

Western  Graduate&PostdoctoralStudies

Western University  
Scholarship@Western

---

Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository

---

4-16-2020 1:00 PM

## A Commentary on the first 118 lines of John of Garland's Integumenta Ovidii

Garett Schoffro  
*The University of Western Ontario*

Supervisor  
Gervais, Kyle  
*The University of Western Ontario*

Graduate Program in Classics

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Master of Arts  
© Garett Schoffro 2020

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>

---

### Recommended Citation

Schoffro, Garett, "A Commentary on the first 118 lines of John of Garland's Integumenta Ovidii" (2020).  
*Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 6904.  
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/6904>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact [wlsadmin@uwo.ca](mailto:wlsadmin@uwo.ca).

## Abstract

An important text for understanding Ovidian reception in the Middle Ages is John of Garland's *Integumenta Ovidii*, a 13<sup>th</sup> century Latin poem that allegorizes the myths of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The *Integumenta* has received little scholarly attention, with the most recent edition having been published in 1933. This thesis seeks to improve upon the understanding of the poem's text, transmission, and allegorical interpretations by closely studying the first 118 lines, Garland's allegorization of Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses*. The project includes collations of six previously unexamined manuscripts, an edition considering readings from sixteen manuscripts, an English translation, an introduction, and a commentary discussing the textual, contextual, and interpretive issues of the poem.

## Summary for Lay Audience

In France during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a scholarly tradition of interpreting literature from the ancient world – including work of scripture, philosophy, historiography, and poetry – as allegorical stories with underlying truths emerged. One of these works that was often explained through the lens of allegory was Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, an extremely influential Latin epic poem from 1st century Rome that tells ancient myths of the world and mythological characters changing their forms. A text that explains Ovid's myths as stories with various allegorical meanings is the *Integumenta Ovidii*, a thirteenth century poem by John of Garland, a Master at the University of Paris.

The poem, like most ancient or medieval texts that survive to the modern day, was preserved and distributed through copies in manuscripts. The copying was done by hand by human scribes, and as a result, these manuscripts would often include changes to the original poem through natural human error. Therefore, these manuscripts each have a slightly different version of John's original poem. Of the manuscripts that contained the full poem, ten had been collated (read through carefully with all textual differences recorded) by other scholars, who, with their collated data, printed editions of the poem with the "correct" readings.

For my project, I have collated six previously unexamined manuscripts, and edited a new text using both these new manuscripts, and the ten recorded by others for the poem's first 118 lines (John's allegorization of Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses*). I have written a clear English translation of the Latin, and a commentary that explains my decisions in editing the text and the meanings of John's allegories. There are also introductory essays with contextual information. With its updated text, new translations, and thorough commentary, my thesis advances an improved understanding of John's *Integumenta*, contributing to our knowledge of the poem's manuscript transmission, scholarship in the medieval university, and Ovidian reception.

## Key Words

*Integumenta Ovidii*, John of Garland, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Ovidian Reception, Medieval Latin Poetry, Allegorization

## Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to express my thanks to my supervisor, Kyle Gervais. Through all of my time at Western, beginning with Latin 1000 6 years ago, he has been a mentor, supporter, and friend. He introduced me to nearly all of my academic interests, including Latin poetry, manuscript studies, and textual criticism, and has always challenged me to improve as a student. Even beyond academics, his door has always been open to chat, whether about pop-culture, politics, or film, and I have always been able to come to him for any moral support. Thank you, Kyle, for being such an integral part of my university experience.

I would also like to thank all the other people in the Western Classics Department who have impacted my education. For the professors who gave me the opportunities to have incredible study-abroad experiences, for the ones whose courses I enrolled in almost every year, and for all my fellow students and colleagues, now friends, who I have grown alongside with, I am so grateful. You all made this department feel like home.

Finally, I would like to thank my other friends and my family, whose love and support through the years have empowered me to commit to my education and my development as a human being. This project would not have been possible without you.

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Summary for Lay Audience</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Key Words</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>John of Garland</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<i>John's Life</i> .....	<b>1</b>
<i>John's Works</i> .....	<b>2</b>
<i>Problems with Biography and Scholarship</i> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>The <i>Integumenta Ovidii</i></b> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>What is and Integumentum?</i> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>John's Intellectual Context</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<i>Twelfth Century Thought</i> .....	<b>10</b>
<i>The Medieval University</i> .....	<b>12</b>
<i>John in his Context</i> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>John's Poetic Style</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Transmission and Text</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<i>Translation</i> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Index Siglorum</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>Text and Translation</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Commentary</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>Appendix: Collations of Manuscripts</b> .....	<b>84</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>87</b>

## Introduction

### John of Garland

#### *John's Life*

John of Garland was a medieval scholar-poet who lived ca. 1195 CE – ca. 1270 CE. L. J. Paetow's Introduction to his 1927 edition of the *Morale Scolarium of John of Garland* still provides the best account of John's life. Although the precise location of his birth is unknown, in his poem *De triumphis ecclesie* he tells us that he was born in England: "Anglia cui mater fuerat, cui Gallia nutrix" ("England had been his mother, France had been his nurse", v.7). Beyond this information, little is known about his early years, including the exact date of his birth, his parentage, or where he spent his childhood; however, he does note that he was not born to an upper-class family.<sup>1</sup> His birth date can be estimated because of a passage in *De triumphis ecclesie*, where he mentions that he was a student of John of London, a professor at the University of Oxford 1210-1213. John of Garland must have been a youth at this time, which places his date of birth in the 1190s.<sup>2</sup>

Following his education at Oxford, he left England for Paris, where he became one of the earliest masters at the developing University of Paris around 1220.<sup>3</sup> He taught there for about nine years, until a strike by the students and faculty in 1229, and the resulting temporary closure of the university, forced him to relocate. Following the conclusion of the Albigensian Crusades against the Cathars in 1229, a new university, the University of Toulouse, had been established as part of the Treaty of Paris to repress the heretical Cathars and provide education for orthodox clergy in the region.<sup>4</sup> Newly unemployed, John received an invitation to move to Toulouse and

---

<sup>1</sup> Louis John Paetow, *Morale scholarium of John of Garlande... with an introduction on the life and works of the author* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1927), 82; and John of Garland, *Morale scolarium*, v. 215.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 83.; and John of Garland, *De triumphis ecclesie*, v. 223-248 (ed. Wright, pp. 53-54).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 87-88.

<sup>4</sup> Georges Duby, *France in the Middle Ages: 987-1460* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1991), 247.

become the Master of Grammar at the new institution.<sup>5</sup> He spent three years at this post before returning to Paris, perhaps because his interest in Aristotelian science and pagan Classical authors caused the inquisitors at Toulouse to become suspicious of his beliefs.<sup>6</sup> The University of Paris had reopened, and he reassumed his role as a teacher there in 1232.

After his return to Paris, the events of John's life become more uncertain. He records that some of his works were published in 1234,<sup>7</sup> and that he was in Paris working on *De triumphis ecclesie* in 1245.<sup>8</sup> The historian and bibliographer John Bale asserts that for his remaining years he was employed by certain nobles to teach their children Latin and poetry, but this may be a fiction recorded to fill a gap in information about John's later life with a stereotypical biography of a scholar at this time.<sup>9</sup> The circumstances of his death are similarly unclear, as both the location and the date of his death are uncertain. He probably died in Paris, and from a reference by Roger Bacon in his *Compendium studii philosophiae*, John seems to have been alive as late as 1272.<sup>10</sup>

### *John's Works*

John of Garland was a prolific writer, who published works in various genres and for various purposes. His most significant literary works include: the *De triumphis ecclesie* ("On the victories of the church"), an eight book Latin epic poem concerning the victory of the church in the crusades;<sup>11</sup> *De mysteriis ecclesie* ("On the mysteries of the church"), which discusses the

---

<sup>5</sup> Paetow, *Morale Sclorum*, 90.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 92.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 93; and John of Garland, *Ars lectoria ecclesie*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 111; and John of Garland, *De triumphis ecclesie*, v.11-14.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 94; and John Bale, *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae . . . Catalogus* (Basel, 1559), 153.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 96.

<sup>11</sup> *De triumphis Ecclesiae* (1856), Wright, T. (ed.), London, J. B. Nichols and Sons.

symbolism of cathedrals and Christianity;<sup>12</sup> the 6000 line *Epithalamium Beate Marie Virginis*, a mystical treatise for the medieval cult of the Virgin Mary;<sup>13</sup> the *Historie majores ab origine mundi* (“Greater histories from the beginning of the world”) a lost compendium of world history; and the *Morale scolarium* (“The Morality of Students”), a book of satirical elegiac poems for students of Latin. In addition to these, John wrote other moral and religious works, treatises on grammar and rhetoric, wordbooks, notably his *Dictionarius*,<sup>14</sup> a catalogue of Latin words, and possibly even works on medicine and music.

### *Problems with Biography and Authorship*

A sketch of John’s biography can be reconstructed primarily from his own works, but through the centuries following his life, confusion regarding his identity and accomplishments built up. Even the placement of the *Integumenta* within his corpus is a recent development. One of Paetow’s contributions was in clarifying the confusions around John’s life and his works. As early as the fifteenth century, the misconception that John had lived during the eleventh century began to spread.<sup>15</sup> In the eighteenth century, Dom Rivet claimed that John had been born a Frenchman in the eleventh century, and this misconception was soon spread by Louis Moneri, Hercule Géraud, and Charles Weiss.<sup>16</sup> There have been various suggestions that his name “Garland” was perhaps because he was born in “Garlande”, a village in Brie, because he was a member of the French house of Garlande, or that he was a member of the family of Garlands in England during the reign of Henry III.<sup>17</sup> These are all incorrect hypotheses, as John himself

---

<sup>12</sup> *De Mysteriis Ecclesiae* (1842), Otto, F. W. (éd.), *Commentarii critici in codices bibliothecae academiae Gissensis*, 131-151, Giessen, G.F. Heyer.

<sup>13</sup> *Epithalamium beate Marie Virginis* (1980), Saiani, A. (éd.), *Quadrivium* 21, 5-141.

<sup>14</sup> *Dictionarius*, Wright, T. (ed.), A volume of vocabularies, 120-138, (London, UK, 1857).

<sup>15</sup> Paetow, *Morale scolarium*, 81.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

asserts he had the surname “Garland” because he taught in the *clos de Garlande* neighbourhood of Paris, where the University had been established: “Parisius vici cum sit Garlandia nomen / agnomen florens contulit illa mihi” (“Since Garland is the name of the Parisian quarter, that place flourishing brought me my surname”).<sup>18</sup>

John has also often been confused with other medieval writers, which has made ascribing works to him a difficult puzzle. A tradition amongst bibliographers until the 20<sup>th</sup> century was to identify John as two separate characters: John of Garland, who supposedly lived in the eleventh century, and Johannes Grammaticus, who supposedly lived in the thirteenth century.<sup>19</sup> Because of this, John’s works were split between the two characters, and even the works of other writers were often attributed to one or the other, in order to increase their output. The *Integumenta Ovidii* are one such work which no bibliographer had suspected was written by John of Garland but was attributed to Johannes Grammaticus or a Thomas Walleys instead.<sup>20</sup>

### **The *Integumenta Ovidii***

John of Garland’s *Integumenta Ovidii* is a 520-line elegiac poem that comments on Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. Its date of publication is somewhat unknown, though it was certainly before 1241, and probably in 1234, when John published several of his other works.<sup>21</sup> In the proem, John declares the purpose of the work:

Morphosis Ovidii parva cum clave Johannis  
Panditur et presens cartula servit ei.  
Nodos secreti denodat, clausa revelat  
Rarificat nebulas, integumenta canit.

Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* are unlocked with John’s little key and the present little page serves it. The key unknots the knots of secrecy, discloses closed things, dissipates the mists, and sings the integuments. (5-8)

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 87.; and *Exempla honestae vitae*, v. 96-97.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 96.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 98.

<sup>21</sup> Paetow, *Morale Sclarium*, 109.



John is writing the poem to interpret and allegorize the myths of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. By producing this poem, he will reveal the true meaning of Ovid's stories. He further comments that he will restrict how much of the *Metamorphoses* he will interpret, only choosing to record the "essence" of the stories.<sup>22</sup>

John's interpretive approach to the epic emerged from a tradition of Medieval commentators, for he was not the first to allegorize Classical texts, or even Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In the late twelfth century, a group of three scholars in Orléans - Arnulf, William, and Fulco - wrote commentaries on the Ovidian corpus.<sup>23</sup> William primarily focused on explaining grammatical issues of Ovid's corpus for an elementary student audience,<sup>24</sup> while Fulco wrote commentaries on Ovid's elegiac works.<sup>25</sup> Arnulf's *Allegoriae*,<sup>26</sup> a work on the *Metamorphoses*, explained Ovid's stories historically, morally, or allegorically, and became the most influential interpretation of the epic in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.<sup>27</sup> Coulson argues that Arnulf especially seems to have initiated the allegorical approach to reading Ovid.<sup>28</sup> He was certainly a significant influence on John, as John borrows Arnulf's interpretations in his retelling of the Lycaon myth (85-86n.), the Deucalion and Pyrrha myth (87-90n.), and the Apollo and Python myth (91-92n.). In certain manuscripts, the two works are transmitted together, and verses from the *Integumenta* are even found outside their authorial context, placed with Arnulf's relevant allegory.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., v. 19-20.

<sup>23</sup> Frank T. Coulson, "Metamorphoses in the school tradition of France", in *Ovid in the Middle Ages*, ed. James G. Clark et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 50.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 56.

<sup>25</sup> Wilken Engelbrecht, "Fulco, Arnulf, and William: Twelfth-century Views on Ovid in Orléans," *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 18 (2006), 57.

<sup>26</sup> Fausto Ghisalberti, "Arnolfo d'Orleans: un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII," *Memorie del R. Istituto Lombardo, Classe Lettere* 24 (1932), 157-234.

<sup>27</sup> Coulson, "Metamorphoses in the school tradition of France", 51-55.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., 55.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 51.

After John wrote, the interpretive tradition continued, most notably with the Vulgate Commentary, written ca. 1260.<sup>30</sup> This commentary, assembled by an anonymous compiler, became the most authoritative interpretive text for the *Metamorphoses* in the Middle Ages. It clearly has an intimate knowledge of its predecessors, often including allegorical and moral interpretations from either Arnulf, John, or both.<sup>31</sup>

In conjunction, the Vulgate Commentary and the *Allegoriae* of Arnulf of Orléans are excellent supplementary tools to help our understanding of John's *Integumenta*. They emerged from the same tradition and obviously influenced each other. In my commentary, I often refer to these two additional texts to fill in the gaps of John's more cryptic verse interpretations.

### *What is an Integumentum?*

With his *Integumenta*, John places himself not only in the tradition of Ovidian interpretation, but in the tradition of Medieval hermeneutics and allegorization in general. This tradition of allegorization emerged at the School of Chartres in the twelfth century. Here, scholars such as Guillaume of Conches, Peter Abelard, William of Conches,<sup>32</sup> and Bernard Silvestris began to read and interpret Classical texts in a new way. Central to their studies were Classical *auctores*, who were not seen as merely authors, but as authorities who would convey their wisdom on issues in moral, natural, and theological philosophies as hidden meanings in their texts. The *auctores* they read included the works of Plato, Vergil, Boethius, and Ovid.<sup>33</sup> The foremost of these *auctores* was Plato, due to the pre-eminence of Calcidius' fourth century Latin translation of the *Timaeus*, but other Classical philosophers and poets were also studied.

---

<sup>30</sup> *The Vulgate Commentary on Ovid's Metamorphoses Book 1*, ed. Frank T. Coulson. (Kalamazoo, MI, Western Michigan University, 2015).

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>32</sup> A different scholar than Guillaume of Conches.

<sup>33</sup> Winthrop Wetherbee, *Platonism and Poetry in the Twelfth Century: the literary influence of the School of Chartres* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972), 28.

Their studies were focused on the hidden meanings of the texts of the *auctores*, as the twelfth century scholars sought to relate these ancient writers to their Christian contexts.

Wetherbee summarizes their approach thus:

the assimilation of secular writings to Christian contexts, as in the equation of Plato's personifications and mythical figures with the persons of the Trinity, was justified by the conviction that Plato and other ancient philosophers and poets had expressed their deepest wisdom mysteriously, shrouding it in veils of imaginative detail which might consist of mere invented personifications and cryptic etymologies, or involve the use of extended myth or *fabula*.<sup>34</sup>

The fictions in the works of these *auctores* were seen to be *involucra* ("wrappings" or "coverings") that concealed moral, cosmological, spiritual, or even historical truths. A more specific term than *involucrum* was the *integumentum* ("outer covering").<sup>35</sup>

The most central component to most understandings of an *integumentum* is that it relates to myth.<sup>36</sup> The term can refer either to the "myth", which covers the inner truth, or to the inner truth that is concealed.<sup>37</sup> The interpretations were a type of allegorical reading of the myths, searching for the wisdom hidden in Classical secular texts. Such an allegorical interpretive reading of myth tended to result in forced interpretations, but the more sophisticated the *integumentum*, the more these forced interpretations were seen to reveal a genuine truth.<sup>38</sup> The proposed allegorical framework of a myth was presented as "anterior to the text", and the mythic text is seen to have emerged as a result of the pre-existing allegorical truth.<sup>39</sup> The allegorical interpretation ranged from readings as simple as etymologies of proper names in mythology, to larger allegorizations of cosmological and moral significances coming from entire myths.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 37.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 38.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 44.

<sup>37</sup> Peter Dronke, *Fabula: Explorations into the Uses of Myth in Medieval Platonism* (Belgium: Leiden and Koln, 1974), 5.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 45.

<sup>39</sup> Rita Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic traditions and vernacular texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 81.

<sup>40</sup> Wetherbee, *Twelfth Century Platonism*, 45.

Furthermore, these truths were not expected to be easy to find. William of Conches compared the relationship between truth and *integumenta* to a rabbit hiding in a tunnel; the truth hides in the dark, just as a rabbit, to be discovered by an adept scholar.<sup>41</sup> The *auctor* does not even have to directly invite a reader to interpret the text, since all texts by the *auctores* were assumed to hide allegorical interpretations.<sup>42</sup>

Exactly how the nature of an *integumentum* was understood varied from scholar to scholar; they each had their own understanding of how *integumenta* related to other forms of figural elements in the texts. In general, *involucra* were a broad range which could apply to both allegory from Scripture or pagan texts, while more specifically the term *allegoria* was associated with Scripture and *integumentum* with pagan myth.<sup>43</sup> This classification is by no means universal or precise; Abelard had no exact definition or usage of these terms, and Guillaume tended to use *integumentum* as a term for all hidden significances in *auctores*. Thus, it is impossible to construct a generally accepted classification for how Medieval scholars conceptualized the nature of hidden meanings.

A potentially illuminating classification of these terms comes from Bernard Silvestris, in a commentary on Martianus Capella, here summarized by Dronke:

Bernard regards *figura* as a branch of knowledge; he affirms that *figura* and *involucrum* are normally used as synonyms. Within the category *figura-involucrum* he distinguishes (1) *allegoria*, where the hidden meaning is enclosed in a historical account . . . and (2) *integumentum*, where it is enclosed in a *fable*.<sup>44</sup>

In other words, *allegoria* is only present in texts that express “historical truths”, while *integumentum* is present in the fictions of poets and philosophers.<sup>45</sup> Although Dronke later

---

<sup>41</sup> Dronke, *Fabula*, 49-50.

<sup>42</sup> Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski, *Reading Myth: Classical Mythology and Its Interpretations in Medieval French Literature* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 7.

<sup>43</sup> Wetherbee, *Twelfth Century Platonism*, 42.

<sup>44</sup> Dronke, *Fabula*, 119.

<sup>45</sup> Wetherbee, *Twelfth Century Platonism*, 113.

asserts that this categorization does not seem to have been widely accepted,<sup>46</sup> it may be helpful for our understanding of John's conceptualization.

John addresses the issue of the categorization in the *Integumenta*, when he discusses the relationship of *historia* and *fabula* to *allegoria* and *integumentum*:

Est sermo fictus tibi fabula vel quia celat,  
 Vel quia delectat, vel quod utrumque facit.  
 Res est historia magnatibus ordine gesta  
 Scriptaque venturis commemoranda viris.  
 Clauditur historico sermo velamine verus;  
 Ad populi mores allegoria tibi.  
 Fabula voce tenus tibi palliat integumentum,  
 Causa doctrine res ibi vera latet.

Mark you, a fictional discourse is a “fable”, either because it conceals or because it delights, or because it does both. History is accomplishments done by great men told in order and written down to be recalled by future men. The true discourse is enclosed in the historical veil; mark you, allegory is for the morals of the people. Mark you, nominally, a fable conceals an integument, and for the sake of teaching, the truth lies hidden there. (55-62)

Notice how his terms parallel those of Bernard: both identify that there is history, which hides the secret meaning of *allegoria*, and fable, which hides the secret meaning of *integumentum*.

John seems to understand these concepts in a similar way to Bernard.

John introduces new terminology that Bernard does not when he mentions the “fictus sermo” (“fictional discourse”) and “verus sermo” (“true discourse”). The best way to understand these categories is that the “fictional discourse” is the explicit narrative or veil present in both history and fable, that hides the “true discourse”, which also corresponds to “res . . . vera” (“the true thing”), which is separated into either *allegoria* in history, or *integumentum* in fable. The *sermones* are John's broader framework for understanding the use of figural language. He seems to think that neither history nor myth is a true discourse, but both are fictional veils, that differ in their subject matter, but have the same purpose. In this way, an *auctor* is communicating in two

---

<sup>46</sup> Dronke, *Fabula*, 120.

different planes. The first is the overt narrative that is a fictional veil, even in historiography, and the second is the moral, philosophical, or etymological truth that lies underneath.

John's classification of *integumentum* seems possible to reconstruct. In interpreting Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, he is working with a mythic text of *fabulae*, not an historic text. He explains that the hidden meanings of myths or *fabulae* are to be called *integumenta*, which explains why he titled the work the *Integumenta*, as opposed to the *Involucra* or *Allegoriae*.<sup>47</sup> Like other medieval commentators, though, he does not seem to distinguish between using *integumentum* to mean the veil or to mean the inner truth; the term seems to conflate both meanings. Thus, John's *Integumenta Ovidii* is a poem that will attempt to detail both the fictional coverings of myth and the truths that Ovid hid in them.

### John's Intellectual Context

John of Garland's career occurred at an interesting point in Western intellectual history, which informed his approach to interpreting Classical texts. His perspective was influenced by philosophical ideas of the twelfth century scholars and the rediscovery of Aristotle in Western Europe in the thirteenth century. The development of medieval universities also influenced his academic background, which is reflected in the *Integumenta*.

#### *Twelfth Century Thought*

The roots of twelfth century philosophy are found in the intersection of pagan and Christian ideologies that began in the Roman world of Late Antiquity. Philosophical concerns at

---

<sup>47</sup> Although Arnulf titled his similar interpretive reading of the *Metamorphoses* the *Allegoriae*, according to Bernard's and John's categorization, these hidden meanings cannot be called allegories, but must be called integuments. This is further evidence of the disagreement over the meaning of these terms between different authors in the period.

this period were focused on the Christian religion and theology, combined with the traditional pagan thought of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, and the Stoics.<sup>48</sup> The knowledge of these pagan authors was not drawn directly from these sources, but from Latin authors of Late Antiquity, including St. Augustine, Boethius, and Calcidius. Calcidius provided the indispensable Latin translation of Plato's *Timaeus*, while Augustine and Boethius helped to establish the tradition of applying logic and reason to scripture and theology.<sup>49</sup>

Scholars of the twelfth century took this application of logic and emphasized it even more. During the twelfth century, the enthusiasm for logic was so great that scholars would travel from school to school, in order to seek the best teachers of logic in Europe.<sup>50</sup> Grant explains that the pre-eminence of logic in this period was to remedy a paucity of sources in natural philosophy, theology, medicine, and law, meaning that in these disciplines, scholars had to use logic to deduce answers.<sup>51</sup> In issues of cosmology, they pieced together an understanding of the universe especially from Calcidius' *Timaeus*, and the writings of Boethius, Martianus, and Macrobius.<sup>52</sup> Before any of Aristotle's works on logic were available in Latin, Western scholars had addressed issues of logic they thought had been ignored.<sup>53</sup>

In the second half of the twelfth century, new translations of Aristotle from Greek and Arabic into Latin began to change the availability of Classical sources in Western Europe. These translations into Latin were introduced over more than a century by scholars such as James of Venice, who translated Aristotle's *Physics*, part of the *Metaphysics*, and the *Parva Naturalia*.<sup>54</sup> Gradually the remainder of Aristotle's works were translated until most were accessible by the

---

<sup>48</sup> Edward Grant, *God & Reason in the Middle Ages*, (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 31.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 46.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 47.

<sup>52</sup> Michael Haren, *Medieval Thought: The Western Intellectual Tradition from Antiquity to the Thirteenth Century*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. (Toronto, CA: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 114.

<sup>53</sup> Marcia L. Colish, *Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition 400 -1400*, (London UK: Yale University Press, 1997), 275.

<sup>54</sup> Haren, *Medieval Thought*, 132.

late thirteenth century. These translations meant that the logical corpus was complete, and that a better understanding of natural philosophy and the scientific system was beginning to spread through Western Europe.<sup>55</sup> Aristotle's advent in the West, as much as it provided new ways to think about natural philosophy and science, also reinforced the primacy of logic as the most important scholarly tool. The twelfth century view that logic was the most important tool for learning was reinforced in the thirteenth century by Aristotle's ideas about logic. He wrote that only the part of a human that actively can reason is immortal, and that humans were only like the gods because they could reason.<sup>56</sup>

### *The Medieval University*

The medieval university arose in the second half of the twelfth century. The first of these were at Oxford, Montpellier, Salerno, Bologna, and Paris. These schools grew out of monastic communities and cathedral schools; in fact, the University of Paris was never founded, it simply coalesced and grew from the various schools and masters already inhabiting Paris at the time.<sup>57</sup> By 1200, these institutions were independently governed corporations of similar minded individuals.<sup>58</sup>

The curriculum of a medieval university was heavily influenced by the translation of Aristotle, but also relied on the authors that were previously available. The broader education at a university relied on logic, and traditional natural philosophy, before the development of empirical sciences; the main subjects were the *trivium* (i.e. logic, grammar, rhetoric), the *quadrivium* (i.e. arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music), and the three philosophies (i.e. moral, natural, and metaphysical). The curriculum was so based on Aristotelian material, masters

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 117.

<sup>56</sup> Grant, *God & Reason*, 90.

<sup>57</sup> Colish, *Medieval Foundations*, 267.

<sup>58</sup> Grant, *God & Reason*, 99.



did not attempt to make new discoveries with experimental science, but used Aristotle instead, to reason out “eternal truths about the world, to explain why things are as they are and will remain as they are”.<sup>59</sup> This allowed scholars to attempt to understand the mechanisms of God’s creation. Courses were never on a theme, but usually focused on a specific book by an *auctor*.<sup>60</sup> The courses occurred in two parts: lectures that would center on discussion of small passages, and *disputationes*, where a master proposed a question about the text and asked the students to debate both the affirmative and negative sides of the question, ending when the master resolved these debates. The focus on debate reflects that the main method of learning was through logic.<sup>61</sup> Masters were expected to write commentaries on authoritative texts sharing their interpretations and explanations of the texts, which resulted in a vast tradition of commentary on literature, natural philosophy, and theology.<sup>62</sup>

### *John in his Context*

All of this intellectual context had an enormous impact on John of Garland and his *Integumenta*. His university education and teaching experience reinforced reason and learning as the most important tools for a scholar. In the *Integumenta*, this is evident in his consistent emphasis on *ratio* and *sapientia* (v. 65, 66, 91,92, 93, 100, 105, 113). His background at the University of Oxford prepared him to write about the many different topics in the university curriculum. His widespread learning appears in the *Integumenta* in the form of medical science (i.e. his explanation of a *syrinx* in v. 109-111), several etymological interpretations (v. 69, 99, 117), and an excellent understanding of natural philosophy, represented in his explanation of the

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 102.

<sup>60</sup> Colish, *Medieval Foundations*, 271.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 272.

<sup>62</sup> Grant, *God & Reason*, 104.

elemental proportions and universal cosmology (v. 9-49). As a university master, this poem would have served as his own commentary on the *Metamorphoses* to help his students better understand his interpretations of Ovid's myths.

### John's Poetic Style

John taught versification as a master at the University of Paris, and was very concerned with the ancient Latin classics, but even still has often been read as a weak producer of Latin verse. Paetow asserted that "it is safe to say that John of Garland will never rank with renowned Latin poets . . .".<sup>63</sup> Despite this, it is still worthwhile to examine both John's metrical tendencies and the finer points of his style.

The poem is written in elegiac couplets, and mostly adheres to the metrical practice of Classical elegists. The thought units are confined to couplets in every case through the first 118 lines. Of his 59 hexametric lines in this section, 57 follow the Classical rule of a caesura following the arsis (i.e. the first syllable of a foot) of the third foot, while only two lines (v. 33 and 77) place a caesura after the thesis of the second and fourth feet. In terms of patterns of dactyls and spondees in the first four feet, John strays away from Classical, especially Ovidian, practice. In the first 118 lines, John's first ten patterns are as follows:<sup>64</sup>

Pattern	John	Ovid	Vergil
<i>ssss</i>	9 (15.25 %)	1.52 %	6.70 %
<i>ddss</i>	9 (15.25 %)	12.68 %	11.82 %
<i>ssdd</i>	6 (10.17 %)	1.19 %	2.93 %
<i>sdsd</i>	4 (6.77 %)	3.45 %	3.89 %
<i>sdss</i>	4 (6.77 %)	3.92 %	9.45 %
<i>ddsd</i>	4 (6.77 %)	11.37 %	4.91 %
<i>dddd</i>	3 (5.08 %)	5.67 %	2.32 %
<i>dsdd</i>	3 (5.08 %)	7.47 %	3.68 %
<i>dssd</i>	3 (5.08%)	12.62%	6.12%

<sup>63</sup> Paetow, *Morale Scholarium*, 104.

<sup>64</sup> The patterns for John's lines have been counted, while the percentages of these patterns in Ovid and Vergil (and Ennius, Statius, and Claudian) have been taken from the database of Latin hexameter at [pedecerto.eu](http://pedecerto.eu).

<i>dsss</i>	3 (5.08%)	13.46%	14.34%
-------------	-----------	--------	--------

There is a prevalence of spondees in John's hexameter that is more like early Latin poetry than post-Ovidian hexameter – Ennius' most common pattern is *ssss*, the same as John's, in 13.58 % of his lines, while more like Ovid, Statius uses this 2.39 % and Claudian only 0.62 % of the time. John's clausulae typically adhere to the Classical practice, since the last word is almost always a disyllable or trisyllable. He only ends with a tetrasyllable or pentasyllable six times in the first fifty-nine hexametric lines (v. 9, 11, 43, 61, 97, and 105), and in no line does he end with a monosyllable.

Another way that John differs from Classical practice is that he occasionally either lengthens or shortens vowels. This seems to happen especially with lengthening the vowel immediately preceding the caesura, which occurs 23 times in hexameter and 13 times in pentameter through the whole poem according to Born,<sup>65</sup> but lengthening and shortening occasionally occur in other instances as well. Another feature of John's style is his lack of elisions; through the first 118 lines of the *Integumenta*, there are no examples of elision.

For an analysis of his stylistic tendencies, I will continue with a close reading of John's first twelve lines:

Parvus maiori paret veloxque viator	
Quo iubeat dominus previus ire solet;	
Sic mea proclivis famulatur harundo poetis	
Et pede pentametro cursitat illa levis.	
Morphosis Ovidii parva cum clave Johannis	5
Panditur et presens cartula servit ei.	
Nodos secreti denodat, clausa revelat	
Rarificat nebulas, integumenta canit.	
Mundus ydealis fit mundus materialis,	
Constituens genesin principii que thesin.	10
Ars et natura, typus et magus, a genitura	
Mutant que pereunt, dum veniunt et eunt.	

---

<sup>65</sup> Born, *Integumenta*, 36.

In this short passage, certain stylistic trends emerge. The first is John's common usage of assonance and alliteration. Even in v. 1, the two clauses are striking because of the assonance of "parvus" and "paret" and the alliteration of "velox" and "viator". Similar assonance occurs with "pede" and "pentametro" in v. 4, and in the juxtaposition of related words, "nodos" and "denodat" in v. 7. John expands his use of assonance by often employing the Medieval Leonine verse, rhyming the last word of a line with the word that precedes the caesura.<sup>66</sup> This occurs with "proclivis" and "poetis" in v. 3, "ydealis" and "materialis" in v. 9, "genesin" and "thesin" in v. 10, "natura" and "genitura" in v. 11, and finally "pereunt" and "eunt" in v. 12. In order to accomplish these rhymes, he even lengthens the second syllable of "ydealis" in v. 9, and the last syllable of the nominative "natura" in v. 11, ensuring that they can be used at the caesura. An example of a shortened syllable occurs with "Morphosis" in v. 5, in which the second syllable is shortened (this is a Latinization of the Greek "μόρφωσις").

John carefully structures his sentences, often breaking his lines into segmented thought units. For example, John fills v.7-8 with four independent clauses, each taking about half a line. To make these clauses especially balanced with each other, he makes each follow the same grammatical structure of a singular verb and its direct object. John uses asyndeton, emphasizing the parallelism of the related clauses. Later in the poem, John often structures his allegorical readings in a similar way, like here with his Gigantomachy integument:

Virtutes Superi, viciorum turba Gigantes,  
Mens humilis Phlegra, mons tibi fastus erit. (v.83-84)

John ensures that his allegorical interpretation is clear by grouping the aspects of Ovid's myth – here the "superi", "gigantes", "Phlegra", and "mons" – with the true meaning that they represent – the "virtutes", "viciorum turba", "mens humilis", and "fastus". Such a segmentation of each

---

<sup>66</sup> Dag Norberg, *An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Latin Versification* ed. Jan Ziolkowski, trans. Grant C. Roti et al. (USA: Catholic University of America Press, 2004), 59.

line keeps the symbols separate from each other, providing a clear and concise explanation. In other integuments, he shows a variance in his style as well. He employs ascending tricola and ascending tetracola in some cases (v. 35-6, 43-4, 51-2, and 107-8), and enjambment to balance certain couplets (v. 21-22, 35-6, 43-4, 73-4, 89-90, and 107-8). Overall, John uses a variety of rhetorical devices to great effect.

### Transmission and Text

The *Integumenta Ovidii* has been found in thirty-five manuscripts in various forms - as a complete text independently, interspersed with Arnulf D'Orleans' *Allegoriae super Ovidii Metamorphosin* ("Allegories on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*"), interspersed with Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, interspersed with both, or as fragmentary marginalia in the *Metamorphoses*. Frank Coulson identifies twenty-four manuscripts in which at least part of the *Integumenta* survives, while Fausto Ghisalberti identifies an additional eleven with marginalia from the *Integumenta*.<sup>67</sup> Of these manuscripts, only sixteen have a continuous and substantially complete text of the *Integumenta*: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, L, M, P, R, U, V, Vp, and W. I have ignored those manuscripts that only have marginalia of certain integuments, because these texts would be more corrupt due to a less careful transmission and are unlikely to have correct readings that are not also in complete manuscripts.

The two previous editions of the text only considered a fraction of these sixteen manuscripts: Ghisalberti used four manuscripts (D, P, V, and Vp), while Born used eight (A, B, C, D, H, L, M, P). Born was aware of two other manuscripts, R and U, which he includes in the

---

<sup>67</sup> Frank T. Coulson and Bruno Roy, *Incipitarium Ovidianum: a finding guide for texts related to the study of Ovid in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, (Belgium, Brepols Publishers: 2000); Frank T. Coulson, *Addenda and Corrigenda to Incipitarium Ovidianum*, " *Journal of Medieval Latin* 12 (2002): pp. 154-180; Fausto Ghisalberti, *Integumenta Ovidii: poemetto inedito del secolo XIII*, *Testi e documenti inedita o rari* 2 (Messina-Milan, 1933): 32.

stemma of his 1929 article, but which he did not consider when making his edition.<sup>68</sup> He also never reported readings for these manuscripts. For my text, I have considered all sixteen manuscripts, using the reported readings in Ghisalberti for manuscripts V and Vp, those in Born for manuscripts A, B, C, D, H, L, M, and P, and my own collations for E, F, G, R, U, and W.<sup>69</sup>

I have taken an eclectic approach in editing the text, choosing readings from all sixteen of the manuscripts. This may seem to disregard Born's stemma, but I have chosen this methodology for several reasons.

First, following the stemma would only eliminate one manuscript, B, from consideration, since it is probably a copy of D. Born correctly identifies this relationship, showing that there are twenty-eight errors shared between them, omitted subtitles, and a shared omission of lines v. 449-450, which D inserts at the "bottom of the next column" and B omits entirely. D cannot be copied from B, because B also omits v. 31-32, 260, and 459-520. B is therefore copied from, or closely related to, D, but there are several cases even in the first 118 lines where B has a correct reading attested elsewhere in the tradition that D does not have:

Line #	D	B
12	veneunt	veniunt
24	granis	gravis
47	te poscit	deposcit
86	pot	potes
95	phevi	phebi

All of these are quite close in spelling, so they are not necessarily indicative of a problem with the stemma, but they are all examples of B providing evidence of the correct reading. There are two possible explanations for these corrections: the scribe who recorded B used other manuscripts of the *Integumenta* for reference, resulting in contamination from other sources, or

---

<sup>68</sup> Lester Born, "The Manuscripts of the *Integumenta* on the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid by John of Garland," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 60, (1929): 179-199.

<sup>69</sup> See the *Appendix* for these collations.

the scribe made several correct emendations to the text by himself. The simplicity of these corrections seems to point towards independent emendation by the scribe, but the possibility of contamination can not be dismissed. At any rate, following the stemma and eliminating B from consideration would have caused the loss of evidence of the correct reading.

Furthermore, following Born's stemma would have required that the previously uncollated manuscripts be fit into the stemma. This task would be virtually impossible to do for all four of the new manuscripts in only the first 118 lines of evidence, and to collate more would be beyond the scope of the project. Despite this, I have identified W as a possible a copy of U. In the first 118 lines, they have the following significant shared readings:

Line #	<i>Ceteri</i>	UW
11	ars et	ars quoque
14	silva	flamma
19	stat	flax
33	cuncta	tanta
36	bruma comis	<i>om.</i> bruma comis
40	annuus	anus
41	est, ventus	fit, mentis
42	vendicat	exigit
57	magnantibus	quia nuncciat U; qui nunciat W
73	ubertas	libertas
82	primus	mundus
83	viciorum	viciosaque
87	misisse	genuisse
97	flacco teste, fugit	teste fugit flato

U cannot be a copy of W, since W features many more errors not found in U. W may be a copy of U, but with probable contamination from other sources, since W does feature some readings from elsewhere in the tradition:

Line #	U	W
3	falulatur	famulatur
35	estuat estas, viget	exestuat estas, auget
46	hincquoque	hincque
88	in comitu	in coytu

Like with D and B, some of these could be the product of independent emendation by a scribe, but especially in the case of v. 35 and v. 88, there seems to be evidence of contamination from an unidentified manuscript. Even in this case, where the existence of a relationship is obvious, W can not be eliminated from consideration because the evidence of contamination shows that there are instances where it corrects U.

Although there are cases then where the stemma identifies real relationships, and at least one instance where the stemma may be updated, the uncertainty about how much contamination has occurred in the stemma makes it an ineffective tool for evaluating variants. Readings in any manuscript could be present due to influence from anywhere on the stemma, and thus all readings must still be evaluated eclectically, based on their own merits. The evaluations of these variants are recorded in my commentary.

In the tradition, certain manuscripts have subtitles that correspond to integuments and parts of the poem. Because these subtitles have so much variation, are not consistently recorded in manuscripts, and may or may not actually descend from John's original work, I have decided to omit them from this project. In issues such as orthography in the text, which is varied in the tradition, I have deferred to the expertise of Ghisalberti, printing the text with his spellings of proper nouns and in any cases where there is scribal variation.

### *Translation*

For the translation of the *Integumenta Ovidii*, I have followed several basic principles. I have translated into English prose, keeping the original sense of the Latin, and attempting to maintain John's thematic components, and some poetic effects where possible.



To illustrate some instances where a specific decision regarding translation was made, I will take some examples from the proem:

Morphosis Ovidii parva cum clave Johannis  
 Panditur et presens **cartula** servit ei.  
 Nodos secreti **denodat**, clausa revelat  
 Rarificat nebulas, integumenta canit.

Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are unlocked with John's little key  
 and the present **little page** serves it.  
 The key **unknots** the knots of secrecy, discloses closed things,  
 dissipates the mists, and sings the integuments. (5-8)

For “cartula”, I chose to maintain the diminutive sense with “little page”, rather than translate as the usual Medieval sense, of “document” or “letter” (DMLBS). This was done to preserve the thematic tone of the proem, where John establishes that his poem will work as a small servant for the greater epic, the *Metamorphoses*. His inclusion of words such as “parvus” (v. 1), “levis” (v. 4), and “parva clave” (v. 5) demonstrate that the diminutive in this section was no accident, but the result of his thematic undertones, and I have translated the word accordingly. For the word “denodat”, rather than translate it as the more idiomatic and natural English “untie”, I have maintained John's poetic effect of polyptoton, using a word with the same root in “unknot”.

One difficult aspect to translate was John's frequent use of “tibi”, which he uses to draw the attention of his reader directly. Here is an example in the integument of the Gigantomachy:

Virtutes Superi, viciorum turba Gigantes,  
 Mens humilis Phlegra, mons **tibi** fastus erit.

**Mark you**, the gods will be virtues, the giants the crowds of vices,  
 Phlegra the humble mind, the mountain pride. (83-84)

In the absence of an idiomatic modern English translation of “tibi”, I have translated these consistently as “Mark you”, in an attempt to convey the how John calls attention to the reader directly. For spellings of proper nouns in the translation, I have abandoned the Medieval orthography, and for clarity, reverted them to their Classical spellings.

## Index Siglorum

<b>A</b>	Oxford, Bodelian Library, Auct. F.5.16, saec. XIV, pp. 161-204
<b>B</b>	London, British Library, 12.E.XI, saec. XV, fols. 143-79v ( <i>incomplete, to line 458 only</i> )
<b>C</b>	Oxford, Bodelian Library, Canon. Class lat .9, saec. XIV <i>in.</i> , fols. 152-66
<b>D</b>	Oxford, Bodelian Library, Digby 104, saec. XIII <i>in.</i> , fols 161-67
<b>E</b>	Erfurt, Stadt- und Regionalbibliothek, Amplon. Q. 388, saec. XIV, fols. 133-34
<b>F</b>	Montpellier, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de médecine, H 328, saec XIII, fols. 1v-8
<b>G</b>	Wölfenbittel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Guelf. 5.4. Aug. 4°, saec. XIII, fol. 2v
<b>H</b>	Oxford, Bodelian Library, Hatton 92, saec. XIV, fols. 70v-100
<b>L</b>	Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat.O.46, saec. XIV, fols. 7-9
<b>M</b>	Oxford, Merton College, 299, saec. XIV, fols. 283-316v
<b>P</b>	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 8008, saec. XV, fols. 153-159
<b>R</b>	Reims, Bibliothèque municipale, 1262, saec. XIV/XV, fols. 2-14
<b>U</b>	Prague, Národní knihovna České Republiky, IX.C.3, saec. XV, fols. 71v-83
<b>V</b>	Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1479, saec. XIII/XIV, fol. 53r-182v
<b>Vp</b>	Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1726, saec. XV (an. 1423), fols. 78-93v
<b>W</b>	Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, IV F 42, saec. XV, fols. 16-32v

<i>ac</i>	ante correctionem
<i>cett.</i>	all other manuscripts, except those listed explicitly in the apparatus
<i>om.</i>	om(ittit, -unt)
<i>pc</i>	post correctionem

The following abbreviations are also used in the commentary:

C.C.	Corpus Corporum, online database of Medieval Latin
DMLBS	Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources
L&S	Lewis and Short

## Text and Translation

Parvus maiori paret veloxque viator

Quo iubeat dominus previus ire solet;

Sic mea proclivis famulatur harundo poetis

Et pede pentametro cursitat illa levis.

Morphosis Ovidii parva cum clave Johannis 5

Panditur et presens cartula servit ei.

Nodos secreti denodat, clausa revelat

Rarificat nebulas, integumenta canit.

Mundus ydealis fit mundus materialis,

Constituens genesin principiique thesin. 10

Ars et natura, typus et magus, a genitura

Mutant que pereunt, dum veniunt et eunt.

Dicitur artificis mutatio quando recedit

A silva veteri flamma remota solo.

Mutat natura generans dum ducit in esse 15

Et genitum perdit res variare potens.

Fit typice, magice mutatio: vir leo factus

Est typice; magice stat retro currit aqua.

1 maiorum P || 2 quo] cum P | iuberat MP || 3 simulatur B : famulator P | arundo UW || 5 cum clave] conclava *Gac* : conclave *GpcR* | Johannis] sophanis W || 7 denodat C | revelat] revelait *BDpc* : revellat C : resolvit *FGR* : revolvit *ADac* || 8 rarificat *BDHMPV* : ratificat A : clarificat *CEFGLRUW* : glorificat tenebras *Vp* || 11 typus] tempus B : tipus *cett.* || 12 dum veniunt et eunt] dant veniunt et emunt B : dum beneunt et eunt C : dant veneunt et emunt D : deveniunt et eant *Vp* || 15 ducit in esse] defit in esse *Ghis.* : ducit inesse O : deficit in esse *PVp* || 18 stat] flat C : cum G : fit *HM* : statque R : flax UW | retro currit] retrocurit B : retro curit *CD* : recurit R

The little man obeys the greater and the swift messenger  
 is accustomed to go where the master leading the way orders;  
 Thus my ready pen acts as a servant for poets  
 and rushes along lightly with a pentametric foot.

Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are unlocked with John's little key 5  
 and the present little page serves it.

It unknots the knots of secrecy, discloses closed things,  
 dissipates the mists, and sings the integuments.

The ideal world is made the material world,  
 establishing creation and the setting down of the beginning. 10

Art and nature, property and magic, change things which die  
 from their inception while they come and go.

It is called the change of the craftsman when from old primordial matter  
 the flame moves away, set aside from the earth.

Generative nature changes while it leads things into existence 15  
 and destroys what it made, able to change things.

A change of type and of magic happens: it is of type when a man is made  
 a lion; it is of magic when the water stops and runs backwards.

Omnes ficticii partes non discute, summam

Elige, quid sapiat, quid velit illa vide. 20

Flamma volat, volitat aer, aqua cursitat, heret

Terra, sedent valles, mons tumet, arva iacent.

Ignis acutus amat subtilis mobilis altum,

Obtusum reddit aera terra gravis.

Corpore plena sedet obtusa immobilis illa, 25

Aer subtilis mobilis igne volat.

Dum movet ignis aquas obtusas corpore plenas

Ex terra, terre porrigit unda fidem.

Nos iuvat hec numeri proporcio mensio terna:

Dic michi bis duo bis, ter tria ter tibi sint. 30

Hos iungat medio numeros proporcio talis:

Dic michi bis duo ter, ter tria bis tibi sint.

Sic numeris elementa ligat quo cuncta moventur

Quique iubet stabilis temporis ire vices.

Vernat ver, estas exestuat, auget et escas 35

Autumnus, canet hispida bruma comis.

Zona rubet media, tristantur frigore bine

Extreme, geminas temperat ignis, hiems.

19 omnis ABCGHR : omnes *cett.* || 20 elige] eligite D || 24 redit BC || 25 corpora B | sedit A || 27 movit B || 28 fidem] fretum V || 30-32 *vide annotationem meam ad loc.* || 33 numerus VL | ligant CF || 34 stabiles LVp || 35 estas exestuat *cett.* : estas estuat AL : exestuati BD : estuat estas CRU : exestuat estas W | escas CLOVp : estus W : estas *cett.*

Don't discuss all the parts of the fiction, select the essence,  
see what it smacks of, what it means. 20

Flame flies, air floats, water rushes, earth remains fixed,  
the valleys sink, the mountain surges, and the fields lie flat.  
Sharp fire, being insubstantial and quick moving, loves heaven;  
the heavy earth makes the air dense.

Earth is immobile and dense, sits full in its body, 25  
the subtle and mobile air flies because of the fire.

While the fire makes the dulled waters, full in body, move  
away from the earth, the water stays faithful to the earth.

In this numerical proportion a triple measure helps us  
say to me there are twice two twice and there may be for you thrice three thrice. 30

Such a proportion joins these numbers in the middle:  
say to me there are twice two thrice and there may be for you thrice three twice.

Thus, with numbers He binds the elements, by whom all things are moved  
and who, constant, orders the changes of time to proceed.

The spring blooms, the summer swelters, and autumn 35  
increases the food, the bristling winter shines white in hair.

The middle zone is red with heat, the two furthest are grieved because of the cold,  
fire and winter temper the two others.

Sol duodena gradu festino signa pererrat

Annus, et menses luna renata novat. 40

Aeris in multas partes est fractio, ventus

Frigoris et tonitrus vendicat esse pater.

Eurum sol oriens, Zephyrumque cadens, mediusque

Austrum, cui Boreas obstrepit ore, videt.

Dum Subsolano Vulturno cingitur Eurus, 45

Hinc Austrum stipat Affricus, inde Nothus.

Circi, te Zephyrus deposcit teque, Favoni.

Hinc Aquilo Boream, Chorus et inde tenet.

Quid dicam silvas iuvenes herbasque puellas,

Sidera quid referam pingere nocte polum? 50

Quid tellure feras, volucres quid in aere, quidve

Equoribus pisces regna tenere feram?

De terra figulum finxisse Promethea primo

Fabula fert hominem. Res clamidata latet.

Est sermo fictus tibi fabula vel quia celat, 55

Vel quia delectat, vel quod utrumque facit.

40 annuus AEFLR : annos BD : annus CHMVVp : avulsus G : annis P : anus UW ||  
 41 ventis CG : mentis UW || 45 subsolano] sub solano ACELP : sub salano B : sub  
 solamo D sol solano F | cingitur] fingitur BD : siggitur Vp || 46 hinc . . . inde Vp] huic .  
 . . inde BD : hinc . . . atque CG : hunc . . . inde E : hinc . . . hincque *cett.* || 47 circi te]  
 cirti te A : cirthi te E : circa te F : circite H : circine te *cett.* | deposcit] te poscit D :  
 dum poscit P : de poscit VVp || 48 boream aquilo CGUW || 53 figulum B | fixisse P ||  
 54 clammidata D : animata F : clamitata G

Every year the sun wanders through the twelve signs with a hasty step  
and the returned moon renews the months. 40

There is a breaking up of the air into many parts, the wind  
claims to be the father of cold and of thunder.

The rising sun sees Eurus, the setting Zephyrus, and the midday sun Auster,  
against whom Boreas rages with his mouth.

While Eurus is surrounded by Volturnus and Subsolanus 45  
on the one side Africus surrounds Auster, and on the other side Notus.

Zephyrus challenges you Circius, and you Favonius.

On the one side Aquilo holds Boreas and on the other side Corus holds him.

Why should I speak of the young forests and the maiden grasses,  
why should I report that the stars decorate the sky in the night? 50

Why should I say that beasts hold kingdoms on the earth,  
why birds in the air, why the fish in the seas?

The fable reports that as a potter Prometheus first fashioned  
man from the earth. The truth hides cloaked.

Mark you, a fictional discourse is a “fable”, either because it conceals 55  
or because it delights, or because it does both.



Res est historia magnatibus ordine gesta

Scriptaque venturis commemoranda viris.

Clauditur historico sermo velamine verus;

Ad populi mores allegoria tibi. 60

Fabula voce tenus tibi palliat integumentum,

Causa doctrine res ibi vera latet.

Fabula clave patet, tua nam doctrina, Prometheus,

Informasse prius fertur in arte rudes.

Celitus affirmas lucem rationis oriri 65

Celestesque plagas a ratione peti.

Principio mundi cum floruit inclita vita,

Etas ex auro floruit absque malo.

Saturnus satur est annus, saturatio primi

Temporis. Huic hostis filius eius erat: 70

Tempore quod sequitur secuisse virilia patris

Dicitur inque maris precipitasse chaos.

Tempus Saturnus, ubertas mentula, proles

Posteritas, venter est mare, spuma Venus.

57 magnatibus] q̄ nuntiat C : quia nuntiat U : quia nuntiat W || 60 ad] dat GVp | tibi] datur R || 61-2 fabula nocte tenens te polluat integumentum / est doctrine . . . V || 62 clausa doctrine BDVpW : doctrine clausa G | ibi AEFHMpR : tibi *cett.* || 63 prometheu CR : promethe F : promethone P : promethen *cett.* || 64 rudes] vires V: vides W || 65 affirmans FGPUW || 67 confloruit EFRUW || 70 eius] huius CFGUW || 71 tempore *Gervais* : tempus EFGW | servisse HR || 72 dicitur *Gervais* : dicimus *codd.* || 73 ubertas] ultimas E : uebertas H : libertas PUW | mentula] mascula F : vincula W

History is accomplishments done by great men told in order  
and written down to be recalled by future men.

The true discourse is enclosed in the historical veil;  
mark you, allegory is for the morals of the people. 60

Mark you, nominally, a fable conceals an integument,  
and for the sake of teaching, the truth lies hidden there.

The fable opens with a key, for your teaching, Prometheus,  
is said to have instructed men previously unrefined in skill.

You ensure that the light of reason arises from heaven, 65  
and that the heavenly regions be sought by reason.

In the beginning of the world, when glorious life flourished,  
the age of gold flourished without evil.

Saturn is a sated year, the satisfaction of the first age.

His son was his enemy: he is said, in the time that follows, 70  
to have cut the genitals of his father

and cast them down into the abyss of the sea.

Saturn is time, the penis is fertility, the offspring is the future,  
the sea is the belly, and the foam is Venus.

Iam propter varios effectus asserit error 75

Plures esse deos, est seges aucta mali

Non uno contenta deo patet etheris aula,

Sed tot divorum pondere pressa labat.

Primo formavit statuam sibi Belus ut illam

Servus adoraret, paruit ergo timor. 80

Eiecisse deos mundus sitit. Inde ruinam

Primus habet, virtus mentis ab arce fugit.

Virtutes Superi, viciorum turba Gigantes,

Mens humilis Phlegra, mons tibi fastus erit.

Si lupus est Arcas, lupus est feritate lupina; 85

Nam lupus esse potes proprietate lupi.

Vir misisse viros et nimphas nimpha refertur,

Si plus in coitu seminis alter habet.

Est aqua Deucalion, est ignis Pirra, parentes

Sunt lapides lapidum qui pietate carent. 90

Phebus Phitonem superat, sapiensque malignum

Fallacemque virum sub ratione premit.

77 contempta EGUW || 78 latet F : labet P || 79 statua A : statuas C || 81 inde] inque F : unde G || 82 primus] mundus CUW || 83 viciorum EHM : eviciorum L : viciosaque UW : vitiorum *cett.* || 84 mons] mens R | flagra F : flegra GPUW || 85 arcas] acas C : archas GUW : arthas ER || 87 misisse] genuisse CUW : generare G : || 88 coitu] cohitu CG : choytu E : choitu L : comitu U | seminis] sparmatis G : si minus P | habet] heret M || 90 lapides lapidum BD : lapidum lapid<sup>u</sup> C : lapides illi G : lapides lapides EP : lapides lapide UW : lapidum lapides *cett.* || 91 Phitonem] phytona C : phetontem L : phitona UW || 92 fallacemque] fallentemque F : fallentemque R

Now error asserts that there are many gods for  
various purposes; the crop of evil is increased. 75

The palace of heaven, not content with one god, is open,  
but pressed by the burden of so many gods it totters.

Belus first fashioned a statue for himself in order that  
his slave might worship it, therefore fear appeared. 80

The world longed to throw out the gods. Then the  
world first experienced destruction; virtue fled from the fortress of the mind.

Mark you, the gods will be virtues, the giants the crowds of vices,  
Phlegra the humble mind, the mountain pride.

If the Arcadian is a wolf, he is a wolf because of wolflike ferocity;  
for you can be a wolf by having the character of a wolf. 85

A man is said to have produced men, and a woman to have produced women,  
if one has more seed than the other in sex.

Deucalion is the water, Pirra is fire, the parents  
of stones who lack piety are stones. 90

Phoebus defeats Python, and the wise man subdues  
the wicked and deceptive man with his reason.

Mentibus hec arbor sapientum virgo virescit

Que quamvis fugiat victa labore viret.

Est virgo Phebi sapientia, facta corona 95

Laurus quam cupida mente requirit homo.

Flacco teste, fugit Yo vaga bos fugitiva,

Indiga discurrens, fine beata tamen.

Argus ab arguto fertur qui plenus ocellis

Ante retro, plena calliditate sapit. 100

Cauda pavonis tandem pinguntur ocelli,

Quando divicias respicit Argus homo.

Dicitur accessus prior ala, sequensque recessus;

Fax ardor; tela sunt duo: velle, fuga.

Mercurius mentes curans deus eloquiorum; 105

Verbi mobilitas dicitur ala duplex;

Sermonis virga vis est, sopire tyrannos

Fertur, et egrotis mentibus addit opem.

Est instrumentum virge syringa virilis

Cum quo vesicam phisica dextra levat. 110

94 viret] vicet C : nitet GO || 96 cupide M || 97 Flacco] flacce B : flato CE : flacto M : fracto O || 99 plenus] primus H || 100 calliditate] candidate B : sedulitate Cmg. : callitate E : taliditate P || 102 divicias] divitias BCEP | respicit] dispicit B : despicit DO || 104 fax] faux E : pax P | tela] tella A : cela U || 105 curans] curat A : currens P || 106 ala] illa B || 107 tyrannos APUVW] draconem BO : tirannos *cett.* || 108 addit] adit C

This virgin tree flourishes for the minds of wise men;  
 although it flees and is overcome by labour, it flourishes.

The virgin of Phoebus is wisdom, having become a laurel crown 95  
 which man seeks with a desirous mind.

With Horace as the witness, wandering Io, as a fugitive cow flees,  
 running about in need, nevertheless happy in the end.

Argus is said to come from argutus (clever), who, full of eyes  
 in the front and back, is intelligent, full of shrewdness. 100

His eyes are at last painted on the tail of a peacock,  
 since Argus as a man looks for on wealth.

The leading wing is said to be the approach, and the following wing is said to be retreat;  
 the torch is love; there are two arrows: desire, and flight.

Mercury, caring for minds, is the god of eloquence; 105  
 the twofold wings are said to be the swiftness of the word;

The staff is the power of speech, is said to soothe tyrants, and  
 and brings help to sick minds.

The syringe is an instrument of the male staff  
 with which medical skill lightens a bladder. 110

Phos lux dicetur et Pheton dicitur inde,

Sic splendor solis filius esse potest.

Philosophi radium generat sapientia, cuius

Currum deducit sed cadit arte rudis.

Est vero Pheton autumpni lucidus ardor, 115

Cum, dempto fructu, terra cremata iacet.

Helios Heliades nomen sumpsere sorores:

Sunt flores teneri sole parente sati.

111 Phebus BDG : Pheton *Dsscr. cett.* || 115 lucidus] lucidior UW || 116 cum dempto] ceidempto B : codepto CD : comtempo F : contempto G : concepto UW || 117 helios heliades BD : elyos eliades F : helyas heliades G : elyos elyades UW : elios eliades *cett.* | sumpsere] traxere AGPUW

Light will be called Phos, and Phaethon is named from there,  
thus light can be the son of the sun.

Wisdom creates the light of the philosopher  
the chariot of whom the man unrefined in skill leads away, but he falls.

Moreover, Phaethon is the clear burning of autumn 115

when, with the crops removed, the earth lies burned.

The Heliad sisters have taken up their name from Helios:  
they are delicate flowers planted by their parent, the sun.



## Commentary

- 1-6 John consistently emphasizes a theme of servitude in the proem, with the words “paret” (v.1), “viator” (v.1), “iubeat” (v. 2), “dominus” (v.2), “proclivis” (v. 3), “famulatur” (v. 3), and “servit” (v. 6). This theme is related to his other theme of his poem as a small work compared to the *Metamorphoses*, reinforced by the words “parvus” (v. 1), “veloxque” (v.1), “harundo . . . levis” (v.3-4), “parva . . . clave” (v. 5), and “cartula” (v. 6).
- 1 **parvus . . . paret:** John, referring to himself as “parvus”, establishes his relationship to an unnamed greater author. With John’s use of “paret”, this clause begins the proem’s theme of John’s servitude to Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* while holding the reader in suspense about which “greater” author he will obey. John’s service to the *Metamorphoses* is to relate the allegorical wisdom hidden in Ovid’s myths. **veloxque:** “parvus”, the first word of the poem, has established John, and by extension, his work, as lesser than both Ovid and his *Metamorphoses*. While “velox” can indicate something similar – a smaller poem may also be read more quickly – the ideas are not exactly the same. Swiftiness also implies efficiency in communicating ideas, and by referring to himself as swift, John may also be indicating that, though his work is less grand than the original *Metamorphoses*, it also tells the same stories and the same messages, but in a more efficient way. This could also be a metapoetic reference to John’s meter, the faster elegiac couplets compared to Ovid’s dactylic hexameter. **viator:** while this can simply mean a “traveller”, it may also evoke several other meanings and connotations: the religious meaning of a “traveller on the way to salvation” (DMLBS 1.c); a “messenger”, referring to John as someone sent ahead to

relay the inner messages of a greater master, in this case Ovid (DMLBS 2); and a “guide”, implying that John is not only sent by a master, but will lead his readers to discover Ovid’s messages. John has phonetically divided the two clauses in this line: the first clause features repetition of “r” in each word, and even “par” in “parvus” and “paret”, while the end of the line, which begins a new clause, features alliteration in the repeated “v”s and assonance in the repeated “o”s.

- 2 **quo iubeat dominus:** a potential subjunctive that continues the theme of servitude. If the “viator” refers to John, the “dominus” refers most obviously to Ovid. Therefore, the metaphor follows that John must go wherever Ovid orders to uncover the truth hidden in the myths. In this way, John implies that he is only following Ovid; his poem will only convey the ideas and truths already embedded within the *Metamorphoses*. But by naming himself a “viator”, John asserts his poetic authority along with his deference; a master, or Ovid, needs a messenger to convey his message, and whoever performs this duty is important. “Dominus” can also apply to God (DMLBS 10), heightening the religious aspect of the metaphor of servitude, as present previously in “viator”. In following Ovid, the surface level “dominus”, John is actually doing work for God, by revealing the deepest philosophical and Christian truths of the ancient epic. **previus:** i.e. *praeivus*. Medieval orthography changes diphthongs such as “ae” and “oe” to a long “e” (Medieval Latin, p. 3). This will continue throughout the remainder of the poem.
- 3 **proclivis:** the adjective may be either a first declension dative plural or third declension nominative singular (the meter does not allow us to determine the quantity of the final “is”). As a nominative “proclivis” could indicate that the pen is either declining in order to write (DMLBS 1), or more likely, that the pen is “inclined to” its work, and ready to serve Ovid (DMLBS 3). As a dative, “proclivis” indicates that the ancient poets are

declining, which John seems unlikely to have ever meant regarding the ancient *auctores*.

**famulatur**: again, John refers to servitude to a poetic forebear, but rather than him serving Ovid, the pen is now acting as a servant.

- 4 This line evokes some ideas of Ovid's *Amores* 1.1. John's metapoetic reference to the meter he is writing in is similar to Ovid's "risisse Cupido / dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem" ("Cupid is said to have laughed and stolen one foot", 1.1.3-4) and describing his pen as light echoes Ovid's "nec mihi materia est numeris levioribus apta" ("and I do not have material suitable to the lighter meter, 1.1.19). John thus begins his work discussing meter in a programmatic way the same way as Ovid in his *Amores*. Ovid is commenting that he only has epic subject matter at this point, but that he must write in the elegiac meter, for which he does not have the suitable material. By alluding to this Ovidian elegiac passage, John is making a similar observation. Although he is writing in elegiac couplets, his work uses the material from Ovid's epic. John has already referred to his efforts in this poem as "parvus" and "velox", two terms that establish this poem as less grand compared to its "maiori" or "dominus", the *Metamorphoses*. Combining those words with this line, John may be implying that this poem, a smaller paraphrase that only relays the messages already buried deep inside Ovid's myths, is not deserving of the meter of the original epic. But another way to understand the allusion is as a veiled poetic criticism of Ovid; in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid often appropriated the material of love elegy to epic, and then John now is reverting these myths, often of desire and love, back into their more appropriate elegiac meter. **illa levis**: the alliteration of the liquid consonants makes the line end quickly and lightly, highlighting the theme of the line. John emphasizes the theme even further by using the "levis" to complete the couplet. Moreover, "levis" combines the ideas of both "parvus" and "velox", meaning that the

poem can be both less grand and more efficient than the *Metamorphoses*. “Illa” is pleonastic here, but John often uses this word in this *sedes* (v. 4, 20, 138, 346 and the masculine “ille” in v. 124, 188, 361, and 424). While “illa” is perfect in this case for its metrical convenience, John may be trying to evoke the style of Ovidian elegiacs, which often use forms of *ille* in this *sedes*: “attenuat nervos proximus **ille** meos” (“That nearest man lessens my strength”, *Amores* 1.1.18), “tu gravis alitibus, tigribus **ille** fuit” (“You were heavy with birds, he was with tigers”, *Amores* 1.2.48), and “ultima cena tuo sit precor **illa** viro” (“May this be, I pray, the last meal for your husband”, *Amores* 1.4.2).

- 5 **Morphosis Ovidii**: “morphosis” is a poetic way of referring to the *Metamorphoses* (DMLBS 1.b). Through the first two couplets, John has only alluded to the greater work that he will be serving. Here, he finally names the work and begins to explain how he will be treating Ovid’s epic. **parva . . . clave**: this little key, continuing the rhetoric of smallness, can either refer to the poem itself, or more abstractly, to the skill John will use to extract the allegorical meaning from Ovid. Deciphering the allegorical truth hidden within an integument was considered a skill only the most learned men could master, and John may be hinting at this idea (Dronke 49). “Cum clave” is occasionally recorded as “conclave”, which, because it had already begun to mean a papal conclave (DMLBS 1.d), is a sign of religious terminology impacting the transmission of the text. **Johannis**: John names himself as the author of the *Integumenta*. Because he only uses his first name and no other identifiers, in the past scholars have debated about the identity of the author. Some other names include John the Grammarian and Johannes Anglicus, both of which can now be identified as John of Garland. Furthermore, John himself discloses that he wrote a commentary on Ovid called *Integumenta* in his *Ars lectoria ecclesie* (Paetow 117). The fact that he only identifies himself with a single name, juxtaposing himself

with Ovid, who also only requires a single name, shows that he considers himself a prominent poet in his own right.

- 6 **panditur:** In conjunction with “clave” in the previous line, the poetic image is less a sense of spreading out or extending the *Metamorphosis* and more a sense of unlocking the poem, as if it is a chest or locked room (DMLBS 3). **cartula:** The diminutive of “c/charta” adds to John’s rhetoric of smallness. In his *De Triumphis Ecclesiae*, he refers to that work as a “cartula” as well: “vos stilus hic parvus reprehendit cartula iuste / castigat, gracilis crimina prodit apex” (“This little pen holds you back, the little page rightly chides you, the thin letter reveals your crimes”, 1.58). There while criticising a war going on, he performs a great deed with a little page, just as he does here. Part of John’s persona seems to have revolved around the power that may be realised even through little works. **servit:** the final word indicating John’s intention to serve the *Metamorphoses* reinforces the theme seen in v.1, 2, and 3. The subject (i.e., “presens cartula”) becomes the page itself. Where before John described himself as the servant, here he makes the poem itself the thing that serves. **ei:** dat. fem. sing. with “servit”. The antecedent is “Morphosis”. Ovid’s work both begins the couplet and concludes it.

- 7-8 John uses this couplet to discuss the purpose of his work, which is to uncover or reveal the hidden truths of the *Metamorphoses*. Rather than writing this directly, John uses several metaphors, describing his job as untying knots of secrecy, disclosing hidden things, and scattering the fog.

- 7 **denodat:** a rare medieval Latin word, here paired with its root, “nodos”. “Denodat” (“lay bare”) appears in C, but is almost certainly a corruption of *denodo*, which is much less

common in Medieval Latin (C.C.). **revelat**: “unveils”. Several alternative readings appear, including “revolvit” (“unwind”) and “resolvit” (“loosen”). All of these options have similar meanings, but both *revolvo* and *resolvo* are much more common and are unlikely to have been corrupted into *revelo*. Furthermore, *revelo* connotes deeper meanings, including “to reveal something known only to few” (DMLBS 1.3.a) or the religious “to reveal knowledge of the divine” (DMLBS 1.3.b). Since John’s intention for the poem is to reveal Ovid’s various moral and philosophical meanings, “revelat” best fits this theme. The clausula “clausa revelat” also appears at v. 1266 in the 5<sup>th</sup> c. poet Cyprrianus Gallus’ *Liber geneleos* of his Latin versification of the *Vetus Latina*, which indicates that this phrase has been used in earlier ecclesiastical Latin.

- 8 This line is constructed chiastically, with two balanced hemistichs: verb object // object verb. **rarificat**: “scatter”. “Clarificat” (“clarify”) and “ratificat” (“ratify”) are variants. *Rarifico* is the most natural verb with “nebulas”, creates a better visual metaphor, and is a rare word which is likely to have been corrupted into *clarifico*. *Clarifico* would have likely been an unconscious corruption for a scribe who replaced *rarifico* with a more common word that is similar in spelling and identical in scansion. Furthermore, the presence of “ratificat”, due to its similar spelling to “rarificat”, nearly confirms “rarificat” as the original reading, while indicating that this word caused significant confusion.
- integumenta**: although this word originally meant “a covering”, it became a technical term that medieval scholars used to refer to an allegory hidden in a myth. The myth acts as a covering that protects a moral truth from less-educated readers. This moral truth, because it is not overtly visible, is able to be extracted only by the most learned and wise of scholars. Here, John explicitly declares that his work will sing the integuments, or reveal the hidden messages in the *Metamorphoses*. **canit**: John evokes the *Aeneid*’s

poem “arma virumque cano”, using even the same metrical rhythm for this hemistich as Vergil (i.e., – ˘ ˘ – ˘ ˘ –). John transfers the poem from the previous light elegiac register to a more epic register. That he pairs this word with “integumenta”, the truths in Ovid, underlines the significance of his job and his intention with the poem.

- 9 John juxtaposes two worlds: the ideal or conceptual and the material or physical. He writes that the material world was made from the ideal world. This understanding of the universe is based on Platonic cosmology, as discussed in the *Timaeus*, which John knew through Calcidius’ Latin translation. Plato’s character Timaeus discusses his hypothesis of a physical world which was created based on an idealistic model: “. . . liquet opificem deum venerabilis exempli normam in constituendo mundo secutum . . .” (“. . . it is clear that the craftsman god, in making the world, followed the standard of a venerable example . . .”, *Timaeus* 29.a). Plato supposed that the creator of the cosmos based his creation on a model, what John refers to as his “mundus ydealis”. The cosmology of the *Timaeus* will continue to influence John’s comprehension of the ordered universe and the relationship between its elements.
- 10 John’s creation of the universe shifts from Platonic imagery to Biblical: “genesin” evokes Genesis, the first book of the Bible, and “principiique” alludes to “in principio”, the first words of Genesis and the Book of John. The Platonic and Biblical ideas of creation do not conflict; Plato’s creation requires a cause or a creator, which Calcidius describes as either an “opifex” (“craftsman”) or “genitor” (“father”) (*Timaeus* 28.c). **genesin . . . thesin**: most manuscripts have the misspelled “genesim” and “thesim”; the reading “genesi” is also attested. John shows knowledge of the Greek accusative case elsewhere, and is likely to have correctly declined the Greek γένεσις and θέσις, while later scribes replaced the “n” with an “m”.

11-18 John discusses the different types of metamorphosis, naming four categories: *ars* (“craft”), *natura* (“nature”), *typus* (“property”), and *magus* (“magic”). Arnulf in his *accessus* previously divided the metamorphoses into three categories: *generalis* (“general”), *magica* (“magical”), and *spiritualis* (“spiritual”) (Ghisalberti).<sup>70</sup> The Vulgate Commentary assigns different categories to the mutations: *naturalis*, *spiritualis*, *moralis*, and *magica* (Coulson, 24). Furthermore, Guglielmus of Thiegiis divides the mutations into *moralis*, *magica theorica*, and *magica scripturalis* (Ghisalberti). The transformations were classified in different ways, and in the following couplets John explains his categorization: metamorphosis by the creator (v. 13-14), by nature (15-16), and both of properties and magic (17-18). Despite these brief explanations, it is uncertain which myths belong to which category throughout the poem, because John does not identify specific myths with his categories.

12 **dum . . . eunt**: variants for this clause include the misspelled “dum beneunt et eunt”, “dant veneunt et emunt” (“they give, they are sold and they buy”), “dant veniunt et emunt” (they give, they come, and they buy”), and “deveniunt et eant” (“they come and they should go”). None of these variants relate to the previous clauses of the sentence. Although “dum veniunt et eunt” is the *lectio facilior*, the others do not complete the thought of the sentence. Ghisalberti prints “dant veneunt et emunt”, which presents three conceptually linked verbs, but he is restricted in his evaluation of the readings because of his limited selection of manuscripts; the correct reading “dum veniunt et eunt” is not

---

<sup>70</sup> Where Ghisalberti is cited without a page number, the citation is to his own note on the same set of lines in his Commentary.



attested in his selection. The presence of so many plural endings could have influenced an initial corruption from “dum” to “dant”; “eunt” may have influenced “veniunt” to become “veneunt”, and then “eunt” was changed to “emunt” to make all three verbs fit a common theme. With the correct reading, the couplet means that the four processes of change transform things from birth until death, as they come into the world and as they leave it.

- 13 **artificis**: referring to the Christian God as the craftsman, though, as seen in n.10, the skilled craftsman who created the universe is a Platonic ideal as well. This is an alternative to Calcidius’ *opifex*, which John could not have used here due to the meter (i.e., “opificis” scans as  $\sim \sim \sim \times$ ).
- 14 **silva**: not “forest” here, but “primordial matter”, an allusion to Calcidius who translates Plato’s  $\delta\lambda\eta$ , literally “forest” but meaning “matter” in the *Timaeus* (Liddell & Scott A.III.2), as *silva* (DMLBS 4). With this context of “silva”, the couplet describes how the creator created the various elements from the primordial matter by balancing ratios of fire and earth to create air and water, paraphrasing Ovid’s *Met.* 1.21-23. John explains the proportions of the elements further in v.29-32. **flamma remota solo**: John refers to the organization of the elements; fire is kept far away from earth.
- 15 **natura generans**: the Vulgate Commentary may clarify this meaning: “Nature is twofold: generative nature (*natura naturans*) and generated nature (*natura naturata*). Generative nature is God himself, while generated nature is a certain power situated in matter which creates like things from like things, just as a bull comes forth from a cow” (Coulson, 29). The terms *natura naturans* and *natura naturata* originate in the Middle Ages but are especially discussed by Baruch Spinoza, who explains that nature can be either active or passive. Like the Vulgate, he identifies the active nature as synonymous

with God, and the passive nature as all things which follow from the generative nature of God (Spinoza Part I, Prop. 29). If John wrote with this understanding, the problem becomes distinguishing between transformation by the *artifex* in the previous couplet, and the natural change, which refers to the same creator. Presumably, John means that the *artifex* created nature in such a way that it can produce change independently without the creator having to initiate change himself. This would allow for a difference between a deliberate artificial transformation, such as the creation of the elements, and the change which is intrinsic to the universe and living beings as they progress through time. Both changes are the result of God, but one occurs without him directly acting in the transformation. **ducit**: a corruption in two manuscripts is “deficit”, and Ghisalberti incorrectly emends to “defit” due to his limited selection of manuscripts; all other manuscripts read “ducit”, but his selection only has this attested once. **in esse**: “into being”, “esse” as an accusative noun.

16 **genitum**: i.e. the thing that nature has created, and then destroys.

17-18 John fits his explanation of transformations of *typus* and of *magus* into the same couplet, differentiating the two with examples: a man becoming a lion is a change of *typus* or property, while a river stopping and flowing the opposite direction is change of *magus* or magic. A change of *typus* is clearly a change of physical characteristics, like a transformation to a new species. A change of *magus* is the sort of transformation that contradicts the laws of nature, through a magic spell. In Book 7 of the *Metamorphoses*, in listing a series of *adynata*, or natural impossibilities, that she can make happen, Medea includes reversing rivers: “quorum ope, cum volui, ripis mirantibus amnes / in fontes

reiere suos . . .” (“with whose [magic arts] help, when I want, the rivers go back on their own source, with the banks marvelling”, *Met* 7.199-200).

19-20 Before beginning his discussion of Ovid’s myths, John provides a final methodological explanation. In this couplet, he explicitly summarizes his approach to engaging with the *Metamorphoses*. He clarifies that his purpose is not to describe and analyse all the elements of the various myths, but to only pick out the most important aspects, explaining the essence and meaning of the stories.

19 **omnes**: the corruption “omnis” is common, and may either be read as the genitive singular modifying “ficticii”, which does not accurately reflect John’s method, or it may be a Vergilian “is” feminine accusative ending, which John never uses. “Omnes”, the accusative feminine modifying “partes” provides the clearest reading that best relates to John’s next clause “summam elige” (i.e. do not discuss all parts of the fiction, choose the highest”).

20 **quid . . . quid**: two indirect questions with “illa” as their subject. **quid velit**: may be understood as “what it [i.e. the myth] means” (DMLBS 6.b).

21-34 John begins his actual engagement with Ovid, starting with his description of the creation of the world and the elements (1.21-56). John especially focuses on the four elements, their characteristics, and influence on each other.

21 **flamma**: what Ovid refers to as “caelum” at this point (*Met.* 1.23, 26, 45), and later “ignis” (*Met* 1.53), John calls “flamma”. Ovid also describes the *caelum* as having an

“igneae . . . vis” (“fiery energy”, 1.26). John conflates the two terms for the element into one term to represent the element fire. In his translation of the *Timaeus*, Calcidius identifies the element as “ignis”, like Ovid, so John departs from the two authorities. Throughout his description of the elements, Ovid often varies his terminology: both *umor* (1.30) and *aqua* (1.42) for water, *terra* (1.22, 34, 52) and *tellus* (1.29) for earth. John, in contrast, is always consistent. **volat volitat**: John differentiates the flying action of fire and air by using different, though related verbs. The frequentative “volitat” seems to better describe how the air flutters or floats in the atmosphere (DMLBS 1) compared to “volat” which describes how the fire flies straight up to the highest region. This language echoes that of Ovid when describing the way fire goes to the highest part of the sky: “igneae convexi vis et sine pondere caeli / emicuit summaque locum sibi fecit in arce” (“the fiery force of the convex sky, without weight, leapt up and made its place in the highest part”, *Met.* 1.26-7).

- 22 This line is an adaptation of Ovid: “iussit et extendi campos, subsidere valles / fronde tegi silvas, lapidosos surgere montes” (“he ordered that the fields be spread out, the valleys sink low, the forests be covered with foliage, the rocky mountains rise up”, 1.42-43). John includes fields, valleys, mountains, but omits the forests.
- 23-8 When describing the characteristics of the elements, John uses several words found in neither Ovid nor Calcidius: the lighter elements (i.e. fire and air) are “acutus”, “subtilis” and “mobilis” (v. 23, 26) and the heavier elements (i.e. earth and water) are “obtusus”, “corpore plenus”, and “immobilis” (v. 24, 25, 27). Ovid focuses solely on the weight of the elements, using only “levius” and “onerosior” in his description (*Met.* 1.53). In contrast, John explains their sharpness or dullness, their mass, and their mobility or lack

thereof. He may have been influenced to describe the elements in this way by Calcidius' Commentary on his translation of the *Timaeus*: “terrae vero <obtunsitas> quod est retunsa, quod corpulenta, quod semper immobilis” (“of earth, the compactness, that it is dull, that it has a body, that it is always immobile”, Comment 21). Calcidius refers to the compact mass, full body, and immobility of the earth. John's lines also indicate his understanding of the relationship between the elements, which he seems to have also taken from Calcidius. In the *Timaeus*, Calcidius asserts: “opifex inter ignem terramque aera et aquam inserit” (“the craftsman inserted air and water between fire and earth”, 32b). Calcidius identifies fire and earth as being made before air and water, which are made to balance the elements. From this, John understands fire and earth as independent elements, and air and water as essentially composites of the two, with air being more influenced by fire, and water more influenced by earth. This is clear as he explains that air flies because of fire (v. 26) but nevertheless is slower, due to influence by earth (v.24). The characteristics of water are explained in similar terms, as fire moves the water, which nevertheless remains faithful to earth (v. 27-8). Calcidius, however, does not mention such a relationship, so this seems to be John's interpretation and explanation.

24 **aera**: a Greek neuter accusative, modified by “obtusum”.

25 **corpore**: corrupted to the accusative plural “corpora” in one manuscript, but the ablative after *plenus* is clearly correct, and is further attested in v. 27. John may have been influenced to use *corpus* to refer to elements by Calcidius, who identifies them as four bodies: “igitur quattuor illa integra corpora et sine ulla debilitatione ad mundi continentiam sumpta sunt” (“so those four bodies were taken up intact and without any loss for the

containment of the world”, *Timaeus* 32c). Calcidius’ “corpulentia” (23-8n.) is likely another influence.

- 26 **volat**: Earlier John used “volat” to describe the movement of fire (v. 21), but now, because of its relationship to fire, he shows that air can *volare* as well. By using the same attribute previously given explicitly to fire, John further attaches air’s mobility to the influence of fire.
- 27 **movet**: one manuscript attests the corrupted perfect “movit”, which does not scan. The present “movet”, indicates contemporaneous action with the dependent clause. Since the elements fire and earth influence water at the same time, this must be correct.
- 28 **ex terra**: this suggests a physical movement of water away from earth, while “fidem” denotes a metaphorical affinity between water and earth. **fidem**: one manuscript features the variant “fretum”, meaning “sea”, which, while plausible in meaning as the water extends its sea over the land, was corrupted from the metaphorical “fidem”, which explains water’s elemental relationship to earth.
- 29-32 These four lines expand on Ovid’s brief explanation of the proportional weight of the elements: “inminet his aer, qui, quanto est pondere terrae / pondus aquae levius, tanto est onerosior igni” (“air hangs over these, which is heavier than fire by as much as the weight of water is lighter than weight of earth” *Met* 1.52-3). The Vulgate Commentary explains this in prose: “Ovid shows thus that the sense may be explained through a numerical proportion. So let the earth represent twofold; water, fourfold; the air, sixfold; and the sky, eightfold. Sixfold is greater than fourfold by two, and is bigger than twofold by four. And thus by how much greater twofold is than fourfold, by so much less sixfold is than eightfold” (52 Coulson). While the Vulgate uses arithmetical proportions of fixed

mass of the elements, John uses a more sophisticated proportion of ratios and fractions: “bis duo bis; ter tria ter . . . bis duo ter; ter tria bis” (“twice two twice; thrice three thrice . . . twice two thrice; thrice three twice”). The first pair refers to fire and earth, and the latter refers to air and water. If John’s “two” is taken as a fundamental lightness (l), and “three” as a fundamental heaviness (h), then John establishes a series of ratios to represent the proportions: fire : air :: water : earth or  $l^3 : l^2 \times h :: h^2 \times l : h^3$  or  $2^3 : 2^2 \times 3 :: 3^2 \times 2 : 3^3$  or 8 : 12 : 18 : 27. The proportions align clearly as fractions: the ratio of fire to air is 8/12 or 2/3; the ratio of air to water is 12/18 or 2/3; and the ratio of water to earth is 18/27 or 2/3. In this way, John’s proportions allow for an equal proportional spacing in terms of mass of the elements. These proportions do not seem to be his own calculation. Calcidius’ *Timaeus* does not mention proportions in the way John does, but Boethius in *The Consolation of Philosophy* refers to a proportioning of elements: “Tu numeris elementa ligas ut frigora flammis / Arida convenient liquidis, ne purior ignis / Evolet aut mersas deducant pondera terras” (“You bind its elements with numbers so that the cold comes together with flames, the dry with the wet, lest the purer fire fly off or the weights pull down the sunken earth”, 3. Metr. 9.10-12). Nicholas Trevet’s commentary on Boethius, which was written in the late 13<sup>th</sup> c., after John wrote the *Integumenta*, explains Boethius’ “numeris” in the same proportions as John: “bis duo bis faciunt 8, ter tria ter faciunt 27. Inter 8 autem et 27 non est invenire aliquod medium proporcionale, ut patet inducenti, sed est invenire duo media proporcionalia scilicet 12 et 18” (“twice two twice makes 8, thrice three thrice makes 27. But between 8 and 27 it is not possible to find any middle proportion, as lies open for finding, but it is possible to find two middle proportions, namely 12 and 18”, Minnis 45). John’s proportions of the elements clearly

emerge from the tradition of Boethius, and are a sophisticated way to reflect Ovid's text, especially compared to the Vulgate Commentary.

29 **mensio**: DMLBS defines “mensio” as an alternative spelling of “mentio” (i.e. “mention” or “reference”, but here it must have the Classical definition “measure” (L&S). This is the most appropriate considering the context of numerical proportions, and it may have been familiar to John, since it was used in at least one Late Antique source: “hoc mensio vel mensura” (Augustinus Hipponensis, *De Musica*, 32, 1115). **mensio terna**: John indicates that each of the elements is composed of a measure of three parts, or a threefold mixture. He later clarifies this by breaking each element down into 3 parts of two fundamental terms (i.e. lightness and heaviness).

30-2 Although the manuscript tradition features many variants because of the confusing repetition of the numerical words – some order the numbers differently and some omit parts of either couplet - the printed reading is the only one that organizes the numbers into John's logical series of progressively larger proportions. Because of this confusion, I will list the variant readings here:

B: v. 31-32 om.  
 C: v. 30: b. d. d. b. ter tria ter tibi, v. 32 dic] bis  
 E: v. 32: ter tria ter  
 F: v. 32 ter tria ter  
 G: v. 31-32 om.  
 L: v. 30 bis ter ter tria, v. 32 om.  
 M: v. 30: b. d. d. b. tibi tria ter tibi  
 R: v. 30-32 ter tria ter . . . bis duo ter om.  
 VVp: v. 31-32 om.  
 W: v. 30-32 ter tria ter . . . bis duo ter om.



- 30 **sint**: there are several variants, including the indicative “sunt”, singular subjunctive “sit” and singular perfect “fuit”. The plural is most likely correct, because John lists two proportions, and “sint”, the subjunctive, which is also attested by “sit”, closely resembles “fuit” – the nearly identical “f” and “s” are followed by three minims in both words. “Sunt” may have been an attempt to correct the unexpected jussive subjunctive.
- 33 **sic . . . ligat**: this phrase is a clear allusion to Boethius: “Tu numeris elementa ligas ut frigora flammis . . .” (“You bind the elements together so that the cold comes together with flames”, 3. Metr.9.10). The only difference, as John is discussing an understood God in the third person, is the change of the second person “ligas” to “ligat” and replacement of “tu” with “sic”. This allusion, considering John’s previous engagement with Boethius, is unsurprising, and may have marked for readers which philosophical work John modeled his elemental ideas after. This allusion also clarifies some textual variants: “numerus”, an incorrect attempt to provide “ligat” with a subject, is recorded in two manuscripts, and “ligant”, an incorrect attempt to make “elementa” the plural subject, is recorded in two different manuscripts.
- 34 **stabilis**: corrupted to “stabiles”, to modify “vices”, in two manuscripts. The correct “stabilis” is a nominative substantive adjective for the understood “Deus”. John is highlighting the relationship of a God who is unchanging to his creation, which he causes to change.
- 35-6 John includes a couplet about the four seasons. This summarizes *Metamorphoses* 1.116-8. John is reordering Ovid’s narrative, taking this section, which occurs in Ovid’s description of the Silver Age, and placing it before the five zones of the world, the winds, and the Golden Age. Such a reorganization makes sense considering the structure of

John's poem: the seasons, just as the elements, the zones of the world, and the winds, did not require allegorical explanations, since they were seen to be explicitly true descriptions – Arnulf asserts that Ovid's seasons are the truth and thus not subject to allegory (I.4). Therefore, John pulled this section out from what he understood as an allegorical narrative (i.e. Saturn ruling over the Golden Age and his subsequent defeat) to situate it with the other descriptions of natural truths. Ghisalberti points out that the couplet is similar to one by Bernardus Silvestris: "Viderit: unde vices rerum, cur aestuat aestas / Siccitat autumnus, ver tepet, alget hiems" ("He saw: whence come the changes of things, why the summer is hot, autumn is dry, spring is warm, winter is cold", II.8.39-40). John's couplet is preceded by "vices" in v.34.

- 35 **estas exestuat**: the variants "estas estuat", "estuat estas", and "exestuat estas" appear. The first two, even though Born prints "estas estuat", are not metrical and are clearly corruptions. "Exestuat estas" is metrical inversion of the correct reading, but the inverted word order was likely influenced by of the word order in the rest of the couplet, which places the verb before the subject (i.e. "vernatur ver", auget . . . autumnus", and "canet . . . bruma", v. 35-6). **escas**: the corrupt "estas" is reported by more manuscripts, but this is due to similarity in spelling to "estas exestuat" earlier in the line. Furthermore, "Autumnus" must be the subject with "escas" as the object, which is impossible if the nominative "estas" is the reading.
- 36 **bruma comis**: compared to his descriptions of the other seasons, which focus on a naturalistic property (i.e. spring is warm, summer is hot, autumn increases food), John's description for winter is an example of striking anthropomorphism, a description of Winter's own shaggy white hair. Similar thoughts appear in Classical poetry: "nec minus,

arenti cum crine attollitur aestas / et cum cana comas redit anno bruma rigenti . . .”

(“likewise, when the summer rises with dry hair, and when the white-haired winter returns when the year freezes”, Avienus *Aratea* 612-3).

- 37-8 John relates the division of the world into five zones in this couplet, summarising *Metamorphoses* 1.45-51.
- 39-40 John includes a couplet about the Zodiac signs (“signum”, DMLBS 2.19)), the sun, and the moon, which seems mostly absent from Ovid. He may be briefly explaining *Metamorphoses* 1.72-3: “neu regio foret ulla suis animalibus orba, / astra tenent caeleste solum formaeque deorum . . .” (“lest any region be without its own animals, the stars and the forms of gods held the floor in heaven”).
- 40 **annuus**: there are many variants, including “annus”, “annis”, “annos”, “anus” and “avulsus”. “Anus” and “avulsus” are both nonsense and can be dismissed as obvious corruptions. The nominative “annus” must be a corruption, because “sol” is the subject of the clause. “Annis” means “in the years”, which is possible, but is likely an attempt to correct one of the other corruptions, such as “annus”. Finally, “annos” is also a corruption, influenced by the accusative “menses” and taken as an additional object of “luna” – the moon does not renew years, only months. Therefore, the less common adjective “annuus”, modifying “sol”, is the probably the correct reading.
- 41-8 John dedicates a lengthy description to the catalogue of winds. Ghisalberti observes that while Ovid only mentions the four cardinal winds – Eurus, Zephyrus, Boreas, and Auster

– John fills in the winds of the rest of the compass rose with collateral winds – Subsolanus, Vulturnus, Africus, Notus, Circius, Favonius, Aquilo, and Corus - just as other Ovidian commentators do. The Vulgate Commentary discusses many of these winds, including a series of verses as a mnemonic: “The principal and secondary winds may be learned from these verses: Circius, and Boreas, Aquilo, Vulturnus and Eurus / And Subsolanus fulfill their proprietary work. / Africus and Zephyr, Corus Notus, Auster and Euroaster / threaten them with war from the opposite direction” (n. 61). Similarly, *L’Ovide Moralisé* discusses winds omitted by Ovid (Ghisalberti n.41-8). In Medieval scholarship, a canonical list of the winds did not exist. Understandings varied from having fourfold, eightfold, twelvefold, or sixteen-fold systems of winds, and even among the specific systems, the nomenclature and organisation of the winds was often confused (Taylor 24). For example, Taylor writes: “*Septentrio, boreas, aquilo, and aparctias* can all be found as names for due north; *affricus* is variously assigned as a collateral of *zephyrus* and of *nothus*; *nothus* is distinguished from or equated to *auster*, and so on” (25). Amongst twelvefold systems, there were always four groups of winds – the groups usually aligned to either four quarters of the heavens as defined by sunrise, sunset, noon, and celestial pole or the four *plagae* - but the winds that belonged to each group often differed (24). In the notes of Matthew Paris, a 13<sup>th</sup> c. scholar who attempted to reconcile the classical twelvefold system with the sixteen-fold system of contemporary seamen in his *De Ventis*, there is recorded a hexametric mnemonic that aligns closely with John’s catalogue in terms of the winds listed and structure:

Euro Vulturnus Subsolanusque sodales,  
Affricus atque nothus Austro sunt collaterales,

Hinc chorus zephirus<sup>71</sup> Favonius atque<sup>72</sup> sequuntur,  
Circius atque aquilo Boream stipare feruntur.

Vulturnus and Subsolanus are the companions for Eurus, Affricus and Nothus are collateral to Auster, from here Chorus Zephirus and Favonis follow, and Circius and Aquilo are said to surround Boreas. (Taylor 24, with my translation)

This mnemonic poem, which rhymes to aid memory, records the same twelve winds as John and groups them into nearly identical groups; the only difference is that John groups Circius with Zephirus and Chorus with Boreas. Such confusion is logical since these two collaterals both come from the North-West (25-6). Furthermore, many systems of organizing the winds differ in which winds are the main cardinal winds, but John's system uses the same main four cardinal winds as the poem. Therefore, although there were many different systems for categorizing and naming the winds, John does seem to have mostly followed an existing system, as evidenced by this mnemonic, rather than developing his own.

- 41 **multas partes:** John hints that he will list more winds than the four that Ovid lists.
- 42 **frigoris . . . tonitrus:** these two concepts – cold and thunder – are an unusual pairing; thunder is much more common, even in North-Western Europe, during the summer months because of the necessity of moisture and rapidly rising warm air. John has adapted a pair of lines from Ovid: “. . . iussit et humanas motura tonitrua mentes / et cum

---

<sup>71</sup> It seems likely that “zephirus” has supplanted an accusative “zephyrum”, which would follow the pattern of the other three lines in which the cardinal winds are all objects. This would give “sequuntur” the meaning “to follow the lead or guidance of” (DMLBS 8).

<sup>72</sup> The appearance of “atque” here is interesting because of its appearance as a variant to “inde” in v. 46 of John's *Integumenta* in several manuscripts. In this case, “inde” or “hincque”, which are both variants for John, could be appropriate. Other possibilities are that the “atque” in this mnemonic could have influenced a corruption in John's tradition, or that “atque” here influenced John to write “atque”, which survives in two manuscripts.

fulminibus facientes fulgora uentos” (“he ordered both thunder, that moves human minds, and the winds that make lightning with thunderbolts”, *Met.* 1.55-6). Ovid’s “fulgora” is a variant in an older ninth century manuscript of the *Metamorphoses*, but almost all of the other extant manuscripts have “frigora” instead. Therefore, when John adapted this passage, he almost certainly would have read “frigora”, which he includes here. This would explain the unusual pairing of “frigor” and “tonitrus”, which in Ovid was actually the conceptually linked “tonitrus” and “fulgor”.

- 45 **subsolano**: the uncommon “subsolanus”, a wind of the East, confused scribes, resulting in the variants “sub solano”, “sub salano”, “sub solamo”, and “sol solano”. **cingitur**: there are two variants: the gibberish “siggitur” and corruption “fingitur”, which would incorrectly suggest that Eurus is fashioned by combination of the collateral winds Subsolanus and Vulturus; “cingitur” or “is surrounded” is the most appropriate meaning.
- 46 **hinc . . . inde**: variant readings are “huic . . . inde”, which, though nonsensical, is virtually identical to “hinc” and an easy corruption, “hinc . . . atque”, a corruption that inadequately explains that the winds are on either side of Auster, and the potentially correct “hinc . . . hincque”. I have elected to print “hinc . . . inde” for the following reasons: although the “inde” could have been a corruption influenced by the “inde” in v. 48, it seems more likely that John would have structured these couplets in the same way – he similarly uses repetition to structure his poem in v. 29-32 and 49-52; “hincque” seems likely to have been corrupted by influence of the nearby “hinc”; and finally, in terms of meaning, using “inde” rather than “hincque” clearly indicates that the two winds are on either side of Auster. “Hincque” is still possibly correct: it is the most common in manuscripts, and as much as John structures his couplets through repetitive language, these particular lines are marked with some variance in conveying similar ideas in each

line (i.e. he rearranges the ordering and *sedes* of the primary wind and its collaterals, and changes whether the primary wind or the collaterals serve as the subject in each line). But this last argument in favour of “hincque” is undermined by the argument of structure in favour of “inde”, since the couplets mirror each other in terms of subjects (i.e. v. 45 and 47 use the cardinal wind as subject, while the collaterals are either objects or agents, and v. 46 and 48 feature the collateral winds as the subjects, while the cardinal winds are accusative direct objects).

47 **Circi te**: corrupted to “circite”, nonsense which compounds the two correct words, “cirti te”, a misspelling of the unfamiliar vocative of North-west wind “Circius”, “circa te”, an attempt to correct the unfamiliar word, and “circine te”, which does not scan with a vocative “Circī”, appear. **deposcit**: the attested corruptions are “te poscit”, which adds an unnecessary “te” to the line, “dum poscit”, which adds an unnecessary conjunction, presumably to mirror the “dum” in v. 45, and “de poscit”, in the prefix is simply separated from the correct verb.

48 **Aquilo Boream**: the reordered “Boream Aquilo” appears, which was likely corrupted by the influence of the word order in the similar v. 46. Although this variant is synonymous in meaning and metrical, in terms of style, John has previously positioned the cardinal wind and its collaterals in different locations for each line of the section; furthermore, placing “Boream” directly between its collaterals “Aquilo” and “Chorus” produces striking imagery that emphasizes the organization of these winds in relation to each other.

49-52 These four lines refer to Ovid’s 1.72-75, which appear just before Prometheus creates humans:

neu regio foret ulla suis animalibus orba,  
astra tenent caeleste solum formaeque deorum,

cesserunt nitidis habitandae piscibus undae,  
terra feras cepit, volucres agitabilis aer.

lest any region be without its own animals, the stars and the forms of gods hold the floor in heaven, the waves yielded to the sparkling fish to live in, the earth recieved the beasts, the moveable air the birds. (*Met.* 1.72-75)

John's "young forests" and "maiden grasses" are absent from Ovid and seem to be John's own addition to the scene. Beyond this, John models his passage heavily on Ovid, borrowing the words "feras", "pisces" and "volucres", while "sidera" aligns with "astra", and "polum" aligns with "caeleste solum". John structures this section with the deliberative subjunctives "dicam" and "feram", which are all dependent on his repeated "quid"s, understood as "why" in this context. This is an example of John using praeteritio to summarize details in Ovid that he does not allegorize.

- 53-4 In this couplet John relates part of Ovid's creation of humans. While Ovid discusses two possible origins for humanity, a creation by an "opifex rerum" (*Met.* 1.79) or by Prometheus, John summarizes only the second myth:

. . . sive recens tellus seductaque nuper ab alto  
aethere cognati retinebat semina caeli.  
quam satus Iapeto, mixtam pluvialibus undis,  
finxit in effigiem moderantum cuncta deorum . . .

or the fresh earth, recently separated from the high ether,  
retained the seeds of its kinsman the sky, which, after it was  
mixed with rainwater, Prometheus fashioned  
into the likeness of the gods who govern everything. (*Met* 1.80-3)

John condenses Ovid's passage into a single couplet. Ovid's "tellus" becomes "terra", "satus Iapeto" becomes "Promethea", "finxit" becomes "finxisse", and the mixing of earth with water is replaced by "figulum" or "potter" (DMLBS 1.a.). Although John only



explicitly discusses the second of Ovid's creation myths, by including *figulus*, which can also refer to the Christian God (DMLBS 1.c.), John implies the first myth of a greater creator, who can easily be interpreted as God.

- 53 **figulum**: is corrupted into the gibberish “fingulum” in one manuscript, because of the following word “finxisse”. **finxisse**: one manuscript has the variant “fixisse”, which can mean “to have established”, but the more appropriate meaning of “finxisse”, “to have fashioned”, combined with John's allusion to Ovid “finxit” (53-4n.) confirms that “finxisse” is correct.
- 54 **clamidata**: (i.e. *chlamydata*) variants include the misspelled “clammidata”, the nonsensical “animata”, the ungrammatical finite verb “clamidat”, and finally “clamitata”, which would mean a clearly incorrect “the exclaimed truth lies hidden”.
- 55-62 In this section, which is the last before John begins to properly explain the *integumenta* of Ovid's myths, he provides an explanation of his understanding of stories and their relation to hidden truths with which he will interpret Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. For a discussion of these lines, and John's understanding of *integumenta*, see above in *Introduction: The Integumenta Ovidii*, p. 7-11.
- 57 **magnatibus**: several manuscripts have the related corruptions of “quia nuntiat”, “quia nuntiat”, and “q̄ nuntiat” (Born's reported reading for C), which would mean “it is history because it announces the accomplishments in order . . .”. Scribes may have been influenced to corrupt the original “magnatibus” because of the presence of three similar

causal statements (i.e. “quia celat”, “quia delectat”, and “quod utrumque facit”) in the preceding couplet.

59-60 Ghisalberti prints these lines as two independent and unrelated sentences, but the fact that John understood “allegoria” as the meaning hidden within “historia” means that the clauses must be connected. Born prints them as a single sentence, which helps this somewhat, but punctuating with a semi-colon between the lines, and understanding an “est” as the verb in v. 60 is best. The implied “est” confused more than one scribe, as corruptions such as “dat” in place of “ad” and “datur” in place of “tibi” appear in v. 60 in several manuscripts. “Ad” is correct, because it denotes the purpose of allegory, and “tibi” is probably correct, since John often uses “tibi” to emphasize his explanations to his students (v. 30, 32, 55, 61, 62, 84).

61 In one manuscript, the entire line is replaced by the nearly nonsensical “fabula nocte tenens te polluat: integumentum / est doctrine” (“At night, a fable holding you spoils you: the integument is something for teaching”). **voce tenus**: several manuscripts combine the two words as “vocetenus”, which is a possible variant, since “tenus” may be written as combined with its preceding subject (DMLBS 3). Although “tenus” with “voce” may mean “verbatim” (DMLBS 3.3.b.), here the meaning of “tenus” as “as far as” (DMLBS 3.1), making the phrase “as far as it [fabula] is called” or, idiomatically, “nominally, a fable”.

62 **causa doctrine**: variants are “clausa doctrine”, which was likely corrupted by influence of the “clauditur” that begins v. 59, and “doctrine clausa”, an inversion of this corruption. “Clausa” must be read as an ablative, not as a nominative modifier of “res . . . vera”, for

metrical purposes, which makes the meaning mostly nonsense. A possible conjecture would be “clausaque doctrine”, which allows the nominative participle, and has a possible meaning (i.e. “the closed up truth teaching lies hidden for you”). With this, presumably the “que” dropped out, resulting in a “clausa” which certain scribes would change to “causa”. Despite this possibility, the ablative “causa” is almost certainly the correct reading; it denotes the purpose of an integument (i.e. for the sake of teaching), paralleling the purpose of *allegoria* “ad populi mores” in the preceding couplet, and a corruption to “clausa” would have been very likely in the context. **ibi**: the variants “tibi” and “ibi” are attested about equally; “tibi” is likely incorrect because it is redundant with a “tibi” already appearing in v. 61, and it is the more likely corruption due to the many “tibi”s that appear in this section (v. 55, 60, 61).

- 63 John summarises Ovid’s myth of Prometheus creating man. His allegory focuses on the part of the myth that Ovid omits: Prometheus giving fire to humankind. John’s inclusion of the larger myth, not only what is in Ovid, proves that he is both expanding and radically re-interpreting these myths. His interpretation takes Prometheus as an allegorical wise man who bestows fire, a symbol for reason, upon man. In Classical myth, however, Prometheus is a symbol of disobedience and impiety; here, John re-moralises the story, making Prometheus’ action honorable. **doctrina**: “learning”. Sharing a line with “clave”, which has previously referred to this poem as a product of John’s learning in v. 5, John seems to connect himself and his work to Prometheus and his fire. Prometheus uses his learning to instruct unskilled men in the art of making fire, a symbol representing reason, just as John, with this work, instructs his students and readers as a wise man. **Prometheu**: masc. voc. sing. Ghisalberti prints “Prometheu”, while Born prints “Promethen”. Other variants include “Promethe” and “Promothe”. The confusion over this word is justified,

because written “u”s and “n”s are made both of two minims, appearing virtually identical in manuscripts, and the Greek vocative of Prometheus ends in a Greek diphthong, which would have been unfamiliar to most scribes. The vocative “Prometheu” seems correct, however, especially following “tua”, which would require an antecedent to make sense. Furthermore, Born’s “Promethen” is not the correct declension of *Prometheus* in any case.

64 **prius**: taken closely with “rudes”. **rudes**: These unrefined people may be the many people who, in John’s eyes, have not achieved a higher learning and thus cannot use reason to become enlightened. John borrows this word from Ovid, who describes the earth before man as “rudis” (*Met.* 1.87).

65 **celitus**: “from heaven”, adv. Reason is shown as a gift from heaven, given in order that humans might understand the heavens. **affirmas**: “you establish”. Ghisalberti prints “affirmas” and Born prints “affirmans”. The vocative “Prometheu” in conjunction with “tua doctrina” requires a second person singular verb to follow later in the sentence, giving agency to the god. Despite this, “affirmans” is a common reading in the manuscripts; the second person verb, following a third person “fertur” may have been unexpected to scribes, so they changed it to “affirmans”, taking “doctrina” as the continued subject. Because “tua” and “Prometheu” are two lines above, many scribes would not have been expecting a second person verb. Both readings are possible, but the enhanced agency of making Prometheus the subject, and the finality of an indicative verb makes “affirmas” my preferred reading. **lucem . . . oriri**: John’s imagery here seems to reference Prometheus’ fire, a detail that Ovid omits. The importance of this fire in the original myth is equated to the importance of reason in Medieval philosophy. **rationis**: the first mention of “reason” in the poem. In 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> century education, reason was the

most important tool that a scholar could use. *Ratio* was obtained through God, and with it, you could strive to understand him and the mysteries of creation.

66 **rationis**: John repeats *ratio* from the previous line. This emphasizes his interpretation of the myth, that Prometheus gave reason to humans. **peti**: This can be read as both a method to strive for an afterlife in heaven, and to an abstract type of striving; through reason you can strive to understand the “celestesque plagas”, or the nature of the universe and of god.

67 John compresses Ovid’s narrative of the Golden Age (*Met.* 1.89 – 112) into a single couplet. **Principio mundi**: with a clear allusion to the first words of Genesis, John establishes that he interprets Ovid’s Golden Age as a reference to Eden. **floruit**: just as he used repetition in v. 65 and 66, John repeats “floruit” in the two lines of this couplet.

While Ovid uses twenty-three lines on this narrative of a Golden Age, describing many signs of a flourishing world, John simply uses repetition to emphasize the nature of this time.

68 **etas ex auro**: John writes a variation of Ovid’s original “aurea . . . aetas” (1.89). **absque malo**: A substantive neuter “malo” signifies not a single evil person, but, more generally, all evil. This phrase, but especially “absque bono” and “absque deo”, appear in previous poetry: “‘Nil’ ait ‘absque deo factum, sed cuncta per ipsum / cuncta, nec est alius quisquam nisi factus ab ipso’” (“‘Nothing’ he said ‘is made apart from God, but all things are through him and there is nothing other than that made by him’”, Prudentius *Hamartigenia* 182-3); “Sanctus enim sanctos facit, et de lumine lumen / exoritur: nullus fit bonus absque Bono” (“For a holy man makes men holy, and light comes from light: nobody becomes good without Good.” Prosper Aquitanus *epigrammata* 22.5-6). In these examples, God is responsible for all creation. John seems to be inverting this rhetoric,

striking a contrast between his current world and that of the Golden Age, for him presumably Eden, before sin, where only the good aspects of God's creation existed.

- 69 In the myth of Saturn, John refers to the multiple ancient understandings of Saturn; this includes his association with the Greek Cronos, or "time" (v. 73-74), as a patron of sowing and agriculture (v. 69-70), and a deposed king (v.70-72) (Ghisalberti). **Saturnus** . . . **annus**: John connects Saturnus with etymology: "satur" + "annus" (i.e. he is a sated/full year). John elaborates on this further, connecting his name with the "saturatio" ("satisfaction/fertility") of the Golden Age. Thus, with a repetition, John emphasizes the etymology. The Vulgate Commentary understands the pseudo-etymology slightly differently: "satur annis" ("filled with years", v.114) connects Saturn to Kronos. **primi / temporis**: i.e. the Golden Age, referring to "etas ex auro" in v. 68.
- 70 **eius**: corrupted to "huius" in several manuscripts. Either reading is possible; however, "huius" is the likely corruption due to the proximity of "huic" earlier in the line. **filius**: John does not explicitly name Jupiter, whom Ovid names twice in his passage (*Met.* 1.114, 116).
- 71 The next two couplets describe and allegorize the story of Saturn's defeat and castration by Jupiter. John expands on Ovid's version of the story: "Postquam Saturno tenebrosa in Tartara misso" (*Met.* 1.113). As with the story of Prometheus in v. 63-66, John fills in story missing from the *Metamorphoses*, extracting allegorical meaning from the myth that Ovid omits. **tempore**: Born and Ghisalberti print the manuscript reading "tempus", as the subject of both "secuisse" and "precipitasse". This reading is dissatisfying, because it removes Jupiter's agency in the castration of his father, and gives it to "time", which is an awkward subject in this context. "Tempus" here may have been corrupted from the correct "tempore" because of the "tempus" at the beginning of v. 73. Furthermore, the

abbreviations of “tempore” can either be “tpe” or “tpc” with a macron, which would be very easily confused for “tempus” or “temporis”. Gervais’ conjecture would assume “filius” in v. 70 is the continued subject of these infinitive verbs, meaning “the son is said, in the time that followed, to have cut off the manhood of his father and cast it into the chaos of the sea”. “Filius” being the subject also strengthens the connection with “patris”, and joins the thoughts between the two couplets.

- 72 **dicitur**: Both Born and Ghisalberti print the manuscript reading “dicimus”; I have followed Gervais’ conjecture “dicitur”. John uses both words in the poem, which means a slightly more awkward first-person plural is not impossible, but he uses “dicitur” far more frequently. Furthermore, “dicimus” is only used when there is an obvious accusative subject of indirect speech (v. 297, 333, 508); if we assume that “tempore” is correct, the subject must be the nominative “filius”, which would require a correction to “dicitur”. This construction appears several times (v. 165, 167, 393).
- 73 There are various possible interpretations of this allegory. John may be following the tradition of Macrobius: originally all seeds that form the elements fell from heaven until the earth was finally complete. At a fixed moment in time, because all the elements had been settled on earth, seeds stopped falling from heaven and the ability of reproduction was transferred from water to Venus, and all things then came into being through male and female intercourse (*Sat* I.8.8.). John’s allegory is then that Saturn is time, his penis is fertility, the later descendants represent future generations, the sea is a womb, and the foam is Venus, who gives life the ability to reproduce. The Vulgate Commentary interprets the myth differently: Saturn’s penis represents grain, the sea represents the stomach, and a full stomach leads to Venus, or libido (v.114). **ubertas**: the rare “ubertas” has been corrupted into the common “libertas” and nonsense “uebertas”. **proles**: John here

refers to Ovid's "argentea proles" ("silver race", *Met.* 1.114) and "aenea proles" ("bronze race", 1.125). The silver race that arises after Saturn's defeat represents all that comes after; while Ovid describes the Bronze and Iron Ages, John almost entirely omits these.

74 **spuma Venus:** Cicero, in his *De natura deorum* uses this phrase in one account of Venus' birth: "Venus . . . altera spuma creata" ("another Venus was created from foam", 3.59).

75 John's integument combines the theme of increasing evil in Ovid's Iron Age (*Met.* 1.127-150) with his description of Olympus and the council of gods (*Met.* 1.163-252). John interprets these passages as causally linked: so many gods in heaven, which he later relates to the advent of Biblical false idols (v. 79-80), bring an increase in sin. **propter . . . effectus:** "for the sake of many purposes". There are many gods, and they all have different functions in the natural world.

76 **seges . . . mali:** John metaphorically refers to increasing sin as a "crop". The imagery of a crop establishes a parallel between harvest imagery of "satur" and "saturatio" (v. 69), the good bounty of the Golden Age, free from "malo" (v. 68), with the new bounty that comes after the Golden Age, tainted with evil.

77 **etheris:** John possibly borrows this word from Ovid: "gravitate carentem aethera" ("the ether, lacking weight" *Met.* 1.68). John juxtaposes Ovid's description of ether as weightless with his own description of a heaven overabundant and heavy with gods.

78 **pondere:** John echoes two passages in Ovid: "sine pondere, habentia pondus" ("weightless [against] possessing weight", *Met.* 1.20) and "inminet his aer, qui, quanto est pondere terrae / pondus aquae levius, tanto est onerosior igni" ("over these hangs the air, which is heavier than fire by as much as the weight of water is lighter than the weight of earth", 1.52-3). In the first passage, Ovid is describing the nature of chaos, juxtaposing weightlessness and heaviness as two forces conflicting with each other that are ultimately



balanced when the world is created. The second passage similarly relates a balanced universe with four elements proportional to each other with respect to weight. The word in both cases is associated with the creation of the elements, and the balance they cause in the universe. By echoing Ovid's language, John seems to comment that the abundance of gods has threatened the balance of the universe. **pondere pressa labat**: the second hemistich of the line alludes to Ambrose: "cum vice materna producit et excipit ista / admiror quod non pondere pressa labat" ("that leads out and withdraws with a maternal change, I marvel that the world, pressed by a weight, does not totter" *de. nat. rer.* 106-7). John is similarly marvelling that the world remained stable through a period of such heresy, with so many idols in heaven. **labat**: two variants are the virtually nonsensical subjunctive "labet" and "latet". Both of these may be corruptions from the influence of "patet" in the previous line, which rhymes with "latet" and "labet". But it must be "labat", as John's comment on the dangers of so many gods in heaven is best emphasized by the indicative verb.

- 79 John connects the council of Olympian gods to Biblical idolatry, specifically Baal (i.e. *Belus*), the Babylonian idol. Baal was thought to have been the first Assyrian king at the time of the Olympian wars of the Titans and Giants, who was worshipped as a god following his death. While John asserts that he fashioned a statue for himself, in other traditions Belus' son Nilus fashions the statue (Ghisalberti). **illam**: referring to the "statuam", John emphasizes that only the image is worshipped, not Baal himself as a deity.
- 80 John's language in this line clearly condemns the worship of idols; Baal's first worshipper, and by extension his following, is described as a slave, and he is only worshipped by inspiring fear.

- 81 **ruinam:** John seems to borrow from the only place Ovid uses *ruina* in Book 1: “attonitum tantae subito terrore ruinae / humanum genus est totusque perhorruit orbis” (“the human race is stunned by the sudden terror of such a destruction, and the whole world shudders”, *Met.* 1.202). In Ovid, the destruction refers to Jupiter’s punishment of humans because of Lycaon’s crime, a narrative that follows the Gigantomachy. By borrowing this word, inserting it into his integument about the Gigantomachy, and emphasizing that this is an earlier destruction with the inclusion of “primus” in v. 82, John asserts that he will be discussing a different destruction than what Ovid refers to when he uses *ruina*.
- 82 **primus:** the variant “mundus” is clearly corrupted due its proximity to “mundus” in v. 81. “Primus” then modifies this “mundus”, which is the continued subject of “habet”. Like “primo” in v. 79, John is emphasizing that this is the first occurrence of this kind of sin.
- virtus . . . fugit:** before the integument in v. 83-4, John briefly summarizes the message of Ovid’s Gigantomachy.
- 83-4 John’s moral integument is independent from the previous tradition of Macrobius and Arnulf (Ghisalberti). Macrobius summarizes the myth, and Arnulf explains that the name of the giants comes from “ge”, which shows that they were tyrants of the earth who wanted to cast Jupiter down (Macrobius *Sat* I.20.8; Arnulf I.5). As John interprets this myth, in the Gigantomachy, the gods are virtues, the attacking giants is a crowd of vices, Phlegra a humble mind, and Pelion is pride.
- 83 **viciorum:** in addition to the variant spelling “vitorum” and the nonsensical “eviciorum”, some manuscripts read “vicioaque”, a corruption that arose to produce an adjective modifying turba.

- 84 **Phlegra:** Ovid's narrative never mentions Phlegra, the location of Jupiter's overthrowing of the giants, which means John is again filling in his gaps with other knowledge about the myths. **mons:** John references Pelion, which, unlike Phlegra, Ovid does mention. John's inclusion of details absent from Ovid and omission of details present in Ovid in the same line demonstrates his understanding that his poem was not intended as a simple summary and moralization of Ovid's epic, but a supplementary poem to help readers understand broader contexts and meanings in the *Metamorphoses*.
- 85-6 John may summarise Arnulf's interpretation of the Lycaon myth (Ghisalberti): "qui in lupum fingitur mutatus, quia luporum est esse tyrannos ovium" ("[Lycaon], who is depicted as having been changed into a wolf, because it is the nature of wolves to be the tyrants of sheep", I.6). John may modify Arnulf's idea, pronouncing the tyrant Lycaon a wolf due to his character as a savage tyrant. John never explicitly indicates that Lycaon becomes a wolf because of his relation to his subjects; rather, because he has the *feritas* and *proprietas* of a wolf, he may be metaphorically referred to as a wolf. This connects more closely to Ovid, who describes him similarly after his transformation: "canities eadem est, eadem violentia vultus, / idem oculi lucent, eadem feritatis imago est" ("there is the same white hair, the same ferocity in his face, the same eyes shine, there is the same semblance of bestiality", *Met.* 1.238-9).
- 85 John emphasizes his metaphor by creating two mirroring clauses, one where "lupus" specifically refers to Lycaon, and another where "lupus" is a more general metaphor. His repetition of "lupus est" to refer both to a specific character and later to a metaphorical characteristic underlines his interpretation. **Arcas:** i.e. Lycaon. John does not refer to him by name, but with an epithet borrowed from Ovid's "Arcadis . . . sedes" (*Met.* 1.218).

- feritate**: ablative of cause. John explains that Lycaon is a wolf because he has the wildness and savageness of a wolf.
- 86 **potes**: several manuscripts have an abbreviated “potest”, a corruption that attempts to correct an unexpected 2<sup>nd</sup> person verb. This is similar to the confusion between “affirmas” and “affirmans” in v. 65 (65n.).
- 87-90 John interprets the story of Deucalion and Pyrrha the same as Arnulf does (Ghisalberti): “in coitu enim viri et femine si superhabundat sperma viri creatur vir, si mulieris, creatur femina” (“for in sex of a man and of a woman, if the sperm of a man is the most abundant, a man is created, if the sperm of a woman is more abundant, a woman is created”, I.7). In this story, John passes over the flood. Although Arnulf briefly includes a reference to the story, his account may explain why John did not include an integument: “Terra in mare mutata est per diluvium. Hoc non indiget integumento, quia re vera hoc fuit in tempore Noe” (“The earth is changed into sea through a flood. This does not need an integument, because this was a true thing in the time of Noah”, I.6). The significance of the flood was so obvious to a Christian audience that an integument was unnecessary.
- 87 **misisse**: the correct reading has been corrupted to “genuisse” and “generare” in some manuscripts, which both more clearly explain the difficult “misisse”, meaning “sent forth” rather than the specific “begat”; they may both be intrusive glosses. Ovid uses *mitto* to describe Deucalion and Pyrrha casting the stones: “et iussos lapides sua post vestigia mittunt” (“and they cast the ordered stones behind their tracks”, *Met.* 1.399). This verbal echo supports “misisse” as the correct reading. **nimpha**: the variant “mulieres femina fertur” is found in several manuscripts. Their meanings are the similar, but, as

more common words, “mulieres” and “femina” are likely to have intruded as glosses explaining “nimpha” “refertur” was then corrupted to “fertur” to fix the meter.

- 88 **coitu:** as often happens when John uses a sexual term, corruptions appear. The alternate spelling “cohitu” and the nonsensical “comitu” are variants. This trend also explains the variant “si minus” for “seminis”, which would have been influenced by “si plus” earlier in the line.
- 89 **aqua . . . ignis:** In Ovid, life is born from the union of fire and water: “cumque sit ignis aquae pugna, vapor umidus omnes / res creat . . .” (“and although fire fights water, moist vapour creates all things”, *Met* 1.432-3). John parallels his male and female characters to the two opposing elements which must come together to produce life.
- 90 **lapides lapidum:** “lapidum lapides” is commonly attested, while the other clear corruptions “lapides lapides”, and “lapides lapide” indicate confusion. One manuscript reads “lapides illi”, which could suggest that “lapidum” is not a correct reading in any place. Ghisalberti prints “lapides lapidum”, while Born prints “lapidum, lapides”. In the former “lapides” is the subject of “parentes / sunt”, and “lapidum” both a possessive genitive after “parentes” and the antecedent of “qui” (i.e. “the stones are parents of stones who lack piety”); in the latter, “lapidum” is only a possessive of “parentes”, and “lapides”, referring to the preceding “lapidum”, is the antecedent of “qui” (i.e. “the stones which lacked filial devotion are the parents of stones”). Although both are grammatically correct, the repetition in the latter is unnecessary and unusual; for the former, the more sophisticated genitive antecedent seems more appropriate. In addition, “lapides lapidum” carries a metaphorical translation of Ovid: “lapidum” refers to the “genus durum” (1.414), a hardy people, who spring from the “saxa” (1.411), their parents, which John refers to as literal “lapides”. **qui pietate carent:** John seems again to be referring to the

“genus durum”, as though these humans born from stones were tough but lacked piety. This interpretation is absent in both Arnulf and the Vulgate Commentary.

- 91-2 John interprets Apollo’s victory over the Python as a moralizing allegory, again following an interpretation from Arnulf (Ghisalberti): “vel Phiton est falsa credulitas, quam Apollo id est sapiens ratione sua exterminat” (“or the Python is a false gullibility which Apollo, i.e. a wise man, banishes with his reason”, I.8). John adapts this idea, personifying Arnulf’s “credulitas” as a metaphorical “malignum / fallacemque virum”.
- 91 **Phebus Phitonem:** John uses Phoebus, an alternative name for Apollo, to more emphatically juxtapose the two foes with alliteration. “Phiton” is a Medieval spelling of *python* that also appears in Arnulf’s allegorization of the myth (I.8).
- 92 **fallacemque:** “fallacemque” is attested in all manuscripts except two, which read the synonymous but simpler participle “fallentemque”, which is likely influenced by “sapiensque” in v.91, and a misspelling of this corruption, “fallentenmque”.
- 93-6: In his integument about Apollo and Daphne, John fashions a new symbolic interpretation (Ghisalberti): Daphne represents wisdom, Phoebus a man trying to attain wisdom, the tree is the wisdom flourishing in a wise man’s mind, and the laurel crown is the victory of a man who has become wise. This reading differs from Arnulf who emphasizes Daphne’s virginity as integral to the story: Daphne is a symbol for the virginity, and her changing into a laurel refers to the crown given to young women who died as virgins (I.9). Maiden’s crowns, or crantses, are customary in England at least as early as the 17<sup>th</sup> c. – the earliest surviving such garland dates from 1680, and Shakespeare mentions them in

*Hamlet* (Morris 356-7). The origin of this custom is uncertain, but it may have come from ancient Egypt, Etruria and Rome, and may have been imported by the Romans to the rest of Europe (356). This custom is likely what Arnulf is referring to in his interpretation.

- 93 **sapientum**: a substantive adjective, generalising the allegory to apply to all wise men.  
**virgo virescit**: The alliteration in the clausula of the line seems not only to be stylistic, but possibly more significant: John, by identifying and juxtaposing the similarity of the words, seems to imply that they are etymologically linked.
- 94 **fugiat victa labore**: this is adapted from Ovid's narration: "victa labore fugae spectans Peneidas undas" (*Met.*1.544). For Ovid, the labour refers to Daphne's flight, but John changes it to give a more positive message: wisdom flees from you, but once you have "defeated" it with labour, it flourishes for you. **viret**: two variants include "vicet", likely corrupted from the nearby "victa, and "nitet". "Nitet" is a plausible reading: not only would it look similar enough to "viret" in a manuscript to be corrupted, but the presence of "virescit" directly above could have influenced a corruption to "viret". "Viret" is slightly less common in Medieval sources than "nitet" (C.C.) but is not uncommon enough to certainly indicate that it is the correct reading. John does occasionally repeat verbs for emphasis (68n.), and here the repetition of a root would serve a similar purpose, making "viret" the preferable reading.
- 95 **corona**: Ovid's narrative of the myth explains the reason that the laurel tree and the crown is sacred to Apollo. In celebration of his victory over the Python, Apollo crowns his head, but not with laurel: "nondum laurus erat, longoque decentia crine / tempora cingebat de qualibet arbore Phoebus" ("There was no laurel yet, and Apollo circled his temples, beautiful with long hair, from whatever tree was available", 1.450-1). Once

Daphne is transformed into a laurel and Apollo reaches her, he pledges that she will be his tree and that she will be worn by Roman generals in triumph (1.557-565). For John this crown represents the achievement of a man who has attained wisdom.

96 **cupida**: a playful reference to Cupid having shot Apollo with his bow, making him fall in love with Daphne. John alters the meaning from Ovid's erotic desire to the desire for wisdom.

97-8 John simply summarizes the story of Jupiter and Io, rather than offering an interpretation. Arnulf interprets the metamorphosis as symbolising Io before she was a virgin, and as her having lost her virginity.

97 **Flacco**: variants are "flacce", "flacto", "flato", and "fracto". None of these readings make much sense; Flacco, referring to Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus), is certainly correct, as he reports a wandering Io in his *Ars Poetica*: "sit Medea ferox invictaque, flebilis Ino, / perfidus Ixion, Io vaga, tristis Orestes." ("Let Medea be fierce and unconquered, Ino lamentable, Ixion faithless, Io wandering, Orestes sad", 125-6). John repeats "Io vaga" in the same *sedes*. Therefore, Horace is another authority, or witness, to this myth, but an unexpected one, leading to the corruptions.

99-102 John's interpretation of Argus as a clever but unwise man is modified from Arnulf (Ghisalberti). Arnulf explains that Argus becoming a peacock, an arrogant bird, represents the world that is made arrogant by wealth and decoration, and is ultimately left bare when the wealth is no longer there (I.13). John similarly indicates that Argus is a man who looks to wealth with greed, and is thus turned into a peacock on account of this greed.



- 99     **Argus ab arguto:** John’s first interpretation is that “Argus” comes from the word for clever. John uses this pseudo-etymology to strengthen his integument; not only is Argus a wise man due to his many eyes, but his name even indicates his intelligence.
- 101    **ocelli:** John refers to Argus’ eyes with the diminutive, just as in v. 99, varying from Ovid’s *oculus* (*Met.* 1.629, 686, 714, 721). Ovid does not use the diminutive in his epic, but his elegiac works, following in the tradition of Catullus and Propertius, use *ocellus*: “Cum bene deiectis gremium spectabis **ocellis**” (“when you see the lap with your little eyes cast down”, *Amores* 1.8.37), and “non bene consuetis a te spectaris **ocellis**” (“you should not be well looked at by yourself, accustomed eyes”, *Amores* 1.14.37). John, summarizing the epic poem in the elegiac meter, changes his vocabulary to fit the tradition.
- 102    **respicit:** two variants are “despicit” and “dispicit”, meaning “looks down on” and “considers” wealth respectively. Both are similar in spelling to “respicit”, and *dispicere* is often confused with *despicere*, which may have happened to scribes here. For “despicit”, the moral positively portrays Argus: i.e. he has been described positively as “clever” before, and thus must look down on wealth. This reading is difficult to reconcile with Argus’ defeat by Mercury – he must not be a symbol of a wholly wise man, or he would not have been defeated. Therefore, the negative portrayal of a man who “looks for” wealth is a better reading. Although he is “argutus”, he is not wise like Mercury and is capable of being corrupted, or defeated, by wealth. “Respicit”, not carrying a simple moral, was corrupted into the easier “despicit”, which was then confused with “dispicit”.

- 103-4 John includes a brief comment on Cupid, paraphrasing Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1.461-74: Phoebus demands that Cupid be satisfied with his *fax* which ignites love in people (1.461), and Cupid, in response, draws "duo tela" (1.468), one which causes Phoebus to fall in love, and the other which causes Daphne to run from his advances. John also elaborates on Cupid's dual representation of love: his wings (1.466) are given significance as one represents the approach of love, the other the retreat from love. A manuscript of the *Metamorphoses* includes a note with a similar interpretation: "tela facta ad diversa opera. Unum enim fugat amorem, aliud facit. Et dicitur etiam habere Cupido duas alas: per primam figuratur amoris accessus, per secundum amoris recessus" ("the arrows are made for different work. Indeed, one puts love to flight, the other makes love. And Cupid is even said to have two wings: through the first is represented the approach of love, through the second the retreat of love", Ghisalberti).
- 105-8 John interprets Mercury as a representation of eloquence and stresses its importance to the development of the mind. John frequently discusses *sapientia* or *ratio* in general (vv. 65, 66, 91, 92, 93, 95, 100, 113), but here the integument is about the importance of a specific type of learning: oratory. For John, Mercury's defeat of Argus represents how speech is able to subdue tyrants. Beyond a political application, John also indicates the benefit of the power of speech to help heal sick minds.
- 105 **curans**: the corruptions "curat" and "currens" appear. "Curat" supplies a finite verb, whereas with the correct participle "curans", "est" must be understood, and "currens" is simply a corruption due to similar spelling. John advances "mentes curans" as an etymology for "Mercurius". This etymology is in contrast to the etymology for Mercury

established by Fulgentius, who explains his name comes from “mercium curum”, a reflection of his association with trade and commerce (*Mythographia*, 1.18).

- 106: **ala duplex**: while before John discussed each wing of a single set (103-4n.), this is a double set of wings (i.e. of Mercury’s shoes) that represents the swiftness and fluidity of speech. It is an interpretation of the wings on Mercury’s shoes as described by Ovid: “parva mora est alas pedibus virgamque potenti / somniferam sumpsisse manu tegumenque capillis” (“There is a small delay [for Mercury] to take up the wings on his feet and his sleep-bearing staff in his powerful hand and his cap on his hair”, *Met* 1.671-2).
- 107 **virga**: Mercury’s caduceus, which Ovid calls “somniferam” (*Met* 1.672), physically embodies Mercury’s power of speech. John’s “sopire” is a reference to Ovid’s *sopor*: “quamvis sopor est oculorum parte receptus, / parte tamen vigilat” (“although sleep was received by some of his eyes, nevertheless he was awake in some”, *Met.* 1.685-6) and “firmatque soporem / languida permulcens medicata lumina virga” (“and he strengthened sleep, soothing the dull eyes with the medicated staff”, *Met* 1.715-6). The staff, or the power of speech, is directly able to quell the rule of tyrants. **tyrannos**: the alternative spelling “tirannos” and the corrupt “draconem” appear. The drastic corruption “draconem” is probably influenced by a clausula in Book 7 of the *Metamorphoses*, where Jason needs to drug a dragon to sleep: “pervigilem superest herbis sopire draconem” (“it still remained to lull the watchful dragon to sleep with plants”, 7.149).
- 109-11 While in the *Metamorphoses* Syrinx is transformed into a reed pipe (1.711-2), John uses this myth as an opportunity to discuss the catheter, which is an alternative meaning of *syringa*. The catheter was developed as a method of Hippocratic medicine, and remained

relevant into Medieval Europe as an instrument to open an obstructed urethra and apply topical curatives into the bladder (Moog et al. 441). Arnulf discusses the transformation as a comment on literature: “Tandem Siringam mutatam id est artes grecas de greco in latinum transmutatas consecutus est, et cum eis cantavit” (“Finally, [Pan] pursued Syrinx having been changed, that is Greek arts changed from Greek into Latin, and sang with them”, I.12). The allegory is that Pan’s pipes represent the seven arts, which are taken by from Greek into Latin, and that the music of these pipes is all art together. The Vulgate Commentary simply explains that a *syrinx* is a pipe in Latin, and asserts that the name comes from a “drawing away” (*abstractio*), since she draws men to herself through her song”, which comes from the Greek “σειρά” meaning “rope” (691). Therefore, John’s medical allegory seems to be original.

- 109 **virge . . . virilis**: “a male staff”, i.e. a penis (DMLBS 5.d). John’s repetition of the word *virga* (v.107) either indicates a joke (i.e. the dual meaning of *virga* meaning a literal staff, or a penis), or the breadth of knowledge that his integuments can incorporate. Although sexual words are often corrupted, the transmission is unanimous, possibly due to the medical context. Unsurprisingly, John identifies the catheter as a treatment for men, but in reality, they were also used for women usually more safely because “their urethra is naturally short and rather straight” (Moog et al. 440) compared to men’s.
- 110 **physica dextra**: “medical skill”. The literal meaning is “the right hand of physics/natural philosophy”, but the phrase must be read as referring to the specific skill of medical training. Catheterization is painful and can risk infection and hemorrhaging, something both ancient and medieval doctors were aware of (441). Only skilled physicians could administer the procedure.

111-18 John's allegorization of the fall of Phaethon, which occurs in *Metamorphoses 2*, is included in his summary of *Metamorphoses 1*. John offers several different understandings of the myth: an etymological reading (111-12), a moral reading (113-14), and a natural philosophical reading (115-16). He additionally discusses the Heliades, explaining the etymology of their name (117-18).

- 111 John states that “phos”, Greek for “lux”, gave Phaethon his name. **Pheton**: three manuscripts read “Phebus”, one of which includes “Pheton” in superscript. The etymological integument confused scribes, as both “Pheton” and “Phebus” share the “ph” of “Phos”. “Pheton” must be correct, because with this line, John justifies how in v.112 the son can be understood as the “splendor” of the sun (i.e. since the name “Phaethon” comes from “Phos”, Phaethon can be light).
- 112 The sibilance of this line emphasizes the sizzling heat of the sun. **solis filius**: John juxtaposes the father and the son, without explicitly naming Apollo.
- 113 John moralises the myth, explaining that the sun is wisdom which gives a wise man his light, and that an uneducated man, should he attempt to use wisdom in this way, will always fall and crash, just as Phaethon did. **philosophi**: in this moral allegory, this does not refer to Apollo specifically, but to a general wise man. **cuius**: the antecedent is unclear. “Philosophi” and “sapientia” are both possibly correct; for both, “currum” seems to represent the *ratio* or learning that wise men employ to help them discover the truths in literature, philosophy, and cosmology.
- 114 **deducit**: while this is a common verb, interestingly Ovid uses it to describe Apollo leading Phaethon to the chariot: “ergo, qua licuit, genitor cunctatus ad altos / deducit

iuvenem, Vulcania munera, currus” (“Therefore, the father having delayed as long as he was allowed, led the youth to the high chariot, the gift from Vulcan”, 2.105-6). John, with this verbal link, juxtaposes Apollo, who, wisely knowing Phaethon should not drive the chariot, led him hesitantly, and Phaethon, who without wisdom led the chariot with arrogance. This change of meaning also seems to take the agency away from Apollo and gives it to Phaethon, absolving Apollo of any blame and solidifying his representation as a wise man. **rudis**: used just as “rudes” in v. 64 (64n.).

- 115 John connects Phaethon scorching the earth with the chariot to the fields yellowing in autumn, as the crops dry out as if scorched by the sun. Arnulf understands a different agricultural metaphor: Phaethon, born from Apollo and Climene, representations of heat and water, is the crops; he demands the chariot for his glory just as crops demand sunlight for their growth; and having received these things, Phaethon is freed from his body by lightning just as crops are taken from their plants (II.1).
- 116 **cum, dempto**: the variants “codepto”, “concepto”, “contempto”, and “ceidempto” appear. “Cum”, often abbreviated as “9” (which also abbreviates “con”), was misread with “dempto” and then modified into the real words “concepto” and “contempto”, creating many variants.
- 117 **Helios Heliades**: the Medieval alternative spelling “elios eliades” is the most attested variant, with others including “elyios elyades”, “elyos eliades” and “helyas heliades”; it is unknown which spelling of these nouns John would have been familiar with, so I have printed Ghisalberti’s spelling. **sumpsere**: the variant “traxere” appears. Either may be correct and both are used with “nomen”. I have printed “sumpsere” because it follows John’s alliteration in the rest of the couplet with the words “sorores”, “sunt”, “sole”, and “sati”.

118 **flores:** the sisters are turned into flowering poplar trees. Ovid, not even mentioning the type of tree, focuses on aspects of the trees other than the flowers: the “frondes” (“leaves”, 2.351), “stipite” (“trunk”, 2.351), “ramos” (“branches”, 2.352), “cortex” (“bark”, 2.353), and “electra” (“amber”, 2.365). John could have read that the trees were poplars in another source, for instance Hyginus *Fabulae* 154. Poplar trees do flower, which might account for John identifying the Heliads as flowers, supplementing Ovid’s description with a detail more particular a poplar tree. He could also be referring to some other source which identifies Heliads as a type of flower.

## Appendix: Collations of Manuscripts

E:

4 penthametro 5 9clave 6 1 clausula 7 clava 8 clarificat 10 principiisque  
 11 tipus 13 *de mutatione artificiali* / 15 *de naturali* / 17 *de mutatione mistica et magica*  
 / tipice, factos 18 est] et, tipice 19 *de eo quod quelibet pars fabule non est exponenda* /  
 22 sedens 23 *de proprietatibus elementorum* / amat] adest, mobilis at' l' altum 27 obtusas]  
 obscuro, plenas vel obtusas 29 mencio, terna] facta 30 sint 32 ter tria ter tibi, sint  
 33 numeris] nu-s 35 est/cas 36 auptomnus 40 renata] novata novat 43 cades  
 44 ostreplit 45 sub solano, volcano 46 hinc] hunc 47 cirthi 49 iuvenes] iienes  
 51 feras] ferat 54 clamidata om. 56 velque quia 59 historico] historia 62 ibi  
 67 mundus, 9floruit, vita cut off 71 tempus, patris cut off in scan 72 dicimus, mari, chao  
 (end cut off) 73 ubertas] ultas (ultimas) 74 ven- (end cut off) 76 mal- (end cut off)  
 77 uno] duo, contempta 79 ill- (end cut off) 80 parvis 81 inde ruinam] bud- (end cut  
 off) 82 arc/te 84 phlegra] superi 85 arthas, lup- (end cut off) 86 potest 87 ref-(end  
 cut off) 88 in choytu 89 par- (end cut off) 90 lapides lapides 91 ii- (end cut off)  
 93 viresc- (end cut off) 96 h- (end cut off) 98 fide vel fine 99 two new lines: quod cadit  
 in mcio fit bot dicitur yo / ut gemit esse rea(?) reddit origo dea(?) // qui] quia 100 callitate  
 102 divitias, respicit 103 recesses vel recessus 104 faux 106 nobilitas, duplex] dx  
 107 tirannos 111 phetum 112 sol 114 currum] -rum (beginning cut off)  
 115 auptomni dicitur ardor 116 cum] cut off 118 sunt] -nt (beginning cut off), patente

F:

4 et] de 7 resolvit 8 clarificat; facit 9 *De mutatione artificiali* 11 tipus, a] et  
 14 *Alludit ovidius in modo tractandi humane ut paret in hiis v(ers)ibus* 15 naturam 17 *De*  
*mutatione naturali*; v.19, vel, faiictus 18 v.20, et, tipice] etice 19 *Quelibet pars fabule non*  
*est exponenda*; v.17 20 v.18 21 *De proprietatibus elementorum*; aer et 26 aer subtilior  
 29 trina 30 m', sunt 32 ter tria ter, sunt 33 ligant 34 esse, vides (?) 35 *De quattuor*  
*elementis* 36 autumpnus, yspida 38 hyemps 39 *De sole et luna* 41 *De ventis et*  
*cardinalibus et collateralibus*; et 42 omne 44 cui boreas austrum, instreplit 45 sol solano  
 46 hic, inde]hincque 47 circa, te poscit 49 herbas iuvenesque 54 animata 55 *Quid sit*  
*fabula*; tibi factus 56 *Quid sit historia quid allegoria est integumentum* 62 causa, ibi  
 63 *Integumentum de promotheo qui formavit primum hominem*; Promothe 65 affirmans  
 67 *De primo patre*; mundi, confloruit 70 eius] huius 71 tempus 72 dicimus 73 mascula  
 75 error] ordo 76 deos om. 78 divorum, latet 79 *De illo qui primo formavit et fecit*  
*statuam*; ipsam 81 *De malicia gigantum*; inque 82 habet virtus] vinctus 83 gigantas  
 84 flagra, erat 85 *De licaone*; arcas] licaon 86 p<sup>t</sup> = potest 87 *De deucalione*; Vir] Vel  
 90 lapidum (?) lapides 92 fallentemque 94 que] sed, vita 97 *De lo*; Flato, Io 99 *De*  
*argo* 102 respicit 103 accessus 105 elodorum 107 tirannos 109 *De siringna que est*  
*instrumentum phisicorum*; siringe 110 con, vesical 111 *De Phetonte*; dicatur 112 p<sup>t</sup>  
 113 generat 115 al (?) *secundum alios actores* 116 contempto 117 Elyos eliades



G:

3 inflatur 4 penthametro; ille 5 conclave ex conclava 7 resolvit 8 clarificat 9 sit  
 10 genesin; thesin 11 ars et] ars quoque; a] aut 12 d'veniunt 13 resedit, mutacio  
 15 mutans 17 tipice, mutacio 18 est] et, stat] cum 19 omnis 26 igne] ille 27 d'movet  
 29 hec] haec (h'), mensio terna] mentio trina 30 m', sunt 31 om. 32 om. 33 concta  
 34 stabit, vices] rates 36 autompnus 40 annuus et] avulsus 41 partes multas, est] fit, ventis  
 43 sole sciens 45 Volturmo 46 Auffricus, inde] atque 48 boream aquilo  
 49 iuvenes silvas 50 pingere 51 quidve] vel quid 53 Promothea 54 clamitata  
 58 scriptum 59 verus] tectus 60 ad] dat 62 doctrine clausa 63 om. 64 om.  
 65 affirmans, laudem 70 eius] huius 71 tempus 72 dicimus, cahors 77 contempta  
 79 sibi sic et 80 adornarat 81 unde 84 flegra, fastus 85 archas, lycaon 87 generare,  
 mulieres femina fertur 88 cohitu sparmatis 90 lapidum] illi 94 nitet 97 flaco, vacca  
 98 iudice 101 tandem 102 respicit 103 ala ex alas 106 nobilitas 107 tyrannos  
 109 siringa 111 Phox, phebus 115 vere, autompni 116 contempto, turba 117 Helyas,  
 traxere

R:

4 penthametro 5 conclave 7 nodo, resolvit 8 clarificat fabulas 9 *Alludit ovidius  
 tractando conditionem humanam; mundus...mundus* 11 tipus 13 *De mutatione artificiali*  
 14 bina, vetere 15 *De mutatione naturalli* 17 *De mutatione mistica et magica; tipice, vir*  
 18 Et, tipice, statque recurit 19 *De modo exponendi fabula; omnis* 21 *De eo quod qua libet  
 pars fabule non est exponenda* 23 *de mutatione elementorum* 25 mobilis 27 demovet  
 29 mencio, trina/terna (t'na) 30 om. 31 om. 32 bis duo bis ter tria bis; ter tria ter . . . Bis  
 duo ter om. 33 quo moventur cuncta 35 *de quattuor temporibus; versilis estuat estas,  
 escas]estas* 36 Aptomnus 37 *De quinque zonis sive (?) regionibus* 41 *de ventis  
 cardinalibus et collateralibus (?)* 43 Currum, medius3 (no "Q") 45 Volturmo 46 hincque  
 47 favor -> favoni?, corrected either from favoni or to favoni 53 promothia 55 *Quid sit  
 fabula, quid historia, quid allegoria, quid integumentum* 60 tibi]datur 62 causa, que om.,  
 ibi 63 *de promotheo qui formavit primum hominem; promotheu* 65 oriri] eius 67  
 confloruit 71 tempus, servisse 72 dicimus 73 *integumentum de malicia accrescente;*  
 veteris designat tempora legis / Iupiter in superis tempora gesta geris; ubertas] libertas 79 *De  
 illo qui formavit statuam* 81 *De mali(cia) gigantum* 84 mons] mens 85 *De licha(o)ne;*  
 arthas next line om. 89 *De Deuca(lione); p(ar)antes* 90 lapidum lapides 91 *De phi(to)ne*  
 92 fallentem3 93 *De dane; h<sup>c</sup>* 94 Q' 95 *Item aliter* 97 *De yo; flaco* 99 *(De a)rgo*  
 102 respicit 103 *De alis cupidinis* 105 *De mercurio* 107 virgais, tyrannos 109 *de  
 siringa que est instrumentum phisicorum* 111 *de phetonte; dicatur* 112 splendor 115 *aliter  
 s' (secundum) alios; vere, autompni* 117 *de eliadibus; elios elyades*

U:

1 pariiis 3 falulatur, arundo 4 cursita 6 et] esse 8 clarificat 10 genesi 11 ars et] ars  
 quoque, magis 13 *De mutatione artificii Amen* 14 silva] flamma 15 *de mutatione naturali  
 que fit per summum artificem* 17 *De mutatio mistica et musica; factus est* 18 Et, flax, aquam  
 19 *Deo quod quelibet pars fabule non est exponenda; summa* 21 *De propreatibus*

*elementorum* 22 sedet, iacet 23 mobilis 28 Et, porigit 29 hic/hoc (?), mencio, trina or  
 terna 30 m', sunt 31 proporcio *om.* 32 Dic] Bis, sunt 33 cuncta] tanta 34 queque  
 35 *De iii<sup>or</sup> proprietatibus anni*; estuat estas, auget]viget 36 Autumpnus non (?), hypsida,  
 bruma comis *om.* 37 *De quinque zonis*; quia 38 yemps 39 *De sole et luna*; perorrat  
 40 anus 41 *De ventis cardinalibus et callateralibus*; est] fit, mentis 42 exigit 44 tui/cui  
 (?), obtrepit 45 volturmo 46 Africus, hincquoque, notus 47 Circine 48 boream aquilo  
 50 Sydera 52 regnant 54 clamidat 55 *Quid sit fabula quid hystoria quid allegoria quid*  
*integumentum* 57 magnantibus] quia nunciat/nuntiat 58 Scriptaque, comemoranda  
 59 historiaco 60 mares 62 causa 63 *Primo integumentum de prometheo* 65 *De primo*  
*tempore*; affirmans 67 confloruit 69 est] ab/an (ā) dittography, anticipation of the "a"  
 70 eius] huius 71 Temporis, vialia (? could be virilia), vitilia 72 Dicimus, praecipuisse  
 73 *Integumentum de saturno*; libertas 74 veneus 75 *De malicia succrescente*  
 77 contempta 79 *De illo qui primo formavit statuam*; bellus 81 *De malicia gygantum*<sup>73</sup>  
 82 primus] mundus 83 viciosaque, gygantes 84 flegra 85 archas 87 vir genuisse,  
 mulieres femina fertur 88 comitu 90 lapidum] lapide 91 phitona 93 hec *om.* 97 Teste  
 fugit flato, figi<sup>va</sup> 100 caliditate 101 tangem (?) 102 mando, respicit 104 ador, cela  
 105 eliquorum 107 sopire 110 phizica, dextra 111 inde] idem 113 Philozophi  
 115 lucidior 116 concepto 117 Elyos elyades, traxere

W:

3 arundo 4 penthametro 5 sopheris 6 et] esse; servit] signat 7 nodos] nono; secreti]  
 set(re)u 8 clarificat 10 genesi 11 ars et] ars quoque; magus] mergit; agentura  
 12 mutantque 13 *De mutatione artificii* 14 A flamma 16 geminum, variare] valere  
 17 vir] met, factus] fons est, mayce 18 Et, mayce, stat] flax 21 *De proprietatibus*  
*elementorum*; flamma, volitat] vomitat, heret] heart 22 sedent] sedat, vales, arva] avara, iacet  
 23 subalis 25 plana, immobilis 26 planas 27 ex] et 28 mcio, trina 29 ter tria ter ... bis  
 duo ter *om.*, sunt 33 cuncta] tanta 34 quoque (?), iubat 35 exestuat estas, escas] (a)estus  
 36 Autumpnusve, hypsida, bruma comis *om.* 37 zona] coma, iubet, vine 38 yemps  
 39 pererat 40 anus 41 est] fit, ventus] mentis 42 vendicat] exig<sup>t</sup> 43 candes,  
 mensque 44 obcrepit 45 vulturmo *om.* 46 inde] hincque 47 cricine 48  
 boream aquilo 50 sydera 51 colluere, vocres, inaere 52 regnant 54 fistula 55 est] et,  
 tibi] cum 56 quia *om.*, dilcat 57 hystoria, magnatibus] quia nunciat (?) 58 venturo  
 59 hystoricia 60 mares 61 vocetenus 62 clausa doctrine 63 doctrine permente  
 64 rudes] vides 65 affirmans 66 arationeque 67 confloruit 69 est] an 70 huius  
 71 tempus, milia 72 dicimus, i] T] que, precipuisse, cahos 73 libertas vincula 74 ventus  
 75 maioris 77 deo *om.*, contempta 79 sibi statuam bellus 80 adoraret 82 primus]  
 mundus, fugit *om.* 83 viciosaque 84 flegra 85 archas 87 genuisse viros mulieres femina  
 fertur 88 in coytu, semi<sup>s</sup> 89 deualion, pura 90 lapidum] lapide 91 phitona 93 hec  
*om.* 94 quod, viret] mel 97 teste fugit flato, bos] vos, fugitiva 99 ocellus 102 mundo,  
 respicit 104 ador 109 siringa 110 phisica] visica 111 idem 113 Philozophi  
 115 lucidior 116 concepto, creata 117 Elyos elyades, traxere

<sup>73</sup> From this point in U, marginal subtitles are cut off in the scan

## Bibliography

- Bale, John. *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae . . . Catalogus*. Basel: 1559.
- Blumenfeld-Kosinski, Renate. *Reading Myth: Classical Mythology and Its Interpretations in Medieval French Literature*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- Born, L.K. "The *Integumenta* on the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid by John of Garland – First Edited with Introduction and Translation." Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Chicago, 1929.
- Born, L.K. "The Manuscripts of the *Integumenta* on the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid by John of Garland." In *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 60, 1929.
- Bale, John. *Scriptorum illustrium maioris Brytanniae . . . Catalogus*. Basel: 1559.
- Calcidius. *On Plato's Timaeus*. Edited and translated by John Magee. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016.
- Clark, James G., Frank T. Coulson, and Kathryn L. McKinley. *Ovid in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Colish, Marcia L. *Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition, 400-1400*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Copeland, Rita. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Coulson, Frank T. *The Vulgate Commentary on Ovid's Metamorphoses Book 1*. Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University, 2015.
- Coulson, Frank T, Bruno Roy. *Incipitarium Ovidianum: A Finding Guide for Texts Related to the Study of Ovid in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Turnhout, BE: Brepols Publishers, 2000.
- Dronke, Peter. *Fabula: Explorations into the Uses of Myth in Medieval Platonism*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985.
- Duby, Georges. *France in the Middle Ages: 987-1460*. Cambridge, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 1993.
- Engelbrecht, Wilken. "Fulco, Arnulf, and William: Twelfth-century Views on Ovid in Orléans." *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 18 (2006): 52-73.
- Fulgentius, Fabius Planciades. *Fulgentius the Mythographer*. Translated by Leslie George Whitbread. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1971.
- Ghisalberti, Fausto. *Arnolfo d'Orleans: un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII*. Milan: U. Hoepli, 1932.

- Ghisalberti, Fausto. *Integumenta Ovidii, poemetto inedito del secolo XIII*. Messina-Milan: 1933.
- Grant, Edward. *God and Reason in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Haren, Michael. *Medieval Thought: The Western Intellectual Tradition from Antiquity to the Thirteenth Century*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Toronto, CA: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- Moog, F.P., Axel Karenberg, and Friedrich Moll. "The Catheter and its use in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages." *The Journal of Urology* 174, no. 2 (2005): 439-441.
- Morris, Rosie. "The 'Innocent and Touching Custom' of Maidens Garlands: A Field Report." *Folklore* 114, no. 3 (2003): 355-87.
- Norberg, Dag. *An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Latin Versification*. Edited by Jan Ziolkowski, translated by Grant C. Roti et al. Catholic University of America Press, 2004.
- Paetow, Louis John. *Morale Scholarium of John of Garlande. . . with an introduction on the life and works of the author*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1927.
- Spinoza, Baruch. *The Ethics*. Translated by R.H.M Elwes. 1887.  
<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3800/3800-h/3800-h.htm>
- Taylor, E. G. R. "The "De Ventis" of Matthew Paris." *Imago Mundi* 2 (1937): 23-26.
- Trevet, Nicholas. "Extracts from Trevet's Commentary on Boethius: Texts and Translations." Edited by E.T. Silk. In *Chaucer's Boece and the Medieval Tradition of Boethius*, edited by A.J. Minnis, 36-55. Cambridge, UK: D.S. Brewer, 1993.
- Wetherbee, Winthrop. *Platonism and Poetry in the Twelfth Century: the Literary Influence of the School of Chartres*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972.