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Abstract

Arnulf of Orléans ca. 1170 produced a composite commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. This multifaceted commentary, which includes philological and allegorical interpretations, has left behind a large amount of manuscript evidence from various geographical locations and different time periods. To date, no complete medieval commentary on the *Metamorphoses* has ever been critically edited in full. The purpose of this dissertation is to bring to the modern reader a critically edited version of one of the most influential commentaries on the *Metamorphoses*, which also happens to be one of the earliest full commentaries on the poem still extant.

This study also analyzes fully the extant manuscript evidence paleographically and codicologically to make accessible to the reader the textual relationships of the manuscripts, and also to examine the ways in which their physical formats affected the use of the commentary throughout its long tradition. The commentary and its manuscript tradition shed valuable insight into both the medieval and humanistic classrooms, their pedagogy and styles of instruction, as well as various approaches to the study and teaching of Classical Latin poetry.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1. Opening Remarks

Ovid's *Metamorphoses* has long been regarded as a canonical literary example of Latin poetry during the Augustan Age. The poem also exerted a strong, enduring influence on later authors and scholarship. The *Metamorphoses* distinguished itself, especially during the Middle Ages and Renaissance, as an essential part of school curricula across Europe, which even continues today in the modern classroom. The poem offered ample areas for study during the Middle Ages in various facets of the curriculum—Latin grammar, mythology and mythography, ritual, allegory, hexametric verse, rhetoric and oratory, ancient history, geography and topography, narrative structure, poetics and style, astronomy and astrology, science, the study of the calendar, philosophy—as well as providing a means of reconciling these concepts with a medieval-christian milieu. It is in part due to the commentary genre and the study of the classical auctores in the medieval schools that so much manuscript evidence has survived into the modern day.

The intensive study of the *Metamorphoses* privately and within the schools yielded a vast production of didactic works, namely glosses, *accessus*, commentaries, and prose summaries in order to aid both teachers and students. Arnulf of Orléans' commentary on the *Metamorphoses* is one such work, which was used by students and
teachers alike across Europe from the late twelfth century to the mid-fifteenth century. The multifaceted commentary, which includes philological and allegorical interpretations, has left behind a large amount of manuscript evidence from various geographical locations and different time periods. To date, no complete medieval commentary on the Metamorphoses has ever been critically edited in full. The purpose of this dissertation is to bring to the modern reader a critically edited version of one of the most influential commentaries on the Metamorphoses, which also happens to be one of the earliest full commentaries on the poem still extant.

This study also analyzes fully the extant manuscript evidence paleographically and codicologically to make accessible to the reader the textual relationships of the manuscripts, and also to examine the ways in which their physical formats affected the use of the commentary throughout its long tradition. The commentary and its manuscript tradition shed valuable insight into both the medieval and humanistic classrooms, their pedagogy, styles of instruction, and various approaches to the study and teaching of Classical Latin poetry.

2. The Metamorphoses in the Late Antique Period

The Metamorphoses notably lacks witnesses from both the late antique and early to middle Carolingian periods. The earliest fragments date to the late ninth century,\(^1\) and a complete version of the poem is not represented until the end of the eleventh century.\(^2\) In fact, the twelfth century—to employ the well known phrase of Traube\(^3\)—is

considered the *aetas Ovidiana*, furnishing manuscript evidence that eclipses that of the preceding periods. If Ovid and his *perpetuum carmen* were so popular and read widely, where is the evidence? R. J. Tarrant suggests that the physical gap in the manuscript evidence actually points toward an extremely high usage and circulation of the text, so much so, that older copies were worn out and abandoned for newer and more durable copies. Tarrant also asserts that the manuscripts initially disregarded by previous editors may actually transmit older and textually more credible readings.

The manuscript evidence for the early circulation of the *Metamorphoses* introduces a second problem: the presence of the so-called ‘Lactantian’ material. The ‘Lactantian’ material, falsely attributed to the fifth-century author Lactantius Placidus, includes *tituli* and what are known collectively as the *Narrationes*, which were transmitted along with the text in several important witnesses. Editors of the text often

---


4 Tarrant 1995, 84.


6 However, this appellation does not occur in pre-fifteenth century manuscripts, which transmit the *Narrationes* anonymously. In those manuscripts and printed editions which do cite an author, the material is also attributed to Donatus and Fulgentius as well as Lactantius. For a fuller discussion see Tarrant 1995, 89-92.

have examined the *tituli* and *Narrationes* not in terms of their content, but rather for the
textual weight they may lend to the poem's manuscript tradition. For example, Hugo
Magnus, who edited the text in 1914, proposed that the 'Lactantian' manuscripts could
represent an ancient edition\(^8\) of the poem, and thus privileged the ‘Lactantian’ family of
manuscripts over others. R. J. Tarrant, the most recent editor of the *Metamorphoses*, has
shown that the ‘Lactantian’ witnesses do constitute a class (known as Δ)\(^9\), but that their
readings are no more genuine or credible than other manuscripts which do not transmit
the 'Lactantian' material.\(^10\)

A further debate surrounding the ‘Lactantian’ material deals with the origin and
date of the *tituli* and *Narrationes*. Some scholars posit that the material may be a
redaction of a fuller commentary which is now lost;\(^11\) others propose that it was
composed in its current state and does not originate from such a commentary.\(^12\) It is
notable that other classical authors do have a strong commentary tradition from the late
antique period: for Terence, there is the commentary of Aelius Donatus; for Vergil, that

---

\(^8\) The ancient edition theory is also put forth by Brooks Otis, “The Argumenta of the so-called
adopted Otis’s argument in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin
Classics* (Oxford, 1983), 278, but discusses further this conclusion in Tarrant 1995, 101. See also
D. A. Slater, *Towards a Text of the Metamorphoses of Ovid* (Oxford, 1927) for his conjectural
argument for a critical apparatus accompanying the work in ancient versions. The tension
between the the ancient edition theory and editorial approaches is not unique to the textual

\(^9\) See Tarrant's *stemma codicum* for Δ and the manuscripts which descend from it. Tarrant 2004,
xxvii.


\(^12\) For an extremely thorough analysis of the *tituli* and *Narrationes* see Alan Cameron, *Greek
of Servius (and Aelius Donatus through Servius); and for Horace, the commentary of Porphyrio. It is not inconceivable that the *Metamorphoses* could have had a full commentary, but the extent to which the 'Lactantian' material represents that commentary, or a form of it, may never be elicited fully. However, the material itself maintains a level of textual stability, which is evident in its propagation and dissemination.\(^{14}\)

The 'Lactantian' material, however, does provide evidence for another aspect of the commentary tradition of the *Metamorphoses*. The *tituli* and *Narrationes* are the earliest extant witnesses to the utilitarian tradition of manuscripts transmitting the *Metamorphoses*. They reflect a didactic approach to the text as a reading strategy for an individual user of a particular manuscript. The *tituli* are placed in the margins of the manuscripts in positions relevant to the poem's narrative. The comments are visual markers, not a form of exegesis or explication of the text. For example, *Actaeon in ceruum* is written in the margin to identify easily to the reader where the story of Acteon is positioned visually in the text. The *tituli* do not function as summaries, but rather as a means of finding a particular section of the text, just as line numbers do in modern editions.

---

\(^{13}\) Often referred to as the ‘longer version’ of Servius, see Peter K. Marshall, *Servius and Commentary on Virgil*, Occasional Papers, No. 5, Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, (Binghamton, New York: North Carolina 1997).

\(^{14}\) The material’s stability has been underlined in Tarrant 1995, 96: “the writing of the *Narrationes* is sufficiently consistent and distinctive to suggest that they are based on and largely preserve the work of a single hand; our Ovidian commentator may lack a name and face, but he is not without a style, or at least a manner.” It seems that a demand for this specific material must have been a crucial factor in its transmission, at least enough to all this “style” or “manner” to be represented in the extent witnesses of the text. See also Annalisa Rossi, "Il Vat. Ottob. lat. 3313: un’edizione sinottica di Virgilio e Ovidio e la sua storia (secc. XI-XV)," *Studi in memoria di Giorgio Costamanga* (2003): 881-908.
The appearance of the *tituli* and the means by which they function must indicate that there was a need for the reader to find quickly specific sections of the text. The implications show that, at least by this period, the text was not read from beginning to end in a linear fashion every time. Specific sections of the poem may have begun already to garner higher demand than others for study, and the *tituli* do not exist for every episode of the *Metamorphoses*. There is no evidence to suggest exactly the specific environment from which this demand originated, but that it existed nevertheless.

Most likely, the *tituli* and *Narrationes* were used in some form of private study. Their nature as a reading strategy does suggest that the manuscripts, after the addition of the *tituli* and *Narrationes*, were probably used by single users individually. They do not indicate use in an intensive classroom setting, nor use as preparatory material for oral lectures. However, this small glimpse into the utilitarian tradition of the *Metamorphoses* allows us to see more fully the way in which it will develop throughout the medieval and humanistic periods.

3. The Twelfth-Century Renaissance and Ovid

The twelfth-century Renaissance\(^{15}\) brought to the fore the Ovidian corpus. It was during this period that manuscripts of Ovid's poetry began to circulate widely, and

---

influenced strongly both vernacular and Latin authors. There was a demand not only for his longer works such as the Fasti and Metamorphoses, but also for the “minor” (and sometimes spurious) works such as the Ibis, Nux, and Medicamina Faciei Feminae. As Tarrant indicates, omnibus editions containing the elegiac works, which at times also contained the Metamorphoses and medieval pseudo-Ovidian works, grew in popularity and became an alternative to manuscripts containing single works circulating independently of one another.16

In addition to multi-volume manuscripts transmitting nearly all Ovidian works, scholars produced florilegia (selections), which became widely used by magistri and pupils alike during the twelfth century. Florilegia were particularly important for two reasons: first, they provided medieval schools with excerpts of classical Latin, in the manner of an anthology; and secondly, they often preserve a textual tradition from an earlier stage than is found in extant manuscripts. The Florilegium Gallicum17 was an

---


extremely influential florilegium, which, in addition to extracts of Tibullus, Petronius, and Valerius Flaccus, also included generous extracts from all of Ovid’s works circulating in the area during the twelfth century. Another highly influential florilegium, the Florilegium Angelicum, also enjoyed rich circulation during the period.

3.1 The Orléanais

France's Loire valley was perhaps the most active center of classical studies in the twelfth century, and it was here that Ovid would first become part of a standard canon of authors. The Orléanais region experienced a great resurgence of scholarly activity during the third quarter of the twelfth-century Renaissance. Vast numbers of texts and commentaries were produced herein during the period for use in schools, including the aforementioned Florilegium Gallicum and the Florilegium Angelicum. Orléans had garnered a reputation for its treatment of classical philology, and the classical auctores, as can be attested in references from Alexander Necham and Geoffrey of Vinsauf:

Non se Parnassus tibi conferat, Aurelianis,
Parnassi uertex cedet uterque tibi.
Carmina Pieridum multo uigilata labore
exponi, nulla certius urbe reor.

(Alexander Necham, De Laudibus Diuiniae Sapientiae V. 607-610)

---

20 For the use of florilegia in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in Orléans, see Rouse and Rouse 1991, 153-190.
"Parnassus could not compare itself to you, Orléans, each of its peaks shall yield to you. I reckon the songs of the Muses, watched over so laboriously, are interpreted more precisely in no other city."


(Poetria Nova 1013-17)

"In disease, Salerno cures the sick with its medical virtue. In court cases, Bologna armies the naked with laws. Paris distributes sustenance in the arts whence it feeds the robust. Orléans nurses babes in their cradles with the milk of the classical authors."

Orléans was also home to two major schools, the Holy Cross, and St. Euverte, which had their foundations in the earlier scholastic models of the cathedral and the monastery. The Holy Cross and St. Euverte both flourished with scholarly and pedagogical activity, and the Ovidian corpus maintained a strong position in the curricula of both schools and was studied vigorously. A large number of accessus, commentaries, allegories, and lectures produced by the authoritative schoolmasters of the area survive. Hilary of Orléans is regarded as the first master to excel in teaching the classical auctores, and he contributed to the tradition of knowledge within the Orléanais. Three schoolmasters, who follow Hilary, are known to us by name: Arnulf of Orléans, Fulco of Orléans, and William of Orléans.

22 For a detailed discussion of the three schoolmasters see Wilken Engelbrecht, “Carmina Pieridum molto vigilata labore/ exponi, nulla certius urbe reor: Orléans and the reception of Ovid in the aetas Ovidiana in school commentaries,” Mittellateinisches Jarbuch 41:2 (2006a),
4. Arnulf of Orléans: Life and Works

Arnulf of Orléans was a schoolmaster at the cathedral school of St. Euverne in the Loire valley. Many of his biographical details are transmitted indirectly through the works of other writers, especially Hugh Primas and Matthew of Vendôme. Invective saturates both Hugh and Matthew’s portrayal of Arnulf in several disparaging contexts: an avid drinker, gambler, cheat, the lover of a prostitute, and a man guilty of taking a concubine into his bed—to name a few. Arnulf, better known as Rufus Arnulfus on account of his red hair and a temperament to match, is often referenced by Matthew and Hugh through puns, reminiscent of Catullus and Martial, such as Rufus or Rufinus (Ars Versif. prol. 3, 5; 2. 38.39; 3. 5, 14, 20; 4. 42, 47, 48; Primas 1), and both

23 Fausto Ghisalberti is responsible for much of Arnulf’s “rediscovery”; see his seminal article: “Arnolfo d’Orleans: un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII,” Memorie del R. Instituto Lombardo, Classe Lettere 24 (1932): 157-234. See also Haskins 1939, 103 and 114 for brief mentions of “Master Arnold.”
24 Fulco, a contemporary of Arnulf, produced commentaries on the Ars Amatoria, the Tristia, the Amores, the Heroïdes, and the Remedia Amoris. His commentaries on the amatory works have yet to be edited.
Rufa and Thais (Ars Versif. 2. 38.39; 3. 5, 14; 4. 48) are also used to denote his connections with a certain woman.

Matthew, in Ars Versificatoria 4. 48, identifies Arnulf by name in addition to the aforementioned puns and disparages him:

Amplius, facta exceptione similiter coloratorum, quia rufi coloris iniquitas in eo plenius exuberat et in eius successore forsitan emanabit, quicquid dictum est de Rufo et Rufino, de Arnulfo de sancto Evurcio spiritualiter intelligatur, qui me cotidianis exasperat absentem obprobriis, cuius linguam veneno invidie toxicatam existimo. Sed quicquid de me, Rufine, presumas conicari, dignum te Cesaris ira

Nullus honor faciet.

Et tamen durum est contra stimulum calctrare: quippe, qui plurimum contra stimulum recalcitrat, se duplici cuspidis lesione exacerbat.29

"More, an exception similarly of those reddish-tinged has occurred, because the excessiveness of the color red in him abounds more fully and perhaps will flow out in his successor; whatever was said about Rufus and Rufinus, should be understood spiritually about Arnulfus from St. Euverte, who irritates me everyday I'm away with his taunting; I reckon his tongue is saturated with the poison of envy. But whatever, Rufinus, you may presume to crow about me,

No honor will make you worthy of Caesar's anger.

And still it is hard to kick against the pricks: surely the one who kicks back against the most pricks irritates himself with double the injury of a spear."

Arnulf himself does not transmit much autobiographical information, with the exception of a few identifying comments contained inside his numerous glosses and commentaries.

29 Ars Versificatoria 4. 47; Munari 1988, 215.
Arnulf is known to have authored *accessus* and commentaries to several classical works: the *Metamorphoses*,\(^30\) the *Fasti*,\(^31\) *Amores*,\(^32\) *Ars Amatoria*,\(^33\) *Remedia Amoris*,\(^34\) *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Lucan’s *Bellum Ciuile*\(^35\) (i.e. *Pharsalia*), possibly the *Tristia* and the works of Horace, and debatably on the "elegiac" comedies *Miles Gloriosus* and *Lydia*,\(^36\) and the pseudo-Plautine *Querolus*. The commentator was also in the habit of embedding his own name within his final glosses to a work, often displaying a certain wit, cleverness, and egotism (italicized words indicate lemmata):

Arnulf on *Met.* 15. 862: *indeffleble* anime siquidem bonorum non deflectur immo malorum unde et anima Rufi Arnulfii, qui has glosulas fecit Aurelianus, defleri non debet si eas bene fecit immo *si quid habent ueri uatum presagia uiuam* cum Oudio.

"unlamentable, indeed the souls of the good are not lamented, rather those of the wicked, and for this reason the soul of Rufus Arnulfus,

\(^30\) Small selections of the commentary have been edited in Frank T. Coulson and Krzysztof Nawotka, "The Rediscovery of Arnulf of Orléans' Glosses to Ovid's Creation Myth," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 44 (1993): 267-299; and also in Ghislalberti 1932, 180-189.


\(^32\) An edition of Arnulf’s glosses to the *Amores* is in progress by Bruno Roy. The *accessus* can be found in Wilken Engelbrecht, "Fulco, Arnulf, and William: Twelfth-century Views on Ovid in Orleans,” *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 18.2 (2006): 63-4, which follows Roy’s provisional edition. Select glosses are also cited throughout Engelbrecht’s article.

\(^33\) Bruno Roy is presently working on an edition of the commentary.


12
who made these glosses at Orléans, should not be lamented if he made them well, nay if the vagaries of poets have any truth I shall live with Ovid."

Arn. Rem. 813: *Postmodo*, postquam legeritis et sanati fueritis, soluetis quod uouistis, quia eger sanitatem recepit per hoc opus *De remediis* quod Arnulfus glosauit ad sanandos illos qui a Fulcone fuerant decepti.\(^{37}\) "after, after you read and are cured, you will absolve what you prayed for because a sick man took back his health through this work, *The Remedia*, which Arnulf glossed to cure those who had been deceived by Fulco."

Arn. Fast. 6. 812: *increpuitque liram* quod fuit signum concessionis. Sicut Aurelianis ubi facte fuerunt hec glosule, dicitur quasi 'aurea alienis' et Arnulphus, qui eas glosauit, dicitur quasi *ardu a nulla fugiens* et ita Alcides dicitur quasi *alta celi desiderans*.\(^{38}\) "and he plucked the lyre which was a sign of concession. Just as "Aurelianis," where these glosses were made, is said just as if "aurea alienis" and "Arnulfus," who composed these glosses is said just as if "ARdua NULla FUgienS, and in this way, "Alcides" is said just as if "ALta CeI DESiderans.""

Arn. Bel. Ciu. 10. 545: *Epidaure* locus est et sicut Arnulfus Aurelianis has fecit glosulas, ita Sceua apud Epidaurum tot exercitui Pompeiano restitit solus et suos obsessores potius obsedit quam obsideretur ab illis.\(^{39}\) "Epidaurus is a location, and Arnulf made these glosses at Orléans just as Scaeva alone resisted the Pompeian army at Epidaurus, and besieged his own besiegers rather than allowing himself to be besieged by them."

The self-referential colophons serve as marks of authorship for each commentary, whereby Arnulf promotes himself as the author of a particular lecture series. Arnulf establishes his own *auctoritas* as a teacher and distinguishes himself as an authoritative  

\(^{37}\) Roy and Shooner (eds.) 1996, 135.  
\(^{39}\) Marti (ed.) 1958, 530.
master in the field. The colophon from the *Remedia Amoris* allows a view into the agonistic setting between rival schoolmasters in the *Orléanais* as Arnulf asserts his superiority over his rival, Fulco at the Holy Cross.40

In addition to the four colophons in which Arnulf identifies himself, there is also another curious instance where Arnulf releases autobiographical information. A gloss on *Met.* 10. 236 offers a problematic view into the author's nationality in the form of a popular joke between the French and English, referencing the *Anglici Caudati.*41 In this section of Book 10 one finds a description of the Propoetides, who apparently had horns even before Venus transformed them into cows:

*Met.* 10. 235-7: dum dubitat quo mutet eos, ad cornua uultum
flexit et admonita est haec illis posse relinquii;
grandiaque in toruos transformat membra iunencos.

"While Venus hesitated how to change them, she lowered her gaze to their horns and recalled that the horns could be left behind for them; and she transformed their large limbs into grim cows."

---


41 See Roy and Schooner 1985-1986, 326-327 for their analysis and interpretation of the gloss. However, Roy and Schooner only draw upon clm 7205 for their text, and are unaware of the variations of the joke which appear in other manuscripts and alter the nationalities.
Arn. Met. 10. 236: posse relinqui quia dicit 'relinqui' innuitur eos prius habuisse; nam si Anglici modo mutarentur in aliquod animal caudatum, non eis relinquerentur cauda cum prius non haberent; sed de Aurelianensibus metaphorice dici posset infamiam suam competenter caude comparando; nam sicut omnium peccorum hoc uilium est, ita cauda in animalibus uilior habetur. (M, fol. 49vb).  

"they could be left behind since he says 'being left behind' he implies that they had the horns before. Because if the English were now transformed into some animal with a tail, the tail wouldn't be left behind for them since they didn't have it before. But, concerning the 'Orléanese', it could be stated metaphorically by suitably comparing their own infamy to a tail, because just as of all beasts this is cheaper, in the same way, the tail among animals is considered cheaper."

The popular form of the joke is actually the opposite of the Arnulfian rendition, which is used as evidence to suggest an English origin for the commentator. During the period, Englishmen were often satirized by the French for having a third appendage, a cauda. The cauda appears as a mark of shame for the disrespectful treatment of St. Augustine, when the Englishmen of Dorchester pinned fishtails to his clothes. Rickard gives 1163

---

42 M is the only manuscript which transmits metaphorice...habetur. The remaining manuscripts transmit various readings which will be noted shortly.
43 See Roy and Shooner 1085-196, 326 states that Arnulf is turning the popular anti-English joke back on the French. For other evidence to support Roy and Shooner's argument for an English origin see pp. 327 ff. of the same article.
as the earliest occurrence of a Latin example of the joke on the continent,\textsuperscript{45} which places
Arnulf's version among the earliest, and perhaps the first (or only) to reverse the pun.

Alternate versions, however, of the joke appear in all manuscripts\textsuperscript{46} which
transmit the text of the commentary. Roy and Shooner drew upon a single manuscript,
München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 7205 (M) to constitute their text of the joke,
as the other twelfth-century witness known to them, Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale
Marciana, Marc. lat. XIV.222 (4007) (V), is incomplete for this section of the text.\textsuperscript{47}
What remains of V's text is fairly consistent with that of M.\textsuperscript{48} London, British Library,
Burney 224 (B), a thirteenth-century manuscript transmits a slightly different version of
the joke, but maintains the same reversal of the punch line as M.\textsuperscript{49}

The remaining manuscripts, dating from the early thirteenth through the fifteenth
century which transmit the joke do so in some form of its popular fashion: with the
English being the caudati, or the pun on the nationalities is lost on the scribe and replaced
or omitted. For example, the joke is transmitted in F (and similarly in T) as follows:

\textit{posse relinqui} quia dicit relinqui innuitur eos prius habuisse; nam
si Franci modo mutarentur in aliquod brutum animal et caudatum, non eis
relinqueretur cauda cum prius non haberent; sed de Anglicis dici posset
quod eis relinqueretur cum prius haberent (F, fol. 98r).

\textsuperscript{45} Rickard 1956, 165.
\textsuperscript{46} A complete description of all manuscripts with \textit{sigla} can be found in section 9 of this
dissertation.
\textsuperscript{47} See Roy and Shooner 1985-1986, 327 n. 39.
\textsuperscript{48} \textit{posse relinqui} quia dictus relinqui innuitur prius habuisse nam si Anglici modo mutarentur in
aliquod (sic) brutum...(V fol. 41vb).
\textsuperscript{49} \textit{posse relinqui} quia dicitur relinqui innuitur eos prius habuisse; nam si Anglici modo mutarentur
in aliquod brutum animal et caudatum non eis relinqueretur quod prius habeant sed de
Aurelianensibus dici posset quod eis relinqueretur cum prius haberent (B fol.111).
\textsuperscript{50} Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 36. 18
"it could be left behind because he says 'being left behind', he implies that they had it before; For this reason, if the French were now transformed into some ugly animal and had a tail, the tail wouldn't be left behind for them since they didn't have it before; but it could be stated about the English that it would be left behind for them since they had it before."

The versions transmitted in W, D, and A follow closely the text of F, and transmit consistently the reading de Anglicis. They also transmit variations of the initial protasis of the condition which begins the joke.

Apart from whether the English or the French are caudati, another tension arises from the manuscript evidence. When naming the English, Anglici is used consistently in all manuscripts, but when mentioning the French either Franci or Aurelianenses occurs. The specific mention of "Orléanese" as opposed to "French" adds more credibility for an Orléanais origin and audience for those versions of the joke. Arnulf uses the same vocabulary in his gloss to Bellum Ciuile 1. 584 when promoting Hilary of Orléans as the first commentator of the Orléanais:

Tuscos quia de Tuscia fuit qui primus artem aruspitii inuenit, unde et homines illius terre magis quam alii in illa ualent arte, sicut nos Aurelianenses in auctoribus a primo patre magistro nostro Hylario.

---

51 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek Cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 4º (W), Vaticano (Città del), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5222 (D), and Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 18 inf. (A).

52 The following apparatus criticus entry will illustrate the significant variations: si anglici MV B: si franci TF: si frons(!) uel frncs? D: si species A: om. W de aurelianensisbus M B: de anglicis WFDA. See Appendix A for a table and additional data relating to the gloss and pun.

53 Arn. Bel. Ciui. 1. 584, found in Marti 1958, 72. For Englebrekt's interpretation of the gloss see Englebrekt 2006a, 214.
"Tuscan because the first to discover the skill of augury was from Tuscany, and for this reason men of that land, rather than others, thrive in that skill, just as we, the 'Orléanese', thrive in the authors from our first father, master Hilary."

The uses of *Aurelianenses* in the two glosses create a discrepancy between the origins with which Arnulf chooses to identify. From the gloss on Bel. Ciu. 1. 584, Arnulf identifies himself as "Orléanese". The use of *sicut nos Aurelianenses* implies that like the Tuscans, who excel in augury by virtue of being *hominès illius terre* (Tuscany), he excels as a commentator on the classical authors through being a *homo illius terre* (Orléans). Yet, the versions of the gloss to Met. 10. 236 in M and B advance sentiments toward an English origin through their uses of *Aurelianenses*. It does not seem likely that Arnulf would reverse the punch line of the *Anglici Caudati* joke if he were in fact French.

Additionally, Marti has identified several vernacular proverbs and *sententiae* in the *Bellum Ciuile* commentary as Arnulf's own sayings.54 Roy and Shooner have added more examples to Marti's from other commentaries attributed to Arnulf, and conclude that the vernacular sayings are possibly representative of an Anglo-Norman dialect.55 In his commentary to the *Metamorphoses* Arnulf does reference Mont Saint-Michel (7. 267), which is in Normandy. Further evidence of Arnulf's English origin is also

---

55 "Les scholies d'Arnoul contennent parfois un proverbe ou un mot français. Malgré leur rareté et les incertitudes de la tradition manuscrite, il est possible de discerner chez eux quelques traits d'anglo-normand, notamment l'utilisation de *u* pour *o* et de *ei* pour *oi,*" Roy and Shooner 1985-1986, 328; see also n. 44 for a few of their examples.
advanced by Roy and Shooner,\textsuperscript{56} and remains the accepted version followed by scholars.\textsuperscript{57}

5. Overview of Arnulf's \textit{Metamorphoses} Commentary

The following sections serve as brief and general overviews of the commentary's large and divergent textual and utilitarian traditions. The overviews of the textual tradition and the commentary's fluidity are intended to provide a survey of the tradition as a whole, in particular to illustrate how the text is affected by its various users through correction, hypercorrection, modification, and levels of Latinity. A critical analysis of the textual tradition, the affiliations of the manuscripts, and my editorial principles for the constitution of the text for this edition are found in section 10.

5.1 Textual Tradition and Fluidity of the Commentary

Arnulf produced ca. 1175 a composite commentary on Ovid's \textit{Metamorphoses} which influenced the interpretation of the poem well into the fifteenth century. The commentary originally contained four parts: an \textit{accessus},\textsuperscript{58} philological glosses (\textit{glosulae}), a comprehensive list of transformations for each book (\textit{mutationes}), and an


\textsuperscript{57} See also Engelbrecht 2006a, 215, and 215 n. 18 and n. 19; Jane Chance also attributes a "possibly English origin" to Arnulf relying on Astrik L. Gabriel, "English Masters and Students in Paris during the Twelfth Century," chapter 1 of \textit{Garlandia: Studies in the History of the Mediaeval University} (Frankfurt, 1969) in her own work, \textit{Medieval Mythography Volume 2: From the School of Chartres to the Court at Avignon, 1170-1350} (Gainsville, 1994), 57 and 391-392 n. 70.

\textsuperscript{58} See Coulson and Roy 2001, \textit{Incipitarius} no. 419 for a list of manuscripts; see also Frank T. Coulson, "New Manuscript Evidence for Sources of the Accessus of Arnoul d'Orléans to the \textit{Metamorphoses} of Ovid," \textit{Manuscripta} 30 (1986): 103-7; the accessus was also edited from Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XIV.222 (4007), and mildly supplemented by later witnesses in Ghisalberti 1932, 180-181;
allegorical interpretation of the text (*Allegoriae*). The original format of the text, incredibly meticulous in the ordering of this material, reflects the multi-faceted usage of the commentary. First, the *accessus* introduces the work by identifying the author and providing biography (*uita poetae*); it then examines the work in terms of its title (*titulus operis*), subject matter (*materia*), authorial intention (*intentio auctoris*), usefulness for study (*utilitas*), to which philosophical category it should be assigned (*cui parti philosophiae subponatur*) and the didactic procedure employed by the work (*modus tractandi*). The philological glosses (*glosulae*) follow the *accessus*, aiding the reader of the text on multiple levels. The glosses provide information covering Latin grammar and syntax, style and use of rhetorical features (e.g. hypallage, synecdoche, and apocopae), vocabulary in the form of etymologies often accompanied by synonyms, geographical references, historical and mythological background, and comments on the overall structure of the poem. Elements of astronomy and the calendar are also treated briefly as well as philosophical interpretations of the text. Arnulf also attempts to explicate textual *crucès* by listing alternate readings and textual variations, or by expansively (and, at times, innovatively) glossing a problematic reading in order to help the student construe the sense of the selection. These glosses are followed by the list of *mutationes*, which

---

59 Ghisalberti believed that the commentary was originally written in an interlinear format: see Ghisalberti 1932, 179. Ghisalberti, however, only knew of one witness to Arnulf's text, Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana Marc. lat. XIV.222 (4007). His reliance upon this heavily mutilated, disorderly, and fragmentary witness could not have provided him with enough evidence to draw such an absolute conclusion. Ghisalberti's "edition" of the *accessus and allegoriae* within the same article are thus influenced by the manuscript's current state and are also riddled with several errors of transcription, and supplementation from less reliable manuscripts than those known presently.

60 In the case of Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 13. 10 Aug 4°, fol. 141v Arnulf's *accessus* and a modified version written by the same hand follow the work.
serve as both a break between philology and allegory, as well as an adapted form of tituli for both teacher and student.\textsuperscript{61} The allegorical material (Allegoriae) then follows the mutationes, explicating the subject matter in an interpretative manner morally, historically, and allegorically. The progression of glosula-mutationes-Allegoriae is maintained in an alternating fashion for each book of the poem, covering all fifteen books of the Metamorphoses (i.e. Book 1: philological glosses, mutationes, allegorical interpretation; Book 2: glosulae, mutationes, Allegoriae, etc.).

This intentional ordering of diverse material, which covers multiple aspects of the poem, offers a clear view into the overall function of the commentary. The \textit{accessus} provides the appropriate background information and sets the foundations for study. The philological glosses are designed to help the student construe the Latin and understand the literal expression of ideas via the text. The mutationes serve as visual markers and recapitulations for each book, beginning the shift toward a more abstract and advanced interpretation of the text. Finally, the allegorization of the poem is just that, Arnulf’s own abstract interpretation. The ordering of the commentary demonstrates a hierarchy of material and also of approach. The first and most emphatic area is the understanding of the actual \textit{sensus ad litteram} and the ideas it expresses—an abstract and more interpretative discussion of the material can only begin once the student achieves success in a literal interpretation of the text.\textsuperscript{62} Arnulf identifies himself as the author of the


\textsuperscript{62}Hexter is also of a similar opinion, stating "...that 'allegorical' interpretation is a secondary movement: higher-level interpretation follows the study of the letter," Hexter 1987, 77.
commentary by inserting his colophon into the final glosses to Book 15, as discussed previously in section 4.

All four parts of Arnulf’s commentary are transmitted together, and they maintain a strict observance of their alternating order in the three earliest extant manuscripts: München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 7205 (M), Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XIV.222 [4007] (V), and Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Q 91 (T). All three manuscripts date from the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. The three witnesses also transmit Arnulf's philological glosses in the *catena* format: 63 that is to say, a complete text of the *Metamorphoses* is not transmitted with the glosses and commentary, but rather lemmata, or words and phrases from the poem, precede the gloss and serve as a link between text and commentary. 64 In these manuscripts the lemmata are underlined to set them apart visually from the gloss; however, lemmata often become part of the gloss grammatically as well. The glosses often maintain a continuous syntactic relationship with the excerpted words used as lemmata, in which the syntax of the lemmata often governs features of their gloss (e.g. morphology, noun-adjective agreement, sequence of tense, antecedents of pronouns, etc.). Additionally, the lemmata may also exert an influence on a gloss's word order and structure of emphasis (e.g. the placement of enclitics or stylistic rubrics).

64 London, British Library, Burney 224 also transmits both the philological and allegorical material, though its format is different. Burney 224 does not transmit Arnulf's glosses in a *catena* format, but rather it transmits the entire *Metamorphoses* with Arnulf's philological glosses written interlinearly and marginally. The allegorical interpretation is not dispersed per book in the an alternating fashion, but follows continuously after Book 15 concludes.
This syntactic relationship shared between gloss and lemma at this stage in the tradition is but one example of the emphasis placed on the commentary as a primary text, which could be continuously read by anyone with an intimate familiarity of the *Metamorphoses*. The *catena* format also provides a glimpse into the utilitarian tradition of the commentary, which will be discussed in section 5.2.

Beginning with the thirteenth century, the tradition of Arnulf’s commentary on the *Metamorphoses* diverges. The four parts of the commentary, hitherto a single continuous text, are divided textually and physically. The textual divergence occurs as the *accessus*, *glosulae*, *mutationes*, and *Allegoriae* begin to circulate independently and also in hybrid forms. Various combinations of the commentary are attested in several manuscripts, and a few examples are: St. Omer, Bibliothèque de la Ville, 678, (S) where the *accessus* introduces the *Allegoriae*, which are written continuously (fols. 104r-111r); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 8001, (P) in which leaves have been inserted transmitting Arnulf’s *accessus*, sparse glosses for Books 1 and 2, and the entire *Allegoriae*, also written continuously (fols. 17r-21r). Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 4° (W) transmits the *glosulae* with Arnulf’s *accessus* and a modified version which draws heavily upon Arnulf’s life of Ovid. The two Wolfenbüttel *accessus* are written after Book 15 concludes (fol. 141v), and only terse selections of the *Allegoriae* appear sporadically throughout the margins.

---

65 There are also manuscripts in *scholion* format of his other commentaries. See Marti 1958, intro. lxvi-lxvii; Rieker 2005, *Einleitung* lli-lvii; and Roy and Shooner 1996, 151-153.  
66 See *Incipitarium* no. 257 for a list of manuscripts transmitting the *mutationes* and *allegoriae*. 
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Further, during the thirteenth century, the *Allegoriae* (often still introduced by the mutationes) begin to circulate with a verse allegorization of the *Metamorphoses* entitled the *Integumenta Ouidii* of John of Garland.\(^6^7\) The glosulae continue to circulate independently and are also introduced by other accessus: e.g. Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 36. 18, (F) and Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 18 inf. (A) transmit the glosses introduced by two different accessus which are not Arnulfian.\(^6^8\) The mutationes generally accompany the *Allegoriae* in continuous prose, or the glosulae where they are written either as marginal tituli in the relevant positions, or they appear in a list format at the beginning of each of the fifteen books of the *Metamorphoses*. There are, however, several manuscripts which transmit Arnulf's mutationes independently from the other sections of his commentary.\(^6^9\)

The physical divergence of the commentary reflects a shift in format and demonstrates a significant division within the commentary's utilitarian tradition. The catena format utilized by the earliest extant manuscripts to transmit the commentary is replaced during the thirteenth century by the scholion format. In the scholion format, Arnulf's commentary is transmitted alongside the *Metamorphoses*, and the glosses and


\(^6^8\) The *incipit* of this accessus in the Florence manuscript is "<O>uidius natione sulmontinus ex patre pilio poeta facundissimus temporibus octauiani augusti claruit...," see *Incipitarium*, no. 322; and also Fausto Ghisalberti, "Mediaeval Biographies of Ovid," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 9 (1946): 10-59, for this accessus see p. 56. The Milan manuscript transmits "ne prolixitatis fastidio aures audientium obturentur, breuiter et compendiose de quo, ad quid, et qualiter auctor agit in hoc opere uideamus..." See *Incipitarium* no. 271.

\(^6^9\) See *Incipitarium* no. 257.
comments are written in the margins around the poem and also interlinearly. When the
glosses appear *in margine* underlined lemmata are used, and when positioned *supra
uersum* lemmata are omitted entirely. However, the glosses *in margine* no longer
maintain the rigid syntactic linkage as they did in *catena* format. For example, nouns and
adjectives are often redeclined into the nominative case to form the lemma, rather than
directly excerpting the word as it appears in the *Metamorphoses*. If a lemma is directly
excerpted from the text, it is usually written again in the nominative case and all
grammatical modifications are made within the entire gloss in order to form a new
sentence which reads correctly according to the syntax of the newly modified text.

The one consistent factor among the various divergent examples is the inclusion
of a primary text with the commentary. That text is usually the *Metamorphoses* with the
exception of those manuscripts which transmit Arnulfian material with John of Garland's
*Integumenta Ouidii*. Through the shift of physical format, the commentary has become a
secondary text transmitted along with its object, which has thus become the primary text.

The shift from *catena* format to *scholion* represents one of several fluid elements
which enter the tradition of the commentary. The transition of the visual layout and
physical format of the commentary has a marked impact on its textual tradition as well.
The fluid nature of the text in *scholion* format becomes far greater than within the *catena*
manuscripts due to the displacement of the commentary as a primary text. The amount of
variation is pervasive and affects not only the ideas expressed by the commentary, but the
ways in which those ideas are expressed. In addition to format and layout, other fluid
elements which enter the tradition can be categorized as follows: (1) the tension between
words and ideas, also encompassing modification, correction, and Latinity; (2) lemmatic discrepancy; and (3) orthography.\footnote{For a full discussion of the tradition’s orthography, a survey of problems, and its treatment in the edition, see section 10.}

The first category contains variations which do not explicitly alter the sense of a reading, but rather the way ideas are expressed to the reader. These variations are manifestations of changes in Latinity and the relationship of these changes to the users of the text. It is also probable that variations of this type both stem from, and maintain, a relationship with the oral use of the text for lectures.\footnote{For the importance of orality in the catena commentary, see Ward, 1996.} The substitution of words with synonyms, changes in word order, and different grammatical constructions are common instances in the first category. For example, when mentioning the “golden apples” of the Hesperides, both the adjectival form *aurea* and the genitive *auri* are used to render the phrase within the different manuscripts. There is a difference between “golden apples” (*mala aurea*) and “apples [made] of gold” (*mala aurī*), but it deals with the use of different grammatical constructions to express a similar idea: these are not normal apples, but ones either golden in color, or made of gold.\footnote{Though *aurea mala* is the usual way to refer to such apples in Classical Latin (e.g. Lucr. 5. 33, and Varro, *R. R.* 2. 1. 6); the expression is adopted from the Greek χρύσια μηδέα, which also uses the adjectival from.} This is a variation of words and medieval Latinity more so than the expression of ideas. Consequently, the same general information is available to both teacher and student regardless of the presence of *aurea* or *auri*. Another example is the use of *debere* with the infinitive as a substitution for the gerundive predicated by a form of *esse*: ideas of necessity, duty, and obligation are present in both constructions, but are expressed differently.

---
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Corrections and, to an extent, hypercorrections are present in almost all manuscripts of the tradition. As a term, "correction" usually implies that a manuscript is checked either against its exemplar or another witness and then made to agree in those instances where it does not. Hypercorrection erroneously corrects the text when there actually is no error. The source of hypercorrections may previously have had no connection with the textual tradition, but hypercorrections can became part of the tradition through an outside source. However, in the commentary genre, corrections (or what appear to be corrections) can be transformed easily into modifications, which are neither actual "corrections" nor interpolations. Modification can be a spontaneous and idiosyncratic feature of a particular manuscript and remain so, or it may subsequently work its way into the tradition in the same way as errors, legitimate corrections, hypercorrections and the like. A gloss on Met. 15. 278 illustrates one type of modification as it enters several incarnations in four different manuscripts:

\[ \text{nunc ire Caicum} \quad \text{fluvius est qui cursum suum mutauit; Caicus est fluvius Misie.}^{73} \ (\text{M})^{74} \\
\text{nunc ire Caicum} \quad \text{fluvius est qui cursum mutauit suum et est fluvius Misie.} \ (\text{B})^{75} \\
\text{nunc ire Caycum} \quad \text{Caicus fluvius est Misie qui cursum suum mutauit.} \ (\text{WO})^{76} \]

There is no tension between the words chosen and the ideas they express; simply put, Caicus is a river in Mysus which changed its own course. The information conveyed to

---

74 clm 7205, fol. 57rb.
75 Burney 224, fol. 171r.
76 Guelf. 13.10, fol. 134r; the folia of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. class. lat. 1 are not numbered, or at least do not appear so in the microfilm. This is one of the few manuscripts of the tradition which I have not examined *in situ*. I shall resolve this issue upon my own examination of Canon. class. lat. 1.
the reader remains the same, though the means by which the idea is expressed varies. In this example, the sentence structure, not the vocabulary, is the subject of the modification. What began as two asyndetic statements in the twelfth century has been transformed into one concise statement by the mid-thirteenth, which appears in two witnesses. In other instances, the modification is far more intrusive than in the case of the previous example. Consider a gloss from the beginning of *Met.* 11.3:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Ciconum} & \text{ populi sunt. (M TFDA)} \\
\text{Ciconum} & \text{ Cicenses populi sunt in Tracia.}^{77} (B)^{78} \\
\text{[Ciconum]} & \text{ populorum. (WO)}^{79}
\end{align*}\]

Burney 224 (B) has modified the gloss in two ways in order to append additional information, rather than to correct an error or supply material omitted accidentally. The desire for the nominative form of the proper noun and the population’s geographical location have moved the scribe to modify the gloss to include them.\(^{80}\) The third example is another two-fold modification of the gloss: grammatically and visually. The gloss is written interlinearly in W and O, so the lemma is replaced by the actual text of the poem; apposition is used as the predicative structure to convey the idea, as opposed to a nominative noun with a finite verb, which is used by all other manuscripts in the tradition.

---

\(^{77}\) Class. *Thracia.*

\(^{78}\) Burney 224, fol. 119r.

\(^{79}\) Guelf. 13.10, fol. 97r; Canon. class. lat. 1.

\(^{80}\) Based upon the textual variations transmitted in Burney 224 and its position in the stemma, this modification appears to be idiosyncratic and would not have been part of a previous version of Arnulf's commentary. It does not, however, rule out the possibility that this form of the gloss may have either existed in another commentary consulted or was part of a lecture and subsequently entered into the copying of Burney 224. The appearance of this gloss in its modified format is unique to Burney 224, and nothing similar to the added information appears elsewhere in the tradition.
(even those in scholion format). The impetus for modification of existing glosses seems to originate from any combination of the need for clarification, more precise information or references, as well as a more concise expression of ideas (i.e. a “better” Latinity). The need for clarification is often grammatical in nature after the glosses have moved from the catena form to scholion, in which the grammatical link between text and commentary has waned. A common example is the insertion of demonstratives, reflexive pronouns, and a frequent addition of the third person reflexive adjective suus, -a, -um. Most insertions of this type probably originated spontaneously to serve as markers since often the subject of a gloss’s main verb is not expressed within the gloss, but in the poem. Let us consider two examples to illustrate (1) the inherent grammatical linkage between text and commentary, and (2) an instance where clarification is needed and thus grammatical markers are inserted through a modification of the gloss:

Met. 7. 458: Androgeique necem iustis ulciscitur armis.
Arn. Met. 7. 485 Androgei filii sui quem Athenienses necauerunt. (M BWFDA).\(^8^1\)

Minos is the grammatical subject of ulciscitur in the Metamorphoses line, but appears only in the gloss as sui. The sense runs continuously from text to commentary in an unbroken sequence, which uses apposition and maintains the genitive singular form of Androgei. The use of sui to reference Minos can only be inferred if the reader is aware of the poem’s grammar. The same gloss has been heavily modified in the Oxford

\(^8^1\) necauerunt M WA: interfecerunt B: necauerant FD
manuscript, or the scribe has chosen to forgo the gloss entirely in favor of one more independent of the poem:

Androgeus filius fuit Minois quem Athenienses interfecerunt vnde Minos Athenas inuasit et eas subiuguit et sibi tributa reddi constituit. (O)\textsuperscript{82}

The modified form breaks the grammatical link maintained in the other manuscripts. The noun *Androgeus* is written in the nominative case and the construction used to express the predicate has changed from apposition to a noun-finite verb pair: *Androgei filii* becomes *Androgeus filius fuit*. The genitive form *Minois* is also substituted for *sui* as there is now a new nominative (*Androgeus*) governing the sentence and the reflexive pronoun would no longer convey the meaning accurately. Additional information about events relevant to the episode (i.e. Minos’s attack, victory, and the tribute to be paid subsequently to him) is appended to the gloss. The appended information is linked in a continuous manner using *unde* and states *Minos* as the new subject in the nominative, who was previously understood as the expressed subject before any modifications to the gloss occurred.

When the glosses are written interlinearly, their lemmata are omitted intentionally since their position *supra uersum* provides the appropriate link (as in 11. 3). Glosses written in *margine* will transmit the underlined lemmata, but the lemmata themselves are prone to change. The close syntactic relationship between a gloss and its lemma is no longer maintained as strictly as before. Lemmata at times retain their inflection as used within the text, but the gloss, however, will often be rewritten. Nouns are usually either

\textsuperscript{82} Canon. class. lat. 1.
“redeclined” or added in the nominative case and all syntax is then adjusted to convey the sense of the gloss.

When a manuscript’s textual tradition of the *Metamorphoses* does not match that of the relevant lemma, there are three possible scenarios: (1) the lemma is copied as it appears, thus creating a discrepancy between text and commentary; (2) the lemma is copied as it appears, but the scribe then annotates the text with the variant reading; or (3) the lemma is replaced with the reading transmitted by the manuscript receiving the gloss, thereby homogenizing the text and commentary. There is, however, no consistency in resolving lemmatic discrepancy throughout the text, and all manuscripts of the tradition in *scholion* format utilize all three methods. The gloss, however, is seldom ever altered in the event of lemmatic discrepancy, no matter which means were selected for its resolution. This phenomenon brings two results which affect both text and commentary. Firstly, the text itself can become an amalgamation of different traditions, which otherwise may have never intersected: the glosses could be a source of contamination within the textual tradition of the poem. Secondly, the gloss takes on a new meaning when the lemma shifts, thereby reappropriating exegetical information beneath a new heading. Arnulf’s gloss on Phiton (*Met. 7.365*) is an illustrative example (Tarrant’s *apparatus criticus* lists two variations for Rhodon: *phiton* and *phodon*):

*Met. 7. 365: Phoebeamque Rhodon et Ialysios Telchinas.*

---

83 The textual variant is usually written interlinearly and introduced by the conjunction *uēl.* In most cases the hand, which annotates the main text with the variation, is the same hand writing the glosses, and, in some examples, the text as well.

84 See Tarrant 2004, 194, "rhodon] phiton FL: phodon P."
Arn. Met. 7. 365: _Phiton_ proprium nomen ciuitatis ubi colitur Phesus unde dicit Phbeiam. (MV B)\(^85\)

_Rodon_ rodos est proprium nomen ciuitatis ubi colitur Phesus unde dicit Phbeiam. (W)\(^86\)

_Phiton_ as a lemma is transmitted by two of the _catena_ commentaries, M and V,\(^87\) as well as in _scholion_ format by Burney 224 (B). The text in Burney 224 reads _Rodon_, but the lemma copied _in margine_ reads _Phiton_. Subsequently, the scribe has retained the lemma and annotated the text interlinearly with _uel Phiton_ to mark the textual variation. The lemma _Phiton_ does not appear in any of the other witnesses but has instead been homogenized to _R(h)odon_. Vat. lat. 5222 (D) avoids the discrepancy altogether and writes the gloss above _Phebeiam_.

The phenomenon of lemmatic discrepancy and its different means of resolution are not confined solely to the manuscripts transmitting the _glosulae_ in _scholion_ format, but are also present in those manuscripts in the _catena_ format as well. However, in the case of the _catena_ manuscripts it is often impossible to discern the nature of lemmatic discrepancy and its resolution because there is no accompanying text for comparison. In such instances, whether the alteration is contemporaneous with the initial copying of the commentary or occurred subsequently cannot be ascertained with certainty.

\(^{85}\) clm 7205, fol. 43va; Marc. lat. XIV.222 (4007), fol. 47vb; Burney 224, fol. 75v.
\(^{86}\) Guelf. 13.10, fol. 59r.
\(^{87}\) Due to its fragmentary condition, T (Anna Amalia Q 91) lacks this section of the text.
5.2 Utilitarian Tradition of the Commentary and Arnulf's Pedagogy

The commentary has a lengthy utilitarian tradition in addition to its rich textual tradition. As mentioned previously, the earliest extant manuscripts of the commentary (M, V, and T) are transmitted in the *catena* format. The *catena* format is a physical and visual indicator of the way in which the commentary was used in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. In 1996, John Ward published the first study of this particular format using commentaries on the rhetorical texts of Cicero and pseudo-Cicero (*De Inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*).\(^88\) The primary concern of the study was "the origin of a rhetorical teaching tradition, a set of accepted techniques for the effective transmission of a body of knowledge, in the period leading up to the 'Twelfth-Century Renaissance'."\(^89\) Ward defines the *catena* format as: "in brief, the *catena* gloss contains, not the text being glossed, but only key-words abstracted from that text, each of these being followed by the gloss on it. The resultant text, made up of these 'key-words' inserted into the gloss, like links in a chain, looks like a new continuous prose work which completely replaces the original."\(^90\)

---


\(^89\) Ward 1996, 111.

Through the course of the article, several criteria to establish the *catena* format are also advanced: authoritative masters in the field, evidence of student bodies, a systematic transmission of knowledge in the classroom with *reportationes* of oral lectures or published versions of lectures, and methods of organization which facilitate teaching and effective classroom digestion.\(^ {91}\) Several codicological and paleographical features of the manuscripts transmitting Arnulf's commentary meet these criteria and lend support to their validity.

The three *catena* manuscripts (M, V, T) exhibit codicological and paleographical similarities which indicate use as school texts during the period: they are small, highly portable, ruled for two columns of text, and written in various incarnations of Pregothic script.\(^ {92}\) The scripts also show unmistakably the influence of documentary script, including *litterae elongatae*, the treatment of many ascenders and descenders, and a certain rapidity of writing and inconsistency of letter forms.\(^ {93}\) Decoration within the manuscripts is minimal, consisting of plain initials in a single color. Letter heightening in red and line fillers are very sparse. The placement of the initials (when they appear) is consistent: for the *incipit* of each book of the *Metamorphoses* in its lemmatic form, and for the 'M' of *mutationes* (each list of transformations begins with an incarnation of

---

\(^{91}\) Ward 1996, 111-112.
\(^{92}\) Also known as *littera Praegothica*. See Albert Deroze, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books From the Twelfth to the Early Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2003), 56-71. A discussion of other names for this transitional form of Caroline is found on p. 57.
\(^{93}\) Judging from Marti's description of Köbenhavn, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. kgl. S. 2025, s.xiii\(^ {1}\), similar features are present: "the main upper and lower shafts of the letters in the first and last line of each page are lengthened almost to the edge of the page and cut at intervals by small horizontal cross strokes," Marti 1958, intro. lxiii. Marti seems to be referring to *litterae elongatae* (though this term is not used), a common feature of documentary script. In addition to other features of documentary script, *litterae elongatae* are extremely pervasive in M, V, and T. For the intrusion of *litterae elongatae* into book scripts, see Deroze 2003, 59 and 80.
Mutationes in hoc libro hee sunt). The initials are visual markers\textsuperscript{94} between the commentary's grammatical and allegorical interpretations.\textsuperscript{95} They allow the user to find easily and quickly specific sections of the commentary and the different levels of interpretation.

However, these catena commentaries are mostly fragmentary;\textsuperscript{96} M is the only complete witness, while V and T lack significant portions of the text. In all three manuscripts, writing is often rapid, letter size, forms, and ruling are inconsistent, and mistakes are made and corrected. This may be due to the oral influence of the lecture as well as the demand to copy the material quickly for later use. Corrections, however, are made in multiple ways: words are crossed out, expunctuated, or erased. Sections omitted are written in all margins, including the space between each column of text, and keyed to their respective position via signes-de-renvoie. Some corrections are contemporaneous with the writing of the text, others show a subsequent attempt of the same hand, while

\textsuperscript{94} However, several initials were never filled in, but remain empty with an instruction letter. This is most likely due to the low-quality production of the manuscripts, yet it does not inhibit the function of actually having the initial present. The space can draw the eye to the specific section of the text in the same way as an initial could.


\textsuperscript{96} Ward also addresses the fragmentary status of several catena manuscripts in his sample. See Ward 1996, 118, where he also advances another hypothesis: "Presumably rhetoric, as a relatively low-status art, did not enjoy the same institutional investment during our period that would have been necessary if it were to produce scriptorial activity on the same scale and of the same standard as are evident in the study of other arts." However, as rhetoric is not a factor in our sample of manuscripts, this hypothesis does not aid the current study. It is equally as probable to operate under the assumption that the quantity of manuscript evidence could suggest a high level of use. See Tarrant 1995, 84. Newer copies may have been used to replace older, worn-out manuscripts, but in this case the catena format could also have been replaced by scholion, which is likely the scenario in London, British Library, Burney 224, which transmits Arnulf's commentary completely with the glosulae in scholion format and the allegoriae written continuously after Book 15 of the \textit{Metamorphoses} concludes.
others are the work of later hands. The student or teacher is correcting his own copy of the commentary. The nature of these corrections suggests that there were written exemplars, and there is a definitive textual tradition of the commentary as a whole.97

As we have seen, Arnulf consistently names himself in the final glosses to his works as a mark of authorship, which is also a method of self-promotion and a proclamation of the schoolmaster's auctoritas.98 The embedded colophon furnishes direct evidence of an authoritative master in the field. Arnulf's name is in fact part of the textual tradition of this lecture series, whether the manuscript is in catena or scholion format. Thus far, there is direct evidence of an authoritative master in the field (Arnulf), an institution (St. Euverte), and student bodies (those responsible for copying these texts, and even specifically those "deceived" through Fulco's lectures). This evidence meets Ward's criteria, and serves to assuage Margaret Gibson's criticism that the existence of catena commentaries does not prove the existence of schools.99 In our sample, we have direct evidence that these catena commentaries do originate from a particular school and a particular schoolmaster.

The organization of the commentary in M, V, and T also meets Ward's criterion for facilitating effective teaching, and "digestion" in the classroom. The alternation between grammatical glosses, list of transformations, and allegorical interpretation

97 See section 10 ff. of this dissertation.
98 See Ward 1996, 117 for his list of particular masters cited by name, and his conclusion that it "indicates the growth of auctoritas around select major names."
99 See Ward 1996, 119, where Margaret Gibson states "I agree that the catena commentary is better adapted to 'the schools' in that it is more easily adapted/altered/intercalated. But I cannot see that the mere existence of such commentaries proves the existence of the schools." See also n. 20 on p. 119 for the nature of their correspondence.
enables lectures on primary and secondary levels from the same manuscript, on all fifteen books of the *Metamorphoses*, and in any order required by the demand. Collectively, the material's organization in *catena* format and its definitive textual tradition strengthen Ward's hypothesis that the *catena* format must be part of what he refers to as a "teaching tradition."\(^\text{100}\) However, though an oral reproduction of the lecture is likely the aim of the *catena* format, a "teaching tradition" excludes the possibility for the later reception and innovation upon a manuscript's format. The term "teaching tradition" must be redefined as "utilitarian tradition" because teaching, or teaching in a specific fashion, may not be the only way a manuscript was used throughout its lifetime. The physical format of the manuscript is the result of the commentary's function, but the function can also change throughout the commentary's extensive tradition of use. The utilitarian tradition of Arnulf's commentary cycles back-and-forth between *catena* and *scholion* formats, through the span of nearly three hundred years.

When the commentary begins to diverge and circulate in *scholion* format\(^\text{101}\) along with the text of the *Metamorphoses*, or in hybridized forms, the utilitarian tradition also diverges. The *catena* format provides a clearer view as to how the text moved, and why it moved: the organization in *catena* format allows the commentary to be copied more rapidly, which also allows a more rapid circulation and dissemination into different geographical locations and institutions. The demand for obtaining quickly a specific

---

\(^{100}\) "If we are to accept the hypothesis that the *catena* gloss functioned as a short-cut way of ingesting the content of a lecture series with a view to reproduce it (orally) in conjunction with a text, it is then logical to conclude that a lecture series found in manuscripts as a *catena* gloss must be part of a teaching tradition," Ward 1996, 114.

\(^{101}\) Ward 1996, 109 says the *scholion* format "presents the original text as an integral unit, the glosses being arranged around the text-block or inserted between the lines."
master's lecture on a given topic is the most significant reason for copying commentaries in *catena* format rather than in *scholion*.

Increasingly, the *catena* commentary must be understood as a pedagogical technique, not specifically as part of a rhetorical teaching tradition. The subject matter only represents a specific demand for a certain topic in a specific setting. Ward's study focused on rhetoric, but, as we now see, the *catena* format was used in the study of and lectures on Latin poetry as well. Therefore, the topic, the demand for it, and the means by which it is conveyed (i.e. the utilitarian tradition) are results of the environment in which the text was produced (e.g. usually a fast paced classroom setting). The manuscript's format, in this way, is not related to the specific text itself, but rather indicates the specifications for the text's use in its intended setting.

Considering the entire utilitarian tradition of the commentary can strengthen the link that demand and environment maintain with a manuscript's physical format. Three manuscripts from the fifteenth century (the latest extant manuscripts of Arnulf's commentary) offer evidence to show how demand and environment forced the commentary to shift its format from *scholion* back to *catena*. The progression will show that, as demand increases and the scholastic environment intensifies, the utilitarian tradition eventually will change in order to be more efficient.

Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 18 inf. (A), written in 1420 at Urbino by a certain Marcus,\(^{102}\) transmits the commentary in *scholion* format. The commentary is

---

\(^{102}\) The colophon, written in red ink, on fol. 151r reads: ""Publii ouidii nasonis metamorphoseos quintusdecimus et ultimus liber explicit et completus per me marcum quondam magistrum luce honorablis phisici de urbino 1420."" See Munari, no. 12.
added by a hand contemporaneous with the text-hand. The manuscript is large, measuring 400x290 mm (height by width), and is elaborately decorated with initials in gold leaf, other luxury colors like pink, green, shades of blue, and white pen work. An ownership crest is also painted on the first folio, and the text hand is well executed in Gothic Rotunda. This manuscript is luxurious and the commentary's use was most likely for private study and reflective reading. The commentary in A was neither copied with the intention of reproduction for oral lecture, nor for use in a large classroom setting or an intensive scholastic environment. Due to these factors, I suggest that in this particular manuscript the commentary and its layout are more suited to a reading strategy than to a teaching strategy. It is clear that the hand writing the commentary has annotated the manuscript multiple times. This indicates numerous annotation sessions over a long period of time by a single user, not use for oral lectures to students in a classroom. As a witness to Arnulf's commentary, the manuscript demonstrates the uniformity of the textual tradition, but the variation of the utilitarian tradition. The following examples will aid in examining the utilitarian tradition's relationship to the demand for the material and the environments in which the manuscripts were used.

Vaticano (Città del), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5222, (D), a manuscript written by Damiano da Pola in 1415, shows how the commentary's utilitarian tradition can operate differently from its textual tradition. D, like A, transmits

---

103 This statement should not exclude the fact that a commentary is also a fluid text, and there are deliberate modifications, additions, and omissions within the textual tradition. Milano, B 18 inf. does contain modifications, but my collation of the manuscript reveals that it proves to be a valid witness to the textual tradition of Arnulf's commentary.

Arnulf's commentary in \textit{scholion} format with the text of the \textit{Metamorphoses}, and also shows repeated annotation sessions by a single user, Damiano da Pola. The commentary is a faithful witness to the overall textual tradition, but D's utilitarian tradition differs drastically from the Milan manuscript. Damiano's manuscript is being used for oral lectures to audiences in institutionalized settings. In the colophon, Damiano has added specific comments on separate occasions about his own use of the manuscript for teaching. There are at least three occasions where he used it for public lecture in Padua and Venice. Damiano's choice of vocabulary (\textit{legere, lectura, schola, publice}) indicates oral lecture at a school (fol. 247v):

\begin{quote}
hunc Ovidium emendaui ego Damianus de Pola, anno domini 1415. Sex tamen primos libros antea correxeram et legi eum a principio usque ad finem Padue et publice et compleui die 6. Octobris 1415 ad laudem dei omnipotentis et omnium sanctorum suorum,amen. et meus est liber iste.

Rursus compleui lecturam huius Ouidii Venetiis in schola mea de Sancto Leone die Lune .29. Septembris 1430 hora 23...

Tercius legi hunc Ouidium publice Padue in schola mea et compleui lecturam die ueneris .12. Ianuarii 1442 hora quasi 24.
\end{quote}

Unlike the Milan manuscript, Damiano is using the commentary for oral lectures and readings. The three colophons reveal Damiano's growing \textit{auctoritas} as a schoolmaster during the period of 1415-1442. It is impossible to ascertain conclusively whether Damiano copied the commentary with the initial intention of reproducing it orally, but it is certain that he did use the commentary orally in lectures. The scholion format in Vat. lat 5222 is used both for private study (i.e. a reading strategy) and for teaching. Both text-hand and commentary-hand are that of Damiano himself. He not
only copied the text, but also annotated it with Arnulf's commentary and numerous other comments. Yet, in the same layout, the manuscript is used for teaching in specific "institutions" (scholae) to different audiences with an oral element. The demand for Damiano's lecture does not seem high enough to necessitate the catena format, but the commentary's use has already begun to move from a reading strategy to a teaching style. Just as the demand dictates the commentary's function, its function must dictate its form. The catena has begun to resurge elsewhere during the period, where the demand for the material was high enough to alter the physical format of the commentary.

In the case of Zomino da Pistoia\textsuperscript{105} (1387-1458), the format's movement is fully realized. Zomino (Sozomeno) was a humanist as well as the author of the *Chronicon universale*, a teacher at least in Florence, and also responsible for commentaries on authors as diverse as Apuleius and Seneca.\textsuperscript{106} One of Zomino's manuscripts, Pistoia, Biblioteca Comunale Forteguerriana, A 46, (Z), transmits commentaries on Seneca and Ovid in catena format. This manuscript is significant not only as a textual witness to Arnulf's commentary, but also as a witness to the commentary's utilitarian tradition: A 46 traps a particular stage of Zomino's teaching career. Zomino only transmits specific\textsuperscript{105} See Lucia Cesarini Martinelli, "Sozomeno Maestro e Filologo," *Interpres* xi (1991): 7-92; Julia Haig Gaiser, *The fortunes of Apuleius and the Golden Ass: a study in transmission and reception* (Princeton, 2008), 141-144; and Frank T. Coulson, Hitherto Unedited Medieval and Renaissance Lives of Ovid (1), *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987): 152-207. for Zomino's handwriting, see Albinia C. de la Mare, *The Handwriting of Italian Humanists* 1.1 (Oxford, 1973), 91-105. For Zomino's library, see Remigio Sabbadini, "La biblioteca di Zomino da Pistoia," *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 45 (1917): 197-207; for an overview of Zomino's teaching career see Robert Black, *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2001), 129-137.\textsuperscript{106} See Julia Haig Gaiser, "Apuleius in Florence," in *Classica et Beneventana: Essays Presented to Virginia Brown on the Occasion of her 65th Birthday*, eds. Frank T. Coulson and Anna A. Grotans (Turnhout, 2008): 45-72; esp. 53-66 for Zomino da Pistoia, and 63-64 for Pistoia, A 46.
sections of Arnulf's philological *glosulae*, which must relate to the manuscript's setting:
(1) the absence of the *Metamorphoses* text, as in the twelfth-century *catena* manuscripts,
displays both an intimate familiarity with the text and an emphasis on the lecture
material; (2) Zomino has organized the manuscript in a systematic order, a typical feature
of the *catena* format as we have already seen in M, V, and T. Pistoia A 46 is arranged
by subject and content, which are labeled as headings in the upper margins (e.g. *Liber
VII* or *Medea*). There are multiple ways of cross-referencing the material, including an
index in the beginning of the manuscript. The subject headings represent topics which
were in demand for Zomino. The manuscript is extremely utilitarian, and Zomino has
compiled it to fulfill his needs as an instructor. The *catena* format is the most suitable
teaching strategy for his purposes, as he may not need to lecture on the entire poem, but
perhaps only on specific sections. Zomino sought out the commentary, not the
*Metamorphoses* with a commentary, to satisfy this demand. Additionally, Zomino was
once in possession of a copy of Arnulf's commentary on Lucan's *Bellum Civile* in *catena*
format.\(^{107}\)

There is also further evidence showing the reuse of twelfth/thirteenth-century
*catena* commentaries during this period. T, an early thirteenth-century *catena*
commentary of French origin, found its way to Amplonius Rating de Berka\(^ {108}\) (ca. 1365-

---

\(^{107}\) London, British Library, Harley 6502, which Marti dates to the late twelfth or early thirteenth
century. See Marti, 1958, intro. lxii.

\(^{108}\) Wilhelm Schum, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der Amplonianischen Handschriften-Sammlung
zu Erfurt*, (Berlin 1887), i-xxxvi; Kathrin Paasch ed., *Der Schatz des Amplonius. Die große
Bibliothek des Mittelalters in Erfurt*, (Erfurt, 2001), 26-37; Almuth Märker, "Amplonius Rating
de Bercka (ca. 1365-1435) und die Anfänge der Erfurter Universität," in *Große Denker Erfurts
1435) and then to the University of Erfurt. In this case, the commentary was not recopied, but inserted in its fragmentary state and subsequently reused. There is, however, not sufficient evidence to suggest much else about T’s use during this period. Whether the commentary functioned as a teaching strategy and pedagogical technique for oral lecture, or culminated into a reference material for private study, cannot be ascertained from the current manuscript evidence. It does, however, represent some type of didactic use, for which there must have been a demand. The *catena* format still allows the rapid dissemination of the lecture series independent from the classical text. Like Zomino, Amplonius also possessed another commentary of Arnulf, a commentary on the *Fasti*, which was written in the late twelfth century.¹⁰⁹

The *catena* commentary is utilized when there is a high demand for lectures on a specific topic by an individual (i.e. Ward's authoritative master). The authoritative master, however, need not be the original authoritative master of the series. Arnulf, in both name and practice, was replaced by Damiano, Zomino, and possibly even Amplonius, yet virtually the same commentary was being used for the lectures. The *catena* format is not only didactic and a systematic means of organization, but also pedagogical. It is a teaching strategy and represents a particular style of instruction.

Within this sample of manuscripts, the utilitarian tradition represented by the *catena* format shows an efficient way to teach Ovid's *Metamorphoses* at different times and in specific centers where the material was in demand. In the later resurgence of the commentary, especially in the manuscripts of Damiano and Zomino, there is no need for

¹⁰⁹ Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, lat. qu. 537, s. xii². See Rieker 2005, *Einleitung* liii; and Schum 1887, 792.
the inclusion of the allegorical interpretation of the poem as in the twelfth century. The demand has changed and so have the curricula. The way information moves from teacher to student, who may also be, or become, a teacher, illustrates the purpose of the catena as well as its effectiveness. There is no reason which may rule out variation of format in textual exemplars: the witnesses in scholion may have had catena exemplars and vice-versa, perhaps even one scribe being responsible for copies in both formats. The commentary is able to move full circle within its utilitarian tradition.

The catena format is employed under the right conditions. These conditions have a direct relationship with teaching and the manuscript's environment. To the copyist (either student or teacher), the lecture material is more important than the text it explicates. When in catena format, a school text is able to move and circulate more quickly, and with a broader geographical span. This rapid transmission of ideas has the ability to influence those which follow, in format as well as approach.

Returning to Ward's argument, the catena commentary should not be confined solely to a method for the teaching and study of rhetoric or rhetorical theory. Ward's analysis reflects the utilitarian tradition of the specific commentaries transmitted by his sample of manuscripts. The introduction of the sample comprised of Arnulf's commentaries enables a broader understanding of the catena format. The catena format is evidence of a pedagogical technique for any body of knowledge in demand in a specific setting. At some point in a catena commentary's tradition there are both oral and written agents of transmission (these may or may not be present if it is in scholion format with the classical text, as we have seen through the fifteenth-century manuscripts discussed
earlier). The teaching tradition is not just the commentary itself (i.e. its approaches), but the way it is suited to this particular pedagogical technique and the environment in which the commentary was produced and/or used. The format of a manuscript represents its utilitarian tradition, which may include several "teaching traditions" from its different users.

In sum, Arnulf's pedagogy is largely determined by the particular teaching style he adopted in his classroom, not only by the approaches of his commentary. Due to the presence of *catena* format manuscripts so close in date to Arnulf's own *floruit*, it is reasonable to conclude that his lecture series on the *Metamorphoses* was in high demand and was delivered in a scholastic environment with both oral and written elements. The utilitarian tradition's movement from *catena* to *scholion* has little to do with Arnulf's own pedagogy, but rather that of subsequent users of the commentary and the respective settings in which they used the commentary. Thus, the resurgence of the *catena* format in the classroom of Zomino da Pistoia is also unrelated to Arnulf's pedagogical practices, and tied intimately to Zomino's own pedagogy and teaching environment.

### 5.3 Influence of the Commentary

Arnulf's commentary proved to be a highly influential work in the reception history of the *Metamorphoses* for over three hundred years. Even after the commentary's divergence in the thirteenth century, Arnulf's works remained part of the tradition of knowledge surrounding the *Metamorphoses*, its literal and allegorical interpretations, and

---

110 Arnulf's approaches are discussed in sections 6.2 ff. of this dissertation.
its *accessus* tradition. The physical evidence exists in the sheer amount of manuscripts which transmit partial sections or incorporations of the commentary throughout the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{111} In addition to its strong French tradition,\textsuperscript{112} there is manuscript evidence which indicates a definitive Italian tradition of the commentary appearing as early as the first quarter of the thirteenth century and enduring throughout the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{113}

Much scholarly attention has been devoted to the *Allegoriae*,\textsuperscript{114} which are perhaps the beginning of the allegorical tradition surrounding the *Metamorphoses*.\textsuperscript{115} Arnulf's allegorical influence on John of Garland's *Integumenta Ouidii* has already been shown, and the tradition can be traced through the prosimetric *Allegoriae* of Giovanni del Virgilio,\textsuperscript{116} and Pierre Bersuire's *Ouidius Moralizatus*.\textsuperscript{117} Giovanni del Virgilio also

\textsuperscript{111} See *Incipitarium* no. 419.
\textsuperscript{112} The seminal manuscripts of the French tradition are Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XIV.222 (4007); Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Q 91; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 13.10 Aug. 4\textsuperscript{o}; London, British Library, Burney 224; and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 8001.
\textsuperscript{113} The Italian tradition of the philological commentary is best represented by Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. class. lat. 1; Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 36.18; Vaticano (Città del), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5.222; Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 18 inf.; and Pistoia, Biblioteca Comunale Forteguerriana, A 46.
\textsuperscript{116} Fausto Ghisalberti, "Giovanni del Virgilio, espositore delle *Metamorfosi*," *Giornale dantesco* 34:4 (1933): 1-110; Frank T. Coulson, "Pierpont Morgan Library MS M. 938: A Newly Discovered Copy of Giovanni del Virgilio's Prose Paraphrase of the *Metamorphoses*,"
exhibits similarities to Arnulf's *accessus* when discussing the types of metamorphosis, though this is likely shared with Boethius' treatment of the subject.\textsuperscript{118} It has also been suggested that Arnulf's treatment of the types of metamorphosis in his *accessus* are strikingly similar to Dante's for Vanni Fucci's transformation in *Inferno* XXIV.\textsuperscript{119} However, Arnulf's commentary has directly influenced other works of the *Metamorphoses* commentary tradition, which are not limited to allegorical interpretations.

During the thirteenth century (ca. 1250), the *Vulgate* commentary, compiled by an anonymous French schoolmaster, established itself as one of the authoritative Ovidian school texts on the *Metamorphoses*.\textsuperscript{120} Coulson has identified the *Vulgate* commentator's

---


incorporation of Arnulf's glosses and allegorizations, and glosses of William of Orléans among others into the commentary.\textsuperscript{121} The \textit{Vulgate} commentary is transmitted by numerous manuscripts, by far outnumbering those of Arnulf which are still extant.\textsuperscript{122} The authoritative nature and wide dissemination of the \textit{Vulgate} commentary illustrates the way in which Arnulf's contributions were able to remain influential to the \textit{Metamorphoses}' tradition of knowledge indirectly, as well.

In discussing the utilitarian tradition of the commentary, we have seen the resurgent use of Arnulf's philological glosses in both \textit{scholion} and \textit{catena} formats among Humanists Damiano da Pola and Zomino da Pistoia as well as in Amplonius Rating de Berka in Erfurt. Both Damiano and Zomino used Arnulf's glosses in a modified format, incorporating glosses from other sources as well as their own into the text. Of the two, Damiano leaves behind a fuller version of Arnulf's glosses, which are nearly complete save for Book 15. Zomino only transmits sections of Arnulf's commentary, but likely had access to the entire philological glosses since several readings of Pistoia A 46 (Z) seem to either derive directly from Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 36.18 (F), or to indicate a single common source for both manuscripts.

Arnulf's \textit{accessus} also remained influential to the later study of the \textit{Metamorphoses}, and leaves behind the most manuscript evidence for an independent circulation compared to the other sections of the commentary. Particular examples are

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{121} Coulson 1989, 30, 31-33, and 57 n. 10.  \\
\textsuperscript{122} For a list of manuscripts of the \textit{Vulgate} commentary, see Coulson and Roy, \textit{Incipitarium} no. 421.
\end{flushright}
collections of *accessus* to the Ovidian corpus such as those found in Antwerpen, Musaeum Plantin-Moretus lat. 85, and Vaticano (Città del), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1563 (*R*), which include Arnulf's *accessus* to the *Metamorphoses* and to other Ovidian works. The only later extant witness to the *accessus* which derives directly from a common source shared by *M* and *V* appears in Vaticano (Città del), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1593 (*C*), a manuscript which also transmits Orico de Capriana's *Summa Memorialis* in addition to the *Metamorphoses*.\(^{123}\) Further examples of the influence of the *accessus* appear in Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 5.4. Aug. 4°, London, British Library, Add. 15.733, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 214.\(^{124}\) The three manuscripts are not direct copies of Arnulf's *accessus*, but do share the same *incipit*. They are actually three independent works which have drawn extensively from Arnulf's *accessus* and, in some instances, echo him verbatim, particularly his life of Ovid.\(^{125}\)

### 6. Analysis of Arnulf's Commentary on the *Metamorphoses*

The following section examines closely Arnulf's approaches in the *accessus* and philological *glosulae* of the commentary, as they are the principal components of this

---

\(^{123}\) Although the text of the *Metamorphoses* in Vat. lat. 1593 is from the twelfth century, Arnulf's *accessus* was added by a hand contemporaneous with the one writing Orico de Capriana’s *Summa*. See also Frank T. Coulson, "Newly Identified Manuscripts containing the *Summa Memorialis* on the *Metamorphoses* by Orico de Capriana," *Studi Medievali* 35 (1994): 817-822.


\(^{125}\) Just as the second *accessus* transmitted in Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 13.10 Aug. 4°, fol. 141v (*W*) draws verbatim on Arnulf's life of Ovid, but not as thoroughly on the rest of the *accessus*, which precedes it directly on the same page.
study. The *Allegoriae* have been mentioned in reference to the commentary's textual tradition and sphere of influence, with abundant scholarly literature and secondary sources for a variety of interpretations provided in the footnotes. Briefly, the *Allegoriae* chiefly undertake an allegorical, moral, and historical interpretation for each book of the *Metamorphoses*. After the list of *mutationes* recapitulates the transformations significant to Arnulf, the *Allegoriae* begin. A version of the formulaic statement "Modo quasdam allegorice, quasdam moraliter, exponamus, et quasdam historice," precedes the allegorization of each book in order to transition the reader from the literal interpretation (which begins "littera sic exponatur") to the allegorical one.\(^{127}\)

It must also be noted that Arnulf's identifying colophon is embedded in the final gloss of his philological commentary, not in the final allegory of Book 15. However, in the brief *apparatus criticus* provided by Ghisalberti, there are a few readings which do append the commentator's name either as 'Arnulphus Rufus' or 'Magister Arnulphus'.\(^{128}\) Ghisalberti has chosen not to print these readings in his text of the *Allegoriae*, but his editorial decision must not be viewed as an absolute since new manuscript evidence has surfaced since his edition.\(^{129}\) It has also been shown through Arnulf's other works that the commentator was quite fond of inserting his own name to mark his authority on a particular lecture series. I intend to resolve this issue in my own critical edition of the

---

\(^{126}\) Historical interpretations do occur in the glosses as well, but are few in number.  
\(^{127}\) A movement from primary to secondary interpretation, which has already been discussed thoroughly by Hexter 1987, 63-82.  
\(^{128}\) Ghisalberti 1932, 229.  
\(^{129}\) Particularly the two other *catena* commentaries transmitted in M and T, which are far closer to Arnulf's *floruit* than the other manuscripts Ghisalberti used to supplement the fragmentary sections of V. See Ghisalberti 1932, 201 for the shelfmarks of these supplementary manuscripts.
complete commentary, including the *Allegoriae*, which I shall undertake in the near future after completion of this dissertation.

6.1 The *Accessus*

Arnulf's *accessus* is typical of those of the twelfth century. The *accessus* is organized under seven different medieval subject headings: *uita poete* (life of the poet), *titulus operis* (title of the work), *materia* (subject matter), *utilitas* (usefulness for study), *intentio auctoris* (authorial intention), *cui parti philosophie supponatur* (to which category of philosophy the work should be assigned), and *modus tractandi* (didactic procedure of the work).\(^{130}\) Arnulf's *accessus* is largely original, though the commentator does draw on previous *accessus* to the *Metamorphoses* and other sources. These are discussed in 6.1.3. What follows is an analysis of Arnulf's *accessus* as it would have been used in his lecture series.

6.1.1 Life of Ovid

The first portion of the *accessus* is devoted to the life of Ovid, where Arnulf shows a personal fondness for the *Metamorphoses* when it comes to studying Ovid's *uita*:


"Because we have Ovid's greater work before our hands, we should examine the life of the poet more so in this book than in the others."

\(^{130}\) See Alastair J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic literary attitudes in the later Middle Ages* (London 1984), 9-39. For his categorization of the common elements of twelfth-century *accessus* as Hunt's "type C," see 18-28; for his use of Arnulf's *accessus* to Lucan' *Bellum Ciuile* as an example, see 19 and 23.
Arnulf's *uita* moves through the standard Ovidian biographical-geography drawn from the exile poetry: the region of Sulmo and the town of Paelignum. Ovid's familial connections are limited to a father, Plinius, and a brother, Lucilius, one year Ovid's senior. Their father was instrumental in the elementary education of both children, and provided them with a *magister* for their rhetorical education. Ovid is noted as having excelled especially in this skill and then embarked on a career as a *tribunus militaris*. Lucilius dies when Ovid's tribunate is over, and the poet is then urged by the Roman *princeps* "Maximianus" and the Roman people to use his skill of writing to augment his reputation. Next is Arnulf's ordering of the Ovidian corpus, which differs from our current ordering scheme mainly by placing the *Heroides* first. Arnulf lists the succession of works as follows: *Heroides, Amores, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris, Metamorphoses, Fasti, Tristia, Epistulae ex Ponto, and Ibis*. Through the mention of each work Arnulf notes any significant biographical information of relevance: Augustus' anger over corrupting the youth (*Ars Amatoria*), placating Augustus (*Remedia Amoris*), praising Augustus for his ancestry through Aeneas (*Metamorphoses*), and honoring Germanicus (*Fasti*). The composition of the exile poetry is divided into two phases: the journey into exile (*in itinere exilii*), and the arrival at his final destination (*tandem positus*

---

131 *hos dispariter natos pariter ad literas apposuit pater eorum. Met. Acc. 5-6.*
132 *Cumque in minoribus essent eruditii dedit eis magistrum in arte rethorica. Met. Acc. 6-7.*
133 *Deposito autem tribunatu et mortuo fratre suo, rogatu Maximiani Romani principis et aliorum Romanorum ut famam suam maximam scribendo faceret. Met. Acc. 8-10.*
134 For clarity's sake, the titles of the works listed here are given in the accepted classical forms used in scholarly literature. The medieval titles and variants Arnulf uses are these: *Ovidius Heroidum* (also listed as *Ovidius Epistularum*), *Ouidius Amorum* (also listed as *Sine Titulo*), *Ouidius de Arte Amandi*, *Ouidius de Remedio Amoris*, *Ouidius Metamorphoseos*, *Ouidius Fastorum*, *Ouidius Tristium*, *Ouidius de Ponto*, and *Ouidius in Ibin.*
in exilio). The Tristia are said to have been written during the journey and Trist. 1. 7. 35-40 are quoted. The composition of the Ex Ponto is placed in exile as is that of the Ibis, which was written contra inuidium. Arnulf is uncertain whether Ovid died in exile or returned to Rome.\textsuperscript{135}

### 6.1.2 The Accessus to the Metamorphoses

The six remaining headings are addressed after the uita concludes. Arnulf supplies the full title in a typical medieval style: Ouidii Nasonis Metamorpheoseos liber primus incipit. In the same manner the commentator also adds that fifteen books in total comprise the poem: bene dicitur primus quia sequitur secundus, sunt enim XV. Before examining the etymology of metamorphoses, Arnulf discusses briefly the different ways a work can be titled by using examples from the plays of Terence and the De Amicitia of Cicero in a manner common to the accessus tradition. Possibilities include location, characters, an action of a character, or the subject matter of the work itself:

Titulus aliquando sumitur a loco unde Andria Terentii, id est comedia ab Andro, uel a persona ut Eunuchus et Formio, uel ab actu persone ut est Exauctontumerumenos, id est se ipsum excrucians, uel a materia ut Tullius De Amicicia.

"Sometimes a title is taken from a location, like Terence's Andria, that is to say a comedy from Andros, or from a character like Eunuchus and Phormio, or from the action of a character like the Heauton Timorumenos, which means 'self-punisher,' or from the subject matter like Tullius's De Amicitia."

\textsuperscript{135} Vtrum an mortuus fuerit in exilio uel non, nos nescimus.
Arnulf says the title, *Metamorphoses*, is drawn from the poem's subject matter and translates the Greek forms into Latin, while providing a grammatical note about inflection in Greek for his students, who were likely unfamiliar with Greek declensions:

> exponatur titulus sic: 'meta' Grece, 'de' Latine, 'morphe' id est 'mutacio', 'usios' 'substantia', quasi 'de mutatione substantie'. Et notandum quod Greci carentes ablatiuo loco eius utuntur genitiuo.

> "Let the title be explained like this: 'meta' is Greek for the Latin, 'de,' 'morphe' means 'mutatio,' and 'usios' is 'substantia,' just as if it were 'de mutatione substantie'. It must also be noted that Greek lacks the ablative and uses the genitive instead."

The analysis of the subject matter, *materia*, approaches three types of change (*mutatio*): natural, magical, and spiritual (*de naturali, de magica, de spirituali*). The natural aspects of the subject matter deal with the generative and degenerative properties of the elements when combined or pulled apart (*per contexionem elementorum uel retextionem*). Examples include a boy arising from sperm and a chick from an egg, or elements dissolving into another body through fire or decaying into dust. The magical properties deal with transformations that are corporeal not mental, such as those of Lycaon and Io. The spiritual encompasses transformations that are not bodily but deal with one's mental disposition, like Agaue and Autonoe, where insanity can become sanity and vice-a-versa.

The commentator further categorizes the types of transformations which occur in the poem: an animate object becomes another animate object (e.g. Lycaon into a wolf), an inanimate object into another inanimate object (Baucis' house into a temple), an inanimate object into an animate object (Pygmalion's statue into a maiden), and an animate object into an inanimate object (the serpent into a rock, as in *Met.* 10). This is
taken as further proof that the transformation of things is the poem's subject matter (mutatio igitur rerum est sua materia).

Arnulf then moves to Ovid's authorial intention, discussing it more abstractly in terms of change. The schoolmaster advances a theory of the poet's twofold intention for his audience: change should not only be understood as an extrinsic idea but also as an intrinsic one. It is here where a Christian element first enters the discussion:

Intentio sua est de mutatione dicere ut non intelligamus de mutatione que fit extrinseco tantum in rebus corporeis bonis uel malis, sed etiam de mutatione que fit intrinseco ut in anima ut reducat nos ab errore ad cognitionem nostri creatoris.

"Speaking about change is his intention, so we don't only understand change that occurs on the outside in physical bodies, good or bad, but that we also understand change that happens on the inside like in the soul, to lead us back from error toward the thinking of Our Creator."

The explanation of rational and irrational movements within the soul follows the ways the student should think of transformation. These movements are then likened to those of the firmament (rational), which moves East to West and then West to East, and to the planets (irrational) which move against the firmament. Arnulf's allegorical and moralizing approaches manifest themselves as he explains that God gave reason to the soul to repress sensuality like the rational movement of the firmament represses the irrational movement of the planets. Furthermore, if one denies rational motion like the planets, he is turned against God.¹³⁶

¹³⁶ Nos uero rationabilem motum more planetarum negligentes, contra creatorem rapimur.
Arnulf places a great emphasis on Ovid's awareness of this fact, and truly wants the reader to think about the intrinsic movement of the soul, which is explained morally through the transformation of Io:

> Quod Ouidius uidens fabulosa narratione uult ostendere nobis motum anime qui fit intrinsecus. Ideo dicitur Io mutata in uaccam quia corruit in uicia, ideo dicitur Io pristinam formam recepisse quia emersit a uiciis.

"Since Ovid sees this, he wants to show us through a narration of fables the movement of the soul that occurs on the inside. Just as Io is said to have been transformed into a heifer because she fell into vice, in the same way she is said to have regained her beautiful shape because she rose up from vice."

An alternate, and no less moralizing, authorial intention follows, in which Ovid seeks to call the reader back from an immoderate love for *temporalia* (worldly concerns) and urge him toward the one true way of his Creator. This is achieved by showing the reader the stability of the heavenly bodies and the variance of *temporalia*.

Arnulf assigns the poem to the philosophical category *ethice*, in which most classical works are placed. The reasoning is to teach the reader to despise the *temporalia* as if they were transitory and changeable, because ultimately the work pertains to mortality.

Two further authorial intentions are appended after the discussion of the work's philosophical category. Both remove the work from the scope of Christian allegory and moralization, and situate the poem in a secular framework within its original milieu. The first is to prove that Julius Caesar actually was transformed into a star and deified. The second is simply to record briefly in a single volume all stories scattered throughout various texts.
The poem's usefulness for study is the final area examined in the *accessus*. Two possibilities are given: an understanding of all the stories gathered together compendiously, or gaining a knowledge of the divine from the transformation of the *temporalia*. Regardless of which is the work's usefulness, Arnulf draws attention to the author's strict ordering of the material in the creation myth of Book 1:

Talem seruat ordinem: ostendit generalem omnium elementorum confusionem, deinde eorundem distinctionem et que animalia in quibus habitent regionibus.

"He maintains this order: he shows the general confusion of all the elements, then the ordering of these same elements, and which animals dwell in which regions."

Although the *modus tractandi* is listed among the categories, it is not examined in any of the manuscripts which transmit the *accessus*. The closest parallel to any description of the work's didactic procedure falls under the *intentio*, where the instructional value of how Ovid wants one to think about transformation is discussed.¹³⁷

The final portion of the *accessus* follows the standard practice by identifying the poem's *proponatio, inuocatio, and narratio*. However, in the *catena* format manuscripts, which represent most accurately Arnulf's pedagogical technique and the commentary's initial utilitarian tradition, no quotations are given. M and V read only *proponit, inuocat, narrat*. This suggests that the missing quotations were probably supplied orally in the classroom during the lecture, and were likely committed to memory or expected to be.

¹³⁷ Minnis 1984, 21 says of *modus tractandi*, "Under this heading, commentators described the stylistic and rhetorical qualities of the authoritative text, always being concerned to bring out the instructional and pedagogic value of the literary medium."

¹³⁸ For example, the *accessus* transmitted in Burney 224 (B) lists the appropriate quotations for each section.
The final sentence, *littera sic exponatur* initiates the transition from the *accessus* to the philological *glosulae*.

### 6.1.3 Sources of Arnulf's *Accessus*

Arnulf may have drawn upon an earlier tradition of Ovidian *accessus* when composing his own, yet his *uita poetae* is regarded as the first true life of Ovid.\(^{139}\) There is, however, a group of five *accessus* to the *Metamorphoses* which are transmitted in three manuscripts dating from the eleventh through twelfth centuries that contain material similar to sections of Arnulf's *accessus*.\(^{140}\) *Accessus* 1 and 2 do not provide a life of Ovid, and only address the categories *materia, intentio auctoris, utilitas,* and *cui parti philosophiae supponatur*. *Accessus* 3 and 5 transmit a *uita poetae* but it only resembles Arnulf in information regarding the poet's geographical origin and familial relations which were gleaned easily from autobiographical sections of his poetry, namely *Amores*.

---

\(^{139}\) See Fausto Ghisalberti "Medieval Biographies of Ovid," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 9 (1946), 10-59; Ghisalberti discusses Arnulf's life of Ovid throughout the article; for Ghisalberti's account of knowledge of Ovid available in the Middle Ages see 26-44; and also Bruno Nogara 'Di alcune vite e commenti medioevali di Ovidio,' in Miscellanea Ceriani raccolta di scritti prigioniani per enorare la memoria di M. Antonio Maria Ceriani prefetto della Biblioteca Ambrosiana, ed. Ulrico Hoepli (Milan, 1910), 413-431, esp. 416; extracts also appear in Paule Demats, *Fabula. Trois études de mythographie antique et médiévale* (Geneva, 1973), 189-190.

\(^{140}\) See Karl Young, "Chaucer's Appeal to the Platonic Deity," *Speculum* 19:1 (1944), 1-13; Young has transcribed, emended, and provided some sources for the *accessus* which he numbers 1-5 on pp. 4-10, though it must be noted that Young's concern is Platonic comments which appear in the *accessus* and their possible influence on Chaucer, not Arnulf. The shelfmarks and folio numbers are: (Acc. 1) München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm. 4610, fols. 61v-62r, (Acc. 2) clm. 14482, fol. 2r, (Acc. 3) clm. 14482, fols. 12r-12v, (Acc. 4) clm. 14482, fols. 27r-27v, (Acc. 5) clm. 14809, fols. 65r-66v. Young mentions that the three *accessus* in clm. 14482 each preface separate commentaries, but does not provide *incipits* or any descriptive details of their format or content.

Of the five *accessus*, numbers 4 and 5 bear the most probable possibilities for influence, especially in discussing the work's *materia*. Like Arnulf, they describe the types of metamorphosis (natural, magical, spiritual) with a strong Boethian influence, and use the transformations of Lycaon, the house of Baucis, Pygmalion's statue, and the serpent of Book 10 to illustrate the different combinations of animate/inanimate object metamorphoses.

With these exceptions, Arnulf's *accessus* is largely independent and distinguishes itself from the others. The Christianizing element is also more pervasive in the other *accessus* though it is prevalent in Arnulf's version. Also, in the etymology of *metamorphoses*, *accessus* 3 glosses *morphoseon* as *formatio*, and 3 and 4 gloss *morphos(e/i)os* as *transformatio*. Arnulf, however, separates the word into *morphe* and *usios*, glossing them as *mutatio substantie*, which explains the title as pertaining to the transformation of essence, and evokes a more Aristotelian approach to the work.

It is most likely that Arnulf did not draw directly from these texts, but rather the ideas in these five *accessus* were already part of the *accessus* tradition which Arnulf encountered.

**6.2 The Glosulae**

Arnulf's glosses are primarily of a grammatical and philological nature, which emphasize a clear and lucid understanding of the *sensus ad litteram* of the *Metamorphoses*. In this section of the commentary, Arnulf is not concerned with a more
abstract interpretation of the text, which is found in the *Allegoriae*. The glosses address numerous areas which are often problematic to elementary readers of Latin: morphology, grammar, syntax, geographical locales, mythological references, patronymics and matronymics, and the general ability to understand clearly the expression of ideas conveyed by the Latin. However, not all of the commentator's glosses are overtly pedantic; both the structure of the *Metamorphoses* as a whole, textual *cruces*, and textual variations are also treated in the *glosulae*. Due to the large amount of glosses it is impractical to list every occurrence of each type of gloss. The analysis which follows will provide a representative selection to illustrate clearly Arnulf's approaches.

### 6.2.1 Grammar, Syntax, and Morphology

In explanations of grammar, syntax, and morphology, grammatical terminology is used frequently throughout the commentary. Some examples of terms include: *ablatius* *absolutus*, *datius* *aquisitius* (7. 306; 9. 312), *patronymicum* (4. 1; 5. 125, 236), *declinatur* (for declining nouns), *neutraliter* and *neutrum* (for the neuter gender), *femininum* and *masculinum* (for the feminine and masculine genders), *imperfectum*, *nominatius*, *genitius*, *datius*, *accusatius*, *ablattius* (with or without *locus* for the cases of nouns and adjectives), *adverbium* and *adverbialiter*, *nomen* (7. 186/a) and *proprium nomen*, and *participium* (7. 186/a).

Many glosses dealing with grammar and morphology are extremely brief, and often utilize the *catena* format's close syntactical relationship between lemma and gloss to illustrate the concept in question. In these terse examples, there is no explanation of the concepts or discussion of the lemma's context within the appropriate passage.
Consider a gloss comprised of only two words at 7. 509: "eat utinam." The particle *utinam* is added to the lemma *eat* in order to identify the independent use of the subjunctive as the Optative of Wish, without explaining the construction or using grammatical terminology. A similar method, which employs grammatical language, is used at 7. 643: "damno uerbum est." The commentator tells the student "*damno* is a verb," to avoid confusion between other possible forms of *damno*: either the first person, singular, present, active indicative form of the verb *damno, damnare*, or the dative/ablative singular form of *damnum, -i, neuter*. Met. 7. 643 reads *Somnus abit. damno uigilans mea uisa queorqu e*, and does not mark clearly the change of subject with a pronoun in enclitic position, so confusion could arise easily to elementary readers of the text. Alternate forms are treated in a similar manner which expects a certain breadth of knowledge on the student's part. For example, at 3. 639 ("*fore futurum esse*") the regular form of the future, active infinitive is supplied for the alternate form, *fore*.

In other instances, short explanations, ways to illustrate the concept and situate meaning into the context of the line accompany the gloss. Compare 7. 166: "*summa hec summa, huius (sum)me,*" and 7. 327: "*ea neutraliter scilicet que intus erant posita.*" The first gloss shows that *summa* is feminine, singular through declension of the modifying forms of *hic, haec, hoc* in the nominative and genitive cases. 7. 317 identifies *ea* as the neuter-plural form and connects it with the relative pronoun to situate in the context of the line, which discusses how poisoning weakens the limbs of the body.

When the vocabulary is more unusual or the construction is more complex, longer, more detailed explanations appear in the gloss alongside grammatical
terminology. One example treats an unusual word, *anas, anatis*, f. (duck), which does not have a high frequency in Classical Latin.\(^{141}\)

11. 773. *Anas* Anatis proprium nomen est cuiusdam aui, sed femine; tantum masculinus uero dicitur 'masculinus anas' et declinatur nominativuo 'hic masculinus Anas,' genitiuo 'huius masculini Anatis.'

"Anas, Anatis is the proper name of a certain bird, but it's the female. Yet, the male is actually called *masculinus anas*, and it is declined *hic masculinus anas* in the nominative, and *huius masculini anatis* in the genitive."

Words of Greek origin are also singled out for comment in the same way, when morphology is an issue (not the etymology of a word or a Latin word of Greek derivation). Specifically, nouns which are transliterated directly from Greek into Latin and are declined using the Greek endings: "*nimpha* nominativius Grecus est," (9. 89).

The student is apprised that *nimpha* is a Greek nominative, which illustrates aptly the use of -*e* in Latin for -*η* in Greek, as the feminine, nominative, singular form.

Similarly, patronymics, matronymics, types of ethnonyms, and words that are likely Ovidian coinages or *hapax legomena* provide further examples of the commentator's approach to the meaning of unusual vocabulary and its morphology. The following seven examples show glosses which address patronymics and matronymics:\(^{142}\)

4. 1 *Mineias* patrononomicum femininum
7. 10 *Oethias* filia Oete et est patrononomicum femininum in -as.
7. 296 ab Oetide Medea filia Oete.
7. 105 *Ophias* filia Ophii.

\(^{141}\) In addition to *Met.* 11. 773 forms of *anas, anatis* appear in Cic. N. D. 2.48.124; Plin. 25.2.3.S6; and Varro, *R. R.* 3.5.14, and 3.11.1.

\(^{142}\) Other examples include 5. 125, 236.
7. 386 *Latoidos* id est Diane.
7. 484 *Asopides* Eacus nepos Asopi ex parte matris.
11. 198 *Panopeo* a nomine fundatoris.

4. 1 and 7. 10 use explicitly the term *patronymicum femininum* (feminine patronymic).

7. 10 provides a brief interpretation of *Oethias* as the "daughter of Aetees" as well as specifies the nominative termination in -as, where 4. 1 only gives the grammatical term.

7. 296, 7. 105, 7. 386, 7. 484, and 11. 198 do not use the grammatical term, but provide either the proper name, an explanation of the patronymic, or both. Ethnonyms and words of Ovidian coinage receive only slightly more detailed explanations, which also elucidate the meaning of the word and provide some information relevant to the context of the lemma. A few examples are:

4. 12 *ignigenam* id est a Ioue genitum qui est superior ignis; uel quia ex fulmine extractus est.
5. 268 *Mermonidas* a Mnenonida regione uel *mernonidas* quia secundum quasdam filie fuerunt Memnonis et Tespice secundum alios Iouis et Memorie.
7. 74 *Persei* des a Persis populi qui in arte magica ualentes ipsam colunt que dea est ueneficii.
7. 105 *eripedes* quia duros habebant pedes quasi de ere essent.
7. 365 *Iasalios* loco in quo habitant Telechine fratres.

Not all glosses covering grammatical content are as brief as the previous sample may indicate. Other examples demonstrate a strong knowledge of Classical Latin grammatical constructions, as well as combinations of other useful information such as textual variants, descriptive information, and advanced concepts dealing (sometimes erroneously) with philology and linguistics. Arnulf's gloss to *Met.* 7. 306, where the
daughters of Pelias want Medea to restore his youth, illustrates his approaches to classical grammar combined with textual variation:

Met. 7. 306:  idque petunt pretium iuuenis sine pacisci.  (Arnulf’s text)
Tarrant: 143 idque petunt pretiumque iubent sine pacisci
Pretiumque iubent  $\Delta B$: pretium iuuenis ($uel –es$) $M^2U^E \Sigma (F^o)$

7. 306  idque petunt sic construe ‘et petunt a Medea’; pacisci id est ut paciscatur; iuuenis petunt ut faciat pactum pro iuuenae faciendo; uel iuuenes id est puelle.  id precium amicicie quam erga eas simulabat id est in remunerationem amicicie.  iuueni iuentuti Pelie neutraliter intellege sicut honestum pro honestate, ita iuuenae pro iuuentute; nam hic iuuenis et hoc iuuenae declinatur; uel ita petunt precium sine fine id est incessanter.  pacisci precium ab ipsis scilicet precium accipere pro pacto.  iuueni datiuus aquisitiuus; id est ad opus iuuenis, id est iuuenescendi patris sui, Pelias.

"Construe and they seek it as 'and they beg Medea'; to bargain [deponent present infinitive] means 'to strike a bargain' [jussive noun clause]; the youths [nominative plural i-stem] beg her to strike a bargain for creating youth.  Or youths [nominative plural feminine] means 'girls.' that price for friendship which she feigned for them, means 'for the recompense for friendship.' Understand for the youth [substantive adjective] as 'for the youth' [abstract quality] of Pelias; just as repute [substantive adjective in the neuter] is used for repute [abstract noun in the feminine], in the same way youth [substantive adjective in the neuter] is used for youth [abstract noun in the feminine]; because the forms are declined hic iuuenis [masculine singular] and hoc iuene [neuter singular].  Or they sought a price in this way without end means 'incessantly'.  the price was bargained by themselves, of course means 'accepting the price for the deal'.  iuueni is the Dative Aquisitiuus [grammatical construction]; that is to say 'for the work of youth,' meaning 'for rejuvenating their father, Pelias."

As printed above, either version of the line in the Metamorphoses is problematic grammatically. The gloss seeks to guide the student through understanding the sense of the passage, and then the possible variant readings. The gloss first retains the connective

143 Tarrant (ed.) 2004, 192.
force of –que and employs the classical construction of a or ab with the ablative used with peto when introducing an indirect command. Furthermore, the deponent infinitive pacisci is glossed as a jussive noun clause, ut paciscatur, which serves as the object of petunt in accordance with Latin grammar when peto governs an indirect command. The sense becomes "and they ask Medea to strike a bargain." Arnulf's gloss to iuuenis retains the jussive sense of the line as he tells the reader: "they ask her to make a deal for creating youth." An explanation of a textual variant iuuenes, is appended to the gloss: "or iuuenes means the girls" (i.e. the daughters of Pelias). Arnulf proceeds to further gloss the possible ways of construing the problematic passage with particular emphasis on substantive use of adjectives in the neuter, the adverbial meaning of the prepositional phrase sine fine, reading the deponent pacisci as a passive form with the Ablative of Personal Agent ab ipsis, and an explanation of the construction datius aquisitus.

Other examples display a combined approach to unusual forms, and often list several possible reasons to explain the form:

3. 46 Phenicas tres fuerunt fratres: Phenix a quo dicta est Phenicia regio, et Cilix a quo dicta Cilicia, et Cadmus qui condidit Thebas; isti tres missi fuerunt pro sorore querenda quam tamen non inuenerunt; uel Phenices dicti sunt a rubris capillis, 'pheniceos' enim Grece 'rubrum' Latine, postea mutata est 'e' in 'u' et ablata 'h', dicti sunt 'Punices', deinde causa breuitatis dicti sunt 'Puni'.

"Phenicas were three brothers: Phoenix, from whom the region Phoenicia takes its name, and Cilix, from whom Cilicia is named, and Cadmus, who founded Thebes. Those three were sent to find their sister, whom they never found. Or Phenices takes its name from red hair, which in Greek is pheniceos and rubrum in Latin. After the e is changed into a u and the h is removed, the word was Punices. Then it became Puni for brevity's sake."
7. 398 Tytaniacis a Tytane id est orientalibus ibi enim plus ualet ueneficium et ponitur 'Tytaniacis' pro magicis quasi quos arte magica sibi adduxerat; uel Tytaniacis id est curru Lune que fuit de genere Titanorum; uel dracones currum eius trahebant anguinos pedes habentes; uel Titaniacis id est celestibus quia per aerem, que est uia <Titanis>, cursum faciunt.

"Tytaniacis is from 'Titan' that is to say 'Eastern'. Because there sorcery thrives more and 'Tytaniacis' is used for 'magical,' just as if she drew them to herself with the skill of magic. Or Tytaniacis is the chariot of Luna, who was from the race of the Titans. Or since they had snake-like feet, dragons were dragging her chariot; Or Titaniacis means 'celestial' because they ply their course through the lower-atmosphere,\textsuperscript{144} which is the roadway for Titan."

Both 3. 46 and 7. 398 use a variety of approaches to explain the unusual forms, and give several alternate examples introduced by uel. The commentator is consistent in his attempts to explain the forms in both grammatical and contextual fashions. Both approaches provide a general background knowledge of the form and its meaning, and also relate the form to the specific context in its relevant passage.

\textbf{6.2.2 Etymology and Synonyms}

Etymology is another common approach used throughout the glosses, and is employed similarly to many of the examples covering unusual vocabulary and forms in section 6.1.2. However, in the etymological examples, Arnulf refrains from using grammatical terminology, and rather prefers to list the lexical entry for the parent word (introduced by \textit{a} or \textit{ab}) and provide a contextual explanation. The words chosen for comment are not always of a highly unusual nature or rare occurrence, but rather words whose etymologies the commentator believes are useful to the students' contextual

\textsuperscript{144} aer as lower atmosphere as opposed to the \textit{aether}, which is the upper atmosphere.
understanding of a passage. For example, *Met.* 4. 11-12 contains many references to Bacchus which receive etymological comment:

4. 11  *Bachum* a 'bachor, -ris' quia insani sunt qui inebriantur. *Bromium* a 'bromin' quod est 'comedere'. Bachus enim dat appetitum comedendi, inde etiam dicitur 'bruma' quia tunc melius comedimus. *Lieus* lienis pars est intestinorum, splen scilicet, unde risus procedit et inde liem qui ebrii semper rident. uel liem fex est uel lieus dicitur a ligo -as.  

"Bachum is from *bachor*-ris, because drunk people are insane. *Bromium* is from 'bromin' which is 'the state of consuming entirely,' because Bacchus gives the desire for consumption in this manner; then it even becomes 'bruma' because then we consume better [during the Winter Solstice]. *Lieus*: the 'lien' is part of the intestines, namely the spleen, from where laughter comes; and thence *lieus* means people who are drunk and always laugh; or 'lien' is 'dregs' or 'lieus' derives from 'ligo, ligas'."

Arnulf, using both etymologies and contextualized comments, provides enough information for the students to associate Bacchus with the usual aspects of the Bacchic orgia (which appear at 4. 1 and are also glossed): drunkenness, revelry, gluttonous behavior, and frenzied laughter. The etymologies also broaden the students' vocabulary through the introduction of the new forms *bachor, bromin, bruma, and lien*.

Other examples can be terse and only provide the etymology and a brief gloss, or may also utilize precise grammatical terms to convey the general sense:

3. 75  *rasa* squamis exasperata, a 'rado, -dis'.  
3. 140  *herili* ab 'herus, heri'.  
7. 157  *auctorem* non est uerbale, sed ab 'autentin' quod est auctoritas deriatur.  
7. 271  *prosecta* uiscera a 'proseco, -cas'.  
7. 364  *agmen* exercitus ab 'ago, -gis'.  
7. 765  *pauere* timuere a 'paueo, paues'; uel a 'pasco, pascis'.

---

145 uel...ligo -gas BW: om. cet.
11. 132 *Lenee* Bache; a 'leniendo' quia lenit curas; uel a 'lenoi' quod est 'lacus'.

Etymologies are also given for Latin words which have Greek origins. In such instances, the Greek words are explained by the appropriate Latin translation, and sometimes contextual or background information accompanies the etymology. In all occurrences throughout the commentary, Greek forms are never written in Greek characters, but are always transliterated into the Latinized versions. They can be as brief as 11. 635:

*Morphea* ita dictum a 'morphe' quod est 'mutatio'.

"*Morphea* is so taken from 'shape' which means 'transformation'."

Or the explanations may be as detailed as 7. 174, which lists the lexical entry for the Greek form, explains the derivation through the Latinized equivalent, adds possible explanations of meaning, and even provides brief mythological background information.¹⁴⁶

*Hecate* Hecates, Grece, centum Latine, 'hec-' dicitur quia centum habet potestates; uel insepultorum occisorum animas centum annos errare sinat; uel quia Ulixes centum uictimis eam placauit, Tyresia eum ad inferos ducente.

"*Hecate* Hecates. *hec-* is Greek for the Latin *centum* because she has one hundred powers; or she may allow the souls of the unburied dead to wander for a hundred years; or because Ulysses appeased her with a hundred sacrificial victims while Tyresius guided him to the Underworld."

---

¹⁴⁶ Similarly also at 1. 14: "*Amphitrites* id est Neptunus uel ipsum mare, ab 'amphi' quod est 'circum' et 'triton' quod est 'sonans' uel 'terens', quia in lyttoribus mare sonat et littora terit."
Numerous words are explained not through their etymologies, but simplistically through the use of synonyms. Often one or two synonyms are written directly after the lemma in syntactic agreement, and sometimes are introduced with *id est* or *scilicet* though there is no consistency in the use of these expressions with synonyms. As for the brevity of synonym glosses, it must be inferred that the commentator felt that the lemma was a problematic vocabulary word, which the student would not readily recognize or be able to interpret in the given context. When the gloss provides synonyms, it likely represents the vocabulary with which the student should have been readily familiar. Synonyms are used so often in the glosses, that a few examples should illustrate the approach clearly:

7. 77  *reluxit* reaccensa fuit.
7. 173 *transcribere* transmutare.
7. 243 *eigesta* euacuata.
11. 4  *de uertice* id est summitate.
11. 72 *traxit* extendit.
15. 169 *signatur* figuratur.

6.2.3 Rhetoric and Rhetorical Features

Rhetoric is addressed mainly from a stylistic approach. Rhetorical figures of speech are identified and briefly explained. In dealing with rhetorical features, the examples chosen for comment are those which can affect the sense of the passage if one is unaware that a figure of speech is being used. Ultimately, the commentator is still focused intently on conveying the *sensus ad litteram* to the student, while beginning to build a more advanced knowledge of rhetorical features and their meaning. Rhetorical
features identified for comment include apokope, argumentum a maiori parte, hypallage, metaphor, and synecdoche. Hypallage seems to be a particular favorite of Arnulf and is glossed more frequently than other figures of speech. This may be due to the way in which switching the cases of modifiers confounds the students' expectation of a more sensical noun-adjective agreement, and likely does so frequently. The correct interpretation of passages using hypallage may have been a frequent area of confusion within Arnulf's classroom. He addresses this aspect with pedantic repetition to ensure that the students understand the text correctly. Examples of glosses mentioning rhetorical figures of speech are:

1.1 ...sed fiat ypallage sic formas mutatas in noua corpora
3. 341 fidem pro fidei per apocapam.
7. 1 puppe sinodoche.
7. 60 mutasse uelim ypallage, id est dedisse res tocius mundi mutando pro eo.
9. 459 circumdet brachia ypallage, id est circumdet collum brachiis.
9. 590 aura id est voluntas; methafora est sumpta a nauigantibus.
11. 37 cornuque minaci diuellere boues id est cornua a bobus et est ypallage.
15. 175 sanguine feror equore id est plenariam et alteram incepi predicationem; metaphorast.

Aside from a systematic listing and contextualized explanation of rhetorical features, Arnulf examines stylistically the use of rhetorical language in Ovid's proem to the Metamorphoses.

147 Also known as the locus. Cf. ps. Cicero, Rhetorica ad Herennium 2. 20.32.
148 hendiadys appears at 15. 131 only in manuscripts F and Z, which is an addition to this Florentine strain of the commentary. To 15. 131 F and Z add: "et est endyadis; endyadis enim est quedam figura scilicet secundum monis inproprietias quin duo substantiua sub eadem uel sub diversa locutione ponuntur ita quod alterim sine translatione resoluitur in adiectiuum utroque sub eodem casu remaneret ut hic pateris libuit et auro id est aureis pateris id est aureis uasis."
1. 1: *In noua fert animus* id est desiderat; uel *fert* me ad hoc ut uelim *dicere* id est canere. Nam prosaicorum est dicere et rethorum, canere poetarum.

"*into new things the spirit brings* that is to say 'it desires'; or it *carries* me toward this point, namely that I would want *to speak*, meaning *sing*. Because 'speaking' is for prose writers and rhetors, 'singing' is for poets."

Significant detail is given to the interpretation of the first phrase before the caesura. Arnulf highlights the absence of a statement of the poet's volition or desire, then explicitly the absence of the first person. Through the continuous reading offered by the *catena* format, the commentator then comments on the use of *dicere* in a hexametric poem. He feels the poet should *want to sing*, although that is not what the poet has written.\textsuperscript{149} To Arnulf, Ovid's use of language does not meet the reader's expectations of hexametric or epic poetry. In turn, the gloss also highlights a deviation from the normal poetic model. The most accessible evidence of a model for comparison is the opening of two Virgilian poems in hexameter: the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, which were both well known throughout the Middle Ages in their own right and through the commentary of Servius. To date, Arnulf is not known to have commented on either work of Virgil, but that does not exclude the more likely possibility that he was intimately familiar with both texts, and he does draw upon the commentaries of Servius.

In the two Virgilian models, the use of language is fitted aptly to the expectations of Arnulf's gloss: *hinc canere incipiam* (Georg. 1. 1. 5) and *arma uirumque cano* (Aen. 1. 1). Both examples use the first person singular and the verb *canere*. The Ovidian line

\textsuperscript{149} There are no textual variants known for *dicere* in *Met*. 1. 1.
stands in stark contrast to the Virgilian model. Even in beginning his poem about change, Ovid has enacted change already. The reference to the first person is completely absent until *meis* of the third line, although Arnulf feels the need to insert the sense of a statement in first person into the poem's opening line.

Furthermore, the gloss to *dicere* creates a tension between the relationship of speaking and singing as well as between rhetors and poets. Stylistically, it invokes the rhythmic versus the metric, and also the rhetorical versus the poetic, one *ars* set against another. Arnulf does not expound further on these tensions, as the purpose of these glosses is *littera exponatur*, not a more advanced interpretation of the text. The gloss, as it stands is sufficient enough for his own purposes, and thus concludes his comments about the rhetorical use of language in *Met. 1. 1.*

**6.2.4 Geography and Topography**

Specific geographical locales in the form of proper place names, their adjectival forms, and the names of peoples and cities and a localization of their respective regions comprise the majority of the glosses treating geography. Etymologies are provided inconsistently as are mythological references or brief extracts of myths dealing with the relevant location, especially foundation myths when applicable. Several geographical locales are glossed by their associations with a particular god or deity; for example,

---

150 Cicero uses *dicere* when beginning to establish his own program in numerous *exordia* of his orations.

151 The phrase precedes the opening of the glosses after the *accessus* concludes.

152 For example at 5. 145 where Palestine is glossed as "regio est Iudeorum".
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Aganippe is glossed as "the valley or spring of the Muses" (5. 312). In other instances, entire populations are characterized by particular qualities associated with their regions, i.e. the people of Thrace are lasciu (6. 459). The identification of topographical features such as mountains, islands, valleys, rivers, straits, and other bodies of water also appear frequently. Topography is not limited to natural features but also includes those of man's artifice, both ancient and medieval (via simile), such as temples, abbeys, and other structures, including the Pillars of Hercules (3. 145) and the temple of Zeus-Amun near the famed oasis (15. 309).

The aim of these glosses, like the others, stays true to Arnulf's pedagogical intent to provide enough information for the student to understand enough background information to comprehend the text smoothly. Despite geography's importance to the narrative structure of the Metamorphoses as whole, Arnulf does not make many structural comments on geographical features (but comments of this nature are not absent completely). In the style of many of the glosses, some are brief and succinct, while others are more lengthy and discursive.

Examples of geographical and topographical features include:

3. 145 utraque scilicet Oriente et Occidente; uel a Gadibus Bachi in Oriente et a Gadibus Herculis in Occidente.
3. 419 e Pario a Paro insula ubi marmor effoditur.
7. 1 Pegasea a Pegaso monte Grecie ubi factura fuit; uel Pegasea id est palladia id est consilio Palladis factura que dea est Pegasei fontis.

153 5. 312: "aganippe uallis est Musarum uel fons."
154 6. 459: "regionibus illis in unerem est id est in Tracia ubi sunt homines lasciui."
155 The commentator does address the structure of the poem as a whole, which is outlined in section 6.2.7.
Among the few medieval structures mentioned in the glosses is Mont Saint-Michel in Normandy. The island is known for its tidal influx, which allows passage from the coast via a land bridge only during low tide. Arnulf uses Mont Saint-Michel in a simile to explain the mention of low tide at Met. 7. 267:156

7. 267 refluum mare sicut in monte Sancti Michaelis.

This particular example relies upon the students’ familiarity with the tidal phenomena at Mont Saint-Michel in order to illustrate clearly the concept. It is likely that many in the schools of the Loire valley may have either seen the location or at least knew of it, as it was a common site for medieval pilgrimages.

6.2.5 Myth and Ritual

Since mythology and mythological references are used so frequently throughout the Metamorphoses, it is unsurprising that mythography is a large component of the

156 Met. 7. 267: et quas Oceani refluum mare lauit harenas.
glosses. Additionally, mythographical glosses are often lengthy in comparison to many others, due largely to the compendiose amount of medieval mythographical texts from which Arnulf was able to draw. Arnulf’s sources for mythology include primarily the Vatican Mythographers and Hyginus.\textsuperscript{157} The glosses provide mythological information to both direct and indirect references made in the \textit{Metamorphoses}. Usually no single authoritative version of a myth is recorded, but rather several different versions and brief extracts, which are introduced by \textit{uel} or phrases like \textit{secundum quosdam} and \textit{secundum alios}. Throughout the glosses, a known myth is referred to regularly as \textit{fabula} (8. 132; 9. 67; 10. 68, 92, 450; 15. 385 etc.) Arnulf’s intent remains the same in providing just enough information to guide the students' understanding of the text. Because these glosses are quite lengthy, we shall consider only a few which are representative of mythographic treatment. For example, an account of Maera at \textit{Met.} 7. 362 lists several variant myths and immediate digressions:

\begin{verbatim}
7. 362 Mera conuiciata est diis, ideo mutata est in canem; uel de Hecuba matre Hectoris legatur que binomia fuit; uel de Mera quadam uxorre Herculis potest legi quam duo filii eius patre absente prostitutuerunt. Hercules uero reuersus duos filios interfecit, mater quoque pre dolore mutata est in canem, hoc factum expiari non potuit quousque deuictis Lacedemoniis templum constituit et filias nobilium immolari fecit, denique Helena illuc sorte ducta uenit et aquila eam rapuit sicque probatum est deos posse placari et Helenam Iouis esse filiam per aquilam.

"Mera is a reviler against the gods, and so was transformed into a dog; or 'Mera' should be taken from Hecuba, the mother of Hector, who had two names; or it could be read from 'Mera,' a certain wife of Hercules. Her two sons prostituted her when her father was away. When Hercules returned, he killed the two sons; the mother was also turned into a dog
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{157} These, along with other sources, are discussed in detail in section. 6.2.10.
due to her grief. This action could not have been atoned for until he founded a temple after the Lacedaemonians were conquered, and caused the daughters of the nobility to be sacrificed. Finally, Helen came there after she drew her lot, and the eagle snatched her away. And in this way it was proved that the gods were placated and Helen was Jove's daughter through the eagle."

In the following example, Arnulf gives what he would consider the authoritative version of a myth, but then also provides the rendering of other scholars on the subject:

7.369 *quam pater Alcidamas* Alcidamas natam habuit que, cum a deo concepisset patre suo ignorante, miseratone deorum, ne a patre perciperetur, mutata est in columbam; uel secundum alios *<Alcidamas>* et filia sua cultores Veneris fuerunt optantes ut neuter mortem alterius [mortem] uideret et deinde mutate sunt in columbam et ideo columbe dicuntur trahere currum Veneris.

"*quam pater Alcidamas* Alcidamas had a daughter who, since she became pregnant by a god without her father knowing, was changed into a dove due to the pity of the gods so she wasn't discovered by her father; or according to others Alcidamas and his daughter were worshipers of Venus. They hoped neither would see the other's death and thenceforth were transformed into dove<s>. So because of this, doves are said to draw the chariot of Venus."

The famous punishments of Tantalus, Ixion, Sisiphus, and the Belides in the Underworld as well as the fate of Prometheus in *Met.* 10. 42ff. are further examples of Arnulf's approach to the mythographical indoctrination of his pupils. In these glosses, the information is more compressed and presented succinctly. No alternative versions are provided, but rather only a outline of the transgression and punishment of each offender.

In addition to mythography, the glosses address briefly specific elements of myth and ritual like festival practices and magic. The accounts of the specific practices differ
from other related glosses which provide only a brief mention of a location for a particular god's rites. Consider a gloss explaining the Bacchic orgia from Met. 4:

4.1 orgia propria sacra Bachi sicut Phiteia Apollinis, id est ex bonis terre: or Greece, 'bonum' Latine, ge, 'terra'. In sacris siquid Bachi multum annone et uini fundebatur; uel 'orge' id est cultura. Vnde georgica et sacra Bachi ad culturam anime pertinent.

"orgia are the particular rites of Bacchus, just as the Phiteia are those of Apollo, meaning 'from the good of the earth.' or is Greek for the Latin 'bonum,' and 'ge' for 'terra'. In the rites of Bacchus, if at all, the yearly produce and wine were poured out in abundance; or 'orge' means 'cultura'. For that reason husbandry and the rites of Bacchus pertain to the cultivation of the soul."

The gloss primarily situates a ritual practice to its appropriate god, Bacchus, then through the use of simile provides a correlating example to the rites of Apollo. Etymology of the unfamiliar Greek form, orgia, is used to elucidate the form's meaning, which then explains the particulars of the rites. The alternate gloss, cultura, departs from a mere account of the practices to the larger significance of the rite. The function of 4.1 is more than solely erudition, for the information allows the student to understand the structural force of orgia at the beginning of Book 4. The end of Book 3 narrates the story of Pentheus complete with Bacchic frenzy, and the final lines (Met. 3. 732-33) begin a description of women frequenting noua sacra, burning incense, and worshiping the Ismenides aras.

In addition to 4.1 and other references to Bacchic rites also occur (11. 28, 93 etc.), such as a description of Bacchant dress (11. 3) and the Maenads (11. 22). Other Greco-Roman religious practices mentioned include sacrifices to Pan and other gods of the rustic pantheon (8. 276), Hecate (7. 175), Vesta (15. 730, 776), the worship of Zeus-
Amun (15. 306), and prophecies of the Cumaean Sibyl (15. 712). Festivals and other rites include the Hyacinthia (10. 218), Adonia (10. 726), and festival of Cybele (11. 106). For magic and sorcery, the representative glosses occur in *Met.* 7. 188ff. during Medea's spell, which cryptically detail her ritualized movements (7. 189), and the invocations of Nox (7. 192), Hecate (7. 194), the specific locations for the herbs (7. 197), and the *di nemorum* and *di noctis* (7. 197). Some additional references to magical arts and sorcery include those at 7. 74, 398, 406; 10. 397; 11. 314; 15. 360; etc. The vocabulary used to denote these qualities are the nouns *uenefica* and *ueneficium*, the adjectives *ueneficus*, *a*, *um*, and *magicus*, *a*, *um*, and the term *ars magica*.

Particularly in *Met.* 9 glosses occur which detail mythology and genealogy of Egyptian gods (9. 684, 693), and religious rites and cult practices: Bubastis, the location (9. 645) and deity (9. 691), the Apis Bull (9. 691), the rites of Isis (9. 692, 694), and the worship of Aesclepius and serpentine iconography (9. 694). Association of Egyptian deities with Roman gods such as Ceres (9. 689), and Anubis with Mercury (9. 690) are also found in this section of the glosses.

### 6.2.6 Philosophy, Astronomy, the Calendar, and Science

Philosophical interpretations are few within the glosses, in keeping with Arnulf's aim of fostering a literal understanding of the text. Arnulf draws upon sources typical of medieval commentators like Aristotelis Latinus, Macrobius's commentary on the *Somnium Scipionis*, and the *Astronomica* of Hyginus, among others.

When Arnulf chooses to apply philosophy to Ovid's text, he does so in a manner concerned more with literal interpretation than discursive comment. The first occurrence
of Arnulf's use of philosophy is his quotation of Aristotle (Cat. v 4b, 3-5) to "correct"

Ovid's "misuse" of vocabulary in Met. 1. 1:

 formas mutatas in noua corpora per naturam rerum hoc negatur fieri posse, quia res unius predicamenti nulla ratione efficitur res alterius predicamenti. Sed sic legetur quia forme qualitates sunt, corpora uero substantie; si uero diceremus formas mutari in corpora, non posset fieri, quia iam qualitates uerterentur in substantias, sed fiat ypallage: scilicet formas mutatas in noua corpora, id est corpora mutata in nouas formas quia circa corpora habent fieri diuerse forme et cetere qualitates et actiones et passiones; unde Aristotelis: "sola substantia susceptibilis est contrariorum secundum se"; uel aliter formas mutatas in nouas formas et corpora mutata in noua corpora.

"forms changed into new bodies: through the nature of matter it is said this is not possible, because the matter of one category is not rationally effected as the condition of another category. But it will be read in this way because forms are qualities, bodies are really essences; if we were actually to say forms were transformed into bodies, it wouldn't be possible, since qualities would already be turned into essences, but let there be a hypallage: namely, formas mutatas in noua corpora means bodies were changed into new forms, because in terms of bodies, different forms and the remaining qualities and actions and sufferings have a state of becoming. So Aristotle says: 'essence alone is accepting of opposition in and of itself.' Or otherwise: forms were changed into new forms and bodies were changed into new bodies."

The gloss approaches the lemma clearly in terms of the specific meaning of technical vocabulary which is glossed as a use of hypallage, a rhetorical figure of speech.

Arnulf uses the Aristotelian quotation to strengthen his own interpretation, and then paraphrases the idea in more simple language for the student. The use of technical

---

158 predicamentum is used in later Latin to denote one of the ten categories of Aristotle. Cf. Aug. Conf. 4. 6, id. Trin. 5. 8, and Isid. 2. 16. 1 for its use in the plural, which is understood as a synonym for categoriae.
terminology is important to the commentator, such as his mention of the Macrobian
*aurea catena* in explaining intertwined nature of the elements.¹⁵⁹

Astronomy and the calendar also receive selective treatment.¹⁶⁰ In addition to the
movement of planets and the firmament which have already been discussed in the
*accessus*, the signs of the zodiac (1. 73; 2. 4; 10. 78, 127, 165;), solar motion (6. 571),
constellations (8. 181, 206, 207;), and their navigational uses (3. 595; 8. 208), the winds
(5. 285; 8. 2), the five parallels and zones (1. 45; 2. 129) and natural phenomena¹⁶¹ are
often singled out for comment. Calendar items like the year and durations of time (9.
286), seasons, (6. 439; 9. 91-2; 10. 165; 15. 125), other heavenly bodies (6. 571; 11. 296),
and particular events¹⁶² (7. 180; 6. 486; 8. 1) also appear briefly.

Arnulf, predictably, is concerned chiefly with passages which reference specific
astronomical phenomena, and in showing the significance of such references to the
interpretation of the text. Consider one of the glosses that details the description of the
palace of the Sun in Book 2:

2. 4 *bifores value* Cancer et Capricornus; de Cancro ad Capricornum
descendit, sol de capricorno ad Cancrum ascendit; uel *bifores* oriens et
occidens per equora ibi celata; notatur quod beneficio solis illuminentur
per celum, cursum solis, qui fit contra firmamentum.

"the double folding doors are Cancer and Capricorn. The sun
descends from Cancer toward Capricorn and ascends from Capricorn

---

¹⁵⁹ 1. 25: "...hanc elementorum ligaturam Macrobius appellat *auream catenam*.
¹⁶⁰ For a more detailed analysis of astronomy and the calendar in Arnulf's commentary to the
*Fasti* see Rieker 2005, xlvii-xlvi; and Marti 1958, xlv-xlviii for the *Bellum Civile*.
¹⁶¹ A notable example is a description of a solar eclipse at "4. 202-4: *nec tibi quod lunae unam*
causam eclipsis solis innuit. sol enim numquam patituri eclipsim nisi umbra terre soli sit
opposita."
¹⁶² Such as "springtide" at 7. 180: "*orbem quod est in plenilunio,*" and the official beginning of
the Spring season at 10. 165: "*piscique aries aquosos succedit* quia, cum sol de Pisce signo exiens
Arietem intrat, Ver incipit."
toward Cancer. Or two fold means East and West through the plain that was hidden there. It is noted that due to the aid of the sun they are illuminated through the sky, the sun's course, which occurs against the firmament."

The student is to interpret the bifores ualuae not as a physical double set of folding doors, but rather as the constellations Cancer and Capricorn. After the description of the sun's movements between the two signs, the commentator advances an alternate gloss for the ualuae as East and West, followed by another brief explanation.

The same approach can also be seen in Book 10, where Orpheus refuses sex with women after losing Eurydice for the second time. The section of the poem specifically references a particular duration:

\[
\text{tertius aequoreis inclusum Piscibus annum finierat Titan, omnemque refugerat Orpheus femineam Venerem... (Met. 10. 78-80).}
\]

"For the third time Titan enclosed the year in the sea Fish and had drawn it to a close. And Orpheus rejected all sexual love for women..."

The precise point in time and its duration are noted in the Classical Latin through solar motion (tertius...annum finierat Titan) and a particular sign of the zodiac (Piscibus). Arnulf's interpretation to his pupils is:

\[
10. 78 \text{ tertius aequoreis inclusum finitum piscibus signum est in celo quod dicitur pisces in quo signo est sol in Ianuario quasi diceret tertius annus erat cum iam a uenere abstinuerat feminea.}
\]
"tercius equoreis inclusum it was completed [by] the fish [which] is a sign in the sky that is called 'Pisces.' During January the sun is in this sign. Just as if he were to say, 'it was the third year when he [Orpheus] had already abstained from sexual love with women.'"

The relevant astronomical information is conveyed succinctly, complete with month and terminology. A less florid prose paraphrase follows the technical information introduced by the formulaic quasi diceret, as was the commentator’s practice in 1.1 (uel aliter...).

6.2.7 Structure of the Work

Although a structural analysis of the Metamorphoses is not Arnulf's main intention in the glosses, the concept does not escape his notice. He is aware of ways in which Ovid has structured the poem as a whole on a narrative level. Many of Arnulf’s glosses which reference the poem's structure do so through a close reading of the text. Arnulf cites Ovid's use of particular place names, patronymics, and other themes and motifs which correspond to other books and sections of the poem. Some glosses directly state the particular story in one book which the lemma of another references (often using a form of respicere), while others approach the structure more indirectly in terms of the transition from book to book. Brief and direct glosses include:

5. 342 micia respectu glandis qua utebatur primitus.
10. 92 innuba laurus ad fabulam respicit quia Daphne casta uersa fuit in eam.
15. 385 sidera portat ad fabulam respicit de Argo.

---

163 The manuscripts transmit a variety of months for when the sun is in pisces: in ianuario MV TF; in februario B; in martio W; in medio februrari et durat usque ad medium marci A
However, a gloss uses more extensively a geographical reference and a
patronymic to comment on the structural linkage between a section of Book 2 and the
demise of Orpheus at the hands of Maenads:

2. 219 Oegrius mons est qui diuidit Macedoniam a Tessalia. Oeagrius
dictus est ab Orpheo ibi a mulieribus dilacerato. Sed hoc nondum
contigerat, immo futurum erat. Et bene dictus est Oeagrius quia Oeager
fuit Orpei putatiuus.

"Oegrius is a mountain which divides Macedonia from Thessaly.
It was called 'Oeagrius' from 'Orpheus' after the women ripped him apart
there. But this had not yet occurred, but it was going to. And he is
rightly called 'Oeagrius' because Oeager was the supposed father of
Orpheus."

Glosses which reference more indirectly the transition of one book to another
have already been mentioned at 4. 1 (orgia). They occur frequently in the gloss to the
first line of many of the poem's fifteen books. For example, the first words of Book 9,
quae gemitus, are glossed simply as Acheloi (9. 1), which refers back to Met. 8. 884,
gemitus sunt uerba secuti and portends the story of Achelous and Hercules which is about
to be narrated. A similar method\textsuperscript{164} is employed at 7. 1 which connects the use of iam
fretum Minyae with cum Minyis at Met. 6. 720.

The structural comments, albeit brief in nature, do provide evidence of an intimate
familiarity with the work as a whole, and the importance such structural ties lend to a
complete understanding of the text itself.

\textsuperscript{164} See also 3. 1: "iamque deus posita confessus deuirginando eam," and 11. 1: "carmina dum tali
quia hucusque cantauit Orpheus."
6.2.8 Textual *Crucés* and Variant Readings

As the *Metamorphoses* has a rich textual tradition, especially in the twelfth century, it is expected that Arnulf and his students came into contact with different strains of the text. The lemmata of the earliest manuscripts do exhibit some discrepancies with one another, yet within the glosses themselves, there are numerous sections of the text where Arnulf is aware of multiple variant readings. Many of these are also sections of the *Metamorphoses* where *crucés* occur and the textual tradition is problematic. In these instances Arnulf will gloss the first reading, which is to be understood as his choice of the best reading, and subsequent variants follow. The variants may be introduced by the connective *uel*, are often underlined to mark them as alternate lemmata, and then glossed. Glosses of this type reveal a form of textual criticism at work within the commentary, providing all known variants deemed important or plausible, and glossing them to aid in the interpretation of particularly difficult passages. It is doubtful whether Arnulf actively sought out variant readings from other manuscripts, or happened upon such readings already present within a manuscript which he was using. The latter is the general conclusion advanced by Marti, and there is no textual evidence to support that Arnulf actively sought out other manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses* to supplement those already available to him.

A simple gloss on a variant reading is:

---

165 Arnulf's text of the *Metamorphoses* is discussed in section 8.
166 See Marti 1958, lvi-lx.
167 The *apparatus criticus* in Tarrant 2004, 190 lists "auras] aras U P".
7. 252 *ad aras* id est iuxta aras; uel *ad auras* extra domum sub aere nudo.

Both readings are explained contextually, so the student can understand the line as either Aeson's body is to be carried near altars, or outside beneath the breeze.

Passages dealing with more textually corrupt passages are more lengthy and discursive as discussed already at 7. 306. Arnulf's glosses to one of the most textually corrupt passages in Book 7 provide a representative example. Line 186 evidences corruption among the forms *serpit, serpunt, saepes, serpens* and *sopitae similis, sopitis similes, sopitis similis,* and *sopito similis.* Some textual critics also attribute the possible duplication of line 186 to the "double recension theory" surrounding the tradition of the *Metamorphoses.* Tarrant has numbered the two lines 186 and 186a, and has excised 186a using square brackets, [...].168

7. 186(/a) *serpunt* secundum hanc litteram est ibi 'sepes' et non 'serpens' et tunc ita legitur: *sepes* id est lacerte et ceteri uermes sepium. *cum nullo murmure* existentes similes sopitis etsi non dormiant. *cum nullo murmure serpunt* id est tacite; uel *serpens* et tunc ita legatur: *nullo cum murmure serpens* existens; nomen est non participium. *nullo cum murmure serpunt* serpere serpentum est, sed secundum hanc litteram est ibi *sopito similis* [187.] *silent frondes* non mouetur. quod est animatorem attribuit inanimatis cum dicit *silet humidus aer.*

"they creep: according to this reading, it is 'hedges' instead and not 'snake', and is then read as: *hedges,* meaning 'lizards and the rest of the wormy creatures of hedges.' Since those without *a murmur* appear similar to those who are asleep, even if they are not actually sleeping, *they creep without a murmur* means 'quietly.' Or the reading is *snake* and then should be read in this way: *the snake* appears *without a murmur,* so it [the form *serpens*] is a noun, not a participle. *they creep without a murmur:*

---

168 See the *apparatus criticus* entries for 186-7 and 186a in Tarrant 2004, 187. Tarrant's *apparatus* does not list the reading *sopito similis* but it occurs in the manuscripts transmitting Arnulf's commentary, so it was a known variant to him in the twelfth century.
crawling is a quality of snakes; but according to this other reading, it is *similar to someone asleep* instead. *The foliage is silent* means 'there was no motion'. This is a quality of animate objects that he assigns to inanimate objects when he says *the dank air rests*.”

Both lines 186 and 186a contain the phrase *nullo cum murmure*, where *murmure* provides the dactyl in the 5th foot of the line, and any of the disyllabic variants (*serpit, serpunt, saepes, serpens*) appear in the 6th foot. Arnulf lists the variants known to him and comments on the ways to construe each combination of forms, and then connects the meaning to the following line. The highly systematic list of known variants also emphasizes the approach to understand the text in a literal fashion.

### 6.2.9 Proverbs, *Sententiae*, and *Varia*

The use of proverbs and *sententiae* are present within the glosses, but sparingly. Proverbs and *sententiae* are usually used to illustrate a concept, to aid in the interpretation of the sense of a passage, or as remarks on particular qualities (e.g., 7. 189).

For example:

6. 574-5 *grande doloris ingenium est* proverbi est; ualde ingeniosi sunt dolentes et miseri sollertes, quod probat per Philomenam que telam fecit in qua crimina Terei notauit.
7. 633 *fouebam* sua uota fauet, quia sperat quod desiderat.
10. 709 *virtus* Adonis; uel generale id est proverbiuim.

Arnulf rarely glosses words in the vernacular, or allows it to permeate a sentence otherwise written fully in Latin, but he does so on occasion. When Latin words are glossed with a synonym in the vernacular, expressions such as *in uulgari* and *a uulgo* are used. Three examples are:
There are few historical references in the glosses, and most occur in Book 15 since it deals in part with Augustan Rome, rather than the strictly mythological past. There is a reference to a goose sacred to Juno, which aided in the defense of the Capitolium when the Gauls invaded Rome:

11. 599 *sagacior anser* ad historiam respicit de Senonibus Gallis.

Due to the use of *historia*, the gloss likely references Livy, *AVC*. 5. 47. Arnulf mentions the Senones, a people of Cisalpine Gaul, who are mentioned in Livy, 5. 35.10 and 10. 26, a passage which describes their activity at Clusium and subsequent movements toward Rome. Other references to historical events include the defeat of Juba I and Mithridates VI of Pontus, Juba's support for Gn. Pompeius Magnus\(^\text{169}\) (15. 744), and the line of Pontic kings named Mithridates (15. 755).

---

\(^{169}\) The reference is odd as Mithridates VI was defeated by Pompey and subsequently had his own life put to an end. The relative pronoun likely refers to Juba I who joined Pompey's party and won victory over Casear's legate, Curio. Juba I is also said to have committed suicide after Caesar's victory at Thapsus.
6.2.10 Arnulf's Sources

For the most part, Arnulf's glosses display much originality. When it is clear that sources were consulted, Arnulf rarely quotes them verbatim and instead paraphrases them loosely. Arnulf did operate within an a tradition of knowledge which had been established already in the *Orléanais*. Hilary of Orléans may have been at the forefront of this tradition, and may also have been Arnulf's earliest influence as a commentator.\(^\text{171}\) As in the *accessus*, there is also a tenuous link between Arnulf's commentary and a German tradition of Ovidian commentaries to the *Metamorphoses*, which possibly may emanate from the enigmatic Manegold of Lautenbach, an earlier authoritative master.\(^\text{172}\) There is a group of *catena* commentaries of the eleventh century of Germanic provenance,\(^\text{173}\) upon which Arnulf may have drawn.

A survey of the glosses reveals that Arnulf made use of a large variety of ancient, late antique, and medieval sources as well as the works of the *auctores*. Much of the grammatical and etymological information indicates, at least, an acquaintance with the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville, *Vocabulista* of Papias, the commentaries of Servius on

\(^{170}\) For Arnulf's sources for his commentary to the *Fasti* see Rieker 2005, xxxv-xxxvi; for those used in his commentary to Lucan's *Bellum Civile* see Marti 1958, xxix-xxxiv.

\(^{171}\) As expressed in Arnulf's gloss to *Bel. Ciu. 1. 548*. See also Engelbrecht 2003, lxxii and lxxvii for his *stemmata* to the *Bursarii* of William of Orléans, where he include Hilary's glosses as a placeholder above the archetype.


\(^{173}\) Three such *catena* commentaries are transmitted together in München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 17.142.
Vergil, possibly the *Aeneid* commentary attributed to Berhand Silvester, the *Fabulae* and *Astronomica* of Hyginus. In addition to the *Fabulae* of Hyginus, much of the mythological information is drawn heavily from the Vatican Mythographers. However, in all these instances none of the sources is ever cited directly by name. When alternate information is appended to the glosses via *uel*, as has been shown previously, Arnulf uses expressions like *secundum quosdam*, *secundum alios*, and *alii dicunt* to indicate material which can be considered non-Arnulfian. Since these sources are not cited by name and many glosses and commentaries have yet to be edited, many of them remain unidentifiable presently.

When Arnulf uses the *auctores* they are often cited by name. The quotation is introduced by *unde* and only the author's name, or by the expressions *unde dicit*, *unde ait*, and *secundum* as a preposition. In addition to Aristotle (1. 1) and Macrobius (1. 25), other *auctores* cited by name include Vergil (5. 406), Petronius (4. 454), Fulgentius (4. 457), and even "Homer," though more likely the *Ilias Latina* (11. 761).

There are close similarities between many of Arnulf's glosses and sections of the *Deriuationes* of Uguccione da Pisa. Jean Holzworth began a comparison of the two authors using samples from Arnulf's glosses to the *Fasti* and Uguccione's *Deriuationes* which occur solely among both authors. Holzworth concluded that it was

175 *Satyricon*, 82. 164
176 The *Deriuationes* are now critically edited in Enzo Cecchini (ed.), *Uguccione da Pisa Derivationes*, vols. I and II (Firenze 2004).
177 Jean Holzworth "Hugutio's *Derivationes* and Arnulfus' Commentary on Ovid's *Fasti*," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 73 (1942): 259-76; see also Rieker 2005,
chronologically impossible for Arnulf to have drawn from the *Derivationes*, and it is more likely the case that both Arnulf and Uguccione used a common source, rather than for Uguccione to have used Arnulf’s commentaries. Some of the same material singled out by Holzworth in the *Derivationes* and Arnulf's commentary to the *Fasti* also appear in his glosses to the *Metamorphoses*. Many of the examples can be isolated through phraseology, use of vocabulary, references, and specific etymologies which are peculiar to Arnulf and Uguccione. These shared peculiarities do not occur when sources like Servius, Marcrobius, Hyginus, Isidore, Papias, and the Vatican Mythographers treat the same material as Arnulf and Uguccione. Selections from Arnulf's commentary to the *Metamorphoses* that display the same peculiarities which Holzworth isolated in her study are: *Met.* 2. 4; 4. 14, 15, 275; 5. 640; 7. 94, 157; 10. 71; 11. 22, 599. For example, the gloss at *Met.* 7. 157 uses the word *autentin*, which only occurs in Arn. *Fasti* 5. 192 and Ug. S.v. *augeo*; at *Met.* 11. 22 the use of *deficere in (a) sensu* and glossing *mene* as *defectio* or *defectus* occurs only at *Fasti* 4. 458 and 6. 504, and Ug. S.v. *mene*; and *Met.* 640 references Jupiter's disguise as bird also peculiar to *Fasti* 4. 471 and Ug. S.v. *Otrix*.

---

xxxv–xxxvi; for a comparison of similarities between Arnulf and Hugo in the *Bellum Civile* commentary, see Marti 1958, lxxiii-lxxvi.

178 "It is therefore highly unlikely that Arnulfus, whose lectures and commentary were apparently well known by 1203, could have used Hugutio, who was at work upon his *Derivationes* as late as 1197-1201," Holzworth 1942, 260-61.

179 The examples are found in Holzworth 1942, 261-274.

180 See Holzworth 1942, 272 and 272 n. 63.

181 See Holzworth 1942, 269-270 and 270 n. 52.

182 See Holzworth 1942, 270 and 270 n. 53.
7. Arnulf's Style and Latinity

Arnulf's prose style is simple and effective for his purposes. He does not try to imitate the high periodic style of Cicero, but instead prefers short and direct sentences. The few instances of the vernacular have been discussed previously. Through the catena format, much of the glosses' syntax depend upon the syntax of the particular lemmata excerpted for comment. In this manner, Arnulf's own stylistic elements often become subordinate to the lemmata, and as a result his prose and use of grammatical constructions are influenced. Predication through apposition is also a frequent construction for many short glosses. Arnulf's prose does display a high level of proficiency in the grammar and syntax of Classical Latin, although Medieval Latin/vulgar constructions also abound in the text (e.g. the use of *quod* and a finite verb in lieu of the accusative-infinitive construction in Indirect Statement).

Contrary to Marti's claim, I find that Arnulf does maintain a distinction between verbs in the subjunctive and those in the indicative moods. The commentator is aware of the jussive, potential, and optative uses of the subjunctive, both independent and subordinated, though there is a lack of distinction between the proper use of their respective negatives, *ne* and *non*. Correct uses of the subjunctive are documented through his use of conditions (especially the imperfect subjunctive to indicate statements that are contrafactual to the present), indirect commands as noun clauses, purpose clauses as adverbial extensions of the predicate, result clauses and relative clauses of characteristic (the indicative is used regularly when the relative clause is determinative),

---

183 "...the lack of clear distinction between the subjunctive and indicative," Marti 1958, li.
cum clauses (the indicative is used for precise time), indirect questions, independent uses of the subjunctive, and a general adherence to the sequence of tenses, even between lemmata and glosses.

Word order is undeniably post-Classical, but even in Arnulf's style word order is still a structure of emphasis. There is a fairly consistent use of est correctly as an enclitic to predicate the preceding word, and independent uses of the jussive subjunctive in first position. Verbs generally retain their closural force in final position, but they also occur emphatically in other positions either by emphasizing the preceding word or allowing postponement for emphasis of the following word or phrase. There are also attempts to use the present active participle as closural in the final position (e.g. 7. 287). The temporal, causal, and concessive uses of participles appear without consistency, and connectives like quia, quamquam and ubi are often used to indicate such uses. The perfect, passive participle is used predicatively with more regularity. Parallelism, ellipsis, and connective relatives are also common stylistic elements of Arnulf's prose.

Arnulf's vocabulary and use of language is typical of the commentary genre and the twelfth century, employing the usual diction of a medieval schoolmaster. In addition to those already mentioned, other uses of commentary language are: a or ab for word derivation, ad modum plus the genitive, ad ____ respicit for inter- and intratextual references, construe sic, continuatio, declinatur, deriuatur, descriptio est, sic dicitur, unde dicitur/dictum est, et cetera, glosaut, id est, intellige sic, legatur sic, pro for word substitution, quasi and quasi dicat/diceret, scilicet, secundum hanc lectionem for variant readings, sicut, subaudi/subaudis, una dictio est, uel, and uel aliter.
8. Arnulf's text of the *Metamorphoses*

The lemmata of M, V, T offer the clearest portrait of Arnulf's text of the *Metamorphoses*. The three manuscripts date relatively close to the source, and are transmitted in the *catena* format, so they do not include the entire text of the poem but only the chosen lemmata. However, the majority of the lemmata are heavily truncated, even to the point of single letters followed by *puncti*, and none of the *catena* manuscripts writes out every lemma entirely with consistency. The lemmata of M, V, and T, however, are not consistent with one another in every instance, even when the text of the glosses descends from the same archetype. The lemmata of B (in *scholion* format) also offer clearer evidence of Arnulf's text compared to the other witnesses in *scholion* format which homogenize text and commentary regularly. The *Metamorphoses* text in B does not represent Arnulf's version of the text, but offers a clearer view by negative comparison. As mentioned, B often retains the lemmata of the commentary even when they do not agree with its text of the poem, and also annotates the text of the *Metamorphoses* several times with Arnulf's readings. In these cases, the lemmata of B are often in agreement with those of the *catena* manuscripts of the commentary, and as a whole, B's text of the commentary is closely related to M, V, and T through its own hyparchetype (shared with T) and contamination from that of M and V.

A collation of the lemmata reveals significant variants, which aid in isolating the particular strains of the *Metamorphoses* to which Arnulf had access. A large amount of variants point toward a hybrid or composite version of the text, but one which shares
many variants common to Tarrant's \( \Sigma \) class, which is constituted by Tarrant's BFGLP.\(^{184}\) In particular, Arnulf's text is closely related to FGL, which all date to the late eleventh and twelfth century.\(^{185}\) The three manuscripts are of Germanic or Swiss provenance (G was written at Saint Gall), and Tarrant's B and P are of French origin.\(^{186}\) However, there are also readings in the \( \Sigma \) class that are shared by Tarrant's M and U, both of which are of Italian origin and descend from separate branches his \( \Delta \) class. The manuscripts of \( \Delta \), unlike those of \( \Sigma \), contain the 'Lactantian' material and derive from a single source.\(^{187}\)

In sum, the evidence cannot show a derivation of Arnulf's text of the
Metamorphoses from a single source. However, the variants show conclusively a strong relationship with the \( \Sigma \) class, BFGLP, particularly BF, and also of U when it agrees with P.\(^{188}\) Among the evidence, one of the strongest is the final lemma of the commentary, indeflebile, where Arnulf embedded his self-identifying colophon. The reading indeflebile is a variant found in the Metamorphoses manuscripts B\(^{88}\)FGP and the catena commentaries MVT which transmit Arnulf's commentary before its divergence in the thirteenth century. The reading also appears as a lemma in the scholion versions of

\(^{184}\) See Tarrant 2004, xxii-xxiv for a description of the \( \Sigma \) class; xxvii for the stemma codicum; and xlvi-xlvi for a table listing a comparison of the sigla used in the editions of Tarrant, Anderson, Magnus, and Slater.

\(^{185}\) See Tarrant 2004, xii-xiv, for his description of BFGLP.

\(^{186}\) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 8001, (P in this edition), contains Arnulf's accessus, select glosses, and Allegoriae, which have been inserted into the text later.


\(^{188}\) Tarrant 1983, 280-281 discusses this relationship of E(P) and U: "Many of E's readings are also found in U, but neither is likely to have derived them from the other; the most probable explanation for the close agreement of EU is that each has contaminated its basic text with that of another form of ancient tradition. Each was well placed for such activity, since around 1100 the Loire valley and the area of Beneventan dominance were the most promising regions in Europe for the survival of rare texts, or rare branches of tradition."
the commentary BOF, but not in their texts of the *Metamorphoses*, which transmit the reading *indelebile*. In both B and F, the scribes copying Arnulf's commentary have annotated the text of the *Metamorphoses* to agree with the lemma, *indeflebile*, whereas W also reads *indelebile*, and rather than annotating the text of the *Metamorphoses*, W has altered the lemma of the gloss to *meliore* (*Met. 15. 875*), and then transmits the gloss.

It cannot be determined exactly how many movements between the *catena* and *scholion* formats of the commentary occurred throughout its entire textual and utilitarian tradition. It must be viewed as a type of contamination which affects the traditions of both text and commentary, where variants of the lemmata travel back and forth between the texts of the *Metamorphoses* and those of the commentaries. The resultant text becomes a unique composite of the tradition, since all variants from a given manuscript are not available to the scribe copying the commentary, but only those lemmata which happen to have been excerpted for comment.

Among the significant variants that show close relationships between the lemmata of Arnulf's commentary and manuscripts of Tarrant's Σ class are these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARRANT&lt;sup&gt;190&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>ARNULF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. 692 <em>induroque</em> Δ <em>F</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;<em>PL induremque</em> Σμ</td>
<td><em>induroque</em> <em>M F</em>: indur.que <em>V</em>: induremque <em>W</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 158 <em>cicropios</em> <em>FGL</em>: c(h)ociacos Ω</td>
<td><em>cicropios</em> <em>M DA</em>: c(h)olciacos <em>VBW</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 252 <em>auras</em>] aras <em>U P</em></td>
<td>* aras <em>MV FBA</em>: auras: <em>D</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>190</sup> From Tarrant's Oxford edition of the text. For the *sigla* used, see Tarrant 2004, xlv-xlvi.
7. 296 a colchide] acetide $P$; a thetide $G$: ab etheide $L$
8. 49 peperit] genuit $P$
8. 77 nec] neque $Urb\text{c} B_{2c}$
8. 77 FILL IN
8. 578 spatiæ $U^{(c^7)} P$
8. 633 fatendo $M(S)U^c F^3 P^4 T^t$: fauendo $N(U^{ac})$: ferendo $BLT^{2u}$
9. 35 sparsit $B^c P$
9. 456 qua] quam $N^{ac}$: quo $M^{ac}$ ($B^{ac}$)
10. 582 ignes Δ: –em $Σ$
11. 2 ducit] traxit $FL U^{2u}$
11. 86 uineta $M B^a L$: p(i/e)neta $NS B^t FG$: sp- $U P$
11. 204 pacti $Ω$: pacto $B$
11. 328 patriumque $N$: patrisque $M$: patrioque $UB^{2c} F^{2c} G^{ac} P$: patruoque $G^{2c} φ$
11. 381$^{191}$ sua ($S$) $BF^{c^7} GL$: suo $M$: suas $F^{ac}$: sui $N^o U P$
11. 445 in illo $U$ (Magnus)
11. 748 ingressu $cBerol$ (Magnus): egressu $N$ (Magnus)$^{193}$
15. 65 perspexerat] prosplexerat $B$
15. 278 alia $B^{ac} FPT$: alias $UB^{2c}$: alio $G$
15. 813 incisa $P^c ϕ$: -clusa $U^3 BFG$
(Heinsius)
15. 824 emathiique ($F^{ac}?$) $ϕ$: -ia(e)que $U^3 (B^{ac}?) F^c P$: -iaeque $U^3 B^c G$
15. 829 barbariam $FP$: -iem $U^3 G$: -i/ম $B^c$: -icas $ν^{2c} Χ$: -i(a)υ $Χ$
15. 840 hanc $FP$: hunc $U^3 B^c G$
15. 876 indelebile $U^3 B^c ϕ$: indefl- $B^{ac} FGP$

ab etide $MB$: ab oe. $V$: a colchide $WFDA$
genuit $VB F^t$: peperit $B^t D^t$: om. $M T$
neque $MV$: nec $B^t F$
in hoc $VB^t F$: adhuc $M$
spa(c/t)i $M TB$: spa. $V$: spa(c/t)ium $FD$: spatio $A$: uel spatio in dex. marg. add. $B$
ferendo $VTB^t F^t D^t A$: feriendo $M$

sparsit $M W$: spar. $VT$
quo $M$ CHECK OTHERS
ignem $M T$: ignes $F^t$
duxit $M TB^t WP$: ducit $WOtA$: traxit $F^t D^t$
p(i/e)neta...uel uineta $M T(B)D$: uineta...uel pineta $WF$: sp- ($B$): uineta $B^t$: pineta $A$
pacti $M D^t A$: pactis $T$: pacto $B^t WO^t F$
patro(que) $M B^t DA$: patrium(que) $T$
patruoque $W^t O^t$: quantosque $F^t$
sui $M TO^t F^t D^t$: sua $W$: hec $B^t^{92}$
in illo $M TBW^t$: in ipso $OF^t D^t A$
ingressu $M TB$: egressu $B^t W^t O^t F^t D^t A$
per(s)plexerat $M B^t F$: pro(s)plexerat
alia $M T$: alias $F$: alio $B$

inclusa $MV TO^t$: incisa $B^t W^t F^t$

emathia(que) $MV TW^t$: -ie(que) $B$

barbariam $M$: -iem $VTBW^t O^t$: -ie $F$
hunc $MV TB$: hanc $W^t O^t F^t$

indelebile $MV TB(B^t ) OF(F^t )$: indele-$B^t W^t F^t$

$^{191}$ hec $ε^t$ (Magnus)
$^{192}$ $B$ reads hec. $e =$ Amplonianus prior Erfurtanus I saec. XII uel XIII. contulit Grau. $e^2 =$ manus recentior Amplonianii prioris, quae scripsit textum inde a XIII 438 ad XV 879.
$^{193}$ $N =$ Neapolitanus IV F 3. saec. XI (also Tarrant’s $N$)
9. Description of the Manuscripts

The following section describes all manuscripts used for constitution of the text in this edition.

9.1 Manuscripts examined in situ

Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XIV.222 (4007), saec. xi-xiv.

Iohannes de Deo, Liber Iudicum; Unknown, Significationes consecrationis ecclesie; Arnulf of Orléans, accessus, glosulae, Allegoriae to Ovid's Metamorphoses; Cicero, De senectute, In Catilinam I-IV.

In Latin, on parchment. The manuscript consists of four separate booklets written in hands of the eleventh to fourteenth century, which are now bound together. The dimensions of the page and text frame vary throughout the manuscript. Generally, the page measures 245x170mm. I + 73 f., foliated uniformly using Arabic numerals in modern black ink and pencil. The quality of the parchment varies throughout the manuscript from being extremely fine and well scraped to gritty and rough.

Collation: I +1-2^8 +3^4 +4^9 +5-7^6 +8^2 +9-11^8

Format: I +IV^8(x2) +4 stubs +III^6+r3 +IV^8-2(x3) +IV^8-6 +IV^8(x3)

Quires: The quire structure varies throughout the manuscript. The outer side of quires 1-4 is flesh, as is typical of the late medieval period. Quire 3 is comprised of four stubs and quire 4 is a ternio with three stubs added using 'recycled' parchment strips for
reinforcement. The reinforcement strips are from a musical text ruled in red, but not enough survives to identify even a complete word. Quires 5-11 represent the early medieval structure of a quaternio with hair on the outer side.

Quires 5-6, which transmit Arnulf of Orléans' commentary on the *Metamorphoses*, are in particularly rough shape. Their original structure of the quaternio has been altered and the quire no longer obeys Gregory's Rule: quires 5-7 lack one bifolium, quire 8 lacks three bifolia, and at least one quire is missing entirely. There is also fire damage of varying severity throughout quire 7, specifically on fols. 44r-47v (see fig. 1.1.). In addition to the gaps from the missing folia, the order of the remaining material is actually non-sequential, although it is consistent with the foliation. The correct order should be: Quires 5-7-6-lost quire(s)-8. My conclusion is that this section of the manuscript has been unbound, the missing folia and quires were removed, subsequently rebound out of order (i.e. in its current state), and then foliated. See figure 1.2 for a sketch of the correct reconstruction of this section of the manuscript.

**Quire-marks**: Quire signatures appear only on fol. 35v ($I^0 = primus$) and fol. 47v ($II^0 = secundus$). Both marks are positioned in the bottom toward the right column and are contemporaneous with the hand of this section of the text. All other quires lack any trace of quire-marks, leaf signatures, or catchwords.

**Layout**: The layout varies per quire. Quires 1-3 are ruled in lead in two columns of text of approx. 39 lines per column. Prickings are visible in the upper margin and in the far
right. Writing is below the top line. Page: 240x170 mm; text frame: 200x125 mm; ratio: 0.6; ruling pattern corresponds to Derolez no. 41.

Quire 4 is ruled in a single column of text of approx. 40 lines. Prickings are visible in the right margin. Writing is above the top line. Page: 240x165 mm; text frame: 205x105 mm; ratio: 0.5. Corresponds to Derolez no. 33.

Quires 5-8 are ruled in lead. There are two columns of text of approx. 29-41 lines per column. Prickings are visible in the upper and lower margins, and there is a double set down right side of the page. Writing is above the top line. Page: 240x160 mm; text frame: 200x140 mm; ratio: 0.7; corresponds to Derolez no. 42. There are heavily scraped sections on fols. 30v and 39r of Quire 6 which are left blank but outlined in ink, which do not interrupt the text. Most likely these areas were considered unsuitable writing surfaces due to their extremely coarse texture and left blank as a result.

Quires 9-11 are ruled in dry-point (new style) in a single column of text of approx. 33 lines per page. There is a reinforcement leaf before quire 11. Prickings are visible in the upper and lower margins and down the far right of the page. Writing is above the top line. Page: 240x165 mm; text frame: 180x115 mm; ratio: 0.6; corresponds to Derolez no. 33.

Decoration: The decoration varies per section of the manuscript, but overall is extremely minimal. Quires 1-4 have plain majuscule initials two lines in height, all of which are red. There is rubrication and letter heightening also in red.

---

194 Heavy pressure has been applied to also create the appearance of dry-point ruling or a combination of dry-point and lead in various places throughout this section of the text.
Quires 5-8 have plain initials of two to three lines in height, almost all of which are red. Occasionally the initial is in black. Line fillers, decorative flourishes of initials, and letter heightening in red are very sparse. There is also a drawing of a "Scyllaesque dog-serpent" in the lower margin on fol. 33ra, also in red. All decoration types are of an extremely low level of execution and sloppy. Several initials were never added, but the indentations and small instruction letters to the rubricator remain. The placement of the initials is consistent, and they functioned to help the reader navigate through the specific sections of Arnulf's commentary: the accessus, glossulae, and Allegoriae.

Quires 9-11 have plain initials written in red ink, measuring two lines in height. There are also initials which were never written, but the space and indentation remains (e.g. fol. 60v).

**Binding:** Late medieval, reddish leather over boards with an iron clasp with a leather loop. The metal shows signs of corrosion. The front cover measures 240x170 mm. A piece of parchment (45x105 mm) has been affixed to the front cover, displaying a list of contents written in a fourteenth-century hand in black and red inks: liber iudicum iohannis de deo significationes consecrationis ecclesiae gloss super methamorphoseos, invectuvarum tulii. The decoration and tooling are minimal.

**Owners:** The previous shelfmark is Morelli 99.
Script: The script varies per section of the text and spans the eleventh through fourteenth centuries. Correcting hands are also present in several of the texts. Analyses of the different scripts and their respective hands shall appear beneath the description of the contents of this particular manuscript.

Contents:

I. Iohanes de Deo, Liber Iudicum: fols. 1r-20r (quires 1-3). Title: ad honorem summe trinitatis et indiuidue unitatis patris et filii et spiritus sancti incipit liber iudicum a magistro iohane de deo sacerdote yspano compilatus qui per quatuor libros et centum titulos es distinctus nichil est enim in iuris ordine quod in eo non potitus inueniri ibi sun compendio fluitas et ueritas eluscit. primus liber de iudicibus et arbitriis et assessoribus et comitantibus illos. secundus de actoribus et inpungnatione reorum. tercius est de reis et eorum defensione. quartus de comunibus personis et de aduocatis et syndicis et actoribus. 

incipit: uenerabili patri ac domino archipresbytero bonum digno morum copia maiori qualibet dignitate; explicit: de sententia excomunicacionis sacus ff. dele ii qui solidum.

Script: Written in a thirteenth-century hand. The Gothic Textualis is executed rapidly, but the letter forms are fashioned consistently. Letter forms include the "box a," "i lunga," uncrossed Tironian et.
II. Unknown text and author, *Significationes consecrationes ecclesie* (!): fols. 21r-29v (quire 4). *Incipit:* morem quem sacra ecclesia tenet...; *explicit:* portat aaron nomina filiorum israel in rationali iudicij quia oportet ut sacerdos memoriam...

III. Arnulf of Orléans, *accessus, glosulae, Allegoriae* to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (incomplete): fols. 30r-49v (quires 5-8).


IIIb. *Glosulae; incipit* (fol. 30vb): in noua fert id est desiderat...; *explicit* (fol. 48vb): *indefle bile* anime bonorum non deflentur...;

IIIc. *Allegoriae; incipit* (fol. 31vb): mutationes primi libri hec sunt...; *explicit* (fol. 48r): illam magis uisa eos duxit usque ad locum ubi erat.

Fol. 49 has been cut in half, but no text is lost. There is also a handwritten catalogue of text on fol. 49v written in a different hand of the late twelfth century. The texts listed are no longer present in the manuscript, with the exception of the commentary to the *Metamorphoses.*
Script: Written in a French hand of the late twelfth century. The script is a rapidly executed Pregothica. Although Gothic features are beginning to intrude, the letter forms are essentially Caroline and the appearance of the script is still quite "aerated," although, as a transitional form of Caroline, the script is beginning to show elements of compression and compaction with a marked inconsistency (i.e. some sections are more compressed and compact than others). There is an extremely strong influence of documentary script in letter forms, visible especially in the treatment of ascenders and descenders, as well as the presence of litterae elongatae. Notable features of the script include the Tironian et uncrossed, the ampersand is used at word end, but never as a connective, and the con abbreviation in the form of 9. Insular est, enim, and autem are also used. Although the majority of abbreviations for est are written in the insular style, there are also a few instances of the non-insular est (e with a stroke). For example, fol. 40v has a high frequency of the non-insular est, although insular est is still used on the same folio by the same hand. Notable letter forms include the binary system for r and both upright and uncial d. Corrections have been made by means of signes-de-renouie, expunctuation, and strikethroughs. Several corrections also appear in all margins, which are not keyed to the text via signes-de-renouie. The scribe of the commentary as well as a later hand are responsible for the corrections. The later hand writes corrections in all margins in a script which displays Gothic features far more prominently than that of the text.
Specific Observations: It is extremely likely that this section of the manuscript originates directly from Orléans, based on the script, content, physical format, visual layout, and date. The features of documentary script prevalent in the Praegothica script are indicative of university manuscripts of the period, and the style is typically French. The manuscript also transmits the *accessus, glosulae, mutationes*, and *Allegoriae* in the original alternating fashion for each book of the *Metamorphoses*. This witness to the text was copied when the commentary circulated in this order, before the divergence of the tradition and the resultant independent/hybridized transmission routes of the commentary from the thirteenth century through the fifteenth century. The physical format of the manuscript also lends credibility to these observations because the commentary is transmitted in the *catena* format, virtually independent of the text of the *Metamorphoses*, as in the case of M and T. The manuscript represents an incarnation of Arnulf's lecture series, and Arnulf did utilize the *catena* format in his classroom. It is entirely possible that this witness to the commentary could have originated from St. Euverte where Arnulf was a schoolmaster, but it not possible to state this with certainty.

IV. Cicero, *De Senectute, In Catilinam I-IV*: fols. 50r-73v (quires 9-11). *Incipit*: "O tite siquid ego adiuto curamue leuasso que nunc te coquit et uersat in pectore..." *Explicit*: "...et ea que statueritis quoad uiuet defendere et per se ipsum prestare possit."

Script: Written in Caroline miniscule of the eleventh century in a single column of text. The hierarchy of script, typical of Carolingian manuscripts, is present using capitals as a
display script for two lines. The script also contains several other features common to Caroline miniscule: the use of the ampersand as a connective and at verb ending, and $NT$ ligatures.

Figure 1.1: Hypothesized reconstruction of complete quire structure transmitting Arnulf's commentary in Marc. lat. XIV.222 (4007).

Figure 1.2: Fire damage to fols. 44r-45v in Marc. lat. XIV.222 (4007).
Ovid, *Tristia* with scholia; Ovid, *Heroides* with scholia; Bernard von der Geist, *Palpanista*; Arnulf of Orléans commentary to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (fragmentary).

In Latin, on parchment. The manuscript consists of four separate booklets, which subsequently have been bound together, and the texts are written by several different hands of the thirteenth century. Due to the large amount of variation per section, information concerning the script type, origin, and quality of parchment can be found under the respective description of the manuscript's contents.

**Collation:** 1-5\(^8\) + 6\(^2\) + 7\(^9\) + 10\(^1\) + 11\(^4\) + 12\(^8\) + 13\(^5\) + 14-15\(^4\) + 16\(^3\)

**Format:** IV\(^8\)(x5) + I\(^2\) + IV\(^8\)(x3) + V\(^1\) + II\(^4\) + IV\(^8\) + III\(^4+1\) + 4 stubs + II\(^4\) + II\(^4+1\)

**Quires:** The manuscript has quires of mixed structures as seen in the collation and format descriptions. The sections containing the *Tristia* (quires 1-6) and the *Heroides* (quires 7-11) are typical of the later medieval period, structured mostly in quaternios with the fleshside facing outward (although quire 1 is H/H). However, quire 10 is a quinio, and the final quire of each of these sections is not a quaternio, but either a bifolium (quire 6) or a binio (quire 11). A parchment reinforcement strip has been placed between the end of quire 1 and the beginning of quire 2. Quires 1-6 obey Gregory's Rule within each quire.

The unsystematic nature of the quire structure of these sections reflects the lower production quality of a school text. It is likely that the scribes of these texts were the
students who used them originally, and the burden of acquiring parchment was probably their own. By using whatever parchment was readily available, or parchment perhaps already in the students' possession from a previous text, was the most cost effective means for production.

This same reasoning can explain the irregularity of the remaining sections of the manuscript which contain the Bernard van der Geist's *Palpanista* and Arnulf's commentary to the *Metamorphoses*. The *Palpanista* (quires 12-13) is comprised of one quaternio and a binio with one leaf added to it. What remains of the *Metamorphoses* commentary (quires 14-16) is structured irregularly as well. Quire 14 consists of four stubs, quire 15 is a binio, and quire 16 is a binio missing one leaf. Although the commentary is fragmentary, it was still structured irregularly when in its complete state. This can be seen in through the use of four stubs which do not disrupt the text they transmit. It is not impossible that some of the binios (e.g. quire 16) could be the remaining half of a quaternio, however quire 14 does not disrupt the text either, so the binio is probably the original structure of this quire. A more prudent assumption would be that parts of the commentary may have been gathered into quaternios originally (probably near the beginning), which would have been typical during the period, but not the entire manuscript. Hairsides do face outward, however in its present state, this section of the manuscript does not observe Gregory's Rule completely.

**Catchwords:** Quires 1-5 have contemporary horizontal catchwords, all other quires lack catchwords, signatures, or quire marks. On fol. 104v "XII" appears in the lower left
margin, which may be a former quire mark before the manuscript was bound in its present state.

**Layout:** The layout varies per quire. Quires 1-6 (fols. 1r-42v) are ruled in lead in a single column of text with approximately 47 lines. Prickings are visible in the upper and lower margins. Writing is above the top line. Page: 205x135mm; text frame: 155x50mm; ratio: 0.35; ruling pattern corresponds closely to Derolez no. 33.

Quires 7-11 (fols. 43r-80v) are ruled in lead in a single column of text with approximately 34-37 lines. Prickings are visible down the right margin. Text frame: 162x55mm; ratio: 0.34; ruling pattern corresponds closely to Derolez no. 23.

Quires 12-13 (fols. 81r-93v) are ruled in lead in a single column of text with approximately 39-41 lines. Prickings are no longer visible. Writing is below the top line. Page: 207x130mm; text frame: 172x65mm; ratio: 0.37; ruling pattern corresponds to Derolez no. 36.

Quires 14-16 (94r-104v) are ruled in two columns of text with approximately 44 lines per column. Prickings, at times, are visible in the top and lower margins. This section of the manuscript has been trimmed on all sides, thus making it difficult to ascertain with complete certainty if writing is above or below the top line consistently. It appears that the writing is above the top line in the sections where the prickings in the upper margin for the bounding lines are more clearly visible. Text frame: 185x55mm (right column); ratio 0.29 (right col.); ruling pattern corresponds closely to Derolez no. 43.
**Decoration:** The decoration varies per section of the manuscript, but overall is extremely minimal. Quires 1-6 mostly have plain initials in red ink with blue penwork, but the penwork is not maintained consistently throughout these quires. For example, on fol. 33r there is no blue penwork, but it returns on fol. 41r. There is also an initial "P" on fol. 1r in *littera duplex* style.

Quires 12-13 have a few plain initials 2 lines in height written in a more orange than red colored ink. Letter heightening of various initials occurs but only up through fol. 82r.

Quires 14-16 have a few plain initials for the *incipit* of each book of the *Metamorphoses*. The initials are irregular in size, ranging from 4-8 lines in height. Those that are completed are in a faded red ink (e.g. "Q" on fol. 95v and "I" on fol. 97v).

**Binding:** late medieval binding, white leather over the spine and part of the boards, but the boards are mainly exposed, the grain is vertically inclined; the leather is worn but overall in remarkable shape; metal rivots run parallel in the direction of the spine, on both the front and back cover; the back cover has an area cut out where the clasp would have fit.

**Owners:** Amplonius Ratink de Berga.

---

195 Another manuscript, Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek Q 90, has an identical binding. Several of texts were originally transmitted with some of those in Q 91 and share identical parchment qualities, inks, and decoration.
Contents:

I. Ovid, *Tristia* with scholia: fols. 1r-42v (quires 1-6).

Latin, on average quality parchment. Ovid's *Tristia* is written by a single hand of the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. Glosses and commentary are written both marginally and interlinearly by a different, but contemporaneous hand. This section of the manuscript is likely of French origin. The writing of the *Tristia* is consistently above the top line, which is quite atypical of this period as are the outwardly facing hairsides of the quire 1. The ruling pattern is indicative of a school text, allowing space for glosses in both margins as well as interlinearly. One line of text of the poem is equivalent to two lines of marginal commentary.

Script: The text hand is a typical *textualis*, probably from Northern France of the late thirteenth/early fourteenth century. The script is legible, but not a highly executed bookhand. The rapidity of writing and use of letter forms suggest this copy was for use in school by a student.

The glossing hand has a distinctive cursive ductus and displays a strong influence of documentary script, which is best illustrated, but not solely, in the elongation of ascenders and descendents occurring on the top and bottom lines (*litterae elongatae*). The glosses continue in lemmatic format on fol. 42v and there is also what appears to be a brief *accessus* written perpendicular to the glosses, beginning inside the gutter. The *incipit* of this text is severely mutilated and practically illegible. A later hand, likely belonging to Amplonius himself, also appears on fol. 42v.
The collation of this section of Q 91 is regularly comprised of quaternios, obeying Gregory's Rule; a reinforcement strip has been placed between the end of quire one and the beginning of quire two.

II. Ovid, *Heroides* with scholia\textsuperscript{196} fols. 43r-80v

Latin, on average quality parchment; there is thick commentary and dense glossing in both marginal and interlinearal positions. The text is written by two separate hands: the first hand of the late thirteenth/early fourteenth century (M1) writes the text from the beginning on fol. 43r until the twenty-fourth line on fol. 78v; a second, later, hand of the fourteenth century (M2) begins on the twenty-fifth line of fol. 78v and completes the poem on fol. 79r; fols. 79r-80r are blank and fol. 80v contains a catalogue entry.

The glosses appear to be written by the text hand, M1, and end on fol. 66v.

*Incipit*: (fol.43r) "In qualibet epistula habetur duplex intentio secundum auctoris et mittentis in prima epistula intendit. auc(tor) commendare amorem legitimum intentio penelopes est reuocare Vlixem..."

III. Bernard von der Geist, *Palpanista* fols. 81r-93v

Latin, on extremely thick parchment. The parchment is excessively thick, to the touch it feels more than twice the weight of the parchment used in other sections of the
manuscript. In addition to its weight and thickness, the parchment is also extremely dark in color (almost resembling the hue of modern cardboard). The text is written by a single hand of the late thirteenth/early fourteenth century, probably of Germanic origin; there are extremely sparse glosses, mainly single words which are peppered throughout the text by the text hand. Another hand, which is most likely Ampronius's autograph, appears occasionally throughout the margins of the text, as well as the entire codex.

IV. Arnulf of Orleans’ commentary to the *Metamorphoses* (fragmentary): fols. 94r-104v.

Latin on average quality parchment. The commentary contains the philological *glosulae* and the allegorical interpretation of the text in the alternating fashion per book,\(^{197}\) but is this section of the manuscript fragmentary and incomplete. Fol. 94r begins with the glosses to *Metamorphoses* Book 7. 510; fol. 104v ends with the *Allegoriae* to Book XV, which are also incomplete.

The hand writing Arnulf's glosses is most irregular, yet consistently irregular. There is extreme variation in the number of lines and size of the script per folio, but also on the same folio and within the same column. The individual letter forms and scribal idiosyncracies are proof enough that, despite the extreme amount of variation at first glance, it is in fact the same hand throughout.

The letter forms are indicative of rapid writing, particularly the variation of the form of the letter *a*. Different forms appear within the same word, where the letter takes on a triangular shape with the top lobe almost completely disappearing only to reappear...

\(^{197}\) as in München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 7205 and Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XIV.222 (4007).
three letters into the word. There is also a noticeably peculiar formation of the letter $d$, which is not quite upright, but not quite uncial. There are several Insular/tacygraphic symbols used such as the Tironian $et$ (uncrossed), as well as the Insular $est$ and Insular $enim$. Ligatures are used ($st$ and $ct$), the $s$ is upright, the binary system for $r$ is used, and the $g$ is still very Carolingian in its appearance at times. This script also takes on a more Gothic appearance than the other catena format witnesses of Arnulf's commentary and the minim phenomenon is also so problematic in this section that it creates many illegible words at first glance.

The script is representative of French writing of the first half of the thirteenth century, and can be classified as Pregothica, but a more advanced specimen in Gothic tendencies than the other two manuscripts in catena format, $M$ and $V$.

There are several features of this text which indicate its use during the time of its construction as well as in its present state in Q 91. The evidence most indicative of use as a school text is the format of the text itself. The catena format is especially illustrative of use by teachers, and, in the case of this specific witness, students.198 The variation within and bizarre execution of the script are the first signs toward student production. The way in which the level of execution improves, particularly, toward the end of the document may display a few possibilities: either a general improvement in the skill of writing, or an increase in the amount of time to copy the text. Moreover, the types of errors made in the transmission of the commentary also depict a copyist whose knowledge of Latin syntax, grammar, spelling, as well as overall reading skills, were not

198 See Ward 1996. Ward is also of the persuasion that catena commentaries were used by both students and teachers alike, copied from both physical exemplars of text as well as from dictation.
on the level of a schoolmaster, but rather indicate that of a pupil developing his skills. Numerous errors result in "nonsense" words, where inflections are used incorrectly or forms are confused egregiously (e.g. putterit for potuit or poterit), or misused (e.g. the agreement between pronouns and their antecedents). These errors are indiosyncratic to Q 91, appearing in no other manuscripts of the tradition, even those who descend from the same hyparchetype.

The quire structure is haphazardly arranged and no regular pattern can be ascertained from the fragment present in Q 91. The parchment used seems to be have been garnered from surplus pieces, which has already been discussed in the description of the quires. The parchment in this section of the manuscript was neither produced nor purchased for the copying of this text, but rather this text was copied onto parchment which had already been produced or purchased for another purpose.

The present state of Arnulf's commentary in Q 91 is also indicative of its use subsequent to its original form. The other texts in Q 91, with exception of Bernard van der Geist's Palpanista, are all Ovidian texts with commentary and interlinear glosses. It appears that Amplonius used this volume for his own purposes, both educational and his own scholastic endeavors. The annotations added throughout the manuscript are most likely his own, which adds further validity to a claim that Q 91 could have existed in its current form when it was in Amplonius's possession. The missing sections of the commentary are unaccounted for presently, and most likely are no longer extant. It is not known whether Amplonius ever possessed the complete text, but if Q 91 was in his possession in its current form, he did not. However, it is known that Amplonius
bequeathed his library to the Erfurt University where it remained until its acquisition by the Anna Amalia Bibliothek. Q 91 may have been used by a number of scholars, for both teaching and research purposes during its time there.


**W Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 13.10 Aug. 4° s. xiii-xiv**

Ovid, *Metamorphoses*; Statius, *Achilleid*; Avianus, *Fabulae*; Prudentius, *Psychomachia*; Unknown, *Dictionarius* and *Epistula* (both incomplete); Canon Law excerpts from an unknown text. There are heavy interlinear and marginal glosses throughout the manuscript.

In Latin, on parchment. Four separate booklets have been bound together to create the manuscript in its present state. 207 f., foliated in modern black ink, however numbering from a previous foliation is still visible on certain folia (e.g. current fol. 141r was former fol. 138). The dimensions of the page are 225x155 mm, generally. The text frame and number of lines vary per section, which are listed under the description of the layout. The parchment quality is variable, however, generally the parchment is slightly damaged, yellowed, and moldy in many sections of the manuscript. A later hand has added titles for the individual works throughout the manuscript.
The texts are written by several different hands of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries which are of French origin. Analyses of the scripts can be found under the description of the contents of the manuscript.

**Collation:** "I" +1-2² +3² +4-17⁸ +18⁵ +19² +20² +21² +22-26² +27²

**Format:** "I" +IV⁸(x2) IV²⁸⁻¹ +IV⁸(x14) +II²⁴⁻¹ +VI²¹ +III²⁶⁻¹ +II²⁴⁺¹ +IV²⁸(x5) +I²

**Quires:** Quires 1-17 and 22-26 are comprised of parchment quaternios with the fleshsides facing outward, typical of the late medieval period. Quire 3 is missing a leaf and therefore does not obey Gregory's Rule. The text, however, is uninterrupted, so the leaf was removed or lost before the time of copying. Quire 18 is a binio with one leaf added (F/H), but the text is uninterrupted. Since quire 18 contains the end of the *Metamorphoses* and two *accessus*, there was no need to structure the quire as a quaternio and waste parchment. The economical use of parchment resulting in the inconsistency of bibliographic formats is common to manuscripts produced for school use and can be observed in the descriptions of several manuscripts in this dissertation.

Quire 19 is a sexternio of twelve leaves with the fleshsides facing outward. The sexternio structure is indicative of the thirteenth century. Quires 20 and 21 are structured irregularly: quire 20 is a ternio plus one leaf hairsides outward, quire 21 a binio plus one leaf (H/F).

The final quire of the manuscript, quire 27 (fols. 206r-207v), is a bifolium of two leaves (F/F). This section of the manuscript was originally a single folio, which has been
folded into a bifolium, then inserted horizontally into the manuscript to function as guardleaves.

The full variety of bibliographical formats represents a school miscellany at its final stage of compilation. The quire structure indicates a utilitarian intention for this manuscript, which has changed over time and with usage. The absence of a uniform structure combined with the various hands and chronologies throughout the codex show that the demand for the material surpassed the desire for aesthetics.

**Catchwords:** Contemporary catchwords are written horizontally in quires 3-15, 17, 23, 24, and 26. Most correspond with the exception of those on quires 23, 24, and 26.

**Layout:** Combined ruling techniques are used throughout the codex: lead, lead/hardpoint, and lead/ink.

Quires 1-18 (fols. 2r-141v) are ruled in lead and occasionally ink (e.g. fol. 84r) in a single column of text of approx. 43 lines. Prickings are visible in the upper margin to mark the vertical bounding lines (two sets of three; one bounding line separates marginal commentary from the initial of each line of the text, the second and third lines create a blank space between the initial and the rest of the word). Prickings in the right margin to mark the horizontal bounding lines (one or two sets of two) are visible on some folia, but this section of the manuscript has been trimmed both vertically and horizontally. Writing is below the top line. Text frame: 170x65 mm; ratio: .72; ruling pattern corresponds closely to Derolez no. 36.
Folio 1v (actually the verso of a guardleaf which has also been foliated as 1) contains two uneven columns, no ruling pattern, and slanty, uneven writing. Ruling is also present in the left and right margins for marginal commentary and glossing. One line of text is equivalent to two lines of marginal comments. However, later in this section (which transmits Ovid's *Metamorphoses* with scholia) marginal ruling only seems to appear when there are comments.

Quires 19-21 (fols. 142r-165v) are ruled with various combined techniques consisting of hardpoint, lead, and ink in a single column of text with approx. 32-40 lines. In quire 19, ink is used only for the vertical bounding lines at times, and only lead for the horizontal lines. Prickings are visible in the upper, lower, left, and right margins. The curious pattern of prickings in the left and right margins may suggest the use of a rake to rule the horizontal lines. Writing is above the top line. Text frame: 180x155 mm; commentary frames: left col. 190x30 mm, right col. 190x45 mm; ratio (of text area): 0.3; ruling pattern corresponds closely to Derolez no. 32.

Quire 22 (fols. 166r-173v) is ruled in lead in a single column of text of 32 lines. Thick glossing appears in all margins. Prickings are visible for the vertical bounding lines in the upper margin. Writing is below the top line. Text frame: 150x60 mm; ratio: 0.4; corresponds to Derolez no. 33.

Quires 23-26 are ruled in lead in two columns of text with a variable number of lines per column. (approx. 40 lines traced per page). Prickings are visible mainly in the upper margin, and sparsely in the right margin. Writing is above the top line. Text frame
Quire 27 was originally ruled lightly in lead in two columns of text. Gloses are present in all margins. Prickings are visible down the right margin.

**Decoration:** The decoration varies per section of the manuscript. Overall it is minimal, consisting of initials, letter heightening, occasional line fillers, and drawings and doodles in the margins. The inside front cover contains various drawings in numerous inks as well as musical notations.

Quires 1-9 contain *littera duplex* initials in red and blue with contrasting penwork for the beginning of each book of the *Metamorphoses*. The initials on average range from 4-6 lines in height, but those with tails (e.g. "I" and "P") can span anywhere from 12-16 lines. For example, the initial "P" on fol. 46v indents 5 lines for the letter form and 9 for the tail, which actually extends to the bottom of the page. Single colored plain initials 1 line in height run throughout quires 1-9, mainly. The initials alternate between red and blue with contrasting penwork, however there are instances in which the colors do not alternate (e.g. fols. 7v and 8r have two blue initials in a row as do fols. 17r and 17v). Letter heightening in red occurs in quires 1-9, but not in quires 10-18.

The *littera duplex* initials for each book's *incipit* are replaced by single colored plain initials about 5 lines in height for quires 10-17. The plain initials are drawn in

---

199 cf. fols. 11v and 12r which have red following red, for example).
either red or blue ink with contrasting penwork. There is a crude attempt at a littera duplex 'L' in the top margin of fol. 112r, which is mostly likely imitative doodling.

There are also several illustrations throughout the section containing the *Metamorphoses*, mainly quires 14, 17, and 18. The illustrations are not the work of an accomplished illuminator, but rather are low-level doodles penned by distracted students. There are two main hands at work: the first hand (D1) is responsible for several drawings in ink and pencil throughout quires 14, 17, 18 as well as the inside front cover and fol. 1r. Many of those drawn in pencil have been erased (e.g. fol. 113r) but are still clearly visible. The drawings are mainly human figures with various accessories such as hoods (fols. 1r, 138r, 139r,) crowns (fols. 108v, 141r, 82v), caps (fol.130v) flutes (fol. 134v), staves, swords, or spears (fols. 82v, 113r, 140r), and many of these accoutrements are also emblazoned with a *fleur-de-lys* motif (fols. 82v, 108v). Several drawings display semi-exaggerated facial features, particularly those of the figures wearing hoods. There are also a some musical notations (fols. 1r, 141r), and small *varia* in the margins such as flowers (fol. 12r) and bird heads (fol. 77r).

The second hand (D2) is later than the first and appears only in pencil. The level of execution is far below that of the first doodler. Interestingly, the second hand does not add any original illustrations, but rather attempts to imitate those which were added by D1. The pencil imitations appear near their model, usually in a smaller scale (see fols. 108v, 130v, 140r, and 141r, for example).

Quires 19-21 have minimal decoration, consisting only of single plain initials in a reddish ink and occasional letter heightening in the same ink. The plain initials within
the text of Statius (fols. 142r-157r) are, on average, 2-3 lines in height and reflect a markedly low-level of execution. They are either the work of the scribe himself, or another student who has not been trained professionally in decoration. Many of the initials, especially the letter "I," have crude attempts at stylization. The decorator attempts to insert small, negative space symbols into the initials, and to mimic the *littera duplex* style monochromatically also using the negative space of the parchment. The letter heightening is also crudely executed in a single continuous line, rather than for each letter, most likely in an effort to save time. The purpose of the decoration is more functional than it is aesthetic; the reddish ink draws the eye to the marked sections of the text for navigational efficiency.

The section containing the text of Avianus (fols. 157v-165v) is decorated quite similarly to the previous section. Plain initials on average 1-2 lines in height are also drawn in thick red ink. Letter heightening also appears sporadically in red but is of a more precise level of execution than the former example, in which each letter is given separate treatment rather than using a continuous line. "Paraph" marks for the marginal glosses are also heightened in red.

quire 22 contains plain initials in red ink 2 lines in height. Some initials have minimal stylization attempts with floralesque motifs (e.g. fol. 166r). The initials are executed decently, and the letter forms display the same roundness and aversion to sharp angularity as those of the text. No letter heightening is present, yet there is beautiful stylization of each letter beginning each line. The letters display a command of several script types, including various letter forms of both Northern and Southern Textualis with
calligraphic flourishes and decorative hairlines, as well as the use of innovative and unconventional letter forms (e.g. the "Q" on fol. 170v, line 20).

Quires 23-26 have minimal decoration and a few marginal doodles. Most of the decoration is probably the work of the scribe himself, but some of the mariginal doodles are the work of a later hand in ink. Plain initials are executed poorly in red ink with crude attempts of contrasting penwork in blue in varying heights. The blue ink ceases to appear as of fol. 175rb and reappears on fol. 198ra. Crudely drawn line fillers of the same style also run throughout the section. Aside from numerous maniculae there are also various small illustrations and doodles, some of which function to mark sections of the text. For example, a face is drawn in ink on fol. 174r and the nose seems to point to the text in the same manner as the finger of a manicula. Marginal doodles in ink also depict various objects: the heads of a goat (fol. 181rb) and an ass (fol. 184ra), musical instruments (fol. 186vb), and a man and woman facing one another in profile (fol. 201va).

Quire 27 contains well-executed plain Gothic initials with contrasting penwork, alternating between red and blue ink. The initial are 1-2 lines in height.

**Binding:** The medieval binding is damaged severely, and almost completely detached in places. Heavily worn leather over boards (vertical grain), but white leather is visible minimally on a few corners on the front and back covers. Fastenings for the clasps are rusted, but still visible. There is a disproportionate symbol resembling an asterisk (*) incised into the back cover.
**Owners:** Napoleon brought the manuscript to Paris.\(^{200}\)

**Script:** Various hands of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Most are of French origin.

**Contents:**

I. Ovid, *Metamorphoses* with glosses and two *accessus* (fols. 2r-141r); *incipit*: in noua fert animus...; *explicit*: si quid habent ueri uatum presagia uiuam.

a. Arnulf of Orléans, *Glosulae* (fols. 1v-141r); *incipit* animus fert id est desiderat...; *explicit*: anime siquid bonorum non deflentur...

b. *Accessus*

   1. Arnulf of Orléans, *accessus* (fol.141va-b); *incipit*: quia maius opus ouidii pre manibus habemus...; *explicit*: littera sic exponatur.

   2. Modified version of Arnulf's *accessus* (incomplete and mutilated; fol. 141vb); *incipit*: <q>quia maius opus ouidii pre manibus habemus...; *explicit*: magica sicut de....

**Script:** There are three hands at work in this section of the manuscript. The first hand (M1) has written the *Metamorphoses*, and is likely the hand of a few interlinear and marginal glosses. The second hand (M2) has written Arnulf's glosses in two columns on fol. 1v as well as interlinearly and in the margins throughout the entire *Metamorphoses*.

\(^{200}\) See Munari, no. 161
M2 is also responsible for both *accessus* on fol. 141v and correcting some of the marginal glosses written by M1 (e.g. commentary column A on fol. 3v). There is a third, correcting hand (M3) which is present only on fol. 1v. M3 is a later hand writing in a cursive script in black ink. M3's corrections on fol. 1v are few and terse. As a result, there is not enough writing to establish accurately a date for this hand.

IIa. Statius, *Achilleid* with two *accessus* and glosses; *incipit*: magnanimum eacidem formidatum tonanti...; *explicit*: aura silet puppis currens ad littora uenit mater.

**Colophon** (fol. 157r): Explicit Aurel. frater amen ante tamen palm(um) anno domini 1276.

**Accessus** (current fol. 142r, previously fol. 139)

Two *accessus* to the *Achilleid* of Statius. Both *accessus* contain underlined lemmata followed by comments. These glosses may be selections of other complete commentaries to the *Achilleid* which have been excerpted as part of their respective *accessus*. Both *accessus* and their excerpted comments are not part of the marginal and interlinear glosses which accompany the *Achilleid* in this section of the manuscript.

**Accessus 1. incipit**: In presentis libri primordio sunt haec quinque spiritualiter inquirenda... *explicit*: per prosopopeiam musam suam alloquitur ita dicens diua refer et cetera.

**Accessus 2. incipit**: Ad maiorem subsequencium euidenciam...; *explicit*: et sic achillem greci manifeste cognouerunt et secum ad bellum duexerunt et hiis visus ad litteram sit descensus.
Glosses (fol. 142rb-157r) *incipit*: magnanimum id est mire audacie...; *explicit*: aura silet uentus cessat.

**Script:** The text, *accessus*, and glosses are the work of a single thirteenth-century hand of French origin, dated to 1276 via the colophon. Writing is quite rapid, compressed, and typical of the period. The script is not a cursive, yet due to the rapidity of writing some cursive elements have intruded into the script. The scribe is prone to use ligatures as in cursive, particularly with combinations of letters forms consisting of minims (i.e. *i, u, n, m*). A general inconsistency of certain letter forms pervades the script, also due to the rapidity of writing. The letter *a* is generally the two-compartment form, but at times can resemble erroneously its single-compartment counterpart because it was written so quickly. There is also an extremely mild influence of documentary script in the hand, which is seen most clearly by a more restrained use of *litterae elongatae* (see the first line on fol. 142r).

IIb. Avianius, *Fabulae* with *accessus* glosses. (fols. 157v-165v); *incipit* Rustica delfenti paruo iurauerat olim; *explicit*: expedit insignem promeruisse necem.

**Colophon** (fol. 165v): Explicit apud oysemontem anno domini 1277 ante festum beati marchi evangeliste.

*Accessus* and *glosses* (fol.157v-165v); *incipit*: Rustica delfenti et cetera in isto opere et in quolibet sunt ista...; *explicit* necem mortem.
Script: This script is also of the thirteenth century and is dated to 1277 by the colophon. It is possible that the same hand is at work here as the one writing the Statius material. A comparison reveals similarities between the idiosyncrasies of certain letter forms (particularly the form of g, d-e ligature, the way straight s forms an angle, rather than a curve, the formation of Insular est, and the stylized treatment given to majuscule forms often incorporating the flourishes of documentary script). It is also worthy of note that the text of Avianus begins on the verso side of the folio on which the text of Statius ends. The placement of the texts obviously indicates that the text of Statius was already in possession of the scribe who copied that of Avianius, rather than binding two separate booklets together. The level of execution is higher and the text is written less rapidly than the 1276 example. The script in this section could represent a more refined and practiced form of the previous attempt with better inks and instruments of writing. Furthermore, the plain initials which run through both texts are near-identical in letter forms, color, and consistency of ink. The initials may be the work of the same decorator, but more likely were produced in the same environment/workshop.

However, to err on the side of caution, it is indeed more likely that the hand writing this script is not M1, but a different hand (M2) which is closely related to M1 in terms of geographic location, date (which is precisely known through the colophons), and environment (either the same school, workshop, or other "institution").
III. Prudentius, *Psychomachia* with commentary (incomplete; fols. 166r-173v); *incipit*: senex fidelis prima credendi uia est...; *explicit*: non piget attritis pedibus per acuta frutecta.

*Commentary: incipit*: septem sunt requerenda in capite unius cuitusque libri...; *explicit*: pleplum est genus cortine et pleplum factum de serico et de ipso dicitur hic drus drappellum.

The text of *Psychomachia* stops at verse 443. The later hand which has added titles throughout the entire codex notes on fol. 173v: deficiunt octo folia ad integritatem Psychomachie Prudentii.

**Script:** Text and commentary are written by a single hand of the thirteenth century. The script is well executed, highly legible, and maintains a clear and aerated appearance. Despite its aerated appearance, fusions of opposite curves are well represented and quite pervasive throughout both text and commentary (e.g. *de*, *do*, *bo*, *pe*, *ho*, *oc*, etc.) Overall, the letter forms have a very round appearance and the descenders are short, both of which suggest a more southern origin. Single-compartment *a* is used without exception aside from when it is majuscle (see fol. 173r). Both uncial and upright *d* forms are used throughout the text, but uncial *d* is almost exclusively used in the marginal commentary. The binary system for *r* is used throughout the entire section. Straight *s* is written the most, but round *s* seems to appear at word-end at the end of a line (but not exclusively),201 and straight *s* appears at word-end within a line. The shaft of *t* is always

---

201 See fol. 170r.
above the crossbar. Ligatures are rare, with the exception of *st*. Tironian *et* appears uncrossed (e.g. fol. 167v).

IVa. *Dictionarius* (incomplete; fols. 174r-197v); *incipit:* *Dictionarius dicitur libellus iste a donibus magis necessariis...*; *explicit:* the end of the text is too mutilated to decipher accurately:...leuendo no[.....a [...el*e? comitetur. The same is true for the final gloss which reads: [.....] medio loco locatur.

**Script:** The *Dictionarius* and *Epistula* are the work of the same hand. The *Dictionarius* is written in two different scripts, though likely by the same hand. The first script, which writes the main text, is a fourteenth-century Gothic script rapidly written. After each entry there is a space devoted for comments and glosses, which are written in more rapidly in a cursive of a contemporaneous date. The *Epistula* maintains the same display of a rapid textualis for the text and cursive for commentary. The two scripts are identical to those of the *Dictionarius*.

IVb. *Epistula Ade magistri de paruo ponte ad Anselmum de reditu suo in Angliam a Galla* (incomplete; fols. 198r-205v); *incipit:* phale tholum cillentibus radiis perspicuum cum iam prospicerem...; *explicit:* olearea et semiacdia scortica leacidas.
V. Canon Law _excerpta_ including marginal commentary. (fols. 206r-207v); _incipit:_ consuluit nos tue discretionis prudentia; _explicit:_ sane a sancte memorie predecessore nostro alex. propterea modo in.

Previously unidentified text. The _incipit_ of fol. 206r corresponds to KI no. 218, WH no. 197, and JL no. 14026. The card entry dates the _incipit_ to 1159-81 via Alexander III.

**Script:** Written in a well executed Northern Gothic Textualis of the fourteenth century.


_F_ Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 36. 18, s. xiv

Ovid, _Metamorphoses_ with _accessus_ and marginal and interlinear scholia. The text and glosses are written by the same hand of the fourteenth century, but the _accessus_ is that of another contemporaneous hand.

In Latin, on parchment. Page: 235x150mm; text frame: 180x70mm; approx. ratio: 0.39; I +1 +160 f., foliated in modern ink and pencil with Arabic numerals, but Roman numerals are used on the guard leaves. The manuscript has been foliated twice resulting
in a numerical inconsistency between some folia (for example, fol. 38 of quire 2 is also numbered in pencil as fol. 16 and there are similar occurrences in quire 3; there appear to be two folia numbered 104, the last folio of quire 10 and the first folio of quire 11). However, in the instances where misnumbering occurs, the text is undisturbed and continues in the correct order. The parchment is of a good quality with extremely smooth flesh sides.

**Collation:** I +1-178

**Format:** I +I +IV8(x17)

**Quires:** The outer sides of all quires are flesh and the gathering structure is the quaternio, both typical of the late medieval period; all quires observe Gregory's Rule; the manuscript has been trimmed multiple times. The manuscript is missing several quires, as a result Book 1 ends at *Met.* 1. 697, Books 2 and 3 are missing, and Book 4 begins at *Met.* 4. 39.

**Catchwords:** Contemporary catchwords are written horizontally in the lower margin toward the middle. All catchwords present correspond, however the manuscript has been trimmed resulting in the loss of catchwords for quires 1 and 4.

**Layout:** Ruling is a combined technique of hardpoint and lead; prickings are visible in the upper and right margins; a single column of text with 38 lines with glosses written in
the upper, left, and right margins, and also interlinearly. Writing is below the top line. The vertical bounding lines establish separate space for text and marginal glosses. This manuscript was intended to be glossed. Corresponds closely to Derolez no. 35.

**Decoration:** Well executed initials 3-4 lines in height. The initials are red and blue in the *littera duplex* style with contrasting penwork. There is also rubrication of *tituli* and book numbers; some "paraph" marks are also in red.

**Binding:** Late medieval binding; tooled reddish leather over boards; two leather clasps. The front and back covers are decorated with stylized metal corner pieces. A chain measuring approx. 710mm is still attached.

**Owners:** Braccio Martelli (1501-August 17, 1560), son of Piero Martelli.\(^{202}\) Braccio Martelli was the bishop of Fiesole (elected June 20, 1530) and Lecce (transferred February 12, 1552), and also participated in the Council of Trent (December 13, 1545-March 11, 1547).

**Script:** Written in well executed, highly legible, and precise Northern Italian hand of the late thirteenth/early fourteenth century. The letter forms do not display as much roundness typical in the more southern variety of the script. The same hand has written both the text of the *Metamorphoses*, and all marginal and interlinear material. A second

\(^{202}\) *Braccii Martelli Petri filii liber* is written on the inside front cover.
contemporaneous hand has written the accessus on the verso of the guardleaf in a similar script.

**Contents:**

Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, fols. 1r-159r; *incipit*: In noua fert animus mutatas dicere formas;

*explicit*: si quid habent ueri uatum presagia semper uiuam.

Following the *explicit* of the *Metamorphoses*:

uatis peligni traduntur carmina fini
qui studio nittuit dum sibi uita fuit
bis sex millenos uersus in codice scriptos
set ter quinque minus continet ouidius

The text includes *Met. 1. 1-697* and *Met. 4. 37-15.879*

*Accessus*, guardleaf Iv; *incipit*: <O>uidius natione sulmontius ex patre pilio poet facundissimus temporibus octauiani augusti claruit...

See no. 322 in Coulson and Roy, *Incipitarium ouidianum*.

Arnulf of Orléans, *Glosulae*, fols. 1r-159r; *inc. in gigantomachia nati sunt... expl. anime siquidem bonorum non deflentur immo malorum unde.....

Marullus, *De Didone in anulo* (fol. 160r); *inc. tu qui me casusque meos in imagine paruo...expl. quid ferei incesti femina adulterii. Telos de poetis latinis.
The poem was added later and is written in a humanistic hand of the fifteenth century.


**A Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 18 inf., saec. xv**

Ovid, *Metamorphoses* with *accessus* and marginal and interlinear scholia. The text of the *Metamorphoses* was written by a certain Marcus at Urbino in 1420 (colophon on fol. 151r).

In Latin, on parchment. Page: 400x290mm; text frame: 240x100mm; approx. ratio 0.42; II I +1-1410 +1511 f., foliated in modern ink in Arabic numerals, but Roman numerals are used on the guard leaves. The parchment is very smooth and of a high quality. The first two guard leaves are paper.

**Collation**: $I^2 + III^1 + 1-14_{10} +15_{11}$

**Format**: $I^2 + I + V_{10}(x14) + V_{10+1}$
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Quires: The outer sides of all quires are flesh, typical of the late medieval period. The structure of the quinio with ten leaves indicates Italian production, which is consistent with all other factors of this manuscript. However, a parchment stub has been added to quire 15 so it begins on flesh (fol. 141r) and ends on hair (fol. 151v). The folia have been trimmed. A parchment reinforcement strip has been applied to the front of quire 1 (fols. 1r and 10v); guard leaf III is a parchment singleton between guard leaves I and II and fol. 1r.

Catchwords: Contemporary catchwords are written horizontally in the lower margin toward the middle, and correspond. They are often stylized with small decorations like linework or flowers. Quires 12-14 lack catchwords.

Layout: Ruled in pencil with some ink tracing, prickings are not visible; one column of text with 40 lines, glosses are written in both margins and interlinearly. Writing is below the top line. Corresponds closely to Derolez nos. 22 and 23.

Decoration: Extravagantly decorated with highly executed initials. Each book begins with an initial in gold leaf and combinations of violet, pink, green, blue, red, white, and their various lightened shades with white penwork throughout. The size of the initials spans anywhere from 6 to 16 lines of text. An elaborate floral border appears on fol. 1r as well as a coat of arms. There is also the occasional letter heightening in yellow, which is typical of Italian manuscripts.
**Binding:** Modern brown leather over boards. The manuscript was restored in 1978 (see fol. 151v for sticker\textsuperscript{203} and note\textsuperscript{204}, both modern).

**Owners:** The coat of arms on fol. 1r has yet to be identified. The manuscript was also in the possession of Federico Borromai and was viewed by Olgiatus in 1603 at the Biblioteca Ambrosiana. The codex was purchased for 25 gold nummi (see guard leaf III recto).

**Script:** The text of the *Metamorphoses* is written in a highly executed Italian Rotunda script by the "certain Marcus" from Urbino. There is a high level of precision and the letters forms display a fine consistency.

The glosses which surround the text are written in a humanistic miniscule (G1) which still displays some Gothic letter forms. The script is well executed and letter forms are consistent enough to suggest that time was not enough of a factor to sacrifice legibility. A dark ink is used and appears in different hues from blackish to brownish throughout the manuscript (see the bottom of fol. 9v for a clear example of how the ink fades). There have been two main "annotation sets" by this same hand, first in the column to the left of the text, then in the one to the right. The two sets are distinguished often by two different "paragraph marks" by the same hand. Interlinear glossing by this hand occurs sparsely. G1 also added other material after these two attempts were

\textsuperscript{203} abbazia di viboldone laboratorio restauro libro.
\textsuperscript{204} Restaurato a cura dello Fondazione Ercole Varzi estote 1978.
finished wherever there was open space. The order of script, level of execution, and state of the inks suggest repeated attempts of reading and annotation by a single user over a prolonged period of time. These factors are consistent with the manuscript's use for private study and reflection as opposed to oral lecture and lesson.

A second, but later, hand (G2), writes only interlinear glosses in a humanistic cursive script in very few places in the text.

Contents:

Metamorphoses, fols. 1r-151r; incipit: In noua fert animus...; explicit: si quid habent ueri uatum presagia semper uiiet et eternum nomine sine fine manebit.

Colophon: Written in red ink on fol. 150v: "Publii ouidii nasonis metamorphoseos quintusdecimus et ultimus liber explicit et completus per me marcum quondam magistrum luce honorablisphisici de urbino 1420."

Accessus: IIIv (third guard leaf verso); inc. ne prolixitatis fastidio aures audientum obturentur...; exp. proponit inuocat et narrat.

See Incipitarium no. 271 for other manuscripts transmitting this accessus.

Glosulae: Glosses, not those of Arnulf, begin on IIIv; inc. animus deliberacio animi...; exp. ferrum per incisionem uetustas per tineas et corruptionem (fol. 151r); Arnulf's glosses are written throughout the entire manuscript with the exception of Book 15.

9.2 Manuscripts examined via Microfilms and Digital Reproductions

**M** München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 7205, s. xii-xiv


In Latin, on parchment. Different measurements appear for each section of texts: see Coulson and Nawotka 1993, 271-273; I + 112 +1 f., foliated in modern black ink.

**Bibliography:** Munk Olsen vol. 2, 176; Coulson and Nawotka 1993, 271-273.

**B** London, British Library, Burney 224, s. xiii

The manuscript is of French origin.

**Owners:** Roger Twysden, who has also paginated the manuscript.


**Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. class. lat. 1, s. xiii**

Ovid, *Heroides, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris, Metamorphoses, Fasti, Tristia, Epistulae ex Ponto* with *accessus* and marginal and interlinear glosses; a calendar appears on fols. 218v-219r; the commentaries on the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* have been identified as those of Arnulf of Orléans.

In Latin, on parchment. 305x190 mm (Munari); II + 275 + II f. The manuscript is likely of Italian origin.

P    Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 8001, s. xii

Ovid, Metamorphoses; Arnulf of Orléans, accessus, glosulae (incomplete), Allegoriae.

In Latin, on parchment. 265x190 mm (Munari); 69 f. the accessus, Allegoriae, and portions of the glosses of Arnulf of Orléans written in a later hand have been inserted after fol. 16. The manuscript is of French origin.


D    Vaticano (Città del), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5222, s. xv

Orico di Capriana, Summa memorialis; Ovid, Metamorphoses with thick marginal and interlinear glosses; pseudo-Ovid, De Somno.

In Latin on paper; 305x215 mm (Munari); 349 f.; the manuscript dates to 1415 and is of Italian origin. The commentary with the Metamorphoses (fols. 29-247v) is that of Arnulf of Orléans, but lacks the glosses to Book 15. Other marginal and interlinear glosses are present with the poem that are not those of Arnulf.

Owners: Damiano da Pola
Script: All texts and commentary are written in the autograph of Damiano da Pola. A humanistic cursive is used for the book script, and also for all marginal and interlinear glosses and commentaries.


Z Pistoia, Biblioteca Comunale Forteguerriana, A 46, s. xv

Tabula Ovidii Metamorphoseon; Initia et argumenta Metamorphoseon; Accessus ad Ovidium; Arnulf of Orléans glosses to the *Metamorphoses* (excerpts); Boccaccio, *Genealogiae deorum gentilium* (excerpts); Zomino da Pistoia, commentary to Seneca's Tragedies; Boccaccio, *Genealogiae deorum gentilium* (excerpts).

In Latin, on paper and parchment. Excerpts of Arnulf's commentary are transmitted in *catena* format with other glosses, some of which are likely of Zomino's own composition. The manuscript is equipped with an elaborate index and includes subject headings in the upper margins.

Owners: Zomino da Pistoia (Sozomeno).

Script: Written in the autograph of Zomino da Pistoia. The script used is a humanistic cursive.

9.3 Additional Manuscripts Consulted for the Accessus from Microfilms and Digital Reproductions

C Vaticano (Città del), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1593, s. xii
Orico di Cavriana, Summa memorialis (Summae I-III); Glossa in Ouidium: Accessus Ad Ouidium; Arnulf of Orléans, Accessus; Ovid, Metamorphoses with marginal and interlinear glosses; Ovid, Epistulae ex Ponto (excerpts).
In Latin on parchment. 249x145 mm (Buoncore); ff. IV + 148 f. Several Italian hands from the twelfth through the fifteenth century are present in the manuscript.

Contents:

I. Orico di Cavriana, Summa memorialis (fol. III).

*Summae* I-III are added in an Italian hand of the fifteenth century.

II. Glossa in Ouidium (fol. IIIv).

Glosses are added by an Italian hand of the twelfth century.

III. Accessus ad Ouidium (fol. IV).

The *accessus* is added by an Italian hand of the thirteenth century.

IV. Arnulf of Orléans, Accessus (fols. IVr-IVv).

Arnulf's *accessus* is also written in a twelfth century hand.

V. Ovid, Metamorphoses with marginal and interlinear glosses (fols. 1-147).

The text of the *Metamorphoses* is written by two twelfth century hands and the glosses are added thirteenth and fourteenth century.


L Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, BPL 97, s. xiii/xiv.

Ovid, *Metamorphoses* with marginal and interlinear glosses; Arnulf of Orléans, *Accessus*;

In Latin on parchment. 180x140 mm (Munari); 157 f.

Bibliography: Munari, no. 144.
Antwerpen, Musaeum Plantin-Moretus 85 (lat. 71), s. xiii/xiv

Statius, *Achilleid*; Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae*; glosses to the works of Ovid: *Amores, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris, Metamorphoses, Fasti, Tristia, Epistulae ex Ponto*; glosses to the *Achilleid* of Statius.

In Latin on parchment.


Vaticano (Città del), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1563, s. xiii

In Latin on parchment. 235x165 mm (Buoncore); I + 83 f. The manuscript is of French origin. The texts are written in hands of the twelfth century, but the commentaries and *accessus* are in later hands of the thirteenth and fourteenth century.

**Bibliography:** MCL, vol. 3, part 1, pp. 285-87; Buoncore, no. 159; Pellegrin 1978, 285-287; Munk Olsen 1985, 780;

St. Omer, Bibliothèque de la Ville, 678, s. xiii

Ovid, *Metamorphoses* with glosses; Arnulf of Orléans *accessus* and *Allegoriae*.

Ao Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, O 3 sup. s. xiv
Ovid, *Metamorphoses* with commentary and the *accessus* of Arnulf of Orléans;
miscellaneous texts including Petrus Alphonsi, Lotharius diaconus, St. Anselm, St. Denis,
and Geoffrey fo Vinsauf's *Poetria Nova*.

In Latin on parchment. 165x120 mm (Munari); 336 f.

**Bibliography:** Munari, no. 15.

### 10. Editorial Approaches, Constitution of the Text, and Format of the Edition

#### 10.1 Editorial Approaches

The editing of medieval commentaries presents different challenges to the editor than those of strictly literary texts: the commentary is a fluid and utilitarian text, and throughout its textual tradition modification is extremely common. As Marti clearly states of Arnulf's commentary to Lucan's *Bellum Ciuile*, "every magister who used or copied Arnulf's commentary felt free to alter it by drawing upon the information which had been accumulated by succeeding generations of interpreters and by them added to the common body of glosses found in the margins of most texts of the poem."\(^{205}\) Marjorie Curry Woods has also addressed several editorial problems unique to the commentary genre, such as fluidity, oral transmission routes, the significance of omissions and transpositions, the desire to study several manuscripts of a commentary as a group, as well as problems in constructing the *apparatus* and even in presenting the edited text on

---

\(^{205}\) Marti 1958, lx.
the page. More recently, Huygens addressed the broader subject of editing medieval texts and the inherent problems which are not present in the editing of classical texts.

Scott Gwara has also devised his own method for editing glosses which is explained in his edition of Aldhelm's glosses.

Despite the various arguments for and against different editorial approaches for commentaries, there should remain one constant: the manuscript evidence must dictate the editorial approach when dealing with a commentary. An editor must consider all manuscript evidence before arriving at such a decision; if he or she does not, then the approach and its biases have dictated and may have even manipulated the evidence. The only goal in mind in beginning the editorial process of a commentary should be to present a readable text which reflects as accurately as possible the manuscript evidence. So after collation, the stemmatic method may be the best approach to the manuscripts of one commentary's textual tradition, but the single manuscript approach may be the best for the evidence of another manuscript tradition. It is neither possible nor responsible editorially to edit every commentary in the same manner.

Previous editors of Arnulf's works have not used the stemmatic method. Whereas Marti produced an 'eclectic text', and Rieker, in his edition of Arnulf's commentary to the

---

207 R.B.C. Huygens, Ars Edendi (Turnhout 2000). Huygens still maintains that the stemmatic method produced more credible results due to "blind" editorial experiment he conducted.
208 Scott Gwara (ed.), Aldhelmii Malmesbiriensis Prosa de virginitate cum glosa latina atque anglosaxonica, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, two vols. (Turnhout 2001). Gwara's method presents more of collation of the glosses rather than an edited form with a traditional apparatus criticus. Cf. Wallace M. Lindsay, "The Editing of Isidore Etymologiae," The Classical Quarterly 5:1 (1911): 42-53, where Lindsay says on p. 49 "...this encyclopaedia [the Etymologiae] is not a literary work of art...to print a full collation of, say, a score or even a dozen of the leading MSS. would be sheer folly."
Fasti, primarily follows one manuscript and supplements much in the same way that Ghisalberti edited his excerpts of the Metamorphoses commentary. However, Coulson and Nawotka, unlike Ghisalberti, were able to see clear relationships within a small sample of the tradition, because they had access to manuscript evidence which was unknown to Ghisalberti. Coulson and Nawotka's selections of Arnulf's Metamorphoses commentary were edited using the stemmatic method.

In the case of Arnulf's commentary to the Metamorphoses, the manuscripts can be grouped using the stemmatic method. To edit this text from a single manuscript (which would have to be M) would produce a text full of error, omission, and interpolation which would be unreadable. Similarly, using the same manuscript and then supplementing only select readings would furnish that manuscript with a false sense of authority to the reader, and provide a less reliable edition of the text. One does well to remember that the "good copy" of a text could originate from a "poor" exemplar and vice-a-versa. An editor cannot make an informed choice until all evidence is examined closely, which should not be limited to paleographical but should include codicological features as well, because they too represent part of the commentary's tradition.

Textually, the variants in this tradition contain conjunctive and separative errors, where often the fluid elements result from the need to correct such errors. In the majority of cases, there is not so much significant variation within the manuscripts as to render them incapable of grouping or displaying close affiliations. It is true that the textual

---

209 See Rieker 2005, l-lii.
210 See Ghisalberti 1939, 180-189.
211 For their editorial principles see Coulson and Nawotka 1993, 269-271.
tradition contains instances of contamination between groups and from outside sources, but the stemmatic approach reveals, in most cases, where these contaminations entered the tradition and how they influenced later copies. I must fully disagree with Robert Dale Sweeney's statement about the failure of using the presence or absence of various glosses in constructing a stemma.\textsuperscript{212} It cannot be the only criterion for grouping, but can be fully reliable depending on the evidence. For example, in Arnulf's commentary to the \textit{Metamorphoses}, the earliest witnesses in \textit{catena} format present the commentary as a primary text in its own right. The format stabilizes the tradition in a way that is not always possible in \textit{scholion} manuscripts, but does not preclude all fluidity because it still remains a utilitarian text. A discussion of my application of the stemmatic method follows in the next section.

\textbf{10.2 Constitution of the Text}

Before examining the particular textual divisions, affiliations and contaminations between the manuscripts, the relationships of their physical formats must first be examined briefly. The reason is because the particular formats of the various manuscripts and the different utilitarian traditions are also significant factors to the constitution of the text of this particular commentary.

The three manuscripts in \textit{catena} format, \textbf{M}, \textbf{V}, and \textbf{T} are the earliest extant witnesses to the commentary, in fact, quite close to Arnulf's lifetime, and all three transmitted the complete text before the tradition's divergence in the thirteenth century:

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{212}Woods 1984, 136 quotes Sweeney: "...an attempt to construct a stemma based on the presence or absence of various scholia, or to determine, by the mere comparison of the manuscripts whether or not a given passage is 'original,' must fail."}
accessus followed by glosulae, mutationes and Allegoriae in an alternating fashion for each book. They are the most representative sources of the text's use in Arnulf's classroom at Orléans. M and V may originate directly from Orléans within approximately fifteen years of the commentary's composition. T, which was also used in France, is only slightly later, but it is not as reliable to attribute an Orléanais origin to this manuscript as for the others.

Presently, however, M is the only complete witness to the text, while both V and T are fragmentary. Although it is a later witness, B, also transmits the commentary in full, albeit the format of the commentary has changed: The accessus precedes the work, the glosulae are written in scholion format between lines and in the margins of the Metamorphoses, and both the mutationes and Allegoriae follow in continuous prose after Book 15 concludes. In this way, B distinguishes itself from the other scholion witnesses WOFDA, which do not transmit the commentary in its full version. Furthermore, B also shares many readings and significant variants (notably several significant lemmata which do not match its text of the Metamorphoses) with the catena tradition of M, V, and T. From these factors it is reasonable to conclude that B, or more likely its exemplar, was copied directly from a manuscript in catena format which transmitted the entire commentary.

Based upon their dates, formats, and common variants, the remaining manuscripts, W and particularly the Italian tradition represented by OFDA, are likely to derive from a class of manuscripts which in turn derive from a common source after the commentary's divergence in the thirteenth century. This common source has admitted
numerous variants and "interpolations" through the course of time that are not present in MVTB, or rarely only in B through contamination.

For these reasons, after a collation of the manuscripts, the text of the glosulae is constituted from the readings of MVTB, and those of WOFDA are listed to lend support to a reading, to illustrate the significant variants of the scholion and Italian traditions, or to supplement when V and T are fragmentary. The text of this edition is best representative of Arnulf's lecture series on the Metamorphoses before the thirteenth-century divergence of the tradition.

The accessus tradition leaves behind a rich manuscript tradition which does not transmit the commentary in full. The versions of the accessus transmitted in CLNRSPAo have been collated against those of MVBW, and their relationships and groupings are described below. The text of the accessus is constituted from MVBW, and the readings of CLNRSPAo are listed to support a reading, to show significant variants and later modifications, and to illustrate the way the accessus tradition circulates with the full commentary and independently from it. The aim is, again, to produce a readable text which is most faithful to the accessus used by Arnulf in his lecture series.

Although this edition does not claim to represent precisely the ipsa uerba of Arnulf, it is more reliable than if an eclectic version were produced only through following M (which contains many errors) supplemented by the fragments of V (which is reliable, but also contains errors) and T (which is riddled with error more than any other manuscript of the tradition). The text of this edition does, however, represent the incarnation of Arnulf's lecture series from which all other copies likely derive and and
drew upon for modification. The archetype $\Omega$ should not be synonymous with "Arnulf's autograph"
but rather the archetype of the apographs derived from the lecture series. It is impossible
to state with certainty whether they descend from Arnulf's actual autograph. The stemma
illustrates both the textual relationships of the manuscripts, but also simultaneously the
tradition of ideas and their movements throughout the commentary's tradition.

10.3 Affiliations of the Manuscripts

The following information is also represented graphically by the stemmata
codicum (figs. 1.3 and 1.4).

Manuscripts MV share a number of significant variations, through which they can
be grouped together into a definitive subgroup (\(\alpha\)) against those of TBWOFDA (\(\beta\)).
Within M and V there are errors and omissions which suggest they do not derive from a
single manuscript, but their exemplars did share a common source.

Among the variants which demonstrate the consensus of \(\alpha\) (MV) against \(\beta\)
(BTWOFDA) are these:

7. 4 tangit] om. MV
7. 62 marinis periculis BFDA: periculis W: periculis maris O: periculis qui sunt in armis
   sic M: periculis qui sunt in mari sic V
7. 157 au(c)torem] om. MV
7. 157 ab] om. MV
7. 260 uocat BWFDA: om. MV
7. 272 excor(t/c)icatur BWF: excoriatur MV DA: decoriatur O
7. 388 quem] quam MV
8.12 uictor] uictus MV
8.139 ipsa TBWF: ipsi DA: om. MV
8. 139 mecum] om. MV
8. 153 quibusdam] om. MV
8. 169 semel] om. MV
and those which show TBWOFDA against MV are these:

7. 68 tantum MV: om. TBWFDA
7. 94 propter tres potestates MV: pro tribus potestantibus BFDA
7. 306 intellige MV: positus F: ponitur A: om. WBD
7. 398 adduxerat MV: aduocauerat BWFDA: adnouerat O
8. 12habebatur nec e contrario] om. TBWFDA
8.67 hoc] id (illud) TB(W)FDA
8. 71 assequendum MV (+WF): consequendum TBDA
8.81 curiosi...o(c)tiosi] curiosi...curiosi T(B)WF(DA)
8. 181 est MV: sonat TBWFDA
8. 196 dicit MV (+W): om. TBFDA
8. 416 hab. MV: om. TBWOFDA
8. 430 gracius MV (+WA): gra(c/t)iosius TBFD
8. 450 de MV: om. TBWFDA
8. 746 driopes MV: driopis TBFD
8. 879] eorum aliorum T? BFDA
9. 91-2 fructum] fructus TB
9. 130 palude MV: om. TB
10. 42 idem add. TBWF
10. 42 monte] montis TBFD
10. 127 in celeste signum] ad signum faciendum BWFDA: om. T
10. 127 in celum add. TBWFDA
10. 127 iacintum] narcisum TBDA
There is contamination between α (MV) and B, which allows for the consensus of MVB against TWOFDA. Among the variants which demonstrate the consensus of MVB against TWOFDA are these:

7. 69 uocando coniugium MVB
7. 365 phition MVB: rodon WO(F)A
7. 382 menalip(p)o MVB: meleagro WFDA (-O)
7. 421 intelligatur M: legatur uel si subintelligatur B: legatur WFDA
8. 123 esse MVB: fuisse TWOFDA
8. 150 plumis apparuit MVB: ap(p)aruit TWFDA
8. 181 inmissos MVB: missos TWFDA
11. 387 dicens] dicunt MB
15. 161 templo TWOF: bello MB

Within TBWOFDA, there is a division where manuscripts WOFDA form a class, Ψ which allows for the consensus of WOFDA against TB. These variants likely come from sources outside the tradition, due to the divergence of the textual tradition within the thirteenth century. Thus it creates a consensus of MV TB against WOFDA:

7. 796 sum: M TB: fui WOFA: om. D
8. 842 afferens MV TB: conferens WFDA
8. 562 maneries WF: maneria MV TB
8. 881 flector WFDA: om. MV TB
15. 199 num (non) id est numquid M(T)B: om. WOF

Among the variants which demonstrate the division of TBWOFDA into TB and WOFDA (Ψ) are these:

7.576 essent WDA: sint M: om. TB
8. 291 maturitatem] materitatem TB
8. 450 fratrem] fratrem TB
8. 665 condiuntur] condicuntur TB
8. 875 uiolentia] uolencia TB
15. 269 labentia] habundantia TB
15. 342 poterunt MV WFD: possunt TB

153
There is also evidence of another instance of contamination between the class Ψ and B, which allows the consensus of BWOFDA against MV T. Among the variants which demonstrate the contamination between B and Ψ are these:

7. 362 mutata[u]ersa BWFD
8.123 nam...ueritatem BWFD: om. MVT
8. 126 hab. MVT: om. BWFD
8. 282 quanto maiores et cetera MVT: om. BWOFDA
11. 55 pociuntur...herbum MT: om. BWOFDA
11. 215 neptunum MT: neptunum et apollinem (neptuno et apollini) B(W)FDA
11. 229 curuat OMT: curuatus BWOFDA
11. 541 inuidet MT: non uidet BWFDA

The manuscripts which transmit the accessus form much the same relationship as those transmitting the philological glosses. Among the variants which show the agreement of MVC group (α) against BWLNRS P Ao group (β) are these:

4. plinio MV(C): p(e/i)lio BWLNRP Ao: pelnio S
4. lucilium MV(C): lucium BWRP: lucinum N P: lucanum Ao (lucilium sic C)
11. ibique MV: ubi C (+N°): ubi quia BWLN P: in quo S: in quo quia Ao
12. ubi MVC: per quod R: om. BWLNS
12. inimiciciam MVC: -ias BWLNRS P Ao (Ao adds prep 'in')
13. incurrit MVC (+LRP): incidit BWNS Ao
13. docendo adulterium MVC: om. BWLNRS
13. quas MVC: fuisse add. BWLN SP
20. inemendatum MVC: incorre(c/p)tum BLNRS: inperfectum W
28. exilio MV (+L): ponto BWNSP
29. utrum an(te) MVC: an BWL N
29. uel non MV: necne B: an redierit WLN (lacuna C: siue redierit S)
30. modo MV: primo B: postea WLNRS (lacuna C)
30. querendum est MVC: queramus BWLN RS
32. bene...enim xv] om. WL NRS
50. igitur MVC: ergo B: om. WLNRS
50. mutatio...materia MVC: materia...mutatio BWLNRS
50. ut non MV: non ut BWNS
53. alter...alter MVC: unus...alter BWL(N)RS (unus...alius N)
58. planetarum MVC: vii planetarum BWLN RS
Within group $\beta$, several manuscripts seem to have a closer affiliation with one other. Particularly, closer affiliations between $\text{BWL}$, and $\text{NR}$, and, more broadly, $\text{LNRS}$ may be posited. Yet, these variants are not numerous enough to create definitively multiple subgroupings within group $\beta$. Many, however, are worth noting:

2. sole(i)mus$\text{ sulmius BWL}$
3. in$\text{ om. BL}$
6. minoribus$\text{ moribus BWL}$
9. maximiani$\text{ maximi WLP: maxi R}$
29. nescimus$\text{ nescio }\text{BW (ignoramus L: nesiemus R: act**non habemus mutlio S)}$
19. nequaque...posset$\text{ nequisset NR}$
54. et$\text{ uel NR}$
61. recepisse$\text{ assumpsisse WL: reuertisse NR: resumpsisse S}$
35. id est se (ipsum) excrucians$\text{ om. BLNS}$
36. uideamus$\text{ uideatur LNRS}$
36. exponatur$\text{ exponamus B: sic expone LNRS}$
63. ethice...mortalitatem$\text{ om. WNRS}$
Figure 1.3: Stemma codicum of Arnulf’s philological *glosulae*.
Figure 1.4: Stemma codicum of Arnulf's *accessus*.
10.4 Format of the Edition

All glosses are numbered according to the respective lines of Tarrant's Oxford edition of the *Metamorphoses* to which the lemmata correspond. However, Arnulf's lemmata are always printed in this edition, even when they do not correspond with the readings Tarrant has chosen to print. In such instances, the reader should refer to his *apparatus criticus* and the lemmata corresponding to Arnulf's text will usually appear as variant readings.

The same line numbers are also used in all *apparatus* entries at the bottom of the page to avoid unnecessary confusion by introducing separate line numbers for each gloss. However, line numbers have been introduced for the *accessus* only and correspond to all entries in the *apparatus* for that section of the text.

Lemmata have been italicized in the text to set them apart visually for the modern reader, in the same fashion as underlining did for the medieval reader. I have chosen not to print lemmata in all capital letters, as is the usual convention when editing glosses. Full capitalization of the lemmata presents a false sense of *grauitas* which was never inherent in the actual medieval transmission of the work. The modern reader may conclude reliably that all italicized words in this edition were underlined in the manuscripts. I have taken the liberty of marking lemmata which scribes have forgotten to underline, and these occurrences are noted within the *apparatus criticus* only when they may affect a reading or sense of a passage, or if they demonstrate significant features of the textual tradition. My foremost intentions are to facilitate readability and to do so as faithfully to the utilitarian tradition of the commentary as possible. However, all lemmata have been fully expanded from their abbreviated forms without using
parentheses. The truncated forms appear in the *apparatus criticus* only when there is discrepancy among lemmata in order to report accurately what the manuscripts actually transmit.

Proper nouns and adjectives have been capitalized and punctuation has been introduced according to modern conventions.

I have retained the inconsistencies of the medieval orthography because it is representative of a medieval school text, nor is it possible to infer precisely what Arnulf's orthography actually was from the manuscripts. Arnulf himself probably also wrote with the same orthographical inconsistences present in the manuscripts. This influence is likely due to the tension between his own spellings and those of the manuscripts which he consulted. Among these inconsistences are interchangeable uses of *ci* and *ti*, as well as *c*, *t*, and *ct*, (e.g. *actedere* for *accedere*), *f* and *ph*, aspirated forms of *c*, *t*, *ch*, and *th*, *pp* and *bp* (e.g. *subponatur* and *supponatur*), and double and single consonants like *p* for *pp* and vice-a-versa (e.g. *oppidum* appears also as *opidum*). To standardize the text would create a uniform orthography which is artificial and lend no benefit for further study of the commentary or this particular stage of the Latin language.

Although it is of Germanic origin, I follow the orthography of *M* because it is the earliest complete witness to the text. However, when the manuscript evidence allows, it is possible to supplement the orthography of *M* with that of *V* or *T*, which are of French origin, to remove any Germanic influence, and these may represent more accurately Arnulf's own spellings. Matters of orthography do not appear in the *apparatus criticus* unless they affect the sense of a reading, demonstrate significant features of the textual tradition, or represent variant forms of proper nouns and adjectives.
10.5 Apparatus

Source materials and references to other works are reported through the *apparatus fontium* in the conventional position directly below the edited text. The second *apparatus* beneath the *apparatus fontium* reports additions, omissions, modifications to the text, and other factors which are fluid in nature. These variants are largely idiosyncratic to a particular manuscript and likely occurred spontaneously since they appear in no other extant manuscripts of the tradition. They indicate the ways the commentary continued to grow after Arnulf's initial lecture series. All other variants are reported in the standard *apparatus criticus* at the bottom of the page.
## Chapter 2: Text of the *Accessus* and Philological *Glosulae*

### SIGLA

#### I. Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td>München</td>
<td>clm. 7205, s. xii²</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana</td>
<td>Venezia</td>
<td>Marc. lat. XIV.222 (4007), s. xii²</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek</td>
<td>Weimar</td>
<td>Q 91, s. xiii¹</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>lat. 8001, s. xii-xiv</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>London, British Library, Burney 224</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>s. xiii²</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek</td>
<td>Wolfenbüttel</td>
<td>Cod. Guelf. 13.10. Aug. 4°, s. xiii</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. class. lat. 1</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>s. xiii</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana</td>
<td>Firenze</td>
<td>Plut. 36. 18, s. xiv²</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Vaticano (Città del), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td>Vaticano</td>
<td>Vat. lat. 5222, s. xv</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana</td>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>B 18 inf., s. xv</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Pistoia, Biblioteca Forteguerriana Comunale</td>
<td>Pistoia</td>
<td>A 46, s. xv</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. Additional Manuscripts of the *Accessus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Vaticano (Città del), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td>Vaticano</td>
<td>Vat. lat. 1593</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Leiden, Bibliothec der Rijksuniversteit</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>BPL 97, s. xiii</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Antwerpen, Musaeum Plantin-Moretus</td>
<td>Antwerpen</td>
<td>85 (lat. 71), s. xiii</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Vaticano (Città del), Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td>Vaticano</td>
<td>Reg. lat. 1563</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>St. Omer, Bibliothèque de la Ville</td>
<td>St. Omer</td>
<td>678, s. xiii</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ao</td>
<td>Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana</td>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>O 3 sup.</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. Corrections and varia.

- *ac* before correction (*ante correctionem*).
- *c* after correction (*post correctionem*). Numbers indicate subsequent correcting hands (e.g. *c2* = alia manu etc.). ‘c’ without enumeration is always the hand writing the commentary, which in *scholion* format may be the same as the text.
hand or not. When the text hand is earlier it is always noted with the numeral 1. (e.g. $W^t$ = text hand and $W$ = commentary hand, so $W^c$ = correction by the commentary hand).

- A variant reading is introduced intentionally as a variant, not as a correction.
- The lemma is either marginal or part of a catena gloss, but not underlined. It may still be set off with a punctus or it may not. (* lemma non notatur *).
- At times words of the commentary are underlined as lemmata when they are clearly not. (* quasi lemma/lemmata *).
- The gloss is interlinear, therefore the lemma does not actually exist in written form in the commentary; a part of the manuscript's text of the *Metamorphoses* is used in place of the lemma. (* supra uersum *).
- A reading in a manuscript's text of the *Metamorphoses*, not the reading of a lemma. This is used when the reading of the *Metamorphoses* text does not match the lemma, but both are written by the same hand (e.g. $B^t$ = the *Metamorphoses* text of $B$ and $B$ = the commentary text of $B$.) This designation is only relevant when lemmata and text do not agree, and also when a lemma of the commentary is introduced into the text as a variant reading, not as a correction, by the same hand. For example, the critical entry for the lemma at 15. 876:

\[
\text{indeflebile } MV TB(B^\text{fuel})OF(F^\text{fuel}): \text{ indelebile } B^tW^cF^t
\]

The lemma of the commentary in $B$ and $F$ reads *indeflebile*, but their text of the *Metamorphoses* reads *indelebile*. The reading *indelebile* has been introduced into the text of the *Metamorphoses* interlinearly as a variant, so the same hand (in each manuscript) has written the *Met.* text, the lemma, and the interlinear variant.
QVIA maius opus Ouidii pre manibus habemus de uita poete potius in hoc libro quam in aliis uideamus. Vita talis est: de Frigia quidam, Solemus nomine, cum Enea uenit in Italia, qui Sulmonem a nomine suo appellavit regionem. De cuius regionis opido Peligno natus fuit Ouidius, Plinio patre, fratrem habuit Lucilium, qui senior fuit illo spatio unius anni. Nam in eius nataliciis siue anniversario die natus fuit Ouidius; hos dispariter natos pariter ad literas apposuit pater eorum. Cumque in minoribus essent eruditi dedit eis magistrum in arte rethorica, de qua palmam adeptus est adeo Ouidius quod facundia et uirtute sua meruit fieri tribunos militum. Deposito autem tribunatu et mortuo fratre suo, rogatu Maximiani Romani principis et aliorum Romanorum ut famam suam maximam scribendo faceret, primo fecit Ouidium Heroidum, id est Ouidium Epistularum; secundo Ouidium Amorum id est sine titulo; tercio Ouidium De Arte Amandi ibique iuuenes Romanos adulteros esse docuit matronasque inpudicas, ubi <in> inimiciam Augusti incurrit docendo adulterium; dicuntur tamen et alie cause quas in Ouidio Tristium et in Ouidio De Ponto solemnus assignare.

MVC BWLNRS PAo

2-3 cf. Fast. 4. 79-80

1 et origo post fuit add. P 4 luciuo fratre L 5 in post siue add. B 6 sufficienter ante essent add. M 10 dicitur post epistularum add. LP

Ad mitigationem igitur Augusti quarto loco Ouidium De Remedio Amoris subiunxit et Ouidium Metamorphoseos quinto loco ubi laudat Augustum ab antecessoribus suis per Eneam. Sexto loco Ouidium Fastorum quem in honore Germanici, qui futurus erat pontifex anni illius, fecit ut eius interuentu gratiam Augusti recuperaret; sed cum nequaquam posset eum reddere beniuolum, in exilium promoverat Ouidius magnum inemendatum reliquit. In itinere exilii Ouidium Tristium fecit in quo ad presentis operis commendationem ursus istorum Romam direxit:

Orba parente suo quicumque uolumina cernis
His saltem uestra detur in urbe locus,
Quoque magis faueas non sunt hec edita ab illo,
Sed quasi de dominni funere rapta sui,
Quicquid in his igitur uicii rude carmen habebit,
Emendaturis si licuisset eram

Tandem positus in exilio fecit Ouidium De Ponto et Ouidium In Ibin, contra inuidum. Vtrum an mortuus fuerit in exilio uel non, nos nescimus.

Modo querendum est de titulo, de materia, de utilitate, de intentione, cui parti philosophie supponatur liber iste, de modo tractandi. Titulus talis est: Ouidii Nasonis Metamorphoseos liber primus incipit; bene dicitur primus quia sequitur secundus, sunt enim xv. Titulus aliquando sumitur a loco unde philosophia supponatur liber iste, de modo tractandi. Titulus talis est:

Exautontumerumenos, id est se ipsum excrucians, uel a materia ut Tullius De Amicia.
Titulus uero huius libri sumptus est a materia quod ut melius uidemus, exponatur titulus sic: 'meta' Grece de Latine, 'morphē' id est mutacio, 'usios' substancia quasi 'de mutacione substancie'. Et notandum quod Greci carentes ablatiuo loco eius utuntur genitiuo. In hoc titulo designatur materia: de mutatione enim agit tripliciter, scilicet de naturali, de magica, de spirituali. Naturalis est que fit per contexcionem elementorum uel retecionem: per contexcionem scilicet quando elementa coniunguntur ut de spermate fiat puer uel de ouo pullus, per retecionem quando scilicet retexuntur et dissoluuntur elementa in quolibet corpore uel per ignem uel alio modo in puluerm redigendo. Magica est que fit per prestigia magorum sicut de Licaone et Io, qui in corpore non animo mutati sunt.

Spiritualis que fit circa spiritum ut de sano fit insanus uel e contrario: ut Agaue uel Autonoe, que spiritu et non corpore mutabantur. Notandum etiam est quod mutatio fit de re animata ad rem animatam ut de Licaone homine in lupum, de inanimata ad inanimatam ut de domo Baucidis in templum, de inanimata ad animatam ut statua Pigmalionis in uriginem, de animata ad inanimatam de dracone mutato in saxum. Mutatio igitur rerum est sua materia. Intentio sua est de mutatione dicere ut non intelligamus de mutatione que fit extrinsecus tantum in rebus corporeis bonis uel malis, sed etiam de mutatione que fit intrinsecus ut in anima ut reducat nos ab errore ad cognitionem nostri creatoris. Duo sunt motus in anima: alter rationalis, alter irrationalis

MVC BWLNRs


Rationalis est qui imitatur motum firmamenti qui fit ab oriente in occidentem et e contrario; irrationalis est qui imitatur motum planetarum qui mouentur contra firmamentum. Dedit enim deus anime rationem per quam reprimeret sensualitatem sicut motus irrationalis vii planetarum per motum firmamenti reprimitur. Nos uero rationabilem motum more planetarum negligentes, contra creatorem nostrum rapimur.

Quod Ouidius uidens fabulosa narratione uult ostendere nobis motum anime qui fit intrinsecus. Ideo dicitur Io mutata in uaccam quia corruit in uicia, ideo dicitur Io prustinam formam recepisse quia emersit a uiciis. Vel intentio sua est nos ab amore temporium inmoderato reuocare et adhortari ad unicum cultum nostri creatoris ostendendo stabilatatem celestium et uarietatem temporalium. Ethice supponitur quia docet nos ista temporalia quasi transitoria et mutabilia contempnere quod pertinet ad mortalitatem. Vel intentio sua est multorum enarrare mutationes ut per tot mutationum generae quod uidentur impossibilia, mutationem Iulii Cesaris in stellam, id est deificationem, ueram esse confirmet. Vel intentio sua est fabulas in ceteris dispersas in hoc volumine breuiet colligere. Villitas an est cognitio fabularum compendiose collectarum uel utilitas eruditione diuinorum habita ex mutatione temporalium. Talem seruat ordinem: ostendit generalem omnium elementorum confusionem, deinde eorundem distinctionem et quantum animalia in quibus habitent regionibus. Proponit, inuocat, narrat. Littera sic exponatur:

MVC BWLNRSPAo

---

63 ethice supponitur quia in mortalitate nos instruit talem seruans ordinem ostendens... post ex mutatione temporalium ponit L 67 et ita beniuolentiam augusti captat post confirmet add. BWLNR(S)P(Ao); iulii S : auditorum Ao 71 et cetera post regionibus add. L
1. *Iamque deus posita se confessus* deuirginando eam.
2. *Dictea Cretensia*; a *Dictis* quadam ciuitate Crete.
3. *Boetia* a 'boue' inuenta; uel *Boetia* auxiliaria; Boetius enim adiutor.
4. *Castalia* Castalis nimpha fuit; ibi sepulta et ab ea regio et fons dictus est.
5. *Panopis* regio quedam a regina; uel a nimpha sic dicta.
7. *despicit* deorsum aspicit supereminens. *quo dict quae* anguis determinans arthos pretenditur in austrum ubi deprimitur terra, sic quod totus uideri non potest.
8. *Phenices* tres fuerunt fratres: Phenix a quo dicta est Phenicia regio, et Cilix a quo dicta Cilicia, et Cadmus qui condidit Thebas; isti tres missi fuerunt pro sorore querenda quam tamen non inuenerunt; uel *Phenices* dicti sunt a rubris capillis, 'pheniceos' enim Grece 'rubrum' Latine, postea mutata est 'e' in 'u' et ablata 'h', dicti sunt 'Punices', deinde causa breuitatis dicti sunt 'Puni'.

1-46 M BWODA P

50. *sol altissimus* in meridie.
52. *uestigat* id est uestigia eorum sequitur.
55. *letata* mortificata a leto.
59. *molarem* lapidem magnum ad modum mole.
64. *durica eadem* qua uincent molarem.
[70. *idque scilicet hastile.*]
72. *dum accessit* de uulnere dicit.
74. *albida* idem est quod alba.
75. *rasa squamis exasperata* a 'rado, -dis'.
77. *spiris* spira est circulus imperfectus non ad idem punctum rediens.
79. *inpete* pro inpetu, nec plus inuenitur sicut nec de sponte rite ritu.
88. *plagam sedere* id est in profundu locum tenere; *plasit* profunda erat.
105. *mortalia semina* mortalium; uel humana quia homines sunt procreati.
126. *quorum fuit unus Echion* et alius Ideus, tercius Cromis, quartus Iperon, quintus Pelorus; uel unus eorum fuit Bromius ut quidam dicunt.
132. *Marsque Venusque* per Hermionem, communem filiam, Cadmo desponsatam.
133. *huc adde* propter hanc felicitatem de uxore.
134. *et pignora et cara nepotes* non minus cari sepe sunt nepotes quam filii.
139. *aliena* ab homine; natura enim homini cornua denegauit.
140. *herili †denico†* ab 'herus, heri'.

50-140 *MBWODA*

64 qua icum lapidis repulserat *W* 77 circulus non rediens ad eundem orbeh ita uel imperfectus circulus *B*: reuolutio non rediens ad eundem punctum sed est semicirculus *W*: sicut in angue ubi habere figura *add. O* 88 plagam dicitur sedere dum non *aperta O*: sorbere profunuum omne uel ad infinitiu ire uel se in profundum destendere metafora a sedente *A* 92 caput serpentis *D* 126 quorum nomina sunt hec acius yedeus cromis ypion peleus sic *O* 133 sua post uxore *add. W* 140 quod est dictus ut uid. *add. W*
145. *utraque* scilicet Oriente et Occidente; uel a Gadibus Bachi in Oriente et a Gadibus Herculis in Occidente.

147. *Hiantius* a loco qui dicitur ab Hiante quadam uirginem ibi sepulta; uel ab Hiante filio Athlantis; uel *hiantius* aduerbium ab 'hio, hias'.

148. *lina madent* sanguine ferarum.

152. *idem* communis uel equalis.

188. *et ut uellet habuisse sagittas* id est sicut uerum est quod uellet habuisse sagittas, sic hoc uerum est quod hausit aquas

155. *cultur* acuit.

198. *pauor* ceruus naturaliter est timidus. *Autonoeius* nomen a matre.

203. *Non sua* non humana sed ceruina.


255. *pars utraque* et qui laudant et qui non laudant.

256. *non tam eloquitur* id est discutit loquendo de hoc facto; *ne* pro an probet uel culpet.

258. *Tiria* id est Europe.

261. *ad iurgia* ut maritum obiurgaret pro pellicibus.

266. *certe soror* tantum cum mecum iacet ut maritus quia melius obseruat erga officium sororis quam uxoris. *at puto* tu dicis mihi quam

145-266 M BWODA

147 ab hiante fonte thebano ($W^4$) uel hyantius pinitur aduerbialiter quia est sonus quem emittebat uocando sonoros suos uel hyantius id est fatigatus ab hyeras quod idem quod fatigas uel hyantius a loco qui dicitur ab hiante uirginem ibi sepulta uel ab hiante filio alantis sic $W$: a loco qui ita dicitur ab yante uirginem ibi sepulta uel ab yante filia atatis uel yantius ab yo yas et id est plenamnos quod ateius sic $O$ aduerbium...hias] ab hio hias et erit aduerbium quia unatorum est hiare et tlamarum sic $A$ 198 filius anthenoeis filie cadmi sic $W$: id est acteon filius authoines $O$: filius authonoeis $D$ 255-6 et que laudat et que culpct quare laudet et quare culpct $W$ 266 id est tantum ut culpct et probet quantum id est quantum gaudet et cetera $B$ 258 a tiro opido post europa $add. W$ 261 suis post pellicibus $add. O$ 262 pro iurgia obiurgando maritum sepe enim eum pro pellicibus obiurgaut $add. B$ 266 quia melius exercet erga me officium sororis quia mecum non iacet ut maritus $B$

269. uix mihi contigit uni id est in uno, de Vulcano dicit; uel de Hebe.
271. faxo id est faciam.
272. a suo loue quia per eum morietur.
273. surgit ab his id est post hec dicta.
278. Epidaurea a loco.
284. quantusque cum Iupiter, id est ether, descendit ad Iunonem, id est ad aerem, mouetuer aer et ex illo motu proveniunt nubes, ex quorum collisione procreantur fulmina.
286. insignia fulmina enim sunt insignia Iouis.
291. timor deorum quia ita timent eum ac si deus esset.
299. sequentia uultu quia nubilem et tristem habuit uultum.
314. inde datum id est postea datum. Niseides a Nisa ciuitate.
316. fatali lege fatali dispositione.
317. incunabula una dictio est et idem quod cunabula uel cubilia.
319. seposuisse seorsum posuisse.
331. genitius in qua fuit genus scilicet masculina
334. Nec pro materia id est non secundum materiam. pro materia secundum rei exigentiam uel secundum modum.
341. fide pro fidei per apocapam.
350. leti genus in florem mutatus fuit. noutasque furoris quia se ipsum illice amauit.
357. Vocalis quia semper ultimam uocem terminat.
368. tamen hec in fine loquendi quamuis breuissimum habeat usum uocis.

269-368 M BWODA

269 hoc dicit quia non habuit filium nisi uulcem uel hebem sic O 291 id est demorgorgon quam timent ac si esset deus sic O 317 incunabula una est dictio id est cunabula. 331 uel apsa ad gignendum post masculina sic add. A


170
372. *flamma propiore* quanto prrior erat. [quoque quanto.]
382. *Voce* respondens 'Ven!
393/400. *latet siluis* id est ex illo tempore
400. *in nullo monte uidetur* quia res incorporea et inanis tantum auditur.
407. *inlimis* id est sine limo.
414. *faciemque loci fontemque secutus* id est causa loci et causa fontis.
415. *sitis altera* scilicet amoris.
417. *speciem sine corpore amat* scilicet umbram.
419. *e Pario* a Paro insula ubi marmor effoditur. *signum* imago.
422. *eburnea* alba et plana ad modum eboris.
433. *aueertere* inperatiui modi; id est aduertaris et amplius non apparebit tibi; uel
aduertere ad te uertere.
456. *quam fugias* quam fugere debases.
466. *copia* mei ipsius.
478. *quam tangere non est* non licet non contigit.
508. *quassasque faces* diminutas et decorticas.
525. *nimium* de futuris.
530. *incognita ad sacra* id est noua.
537. *obsceni* quia castrati.
541. *propriorque mee* quia iuuenis.
549. *tormenta* machine bellice.

---

372-549  *MB WODA*

406 id est fortuna sic dicta a monte in quo colitur B: sic dicta a ciuitate ubi colitur a ramnusio
opido D: fortua A fortuna post colitur add. W 417 incorpoream post umbram add. D 419
ab insula A 419 eburnea post imago add. D 422 id est colla alba et planum ad modum eboris D
433 verba sunt auctoribus ad ipsum post tibi add. O 478 quia ille imaginat que apparent in aquis
non possunt tangere sed bene uidere post contigit add. D 537 uel quia in sacris bachi
committebantr multa *pra et adulteria* post castrati add. D: uel hebrei uel nausei post castrati
add. A 541 ualda propinqua mee etati ante quia add. W

---

372 *flamma...erat M BA*: *om. WOD* quoque quanto B′W′iD′: *om. M WOA*
382 *om. WO* 393/400 *om. WO* 400 *om. BWODA* 406 *inlimis M*: *illimis BWODA limo]*
ceno *sic D 414 om. OA* pulcritudinem loci et fontis W 415 om. W 417 om. WOA 419
p(h)aro M WO: pario D *signum imago]* om. W *imago alba et plana ad modum eboris M 422
WOA quem fugere M D: fugere WOA 466 *om. BWODA* 478 *om. WO* non licet MB: om.
DA non MB: om. DA contigit] contigit sic B 508 om. OA decorticas] excortitas M
525 *om. WODA* *nimium B*: mixte uiris (*lin. 529*) M 530 *om. OA* 537 *om. W* 541 *om. O*
iuuenis M: *ipse iuuenet sic B*: *ipse sum iuuenis W: ipse iuuenis erat D: ipse erat iuuenis A*
549 *om. O bellice]* bellorum A
551. *querenda* quantum ad miseriam.
552. *non celanda* quantum ad crimen.
557. *acutum* id est uelociter.
559. *an satis* animi habuit Acrisius ad expellendum nouum numen, scilicet Perseum nepotem suum, et ego, qui fortior illo sum, in me habeo fortem animum ad expellendum hunc Bachum.
571. *ab obice* propter obicem, propter obstaculum.
572. *cruentati* quia quosdam de sacrificantibus occiderant.
587. *calamo* harundinea uirga.
592. *scopulis hererem* morarer, si nauem nescirem regere.
594. *Olenie* Amalatea ab Olenos cuitate ubi fuit; uel ab Oleno rege, cuius fuit;

Amaltea dicitur quasi amans deum.

598. *adducor litora* id est ducor ad littora.
606. *utque putat* se nactum fuisse.
607. *ille puer.*
611. *et sensi numen in isto* deum esse.
615. *Dictis* proprium nomen est.

---

551-615 *M BWODA*

559 nam acrisius genuit daphnem dapne perseum ex ioue perseus ablatus fuit per aerem post interfectionem gorgonis et uoluit ingredi thebas sed acrisius auunculus eius clausit ei portas cuitatis post bachum add. A 572 id est sanguine liniti post occiderant add. A 587 uel equore post urga add. W 592 morarer sinauem regere scirem sic D 595 hiades (lem.) thiagetem arcton signa esse necessaria nauigantibus in dex. marg. add. B1/35

617. Libis Flauos Melantus Alcimedes propria nomina sunt. tutela prœre ne anterior pars nauis in rupe offendat, id est in anteriori parte sedens nauis; uel tutela dicitur quia preuidet prœre.
626. iuuenilis fortis.
628. quamuis amens unde mirum fuit quod adhesit quasi diceret 'sine mente essem.'
631. atque mero post merum.
636. Naxon insula est.
637. uobis tibi. hospita quia, quicumque alienigna est, hospes est.
639. fore futurum esse.
640. dextra mihi parte subaudì.
642. pro se quisque timet ideoque Ofelii contradicere non audet.
660. quod maiora fide id est incredibilius.
661. nauale id est portum ubi hiemant nauis.
663. deducunt extendunt. gemina ope ueli et remorum.
665. distinguunt uariant. corimbus racemus hedere.
668. simulacra inania quia apparebant et reuera non erant.

617-668 MBOWDA

617 prore tute, melis, prora prœre prima pars nauis cuius tutela dicitur quia in anteriori parte sedens prouidebat ne anterior pars ledetur in rupes B 642 id est quique sui timet ne perdat predam suam uel alius sensus si quisque est timoratus in se ante ideo add. W 660 quantum ueritatis credulitate ante id est incredibilius add. W 661 uel locus ubi reponuntur naue emerit post naues add. A 663 et ampliand imponent post extendunt add. D 668 geminata sic licet ope ante ueli add. O 668 racem et pampini ante apparebant add. W uana et non uera sed apparentia (D') quia uera non erant D

672. pictarum pinna -ne illud est quod superminet in dorso piscis quod dicitur natatoria; quidam libri habent pennas unde credunt quosdam eorum in aues mutari, quosdam in pisces, sed male credunt a pinna dicitur pinnaculum.

681. falca ad modum falcis.

693. uires consumere id est ut magis irasci possem erga te; uel absumere et alia littera et tunc ita lege: prebuenimus longis ambagibus quas longas fecisti hac intentione ira mea absumeretur. mora id est ut ire mee obliuisceret; uel ideo ironice ut excogitarem grauiorem penam.

706. Tirrenus de Tirrenia; Tirrenia et Meonia eadem est regio.

713. gemine sorores ad Inoem dicit et ad Autonoem; uel Semelem; uel Agauem. 

726. aguam quia filius tuus sum.

726. collaque iactauit si sua dicatur quod ea rotauit ad modum furibunde; si colla Penthei dicatur, iactauit id est truncauit.

733. Hismenides Thebane, ab Hismeno floruiu Thebano.

669-693 M BWODA 696-733 MV BWODA

672 quidam textus habent pennas unde credunt quidam quod isti naute fueraint (sic) mutati aues sed male credunt pinna est illud quod cum in dorso piscis et a pinna dicitur pinnaculum D unde credunt...male credunt] unde creditur esse mutati in pisces uel in aues O 693 id est ut obliuisceret ire mee B: id est ut per moram refrenarem causa meam quam habebam contra te uel ut ira mea magis irritaretur contra te D: prebuenimus sponte hac mutacione ut ira mea assumeretur mora ut ire mee obliuisceretur ut mora uires assumere ut magis possit irae contra te uel absumerre ut ira mea posset diminui secundum opinionem tuam ne meam que oppositium sentiebat tamen te audui A 696 tirrenus de tirrenia que eadem est regio que meonia B: meoni B

713 mee no et anthonoe sic W: o ino et authonoe D: 725 filii tui D 726 scilicet quod ea rotauit ad modum furibunde uel iactauit colla amputauit colla penthei. 733 mulieres thebane D
1. *Iamque fretum Minie* postquam illi erant adulti et Minie similiter adulti; *iam* id est consequenter socii lasonis populus sic dictus a minio colore quia eiusdam coloris sunt cum minio; uel a terra rubea, uel quia capitales litteras de minio primo fecerunt. *Pegasea* a Pegaso monte Greciae ubi facta fuit; uel *Pegasea* id est palladia id est consilio Palladis facta que dea est Pegasei fontis; nam ipsa est sapientia cui uacatur ibi; uel a Pegaseo equo propter uelocitatem. *puppe* sinodoche.

2. *sub nocte cecitate.*
4. *uirgineas uolucres* breuiter tangit de Arpiis a mensa Phinei usque ad Trophades fugatis.
5. *Phasidos* fluuius est Colchorum.

---

1-10 MV BW((OFDA) (P)

1 *iamque...fecerun[] populi illi* W 4 *uolucres id est arpias B'O'D' 6 insula post colcho add. F 7 oetham regem colchorum F: eeteus O 8 et hec uox fuit horrenda post sopita add. O 9 id est medea O: filia oethes scilicet medea A

---


---

175
11. *uncere deponere.* _frustra Medea_ ad se ipsam loquitur quasi ad terciam
personam.

13. *quod amare* id est amor uocatur.

14. _iusca_ erga lasonem de bobus domandis, de serpente sopiendo. _uidentur et quia multa uidentur quod non sunt, ideo subiungit sunt quoque dura nimis._

16. *ne pereat scilicet_ lason.

19. _noua uis_ amoris. _cupido amare._

20. _mens_ minime. _meliora non amare._

21. *deteriora amare._ _hostipe uili._ _regia nobilis._

22. _thalamos_ coniugium. _coniupis_ sperans in animo.

23. _hec quoque terra_ sicut _et_ terra lasonis.

24. _in diis est_ non in _ipso; nam uirute sua tutus esse non poterit nisi fauere deorum._

25. _uel sine amore_ id est etiam non amem; humanum enim est cuilibet conpati.

27. _quem non ut_ id est quamuis; _ut cetera_ scilicet genus _et_ uirute.

29. _ore_ pulcritudine _oris._

35. _concelero_ sceleratos uidendo facio; _qui enim scelus uidet, cum possit auferre, se ipsum scelerat._

37. _di meliora uelint_ quam hoc faciam quod orauerat dicendo. _di meliora uelint modo_ redarguit se _ipsam quia_ orando _dixerat cum dicit quamquam et cetera._ ego _precor ut moriatur sed_ precari tamen _non_ _debeto sed_ _artibus idem efficere et_ _hoc est quamquam timeam._

45. _fraudem_ ab _ipso._

46. _fidem se non_ _mentitum._

11-46 MV BW(OFDA)

11 inuanum o. loquitur ad _se_ _ipsam tamquam ad_ _aliam W_ 14 ad _iasona_ _e_ _auris domandis de dentibus_ _seminandis de_ _tergenis_ _hominibus interficiendis_ _de_ _dracone_ _sopiendo W_ 21 _tuo_ _uili W_ 24 _medico_ _quod_ _ulo**niat que pro quia post_ _deorum add. W_ 25 _si_ _dico quod_ _uellem illum in ere enim_ post _conpati sic W_

48. debeat se id est obnoxius erit de se conseruato.
54. stant mecum uota sororis id est factura est soror quicquid uoluero; uel uota sororis soror mea fauet Pelasgis; uel ipsa uolet Iasoni nubere.
55. maximus in me deus est id est fauor dei, scilicet Cupidinis, qui fauet Iasoni.
56. titulum laudem de Achiua plebe conseruata.
58. hic quoque id est in Colco per famam congnita sunt.
60. mutasse uelim ypallage, id est dedisse res tocius mundi mutando pro eo. quo coniuge mihi existente.
62. quid quod adhuc deliberat opponendo de periculis que sunt in mari.
68. de coniuge tantum potius quam de me.
69. coniugiumne putas quod potius debet dici adulterium. culpe uocando coniugium.
71. dum licet antequam inceperis.
72. rectum de patre non prodendo. pietas de eodem. pudor de adulterio uitando.
73. uicta a rectitudine pietae pudore.
74. ibat Medea. [Hecates Properpine.] Perseides a Persis populis qui in arte magica ualentes ipsam colunt, que dea est ueneficii.
76. ardor amoris.
77. cum uidet Medea. reluxit reaccensa fuit.
78. recanduit recaluit; tractum est a ferro quod quanl calidius tanto candidius.
80. scintilla ardens. fauilla non ardens.
85. posses ignoscere amanti Medee quasi non esset mirum quod tam formosum amabat.

48-85 MV BW(OFDA)


89. ut uero prius amauit sed postquam cepit loqui et cetera.
92. quid faciam quasi diceret quantum facinus.
94. promissa dato scilicet thorum. triformis Hecate propter tres potestates: lune,
Diane, Proserpine.
96. futuri soceri Oete scilicet patris Medee, unde socer erat futurus, qui filius erat
Solis.
99. usum quomodo illis uteretur.
100. postera descriptio est diei orientis.
103. purpureus purpura indutus.
104. ulcanum id est ignem.
105. eripedes quia duros habebant pedes quasi de ere essent.
106. pleni igne.
107. soluti cremati. fornace terrena id est terra facta ad modum spelunce.
108. aspergine sepe siquidem putatur lapis esse non coctus qui tamen solutus
minuitur si aqua aspergatur.
112. prefixa ferro id est dura quasi ferrea essent.
117. palearia pelles dependentes.
121. adiciunt animos id est animositatem.
126. perque suos numeros id est secundum spatium quod ad illud faciendum
sufficit.
137. neue parum ualeant timens.
138. secretas aduocat ad se uocat secreto.
139. silicum quem Medea sibi dederat sicque preceperat; preposterus ordo quod
prius dicit seminatos esse dentes quam serpentem occisum.
143. victorem Jasonem.
[150? trisulcis propter uelocitatem.]
151. arboris auree id est aurei uelleris; uel arboris iuxta quam erat aureum
uellus.
154. que mare turbatum efficatiam ostendit herbarum.
157. auctorem non est uerbale sed ab 'autentin' quod est auctoritas deriuatur.
spolia altera Medeam cum uellere.

89-157 MV BWOFDA

92 faciam post facinus add. W 96 socer futuri scilice oethes patris meede qui erat futurus
socer iasonis et fuit filius solis 100 postera posterius ueniens post orientis add. A 126 id est
per spacion quod per illud faciendum sufficit D

89 om. ODA cepit loqui] ceptis loqui sic M: om. W et cetera quasi diceret MV: et cetera F:
propter tres potestates MV: pro tribus probantibus BFDA 96 om. WO oeth(h)e] oethes F
purpuram F inductus W 104 om. VOF 106 habet M A: om. cet. 107 terra MV W: in
Cecropios portus illos patrie sue in quibus applicabant a Colcho uenientes. natis qui erant cum Iasone. cornibus aurum id est aureis et sericis pannis cornua habens inuoluta de more sacrificii.

excessitque fidem id est tanta est quod uix credi posset. summa hec summa, huius -me.

nec tenuit lacrimas id est hec dicens lacrimabatur. dissimilem animo Iasonis erga patrem. animum Medee quia patrem prodiderat. subit quasi in memoriam ei uenit.
affectus pietais erga Oetam.

transcribere transmutare.

Hecate Hecates; Greece, centum Latine, hec- dicitur quia centum habet potestates; uel in sepultorum occissorum animas centum annos errare sinat; uel quia Vlixes centum uictimis eam placuit Tyresia cum ad inferos ducente.

non annis non danpno annorum tuorum. modo id est solummodo.
cornua lune.
orbem quod est in plenilunio.
solida perfecta et rotunda.
relictas scilicet sirpas ueteres.

serpunt secundum hanc litteram est ibi 'sepes' et non 'serpens' et tunc ita legitur: sepes id est lacerte et ceteri uermes sepium. cum nullo murmure existentes similae sipitis et si non dormiant. cum nullo murmure serpunt id est tacite; uel serpens et tunc ita legatur: nullo cum murmure serpens existens nomen est non participium. nullo cum murmure serpunt serpere serpentum est, sed secundum hanc litteram est ibi sopito similis [187.] silent frondes non mouetur. quod est animatorum attribuit inanimatis cum dicit 'sileth humidas aer.'

MV BWOFDA


uel cicropios athenienses a cicrope rege athienensi post uenientes add. W 166 nomen est A 174 hecete diana dicitur quasi centum habens potestates B: triformis hecate id est habens triplicem potestatem (sic) quia dicitur luna diana proserpina (lin. 177) O

189. ter se conuertit hinc habuit inicium monachi uertigo.
192. fidissima de nocte fiunt fidelius secreta quam de die.
193. succeditis ignibus diurnis scilicet remotis.
194. conscia quia de nocte fiunt.
197. aure et uenti per quos herbe crescent. montes amnes lacus circa que loca
crecunt herbe.
198. dii omnes nemorum in quibus herbe crescent. dii noctis in qua fiunt sacra.
203. rumpo facio rumpi.
204. uiua adhuc in rupe uientia.
207. temerata temere icta; uel propter illos temerarios qui ea percucuent quia
putant per hec ipsis auxiliari; uel temerata id est diutina percussione lesa.
209. Aurora uenenis id est herbis ad modum ueneni efficacibus.
214. uindice custode serpente uigili.
216. in florem id est in iuuentutem.
217. et dabis quod apparat in stellis micantibus et hoc est quod dicit: nec enim
micuerunt sidera frustra. [219.] adest uerba sunt Ouidii.
220. quo curru. draconum qui trahebant currum.
223. despicit deorsum aspicit.
224. Ossa Pelios Otrix Pindus Olympus montes sunt.
229. Amprisi fluuius est. Enipeus fluuius est.
230. Peneus Spercheides fluuii sunt.
231. Phoebes palus est.
232. uiuax ab effectu quia uiuos reddit pisces Glauci.
233. nondum uulgatum sed postea fuit.
234. draconum trahentes currum.

189-234 MV BWOFDA


197 circa quos crescent herbe sup. lin. 205 ponit W 214 sopito dracone D: dracone A 220
drachonum traenti non currum illum sic W 224 thessalie post montes sunt add. F 233 ut infra
habetur in mutacione glauci post fuit add. F

189  om. OD  hinc hic sic WFA monachi uertigo] sue incantacionis A 192  om. WO
197 om. O  198 om. WOF  dii omnes nemorum in quo fiunt sacrificia M in quibus] per
quos B fiunt] fuit sic A 203 om. WOA 204 om. WO uiuentia MV: herentia BFDA
207 icta] percussa W: dicta O uel propter...auxiliari sic M: om. cet. diutina] diuturna W:
224 om. BODA pelios MV: pelion WF otrix MV: otrix W: orrix F 229 variae lectiones
trahentes] qui trahentes B: trahencium A
tantum celo aere ita quod non domo. uiriles contactus coitum.
Iuuente dea est iuuentutis.
uerbenis herbis illis.
egesta euacuata.
nelleris atri id est nigre ouis.
sanguine ouis.
carchesia uasa sunt.
terrena numina Satiros et Faunos; uel terrena numina Plutonem et
Proserpinam reges inferorum sub terra existentium.
fraudere euacuare.
precibus et murmure longo id est uerbis non apertis.
effetum senile sine feto. ad aras id est iuxta aras; uel ad aras extra domum
sub aere nudo.
profanos oculos circumexistentium ac si profani essent.
infectas tinctas. geminis aris aras uocat rogos.
inoquit intus decoquit.
refluum mare sicut in monte Sancti Michaelis.
strigis bubonis; auis est.

239-271 MV BWOFDA

id est aere sine domo B': non domo W': aere D' 241 iuuenta ante dea add. D: cles (sic)
filie iunonis dee iuuentutis A 246 ad similitudinem troclearum sic A 251 precibus (B') apertis
murmure longo (B') id est uerbis non apertis B': precibus apertis et murmure parua in uerbis non
apertis A 256 prohansi sunt qui uident ca que non debent uidere post essent add. W 269 illius
ante auis add. W: strix ante auis add. A

om. O non V: nec M FA uiriles...coitum] om. DA 241 om. WO iuuentem sic M
plutonem et proserpinam] pluto et proserpina MV F inferorum FD sistencium sic A
uervis DA non in precibus non post uerbis del. D 252 om. WO effectum M senilem sic
F ad aras] ad auras D' ad aras] ad aras FA 256 om. O pro(f/ph)anos] prohans sic W
MV 265 om. O de(c/qu)qoit MV F: (c/qu)qoit BDA 267 om. O sancti michaels
MV BD: micha(e)lis WF: om. A 269 bubonis M': om. cet. est] om. WO 271 non ueri]
om. M O id est illius] om. O quandoque...quandoque quando...quando D: quantum...quantum
sic A unde...humanus sic M: et talis dicitur leus varons sic O: om. cet. uiscera] om. M a
proseco as] om. O
272. Ciniphei a fluuio Ciniphe ubi habundant serpentes isti. membrana tenuis pellis quia a membris excoriatur.
273. uiuaeis diu enim uiuit.
274. nouem secula id est nouies centum annos.
275. sine nomine non multum cognitis.
276. propositum a deo preuisum; uel ab hominibus inuentum. mortali ad opus mortalium.
277. mitis oliue quia pacem significat; uel quia mitis ad gustum si condiatur.
278. grauidis ramos grauantibus.
279. eiecit ebuliido.
280. uernat humus floret quasi in uere. mollia ad recubandum.
281. recludit iugulis.
282. nigrum rapuere velociter accepere.
283. situs senectutis neglectus.
284. luxuriant uidentur esse in uenis luxuriantis. et olim sic construe: 'et reminiscitur se nunc talem subaudis qualem olim ante quater denos annos senserat.'
285. capit accipit. ab Oetide Medea filia Oete. munus pro munere.
286. doli cessent Medee.
287. Phasias Medea a Phasi fluuiio. Pelie patruui Iasonis qui Iasonem habebat suspectum ne filium suum de regno fugaret; unde Iasona querens interficzere eum ad aureum uellus misit.
288. nate Pelie.
289. cepit decept; uel quasi captiuas duxit.

272-301 MV BWOFDA

273 cf. Pap. Vocab. V. Viuax


D patruj patruo A iasonem] iasona W habebat] habuerat B: habuit WOFDA filium suum
captuas] quatiuas sic W
meritorum erga Iasona.

situs pro senectute. in hac parte in relatione meritorum.

subiecta inmissa.

pariti simili.

idque petunt sic construe: et petunt a Medea; pacisci id est ut paciscatur. iuuenis petunt ut faciat pactum pro iuuene faciendo; uel iuuenes id est puelle. id precium amicicie quam erga eas simulabat id est in remunerationem amicicie. iuueniiuuentut Peli neutraliter intellige sicut honestum pro honestate, ita iuueno pro iuuentute; nam hic et hec iuuenis et hoc iuuenae declinatur; uel ita id petunt precium sine fine id est inessanter. pacisci precium ab ipsis scilicet precium accipere pro pacto. iuueni datiuius aquisitus; id est ad opus iuuenis, id est iuuenescendi patris sui, Peli.

uidetur a filiabus Peli.

suspendit sursum erigit maiori spe. ficta grauitate ac si graue esset quod poscebatur.

pollicita se facturam eum iuuenem.

muneris id est promissionis de iuuentute Peli.

laniger aries.

Hemonio id est magico nam in Hemonia habundant magi. marcentia senilia; senes enim ad modum florum uidentur marcescere.

exiguo sanguine quia non habundat in senibus.

pecudis arietis.

era ereo use. ea neutraliter scilicet que intus erant posita.

cum cornibus annos quia paucorum uisus est esse annorum pro cornibus paruis.

mirantibus id est dum mirarentur.

MV BWOFDA

uel nugas post senectute add. W surorum post meritorum add. W 306 est quam igitur eas simulabat id est in remuneratione a amicicie post pelie sic add. W 309 postqua pollicita est id est pepiget se facturam illum iuuenem W 315 sanguis post habundat add. W 320 filiabus pelie ante dum add. W
321. lascuitque fuga ad modum lasciui fugit. lactancia lacte plena.
323. fudem quia per hoc melius crediderunt.
327. impensis largius. purum non medicatum.
329. sonpnu datur a Medea.
335. uita etas id est iuuenilis.
336. inanes quod siquidem erit nisi hoc feceritis.
338. exigite extra agite.
339. pia volendo seruire patri. prima est inopia patrem feriendo.
340. scelerata pariendo. facit scelus feriendo.
342. auerses aduersantes se.
347. armat id est armis inuadere facit
348. locuturo Pelie.
349. mersit in undas ut cicius periret.
350. serpentibus qui trahebant currum eius.
352. Pelion mons est. Philireia a Chirone filio Phillires et Saturni qui ibi
habitauit. Philaceri ciuitas est.
353. Oltrim mons est.
357. Eoliam a rege.
358. draconis illius scilicet qui caput Orphei deuorare voluit.

321-358 MV BWOFDA
Ideumque nemus quidam ex filii Bachi, cum furatus esset iuuencum, transiit per Ideum nemus; multi homines secuti sunt eum volentes suspendere, sed, cum ad eum adpropinquarent ut eum iam caperent, sui nati Bacchus miseratus iuuencum mutatauit in ceruum et sic filium suum liberauit.

quaque pater posito nomine patris uel filii, nihil aliud tacetur <quin> cognomines esse eos intelligas. Coritis diis est conuiciatus unde ab ipsis est occisus et negata ei sepultura, quem dum filius tumularetur, fulminatus est a Ioue.

Mera conuiciata est diis, ideo mutata est in canem; uel de Hecube matre Hectoris legatur que binomia fuit; uel De Mera quadam uxor Herculis potest legi quam duo filii eius patre absente prostitutuerunt. Hercules uero reuersus duo filios interfecit, mater quoque pre dolore mutata est in canem, hoc factum expiari non potuit quosque deiictis Lacedemonis templum constituit et filias nobilium immolari fecit, denique Helena illuc sorte ducta uenit et aquila eam rapuit sicque probatum est deos posse placari et Helenam Iouis esses filiam per aquilam.

Euriplique urbem proprium nomen est urbis que ita dicitur 'urbs Euripli' a rege quodam. qua Coee filie Cei quas Luno mutauit. cum Hercules de Hispania rediret Euripli rege spoliato necon et Gerione tergeminó receptus in hospicio a rege Céo filias eius incitauit ut maximas Lrunias inferrent blasphemias que suorum erat auctor malorum; unde Luno irata mutauit eas in ceruas cornutas.

359-363 MV BWOFDA

359 ydeum nemus est filius bachi furatus esset iuuencum transunt per ydeum nemus quem cum illi qui taurum perdiderant insequerentur volentes eum suspendere baxhus nati sui miseratus iuuencum mutatait ceruum et in fillium suum liberauit sic O volentes suspendere] et suspendereit post caperent add. B et filium in uenatrem post ceruum sic add. D a suspendio post liberauit add. D 361 quaque pater choriti nomen choriti tacetur qui cum conuiciat dis inferret occisus est negata est ei sepultura quem cum filius suus tumulat et a ioue fulminatus est O in arena post tumulat add. D 362 et quos mera et cetera mera quia dei conuiciabatur in canem mutata est uel de ecuba matre hectoris qui binomia erat potest legi uel de mera quadam uxor herculis qui Duo filios habuerat qui eo absente prostitutuerunt se vnde herculis reuersus eos interfecit mater uero eorum pre dolore in canem mutata fuit quod nihil adest quam hoc quod garrula erat sic O herculis uero reuersus duo filios interfecit] quos herculis reuersus occidit sed A 363 euriplique urbem qua cee et cetera cum herculis rediret troiano bello... O cee matres matrone uel puelle cei filie. herculis ab hispania tegeniori gerione de uicto rediens susceptus est cei regis hospitio ibi que cum suos referret labores cee matres lunonem cuius inuidia huus herculis pateretur blassemare ceperunt vnde Luno irata recedente herculis cornua capitisus imposuit sic A

euripilique...euripili] om. A que ita dicitur urbs euripili] om. M F nec non et] et BD
tergemino] (c/t)um gerione WF inferrent] referrent D erat] fuerat F
364. discederet a Cea ciuitate. agmen exercitus ab 'ago -gis'; uel agmen uaccarum quas ducebat.

365. Phiton proprium nomen ciuitatis ubi colitur Phebus unde dicit Phebeiam. lasalios a loco in quo habitant Telechine fratres; fuerunt filii Plutonis et Imuidie quorum aspectus mutabat omnia in saxum. Jupiter uero metuens ne celum mutarent subuertit in mare.

366. Carcheia a fundatore. Cee ciuitas est.

367. quam pater Alcidamas Alcidamas natam habuit que, cum a deo concepisset patre suo ignorante, miseratione deorum, ne a patre perciperetur, mutata est in columbam; uel secundum alios <Alcidamas> et filia sua cultores Veneris fuerunt optantes ut neuter mortem alterius [mortem] uideret et deinde mutate sunt in columbam et ideo columbe dicuntur trahere currum Veneris.

371. Hiries illius nimphe. Cigneia a rege qui in olorem mutatus fuerat.
374. subitus nouus.
375. stricto id est magno pre nimo enim amore irascimur aliquando erga illos quos amamus potius quam erga extraneos.
377. ille indignatus id est puer.
380. genitrix pueri.
381. delicuit defluxit.
382. adiacet propinquus est. his scilicet locis. Pleuron ciuitas est de qua fugit Tydeus ad Adrastum interf ecto fratre suo Menalipo ignoranter.

364-382 MV BWOFDA

382 cf. Hyg. Fab. LXIX.2

365 ciuitas B': uel phiton B' insulam ubi phebus colitur O: ciuitas F: quia ibi colebatur phebus D: in quae colitur phebus A eos (cf. fratres) add. BWOD 369 alcidamas...habuit filia alcidame concubuit cum ioue O 371 que mutata fuit in fontem post nimphe add. W
377 hirie mater pueri W* 382 ab altea mater sua post meleagro add. W2

383. *Ophias* filia Ophii, nouerca filiorum, Conbe deprehensa fuit in adulterio a priuignis suis sed miseratione deorum mutata in auem eorum uulnera effugit.


388. *nepotis* quem deuictum Appollo mutauit in phocam piscem maximum. *Cephus* fluuius est; Cephus pater Narcissi nepotem quendam Delphi nomine habuit; quidam dicunt Narcissi filium, qui se pretulit Appollini in cantu lire et mutatus eorum uulnera effugit.

390. *Eumeli* rex fuit quidam uicarius Eoli qui filiam habuit quam, cum ipse uellet corrupere Mercuriium eam, mutauit in auem.

391. *Ephirem* ciuitas est iuxta Pireneos montes unde dixit *Pirenda* ubi homines nati sunt de fungis.

394. *noua uupta* Iasonis, scilicet Creusa quam superduxit Medee ea expulsa pro sceleribus suis, sed Medea uestem Creuse latenter intoxicauit adeo quod ea induta arsit.

---

**383-394 MV BWOFDA**

384 calaurea ante regio add. W 385 therei et proges thereus mutatus fuit in hupupam proge in hironinem uel ceicis et alciones ceis rex et alcione mutati fuerunt in aues marinas que aues usque hodie uxorix nomine appelantur alciones gallicae moetes W: scilicet upupam et yruindem add. D' quia uoluit concumbere cum mate sua more ferarum post mutauit add. D 391 scilicet curete qui prius ephirem et correntum inhabitauerunt ubi regnauit pireniis a quo deam est regio illa deinde curete prius sacra colentes per iuglumiaem sacra comedunt uipiter illos deleuit aquis cum postea are starent sine honore ex aqua qua eos deleuerat reperauerit boletos per fungos ex aquis exuente post fungis add. W apud ephireni nati sunt homines de fungis sic O 394 secundum quosdam misit ei tunicam secundum alienam eorum batiam uerum aum in ultione occidit medea filios suas proprios quo potuit quia fugit illa per loca que enumerauit actor post arsit add. W
395. flagrantem pro Creusa ardente. uidit Medea.
396. natorum suorum quos ipsa interfecti in ultronem patris eorum.
397. arma quia eam uolebat interficere.
398. Tytaniaci a Tytane id est orientalibus ibi enim plus ualet ueneficium et

ponitur Tytaniaciis pro magicis quas quoau arte magica sibi adduxerat; uel Tytaniaci id

est curru Lune que fuit de genere Titanorum; uel dracones currum eius trabeant

anguinos pedes habentes; uel Titaniaci id est celestibus quia per aerem, que est uia

<Titanis>, cursum faciunt.

399. Palladas Athenas ubi colitur Pallas. que te iustissima Phineu Phineus et

Perifas fuerunt reges Athenienses qui in aues mutati sunt.

401. neptem Polifemonis mutata fuit in auem. annexam sustentatam.

402. in uno quia eam receptit in aliis probandus est.

403. hospicium Egeo.

404. proles ignara quia diu non erat uisus.

405. placauerat subiugando habitatores illius montis; uel interficiendo ibi taurum

indomitum.

406. Medea que eum bene congnoscetabat quia uenefica timebat quia nouerca.

408. Echidnus Echidnus est genus serpentis, unde Cerberus habet uillos; ostendit

quomodo habuit illud scilicet cum Hercules descendit ad inferos, extraxit Cerberum, qui

uiso die exspuamque in terra retenta lapidea fructificauit.

414. pariter quia tria habet ora.

---

395-406 MV BWOFDA  408-414 M BWOFDA

---

395. ardentem pro creusa ardente B accensam ante pro add. W 396. medea in ultronem

iasonis filios suos interfecti O et iasonis post suorum add. F 397. quia filios occidit ante quia

eam uolebat interficere add. W 399. id est procul a patria fugerunt post mutati fuerunt add. O

401. ad uiam substantandam A 404. ab eo post uisus add. W 405. monstra post interficiendo

add. D 408. est genus...ostendit] ostendit quomodo habuit illud uenenum ecydne D'

414. canina post ora add. W
416. *feracis fecundi* id est ferax et fecundus sed inculcatio est quedam.
417. *nocendi* quia uenenum.
419. *aconita* quasi a caute nata.
421. *ignara* ueneni, si de Thesei manu intelligatur; uel *ignara* filii, si de manu Egei ita tunc lege *a dextra in capulo* ensis enim, quo accinctus erat Theseus, fuerat Egei per quam congnouit eum esse suum natum.
426. *discrimine paruo* leti; parua enim distantia fuit usque ad mortem filii.
429. *thorosa* pinguia. *uittis* de more sacrificii.
430. *Erichidis* Atheniensibus a rege.
433. *faciente* quia post uinum ingenium in quibusdam plus habundat.
435. *Cromona* terra quam a latrone quodam liberauit.

416-439 MBWOFDA


om. O cercionis MW*: cercionis BA: gerionis F eleusin MB*: el(l)eusis WF* A ciuitas est]
c. e. eiusdem populi BA ubi colitur ceras] om. A
440. occidit ille scilicet Cercion.
443. Alcitoe populus. <Al>chtoe ciuitas est eiusdem populi.
444. Chirone latro quidam erat qui sedebat in quodam loco uel transitu iuxta
scopulum quendam cogebat transeuntes pedes suos osculari, quos statim precipitabat et
precipitatos spoliabat, quem tandem Theseus in habitu pauperis transiens precipitauit et
ideo per illum uia tuta erat.
445. terra sedem negat negat unda nec in terra nec in mari remanere potuerunt.
447. nomen Schironis quia dictus est populus ille Schiron.
449. facta premant quia pluris uidebuntur esse quam exigit numerus annorum.
450. publica quia omnes simul. hac tibi ad honorem tuum.
453. Nec tamen hic est putandum quasimus nullus in urbe tristis
locus, tamen, 'usque id est non assidue duruuit letitia quia nulla est sincera uoluptas id est
sine tristitia quod probat dicens: Egeus percepit et cetera.
456. qui scilicet Minos. milite copia milium.
457. classe copia nauium. ira de filio interfecit.
458. Androgei filii sui, quem Athenienses necauernunt. iustis quia pater.

440-458 M BWOFDA

440  in mare post statim add. B  in quodam...erat] in uia homines transeuntes pedes suos
conselari cogebat et dum oscularentur eos interficiebat et spoliabat postea theseus in habitu
pauperis cum interfecit sic O  iste chiron habitatbat inter alcitoe et lelegas post erat add. A
453ff. illa bene dicet quod nulla voluptas est sum tristicia -que per quia post lectia add. W
contra Athenienses sollemnabant ita sed tamen nulla uo. a de in tantum uel certe usque assidue uel
usque ad omnino et illa nullam superfuit post lectia sic add. A  pater post egeus add. D
458  andogoeus filius fuit minois quem Athenienses interfecerunt vnde minus Athenas inuasit et eas
subiugauit et sibi tributa reddi constituit in lae. marg. O

440 om. WOFDA  ille scilicet M: om. B  cercion B: cenis sic M  443 om. WODA
alcitoe sic M: alcitoe B: alcitoe F* populus M B: populi sunt F  chitoe...populi sic M: om.
quodam sic M osculari] obscurari sic F  tandem] om. A  transiens BDA: ueniens WF:
omnes simul] deus simul M  tuum] tui W  453 om. O  nec tamen B: at tamen usque M:
nec tamen usque F: om. WDA  hic est putandum quasimus B: om. WFDA  quasimus
nullus in urbe tristis locus tamen B: q. ullus in urbe ci. sic locus nec tamen M: om. WFDA
duruuit assidue W  sine tristicia] sed sine tristicia M: tristitia F  quod probat...percepi] om.
W  458 necauerunt] interfecerunt B: necauerant WFD  iustis...pater] om. O
459. *bello* ad bellum.
460. *aditus* nauibus.
473. *Enopiam* ciuitas est.
474. *dixit* nominavit Eginam.
475. *ruit* obuia Minoi.
477. *proles* Eaci.
480. *patrii luctus* pater de morte filii sui lugebat.
481. *centum* quia in Creta sunt centum ciuitates.
482. *pie* pium enim est succurrere patri filium uindicare uolenti.
484. *Asopiades* Eacus nepos Asopi ex parte matris.
486. *ea federa nobis* et Cicropidis quod in illos nihil facere audemus.
487. *magnó* incommodo.
489. *preconsumere* si enim modo pugnaret ante bellum Atheniense uires suas preconsumerent.
490. *Licia Cretensis*.
492. *Athica* Atheniensis.

---

459-492  *M BWOFDA*


---

459  om. O per bellum B 460 om. O 461 om. O ciuitas[ insulam D stiphaleida M
493. patrie Cephalis id est Athenarum.
497. ueteris que in iuuentute solebat esse.
498. popularis de populo suo quia Pallas oliuam creuit.
500. habet Cliton et Buten a dextra a leua uel aliter Cephalus habet duas minores etate a dextra et a leua, scilicet Telamon et Phocum; maior uero scilicet Peleus habet Cliton et Buten.
501. sua uerba id est salue.
502. fedus Atheniensum et Eaci.
504. peti a Minoe si eos possit prius deuincre. Achaidos Grecie.
505. iuuat facundia Cephalis rethorice orando.
506. in capulo sceptro.
508. nec dubie immo certe.
509. eat utinam. iste id est similis quasi diceret numquam deterius eat mihi.
510. superat habundat. mihi id est ad retinendum in ciuitate mecum et hosti id est ad mittendum contra hostes; uel ita mihi id est ad uictoriam meam et hosti ad suam confusionem.
511. felix et inexcusabile alterum sequitur ex altero quia felix ideo inexcusabile.
512. inmo ita sit ita continua: tu dixisti talis erat status meuar merum rerum, id est tam bonus quam bonus est modo. inmo ita sit quod etiam melior sit crescendo.
515 om. OD
519 om. OD hanc...principium om. F que B: quam M TWA illo M TA: ullo FA: om.

493-510 M BWOFDA 510-524 M TBWOFDA
509 uel eat auxilium uerbum post mi(c)hi sic add. A 521 mei post filii add. D 522 alibi modo ponitur pro paucu post magna sic add. F

525. mortale aliqua mortali causa non ex ira Lunonis contigisse; uel ab effectu perducens ad mortem.

526. pugnatum contra morbum.

527. exigium morbus. superbat opens medicine non potens extinguui.

529. ignauos ab effectu. nubibus estus quia calidum erat tempus et tamen nubilum.

533. constat uerum est. uiciam corruptionem.

535. errasse pro calore.

537. deprenda cognita.

541. tabent in tabem deficiunt.

542. in puluere id est in laborum; ex labore enim currendi sequitur puluis.

543. degenerat hic est punctandum quia oblitus palme et ueterum honorum; uel est ibi alia littera: degener ad palmas habendas, quas habere solebat.

544. longo inerti substantiue ponitur pro inhercia.

548. odoribus fetore cadauerum.

551. contagia contagium proprius morbus est porcorum. grauior quam de bubus et de ouibus.

554. fatiscent ex affatim quod est habundanter et 'hio, hias,' habundanter hio.

555. indicium morbi.

561. moderator medicus. adest succurrit.

---

525-529 M TBWOFDA 533-561 M TBWODA

---
562. obsunt nam, quia medici sunt, assidendo morbidis morbum incurrunt.
565. finem in funere cum sepe soleant finiri sanitate.
566. indulgent animis id est quicquid placbat animo faciebant.
571. aliis tamen haurit bibit quamuis ibi uideat homines morientes. et id est
etiam.
573. prosiliunt procul saliunt. consistere super pedes.
574. deuoluunt deorum uoluunt.
575. funesta mortalis.
576. locus est in crimine id est criminarum ac si esset causa morbi.
579. supremo pro morte inminente.
585. stratum per uias. uides contra id est ante nos ex opposita parte.
588. tenet Deus dicitur tenere templum cui sacrum est.
591. non exoratis id est oratione non placatis.
592. inconsumpta non cremata.
599. exiguo quia per morbum defecerat sanguis.
603. inuidiosior inuidiam et odium diis afferens.
604. mortis per morbum.
605. morte per laqueum uel alio modo.
607. funeribus id est pompis funerum. capiebant quasi non sufficiebant ad
exportanda cadavera.
609. indotata solent enim in rogum proici etiam preciosa.
610. alienis iste illius ille istius.

562-605 M TBWODA 607-610 M TBWOFDA

571 licet uideat alios mori bibendo tamen Wd: licet uideantur mori bibendo tamen Wc tamen
quamuis moriatur post etiam add. A 573 quod saltant extra lectos D*: prosiliunt de thoro A
575 funesta quia mortalis locus est A 579 lassata ante pro add. W exalantes (lem.) animam
post (m) in minente add. A (cf. lin. 581) 585 uidere posses ante contra add. W 599 prodiderat
(lem.) marcte erant uene post sanguis add. A (cf. lin. 601) 607 ad sepulcrum post cadavera add.
W 610 iste igne illius ille igne istius sic W reuerentia (lem.) ubi erat diues et pauper post istius
add. A (cf. lin. 609)

562 om. O nam M WD: non sic T; om. BA sunt] sint D; om. BA morbidis] morbis sic M:
inculcans sic T animis M A; om. cet. 571 om. OD aliis tamen MT: tamen A: om. BW
O oratione] ex oratione M: in oratione TW 592 non cremata] incremata sic T 599 om. O
per] propter D 603 afferens] conferens M: affectans morbum mortis (cf. 604) T: ut...afferret
pompis TDA quasi M: quia W: id est TBFDA exportanda] exportandum D 609 om. O
et dotata M enim] etiam enim M rogum] roge B: rogis F pre(c/t)iosa] preciosi sic W
610 om. O
613. nec locus in tumulo sufficit.
619. notam prosperitatis.
623. Dodoneo a silua quadam.
625. grande onus de formica, siquidem asserunt quod massam plumbi ferat
tantam quanta ipsa est quod nullum aliud animal facit; unde fortius omni animali creditur.
629. sine flame sine uento; hoc fuit miraculum quod sine uento.
631. tamen oscula quamuis timerem.
633. fouebam sua uota fouet qui sperat quod desiderat.
634. exercita fatigata.
640. recto non quadrupedes.
641. numerumque pedum cum plures habeat formica pedes quam homo.
643. danpno uerbum est.
646. has quoque uoces.
647. properus uelox.
654. nec origine Mirmidonas quia a 'mimir' quod est 'formica', eos uoco.
658. pares annis quia eadem die nati. animisque quia parci omnes sunt.
660. fuerit mutatus nam eodem uento accedere non poterant et recedere.
662. pars optima magna.
665. ad Cephalum Pallante sati comita<n>tur Cephalo ad regem.

613-665 M TBWOFDA

619 secundo (lem.) prospero uel secundo (lem.) sequenti fulgetram licet prior sit tonitus postea
fuletra rarissima (lem. cf. lin. 622) paucissimia uel preciosissma post prosperitatis sic add. A
625 philosopi post asserunt add. W 654 uel a mirmidon post mimir add. A 658 sunt post
nati add. W et fortes et luxuriosi post omnes sunt add. A 655 sati ueniunt etas est sati pallante
clites et butes sic A

613 om. O 619 probatissim T 623 om. O dondona sic T 625 de formica] formica O
T for(c/t)ius (supp. animal) M TBA: for(uc)ior (supp. formica) WOFD creditur] dicitur O
fortius...creditur M: f. creditur esse TB(O)D f. esse...creditur WF: f. omni creditur A 629 om. O
sine flame] flame D'A hoc id est ante sine uento sic M sine uento] uento DA hoc...uento]
om. D hoc fuit[ hoc et *** T: et hoc fuit BF quod] quia TA sine uento] sine uento sine
tamen oscula] non tamen has sic M timerem BA: tenerem MT: tremerem WF 633 om. O
sua uota fouet] sua fouet sua uota M'B: ille fouet sua uota W sperat] superat sic T quod] quia sic
cum...habeat] quia...habet W 643 om. O uerbum est M BF: uerbum est legum TDA: suerno?
W 646 om. OD 647 om. OFD properus M BA: pertops sic T': properans W 654 om. OD
mirmidonas M: om. cet. quia...uoco] quasi formicas eos uocos sic M 658 om. O
pares...nati post omnes sunt ponit F pares annis] quos ante sic M (cf. lin. 655) annis] animis
in interius spatium in thalamum scilicet.
aspicit Eolidem scilicet Cephalum.
pauca prius quam de iaculo loqueretur.
e fratribus filiis Pallantis. Acteis Atheniensibus. usum utilisatem.
specie pulcridudine.
revolat in pharetram.
Nereius Phocus filius cuiusdam nimphae marine, scilicet Salmacis, et Eaci.
cur sit id est qua de causa. et unde a quo. quis tanti munus auctor id est qui tante efficaciam telum fecit.
ille refert quis fuerit auctor. et cetera nota sibi et suis.
qua tulerit mercede que petit ille scilicet sibi referri. pro pudore silet
pudebat enim quia eam proprio dono interfecerat. silet hoc scilicet, qua tulerit mercede
id est quam mercedem habuit ipsa de dono suo.
derius ista rapit quam Oricia; Oricia fuit filia regis Atheniensis, uxor Boree
Tracie et Procris erat soror.
amor quia pro amore magis duxi quam pro dote.
essem felix.
post sacra iugalia post nuptias.
lutea a colore.
quod id est quamuis [teneat et cetera].
quod id est quamuis. alatur quod apparat in rore matutino. amabam potius
quam illam.

670-707 M TBWOFDA

672 aspicit phocus eloidem cephalus sic A 685 uel nepos (D) nerei de marini cuius filia erat
salmatis mater phoci post eaci sic add D 670 himeti (lem.) illius loci post nuptias add. A (cf.
lin. 702) 703 pace (lem.) salua post colore add. A (cf. lin. 705) 707 pocius quam in alio
tempore post matutino add. A

684 om. OD in] ad W 685 phocus filius samalte (salmaces) filie nerei M (W) pelus uero
telamone de aqua matre ciusdam marine et eaci post nerei M: om. cet. marine (M) TBODA:
om. F scilicet salmacis BA: om TOFD 686 auctor M OF: actor TWA qui (W)A: quis BOD:
om. M effica(tuc)ie efficatio fication sic W telum TOFD culum M WBD ut uid. fecit]
BWFD 688 om. O qua tulerit...referri M: petit phocus ille cephalus A: om. TBWOFDA pro
M: io. sic T: ipsa B′F′D′ oricia M: orica T: orith(i)y)a BFD: orthigia A oricia fuit...soror sic
M: om. cet. 698 om. O magis...quam WFDA: po(c)tius quam BT: non M duxi M WFDA:
duxit BT 699 om. TOD 700 om. O 703 om. WO a colore M B: eo colore TFA:
motae deae est id est irata.
memorata dicta.
esse metus cepit mihi.
facies pulcra. etas iuuenilis.
mores pudici.
sed tamen abfueram quasi sed tamen erat coniectura quia abfueram, sed erat alia coniectura, unde redibam, id est Aurora.
sed cuncta ecce tercia.
quod doleam si sciero quod est summus furo.

inmutat faciens me non congoscibilem Procri.
culpa signo culpe. domus ipsa nondon Procris.
fide ablatium pro genetiuo posuit.
coniugis abrepti id est absentis.
pudici repulerint mores id est ipsa pudica.
magna foret castitatis; contentus hac experientia.

mala pectora id est malam intentionem pectoris detego. quia pactus adulter
non pactus reuera sed ulultus dubitacione.
icta pudore quia pro pudore loqui non potuit.
tum mihi deserto quia deserto, ideo uiolentior.
culpe id est adulterio.
prius alta quia dui abfuit.
tamquam si dedisset dona de reditu suo.
manibus nam in manibus habemus.
747 om. O deserto (lem.)] deserte sic M deserto ideo] desertus fui A 749 om. OF
manibus quod T: illaque sic M: manibus F nam TF: est nam M: me nam W manibus TWF:
nauibus sic M
Carmina Naiades Themis uates Diane dabat responsa hominibus quam solutionem uates eius, scilicet Themis, dum reddere non posset, populo uero rogante solutionem eius dederunt Naiades. Sacerdos uero Themis ideo interfecta est quia obscura soluere non potuit; uel ideo quia Themis obscura dedit responsa, ideo populus despexit eam; uel sic lege: Naiades ille nimphe. soluunt carmina que dabat Themis. non intellecta ab ingenii. priorum id est antiquorum et ideo quia nimis obscure dabat uates. scilicet alma Themis precipitata id est obliuioni tradita uel neglecta. immemor suorum ambagum quia non erat cui loqueretur propter ambigua responsa et quia eam contempsaret. Themis non reliquit talia inulta uel de sacerdotissa Themis, que erat in Parnaso monte, nimis obscura dabat responsa, que predixerat de cane et de lupa et de uenturis nimis obscure; que quia non solueret populus precipitauit sacerdotissam, in cius utionem inmissa est belua. ordo carmina et cetera ut prius. uates obscura id est sacerdotissa Themis. iacebat precipitata a populo interfecta. immemor priorum quod procubuit mortua, satis fuit immemor sed scilicet id est cerate. alma Themis non reliquit talia inulta uel aliter Spinx monstrum fuit alas et ungues habens in similitudine Arpiarum, que insidens in crepidine montis, hec enigma a pretereuutilus quesiuit: 'quid animal esset quod prius ibat quattuor pedibus post duobus postea tripes erat?' eos ita qui soluere nequiban ungibus dilacerabat; tandem auxilio nimpharum Edippus soluit et eandem saxo precipitauit. sensus autem secundum hoc erit quod Naiades predixerit Edippo quod iste uocat carmina, sic lege: Carmina Naiades manifestant; carmina scilicet engima Spingis. non intellecta priorum et uates Spinx quia fingit uatem appellat quia quod dicebat clausum erat figuris sicut esset uates alicuius. obscura immemor suorum id est obliuioni tradita et precipitata ab Edippo; uel uates id est Spinx. obscura id est obscure in suo enignate dando. iacebat immemor quia obliuioni tradita; uel immemor quia ad alium transiuit memoria et laus scilicet ad Edippum. iacebat et precipitata sed alma Themis scilicet id est cerate. non reliquit talia inulta nam alteram beluam inmisit, alter fuget, alter sequetur, neuter uinctet, neuter uinctetur; hec problema soluerunt Naiades, datum a Phebo non solutum a sacerdotissa Themis, unde indignata Themis inmisit bestiam, quam cum canis Cephalis sequetur, mutati sunt pariter in marmora et sic conple tum est problema.

759-62 M TBWOFDA

759 carmina diana quidam carmina fecerat ambigua quorum solutionem cum uates diane dare non posset homines ea carmina non intelligentes iuerunt ad naiades et ueram solutionem ab eis receperunt uatem uero diane scilicet themim precipitauit diana irata misit aprum ad nicolarum exicium inde immemor ambagum fuit postquam mortua procubuit sic A

759-62 sic habet M: om. TBWOFDA
760-62. precipitata ab honore. iacebat uilis erat quia immemor futuri. et uates obscura suarum ambagum id est dans responsa obscura et quasi ambages.

763. immissa est a Themi.

764. multis ad incommodum multorum. pecorum quia ea interfecit. suoque quia eadem fera fuit interfecta.

765. pauere timuere a 'paueo, paues'; uel a 'pasco, pascis' pauere saturauerent armentis suis.

766. indagine recium uel canum uel hominem.

768. summa id est summitatem cordarum.

769. copula canum est uinculum.

772. munere id est canis mihi dati.

775. pedum calidus pululis habebat ipse oculis erectus erat quasi diceret uestigia tantum uidebantur canis uero minime.

779. apex collis medii id est in medio campi.

781. quo id est de quo.

783. in spaciun in directum.

784. ne sit suus id est ne prosit. inpetus hosti id est cani.

788. amentis corrigia iaculi est amentum.

789. deflexi deorsum a cursu flexi.

792. scilicet id est reuera hoc potuit esse causa mutationis.

793. deus uoluit et cetera.

794. et tacuit Cephalus.

796. gaudia principium quasi diceret unde prius gausius sum postea dolui; uel gaudia id est iaculum est principium; uel gaudia nemus et uenatio.

800. mutua cura id est mutuos amor.

804. cacumina quia prius in alto quam in imo.

760-804 M TBWOFDA

760 precipitata quia spreta tamquam immemor futuri sic A 764 uerba sunt cephalis ad phocem post multorum add. O 766 id est circuitu O' 772 munere canis mordacis F' a procri post dati add. W 781 quo (lem.) aliquo modo (lem.) id est aliquando sic O afferesis est post prosit sic add. W' 788 corrigis A 804 cacumina nam prius tam loca quam ima W

naribus acres quia bene odorant.
recordor enim quod dicebam
magna uoluptas es.
exemplo id est similitudine.
se fati dixit inqui inique fatatam.
deuque fide uiolata a marito uel a se seruata cum maritus eam non seruauerit.
metuit nomen aure.
falli a criminis indice.
danpnatura coram eo.
dona iaculum quod mihi donauerat.
meosque id est inferos qui sunt mortuorum.
cum pereo id est quamuis pereo.
mielore letiores. secura de pelice.
nouo quia de formicis nuper facto.

806-864 M TBWOFDA

suo post marito add. W  decipi ante a(b) add. W  855 superos (lem.) tuos post
mortuorum add. A  864 duplici prole (lemmata) pelleo et thelamone sic A  uel nouier ad
bellum misso post facto add. A

sic W17: nouier nato quia de formicis add. D
<GLOSVLE LIBRI VIII>

1. *Iam nitidum retegente* descriptio est matutini temporis.
2. *surgunt* cum austris quia pluuiosi sunt.
6. *Interea Minos* Cephalus accepto milite ab Eaco redibat et iam Minos obsederat ciuitatem Nisi regis, que cum Atheniensibus erat confederata, quam tandem filia eius prodente una cum Athenis subiugatuit.
8. *Alcaithoe* proprium nomen ciuitatis.
12. *pendedebat* quia nec Minos uictor nec Nisus uictus habeatur, nec e contrario.
14. *uoicalibus* sonoris quia ibi lilam deposuisse dicebatur Appollo.
18. *petere* percutere ut resonarent.
21. *procerum* extraneorum
24. *quam nosse sat est* id est ultra modum.
25. *pennis* penus uocat conum galee.
28. *adductis* gestum exprimit iaculantis.
29. *iuncta cum uiribus* quia et uirtuose et artificiose.
35. *uix sua* id est sui iuris qui se cohiber non postet sui iuris non est; *uix* ad 'sane' et ad 'compos' referri potest.
39. *inpetus est illi* id est uoluntas ex inpetu non ex ratione proueniens.
40. *Gnosia* Cretensia a Gnosii ciuitate.
41. *letter* ecce deliberatio.
43. *Dictei* a 'dicti' ciuitate Crete.
47. *me tamen accepta* sic continuandum est: quamuis sit hostis *me tamen accepta* et cetera.

1-47 MV TB(WOFDA)

2 quia austrer pluuiosus est *sic O 40 crete post ciuitate add. M*

2 om. B (h)austris M\textsuperscript{2} V TWD: austris M \textsuperscript{F} A quia] quasi M: qui sic A pluuiosi] pluuiosa M
49. que te genuit scilicet Europa.
50. deus id est Iupiter.
51. ter felix finitum pro infinito.
56. prodicione potens mei uoti.
59. et causa quia iustam habet causam. tuentibus armis quamuis iniusta sit causa
     sepe uincit qui fortior est.
61. suus Mauors uincendo.
62. et non nos amor id est ego amans. melius scilicet per me.
65. inprudens quia nemo prudens te uulnerabit.
67. cepta placent de prodicione.
69. uelle parum est nisi hoc faciam.
71. mea uota de prodicione ad amorem meum assequendum.
74. altera a me.
76. me fortior in perficiendo uota sua.
77. neque in hoc id est ad uotum meum assequendum.
80. purpurae purpureus crinis.
81. curarum maxima nutrix quia de nocte magis sumus curiosi de die otiosi
     fuerimus.
85. fatali in quo pendebat fatum regni quia quamdiu crinem haberet et regnum
     eius duraret.
87. spolium sceleris id est spolium habitum de scelere.
88. meriti fiducia tanta quod etiam hostem non horret.
90. suasit amor facinus donum suum intendit commendare et crimen simul
     excusare.
96. imagine imaginatione; apud se enim cepit cogitare et imaginari.
99. incunabula una dictio est; in Creta nutritus fuit Iupiter.

49-99 MV TB(WOFDA)

59 tamen post sit causa add. WFD 90 hic post donum add. B
100. tantum contingere monstrum id est te monstruosam.
102. hostibus Lelegibus et Atheniensibus.
101. auctor legum iustarum.
103. eratas pro ereis rostris.
104. deductas de portu in mare.
108. meritorum auctore relictæ me scilicet.
110. victoria tua.
111. munera nostra quia dedit tibi uincere per crinem datum. scelus quantum ad patrem. meritum quantum ad te.
114. manere patriam.
115. clausa prohibita. patris ad ora reuertar.
116. odere merentem odiri ut ita dicam.
117. exemplum prodicionis ne scilicet eos prodam sicut patrem prodidi et patriam. obstruximus per scelus.
119. ingrate nullam merito meo gratiam referens.
123. genitrix falsa est id est falsum est Europam tibi esse genitricem. falsa fabula que dicit Iouem in taurum fuisset mutatum, cum uerus fuerit taurus qui te genuit; sicut historia falsa est que sibi falsitatem intermiscet, ita et fabula uidetur esse falsa que sibi admiscet ueritatem. Nam sicut est in amore modus non habuisse modum, ita et in fabula est ueritas non habuisse ueritatem.
125. exige a me.

100-125 MV TB(WOFDA)

100 leges hostibus Atheniensibus minos rex deuictis Athenis per filiam nisi imposuit illud? quandam legem ut in tercio anno vii. iuuenes me? nota uro comedendos tamen mitterent in marg. add. B 108 et nota quod auctore non prouenit a uerbal sed ab autin greco quod est auctoritas quia non benedicetur ista mulier est auctor sed iure formationis auctrix post scilicet add. B 111 aureum post datum add. M 120 sed uerum esse taurum esset tibi patrem add. O 123 fabula falsa est et genitrix falsa est uerum pro sed post ueritatem add. M

127. merui perire et sum digna.
129. crimine munere criminoso.
130. insequeris id est reprehendis quod uideris facere cum pro crimine me
dimittis.
131. officium tibi sit pro officio tibi habeatur.
132. ligno Pasiphe ligneam fecit uaccam ad tauro succumbendum; nota est fabula
illa de Pasiphe.
133. discordem quia semibouem.
138. †hoc quid est† iuuat delectat Minoem.
139. recedit a Minoe mecum quod plus eam grauabat; nam si nauis recederet a
terra ita quod ipsa naui inhereuet non ei tantum displiceret.
143. uires consequendi.
144. inuidiosa odiosa Minoi.
145. pater cui ipsa crinem secuerat.
146. alienus species est auis.
150. plumis in auem mutata plumis apparuuit eam esse auem.
151. adepta nomen capillo nam Cirrus est capillus; uel capillorum globus et a
'cirro' dicta est 'cirris' que est alauda cristata.
152. uota de uictoria.
153. Curetida Cretensem a populus quibusdam qui Curetes dicuntur.
154. spolii in bello aquisitis.
156. biformis quia partim erat homo, partim bos.
157. thalami sui scilicet et uxorii.
160. ponit opus id est domum. notas itineris.
161. in errorem intrancium.
162. Meandros fluuius est qui tortuosas habet aquas sic et uie erant tortuose.

127-162 MV TB(WOFDA)

150 quibus ante apparuuit add. M 156 biformis quia semibos et semiuir O
164. *occurrens* quia suis ibat obuius aquis.
169. *geminam* quia tauri et iuuenis.
170. *Acteo* Athenienses enim soluere habebant tributum semel in tribus annis Minotauro septem iuuenes qui sorte erant electi; cum autem bis misissent in duobus ternaris tercio ternario unde subiungitur.
171. *nouenis* cecidit sors super Theseum cui filum et picem tradidit Adriagne, filia Minois, amans illum, quo filo de poste ligato ueniens ad Minotaurum, cum aperiret os suum ad eum deuorandum, misit piceum globum in os eius, quem dum mastigaret euaginato gladio capud eius amputavit; deinde sequens filum ad portam reidiens exiuit.
179. *innisit celo* stellificans eam.
181. *remanente corone* quia in circuitu et rotunditate sunt disposite. *loco* quia medius illorum signorum, quorum alterum 'Ninox genu,' dicitur, alterum 'tenens Anguem'. Hercules in eo statu, in quo genu nitens, leonem interfecit in celo figuratus est, et in alio statu in alia parte celli in eo scilicet in quo erat in cunis strangulans angues sibi inmissos a lunone; uel interficiens Idram in Lerna palude et in eo statu dicitur 'tenens Anguem' uel 'Ofiulcus' quod est Serpentinus. Inter duos Hercules est corona illa uel Esculapium significat, qui in celo tenet duos angues a quibus habuit herbas quibus Ypolitum suscitauit.
184. *exilium* quia extra solum sue natiuitatis erat utpote aduena.
189. *nouat* nouitate quadam mutat dando homini pennas quas aui natura dederat.
190. *longam* non reuera sed respectu breuioris.
191. *cliuo* id est per cliuum ad modum cliui.
193. *lino* lineo filo.
196. *pericula* dicit quia inde perit ut audietis in sequentibus.

164-196 MV TB(WOFDA)

181 nixus genu...tenens anguem cf. Met. 8.182 cf. Hyg. Ast. 2.14.1

171 filium egei regis post theseum add. T de laberinto post exiit sic add. F 181 idem quod ante serpeninus add. W
retinenti aplaudenti. mollibat pro molliebat. manus ultima id est finis. Booten septentrionalem; stella est. Elicen Orionis stelle sunt. precepta uolandì ut pote de motu alarum et de talibus. tremuere quod fuit signum casus inminentis. comiti timet potius quam sibi. dampnosasque erudit artes hoc totum adhuc est de conparagione uel potius dicatur de Dedalo. dampnosas Icaro ut audietur in sequentibus.

manus ultima id est finis. Booten septentrionalem; stella est. Elicen Orionis stelle sunt. precepta uolandì ut pote de motu alarum et de talibus. tremuere quod fuit signum casus inminentis. comiti timet potius quam sibi. dampnosasque erudit artes hoc totum adhuc est de conparagione uel potius dicatur de Dedalo. dampnosas Icaro ut audietur in sequentibus.

stuia manica est aratri. quique ipsi. ducem patrem. traxit ab illò nam Icareum mare dictum est ab Icaro. nec iam pater quia filio carens a relatiuis. pennas non autem Icaro. et plausit pennis quasi gaudens. unica sola. namque huic scilicet Dedalo. germana Dedali. natalibus annis quia singulis annis natalicios dies celebrabant. quod dicit ad secanda ligna quia dentatum e dicatur de Dedalo. x

truma: ex uno. quod dicit ex uno et cetera. ingeniis ingeniosis quia dea est sapientie. uigor uiuacitas.

197-254 MV TB(WOFDA)

218 cf. Serv. et Schol. Dan.: 174 stiuaque

197 et descendit ab hoc ambo renideo. quod est applaude et tractum est ab auribus in nido qui applaudent cum alter? muneri post aplaudenti sic add. B 245 et durum post dentatum est add. M

256. *non tamen* quamuis alas habeat.
258. *propter humum* id est iuxta.
261. *Cocalus* rex quidam qui Dedalum a Minoe qui eum persequebatur bello defendit; uel secundum quosdam *†* Dedali*†* qui expulerat eum a regno.
262. *lamentabile* de hominibus deuorandis a Minotauro.
263. *Thesea laude* id est laudabili facto, nota est nobis fabula.
271. *causa petendi* auxilium.
276. *septus ab agricolis* id est a rusticis; uel aliter quia primitus sacrificauerunt
Pani et ceteris diis ruris et ad superos ascendit.
278. *Latoidos* Diane.
279. *et id est etiam. ira deos* sicut et homines. *at non inpune* ita continua: ego
contemnor *at non impune misit aprum* tantum
282-3. *quanto maiiores* et cetera. Epiros locus est ubi sunt magni tauri sed in
Sicilia parui.
284. *sanguine et igne* id est rubore simili sanguini et igni.
288. *dentes Indis* id est dentibus elephantorum qui sunt in India.
289. *fulmen* id est ictus ad modum fulminis.
291. *uota* quia hoc uouit ex quo seminavit colonus quod ad maturitatem ueniret
seges.
293. *promissas* a colono uel a tempeire temporis.
294. *fetus* racemi.
295. *semer frondentes* etiam in hieme.
302. *alter equo scilicet* Castor.

256-302 MV TB(WOFDA)

261 et armis *post* bello *add. F* 291 metuendus *post* fulminis *add. W* 301 filii putatuii tindaris
*post* castor et pollux *add. F*: filli tindarei putatuii *post* castor est pollux *add. W*

256 alas] om. MV 261 om. T* crocalus* WFD*]: contalus V: corcalus A uel secundum...
263 laudabils M T* nobis*] om. TBD 275 latices BWF*]: 276 septus.....ascendit M: a
deis primatis ut a pane aliis sic W: faunis et satiris qui dii sunt agrestes A: om. V TBFD
BWOFDA 283 ep(i)yros lemma est TBWOF: *int. lin. DA* sicilia] phiestia sic T: cicilia F
om. W 291 hoc] hic W: maturitatem] materitatem TB ueniat T 293 temporis] aeris B:
aeris uel temporis W 295 etiam TBWFA: et MV 301 cestibus alter id est pollux om. T:
pollux om. M

219
304. duo Testiade Flexipus et Toxipus. 
305. iam non femina quod prius fuerat. 
308. Actoride id est pater Patrocli ipse scilicet Actor. 
309. Achillis scilicet Peleus. 
315. Penelopeque socer id est Laertes. 
317. Oeclides Oecle filius, Amphioraus quem uxor sua prodidit. decus nemoris quia uenatrix. Tegea Athalanta a monte sic dicta. 
318. rasilis plana et tractum est a rasa, que planatur cum raditur. 
319. simplex sine plica. 
321. telorum custos Coritus uocatur. 
322. talis erat cultu qualem descripsi. facies erat talis quam dicere prius et cetera. 
324-5. pariter uidit pariter optauit quasi diceret uisam statim amauit. renuente deo ut apparuit postea. 
327. tempus temporis inportunitas. 
329. silua frequens habundans. nulla etas id est nullius etatis homines. 
332. pressa pulueri. 
333. pedum fere 
337. parua sub arundine existente; canna est longa fistula et concaua, harundines sunt folia ab ipsa dependentia et ideo sunt sub harundine. 
339. elisus nubibus naturam exprimit fulminis. 
341. protentaque procul tensa. 

304-314 MV TB(WOFDA) 


350. **Oeclides** Anphiaraus.
352. *quam* id est quantum. *pouit* quia non plenarie annuit.
[356. *emicat ex oculis* ardor uel ira.]
357. moles saxum perrarie.
359. *inpete* pro inpetu nec plus inuenitur sicut et desponte.
360. *dextra cornua* dextram partem aciei.
368. *despexit* deorsum aspexit.
371. *femur hausit* uulnerat, sed haurit dicit quia uulnus sanguinem euacuat.
372. *nondum sidera* postea fuerunt.
378. *studio incautus eundi* magis studebat ad eundum quam ad sibi cauendum.
382. *sumnum* quasi in superficiem non in imum. *distrinxit* uulnerat.
384. *nec tamen ipsa* quamuis sit leta.
388. *erubuer* pro pudore quia femina melius fecerat illis.
392. *prestant* preualeant.
397. *ancipitem* quia ab utraque parte secatabat.
406. *pars anime* quia duo amici una et eadem anima dicantur vegetari. *licet*
eminus esse fortibus id est modestos et non extra se.
414. *Oenide Meleagri. uariat* iacula uaricando iaculantur.
416. *dum seuit* ad parandum(!) Meleagrum.

350-416 MV TB(WOFDA)

350 *amphicidas* B*: uel oeclides B*sel* filius oeclii sacerdos phebi *post* amphioraus add. W
360 *uulnerat* *post* aciei *add* W 365 *citra ante* bellum *add* W 371 *non ante* uulnerat *add* W 384 *fereus* id est *apri post* leta *sic* *add M* 406 uel remotos et non prope sicut anteus *post esse add M*

350 *oeclides M TBWF* : *oe. V*: a(m/n)phicidas B*OD' A* a(n/m)phiaraus V F* : amphioraus M* BWA* : amphioraus T* id est mopsus filius amphi. sacerdos phebi O* : mopsus D 352 quam MV* TW* : qua B*FDA* in quantum V WFD quia] *om T* amouit W 356 *post 357 ponit M* : *om* *V TBWOFDA* 357 perrarie MV BW* : *om* T FDA 359 *pro MV ODA* : id est TBW* : *om*

FD sicut et MV* : nunc ut uid. T 360 cornua] tuentis M 365 troiana...bellum *post 359 ponit M* tempora *om M* 370 *exixo sic M* : *exixo sic T descenderat M* fricando*


MV* : *om. cet.*
418. *irritat* pretendens uenabulum.
421. *petunt* desiderant.
424. *cruentat* ut uideatur particeps fuisse prede.
425. *inposito* fere. *caput exiciabile* pro dampno facto iam colonis uel pro futuro de morte Meleagri et auunculorum.
426. *mei iuris* quia eum interfeci.
427. *in partem* ut sis particeps.
430. *muneris auctor* quia sepe pro donatore gracios est donum.
431. *murmur* est inuidentium.
432. *e quibus* scilicet murmurantibus.
433. *intercipe* id est inter tam bonos sola cape.
434. *Testiade* filii Testii.
435. *amore* tuo.
439. *quantum dient* id est quanta sit distancia dictorum ad facta.
440. *Plexippi* unus erat de fratribus.
441. *Toxea* pro Toxeum, alter erat de fratribus.
442. *fraternaque fata timentem* id est mortem, sicut frater suus erat mortuus.
444. *consorti* quia fratres erant.
445. *nato uictore* scilicet Meleagro.
448. *mutavit* sicut fieri solet in funere.
450. *pene* id est puniendum de fratrum interfectione.

418-450 *MV TB(WOFDA)*

427 illi adimunt munus scilicet atalante illi scilicet meleagro post particeps *add. M cf. Met. 8.*
436 uel ius muneris quia poterat dare cui uolebat *ante* dandi *add. M 439* ann facta *post ad factura sic add. V.*

452. Testias Altea a patre.
457. spargit ut extinguat.
460. protulit de archa.
463. cepta quater tenuit id est detinuit. mater maternitas ne inponat. soror sororitas ut ita dicam ut inponat.
466. suum sibi congruum scilicet ruborem.
467. crudele minanti per sororitatem.
468. misereri per maternitatem.
471. estus naturalis cursus maris.
472. uim geminam uenti et estus.
473. dubiis ab effectu. affectibus ira et pietae.
478. mea uiscera filius est de uisceribus matris.
479. fatale in quo pendebat fatum iuuenis.
480. sepulcras uel pro morte filii uel pro morte fratrum.
487. Testius pater meus. orbis erit fratibus meis interfectis.
489. officium id est uindictam officiosam. magnus labore cum eum peperi.
493. displicet auctor nam si meruit interfici non tamen a matre.
495. successu de morte fratrum.
498. trahat in ruinam.
499. pia uota parentum que pie solent pro filiis uouere.
502. munere nostro cum facem ab igne rapui.
503. merito quia auunculos tuos occidisti.
505. adde interficiendo.
509. male ad malum. uincetis me a pietae retrahendo.
511. ipsa sequar me occidendo. auersa quia respicere non sustinuit.
514. inuitis quia etiam ignis uidebatur ei uelle parcere.
517. superat nihil turpe coactus dicere. uirtute animi.
519. uulnera ei facta ab apro.

452-519 MV TB(WOFDA)

487 et filius meus et oeni utri mei uiiet post interfectis add. M 511 me post respicere add. T
ignis facis. dolor Meleagri.
uterque fax et iuuenis.
iacet in luctu.
increpat eum id est se quod tam diu uixit.
Elica id est sapientia Eliconis ubi sunt Muse.
dum manet extra rogum.
post cinerem id est post conbustionem.
Gorgen una erat filiarum Oenei. nurunque Deianiram dicit uxorem
Herculis.
Erical ab Ericalo rege. Tritonidos Palladis cui Athene sunt deputate.
ait Achelous.
contermina uicinia.
turbinoe ulubili.
dum pro donec.
domo hospicio.
uroque quia non transiit et in domo eius remansit.
tophis quedam maneries lapidis.
lacunabant id est ad modum lacus curuabuntur. conche id est ibi depicte.
cum alterno murice quia inter conchas murices pisces qui in conchis latitant alternatim et
mixture uidebantur depicti in summo domus nare; uel alia est littera summa lacusnabant
id est per summa.
Yperione id est sole circa horam nonam; uel a gygante dictus; uel ab 'yper'
quod 'super' et 'on' quod est 'totum' et dicitur 'Yperion' quasi 'super omnia luminaria'.
Troezenius a ciuitate.
Acharnanum populus est, cuius fluuius est Achelous.
vestigia id est pedes.
in gemma in uasa gemmata. maximus heros descriptio est Thesei.
amnis ad hec id est deus amnis.

522-577 MV TB(WOFDA)

543 cuius per oeneus mater alcemena fuit post herculis add. B 564 acheloi post domus add. W

fas VT 534 eliconius M 539 post om. FDA 534 fuit MD 543 deiniram
561 quia] om. TA eius] om. T non remansit F 562 maneries WF: maneria MV TB:
materia ut uid. D: maneroem sic A 564 curuabuntur MV D: curuabant TWOFA: manabant B
pite V cum M B(W): cuius alterno sic V depicti V WFDA: depicte B: om. M T
per summa] per summa lacri ibi depicte sic M: per summa lacus W: per summam DA
577 adhoc VT
578. spacii per spaciun. discrimina differentie quasi diceret adeo longe sunt quod uidentur insule ille unum quid esse.
582. inmemores nostri id est mihi non sacrificantes.
586. tunc denique repulsi.
589. Echinadas insule sunt; uel propter pisces uel serpentes sic dicte que ibi habundant.
593. quod pater uirginis.
596. tridentifer Neptune.
600. si pater benignus ad modum patris.
603. hunc quoque sicut et uirginem.
604. assensibus id est signum assensus.
608. inducris inter precordia ductis.
611. amnis ab his id est post hec tacuit Achelous.
613. Ixione id est Peritous.
617. ante omnes stupuit Lelex. animo maturus id est sapiens. et euo id est senex.
618. celi id est celestium.
620. minus dubites de potentia deorum. tilie arbor est.
625. fulicis aues sunt.
627. Athlantiades Mercurius.
631. parili idem est quod pari.
633. ferendo patienter.
634. effecere leuem magis tolerabilem. ferendam indigam ferri.
635. nec referd id est nulla est differentia.
636. tota domus id est familia.
639. releuare a labore. sedili sedendo.
640. textum rude id est rudem telam.

578-640 MV TB(WOFDA)

620 uel tilic cotermia quere est litera et est ante tilic sic in dex. marg. add. B 634 quia leue fit quod bene furtur honus post tolerabilem add. W 635 inter duos et seruientes quia non erat nisi duo add. W
641. foco locus est ignis.
643. anima id est flatu.
650. sectamque domat id est coquit.
653. clauo ad clauum.
654. fouendos balneando uel pedes lauando.
656/656a. inpositis lecto sponda pedibusque salignis sic construe: sponda et pedibus salignis inpositis lecto et sunt ablatiui absolui.
658. sternere lectorum est. sed et id est etiam.
659. uestis ululis erat sicut lectus.
663. mente herba sunt.
664. sincere caste.
665. autumpanalia quia tunc maturescunt. fece mellis uel etiam uini, quia etiam in uino conduntur.
666. intiba herba est; hec intiba, huius intibe; uel intiba, -borum. radix species est herbe.
668. fictilibus scilicet uasis. eodem argento id est de argilla.
669. sistitur cum reuerentia ponitur et est uerbum sacrificii.
670. qua caua id est rimosae.
672. referuntur iterum feruntur; in domibus diuitum non nisi semel fertur uinum, sed sepe mutatur.
673. seducta remota scilicet; subaudi prima fercula. secundis mensis id est ferculis.
674. carica fructus est palme.
683. ueniam quasi de culpa quod scilicet nihil parauerant.
684. custodia magis enim uigilat quam canis.
689. merita de nostro contemptu.
699. duobus Pilemoni et Baccidi.

641-699 MV TB(WOFDA)

684 anser post uigilat add. B

669 ponitur] a puero sic T sacrificii] sacrificium T 670 qua MV: que T: int. lin. BFD
rimosa MV"T V" BFD: ruinosa T V" 672 unum VT add.: unde M B add. 673 ferculis V
(W)F: ferculis sic M B: feruculem T: fructibus D: fertilibus A 683 parauerat M T: -erit V:
baccidi MV T: bauici B(W)FDA
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701. stramina stramineum tectum.
705. locutus antequam optaret quasi consilium querens.
710. ab illa superstite.
712. donec id est quamdiu uita data est; soluti a uigore suo.
718. o coniunx ad utrumque potest referri; nam hic et hec coniunx dicitur.
719. Tuneus a loco ubi fuit ista mutatio.
721. non uani non mendaces unde credendi. nec erat cur fallere uellent id est causam fallendi non habeant.

723. recentia nova scilicet dona.
724. cura deum sic lege: cura deum id est homines quilibet sicut et isti duo, de quibus curam habent dii, sunt dii, et qui coluere deos colantur sicut dii; uel alia littera dii sunt id est pro diis quilibet habentur cum istis duobus qui sunt cura deum id est curiosi de deis uel de quibus dii curant et qui coluere coluntur ab omnibus.
731. Protheus[ ] in diuersas se transmutat figuras.
739. iuris scilicet potestatis in mutando.
740. adoleret incenderet.
744. una nemus faciens subaudiri.
745. argumenta probationes. uoti potentes ad effectum ducti.
746. Driades Eresitn filius Driopes.

701-746 MV TB(WOFDA)

724 quibus post cum add. D uel dii sunt cura deum i. dii curant de diis et qui col. col. sicut dii deos coluere ita ab ipsis coluntur uel sint dii protectione deorum et qui colunt d. co. a diis uel dii id est homines bone conuersacionis deos operibus imitantes sint cura deum inprotectione deorum add. A
licebit pro quamuis.

ingens uictima quia maior est oue, capra, ceterisque uictimis.
deterrere nefas id est eum a scelere.
Thesalus Eresite de Thessalia.
instare esse presens.
tamen quamuis uocem audiret. scelus de arboris truncatione.
adducta ad terram quia alta.
damno nemorum minorari. suoque quia ibi choreas ducere solebant.
atri sicut fit in merore.
non nulli due negationes faciunt unam affirmationem.
dee id est Cerei.
sinunt ut pote contraria.
Oreada Oreades nimphe sunt montium.
Friges iners quia nihil gignit. Pallorque Tremorquae ista secuntur ex
Frigore.

eam Famen. uires Cereis sunt, fertilitas annone.
et dedit currum.
serpentum qui currum eius trahebant. leuauit alleuiauit descendingo.
situ antiquitate uel intermissione comedendi; a 'sino, -nis' deriuatur.
extabant eminebant.
ut uidit Oreas.
domum Erisitonis.
mandata Oreadis.
regnat ardoc edendi.

755-829 MV TB(WOFDA)

763 taurus ante maior add. A 783 molitur genus miserabile omnibus scilicet lacerare eum
fame. miserabile esset si ipse esset miserabilis alicri sed nullus habebat miseri que de eo ideo non
erat miserabile alicri quia miserabile in factis suis  add. B

763 oue] boe B 768 eresiton M: erision V A: ericto T: erisiton BWFD thessalio M
772 presentes W: presentes D 774 tamen...audiret] post truncatione ponit F: om. BD
arboribus truncatis T 775 damno...minorati] om. BWD minoratorum A
778 merore WF: nemore MV TBDA 785 cereri] cereris MV 786 fiunt sic V T
sequentur): sequitur TB: sequentur FDA frigore MV BWF: (c/t)ridore sic T: stridore D: timore
et etiam ex frigore A 793 famam sic M fertilitas] om. T 798 serpentium BF
qui] quia TB 802 antiquitate] -em M B intermissione] -em M 809 uidet V:
uideticiet ut uid. sic T 821 mandata MV TF': mandato B'W' 829 om. B
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834. *plusque cupit quo* id est in quantum.
837. *alimenta* id est ligna.
842. *causa cibi* id est appetitum afferens comedendi. *locus* uenter.
848. *dominum* id est alicui subdita esse.
851. *hec* scilicet premia.
854. *pisces capientibus* id est piscatoribus.
856. *moderator harundinis* cum harundine enim piscantur quidam de piscatoribus.
858. *credulus* tunc capitur quando est credulus piscatori.
862. *bene cedere* id est bonum sibi euenire per mutationem.
863. *resecuta* respondendo.
865. *studio* piscandi.
867. *ut nemo* ut pro sicut.
870. *sua* feminea.
874. *non iusta* quia ipse iniustus erat.
879. *quid moror extremis* eorum mutationem assignando.
880. *numero finita* quia non in qualibet.
881. *flector* dicit quia angues tortuosi sunt et flexibles.
882. *armenti dux* taurus. *uires in cornua* fortiores enim sunt tauri in cornibus quam alibi unde et cornibus aratrum ducunt.
883. *telo* cornu, telum est tauri.
884. *uerba* sunt Acheloii.

830-884 MV TB(WOFDA)

830 vnde ante aues add. T 848 cepit post esse add. B mutari possum figuram sed in tres tantum post quamlibet add. WF: sed solum in hominem anguem et taurum add. A 884 ad theseum post aeholii add. W

1. *Carmine dum tali* quia hic usque cantuit Orpheus.
2. *duxit* post se.
4. *de uertice* id est summitate.
5. *sociantem* concordando.
6. *iactato crine* id est excusso ad modum insane.
7. *contemptor* ut dictum est superius post mortem eiusdem noluit cum alia rem habere sed tantum amasios habuit.
9. [*presuta* circumdata]. *notam* ictus.
10. *alterius* mulieris.
11. *concentu* quia uoci lira concordabat.
12. *ausis* quia in uatem uenearly.
13. *ante pedes* Orphei.
15. *Berecinthia* Cibeleia.
16. *obstrepuere sono cithare* ita quod audiri non potuit.

1-18 *M TBWOFDA*

2. *duxit dum* ita cantasset orpheus ecce *W* 3 cicenses populi sunt in tracia *B* id est silusestribus a fera ita dictis *ante* quia *add. W* 11 id est cantu *ante* quia *add. W* 18 id est obstrepando hebeto auere *post* poterat *add. A*

---

19. uatis uulnerati.
23. *inde* id est ab illis; *uel* *inde* postea.
25. *noctis aue*m id est noctuam. *structo* id est obsesso.
28. *hec in munera* sed ad sacra Bachica.
33. *lacertos* dicuntur qui pingues habent lacertos.
37. *vere* id est crudeles; subaudi mulieres. *cornuque minaci diuellere boues* id est cornua a bobus et est ypallage.
40. *nec quicquam* due dictiones sunt; id est 'non alicui.'
43. *in uentos* id est in aerem qui est regio uentorum.
48. *carbas* uestes sunt.
50. *Hebre* fluuius est.
53. *respondent* per Echo.
56. *Methinnee* a ciuitate Methinna que est Lesbo.
60. *congelat* mutando in lapides duros reddit ac si essent congelati.
67. *scelus* de morte Orphei.

---

19-67 *TBWOFDA*

22 illa sacerdotisse *O* theatri uocat theatrum actor locum ubi sedebant orpheus *sic* *W* theatri loci ubi sedebat *A* 37 fere bache ille uel fere crudels mulieres *sic* *A* 48 pullo id est nigredine *add. BWA:* pullo id est negro colore *O* 53 *eis post* respondent *add. W* 56 *scilicet* ebro *post lesbo add. T*
70. ligauit mutando in arbores.
71. in quantum queque secuta digitos id est in quantum queque grossiores habuit, quia quanto grossiores sunt tanto magis extendi possunt; queque secuta est Orpheum tam illa que faciebat scelus quam illa que uidebat.
72. traxit extendit.
73. externata stupida.
74. exultantem id est extra saltare uolentem.
75. nec satis hoc quod matres mutuuerat.
76. cumque choro Bacharum, Satirorum. meliore Edoniis matribus. pineta quia pinus ibi habundant; uel uinetu a uineis.
77. Pactalon fluiuus est
78. annis id est senio. mero ebrietate.
79. cui Mide
80. cum Cecropio Eumolpho id est Mide et Eumolpho. orgia sacra Bachi. tradiderat id est docuerat.
81. genialiter id est splendidie ac si genium coleret.
82. sed inutile sicut in sequentibus audiemus.
83. Berecinthius heros id est Midas Trojanus quia ibi pocius fit festum Cibeen quam alibi.
84. massa aurea.

70-112 M TBWOFDA


232
114. Hesperides que mala habuerunt aurea.
117. Danem deludere possit id est adeo purum, quam purum, fuit illud quod
Danem decepit.
118. animo capite quia ultra modum letatur.
121. Cerealia munera id est panem.
124. lamina frustrum argenti.
125. actorem muniris Bachum. Acheleum pro qualibet aqua accipit.
126. fusile a fundendo.
127. diues quia habens. miser quia habitis uti nequiens.
130. meritus quia pre aliis uouerat.
131. splendidia quia aurea.
132. Lenee Bache; a 'leniendo' quia lenit curas; uel a 'lenoi' quod est 'lacus.'
peccauimus tale quid uouendo.
137. Sardibus populi sunt.
141. crimen de stulto uoto.
142. uis aurea id est aurum faciendi.
148. ut ante nocuerant.
152. Hipepis nomen est uille.
153. iactat iactando canit.
154. leue uile respectu Phebei cantus.
156. indice sub Thimolo proprium nomen montis; uel dei qui preest monti.

114-156 M TBWOFDA

114 quia esperia sunt aurea poma O filias hesperi ante quae add. W: in orto earum que
hercules rapuit post aurea add. F: filii athlatis ante quae add. A 117 adeo puru(m) fuit unda O
iupiter post quod add. F 132 qui post bache add. B sic dicetur post leniendo add. TBWF 152
populi sunt uel ciuitas B: illis uilleis sic W: id est uille O: uilla est A 156 est post nomen add.
BWFD A

114 quae M BWA: quia TD: hesperides F mala MT: poma BWFDA habuerunt M TBA: habent
W: hambant FD 117 dan(n)e(m)n M TBWF D2 A: daphnem Dsc deludere M BA: eludere WFD
possit M: pos BFA: posset WD purum...purum] purpureum purpuream W quam] quem T: erat
quem D: sicut F fuit] erat D illud] per F dan(n)e(m)n TWF: danes M: dane B: daphnem D:
danise sic A decepit[ acceptit M 118 om. O letatuir] letabatur D 124 argenti] auri F 125
acheloum...acceptum om. BWFA: ammem id est acheloum lin. 137 ponti O’ acheloum M:
lenu(i/y)] lenei D peccauimus M WFD: feci. T: fatentem B: pecesse A quid uouendo] quia
petendo W 137 populi sunt] populis O’A: populis illis W: ciuitatibus illis W 141 om. O
om. O montis uel dei M B: montis et dei TDA: et montis et dei WF
158. liberat ut melius audiat. arboribus ad ueritatem respexit quia in monte sunt arbores.

160. deum pecoris Satirum.

163. delinit demulcet. [liberat remouet arbores ab auribus]. post hunc id est post huius cantum scilicet Panis. Thimolus resoluit ora sacra quia deus erat montis.

164. ad os Phebi id est locutus Phebo ut os suum cantando aperiret. uultum

Thimoli quia, quo uertit uultum, uertit se et sui montis siluam.

165. ille scilicet Phebus.

166. saturata tincta.

169. artificis status ipse fuit id est in ipso statu apparuisset eum esse bonum illius artis artificem.

171. submittere ut pote uictum.

173. arguitur reprehenditur.

174. unius solius.

176. sed trahit in spatium id est extendit.

180. celare aures.

187. hauste effosse.

188. indiciumque sue uocis id est uerba que aures asini Midam habere indicabant.

189. obruitt tegit.

192. prodidit agricolam id est aures asini demonstrauisset inesse Mide, qui agricola erat factus; uel prodidit agricolam id est indicauisset uerba agricole, id est famuli illius, qui uerba illa infuderet.

193. coarguit conprobat.

195. Nepheleidos Helles a matre Nephile

158-195 M TBWOFDA

158 mundat ante ut add. W 160 scilicet pana post satirum add. A 163 liberat...auribus post satirum add. M quia...montis] mens ubi phebe colitur O 164 uultum sua silua se inuit deum et siluam A 188 phebus mutauit aures mide in aures asini O 192 id est uerba agricole qui iabi condidit uerba domini sui B*: agricolam id est annuit uerba id est famuli sui O 195 fuit mater phiiri et elles sic B: helles post nephele add. F

196. Latioius Phebus Latone filius.
198. Panopeo a nomine fundatoris.
201. nec opes exposcere paruas immo indigere magnis.
204. pacti id est in pacto ponentes se pro muris aurum habituros.
205. auare pro rege auaro.
212. poscitur ut marine exponeretur belue pro peccato patris, quam Hercules liberavit sub tali condicione quod albos haberet equos; sed ea liberata equis Herculi negatis fingens se abire Hercules sub profumtorio, quodam cum exercitu suo latuit; unde illud dictum est 'Sigeum' a sige quod est 'latere'; deinde de inprouiso Troiam obsidens eam cepit, Thelamoni quoque, quia primus murum ascendit, Hesionem, quam liberauerat, despensauit.
215. bis periura semel de modo auri erga Neptunum, iterum de albis equis erga Herculem.
216. pars milicie id est unus de militibus Herculis.
218. aui id est Iouis per Eacum.
219. quam soceri id est Neptuni cuius filia fuit Thetis.
222. accipe filium.
225. ignes amorem.
228. urginis marine id est Thetidis.
229. est sinus id est angulus, descript locum ubi capta fuit Thetis. falcatus ad modum falcis curatur.
231. portus erat esse poterat. summis in superficie existentibus.
uestigia seruet ut inpressa.

nec remoretur iter sicut leuis harena

frenato ut pote currum trahente.

ad solitas artes scilicet mutandi. auso uoto scilicet quod audacter inuaserat.

a pectore tigridis.

Carpatius Protheus a Carpato insula, id est a quodam mari sic dictus.

dum id est donec.

admisit recept se mergendo; gestum exprimit in aqua se mergentis.

pronus erat Titan descriptio est serotini temporis.

sensit Thetis.

sine numine id est sine documento numinis.

exibita id est manifestata.

potitur concumbendo.

iugulati quem in uenatione inprudens occiderat.

sine ui id est sine uiolentia suis illata.

patrium nitorem patrium nitorem Ceicis pater erat Lucifer.

dissimilisque sui qui solebat esse letus et pulcher.

copia licentia. tiranni pro regis, scilicet Ceicis.

uelamenta scilicet ramum olitue albo panno uelatum quod erat signum pacis.

crimina de morte sui fratris.

Tracinus a ciuitate.

huic animo id est uluntati mee quam habeo de hospitibus recipiendis.

232-285 M TBWOFDA

237 tuum post currum add. W 256 condidit mergendo gestum exprimit aque se mergentis A 257 et est tractum ab auriga quicum in sero uelit pausare inclinat themonem suum equos a currus seperando add. A 265 cum ea add. W 285 meo id est uluntatit add. B'

287. pro parte id est secundum partem quasi diceret ut particeps mecum non dicens.

290. quibus ille scilicet Ceix.

293. tanta animi constantia quod uiolentiam suam etiam mutatus retinuit.

296. qui uocat Auroram descriptio est Luciferi. nouissimus stellarum.

300. que nunc scilicet uirtus. mutata de homine in auem. Tisbeas a loco ubi optime nascentur columbe que a uulgo dicuntur 'tube'.

301. dotatissima forma pro qua sola sine dote deberet duci.

304. ille scilicet Phebus; hic scilicet Mercurius.

305. calorem amoris.

308. potenti efficaci.

310. prerepta a Mercurio.

314. candida de nigris per artem magicam.

317. uocali sonoro.

319. et forti scilicet fratre meo. progenitore id est proaou; Jupiter enim Luciferum genuit; istius Autolici filius fuit Sinon et Autolia mater Vlixis.

322. at illi id est Diane; uel illi id est in illam et tunc legetur: de Chione.

328. patrio ac si essem pater eius.

338. cupidine leti ut se scilicet occideret.

345. causa dolendi malefaciendo eis.

351. pendet dubitat.

354. tantum respiceret descriptio est dici medie.

287-354 M TBWOFDA
356. campos id est planiciem.
360. trabibus pro arboribus de quibus fiunt trabes.
367. oblitus fedatus.
370. acrior est rabie quam fame.
372. hostiliter ac si esset hostis.
375. undaque prima que est in litore. demigite 'de' augmentatum est.
378. coniuncta id est insimul, ut si non singuli saltem simul uincamus.
381. damna sui siclicet Pelei.
383. Ethereus quia Luciferi filius qui in ethere lucet.
388. duas Ceicis et Alciones.
390. plena est plenarie; sufficit mihi quia mihi promisistis inpleuisistis.
401. ueniam ire.
407. nec tamen quamuis ueniam Thetis accepisset.
408. Magnetas populi sunt.
409. Acasto Achastus uates filius Pelie, regis Hemonie et patru Iasonis, Peleum in amne mersum a scelere purgauit; uel Achastus fluuius est in quo ipse Peleus se purgauit.
410-11. anxia prodigiiis fratris siclicet de mutatione eius. fratrumque securit post mutationem.
412. hominum oblectamina maxima enim hominum est delectatio noscere de futuris.

356-412 M TBWOFDA


413. ad Clarium id est ad Phebun, a Claro insula ubi colitur. nam Delphica continuatio: ad Clarium parat ire deum nam ad Delphos ire non poterat pro Forbante rege Plegiorum, qui transeuntes interficiens iter illud clauserat.

417. ossa Alciones.
422. uertit ab amore meo.
424. carior absens quam presens.
428. tabulas nauium fractarum.
429. sine corpore quia submersis solent fieri cenotaphia cum eorum non possunt inueniri corpora.

431. Ypotades Eolus rex uentorum, filius Ypoti, pater erat Alciones.
436. rutilos concursibus ignes id est fulmen et exprimit naturam fulminis, quod ex collisione nubium per uentos exprimitur.

445. sidereus filius sideris Luciferi. minor ignis id est amor in illo id est in Ceice quam in Alcione.
449. causam probat probablem esse potest ostendere.
454. admoda adpropinquata.
460. collapsa in extasim.
461. moras nauigandi.

413-461 M TBWOFDA

413 propter phorbanthem regem D nam delphica continuatio om. M: nam del. ad cla. ire deum T: nam delphica continuatio ad claram parat ire deum B: nam quia coninuatio est W: nam templam delp. continuatias ad cla. p. i. d. F: nam continuatia ad claram parat ire deum D: nam delphica continuatio nam ad claram parat ire deum A 429 poterat post inueniri add. T 445 cey(y)i)x add. BO 449 id est probablem esse ostendere ul potest ostendere B: id est probablem esse ostendit W: causam id est probablem O: probat ostendit O: probablem esse potest o(st)nderire ul non propter ea facit illi causam probablem et gratam esse sic A

462. ad fortia pectora gestum exprimit remigium.
466. reddit innuendo.
468. lumine oculis.
473. et ammonet in memoriam reductum. qua pars absit scilicet maritus.
479. utraque et a qua mouerant et ad quam tendebant.
480. sub noctem circa noctem.
482. rector nauis.
486. sponte tamen quamuis non audiant uocem iubentis.
487. munire latus ne fluctus intret.
489. sine lege festinanter.
490. hiemps tempestas.
494. mali tempestatis.
504. [despicere deorsum aspicere.]
506. suspicere sursum aspicere.
509. aries machina bellica sicut et balista.
517. totum pro nimietate pluie.
518. scandere per fluctus
520. ignibus stellis.
533. pars fluctuum. temptabat numdum recepta.
537. animi Ceicis et suorum.
541. inuidet pro tenebris.
542. subeunt in memoriam.
547. supremos id est in fine supremo.
550. duplicata tum de tenebris, tum de tempestate.

462-550 M TBWOFDA

468 suis post oculis add. W 473 suus post maritus add. W: longe stetit uel cessuit add. A
479 se post mouerant add. D 489 quia add. B id est fiunt festinanter euidue sic W 509
machina bellica et balista similiter O 537 eorum ceicis et suorum sociorum W 542 ueniant
post memoriam add. O

scilicet B: illa W a quae... ad quam] ad qua...ad quam M: aqua..ad aquam T: ex qua...ad quam W
scandere M TF*D*: ascendere uel scandere W*A 533 om. O fluctuum] fluentis uini T:
temptabat...recepta] om. B temptabat M WFD*: tempora sic T: tentabat D*A 537 om. O
O sup(p)remo] suppremos T: ultimo W 550 om. OF tum...tum] tam...quam W
551. arbor malus.
552. spolitis id est naui que erat quasi spolium sue uictorie.
558-9. fato functa id est mortua.
561. socrum Eolum. patremque scilicet Luciferum.
566. hiscre extra fluctum.
569 mersum caput Ceicis.
573. Eolis Alcione.
574. indu[l]at ille scilicet Ceix.
576. reditus Ceicis. inanes quia non erat reediturus.
579. qui nullus quia mortuus.
582. hoc de tot quod scilicet nullam sibi preferret.
583. At dea luno.
584. utque manus Alciones. funestas que potius deberent facere funus.
590. arcuato ad modum arcus curuato.
592. Cimeros populi sunt.
597. uigil ales scilicet gallus.
599. sagacior anser ad historiam respicit de Senonibus Gallis.
610. Hebeno arbor est que per antiquitatem durescit in lapident. uirgo scilicet
Yris.

621. excussit sibi id et somnpo, quia ipse est sompnus. se deum.
623. placidissime deorum inter deos nullus adeo placidus.

551-623 M TBWOFDA

551 om. DA malus M TB; malus nauis WF; nauis O 552 om. ODA 558-9 om. O fato
BA: sata sic M; facto sic T; lin. 558 Wf*D' 566 om. OD 569 m(er) T; inde sic M ca. M:
cacauer sic T: capu(t/d) W^O^F^U^A 573 om. D alcione M BOFA: alcinoe TW filia eoli post
alcione add. WOF 574 om. OD indul. il. MT: ille B^W^F^A 576 reeditus ceicz] om. O
MT 584 om. O utque man*...*cere funus folium sectum est T alciones M FDA: alcinoes
BW deberent|debeant D 590 om. O 592 om. O c(h)imeros M TF^e^: -ios B^W^D^A 599
propter TDA antiquitatem M WOFDA: vestutatem T: diuturnitatem B durescit] magnus est sic
M: nigrescit OFD uirgo...yris] om. D 621 om OD sompnos] sibi somnum A ipse est
quam cura fugit id est qui non est sollicitus.

arcus id est arcuatum.

Morphea ita dictum a 'morphe' quod est 'mutatio'.

at alter filius.

positis pro depotitis.

luridus color est mortui.

mutata ita quod congnoscere non possis.

falso quia non revido.

uoce sua quia clamabat. specieque uiri que illi apparuit.

uestigia mariti

non simul id est sine te quia statim me interfecisset.

iactor ut mihi uidetur.

nos littera quia ibi scribetur 'HIC IACET ALCIONE CEICIS'.

distante remoto a se.

erat dubium. Alcione.

et si qua est coniunx tibi misera est.

minus et minus est sua mentis id est minus est sana quia quanto plus accedebat, tanto plus eum agnoscent insaniebat.

predellasat una est dictio; id est ante ualde lassat.

potuisse insilire

modo natis id est recentibus.

stringebat percutiebat.

corpus Ceicis.

624-736 M TBWOFDA

738. nequicquam quia non sentiebantur prius sicut postea fuerunt sentita.
742. fatis obnoxius id est debere quia pro illa remansit; uel obnoxius sibi inuicem mutuus.
748. ingressu maris. nepotibus scilicet pullis. equor scilicet planiciem ab equalitate.
750. proximus laudanti.
753. spatiosum in gattro quia longum habet guttur.
755. ordine perpetuo continuo.
757. nouissima quia nouissimus rex Troie fuit.
759. noua fata id est inauditam mutationem.
761. illum Hectorem. proles Dimantis id est Hecuba que filia fuit Dimantis secundum istum; Cisei uero regis Tracie secundum Homerum.
763. conata dum pareret. bicorni furca.
765. inambiciosa quia rure uiuenes non inhiant honoribus sicut urbani.
773. Anas Anatis proprium nomen est ciusdam auis, sed female; tantum masculus uero dicitur 'masculus anas' et declinatur nominatio 'hic masculus Anas,' genitiuo 'huius masculi Anatis.'
777. suppressa id est retenta et finita.

738-777 M TBWOFDA

779. *uincere tanti* quod etiam pro uoto assequendo tuam ego mortem desiderarem.

782. *morte mea* me interficiendo.

783. *subsederat* cauauerat.

792. *retemptat* iterum et iterum temptat.

793. *internodia* id est tibie que sunt inter nodos genuum et [c]heuilarum.

795. *quia mergitur* mergus appellatur.

---

779-795 M TBWOFDA
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Appendix A: Anglici Caudati Data

The following table lists the national origins and approximate dates of the manuscripts which transmit the joke, as well as the nationalities of those who are caudati and those who are not:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Not Caudati</th>
<th>Caudati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Anglici</td>
<td>Aurelianenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Anglici</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>s. xii / xiii</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Franci</td>
<td>omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>s. xiii</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Anglici</td>
<td>Aurelianenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>s. xiii</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>Anglici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>s. xiv</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Franci</td>
<td>Anglici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>s. xv</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>??????</td>
<td>Anglici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>s. xv</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>species</td>
<td>Anglici</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.1: Distribution of Anglici Caudati references and manuscript origins.

The joke, as transmitted in M, B, and the fragment contained in V, is most likely the actual version originating from Arnulf. Students copied the text accurately, but they either might have been unfamiliar with the joke, interpreted the joke differently, or chose not to alter the glosses of their authoritative schoolmaster. Whereas the variant

\[\text{\textsuperscript{213} If the reader has no familiarity with the idea of Anglici Caudati, the joke could elicit quite a different interpretation in which cauda denotes the membrum uirile in the vulgar sense: c.f. Horace, Satires 1. 2. 45 and 2. 7. 49. This reading is unlikely for the period under scrutiny, but is indeed a possibility for later readers of the text attempting to understand the pun, who had no knowledge of the Anglici Caudati.}\]
readings transmitted by T, F, and W, D, A likely represent an alteration of the text by a later reader, possibly of French origin and disgruntled by the implications of *Franci Caudati*, or the alternate readings were less likely introduced in the manner of a "correction" of the joke which would have been far more widespread on the continent in the thirteenth century than during the late twelfth century. The substitution of *Franci* for *Aurelianenses* also suggests a broader audience of "the French" as opposed to only those within the *Orléanais* or those who identified as "Orléanese".