in v
1.38 facta, also in a (s.c.) c (in mg.) z, not in v
1.69 flore, also in fimruy, not in v
4.13 dixere, also in NGHcefirtu, not in v.

a, v^3 and z

Reeve (228) considers that these three manuscripts form a sub-group, but his evidence is not particularly convincing. The fact that these three agree in reading the truth proves nothing at all, and Reeve further ignores the fact that some of their true readings (e.g. 1.61 and 4.63) are found in other V manuscripts. None of the errors which he cites on p. 229 are exclusive to av^3z either, and in three of these four cases they agree with lmx as well, and we have already seen (above) that az have some links with this group. The only error I can find which is exclusive to av^3z is 2.11 sonarent. Reeve also does not tell us that the first hand in a has altered the truth breue to leue which might (a possibility Reeve rejects) indicate contamination.

e and the ed. Ven.

The following errors are unique to e and the ed. Ven.: 

2.61 quae ducit) quae non ducit
2.76 lumen splenderet) splenderet lumine
om. 3.15.
Verdière first suggested that these two manuscripts were derived from early editions, "A propos du Calpurnius Siculus de
k and Dav. 1 alone share the following errors:

1.50 \textit{canente)} \textit{cruente}
2.86 \textit{coniferas)} \textit{confertas}
4.72 \textit{meus)} \textit{minus}

\textit{t} and Dav. 2 alone share the following errors:

1.50 \textit{canente)} \textit{cernente}
1.75 \textit{in aruis)} \textit{in arui}
1.77 \textit{anni)} \textit{annis}
2.61 \textit{ducit)} \textit{non canit}
2.86 \textit{coniferas)} \textit{consertas}
3.5 \textit{e tereti)} \textit{e tenti}
4.72 \textit{meus)} \textit{munus}

It was Schenkl, too, who first realised (p. liv of his edition) that the Deventer editions were derived from the ed. Ven. Another early edition which agrees closely with the Deventer editions is the ed. Norimbergensis (1490?) which repeats their errors at 1.66; 2.3, 56, 77; 3.6, 14, 50, 63, 64; 4.30. Schenkl gives no evidence for the derivation of the Deventer editions from the ed. Ven., but these editions agree, for example, in the following errors:

3.42 \textit{elidere)} \textit{illudere}
4.15 \textit{cur)} \textit{et}
\textit{om. 4.36}
4.54 \textit{iuga)} \textit{uirga}

The Deventer editions are, however, not simply later copies of the ed. Ven., but bear signs of emendation, cf. 2.3, 11, 43; 4.54
above, and sometimes restore the truth, as at 2.8 and 2.50.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\downarrow \\
d \\
\downarrow \\
\text{ed. Ven.} \\
\downarrow \\
e \\
\downarrow \\
\text{ed. Dav. 1} \\
\downarrow \\
k \\
\downarrow \\
\text{ed. Dav. 2} \\
\end{array}
\]

A, az and v

Giarratano alleges in his edition (p. xxxv) that there are frequent agreements between A and the manuscripts ade and ed. Ven. d, e and ed. Ven. are, as I have shown above, copied from v, a manuscript which Giarratano did not know, and therefore his group can be reduced to Aav. Some of his examples can be discounted as errors commonly found in the V tradition, and others are not found in a, and we are not left with any errors peculiar to these manuscripts alone. A's agreements with the ed. Ven. may be due to his use of this edition (see above in my section on A).

v and cjpcs

v cannot be the source of cjpcs because they do not repeat v's errors at, for example, 1.86 and 4.15.

None of the manuscripts cjpcs can be the source of v as it has the truth where they are in error at, for example, 1.61.

v and cjpcs disagree in error at, for example, 2.30 nullo libarunt) nullo lamberunt cjpcs: nulloque biberunt v and 3.65 prosatus) natus ab v: pronatus cjpcs.
Poggio's Manuscript

Poggio spent some years in England, and in 1423 we find him writing from Rome to Niccolò de' Niccoli: "mittas ad me oro Bucolicam Calpurnii et particulam Petronii quas misi tibi ex Britannia." (Poggii Epistolae, Florence 1832, vol. 1, p. 91).

Reeve (op. cit.) takes up the idea, first proposed by Baehrens (PLM 3, p. 68), that this manuscript of Poggio's was the source of the V manuscripts. Reeve's theory (226-7) is based on the idea that the V manuscripts in all probability originated in North-East Italy (perhaps specifically Padua), Florence and Rome, an idea which reminds him of another fifteenth century tradition, that of Silius Italicus, all of whose manuscripts derive from a copy made for Poggio in 1417. He thus criticises Castagna for not mentioning the possibility that the V manuscripts might all derive from "this copy of Poggio's."

From Reeve's reference to a copy of Silius Italicus "made...for Poggio," we might infer that by "this copy of Poggio's" Reeve means a copy made by or for Poggio, but he does not say so specifically and his words could refer to the manuscript which Poggio found; indeed, Poggio's own words might refer either to the manuscript he discovered or to a copy of it. This point is important, as a copy of the original manuscript Poggio discovered would have to have been made after 1417 - Poggio was in Britain from 1418 to the beginning of 1423 - and could not therefore be the ancestor of v if Reeve is right (237) in dating it to the fourteenth century. On the other hand, if by "this copy of Poggio's" Reeve means the manuscript Poggio found, then this could of course be of any date and v could have been derived from it before it was discovered by Poggio, but Reeve makes no mention of this as a possibility. Whichever interpretation of the phrase "Poggio's copy" is correct, Reeve fails to appreciate that his placing of v in the fourteenth century
causes difficulty to his theory. If the Vatican is right in dating
V to the fifteenth century, then this difficulty is of course
removed, but this is not what Reeve says.

The principal weakness in Baehrens's and Reeve's theory is the
simple fact that we have no evidence to support it. It is a
possibility, but no more than that, and it is, in my opinion, unfair
of Reeve to admonish Castagna for failing to consider a theory
based on nothing but surmise.

Baehrens (p. 67) suggests that Parisinus 8049, the only extant
manuscript which contains both Petronius and Calpurnius, is to be
identified with Poggio's manuscript. Reeve, however, asserts (228)
that Parisinus 8049 has never left France, which is a poor
argument as a copy of it could have been made there and travelled
to Britain. But Parisinus 8049 could not in any case have been an
ancestor of V because it apparently never contained more than
Calpurnius 1-4.12 and because it is a far worse copy than V (cf.
Giarratano p. xxix).

Poggio's manuscript may have played an important part in the
textual history of Calpurnius and Nem., or it may have been a very
minor member of the tradition. Since we know nothing more about it,
however, than what Poggio tells us, and since we have no evidence
at all about its subsequent history, it seems pointless to
speculate about it.

Variant Readings added in the V Manuscripts

laxatus in q at 3.4 may be a conjecture.

There are not many corrections in q, and the sources of some of
these are not identifiable. There is, however, some slight evidence
to suggest that the archetype of q and v had some variant readings
in the margin.
Margin of poem 2: Astacus dict'/ Idas pronomine incipit q:
ASTACUS/ DICTUS/ IDAS dv
3.51 cimbia dv (all in mg. in the first hand).
4.59 gaudia cd (text) qv (margin): grandia jps (text).
d and v also have the meaningless notes uitea at 3.19 and
parilia at 4.5.

V
Reeve has been led to make a sweeping statement about the first
hand in v (229) which unfortunately is largely unjustified. He quotes
a number of readings of merit found in v which he says may be
conjectural or accidental and comments, "Even if some or all of
these readings derive from another manuscript, the wider stemma is
not affected because f (i.e. v) belongs very firmly to M3 (i.e. ps)
and no other member of M3 has them." Some of these readings are,
however, to be found in ps, and a number of others are shared by
other manuscripts of the B branch of the V tradition, and therefore
the situation is not quite as clear as Reeve would have us believe.
Most of these readings are fairly simple corrections, however, and
need not imply separate descent for v (see above).

V^3
The source of these variants is impossible to identify, but
all the readings, apart from those at 4.18 and 4.69, are also to be
found in a or z or both. The readings at 4.18 and 4.69 may be
conjectures.

A
The variants in a are all noted in the first hand. Most of
them are readings commonly found in the V tradition, but at 2.40
and 3.57 a is brought into line with imx and at 4.45 with z.
The variants are noted by the hand of the scribe. Some of them are errors commonly found in the V tradition, but *rumpitum* (1.2) and *sectabas* (1.61) have the appearance of conjectures, and possibly also *mihi* at 2.25 where the only other V manuscript not to have *me* is 2. The scribe of f has clearly not gone through the text systematically as there are numerous errors left uncorrected.

There are a few interventions by a second hand in I, but they are not sufficiently numerous to identify the source.

At least one correcting hand has been at work here. It is dated 1543 and has added the title "Aurelij nemesiani / chartaginensis poete" and a few variant readings, probably from an early edition.

There have been two correcting hands at work here, besides one correction by the scribe at 3.16. One hand has clearly had access to the NG tradition as it has noted the omissions of lines 1.28, 2.83 and 3.30. The transposition of 3.52 and 3.53 found in all the manuscripts except a and z, has been corrected. At 1.59 is noted the variant *ornatus*, which is found also in the ed. Cadomensis, the ed. Brassicana and the ed. Oporiniana. Reeve says (237), "The corrections in red derive from the ed. Ascensiana," but gives no evidence. The only evidence I can see is at 3.19 where the variant *comptus* has been added, and the ed. Ascensiana reads *comptos*.

Thus we can propose the following stemma for V:
This, with the *codices descripti* eliminated appears thus:
The Florilegia

Nem. is represented in seven florilegia, and although none of these makes an original contribution to the text of Nem., their relationship to the direct transmission is of interest. Four of these florilegia, Parisinus Thuaneus 7547 (p), Parisinus 17903 (n), Atrebatensis 64 (a) and Escorialensis Q 114 (e) (Ullman's sigla), form a group. They all attribute all the quotations to Calpurnius, all offer the same lines, i.e. Cal. 2.23-4; 3.10; 4.14-5; 55-6; 5.12-3; 46-8; 6.53-6; Nem. 4.19 (leuant...curas), 21-4, 32, 38 (uocat...umbram), and preface each set of lines with the same title. All four are of French origin and their contents are in general the same. They also agree in unique errors at Cal. 4.155 mihi; 5.46 erit.

On p. 192 Castagna gives a table of concordances between the Florilegia, NG, V and P (Parisinus 8049). He confuses matters by not distinguishing true readings from errors, but once this has been done, certain conclusions can be reached:

1) There is no evidence for any link between the Florilegia and P. There is only one line in the Florilegia which is also found in P (Cal. 2.23), but P has two errors in this line not found in the Florilegia, or, indeed, in any other manuscript.

2) There are errors which are unique to the Florilegia, but these do not suggest access to a branch of the direct tradition now lost. At 4.21 na's h' is probably a scribal error, and at Cal. 4.155 and 5.46

6 These four manuscripts, together with Berolinensis Diez. B. Santen. 60, are generally regarded as representative of what is commonly referred to as the Florilegium Gallicum. See Anders Gagner, Florilegium Gallicum: Untersuchungen und Texte zur Geschichte der mittellateinischen Florilegienliteratur, (Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund 18), Lund 1936.
connectives have been ejected, no doubt by the editor who compiled the original florilegium.

3) The Florilegia agree in various true readings with both NG and V, which of course proves nothing, but while the Florilegia agree in error with V at 5.12 and 6.55 (6), they do not agree with NG in error. This, together with the fact that the Florilegia attribute all the extracts to Calpurnius, suggests that there is a rather closer affinity between the Florilegia and the V branch of the tradition than with the NG branch.

According to Castagna (p. 195), it was Ullman who first put forward the idea that the common archetype of the Florilegia belonged to the ninth century. In fact Ullman (CP 23 (1928), 130-1), rejects this idea without saying whose it originally was and suggests that "The common archetype perhaps belonged to the twelfth century. An earlier date may be suggested to some by the reading of one manuscript (n = Paris 17903) in line 118 of the text that follows (i.e. Tib. 1.10.36). It has pauppis, while the other manuscripts, evidently following the archetype, have pupis. It may be thought that the immediate parent of n had pauppis, intended for puppis. If this be true, it would seem that the grandparent of n used an open a, and that would point to an earlier century. But it is not safe to draw definite conclusions from one such case. It is more likely that the scribe still had in mind the word pauperis of line 76 (i.e. the heading De felicitate pauperis) and the occurrences of pauper in line 77 (i.e. Tib. 1.5.61). An argument in
favour of the twelfth century is the fact that a classical revival takes place in that century. Another is that Ovid is more extensively represented than any other poet in our florilegium and the twelfth century is the heart of the aetas Ovidiana." Verdière (p. 72 of his edition of Calpurnius) accepts Ullman's general theory about the relationship of the florilegia to one another, but with regard to the date of the archetype comments, "je me demande pourquoi M. Ullman la rejette pour expliquer la faute par la présence de pauperis à la ligne 76 et de pauper à la ligne 77. Le scribe avait eu tout le temps, je crois, d'oublier ce qu'il avait écrit quarante lignes plus haut! Or l'a ouvert est utilisé dès le IXe s. Dans ces conditions, il se pourrait que l'archétype des manuscrits à texte entier et des manuscrits à florilèges soit de cette époque." I agree with Verdière that pauperis is unlikely to have arisen in this way and would suggest that the presence of nauita in the same line or audax in the line above might be more likely to have caused the corruption, but on the other hand, I cannot agree that an open a was necessarily the cause of the confusion and Ullman is in any case right not to attach too much importance to a single case. The theory of Castagna (p. 195-6) is that the florilegium was compiled from a complete ninth century manuscript in the twelfth century. Neither Verdière nor Castagna, however, takes into account the fact that many of the texts are utterly unlikely to have been available in the ninth century and most scholars agree with Ullman in a twelfth century date for the compiling of the Florilegium Gallicum, see Reynolds and Wilson, Scribes and Scholars 1, Oxford, pp. 95-6.

The relationships of the individual florilegia to one another were first discussed by Ullman (CP 23 (1928), 130-54) and no one since has seriously disagreed with his conclusions. Ullman contends (p. 147) that n, while it has most individual errors, also has many genuine readings not found in the other florilegia and concludes that
it has no near relatives, while p, a and e are descended from an intermediate manuscript. He lists a number of examples which appear to bear out this view. Further evidence for the derivation of epa from an intermediate manuscript rather than from the common archetype of the four is their omission of Actna 633-34.

There are a number of cases (listed by Ullman, pp. 148-9) where pa agree in errors which are unlikely to have arisen independently. There is also a small number of cases (listed on p. 149) where n and e agree in error, which would appear, as Ullman says, to point to a closer relationship between n and e than had previously been suggested. The number of cases is, however, small, and some may be due to independent error. Ullman analyses a number of puzzling sets of variants (pp. 150-2) and eventually concludes (p. 153-4): "the fact that no close relative of n has been found raises it, in spite of its faults, to a point where only the three other manuscripts together can claim equality...On the other hand the large number of errors in n warrants our putting greater credence in epa when these agree with one another." Ullman does not offer a stemma, but Verdière (p. 75) and Castagna (p. 198) agree in the following:

```
    C
   / \  
  A   B
 / \ / \  
 p  a  e  n
```

Ullman (CP 23 (1928), 132-3) suggests that only part of Berolinensis Diez. B. Santen. 60 (b) (from f. 37 on) is related to our group, and because it contains certain "uerba scriptoris ad lectorem" which also appear in e, he considers that the former is derived from the latter. Verdière (p. 75) and Castagna (p. 198) in their stemmata also derive b from e, but ignore the fact that b's excerpts from Calpurnius and Nem. appear in the section which is not
closely related to nepa in Ullman's view. Ullman suggests that the excerpta in the first part of the manuscript have been chosen because they represent authors widely studied in schools, but makes no suggestion about the text from which these excerpta might have been made. The excerpta from Calpurnius and Nem, in b consist of fewer lines than in nepa and do not include the headings to each citation (ad superbientem etc). It is impossible to say on such scanty evidence where the first part of b stands in relation to nepa, but it is interesting to note that at Cal. 5.48 it agrees with pae in error in reading tonsoribus and at Nem. 4.21 it has hic while na have h' and pe the truth, hoc.

In Schenkl's view (p. xlix and WS 6 (1884), 85) the reading tonsoribus (Cal. 5.48) in epa, is an emendation of tondentibus found in the group of manuscripts he calls w, i.e. firu and Gothanus 55, and he therefore places the common ancestor of these manuscripts earlier than that of the florilegia. Ullman (CP 27 (1932), 8-9) objects that "the reading of n shows that the archetype of all the florilegia had torrentibus, in agreement with the best manuscripts. It is possible that the archetype of epa changed to tonsoribus under the influence of tondentibus, but it is more likely that the archetype of the w family changed torrentibus to tondentibus through the influence of a florilegium." On both these theories Castagna comments (p. 194), "Non vedo la necessità di stabilire un rapporto genetico tra le due lezioni caratteristiche, che possono ben essere due diversi ed indipendenti fraintendimenti di torrentibus, scritto
forse in forma compendiosa," and this is my view also. There does not appear to be any evidence for the *Florilegia* being more closely related to one particular group of *V* manuscripts than to the others.

**Bononiensis 83 (saec. xv-xvi)**

The *Exc. Bon.* contain a much shorter selection of quotations from Calpurnius and Nem. than the other *Florilegia*: only 3.90 from Calpurnius, and from Nem.'s fourth *eclogue*, uu. 20.32 and 56-59. The *Exc. Bon.* are not related to the group of *Florilegia* discussed above as they agree in error with *V* at 4.24 whereas the other *Florilegia* agree with *NG* in the truth. The *Exc. Bon.* were taken from a manuscript which belonged to the *V* tradition, as is shown by the attribution of all the lines to Calpurnius and by the fact that they agree in error with *V* at Nem. 4.24 and 4.30 but do not share any errors with *NG*. As Castagna rightly says (p. 202), the manuscript from which the excerpta have been taken could not have been a member of the *firuy* group as they omit uu. 56-61, and I cannot find any evidence for the excerpta being from any particular *V* manuscript. Castagna points out (p. 202) that both the *Exc. Bon.* and the ed. *Farm.* incorrectly preface 4.37 with *Mopsus* and it is possible that the excerpta may have been taken from this edition, but Castagna does not say why, in that case, the compiler does not know that poem 4 (although admittedly numbered XI also in the ed. *Farm.*) is by Nem., since this fact is mentioned in the colophon and also before poem 1 in the ed. *Farm.*

**Laurentianus Conv. Sopp. 440 (saec. xvi)**

This *florilegium* differs from all the rest in that it offers lines from the *Cyn.* and gives Nem.'s *Eclogues* to their rightful author. It also contains excerpta from Gratus and Calpurnius. There is no other extant manuscript to which this description applies, but
it is true of the second Aldine edition (1534). Conv. Sopp. agrees with this edition in error at Cyn. 209 sinus; 245 capitique decoro; 3.53 potis; 4.17 serenans; 4.18 non possum nolle and also in having uu. 3.52-3 in the correct order. It is therefore likely that Conv. Sopp. was compiled from this edition. Castagna, who eventually also comes to this conclusion, rightly draws our attention (p. 208) to the resemblance between the life of Nem. by Petrus Crinitus in the second Aldine edition, and the description of Nem. in the title in Conv. Sopp. There is, however, one drawback to Castagna's theory and that is that a note in Conv. Sopp. states that the three poets have been "nuper inuenti ab Actio Syncero Sannazario," but the second Aldine edition does not say this. The only reference in this edition to Sannazaro is concerned with his discovery of the texts of Ovid's Halieutica, the Cynegética of Grattius and that of Nem., not Grattius, Calpurnius and Nem., so that if the compiler of Conv. Sopp. did use the second Aldine edition, he must have had only the briefest glance at the introduction to have made such a mistake.
The relationship of the manuscripts of the Cynegotica

An archetype for the three surviving manuscripts of Neasianus can be assumed because they have uu. 12 and 224-230 out of place and share the following corrupt readings: uu. 20 compellere; 35 currus; 43 ingentia; 76 nobis; 99 hinc; 107 natum; 112 deductaque; 131 quis non; 142 in; 209 sinus; 232 est; 282 posse; 311 tempore. Verdière (Prolégomènes p. 66) lists further examples, but these are not certainly corrupt readings.

It is difficult to come to any definite conclusions about the relationships of the manuscripts. In the vast majority of cases where they disagree, this is simply due to a trifling copying error on the part of a single scribe, and the number of really significant errors is small. To complicate the position further, we have a number of corrections in A, many of which it is impossible to date, and we know that the scribe of C, the well-known humanist Sannazaro, was perfectly capable of correcting many of the errors which he may have found in his exemplar.

A and C

There are many cases where A and C agree in the true reading where B is in error, and both have similar colophons, but the number of cases where they agree in error is very small, viz.

99.Iuso B: ]uso AC and
234 praedae A'B: praeda AC

In neither of these cases is the error particularly significant. Verdière, partly because of his theories concerning C and Vindobonensis 277, which I shall discuss below, argues for separate descent from the archetype, and discusses (p. 72f.) some of the places where C disagrees with A. Most of his evidence I find unconvincing: he makes the great mistake of supposing that the
errors peculiar to C necessarily indicate that it must have descended separately from A, which does not contain these errors. To make probable the separate descent of C and A from the archetype, it is necessary to show that where C is right and A wrong, C could not have acquired the truth by conjecture and that C's errors could not be due to the condition or script of A. I shall therefore examine the readings adduced by Verdière as evidence, to see if they do in fact support his theory.

35 loquantur AB: loquuntur C
Verdière considers that C's reading may be a misreading of an open a, such as is to be found in Vind. 277, but it may quite easily be due to a simple error. (mundi appears almost directly above loquantur in A).

45 curantem A²; purantem AB: purgantem B sup. lin.; furantem C
Verdière says that curantem is perfectly clear in A. This is true, but it is almost as clear that p has been erased, and the q which has been written over it is not the same, it seems to me, as A's usual q. Sannazaro might be emending purantem, perhaps intending furantem to mean furtim condentem (cf. TLL), the correction curantem not having been made when he saw the manuscript.

46 præcepit A²BC: percepit A
Verdière asks why Sannazaro conjectured præcepit when A's percepit is acceptable. The manuscript is blotched here, but it seems to me to read pœpit, and Sannazaro is either preferring the reading of the second hand or making a necessary conjecture.

54 placidie ex placidas C
Sannazaro has corrected his error placidas to placidie. Since flumineas and umbras appear in u. 53 and harundineas in the line below, I can see no reason to suppose that Sannazaro could not have made this error himself without the aid of the "lost" portion.
of Vind. 277, as Verdière would have us believe.

116 primaevia A: primaevi C
C's reading may possibly be a slip, as Van de Woestijne suggests (p. 27 of his edition), a being lost before sanguis, or it may be, more probably, that -le...-le...-le was thought inelegant by Sannazaro. Whatever the reason, this is no argument for separate descent.

122 iugandi AB: iugandis C
Verdière wonders why Sannazaro should have conjectured iugandis when faced with the "excellent" iugandi. Other editors, however, knowing iugandi, have preferred iugandis, and I can see no reason to believe that iugandis is anything other than a conjecture by Sannazaro.

174 catulos ex catulias
Again Sannazaro, perhaps under the influence of illaesias preceding, made a slip and corrected himself. There is no need to suppose, as Verdière does, that the error appeared in his exemplar.

265 deuerberat A: diuerberet C
As Verdière says, A clearly reads deuerberat and he concludes that diuerberet cannot be a conjecture of Sannazaro's because he can see no reason for reading the subjunctive. There is, however, nothing unusual in having the subjunctive in a subordinate clause dependent on a primary clause which has the subjunctive. (See Martin ad loc.). This could be a conjecture of Sannazaro's, or it might simply be a slip. Verdière does not mention that de- has been corrected to di- in A, though it is impossible to say when.

Verdière's other examples are a little more difficult to explain.

6 metatus A: meatus B: metatur B^2 in mg.: maetatur C
Sannazaro may perhaps have preferred -ur because of the surrounding present indicatives, but why he should have spelled
the word thus is puzzling.

36 *emisso* AB: *ēmisso* C

The only explanation I can see for the separation of the prepositional prefix is that this is a conjecture by Sannazaro, the accent perhaps serving to indicate that *ē* and *misso* are to be taken separately.

127 *sed* AB: *sunt* C

This error is repeated at 157, a fact which Verdière does not mention. Verdière suggests that Sannazaro found in his exemplar *ē*, the insular abbreviation for *sed*, which he took to be the continental abbreviation for *sunt* (see W.M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae* p. 283). *Sed* is not abbreviated in A, and Verdière does not tell us whether such an abbreviation appears in Vind. 277. It is very likely that Sannazaro made a copy of Kemesianus prior to making the very neat one which we now possess, and that in the earlier one he made abbreviations which he has expanded incorrectly here. But it is a difficult problem.

245 *capitisque decoris* A: *captuque decoris* B: *capitique decoro* C

Verdière claims that Sannazaro would have made the easy correction to *capitisque decori* if he had had A’s reading before him. But the dative might equally have suggested itself to him. Opinions differ as to the significance of *altus honos* here and Sannazaro’s interpretation of the phrase may be the reason for his choice of the dative case.

Verdière makes a great deal of these few cases, but none of them is beyond explanation. He has not found a single case where C is right and A is wrong, where C could definitely not have acquired its reading by conjecture.

There have also been objections to the theory that C is derived from A based on speculations about the lost portions of Vind. 277, a mutilated manuscript of which only the quaternions 17 and 18
survive, together with excerpta of Martial which may have belonged to the first quaternion. The contents of the surviving part of Vind. 277 are: 'Versus Sucheriae poetie' vv. 21-32; 'Versus Ouidii de piscibus et feris'; an elegiac couplet 'Ceruus aper...'; 'Gratti Cynegeticon Lib. 1'; and select epigrams from Martial (written in a different hand from the other works). The texts of the Halieutica and Grattius contained in C are generally agreed to be derived from Vind. 277 and Haupt suggested that C's text of Nemesianus is also derived from Vind. 277, from a section now lost. H. Schenkl, however ("Zur Kritik' und Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Grattius und and. lat. Lichter," Jahrbucher für classische Philologie, Supplementbd. 24 (1898), 399-401) endeavours to prove that Vind. 277 never contained Nemesianus. His calculations are based on the assumption that Parisinus lat. (Thuaneus) 8071 is an apograph of Vind. 277, because of the similarity between the contents of the Thuaneus and what remains of Vind. 277. This, too, has been disputed, but the arguments in favour of this assumption presented by J.A. Richmond (The Halieutica ascribed to Ovid, London 1962, p. 6f.) seem to me entirely convincing. The Thuaneus does not contain Nemesianus, and Schenkl concludes that Vind. 277 did not do so either, since there is no evidence that there were any leaves following quaternion 18, and according to his calculations there is no room for Nemesianus in the quaternions preceding those we still have. Richmond regards Schenkl's calculations as "plausible, yet not quite convincing" for various reasons (p. 3f.):

"(a) He has to assume pages with varying numbers of lines; this deprives the demonstration of desirable rigour.

(b) He relies on the loss of a whole line at Grattius, v. 59, as evidence for the loss of a line at the foot of a page, yet the fragment at Halieutica, v. 127, and the
gap after concolori, v. 124, which are also evidence for the foot of a page, are not brought into account.

(c) No account of the lacunae between vv. 81 and 91 is given."

Verdière (p. 70) rejects them because the first 149 lines of Grattius in the Thuaneus are written in scriptura continua and Schenkl has not made allowance for parts of the lost quaternions possibly having been written in this way, too. It does not seem to me helpful to bring the Thuaneus into the discussion, as if there was once room in Vind. 277 for Nemesianus, that is no proof that Nemesianus was in fact in it, and again, Vind. 277 might have been mutilated before the Thuaneus was copied from it. Setting this aside, there does not seem to me any reason to believe that Vind. 277 ever contained Nemesianus.

Three sixteenth century scholars speak of Sannazaro's bringing back from France certain works hitherto unknown. Summontius mentions Grattius, the Halieutica, Nemesianus and Rutilius Namatianus, while Gyraldus and Logus mention only the first three. Logus goes further and says that these three works were all in a very old manuscript (vetustissimo codice - see below). This has led two modern scholars (Haupt, Guidii Halieutica, Gratii et Nemesiani Cynegetica p. xxiii, and R. Sabbadini, Le Scoperte dei codici latini e greci, p.165) to conclude that this manuscript was Vind. 277. It is clear for textual reasons that Sannazaro did use Vind. 277 but that this manuscript contained the three works together is not clearly stated in the sources as these scholars would have us believe. A certain Summontius in his preface to the dialogue Actius by J.J. Pontanus (1509) says, "aduexit (i.e. Sannazaro) nuper ex Heduorum usque finius atque e Turonibus dona quaedam mirum in modum placitura literatis iuris Martialis Ausonii et Solini codices nouae et incognitae emendationis... Is
etiam ad nos attulit Ouidii fragmentum de piscibus, Gratii poetae
cynegeticon, cuius meminit Ouidius ultima de Ponto elegia,
cynegeticon idem (sic, for *item*) Aurelii Nemesiani qui floruit sub
Numeriano imperatore et Rutilii Namatiani elegos..." and
Gyraldus (Historia poetarum Dial. 1545 p. 4) mentions a letter from
Pontano to Sannazaro, "Sed quod Gratius scripsit Actius
Sannazarius mihi aliisque pluribus asservuit et nos (sic, for nobis)
ostendit cum Neapoli animi gratia ex urbe profecti essamus: se enim
ex Heduorum finibus atque e Turonibus detulisse opusculum de
piscibus Ouidii et Cynegetica Gratii et Nemesiani. Id quod etiam
suo scripto testatus est Pontanus quadam sua epistula ad ipsum
Actium et P. Summontius." The fact that the phrase "ex Heduorum
finibus atque e Turonibus" appears in both suggests that both are
quoting from the same source. In neither reference is it stated
that all three works were to be found in one manuscript.

The evidence of Logus in his preface to the second Aldine
edition (1554) seems at first sight to be more precise: "Si quidem
cum proxima aestate Romae essem, conflata mihi non mediocris
amicitia fuit cum Ioanne Lucretio Aesiandro Germano iuuene cum rara
et exquisita bonarum artium et litterarum cognitione; tu
hebraiceque et latinae linguae peritia egregie instructo. Is mihi
trium optimorum, et antiquissimorum authorum, qui t
latuerunt, ut peritus in obliuionem hominum uenerint, copiam fecit,
Gratij, qui de uenatione siue *μυθικά* librum carmine
conscripsit; itemque M. Aurelij Nemesiani, qui idem tractauit
argumentum: quibus adiunctum erat P. Ouidij Nasonis fragmentum de
piscibus...Illud uero dolendum summopere est, quod tam lacer, et
mutilatus ad nos peruenit: ut non pauca in eo uideantur
desyderari. Aesiander quidem ex uetustissimo codice, quod (sic, for
quem) nobilis et cultissimus nostri temporis poeta Accius Syncerus
Sannazarius longobardicis literis (sic) scriptum ex Gallijs secum
attulerat, quam potuit integre et incorrupte descripti una cum
autorisibus illis coniunctis. Quorum exemplar mihi cum dedisset: non
modo ut edendos curarem ulenti mihi permisit: userum etiam, id ut
facerem, ulbro ipse me est adhortatus..."

Since, as Schenkl shows (p. 393), the second Aldine edition
does not rely for its texts of the Halieutica and Grattius on one
manuscript alone, but on two - Sannazaro's apograph bound into
Vind. 277 (fos. 74-83) and C - Logus is either not giving us
sufficient information about his sources, or else some other
manuscript is here referred to. Schenkl concludes that Aesiander
did not have the old manuscript itself, but a third copy by
Sannazaro which had taken the deciphering of the manuscript still
further, "Ebendorwenig Aesiander die Halieutica und den Grattius aus
dem alten Codex selbst abgeschrieben hat, ebendorwenig braucht er für
die Cynegetica des Nemesienus eine andere Quelle gehabt zu haben,
als Sannazar's uns noch erhaltene Copie im Cod. Vindob. 3261 oder
eine andere Abschrift von derselben Hand, wie deren ja auch für
Grattius und die Halieutica mehrere existiert haben. Ich glaube
mich aber nicht zu täuschen, wenn ich annehme, dass Sannazar aus
Frankreich bloss eine Abschrift des Nemesianus mitgebraucht hat...
(p. 401). The text in the second Aldine edition of the Halieutica
and Grattius in a number of places has readings which do not
appear in C or Vind. 277 and Schenkl puts forward three possible
reasons for this: that Aesiander has introduced into his copy
variants taken from Sannazaro's; that Aesiander or Logus has
introduced his own corrections, or that Logus had before him an
interpolated copy which had been collated with the original
(p. 394). From the text of the Eclogues in the second Aldine
edition, it appears perfectly possible that Logus has introduced
his own conjectures, as the text is not that of any of the
surviving manuscripts, and is the oldest source of the readings
immitis (2.6); genis leues (2.17); and potis (3.53), which are almost certainly conjectural.

Logus, then, is an unreliable witness and the words of neither Summontius nor Gyraldus can be taken as evidence that the works of the three poets were all to be found in one manuscript. In fact Summontius mentions Rutilius Namatianus and Nemesianus, and neither of these appears in what is left of the old Vind. 277. It therefore seems to me most likely that Sannazaro when on his travels in France discovered Vind. 277, Prer. lat. 7561 (A) and the exemplar of the surviving manuscripts of Rutilius Namatianus and made various copies. Verdiere in his edition of Grattius (p. 95) says that C is a second and better copy of Grattius than that bound into Vind. 277, so that Sannazaro may have made the latter copy first, and subsequently discovered Nemesianus and made C. It is also important to remember that neither Grattius nor the Halieutica appears in A or B which are almost as old as Vind. 277, which shows that Nemesianus and Grattius were being transmitted separately in the tenth century.

In the absence of any reliable evidence both in the text itself, and in the remarks of sixteenth century scholars, it is easy to speculate, but in view of the fact that there is no evidence or convincing argument that Nemesianus was ever contained in Vind.277, whilst we have two tenth century manuscripts showing the separate transmission of the text of Nemesianus, and bearing in mind the large number of agreements between A and C, I would conclude that C is descended from A.

A and B

The relationship between A and B has also been the subject of some discussion. A cannot be copied from B because B omits 279 (cf. B's colophon: Versus Codicis coxxv autem recte numero
rimantur), and also iam in u. 46 an. liber in u. 264, but whether
B is a poor copy of A (as Schenkl suspects, p. 401) or is
independently descended from the archetype, as Van de Woestijne
thinks (p. 20) is a difficult question. Van de Woestijne gives
four reasons why he considers that B is not a copy of A:

"1 le Parisinus B contient une série de fautes graphiques
(confusion de lettres et de groupes de lettres)
auxquelles le texte de A, écrit en une minuscule très
claire, n'a pu que malaisément donner lieu;
2 B s'écarte de la leçon de A en bon nombre d'endroits,
sans que ces variantes puissent s'expliquer par une
transcription fautive du texte de A, le Parisinus lat.
7561 (=A) ne pouvant pas, aux dits endroits, prêter à
mélecture;
3 les annotations de la main du copiste de B portant sur
plusieurs de ces variantes tendraient à prouver que les
variantes en question figuraient déjà dans la modèle de B;
4 enfin, les gloses fourvoyées dans le texte du Parisinus B
(cf. les vers 133 et 212) semblent devoir indiquer que B
derive d'un modèle annoté."

The distinction between the first two reasons escapes me, as it
evidently also does Verdière who runs them into one (p. 67).

As regards the errors which Van de Woestijne cites to support
his first point, it appears to be a characteristic of B to
rearrange the letters in words (cf. 36; 146; 192; 218; 227; 232;
252; 280; 322). There are also numerous minor errors, such as
horrendaque for horrendasque (41), but there is no reason to
assume that these errors are caused by difficulty in reading the
exemplar, since there could be any number of other reasons for their
appearance. To the errors which Van de Woestijne cites to support
his second statement may be added u. 259 maurusia AC: macrus B, but
it does not seem to me impossible that these errors should not simply have arisen as a result of careless copying. Van de Woestijne also mentions vv. 153 and 177 but I cannot see what he is referring to.

There are a number of glosses, variant readings and explanatory notes in B in the scribe's own hand, and it is these to which Van de Woestijne refers in points 3 and 4. Unfortunately he does not understand or simply ignores B's sigla, which means that he does not always correctly distinguish variant readings from glosses, and of the two examples which he quotes in support of point 4, at v. 133 it is not clear exactly which reading in B he regards as a "glose" - autem, presumably - and at v. 212 c is preceded by the sign ± and is therefore not a "glose" but a variant reading. This leads him into complete confusion on p. 22 where he says that at v. 135 passo is "glosé" by aperto (in fact a variant reading), which "proves" that lumine passo must have appeared in the exemplar of B. Thus, according to his reasoning, A, which reads lumina passa, must be deviating from the reading of the archetype, as he cannot see why B, if he had lumina passa before him, should have written lumine passo which is, as he says, scarcely satisfactory. This is nonsense: if Van de Woestijne believes that lumina passa is what Nemesianus wrote (which he evidently does, as this is what he prints) then according to his argument, at some stage in the tradition this "en tous points satisfaisant" reading lumina passa must have been changed to lumine passo, which then appeared in the archetype of AB, and was promptly changed back again by A. This "deviation" from the reading of the archetype by A proves, according to Van de Woestijne, that there must have been another manuscript between A and the archetype in which the "conjecture" lumina passa appeared. Van de Woestijne attributes this "conjecture" to ninth century school-masters, and concludes by saying (p. 23), "Le Parisinus B
se trouverait ainsi reproduire plus fidèlement l'aspect de
l'archétype que ne le fait le Parisinus lat. 7561 (=A)" and
justifies this assertion in a footnote, "En raison même des fautes
qui déparent si fâcheusement son texte (pour autant que celles-ci
ne soient pas le fait du copiste de B)." It is far more reasonable
to suppose that lumine passo is a simple error which arose in an
exemplar of B and later had the correct reading added to it as a
variant. I am not clear why B should be considered so reliable by
Van de Woestijne when it contains a multitude of elementary
scribal errors, while he speaks of "l'impératif du copiste du
Parisinus lat. 7561 (=A)" which in fact contains a sounder text:
where A is corrupt, B seems to me to be more corrupt still, e.g.

295 toto scenibus A: toto scenibus B

33 s&oller&acerea A: retoller&aurea B

Verdière also believes that A and B are descended independently
from the archetype. He would go further, however, and suggests that
the archetype of A and B was an annotated one and that it is
connected in some way not clear to me with Vind. 277. Verdière
quotes various passages in support of this theory (pp. 74-5) but
none of these seems to me evidence that A, at any rate, is
descended from an annotated exemplar.

133 uero AC: autem B

Verdière suggests that the abbreviations au and uo could have been
confused. This seems to me unlikely: either variant could be due
to psychological error, but either way, nothing is proved about
descent from the archetype.

170 nouos BC: notos ex nouos A: h sup. ras. A²

The fact that A has for some reason altered the archetypal reading
proves nothing about descent from the archetype; either A and B got
nouos independently, or B has copied what he fancied he saw as the
original reading beneath the alteration in A.
Like Van de Woestijne, I do not agree with Verdière that the alterations in A are in the scribe's hand, and therefore his argument seems to me invalid. In any case, the disagreement between A and B could be due either to a barely legible archetype, or to B's further corrupting A's already corrupt reading.

Verdière, like Van de Woestijne, is led into error by his failure to take into account the sigla which distinguish glosses from variant readings. In B a gloss is sometimes prefaced by the sign † e.g. at u. 110 where carinam is glossed † dorsum and at u. 200 where maritas is glossed † feminas, whereas a variant reading is introduced by the sign ± e.g. u. 70 confeceris, † cum (sup. lin.) and u. 89 sunt † sint (sup. lin.). Therefore at the end of u. 135, ± a and † a above lumina passo indicate that lumina passa is an alternative reading and † matura ± apto does not mean, as Verdière (p. 68) would have us believe, "c'est-à-dire matura ou aperto," that is, matura glosses passa and aperto glosses passo, but that aperto is a variant reading and matura glosses passa.

There are no glosses, explanatory notes and, apparently (since it is difficult to distinguish the hands in A), no variant readings in the scribe's hand in A, although there are a few corrections by him. Nevertheless, Verdière would argue on the basis of the "evidence" of u. 135 and the situation at u. 45 which I have discussed above in my section on A and C, that A's exemplar contained "leçons doubles." He claims to have proved (Grattius vol. I pp. 89-93) that there was a Merovingian model for Vind. 277 and the Thuaneus, and that this had double readings, but even if these assertions are true, this does not prove that A and B must have been descended from it. (Verdière is thoroughly confused by this point, for he mixes up his sigla for the manuscripts of Grattius with those of Nemesianus, as at the beginning of his third
argument (p. 73) he says, "A et B contiennent les mêmes excerpta
des Ealieutica d'Cvide," which is untrue of the A and B of which
he has been speaking, but true of the manuscripts of Grattius,
Vind. 277 and Ter. 8071). His case for A's being descended from an
annotated manuscript is therefore totally unconvincing.

Both Verdière and Van de Woestijne fail to get to grips with
the problem here. The latter has the clue to the solution in his
third and fourth points, but he then proceeds to misinterpret the
evidence completely. It is true that the cases where B has the
truth and A is in error are few and not of great significance:

44 saeuae BC: saeue A
71 utque BC: utquea A
87 Latonaæ BC: Lato//e (n exp.? ) A
109 sub spectore BC: supsectore A
146 conclusa BC: conclusa A
161 ne BC: nec A
174 catulos BC: catulus A (not 181, as Van de Woestijne says).
204 manat BC: manant A
211 semina A BC: semine A
307 fulgura BC: fulgora A

but in spite of this absence of any exceptionally good true
readings preserved in B and not in A, these passages do seem to
afford evidence that A and B are independently descended from the
archetype. Coincidences in truth between B and C may well be due
to conjecture by Sannazaro.

The division into words in both manuscripts is very interesting.
A frequently runs two or three words into one, and this cannot
always be accounted for by exigencies of space. B does the same
thing, though not to the same extent and for no apparent reason.
There are also a number of cases, more in B than in A, where the
division into words is incorrect, and also a few where both
manuscripts make the same incorrect division:

16 non semel C: non semel en B: non semel en A

21 sacrilego orantes C: sacrilego orantes A3

27 et saeuo violatum AC: et saeuo violatum B

29 in arboreas C: in arboreas A: in arboreas B

30 sunt qui squamosi referant C: quis quâ osireferant A:

Sunt qui squamosi referant B

34 Philomela tuas sunt C: philomela tus sunt A: philomelatu

ar B

39 Tantalidum AC: Tantalidum B

49 citi discurrimus C: citidis currimus A: citidis currimus B

53 gaudemus AC: Gaudemus B

56 praefigere telis C: praefigere telis A: praefigere telis B

57 sinu spinosi BC: sinus pinosi A

67 tigrimque bibunt BC: tigrimque bibunt A

147 saltu transcendens AC: saltu transcendens B

168 uexare rabes A: uexare rabies B

179 Phoebe reparauerit ortus C: Phoebe reparauerit ortus B

199 tritonide oliuo AC: tritonide oliuo B

This would seem to suggest that A and B are both descended from
an archetype which had no word divisions. A and B are sometimes
strikingly alike visually, but this could be due either to B
copying A, or to attempts by both to represent the appearance of
another manuscript.

There are a number of variant readings in B. Some of these are
to be found in A's text:

135 i a above lumine passo

193 sit sic sup. lin.

215 medicus sic sup. lin.

but there are more which are not:
45 purantem † in sup. lin.
118 nonfirma † in sur. lin.
228 manethi-bero † i sup. lin. & hiberno in mg.
230 giruntur † cinguntur sup. lin.
292 arma rit † ue sup. lin.
317 magne † ma gis sup. lin.

The above variant readings are also not found in C or in the second Aldine edition, which would suggest, since it is unlikely that they are conjectures on the part of B, that B had access to another manuscript now lost. Van de Woestijne (p. 19) suggests that B has made some "conjectures" but I find this difficult to believe.

The glosses and explanatory notes in B are also interesting. It is possible that the scribe of B made these himself, but this is unlikely. Apart from the improbability of a scribe's being able to make intelligent notes when he has made such a faulty text, some of these notes seem to suggest that the scribe was copying something which he understood no better than he understood the text, e.g.

11 musco in mg. • ceuni sup. ligni sit
33 Miratū que adū biū sup. lin.
128 nutrire uet sup. lin.
212 et audimus † c sup. lin.

There are also cases where the gloss does not apply to B's reading, which is corrupt.

15 moben p m ut sup. lin. (mul.?)
120 aerem † uelcē
218 Exebreo (for ex ebore) no m hole ris (sup. lin.)

Again, we have a number of cases where there is a sign which normally introduces a gloss or other note, above a word, but nothing follows it. This occurs with p at uu. 21; 22; 26; 43; 44; 107, p at uu. 77; 112; 114 and 209; p at u. 56 and q at u. 68, which may
indicate that someone had made the mark intending to add a note and had not done so, or that B was copying the notes and was unable to decipher his exemplar at this point. The fact that the glosses at u. 30 (soui sosi = patriae) and u. 54 (humona id humo nat sup. lin., a in mg.) are attempts at explaining corrupt readings is no evidence for B's having made these notes as A is also corrupt at this point in both places, having readings which are not likely to have given rise to B's gloss, and this may suggest that the archetype of A and B was difficult to decipher here. It is possible, however, that B himself may have made the notes at u. 137 where annue is incorrectly glossed with ŝ tinue and at u. 230 where the vox nihilī, giruntur is glossed cinguntur, which is also nonsense.

Thus the evidence does seem to me to suggest that A and B are independently descended from the archetype, and combining this conclusion with our earlier one that C is derived from A, we can propose the following stemma:
EDITIONS

ECLOGUES

1 *The editio princeps of the Eclogues is that of C. Schweynheim and A. Pannartz, Rome c. 1471 (ed. Romana). There is no title page, and the poems themselves are prefaced by, "C. Calphurnii carmē bucolicū incipit feliciter." All eleven Eclogues are attributed to Calpurnius. The contents of this edition are the same as those of Laurentianus pl. 37, 14.

2 *The Eclogues are included in an edition of Ausonius published in Venice in 1472 (ed. Veneta). The edition has no title page, and begins, "Ad lectorem ô musarum cultor" etc. At the beginning the book is dated "A NATIVITATE CHRIST DVCE/NTEA NONGAESIMAEC Quin/Tae OLYMPIATIS ANNO IIIII VII / IDVS DECEM/mares," and again at the end, "TITI CALPHURNII POETAE SICULI / BUCOLICVM CARMEN/ FINIT./ ANNO INCAR. DOMINICE. M. CCC LXXII." All eleven Eclogues are attributed to Calpurnius under the title, "TITI CALPHURNII SICULI BUCOLI/CVM CARMEN." This appears to be the edition which Wernsdorf thought was no longer extant. This edition was reprinted at Milan in 1490, at Venice in 1494 and again at Venice in 1496.

Maittaire first mentioned an edition entitled "Calphurnii Siculi poetae Bucolica" published by Fabrizi (called Fabricius) in Farma

---

1 I have marked with an asterisk those editions which I have consulted. Many (but not all) have been listed by Castagna and some, indeed, are discussed in greater detail, but this is the only comprehensive list.
in 1478. Wernsdorf was unable to find any trace of such an edition, and thought that Maittaire was confusing it with the Parma edition of 1490. Verdière mentions it in his edition of Calpurnius Siculus (1954), but I have been unable to trace it and must agree with Wernsdorf's conclusion.

3,4 Two editions of Calpurnius Siculus were published at Deventer under the title "Titi Calphurnii Siculi Bucolicon carmen." One, published "in platea episcopi" (Richard Paffraet), is undated and has been assigned variously to 1488 and 1498. Hellinga, however, (The Fifteenth Century Printing Types of the Low Countries, Amsterdam 1966) dates it between 1488 and December 24th, 1490 because of the type used in it. *The other edition was published by Jakob van Breda and bears the colophon, "Bucolica Titi Calphurnij Siculi finiunt / Impressa Dauantric (sic) Anno Millesimo quadrin/gentesimo nongentesimo primo Per me Iacobu / de Breda iuxta scholas."

5 *The Parma edition c. 1490 of A. Ugoletus (ed. Parmensis) is the first to assign the final four poems to Nemesianus under the title "AVRELI NEMESIANI POETAE CARTAGINEN/SIS ECLOGA PRIMA INCIPIT." Ugoletus tells us in a colophon that it is, "E uetustissimo atque emendatissimo Thadei Ugoletti codice e germania allato ï quo Calphurni et Nemesiani uti Tpressi sunt tituli leguntur," and its relationship to H and A is discussed elsewhere in my section on the Relationship of the Manuscripts. Hain-Copinger dates this edition c. 1493/94.

6 *An edition with a text very similar to that of the Deventer editions was published by Georg Stuchs, under the title "Titi Calphurnij Siculi Bucolicum carmen," at Nuremberg c. 1490.
in 1478. Wernsdorf was unable to find any trace of such an edition, and thought that Maittaire was confusing it with the Parma edition of 1490. Verdière mentions it in his edition of Calpurnius Siculus (1954), but I have been unable to trace it and must agree with Wernsdorf's conclusion.

Two editions of Calpurnius Siculus were published at Deventer under the title "Titi Calphurnii Siculi Bucolicon carmen." One, published "in platea episcopi" (Richard Paffraet), is undated and has been assigned variously to 1488 and 1498. Hellinga, however, (The Fifteenth Century Printing Types of the Low Countries, Amsterdam 1966) dates it between 1488 and December 24th, 1490 because of the type used in it. The other edition was published by Jakob van Breda and bears the colophon, "Bucolica Titi Calphurnij Siculi finiunt / Impressa Dauantrie (sic) Anno Millesimo quadrin/gentesimo nongentesimo primo Per me Iacobû / de Breda iuxta scholas."

*The Parma edition c. 1490 of A. Ugoletus (ed. Parmensis) is the first to assign the final four poems to Nemesianus under the title "AVRELI NEMESIANI POETAE CARTAGINEN/SIS ECLOGA PRIMA INCIPIT." Ugoletus tells us in a colophon that it is, "E vetustissimo atque emendatissimo Thadei Ugoletti codice e germania allato ë quo Calphurni et Nemesiani uti Tpressi sunt tituli leguntur," and its relationship to H and A is discussed elsewhere in my section on the Relationship of the Manuscripts. Hain-Copinger dates this edition c. 1493/94.

An edition with a text very similar to that of the Deventer editions was published by Georg Stuchs, under the title "Titi Calphurnij Siculi Bucolicum carmen," at Nuremberg c. 1490.
Hain-Copinger mentions a Leipzig edition of the poems, under the title "Bucolicum carmen seu Eclogae XI", no. 4270 (a misprint for 4270), with the colophon, "Bucolica titi calphurnij siculi finiunt." This is probably the edition of which a collation by J.G. Huber exists in the Oxford MS. Lat. Class. f.2, fos. 23-26. Many of its readings are identical with those of no. 6.

7, 8 Two editions of Calpurnius were published by Antoine Caillaut in Paris, one c. 1492 under the title, "Carmen bucolicon Calphurnii," and the other c. 1500 under the title, "Buccolica calphurnii."

9 A third Deventer edition of Titi Calphurnii Siculi Bucolicum carmen was published by Heinrich de Nordheim c. 1494. The readings of this edition as reported by Wernadorf are similar to those of the other two Deventer editions and to the Nuremberg edition and Reeve (p. 234 n. 49) thinks that it may be identifiable with the latter edition.

10 *Carmen bucolicon calphurnii, published by Philippe Pigouchet in 1495. The text of this edition is very similar to that of no. 1.

11 Buccolica calphurnij/poete clarissimi nuper per fratrem Johan/nem Caron Marchyanensem exacta cum/uigilantia emendata, edited by Jean Caron and published by Félix Baligault between 1495 and 1500. "A later edition was published at Caen c. 1500 under the title "Bucolica calphurnii poete clarissimi nuper per fratrem iohannem Caron Marchianensem exacta cum uigilantia emendata per Iohannem le bourgoys. Rothomagi: pro Roberto mace." The copy in the British Library has unfortunately lost several
Buccolica canori poete Titi Calphurnii Siculi undecim aeglogis iucunditer decantata, published by Henry Quentell at Cologne between 1495 and 1500. The text is similar to that of the Deventer editions.


Two editions were edited by Benedictus Philologus and published in Florence in 1504 under the title "Eclogae Vergilii. Fraci Pet. / Calphurnii Ioannis Boc. / Nemesiani. Ioan. bap. Mā / Pomponii Gaurici." The texts are identical. One also bears the name of P. de Giunta (ed. Juntina).

*Calpurnii et Nemesiani Poetarum Bucolicum Carmen. Una cum Commentariis Diomedis Guidalotti Bononiensis. Per C. Bazalerium, Bologna 1504. It follows the Parma edition of Ugoletus, but has some good readings by Guidalotti himself. This is the first edition to eject 4.13 from the text after 4.6 where it appears in some early editions and in G.

Editio Germanica 1513. This edition is known only to Barth and most editors doubt its existence. It is also often not clear from Barth's notes when readings are supposed to have appeared in the editio Germanica and when they are his conjectures. Barth said that he found it in a ruined convent in the Hercynian Forest. He describes it as "Vetustissima editio litteris Germanicis, siue, Longobardicis maulis, excussa Lipsiae, ut
arbìérò." He says that he believes that it was printed by Andrea Lotter, but at Leipzig we only know of a printer called Melchior Lotter. It is undated, but he believes it was printed in about 1513. It contains, he says, the works of Calpurnius, Grattius and Nemesianus, which would mean that the Aldine edition of 1534 is not the first edition containing the Eclogues and Cynegética.

Wernsdorf makes a half-hearted attempt to identify this mysterious edition by suggesting that Barth really means the Farma edition of Ugoletus, while Glaeser suggests that Barth is thinking of the 1539 edition. Barth, however, does state that his edition contained the Cynegética, so that neither of these explanations can be the true one. We must conclude, therefore, either that all trace of this edition has been lost or that Barth has invented a source for what are in fact his own conjectures.

17 T. Calphurnii Siculi et Aurelii Nemesiani Carthaginensis
Poetarum Aeglogae, decoro diligenté observatíoc etc. Jérôme Victor and Jean Singren, Vienne (France) 1514.

18 *C. Calphurnij Bucolica ab Ascensio iam diligenté recognita,
Vu. Stöckel, Leipzig 1517. The introduction is dated 1503 and it includes a letter from Ascensius.

19 T. Calphurnii Siculi Buccolicon et Aurelii Nemesiani
Cartaginensis Eclogae, Aldus, Venice 1518.

20 *Amorum libri II. De amore conjugalí III etc. J.J. Pontanus,
Venice 1518.

21 *Ludi Literarii Magistria etc. edited by Ioannes Alexander
Brassicanus, with a life of Nemesianus, Hagenau 1519.
22 *Titii Calphurnii Siculi et Aurelii Nemesiani...Eclogae etc.
   Apud C. Froschoverum, Zurich 1537.

23 Rerum bucolicarum scriptores. F. Virgili Elogae X, T.
   Calphurnii Elogae VII, Aurel. Nemesiani Olympii Elogae IV et
   Act.Sinceri Sannazarii Elogae V, Christophe Egenolph,
   Franckfurt 1539.

24 *En habes lector Bucolicon autore XXXVIII etc. Joannes
   Oporinus, Basle 1546.

25 Illustrium poetarum flores per Octauianum Mirandulas collecti
   etc. Ioannes Bellerus, Antwerp 1563.

26 *F.A.O.Nemesiani...T. Calphurnii...Bucolica...commentariis
   exposita opera ac studio R. Titii (Epistola Hugolini
   Martelli, in qua loci aliquot horum Poetarum uel declarantur,
   uel emendatur), Florence 1590.

27 *Les Pastorales de Némésien et de Calpurnius, A.M. de Mairault,
   Brussels 1744. With notes, a prose translation into French
   and an excursus on Eclogues.

28 La Bucolica di Nemesiano e di Calpurnio, T.G. Farsetti 1761.

29 *M.Aurelii Olympii Nemesiani Eclogae IV et T. Calpurnii
   Siculi Eclogae VII ad Nemesianum Carthaginiensem, cum notis
   selectis etc. Mitavia 1774. Taken from Burman's Poetae Latini
   Minores.

30 *T. Calpurnii Siculi Eclogae XI. Recognouit adnotatione et


31 *Des Titus Calpurnius Siculus Ländliche Gedichte, F. Adelung, St. Petersburg 1804. With a translation into German. All eleven eclogues are attributed to Calpurnius. There is an introduction, and also some notes.

32 Calpurnius auserlesene Gedichte, C. Ch. G. Wiss, Leipzig 1805.

33 Calpurnius Idyllen, E.E. Klausen, Altona 1807. From Beck's text.


35 Virgil Bucolica et Titi Calpurnij Bucolica etc. ed. F.A.C. Grauff, Berne 1830.

36 *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum, Wilhelm Ernst Weber, Francofurti ad Moenum 1833. Follows Burman and Wernsdorf.

37 M. Aurelius Olympius Nemesianus Vier Idyllen, R. Mueller, Zeitz 1834. With a translation into German verse.


39 *Calp. et Nemes... recensuit, C.E. Glaeser, Göttingen 1842. Glaeser collated some of the manuscripts himself and used g r s x y for his apparatus criticus.
40 *Calpurnii et Nemesiani bucolici recensuit H. Schenkl, Leipzig 1885. With introduction, apparatus criticus, *index verborum*, *index auctorum*, imitatorium, locorum similum. Schenkl first isolated the manuscript group *firy*.


42 *Anthology of Latin Poetry*, Robert Yelverton Tyrrell, London 1901. (Ecl. 3. 18-51).

43 *Calpurnii et Nemesiani Bucolica*, Cesare Giarratano, Naples 1910. Re-edited at Turin 1924. With a long introduction including a brief description of the manuscripts. He collated NGabcdefghilnu himself and also used pqrs in his apparatus criticus.

44 *I carmina bucolici di Calpurnio e Nemesiano*, F. Vernaleone, edited by Vincenzo Fiorentino, Noicattaro 1927. Text taken from that of Giarratano, with introduction and notes, and a translation into Italian. There are a number of misprints.


CYNEGETICA


3 Cynegeticon des Nemesianus, Christianus Fridericus Schmidt, Lunebourg 1716.

4 *Gratii Falisci Cynegeticon et M. Aurelii Olympii Nemesiani Cynegeticon. Cum notis selectis Titii, Barthii, Ulitii, Johnsonii et Petri Burmanni integris, Mitau 1775. The text differs from that of Burman's of 1731 in a few places, almost all certainly misprints.

5 *Gratii Cynegeticon et Nemesiani Cynegeticon, Mitau 1775. According to the title page, this edition contains the De Aucupio, but this is not the case.

6 *M. Manilii Astronomicon libri V ex recensione R. Bentley, Venice 1788. This edition includes a life of Nemesianus. The text is taken from Burman's edition.

7 *Gratii et Nemesiani carmina venatica, R. Stern, Halle 1832. With notes and introduction. Includes the De Aucupio.
8 *Ovidii Halieutica Gratii et Nemesiani Cynegetica*, K. Haupt, Leipzig 1838. Includes the *Le Aucupio*. With an introduction discussing the manuscript tradition, apparatus criticus and *Index Verborum*.

9 *Selections from the Less Known Poets*, N. Pinder, Oxford 1869. uu. 240-82 with notes.


13 *Les Cynégétiques de Némésien*, Paul Van de Woestijne, Gent 1937. With introduction mainly concerned with the manuscripts, and an *Index Verborum*. 
ECLOGUES AND CYNEGETICA

1 *Poetae tres egregii, G. Logus, Aldus Venice 1534 (ed. Aldina secunda). This is the first edition to have the Eclogues and Cynegetica together. A manuscript copy of this text of the Cynegetica exists in Dorvillianus 57, fos. 9-12 which was written c. 1600 partly by R. Titius.


4 *Epigrammata et Poematia uetera, ed. Pierre Pithou apud N. Gillium, Paris 1590. Re-edited *Lyons 1596. This edition is the basis of many later ones. The text of the Eclogues is based on those of the ed. Juntina and the Paris edition of 1503. The text of the Cynegetica is very like that of ed. Aldina secunda, but differs from it in a few significant particulars. The colophon is dated 1589.

5 ed. Lugduni mentioned by Keene. He says it follows edition no. 4 and is dated 1603.


7 *Corpus omnium ueterum poetarum latinorum etc. Volume II. A Petro Bassaeo Patricio Gacensi, Geneva 1611, second edition.
8 *Venatici et bucolici poetae latini, Gratius, Nemesianus, Calpurnius etc. Edited by C. von Barth, Hanover 1613.

9 *Chorus poetarum classicorum duplex; sacrorum et profanorum lustretus illustratus etc. Part 1. L. Auguet, Lyons 1616. Follows edition no. 4.


11 Venatio Novantiqua, edited by J. van Vliet (Ulitius), Leyden 1645 (1655). Includes the De Aucupio.


14 *Opera et fragmenta ueterum Poetarum Latinorum profanorum et ecclesiasticorum vol. 2, edited by Michael Maittaire, London 1713, a copy of which was published under the title of Corpus omnium ueterum Poetarum Latinorum tam prophanorum quam ecclesiasticorum etc. London 1721. Includes the De Aucupio. Follows edition no. 4.

16 *Poetae latini rei uenaticae scriptores et bucolici antiqui (cum notis Barthii, Ulitii, Johnsonii), edited by Sigebert Havercamp and R. Bruce, Leyden 1728. With an elaborate commentary.


18 *Poetae latini minores tom. 1, edited by P. Burman, Leyden 1731. Includes the De Aucupio. With introduction and notes, including those of Ulitius, Barth, Titius and Martellius. The text only, without the notes, was reprinted at Glasgow in *1752, under the same title.

19 M. Aurelii Olympi Nemesiani poetae Carthaginensis nec non T. Calpurnii Siculi opera quae exstant omnia, edited by Heinrich-Gottlieb Schmid, Lunebourg 1746.

20 *Collectio Pisaurensis omnium poematum carminum, fragmentorum latinorum etc. tom. 4, edited by Pasquale Amati, Poglia 1766. Includes the De Aucupio.

21 *Poetae latini minores, edited by J.C. Wernsdorf, Altenburg 1780. The Cynegetica and De Aucupio are in vol. 1, and the Eclogues in vol. 2. Wernsdorf argues in his introduction for the attribution of Nemesianus's Eclogues to Calpurnius. There are copious notes.

22 *Phaedri et Aviani Fabulae, Milan 1785. With a translation into Italian.
23 *Poésies de M.A.O. Némésien, suivies d'une idylle de J.
Fracastor sur les chiens de chasse, edited by S. Delatour,
Paris 1799. With a translation into French prose. Includes the
De Aucupio. Follows edition no. 18.

24 *Bibliotheca classica Latina vol. 134, edited by K.E. Lemaire,
Paris 1824. The text, testimonia and argumenta are those of
Wernsdorf. Includes the Le Aucupio.

25 *Collections des Auteurs Latins, edited by M. Nisard, Paris
1842. With a translation into French. The text is that of
Lemaire.

26 *Poetae latini minores vol. 3, edited by Emil Baehrens,
Leipzig 1881. Includes the De Aucupio. This was the first
dition to use G and to give NG their proper position in the
manuscript tradition. His collation of the manuscripts,
however, was not very carefully done and his apparatus
criticus contains a number of errors.

27 *Corpus poetarum latinorum vol. 2, edited by E. Schenkel,
criticus. Includes the De Aucupio.

1912. Texts of Cyn. 1-102 (no. 303) and Eolougue 3 (no. 304).

29 *Poetae Minores, edited by Ernest Raynaud, Paris 1931. Includes
the De Aucupio and a translation into French. Some notes. The
Eclogues are attributed to Calpurnius.

ORTHOGRAPHY

The manuscripts of the Eclogues belong mainly to the fifteenth century and are therefore no reliable guide to the spellings which Nem. himself used. The manuscripts A and B of the Cynegética, however, which are five centuries older, do seem to indicate that Nem. preferred non-assimilated forms of in- and ad-, and I have therefore accepted non-assimilated forms where they are attested and have regularised throughout. I have not introduced spellings which are not found in any manuscript of Nem.

The following are the forms which I have adopted:

1 In- not assimilated: inbellis; inlaesus; innitis; inmittere; inmodicus; inpatiens; inpendere; inpingere; implicare; inponere; inprobus; inprudens; inpune.
   In- assimilated: imbutus; immunis; impius.

2 Ad- not assimilated: adquirere; adrodere; adstringere; adsuescere; adtonitus; adritus.
   Ad- assimilated: accingere; allicere; applaudere; arridere; aspectare; aspicere; assiduus.

3 Con- not assimilated: conplere; conrugus.
   Con- assimilated: collidere; colligere; commodare; commouere; communis; complacitus; componere; corripere; corrumpere.

4 s omitted after ex-: expectare; extinguere.

5 Miscellaneous spellings which I have preferred are: conubia; hiemps; pinna; querella.

I have everywhere adopted the commoner -es endings of third declension nouns; endings in -is are found only in Hfiruy where they are frequent but not constant, and I have recorded them in my apparatus where they occur.

The manuscripts vary between hae and haec in only four places, and as Nem. seems to have used the two forms indiscriminately, I have printed the majority reading in these places.
My reports of the readings of the manuscripts are the results of my own collations, either of the manuscripts themselves or from photographs or microfilm. I have not included many insignificant corruptions, nor unimportant variations in spelling, such as $e$ for $ae$, nor mediaeval misspellings, such as $mich$ for $mihi$. Where the correct spelling appears assigned to a few manuscripts only, it is to be assumed that the word is misspelled in the others, as at 1.1, 6, 53, 68, 2.44 etc. Readings of interest for which there is no room in the main body of the apparatus criticus have been included in the Appendix Lectionum.
Riccardianus 636 i. Angelius emotauit.

N Harleianus 2570 saec. xv vel xvi

X Legiabecchianus VII 1195 saec. xvi

V codiciv cui sequuntur consensus

a Ambrosianus O 74 sup. saec. xv
b Ambrosianus I 26 sup. saec. xv
c Vaticanus 2110 saec. xv
d Vaticanus 3152 saec. xv
e Vaticanus Urbinas 353 saec. xv
f Vaticanus Ottobonianus 1466 saec. xv
g Vaticanus Palatinus 1652 saec. xv
h Vaticanus Reginensis 1759 saec. xv
i Laurentianus pl. 37, 14 saec. xv
j Holkhamicus 334 saec. xv
k Bruxellensis 20589 saec. xv
l Laurentianus bibl. red. 225 saec. xv
m Monacensis 362 saec. xv
n Riccardianus 724 (olim L.II l) saec. xv
o Dorvillianus 147 saec. xv
p Quirinianus CVII 1 saec. xv
q Corsinianus 43 F 5 saec. xiv vel xv
r Rehdigeranus 60 saec. xv
s Rehdigeranus 59 saec. xv
t Monacensis (olim Tegernseensis) 19699 saec. xvi
u Riccardianus 636 saec. xv
v Vaticanus 5123 saec. xiv vel xv
w Sloanianus 777 saec. xv
x Vindobonensis 305 saec. xv
y Leidensis Vossianus L.Q. 107 saec. xv-xvi
z Canonicianus Class. Lat. 126 saec. xv

FLORILEGIA

Parisinus Thuanus 7647 saec. xii-xiii
Parisinus 17903 (olim Nostradamensis 188) saec. xii-xiii
Atrebatensis 64 (olim 65) saec. xiii-xv
Escorialensis Q 114 saec. xiii-xiv
Berolinensis (Diez. B. Santen. 60) saec. xiv
Bononiensis 83 (52, Busta II n. 1) saec. xv-xvi
Laurentianus Conv. Sopp. 440 saec. xvi

His etiam compendiis usus sum: a.c. = ante correctionem; codd. =
codices omnes; p.c. = post correctionem; ras. = rasura; s.c. = sed
correxit; HV plerique = H et plerique codices V stirpis; HV
reliqui = H et omnes codices V stirpis praeter eos quorum propria
nota adlata est
TIM. Dum fiscella tibi fluuiiali, Tityre, iunco
texitur et raucis immunia rura cicadis,
incipe, si quod habes gracili sub harundine carmen
compositum. nam te calamos inflare labello
Pan docuit uersuque bonus tibi fauit Apollo.
incipe, dum salices haedi, dum gramina uaccae
detondent, uiridique greges permettere campo
dum ros et primi suadet clementia solis.
hos annos canamque comam, uicine Timeta, tu iuuenis carusque deis in carmina cogis? uiximus et calamis uersus cantauimus olim, dum secura hilares aetas ludebat amores. nunc album caput et ueneres tepuere sub annis, iam mea ruricolea dependet fistula Fauno. te nunc rura sonant; nuper nam carmine uictor risisti calamos et dissona flamina Mopsi iudice me. mecum senior Meliboeus utrumque audierat laudesque tuas sublimie ferebat;

9 canamque NGHV pler.: caramque x; cantabo ps comam uicine timeta AH: comam uicine timere G: comam uicine timere (timera m²)N: mean mihi care senectam V pler.: mean mihi cane senectam x: comam uicine Thymoeta Hault, fortasse recte
10 carusque NEV: carisque G deis G:Hailvy: diis bogjnxu: dis N: deos ps in NGHV pler.: mihi iu (sub ras.)
12 hilares V pler.: illares N: ylares G: orthographia etiam peius deprauata Hiux: hilaros Heinsiua ludebat GHV pler.: ludabat N (corr. m¹): laudabat ps: rumpebat x
13 caput N: campud G et NGAHV: ac V reliqu: tepuere N₂:in mg.: ztepuere G (z del. et in mg. uenus in tepuere): stupuere HV pler.: periere Keene
14 iam V pler.: nam NGz: et AH
15 te NGH: et V sonant codd.: sonent Earth nam NGHV pler.: iam u² carmine HV pler.: carmina NGajpsu²:²:z uictor NGHV pler.: uictos ps: rauco Maehly
16 risisti codd.: uiciisti Maehly dissona GHV: disona N flamina NAHV pler.: carmina Ggiu²:
quem nunc emeritae permensum tempora uitae
secreti pars orbis habet mundusque piorum.
quare age, si qua tibi Meliboei gratia uiuit,
dicat honoratos praedulcis tibia manes.

TIM. et parere decent iussis et grata iubentur.
namque fuit dignus senior, quem carmine Phoebus,
Pan calamis, fidibus Linus aut Oeagrius Orpheus
concinerent totque acta uiri laudesque sonarent.
sed quia tu nostrae musam deposcis auenae,
accipe quae super haec cerasus, quam cernis ad amnem,
continent, inciso seruans mea carmina libro.

TIT. dic age; sed nobis ne uento garrula pinus

20 secreti codd.: siderei Maehly piorum HV pler.: piorum NGagnuv3
21 gratia NGHV pler.: uerbum om. z uiuit codd.: uiui (sc.
fuit) Castiglioni
22 praedulcis NGHV pler.: per dulcis nu tibia NGHV pler.: fistula z
23 iussis et grata GHV: iussis grata N
25 fidibus Nciu; fidibusque GHV reliqui linus N2H pler.: orthographia peius deprauata NGbcsv: uerbum om. 1 aut
Oeagrius N: aut egrius G: modulatibus Hacgqvz: modulantibus V reliqui
26 concinerent NGHV pler.: concinnent n totque NGHu2: atque V uiri GHV: uiridi N (di postea exp.)
sonarent NHV: sonabant G (corr. in mg.)
27 quia NGHV pler.: quare n musam N2 (in mg.)HV: laudem NG
28 uersum om. V, add. A super codd.: sacra Leo
haec codd.: hoc Heinsius
29 seruans NGAH : quercus V
30 nobis ne uento codd.: foliis cantu (uel cantum) ne Burman
garrula HV pler.: garula Njnp: gracula g: cartula G (sed
garrula in mg.)
obstrepat, has ulmos potius fagosque petamus.

TIM. hic cantare libet; uirides nam subicit herbas
mollis ager lateque tacet nemus omne: quieti
aspice ut ecce procul decerpant gramina tauri.

omniparens aether et rerum causa, liquores,
corpus et genetrix tellus, vitalis et aer,
accipite hos cantus atque haec nostro Meliboeo
mittite, si sentire datur post fata quietis.
nam si sublimes animae caelestia templae
sidereaque colunt sedes mundoque fruuntur,
tu nostros aduerte modos, quos ipse benigno

31 obstrepat GHapsuvz: obstrepet NV reliqui has NGHV
pler.: hos gpsv ulmos potius NGHV pler.: potius ulmos x
fagosque NGcginu: fagos ne x: fagosue HAV reliqui
32 uirides GV pler.: uiridis Hi: uiridas N (corr. m
subicit H: subycit v: subic N: sugerit Aspv (in mg.):
sugerit a: surgerit z: suggerit ex subegerit l: subigt GV
reliqui: subrigit Baehrens
33 lateque tacet HV: lacteaque (c postea exp.) tacet N: late
tacet et G: lateque iacet Baehrens nemus NGHV pler.:
genus ps: pecus Burman
34 decerpant gramina tauri codd.: deflectant flamina Caurei
cod. Titii
35 omniparens HV pler.: omni parens Nc: omne parens G:
omnipotens ps liquores NGHV pler.: liquoris bogjlnpquv
36 genetrix bnu
37 accipite NGHV pler.: accipe bpx (s.c.) hos cantus N:
hoc cantus G: hos calmam HV pler.
38 mittite si sentire datur HV pler.: si sentire datur
mittite N: si sentire datur mittite G fata NGHV pler.:
facta a (s.c.)c (in mg.) z
39 nam codd.: iam Ulitius
41 nostros...modos codd.: nostris...modis Burman
pectore fouisti, quos tu, Meliboe, probasti.
longa tibi cunctisque diu spectata senectus
felicesque anni nostrique nouissimus aequi
circulus innocuæ clauserunt tempora uiae.
nec minus hinc nobis gemitus lacrimaeque fuere
quam si florentes mors inuida carperet annos;
nec tenuit tales communis causa querellas.
"heu, Meliboe, iaces letali frigore segnis
lege hominum, caelo dignus canente senecta
concilioque deum. plenum tibi ponderis aequi
pectus erat. tu ruricolum discernere lites
adsueras, varias patiens mulcendo querellas.

42 fouisti HV: nouisti NG
43 spectata codd.: sperata Burman
44 anni NGHV pler.: animi ginu nostrique NGHV pler.: anni ps
46 hinc HV: hic NG gemitus lacrimaeque codd.: lacrymae
gemitusque Barth
47 quam GHV: qua N florentes NG V pler.: florentis Hi
carperet NGAH: pelleret V pler.: carperet vel perderet vel
rumperet Burman: uelleret Glaeser: tolleret Heinsius
48 nec NGV pler.: h(a)ec Hnqv (a.c.) tenuit codd.: renuit
Martellius tales NGV pler.: talis Hiu, prob. Glaeser
com(m)unis NGHV pler.: comunes s: communes Glaeser. communis
defendit Leo
49 iaces NGHV pler.: taces n 1(a)etali HV: mortali NG
50 canente senecta NGHV pler.: callente vel sapiente senecta
Baehrens: labente senecta Hartel: post fata peracta Maehly
om. dignus lx, sed add. x'
51 concilioque deum NGHV pler.: consilioque deus i
ponderis codd.: iuris et Maehly
53 assueras NGHV pler.: adfueras 1 patiens GHV pler.:
pariens g: paciens Ncxz(?): pacans Maehly: sapiens Burman
mulcendo NHV: mulcedo G: mulcere Wakefield: mulcensque
Ulitius querellas jlxz
sub te iuris amor, sub te reverentia iusti
floruit, ambiguos signauit terminus agros.
blanda tibi uultu grauitas et mite serena
fronte supercilium, sed pectus mitius ore.
tu calamos aptare labris et iungere cera
hortatus duras docuisti fallere curas;
ne segnum passus nobis marcere iuuentam
saepe dabas meritae non uilia praemia Musae.
saepe etiam senior, ne nos cantare pigeret,
laetus Phoebea dixisti carmen auena.
felix o Meliboee, uale! tibi frondis odorae
munera dat lauros carpens ruralis Apollo;
dant Fauni, quod quisque ualet, de uite racemos,
de messi culmos omnique ex arbore fruges;
dat grandaeua Pales spumantia cymbia lacte,
mella ferunt Nymphae, pictas dat Flora coronas;
manibus hic supremus honos; dant carmina Musae.
carmina dant Musae, nos et modulamur auena.
siluestris te nunc platanus, Meliboeae, susurrat,
te pinus; reboat te quicquid carminis, Echo
respondet siluae; te nostra armenta loquuntur;
namque prius siccis phœcae pascentur in aruis
insuetusque freto uiuet leo, dulcia mella
sudabunt taxi, confusis legibus anni

67 messi Maehly: messe NGAH: campo V: messo Burman
68 dat NGHV pler.: dant x cymbia GHinu’z
69 mella NGHV pler.: mala iu^2 pictas NGHV pler.: pietas g
(s.c.) iu dat NGHV pler.: dant n^1 flora NGHV pler.: flore iu
70 hic NGV: hinc AH honos HV: honor NG
71 dant codd.: dent Burman nos et GH: nos N: nos te V pler.: nos tamen z: nos quae Burman
72 te nunc NG: nunc te HV pler.: quoque z
74 respondet NA uel u^1: respondent GHV siluae codd.: siluis Modius armenta codd.: arbusta Haupt
loquuntur NAH: locuntur G: sequuntur V pler.: secuntur nvxz post siluae interpunxerunt Burman, Giarratano, Duff Earth maiorem distinctionem post pinus posuit, Leo post respondet
75 pascentur NGH: nascentur V in aruis GHV pler.: in herbis N (corr. m^2 in mg.)
messem tristis hiemps, aestas \+ tractabit\overset{\text{foli}}{\text{am}},
ante dabit flores autumnus, uer dabit uuas,
quam taceat, Meliboee, suas mea fistula laudes."

TIT.

perge, puer, coeptumque tibi ne deserere carmen.

nam sic dulce sonas, ut te placatus Apollo

prouehat et felix dominam perducat in urbem.

namque hic in siluis praeens tibi Fama benignum

strauit iter, rumpens liuoris nubila pinnis.

sed iam sol demittit equos de culmine mundi,

flumineos suadens gregibus praebere liquores.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[79] ante 78 coll. V \textit{obelos adfixit Williams}
\item[78] tractabit GHV: tractavit N: praestabit Haupt: iactabit
\item[77] Burman: ructabit Ellis \quad oliuam NG: oliuas AHV
\item[79] floris Hi \quad uer NGHV \textit{pler.}: nec bgilnux
\item[80] quam GHV: qua N \quad laudis Hiu
\item[81] coeptumque ed. Oporiniana: ceptumque NGAq: certumque H:
\item[81] q(o)eptum V \textit{relicui} \quad tibi ne NG: tibi neu H: tibi iam ne
\item[81] V \textit{pler.}: tibi ne iam x: tibi iam neu io\textsuperscript{2}: tibi iam nec ps:
\item[82] sic NGHV \textit{pler.}: si z \quad sonas NHV \textit{pler.}: sonans z:
\item[82] canis G
\item[83] prouehat GHV \textit{pler.}: prouehit N: prouehit c \quad perducat
\item[83] NGHV \textit{pler.}: perducit c: producat lzx \quad in NGH\textsuperscript{2}: ad V
\item[84] urbem GHV: orbem N (\textit{corr. m}\textsuperscript{2})
\item[84] namque codd.: iamque Heinsius \quad hic in siluis codd.: huc
\item[85] e siluis Hoeufft
\item[85] rumpens NGHV \textit{pler.}: rumpes g, Barth \quad liuoris NGHV \textit{pler.}:
\item[86] liuoribus a \quad pennis NG: plena HV \textit{pler.}: plena bgx:
\item[86] plenae l2
\item[86] demittit npqv: dimittit NGHV \textit{pler.}: dimitit c: dimittit j
\item[87] flumineos NGHV \textit{pler.}: fluminibus l\textsubscript{x} \quad suadens NGHV \textit{pler.}:
\item[87] sudans z \quad liquoris H
\end{enumerate}

Explicit prima G
Formosam Donacen Idas puer et puer Alcon
ardebant rudibusque annis incensus uterque
in Donaces uenerem furiosa mente ruebant.
hanc, cum uicini flores in uallibus horti
carperet et molli gremium conpleret acantho,
inuasere simul uenerisque imbutus uterque
tum primum dulci carpebant gaudia furto.
hinc amor et pueris iam non puerilia uota:

1 donacen GHbgqu idas puer N: ydas puer G: puer idas Hauz:
puer astacus bgjlnpqvx: orthographia depraunita cis
2 rudibusque NGAZ : rudibus V reliqui incensus NGHV pler.: intensus u²: sucensus z
3 furiosa NG: furiate HV pler. ruebant NGHV pler.: ruebat ci
4 uicini codd.: uicinis Hartel floris Hi uallibus codd.: callibus G. Hermann
5 molli codd.: dulci Barth
6 uenerisque Hil²nu: uenerique V reliqui: ueneris NG
imbutus codd.: immitis ed. Aldina secunda
7 tum NGHpsv: tunc V reliqui carpebant NGHV pler.: carpebat j:
carperunt Barth dulcia tunc primum carpebant uel capiebant
Burman
8 hinc NHV: hic G iam non AHv: iam nunc NGV reliqui
† quis anni ter quinque hiemes et † cura iuuentae.

sed postquam Donacen duri clausere parentes,
quod non tam tenui filo de uoce sonaret
sollicitumque foret pinguis sonus, inproba ceruix
suffususque rubor crebro uenaeque tumentes,
tum uero ardentem flammati pectoris aestus
carminibus dulciisque parant releuare querella;
ambo aevo cantuque pares nec dispares forma,
ambo genas leues, intonsi crinibus ambo.

^^

9 quis anni ter quinque hiemes et cura iuuentae codd.: uix anni ter
quinque et mens et cura iuuentae Summers: quis actae ter quinque
hiemes et cura iuuentae Heinsius: quis anni ter quinque hiemes et
cruda iuuenta Haupt: quis anni ter quinque ignes et cura iuuentae
Leo: quis anni ter quinque uirent et cura iuuenta Ellis: quis anni
ter quinque hinc mens et cura iuuentae Verdière: quis anni ter
quinque hymeni sed cruda iuuenta Maehly: quis anni ter quinque
increscit cura iuuentae Baehrens: quis anni ter quinque et primae
cura iuuentae Burman: quis anni ter quinque biennis cura iuuencae
Birt: quis tantum ter quinque hiemes set cura iuuentae Hall: quis
aeui ter quinque hiemes et cura iuuentae Hartel

11 quod NGHgiu: qui n: et V reliqui tenui filo de codd.: tenui
defilio Titius: tenui sua filia uel filum ceu Maehly uoce codd.:
uoxxque Glaeser sonaret NGHV pler.: sonarent av\frac{3}{2}
12 sollicitumque GHacijluxz: sollicitumque Nbn: sollicitamus ps:
sollicitumque g: sollicitusque Ulitius: insoluitumque Heinsius
pinguis sonus NGHu^2: linguis onus abilnuxz: pelora cgjpqs: linguace
sonus Ulitius
14 flammati om. l pectoris NGHV pler.: corporis lx
15 releuare NGHV pler.: reuselare A
16 aevo cantuque GHV: cantu euoque N
17 genas l(a)eues NGHV multi: genas leues N^2cqx: genes leues s: gen
leues p: genas leues n intonsi NGHV pler.: intonsis v

\^echeles ad.Fixit Williams
atque haec sub platano maesti solacia casus
alternant, Idas calamis et uersibus Alcon.

I. "quae colitis siluas, Dryades, quaeque antra, Napaeae, et quae marmoreo pede, Naiades, uda secatis
litora purpureosque alitis per gramina flores:
dicite, quo Donacen prato, qua forte sub umbra
inueniam, roseis stringentem lilia palmis?
nam mihi iam trini perierunt ordine soles,
ex quo consuco Donacen expecto sub antro.
interea, tamquam nostri solamen amoris
hoc foret aut nostros posset medicare furores,

18 haec sub Glaeser: hic sub NG: hi sub AHu2: sub hoc V reliqui:
hinc sub H. Schenkl
19 idas NHabcilpuxz alcon NGHabgijlnpjpsuvoxz
20 dryades ilpu2v quaeque HV: atque NG napaeae Hu
21 Naiades ed. Parm.: naiades G Habgilnqvz uda NGHV pler.:
ulla abcjq secatis NHV pler.: secantes Gi
22 litora Gln: littora NHV pler.: gramina Barth alitis
NGHV pler.: uerbum om. z purpureosque NGHV pler.: purpureos
quae n, Gudius: purpureos (om. -que) cijpqsu gramina HV:
littora N: litoro G floris Hi
23 dicite quo donacen (donacem H) prato CH: donace prato N
(dicite quo prato add. pto exp. N2): dicite quo prato donacen
bclqwv: dicite quo prato donacen agnpsz: dicite quo pacto
donacen i: dicite quo pacto donacen x
25 mihi iam NGHu2: me iam V perierunt NGHu2: petierunt a1b
cgijnpqsvuv: pellerunt x: pepulerunt ax1: uerbum om. l:
pecierunt z
26 expecto NGHV pler.: experto gi
27 tamquam nostri NHV: nostri tamquam G
28 hoc NHV pler.: hic G: haec x: nostros posset N (rapidos
sup. m2) G: posset rabidos Hcjpqsuvz: posset rapidos bgilnux:
posset radios a
nulla meae trinis tetigerunt gramina uaccae
luciferis, nullo libarunt amne liquores;
siccaque fetarum lambentes ubera matrum
stant uituli et teneris mugitibus aera conplent.
ipse ego nec iunco molli nec uimine lento
perfeci calathos cogendi lactis in usus.
quid tibi, quae nosti, referam? scis mille iuuencas
esse mihi, nosti numquam mea mulctra uacare.
ille ego sum, Donace, cui dulcia saepe dedisti
oscula nec medios dubitasti rumpere cantus
atque inter calamos errantia labra petisti.
heu heu! nulla meae tangit te cura salutis?
pallidior buxo uiolaeque simillimus erro.
omnes ecce cibos et nostri pocula Bacchi

29 trinis NHV pler.: ternis G
30 nullo libarunt Glaeser: nullo libar N: nullo sudarunt (d ex r) G:
nullo lambertum bocijqpsuvz: nulos lambertum alx: nulloque
biberunt AHv: nullo laberft n: nullos libarunt Ulitius
32 aera NHV pler.: ethera G: aethera Ulitius: atria i
33 iunco molli NG: molli iunco HV uimine NHV: uigmine G
34 calathos GHiu2v: calatos Nabcgjnqzxy: calamos ps
35 quid NGHV pler.: qui gu scis NGHV.pler.: sis gs
iuuenca NGHV pler.: iuenca NGHV.pler.: iuuenca cjpqv: bidentes Rooy
37 ille ego sum Donace cui dulcia GAH: ille ego sum Donace dulcia
cui N: Idas ille ego sum Donace cui saepe V pler. cui NGHV
pler.: quot fix
40 heu heu GAv: heu N: en heu Habcgijnpqsu: en ego! a1lx: heu ego z
tangit te NGHi: te tangit V reliqui cura NGHacjpsuv: causa V reliqui
41 uiol(a)eque GAHV pler.: uil (del.) uioleque N: uioleque inu:
uioleque b erro NGHV pler.: ero sxz: horti A
42 omnis Hiu nostri codd., suspectus: noti Heinsius
bacchi ailsux: bachi HV reliqui: uini NG
horreo nec placido memini concedere somno.
te sine, uae misero, mihi lilia fusca uidentur.
pallentesque rosae nec dulce rubens hyacinthus,
nullos nec myrtus nec laurus spirat odores.
at si tu uenias, et candida lilia fient
purpureaeque rosae, et dulce rubens hyacinthus;
tunc mihi cum myrto laurus spirabit odores.

nam dum Pallas amat turgentes unguine bacas,
dum Bacchus uites, Deo sata, poma Priapus,
pascua laeta Pales, Idas te diligit unam."

43 somno HV: sompno G; sono N
44 ue NGaboglnvzx fusca NGA: nigra HV
45 pallentesque NGHV pler.: pallentes ps rubens HV: rubensque
NGA hyacinthus ed. Farm.
om. 46-8 bc, om. 47-9 z, 47-9 post 67 g, corr. m^2
46 nullos nec myrtus nec laurus spirat NGHV pler.: tum mihi cum
mirtho laurus spirabit x: nullos nec myrtus nec laurus (lauros m^1)
spirabat odores z myrtus Hijvz
47 si tu N^2 Ha: si G: tu si V reliqui et codd.: iam Titius:
tunc C. Schenkl.
48 et dulce rubens Hinu: ac dulce rubens lx: tunc dulce rubens
agjpqz: tum dulce rubens Av: tunc dulce rubensque
G: dulce atque rubens Baehrens
49 uersum post 45 colloc. G tunc NGHV pler.: tum v
spirabit NHV pler.: spirabat G: pirabit s
50 dum N^2 HV pler.: cum NG: dea iu (sub ras.) amat NGV pler.:
amet Hu^2 v turgentis i unguine NGAH: sanguine n^2 V
51 uites Deo sata Glaeser: uites deus sata H: uites deus et sata V:
uuas cl's et sata N: deus uua et sata G: uites meus et sata Burman:
uites deus et sua nel rata Heinsius: uuas dum Bacchus Deo sata
Baehrens: Ceres et aut Tellus Ulitius sata NGHV pler.: noua ps
52 te NGHV pler.: quoque i diligit NGalsx: dilligit z:
dilliget (?) j: diliget HV reliqui unam NGHV pler.: uuam i
haec Idas calamis. tu, quae responderit Alcon
uersu, Phoebe, refer: sunt curae carmina Phoebo.

A. "o montana Pales, o pastoralis Apollo,
et nemorum Siluane potens, et nostra Dione,
quae iuga celsa tenes Erycis, cui cura iugales
concubitus hominum totis conectere saeculis:
quid merui? cur me Donace formosa reliquit?
munera namque dedi, noster quae non dedit Ida,
uocalem longos quae ducit aedona cantus;
quae licet interdum, contexo uimine clausa,
cum paruae patuere fores, ceu libera ferri
norit et agrestes inter uolitare uolucres,

53 h(a)ec GE7 pler.: hic N: nec g        tu quae GHblu²v: tuq; N:
tum qu(a)e cjnpqswvxz: tunc quae g: tuque quae a: nunc quae i
responderit GHV: respondis N
54 refer NGHV pler.: refert z        sunt codd.: sint Barth
curae Haupt: aurea codd.
55 o pastoralis NHV pler.: et pastoralis ps: o pastoralis G
56 Dione NGHV pler.: dionę bu: diane gn: dyone x
57 erycis Has cu NGHV pler.: quoi x: uerbum om. c
cura NGHV pler.: rura n
58 conectere bu
59 reliquit NG²HV pler.: reliquid G: reliquit ijnu: reliquitur g
61 longos qu(a)e ducit NGHV pler.: longos quę ducat a:
longosque ducit g: longos quaе duceret i
aedona GHV pler.:
reius deprauata Ngluz
62 contexo HV: contexo G: contexo N    clausa codd.:
clausae Haupt
63 paruae patuere NGHV pler.: caueae patuere Maehly: paruae
potuere g: paruae patiere s: patuere paruae n (s.c.): paruae
pature z    libera GHV: liberara N
64 norit Wernadorf: norat j: nout codd.    agrestes NV pler.:
agrestis Hi: agres G
scit rursus remeare domum tectumque subire,
ui minimis et caueam totis praeponere siluis.
praeterea tenerum leporem geminasque palumbes
nuper, quae potui, siluarum praemia misi.
et post haec, Donace, nostros contemnis amores?
forsitan indignum ducis, quod rusticus Alcon
te peream, qui mane boves in pascua duco.
di pecorum pauere greges, formosus Apollo,
Pan doctus, Fauni uates et pulcher Adonis.
quin etiam fontis speculo me mane notaui,
nondum purpureos Phoebus cum tolleret ortus
nec tremulum liquidis lumen splenderet in undis:

66 totis codd.: notis Heinsius
67 geminasque palumbes NGAHV multi; geminosque palumbes nu (sub. ras.): geminosque palumbos iu²: geminasque palumbos g
68 quae codd.: quod Titius praemia NGHV pler.: munera ps
69 et NGHV pler.: tu i: h(a)ec NGHV pler.: hoc xz
70 forsitam GHV pler.: forsitam Nal (a.c.)sz quod NHV: quia G
71 peream NG: cupiam HV duco G: ducam HV: ducas N
72 pecorum GHV pler.: precor Nps
73 fauni uates V pler.: phauni nates s: uates fauni NG(q; supra lin. add. G): faunusque pater Ulitius Adonis NHV: apollo G
74 etiam NHV: omnes G
75 cum HV pler.: quom x: dum NG: tum v: quum s ortus NGHV pler.: orbes v³ in mg.
76 tremulum N' HV: tenerum G lumen splenderet NG; splenderet lumen HV
quod uidi, nulla tegimur lanugine malas;
pascimus et crinem; nostro formosior Ida
dicor, et hoc ipsum mihi tu iurare solebas,
purpureas laudando genas et lactea colla
atque hilaris oculos et formam puberis aequi.
nec sumus indocti calamis: cantamus auena,
qua diui cecinere prius, qua dulce locutus
Tityrus e siluis dominam peruenit in urbem.
nos quoque te propter, Donace, cantabimus urbi,
si modo coniferas inter uiburna cupressos
atque inter pinus corylum frondescere fas est."

sic pueri Donacen totosub sole canebant,

frigidus e siluis donec descendere suasit
Hesperus et stabulis pastos inducere tauros.

87 atque NGHV pler.: at ed. Parm.: aut ed. Bon. pinus GHp:
pinos NV reliqui corylum iu₂
88 pueri NGHV pler.: pueru z
89 descendere Nbglnqvz: discedere GHcijsu₂x: discedere u (in ras.):
discede a: decedere Baehrens suasit NHV pler.: suauit G:
susasit a
90 pastos NGHV pler.: pastores c (s.c. in mg.) inducere NGHV pler.: includere l, Baehrens
Explicit secunda G
Nyctilus atque Micon nec non et pulcher Amyntas
Torrentem patula uitabant ilice solem,
cum Pan uenatu fessus recubare sub ulmo
coeperat et somno laxatus sumere uires;
quem super ex tereti pendebat fistula ramo.

5
hanc pueri, tamquam praedam pro carmine possent
sumere fasque esset calamos tractare deorum,
inuadunt furto; sed nec resonare canorem
fistula quem suerat nec uult contexere carmen,

sed pro carminibus male dissona sibilla reddit,
cum Pan excussus sonitu stridentis auenae
iamque uidens, "pueri, si carmina poscitis" inquit, 
"ipse canam: nulli fas est inflare cicutas, 
quas ego Maenaliis cera coniungo sub antris.
iamque ortus, Lenaee, tuos et semina uitis
ordine detexam: debemus carmina Baccho."

haec fatus coepit calamis sic montiuagus Pan:
"te cano, qui grauidis hederata fronte corymbis
uiterea sert a plicas quique udo palmita tigres
ducis odoratis perfusus colla capillis,
uera Iouis proles: iam tunc post sidera caeli
sola Iouem Semele uidit Iouis ora professum.
hunc pater omnipotens,uenturi prouidos aei,

15 iamque ortus Lenaee tuos g² (in mg.): similia sed orthographia
depra data Giaulgilnux: iamque ortus Lenaee tuus N: iamque ego Bac(c)he
tuos ortus acjpsu²(in mg.): iamque ego Baccheos ortus Ulitius:
iamque ego Bacche tuos orsus Titius semina
Titius
16 carmina NGHV pler.: carmina g, uir doctus apud Burmannum: canere
g² in mg. post hunc uersum in N insertus est II 81, suo loco
omissus, in eoque scriptum est illares et puberius,
17 haec HV pler.: hoc Nbglnu²xz: uerbum om. G (sed h m² in mg.)
fatus coepit Hailnpsuvx: fatus cepit V reliqui: cepit fatus NG
haec fatus coepit) occoepit fatus Glaeser
18 grauidis GHV: grauidus N corymbis i
19 uitea NGHV pler.: uitrae lx plicas GHV: plicas N
qui que udo NGAH: qui quando V: qui comptus g², Santenius: qui
comptas Heinsius: qui quasso uel comptus Hoeufft: qui pando uel
lento uel qui que udo Burman: qui ouantes Ulitius
20 odoratis...capillis NGH: odorato...capillo V perfusus NGHV
pler.: profusus g (corr. m²)
21 iam tunc NGHV pler.: iam tum vx: nam cum Baehrens: nam tunc
Burman: quoniam Glaeser post sidera codd.: per sidera Maehly
caeli NGHV pler.: caelo u²: celo i
22 uidit iouis NGHV pler.: iouis uidit n
23 uenturi codd.: futuri Beek
pertulit et iusto produxit tempore partus,
hunc Nymphae Faunique senes Satyrique procaces,
nosque etiam Nysae uiridi nutrimus in antro.
quin et Silenus paruum ueneratus alnum
aut grenio fouet aut resupinis sustinet ulnis,
euocat aut risum digito motuue quietem
allicit aut tremulis quassat creptacula palmis.
cui deus arridens horrendes pectore setas
uellicat aut digitis aures adstringit acutas
applauditue manu mutilum caput aut breue mentum

24 pertulit NGV: protulit V  iusto V: iuso G: iusso N
25 33 pertulit NGV: protulit V  iusto V: iuso G: iusso N
25 32 pertulit NGV: protulit V  iusto V: iuso G: iusso N
25 31 pertulit NGV: protulit V  iusto V: iuso G: iusso N
25 30 pertulit NGV: protulit V  iusto V: iuso G: iusso N
25 29 pertulit NGV: protulit V  iusto V: iuso G: iusso N
25 28 pertulit NGV: protulit V  iusto V: iuso G: iusso N
25 27 pertulit NGV: protulit V  iusto V: iuso G: iusso N
25 26 pertulit NGV: protulit V  iusto V: iuso G: iusso N
25 25 pertulit NGV: protulit V  iusto V: iuso G: iusso N
25 24 pertulit NGV: protulit V  iusto V: iuso G: iusso N

pertulit et iusto produxit tempore partus,
hunc Nymphae Faunique senes Satyrique procaces,
nosque etiam Nysae uiridi nutrimus in antro.
quin et Silenus paruum ueneratus alnum
aut grenio fouet aut resupinis sustinet ulnis,
euocat aut risum digito motuue quietem
allicit aut tremulis quassat creptacula palmis.
cui deus arridens horrendes pectore setas
uellicat aut digitis aures adstringit acutas
applauditue manu mutilum caput aut breue mentum
et simas tenero collidit pollice nares.

interea pueri florescit pube iuuentus
flauaque maturo tumuerunt tempora cornu.
tum primum laetas ostendit pampinus uus:
mirantur Satyri frondes et poma Lyaei.
tum deus, 'o Satyri, maturos carpite fetus'
dixit, 'et ignotos primi calcite racemos.'
uix haec ediderat, decerpunt uibus uus
et portant calathis celerique elidere planta
concaua saxa super properant: uindemia feruet
collibus in summis, crebro pede rumpitur uua
nudaque purpureo sparguntur pectora musto.
Satyri, lasciua cohors, sibi pocaula quisque
obuia corripiunt: quae fors dedit, arripit usus.
cantharon hic retinet, cornu bibit alter adunco,
concauat ille manus palmasque in pocaula uertit,
pronus at ille lacu bibit et crepantibus haurit
musta labris; alius uocalia cymbala mergit
atque alius latices pressis resupinus ab uuis
excipit; at potu saliens liquor ore resultat,
spumeus inque umeros et pectora defluit umor.
omnia ludus habet cantusque chorique licentes;

tum GHV: cum N
46 corripiunt NGHV pler.: corrupit jqv: corrumpunt lx quae NG:
quod HV fors NG: sors HV arripit NGH: hoc capit V: occupat Ulitius arripit usus) accipitur uas Maehly
48 cantharon Hipu
49 concacuat NGHV pler.: concanat cs: conuocat bgnv palmasque
GBaiu vz: palmas Nbcgjlnpqsu: palmis x
50 pronus at NGHV pler.: primus ad c: protinus i haurit HV pler.:
aurit Ggix; harit N (corr. m)
trepidantibus a
51 uocalia Ha bognlpsqsyz: uenalia iu: uerialia n: uocabula NGa
cymbala Hipnsv: orthographia deprauata NGabhjlnqvxs: cymbia Au (in mg.): cimbia q in mg.
52 uersum post 53 colloc. codd. praeter agz. 52 post 53 prob.
Baehrens pressis HV pler.: pressus NG (corr. m)
acjpqsv: pressat Baehrens
53 at NG: ac HV: ad Barth: aes Baehrens potu as: potus NGHV
pler.: putu z: poto Heinsius: potis ed. Aldina secunda: potum
Baehrens saliens liquor ore NHV: saliensque liquore G, prob.
Baehrens: rediens liquor ore Maehly
54 spumeus V: eumit NGH: eumis Glaeser: ebibit (uel pressat/
spumeus) Baehrens defluit NGV: diffuit H: diffuit u
55 chorique Glaeser: corrique NG: chorosque HV pler.: corroques n:
cohorsque p: corhosque s licentis Hi post licentes
Glaeser interpunxit
et uenerem iam uina mouent: raptantur amantes
concubitu Satyri fugientes iungere Nymphas.
iamiamque elapsas hic crine, hic ueste retentat.
tum primum roseo Silenus cymbia musto
plena senex auide non aequis uiribus hausit.
ex illo uenas inflatus nectare dulci
hesternoque grauis semper ridetur Iaccho.
quìn etiam deus ille, deus Ioue prosatus ipso,
et plantis uenas premit et de uitibus has tas
integit et lynci praebet cratere bibenti."
haec Pan Maenalia pueros in ualle docebat,
sparsas donec oues campo conducere in unum
nox iubet, uberibus suadens siccare fluorem
lactis et in nuæas adstrictum cogere glebas.

56 raptantur amantes NHV: raptantur amanti G: trepidant adaman tes
Maehly: raptantur amicis L. Müller
57 concubitu HV: concubitum G: cůcubitum N
satyris codd.: satyri codd.: fugientes NGV pler.: fugientis
Hi: cupientes a'lx nymphas codd.: nymphae L. Müller
59 primum NGHiu: primus V reliqui silenus acijlpqsuv
cymbia Hinu: orthographia deprauata Gbcgjlvxz: cymbala p: cimbala
as: tibia N
60 senex NHV: senes G (corr. m^1)
62 hesternoque NV pler.: h Externoque H: externoque Gbgjn (corr. m^2)
63 prosatus ipso Eginu: prosatus ab ipso N: satus ab ipso G: natus
ab ipso Aalvxz: pronatus ipso cjpqsa: pro natus ipse b
64 plantis codd.: palmis H. Schenkl
65 integit NG: inerit HV bibenti NGEV pler.: bibendi lx
67 ouis Hi
68 fluorem NGAHbcjlpqsa^2vxxz: fluorem a: liquorem V reliqui
Explicit tertia G
Populea Lycidas nec non et Mopsus in umbra,
pastores, calamis ac uersu doctus uterque
nec triuiale sonans, proprios cantabat amores.
nam Mopso Merco, Lycidae crinitus Iollas
ignis erat; parilisque furor de dispare sexu
cogebat trepidos totis discurrere siluis.

hos puer ac Merco multum lusere furentes,
dum modo conditas uitant in uallibus ulmos,
nunc fagos placitas fugiunt promissaque fallunt
antra nec est animus solitos ad ludere fontes,

1 Lycidas Hinsv
2 ac HV: et NG
3 nec codd.: nil Scrivierius triuiale NGHV: rurale G² in mg.
cantabat NGHV pler.: cantabit z
4 crinitus codd.: formosus Heinsius
5 erat codd.: exant Heinsius post 6, G habet u. 13 (qui iterum suo exstat loco). in u Angelius adnotauit: "ucat hic uersus: inque uicem cantu dulces dixere querellas."
7 hos NGHV pler.: nos n: flos oqs multum lusere furentes GHV:
luxere parentes furentes N (unde pauentes Claeser) furentis Hiu
8 dum NEH: nam G conditas HA uel u²v²: conductas NGV reiligui:
codictos v: constitutas u² ulmos codd.: ornos Modius
9 placitas NAH: placidas G (in quo corr. m in mg.) V
promissaque HV: promissaque NG (in mg.)
10 animus N²V pler.: animos G (s exp.). animo G¹AH: animis lvx:
amnus s: arons N ad ludere lz, Maehly: adludere Nabjq:
alludere GHV reiligui fontis Hiu
cum tandem fessi, quos durus adederat ignis,
sic sua desertis nudarunt uulnera siluis
inque uicem dulces cantu duxere querellas.

M. inmitis Meroe rapidisque fugacior Euris,
cur nostros calamos, cur pastoralia uitas
carmina? quemue fugis? quae me tibi gloria uicto?
quid uultu mentem premis ac spem fronte serenas?
tandem, dura, nega: possum non uelle negantem.
cantet, amat quod quisque: leuant et carmina curas.

L. respice me tandem, puer o crudelis Iolla.

11 cum NG: tum HV pler.: tunc l: dum Barth quos durus
NGAH: quos luxus bcgjlqvx: quos lusus V reliuui: quos dirus H.
Schenkl: dirus quos (ederat) C. Schenkl: quos torridus Baehrens
adederat Hau(vel A): ederat NGV pler.: aderat z
12 uulnera NGHV pler.: vellera iu (sub. rer.)
13 uicem NGHV: uices cod. Titii dulces cantu NGV pler.:
dulcis cantu iu: cantu dulcis H duxere V pler.: dixere
NGHciu: luxere Glaeser: mulser Maehly
14 rapidisque ex rabidisque N
15 cur...cur NGHV pler.: quur...quur lx: cur...et v
uitas NGHV pler.: uites ps
16 quemue NGHV pler.: quemon ed. Dav. prior: quae me codd.:
quemen Burman uicto NGHV pler.: luso uel spreto uel fido
Burman
17 quid codd.: si Burman uultu mentem NGAH: uultum ueniens
V pler.: uultum scoenis uel poenis Gebhardt serenas codd.: serenas ed. Aldina secunda, prob. Wernsdorf
18 nega NG: negas HV possum non uelle NGHV pler.: non
possum non uelle v: possum non uelle v3 in mg.: possim non uelle
Burman: possum nunc uelle Uilitius: possum nam uelle C. Schenkl:
possum iam uelle Baehrens
19 amat NGHV pler.: amet bglnux (ut semper) leuant...curas
habent Exc. Parr., Berol., Atreb. et Esc.
uu. 20-32 habet Exc. Bon., 21-4 habent Exc. Parr., Berol.,
Atreb. et Esc.
non hoc semper eris: perdunt et gramina flores,
perdit spina rosas nec semper lilia candent
nec longum tenet uua comas nec populus umbras:
donum forma breue est, nec se quod commodet annis.
cantet, amat quod quisque: leuant et carmina curas. 25

M. cerua marem sequitur, taurum formosa iuuenca,
et Venerem sensere lupae, sensere leaenae
et genus aerium uolucres et squamea turba
et montes siluaeque, suos habet arbor amores:
tu tamen una fugis, miserum tu prodis amantem.
cantet, amat quod quisque: leuant et carmina curas. 30

21 non hoc GHV pler.: non hec Nbf: non hic Exc. Berol., Baehrens:
nunc hoc u: hec hoc p: hoc hoc s eris HV Exc. Parr.: erit
G: herit N gramina GHV: germina N flores V pler.:
florem N (corr. m²)G: floris Hi
22 perdit GHV: perdunt N: perdet Barth candent NHV pler.:
canent G
23 longum NGHV pler.: longam x
24 nec codd.: et Heinsius se NGHV: scit G (in mg.)
com(m)odet NG Exc. Parr., Atreb., Esc. et Berol.: com(m)odat
HV pler., Exc. Bon.: commodans z annis NGHV pler.: annus
G (in mg.)i²n: annos iu² nec se quoi (cui) commodet annus
Maehly
25 cantet ex cantat N uu. 26-37 om. n
26 iuuenca NHV pler.: iuuenta G (ut uid.): iuuentcam x
27 leaenae GHl
28 aerium GHi: aereum NV reliqui uolucres et HV: uolucru et
N: uolucrum tum G squamea GHV pler.: sua mea N: siqua mea
a: stamea g, corr. m²
29 suos codd.: suosque Burman arbor amores GHV pler.:
arbos amoris N: amor amores g (corr. m²): actor amores c
30 prodis NG: perdis HV: pellis Burman: spernis Heinsius
31 quisque...curas om. G
L. omnia tempus alit, tempus rapit: usus in arto est.
   uer erat, et uitulos uidi sub matribus istos,
   qui nunc pro nieua coiere in cornua uacca.
   et tibi iam tumidae nares et fortia colla,
   iam tibi bis denis numerantur messibus anni.
   cantet, anat quod quisque: leuant et carmina curas.

M. huc, Meroe formosa, ueni: uocat aestus in umbram.
   iam pecudes suiber nemus, iam nulla canoro
gutture cantat ausis, torto non squamea tractu
   signat humum serpens: solus cano. me sonat omnis
   silua, nec aestuis cantu concedo cicadis.
   cantet, anat quod quisque: leuant et carmina curas.

L. tu quoque, saeue puer, nieum ne perde colorem
sole sub hoc: solet hic lucentes urere malas.

hie age pampinea mecum requiesce sub umbra;
hic tibi lene uirens fons murmurat, hic et ad undas
purpureae fetis dependent uitibus uuae.

cantet, amat quod quisque: leuant et carmina curas.

M. qui tulerit Meroes fastidia lenta superbae,
Sithonias feret ille niues Libyaeque calorem,
Nerinas potabit aquas taxique nocentis
non metuet sucos, Sardorum gramina uincet
et iuga Marmaricos coget sua ferre leones.

45 solet hic NGAH: sed et hic V pler.: sed et hoc a'zi: sedet
hoc u: sed de hoc g(?)
luentes N: liuentes Heinsius
urere NGH: uertito V pler.: h* N
luentes GV pler.: lucentis Hiu:
luentes N: liuentes Heinsius
urere NGH: uertito V pler.: uertite j

46 hic HV pler.: h' N: hac G: dic bgjlnqy

47 hic GHV: hoc N
lene NGHV pler.: leue bgjlnx
uirens NG: fluens HV pler.: fluat z
ad undas Glaeser:
habundas N: habundans G (habunde in mg.): ab ulmis HV pler.: ab
ulnis c: abunde Baehrens

uu. om. 50-55 ps

50 tulerit HV pler.: tullerit N: tuleris G: tulit g
lenta NG: longa HV

51 Sithonias anqv (in mg.)
libyaeque calorem Baehrens:
libyaeque calorem NG: libycosque calores iluvz: similia sed
orthographia deprauata Habcgjnqy: libyesque (calorem?) Verdière

52 Nerinas Nabgijnqy: Narinas c: Nerynas (Nereydas in mg.) G:
Nerines Hu (in ras.)v
potabit potabit x aquas GHV:
aqua N (corr. m^2) nocentis NGHV pler.: nocentes gluxz

53 metuet NGHV pler.: metuat bn: metuant g
sucos Gcleln:
succos NHV reliqui: Sardorum N'GHV pler.: sardot uel sardet
N: sarebrum m: salebrosaque iu^ (in mg.): Sardorum et
Castiglioni gramina GHV pler.: germina N: carmina a (s.c.)

uincet GHV: uinet N: iunget Heinsius

54 iuga...sua NGu^2: sua...iuga HV pler.: sua...iura bv: sua...
iugi c leonis Hiu
hunc uersum post 55 colloc. N (corr. m^1)
cantet, amat quod quisque: leuant et carmina curas. 55
L. quisquis amat pueros, ferro praecordia duret,
nil properet discatque diu patienter amare
prudentesque animos teneris non speret in annis,
perferat et fastus. sic olim gaudia sumet,
si modo sollicitos aliquis deus audit amantes.
cantet, amat quod quisque: leuant et carmina curas.

M. quid prodest, quod me pagani mater Amyntae
ter uittis, ter fronde sacra, ter ture vapore,
incendens uivuo crepitantes sulphure lauros,
lustrauit cineresque auersa effudit in amnem,
cum sic in Meroen totis miser ignibus urar?

uu. 56-9 habent Exc. Bon. uu. 56-61 om. iu
56 duret NEV pler.: curet G: diues g
57 diu GHV: diri N
59 perferat NGHV pler.: proferat ps gaudia NGHV pler.: grandia jps sumet Aabcjnpqvz: summet NGHV reliqui
60 aliquis deus NGHV pler.: deus aliquis z audit GHV: uerbum om. N
62 Amyntae iv
63 uittis acs: uitis NGV pler.: uictis Heinsius
fronde GHV: frondes N ture vapore Gz: thure vapore NHaps u²v³: ture vaporem b: thure vaporem cgjlvqz(?): fonte uaporem i:
fronde uaporem nu
65 post 64 habent codd., transposuit Haupt. 65, 63, 64 colloc.
C. Schenkl. Valckenaer trans. inter se lustrauit et incendens
64 cineresque NGHV pler.: cinereque ps auersa Hbin²q²u²vz:
auersa N (d supra au)GV reliqui
65 uivuo NGHV pler.: uivos ci uivo bgjnz (s.c.)
crepitantis Hi lauros NGHV pler.: tauros n
66 meroen Ebipqvz: meroe l², prob. Heinsius: meroem NGV reliqui
totis codd.: totus Wendel ignibus codd.: ossibus cod.
Barthii urar (ex uratr)N: uror G: arsi N (m² in mg.) HV
cantet, amat quod quisque: leuant et carmina curas.

L. haec eadem nobis quoque uersicoloria fila
et mille ignotas Mycale circumtulit herbas;
cantauit, quo luna timet, quo rumpitur anguis,
quo currunt scopuli, migrant sata, uellitur arbos.
plus tamen ecce meus, plus est formosus Iollas.
cantet, amat quod quisque: leuant et carmina curas.

68 quoque NGAH: qu(a)e V pler.: uerbum om. n: quid uel quin
Glaeser uersicoloria Eau (in ras.)v (? v² (in mg.)v:
uersico loria G: uersu colaria N: uericoloria bogjlpqsx:
uaricoloria n: uarieque coloria iu (sub ras.)
69 Mycale Hinu²: micale micale x: orthographia deprausta NGV
reliqui herbas NGHV pler.: artes Av³ in mg.: etas x
70 quo luna Hi² in ras.: quod luna NV pler.: qua luna G:
colubrina i (sub ras.) u (sub ras.) timet V pler.: tumet
NGHiu (sub ras.) quo rumpitur HV pler.: quod rumpitur Ni²
(in ras.)nu²: qua rumpitur G: corrumpitur i (sub ras.)u (sub ras.)
71 quo currunt GHV pler.: quo curI N: concurrunt i: qui currunt
Pontanus migrant NHV pler.: quo (del.) migrant G: migra g:
magice iu (sub ras.) uellitur NGHV pler.: rumpitur 1x
post u. 73 in G, duo uersus erasi
Explicit quarta G
SIGLA CODICUM

A Parisinus 7561, saec. ix uel x
B Parisinus 4839, saec. x
C Vindobonensis 3261, saec. xvi
Venandi cano mille uias; hilaresque labores
discursusque citos, securi proelia ruris,
pandimus. Aonio iam nunc mihi pectus ab oestro
aestuat: ingentes Helicon iubet ire per agros,
Castaliusque mihi noua pocula fontis alumno
5
ingerit et late campos metatus apertos
inponitque iugum uati retinetque corymbis
implicitum ducitque per aula, qua sola numquam
trita rotis. iuuat aurato procedere curru
et parere deo: uirides en ire per herbas
imperat: intacto premimus uestigia musco;
et, quamuis cursus ostendat tramite noto

Inscriptione caret A: INCIPIT MAURELII MENESINI KARTAGINENSIS/
CYNEGETICON B: M. AURELII NEMESIANI/CARTHAGINENSIS/CYNEGETICON C:
nemesiani cynegetica A
1 cano codd.: cane Gronovius, prob. Damste
2 proelia AB: praelia C
3 pandimus codd.: pandimur ed. Germanica Barthii Aonio ex
Aonio C glossam liber pater ad aonio ssor. B
oestro AC: oestro B, corr. m
5 Castaliusque codd.: Castaliique Pithoeus alumno codd.: alumnus Uliius
6 late AC: late B metatus A: meatus B, sup. Eg1: maetatur
C: metatur B in mg., ed. Aldina secunda
7 inponitque B: imponitque A: imponit A
8 implicitum B: implicitum AC
10 parere AC: parcere B, corr. m in mg. uirides AC:
uirides B en ire AC: enire B
11 oenii super lignum sit Eg1 in mg.
12 Versum hic posuit Pithoeus, post 24 habent codd. et codd.: at Raynaud cursus codd.: cursus se ed. Aldina secunda
ostendat codd.: ostendas Uliius
obuia Calliope faciles, insistere prato
complacitum, rudibus qua luceat orba sulcis.

nam quis non Nioben numeroso funere maestam
iam cecinit? quis non Semelen ignemque iugalem
letalemque simul nouit de paelicis astu?
quis magno recreata tacet cunabula Baccho,
ut pater omnipotens maternos reddie re menses
dignatus iusti conplerit tempora partus?
sunt qui sacriego rorantes sanguine thysos
(notas nimis) dixisse uelint, qui uincula Dirces
Pisaeique tori legem Danaique cruentum
imperium sponsasque truces sub foedere primo
dulcia funereis mutantes gaudia taedis.

Biblidos indictum nulli scelus; impia Myrrhae

13 Calliope A²C: Calliopg B: calloope A faciles codd.: facies ed. Aldina secunda: facilest Pithoeus: facias Scaliger prato AC: parto B (corr. m² in mg.)
14 complacitum H. Schenkl: complacito codd.: non placito Baehrens luceat AC: lucet B
15 Nioben AC: moben B maestam AC: mestam B
16 cecinit AC: cecinis B (corr. m²)
21 sacrilego rorantes C: sacrí legos orantes AB: sacrilegos rotantes (sic) Burman
22 nota nimis AC: nota ninis B
23 Pisaeique C: Pisei (om. que) A: Pyreique B
24 foedere AC: fodere B
25 taedis A²C: tedis AB: lucernis BGL in mg.
26 Biblidos codd.: Byblidos uel Bublidos Verdiere
conubia et saeuo violatum crimine patrem

noiimus, utque Arabum fugiens cum carperet arua

uit in arboreas frondes animamque uirentem.

sunt qui squamosi referant fera sibila Cadmi

stellatumque oculis custodem uirginis Ius

Herculeosque uelint semper numerare labores

miratumque rudes se tollere Terea pinnas

post epulas, Philomela, tuas: sunt ardua mundi

qui male temptantem curru Phaethonta loquantur

extinctasque canant emisso fulmine flammas

fumantemque Padum, Cycnum plumamque senilem

et flentes semper germani funere siluas.

27 conubia A: connubia C: concubia B saeuo violatum AC

(uiolatum ex uiolatur C): psaeudouio-latum B: foedo uel saeuo uiolatum Ulitius

29 iuit codd.: irit Heinsius arboreas AC: arbore as B

30 qui squamosi referant A[C]: quis quam osi A: squi so B: squi sosi B

31 uirginis AC: uiginis B ius BCA (in mg.): uis A in eius alt.

32 Herculeosque A: Herculeos AB numerare codd.: fort.

memorare Postgate "num forte post 25 ponendus, cum numerare parum ad sequentia faciat?" Baehrens

33 se tollere Terea A (in mg.): se tollere Therea (in ras. ac...(?)

sub. ras.: sustoller&acerea A sed alt. e del. A: retoller& aurea B: se tollere ad aera (siue aethera) Baehrens: sustollere Terea Burman rudes...pinnas codd.: rudi...pinna Heinsius

34 philomela tuas sunt C: philomella tuas sunt A: philomella tua sunt A: philomelatu aB

35 temptantem C: teptantem A: têtantem A: curru ed. Aldina


36 emisso AB: é misso C fulmine AC: flumine B

37 ciconum C: ciconum AB: cignum A: plumamque AC: palmamque B

38 funere codd.: in funere uel funera Heinsius
Tantalidum casus et sparsas sanguine mensas
cendentemque caput uisis Titana Mycenis
horrendasque uices generis dixere priores.
Colchidos iratae sacris imbuta uenenis
munera non canimus pulchraeque incendia Glauces,
non crinem Nisi, non saeuae pocula Circes,
nec nocturna pie curantem busta sororem:
haec iam magnorum praecepit copia uatum,
omnis et antiqui uulgata est fabula saecli.

nos saltus uiridesque plagas camposque patentes
scrutamur totisque citi discurrimus aruis
et uarias cupimus facili cane sumere praedas;
nos timidos lepores, inbelles figere dammas
audacesque lupos, uulpem captare dolosam
gaudemus; nos flumineas errare per umbras

41 horrendasque AC: horrendaque B uices codd.: neces Ulitius
priores codd.: prioris ed. Aldina secunda
42 iratae A^2:C: irate AB sacris ex sacrisque C
43 pulchraeque C: pulchreque A: puchreque B incendia Pithoeus:
ingentia codd., ed. Aldina secunda
44 saeuae BC: saeue A circres: pro filia solis s^1 sup.
45 nec AC: naec B pie AC: piae B curantem A^2: furantem
C: purantem AB: purgantem B (sup.)
46 iam om. B magnorum AC: magnarum B praecepit A^2 BC:
percepit A
47 saecli A^2 BC: seculi A
48 nos C: non AB
49 totisque codd.: notisque Heinsius citidis currimus A
50 etuarias B facili AC: facile B
51 inbelles AB: imbelles C
52 audacesque AC: audeces B
53 gaudemus AC: gaude amus B
malumus et placidis ichneumona quaerere ripis
inter harundineas segetes felemque minacem
arboris in trunco longis praefigere telis
implicitumque sinu spinosi corporis erem
ferre domum; talique placet dare lintea curae,
dum non magna ratis, uicinis sueta moueri
litoribus tutosque sinus percurrere remis,
nunc primum dat uela notis portusque fideles
linquit et Adriacas audet temptare procellas.

mox uestros meliore lyra memorare triumphos
accingar, diui fortissima pignora Cari,
atque canam nostrum geminis sub finibus orbis
litus et edomitas fraterno numine gentes,
quae Rhenum Tigrimque bibunt Ararisque remotum
principium Nilique *bibunt* in origine fontem;

54 placidis AB: placidis ex placidas C: placitis ed. Germanica
Earthili: cneumona C: sicneumona A: sicu humona B (humo
nata s^1 sup.) quaerere A^2 BC: q^a: rere A
55 harundineas AB: arundineas C felemque B: faelemque AC
56 praefigere C: prfigere B: prfigeret A: perfigere Johnson
telis C: tolis B: olis A: contis Bachrens
57 implicitumque AC: implicitamque B sinu spinosi BC: sinus
pinosi A erem AC: aerem B
58 lintea : retia E^1 sup. curae codd.: cymbae Heinsius: melius
cumbae Postgate: cursu (=cursui) Bachrens: gyro Damste
59 dum codd.: cum Johnson sueta AC: sueta B
60 percurrere AC: percurre B
62 linquit ex linquid C Adriacas AB: hadriacas C
63 mix A^2 (in mg.) C: uox AB triumphos AC: triumfos B
65 geminis codd.: gemini Heinsius
67 quae Rhenum AC: querenum B tigram quebibunt A
68 bibunt in codd.: bibunt ab ed. Aldina secunda: uident in
Johnson: colunt in Johnson: metunt in Stern: habitant in Tross
cheles ed.Pixit Williams
nec taceam, primum quae nuper bella sub Arcto felici, Carine, manu confeceris, ipso paene prior genitore deo, utque intima frater Persidos et ueteres Babylonos ceperit arces, ultus Romulei violata cacumina regni; inbellemque fugam referam clausasque pharetras Parthorum laxosque arcus et spicula nulla.

haec uobis nostrae libabunt carmina Musae, cum primum uultus sacros, bona numina terrae, contigerit uidisse mihi: iam gaudia uota temporis inpatiens sensus spretorque morarum praesumit videorque mihi iam cernere fratrum augustos habitus, Romam clarumque senatum et fidos ad bella duces et milite multo agmina, quis fortes animat deuotio mentes: aurea purpurea longe radiantia uelo signa micant sinuatque truces leuis aura dracones.

69 primum codd.: prima Stern: primus Burman
70 felici C: feliti B: felicia A confeceris ABC: cum Bgl sup.
71 paene AB: poene C deo A BC: de A utque BC: utquae A frater AC: pater B
72 babylonos ceperit arces AC (ceperit C): babylonis ceperit artes B
73 ultus romulei AC: uultus rumulei B regni AC: regna B
74 inbellemque AB: imbellemque C clausasque codd.: exhaustasque Burman
75 arcus A BC: arcos A nulla codd.: muta Barth: nuda Clark
76 uobis Pithoeus: nobis codd.
78 uota ABC: mut (sic) A
79 inpatiens AB: inpatiens C spretorque morarum C: spretorque (sed -que del. m2) memoratum A: spretos memoratum
80 praesumit AC: praesumit B
81 augustos AC: angustos B
84 purpureo AC: purpurea B radiantia BC: radiantta A
tu modo, quae saltus placidos siluasque pererras,
Latonae, Phoebe, magnum decus, heia age suetos
sume habitus arcumque manu pictamque pharetram
suspende ex umera, sint aurea tela sagittae;
candida puniceis aptentur crura cothurnis;
sit chlamys aurato multum subtegmine lusa
conrugesque sinus gemmatis balteus artet
nexibus; implicitos cohíbe diademate crines.
tecum Naiades faciles uiridique iuuenta
pubentes Dryades Nymphæaque, unde annibus umor,
adsint, et docílis decantet Oreadas Echo.
duc age, diua, tuum frondosa per aua uatem:
te sequimur, tu pande domos et lustra ferrum.
huc iigitur mecum, quisquis percussus amore

86 placidos A (?)C: placidas B: placitos Heinsius
87 Latonae Phoebe C: Latonae phebe B: Latone pheebe A: sol B sup.
    heia AB: eia C
88 pictamque A²C: pictumque AB
89 humeris codd.  sint AB (sup.)C: sunt B
90 cothurnis C: coturnis AB
91 chlamys C: clamas A: clamis B  subtegmine BC: subtemine A
    lusa B: lusio AC
92 conrugesque AC: correctos B sup.
    gemmatis ABC: gemmatus A² artet AB: arctet C
93 implicitos AC: implicatos B  diademate AC: deademate B
94 naiades C: naides AB: desil uarum B sup.  faciles A²C:
    facile B: facilem A
95 Dryades AC: driades B: deflu minum B sup.
    nymphaeque
    A²C: nymphaque AB  annibus AC: anibus B  umor A: humor
    B E
96 docílis AC: dociles A²B  decantet C: dicant AB
    oreades ed. Aldina secunda: oreades codd.
98 domos C: dolos A: solos B
99 huc Ulitius: hinc codd.  mecum A²C: metum AB
uenandì damnas litter auidosque tumultus

ciulesque fugis strepitus bellique fragores.

nec praedas auido sectaris gurgite ponti.

principio tibi cura canum non signis ab anno

incipiat primo, cum Ianus, temporis auctor,
pandit inocciduum bis senis mensibus aeuum.

elige tunc cursu facilem facilemque recursu,

seu Lacedaemonio natam seu rure Molosso,

non humili de gente canem. sit cruribus altis,
sit rigidis, multamque trahat sub pectore lato
costarum sub fine decenter prona carinam,

qua sensim rursus sicca se colligat aluo,

renibus ampla satis ualidis diuctaque coxas,
cuique nimis molles fluitent in cursibus aures.

huic parilem submitte marem, sic omnia magnum,

dum superant uires, dum laeto flore iuventas

100 damnas AB: dānas ex damas C

aulidosque codd.: paulodosque

ul rabidosque Ulitius: rabidosque baehrens: rapidosque

Postgate: subitosque Martin

101 strepitus A² BC: strepidus A

102 praedas AC: predas B

auido AC: auide B: auidus Ulitius

103 signis ab anno AC: signis abanni B

104 ianus AC: iaiis B: sanus ed. Aldina secunda

auctor AB: author C

105 aeuum C in ras.: annum C sub. ras.

107 lacedaemonio A: lacedemonio BC

natam ed. Aldina secunda:

natam codd. molosso AC: moloso B

109 rigidis AC: rigidus B trahat codd.: gerat ed. Aldina

secunda

110 carinam : dorsum E¹ sup.

112 diuctaque Logus: deductaque codd.

114 submitte C: summite A: sumite B

sic omnia magna codd.: sic omnia magna Scaliger

115 laeto AC: loeto B

iuuentas AC: iuuenta B: iuventus ed. Aldina secunda
corporis et uenis primaeui sanguis abundat.
namque fraues morbi subeunt segnisque senectus,
inualdamque dabunt non firmo robore prolem.
sed diversa magis feturae conuenit aetas:
tu bis uicenis plenum iam mensibus acrem
in uenerem permitte marem; sit femina, binos
quae tulerit soles. haec optima cura iugandi.
mox cum se bina formarit lampade Phoebe
ex quo passa marem genitalia uiscera turgent,
fecundos aperit partus matura grauedo,
continuo largaque uides strepere omnia prole.
sed, quamuis auidus, primos contemnere partus
malueris; mox non omnes nutrire minores.
nam tibi si placitum populosos pascere fetus,
ism macie tenues succique sidebis inanes
pugnantesque diu, quisnam prior ubera lambat,
distrahere invalidam lassato uiscere matrem.
sin uero haec cura est, melior ne forte necetur
abdaturue domo, catulosque probare uoluntas,
quis nondum gressus stabiles neque lumina passa
luciferum uidere iubar, quae prodictit usus
percipe et intrepidus spectatis annue dictis.
pondre nam catuli poteris perpendere uires
corporibusque leues grauibus praenoscere cursu.
quen et flammato ducatur linea longe
circuitu signetque habilem uapor igneus orbem,
inpune ut medio possis consistere circo:
huc omnes catuli, huc indiscreta feratur
Turba: dabit mater partus examen, honestos

130 tenues AC: tenues (i supra alt. e) B succique A: succique BC
inanies AC: manes (i supra m) B
ubera AB: hubera C
133 uero AC: autem B cura est AC: cura tibi est B
134 Abdaturue ex Abdaturque C
135 quis pro quibus B\(g^1\) sup. gressus AB: gressu C stabiles AC: stabilis A\(^2\)B (est sup.) lumina AB\(^2\)C:
lumine B passa AB\(^2\)C: passo B: pansa Heinsius: matura e aperto B in mg.
137 annue AB: a\(n\)ue C
138 poteris AC: poteret B
139 corporibusque A\(^2\)C: corporibus AB cursu AC: cursus B,
Ulitius
141 circum sit signetque C: circuitus igne & B
142 inpune B: impune AC ut Johnson: in codd. medio in
ras. C, medios sub. ras. possis: a\(b\) ut g\(g^1\) sup.
143 indiscreta AC: indiscreta B
144 examen AC: exam. B: examine ed. Aldina secunda: iudicium B\(g^1\) sup.
iudicio natos servans trepidoque periclo.  
nam postquam conclusa uidet sua germina flammis,  
continuo saltu transcendens feruida zonae  
uincla, rapit rictu primum portatque cubili,  
mox alium, mox deinde alium. sic conscia mater  
segregat egregiam subolem uirtutis amore.  

hos igitur genetrice simul iam uere sereno  
molli pasce sero (passim nam lactis abundans  
temps adest, albent plenis et ouilia mulctris),  
interdumque cibo cererem cum lacte ministra,  
fortibus ut sucis teneras conplere medullas  
possint et ualidas iam tunc promittere uires.  

sed postquam Phoebus candentem feruidus axem  
contigerit tardasque uias Cancrique morantis  
sidus init, tunc consuetam minuisse saginam  
profuerit tenuesque magis retinere cibatus,  

145 iudicio AC: indicio B: exitio _Scaliger_  
trepidoque codd.:  
trepidoque _Baehrens_: trepidansque _Burman_  
146 conclusa BC: conclusa A  
_perman_ AC: gremina B: filios  
_Egl_ sup.  
147 saltu transcendens AC: salturans cendens B  
zonae:  
circuli ignei _Egl_ in mg.  
148 uincla A^2^BC: uinda A  
portatque AC: portatque B  
150 subolem AC: sobolem _A^2^B_  
151 genetrice A: genitrice BC  
152 lactis _in ras._ C, nactis (?) _sub_ras.  
_abundans AC: habundans B_  
154 cibo AB: cibo _ex cibi_ C: cibos _Heinsius_: novo _Baehrens_: _ultimo_  
_Orstë_  
155 sucis AB: _succis_ C  
157 sed AB: _sunt_ C  
158 morantis AC: morantes B
ne gravis articulos depraevet pondere moles.
nam tum membrorum nexus nodosque relaxant
infirmosque pedes et crura natantia ponunt,
tunc etiam nueue armantur dentibus ora.
sed neque conclusos teneas neque uinclula collo
inpatiens circumderis noceasque futuris
cursibus inprudens. catulis nam saepe remotis
aut uexare trabes, laceras aut pandere ualues
mens erit, et teneros torquent conatibus artus
obtunduntue nouos adroso robore dentes
aut teneros duris inpingunt postibus uingues;
mox cum iam ualidis insistere cruribus aetas
passa, quater binos uoluens ab origine menses,
inalesis catulos spectauerit undique membris,
tunc rursus miscere sero Cerealia dona.
conueniet fortemque dari de frugibus escam.
libera tunc primum consuescant colla ligari
concordes et ferre gradus clausique teneri.
iam cum bis denos Phoebe reparauerit ortus,
incipe non longo catulos producere cursu,
sed paruae uallis spatio saeptoue nouali.
his leporem praemitte manu, non uiribus aequis
nec cursus uirtute parem, sed tarda trahentem
membra, queant iam nunc faciles ut sumere praedas.
nec semel indulge catulis moderamina cursus,
sed donec ualidos etiam praeuertere suescant
exerceto diu, uenandi munera cogens
discere et emeritae laudem uirtutis amare.
nec non consuetae norint hortamina uocis,
seu cursu reuocent, iubeant seu tendere cursus.
quin etiam docti uictam contingere praedam

176 dari AC: dare B escam A: aesam A²BC
179 Phoebe reparauerit C: phoebaereparauerit A: phereparauerit B
180 catulos A¹BC: catulus A
181 sed codd.: seu Tross paruae A²C: parue AB saeptoue
nouali C: saepto ueno uali A: septoq; nouali B
182 praemitte A: praemite B: premitte C manu AC: manu B
183 sed AC: s& B
184 sumere C: summere AB praedas codd.: praedam ed. Gryphiana
185 nec C: ne AB moderamina Heinsius: moderamine codd.
186 ualidos: lepores B sup.
187 munera Ulitius: munere, AC sic interpunxit Postgate: numere B
189 consuetae A²BC: consuet A: consuetas Burman uocis codd.:
uoces Burman
190 cursu Heinsius: cursus codd.: rursus Burman reuocent,
iubeant codd.: reuoces iubesas Heinsius
191 quin AC: quam B: ante B sup.
exanimare uelint tantum, non carpere sumptam.
sic tibi ueloces catulos reparare memento
semper et in paruos iterum protendere curas.
nam tristes morbi, scabies et scordida uenis
saepe uenit multamque canes discrimine nullo
dant stragem: tu sollicitos impende labores
et sortire gregem suffecta prole quotannis.
quin acidos Sacchi latices Tritonide oliua
admiscere decet catulosque canesque maritas
unguere profuerit tepidoque ostendere soli,
auribus et tineas candenti pellere cultro.

est etiam canibus rabies letale periculum.
quod seu caelesti corrupto sidere manat,
cum segnes radios tristi iaculatur ab aethra
Phoebus et adtonito pallens caput exserit orbe,
seu magis, ignicomi candentia terga Leonis
cum quatit, hoc canibus blandis inuiscerat aestsus,
exhalat seu terra sinu, seu noxius aer
causa mali, seu cum gelidus non sufficit umor
torrida per uenas concrescunt semina flammae:
quicquid id est, imas agitat sub corde medullas
inque feros rictus nigro spumante ueneno
prosilit, insanos cogens infigere morsus.
disce igitur potus medicos curamque salubrem.
tunc uirosa tibi sumes multumque domabis
castorea, adtritu silicis lentescere cogens;
ex ebores hoc trito puluis sectoue feratur,
admiscensque diu facies concrescere utrunque:
mox lactis liquidos sensim superadde fluores,
ut non cunctantes haustus infundere cornu
inserto possis Furiasque repellere tristes
atque iterum blandas canibus componere mentes.
sed non Spartanos tantum tantumue Molossos
pascendum catulos: diuisa Britannia mittit
ueloces nostrique orbis uenatibus aptos.
nec tibi Pannonicae stirpis temnatur origo,
nec quorum proles de sanguine manat Hibero.
quin etiam siccae Libyes in finibus acres
gignuntur catuli, quorum non spreueris usum.
quin et Tuscorum non est extrema voluptas
saepe canum. sit forma illis licet obsita uillo
dissimilesque habeant catulis uelocibus artus,
haud tamen inuicunda dabunt tibi munera praedae,
namque et odorato noscunt uestigia prato
atque etiam leporum secretas cubilia monstrant.
horum animos noresque simul naresque sagaces
mox referam; nunc omnis adhuc narranda suppellex
uenandi cultusque mihi dicendus equorum.
cornipes igitur lectos det Graecia nobis
Cappadocunque notas referat genera propago
† armata † et palmas superet grex omnis auorum.
illis ampla satīs leui sunt aequora dorso

235 odorato AC: hodorato B
236 atque AC: adque A cubilia AC: conabula B
237 horum AC: honorum B
238 suppellex AC: supplelix A: subpellex B in mg.
239 equorum AC: aequorum B
240 Graecia C: gratia A3
242 armata et palmas superet grex omnis Postgate: armata et palmas
nuper grex omnis codd., prob. E. Liénard: armata et palmas
superat grex omnis Ulitius: armata ut palmas superat grex omnis
Stern: harmataque et palmas nuper grex omnis Wernsdorf: armenti
et palmas numerat grex omnis Gronovius: praemiaque et palmas
superet grex omnis Martin: ambiat et palmas superat grex omnis
Uilitius: Sarmatiae vel Karmaricae vel Aemathiae et palmae cui
per grex omnis Reinsius: Aemathiae palmas superat grex omnis
E. Swartius: Sarmatiorum (sic) L. Hermann: Martius et palmas
superans grex omnis Burman: Sarmatiae palmas superet grex
omnis Eden: Argaea et palmae nuper grex omnis J. Gothofredus:
firmata et palmas superet grex omnis Verdière: maternos.
palmas numerat Epeiros Barth: forma sat; et palmas superat
grex omnis Barth: Karte det et palmas nupert grex omnis ed.
Germanica Barthii unde Karte decet palmas grex nuperus omnis
Barth obelos ad C. Williams.
243 leui A: laeui C: leuis B aequora dorso AC: equora dorsi B
inmodicumque latus paruaeque ingentibus alui,
ardua frons auresque agiles capitisque decori.
altus honos oculique uago splendore micantes;
plurima se validos ceruix resupinat in armos;
fumant uementes calida de nare uapores,
nec pes officium standi tenet, uingula terram
crebra ferit uirtusque artus animosa fatigat.
quing etiam gens ampla iacet trans ardua Calpes
culmina, cornipedum late fecunda proborum.
namque ualent longos pratis intendere cursus,
nec minor est illis Graio quam in corpore forma;
nec non terribiles spirabile flumen anheli
prouoluunt flatus et lumina uiuida torquent
hinnitusque ciae tremuli frenisque repugnant,
nec segnes mulcent aures, nec crure quiescunt.

244 inmodicumque A\textsuperscript{2} BC: inmodicum A paruaeque AC: paruique A\textsuperscript{2}:
paurisque B ingentibus alui AC: ingenibus aluis B
245 capitisque decori Baehrens: capitique decoro C: capitisque
decoris A: captuque decoris B
246 oculique A\textsuperscript{2} BC: oculisque A splendore AC: spendore B
247 se C: seu A\textsuperscript{2} B: s-e A
248 uementes AB: humentes A\textsuperscript{2} C
250 uirtusque AC: uirtutisque B
251 calpes: pro nomen montis B\textsuperscript{1} in mg.
252 cornipedum AC: cornipedum B late AC: late B fecunda A:
foeunda C: secunda B
253 pratis AC: par this B intendere C: incendere AB
cursus AC: currus B
255 terribiles spirabile AC: terribilis spiritual\textsuperscript{1} B flumen ed.
Germanica Barthii: numen codd.: lumen Ulitius: flamen Verdière
anheli Ulitius: anhelae codd.: anhelis Barth
256 flatus AC: saltus B
258 nec segnes A\textsuperscript{1} BC: haec segnes A
sit tibi praeterea soniores, Maurusia tellus
quem mittit (modo sit gentili san uine firmus).
quemque coloratus Mazax deserta per arua
pauit et assiduos docuit tolerare labores.
nec pigeat, quod turpe caput, deformis et aluus
est ollis quoque infrenes, quod liber uterque,
quodque iubis pronos ceruix diuerberat armos.
nam flecti facilis lasciuiaque colla secutus
paret in obsequium lentae moderamine uirgae:
erbera sunt praecupta fuge, sunt uerbera freni.
quin et promissi spartiosa per sequora campi
cursibus adquirunt commoto sanguine uires
paulatimque uidos comites post terga relinquunt.
haud secus, effusi Nerei per caerula uentis,
cum se Threicius Boreas superextulit antro
stridentique sono uastas exterruit undas,
omnia turbato cesserunt flamina ponto:

ipse super fluctus spumanti murmur murmur
conspicuum pelago caput eminet: omnis sustem
Nereidum mirata suo stupet aequore turba.

horum tarda uenit longi fiducia cursus,
his etiam emerito uigor est iuuenalis in aeuc.
nam quae cucumque suis virtus bene floruit annis,
non prius est animo quam corpore passa ruinam.
pasce igitur sub uere novo farragine molli
cornipedes uenamque feri ueteresque labores

mox laetae redeunt in pectora fortia uires
et nitidos artus distento robore firmant;
mox sanguis uenis melior calet, ire uiarum
longa uolunt latumque fuga consumere campum.

omnium turbato cesserunt flamina ponto:

ipse super fluctus spumanti murmur murmur
conspicuum pelago caput eminet: omnis sustem
Nereidum mirata suo stupet aequore turba.

horum tarda uenit longi fiducia cursus,
his etiam emerito uigor est iuuenalis in aeuc.
nam quae cucumque suis virtus bene floruit annis,
non prius est animo quam corpore passa ruinam.
pasce igitur sub uere novo farragine molli
cornipedes uenamque feri ueteresque labores
effluere aspecta niquiri cum labe cruoris.
mox laetae redeunt in pectora fortia uires
et nitidos artus distento robore firmant;
mox sanguis uenis melior calet, ire uiarum
longa uolunt latumque fuga consumere campum.
inde ubi pubentes calamos durauerit aestas
lactentesque urens herbas siccauerit omnem
messibus umorem culmosque armarit aristis
hordea tum paleasque leues praebere memento:
puluere quin etiam puras secernere fruges
cura sit atque toros manibus percurrere equorum,
gaudēat ut plausu sonipes laetumque relaxet
corpus et altares rapiat per uiscera sucos.
id curent famuli comitumque animosa iuuentus.

nec non et casses idem uenatibus aptos
atque plagas longoque meantia retia tractu
addiscant raris semper contexere nodis
et seruare modum māculis linoque tenaci.
linea quin etiam, magnos circumdare saltus

290 indē ubi AC: indubi B
291 lactentesque AB: lactantesque C: lactantesque A² urens
herbas A: urens herbas C: uirens haerbas B
292 messibus AB: mensibus C umorem AB: humorem A² C
armarit AC: arma rit (ue. sup.) B: aptarit sight Duffy
aristis Martin: aristas AB in mg. C: aetias B
293 hordea AB: ordea C paleasque A² BC: paleasque A
leues AC: leuaes B
294 puras secernere AC: purasse cernere B
295 atque AC: aude B toros manibus A (in rag.) C: totos
manibus A²: toto scenibus B percurrere AC: percurre B
296 plausu C: plauso AB laetumque AC: letumque B
297 uiscera succos AC: uiscere succos B: aquas Bg¹ sup.
298 comitumque AC: comitumque B
299 idem A: iidem C: hisdem B
300 retia AC: recia B
301 addiscant AC: atdiscant B contexere AC: contraxere B:
stringere Bg¹ sup.
303 linea AC: linaea ex llnae B
quae possit uoluoresque metu conclusere praeedas,
digerat innexas non una ex alite pinnas.
namque ursos magnosque sues ceruosque furaces
et uulpes acresque lupos ceu fulgura caeli
terrificant linique uetant transcendere saeptum.
has igitur uario semper fucare ueneno
curabis niuesisque alios miscere colores
alternosque metus subtegmine tendere longo.
dat tibi pinnarum terrentia milia uultur,
dat Libye, magnarum auium fecunda creatrix,
dantque grues cyncique senes et candidus anser,
dant quae fluminibus crassisque paludibus errant
pellitosque pedes stagnanti gurgite tingunt.
hinc mage puniceas natiuo munere sumes:
namque illic sine fine greges florentibus alis
inuenies auium susuique rubescere luto

305 pinnas ABC: pennas A²
307 fulgura BC: fulgora A caeli AB: coeli C
308 Terrificant exterrificant C saeptum Baehrens: septum codd.
310 curabis Haupt: cura tibi codd.: st sit B² sup.: curato uel curabunt Haupt: curam athibe Lachmann
312 dat AB: dart C milia AB: millia C
313 libye A: libiq B: lybie C: libye A² secunda AB: foecunda C
314 grues AC: grues B Cyonique C: cignique A: cignique A²B anser AC: anscher B
315 dant quae AC: dantq; B
317 hinc mage AC: huic magne B (magis sup.) munere codd.: murice Barth et Heinsius
319 luto AC: lutho C
et sparsos passim tergo uernare colores.

his ita dispositis hiemis sub tempus aquosae
incipe ueloces catulos inmittere pratis,
incipe cornipedes latos agitare per agros.
uenemur dum mane nouum, dum mollia prata
nocturnis calcata feris uestigia servant.
1 tibi  Neum. varies in his scansion of tibi. The second syllable is long here and at 1.21; 1.45; 1.56; 1.31 and Cyn. 276, but short in the remaining 16 cases.

Titurus  The name is also used by Theocritus (3.2, 3.4; 7.72), Virgil (Buc. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9), Calpurnius (3 and 4), Longus (2.32) and Severus Sanctus Edelechius, De mortibus hominum (no. 893 in Riese's Anthologia Latina, vv. 99, 101, 121).

2 immunia  This line caused difficulty to earlier editors, particularly Martellius, because resonant tua in H and many of the V manuscripts does not agree with u. 8: it is clearly still early in the morning and therefore the cicadas would not yet have begun to sing. It was a commonplace among the poets that the cicada sings during the heat of the day when men and animals rest (Hesiod Op. 584; Solut. 396; Theoc. 16.94; Virgil Buc. 2.13; Culex 153). GA's reading immunia, of which the earlier editors were not aware, gives us the sense which the context requires. resonant tua seems to be a conjecture from Virgil Buc. 2.12.

3 sub  Barth explains sub harundina, "ad modos fistulae." Cf. Copa 2, Crispum sub crotalo docta mouere latus. sub is a Grecism, imitating the use of ὀμό of accompanying music. Volpilhac (p. 64, n. 41) compares Virgil Aen. 12.180, a quite different use of sub.

8 primi...clementia solis  Other examples of the phrase clementia solis seem to be lacking. clementia is usually used of
the sky, as at Col. 4.23.1 mitis ac temperata...caeli clementia,
or of the weather, as at Plin. hist. 5.6.4 aestatis mira
clementia. sol could be used here in one of two senses, "sunshine,"
as at Cic. Or. 2.14.60 cum in sole ambulem, or in the sense of "a
time of day," as at Juv. 2.133 primo sole. Thus the phrase primi
clementia solis could mean either "the mildness of the early
sunshine," or "the mildness of the early morning."

9 Timetas Haupt (OroscaIa I, p. 399) prefers the spelling
Thymoetas and Wendel ("De Nominitus Eucolicis," Jahrbücher für
klass. philol. Suppl. 26, 61) supports him, comparing Virgil Aen.
12.364, where, however, the name is Thymoetes, not Thymoetas, and
he is not a bucolic character. I can find no example of either
Timetas or Thymoetas, but as the spelling Timetas is found here
in N2AH and in the title in other manuscripts, I have preferred
this form, although Haupt may well be correct. Korzeniewski (p.
111 of his edition) considers that Timetas derives either from
τυμητής or τυμαν, comparing u. 22 honorates, u. 70
honos, but these explanations seem to me very far-fetched.

11 uiximus "(once) I enjoyed life to the full" (as opposed to
simply having existed), cf. Cic. C. Fr. 3.1.4.12 auod me
cohortaris ad ambitionem et ad laborem, faciam quidem: sed
quando uiuemus? Hor. Carm. 3.29.41-5 ille potens sui/
aetatesque deget, cui licet in diem/ dixisse uixi: cras uel
atra/ nube polum Fater occunato/ uel sole ruro and Hier.
exist. 22.29 rebus tuis uteres, et uiue dum uiues. diximus could
only mean "sing" and would therefore add nothing to the line.

et calamis versus cantauimus This, the reading of asuv3, is
accepted by most editors. Barth conjectures *et calamo et uersu* from *calamo uersu*, which he claims to have found in an old edition now untraceable, but this conjecture makes poor sense and would give us a line with only a fourth foot spondaic caesura, for which there is no parallel in Rem. Baehrrens conjectures *et calamis et uersum aptuimus*, no doubt working from NGA's unmetrical reading *et calamis et uersu* and possibly also thinking of Prop. 3.3.35 *carmina neruis aptat*, but this again gives poor sense and, as Magnus points out (*Ph./I.*, 26 (1882), 813), the second *et* is superfluous and *cantauimus* quite satisfactory. Baehrrens does not give any reason for his conjecture and it is strange that he did not adopt *et calamis uersus* when he was aware of this reading. The second *et* in NGA possibly came in from p. 13. Heinsius conjectures *mandauimus* although it is not clear what he would read with it, but a phrase such as *mandari uersibus* (*Cic. Arch.* 20) is no parallel for *calamis mandare*, since the former reference is to written verse, and here we are dealing with "singing," as *calamis* tells us. *cantauimus* is, in any case, in no need of emendation.

12 ludebat Owen on Ovid *Trist.* 2.491 comments, "ludere is used of the lighter forms of verse contrasted with the serious epic, tragic and didactic poetry. Thus it means to write pastorals (*Verg. Buc.* 1.10, *Geor.* 4.565), lyrics (*Hor. Carm.* 1.32.2), satires (*Hor. Sat.* 1.10.37, cf. 4.139), love elegies (*Am.* 3.1.27, *Fast.* 4.9, *Trist.* 1.9.61, 3.2.5, 5.1.7), epigrams (*Mart.* 7.12.9)."

For the construction *ludere amores* cf. *Virgil Geor.* 4.565 *carmina...lusi* and Ovid *Trist.* 1.9.61 *lusum...carmen*.

1.2.89, but the meaning in each case is "mock", which would be impossible here.

13 *tepuere*  This, the reading of N, seems to me to give better sense than EV's *sturure*, cf. Lucan 4.284 *paulatim fugit ira ferox mentesoue tepescunt*.

*sub*  For this use of *sub*, "under the effects of", cf. Ovid Met. 5.62 *sub uulnere*.

15 *sonant*  Barth and Burman both favour *sonent*, but as Beck points out, this would be inconsistent with what follows: Timetas has recently been victorious in a competition and would therefore already be much talked-of at the time Tityrus is speaking.

15-6 *carmine uictor/risisti*  Hgajpsu*²v*³ read *carmina*, which would have to be taken as accusative of respect, but would be rather confusing so close to the other accusatives after *risisti*, and there appear to be no parallels for such an expression as *carmina uictor*. I can see no reason to read *raucos/uicisti* with Kaehly.

16 *dissona*  Nem. uses this word again at 3.10. It is not found in Horace, Virgil or Ovid, but occurs in later poets such as Lucan, Statius, Claudian and Prudentius. It is found in poetry used of music only in Nem.

*flamina*  Barth prefers to read *carmina* here, but Beck rightly compares Hor. *Carm. 3.19.19 flamina tibiae, carmina*
was probably introduced under the influence of carmine above.

Mopsi The name is also used by Virgil (Buc. 5.1 and 10; 8.26 and 29) and Calpurnius (poems 3 and 6). Servius on Virgil Buc. 6.72 says that Gallus translated in Latin a poem of Euphorion, which told how Calchas and Mopsus had a divination contest, and Wendel, "De nominibus bucolicis," Fleckeis, Jahrb. Supp. 26 (1901), 47) suggests that Virgil may have used this name as a compliment to Gallus. Ovid also uses Mopsus as the name of a Thessalian prophet (Met. 12.456 and 528), and there is an Argonaut of this name in Statius, Seneca and Valerius Flaccus. Unlike the Mopsus of poem 4, he is in this line an unskilled musician.

Meliboeus The name is also found in Virgil (Buc. 1, 3, 5 and 7), Calpurnius (1 and 4) and Catalepton 9.18. Wendel remarks (p. 49), "Meliboeum Johannes Antiochenus appellat pastorem illum, qui Oedipodem expositum inuenit (frg. 8, Müller FHG vol. 4 p. 545). Quis hoc nomen fabulae adiecerit ignoramus; dubitari autem non potest, quin Vergilius pastorem Meliboeum ab Oedipodis fabula acceperit."

audierat Pluperfect for imperfect. K-S say (1, pp. 140-1), "Aus der Volkssprache stammt die eigenartige Tempusverschiebung, vermöge deren das Plusquamperfekt bestimmter Verben nicht in der eigentlichen Bedeutung dieses Tempus, sondern ganz im Sinne des Imperfekts...gebraucht wird; das trifft vor allem fueran und habueram...im Spätln. besonders bei den Afrikanern."
sublime Used aurally, cf. Virgil Aen. 9.27f.; Lucre. 2.206; Frud. Per. 10.696.

19 nemensum tempore Cf. (Tib.) 3.3.9 tum cum nemensae defunctus tempore lucis; Cic. frg. de Univ. C. 9; Seneca Her. Fur. 742.

20 secreti Kaehly reads siderei here, comparing uu. 39-40, but secreti is quite satisfactory, cf. Hor. Ep. 16.63 Jupiter illa piae secures litora renti and Hor. Carm. 2.13.23 sedesque discretas piorum. These two passages also support the reading here of piorum. The idea of a mundus piorum was traditional, cf. Hor. Carm. 1.10.7; Virgil Aen. 5.734 and 6.638-9; Ovid Met. 11.62 etc., and see Lemaire p. 537f. The location of Elysium is rather vague in Latin literature, but it is always at the end of the world and usually beyond the Ocean Stream where the sun sets. (See E.F. Smith on Tib. 1.3.57-66 and R.G. Austin on Virgil Aen. 6.637-78). Servius on Aen. 5.735 says, "secundum poetas in medio inferorum est sui felicitatibus plenum, ut solem suam sua sidera norunt (Aen. 6.641). secundum philosophos elysium est insulae fortunatae, quas ait Sallustius incolitas esse Homer carminibus, quarum descriptionem Porphyrius commentator dicit esse sublatem. secundum theologos circa lunarem circulum, ubi iam aer purior est: unde ait ipse Vergilius (6.387) aeris in campis, item Lucanus (9.10) non illuc auro positi, nec ture sepulti perueniunt."

Timetas (uu. 39-40) seems less certain than Tityrus of the existence of the mundus piorum.

21 gratia vivit vivus is used with an abstract subject also at Ovid Met. 12.617 (gloria); A. A. 2.101 (amor); Trist. 5.14.39 (fama); Stat. Theb. 11.714 (libertas and spea); Theb. 12.441
(odia); Lucan 10.188-9 (virtus and amor). Cf. also Virgil Aen. 7.401-2.

uiuui L. Castiglioni ("Due note alle Bucoliche di Calpurnio e Nemesiano," Studi in Onore Gino Funaioli, Rome 1955, p. 20) objects to uiuui, saying, "Li uiuere, uigere nel senso di 'durare' nessuno, credo, ha mai fatto questione," and therefore conjectures uiui, justifying it by saying, "Il punto sul quale si concentra il pensiero del poeta è Meliboeo defunto e il ricordo di lui strappato alla realtà presente: è sintetica esigenza poetica quella che richiami al ricordo di lui vivo, più e meglio che non alla sopravvivenza del ricordo," and compares Virgil Aen. 6.653.

Castiglioni's objections to the reading of the manuscripts seem to me to be trifling; it is clear from the parallels I have quoted above that uiuere was used in the sense of durare (see also Lewis and Short p. 2001 uivo C2). uiuui also makes better sense than uiui - it is the fact that they still feel affection towards Meliboeus that causes them to praise him now, not simply that they respected him when he was alive.

25 Nem. is perhaps recalling here Virgil Buc. 4.55-7 non me carminibus uincat nec Thracius Orpheus / nec Linus, huic mater quamuis atque huic pater adsit / Orpei Calliopea, Lino formosus Apollo. Orpheus is described as Oeagrius also at Virgil Geor. 4.524; Stat. Theb. 5.343f.; Manil. 5.326. V's modulatibus and modulantibus are either conjectures after the uncommon adjective had become corrupt, or conscious attempts to continue the balance of carmine Phoebus, Pan calamis, fidibus Linus. The insertion of -que after fidibus was then necessary to restore the metre.
26 \textit{toteue} Burman (p. 723) explains the appearance of \textit{atoue} as having come from \textit{oxcue} after the \textit{t} of \textit{totcue} was absorbed by \textit{concinerent}. \textit{toteue} emphasises the greatness of Meliboeus.

27 \textit{musam} \textit{musa} is used here in the sense of "a piece of verse," as at Lucr. 4.589; Virgil \textit{Buc.} 1.2 etc. NG read \textit{laudem}, no doubt under the influence of \textit{laudescue} above, but the repetition of \textit{laus} in two consecutive lines would be inelegant.

28 This line has been lost from the \textit{V} tradition and Haehly attributes its omission to \textit{auena} (u. 27) and \textit{annem} (u. 28). See Housman's edition of Lucan (p. xix) for further examples of this type of omission. \textit{V}'s \textit{cuercus} (u. 29) is an attempt to restore the sense after u. 28 had been lost.

\textit{suer haec} Understand "the glorious deeds of Meliboeus." \textit{suer} is used here as equivalent to \textit{de}, in the sense of "concerning." It is often found in this sense governing the ablative, but as \textit{LHS} say (2, p. 281), "in gleicher Bedeutung vereinzelte auch mit dem Akk. seit Tert. (z.B. \textit{cult. fem.} 1, 1, 2 \textit{sententia dei suer sexum istum...}) und der Itala..., ferner z.B. bei Pallad..., in den Vitae patr. (3, 160 \textit{suer sermonem} = 5, 1, 16 \textit{de, gr. εμε...})\textit{, Alc. Avit...}}, Greg. Tur..." Heinsius conjectures the ablative \textit{hoc (ac. sene)}, the more common case when \textit{suer} is used as equivalent to \textit{de}. Leo suggests reading \textit{sacra} for \textit{suer}, but I can see no reason for describing the \textit{cerasus} in this way.

30 Burman conjectures \textit{folis cantu (cantui) ne garrula pinus}, since Nem. says (u. 33) \textit{tacet nemus}, and the two statements seem to
him incompatible, because if the wind is blowing, not only the pine would be making a noise, but the other trees as well. But the pine need not be part of this nemus since at u. 31 Tityrus suggests that he and Timetas move away from the pines and it is probably to be assumed that they have done so by u. 33: pines tend to form their own forests and do not mingle much with other trees. Burman is in any case being hypercritical here: it is surely going too far to assume that by tacet nemus omne Timetas means that there is dead silence, without so much as a leaf stirring, but simply that their surroundings are peaceful. The pine seems to have been thought especially noisy by the ancients, cf. Ausonius Erist. 24.17f. (Schenkl's text); Claudian De rapt. Proserpinae 1.204f.; Terentianus Maurus 1980-1 (Septimius Severus), no doubt because of the rattling noises made by the pine cones in the wind. Titius's suggestion that garrula refers either to birdsong, or to the rustle of leaves is clearly wrong, as these sounds could come from any tree.

32 subicit "puts forth." subicere is used of plants also at Virgil Buc. 10.74 quantum uero nouo uiridis se subicit alnus and Virgil Geor. 2.18f. laurus/ parua sub incenti matris se subicit umbra. Apsv read sugerit which is perhaps a gloss. G and the majority of the V manuscripts read subigit which is unmetrical and makes no sense. Baehrens, who regards G as the most reliable manuscript, conjectures subrigit.

33 nemus Burman (p. 723) says that genus in ps can be defended, but does not do so; presumably he would understand animantum. Because of the common confusion between pecus and nemus in manuscripts, as at Ovid Fast. 3.71; Virgil Geor. 3.264 and Aen. 3.221, Burman suggests pecus, comparing Hor. Carm. 1.2.7; Ovid
Let. 13.821 and Calpurnius 1.37, and would adopt pecus if it had any manuscript authority. However, he seems to me wise to retain pecus here, because to read pecus would mean that u. 34 virtually repeated the same idea.

37 cantus To read calamos here, with V and Baehrens, the word would have to be taken as meaning "song", and I cannot find a parallel for the use of calamos in this sense. cantus is more appropriate, cf. Birae 50 accipite has voces. calamos has possibly come in from another line, perhaps u. 25.

38 quietis quieti is used of the dead also at Anth. Lat. 315.6.

39-40 Luiselli (Paia 10 (1958), 198-9), says that these lines recall Virgil Aen. 6.719-20 and 10.3. Cicero also has the same basic motif of the souls of the good existing in a place apart. He uses colere for "live in" at Somn. Scip. 3.8 and Nem.'s use of templa in the sense of spatia also recalls Cicero's use. Ennius (Valen fr. 39) also uses templa in this way, and this use is also found occasionally in Lucretius, e.g. 5.1204-5 magni caelestia mundi/ templa. (Here of the sky).

40 This line is identical to u. 3 of Buecheler Carm. Epist. 755, a Christian inscription.

dquo; mundoque fruuntur This use of mundus in the sense of Elysium appears to be very rare. The only other examples in TLL (8.1638) are Rufin. Orig. princ. 2, 3, 6 p. 124, 7 sanctorum...est... mundus ille, non etiam impiorum siout iste noster, and Rust. Help. benef. 137 gratia dei limina pandit ad mundi potioris iter regnumque perenne caelestia patriae. To these must surely
be added Lam. 1.77: aetherios vivunt annos mundocue fruuntur
which, as J. Hubsch (Les thèmes bucoliques dans la poésie latine,
p. 244) suggests, Lem. must be echoing here. Cf. also Lam. 1.758
dignatave nomina caelo and Lem. 1.50 caelo dirimus.
Adelung considers that mundo means the earth and explains that
although the pious dead are living in heaven, they still take an
interest in what happens on earth, which seems to me very far-
fetched, and would imply an extraordinary use of frui.
Luiselli ("L'identificazione del Melibeo", Neia 10 (1959),
179ff.), considers that there is a Pythagorean element in the poem.
Raynaud suggests Christian inspiration and Verdière ("La
Bucolique post-virgilienne", Eos 56 (1966 (1969)), 177 and
Proléromènes, p. 12-4) thinks that the poem reflects Platonism
as it appears in Cicero. Faladini ("Il Compianto di Melibeo in
Nemesiano", Ac 25 (1956), 324-5) believes that he detects a
Stoic influence at mm. 44-5 and m. 19. Volpilhao (p. 65) also
regards the ideas expressed here as predominantly Stoic, but
thinks that Nem. is mixing several philosophical doctrines. To
me, Nem.'s ideas of Elysium appear to be rather vague, as is
the case with other Latin poets (see my note on 1.20); perhaps,
like many people, Nem. was not clear what he did believe.

41 aduerte A rare use of aduerto with the plain accusative,
which is also found at Varro L.L. 10.46 and Tac. ann. 14.4.3.
Burman, because of the rarity of this use of aduerto would
read tu nostris aduerte modis (sc. mentem, ocu los, aures or
sim.). He rightly adds, however, "nihil tamen temere mutem,
quem huius aetatis scriptores audaci us saep e locutiones
uesteres nouauerint." The Deventer editions read in for tu, but
aduerto appears to be used with in only in the sense of
literal motion, as at Ter. Eum. 343-4; Livy 37.9.7 and Ovid Met. 6.180.

spectata  "respected." Burman reads spectata here, explaining "quia quique sibi uocet diuturnitatem, uel quia Melibeo uouerant longam aetatem eius amici, ut sequentia u. 46 &c uidentur uelle" and compares the variants at Ovid Met. 14.652, but this use of spectata, he admits, is quite acceptable, cf. Silius 16.332 longo sonipes spectatus in seuo.

circulus  For circulus of time cf. Seneca Epist. 1.12.6 mensis artiore praeconitit circulo and Porph. Hor. Carm. 3aeq. 21.42.5. For the idea of life consisting of concentric circles, Volpilhac rightly compares Seneca Epist. 1.12.6 tota aetas partibus constat et orbes habet circumductos maioribus. Est alicuis, cui omnes cumplectetur et cingat; hic pertinet a natali ad diem extremum. Est alter, cui annos adolescetiae excludit; est cui totam aetiam ambitu suo adstrinxit; est deinde per se annus in se orria continens tempora, quorum multiplicatione uita componitur. Mensis artiore praecipit circulo: angustissimum habet dies gyrum, sed et hic ab initio ad exitum uenit, ab ortu ad occasum.

carpet  The supporters of pelleret are in my opinion misguided. Keene translates "were hastening on" and Wernsdorf compares Calpurnius 5.121 aetius imellit Noctifer horas, but Meliboeus is dead, not ageing prematurely. Burman regards such a use of pellere as "duriter et sine exemplo", unless it has the same sense as uita truditur, as at Petronius 45 and elsewhere, and Beck approves of this theory. But Burman rightly doubts the
acceptable of this expression.

If we possessed only V's reading, Gläser's conjecture
uelleret would be a very satisfactory solution to the problem,
cf. Lucan 6.562 illa (i.e. more) senae flore arum corpore
uoluit. However, ICGAE read carperet, which must surely be the
truth, cf. Seneca Epist. 120.16 ad mortem dies extremus pervenit,
accedit omnis, carpit nos illa, ion corripit. V's pelleret
possibly comes from a gloss on carperet, uelleret.

si...carperet Imperfect for pluperfect. LH3 say (2, p. 321),
"Die...Verwendung des Konj. Impf. statt Plpfp. ist bei
volkstümlichen Autoren, wenigstens zum Teil, als Gebräuchlich zu
werten, z.B. Vitae patr. 5.15.39 si responderem es, inuenieber
deslectatus nach eι άπεκρύθην... γύρωσκόμην... , sonst,
π.Τ. unter dem Einfluss der Klausel, als willkürliches Schenken,
z.B. bei Tert. und Fulg." Here the use of imperfect for
pluperfect seems to be due to metrical necessity, as at 2.75.

48 communis causa Gläser conjectures communes, but Leo rightly
defends the reading of the manuscript, interpreting it thus:
"και το κοινον παθος ου κατεσχε πα τολαυτα
δόμυματα." (quoted by Giarratano ad loc.)

49 letali Keene justifies Gläser and Schenkl's retention of
NG's mortalici by saying (CR 26 (1912), 97-8), that the phrase
mortalici frigore means "the chill of death, such as mankind are
(sic) liable to, a meaning which is more clearly defined by
lege hominum in the following line and which may perhaps be
illustrated by Calp. iv 139, where the term of life allotted to
man mortale (pensum) is contrasted with the everlasting life of
the gods (perpetuo caelestia filia metallo). The somewhat
unfamiliar use of mortali would account for the change to letali. If the archetype had letali, it is hard to see why mortali should have ousted that word." A similar use of mortalis is found at Cic. Phil. 14.12.33 mortalis condicio uita and this adjective is acceptable here, but I think it extremely probable that NG’s mortali has come about under the influence of more in u. 47. TLL (8 1513 45) also reads mortali here and says that it is used in the sense of "mortem imminetem praenuntians uel afferens, melius," but this is inappropriate as Meliboeus is not dying but already dead. For HV’s letali cf. Ovid Met. 2.611 corpus inane animae frigus letale secutum est. (Prud. apoth. 466; Sedul. carm. 3.36).

frigore For frigus meaning "the chill of death," cf. Virgil Aen. 12.951 and Lucr. 4.924.

50 canente senecta Nem. is perhaps echoing Virgil Aen. 10.192 canentem...senectam and emendation is unnecessary. As Titius points out, canente senecta is not to be taken as dependent on dignus, and he rightly compares u. 43 longa tibi, cunctisque diu spectata senectus. canente senecta is probably temporal in force, "deserving to go to heaven when you were old."

51 ponderis aequi It is difficult to be sure exactly what Nem. intends this phrase to mean. The same expression occurs at Vulg. lev. 19.36 and Vulg. prov. 11.1, but in both cases it is used literally of weights. Nem. might be using pondus metaphorically to mean "importance" or "authority", as at Prop. 3.7.44; 4.7.88; Cic. Att. 11.6.1; Ovid Fast. 1.182; Seneca Dial. 11.14.2, where the metaphor is from the scales. On the other hand, pondus may signify "stability" or "constancy", as at Cic.
Fin. 3.2 equissimus aequitor et iudex, or it may be used in the sense of benigamus, as at Cic. ad Q. fr. 2.3.4 nobilitate inimica, non aequo senatu, ("no friendly authority"). pondus and gravitas (u. 56) are two qualities frequently associated with one another by the Romans, e.g. at Cic. Apq. 2.32; Seneca epist. 115.3; Arnob. nat. 2, 41, p. 81, 20; 2, 45, p. 83, 26; 7, 41, p. 274, 10, and it may be that Ném. is recalling Silius's description of Brutus (8.609) laeta uero gravitas ac mentis amabile pondus but here, too, it is not clear how pondus is to be taken. Housman compares this line of Silius, and also Silius 6.429 animi uenerabile pondus and ëæail. 5.451 pondere mentis, with ëæail. 1.771 strictae pondéra mentis, on which he comments, "pondus non unicit mentem sed stricta mente efficitur."

On balance I would translate ponderis aequi, "friendly authority": Meliboeus was a highly respectable and dignified man but not an unapproachable one. "Impartial authority" is, however, another possible translation.

53 patiens mulcendo This is an awkward expression and has been variously explained and emended. Kaehly's pacans has found favour with Baehrens, H. Schenkl, Giarratano and Schubert, the last punctuating with a comma after aésueras and comparing Claudian Cons. Hon. 4.226 and Hor. A.r. 197 (Sентley's version, et amet pacare tuenteras); but pacans would seem to render mulcendo superfluous. Burman reads serviens mulcere, comparing Virgil Geor. 1.234 felix ponere, and Wakefield conjectures patiens mulcere, but it is unlikely that anyone would have replaced mulcere by mulcendo, a much rarer form, with its unusual scansion. Gebhardt (Crepundiorum seu iuuenilium curarum libri tres, Hanover 1615, p. 147), suggests pauiens, "Ut pauire
hic esset compescere, componere, & quasi complodere, comprimendo exstinguere: metaphorra sumpta a solo & aecuore sedificii cuod fistuca compauitur ac complanatur, " but examples of pauire used in these senses appear to be lacking, and I can see no difficulty in patiens as regards sense, as the good nature of Meliboeus is stressed throughout the poem (e.g. uu. 41-2; 56-7). Jernsdorf's explanation, "h. quum uarias querelas patienter audires, easque placares et componeres," and that of Beck, "patiens (ferens, patienter audiens) querelas ita ut mulceas (lenias, componas eas), poetic pro, patiendo mulcens" do not take account of the syntax, and Ulitius's patiens mulcensque is clumsy in the extreme. I have been unable to find an example of verbal adjective with the ablative of the gerund, but such a use is probably not unjustifiable, as other kinds of adjective are sometimes found used in this way, e.g. Cio. De Or. 1.240 cum disserendo par esse non posset. The adjective is normally used with a preposition, see C.F.W. Müller, Ciceronis Opera Omnia 3.1 Teubner 1896, pp. xxiii-xiv, but the absence of a preposition can be defended, cf. K-3 1, p. 754, "Bei Adjektiven steht der Ablativ des Gerund. selten...Klassisch bei Adjektiven nur im limitativem Sinne, wie C. De 128 latine loquendo cuiuis erat par. de or. 1.240."

mulcendo is probably used here as equivalent to the present participle, as often in later Latin, see LHS 2, p. 380, "Während bereits Liv. und Vit. den Abl. des Gerundiums nicht selten ohne Unterschied vom Part. Frass. und im Wechsel mit diesem...verwenden, dehnt sich sein Gebrauch in der nachklass. Volkssprache auf Kosten des Part. Frass. immer mehr aus... Allgemein wird der Gebrauch seit dem 3 Jh." It is found in poetry for example at Virgil Aen. 2.6; Hor. Carm. 4.11.30;
Mar. 4.173, 201; 2.153. For the gerund used as equivalent to the present participle with an object cf. Venantius Fortunatus carm. 11.19.2 animos plura uidendo.

If mulcendo effectively equals mulcens, patiens must then be used here adverbially, cf. Lüftstadt (Syntactica 2, p. 368f), "Seit ältester Zeit ist diese Erscheinung die ganze Latinität hindurch für die poetische Sprache sowie für die poetisch-rhetorisch stilisierte Prosaracteristisch," e.g. Virgil Aen. 1.301 Libyae citus astitit oris; Prop. 4.8.49 rauci sonuerunt cardine postes.

Thus patiens has the force of patienter here and mulcendo is equivalent to mulcens, "patiently allaying."

mulcendo For the scansion, see my excursus.

54 iuris...justi Burman, Titius and Barth all support N²GHV's ruris for iuris, taking ruris amor to mean the study of agriculture, and Barth points out that justice and agriculture were often conjoined, e.g. at Cic. Rosc. 75 uita rustica...iustitiae magistra est. Martellius, however, rightly prefers iuris because the context is law, not agriculture. Heinsius also reads iuris (=leges scriptae)...justi (=bonum). The expression iuris amor might be paralleled by Cic. Leg. 1.48 ipsam aequitatem et ius ipsum amant. ruris could have come about either by visual aberration or the recollection of ruricolum in u. 52 above. NV read justi, but the evidence of NG is confused, probably due to justi having been ousted by iuris which had occurred earlier in the same line, and then having been variously emended.

Volpilhac, who prints ruris...iuris, strangely uses Lucan 9.192 justi reverentia to support his reading.
56-7 serena/ fronte  Sen. is here probably imitating Calpurnius
5.46-7 fronte serene. Martellius conjectures seuera, but Sen.
is at pains in these lines to emphasise that while Meliboeus is
an upright character, he is not a forbidding one, cf. blanda
and mite (u. 56), and therefore seuera would be inappropriate.
Silius (8.609) similarly speaks of the laeta... creuitas of
Brutus.

58 antare et iungere.../ hortatus  Hortor used with the
infinitive is mainly found in poetry, although it is also
found at Cic. off. 3.55; Flanc. Cic. epist. 10.17.2 and Nepos
Phoc. 1.3. V's coniungere is probably an interpolation from
Virgil Duc. 2.32 calamos cera coniungere.

59 hortatus  Heinsius, who was aware only of V's reading,
conjectured noras tu or gratus tu.

Duff takes the implied object of hortatus and docuisti to
be me, i.e. Timetas, but it may be nos, i.e. the young people
in general, cf. perhaps nobis (u. 60) and nos (u. 62).

duras  Heinsius conjectured cruas, but as Burman points out,
the jingle duras... curas is quite common, e.g. at Virgil Aen.
4.438; Silius Italicus 11.371-2.

fallere curas  Cf. Ovid Trist. 3.2.16 fallebat curas and ibid.
5.7.39 detineo studiis animum fallorque dolores.

63 dixisti carmen  Heinsius, Eroukhusius and Beck would all read
duxisti carmen. Eroukhusius on Tib. 2.15.4 says that ducere is
used of epic and sad songs, and dicere of lighter works, but
this statement is not quite accurate, and even if it were, is
surely not evidence against dixisti, but in favour of it, since we are told that Meliboeus was laetus and we should scarcely expect to find shepherds reciting epic to the accompaniment of the fistula.

There appear to be three situations in which ducere carmen is used rather than dicere: of writing epic (e.g. Hor. Serm. 1.10.44; Prop. 4.6.13; Stat. Silv. 5.3.92); of songs of mourning and complaints (Ovid E.P. 1.5.7) and of composing verse in general, as distinct from "singing" it, (Ovid Trist. 1.11.18; 3.14.31; 5.12.63). In the first two cases the idea of length which is often present in duco seems to be relevant (as in the slightly different case at 2.61), since epics are by nature long and no one ever mourns or complains briefly. (See also my note on 4.13).

dicere, on the other hand, is used as equivalent to canere, when employed with carmen, as at Virgil Buc. 6.5 and Hor. Serm. Saec. 8, or of writing short poems as at Virgil Buc. 10.3 (where again "singing" is involved, cf. u. 8), or of playing a tune on a musical instrument, as at Hor. Serm. 1.32.4; 4.12.10.

There are three apparent exceptions to the rules which seem to dictate whether dicere or ducere should be used: Dirae 75, Prop. 1.7.1 and ibid. 1.9.9. At Dirae 75 and Prop. 1.9.9 we have dicere used of sad songs. In the former case we are again dealing with a song played on the fistula, and in the latter, the reference is to writing elegy, although it is interesting that here the Renaissance manuscripts and Heinsius read ducere. At Prop. 1.7.1 we have dicere used of epic, where again the Renaissance manuscripts, supported by Scaliger, read ducere, but perhaps we are dealing with a reference to Homer's use of δείκνύω of his epics, where, of course, the reference to
singing is more appropriate than it is in the case of Latin epic. There is therefore perhaps a degree of overlap in the uses of *dicere* and *ducere*, but if so, it is one which does not trouble us here, as the context is "singing", (cf. *cantare* u. 62) and *dixisti*, the reading of all the manuscripts, is therefore the appropriate verb.

66 *de* Used here instead of the genitive, of a part taken from the whole, as at *Cyn.* 176. Sittl (lokale Verschiedenheiten der lat. Sprache, p. 126) regards this use of *de* as one of the features of African Latinity, but it is in fact found in Latin literature generally from Plautus on, becoming quite frequent in late Latin. See LHS 2, p. 58.

67 *messi* NGAH's reading, *messe*, is unmetrical and naively therefore reads *messi*, a rare form found otherwise only at Varro L.L. 5, 4, 21; R.R. 1, 53 and Charisius 1, 14 p. 28 (1.43, 15 Keil). (See Heue 1, p. 329). V's *campo* makes good sense but is less precise- *campo culmos* need not necessarily signify grain - and may be an emendation to restore the metre. Burman reads *messo*, i.e. *de frumento messo*, but I can find no example of this substantival use of *messum*.

68 *grandaeua* The adjective is applied to Pales only in *Nem*. It also appears at Virgil *Aen.* 1.121 and *Geor.* 4.392, where it is applied to Nereus.

*spumantia cymbia lacte* The same phrase occurs at Virgil *Aen.* 3.66. At Virgil *Buc.* 5.67f. *pocula...spumantia lacte* are offered to Laphnis.
69-70  Most editors punctuate with a colon after coronae and a full-stop after honos, but Volpilhac rightly adopts the punctuation of Vernsdorf with a colon after honos, since hic is here used in a prospective sense. I cannot agree with Volpilhac, however, in placing a full-stop after coronae, since the gift of the Muses continues the list given in vv. 65-69, and I have therefore punctuated with a semi-colon.

73-4  te pinus; reboat te quicquid carminis, Echo/ respondet siluae; All the manuscripts read respondet in v. 74, except for N Au² which read respondet. With either reading, the expression is rather awkward, and various solutions have been offered. Titius reads te pinus reboat; te quicquid carminis Echo/ respondet siluae, and explains "quicquid carminis respondet, Echo respondet & quicquid siluae respondent, te respondent," but this is difficult to reconcile with his text and makes very poor sense. Kodius conjectures respondent omnia siluae from Virgil Buc. 10.9, but this is quite unnecessary and it is not clear what he would eject to make room for omnia. carminis exit is the suggestion of Ulitius, but he does not explain it, and the significance of this conjecture escapes me. Gebhardt (op. cit. p. 148) conjectures te quid cuit Carminis Echo/, respondent siluae, explaining, "quicquid uocalis Echo in carmine & te sonando ualet, omne impertit, & hinc plenis angulis respondent ad tuas laudes siluae," and also suggests, Te pinus reboat, te quid cuit Carminis, but his explanation is forced and his conjectures do nothing to simplify the text. Baehrens proposes reboant, with siluae to be taken as nominative plural, whilst retaining N Au²'s respondet, presumably under the influence of Virgil Geor. 3.223 reboant siluaeque et
longus Olympus, which is an elegant conjecture but, I think, unnecessary. Leo suggests a stop after respondet, but I do not see how siluae could fit in with what follows. Keene, who also reads respondet, translates "every echo of the woods resounds your name," and adds "quicquid is acc., Echo nom., siluae dat."
which is totally at variance with his translation and ignores respondet and carminis. Dunlop (p. 190) translates "whatever song Echo sings of you, the woods repeat in answer," but this is not translating the text he prints (Duff's), and takes no account of reboat.

reboat te is in itself unusual. reboare is rare; it occurs once each in Virgil and Lucretius, and not at all in Ovid, Statius and Lucan. Apart from the example here, Lucr. 4.546 seems to be the only transitive use.

GHV's respondent appears to me to be either an interpolation from Virgil Buc. 10.8 (quoted above) or an attempt to simplify the text. There are to my mind two possible ways of justifying the text of NAu2. One is to follow Burman, who takes the words in the order, "Quidquid Echo carminis siluae respondet, te reboat," or to punctuate with a comma after carminis and translate "whatever song resounds you (i.e. your name), Echo sends back to the wood."

74 armenta loquuntur Haupt (Opuscula I, p. 400) conjectures arbusta, comparing Virgil Buc. 5.62ff. ipsi laetitia uoces ad sidera tollunt / intonsi montes, ipsae iam carmina rupes, / ipsa sonant arbusta 'deus deus ille, Menalca' and Buc. 1.39f. Tityrus hinc aberat ipsae te, Tityre, pinus, / ipsi te fontes, ipsa haec arbusta uocabant. He regards armenta as impossible with loquuntur. TLL gives no examples of loquor used of animals
except in the case of prodigies, but Virgil Buc. 5.27-8 tuum
Poenos etiam ingenuisse leones/ interitum montesque serp
silueaeque locuntur may well be relevant here. This passage may
be thought to tell for arbusta, but I think it very likely that
Vem. is clumsily adapting Virgil's lines and has contaminated
leones (here changed to armenta) with locuntur, to produce the
curious expression armenta locuntur. Again, Claudian (26.410)
speaks of the uox of cattle. Also, although locoer is apparently
not used of the sounds made by animals, dico is, at Flautus Vem.
654 uin asserri noctum, quae 'tu, tu' usque dicat tibi and
Lucilius 2 Charisius ap. C.L.I. 125 19k), (r littera...)
inritata canes quam homo quam planius dicit. armenta
furthermore contributes to the scene whereas arbusta does not:
the huses are singing for Meliboeus; the herdsmen are playing;
the trees are whispering; echo is picking up the sound and
sending it back, "our own (necstra) herds speak of you." A
return of subject to trees would add nothing.

secuntur in many of the V manuscripts may be an emendation
in order to simplify an unusual expression.

75-6 Vem. is probably influenced here by Virgil Buc. 1.59f. ante
leues ergo pascentur in secuore cerui/ et freta destituent
nudos in litoris piscis and Prop. 2.3.5f. sicca si roset riscis
harena/ nec solitus potty uiuere toruus arer.

76 insuetusque The variant readings here seem to indicate that
the beginning of this line became corrupt early in the tradition
and has been variously restored. hirsutus, although objected to
by Heinsius, is a perfectly acceptable epithet for a lion, cf.
Ovid Her. 9.111: Met. 14.207 etc., but it adds nothing to the
sense here. w's solitary retulus is certainly conjectural. There
have been attempts to justify vestitus on the ground that it is
often used of trees on mountains, and is used absolutely at Cic.
N.D. 2.53.172, but this is surely not a just parallel, as
mountains without trees can be found, but not lions without hair.
C. Schenkl's villosus (cf. Virgil Aen. 8.77), seems to me no
improvement on hirsutus. in vestitoque is the suggestion of H.
Schenkl, which can be paralleled by Seneca Med. 758f. et
vestitum mare/ tetigistis ursae (Herc. Get. 1585). I think it
very probable, however, that vestitus is concealing an original
insuetus, as Heinsius conjectured, and a comparison with the
Propertius passage quoted above, and also Virgil Geor. 3,543
insolitae fugiunt in flumina rhocae would seem to support his
suggestion. Jacoby also comes to this conclusion (Voch. für
Klass. Phil. 34(1886), 1294), but is unenthusiastic, regarding
insuetusque as very improbable, but the best suggestion so far.

78 † tractabit Keene translates "presides over", and tractare is
found in the sense of "have charge of" at Cic. Fam. 13.77.3,
erusus, qui mean bibliothecen multorum nummorum tractavit, but
I can find no example of this verb used with an abstract
subject, and although tractare is often used literally of
handling vines, here it has to govern messem as well, which as
Burman points out, is inappropriate. He therefore suggests
iactabit, since the two verbs are often confused in manuscripts,
e.g. at Stat. Theb. 5.67, but iactare seems to be used only of
using the hands, or of verbal handling (see TLL 6 55 54ff.)
Ellis (AJPh 7 (1886), 91) conjectures ructabit, but parallels
for such a use of ructare seem to be lacking. praestabit, the
suggestion of Haupt (Cruscula I, p. 400), gives excellent sense
and has been adopted by Baehrens and Giarratano, but such a
corruption would be difficult to explain. Verdière (Prolegomenes, p. 79), taking his cue from Keene's rather-half-hearted support, would retain tractabit, and compares Cic. Fin. 5.4.39 where, speaking of vines, "tractare est stipulé avant suerí" and he would translate tractare, "manipuler," but in the Cicero passage he cites, tractare is probably to be translated, "train," which is obviously irrelevant to messem. For tractare used of olives, cf. Pliny N.H. 19.337 oles tractandi. If tractabit is to be retained here, it must be used in the sense of "have charge of," or "manage," which gives adequate sense, but this use with an abstract subject appears to be unparalleled. On the other hand, Haupt's praestabit accords much better with dabit in u. 79, but is difficult to explain palaeographically. I have therefore obelized here.

79 ante takes up prius (u. 75), leading to quam (u. 80).

83 Cf. Calpurnius 4.161 Tityron e siluis dominam deduxit in urben. The phrase dominam...urben also occurs at 2.84 and is common in poetry from Cvid onwards, see TLL 5 1941 33.

84 namque I cannot see that the objections to namque are so great that it should not be retained in the text. Indeed Duff, though he prints iamque, translates "for". The only objection I can see is that nam occurs in u. 82, and as the repetition of words and phrases at short intervals is quite common in Nen. (e.g. 3.37 and 3.39 tum; Cyn. 152 lactia and 154 lacte; Cyn. 322 pratis and 324 prata; all at the same point in the line), I cannot see that this is a serious objection.
Cf. Stat. Theb. 12.32f. præsens tibi Fama beniamum/stræuit iter and ibid. 12.81f. tibi (Thetædi) si quis aehuc pretendit nubila livor occidet. The figure of clouds of envy occurs also at Cyr. sel. 1; Greg. A. moral. 6.38 and Optat. 1.27 p. 30, 12.

85 pinnis H and most of the V manuscripts read plena, which makes little sense. Fama personified in the sense of "Fame" rather than "Rumour" is given wings also at Hor. Carm. 2.2.7-8.

87 flumineos flumineus is not used by other bucolic poets, but it is found in other types of poetry, used by Ovid, Lucan, Silius Italicus, Martial, Ausonius, Valerius Flaccus, Statius, Claudian, Paulinus of Nola, Cyprianus Gallus, Corippus, Palladius and Sedulius.
Lem. is influenced here by the opening line of the second Eclogue of both Virgil and Calpurnius, and this fact is a point, albeit a minor one, in favour of Lem. 's authorship of these four poems: to begin a poem with a line so similar to that of another poem in the same corpus would be clumsy, but with these four poems attributed to their proper author, this line becomes a compliment to both Lem.'s predecessors in the pastoral genre.

Ionen Wendel ("De nominibus bucolicos," Fleckeis Jahrb. Suppl. 26 (1901), 61), "Nomen femininum ignoratur, masculinum exstat CIA 111 1133, 2371" which leads him to the doubtful conclusion that, "Cum Donax nomen comœdiae sit (Ter. Eun. 772. 774), Ionacen cuoque per nescio quos rins e comœdia in Nemessianœ eclogam fluxisse suspiceris." This does appear to be the only occurrence of the name in Latin poetry, but it is also found in inscriptions, see TII Onomasticum 3 225 65, so that it is unnecessary to seek for its origins in comedy.

Idas The name is also used by Calpurnius, three times in Ovid's Metamorphoses (5.90; 8.305; 14.504), at Virgil Aen. 9.575 and Propertius 1.2.17. Wendel fails to note that Theocritus also uses this name, in one of his non-pastoral idylls (22.140).

Idas puer The variants here illustrate the interpolation in the V manuscripts of readings from Calpurnius, a characteristic of this branch of the tradition. Here in the majority of the V manuscripts the line has been altered under the influence of Cal. 2.1 intactam Crocalen puer Astacus et puer Idas, although
Idas has had to be retained in V in u. 19 where Astacus would not fit the metre. The more common patterning in bucolic poetry is to have the noun before the name, as at Virgil Buc. 2.1, and Cal. 2.7 and 6.1, but the reverse occurs at Cal. 5.1. Hauz's ruer Idas gives us a fourth foot block spondee, which is not in itself objectionable, as there are twelve examples of this in the Bucolica and five in the Syræatica, but it is possible that, like the other V manuscripts, Hauz have been influenced here by Cal. 2.1, or else that they are adopting the more usual patterning, and therefore I have preferred the word order of MG.

Alcon The name is also used by Virgil (Buc. 5.11) and Calpurnius (6.1, 6, 18, 21). The names Idas and Alcon occur together at Stat. Theb. 6.553ff. Servius tells us that the original Alcon was a Cretan archer who accompanied Hercules and was so skilled that when a snake attacked his son he was able to kill it without harming the boy.

1-2 Donacen.../ ardebant The use of ardeo with the accusative object goes back to Virgil Buc. 2.1 (LHS 2, p. 33) and is later found at Hor. Carm. 4.9.13; Martial 8.63.1; Gell. 6.3.3; Aug. solil. 1.33.22 etc. LHS say (2, p. 31), "In der historischen Zeit ist der Übertritt eines Verbums in die andere Kategorie ziemlich verbreitet. Im allgemeinen geht die Entwicklung in der Richtung einer steten Zunahme der Transitiva." pereo is similarly used transitively at Plautus Poen. 1095 and depereo at Plautus Epid. 219.

2-3 incensus uterque/...ruebant cfiry read ruetat, but in view
of the plural verbs ardebant (u. 2), inuasere (u. 6) and carnebant (u. 7), it seems reasonable to retain the reading of the majority of the manuscripts. utercue is found with a singular adjective and a plural verb also at Ovid her. 5.46 miscuimus lacrimas maestus utercue suas and Lucan 7.31-2 fati certus utercue/ extremum tanti fruetur raueretis amoris.

3 in...uenerem...ruebant For this expression cf. Livy 3.47 in concubitus ruere.

furiosa mente furiosa, the reading of A.G, is a less common adjective than HV's furiata, and is not used by Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Virgil, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, Silius Italicus, Statius or Calpurnius. The phrase furiata mente is quite common (see, for example, Virgil Aen. 2.407) and it would appear likely that V is again replacing a less usual expression with a more common one. Apart from this line, the adjective furiosus is used of parts of the body elsewhere only at Lucr. 16.1184 furiosus uoltus et acer.

4 uicini Hartel conjectures uicinis, presumably in order to resolve the apparent difficulty of uallibus. This is a neat conjecture, but unnecessary.

uallibus Haupt says of this, the reading of all the manuscripts, "ualles horti intolerabiles sunt" (Ovuscula I, p. 401), and asked help of G. Hermann, who conjectured callibus. Keene describes this as a brilliant emendation, but Schenkl accepts it with some doubt "nam in callibus hortuli uix pueri aggredi potuerunt puellam neque causa erat parentibus cur eam
clausam tenerent, si intra horti fines se tenuisset (p. lxx). However, the idea of picking flowers *in collibus* is improbable. *Uallibus* can be justified, as it need not refer to anything as large as a valley, cf. Stat. Theb. 7.749 *uallum curvat* (of part of a mountain-side which becomes detached and rolls down), and Silius 3.662 where *uallum* is used of the space between two sand-dunes, so that *uallum* here need refer to nothing larger than a hollow. Schenkl tries to solve the difficulty he finds over *horti* by suggesting that "*horti* vocabulo significetur uilla, non solum aedcs ipsae earumque uicinia, sed etiam quae ad uillam pertinebant pascua at aedibus remotiora. constat autem antiquioribus temporibus, ueluti in XII tabulis uccabulum hortum ad uillam significandam aehibitum esse." (cf. Pliny N.E. 19.50) "neque a ueri specie abhorret hac ui id posterioribus etiam temporibus in sermone uulgari usitatum fuisse, quern hoc loco secutus est N-mesianus." I consider it unlikely that *hortus* should be used in this rare sense here, and I also do not see that Donace's having been close to the house or some distance away could have had much bearing on the parents' subsequent course of action: wherever she had been, they had been unwise to allow her out on her own.

5 *molli* I cannot see why Barth should want to alter the text here, as it is perfectly sound, and the same expression occurs at Virgil Buc. 3.45.

6 *uenerisque imbutus* Titius,riotellius and Burman all favour the second Aldine edition's *immitis*, in the sense of "immature." However, I can find the adjective used in this sense only of fruit, as at Hor. Carm. 2.5.10, which Burman quotes; Pliny N.E. 13.26 and 19.82; Silius 8.378; Gell. 10.11.3. *immitis* is
apparently not used with the genitive, and the only other sense in which it can be used, with the ablative, seems to be "cruel" or "harsh", as at Livy 2.29.9 Claudius...nature inmitis; Claudian carm. min. 26.31 (lacus) tactu...inmitis et haustu, a meaning which would be inappropriate here.

The use of imbutus with the genitive is rare. TLL cites only Schol. Hor. ara 312 and Pass. cor定向. 1. The more common use is with the ablative, and Wensdorf compares Silius 3.64-5 uirrineis iuuenem taedis, primoque hymenaeo/ imbuerat coniunx. The evidence for an ablative form Veneri, however, rests on only one passage, Flatus Foen. 1.2.49 (256), where it is rejected by Pius and Leo but retained by Bentley and Lindsay. At Cyn. 42, Nem. uses the ablative with imbutus, sacram imbuta uerenis, but in view of the fact that the evidence for the ablative form Veneri is so tenuus, I read ueneriscue here.

Surman suggests dulcia tunc primum carreбt, comparing, for reasons not clear to me, Claudian Erith. Hor. 81 in prism titubans audacia furtia, but this conjecture is unnecessary. He is also doubtful about carreбt because of the presence of carreбt above (u. 5), and tentatively suggests carreбt, as at Ovid Her. 4.27, but rightly rejects it "quia & alias eadem verba peperere solet noster."

Barth conjectures carpserunt, but in late Latin the imperfect is sometimes found when we might expect the perfect, cf. K-S 1, p. 127ff.; "Am häufigsten ist der Wechsel des historischen und des beschreibenden Imperfekts. Das Perfekt Perfekturführt (wie der griechische Aorist) die Hauptereignisse und Haupttatsachen an, das Imperfekt hingegen stellt die gleichzeitigen Nebenhandlungen und begleitenden Umstände veranschaulichend dar. Auf diese Weise tritt auf dem historischen Gemälde Licht und Schatten hervor. Das Perfekt erzählt, das
Imperfekt beschreibt." LH3 (2, p. 305) compare Vitae narr. 3.2.6
uitam suam consumebat.

9 *iam non* This is clearly the correct reading here, as u. 9
shows: their feelings are no longer those of children, but of
young men.

9 The only words in this difficult line which have been left
untouched by editors are *ter quincue!* The difficulty falls into
two main parts, each with subsidiary questions: whether anni
and hienas are possible together, and if not, which of them
should be emended; and whether any meaning can be extracted
from the rest of the line, and if not, in what way it should be
emended.

In spite of such renderings as, "Their years were only
fifteen winters" (Duff), and "whose years numbered but fifteen
winters" (Këene), it would appear superfluous to mention both
anni and hienas, and pleonasms such as Ovid Met. 6.438f. *iam
tempora Titan/·quince per autumnos repetiti duxerat anni,* are
no parallel since here hienas and anni stand side by side. There
have therefore been a number of emendations of anni and hienas.

Heinsius would presumably have his conjecture *guis actae ter
quincue hienas* in parenthesis, since *actae* would go
extremely awkwardly with *cura iuuentae,* but even with a
parenthesis, the line would read somewhat clumsily. Hartel
suggests *aeui,* but an expression such as *aeui hienas* would seem
to be unparalleled. Kornhardt (TLL 6 2780 54) includes this
line under two headings, hienas as equivalent to anni, and
under "hienas tempus", so that in the latter case, anni would
have to be taken as genitive, which is highly improbable.
J. E. Hall would read quis tantum ter quinquae hiemae sed cura iuuentae, suggesting that anni is either a visual slip, or has wandered in from u. 2 by a process of mental association. This gives good sense, but such a corruption seems to be rather unlikely. anni is usually used of age on its own with a number (but cf. 4.36) and therefore other scholars have focused their attention on hiemae.

Leo's ignes is rather a feeble effort, in my opinion. Burman would bracket quis anni ter quinquae and read et primae cura iuuentae, which Haupt (Oouscula I, p. 402) says is impossible "cum pueri iam se inspensus colere et ornare coepisse ut puellae placarent (hoc enim voluit Burmannus) praepostere hic atque inepte dicerentur..." Burman's conjecture and interpretation are indeed unlikely, but Haupt is going too far in his condemnation. He then goes on to say, "Immo error librarii tollendus est: Nemesianus enim scripsisse uidetur quis anni ter quinquae hiemae et CRVDA IVVENTA, quo non puerilia optantium aetatem nondum aduantem apertius indicaret, (ac dixit similiter Silius XII 348 crudos sine viribus annos)". This is a clever conjecture but, I think, wrong: cura iuuentae surely takes up and elaborates on non puerilia uota in the line above. I also adds hymeni sed to Haupt's cruda iuuenta - an ingenious though grotesque emendation - but hymen used in the sense of "marriage" would appear to be indeclinable.

Ellis's conjecture, uirent et crura, is palaeographically unlikely, and makes extremely poor sense. Baehrens's increscit makes better sense, though it fails to bring out the probable contrast between pueris and iuuentae, and is also palaeographically unlikely.

Birt (The Halleutica of Ovid, p. 191) would read biennis... iuuentae, saying that et has crept in, as it has in u. 51, but
the adjective biennis is very rare, and mention of a iuuenca is surely quite irrelevant. G. Orlandi (studia mediev. 17 (‘976), 738 n. 5) would also read iuuencae, taking it as nominative, but he does not say whether he also reads biennis.

The emendation of Summers, et mens, is clever, and not impossible palaeographically, but it seems to require et or set (sed), rather than et before it, so that u. 9 then elaborates on u. 8: "they were fifteen, but they had the minds and cares of young men." Verdière's hinc mens (Eos 56 (1966-1969), 179-80), would be an easy corruption, but is less satisfactory from the point of view of sense.

It does not seem to me possible to justify the reading of the manuscripts and none of the emendations is entirely convincing. I therefore obelize the whole line.

11 This line has troubled some editors, and various emendations have been suggested, but although the line is somewhat tortuously phrased, the reading of the manuscripts can be defended.

Maehly objects to tam because it is not followed by quam or ut and suggests non iam, in the sense of non amplius. This is an elegant conjecture, but unnecessary, as a general comparative clause such as "as it did before" is to be understood.

The use of de here has also caused difficulty. de must belong with uoce and not with tenui filo as it would appear to be impossible for de to follow the adjective and noun which it governs. Maehly says that filo de is "ein binding" without defining precisely what he finds objectionable about it, though no doubt he means that it is impossible for de to follow just
the noun, where there is no adjective or dependent genitive.

He would therefore read *sua filia* or *filum ceu* and remarks
that *sua filia* "scheint noch an gerathensten zu sein, wenn man
dem Lichter nicht etwa die Abgeschmacktheit zutrauen will;
cuod non iam tenui, filum ceu, uoce sonaret", but neither of
these conjectures gives good sense. Titius in the margin of his
copy suggests *tenui de filo*, which is not in my opinion a very
useful alteration, and *de more* of the Deventer editions looks
like an early and not very happy emendation. I am not clear
quite how Glaeser means his *voxquae* to be taken. Furman is
perhaps nearer the mark when he says that *de* "non temere
additur, ne duo ablative voce, filo impedirent sensum." *de* is
here used with a modal or instrumental ablative, as at 3.64,
Anth. Lat. (Riese) 246.2 dulce de labris locuntur, and often in
Latin literature (see TIl. 5 62 23ff.). A. Judeman (TIl. 5 62 19)
says "certa exempla non ante saec. 1 ubia, sed nonnulla priora
iam proxime ad hunc uulgarem usum accedunt. inde ab Apul. deest
apud nemen et plerisque recentioris aetatis in deliciis
habetur." *sonare uoce* appears at Silius 2.491 and Calpurnius
2.4.

I would translate the line "because her voice did not sound
so fine and delicate as it used to do."

12 sollicitumque (foret pinguis sonus) The use of the neuter
sollicitumque at first sight seems puzzling, but it is
probably to be explained as meaning "a circumstance causing
apprehension", cf. K-3 1, p. 32 "Die in Griechischen häufig
vorkommende Konstruktion, in der auf ein Subjekt, wenn es
nicht als ein bestimmter Gegenstand, sondern als einen
allgemeiner Begriff (als ein Ding oder Wesen) aufgefasst werden
soll, das prädikative Adjektiv ohne Rücksicht auf das Genus
Ularius conjectures sollicituscue, which is unnecessary. Heinsius suggests insolitumcue, but this is rather feeble. sollicitum here means "worrying", as at Cic. Hil. 2.5 guid magis sollicitum dici potest; Ovid Met. 7.454 sollicitumcue alicuid laetis interuenit etc.

Pincuis sonus V reads linguis onus. Stegen (Iatonus 25 (1966), 313) translates V's text "et qu'il y avait un fardeau d'inquiétude sur sa langue" and compares Catullus 51.6-8 and Virgil Aen. 4.76 incipit effari mediaque in uoce resistit, but as Wernsdorf points out, linguis refers only to Donace, and the use of the plural linguis of one person's tongue would be unparalleled. Wernsdorf attempts to justify the use of the plural in two ways, firstly by comparing Hor. Epist. 1.5.18 sollicitis animis onus exinit, and attributing the plurals both in Horace and Mem. to metrical necessity, and secondly by suggesting that linguis refers to the boys as well, since Donace's parents can recognise signs of guilt in them, too. The first suggestion I find unlikely, and the context of the Horace passage is different, and his second suggestion seems to me an unnatural way of taking the line, especially next to the singular ceruix. Castagna ("Fonti Greche dei 'bucolica' di Kemepiano," Aevum 44 (1970), 437), supports Stegen's interpretation, comparing a fragment ascribed to Callimachus,
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(1. Pfeiffer, *Fragmenta*, Oxford 1934, vol. I, p. 475, fn. 754), saying, "Il nostro verso nemisiano pare una traduzione abbastanza fedele di questo frammento," but *larius* would be a much nearer translation than *onus*, which gives quite a different sense, and I can find no parallel for the use of *onus* with *lingua*.

"*Gnu* read *pinguis sonus*. Stégen asks if *pinguis* "est bien le terme propre pour une voix de femme." The answer to this question lies in his objection that with *pinguis sonus*, *u*. 12 "n'ajoute pas grand-chose à l'idée du vers précédent." *u*. 12 in fact enlarges on *u*. 11: she speaks *non tam tenui filo*, i.e. her voice has *pinguis sonus*. It is true, as Stégen points out, that the use of *pinguis* of a woman's voice is apparently unparalleled, but it is used of sounds as at Gell. 13.24.4, where he describes *urbes* as *pinguius* than *urbie*, and in view of the use of *tenui filo* of the voice in *u*. 11, the use of *pinguis* here must be considered admissible.

There has been some speculation as to the significance of *pinguis sonus*. Glaeser says that this change in Lonace's voice indicates pregnancy and Wernsdorf (exc. xviii, p. 335), supported by Schenkl, says that it is a sign of lost virginity. I can find no evidence that either idea was current in antiquity. It is impossible to be sure that Nem. means here. The whole description from *u*. 11-3 is rather obscure, but I would think it probable that Lonace's voice is *pinguis* through excess of emotion.

*improba ceruix* Burman says that *improba* here means *grandior, tumescens*, and Barth rightly compares Catullus 64.377. For
improbis used in the sense of "large", cf. Columella 6.1.3

cenibus improbis, uncilis narnis; Stat. Theb. 6.379 hominem
suer improbus eexit. Ellis on Catullus 64.377 quotes a story
from Ramage's *Looks and Lynxes of Italy*, p. 208. Ramage met
"an intelligent inhabitant" in Venusia who told him that it was
a custom in Southern Italy to "measure the neck of a
marriageable youth or maiden correctly with a ribbon; then
double the length, and bringing the two ends together, place the
middle of it between the teeth. If we find it is sufficiently
long to be carried from the mouth over the head without
difficulty, it is a sign that the person is still a virgin, but
if not, we are to infer the contrary."

17 *genas leues* The second Aldine edition reads *genis leues*, but
this is apparently an emendation to bring about a chiasmus with
*intonsi crinibus*.

*intonsi* The adjective *intonsus* is usually found either in the
ablative case qualifying a noun, or followed by a Greek
accusative, and probably for this reason has been altered to
*intonsis* in v. *intonsus* followed by the ablative is, however,
perfectly acceptable and is found also at Apul. *flor.* 3, p. 14
*coma intonsus et genis fratus* and Erac. *laud. dei* 1.395
*caesaries intonsa comis*.

18 *haec sub* As Schenkl points out, V's *sub haec* is probably an
interpolation from Calpurnius 4.2. Here it is meaningless, since
no plane-trees have hitherto been mentioned. AH's *hi sub* would
give us a rather ugly line-opening, and KG's *hic sub* makes no
sense. H. Schenkl's *hinc sub* would be rather obscure, since
there is nothing nearby to which it could reasonably refer. I therefore prefer Glaeser's conjecture haec sub. The readings of \( \text{HG} \) and \( \text{AH} \) could easily have come about through confusion of abbreviations.

19 Ιέας καλαίας et uersibus Alcon  The same distinction is made again at vv. 53-4, and at Virgil Æne. 5.2 tu calamos inflare leuis, c.r dicere uersus where also both men go on to sing. The reason for this distinction is not clear to me.

21 Haides  As Schenkl ("Zu Calpurnius" All. 1 (1884), 292) and Ehwald (ZPhW 35 (1887), 1084) point out, the reading of most of most of the manuscripts and many of the editions, nαίδες, is unmetrical. The form nαίς, nαίδις (or nαίδος) is the more common, according to Lewis and Short.

22 litora...gramina H and G are confused here, and Barth would read gramina, litora. But Rem. is very probably imitating Ovid Am. 2.11.15 litora marmoreis pedibus signate ruellae, and V's reading is to be preferred. Beck explains that pervireoque alitis per gramina flores means that the nymphs nourish the flowers because they water them as they go.

25 trini  The distributive is here used for the cardinal. Originally the distributive was used in this way in the case of plural nouns where only one object was meant, but later the use was extended to ordinary plurals e.g. Pliny H.N. 2.99 trinos soles anticiu saepius uidere, 7.169 etc. See K-S 1, p. 660. In late Latin the distinction between terni and trini was no longer clear and they were used interchangeably.
ex quo exrecto expecto is a perfect-present used with a temporal conjunction. See line 2, p. 305.

Ulitius's conjecture liberunt is certain. Hem. is probably remembering here Virgil Buc. 5.25-6. The readings of the manuscripts, all corrupt, give some interesting indications as to their value and relationships. H comes nearest to the truth, while G's reading is nonsense. The reading of AHV is clearly an attempt at emendation, while in the remaining manuscripts lamb- has crept in from the line below.

Originally aer signified the lower air and aether the upper, but this distinction became blurred, see Til. 1 1151 61. Thus we have aethera completere at Virgil Aen. 7.395; 12.724 and Lucan 8.658, but aera completere at Ovid Met. 14.557 and Iuuenae. 1.172. Therefore, either aera (the reading of AHV) or aethera (the reading of G) would be perfectly acceptable here. I have preferred aera because, owing to the interpolated nature of G, the reading of AHV is usually to be preferred where AHV agree against G. (See my section on the Relationships of the Manuscripts). atria in i is perhaps a reminiscence of Ovid Met. 5.153 ululatue atria Complent.

Rooy (Epigrasia Critica, Dortrecht, p. 110) would read bidentes here, as he says that although herdsmen in love exaggerate, it is still unlikely that they would boast of having a thousand heifers, and he compares Virgil Buc. 2.21 (agnae) and Calpurnius 2.68 (agnae) which he says Hem. is imitating. But there are several objections to this conjecture. First, it is stated in u. 29 (uaccae) and u. 32 (uituli) that it is cows which Idas tends, not sheep. It is possible, too, that
Hem. is here remembering the words of Polyphemus at Calypso.

11.34 Μοτά χίλια ρόσκω

Again, a thousand need not mean "a thousand" but simply a large number, as at Virgil Aen. 5.59; 8.231 and Tib. 1.3.50, and in Hem. himself at 4.69 and 2.3. 1.

As at Virgil Buc. 2.20, a herdsman who is very probably a slave speaks of the animals he tends as though they were his own.

38-9 These lines are repeated from Calpurnius (3.57-8).

39 inter calamos errantia C. Szemerényi (Ch. 3 809 42) comments on this use of inter, "loc. temp.?", but the latter interpretation seems to me impossible, for calamos would in that case have to refer to the actual playing of the pipe, which does not appear to be a possible use, and it is difficult to see how errantia would then have to be taken. erro with inter is rare, but does occur also at Hor. Carm. 3.19.13.

41 uviolæus simillimus erro Horace has the same idea at Carm. 3.10.14 tintæus viola pallor amantium. Page on Virgil Buc. 2.47 pallentis violas translates viola as "wall-flower" and comments, "The 'paleness' of an Italian complexion, it should be remembered, is 'yellow' rather than 'white', hence the colour of gold is described in Latin as 'paleness' and pallere is used of a yellow rather than a white hue. Cf. Georg. 1.446; Hor. Epod. 10.16; Met. 11.110." atrae in a may be an interpolation from Virgil Buc. 10.39.

42 nostri...Bacchi We have-glores Bacchi with uini, see
for similar cases of this type of error, a gloss intruding into the text. The significance of nostri here is not clear. It may be used to indicate affection or approval as at Plautus Bud. 125; Cic. _Fr. 1.1.3: Idas wants to drink but cannot (correo), just as he wants to sleep and cannot, and speaks of sleep in approving terms (placido). Alternatively, nostri may be used in the sense of "with which we are both familiar", as at _Cart. 10.64.3 heliconis gloria nostri, where Lertial is talking of himself and Lucan. Heinsius and Z Brukhusius (on Tib. 1.9.64) both conjecture _noti and the latter compares the fragment attributed to Petronius (fr. 35.2 = Anth. Lat. (diese) 1.467) nec noto stomachum conciliare mere, where, however, Vossianus L.C. 66 has _tote, but there the context is different, as the wine is being taken for medicinal purposes, as often in the poets. Thus, although the use of nostri is vague here, I can see no reason to alter it.

44 fusca As at u. 1 and elsewhere in the poems, the scribe of the hyparchetype of _V has decided that Hem. must not simply imitate Calpurnius closely, but repeat him verbatim. It is more understandable that there should be tampering with the text in this poem than in the others, as Hem. has taken several complete lines from Calpurnius 3 (2.47 = Cal. 3.55; 2.58-9 = Cal. 3.57-8) and has followed him more closely than usual elsewhere. But there is no reason to doubt the veracity of _EGA here, the more reliable branch of the tradition.

47-8 Hem. is imitating Calpurnius very closely in these lines and u. 47 as it stands repeats Cal. 3.55. Titius conjectures
ian for et, presumably because some V manuscripts read ian at Cal. 3.55, and C. Jochenski suggests tunc, no doubt in order to create an anaphora with u. 49, but I see no reason for emendation. et is, admittedly, redundant as regards sense, but serves to introduce the series of results of Lonae's appearance.

Calpurnius at 3.53-4 also has the pattern si...et...et (here -sue)...et, but here the final et causes a prosodic hiatus, not found elsewhere in the Eclogues. Some of the manuscripts here have tried to "mend" the metre by substituting tun or tunc for et, but either of these would come in very awkwardly and neither tun nor tunc is found in the middle of a line elsewhere in Nem. Beck rightly defends et in u. 48 by pointing out that Nem., as well as Calpurnius, is imitating Virgil Buc. 3.63 munera sunt, lauri et susae rubens hyacinthus where there is also a prosodic hiatus.

50 dum...amat dum is not here used as a restrictive particle in a conditional clause as equivalent to dummodo (see TLL 5 2207 75), but as a conjunction expressing contemporaneous action, so that the indicative is required here.

unguine Heinsius, who was aware only of V's sanguine, conjectured unguine from Arnob. nat. 1.39 lapidem ex olui unguine sordicatur, and this is in fact the reading of LCAH, but he later came down ir favour of sanguine because of Arnob. nat. 1.2.4 Olearum ex baculis cruror teeter exprimitur. Both readings can therefore be paralleled, but in view of the fact that V is the less reliable branch of the tradition, I have preferred LCAH's unguine.
Glaeser's conjecture here is inspired and certainly correct. The name \textit{Laec}, i.e. \(\Delta \nu \omicron\), for \textit{Lemeter}, is not attested elsewhere in Latin, but we do have the adjectives \textit{Lecis} (Proserpina) at Ovid \textit{Iust.} 6.117; \textit{Ps. Lect. Plac. Fab. Luv.} 6.1; Auson. 393, 50 and \textit{Leucius} at Ovid \textit{Iust.} 6.753. This unusual noun no doubt baffled a scribe, who, mistaking it for an oblique case of \textit{deus}, and perceiving that the phrase demanded a nominative, altered his text. It is interesting that \textit{H} represents this first stage in the corruption of the text. Later, \textit{et} was added to restore the metre, as we see in \textit{V}. In the \textit{HG} tradition the process has continued still further: \textit{uites} has been ousted by \textit{uusas}, perhaps a gloss, and in \textit{H} this renders the line unmetrical, if \textit{el's} is taken to represent \textit{deus}. \textit{G} by rearranging the words has restored the metre. Heinsius and Burman have both tried to emend \textit{V}'s reading, but the sense demands the mention of \textit{Lemeter}, as Ulitius saw, as it would be a striking omission if the corn-goddess were not included in this list of deities responsible for fruits and crops. Sackenius's rearrangement of the word-order to bring in \textit{L}'s \textit{uusas} seems to me quite unwarranted.

\textit{54 curae} All the manuscripts read \textit{aurea} and this adjective is used of words or speech also at Lucr. 3.12; Cic. \textit{ad.} 2.119; \textit{Ec off.} 3.70; Fulg. \textit{Virgiliana Continentis}, p. 154 \(\times\) (Helm), but it is inappropriate here, as the nature of Iphoebus's songs is not relevant to what Alcon sings. Haupt emends to \textit{curae}, possibly thinking of Virgil \textit{Buc.} 3.61 \textit{illi mea carmina curae} (i.e. to Jupiter) and \textit{Stat. Theb.} 3.659, and this makes better sense, since it is Alcon's songs we are concerned with here.

\textit{62-4 licet.../...necit} Here, as at Cyn. 232, all the manuscripts (except \textit{j} which has \textit{necat}) have the indicative \textit{necit}. 
There is evidence for the use of the indicative with licet in prose in the Imperial period from Cyriacus on (see 7.1565 ff.), but it does not seem to be found in poetry until the fifth century (see RHS 2, p. 605), that is probable that Arnold is right to propose the subjunctive norit here. The corruption from norit to noutit could easily have happened, especially with the indicative scit directly below it. Nevertheless, a case could be made out for the indicative.

62 clausa Haupt conjectures claucae, presumably to be taken with fores, since he objects to the reading of the manuscripts on the ground that "clausa luscina non potest libera ferri." clausa is, however, a quite appropriate epithet to apply to a bird before it is released and I can see no reason to alter the reading of the manuscripts.

67 paruae Mackley, who accepts Haupt's conjecture claucae in u. 62, says that we need to be told here to what the fores belong, and therefore suggests caueae. But this is unnecessary; we can infer from contexto uimine clausa that they belong to a cage of some sort, and the point about the bird's unexpected preference is made better if cauean is held back until u. 66.

66 totis Heinsius, comparing Virgil aen. 7.491 errabat siluis, rursusque ad ligna nota, conjectures notis. Purman rejects this, comparing 4.6, and comments "nam notam deberet domum uel caueam potius uocare, quam siluan, in quibus errabat modo, sed in cauea habitabit." totis is here used as equivalent to omnibus, see my note on 4.66 and also udi 2, p. 233. Compare also Cyn. 49 totis...aruis.
71 te leretem Here again it would appear likely that V has altered an unusual expression to a more common one. To may be accusative or ablative, but the use of either case with terem is unusual. terem is used with the accusative at Ilesius Icer. 1075 and Appuquem Truc. 1, and with the ablative at Truc. 2.15.3.

cuoc The reading of G. IV read luceam, which is not impossible as the subjunctive could be justified as being due to assimilation of moods, or to the fact that we have a clause dependent on a subjunctive clause, or to the extension of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses generally in late Latin (see Lib. 2, pp. 547 and 575). It is, however, very likely that here IV are simply altering under the influence of the subjunctive earlier in the line.

72 Apollo Apollo killed the Cyclopes who made the thunderbolt which killed his son Asclepius and as a punishment was made the serf of Admetus, king of Therai, and looked after his cattle.

Volpilheo criticises Ken. for having "forgotten" that Apollo was a cowherd not a shepherd, but neither rectex nor rectus is restricted in use to sheep, and clearly rectus here must refer to cattle after the reference in u. 71.

73 Pan doctus This is the only example cited in Lib. of this epithet applied to Pan, but it is elsewhere used of the divus (Catull. 65.2; Ovid A. A. 3.411 etc.), of Fauss (aen. in Lacer. 1.17) and of Phoebus (Stat. Silv. 5.3.91) and is no doubt used of Pan here because of his rôle as patron of the arts.

Fauni uates Fauns are connected with uates at Ann. ann. 2.4

Fauni uatescue canebant. Fauns was endowed with uncuscular and
prophetic power (Cic. Nat. 2.2.4; Liv. 1.45; Virgil Aen. 7.677; Lioz. lat. V.6.2 etc.) gave his answers in dreams or supernatural voices. This method of manifestation seems to have given rise to the idea of plurality of deities, who are here accredited with the prophetic power of Janus.

75 nunnusos This adjective may have meant "red" as it does at Cvid. Let. 3.164 where it is used of aurora, or "shining", as at Virgil Aen. 1.590 and Cvid. Fast. 6.252, where it is used of light.

 Ortus The fact that orbes appears only in v3, whose readings sometimes seem due to conjecture (e.g. at 3.26) suggests that this variant is also conjectural. Burman prefers orbes, comparing Cyn. 206, where the sense is uncertain, Tib. 2.4.53 and Cvid. Fast. 3.517, but the expression tolleret ortus can be paralleled by Virgil. Geor. 4.544 aurora ostenderit ortus and 4.552 aurora induxerat ortus.

75-6 cum tolleret... splenderet Determinative cum occurs with the subjunctive in classical Latin only at Cael. Cic. exist. 8.2 sermones... cui de eo tum fuerant, cum iussus nos esseurus, but is more frequent in later Latin. (see LL 2, p. 622).

82 indociti calamis This is the only example of indociti with the plain ablative cited by Gumpoltsberger (ILL 7 1215 76-7). On the other hand, indociti with an accusative, calamus, the conjecture of Heinsius, is also rare: ILL cites only Gall. 9.7.5 homo...pleracu alia non indocit us reque in iuderes. But Keene is probably right to compare 4.2 calamus ac verum ductus, and the
...ablative is surely acceptable here. Some prints have indicat
valesque, but as Ackland says (Phlm. 35 (1967), 335), this is
surely a scribal error.

locutus locuti is used of the sound of musical instruments, for
example, also at Puc. Linea. 1.25 and Apul. Gct. 5.15.

Neu. is here imitating, and very nearly borrowing wholesale, Cal.
A.16 Tityron e siluis dominam deduxit in urbem.

dominam...urbem For the locution dominam...urbem see the note
on 1.83.

cantabimur The majority of the manuscripts read cantabimus
and Volpilhac comments (p. 69), "les vers 82-84 semblent bien
indiquer qu'Alcon représente le poète. N'est-il pas dès lors
logique d'admettre que, comme en 1.82-8, il souhaite aller
chanter lui-même à Rome?" I have discussed elsewhere, in my
section on the Authorship of the Poems, the dangers of attempting
to identify the characters in these poems with real people.
Volpilhac quotes in support of his theory Hor. Serm. 2.1.46;
Ovid Trist. 4.10.59 and Stat. Silv. 1.2.197, but none of these
passages supports his interpretation. Ehrman rightly says, "sine
dubio cantabimus, id est celebrabimus...nam an propter Lonacen
cantaret urbi?" Alcon is ambitious, and wants to be famous in
Rome, not merely to be there.

inter inter here governs cupressos, although lec. is doubt-
less imitating Virgil Puc. 1.25 quantum lenta solent inter
uibusra cupressi, where inter can only govern uibusra. That
inter should govern eum, peneus is necessary both to the sense and to the balance with v. 67, where the more humble tree, the hazel, can only be the subject of frontispice. Alone is a humble poet who may be allowed to shine among the more noble poets of Rome.

87 pinus  Neue (1, pp. 769-79) reads pinoe in this line but the evidence which he quotes seems to suggest that pinus was an earlier form, as it occurs at Lmn. ann. 267; Cato Ann. 29.1; Varro R.R. 15 and in some manuscripts at Virgil Ec. 8.22 and Gna. 2.41.3 (Read), whereas in those of Virgil, Ovid, Lucret, Valerius Flaccus, Statius and Martial the form pinus is nearly always found, and I have therefore preferred this form here.

88 toto sub sole  "beneath the long day's sun", or perhaps simply "all day." If the latter, for totus in the ablative used to denote the duration of time, cf. Cic. H.l. 2.105, 108, 133; Catull. 109.5; Caes. B.G. 1.26.5; Curt. 8.6.19 and see LEX 2, p. 203; and for the use of sub when it appears to add nothing to the sense, see Housman FOPhS 1927, 5; (=Classical Papers 3, p. 1274).

89 descendere  The manuscripts are almost equally divided between descendere and discedere here. The latter verb is of course perfectly acceptable and is often used with e (see TLL 5 239 19ff.), but there has been some argument as to what descendere would signify here. Kernodell says that descendere is here equivalent to abire, but the word is used in this sense apparently only to refer to departure from public office, as at Seneca Clem. 1.2.2 and Lucret 1.354-5. Earth quotes as parallels for descendere as equivalent to abire, Virgil Aen. 11.450 and Prop. 2.4.19, but in the former case descendere must be used in
its literal sense because its subject, an army, is advancing partly along the mountains (see u. 51) and Joannin on u. "50), and "as to come now to reach the plains, and in the latter case, descendere is used because the boat is moving downstream with the tide. Therefore, as far as I can see, if descendere is the correct reading here, downward motion must be implied. Schenkl points out that shepherds sit under trees uphill to avoid the heat and compares Cal. 4.118, and we learn from Pliny extist. 2.17.5 that cows were kept on hills in winter, although it is not necessary to suppose that the cows were uphill here, only that the herdmen may have been. Jaehrens conjectures descedere, presumably thinking of Virgil Geor. 4.186-7 but descendere is not in need of emendation.

Both descedere and descendere appear to me equally likely readings, but as N seems to be marginally the most reliable manuscript, I have adopted its reading descendere.
Lyctilus. This name appears to be unique to Hes. Menech (p. 52) comments, "Certo uero dicere possumus hoc nomen fabulas, non ueritatisuisse, cum de nocte infesta Graeci noctina sua non duxerint. Liberi cognomen Νυκτέλιος docere uidetur personam quendam ab eius latere ita appellatasuisse." The name Νυκτέλιος has been found on a gravestone now in the British Museum (CIG 4.6859). The name Lyctilus, if it is indeed connected with Νυκτέλιος, may be used here because Νυκτέλιος is an epithet of Dionysus (A.P. 9.521.4; Plutarch 2.399a, Pausanias 1.40.6), and Bacchus occupies a large proportion of the poem. Noccius is no doubt influenced by Hes. when he uses the name Lectylus for one of the characters in his own ecoloue.

atque icon fire' read ικον and y et ικον, but the first syllable of the name must be short, as at Theocr. 5.112 Μικον, Virgil Buc. 3.10, 7.30 and Cat. 5.1.

νομον et A double negative used for an emphatic affirmative, further strengthened by a redundant et, as at Virgil Aen. 8.461. This connecting formula is not used before Virgil and is not found in prose before the first century A.D. It is found often in the elder Pliny, once in Quinilian, and also in Columella, Suetonius, Florus and the legal writers. From Virgil, the formula spread to Ovid, Lucan, Statius and the later poets. See LIM 2, p. 524; Lofstedt Per. Aeth. p. 95ff.; Kübler LIM 6, p. 180; Lease LIM 10, p. 390.
Amyntas  This name is first used in bucolic poetry by Theocritus (7.2). It is used also by Virgil (in Bucolics 2, 7, 5 and 9) and Calpurnius (I, 9) and again by Hes. at 4.62.

2 This is one of several lines which Hes. has borrowed from Calpurnius and used without any alteration.

3 Pan is pictured resting from hunting also at Theocr. 1.5.

recumbere  This verb is rare but classical and is also found, for example, in Lucretius (once), Tibullus (once), Virgil (5 times), Ovid (twice) and Valerius Flaccus (once).

4 somno laxatus sumere uires

laxatus  There is some confusion in the manuscripts here.

lassatus, the reading of Hes.2v2 would be virtually redundant as we already have fessus in u. 3. Labglinuvxz read lassatas, which has found favour with many editors, and Schübler (AD 212 (1927), 120) asserts that this is the correct reading. lassatas would be acceptable if sumere here means "regain", but I can find no evidence for the use of sumere as equivalent to resumere. G reads laxatas, which Hein. approved, and which may be taken as a transferred epithet, but the most satisfactory reading is in my opinion laxatus, which is found in the margin of q. This reading, with which may be compared Virgil Aen. 5.336 placida laxabant membra cuiate, balances fessus in u. 5 and has the support of Hoeufft (Fericula poet. et crit. III, p. 326). Schrader suggests resolutus, which is unnecessary.

sumere uires  This phrase seems to have worried some editors, as
it often means "other strength (for an attack)", cf. Ovid et.
3.5.0 utque (locum) solent sumere in carmine, utique esse... ibid. 3.6.2 utque in corpus sumere. It can, however, also be used to
mean "take strength from" with the ablative, without suggestion
of attack, as at Ovid ep. 4.10.42 et (locum) sumit utque re
tropone loco, and cf. ibid. 3.4.5 surpissens talis clamore
utique. Barth would read lessus resumere, saying that the
scansion <B is found, but he does not say where, and I find his
conjecture improbable.

5 ex Whilst ex is the preferred form in Latin literature before
vowels, either e or ex can be used before any consonant (see Leue
2, p. 375ff.). Caesar always uses ex before t, but Lucretius on the
other hand always has e (see Lachmann on 6.1018). Kem.'s own
usage is of little help here, since he has the set phrase ex cuc
twice (2.26, Cyn. 124) and also e silvis twice (2.34, 89). It is
perhaps, then, safest to adopt the reading of G, one of the more
reliable manuscripts, G having a lacuna at this point.

6 praedam All the manuscripts read praedam here, but its
significance is rather difficult to establish. Attempts to justify
this reading have been few and unconvincing, and many editors
have followed Titius in reading praedam.

Burman supports praedam, comparing Cyn. 191 and Cal. 6.30
where V reads praedam nactus, but he admits that he cannot explain
the significance of praedam sumere pro carmine, "nisi... loco
carmina, quod poscereant, & negaverat Pan, nunc furaretur eius
fistulam." There is, however, no evidence that Pan has refused to
sing to the young men; indeed, his words at v. 12 (si carmina
poscitis) imply that he did not know they wished him to sing, and
Burman is perhaps taking pro carmine in the wrong sense (see below). Volpilhac is surely correct when he says, "les bergers ne se contentent pas de prendre la flûte pour obtenir de Pan qu'il joue, ils tentent eux-mêmes de jouer." Volpilhac goes on to say, however, that the phrase praedam sumere is "fréquent" in Nem., which is misleading, as it occurs only twice more, at Cyn. 50 and 184 and in a quite different context, in the sense of "prey." The reading of the manuscripts appears to me to mean, "as if they were able to seize it (i.e. the fistula) as booty for the sake of a song", and the significance of these words is explained by uu. 8-10 and 13-4: the pipe will not play for anyone but Pan. pro is here used in a final sense, "in order to get", as at Venantius Fortunatus V.M. 4.304 (p. 357, ed. F. Leo) pro munere currens; Orosius 7.3.2 persecutionibus, quas pro uita aeterna exciperent, and see S. Blomgren, Studia Fortunatiana, Uppsala 1933, p. 26, and J. Svennung, Orosiana, Uppsala 1922, p. 41f.

Editors who support praedem here have perhaps been deluded by the general similarity of this scene to that in Virgil Buc. 6 into thinking the resemblance more close than it is (Silenus at Virgil Buc. 6.18-9 is described as having broken his promise to sing). praedem might be acceptable if it could be used as equivalent to pignus, but there is no evidence that such a use is possible, and even if it were, this would not explain why Nem. did not simply use the unambiguous pignus. praes is an unpoetic word and is not used by Lucretius, Horace, Virgil, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid, Seneca, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, Statius or Silius Italicus; indeed, the only example of its use in poetry which I have been able to find is at Ausonius Technopaegnion 12.2, though there may well be others.

Dunlop concedes that if praedem is the correct reading here,
it is used loosely, as it refers neither to a person nor to money, but nevertheless compares Cic. att. 2.52. preer stre similisque, which passage is, however, quite irrelevant to the banalities of the context here, see Shackleton Bailey ad loc. and on att. 9.24. Also, as Beck points out, praedan...accords ill with invadunt furtu (u. 8). All in all, I can see no reason to reject praedan.

9 suerat A contracted pluperfect used for the imperfect, as often in poetry. See my note on 1.18.

contextere carmen This metaphor also occurs at Cic. Gall. 3.13 contextere hoc carmen liceret, andFinder lrm. 2.2 ἑρρητῶν ἐπεων λοιδοῦ.

10 male The intensive use of male is colloquial. J.J. Hofmann (Lateinische Umgangssprache, Heidelberg 1926, p. 74), says, "Es trat zunächst zu Verben und Adj. der Furcht, Besorgnis, des Hasses und verwandter Geinitzbezüge, z.B. Ter Haut. 664 quam ti-rui male, Ad. 523 illud rus...tam male odii (Caes. Cic. Att. 14,1,2), dann umgangssprachlich zu andern, so in häufigem male mulcatus (Flaut., Ter., Acc., Cic. Var. 5,9, Pheadr. 1,3,9), dann bei Catull (10,3 insulae male), Hor. Sat., Sulpicia; Mart...Die selbe Funktion...im Roman., vgl. ital. malcaritate usw."

sibila Neuter plural, metri gratia, from sibilus (m.), as sibili is non-dactylic.

12 iamque uidens Understand either Myotilon, Hiconem et Amyrten, or, less likely, with —erdorf, "that his pipe had been taken." There is a third possibility: the identical phrase occurs
at Virgil loc. 6.21, where Silenus has just been roused from sleep, and Servius explains uidenti by uivilanti, "with his eyes open", "wide awake", which Johnston say is unparalleled.
Page translates "now beginning to open his eyes."

14 coniurabo for the short final -o see my excursus.

15 Lenaeus The less well-known name for the god Bacchus, Lenaeus, has become corrupt in some manuscripts and the sense of the line has been restored by conjecture, with erro inserted to restore the metre, or possibly Bacche is a gloss which has intruded into the text.

semina Titius seems to have taken this word literally, which led him to conjecture stamina, but semina is used here in its common sense of "origins", though Nem. perhaps intended it to carry the meaning "sowing" as well.

17 fatus coepit HV's reading, with the participle first, is rather better than NG's cepit fatus. Glaeser's conjecture occoemit fatus is ingenious, but occirio does not seem to be used by the poets, except perhaps in Ausonius and Cyprianus Gallus, and possibly at Lucretius 5.889.

montiuanus A rare, mainly poetic, adjective, also used by Lucretius and Statius. It is used as an epithet for Fans at Seneca Phaed. 734.

Fan This is the only example of a monosyllabic ending in Nem. Virgil is quite fond of this type of line-ending and it occurs
It occurs eleven times in *Ovid*, four in *Statius* and only once in *Lucan*. *Nen.* may be here recalling *Ovid*, *Met. 4.535* et *laxibus cannia latitans veniens per fen. For monosyllabic endings in general, see Austin on *Virgil* *Aen.* 4.122; Page on *Aen.* 10.2; *Norden* on *Aen.* 6 p. 47ff., 440ff., 446ff.; *Bridges*, *Itaut* (Chouari), p. 8f.; *Marouzeau*, *Traité de stylistique latine*, pp. 513-6;

"H.L. Rouse CR 1919, 38-40."

19 *fraudis hederata fronte corymbis* *Nen.* appears here to have been influenced by *Virgil* *Luc. 3.39* *diffuser hederam vestit pallente corymbos*; *Tit.* 7.45 *frome redimita corymbis* and *Ovid* *Met.* 3.665 *fraudis...corymbis*. *Hederata fronte* is a local ablative and *fraudis...corymbis* is a sociative ablative dependent on *vites sarta* (*u.* 19).

*hederata* The adjective *hederatus* is rare and late. It is also used by *Tertullian* (*coron.* 7 p. 433, 1) and *Paulinus of Nola* (*carm.* 19.273) to describe * Bacchus* and his retinue, and also occurs in *Sidonius* (*carm.* 9.295).

19 *plicae* For *plico* used in the sense of "plait" cf. *Gell.* 17.9.9

*ita uti orae...cohaerentes lori, quo plicatur, coirent.*

*udo* The discovery of the reading of *N, udo* (since GAH were not known in *Burman's* time), confirmed his suspicion, recorded in his *PLI-I*, vol. 1, *Addenda*, p. 725, that *V* 's *cuando* concealed an epithet. He suspects that *udo* can be taken as describing * Bacchus* himself, or "de madiço flore uini." But the adjective must surely describe the vine-branch, cf. *Stat.* *Theb.* 4.658 *uda mere*
Lamberti reticulis timere, where the corpus is feminine
(u. 656), s\(^2\)'s cum tua, and some early editions' equites, -
from which Leinsius conjectured cum, as timere is always
feminine in the poets (Dean 1, p. 5\textsuperscript{6}ff.), - look like early
attempts at emendation.

21 iam tunc  Laehrens's nam cum has found favour with some
editors, and a causal clause would go well here, except that it
would seem likely that iuno in u. 23 begins a new sentence (see
below on u. 22), which would leave the cum clause without an
apodosis. Also, uu. 23-4 are not the logical result of uu. 21-2.
The majority of the manuscripts read iam tunc, which is
perfectly acceptable: even before Jupiter took over the
pregnancy, Bacchus was already (iam) proved to be uera Io\(\textsuperscript{5}\)a
proles - because Semele alone of mortals had seen Jupiter
undisguised and had been blasted by a thunder-bolt as a result.
I have preferred tunc here, because although this form is in
other writers often used before vowels or the letter g, Hex.
uses it before any letter indiscriminately, and iam tunc is
much more common than iam tunc in later writers (see J.E.
Hofmann in TLL 7 116 26ff.). Surman's nam (tunc) makes sense,
but has less point than iam. It is strange that no one,
apparently, has suggested iam cum: Bacchus was already proved
to be uera Io\(\textsuperscript{5}\)a proles when Semele saw Jupiter undisguised;
the fact that Jupiter took over the pregnancy was a further
proof. Glaeser conjectures cunctiam, which gives good sense, but
it is difficult to see how such a corruption could have come
about.

post sidera esset  Luxlop (p. 194) suggests that this phrase
means "after the thunderbolt from heaven," and indeed the editions Ersigniea, Ascendamia and Aporiniana read post fulmine oscele where oscele is presumably to be taken as an ablative of origin or ablative of place from where. If this is, however, what Seneca meant, there would have been nothing to prevent him from writing fulmine oscele and making the point clear. The nearest parallel to such a use of ficus that I can find is Fliny H. N. 2,82 siderum ignes esse cui deo/4ui ad terras fulminum nonem habant. It is better to take the words in their usual sense: Semele is the only one, apart from the stars of heaven, to see Jupiter in his true form.

post This use of post to mean "except for," "apart from" is rare. K-d 1, p. 535 mentions also Cass. l.2. 6,17,1 decurum maxime mercurium colunt, post hunc Apollinem; Cic. Gall. 1. 7,6 ut sua necessaria post illus honorem habent; Hor. Carm. 3,9,6 nescus erat Lydia post Chloen; Vell. 2,59,1 ciuium post unum eminentissimum; Seneca erist. 104, 9 tantus erit ambitionis furor, ut nemo tibi post te uidetur, si aliquid arte te fuerit; Justin. 42,2,8 cui fines eius (remi) post Farthiam omnium regnorum magnitudinem supervent.

22 Jochenkl, Giarratano, Luff and others punctuate with a comma at the end of this line, but I think it unlikely that Seneca would have switched from invocatory te to hunc in the same sentence: hunc in the next line and hunc in l. 25 are surely in anaphora in the same sentence. I have therefore punctuated with a full stop at the end of l. 22, as do Lusman and Keene.
Juno (Apollodorus 3.4.5).

23 venturi...aeui The same expression also occurs at Virgil, Aen. 3.627 baud...venturi inquiis aeui. Apart for being unnecessary, Beck's futuvi does not scan.

24 restulit As Beck points out, V's produlit is too much like prodixit following, and adds nothing to the sense. restulit means "carry to full term," as at Ovid, Met. 7.57 quaeam (feriae), non perseverunt vertus.

isto produxit tellures vastus for a similar expression of.

25-6 For the probable cause of the omission of u. 25 in some V manuscripts, see my excursus on the relationship of the manuscripts.

26 noceue...nutrixus The majority of the V manuscripts no doubt understand nymeae, which all the V manuscripts read for nysae here, as a case of apostrophe, but a 12 3 2 have thought it necessary to simplify by altering to nutristis. All, however, also have the second person plural, although they preserve u. 25 and nysae in u. 26, and this may be due to the use of a number of different sources, the ali codices which Ugoletus mentions in his colophon.

Fan is not normally connected with the rearins of Bacchus.

nutrixus L. Castiglioni (Studi in onore di Jino Zunerioli, p. 20-1) objects to nutrixus, which he takes as a perfect form, because of its ambiguity next to the present form fucet, sustinet etc. He argues, too, that the preposition in is
superfluous to the sense, and proposes reading *nutritimus* antea.

He will, not, however, insert this into the text, and also regards explanation of such a corruption as unnecessary; a few examples of such contracted perfects are given in Suetonius 3, p. 65, where *nutruimus* is rejected in Cicero, and *nutritus* at Lucan 3.410, but the forms *coinus* in Olympeans, in Lucan 17.2.53 and in some manuscripts of Terence (*Jun.* 5.59); *nutruimus* in Lucan 1.24; *desimus* *Jenaca* *brv. vit.* 17.5; *Fling* *enist.* 3.2.3 in some manuscripts; *lacessimus* *Brut.* and *Cass.* (*Sal. Fam.* 17.3.1) and *repetitis* *Jenaca* *consol. helv.* 3.10, are accepted. But it is in my opinion unlikely that *nutritus* is a contracted perfect form at all; in view of the presence of *fouet* and *sustinet* in u. 20, it is almost certain that *nutritus*, too, is historic present.

27 *veneratus* Schubert (*Acta Soc. Philol. Line.* 22 (1974), 49) proposes *veteranus*, saying that it contrasts well with *servum* and fits well with *sene* in u. 25. It is true that Silenus is often described in poetry as *senex* (e.g. at Cvid. *Aem.* 1.543; *Fast.* 6.339) or senior (*Fast.* 1.399), but *veteranus* is an unpoetic word, although it occurs at *Frid.* 2.1082 and *Iraec. Hev.* 1.100, and is used to mean "old" only in technical language. There is nothing impossible about *veneratus* of the manuscripts: Silenus is a mere demi-god and *Bacchus* one of the great gods.

29 *uoecat aut* For *uoecare* in the sense of "elicit" cf. *Jenaca enist.* 27 *risum uoecare luarentibus*. K's *aut uoecat ad* makes sense, but looks like an emendation of *V*, or possibly a conflation of the *NG* and *V* readings. *V* reads *et uoecat ad*, which is accepted by early editors and is also possible, cf. *Livy* 23.15 *Carthaginenses fessos nox imbercuc ad necessarium quisten uoecat*, but it is
more likely that its reading is a corruption of vice versa: *mucere* could have been misread as *mucare* and then cut altered to *ad* to restore the sense.

For *ad* placed second in the clause cf. *Lucri. 6.325; Virgil* *Geor. 1.402, Aen. 1.363* etc.

notuce This, Glaeser's conjecture, is required by the sense: *notuce* would link *suocat...risum* and *euisem aliquet* as if they were simultaneous actions, which would be nonsense.

32 *adstrictis* Lsel here in the sense of "grasps," as at Valerius Flaccus 1.232 *adstrictis ut se lit cornibus helve.*

33 *mutilum* This adjective is found from Cicero and Caesar on, and its basic meaning is "cut off," see Walde-Hoffmann 2, p. 176f. It later became used to mean "with horns cut off" or "hornless" as at Ovid A.A. 3.249, but this would be a strange epithet to apply to Silenus, who is sometimes portrayed as having horns, and *mutilum* has therefore been interpreted as "bald," a common attribute of Silenus. This would then, according to Til, be the only example of *mutilus* with this meaning, apart from Gloss. *Ansil.* 15 395 *mutilo capite; tonso capite* which presumably refers to monks. Plautus (Capt. 269) uses *admutile* for *tondere.* *mutile* would appear, therefore, to mean "bald" only when the hair has actually been cut off, which is clearly not the case here. *mutile* perhaps refers to the abnormally short forehead which Silenus often has in paintings, cf. Apul. *Let. 1:0.29.*

33 *mutile* rotunda atque *mutile* where again the adjective is applied to a part of the body without literal cutting off being involved.
All the manuscripts read at here, North suggests but, which would be appropriate, as we have a succession of disjunctive particles in vv. 29-30 and again in vv. 32-3, and v. 34 completes the description. It does occur, however, in conclusions after disjunctive particles (see TL 5 991 71ff) and is also itself sometimes used in a disjunctive sense. (see TL 5 894 30ff).

Burman prefers *puero* here, but does not say why, and I can see no reason to alter the reading of the manuscripts.

*iuventus* Heinsius conjectures *iuuentus*, which is very rare in the poets, and is used only once by Lucretius, three times by Virgil, four by Horace and twice by Tibullus. Lucretius and Tibullus do not use either of the other similar words for "youth." Nem. uses *iuventas* once, at Cyn. 115. AëV have *iuenta*, which is less common overall in the poets, although Propertius (4-2), Cvid (21-13), Manilius (4-2), Valerius Flaccus (17-7), Calpurnius (4-0), Statius (24-15) and Martial (3-0) prefer it to *iuventus*. *iuuenta* is often used in the oblique cases as more convenient metrically than *iuventas* and *iuventus*, and is found in Nem. three times (1.60, 2.9 and Cyn. 94), always in the oblique cases. *iuventus* is the most common term overall and I have therefore preferred it here. Nem. uses *iuventus* at Cyn. 298. For the use of *iuventus*, *iuventa*, *iuventas* in the poets see Oberhard Beck, "*Iuventas-Iuventas-Iuventus* in der römischen Lichtung" in Silvae. Festschrift für Ernst Zinn, Tübingen 1970.

 obliviously objects to *cornu* of the manuscripts on the ground that a horned *coccus* fits badly with his description in
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u. 24 as voca liqui ruos and therefore reads crine. This consideration does not seem to have worried the poets, however, who occasionally refer to a horned Bacchus, especially as a giver of courage, e.g. Tib. 2.1.3; Sor. Germ. 2.3.30; Prop. 3.7.19; Ovid Met. 4.19; Fast. 3.48; 7.767; 6.49; Stat. Silv. 3.3.62 etc. Kirby Flower Smith on Tib. 2.1.3 says that Zacchus appears to have received his horns in the Alexandrian age and he is often thus represented on the coins of the Lacedaemonians. Plutarch, Le Is. et Cesir. 35 (Mor. 332f), says that in his time this conception of Dionysus was common in Greek art, cf. also Philost. Imag. 1.15 etc. The horned Bacchus is less common in sculpture, see Lemaire p. 567ff.

37 lastas Burman conjectures foetas, comparing 4.48, although he concedes that the reading of the manuscripts can be justified. I have been unable to find another example of lastas used of uvas, but this adjective is often used of flourishing plants and crops, and is applied to uitis at Cic. i.L. 2.156; Virgil Geor. 2.48, 2.221, and to ralves at Virgil Geor. 2.363.

ostendit NHV read ostendit and G extendit, both of which are possible. For the former reading cf. Columella 4.28; antecessum florem uitis ostendat and for the latter cf. Ovid Trist. 4.6.9 ut extensis tumeat...uva racemis, but I have preferred NHV's reading because, as there is no evidence that L is contaminated with V, and because G bears signs of scribal emendation, it would seem more likely that NHV are preserving the truth independently. ps read ostentat, but the frequentative is inappropriate with primum.
Because he is the first to show their use. True lib. 1.7.32 of Caesar, *primum.../pers...non notio le it at arbiterius*. Freshly suggests *ignitos*, perhaps thinking of Bell. 17.6.17 *primum*...(*primum*) esse? natura *initium*, a clever conjecture, but *ignitos* is perfectly satisfactory.

They are the first ever to treat the grapes. V's *puerilium* may have come in from *puerilium* 35, or is perhaps due to a confusion of abbreviations.

Lemaire alleges that *elidere* is more common than *illidere* with reference to treading vine. This implies that there are a number of examples of these two verbs used in this way, but in fact, TIL cites only one other example of *elidere* used of wine: Prop. 4.6.73 *vinacue fundantur prelis elisa Falernis*, and does not have a single example of *illidere* used of wine. Beck considers that *illidere* fits better with *lasciva cohors* (v. 46), but *illidere* is surely nonsense.

LG's *rubracue* has found favour with some editors and could possibly be defended as a preteritic use, but it is more likely, as Schuster suggests (id 212 (1927), 123) that *rubracue* has come about under the influence of the following *purpureum*. Müller (B. Ph. 3. 34 (1885), 1072) also rejects *rubra*, proposing instead *dura* or *cruda*, and Iaehly would read *scabra*, but I can see no reason for not accepting HV's *nudacue*. Cf. also Cal. 4.124.

Schenkl (p. lxxi) defends the use of two such similar words as *corririunt* and *arririit* so close together on the ground that such examples of "neglegentia" are quite
common. Müller, on the other hand, (B. Ph. W. 34 (1885), 1072), rejects the reading in spite of this defence, and regards Ulitius's occupat, together with quod, as more probable. Maehly is also worried by arripit, and reads, because of u. 48, accipitur uas, comparing u. 17 for the metre, but uas is highly improbable.

arripit cannot be rejected here simply on the ground of the repetition. Cf. for repetitions of words with similar roots, Ovid R.A. 41 ad mea, decepti iuuenes, praeccepta uenite; Met. 2.695 et dedit, accepta uoces has reddidit hospes; Met. 7.455 gaudia percepit nato secura recepto, and for repetitions in general see Norden on Virgil Aen. 6.204ff. and Allen on Cic. Div. 1.35. Cf. also 1.59 duras...curas and see my note ad loc. V's hoc capiti looks to me very much like an emendation, and it may be significant that H agrees with NG in reading arripit, although too much attention should not be paid to this, as H agrees with V in reading quod sors!

quae It might be argued that NG's quae was prompted by poca.../obua, but I think it more likely that V's quod is an emendation necessitated by the introduction of hoc. The fact that H has readings from both the NG and V branches of the tradition is no doubt due to its use of two or more sources representing both branches.

49 concavat Cf. Prop. 4.9.36 et caua suscepio flumine palma sat est. TLL cites only three other occurrences of the verb concave: Ovid Met. 2.195; Amm. 23.4.14 and Fulg. myth. 21 p. 38, 24 (ed. Helm).
lacus  A hollow rock where grapes are pressed, cf. Tib. 1.1.10, 2.5.86; Ovid Fast. 3.558.

The evidence of the manuscripts is very confused and no attempt to solve the problems here has, to my mind, been entirely successful. The text appears in the different manuscripts as follows:

```latex
\textit{alius uocalia cymbala mergit}  51 \\
\textit{excipit ac potus saliens liquor ore resultat}  53 \\
\textit{atque alius latices pressis (pressit cjpqs)} resupinus \\
\textit{ab uuis}  52 \\
\textit{spumeus inque umeros et pectora defluit umor.}  54 \\
\textit{V plerique}
```

```latex
\textit{alius uocalia cymbala mergit}  51 \\
\textit{excipit at (ac H) potus saliens liquor ore (saliensque} \\
\textit{liquore G) resultat}  53 \\
\textit{atque alius latices pressis (pressus NG) resupinus ab} \\
\textit{uuis}  52 \\
\textit{euomit inque umeros et pectora defluit (diffluit H)} \\
\textit{umor}  54 \\
\textit{NGH}
```

```latex
\textit{alius uocalia cymbala mergit}  51 \\
\textit{atque alius latices pressis (pressit a) resupinus} \\
\textit{(resupinis z) ab uuis}  52 \\
\textit{excipit ac potu (putu z, potis ed. Aldina secunda)} \\
\textit{saliens liquor ore resultat}  53 \\
\textit{spumeus inque umeros et pectora defluit umor.} \\
\textit{ag^2z, ed. Aldina secunda}
```
In the text as given by the majority of the V manuscripts, there is no verb governing latices, unless we read pressit, which looks suspiciously like an interpolation. potus would be the object of excipit, ae would be postponed as at Valerius Flaccus 8.400, and there would be a sense pause after potus. This is in my view unnatural and thoroughly clumsy. Also, u. 52 follows on a little awkwardly from u. 53.

The textual conformation of NGAH leaves intact the problem of the order of uu. 52 and 53. latices does indeed now have a verb governing it, but euomit is otiose after liquor ore resultat and looks like a gloss which has crept into the text, or possibly an interpolation designed to restore the sense after the lines had been transposed. Also, the literal use of euomo is mainly confined to post-Augustan prose and its occurrence here is the only example in poetry cited by TLL. Again, while potus as the accusative of the noun potus governed by excipit would give good sense, we should then have two drinkers vomiting which would seem contrary to the requirements of sense. G's saliensque liquore is clearly the result of liquor ore being run together and -que then added to restore the metre.

Baehrens attempts to justify the order of the majority of the manuscripts by reading

\[
\text{alius uocalia cymbala mergit} \\
(\text{Excipit aës potum saliensque liquore resultat);} \\
\text{Atque alius latices pressis resupinus ab uuis} \\
\text{Ebibit}
\]

and suggests alternatively pressat in u. 52, retaining V's spumeus in u. 54, but he is, in my opinion, taking quite unwarranted liberties with the text.
The line-order of $a_g^2 z$ gives, to my mind, the best sense, with $u. 52$ now following on quite naturally from $u. 51$. The repetition of *alius* may have caused a transposition here: the scribe's eye was drawn down from $u. 51$ to $u. 52$ after $u. 51$ had been copied. $u. 53$ was copied next and the omitted $u. 52$ inserted after it. V's *spumeus* is to be preferred to *euomit*; for the postponement of *-que* cf. Norden on Virgil Aen. 6.818. Giarratano, followed by Duff and others, adopts $a_g^2 z$'s line-order while reading *euomit* and places *saliens liquor ore* in parenthesis, but this is most unnatural and thoroughly clumsy. Giarratano does not say what he intends his text to mean, and especially how he would take *potus*, but Duff translates "when drunk," clearly taking *potus* as a perfect participle with active meaning, as at Cic. Fam. 7.22; Prop. 2.29.1 etc. Another possibility would be for *potus* to be the object of *euomit*, but this, too, is inelegant and unlikely.

Once we have adopted $a_g^2 z$'s line-order and *spumeus*, the remaining problems are 1) whether to read *ae* or *at*, and 2) to determine whether *potus* is possible and if so, what it means, and if not, what is to be read instead? The answer to the first question depends partly on the answer to the second, but *at* is probably to be preferred as there is a contrast between *excipit* and *resultat*. The second question is rather more difficult. *Potus* as participle meaning "being drunk," referring to the Satyr, is impossible as there is nothing with which it could go syntactically now that we have rejected *euomit*, and that it might be accusative of the noun *potus* is unlikely as *latices* is now the object of *excipit*. If *potus* is participle with passive significance, "having been drunk," then it would have to be taken with *liquor*, and the combination of the two participles *potus* and *saliens* is improbable. *Potus*, therefore, must be rejected. The second Aldine edition reads *potis*, with *Satyris* presumably to be understood, but the plural is
awkward, as Nem. has been describing individual Satyrs. poto,
the conjecture of Heinsius, is elegant and may well be right,
but on balance I prefer as's potu, "in the act of drinking."
Thus I would read here:

\[
\text{alius uocalia cymbala mergit}
\]
\[
\text{atque alius latices pressis resupinus ab uuis}
\]
\[
\text{excipit; at potu saliens liquor ore resultat,}
\]
\[
\text{spumeus inque umeros et pectora defluit umor.}
\]

52 resupinus The Satyr is not necessarily lying on his back to
drink, but may only be leaning backwards, cf. Ovid Met. 15.520
et retro lentas tendo resupinus habenas.

53 saliens Maehly considers that either Nem. is very careless in
writing saliens...resultat, or else we should read rediens. But
alteration is unnecessary: salio need not imply upward movement,
cf. Cato R.R. 154 ut in culleum de dolio uinum salire possit,
and is perhaps to be referred to the juice going into the
drinker's mouth, whilst resultat refers to its coming out again.

55 ...-que...-que According to Christensen (ALL 15 (1908), 186),
the use of -que...-que to join two nouns signifying human
activities is not common: "Angewandt wird q. q. von den Dichtern
eigentlich nur als Polysyndeton, d.h. in dem Sinne, wie im
Lateinischen überhaupt, auch in der Prosa, mehr als zwei
Substantive im allgemeinen stets polysyndetisch oder asyndetisch
an einander gefügt werden, so dass jene beiden Partikeln im
Grunde nur gleich dem prosaischen et - et stehen." This is the
only example in Nem. of two nouns so joined.
This is an awkward sentence and has been variously emended. Müller (E. Ph. Wo. 34 (1885), 1072) suggests that we read
raptantur amicis / concubitum (concubitum being the reading of NG) Satyris fugientes iungere Nymphae, with nymphae the subject of raptantur, but it is impossible to see how this could be reconciled with what follows. Maehly conjectures trepidant adaman tes / concubitum, but this is also highly unlikely. The use of raptare with the infinitive is extremely rare, and the only other example I have been able to find in poetry is Silius 13.720 raptabat amor priscos cognoscere manes. However, K-S (1, p. 673) say, "In der vorklassischen Sprache, in der Dichtersprache und daran anschließend in der Prosa seit Livius werden noch viele andere Verben mit dem Infinitiven verbunden." It therefore does not appear necessary to regard this, with Wernsdorf, as a Grecism: raptim discurrent apprehensuri Nymphas fugientes ut concubitum sibi iungant. Dunlop translates "seized with desire to," as at Plautus (Cist. 215-6), Virgil (Geor. 3.291-2) and Manilius use the phrase amor raptat, and I wonder if Nem. is not here using raptantur amantes Satyri as equivalent to amor raptat Satyros.


The variants in N and G here have apparently been caused by the intrusion of explanatory ab. Beck says that prosatus is "exquisitus," but natus ab in Aalxz is more probably a gloss or an emendation of one of the unmetrical variants.

H. Schenkl conjectures palmis, perhaps feeling it
undignified for a god to be treading grapes, but this is unnecessary: u. 63 is strongly emphatic to build up to what follows: the god himself is treading the grapes.

64-5 de uitibus hastas / integit  HV here read ingerit, which may be a simple scribal error, or they may have been influenced by the occurrence of the phrase ingerit hastas at Virgil Aen. 9.763 and Stat. Theb. 9.708. Keene retains ingerit, comparing these two passages and taking de uitibus hastas as a unitary phrase with ingerit, "hurls," "throws," but the thyrsus was ornamented with vines, not made from them. integit fits the context better, since uu. 64-5 list the very humble and ordinary tasks which Bacchus has condescended to do, and hurling the thyrsus scarcely counts as one of these. The vine-clad thyrsus is a fairly frequently mentioned attribute of Bacchus (e.g. at Ovid Met. 3.667) and there is perhaps a reminiscence here of Virgil Buc. 5.31 foliis lentas intexere mollibus hastas. This is the only example cited by Kuhlmann in TLL of intego used with de; elsewhere it is used with ex, e.g. Marcell. med. 8.115 ex altera parte panni...oculos, but usually it is followed by the plain ablative. de here denotes "the material used," cf. Ovid Met. 2.554 texta de uimine cista; Fast. 3.254 de tenero cingite flore caput; Silius 5.48 texens de uimine massam. There are no certain examples of this instrumental use of de before the first century, but from the time of Apuleius on, it becomes more and more common, e.g. Apuleius Met. 11.16; Peregrinatio Aetheriae 37.2, 37.3; Canon. Apost. 73.15 (Didasc. Apost. 5 111 Hauler) etc. See also my note on 2.11.

67 conducere  x reads deducere, but I can find no other example of this verb used with in unum. conducere in unum, on the
other hand, is quite common and is found, for example, at Ovid R.A. 673; Tac. ann. 2.52, 4.47, 15.26, Paneg. 10.25; Dict. 2.2 and accords much better with *sparsas*.

68 *uberibus...siccare* For *siccare* with the ablative cf. Hor. Carm. 1.31.10-2 *diues ut aureis / mercator exsiccat culullis / uina Syra reparata merce.*

suadens *siccare* This use of *suadeo* with the infinitive of indirect command is poetic, and rarely occurs in prose. Cic. de Or. 1.59.251 *nemo suaserit adolescentibus elaborare* is an exception.

68-9 *fluorem / lactis* The only other example of this use of *fluor* appears to be Cyn. 220, which as Haupt points out (Opuscula 1, p. 371) is a significant point in favour of the Eclogues and Cynegetica being by the same author. *fluor* is post-Augustan and is used by Celsus, Arnobius, Ausonius and others. Some V manuscripts, characteristically, read the more common *liquorem*, cf. Lucr. 2.398 *mellis lactisque liquores*.

69 *gleba* This appears to be the only example of this word applied to cheese.
1 Lucidus. The name is also used by Theocritus (3), Virgil (Juc. 7 and 9) and Calpurnius (3 and 6).

rec non et See my note on 3.1.

Vopsus See my note on 1.16.

2 versu doctus Keene rightly compares 2.52 indocti calamis.

3 triuaiue A post-Augustan word found first, apparently, in Quintilian (1.4.27), it derives from triuium and no doubt originally meant "belonging to the cross-roads," hence, transitively, "common," "vulgar" or "trivial." It also occurs at Suet. Rhet. 6, Aug. 74; Juv. 7.55; Calpurnius 1.28 and seems always to be used of words or song.

proprios Lüi (2, p. 179) comment, "In Spätlatein erscheint proprius (vgl. gr. λόγος ) als Konkurrent von suus..., in klassischer Zeit tritt es nur bei besonderem Nachdruck zum Possessivum hinzu, z.B. Caes. civ. 3.20.3 calamitatem... proprium suam. Ansätze zu der Verwendung von pr. statt suus finden sich schon früh, vielleicht bei Lucr. 3.991, sicher Hor. (epist. 1.7.5: cultello proprios pungentem leniter unquis, dann bei Tac., z.B. ann. 6.50.2 prorria ad negotia digrediens. Bei einzelnen Spätlateinern, so bei Anm..., Is. Rufin. und Vitae patr., ist suus von proprius fast ganz verdrängt... Sonderlich volkstümlich wurde proprius jedoch nicht, wie es auch nicht in die romanischen Sprachen übergegangen ist."
Henry Wendel (op. cit. 61) wrongly says that, "Fraeter
Nemesianum nomen est insulae et urbis in Aethiopia sitae," as
the name also occurs as the name of a person at Silius 2.104,
and there is a witch of that name in Apul. Met. 1.13f. The hero
of Ovid Fast. 4.570 and Prop. 4.6.78 which Schenkl mentions in
his index (II), is the celebrated island of the Nile.

crinitus  Heinsius conjectures formosus, presumably, as Burman
suggests, under the influence of Ovid Her. 16.102 but this is
unnecessary. crinitus occurs as an epithet of a young man also at
Virgil Aen. 1.740.

Iollas  The name is also used in Virgil Buc. 3 and Calpurnius
3,4 and 6. Wendel (p. 43) comments, "Iollas (= 'ιολλας =
'ιδιλλας) est celeberrimus ille Herculis comes atque
amicus, quem etiam expeditioni in Erytheam factae interfuisse
Diodorus (4.24.4) testis est. Lubium non est, quin Euphorio in
carmine laudate Iollam quoque induxerit."

Imis  This use, to signify one who inspires love, is much
less common than its use as equivalent to amor (as in u. 11):
Rubenbauer (TLL 7 295 75ff.) cites besides this line only Ter.
Eun. 85; Virgil Buc. 3.66; Ovid Am. 2.16.11; 5.9.56; Her. 16.104,
17.93; Manil. 4.683 (Jacob's conjecture) and Homer. 72.

erat  erant is the conjecture of Heinsius, but as Burman
rightly says,"non male: nulla tamen necessitas mutandi vulgatam."
The distribution of the two subjects also tells against erant.

7-11  For an inverted cum clause to be preceded by a verb in the
perfect indicative (luxere) is rare. Livi (2, p. 62?) say, "Im
Hauptzutzt steht meist ein duratives Tempus (impf. oder Ilqpf.)
ganz selten das hist. Perf. seit Cic. Phil. 2.75 al." Housman
(L. 27 (1953), 70 = Classical Papers p. 1219) says that in
Statius he has noticed only two examples of the preterite (Theb.
5.89 and 10.329) against twenty of the imperfect or pluperfect.

7 furentes  N reads luxere varentes surentes, from which
Glaeser conjectured sauentenes, but both luxere and sauentenes would
give the wrong sense. It could be argued that furentes has
appeared here under the influence of furor in u. 5, but such
repetitions are quite common in both poetry and prose e.g. Cic.
Div. 1.78; N.2. 1.12 and 13; Virgil Aen. 4.25-6, 173-4, 247-8,
412-4; 6.162-4, 495-6; 10.82 -2; Hor. Carm. 3.3.60-1 and see my
note on Cyn. 100.

9 placitas  For the use of placitas in the sense of "fixed upon,"
"appointed", cf. Sallust Jug. 81.1 locum...placitum; Vulg. 1. Rep.
13,11 placiti dies.

10 animus  For the use of animus with est and the infinitive cf.
Virgil Aen. 4.639 sacra lovi stygio...performere est animus;
Curt. 5.3.11; Ovid Met. 1.1 etc. CAH's animo was perhaps
influenced by the more common expression in animo habere.

solitos ad ludere fontes  Most editors read alludere here,
but for alludere to be followed by a plain accusative denoting
the place where the action of the verb takes place would be
unparalleled. Catull. 64.66, which Keene cites, is no parallel,
as there the accusative is governed by the preposition ante.
Calpurnius (4.67) uses *alludere* with the dative, slyly suggesting *ad lu'ere*, which does in fact appear in 12, and this would remove the difficulty. For the anastrophe of the monosyllabic preposition of *Fan. i. 15.4* *horrea fecundas ad deficientias pessae*; Stat. Theb. 10.7.4 *medioscule per obius ensis*; Manil. 4.605 *necue canes ad, lovia, tuco* and see Housman on Manil. 1.245.

1° *durus adederat ignis* *durus*, the reading of HOnm, would be a strange epithet to use of *ignis* in its literal sense, and H. Schenke therefore conjectures *dirus cuos ederat. ignis*, however, is not used here in its literal sense, but as equivalent to *amor*, as often in the poets, and *Hem* almost certainly had in mind Virgil *Aen. 6.442 hic cuos durus amor crudeli tabe peredit*. The V manuscripts read *lusus* or *lurus*. Barth considers *lusus* is here used as equivalent to *elusus*, and Wernsdorf explains *lusus ignis* as meaning "amor saepius deceptus et hinc magis urens."

*lusus* is not impossible, but in view of the Virgil passage cited above, *durus* is to be preferred. *lusus* might have come about under the influence of *ludere* in u. 7 above.

*adederat* Nearly all the manuscripts read *ederat*, a more common verb than *adedo*, and *ederat* gives good sense, but would require *durus cuos* to scan, and there is no manuscript evidence for this reading. Hau² uel A read *adederat*, which is used of literal fire, for example, at *Ovid Am. 1.15.41*. Titius explains "ignes deceptos corroserat, & iam ferme consumpserat," and a parallel for the figurative use of *adedo* is perhaps Silius 13.679-80 *adesum/ cladibus Hascrubalem. ad-* could easily have been lost by haplography.
The use of querellas as direct object of either dicere or ducere appears to be unparalleled, and various emendations have been suggested.

dixere appears in the less-interpolated branch of the tradition, and the expression cantu dixere querellas could perhaps be explained as an extension of dicere carmen, which occurs at 1.63, and also at Cal. 1.92-3, 2.30. However, Markland on Stat. Silu. 5.3.92 argues very cogently in favour of duxere. He cites as parallels the use of ducere bellum as equivalent to bellare (Virgil Aen. 8.55); ducere dolorem for dolere (Silius 8.212); ducere uolatus for uolare (ib. 12.101); ducere suspiria for suspirare (Stat. Theb. 9.711); ducere uirides annos for in iuuenta esse (Ovid A.A. 3.61, where the text is, however, doubtful). Here he says that duxere querellas is equivalent to querebantur, and dixere is employed "male."

The expression duxere querellas might furthermore be paralleled by ducere uoces, for which see Lucr. 5.1406; Virgil Aen. 4.462-3 and Manil. 5.117, and by carmen ducere at Ovid E.P. 1.5.7, and the idea of "drawing out" or "prolonging" inherent in ducere is surely relevant here. Markland would also read duxisti at 1.63, comparing ducit...cantus at 2.61, but the context of these two passages is different, and I would retain the reading of the manuscripts at 1.63. (See my note ad loc.).

Glaeser's conjecture, luxere, has found considerable support, but such an expression seems unparalleled. OLD gives its meaning in the transitive sense as "bewail, mourn" (persons or events) and "lament" (with accusative and infinitive), neither of which meanings applies here. Maehly objects to lugere on the ground that it and queri mean almost the same, which is hardly an overwhelming objection, and he therefore reads dulci cantu
mulisere, comparing the refrain canter, amat codic cuiusque: levant
et carmina curae: similar uses of mulisere also occur at Stat.

Silv. 5.1.27; Hor. Carm. 3.11.24; Julius 10.6.5 etc., but
Arkland's explanation has in my opinion rendered all conjecture
unnecessary.

14 furacior curia A very common comparison. Verdière in his
commentary on Grattius 537 gives numerous other examples.

16 euemue It is not necessary to read euemue with the first
Deventer edition, as the use of -ue, or aut, in a succession of
questions where there is no real alternative involved, is quite
common, cf. Virgil Aen. 2.286, 520; 3.33 and 1.87; 4.505; 5.742;
6.319; 9.94; 10.675 etc.

quae me tibi gloria uicto? Durman comments "nec quare uictus
Kopsus diceretur, quum fugeret heroe, poteram intelligere,
conieceramque uel anretto uel luso esse legendum, uel etiam,
euemue tibi gloria, ficto si uultu mentem premis? &c. sed
seruari posse tandem uulgatam lectionem credebam, si uicto
explicaretur, amore tui uicto & succumbenti, & imitationem esse
Tibulli uidetam, qui lib. 1.8.49 puero quae gloria uicto est?
sic femina uicta Ov. A.A. 1.278 & Pet. 4.233 uicta nitore Dei,
posita uim passa querela & ita potest capi Venus uicta apud
Gratium (sic) 67". Tibullus's poem shares other motifs with
Nem.'s poem: Pholoe makes promises to Marathus and breaks them
(y. 63) and Tibullus warns that she will soon be old and
unattractive (y. 47-8). Lunlop describes uicto as a conditional
ablative absolute, "if I am conquered," but Kopsus's state as
uicto is surely already a fact.
It is difficult to say precisely what rem. means by these lines. Hornsdorf and others would read serenas in u. 17 and connect it with tandem cura neras? but this reading seems to me to make nonsense of tandem because it is clear from uu. 8-9 (modo...nunc) that Heroe makes a habit of holding out false hopes by arranging to meet Hopsus and then not turning up, (uu. 8-10), whereas tandem...neras surely implies that she has done so on this occasion only. I would therefore separate u. 17 from u. 18, which makes it necessary to read serenas with the manuscripts. vultu and fronte indicate the encouraging appearance that Heroe assumes and mentem her true attitude to Hopsus, namely that she looks on him as a source of amusement. (u. 7).

The choice between nera and neras, and the question of punctuation here seem to depend largely upon how the next phrase is to be interpreted. The reading of e, non rossum non uelle, is unmetrical, and the "positive" sense given by the reading of v, non rossum nolle, and by the conjectures of Ulitius, C. Schenkl and Baehrens, i.e. he will love her if, or although, she refuses him, is, as Hartellius says, contrary to the sense required here: the complaint of Hopsus is that he loves Heroe, but she is constantly breaking her promises to him. Lemaire's possum non uelle neras? which he explains as "Et si tu neras, num inde fieri potest, ut te minus amem?" I would reject for the same reason.

There remain four possibilities. One is to read neras? possim with Burney, thus making the clause possim non uelle neras? a wish: her refusals make him love her even more, which he wishes were not the case. The second is to take neras?
nego non uelle rempt:te as a threat, as at Virgil Ec. 2.77: he will stop loving her if she persists in her unkindness. A third possibility is that niga is to be taken as a statement, which would make reasonably good sense. If this were then followed by Durman's possem with potential force, the sequence of thought would be adequate. The fourth interpretation is that of Hartellius which makes better sense if one reads nega with N3: he wants her to tell him openly that she does not care for him, which he really knows already (u. 17), and as he has some self-respect, he will cease to love her. nega and possum, internally related, would then answer u. 17. This last is for me the most likely solution and involves no conjecture.

19 Dunlop (ad loc.) points out that a refrain also occurs in Theocr. Id. 1 (15 times), Id. 2 (2 refrains, one 10 times and the other 12); Moschus 3 (13 times); Virgil Ec. 8 (2 refrains, 10 times each); Catullus 61 (9 times), and Perseus Veneris (11 times). Here the refrain occurs 10 times.

21 G. Kaibel (Hermes 17 (1882), 419) suggests that Hem. is imitating Theocritus 23.2ff. here, and Castagna (Revum 44 (1970), 417) agrees, but Schenkl (p. xxxiii) thinks that Hem. did not know this author, and compares Ovid A. A. 2.115-6 forma bonum fragile est, quantumque accedit ad annos, fit minor et satio carritur ipsa suo/ nec violae semper nec hiernia lilia florent/ et rilet amissa spina relita rosa which is closer to Hem. than the Theocritus passage, to my mind. The theme here is a common one, and also occurs, for example, at Seneca Epist. 76ff.; Tib. 1.4.32.
2. longum metri gratia for diu, as at Virgil Aen. 10.740; Cicid Let. 5.65 and 10.467.

uua uua is here used as equivalent to uitia, as at Virgil Geor. 2.60.

24 nec Burman does not see why Heinsius conjectured et here, but it does make a sort of sense. Deek explains it: "accommodat se tuis annis iuuentuti." This does not, however, bring out sufficiently clearly the idea of a gift of short duration, and annis here more probably means "length of years."

se cuod commodet annis The reading of in, se tibi commodat annus, makes sense, but it is a truism, and its application to a particular person comes in rather abruptly after a series of generalisations. HV relioui read se tibi commodat annis, but the use of the ablative annis as equivalent to annos (accusative of duration) would be rather flat. KG reads se cuod commodet annis which gives the best sense, and the generic subjunctive is surely required here.

29 suos habet arbor amores There have been three different interpretations suggested for this phrase. According to Martellius, love is in everything: "nam omnia, quae natura constant, suos foetus habent et amant." Barth, on the other hand, points out that some nymphs were trees, and Camps gives as one interpretation of Prop. 1.18.19 si cuos habet arbor amores, "trees that are acquainted with love" (for each tree has its nymph with which it can be identified), so that if Nem. is echoing Propertius, this is probably the way he understood the
phrase, as the other possible interpretation of Ipropertius's line is not relevant here. A third possibility is that it is a reference to the sexuality of trees, as Raynaud suggests. The Romans were aware of this fact, as Pliny (Nat. Hist. 13.3) shows, and Claudian refers to it at nupt. Con. 65ff. 

Venerum frondes omnesque vicissibus felix arbor est, mutant ad

mutua raiiae/ foederis, nocte suspirat pterulus iuctu/ et

platanis alnus alnus adsibilat alnus. The second interpretation is perhaps the most likely because of the inclusion of montes in the list of those who love; the explanation of Martellius is rather trite, and he would have had to have been more than usually careless to include montes if the phrase is to be taken according to the third interpretation.

30 prodis Faladini (Atenomus 16 (1957), 140) rejects both prodis and perdis for Horace's pellis, strangely asserting that it is not a question here of desertion or betrayal, but, as often in Eclogues, of the loved-one being extremely shy. This is totally incorrect, as u. 7 shows, though hem. is clearly indebted in uu. 26-30 to other passages where this is the case, e.g. Virgil Ene. 2.63-5. Although perdo is often used of those desperately in love, it appears usually to be used of those whose love is returned, or at least, whose attentions are not rejected, cf.

Hor. Carm. 1.8.3; Ovid Am. 2.18.10, and in the passive at Plaut.

Cist. 1.2.13; Prop. 1.13.7. Only Catull. 91.2 seems doubtful.

MG read prodis, which gives good sense. Catullus (30.3) uses this verb of a friend who has broken his word, as Neron has here (uu. 8-10). It need not imply, as Faladini seems to suggest, that Mopsus thinks he has a rival.

Schuster (AJ 112 (1927)) supports Giarratano's punctuation
with a comma after micerum as more correct than having one after fugis, as micerum is parallel to amantem. But this is surely misguided; the sense of the passage is "omnia amant: tu una fugis," and micerum has no place in this clause: it is the fact that she alone flees which is important at this point, not whom she flees. Lopusus then with his next words returns to himself.

32 alit All the manuscripts read alit, but Verdière (Prolégomènes, p. 82) objects to it on the ground that, having said that time aids the development of things in order to destroy them, hem. then insists on the brevity of joy, which implies that there is only a short space between the nourishment of things by time, and their destruction. This, Verdière says, is obviously false, and he reads usit, comparing Cyn. 104 Ianus temporis auctor, and Maximian Sl. LVIII (Baehrens Fili V, p. 349 1.3), omnia tempus sit, cum tempore cuncta trahuntur. Then, in place of an antithesis, there is a crescendo.

These objections I find unconvincing. It is a short time, in comparative terms, between birth and death, and lycidas illustrates his point by going on to describe how he saw calves in the spring which are now fully grown bulls. Iollas is twenty, and his days as a beautiful youth are already numbered. Also, the antithesis of alit...rapit gives more point to usus in arto est than usit...rapit.

Earth, who thinks this is the best poem in the corpus of hem. and Calpurnius, calls this "diuinissimus uersus."

34 coiere in cornua Earth conjectures coiere in praelia (sic), for which see Stat. Theb. 7.21 and 11.506, and Lucan 2.225.
coiere in cornua does seem, at first sight, rather odd. TLL (4 966 24) explains in cornua, "i. in pugnam" and describes it as a syllogism, but cites no comparable passages. Nem. is apparently using cornua in the sense of "battles with horns" by analogy with the common use of arma in the sense of "armed conflict." in cornua is probably to be explained as a pregnant use, "for the purpose of horn-battles."

38 uocat aestus in umbram Duff is wrong to understand nos here, as the two shepherds are already in the shade (u. 1). The object understood is Meroe, who is apparently the only one not avoiding the heat.

39 iam nulla Glaeser reads et iam, presumably with N's subeunt, otherwise the line would be unmetrical. et, however, spoils the asyndeton of uu. 39-41, and subeunt gives less good sense than subiere, the reading of HV plerique: all living things except Meroe are already resting away from the heat.

41 cano For the scansion, see my excursus.

42 concedo For the scansion, see my excursus.

45 lucentes The expression lucentes malas does not apparently occur elsewhere, but the motif of cheeks blooming with youth is
common enough, e.g. Lvid. am. 3.7.6; Stat. Jiliu. 3.4.65. I am at a loss as to why Heinsius conjectured livenent, as this participle seems only to have been used of the skin of the injured or sick. The expression livenent renas occurs at Lucan 5.2.5 of a priestess in prophetic ecstasy, and at Stat. Jiliu. 5.5.12 of a dying child.

46 hic Schuster (AJ 112 (1927), 120) prefers G's hac to XXY's hic which he says is obviously an early alteration from u. 47, and regards hac as an unmistakable lectio difficilior.

Interjection are, however, is generally preceded, when it is preceded at all, by another imperative, an adverb such as erro, hic, hue, nucre or quanto, a conjunction such as quin or an interjection such as heia. For are to be preceded by a demonstrative pronoun would appear to be very unusual, if not unparalleled. I would therefore retain XXY's hic. This line is then almost identical to Cora 3: hic age cambinea fessus requiesce sub umbra.

47 lene uirens V's reading, lene fluens, has found favour with most editors. H. Schenkl and Giarratano, however, both adopt NG's uirens. The phrase lene uirens fons murmurat seems at first sight to present a difficult word order, if lene is taken with murmurat. Lene, however, is to be taken with uirens as a single unit qualifying fons, as at Stat. Theb. 4.816f. longusque a fontibus amnis/ diripitur, modo lene uirens et ruggite puro.

Calpurnius has a similar picture at 2.57-8 uirides cus reumeus undas/ fons amit. V has, as often, simplified. Lucan 10.3.5 has the phrase tam lene fluentem.
ad undas N and G are corrupt here and therefore most editors ab ulmis with HV, but if this is the true reading, it is hard to see how the corruptions in N and G could have come about. HV's reading looks suspiciously like an intelligent conjecture to restore the sense. If we read ab ulmis, uitibus uuae in v. 48 is presumably to be taken as a pleonasm for uuae, with ab ulmis dependent on dependent. But ab ulmis adds nothing material to the sense: vines were usually hung from elms as they are in Southern Italy today, and it is noteworthy that when this fact is mentioned at Virgil Euc. 2.70; Geor. 1.2 and Hor. Sist. 16.3, it is to make a particular point. Here, it is mere padding and might cause confusion with fetis...uitibus following. A further, though less important, point against ab ulmis is that when Niem. uses dependere at 1.14, he uses it absolutely.

habunde is noted in the margin of G, from which Daehrens conjectures abunde, but this word is rare in poetry. It appears at Virgil Aen. 7.552 where it is used in the rare sense of satis, and occurs three times in Ovid (Het. 15.759; Host. 1.7.5: E.F. 4.8.37) in connection with thanks or favour. This marginal note, too, would appear to be an intelligent conjecture. Glaeser conjectures ad undas which, unlike ab ulmis, adds to the sense and, more important, would explain the corruptions in N and G. In ancient minuscule, d and b were visually very similar, so that the corruption to abundas could easily have come about, and later the word acquired the initial h with which abundo frequently begins in manuscripts. The reading ab ulmis is then simply another case of conjecture in HV.

50 fastidia lenta Cf. Ovid Het. 14.761 lentos fastus. HV's reading, longa, was perhaps influenced by Virgil Euc. 4.6: longa...fastidia, where, however, the context is quite different.
Libvaecue calorem Verdière (Proléromènes, p. 83) conjectures Libye because he uses Libye twice in the Cynegetica (227 and 313, metri causa), and compares Lucan 1.368 and 9.35-2, and Carson (Latomus 35 (1976), 61) regards this as a "manifest orthographical improvement." However, this form has no manuscript authority here, and there is no reason why he should not have used Libvaecue here.

There is little to choose between Libvaecue calorem and Libyeosoue calores as regards sense, but it is very likely that the latter reading, that of V, is an interpolation in order to produce another pair consisting of noun and adjective denoting the country of origin to balance with Lithonies...riues.

Interpolation is also surely the reason for the appearance of Sardoacue in some early editions and salebrosacue in iu in u. 53.

Sardorum gramina Conington says on Virgil Euc. 7.41, "The technical name is Ranunculus Sardous, βατράχιον χνωδοστερον, known in English as celery-leaved crowfoot, so acrid that its leaves applied externally produce inflammation. Those who ate it had their faces distorted into the proverbial Sardonic smile." Cf. Solinus 4.4 and Serenus Sammonicus 22.427.

Verdière (Proléromènes, p. 83) rightly rejects Castiglioni's conjecture Sardorum et, and his explanation of H's sarist, that a scribe omitted the abbreviation for -orum, and himself suggests that the scribe of H confused abbreviations for -orum and et. et, however, is not only unnecessary but would spoil the asyndeton between the clause of uu. 53-4 Sardorum...leones which balances the asyndeton between u. 51 and that of uu. 52-3
Hirman does not understand why Heinsius conjectures junct, but possibly he intended it to govern N's gernina, the reference being to yoking some wild animal. GW's cramina uncet, however, gives perfectly good sense.

57 discatue diu patienter anare. diu modifies discatue, and patienter, anare.

58 speret. It is curious that editors should have let the difficult reading of the manuscripts, speret, pass without comment. Kaehly's conjecture speret is surely a great improvement: a lover must be patient, and not expect prudence from the young, but be prepared even for scorn. This interpretation assumes that the teneris...annis belong to the beloved boy. They could conceivably refer to the lover: let him be sensible, even though he is young, but this is less likely as teneris...annis is more appropriate of a boy. Volpilhac compares Stat. Theb. 4.512-3 ne tenues annos...spernit, but the context is quite different.

62ff. There is no manuscript authority for the transposition of uu. 64-5, but some alteration seems necessary, as the cineres (u. 64) are probably those of the bay-leaves, as at Theocr. 2.25 (though it is curious that there it is expressly stated that they are not seen), and without transposition this point is not clear: also, with u. 64 before 65, and cineres before incendens, we should have a rather strange hysteron proteron. The pouring-away of the ashes in Virgil Buc. 8 likewise follows the burning of laurel, and also that of herbs and incense on the altar.

Giarratano's apparatus is confused here, as he has
numbered u. 64 of the manuscripts 65 in his text and in his reference to Haupt, but in his reference to C. Schenkl, 64 indicates u. 64 of the manuscripts, while he does not make it clear precisely what transpositions Valckenaeer wants. In fact, Valckenaeer would read lustrauit, uiuo creniantes sulphure lauros/ incendens, cinerescue auersa effudit in amnem (Lustola ad Matthian Roeverum, p. 373, in Ludovici Caspari Valckenaeerii Upscula Philologica, Critica, Gratoria vol. I, Leipzig 1808).

For such a transposition of hemistichs see Housman on Anil. 4.257. Both Valckenaeer's and Haupt's transpositions give better sense than the line order of the manuscripts, but I have preferred Haupt's transposition because u. 65 works better as a unit, with all the elements of the purification rite preceding lustrauit. C. Schenkl would transpose u. 65 before u. 63, but this is less satisfactory, as u. 63 is perfectly appropriate after u. 62. The transposition of these lines can be explained by what Housman calls homoeomeson, similarity within the verse (see his edition of Lucan, p. xixf.): having copied u. 63, the scribe's eye slips down from ture in u. 63 to sulphure in the line below, and this line is then omitted, and the next (u. 64 in our manuscripts) copied. The scribe then realises his mistake and copies the omitted line, making the appropriate signs in the margin to indicate the correct order, but these instructions are subsequently overlooked.

63ff. The influence of Virgil Buc. 8 upon these lines is clear, but Hem.'s magical procedure differs in a number of particulars, and he seems to bring in elements not only from spells to bring back a lost lover, or to rid a person of unrequited love, as u. 72 seems to indicate, but also from those to raise the
dead and cure the sick. A notable omission from his list of ingredients is pure water, which is normally an important feature of rites (see Theocr. 24.38; Virgil *Buc.* 9.64; Aen. 6.229; Prop. 4.3.34; Ovid, *Met.* 7.261 and Claudian, *Jon.* 6.327, of the sick). If Heroe were here casting a spell to bring back a faithless lover, as in Virgil *Buc.* 8; Theocr. 2; Lucian, * Dial.* 4.5, etc., we should also expect some of the other person's belongings to be used in the spell (Virgil *Buc.* 8.91; Lucian, * Dial.* 4.5 etc.). Neither the threads nor the herbs in Virgil are carried round the person for whom the spell is being cast, and in *Jon.* the herbs and incense are not mentioned as being burnt, as in Virgil. Like Neda's spell (Ovid, *Her.* 12.167) for dissolving love, Lycale's attempts are unsuccessful.

The supernatural power of the number three also appears at Virgil *Buc.* 8.74; *Geor.* 1.345; 4.364-5; Aen. 2.792-3; 3.565-6; 4.510, 690-1; 6.700-1; 8.230-1, 429-30, 564-6; 10.685, 885-6; 11.188-9; *Ciris* 369-73; *Tib.* 1.2.54; *Gratt.* 441; Ovid *Fast.* 4.551; Theocr. 2.43, and at numerous other places. Dunlop gives more examples, both from Classical and English literature. *Jon.*, like Ovid at *Met.* 7.261, not only mentions the magic number, but does so three times.

It is unnecessary to read *uicius* with Heinsius. *Jon.* is almost certainly thinking of Virgil *Buc.* 8, and *uicius* must correspond to Virgil's *molli uitta* (8.64), as *fronde sacra* does to *uerbenascue plinuis* (8.65). Fillets also feature in Theocr. 2 and at Valerius Flaccus 3.424 and Seneca *Med.* 803. I can find no reference to vetch in connection with magic.
fronde sacra Titius remarks "uerbona scilicet." Servius on
Virgil Aen. 12.120 says that all sacred boughs, which might be
laurel (as here), olive (Aen. 6.236) or myrtle, were vanebs.

vaporem The adjective vaporem is very rare, and the only other
instance cited in Lewis and Short is irud. Peristeph. 6.115. This
fact has probably contributed to the confusion in some manu-
scripts. vaporem could have come about under the influence of
amnem in V. 64.

64 auera An important feature of rites of all kinds. See also
Theoc. 24.96; Virgil Buc. 8.102; Aen. 6.224; Valerius Flaccus
3.442; Claud. Cons. Hon. 6.329.

65 uinum sulphure Also at Tib. 1.5.11-2 (of the sick); Prop.
4.8.86; Ciris 369; Ovid Fast. 7.261; Fast. 4.740; Rem. 260;
Claud. Cons. Hon. 6.324-5; Lucian Dial. mer. 4.5. Fliny
describes the nature and uses of sulphur (H.n. 35. 174-7). He
tells us (175) that the Greeks called uinum sulphure, anyros, and
that no other substance is more easily ignited, "quo apparat
ignium uim magnam ei inesse." (177).

Sulphur was used in ceremonies of purification, cf. Hom. Od.
22.481-94; Theoc. 24.96-8; Ciris 369; Fliny H.n. 35.177 etc.

crepitantes...lauros Mentioned also at Theoc. 2.1 and 24;
Lucr. 6.154f.; Virgil Buc. 8.82; Prop. 2.28.36 (of sickness),
Ovid Fast. 4.742; Apul. Arcol. 30; Met. 3.23; Valerius Flaccus
3.434. It appears to have been a good omen if the laurel
crackled loudly (Tib. 2.5.31). The use of laurel apparently
persisted in magic rites in Italy for many centuries, as it is
mentioned in R.L. Blackmore's "Lorna Doone" (ch. 53).
in...uror. This is the reading of the majority of the manuscripts. Heinze prefers the reading of 1, in...uror, and this is also possible. Both uror and ardeo can be used with in and either the accusative or the ablative of the person beloved. uror is used with in and the accusative at Cal. 2.56 and with in and the ablative at Hor. Phad. 1.4 and Ovid Met. 7.21.

totis Wendel (Hermes 69 (1934), 347), objects to the reading of the manuscripts because he says that the idea of completeness belongs to the lover, not to ignibus, and therefore conjectures totus. But totus riper would be most inelegant, and totis here is perhaps a transferred epithet, cf. Hor. Carm. 1.19.9 in me tota ruens Venus where totum would be impossible metrically. Alternatively, totis could be used here as equivalent to omnibus ("with all its fires"), a use found in prose from Seneca and Pliny on, and often in poetry, from Virgil and Propertius on. It is particularly common in the legal writers and in late Latin, see Lll 2, p. 203.

cuocue Keene here follows the V tradition and reads cuae uersicoloria. He takes haec eadem as accusative and translates, "Mycale has performed these same incantations for me." But it is awkward to have a relative clause whose antecedent follows it, since cuae cannot follow haec eadem taken Keene's way. It is better to take haec eadem as nominative, "this same woman," and we then learn her name. cuocue has far more point than cuae; Lycidas is saying that Mycale has cast spells for him, too.

uersicoloria Ulitius would read diversicoloria (fila), a rare adjective which occurs only in late authors, including four
times in Martianus Capella. He is presumably thinking of Virgil Ec. 2.73, but such a change is unnecessary. Threads are used in magic also at Virg. Buc. 3.71; Lucan 6.460; Iatron. 549. At Marcell. med. 29.52 the threads are of 3 colours and used for medicinal purposes.

For the use of herbs in rites see also Tib. 1.2.62; 1.8.7; Hor. serm. 1.3.49; Virg. Buc. 3.95; Aen. 7.19; Cvid. Fast. 2.425, 4.74; Seneca erist. 9.6 etc. Keene translates *imnotas* as "foreign", comparing Virg. Buc. 6.90f., but it might also signify "strange"; "mysterious", cf. quint. 7.3.13 *obscurioribus et imnotioribus verbis*; Cvid. Let. 14.299 *imnotae*... *herbae* (of Circe) and 366 *imnoto carmine*. Again, it might mean "of unknown qualities", cf. 3.40.

**Hycale** A witch called Hycale appears also at Cvid. Met. 12.262 and Seneca Herc. Oct. 228. It is strange, as Verdière says (Proléromènes, p. 34), that the name does not appear to be attested in Greek Literature. Verdière thinks it possible that the name comes from *μυκάομαι*, which is used of thunder (Aristophanes Nub. 292), of a river (Opp. Cyn. 4.166), and of an earth-tremor (Plato rep. 615e), and he quotes Lucan 6.685-93, where the sorceress Eriotho is portrayed as making various sounds. He concludes that the name has been given to a witch because it represents the unintelligible sounds which accompany most formulae in spells, cf. μῦ μῦ, (Aristophanes Eq. 10).

The problem here is two-fold: what is Hycale doing to the moon, and which, if either, of the readings of the
manuscripts can reasonably be taken as expressing that action.
It is difficult to believe that tēm. can be referring to anything other than the practice of witches of drawing down the moon; neither tumet nor timet would naturally suggest the reddening of the moon, and witches in Latin poetry do not, apparently, hurry time along by tampering with the moon's phases as tumet would suggest.

The solution to the problem is perhaps given by two passages in Cvid, Ner. 6.85 illa (sedea) reluctantem cursu deducere lunam/ nititur and Let. 12.265f. mater erat iucce, quam desuxisse conendo/saepe reluctantiis constabat cornua lunae. Burman explains timet as meaning that the moon is afraid of being drawn down, and as Cvid describes the moon as reluctans suffering this action, it is perhaps not improbable that tēm. has gone one stage further and described it as afraid, either of being drawn down in particular, or else simply of any possible results of the incantation. On the other hand, it could be argued that tumet refers to the increasing size of the moon as it descends towards the earth, though this is a rather forced explanation. But of the two difficult readings, timet is less difficult to my mind, and tumet may have come about under the influence of rumnitur later in the line, or simply from the common confusion between timeo and tumeo.

The drawing down of the moon is a frequently mentioned accomplishment of witches, particularly those from Thessaly (see RE 6 2 2333 s.v. Finsternisse). That the belief in this practice was an attempt to explain the eclipse of the moon is made clear by Claud. de Bello Gothico 233ff. territat assiduus lunae labor atrauce Phoebe/noctibus aerisonas crebris ululata per urbes/ nec credunt uetito fraudatan sole sororem/ telluris subeunte.
Menander wrote a play about the activities of the Thessalian witches, but unfortunately the surviving fragments tell us little about it. References to the drawing down of the moon include Aristophanes, Plato, Corn. 513a; Virgil, Buc. 8.69; Hor. arg. 5.45; Tib. 1.2.43 and 1.8.21; Prop. 1.1.19, 2.28.37 and 4.5.13; Ovid, Am. 2.1.23; Her. 6.85; Met. 7.208, 12.263f.; Lucan 6.505; Silius 8.500; Mart. 9.29.9; Fliny ad. 30.7; Lucian, Dial. Her. 1.28; Claude, in ethn. 1.146-7 etc. For an ingenious explanation of how the witches convinced spectators that they had accomplished this feat see L. W. Hill, "The Thessalian Trick" (ABV 116(1973), 224-238).

rumritur arcuis Also at Virgil, Buc. 8.71; Tib. 1.8.20; Ovid, Met. 7.203 etc.; Am. 2.1.25; Medici. 39; Ranil. 1.92; Lucan 9.914.

currunt scopuli...uellitur arbos These feats are part of Medea's repertoire at Ovid, Her. 6.88 and Let. 7.204. The Marsi were also able to move trees (Silius 11.441-2). Stones are apparently moved by a witch at Lucan 6.439. Others who are able to move trees and stones are Teuthras, who built Thebes in this way (Silius 11.441-2), and Orpheus, whose singing attracted both trees (Hor. Carm. 1.12.7-8; Virgil, Buc. 3.46; Geor. 4.50; Ovid, Met. 10.90ff., 11.45-6) and stones (Ovid, Met. 11.2), though of course in his case this effect was not produced deliberately.

migrant sata Also at Virgil, Buc. 6.99; Tib. 1.8.19; Ovid, Nat. 2.54-5. Fliny tells us that the Twelve Tables forbade this practice. Servius, commenting on Virgil's line, says "magicis quibusdam artibus hoc fiebat, unde est in XII Tabb."
segetem pedexeris." At one time the belief that the life-force of a neighbour's crops could be transferred to another's land by magic seems to have been common. In support of this St. Augustine, after quoting Virgil's words, says (La Civ. Lei 3.17) ec cuod hoc restifera scelerataque doctrina fructus alieni in alias terras transferri rerhibentur, nonna in XII Tabulis, id est Romanorum antquisrinis legibus, Cicero rememorat esse consolitum et si cui hoc fecerit surricium constitutum?

According to Lunlop, this expression is a step on the way towards the Romance languages. It seems, however, that the use of *plus* with an adjective is a form which had always existed in Vulgar Latin, although the evidence for its colloquial currency between the time of Plautus and the second century A.L. is slim, cf. Neue 2, p. 263: "Plus mit einem Adjektivum ist bei Plaut. Aulul. 3.2.6 (420) male plus lubens faxim nicht beweiskräftig, als sicher aber lässt sich eine solche Verbindung bei Ann. (Fab. 371 ed. L. Müller), bei Nonius S.507, 22 plus miser sin, si scelestum faxim nachweisen; dann scheint dieser Gebrauch von *plus* aus der Schriftsprache verbannt zu sein und nur in der Volksprache fortgelebt zu haben. Erst gegen das Ende des zweiten Jahrhunderts nach Chr. finden wir wieder plus miser bei Tertull. de spectac. 17; plus formosus bei Nemes. Eclog. 4, 72; oft bei Sidonius Apollinarius, so *Epist.* 3, 13, 2 plus rusticus; 3.13.4 plus fetida; 7.17 *carm.* 14 plus onerosus," and many other examples from later Latin. Buhlart in *TLL* also quotes Hor. *Serm.* 1.3.52 truculentior atque plus secuo liber.
None of the titles or colophons in the manuscripts includes the words liber or libri, but it is most probable that Cynegeticon is a neuter plural genitive, like in Patrocinium.

Henriksson (Griechische Eckertitel in der römischen Literatur, Annales Acad. Scient. Fennicae, Ser. B., Tom. 102,1, Helsinki 1956) lists as titles the following words in -ων: Ευκριτικόν, Ὁδοπορικόν, Προπερπτικόν, Ὑπογυμνηστικόν, which are all apparently in the accusative, but as Richmond (The isidicrica ascribed to Civid, London 1962, p. 25) points out, either these may not be book-titles, or it is not possible to be sure whether the nominative was masculine or neuter.

Ellipses of liber or libri occur in the title to book three of the Georgica in Veronensis XL (p. 498) and in the title to the Cynegetica of Grattius in Ambrosianus J. 81. Jetricon is no doubt another example of ellipse, see H. Heraeus, Kleine Schriften, Heidelberg 1937, p. 109.

Whether we are to understand liber or libri here is another question. Hincmar of Reims tells us (Ligne 30 vol. 126, p. 383) "et lectione puer scholarius in libro qui inscribitur Cynegeticon Carthaginensis Aurelii didici." Liber seems not to have been used in the Classical period to designate the whole of a work unless that work comprised only one book, the plural being used when the work consisted of several books, but from the fifth century on, liber does appear to be used of a work of more than one volume, cf. Sidon. enist. 5.2.1 librum de statu animum tribus voluminibus ilustrem Mamertus Claudianus...comere et excolere curavit, and Hincmar's words therefore give us no clue as to whether he had one book, or more than one book, before him. In the absence of any firm evidence on this point, therefore, I have understood liber for the possible
original length of the poem, see my note on u. 325.

cano Gronvius, followed by Laneti ("Unde necessarium Socraticum," Enar. 57 (1923), 297), conjectures canet, and the latter objects to cane on the ground that the plural randimus (u. 3) is incongruous so soon after a singular verb, but neither comments on the fact that mihi follows randimus in u. 3, nor that secundum is followed by mecum at uu. 98f. Jernsdorf, who rejects the conjecture "nec enim κυρνησεοια tota est usanitic, nec sille eius usia possunt dici" - an unconvincing argument - attributes the passage from singular to plural to "votario furore" and Luiselli ("Il proerio del 'Cynegeticon' di Olimpio Nemesiano", JFC 30 (1958), 79) says that it underlines the "crescendo" of enthusiasm which pervades Lem.'s proemium. This may be so, but as Burman points out, the alternation between singular and plural occurs elsewhere in Latin where no particular significance can be attached to its use, e.g. Cic. Fam. 5.14.2; Prop. 1.7.5f. and see K 1, p. 88f. Also, it is very difficult to believe that Lem. is not echoing the first line of the Aeneid here, and possibly also Grattius uu. 1.

For the short final -e see my excursus.

-2 ...-cue.../-cue As at u. 200, the first -cue connects the two verbs and the second, the two nouns. For this use of -cue...
-cue see H. Christensen ("-ue - que bei den römischen Hexametrikern (bis etwa 500 n. Chr.)" ALL 15 (1903), 189).

3 randimus Barth would have us believe that his German edition reads P-n tuus. Lutius comments "ego junctamento illius non majorem fiorem habeo, quam Atopiensi & Utopiens isti Editioni, ex qua notis iterum hoc nugamenti profert."
Aonic Literally "Boeotian", used here in the sense of "belonging to the Muses," as at Catullus 69.68; Ovid Met. 4.2.7; Stat. Silv. 1.4.23; Silius 12.22 etc.

Helicon Since Hesiod Theog. 1 ff., it became a commonplace for poets to describe themselves as being inspired by drinking from the spring on Mount Helicon, or by meeting the Muses there. This motif is found in Latin poetry also, for example, at Lucr. 1.178; Virgil Aen. 7.641; Hor. Carm. 1.12.5, Ars 296; Prop. 5.1.1; Ovid Met. 3.534, Fast. 4.193; Martial 10.63; Avienius Phae. 2.76 etc.

Castaliusque Ithoeus proposed Castaliique, but Castalius is found used absolutely of Apollo also at Annod. Carm. 2.199.2.

alunno 'Ulitius conjectures alunno, but the expression Castalius...alunno would imply that Apollo was born or brought up there, which would be false. Apollo is connected with the Castalian spring because, according to one account, the nymph Castalia threw herself into a spring subsequently named after her when pursued by him. The poet is referred to as nursling of the Muses also at Pallasas anth. Fall. 10.52.2; Ausonius 399.4 etc.

10-11 ire...imperat The use of the infinitive with impero is mainly post-Augustan and poetic, see TLL 7 585 36f. Its use here with the active infinitive and without a noun or pronoun in the dative is rare, but it is also found at Prop. 4.3.65 and Lucan 4.54. For further examples see K-2 1, p. 682.

1 The claim to poetic originality is a conventional one, cf. Lucr. 1.924-5; Virgil Geor. 3.291-3; Hor. Carm. 3.7.2-5; Prop. 3.7.7-4;
Aetna 3; Oppian Georg. 1.29-30. Nem.'s particular claim to originality is presumably that he is the first Latin poet to write a hunting poem. A number of scholars, including Lipi, Liegl, Müller and Volpilhez, consider that Nem. must have known Grattius, but their evidence I find unconvincing. A. Scheuck. (supplement-
band der Jahrhücher für klass. Philol. 24 (1878), 437-8) and
Curcio (Arch. 27 (1897), 451f.) discuss the vocabulary and subject-
matter of Nem. and Grattius and rightly conclude that there are
dark differences between the two authors, particularly as regards vocabulary. It is true that both authors deal with horses
and dogs, but Oppian does so, too, and as Martin points out,
Nem.'s work seems to show a knowledge of Oppian rather than
Grattius. As regards language and style, as Martin also tells us,
Virgil Georg. 3 has clearly been the strongest influence on Nem.

12 Fithoeus restored this line to its rightful place, although the
asterisk against this line in the second Aldine edition where it
appears after v. 24 shows that Logus was aware that the line was
not in its proper place.

et I am at a loss to understand why Raynaud should assert that
"Le sens paraît exiger plutôt la conjonction et." Nem. elaborates
in vv. 13-4 on his statement in v. 14, and an adversative
conjunction here would be inappropriate.

(se) The reason for the presence of se before ostendat in the
second Aldine edition is uncertain, but it may have been
inserted to give sense to the line when it appeared detached
from its original context, with cursus being taken as nominative
singular instead of accusative plural. Llitius and Johnson
attribute the conjecture to Stupper, but it originates with Logus.

13 obius Luff is surely wrong to translate obius as "oc. • to meet us." obius here is more probably an epithet describing the Audia and her willingness to help the poet in his work, of.

Pliny epist. 1.10.2 est obius et expeditus plenus humanitas (Socrates philosophus). Martial (4.51.7) describes Scilicet as via.

13-4 Pithoeus conjectured facilest, and was followed by Baehrens and Haupt, but this conjecture is surely impossible: Neb. is at pains
to stress his originality (uu. 8-9, 11 and 14) and saving (uu. 52),
and it is highly unlikely that he would describe his task as easy.

complacito seems to be an attempt to restore some sense after
uu. 12 had been misplaced. The second Aldine edition has then
gone further and read facies for the manuscripts' faciles and
Ulitius reads octendas in uu. 12 to balance it. Scilicet is then
presumably to be taken as vocative. However, octendas...facies
is objectionable on the ground of sense, and it is more satis­
factory to adopt E. Schenkl's conjecture com lacitum and retain
faciles. For complacitus with active force see Neue 3, p. 117 and
for the omission of est see 1.5-1, p. 13. Baehrens adopts
facilest and conjectures non placito, but this gives poor sense,
and the objection to facilest still stands.

14 rudibus "new", as at iart. 9.7.6 rudis apera; Clau. Cons. Hon.
6.54 lunarcue rudem.

luceat Scaliger was apparently the first to ask how the path
could shine if it had not yet been trita. luceat, however, is
best interpreted as a subjunctive with prospective force, in a consecutive clause, "a meadow where a path will shine."

17 de de cannot be employed here in the sense of "about," "concerning," a use found in prose and poetry of all periods, as the use of nosco with accusative of the object and also with de and the ablative appears to be unparalleled. Gudeman (TLL 5 63 24ff.), classifies the use of de here under "pro ablat. instrumenti uel modi," but I find this improbable. I think it most likely that de is used here as equivalent to ob, propter, as at Vitr. 10.1.5 inuentum de necessitate, see TLL 5 65 41 ff.

paelicis paelex originally meant a concubine, the wife's rival for her husband's affections. The idea of rivalry gradually gained prominence, as at Ovid A.A. 1.320 where Pasiphae uses the word to describe the cows who are her rivals for the bull, and later it comes to mean simply a rival for someone's affections. paelex is used of Juno also at (Claud.) Laus Herculie 47.

astu Burman would read aestu, referring the phrase to Semele, but this is unnecessary.

18-9 tacet.../ ut tacere is used with ut also at u. 71 and Lucan 5.208.
2. As Drantius (Kroll 44 (1889), 543-4), suggests, rem. may be recollecting Valerius Flaccus 5.76 abluit loca roendent aemuline thunae. Furman's sacellarae roendent a appears to be a misprint.

24 sub For sub with temporal force cf. u. 237 sub vera nova and Cvid Fast. 5.491 sub eadem terrors.

26 Biblis The manuscripts all have ocl- and this spelling is also found at Hythoet. 1.234 Caunum et liblides an and in some manuscripts of Cvid let. 9. Verdière (irrolégorhres, p. 36) suggests the spelling Cyblis or even Bublis, since the word is the Greek Bυβλίς and Garson (Latorus 35 (1976), 560) regards this as a manifest orthographical improvement. The spelling Bυβλίς is also attested, however, at Faus. 7.5.10 and in some manuscripts of Farthen. 11, and I have therefore retained the spelling of the manuscripts here. For the story of the love of Biblis for her brother Caunus see Cvid let. 9.454ff.

27 saeuo Ulitius conjectures foedo or scseuo, but cf. Prop. 3.15.11 Lircet tam uero crimine saeua and Lucan 2.186 vix erit uilla fides, tam saeui criminis unum tot poenas cepisse carit. For the story of Hyrrha see Cvid let. 10.298ff.

29 iuit Heinsius conjectures irit, but the reading of the manuscripts is perfectly acceptable as the indicative in indirect questions is not uncommon in poetry and late prose, see K-S 2, p. 494, LHS 2, p. 538 and Norden Vergilius Aeneis VI, p. 290. Leo (De Gerecæ Tragoedis Observationes Criticæ I, p. 93 f.) gives a large number of examples. The indicative occurs in an indirect question after ut also at Valerius Flaccus 7.119.
29 iuit in For ire plus in in the sense of "becomes," "changes into," cf. Ovid Met. 10.493 sanguis it in sucos; Seneca epist. 121, 4 uoluptates ituras in dolorem.

31 stellatumque Cf. Ovid Met. 1.664 stellatus...Argus and Stat. Theb. 6.277 inocciduis stellatum uisibus Argum.

32 Baehrens suggests that this line be placed after v. 25, since he regards numerare as inappropriate to what follows, and Postgate conjectures memorare, but it is not difficult to see from such examples as Virgil Geor. 4.345-7 curam Clymene narrabat inanem/ Volcani, Martisque dolos et dulcia furta, / acue Chao densos diuum numerabat amores and Prop. 2.1.44 de tauris narrat arator, et numerat miles uulnera how numerare could have come to have the added meaning, "keep on telling" or "tell at tedious length."

38 funere This appears to be the only case of flere followed by the plain ablative. Heinsius conjectures in funere or funera and compares Ovid R.A. 127 in funere.../ flere. The former conjecture would involve the elision of a long syllable, which is rare in Nem., but not impossible, while the latter, the accusative, is the usual use with flere. Nem.'s use of the ablative here, however, can perhaps be paralleled by the use of the plain ablative after maerere, as at Cic. Sest. 39; Virgil Geor. 3.518; Ovid Trist. 1.3.23 etc and after lacrimare, as at Seneca Ag. 654; Valerius Flaccus 3.9 etc, and is an ablative of cause.

45 curantem busta Cf. Ter. And. 108 curabat una funus; Aug. Civ. 5.18 sepultura curaretur; Ps. Rufin. in Am. 6.8 busta curabant. curantem, the reading of A, is preferable to C's furantem,
although, as Haurt says (W. K., p. 492), the reading is not impossible.

50 facilis Buff translates "docile," and it is true that Gratii uses facilis as the opposite of intractabilis (u. 160), but here its significance is more likely to be that of speed (cito u. 43). facilis is used of the swiftness of animals also at Hart. 5.71.2 and Juv. 8.58.

53 fluminae See my note on 1.87.

54 placidus Barth's German edition is said to have read placitus and the anonymous editor of the Milan edition of 1735 agrees, commenting "delectari enim Ichneumon aquis, testimonio est eius cognomen enudros, quod Isidorus asserit memoriae lib. XII cap. 2. De hoc animante plura Aristoteles in historia, Flinius et Aelianus; meminit etiam Oppianus lib. III. Nos alibi in Pharsalia Lucani aliquid innuimus." placitus is an interesting conjecture, but not needed, for as Llitius rightly points out, Nem. is at pains to emphasise the contrast between the noise of the city (as at uu. 100-1) and the peace of the countryside (as at u. 86, where he again uses the adjective placidus).

Ichneumona Ichneumon is "the common name of the North African representative of a number of small weasel-shaped mammals belonging to the carnivorous family Viverridae; the Indian representatives of the group being known as mongooses. A large number of species of the type genus are known, and range over southern Asia and all Africa, the typical Kerastes Ichneumon also occurring in the south of Spain. The latter is an
Inhabitant of Egypt and the north of Africa, where it is known to foreign residents as Theriac's rat! (Aquae Ibratiae Halnaniae, vol. 4, p. 246, eleventh edition). Pliny (II. 38) and Curran (Jyn. 5.477) describe its habits. See also Keller Antike Tierwelt, p. 58f., and J. Toynbee Animals in Ancient Life and Art, p. 9.

55 felamue Tli (6 426 57ff.) says, "inter fel- et fael- variant codd....apud Cic. optini codd. fael- habere videntur, contra apud Plaedr. fel-" but other authorities maintain that fel- is the better spelling. Hilde-Hoffmann (1, p. 471) say, "-ae-schlechtere Schreibung" and CL "fael- dub. cf. meles."

The identity of this animal is not clear. Suff (TLL 6 426 21-2) says "dubium utrum mustela an catta intellegenda sit." Both Varro (i, 3, 17) and Columella (8, 14) say that it steals poultry. Columella says feles...aut etiam mustela, which implies that the words are not synonymous. Fliny (V. 10.202) describes the feles as stealthily hunting mice and birds, which sounds like a domestic cat, but minacem here suggests a larger, dangerous animal. The description of the animal sitting in a tree sounds rather like a panther, which is found in both Asia and Africa, but Fliny (V. 10.202) distinguishes the feles and the marinus. Duff translates "polecat," but although this animal is fierce, it is not fond of climbing. The most likely explanation is that the animal here is a wildcat, which lives mainly in mountain forests and is a keen climber of trees, but I can find no reference to the wildcat being hunted.

56 praefigere A and B here have the non-existent word profigere. Johnson conjectured profigere, but as Martin rightly points out, this word appears to be unique to Lucretius. praefigere occurs in
the sense of "impale" at Livy 42.60.2; Tac. Ann. 1.34; Suet. Jul. 75; Virgil Aen. 9.466, but it is more likely that here it simply means "pierce" as at Tibullus 1.4.50 statue latum praevisit, rectus.

57 *Greek* Χήρ ... More common words for the hedgehog in Latin are ericius and echinus. Χήρ is found elsewhere only at Plautus Capt. 134 where all the manuscripts have the accusative form irin, and possibly also at Hor. Sat. 1 where erin is conjectured for enin by Canal (Varro lat. 7.63).

57-8 Housman (SC 49 (1935), 79 = Classical Papers 3, p. 242), translates "carry home the prickly hedgehog wrapped in one's bosom," but it is surely highly unlikely that anyone would carry a hedgehog, which is covered not only with spines but with fleas as well, about their person. sinu is more probably used here in the sense of a bag, as at Grattius 29.

58 curae This word has been variously emended, presumably because previous editors have felt, like Martin, that curae "slightly confuses the metaphor." The reading of the manuscripts, however, does not, in my opinion, offer any problems: curae, which is quite common in the sense of the poet's theme (see TLL 4 1467ff.) refers back to the activities mentioned in vv. 46-58, which Mem. now announces will be the subject-matter of his new and "original" task. curae is a final dative, see LIM 2, p. 98. Baehrens conjectures cursu as equivalent to cursui, cf. Virgil Geor. 4.198 and Aen. 6.465 and see Keue 1, p. 541f. Heinsius's cymbae is awkward with non manna ratis following, and renders talique virtually redundant. Lamte suggests *turro*, comparing Grattius 225 and 245, but in both of these cases, the reference
is to the movements of dogs when hunting.

The metaphor of the poet's work expressed in sailing terms is quite common and occurs for example also at Virgil (Geor. 1.4; 2.4 and 4.17; Hor. Serm. 4.5.5; Ovid Fast. 1.4 etc.

59 moveri A medio-passive use which often occurs in connection with the movement of heavenly bodies. It is used of ships also at Livy 37.29.2 and Julius 6.512.

61-2 Martin compares the thought and expression in these lines with Claudian De rapto Proserpinae 5ff.

64 divit The use of this title means that C.erus was dead when the Cynogetica was written and gives us a terminus post quem for the composition of the poem, December 28.

67-8 The frontiers of the Roman Empire - the Rhine (North), Nile (South), Saône (West) and Tigris (East).

bibunt.../...bibunt I find it impossible to believe that Mem. could have repeated himself in this way. Van de Woestijne, however, retains the verb in both places, and Verdière (p. 86) seeks to defend it by comparing the repetitions nostri.../...nostros at 2.27-8 and amat.../...amat at 4.55-6 to which he attaches particular importance as the verb appears at the same place in the line in both, but neither of these examples seems to me to have any weight whatever. It would appear extremely likely that a different verb in one of these lines has been ousted under the influence of bibunt in the other, just as at 2.30, libarunt has been replaced by lamberunt in some V manuscripts under the
influence of *sunt* in the line below. It is more probable that *bibunt* belongs in u. 67 than u. 66, because *sunt* appears in u. 67 to be echoing Virgil *Aen.* 1.62 aut arernin lesto ins bibet aut Germania Cirrae in aut. 7.715 cui Tiberim Philantrinus bibunt. It is almost impossible now to say which verb *bibunt* could have supplanted in u. 68. Toss (*Observationum criticarum Liber*, pp. 46-7) conjectures *habitantes*, but I have been unable to find any examples of *habitare* used of rivers. Stern's *metunt* appears to be used as almost equivalent to *incolere* only at *Julius* 8.265 (TELE 8 289).

Johnson waxes indignant at *sunt* 's apparent repetition of *bibunt*: "Ubi, Hemiesiae, est illa tua uis poetica? ut inter Leus qui in exordio tanta tibi induisit?" and suggests as a solution "repone itaque *vel colunt*, *vel uident* aut quocunque tibi, Lector, melius occurrerit." Of these two conjectures, the latter has found greater favour, some editors comparing Lucan 10.191-2 *spes sit mihi certa uidendi/Niliacos fontes* and 275 *Hilum uidere calentem*, but the sense seems rather to demand another verb meaning "inhabit." I therefore prefer Johnson's conjecture *colunt*, cf. Virgil *Aen.* 7.714 *colunt* Foruloscue et flumen *Hirellae* and Lucan 3.230 *sua colitur Ganges*. By own suggestion, from Jeneca *Med.* 372ff. and Claud. 24.158, would be *principium* et *Nili notant* but this certainly is not "melius" than Johnson's *colunt*.

69 *triumum* Not a great deal is known about the reigns of Carinus and Numerianus and we cannot be sure which wars are referred to here. F. Bianchi (*Le fide historica in Carini et Numeriani rebus certis enarrandis Hemiesiano poetae tribuenda*, Iria 1911, pp. 16-9), concludes from *Julia Carus et Carinus et Numerianus* 8.2 that
the reference must be to successful battles against Lycosthen and concludes that Cat. Arctos refers to this, but Martin disagrees and contends that if LCM knew of these battles, he would have known that Numerianus was dead, almost certainly murdered by his father-in-law Aper, whereas at u. 64 LCM clearly thinks that both emperors are still alive. The Luffs say that "the war maintained against the Jarmatians by Carus after Probus' death was left to Carinus to finish, when Carus had to face the Persian menace in the East," but it appears that there was a campaign against the Quadi as well and Numerianus, not Carinus, issued coins celebrating a victory over them (Jaffen, Jfr., vi, p. 379, no. 91). Possibly the wars mentioned here were in Germany, as Carinus issued a coin commemorating Victoria Germanica (Cohen, no. 359), and is called Germanicus Maximus in inscriptions (Colin 8.2747; 7902). He had been sent out to protect Gaul when his father was fighting the Persians (JHA 36.7), and it is possible, as Martin suggests, that the Germans, who had been troublesome under the reign of Probus, had risen up in arms again. Baehrens would read urima, but since Arctos is used so vaguely by the poets to mean any Northern territory, and urima could as well mean "nearest" as "furthest", it is impossible to say what this phrase could signify, or what improvement it would make to the text. Burman also objects to urima, saying, "certe incomoda uox illa prior praeterea quia non noster repetetur, sed nihil succurrit, quod substitutum, nisi urimus confeceris quia malit." In actual fact, however, there is no "repetition" since prior in u. 71 means there not "first" but "superior," "more excellent" as at Hor. Carm. 51 bellante prior. urima may be used here as equivalent to primum or um as at Hor. Serm. 2.3.41 and Cic. Cæc. 90, or, less likely, in the
sense of "for the first time," as at Virgil *Aen.* 5.647, as Lenz suggests.

7-2 Humerianus accompanied his father on his campaign against the Persians (*SHA* Carus et Gabinus et Humerianus 7) and on his death became governor of the Eastern Empire. He is referred to in an inscription as *Humerianus Reximus* (*OII* XIV 16), although he appears to have been a man of letters rather than a soldier. (*SHA* Carus 11).

72 Babylon. Babylon is sometimes used in the poets as a synonym for Parthia (as at Lucan 1.10), or, as here, for the capital. In Gem.'s time, the capital was Ctesiphon (not Ctesou, as Martin says, which was destroyed by Avilius Cassius in A.I. 164), and Babylon itself had long been little more than a desert, see Strabo 16.15 (738) and Pliny *NH* 6.122.

73 *violata cacumina* There has been some discussion as to the significance of this phrase. Barth thinks that it refers to the Euphrates, which the emperor Hadrian wanted to be the boundary between the Persians and the Romans. Littius comments, "Heras nugas iterum agit Barthius" and says that *violata cacumina* refers to the death of the emperor Carus, who was allegedly struck by lightning in Persia, and Johnson agrees. Burman says that *culmina* refers to the emperors and is used in a similar way at *Cons. ad Liviam* 347 where, however, the accepted reading is now *lumina*, and at *Claud. in Ruf.* 1.21 where the use of *culmina* hardly supports his interpretation. Tili (3.12.1) explains "*dignitatem*" and Hernsdorf interprets "*fastigium et maiestatem imperii Romani*," and *cacumina* here doubtless means something of
nulla. It is difficult to determine the exact significance of this word here and various attempts have been made to explain or explain it. Barth's German edition allegedly read muta, which Martin approves, explaining that muta signifies "they no longer hiss through the air." This explanation seems to me rather far-fetched, and examples of mutus used in this way seem to be lacking. J.C. Clark (Ch 27 (1913), 261) suggests nulla in the sense of "unbarbed," but such a use would appear to be unparalleled.

There are several possible interpretations of nulla. Verdier (lireppondres, p. 87) says that the sense is "at Civid lit. 9. 725"
The sense seems to me to be "not existing," a use of *nullus* which is not appropriate here. Ulitius suggests that *nullus* is equivalent to *nirrita," ruined," but this is not quite what the sense demands. He also suggests, "res nulla pro nullius preti aut meriti" and compares Cic. *ad Att.* 15.2 (by which he apparently means *De loc. 7: both reference and quotation are inaccurate), but he does not explain what he considers the sense to be in these two passages.

The buffs translate "unavailing," but this is unlikely in view of *clausas* and *laxas;* no arrows appear to have been fired, and an suggests that we are to understand *spicula emiserint,* which gives excellent sense and is, I believe, the most satisfactory explanation of *nulla* here.

83 *devotio* At the time of Hem., *devotio* was a synonym for *obedientia* or *fides,* see TLL 5 379 19. For the scansion, see my excursus.

99 *chlamys* Bernadorf, in a long excursus, argues that Hem. is using the word loosely for the tunic, as Diana in her role as hunting goddess was usually represented with a *wifed tunic,* and the *chlamys* was never belted as described in u. 92. As Martin points out, however, *corrurescue sine* need not refer to the *chlamys.* Also the *chlamys* is referred to as belted at *Aul.* *Et.* 11.8 *illum succinctum chlamyde.*

92 *corrurescue* This adjective, used for *corrurestus,* apparently occurs only here. TLL (4 1043 Bd) strangely understands *arcolc*
Here, whereas in fact vv. 16-23 are ascribed to Siena.

54 docile. This adjective is used in the sense of lectorum, propter of hynhs at Virgil, Ec. 5.3. In, Aen. 6.102 and of Aeneid at Prop. 2.37.76.

56 docile. This appears to be the only example of this adjective used of Echo, but it is very appropriate. Isidorus defines docile (orig. 10.66) "non quid sit doctus, sed quia doceri solat: est enim ingeniosus et ad discendum aptus."

Docentet. As Martin points out, it is not necessary to interpret this verb as Guidoan (EIL 5.6.7 11-2) does in the sense of iterum iterumcnsus adducet, which would be a unique use. decantare is surely used here in its usual sense of "repeat," as at Hor. Carm. 1.33.3 etc. decantet appears to be an emendation by Jannazero: AB have the unmetrical sicant.

100 audioscute. The reading of the manuscripts has been variously emended because of the presence of audio in 102. The repetition is inelegant, but not, I think, impossible, as similar repetitions occur elsewhere in Ec., both in the Ec., and in the Eclogues, e.g. 121 binos 123 bins; 169 and 171 teneros; 214 and 217 coxena; 322 prata 324 prata; 2.7 and 74 manes; 14 and 7 etere etc. For repetitions elsewhere in Latin poetry see Shackleton Bailey, Properties, p. 3.

tumultu. Here probably used in the sense of "crowds" as at Stat. Ecly. 1.2.234 omnis plebeio teritur praestans tumultu.
Erupt, but to emphasize the permanence of the various occupations which the lover of hunting is leaving behind him, and to imply that a person is born on his occupation would be inappropriate. It must therefore read *guide*, which is often used of the sea e.g. Luocr. 1.1051; Hor. Carm. 1.25.13 etc. Ullius says that this line refers to fishing, but as Martin remarks, it must surely refer to merchants who risk their lives for profit, as the context requires a reference to another profession.

105ff. For dog-breeding in antiquity, see Aelian H.A. 12.16; Varro L.L. 2.9.1; Virgil Geer. 2.75ff.; Gratius 26ff., 237; Pliny N.H. 2.151.

105 This line is rather clumsily phrased, but I take it to mean "opens a period of twelve months which proceeds without interruption." *bis senis mensibus* is a descriptive ablative attached indiscriminately to *inocciduum* and *aeum*. The ablative is used instead of the genitive for metrical convenience also for example at Claudian Bell. Sild. 1.416 *praecipitus electa muta manus*.

*inocciduum* This word is usually used of constellations and the only other example of its use of time is Justinius *Hes. hex. 2, 8 p. 390A*. Lucan is apparently the first to use *inocciduum* (once), followed by Statius, Claudian, Arcoius, Seculius, Avienius, Faronius Lulogius and Germanicus.

107 *Laconica* The Spartan dog is also mentioned, for example,
Colossus

The Colossian dog is frequently mentioned in Latin literature, e.g. at Lucr. 5.1265; Virgil Georg. 2.405: Hor. Eprod. 6.5; Grott. 18'ff.; Stat. Theb. 3.203; Silv. 3.6.9; Aen. 1.7.7; Seneca Phaed. 7'ff. etc. and see also Heller on cit. 1, pp. 103'ff.; Aymerd on cit. pp. 25'ff.; Hull on cit. pp. 20'ff.

'trebet' 'trehere is used here for contrahere, as at Lucr. 6.966, 1190 and Cvid Am. 2.2.33. There is no need to read rival with the second Aldine edition.

costerum sub fine Volpilhac rightly comments, "il s'agit du point où les côtes et le ventre se rejoignent, et non de celui où les côtes et l'épaule se rejoignent, comme le prétend J.C. Wernsdorf."

carinam B glosses this word with dorsum, and carina does usually seem to be used of the spine e.g. Lact. orif. 5.4 (feua) quasi carinam connexit, quam nos dicimus arsinam; Tacit. stat. 7.9.22 spinili secullae, quae hoc est animali, quod est rauici carina and cf. Cvid. Let. 14.552 mediiscue arsa carinam subdita nauiscia arsina sustur tur in usum, but the sense demands that the word be used here in the sense of "rib-cage." decenter prona would be inappropriate of a dog's back, which is more or less level in every breed, and sub rectore late and costarum. sub fine
define the limits between which the 
"firm," as at Catull. 23.12; Gratt. 277 etc.

This word is used in the sense of "loins" elsewhere 
only at Vulg. Exod. 12.1; id. Lan. 10.5.

It is difficult to see what significance 
the conjecture of Logus has been generally accepted. Johnson explains 
"spread. lata, non contracta," and T1 1 (6 1020 46) "cistentus, 
patulus," quoting also Germ. 188; Quint. 11.3.59. Avien. Arm. 
465 and 467. The dog would need broad, powerful hindquarters for 
swift running.
It is mainly used of mules and horses, and also of camels and rams (once each).

ommia. An adverbial accusative of reference after caeverm, cf. Virgil, Aen. 4.558; Stat. Aen. 2.9.1. Austin on Aen. 4.558 comments, "This use of omnia is an invention of Virgil's, by analogy with \( \pi \alpha \nu \kappa \tau \alpha \) and was seldom imitated...; it is foreign to prose (Livy xxi. 34.5 is not an example of it). See Kilflin Akt. 2 pp. 95ff., 615; L-L, p. 373; Roll Arsenehaftliche Syntax, p. 76." Austin goes on to explain this use of omnia as a generalizing example of the poetic accusative of respect after adjectives as an entirely Greek mannerism introduced by Virgil and widely adopted by later poets. The first certain prose example of such an accusative is Tac. Ger. 17 nude kynochia.

Romaeui. There is little to choose between A3's romaeui and B's romaeui as regards sense, but the number of sibilants provided by A3's reading produces, I think, a very ugly line. There is a high number of sibilants also in vv. 41, 45 and 51, but in these lines the sibilants are much less obtrusive. A3's romaeui could have come about as the result of dittoigraphy.

Robore. Kuttner conjectures corrore. Firmus is quite often used of corpus, but it is also used with robust as at Columella 1.5.7; Lucan 1.42; Fliny, 21. 31.13; Stat. Theb. 8.309; Quint. 1.8.6 and corpore is therefore unnecessary.

Sole. A rare use of the word to mean "year." Wolpilhez points out it cannot mean "day," as at Virgil, Aen. 9.51-2, since
this would be nonsense here. The meaning "year" is
guaranteed by Ovid Trist. 4.7.1-2 bis me sol adiit relidæ
post frigora brumæ / bisque suum tacto Fisce peregrit iter

jugandi  C's jugandis is presumably a conjecture by Sannazaro.
TLL says (4 1453 10) that cura is used "cum gerund. persaepe,
multo rarius cum gerundivo." Here the abstract gerund is better
than the gerundive, since haec optima cura refers to what has
been discussed previously, that is, the right time for mating,
not to the dogs themselves.

123 A rather elaborate way of saying "when two months have passed."
The actual gestation period for dogs is on average 63 days.
mox cum is not used here as a unitary conjunction equivalent to
simulac as this would give less good sense than if the two
words are taken separately.

se  For the reflexive use of formare cf. Firm. math. 4.19.24
Mercurius...si se sub trigonica radiatione formauerit.

bina  For bini in the singular in the sense of duo cf. Lucr.
4.451 and 5.879; Anth. Lat. (Riese) 791.25; Iul. Val. 1.3 etc.
and see LHS 2, p. 212.

formarit  For the shortened form of the future perfect, see
LHS 1, p. 335. Burman conjectures formuit, but cf. u. 157f.
and u. 179. Heinsius conjectures renouauit, with which we
might compare u. 179, but formare is quite satisfactory.
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The word is not used of pregnancy in the classical period. Ili (6 2267 7'-4) gives only two other examples of the word used in this sense, Is. Aur. xem. 125, 1 and Isid. diff. 1.455.

Columella also recommends discarding the first litter (7.2.11).

This is a post-classical word which occurs first in Apuleius, e.g. porulosam familiam (et. 5.3). See Kretschmann, De Latinitate Apuleii, p. 51.


Uiscere is used in Latin of any vital organ, usually in the plural. It is used of the womb also at Quint. 12.3.4 and Lig. 42.6.3.

The reading of is rare word among the poets except for comedy. It is not used elsewhere by Nex. Axelson (Unpoetische örter, p. 36) remarks, "der Gebrauch dieser lartikel, wo sie überhaupt in der Poesie vorkommt, in der Regel an gewisse Partikeln oder Pronomina gebunden ist. (e does not specify which particles and pronouns he means.) Etwas freier verfahren nur Lucr. Cat. Hor. Juv." autem is found once each in Propertius, Aetna and
Lycurus, twice in Ciris andartial, three times in Horace (Cristler), four in Lucentius and Catullus, six in Avit, seventeen in Lucretius, nineteen in Valerius Flaccus, thirty-four in Virgil (of which twenty-eight are in the Aeneid) and forty-two times in Statius. AC read 'sin uero.' Both the combinations 'sin autem' and 'sin uero' are rare in poetry, but sin uero occurs only in later Latin (see 2, p. 669), e.g. at Valerius Flaccus 5.221; Com. arcol. 879; Iuvene. 1.62', whereas 'sin autem' is found also at Virgil Sac. 4.67; Calerecton 7.3 and Prop. 2.52.29. Since uero appears in A, the less corrupt manuscript, I have therefore preferred it to B's autem.

abcaturue abdo seems often to have been used rather ambiguously. Its significance here has caused some disagreement. Hey (TLL 1 56 65-6) considers that it is here used in the sense of reToueo, but compares this line with Gratt. 270-30 abdita sin non/ alres in latebras unicae inclus marito est, where, however, abdo is surely used in the sense of "shut up", "hidden away." "Hidden away," however, is precisely what abdo here in fact means, in the view of Thielmann (All 3, p. 474). The same problem of interpretation occurs at Virgil Geor. 3.96 abde domo nec turpi ignosce senectae, which Conington says does not mean "remove him from home" but "leave him no longer out with the mares." I find this interpretation difficult to accept: it is surely bad economics to continue to keep a useless horse needing regular feeding and presumably also occupying land or an outbuilding which could be used for more profitable purposes, and Virgil must surely be recommending that the horse be turned off the farm. As for this passage, the interpretation "shut up at home" is in my view nonsense: how and where could
one may put up another. Most examples of abdo in the sense of
removed seem to carry the additional meaning of occultus, but
this additional sense is perhaps lacking in the case of Tib.
2. 32 procoul ad dentem hinc precor abdo facer. Rem. is almost
certainly echoing Virgil here, and it seems to me most likely
that they are both using abdo in the sense of exclude. It is
ture that Varro, Columella, Pliny and Oppian recommend rearing
only the best puppies so that the mother is not overtaxed, and
not because they may be injured or rejected, but this latter
interpretation of the passage is surely the only sensible one.

There has been some controversy about the meaning of these
lines. Vernsdorf interprets them thus: "Ioteres e corporibus
grauibus ueluis uaeu praeronderent, praenoscere uii leues
cursu futuri sint, nempe leuiores pondece, and Stern, Cabaret-
Fuarty and Fiégl agree. Iulius on the other hand says, "ex
grauibus corporibus agnosces leues cursus. aut, ut primum
Berthius construit: a grauitate cornorum futuri cursus
CELERITATEM PRAE NOSCERE POTES. Grauiissimi enim catuli,
velociissimi euadunt, quia scilicet ex pendere futura illorum
magnitudo, ex magnitudo velocitatem praesumitur," and Inl
(Grattii Commenticon vol. 2, p. 89) also disagrees with
Vernsdorf, rightly describing his interpretation as "contortaun."
Rem., then, seems to be saying that the heaviest puppies will
turn out the swiftest. Inl, however, regards this statement as
factually incorrect and comments, "Graues catuli grandia membra
promitunt, non tamen velocitates; potest fieri ut canis
corporis uim habeat magnam, careat autem velocitate," also
quoting Oppian Cyn. I. 423-4 κραπνοι δ' ου τελέθουσιν,
ατάρ μένος ἐνδοθι πολλόν, / καί οθένος ἀφραστον,
καθαρόν, καί θυμὸς ἀναιδῆς
He further suggests that Nem. is echoing Grattius uu. 298-9 and has misunderstood him. This raises two very vexed questions: whether Nem. did in fact know the work of Grattius, and whether leuis at Grattius 299 (Enk's text) is to be taken as accusative plural (in which case Grattius is expressing the same idea as Nem., see Housman, "Notes on Grattius," Cq. 28 (1934), 128 = Classical Papers 3, p. 1225) or nominative as Enk believes (pp. 87-8). But in fact these questions can be set aside, and Enk's accusations of error by Nem. can be answered independently of Grattius, for F. Müller ("Ad Nemesianum," Mnem. 46 (1918), 329-33) has produced support for Nem.'s statement from Xenophon Cyn. 4.1: πρῶτον μὲν οὖν Χρή εἶναι μεγάλας, εῖτα ἐχούσας τὰς κεφαλὰς ἐλαφρὰς 4.2: καὶ ἕαν ὦς ποιαύται αἱ κύνες, ἔσονται ἱσχυρὰ τὰ ἔδη 3.3: Χείρους δὲ καὶ πλέον ἡς αἱ ποιαίδε, μικραί, γρηγοραί... αἱ μὲν οὖν μικραί πολλάκις ἐκ τῶν κυνάρων ἀποστεροῦνται τῆς ἐργασίας διὰ τὸ μικρόν (Dindorf's text, Teubner 1900).

Enk (p. 88) quotes the thirteenth century writer Demetrios Constantinopolitanos (Aelian H.N. II p. 588 ed. Herscher) whose words contradict his theory: Ἐν δυνατὴ εὐθυμίᾳ τὰ κυνάρα ἐπίλεξα τὸ βαρύτερον.

Nem.'s conclusions about the puppies' speed are probably not unjustified: the heaviest will be the best-nourished and therefore the most likely to turn out fit and strong. Heaviness need not imply that their limbs will turn out large and ungainly, as Enk suggests. Müller's conjecture, however, based as it is on a desire to bring the reading of Nem. closer to that of Grattius ("Propius igitur iam ad Grattium accedit auctor posterior... si scripsisset Nemesianus perpendere uires /
corpus is not, like the rest of the passage, written in a standardised manner, as it is often not be certain that Nun. odd. (equiv. Grattius's work and in any case, the subject-matter is slightly different, Grattius speaking only of strength and weight, while Nun. links strength, weight and speed.

43 catulus hic. Duff (p. 453) strangely calls this "the single occurrence of hiatus" in the *Cynarites*. There is hiatus at *Cyn. 7* and also at 2,45.

indiscreta. TLL explains the meaning of the word as "fere i.e. indistinctus." Virgil uses the word of twin brothers (Aen. *0.391*)

Cf. also Lact. *epit. 33.3* sicut in crepitibus necorum confusa et indiscreta onnia. Nun. is perhaps exaggerating here, as most litters have a "runt", which is usually distinguishable at a very early age.

144 examen. This use of the word as almost equivalent to *examinatio* or *judicium* is poetic and late. It is also found at Stat. *Silv. 3.2.203*; Min. *Pell. 5.10*; Ter. *Laur. 81*; Arnob. *Nat. 2.14* p. 50; Hil. *Lyst. 2.11* p. 35.24.

145 trevidocue. Martin comments, "If we follow the manuscripts, a double construction must be understood for the ablatives *judicio* and *periculo*, i.e. 'saving them by her judgment and from the danger.' Such a use seems impossible. Moreover, the epithet *trepidus* is naturally applied to the dogs rather than to the danger." The latter objection need not trouble us since it is clearly a straightforward case of transferred epithet. Martin's other objection, however, has more weight, and if the words are
to be taken as she describes, the construction would indeed seem to be impossible. I wonder, however, whether Martin and others are right in referring the danger to the puppies rather than to the mother. The puppies are actually in no danger, as u. 142 implies, although admittedly the mother cannot know that; it is the mother herself who is in danger, having to negotiate a ring of fire to reach her puppies. I would therefore translate "preserving the best ones by her judgment and in the face of alarming peril." There would seem to be no difficulty about the zeugma if the words are taken in this way. Burman, supported by Lostgate, conjectures transidencus, which is unlikely. Baehrens reads trapisocus, followed by Martin and Volpilhac, but this is in my view unnatural and awkward.

146 germina There is no other example cited in Ill. of germina used of puppies, but it is used of goslings at Avian. fab. 32.1 and at Mart. Cap. 7.729 of the young of the hydryus.

149 primum primum is used here in the sense of optimus as at Liv. 26.16.7, Columella 5.8.1 etc.

portatcue cubili Iliny makes a similar statement at [. . .] 8.151 optimus in foetu qui nouissime cernere incirit, aut cuem primum fert in cubile feta.

150 segregat The verb is here used in its literal and rare sense of "separate from the flock" as also at Phaedr. 3.15.3 and Vulg. Matt. 25.32. Martin comments, "If we recall the fact that segregat literally means 'chosen from the herd,' the combination of the two words is rather striking."
A final cative, as at Callat., 1.14.7 (unus) quam in
anno unicus ministrare, an addition is not necessary.

lecte It was the practice in antiquity, as it is today, to
add milk to puppies' food, see Arrian 8.2.4; Xenophon Syn.
7.4.11-12; Varro ibid. 2.9.10; Quatt. 307.

'tenuascue...cibatus' i.e. the selle serum of u. 152. cibatus
is also used of animals' food at Luor. 6.7.27; Varro ibid. 2.4.15;
2.9.8; 3.5.3; 3.8.7 and a number of times in Fliny. Except for
Fliny, the word appears only in ante- and post-classical Latin.
Hartin considers that marius has the force of notius, but it is
perhaps better to take it with tenues: i.e. in recommending that
not too much of the more fattening camina should be given to the
puppies, while the thinner cibatus should still be given.

articulos deprauet Xenophon (Syn. 7.4) also says that too
much fattening food will make a young dog's legs crooked.

natantia The word is used to mean "unsteady" also at Stat.
Theb. 6.34.1-2 effusaque san-uiue lexo/membra natant.

laceras The proleptic use also occurs at Cvid. lat. 1.5.29
cum laceras aries balistate concurtit ares.

randere Hartin comments "mandere ualues could scarcely be
used of the actions of dogs. The proleptic epithet laceras
applied to the doors indicates that randere is the correct
reading." I cannot follow this argument at all: there is nothing
in the least improbable in the idea of dogs trying to open doors,
and modern doors, at any rate, can be opened by some dogs. It
would be impossible, of course, for a dog to open a door, but
Men. does not say that they succeed, merely that they take the
attempt (pausa u. 173), presumably by
scratching at the door. I have never seen a dog try to open a
door by attempting to bite at it, and indeed, it is difficult
to see how a dog could bite a closed value, although as Men.
says, they might easily bite the wood around the door. Verdier
(p. 92) appears to object to variae on the ground that dogs
are not likely to chew wood. This, however, is untrue, as many
dogs enjoy this activity, and it does not appear, as Men. fears,
to affect the sharpness of their teeth or claws at all.

\[171\] *inrinunt* Johnson conjectures *influnct* and Heinaeus *inflirunct*,
but *inrinunt*, "dash against," is perfectly acceptable, cf.
Fliny "H. 8.8 *impactus arbore* (dentes) *fragment* (alae lantii).

\[174\] *spectauerit* The manuscripts read *spectaueris*. Any editors
take u. 175 as the apodosis to the clause beginning *max cum*
(u. 172). If the lines are to be taken in this way, then either
we have a case of two co-ordinate verbs (*pausa* u. 175 and
*spectaueris* u. 174) being used without a connective, which
would be contrary to Men.'s usual practice and to good style, or
we must emend to *spectauerit* with Johnson. *aetas* is then the
subject of *spectauerit* and *passa* is a participle. Johnson
compares Virgil *Aen. 1.265 uicerit aetas*. Vendsdorf, on the
other hand, retains *spectaueris*, interpreting as the apodosis
of the *max cum* clause. *spectaueris* is then future perfect used
for future, see *Lii 2*, p. 324. Martin agrees with Vendsdorf, but
for a reason which in my view supports Johnson's conjecture
rather than *spectaueris*, since she remarks, "*inlaenis...membris*
is not a repetition of velicr...ceurinins, but is explained by
11. 65-71: the dogs will no longer have alunnus mutin (u. 65)
at eight months old, but that will not mean that their limbs are
also inlacin, unless you have been wise enough not to lock them
up. It seems to us that non coloc...red etiam is implied in the
two clauses in uu. 172-3 and uu. 174, and therefore read
spectuarum with Johnson. For the omission of est after Yssa,
see uu. 174, p. 13.

175 Ceresalia dona The name of the goddess is a common metonym
for corn, as at Virgil Georg. 1.297: best. 3. 5. 6; Gratt. 352;
Copian Cyn. 1. 134. Lvid in fond of the expression Ceresalia
dona, see Let. 11. 122 and best. 1. 883 and 6. 39.

178 clausiique teneri Luff translates "or be kept on a chain."
That dogs were chained as well as shut up we know from uu. 65
and from Varro (uu. 1. 21. 1), but there is no evidence that
clausere was ever used as synonymous with vincire. Cato (uu.
121) simply says that dogs ought to be clauses. Lxx. has
recommenced above (uu. 65-6) that young dogs should not be
confined, but as they grow older, this is one of the things
they must learn to bear.

179 Xenophon (Cyn. 7. 6) advises hunting the young dogs at eight or
ten months and Arrian (Cyn. 25. 1 and 26. 1) suggests eleven
months for bitches and two years for dogs.

181 sed Tross conjectures seu (Observationum, Criticarum Liber,
Hamm '829, p. 49). He rejects sed, "sed enim, unde penient,
parum liquet; nam uelitis non longo cursu oppositum esse necuit,
quum sensus sit: catulos paulatin cursu producer (i.e. cursui
acuæfacias) et virium quibus hanc ita longo, quod aut in varia
vella aut in seco non salvi, cuisse quænam autem utque loco longius
suae non possum, institut omnemitemillum est,' and
comparis Gratt. 362. Here Heinsius conjectures seu. This is not,
however, a relevant parallel, and I therefore reject: seu at
Gratt. 362, as there is a contrast between u. 36 and u. 362.
Here also, u. 164 is clearly not an explanation of u. 129, but
a contrast to it, and seu (resurse), which picks up non longe,
should therefore be retained.

35 nec K-j say (1, p. 92), "Wenn an einen affirnattiven
Imperativ oder einen affirnattiven volitiven Konjunktiv ein
negativer Konjunktiv des Willens angereiht wird so steht regel-
recht necus (nec)." Martin asserts that nec with the imperative
is rare in classical poetry, but K-j quote a number of examples,
including seven from Virgil (p. 192).

moderarina Martin would retain moderarina of the manuscripts,
suggesting that "cursus is not the object of indulge but
female with moderarina, 'don't once only indulge the dogs
with moderation in coursing, but train them frequently etc.'"
but I can find no evidence for indulge with the dative and
ablative, or a parallel for such an expression as moderarina
cursus, "restrained running." It might also be suggested that
cursus is the object of indulge and that moderarina is ablative
of manner: 'don't grant the dogs runs in moderation once only
etc.', but only a very few nouns can be used in the ablative
without a qualifying adjective, and there is no evidence that
moderarina is one of them (see K-j 1, p. 409 and K-j 2, p. 117).

Heinsius conjectured moderarina, and most modern editors
followed him. Johnson, who was not the originator of the conjecture _moderamina_ as Latin states, takes the line to mean "don't once let the dogs have the management of the chase (i.e. don't let them forth unrestrained), but train them for a long time in a small valley or enclosed field," but _moderamen_ must surely refer to the amount of exercise which it is proper for the dogs to take in order to build up their strength, cf. u. 186-7, and the line must surely mean "regularly give the dogs the control of a run," i.e. a controlled run. This use of _moderamen_ appears to be rare: TLL describes it as "de restrictione proprie de actione retinendi" and gives only one other example, Jilicus 6.17 _constantem et aequo moderamina ecuorum docentes_ (Syrnum). TLL seems to be in two minds about this problem, as L. Lumpe reads _moderamina_ under _moderamen_ (s. 120447) and V. Pulhart reads _moderamine_ under _infulsec_ (75084).

187 _munera_ AC's _munere_, punctuated with a comma after it by Postgate, gives good sense, but there are no other examples of a major sense pause between the fifth and sixth feet in Hex. Ulinius conjectures _munera_, and as Martin points out, _munera_ is more natural than _laudem_ as the object of _discere_. _discere_ might be absolute, but this is unlikely. _munera...discere_ then balances _laudem...amare_ (u. 188). _munera_ might have come about under the influence of _moderamina_ in u. 185.

190 _cursu reuocent, iubeant_ The manuscripts read _cursus_, which is difficult as I can find no example where the sphere of action from which a person or animal is recalled by another is in the accusative case. The natural object of _reuocent_ is, as Martin...
suggests, the same as that of *iubeant*, i.e. *catulos* understood. Heinsius proposed *cursu* but Verdière (p. 93), who wishes to preserve the balance of *cursus...cursus*, suggests that Heinsius is thinking of Cic. *Fam. 10.1* *de meo cursu...uoce reuocatus* and objects that "apparemment, Cícéron n'est pas un chien de chasse." His solution is that *cursus* is equivalent to *canis currens*, but I can find no evidence for this suggestion. Heinsius's *cursu* is in my view the best solution. *reuvocare* usually has a preposition when it is followed by the ablative, but it is also found with the plain ablative, as at Virgil *Geor. 4.88*.

*reuocent, iubeant*  Heinsius suggests *reuoces iubeas*. This is neat, but unwarranted: *hortamina* understood is the subject of the plural verbs, and this change of subject causes no real confusion.

tendere *cursus*  tendere is used here as equivalent to *extendere* as at Hor. *Serm. 2.1.2* and *Epist. 1.5.11*. Heinsius presumably did not conjecture *cursum* to balance the singular *cursu* because *cursum tendere* apparently always means "direct one's course," cf. Virgil *Aen. 1.656, 6.240; Silius 9.216, 10.73* etc., which would make no sense here.

192 *carpere*  "tear at," as at Ovid *Met. 10.43* and *458; Phaedr. 1.28.4.*

195-7 *morbi...canes.../dant stragem*  Damste conjectures *canum* and Verdière supports him (p. 94), contending that *tristes morbi* is the subject of *dant*, and comparing Ovid *Met. 7.536-7 strage canum primo uolucrumque cuiumque boumque / inque feris subiti derrensa*
rotatio monti but it is impossible that morti should govern
the plural don't when the singular mortit intervenes. However,
however, preserves the reading of the manuscripts, saying:
"Virgil Aen. 2.78 'is it would ruin..." from which in turn may
be inspired by Lucret. 2.45 (moriis) dabunt labor putrisque
ruinas. The reading of the manuscripts can perhaps therefore be
justified as an analogous use of the phrase dant stragem, "with
canes as the subject: "the dogs suffer destruction." The
simplest and most likely solution is that of Duff, who takes
canes as the subject and dant stragem in an active sense, and
translates "the dogs cause widespread mortality without
distinction"; canes is presumably the noun of u. 18/1. Here is
then expressing a fear that the puppies will contract diseases
which will spread amongst the other dogs. Grattius (u. 172) also
mentions the highly contagious nature of scabies.

195 scabies Scabies was a serious problem in antiquity, although
it is not mentioned by Aristotle. Remedies for scabies in sheep
are found in a number of authors, but only Columella (6.5.1),
Grattius and Nem. discuss it in dogs. (For ancient remedies see
Hull et al. cit. pp. 56-7). There is little similarity between Nem.
and Grattius's discussions of scabies, as Martin points out:
Nem. imitates Virgil directly in his introduction of the subject,
while Grattius begins in a quite different manner (409ff.).

199 Tritonide oliua Kuhlmann (Tii 9 563 41) retains oliua of the
manuscripts but evidence for Tritonide being used otherwise than
as a feminine adjective appears to be lacking. It is highly
unlikely that Tritonide here is a noun, though the use of the
name as metonymy for the olive-tree can be paralleled by Cvid
A m. 2.16.8. Housman (CR 16 (1902), 444 = Classical Papers 2, p. 580) says, "Pretty Latin is Tritonis oliuum. They conjecture oliua; but the corruption of oliua with Tritonide beside it, to oliuo would be a strange event; and what you would mix with vinegar to make an ointment is not the berry of the olive, but its oil. Expel the gloss and write Tritonide pingui or dulci or the like. Ou. her. xix 44 'Pallade iam pingui tinguere membra putas,' trist. iv 5 4 'uigil infusa Pallade flamma,' Mart. vii 28 3 'nec Tartesiacis Pallas tua, Fusce, trapetis / cedat.'

Tritonide in Stat. silv. II 7 28 'Tritonide fertiles Athenas' means oliua rather than oliuo. In Nemes. buc. II 42 a similar gloss has invaded only part of the MSS: 'nostri pocula Bacchi V, uini NG.' H. Schenkl's olenti and Postgate's leui show that they have been thinking along similar lines. I too think it likely that oliuo is a gloss which has intruded into the text, but it is, of course, impossible to say which word it might have ousted. However, the second Aldine edition's oliua does not seem to me impossible; -o could have come in from u. 196 or u. 202, or could have arisen simply from confusion between -a and -o, as at u. 91. Elision occurs in the thesis of the fifth foot also at u. 219 and 295.

200 -que...-que H. Christensen (Que - que bei den römischen Hexametrikern (bis etwa 500 n. Chr.) ALL 15 (1908)) points out that the use of -que...-que, where the first -que joins the two clauses together while the second joins the two accusatives, occurs several times in Virgil, Ovid and Statius, but only once each in Horace, Manilius, Grattius and Nem. He further comments (p. 196) that the use of -que...-que to connect types of animals occurs apart from this line only at Ovid Met. 13,832;
tinea is used in Latin to denote parasites of various types, e.g. lice (Claud. in Eutr. 1.113, 260) and woodworm (Vitr. 5.12 fin.). Here, to be scientifically accurate, it ought to be translated "psoric mite"! On the subject of mites, the Encyclopaedia Britannia tells us (vol. 18, eleventh edition, p. 619), "A certain number of species...called...'psoric' mites, give rise...to a highly contagious disease known as scabies or mange, which if not treated in time produces the gravest results. These mites belong exclusively to the Sarcoptidae and Demodicidae...Three genera of Sarcoptidae, namely Sarcoptes, Chorioptes and Psoroptes, cause mange or scabies in mammals...Of the genus Chorioptes two species have been described on domestic animals, viz. Ch. symbiotes...and Ch. cynotis, which has been detected only in the ears of certain carnivora such as dogs, cats and ferrets." The knife which Nem. recommends is presumably used to cut off the skin encrustations which the mite produces. Martin equates the tinea with the ricinus, a suggestion which Volpilhac rejects (p. 119), saying, "seules les tiques infectées (cf. P.J. Cadiot et F. Breton, Médecine canine, p. 262) provoquent une maladie mortelle, la piroplasmose, qui ne se manifeste pas par des affections dermiques." It is not impossible, however, that both ricinus at Varro R.R. 2.9.14; Col. 7.13.1; Pliny N.H. 22.47; 30.82, 83 and κροτών at Plut. Mor. 55e and Bassus Geop. XIX 2.10 are also references to this mite and not to the tick, which is usually found in an animal's fur. With so many parasites and so few ancient terms for them, it is not unnatural that the same word should have to do duty for a number of different creatures.
Burman, Baehrens, Postgate, the Duffs, Van de Woestijne and Volpilhac all punctuate with a comma after rabies, but the sense is surely, "there is also rabies, a deadly peril to dogs," or "rabies is also a deadly peril to dogs."

Pliny (N.H. 7.64) suggests some causes of rabies and at N.H. 29.98ff. describes in detail ways of preventing hydrophobia. Grattius (383-95) and Columella (17.12.14) recommend other preventative measures. Aristotle (De Animalibus Historia 604a 4-9) also discusses the disease, and a few of the manuscripts of Aristotle exempt man from the certainty of death from rabies. It is strange that neither Nem. nor Grattius, unlike Pliny (N.H. 8.152), mention the danger to people. Other references to rabies in Roman poetry include Hor. Ep. 1.10.16, 2.2.75; Virgil Aen. 7.479; Prop. 3.16.17; Ovid Met. 14.66; Stat. Theb. 1.589, 625; Silius 16.236 etc.

Nem. here lists five possible causes of rabies. The first (204-6) has been the cause of much discussion (see below). The second possible cause is the time of the year and the heat it brings with it (207-8); the third is that the disease may emanate from the earth (209); the fourth is the unhealthy state of the atmosphere (209) and the fifth a shortage of water causing over-heating (210).

The interpretation of these lines has been much disputed. Wernsdorf considers that caelesti corrupto sidere is a reference to the sky, possibly thinking of Virgil Aen. 12.451f. abrupto sidere nimbus/it, or to the air, as outbreaks of disease were often attributed to unhealthy atmospheric conditions, but this
is stated as a possible cause at u. 209. Burman thinks that sidere means the sun. Martin and Volpilhac consider that there is a reference in uu. 205-6 to an eclipse of the sun, cf. Lucr. 5.758 solque suas etiam dimittere languidus ignis, and naturally find this idea incompatible with Ulitius's explanation of corrupto sidere as "pro signo coelesti." Volpilhac (p. 119) comments, "les vers 205-6 évoquent manifestement une éclipse de soleil, qui n'est guère comparable au passage du soleil dans la zone de l'une ou l'autre de ces constellations." He goes on to say (p. 120) that "l'expression caelesti corrupto sidere désigne une éclipse de soleil." I find uu. 204-6 very vague and would not reject any of the above interpretations out of hand, although I find it hard to believe that caelesti corrupto sidere could refer to the sun in eclipse, even if this meaning is appropriate in uu. 205-6, which is doubtful, as I have been unable to find any evidence that eclipses were thought to cause diseases. Ulitius compares with segnes radios, uu. 157-9, especially tardas uias, but uu. 205-6 suggest to me bad weather rather than the very hot conditions referred to in uu. 157-9. It is surprising that no one has, apparently, suggested that sidere might refer to one of the malefic planets, Mars and Saturn, although I think it unlikely that this is in fact the reference here.

As Volpilhac points out, each possible cause of the illness is introduced by seu, and magis in u. 207 seems to me to imply a connection between the causes suggested in uu. 204-6 and uu. 207-8. The connecting link is possibly the Dog-Star. uu. 207-8 clearly contain a reference to the Sun entering Leo, which the Romans considered to be the hottest time of the year, and the Dog-Star rose about this time (see note on u. 207). The Dog-
Star was thought to be even more baneful in the autumn, when it rose in the evening, see Homer Il. 11.173, 22.27; Hesiod Opp. 419; Virgil Aen. 10.274 etc. and it is therefore possible that caelesti corrupto sidere may be a reference to it. The significance of uu. 205-6 still remains unclear. Nem. may be referring to the appearance of the sun in bad weather such as might be expected in the autumn, cf. Lucan 5.544-5 orbe quoque exhaustus medio languensque recessit/ spectantis oculos infirmo lumine passus and Avienius Phae. 1626-8. It is also possible that Nem. is incorrectly recalling Cic. Div. 1.57.130, where Cicero tells us that if the Dog-Star rises looking dim, the atmosphere will be unwholesome. A third possibility is that sidere means a constellation, as at Stat. Silv. 1.1.95; Pliny N.H. 18.31, and that uu. 205-6 refer to a particular condition of the sun which has an effect on the constellation. According to Manilius (2.905-9), it is by the influence of Phoebus that the stars decree whether things go badly or well on Earth. Manilius does not say so, but it is perhaps not unreasonable to suppose that if the sun is in an unhealthy or unusual condition, this has a corresponding effect on the constellations. The expression is very vague here and it is impossible to say with any degree of certainty what Nem. means.

206 adtonito Heavenly bodies are described as adtonitus also at Stat. Theb. 6.685 (the stars) and Claudian 26.66 (the Great Bear), and in both cases the adjective is to be translated "astonished." Here, however, it is possible that adtonitus is being used in an active sense, to mean, "that causes madness" cf. Virgil Aen. 6.53 on which Servius comments, "attonitae stupendae, non stupentis, ergo 'attonitae' facientis attonitos,
ut 'mors pallida,' 'tristis senecta.'" *adtonitus* in a passive sense is clearly required by the context in the Statius and Claudian passages, but has little point here, whereas the active sense is very appropriate.

**Orbe** Volpilhac asks,"S'agit-il de l'orbes terrarum ou de l'orbes ipsius solis?" Duff supports the former interpretation and preserves *orbe* as an ablative of place, translating "in a world dismayed," which is surely impossible, although as Volpilhac says, *exsero* seems usually to be followed by an ablative of place (but apparently not at Seneca H.F. 594 *inlustre latis exeris terris caput*). Barth would read *orbi*, and Burman would not reject *orbi* altogether, comparing 2.75 (where he prefers *orbes* of the early editions) and Ovid R.A. 256. Presumably they would take *orbi* as referring to the earth. Burman also suggests *ore*, comparing Valerius Flaccus 2.57 and Ovid Fast. 4.944, (where, however, the accepted reading is now *orbe*), explaining "ut ita *or solis attonitum ex ipso pallore arguatur." *Orbe*, however, is in my view perfectly satisfactory, and like Martin, I think that it must refer to the sun. Martin compares Ovid R.A. 256 *nec subito Phoebi pallidus orbis cert* which presumably refers to the accomplishment of witches of making the sky cloud over, cf. Ovid Am. 1.8.9-10. Martin would translate, "puts forth a pallid face from his astonished orb," and adds, "Such an expression - as if the sun were distinct from its orb - is not unusual," comparing Virgil Geor. 1.442 and Avienius Arat. 1568. Martin is, however, I think, misguided here, as the reference to Phoebus and his orb is surely a pleonasm, compare modern astronomical references to "the sun's disc." Cf. Ovid Met. 1.592 *dum calet et medio sol est altissimus orbe,*
and Manilius 1.469 *medio cum luna implebitur orbe*. For examples of similar pleonastic adjectival phrases, see Housman on Manil.

1.539 and CQ 27 (1933), 4 = Classical Papers 3, pp. 1200-1.

207 *seu magis* LHS say (2, p. 498), "Dass im Spätlatein *magis* z.T. ganz an die Stelle von *potius* 'vielmehr' getreten ist, das im Romanischen fast ganz fehlt..., zeigen nicht nur neue Partikelverbindungen wie *an magis* 'oder vielmehr' (Tert. orat. 19, 2 Tert. Maur. 772 usw.), *cur non et magis* (Tert. anim. 32, 1 al.), *seu magis* (Nemes., Claud. al.)..."

**Ignicomi** A rare and late compound adjective found also at Iuuenc. 3.1 and 4.151; Avienius *orb. terr.* 80; Auson. 396.8.

**Leonis** Manilius (4.464-8) refers to the unhealthy effects of Leo. At the time when the sun entered the constellation of Leo, Sirius the Dog-Star rose (about July 17th), and this star was considered one of the prime causes of rabies (Fliny N.H. 2.107 and 8.152). According to Fliny (N.H. 2.123), the hottest time of the year was when the Dog-Star rose. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, however, (vol. 5, eleventh edition 1911, p. 183), states, "The experience of the ancient Greeks that Sirius rose with the sun as the latter entered Leo, i.e. the hottest part of the year, was accepted by the Romans with an entire disregard of the intervening time and a different latitude." The time for people to get rabies, according to Firmicus Maternus (8.9.4), is when the Dog-Star is on the descendant in Cancer and Mars is in opposition or in square aspect, and the influence of Jupiter is lacking.
The use of hoc here is so vague that it is impossible to be sure what significance is to be attached to it. It is most likely, however, that hoc picks up quod in u. 204 and refers therefore to letale periclum (203). Scaliger conjectures hos, which would make Phoebus the subject of inuiscerat, and this is possible, but not, I think, necessary.

This appears to be the first appearance of this verb in Latin. It is also used by Cassianus (conl. 4.7.1) and figuratively by Augustine (conf. 7.21.27 fin., epist. 187.41 etc.), Aponius (8, p. 161 fin.) and Gregorius Magnus (moral. 30. 78 p. 568B etc.).

An unhealthy atmosphere is often mentioned as the cause of disease e.g. at Lucr. 6.1090 ff., 1119ff.; Virgil Buc. 7.57, Geor. 3.478ff., Aen. 3.137; Gratt. 375 etc.

This is apparently the only example of concrescro used of fire. Heinsius conjectured crudescunt or inolescunt because concrescere recurs at u. 219, but these verbs also seem to be unparalleled used of fire. concrescunt, "thicken" is perfectly satisfactory and there is nothing unusual about the repetition.

"And spurt out into the fierce jaws in a discoloured, poisonous foam," i.e. the dog is snarling and foaming at the mouth. For niger in the sense of "having an unhealthy colour" cf. Ovid Met. 1.444 uulnera nigra ueneno. I can find no other example of prosilire used of a disease, but as this verb is used of
liquids, vapours etc., its use here is not unnatural, cf. Pliny N.H. 12.58 *inde prosilit spuma pinguis*.

215 Celsus (5.27.2) and Bassus (Geop. 19.3) also recommend treatment for rabies. R.E. Walker, a veterinary surgeon, in an appendix to Jocelyn Toynbee's *Animals in Roman Life and Art*, p. 331, says that cures for rabies would appear successful where the "madness was merely a fit, or a manifestation of distemper such as encephalitis." Rabies is always fatal in animals and there is only one case of complete recovery by a human being, a small boy who was bitten by a rabid bat.

217 *castorea* Castoreum is a substance with a strong smell secreted by the beaver. It had a number of medicinal uses, see Pliny N.H. 32.13.

221 *non cunctantes* If no liquid was added, much of the powder would simply stick in the throat.

*infundere cornu* Virgil (Geor. 3.509-10) and Columella (R.R. 6.10.1) also recommend the use of a horn in giving animals medicine.

223 *blandas* Enk on Gratt. 398 (p. 111 of his edition) conjectures *blandis*, but gives no reason. Garson (Latomus 35 (1976), 161) objects that although *blandus canis* is a cliché, it is inappropriate for a dog with rabies. But this proleptic use of *blandas* is perfectly satisfactory.

224ff. For hunting dogs in general, see Aymard *op. cit.* ch. XII.
224-30 These lines are found after u. 122 in the manuscripts. J.C. Scaliger (Poetic. VI.7) was apparently the first to point out that they interrupt the discussion of breeding there, but Barth remarks, "Haec talia talibus Poetis exigua sunt peccata." J. Schrader (Observationum Liber, p. 86) objects to Nem.'s being criticised and was the first to suggest transposition, but after u. 127 (Sic. This appears to be a misprint for 107). He would have the lines in this order: 224-8, 231-6, 229-30, since "Librarios uero, non autem Nemesianum, uersus turbasse uel ex illis effici cogique possit, horum animos moresque simul naresque sagaces/ mox referam quippe quae non ad Tuscos canes, qui in perulgatis libris antecedunt, sed omnes ininitio laudatos pertineant. Quis enim credat Poetam de canibus, quos unus forsan Oppianus memoret, ipse autem parce laudet, accuratius & diligentius agere voluisse, quam de Spartanis & Molossis, & reliquis nobilioribus initio carminis celebratis? Deinde, qui libros de uenatione scripserunt, aliis canibus animos, aliis nares sagaces tribuunt, ut Gratius vs. 171 at fugit adversos idem quos reperit hostes/Umber: quanta fides utinam et sollertia naris, /tanta foret uirtus et tantum uellet
in armis! At Tuscos & animosos & sagaces fuisset quis tradidit?" Schrader therefore transposes uu. 229-30 after u. 236 so that these attributes then become those of the Libyans. As Nem. is apparently the only writer to mention the Libyan dogs, we cannot know whether the resulting description is a fair one. Schrader is, moreover, clearly identifying the Tuscan dog with the Umbrian, which Aymard (op. cit. p. 263) regards as unlikely. According to Aymard, sculptures from the Etruscan period closely resemble Nem.'s description of the Tuscan dog. Apart from u. 232, the only reference to the Tuscan dog seems to be Oppian Cyn.
1.396) which tells us nothing that would be helpful here. I see no reason, therefore, to move uu. 229-30 from their place before u. 231. To Schrader's transposition as a whole, there is one main objection: when what are now uu. 224-36 are removed, u. 237 follows u. 223. Schrader regards this as very apt, but u. 237 seems to me clearly to belong after u. 236, since it speaks of further characteristics of dogs and *nares sagaces* can have nothing to do with canine diseases. I have therefore followed Haupt in his transposition of the lines, although the transition from u. 223 to 224 does seem a little abrupt. *sed non* in u. 224 refers back to u. 107.

225 *pascendum catulos* K-S say (1, p. 734), "Diese Konstruktion gehört fast ausschliesslich der vorklassischen Sprache und dem altertümliche Ausdrucksweisen liebenden Varro an und begegnet nur selten in der klassischen Sprache, taucht dann wieder öfters bei den späteren Juristen auf." This construction is found in poetry also for example at Plaut. *Trin.* 869; Lucr. 1.111, 2.492, 5.43-4; Catull. 39.9; Silius Italicus 11.562 ff.

**Britannia** British-bred hunting dogs, including the Agassaean, were imported into Gaul by the Celts and used not only for hunting, but also for war, see Strabo 4.5.2 (c. 199), Claudian *Stil.* 3.301; Gratt. 174-8; Oppian *Cyn.* 1.468 ff. It has been suggested that these were the ancestors of the bulldog, but Hull (op. cit. p. 26) considers that there is insufficient evidence on this point. Aymard (op. cit. p. 268-70) thinks that there were two different types of British dog, the Irish wolfhound and the Agassaean (either a bulldog or terrier).
227 Pannonicae  The Pannonian breed of dog is mentioned also at Oppian Cyn. 1.37.

228 Eibero  The Spanish horse is also mentioned at Oppian Cyn. 1.37 and Pollux 5.37.

231 Tuscorum  For the Tuscan dog see my note on uu. 224-30.

extrema  Duff remarks "Non...externa seems to fit better the only Italian dogs in the passage" and translates "not foreign to us." This appears to suggest that Nem. is here looking upon himself as an Italian, which is unlikely. (See my note on u. 251). The reading of the manuscripts is quite satisfactory and is here almost equivalent to exiguus, minutissimus, cf. Prop. 1.4.11 haec...forma mei pars est extrema furoris.

234 haud  According to Martin, haud is rare in late Latin. This generalized statement is unhelpful as the use of haud in poetry depends largely on the type of verse a particular author is writing. Heraeus on Martial 9.2.8 says, "haud proprium heroici versus esse, hic quoque inde ab Aug. aet. a multis spretum (Calp., Pan. Mess., Colum.X, Manil.). In elegiacis semper uitatum est, deest hic omnino Ovidio (fast. 4.609. 3.524 epist. 10.112 dubia), Cons. Liv., El. Maec., sed et in tota append. Vergiliana Vollmeri hodie iam non legitur (Ciris 228 aut probum est) praeter Aetnam. Nec Horatius in odis usus est." There is also some variation from author to author, as the following table of its occurrences in poetry shows. (haut and hau are included):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucretius</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catullus</td>
<td>3 (twice in 64, once in 66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil</td>
<td>123 (but not in the Eclogues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tibullus 2
Propertius 6
Horace 16 (Once in the *Epodes*, 12 times in the *Sermones*, 3 in the *Epistles*)
Ovid 54 (in elegy only at *Trist.* 1.3.73 in the epic formula *haud aliter*)
Grattius 2
Manilius 0
Calpurnius 0
Laus Pisonis 1
Aetna 9
Persius 7
Lucan 35
Valerius Flaccus 57
Statius 72
Silius Italicus 155
Martial 0
Juvenal 16
Serenus Sammonicus 3
Commodianus 0
Nemesianus 2 (*Cynegetica*)
Avienius 11
Prudentius 21
Claudian 24

235 *odorato* Carl Hosius (*Ph. W.* 42 (1922), 268), considers that *odorato* refers to the hound's tracking nose, while Wernsdorf explains "quod odorem ferarum uestigiis inhaerentem seruat."

Martin and Duff, however, correctly interpret *odorato* as referring to the fragrance of the meadow. Xenophon (*Cyn.* 5.5) describes
the difficulties for the hound in following a trail when there are flowers in a field.

240 cornipedes The word cornipes was originally an adjective, used of the goat (Priap. 86.16); Faunus (Ovid Fast. 2.361) and of the horse (Virgil Aen. 6.591, 7.779). Under Virgil's influence it later became a synonym of equus, as here.

241 Oppian also describes the merits of the Cappadocian horse (Cyn. 1.197 f.). It is not mentioned by Xenophon, Arrian or Grattius.

242 Wernsdorf rightly calls this "locus uexatissimus totius poematii."

E. Liènard in his review of Van de Woestijne's edition (Latomus 2 (1938), 73-4), would justify the reading of the manuscripts by interpreting it thus: "Que leur descendance généreuse, récemment armée, (le court règne de Carus s'est passé presqu'en entier en Asie où il a fait une campagne heureuse contre les Perses), rappelle les caractéristiques des chevaux de Cappadoce et que le troupeau entier nous vaille à nouveau (s.e. referat) les triomphes de ses aîeux," but this explanation is in my view forced in the extreme, and it would seem impossible for nuper to go with referat when they are so far apart.

J. Gothofredus conjectures Argaea et palmae, also retaining nuper, which leaves the line without a verb, for it is unlikely that referat also governs palmas, and the balance of uu. 240-1 seems to demand another jussive subjunctive here. Postgate's superet appears to be the best solution, as it gives good sense and such a corruption is palaeographically plausible, although Gronovius's numeret is also possible.
The worst problem posed by this line is that of *armata*. Verdière (p. 97) seeks to justify this expression by saying that *armata* (*notis*) "peut être mise sur le même pied que l'expression *signo armare* qu'on lit chez Lactance, mais, bien entendu, mutatis mutandis: quo *signo armatus exercitus capit ferrum*, car J. Moreau me semble avoir parfaitement établi que, dans cette phrase, *signum* est l'équivalent de *nota*. (Cf. J. Moreau, *Lactance, De la mort des persécuteurs II*, Paris, 1954, p. 434)," but the two cases are quite different and it is difficult to see what sense *armata* (*notis*) would make.¹ Volpilhac considers that *armata* is to be taken as equivalent to *instructa*, comparing TLL 2 3 619, and interprets "une fois équipé, harnaché, pour lutter dans une course," but I have been unable to find an example of *armata* used in this sense without either the nature of the equipment or its purpose being specified. Also, the offspring would not need to be *armata* to be seen as pedigree stock. Again, *palmas...aurorum* suggests racing, and race-horses do not wear armour, which is the only possible significance which *armata* could have here. Then we have the further problem that, even if *armata* gave good sense, the balance of the lines suggests that it is to be taken with *grex* rather than with *propago*. *Grex* as a feminine noun, however, is rare, apart from Lucr. 2.662, being found only at Vulg. *psalm. 78.13* and in various places in Christian Latin where the author is or may be translating the...

¹Verdière is also wrong to say that, "Il est patent que Rome insiste sur le fait que ses seuls arma sont *galea, cristae et cingula*, c'est-à-dire des armes qui ne sont pas offensives" because *arma* is used of weapons used at close quarters and cf. Cic. *Caec. 21: arma alia ad tegendum, alia ad nocendum.*
Greek words νομι, πόλις or αγελη. See TLL 6 2329 79ff. There is no evidence for the gender of grex in Nem. and armata seems to me in any case impossible.

P.T. Eden (CR 20 (1970), 142), who advances what is in fact Heinsius's conjecture Sarmatiae as his own, asserts that "the line all but demands a proper name, of place or people to balance Graecia and Cappadocum," and Heinsius, Swartius, L. Hermann and Gothofredus seem to have agreed with this view.

omnis, however, indicates that ν. 242 summarises vv. 240-1, and to conjecture the name of a particular country for armata would therefore be contrary to the demands of the sense. A further difficulty involved in reading the name of any particular country for armata is that the sense and balance of the lines apparently demand a connective, and a proper name in the genitive followed by et would involve a harsh elision unparalleled in Nem. On the other hand, if we drop et with Swartius, we have an asyndeton, which is also contrary to Nem.'s usual practice.

Barth's conjectures are all more or less improbable, and the reading of his German edition looks suspiciously as though it has been invented in order to justify one of them.

Wernsdorf's conjecture harmataque et is ingenious, but harma is attested in Latin only in the sense of an eye-salve, whereas Wernsdorf doubtless wants it to mean a racing-chariot or team of horses.

Verdière also seems to be thinking of the Greek when he proposes firmata et palamas superet, but palama for the Greek παλαμα does not appear to be attested in Latin.

Martin suggests praemiaque et, assuming that Nem. is, as often in this poem, imitating Virgil Geor. 3, here vv. 49-50 seu
quae Olympiacae miratus praemia palmae pascit equos. This
conjecture gives the best sense of any yet suggested, but is
unlikely palaeographically.

Much energy has been expended in attempting to explain or
emend these lines, but I remain unconvinced by any of the
solutions so far offered, and I therefore obelize armata as the
seat of the corruption.

245 capitisque decori This, the conjecture of Baehrens, gives
much better sense than C's capitique decoro, while A and B are
corrupt. The words are then to be taken with altus honos. Mehmel
(TLL 6 2929 81 f.) considers that altus honos refers to the
horse's mane, and there are a number of examples of honos used of
hair, e.g. Tert. orat. 22 p. 195; Ser. Samm. 105, but I prefer
to take the phrase more generally as referring to the overall
appearance of the horse's head, and would translate "dignity."

247 plurima...ceruix The same phrase occurs at Virgil Geor. 3.
51-2 where plurima, as Conington says, "denotes both thickness
and length." These were evidently considered very desirable
qualities in a horse, cf. Varro R.R. 2.57 ceruicibus crassis ac
longis and Silius Italicus 16.362-3 insignis multa ceruice et
plurimus idem / ludentis per colla iubae.

250 crebra Martin suggests that crebra limits ungula (u. 249) with
adverbial force, but as Nem. is here imitating Virgil Geor.
3.499f. et pede terram / crebra ferit, it seems more likely that
crebra here is meant to be taken in the same way, i.e. as an
adverbial use of the neuter adjective. Conington compares with
Geor. 3.499f., Geor. 3.149 acerba sonans, and Page comments on
Virgil Buc. 3.63 "the cognate accusative of the neuter adjective is often used adverbially...So too in the plural," and compares also Geor. 4.122.

251 *gens* For *gens* used as equivalent to *regio* cf. Ovid Met. 15.829 and Avien. *ora* 252, and see also Housman on Manil. 4.602.

**Calpe** Calpe was one of the pillars of Hercules in Hispania Baetica, the modern rock of Gibraltar. The other pillar, on the African coast, was called Abyla or Abila (see Avien. *orb. terr.* 110f.). The fact that Nem. refers to the Spanish as living trans...Calpe culmina suggests that Nem. is writing in Africa. His designation in various manuscripts as *Carthaginensis* is further confirmation of his African origin.

255-6 "Panting, they pour forth terrible snorts, a stream of breath." *spirabile flumen* is in apposition to *terribiles flatus*.

255 *spirabile* This adjective is found first in Cicero, who uses it of the air (N.D. 2.91 etc.).

*flumen* The manuscripts read *numen*, and this variant may have come about under the influence of Virgil *Aen.* 3.600, where the manuscripts vary between *spirabile lumen* and *spirabile numen*. *numen*, though accepted by Sabbadini in Virgil, would be nonsense here. Ullius conjectures *lumen*, comparing Virgil Geor. 3.85 *uoluit sub maribus ignem* and Geor. 2.140 *spirantes maribus ignem*, and for the repetition, *uu.* 67-8 and *uu.* 100 and 102, but I find it impossible to believe that Nem. would use the same
word in consecutive lines in two different senses. Verdière (Prolégomènes, p. 99) conjectures flamen, comparing Apuleius Met. 11.25.4 and Prudentius 837-40, and says that Nem. is playing a game of adnominatio, as at u. 138 and u. 150, but, unlike these two passages, flamen...flatus is inelegant.
Johnson suggests flumen or fulmen without explanation but I find it impossible to see what sense fulmen could make. Barth's German edition allegedly reads flumen and this reading gives in my view the best sense. For flumen used of air, cf. Apuleius mund. 10 (uentus) nec...aliud est nisi multum et uhehemens in unum coacti aeris flumen.

anheli Klotz (TLL 2 67 59f.) says of the adjective anhelus that it is "vox poetica (inde a Lucretio), maxime Flavianae aetatis, rara apud recentiores scriptores paganos, frequentior apud christianos."

mulcent aures mulcere is used here as almost equivalent to mollire, relaxare. It occurs in the same sense at Prud. psych. 331. Pliny (N.H. 11.137) regards relaxed ears as a sign of a sick horse, in equis et omni iumentorum genere indicia animi praeferunt, (sc. aures) marcidae fessis, micantes pauidis, subrectae furentibus, resolutae aegris.

sonipes In contrast to cornipes (see my note on u. 240), sonipes is found in poetry as a synonym for equus as early as Lucilius (542) and Accius, and thereafter in Virgil, Catullus, Silius Italicus, Valerius Flaccus and Statius.

Maurusia For Mauretanian horses see Oppian Cyn. 1.289, and
Martin ad. loc.

260 gentilis TLL considers that gentilis is used as equivalent to nobilis here, and compares Ter. Maur. 188 gentilis...ecus, where, however, the interpretation is doubtful. gentilis is more probably used here in the sense of "native," as at Stat. Theb. 8.705-6 fatiscit/...umeris (Tydei) gentilis aper.

263 Livy also describes the Numidian horse as deformis (35.11.7).

264 ollis This dative plural form is found first at Ennius ann. 306 (Vahlen) and also at Lucr. 5.1291, 1390; Virgil Aen. 6.730, 8.659; Valerius Flaccus 3.386, 5.126; Avien. arat. 870, orb. terr. 1145; Ausonius Mos. 167; Prudentius ham. 730; CE 436.13; Iuvenecus 2.410 etc. For this form see Neue 2, pp. 423-5.

infrenes TLL (7 1488 81) considers this adjective signifies "indomitus, immoderatus, praeceps," but we surely have here a reference to the Numidian custom of riding a horse without a bridle. The horse was guided by the touch of a switch on the head, see Lucan 4.683; Silius Italicus 1.215ff.; Claudian 15.440. nec pigneat (263) is compatible with infrenes because, as Ulitius points out, Claudian, when speaking contemptuously of the ineffective methods of warfare of the Mauretanians, includes this practice as one of them (15.439), but Nem. is at pains to tell us that it is no disadvantage.

Further references to the practice of riding a horse without a bridle are at Arrian C. 24.3; Oppian Cyn. 4.50; Virgil Aen. 4.41; Livy 35.11.7; Lucan 4.682; Silius Italicus 1.215 and 2.64; Gratt. 517-8; Polybius 3.65; Claudian Bell.
Gild. 439; Mart. 9.22.14; Herodian 7.9 etc.

lribur utque Burman calls this locus suspectus, although he offers no suggestions. Damsté (Numem. 53 (1925), 308) says that there is no sensible interpretation of the phrase and conjectures libera torque (understand cervix), but I cannot find another example of the use of torques of collars on horses, only of a coupling collar for oxen. Also, this conjecture is in my view no improvement on the reading of the manuscripts, since libera torque simply repeats the idea contained in infrenes. liber utque is vague and rather clumsy, but not impossible. utque refers to the two types of horses which are ridden without bridles, the Mauretanian (259) and that belonging to the Mazaces (261). Duff translates liber "temper of freedom" and Volpilhac, "L'amour de la liberté," but this seems to me incompatible with flecti facilis and paret in obsequium (265-6), and I would prefer to understand "from restraint."

Nem. is telling us in uu. 264-5 that although the Numidian horses appear too high-spirited, they are in fact quite obedient.

For liber used without an ablative of separation cf. Virgil Aen. 11.493; Stat. Theb. 7.632.

265 diuerberat TLL and OLD are divided as to whether there are two separate verbs, diuerberare and deuerberare. According to Hey (TLL 6 1571 35) de- is simply a variant form which often occurs in manuscripts, and there is no separate entry for deuerbero. OLD, on the other hand, considers that there are two separate verbs, although it lists only one example under deuerbero, Ter. Ph. 327, and translates "flog soundly," which is not the meaning required here. Gronovius (Observationum libri
tres, Leyden 1662, p. 543) conjectures quodque iubas pronis ceruix diuerberet armis, commenting, "Si memineris quid diuerberare sit, satis intelligas ceruicem armos diuerberare jubis dici non posse: non enim flagellare aut percutere est diuerberare, sed euentilare, discutere, agitando digerere & componere." This is incorrect, however, since diuerberare does mean percutere, see TLL 6 1571 37-8.

Martin attempts to justify C's diuerberet by saying, "Such change of mood in dependent clauses of apparently the same significance is found occasionally in poetry e.g. Prop. 4.4.10; 2.16.29," but since AB both have the indicative, attempts to justify C's reading are not needed.

266 flecti facilis facilis is used with a passive infinitive also at Prop. 4.8.40; Ovid A.A. 1.358; Lucan 2.656 etc.

facilis This adjective is used of animals in the sense of tractabilis also at Cic. off. 1.90; Avian. fab. 10.4; Gratt.160.

lasciuauge colla secutus Burman does not understand what this phrase means and therefore conjectures solutus, i.e. "sine loro & freno." The phrase is justifiable, however: the touch of a switch on his neck makes the horse turn in the direction his rider wishes him to go, and he "follows his nose."

267 paret in obsequium in obsequium is the result of the action of the verb. For the use of in and the accusative see K-S 1, p. 567.

lentae moderamine uirgae Silius Italicus also refers to this way of guiding the Numidian horse (1.215ff.).
268 Ausonius refers to Nem.'s words at Grat. Act. 27: "mirabamur poetam, qui infrenos dixerat Numidas (Aen. 4.41) et illum alterum qui ita collegerat ut diceret in equitando uerbera et praecepta esse fugae et praecepta sistendi."

269 promissi The significance and use of promissi have caused difficulty. Wernsdorf took it with campi and interpreted it as longi, porrecti patentis, but this would be a very unusual use of the word which generally describes beards or hair. Heinsius and Burman therefore conjectured permissi, comparing Grattius uu. 227-8 spatiis qualis permissa Lechaeis/ Thessalium quadriga decus. Martin interprets promissi from its components as "sent forth," presumably taking it as nominative, and compares Lucr. 4.680-2 tum fissa ferarum/ ungula quo tulerit gressum promissa canum uis/ ducit. promissa, the reading of the manuscripts, has been criticised in Lucretius too, notably by Lachmann in his edition, but N.P. Howard ("On Lucretius" JPh 1 (1868), 131) contends that the word is to be interpreted as "emissa, uel porrotenus missa," and quotes Nem.'s line as evidence. Munro also supports the reading promissa in Lucretius, citing this line and also Pliny N.H. 16.107 nec ualla arborum avidius se promittit, "sends itself forth" i.e. "grows," but as Lachmann points out, this is hardly parallel. A similar use to that of Pliny of promitto occurs at Colum. 5.6.11 ramos proprius ferro compescunt uel longius promittunt, ut uites laxius diffundantur. Some editors accept pro- also at Lucr. 4.688. OLD accepts pro- both in Nem. and at Lucr. 4.681 and also at Silius 3.534 quacumque datur promittere uisus. Martin's explanation seems to me a good one, and given the evidence of the Lucretius and Silius passages, I would retain the reading of the manuscripts here.
273 superextulit An unusual compound first found in Tertullian (resurr. 24) and later used by Augustine (Civ. 20.19); Evagrius (alterc. p. 44.17); Cassian. concl. 16.14.4; Vulg. psalm. 71.16.

276 ipse Some scholars, including Magnus (Ph. W. 26 (1882), 813), Duff and Martin refer this pronoun to Boreas, but it must surely refer to Nereus, previously mentioned in v. 272, putting his head out of the sea as in the similar picture at Virgil Aen. 1.127; Ovid Met. 15.697; Stat. Ach. 1.58. The fact that Nem. goes on to mention the Nereids confirms this view.

murmure Cf. Stat. Silu. 1.3.21-2 spumosa...murmura. Heinsius conjectures marmore, comparing Lucr. 11.766f. where four different words for the sea are used within the space of two lines. marmor and murmure are sometimes confused in manuscripts, but murmure adds to the description of the noisy sea, whereas marmore does not. murmure is used of a noisy sea also at Prop. 1.8.5; Ovid Trist. 1.11.7 etc.

278 mirata...stupet This pleonasm is quite common, cf. Lucan 8.13 stupens admirabatur; Apuleius Met. 9.34.2 stupore defixi mirantur etc. Baehrens conjectures super, which would then govern suo...aeguore, a rare and mostly poetic use of super not found elsewhere in Nem. For ire with the plain ablative in the sense of "pass over," cf. Virgil Aen. 4.404, 7.624.

283 farragine farrago was a mixed crop of inferior grains fed not only to horses (as also at Virgil Geor. 3.205), but also to cattle (Colum. 9.11.8) and geese (Varro R.R. 3.10.3).
Virgil (Geor. 3.460) recommends the practice for curing sickness in sheep. Vegetius (Mulum. 1.22) gives detailed methods for bleeding animals.

Heinsius conjectures vapores, but labor is used in the sense of morbus also at Virgil Geor. 3.452 of diseases of sheep. Here it might almost be translated "bad humours."

Barth conjectures tabe, but TLL rightly compares Paul. NoL. carm. 19. 216f. ut saniem suffusa labe coactam / exprimeret (medicus): labe here refers to the flow of the liquid, not to the ailment, which is expressed by ueteres labores in u. 284. At Grat. 468 labem refers to the disease itself and is therefore not relevant here. labes is used of the flow of liquids also at Arnob. nat. 5.40; Auson. 325,7 p. 110 P etc.

This appears to be a rare use of distendo, not of a part of the body, but of the force which renders it distentus, cf. Petron. 87.1 and see TLL 5 1512 65ff.

Verdière (Prolégomènes p. 100), who claims Heinsius's firmant as his own conjecture, comments, "Si l'on admet la leçon formant, par voie de conséquence on est entraîné à admettre aussi qu'il s'agit de la 'formation' des membres du cheval. Or cette interprétation va à l'encontre du sens général, puisqu'il est question de rendre à la bête les forces que la saignée lui avait fait perdre." He goes on to quote a number of examples of the "véritable cliché" robore firmare. Part, however, at least of Verdière's objection is inaccurate because it is not strength which the horse has lost by being bled, but the bad humours
whose removal returns the horse to peak condition. Kenney (CR 26 (1976), 272) also supports firmant, saying that it is "a correction such as any attentive reader is bound to make." Garson, however, (Latomus 35 (1976), 161) says that firmant "involves considerable tautology in the whole context and one could argue for the manuscript reading on the grounds that the horses will hold themselves erect once their strength returns," an explanation which I find unconvincing. J. Kapp (TLL 6 1103 35) also retains the reading of the manuscripts, but formare appears always to imply a change in shape or the imparting of shape initially, which would be nonsense here. I have therefore adopted Heinsius's conjecture firmant; the muscular strength of the horses is renewed by the blood-letting. formant could have come about under the influence of fortia in u. 286, though the corruption is common enough.

288-9 uiarum/ longa K-S say (1, p. 230) of the use of substantiated adjectives with the genitive, "häufig gebrauchen Dichter u. Spät. nach Analogie des partitiven Genitivs solche Verbindungen, auch wenn im Grunde gar kein partitives Verhältnis vorliegt, so Lucr. 2, 1100 caelique serena = caelum serenum. Verg. A. 1, 422 miratur...strata uiarum = stratas uias (vergl. Lucr. 1, 315). 2, 332 angusta uiarum. 725 ferimur per opaca locorum. 5, 695 ardua terrarum. 8, 221 petit ardua montis. 6, 633 per opaca uiarum (vergl. Norden). Hor. C. 4, 12, 19 amara curarum" etc. Lucretius is apparently the first Latin writer to use the neuter plural of adjectives thus and does so quite frequently, e.g. at 1.315 strata uiarum; 3.498 munita uiae; 6.332 rara uiarum, and see C. Bailey's edition vol. 1, pp. 91-2 and on Lucr. 1.86.
289 uolunt Tross (op. cit. p. 49) would read valent because of ueteres labores mentioned previously, and compares u. 253. This is a good conjecture, but unwarranted, as laetae in u. 286 seems to imply a return of enthusiasm as well as strength to the horse.

consumere This verb is used of covering distances also at Solinus 52.47 ramorum umbrae ambitu bina stadia consumunt.

292 culmosque armavit arisit If we follow the reading of A and C, "the logical order of thought seems exactly reversed," as Martin says. Also, we would expect aestas to be the subject of armavit as it is of durauerit and siccauerit. I can see no reason to doubt, as Duff does, that armare is the correct verb here, as it is found elsewhere of plants, e.g. Claudian 14.10 armat spina rosas and see TLL 2 618 65ff. Inversions such as Virgil Aen. 6.4 ancora fundat nauis are no parallel, for there the inversion is due to metrical necessity, see Norden's edition p. 113 ff. Martin points out that Dracontius expresses a similar idea as we might expect it (Rom. 3.6), nam core maritae / arua suo uel sole fouet uel temperat aestus / alternans elementa potens, ut reddat et umbras / montibus arboreis et culmos armat arisit, and she therefore conjectures culmosque armavit arisit. Schuster ("Bericht über die nachaugusteischen heidnischen Dichter von 1915-1925," AJ 1927, 120-21), says that this emendation fails because Martin has altered two words. This is a feeble objection, and I wonder if B's initial error (aestas has crept in from u. 290) might not be a clue to the source of part of the corruption: aristis has in the archetype become aristas under the influence of aestas above, and this has
perhaps caused the alteration to *culmusque*, to remove the two accusatives, or possibly *culmusque* is simply a scribal error, as there is some confusion between *u* and *o* in A and B.

293 *hordea* Virgil was abused by the poet Bavius for his use of this plural form at *Buc.* 5.36, *Geor.* 1.210, 317. Quintilian says (1.5.16) *hordea et mulsa...non alio uitiosa sunt quam quod singularia pluraliter efferuntur*. The plural also appears *metri gratia* at Ovid *Met.* 14.273; *Medic.* 53, 56 etc. For other examples see *TLL* 632966 80.

297 *altores...suocos* The only other example of *altor* used adjectivally cited by A. de Mess in *TLL* is Paul. Petric. *Mart.* 6.497 *altores fauos*.

298 *iuuentus* Curcio considers that *iuuentus* here means "young dogs," as at Gratt. 330, but this is surely impossible here. Nevertheless, it is not at all clear from this line what the rôles of the *famuli* and the *comitum animosa iuuentus* are, or whether both phrases refer to one group of people or to two distinct groups. Grattius (218-9) speaks of *turbam...comitem*, but again, it is not clear what their rôle is.

299 *casses* For nets in general see Xen. *Cyn.* 2.3-8; Arrian *Cyn.* 1; Gratt. 25ff.; Oppian *Cyn.* 1.150-5 and especially Poll. *Onomast.* v.4. See also Enk p. 18ff., Martin ad loc., F. Capponi, "Il cassis ed i suoi poeti," *Latomus* 17 (1958), 669ff.; Verdière (*Prolégomènes*, pp. 204-6), and the table from E. Debecque's *Xénophon, L'art de la chasse*, Paris 1970 reproduced by Volpilhac (p. 147).
Different types of net required different threads and sizes of mesh, see Xenophon Cyn. 2.4-5, 10.2.

Enk on Gratt. 85 thinks that metus in u. 304 refers to the formido. TLL, on the other hand, regards u. 311 as a reference to the formido and u. 304 as literal fear. Again, according to TLL, Grattius, Manlius and Nem. all use metus as a synonym for the formido, but Housman regards the Manlius passage (4.182) as a reference to literal fear. As the idea of the formido, a rope strung with feathers, was to scare animals into the net, it is not surprising to find that the use of metus is sometimes ambiguous, and Nem. may be playing on the two meanings, as Grattius does at u. 88 metus...false. I think it more likely that u. 304 is a reference to the formido and u. 311 to literal fear, but any of the four possible interpretations might be the right one.

Grattius also recommends dyeing the feathers (u. 86).

The manuscripts read cura tibi, but its use without sit where the sense demands the jussive subjunctive or something similar would appear to be impossible (see K-S 1, pp. 10-5), although Postgate, Damsté and Volpilhac retain this reading. Damsté ("Ad Nemesianum Cynegeticum" Mnem. 53 (1925), 308) compares Grattius uu. 495ff. and u. 346, but in the former case the omission occurs in a subordinate clause, which is not unusual (see K-S 1, p. 11), and in the second there is no omission of a part of esse. Haupt comments (Opuscula 1, p. 405f.): "non plena est oratio, sed dicendum erat Cura tibi sit vel omisso
pronomine Curasit, ut in hac tota carminis parte poeta praeecepta dat et quae facienda sint docet. possumus plura conicere Curato, Curabis, Curabunt (nam famuli antea commemorantur.) scitius et probabilius est quod Lachmannus excogitauit Curam athis. dixit de hac uocabuli quod est ad scribendiri ratione in commentario Lucretiano p. 352: in hoc ipso adhibendi uerbo codicem palimpsestum Vaticanum secutus Martinus Hertzius eam in Gellii libro I cap. 3 et 6 exhibuit. (athibetur Tac. ann. XV.4 athibetur Gaius III 174 athibuerint. Gaius II 109)." Lachmann's is an interesting conjecture, but according to TLL (4 1459 13), curam adhibe does not occur with the infinitive, "nonnisi Paul. dig. 1.15.3.14." Haupt's curabunt is possible as the famuli are the subject of addiscant (301), but somewhat awkward, as there have been two changes of subject since then, and famuli is by this point twelve lines away. curabis is probably the best solution to the problem as we have two second person future verbs following, sumes (317) and inuenies (319). The corruption could have come about by a scribe's eye slipping to u. 312 and his absent-mindedly writing tibi for -bis.

312 Vulture's feathers were apparently used because of their smell, cf. Gratt. 79 and Lucan 4.437. The vulture is also mentioned at Gratt. 75 and Oppian Cyn. 4.392. The only other bird in Nem.'s list which is also mentioned by Grattius is the swan (u. 77).

313 Martin and Keller (op. cit. 2, p. 171) think that there is here a reference to the ostrich, which is found in Arabia as well as Africa and is much sought-after for its beautiful plumage.
314 cycnique senes  The swan is referred to as senex elsewhere, but in at least two of the cases, the reference must be to the swansong (Stat. Theb. 5.341; Mart. 9.42.2), whereas here the reference must be to the white plumage (cf. u. 37 plumamque senilem). It is possible, however, that in Statius and Martial senex has the added connotation of "white," cf. Ovid Her. 7.2 ubi fata uocant...concinit albus olor, or perhaps swans were always thought of as old because of their colour.

316 pellitosque pedes  I cannot find another example of pellitus used in this way, of webbed feet, but it is not in my view an unnatural use. Pliny uses palmipes (N.H. 10.29 and 11.256).

317 -8 hinc.../...illio  Wernsdorf interpreted hinc as "from the water-fowl" and illio as "in the rivers and marshes." Such an interpretation is forced, according to Martin, who says that "hinc and illio must refer to Libya, though the logical connection is broken by the interposition of u. 314-6."Ulitius, followed by Johnson, says that u. 317 interrupts the sense because "Si ad ardeas & ciconias haec referas, falsa sunt; sin ad Libycas aues, uera quidem" and therefore transposes u. 313 after u. 316, thus bringing Libye and hinc closer together. But in u. 316, Nem. may well be referring to the flamingo, which is found in North and Central Africa and is noted for its vermilion plumage. The use of hinc here is somewhat vague, but it may well be used in a partitive sense, referring to the water fowl in u. 316, since the other birds previously mentioned do not have red feathers. illio could be taken as a reference to Libya or as a further reference to the water fowl, though it is possible to take it, with Wernsdorf, as referring to the rivers.
and marshes in u. 315. Duff translates "among the former," which
might refer to anything.

317 *mage* Probably used here in the sense of *potissimum* as at
Gratt. 85 hinc *magis* in ceruos ualuit metus; Pliny N.H. 18.152
*matrescentia* frumenta imbre laeduntur et *hordeum magis*.

This form is comparatively infrequent in early and
classical Latin. In Plautus it is found only before vowels, but
in classical verse, only before consonants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plautus</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucretius</td>
<td>4 (magis 154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil</td>
<td>1 (Aen. 10.481) (magis 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propertius</td>
<td>3 (magis 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid</td>
<td>1 (Trist. 2.479)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the time of Terentianus Maurus on, *mage* becomes more
common, occurring almost 80 times in poetry and almost 20 times
in prose, generally before a consonant, see TLL 8 52.8ff. and
Neue 2, pp. 594-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terentianus Maurus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reposianus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solinus</td>
<td>1 (22 (12.201))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesianus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iul. Valerius</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionys. Cato de moribus</td>
<td>3 (once before a vowel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avienius</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudentius</td>
<td>4 (magis 11 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidonius</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulinus Petricordiae</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennodius</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boethius</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The origin of the doublet magis and mage arises from the tendency in early Latin to undervalue final -e. Final -i in an open syllable in Latin became -e, e.g. cape, imperative of capere, alongside capio, capiunt (see M. Niedermann, Précis de Phonétique Historique du Latine, Paris 1953, p. 38), so that we have mage rather than *magi. Final -s was lost in early Latin if preceded by a short vowel and followed by an initial consonant (see Niedermann, p. 96) so that final -s was sometimes preserved and sometimes not, giving us the doublets mage and magis, pote and potis. magis came to be the more popular form in classical Latin (pp. 97-8).

puniceas Virgil also recommends this colour for the formido (Geor. 3.372). For the adjective puniceus in general see J. André, Etude sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine, Paris 1949, pp. 88-90.

natiuo munere murice is the conjecture of Barth, but the reading of the manuscripts gives perfect sense. As is clear from what follows, Nem. is here referring to feathers naturally coloured and therefore needing no dye. munus is here almost equivalent to donum, cf. Ovid Met. 14.685 naturale decoris/ munus.

324 From the time of Homer, the early morning was considered the best time to hunt, cf. Odyss. 19.428-9; Virgil Aen. 4.130, 586; Ovid Met. 7.804; Lucan 4.32, 734; Seneca Phaed. 39f.; Gratt. 223.

325 The text ends here in the manuscripts, but it is generally
agreed that the poem has been transmitted in an incomplete state. Setting aside Haupt's ingenious reconstruction of the archetype in which u. 325 comes at the bottom of the verso side of a leaf (Opuscula 1, p. 404f.), the prooemium is inordinately long for a poem of this size (102 lines), and Nem. has not fulfilled his promise (uu. 237-8) to describe further the attributes of the Tuscan dog. The poem as a whole also is short for a book of Cynegética; Grattius's also incomplete poem breaks off after 541 lines and Oppian's books average 536 lines. It is now impossible to tell how long the poem might originally have been: Oppian's Cynegética runs to four books, and like Nem. he deals in his first book mainly with horses and dogs, so that there is a precedent for a reasonably long hunting treatise, but there is no evidence that Nem.'s work, or that of Grattius for that matter, was of comparable size to that of Oppian.
APPENDIX LECTIONUM

I

1 dum) cum rw : qum f
2 raucis) raucos f immunia) rumpitur f² in mg.
3 quid) quod w
4 fauit) flauit k
8 clementia) dementia f
9 hos) nos fy
10 deis) deos ekt
14 dependet) dependent fg: dependat x
16 mopsi) mopso p(?): mopsu z
17 mecum) tecum y
18 audierat) audierant i (s.c.)
22 praedulcis) per dulcis hrw
25 aut Oeagrius) modulabitis r: modulanbus (?) x
26 concinerent) concineret y
29 quercus) querens c
30 pinus) primus w
35 omniparens) omnipotens k
38 mittite si sentire datur) mittite si sentire dat h: miti ne
findatur sentire g (corr. m² in mg.) fata) facta a (s.c.) c
(in mg.) ez quietis) quietem a (corr. in mg.) c
44 felicesque) felices s: faelices r
47 florentes) florentis f carperet) palleret h: pellet a:
pelle z
50 canente) cante p: cruente k: cernente t
51 concilioque) consilioque kt
54 sub te) subiti w
56 blanda) blando h
61 saepe dabas) sectabas f² in mg.
63 phoebea) phorbea fry unde orpha Burman carmen) carmina f: carmine w
66 uaellet) ualent w: lauet ps
69 flora) flore fmry
73 te pinus) te pinnus a: te primis e: te pierus p: te pienis s: te prius l: teque prius l²mx: te pignus j reboat) roborat gj
75 uersum om. m aruis) armis g
76 insuetusque) uestitusque h: restitusque s: getulusque w
79 uer) nec fhmrwy
81 coeptumque) coptum z
85 pinnis) plena ehkry: plene mw: plena f
86 iam sol) sol iam j demittit ehmw: dimittit kry: dimictit f
87 flumineos) fluminibus my

II

1 idas) astacus hmwy: hastacus fr
3 ruebant) ruebat fry
6 uenerisque fhryw
11 quod fry: qui hw
13 suffususque) effususque w
15 dulcique) dulci z releuare) reuellare e: reuellare j
17 genas leues) genas leuas n: leues genas y (g.c.)
24 palmis) plantis x (corr. m² in mg.)
25 iam trini) iam trino c: iam tam g (corr. m²): iam mihi f² in mg. perierunt) potierunt (?) p.c. pet (?) j
26 expecto y: experto fr
29 trinis) ternis kw gramina) carmina a, corr. m¹
30 amne liquores) ubera matrum c (om. 31)  
32 mugitibus) uagitibus et w aera) atria fry  
34 in usus) in usum pz (s. c.): musum s  
35 iuuencas) iuentas fv³y  
37 ego om. m cui) quoi fmy  
40 heu heu dehw: en heu fry: eheu kt  
41 moleque c: molesque g erro) euro a: atrae ry: atre f²: antre f  
46 uersum om. m 46-8 om. rw  
50 dum) dea fr: mea y  
53 tu quae) tum quem w  
56 dione) diane hw: dyane m  
57 celsa om. z cui) quoi fmry  
58 saeclis) sedis Nhm  
59 cur om. z reliquit) reliquid f: reliquit hry  
60 noster quae) nosterque ps: que noster c: noster quem h  
61 longos quae ducit) longos quae non ducit e: longosque ducit w: longos quae duceret ry: longos quam duceret f  
aedona) e donace w  
63 cum) quom fmryx: quum s  
65 scit) sicut r: et w  
71 in) ad w  
72 pecorum) precorum m  
74 fontis speculo) fonte speculo c: speculo fontis l  
75 nondum) nundum Nx: num dum s cum) quom f  
77 nulla tegimur lanugine malas) nulla tegimur (lacuna) lanugine mallas m (teneras in mg. m¹): nulla tegimus lanugine malas f  
82 cantamus) certamus p  
85 nos quoque te) nosque te g  
86 modo) non w coniferas) corniferas hmw
87 atque) at f
89 suasit) suasi f

III

1 atque) ac fry\(^1\); et y et om. f
2 ilice) ille z
6 possent) posset z; poscunt kt
7 post & transpos. b
9 suerat) fuerat hw; sueuit fry nec) ne z
10 sibila) carmina y
11 excussus) excussis f
17 montiuagus) montmagus c; noctiuagus w
18 fronte a\(^1\): fronde a
19 tigres) tygris H
22 uidit Iouis) iouis uidit h: iouis uidet w
25 uersum om. dekmt
26 nosque etiam) nos quoque etiam f
28 resupinis) resupinus h
29 quietem a: quietum a\(^1\)
33 applauditue h: applaudit ue w
34 tenero) teneros z collidit) sustulit fry: sustolit y\(^1\)
41 ediderat) audierant ry: audierat f
43 feruet) feruent fs
46 cohors) chori b: chors a: cohoris f (m\(^1\) ut uid.)
52 resupinus) resupinis z
63 prosatus ipso) natus ab illo kt
67 conducere) deducere x (corr. m\(^2\) sup.)
69 in niueas) uinea hn
IV

5 parilisque) puerilisque h: puerique w
11 cum) tunc y adederat fy: dederat r: edit et kt
15 cur...cur) quor...quor fry: cur...tum j
20 crudelis crudelis q
22 perdit) perdet m
26 uu. 26-43 om. w, uu. 26-37 om. h
32 alit rapit (om. tempus) c
38 umbram) umbra h huc)nunc j
39 subiere) subire m iam nulla y (sup.): non ulla d
42 cantu) cantum h
53 metuet) metuat fh: metuas w sardorum) sarebrum h: acerbum w
54 coget) cogiet a: ferret w: perstringet kt
uu. 56-61 om. fry (in quo scriptum est "deest hic puto")
57 discatque diu om. w
59 perferat) preferat w sumet) sument w
63 uittis ry: uictis f
64 lustrauit cineresque) lustrauitque cineres h auersa) aduersum w
68 haec) nec j
sine titulo Nhjnopsw
Nemesiani Eclogae N
Aurelianij nemesiani cartaginensis egloghe incipiunt G
Calphurnij Aurelij Nemesiani poetae Cartage/nensis egloga prima A
Aurelii nemesiani cartaginensis poetae illustris / carmen bucolicum
ad C. titum calphurnium sicul/lum. Aegloga prima: quae epyfunus
inscribitur: / Interlocutores Timetas et Tityrus amici H
Calphurnii Aurelii Nemesiani Poetae Carthaginensis / Egloga Prima
Interloquutores Timeta et Tityrus M
Titi Calpurnij poetae Octaua Egloga adsunt / Collocutores Timetas
et Tityrus a Nemesiani a in mg.
TIMETAS TITIRVS bg(?)
Octaua Egloga collocutores Timetas et Titirus cq
TIMETAS ET TITIRVS dv
TIMETAS ET TITYRVS INTERLOCU/TORES AEGLOGA OCTAVA e
In hac egloga tractantur laudes Meliboei uitaee defuncti.
Interloquutores Amyntas et Tityrus amici fir
TIMETAS TYTIRUS g
Tymetas et Tytirur (tityrus t) Interloquutores Egloga (Aegloga t)
Octaua egloga inducuntur thimetas & Titirus l
Egloga (lacuna) in qua titirus et / Timetas Colloquuntur m
viii egloga Timetas Titirus u
NONA (viii in mg.) EGLOGA: COLLOQUUTO / TITIRVS. ET. TIMETAS x
1543 Aurelij nemesiani chartaginensis poetae (?) eglo. t x2 in mg.
Cantant laudes Meliboei uitae functi. Amyntas / et Tityrus amici
Eglo. VIII y
Octaua egloga collocutores thimetas tityrus z

II

sine titulo NGbghjnpsw
Aegloga secunda: quae donace inscribitur / Interloquutores Idas et
Alcon rurales H
Idas et Alcon Eglo 2ᵃ M
Titi Calpurnij poetae. Nona egloga Collocuto/ res Idas et (?) Alcon:
mutuo uersu Cantantes de/ Amore Donaces a
Nona egloga collocutores. astacus et alchon c
ASTACVS ET ALCON dv
ASTACVS ET ALCON INTERLO/CVTORES AEGLOGA VIII e
In hac egloga cantantur amores pueriles inter amicos pastores Idan
qui et Hastacus (astacus i) et Alconem In qua etiam poeta ipse
loquitur fir
Astacus et Alcon Interloquutores Egloga (Aegloga t) nona kt (poeta
add. t)
Nona egloga (?) inducuntur idas et alcon l
Egloga (lacuna) In qua Idas et / Alcon colloquuntur m
Nona Egloga Collocutores Astacus: et Alcon / mutuo uersu cantantes
de amore donaces q
IX egloga u
ECLOGA IX COLLOQVTORES / IDAS ET ALGON (?) x
Cantantur amores pueriles inter amicos pastores / Idan qui et
Astacus dI (?) et Alcontem Eglo. VIII y
Egloga nona collocutores idas & alcon z
III

sine titulo NGbghjnopsw

Aegloga tertia: quae banchus inscribitur / in qua Pan puerorum
Nyctili Myconis / et amyntae impulsu modulatur H
Titi Calpurnij poetae decima eegloga Collocutores Nictilos Michon
et (?) Amitas. Inducentes pana cantare de laudibus Bachi a
DECIMA EGLOGA. COLL. NICTILOS. MICHON ET. aminthas inducens pana
cantare de laudibus bachi c
Pan trium puerorum impulsu modulatur dv
PAN. TRIUM Puerorum impulsionemmodulatur EGLOGA DECIMA e
In hac egloga pan inducitur cantare / laudes et munera dei bacchi
nictilo (Nyctilo ir) et micone (Mycone i, Mycon r) audientibus cum
aminthai (Amynta i, Amynota r) fir
Pan trium puerorum impulsu modulatur Eegloga (Aegloga t, Eglo M) 10ma
(decima t, 3 M) Mkt
Decima egloga t 1
Eegloga X (lacuna m) In qua poeta Solus Loquitor mx
Decima Eegloga Collocutores: Nictilos Micon et Aminthas Inducentes
Pan cantare de laudibus Bachi q
X egloga u
Pan inducitur cantare laudes ac munera Bacchi Nyctilo et Mycone
cum Amynta audientibus Eglo. X y
Decima egloga in qua pan cantar laudes bacchi z

IV

sine titulo NGhjnopsw

Aegloga quarta: quae / Interloqutores Mopsus et Lyccidas amici H
Mopsus et Lycidas Egloga IIII M
Titi Cal. poetae Undecima & ultima egloga. / Collocutores. Mopsus & Licidas Cantantes / amore (?) Meroes & Iole a

MOPSVS LICIDAS bg
Undecima egloga collocutores. Mopsus et licidas in (om. in q) amore merores (Meroes q) et Iole cq

MOPSVS ET LYCIDAS dv (lycydas v^3)

MOPSVS ET LYCIDAS INTERLOCV/TORES AEGLOGA VNDECIMA e

In hac egloga licidas et mopsos / Amores suos disperat querelis et secuntur (?) / Mores mopsus et licidas Iolla f
In hac egloga Lycidas & Mopsus amores / suos querellis (querelis r) desperati prosequuntur / Meroes Mopsus & Lycidas Iolle ir
Mopsus et lycidas Interloquutores Egloga (Aegloga t) 14\textsuperscript{ma}

(Undecima t) kt

Ultima egloga inducuntur mopsus & licidas l

Egloga Ultima in qua Mopsus / et Licida Colloquentur m
Mopsus licidas xi egloga u

EGLOGA XI VLTIMA COLLOG/ MOPSVS.ET. LICIDAS x

Lycidas et Mopsus desperati suos amores pro/sequuntur Egloga

Undecima y

Undecima & ultima collocutores licidas & mopsus z

**FLORILEGIA**

**TITLES**

- Calpurnius in bucolicis Parisinus Thuaneus 7647
- Scalpurius in bucoliccis Parisinus Nostradamensis 188 (by n^1)
- Calpurnius in buccolicis Atrebatensis 64
- Ex Calphurnio poeta Siculo Bononiensis 83
- Calpurius in bucolitis Escorialensis Q, 1.14
Calphurnus in bucolicis Berolinensis Diez. B. Sant. 60
Ex Eclogis eiusdem Ecloga pæ Conv. Sopp. 440
Ex Ecloga 2æ Conv. Sopp. 440
Ex Ecloga 3 De Baccho loquitur (?) Pan Conv. Sopp. 440
Ex Ecloga 4æ Conv. Sopp. 440
Aureliani Nemesiani Cartag bucol' Explicit / Deo gratias Amen

Antonij Seripandi ex Iacobi perilli / amici opt. munere

Explicit quarta

FINIS / Contuli ego Nicolaus Angelius hunc codicem / cum multisque
alijs & cum illo uetustissimo codice / quem nobis Thadeus Ugoletus
pannonia regis / bibliotheca praefectus e Germania allatum /
accurato accomodauit in quo multa carmina sunt reperta / Anno
salutis MCCCCLXXXII

Collatus accuratissime hic codex cum illo uetustissimo: / quem
Thadeus ugoletus pannoniae regis bibliothecae / praefectus e germania
secum attulit et cum illo / quem Johannes boccaccius propria manu
scripsisse / traditur bibliothecae sancti spiritus florentini /
dicatum. et cum plerisque aliis: ubi titulum et / operis divisionem
multa etiam carmina reperimus

FINIS  Msw

Titi Calpurnij poetae Bucolicum explicit / DEO GRATIAS AMEN

Die 4 augusti 1463 ego petrus feliciter peregi / FINIS

CALPURNII. POETAE. SICVLI. BUCOLICA / EXPLICIT FELICITER

TITI CALPHVRNII POETAE SICVLI BUCOLICV / CARMEN FELICITER

EXPLICIT
dv^2

TITI CALFVRNII SICVLI BV/COLICI. CARMINIS LI/BER. EXPLICIT

FELICITE/R

P. Calpurnij Buccolicon / carmen desinit / AMEN/ DEO GRATIAS /

FINIS

Explicit Buccolica Calphurnii Poetae (bis) g and g^2

C. CALPHVRNII / BVCOLOCN / CARMEN / DESI/NI/T

Amen / Explicit carmen bucolicum Theocriti Calphurnij

Expliciunt bucolica titi Calphurnij siculi / scripta per manum.
Johannis de Gorcum An/no a natali dominico millesimo CCCCXC

τελοσ

τελοσ / Anno ra lxxv die dena octaua / Nouembris in Padua

H.S. m

Opus absolutum ad petitionem Ioannis Marcha/nonae artium & / medicinae doctoris .p. Bono/niae Brixiae Anno D.MCCCCLX o

T. Calpurni poete Siculi decima et ultima Egloga / Bucolici

carminis explicit feliciter q

C. Calphurnii Bucolicon carm desinit / τελοσ κοσλος (?) r

Bucolica Titi Calphurnij Siculi finiunt per me fratrem Stephanus

leupolter 1510 t

Titi Calphurnij poetae Siculi bucolico carmen foe/licit explicit v

EXPLICIT BUCCOLICON THEOCRITI CALPHURNII POET/AE SICVLI x

C. Calphurnij bucolicon carm desunt y

τελως / ις - Finis z
One of the distinctive features of the poetics of Neposianus is his treatment of short final -o. The shortening of the final vowel was apparently a feature of colloquial Latin pronunciation (see L. Hülser, *Le Re Lettico*, p. 412ff.; Rudolf Hartenberger, *Le o finali e poetae latinius ab annio usque ad Iuuenalis*, Liss. Bonn 1911, p. 8; W. Lindsay, *The Cautui of Plautus*, London 1900, p. 30; Quint. 1.6.21) and is frequently found in comedy. This feature of Latin pronunciation is accounted for by the Law of Brevis Brevians, according to which a long syllable following a short syllable with a dominant accent was shortened as a result of this emphasis. This most frequently affected words of iambic form. Long final -o was at first preserved outside comedy, but was later admitted in dactylic poetry in the case of auxiliaries like volo and certain other common words. Short final -o spread to nouns, adverbs and other verbs of iambic shape, and in the first few centuries of the Empire to words of other metrical shapes and to the ablative of the gerund.

The final -o of the first person singular of the present indicative was originally always long, but under the influence of the Law of Brevis Brevians, final -o is found scanned short in iambic verbs frequently in Plautus. The other poets, however, are at first reluctant to admit such shortening, and it is not until Ovid that we find short final -o appearing with any degree of frequency. It is perhaps a sign of its colloquial origin that we

1There is still controversy about whether Brevis Brevians is a phonetic or metrical law. See E. Lrexler, *Einführung in die römische Metrik*, Darmstadt 1967, p. 41ff.
find it much less often in the *Metamorphoses*, where there are only five cases of *puto* scanned short, as opposed to thirty-three (thirty-four counting the *dux*), in the other poems, and *peto* is scanned short only once in the *Metamorphoses* (6.352), as opposed to four occurrences in the other poems (*Her. 12.97; 16.35; A.A. 2.10; Trist. 1.2.77*). The later poets vary considerably in their admission of short final -o in verbs. Seneca has many examples of short final -o, but Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, Calpurnius Siculus and Grattius generally preserve the long syllable in verbs. Silius Italicus fluctuates in his usage, and in the case of Statius, verbs end with a long -o generally only before a pause or caesura. In Martial, final -o in iambic verbs is always short except for *nego* (11.49.2), but he often preserves long -o in other verbs, e.g. *laudo* (3.51.1). Juvenal also shortens final -o in iambic words and some other disyllabic words, but not those longer than two syllables, except for *proserabo* (3.591). Persius and Petronius have short -o only in the case of verbs of iambic form.

**Iambic Verbs**

- **puto** Shortened in Ennius; Propertius (2.26.18 parenthetic); Ovid (23 times); Calpurnius (6.83); *Carm. Eins.* 1.11; Martial (12 times). In the *Priaeva* it is scanned short at 70.6 but long at 12.2. Catullus preserves long -o.

- **nego** Shortened in Plautus, Ovid (*Am. 1.10.64*), but Catullus and Martial preserve long -o.

- **scio** Shortened in Plautus, Terence, Virgil (*Aen. 3.602 and 10.904*); Ovid *Trist.* 5.4.46; Valerius

---

2These lists are arranged in chronological order.
Flaccus (1.196 and 5.289); Seneca, Martial, Phaedrus, Statius.

uolo Shortened in Plautus, Terence, Catullus, Horace; Propertius (2.10.9); Ovid (Am. 2.5.54); Phaedrus; Petronius; Persius; Statius; but long -o is preserved in the *Priapea.*

reso Shortened in Terence; Ovid (Her. 11.127 used parenthetically. See ECUSMAN Ga 13 (1899), 74); Stat. Silv. 4.9.42; Martial (7 times); Long -o is preserved in Virgil and three times in Statius.

dabo Long in Lucilius, Virgil and Ovid, but short in Catullus, Silius Italicus and Statius.

amo Shortened in Ovid (Am. 3.14.39, disputed; P.A. 648) and Petronius. Catullus, Horace, Propertius and Persius all preserve long -o.

cano Shortened in Ovid (Ep. 3.9.35); Statius (Silv. 3.2.41) Mem. 3.18; 4.41; Cyn. 1. Tibullus; Propertius; Grattius; Calpurnius and Lucan preserve long -o.

neto Shortened in Ovid (5 times); *Priapea* 32.4. Catullus Tibullus and Lucan preserve long -o.

Non-iambic Verbs and Verb Forms

*ibo* Shortened at Caecil. 187 (Guardi's text).

*nescio* Shortened in Terence; Catullus (85.2); Virgil (5 times); Tibullus (3 times); Ovid; Petronius.

dixero Shortened at Horace *Serm.* 1.4.104.

desino Shortened in Tibullus (2.6.41); Ovid (Her. 18.203).

confero Shortened in Ovid (Ep. 1.1.25); Statius (Silv. 3.3.42).

*credo* Shortened at Ovid *Ep.* 1.7.56 and twice in Valerius Flaccus.
omicru Shortened at Cvid. Am 3.1.55.
acci-te Shortened in Seneca (Th. 5.2), but lengthened in Cina. 2.4.
cerno Shortened in Seneca, Juvenal (16.64).
proserabo Shortened in Seneca, Statius (Thet. 2.342) and Juvenal (3.59).
quero Shortened in Seneca, Juvenal (3.296), Statius (Thet. 1.66 and 9.437).
retineo Shortened in Seneca (Thet. 105).
tenebo Shortened in Seneca (Thet. 412).
dilico Shortened in Statius (Thet. 7.514).
sentio Shortened in Statius (Thet. 2.356).
anteambulo Shortened in Martial (2.13.5).
commendo Shortened in Martial (10.32.4).
concedo Shortened in Mem. (4.42).
coniungo Shortened in Mem. (3.14).
expecto Shortened in Mem. (2.26).
horreo Shortened in Mem. (2.33).

Pronouns
ego Shortened by Livius Andronicus (trac. 39); Maev. (com. 9); Plautus; Terence; Cicero; Catullus; Virgil; Propertius and thereafter usually short. Final -o is found lengthened in Plautus and Valerius Flaccus (37 times).
ambo The -o is always long in the elegists. Its shortening may be due to the extension of brevis brevis to non-iambic words, or by semantic analogy with duo. Long -o is preserved in the Ilias Latina (941). It is
shortened in Valerius Flaccus (7.653); Stat. Theb. 6.374 (but lengthened at 6.374, 798, 814; 10.249; 11.36, 102); Martial 7.40.4; Sen. 2.17.

Nouns

The final -o in nouns is always short from Naevius and Lucilius on.

The -o is shortened first by Manilius (4.635; 5.339), then by Martial, Juvenal and Ausonius.

Short final -o in poetry is also found in the nominative of nouns very early and becomes common in the Imperial period, but it is not found in the oblique case forms of nouns and adjectives of the second declension. Horace is the first dactylic poet to admit short final -o in nouns with any degree of frequency, and this Hartenberger attributes to the fact that he is imitating colloquial language in his satires. Statius is also very free in his use of short final -o except in the case of some Greek names, but Lucan usually retains long -o. Juvenal shortens the final -o of origo and other words of the same metrical form and some longer nouns.

In Martial, we find short final -o in nouns of every metrical type, except for three proper names, and hereafter the practice becomes extremely common.

Some examples of the shortening of final -o in nouns are:

- homo Shortened in Lucilius, Hlautus, Terence, Lucretius (6.652); Catullus (twice). Lucretius and Catullus both have long -o twice, but after Catullus, short -o becomes the rule.
- suspicio Shortened in Terence (Ad. 615).
- mentio Shortened in Horace (Jerm. 1.4.93).
- leo Final -o is scanned long in Lucilius, Lucretius,
Cicero, Virgil and the Ilias Latina. Final -o is shortened in Lucan, Seneca, Silius Italicus, Statius (10 times), Juvenal (3 times), Phaedrus and Nem. (1.76). Ovid, Manilius, Germanicus and Valerius Flaccus very in their scansion.

nemo Shortened in Manilius and Seneca. Long -o is preserved in Cicero, Lucretius, Horace (Serm. 1.1.1), Aetna (10) and Persius. Ovid (5 times short, 14 long), Martial (short at 1.40), Lucan, Juvenal (27 times short, twice long) and the Priapea vary in their scansion.

superstitio Shortened in Seneca, but long -o is preserved at Statius Theb. 6.11 and 12.487.

homuncio Shortened in Petronius.

lanugo Shortened in Statius (twice).

obliuio Shortened in Statius and Lucan (10.403).

consuetudo Shortened in Juvenal (7.51).

damnatio Shortened in Juvenal (8.94).

origo Shortened in Juvenal and Silius Italicus.

deuotio Shortened at Nem. Cyn. 83.

Proper Names

Cato Shortened in Varro Atacinus, Manilius, Lucan, Silius Italicus and Statius.

Pollio Shortened in Horace (Serm. 1.10.42, 85).

Gallio Shortened in Ovid (E.P. 4.11.1).

Naso Shortened in Ovid (30 times).

Scipio Shortened in Ovid (A.A. 3.410); Statius (Silu. 3.3.110); Lucan (3 times).

Sulmo Shortened in Ovid (twice).

Agamemnon Shortened in Seneca.

Corbulo Shortened in Statius (Silu. 5.2.35).
Adverbs and Conjunctions

cito  Shortened in Plautus and Terence. Final -o is shortened from Tibullus on everywhere except at Dracontius Crest. 63, see Till 3 1209 79ff.

immo  Shortened by Plautus, Caecilius and Terence, but then not found shortened till Seneca. It is also shortened in Martial, Terentianus Major, Ausonius and Prudentius.

modo  modo is scanned pyrrhic more often than iambic in Plautus, see J. Lindsay, Early Latin Verse, p. 56f. Final -o is usually short in Terence (but long at And. 630) but is scanned long in Lucretius 3 times and at Cic. post. H.L. 42.107. Lucretius is apparently the first poet in hexameters to scan it short (twice) and thereafter it is always short, as at Nem. Cyn. 86 and 260.

cuomodo  Final -o is shortened first by Horace.

dummodo  Always short in Propertius and Ovid.

postmodo  Always short in Propertius and Ovid.

sero  Shortened in Ovid, Seneca and Statius. Petronius, Silius Italicus and Juvenal preserve long -o. Martial and Valerius Flaccus vary in their scansion.

tantummodo  Always short in Ovid.

cuando  Shortened in Germanicus, Statius and Martial.

Valerius Flaccus varies in his scansion.

sero  Final -o is short in Seneca and Statius and sometimes in Martial.

subito  Final -o is shortened in Seneca.

uero  Shortened in Seneca. Valerius Flaccus is the first
dactylic poet to shorten the final vowel (5.321). The Ilias Latina preserves the long -o (922) and so does Martial. Statius varies in his scansion. 

Porro Shortened by Silius Italicus and Statius.

Imperatives

There are not many examples of the imperative scanned with short final -o, and of these, some are disputed. The first generally accepted case is in Ovid.

Caedito Supposedly found shortened at Irop. 4.5.77, now rejected.

Esto Shortened at Ovid Trist. 4.3.72; Juv. 8.79.

Respondeto Shortened at Martial 3.4.7.


Gerund

The shortening of final -o in the ablative of the gerund seems to be found first in Seneca, who begins iambic lines in this way. The readings medicendo ((Tib.) 3.6.3) and tegendo. (Ovid Her. 9.126) are no longer accepted, and as Palmer comments on the latter reading, "no passage from any Augustan poet can be cited for the -dō save the false reading Tib. 3.6.3." The earliest occurrence in dactylic poetry appears to be in Juvenal, and by the time of Mem. this scansion was not unusual. The trend continued and, according to Karl Strecker (Introduction to Mediaeval Latin, translated and revised Palmer 1957, p. 72), in the quantitative poetry of the Middle Ages when the ablative of the gerund was often used for the present participle, final -o was almost always short, e.g. 

Exererriscendo socratem (cited by Strecker-Falmer).

Lugendo Shortened in Seneca (E.Q. 1862).
retendo Shortened in Seneca (Inc. 539).
scuendos Shortened in Seneca (Led. 9:2, a disputed reading.
See L. Müller, Le Re etrica, p. 417).
vincondo Shortened in Seneca (Tr. 26a).
vigilando Shortened at Juv. 3.232.
miserando Shortened at Aenigma pericae 21.
renovando Shortened at Terentianus 1266 (quoted by Servius,
Aen. 4.415, who strangely says, "in hoc modo 'do'
naturaliter breuis est).
cessando Shortened at Senens Sammonicus 396.
manando Shortened at Senens Sammonicus 346 (Zachrens,
FLM 3).
reanendo Shortened at Senens Sammonicus 368 dub. lect.
laudando Shortened at Rem. 2.80.
ruceando Shortened at Rem. 1.53.
prohibiendo Shortened at Prudentius Contra Symm. 1.90.
curiendo Shortened at Maximian eleg. 1.54.
satiando Shortened by Alcimus Avitus (Priscian 8.71.1,
427 Keil).
temptando Shortened at Bede Vita Cuthberti 241.
prestando Shortened at Carm. de Gest. Fred. 1.987.
pugnando Shortened at Carm. de Gest. Fred. 1.384, 507 and
3197.
tenendo Shortened at Carm. de Gest. Fred. 1.1019.
uiuendo Shortened at Carm. de Gest. Fred. 1.946.
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INDEX VERBORUM

a, ab 3.52; C. 3, 103, 173, 205.
abdere C. 134
abundare C. 116, 152
ac 4.2, 7, 17
acanthus 2.5
accingere C. 64
accipere 1.28, 37
acer C. 120, 229, 307
acidus C. 199
acutus 3.32
ad 1.28; 4.10, *47 C. 82
addiscere C. 301
adedere 4.11
adesse C. 96, 153
adhuc C. 238
admiscere C. 200, 219
Adonis 2.73
adquirere C. 270
Adriacus C. 62
adroder C. 170
adstringere 3.32, 69
adsuescere 1.53
adtonitus C. 206
adrimitus C. 217
aduertere 1.41
aduncus 3.48
aedon 2.61
aequor C. 243, 269, 278
aequus 1.51; 3.60 C. 182
aer 1.36; 2.32 C. 209
aerius 4.28
aestas 1.78 C. 290
aestius 4.42

* denotes a conjecture which has been accepted into the text. (*)
denotes a possible conjecture.
aestuare C. 4
aestus 2.14; 4.38 C. 208
aetas 1.12 C. 119, 172
aether 1.35
aethra C. 205
aeuuum 1.44; 2.16, 81; 3.23 C. 105, 280
age (interj.) 1.21, 30; 4.46 C. 87, 97
ager 1.33, 55 C. 4, 323
agere 1.26
agitare C. 212, 323
agmen C. 83
agrestis 2.64
ala C. 318
albere C. 153
albus 1.13
Alcon 2.1, 19, 53, 70
alere 2.22; 4.32
ales C. 305
aliquis 4.60
alius 3.51, 52 C. 149 (bis), 310
allicere 3.30
alter 3.48
alternare 2.19
alternus C. 311
altor C. 297
altus C. 108, 246
alumnus 3.27 C. 5
aluus C. 111, 244, 263
amare 2.50; 3.56; 4.19 (et in rell.uers. intercal.), 56, 57
C. 188 amans (subst.) 4.30, 60
ambiguus 1.55
ambo 2.16, 17 (bis)
amnis 1.28; 2.30; 4.64 C. 95
amor 1.12, 54; 2.8, 27, 69; 4.3, 29 C. 99, 150
amplus C. 112, 243, 251
Amyntas 3.1; 4.62
anguis 4.70
anhelus C. 255
anima 1.39 C. 29
animare C. 83
animosus C. 250, 298
animus 4.10, 58 C. 237, 282
annuere C. 137
annus 1.9, 13, 44, 47, 77; 2.2, 9; 4.24, 36, 58 C. 103, 281
anser C. 314
ante (adu.) 1.79
antiquus C. 47
antrum 2.20, 26; 3.14, 26; 4.10 C. 273
Aonius C. 3
aperire C. 125 (apertus) C. 6
Apollo 1.5, 65, 82; 2.55, 72
applaudere 3.33
aptare C. 90, 292
aptus C. 226, 299
aqua 4.52
aquosus C. 321
Arabs C. 28
Arar C. 67
arbos 1.67; 4.29, 71 C. 56
arboreus C. 29
Arctos C. 69
arcus C. 75, 88
ardere 2.2, 14
arduus C. 34, 245, 251
arista C. 292
armare C. 164, 242
armamentum 1.74
armus C. 247, 265
arridere 3.31
arripere 3.47
artare C. 92
articulus C. 161
artus (subst.) C. 169, 233, 250, 287
artus (adj.) 4.32
aruum 1.75 C. 28, 49, 261
arx C. 72
aspectare C. 285
aspicere 1.34
assiduus C. 262
astus C. 17
at 2.47; 3.50, 53
atque 1.37; 2.18, 39, 81, 87; 3.1, 52 C. 65, 223, 236, 295, 300
auctor C. 104
audax C. 52
audere C. 62
audire 1.18; 4.60
auena 1.27, 63, 71; 2.82; 3.11
auere 4.64
augustus C. 81
auide 3.60
auidus C. 100, 102, 127, 271
auis 4.40 C. 313, 319
auius C. 8, 97
aura C. 85
auratus C. 9, 91
aureus C. 84, 89
auris 3.32; C. 113, 202, 245, 258
aut 1.25; 2.28 C. 171 aut...aut C. 168 aut...-ue...
aut 3.32f aut...aut...aut...-ue...aut 3.28ff.
autumnus 1.79
aus C. 242
axis C. 157
Babylon C. 72
baca 2.50
Bacchus 2.42, 51; 3.16 C. 18, 199
balteus C. 92
bellum C. 69, 82, 101
bene C. 281
benignus 1.41, 84
bibere 3.48, 50, 65 C. 67, 68
Biblis C. 26
bini C. 121, 123, 173
bis 4.36 C. 105, 120, 179
blandus 1.56 C. 208, 223
bonus 1.5 C. 77
Boreas C. 273
bos 2.71
breuis 3.33; 4.24
Britannia C. 225
bustum C. 45
buxus 2.41
cacumen C. 73
Cadmus C. 30
caelestis 1.39 C. 204
caelum 1.50; 3.21 C. 307
caelus C. 272
calamus 1.4, 11, 16, 25, 58; 2.19, 39, 53, 82; 3.7, 17; 4.2, 15
C. 290
calathus 2.34; 3.42
calcare 3.40 C. 325
calere C. 288
calidus C. 248
Calliope C. 13
calor 4.51
Calpe C. 251
campus 1.7; 3.67 C. 6, 48, 269, 289
Cancer (sidus) C. 158
candere 4.22 C. 157, 202, 207
candidus 2.47 C. 90, 314
canère 1.50
canere 2.83, 88; 3.13, 18; 4.41 C. 1, 16, 36, 43, 65
canor 3.8
canorus 4.39
cantare 1.11, 32, 62; 2.82, 85; 4.3, 19 (et rel. uers. interc.), 40, 70
cantharos 3.48
cantus 1.37; 2.16, 38, 61; 3.55; 4.13, 42
canus 1.9
capere C. 72
capillus 3.20
Cappadox C. 241
captare C. 52
caput 1.13; 3.33 C. 40, 206, 245, 263, 277
carina C. 110
Carinus C. 70
carmen 1.3, 10, 15, 24, 29, 63, 70, 71, 73, 81; 2.15, 54; 3.6, 9,
10, 12, 16; 4.16, 19 (et rell. uers. interc.) C. 76
carpere 1.47, 65; 2.5, 7; 3.39 C. 28, 192
carus 1.10
Carus C. 64
cassis C. 299
Castalius C. 5
castoreus C. 217
casus 2.18 C. 39
cavea 2.66
causa 1.35, 48 C. 210
cedere C. 275
cèler 3.42
celsus 2.57
cera 1.58; 3.14
cerasus 1.28
Cerealis C. 175
ceres C. 154
cernere 1.28 C. 80
cera 4.26
ceruix 2.12 C. 247, 265
cerusus C. 306
ceu 2.63 C. 307
chlamys C. 91
chorus 3.55
cibatus C. 160
cibus 2.42 C. 154
cicada 1.2; 4.42
cicuta 3.13
ciere C. 257
cinis 4.64
Circe C. 44
circuitus C. 141
circulus 1.45
circumdare C. 166, 303
circumferre 4.69
circus C. 142
citus C. 2, 49
ciuilis C. 101
clarus C. 81
claudere 1.45; 2.10, 62 C. 74, 178
clementia 1.8
coepisse 3.4, 17 coptus 1.81
cogere 1.10; 2.34; 3.69; 4.6, 54 C. 187, 214, 217
cohibere C. 93
cohors 3.46
coire 4.34
Colchis C. 42
colere 1.40; 2.20
collidere 3.34
colligere C. 111
collis 3.44
collum 2.80; 3.20; 4.35 C. 165, 177, 266
color 4.44 C. 310, 320
colorare C. 261
coma 1.9; 4.23
comes C. 271, 298
comodare 4.24
commouere C. 270
communis 1.48
complacitus C. 14
componere 1.4 C. 223
conatus (subst.) C. 169
concauare 3.49
concaus 3.43
concedere 2.43; 4.42
concilium 1.51
concinere 1.26
concludere C. 146, 165, 304
concors C. 178
concrescere C. 211, 219
concubitus 2.58; 3.57
condere C. 40
condicere 4.8
conducere 3.67
conectere 2.58
conficere C. 70
confundere 1.77
conifer 2.86
coniungere 3.14
conplere 2.5, 32  *C. 20, 155
conrugis C. 92
conscius C. 149
consistere C. 142
conspicuus C. 277
consuescere C. 177
consuetus 2.26  C. 159, 189
consumere C. 289
contemnere 2.69  C. 127
contexere 2.62; 3.9  C. 301
continere 1.29
contingere C. 78, 158, 191
continuus (continuo) C. 126, 147
conubium C. 27
conuenire C. 119, 176
copia C. 46
cor C. 212
cornipedes C. 240, 252, 284, 323
cornu 3.36, 48; 4.34  C. 221
corona 1.69
corpus 1.36  C. 57, 116, 139, 254, 282, 297
corripere 3.47
corrumpere C. 204
corylus 2.87
corymbus 3.18  C. 7
costa C. 110
cothurnus C. 90
coxa C. 112
crassus C. 315
crater 3.65
creatrix C. 313
creber 3.44  C. 250
crebro 2.13
crepitaculum 3.30
crepitare 3.50; 4.65
crimen C. 27
crinis 2.17, 78; 3.58  C. 44, 93
crinitus 4.4
crudelis 4.20
cruentus C. 23

Cruor C. 285

Crus C. 90, 108, 163, 172, 258

cubile C. 148, 236

culmen 1.86 C. 252

culsus 1.67 C. 292

culter C. 202

cultus C. 239

cum (praep.) 1.17; 2.49; 4.46 C. 94, 99, 154, 285

cum (coni.) 2.4, 63, 75; 3.3, 11; 4.11, 66 C. 28, 77, 104, 123, 172, 179, 205, 208, 210, 273

cunabulum C. 18

cunctari C. 221

cuncti 1.43

cupere C. 50

cupressus 2.86

cur 2.59; 4.15 (bis)

cura 1.59; 2.9, 40, *54, 57; 4.19 (et rel. uers. interc.) C. 58, 103, 122, 133, 194, 215, 295

curare C. 45, 298, *310

currere 4.71

currus C. 9, 35

cursus C. 12, 58, 106, 113, 139, 167, 180, 183, 185, 190 (bis), 253, 270, 279

custos C. 31

cycnus C. 314

Cycnus C. 37

cymbalum 3.51

cymbium 1.68; 3.59

damma C. 51

damnare C. 100

Danaus C. 23

dare 1.38, 61, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 79 (bis); 2.37, 60 (bis); 3.47 C. 58, 61, 118, 144, 176, 197, 234, 240, 312, 313, 314, 315

de 1.66, 67, 86; 2.11; 3.64; 4.5 C. 17, 108, 176, 228, 248

debere 3.16

decantare C. 96

decenter C. 110

decere 1.23 C. 200
decerpere 1.34; 3.41
decorus C. 245
decus C. 87
defluere 3.54
deformis C. 263
deinde C. 149
demittere 1.86
deni 4.36 C. 179
dens C. 164, 170
Deo *2.51
dependere 1.14; 4.48
deposcere 1.27
deprauare C. 161
descendere 2.89
deserere 1.81; 4.12 C. 261
detexere 3.16
detondere 1.7
deuotio C. 83
deus 1.10, 51; 2.72; 3.7, 31, 39, 63 (bis); 4.60 C. 10, 71
diadema C. 93
dicere 1.22, 30, 63; 2.23, 79; 3.40 C. 22, 41, 239
dictum C. 137
diducere *C. 112
digerere C. 305
digitus 3.29, 32
dignari C. 20
dignus 1.24, 50
diligere 2.52
Dione 2.56
Dirce C. 22
discere 4.57 C. 188, 215
discernere 1.52
discrimen C. 196
discurrere 4.6 C. 49
discursus C. 2
dispar 2.16; 4.5
disponere C. 321
dissimilis C. 233
dissonus 1.16; 3.10
distendere C. 287
distrarahere C. 132
diu 1.43; 4.57 C. 131, 187, 219
diuia C. 97
dierberare C. 265
diuersus C. 119
diiisus C. 225
diuus 2.83 C. 64
docere 1.5, 59; 3.66 C. 262 doctus 2.73; 4.2 C. 191
docilis C. 96
dolosus C. 52
domare C. 216
dominus (adi.) 1.83; 2.84
domus 2.65 C. 58, 98, 134
Donace 2.1, 3, 10, 23, 26, 37, 59, 69, 85, 88
donec 2.89; 3.67 C. 186
donum 4.24 C. 175
dorsum C. 243
draco C. 85
Dryas 2.20 C. 95
dubitare 2.38
ducere 2.61, 70, 71; 3.20; 4.13 C. 8, 97, 140
dulcis 1.76; 2.7, 15, 37, 83; 3.61; 4.13 C. 25 dulce
(adu.) 1.82; 2.45, 48, 83
dum 1.1, 6 (bis), 8, 12; 2.50, 51; 4.8 C. 59, 115 (bis); 324 (bis)
durare 4.56 C. 290
durus 1.59; 2.10; 4.11, 18 C. 171
dux C. 82
e 2.84, 89 ex 1.67; 2.26; 3.5, 61 C. 89, 124, 218, 305
ebur C. 218
ecce 1.34; 2.42; 4.72
echo 1.73 Echo C. 96
edere 3.41
edomare C. 66
effluere C. 285
effundere 4.64 C. 272
go 2.33, 37; 3.14 mihi 2.25, 36, 44, 49, 79 C. 3, 5, 78, 80, 239 me (acc.) 2.59, 74; 4.20, 41, 62 me (abl.) 1.17 (bis); 4.16, 46 C. 99
egregius C. 150
elabi 3.58
elidere 3.42
eligere C. 106
emergus 1.19 C. 168, 280
eminere C. 277
emittere C. 36
en C. 10
epulae C. 34
equus 1.86 C. 239, 295
eres C. 57
errare 2.39, 41 C. 53, 315
Eryx 2.57
esca C. 176
esse 2.36 sum 2.37 est 2.87; 3.13; 4.10, 24, 32, 72
C. 47, 133, 203, 212, 231, 254, 264, 280, 282 sumus 2.82
sunt 2.54 C. 21, 30, 34, 243, 268 (bis) sit C. 91, 108,
109, 121, 232, 259, 260, 295 sint C. 89 erat 1.52; 4.5,
33 esset 3.7 fuit 1.24 fuere 1.46 eris 4.21
erit C. 169 futurus C. 166 foret 2.12, 28
et 1.2, 8, 11, 13, 16, 35, 36 (bis), 56, 58, 83; 2.1, 5, 8, 9, 19,
21, 32, 42, 47, 48, 56 (bis), 64, 66, 73, 79, 80, 81, 90; 3.4, 15,
24, 34, 38, 40, 42, 50, 54, 69; 4.27, 28 (bis), 29, 33, 35, 54, 69
C. 6, 10, 27, 38, 39, 47, 50, 54, 62, 66, 72, 75, 82 (bis), 96, 98,
116, 137, 153, 156, 163, 169, 178, 188, 194, 195, 198, 202, 206,
242, 256, 262, 263, 287, 297, 302, 307, 314, 320
(in initio enuntiati) 2.69; 3.56; 4.35 C. 12 et...et 1.23
et...et...et 3.64f. et...que C. 178 et...atque etiam
C. 235f. et (etiam) 1.71; 2.78; 3.1, 27; 4.1, 19 (et rell.
uers. interc.), 21, 47, 59 C. 140, 231, 269, 299
etiam 1.62; 2.74; 3.26, 63 C. 164, 186, 191, 203, 229, 236,
251, 280, 294, 303
euocare 3.29
Eurus 4.14
examen C. 144
exanimare C. 192
excipere 3.53
excitare 3.11
exercere C. 187
exhalare C. 209
expectare 2.26
exserere C. 206
extendere 3.37
exterrere C. 274
extinguere C. 36
extremus C. 231

fabula C. 47
facere C. 219
facilis C. 13, 50, 94, 106 (bia), 184, 266
fagus 1.31; 4.9
fallere 1.59; 4.9
Fama 1.84
famulus C. 298
fari 3.17
farrago C. 283
fas 2.87; 3.7, 13
fastidium 4.50
fastus 4.59
fatigare C. 250
fatum 1.38
fauere 1.5
Faunus 1.14 (plu.) 1.66; 2.73; 3.25
fecundus C. 125, 252, 313
feles C. 55
felix 1.44, 64, 83 C. 70
femina C. 121
fera C. 98, 325
ferire C. 250, 284
ferre 1.18, 69; 2.63; 4.50, 51, 54 C. 58, 122, 143, 178, 218
ferrum 4.56
ferure C. 276 feruere 3.43
feruidus C. 147, 157
ferus C. 30, 213
fessus 3.3; 4.11
fetura C. 119
fetus (subst.) 3.39 C. 129
fetus (adj.) 2.31; 4.48
fidelis C. 61
fides 1.25
fiducia C. 279
fidus C. 82
fieri 2.47
figere C. 51
filum 2.11; 4.68
finis C. 65, 110, 229, 318
firmare C. 118, 260
firmus C. 118, 260
fiscella 1.1
fistula 1.14, 80; 3.5, 9
flamen 1.16 C. 275
flamma C. 36, 146, 211
flammare (flammatus) 2.14 C. 140
flatus C. 256
flauus 3.36
flectere C. 266
flere C. 38
Flora 1.69
florere 1.47, 55 C. 281, 318
florescere 3.35
flos 1.79; 2.4, 22; 4.21 C. 115
fluctus C. 276
fluitare C. 113
flumen C. 255, 315
flumineus 1.87 C. 53
fluor 3.68 C. 220
fluuisalis 1.1
foedus C. 24
fons 2.74; 4.10, 47 C. 5, 68
fores 2.63
forma 2.16, 81; 4.24 C. 232, 254
formare C. 123
formosus 2.1, 59, 72, 78; 4.26, 38, 72
fors 3.47
forsitan 2.70
forte 2.23 C. 133
fortis 4.35 C. 64, 83, 155, 176, 286
fouere 1.42; 3.28
fragor C. 101
frater C. 71, 80
fraternus C. 66
freni C. 257, 268
fretum 1.76
frigidus 2.89
frigus 1.49
frondescere 2.87
frondosus C. 97
frons 1.64; 3.38; 4.63 C. 29
frons (-tis) 1.57; 3.18; 4.17 C. 245
fruges 1.67 C. 176, 294
frui 1.40
fucare C. 309
fuga C. 74, 268, 289
fugax 4.14 C. 306
fugere 3.57; 4.9, 16, 30 C. 28, 101
fulgur C. 307
fulmen C. 36
fumare C. 37, 248
funereus C. 25
funus C. 15, 38
furere 4.7
Furia C. 222
furiosus 2.5
furor 2.28; 4.5
furtum 2.7; 3.8
fuscus 2.44

garrulus 1.30
gaudere C. 53, 296
gaudium 2.7; 4.59 C. 25, 78
gelidus C. 210
geminus 2.67 C. 65
gemitus 1.46
gemnatus C. 92
gen C. 217, 80
generosus C. 241
genetrix 1.36 C. 151
genitalis C. 124
genitor C. 71
gens C. 66, 108, 251
gentilis C. 260
genus 4.28 C. 41
gerumanus C. 38
gerumen C. 146
gignere C. 230
Glauce C. 43
gleba 3.69
gloria 4.16
gracilis 1.3
gradus C. 178
Graecia C. 240
Graius C. 254
gramen 1.6, 34; 2.22, 29; 4.21, 53
grandaeuus 1.68
gratia 1.21
gratus 1.23
grauedo C. 125
graudus 3.18
graulis 3.62 C. 117, 139, 161
grauitas 1.56
gremium 2.5; 3.28
gressus C. 135
grex 1.7, 87; 2.72 C. 198, 242, 318
grus C. 314
gurges C. 102, 316
guttur 4.40

habere 1.3, 20; 3.55; 4.29 C. 233
habilis C. 141
habitus C. 81, 88
haedus 1.6
harundineus C. 55
harundo 1.3
hasta 3.64
haud C. 234, 272
haurire 3.50, 60
haustus C. 221
hederatus 3.18
heia C. 87
Helicon C. 4
herba 1.32; 4.69 C. 10, 291
Herculeus C. 32
Hesperus 2.90
hesternus 3.62
heu 1.49    ~ heu heu 2.40
Hiberus C. 228
hic 1.9, 28, 31, 37 (bis), 70; 2.4, 18, 28, 53, 69, 79; 3.6, 17, 23, 25, 41, 48, 58 (bis), 66; 4.7, 21, 45 (bis), 48 C. 46, 76, 114, 122, 133, 151, 182, 208, 237, 279, 280, 309, 321
hic (adu.) 1.32, 84; 4.46, 47 (bis)
hiemps 1.78; 2.9 C. 321
hilaris 1.12; 2.81 C. 1
hinc 1.46; 2.8 C. 317
hinnitus C. 257
homo 1.50; 2.58
honestus C. 144
honorare 1.22
honos 1.70 C. 246
hordeum C. 293
horrere 2.43; 3.31 horrendus C. 41
hortamen C. 189
hortari 1.59
hortus 2.4
huc 4.38 C. 99, 143 (bis), 218
humilis C. 108
humus 4.41
hyacinthus 2.45, 48

Iacchus 3.62
iacere 1.49 C. 251
iaculari C. 205
iam 1.14, 86; 2.8, 25; 3.12, 15, 21, 56; 4.35, 36, 39 (bis) C. 3, 16, 46, 78, 80, 120, 130, 151, 156, 172, 179, 184
iamiam 3.58
Ianus C. 104
ichneumon C. 54
Idas 2.1, 19, 52, 53, 60, 78
idem 4.68 C. 299
igitur C. 99, 151, 215, 240, 283, 309
igneus C. 141
ignicomus C. 207
ignis 4.5, 11, 66 C. 16
ignotus 3.40; 4.69
ilex 3.2
ille 2.37; 3.49, 50, 61, 63; 4.51  C. 232, 243, 254
illio C. 318
imbuere 2.6  C. 42
immunis 1.2
imperare C. 11
imperium C. 24
impius C. 26
imus C. 212
in (cum acc.) 1.10, 83; 2.3, 34, 71, 84; 3.49, 54, 67, 69; 4.13, 34, 38, 64, 66  C. 29, 121, 194, 213, 247, 267, 286
(cum abl.) 1.75, 84; 2.4, 76; 3.26, 44, 66; 4.1, 8, 32, 58  C. 56, 68, 113, 229, 254, 280
inanis C. 130
inbellis C. 51, 74
incendere 2.2; 4.65
incendium *C. 43
incidere 1.29
incipere 1.3, 6  C. 104, 180, 322, 323
inde C. 290
indictus C. 26
indignus 2.70
indiscretus C. 143
indoctus 2.82
inducere 2.90
indulgere C. 185
infigere C. 214
infirmus C. 163
inflare 1.4; 3.13, 61
infrenis C. 264
infundere C. 221
ingens C. 4, 244
ingerere C. 6
inire C. 159
iniucundus C. 234
inlaesus C. 174
inmitis 4.14
inmittere C. 322
inmodicus C. 244
innectere C. 505
innocuus 1.45
inocciduus C. 105
inpatiens C. 79, 166
inpendere C. 197
inpingere C. 171
inplicare C. 8, 57, 93
inponere C. 7
inprobus 2.12
inprudens C. 167
inpune C. 142
inquam 3.12
insanus C. 214
inserere C. 222
insistere C. 13, 172
insuets *1.76
intactus C. 11
integere 3.65
intendere C. 253
inter 2.39, 64, 86, 87 C. 55
interdum 2.62 C. 154
interea 2.27; 3.35
intimus C. 71
intonsus 2.17
intrepidus C. 137
inuadere 2.6; 3.8
inualidus C. 118, 132
inuenire 2.24 C. 319
inuidus 1.47
inuiscerare C. 208
Io C. 31
Iollas 4.4, 20, 72
ipse 1.41; 2.33, 79; 3.13, 63 C. 70, 276
iratus C. 42
ire C. 4, 10, 29, 277, 288
is C. 212, 298
iste 4.33
ita C. 321
iter 1.85
iterum C. 194, 223
iuba C. 265
iubar C. 136
iubere 1.23; 3.68  C. 4, 190
iudex 1.17
iudicium C. 145
iugalis 2.57  C. 16
iugare C. 122
iugum 2.57; 4.54  C. 7
iuncus 1.1; 2.33
iungere 1.58; 3.57
Iuppiter 3.21, 22 (bis), 63
iurare 2.79
ius 1.54
iussum 1.23
iustus 1.54; 3.24  C. 20
iuuare C. 9
iuuenca 2.35; 4.26
iuuenalis C. 280
iuuenis 1.10
iuuentas 1.60; 2.9  C. 94
iuuentas C. 115
iuuentus 3.35  C. 298
labellum 1.4
labes C. 285
labor C. 1, 32, 197, 262, 284
labrum 1.58; 2.39; 3.51
lac 1.68; 2.34; 3.69  C. 152, 154, 220
Lacedaemonius C. 107
lacer C. 168
lacrima 1.46
lactere C. 291
lacteus 2.80
lacus 3.50
laetus 1.63; 2.52; 3.37  C. 115, 286, 296
lambere 2.31  C. 131
lampas C. 123
lanugo 2.77
largus C. 126
lasciius 3.46  C. 266
lassare C. 132
late 1.33  C. 6, 252
latex 3.52 C. 199
Latona C. 87
latus C. 244
lātus C. 109, 289, 323
laudare 2.80
laurus 1.65; 2.46, 49; 4.65
laus 1.18, 26, 80 C. 188
laxare 3.4
laxus C. 75
leaena 4.27
lectus C. 240
Lenaeus 3.15
lenis 4.47
lentescere C. 217
lentus 2.33; 4.50 C. 267
leo 1.76; 4.54 Leo C. 207
lepus 2.67 C. 51, 182, 236
letalis 1.49 C. 17, 203
leuare 4.19 (et in reli. uers. interc.)
leuus C. 85, 139, 293
léuis 2.17 C. 243
lex 1.50, 77 C. 23
libare 2.30 C. 76
liber (adi.) 2.63 C. 177, 264
liber (subst.) 1.29
libet 1.32
Libye C. 229, 313 Libyae (gen.) 4.51
licens 3.55
licet (coni.) 2.62 C. 232
ligare C. 177
lilium 2.24, 44, 47; 4.22
linea C. 140, 303
linquere C. 62
linteum C. 58
linum C. 302, 308
Linus 1.25
liquidus 2.76 C. 220
liquor 1.35, 87; 2.30; 3.53
lis 1.52 C. 100
litus 2.22 C. 60, 66
liuor 1.85
longe C. 84, 140
longus 1.43; 2.61; 4.23 C. 56, 180, 253, 279, 289, 300, 311
loqui 1.74; 2.83 C. 35
lucere 4.45 C. 14
lucifer C. 136
Lucifer 2.30
ludere 1.12; 4.7, 10 C. 91
ludus 3.55 C. 188
lumen 2.76 C. 135, 256
luna 4.70
lupa 4.27
lupus C. 52, 307
lustrare 4.64
lustrum C. 98
lutum C. 319
Lyaeus 3.38
Lycidas 4.1, 4
lynx 3.65
lyra C. 63

macies C. 130
macula C. 302
Maenalius 3.14, 66
maestus 2.18 C. 15
mage C. 317
magis C. 119, 160, 207
magnus C. 18, 46, 59, 87, 114, 303, 306, 313
mala 2.77; 4.45
male 3.10 C. 35
malle C. 54, 128
malum C. 210
manare C. 204, 228
mane 2.71, 74 C. 324
manes 1.22, 70
manus 3.33, 49 C. 70, 88, 182, 295
marcere 1.60
maritus C. 200
Marmaricus 4.54
marmoreus 2.21
mas 4.26 C. 114, 121, 124
mater 2.31; 4.35, 62 C. 132, 144, 149
maternus C. 19
maturus 3.36, 39 C. 125
Maurusius C. 259
Mazax C. 261
meare C. 300
medicare 2.28
medicus C. 215
medius 2.38 C. 142
medulla C. 155, 212
mel 1.69, 76
Meliboeus 1.17, 21, 37, 42, 49, 64, 72, 80
melior C. 63, 133, 288
membrum C. 162, 174, 184
meminisse 2.43 memento C. 193, 293
memorare C. 63
mens 2.3; 4.17 C. 83, 169, 223
mensa C. 39
mensis C. 19, 105, 120, 173
mentum 3.33
merere 2.59
mereri 1.61
mergere 3.51
Meroe 4.4, 7, 14, 38, 50, 66
messis 1.67, 78; 4.36 C. 292
metari C. 6
metuere 4.53
metus C. 304, 311
meus 1.14, 29, 80; 2.29, 36, 40; 4.72
micare C. 85, 246
Micon 3.1
migrare 4.71
miles C. 82
mille 2.35; 4.69 C. 1, 312
minax C. 55
ministrare C. 154
minor C. 128, 254 minus 1.46
minuere C. 159
mirari 3.38 C. 33, 278
miscere C. 175, 310
miser 2.44; 4.30, 66
mitis 1.56, 57
mittere 1.36; 2.68 C. 225, 260
moderamen C. 185, 267
modo 2.86; 4.60 C. 86, 260 modo...nunc 4.8f.
modulari 1.71
modus 1.41 C. 302
moles C. 161
mollis 1.33; 2.5, 33 C. 113, 152, 283, 324
Molossus C. 107, 224
mons 4.29
monstrare C. 236
montanus 2.55
montiuagus 3.17
Mopsus 1.16; 4.1, 4
mora C. 79
morari C. 158
morbus C. 117, 195
mors 1.47
morsus C. 214
mos C. 237
motus 3.29
mouere 3.56 C. 59
mox C. 63, 123, 128, 172, 220, 238, 286, 288 mox...mox C. 149
mugitus 2.32
mulcere 1.53 C. 258
mulctrum 2.36 C. 153
multus 4.7 C. 82, 91, 109, 196, 216
mundus 1.20, 40, 86 C. 34
munus 1.65; 2.60 C. 43, 187, 234, 317
murmur C. 276
murmurare 4.47
musa 1.27
Musa 1.61 (plu.) 1.70, 71 C. 76
muscus C. 11
mustum 3.45, 51, 59
mutare C. 25
mutulus 3.33
Mycale 4.69
Mycenae C. 40
Myrrha C. 26
myrtus 2.46, 49

Nais 2.21 C. 94
nam 1.4, 15, 32, 39, 82; 2.25, 50; 4.4 C. 15, 129, 138, 146, 152, 162, 167, 195, 266, 281
namque 1.24, 75, 84; 2.60 C. 117, 235, 253, 306, 318
Napaeae 2.20
naris C. 248 (plu.) 3.34; 4.35 C. 237
narrare C. 238
nasci C. 107
natare C. 163
natiuus C. 317
natus C. 145
ne 1.30, 62, 81; 4.44 C. 133, 161
nec 1.46, 48, 60; 2.16, 38, 43, 45, 76, 82; 4.3, 10, 22, 24, 42
C. 45, 69, 102, 183, 185, 249, 263 nec...nec 2.33, 46; 3.8f.;
4.23 C. 227f., 258 nec non 3.1; 4.1 C. 189, 229
nec...nec non C. 254, 255
nectare C. 133
nectar 3.61
negare 4.18 (bis)
nemus 1.33; 2.56; 4.39
neque C. 135 neque...neque...nec C. 165 f.
Nereis C. 278
Nereus C. 272
Nerinus 4.52
nexus C. 93, 162
niger C. 213, 285
nil 4.57
Nilus C. 68
nimis C. 22, 113
Niobe C. 15
Nisus C. 44
nitus C. 287
niveus 3.69; 4.34, 44 C. 164, 310
nix 4.51
nocere 4.52 C. 166
nocturnus C. 45, 325
nodus C. 162, 301
non 1.61; 2.8, 11, 60; 3.1, 60; 4.1, 18, 21, 40, 55 C. 15, 16, 59, 103, 108, 118, 128, 180, 189, 192, 221, 224, 230, 231, 282, 299, 305 et...non C. 231 -que...non 4.58
non...nec C. 182f. non...-que...non...non...nec C. 43ff.
non...-ue C. 210
nondum 2.75 C. 135
nos 1.71; 2.85; 3.26 C. 48, 51, 53 nobis 1.30, 46, 60; 4.68 C. 240 nos (acc.) 1.62
noscere C. 235 nouisse 2.35, 36, 64 C. 17, 28, 189
notus C. 12, 22
noster 1.27, 37, 41, 44, 74; 2.27, 28, 42, 56, 60, 69, 78; 4.15 C. 65, 76, 226
nota C. 241
notare 2.74
notus C. 61
nouale C. 181
nouus 1.44 C. 5, 170, 283, 324
nox 3.68
noxius C. 209
nubilum 1.85
nudare 4.12
nudus 3.45
nullus 2.29, 30, 40, 46, 77; 3.13; 4.39 C. 26, 75, 196
numen C. 66, 77
numerare 4.36 C. 32
numerosus C. 15
numquam 2.36 C. 8
nunc 1.13, 15, 19, 72; 4.9, 34 C. 3, 61, 184, 238
nuper 1.15; 2.68 C. 69
nutrire 3.26 C. 128
Nyctilus 3.1
Nymphae 1.69; 3.25, 57 C. 95
Nysa 3.26

o 1.64; 2.55 (bis); 3.39; 4.20
obsequium C. 267
obsitus C. 232
obstrepere 1.31
obtundere C. 170
obuius 3.47 C. 13
oculus 2.81 C. 31, 246
odor 2.46, 49
odoratus 3.20 C. 235
odorus 1.64
Oeagrius 1.25
oestrus C. 3
officium C. 249
olim 1.11; 4.59
oliua 1.78 *C. 199
ollus C. 264
omniparens 1.35
omnipotens 3.23 C. 19
omnis 1.33, 67; 2.42; 3.55; 4.32, 41 C. 47, 114, 126, 128, 143, 238, 242, 275, 277, 291
optimus C. 122
orbis 1.20 C. 65, 141, 206, 226
orbita C. 14
ordo 2.25; 3.16
Oreas C. 96
origo C. 68, 173, 227
Orpheus 1.25
ortus 2.75; 3.15 C. 179
os 1.57; 3.22, 53 C. 164
osculum 2.38
ostendere C. 12, 201
ouile C. 153
ouis 3.67
Padus C. 37
paelex C. 17
paene C. 71
paganus 4.62
palea C. 293
Pales 1.68; 2.52, 55
Pallas 2.50
pallere 2.45 C. 206
pallidus 2.41
palma 2.24; 3.30, 49 C. 242
palmes 3.19
palumbes 2.67
palus C. 315
pampineus 4.46
pampinus 3.37
Pan 1.5, 25; 2.73; 3.3, 11, 17, 66
pandere C. 3, 98, 105, 168
Pannonicus C. 227
par 2.16 C. 183
parare 2.15
parens 2.10
parere 1.23 C. 10, 267
parilis 4.5 C. 114
pars 1.20
Parthus C. 75
partus 3.24 C. 20, 125, 127, 144
paruus 2.63; 3.27 C. 181, 194, 244
pascere 1.75; 2.72, 78, 90 C. 129, 152, 225, 262, 283
pascuum 2.52, 71
passim C. 152, 320
pastor 4.2
pastoralis 2.55; 4.15
pater 3.23 C. 19, 27
patere 2.63 C. 48
pati 1.53, 60 C. 124, 135, 173, 282
patienter 4.57
patulus 3.2
paulatim C. 271
pectus 1.42, 52, 57; 2.14; 3.31, 45, 54 C. 3, 109, 286
pecus 4.39
pecus (-oris) 2.72
pelagus C. 277
pellere C. 202
pellitus C. 316
pendere 3.5
per 2.22 C. 4, 8, 10, 53, 97, 211, 261, 269, 272, 297, 323
percipere C. 137
percurrere C. 60, 295
percutere C. 99
perdere 4.21, 22, 44
perducere 1.83
pererrare C. 86
perferre 3.24; 4.59
perficere 2.34
perfundere 3.20
pergere 1.81
periclum C. 145, 203
perire 2.25, 71
permitiri 1.19
permitere 1.7 C. 121
perpendere C. 138
Persis C. 72
peruenire 2.84
pes 2.21; 3.44 C. 163, 249, 316
petere 1.31; 2.39
pharetra C. 74, 88
Phaethon C. 35
Philomela C. 34
phoca 1.75
Phoebe C. 87, 123, 179
Phoebus 1.63
Phoebus 1.24; 2.54 (bis), 75 C. 157, 206
pie C. 45
piget 1.62 C. 263
pignus C. 64
pingere 1.69 C. 88
pinguis 2.12
pinna 1.85 C. 33, 305, 312
pinus 1.30, 73; 2.87
Pisaeus C. 23
pius 1.20
placare 1.82
placere C. 58 placitus 4.9 C. 129
placidus 2.43 C. 54, 86
plaga C. 48, 300
planta 3.42, 64
platanus 1.72; 2.18
plausus C. 296
plenus 1.51; 3.60 C. 120, 153
plicare 3.19
pluma C. 37
plurimus C. 247
plus 4.72 (bis)
poculum 2.42; 3.46, 49  C. 5, 44
pollex 3.34
pomum 2.51; 3.38
pondus 1.51  C. 138, 161
ponere C. 163
pontus C. 102, 275
populeus 4.1
populosus C. 129
populus 4.23
portare 3.42  C. 148
portus C. 61
poscere 3.12
posse 2.28, 68; 3.6; 4.18  C. 138, 142, 156, 222, 304
post 1.38; 2.69; 3.21  C. 34, 271
postis C. 171
postquam 2.10  C. 146, 157
potare 3.53; 4.52
potens 2.56
potius 1.31
potus C. 215
praebere 1.87; 3.65  C. 293
praecceptum C. 268
praecipere C. 46
praecordia 4.56
praeda 3.6  C. 50, 102, 184, 191, 234, 304
praedulcis 1.22
praefigere C. 56
praemittere C. 182
praemium 1.61; 2.68
praenoscere C. 139
praeponere 2.66
praesens 1.84
praesumere C. 80
praeterea 2.67  C. 259
praeuertere C. 186
pratum 2.23  C. 13, 235, 253, 322, 324
premere 3.52, 64; 4.17  C. 11
Priapus 2.51
primaeuus C. 116
primum 2.7; 3.37, 59  C. 61, 69, 77, 177
primus 1.8; 3.40  C. 24, 104, 127, 148
principium C. 68, 103
prior C. 41, 71, 131
prius (adu.) 1.75; 2.83 C. 282
pro (praep.) 3.6, 10; 4.34
probare 1.42 C. 134
probus C. 252
procax 3.25
procedere C. 9
procella C. 62
procul 1.34
prodere 4.30 C. 136
prodesse 4.62 C. 160, 201
produere 3.24 C. 180
proelium C. 2
profiteri 3.22
proles 3.21 C. 118, 126, 198, 228
promittere 4.9 C. 156, 269
pronus 3.50 C. 110, 265
propago C. 241
properare 3.43; 4.57
proprius 4.3
propter 2.85
prosatus 3.63
prosilire C. 214
protendere C. 194
prouehere 1.83
prouidus 3.23
prouoluere C. 256
prudens 4.58
pubens C. 95, 290
puber 2.81
pubes 3.35
puer 1.81; 2.1 (bis), 8, 88; 3.6, 12, 35, 66; 4.7, 20, 44, 56
puerilis 2.8
pugnare C. 131
pulcher 2.73; 3.1 C. 43
puluis C. 218, 294
puniceus C. 90, 317
purpureus 2.22, 48, 75, 80; 3.45; 4.48 C. 84
purus C. 294
qua C. 8, 14
quaerere C. 54
quam (comp.) 1.47, 80 C. 254, 282
quamuis C. 12, 127
quare 1.21
quassare 3.30
quater C. 173
quaterere C. 208
que 1.5, 7, 9, 10, 18, 20, 26 (bis), 31, 33, 40 (bis), 43, 44 (bis), 46, 51, 67, 76, 81; 2.2, 6, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 31, 41, 45, 48, 65, 67; 3.7, 12, 15, 19, 25 (bis), 26, 36, 42, 45, 49, 54, 55 (bis), 58, 62; 4.5, 9, 13, 14, 29, 51, 52, 57, 58, 64 C. 1, 2, 5, 16, 17, 23 (bis), 24, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43, 48 (bis), 49, 52, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 67 (bis), 68, 71, 74 (bis), 75, 79, 80, 81, 85, 86, 88 (bis), 92, 94, 95, 100, 101 (bis), 106, 109, 112, 113, 117 (bis), 118, 126, 130, 131, 134, 139, 141, 145, 148, 154, 158 (bis), 160, 162, 163, 166, 176, 178, 196, 200 (bis), 201, 213, 215, 216, 219, 222, 226, 233, 237 (bis), 241, 244 (bis), 245 (bis), 246, 250, 257 (bis), 261, 264, 265, 266, 271, 274, 284 (bis), 289, 291, 292, 293, 295, 298, 300, 302, 304, 306 (bis), 307, 308, 310, 311, 314 (bis), 315, 316, 319 et...que...que...que C. 6ff.
querella 1.48, 53; 2.15; 4.13
qui 2.71; 3.18, 19; 4.50 cui 2.37; 3.31 quem 1.19, 24;
3.5, 9 C. 260, 261 qui 4.34 C. 21, 22, 30, 35
quorum C. 228, 230 quis 2.9 C. 83, 135 quos 1.41, 42; 4.11 quae 2.57, 61, 62 C. 86, 111, 122, 304
cui 2.57 C. 113 quam 1.28 qua 2.23, 83 (bis)
qua 2.20 (bis), 21 C. 67, 315 quas 3.14 quod C. 204
quad (acc.) 1.66; 2.77; 4.19 (et rell. uers. interc.), 24
quo 2.23, 26; 4.70 (bis), 71 C. 124 quae 1.28; 2.35, 53, 60, 68; 3.47 C. 69, 136
quia 1.27
quicumque C. 281
quies 3.29
quiescere C. 258
quietus 1.33, 38
quin 2.74; 3.27, 63 C. 140, 191, 199, 229, 231, 251, 269, 294, 303
quinque 2.9
quire C. 184
quis (interrog.) 2.35, 59; 4.16, 17, 62 C. 15, 16, 18
quis (indef.) 1.6, 21
quisnam C. 131
quisque 1.66; 3.46; 4.19 (et rel. uers. interc.)
quisquis 1.73; 4.56 C. 99, 212
quod 2.11, 70; 4.62 C. 263, 264 (bis), 265
quoque 2.85; 4.44, 68
quotannis C. 198

rabies C. 203
racemus 1.66; 3.40
radiare C. 84
radius C. 205
ramus 3.5
raper 4.32 C. 148, 297
rapidus 4.14
raptare 3.56
rarus C. 301
ratis C. 59
raucus 1.2
reboare 1.73
recreare C. 18
recubare 3.3
recursus C. 106
reddere 3.10 C. 19
redire C. 286
referre 2.35, 54 C. 30, 74, 238, 241
regnum C. 73
relaxare C. 162, 296
releuare 2.15
relinquere 2.59 C. 271
remeare 2.65
remouere C. 67, 167
remus C. 60
renes C. 112
reparare C. 179, 193
repellere C. 222
repugnare C. 257
requiescere 4.46
res 1.35
resonare 3.8
respicere 4.20
respondere 1.74; 2.53
resultare 3.53
resupinare C. 247
resupinus 3.28, 52
rete C. 300
retentare 3.58
retinere 3.48 C. 7, 160
reuerentia 1.54
reuocare C. 190
Rhenus C. 67
rietus C. 148, 213
ridere 1.16; 3.62
rigidus C. 109
ripa C. 54
risus 3.29
robur C. 118, 170, 287
Roma C. 81
Romuleus C. 73
rorare C. 21
ros 1.8
rosa 2.45, 48; 4.22
roseus 2.24; 3.59
rota C. 9
rubere 2.45, 48
rubescere C. 319
rubor 2.13
rudis 2.2 C. 14, 33
ruere 2.3
ruina C. 282
rumpere 1.85; 2.36; 3.44; 4.70
ruralis 1.65
ruricola 1.14, 52
ursorsus 2.65 C. 111, 175
rus 1.2, 15 C. 2, 107
rusticus 2.70

sacer 4.63 C. 42, 77
sacrilagus C. 21
saeclum 2.58 C. 47
saepe 1.61, 62; 2.37 C. 167, 196, 232
saepire C. 181  saeptum C. 308
saeuus 4.44  C. 27, 44
sagax C. 237
sagina C. 159
sagitta C. 89
salire 3.53
salix 1.6
saltus C. 48, 86, 147, 303
saluber C. 215
salus 2.40
sanguis C. 21, 39, 116, 228, 260, 270, 288
Sardus 4.53
satis C. 112, 243
saturn 2.51; 4.71
Satyrus 3.25, 38, 39, 46, 57
saxum 3.43
scabies C. 195
scelus C. 26
scire 2.35, 65
scopulus 4.71
scutari C. 49
se 4.24  C. 33, 111, 123, 247, 273  sibi 3.46
secare 2.21  C. 218
secernere 1.20  C. 236, 294
sectari C. 102
securus 1.12  C. 2
secus C. 272
sed 1.27, 30, 57, 86; 2.10; 3.8, 10  C. 119, 127, 157, 165, 181, 183, 186, 224
sedes 1.40
seges C. 55
segnis 1.49, 60  C. 103, 117, 205, 258
segregare C. 150
semel C. 185
Semele 3.22  C. 16
semen 3.15  C. 211
semper 3.62; 4.21, 22  C. 32, 38, 194, 301, 309
senatus C. 81
senecta 1.50
senectus 1.43  C. 117
senex 3.25, 60  C. 314
seni C. 105
senilis C. 37
senior 1.17, 24, 62
sensim C. 111, 220
sensus C. 79
sentire 1.38; 4.27 (bis)
sequi 4.26 C. 98, 266
serenare 4.17
serenus 1.56 C. 151
serpens 4.41
serum C. 152, 175
seta 3.31

deseu...seu...seu...seu...seu C. 240ff. seu...seu

C. 107, 190
sexus 4.5
si 1.3, 21, 38, 39, 47; 2.47, 86; 3.12; 4.60 C. 129
silibilum 3.10 C. 30
sic 1.82; 2.88; 3.17; 4.12, 59, 66 C. 114, 149, 193
siccare 3.68 C. 291
siccus 1.75; 2.31 C. 111, 229
sidereus 1.40
sidus 3.21 C. 159, 204
signare 1.55; 4.41 C. 141
signum C. 85
Silenus 3.27, 59
silex C. 217
silua 1.74, 84; 2.20, 66, 68, 84, 89; 4.6, 12, 29, 42 C. 38, 86
Siluanus 2.56
siluester 1.72
similis 2.41
simul 2.6 C. 17, 151, 237
simus 3.34
sin C. 133
sine 2.44 C. 318
sinuare C. 85
sinus C. 57, 60, 92, 209
Sithonius 4.51
sol 1.8, 86; 2.25, 88; 3.2; 4.45 C. 122, 201
solamen 2.27
solatium 2.18
solere 2.79; 4.45  solitus 4.10
sollicitus 2.12; 4.60.  C. 197
solum C. 8
solus 3.22; 4.41
somnus 2.43; 3.4
sonare 1.15, 26, 82; 2.11; 4.3, 41
sonipes C. 259, 296
sonitus 3.11
sonus 2.12  C. 274
sordidus C. 195
soror C. 45
sortiri C. 198
spargere 3.45, 67  C. 39, 320
Spartanus C. 224
spatiosus C. 269
spatium C. 181
spectare 1.43  C. 137, 174
speculum 2.74
sperare *4.58
spernere C. 230
spes 4.17
spiculum C. 75
spina 4.22
spinosus C. 57
spirabilis C. 255
spirare 2.46, 49
splendere 2.76
splendor C. 246
sponsa C. 24
spretor C. 79
spumare 1.68  C. 213, 276
spumeus 3.54
squameus 4.28, 40
squamosus C. 30
stabilis C. 135
stabulum 2.90
stagnare C. 316
stare 2.32  C. 249
stellatus C. 31
sternere 1.85
stirps C. 227
strages C. 197
strepitus C. 101
strepere C. 126
stridere 3.11 C. 274
stringere 2.24
stupere C. 278
suadere 1.8, 87; 2.89; 3.68
suauis C. 319
sub (c. acc.) C. 321 (c. abl.) 1.3, 13, 54 (bis); 2.18, 23, 26, 88; 3.3, 14; 4.33, 45, 46 C. 24, 65, 69, 109, 110, 212, 283
subicere 1.32
subire 2.65; 4.39 C. 117
sublimis 1.18, 39
submittere C. 114
suboles C. 150
subtegmen C. 91, 311
sucus 4.53 C. 130, 155, 297
sudare 1.77
suescere 3.9 C. 186 suetus C. 59, 87
sufficere C. 198, 210
suffundere 2.13
sulcus C. 14
sulphur 4.65
sumere 3.4, 7; 4.59 C. 50, 88, 184, 192, 216, 317
summus 3.44
supellex C. 238
super 1.28; 3.5, 43 C. 276
superaddere C. 220
superare C. 115, *242
superbus 4.50
supercilium 1.57
superefferre C. 273
supremus 1.70
sus C. 306
suspendere C. 89
sustinere 3.28
susurrare 1.72
suus 4.12, 29, 54 C. 146, 278, 281

tacere 1.33, 80 C. 18, 69
taeda C. 25
talis 1.48 C. 58
tam 2.11
tamen 4.30, 72 C. 234
tamquam 2.27; 3.6
tandem 4.11, 18, 20
tangere 2.29, 40
Tantalides C. 39
tantum C. 192, 224 (bis)
tardus C. 158, 183, 279
taurus 1.34; 2.90; 4.26
taxus 1.77; 4.52
tectum 2.65
tegere 2.77
tellus 1.36 C. 259
telum C. 56, 89
temnere C. 227
templum 1.39
tempora 3.36
temptare C. 35, 62
tempus 1.19, 45; 3.24; 4.32 (bis) C. 20, 79, 104, 153, 321
tenax C. 302
tendere C. 190, 311
tener 2.32, 67; 3.34; 4.58 C. 155, 169, 171
tenere 1.48; 2.57; 4.23 C. 165, 178, 249
tenuis 2.11 C. 130, 160
tepescere 1.13
tepidus C. 201
ter 2.9; 4.63 (ter)
terere C. 9, 218
teres 3.5
Tereus C. 33
tergum C. 207, 271, 320
terminus 1.55
terra C. 77, 209, 249
terrere C. 312
terribilis C. 255
terrificare C. 308
texere 1.2
Threicius C. 273
Thymoetas (*1.9)
thyrsus C. 21
tibia 1.22
Tigris C. 67
tigris 3.19
timere 4.70
Timetas 1.9
timidus C. 51
tinea C. 202
tingere C. 316
Titan C. 40
Tityrus 1.1; 2.84
tolerare C. 262
tollerare 2.75 C. 33
torquere 4.40 C. 169, 256
torrere 3.2
torridus C. 211
torus C. 23, 295
tot 1.26
totus 2.58, 66, 88; 4.6, 66 C. 49
trabs C. 168
tractare 1.78; 3.7
tractus 4.40 C. 300
trahere C. 109, 183
trames C. 12
trans C. 251
transcendere C. 147, 308
tremulus 2.76; 3.30 C. 257
trepidus 4.6 C. 145
trini 2.25, 29
tristis 1.78 C. 195, 205, 222
Tritonis C. 199
trivialis 4.3
triumphus C. 63
truncus C. 56
trux C. 24, 85
tu 1.10, 27, 41, 42, 52, 58; 2.47, 53, 79; 4.30 (bis), 44
C. 86, 98, 120, 197  tibi 1.1, 5, 21, 43, 51, 56, 64, 81, 84;
2.35; 4.16, 35, 36, 47  C. 103, 129, 193, 216, 227, 234, 259,
312  te (acc.) 1.4, 15, 72, 73 (bis), 74, 82; 2.40, 52, 71
(abl. ?), 85; 3.18  C. 98  te (abl.) 1.54 (bis); 2.44
C. 94
tum 2.7, 14; 3.37, 39, 46, 59  C. 162, 293
tumere 2.13
tumescere 3.36
tumidus 4.35
tunc 2.49; 3.21  C. 106, 156, 159, 164, 175, 177, 216
turba 4.28  C. 144, 278
turbare C. 275
turgere 2.50  C. 124
turpis C. 263
tus 4.63
Tuscus C. 231
tutus C. 60
tuus 1.18, 80; 3.15  C. 34, 97
uacare 2.36
uacca 1.6; 2.29; 4.34
uae 2.44
uagus C. 246
ualer e 1.66  C. 253  uale 1.64
uvalidus C. 112, 156, 172, 186, 247
uallis 2.4; 3.66; 4.8  C. 181
uallua C. 168
uapor C. 141, 248
uaporus 4.63
uarius 1.53  C. 50, 309
uastus C. 274
uastes 2.73  C. 7, 46, 97
uber 2.31; 3.68  C. 131
ubi C. 290
udus 2.21; 3.19
ue *3.29, 33; 4.16  C. 134, 170, 181, 218, 224
uelle 3.9; 4.18  C. 22, 32, 192, 289
uellere 4.71
uellicare 3.32
uelox C. 193, 226, 233, 322
uelum C. 61, 84
uena 2.13; 3.61 C. 116, 195, 211, 284, 288
uenari C. 1, 100, 187, 239, 324
uenatus 3.3 C. 226, 299
uenenum C. 42, 213, 309
uenerari 3.27
uenire 2.47; 3.23; 4.38 C. 196, 279
uentus 1.30 C. 272
uenus 1.13; 2.3, 6; 3.56; 4.27 C. 121
uer 1.79; 4.33 C. 151, 283
uerbera C. 268 (bia)
uernare C. 320
uero 2.14 C. 133
uersicolor 4.68
uersus 1.5, 11; 2.19, 54; 4.2
uerture 3.49
uerus 3.21
uester C. 63
uestigium C. 11, 235, 325
uestis 3.58
uetare C. 308
uetus C. 72, 284
uexare C. 168
uia C. 1, 158, 288
uiburnum 2.86
uiceni C. 120
uicem 4.13 (plu.) C. 41
uicinus 1.9; 2.4 C. 59
uictor 1.15
uidere 2.77; 3.12, 22; 4.33 C. 40, (*68), 78, 126, 130, 136, 146
uideri 2.44 C. 80
uigor C. 280
uillis 1.61
uillus C. 232
uimen 2.33, 62, 66
uinere 4.16, 53 C. 191
uinere 4.16, 53 C. 191
uinertem C. 22, 165
uinertem C. 148
uinum 3.56
uiola 2.41
uiolare C. 27, 73
uir 1.26
uirere 4.47 C. 29
uirga C. 267
uirgo C. 31
uiridis 1.7, 32; 3.26 C. 10, 48, 94
uirosus C. 216
uirius C. 150, 183, 188, 250, 281
uis 3.4, 60 C. 115, 138, 156, 182, 270, 286
uiscus C. 124, 132, 297
uita 1.19, 45
uitalis 1.36
uitare 3.2; 4.8, 15
uiteus 3.19
uitis 1.66; 2.51; 3.15, 41, 64; 4.48
uitta 4.63
uitulus 2.32; 4.33
uiuere 1.11, 21, 76
uiuidus C. 256
uiuus 4.65
uix 3.41
ulcisc C. 73
ulmus 1.31; 3.3; 4.8
ulna 3.28
umbra 2.23; 4.1, 23, 38, 46 C. 53
umere C. 248
umerus 3.54 C. 89
umor 3.54 C. 95, 210, 292
unda 2.76; 4.47 C. 274
unde C. 95
undique C. 174
ungere C. 201
unguen 2.50
unguis C. 171
ungula C. 249
unos 2.52; 3.67; 4.30 C. 205
uocalis 2.61; 3.51
uocare 4.38
uolitare 2.64
uolucer C. 304
uolucris 2.64; 4.28
uoluere C. 173
uoluntas C. 134
uoluptas C. 231
uos uobis *C. 76
uotum 2.8
uouere C. 78
uox 2.11 C. 189
urbs 1.83; 2.84, 85
urere 4.45, 66 C. 291
ursus C. 306
usus 2.34; 3.47; 4.32 C. 136, 230
ut (adu.) 1.34 C. 19, 28, 71 (coni.) 1.82 C. *142, 155, 184, 221, 296
uterque 1.17; 2.2, 6; 4.2 C. 219, 264
uua 1.79; 3.37, 41, 44, 52, 64; 4.23, 48
uulgare C. 47
uulnus 4.12
uulpes C. 52, 307
uultur C. 312
uultus 1.56; 4.17 C. 77
zona C. 147