

passages within the *Thebaid* and *Achilleid* (the commentaries on the *Silvae* are not classified, as this method did not yield any substantial results). Because medieval commentaries tend to contain materials from other commentaries, I provide additional data in the indices in the form of transcriptions of some additional notes. The methodology for classifying periochae is slightly different. Most if not all of the periochae in the manuscripts were transcribed, but since few manuscripts have similar periochae for all books and because a manuscript may have periochae to only a few books, I have not classified them. Rather, I can only show which manuscripts contain similar texts. Florilegia are classified on the basis of the lines cited. I discuss these methodologies more in-depth below and in the preface to the respective indices.

### Citation of Manuscripts

Except in direct quotes, manuscripts are cited by the modern, vulgar name of the city in which the manuscript was located when I examined it. Missing manuscripts are cited by their last known whereabouts. This is followed by the name of the library, followed by the collection name (if any) and the shelfmark. Manuscripts are dated either by year in Arabic numerals or by century in Roman numerals. In the latter case, I include precisising details whenever possible. Among these, the abbreviation “s. in.” refers to the first 25 years of a century; “s. ex.” refers to the last 25 years and “s. med.” refers to the years 26–74. Superscripts refer to the first (¹) or the second (²) half of the century. I occasionally use the abbreviation, “saec. inc.” to refer to undatable manuscripts. The adjective “contemporary” is always in reference to the manuscript hand in question. The statistics on manuscripts avoid double-counting of volumes that are or were once separated. Thus, the Worcester fragments (add. 7 and Q. 8) are counted as one manuscript, as are the Düsseldorf fragments (K2: F.49), which before the end of World War II were housed separately at Düsseldorf and Werden.<sup>230</sup>

### Proper Names

If the name of an author is commonly understood in English (e.g., Virgil or Politian), that name is used throughout the narrative portions of this work. Otherwise, I use the Latin name for authors before 1600 and either the Latin or vulgar name thereafter, depending on the author’s own preference (e.g., Gevartius is used instead of Gevaerts, which he himself seems to have preferred).<sup>231</sup>

### Editorial Principles

I have taken a very conservative approach to transcribing, editing and emending the texts presented here. In my recensions in the indices in Volume II, I have chosen to favor two types of manuscripts: the oldest and those witnesses that preserve the longest, most complete text

<sup>230</sup> The circumstances of their reunion are still unknown. [Düsseldorf and Münster were both in the British zone after World War II. While I have been unable to examine British inventories from after the War or the lists compiled by the British authorities at the collection points, U.S. military records indicate that manuscripts from Münster were evacuated to either Wending or Schloss Vollrads while those from the Staatsbibliothek Düsseldorf were evacuated to the Heimboldshausen salt mine \(the holdings of other libraries in Düsseldorf were evacuated to an unspecified castle in Lindau\). See Seventh U.S. Army, “Repositories of Material Evacuated from Museums and Libraries in Berlin” \(April/May 1945\); Office of Strategic Services, “Military Agency Records” \(College Park, MD, National Archives and Records Administration \[NARA\], RG 226 nr. 12361\); and “Records of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas” \(College Park, MD, NARA, RG 239\). A note accompanying the extant fragments indicates that they all appeared in Düsseldorf after the War.](#)

<sup>231</sup> See M. Hoc, *Étude sur Jean-Gaspard Gevaerts* (Bruxelles, 1922), 29 n. 1.