



Western Michigan University  
Medieval Institute Publications/Arc Humanities Press

---

TEAMS Secular Commentary Series

Medieval Institute Publications

---

11-12-2015

## Accessus ad auctores: Medieval Introductions to the Authors (Codex latinus monacensis 19475)

Stephen M. Wheeler  
*The Pennsylvania State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/mip\\_teamssc](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/mip_teamssc)



Part of the Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons, Classical Literature and Philology Commons, and the Medieval Studies Commons

---

### Recommended Citation

Wheeler, Stephen M., "Accessus ad auctores: Medieval Introductions to the Authors (Codex latinus monacensis 19475)" (2015). *TEAMS Secular Commentary Series*. 3.  
[https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/mip\\_teamssc/3](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/mip_teamssc/3)

This Edition and/or Translation is brought to you for free and open access by the Medieval Institute Publications at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in TEAMS Secular Commentary Series by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact [wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu](mailto:wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu).





**ACCESSUS AD AUCTORES: MEDIEVAL  
INTRODUCTIONS TO THE AUTHORS**  
(Codex latinus monacensis 19475)

edited and translated by  
**Stephen M. Wheeler**



**TEAMS**

# Accessus ad auctores

## SECULAR COMMENTARY SERIES

### GENERAL EDITORS

Robert R. Edwards

Michael J. Livingston

### ADVISORY BOARD

Rita Copeland, *University of Pennsylvania*

John V. Fleming, *Princeton University*

William J. Kennedy, *Cornell University*

Alastair J. Minnis, *Yale University*

Richard J. Tarrant, *Harvard University*

The Secular Commentary Series provides modern English translations of medieval texts that analyze, annotate, and explicate classical and vernacular works. These texts date from the fourth through the sixteenth centuries, and they represent various traditions (grammatical, allegorical, exegetical, academic, and humanistic). The works they elucidate include poetry, fiction, history, philosophy, and scientific treatises. Each volume in the series contains a critical introduction and select bibliography, a clear prose translation, and notes designed to gloss difficult passages. The aim of the series is to support teaching in the broadest sense: the volumes are suitable for the classroom and serve as an aid to scholars and generalist readers across the full range of the humanities.

Medieval Institute Publications is a program of  
The Medieval Institute, College of Arts and Sciences



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

# Accessus ad auctores

Medieval Introductions to the Authors  
(Codex latinus monacensis 19475)

Edited and translated by  
Stephen M. Wheeler

TEAMS • Secular Commentary Series

MEDIEVAL INSTITUTE PUBLICATIONS  
Western Michigan University  
*Kalamazoo*

Copyright © 2015 by the Board of Trustees of Western Michigan University  
All rights reserved  
Manufactured in the United States of America  
This book is printed on acid-free paper.

**The Library of Congress has already cataloged the paperback as follows:**

Accessus ad auctores : Medieval Introductions to the Authors (Codex latinus monacensis 19475) / edited and translated by Stephen M. Wheeler.

pages cm. -- (TEAMS/Secular Commentary Series)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-58044-189-6 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Latin literature, Medieval and modern. 2. Criticism--History--To 1500.  
3. Classical literature--Study and teaching--History--To 1500. I. Wheeler,  
Stephen Michael, 1962- editor translator.

PA8112.A34 2014

870.8'003--dc23

2014011370

ISBN 978-1-58044-189-6

eISBN 978-1-58044-190-2

For Marcus and Clara

*This page intentionally left blank.*



# Contents

Acknowledgments	ix
Abbreviations	xi
Introduction	1
Accessus ad auctores: Text and Translation	25
1. <i>Ovid's Heroides</i>	26
2. <i>Ovid's Heroides</i>	26
3. <i>Prudentius's Psychomachia</i>	28
4. <i>Prudentius's Psychomachia</i>	30
5. "Cato"	32
6. <i>Avianus</i>	34
7. <i>Maximianus</i>	40
8. "Homer"	42
9. <i>Physiologus</i>	42
10. <i>Theodolus</i>	44
11. <i>Arator</i>	44
12. <i>Prosper's Epigrams</i>	46
13. <i>Sedulius</i>	46
14. <i>Ovid's Ars amatoria</i>	48
15. <i>Ovid's Remedia amoris</i>	50
16. <i>Ovid's Epistulae ex Ponto</i>	52
17. <i>Ovid's Tristia</i>	52
18. <i>Ovid's Amores</i>	54
19. <i>Ovid's Fasti</i>	56
20. <i>Lucan</i>	58
21. <i>Cicero's Stoic Paradoxes</i>	68
22. <i>Cicero's Stoic Paradoxes</i>	68
23. <i>Boethius's Consolation of Philosophy</i>	80
24. <i>Priscian's Institutiones grammaticae, Books 17–18</i>	82

25. <i>Ovid's Amores</i>	86
26. <i>Ovid's Heroïdes</i>	86
27. Horace's <i>Ars poetica, Satires, and Epistles</i>	92
28. <i>Pamphilus and Galathea</i>	98
29. <i>Thebaldus's Regula de longis et breuilbus protis</i>	100
Explanatory Notes	103
Bibliography	255
Index	267

## Acknowledgments

This volume on a famous manuscript collection of medieval introductions to ancient authors, known in modern times as the *Accessus ad auctores*, arose through my interest in the reception of Ovid's poetry in antiquity and the Middle Ages. The idea for the project began at the Freie Universität Berlin, where I held an Alexander von Humboldt Fellowship from 2000 to 2001. I developed the idea of a new translation of the *Accessus ad auctores* several years later, when my colleague Professor Robert R. Edwards, the editor of the TEAMS Secular Commentary Series, kindly welcomed it as a potential contribution to his proposed series. My initial aim was simply to provide an accurate and comprehensive translation of the *Accessus ad auctores* edited by R. B. C. Huygens. As I dug into the material, however, I discovered that Huygens's edition of the *Accessus ad auctores* does not represent with fidelity what is copied in the base manuscript Clm 19475. Consequently, because I disagreed fundamentally with the assumptions of his text, I was impelled to prepare a new critical edition of Clm 19475 as the basis for my translation. It also became clear that the value of the *Accessus ad auctores* and its importance for understanding medieval education and literary culture would be underestimated if it were not equipped with notes and bibliography.

As my aims multiplied, so have my debts. To begin with, I am grateful to Professor Widu-Wolfgang Ehlers who was my host at the Freie Universität Berlin during my Humboldt Fellowship. The same gratitude extends to Dr. Fritz Felgentreu who also commented on my work at an early stage. Throughout the course of the project I relied on the excellent services and staff of the libraries at Pennsylvania State University and benefited from the bibliographical support of Daniel Mack, former Head of the George and Sherry Middlemas Arts and Humanities Library and Tombros Librarian of Classics and Ancient Mediterranean Studies. I am also indebted to the Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig (Bibliotheca Albertina), where I worked during the summers of 2006 and 2007, and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (Lesesaal der Abteilung Handschriften und alte Drucke), where I examined the manuscripts Clm 19475 and 19474 during the summer of 2007. My research was aided again by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in the form of a sponsored visit to

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in July 2007. I owe special thanks to my host Professor Niklas Holzberg, who gave me access to his office and considerable bibliographical resources. I would also like to thank Christine Jackson-Holzberg and Isabella Wiegand for their kind support during my visit.

At different stages of the project, Professor Edwards, my editor, has given me valuable advice on the format of the Latin text, the English translation, and the notes. His careful reading and corrections of the first draft enabled me to produce a work that, I hope, will be relevant to medievalists. Michael Livingston also looked at the first draft and provided useful perspectives for making the volume user-friendly. The now-no-longer anonymous referee, Ralph J. Hexter, read the second draft of the typescript and produced a scrupulous reader's report, and many of his numerous suggestions for improvement have been incorporated into the final version. Additionally, I should say that Professor Hexter's work on the medieval Ovids and his inspiration as a teacher have helped fuel my own project. In matters concerning Ovid, the *accessus*-tradition, medieval paleography, and conventions of textual criticism, I could not have proceeded without the generous help of Frank T. Coulson, with whom I spoke and corresponded on a regular basis, and who shared his unpublished and recently published research. I have also benefited from communication with John O. Ward on Ciceronian commentary, and Wilken Engelbrecht who sent me his excellent dissertation on the *Bursarii super Ouidios* of William of Orléans, which is now deposited with Penn State University Libraries for wider circulation.

A last round of thanks is due at home. I am grateful to my colleagues in Classics and Ancient Mediterranean Studies at Penn State, as well as to my students in Medieval Latin over the years, of whom Dr. Annika Farber deserves special recognition. Additionally, I have enjoyed conversation on numerous points with Philip Baldi and Paul B. Harvey, Jr., and have profited from Gary N. Knoppers, whose Anchor Bible Commentary on the Book of Chronicles provided me with a model for my own work. My last debt of gratitude is to my wife, Denise, for her patience and encouragement.

## Abbreviations

The abbreviations of ancient Latin authors and works are, with self-explanatory exceptions, those used in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, for which see the *Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum ex quibus exempla adferuntur* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1904).

*Acc.*

*Accessus ad auctores*

Bischoff, review of *Accessus*

Bernard Bischoff. Review of *Accessus ad auctores*, edited by R. B. C. Huygens. *Scriptorium* 9 (1955): 335–36.

Boas, “*De librorum Catonianorum historia*”

M. Boas. “*De librorum Catonianorum historia atque compositione.*” *Mnemosyne* 42 (1914): 17–46.

*Brill’s New Pauly*

*Brill’s New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World*. English edition of *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, edited by Christine F. Salazar and David E. Orton. 15 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2002–10.

Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*

John M. Burnam. *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence d’après le manuscrit 413 de Valenciennes*. Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1910.

CCSL

Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina. Turnhout: Brepols, 1953–.

Clm

Codex Latinus Monacensis (abbreviation used by the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek)

CSEL

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1866–.

Franceschini

E. Franceschini. Review of *Accessus ad auctores*, edited by R. B. C. Huygens. *Aevum* 28 (1954): 94.

## Ghisalberti, "Mediaeval Biographies"

Fausto Ghisalberti. "Mediaeval Biographies of Ovid." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 9 (1946): 10–59.

## GL

Heinrich Keil, ed. *Grammatici Latini*. 7 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1855–80.

Glauche, *Schullektüre*

Günter Glauche. *Schullektüre im Mittelalter: Entstehung und Wandlungen des Lektürekansons bis 1200 nach den Quellen dargestellt*. Munich: Arbeo-Gesellschaft, 1970.

Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*

Ralph J. Hexter. *Ovid and Medieval Schooling: Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's "Ars amatoria," "Epistulae ex Ponto," and "Epistulae Heroidum"*. Munich: Arbeo-Gesellschaft, 1986.

## Hunt, "Introductions"

R. W. Hunt. "The Introductions to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century." In *Studia mediaevalia in honorem admodum Reverendi Patris Raymundi Josephi Martin*, pp. 85–112. Bruges: De Tempel, 1948. Reprinted in *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Collected Papers*, edited by G. L. Bursill-Hall, pp. 117–44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1980.

Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*

Tony Hunt. *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England, Vol. 1: Texts*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1991.

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954)

R. B. C. Huygens, ed. *Accessus ad auctores*. Berchem-Bruxelles: Latomus, Revue d'Études Latines, 1954.

Huygens, *Accessus* (1970)

R. B. C. Huygens, ed. *Accessus ad auctores. Bernard d'Utrecht. Conrad d'Hirsau: Dialogus super auctores*. 2nd ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.

*Incipitarium Ovidianum*

Frank T. Coulson and Bruno Roy. *Incipitarium Ovidianum: A Finding Guide for Texts in Latin Related to the Study of Ovid in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.

Lehmann, *Pseudo-antike Literatur*

Paul Lehmann. *Pseudo-antike Literatur des Mittelalters*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964. Reprint of edition published in Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927.

## Lewis and Short

Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Lewis. *A Latin Dictionary: Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879.

Maltby, *Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*

Robert Maltby. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1991.

Mancini, “Un commento ignoto di Remy d’Auxerre”

A. Mancini. “Un commento ignoto di Remy d’Auxerre ai *Disticha Catonis*.” *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei: Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche*, 5th ser., 11 (1902): 175–98, 369–82.

Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*

Max Manitius. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*. 3 vols. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1911–31. Reprint, 1964–65.

MBK

*Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, edited by the Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vol. 1, *Die Bistümer Konstanz und Chor*, prepared by Paul Lehmann. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1918.

MGH Auct. ant.

Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores antiquissimi. 15 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1877–1919.

MGH Poetae

Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Poetae Latini medii aevi, *Tomus I*–. 6 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1881–.

Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*

A. J. Minnis. *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*. London: Scolar Press, 1984. 2nd ed., 1988.

Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*

A. J. Minnis and A. B. Scott, eds., with the assistance of David Wallace. *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism, c. 1100–c. 1375: The Commentary-Tradition*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

MLW

Otto Prinz and Johannes Schneider, eds. *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch bis zum ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1959–.

Munk Olsen, *Classici*

Birger Munk Olsen. *I classici nel canone scolastico altomedievale*. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull’alto Medioevo, 1991.

Munk Olsen, “Recueils”

Birger Munk Olsen. “Les recueils de commentaires et d’*accessus* classiques dans les manuscrits du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle.” *Renaissanceforum* 3 (2007): 1–16.

Niermeyer

J. F. Niermeyer, ed. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

*OCD*

Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

*OLD*

P. G. W. Glare, ed. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968–82.

Otto

August Otto. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1890.

PL

J.-P. Migne, ed. *Patrologiae cursus completus*, Series Latina. 221 vols. Paris: Migne, 1844–64.

Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*

Gustavus Przychocki. *Accessus Ovidiani, Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności, Wydział Filologiczny (Dissertations of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Philological Section)*, Ser. 3, no. 4 (1911): 65–126. Reprint, Cracow: Nakładem Akademii Umiejętności, Główny Skład w Księgarni Spółki Wydawniczej Polkskiej, 1911.

Quain, “Medieval *Accessus*”

Edwin A. Quain. “The Medieval *Accessus ad auctores*.” *Traditio* 3 (1945): 215–64.

*RE*

August Friedrich von Pauly, Georg Wissowa et al., eds. *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler (A. Druckenmüller after 1948), 1894–1980.

*RLM*

Karl Halm, ed. *Rhetores Latini minores*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1863. Reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1964.

Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors”

Eva Matthews Sanford. “The Use of Classical Latin Authors in the *Libri Manuales*.” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 55 (1924): 190–248.

Tarrant, “Horace”

R. J. Tarrant. “Horace.” In *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 182–86.

Tarrant, “Lucan”

R. J. Tarrant. “Lucan.” In *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 215–18.

Tarrant, “Ovid”

R. J. Tarrant. “Ovid.” In *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 257–84.



*Texts and Transmission*

L. D. Reynolds, ed. *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*.  
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

*ThLL*

*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1900–.

## Note on References to Manuscripts

The first time a manuscript is cited, it is identified by place-name, library, and shelf mark (labeled as necessary by the abbreviation MS). Additionally, the date of the manuscript is noted in a roman numeral indicating the century (saec.). More precise dating within a century has not been given, but an exception has been made for the turn of the twelfth century (saec. XI/XII), which is not to be confused with the eleventh or twelfth century (saec. XI–XII).

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# Introduction

Vt in principiis quedam occurrunt inquirenda, . . . ita et huius libri principio quedam inquirere debemus, ut per ea bene et sapienter exquisita totum subsequens opus nobis clarius appareat. (*Accessus* to Ovid's *Remedia amoris*, Clm 19475, fol. 6ra25–6rb4)

Just as in introductions a number of things come up to be examined, . . . so too in the introduction to this book we should examine a number of things, so that through their proper and wise examination the whole of the following work may appear more clearly to us.

Medieval grammarians and schoolmasters typically began their commentaries on classical authors with a standard type of introduction called an *accessus*.<sup>1</sup> In the twelfth century, such introductions were excerpted and collected into anthologies that served as the first handbooks of literary criticism. Modern scholars refer to these collections as *accessus ad auctores* (“introductions to the authors”).<sup>2</sup> The earliest and most comprehensive example is preserved in the twelfth-century manuscript Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19475, saec. XII, which was copied at the Benedictine abbey of Tegernsee, a leading center of classical learning in southern Germany.<sup>3</sup> The purpose of this volume is to present for the first time a faithful critical edition of the anthology in Clm 19475, known by the modern title *Accessus ad auctores*, and to provide an accurate translation of it together with explanatory notes addressing different aspects of the text.<sup>4</sup>

## Origins of the *Accessus ad auctores*

As the epigraph to this introduction reminds us, an introduction is supposed to facilitate the understanding of the work that follows. Unfortunately, the *Accessus ad auctores* in Clm 19475 does not have its own introduction explaining by whom, when, where, from what sources, and for what purpose it was put together. In order to understand better the aims of the collection, it may be helpful to consider the institutional setting and educational practices that produced it.

Throughout the Middle Ages, students began their formal education by learning Latin through the art of grammar (*grammatica*), which was commonly defined as the science of interpreting the poets and historians, on the one hand, and as the theory of writing and speaking correctly, on the other.<sup>5</sup> Latin grammar provided not only a foundation for the pursuit of rhetoric and logic—the other liberal arts in the *trivium*—but also “the point of access to all of the orders of textual knowledge” including, above all, the Christian truth in the Vulgate Bible.<sup>6</sup> Schoolmasters taught the grammatical minutiae of Latin morphology, syntax, and prosody, as well as the basics of rhetorical style (tropes and figures), through the communal reading of classical authors.<sup>7</sup> Within this context, they wrote glosses and commentaries on canonical works in order to help students understand the letter and meaning of the texts they read.<sup>8</sup>

Medieval commentaries were usually headed by an *accessus* that introduced the author or book to be explained.<sup>9</sup> This preliminary section raised and answered a set of standard questions presented in the form of headings.<sup>10</sup> The number, phrasing, and arrangement of these headings were variable and changed over time. Four classic schemes of introduction, however, will have been encountered in medieval schools at the beginning of the twelfth century; for convenience, these may be identified as *Servian*, *rhetorical*, *philosophical*, and *modern*.<sup>11</sup> The Servian scheme is exemplified by the prologue to Virgil’s *Aeneid* written by Servius, the fourth-century grammarian. It consists of seven headings: *life of the poet*, *title of the work*, *genre of poem*, *intention of the writer*, *number of books*, *order of books*, and *explanation*.<sup>12</sup> The rhetorical scheme, which was favored by the influential Carolingian grammarian and commentator Remigius of Auxerre (ca. 841–908), likewise presents seven headings, but these are based on the seven circumstances or questions that classical orators use as topics for invention: *who*, *what*, *where*, *by what means*, *why*, *how*, and *when*.<sup>13</sup> The philosophical scheme can be traced back to Boethius’s introduction to his commentary on Porphyry’s *Isagoge* and is articulated into six headings: *intention of the work*, *utility*, *order of the work*, *name of the author*, *title*, and *part of philosophy under which it is classified*.<sup>14</sup> Finally, the modern scheme of introduction, which appears frequently in the *Accessus ad auctores*, is a modified version of the philosophical scheme, deploying three or four headings: *subject matter*, *intention*, *utility* (optional), and *part of philosophy under which it is classified*. Schoolmasters such as Conrad of Hirsau who were self-declared “moderns” expressed their preference for the last scheme and contrasted their method with the rhetorical circumstances used by the “ancients.”<sup>15</sup>

Although the *accessus* originated as a kind of prologue to a commentary, it evolved into an independent form of critical discourse by the beginning of

the twelfth century.<sup>16</sup> Numerous examples were composed autonomously and transmitted with the canonical works that they introduced. At the same time, compilers began to collect *accessus* into handbooks. The *Accessus ad auctores* in Clm 19475 is the earliest extant anthology of its kind, being dated in the twelfth century. It consists of twenty-nine introductions to twenty-six different works and remarkably includes ten different *accessus* to the seven major elegiac works of Ovid (three cover the *Heroides* and two the *Amores*). Two manuscripts of later date present different selections of fifteen *accessus* that also appear in Clm 19475; all three handbooks share a core set of eleven *accessus* with an emphasis on Ovid. One of the two later manuscripts is Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 242, fols. 74v–80v, which was copied toward the end of the twelfth century in Frankenthal between Speyer and Worms. The other is Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19474, pp. 59–78, produced at Tegernsee at the end of the twelfth century. Although there is evidence that the core of these three different anthologies could descend from a common source, there are enough variant readings among them to presuppose the existence of at least three other manuscript collections from which they were copied.<sup>17</sup>

Other constellations of *accessus* with different authors were compiled on a smaller scale elsewhere in Germany and northern Italy in the thirteenth century.<sup>18</sup> In particular, it became common to anthologize different introductions to Ovid. Notable assemblages of *accessus Ovidiani* are found in the manuscripts Vatican City, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1563 (six); Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Barth. 110 (twelve); Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Fabricius 29 2° (fourteen).<sup>19</sup>

The *accessus ad auctores* in Clm 19475, Pal. lat. 242, and Clm 19474 appear in handbooks designed to teach *grammatica*.<sup>20</sup> At a minimum, these anthologies provide an index of the canonical authors (*auctores*) and books read in the schools of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.<sup>21</sup> In addition to reflecting reading practices, the *accessus ad auctores* may implicitly justify the addition of certain classical authors to the canon, such as Ovid, who were not universally approved.<sup>22</sup> Indeed, when the medieval grammar curriculum first took shape in the Carolingian age, Ovid was not commonly regarded as an *auctor* suitable for a Christian education. By definition an *auctor* was an ancient writer who was respected and believed unquestioningly as a source of wisdom and truth.<sup>23</sup> For the early church fathers, the only genuine authors or books were biblical and Christian. In the early Middle Ages, students would cut their teeth reading Christian poets such as Juvenecus, Sedulius, Arator, and Prudentius. From the late Carolingian age on, however, schoolmasters began to admit a selection of

pagan poets into the curriculum because they were models of good Latin grammar and style and were morally improving.<sup>24</sup> Theological error did not necessarily vitiate their authority, because allegorical or moral interpretation could reveal a deeper philosophical truth under the false surface of their texts. By the twelfth century, a poet such as Ovid was valued because he taught (or could be made to teach) ethics that were consistent with Christianity.<sup>25</sup>

As the canon of Christian and pagan literature grew, masters or institutional centers began to produce criticism of Latin literature that ranked authors in value and organized them into pedagogical programs.<sup>26</sup> In this regard, it is helpful to compare the *Dialogus super auctores* (“Dialogue on the Authors”), a treatise that Conrad of Hirsau, a Benedictine master, wrote for his monastic students in the first half of the twelfth century.<sup>27</sup> Within the framework of this fictive dialogue between master and student, Conrad draws on the tradition of *accessus ad auctores* to introduce his own recommended reading program of twenty-one authors, Christian and pagan. Minor and major authors (*auctores minores* and *maiores*) are distinguished and arranged in ascending order of difficulty from Donatus to Virgil (*Dialogus super auctores*, p. 72.29–32). The first four minor authors are pagan: Donatus, “Cato” (*Disticha Catonis*), “Aesop” (prose paraphrase of Phaedrus), and Avianus. These provide elementary readings in Latin grammar, verse maxims, and fables (both in poetry and prose). The list of minor authors continues with the Christian poets Sedulius, Juvenius, Prosper Tiro, and Theodolus (or Theodulus). Conrad then introduces the “Romans” (*Romani*) who also appear to be the major authors. The list begins with the Christian poets Arator and Prudentius and continues with two pagan prose authors, Cicero and Sallust, the prosimetric author Boethius, and seven pagan poets: Lucan, Horace, Ovid, Juvenal, “Homer” (*Ilias Latina*), Persius, Statius, and Virgil. Although the *Dialogus super auctores* presents a more comprehensive and explicitly planned program of curricular authors than the *Accessus ad auctores* in Clm 19475, Conrad’s reception of such anthologies confirms their function as a guide to Latin literature.

Conrad pointedly diverges, however, from the *accessus ad auctores* in his assessment of Ovid, whom he is reluctant to let into his classroom. After the teacher of the *Dialogus* explains the ethical value of reading Horace, the student asks whether he needs to read Ovid: “Since such great works are available to us, through whose respectful reading we sharpen the mind and are summoned to pursue the virtues, why should morally defective writings be desired, whose sense corrupts minds that have to be kept fit by their studies? Why does Christ’s little student submit his mind to the books of Ovid,

in which, even if gold can be found in dung, the stench itself next to the gold still overpowers the seeker, albeit greedy for gold?" (*Dialogus super auctores*, p. 114.1325–30). Here the student objects ironically to the Augustinian directive to despoil pagan literature of its gold, by instancing the moral hazards of reading Ovid's books.<sup>28</sup> The master applauds the aversion to Ovid: "You are led by the spirit of reason, turning your mind away from the error of falsehood. Here's why. Even if the same author Ovid would have to be tolerated in whatever way in some of his works—that is, in the *Fasti*, *Ex Ponto*, *Nux*, and in other works—who, if he should know what is good for himself, would tolerate him croaking like a crow about love and wailing disgracefully in certain letters?" (lines 1331–35). Conrad does not go so far as to reject Ovid outright, acknowledging that his nonerotic elegiac works can be rendered acceptable in the classroom. Nonetheless, he finds the love elegies and heroic epistles intolerable, for in each case Ovid does not display the moral authority of an *auctor*.<sup>29</sup> Conrad's master goes on to reject the study of the *Metamorphoses* on the grounds of Ovid's idolatry (lines 1335–37). The ethical and theological resistance that Conrad offers to Ovid in the *Dialogus super auctores* may be ascribed to the orthodoxy of a Benedictine monk who belonged to an abbey that recently underwent the Cluniac reform.<sup>30</sup> But it may also represent one side of a literary critical debate opposing those *accessus ad auctores* that champion Ovid.

### The Arrangement and Intentions of the *Accessus ad auctores*

The anthology of *accessus* in Clm 19475 is a collaborative effort of medieval scholarship whose different layers of compilation are difficult to separate. It seems likely, however, that the final form of the work was realized by an anonymous compiler or compilers active in the monastic school of Tegernsee in the mid-twelfth century. The *accessus* themselves derive from different anonymous sources, one of which, at least, appears to have been a collection written or redacted by a single master. The anthology as a whole does not have an overarching design but appears to be made up of five smaller collections. The first three sets of *accessus* are internally ordered and coordinated with each other. The arrangement of these introductions can be appreciated through a comparison with the related compendia of *accessus* in Pal. lat. 242 and Clm 19474 in table 1.

The collection in Clm 19475 begins with a pair of introductions to Ovid's *Heroides* matched by a pair of introductions to Prudentius's *Psychomachia*. This arrangement has no analogue in Pal. lat. 242 or Clm 19474, each of which begins with "Cato" (*Disticha Catonis*), who is usually the first poet read in a grammar curriculum. The pairing of the two *accessus* to the *Heroides*

**Table 1.** Order of *accessus* in Clm 19475, Pal. lat. 242, and Clm 19474

Clm 19475	Pal. lat. 242	Clm 19474
1. Ovid, <i>Heroides</i> (I)		
2. Ovid, <i>Heroides</i> (II)		
3. Prudentius, <i>Psychomachia</i> (I)		
4. Prudentius, <i>Psychomachia</i> (II)		
5. "Cato"	1. "Cato"	1. "Cato"
6. Avianus	2. Avianus	2. Avianus
7. Maximianus	3. Maximianus	3. Prosper
8. "Homer"	4. "Homer"	4. Ovid, <i>Amores</i> (II)
9. <i>Physiologus</i>	5. <i>Physiologus</i>	5. Cicero, <i>Paradoxa Stoicorum</i> (I)
10. Theodolus	6. Theodolus	6. "Homer"
11. Arator	7. Arator	7. Arator
12. Prosper	8. Prosper	8. Ovid, <i>Ars Amatoria</i>
13. Sedulius	9. Sedulius	9. Ovid, <i>Remedia amoris</i>
14. Ovid, <i>Ars amatoria</i>	10. Prudentius, <i>Psychomachia</i> (II)	10. Theodolus
15. Ovid, <i>Remedia amoris</i>	11. Ovid, <i>Ars amatoria</i>	11. Sedulius
16. Ovid, <i>Epistulae ex Ponto</i>	12. Ovid, <i>Remedia amoris</i>	12. Ovid, <i>Heroides</i> (II)
17. Ovid, <i>Tristia</i>	13. Ovid, <i>Epistulae ex Ponto</i>	13. Prudentius, <i>Psychomachia</i> (I)
18. Ovid, <i>Amores</i> (I)	14. Ovid, <i>Tristia</i>	14. Maximianus
19. Ovid, <i>Fasti</i>	15. Ovid, <i>Heroides</i> (III)	15. <i>Physiologus</i>
20. Lucan		
21. Cicero, <i>Paradoxa Stoicorum</i> (I)		
22. Cicero, <i>Paradoxa Stoicorum</i> (II)		
23. Boethius, <i>Consolatio philosophiae</i>		
24. Priscian		
25. Ovid, <i>Amores</i> (II)		
26. Ovid, <i>Heroides</i> (III)		
27. Horace, <i>Ars, Sermones, Epistulae</i>		
28. <i>Pamphilus et Galathea</i>		
29. Thebaldus		



appears to have the purpose of illustrating two different types of approach to a popular school text. If the second *accessus* to the *Heroides* were copied from an anthology such as in Clm 19474, in which that *accessus* appears, then the copyist may have been prompted to copy in turn the *accessus* to Prudentius's *Psychomachia* that follows it (see table 1). A second *accessus* to the *Psychomachia* could then have been copied for comparison's sake from another anthology, such as in Pal. lat. 242, to illustrate an alternative type of introduction to that text. Thus, two different kinds of *accessus* were presented for two canonical authors, one pagan, the other Christian.

After the first set of four *accessus*, a second set of nine appears: "Cato" (*Disticha Catonis*), Avianus, Maximianus, "Homer" (*Ilias Latina*), *Physiologus*, Theodolus, Arator, Prosper, and Sedulius. The same sequence appears in Pal. lat. 242. It is therefore probable that the second set of *accessus* in Clm 19475 transmits the basic arrangement of an archetypal collection that treated a series of ten authors beginning with "Cato" and ending with Prudentius's *Psychomachia*.<sup>31</sup> This archetypal sequence is preserved in Pal. lat. 242 but has been varied in Clm 19475 by the transposition of Prudentius before "Cato"; as remarked above, this change of order was motivated by the design of the first set of four introductions presenting pairs of *accessus* to Ovid's *Heroides* and Prudentius's *Psychomachia*. Nonetheless, the introductions to elementary pagan and Christian poets shared by Clm 19475 and Pal. lat. 242 are relatively homogenous in form and method and could be the work of a single commentator.<sup>32</sup>

The third set of *accessus* in Clm 19475 comprises six introductions to the other major elegiac works of Ovid besides the *Heroides*: *Ars amatoria*, *Remedia amoris*, *Epistulae ex Ponto*, *Tristia*, *Amores*, and *Fasti*. These vary enough in their method to have originally been compiled from different commentaries, but the first four appear to have already been transmitted in anthologized form. The same sequence (*Ars amatoria* to *Tristia*) also appears in Pal. lat. 242. The order of the works follows Ovid's moral conversion from the confident teacher of love to the repentant exile writing letters to friends for help. The parallel arrangement of Clm 19475 and Pal. lat. 242 indicates that the Ovidian works were treated as the next stage of reading after the Christian poets.

After presenting Ovid, the anthology in Clm 19475 adds introductions from different sources and presumably for different reasons. The epic poet Lucan is introduced as an authority for Roman history. The collection then includes three different prose works on moral philosophy and grammar. First, it offers two different *accessus* to Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum*.<sup>33</sup> The copying of the second Ciceronian *accessus* includes an extensive excerpt of

a commentary on the first fifteen chapters of the *Paradoxa Stoicorum*. The anthology of *accessus* then resumes with Boethius, the author of the prosimetric *Consolatio philosophiae*. The third prose author introduced is the grammarian Priscian, whose two books on syntax, the *Priscianus minor* (“Lesser Priscian”), receive attention. After Priscian come additional introductions to Ovid’s *Amores* and *Heroides* and an omnibus introduction to Horace’s hexameter works: *Ars poetica*, *Sermones*, and *Epistulae*.

At this point the collection appears to end, and a school commentary on the *Heroides* takes up the next sixteen folios of Clm 19475.<sup>34</sup> The commentary is not preceded by an *accessus*; however, the three introductions to the *Heroides* collected in the *Accessus ad auctores* clearly prepare the way for the commentary.<sup>35</sup> Following the commentary, a fifth set of *accessus* to the “modern” texts *Pamphilus* and Thebaldus is copied as a postscript to the ancient authors introduced in the first part of the manuscript.

What does the order of *accessus* in Clm 19475 tell us about the intentions that motivated the creation of this particular anthology? The organizational principle underlying the collection is not chronological or developmental so as to qualify as a literary history in the common sense of the term.<sup>36</sup> The core of the collection in Clm 19475 that is shared with Pal. lat. 242 reflects indeed a common curriculum of authors read in twelfth-century schools; but the order of these authors follows a graded course of study from simpler to advanced reading.<sup>37</sup> We have already seen that the didactic program of Conrad’s *Dialogus super auctores* is likewise based on the student’s progress. However, there are important differences between the *Accessus ad auctores* and the *Dialogus super auctores*. Most notably, the core collection in Clm 19475 begins with elementary pagan and Christian poets and leads to the reading of Ovid’s elegiac works. Conrad discourages students from reading Ovid and explicitly blacklists some works. In the abbey of Tegernsee, however, Ovid was a privileged *auctor* as his prominent position in the *Accessus ad auctores* attests. Ten of the twenty-nine *accessus* are Ovidian. The collection begins with two *accessus* to the *Heroides* and includes another longer example near its end; it is, in turn, succeeded by a commentary on the *Heroides*. The same interest in Ovid may have motivated the compilers of Clm 19475 to follow up the *Heroides* commentary with an *accessus* to the pseudo-Ovidian *Pamphilus*, a “modern” elegiac comedy composed around 1100 that imitates Ovid’s erotic works.<sup>38</sup>

The attention given to Ovid’s elegiac and didactic poetry in the *Accessus ad auctores* is the more marked if one considers the authors that are not included in it but appear in other reading programs. For example, the grammarian Aimeric lists nine pagan authors who are golden in the *Ars*

*lectoria*: Terence, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Sallust, Lucan, Statius, Juvenal, and Persius.<sup>39</sup> Of these authors, Conrad's *Dialogus super auctores* treats everyone except Terence. Clm 19475, by contrast, contains introductions to only three of the eight authors covered by Aimeric and Conrad: Ovid, Lucan, and Horace. The silence about Virgil may be explained by the availability of Servius's introductions to his commentaries on the *Aeneid*, *Eclogues*, and *Georgics*. However, the absence of introductions to the satires of Juvenal and Persius, on the one hand, and to the mythological epics of Statius (*Thebaid* and *Achilleid*), on the other, shows a lack of interest in certain genres of hexameter poetry. Likewise, although it features Ovid's elegiac works, the *Accessus ad auctores* does not introduce his one epic work, the *Metamorphoses*, whose popularity as a school text was on the rise in twelfth-century France and Germany.<sup>40</sup>

What explanations are there for the focus on Ovidian elegy? One answer may be Ovid's suitability as a model for verse composition. Ludwig Traube called the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the *aetas Ovidiana* ("Age of Ovid") because medieval Latin poets during this time preferred writing elegiac couplets in the manner of Ovid rather than imitating the hexameter verse of Virgil, Horace, or Juvenal.<sup>41</sup> The collection of *accessus* in Clm 19475 could therefore have supported a grammatical program concerned with the composition of poetry. The aim to teach correct versification is further suggested by an *accessus* to a poem by Thebaldus that explains by example the rule governing the quantity of a word's first syllables. If the *Accessus ad auctores* was assembled around 1150, it coincided with the appearance of the first medieval arts of poetry and prose.<sup>42</sup>

By the same token, the epistolary works of Ovid receive special attention in Clm 19475 because they are also models for the art of writing letters, which was known as the *ars dictaminis*.<sup>43</sup> Ovid's *Heroides* in this regard claims pride of place in the *Accessus ad auctores* with the title of *Epistulae* and three different *accessus*; this work was regarded as an exemplary collection of love letters written by mythological heroines begging the return of their beloveds. Introductions to the *Tristitia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, which are the apologetic letters that Ovid wrote from exile requesting help from his friends in Rome, appear later in the *Accessus ad auctores*. After this collection of *accessus* to the letters of Ovid, as well as a commentary on the *Heroides*, the Tegernsee codex evinces continued interest in epistolography through the inclusion of a short treatise on salutations (fols. 42r–43r).

If the *Accessus ad auctores* establishes Ovid as an authority for the composition of Latin verse and epistles, how does it avoid the charge made by Conrad's student that the poet corrupts a Christian student's morals? The

answer, of course, is to introduce Ovid as an ethical author just like the others in the grammar curriculum who are moral exemplars and hence authorities for a virtuous life.<sup>44</sup> Some are noted for their studies in the arts or philosophy (Maximianus, Theodolus, Arator, Prosper, Sedulius); some converted to Christianity (Prudentius, Arator, Sedulius); some rejected worldly goods and honors (Prudentius, Boethius); others suffered misfortune or injustice at the hands of a tyrannical ruler (Ovid, Lucan, Boethius). Ovid is therefore read and interpreted in context with other authors, pagan and Christian, who testify to the same ethical truths. As Quain puts it, "Ovid, as an *auctor*, was the possession of the teacher of the Middle Ages and he could be used for whatever purpose the teacher wished. Anything in Ovid that was in accord with revealed truth, was God's truth from the beginning; anything that contradicted it, had to be interpreted in a way that would save, externally, the *auctor*, and that could be used for the instruction of his pupils. The medieval teacher would doubtless be amused at our suspicions of his intelligence."<sup>45</sup> The institutional pressure to moralize Ovid is evident throughout the *accessus Ovidiani*, which lay particular emphasis on the poet's moral conversion after he caused offense by writing the *Ars amatoria*. Consequently, the *Remedia amoris* assumes central importance for the medieval student's understanding of Ovid.<sup>46</sup>

The same imperative to moralize Ovid may explain why the *Accessus ad auctores* begins by juxtaposing Ovid's *Heroides* with Prudentius's *Psychomachia*. The purpose of Ovid's *Heroides* is summed up tendentiously through the introductory example of Penelope who expresses a chaste love for her husband and rejects the temptation for illicit love posed by the suitors. Ovid's introduction of Penelope's legitimate love serves as an ideal that is contrasted with the illicit or mad forms of love that other heroines confess to in their letters. The privileging of Penelope's chaste love may appear arbitrary to a modern reader.<sup>47</sup> However, it begins to make more sense when squared with the reading of a central Christian school text such as Prudentius's *Psychomachia*. The first *accessus* to the *Psychomachia* states that the poem's subject matter is Abraham and the fight within his soul waged by the Christian virtues against the pagan vices. The reading of the *Psychomachia* as Abraham's moral struggle provides a model for interpreting the *Heroides*. Penelope, like Abraham, is the site of a conflict between virtue and vice, in which virtue triumphs. In other words, Penelope's conjugal fidelity is analogous to Abraham's faith in God.

The introductory set of *accessus* in Clm 19475 foregrounds Penelope because of a curricular emphasis on reading the *Heroides* and, quite possibly, because the compilers of the manuscript intended to copy the commentary

on the work that later appears in folios 16r–31v.<sup>48</sup> The editorial decision to pair the introductions of Ovid’s Penelope with the introductions of Prudentius’s Abraham, however, may be motivated by a theory of the parallelism of pagan and biblical exemplary figures.<sup>49</sup> This theory would have been well known from another popular school text that entered the grammar curriculum around 1050: the *Eclogue* by the pseudonymous Theodolus (also titled *Ecloga Theoduli*). This medieval Christian work, perhaps composed in the tenth century, stages a singing contest in alternating quatrains between the pagan goatherd Pseustis (“Falsehood”) and the Jewish shepherdess Alithia (“Truth”). Pseustis, who has strong Ovidian affiliations, summarizes an example of Greek myth often drawn from the *Metamorphoses* while Alithia counters with a superior parallel story from the Old Testament.<sup>50</sup> The *Eclogue* of Theodolus, whose introduction is included in the *Accessus ad auctores*, thus provides a conceptual framework for the comparison of the Ovidian Penelope with the biblical Abraham.

The configuration of the remaining *accessus* in Clm 19475 reflects ideas about the order of authors in the grammar curriculum and the intellectual mission of a medieval literary education.<sup>51</sup> An introductory sequence of authors from “Cato” to Prudentius is discernible. The reading of Ovid represents a middle stage: the introductions to his works may not be in strict chronological order (the *Epistulae ex Ponto* is introduced before the *Tristia*), but they reflect his conversion from love poet to exile. After Ovid, the reader advances to historical and philosophical texts in hexameters, prose, and Menippean satire: Lucan’s epic on civil war, Cicero’s essays on Stoic maxims, Boethius’s *Consolation of Philosophy*, and Horace’s *Satires* and *Epistles*.

In sum, the *Accessus ad auctores* in Clm 19475 is not a chance convergence of unrelated introductions: it is a self-produced literary critical handbook that records the latest program for reading ancient authors that was presumably being implemented by teachers and students at Tegernsee in the mid-twelfth century. To call such a collection “literary history,” as some scholars do, may beg the question of what is meant by “history,” particularly if the authors are read synchronically to exemplify Christian ethics.<sup>52</sup> The intrinsic historical value of the collection lies rather in the interpretive methods it uses to create a unified approach to Christian and pagan writers alike. If the *Accessus ad auctores* is a singular institutional text, then a faithful edition and translation of it may provide access to a critical moment and monument in the history of literary criticism that is at once unique and paradigmatic.

### Manuscript Description of Clm 19475

The codex containing the *Accessus ad auctores* is a parchment manuscript consisting of forty-five folios in octavo format, measuring around 180 x 133 mm. The *accessus* (including the partial commentary on Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum*) are copied in folios 1r–16r and 31v.<sup>53</sup> The layout is double-columned: a typical column measures around 135 x 47 mm and is ruled to accommodate between twenty-five and thirty-one lines. The copying of the text was done mainly by three hands.<sup>54</sup> Additionally, the hands of correctors, possibly the same hands, made numerous revisions: additions of letters or words, deletions of letters or words, or alterations of letters. The titling of the *accessus* appears to have been a separate task. When the copying of a new *accessus* was begun, the scribe left space on the right side of the column for a heading in majuscule. A rubricator has applied red ink to titles and to the beginning letters of sentences, common headings in the *accessus* (*materia*, *intentio*, etc.), and quotations to help orient the reader. Occasionally, supplementary material has been added in the margins that clarifies the main text. The care that was put into assembling and copying the collection points to a concerted scribal effort to create a usable reference work. In this respect, it does not seem accidental that the *accessus* are placed at the *beginning* of the codex, reminding the reader of what one needs to know when one *begins* to read a book.<sup>55</sup>

### Editorial Principles

I have prepared the Latin text of the *Accessus ad auctores* in Clm 19475 from a microfilm and by autopsy of the manuscript at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. More recently, Clm 19475 has been digitized and assigned the universal record number urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb00034653-2. I have also collated readings from Clm 19474, which I examined first hand, and from Pal. lat. 242, whose variants I have taken from the second edition of Huygens's *Accessus ad auctores* (although the manuscript has now been digitized and has a permanent URL: [http://digi.vatlib.it/view/bav\\_pal\\_lat\\_242](http://digi.vatlib.it/view/bav_pal_lat_242)). The aim of this new critical edition is to present an accurate version of the text in Clm 19475. My policy has been to preserve the orthography and grammar of the medieval Latin as long as it is intelligible and readable.<sup>56</sup> That said, it seems potentially confusing to reproduce common orthographic variations produced by different scribal hands. Consequently, alternation in lettering between *e* and *ē* (for *ae*) or between miniscule *u* and *v* have been made consistent: miniscule *e* and *u* (but majuscule *V*) will be used. I have also corrected scribal errors that result in an ambiguous, untranslatable, or lacunose text. Correct readings can

be supplied in many cases from Pal. lat. 242 and less frequently from Clm 19474; in other cases, I have emended the text or adopted the emendations of previous editors. Such changes to the manuscript are usually not marked in the text but recorded in a separate section of the volume under the heading “Textual Notes.”

No system is adopted in the text to indicate supplements, alterations, and deletions made in Clm 19475 by the hand of a corrector (in some cases the scribe himself) or by later readers. Generally speaking, I accept the correction in the text and record it in the textual notes. On three occasions, however, square brackets [ ] are used to indicate superfluous text that has been deleted through underscoring by medieval correctors but whose presence is nonetheless significant.

Where the text is lacunose or nonsensical, the corrections and conjectures of modern editors have been adopted, often based on comparison with other manuscripts that contain similar versions of a given *accessus*. Modern editorial supplements of missing words or lines are signposted with angle brackets < >. In some cases, the text cannot be supplied. Asterisks \*\*\* have been used to mark such lacunae, with each asterisk representing a missing letter. If the lacuna’s size is indeterminate the asterisks are enclosed in angle brackets: <\*\*\*>. For corrupt text, the obelus or crux † is employed.

The scribes of Clm 19475 frequently abbreviate words and names to save space and effort. In my transcription I do not mark the expansion of standard abbreviations. However, round brackets ( ) are used when the expansion of an abbreviation is unusual or if there is orthographical uncertainty about an expansion.

A word needs also to be said about the articulation of the text. The anthology of the *accessus* in Clm 19475 is written in continuous columns with rubricated titles serving to demarcate the end of one *accessus* and the beginning of another. I have numbered each of the *accessus* according to its order in Clm 19475 and provided a modern title of the *auctor* in the contents while reproducing the medieval title in the edition of the text. I have also numbered the sentences within each *accessus* to aid reference and discussion of the text in the “Explanatory Notes.” Decisions about where sentences begin and end and what punctuation to use are mine, but I have attempted to follow the capitalization and punctuation of the manuscript, where it makes sense. Additional typographic conventions have been adopted for the sake of intelligibility. Quotation marks are used when an *accessus* quotes material from the work it introduces. However, when an *accessus* includes commentary on the text itself, the glossed text (known as a *lemma*) is set in italics.



### Earlier Editions of the *Accessus ad auctores*

Earlier editions of the *Accessus ad auctores* have sought not so much to reproduce the medieval text of Clm 19475 as to present a tidy, classicized version of individual *accessus* arranged into a new order. This edition of the *Accessus ad auctores*, by contrast, not only represents the text of the individual *accessus* as faithfully as possible, but it also respects the arrangement and integrity of the anthology as a whole. It includes, for example, previously unpublished material from a commentary on the first fifteen chapters of Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum* that had been deemed irrelevant to the anthology.

In 1911, the Polish philologist Gustav Przychocki published a dissertation titled *Accessus Ovidiani* in which he edited introductions to Ovid's works found in the manuscripts Clm 19475, Pal. lat. 242, and Clm 19474.<sup>57</sup> Przychocki normalized medieval orthography according to classical standards and emended stylistic infelicities, even when unnecessary. He also reordered the Ovidian introductions so that the third *accessus* to the *Heroides*, the twenty-sixth in Clm 19475, appears first in his collection and the first two *accessus* in Clm 19475 are presented underneath it in smaller type. Although Przychocki's collection and explication of Ovidian *accessus* pioneered the study of *accessus ad auctores*, his edition is far from definitive, as it is marred by numerous paleographical and typographical errors.<sup>58</sup>

Four decades later, R. B. C. Huygens, the Dutch philologist and editor, recognized the need for a complete edition of the *Accessus ad auctores* and collated the collections in Clm 19745 (T), Pal. lat. 242 (P), and Clm 19474 (M) to produce the first text of its kind.<sup>59</sup> In his 1954 edition, Huygens did not classicize medieval orthography as Przychocki did but sought to prove his editorial sophistication in another way. In preparing his text, he compared manuscripts according to the editorial principles identified with the nineteenth-century philologist Karl Lachmann.<sup>60</sup>

Huygens hypothesized a stemma in which T (Clm 19475) and M (Clm 19474) descended from a common manuscript  $\gamma$ , while P (Pal. lat. 242) and  $\gamma$  were derived from a hypothetical manuscript  $\beta$ , the descendant of the archetype. On this basis, Huygens improved his base manuscript T with variants from P that he alleged were closer to the truth.<sup>61</sup> His hypothetical stemma, however, did not carry conviction. The great paleographical authority Bernard Bischoff pointed out that the readings of T, P, and M disagree so much that it is impossible to construct a stemma along the lines that Huygens set out; moreover, Bischoff opined that the readings of T and M were better than the variants of P because the latter had a tendency to clarify and simplify.<sup>62</sup>

Huygens responded to Bischoff's critique of his stemma by producing



an entirely revised edition of the *Accessus ad auctores* in 1970, in which he recollated T, M, and P and added a new witness for the *accessus* to Lucan.<sup>63</sup> He also modified some of the editorial principles of the first edition by converting medieval *e* or *ę* (e.g., *ethice*) to the classical *ae* (*ethicae*) and by using *v* for consonantal *u*. In the second edition, Huygens abandoned his stemma, acknowledging that the relationships among T, M, and P were uncertain, but continued to view T as a flawed witness in the transmission of individual *accessus*.<sup>64</sup> In about forty cases he preferred “better” variants in P to acceptable readings in T. In short, Huygens did not change his original aim: to reconstruct an archetypal collection from the different manuscripts of *accessus ad auctores*.

In order to understand the distortions that such an editorial method produces in the editing of the *Accessus ad auctores* in T, it is helpful to look at the way Huygens edited the *accessus* to Lucan. He collated T with an *accessus* that prefaces a glossed text of Lucan in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 4593 (B), saec. XII, fols. 3r–4v. The two *accessus* are clearly related, but they also disagree in 193 readings reported by Huygens. In constituting his text, Huygens corrected T with a variant from B 166 times, even where the readings in T make sense. In one instance, B has nine lines of text not contained in T. Huygens grafted this additional text on T. Conversely, T also contains text that does not appear in B; Huygens included that too. The result of Huygens’s editorial method is a hybrid *accessus* that appears in neither T nor B. It is difficult to imagine that Huygens’s new version of the text is a closer approximation to a supposed archetype given the sheer number of changes. The same doubt can be voiced on a larger scale about his editions of *accessus ad auctores* that have been established through an arbitrary synthesis of different manuscripts.

The editorial approach of Huygens makes sense, of course, for establishing the text of an ancient or medieval author for which there is an archetype. But is it suitable for an anonymous collection of *accessus*, whose authorship and origins are unknown, and whose form inevitably changed in transmission, as anonymous author-editors and copyists changed, omitted, or added text? How useful or realistic is it to reconstruct an authoritative archetype for a set of texts that are inherently unstable? The transmission of individual *accessus* and *accessus ad auctores* is comparable to that of ancient commentaries about which James E. G. Zetzel observes:

The transmission of ancient commentaries . . . provides a model that is almost the complete opposite of that presupposed by the method of Lachmann. Instead of a single original, there are many; instead of an

archetype, there are multiple forms constantly present and transmitted in overlapping patterns; instead of mechanical copying from one manuscript generation to the next, there is pervasive contamination and horizontal transmission. And instead of a unified and univocal text, commentaries deliberately contain alternative and mutually contradictory explanations of the text they purport to explain: there is not one text, but many; there is not one truth, but many.<sup>65</sup>

Consequently, when Huygens extrapolates an ideal text from the manuscripts T, M, and P, he does not necessarily present a more authoritative or truer version of an archetypal *accessus ad auctores*. His editions of 1954 and 1970 are, in fact, just two more variants in the tradition. They may be easier to read and more systematic, but they do not represent the text that medieval teachers and students wrote, read, and used to understand classical and medieval literature at a particular moment in time.

This point raises another problem with Huygens's edition. Critics have repeatedly observed that Huygens changed the order of *accessus* in T, the base manuscript, in order to create a more unified collection.<sup>66</sup> Following the dubious model of Przychocki, Huygens grouped all of the Ovidian *accessus* together that are divided into three separate groups in T. This rearrangement is naturally convenient and coherent, but it also changes the original form and dynamics of the Tegernsee anthology.

Huygens took other editorial liberties with T. He corrected or added titles to the *accessus* (fourteen of twenty-nine), some of which are of his own invention. He also abridged the commentary on Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum* by more than half and printed it in a smaller font to take up less space. This editorial decision obscures the fact that the second *accessus* to Cicero together with commentary constitutes the longest single extract in T.

The divergences of Huygens's edition from the *Accessus ad auctores* in Clm 19475 (T) vary sometimes only in small degree, but in aggregate they add up to a markedly different text. Theoretically, one could reconstruct T from Huygens's critical apparatus. Yet even there the truth can be elusive. My examination of T (and M) shows that Huygens misreported or misrepresented the readings in T and M on numerous occasions.<sup>67</sup> Occasionally, he misinterpreted abbreviations. In a number of instances, he omitted readings or did not report corrections in the manuscript.

### Notes on the Latin Text

A critical apparatus is appended for each *accessus* in Clm 19475, in which are recorded corrections, relevant variant readings in other manuscripts,

and modern conjectures. Textual critics (Bischoff, Franceschini, Hexter, Huygens, Przychocki, and Quain) are referred to by name without short titles. For other references, see the table of abbreviations at the beginning of the volume.

I adopt the sigla of Huygens for the following manuscripts:

- B Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4593, fols. 3r–4v
- F Sankt Florian, Bibliothek des Augustiner-Chorherrenstifts, MS XI 587, fols. 171v–173r
- M Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19474, pp. 59–78
- P Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 242, fols. 74v–80v
- T Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19475, fols. 1r–16r, 31v

Additionally, I refer to Hexter's T<sup>19</sup> as follows:

- T<sup>20</sup> Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 29208(20, fols. 1–2

In Acc. 20, I also refer to the following manuscript:

- C Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Domblibliothek, Codex 199, fol. 1r–v

T contains numerous corrections that are duly noted, but no attempt is made to distinguish rigorously among those made in the text's production, whether by the original hand, the hands of the titler, rubricator, or an editor in the scriptorium, and those made by later readers. Rather, a simple system is adopted in which T usually refers to the original hand but could include a corrector who adds or deletes text. To clarify whether a reading is a correction, I have generally used the sign T<sup>pc</sup> to indicate the reading of T after a correction (*post correctionem*); in some cases, where the corrected text agrees with other texts, the sign T<sup>ac</sup> indicates the reading of T before a correction (*ante correctionem*).

### English Translation and Notes

A new edition of the *Accessus ad auctores* in Clm 19475 demands a new translation into English.<sup>68</sup> The translation offered in this volume attempts to steer a course between faithfulness to the Latin and readability. One area of difficulty is the translation of medieval titles of classical Latin works. Generally, I translate a medieval title into English and indicate in square brackets, if necessary, what the work's standard Latin title is in modern editions. Another area of difficulty is the variable orthography of proper names in Latin and of names and words transliterated from Greek. While the Latin text retains variant spellings, the English translation normalizes minor variations in the spelling of Latin names and in transliterated Greek either silently or with brackets. If nonstandard orthography is significant,

especially for etymologies, it is retained in the translation unapologetically, that is, without a *sic* in brackets. Brief notices should be given to the punctuation of the translation. It does not adhere to that of the Latin text in every instance but follows the rules of American usage set out in *The Chicago Manual of Style*.

Each *accessus* comes additionally equipped with “explanatory notes,” in which the introduced author or work is discussed in modern terms and situated in the context of medieval education and literature. Additionally, relevant documentation about the text of the *accessus* is given. A selected bibliography follows for each author to provide a starting point for further research.<sup>69</sup> These bibliographies come with a caveat. They pay attention mainly to the fortunes of classical authors in medieval Latin literary culture and refrain (for practical reasons) from tracking their translation and adaptation in the vernacular literatures. The text and translation of each *accessus* also receives a section of commentary containing an overview of its structure, discussion of its title, and annotations to individual sentences. The purpose of these comments is to address different kinds of problems of understanding posed by the medieval text and to spell out the theoretical assumptions and knowledge that informs the *Accessus ad auctores*.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The noun *accessus* is a deverbative (< *accedere*) belonging to the fourth declension. Its nominative plural has a long vowel in the final syllable (*accessūs*). As it is not conventional to mark long vowels in Latin outside of grammars and lexica, the reader should be aware that *accessus* could be singular or plural. For *accessus* meaning “introduction” in medieval Latin, see *MLW*, s.v. *accessus* II.A.3. The terms *initium*, *exordium*, and *principium* were also used to identify the introduction of a literary commentary. Modern scholars, however, have come to use *accessus* as the standard designation for this kind of preface or prologue. More discussion of terminology can be found in Kantorowicz, *Studies in the Glossators*, p. 38; Quain, “Medieval *Accessus*,” p. 215n1; Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, pp. 14–15.

<sup>2</sup> Quain coined the term in “Medieval *Accessus*,” p. 216, in order to designate the traditional method by which medieval commentators introduced classical authors. Subsequently, Huygens used *accessus ad auctores* as the title for two editions of the anthologies of *accessus* that are discussed later in the introduction: see Huygens, *Accessus ad auctores* (1954); Huygens, *Accessus ad Auctores* (1970). Scholars now use the term *accessus ad auctores* to designate a category of medieval literary criticism: see Minnis and Johnson, *Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, p. 2; Hexter, “From the Medieval Historiography of Latin Literature,” p. 7.

<sup>3</sup> For the provenance and rough dating of the manuscript, see Munk Olsen, “Recueils,” p. 12. Dronke, “Note on *Pamphilus*,” pp. 225–26, dates Clm 19475 around 1150.

<sup>4</sup> The term *Accessus ad auctores*, capitalized in sentence style, is used from this point on as the title for the master collection in Clm 19475, while the uncapitalized term refers to this kind of anthology.

<sup>5</sup> This definition of *grammatica* is a commonplace of late antique Latin grammarians (see Audax, *GL* 7:321; Sergius, *GL* 4:486; Marius Victorinus, *GL* 6:3–4; Maximus Victorinus, *GL* 6:188), and is also used by Carolingian grammarians such as Rabanus Maurus (*De institutione clericorum* 3.18 [PL 107:395]). The method of instilling grammar through an explanatory reading of the poets is ancient. The classical rhetorician Quintilian divides grammar into two parts: “the knowledge of speaking correctly and the detailed interpretation of the poets” (*Inst.* 1.4.2).

<sup>6</sup> For grammar as the foundation of eloquence, see Quint. *Inst.* 1.4.5 and Cassiod. *Var.* 9.21.3; as the foundation of the liberal arts, see Isidore, *Etym.* 1.5.1; John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon* 1.13. See also Irvine, *Making of Textual Culture*, whose preface (p. xiv) is quoted.

<sup>7</sup> For the role of expository reading in the medieval grammatical curriculum, see Reynolds, *Medieval Reading*, esp. pp. 28–31.

<sup>8</sup> On the “school” commentary, see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 6. For the distinction between “glosses” as discrete grammatical notes and “commentary” as a coherent and unified exposition of the text, see Reynolds, *Medieval Reading*, p. 29; Wittig, “Remigian’ Glosses,” pp. 172–73.

<sup>9</sup> See Quain, “Medieval *Accessus*,” pp. 215–16. On the essential critical difference between *accessus* and commentary, see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 8; Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, p. 14; see Brinkmann, *Mittelalterliche Hermeneutik*, pp. 4–5.

<sup>10</sup> Boethius, a sixth-century philosophical author, calls them *didascalica* (“points of instruction”) at the beginning of his commentary on Porphyry’s *Isagoge* (*In Isagogen Porphyrii commenta* 1.1; CSEL 48, 4.10–5.10), an introduction to Aristotle’s *Categorias*. On Boethius’s sources in the tradition of late antique Aristotelian commentary, see Quain, “Medieval *Accessus*,” pp. 243–64.

<sup>11</sup> The different types of introduction, their origins in the tradition of ancient commentaries, and their later development in the Middle Ages have been well studied: see Quain, “Medieval *Accessus*”; Hunt, “Introductions,” pp. 93–98; Brinkmann, *Mittelalterliche Hermeneutik*, pp. 4–10; Sandkühler, *Die frühen Dantekommentare*, pp. 24–41; Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, pp. 9–39; Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*, pp. 12–15; Wetherbee, “From Late Antiquity to the Twelfth Century,” pp. 119–20.

<sup>12</sup> Servius, *Commentarii*, 1:1–2.

<sup>13</sup> On this scheme, see Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation*, pp. 66–76; see Silvestre, “Le schéma ‘moderne’ des *accessus*”; Lutz, “One Formula of *Accessus*”; Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, pp. 16–17.

<sup>14</sup> Boethius adopted his method from late antique Greek commentaries on Aristotle: see Hunt, “Introductions,” pp. 94–96; Quain, “Medieval *Accessus*,” pp. 243–52.

<sup>15</sup> Conrad of Hirsau, *Dialogus super auctores*, p. 78.215–20. Contrast Bernard of

Utrecht, *Commentum in Theodolum*, p. 59.37–51, who opts to introduce Theodolus with the Servian rather than the modern scheme; later, however, he gives an extensive theoretical explanation of the modern scheme (pp. 66–67.201–53). See further Silvestre, “Le schéma ‘moderne’ des *accessus*,” p. 688; Tunberg, “Conrad of Hirsau,” pp. 74–75. For the modern variant of a three-heading scheme, see the “Overview” of *Acc.* 1 (“Overview”) and note to *Acc.* 3.9–10.

<sup>16</sup> Munk Olsen, “Recueils,” pp. 11–12.

<sup>17</sup> Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 3–4; Bischoff, review of *Accessus*.

<sup>18</sup> Munk Olsen, “Receuil,” p. 14; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 6.

<sup>19</sup> See *Incipitarius Ovidianum*, pp. 2–3.

<sup>20</sup> On the compilation of handbooks for pedagogical purposes in the Middle Ages, see Sanford, “Use of Classical Authors.”

<sup>21</sup> On medieval canons of school authors, see, e.g., Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 48–51 and 464–67; Glauche, *Schullektüre*; Munk Olsen, *Classici*.

<sup>22</sup> See Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 11, for the estimate that Ovid did not achieve general acceptance into the classroom until around 1050.

<sup>23</sup> On the term *auctor*, see Quain, “Medieval *Accessus*,” pp. 225–26; Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, pp. 10–12.

<sup>24</sup> The process of redeeming pagan literature begins with Augustine, who explains in *De doctrina christiana* (2.40.60) that Christians ought to despoil the pagans of the liberal arts and valuable moral precepts just as the Israelites despoiled the Egyptians of gold and silver in Exodus (3:22, 11:2, 12:35–36); these riches derive from God’s providence and should be used to preach the Gospel. For a survey of Christian strategies to appropriate pagan literature, see Quain, “Medieval *Accessus*,” pp. 222–30.

<sup>25</sup> On the teaching of ethics through the authors, see Delhaye, “L’enseignement de la philosophie morale”; Delhaye, “‘Grammatica’ et ‘Ethica’”; Jaeger, “Cathedral Schools and Humanist Learning”; see Allen, *Ethical Poetic*, pp. 3–11; Reynolds, *Medieval Reading*, pp. 14–15.

<sup>26</sup> The French grammarian Aimeric gives one of the earliest systematic classifications of the authors and books of Christian and pagan literature according to a scheme of metals (gold, silver, tin, and lead) toward the end of his prose treatise on the quantity of vowels and accent of words, the *Ars lectoria* (“Art of Reading Aloud”), written in 1086. For the text, see Aimeric, *Ars lectoria* (3), pp. 168–70; see Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 464–65; Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 72–75.

<sup>27</sup> A revised edition of the text is in Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 71–131; partial translation in Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*, pp. 39–64. For discussion, see Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 49 and 465–67; Quain, “Medieval *Accessus*,” pp. 215–17; Tunberg, “Conrad of Hirsau,” pp. 65–94; Whitbread, “Conrad of Hirsau”; Wetherbee, “From Late Antiquity to the Twelfth Century,” p. 125.

<sup>28</sup> For Augustine’s Christian interpretation of the Israelites despoiling the Egyptians of their gold, see n. 24 above. On Conrad’s use of the commonplace, see Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 466–67; Whitbread, “Conrad of Hirsau,” p. 245.

<sup>29</sup> Alexander Nequam expresses similar reservations about Ovid’s amatory poems

in the *Sacerdos ad altare accessurus*, an educational treatise written around 1200; for the text, see Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, pp. 269–70; see Alton and Wormell, “Ovid in the Mediaeval Schoolroom,” pp. 30–31.

<sup>30</sup> On Conrad’s orthodoxy, see Curtius, *European Literature*, p. 466; Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 113.

<sup>31</sup> Bischoff, review of *Accessus*, p. 335; Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 120. A similar pattern can be found in the first ten authors treated by Conrad in the *Dialogus super auctores*; see Whitbread, “Conrad of Hirsau,” pp. 239–40.

<sup>32</sup> Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 119.

<sup>33</sup> The combination and comparison of different introductions to the same work is a characteristic critical habit of the *Accessus ad auctores*. The technique of pairing together separate *accessus* on the same work generated the first set of four introductions to Ovid and Prudentius. The same compiling principle is also found internally in the *accessus* to “Homer,” which is a composite of two different introductions.

<sup>34</sup> For an edition of the commentary, see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 229–302, together with the discussion of the text in pp. 143–204.

<sup>35</sup> Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 148–51, argues that the first two *accessus* are variants of the original *accessus* that preceded the commentary copied in Clm 19475.

<sup>36</sup> It is often suggested that such an anthology represents a kind of literary history: Hunt, “Introductions,” p. 110; Sandkühler, *Dantekommentare*, p. 28; Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 154; Hexter, “From the Medieval Historiography of Latin Literature,” pp. 7–8 and 15–16; Munk Olsen, “Receuil,” p. 12. On the term “literary history,” see the useful distinctions in Harris, “What Is Literary History?”

<sup>37</sup> See Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 120.

<sup>38</sup> See Dronke, “Note on *Pamphilus*,” pp. 225–30.

<sup>39</sup> See n. 26.

<sup>40</sup> See Coulson, “Ovid’s Transformations,” pp. 42–43.

<sup>41</sup> Traube, *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie*, p. 113; see Wheeler, “Before the *Aetas Ovidiana*,” pp. 9–12.

<sup>42</sup> On the arts of poetry and prose, see Kelly, *Arts of Poetry and Prose*; cf. Faral, *Les arts poétiques*. For the large part that Ovid plays in the arts of poetry, see Alton and Wormell, “Ovid in the Mediaeval Classroom,” p. 28.

<sup>43</sup> For the emphasis on letter writing in Clm 19475, see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 144–45 with n. 22, and p. 147. On the importance of Ovid’s epistolary works as a model for medieval letter writing at the turn of the twelfth century, especially with reference to the poet Baudri of Bourgueil, see Bond, *Loving Subject*, pp. 47–53 and 61–69.

<sup>44</sup> Tarrant, “Ovid,” p. 259: “With acceptance and respectability came assimilation to medieval habits of understanding. Even when they were not interpreted allegorically (as the *Metamorphoses* often was), Ovid’s poems were read as a form of ethical discourse, and Ovid himself often seen as a serious *praeceptor morum*: a transformation that the author of the *Ars amatoria* would have relished for its incongruity,



and in which the poet of the *Metamorphoses* might have recognized a measure of justice." On the ethical reading of Ovid, see, e.g., Rand, *Ovid and His Influence*, pp. 131–34; Quain, "Medieval *Accessus*," pp. 225–26; Delhaye, "'Grammatica' et 'Ethica,'" pp. 72–74; Allen, *Ethical Poetic*, pp. 3–11; Reynolds, *Medieval Reading*, pp. 14–15.

<sup>45</sup> Quain, "Medieval *Accessus*," pp. 225–26.

<sup>46</sup> See Alexander Nequam, *Sacerdos ad altare accessurus*, p. 270: "But let him also know intimately above all the book 'On the Remedy of Love'" (sed et precipue libellum De remedio amoris familiarem habeat).

<sup>47</sup> See Quain, "Medieval *Accessus*," p. 224; Dimmick, "Ovid in the Middle Ages," p. 268.

<sup>48</sup> See Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 148–51. Hexter hypothesizes that the *Accessus ad auctores* were interpolated between the first *accessus* and the commentary on the *Heroides*. This scenario seems unlikely. It would entail believing that a preexisting anthology began asymmetrically with one *accessus* to the *Heroides* followed by a pair of *accessus* to the *Psychomachia*. The evidence of Pal. lat. 242 and Clm 19474, as well as Conrad's *Dialogus super auctores*, indicates that the norm was to begin a collection with "Cato" and Avianus. In all probability, the *Accessus ad auctores* is a unique compilation to which the commentaries on Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum* and the *Heroides* were eventually added. The juxtaposition of *accessus* collections with commentaries was not uncommon: Munk Olsen, "Receuil," p. 14, notes two twelfth-century manuscripts from Piacenza that do this, citing Riva, *La Biblioteca Capitolare*, pp. 176–77 and 197–99, on Cassetta C. 48, fr. 4 and fr. 51.

<sup>49</sup> See Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 363–64.

<sup>50</sup> See Demats, *Fabula*, p. 1; Wheeler, "Von der Lüge zur Wahrheit."

<sup>51</sup> Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*, p. 15, states: "collections of this kind . . . grew haphazardly and without any advance planning in respect of arrangement." If one looks at table 1, the assertion may be true of the collection in Clm 19474, which was copied by multiple hands and may have been assembled and produced as a school exercise. However, the parallels between the anthologies in Clm 19475 and Pal. lat. 242 are not accidental.

<sup>52</sup> See n. 36 above.

<sup>53</sup> For a fuller description of the manuscript and its contents, see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 144–46 (with bibliography); cf. Halm et al., *Catalogus codicum latinorum*, p. 249. Additional research documentation for Clm 19475 is collected and catalogued by the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek through the links *Catalogues*, *Databases*, *Special Collections*, and *Manuscripts and Modern Papers*. Accessed October 23, 2012, <http://www.bsb-muenchen.de/Forschungsdokumentation-Handschriften-br-Research-Documenta.172+M57d0acf4f16.0.html>.

<sup>54</sup> See Dronke, "Note on *Pamphilus*," p. 225, citing an unpublished report by Christine Eder; Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 154. From my autopsy of the manuscript, I tentatively conclude that the first hand copies twelve *accessus* up to the middle of the introduction to Prosper (fols. 1ra–5rb) and then is relieved by a second



hand who completes the twelfth *accessus* and continues to the end the twenty-sixth, the third *accessus* to Ovid's *Heroides* (fols. 5va–14vb.20). A third hand copies the *accessus* to Horace's *Ars Poetica*, *Sermones*, and *Epistulae* (fols. 14vb.20–16rb.5) and appears to begin copying the *Heroides* commentary beginning at fol. 16rb.6 (*pace* Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 164).

<sup>55</sup> Here one may contrast the lesser anthologies in Pal. lat. 242 and Clm 19474 that appear in the middle of codices.

<sup>56</sup> In this regard, the creative misspelling of classical names, which is routinely corrected in modern editions, may be treated as evidence for the state of medieval learning; see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 230–31.

<sup>57</sup> Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*. For a response to the dissertation, see Quain, "Medieval *Accessus*," pp. 218–22.

<sup>58</sup> On the editorial negligence of Przychocki, see Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 6–7. It is a bad omen when the first sentence of the first *accessus* on p. 80 (=Acc. 26.1) converts the subjunctive verb in the common heading *cui parti philosophiae supponatur* into the indicative *supponitur*.

<sup>59</sup> He also drew on the smaller *accessus* collection in Sankt Florian, Bibliothek des Augustiner-Chorherrenstifts, MS XI 587, saec. XIII/XIV, fols. 171v–173r, (F), which contains an *accessus* to Horace. From this point on in the volume, I will use Huygens's sigla (principally, T, P, and M) to discuss the manuscripts of the *accessus ad auctores*.

<sup>60</sup> Lachmann's method is to collect the oldest witnesses of a given text, collate them, and construct a stemma that relates the individual manuscripts to an archetype according to lines of descent determined by shared errors. That Huygens is an advocate of the editorial principles of Lachmann is clear from his book *Ars edendi*.

<sup>61</sup> Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 7–9.

<sup>62</sup> Bischoff, review of *Accessus*, p. 336.

<sup>63</sup> Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 19–53.

<sup>64</sup> Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 2–4.

<sup>65</sup> Zetzl, *Marginal Scholarship*, p. 157.

<sup>66</sup> Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 148: "Huygens, subjecting an authentic if apparently haphazard medieval ordering to a modern ideal of systematization, creates a collection that in fact never existed." Cf. Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*, p. 15.

<sup>67</sup> I have found more than two dozen examples of false readings of T. Huygens also misreported the relationships among T, M, and P. For instance, in his text of *Accessus Ovidii Epistolarum* (II), he printed *Ulixē* rather than the incorrect *Uluxi* transmitted by T (*Accessus* [1970], 30.18). The critical apparatus indicates that *Ulixē* is found in M. In fact, T and M share the error *Uluxi*. The source for *Ulixē* is Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*, p. 83, who emended T and M. A different kind of false report occurs in the *Accessus Maximiani*. Huygens attributed the readings *quemlibet dehortari* (7) and *libri est* (8) to T and M, while noting that P has the variant readings *dehortari quemlibet* and *est libri*. However, the scribe of M wrote *dehor(ta)ri quemlibet*

and *est libri* agreeing with P rather than T.

<sup>68</sup> Parts of Huygens's edition have been translated with varying degrees of fidelity. Elliott, "*Accessus ad auctores*," gives versions of the ten Ovidian *accessus*. Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*, pp. 15–36, translate about 60 percent of Huygens's text including the ten Ovidian *accessus* and ten others ("Cato," Avianus, "Homer," *Physiologus*, Theodolus, Arator, Sedulius, Cicero, Priscian, and Horace).

<sup>69</sup> In the explanatory notes, frequently cited primary and secondary works are generally presented by short title or abbreviation and documented fully in the list of abbreviations at the beginning of the volume. Less frequently cited secondary literature is documented fully the first time and referred to by short title thereafter, but can also be referenced in the bibliography. Editions of primary sources are listed in the bibliography.

Accessus ad auctores  
Text and Translation

## Accessus ad auctores

### 1. Accessus Ouidii epistolarum

1. Intentio huius operis est reprehendere masculos et feminas stulto et illicito amore detentos. 2. Materia huius sunt heroes et matrone. 3. Ethice subponitur que morum instructoria est et exstirpatrix malorum. 4. In hac prima epistola commendatur Penelope legitimum seruans amorem, et econtra non idem agentes reprehenduntur. 5. Vlixes unus Grecorum fuit qui ad exstruendam Troiam uenerant. 6. Vbi quia in multis deos offenderat, cum in patriam reuersurus esset, septem annis errauit. 7. Penelope uero ipsius coniux cum a plerisque procis sollicitaretur, omnes aspernata desiderio solius mariti. 8. Que cum ignoraret ubi esset, mittit ei hanc epistolam que si inueniri possit ad eum deferatur.

### 2. ITEM

1. Sciendum est Ouidium Rome primum scripsisse epistolas non imitando quemquam Romanorum, quorum quippe poeta nullus adhuc scripserat epistolas, [fol. 1ra26 | fol. 1rb1] set quendam Grecum cuius uiderat epistolas. 2. Epistola autem dicitur supramissa, quia supra uerba mittat. 3. Materia Ouidii est in hoc opere tam mittentes quam quibus mittuntur epistole. 4. Intentio sua est legitimum commendare conubium uel amorem, et secundum hoc triplici modo tractat de ipso amore, scilicet de legitimo, de illicito et stulto: de legitimo per Penolopen, de illicito per Canacem, de stulto per Phillidem. 5. Set has duas partes, scilicet stulti et illiciti, non causa ipsarum, uerum gratia illius tercie commendandi interserit, et sic commendando legitimum, stultum et illicitum reprehendit. 6. Ethice subiacet quia bonorum morum est instructor, malorum uero exstirpator. 7. Finalis causa talis est, ut uisa utilitate que ex legitimo procedit, et infortuniis, que ex stulto et illicito solent prosequi, hunc utrumque fugiamus et soli casto adhareamus. [fol. 1rb26 | fol. 1va1] 8. In hac itaque prima epistola intentio est mittentis Penolopes, que sibi ab Vluxe obici possint, remouere obiectiones, et ut reuerti properet, et multas domi

*Acc. 1 T*

5 exstruendam] destruendam *Bischoff, Franceschini, Huygens*

7 aspernata] aspernata <est> *Przychocki*

*Acc. 2 TM*

5 tercie commendandi] tercie commendande *T<sup>20</sup>*: tercii commendandi *Huygens*

8 Vluxe] Vluxe *is an emendation by Przychocki; Huygens falsely ascribes the reading to M*

## Introductions to the Authors

### 1. Introduction to *Ovid's Epistles [Heroides]*

1. The intention of this work is to reproach men and women held captive by foolish and illicit love. 2. Its subject matter is heroes and ladies. 3. It is classified under ethics, which is a teacher of manners and an eradicator of faults. 4. In this first epistle Penelope is praised for maintaining her lawful love, and, by contrast, those who do not do the same are reproached. 5. Ulysses was one of the Greeks who had come to lay waste to Troy. 6. And because he had offended the gods in many ways there, when he was going to return to his country, he wandered seven years. 7. But Penelope, his wife, although she was tempted to remarry by very many suitors, spurned them all out of desire for her husband alone. 8. Since she did not know where he was, she sends this epistle to him, to be delivered to him if he could be found.

### 2. Again [Introduction to *Ovid's Epistles*]

1. One should know that in Rome Ovid was the first to have written epistles, not by imitating anyone of the Romans, of whom namely no poet had as yet written epistles, but by imitating a certain Greek whose epistles he had seen. 2. Moreover, "epistle" means "sent over," because it "sends" words "over." 3. The subject matter of Ovid in this work is as much the senders as those to whom the epistles are sent. 4. His intention is to commend lawful marriage or love, and he deals with love specifically according to this threefold typology, namely, lawful, illicit, and foolish love: lawful love through Penelope [*Her.* 1]; illicit love through Canace [*Her.* 11]; and foolish love through Phyllis [*Her.* 2]. 5. Yet he inserts these two parts, namely of foolish and of illicit love, not for their own sake, but for the sake of praising that third part, and so by commending lawful love, he reproaches foolish and illicit love. 6. He is classified under ethics because he is an instructor of good manners and an eradicator of bad. 7. The final cause is such that, after the benefit that comes from lawful love has been seen, and after the misfortunes that usually proceed from foolish and illicit love have been seen, we avoid each of the latter and cleave to virtuous love alone. 8. So in this first epistle the intention of the sender Penelope is to set aside the objections that could be made against her by Ulysses, and that he hasten to return, and she points out at home the many

diutine more ostendit incommoditates. 9. Et iste Vlixes in obsidione Troie in multis deos offenderat; post destructionem Troie uolens redire in patriam suam septem annis errauit in mari. 10. Cuius uxor Penolopes inuiolabiliter conseruans copulam ob ipsius gratiam multos se sepe petentes aspernabatur, et ignorans ubi sit, scripsit ei hanc epistolam, que si alicubi inueniatur ipsi tribuatur. 11. Et dicit Ouidius in persona Penolopes: “O Vlixee hanc salutem uel hanc epistolam mittit tibi Pen(olope). Ipsa dico assidue perseuerans in tuo amore; tibi dico lento in reditu.”

### 3. ACCESSVS PRVDENTII Phsicomachie

1. Prudentius genere Terraconensis esse dicitur. 2. Terraconia quedam fuit regio serpentibus inhabitabilis, modo autem habitabilis facta. 3. Studuit autem et ad tantum peruenit honorem, ut ter consulatus ascenderet dignitatem. 4. Iam fidem recipiens et factus Christianus plurimos [fol. 1va25 | fol. 1vb1] libros composuit de diuinitate. 5. Ad quorundam differentiam scripsit Phichomachiam, id est de pugna anime: psiche anima, machia pugna dicitur. 6. Intentio eius est istam inuisibilem rem nobis facere uisibilem, quia quod oculis subiacet facilius uidetur quam quod auditur. 7. Principalis materia est Abram, secunda secularia, omne quod introducitur. 8. Cui autem parti philosophie subponatur non dubitatur quia ethice subponitur. 9. Absque his multa apud ueteres solebant inquiri, scilicet “quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando.” 10. His autem positis utpote non adeo necessariis, tria quorundam more magistrorum, scilicet ea que proposuimus, inquiruntur. 11. Titulus uero a nomine Titan dicitur, quia sicut hinc uniuersa illuminantur, sic per titulum subsequens opus manifestatur. 12. “Incipit,” id est intus capit, “Liber Aurelii Prudentii.” 13. Liber dicitur a liberando uel a librando, liberando quia nos legendo liberat ab errore, librando quia intentionem cum materia librat, et materiam cum intentione, quia si scriberet de monte uel huiusmodi nihil esset ad hanc rem. [fol. 1vb25 | fol. 2ra1] 14. Solebant autem philosophi alicuius auspiciati nomine nominare. 15. Ergo iste Aurelius

*Acc. 3 TM*

*Title: phsicomachie T<sup>pc</sup>: YMNORUM T: no title in M*

*1 Terraconensis T: Draconensis T<sup>pc</sup>: Traconensis M*

*2 Terraconia T: Draconia T<sup>pc</sup>: Traconia M*

*5 differentiam] deferentiam Bischoff*

*7 secunda secularia] secundaria Bischoff, Huygens*

difficulties of his long delay. 9. And this Ulysses had offended the gods in many ways during the siege of Troy; though wishing to return to his country after the destruction of Troy, he wandered seven years on the sea. 10. His wife, Penelope, was preserving their marriage chastely and for his very sake kept rejecting the many men who were often wooing her, and, since she did not know where he was, she wrote him this letter, to be given to him, if he should be found somewhere. 11. And Ovid speaks in the character of Penelope: “O Ulysses! Penelope sends this greeting or this epistle to you. I myself am speaking, who am continually persevering in my love for you; I am speaking to you, slow in your return home” [cf. *Her.* 1.1–2].

### 3. Introduction to *Prudentius's Psychomachia*

1. Prudentius is said to be from Terraconia [Tarraco] by birth. 2. Terraconia was a certain region uninhabitable because of snakes; however, it has lately become habitable. 3. He pursued his studies, however, and came to such great honor that three times he rose to the office of consul. 4. Thereafter, accepting the faith and having become Christian, he wrote very many books about divinity. 5. In response to the disagreement of certain men, he wrote *Psychomachia*, that is, on “the battle of the soul”: *psyche* means “soul” and *machia* means “battle.” 6. His intention is to make visible for us this invisible phenomenon, because that which lies before the eyes is perceived more easily than that which is heard. 7. His primary subject matter is Abram; the secondary subject matter, worldly things, is everything else that is introduced. 8. Moreover, there is no doubt about the part of philosophy under which it is classified, because it is classified under ethics. 9. Apart from these things, many things were examined in the writings of the ancients: namely, who, what, where, by what means, why, how, when. 10. However, these questions have been put aside on the grounds that they are not so important, and three things, namely those that we have stated, are being examined after the manner of certain teachers. 11. *Title* is, in truth, derived from the name “Titan,” because just as all things collectively are illuminated from this source, so the work that follows is made clear through the title. 12. “Here Begins” [*incipit*], that is, takes inside [*intus capit*], “the Book of Aurelius Prudentius.” 13. *Book* [*liber*] gets its name from “freeing” [*liberando*] or from “balancing” [*librando*]: from “freeing” because it frees us from error through reading; from “balancing” because it balances the intention together with the subject matter and the subject matter together with the intention, because if he were writing about a mountain or something of this kind, it would have nothing to do with this matter. 14. Additionally, philosophers were accustomed to give their name after the name of something auspicious. 15. Hence, this “Aurelius” is

decorus est, quasi aureo ore loquens. 16. Prudentius non sine causa dicitur, multi enim sunt sapientes, set non prudentes, quia iste utrumque fuit. 17. Principales uirtutes quatuor sunt: fortitudo, iusticia, temperantia, prudentia. 18. Fortitudo est cum utilitate laborum et periculorum susceptio. 19. Iusticia est meritis suis exhibens dignitatem. 20. Temperantia est cum discretione moderationis queque facere. 21. Prudentia est diuinarum et humanarum rerum loco et tempore cognitio. 22. Quibus uirtutibus unaqueque anima fidelis spirituali professione munita, contra omnes spiritalis nequicias pugnatu diuina gratia preualere poterit.

#### 4. ITEM aliter, ACCESSVS PRVDENTII PHICHOMACHIE

1. Prudentius Draconensis fuisse dicitur. 2. Draconia est regio modo inhabitabilis serpentibus. 3. Rome autem didicit literas et ad tantam uirtutem peruenit quod ter ascendit consulatum. 4. Ad ultimum autem fidem recipiens et factus est Christianus. 5. Scripsit quosdam libros de diuinitate, inter [fol. 2ra25 | fol. 2rb1] quos etiam hunc composuit, uocans eum Phychomachiam, id est anime pugnam. 6. Est enim huius libri titulus: “Aurelii Prudentii Clementis incipit liber Phicom(achie).” 7. Psyschos Grece, Latine pugna dicitur, machia anima, inde psycomachia, id est pugna anime. 8. Descripsit enim in hoc libro uirtutes uisibiliter cum uiciis pugnantes que pugna pertinet ad animam. 9. Virtutes enim fundantur in anima. 10. Ideo materia sua uirtutes sunt et uicia adinuicem confligentia corporaliter. 11. Incorporreas res istas ideo uisibiliter et corporaliter ostendit pugnantes, ut per hoc magis excitet mentes hominum ad talem pugnam. 12. Facilius enim et cicius commouet hominem quod uidetur quam quod non uidetur, set solum auditur. 13. Intentio sua est nos hortari ad appetitum uirtutum et contemptum uiciorum; ad talem enim pugnam quosque fideles hortatur, quia etsi laboret corpus in tali pugna, anima tamen, que dignior pars est in homine, si legitime certauerit, eterna premia possidebit. 14. In principio autem libri Abraham nobis proponit exemplum, insinuans nobis quod merito debemus pugnare, precipue [fol. 2rb25 | fol. 2va1] ideo quia habemus exemplum pugnandi per illum. 15. Sicut enim pugnavit et hostes dei adiutorio superauit, per quos

*Acc. 4 TP*

*Title: ITEM aliter T, in the lower margin is added ACCESSVS PRVDENTII PHICHOMACHIE: Inicium Prudentii P*

1 Traconensis *P<sup>pc</sup>*: Troconensis *P*

2 Traconia *P*

7 psyschos *T*: psychos enim *P*

13 appetitum *T*: appetitum *P*



fitting, since he is speaking, as it were, “with a golden mouth” [*aureo ore*]. 16. He is called “Prudentius” not without reason (for many men are wise, but not prudent), because he was both wise and prudent. 17. There are four cardinal virtues: fortitude, justice, temperance, and prudence. 18. Fortitude is usefully undertaking hardships and dangers. 19. Justice is displaying esteem to men as they deserve. 20. Temperance is to do each thing with discrimination and moderation. 21. Prudence is the knowledge of divine and human things in place and time. 22. Fortified by these virtues, each soul faithful in its spiritual calling will be able to prevail by divine grace when it is going to fight against all spiritual depravities.

#### 4. Again, alternatively: Introduction to *Prudentius’s Psychomachia*

1. Prudentius is said to have been from Draconia. 2. Draconia is a region now uninhabitable because of snakes. 3. He was schooled, however, in Rome and came to virtue so great that he rose to the consulate three times. 4. At last, moreover, upon accepting the faith, he also became Christian. 5. He wrote some books about divinity, among which he also wrote this one, calling it *Psychomachia*, that is, “the battle of the soul.” 6. The title of this book, in fact, is: “Here Begins Aurelius Prudentius Clemens’s Book of the *Psychomachia*.” 7. *Psychos* in Greek [*psyche* = “soul”] means “battle” in Latin while *machia* means “soul”: hence *psychomachia*, that is, “battle of the soul.” 8. For he has described in this book the virtues fighting visibly with the vices, which battle pertains to the soul. 9. For the virtues are founded in the soul. 10. Therefore, his subject matter is the virtues and the vices, while they fight against one another in bodily form. 11. He shows these bodiless things fighting visibly and bodily for this reason that he may thereby stir the minds of men more to such a battle. 12. For that which is seen moves a man more easily and quickly than that which is not seen but only heard. 13. His intention is to exhort us to the desire for virtues and the disdain for vices; in fact, he exhorts each faithful man to such a battle because, even if the body should suffer in such a battle, nevertheless the soul, which is the worthier part in a man, will possess eternal rewards if it fights lawfully. 14. Moreover, in the beginning of the book, he sets forth Abraham as an example for us and recommends to us that we ought to fight worthily, chiefly on account of this, because through him we have an example of fighting. 15. For just as he himself fought and with the help of God overcame his enemies—through whom the vices

uicia intelliguntur, deo credit, credendo eterna premia possedit, sic nos nimirum uiciis congressi uincemus et regna celestia possidebimus. 16. Vtilitas est ut sciamus qualiter armati uirtutibus uiciis resistere debeamus. 17. Ethice, id est morali scientie, subponitur, quia de morum instructione loquitur. 18. Accessus [ad literam uel] ad librum est: “Abraham credit deo et rep(utatum) est ei in iu(sticiam), ergo et uos credite.” 19. Proponit etiam ut alii poete, et inuocat et narrat: proponit ubi dicit: “Senex f(idelis)”; inuocat ubi dicit: <“Christe graues”; narrat:>: “Prima petit campum.”

### 5. ACCES(SVS) Catonis

1. DVO Catones erant Rome, Censorinus et Vticensis Cato. 2. Ideo Censorinus dicitur Cato quia bonus iudex erat, et bene et iuste de omnibus iudicabat. 3. Ideo autem Vticensis Cato dicitur quia deicit Vticam que est regio in Romano imperio. 4. Set Censorinus Cato cum uideret iuuenes et puellas in magno errore uersari, scripsit hunc libellum ad filium suum, insinuans ei rationem bene uiuendi, et per eum docens cunctos homines ut iuste et caste uiuant. 5. Alii dicunt quod huic libello nomen non ab auctore set a materia sit inditum; catus enim sa [fol. 2va29 | fol. 2vb1] piens dicitur. 6. Dicitur autem scripsisse ad filium, ut eo utiliora collegisse uideatur. 7. Materia eius sunt precepta bene et caste uiuendi. 8. Intentio eius est representare nobis qua uia tendamus ad ueram salutem, et diligenter eam appetamus, et omni studio inquiramus, non ad tempus, set perseueranter. 9. Vtilitas est hunc librum legentibus ut uitam suam instituere agnoscant. 10. Ethice subponitur quia ad utilitatem maxime nititur. 11. Premittit itaque prologum in quo nos attentos, dociles, beniuolos fieri desiderat. 12. Quippe dum dicit “grauiter,” attentos nos reddit. 13. Dum uero dicit ubi errorem illum intellexerit, scilicet “in uia morum,” in ipsorum morum consideratione dociles nos reddit; dum autem uocat nos filios, dicens “Fili karissime,” beniuolos nos reddit.

18 ad literam uel *is deleted in T and omitted in P* in iu(sticiam) *T: ad iusticiam P, cf. Gen. 15:6*  
 19 <“Christe graues” narrat> *is my supplement: inuocat ubi dicit (lacuna) Prima petit campum*  
*T: inuocat Christe graues narrat Prima petit campum P*

*Acc. 5 TMP*

*Title: no title in P*

1 Censorinus *T: Censorinus Cato MP*

6 filium *TM: filium suum P*

8 et *TM: et ut P*

10 ad utilitatem maxime *TM: ad morum utilitatem P*

11 attentos] intentos *T<sup>ac</sup>*

are understood—and just as he believed in God and by believing possessed eternal rewards, so after having fought with the vices, we will doubtless be victorious and possess the kingdom of heaven. 16. The utility is that we know how, armed with virtues, we ought to resist vices. 17. He is classified under ethics, that is, the knowledge of morality, because he speaks about the teaching of moral behavior. 18. The introduction *to the literal commentary* or to the book is [text in italics deleted by another hand]: “Abraham believed in God and had a reputation for justice; therefore, believe you too” [Gen. 15:6]. 19. He also states his purpose just as other poets do and invokes and narrates: he states his purpose when he says: “Faithful elder” [*Psych. praef.* 1]; he invokes <when he says: “Christ, the heavy” [*Psych.* 1]; he narrates>: “She first seeks the battlefield” [*Psych.* 21].

### 5. Introduction to *Cato [Disticha Catonis]*

1. There were two Catos in Rome, Cato the Censor and Cato of Utica. 2. Cato is called “the Censor” because he was a good judge and passed judgment about all men both well and justly. 3. On the other hand, Cato is called “of Utica” because he conquered Utica, which is a region in the Roman Empire. 4. But it was Cato the Censor who, as he saw that young men and women were living in great error, wrote this little book to his son, introducing to him a regimen for living well and, through him, teaching all men to live justly and uprightly. 5. Others say that the name was given to this little book not from the author but from the subject matter, for *catius* means “wise.” 6. Furthermore, he is said to have written to his son so that for this reason he may appear to have made a more useful collection. 7. His subject matter is rules for living well and uprightly. 8. His intention is to show us by what way we are to direct our course to true salvation and desire it assiduously and search for it with complete devotion, not to suit the occasion, but persistently. 9. The utility for those reading this book is that they learn to regulate their life. 10. He is classified under ethics, because he strives very greatly for utility. 11. And so he prefixes a prologue in which he wants us to become attentive, ready to learn, and well disposed. 12. For in fact when he says “seriously,” he makes us attentive. 13. But when he says where he understood that error, namely “in the way of moral conduct,” he makes us ready to learn in contemplating moral conduct itself; moreover, when he calls us sons, saying, “dearest son,” he makes us well disposed.

## 6. ACC(ESSVS) AVIANI

1. ISTE liber intitulatur Auianus; et fuit Romanus ciuis, quem rogauit quidam Theodosius nobilis Romanus ut scriberet sibi aliquas fabulas in quibus delectaretur. 2. Cuius rogatui Auianus satisfaciens, scripsit ei quasdam fabulas, in quibus non solum ualuit delectari uerum etiam allegoricum sensum in singulis notare, quoniam habet unaqueque fabula suam intentionem et suam moralitatem. 3. Fabule autem [fol. 2vb29 | fol. 3ra1] sunt aut Libistice aut Hesopice. 4. Sunt autem fabule Libistice cum hominum cum bestiis, uel bestiarum cum hominibus fingitur uocis esse commertium. 5. Hesopice uero sunt cum animalia inter se sermocinari finguntur, uel que animata non sunt ut arbores et similia. 6. Materia eius sunt ipse fabule, et commune proficuum allegorie. 7. Intentio eius est delectari nos in fabulis, et prodesse in correctione morum. 8. Vtilitas eius est delectatio poematis et correctio morum. 9. Ethice subponitur, quia tractat de correctione morum.

10. *Rustica def(lentem)* (i). Hic hortatur ne temere credamus omni promittenti, ne dampnum incurramus, ut lupus seductus a femina.

11. *Pennatis auibus* (ii). Hic monet nequis sue nature terminum excedat, set uiuat contentus propriis, ne cum indignus sit gloria magis acquirat sibi contumeliam, et hoc per testudinem.

12. *Curua r(etro)* (iii). Hic suadet nequis in alio notet quod in se uicium reprehendi potest.

13. *I<n>mitis* (iv). Corrigit superbos qui solis minis alienam uirtutem uolunt superare.

14. *Metiri* (v). Hic, ne quis sibi alienam uirtutem tribuat ne irrideatur, et deponatur ut asinus.

15. *Edita* (vi). Hic reprehendit eos [fol. 3ra29 | fol. 3rb1] qui simulant se habere artem et non habent, et aliis prodesse, cum sibi nequeant, et hec per ranam, que dicebat se percipisse artem medicine cum esset pallida.

16. *Haut fa(cile)* (vii). Hic reprehendit subdolos sub ouina pelle, qui morsu detractionis mordent alios, quod si a cauentibus ne ledantur conducti fuerint precio, putant sibi id dari pro meritis, cum digni sint supplicio.

Acc. 6 TMP

Title: Inicium Auiani P

7 delectari TM: delectare Huygens: delectionem dare P:

13 imitis T: inimitis MP

14 hic TM: hic monet P: quis] quisquis T<sup>ac</sup>: uirtutem tribuat TM: laudem attribuat P

## 6. Introduction to *Avianus*

1. This book is entitled *Avianus*; Avianus was also a Roman citizen whom a certain Theodosius, a Roman nobleman, asked to write some fables for him in which he could take pleasure. 2. In satisfying the request of this man, Avianus wrote certain fables for him in which he could not only take pleasure but also observe the allegorical meaning one by one, because each fable has its own intention and moral. 3. Fables, moreover, are either Libyan or Aesopic. 4. They are Libyan, on the one hand, when the conversation is imagined to be of men with beasts or of beasts with men. 5. They are Aesopic, on the other hand, when animals are imagined to converse among themselves, or things are imagined to converse among themselves that are not animate, such as trees and similar things. 6. The fables themselves are his subject matter as well as the universal benefit of the allegory. 7. His intention is to please us in the fables and to be of use in the improvement of manners. 8. His utility is the pleasure of his poetry and the improvement of manners. 9. He is classified under ethics because he discusses the improvement of manners.

10. *The Nurse and the Child* (i). Here he urges us not to trust thoughtlessly everyone who makes a promise so that we may not meet with harm, just as the wolf after he has been led astray by the woman.

11. *The Tortoise and the Eagle* (ii). Here he warns that no one go beyond the limit of his nature but live content with his own lot so that when he is unworthy of his glory he may not rather obtain for himself rough treatment, and this is illustrated through the tortoise.

12. *The Crab and Its Mother* (iii). Here he recommends that no one censure in another person what can be reproached as a fault in oneself.

13. *The Wind and Sun* (iv). He corrects arrogant men who want to surpass another man's virtue with threats alone.

14. *The Ass Clothed in the Lion's Skin* (v). Here, let no one credit another man's virtue to one's own account, lest he be mocked and put down just as the ass.

15. *The Frog and the Fox* (vi). Here he reproaches those who pretend they have a skill and do not have it and pretend to be of use to others, although they are unable to be of use to themselves, and this is illustrated through the frog who kept saying that she knew the art of medicine although she was sickly.

16. *The Dog That Did Not Want to Bark* (vii). Here he reproaches deceitful men in sheep's clothes who hurt others with the bite of slander, but if they are bribed by those who are taking precaution not to be injured, they suppose that this bribe is given to them in recognition of their merits, although they are worthy of punishment.

17. *Contentum p(ropriis)* (viii). Monetur ne cum altiora nimiis uiribus nostris cupimus magis inde humiliemur, ut camelus qui iura sue nature despiciens, melioraque cupiens, magis humilatus fingitur accepisse deteriora.

18. *Montibus* (ix). Monet nequis inconsiderate nimis <eligat> sibi socium nisi iam probatum.

19. *Caluus* (x). Admonet siquis uidet merito derisum se a sociis, ne grauius ferat, set iocis interpositis risum deducat.

20. *Eripiens* (xi). Hic monet ne congregiamur sponte cum superioribus, et illos uolentes uitemus.

21. *Rusticus* (xii). Hoc, ut retribuamus qui nobis profuerunt, quia si defuerit, iterum succurrent.

22. *Inmensum* (xiii). Hic, ne obpressis aliquo casu noceamus, set iuueamus, ut et ipsi nobis pendant si indigemus.

23. *Iupiter* (xiv). Nequis uelit sua laudare cum non sint laudanda, set relinquunt alieno iudicio [fol. 3rb39 | fol. 3va1] discutienda, nam nullam gloriam set sepe sibi risum procreant, ut simia in laude filii.

24. *Treicia(m) u(olucrum)* (xv). Monet ne super amicos et socios nostros extollamur, ne hinc obprobrium sustineamus a grue.

25. *Montibus e s(ummis)* (xvi). Hic reprehendit arrogantes qui uolunt resistere prelatis suis, nam dum hoc uolunt, suimet dampnum incurrunt, ut quercus que resistebat uento.

26. *Venator* (xvii). Hic reprehendit stultos qui parant alios defendere, cum se ipsos non possunt, sicut tygris non potuit percussa a uenatore. 27. Per uenatorem possumus accipere aliquem probum et ualentem, quem cum ledere uoluerit stultus, ab eo leditur.

28. *Quatuor* (xviii). Per fidem ruptam inter iuuenos amicos amicis monet coherere firmiter ne possint disiungi.

29. *Horrentes* (xix). Per abietem disuadet iactare de diuitiis quia sunt instabiles, et cum putantur teneri amittuntur.

17 monetur *TM*: monet *P* nimiis *TM*: nimis *P*

18 eligat *P*: omitted in *TM*

21 hic *TM*: hic monet *P*

23 relinquunt *TM*: relinquat *P* procreant *TM*: procreat *P*

24 sustineamus *TM*: sustineamus ut pauo *P*

29 disuadet *TM*: dissuadet *P*

17. *Jupiter and the Camel* (viii). The warning is given that whenever we desire things more exalted than our puffed-up strength we not suffer humiliation from this in greater measure, just as the camel that is imagined to have been more humiliated and to have received worse things because he disdained the laws of his nature and desired better things.

18. *The Two Companions and the Bear* (ix). He warns that no one <choose> too recklessly a companion for himself unless he has already been proved fit.

19. *The Bald Horseman* (x). He advises someone if he sees himself mocked deservedly by his associates not to be upset but to deflect the laughter by interposing jokes.

20. *The Two Jars* (xi). Here he warns us not to be willingly contentious with our superiors and to avoid those who want to be contentious.

21. *The Peasant and the Treasure* (xii). That is, that we repay those who have been helpful to us because, if we are in need, they will come to our aid again.

22. *The Goat and the Bull* (xiii). Here, let us not injure men overcome by some misfortune but help them in order that they too may repay us if ever we are in need.

23. *The Monkey* (xiv). Let no one wish to praise his own possessions when they should not be praised, but let men leave things alone that ought to be decided by another man's judgment, for they generate no glory for themselves but often laughter just as the monkey in praise of her son.

24. *The Crane and the Peacock* (xv). He warns us not to feel superior to our friends and associates, lest we therefore endure a reproach from the crane.

25. *The Oak and the Reed* (xvi). He reproaches haughty men who want to resist their betters, for when they want to do this, they meet with harm to themselves just as the oak that kept resisting the wind.

26. *The Hunter and the Tigress* (xvii). Here he reproaches fools who are ready to defend others when they cannot defend themselves, just as the tigress could not after she had been wounded by the hunter. 27. Through the hunter, we can learn about someone who is honorable and strong. Although the fool wanted to wound him, he is wounded by him instead.

28. *The Four Oxen and the Lion* (xviii). Through the broken trust among the oxen, he advises that friends stick steadfastly together with friends so that they may not be able to be split apart.

29. *The Fir and the Bramble Bush* (xix). Through the fir, he advises against boasting about riches because they are inconstant, and whenever they are thought to be possessed, they are lost.

30. *Piscator* (xx). Monemur rem nobis apertam non linquere, et hoc piscis a piscatore captus insinuat.

31. *Paruula* (xxi). Hoc, ne possideamus in aliena dona, ne coacti iuste priuemur.

32. *Iupiter* (xxii). Hic aperte reprehendit cupidos et maxime auaros, qui et maxime inter homines sunt uiciosi dum nec saluti nec honori consulunt, tantum [fol. 3va29 | fol. 3vb1] ut per sua uicia ferantur, unde et crebro non solum anime set et corporis dampna incurrunt, ut hec fabula dicit.

33. *Venditor* (xxiii). Hic reprehendit illos qui cum possint aliis prodesse nolunt, cecati auaricia.

34. *Certamen* (xxiv). Hic inuehitur super nobiles qui contempnunt omnes alios preter se, superque eis aliena uirtus inuidiosa est.

35. *Flens p(uer)* (xxv). Hic reprehendit cupidos qui sepe cupientes aliena perdunt sua, ut ille qui querebat cadum perdidit pallium.

36. *Viderat e(xcelsa)* (xxvi). Hic monet fidei intendere non uerbis et fugendos malos, qui dum bona promittunt, mala inferre parant.

37. *Ingentem* (xxvii). Hic intendit ingenium preferre uiribus corporis, nam quod uiribus non poterat cornix ingenio assecuta est.

38. *Vincla r(ecusanti)* (xxviii). Hic reprehendit iure subiectos impacientes correctionis, qui cum sint dure ceruicis et non possint resistere, saltim temptant ledere.

39. *Horrida* (xxix). Reprehendit illum qui aliud in pectore gerit, aliud in lingua, dicens illum merito exp<el>lendum.

40. *Ingentem* (xxx). Monet magnos humiles non debere nimis despiciere, cum sepe plures de plebe plus possint uno potente.

41. *Vastantem* (xxx). Per suem introductam stultos notat quibus non sufficit una correctio dicens eos merito incurrere etiam dampnum corporis.

31 hoc *TM*: hic *P* in aliena dona *T*: aliena dona ui *M*: ui aliena ona *P*: ui aliena bona *Huygens*

32 ut *T<sup>pc</sup>*: ut suo ut *T*: ut suo impetu *M*: ut suo imperatu *P*

34 superque *TM*: semperque *P*

36 fugendos *TM*: fugiendos *P*

39 explendum *TM*: expellendum *P*

41 suem *P*: suam *TM*



30. *The Fisherman and the Fish* (xx). We are warned not to give up an opportunity that has been made available to us, and the fish caught by the fisherman suggests this.

31. *The Bird and the Reaping* (xxi). That is, let us not seek possession over another's gifts, lest under compulsion we be rightly deprived of them.

32. *The Greedy Man and the Jealous Man* (xxii). Here he obviously reproaches covetous and especially greedy men, who among men are especially morally vicious, since they look after neither their health nor their honor, so much so that they are carried away by their own vices; therefore, they also frequently meet with injuries not only to the soul but also to the body as this fable says.

33. *The Salesman and Bacchus* (xxiii). He reproaches those who, although it is within their power, do not want to be of use to others, because they have been blinded by greed.

34. *The Hunter and the Lion* (xxiv). Here he launches an attack about noblemen who look down on all others except themselves, and, additionally, another man's virtue is odious to these men.

35. *The Boy and the Thief* (xxv). He reproaches greedy men who often lose their own things while coveting another man's, just as that man who was looking for the pitcher lost his cloak.

36. *The Goat and the Lion* (xxvi). Here he advises to pay attention to credibility, not words, and that bad men should be shunned who when they promise good things are preparing to inflict bad.

37. *The Crow and the Jar* (xxvii). Here he intends to attach more value to cleverness than to bodily strength. For that which the crow could not gain by strength, she gained by cleverness.

38. *The Farmer and His Ox* (xxviii). Here he justly reproaches subordinates who are intolerant of correction and, though they are stiff-necked and unable to offer resistance, try to do harm anyhow.

39. *The Traveler and the Satyr* (xxix). He reproaches that man who carries one thing in his heart and another on his tongue, saying that that man ought to be driven off as he deserves.

40. *The Mouse and the Ox* (xxx). He warns that the great ought not to disdain the humble excessively since the multitude of the people often possesses more power than one powerful man.

41. *The Pig and Its Master* (xxx). Through the introduction of the pig, he censures fools, for whom one disciplining is not sufficient, saying that they deservedly meet with harm to the body too.

42. *Herentem luteo* (xxxii). Hic dicit [fol. 3vb29 | fol. 4ra1] hominem non debere esse remissum, set totis uiribus laborare, et ubi per se non ualet deum et amicos ut sibi succurrant tunc demum implorare.

43. <*Anser erat*> (xxxiii). Hic reprehendit cupidos qui perdunt spem que posset in futuro prodesse, cum ceci cupiditate ad presens nimis cupiunt accipere.

44. *Quisquis t(orpentem)* (xxxiv). Hortatur ut, quamdiu laborare possumus, preuideamus nobis, ne cum uelimus non potuerimus, et reprehendit hos qui hoc nolunt.

45. *Fama est* (xxxv). Monet ne abiecti desperemus, set humiles spem teneamus.

46. <*Pulcher*> (xxxvi). Corripit iuuenes stultos in ocio, qui derident senes laborantes.

47. *Pinguior* (xxxvii). Hic docet neminem pro uili re libertatem debere amittere, set gule magis laborem preferre.

48. *Dulcibus* (xxxviii). Docet quosque remotos a patria superbire, set eos a ceteris irrideri, sicque humiles reddi.

49. *Vouerat* (xxxix). Hic dicit non solum reos illos teneri qui mala faciunt, set qui alios ad malefaciendum accendunt.

50. *Distinctus* (xl). Hic reprehendit illos qui intendentes pulchritudini sue et bona uirtutis non considerant in aliis, set despiciunt sicut pardus feras.

51. *Inpulsus* (xli). Hic dicit plebem inutiliter resistere potentibus, nam sepe casum paciuntur ut amphora.

52. *Forte* (xlii). Monet nos cum sit necessarium mori, debere tamen eligere mortem talem per quam famam in futuro consequamur. [fol. 4ra29 | fol. 4vb1]

## 7. ACC(ESSVS) MAXIM(IANI)

1. MAXIMIANVS ciuis esse Romanus, unus ex nobilioribus ex libri auctoritate narratur. 2. Forma quoque electus, ac rethorice artis ceterarumque artium diuersarum pericia instructus ueraciter probatur. 3. In hoc autem libro senectutem cum suis uiciis uituperat, iuentutemque cum suis deliciis exaltat. 4. Est enim sua materia tarde senectutis querimonia. 5. Intentio sua

43 lemma is omitted in TMP

46 lemma is omitted in TMP

42. *The Ploughman and His Oxen* (xxxii). Here he says that a man should not be easygoing, but toil with all his strength, and when he does not have sufficient strength by himself, only then should he ask God and his friends to come to his aid.

43. <*The Goose Laying Golden Eggs*> (xxxiii). Here he reproaches greedy men who ruin a prospect that could be profitable in the future, since blind with greed they desire to gain too much for the present.

44. *The Ant and the Grasshopper* (xxxiv). He urges us, as long as we can work, to provide for ourselves lest we could not work when we want to, and he reproaches these men who do not want this.

45. *The Monkey's Twins* (xxxv). He warns us not to despair when we have been cast down, but humbly to maintain hope.

46. <*The Calf and the Ox*> (xxxvi). He rebukes foolish boys in their leisure who mock old men as they work.

47. *The Dog and the Lion* (xxxvii). Here he teaches that no one should lose freedom in exchange for a worthless thing, but should prefer work in greater measure to gluttony.

48. *The Fish and the Lamprey* (xxxviii). He teaches that each and every one is arrogant far away from his country but is mocked by others and thus rendered humble.

49. *The Soldier Who Burns His Weapons* (xxxix). Here he says that not only those men are held guilty who do evil things but also those who incite others to evildoing.

50. *The Leopard and the Fox* (xl). Here he reproaches those who pay attention to their own beauty and do not notice also the good points of virtue in others, but look down on them, just as the leopard looks down on the wild beasts.

51. *The Shower and the Jar* (xli). Here he says that the common people uselessly resist powerful men for they often suffer a fall, just as the amphora does.

52. *The Wolf and the Kid* (xlii). He advises that although it is necessary to die we should nevertheless choose such a death that we attain fame in the future as a result of it.

## 7. Introduction to *Maximianus*

1. Maximianus is said on the authority of the book to be a citizen of Rome, one of the nobler rank. 2. Since he is excellent in his appearance and versed in the knowledge of the art of rhetoric and the other various arts, he truly meets approval. 3. In this book, moreover, he censures old age together with its vices, and he praises youth together with its pleasures. 4. For his subject

est quemlibet dehortari ne stulte [obstando] optando senectutis uicia desiderat. 6. Vtilitas libri est cognitio stulti desiderii, senectutis euitatio. 7. Ethice subponitur, quia de moribus tractat.

## 8. ACC(ESSVS) HOMERI

1. HOMERUS in Greco sermone fecit duos libros, Odissam et Eliadem in quibus imitatur eum Virgilius: in prioribus VI in Odissa, quod laudatorium carmen est, ode enim est laus, sicut enim ille Vlixem in Odissa suo libro maris ostendit pericula uicisse, ita iste Eneam; in Eliade in posterioribus VI. 2. Ylias est fabula de destructione Troie composita, in quo eum iterum Virgilius imitatur in Turni bello et Enee. 3. Virgilius uero quia non plenarie cuncta descripsit, Homerus quidam Latinus Homerum Grecum in ea parte imitatur. [fol. 4rb29 | fol. 4va1] 4. Et est eius intentio uel hunc Grecum imitari uel Troianum bellum describere. 5. Materia sua est uel Troia uel Grecia. 6. Vtilitas cognitio Troiani belli. 7. Vel aliter, materia eius sunt persone de quibus facta illicito coniugio ortum est bellum. 8. Intentio sua est deortari quemlibet ab illicito coniugio unde offensam deorum incurrat, uti Paris et Elena ac suorum fortiores, qui destructi bello cum Troia perierunt. 9. Vtilitas est ut uiso interitu reorum superum maiestatem tam leui quam delicto timeamus offendere. 10. Ethice subponitur. 11. Diuidit quoque carmen in tria: propositionem, inuocationem, narrationem. 12. Propositionem et inuocationem commiscet; narrationem incipit ubi dicit: “†Cum ficiebat† enim.”

## 9. ACC(ESSVS) PHISIOLOGI

1. Iste liber intitulum Physiologus: phisis Grece, Latine natura dicitur; logos Grece, sermo Latine, inde Physiologus naturalis sermo. 2. Materia eius sunt animalia que introducuntur in eo. 3. Intentio eius est delectari in animalibus et prodesse in figuris. 4. Vtilitas est ut naturas et figuras animalium cognoscamus. 5. Phisice supponitur, quia de naturis animalium tractat.

*Acc. 7 TMP*

*Title:* Inicium Maximiani *P*

6 utilitas libri est *T<sup>pc</sup>*: utilitas eius est *T*: utilitas est libri *MP*

*Acc. 8 TMP*

*Title:* Inicium Homeri *P*

1 imitatur eum] eum imitatur *T<sup>ac</sup>* Vlixem *P*: ultrem *TM*

8 dehortari *MP*

9 quam delicto *TM*: quam graui delicto *P*

12 cum ficiebat *TM*: conficiebat *P*: *correct reading is confiebat* (cf. *Il. Lat.* 6)

*Acc. 9 TMP*

*Title:* Inicium Physiologi *P*: *no title in M*

3 delectari *T<sup>pc</sup>*: delectare *TMP*

matter is a complaint about slow old age. 5. His intention is to dissuade anyone at all from desiring the vices of old age by wishing for them foolishly. 6. The utility of the book is the knowledge of foolish desire and the avoidance of old age. 7. It is classified under ethics because it deals with moral behavior.

### 8. Introduction to *Homer [Ilias Latina]*

1. Homer wrote two books in the Greek language, the *Odyssey* and *Iliad*, in the cases of which Virgil imitates him: in the first six books, Virgil imitates Homer in the *Odyssey* because it is a poem of praise, for *ode* means “praise”; in fact, just as Homer shows that Ulysses in his book the *Odyssey* overcame the dangers of the sea, so Virgil shows that Aeneas did; in the last six books, Virgil imitates Homer in the *Iliad*. 2. The *Iliad* is a story written about the destruction of Troy, in which [book] Virgil imitates him again in the war of Turnus and Aeneas. 3. However, because Virgil did not write about all things in full detail, a certain Latin Homer imitates the Greek Homer in this part. 4. And it is his intention either to imitate this Greek or to write down the Trojan War. 5. His subject matter is either Troy or Greece. 6. The utility is knowledge of the Trojan War. 7. Or, alternatively, the characters are his subject matter from whom the war arose because they had entered into an illicit marriage. 8. His intention is to dissuade anyone from an illicit marriage from which one could incur the hatred of the gods, just as Paris and Helen and the more courageous of their kin did, who were destroyed by war and fell together with Troy. 9. The utility is that when we have seen the death of the guilty we fear offending the majesty of the gods with as much a trivial thing as a personal affront. 10. He is classified under ethics. 11. He also divides the poem into three parts: statement of theme, invocation, and narrative. 12. He combines the statement of theme and invocation; he begins the narrative when he says: “For it was accomplished” [*Il. Lat.* 6].

### 9. Introduction to *Physiologus*

1. This book is entitled *Physiologus*: *physis* in Greek means “nature” in Latin; *logos* in Greek means “speech” in Latin; hence *Physiologus*, “Speech on Nature.” 2. Its subject matter is the animals that are introduced in it. 3. Its intention is to take pleasure in animals and to be of use in its allegorical interpretations. 4. Its utility is that we come to know the natures and allegorical interpretations of animals. 5. It is classified under natural philosophy because it deals with the natures of animals.

## 10. ACC(ESSVS) THEODOLI

1. THEODOLVS parentibus Christianus non infimis editus, puer in Italia, adultus in Grecia [fol. 4va29 | fol. 4vb1] studuit. 2. Eruditus ergo utraque lingua cum esset Athenis, gentiles cum fidelibus altercantes audiuit, quorum colligens rationes, reuersus in Italiam in allegoricam contulit Eglogam, quam morte preuentus non emendauit. 3. Vnde et paucos in hoc opere inuenimus uersus falsos, ut ille “Dic et troianum lauderis scire secretum”; “se” male corripuit. 4. Ipse autem tam morum quam scientie honestate preditus sub clericali norma obiit. 5. Egloga a capris tractum est: egle Grece, capra Latine; logos Grece, Latine sermo; unde Egloga, caprinus sermo. 6. Materia eius sunt sententie de ecclesiasticis et paganis scriptis collate, et ipse in eis certantes persone. 7. Intentio eius est ostendere uires ueritatis et falsitatis, et tamen catholicam traditionem excellere ritum gentilem, quantum ueritas falsitatem. 8. Vtilitas est ut cum uiderimus uictam succumbere falsitatem, ipsam relinquamus, et lumen ueritatis assequamur. 9. Ethice subponitur. 10. Titulus est: “Incipit Egloga Theodoli.” 11. Introducuntur hic due persone Ps(eustis) et Al(ithia), quibus hec nomina bene conueniunt. 12. Ps(eustis) enim stans in falsitate, et Al(ithia) ueritas dei interpretatur: ali Hebreo sermone ueritas, thia deus dicitur. 13. Auctor [fol. 4vb29 | fol. 5ra1] etiam non absurde Theodolus nominatur, quia de ueritate et falsitate tractat. 14. Theos Grece, Latine deus, dolus fraus dicitur, quod designatur in ipsa materia, et per introductas personas. 15. Vel secundum quosdam Theodolus dei seruus dicitur, quia cuiusque dei serui est uera a falsis discernere. 16. Titulus sic resoluitur: “Incipit Egloga Theodoli,” id est caprinus sermo inter pastores habitus a Theodolo compositus.

## 11. ACC(ESSVS) AR(ATORIS)

1. ARATOR ISTE paganus fuit et Romanus ciuis; tunc enim temporis et Christiani et pagani simul inhabitabant Romam. 2. In tempore uero Vigili pape obsessa est Roma a Theodorico rege Gothorum. 3. Vigilius autem liberauit eos auxilio dei a morte corporis, et quosdam conuertendo a morte anime. 4. Postquam autem Arator uidit deum Vigili tam potentem esse cuius auxilio eum liberauit, placuit sibi fidem recipere et baptizatus est a Vigilio papa. 5.

*Acc.* 10 *TMP*

*Title:* Inicium Theodoli *MP*

1 Christianis *MP*

5 Grece *T<sup>c</sup>*: enim *T*: enim Grece *MP*

7 et falsitatis *TM*: et defectum falsitatis *P* tamen *T*: tantum *M*: *omitted in P*

### 10. Introduction to *Theodolus* [*Egloga Theoduli*]

1. Theodolus, a Christian born of parents of no mean rank, studied in Italy as a boy and in Greece as a young man. 2. When therefore as a man educated in each language he was in Athens, he heard pagans disputing with Christians whose doctrines he collected and, after his return to Italy, assembled into the allegorical *Egloga*, which he did not correct because he was prevented by death. 3. Hence, we also find in this work a few metrically incorrect verses; for example, that verse, “Speak and be praised to know the secret of Troy” [*Ecl.* 323], has wrongly corrupted the quantity of *se*. 4. However, he was endowed with nobility as much of character as of knowledge and died under clerical rule. 5. The word *egloga* has been derived from “goats”: for *egle* in Greek means “goat” in Latin; *logos* in Greek means “speech” in Latin; and hence *Egloga*, “goat-speech.” 6. The subject matter is the sayings that have been gathered from ecclesiastical and pagan writings and the characters debating in regard to them. 7. Its intention is to show the strength of truth and of falsehood and yet to show that the Catholic tradition surpasses pagan ritual as much as truth does falsehood. 8. The utility is that when we have seen that falsehood surrenders in defeat we forsake it and attain to the light of truth. 9. It is classified under ethics. 10. The title is: “Here Begins the *Egloga* of Theodolus.” 11. Here two characters are introduced, Pseustis and Alithia, whom these names fit well. 12. For Pseustis is taken to mean “standing on falsehood” and Alithia “the truth of God”: *ali* in the Hebrew language means “truth” and *thia* means “God.” 13. The author is also appropriately named Theodolus because he discusses truth and falsehood: *theos* in Greek is “God” in Latin, and *dolus* means “deceit.” 14. This is what is signified in the very subject matter and through the characters that are introduced. 15. Or, according to some, Theodolus means “servant of God” because it is the mark of each servant of God to distinguish true things from false. 16. The title is thus analyzed: “Here Begins the *Egloga* of Theodolus,” that is, “a goat-speech” held among herdsmen that was written by Theodolus.

### 11. Introduction to *Arator* [*Historia apostolica*]

1. This Arator was a pagan and a citizen of Rome; at that time, in fact, both Christians and pagans inhabited Rome together. 2. But in the time of Pope Vigilius Rome was besieged by Theoderic, king of the Goths. 3. Vigilius, however, freed these men with God’s aid from the death of the body, and some men he freed from the death of the soul by converting them. 4. After Arator saw that Vigilius’s god was so powerful through whose aid Vigilius freed him, he resolved to accept the faith and was baptized by Pope Vigilius.

Post receptam fidem didicit literas et in tantis profecit uirtutibus, quod factus est Romanus subdiaconus. 6. Ad tantam etiam scientiam peruenit quod hunc librum composuit. 7. Materia eius est actus apostolorum describere historialiter et allegorice. 8. Intentio sua est nos hortari ad uirtu- [fol. 5ra29 | fol. 5rb1] tes, proponendo quorundam bene gesta quorum auctoritas uiget in ecclesia, scilicet apostolorum. 9. Vtilitas est ut uestigia eorum simplici corde sectemur, ne peruerse eos imitando dampnationem Ananie et Saphire incurramus. 10. Ethice subponitur, id est morali scientie, quia tractat de moribus. 11. Et facit duas epistolas quibus utitur prologo, unam Floriano abbati, ut tanto acceptabilior sit cum legat eum tantus uir. 12. Alteram facit Vigilio pape agens ei grates quod liberauit eum a morte corporis, maiores tamen quia liberauit eum a morte anime, et hortatur unumquemque reddere grates pro collatis sibi beneficiis.

## 12. ACC(ESSVS) PROSPERI[S]

1. In exordio huius auctoris requirenda sunt quinque: uita poete, materia, intentio, finalis causa, cui parti philosophie subponatur. 2. Vita poete talis esse dicitur: quod fuit Equitanicus uir diuersarum artium eruditissimus; deinde factus Augustini discipulus hoc opus composuit ex diuersis sententiis illius. 3. Et bene dicitur Equitanicus regione Prosper uocabulo, quia uiam equitatis, id est uere fidei, nobis manifestauit prosperitatemque, id est fructum bonorum operum, omnibus hunc [fol. 5rb29 | fol. 5va1] librum legentibus indicauit. 4. Et est materia sua uarie Augustini sententie in hoc libro compendiose composite. 5. Intentio sua est nos hortari summo studio despiciere terrena et casto corde concupiscere celestia. 6. Vtilitas est fragilis mundi cognitio, et sententiarum Augustini agnitio. 7. Ethice subponitur quia de moribus tractat.

## 13. SEDVLII ACC(ESSVS)

1. IN PRINCIPIO huius libri septem sunt inquirenda: uita poete, titulus operis, qualitas carminis, intentio scribentis, numerus librorum, <ordo librorum>, explanatio. 2. Vita huius poete talis esse dicitur: laicus fuit gentilis, set in

*Acc.* 11 *TMP*

*Title:* Inicium ARATORIS *P:* no title in *M*

11 utitur prologo *TM:* utitur pro prologo *P*

*Acc.* 12 *TMP*

*Title:* ACC(ESSVS) PROSPERIS *T<sup>ac</sup> M:* INICIVM Prosperi *P*

*Acc.* 13 *TMP*

*Title:* INICIVM SEDVLII *P:* no title in *M:* ACCESSVS SEDVLII *Huygens*

1 <ordo librorum> *Huygens*



5. After having accepted the faith, he acquired knowledge of literature and advanced in the virtues so greatly that he became a subdeacon in Rome. 6. He also came to such great knowledge that he wrote this book. 7. His subject matter is to write down the Acts of the Apostles historically and allegorically. 8. His intention is to exhort us to the virtues by relating the good deeds of certain men whose authority is strong in the church, namely the apostles. 9. The utility is that we may follow the footsteps of these men with a simple heart, lest by imitating them in reverse we meet with the punishment of Ananias and Sapphira. 10. He is classified under ethics, that is, moral science, because he discusses moral behavior. 11. He also composes two letters that he uses as a prologue, one to Abbot Florian, so that he may be so much more acceptable since such a great man reads him. 12. The other he composes to Pope Vigilius, giving thanks that he freed him from the death of the body and greater thanks still because he freed him from the death of the soul. He also exhorts each and every person to render thanks for the benefits that have been bestowed upon him.

### 12. Introduction to *Prosper [Epigrammata]*

1. In the introduction to this author, five things must be researched: the life of the poet, subject matter, intention, final cause, and the part of philosophy under which it is classified. 2. The life of the poet is said to be as follows, that he was a man from Aequitania [Aquitaine], highly educated in the different arts; then, after he had become a student of Augustine, he composed this work from the different maxims of that man. 3. He is also properly called Aequitanian by region and Prosper by name, because he revealed to us the way of equity, that is, of true faith, and because he showed prosperity, that is, the fruit of all good works, to all those reading this book. 4. Also his subject matter is Augustine's different sayings collected concisely in this book. 5. His intention is to exhort us to look down on earthly things very passionately and to desire heavenly things with a pure heart. 6. His utility is acquaintance with the impermanent world and knowledge of Augustine's sayings. 7. He is classified under ethics because he discusses moral behavior.

### 13. Introduction to *Sedulius [Carmen paschale]*

1. In the beginning of this book, seven things must be examined: life of the poet, title of work, genre of the poem, intention of the writer, number of books, <order of books>, and explanation. 2. The life of this poet is said to be

Italia philosophiam sub tempore Theodosii et Valentini consulum didicit. 3. Deinde ad Deum conuersus et a Macedonio presbitero baptizatus in Achaiam uenit, ubi hunc librum ut errorem gentilium destrueret composuit. 4. Titulus autem Seruio adtestante a Tytano, id est a sole, per diminutionem uel per similitudinem dicitur: per diminutionem dicitur quia parua lux est istius operis respectu totius solis; per similitudinem autem, sicut sol oriens totum orbem illuminat, sic titulus sequens opus. 5. Titulus istius operis est: “Incipit Paschale carmen.” 6. Ex titulo uero materia concipitur, quia de miraculis paschalis agni, id est Christi, in hoc libro tractatur. 7. Qualitas [fol. 5va29 | fol. 5vb1] carminis in hoc dinoscitur, quia heroico carmine compositus esse dicitur; heroico enim carmine gesta regum et ducum scribebantur antiquitus, quo miracula summi regis composuit. 8. Intentio eius est ritum gentilium destruere, et uiam uere fidei demonstrare. 9. Numerus librorum hic est, quod hoc opus per quatuor libros diuidat. 10. Ordo autem talis est, quod in primo libro de miraculis que pater cooperante filio et spiritu sancto <gesserat in ueteri testamento tractat, deinde in tribus sequentibus que filius cooperante patre et spiritu sancto> sub noua gratia ediderat. 11. Explanatio, id est totius libri expositio. 12. Iste etiam more aliorum poetarum proponit, inuocat, narrat: proponit ubi dicit: “Paschales”; inuocat ubi dicit: “Omnipotens”; narrat ubi dicit: “Primus abusque.”

#### 14. OVIDII de amat(oria) a(rte)

1. Intentio Ouidii est in hoc opere iuuenes ad amorem instruere, quomodo debeant se in amore habere circa ipsas puellas. 2. Materia sua est ipsi iuuenes et puelle et ipsa precepta amoris que ipse iuuenibus intendit dare. 3. Modus istius operis talis est, ostendere quomodo ipsa puella possit inueniri, inuenta exorari, exorata retineri. 4. Finalis causa est ut perlecto libro in mandatis suis quid tenendum sit in amore ipsis iuuenibus enucleatum est. 5. Ethice subponitur, quia de moribus puellarum loquitur, id est quos mores habeant,

10 gesserat . . . sancto *P*: omitted in *TM*

*Acc.* 14 *TMP*

*Title*: Ouidii de amore *P*: no title in *M*: <ACCESSVS> OUIDII DE AMATORIA ARTE

*Huygens*

1 O(uidii) *T*: sua *MP*

3 exorata *P*: exhorta *M*

4 enucleatum est *TM*: enucleatum sit *P*

as follows: he was a layman of pagan origin, but learned philosophy in Italy during the time of the consuls Theodosius and Valentinus. 3. Next, after he had converted to God and had been baptized by the priest Macedonius, he came to Achaia [Greece], where he wrote this book in order to stamp out the error of the pagans. 4. *Title*, moreover, on the testimony of Servius, is derived etymologically from “T[i]tan”, that is, from the sun, either through the formation of a diminutive or through an analogy: it is derived through the formation of a diminutive because it is this work’s little ray of sunlight with regard to the whole sun; on the other hand, just as the rising sun illuminates the whole world, so through analogy the title illuminates the following work. 5. The title of this work is “Here Begins the *Paschale carmen [Poem of the Passover Lamb]*.” 6. The subject matter is indeed grasped from the title because in this book there is a treatment of the miracles of the Passover Lamb, that is, of Christ. 7. The genre of the poem is discerned in this: the fact that it is said to have been composed with heroic verse; for the deeds of kings and generals used to be written about anciently in the heroic verse with which Sedulius celebrated the miracles of the highest king. 8. His intention is to demolish the ritual of the pagans and to point out the way of true faith. 9. Because he divides this work into four books, the number of books is this. 10. Additionally, the order of books is as follows: in the first book, he deals with the miracles that the Father, in cooperation with the Son and the Holy Ghost, <had accomplished in the Old Testament; then in the following three books, he deals with the miracles that the Son in cooperation with the Father and the Holy Ghost> had produced under the new grace. 11. Explanation, that is, the commentary of the whole book. 12. In the manner of other poets, this one also states his purpose, invokes, and narrates: he proposes when he says: “Passover” [Sedulius, *praef.* 1]; he invokes when he says: “Almighty” [*Pasch.* 1.60]; he narrates when he says: “First, ever since the time of” [1.103].

#### 14. *Of Ovid on the Art of Love*

1. In this work, the intention of Ovid is to instruct young men for a love affair—how they ought to conduct themselves around their girlfriends in a love affair. 2. His subject matter is the young men themselves and the girlfriends and the rules of love, which he intends to give to the young men. 3. The method of this work is as follows: to show how a girlfriend herself can be found; how she can be won by entreaty; and once won by entreaty, how she can be kept. 4. The final cause is that, after the book has been read through, it has been made clear in its instructions what ought to be observed by the young men themselves in a love affair. 5. He is classified under ethics because he talks about the moral character of girlfriends, that is, what moral character

quibus modis reti- [fol. 5vb29 | fol. 6ra1] neri ualeant. 6. Videndum etiam est quia morem recte scribentium seruat et sequitur: proponit, inuocat, narrat. 7. Proponit ubi dicit: “Siquis in hoc”; inuocat ubi dicit: “Ceptis”; narrat ubi dicit: “Principio.”

## 15. DE REMED(IO) A(MORIS)

1. Ouidius iste amandi librum composuit, ubi iuuenes amicas acquirere, acquisitas benigne tractare docuit. 2. Et puellas id idem instruxerat. 3. Quidam autem iuuenes uoluptati nimium obedientes non solum uirgines uerum etiam ipsas matronas et consanguineas minime uitabant. 4. Virgines coniugatis sicut non uxoratis se pariter subiungebant. 5. Vnde Ouidius ab amicis et ab aliis in maximo odio habebatur. 6. Postea penitens, quos offenderat, sibi reconciliari desiderans, uidens hoc non melius posse fieri quam si dato amori medicinam adinueniret, hunc librum scribere aggressus est, in quo pariter iuuenibus et puellis irretitis <consulit>, qualiter contra illicitum amorem se armare debeant. 7. Instruit enim ad medici similitudinem; bonus uero medicus infirmis ut sanentur medicinam tribuit, et etiam sanis ut ab infirmitate non capiantur. 8. Vt in principiis quedam occurrunt inquirenda, que hac occasione inquiruntur, ut bene inquisita et prudenter intellecta facilem [aditum] intellectum compare<n>t [fol. 6ra29 | fol. 6rb1] ipsis auditoribus, ita et huius libri principio quedam inquirere debemus, ut per ea bene et sapienter exquisita totum subsequens opus nobis clarius appareat. 9. Videamus ergo quot sunt et que sunt que in hoc libro inquiruntur, quatuor uidelicet, primo materia, secundo intentio, deinde causa intentionis, ad ultimum cui parti philosophie subponatur. 10. Materia huius libri sunt iuuenes et puelle capte de illicito amore. 11. Intentio sua est dare precepta quedam quibus illicitum amorem remoueat. 12. Causa est ut illicito amore detenti expediantur, et nondum capti sciant sibi precauere ne capiantur. 13. Ab illa questione librum suum incipit, quam aliquis sibi posset facere dicendo: “Cum inprimis artis amandi iuuenes edocuisti, nunc uero remedium amoris scribis eis, tibi ipsi contrarius esse uideris.” 14. Cui sic respondet Ouidius: “Tu mihi non debes

*Acc.* 15 *TMP*

*Title:* OVIDII DE REMEDIO AMORIS *P:* no title in *M:* <ACCESSVS> OVIDII DE REMEDIO AMORIS *Huygens*

6 <consulit> *Przychocki*

8 facilem intellectum *T<sup>m</sup>* facilem aditum intellectum *T:* compare<n>t *Przychocki:* comparet *TMP:* et huius *TM:* et in huius *P*

9 quot *P:* quod *TM*

13 quam *P:* quas *TM*

they have, and in what ways they can be kept. 6. One must also see that he preserves and follows the usage of those who write correctly: he states his purpose, invokes, and narrates. 7. He states his theme when he says: “If anyone of you in this” [*Ars* 1.1]; he invokes when he says: “Mother, my beginnings” [*Ars* 1.30]; he narrates when he says: “In the beginning” [*Ars* 1.35].

### 15. *On the Cure for Love [Remedia amoris]*

1. This Ovid wrote the book of loving, where he taught young men to acquire girlfriends and to treat them kindly after they have been acquired. 2. He had also given girls this same instruction. 3. A certain number of young men, however, were obeying their pleasure too much and were doing very little to avoid not only maidens but also matrons themselves and female relatives. 4. Maidens were equally attaching themselves to married men just as to unmarried men. 5. Hence, Ovid was very much hated by his friends and by others. 6. Afterwards, because he was repentant and yearned that those whom he had offended be reconciled with himself, and because he saw that this could not be better done than if he discovered a medicine for the love that he had given, he started to write this book in which <he gives advice> equally to young men and women caught in the nets of love, about how they should arm themselves against an illicit love. 7. He gives instruction, in fact, according to the analogy of a doctor; indeed, a good doctor gives medicine to the sick so that they may be cured and also to the healthy so that they may not be seized by sickness. 8. Just as in introductions, a number of things come up to be examined, which are examined on this occasion, so that when properly and sensibly understood, they may provide the listeners themselves easy understanding [*easy, understood access* was written before *access* was deleted], so too in the introduction to this book, we should examine a number of things so that through their proper and wise examination the whole of the following work may appear more clearly to us. 9. Let us see therefore how many things there are, and what they are, which are being examined in regard to this book, namely, four: first, the subject matter; second, the intention; next, the cause of the intention; and, finally, the part of philosophy under which it is classified. 10. The young men and the girls that have been seized by illicit love are the subject matter of this book. 11. Its intention is to give a certain number of rules to get rid of illicit love. 12. The rationale is that those who are held prisoner by illicit love may be freed and that those who have not yet been seized by it may know how to take precautions from being seized. 13. He begins his book from that question which someone could pose to him saying: “When in the first place you informed young men of the art of lovemaking but now write for them a cure for love, you seem to be contradicting yourself.” 14. And to

obicere hoc, quia ipse obiecit mihi Amor, cui respondi et amare letus recessit, et meum opus finire precepit.”

## 16. OVIDIUS DE PONTO

1. In hoc libro sicut in ceteris ista inquiri solent: intentio, materia, utilitas, cui parti philosophie subponatur. 2. Intentio sua est unumquemque persuadere ut uero amico suo in necessitate subueniat. 3. Materia sua amici sui sunt, ad quos scribit mittens singulis singulas epistolas, uel ipsa uerba quibus precatur. 4. Utilitas est maxima, si possit misericordiam consequi apud Octavianum Cesarem intercessionem amicorum quibus mittit ipsas epistolas. 5. Ethice subponitur, quia in unaquaque epistola agit de moribus. 6. Dicitur et hunc librum in Ponto insula Scythie composuisse, quo missus erat in exilium ab Octauiano Cesare propter librum quem scripserat de amore, per quem corrupte fuerant Romane matrone, uel ut quidam uolunt, quia cum uxore sua siue cum puero rem eum habuisse perceperat. 7. Ibi, scilicet in Ponto, cum multa pateretur aduersa, mittit singulis epistolas; rogat ut sibi subueniant. 8. Quas tandem in unum collectas mittit Bruto thesaurizatorio rogans eum ut reponat in armario cum ceteris libris. 9. Atque hanc primam epistolam facit sic dicens: “Naso Thomitane.”

10. *Naso* dictus est Ouidius, et est agnomen, quia ab euentu inpositum est ei eo quod magnum nasum habuerit.

11. *Thomita[ta]ne terre* dicit, quia ibi membratim diuidebat Medea fratrem suum, uolens tardare patrem qui insequeretur eam cum fugeret cum Iasone; thomus enim dicitur diuisio: inde *Thomitane*, id est diuisionis.

12. *Iam non nouus*, quia diu steterat ibi.

## 17. OVIDIUS TRISTIVM

1. IN HOC LIBRO Ouidii sex sunt requirenda: titulus operis, materia, intentio, causa intentionis, utilitas, cui parti philosophie subponatur. 2. Huic operi titulus a [fol. 6va31 | fol. 6vb1] causa inponitur, eo quod eius auctor in tristitia uersabatur. 3. Materia sua est periculorum descriptio uel ipsi amici quibus

14 amare] Amor *P<sup>c</sup>*

*Acc.* 16 *TP*

*Title:* OVIDII DE PONTO *P:* <ACCESSVS> OVIDII DE PONTO *Huygens*

7 singulis *T:* singulis amicis singulas *P*

8 thesaurizatorio *TP:* thesaurizario *T<sup>c</sup>:* thesaurizatori *Clm 14819, fol. 134r, reading reported by Hexter, p. 125: the correct reading would be thesaurizatori* reponat in armario *T<sup>c</sup>:* reponat eum in armario *T*

11 Thomitane *T:* correctly Thomitane *P*

this person Ovid responds thus: “You should not make this objection to me, because Love himself made the objection to me, and I responded to him, and he withdrew happy to love and instructed me to finish my work.”

### 16. *Ovid from Pontus [Epistulae ex Ponto]*

1. In this book, just as in others, the following things are usually examined: intention, subject matter, utility, and the part of philosophy under which it is classified. 2. His intention is to persuade each person to help his true friend in difficulty. 3. His subject matter consists of his friends to whom he writes, sending one epistle to one person at a time; or his subject matter consists of the words themselves with which he makes entreaty. 4. The utility is the greatest if he could obtain mercy in the court of Octavian Caesar through the intervention of his friends to whom he sends these epistles. 5. He is classified under ethics, that is, moral science, because in each epistle he deals with moral behavior. 6. It is also said that he wrote this book upon Pontus, an island of Scythia, where he had been sent into exile by Octavian Caesar on account of the book that he had written about love, through which the married women of Rome had been corrupted; or, as some maintain, because he had observed that he [Caesar] had an affair with Ovid’s own wife or with a boy. 7. In that place, namely on Pontus, while he was enduring many hardships, he sends epistles to individuals and asks that they come to his support. 8. At last, he also sends these epistles, which he has gathered together into a unit, to Brutus his librarian, asking him to put them away in a bookcase together with the rest of his books. 9. And he composes this first letter, saying the following: “Naso of the land of Tomis” [*Pont.* 1.1.1].

10. *Naso* was Ovid’s name, and it is a nickname because it was given to him by chance because he had a big nose.

11. *Of the land of Tomis* he says because there Medea divided up her brother limb by limb, wanting to slow her father who was pursuing her when she was fleeing with Jason, for *thomus* means “division”: hence “of Tomis,” that is, “of the division.”

12. *No longer new* because Ovid had remained there for a long time.

### 17. *Ovid’s Sorrows [Tristia]*

1. In this book of Ovid, one must seek to know six things: the title of the work, subject matter, intention, cause of the intention, utility, and the part of philosophy under which it is classified. 2. The title is given to this work from its cause—for this reason, because its author was living in sorrow. 3. His subject matter is the description of dangers, or it is the friends themselves to

singulis mittit epistolas. 4. Intentio sua est ut per scripta sua unumquemque moneat ut pro eo ad Cesarem intercedat. 5. Causa est intentionis, quia sub spe reuertendi in exilium missus fuerat ut per preces eorum iram Caesaris leniret sibi que reditum impetrarent. 6. Vtilitas est uehementis ire Caesaris cessatio, et dilecte patrie adeptio. 7. Ethice subponitur, quia de moribus tractat. 8. Queritur autem cur missus sit in exilium. 9. Vnde tres dicuntur sententie: prima, quod concubuit cum uxore Caesaris Linia nomine; secunda, quod sicut familiaris transiens eius porticum uidit eum cum amasio suo coeuntem, unde timens Cesar ne ab eo proderetur misit eum in exilium; tertia, quia librum fecerat De arte amatoria in quo iuuenes docuerat matronas decipiendo sibi allicere, et ideo offensus Romanis dicitur missus esse in exilium. 10. Quatuor quoque apud Romanos dicuntur fuisse genera exilii: proscriptio, inscriptio, relegatio, exilium. 11. Proscriptus dicebatur cuius bona publicabantur et ipse sine aliqua spe reuertendi missus est in exilium; inscriptus, cuius bona etiam publicabantur et ipse domi inter ami- [fol. 6vb31 | fol. 7ra1] cos retentus; relegatus, cuius bona non publicabantur et ipse sub spe redeundi in exilium missus; exul, cuius bona publicabantur et ipse sub aliqua spe reuertendi in exilium missus.

## 18. OVID(IVS) S(INE) TI(TVLO)

1. Diuerse cause dicuntur quare liber iste intitulatur Sine titulo. 2. Hec una causa est quod metuebat emulos qui solebant reprehendere opera eius, ne titulo lecto detraherent ei. 3. Altera causa est quia metuebat Augustum Cesarem quem offensum sciebat de Amatoria arte, quia ibi matronas quasi in prostibula posuit; sciebat autem quod magis offenderetur lecto hoc titulo: inscripta sunt enim hic quedam De amore. 4. Tercia causa est quod Augustus preceperat ut describeretur bellum suum contra Antonium et Cleopatram, unde proposuit quinque libros facere, set abstractus est a Cupidine, et ideo istos tres libros fecit in quibus est sua materia amica eius uel amor. 5. Intentio eius est delectare. 6. Ethice subponitur. 7. Dicitur autem rogatu Octauiani giganteum bellum incepisse, set Cupido retraxit eum. 8. Finito primo libro premittit prologum, antequam incipiat, in quo ostendit uerum nomen

*Acc. 17 TP*

*Title: OVIDII TRISTIVM P: <ACCESSVS> OVIDII TRISTIVM Huygens*

*4 intercedant P*

*5 lenirent P*

*9 Linia] Liuia Przychocki: omitted in P*

*Acc. 18 T*

*2 hec T: harum is read by Przychocki, Huygens*



whom he individually sends letters. 4. His intention is to remind each person through his writings to intervene with Caesar on his behalf. 5. The reason for the intention is that he might soften the anger of Caesar through their prayers, and they might obtain for him his return home, because he had been sent into exile with the hope of returning. 6. The utility is the cessation of the violent anger of Caesar and the attaining of his beloved homeland. 7. It is classified under ethics because it deals with moral behavior. 8. Additionally, it is asked why he was sent into exile. 9. And therefore three opinions are given: first, because he slept with the wife of Caesar, Li[v]ia by name; the second, because, when he was crossing his portico as a household retainer, he saw him having sex with his male lover—because of which Caesar sent him into exile, fearing that he would be betrayed by him; third, because he had written the book *On the Art of Love*, in which he had taught young men to attract to themselves married women through deception, and for this reason, having offended the Romans, he is said to have been sent into exile. 10. Four kinds of exile are said to have existed among the Romans: proscription, inscription, relegation, and exile. 11. A man was said to be proscribed whose property was confiscated and himself was sent into exile without any of hope of returning; he was said to be inscribed, whose property was also confiscated and himself held under house arrest among friends; he was said to be relegated whose property was not confiscated and himself was sent into exile with the hope of returning; and he was said to be an exile whose property was confiscated and himself was sent into exile with some hope of returning.

### 18. *Ovid without a Title [Amores]*

1. Different reasons are given why this book is entitled *Without a Title*. 2. One reason is the following: because he [Ovid] was afraid that rivals, who were in the habit of reproaching his works, would disparage it if they read the title. 3. Another reason is because he was afraid of Augustus Caesar, who he knew was offended about the *Art of Love* because there he put married women in something like the position of a prostitute; moreover, he knew that he would be more offended if he had read this title: for here certain words, *On Love*, were given as a title. 4. A third reason is because Augustus had ordered that his war against Antony and Cleopatra be written down; and hence, he [Ovid] planned to write five books but was diverted by Cupid and for this reason wrote these three books, in which his subject matter is his girlfriend or love. 5. His intention is to give delight. 6. It is classified under ethics. 7. Moreover, it is said that he began a gigantomachy at the request of Octavian, but Cupid called him back. 8. After he finished the first book and before he begins the second, he prefixes a prologue in which he points out the real

auctoris, prelibando materiam subsequenti operis et prioris. 9. Finitis duobus libris premitit prologum antequam incipiat tertium, in quo se ostendit coactum ab Elegia scripsisse tertium de amore. 10. Cuius carmine maxime [fol. 7ra31 | fol. 7rb1] incurrat famam et infamiam. 11. Cum autem dubitaret unde scriberet, Tragedia ex improviso ad eum ueniens hortatur eum ut de ea ipsa scriberet; Elegia uero ueniens et contradicens Tragedie coegit Ouidium, ut, sicut iam supra dictum est, de ea faceret tertium librum. 12. In principio enim prologi describit amenitatem loci quo conuenerunt tante deae. 13. Et sciendum est quod Tragedia dea est facti carminis de gestis nobilium et regum. 14. Elegia autem dicitur dea miserie—contingunt etiam in amore miserie et aduersitates—et scribitur impari metro et exametro.

### 19. O(VIDIUS) FASTORVM

1. Quidam libri dudum fuisse Rome dicuntur, quibus ab actu nomen est inditum; Fasti enim dicebantur. 2. Sciendum uero est istud nomen esse a fasto nominatum; fastus enim licitus dicitur, unde fasti dies quasi liciti uocabantur. 3. Mos erat Romanorum antiquitus, ut quacumque die aduersitates uel prosperitates sustinerent, in Fastis eas notari facerent, ut per eas notatas exemplum bone uite relinquerent posteris, et sic animos eorum ad perenne decus excitarent. 4. Sciendum autem est Romanos poetas gestas res rei publice partim sic prolixè, partim tam breuiter descripsisse, ut per inscientiam fastorum et nefastorum dierum pene omnes adeo [fol. 7rb31 | fol. 7va1] oberrarent, ut penitus omnem morem sacrificii transuerterent, ita ut in fastis diebus nulla sacrificia facerent, et in nefastis hostias diis immolarent. 5. Ouidius autem sciens eo tempore Romanos sibi esse odiosos propter opus quod fecerat de arte amatoria—multi enim per illud preceptum amandi decipiebantur—istud opus duabus de causis explicandum suscepit et spaciosa uolumina in compendiosum tractatum redegit, quo morem sacrificii explicaret et Romanos sibi offensos mitigaret. 6. Huius libri titulus talis est: “Incipit Ouidius Fastorum.” 7. Hic obicitur, cum iste liber tam de fastis quam de nefastis diebus Romanorum edisserat, cur magis fastorum quam nefastorum dierum titulum habeat. 8. Ad quod respondetur quod secundum digniorem partem

9 antequam incipiat <secundum> *Huygens* incipiat tertium *T<sup>pc</sup>*: incipiat tertium de amore *T*

*Acc.* 19 *T*

5 duabus *Przychocki*: duobus *T* compendiosum *T<sup>pc</sup>*: compendiose *T*

8 ad *Przychocki*: at *T*

name of the author, introducing the subject matter of the following book and of the first. 9. After he finished two books and before he begins the third, he prefixes a prologue, in which he shows himself compelled by Elegy to write a third book about love. 10. Because of her poetry, he met with the greatest fame and disgrace. 11. Moreover, when he was in doubt of what he should write, Tragedy comes unexpectedly to him and urges him to write about herself; Elegy, on the other hand, comes and speaks in opposition to Tragedy and compels Ovid, as was already mentioned above, to write a third book about her. 12. In fact, at the beginning of the prologue, he describes the loveliness of the place where such great goddesses met. 13. And one should know that Tragedy is the goddess of poetry that is composed about the deeds of noble men and kings. 14. Elegy, moreover, is spoken of as a goddess of woe—woes and hardships occur also in love—and is written with an unequal meter [i.e., pentameter] and a hexameter.

### 19. *Ovid's Fasti*

1. Certain books are said to have existed some time ago at Rome that were named after business of state, for they were called *Fasti*. 2. Moreover, one should know that this noun was formed from *fas* [“that which is permissible by divine law”], for *fastus* means “that which is permitted,” from which the holy days were called, as it were, “permitted.” 3. It was the custom of Romans from antiquity, on whatever day they experienced misfortunes or successes, to let those be recorded in the *Fasti* so that through those recorded events they might leave behind the example of a morally good life to their descendants and thus rouse their hearts to eternal glory. 4. One should know, moreover, that the Roman poets wrote down the exploits of the republic so lengthily in some parts and so briefly in others that virtually all men went so astray through their ignorance of holy and unholy days that they turned the entire practice of sacrifice to cross purposes so that they performed no sacrifices on holy days and sacrificed victims to the gods on unholy days. 5. Ovid, moreover, knowing that the Romans were full of hatred toward him at that time because of the work that he had written on the art of love—for many people were being deceived through that guide to loving—undertook this work, which is to be explained for two reasons, and condensed lengthy books into a succinct treatise by means of which he could explain the practice of sacrifice and appease the Romans whom he had offended. 6. The title of the book is as follows: “Here Begins *Ovid's Fasti*.” 7. Here there is an objection: since this book expounds the holy as well as the unholy days of the Romans, why does it have a title more appropriate to the holy than to the unholy days? 8. The response to this question is that it has received its name according to

nomen accepit, ut in plerisque uidemus fieri, ut in Oratio intitulatur Liber Carminum et Odarum; non tamen ubique laudes continentur, set a digniori parte trahit sibi uocabulum. 9. Similiter in Terentio a personis nuncupantur, que plus exercentur in comedia, sicut Andria ab Andro insula, Eunuchus ab eunucho persona. 10. Videnda est etiam quorundam uersutia de fastis et nefastis diebus; peruerso enim modo accipiunt. 11. Cum enim superius diceremus fastos dies commoditates in quibus iura exercere, sacrificia fieri liceret, [fol. 7va31 | fol. 7vb1] nefastos uero, in quibus horum nihil Romana curia fieri censeret, quidam opinantur dies fastos uocari ab urbanis negotiis in quibus deberent uacare nec liceret Romana iura exerceri nec ulla diis hostias immolare. 12. Nefastos uero uocant in quibus a supradictis decretum erat non abstinere. 13. Horum et similium errores cognoscuntur Ouidio testante qui ait: “Ille nefastus erit per quem tria uerba silentur: fastus erit per quem lege licebit agi.” 14. Dubitatur etiam ubi composuerit hunc librum: dicunt quidam quod eum in exilio composuerit; alii uero dicunt antequam mitteretur, ut sic sibi placaret Cesarem. 15. Nunc autem quoniam de obstaculis, que in principio habentur, explicuimus, ad materiam et intentionem accedamus. 16. Materia eius sunt in hoc opere fasti nefastique dies. 17. Intentio sua est spaciosa uolumina similiterque tediosa in breui tractatu comprehendere. 18. Causa intentionis est ut morem sacrificandi rei publice ualeat edocere, et quomodo sacrificia in sollempnitatibus debeant apparare. 19. Queritur cur in tractatu suo ortum et occasum siderum interponat. 20. Respondetur quod ideo de signis interposuit ut obitu uel ortu alicuius signi ostendat festiuitatem imminere. 21. Videndum est etiam cui parti philosophie subponatur, set sciendum est eum secundum maiorem partem [fol. 7vb31 | fol. 8ra1] sub ethica contineri, secundum uero hoc quod dictum est, ubi de signis interserit, manifestum est eum phisice subiungi.

## 20. ACC(ESSVS) LVCANI

1. Expulsis regibus ob sui superbiam cum res publica ad tantum deuenisset augmentum, quod per consules nequaquam gubernari potuisset, nouas dignitates sibi creabant, sicut dictaturam, que maior fuit et diuturnior quam

its worthier part, as we see happen in very many authors, just as in Horace the title *Book of Songs* [*Carmina* or *Odes*] and *Odes* [*Epodes*] is given; nevertheless, praises are not contained everywhere, but it derives its name from its worthier part. 9. Similarly, in Terence the plays are named after characters that play a greater role in the comedy, just as the *Andria* is named from the island Andros, and *Eunuchus* from the eunuch, a character. 10. One should also see the twisted logic of certain men about holy and unholy days, for they understand them in a wrong-headed way. 11. In fact, although we previously identified holy days as fit occasions on which it was permitted to enact laws and perform sacrifices but identified as unholy the days on which the Roman senate decreed that none of these things be done, certain men hold the opinion that the days are called holy on which they ought to have been unoccupied with public business, and it was not permitted for Roman laws to be enacted nor to sacrifice any victims to the gods. 12. Indeed, they call the days unholy on which it had been ordained not to abstain from the aforementioned things. 13. The errors of these and similar men are recognized through the testimony of Ovid when he says: “That day will be unholy during which three words are kept silent; the day will be holy during which it will be permitted to conduct business legally.” 14. It is also a matter of doubt where he wrote this book: certain men say that he wrote it in exile; others say, however, that he wrote it before he was sent away so that in this way he might reconcile Caesar with himself. 15. Now, in turn, since we have treated the obstacles that are situated in the beginning, let us approach the subject matter and intention. 16. The holy and unholy days in this work are his subject matter. 17. His intention is to deal with lengthy and likewise tedious books in a brief treatise. 18. The reason for his intention is to be able to teach the republic’s custom of sacrificing and how they ought to prepare sacrifices in religious rites. 19. It is asked why he inserts the rising and setting of stars in his treatise. 20. The response is that he has inserted material about the constellations for this reason: to show that a festival is imminent at the setting or rising of some constellation. 21. One should also look at the part of philosophy under which he is classified, but one should know that he is retained under ethics in keeping with the greater part of his work; on the other hand, according to that which has been said in places where he makes additions about the constellations, it is clear that he is brought under natural philosophy.

## 20. Introduction to *Lucan*

1. After the kings had been driven out on account of their arrogance, and when the state had reached such increase that it could in no way be governed by consuls, they created new offices for themselves, as, for instance, the

consulatus uel regia potestas; nam quinquennalis erat. 2. Statuerunt igitur tres dictatores, Pompeium M(agnum) et Marcum Crassum et Iulium Cesa- rem, duos ob uirtutem bellicam, Cesarem propter sapientiam, quia siderum considerationi deditus erat. 3. Imperatum est itaque unum urbi prouidere et duos hostibus prouidenter obuiare, sicque Pompeio ciuitatis cura, Crasso Parthia, Cesari Gallia destinatur, quam Brenno dux Sueuorum uictam ferme totam suo subiugauit imperio. 4. Idem uero a suis postea occiditur, quia Cesarem fugit ex prelio. 5. Denique Crassus pro uoto Parthia potitur, in quam uenit pacificus peccunia ab Assiriis accepta. 6. Cuius filium Crassum occiderunt et in conuiuio patri caput in disco obtulerunt; ipsum quoque manu forti circumuentum cum quam plurimis nobilibus Romanis occide- runt et auro liquenti guttur eius repleuerunt, sicque auaricie sue penas exsoluit. 7. Cesar nihilominus [fol. 8ra31 | fol. 8rb1] cum duce Sueuorum congressus Lugduni hostium exercitum sternit ducemque fugat; post apud Tullensem urbem reparatis a supradicto duce uiribus male pugnatur. 8. Hac gemina elatus uictoria toti Germanie simul parat cum Gallia. 9. Quia et Romani suis uiribus diffidebant Parthosque timebant, Cesarem ut rediret iusserunt. 10. Ipse uero quia nil dignum memoria fecerat, aliud quinquen- nium usurpauit, uictisque omnibus Gallis triumphum sibi a Romanis expos- tulauit. 11. Quo negato, collectis undique presidiiis que in urbibus posuerat, armata manu patriam hostiliter inuadit. 12. Pompeius igitur totusque senatus furoris ipsius immanitate territus Brundisium loci firmitate confisus profu- git. 13. Hinc quoque Cesare prosequente fuga nocturna dilapsi Epyrum eru- perunt. 14. Cesar igitur Pompeium Italia fugatum agnouit, Romam petiit, et opes erarii omnibus suis distribuit. 15. Inde in Yspaniam que Pompeio fidis- sima erat—manus erga Cesarem collegit—properat et Massiliam propter Brutum deleuit; ipse quoque in Hispania Petreium et Anfranium ad deditio- nem compulit. 16. Hoc facto Romam, post in Epyrum uenit, ubi modice certato in Tessaliam coierunt, ubi numerus Romanorum tamquam pro liber- tate pugnantium infi- [fol. 8rb31 | fol. 8va1] nitus occubuit; auxiliaria quoque totius uel agmina supra modum sternuntur. 17. Pompeius uictus examine

*Acc.* 20 *TBC*

7 Lugdū *T*: Lugduni *C* (*Bischoff* also proposes this expansion)

12 Brundisium *T*: Brundisium *Huygens*

13 Epyrum eruperunt *T*: eruperunt in Epyrum *BC*

dictatorship, which was greater and longer in duration than the consulship or royal power, for it was five years long. 2. They therefore appointed three dictators—Pompeius Magnus, Marcus Crassus, Julius Caesar—two on account of their military virtue, and Caesar on account of his wisdom, because he was devoted to contemplation of the stars. 3. Accordingly, it was commanded that one care for the city, while the other two were commanded to oppose the enemy with foresight, and so the administration of the city was allotted to Pompey, Parthia to Crassus, and Gaul to Caesar, which Brenno, leader of the Suebi, had conquered and almost completely subjected to his rule. 4. But afterwards, the same man was killed by his own people because he fled from battle to escape Caesar. 5. At last, according to his wish, Crassus acquired Parthia, into which he came as a peacemaker after he had taken money from the Assyrians. 6. They killed his son, Crassus, and in a banquet presented his head on a dish to his father; they also surrounded him with a powerful force and killed him together with as many Roman nobles as possible and filled his throat with molten gold, and so he paid the penalty for his greed. 7. Caesar nevertheless engaged in battle with the leader of the Suebi at Lugdunum [Lyon] and put their leader to flight; later at the city of Tullum [Toul] he had a difficult fight with their forces, which had been refreshed by the aforementioned leader. 8. Lifted up by this twin victory, he prepared for all of Germany together with Gaul. 9. Because the Romans were both distrusting their own military strength and fearful of the Parthians, they ordered Caesar to return. 10. But because he had accomplished nothing worthy of memory, he assumed power for another five-year period, conquered all the Gauls, and demanded from the Romans a triumph for himself. 11. When they refused this, he gathered together the garrisons that he had stationed in the cities and invaded his country as an enemy with an armed force. 12. Therefore, Pompey and the whole senate, which was terrified by the enormity of Caesar's anger, fled to Brundisium, assured of the fastness of the place. 13. From here too, because Caesar was in pursuit, they slipped away with an escape under cover of darkness and sallied forth to Epirus. 14. Caesar realized, therefore, that Pompey had been put to flight from Italy, headed to Rome, and distributed the wealth of the treasury to all his own people. 15. From there he hastened to Spain, which was very loyal to Pompey—it gathered troops against Caesar—and destroyed Massilia through the actions of Brutus; he himself also drove Petreius and Afranius to surrender. 16. After this had happened, he went to Rome and thereafter to Epirus; and after limited combat took place there, they came into Thessaly to join battle, where a countless number of Romans died fighting as though for their freedom, while the auxiliaries or troops of the entirety were wiped out beyond measure. 17. Vanquished in the ordeal,

uenit in Egiptum, ubi seu Cesaris gratia promerenda seu ira uitanda occideretur. 18. Porro Cesar insequens uenit in Egiptum, cui oblatum est caput; ibi Cleopatre copulatur. 19. Quem Photinus inter epulas molitur occidere; Cesar autem quasi pro mortis solatio Pholomeum tenuit, quem postea Nilo submersit, ut sequentia docebunt. 20. Pharum quoque cepit domitisque Egiptiis Cleopatram regno restituit. 21. Deinde Scipionem et unionem cum ceteris qui in Affrica cum Iuba rege copias habuerunt insequitur et plures occidit. 22. Cato Vticam fugiens ueneno periit. 23. Cesar adhuc persequi animatus uenit Mundam Hispanie ciuitatem, ubi Gneius Pompeius bello procubuit. 24. Sextus uero Pompeius in Siciliam fugiens pyriticam exercuit. 25. His omnibus prosperatis Iulius Romam rediit, libertatem obpressit. 26. Set post duos annos senatu conspirante a Bruto et Cassio uiginti quatuor uulneribus in Capitolio occubuit. 27. Qui timentes uulgu fug[i]erunt ab urbe. 28. Antonius uero magister milicie Cesaris contra predictos interfectores bellum as- [fol. 8va29 | fol. 8vb1] sumens apud Mutinam Italie ciuitatem eosdem obsedit. 29. Senatus ergo quia se consentiente factum fuerat tres principes eis in auxilium miserunt, scilicet Hyrcum et Pansam cum Octauiano qui postea dictus est Augustus Cesar qui fuit filius Iulie que soror fuit Iulii Cesaris Gagi, quem sibi in filium adoptauerat. 30. His aduenientibus occurrit Antonius, et ibidem Yrcus occubuit. 31. Pansa uero uulneratus multis diebus post moritur. 32. Octauianus quoque exercitum trium obtinuit. 33. Set Dolobella miles acceptus Antonio ipsum Antonium cum Octauiano confederauit, dicens Octauiano, “Antonius ulciscitur auunculum tuum, facias secum fedus.” 34. Et sic factum est, quia iunctis exercitibus Romam redierunt et rem publicam obpresserunt. 35. Ciceronem quoque quia publica Philippica inuecticia scripserat in Antonium et preterea ex multis Romanis nobilibus plures peremerunt. 36. Antonio quoque ad maiorem confirmationem federis Octauiam sororem suam cum matrimonio coniunxit. 37. Diuiseruntque cuncta regna Rome subdita. 38. Et euenerunt transmarine <\*\*\*> Egyptus scilicet. 39. Catulo quoque, qui magnam partem habuit exercitus [fol. 8vb29 | fol. 9ra1] in Affrica, ei relicta est Affrica et Sardinia et Corsica cum Sicilia.

19 Pholomeum *TC*: Ptolemeum *Huygens*

25 Iulius *is added above* Romam *T*

27 fug[i]erunt *my correction*

29 Hircium *BC* filius Iulie *TC*: filius Acciae filie Iulie *B reported by Huygens*

35 inuecticia *TB*] inuectiua *Bischoff*

38 *between transmarine and Egyptus there is a lacuna of probably two lines in T whose text can be supplied from C*; cf. Octauiano transmarine partes scilicet Gallia obuenerit; Antonio uero cismarine egyptus et cetera. Catulo quoque, qui magnam partem exercitus habuit in manu, ei relicta est Affrica, Sardinia, Corsica, Sicilia. *Cf. text of B read by Huygens*



Pompey went to Egypt where he was killed, either to win Caesar's favor or to avoid his wrath. 18. Further, Caesar came to Egypt in pursuit, and the head was presented to him; there he united with Cleopatra. 19. Fotinus tried to kill him at a banquet, but Caesar held Ptolemy prisoner as compensation for his own attempted murder and later drowned him in the Nile, as the following events will show. 20. He also captured Pharos, and after he defeated the Egyptians, he restored Cleopatra to the throne. 21. Then he pursued the younger Scipio and the coalition with the rest who kept their forces together with King Juba in Africa and killed many. 22. Cato fled to Utica and died by poison. 23. Caesar, still minded to take vengeance, came to Munda, a city of Spain, where Gnaeus Pompey died in battle. 24. Sextus Pompey, on the other hand, fled to Sicily and practiced piracy. 25. After all these things had been brought to a favorable pass, he [Caesar] returned to Rome and suppressed freedom. 26. But after two years the senate conspired against him, and he died on the Capitoline at the hands of Brutus and Cassius with twenty-four wounds. 27. These men feared the common people and fled from the city. 28. Antony, on the other hand, the general of Caesar's army, took up war against the aforementioned murderers and besieged the same men at Mutina, a city of Italy. 29. Therefore, the senate, because it had been done with its consent, sent three generals to them as aid, Hirtius and Pansa together with Octavian—who afterwards was called Augustus Caesar, who was the son of Atia, the daughter of Julia, who was the sister of Gaius Julius Caesar, and the latter had adopted him as his son. 30. Antony attacked these men when they were arriving, and Hirtius died on the spot. 31. Pansa, on the other hand, was wounded and died many days later. 32. Octavian also took control of the army of the three men. 33. But Dolabella, a soldier who had been welcome to Antony, made Antony himself a confederate with Octavian by saying to Octavian: "Antony is avenging your uncle; make a pact with him." 34. A pact was also thus made because they joined their armies and returned to Rome and overthrew the republic. 35. They killed Cicero, too, because he had written public Philippic invectives against Antony, and many Romans besides. 36. [Octavian] also joined his own sister Octavia to Antony in marriage as a greater confirmation of his alliance. 37. And they divided all the kingdoms that lay under Rome. 38. And the ones on the other side of the sea [lacuna] fell [lacuna] namely Egypt. 39. To Catulus also, who held a great part of the army in Africa, was left Africa, Sardinia, Corsica, and Sicily. 40. Afterwards, Lucius

40. Postea Lucius Antonius tercius esse in regno nisus est, cum Octavianum assidue lacesseret, primum apud Mutinam obsessus, et demum apud Perusium obsidione clausus, et fame compulsus est ad deditioem. 41. Que res inter Antonium Gaium et Octavianum primo discordias mouit, et autem dimissa Octouia sorore Octavianus Bruto et Cassio confederatus est. 42. Set Octavianus comparatis copiis adoptiui patris, scilicet Iulii, interfectores eius tunc primo assequitur. 43. Emathia concurritur: Brutus et Cassius sternuntur in prelio; Antonius uero <in> Egiptum <fugiens> Cleopatram reginam Egipti uxorem duxit. 44. Huius opibus cum Octavianum assidue fatigaret, apud Accium promunctorium nauali prelio concurritur, et ibi Agrippa cum turrinis nauibus Egiptiis occurritur. 45. Octavianus Antonio et Cleopatre pedestri prelio concurrit, uictorque fuisset ibi Antonius, nisi duo milia Gallorum qui se ab utraque parte abstinerant propter amorem Iulii Cesaris Octauiano occurrisent. 46. Horum auxilio uictor existens cum Cleopatram insequeretur, illa aspides mamillis suis apposuit, et mortua est; Antonius uero sumpto ueneno interiit. 47. Omnibus his sic prosperatis, desita ty- [fol. 9ra30 | fol. 9r1] rannide seuicia Romam rediit, et in tanta tranquillitate ciuitatem gubernauit, ut ob sui temporis tranquillissimam pacem Pater Urbis appellaretur. 48. Maxima quoque fuit frugum copia. 49. Agrippa Octauiam ab Antonio relictam duxit, qui Sextum Pompeium pyraticam in Sicilia exercentem nauali bello deuicit. 50. Augustus quadraginta annis regnauit; post hunc eius priuignus Liuie filius Tiberius Germanicus Claudius Nero Cesar; post hunc Gaius Cesar Galigula [post quem Gaius Cesar Galigola] post hunc uero Nero caluus nequam qui necauit matrem suam, st[r]uprum sororibus intulit, qui et Cordubam ciuitatem Burgundie uicit. 51. Ibi Lucanum et Senecam auunculum eius, quem sibi pedagogum fecit, duxit raptum Romam. 52. Hic dum scribentium laudem et utilitatem perpenderet, scribendi desiderium inuadit; fuit enim tragedus optimus, stilo florens grandiloquo. 53. Tragas Grece, Latine dicitur yrcus, inde tragedia, quia illam scribenti yrcus dabatur in precium. 54. Hec regales personas habens materiam leto principio, tristi fine contexebatur. 55. Differtur ergo tragedia a comedia, quia comos est uicus [fol. 9rb30 | fol. 9va1] ode carmen, inde comedia que mediocres personas et flebile principium cum leto fine habet. 56. Lucanus iste accusatus apud Neronem, quia

41 autem *my correction*: an(te) T

43 <in> Egiptum <fugiens> *my supplement*: in Egiptum fugiens BC

44 Egiptiis occurritur T: cum Egiptiis occurrit B

45 ab utraque parte T<sup>pc</sup>: ab utraque TB

47 desita T: *better* deposita BC (*also conjectured by Bischoff*)

50 annis T: *correctly* annos BC

52 dum scribentium *my correction*: dum scribendum T: cum scribentium BC

Antonius tried to be third in power, since he was continuously challenging Octavian, and, after he was first besieged at Mutina and at last shut in by a blockade at Perugia, he was compelled by starvation to surrender. 41. This affair at first caused disagreement between Gaius Antony and Octavian; and additionally, after his sister Octavia had been divorced, Octavian made a pact with Brutus and Cassius. 42. But Octavian mustered the troops of his adoptive father, namely Julius, and then went after his murderers for the first time. 43. There was a clash at Emathia: Brutus and Cassius fell in battle; Antony, on the other hand, <fled to> Egypt and married Cleopatra, queen of Egypt. 44. Since he was vexing Octavian continuously with her forces, there was a naval clash at the promontory of Actium, and there Agrippa had an encounter with the turreted fleet of the Egyptians. 45. Octavian clashed with Antony and Cleopatra in a land battle, and Antony would have been the victor there if two thousand of the Gauls, who had remained neutral, had not run to meet Octavian out of love for Gaius Julius Caesar. 46. After he was the victor through their help and was pursuing Cleopatra, she placed asp's next to her breasts and died. Antony, on the other hand, took poison and died. 47. After all things had thus been brought to a favorable pass and after the tyranny had ceased from cruelty, Octavian returned to Rome and ruled the state in such tranquility that he was called *Father of His City* on account of the very tranquil peace of his time. 48. The supply of the fruits of the earth was also very great. 49. Agrippa, who defeated Sextus Pompey in naval battle because he was practicing piracy in Sicily, married Octavia who had been abandoned by Antony. 50. Augustus ruled for forty years; after him, his stepson, the son of Livia, Tiberius Germanicus Claudius Nero Caesar; after him, Gaius Caesar Galigula, and after this man Gaius Caesar [*C*]aligola [italicized text is a variant of previous item]; after him the wicked, bald Nero, who killed his mother and had sex with his sisters, and who also conquered Corduba, a city of Burgundy. 51. There Nero seized and led to Rome Lucan and Seneca, Lucan's uncle, whom he made his teacher. 52. When Seneca was considering the fame and utility of writers, a desire for writing took possession of him; in fact, he was an excellent tragedian, colorful in his grand style. 53. *Tragas* [*tragos* = goat] is said in Greek, *hircus* in Latin and hence "tragedy" because a goat was given as a prize to the one who writes it. 54. Having royal characters for subject matter, it was constructed with a happy beginning and a sad ending. 55. Tragedy therefore differs from comedy because *comos* is "village," *ode* "song": hence, comedy, which has ordinary characters and a tearful beginning with a happy ending. 56. Lucan was indicted before Nero because he had been an accomplice to a

in coniuratione contra se facta consensisset, occisus est, simul et Seneca postea. 57. Materiam habet Lucanus in hoc opere principaliter Pompeium et Cesarem. 58. Secundariam habet materiam Romanos ciuilia bella facientes. 59. Intentio eius est laudare Neronem, et hoc a laudibus parentum, scilicet Iulii Cesaris et Augusti de quorum progenie iste fuit. 60. Hic uolebat descendere ad singulares duces Neronis, si non fuisset morte preuentus. 61. Recte autem intelligentibus hec laus uituperatio est. 62. Alii autem dicunt quod sit intentio sua dehortari a ciuili bello, scilicet ut hoc inducant facere quia tale malum inde euenit, ut est istud, quod nequissimo principi subiecta fuisset Roma; quod non feret, si uiuerent illi Romani, quos bellis ciuilibus abstulit. 63. Qualitas operis partim ex modo scribendi, partim ex modo recitandi, partim ex modo carminis solet adtendi. 64. Vel tres sunt stili: humilis, mediocris, grandiloquus. 65. Humilis stilus habet uicium et confinem torridum et exsanguem; medius, uagum et licenciosum; grandiloquus, turgidum et [fol. 9va30 | fol. 9vb1] inflatum. 66. Metrum istud est heroycum, quia constat ex humanis diuinisque personis continens uera cum fictis et ex dactilis constat, ad primam dico inuentionem, set propter difficultatem concambium fecit et spondeum ubique nisi in penultimo recepit, trocheum etiam in ultimis. 67. Ex humanis constat personis scilicet ex Iulio Cesare et Pompeio. 68. Aliquando etiam de diuinis in hoc agitur, continet et uera quedam ad phisicam et quedam ad historiam cum falsis et fabulosis. 69. Mixtum modum recitandi habet; sunt enim tres stili: dragmaticon ubi introducte persone locuntur, ut in Ouidio epistolarum; exagematicon, ubi auctor tantum loquitur, ut in primis libris Georgicorum; misticon, ut in Eneide. 70. Latinis etiam nominibus uocatur hii stili: proprius, alienus, mixtus. 71. Liber iste habet stilum grandiloquum et mixtum modum. 72. Est etiam historicus et tamen satyricus. 73. Vtilitas eius est abstinentia ciuilis belli. 74. Ethice subponitur. 75. Notandum quoque quod iste dicitur proprie poeta. 76. Ordinem quoque habet naturalem. 77. De duobus si opponatur, scilicet Silla et Mario, de quibus frequentur inducit, respondetur: non facit hoc secundum suam intentionem, set ad libri decorem.

59 hoc is added above et in T

60 hic T: hinc Huygens

62 ut . . . Roma T: quod nequissimi principis subiecta est regimini Huygens falsely attributes to T

conspiracy formed against him and was killed, and later Seneca was killed. 57. In this work, Lucan has as his subject matter principally Pompey and Caesar. 58. He has as his secondary subject matter the Romans waging civil wars. 59. His intention is to praise Nero, doing this also from the merits of his ancestors, namely of Julius Caesar and Augustus, to whose family he belonged. 60. Here he wanted to continue down to the individual generals of Nero if he had not been prevented by death. 61. To those who understand correctly, however, this praise is censure. 62. Others say, moreover, that his intention is to dissuade from civil war, obviously so that people will resolve not to do this because such an evil results from it, just as it is an evil, the fact that Rome had been made subject to a very wicked emperor; and this would not be happening if those Romans were living whom the civil war carried away. 63. The genre of the work is usually studied partly from the mode of writing, partly from the mode of reciting, and partly from the mode of the poem. 64. For instance, there are three styles: simple, middle, and grand. 65. The humble style has as a fault the associated characteristics of being dry and bloodless; the middle style, of being rambling and loose; the grand style, of being swollen and full of air. 66. This meter is heroic, because it consists of human and divine characters, containing truths together with falsehoods, and because it consists of dactyls—I mean at the time of its first invention—but it made a change on account of its difficulty and accepted a spondee everywhere except in the fifth foot and a trochee in the final foot. 67. It consists of human characters, namely Julius Caesar and Pompey. 68. Sometimes in this work even divine matters are discussed, but it contains both a number of truths pertaining to physical nature and a number of truths pertaining to history together with false and fabulous matters. 69. It has a mixed mode of reciting, for there are three styles: dramatic, where introduced characters speak, as in Ovid's *Epistles [Heroides]*; narrative, where the author only speaks, as in the first books of the *Georgics*; and mixed, as in the *Aeneid*. 70. These styles are also called by Latin names: one's own, belonging to another, and mixed. 71. This book has a grand style of writing and a mixed mode of reciting. 72. It is also historical and yet satirical. 73. Its utility is the avoidance of civil war. 74. It is classified under ethics. 75. One should also observe that Lucan is properly called a poet. 76. It also has a natural order. 77. If there should be an objection concerning two men, namely Sulla and Marius, about whom he gives an introduction in numerous verses, there is this response: he does not do this according to his intention but for the embellishment of his book.

## 21. TVLLII ACC(ESSVS)

1. Cato perfectus in lingua Latina transtulit se in Greciam, ubi cum studere proposuisset, contulit se in sectam [fol. 9vb30 | fol. 10ra1] Stoicorum, et perfectus factus est in illa. 2. Postea Romam ueniens in senatu multas sententias edidit editasque comprobauit, set probatas in scriptum non contulit. 3. Vnde emuli eius post mortem ipsius quod uiuentem nouerant confirmasse sumopere nisi sunt dissoluere. 4. Hoc autem cognito Brutus predicti Catonis cognatus, Tullium amicum suum, quem etiam in arte loyca nouerat peritissimum, rogauit quatenus sententias Catonis confirmaret et emulorum molimen funditus exstirparet. 5. Cuius itaque rogatu satis facere uolens, materiam in hoc opusculo Catonis sententias proposuit, set diuersas habet intentiones. 6. Nam eius principalis intentio est sententias Catonis confirmare emulorumque confutare. 7. Cuius utilitas est earundem confirmatio. 8. Alia uero intentio est et prodesse et delectare. 9. Vtilitas perfectio. 10. Per ethicam subponitur theorice, per sententiarum argumentando confirmationem loyce subponitur.

## 22. PARADOXA TVLLII

1. Tria inquiruntur in hoc libro: titulus operis, de quo agatur et qualiter. 2. Titulus est: "Incipiunt Paradoxa Tullii." 3. Vnde dicatur Paradoxa uideamus. 4. Paradoxa Grece est, et potest interpretari admirabilis gloria: admirabilis, quia sententie que dicuntur in hoc li- [fol. 10ra30 | fol. 10rb1] bro sunt contra communem opinionem hominum, ut ipse Tullius in prologo dicit, ideo admirabilis; doxa autem gloria dicitur quia ipse Tullius gloriam consecutus est, dum ea, que aliis aliena et ignota uidebantur, ipse per scripta sua fecit clara et aperta. 5. De quo agatur in hoc libro patet, scilicet de generalibus sententiis, id est de communibus, unde plurimi dubitabant, quarum prima est "quod honestum sit, id solum bonum esse." 6. Sequitur qualiter agatur. 7. Premittendo prologum agitur, in quo redditur auditor attentus, docilis, beneuolus: attentus et docilis ab inicio prologi usque in eum locum: "Accipiens igitur hoc p(aruum) o(pusculum)." 8. Ibi et beneuolus redditur auditor. 9. Ad Brutum dirigit sermonem cuius rogatu fecit hunc librum.

*Acc. 21 TM*

1 factus *is added above* est in *T*

5 rogatu *T*: rogatui *M*

*Acc. 22 T*

7 attentus et docilis ab inicio] attentus et beneuolus et docilis ab inicio *T<sup>ac</sup>* accipiens] accipies  
*Huygens* (cf. *Cic. Parad. 5* and §39 below)

## 21. Introduction to *Cicero [Paradoxa Stoicorum]*

1. Cato, after he had attained perfection in Latin, traveled to Greece, and since he intended to study there, he went into the sect of the Stoics and attained perfection in it. 2. Afterwards, on coming to Rome, he pronounced many maxims in the senate and proved the truth of the maxims he had pronounced, but did not collect the proven ones into a book. 3. Hence, after his death, his enemies strove to refute with very great effort that which they knew he had confirmed while alive. 4. Brutus, a relative of the aforementioned Cato, learned this and asked his friend Cicero, who he knew was also very skilled in the art of logic, to demonstrate the truth of Cato's maxims and eradicate the effort of his rivals root and branch. 5. And so wishing to give all that is required at the request of this man, Cicero set forth the maxims of Cato as his subject matter in this little work, but has different intentions. 6. For his first intention is to confirm the truth of the maxims of Cato and to refute those of his rivals. 7. His utility is the confirmation of the same maxims. 8. Another intention, however, is both to be of use and to give delight. 9. The utility is the attainment of perfection. 10. He is classified under speculative philosophy because of ethics; he is classified under logic because he confirms maxims by adducing proofs.

## 22. *Cicero's Paradoxes [Paradoxa Stoicorum]*

1. Three things are being examined in the case of this book: the title of the work, what is discussed, and in what manner. 2. The title is: "Here begin *Cicero's Paradoxes*." 3. Let us see why it is called *Paradoxes*. 4. *Paradoxa* is a Greek word and can be understood as "surprising glory," "surprising" because the maxims that are stated in this book are contrary to the common belief of men, as Cicero himself says in the prologue, and therefore, "surprising"; *doxa*, moreover, means "glory" because Cicero himself achieved glory when he made those things plain and clear that seemed foreign and strange to others. 5. In this book, it is clear what is discussed: namely, general maxims, that is, common ones, about which very many men are in doubt, the first of which is that "only what is morally virtuous is good." 6. Next follows in what manner the work is discussed. 7. It is discussed by introducing a prologue, in which the listener is made attentive, ready to learn, and well disposed: the listener is made attentive and ready to learn from the beginning of the prologue right up to this passage: "Receiving this little work" [cf. *Parad.* 5]. 8. There too the listener is made well disposed. 9. Cicero addresses his discourse to Brutus, at whose request he wrote this book.

10. *Animaduerti*, id est meminī; animaduertite, id est ad animum uertite.
11. *Cum in senatu s(ententiam) d(iceret)*: sententia est oratio sumpta de uita que aut quid sit aut quid esse oporteat in uita breuiter ostendit, sic: “Liber est iste qui nulli turpitudini seruit.”
12. Tales sententias dicebat Cato in senatu.
13. *Locos graues*, id est sententias graues uel ad intelligendum uel ad credendum. 14. *Abhorrentes*, id est facientes abhorrere.
15. *Ab hoc usu f(orensi) et p(ublico)*, id est ab actione forensium causarum.
16. *Maius (est) illi*, id est gloriosius et difficilīus.
17. *Cato autem*: continuatio, [fol. 10rb30 | fol. 10va1] nos autem utimur ea philosophia que parit copiam dicendi, Cato autem non.
18. *Et ea sentit*, id est ea sentit: hic est expolicio cum uidemur aliud dicere, cum maneamus in uno loco.
19. *Et est in ea heresi*, id est in ea diuisione a nobis, heresis enim diuisio dicitur.
20. *Que nullum s(equitur) f(lorem) o(rationis)*, in dialectica que non curat ornatus seruare uerborum, sicut rethorica.
21. *Neque dilatat*: per propositionem et probationem propositionum et per assumptionem et probatam et assumptam, ut rethores.
22. *Minutis interrog(atiunculis)*, id est dialecticis interrogationibus que non sunt implicite circumstantiis.
23. *Quasi punctis*, respectu rethorice probationis.
24. *Set nihil*: continuatio, ipse quod non sequebatur ornatus uerborum et tamen probabat quod uolebat quia *nihil* (*sc. est tam incredibile quod non fiat dicendo probabile*).
25. *Tam horridum*, id est tam durum.
26. *Tam incultum*, id est tam obscurum et <in>intelligibile.
27. *Quod non s(plendescat) o(ratione)*, id est quod apertum fiat per orationem
28. Et scilicet ita splendescat *tamquam excolatur*: metaphorice loquitur: sicut terra spinis obsita horrida est et inculta; spinis autem demptis est exculata, ita omnis dura sententia per expositionem clara fit et aperta.

11 aut quid sit aut quid esse oporteat *T*: aut quod sit aut quod esse oporteat *Huygens*

17 philosophia *T<sup>pc</sup>*: philopha *T*

25 *second* tam *is added above* durum

26 <in>intelligibile *Huygens*

27 *first* quod *Huygens*: quot *T*

28 demptis *T<sup>pc</sup>*: ademptis *T*



10. *I have noticed* [Parad. 1], that is, I remember; notice, that is, turn toward the mind.

11. *When he was uttering a maxim in the senate*: a maxim is speech taken from life, which shows in brief what either is in life or ought to be, just as follows: “That man is free who is a slave to no disgrace.”

12. Cato used to utter such maxims in the senate.

13. *Weighty commonplaces*, that is, maxims weighty either for understanding or for believing.

14. *Being remote*, that is, causing aversion.

15. *From this usage of the forum and people*, that is, from the pleading of court cases.

16. *A greater thing for him*, that is, more glorious and difficult.

17. *But Cato* [Parad. 2]: the connection is: we, moreover, employ that philosophy which produces fluency in speaking, but Cato does not.

18. *He both thinks these things*, that is, he thinks these things; here is an elaboration of a theme, when we seem to say something different, although we are dwelling on one topic.

19. *And he is in this sect*, that is, in this division separate from us, for *heresis* means division.

20. *Which does not pursue the embellishments of speech*: in logic, which does not care to observe embellishments of speech as rhetoric does.

21. *Nor does he amplify* through a proposition and proof of propositions and through an assumption both proved and assumed, as the orators do.

22. *With little syllogisms*, that is, with logical syllogisms that are not connected to the circumstances.

23. *As if with pinpricks*: in respect to a rhetorical proof.

24. *But nothing* [Parad. 3]: the connection is that he himself was not pursuing embellishments of speech and nevertheless proved what he wanted because *nothing* [is so unbelievable that it is not made plausible by public speaking].

25. *So rough*, that is, so hard.

26. *So uncultivated*, that is, so obscure and unintelligible.

27. [There is nothing so rough, so uncultivated] that it would not grow brilliant from oratory, that is, that it would become clear through oratory.

28. And, namely, it would grow so brilliant *as if it were cultivated*: he speaks metaphorically: just as a piece of land covered with brambles is rough and uncultivated, and after the brambles have been removed it is cultivated, so every hard maxim becomes intelligible and clear through explanation.

29. *Feci audatius*: Cato enim multa dixit que tamen probauit; ego autem pauca dicturus sum, et ideo au- [fol. 10va30 | fol. 10vb1] datius. 30. Vel aliter, que Cato dixit non discordabant a sententiis ceterorum; que uero ego dico non ergo audiuntur.

31. *Stoyce s(olet) orn(amentis) o(ratoriis) a(dhibitis) dicere*, id est sententiarum ornatibus; *Stoyce*, quia raro solebant Stoyci ornare sententias.

32. *Gimnasiis*, id est *in ipso ocio*; gymnasium locus fuit ubi exercebant ludos athlete et preter pro scolis; quia philosophia exercetur in scolis et ideo *in ipso ocio* dicit, quia ad hoc solum uacabant.

33. *Ludens*, id est non philosophicis nec grauibus argumentis utens.

34. *Communes locos*: generales sententie communes loci dicuntur, quia ab eis adducuntur probationes aliarum sententiarum, unde Tullius in Rethorica: “Hec argumenta, que in plurimas causas transferri possunt, communes locos nominamus.”

35. *Temptare uolui*: hic indicat cur aggressus sit dicere has sententias.

36. *In lucem*, id est in apertum; quomodo *in lucem* dicit *in forum*, id est in forenses causas.

37. *An alia esset que(dam) er(udita), alia p(opularis)*, id est temptare uolui an essent quedam que possent probari eruditis et uulgo, quedam que eruditis et non uulgo; quod enim non capit uulgo, capiunt eruditi.

38. *Socratica*, id est qualia Socrates solebat probare.

39. *Accipies igitur*: continuatio, quinque talia dicam, que uera sunt et Socratica igitur.

40. *Lucubraturum*, id est nocturnis [fol. 10vb30 | fol. 11ra1] uigiliis compositum: lucubratio est uigilatio iuxta lucernam in nocte habita.

41. *Contractioribus noctibus*, id est breuioribus, uel *maiorum uigiliarum munus*, id est *liber Tusculanorum* que longioribus noctibus composuit.

42. *Degustabis genus*, id est senties qualitatem.

43. *Tetica*, id est possessiua quasi dicat propria que alibi non disputa<n>tur, non ibi scolis.

32 pro scolis: pro stolis T

34 locos nominamus: locis nominamus T

37 probari *is added above* eruditis

41 maiorum *Huygens* (cf. *Cic. Parad. 5*): malorum T

43 <k>tetica *my correction*, (cf. *Cic. Parad. 5*, ed. Plasberg, p. 4, *app. crit. for l. 11*): tetica T disputatur T<sup>pc</sup>: distat T

29. *I have acted even more boldly*: for Cato said many things that he nevertheless made acceptable; however, I am going to speak briefly and for this reason more boldly. 30. Or alternatively: the things that Cato said were not in disagreement with the opinions of the rest of men; the things that I am saying, on the other hand, are therefore not heard with approval.

31. [*He is accustomed*] *in Stoic fashion to use rhetorical embellishments in speaking*, that is, the embellishments of maxims; *in Stoic fashion*, because the Stoics were accustomed to embellish their maxims rarely.

32. *In the gymnasia*, that is, *in that leisure time*. The gymnasium was a place where athletes practiced sports, and it was also a place for schools; because philosophy is practiced in schools he also says *in that leisure time* for this reason, because they were at leisure only for this purpose.

33. *Playing*, that is, not employing philosophical and serious arguments.

34. *Commonplaces*: maxims of universal application are called commonplaces, because the proofs of other maxims are drawn from them; hence, Cicero says in his *Rhetoric*: “We call these arguments commonplaces that can be transferred to most cases” [cf. *Inv.* 2.15.48].

35. *I wanted to test* [*Parad.* 4]: here he shows why he started to utter these maxims.

36. *Into the light*, that is, into the open; in the same manner as *into the light* he says *into the forum*, that is, into legal cases.

37. *Whether one certain style [of speech] is a learned one and another popular*, that is, I wanted to test whether there were certain things that could be made acceptable to the learned and to the common folk, and whether there were certain things that could be made acceptable to the learned and not to the common folk; for the learned understand that which the common folk do not understand.

38. *Socratic*, that is, the kind of things Socrates used to regard as right.

39. *You will therefore receive* [*Parad.* 5]: the connection is: I will state five such paradoxes that are true and therefore Socratic.

40. *Composed by lamplight*, that is, composed in nightly vigils: lucubration is staying awake in the night near a lamp.

41. *When the nights were more contracted in time*, that is, shorter; or *the work of greater wakeful nights*, that is, the book of *Tusculan Disputations*, which he composed during longer nights.

42. *You will get a taste of the kind*, that is, you will get a sense of its character.

43. [*K*] *tetika*, that is, things belonging to them, as if he should say “their own things” that are not discussed elsewhere, and not there in the schools.

44. *Ad nostrum hoc oratorium g(enus) d(icendi)*, id est ad genus quo nos oratores uti solemus.

45. *In arce*: arx erat locus Rome eminentissimus, ubi nobilium scriptorum scripta reponerentur.

46. *Minerua Fidiæ*: Fidiæ quidam artifex qui Minerue imaginem decentissimam fecit, que ibi reposita est.

47. *Set tamen ut ex eadem officina*, id est ex eodem ingenio.

48. Prime Paradoxe materia est honestas. 49. Intentio probare esse summum bonum honestatem. 50. Facit autem specialiter contra Epycurum, generaliter contra omnes. 51. Grec(um) proposuit ideo cuilibet paradoxe, ut opus sit auctorabilius; magis enim Grecorum quam aliorum ualuit auctoritas.

52. Modus tractandi talis est: primo purgat probando non esse uera bona que Epycuri putabant; deinde docet que sint bona.

53. *Vereor (. . .) tamen*: continuatio, ego quod probaturus sum "quod honestum sit, hoc solum bonum esse," set licet hoc meis argumentis probare uelim, tamen [fol. 11ra30 | fol. 11rb1] uereor. 54. Notandum quod uersum hunc proemii uice premitit de re de qua tractaturus est.

55. *In bonis rebus aut petendis*, id est inter bonas res aut petendas.

56. *Duxi*: pro estimauit more antiquorum.

57. *Quippe*: continuatio, uere non estimauit esse bona.

58. *Neque (. . .) expletur (. . .) neque*: probat per repetitionem.

59. *Sepe requiro*, id est requirendo miror.

60. *Peccunie membra*, id est opes, quia per peccuniam conquiruntur.

61. *Cum re*, id est effectu rei; *ac factis* et cetera, quia quamuis uerbis bona appellasset, non tamen factis suis bona esse iudicauerunt.

62. *Potestne b(onum)(. . .) aut potest*: dicit interrogando, quod debuit affirmando. 63. Est ergo hic sensus: nullus malus potest habere bonum, nec alius bonus potest habere malum, quia cuiumque bonum accedit, ipsum quoque efficit bonum. 64. Ergo diuicie et uoluptas non sunt bona, quia mali habent ea et interdum nocent bonis, quod probat per sequentem uersiculum.

65. *Atqui*, id est certe.

49 esse is added above the line

51 Grec(um) . . . paradoxe is added in the margin: Greca Huygens

52 tractandi talis est *T<sup>pc</sup>*: tractandi est talis est *T* Epycuri] Epycurei Huygens

53 uereor tamen *T<sup>pc</sup>*: uereor bona tamen *T*

55 petendis] correctly expetendis (cf. Cic. Parad. 10)

57 Quippe continuatio non estimauit esse bona *my correction*: con(tinuatio) non estimauit esse bona Quippe *T*

61 appellasset *my correction*: appellasset *T*

44. *To this our own oratorical style of speaking*, that is, to the style that we orators are accustomed to use.

45. *On the citadel*: the citadel was the most prominent place in Rome where the writings of noble writers were stored away.

46. *Pheidias's Minerva*: Pheidias was a certain artist who made a very beautiful statue of Minerva, which was stored away there.

47. *But nevertheless from the same workshop*, that is, from the same talent.

48. The subject matter of the first *Paradox* is moral virtue. 49. The intention is to prove that moral virtue is the highest good. 50. Moreover, he writes in particular against Epicurus and in general against all men. 51. He has placed the Greek before each and every paradox for this reason, that the work might be more authoritative; for the authority of the Greeks has greater validity than that of other men.

52. The method of his discussion is as follows: first he clears the way by proving that those things are not truly goods which the Epicureans thought were goods; then he teaches which things are goods.

53. *I am afraid . . . nevertheless [Parad. 6]*: the connection is that I am about to prove "that this is only good that is morally virtuous" [*Parad. I*] but, although I wish to prove this with my arguments, nevertheless I am afraid.

54. One must observe that in the place of an introduction he prefixes this line concerning the matter that he is about to discuss.

55. *In good or desirable things*, that is, among good or desirable things.

56. *I deemed*: instead of I reckoned, in the manner of the ancients.

57. *Since in fact*: I did not reckon that they were truly goods.

58. *Neither is it fulfilled nor*: he makes his proof through repetition.

59. *I often feel the loss of [Parad. 7]*, that is, while feeling the loss I marvel.

60. *Units of money*, that is, wealth, because it is procured through money.

61. *Although in reality*, that is, in the result of reality, *and in actions* etc.: because, although they had called them goods with words, nevertheless they showed with their actions that they were not goods.

62. *Can good [be for someone an evil] or can [someone in an abundance of goods not be good himself]*: he says interrogatively that which he ought to say in the affirmative. 63. There is therefore this meaning: no evil man can have good, nor can another good man have evil, because to whomever good comes, it also makes him good. 64. Therefore, wealth and pleasure are not goods because evil men have these and sometimes harm good men, which he shows through the following line.

65. *Yet*, that is, at any rate.

66. *Vera ratio*: ratio diuersas habet significationes: ratio pro computatione, pro doctrina, pro ui anime, pro consuetudine, ut hic.

67. *Ludibria fortune*, id est diuicias per quas ludit fortuna, modo huic dando, et huic auferendo, et e conuerso. [fol. 11rb30 | fol. 11va1]

68. *Cum le<n>tius d(isputantur)*, id est non acutis nec uehementibus argumentis probantur.

69. *Illustranda*, id est clare uidenda.

70. *Hanc rem*, scilicet *publicam*.

71. *Aut argenti*, id est scilicet acquirendi ad id est ipsum.

72. *Amenitates* sunt loca sine edificiis, dicte quasi sine *munitio<n>ibus*.

73. *Delectatio*, quasi dilatio.

74. *Aut suppel(lectilis)*: suppellex utensilia domus dicitur.

75. Inter *delicias* et *uoluptates* hoc interest quod delicie pertinent ad delectationem uisus, ut est in inspiciendis uasis aureis; uoluptates autem sunt in cibis potuque.

76. *Ponite*: probat per inductionem quod magis expetenda sit honestas quam uoluptas.

77. *Capedines*: uasa maiora a capiendo dicte.

78. *Vrna*: a Greco orne quod Latine dicitur recipere.

79. *Patere*: cipi; a patendo dicitur.

80. *Omitto reliquos*: occupatio.

81. *Brutum siquis*: uide fabulam in Ouidio Fastorum de Tarquinio Superbo et Arunte filio suo.

82. *Porsenna* fuit rex multa mala Romanis inferens, quem Mutius Quintus castra eius nocte ingressus occidit.

83. *Que uis Coolitem*: Samnites quodam tempore Romam inpugnabant et iam fere irruperant, set fugientibus ceteris solus Cooles Romanus ciuis contra omnem exercitum se posuit, donec hostibus impulsus de ponte [fol. 11va30 | fol. 11vb1] cadens in femore uulneratus est, unde et claudus factus est. 84. Quod cum quidam illi exprobraret, respondit: "Gaudeo quod insigne uirtutis mee mecum porto."

85. *Quem patrem Decium*: uterque Decius, et pater et filius, alter bello Samnitico, alter bello Gallico pro populo Romano se tradidit. 86. Cum

66 uera ratio *my correction* (cf. *Parad.* 8): uere rò *T*  
68 letius] *correctly* lentius (cf. *Cic. Parad.* 10)

75 uasis aureis] aureis uasis *T<sup>pc</sup>*

81 Brutum *Huygens*: Brutam *T*

84 gaudeo *my correction*: gaudio *T*

66. *True experience* [*Parad.* 8, *uera ratio*]: *Ratio* has different meanings: *ratio* corresponds to “calculation,” to “learning,” to “the power of the mind,” and to “experience,” as here.

67. *The playthings of fortune* [*Parad.* 9], that is, the wealth through which fortune plays, now giving it to this man, now taking it away from this man, and conversely.

68. *When they are discussed rather coldly*, that is, they are not proved with sharp and impassioned arguments.

69. [*They must*] *be illuminated*, that is, must be seen clearly.

70. *This state*, namely, of the people.

71. *Either of silver*, that is evidently to be acquired for itself, that is.

72. *Gardens* [*Parad.* 10, *amenitates*] are places without buildings, said as if “without fortifications” [*sine munitionibus*].

73. *Delight* [*delectatio*], as it were “delay” [*dilatatio*].

74. *Or of furniture*: furniture means “necessities of the house.”

75. Between *comforts* and *pleasures* there is this difference: that comforts have to do with the delight of sight, just as there is delight in looking at golden vases; however, pleasures are in food and drink.

76. *Place* [*Parad.* 11]: he proves by an argument from analogy that moral virtue ought to be sought after more than pleasure.

77. *Primitive sacrificial vessels (capedines)*: larger vases named from “taking” [*capiendo*].

78. *Urn*: from *orne* in Greek, which means “to receive” in Latin.

79. *Shallow bowls* [*patere*]: *ciphi* [*skyphos* in Greek = cup]; they are named from “lying open” [*patendo*].

80. *I leave out the rest of the kings*: anticipation of an objection.

81. *If anyone* [*should ask*] *Brutus* [*Parad.* 12]: see the story in Ovid’s *Fasti* about Tarquinius Superbus and his son Arruns.

82. *Porsenna* was the king inflicting many troubles on the Romans, whom Mucius Quintus killed after he had entered his camp at night.

83. *What power* [*held*] *Cocles*?: the Samnites at a certain time were besieging Rome and had already almost broken in, but as the others were fleeing Cocles, a Roman citizen, positioned himself against the whole army until he was attacked by the enemy and falling from the bridge was wounded in his thigh, from which he also became lame. 84. When some men chastised him for this, he replied: “I am glad that I carry with me the badge of my courage.”

85. *What power* [*caused the self-sacrifice of*] *father Decius*?: each Decius, both father and son, the one in the Samnite war, the other in the Gallic war, sacrificed himself for the sake of the Roman people. 86. When there was an oracle that that people would be victorious whose leader had died first, they

responsum esset cuius populi dux prior occubisset, hic uinceret, ipsi sponte in castra hostium uenientes et ipsos in se lacessentes occisi sunt.

87. *Quid continentia Gagi Fabricii*: Gaius Fabricius dictator Romanus fuit; ad quem cum legati Sabinorum uenissent infinitum aurum et argentum pollicentes, ut proderet eis Romanum exercitum, respondit Romanos aurum et argentum nolle accipere, set habentibus imperare.

88. *Qui duo propugnacula*, id est Gaius et Publius Scipio qui erant belli propugnacula Punici. 89. Ornatus rethoricus est qui circuitio dicitur, ubi est iusticia Catonis pro iustus Cato. 90. †Cartaginenses Romam uenientes dum acriter Romanos† scilicet Geius et Publius Scipio, primi ante alios ipsis restiterunt.

91. *Quid Affricanus minor et m(aior)*: Scipio auus et nepos.

92. *An cogitasse*, scilicet putabimus.

93. *Veniant igitur*: continuatio, quinque hii uiri summi et sapientissimi magis elegerunt sequi honestatem quam diuicias, [fol. 11vb30 | fol. 12ra1] aut uoluptatem, et ideo ab omnibus laudantur igitur.

94. *Qui signis*, imaginibus antecessorum.

95. *Qui tabulis*, scilicet pictis.

96. *Qui Corinthiis opibus*, id est aureis uasis et argentis Corinthi factis; ibi enim egregii opifices superfuerunt.

97. *Atque*: ad hoc. 98. Postquam probauit non esse bonum diuicias et uoluptatem, item postquam affirmauit summum bonum esse honestatem, per reprehensionem inuehitur in eos qui summum bonum dicunt esse diuicias et uoluptatem.

99. *Mater (. . .) rerum (. . .) natura*: scilicet quosdam philosophos loquitur, qui dixerunt nullum deum existere creatorem, set per naturam omnia creari et regi.

100. *Quicquam*: continuatio, uel uoluptas non est summum bonum quia non efficit meliorem uel laudabiliorem eum, qui utitur illa.

101. *Atqui*: postquam probauit non esse summum bonum diuicias et uoluptatem, concludit quid sit bonum et beatum et honestum et rectum.

87 qui<d> my supplement (cf. Cic. Parad. 12): Sabinorum] Romanorum *T<sup>ac</sup>*

88 qui] correctly quid (cf. Cic. Parad. 12)

90 Cartaginenses Romam uenientes dum acriter Romanos, a word is missing

96 opibus] correctly operibus (cf. Cic. Parad. 13)

97 atque my correction (cf. Cic. Parad. 14): adque *T*



freely went into the camp of their enemies and were killed as they were rousing them against themselves.

87. *What [was] the self-restraint of Gaius Fabricius [intent on]:* Gaius Fabricius was a Roman dictator; when ambassadors of the Sabines had come to him promising unlimited gold and silver to betray the Roman army to them, he replied that Romans do not want to receive gold and silver, but to rule over those that have gold and silver.

88. *What [were] the two bulwarks [intent on],* that is, Gaius and Publius Scipio who were bulwarks of the Punic War. 89. It is a rhetorical embellishment that is called circumlocution, where “the justice of Cato” is a circumlocution for “the just Cato.” 90. When the Carthaginians came to Rome [and fought against?] the Romans fiercely, it is evident Gaius and Publius Scipio were the first before the others to withstand them.

91. *What [were] Africanus the Younger and the Elder [intent on]:* Scipio the grandfather and the grandson.

92. *Or [do they seem] to have considered:* that is to say, we will think [they have considered].

93. *Let them come therefore [Parad. 13]:* the connection is: these five very great and wise men chose to pursue moral virtue more than riches or pleasure, and for this reason they are therefore praised by everyone.

94. *Who [are rich] in statues:* likenesses of their ancestors.

95. *Who [are rich] in pictures:* namely, paintings.

96. *Who [are rich] in Corinthian wealth,* that is, with gold and silver vases made in Corinth; for outstanding artisans abounded there.

97. *And:* in regard to this. 98. After he has proved that riches and pleasure are not the good, likewise after he has confirmed that the highest good is moral virtue, he rails reproachfully against those who say that riches and pleasure are the highest good.

99. *Nature the mother of [all] things:* evidently he is speaking of certain philosophers who have said that no god exists as creator, but that all things are created and ruled through nature.

100. *[Is] anything [good that does not make him who possesses it better?]:* the connection is, certainly pleasure is not the highest good because it does not make him who enjoys it better or more praiseworthy.

101. *Yet:* after he has proved that riches and pleasure are not the highest good, he draws the conclusion what is good and fortunate and morally virtuous and right.

## 23. ACC(ESSVS) BOETII

1. Tempore Theoderici regis Gothorum, qui tyrannidem in Romanos exercuit, auctor Boecius claruit, qui uirtute sua consul in urbe fuit. 2. Theodoricus iam tyrannidem in urbe uoluit exercere ac bonos quosque de senatu occidere. 3. Boecius uero, qui precibus et precio inuincibilis fuit, omnibus bonis presidium intulit, dolos istius [fol. 12ra30 | fol. 12rb1] effugere gestiens, quippe qui necem omnibus bonis parabat. 4. Clam literis ad Grecos missis nitebatur urbem et senatum ab impiissimis manibus suis eripere et eorum dicioni subdere. 5. Set postquam a rege reus est maiestatis et uictus ab eoque, licet falso, nigromanticus appellatus, iussit eum in carcerem Papie retrudi. 6. In quo positus hos libros per satyram edidit, imitatus Marcianum F(elicem) C(apellam). 7. Eadem specie De nuptiis Mercurii et Philologie libros composuit. 8. Set iste nobilior longe materia et facundia eum precellit, quippe quia nec Tullio in prosa nec Virgilio in metro inferior fuit. 9. Et est in hoc opere intentio Boetii inducere homines ad contemptum temporalium, que mutabilia sunt et caduca, et ne aliquis unquam uelit spem ponere in istis temporalibus nec credat aliquam sibi inesse beatitudinem. 10. Que siquis habeat et amittat, non inde doleat, et si non habeat, non in eis spem acquirendi ponat, uel ea si habiturus est, non gaudeat. 11. Proponit se ipsum exemplum omnibus, qui de tanta gloria ad tantam miseriam deuenerunt et honorem cum diuiciis amiserunt. 12. Est etiam querendum ad quam partem philosophie spectet, ad ethicam scilicet; docet enim nos bonos mores cum dicit temporalia non esse appetenda, quorum appetitu [fol. 12rb30 | fol. 12va1] mali mores ornantur. 13. Queritur: tempore cuius imperatoris fuit iste B(oetius)? 14. Dicunt quidam quod tempore Marciani imperatoris, colligentes hoc ex quatuor synodis, quarum una fuit Nicena, altera <Constant>inopolitana, tertia Ariminensis, quarta Calcidonensis. 15. Edidit autem librum de Sancta Trinitate contra Nestoridem et Euticen, unde mentionem fecit Calcedonensis

Acc. 23 T

5 reus est] reus <factus> est *Huygens* uictus] <con>uictus *Huygens* eoque] eo *Huygens*  
 licet *is added above the line in T*

6 imitatus Marcianum F(elicem) C(apellam). Eadem specie *my punctuation*: imitatus Marcianum F(elicem) C(apellam), <qui> eadem specie <poematis> *Huygens*

11 qui *Huygens*: quae T

14 <Constant>inopolitana *Huygens* Ariminensis *Huygens*: Arumnensis T

23. Introduction to *Boethius [Consolation of Philosophy]*

1. In the time of Theoderic, king of the Goths, who exercised despotism over the Romans, the author Boethius achieved fame and held the office of consul in the City because of his virtue. 2. Theoderic then wanted to exercise despotism in the City and to kill every good man from the senate. 3. But Boethius, who could not be overcome by entreaties and bribery, brought protection to all the good men, desiring passionately to evade the snares of that man as one who was in fact preparing death for all good men. 4. After a letter had been sent secretly to the Greeks, Boethius strove to rescue the City and the senate from the very unholy hands of Theoderic and place them under the authority of the Greeks. 5. But the king, after he accused and convicted him of high treason and called him, though falsely, a black magician, ordered him to be sent away to prison in Pa[v]ia. 6. And when he had been put in this place, he published these books as a prosimetric satire in imitation of Martianus Felix Capella. 7. Martianus composed the books *On the Wedding of Philology and Mercury [De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii]* in the same fashion. 8. But Boethius, who was nobler by far in subject matter and in eloquence, outstripped him, since he was inferior neither to Cicero in prose nor to Virgil in poetry. 9. In this work it is also the intention of Boethius to lead men by persuasion to the contempt of temporal things, which are changeable and transitory, and he intends that no one ever want to put their hope in these temporal things nor believe that there is any happiness in them. 10. And if anyone should have these things and lose them, he therefore should not suffer; and if he should not have them, he should not put hope in acquiring them; or if he is going to have them, he should not rejoice in them. 11. He sets forth himself as an example for all men who have declined from such great glory to such great wretchedness and lost their honor together with their riches. 12. One must also ask which part of philosophy he has in view: ethics, naturally, for he teaches us good moral behavior when he says that we should not long for temporal things; bad moral behavior is distinguished by the desire for these things. 13. It is asked: In the time of which emperor did Boethius live? 14. Some say that he lived in the time of emperor Marcianus, inferring this from the four councils, one of which was the Council of Nicaea [AD 324]; the second, the Council of Constantinople [381]; the third, the Council of Ariminium [359]; the fourth, the Council of Chalcedon [451]. 15. Moreover, he published the book *On the Holy Trinity [De sancta trinitate]* [and] *Against Eutyches and Nestorius [Contra Eutychen et Nestorium]*, because of which he made mention of the Council of Chalcedon. 16. However, it

synodi. 16. Set potest dici quod sub Martiano iuuenis fuisset et senex sub Theod(erico) rege Philosophice consolationis librum composuit, in quo imitatus est Marcianum F(elicem) C(apellam), quemadmodum prediximus partim prosa partim metro. 17. Titulus quoque talis est: “Anicii Mallii Seuerini Boetii ex magno officio uiri clarissimi et illustris exconsulum ordine atque patricio liber Philosophice consolationis primus incipit.” 18. Sciendum est quod liber iste quinque partibus componitur; tractat enim de g(enere) et s(pecie) et p(roprio) et d(ifferentia) et a(ccidenti). 19. Sciendum est etiam quod nobiles Romani auspiciu nomina et pronomina suis inponebant filiis, ut in ipsis nominibus eorum origo cognosceretur, et quales futuri essent in ipsis pronomibus pretenderetur. 20. Boecius ergo dictus <est> Anicius eo quod de gente esset Aniciorum; Anicii autem dicti sunt Fabii quasi inuicti, [fol. 12va29 | fol. 12vb1] anichios enim Grece, Latine inuictus dicitur. 21. Vel dictus est Anicius eo quod singulari certamine Gallum quendam uicerit et torquem aureum sibi abstulerit et collo suo inposuerit. 22. Seuerinus a seueritate iudiciaria. 23. Boetius a Greco boethes quod interpretatur multorum adiutor et consolator, et maxime Simmachi soceri[s] sui. 24. Ordinarius dictus est quia ordinatus erat consularis, uel quia alios ordinabat in dignitate, uel super ordinem dignitatem habens, uel quia gradatim ad summum dignitatis gradum ascenderat.

#### 24. PRISCIAN(I)

1. Licet diuersa sint uolumina, scilicet maior Priscianus de octo partibus et minor constructionum, tamen unus liber reputatur, quemadmodum liber Psalmorum, licet diuersi reputantur secundum assertionem quorundam sanctorum, tamen unus liber reputatur, quemadmodum in auctoribus, scilicet in Ouidio Metamorphoseon et in Lucano, licet diuersi sint libri, tamen pro uno libro reputantur. 2. Sic etiam est de Prisciano, quod inde conicitur, quod idem sit iste cum premissis, quia ipse asserit in principio operis sui

16 F(elicem) *Huygens*: E T *second partim is added above line*: metro *Huygens*: metum T<sup>pc</sup>: metm T

17 primus *Huygens*: primum T

19 auspiciu] auspiciato *Huygens*: cf. *Vita V, l. 11 in Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii Philosophiae consolationis libri quinque, ed. Peiper, xxxiii*

20 dictus <est> *Huygens*

23 soceri *Huygens*

*Acc. 24 T*

1 reputantur *after licet*] reputentur *Huygens*

can be stated that he had been a young man under Marcianus, and that as an old man he composed the book *Consolation of Philosophy* under King Theodoric, in which he imitated Martianus Felix Capella in the manner we have already stated, partly in prose, and partly in poetry. 17. The title also is as follows: “Here Begins the First Book of the *Consolation of Philosophy* of Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius a Senator by Virtue of His Great Service and Illustrious in His Exconsular and Patrician Rank.” 18. One should know that this book is composed with five parts: for it deals with genus, species, what is a property, what is a specific difference, and what is accidental. 19. One should also know that noble Romans gave their sons names and alternate names auspiciously so that their origin might be recognized in the names themselves and so that in their alternate names it might alleged what kind of men they will be. 20. Therefore, Boethius was called Anicius because he was from the family of the Anicii; moreover, the Fabii were called Anicii, as it were “invincible,” for *anichios* in Greek means “invincible” in Latin. 21. Or he was called Anicius because he defeated a certain Gaul in a match combat and took away for himself a golden torque and put it around his neck. 22. The name Severinus derives from judicial severity. 23. Boethius derives from the Greek word *boethos*, which is interpreted as a supporter and comforter of many men, and especially of his father-in-law Symmachus. 24. He was called Ordinarius because he had been ordained as a consul or because he was ordaining others to high office or because he held high office above his rank or because he had risen step-by-step to the highest office.

#### 24. <Introduction to> *Priscian [Institutiones grammaticae]*

1. Although the volumes are various, namely the greater Priscian on the eight parts of speech and the lesser Priscian on syntax, it is nevertheless regarded as one book, just as the book of Psalms is still regarded as one book, although they are regarded as various [books] according to the declaration of some saints; and just as in the authors, namely in Ovid of the *Metamorphoses* and in Lucan, although their books are various, they are nevertheless regarded as one book. 2. So it is also with respect to Priscian, which is concluded from this: that he is the same author as in the preface, because he himself states in the

se tractaturum in XVIII libro de constructione siue ordinati- [fol. 12vb29 | fol. 13ra1] one dictionum. 3. Ipse etiam continuat se ad supra dicta, dicens: “Quoniam.” 4. Ex his omnibus patet, quod idem sit cum premissis, et ideo non est requirenda materia nec intentio specialis. 5. Set quia hec est summa operis sui, et quia subtilius tractat hic, et quia omnis laus in fine canenda est, ideo non incongrue hic requiritur materia et intentio. 6. Materia est in hoc opere constructio perfecta uoce et sensu, ut “Socrates legit.” 7. Intentio eius est nos construere dictiones congrue copulatas, rationabiliter pronunciare ad intellectum nostrum manifestandum uel ad perficiendam constructionem. 8. Ideo dico utramque et de apta pronuntiatione et de congrua copulatione, quia tantum est uicium in grammatica praua pronuntiatio, quam praua copulatio, quemadmodum si diceretur “domine uenit”—tantum delinqueret pronuncians quantum si diceret “dominum uenit”—quia uocatiuus requirit secundam personam, set nominatiuus terciam. 9. Modus talis est: ostendit quem imitatus sit in precedenti opere, et quem imitaturus sit in subsequenti et qualiter in precedenti opere tractet de uocibus non significatiuis sigillatim acceptis, in sequenti de uocibus [fol. 13ra29 | fol. 13rb1] significatiuis constructione copulatis. 10. Ordo tractandi est: cum tractaturus esset de preposita materia, scilicet de constructione nominis et uerbi, premitit infinitas similitudines. 11. Postea, ne interpolatio fieret, id est ne sciscitaretur, quare nomen ante uerbum poneretur, cum non sit assignata causa in maiori Prisciano, primo, antequam tractet de constructione nominis et uerbi, assignat rationabilem causam quare nomen ante uerbum ponatur, et sic de ceteris, et sic finit priorem librum. 12. Postea in secundo libro incipit tractare de materia, scilicet de constructione nominis et uerbi et sic finit uel consummabit tractatum suum. 13. Et hic agit de intrinseca arte, in priori de extrinseca. 14. Extrinsecam artem nuncupamus regulas que date sunt secundum placitum auctorum. 15. Grammatica autem dicitur quasi literalis scientia, id est scientia tradita de literis. 16. Ars autem ista utilis ualde est et nulla potest sciri absque ista et magis necessaria quam dialetica, quemadmodum aqua magis necessaria est quam balsamum.

7 copulatas rationabiliter] copulatas <et> rationabiliter *Huygens*

8 domine *Huygens*: dominus *T*

11 poneretur *T<sup>bc</sup>*: ponatur et sic de ceteris *T<sup>ac</sup>*: ponatur *Huygens*

16 utilis *T*: utilis *Huygens*: necessaria quam] necessaria <est> quam *Huygens*, but perhaps better necessaria <esse> quam

beginning of his work that he will discuss the syntax or arrangement of words in the eighteenth book. 3. He also continues his train of thought in reference to the things said above when he says: “Since” [*Inst.* 17.1, *GL* 3:107]. 4. From all of these things, it is evident that he is the same as in the preface, and for this reason, one need not examine the subject matter or the specific intention. 5. However, because this is the summation of his work and because his discussion is more subtle here and because every praise must be sung at the end, the subject matter and intention are therefore not unsuitably examined here. 6. The subject matter in this work is syntax complete in sound and sense, such as “Socrates reads.” 7. His intention is that we arrange words that have been combined appropriately, and that we pronounce them systematically to make our meaning evident and to make the syntax complete. 8. For this reason, I mention each of the two, both with respect to proper pronunciation and appropriate combination, because improper pronunciation is as great a fault in grammar as improper combination, just as if one were to say *domine uenit*—one would be making as great an error in pronunciation as if one were to say *dominum uenit*—because the vocative requires the second person, but the nominative the third. 9. The method is of such a kind: he points out whom he imitated in the preceding work and whom he is going to imitate in the following work; and he points out how in the preceding work he treats words without significance if heard singly and in the following work he treats with words with significance if combined by syntax. 10. The order of discussion is: when he is going to deal with his planned subject matter, namely the syntax of the noun and verb, he gives a preface with countless analogies. 11. Next, lest an interpolation be made, that is, lest one inquire why the noun was placed before the verb, since a reason was not set down in the greater Priscian, he first sets down a theoretical reason why the noun is placed before the verb before he treats the syntax of the noun and verb, and so he treats the remaining matters, and so he finishes the first book. 12. Next, in the second book, he begins to treat the subject matter, namely the syntax of the noun and verb, and so finishes or will bring his treatise to completion. 13. And here he is concerned with an intrinsic art but in the former book with an extrinsic art. 14. We call rules that have been formed according to the opinion of the authors an extrinsic art. 15. Grammar, moreover, means as it were “knowledge of letters,” that is, “knowledge transmitted about letters.” 16. This art, moreover, is very useful—and no art can be known apart from it—and [it is] more indispensable than dialectic, just as water is more indispensable than balsam.

## 25. (Ovidius de amore)

1. Iste Ovidius dicitur De amore. 2. Materia huius est amica eius [fol. 13rb29 | fol. 13va1] Corinna, quia quamque amicam suam uocat Corinnam. 3. Finalis causa, scilicet utilitas, est ornatus uerborum et pulchras hic cognoscere positiones. 4. Quid autem differat inter Ouidium de amore et de amatoria arte sciendum est. 5. Ovidius de amatoria arte dat precepta amantibus ut sint cauti. 6. Hic dat precepta Ovidius de amatoria arte; hic autem de amore et in semetipso complet. 7. Et quia hic non habeat titulum sciendum est. 8. Nam antequam componeret istum, composuerat Ouidium de amatoria arte et cunctas fere matronas et puellas fecerat adulteras et hinc Romanos sibi reddiderat inimicos, et ideo ne adhuc maius incideret odium huic non adposuit titulum. 9. Nos autem lectores apponimus Ouidium sine titulo. 10. Proposuerat describere bellum quod fuit inter deos et Gigantes in Flegrea ualle quinque libris, set ne maius facerent tedium duos ademit. 11. Et secundum hunc propositum loquitur. 12. Facit hic prosopopeiam, id est libros loquentes ut rationales, [in]inanimatos ut animatos.

## 26. OVIDII EPISTOLARVM

1. In principio huius libri sex sunt inquirenda: uita poe- [fol. 13va30 | fol. 13vb1] te, titulus operis, intentio scribentis, materia, utilitas, cui parti philosophie subponatur. 2. Vita poete istius: Sulmonensis fuit, quod ipse testatur: "Sulmo mihi patria est." 3. Ex Peligno oppido natus est patre Publio, matre uero Pelagia. 4. Cuius frater Lucius ad rethoricam se contulit, iste uero in poetria studuit. 5. Et sciendum est ante tempus Ouidii non esse factas epistolas Rome, set Ovidius suo tempore ad imitationem cuiusdam Greci fecit primus epistolas. 6. Titulus operis sumitur a materia, que sunt epistole. 7. Sumitur etiam a loco et a persona, ut Formio et Eunuchus, uel ab actu personarum, ut Auctontumerumenos, id est se ipsum excrucians, et Sic faciunt astra, uel a materia, ut Tullius de amicitia. 8. Iste quoque a materia sumitur;

*Acc. 25 TM*

*Title: no title in T: Ouidius sine titulo M: <ACCESSVS> OVIDII SINE TITVLO Huygens*

*3 causa scilicet M: scilicet causa T*

*6 hic dat precepta . . . complet T: hic dat precepta O(uuidius) de amatoria arte is deleted and complet is added above precepta in M*

*9 O(uidium) is added above the line*

*11 hunc] hoc is the reading of Przychocki and Huygens*

*12 prosopopeiam T<sup>pc</sup>: prosopopeiam T inanimatos Przychocki: inanimatos TM*

*Acc. 26 T*

*7 sic] correctly si (cf. Macrob. In somnium Scipionis 1.19.27) amicitia T<sup>pc</sup>: amicia T*



25. [Introduction to *Ovid on Love* or *Ovid without a Title (Amores)*]

1. This Ovid is called *On Love*. 2. The subject matter of this book is his girlfriend Corinna, because he calls each girlfriend of his Corinna. 3. The final cause, namely utility, is to learn rhetorical embellishments of words and their beautiful arrangements here. 4. One should know, moreover, what the difference between *Ovid on Love* and *Ovid on the Art of Love* is. 5. *Ovid on the Art of Love* gives rules to lovers so that they may be on their guard. 6. This *Ovid on the Art of Love* gives rules; this one *On Love*, on the other hand, also fulfills them in his own person. 7. One should also know that this book does not have a title. 8. In fact, before he wrote it, he had written *Ovid on the Art of Love* and had made almost all the married women and girls adulterous and hence had rendered the Romans his enemies; and he did not give a title to this book for this reason, so that still greater antipathy might not befall him. 9. However, we readers give it the title *Ovid without a Title*. 10. He had planned a composition of five books about the war that was between the gods and the Giants in the Phlegrean valley, but he took away two books so that they might not cause greater disgust. 11. He also speaks in pursuance of this plan. 12. He makes a personification [*prosopopeia*], that is, books speaking as persons endowed with reason—inanimate as if animate.

26. <Introduction to> *Ovid's Epistles [Heroides]*

1. In the introduction to this book, six things must be examined: the life of the poet, title of the work, intention of the writer, subject matter, utility, and the part of philosophy under which it is classified. 2. The life of this poet: he was from Sulmo, because he himself declares: "Sulmo is my homeland" [*Tr.* 4.10.3]. 3. From the town of Pelignum, he was born of a father named Publius and of a mother named Pelagia. 4. His brother Lucius devoted himself to rhetoric, but he pursued his studies in the art of poetry. 5. One should know that epistles were not written at Rome before the time of Ovid, but Ovid was the first in his own time to write letters in imitation of a certain Greek. 6. The title of the work is taken from the subject matter, which is epistles. 7. The title of a work is also taken from a place and from a character, such as *Phormio* and *Eunuchus*; or from the action of characters, such as *Heautontimoroumenos*, that is, *The Man Who Tortures Himself* and *So the Stars Act*, or from the subject matter, such as *Cicero on Friendship*. 8. This title is also taken from the

intitulatur enim a quibusdam Ouidius Epistolarum propter hanc causam, quia diuerse sunt epistole in hoc uolumine, que poterant mitti uel mittebantur Grecis in obsidione Troie manentibus, uel illuc tendentibus aut inde redeuntibus, cuique de uxore sua. 9. Epi Grece, Latine supra, stola missa. 10. Littere mittuntur propter necessariam causam aliquam et sumuntur a personis que sunt eius materia. 11. Vnde quidam intitulant eum Ouidium Heroum, id est matronarum, uel librum Heroydos—heros, herois Grecum est masculinum et significat Grecas mulieres nobiles. 12. Ideo autem sic intitulatur quia subscriptus est sub personis illarum Greearum mulierum, quarum uiri demorabantur in obsidione Troie, et quia heroydes excellentiores matrone [fol. 13vb30 | fol. 14ra1] erant in Grecia, a quibus et maxima parte amatoribus suis he epistole mittebantur. 13. Hic de titulo; nunc de intentione eius uideamus. 14. Intentio eius est de triplici genere amoris, stulti, incesti, furiosi scribere, de stulto habens exemplum per Phillidem, que Demophonti reditum ut suis disponderet concessit, que exspectare non ualens ex amoris intemperantia se laqueo suspendit. 15. Incesti habet exemplum per Helenam que Paridi nupsit legitimo uiro suo sumpta Menelao. 16. Furiosi habet exemplum per Canacen que Machareum fratrem suum dilexit. 17. Aliter, intentio huius libri est commendare castum amorem sub specie quarundam heroydum, id est nobilium Greearum mulierum, quarum una erat Penolopes uxor Vlixis, uel uituperare incestum amorem sub specie incestarum matronarum quarum una fuit Phedra. 18. Aliter, intentio sua est quasdam ex illis committentibus epistolas laudare de castitate sua, quasdam autem [uituperare] reprehendere de incesto amore. 19. Aliter, intentio sua est: cum in preceptis de arte amatoria non ostendit quomodo aliquis per epistolas sollicitaretur, illud hic exequitur. 20. Aliter, intentio sua est in hoc libro hortari ad uirtutes et redarguere uicia. 21. Ipse accusatus fuit apud Cesarem, quia scriptis suis Romanas matronas illicitos amores docuisset. 22. Vnde librum scripsit eis istum exemplum proponens, ut sciant amando quas debeant imitari, quas non. 23. Sciendum quoque est quod, cum in toto libro

13 hic] hoc *Przychocki, Huygens*

17 Penolopes uxor *T<sup>pc</sup>*: uxor Penelopes *T*

18 illis *Quain*: autem reprehendere *T<sup>pc</sup>*: autem uituperare reprehendere *T*

20 redarguere *T<sup>pc</sup>*: reguere *T*

subject matter; for it is entitled by some *Ovid's Epistles* on account of this reason, because there are various epistles in this book that could have been sent or were being sent to the Greeks—to each man from his wife—who were remaining at the siege of Troy, or heading there, or returning from there. 9. *Epi* in Greek means “over” in Latin; *stola* means “sent.” 10. Letters are sent on account of some necessary reason and are taken up by the characters that are its subject matter. 11. Hence, some entitle this book *Ovid's Heroines*, that is, *Ovid's Married Women* or *Book of the Heroine*—(*heros, herois* is a Greek masculine noun and means “noble Greek women”). 12. For this reason, moreover, it is so entitled because it has been written in the assumed characters of those Greek women whose husbands were detained at the siege of Troy, and because the heroines were the more noble married women in Greece, by whom also, for the most part, these epistles were being sent to their lovers. 13. Here we have seen about the title; now let us see about his intention. 14. His intention is to write about the three types of love: foolish, unchaste, and insane, having an example concerned with foolish love in Phyllis [*Her.* 2], who allowed Demophoon to return home to settle matters with his relatives but was not able to wait for him and hanged herself with a noose because of the immoderation of her love. 15. He has an example of unchaste love in Helen, who married Paris after he had taken her from her lawful husband Menelaus [*Her.* 16–17]. 16. He has an example of insane love in Canace, who fancied her own brother Macareus [*Her.* 11]. 17. Alternatively, the intention of this book is to commend virtuous love under the guise of some heroines, that is, of noble Greek women, one of whom was Penelope, the wife of Ulysses [*Her.* 1]; or to disparage unchaste love under the guise of unchaste heroines, one of whom was Phaedra [*Her.* 4]. 18. Alternatively, his intention is to praise some of those women sending epistles on the basis of their chastity and to reproach some on the basis of their unchaste love. 19. Alternatively, his intention is this: since he did not show in his teachings on the art of love how someone could be wooed through epistles, he accomplishes that here. 20. Alternatively, his intention in this book is to urge the pursuit of virtues and to prove vices wrong. 21. He himself was charged with a crime before Caesar because he had taught Roman married women about illicit love affairs with his writings. 22. Consequently, he wrote a book setting this example for them in order that they may know which women they ought to imitate in loving and which not. 23. One must also know that although in the whole

hanc et supra dictas habeat intentiones, preterea duas habet in hoc libro, unam generalem et aliam specialem: generalem, delectari et communiter prodesse; specialem habet intentionem, sicut in singulis epistolis, aut laudando castum amorem, ut in hac, “Hanc tua P(enelope),” aut uituperando incestum amorem, ut in illa, “Quam nisi tu dederis.” 24. Et bene diuerse epistole diuersas intentiones habent, quia dum quasdam de castitate <laudare>, alias de incesto amore reprehendere proposuit, diuersa intendebat. 25. Materia sua sunt epistole sue, siue eas scribentes, scilicet maritate. 26. Vtilitas uel finalis causa secundum intentiones diuersificantur: uel illicitorum uel stultorum amorum cognitio, uel quomodo aliquem per epistolas sollicitemus, uel quomodo per effectus ipsius castitatis commodum consequamur. 27. Vel finalis causa est ut per commendationem caste amantium ad castos amores nos inuitet. 28. Vel ut uisa utilitate, que ex legitimo amore procedit, uisisque infortuniis uel incommoditatibus que ex illicito et stulto amore proueniunt et stultum et [fol. 14rb30 | Fol] illicitum repellamus et fugiamus et legitimo adhareamus. 29. Ethice subponitur, quia de iusto amore instruit. 30. Sunt quoque tres modi recitandi: exagematicus, dragmaticus, ubi persone introducuntur, misticon uel cinamicticon, ubi introd(ucitu?)r \*\*\*\* et persona loquitur. 31. Iste dragmatico[n] utitur propter quod neque inuocat neque proponit, quod si faceret, exagematico[n] uteretur.

32. In hac uero prima epistola constantia castitatis in Penolope Vlixis uxore quam castimonie exemplum proposuit. 33. Intendit quoque laudare Penolopen, non tantum propter castitatem set etiam propter fidem quam seruabat marito suo Vlixii donec in obsidione Troie permansit, quia dum cetera matrone non expectarent maritos suos saltim per duos annos aut tres, ista per undeuginti annos suum expectabat cum magna castitate, licet multi nobiles et diciores cuperent eam ducere uxorem. 34. Vlixes ytacus dux Grecorum fuit qui ad destruendam Troiam uenerant coniurati, qui prius simulata furia cum aliis ducibus non iuit ad bellum, set cum animalibus disparis nature arauit et salem seuit. 35. Hunc Palimedes Antilocho filio suo in sulco posito reuocatum ad Troiam ire coegit. 36. Qua destructa [fol. 14va30 | fol. 14vb1]

23 delectari] delectare *Huygens*

24 de castitate <laudare> *my supplement*] de castitate <commendare> *Przychocki*

26 aliquem *my correction* : aliquae *T* sollicitemus] sollicitentur *Przychocki*

28 legitimo *T<sup>pc</sup>*: legetimo *T*

30 cinamicticon *T<sup>pc</sup>*: cinamisticon *T* introd(ucitu?)r \*\*\*\*: introdcī *and lacuna of four letters in T is followed by a lacuna of four letters*

31 dragmatico[n] *my deletion*: exagematico[n] *my deletion*

32 uero *is added above hac in T*

33 tantum *Przychocki, Huygens*: tñ *T* XIX *T<sup>pc</sup>*: XX *T*

35 Palimedes *T<sup>pc</sup>*: Palamedes *T*

book he has this intention and the ones mentioned above, beyond these, he has in this book two intentions, one general and the other specific: the general, to take pleasure and to be of common use; he has a specific intention, as in every single epistle, either to praise virtuous love, as in this one, “This your Penelope” [*Her.* 1.1]; or to disparage unchaste love, as in that one: “Which, unless you give [it]” [“Phaedra to Hippolytus,” *Her.* 4.1]. 24. The quite different epistles also have different intentions because he intended different things when he planned to praise certain women for their fidelity and to reproach others for unchaste love. 25. His epistles or those writing the epistles, namely the married women, are his subject matter. 26. The utility or final cause varies according to the intentions: it is the acquaintance with either illicit or foolish love affairs; or, how we are to seduce someone through epistles; or, how we are to obtain profit through the effective practice of chastity itself. 27. Or, the final cause is that through the praise of those who love virtuously he may invite us to pursue virtuous loves. 28. Or, the final cause is that when we have seen the utility that comes out of a lawful love and the misfortunes or inconveniences that proceed from illicit and foolish love, we may reject and avoid illicit and foolish love and cleave to lawful love. 29. It is classified under moral philosophy because it gives instruction about lawful love. 30. There are also three modes of reciting: narrative; dramatic, where characters are introduced; and mixed, where they are introduced [lacuna] and a character speaks. 31. He uses the dramatic mode because he neither invokes nor announces his theme; but if he were doing this, he would use the narrative mode.

32. In this first epistle, however, it is the steadfastness of chastity in Penelope, the wife of Ulysses, which he has in mind as an example of chasteness. 33. He also intends to praise Penelope not only because of her chastity but also because of the faith that she maintained to her husband, Ulysses, while he stayed on in the siege of Troy, because even when the other married women were not waiting for their husbands so much as two or three years, she was waiting nineteen years with great chastity for her own, though many noble and quite wealthy men were desirous to take her hand in marriage. 34. Ulysses of Ithaca was a leader of the Greeks who had formed an alliance and come to lay waste to Troy. Earlier he feigned madness and did not go with the other leaders to war, but plowed with animals mismatched in nature and sowed salt. 35. Palamedes called Ulysses back to sanity when he placed his son Antilochus in a furrow and compelled him to go to Troy. 36. And,

cum in patriam reuersurus esset, quia deos in multis offenderat decem annos errauit; quidam autem dicunt, “Septem (annos),” quidam “Duodecim,” quidam “Decem in bello moratus est.” 37. Penelopes uero ipsius coniux cum de aliis sollicitaretur, hanc illi mittit epistolam, que ad eum si inueniri possit deferatur, quoniam omnes procos aspernata solius mariti desiderio calebat. 38. Set quia ista per castitatem ceteras precellebat, auctor ei primum locum dat, et quia fidem uiro suo seruat, in hac epistola commendatur et eontra idem non agentes reprehenduntur. 39. Intendens ergo eum reuocare hec uerba castitatis mittit illi dicens: “Hanc tua P(enelope),” id est in tuo amore perseuerans, “mittit.”

40. *Hanc*, scilicet epistolam, uel salutem.

41. *Vlixē*: Grecus est uocatiuus.

42. *Attamen*, una pars.

## 27. Acc(essus) De arte poetica

1. Horatius Flaccus libertino patre natus in Apulia cum patre in Sabinos comme<a>uit. 2. Quem cum pater Romam misisset in ludum literarum parcissimis impensis, angustias patris uincit ingenio, coluitque adolescens Brutum, sub quo tribunus militum in bello militauit captusque est a Cesare Augusto. 3. Post multum uero temporis beneficio Mecenatis non solum seruatus, set etiam [fol. 14vb30 | fol. 15ra1] in amiciciam est receptus. 4. Quapropter Mecenati et Augusto in omnibus scriptis suis uenerabiliter assurgit. 5. Scripsitque libros Carminum quatuor, Epodon, Carmen seculare, De arte poetica librum unum, Sermonum libros duos, Epistolarum libros quoque duos. 6. Commentati sunt in eum Porfirion, Modestus, Helenus, melius tamen omnibus Acron.

7. “Incipit liber Poesis,” uel “Poetrie,” seu “De arte poetica,” id est illa arte qua utuntur poete in scribendo: hic est titulus. 8. Intendit autem in hoc

36 moratus est moratum esse *Przychocki*

37 deferatur *T<sup>pc</sup>*: deferetur *T*

42 attamen] attm̄ *T*

*Acc. 27 TF*

1 comme<a>uit *my correction*: commeauit *Huygens*

2 angustias *correction of angustias T*: angustias *F* uincit *T*: uicit *F*

6 eum] unum *T<sup>ac</sup>* Helenus] *correctly Helenius, cf. the second life of Horace in the edition of O. Keller, p. 3* tamen] tm̄ *T*

after its destruction, although he had intended to return to his country, he wandered for ten years because he had offended the gods in many ways; some authorities, moreover, say that he was delayed in war for seven years, some say twelve, and some ten. 37. When indeed his wife, Penelope, was being tempted to remarry by other men, she sent this letter to him, that it might be delivered to him if he could be found, since having spurned all the suitors she burned with desire for her husband alone. 38. But because she was surpassing other women in her chastity, the author gives her first position, and because she was keeping her faith to her husband, she is commended in this epistle and, by contrast, those who do not do the same thing are reproached. 39. Intending therefore to call him back, she sends these words of chastity to him, saying: “This your Penelope,” that is, persistent in love for you, “sends” [*Her.* 1.1].

40. *This*, evidently, epistle, or greeting

41. *Ulix*e is a Greek vocative.

42. *But still* is one participle.

## 27. Introduction to *On the Art of Poetry* [*Ars poetica*]

1. Horatius Flaccus, the son of a freedman in Apulia, journeyed with his father to the territory of the Sabines. 2. When his father had sent him to Rome to an elementary school on a very tight budget, Horace overcame his father’s narrow means with his intellectual talent, and as a young man he revered Brutus, under whom he fought in war as a military tribune and was captured by Caesar Augustus. 3. However, after much time he was not only saved by the kindness of Maecenas but also welcomed into his friendship. 4. For this reason he rises respectfully above the commonplace in all of his writings for Maecenas and Augustus. 5. And he wrote four books of *Odes*; *Epodes*; the *Carmen saeculare*; one book *On the Art of Poetry*; two books of *Sermones*, and two books of *Epistles*. 6. Porphyrio, Modestus, and Helenius [Acro] commented on him, but Acro better than everyone.

7. “Here Begins the Book of *Poesis* or *Poetria* or *On the Art of Poetry*, That Is, on That Art Which Poets Use in Writing”: this is the title. 8. Moreover,

libro dare quedam precepta in artem poeticam, ut sciat quisque poeta quid ei sequendum sit et quid fugendum. 9. Dirigit autem hunc librum ad Pisonem et duos filios eius, maxime ad maiorem, qui scriptor comediarum fuit. 10. Quorum scripta ne reicerentur publicata, sicut quorundam aliorum fuerant repudiata, petiit pater ab Horatio precepta proprie scribendi commedias. 11. Huius rei gratia altius incepit Horatius ut de poesi communiter incipiat. 12. Est itaque correctorius quantum ad suos contemporaneos, introductorius quantum ad posteros. 13. Vtilitatem ex intentione collige, que est omnibus illis que hic preci<pi>untur instructum esse. 14. Ethice subponitur, quia ostendit qui mores conueniant poete, [fol. 15ra30 | fol. 15rb1] uel potius logice, quia ad noticiam recte et ornate locutionis et ad exertitationem regularium scriptorum nos inducit. 15. Cum ergo precepta det in omne genus scribendi, rectum ordinem seruat, prius remouendo que sunt uitanda, dehinc docendo que sunt fatienda. 16. Est autem Poetria quadripertita. 17. In prima parte remouet tria uitia que maxime scribentibus obesse solent, uidelicet eiusdem persone uel alicuius rei inequalitatem et ineptam commutationem, inutilem digressionem, ut ibi: “Inceptis gra(uius)” ; incongruam stili uariationem, ut ibi: “Maxima p(ars).” 18. In secunda parte ostendit que et qualis materia cuique sit eligenda, que scilicet par sit uiribus suis, ut ibi: “Sumite.” 19. In tercia parte quibus rethoricis coloribus materiam electam poliat et exornet, ut ibi: “Tu quid ego et.” 20. In quarta parte quibus iudicibus et correctoribus illam committat emendandam, ut ibi: “Tu mihi.” 21. Nota: poetrides uocatur ipse Horatius in hoc opere, opus ipsius uocatur Poetria, id est lex poete; aliquis enim exequens quod Horatius hic precepit uocatur poeta, id est factor uel formator; opus unius poete poema, id est fictio, scripta omnium poetarum poesis. 22. Nota etiam quod illi dicuntur [fol. 15rb30 | fol. 15va1] poete qui id quod non est in re ita ueri simile dicunt, quod, si uere esset, non posset magis proprie dici ut Virgilius, Ouidius, Terentius. 23. Quod quia iste non facit set id potius quod est in re dicit, non uocatur poeta sed poetrides.

8 fugendum *T*: fugiendum *Huygens*

9 comediarum] comearam *T<sup>ac</sup>*

10 comedias *Huygens*

13 preci<pi>untur *my correction*

14 inducit] ducit *T<sup>ac</sup>*

15 dehinc] de huic *T<sup>ac</sup>* fatienda *T*: facienda *Huygens* uiribus suis] suis uiribus *T<sup>pc</sup>*

20 ut *is added above the line* tu mihi] *correctly* tu nihil (*cf. Hor. AP 385*)

21 enim *is added above* exequens

23 poeta *is added in the margin*

*In the lower margin of fol. 14v is added* Pio grece, latine facio dicitur, inde poeta factor dicitur carminis et opus illius poema uocatur. *Cf. Huygens, Acc. de arte poetica, critical apparatus for ll. 39-46.*



in this book he intends to give certain rules for the art of poetry so that each poet may know what he must follow and what he must avoid. 9. Moreover, he addresses this book to Piso and his two sons, especially the elder, who was a writer of comedies. 10. So that the published writings of his sons might not be rejected, just as the writings of certain others had been dismissed, the father asked Horace for rules about writing comedies properly. 11. Horace began his work with greater elevation for the sake of this reason: that he may begin writing about poetry in general. 12. Accordingly, he is corrective as far as his contemporaries are concerned, but introductory as far as future generations are concerned. 13. Gather his usefulness from his intention, which is to be fully instructed in all those things that are taught here. 14. He is classified under ethics because he shows what morals befit a poet, or he is classified rather under logic because he guides us to the knowledge of correct and embellished speech and to the practiced skill of exemplary authors. 15. Therefore, since he gives rules for every kind of writing, he keeps a proper order, first by removing what must be avoided, next by teaching what must be done. 16. Moreover, the *Poetria* ("Poetics") is divided into four parts. 17. In the first part, he removes the three faults which above all are apt to hurt writers: namely, inconsistency and senseless change of the same character or of a subject; useless digression, as in that line: "At the beginning of serious works" [*Ars* 14]; and incongruous variation of style, as in that line: "The greatest part of poets" [*Ars* 24]. 18. In the second part, he shows what subject matter each poet must choose and of what kind, namely, that which is equal to his strength, as in that line: "Take a subject equal to your strength" [*Ars* 38]. 19. In the third part, he shows with what colors of rhetoric the poet may refine and adorn his chosen subject matter, as in that line: "You listen to what I and, together with me, the public expect" [*Ars* 153]. 20. In the fourth part, he shows to which critics and editors the author may entrust that poetry for correction, as in that line: "You will say or do nothing against the will of Minerva" [*Ars* 385]. 21. Note: Horace himself is called a versifier in this work, and the work is called *Poetria*, that is, the poet's law; in fact, someone who follows what Horace teaches here is called a poet [*poeta*], that is, a fashioner or shaper; the work of one poet is called a poem [*poema*], that is, a fashioning; the writings of all poets are called poetry [*poesis*]. 22. Note also that those men are called poets who so plausibly tell that which does not exist with the result that if it truly were, it could not be more properly said, just as Virgil, Ovid, and Terence do. 23. Because this author does not do this, but says rather that which exists, he is not called a poet but a *poetrides*.

24. “Incipit liber Sermonum”: talis est titulus. 25. Nota quod titulus ad hoc debet preponi, ut breuiter denotetur intentio; quod hic non possumus facere. 26. Nam intentio sua est in hoc opere diuersa uitia Romanorum reprehendere que non ostenduntur in titulo, set tamen notare possumus modum reprehendendi. 27. Nam reprehensio fit diuerso modo, alia humili oratione, ut hic, alia aliis modis. 28. Quod ipsa diffinitio sermonis ostendit; est enim sermo oratio remissa et hoc quantum ad <ex>planationem et quasi finitima cotidiane locutioni, et hoc quantum ad ipsas res. 29. Et per hoc humiliat se auctor, quod dicit se humiliter describere. 30. Et dicitur sermo eo quod inter eum et ad minus inter duos seritur et ad presentem personam fit; unde et predicatio episcoporum recte dicitur sermo. 31. Et nota: quamuis reprehendat hic quod conuenit satire, tamen non uocatur satira, cum satire sit sub certo nomine reprehendere, quod hic non fit. 32. Item nota quod hac [fol. 15va30 | fol. 15vb1] de causa reprehendit uitia, ut dehorteatur a uitiiis, et hortetur ad contraria, uirtutes scilicet. 33. Adtende: quamuis in omnibus sermonibus reprehendat, tamen, quia diuersa reprehendit uitia, in unoquoque sermone danda est propria intentio, et est in primo sermone intentio reprehendere auaritiam. 34. Scribit autem hunc primum sermonem ad Mecenatem, reprehendens inconstantiam et leuitatem hominum, quorum sententia semper secum dissidet, quibus propria sors displicet. 35. Deinde reprehendit ipsum Mecenatem nimie auaritie, non quod eum notet, set per eum alios; de inconstantia autem incipiens alloquitur Mecenatem sic: “Qui,” id est quomodo, “fit.”

36. LIBRVM Epistolarum fecit Horatius ultimum. 37. In quo non derisor ut in Odis, non ita reprehensorius ut in Sermonibus, non introductorius ut in Poetria set constanter et serio de uirtutum insertionem, de morum emendatione, proponit agere. 38. Vnde colligitur hoc principaliter intendere quoslibet moribus exornare, uirtutibus insinigare, secundo uitia remouere. 39. Materia<m> habet principalem uirtutes et bonos mores, secundo uitia que reprehendit. 40. Ethice subponitur, quia circa morum instructionem

24 titulus *T*: titulus *F*

28 explanationem *Huygens* cotidiane *T*: cottidiane *Huygens*

30 eo quod *F*: eō quod *T*: quod *Huygens*

34 hunc primum] hunc librum primum *T<sup>ac</sup>*

37 reprehensorius *T<sup>pc</sup>*: reprehensorie *T*: reprehensor *F* introductorius *T<sup>pc</sup>*: inductorie *T*: introductor *F* constanter] inconstanter *T<sup>ac</sup>*

38 insinigare] insinigare *T<sup>ac</sup>* secundo] secunda *T<sup>ac</sup>*

39 materiam *Huygens*: materia *T* secundo *F*: secunda *T*

24. “Here Begins the Book of *Sermones* [*Satires*]”: such is the title. 25. Note that the title ought to be placed at the beginning for this reason: that the intention may be briefly indicated; but here we cannot do this. 26. For his intention in this work is to reproach the different vices of Romans, which are not shown in the title, but nevertheless we can note his manner of reproaching. 27. For the reproach is done in a differentiated manner: sometimes in simple speech, as here, sometimes in other manners. 28. The definition of *sermo* [“conversation”] shows this: for *sermo* is relaxed speech—this too as far as exposition is concerned—and is, as it were, akin to everyday expression—this too as far as the themes themselves are concerned. 29. And the author puts himself on a simple level by means of this, that he says he is delineating in a simple way. 30. It is also called a conversation [*sermo*] for this reason because it is joined [*seritur*] between him and, at least, between two parties and is made to a person who is present; and from this, the preaching of bishops is also rightly called a sermon. 31. Note also: although he reproaches here, which is fitting for satire, nevertheless it is not called satire since it is the mark of satire to reproach under a definite name, which does not happen here. 32. Likewise, note that he censures vices for this reason, that he may dissuade from vices and exhort to the opposite: namely, virtues. 33. Take heed: although he is reproachful in all the *Sermones*, still one must give the intention appropriate to each “conversation” because he reproaches various vices, and the intention in the first “conversation” is to reproach greed. 34. Moreover, he addresses this first “conversation” to Maecenas, reproaching the inconstancy and fickleness of men, whose opinion is always in disagreement with itself and who are unhappy with their own lot. 35. Then he reproaches Maecenas himself for excessive greed, not because he is stigmatizing him, but because he is stigmatizing other men through him; moreover, concerning inconstancy he begins by addressing Maecenas thus: “How,” that is, in what manner, “does it happen” [*Serm.* 1.1.1].

36. Horace wrote the *Book of Epistles* last. 37. In this book he is not a derider as in the *Odes*, nor is he as reproachful as he is in the *Sermones*, and he is not introductory as in the *Poetria*, but proposes to deal firmly and seriously with the implanting of virtues and with the improvement of manners. 38. Therefore, he is understood to intend this above all: to adorn anyone whoever with good manners and to distinguish them with virtues and, in the second place, to remove vices. 39. He has as his primary subject matter virtues and good manners and secondly the vices that he reproaches. 40. He is classified under ethics because he is concerned with the instruction

uersatur. 41. Epistola sonat supermissa, unde iste liber intitulatur liber Epistolarum, uel ideo quia excellentior est ceteris operibus Horatii, [fol. 15vb30 | fol. 16ra1] uel quia super uerba missi mittuntur. 42. Tractatus Sermonum et iste in hoc conuenire uidentur, quod hic et ibi reprehensorie agitur. 43. Set multum distat, quia ibi ad presentes, hic ad absentes. 44. Hic principaliter nos instruit et secundo reprehendit, ibi agitur e contrario. 45. Distat etiam quia hic pulchris et honestis uerbis nos ad uirtutes excitat, ibi nudis et apertis uerbis uitia resecat. 46. Cum per totum librum illam quam diximus habet intentionem, in unaquaque tamen epistola specialem habet, ut in prima hanc habet intentionem nos uirtute instruere et uitia fugere. 47. Quod autem uitia fugere sit uirtus et ostendit ubi dicit: “Virtus est uitium fugere et s(apientia) prima s(tultitia) caruisse.” 48. Singule epistole in quatuor partes sunt distincte. 49. Prima igitur pars prime epistole est quedam prologi premissio. 50. Captat namque beneuolentiam Mecenas in primo. 51. Deinde cur lyrica non scribat se excusat his quinque de causis: quia in hoc genere scribendi non sit probatus, tum quia etati sue non congruat, et si etati, non tamen libeat, et ne sibi sicut Veiano gladiatori contingat, et ut monitis amicorum satis fatiat. 52. Postea prelibat opus sequens, ut ibi: “Quid uerum atque decens c(uro) et r(ogo).” 53. Subinde opus commendat ubi simili- [fol. 16ra30 | fol. 16rb1] tudinem de amante et mercenario et pupillo dat. 54. Habet igitur quod prologo conuenit cum excusatorius, prelibaticus, commendatus fit. 55. Secunda et tertia et quarta in libro notatur.<sup>1</sup>

### 28. (*Pamphilus et Galathea*)

1. In exordio huius libri ista sunt consideranda: scilicet materia, intentio, utilitas, cui parti philosophie subponatur et titulus. 2. Materia huius libri sunt iste tres persone: Pamphilus, Galathea, et anus. 3. Intentio auctoris est tractare de amore Pamphili et Galathee. 4. Utilitas est ut hoc libro perlecto unusquisque sciat sibi pulcras inuenire puellas, uel utilitas est cognitio eorum que continentur in hoc libro. 5. Ethice subponitur, quia de moribus loquitur.

41 Horatii added in lower margin as catchword below fol. 15vb30, Hor(atii) deleted in fol. 16ra1

51 fatiat T: faciat Huygens

52 quid] quod T<sup>ac</sup>

of manners. 41. Epistle means “sent over,” from which this book is entitled *Book of Epistles* either for this reason, because it is higher in quality than the rest of Horace’s works, or because messengers are sent over words. 42. The treatise of the *Sermones* and this treatise seem to agree in this point: that in the former and the latter one is concerned with reproach. 43. But there is a great difference because in the former the addressee is present while in the latter the addressee is absent. 44. In the latter, he primarily instructs us and secondarily reproaches us; in the former, the opposite is done. 45. There is also a difference because in the former he rouses us to virtues with fine and noble language while in the latter he cuts back our vices with unadorned and artless language. 46. Although throughout the whole book he has that intention that we have mentioned, nevertheless in each epistle he has a special intention, as, for example, in the first he has this intention: to instruct us in virtue and for us to avoid vices. 47. Moreover, he shows that to avoid vices is a virtue when he says: “To avoid vice is the first mark of virtue and to be free of foolishness is the first mark of wisdom” [*Epist.* 1.1.41–42]. 48. Individual epistles have been divided up into four parts. 49. Accordingly, the first part of the first epistle is a certain prefixing of a prologue. 50. For he captures the good will of Maecenas first of all. 51. Next, he excuses himself from writing lyrics on these five grounds: because he did not win approval in this literary genre; next, because it is not suited to his age; and if it were suited to his age, it would nevertheless not be pleasing; and that he may not suffer misfortune as, for example, the gladiator Veianus; and that he may give sufficient attention to the advice of his friends. 52. Afterwards, he gives a foretaste of the work that follows as in that line: “I am concerned about and ask what is true and proper” [*Epist.* 1.1.11]. 53. Thereupon, he recommends his work where he gives the simile about the lover, the hired worker, and the ward [*Epist.* 1.1.20–26]. 54. He has therefore what befits a prologue, when he becomes apologetic, prefatory, and commendatory. 55. The second, third, and fourth parts are marked in the book.

### 28. [*Pamphilus and Galathea*]

1. In the introduction to this book, one should look at the following things carefully: namely, subject matter, intention, utility, part of philosophy under which it is classified, and the title. 2. The subject matter of this book is these three characters: Pamphilus, Galathea, and the old woman. 3. The intention of the author is to treat the love affair of Pamphilus and Galathea. 4. The utility is that each single person who has read through this book knows how to find beautiful girlfriends for himself; or, the utility is the knowledge of these things which are contained in this book. 5. It is classified under ethics because

6. Titulus talis est: “Incipit liber Pamphili et Galathee.” 7. Pan, id est totus, philos, id est amor, inde Pamphilus quasi totus in amore. 8. Gala, id est alba, thea, id est dea, inde Galathea quasi alba sicut dea. 9. Pamphilus fuit quidam qui quandam puellam, scilicet Galatheam, ualde diligebat et eam nullo modo habere poterat. 10. Tandem iuit ad Venerem, cuius consilio acquisiuit sibi interpretem eiusque auxilio habuit eam. 11. Vnde compositus est liber iste. 12. Descensus ad literam talis est: “Ego diligo quandam puellam et ideo ego uulneror.”

### 29. (Tebaldus)

1. Materia Tebaldi est in hoc opere omnis illa prima sillaba que ante suum tempus non poterat cognosci nisi per exemplum. 2. In hoc eodem libro est eius intencio uniuersalem tradere regulam, qualiter omnis uocalis antecedens ad omnem consonantem in principio dictionum utrum sit breuis an longa. 3. Vtilitas est ut perlecto hoc libro et uisis his regulis non ulterius uagabimur per exempla. 4. Loyce supponitur per inuentionem. 5. Titulus factus <est> per duo carmina, scilicet: “Incipit a magno per carmina scripta Tebaldo, Regula de longis de breuibisque protis.” 6. Tebaldus autem Placentinus clericus uersificator optimus fuit, qui metrice de primis sillabis dixit hoc quod Seruiolus dixit prosaice. 7. In hoc enim opere suo premitit prologum, in quo quicquid in toto sequenti opere dicturus est breuiter preponit, dicens: “Ante per exempla,” et cetera.

### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Glose Ouidii epistolarum*, fols. 16rb6–31vb7. Edition of text in Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 229–304.

*Acc.* 28 *T*

8 alba *is added above* sicut: sicut *is deleted by Huygens*

*Acc.* 29 *T*

2 eodem *Huygens*: eadem *T*

5 factus <est> *Huygens*

7 est *Huygens*: et *T*

it speaks about manners. 6. The title is of such a kind: “Here Begins the Book of *Pamphilus and Galathea*.” 7. *Pan*, that is, “all”; *philos*, that is, “love”; hence Pamphilus as it were “all in love.” 8. *Gala*, that is, “white”; *thea*, that is, “goddess”; hence Galathea, as it were, “white” as “a goddess.” 9. Pamphilus was a certain man who strongly fancied a certain girl, namely Galathea, and in no way could he have her. 10. At last he went to Venus through whose advice he obtained a go-between for himself, and with her help he had Galathea. 11. For this reason the following book was written. 12. The way down to the literal level is of such a kind: “I fancy a certain girl and for this reason I am wounded.”

### 29. [Thebaldus]

1. The subject matter of Thebaldus in this work is every first syllable which, before his time, could not be learned except by example. 2. In this same book, his intention is to hand down a universal rule in what manner every vowel precedes every consonant at the beginning of words, whether it is short or long. 3. The utility is that after we have read through this book and have seen these rules we will no longer wander aimlessly through examples. 4. It is classified under logic on account of its invention. 5. The title has been composed by means of two verses [an elegiac couplet], to wit: “Here Begins in Verses Written by Thebaldus the Great / *The Rule on Long and Short First Syllables*.” 6. Moreover, Thebaldus, a cleric from Piacenza, was an excellent versifier who said in verse about first syllables that which Serviolus said in prose. 7. In this work of his, in fact, he prefixes a prologue, in which he briefly sets out beforehand whatever he is going to say in the whole of the work that follows, saying: “Before by examples,” et cetera.

*This page intentionally left blank.*



## Explanatory Notes

### 1. Introduction to *Ovid's Epistles [Heroides]*

The work introduced with the medieval title *Ovidius epistolarum* (literally, “Ovid of the Epistles”) is the *Epistulae heroidum* (“Epistles of the Heroines”) or *Heroides* (“Heroines”). The medieval text, which survives in over two hundred manuscripts, combines two different collections of fictional love letters composed between 20 BC and AD 2 by Publius Ovidius Naso (43 BC–ca. AD 17): the first contains letters addressed by Greek mythological heroines to their absent husbands or lovers (1–14); the second, written at a later date, consists of three pairs of letters exchanged between heroes and heroines (16–21). These two collections were transmitted together from antiquity through a single codex copied in Carolingian France around 800, which did not transmit *Her.* 15, the *Epistula Sapphus* (“Epistle of Sappho”), as well as *Her.* 16.39–144 and 21.15–250.<sup>1</sup>

Although the *Heroides* were copied and housed in some libraries in the ninth and tenth centuries, the work’s readership was limited to learned circles. When Ovid entered the canon of school authors around the middle of the eleventh century, interest in the *Heroides* grew.<sup>2</sup> An important witness for its pedagogical use in the late eleventh century is the handbook Eton, Eton College Library, MS 150: this elementary reader, which was copied in the Benedictine abbey of Monte Cassino, assembles a set of school texts including the so-called *Ecloga Theoduli* (see *Acc.* 10); the elegies of Maximianus (see *Acc.* 7); Statius’s *Achilleid*; Ovid’s *Remedia amoris* (see *Acc.* 15) and *Heroides* 1–7.159; and a fragment of Arator’s *Historia apostolica* (see *Acc.* 11).<sup>3</sup> Around the same time, the *Heroides* also appeared under the title *Ovidius in epistolis* (“Ovid in Epistles”) along with other elegiac works by Ovid in the list of a private library that a certain Brother Hugo bequeathed to the Benedictine abbey of Blaubeuren when he took orders.<sup>4</sup> By 1100, knowledge of the *Heroides* was the mark of educated readers. Baudri of Bourgueil famously imitated and rewrote *Heroides* 16 and 17, the double letters of Paris and Helen, in hexameters.<sup>5</sup> Around 1175, the influential commentator Arnulf of Orléans established the heroic epistles as the first of nine works that Ovid wrote.<sup>6</sup> The

emphasis placed on the *Heroides* in the *Accessus ad auctores* evidently reflected the view that it was an introductory work to the Ovidian corpus. The first letter by Penelope set the moral example of legitimate love that was fundamental to understanding the ethical basis of Ovid's poetry.

#### Text of *Acc.* 1

The text is based on Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19475 (T), fol. 1ra.1–21. Another version of this *accessus* appears at the beginning of a commentary to the *Heroides* in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5137, saec. XII/XIII, fols. 97r–102r. See *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 73, no. 206.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 1

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 24–25; Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*, p. 80; Rosa, “Su alcuni commenti inediti,” p. 210; Huygens *Accessus* (1970), pp. 29–30.

#### Selected Bibliography on Ovid's *Heroides*

##### Critical Edition

Ovid. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum*. Edited by Heinrich Dörrie. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.

##### Edition with Translation

Ovid. *Heroides and Amores*. Edited and translated by Grant Showerman. 2nd ed., revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1997.

##### Editions with Commentary

Ovid. *Heroides, XVI–XXI*. Edited by E. J. Kenney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. *Heroides: Select Epistles*. Edited by Peter E. Knox. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

##### Medieval Reception

Bond, Gerald A. *The Loving Subject: Desire, Eloquence, and Power in Romanesque France*, pp. 61–62. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.

Dörrie, Heinrich. *Der heroische Brief: Bestandaufnahme, Geschichte, Kritik einer humanistisch-barocken Literaturgattung*, pp. 98–100. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968.

Hagedorn, Suzanne C. *Abandoned Women: Rewriting the Classics in Dante, Boccaccio, and Chaucer*, pp. 21–46 and 187–92. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 137–204.

Commentary on *Acc.* 1*Title*

A few words need to be said about the titles that head most of the *accessus* in our Tegernsee manuscript before looking at the title of the first *accessus*. The copyists of the *Accessus ad auctores* typically left room on the right side of the first line of an *accessus* for a rubricated title that another hand filled in with majuscule lettering and rubricated. The titles occupying their own fields on the right side of the column help the reader survey the handbook's contents and see where one *accessus* ends and another begins. The titles are typically balanced on the left side of the margin by the special treatment of the first words of the *accessus* and in particular by the enlarged first initial of the first word that ascends above and/or below its own line and is decorated with flourishes and touches of red ink. The opening words of an *accessus* can have a titular function and may complement or be complemented by the title. The title is therefore an integral part of each *accessus* and of the *Accessus ad auctores* in that it helps the reader to gain access to the work.

The title of *Acc.* 1, *Accessus Ouidii ep(isto)larum*, is unique in the Tegernsee anthology. First of all, it serves as a heading not only for *Acc.* 1 but also for *Acc.* 2, which is a second introduction to the same work. It is written in miniscule and so does not have the appearance of a title, in contrast to the heading of *Acc.* 2 (*ITEM*) in the same column twenty-one lines below. Nonetheless, its position in the top margin centered over the first line of the right column establishes it as the first topic of the *Accessus ad auctores*, under which or in addition to which the other *accessus* are compiled.

There are two points to notice about the titling syntax of *Accessus Ouidii epistolarum*. First, *accessus* is used with the author's name in the genitive case rather than with the preposition *ad* followed by the author's name, as in *accessus ad Ouidium* or *accessus ad auctores*. The genitive *Ouidii* defines *accessus* adjectivally, indicating "to whom" the "introduction" relates, and so is more idiomatically translated in English as "Introduction to Ovid" rather than "Introduction of Ovid."<sup>7</sup> Second, the title of the *Heroides* is given as *Ouidius epistolarum*. The name *Ouidius* is used instead of *liber* ("book") or perhaps instead of *Ouidii liber* ("Ovid's book"). *Epistolarum* is a genitive of definition, specifying the subject matter of the Ovidian book. The titular word *epistolae* (note the medieval orthography) is probably taken from *Ars* 3.345 where Ovid titles a single letter of the *Heroides* as *Epistula*. The work's ancient title is uncertain, but it was more likely *Heroides* (*GL* 2, 544.4) or *Heroidum liber* ("Book of the Heroines").<sup>8</sup>

*Overview*

The *accessus* consists of two different sections. The first section (1–3) introduces the *Heroides* according to three headings: *intention*, *subject matter*, and *part of philosophy under which it is classified*. The second section (4–8) gives the dramatic situation (*argumentum*) of the first epistle written by Penelope to Ulysses, identifying the moral intention of Penelope and explaining the mythological background that leads her to write the letter. Such an *argumentum* would precede the word-by-word commentary (gloss) of the first epistle. Indeed, this *accessus* with the *argumentum* to *Heroides* 1 probably was excerpted from the commentary copied later in the Tegernsee codex (Clm 19475, fols. 16r–31v); the first epistle on fol. 16r is the only epistle in the commentary that does not have an *argumentum*.<sup>9</sup> The inclusion of the *argumentum* to the first epistle with the *accessus* suggests that the subject matter of Penelope’s letter to Ulysses is also introductory to the *Heroides* as a whole. The medieval commentator identifies Penelope’s legitimate love for Ulysses as the moral norm, from which the majority of subsequent letter writers deviate in displaying examples of foolish or illicit love. The other two *accessus* to the *Heroides* (*Acc.* 2 and 26) in T also include the *argumentum* of the first epistle.

The first *accessus* to the *Heroides* in the *Accessus ad auctores* has been considered defective because it discusses the *subject matter*, *intention*, and *part of philosophy* but omits treatment of topics such as the *author*, *title*, and *utility*.<sup>10</sup> However, a later introduction to Prudentius’s *Psychomachia* (*Acc.* 3.10) states that it is only necessary to handle three issues: *subject matter*, *intention*, and *part of philosophy*. This is also the opinion of Bernard of Utrecht, an influential grammarian at the end of the eleventh century, who says that some modern critics (*moderni*) discuss only these three topics in the introduction to a book (*Commentum in Theodulum*, p. 66.205–6). Similarly, in a contemporaneous introduction to a commentary on Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* uncertainly attributed to Manegold of Lautenbach (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 4610, saec. XI/XII, fol. 61va), the following pronouncement is made: “Although many things could be examined at the beginning of each book, modern critics who take joy in a certain brevity have decided that three things must be principally examined: that is, *subject matter*, *intention*, and *part of philosophy under which it is classified*.”<sup>11</sup> The first *accessus* to the *Heroides* appears to follow the trend of “modern” critical practice in concentrating its attention on these three topics. The *accessus* to Horace’s *Epistles* (*Acc.* 27.36–40) adopts the same framework.

1. “The intention of this work” (*intentio huius operis*): the heading is very close to the one Boethius uses in his paradigmatic introduction to

Porphyrius's *Isagoge* (see Hunt, "Introductions," p. 95). The preference for this heading over the Servian "intention of the writer" is a sign that the commentator recognizes that Ovid does not speak (or write) in his own person in the *Heroides*, but that there is a textual intention that organizes the letters of the heroines. The emphasis on the intentionality of the work may also reflect the tendency of "modern" grammarians to eschew biographically-based criticism at the beginning of the twelfth century (Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 116).

"To reproach men and women held captive by foolish and illicit love": the moral intention ascribed to the *Heroides* complements the program ascribed to Ovid's *Remedia amoris* in *Acc.* 15.6 and 10–12. The commentary to the *Heroides* in Clm 19475, fols. 16r–31v (Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 233–302), identifies in its *argumenta* the men and women who are censured for their love: Phyllis (*Her.* 2); Briseis (3); Oenone (4); Hypsipyle (6); Dido (7); Hercules, who is the addressee of Deianira (9); Ariadne (10); Canace and Macareus (11); Medea (12); Helen and Paris (16–17); Leander and Hero (18–19); Acontius and Cydippe (20–21).

"Foolish and illicit love": these are two different types of love (*stultus amor* and *illicitus amor*) in a tripartite scheme of love (see *Acc.* 2.4–5), whose third type "lawful love" (*legitimus amor*) is introduced below at 4. The *argumenta* for the individual letters in T's commentary on the *Heroides* generally fault the letter writers for a love that is "foolish" (Oenone, Hypsipyle, Dido, Ariadne, Medea, Leander). The siblings Canace and Macareus illustrate "illicit" love. Helen, however, is a warning to women not to love "foolishly and illicitly."

3. "Which is a teacher of manners and an eradicator of faults" (*que morum instructoria est et exstirpatrix malorum*): this definition of ethics is comparable to *Acc.* 2.6, where ethics is said to be a teacher of *good* manners (*bonorum morum est instructor*) and an eradicator of *bad* manners (*malorum uero exstirpator*). The copyist of this *accessus* could have omitted *bonorum*, but the presence of chiasmic word order, antithesis, and the wordplay with *morum* and *malorum* (the adjective is used as a substantive) suggest a conscious variation on an inherited sentence. It should also be noted that a satisfactory English translation of *mores* is difficult, which can be glossed alternatively as "morals," "moral behavior," "habits," and the like. For the translation of *mores* as "manners," compare Elliott, "*Facetus*," p. 33, who translates the first verse of the pseudo-Ovidian *Facetus*: "Whoever wishes to be courtly in manners and in life" (*Moribus et uita quisquis uult esse facetus*).

4. "Penelope": the spelling of the name here is *Penolope*, but later, correctly, *Penelope* (7), and in *Acc.* 2.10 *Penelopes*. The orthography of Greek

and Latin proper names is frequently corrupted in transmission, and variant spellings are carefully preserved rather than corrected: for an example of the rule, see the comment on *Acc.* 2.10; and for an interesting exception to the rule, see *Acc.* 3.1–2.

“Maintaining her lawful love”: this is the third type of love (*legitimus amor*) in the tripartite scheme of love (foolish, illicit, and lawful). Penelope calls her love *castus amor* in *Her.* 1.23. The phrase *legitimus amor* occurs in Ovid only at *Her.* 13.29, where Laodamia writes her departed husband Protesilaus about the pain married love causes. The writer of the *accessus* may implicitly draw a parallel between the letters of Penelope and Laodamia. In the *Heroides* commentary of T, Laodamia is praised for “preserving her lawful love” (*legitimum amorem conseruantis*; text in Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 277). Three other letters are likewise interpreted as examples of lawful love: Hermione (8), Deianira (9), and Hypermestra (14).

“Those who do not do the same are reproached”: see *Acc.* 26.37.

5. “To lay waste to Troy” (*ad extruendam Troiam*): in classical Latin the phrase would mean “to build Troy.” In his first edition, Huygens accepted this reading, but two reviewers, Francheschini and Bischoff, independently emend *extruendam* to *destruendam*, comparing *Acc.* 2.9, 8.8, and 26.34 (*ad destruendam Troiam*) and 35. While *destruendam* is the easier reading, the copyist of T or his source seems to have thought that *extruendam* is a synonym for *destruendam*, perhaps having been influenced by the phrase *extirpatrix malorum*. Furthermore, Niermeyer (s.v. *extruo* 2) attests that the verb has the meaning “lay waste” elsewhere in Medieval Latin.

6. “And because he had offended the gods . . .”: see *Acc.* 2.9 and 26.35.

7. On the courtship of Penelope by the suitors, see *Her.* 1.87–88. This reading of Penelope’s letter betrays the influence of Ovid’s tendentious reading of the *Odyssey* in *Trist.* 2.375–76: “What is the *Odyssey* except one woman sought for love by many suitors while her husband is away?”

“Penelope . . . spurned them all out of desire for her husband alone” (*omnes aspernata desiderio solius mariti*): the sentence, as it stands, lacks a verb, but is nonetheless intelligible if one understands *est* with *aspernata*. Huygens clarifies T by adopting Przychocki’s supplement: *aspernata <est>*. However, this is not the only solution for a verb lost in transmission. It is also possible that the sentence in T had a source that ended with the verb *calebat*. Cf. *Acc.* 26.36: *quoniam omnes procos aspernata solius mariti desiderio calebat* (“since having spurned all the suitors she burned with desire for her husband alone”). There is a similar sentence in another *accessus* to the *Heroides* in Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, MS Fabricius 29 2°, fol. 11ra: *Cum plerisque procis sollicitaretur, omnes aspernata solius mariti calebat desiderio* (“Although she was

tempted to remarry by very many suitors, she spurned them all and burned with desire for her husband alone").<sup>12</sup>

8. "She sends this epistle to him" (*mittit ei hanc epistolam*): this is a paraphrase of the received text of *Her.* 1.1 (*hanc tua Penelope lento tibi mittit, Ulixee*), on which see note on *Acc.* 2.11. The explanation for why Penelope sends Ulysses a letter is drawn from *Her.* 1.57–62. In that passage, Penelope complains to Ulysses that she does not know where he is and explains that she gives every sailor who puts into Ithaca a letter to deliver to him. The twelfth-century reader did not know Homer's *Odyssey* and would not have been able to recognize from the circumstances mentioned in her letter that Penelope intends to give it to the Cretan beggar—her husband in disguise—on the eve before he reveals himself to the suitors. On the timing of Penelope's letter in relation to the events of the *Odyssey*, see Kennedy, "Epistolary Mode," pp. 417–18.

"To be delivered to him if he could be found": a paraphrase of *Her.* 1.61.

## 2. Again [Introduction to *Ovid's Epistles*]

The compiler of the *Accessus ad auctores* has added a second introduction to the *Heroides* from a different source. The technique of pairing different *accessus* on the same work is applied again to Prudentius's *Psychomachia* (*Acc.* 3 and 4) and Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum* (*Acc.* 21 and 22). The same principle of compilation may also be applied within an introduction, such as *Acc.* 3 or *Acc.* 8, each of which appears to be composed from two different *accessus*.

### Text of *Acc.* 2

Clm 19475 (T), fol. 1ra.22–1va.19. The same introduction with a few variant readings appears in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19474 (M), pp. 75–76. A third version is preserved in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 29208(20 (T<sup>20</sup>), fols. 1–2, which is part of a fragmentary commentary to the *Heroides* similar to the commentary that is included in T. Hexter (*Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 149) and Munk Olsen (*Classici*, p. 49n139) identify this manuscript fragment by the shelfmark Clm 29208(19, which is now catalogued as Clm 29208(20. See further *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, pp. 130–31, no. 438 and Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 146–47, 149–51, 154–58.

### Editions of *Acc.* 2

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), p. 25; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 30; Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*, pp. 81–84.



## Commentary on *Acc.* 2

### *Title*

In the first line of the second *accessus* (fol. 1r22a), generous space is allotted on the right for a title after the opening words *Sciendum est*. The scribe who filled in the titles, however, recognized that the new *accessus* should have the same title as the first and simply wrote in the center of the offered space *ITEM* (“Again”). Although *item* may be read as a convenient way of repeating the title of the preceding *accessus* (see *Acc.* 4), it is also the kind of verbal signpost that a compiler uses to indicate an addition of similar material from a different source. Consequently, the division between the first and second *accessus* blurs, and one could view them as a composite *accessus* under the same title. *Acc.* 2 appears in M (*Acc.* 1 does not) and is titled *Accessus Ouidii epistolarum*.

### *Overview*

Like the first *accessus* to the *Heroides*, the second falls into two parts. The first part (1–7) is the introduction proper, and the second (8–11) gives the *argumentum* to the first epistle. The introduction begins by discussing the life of the author and the title of the work without using headings (1–2); the same material appears in an expanded form under headings in *Acc.* 26.2–12. The *accessus* then implements four headings to analyze the *Heroides*: *subject matter*, *intention*, *part of philosophy*, and *final cause* (= *utility*). This is the modern form of introduction that Conrad of Hirsau prefers in his *Dialogus super auctores* (p. 78.215–20) to the seven headings of the Servian introduction. The second part of the *accessus* (8–11) is comparable to the *argumentum* in the *Acc.* 1.4–8, but it focuses on the intention of Penelope, which is distinguished from that of Ovid.

1. “In Rome Ovid was the first to have written epistles”: see *Acc.* 26.5. Horace also wrote a collection of epistles, on which see *Acc.* 27. The source for the claim that Ovid was the first Roman to compose *poetic* epistles is Ovid himself. In *Ars* 3.345–46, an anonymous speaker recommends an *Epistula* as reading for women and says that it was a work previously unknown. Here Ovid implies that he had invented the genre of the heroic letter, although Propertius may have given him the idea through Arethusa’s elegiac epistle to Lycotas (4.3). Propertius’s poetry, however, was unknown in the Middle Ages. The *accessus* accepts Ovid’s claim of originality only in the limited sense that he was the first Roman to imitate the work of a Greek author. Medieval readers may have assumed that Ovid had a Greek model because Virgil (*Georg.* 2.275–76; 3.10–11) and Horace (*Carm.* 3.30.13–14) had made



similar claims to have originated a genre when they were the first to imitate a classic Greek author in Latin. Medieval grammarians thought that Ovid had a Greek model because he identified his work with the word *epistola*, which was recognized as a Greek loanword. See Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 155–56, who notes (n. 47) that later *accessus* to the *Heroides* name Hesiod, the author of the *Theogony* and *Catalogue of Women*, as Ovid’s model for writing epistles; see *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 130, no. 437.

2. “Epistle’ (*epistola*) means ‘sent over’ (*supramissa*)”: see *Acc.* 26.9 and 27.41. The Latin gloss of the Greek loanword is based on an etymology of *epistola* given by Isidore (*Etym.* 6.8.17), which explains that *stola* means “sent” (*missa*). He does not address the meaning of the prepositional prefix *epi*, which, in this case, means “to.” However, in the Middle Ages, *epi* was (incorrectly) reinterpreted as *super* (“over”) by analogy with words such as *epitaphios* (“over a tomb”). So *epistola* was glossed as *supermissa* (“sent over”). Here, however, *epistola* is glossed *supramissa*, which literally means “above sent.” It may be better to translate *supramissa* as an orthographical variant of the more common gloss *supermissa* given the parallel at *Acc.* 27.41, where *epistola* is glossed as *supermissa*. *Supramissa* also appears as a gloss for *epistola* in Hildebertus Cenomanensis (*De expositione missae*, PL 171:1157B), where it is clearly a variant spelling of *supermissa*. The sense of *supermissa* seems to be purely spatial, that is, the letter is “sent over” to the addressee. It is worth observing, however, that the gloss *supermissa* commonly appears in medieval commentaries on the Epistles of Paul, where it means that a Pauline “epistle” has been “sent” (*missa*) “over” (*super*) or “concerning” the Old Testament and Gospel: see Ps-Alcuin, *De divinis officiis*, PL 101:1250A; Haymo Halberstatensis, *In Divi Pauli epistolas expositio*, PL 117:362D–363A; Atto Vercellensis, *Expositio epistolarum S. Pauli*, PL 134:125B–126A; Herveus Burgidolensis, *Commentaria in epistolas Pauli*, PL 181:591D–593A; Niermeyer, s.v. *supermissus*.

4. The division of love into types can be traced back as far as Isidore, who lays out a quadripartite scheme: lawful, pious, cruel, and obscene (*Differentiae* 1.2.5, PL 83:9A–10A). Here the tripartite division of love into lawful, illicit, and foolish is shared with *Acc.* 1. The same division can be found in other *accessus* to the *Heroides*: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7994, saec. XIII, fol. 27 (edited by Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” pp. 45–46) and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 631, saec. XII, fol. 148v (edited by Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 223). Different divisions of love are distinguished in *Acc.* 26.14 and 17–18.

5. “For the sake of praising that third part” (*gratia illius tercie commendandi*): the text of T (and M) is grammatically incorrect, but the error is

transmitted from an earlier source and is either too trivial to correct or not perceived as an error. The gerund *commendandi* should govern an accusative (i.e., *illam terciam*), or it should be the gerundive *commendande* agreeing with *illius tercie* (sc. *partis*), which is the reading of T<sup>20</sup>.

6. “Because he is an instructor of good manners and an eradicator of bad” (*quia bonorum morum est instructor, malorum uero extirpator*): the antithesis between *bonorum* and *malorum* implies that the latter is an adjective modifying an implied *morum*. Cf. the variant in T<sup>20</sup>: *morum bonorum instructrix est, malorum extirpatrix* (Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 149n31) and *Acc.* 1.3.

7. “Final cause” (*finalis causa*): this heading also appears in three other Ovidian *accessus* in T: *Acc.* 14.4, 25.3, and 26.26–27. It is synonymous with the more common heading *utility* (*utilitas*); see *Acc.* 12.1 and 6, where these two rubrics are used interchangeably, and *Acc.* 26.26. In the *Dialogus super auctores*, Conrad of Hirsau defines the final cause as the “benefit of the reader” (*fructus legentis*, p. 78.227–28). The term is borrowed from the Aristotelian scheme of the four causes (efficient, material, formal, and final), which Boethius summarized and transmitted to the Middle Ages in his commentary on Cicero’s *Topica* 14.58–17.65 (see PL 64:1145C–1146A). For further details, see Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, p. 29; Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 147 and n. 27.

8. The objections (*obiectioes*) that Penelope “intends” to defend herself against are recorded in T’s commentary on *Heroides* 1 (Latin text in Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 233):

1.2 *Do not write anything back to me*: so that he [Ulysses] may not object to her “neither do you want me to write back nor do you want me to return.” To these words she writes: “I don’t want you to write back, but rather to come.”

Here the commentator explains the opening couplet as the rhetorical figure of responding to an anticipated objection.<sup>13</sup> Penelope’s purpose, therefore, is to counter the objection that she does not want Ulysses to return home, the implication of which is that she has been unfaithful. So the word *obiectio* may also have the sense of “reproach.” The paraphrase of the first couplet of *Heroides* 1 therefore stresses Penelope’s marital fidelity and may be attuned to other passages of the letter where Penelope draws attention to her chastity (e.g., 6–10, 23–24, 83–86).

9. Cf. *Acc.* 1.6 and 26.35.

10. “Penelope” (*Penolopes*): T, like M, presents a morphologically incorrect variant of the nominative *Penelope* (see *Acc.* 26.17). Properly speaking, *Penolopes* is a Greek genitive; however, it is not necessarily a local scribal error.

The form appears four times in Ovid's works (*Am.* 2.18.20; *Met.* 13.511; *Tr.* 1.6.22; *Pont.* 3.1.7). The first of these is Ovid's account of writing the first epistle of the *Heroides* in the *Amores: quod Penelopes uerbis reddatur Vlixi, / scribimus* (*Am.* 2.18.20–21, "I write what is delivered to Ulysses in the words of Penelope"). It may be that *Penelopes* was reinterpreted as a third declension nominative by analogy with *Ulixes*. On the limited knowledge of Greek in medieval western Europe, see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 156n49, who cites a standard work now translated into English: Berschin, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages*.

"Since she did not know where he was" etc.: see *Acc.* 1.8 and 26.36.

11. The alleged quotation is partly a prose paraphrase of the first line of Penelope's epistle and partly a summary of her overall intention. The paraphrase of the first line of the poem explains two obscurities in the transmitted text: *Hanc tua Penelope lento tibi mittit, Ulixes* (*Her.* 1.1, "Your Penelope sends this to you as you tarry, Ulysses"). The first word *hanc* ("this") is a demonstrative that lacks a referent. The prose paraphrase "Penelope sends *this greeting* or *this epistle* (*hanc salutem* uel *hanc epistulam*) to you" recognizes the ellipsis of a feminine accusative noun with *hanc* and supplies two possible referents.<sup>14</sup> Given the etymological gloss of *epistula* as *supramissa* at *Acc.* 2.2, one might see in the phrase *hanc . . . mittit* a prompt to supply *epistulam*, which is not only generically appropriate but also a title that Ovid gives to each of the *Heroides* in *Ars* 3.345. Modern textual critics, by contrast, conclude that such an ellipsis is awkward, on the grounds that it is unparalleled in Ovid and not well supported by Cicero: see Knox, *Heroides*, pp. 87–88. They prefer to adopt Palmer's emendation *haec* ("these") with which one can easily understand *uerba* ("words"), a more common form of ellipsis. The second obscurity is in the word *lento* ("slow"), which the *accessus* clarifies as "slow in your return" (*lento in reditu*). The commentator Knox (*Heroides*, p. 88) detects a possible reproach in Penelope's letter that Ulysses is "tarrying in love with another woman," an erotic possibility that the medieval commentator, not surprisingly, does not pursue. On the contrary, as one has already seen above, Penelope is read as a writer who defends herself against the charge of infidelity.

### 3. Introduction to *Prudentius's Psychomachia*

The *Psychomachia* by Aurelius Prudentius Clemens (AD 348–after 405) is an allegorical epic in one book (915 hexameters), that depicts the battle in the soul waged between personifications of Christian virtues

and pagan vices. The author introduces his work with a preface in iambic pentameter.

Prudentius became the most important of the Christian Latin poets of late antiquity. In the year 405, he gave up a successful administrative career in the service of the Christian emperors and devoted himself to writing lyric and didactic literature on Christian themes, which he published in an omnibus edition with an autobiographical preface (*Praefatio*). His literary corpus includes two works of lyric hymns (*Cathemerinon* and *Peristephanon*), four epics on Christian doctrine and polemic (*Apotheosis*, *Hamartigenia*, *Psychomachia*, and *Contra Symmachum*), and a book of epigrams (*Dittochaeon*, also titled *Tituli historiarum*).

In the earliest testimonia to the canon of Christian poets, Prudentius is recognized less for the *Psychomachia* than for his hymns and their metrical variety.<sup>15</sup> The Carolingian reception of Prudentius was more comprehensive, as witnessed by the commentaries on all of his works by the renowned grammarian Remigius of Auxerre, who was a student of John Scottus Eriugena. An anonymous version of Remigius's commentaries on Prudentius is preserved in the manuscript Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 413, saec. IX (see Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*). The same constellation of Prudentian commentaries also appears to have been transmitted in an expanded form in Trier, Stadtbibliothek, MS 1093, saec. XI, which is a famous example of a handbook (*liber manualis*) designed for the school curriculum.<sup>16</sup> Despite the all-embracing approach of the Carolingians to Prudentius's various works, the *Psychomachia* began to be transmitted separately from the rest of his poetic corpus in the ninth century and, by the eleventh century, became his signature work in library catalogues of school books.<sup>17</sup> By the end of the eleventh century, the *Psychomachia* had secured a place as one of the foundational texts of the Middle Ages, giving rise to allegorical literature and inspiring the iconography of the seven virtues and vices.<sup>18</sup>

The compiler of Clm 19475 appears to juxtapose Prudentius's *Psychomachia* with Ovid's *Heroides* as a Christian example of an advanced reading in ethics. Conrad of Hirsau treats Prudentius as the last of the Christian poets and the tenth author in his graduated curriculum (*Dialogus super auctores*, pp. 97–98.804–74). Similarly, the *accessus* collection in Pal. lat. 242 treats Prudentius as the last of the Christian poets before introducing Ovid.

### Text of *Acc.* 3

Clm 19475 (T), fols. 1va.20–2ra.18. A variant of this *accessus* appears in the Clm 19474 (M), pp. 76–77.

Editions of *Acc.* 3

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 13–14; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 19.

Selected Bibliography on Prudentius's *Psychomachia*

## Critical Editions

*Aurelii Prudentii Clementis Carmina*. Edited by Johan Bergman. CSEL 61:165–211

*Aurelii Prudentii Clementis Carmina*. Edited by Maurice P. Cunningham. CCSL 126:149–81.

## Edition with Translation

*Prudentius*. Edited and translated by H. J. Thomson. Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949.

## School Commentary

Burton, Rosemary. *Prudentius: Psychomachia*. Bryn Mawr, PA: Bryn Mawr Commentaries, 1989.

## Medieval Reception

Burnam, John. *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence d'après le manuscrit 413 de Valenciennes*, pp. 84–117. Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1910.

———. *Glosemata de Prudentio*. Cincinnati: Cincinnati University Press, 1905.

O'Sullivan, Sinéad. *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius' "Psychomachia": The Weitz Tradition*. *Mittellateinische Studien und Texte* 31. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004.

Wieland, Gernot Rudolf. *The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.5.35*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1983.

———. Review of Sinéad O'Sullivan, *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius' "Psychomachia"*. *Speculum* 80 (2005): 944–46.

## Secondary Literature

Mastrangelo, Marc. *The Roman Self in Late Antiquity: Prudentius and the Poetics of the Soul*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008.

Nugent, S. Georgia. *Allegory and Poetics: The Structure and Imagery of Prudentius' "Psychomachia"*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1985.

Paxson, James J. *The Poetics of Personification*, pp. 63–81. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Smith, Macklin. *Prudentius' "Psychomachia": A Reexamination*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Trout, Dennis E. "Latin Christian Epics of Late Antiquity." In *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, edited by John Miles Foley, pp. 550–61 (pp. 554–57). Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.

### Commentary on *Acc.* 3

#### *Title*

The title for the *accessus* does not appear in its first line (the copyist left no space). Rather, it is added in the lower margin underneath the double columns by a another hand who misidentifies the work as "Introduction to Prudentius's Hymns" (*Accessus Prudentii ymnorum*). A third hand struck out *YMNORUM* and wrote next to it *phsicomachie*. There is no title in M. It is therefore possible that the source for this *accessus* bore no title.

#### *Overview*

This *accessus* to the *Psychomachia* can be divided into three sections. The first (1–5) treats the life of the poet (1–4) and the title *Psychomachia* (5), which it analyzes etymologically. The headings *life of the poet* and *title of the work*, however, are not used. The second section (6–10) briefly examines the work according to three headings (*intention*, *subject matter*, and *under which part of philosophy it is classified*) and concludes by contrasting this kind of scheme with the "ancient" introduction based on the seven rhetorical circumstances. The third section (11–22) treats the work's incipit as its title ("Here Begins the Book of Aurelius Prudentius"). The commentator then explains the etymological meaning of each word (11–16). The etymologizing connection of Prudentius's name with *prudencia* prompts an excursus on the scheme of the four cardinal virtues (17–22), which is the only exposition of ethics in the *Accessus ad auctores*. According to Minnis (*Medieval Theory of Authorship*, pp. 19–20), the etymologizing method applied to the titular incipit is one that is typical in "modern" introductions and so could be viewed as a continuation of the second section (6–10). The titular incipit does not include the title *Psychomachia*, which was introduced and glossed earlier in the *accessus* (5). The difference between these two approaches to the title of the work, while complementary, may indicate that the *accessus* is a compilation of two types of introduction. If the pairing of the first two *accessus* to Ovid's *Heroides* in Clm 19475 aims to document different kinds of *accessus* on the same work, this Prudentian *accessus* itself exemplifies the pairing of two kinds of introduction to the *Psychomachia*.

1–4. The *accessus* begins with a brief life of Prudentius. The information about Prudentius's place of origin, and presumably his political career

too, is taken from an earlier source, which paraphrases autobiographical statements in Prudentius's poetry and, in particular, his *Praefatio*, the verse preface to his collected works. In the latter, Prudentius indicates that he underwent a spiritual conversion to Christianity as he renounced a successful political career and devoted himself to writing about God. The biographical emphasis on Prudentius's conversion is relevant to the *Psychomachia* which is concerned with the victory of Christian faith over pagan idolatry. On the question of Prudentius's conversion, see Mastrangelo, *Roman Self*, pp. 4 and 179n15.

1–2. “From Tarraco” (*Terraconensis*) and “Tarraco” (*Terraconia*): the scribe originally copied *Terraconensis* and *Terraconia* but another hand deleted the words and wrote *Draconensis* and *Draconia* instead, perhaps to make the geographical identifications consistent with those copied in *Acc.* 4.1–2. The adjective *Terraconensis*, however, is correctly transmitted inasmuch as it is an accepted medieval spelling of *Tarraconensis*, the adjective used to designate the imperial Roman province in northeast Spain or someone from the capital city Tarraco. *Terraconia* is a variant of *Terracona* or *Tarracona*, the medieval name for Tarraco (modern Tarragona), which was the Roman provincial capital. Prudentius refers to this city as “his own” in *Peristephanon* 6.143–44. However, he also calls Calagurris (Calahorra) and Caesaraugusta (Saragossa) “his own” in *Peristephanon* (1.116; 4.31; 4.141).

2. “Tarraco (*Terraconia*) was a certain region uninhabitable because of snakes”: the place-name is explained by an etymologizing connection, apparently a medieval invention, between *Terraconia* and *drakôn*, which is Greek for serpent or snake. Whitbread, “Conrad of Hirsau,” p. 236, suggests that the snakes were to be understood as the Moors who made Spain uninhabitable for Christians, and that they were expelled from Tarraco by Raymond IV of Barcelona in 1089, thus making the place habitable. Yet one does not know whether this part of the *accessus* was written before or after 1089. If snakes were associated with idolatry in Christian theological polemic, the snakes of Tarraco could also have been the pagans who persecuted Christians. Support for this idea comes from Prudentius's hymn to the Christian martyrs of Tarraco who were put to death in the year 259 by the “bloody snake of God” (*Perist.* 6.22–23) during the persecutions ordered by the emperor Valerian.

3. “Three times he rose to the office of consul”: Prudentius says in the autobiographical introduction to his poetic works that he held two appointments as a governor of cities and that he was promoted within the civil service to a position very close to the emperor (*Praefatio* 16–21). That he rose to the consulship three times appears to be a better story for someone who was a model student.



4. “Thereafter, accepting the faith and having become Christian”: in his *Praefatio* (22–45), Prudentius explains that he renounced political office and turned to writing poetry in the service of God. Modern scholars have taken this to mean that Prudentius was a nominal Christian, rather than a pagan, when he underwent his conversion. The medieval biography assumes rather that Prudentius converted from paganism to Christianity. This assumption may also be encouraged by the *Psychomachia* itself, in which the first virtue *Fides* (“Faith”) defeats the opposing vice *Veterum Cultura Deorum* (“Worship of the Old Gods”).

5. “In response to the disagreement of certain men” (*Ad quorundam differentiam*): the sense of this phrase is difficult. The “disagreement” or “difference of opinion” appears to refer to pagan disapproval of Prudentius’s service to God. Bischoff (p. 336) suggests that the word’s proper orthography should be *deferentiam* (see *Acc.* 27.28, where *diffinitio* appears instead of *definitio*). The noun *deferentia* is not treated in standard medieval Latin lexica, but one may compare French *déférence* and Italian *deferenza*. The proposed emendation, however, scarcely improves the text’s sense.

“The battle of the soul” (*pugna anime*): this Latin translation of the Greek title *Psychomachia* is found in the earliest glosses (from the seventh or eighth century) on Prudentius (see Burnam, *Glossemata de Prudentio*, p. 58) and in the Remigian commentary on Prudentius in Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 413 (see Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*, p. 84). It is unlikely that *pugna anime* means “the battle for the soul,” given that the Valenciennes commentary clarifies *psychomachia* as “the soul’s battle with the vices” (*pugna animae cum vitiis*), thus making the genitive subjective rather than objective; this interpretation accords with the *Glossemata de Prudentio* (“the battle of the soul, that is, the vices stand opposed”). Modern commentators discuss three possible meanings for the title: (a) the battle in the soul between virtues and vices; (b) battle between virtues and vices for the soul; (c) and the battle of the soul against bodily vices. The medieval commentary tradition opts for (c). See Smith, *Prudentius’ “Psychomachia,”* p. 113n5, with reference to Gnllka, *Studien zur Psychomachie*, pp. 19–26.

6. “His intention is to make visible (*uisibilem*) for us this invisible phenomenon (*inuisibilem rem*)”: Prudentius makes the invisible battle of the soul visible by personifying the virtues and vices as flesh and blood creatures fighting in single combat with each other. Modern critics call this type of narrative—the first sustained one of its kind—personification allegory; see Smith, *Prudentius’ “Psychomachia,”* pp. 3–4, 23–24, 109–10; Mastrangelo, *Roman Self*, pp. 82–83. The adjectives *inuisibilis* and *uisibilis* belong to ecclesiastical Latin and usually refer to the soul and body respectively. Making visible the



invisible is also central to Christian doctrine, as the invisible Father made himself visible through the body of Christ. This idea is taken up in Tertullian's treatise *De carne Christi* 11 (see the edition of Evans, pp. 40-43, with notes, pp. 130-34) and is handled by Prudentius in the *Apotheosis* (122-24): "It is the gift of the *invisible* Father to produce a *visible* Son, through whom the Father himself is able to be seen." In the *Psychomachia*, Prudentius makes visible the invisible virtues and vices, so that the battle of the soul for salvation may be seen (see *Psych.* 18-20).

"Because that which lies before the eyes is perceived more easily than that which is heard": a fuller explanation of this principle is given at *Acc.* 4.10-11. The idea may be commonplace (see Otto, s.v. *oculus* 9), but the phrase *quod oculis subiacet* ("that which lies before the eyes") may be influenced by Horace's *Ars poetica* (180-83). Horace states that "what has been placed before the eyes" (181, *quae sunt oculis subiecta*) moves the minds of men more quickly than things heard. He himself draws the idea from rhetorical theory about "vividness" (*euidencia*), on which see Brink, *Horace on Poetry*, pp. 245-46. The *accessus* thus harmonizes Prudentius's theological intention of making visible the invisible with a rhetorical one of turning the listener into a spectator through vivid description. The probability that Horace is the authority for this rhetorical explanation of Prudentian personification is increased by the fact that the *Ars poetica* is part of the medieval curriculum (see *Acc.* 27). In addition, Servian commentary, which served as a model for commentaries on Prudentius, frequently deploys the *Ars poetica* to explain Virgil.

7. "His primary subject matter is Abram": in the iambic preface to the *Psychomachia*, Prudentius introduces Abraham by his original name and explains that God increased his name by a syllable. Prudentius then paraphrases the story of Abraham's fatherhood in Genesis and interprets it as a prefiguration of Christianity. The *accessus* therefore identifies the subject matter of the preface as the subject matter of the *Psychomachia* itself. However, it does not clarify the relationship between Abraham's tale, as told in the preface, and the battle of the soul in the epic itself. This relationship is explained in Prudentius's preface to the poem (*Psych. praef.* 9-10 and 50-57), as well as in *Acc.* 4.14-15. Abraham's fight with the four gentile kings in Genesis 14 is a typological example of the faithful Christian's battle with the vices. Consequently, the *Psychomachia* is not only a personification allegory about the moral struggle conducted within the soul of every Christian but also a scriptural allegory, which is to say a Christian moral exegesis of the Abraham tale. This understanding of Prudentius's purpose is already attested in the Remigian commentary on the *Psychomachia*, especially in its comments on

*Psych. praef.* 9 and 57 (Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*, pp. 84 and 87). Prudentius's association of the four barbarian kings with the vices appears original, but he may have been familiar with St. Ambrose's interpretation of the four kings as bodily and worldly enticements and more specifically the four elements out of which man's flesh and the world are composed (*De Abraham* 2.7.41, PL 14:497B).

"The secondary subject matter, worldly things, is everything else that is introduced" (*secunda secularia, omne quod introducitur*): Huygens (*Accessus* [1970], p. 19) reports the deletion of *secunda* in T, of which I see no evidence. He adopts Bischoff's emendation of *secunda secularia* to *secundaria*, which yields the following sense: "the secondary subject matter is everything (else) that is introduced." But can one be so certain about emending *secularia* away? Tertullian says in a memorable phrase in *De spectaculis* 15 (CSEL 20:17): "The world is God's, but worldly things are the devil's" (*saeculum Dei est, saecularia autem diaboli*). Prudentius picks up this idea in his *Praefatio* when he reflects on the meaning of his political career at the end of his life (31–34): "It must be said to me: 'Whoever you are, your mind has lost the world (*mundum*) which it cherished. Those things which it pursued are not God's, to whom you will belong.'" If Abraham is the Christian soul, the barbarian kings are the worldly things—the vices—introduced in the preface to the *Psychomachia*.

9–10. This part of the *accessus* contrasts its introductory scheme of three headings with the rhetorical scheme of the "ancients" based on the seven circumstances. This kind of methodological self-consciousness is paralleled in the introduction to a Remigian commentary on the *Disticha Catonis* revised in the eleventh century and copied in Lucca, Biblioteca Statale, MS 1433, saec. XI/XII (Mancini, "Un commento ignoto di Remy d'Auxerre," pp. 179–80), which reviews the seven circumstances but adopts a modern scheme of the *life of the poet*, the *title of the work*, and *to what part of philosophy it looks*. Bernard of Utrecht's introduction to his *Commentum in Theodolum* (p. 66.201–6) likewise distinguishes the rhetorical scheme of the ancients from the modern scheme (*subject matter of the work, intention of the writer, and part of philosophy at which it aims*).

9. "In the writings of the ancients (*ueteres*):" the term "ancients" appears to refer to Carolingian commentators such as John Scottus Eriugena, Heiric, and Remigius of Auxerre, who used the seven circumstances in their *accessus*. For the Carolingian practice, see Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 40–51. An important example of this method is furnished by the influential commentary of Remigius on Martianus Capella; see Lutz, "One Formula of *Accessus*"; Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, pp. 16–17.

“Who, what, where, by what means, why, how, when” (*quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando*): these questions form a mnemonic hexameter in Latin corresponding to the seven circumstances (person, matter, place, means, reason, manner, time). This aide-mémoire also appears in the eleventh-century revision of the Remigian commentary to the *Disticha Catonis* (Mancini, “Commento ignoto di Remy d’Auxerre,” p. 179) and Bernard of Utrecht’s Introduction to the *Commentum in Theodolum* (p. 66.201–2). The verse formula seems to postdate Remigius, who usually poses his questions in the following (unmetrical) order: *quis, quid, cur, quomodo, ubi, quando, unde* (*Comm. in Mart. Cap.*, 1:66).

The seven circumstances were originally developed by ancient rhetoricians to define and dispute a legal case; the most influential source for the rhetorical doctrine of the circumstances in the Middle Ages was Cicero’s *De inuentione* (1.24.34–1.28.43), but the theory also had important intermediaries in Victorinus’s commentary on *De inuentione* (*Explanaciones in Ciceronis rhetoricam*), Boethius’s *De differentiis topicis*, and Alcuin’s *De rhetorica et uirtutibus*. On the origins and medieval adaptations of the rhetorical circumstances, see Robertson, “Note on the Classical Origin of ‘Circumstances,’” pp. 9–12; Copeland, *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation*, pp. 66–69.

11. The etymological explanation of *titulus* (“title”) as the diminutive form of *Titan* is widespread in the Middle Ages (it recurs again in *Acc.* 13.4). *Titan* is a common mythological metonymy for the sun in the Roman poets. The Titans were the generation of gods before the Olympians. The god of the sun, Helios, comes to be called *Titan* because he is the son of the Titan Hyperion (see Hesiod, *Theog.* 371–74). There is no ancient testimony for the folk etymology of *titulus* from *Titan*, however. It first appears in the commentary of Remigius of Auxerre on the *Ars minor* of Donatus: “Title is derived from Titan, that is from the sun, because just as the sun illuminates the world, so the title illuminates the book” (*Commentum in artem Donati minorem*, p. 1); see the introduction to Bernard of Utrecht’s *Commentum in Theodolum* (60.68–69). A different version of the etymology appears in the introduction to the Remigian commentary on the *Disticha Catonis* preserved in Lucca, Biblioteca Statale 1433: “Title is a diminutive form of Titan and derived from the same name . . . for just as Titan causes gold or silver or other very beautiful things to be more beautiful with his own splendor, so the title . . . causes the following work to be more pleasing” (Mancini, “Commento ignoto di Remy d’Auxerre,” p. 180); see the text quoted in Huygens, *Accessus* [1970], p. 29n8–12, from an unspecified source.

12. The *accessus* treats the incipit, the beginning words of the text in a manuscript, as the title of the work. This particular incipit bears only the

author's name and not the title *Psychomachia*. On the importance of the incipit as a means of identifying a work in the Middle Ages, see Sharpe, *Titulus*.

The etymologizing gloss of *incipit* as *intus capit* ("takes inside") may derive from Remigius, it also appears in the *accessus* to the *Disticha Catonis* in Lucca, Bibliotheca Statale 1433 (Mancini, "Commento ignoto di Remy d'Auxerre, p. 181): "A book must be read, because it begins (*incipit*), that is, it takes the mind of the reader inside"; the commentator also observes: "Here begins the book (*incipit liber*), that is, the delight of knowledge of the book takes me inside (*intus capit me*)."

13. "Book' (*liber*) is named from 'freeing' (*liberando*):" the false etymological connection of *liber* with *liberare* was commonplace in the Middle Ages; it was given authority by Isidore of Seville (*Etym.* 17.6.16) and by his source, Cassiodorus, who explains (*Inst.* 2 *praef.* 4): "Book was derived from bark, that is, the outer covering of the tree that has been taken away and freed" (*Liber autem dictus est a libro, id est arboris cortice dempto atque liberato*). The etymology is discussed by Conrad of Hirsau, *Dialogus super auctores*, p. 74.100–105; see Maltby, *Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, s.v. *liber* (1); Brinkmann, *Mittelalterliche Hermeneutik*, pp. 1–2.

"Or from 'balancing' (*librando*):" the alternative etymology of *liber* from *librare* ("to balance with a pair of scales") does not have an ancient source.

"Because if he were writing about a mountain or something of this kind, it would have nothing to do with this matter": the illustration of subject matter not balanced with intention is something highly visible like a mountain, which does not pertain to Prudentius's intention to make visible the invisible.

14. "Philosophers were accustomed to give their name with the name of something auspicious" (*solebant . . . nomine nominare*): the Latin is awkward; one would expect either a direct object with the active infinitive *nominare* or the passive *nominari*.

15. The *accessus* falsely etymologizes the name Aurelius in order to highlight Prudentius's rhetorical excellence. The etymological gloss of the name Aurelius as speaking with a golden mouth (*aureo ore loquens*) seems to be based on the Greek sobriquet *Chrysostoma* ("golden-mouthed"); see John Chrysostom, the eloquent bishop of Constantinople.

16. "For many men are wise, but not prudent": the distinction between wisdom (*sapientia*) and prudence (*prudentia*) is made by Cicero in *De officiis* 1.153: "And first of all virtues is that wisdom (*sapientiam*) which the Greeks call *sophia*—for we understand prudence (*prudentiam*), which the Greeks call *phronesis*, as some other virtue, which is the knowledge of things to

be sought out and avoided; that wisdom, however, which I called first of all virtues, is the knowledge of divine and human things.” The etymologizing connection between Prudentius’s name and the adjective *prudens* is first made by Avitus of Vienne in his hexameter poem *De uirginitate: Discibens mentis uarias cum corpore pugnas, / Prudenti quondam cecinit Prudentius arte* (Poem. 6.372, “Describing the various battles of the mind with the body, / Prudentius once sung with prudent art”), and is picked up by Venantius Fortunatus at the beginning of his epic *Life of St. Martin: martyribusque piis sacra haec donaria mittens / prudens prudenter Prudentius immolat actus* (Vita S. Martini 1.18–19, “and sending these holy gifts to the pious martyrs [*Peristephanon*], the prudent Prudentius prudently makes an offering of their acts”).<sup>19</sup>

17–22. The *accessus* concludes with an excursus of the four cardinal virtues, which were a relatively common interpretative tool in biblical commentary and were understood by Isidore and Alcuin to be the constituent elements of ethics, one of the three subdivisions of philosophy, and hence useful for teaching proper moral conduct: see Wallach, “Alcuin on Virtues and Vices”; Mähl, *Quadrige virtutum*, pp. 7–42. The definitions of the cardinal virtues by the *accessus* bear some resemblance to those found in Cicero’s *De inuentione* and adapted to a Christian theological outlook by Alcuin in *De rhetorica et uirtutibus* and *De uirtutibus et uitiis*; however, they are more remarkable for their deviations from traditional sources, suggesting that the author of the definitions was not simply compiling received doctrine but attempting to formulate them in new ways. Since the *Psychomachia* is classified under ethics, it would make sense to remind the reader of the four cardinal virtues.

17. “There are four cardinal virtues” (*principales uirtutes*): Ambrose coined the term *principales uirtutes* when he interpreted the four rivers of Paradise as the four cardinal virtues (*De Paradiso* 3.14–18 [CSEL 32:272–77]). This is a Neoplatonic interpretation that he introduces into Latin from Philo’s *Quaestiones in Genesin*. The phrase *principales uirtutes* remained the preferred designation for the cardinal virtues in the early Middle Ages, but Ambrose also referred to the four virtues as *cardinales*, which later emerged as the standard epithet in Latin; see Mähl, *Quadrige virtutum*, p. 8.

“Fortitude, justice, temperance, and prudence”: the introduction of the topic of the four cardinal virtues may be motivated by the etymologizing connection of Prudentius with “prudence.” Unusually, however, the series does not start with prudence, as is the norm, but ends with it. On the order of the virtues, see Mähl, *Quadrige virtutum*, pp. 101–3. The four cardinal virtues can be traced back to the fourth book of Plato’s *Republic* (427e), but they became a commonplace of classical philosophy and rhetoric. For the

Middle Ages, one of the most important ancient sources for the doctrine was Cicero's *De inuentione* (2.159–64) and its retreatment in Victorinus's commentary on *De inuentione*. Also influential was Isidore of Seville's tripartite division of philosophy into three branches (natural, ethical, and logical), following Plato, and his placement of the cardinal virtues under ethics (*Etym.* 2.24.5): "Socrates was the first to establish ethical philosophy for correcting and regulating moral behavior, and he brought the entire study of it over to the consideration of living well, dividing it into the virtues of the soul, that is prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance." *Acc.* 3 does not appear to draw directly on Isidore, but on an intermediary such as Alcuin who adapts material from Cicero and Isidore about the cardinal virtues in *De rhetorica et de uirtutibus* 44–45 (*RLM*, pp. 548–49) and *De uirtutibus et uitiiis* 35 (PL 101:637B–D).

18. "Fortitude is usefully undertaking hardships and dangers": most of the wording derives from Cicero (*Inu.* 2.54.163), but the *accessus* may look to *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.25.35, where bravery is distinguished from rashness because the former is motivated by a consideration of usefulness (*utilitas*) to the community.

19. "Justice is displaying esteem (*exhibens dignitatem*) to men as they deserve": the participle *exhibens* appears to be used as a verbal noun, or it once modified a noun that has been omitted. The ultimate source is Cicero's *De inuentione* 2.54.160: "Justice is a habit of mind ascribing to each man his worth (*tribuens dignitatem*) after the advantage of the community has been guaranteed," perhaps transmitted through Alcuin's *De uirtutibus et uitiiis* 35, which omits reference to the advantage of the community.

20. Cf. Cic. *Inu.* 2.54.164: "Temperance is reason's steady and measured mastery over lust and other misguided impulses of the mind."

21. This definition of prudence deviates markedly from that in Cicero's *De inuentione* (2.54.160): "Prudence is the knowledge (*scientia*) of good and bad things."<sup>20</sup> On the other hand, it is similar to Alcuin's definition in *De uirtutibus et uitiiis* 35: "the knowledge (*scientia*) of divine and human things." The latter formulation recalls Isidore's definition of philosophy (*Etym.* 2.24.1), which is repeated by Alcuin in *De dialectica* (PL 101:952A): "Philosophy is the knowledge (*cognitio*) of human and divine things." Isidore's source for his definition of philosophy is Cicero's definition of wisdom (*sapientia*) in *De officiis* 1.153, quoted in the note to 16, which attempts to make a distinction between prudence and wisdom. The *accessus* therefore follows Alcuin in treating prudence in the same terms as Ciceronian wisdom.<sup>21</sup>

"In place and time": these are headings typically found in the rhetorical introductory scheme to answer the questions *where* and *when* a book was



written, and are also used by theologians in their prologues on scriptural authors; see Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, p. 17.

22. “Fortified by these virtues”: this idea may be suggested by *Psych. praef.* 52, “one must watch in the armor of faithful hearts,” or *Psych.* 5–6, “with what an army the armed mind is able to drive sins from the cave of our breast,” or 15–16, “you yourself arm the spirit with outstanding skills.” The metaphor of the soul fortified with the virtues can be traced back to Cassiodorus, *De anima* 5, who compares the cardinal virtues to a breastplate of four layers. The ultimate source for the idea, however, may be Paul in Ephesians 6:11–17. Remigius of Auxerre also refers to the cardinal virtues as fortifying the soul against the vices in his commentary on Martianus Capella (*Comm. in Mart. Cap.* 7.18) and so may be a more proximate source for *Acc.* 3.<sup>22</sup> The only problem is that Prudentius does not introduce the four classical virtues in the *Psychomachia*. Rather, he follows the Isidorean principle: “One must fight against the attacks of vices with the opposite virtues” (Isidore, *Sententiae* 2.37.2 [PL 83:638C]). In the course of the *Psychomachia*, seven vices (idolatry, anger, arrogance, indulgence, deception, greed, and discord) challenge opposing virtues to match combat (faith, patience, humility, sobriety, hope, reason, harmony), but none of the latter fit the mold of the cardinal virtues, just as the seven vices do not correspond to the Seven Deadly Sins. A schoolmaster would therefore have to explain the relevance of the classical scheme to the *Psychomachia*, perhaps observing the difference between competing schemes of virtues or attempting to reconcile them in some way. Alcuin, for example, says that the cardinal virtues are the generals of the Christian virtues opposed to the vices (*De uirtutibus et uitiiis*, 35).

“By divine grace”: the soul’s victory over the vices occurs, according to the Remigian commentary to Prudentius, “with the aid of the Holy Cross” (Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*, p. 87), which is a reference to the allegorical reading of the number of servants that help Abraham to victory. The number 318 was written with the Greek letters TIH, which Ambrose (*De Abraham* 1.15) interpreted as the sign of the cross and the first two letters of Jesus’s name.

“When it is going to fight” (*pugnatura*): the future active participle also occurs at *Psych.* 22 (*pugnatura Fides*), as Faith first takes the battlefield.

“Against all spiritual depravities” (*contra omnes spirituales nequicias*): the source for this phrase appears to be the Remigian commentary on *Psych. praef.* 57 (Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*, p. 87): “So also may each one of us wage a spiritual war for his own soul just as Abraham does for his brother against the four kings, that is, against spiritual depravities (*contra spirituales nequicias*).”

#### 4. Again, alternatively: Introduction to *Prudentius's Psychomachia*

The compiler of the *Accessus ad auctores* has added a second introduction to the *Psychomachia* from a different source. The pairing of different *accessus* to Prudentius mirrors the pairing of different *accessus* to Ovid's *Heroides* at the beginning of T.

##### Text of *Acc.* 4

The text is based on Clm 19475 (T), fol. 2ra.19–2va.15, but is supplemented at 19 by the same *accessus* in Pal. lat. 242 (P), fol. 78v.

##### Editions of *Acc.* 4

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 14–15; Huygens *Accessus* (1970), p. 20.

##### Commentary on *Acc.* 4

###### *Title*

The first line (fol. 2ra19) begins with the words *Prudentius Draconensis* in the left margin and in the space to the right appear the words *ITEM al(iter)* (“Again, alternatively”) that indicate another *accessus* with the same title as *Acc.* 3. The word *aliter* typically signals the addition of similar material from a different source (see comment on *Acc.* 8.7). Another hand adds the title *ACCESSVS PRVDENTII PHICOMACHIE* in the lower margin. P has the title *Inicium Prudencii* (“Introduction to Prudentius”).

###### *Overview*

This *accessus* combines elements of Servian and philosophical introductions. It begins in a Servian fashion with an unheaded discussion of the life of the poet (1–5) and a headed analysis of the *title* (6–9). It continues with the modern scheme of four headings: of *subject matter* (10–12), *intention* (13–15), *utility* (16), and *part of philosophy* (17). The third section of the *accessus* (18–19) makes the transition to grammatical commentary by introducing the argument of the *Psychomachia* and identifying in Servian fashion the lines in which the poet announces his theme, invokes a divinity, and narrates.

1–2. “From Draconia” (*Draconensis*) and “Draconia” (*Draconia*): Huygens prefers the text of P (*Traconensis* and *Traconia*). I have retained the creative error to illustrate the power of etymological thinking in constructing the



life of the author. *Draconia* would mean “land of the serpent” via the Greek *drakôn*.

2. “A region now uninhabitable because of snakes”: this notice, a version of which also appears in Conrad of Hirsau, *Dialogus super auctores*, p. 100.869–70, contradicts *Acc.* 3.2, which states that the area lately became habitable.

3. “He was schooled, however, in Rome”: this biographical detail, which also appears in Conrad of Hirsau, *Dialogus super auctores*, p. 100.871, is unattested in ancient sources. Prudentius talks about traveling to Rome as an adult in *Peristephanon* 9 when he visited the tomb of St. Cassian in Forum Cornelii (Imola), who was a Christian schoolteacher (*magister litterarum*) martyred by his pupils with writing instruments.

6. As in *Acc.* 3.12, the *accessus* quotes the incipit of the work as the title. This incipit is more comprehensive, including the author’s full name and the title of the work.

7. *Psychos* (correctly *psychos*) in Greek means “cold” but is traditionally confused with *psyche* (“soul”) in the commentary tradition: see Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*, p. 84. That *psychos* is glossed as “battle” and *machia* as “soul” may appear to be a scribal confusion, but it is an error shared by T and P and hence transmitted from a common source. *Psiche* and *machia* were properly glossed in *Acc.* 3.5, but no attempt was made in T to reconcile the contradictory glosses: truth and error are allowed to coexist as scribes faithfully copy their sources. Conrad of Hirsau, however, gets his glosses right (*Dialogus super auctores*, p. 98.819–20).

10–15. The value of the second Prudentian *accessus* lies in its treatment of *subject matter* (10–12) and *intention* (13–15). *Acc.* 3 treats these topics briefly and somewhat obscurely, identifying the *subject matter* of the *Psychomachia* as Abraham and the *intention* as making visible the invisible. The second *accessus* takes a more obvious approach: it makes the combat of the personified virtues and vices the epic’s *subject matter*. The plastic representation of this battle is not an end in itself (as is suggested by the truncated discussion of intention in the first *accessus*) but is supposed to move the listener to conduct the same moral battle. The *intention* of Prudentius, therefore, is to exhort the Christian faithful to fight this moral battle in order to win salvation. The listener is supposed to follow the example of Abraham (construed as *subject matter* in *Acc.* 3) whose battle with the barbarian kings is an allegorical battle of the soul with the vices. The material of the second Prudentian *accessus* therefore clarifies the abbreviated and somewhat confused treatment of *subject matter* and *intention* in the first. In particular, the second *accessus* is more explicit about the rhetorical goal of personification allegory:

to turn the spectator into a moral combatant. Additionally, it makes clear how the allegory of the soul's battle is an inside-out version of the biblical story of Abraham and even suggests that the latter is a kind of *accessus* to the *Psychomachia*.

10: "Against one another" (*adinuicem*): for the compound adverb, which appears frequently in ecclesiastical Latin, see *ThLL* s.v. 1. 689.30–62.

11–12. Cf. Horace, *Ars* 180–81: "that which enters the ear rouses minds more slowly than that which is brought before the trusty eyes" (*segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem / quam quae sunt oculis subiecta fidelibus*).

13. "Which is the worthier part in a man" (*que dignior pars est in homine*): that the soul is better than the body is a commonplace of both ancient philosophy and Christianity. A parallel can be found in Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* where he discusses virtue's place in the soul: "which is the best part in man" (*Tusc.* 5.23.67, *quae pars optima est in homine*).

"Will possess eternal rewards" (*eterna praemia possidebit*): the phrasing appears to be a conflation of "will possess eternal life" (*uitam aeternam possidebit*) in Matt. 19:29 and "to attain to eternal rewards" (*peruenire ad aeterna praemia*), a common metaphor for salvation in early Christian writers (see John 13:5–6). Here, the second Prudentian *accessus* agrees with the first that the Christian is a soldier armed with the virtues in a battle against the vices, but it goes farther in identifying the object of victory as heavenly reward. The second *accessus* thus underscores the fundamental importance of reading the *Psychomachia* by drawing attention to its "total scriptural design and movement" (Smith, *Prudentius' "Psychomachia,"* p. 168), beginning with Genesis and ending with the Apocalypse.

14. This sentence elaborates what Prudentius says about Abraham in the preface to the *Psychomachia* (*Psych. praef.* 9–10): "he has counseled us to fight with the unholy tribes, and as a counselor he has set his own example."

18. The quoted text of Genesis 15:6 is Jerome's version in the Vulgate with one variant (*in iusticiam* rather than *ad iusticiam*). The verse in Genesis is also quoted in the Remigian commentary on the first line of the *praefatio* to the *Psychomachia* (Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*, p. 84), to illustrate why Prudentius calls Abraham "the first way of believing" (*Senex fidelis prima credendi uia*).

"The introduction to the literal commentary or to the book is" (*[ad litteram uel] ad librum*): the italicized words in the translation (bracketed in the Latin) are deleted by a second hand. Although they do not appear in P, they are a clue that *Acc.* 4 may have been directly excerpted from a commentary. The transition to the word-for-word gloss was also copied, but when the *accessus* was anthologized, the quotation of Genesis was no longer understood

as an “introduction” to the literal commentary (*ad literam*) to the book as a whole; consequently, someone added the words “or to the book” (*uel ad librum*) as a clarification. A later corrector of T then deleted the words “to the literal commentary or” (*ad literam uel*) because there is no commentary.

“Introduction” (*accessus*): this is the only place in the *Accessus ad auctores* that the word *accessus* appears, but here it has the somewhat different sense of being the “argument” of the preface to the *Psychomachia* and the poem as a whole, which provides the context for the commentary on the literal text; see *Acc.* 28.12, where the word *descensus* is used in a similar way.

19. The commentator applies to the *Psychomachia* a tripartite scheme of epic speech drawn from Servius’s commentary on Virgil’s *Aeneid*. Servius remarks on *Aen.* 1.8, when Virgil invokes the Muse, that epic poets such as Virgil and Lucan divide their poem into three parts: they announce their theme, they invoke, and they narrate (*proponunt, inuocant, narrant*). The Remigian commentary on the *Psychomachia* adopts this form of analysis in its note on the invocation of Christ in the first line of the epic (Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*, p. 88, *Psych.* 1 “CHRISTE G. H.”, note *b*). See also its implementation in the introductions to Sedulius and to Ovid’s *Ars amatoria* (*Acc.* 13.12 and 14.6–7).

“Faithful elder”: the commentator identifies the theme of the *Psychomachia* again as Abraham, focusing on the first two words of the preface.

“He invokes when he says: <‘Christ, the heavy’ (*Psych.* 1); he narrates: > ‘She first seeks the battlefield’ (*Psych.* 21)”: there is evidently a lacuna in T; the *accessus* mistakenly assigns the “invocation” to the line of the *Psychomachia* where the narrative begins. The omitted text of the *accessus* in T is attested in P.

## 5. Introduction to *Cato* [*Disticha Catonis*]

The name “Cato” was used in the Middle Ages to refer to a collection of maxims, each of which teaches a practical rule of moral conduct in the form of an hexameter couplet. The “vulgate” collection consists of 144 distichs divided into four books and is now commonly known as the *Disticha Catonis* (or *Dicta Catonis*).<sup>23</sup> The *Disticha*, which reflect the tenets of popular Stoicism, are thought to have arisen between the second and fourth centuries AD, although some aphorisms are attested earlier. The author or compiler is unknown but apparently wished to identify his work with a book of moral instruction (no longer extant) that Cato the Censor had written to his son (*Ad filium*) in the second century BC. A short prose letter by “Cato” to his son and a list of fifty-seven brief prose sayings precede the distichs in the first book. Verse introductions, probably medieval additions, head the other three books.

The proverbs of “Cato” were probably in continual use as a textbook for teaching elementary Latin since the third century AD and were one of the most widely read and remembered texts in the Middle Ages.<sup>24</sup> “Cato” appears in the library catalogues and codices of school authors in the ninth century, at which time the work appears to have been canonized as the first text that students read in elementary Latin instruction after Donatus’s *Ars minor*.<sup>25</sup> From the tenth century on, “Cato” appears first in readers that collect school authors and eventually furnishes the basis for the so-called *liber Catonianus* of the thirteenth century.<sup>26</sup> Remigius of Auxerre is known to have written a commentary on “Cato,” versions of which, possibly revised, are found in later codices.<sup>27</sup>

#### Text of *Acc.* 5

Clm 19475 (T), fol. 2ra.15–2rb.18. The same *accessus* with minor variation appears in Clm 19474 (M), pp. 59–60 and Pal. lat. 242 (P), fol. 74v. This is the first of eleven *accessus* that are common to T, M, and P.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 5

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 15–16; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 21–22.

#### Selected Bibliography on *Disticha Catonis*

##### Critical Edition with Commentary

*Disticha Catonis*. Edited by Marcus Boas and Hendrik Johan Botschuyver. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing, 1952.

##### Editions and Translations

Chase, W. J., ed. and trans. *The Distichs of Cato: A Famous Medieval Textbook*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1922.

Duff, J. W., and A. M. Duff, eds. and trans. *Minor Latin Poets II*, pp. 585–621. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Pepin, Ronald E., trans. *An English Translation of “Auctores octo”: A Medieval Reader*, pp. 9–24. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1999.

Thomson, Ian, and Louis Perraud, trans. *Ten Latin Schooltexts of the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 58–85. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.

##### Tradition and Medieval Reception

Chase, W. J., ed. and trans. *The Distichs of Cato: A Famous Medieval Textbook*, pp. 1–11. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1922.

Hazleton, Richard. “Chaucer and Cato.” *Speculum* 35 (1960): 357–80.

———. “The Christianization of ‘Cato’: The *Disticha Catonis* in the Light of Late Mediaeval Commentaries.” *Mediaeval Studies* 19 (1957): 157–73.

- Mancini, “Un commento ignoto di Remy d’Auxerre ai *Disticha Catonis*.”  
 Pepin, Ronald E., trans. *An English Translation of “Auctores octo”: A Medieval Reader*, pp. 5–8. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1999.
- Roos, Paolo. *Sentenza e proverbio nell’antichità e i ‘Distichi di Catone’: Il testo latino e i volgarizzamenti italiani*, pp. 187–231. Brescia: Morcelliana, 1984.
- Thomson, Ian, and Louis Perraud, trans. *Ten Latin Schooltexts of the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 49–58. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.

### Commentary on *Acc.* 5

#### *Title*

The heading *Acces(sus) Catonis* is partially truncated and written in majuscule; it is positioned in its own field on the right hand side of the left column (fol. 2va.15–16). It is the first heading in the *Accessus ad auctores* that clearly indicates the framework of a collection of *accessus* excerpted from commentaries and identified by the author’s name. The pattern of titles with the rubric *Accessus* and the author’s name in the genitive occurs in *Acc.* 5–13, 20–21, and 23.

#### *Overview*

The *accessus* treats the author (1–5) and indirectly the title of the work (6) without headings and then deploys the modern scheme of four headings: *subject matter*, *intention*, *utility*, and *part of philosophy* (7–10). It concludes with a rhetorical analysis of the epistolary prologue “Cato” writes to his son (11–13).

1–4. The beginning of the *accessus* may be compared with that of the Remigian commentary in Trier, Stadtbibliothek 1093, fol. 241r (text in Huygens, *Accessus* [1970], p. 21n2):<sup>28</sup> “One must research four things in the beginning of each and every book: namely, person, place, time, and reason for writing. However, nothing is known about the person of this Cato, although his name is known. In fact, we have read that there had been two Catos: the one Uticensis from Utica, the city in Africa, where he died when he was fleeing Julius Caesar over the desert; the other Censorius. However, neither of them was this Cato. . . . Moreover, he wrote this book to his own son, suggesting to him a regimen.” If the Remigian introduction is a source for the present *accessus*, it is instructive to observe what has been omitted, changed, or retained in transmission. The Remigian introduction treats four topics (*person*, *place*, *time*, and *cause of writing*) in a reduced version of the rhetorical type of introduction based on the seven circumstances (see *Acc.* 3.9–10). The

present *accessus* retains some of these features by beginning with questions about the person of the author and the cause of writing, but ends by identifying the author as Cato the Censor in disagreement with the Remigian source.

1–2. “The Censor” (*Censorinus*): TMP commonly transmit the cognomen of Cato, *Censorius*, incorrectly as *Censorinus*. Marcus Porcius Cato (234–149 BC) took the cognomen Censorius after he held the censorship in 184. The mistaken cognomen Censorinus may be explained by the popularity of a ghost compiler named Censorinus, who put together a proverb collection known as the *Florilegium Angelicum*: see *Texts and Transmission*, p. 49. The Remigian *accessus* in Trier, Stadtbibliothek 1093, transmits the correct form of the cognomen, but its counterpart in Lucca, Biblioteca Statale 1433, also has *Censorinus* (Mancini, “Commento ignoto di Remy d’Auxerre,” p. 179).

3. Cato of Utica was Marcus Porcius Cato (95–46 BC), the great-grandson of Cato the Censor, sometimes referred to as Cato the Younger. Utica was a Punic city in North Africa that remained loyal to the cause of the Pompeians during the civil war. Cato governed the city after the death of Pompey and committed suicide in its vicinity after the battle of Thapsus in 46. Cato received his cognomen posthumously not because he conquered the city but because that was the place of his death, as the Remigian introduction correctly reports.

4. “As he saw that young men and women were living in great error (*Cum uideret iuuenes et puellas in magno errore uersari*)”: this clause appears to be a paraphrase of the beginning of the epistolary prologue to the first book of the *Disticha Catonis*: “As I noticed that the greatest possible number of men erred seriously in the way of their moral conduct” (*Cum animaduertterem quam plurimos grauiter in uia morum errare*).

“Wrote this little book to his son, introducing to him a regimen for living well”: a virtual excerpt from the Remigian introduction to “Cato.”

“To his son” (*ad filium suum*): this phrase may reflect the oldest title to the work: *Dicta Marci Catonis ad filium suum* (“The Sayings of Marcus Cato to His Son”); see Boas and Botschuyver, *Disticha Catonis*, p. lxxv.

“And, through him, teaching all men to live justly and uprightly”: the addressee of the work, Cato’s son, is taken to be a model for everyone, just as Abraham is in *Acc.* 4.20–22. In the epistolary prologue, Cato professes to give his son moral instruction “so that he might live gloriously and achieve honor.” The *accessus* reinterprets the goal of the work in terms of justice and morality which fit better with Christian ethics.

5. For “others” who think that the author “Cato” is a persona, one may compare the Remigian *accessus* quoted above, which rejects the identification of the author of the work with either of the two Catos, but it is unlikely that the writer of this sentence is referring to this specific example.

“The name was given to this little book . . . from the subject matter”: see *Acc.* 26.6.

“For *catus* means ‘wise’” (*catus enim sapiens dicitur*): *catus* means “acute” or “of sharp mind,” but comes to be glossed as “wise” in Latin glossaries: see *ThLL*, s.v. 1. *catus* (623.19–35). The name Cato is thus implicitly derived from *catus* and taken to mean “wise man.” This Latin etymology is actually sound. It also disagrees with the authoritative but false Greek etymology given in the Remigian *accessus* material in the Lucca, Bibliotheca Statale 1433 (Mancini, “Un commento ignoto di Remy d’Auxerre,” p. 182): “*catus* in Greek is ‘full of genius’ (*ingeniosus*) in Latin or ‘clever’ (*callidus*); therefore, it seems that the name of Cato was derived from ‘genius’ (*ab ingenio*).” Late antique grammarians derived *catus* from the Greek verb “to burn” (*kaiein* or *kaiesthai*): see Maltby, *Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, s.v. *catus*.

8. “His intention is to show us by what way we are to direct our course to true salvation”: the metaphor of the “way” (*uia*) is drawn from the epistolary prologue to the first book quoted above (4), where it leads to glory and civic honor. However, the “way” lends itself easily to Christian reinterpretation, since Christ says in John 14:6: “I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the father except through me” (*Ego sum uia et ueritas et uita. Nemo uenit ad Patrem nisi per me*). Huygens compares the Remigian introduction (citation in note to 1–4 above): “The intention of this author is to reproach the moral conduct of men, who used to believe at that time that they could attain to true happiness through vainglory.” On the Christianization of Cato in the Middle Ages, see Hazleton “*Disticha Catonis*,” pp. 163–73.

“And desire it . . . and search for it”: the text of TM joins these clauses to the preceding indirect deliberative question with the conjunctions *et . . . et*, which would make them indirect deliberative questions. The text of P (preferred by Huygens) joins the clauses with *et ut . . . et*, which would make them substantive *ut*-clauses of purpose dependent on the construction *intentio eius est* and parallel with *representare*.

10. “He strives very greatly for utility” (*ad utilitatem maxime nititur*): this is the text of TM. P reads *nititur ad morum utilitatem* (preferred by Huygens) and means “he strives for the utility of moral conduct.” The textual variant in P obscures the main critical point of the *accessus* in T: that the utility of “Cato” is salvation and hence an ethical goal in itself.

11. “Attentive, ready to learn, and well disposed” (*attentos, dociles, beniuolos*): the *accessus* analyzes the epistolary prologue to the *Disticha Catonis* according to the common rhetorical doctrine that the first part of a speech—the exordium—should make the audience better listeners in three ways. In



the Middle Ages, the chief classical sources for making the audience attentive, ready to learn, and well disposed were: *Rhet. Her.* 1.4.6, *Cic. Inu.* 1.15.20, and *Isid. Etym.* 2.7.2. The order of the adjectives (*attentos, dociles, beniuolos*) goes back to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, but the sentence may be based on an intermediary source or simply a rhetorical commonplace: here one may compare the gloss of the twelfth-century legal scholar Martinus on the *Institutes* which begins: “Preserving the custom of writing correctly, Justinian prefixes a prologue in which he makes the readers attentive, receptive, and well disposed” (*Morem recte scribentium seruans Justinianus prologum premitit in quo lectores attentos, dociles, et beneuolos reddit*; text in Kantorowicz, *Studies in the Glossators*, pp. 39–40).

12–13. The *accessus* quotes elements of Cato’s prefatory letter to his son and analyzes them according to the rhetorical triad of attention, receptiveness, and good will.

## 6. Introduction to *Avianus*

Avianus is the author of a collection of forty-two fables (*Fabulae*) composed in elegiac distichs around AD 400 or later. He prefaces his work with a prose letter addressed to a certain Theodosius in which he defines the genre of verse fable and seeks to surpass his predecessors—the Roman iambic poet Phaedrus (*Fabulae Aesopiae*), who lived in the early first century AD, and the Greek iambic poet Babrius (*Mythiambi*), who lived later but not after the second century. However, the name, identity, and date of Avianus are debated.<sup>29</sup> Also disputed is the nature of his literary achievement. Did he directly translate and adapt the fables of Babrius written in Greek choliambis (*Mythiambi*) into an original work of Latin elegiac narrative influenced by Virgil and Ovid? Or did he versify a Latin prose paraphrase of Babrius that scholars attribute to an early third-century rhetorician Julius Titianus on the testimony of Ausonius (*Epist.* 16.2.74–81)?

Such questions did not trouble medieval readers. The literary and moral preoccupations of Avianus made him ideal for instructing grammar from the ninth century on. Like “Cato,” with whom he was closely associated, Avianus was one of the most widely and consistently read elementary pagan authors throughout the Middle Ages, being one of the core authors around whom the textbook tradition of the *liber Catonianus* formed.<sup>30</sup> Over 140 manuscripts of the *Fabulae* survive, and one hundred more are attested in the library catalogues of France, Germany, and Italy.<sup>31</sup> Commentaries on Avianus are first attested in the twelfth century, but it has been conjectured that the commentary tradition goes back to Remigius of Auxerre, who cites the tenth fable



in his commentary on the *Disticha Catonis*.<sup>32</sup> Conrad of Hirsau positions Avianus as a rudimentary author after Donatus, “Cato,” and “Aesop,” the last being a Latin prose paraphrase of the Phaedrus’s *Fabulae Aesopiae* (*Dialogus super auctores*, pp. 86–88.455–513).

#### Text of *Acc.* 6

The text is based on Clm 19475 (T), fols. 2vb.19–4ra.29, but is occasionally corrected with variant readings in Pal. lat. 242 (P), fols. 75r–76v. Another version of the same *accessus* appears in Clm 19474 (M), pp. 60–65.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 6

Huygens *Accessus* (1954), pp. 17–20; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 22–25.

#### Selected Bibliography on Avianus’s *Fabulae*

##### Critical Edition with Commentary

Ellis, Robinson, ed. *The Fables of Avianus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1887.  
Reprint, Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1966.

##### Editions with Translation

Avianus. *Fables*. Edited and translated by Francoise Gaide. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1980.

Duff, J. W., and A. M. Duff, eds. *Minor Latin Poets II*, pp. 669–749. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

##### Secondary Literature

Adrados, Francisco Rodríguez. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable*. Vol. 2, *The Fable during the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages*, pp. 254–74. Translated by Leslie A. Ray. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000.

Holzberg, Niklas. *The Ancient Fable*. Translated by Christine Jackson-Holzberg, pp. 61–71 (with further bibliography). Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.

##### Medieval Reception

Baldzuhn, Michael. “Avian im Gebrauch. Zur Verwendung von Schulhandschriften im Unterricht.” In *Der Codex im Gebrauch*, edited by Christel Meier, Dagmar Hüpper, and Hagen Keller, pp. 183–96, xxxiv–xlvi. Munich: Fink, 1996.

Wright, A. T. “*Iste auctor ab aliis differt*: Avianus and His Medieval Readers.” In *Fremdes wahrnehmen—fremdes Wahrnehmen*, edited by Wolfgang Harms and C. Stephen Jaeger, pp. 9–19. Stuttgart: S. Hirzel, 1997.

Ziolkowski, J. M. *Talking Animals: Medieval Latin Beast Poetry, 750–1150*,

pp. 19–20, 23–24. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

### Commentary on *Acc.* 6

#### *Overview*

This *accessus* begins with an unheaded discussion (1–2) of the title, which is the same as the author, and of the occasion for the author's writing of the work. This is followed by an excursus (3–5) explaining the term *fabulae*, the kind of literature that Avianus writes. The second section of the *accessus* (6–9) deploys the modern scheme of four headings found in *Acc.* 4–5. After the introduction, the *accessus* quotes the beginning of each of the forty-two fables and gives its argument in the form of a moral. Some of the comments are paraphrases of the text of Avianus with its medieval interpolations.

1. “Whom a certain Theodosius, a Roman nobleman, asked to write some fables for him”: this idea appears to be a misreading of the epistolary preface to the *Fabulae*, in which Avianus explains to his patron why he chose to write fables. Avianus does not say that Theodosius asked him to write fables, but rather that he chose the genre because he wished to preserve the memory of his own name in an area in which he would not have to compete with Theodosius who excelled everyone of his time in oratory and poetry. The identity of this Theodosius is uncertain. The leading candidate is Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius, the author of the *Saturnalia*, who had the kind of literary credentials that Avianus praises. Another possibility is the emperor Theodosius II (401–50). On the question, see Holzberg, *Ancient Fable*, pp. 68–69.

2. In the epistle that prefaces the *Fables*, Avianus writes to Theodosius: “You therefore have the kind of work in which to delight the heart, exercise the mind, alleviate worry, and prudently learn the whole course of life” (Avian. *Epist.* 18–21).

3. “Fables, moreover, are either Libyan or Aesopic”: see Isidore, *Etym.* 1.40.2; Bernard of Utrecht, *Commentum in Theodolum*, p. 63.129–34; Conrad of Hirsau, *Dialogus super auctores*, p. 84.393–98. The division of fables into those from Libya and those from Aesop is first recorded in Aristotle (*Rhet.* 2.20.3, 1393a) and repeated by Quintilian (*Inst.* 5.11.20). The distinction that is drawn between the two categories appears to be a late invention transmitted by Isidore, for “Libyan” and “Aesopic” appear to be alternative labels for fables with a moral, regardless of content. In Greek literature, the first example of a “Libyan” fable identified by source is the story of the eagle shot with an arrow of eagle feathers told in Aeschylus's *Myrmidons* (ed. Mette, frag. 231).<sup>33</sup>

7. “His intention is to please us (*delectari nos*) in the fables and to be of use (*prodesse*) in the improvement of manners”: this is the first appearance in the *Accessus ad auctores* of the Horatian commonplace from *Ars poetica* 333: *aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poetae* (“Poets want either to be of use or to please”). The text *delectari nos* (TM) may have appeared acceptable to the medieval reader who understood the passive form of the infinitive as a deponent. The deponent *delector* is attested both in antiquity and in the Middle Ages: see *ThLL*, s.v. *delector* (422.5–7), and *MLW*, s.v. *delecto*, I.A.1 (246.42–45). There are three other reminiscences of the Horatian dictum in T, two of which likewise give the form *delectari* (*Acc.* 9.3, 26.23) instead of *delectare* (*Acc.* 21.8). In the latter cases, however, *delectari* does not govern an object and so is more likely to be understood in the medio-passive (reflexive) sense “to take pleasure.” Huygens removes the difficulty posed by *delectari* through-out T by emending its text to *delectare*. P also appears to clarify the manuscript tradition when it reads *delectationem dare* (“to give pleasure”) instead of *delectari nos* (“to please us”).

10. [“The Nurse and the Child”]: each fable is identified by its first word or words in Latin. Translations of initial Latin words, however, are not necessarily helpful in identifying many of the fables, so the English translations of the titles for each fable are provided instead. Preceding each title is a number in parenthesis which corresponds to the number assigned to the fable in modern editions.

11. “That no one” (*nequis*): here as elsewhere the classically correct *ne quis* has been written as a compound word. Contrast, however, 14 below.

“But live content with his own lot”: this is a virtual quotation of the first line of the moral attached to Avian. 8 (all such references to ‘Avian.’ refer to the *Fabulae*).

12. Cf. Avian. 3.11–12.

13. Cf. Avian. 4.15–16.

14. “Here let no one credit another man’s virtue to one’s own account” (*hic ne quis sibi alienam uirtutem tribuat*): the text of TM differs from P: *hic monet ne quis sibi alienam laudem attribuat* (“Here he warns that no one credit another man’s glory to himself”). Huygens prefers P. The tradition of TM commits a common scribal error, as it repeats the phrase *alienam uirtutem* from the previous *argumentum* (13). The word *laudem* is probably correct as it corresponds to the word *laudibus* in the second (interpolated) verse of the fable: see Avian. 5.1–2.

16. Cf. Avian. 7.16.

17. “Whenever we desire things more exalted than our puffed up strength” (*cum altiora nimiis uiribus nostris cupimus*): the text of TM, *nimiis*

*uiribus nostris*, is at variance with that of P, *nimis uiribus nostris* which means: “whenever we desire excessively things more exalted than our strength.” Huygens prefers P.

18. “He warns that no one <choose>”: TM omit the verb *eligat* (“choose”) which has been supplied from P.

21. “That is, that” (*hoc, ut*): the only example of this formula may be a scribal simplification of *hortatur ut* (see *Acc.* 6.44). P has *hic monet ut*, which is also unparalleled. The usual phrase is *hic monet ne* as in the preceding sentence *Acc.* 6.20.

24. “Lest we therefore endure a reproach from the crane”: the version in P, “lest we therefore endure reproach, just as the peacock does from the crane” (*ne hinc obprobrium sustineamus ut pauo a grue*), makes clear that the text of TM has omitted the words *ut pauo*, as the reader is made to identify with the peacock.

31. “That is, let us not seek possession over another’s gifts” (*hoc, ne possideamus in aliena dona*): Huygens reads *hic* (P) not *hoc* (TM), and emends *dona* to *bona*, so that the text would not mean “another’s gifts” but “another’s wealth.” However, *dona* makes sense if one reads the fable of the bird and the reaping as a tale about the gifts of the earth (wheat) which are the object of the farmer’s hope.

32. “So much so that (*tantum ut*) they are carried away by their own vices”: the original text of T (*tantum ut suo ut*) contained a scribal error but the phrase *ut suo* was deleted by a corrector to yield a comprehensible sentence. M adds the phrase *suo impetu* over *tantum ut* and P reads *ut suo inperatu* instead of *tantum ut*. Huygens indicates that the paradosis of TMP is corrupt, but the text of T makes sense on its own terms.

34. “And additionally another man’s virtue is odious to these men” (*superque eis aliena uirtus inuidiosa est*): TM have *superque*, but P has *semperque*, which Huygens prefers and supports with a parallel from Sallust, *Catilina* 7.2: *semperque eis aliena uirtus formidulosa est* (“and always to these men another man’s virtue is dangerous”). The change of *semperque* to *superque* may be explained as a form of dittography influenced by the preceding phrase *inuehitur super* (“he launches an attack about”). Is the variant in TM a poorer text because it weakens the echo of Sallust?

36. “Should be shunned” (*fugendos*): TM transmit *fugendos*, an incorrect form in classical Latin. P has correctly *fugiendos*.

38. “Stiff-necked” (*durae ceruicis*): Huygens notes that this phrase is drawn from Exodus 32:9; 33:3, 5; 34:9.

39. “He reproaches that man who carries one thing in his heart and another on his tongue”: this is a variation on Psalm 14:3, “he who speaks

the truth in his heart and who has practiced no deceit in his tongue,” which answers the question who will dwell in God’s tabernacle and reside on his mountain.

“Ought to be driven off as he deserves” (*exp<el>lendum*): TM transmit the nonsensical reading *explendum*, while P has the correct *expellendum*. The variant *explendum* is a simple scribal error due to the omission between the letters *p* and *l* of another *l* with a straight line through the shaft to abbreviate the syllable *el*.

41. “Pig” (*suem*): TM transmit the incorrect form *suam*; P has the correct *suem*.

46. <“The Calf and the Ox.”>: the lemma *Pulcher* is omitted in TM, but appears in P.

49. “But also those who incite others to evil-doing”: see Avian. 39.16.

50. “Good points of virtue” (*bona uirtutis*): this is a paraphrase of “gifts of the mind” (*munera mentis*) as opposed to the “good points of the body” (*corporeis . . . bonis*) in Avian. 40.11–12.

51. “They often suffer a fall just as the amphora does”: the jar (*testa*) proudly calls itself *amphora* (Avian. 41.8) when asked by the rain what its name is.

52. Cf. Avian. 42.16.

## 7. Introduction to *Maximianus*

The author introduced is the Maximianus, who wrote elegies probably in the sixth century AD, in which the authorial persona (named at *Eleg.* 3.26) laments the onset of old age and recalls past love affairs. Nothing is known about Maximianus beyond what he says about himself in his poetry. “Autobiographical” details, such as the poet’s life in Rome (1.37, 63), acquaintance with Boethius (3.48), and participation in an embassy to Constantinople (5.1–3), point to a high-born Roman who pursued the career of an orator under Gothic rule during the first half of the sixth century.

Modern editions of Maximianus divide his work of 686 verses into six elegies. These divisions have little support in the manuscript tradition, but date back to Pomponius Gauricus’s notorious edition (1501) that misidentified Maximianus as the Roman poet Cornelius Gallus.<sup>34</sup> The manuscripts either transmit the elegies without break or disagree in their segmentation of the text; consequently, it is unknown what the original articulation of the work was.

Maximianus’s poetry was highly influential in the Middle Ages both as a school text and as a model for poetic imitation. In the eleventh century

at the latest, as Aimeric's *Ars lectoria* (1086) attests, Maximianus occupied a place in the canon of school authors, alongside "Cato," Avianus, and the Latin Homer (see *Acc.* 8).<sup>35</sup> His work first appears in its entirety in the eleventh-century manuscript Eton College Library 150 discussed earlier (p. 103). Around 1200, Alexander de Villa Dei wrote a versified grammatical work, *Doctrinale puerorum*, which was intended to replace Maximianus's "trivialities" (*nugae*) in the school curriculum (24–25). In the thirteenth century, however, Maximianus continued to be included in the *libri Catoniani* as one of the six core authors. In his *Laborintus*, Eberhard the German mentions reading Maximianus for his lessons on versification: "Maximianus writes of the very great troubles (*incommoda maxima*) that strike old age and takes his subject matter (*materiam*) from himself" (611–12). Maximianus's sententiousness about old age and love made him a favorite for the instruction of rhetoric and ethics; he was frequently anthologized in *florilegia* and collections of proverbs. The poet's reflections about his sex life as a young man and his impotence in old age do not appear to have been an obstacle to his use in the classroom. It is possible that the "obscene" parts were not read; or, if read, they were interpreted ethically as a condemnation of sensuality. Conversely, medieval teachers may not have been as prudish about sexual topics as some of their modern counterparts have been.<sup>36</sup>

If Maximianus was first and foremost an authority on ethics, he was also a reservoir of literary learning and an influential model for the art of versification in medieval schools. In his poetry, the different strands of Ovidian elegy (erotic and exilic) join with the traditions of Roman satire (Horace and Juvenal). By reviving Ovidian elegiacs to satirize old age and its erotic failings, Maximianus not only anticipated the *aetas Ovidiana* of the Middle Ages but also contributed to the movement that saw the elegiac Ovid emerge as the primary model for poetic composition from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries. Evidence for Maximianus's role in the development of the *aetas Ovidiana* includes imitations of his poetry in Ovidian elegiac comedies such as the *Pamphilus*, which is treated in *Acc.* 28, and in the pseudo-Ovidian *Facetus moribus et uita*, a twelfth-century didactic poem in elegiac distichs teaching the art of courtly living.<sup>37</sup>

#### Text of *Acc.* 7

Clm 19475, fol. 4rb.1–15. Variants of the same *accessus* appear in the collections of Clm 19474 (M), pp. 77–78, and Pal. lat. 242 (P), fol. 76v.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 7

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), p. 20; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 25.

Selected Bibliography on Maximianus's *Elegiae*

## Critical Edition

Baehrens, E., ed. *Poetae Latini Minores*. 5:313–48. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1883.

## Editions with Commentary

Maximianus. *The Elegies of Maximianus*. Edited by Richard Webster. Princeton: Princeton Press, 1900.

Schneider, Wolfgang Christian. *Die elegischen Verse von Maximian: eine letzte Widerrede gegen die neue christliche Zeit mit den Gedichten der Appendix Maximiani und der Imitatio Maximiani*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003.

## Translation

Lind, L. R., ed. and trans. *Gabriele Zerbi, Gerontocomia, On the Care of the Aged, and Maximianus, Elegies on Old Age and Love*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988.

## Secondary Literature

Boas, M. “*De librorum Catonianorum historia atque compositione*.” *Mnemosyne* 42 (1914): 17–46.

Butrica, J. L. Review of *Die elegischen Verse von Maximian*, by Wolfgang Christian Schneider. *Classical Review* 55 (2005): 562–64.

Coffman, G. R. “Old Age from Horace to Chaucer: Some Literary Affinities and Adventures of an Idea.” *Speculum* 9 (1934): 249–61.

Ellis, Robinson. “On the Elegies of Maximianus.” *AJP* 17 (1884): 1–15.

Schneider, Wolfgang Christian. *Die elegischen Verse von Maximian*.

Szövérfy, Joseph. “Maximianus a Satirist.” *HSCP* 72 (1968): 351–67.

Commentary on *Acc.* 7*Overview*

The *accessus* follows a format similar to that of the introductions to “Cato” and Avianus. First addressed is the question of who the author is (1–2). Next comes a summary of the contents of the work (3). Then the modern scheme of introductory heading is applied as in the preceding three *accessus* (4–7). The introduction focuses on the evils of old age in contrast to the joys of youth but does not indicate the degree to which Maximianus occupies himself with memories of his past loves, nor does it prepare the reader for the work’s (anti-)climactic theme of impotence, which is capped by a Greek woman’s praise of the phallus as the source of all good in the universe. The *accessus*, therefore, introduces less than half of the elegiac work (1.1–292), that is, to the point where Maximianus recounts how his long-standing



girlfriend Lycoris abandoned him and sought out other lovers because he was impotent. If this is the case, then it is possible that Maximianus was read only partially in the medieval classroom and that the obscene sections were extracurricular. A great number of *florilegia* and collections of proverbs from Maximianus confirm a policy of selective reading.

It has been claimed, on the other hand, that Maximianus was popular in the classroom because he was “anti-feminist” in his portrayal of women’s all-consuming sexual desires and that this corresponds with the rise of misogynistic poetry in the eleventh century.<sup>38</sup> The *accessus Maximiani*, however, does not support this hypothesis, since it identifies the work explicitly with the faults of old age and not women. In the medieval classroom, Maximianus was an *ethicus* whose satirical view of old age shows the vanity of sensual pleasures and by implication the value of Christian salvation.<sup>39</sup>

1. “Maximianus is said on the authority of the book to be a citizen of Rome (*ciuis Romanus*)”: Avianus is also identified as a “citizen of Rome” (*Acc.* 6.1), but here the book itself is cited as an authority for the biographical datum: the elegist mentions swimming in the Tiber (*Eleg.* 1.37) and strolling through the middle of Rome to attract the attention of young women (63).

2. “Since he is excellent in his appearance”: Maximianus praises his own handsomeness as a young man (see *Eleg.* 1.17, 71, and 131–32), but the *accessus* may also be stressing the formal excellence of his poetry.

“And versed in the knowledge of the art of rhetoric”: see *Eleg.* 1.13–14; 129–30.

“And the other various arts”: he mentions his skill at poetry at *Eleg.* 1.11–12; hunting, 21–24; wrestling, 25–26; running, 27; and tragic song, 28.

“He truly meets approval”: Maximianus writes at *Eleg.* 1.29: “The sweet mixture of my talents increased my merit.”

3. “In this book, moreover, he censures old age together with its vices, and he praises youth together with its pleasures”: this summary of the content corresponds to Maximianus’s first elegy (1.1–292), but does not appear to cover his loves for Lycoris, Aquila, Candida, and his Greek girlfriend in Constantinople, which are treated in the remaining 404 lines of the work.

4. “Complaint about slow old age”: see *Eleg.* 1.1–2.

5. “His intention is to dissuade anyone at all from desiring the vices of old age by wishing for them foolishly”: see *Eleg.* 1.151–52: “What authority (*quis auctor*) would madly persuade one of such things, to desire to be uglier by one’s own prayer.” Maximianus disagrees with the praise of old age in



Cicero's *De senectute* as a desirable time of life, and concurs with Juvenal's tenth *Satire*, which ridicules men who pray to Jupiter for a long life (lines 188–288). The latter's litany of the evils of aging is a key model for Maximianus's satirical treatment of the topic in lines 111–276. Medieval readers took measure of Maximianus as a moralist in the tradition of the satirists Horace and Juvenal.

6. "The utility of the book is the knowledge of foolish desire" (*cognitio stulti desiderii*): it is not stated what the foolish desire is, but given the previous sentence and what follows, one may understand that the foolish desire is for old age. In one of the introductions to the *Heroides*, a similar utility is found in the work: knowledge of foolish love affairs (*Acc.* 26.26, *stultorum amorum cognitio*).

"And the avoidance of old age": it is hard to see how one can avoid old age (Maximianus clearly does not advocate suicide); the sense here may be "the avoidance of the foolish desire to live for old age." See *Acc.* 26.28, where the *Heroides*'s use is to avoid foolish and illicit love.

## 8. Introduction to *Homer [Ilias Latina]*

The Latin Homer of the Middle Ages was the author of an abbreviated translation of the *Iliad* (1,070 hexameters) now known as the *Ilias Latina*. The work concentrates on the first third of the Greek epic while elliptically summarizing the rest. The author and date of the work are uncertain. Modern editors, however, interpret the acrostics at the beginning and end of the poem—ITALICUS (1–8) and SCRIPSIT (1063–70)—as a clue that Baebius Italicus (consul in AD 90) wrote the work as a young man toward the end of the Neronian age (ca. AD 68). The diction of the *Ilias Latina* shows signs of influence by Virgil, Ovid, and Seneca but by no author of a later date.

When readers in the late antique West no longer knew enough Greek to read the *Iliad* in the original, the Latin version became valuable, and the identity of the translator-epitomator became less important than that of Homer. The so-called Lactantius Placidus quotes lines from the *Ilias Latina* in his commentary on Statius and attributes them to Homer. Consequently the poem began circulating in the Middle Ages under the title *Liber Homeri*. At a later stage in the eleventh century, however, it was thought that Homer was translated into Latin by someone named Pindarus.<sup>40</sup>

Evidence for the readership of the Latin Homer is scant in the Carolingian age.<sup>41</sup> In the year 984, however, Walther of Speyer reports that his study of Roman writers began with "Homer."<sup>42</sup> A century later, Aimeric (*Ars lectoria*) sets "Homerulus" ("Little Homer") after "Catunculus" ("Little Cato") in

the sequence of beginning readings.<sup>43</sup> Medieval textbooks of the eleventh and twelfth centuries confirm the close association of “Homer” with “Cato” as a Latin primer in grammar classes.<sup>44</sup> In the thirteenth century, the *Ilias Latina* continued to be a school text, as attested by Eberhard the German in his *Laborintus* (643–44).

#### Text of *Acc.* 8

The text is based on Clm 19475 (T), fol. 4rb.16–4va.17, but is corrected with variants in Clm 19474 (M), p. 68, and Pal. lat. 242 (P), fol. 76v.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 8

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 20–21; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 25–26.

#### Selected Bibliography on *Ilias Latina*

##### Critical Editions, Translations, and Commentaries

Baehrens, E., and F. Vollmer, eds. *Poetae Latini Minores*. Vol. 2, fasc. 3, *Homerus Latinus id est Baebii Italici Ilias Latina*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner 1913.

[Kennedy, G. A. *The Latin Iliad: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Notes*. Fort Collins: printed by the author, 1998.

McKinley, Kathryn L. “The Medieval Homer: The *Ilias Latina*.” *Allegorica* 19 (1998): 3–61.

Scaffai, Marco. *Baebii Italici Ilias Latina. Introduzione, edizione critica, traduzione italiana e commento*. Bologna: Pàtron, 1982; 2nd ed. 1997.

##### Medieval Reception

Courtney, E. “*Ilias Latina*.” In *Brill’s New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World*. Vol. 6, *Hat–Jus*, edited by Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider, p. 724. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2005.

Munk Olsen, Birger. *I classici nel canone scolastico altomedievale*, pp. 63–65. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull’alto Medioevo, 1991.

Scaffai, Marco. *Baebii Italici Ilias Latina*, pp. 29–36.

#### Commentary on *Acc.* 8

##### *Overview*

The *accessus* deals first with the author (1–3), distinguishing between a Homer who wrote the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in Greek and a Latin Homer who imitated his Greek predecessor in the places where Virgil did not in the *Aeneid*. The *accessus* then deploys the four headings of a modern introduction

in a different order; it begins with *intention* instead of *subject matter* in contrast to the preceding four *accessus* (4–10). More unusually, it gives two sets of analyses under the headings *intention*, *subject matter*, and *utility* (4–6 and 7–9). The final section (11–12) follows Servius’s commentary on the *Aeneid* by identifying “Homer’s” three modes of epic speech (see *Serv. Aen.* 1.8).

The *accessus* appears to combine two different introductions under the headings of *subject matter*, *intention*, and *utility* and so offers two approaches to reading the Latin Homer. In the first, the author’s intention is to imitate Homer or to write down the Trojan War. The subject matter (Troy and Greece) and utility (knowledge of the Trojan War) are linked insofar as the *Ilias Latina* represents one of the main sources for the historical and political events of Troy (others include late Latin translations of Dictys of Crete’s *Ephemeris belli Troiani* and Dares of Phrygia’s *De excidio Troiae historia*). The second approach attributes a moral motive to the work similar to that found in the *accessus* to Ovid’s *Heroides* (see *Acc.* 26.15). The subject matter is Paris and Helen whose illicit marriage causes the Trojan War. The intention of the work is to dissuade the reader from entering into an illicit marriage that is sacrilegious and that leads to mass destruction. The former introduction is probably the older one, while the latter is more in keeping with the *aetas Ovidiana*, in that it reads the Latin Homer in the ethical context of Ovid’s *Heroides* and *Remedia amoris*.

1. “In which Virgil imitates him”: the idea that Virgil imitates Homer derives from the Servian prologue to his commentary on the *Aeneid* (*Serv. Aen.* 1 prooem., ed. Thilo, vol. 1, p. 4.10–11): “Virgil’s intention is this: to imitate Homer.” Servius is also the source for the idea that Virgil imitates the *Odyssey* in the first six books of the *Aeneid* and the *Iliad* in the last six books: see *Serv. Aen.* 7.1.

“For *ode* means ‘praise’”: the word *ode* is a transliteration of the Greek word for “song” or “poem” and is used by grammarians such as Pomponius Porphyrio, Victorinus, Diomedes, and Servius to designate Horace’s *Odes* and *Epodes* (*ThLL*, s.v. *ode* I.A.1); the glossing of *ode* as “praise” (*laus*) does not appear to have ancient authority. The *accessus* derives the title of the *Odyssey* from this word rather than from the name of Odysseus. The author of this *accessus* is apparently unaware of the latter etymology because Odysseus’s name in Latin is *Ulixes*. The name *Ulixes* derives from a western Greek variant for the name Odysseus, first attested in the western Greek poet Ibycus (see Diomedes, *GL* 1:321.29–30).

“Ulysses”: the correct reading *Ulixem* (preserved in P) has been corrupted to the nonsensical *ultrem* in TM. The error stems from the common

source of TM for this *accessus*. The proper form of the name appears elsewhere in T (see *Acc.* 1.5; 2.9).

2. “The *Iliad* is a story written about the destruction of Troy”: properly speaking, the *Iliad* is a story about the siege of Troy and not the sack itself, which was the subject of another epic poem, the *Iliupersis*. Latin versions of the destruction of Troy were familiar to medieval readers from Aeneas’s account in *Aeneid* 2 and Dares of Phrygia’s *De excidio Troiae historia*.

3. “A certain Latin Homer”: this *accessus* does not agree with the medieval tradition that the name of the translator was Pindarus (see Conrad of Hirsau, *Dialogus super auctores*, p. 118.1450–52). Homer may have been regarded as the pseudonym of the translator.

7. “Or, alternatively” (*Vel aliter*): a scholiastic formula signaling the addition of material from another source. In the commentary tradition, the word *aliter* is used as a subsidiary heading to divide sections of scholia compiled from different sources; the use of this tool can be found, for example, in Servius.<sup>45</sup> The scholiastic *aliter* is itself a discursive practice borrowed from the Greeks who used the word *allōs* to mark the quotation of a different source, to introduce an alternative definition, or simply to separate multiple epitaphs on a gravestone. For another example of *uel aliter* in the commentary on Cicero’s *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, see *Acc.* 22.30. For *aliter* and *uel* as subheadings introducing material from different sources, see *Acc.* 26.17–20 and 26–28.

8. “An illicit marriage”: this theme is treated in *Ilias Latina* 252–338. The alternative explanation for the subject matter thus highlights an erotic aspect of the text and subjects it to the moralizing approach that one finds in *Acc.* 2.4–5: that is, the *illicitum coniugium* of Paris and Helen may be compared with examples of *illicitus amor* in the *Heroides* that are held up for condemnation. This association with the *Heroides* may be encouraged by the fact that Paris and Helen exchange letters in the *Heroides* (16–17) that are an intertext for the *Ilias Latina*. So it is not surprising that the negative moral reading of Paris and Helen in *Acc.* 26.15 is transferred to the *Ilias Latina*. Just as the *Heroides* are supposed to dissuade readers from pursuing illicit love, so too does the Latin Homer warn against indulging the passions and offending divinity.

9. “We fear offending the majesty of the gods”: the medieval commentator is able to adopt the perspective of the pagan characters without feeling the need to interject Christian dogma.

“With as much a trivial thing as a personal affront” (*tam leui quam delicto*): TM are at variance with P, which reads *tam leui quam graui delicto* (“with a trivial offense as well as a serious one”). The latter is grammatically and rhetorically sounder and preferred by Huygens.

11. “He also divides the poem into three parts: statement of theme, invocation, and narrative”: as a form of epic, the *Ilias Latina* is analyzed according to the Servian scheme applied to epic poets such as Virgil and Lucan: see note to *Acc.* 4.19.

12. “For it was accomplished” (“†*Cum ficiebat† enim*”): the quotation of the sixth verse of the *Ilias latina* 6 is corrupt in TM. The reading of P (*conficiebat enim*) is one step closer to the truth. The verse in question is: *confiebat enim summi sententia regis* (“for the will of the supreme king was accomplished”). The corruption of *confiebat* in TMP is a sign that this *accessus* was transmitted in an anthology separately from the poem and commentary.

## 9. Introduction to *Physiologus*

This *Physiologus* (“The Natural Scientist”) is an eleventh-century collection of twelve short animal poems in different meters (305 verses). Each poem describes and interprets the nature of an animal allegorically as a prefiguration or sign of a Christian truth. The selective character and metrical variety of the work (hexameters, elegiac distichs, sapphic stanzas, hypercatalectic dactylic trimeters, and adonics) made it an ideal school text for teaching a variety of subjects, including natural philosophy, Christian allegory, and versification.

The *accessus* in Clm 19475 does not name the author of the *Physiologus*—perhaps a clue that the work was originally anonymous.<sup>46</sup> However, the earliest manuscript of the work (London, British Library, Harley 3093, saec. XI/XII, fol. 36r) identifies the author as *Theobaldus Italicus*.<sup>47</sup> In later commentaries on the poem, the author is called *magister Theobaldus doctor et episcopus* (“master Theobaldus Doctor and Bishop”). Consequently, scholars ascribe the authorship of this verse *Physiologus* to Theobaldus, although there is little consensus who he is.

The *Physiologus* represents the first versified bestiary of its kind, distilling animal lore from the different prose traditions of the *Physiologus Latinus* which translated a popular Greek work. The latter appears to have been a compilation by an anonymous Christian commentator who quotes an anonymous natural scientist, the *physiologus*, whose descriptions of marvelous animals, plants, and stones are interpreted allegorically as prefigurations of Christ, the devil, and the Christian believer.<sup>48</sup> The date and provenance of the Greek *Physiologus* is unknown, but the influence of the allegorical interpretive method of Philo and the catechetical school of Alexandria suggest the milieu of second-century Egypt.<sup>49</sup>

Four redactions or versions of the *Physiologus Latinus* were transmitted in the Middle Ages. The poet of the *Physiologus* versified material from the different traditions of the *Physiologus Latinus*, but his concentration on animals (to the exclusion of plants and stones) appears to be indebted to *Versio l* (based on *Versio b*), the prose prototype for the medieval bestiary. The latter was attributed to John Chrysostom, the fifth-century patriarch of Constantinople, but was probably compiled and edited between the ninth and eleventh centuries in the Latin West.

The poetic *Physiologus* quickly became a modern classic in the school curriculum. It appears in other manuscripts of the eleventh and twelfth centuries that are clearly textbooks, containing elementary readings such as the *Disticha Catonis*, Avianus's *Fabulae*, *Ilias Latina*, Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, Sedulius's *Carmen paschale*, and Arator's *Historia apostolica*, all of which are works introduced in the *Accessus ad auctores*.<sup>50</sup> P. T. Eden's edition of the text collates more than forty manuscripts from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries and records a commentary to the work in no less than thirty-five manuscripts (twenty-five of which have commentary and text, and ten of which just a commentary).

#### Text of *Acc.* 9

Clm 19475, fol. 4va.18–26. Different versions of the *accessus* appear in Clm 19474 (M), p. 78, and Pal. lat. 242 (P), fols. 76v–77r. One should also compare the *accessus* edited by Eden, *Physiologus*, p. 10, based on the manuscripts Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 825 and MS 882, and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5129.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 9

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), p. 21; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 26.

#### Selected Bibliography on *Physiologus*

##### Critical Edition, Translation, and Commentary

*Physiologus*. Edited by P. T. Eden as *Theobaldi "Physiologus."* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

##### Secondary Literature

Henkel, Nikolaus. *Studien zum Physiologus im Mittelalter*, esp. pp. 34–41. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1976.

Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*. 3:730–34.

Ziolkowski, Jan M. *Talking Animals: Medieval Latin Beast Poetry, 750–1150*, pp. 34–35. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

## Commentary on *Acc.* 9

### Overview

The *accessus* begins with an etymological analysis of the title (1). It then approaches the work according to the modern introductory format of four headings beginning with *subject matter* (2–5). For the first three headings, the *accessus* paraphrases the opening lines of the *Physiologus* (*De leone, prologus* 1–4 in Eden, *Physiologus*, p. 24), which set forth a program to treat the natures and allegorical interpretations of animals. The work is classified under natural philosophy rather than under ethics.

1. “Hence *Physiologus*, ‘Speech on Nature’ (*naturalis sermo*)”: the Latin gloss of *Physiologus* misinterprets the title of the Greek work which means “The Natural Scientist.” For the etymological method, compare the gloss of *Egloga* as “Goat-speech” in *Acc.* 10.5. Here the error, however, makes sense. In the Greek original, the Christian allegorist frequently cites his source in the form “as the natural scientist says,” which gives the work its title. The author of the poetic version does not usually refer to the *Physiologus* because his name is unmetrical. Consequently, the persona of the “natural scientist” is effaced. The one time that the *Physiologus* is named in the work may support the idea of a discourse about nature: “The stag is said by the *physiologus*, when he teaches about it, to have two natures and two allegorical interpretations” (6.2–3). In Latin, the word *Physiologus* is split into two parts through the rare device of tmesis and the last syllable of *Physio* is artificially lengthened: *Dicitur a Physio, cum docet inde, logo* (3). This metrical trickery is necessary to accommodate a word that does not scan. The splitting of the name into two parts, *physis* and *logos*, clearly encourages the etymological gloss *naturalis sermo* and may have been inspired by the etymology. More importantly, the division of the name corresponds to the two aspects of the *Physiologus*: the natures of animals and their allegorical meanings. The original narratological distinction between the natural scientist and the Christian allegorist is thus blurred, and the *Physiologus* becomes assimilated with the double aspect of his discourse.

2. Cf. *De leone, prol.* 3, where the subject matter of the *Physiologus* is expressly identified as animals in contrast to the prose versions which also deal with plants and stones.

3. “To take pleasure in animals and to be of use in its allegorical interpretations” (*delectari in animalibus et prodesse in figuris*): the scribe of T copied *delectare* (also the reading of M) but the text was corrected to read *delectari*. Huygens does not report the correction, but assumes that the *accessus* aims to echo the Horatian dictum of *Ars poetica* 333: *aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare*



*poetae*. However, the act of correction in T is itself a sign that the Horatian dictum has undergone modification in the collective medieval memory (see the note on *Acc.* 6.7; see 21.8, 26.23). *Delectari* is reflexive and puts the emphasis on the poet's delight in writing poetry about animals; see *Acc.* 26.23 for the idea of the poet taking pleasure in his own work.

"In its allegorical interpretations" (*figuris*): *figura* refers to the deeper historical, moral, and mystical meaning of animals which is communicated by God to man: e.g., the lion prefigures Christ. Cf. Auerbach, "Figura," pp. 28–60, esp. pp. 53–56.

4. "We come to know the natures and allegorical interpretations (*naturas et figuras*) of animals": the phrase *naturas et figuras* alludes to the rhyme in the first line of the verse prologue to Theobaldus's *Physiologus* (*De leone, prol.* 1): *Tres leo naturas et tres habet inde figuras* ("the lion has three natures and therefore three allegorical interpretations"). It has been suggested that this line (and the poem on the lion) gave rise to the term 'leonine', which refers to the technique in dactylic verse of rhyming the word at the principal caesura with the word at the end of the verse.<sup>51</sup>

5. The *Physiologus* is the only work introduced in the *Accessus ad auctores* that is classified solely under natural philosophy; Ovid's *Fasti* falls partly into this category through its astrological notices (*Acc.* 19.21).

## 10. Introduction to *Theodolus* [*Ecloga Theoduli*]

Theodolus (or Theodulus) is a pseudonymous Latin poet who lived between the tenth and mid-eleventh century and authored the *Eclogue*, a learned pastoral poem of 344 (or 352) leonine hexameters. In the Middle Ages, the *Ecloga Theoduli*, as the work is now called, achieved the status of a classic in the grammar curriculum, and Theodolus came to be regarded as a Christian *auctor* who was ancient.<sup>52</sup>

The *Eclogue* is formally indebted to Virgil's *Eclogues*, especially the third and seventh, and is considered to be the most influential Christian adaptation of Virgilian pastoral, even rivaling its model for readership. Theodolus reports a singing contest between the pagan goatherd Pseustis ("Falsehood") and the Jewish shepherdess Alithia ("Truth"), which is judged by another shepherdess Phronesis ("Prudence"), who is Alithia's sister. The singers compete in alternating (amoebaeon) quatrains. For the greater part of the contest consisting of twenty-nine exchanges, Pseustis summarizes an exemplary theme or story from pagan mythological history (Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is an important source), and Alithia counters with a superior parallel from the Old Testament—until Pseustis admits defeat.



The *Eclogue's* value in the classroom was its compendious, comparative treatment of heroes and heroines in classical mythology and the Old Testament. At the same time, however, the allusive and enigmatic style of Theodolus required the explanatory expertise of medieval grammarians and schoolmasters. Toward the end of the eleventh century, Bernard of Utrecht wrote an influential grammatical and interpretive commentary to Theodolus introduced by a critically ambitious *accessus* in the Servian mode.

The earliest evidence for the work's circulation is the eleventh-century manuscript Eton College Library 150, fols. 6v–18v, the textbook in which the *auctores* Maximianus, Statius, Ovid, and Arator also appear. Theodolus likewise stood alongside the introductory pagan authors “Cato,” Avianus, and the Latin Homer in textbooks such as Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS Voss. lat. O.89 (see Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors,” p. 218, no. 144). In the *accessus ad auctores* (TPM), Theodolus builds a transition from the elementary pagan authors to Christian poets such as Arator, Prosper, Sedulius, and Prudentius. Conrad of Hirsau, by contrast, introduces Theodolus as the fourth Christian author after Sedulius, Juvenius, and Prosper (*Dialogus super auctores*, pp. 94–95.669–734). In the *libri Catoniani* of the thirteenth century, Theodolus usually followed “Cato” and remained an elementary school author in northern Europe until the fifteenth century.<sup>53</sup>

#### Text of *Acc.* 10

Clm 19475, fols. 4va.26–5ra.10. Variants of the same *accessus* appear in Clm 19474 (M), pp. 72–73, and Pal. lat. 242 (P), fol. 77r.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 10

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 21–22; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 26–27.

#### Selected Bibliography on Theodolus

##### Critical Edition

Theodolus. *Ecloga*. Edited by J. Osternacher as *Ecloga Theoduli*. Linz-Urfahr, 1902.

##### Edition with Commentary

Green, R. P. H., ed. *Seven Versions of Carolingian Pastoral*, pp. 26–35 and 111–49. Reading: University of Reading, 1980.

Theodolus. *Teodulo, Ecloga: Il canto della verità e della menzogna*. Edited and translated by Francesco Mosetti Casaretto. Florence: SISMEL, 1997.

## Translations

- Pepin, Ronald E., trans. *An English Translation of "Auctores octo": A Medieval Reader*, pp. 28–40. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1999.
- Thomson, Ian, and Louis Perraud, trans. *Ten Latin Schooltexts of the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 126–44. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.

## Medieval Commentary

- Bernard of Utrecht. *Commentum in Theodolum (1076–1099)*. Edited by R. B. C. Huygens. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, 1977. The prefatory letter and *accessus* to the commentary, however, are published in Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 54–69.

## Secondary Literature

- Green, R. P. H. "The Genesis of a Medieval Textbook: The Models and Sources of the *Ecloga Theoduli*." *Viator* 13 (1982): 49–106.
- Hamilton, George L. "Theodulus: A Mediaeval Textbook." *Modern Philology* 7 (1909): 169–85.
- Henkel, Nikolaus. "Die *Ecloga Theodoli* und ihre literarischen Gegenkonzeptionen." *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 24/25 (1989/90): 151–62.
- Quinn, Betty Nye. "ps. Theodulus." In *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*. Vol. 2, edited by Paul Oskar Kristeller, pp. 383–408. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1971.
- Thomson, Ian, and Louis Perraud, trans. *Ten Latin Schooltexts of the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 110–26.
- Vredewald, Harry. "Pagan and Christian Echoes in the 'Ecloga Theoduli'—A Supplement." *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 22 (1987): 101–13.

Commentary on *Acc.* 10*Overview*

The *accessus* follows a format similar to the preceding introductions. It begins with a brief life of the author which includes an explanation of the origin of the *Eclogue* (1–4). Next the title *Ecloga*, written as *Egloga*, is etymologized (5). Then the modern introductory scheme of four headings is deployed beginning with *subject matter* (6–9). The *accessus* returns to the discussion of the title (begun at 5) by giving the incipit (10). It then adds etymologies of the names Pseustis and Alithia (11–12). It concludes with a discussion of the incipit in 13–16, presenting two etymologies for the name Theodulus (13–15).

1. "Born Christian of parents of no mean rank" (*parentibus Christianus*

*non infimis editus*): reading *Christianus* in T is retained after *parentibus* despite the fact that other manuscripts transmitting this *accessus* read *parentibus Christianis*, such as MP and the introduction in Bernard of Utrecht's *Commentum in Theodolum* (p. 59.51–52): *parentibus non infimis et Christianis editus*. Cf. Conrad of Hirsau, *Dialogus super auctores*, p. 93.669: *Theodolus a Christianis parentibus natus*. As a model for the sentence in its original form, Huygens (*Accessus* [1970], p. 26) Sulpicius Severus, *Vita S. Martini*, 2.1 (CSEL 1:111.27–28): *parentibus . . . non infimis, gentilibus tamen* (“[Martin was born . . .] of parents who were of no mean rank, but nevertheless pagan.” Cf. also the beginning of Donatus's *Vita Vergilii: P. Vergilius Maro Mantuanus parentibus modicis fuit* (ed. Brummer, p. 1).

2. “When he was in Athens” (*cum esset Athenis*): this biographical detail appears to arise from the beginning of the *Eclogue*, in which the goatherd Pseustis is said to come from Athens (4, *natus ab Athenis pastor cognomine Pseustis*).

“*Egloga*”: on the orthography, see note on 5.

3. “Wrongly corrupted the quantity of *se*”: here the *accessus* refers to the false quantity of the first syllable of *secretum*, which is naturally long, but must be artificially shortened to form a dactyl and avoid a cretic in the fifth foot.

5. The etymology of *Egloga* from *egle* (the Greek for “goat” is *aix*, *aigos*) relies on a number of convenient orthographical confusions. Properly speaking, *Ecloga* is borrowed from the Greek *eklogê*, which literally means “selection” and is applied to a short poem of any kind (see Lewis and Short s.v.). The Latin transliteration of the Greek renders the preposition prefix *ek* (“from”) as *ec* and *logê* (“picking”) as *loga*. When *ec* is written as *eg* and *e* is interpreted as *ae* (Latin transliteration of Greek *ai*), the Greek preposition *ek* can be creatively reread as the root of the Greek word for “goat.” The etymological association of *loga* with *logos* (both o-grade noun-forms derive from the verb *lego* meaning “pick” or “say”) enables, in turn, the inventive gloss “goat-speech.” Cf. Bernard of Utrecht, *Commentum in Theodolum*, p. 60.60–62: “The word *egloga* is derived from goats, as if it were saying *egle logos*, that is ‘goat-speech,’ or because it concerns shepherds or because it reproaches the repulsiveness of the vices, which is indicated through this animal.” The main character Pseustis is said to be a goatherd (see *Ecl.* 3, *mouerat . . . capellas*, “he had moved . . . his she-goats”), while Alithia is appropriately a shepherdess. The *accessus* is not interested in the fact that the title *Ecloga* is also given to each of Virgil's pastoral poems, a point remarked on by Conrad of Hirsau (*Dialogus super auctores*, p. 94.689–93), but not by Bernard. The impulse to derive *Ecloga* from the Greek word for “goat,” on the other hand, can be traced back to Aelius Donatus's *accessus* to the *Eclogues* which follows his *Vita*

*Vergilii* (ed. Brummer, pp. 11–19; see Serv. *Buc. prooem.*, ed. Thilo, vol. 3.1, pp. 1–2), where the authoritative grammarian explains that the work’s other Greek title, *Bucolica*, is adopted from the Hellenistic poet Theocritus’s *Boukolika*, poems about the pastoral way of life that were named after the highest class of herders, the *boukoloi* or “cowherders.”

7. “To show the strength of truth and of falsehood” (*ostendere vires veritatis et falsitatis*): So the text of TM. Huygens prefers the variant in P *ostendere vires veritatis et defectum falsitatis* (“to show the strength of truth and the weakness of falsehood”). It is possible that TM have omitted the idea of “the weakness of falsehood,” but T appears to support the idea that “falsehood” is a strong competitor, for the subsequent adverb *tamen* (“nevertheless”) indicates that “truth” still wins.

12. “*Ali* in the Hebrew language means ‘truth’ and *thia* means ‘God’”: Huygens points out that the Hebrew etymology is fantastic. The name Alithia is, of course, based on the Greek word for “truth,” whose proper etymology is “that which is not forgotten” or “that which is obvious.” However, the authority of Alithia is Hebrew scripture.

15. “Theodulus means ‘servant of God’ because it is the mark of each servant of God to distinguish true things from false”: this etymology would presuppose that the orthography of Theodulus is *Theodulus* in which *dulus* transliterates *doulos*, the Greek word for “servant.”

## 11. Introduction to *Arator [Historia apostolica]*

The late antique Christian poet Arator composed an epic paraphrase and commentary on the Acts of the Apostles in the New Testament and recited the work publicly at the Basilica of St. Peter ad Vincula in the year 544 to great acclaim. The epic, which is usually titled *Historia apostolica*, consists of forty-three loosely connected episodes that are divided into two books (2,326 hexameters), with the first book treating the acts of Peter and the second those of Paul. It forms a sequel to Sedulius’s epic *Carmen paschale* on the life of Christ (see *Acc.* 13). Arator is indebted to Sedulius for his poetic conception of biblical paraphrase, but he departs from his predecessor by alternating between a literal paraphrase of events in Acts and commentary on their moral, dogmatic, and mystical meaning.<sup>54</sup> In the manuscript tradition, the epic is accompanied by three different letters in elegiac distichs in which Arator introduces his work and dedicates it to his patrons Pope Vigilius, Florian, an abbot, and Parthenius, a high-ranking official.

Like Juvenius and Sedulius, the other Christian epic poets of the New Testament, Arator was quickly incorporated into the canon of Christian

poets.<sup>55</sup> At the end of the sixth century, Venantius Fortunatus praises Arator's eloquence at the beginning of his *Life of St. Martin* (1.22–23, MGH Auct. ant. 4:295–96). In the early eighth century, Bede drew on him as a model for versification in his *De arte metrica*. Important Carolingian educational leaders, such as Alcuin of York, Theodulf of Orléans, and Rabanus Maurus invariably mention Arator among the Christian *auctores*.<sup>56</sup> In the late Carolingian age, an anonymous writer composed a poem in praise of Arator (MGH Poetae 6:176–77) that was commonly transmitted with the *Historia apostolica* in manuscripts from the tenth to the twelfth centuries.

Copies of Arator's epic are not only attested in ninth-century libraries of France and Germany but are also found in the earliest textbooks (*libri manuales*) of curricular authors, such as Eton College Library 150, which has already been mentioned in connection with Maximianus and Theodolus.<sup>57</sup> During the High and late Middle Ages, Arator was routinely collected with other Christian authors such as Sedulius, Prosper, Prudentius (*Psychomachia*), Theodolus, and the pagan primers "Cato" and Avianus. In his *Ars lectoria* (1086), Aimeric ranks Arator with Sedulius and Prudentius in the third ("tin") class of Christian writers, putting him on a level with the elementary pagan authors "Cato," "Homer," Maximianus, Avianus, and Aesop.<sup>58</sup> In the curriculum of Conrad of Hirsau, Arator follows the Christian poets Sedulius, Juvenius, Prosper, Theodolus, but precedes Prudentius (*Dialogus super auctores*, pp. 96–97.749–803). Arator is positioned between Sedulius and Prudentius by Eberhard the German in the list of *auctores* he presents in the *Laborintus* (657–58).<sup>59</sup>

#### Text of *Acc.* 11

Clm 19475, fol. 5ra.11–5rb.16. Variants of the same *accessus* appear in Clm 19474 (M), p. 69, and Pal. lat. 242 (P), fol. 77.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 11

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), p. 22; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 27–28.

#### Selected Bibliography on Arator's *Historia apostolica*

##### Critical Editions

Arator. *Arator Subdiaconus, De actibus apostolorum*. Edited by Arthur Patch McKinlay. CSEL 72.

———. *Aratoris Subdiaconi Historia apostolica*. Edited by A. P. Orbán. 2 vols. CCSL 130, 130A. Includes Latin glosses.

## Edition with Translation

Arator. *Arator's "On the Acts of the Apostles": De actibus apostolorum*. Edited and translated by Richard J. Shrader et al. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

## Medieval Reception

McKinlay, Arthur Patch. *Arator: The Codices*. Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America, 1942. Especially chapter 6, "The Place of Arator in Mediaeval Culture," pp. 104–18.

Wieland, Gernot Rudolf. *The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius in Cambridge University Library, MS Gg.5.35*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1983.

## Secondary Literature

Orbán, A. P. "Introduction," and "Bibliography." In Arator, *Aratoris Subdiaconi Historia apostolica*, edited by A. P. Orbán. CCSL 130: 1–204.

Green, Roger P. H. *Latin Epics of the New Testament: Juvenecus, Sedulius, Arator*, pp. 251–366. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Hillier, Richard. *Arator on the Acts of the Apostles: A Baptismal Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Roberts, Michael. *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity*, pp. 86–92, 113–16, 137–39, 172–79. Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1985.

Schwind, Johannes. *Arator-Studien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

Trout, Dennis E. "Latin Christian Epics of Late Antiquity." In *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, edited by John Miles Foley, pp. 550–61 (pp. 557–59). Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.

Wright, Neil. "Arator's Use of Caelius Sedulius: a Re-examination." *Eranos* 87 (1989): 51–64.

Commentary on *Acc.* 11*Overview*

This *accessus* has three sections. The first (1–6) treats the life of Arator based on the elegiac *Epistola ad Vigilium* that prefaces the *Historia apostolica*; it emphasizes how Arator's study of literature was morally edifying and gave him the knowledge to write his poem. The second section (7–10) analyzes the work according to the modern introductory scheme of the four headings beginning with *subject matter*. Notable here is the didactic interpretation of Arator's epic as a work that exhorts the reader to a virtuous life by representing examples of good deeds performed by the apostles (see *Acc.* 4.13–15). The third section of the *accessus* (11–12) interprets the two elegiac epistles that serve as a prologue to the work.

1. The claim that Arator was a pagan appears to be based on a misinterpretation of his “Letter to Vigilus” (*Epistola ad Vigilium*, 9–10 [CCSL 130:213]): “I enter the church as a shipwrecked sailor having abandoned the court; I desert the perfidious ship of a worldly sea.” Here Arator refers to his spiritual conversion after pursuing a civil career as a lawyer and orator in Ravenna; he eventually served in the court of the King Atalaric, the successor of Theoderic. In 537, he left the service of the court and became a subdeacon of the Roman church under Pope Vigilus.

2. Vigilus became pope in 537, when Rome was besieged by the Gothic king Vitigis (Procopius, *History of the Wars*, 5.25.13). King Theoderic had died in 526 and was not said to have besieged Rome; however, there was a tradition that Theoderic behaved tyrannically to Rome; see *Acc.* 23.1–2 with notes.

3. Cf. *Epistola ad Vigilium* 4–8. Procopius credits Belisarius, Justinian’s supreme military commander, with the successful defense of Rome against the Goths.

4. For Arator’s alleged conversion, compare the similar accounts for Prudentius (*Acc.* 3.4; 4.4) and Sedulius (*Acc.* 13.3).

9. Arator treats the story of Ananias and Sapphira at 1.417–37; see Acts 5.1–11.

11. In the *Epistola ad Florianum* 5–6 (CCSL 130:211), Arator asks the abbot Florian to correct his work.

## 12. Introduction to *Prosper [Epigrammata]*

The work introduced is the *Epigrammata ex sententiis S. Augustini* (“Epigrams from the Sayings of St. Augustine”) by Prosper Tiro of Aquitaine (ca. 390–ca. 463), who was a follower and defender of Augustine’s theological views during the doctrinal controversies of his time. In order to promote Augustinian thought, he published in prose the *Liber sententiarum ex operibus S. Augustini delibatarum* (“Book of Sayings Selected from the Works of St. Augustine”), an anthology of 392 moral and dogmatic meditations extracted from Augustine’s different works. To reach a wider audience, he published a second book of selected meditations in the form of 106 elegiac epigrams. The publication of the work in two books, one prose and the other poetry, set an example for later authors such as Sedulius (*Carmen paschale* and *Opus paschale*) and Rabanus Maurus (*De laudibus sanctae crucis*). Prosper wrote other religious poetry as well as a commentary on the Psalms and a universal historical chronicle. It was his book of epigrams, however, that won him an enduring readership in the Middle Ages.



Prosper's book of Augustinian epigrams is cited by Bede in his *De metrica arte* and listed by Alcuin among the Christian poets in the cathedral library at York.<sup>60</sup> In the ninth century, the *Epigrammata* appeared in the library catalogues of continental Europe, indicating their widespread use in the educational curriculum; through the beginning of the fourteenth century, Prosper regularly accompanied Sedulius, Arator, Prudentius, and Theodolus as a canonical Christian poet read in the schools. Prosper is the seventh author discussed in Conrad of Hirsau's *Dialogus super auctores* (pp. 92–93.630–88).

#### Text of *Acc.* 12

Clm 19475, fol. 5rb.17–15va.7. The same *accessus* is copied in Clm 19474 (M), pp. 65–66, while a variant of it appears in Pal. lat. 242 (P), fols. 77v–78r.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 12

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), p. 23; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 28.

#### Selected Bibliography on Prosper's *Epigrammata*

##### Editions

The *Epigrammata ex sententiis S. Augustini* has not yet received a modern critical edition but is presented (with prose models) in PL 51:497–532.

*Liber sententiarum ex operibus S. Augustini delibatarum*. In *Prosperi Aquitani Opera, Pars 2*. Edited by M. Gastaldo. CCL 68A.

##### Secondary Literature

Helm, R. "Prosper." *RE* 45:888 (for a literary appreciation of the epigrams).

White, Caroline. *Early Christian Latin Poets*, pp. 113–17 (with translations of *Epigrams* 52 and 77). London: Routledge, 2000.

#### Commentary on *Acc.* 12

##### *Overview*

This is the first introduction in the *Accessus ad auctores* that begins with a methodological statement about the number of topics it will examine (1). The format of five headings includes the Servian heading *life of the poet* (2–3) together with the modern headings *subject matter*, *intention*, *final cause*, *part of philosophy* (4–7). In treating the life of the poet, the *accessus* lays emphasis on his education in the arts, his relationship to Augustine, and the meaning of his name.



1. “In the introduction to this author” (*In exordio huius auctoris*): *exordium* is another term for *accessus*. See Kantorowicz, *Studies in the Glossators*, pp. 37–38; see *Acc.* 28.1.

“Five things must be researched”: the enumeration of topics to be investigated in the *accessus* is a common type of beginning: see *Acc.* 13.1, 16.1, 17.1, 26.1, 28.1. The model for this statement of method is the first sentence of Servius’s prologue to the *Aeneid* (ed. Thilo, 1:1–2).

“Life of the poet” (*uita poete*): although most of the *accessus* in T treat the life of the author, the Servian heading *uita poete* occurs only here and two other *accessus*: *Acc.* 13.1–2 (a Servian introduction) and *Acc.* 26.1–2.

“Final cause” (*finalis causa*): this Aristotelian term is introduced instead of *utilitas* (“utility”), but when the time comes to discuss the *finalis causa* the heading *utilitas* is used. See note to *Acc.* 2.7.

2. “Highly educated in the different arts” (*diuersarum artium eruditissimus*): see *Acc.* 7.2. This appears to be praise of Prosper as a well-rounded student of the liberal arts. Or it may be a reference to Prosper’s mastery of the arts of poetry and prose, for he would go on to write the maxims of Augustine in two different forms. In the eleventh-century poem *Querela magistri Treuerensis* (“Complaint of a Trier Schoolmaster”), Prosper is praised for handling the dogma of Augustine in both prose and poetry (108–9); see Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 79–80 and n. 43.

“A student of Augustine”: after receiving his education in the arts, Prosper studied under Augustine; his life exemplifies and reflects the educational ideals of medieval schooling.

“He composed this work from the different maxims (*sententiis*) of that man”: Prosper’s versification of Augustine’s moral and theological statements is the Christian equivalent to the sayings of Cato (*Acc.* 5).

3. The etymologizing of Prosper’s name is based on the pagan belief that a *nomen* is an *omen*, on which see *Acc.* 3.14. The technique of etymologizing an author’s name in order to underscore his moral authority is applied primarily to Christian authors in the *Accessus ad auctores*: Prudentius (*Acc.* 3.15–16), Theodolus (*Acc.* 10.13–15), and Boethius (*Acc.* 23.19–24).

“Aquitanian” (*Equitanicus*): the proper orthography is *Aquitanicus*. The creative derivation of the place-name *Aquitania* from *aequitas* has led to the confusion of *a* and *ae* (written as *e*); Isidore derives the name *ab obliquis aquis Ligeris fluminis* (“from the slanting waters of the river Liger,” *Etym.* 14.4.27).

“Because he revealed to us the way of equity, that is, of true faith” (*quia uiam equitatis, id est uere fidei, nobis manifestauit*): the metaphor of the way (*uia*) for moral conduct occurs in the introduction to “Cato” (*Acc.* 5.8), where it leads to true salvation (*ad ueram salutem*) and is contrasted with *error*

(5.4). The glossing of “the way of equity” as “the way of true faith” (*uiam uere fidei*) establishes a link with the intention of Sedulius in *Acc.* 13.8.

5. Prosper’s intention is expressed with the rhetorical ornaments of antithesis and alliteration. For the Christian idea of despising earthly things and desiring heavenly ones, see *Acc.* 23.9.

### 13. Introduction to *Sedulius [Carmen paschale]*

The work introduced is the *Carmen paschale* or *Paschale carmen* by the Christian poet Sedulius (fifth century AD), which is an epic about the life and miracles of Christ.<sup>61</sup> The poem is generally divided into five books (1,737 hexameters): the first book treats the miracles of the Old Testament that prefigure Christ’s; the next four paraphrase the New Testament narrative of the evangelists, concentrating on the wonders worked by Christ and culminating in his passion and resurrection. Sedulius frequently echoes Virgil and sets up the *Carmen paschale* as a Christian alternative to the *Aeneid*. In contrast to the Christian Latin poet Juvencus, who closely versified the evangelists a century earlier in his epic *Euangeliorum libri quattuor* (“Four Books of the Gospels”), Sedulius presents a free adaptation of the Gospels and interjects didactic exegesis of the mystical and typological meaning of evangelical history. The work is prefaced by a prose letter to Macedonius and a short prologue of eight elegiac distichs. Sedulius also wrote a prose version of the poem’s story titled *Opus paschale* as well as two *Hymns*.

In the early Middle Ages, Sedulius’s fortunes were linked to those of Juvencus in the early canon formation of the Christian authors. In his *Life of St. Martin*, Venantius Fortunatus praises Sedulius as the successor of Juvencus (1.16, MGH Auct. ant. 4:295). The pairing of Sedulius with Juvencus is repeated in Isidore’s *Versus* 11.6 (CCSL 113A: 223). Bede imitates and expresses admiration for Sedulius in *De arte metrica*.<sup>62</sup> In Alcuin’s verse catalogue of authors who are represented in the cathedral library at York, Sedulius heads the list and is followed by Juvencus (*Versus de patribus et sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae*, 1550, MGH Poetae 1:204). In his poem “On the Books Which I Used to Read,” Theodulf of Orléans begins his list of six Christian authors with Sedulius and ends with Juvencus (*Carm.* 45.13–14, MGH Poetae 1:543). The Carolingian master Rabanus Maurus lists Sedulius after Juvencus and before Arator in his treatise on the education of clerics (*De institutione clericorum* 3.18). These three epic poets of the New Testament were often collected together in manuscripts and read in the schools through the late Middle Ages.<sup>63</sup> Sedulius’s prestige in the grammar curriculum is evidenced by the late ninth-century commentary on the *Carmen paschale* by

Remigius of Auxerre; the same grammarian also wrote an *accessus* for Sedulius of the rhetorical type.<sup>64</sup>

Sedulius is the first of the Christian authors treated by Conrad of Hirsau in the *Dialogus super auctores* (pp. 8–89.514–91) after Donatus, “Cato,” “Aesop,” and Avianus, but preceding Juvenecus. He also appears in the thirteenth-century list of authors given by Eberhard the German (*Laborintus*, 655–56), which, like the *Accessus ad auctores*, drops Juvenecus from the group of Christian poets that includes Arator and Prudentius.<sup>65</sup> In the ninety-seven *libri manuales* surveyed by Munk Olsen (*Classici*, p. 67), Sedulius is the fourth most frequently collected author after “Cato,” Avianus, and “Homer,” appearing seventeen times.

#### Text of *Acc.* 13

Clm 19475 (T), fol. 5va.8–5vb.16. The text at 10 is lacunose and supplemented from the version of the same *accessus* in Pal. lat. 242 (P), fol. 78r–78v. A variant of the same *accessus* appears in Clm 19474, pp. 73–74, which shares with T the lacuna at 10.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 13

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 23–24; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 28–29.

#### Selected Bibliography on Sedulius’s *Carmen paschale*

##### Critical Edition

Sedulius. *Sedulii opera omnia, una cum excerptis ex Remigii expositione in Sedulii Paschale carmen*. Edited by Johann Huemer. CSEL 10:14–146. Excerpts from Remigius’s commentary on the *Carmen paschale* appear on pp. 316–56.

———. *Sedulii opera omnia, una cum excerptis ex Remigii expositione in Sedulii Paschale carmen*. Edited by Johann Huemer. 2nd ed. edited by Victoria Panagl. CSEL 10.

##### Translations

Kuhnmuensch, Otto J. *Early Christian Latin Poets*, pp. 254–72. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1929.

Sedulius. *The Paschal Song and Hymns*. Translated with an introduction by Carl P. E. Springer. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

Sigerson, George. *The Easter Song: Being the First Epic of Christendom by Sedulius, the First Scholar-Saint of Erin*. Dublin: Talbot Press, 1922.

Swanson, R. A. “Easter Poem.” *Classical Journal* 52 (1957): 289–97.

White, Carolinne. *Early Christian Latin Poets*, pp. 105–12. London: Routledge, 2000.

#### Secondary Literature

Green, *Latin Epics of the New Testament*, pp. 135–250 and 351–66.

Kurz, Rainer. “Zu Konrads von Hirsau ‘Dialogus super auctores’ 590 über das Leben des Sedulius.” *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 14 (1979): 265–72.

Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase*, pp. 77–82, 84–86, 110–12, 144–45, 165–72.

Springer, Carl P. E. *The Gospel as Epic in Late Antiquity: The Paschale carmen of Sedulius*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988.

———. *The Manuscripts of Sedulius: A Provisional Handlist*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1995.

Trout, “Latin Christian Epics,” pp. 557–59.

Wright, “Arator’s Use of Caelius Sedulius,” pp. 51–64.

#### Commentary on *Acc.* 13

##### Overview

The *accessus* of Sedulius is the only example of a Servian introduction in the *Accessus ad auctores*. It begins with a list of the seven headings under which it will examine Sedulius (1) and then treats the *life of the poet* (2–3), *title of the work* (4–6) *genre of poem* (7), *intention of the writer* (8), *number of books* (9), *order of books* (10), and *explanation* (11). The introduction concludes (12) with the Servian tripartite analysis of the epic poet’s modes of speech: announcement of theme, invocation, and narration. Minnis (*Medieval Theory of Authorship*, p. 16) suggests that the Servian introduction is applied to Sedulius because he was regarded as a Christian Virgil. Although this introduction differs markedly in form from the preceding twelve in T, it nonetheless introduces the extraneous heading *subject matter* into its discussion of the title (6), indicating that even the Servian introductory scheme is susceptible to modification.

1. The first sentence is closely modeled on the beginning of Servius’s prologue to Virgil’s *Aeneid* (ed. Thilo, vol. 1, pp. 1–2).

“In the beginning” (*In principio*): the word *principium* may be understood here as a synonym for *accessus*: see Kantorowicz, *Studies in the Glossators*, pp. 39–40. See also *Acc.* 15.8, 19.15, 26.1.

“Order of books”: the sixth heading dropped out of TMP and has been supplied by Huygens on the basis of the Servian introduction to the *Aeneid*. An abbreviated form of the heading appears later at 10.

2–3. The biographical information derives from a subscription found in ninth-century manuscripts (text in CSEL 10:viii1):

Sedulius uersificus primo laicus in Italia philosophiam didicit; postea cum aliis metrorum generibus metrum heroicum Macedonio consulente docuit. In Achaia libros suos scripsit tempore imperatorum Valentiniani et Theodosii.

(Sedulius the versifier first learned philosophy in Italy as a layman; later he taught the heroic meter together with other kinds of meters on the advice of Macedonius. He wrote his books in Greece in the time of the emperors Valentinian and Theodosius.)

“He was a layman of pagan origin (*laicus fuit gentilis*) . . . after he had converted to God”: the *uita* in the ninth-century subscriptions indicates only that Sedulius was a layman (*laicus*). That Sedulius was originally pagan and converted to Christianity is probably an inference drawn from a passage in Sedulius’s prefatory letter to the priest Macedonius in which he explains how with God’s help he turned away from secular studies and trivial literary amusements and devoted himself to the truth of Christianity (*Epistola ad Macedonium*, CSEL 10:2.4–3.6; see Springer, *Gospel as Epic*, pp. 28–29). Whether it was true or not, the experience of a religious conversion is an important feature of the medieval lives of Christian epic poets such as Prudentius (*Acc.* 3.4, 4.4) and Arator (11.4).

2. “But he learned philosophy in Italy during the time of the consuls Theodosius and Valentinus”: the first half of the sentence is taken over directly from the ninth-century *uita*, but the second half has been changed in transmission so that the date of the emperors (now consuls) Theodosius II and Valentinian III (between 425 and 450) has been applied to the time of philosophical study and not to the composition of the *Carmen paschale*. The name of Valentinian has also been corrupted to *Valentinus*.

3. “Had been baptized by the priest Macedonius”: this piece of information appears to have been inferred from Sedulius’s letter to Macedonius, in which he addresses him as priest and venerable father (1.1–3).

4. “*Title*, moreover, on the testimony of Servius, is derived etymologically from Titan”: Servius does not mention the etymology of *titulus* from Titan. The first attestation for the etymology, as already noted in *Acc.* 3.11, appears in Remigius of Auxerre’s commentary on Donatus. The reference to Servius, however, is not altogether misleading, but shows awareness of his commentary on *Aen.* 6.580, where an etymological explanation is given why the sun (*Sol*) is called Titan. Servius derives Titan from the Greek *tisis* (“vengeance”) and explains that the Earth created the Titans out of vengeance (*tisis*). The Servian explanation of Titan is partially preserved in Bernard of

Utrecht's treatment of the *titulus* etymology in his commentary on Theodolus (*Commentum in Theodolum*, pp. 60–61.68–73):

Et titulus dictus a Titane id est sole, quia sicut sol orbem, ita titulus illuminat sequens opus. Sol autem dicitur Titan a singularitate quo plus omnibus luceat stellis, uel quod solus Gigantum a deorum iniuria abstinuit uel secundum Seruius a greco tytanos id est ultione: Tellus enim diis contempta in eos ulciscendos protulit Gigantes, quorum unus fuit Sol.

(*Title* is also derived from Titan, that is, the sun, because just as the sun illuminates the world, so the title illuminates the following work. Titan, moreover, is called *Sol* (“Sun”) after his singularity because he shines more than all the stars, or because he solely (*solus*) of the Giants abstained from the injury of the gods, or, according to Servius, the name derives from the Greek word *tytanos*, that is, vengeance. For Earth was despised by the gods and to avenge herself on them she produced the Giants, one of whom was Sol.)

Bernard does not know the Servian comment to *Aen.* 6.580 firsthand because he confuses the Giants with the Titans and transmits the Greek word *tisis* as *tytanos*; nonetheless, he attests to the conjunction of the Remigian etymology of *titulus* with the Servian etymology of Titan. A trace of this etymological thinking is also preserved in the introduction to Sedulius.

“It is derived through the formation of a diminutive (*per diminutionem*) because it is this work's little ray of sunlight with regard to the whole sun”: the classical orthography of *diminutio* is *deminutio*, which is a grammatical term for the formation of a diminutive. Given that *-ulus* is a diminutive suffix, *titulus* is therefore interpreted as a diminutive of Titan and so means “little Titan.”

5. “Here Begins the *Carmen paschale*” [*Poem of the Passover Lamb*]: the translation of *paschale* with the Anglo-Saxon “Easter” (originally the Teutonic goddess of dawn and spring) is English orthodoxy, but obscures the root meaning of the word, of which Sedulius was very much aware when he invites his reader to the poem as though it were a feast (*praef.* 1, *Paschales . . . dapes*). The word *pascha* in Latin comes from the Greek which, in turn, is based on the Aramaic form of the Hebrew word *pesach*, meaning either “Passover” or the “sacrificial lamb” offered at Passover. In Exodus 12:23, Moses says that God will “pass over” the houses of the Israelites during the plague that will kill the firstborn in Egypt, provided that the Israelites wipe their lintels and doorposts with the blood of a sacrificial lamb and eat its flesh. The sacrifice of the Passover lamb was therefore part of the ritual that led to God's liberation of the Israelites from the slavery of the Egyptian pharaoh. In

Christianity, the term *pascha* takes on new meaning: God sacrifices his son as the Passover lamb to liberate mankind from original sin. The title of *Carmen paschale* thus refers pregnantly to Christ's sacrifice as the Passover lamb, a point that Sedulius makes in his *Epistula ad Macedonium* (CSEL 10:12.8–10) when he explains that he called his work *Carmen paschale* "because Christ was sacrificed as our Passover lamb (*pascha*)."

6. "The subject matter is indeed grasped from the title": as explained in 4, the title is supposed to illuminate the work that follows. The *accessus* explains the word *paschale* as referring to "the miracles of the Passover lamb, that is, of Christ."

7. "It is said to have been composed with heroic verse": heroic verse refers not only to dactylic hexameter but also to the subject matter of pagan epic.

"For the deeds of kings and generals (*gesta regum et ducum*) used to be written in the heroic verse": the definition of the subject matter of heroic epic is conventional, but may be influenced by the Servian commentary on Virgil, *Ecl.* 6.3, *cum canerem reges et proelia* ("When I was singing kings and battles"), where it is explained that Virgil was composing "either the *Aeneid* or the deeds of the kings of Alba" (*et significat aut Aeneidem aut gesta regum Albanorum*).

8. "His intention is to demolish the ritual of pagans and to point out the way of true faith": see the intentions of the Christian authors Prudentius (*Acc.* 4.13) and Theodolus (*Acc.* 10.7).

"The way of true faith" (*uiam uere fidei*): see *Acc.* 12.3.

9. "Four books": in Sedulius's prefatory letter to Macedonium, he says that his poem contains four books of divine miracles (*quatuor . . . mirabilium diuinorum libellos*, CSEL 10:12.4–5). For an attempt to square this statement with the modern editorial consensus that the work is divided into five books, see Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase*, p. 77n60. Isidore of Seville, however, asserts that the poem circulated in three books (*De uiris illustribus* 20). The manuscripts themselves divide the poem into two, three, four, five, and six books. In the next section (10), the *accessus* explains the order of the books: the first book is concerned with the miracles of the Father in the Old Testament and the last three with the miracles of the Son in the New Testament. This division is attested in some of the manuscripts (Springer, *Manuscripts of Sedulius*, p. 26n56).

10. "<Had accomplished in the Old Testament; then in the following three books he deals with the miracles which the Son in cooperation with the Father and the Holy Ghost>": the text of T omits three lines of text. Given that the same error occurs in M, one must assume that the source of T and M was already defective. The complete text is preserved in P, from which this supplement comes.



12. For the three parts of epic discourse, Huygens compares Remigius of Auxerre, *Expositio in Paschale carmen* (CSEL 10:323.28–29): “Sedulius here has kept the manner of the ancient poets and especially of Virgil: for he introduced his theme, invoked, and narrated” (*Sedulius hic morem antiquorum seruuait poetarum et maxime Virgilii: proposuit enim, inuocauit, narrauit*). However, the ultimate source for this analytical approach is Servius on *Aen.* 1.8, discussed in the note to *Acc.* 4.19.

#### 14. *Of Ovid on the Art of Love*

Ovid’s *Ars amatoria* is a didactic poem of three books in elegiac distichs purporting to teach the rules of love to young men in the first two books and to women in the third. It was published between 2 BC and AD 2 at a time when the emperor Augustus was concerned to enforce legislation against adultery. Ovid alleges that his work offended Augustus and was one of the two reasons for his banishment to the Black Sea in AD 8 (*Trist.* 2.207).

The *Ars amatoria* is transmitted with the *Remedia amoris* and *Amores* (in that order) in the earliest manuscripts of the Carolingian age (see Tarrant, “Ovid,” pp. 259–61). In ninth-century Britain, the work was adopted for grammatical instruction, as attested by the manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F. 4.32, saec. IX, fols. 37r–47r, half of whose text of book 1 is glossed in Latin and Welsh, indicating school use in the late ninth and early tenth century.<sup>66</sup> Library booklists from Minden and Tegernsee dated to the mid-eleventh century are perhaps better indicators of when the *Ars* and Ovid’s other works became more available for adoption in the European school curriculum.<sup>67</sup> Within this context, a culturally significant and influential literary response to the *Ars* arose in the elegiac comedy *Pamphilus* written around 1100 (see *Acc.* 28). In the same milieu, and possibly influenced by the *Pamphilus*, an unknown author who calls himself Aurigena composed a pseudo-Ovidian didactic poem of 510 elegiac verses now known as *Facetus moribus et uita* (“Courtly in Manners and in Life”), which includes a section on courtly love (half the length of the poem) in imitation of Ovid’s *Ars amatoria* and the *Remedia amoris*.<sup>68</sup> Toward the end of the twelfth century, the *Ars* received a succession of commentaries by grammarians at Orléans—Fulco, Arnulf, and William—as part of a systematic scholarly treatment of the Ovidian corpus. The same work also inspired the prose treatise *De amore* (*The Art of Courtly Love*) written by Andreas Capellanus, which is a medieval version of Ovid’s didactic poem, rewritten with reference to the Bible, the curricular *auctores*, and vernacular poets such as Chrétien de Troyes.



Text of *Acc.* 14

Clm 19475 (T), fols. 5vb.16–6ra.4. Slight variants of the same *accessus* appear in Clm 19474 (M), p. 70, and Pal. lat. 242 (P), fols. 78v–79r. Cf. *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 74, no. 208. A related but later version of this *accessus* is in Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, MS Gl. kgl. Saml. 1905 4°, saec. XII/XIII, fols. 139v–140r, on which see *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 100, no. 327.

Editions of *Acc.* 14

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 28–29; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 33; Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*, p. 87.

Selected Bibliography on Ovid's *Ars amatoria*

## Critical Edition

Ovid. *Ars amatoria*. Edited by E. J. Kenney in *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris*, pp. 117–219. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. Corrected ed., 1995.

## Edition with Translation

Ovid. *The Art of Love, and Other Poems*. Translated by J. H. Mozely. 2nd ed., revised by G. P. Goold, pp. 11–175. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.

## Editions with Commentary

Janka, Markus. *Ovid, Ars amatoria, Buch 2: Kommentar*. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1997.

Ovid, *Ars amatoria, Book 1*. Edited by A. S. Hollis. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

———. *Ars amatoria, Book 3*. Edited by Roy K. Gibson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

## Medieval Reception

Baldwin, J. “L’*Ars amatoria* au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle en France: Ovide, Abélard, André le Chapelain et Pierre de Chantre.” In *Histoire et société: mélanges offerts à Georges Duby*. Vol. 1, *Le couple, l’ami et le prochain*, compiled by the University of Provence, pp. 19–29. Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l’Université de Provence, 1992.

Dronke, Peter. “Pseudo-Ovid, *Facetus*, and the Arts of Love.” *Mittelalterliches Jahrbuch* 11 (1976): 126–31.

Ginsberg, Warren. “*Ovidius ethicus?* Ovid and the Medieval Commentary Tradition.” In *Desiring Discourse: The Literature of Love, Ovid through*

- Chaucer*, edited by James J. Paxson and Cynthia A. Gravlee, pp. 62–71. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1998.
- Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 1–82.
- . “Sex Education: Ovidian Erotodidactic in the Classroom.” In *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid’s Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*, edited by Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock, pp. 298–317. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Minnis, Alistair. *Magister amoris: The Roman de la Rose and Vernacular Hermeneutics*, pp. 35–39. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Stroh, Wilfried. *Ovid im Urteil der Nachwelt: eine Testimoniensammlung*, pp. 16–21. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969.
- Thiel, Erich Joseph. “Beiträge zu den Ovid-Nachdichtungen ‘Pseudo-Ars amatoria’ und ‘Pseudo-Remedia amoris.’” *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 6 (1970): 132–48.
- . “Mittellateinische Nachdichtungen von Ovids ‘Ars amatoria’ und ‘Remedia amoris.’” *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 5 (1968): 115–80.

### Commentary on *Acc.* 14

#### *Title*

This is the first *accessus* in the collection of T (*Acc.* 2 and 4 are exceptional for another reason) not to use the term *accessus* in its title. The title of *Acc.* 14 begins with Ovid’s name in the genitive *Ovidii* and continues with an abbreviated title of the work *de amat(oria) a(rte)*. The nominative form of the poem’s title would be *Ovidius de amatoria arte*, in which the name *Ovidius* is part of the title, with a defining genitive or, as here, with the preposition *De*, meaning “on” or “about.” Why, then, is the introduction titled with the genitive and not the nominative (as will happen in *Acc.* 16–19)? Given the titling syntax of *Acc.* 1, 3, and 5–12, it seems attractive to supply the missing first word *accessus*. So Huygens, *Accessus* (1954) and (1970), prints his text: <Accessus> *Ovidii de amatoria arte*. Yet, at this point in the *Accessus ad auctores*, it is difficult to tell if one is supposed to supply the word *accessus* or not (see the discussion of the title to *Acc.* 26 for a verdict on this question). One may suppose there is an ellipsis of the obvious term *accessus* because it has appeared regularly up till now with a genitive of the author’s name in the titles of the *Accessus ad auctores*. On the other hand, why drop the word *accessus*? Was there insufficient space for the abbreviation *Acc.*, which is what appears in the preceding titles? Or is there another reason for the genitive *Ovidii de amatoria arte*? One possibility is that the *accessus* was transcribed directly from a manuscript in which the genitive phrase depended on a nominative, for example, *Ovidii de amatoria arte liber*. Another is that the title clarifies the

first line of the *accessus*, which does not specify the title of the work: *Intentio O(uidii) est in hoc libro*. The title specifies which book is meant by *in hoc libro* and expands on the abbreviation of Ovid's name. Whatever the case may be, the change in titling of the *accessus* is an important clue about the methods of assembling and editing the Tegernsee anthology.

### Overview

This introduction differs in format from *Accessus ad auctores* 5–13. It is arranged according to five headings: *intention* (1); *subject matter* (2); *method* (3), *final cause* (4), and *part of philosophy* (5). The *accessus* concludes with a Servian analysis of Ovid's three modes of speech (6–7). Like the first *accessus* to the *Heroides* (*Acc.* 1), there is no treatment of the author's life or the circumstances of composition. The inclusion of a heading on *method* expands the four-heading framework seen in many of the preceding *accessus*, but is particularly apt for outlining the didactic program of the *Ars*. The introduction as a whole does not disapprove morally of the *Ars amatoria*, but is concerned with the argument of the first two books. The value of the work, according to the *accessus*, is that it teaches young men how to behave in a love affair; it is ethical insofar as it reveals the moral character of their girlfriends. The *accessus* does not mention the third book of the *Ars* addressed to women.

3. "The method of this work is as follows" (*modus istius operis talis est*): see Ov. *Ars* 1.39 "this is my method" (*hic modus*), referring to the lessons of his work in 1.35–38: how to find a girlfriend, win her over, and keep her. The choice of heading *modus istius operis* thus appears to have been influenced by the Ovidian text itself. In the *Accessus ad auctores*, this heading is not common: it appears only in the introductions to Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum* and Priscian (*Acc.* 22.52 and 24.9). However, *modus*, *modus tractandi*, and *modus agendi* are common headings in *accessus* of all kinds: see Kantorowicz, *Studies in the Glossators*, p. 37; Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, pp. 21–23.

"To show how a girlfriend herself can be found" (*ostendere quomodo ipsa puella possit inueniri*): this clause paraphrases Ov. *Ars* 1.35, "First, work to find the sort of thing you want to love" (*Principio, quod amare uelis, reperire labora*). It also covers the subject matter of *Ars* 1.41–262. Note, however, that the *accessus* substitutes the synonym *inuenire* for *reperire* with reference to *Ars* 1.52, "Nor do you have to tread a long way to find her" (*nec tibi ut inuenias longa terenda uia est*). The choice of the verb *inuenire* may recognize the Ovidian conceit that the finding of a girlfriend is a rhetorical exercise, in that one of the parts of rhetoric, *inuentio*, is the research and discovery of the subject

matter for a speech (or poem): hence before the lover can have a love affair, the subject for a love affair must be found.

“Once found, how she can be won by entreaty” (*inuenta exorari*): the verb *exorari* picks up the program set forth at *Ars* 1.37, “The next task is to win the girl that one likes by entreaty” (*proximus huic labor est placitam exorare puellam*). Winning the girl by entreaty is the subject of *Ars* 1.269–770 and corresponds to the rhetorical doctrine of *captatio beneuolentiae*.

“Once won by entreaty, how she can be kept” (*exorata retineri*): the verb *retineri* is a paraphrase of *Ars* 1.38, stating the program of the second book of the *Ars amatoria*. Ovid uses the verb *tenere* (*Ars* 2.12) to distinguish the program of the second book from the first. The compound form of the verb *retineri* occurs at *Ars* 2.295: “Everyone whosoever has a concern for keeping . . . his girlfriend” (*cuicumque est retinendae cura puellae*). The *accessus* in Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. kgl. Saml. 1905 4<sup>o</sup>, has *obtinere* instead of *retineri*.

4. “Final cause” (*finalis causa*): see note on *Acc.* 2.7.

6–7. The application of the Servian scheme of three kinds of epic discourse to the didactic *Ars amatoria* may be influenced by earlier introductions to Prudentius and Sedulius (see notes to *Acc.* 4.19 and 13.12).

7. “He narrates when he says: ‘In the beginning’” (*narrat ubi dicit: Principio [Ars 1.35]*): the *Ars amatoria* does not have a narrative, but the commentator interprets the word *principio* as though Ovid were narrating a love affair. In point of fact, *principio* means “first” and is a word typically used by didactic poets such as Lucretius and Virgil’s *Georgics* to introduce the first stage of an argument (Hollis, *Ars amatoria*, p. 39).

## 15. *On the Cure for Love [Remedia amoris]*

Ovid’s *Remedia amoris* (“Cures for Love”) is introduced under the medieval title *De remedio amoris* (“On the Cure for Love”). This work, composed between 1 BC and AD 2, is the last of Ovid’s amatory elegiac works and purports to be a medicinal tract on how to cure the sickness of love; it has accordingly been read as a poem that attempts (successfully or not) to negate the teachings of the *Ars amatoria*.

The *Remedia amoris* was copied in the earliest manuscripts with Ovid’s other amatory works following the *Ars amatoria* and preceding the *Amores*. Late eleventh-century booklists from the abbeys of Tegernsee and Blaubeuren indicate that the *Remedia* was read with the *Ars*.<sup>69</sup> Like the *Ars*, this work also received commentaries from Fulco, Arnulf, and William at Orléans at the end of the twelfth century. The *Remedia*, however, was also transmitted separately

from the *Ars*. In the late eleventh century, it was used as an elementary Latin reading in introductory textbooks, such as Eton College Library 150, which has already been discussed in reference to the *Heroides*, Theodolus, and Maximianus. In the thirteenth century the *Remedia* replaced Maximianus as one of the six core works in the so-called *liber Catonianus*, following “Cato,” Avianus, and Theodolus, and preceding Claudian’s *De raptu Proserpinae* and Statius’s *Achilleid*.<sup>70</sup> One of the reasons for the success of the *Remedia* in the medieval classroom was its ostensible rejection of erotic passion, which conformed well to the ethical pattern of reading the *auctores*.<sup>71</sup>

#### Editions of *Acc.* 15

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 29–30; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 34; Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*, pp. 87–89.

#### Text of *Acc.* 15

The text is based on Clm 19475 (T), fol. 6ra.5–6rb.21, but two readings have been corrected with variants in Pal. lat. 242 (P), fol. 79r–79v, and emendations by Przychocki. A variant of the *accessus* appears in Clm 19474 (M), pp. 70–71. Another version is collected among the Ovidian *accessus* in Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, MS Barth. 110, saec. XIII, fol. 91ra. Cf. *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 96, no. 310.

#### Selected Bibliography on Ovid’s *Remedia amoris*

##### Critical Edition

Ovid. *Remedia amoris*. Edited by E. J. Kenney in *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris*, pp. 221–61. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. Corrected ed., 1995.

##### Edition with Translation

Ovid. *The Art of Love, and Other Poems*. Translated by J. H. Mozely. 2nd ed., revised by G. P. Goold, pp. 177–233. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.

##### Editions with Commentary

Ovid. *Remedia amoris*. Edited by A. A. R. Henderson as *P. Ovidi Nasonis Remedia amoris*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1979.

———. *Remedia amoris*. Edited by Paola Pinotti as *Publio Ovidio Nasone: Remedia amoris*. Bologna: Patron, 1988. 2nd ed. 1993.

##### Medieval Reception

See bibliography for *Acc.* 14.

Pellegrin, E. "Le 'Remedia amoris' d'Ovide, texte scolaire medieval." *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartres* 115 (1957): 172–79.

### Commentary on *Acc.* 15

#### *Title*

The title *De remedio amoris* omits the author's name, which is to be understood from the previous *accessus*, *Ouidii de amatoria arte*. The medieval title of the *Remedia amoris* would therefore be *Ouidius de remedio amoris*.

#### *Overview*

This *accessus* consists of three sections. The first section (1–7) is an unheaded biographical explanation why Ovid wrote *The Cures for Love*: namely, to redeem himself with the Roman people for having written *The Art of Love*, which caused an increase of sexual promiscuity. The second section (8–12) begins with a self-reflexive statement of what introductions are supposed to do and proposes to implement a four-heading analysis according to *subject matter*, *intention*, *cause of intention*, and *part of philosophy*, but does not address the last topic. The final section (13–14) gives a paraphrase of *Remedia amoris* 1–40, in which Ovid responds to the objection that he is contradicting what he said in the *Ars amatoria*.

The reason given for the composition of the *Remedia amoris* is biographical: Ovid regretted writing the *Ars amatoria* because it had led to the pursuit of illicit forms of love, and so his new purpose was to teach young people how to arm themselves against illicit love. This explanation is not the one that Ovid gives in the *Remedia amoris* where he alleges that his purpose is to rescue suffering or sick lovers from death. The medieval reader, however, approaches Ovid as an ethical author in agreement with the moral aims of "Cato," who was concerned to correct the errors of young people and exhort them to live justly (see *Acc.* 5.4).

1–2. The *accessus* begins by summarizing the program of all three books of the *Ars amatoria*. In the preceding *accessus* on the *Ars*, the program of the first two books is treated (14.3), but the instruction of girls in the third book of the *Ars* is not mentioned.

1. "The book of loving" (*amandi librum*): the *accessus* begins by referring to the *Ars amatoria* by a variant title or a shortened form of the title *Ars amandi* that is used below (13).

5. "Ovid was very much hated by his friends and by others": the idea of Ovid's public disgrace is based on comments in his exile poetry about his

unpopularity as in *Trist.* 1.1.24: “I shall be condemned as a public criminal by the voice of the people” (*peragar populi publicus ore reus*).

6. “Afterwards because he was repentant” (*postea penitens*): Ovid frequently expresses regret in exile over having written the *Ars amatoria*. Cf. *Pont.* 1.1.59–60: “I repent, oh, if a wretched man is to be believed at all, I repent and I myself am tortured by my deed” (*paenitet, o—si quid miserorum creditur ulli— / paenitet, et facto torqueor ipse meo*). However, in the *Remedia amoris*, he does not express regret and denies that he is undoing his old work (12): “nor does my new Muse undo my past work” (*nec noua praeteritum Musa retexit opus*). The medieval commentator, therefore, reads the *Remedia* through the lenses of Ovid’s exile poetry, as if it were an early attempt to anticipate a growing tide of public disapproval.

“How they should arm themselves against an illicit love”: the alleged moral program and wording is similar to that of Prudentius in *Acc.* 4.16, where one is armed with virtues against the vices. For the category of *illicit love*, see *Acc.* 1.1 and 2.4–5 and the notes on 1.1 and 2.4.

8. “In introductions” (*in principiis*): for *principium* meaning *accessus*, see *Acc.* 13.1 with note.

“Prepare . . . for” (*compare<n>t*): Przychocki corrects the number of the verb so that it agrees with the preceding verb and the subject does not change. This correction is worth adopting to restore better sense to a text made difficult to understand by the trivial omission of the abbreviation mark that indicates the letter *n*. It is important to recall, however, that many masters and their students worked with the unemended text and made sense of what it was. If one retains the text as is, *comparet* would have a singular subject, and one could supply *occasio* from *occasione* and read it as modified by *bene inquisita et prudenter intellecta*.

“The listeners themselves” (*ipsis auditoribus*): here readers are *auditores*. One may infer that the *accessus* and the following work or commentary was read aloud. On “communal reading, communicated orally,” see Reynolds, *Medieval Reading*, p. 29. For a thirteenth-century Ovidian *accessus* to the *Fasti* that addresses itself to listeners, see Alton, “Medieval Commentators,” p. 123.

“Easy comprehension” (*facilem [aditum] intellectum*): the text of T, in contrast to MP, transmits *aditum* (“access”) after *facilem*, which causes the word *intellectum* (without an *et*) to be a nonsensical participle. A corrector deletes *aditum*, agreeing with the text found in MP; however, *aditum* may have been a reformulation of *intellectum*, which appears redundant in the sentence *prudenter intellecta facilem intellectum compare<n>t*, where the introduction to a book is understood metaphorically as a point of entry.



9. “The cause of the intention” (*causa intentionis*): this heading appears only here and in two other Ovidian *accessus* in T (*Acc.* 17.1 and 5 and 19.18). Later it is referred to as “the cause” (12) and appears to be another formulation for *utility* and comparable to *final cause* (see note on *Acc.* 2.7; see *Acc.* 19.18). In *Acc.* 17.1 and 5, the *cause of the intention* is distinguished from *utility* and explains the reason why Ovid was writing letters home to obtain a pardon.

12. “Those who are held prisoner by illicit love”: see *Acc.* 1.1 with note.

13–14. The *accessus* gives a paraphrase of *Rem.* 1–40, in which Love reads the title of Ovid’s book and concludes that Ovid is going to wage war against him (1–2); Ovid responds by arguing that he is not the enemy of Love, but that his *Remedia amoris* is supposed to prevent lovers from committing suicide and Love from gaining the reputation of a murderer.

14. Cf. *Rem.* 39–40: “I said these things; golden Love moved his jeweled wings and said to me: carry out the work that you have planned” (*Haec ego; mouit Amor gemmatas aureus alas / et mihi “propositum perferce” dixit, “opus”*).

## 16. *Ovid from Pontus [Epistulae ex Ponto]*

The work introduced under the medieval title *Ovidius de Ponto* (“Ovid from Pontus”) is Ovid’s *Epistulae ex Ponto* (“Epistles from Pontus”), a four-book collection of elegiac letters written by the exiled poet from Tomis on the Black Sea (Pontus) to named individuals in Rome. Ovid hopes his addressees will prevail upon the emperor to show him clemency and lighten his punishment for an unspecified crime. Ovid published the first three books together as a unit in AD 13, the year before Augustus’s death, while the fourth book may have appeared after Ovid’s death in 17. The *Epistulae ex Ponto* is a continuation of the *Tristia*, which also takes the form of letters sent to Rome, but whose addressees are usually unnamed (see *Pont.* 1.1.17–18).

In the Carolingian age, the exilic epistles of Ovid were read and imitated by poets such as Theodulf, Modoin, Ermoldus Nigellus, and Walafrid Strabo.<sup>72</sup> Although the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* may have formed a conceptual unity in the Middle Ages, the two works were transmitted separately and enjoyed different institutional fortunes. The *Epistulae ex Ponto* is better attested in manuscripts from the ninth to the twelfth centuries and may have entered the school canon earlier than the *Tristia*.<sup>73</sup> The fact that the *accessus* to the Pontic epistles precedes the *accessus* to the *Tristia* in T and P may reflect its canonical priority.



Editions of *Acc.* 16

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), p. 30; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 34–35; Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*, pp. 89–91.

Text of *Acc.* 16

Clm 19475 (T), fol. 6rb.22–6va.27. A variant of the *accessus* appears in Pal. lat. 242 (P), fols. 79r–80r, as well as in Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, MS Barth. 110, saec. XIII, fol. 91va. Versions of the same introduction appear before school commentaries on the first two books of *Epistulae ex Ponto*: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 14819, saec. XII, fol. 143r; MS Clm 19480, saec. XII, fol. 22r; and MS Clm 29208(17, saec. XII. The *accessus* in T was probably copied from the beginning of such a commentary. Hexter (*Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 100–101, 122–26) discusses the *accessus* in T as well as the variants in the commentaries but does not collate them. See *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 60, no. 155.

Selected Bibliography on Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto*

## Critical Edition

Ovid. *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Edited by J. A. Richmond as *P. Ovidi Nasonis ex Ponto libri quattuor*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1990.

## Edition with Translation

Ovid. *Tristia, Ex Ponto*. Translated by A. L. Wheeler. 2nd ed., revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.

## Editions with Commentary

Ovid. *Epistulae ex Ponto, Book 1*. Edited by Jan Felix Gaertner. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. *Epistulae ex Ponto, Book 1*. Edited by Garth Tissol. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Helzle, Martin. *Ovids Epistulae ex Ponto. Buch I-II. Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 2003.

———. *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto Liber IV: A Commentary on Poems 1 to 7 and 16*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1989.

## Medieval Reception

Brugnoli, Giorgio. "Ovidio e gli esiliati carolingi." In *Atti del convegno internazionale Ovidiano, Sulmona, maggio 1958*, 2:209–16. 2 vols. Rome: Istituto di studi romani, 1959.

Hexter, Ralph. "Ovid and the Medieval Exilic Imaginary." In *The Discourse of*

- Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jan Felix Gaertner, pp. 209–36. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2007.
- . *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 83–136.
- . “Ovid in the Middle Ages: Exile, Mythographer, and Lover.” In *Brill’s Companion to Ovid*, edited by Barbara Weiden Boyd, pp. 416–24. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2002.

### Commentary on *Acc.* 16

#### *Title*

The title of the *accessus* is the same as the medieval title of Ovid’s *Epistulae ex Ponto*: that is, *Ovidius de Ponto*. This title follows the pattern of books titled with Ovid’s name followed by the preposition *de*, that is, *Ovidius de amatoria arte* and *de remedio amoris*. However, *de Ponto* probably does not mean “concerning Pontus,” which is not really the subject of this collection of elegiac epistles. Rather, this Ovid comes “from Pontus.” Moreover, since Pontus is thought to have been an island, the preposition *de Ponto* makes better sense to express place of origin than *ex Ponto*, which refers to the alien region “out of which” Ovid sends his letters.

#### *Overview*

The *accessus* consists of three sections. The first (1–5) begins with a methodological statement that the work will be analyzed according to the four modern headings, beginning with *intention* (see *Acc.* 6). The second (6–8) explains the place of composition, hence the reason for the title, and gives three causes for Ovid’s exile to Pontus; it also explains how Ovid wrote individual letters to friends for help (7) and then sent them as a collection to his librarian Brutus (8). The final section (9–12) introduces the commentary and comments on the first line of *Pont.* 1.1.

2. “Each person” (*unumquemque*): the indefinite compound, which should be *unicuique* with *persuadere* in classical Latin, is distributive and refers in the first place to the different addressees of Ovid’s epistles who are to help him, their “true friend in difficulty”; see *Acc.* 17.4. It is clear from the rest of this *accessus* and other *accessus* to the *Epistulae ex Ponto* that Ovid’s immediate concern, as understood by the medieval commentator, is to persuade his addressees to intervene with Caesar on his behalf: see *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 74, no. 210; p. 94, no. 306. Furthermore, commentators are particularly interested in the epistolary fiction of Ovid addressing specific individuals for help: see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 112–14. However, because Ovid’s intention is introduced before his subject matter,

the distributive *unumquemque* also has a generalizing sense: see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 101; Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” p. 43. For the distinction between specific addressees and a generalized audience in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, see also Gaertner, *Epistulae ex Ponto*, pp. 6–8.

“True friend” (*uero amico*): the phrase does not appear in the Pontic epistles. Ovid speaks of “true friendship” (*uerus amor*) at *Pont.* 4.6.21, where he addresses his friend Brutedius Brutus, who is possibly the same Brutus as Ovid’s literary executor in *Pont.* 1.1 and 3.9: see Helzle, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto Liber IV*, pp. 136–37. Ovid’s idea of true friendship, which is applied to Orestes and Pylades in the *Tristia* (1.5.21–22 and 4.4.71–72), may have been influenced by Cicero’s idea of *uera amicitia* (*Amic.* 23, 59, 91). The commentator’s use of the phrase “true friend” may therefore be inspired by Cicero’s *De amicitia*, a popular work in the medieval school curriculum. Cicero defines a “true friend” as an image of oneself, deserving of love on his own account (see *Amic.* 23, 80).

6. “Upon Pontus”: Pontus is the Latin name for the Black Sea. The frequently repeated medieval misconception that Pontus was an island in Scythia could be explained by Ovid’s sea journey there, but Hexter (*Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 105n81 and 125) suggests that the idea may derive from the legal formulation of “relegation to an island” (*relegatio in insulam*), found in Justinian’s *Digest* and other legal sources. For Pontus as an island, see Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” pp. 34–35; *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 72, no. 199; p. 94, no. 302; p. 100, no. 324.

“On account of the book that he had written about love”: the book “about love” (*de amore*) is an alternative title for the *Ars amatoria*. Ovid claims that he was banished by Augustus for two crimes: “a poem and an error” (*Trist.* 2.207, *perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen et error*). The poem is the *Ars amatoria*, but Ovid notoriously keeps silent about the error (208, *alterius facti culpa silenda mihi*). The belief that the *Ars* induced Roman matrons to commit adultery and incurred imperial displeasure is a charge that Ovid constructs and argues against in his epistle addressed to Augustus (*Trist.* 2.245–312); see *Acc.* 18.3, 26.21.

“He had observed that he [Caesar] had an affair with his own wife”: Ovid himself is the source for the idea that he saw something he should not have seen in *Tristia* 2 (103–6); he compares himself to Actaeon, who unwittingly saw Diana bathing, but is consistently vague about what he saw or did.<sup>74</sup> That Ovid had seen Caesar in the act of sexual wrongdoing with his own wife is an unusual version of the “error” that caused the emperor to banish him.

“Or with a boy”: that Ovid witnessed the emperor’s pederastic misconduct frequently appears in other *accessus* as a second cause of exile. See

Ghisalberti, “Medieval Biographies,” p. 33n4; see *Acc.* 17.9, as well as *Incipitarius Ovidianum*, p. 112, nos. 379 and 380.

8. “To Brutus”: Ovid addresses the first and last epistles (*Pont.* 1.1 and 3.9) of the three-book collection to Brutus. Here, the *accessus* paraphrases the address to Brutus at *Pont.* 1.1.3–4. The identity of this Brutus is unknown, but scholars (see Gaertner, *Epistulae ex Ponto*, p. 93) assume that he was a close friend of Ovid who oversaw the circulation of his books after he had been exiled.

“Librarian” (*thesaurizatorio*): a second hand in T corrects *thesaurizatorio* to read *thesaurizario* (which Huygens accepts); the word, however, is not attested in classical or late Latin. The reading *thesaurizatori* in Clm 14819, fol. 134r, reported by Hexter (*Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 125), points the way to the correct reading *thesaurizatori*, which has been corrupted to *thesaurizatorio* because of its proximity to the phrase *in armario*. *Thesaurizator* is a late Latin word attested in Jerome (see Lewis and Short, s.v.), which in this context does not seem to mean “treasurer” but “librarian” as Przychocki suggests (*Accessus Ovidiani*, p. 90n26).

“To put them away in a bookcase” (*in armario*): a paraphrase and interpretation of *Pont.* 1.1.4: “and hide them away wherever it pleases, provided it is somewhere” (*dumque aliquo, quolibet abde loco*). Ovid does not specify where, but later implies *scrinia* (“receptacles”) in which letters and papyrus rolls are stored (*Pont.* 1.1.24).

9. The scribe copying the *accessus* includes part of the commentary on the first line of *Pont.* 1.1: *Naso Tomitanae iam non nouus incola terrae* (“Naso, who is no longer a new settler of the land of Tomis”).

10. “Ovid was called *Naso*, and it is a nickname” (*Naso . . . est agnomen*): properly speaking, *Naso* is not an agnomen but a cognomen, an inherited surname used in addition to the gentile name *Ovidius*, as at least one *accessus* correctly recognizes (see *Incipitarius Ovidianum*, p. 104, no. 343). Ovid inevitably refers to himself as *Naso* because his gentile name is metrically awkward. This *accessus* assumes that Ovid was given the name *Naso* because he had a big nose (*nasus*); other *accessus* go on to observe that a big nose is a sign of sagacity and moral discernment and compare the olfactory prowess of a hunting dog. Cf. Ghisalberti, “Medieval Biographies,” p. 28 and n.1; Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 125–26.

11. The folk-etymological explanation of Tomis from the myth of Jason and Medea is derived from Ovid, *Tristia* 3.9. Ovid suggests that the name comes from the Greek verb *temno* (“cut”) in the final couplet (33–34): “therefore this place was called Tomis, because the sister is said to have cut up the limbs of her brother there” (*inde Tomis dictus locus hic, quia fertur in*

*illo / membra soror fratris consecuisse sui*). The medieval commentator rightly observes that Tomis would come from the Greek noun *tomos*; however, he misinterprets its sense (properly “cut” or “slice”) as “division.” The association of *diuisio* with Tomis may have been encouraged by the gentile name *Ouidius*, which is first explicitly etymologized as *ouum diuidens* (“dividing the egg”) in the *accessus* to the “Vulgate” commentary on the *Metamorphoses*, on which see Coulson, *Vulgate Commentary*, p. 25 and the note to line 27; see Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” p. 27 and n. 3.

### 17. *Ovid's Sorrows [Tristia]*

The *Tristia* (“Sorrows”) is a five-book collection of elegiac epistles composed by Ovid during the years AD 9–12 that were addressed to his wife, the emperor Augustus, and unnamed friends. Ovid’s aim in these letters is to gain his recall from the Black Sea, where he had been relegated by imperial decree in AD 8.

The manuscript tradition for the *Tristia* is not well attested before the end of the twelfth century, although the work was certainly read in the Carolingian age if one is to judge from the imitations of it by poets in the ninth century such as Theodulf, Modoin, and Walafrid Strabo.<sup>75</sup> In the middle of the eleventh century, a copy of the *Tristia* (collected with the *Metamorphoses* and *Ars amatoria*) is attested in the cathedral library of Minden, but most twelfth-century library catalogues omit the work.<sup>76</sup> The inclusion of the *Tristia* in the *Accessus ad auctores* is therefore a significant piece of evidence for the entrance of the *Tristia* into at least one curricular program in the twelfth century.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 17

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), p. 31; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 35–36; Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*, pp. 91–92.

#### Text of *Acc.* 17

Clm 19475 (T), fols. 6va.28–7ra.5. A variant of the *accessus* also appears in Pal. lat. 242 (P), fol. 80r–80v, as well as in Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Barth. 110, saec. XIII, fol. 91vb. See *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 61, no. 158.

Selected Bibliography on Ovid's *Tristia*

## Critical Edition

Ovid. *Tristia*. Edited by J. B. Hall as *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristia*. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1995.

## Edition with Translation

Ovid. *Sorrows of an Exile*. Translated by A. D. Melville with an introduction and notes by E. J. Kenney. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

———. *Tristia, Ex Ponto*. Translated by A. L. Wheeler. 2nd ed., revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.

## Editions with Commentary

Ovid. *Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Liber Secundus*. Edited with an introduction, translation, and commentary by S. G. Owen. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.

———. *Tristia*. Edited and translated with commentary by Georg Luck. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1966–67.

———. *Tristia Book 1*. Revised, with an introduction and notes, by S. G. Owen. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.

———. *Tristia Book 3*. Introduction and notes by S. G. Owen. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893.

## Medieval Reception

See bibliography for *Acc.* 16.

Commentary on *Acc.* 17*Title*

This *accessus*, like its predecessor, is introduced by the work's title as it commonly appears in medieval manuscripts. *Ovidius tristium* means literally "Ovid of the Sorrows" or "Ovid of the Sad Songs," if one understands *tristia* to be an adjective modifying the implied noun *carmina* as in *Tr.* 2.483 *tristia carmina feci* ("I have composed sad songs").

*Overview*

The introduction has three sections. The first (1–7) begins with a methodological statement that the work will be analyzed according to six headings (1) and proceeds to treat the *title of work* (2), *subject matter* (3), *intention* (4), *reason for the intention* (5), *utility* (6), and *part of philosophy* (7). The second section (8–9) gives three reasons why Ovid was sent into exile. The final section (10–11) explains that the Romans had four kinds of exile.

2. “The title is given to this work from its cause”: this is the only title so explained in the *Accessus ad auctores*. For titles derived from characters, from the action of characters, or from the subject matter, see *Acc.* 26.7.

“Was living in sorrow” (*in tristitia uersabatur*): the *accessus* uses the same word, *tristitia*, that Ovid uses in *Tristia* 5.4 to answer a friend who asks why he sorrows (7, 14). The same elegy appears to be an important source for other biographical material in the *accessus*, such as Ovid’s expectation that his relegation is temporary (17) and that his patrimony is not confiscated (21).

3. “Description of dangers”: the dangers are depicted in Ovid’s voyage to the Black Sea (*Tristia* 1) and the account of his existence there (*Tristia* 3–5). The reference to dangers is probably taken from Ovid’s self-comparison to Homer’s Odysseus (*Trist.* 3.2.7): “Many are the dangers that I have suffered on sea and land” (*plurima sed pelago terraque pericula passum*); see *Trist.* 4.1.65; 5.2a.29.

4. The intention of the *Tristia* is specifically focused on motivating each friend addressed anonymously to take up Ovid’s cause with Caesar; see *Acc.* 16.2 with note, where each epistle can be read as a generalized plea from a friend for help.

5. “Reason for the intention”: for this heading, see note to *Acc.* 15.9.

“That he might soften the anger of Caesar through their prayers”: this idea seems to derive from the first poem of the collection and specifically *Trist.* 1.1.27–34, in which Ovid imagines someone praying to Caesar on his behalf.

“Because he had been sent into exile with the hope of returning”: this is the reason why Ovid is writing home for pardon; had he been exiled without the hope of return, there would have been no reason for him to write such letters. According to the four kinds of exile listed at the end of the *accessus* (11), Ovid’s intention depends on a milder form of exile, relegation, that allowed him to retain his property and to hope for return. Ovid calls his punishment *relegatio* and not *exilium*: *Trist.* 2.137, 5.11.21, *Pont.* 1.7.42.

6. “The utility is the cessation of the violent anger of Caesar and the attaining of his beloved homeland”: the utility of the work is expressed in hypothetical terms. The medieval commentator knows that Caesar’s anger did not cease and that Ovid died in exile. Cf. Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Gl. kgl. S. 2015 4°, fol. 1r (identified as Hafn. 2015 A in Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 226): “The final cause is as follows, namely that the change of punishment and exile be better. The utility is completely the reader’s, because there was no utility for Ovid” (*Finalis causa est talis, scilicet ut melior sit pene et exilii mut(ati)o. Vtilitas tota est lectoris, quia sibi ulla fuit*). Later a tradition arose that Ovid was repatriated but died through



suffocation by the crowds that came to meet him (see Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” p. 35 and n. 4).

8. “It is asked why he was sent into exile”: this is a standard question in medieval lives of Ovid: see Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” pp. 32–34. See note to *Acc.* 16.6.

9. “He slept with the wife of Caesar, Li[v]ia by name”: this is usually the first reason given for Ovid’s exile in medieval biographies. Some sources identify Livia with Corinna, Ovid’s beloved in the *Amores*. Cf. Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” p. 32 and nn. 1 and 4; *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 92, no. 294; p. 112, nos. 379 and 380; and Przychocki, “*Accessus*,” p. 91n20.

“Li[v]ia”: T transmits the name erroneously as *Linia*.

“Having sex with his male lover”: see *Acc.* 16.6 with note.

“Because he had written the book *On the Art of Love*, in which he had taught young men to attract to themselves married women through deception”: from the beginning of the *Tristia* (1.1.67–68), Ovid indicates that the *Ars amatoria* was one reason for his exile, but he defends himself against the charge that he was the teacher of adultery (*Trist.* 2.212, *arguor obsceni doctor adulterii*) and encouraged Roman matrons to have adulterous affairs (245–312, 346). The idea that young men were using the *Ars* to seduce Roman matrons by deception is not what Ovid officially intended, for he specifically prohibits matrons from reading his poem (*Ars* 1.31–34) in deference to Augustan legislation against adultery (*Lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis*). However, the medieval commentator clearly does not take Ovid’s tendentious claims of innocence at face value, but reads them as signs that his poetry was effective in undermining public sexual morality.

“Having offended the Romans, he is said to have been sent into exile”: here Ovid offends society rather than Caesar: see *Acc.* 15.5 and 19.5; contrast 16.6.

10–11. The discussion of the four types of banishment (*proscriptio*, *inscriptio*, *relegatio*, *exilium*) is a common feature of other introductions to the *Tristia* (for examples, see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 103–5); however, it is unclear what legal sources, if any, the *accessus* draws on for the categories of *proscriptio*, *inscriptio*, *relegatio*, and *exile*. The most likely authority for the quadripartite scheme is Isidore, who mentions *exilium*, *relegatio*, *deportatio*, and *proscriptio* (*Etym.* 5.27.28–30). The medieval commentary tradition loses track of *deportatio* and replaces it with *inscriptio* (inspired by *proscriptio*?). That said, Roman law (the *Digesta* of the *Corpus iuris civilis*) distinguished only between two types of exile: *deportatio* and *relegatio* (*Digesta* 48.22.7.24). *Deportatio*, however, would have been irrelevant to Ovid because it was a form of banishment introduced under Tiberius.



Ovid simply distinguishes between *exilium* and *relegatio*. The definition of “relegation” as a milder form of banishment that allows the condemned to retain his property is based on what Ovid says about his penalty (*Trist.* 2.131–38, 4.4.45–46, 4.9.11–12); the idea that the *relegatus* could expect to return home also appears to have its source in Ovid’s *Tristia*, which works on that premise. In the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, Ovid gives up the idea of returning home and prays to be relegated to a milder place (*Pont.* 1.2.103–4, 150; 1.8.73).

### 18. *Ovid without a Title [Amores]*

The work introduced under the medieval title *Ovidius sine titulo* (“Ovid without a Title”) is Ovid’s *Amores* (“Loves”), the three-book collection of erotic elegies in which Ovid presents his life as a poet-lover devoted to a mistress named Corinna. Modern scholars believe on the basis of what Ovid says about his poetic career that he made his debut with the *Amores*, publishing a series of five books, which he later revised and issued in a second edition of three books. The exact chronology of these two editions is difficult to pin down, but they were written in the last quarter of the first century BC, with the second edition having been published after the *Heroides*, which is mentioned in *Amores* 2.18.

The *Amores* was first copied in the Carolingian period following the *Ars amatoria* and *Remedia amoris* (see Tarrant, “Ovid,” pp. 259–60). It was regarded as a later work than the *Ars amatoria*. The *Amores* also appears to have been a later entrant into the medieval school curriculum than the *Ars amatoria* and *Remedia amoris*. Evidence for its use in the schools is scarce before the twelfth century.<sup>77</sup>

#### Editions of *Acc.* 18

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 31–32; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 36–37; Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*, pp. 92–93.

#### Text of *Acc.* 18

Clm 19475 (T), fol. 7ra.6–7rb.15. Versions of the *accessus* appear in the manuscripts Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Barth. 110, fol. 91, and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 8207, saec. XIII, fols. 74rv–76ra; see *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 48, no. 94.

Selected Bibliography on Ovid's *Amores*

## Critical Edition

Ovid. *Amores*. Edited by E. J. Kenney in *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris*, pp. 1–108. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. Corrected ed., 1995.

## Edition with Translation

Ovid. *Heroides and Amores*. Translated by Grant Showerman. 2nd ed., revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1997.

## Edition with Commentary

Ovid. *Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes: Volume I, Text and Prolegomena; Volume II, A Commentary on Book I; Volume III, A Commentary on Book II*. Edited by J. C. McKeown. Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1987–98.

## Medieval Reception

Stapleton, M. L. *Harmful Eloquence: Ovid's "Amores" from Antiquity to Shakespeare*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.

Commentary on *Acc.* 18*Title*

This *accessus*, like the preceding two, is introduced by the work's title as it appears in many medieval manuscripts: *Ovidius sine titulo* (*Ovid without a Title*). The absence of a title is itself paradoxically a title that demands interpretation.

*Overview*

The introduction has two sections. The first section (1–6) treats the work according to four headings, *title*, *subject matter*, *intention*, and *part of philosophy*, devoting most of its attention to three different reasons why Ovid was thought to have called his work *Without a Title* (1–4); the last reason, however, does not explain the *title* but the *subject matter*, particularly in light of the prefatory epigram to the *Amores* and *Amores* 1.1 (4). The topics of *intention* (5) and *part of philosophy* (6) are treated perfunctorily. The second section of the *accessus* (7–14) gives a summary of the first poem of each book of the *Amores*: 1.1 (7), 2.1 (8), and 3.1 (9–14). In each case, the *accessus* observes how Ovid is compelled by Cupid or Elegy to give up writing a more noble work, whether it is an epic about Augustus's war against Antony and Cleopatra, an epic gigantomachy, or a tragedy.

1. “Without a Title” (*Sine titulo*): the *Amores* circulated under this title in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, on which tradition see further McKie, “Ovid’s *Amores*,” pp. 233–38, and Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” pp. 38–39. The genuine title, preserved in Ovid’s *Ars amatoria* (3.343–44), was handed down in one branch of the manuscript tradition from the ninth to eleventh century (e.g., in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, MS Hamilton 471, saec. XI), but was lost in another branch of later manuscripts (the *recentiores*). As the work was copied without a title, it came to be known as *Ovidius sine titulo*, which itself became a title that required ingenious explanations of medieval critics. By the thirteenth century, however, scholars were aware of both titles (as well as a third title, *Arma*, after the incipit of *Am.* 1.1.1). In his commentary on Ovid’s works, *Bursarii super Ouidios* (ca. 1200), William of Orléans introduces the *Amores* with an *accessus* that reconciles the two main traditions by explaining that Ovid originally titled the work *Amores* but removed the title after the *Ars amatoria* was condemned in order that the *Amores* might not cause offense.<sup>78</sup>

2. “He [Ovid] was afraid that rivals, who were in the habit of reproaching his works, would disparage it if they read the title”: this explanation for why Ovid did not title his work seems to be motivated by a poem such as *Amores* 1.15, 2.1, or 3.1, in which the poet takes account of imagined enemies who criticize him for writing love poetry. In *Amores* 1.15, Ovid addresses imagined detractors as the personification *Liur edax* (“Backbiting Envy”). In 2.1, he defends his choice of love poetry as superior to epic and attempts to turn away morally austere Roman readers (3): “Keep your distance from here, keep your distance, prudes!” (*procul hinc, procul este seueri!*). Finally, in 3.1 the personification Tragedy reports what people are saying about his love poetry in a disparaging tone (15–22).

3. “Another reason”: for Augustus’s alleged anger about the *Ars amatoria* and the corruption of matrons, see *Acc.* 16.6 with note; 26.21.

“Because there he put married women in something like the position of a prostitute”: this comment perceptively picks up on the opposition between *matrona* and *meretrix* operative in the *Ars amatoria* and in Roman social relations. In *Ars amatoria* 3, the female audience of the poem is imagined to have the status of a freedwoman courtesan (see *Ars* 3.615).

“For here certain words about love were written as a title”: this could be an allusion to the title *Amores* or possibly the variant title *De amore* (“About Love”), which appears again in 9 below and is possibly attested as a title in *Acc.* 25.1, but does not appear as an *inscriptio* in the manuscripts. *De amore* is also a variant title for the *Ars amatoria*.

4. “His war against Antony and Cleopatra”: this is apparently an

interpretation of the epic poem that Ovid was allegedly composing at *Amores* 1.1.1–2: “I was preparing to celebrate in song arms and violent wars in a heroic meter” (*arma graui numero uiolentaque bella parabam / edere*).

“And hence he [Ovid] planned to write five books”: Ovid prefaces the *Amores* with an epigram in which the personified books explain that they had once been five, but now are three. The medieval commentator does not understand the five books to have been a first edition of the *Amores*, let alone an actual published work; it is rather the martial epic that Ovid abandoned because he had been directed to write love elegy by Cupid.

“His subject matter is his girlfriend or love” (*est sua materia amica eius uel amor*): the alternatives may reflect the ambiguity of the subject matter in the opening sequence of elegies in the *Amores*. In *Amores* 1.1, Ovid is shot with Cupid’s arrow and declares his subject matter (26): “I am burning and Love rules in a once fancy-free heart” (*uror et in uacuo pectore regnat Amor*). *Amores* 1.2 continues the theme of the poet’s awakening love, although he does not know yet with whom he has fallen in love. The girlfriend (*amica*) is first presented as subject matter in *Amores* 1.3.

5. “His intention is to give delight”: see Hor. *Ars* 333.

7. This sentence appears to be out of order and is better read after 8. It gives a biographical interpretation of *Amores* 2.1.11–16, in which Ovid claims to have attempted a gigantomachy. The medieval commentator suggests that Ovid was writing the poem at the request of Octavian, but there is no evidence for this point in the text.

8. This comment applies to *Amores* 2.1.1–10, which is interpreted as a prologue (or *accessus*) to the second book of *Amores*, identifying the poet by name and introducing the book’s subject matter.

9. “Compelled by Elegy to write a third book about love (*de amore*)”: at the beginning of the third book of the *Amores*, Tragedy attempts to compel Ovid to give up love elegy with a speech arguing that he is squandering his poetic talent writing about love (*Am.* 3.1.15–26). Elegy responds to Tragedy (35–60) by arguing for her usefulness in lovemaking. Ovid decides to continue writing elegy, but asks for Tragedy’s permission (61–68).

10. “Because of her poetry, he met with the greatest fame and disgrace”: see *Am.* 3.1.17–22.

11. “When he was in doubt about what he should write”: see *Am.* 3.1.6.

“To write a third book about her”: in the iteration of Ovid’s subject matter the commentator substitutes Elegy in the place of love.

12. “He describes the loveliness of the place” (*describit amenitatem loci*): see *Am.* 3.1.1–5. The Latin phrase *amenitatem loci* correctly identifies the beginning of *Amores* 3.1 as an example of the *locus amoenus*, a rhetorical

ekphrasis or description of a lovely place, which includes trees, shade, water, a grotto, and birdsong, as the beginning of *Amores* 3.1 does. The norms of the rhetorical *topos* may be traced back to Horace's *Ars poetica* (15–17), but Servian comments on the *Aeneid* (5.734 and 7.30) also shaped the poetic commonplace in the Middle Ages: for details, see Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 192–93, 195–200, although he does not treat *Amores* 3.1.

“Such great goddesses”: the commentator interprets the personifications as though they were divine figures like the Muses: but unlike these goddesses, they do not have parents.

13. “Tragedy is the goddess of poetry that is composed about the deeds of noble men and kings” (*Tragedia dea est facti carminis de gestis nobilium et regum*): this comment elaborates on Tragedy's command to Ovid (*Am.* 3.1.25): “sing deeds of men” (*cane facta uirorum*). However, the paraphrase *de gestis nobilium et regum* appears to be derived from Horace's definition of epic in *Ars poetica* 73: *res gestae regumque ducumque* (“deeds of kings and generals”).

14. “Elegy, moreover, is spoken of as a goddess of woe”: the association of elegy with woe derives from antiquity. The Greek word *elegos* was a song of lamentation and was falsely etymologized by late antique grammarians as “to say woe, woe” (*e e legein*): see Luck, *Latin Love Elegy*, pp. 25–27. In the *Ars poetica*, an authoritative text, Horace explains the primal association of the elegiac distich with lament (75): “Complaint was the first content of verses unequally paired” (*uersibus impariter iunctis querimonia primum* [sc. *inclusa est*]).

“Woes and hardships occur also in love”: the extension of elegy to the woes of love is insightful, but the meter came to be used for many different purposes, including love; on the flexibility of elegy's subject matter, see Luck, *Latin Love Elegy*, pp. 27–46.

“Is written with an unequal meter [pentameter] and a hexameter” (*scribitur impari metro et exámetro*): this description of the elegiac couplet (properly a hexameter followed by a pentameter) is probably inspired by Ovid's description of Elegy as having one foot longer than the other (*Am.* 3.1.8, *et, puto, pes illi longior alter erat*), which includes a wordplay on “foot” being the term for a measure of verse, but the wording *impari metro* alludes to *Am.* 1.1.3–4, where Ovid famously explains why his first hexameter is followed by a verse of unequal measure.

## 19. *Ovid's Fasti*

The work introduced under the medieval title *Ouidius fastorum* (“Ovid of the *Fasti*”) is his etiological poem on Rome's religious and civic calendar

written in elegiac distichs. Ovid allots a book to each month and treats the traditional calendrical entries in chronological order, explaining the origins of Roman religious festivals, customs, and commemorative events, through the elegiac treatment of Greek and Roman myths. The poem also contains the astronomical and meteorological notices appropriate to a rustic almanac. The first six books of the work survive. It is likely that Ovid stalled the completion of the last six books after he was exiled by Augustus in AD 8; the poet's silence about the Caesarian months of July and August (see *Trist.* 2.549–52) speaks volumes. Ovid nonetheless revised parts of the first half of the *Fasti* in exile. After the death in AD 14 of Augustus, to whom the work had originally been dedicated (see *Trist.* 2.551), he rededicated the poem to Germanicus (*Fast.* 1.3, 4.81–84), the nephew of the emperor Tiberius.

The *Fasti* were read and copied in the Carolingian age, but the earliest surviving manuscripts date from the end of the tenth century (see Tarrant, “Ovid,” pp. 266–68). The library catalogue of Blaubeuren Abbey from the end of the eleventh century records the first commentary.<sup>79</sup> In the twelfth century, commentaries on the *Fasti* are well attested, including the famous one of Arnulf of Orléans.<sup>80</sup> Conrad of Hirsau conceded that the *Fasti* are one of the few works written by Ovid that are tolerable for students to read (*Dialogus super auctores*, p. 114.1332–34).

#### Editions of *Acc.* 19

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 33–34; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 37–38; Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*, pp. 93–95.

#### Text of *Acc.* 19

Clm 19475 (T), fols. 7rb.15–8ra.3. Versions of the *accessus* appear in Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Barth. 110, fol. 133, and Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS Voss. lat. Q.73, saec. XII, fol. 46r–46v, which accompanies a text of the *Fasti*. Cf. *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 118, no. 406; Munk Olsen, *Classici*, p. 49 and n. 139.

#### Selected Bibliography of Ovid's *Fasti*

##### Critical Edition

Ovid. *Fasti*. Edited by E. H. Alton, D. E. W. Wormell, and E. Courtney as *Ovidius, Fasti*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1978.

##### Edition with Translation

Ovid. *Fasti*. Edited and translated by Sir James George Frazer. 2nd ed., revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.

## Editions with Commentary

- Green, Steven J. *Ovid, Fasti 1: A Commentary*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004.
- Littlewood, R. Joy. *A Commentary on Ovid, Fasti, Book 6*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Ovid. *Die Fasten*. Edited and translated by Franz Bömer. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1957–58.
- . *Fasti. Book 2*. Edited with introduction and commentary by Matthew Robinson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- . *Fasti. Book IV*. Edited by Elaine Fantham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*. Edited by Sir James George Frazer. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1929.

## Medieval Reception

- Alton, E. H. “The Medieval Commentators of Ovid’s *Fasti*.” *Hermathena* 44 (1926): 119–51.
- Newlands, Carole E. “La ricezione dei *Fasti* di Ovidio nel Medioevo: lode e polemica.” In *Nunc teritur nostris area maior equis: riflessioni sull’inter-testualità ovidiana—I Fasti*, edited by L. Landolfi, pp. 117–28. Palermo: Flaccovio Editore, 2004.
- Peeters, Félix. *Les “Fastes” d’Ovide: histoire du texte*, pp. 113–41. Brussels: Librairie Falk Fils, 1939.

Commentary on *Acc.* 19*Overview*

The introduction is divided into two sections. The first section discusses at considerable length the title *Fasti* (1–13) and presents two opinions about where the work was composed (14). The discussion of the title includes the explanation that Ovid wanted to clarify the Roman calendar and do good service for the Romans in compensation for the damage he caused by publishing the *Ars amatoria* (5). The second section (15–21) approaches the poem according to the modern scheme of four headings beginning with *subject matter*. It also addresses why the poem treats the rising and setting of constellations (19–20), thereby justifying the poem’s philosophical classification under both ethics and physics.

1. “Certain books . . . were named after business of the state, for they were called *Fasti*” (*Quidam libri . . . quibus ab actu nomen est inditum: Fasti enim dicebantur*): the *Fasti* were public records enumerating all the days of the year, with their festivals, magistrates, and events (Lewis and Short, s. v. II.A).



They were named from the *dies fasti*, days on which one may say judgments in court and hence perform public business.

2. The etymology of *fastus* from *fas* appears to have its roots in a grammarian such as Priscian (see Maltby, *Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, s.v. *fastus* 1); the gloss of *fas* may be based on an interpretation of *Fast.* 1.48: “the day will be lawful, during which it will be permitted to conduct legal business” (*fastus erit, per quem lege licebit agi*), which is quoted later in the *accessus*. See 13 and the note below. Cf. the etymology for *nefastus* given in Arnulf’s *accessus* to the *Fasti* and Hugutio’s *Deriuationes*: “for ‘unfit for public business’ is derived from ‘something contrary to divine law,’ as it were ‘not permitted’” (*nefastus enim dicitur a nefas quasi illicitus*; text in Ghisalberti, “Arnolfo d’Orléans,” p. 162; Holzworth, “Hugutio’s *Deriuationes*,” pp. 261–62).

3–4. Versions of these sentences appear in Arnulf and Hugutio (see note above).

4. Before Julius Caesar reformed the Roman calendar (46 BC) it only had 355 days, and so it began roughly ten days earlier each solar year (see *Fast.* 3.155–56 and the note in Frazer’s commentary, 3:45–46). Consequently, festivals might not be celebrated at the proper time of the year without the adjustment of an intercalary month. The medieval commentator is aware of pre-Julian calendrical difficulties but thinks the problem lay with the Roman poets who devoted too much attention to heroic exploits in the calendar and neglected religious festivals.

5. “Knowing that the Romans were full of hatred toward him”: see *Acc.* 15.5 with its note. The *Fasti*, like the *Remedia amoris*, are an attempt by Ovid to redeem his public reputation as a morally useful poet after he had caused public harm as a teacher of love in the *Ars amatoria*. The medieval commentator assumes here that the *Fasti* were written before Ovid’s exile but later takes account of the view that they were written in exile.

“Condensed lengthy books into a succinct treatise”: this piece of information is derived from *Fast.* 1.7: “you will recognize rites dug up from ancient annals” (*sacra recognosces annalibus eruta priscis*); see Arnulf’s *Accessus* to the *Fasti*: “Ovid collected briefly in this book what had been arrayed in books of annals” (*Ouidius uero que in libris annalibus erant disposita in hoc libro breuiter collegit*; text in Ghisalberti, “Arnolfo d’Orléans,” p. 162).

“So that he could explain the practice of sacrifice”: Ovid does indeed explain the origins of animal sacrifice in *Fast.* 1.317–456, which could be viewed as the most important feature of pagan Roman religious practice. Yet, this reading of the *Fasti* excludes possible Ovidian criticism of animal sacrifice; it also filters out the many other aspects of Roman religion, legend, and history that Ovid investigates.



8. “Nevertheless, praises (*laudes*) are not contained everywhere”: the commentator assumes that the reader knows that *ode* in Greek is to be understood as *laus* in Latin. The gloss is false, but see *Acc.* 8.4 with note.

9. On titling a work after a principal character, see *Acc.* 26.7, 11–12. The example of the *Andria*, which is named after a place, is obviously the error of a compiler who may have seen it combined with the *Phormio*, which is named after its lead character.

13. Ovid, *Fast.* 1.47–48, is quoted to set the record straight about which days are holy, namely the days on which the *praetor* (a judge) may say the three words *do, dico, addico* (“I grant, I proclaim, I assign”) in the formula used during judicial proceedings to grant leave to bring a case, to state a law, and to assign property in a dispute (see Varro, *De lingua latina* 6.30).

14. The medieval belief that Ovid wrote the *Fasti* in exile overlooks *Tristia* 2.549–52, in which Ovid indicates that he had stopped working on the poem because of his exile.

17. The intention to present a digested form of Roman religious annals was already presented in 5 above.

18. The *cause of the intention* is a heading that is shared with *Acc.* 15.9 (see note) and is another formulation for *utilitas* or *finalis causa*; the utility of the *Fasti* has already been expressed in a purpose clause in 5 above.

21. The *Fasti* is one of two works treated in the *Accessus ad auctores* that can be read as natural philosophy; see *Acc.* 9.5.

## 20. Introduction to *Lucan*

The work introduced is Lucan’s *Bellum ciuile*, an unfinished historical epic of ten books chronicling the civil war between Caesar and Pompey whose climax is the battle of Pharsalus (48 BC). The work’s other title, *Pharsalia*, is based on a misinterpretation of 9.985–86 and does not appear to have been known in the Middle Ages. The author Marcus Annaeus Lucanus (AD 39–65) was the most brilliant literary talent of the Neronian age, who set out to rival Virgil’s *Aeneid* with his epic about the civil war that ended the Roman Republic and ushered in a new form of imperial monarchy. He originally dedicated the work to the emperor Nero on the grounds that Rome’s civil wars were worth fighting if they prepared the way for his rule, but he turned his epic into an impassioned lament for Rome’s loss of liberty under the Caesars.

Lucan was one of the most widely read, imitated, and anthologized authors in the Middle Ages. There are over four hundred complete or partial copies of his work, many of which are glossed, with five of the earliest manuscripts dating from the ninth century.<sup>81</sup> Lucan was among the first pagan

authors to gain acceptance into the school curriculum and be read alongside Christian epic poets, perhaps because of his ethical castigation of Caesarian Rome. As early as the ninth century, his epic was collected (with scholia) into handbooks of authors and recorded in library catalogues.<sup>82</sup> In the tenth and eleventh centuries, Lucan became firmly established as a school author along with Horace, Juvenal, Persius, Stadius, Terence, and Virgil. According to Richer of Reims's account of his schooling under Gerbert of Reims (d. 1006), Lucan was classified as a historian (*historiographus*).<sup>83</sup> This view voiced in Servius's commentary on *Aen.* 1.382—echoed by Isidore of Seville (*Etym.* 8.7.10) and the *Commenta Bernensia* (1.1)—ensured Lucan a central place as historian in the medieval grammar curriculum that was dedicated to explaining not only the poets but also historians.<sup>84</sup> Lucan was a heavily annotated author in the Middle Ages. Some scholia were transmitted from antiquity in the manuscript tradition, others were added by medieval commentators. Consequently, it is difficult to identify a specifically ancient commentary on Lucan comparable to Servius's on Virgil.<sup>85</sup> At the end of the twelfth century, however, Arnulf of Orléans produced his own commentary on Lucan, treating him as both a poet and a historian.<sup>86</sup>

#### Editions of *Acc.* 20

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 33–38; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 39–44.

#### Text of *Acc.* 20

The text is based on Clm 19475 (T), fols. 8ra.4–9vb.27, but it has been emended where necessary. A version of this *accessus*, with a substantial number of variants, precedes the glossed text of *Bellum ciuile* in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4593 (B), fols. 3r–4v; see Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 4. Munk Olsen (“Recueils,” p. 13) reports another example of the same type of *accessus* in Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek, Cod. 199 (C), saec. XII, fol. 1r–v. This *accessus* appears at the beginning of a commentary on Lucan (*Glose Lucani*, fols. 1r–26r) and provides another comparandum for T as an alternative to B. The Cologne manuscript is digitized and archived in the Codices Electronici Ecclesiae Coloniensis (<http://ceec.uni-koeln.de>).

#### Selected Bibliography on Lucan

##### Critical Edition

Lucan. *Bellum ciuile*. Edited by D. R. Shackleton Bailey as *M. Annaei Lucani De bello ciuili libri X*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1997.

## Translation

Lucan. *Civil War*. Translated, with an introduction and notes, by S. H. Braund. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

## Editions with Commentary

Lucan. *Pharsalia*. Edited by C. E. Haskins as *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia* (with notes). Introduction by W. E. Heitland. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1887. Reprint, Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1971.

More recent commentaries are available for most of the individual books:

Book 1: Lucan. *De bello civili Book I*. Edited with a commentary by Paul Roche. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Book 2: Lucan. *De bello civili Book II*. Edited with a commentary by Elaine Fantham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Book 3: Hunink, Vincent. *M. Annaeus Lucanus, Bellum civile. Book III: A Commentary*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1992.

Book 4: Asso, Paolo. *A Commentary on Lucan, "De bello civili" IV. Introduction, Edition, and Translation*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009.

Lucan. *Bellum civile (Pharsalia): libro IV*. Edited with a commentary by Paolo Esposito. Naples: Loffredo, 2009.

Book 5: Barratt, Pamela. *M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis liber V: A Commentary*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1979.

Book 7: *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili liber VII*. Edited with a commentary by O. A. W. Dilke. Revised from the edition of J. P. Postgate. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960. Reprint, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1978.

Book 8: Lucan. *Civil War VIII*. Edited with a commentary by Roland Mayer. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1981.

Book 9: Lucan. *M. Annaeus Lucanus, Bellum civile. Liber IX. Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung*. Edited with a commentary by Claudia Wick. 2 vols. Munich: Saur, 2004.

Book 10: *Marci Annaei Lucani Bellum civile liber X*. Edited with a commentary by Emanuele Berti. Florence: Le Monnier, 2000.

## Ancient and Medieval Commentary

Endt, Joannes, ed. *Adnotationes super Lucanum*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1909.

Marti, Berthe M., ed. *Arnulfi Aurelianensis Glosule super Lucanum*. Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1958.

Usener, Hermann, ed. *Commenta Bernensia*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1869.

## Medieval Reception

D'Angelo, Edoardo. "La 'Pharsalia' nell'epica latina medievale." In *Interpretare Lucano, miscellanea di studi*, edited by Paolo Esposito and Luciano

- Nicastri, pp. 389–452. Naples: Arte Tipografico, 1999.
- Marti, Berthe Marie. “Literary Criticism in the Medieval Commentaries on Lucan.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 72 (1941): 245–54.
- Peterson, Janine Larmon. “Defining a Textbook: Gloss versus Gloss in a Medieval Schoolbook.” *Essays in Medieval Studies* 20 (2003): 18–30.
- Sanford, Eva Matthews. “The Manuscripts of Lucan: *Accessus* and *Marginalia*.” *Speculum* 9 (1934): 278–95.
- . “Quotations from Lucan in Mediaeval Latin Authors.” *American Journal of Philology* 55 (1934): 1–19.

### Commentary on *Acc.* 20

#### *Title*

After a series of six Ovidian introductions headed by the title of the works, the format of titling an introduction with the term *accessus* and the author’s name in the genitive in *Acc.* 5–13 is resumed with the *Accessus Lucani*.

#### *Overview*

The introduction has three main sections. The first section (1–50) provides a summary of Roman history from the expulsion of the kings (509 BC) to the reign of Nero (AD 54–68), a common feature in the *accessus* to Lucan.<sup>87</sup> It is possible that such a historical summary evolved out of a shorter survey of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey such as that which appears in annotated manuscripts of Lucan, such as St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. Sang. 864, fol. 119; see Endt, *Adnotationes super Lucanum*, pp. 324–25. The second section (51–56) gives biographical information about Lucan and his uncle, Seneca the Younger, with a digression treating the definitions of tragedy and comedy. The third section (57–77) treats the poem according to six headings: *subject matter* (57–58), *intention* (59–62), *genre of work* (63–72), *utility* (73), *part of philosophy* (74), and *order* (75–77).

1. The first sentence summarizes the beginning and end of the Roman republic as two turning points: from kings to consuls, on the one hand, and from consuls to dictatorship, on the other. The misconception that the dictatorship was a five-year office is based on the triumvirate of Octavian, Antony, and Lepidus in 43 BC, which was a board of three men who assumed supreme power for a five-year period.

2. The Romans did not appoint Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar dictators in 60 BC; the formation of the “first triumvirate” was an unconstitutional

political alliance. Lucan says that “Rome became the common property of three masters” (1.84–85).

“Because he was devoted to contemplation of the stars” (*siderum considerationi*): the reference to Caesar’s wisdom and the etymological wordplay of *consideratio* and *sidus* would suggest that Caesar had a reputation for astronomical knowledge: this may be an inference based upon his reform of the solar calendar and the introduction of the Julian year of 365 days with a leap year every fourth year. Pliny the Elder says that Caesar had consulted with the astronomer Sosigenes of Alexandria (*Nat. Hist.* 18.210–12). The Julian calendar was used throughout the Middle Ages and was reformed in 1582 by Pope Gregory XIII.

3. “Brenno”: the leader of the Suebi, a German tribe, was Ariovistus, who intervened in Gallic tribal conflicts (see *Caes. Gal.* 1.31–53). Brenno is a scribal error for Brennus, the leader of the Gauls who sacked Rome in 390 BC.

5–6. The historical account of Crassus’s defeat at the battle of Carrae in Parthia has been transformed into a moral tale in which Crassus pays the penalty for his greed. Most of the story’s elements (interest in Parthian wealth, death of Crassus’s son, decapitation, his own death, and the pouring of molten gold into the throat) may have been inventively reworked from a source such as the *Epitome of Roman History* by Florus, which was a popular compendium in the Middle Ages (1.46.10).

5. “Money” (*pecunia*): the variant spelling of *pecunia* appears again at *Acc.* 22.60.

7. This version of the history of the Gallic war appears to be concerned with the years 58–56 BC.

8. “Prepared” (*parat*): the verb appears to be lacking an object. The *accessus* in B has the verb *inperare* before *toti Germanie*: “Caesar prepared to rule over all of Germany, together with Gaul.” It is fair to say that in 56 BC, Caesar considered Gaul under his control and that he aimed to control Germany.

9. “They ordered Caesar to return”: this detail may correspond to the political party headed by L. Domitius Ahenobarbus that was opposed to Caesar in 56 BC and sought his recall to prosecute him for the unconstitutional legislation he passed in 59.

10. “Because he had accomplished nothing worthy of memory”: this motivation derives from Suetonius’s *Life of the Deified Julius* (7.1), when Caesar, at the age of thirty-one, was reminded of his own political obscurity by a statue of Alexander the Great, who had conquered the world by the time he was thirty.

“He assumed power for another five-year period”: this point corresponds to the renewal of Caesar’s military command over Gaul in 55 BC.

“He demanded from the Romans a triumph for himself”: the source for this information is unclear, but it may be derived by inference from Lucan, who speaks of Pompey’s fear of Caesar’s success in Gaul: “You fear that new deeds will obscure your old triumphs and the laurel won in the pirate war will yield to victory over the Gauls” (1.121–22). Suetonius (*Iul.* 31.1) says that Caesar demanded from the senate the right to stand for the consulship while retaining his military command over his armies in Gaul. The senatorial opposition wanted him to lay down his command so that it could prosecute him for his illegal activities as consul in 59 BC.

11. The sentence summarizes Luc. 1.183–468, especially 466–68.

12. Here the *accessus* summarizes Luc. 1.469–2.609 and paraphrases 2.607–9.

13. For the narrative of Caesar’s pursuit and Pompey’s escape, see Luc. 2.610–3.45.

14. On Caesar’s return to Rome and plundering of the treasury, see Luc. 3.46–168.

15. Here the summary tracks the Caesarian campaign led by Decimus Brutus against Massilia (Luc. 3.298–762) and by Caesar himself in Spain at Ilerda against Petreius and Afranius (4.1–401).

16. The events summarized are treated in Luc. 5.237–872.

17. Pompey’s flight to Egypt and his death there are the subject of Lucan’s eighth book. The speech of Pothinus enumerates the reasons why Ptolemy should authorize killing Pompey (8.484–535).

18. Lucan treats Caesar’s arrival in Egypt and his meeting with Pompey’s severed head in 9.1004–1108. Caesar’s erotic alliance with Cleopatra is the subject of 10.1–171.

19. The plot of Pothinus to kill Caesar at Cleopatra’s banquet is treated in 10.333–433. Lucan handles the beginning of the Alexandrian war but breaks off his epic before Caesar gains revenge on Ptolemy. The historical summary of the *accessus* continues beyond the end of Lucan’s fragmentary tenth book.

22. According to the accounts of Plutarch (*Cat. Min.* 70) and Florus (2.13.70–72), Cato did not fight at the battle of Thapsus in 46 BC, but remained at Utica, where he committed suicide by wounding himself with a sword and tearing out his bowels.

26: “He died on the Capitoline at the hands of Brutus and Cassius with twenty-four wounds”: the place of Caesar’s assassination was the senate house in the theater of Pompey (see Suet. *Iul.* 81.4–82.2; Florus 2.13.93–95), not on the Capitoline; the number of wounds was traditionally twenty-three.

28: “Antony . . . besieged the same men at Mutina, a city of Italy”: Mark Antony (Marcus Antonius) did not besiege Brutus and Cassius at Mutina (Modena). His opponent was another Brutus, Decimus Junius Brutus Albinus, who participated in the assassination of Caesar along with Marcus Junius Brutus and Gaius Cassius Longinus. Decimus Brutus had been given proconsular command of Cisalpine Gaul in northern Italy by Julius Caesar and the senate in 44 BC (Suet. *Aug.* 8.2).

29. “Therefore, the senate, because it had been done with its consent, sent three generals to them as aid, Hirtius and Pansa together with Octavian”: the senate sent the two consuls of 43 BC, Hirtius and Pansa, together with Octavian to help Decimus Brutus against Mark Antony.

33. “But Dolabella, a soldier who had been welcome to Antony (*acceptus Antonio*)”: Publius Cornelius Dolabella was a protégé of Julius Caesar and became the consular colleague of Antony after Caesar’s death in 44 BC. Dolabella and Antony were soon rivals; there is no ancient testimony for Dolabella’s having brought Antony and Octavian together after Mutina. Rather, it was Antony’s alliance with Marcus Aemilius Lepidus that led Octavian to renounce his affiliation with the senatorial party and form a triumvirate with the Caesarians in 43 BC.

35. “He had written public *Philippics*, invectives (*inueticia*) against Antony”: Cicero wrote fourteen invectives (*orationes inuetiuuae*) attacking Antony’s policies and person; he called them *orationes Philippicae* (*Epist. ad Att.* 2.1.3) as well as *Philippici*, that is, *libelli Philippici* (*Epist. ad Brut.* 2.3.4), alluding to Demosthenes’s famous speeches urging Athenian resistance to Philip V, the king of Macedon. The identification of these speeches as *publica Philippica inueticia*, however, seems problematic. The text of T, B, and C identify the speeches as *inueticia*, which would mean “imports,” in classical Latin and not “invectives.” *Inueticia*, nonetheless, appears to have the latter sense and to be a neuter accusative plural; syntactically, it is either the direct object of *scripserat* modified by *publica Philippica* or it is an appositive to the neuter accusative plural noun phrase *publica Philippica*, which would be the direct object. Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), followed T here, but Bernhard Bischoff (review of *Accessus*, p. 335) proposed emending *inueticia* to *inuetiua*. Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), adopted Bischoff’s emendation as if it were the original text, or should be. Bischoff, however, did not offer a parallel for his conjecture, raising the question, which I cannot answer, whether *inuetiua* could be used in Medieval Latin as a neuter plural substantive meaning “invectives.” In classical Latin, *inuetiua* is usually a first declension feminine substantive modifying an implied noun *oratio* (*ThLL* 7.2.125.28). The word *Philippica* is used the same way, being an adjective derived from the proper



name *Philippus*. The word *Philippica* used absolutely as a feminine nominative singular refers either to a single speech by Cicero against Antony or to the whole corpus of speeches (see Juv. 10.125). So, the unclassical use of *Philippica* as a neuter plural could lend support to the conjectured *inuectiua*. On the other hand, *inuecticia* is the reading shared among the three versions of the Lucan *accessus*, which may be taken as evidence that this word was read as a synonym of *inuectiuae* and not as evidence for the corruption of an unattested usage of *inuectiua* as a neuter plural substantive.

36. The marriage of Antony and Octavia took place in 40 BC, three years after the triumvirate of Antony, Octavian, and Lepidus was formed.

38. The text is lacunose but apparently explains the division of the Roman Empire into western and eastern provinces. At this point, Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), grafts the more complete text of B on T: *Octauiano transmarine partes, scilicet Gallia obuenuit, Antonio uero cismarine, egyptus et cetera* (“the provinces on the other side of the sea, namely Gaul, fell to Octavian, and to Antony fell the provinces on this side of the sea, Egypt, and the rest”). Here one may compare the reading of C that differs in one word (or abbreviation): *Octauiano transmarine partes et Gallia obuenuit*. The difference between *et* in C and *scilicet* in B is meaningful. In C, Gaul is a province in addition to the *transmarine partes*, but in B, Gaul is equated with the *transmarine partes*, which makes less sense.

39. “Catulus”: the third triumvir was Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, not Quintus Lutatius Catulus, who was consul with Gaius Marius in 102 BC and later a supporter of Sulla against Marius in Rome’s first generation of civil war.

40. “Lucius Antonius”: the brother of Mark Antony and consul of 42 BC caused trouble for Octavian in Italy. Octavian besieged him in Perugia in 41, the year after the battle of Philippi. The mention of an earlier siege of Mutina appears to be either a doublet of or reference to the war in 43 BC treated above in 28–30.

41. “Antony Gaius and Octavian” (*Antonium Gaium et Octavianum*): Roman nomenclature is easily confused. Gaius is Octavian’s praenomen and not Mark Antony’s cognomen. The tensions between the two were relieved through the diplomatic marriage of Antony and Octavia in 40 BC.

“After his sister Octavia had been divorced”: the formal divorce did not take place until 32 BC.

“Octavian made a pact with Brutus and Cassius”: this alliance is invented.

42–43. The information about the battle of Philippi in 42 BC is correct, but out of chronological order; it took place after the battle of Mutina



and the formation of the second triumvirate in 43. After Philippi, Antony went to Asia Minor where he met his mistress Cleopatra at Tarsus (on the Cyndus) and later joined her for a winter in Egypt (41/40).

44–46. The historical synopsis omits events between 40 and 31 BC, advancing directly to an account of the battle of Actium.

44. “There Agrippa had an encounter (*occurritur*) with the turreted fleet (*cum turritis nauibus*) of the Egyptians”: if the verb is correct (and correctly interpreted) in this clause, the *accessus* would appear to paraphrase the naval battle at Actium portrayed on the shield Vulcan made for Aeneas in Virgil’s *Aeneid*, where not only Agrippa (*Aen.* 8.682) but also the towering ships of the Egyptians are mentioned (*Aen.* 8.693; see Florus, 2.21.5–6).

45. There was no land battle at Actium, and the story that Octavian was saved from defeat by two thousand Gauls is a medieval invention that may indicate the provenance of the historical summary. The source that inspired the fabrication may have been Vegetius’s *Epitoma rei militaris* (“Epitome of Military Science”). This manual reports that Augustus defeated Antony with the help of the Liburnians, an Illyrian people who provided a light maneuverable ship that was superior to the towering ships of the Egyptians (4.23).

47. “He was called *Father of his City* (*Pater Urbis*)”: the senate awarded Augustus the title *Pater Patriae* (*Father of His Country*) in 2 BC (Suet. *Aug.* 58.2).

50. The sequence of Julio-Claudian emperors after Augustus (Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, Nero) has conflated the nomenclature of the emperors Tiberius and Claudius, thus eliding Claudius and necessitating the repetition of Gaius’s name twice to fill the gap.

“Tiberius Germanicus Claudius Nero Caesar”: the nomenclature should be either Tiberius Julius Caesar Augustus or, before his adoption by Augustus, Tiberius Claudius Nero. The name *Tiberius Claudius Nero Germanicus* belonged to the fourth emperor known as Claudius.

“Gaius Caesar Galigula”: Caligula was a nickname. The official nomenclature was Gaius Julius Caesar Germanicus.

“Killed his mother and had sex with his sisters”: Nero was notorious for having arranged the murder of his mother Agrippina (see Juv. *Sat.* 8.211–30), but not known to have committed incest with his sisters; such behavior was credited to Caligula (Suet. *Cal.* 24).

“And who also conquered Corduba, a city of Burgundy”: this city is in southern Spain (capital of the Roman province of Baetica) and not in Burgundy (France). Corduba was the birthplace of Seneca the Younger and his nephew Lucan and had been sacked by Julius Caesar during the civil war with Pompey; it was resettled with veterans by Augustus and hence was not

conquered by Nero. See the *accessus* of Arnulf of Orléans in his *Glosule super Lucanum* 3, which correctly identifies Corduba as a city of Spain but likewise asserts that Nero conquered it.

51. “There Nero seized and led to Rome Lucan and Seneca, Lucan’s uncle, whom he made his teacher”: Seneca the Younger and Lucan belonged to the Annaei, an equestrian family in Spain that gravitated back to Rome under the Julio-Claudians. After being exiled to Corsica by Claudius, Seneca was recalled to Rome and appointed Nero’s tutor in AD 49. Lucan was educated in Rome and became a close friend of Nero, who made him quaestor (Suet. *Vita Lucani*).

52. “When Seneca considered the fame and utility of writers” (*Hic dum scribentium laudem et utilitatem perpenderet*): the subject of the sentence is unclear, but it is apparently Seneca, who wrote eight tragedies.

53. For this explanation of the etymology of tragedy, see Hor. *Ars* 220, but the source may be the late antique commentary tradition on Virgil’s *Georgics* 2.383 (ed. Thilo, vol. 3.1, p. 252) witnessed in Servius *auctus* (i.e., Servius “augmented” by material from a variorum edition of Aelius Donatus’s lost Virgilian commentary); see Maltby, *Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, s.v. *tragoedia*, *tragoedus*.

54. The idea that royal characters are the subject matter of tragedy may be derived from a grammatical treatise such as Donatus’s *De comoedia* (5.2); see Diomedes, *GL* 1:488.5.

55. “*Comos* is a village, *ode* a song: hence comedy, which has ordinary characters”: the etymology of “comedy” from the Greek *kômê* (village) and *odê* (song) goes back to ancient grammarians such as Donatus (see note on 54). Comedy’s characters are villagers as opposed to the royal characters of tragedy.

56. According to the Suetonian *Vita Lucani*, the poet was an outspoken member of the unsuccessful Pisonian conspiracy against Nero and was ordered to commit suicide. Seneca was implicated, too, and suffered the same fate.

57–58. The division of the subject matter into two parts, primary and secondary, is paralleled in another *accessus* to Lucan in Cambridge, Trinity College Library, MS O.8.4, saec. XII, fol. 1: see Sanford, “Manuscripts of Lucan,” p. 283.

59–62. The discussion of intention takes account of the controversy over Lucan’s attitude toward Nero but decides that his intent was to censure Nero. See Sanford, “Manuscripts of Lucan,” p. 284.

59. “His intention is to praise Nero, and this beginning from the praises of his ancestors”: here the commentator imitates Servius’s prologue to *Aen.* 1: “Vergil’s intention is this . . . to praise Augustus beginning from his ancestors” (ed. Thilo, vol. 1, p. 4.10–11).

60. The commentator addresses the unfinished state of *Bellum ciuile* and assumes that the historical epic would have continued down to the Neronian present, perhaps by analogy to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

61. This is the first *accessus* in the collection to theorize about authorial irony.

62. For the intention to dissuade Romans from civil war, see Sanford, "Manuscripts of Lucan," p. 283 and n. 4.

63–72. The discussion of the genre of *Bellum ciuile* allows a digression on the rhetorical theory of three kinds of style.

64. "Simple, middle, and grand" (*humilis, mediocris, grandiloquus*): the kinds of style are presented in ascending order. The earliest source in Latin for the three kinds of style is *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (attributed to Cicero in the Middle Ages), where the styles (*figurae*) are presented in descending order: *grauis, mediocris, and adtenuata* (4.11–16). The *accessus*, however, follows the Servian formulation as it was received through John Scottus and Remigius of Auxerre. Servius presents the theory of styles in his prologues to the commentaries on the *Aeneid* and *Eclogues* (ed. Thilo, vol. 1, p. 4; vol. 3.1, pp. 1–2; see Donatus, *Vit. Verg.*, ed. Brummer, p. 14). The Servian styles (*characteres*) or kinds of speaking (*genera dicendi*) are presented in ascending order (*humilis, medius, and grandiloquus*) and correspond to the ascending order of Virgil's works (*Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid*). This critical commonplace recurs in Remigius's gloss of *grandisonis* in Sedulius, *Carm. pasch.* 1.18 (CSEL 10:321.18–19). For further discussion of sources for the theory of the three styles, see Quadlbauer, *Die antike Theorie*, pp. 27–30.

65. The idea that each of the styles, when not practiced properly, has its own faults derives from *Rhet. Her.* 4.10.15–11.16.

66. Here the *accessus* repeats verbatim parts of the discussion of the genre of poem (*qualitas carminis*) in Servius's prologue to *Aen.* 1 (ed. Thilo, vol. 1, p. 4.3–6), but does not acknowledge the novelty of Lucan's epic: namely, the absence of divine characters. The logic of the passage suggests that the *accessus* is not discussing Lucan specifically but the epic genre as it is constituted by the *Aeneid*. In 68, the issue of the absence of divine characters may be implied: "Sometimes in this work even divine matters are discussed."

69. The three different styles of reciting—the so-called *dragmaticon* (properly, *dramaticon*, "dramatic"), *exagematicon* (properly, *exegeticon*, "narrative"), and *misticon* (properly, *mikton*, "mixed")—derive ultimately from the third book of Plato's *Republic* (392D), but were known to the Middle Ages through late antique grammarians such as Diomedes and Servius. Diomedes is the principal source for the division of poems into three genres (*GL* 1:482.13–483.6; see Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 440–41), but a Servian

note on the first line of the third *Eclogue* (ed. Thilo, vol. 3.1, p. 29.18–22), which was excerpted by Isidore (*Etym.* 8.7.11) and used by Bede in the last section of *De arte metrica* (*GL* 7:259), may be a more influential intermediary. See Bernard of Utrecht, *Commentum in Theodolum*, p. 65.176–80.

The orthography of the Greek terms for the different modes of reciting is incorrect and inconsistent in T (see *Acc.* 26.30), but the confusion may stem from the Servian commentary tradition. The *accessus* to Lucan follows the model of Servius, but with a significant difference: the example given for the dramatic style is not “comedies and tragedies” but Ovid’s *Heroides*, on which see *Acc.* 26.30–31.

75. The *accessus* disagrees with Servius’s claim in *Aen.* 1.382 that Lucan should not be reckoned a poet (ed. Thilo, vol. 1, p. 129.17–19).

76. “Natural order”: this means that the poem follows chronological order in contrast to the artificial order of the first half of the *Aeneid* (see Hor. *Ars* 146–49).

77. The objection is anticipated that the speech about Sulla and Marius in Luc. 2.67–233 is not in chronological order.

## 21. Introduction to *Cicero [Paradoxa Stoicorum]*

The work introduced is the *Paradoxa Stoicorum* (*Paradoxes of the Stoics*) by Marcus Tullius Cicero (106–43 BC). Cicero explains in his preface to the *Paradoxa* that it is a playful attempt to popularize Stoic paradoxes—logical propositions that are contrary to common opinion—by casting them into rhetorical arguments. The little work, completed in the spring of 46 BC, consists of six essays devoted to persuading a common audience of the truth of a paradox, such as “only moral virtue is good” or “only the wise man is rich.”

The *Paradoxa Stoicorum* first gained a readership in the Carolingian age; it was included in the excerpts of Ciceronian philosophical works made by Hadoard in his *Collectaneum*.<sup>88</sup> Its adoption into the school curriculum appears to have occurred in the twelfth century. The vocabulary treatise *Sacerdos ad altare accessurus* (“The Priest Going to Approach the Altar”) attributed to Alexander Nequam, for example, includes the *Paradoxa* among the six Ciceronian works that are most useful for the student to read.<sup>89</sup> The currency of the *Paradoxa* in the later Middle Ages is evidenced by references to it in the works of Peter Abelard, John of Salisbury, and Dante.<sup>90</sup>

Cicero’s *Paradoxa Stoicorum* does not appear to have been arbitrarily included in the *Accessus ad auctores*. Other moral works of Cicero, such as *De amicitia* and *De senectute*, were also popular school readings in the twelfth century.<sup>91</sup> But the *Paradoxa* may have found favor because it complemented

the moralizing distichs of “Cato.” This association will have been strengthened by Cicero’s preface to the treatise, in which he remembers how Cato the Younger (Cato Uticensis in *Acc.* 5) used philosophical propositions in the Roman senate.

#### Text of *Acc.* 21

Clm 19475 (T), fols. 9v.27–10r.23. Virtually the same version of the *accessus* appears in Clm 19474 (M), pp. 67–68.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 21

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), p. 38; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 44–45.

#### Selected Bibliography on Cicero’s *Paradoxa Stoicorum*

##### Critical Edition

Cicero. *Paradoxa Stoicorum*. Edited by Otto Plasberg in *M. Tulli Ciceronis Paradoxa Stoicorum, Academicorum Reliquiae cum Lucullo, Timaeus, De Natura Deorum, De Divinatione, De Fato*, pp. 3–26. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1908.

##### Edition with Translation

Cicero. *On Stoic Good and Evil. De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum Liber III and Paradoxa Stoicorum*. Edited and translated, with an introduction and commentary, by M. R. Wright. Warminster: Aris & Philips, 1991.

##### Editions with Commentary

Cicero. *Paradoxa Stoicorum*. Introduction and notes by A. G. Lee. London: Macmillan, 1953.

Ronnick, Michele V. *Cicero’s “Paradoxa Stoicorum”: A Commentary, an Interpretation, and a Study of Its Influence*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1991.

##### Secondary Literature

Ronnick, *Cicero’s “Paradoxa Stoicorum,”* pp. 51–71.

#### Commentary on *Acc.* 21

##### *Title*

The title *Tullii accessus* coheres with the pattern of titling in *Acc.* 5–13 and resumed in *Acc.* 20, but differs from all the other titles, except one, in preferring to position the genitive of the author’s name before the nominative *accessus*. The other case is *Acc.* 13 *Sedulii accessus*. Is this chance variation or

is there a reason for the reversal of the normal order? This title, at any rate, does not specify which work of the orator, rhetorician, and philosopher, now known by the cognomen Cicero, is introduced. Tullius is, of course, Cicero's family name, by which he was identified in the Middle Ages.

### Overview

This introduction is divided into two sections. The first (1–4) assumes a dual authorship for the *Paradoxa Stoicorum* by attributing the paradoxes that head each essay to Cato and the proofs of each paradox to Cicero. It accordingly gives a brief biography of the primary author, Cato, and explains how Cicero became the secondary author. The second section (5–10) analyzes the work according to the modern scheme of headings beginning with *subject matter*. This analysis becomes twofold when a double *intention* is ascribed to Cicero (5). There are correspondingly two sets of answers for the headings *utility* (7, 9) and *part of philosophy* (10).

1. “Cato”: On Cato Uticensis, see *Acc.* 5.1 and note on 5.3. He made his first trip to Greece (Macedonia) as a military tribune in the year 67 BC at the age of twenty-eight. According to Plutarch (*Cat. Min.* 10), he took a two-month leave to study philosophy in Pergamon under the Stoic Athenodorus Cordylion, having already begun his philosophical studies in Rome under the Stoic Antipater of Tyre. It is unclear from what source the *accessus* knows about Cato's study of philosophy in Greece. The only Latin notices are in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 7.113, and Solinus, *Collectanea rerum mirabilium* 1.122, but the *accessus* does not draw on them. For the pattern of studying Latin in Rome and advancing to higher education in Greece, see *Acc.* 10.1–2.

“He went into the sect of the Stoics and attained perfection in it”: in the preface to the *Paradoxa*, Cicero expresses the opinion that Cato was the perfect Stoic (2, *perfectus mea sententia Stoicus*), an idea that he likewise expresses in the *Brutus* 31.120.

2. “He pronounced many maxims (*sententias*) in the senate”: the writer of the *accessus* appears to simplify the first sentence of Cicero's preface to the *Paradoxa* (1): “I have often observed, Brutus, that your uncle Cato, when he was stating his opinion (*sententiam*) in the senate, handled serious arguments from philosophy (*locos graues ex philosophia*).” In classical Latin, the word *sententia* could be used variously for an opinion expressed in the Roman senate, for a pithy saying, or for a philosophical proposition, which in Greek was known as a *paradoxon*.

“And proved the truth of the maxims he had pronounced”: the idea that Cato proved these propositions true is an interpretation of the rest of

Cicero's first sentence in which he explains that Cato made his philosophical arguments seem plausible even to the general public: *ut illa etiam populo probabilia uiderentur*.

3. The idea that Cato's maxims came under attack appears to be an inference based on the tradition that Julius Caesar wrote two books of invective against Cato (*Anticato* or *Anticatones*) in response to Cicero's eulogy *Cato*, which praised the dead sage (see Cic. *Ad Att.* 12.40.1; Suet. *Iul.* 56). Other possible sources for Caesar's attacks on Cato are Juvenal (6.338), Priscian (*GL* 2:227.2), and Martianus Capella who mentions them as an example of vituperation opposed to Cicero's work of praise (5.468; see Remigius, *Comm. in Mart. Cap.* 234.7). The testimonia to and fragments of Caesar's *Anticato* are in Klotz, *Commentarii*, pp. 185–88.

4. "Brutus": Marcus Junius Brutus, the future assassin of Julius Caesar, was the nephew of Cato and the addressee of *Paradoxa* as well as of the rhetorical treatise *Brutus*, which Cicero authored earlier in the year 46 BC. No ancient source supports the statement that Brutus asked Caesar to prove the propositions of Cato true. Furthermore, Cicero does not indicate in his preface that Cato is dead; therefore, Brutus's alleged motive for requesting the work (defense of Cato after his death) is anachronistic. The idea that Brutus asked Cicero to defend Cato's propositions could have been motivated by the tradition that Cicero wrote a panegyric for Cato. This work (*Cato*) was lost to the Middle Ages and may have therefore been identified with the *Paradoxa*. In the preface of the *Paradoxa*, Cicero states his intention to rival Cato in adapting Stoic propositions to his own style of oratory but does not indicate that he is proving propositions formulated by Cato or disproving those of his enemies.

5. "And so wishing to give all that is required at the request of this man" (*cuius itaque rogatu satis facere uolens*): Huygens prefers the variant *rogatui* in M. The text of T is sounder. *Rogatus* appears only in the ablative (*rogatu*) in classical Latin and is perfectly Ciceronian (*OLD*, s.v. *rogatus*). For a request motivating the composition of a work, see *Acc.* 6.2, 18.7.

"In this little work" (*in hoc opusculo*): Cicero refers to the work as *hoc paruum opusculum* (*Parad.* 5).

8. "Both to be of use and to give delight" (*et prodesse et delectare*): this is a variation on the Horatian dictum used of poets who "want either to give delight or to be of use" (*Ars* 333, *aut delectare uolunt aut prodesse*); see *Acc.* 6.7 with note; 9.3, 26.23.

10. "He is classified under speculative philosophy because of ethics" (*Per ethicam subponitur theorice*): this is the only example of such a philosophical classification in the *Accessus ad auctores*; *theorica* appears to be



synonymous *ethica* as one of the three parts of philosophy (ethical, dialectical, and physical).

“He is classified under logic” (*loyce subponitur*): for other works in the *Accessus ad auctores* that pertain to the dialectical branch of philosophy, see *Acc.* 27.14 and *Acc.* 29.4.

## 22. Cicero’s *Paradoxes* [*Paradoxa Stoicorum*]

Another *accessus* to Cicero’s *Paradoxa Stoicorum* is copied in Clm 19475. This is the third occasion in the *Accessus ad auctores* when two introductions to the same work are paired together (see *Acc.* 1 and 2 on Ovid’s *Heroides* and *Acc.* 3 and 4 on Prudentius’s *Psychomachia*). This time, however, the scribe continues to copy the annotations to Cicero’s text and so imports into the framework of the *Accessus ad auctores* a segment of commentary on Cicero’s preface to the work and the first *Paradox* (the first fifteen chapters), which happens to be the longest continuous extract in the *Accessus ad auctores*. The presence of the commentary shows that the compilers of T were drawing from other sources besides *accessus* anthologies, but its inclusion within the *Accessus ad auctores* raises questions about the purpose of the Tegernsee anthology and the events that shaped its compilation. One answer may be that they were interested in how Cicero introduced his own work, perhaps as a model for their own critical activity. The commentary aims to explain the sense of the text with a combination of lexical glosses, rhetorical exegesis, and “historical” clarification. Not surprisingly, the rhetorical comments are indebted to Cicero’s *De inuentione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, which was attributed to Cicero.

### Text of *Acc.* 22

Clm 19475 (T), fols. 10ra.23–12ra.21.

### Editions of *Acc.* 22

The *accessus* and selections of the commentary on the preface and first *Paradox* are in Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 38–40; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 45–46. Of the 230 lines of commentary in T, Huygens edited 103 in eight different selections: 10rb.14–26; 10va.18–28; 10vb.12–18; 10vb.22–26; 10vb.30–11ra.6; 11ra.18–27; 11va.5–11vb.17. He left eight sections of text unpublished: 10rb.27–10va.18; 10va.28–10vb.12; 10vb.28–22; 10vb.27–30; 11ra.6–11; 11ra.17–18; 11ra.27–11va.5; 11vb.17–12ra.21.



Commentary on *Acc.* 22*Overview*

The *accessus* begins with a methodological statement about the three headings it will use to analyze Cicero's work (1), and then proceeds to treat the *title of the work* (2–4), *what is discussed* (5), and *in what manner* (6–9). In contrast to *Acc.* 21, this *accessus* does not introduce the *Paradoxa* as the maxims of Cato; it paraphrases the second half of the preface to the work in which Cicero explains his intention to popularize maxims that run contrary to common opinion. The commentary on the *Paradoxa* covers its preface (10–47) and the first *Paradox* (48–101).

1. This introduction has only three questions to examine and so is comparable in its brevity to *Acc.* 1 and *Acc.* 3. The headings “what is discussed” (*de quo agatur*) and “in what way” (*qualiter*) are not used elsewhere in the *Accessus ad auctores*, but correspond to the headings of *materia* and *modus agendi* or *tractandi* (on which see the note on *Acc.* 14.3). A similar set of headings is found in an *accessus* to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* transmitted with the thirteenth-century “Vulgate” commentary, on which see Coulson, *Vulgate Commentary*, p. 13.

4. *Paradoxa* is the plural of the substantival neuter adjective *paradoxon* in Greek.

“Surprising . . . glory” (*admirabilis gloria*): the Greek word *doxa* can mean “glory,” but in the compound (*para + doxa*) it means “belief.” The compound means “contrary to belief,” as is correctly explained. The etymological interpretation that Cicero gained glory by making things plain and clear that seemed foreign and strange to others corresponds to his intention to illuminate Stoic propositions so that they win popular acceptance (*Parad.* 4).

7. The third topic of the *accessus* concerns the order of the discourse and is devoted to explaining why Cicero begins his treatise with a prologue. The aim to make the listener attentive, ready to learn, and well disposed (*attentus, docilis, beneuolus*) is, of course, a prefatory commonplace (see *Acc.* 5.11 with its note), but Cicero may have been viewed as the ultimate authority for this rhetorical practice (see *Rhet. Her.* 1.4.6; *Inu.* 1.15.20).

“Receiving” (*Accipiens*): the quotation is incorrect. Cicero says *accipies* (“you will receive”).

9. For Brutus as addressee of Cicero's discourse, see *Acc.* 21.4 with note.

11. I have translated the Ciceronian clause *cum in senatu sententiam diceret* (properly, “when he was giving an *opinion* in the senate”) to reflect the medieval commentator's semantic interpretation of *sententia* as “maxim.” The commentator then excerpts the definition of a *sententia* as “maxim” from

*Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.17.24, *sententia est oratio sumpta . . . ostendit*) but varies one of the examples. Here the exemplary maxim begins “That man is free who . . .” (*liber est iste*), which simplifies the source: “He must be thought a free man (*liber is est existimandus*) who is a slave to no disgrace.”

14–24. Huygens omits the commentary from *Abhorrentes* to *Sed nihil* in his editions.

17. “The connection” (*continuatio*): this technical term of commentators appears repeatedly in the commentary (see 24, 39, 53, 93, 100) to denote the thread of the argument. On the widespread use of this term in commentaries, see Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, pp. 4–5 and p. 5n1. Coulson, *Vulgate Commentary*, pp. 10 and 117, observes that *continuatio* is used in the “Vulgate” commentary on Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* to explain the logical link between one episode and another. A variation of the term *continuatio* appears in *Acc.* 24.3 to denote the connection between the two parts of Priscian’s grammar on morphology and syntax.

18. “An elaboration of a theme” (*expolicio*) is a figure of speech dealt with in the *Rhet. Her.* 4.42.54: “Elaboration of theme is when we dwell on the same topic and seem to say one thing and another” (*expolitio est cum in eodem loco manemus et aliud atque aliud dicere uidemur*). The medieval commentator rephrases and simplifies the source.

24. “Because *nothing*”: there is no verb that follows, and so it appears that the commentator expects the reader to supply the corresponding text in Cicero.

30. “Or alternatively” (*Vel aliter*): this is the commentator’s way of signposting a comment from a different source: see note to *Acc.* 8.7.

31. According to Cicero, Cato followed Stoic practice in using rhetorical embellishments when speaking on profound themes such as the mind, self-control, death, the glory of virtue, the gods, or love of country, but otherwise not.

34. “Cicero says in his *Rhetoric*”: the work referred to is *De inuentione*; the alleged quotation of 2.15.48 is fairly close to the transmitted text, but there are differences in word order and variations in diction.

39. “I will state five such paradoxes”: Cicero, in fact, presents six paradoxes in his work.

41. The work that Cicero composed in early 46 and dedicated to Brutus is the rhetorical treatise now known as the *Brutus* and not the *Tusculan Disputations*, which was written a year later.

43. “*Tetica*”: the lemma in the excerpted commentary reflects a variant reading in the textual transmission of the *Paradoxa* (see the critical apparatus of Plasberg’s edition). The preferred reading attested in the manuscripts is the

Greek adverb ΘΕΤΙΚΩΣ, referring to the mode of Stoics debate in the form of propositions. However, the reading ΚΤΗΤΙΚΑ (*ktêtika*) also appears in the manuscripts and is the subject of this comment, which interprets the word to mean esoteric principles that were not even discussed in the schools and hence especially intractable.

45. “On the citadel” (*in arce*): the explanation of this topographical term is correct for Rome, the *arx* being the highest part of the Capitoline Hill, but Cicero means the Acropolis of Athens, where Pheidias’s chryselephantine statue of Athena Parthenos was placed in the Parthenon temple. The evidence for a public library on Rome’s Capitoline is meager and late. The fifth-century Christian historian Orosius (*Hist.* 7.16.3) records a lightning strike on the Capitoline in AD 181 that set fire to the public library “assembled with the care and devotion of earlier generations.” Some scholars assume that the public library had been restored after fires on the Capitoline in the first century, but it seems unlikely that medieval scholars had evidence for the existence of such a library in Cicero’s time.

46. “Which was stored away there”: the commentator erroneously thinks that Pheidias’s statue of Athena (Minerva) was in Rome.

50. “In particular against Epicurus”: Cicero does not represent his first essay specifically as an attack on Epicureanism, but he does refute the idea that pleasure is the highest good, which is an Epicurean tenet expounded in the first book of Cicero’s *De finibus bonorum et malorum* (“On the Ends of Good and Evil”) and then criticized in the second book.

64. “The following line”: the commentator has already paraphrased the content of the following sentence in *Parad.* 7, which shows that riches and pleasure are not good because bad men possess them and good men do not.

68. “Rather coldly” (*le<n>tius*): The copyist of T wrote *letius*, which would mean “rather joyfully,” but the following gloss of the word clearly explains the adverb *lentius*, which is the only attested reading in the manuscripts of the *Paradoxa*. In abbreviating the lemmatized text, the scribe has left out a stroke over the *e*.

69. “(They must) be illuminated” (*illustranda*): the seven manuscripts in Plasberg’s recension of *Paradoxa* agree that the reading is *inlustrata*, but the text of F (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, San Marco 257, saec. IX) has been corrected to read *inlustranda*. The reading in T is therefore based on a different textual tradition that agrees with the correction in the Florentine manuscript.

78–79. The Greek glosses *orne* and *ciphi* are garbled: *ciphi* could conceivably have come from *skaphai*.

81. Cicero briefly alludes to the legend of the foundation of the Roman

Republic, in which Lucius Junius Brutus liberated Rome from the rule of the Tarquins because one of the sons of King Tarquinius Superbus raped the noblewoman Lucretia. The commentator cites as a historical source Ovid's *Fasti* (2.720–852), a work read in the grammar curriculum (see *Acc.* 19). However, Ovid does not identify the son of Tarquinius Superbus by the name *Arruns*; in fact, he does not specify which of Tarquin's three sons (Arruns, Sextus, or Titus) raped Lucretia. Modern scholars assume, however, that Ovid means Sextus, because he reworks the account of Livy who identifies the perpetrator as Sextus (1.57–60). The commentator, on the other hand, apparently does not know Livy's version and follows a variant reported in Servius's note on *Aen.* 8.646 in which the rapist is identified as Arruns.

82. "Mucius Quintus": the commentator clearly does not know the story or even proper nomenclature of C. Mucius (Scaevola), to whom Cicero refers in *Parad.* 12, but invents the story that Mucius killed the Etruscan king Porsenna at night. The point of the original story (see Livy 2.12–13.1) is that Mucius failed to kill Porsenna. He was captured and showed his fearlessness for his own safety by holding his right hand in fire.

83. "Cocles" (*Coolitem*): the transmission of the name Cocles has been corrupted.

"Samnites": The commentator assumes that Horatius Cocles defended Rome from the Samnites rather than the Etruscans. Cicero does not specify the enemy, but the close association with Mucius implies that Cocles defended Rome against Porsenna, as attested in Livy 2.10.

83–84. The wounding of Cocles in the thigh, as well as his limp and later pride in his disability, derive from a different tradition than the Livian one; apparently, the commentator is drawing on material found in Servius's commentary on *Aen.* 8.646 (ed. Thilo, vol. 2, p. 292.8–14), where the cognomen *Cocles*, which usually means "one-eyed person" (*OLD*, s.v. *cocles*), is explained etymologically from the wounding of the hero's hip (*coxa*).

85–86. In 340 BC, P. Decius Mus ritually sacrificed himself in battle against the Latins (not the Samnites); in 295, his son did the same against the Gauls who were allied with the Samnites.

87. Gaius Fabricius Luscinus was renowned for his refusal to be bribed by Pyrrhus, when he was consul in 282 BC. The anecdote that he refused the gold of an embassy of Samnites (the commentary has Sabines) confuses him with Manius Curius Dentatus (see Cic. *De sen.* 16.55–56; Valerius Maximus *De factis dictisque memorabilibus* 4.3.5), who defeated both the Samnites and Sabines. However, the confusion of the commentator is not medieval; it goes back to antiquity. The note on Fabricius is clearly derived from Servius's in *Aen.* 6.844, which is also transmitted in the Remigian commentary on

Prudentius, *Contra Symm.* 2.558 (Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*, pp. 165–66).

88. “Gaius and Publius Scipio”: Gnaeus Cornelius Scipio Calvus and his brother Publius fought against the Carthaginians and died in Spain in 211 BC.

89. “Circumlocution” (*circuitio*): the commentator explains the Ciceronian metaphor “bulwarks of the Punic War” as though it were the “bulwarks of the Scipios,” and so construes it as the figure of speech *circumitio* (*periphrasis*) explained with the following example in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.32.43): “The foresight of Scipio broke the power of Carthage” (*Scipionis providentia Kartaginis opes fregit*).

90. The *dum* clause lacks a verb.

91. The order of *maior* and *minor* has been reversed in the lemma, but the grandfather Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus and the grandson Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus are correctly related.

93. “These five very great and wise men”: Cicero’s list of examples, beginning with Fabricius, numbers seven.

96. “*Corinthian wealth*”: the lemma *Corinthiis opibus* is probably a scribal error rather than a variant reading in the manuscript tradition of the *Paradoxa* which transmits the text *Corinthiis operibus* (“Corinthian works of art”).

99. “Certain philosophers”: the commentator does not identify these philosophers as Stoics, but notes how their theological doctrine contrasts with the Christian belief in God who creates and rules nature.

## 23. Introduction to *Boethius [Consolation of Philosophy]*

The work introduced is the *Consolatio philosophiae* (*Consolation of Philosophy*) by Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius (ca. AD 480–ca. 524). It takes the form of a prison dialogue of five books composed alternately in verse and prose, in which the authorial persona, jailed and awaiting execution, converses in Neoplatonic terms with the personification Philosophy about how to cope with misfortune and moral dejection. Although Boethius was a Christian, he does not refer explicitly to Christianity in the *Consolatio*; rather, he shows Christians how pagan philosophical traditions may be morally edifying and point the way to salvation. The dramatic setting of the dialogue has been taken to be a reflection of the turn of fortune in Boethius’s own life, in which, after having enjoyed the highest political honors under Ostrogothic rule in Italy, he was convicted and executed in 524 by King Theoderic for conspiring with other Roman senators to restore control of Italy to the imperial court of Constantinople.

The *Consolatio* appears not to have been read much until Alcuin of

York made it a centerpiece in his educational program at the palace school of Charlemagne and the monastic school of St. Martin of Tours. By the end of the ninth century, Boethius's *Consolatio* was solidly established in the school curriculum alongside the Christian poets Juvencus, Sedulius, Arator, Prosper, Avitus, and Prudentius.<sup>92</sup> The growing importance of Boethius for Carolingian education is witnessed by numerous manuscripts copied throughout the ninth century and the rise of commentary in the ninth and tenth centuries, most notably the metrical commentary of Lupus of Ferrières and the glosses of Remigius of Auxerre.<sup>93</sup> In the same period, the *Consolatio* was translated into Old English by Alfred the Great and into Old High German by Notker of St. Gall. Over the course of the Middle Ages, the work received numerous commentaries with different emphases (literal, allegorical, and moralizing), including those of William of Conches (twelfth century), Nicholas Trevet (ca. 1300), and William of Aragon (ca. 1300). Trevet's was the most influential, surviving in more than a hundred copies while mediating the learning of William of Conches and Alfred the Great.

#### Text of *Acc.* 23

Clm 19475 (T), fol. 12ra.21–vb.14. The *accessus* originated as a compilation of earlier introductions or *Vitae* of Boethius; however, a number of changes, omissions, and additions have been made to this biographical tradition. The earlier *Vitae* appear together as prefatory matter in three manuscripts, one of which, Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 179, fol. 1, dates to the end of the ninth century.<sup>94</sup> These lives (*Vita* I, IV, V) were first edited by Rudolf Peiper, pp. xxx–xxxiv.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 23

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 40–42; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 47–48.

#### Selected Bibliography on Boethius's *Consolatio philosophiae*

##### Critical Edition

Boethius. *De consolatione philosophiae*. Edited by Claudio Moreschini as *Boethius, De consolatione philosophiae, Opuscula theologica*. 2nd ed. Munich: G. K. Saur, 2005.

##### Translation

Boethius. *The Consolation of Philosophy*. Translated by P. G. Walsh. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

## Commentaries

- Boethius. *Consolatio philosophiae*. Edited by James J. O'Donnell. 2 vols. Bryn Mawr, PA: Bryn Mawr College, 1990.
- Eriugena, John Scottus, and Remigius of Auxerre. *Saeculi noni auctoris in Boetii Consolationem philosophiae Commentarius*. Edited by E. T. Silk. Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1935.
- Gruber, Joachim. *Kommentar zu Boethius, "De consolazione philosophiae."* 2nd ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.

## Medieval Reception

- Bolton, Diane K. "Remigian Commentaries on the 'Consolation of Philosophy' and Their Sources." *Traditio* 33 (1978): 381–93.
- Courcelle, Pierre. *La Consolation de Philosophie dans la tradition littéraire: antécédents et postérité de Boèce*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1967.
- Gibson, Margaret T. "Boethius in the Carolingian Schools." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 32 (1982): 43–56.
- , ed. *Boethius: His Life, Thought and Influence*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.
- Kaylor, Noel Harold. *The Medieval Consolation of Philosophy*. New York: Garland, 1992.
- Nauta, Lodi. "The Scholastic Context of the Boethius Commentary by Nicholas Trevet." In *Boethius in the Middle Ages: Latin and Vernacular Traditions of the Consolatio philosophiae*, edited by Maarten J. F. M. Hoenen and Lodi Nauta, pp. 41–67. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Troncarelli, Fabio. *Tradizioni perdute: la "Consolatio philosophiae" nell'alto medioevo*. Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1981.
- Wittig, Joseph. "The 'Remigian' Glosses on Boethius's *Consolatio philosophiae* in Context." In *Source of Wisdom: Old English and Early Medieval Studies in Honour of Thomas D. Hill*, edited by Charles D. Wright, Frederick M. Biggs, and Thomas N. Hall, pp. 168–200. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Commentary on *Acc.* 23*Overview*

The *accessus* combines the materials of four different introductions. (The first section (1–8) is a *life of the author*, which corresponds in length and detail to *Vita* I in Peiper's edition (pp. xxx–xxxii). The second section (9–12) takes the form of an abbreviated modern introduction investigating Boethius's *Consolatio* according to *intention* and *part of philosophy*; the ethical approach to reading Boethius echoes the *accessus* to Ovid and Prudentius in *Acc.* 1.3, 2.6, 4.13, and 4.14. The third section (13–16) deals with the



imperial dating of Boethius's lifetime and is based on *Vita* IV.1–10 in Peiper (p. xxxiii) but omits the last lines (10–12) because they overlap with material already presented from *Vita* I.13–15. The final section (17–24) begins with the *title* of the work and selectively reproduces part of *Vita* V (1–2 and 10–25 in Peiper, pp. xxxiii–xxxiii), which gives an etymological explanation of Boethius's nomenclature; the format of this section closely parallels the introduction to the *Consolatio* in Bern, Burgerbibliothek 179, fol. 1 (see Peiper, p. viii).

1–2. The view that Theoderic ruled harshly over the Romans comes from a (hostile) tradition that applied only to the last years of his rule (523–26), largely as a result of the trial and execution of Boethius. This tradition is reflected in the vulgar Latin chronicle known as the *Excerpta Valesiana* or *Anonymus Valesianus* (14.83–96). However, the first thirty years of Theoderic's rule (493–522), were usually praised for their prudence and peace.

3. The sentence summarizes Boethius's self-defense in *Cons.* 1.4. The first charge against Boethius, an offense against the majesty of the state (*crimen maiestatis*), was that he tried to protect the senate from the charge of traitorous dealings with Constantinople (1.4.5–6); for the hostility of Theoderic against the senate, see *Cons.* 1.4.32.106–10. Also relevant is the report of the trial in the *Excerpta Valesiana* 14.85–86, especially line 86, in which Theoderic chooses to believe false witnesses against Albinus and Boethius rather than the senators themselves: “But the king was directing his plot [*dolum*] against the Romans and was investigating how he might kill them.”

“Who could not be overcome by entreaties and bribery” (*precibus et precio inuincibilis fuit*): this is an interpolation into the traditional material of *Vita* I that may reflect Ovid's presence in the school canon. The adjective *inuincibilis* is a gloss of Boethius's family name *Anicius* (see 20 below), and this “unconquerability” may be compared to Ovid's Lucretia. Huygens notes that the wordplay of *precibus et precio* is an allusion to Ovid, *Fasti* 2.806: *nec prece nec pretio* (“neither by entreaty nor by bribery”), where Lucretia defends her chastity as a representative of Rome against the tyranny of the Tarquins. The same story is recalled in the preceding commentary to Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum* (*Acc.* 22.81).

4. The second charge against Boethius was traitorous dealings with an enemy (*crimen perduellionis*). Allegedly, he sent secret letters to Constantinople to free Italy from Ostrogothic rule. Boethius, however, claims that the letters were forged and hence the strongest proof of his innocence; see *Cons.* 1.4.26. Theoderic's “very unholy hands” is a reference to his Arianism. In the



hostile tradition he was represented as a heretic who attempted to oppress the Catholics in Rome.

5. Boethius says that the third charge against him was practicing magic (*crimen sacrilegii*), which he attributes to a misunderstanding of his interest in philosophy; see *Cons.* 1.4.37–41.

“Ordered him to be sent away to prison in Pavia” (*iussit eum in carcerem Papie retrudi*): see Genesis 41:10. The location of the prison in Pavia is not mentioned in *Vita* I.9.

6–7. The late fifth-century author Martianus Minneus Felix Capella wrote his encyclopedic work on the seven liberal arts (usually titled *De nuptiis philologiae et Mercurii*) as a prosimetric Menippean satire. Boethius not only imitates the form of this work but alludes to it frequently: see Gruber, *Kommentar zu Boethius*, p. 18. Martianus’s encyclopedic work comprises nine books, the first two of which concern the myth of Philology’s ascent to heaven, apotheosis, and marriage to Mercury; the remaining books individually introduce the seven liberal arts (the medieval *trivium* grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric, followed by the *quadrivium* geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music).

6. “As a prosimetric satire” (*per satyram*): the genre is Menippean satire, a literary composition consisting of a miscellany of prose and verse (see *OLD*, s.v. *satura* 3b).

9–10. The intention of Boethius is identified with what Philosophy says to the prisoner in *Cons.* 2.4.24–27.

9. “To the contempt of temporal things” (*ad contemptum temporalium*): see *Acc.* 4.13.

11. For Boethius’s life as an example of changing fortune, see *Cons.* 2.1.9; 2.2.1–14 (speech of Fortuna); 2.4.1–2. On moral exemplarity, see Abraham in *Acc.* 4.14.

12. On good and bad moral behavior, see *Acc.* 2.6.

13–16. The imperial dating of Boethius’s lifetime is incorrect. Boethius lived under the emperors Zeno, Anastasius, and Justin I. Marcianus was emperor a generation earlier in the years 450–57. The *accessus* is correct that the Council of Chalcedon (451) took place under Marcianus, but the inference that Boethius was alive at this time because he wrote a theological treatise, *Contra Eutychen et Nestorium* (“Against Eutyches and Nestorius”), is false. In this work, Boethius argues theologically for the Chalcedonian dogma that Christ has two natures united in one person, in response to the heresies of Eutyches and Nestorius—the former taught that Christ has one nature and is one person, the latter that Christ has two natures and is two persons. Boethius, however, does not explicitly mention the Council of Chalcedon, but rather

refers to a letter written by eastern bishops to Pope Symmachus in 512 on how to steer a middle course between the Eutychians and the Nestorians.

14. The sequence of the first four ecumenical councils is not well transmitted in Clm 19475, but comparison with *Vita IV* enables the text to be restored. The information in *Vita IV*, however, misidentifies the third ecumenical council with Ariminium (Rimini) rather than Ephesus (431). There was a council in Ariminium in 359, but it notoriously agreed to an Arian definition of Christ's nature, which was later rejected.

15. "He published the book *On the Holy Trinity* [and] *Against Eutyches and Nestorius*": the title of the work given in T (*De sancta trinitate contra Nestoridem et Euticen*) apparently conflates two different theological treatises by Boethius (*Opuscula theologica* I and V); it also gives a variant title of the latter. See the fragmentary notice of Cassiodorus in the *Anecdoton Holderi* confirming that Boethius wrote the book *De sancta trinitate* and the book *Contra Nestorium*, in Usener, *Anecdoton Holderi*, 4.14–16.

17. "A senator by virtue of his great service" (*ex magno officio uiri clarissimi*): this part of the title creatively expands the abbreviated titlature *ex mag(istro) officiorum* ("formerly chief of the civil service") found in some manuscripts. Boethius held the position *magister officiorum* under King Theoderic in Ravenna during the 520s.

"Illustrious in his exconsular and patrician rank" (*illustris exconsulum ordine atque patricio*): this formulation involves a creative expansion of the abbreviated titlature *inlust(ris) ex cons(ule) ord(inario) atque patricio* ("illustrious as former consul regular and patrician") to specify Boethius's high rank (he was *consul ordinarius* in the year 510).

18. This scheme for the description of the *Consolatio* appears to have been taken from Boethius's translation of Porphyry's *Isagoge* ("Introduction to Aristotle's *Categories*"). It is possible that the *accessus* is directing the student to analyze the *Consolatio* in terms of the five "predicables" (*praedicabilia*) or universals. *Genus*, *species*, *property*, *specific difference*, and *accident* represent the five possible things that can be said about a subject. This system of logic (which forms the basis of scholasticism) was thoroughly routinized by the twelfth century, as the Latin abbreviations in T indicate.

19–24. The method of analyzing the names of Boethius etymologically may derive from Remigius of Auxerre. He begins his commentary on Martianus Capella by explaining the roots of the four names of Martianus: see *Comm. in Mart. Cap.* 66.1–13.

"Alternate names" (*pronomina*): the corresponding text in *Vita V* reads *pronomina* ("forenames"). *Pronomen* literally means "pronoun" but apparently refers to names used *instead of* Boethius. The genealogical signals sent by

Boethius's polyonymy (comprising two *nomina gentilicia* and two *cognomina*) are still being picked up in the Middle Ages, but they are taken to be signs of his moral character (*nomen omen*).

20. Boethius was a member of the Anician family (*gens Anicii*), the noblest Roman Christian family of his time.

“The Fabii were called Anicii, as it were ‘invincible’” (*quasi inuicti*): the Fabii were not known in antiquity as Anicii, but they may have been known as *inuicti*. Manilius says in the *Astronomica* “Fabius was invincible through delay” (1.791, *inuictusque mora Fabius*), referring to Q. Fabius Maximus Cunctator, who saved Rome by delaying battle against Hannibal. If Fabius was called *inuictus*, this epithet may have been used to gloss the false Greek etymology of *Anicius* as *a* + *nikêtos* (“invincible”); see 3 above.

21. “Or he was called Anicius . . .”: the sentence should explain why Boethius is called Manlius rather than suggesting that Boethius performed the deed of Manlius Torquatus. If one compares *Vita* V.16–19, the beginning of the same sentence reads: “Moreover, he was called Manlius from Manlius Torquatus who was called Torquatus” (*dictus est autem Manlius a Manlio Torquato qui Torquatus dictus est*). In some manuscripts Boethius is given the additional name Torquatus. However, in this *accessus* the summary of how Titus Manlius defeated the Gauls in 361 BC, a story reported in Florus (1.8.20) and Jordanes (*De summa temporum* 139), explains how Boethius received the name Anicius.

23. “Boethius derives from the Greek word *boethos*”: the Greek is transmitted falsely as *boethes*. The name Boethos is a common one for Greek philosophers, meaning “assistant” or “ally.” Boethius inherited his cognomen from his father who was consul in 487.

24. “He was called Ordinarius because he had been ordained as a consul”: in some manuscripts, Boethius is referred to as “Ordinarius,” meaning that he was a *consul ordinarius* in 510.

## 24. <Introduction to> *Priscian [Institutiones grammaticae]*

The work introduced is the last two books of the *Institutiones grammaticae* (*Institutes of Grammar*) by the grammarian Priscianus Caesariensis (*fl.* early sixth century AD). The *Institutiones* consists of eighteen books that were generally transmitted and glossed in the Middle Ages in two parts. The first sixteen books were known as the *Priscianus maior* (“Greater Priscian”) and dealt first with sounds, syllables, and orthography and then with the morphology of the eight parts of speech. The final two books were called the *Priscianus minor* (“Lesser Priscian”) or *De constructione* (“On syntax”) and

discussed the arrangement of Latin words into sentences. Priscian taught Latin in Constantinople and aimed to provide the Greek-speaking Eastern Roman Empire with a systematic treatment of Latin grammar based on the linguistic theory of the Greek grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus and his son Herodian; his efforts, however, bore fruit not in the Byzantine East but in the medieval West.

Priscian, along with Aelius Donatus, provided the basis for the instruction of Latin grammar in medieval schools and eventually stimulated the development of logical and theological thought. Priscian's *Institutiones* were one of the most frequently copied works in the Middle Ages; according to the most recent surveys, over eight hundred manuscripts survive (*Brill's New Pauly*, s.v. Priscianus). In the Carolingian age, Priscian's grammar received numerous glosses, mostly anonymous, that established him as an author to be studied in the schools; in the same period, he was grouped with other authors in school handbooks and appeared in library catalogues (e.g., at Reichenau). In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, glossators became interested in submitting Priscian to logical analysis, the most notable examples of which are the anonymous early twelfth-century *Glosule super Priscianum maiorem* ("Commentary on the Greater Priscian"), *Glose super Priscianum* of William of Conches, and the *Summa super Priscianum maiorem* ("A Systematic Summary on the Greater Priscian") of Petrus Helias.<sup>95</sup> A generation later, Ralph of Beauvais and his school explicated Priscian anew by turning their attention to the "Lesser Priscian" on syntax and using the authors of the twelfth-century medieval curriculum to illustrate grammatical points: hence the gloss of Priscian titled *Promisimus* includes quotations from the school authors "Cato," Avianus, "Homer," Theodolus, Maximianus, the *Achilleid* of Statius, Ovid (but not the *Tristia*), Horace, Virgil, Lucan, Persius, and Juvenal.<sup>96</sup>

#### Text of *Acc.* 24

Clm 19475, fols. 12vb.15–13rb.27.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 24

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 42–43; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 48–49.

#### Selected Bibliography on Priscian

##### Critical Edition

Priscian. *Institutiones*. Edited by Martin Hertz as *Prisciani grammatici Caesariensis Institutionum grammaticarum libri XVIII*. 2 vols. *GL* 2–3.

## Medieval Reception

- Gibson, Margaret. "Milestones in the Study of Priscian, circa 800–circa 1200." *Viator* 23 (1992): 17–33.
- Hunt, R. W. *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Collected Papers*, pp. 1–116. Edited by G. L. Bursill-Hall. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1980.
- Irvine, Martin. "Medieval Grammatical Theory and Chaucer's *House of Fame*." *Speculum* 60 (1985): 850–76.

Commentary on *Acc.* 24*Title*

The *accessus* is simply headed by the truncated form of Priscian's name: *Prisciañ*, which probably stands for *Prisciani* rather than *Priscianus*. Which part of the work is introduced is addressed in the *accessus*.

## Overview

In its first section (1–5), the *accessus* to the "Lesser Priscian" addresses the problem of the division of Priscian's *Institutiones* into two parts: the "Greater Priscian" on the eight parts of speech and the "Lesser" on syntax. It argues that they form one work. A new introduction is consequently not necessary but desirable because the "Lesser Priscian" is the summation of the work. The second section (6–14) analyzes the "Lesser Priscian" according to four headings: *subject matter*, *intention*, *method*, *order of treatment* (see *Acc.* 13.10). The final section (15–16) concludes by explicating the meaning of *ars grammatica* ("art of grammar"), which was a common alternate title for Priscian's *Institutiones*.

1. "Just as the book of Psalms is still regarded as one book, although they are regarded as various (books) according to the declaration of some saints": Huygens, (*Accessus* [1970], p. 48), observes that this a reference to Saint Jerome's second preface to his translation of the Psalms in the Vulgate, where he says: "I know that some think that the psaltery was divided into five books . . . I, however, would claim that it is one volume" (my translation of Latin text in *Biblia sacra*, ed. Weber et al., p. 769).

2. "He is the same author as in the preface": Priscian's preface takes the form of a letter to someone named Julianus who is identified as consul and patrician.

"He himself states in the beginning of his work that he will discuss the syntax or arrangement of words in the eighteenth book": this is a paraphrase of the end of Priscian's prefatory letter to Julianus, in which he lists

the contents of all eighteen books: “The seventeenth and eighteenth are about syntax or the ordering of the parts of speech amongst themselves” (*GL* 2:4).

3. “He also continues his train of thought” (*Ipse etiam continuat se*): this is a variation on the glossator’s formula *continuatio*, denoting the thread of an argument; see *Acc.* 22.17. The thread in this case is the use of Apollonius Dyscolus as a source for his linguistic theory: see *Inst.* 17.1 (*GL* 3:107): “Since we followed the authority of Apollonius in the previously published books about the parts of speech in very many respects . . .”

“To the things said above” (*ad supra dicta*): Priscian refers to the previous books with the phrase *in supra dictis* (“in the things said above”) at *Inst.* 17.2 (*GL* 3:108).

5. “Every praise must be sung at the end”: Huygens (*Accessus* [1970], p. 49) notes that this is a proverbial expression in the Middle Ages. See Walther, *Lateinische Sprichwörter*, p. 644, no. 20239.

6. “Complete syntax” (*constructio perfecta*): Priscian does not use this term in book 17.1.2 (*GL* 3:108–9) or 17.2.12 (115–16) but repeatedly focuses on the construction of a “complete sentence” (*oratio perfecta*). That said, the commentator’s notion of “complete syntax” has a source in book 18.18.135 (*GL* 3:270.11–13), where Priscian discusses absolute verbs that have complete syntax simply with a nominative. It is possible that the commentator is striving to reword Priscian’s introductory remarks in book 17.

“Socrates reads” (*Socrates legit*): this illustration does not appear in the Priscian passage cited above; the examples are: “*Plato uiuit, Aristoteles deambulat, Socrates philosophatur*” (“Plato lives, Aristotle takes a walk, Socrates philosophizes”). In book 17, Priscian uses the sentence *Aristarchus legit* (17.2.16, *GL* 3:118.7). The example *Socrates legit*, however, is a medieval invention and common in twelfth-century discourses of grammar and logic. Petrus Helias uses it to illustrate that the verb governs the subject (*Ut dico cum “Socrates legit,” ostendo actum transire a Socrate*), just as it governs an object (*Socrates legit Virgilium*).<sup>97</sup>

7. “And that we pronounce them systematically to make our meaning evident and to make the syntax complete”: proper pronunciation is not a concern of the “Lesser Priscian,” although Priscian does compare improper arrangement of words (solecism) to the improper combination of letters and syllables in words (barbarism): see *Inst.* 17.1.6 (*GL* 3:111.12–19). The concern with proper pronunciation of Latin appears to be a concern of the medieval masters teaching Priscian: see the similar remarks about improper pronunciation in William of Conches’s prologue to Priscian in Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*, pp. 132–33.

9. “He points out whom he imitated in the preceding work and whom he is going to imitate in the following”: see note on 3 above.

10. “When he is going to deal with his planned subject matter, namely the syntax of the noun and verb, he gives a preface with countless analogies”: book 17 begins by showing that the arrangement of words in a sentence is comparable to the arrangement of letters to form syllables or the arrangement of syllables to form words (17.1.2–11, *GL* 3:110–15).

11. “Next . . . he sets down a theoretical reason why the noun is placed before the verb”: Priscian discusses this point at 17.2.12–14 (*GL* 3:115–17).

“And so he treats the remaining matters, and so he finishes the first book”: Priscian sums up the remaining discussion of book 17 as “concerning the syntax of articular words and pronouns” (18.1.1, *GL* 3:210). In the case of articular words, he means those words that are used instead of articles, because Latin, unlike Greek, does not have an article. The comparative approach of Priscian, who was following a Greek grammarian and writing for a Greek-speaking audience, appears not to be of interest in this *accessus*.

13. “And here he is concerned with an intrinsic art (*de intrinseca arte*) but in the former book with an extrinsic art (*de extrinseca*)”: the distinction between an *ars extrinsecus* and *intrinsecus* was first made by Victorinus in his commentary on Cicero’s *De inuentione* (*RLM*, 170.28–29), based on his reading of Cicero’s *Topica* (2.8). Victorinus explains that the *ars extrinsecus* (literally, “art oriented toward the outside”) only provides knowledge, whereas the *ars intrinsecus* (“art oriented toward the inside”) teaches the application of what one knows. In order to know about an art’s extrinsic aspects, one must inquire into the following topics: the *kind of art* (*genus artis*), its *function* (*officium*), its *end* (*finis*), its *subject matter* (*materia*), and its *divisions* (*partes*). The headings were derived from Cicero, *De inuentione* 1.4.5, and developed by Boethius, *De differentiis topicis* 4 (PL 64:1207A–B), but Thierry of Chartres is credited with giving new impetus and scope to the distinction in his commentary on *De inuentione* in the middle of the twelfth century: for further discussion of the *ars extrinsecus* and *intrinsecus*, see Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*, pp. 122–24; Ward, “Cicero’s *De inuentione*,” p. 28; Copeland, “Ciceronian Rhetorical Tradition,” pp. 255–57.

The use of this logical distinction to differentiate books 17 and 18 is valid, if one accepts the commentator’s description of their contents: that Priscian provides background knowledge in the former and deals with the syntax of the noun and verb in the latter. William of Conches takes a different approach to Priscian. In the second redaction of his commentary on Priscian, apparently influenced by Thierry of Chartres, William declares that Priscian treated only the intrinsic art and that his own purpose is to discuss the extrinsic side of grammar. On William, see Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*, pp. 122–23, with the translation of his prefatory remarks on p. 130.



14. “We call rules that have been formed according to the opinion of the authors an extrinsic art”: this definition of *ars extrinsecus* appears idiosyncratic. Does the commentator mean that Priscian orients himself to the knowledge of other authors in book 17 such as Apollonius Dyscolus before he turns to the intrinsic art of the noun and verb in book 18?

15. “Knowledge of letters” (*literals scientia*): this definition of grammar appears to be a magisterial commonplace; Petrus Helias gives the same explanation in the *accessus* to his *Summa super Priscianum* (text quoted in Hunt, *History of Grammar in the Middle Ages*, p. 121). Here the explanation that *grammatica* is derived from the Greek word for letter (*gramma*) is not spelled out.

## 25. [Introduction to *Ovid on Love* or *Ovid without a Title* (*Amores*)]

This work by Ovid is introduced with the title *De amore* referring to the *Amores*, which was introduced earlier in T as *Ovidius sine titulo* (*Acc.* 18). The habit of compiling more than one *accessus* to a favored work has already been observed in *Acc.* 1–2, 3–4, and 20–21. In *Acc.* 25 and 26, another pair of Ovidian *accessus* are added, one on the *Amores*, the other on the *Heroides*. There may be an attempt to create a kind of ring composition in the anthology, which began with a pair of *accessus* on the *Heroides*. *Acc.* 25 also forms a pair with *Acc.* 18, and *Acc.* 26 reprises and builds on *Acc.* 1 and 2.

### Editions of *Acc.* 25

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 32–33; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 37; Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*, p. 92.

### Text of *Acc.* 25

The text is based on Clm 19475 (T), fol. 13ra.27–13va.27, but corrected with a variant in Clm 19474 (M), pp. 66–67, and an emendation by Przychocki. Cf. *Incipitarius Ovidianum*, p. 77, no. 225.

### Commentary on *Acc.* 25

#### *Title*

No title is provided for this *accessus* in T. M gives the title *Ovidius sine titulo* (“Ovid without a Title”), which Huygens (1954 and 1970) misreports as *Ovidii sine titulo*. Here the reason for a missing title may be—besides the



fact that the work is later said to be untitled—that one is not needed. The *accessus* begins two lines from the bottom of the right-hand column, the first line of which is titular. Since this line is not engulfed by text above and below, it is easy to see what the subject of the Ovidian work is before one turns the folio to continue reading the rest of the text on the verso. I supply a title for clarity from the first line of the *accessus*.

### Overview

The *accessus* has four sections. In the first section (1–3), the work is identified by the title *Ovidius de amore* and treated under two headings: *subject matter* and *final cause* (or *utility*). The second section (4–6) is devoted to the question of what the difference between the *Amores* and *Ars amatoria* is. The third section (7–9) discusses the origin of the title *Ovidius sine titulo*. The fourth section (10–12) treats the four-line prefatory epigram to the *Amores* as a prologue in the form of a *prosopopoeia*, in which Ovid explains that he had originally proposed to write an epic gigantomachy of five books but had reduced the number of books to three to avoid wearying the reader.

1. “This Ovid is called ‘On Love’” (*Iste Ovidius dicitur De amore*): the author’s name *Ovidius* is treated as though it means *Ovidii liber* (“book of Ovid”). The title *Ovidius de amore* (“Ovid on Love”) is a variant of the ancient title *Amores*, on which see *Acc.* 18.1.

2. Corinna is a notoriously inconsistent character in the *Amores*. The medieval commentator provides a reason: she is a pseudonym for Ovid’s different girlfriends. This view differs from the claim in another *accessus* (*Incipitarius Ovidianum*, p. 115, no. 394) that Corinna is a cover-name for Livia, the wife of Augustus.

3. “Final cause”: see note on *Acc.* 2.7.

“To learn rhetorical embellishments of words (*ornatus uerborum*) and their beautiful arrangements (*pulchras . . . positiones*)”: Ovid is a poet useful for learning both good rhetoric and good grammar; in the latter regard, it may be no accident that the commentator uses *positiones*, also a Priscianic word (see *GL* 3:17.24) for the arrangement of syntax.

4. The title “Ovid on Love” (*Ovidius de amore*) is also given to the *Ars amatoria* in a version of *Acc.* 14 copied in the *accessus* anthology of Pal. lat. 242; so it is necessary to distinguish the two works.

6. “This ‘Ovid on the Art of Love’ gives lessons” (*Hic dat precepta Ovidius de amatoria arte*): M deletes this sentence (as do Przychocki and Huygens), viewing it as a repetition of 5.

“This one ‘On Love,’ on the other hand, also fulfills them in his own person” (*Hic autem De amore et in semetipso complet*): The difference between the two works, then, is that “Ovid on Love” is the practical application of the lessons taught in the *Ars amatoria*; for a similar idea, see *Acc.* 26.19.

7. The new section on the title “Ovid without a Title” (*Ovidius sine titulo*) contradicts the previous discussion about “Ovid on Love,” taking material from another source. For *Ovidius sine titulo*, see the note on *Acc.* 18.1.

8. Here it is assumed that Ovid wrote the *Amores* after the *Ars amatoria* and that he did not title the work because he had offended the Roman people; for this cause motivating the composition of the *Remedia amoris*, *Fasti*, and *Heroides*, see *Acc.* 15.3–6, 19.5, and 26.21–22 with notes.

10. The idea that Ovid had planned to write an epic in five books about the war between the Olympian gods and the earth-born Giants and then reduced the number of books to three is a fanciful interpretation of the prefatory epigram to the *Amores*. There, at the start of the collection, Ovid represents the personified *Amores*, announcing their change from five books to three. Modern scholars understand the epigram to refer to Ovid’s publication of a revised, three-book edition of the *Amores* that supersedes the first edition of five books. On the reading of the *accessus*, however, the talking books have not yet given up the intention to be an epic. Support for this idea can be found in *Amores* 1.1 and 2.1, in which Ovid alleges he was writing an epic, in the latter case a gigantomachy (see 2.1.11–16). The *accessus* therefore construes the prefatory epigram as a prelude to *Amores* 1.1, in which Ovid is set to produce an epic but suffers a redirection of purpose that turns him into a love poet.

11. “He also speaks in accordance with this planned book” (*et secundum hunc propositum loquitur*): that is, a work of three books on the gigantomachic theme. In his edition of the *accessus*, Przychocki apparently makes a paleographical error by taking *hunc* for *hoc* in TM; Huygens follows Przychocki. *Hoc* makes grammatical sense if *propositum* is interpreted as the neuter noun meaning “plan,” but it is unclear what “this plan” is, whether it is the gigantomachy or the number of books. The scribe, however, wrote *hunc propositum*, which means that *propositum* must be a masculine participle modifying an understood word such as *Ovidium* (i.e., *Ovidii librum*) or *librum* (i.e., “intended book”). The demonstratives *huius* (2) and *huic* (8) are used the same way to refer to the *Ovidius de amore* that is being introduced.

12. In the prefatory epigram, the books of Ovid speak in their own voice, which is a form of *prosopopoeia*, a rhetorical device defined by Isidore as follows (*Etym.* 2.13 and 2.21.45): “*Prosopopoeia* is when both the character and speech of inanimate things are imagined.”

26. <Introduction to> *Ovid's Epistles [Heroides]*

This is the third and longest *accessus* to the *Heroides* in Clm 19475. For background about the *Heroides*, see *Acc.* 1.

Editions of *Acc.* 26

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 25–28; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 31–33; Przychocki, *Accessus Ovidiani*, pp. 80–87.

Text of *Acc.* 26

Clm 19475 (T), fols. 13va.27–14vb.19. A version of this *accessus* also appears at the head of a commentary in Freiburg im Breisgau, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 381, saec. XII, fols. 49–63 (see Munk Olsen, *Classici*, p. 49n139). A fragmentary version of it appears in Pal. lat. 242 (P), fol. 80v, and another complete example is collected in Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Barth. 110, saec. XIII, fol. 91va. See *Incipitarius Ovidianum*, p. 69, no. 185. The *accessus* in TP is discussed by Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 147–48, 158–63, and mentioned by Munk Olsen, “Ovide au moyen âge,” pp. 83–84.

Commentary on *Acc.* 26*Title*

This *accessus* is headed in majuscule by the author's name in the genitive, *Ouidii*, followed by the work's title in the genitive, *Epistolarum*. If the complete title is *Ouidius epistolarum* in the nominative, why is *Ouidius* in the genitive? Huygens in *Accessus* (1954) and (1970) assumes that there is an ellipsis of the titular word *accessus*, on which the genitives are dependent and which he supplements with angle brackets in his text. This solution is possible, but there are a number of reasons why one should refrain from printing *accessus* as though it should be in the title. The most important reason is that there is no certain example in the *Accessus ad auctores* in which there is an unmarked ellipsis of the keyword *accessus* in the title of an *accessus*. *Acc.* 1 and 3 spell out the word in full, while *Acc.* 2 and 4 signal an ellipsis with the word *item*. *Acc.* 5–13 use the term *accessus* systematically in their titles, abbreviating the word, first as *Acces.* and then eight times as *Acc.* The Ovidian *accessus* (*Acc.* 14–19), on the other hand, do not use the word *accessus* in their headings, nor do they require it. In *Acc.* 20, 21, 23, and 27, the word appears again in abbreviated form, showing that the scribes could title with it as context required. *Acc.* 22, which is excerpted from a commentary, is headed by the

title of the work *Paradoxa Tulli*. *Acc.* 24 could have an ellipsis of an *accessus* in its title, but that is uncertain. *Acc.* 25, 28, and 29 have no titles. In sum, sixteen introductions use the word *accessus* in their title; thirteen do not and do not need to. A more obvious explanation for the titling of *Acc.* 26 is at hand. The genitive form of the title was probably written and read in conjunction with the genitive *huius libri* (“of this book”) that appears just below it in the first line of the *accessus*: *In exordio huius libri* (“In the introduction to this book”). The word *exordium* is a synonym of *accessus* and governs the genitive *huius libri*. However, *huius libri* no longer specifies which book is meant because the deictic *huius* (“this”) lacks a contextual referent after the *exordium* has been excerpted from the book of the *Epistolae* it introduced. The title of *Acc.* 26, *Ouidii epistolarum*, therefore provides a grammatically correct heading in the genitive case that is in apposition to *huius libri*. There is no ellipsis of the word *accessus*, because the synonym *exordium* in the phrase *in exordio* provides the semantic and syntactic motivation for *Ouidii epistolarum*.

### Overview

The *accessus* has three sections. The first section (1–31) deals with the collection of *Heroides* as a whole and begins with a methodological statement of the six headings it will use to introduce the work: *life of the poet*, *title of the work*, *intention of the writer*, *subject matter*, *utility*, and *part of philosophy under which it is classified* (1). For the *poet’s life* (2–4), details are given about Ovid’s place of origin and family, which are partly invented and partly based on Ovid’s autobiographical letter to posterity (*Trist.* 4.10); this biographical material is usually found in introductions to the *Metamorphoses*. Under the heading of *title*, the significance of *Epistolae* is treated (5–10) and notice is taken of the alternate title *Heroides* (11–12). The *accessus* next catalogues five different explanations of Ovid’s *intention* (13–22), four of which are explicitly derived from different sources. The compiler superimposes two more kinds of intention: general and specific (23–24). The *subject matter* is treated simply (25) but is followed by three different explanations of *utility* or *final cause* (26–28). The *part of philosophy* is ethics (29). The *accessus* then characterizes the work as dramatic, according to the grammarian’s distinction between three narrative modes (30–31). The second major section of the *accessus* (32–38) gives an introduction to the first epistle, “Penelope to Ulysses.” The third section (39–41) presents a gloss of *Her.* 1.1–2.

2–4. For the tradition of Ovidian biographies from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, see Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies”; Coulson, “Hitherto Unedited Medieval and Renaissance Lives of Ovid (I),”

pp. 153–55, and “Hitherto Unedited Medieval and Renaissance Lives of Ovid (II),” pp. 111–12.

2. “Sulmo is my homeland” (*Sulmo mihi patria est*): the quotation comes from Ovid’s autobiographical letter to posterity (*Trist.* 4.10.3). Sulmo (modern Sulmona) was a city located in central Italy, where the people named Peligni had their territory. The commentator, however, thinks that *patria* refers to a region and not a city, because he goes on to make Ovid the native of the town Pelignum; see Arnulf’s *Vita Ouidii* in Ghisalberti, “Arnolfo d’Orléans,” p. 24.

3. “From the town of Pelignum” (*ex Peligno oppido*): this frequently attested medieval misconception about Ovid’s birthplace is based on a misreading of *Am.* 2.1.1: *hoc quoque composui Paelignis natus aquosis* (“I who was born in the well-watered Pelignian territory also composed this”). The substantival ethnic term *Paeligni* (“Pelignians”) looks as if it could be the name of a town but is used in the sense of “Pelignian territory”; for the usage, see McKeown, *Ovid*, p. 357 on *Am.* 2.16.37 (see bibliography for *Acc.* 18). On the mirage of the *oppidum Pelignum* and its eventual disappearance in the fourteenth century, see Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” pp. 28–29.

“He was born of a father named Publius”: this may be the earliest testimony for the common assumption that Ovid’s father had the same praenomen; see Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” p. 26.

“Pelagia”: the name of Ovid’s mother is derived fancifully from *Am.* 2.1.1 quoted above.

4. “His brother Lucius devoted himself to rhetoric” (*cuius frater Lucius ad rethoricam se contulit*): see *Trist.* 4.10.17: “My brother was inclined toward oratory from a young age” (*frater ad eloquium uiridi tendebat ab aeuo*). The name of Ovid’s brother is not attested in ancient sources.

“But he pursued his studies in the art of poetry”: see *Trist.* 4.10.19–26.

5. For the claim that Ovid was the first to write poetic epistles at Rome, see *Acc.* 2.1 with its note.

6–7. Here the commentator sets out a quadripartite typology of titles and illustrates with examples titles by subject matter, place, character, action of characters. A similar discussion of the title *Fasti* occurs in *Acc.* 19.7–9.

7. *Phormio*, *Eunuchus*, and *Heautontimoroumenos* (misspelled in T as *Auctontumerumenos*) are the titles of plays by Terence, who was also a school author equipped with ancient commentaries associated with the grammarian Donatus.

“So the Stars Act” (*Sic faciunt astra*): the title of this work by the Greek Neoplatonist philosopher Plotinus is incorrectly transmitted. It should be “If the Stars Act” (*Si faciunt astra*); the source is Macrobius’s *Commentarii in*

*Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis* 1.19.27, which renders the Greek *Ei poiei ta astra* (*Enneades* 2.3).

9. For the etymology of *epistola*, see note on *Acc.* 2.2.

11. “*Ovid’s Heroines*” (*Ouidium heroum*): the text in Latin could be restored to *Ouidium heroidum* (the correct genitive is transmitted in 17 below), but the error shows the interpretive difficulties that the Greek declension of *herois*, *heroidos* pose. The attempt to explain the genitive plural *heroum* as derived from the masculine noun *hero*, *herois* involves a number of different errors. The proper masculine nominative and genitive singular forms of the noun “hero” are *heros*, *heroos*. The form *herois* is the nominative singular feminine of “heroine” and so might prompt a commentator to think that the masculine noun can signify a noble Greek woman. Another important source for the misconception that a “hero” could be a “heroine” is Ovid’s *Heroides* themselves. The form *hero* is, in fact, the proper name Hero belonging to the well-known priestess of Aphrodite in Sestos loved by Leander, who is the subject of two Ovidian epistles (*Her.* 18–19). Although Hero’s name does not appear in the *Heroides*, it is provided in the Clm 19475 commentary (Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 289–96) and could be supplied from *Amores* 2.16.31.

12. The general explanation for the title *Heroides* is correct, but the specific definition of Greek noblewomen writing letters to their husbands fighting at Troy applies to only two of twenty letters in the collection: Penelope to Odysseus (*Her.* 1) and Laodamia to Protesilaus (*Her.* 13).

14. This *accessus* provides a different typology of love (“foolish, unchaste, and mad”) from that of the other *accessus* to the *Heroides* (“lawful, illicit, and foolish”); see *Acc.* 1.4 and 2.4–5 with notes. The intention of Ovid here is to represent immoral forms of love.

“Phyllis”: see *Her.* 2.99–101, where she resolves to commit suicide, unable to wait for Demophoon’s return.

“Hanged herself with a noose”: Phyllis does not narrate her suicide, of course, but contemplates four possibilities (drowning, poison, sword, and noose), leaving unsaid what her final choice will be (*Her.* 2.131–44). That her choice will be the noose, the last mentioned form of suicide, is knowledge that the commentator supplies from Ovid’s *Remedia amoris* (602–4).

15. “Helen”: the recipient of a letter from Paris (*Her.* 16) and the author of a reply (*Her.* 17); this epistolary exchange takes place before Paris abducts Helen from Menelaus.

17. “Alternatively” (*aliter*): this subheading (used four times in this *accessus*) signals the compilation of material from a different source; see note to *Acc.* 8.7.

19. In the *Ars amatoria*, Ovid gives advice to men (1.437–68) and to women (3.469–98) about seduction through letters. Here, the *accessus* appears to mean that Ovid does not give an example of a love letter in the *Ars* and so must demonstrate how to write one in the *Heroides*. A similar rationale for the composition of the *Amores* is presented in *Acc.* 25.6, as Ovid illustrates his lessons in his own person. This view of the *Heroides* entails an unorthodox chronology of Ovid's works. In the twelfth century, a consensus was building that the *Heroides* was Ovid's first work, because it is mentioned in *Ars* 3.345–46: see 5 above and *Acc.* 2.1 with note.

20. The alleged intention of Ovid to encourage virtues and discourage vices is implicit in *Acc.* 1 and 2 but should be compared with the moral intentions of Prudentius (*Acc.* 4.13), "Cato" (*Acc.* 5.8), and Arator (*Acc.* 11.8).

21. For the accusation that Ovid taught Roman matrons to commit adultery, see *Acc.* 16.6 with note and 18.3.

22. The idea that Ovid wrote the *Heroides* to help women avoid illicit love affairs parallels the intentions of the *Remedia amoris* (*Acc.* 15.6) and *Fasti* (*Acc.* 19.5).

23. "To take pleasure and to be of common use" (*delectari et communiter prodesse*): Huygens changes *delectari* to *delectare* presumably to make the text consistent with Horace, *Ars* 333 (*aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poetae*). New evidence has come to light, however, which supports the reading *delectari* in T: an *accessus* and commentary to the *Metamorphoses* that are attributed to the fifteenth-century humanist Giovanni Francesco Picenardi but are of twelfth-century origin according to Coulson, "Giovanni Francesco Picenardi," pp. 251–52. The text of the *accessus* is preserved in three twelfth-century manuscripts and four from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (see *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, pp. 131–32, no. 444), and has been edited in a forthcoming article by Coulson ("Hitherto Unedited Medieval and Renaissance Lives of Ovid (III)"). In Coulson's recension, the pseudo-Picenardi *accessus* attributes to Ovid the following intention in the *Metamorphoses*: *Intentio est delectari et prodesse: delectari iocunde scribendo fabulas, prodesse per explanationem fabularum que in aliis auctoribus tanguntur* ("His intention is to take pleasure and to be of use: to take pleasure in writing stories pleasantly; to be of use through the explanation of stories which are touched on in other authors"). Here the variant *delectari* is explicitly associated with writing. One may assume that it has the same meaning in 23, as well as in *Acc.* 9.3.

24. "He planned to praise certain women for their fidelity and to reproach others for unchaste love" (*quasdam de castitate <laudare>, alias de incesto amore reprehendere proposuit*): the scribe or his source has clearly



omitted an infinitive that is parallel but the antithesis to *reprehendere*. I have proposed a supplement based on 18 above, *quasdam . . . laudare de castitate sua*, which provides an exact verbal parallel. Przychocki supplies *commendare*, which Huygens adopts, probably on the basis of 17 above and *Acc.* 2.4. But in neither case is the verb *commendare* used with a direct object and a prepositional construction.

26. “The utility or final cause varies according to the intentions”: for the equivalence of *utility* with *final cause* and the preference for the latter heading in some Ovidian *accessus*, see *Acc.* 2.7. This sentence and the following two introduce five versions of utility with the subheading *uel* (“or”); these correspond to the five versions of intention presented under the subheading *aliter* (“alternatively”) in 17–20.

“How we are to seduce someone through epistles” (*uel quomodo aliquem per epistolas sollicitemus*): the text of T has not been well served by previous editors. Przychocki misreads *aliquem* as *aliquae*, emends *sollicitemus* to *sollicitentur*, and makes the text mean “how some women are seduced through epistles.” Huygens accepts Przychocki’s reconstruction of the text as does Hexter (*Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 161), who calls *sollicitemus* a slip. However, the scribe clearly wrote *aliquem* in T, which is the proper direct object of *sollicitemus*. A reexamination of T thus confirms Hexter’s suspicion that the medieval reader could find the *Heroides* useful for writing love letters. (Baudri of Bourgeuil certainly did!) This *utility* clearly corresponds to the *intention* expressed in 19, where the *Heroides* are supposed to exemplify the advice given in the *Ars amatoria* about seduction through letter writing.

28. This sentence is probably an excerpt from an *accessus* such as *Acc.* 2.7.

30. The *accessus* applies the Servian division of three types of reciting to the *Heroides*, but less systematically than in *Acc.* 20.69: see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 162n56.

On the mixed type (*misticon uel cinamicticon*), the text is lacunose and possibly corrupt: some mention of the author is required if one compares Servius on *Ecl.* 3.1.21–22 (ed. Thilo, vol. 3.1, pp. 29.21–22): “The third form is mixed [*mixtum*], as in the *Aeneid*, for both the poet and the introduced characters speak there.”

31. The *accessus* distinguishes the dramatic mode of the *Heroides* from epic by comparing the Servian division of epic speech into three types: announcing the theme, invoking, and narrating. Cf. *Acc.* 4.19, 8.11–12, 13.12, 14.6–7.

34–35. The source for the story of Ulysses’s madness appears to be Servius on *Aeneid* 2.81 (ed. Thilo, vol. 1, pp. 230.23–25).

35. Ulysses’s son Telemachus is erroneously identified as Antilochus,



who was a son of Nestor, mentioned by Penelope at *Her.* 1.15. What the participle *reuocatum* means is unclear (“called back to duty” or “called back to his senses?”), but the *accessus* uses the same verb in 38 below for Penelope’s calling Ulysses back from war.

For Ulysses’s wanderings, see *Acc.* 1.6; 2.9.

37. Penelope’s resistance to the suitors is mentioned in *Acc.* 1.7 and 2.10.

38. On Penelope’s moral exemplarity as the first letter writer, see *Acc.* 1.4.

39–40. For the explanation of the first line of Penelope’s letter (*Her.* 1.1), especially the first word *hanc*, see *Acc.* 2.11 with note.

40. Here the commentary on the *Heroides* begins and it is different from the beginning of the commentary later copied in Clm 19475, fol. 16rb (text in Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 233).

41. “Ulysses” (*Vlixē*): the form is correctly interpreted as a Greek vocative, although it is anomalous as the Latinized form of Odysseus’s name; see Knox, *Heroides*, p. 88.

42. The note on *attamen* (“nevertheless”) in *Her.* 1.2 clarifies that the two words *at* (conjunction) and *tamen* (adverb) are to be read as one word, which confirms one of the readings offered by the manuscript tradition (the other is *sed tamen*). In his note on the verse, Knox (*Heroides*, p. 88) points out that the correct reading *attinet* has only been preserved in the fourth-century metrical treatise of Aphthonius (*GL* 6:109.3 and 111.24).

## 27. Introduction to *On the Art of Poetry* [*Ars poetica*]

This *accessus* introduces the three major hexameter works by the poet Quintus Horatius Flaccus (65 BC–8 BC): the *Ars poetica* (“Art of Poetry”), *Sermones* (*Satirae*), and *Epistulae*. Horace was also the author of lyric and iambic poetry (*Odes*, *Epodes*, and *Carmen saeculare*), but these poems appear to have been studied less in the twelfth-century school curriculum than his satirical and philosophical verse. The *accessus* begins by treating the *Ars poetica*, a didactic poem of 476 lines, in which Horace instructs his youthful patrons, the Pisones, how to write a unified poem, with special attention to the form of drama.<sup>98</sup> Horace does not identify his sources nor claim to present a systematic treatment of literary theory; however, one of his ancient commentators, Pomponius Porphyrio (ca. AD 200), draws attention to the fact that he digests a didactic treatise on the art of poetry by Neoptolemus of Parium, a third-century BC philosopher who theorized in the tradition of Aristotle’s *Poetics*.<sup>99</sup> Consequently, the *Ars poetica* became an important source for Hellenistic Greek literary theory in the Middle Ages.

The second work treated in the *accessus* is the *Sermones*, a two-book collection of eighteen poems in the Roman genre of satire, which Horace composed toward the beginning of his literary career. Horace calls these poems both *Satirae* (*Satires*) and *Sermones* (literally “Conversations”), but the latter title is preferred in the *accessus*. *Sermones* designates the communicative form of the poems—monologues or dialogues in an ordinary conversational style—through which Horace ridicules Roman social practices and moral behavior: “Yet what forbids me to tell the truth with laughter?” (*Sat.* 1.1.24–25, *quamquam ridentem dicere uerum / quid uetat?*).

The third work covered by the *accessus*, the *Epistulae*, comprises two separate books of verse letters addressed to named individuals: the first book contains twenty poems; the second, two. Horace wrote the first book after the publication of the *Odes* in 23 BC, professing to turn away from lyric amusements (*Ep.* 1.1.10, *ludicra*) to address the ethics of leading one’s life: “You want to live right. Who does not?” (*Ep.* 1.6.29, *uis recte uiuere. quis non?*). The second book of *Epistulae* constitutes, by contrast, another subgenre of epistolography which is concerned with literary criticism and poetic theory.

Horace was among the first of the classical poets after Virgil to become an *auctor* in the Middle Ages. His works were zealously copied from the middle of the ninth to the sixteenth century (roughly 850 manuscripts survive) and came equipped with ancient scholia which inspired a medieval tradition of commentary on the author. Horace’s popularity in the eleventh century led Ludwig Traube to call the tenth and eleventh centuries the *aetas Horatiana*, succeeding the *aetas Vergiliana* of the eighth and ninth centuries and preceding the *aetas Ouidiana* of the twelfth and thirteenth.<sup>100</sup>

An important witness for Horace’s early adoption into the canon in the Carolingian age is furnished by the manuscript Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 363, saec. IX, produced by Irish scholars in northern Italy, which contains Servius’s commentary to Virgil and a miscellany of Horatian poetry selected from the *Odes*, *Epodes*, *Carmen saeculare*, *Ars poetica*, and *Sermones*. The Horatian works are also introduced by the second *Vita* of Pseudo-Acro, presumably modeled on the Servian prologue to the *Aeneid*.<sup>101</sup> Glauche (*Schullektüre*, p. 39) sees in this *Vita* the beginning of the institutional practice of introducing a text with short remarks about the author’s life and work that would evolve into the *accessus*. At the end of the tenth century, Horace became established as a school author through masters such as Gerbert of Reims, who taught Horace as a satirist along with Juvenal and Persius.<sup>102</sup> The three hexameter works of Horace may have evolved into a separate body of texts apart from the *Odes* as early as the eleventh century. For example, the manuscript Lucca, Biblioteca Statale, 1433, provides a commentary and text

of the *Ars poetica*, *Epistulae*, and *Sermones*, which is collected together with a commentary on the *Disticha Catonis* attributed to Remigius of Auxerre.<sup>103</sup> Another notable manuscript is Saint-Claude, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 2, saec. XI, which contains Horace's *Sermones* and *Ars poetica* after the basic readings in grammar and hexameter poetry, including Donatus, Priscian, "Cato," and "Homer."

The study of Horace was facilitated by various traditions of ancient scholia, including a late antique recension of the third-century commentary by Pomponius Porphyrio and different compilations of scholia, two of whose identifiable traditions are referred to by modern scholars as Pseudo-Acro.<sup>104</sup> The third-century grammarian Helenius Acro, to whose name these scholia were attached in the Renaissance, was known to have written a commentary on Horace that is no longer extant. Despite the great quantity of ancient scholia transmitted with the Horatian text, there continued to be a need for new commentaries in the Middle Ages geared toward contemporary education and intellectual interests.<sup>105</sup>

The omnibus introduction to Horace's three hexameter works in the *Accessus ad auctores* conforms to the twelfth-century consensus that Horace wrote the *Ars poetica* after the *Odes*, *Epodes*, and *Carmen saeculare* but before the *Sermones* and *Epistulae*. This progression of Horatian works was, in turn, correlated to the four phases of human life: the lyric works were written for boys, the *Ars poetica* for young men, the *Sermones* for full-grown men, and the *Epistulae* for older men.<sup>106</sup>

In the twelfth century, the *Ars poetica* was read as a didactic work on the virtues and vices of poetic composition and explicated in conjunction with the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*; it exercised influence on the new arts of poetry: the prose *Ars uersificatoria* by Matthew of Vendôme (ca. 1175) and the versified *Poetria noua* by Geoffrey of Vinsauf (ca. 1208–13).<sup>107</sup> The *Sermones* and *Epistulae* (the first book) came to be understood as works pertaining to moral maturation and perfection, the former concerned with the removal of vices, and the latter with the cultivation of virtues.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 27

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 43–46; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 49–53.

#### Text of *Acc.* 27

Clm 19475 (T), fols. 14vb.20–16rb.5. Huygens, *Accessus* (1970) collates a variant of this *accessus* in Sankt Florian, Bibliothek des Augustiner-Chorherrenstifts, MS XI 587 (F), saec. XIII/XIV, fols. 171v–173r. Glauche

(*Schullektüre*, p. 54n94) observes that another version appears in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 15962, saec. XIII, fols. 1v–28v, with a commentary on the *Ars poetica* and a fragmentary commentary on the *Sermones*. Munk Olsen (“Recueils,” p. 13) reports having seen comparable *accessus* to the *Sermones* in Lucca, Biblioteca Statale 1433, and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 21653, saec. XII.

Selected Bibliography on Horace’s *Ars poetica*, *Sermones*, and *Epistulae*

Critical Edition

Horace. *Ars poetica*, *Sermones*, *Epistulae*. Edited by D. R. Shackleton Bailey as *Q. Horatii Flacci Opera*. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1985.

Edition with Translation

Horace. *Satires*, *Epistles*, *Ars poetica*. Edited and translated by H. Rushton Fairclough. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Reprint, 1999.

Editions with Commentary

*Ars poetica*

Brink, C. O. *Horace on Poetry: The “Ars Poetica.”* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

*Sermones*

Horace. *Satires I*. Introduction, text, translation, and commentary by P. Michael Brown. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1993.

———. *Satires II*. Introduction, translation, and commentary by Frances Muecke. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1993.

*Epistulae*

Horace. *Epistles, Book I*. Edited by Roland Mayer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

———. *Epistles, Book II, and Epistle to the Pisones (Ars Poetica)*. Translated with an introduction by Niall Rudd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Medieval Commentaries

Marchionni, Roberta, ed. *Der Sciendum-Kommentar zu den Satiren des Horaz*. Munich: G. K. Saur, 2003.

Zechmeister, Joseph, ed. *Scholia Vindobonensia ad Horatii Artem poeticam*. Vienna: C. Gerold, 1877.

Medieval Reception

Friis-Jensen, Karsten. “The *Ars Poetica* in Twelfth-Century France: The Horace of Matthew of Vendôme, Geoffrey of Vinsauf, and John of Garland.” *Cahiers de l’Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin* 60 (1990): 319–88

- . “Horace and the Early Writers of Arts of Poetry.” In *Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, edited by Sten Ebbesen, pp. 360–401. Tübingen: G. Narr, 1995.
- . “Medieval Commentaries on Horace.” In *Medieval and Renaissance Scholarship*, edited by Nicholas Mann and Birger Munk Olsen, pp. 51–73. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- . “The Reception of Horace in the Middle Ages.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, edited by Stephen Harrison, pp. 291–304. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Reynolds, Suzanne. *Medieval Reading: Grammar, Rhetoric and the Classical Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Tarrant, Richard. “Ancient Receptions of Horace.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, edited by Stephen Harrison, pp. 277–90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

### Commentary on *Acc.* 27

#### *Title*

The title is written in miniscule by the same hand that copies the *accessus*. The formulation of the title *Accessus de arte poetica* omits Horace’s name in the genitive, but it is easily supplied from the first word of the *Accessus* which occupies the left half of the same line. The title can be translated without Horace’s name as “*Introduction on The Art of Poetry*.” As such, this title does not indicate that the *accessus* also introduces the *Satires* and *Epistles*. In any event, the title *Accessus Horatii* would have been more appropriate and consistent with the format of the other *accessus* (particularly, *Acc.* 5–13, 20–21, and 23). The fact that the title does not follow the pattern of *accessus* joined with the author’s name is a clue that it derives from a different source from the the core collection.

#### *Overview*

The *accessus* is divided into four parts. The first part (1–6) is a version of the second pseudo-Acronian *life* of Horace first attested in the late ninth-century manuscript Bern, Burgerbibliothek 363 (see Keller, *Pseudoacronis scholia*, 1:2–3), which is loosely based on Horace’s autobiographical *Sermones* 1.6. The following three parts treat the *Ars poetica* (7–23), *Sermones* (24–35), and *Epistulae* (36–55), with each part being headed by the respective work’s incipit.

The introduction to the *Ars poetica* has three sections. The first (7–14) treats the work under the headings *title*, *intention*, and *utility*, and classifies it philosophically as both ethics and logic. The second section (15–20) is concerned with the order of the discussion, which is identified as quadripartite:

what vices should be removed, what subject matter should be preferred, what kind of rhetorical embellishment should be used, and to whom a work should be submitted for correction. The third section (21–23) is concerned with making a distinction between a *poeta* and a *poetrides*, the latter term being reserved for someone who versifies something that is real and not fictive.

The introduction to the *Sermones* is divided into two sections. The first section handles only two headings, *title* (24–25 and 27–31) and *intention* (26 and 32), and is concerned particularly with how the title is to be related to Horace's intention to reproach vices. The second section (33–35) treats the special *intention* of *Sermones* 1.1 as a diatribe against avarice and fickleness.

The introduction to the *Epistulae* has four sections. The first (36–40) applies a tripartite version of the modern introductory scheme, analyzing the work's *intention*, its *subject matter*, and its philosophical affiliation to ethics. The second section (41–45) treats the etymology of *epistola* and explains how the *Epistulae* differ from the *Sermones*, observing that they encourage the pursuit of virtues more than they castigate vices. The third section (46–47) addresses the special *intention* of each letter with reference to *Epistulae* 1.1. The final section (48–55) treats the order of discussion in the first letter according to a quadripartite scheme, the first division of which is the prologue in which Horace attempts to win the good will of Maecenas, excuses himself for not writing lyric poetry, gives a foretaste of what is to come, and recommends his work. The second, third, and fourth divisions of the letter are to be treated in the commentary proper.

1. “Horatius Flaccus”: the beginning of the Horatian *uita* in T omits the first word and praenomen of the second pseudo-Acronian *Vita* (see Keller, *Pseudoacronis scholia*, 1:2.16), whose text begins *Poeta Q. Horatius Flaccus*. Later in the *accessus* on the *Ars poetica*, it is stated that Horace is not a *poeta* but a *poetrides* (23).

“Son of a freedman” (*libertino patre natus*): see *Sat.* 1.6.6, 45, and 46.

“The territory of the Sabines”: there is no ancient evidence for Horace moving with his father to the land of the Sabines, northeast of Rome. Later in life (ca. 33 BC), Horace becomes the owner of a Sabine farm, first mentioned in *Carm.* 2.18.11.

2. “Horace overcame (*uincit*) his father's narrow means”: Huygens prefers the variant *uicit* in F, because it is consistent in tense with the other main verbs, but *uincit* in T can be read as a vivid historic present. The supposed poverty of Horace's father rests on *Sat.* 1.6.71: “poor in his scraggly little plot of land” (*macro pauper agello*). But in Rome his father became an auctioneer (*Sat.* 1.6. 86, *coactor*), which would militate against the view of straitened

circumstances. The *uita*, however, is not concerned with the contradictions in Horace's self-representation. It encourages the medieval student to identify with a Horace who rose from an impoverished background through his literary studies and talent.

"He revered Brutus, under whom he fought in war as a military tribune": Horace's participation in the battle of Philippi (42 BC) under the command of Brutus can be gathered from scattered autobiographical details in his poetry. He mentions his service as military tribune in *Sat.* 1.6.46 and his role at Philippi in *Carm.* 2.7.9–10.

"He was captured by Caesar Augustus": this fanciful idea may arise from a reading of *Epist.* 2.2.47–48, where Horace says that the storm of civil war swept him into arms that were no match for the strength of Caesar Augustus.

3. "Welcomed into his friendship": Horace says to Maecenas: "You bid me to be in the number of your friends" (*Sat.* 1.6.61–62, *iubescque / esse in amicorum numero*).

5. The order of the works written by Horace differs in two places from that in the pseudo-Acronian *Vita* (Keller, *Pseudoacronis scholia*, 1:3.5–6). The important point in this *accessus* is that the *Sermones* are viewed as prior to the *Epistulae*, reflecting twelfth-century ideas about Horace's poetic career.

6. The list of commentators is not chronological. Pomponius Porphyrio wrote his commentary in the third century. Modestus appears to have been a contemporary of Martial (late first century AD). Helenius Acro, whose name is not properly transmitted in T, was a source for Porphyrio as the latter states in his commentary on *Hor. Sat.* 1.8.25.

7. The *accessus* quotes three incipits with different titles for the *Ars poetica*: *Liber poesis* ("Book of Poetry"); *Liber poetriae* ("Book of Poetics"); and *Liber de arte poetica* ("Book on the Art of Poetry"). The first two titles do not have ancient authority; they apparently postdate the earliest Carolingian manuscripts: see the critical apparatus of Brink, *Horace on Poetry: The "Ars poetica,"* p. 55.

"*Book of Poetry*" (*Liber poesis*): the use of the word *poesis* to mean "poetry" as an art like rhetoric is attested in Quintilian (*Inst.* 12.11.26) but unusual in the Middle Ages. *Poesis* was more commonly applied to a long poem or the body of a whole work, in contrast to a *poema*, which was understood as a small poem or part of a whole work. This critical distinction, which can be traced back to Hellenistic literary theory (see Brink, *Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena*, pp. 60–74; Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 439–40), was transmitted to the Middle Ages via the late antique grammarian Diomedes (*GL* 1:473.15–20) and repeated by Isidore (*Etym.* 1.39.21). In this



*accessus*, however, a different distinction between *poema* and *poesis* is adopted, in which the work of one poet is called a *poema*, and the writings of all poets are called *poesis*, on which see 21 below with note. The title “Book of Poetry” may therefore be understood as a book about “the writings of all poets” and hence a kind of introduction to poetry.

“*Poetics*” (*Poetrie*): the use of the medieval Latin term *poetria* (“poetic art” or “poetic composition”) as the title of the *Ars poetica* was well established by the twelfth century. The word already appears in the incipit of the manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 10310, saec. IX/X, *Incipit quintus de arte poetriae* (“Here begins the fifth book on the Art of Poetic Composition”). At the beginning of the thirteenth century, Geoffrey of Vinsauf titles his verse treatise on poetics *Poetria noua* (*New Poetics*) in order to displace Horace’s work which later becomes known as *Poetria uetus* (*Old Poetics*); see Friis-Jensen “Medieval Commentaries,” p. 53. It is unclear, however, how the word *poetria* (from which the English word “poetry” derives) became a nickname for Horace’s *Ars poetica*. In classical Latin, *poetria* is a rare Greek loanword (*poiêtria*) which means “poetess” (Cic. *Cael.* 64; [Ov.] *Ep. Sapph.* 183). Martianus Capella uses the word of the personification *Satira* (8.809), but the textual transmission of the passage was disturbed in the Carolingian age. In his commentary on the passage, Remigius Auxerre (*Comm. in Mart. Cap.* 427.13) glosses *poetria* as the “the art itself” (*ipsa ars*); see Curtius, *European Literature*, p. 153; Wheeler, “Poetry in Motion.”

8. “To give certain rules”: the *Ars poetica* is considered a didactic treatise like Ovid’s *Ars amatoria* and *Remedia amoris* (see *Acc.* 14.2, 15.11, 25.5–6), with a moral regimen similar to that of the distichs of “Cato” (see *Acc.* 5.7); hence, writing well or badly is equated with living well or badly.

9–10. For the Piso family as addressees of Horace’s work, see *Ars* 6, 24, 235, 366. On their identity, see Frischer, *Shifting Paradigms*, pp. 52–59.

9. “Especially the elder, who was a writer of comedies”: there is no internal evidence in the *Ars* that the elder son wrote comedies, although one may infer this from the lengthy discussion of drama (153–294) and the premise that he is embarking on a poem (386–87). The focus on writing comedy may be an interest of the medieval master and the Zeitgeist of Bavarian centers of learning, which Dronke, “Note on *Pamphilus*,” p. 230, suggests were producing the first elegiac comedies: *Ouidius puellarum* and *Pamphilus*, on the latter of which, see *Acc.* 28.

14. The assignment of the *Ars* to two parts of philosophy corresponds to the two different audiences for the *Ars* set out in 12: the work is ethically oriented for Horace’s younger contemporary audience, imagined as the sons



of Piso, and is logically oriented for audiences wanting an introduction to the art of poetry itself.

17. This sentence analyzes *Ars* 1–31.

18. For a fable illustrating this moral prescription, see *Acc.* 6.17.

19. “Colors of rhetoric” (*rethoricis coloribus*): these are usually the figures of speech and thought with which a speaker or poet ornaments his material. The *accessus* alleges that the *Ars* treats rhetorical ornamentation in a section that is concerned with age-appropriate portrayal of characters in drama (153–78). It is unclear, however, how this part of the *Ars* is concerned with rhetorical figures. Indeed, Horace’s *Ars* is lacking in this department. One of the ways that Geoffrey of Vinsauf improves upon the *Ars poetica* in the *Poetria noua* is to treat *colores rethorici* according to the system of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (1098–271, 1230–75); see Camargo, “Latin Composition Textbooks,” p. 274.

20. For Horace’s recommendation that work be “reviewed” in draft, see *Ars* 385–90.

21. “Versifier” (*poetrides*): the Latinized Greek word *poetrides* should mean “poetesses” (plural of *poetris*), but is used to make a distinction between a *uersificator* and a *poeta*, which is explained in 22–23.

“Poet’s law” (*lex poete*): see *Ars* 135 *operis lex*; on “poetic law,” see Brink, *Horace on Poetry: “Ars Poetica,”* pp. 211–12.

“A poet, that is, a fashioner or shaper; the work of one poet is called a poem, that is, a fashioning; the writings of all poets are called poetry (*poesis*)”: this set of definitions for the ancient tripartite scheme of *poema*, *poesis*, and *poeta* is often repeated in medieval literary criticism: see Bernard of Utrecht, *Commentum in Theodolum*, p. 59.31–32, quoted by Conrad of Hirsau in *Dialogus super auctores*, p. 75.138–40. An etymology for *poeta* is quoted in the lower margin of fol. 14v of T, which is excerpted from Remigius of Auxerre’s commentary on the *Ars minor* of Donatus (*Commentum in Artem Donati minorem*, 16.12–13, commenting on Donatus, *GL* 4:355.13): “*Poio* in Greek means ‘I make’ in Latin. Hence poet means ‘fashioner of a song’ and his work is called a poem” (*Pio grece latine facio dicitur, inde poeta factor dicitur carminis, et opus illius poema uocatur*). The distinction between *poema* and *poesis* is a variation of the ancient distinction preserved in Diomedes and Isidore; see note on 7.

24. The Latin title *Sermones* does not have a conventional translation in English, as the alternate title *Satirae* is preferred and easily rendered *Satires* in English. The term *sermo* literally means “talk” or “speech” and Horace uses it for a discourse written in an ordinary conversational style (*OLD*, s.v. *sermo* 1b).

27. “In simple speech” (*humili oratione*): the *accessus* identifies the

manner of speaking using Servian terminology for rhetorical theory's three kinds of style (*tria genera dicendi*), which are treated in *Acc.* 20.64–65 (see note to 64). Horace emphasizes the humble character of his “walking Muse” (*Sat.* 2.6.17, *Musa pedestris*) and says that his *sermones* “crawl over the ground” (*Epist.* 2.1.250, *repentis per humum*); see *Ars* 229.

“As here”: apparently a reference to *Sat.* 1.1.

30. “Is joined (*seritur*) between him and, at least, between two parties”: the etymology of *sermo* from *sero* derives from Servian commentary on Virgil, *Aen.* 6.160: “Here *sermo* has been properly said, which is joined between each of the two men” (*hic proprie dictus est sermo, qui inter utrumque seritur*, vol. 2, p. 35.1). The Servian explanation also appears in Isid. *Etym.* 6.8.3; see O’Hara, *True Names*, p. 167.

31. Horace refers to his first book of *Sermones* as “satire” in *Sat.* 2.1.1 and as “satires” in 2.6.17; but more often he calls this poetry *sermo* as in *Sat.* 2.3.4 or *sermones* as in *Epist.* 1.4.1, 2.1.150, 2.2.60. The medieval commentator explains, therefore, why the work is titled *Sermones*. He recognizes that the work is satirical but that Horace refrains from attacking living public figures by name after the manner of Athenian Old Comedy and so does not conform to the kind of satire written by Lucilius, the genre’s archetype (see *Sat.* 1.4.1–7, 100–103; 2.1.39–41, 79–83).

32. On dissuasion from vices and exhortation to virtues, see *Acc.* 4.13, 5.8, 11.8, 26.20.

33. For special intentions of individual poems in collections, see 46 and *Acc.* 26.23–24.

33–35. The *accessus* gives a summary of the argument of *Sat.* 1.1 but does not explain that the vice of greed is what makes men inconstant.

35. The *accessus* has already explained that Horace does not reproach named individuals and so interprets Horace’s criticism of Maecenas as directed to a type of person. For the idea that the addressee of a work can stand for the general audience, see *Acc.* 5.4.

The last sentence in the section on the *Sermones* includes a transition to the commentary from which it was excerpted. It quotes the first two words of *Sat.* 1.1.1 and clarifies that *qui* is an interrogative adverb, not a relative pronoun.

37. “Not a derider as in the *Odes*”: this Horatian persona appears better suited to the iambic *Epodes*, which are treated together with the *Odes*.

41. On the etymology of *epistola*, see *Acc.* 2.2 with note. The etymology is invoked to support the thesis that the *Epistulae* are the culmination of Horace’s poetry and are higher in style than his other works.

43. The *accessus* draws a fundamental narratological distinction between

the *Sermones* and *Epistulae* as two different kinds of fiction: the fiction of oral communication with an addressee who is present (*Sermones*) and the fiction of written communication with an addressee who is absent (*Epistulae*).

45. The *accessus* not only draws a stylistic distinction between the *Sermones* (low) and *Epistulae* (high) but it also suggests why the *Epistulae* should be read after the *Sermones*. The rhetorically simpler discourse aims to cut back the vices and prepare the ground for the *Epistulae*, which implant moral virtues through a more sophisticated rhetorical style.

46. See 33 above with note.

50. For Horace's tribute to Maecenas, see *Epist.* 1.1.1–3.

51. "Because he did not win approval in this literary genre": the idea that Horace did not enjoy success as a lyrical poet appears to be an interpretation of *Ep.* 1.1.2: "having been watched enough and having been now granted the wooden sword" (*spectatum satis et donatum iam rude*). However, this line suggests, on the usual interpretation, that Horace was successful as a gladiator (i.e., poet) and was honorably discharged from the school of gladiators.

"Because it is not suited to his age (*etati sue non congruat*), and if it were suited to his age (*et si etati*), it would nevertheless not be pleasing (*non tamen libeat*):" a paraphrase of *Ep.* 1.1.4: "Not the same is my age, not the same my mind" (*non eadem est aetas, non mens*). The text of F, adopted by Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 52, reads: "and if it were suited to his age, it would nevertheless not be pleasing to his mind" (*et si etati, non tamen menti libeat*), which makes better sense because it corresponds more closely to the Horatian *sententia* about aging.

"That he may not suffer misfortune like the gladiator Veianius": a paraphrase of *Epist.* 1.1.4–6: "After he has hung up his arms at Hercules's door, Veianius lies hidden in the countryside, so that he may not repeatedly beg the people for his life at the edge of the arena." Horace does not want to endure the humiliation of begging for his life from a fickle crowd.

"That he may give sufficient attention to the advice of his friends": a paraphrase of *Epist.* 1.1.7–9: "There is someone who utters loudly and frequently in my cleansed ear: 'it is healthy to let loose the aging horse at the right time, so that he may not stumble at the end and heave for breath, a laughingstock.'"

53. The simile in *Epist.* 1.1.20–26 expresses Horace's impatience at not being able to pursue a philosophical project that he believes is beneficial for poor and rich alike; the first book of *Epistulae* is represented as the beginnings of such a project.

28. [*Pamphilus and Galathea*]

The work introduced is the anonymous *Pamphilus*, a “comedy” composed in elegiac distichs (780 verses), whose heavy debt to the amatory Ovid shows why the twelfth and thirteenth centuries deserve to be called the *aetas Ovidiana*.<sup>108</sup> The title character comes from the comedy of Terence (*Andria* and *Hecyra*), but the dramatic plot is based on the first book of Ovid’s *Ars amatoria*. Pamphilus is a poor young man who falls in love with the wealthy Galathea but does not know how to court her. Instructed by Venus and aided by a rhetorically manipulative old woman who plays the go-between, the lover seduces his virtuous beloved and consummates his desire against her wishes.

The precise date and provenance of *Pamphilus* are uncertain.<sup>109</sup> Manuscript evidence for the play dates from 1200, but a *terminus ante quem* of 1159 is provided by John of Salisbury’s *Metalogicon* that quotes Venus’s motto in the *Pamphilus* twice: *labor improbus omnia uincit* (*Pamph.* 71, “relentless effort overcomes all obstacles”; see *Metalogicon* 1.6 and 4.30).<sup>110</sup> If, however, the *accessus* in Clm 19475 was copied around 1150, as Dronke argues, then the work could have been composed as early as 1100. The fact that the *accessus*, which appears to have been excerpted from a text with glosses or commentary (see 12), has been appended to the end of a commentary on the *Heroides* in Clm 19475 suggests that this book had become a “modern” classic suitable for reading after the *Heroides* in twelfth-century schools. *Pamphilus* continued to be put to pedagogical use in the thirteenth century. It is the sixth reading after “Cato,” Theodolus, Avianus, “Aesop,” and Maximianus in Eberhard the German’s curriculum (*Laborintus*, 613–14) and is likewise recorded after Maximianus in Hugh of Trimberg’s *Registrum multorum auctorum* (613–14b). The enormous popularity of the work is attested by its presence in 170 manuscripts (tabulated in Becker’s critical edition) as well as by its translation and imitation in vernacular literatures.<sup>111</sup> It is frequently said that the title of this little book gave rise to the word “pamphlet” (*panfletus*), but this etymology is also disputed.<sup>112</sup>

*Pamphilus* appears to have originally been conceived of as a play for public performance or recitation, perhaps inspired by Horace’s prescriptions for playwrights in *Ars poetica* (see *Acc.* 27). Arnulf of Orléans, the Ovidian commentator who also composed elegiac comedies toward the end of the twelfth century, seems to refer to *Pamphilus* in his commentary on Ovid’s *Remedia amoris* as an example of the kind of play one should avoid watching if one does not want to love.<sup>113</sup> Be this as it may, *Pamphilus* eventually came to be regarded as an autobiography written by the *auctor* Pamphilus

about the art of love and was frequently titled *Pamphilus de amore* in the manuscripts.

#### Text of *Acc.* 28

Clm 19475 (T), fol. 31vb.8–21.

#### Editions of *Acc.* 28

Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), pp. 46–47; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), p. 53.

#### Selected Bibliography on *Pamphilus*

##### Critical Edition

*Pamphilus*. Edited by Franz G. Becker as *Pamphilus: Prolegomena zum Pamphilus (de amore) und kritische Textausgabe*. Ratingen: Henn, 1972.

##### Text and Translation

“Pamphilus.” Edited and translated by Eugène Évesque. In *La “Comédie” latine en France au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, vol. 2, edited by Gustave Cohen and Marcel Abraham, pp. 167–223. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1931.

“Pamphilus.” Edited and translated by Stefano Pittaluga. In *Commedie latine del XII e XIII secolo*, vol. 3, edited by Ferruccio Bertini, pp. 13–137. Genoa: Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medievale, 1980.

*Pamphilus de amore (Pánfilo o el arte de amar)*. Edited and translated by Lisardo Rubio and Tomás González Rolán. Barcelona: Bosch, 1977.

##### Translations

Elliott, Alison Goddard. *Seven Medieval Latin Comedies*, pp. 1–25. New York: Garland Press, 1984.

Garbáty, Thomas Jay. “*Pamphilus, De amore: An Introduction and Translation.*” *Chaucer Review* 2 (1967–68): 108–34.

##### Secondary Literature

Blumenthal, Wilfried. “Untersuchungen zur pseudo-ovidianischen Komödie *Pamphilus*.” *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 11 (1976): 224–311.

Woods, Marjorie Curry. “Rape and the Pedagogical Rhetoric of Sexual Violence.” In *Criticism and Dissent in the Middle Ages*, edited by Rita Copeland, pp. 56–86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Dronke. “Note on *Pamphilus*,” pp. 225–30.

Elliott. *Seven Medieval Latin Comedies*, pp. xxvi–xxxiii.

Morawski, Joseph de, ed. *Pamphile et Galatée par Jean Bras-de-fer de Dammar-tin-en-Goële*, pp. 3–62. Paris: H. Champion, 1917.

- Hunt, Tony. "Chrestien and the *Comediae*." *Mediaeval Studies* 40 (1978): 120–56.
- Roy, Bruno. "Arnulf of Orleans and the Latin 'Comedy.'" *Speculum* 49 (1974): 258–66.
- Schotter, Ann Howland. "The Transformation of Ovid in the Twelfth-Century *Pamphilus*." In *Desiring Discourse*, edited by James J. Paxson and Cynthia A. Gravlee, pp. 72–86. Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 1998.

### Commentary on *Acc.* 28

#### *Title*

There is no title for *Acc.* 28. The only other introductions that lack titles are *Acc.* 25 and *Acc.* 29. The former is devoted to *Ovidius sine titulo* and so might reflect the work's alleged lack of title. *Acc.* 28 and *Acc.* 29, however, are added to the end of the *Heroides* commentary that succeeds the main collection of the *Accessus ad auctores*. Consequently, these two *accessus* do not maintain the earlier titling format but appear to be a kind of appendix. The subject or author of each work given in square brackets is not meant to suggest possible titles but to provide a heading for the purpose of cataloguing the contents of the *Accessus ad auctores*.

#### *Overview*

The *accessus* has three sections. In the first section, the *Pamphilus* is introduced under five headings: *subject matter* (2), *intention* (3), *utility* (4), *part of philosophy* (5), and *title* (6–8). The second section (9–11) gives the *argumentum* or summary of the story. The final section (12) summarizes Pamphilus's opening speech (*Pamph.* 1–70) as a transition to literal commentary on the first scene.

1. "In the introduction to this book" (*In exordio huius libri*): *exordium* designates the *accessus* itself rather than the beginning of the work: see *Acc.* 12.1.

2. "Galathea": through the common medieval orthographical confusion between "t" and "th," the ancient Greek name Galatea has become Galathea. The name may be inspired by Galatea in the thirteenth book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (13.738) or Virgil's *Eclogues* (e.g., 1.30), but the orthography in the play's manuscripts (confirmed by the etymology in 8) shows that *Galathea* is intentional.

4. "That each single person . . . knows how to find beautiful girlfriends for himself" (*sciat sibi pulcras inuenire puellas*): the work's utility seems to be equated with the program of the first book of Ovid's *Ars amatoria*, which is

concerned with finding a girlfriend (see *Acc.* 14.3) and seducing her. Properly speaking, however, the *Pamphilus* is less concerned with finding a girlfriend (Pamphilus has been in love with his neighbor for three years) than it is with seducing her. In Latin, however, the verb *inuenire* also has the sense of “acquire” and so may be used in both senses of “finding” and “getting.” The bald statement of erotic utility, especially in light (or in spite) of Pamphilus’s rape of Galathea, marks a striking shift from the usual concern with virtues and vices in the *Accessus ad auctores*. The subjectivity of Pamphilus’s love for Galathea may be regarded as an important landmark in the development of courtly love.

5. “It is classified under ethics because it speaks about manners”: in the *accessus*, this is a common explanation of a work’s ethical dimensions in Christian and pagan authors alike (see *Acc.* 7.7, 11.10, 12.7, 14.5, 16.5, 17.7); here, one cannot tell whose moral behavior is meant and little attention is given to Pamphilus’s rape of Galathea: see Elliott, *Seven Medieval Latin Comedies*, pp. xxviii–xxx.

6. The title *Liber Pamphili et Galathee* is not attested in later manuscripts, which refer to the work as either *Pamphilus* (*Panphilus*) or *Pamphilus de amore*. However, the free translation of the play into French by Jehan Bras-de-fer (1300–1315) also has the title *Pamphile et Galatée* (ed. Morawski), which perhaps indicates that a branch of manuscripts with the title *Liber Pamphili et Galathee* has been lost.

7. The etymology of Pamphilus has a source in Servius’s prologue to Virgil’s *Eclogues* (ed. Thilo, vol. 3.1, p. 4.9), where it is glossed as “he who loves completely” (*totum amans*).

8. The separation of the name Galathea into two roots (*Gala* and *thea*) may be technically false (see 3 above), but it is productive of meaning for the medieval glossator. The Greek meaning of *gala*, “milk,” has been lost, but the word still signifies “white.” Virgil associates the name Galatea with the color white at *Ecl.* 7.38: “more beautiful than white ivy” (*hedera formosior alba*); for Virgil’s readers it was a small step to make the connection with the Greek word *gala*, an etymology that appears to have already been suggested by Theocritus, *Idyll* 11.20; on the ancient etymologies for Galatea, see Michalopoulos, *Ancient Etymologies*, pp. 83–84; see O’Hara, *True Names*, p. 37.

“Galathea as it were ‘white’ like ‘a goddess’” (*Galathea quasi alba sicut dea*): Huygens deletes *sicut* from his text but a corrector in T added *alba* over *sicut* without deleting the latter word.

10. Pamphilus speaks to Venus in lines 25–70; he reports Venus’s speech in lines 71–142. The advice for a go-between comes in lines 135–36.

“Had” (*habuit*): a euphemism. Pamphilus consummates his love by forcing Galathea to have sex. See her speech of resistance in lines 681–96.



“For this reason the following book was written”: the *accessus* appears to approach the work as a kind of autobiography.

12. “The way down to the literal level” (*descensus ad litteram*): this is a formula that medieval commentators use to announce the transition from the *argumentum* (plot summary) to the lower level of commenting on single words: see Sabbadini, “Il commento di Donato a Terenzio,” p. 33. Here the *descensus ad litteram* gives a summary of Pamphilus’s speech at the beginning of the play and so forms a transition from the argument of the play (9–11) to analysis of the literal text.

“I fancy a certain girl”: this statement corresponds to Pamphilus’s speech to Venus (25–70), in which he describes his love for a neighboring girl.

“And for this reason I am wounded (*vulneror*)”: Pamphilus begins his speech (1–24) by describing his wound of love before revealing who his beloved is: “I am wounded and carry the shaft hidden beneath my breast” (1, *Vulneror et clausum porto sub pectore telum*).

## 29. [*Thebaldus*]

The work introduced is an eleventh-century grammatical poem on the quantity of initial syllables, consisting of 375 leonine hexameters, written by an author identified as Thebaldus of Piacenza (also referred to as Theobaldus).<sup>114</sup> The incipit quoted in the *accessus* titles the work *Regula de longis et breuibis protis* (“The Rule about Long and Short First Syllables”). Thebaldus aims to supplement Servius’s prose treatise on final syllables (*De finalibus*). He states the rules of syllabic quantity alphabetically and gives exceptions to the rule rather than illustrating it. The *Regula* can be securely dated before 1086, because Aimeric quotes it in his *Ars lectoria*.<sup>115</sup> In the twelfth century, it underwent a revision by Jean de Beauvais, which Alexander of Villa Dei drew on in his versified Latin grammar, *Doctrinale puerorum* (1199); it was revised again in the thirteenth century by an anonymous grammarian.<sup>116</sup>

### Text of *Acc.* 29

Clm 19475 (T), fol. 31vb.22–34.

### Editions of *Acc.* 29

Hurlbut, Stephen A. “A Forerunner of Alexander de Villa-Dei.” *Speculum* 8 (1933): 258–63 (pp. 260–61); Huygens, *Accessus* (1954), p. 47; Huygens, *Accessus* (1970), pp. 53–54.



## Selected Bibliography on Thebaldus

## Manuscripts

There is no modern edition of the original version of Thebaldus's *Regula*, which can be found in the manuscripts Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 17142, saec. XII, fols. 140–143; MS Clm 17212, saec. XII, fols. 48r–51r; and MS Clm 19488, saec. XII, pp. 121–26. The work is registered in Walther, *Initia carminum*, no. 9184.

## Secondary Literature

Dronke. “Note on *Pamphilus*,” p. 226n9.

Hurlbut. “Forerunner of Alexander de Villa-Dei.”

Leonhardt, Jürgen. *Dimensio syllabarum. Studien zur lateinischen Prosodie- und Verslehre von der Spätantike zur frühen Renaissance*, pp. 90–98, 200–201.

Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

Manitius. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3:734–35.

Commentary on *Acc.* 29*Title*

Again, there is no title. See the discussion above on the title of *Acc.* 28.

*Overview*

The *accessus* treats Thebaldus under five headings (see *Acc.* 28): *subject matter* (1), *intention* (2), *utility* (3), *part of philosophy* (4), and *title* (5–6). It concludes by identifying the work's prologue (7).

1. This sentence paraphrases the first line of Thebaldus's *Regula*: “Earlier we were accustomed to acquire knowledge of a word by example” (*Ante per exemplum soliti cognoscere uerbum*). The *accessus* seems also to be familiar with what Servius says about the quantity of first syllables in *De finalibus* (*GL* 4:449–50), for Servius says that a syllable is known to be long either by a diphthong or by example (*exemplum*), which is to say, one determines the quantity of a syllable by scanning it in a verse of Virgil. Thebaldus is concerned with first syllables that are not diphthongs.

“Thebaldus”: the orthography of the name in T is *Tebaldus*. The name is of Germanic origin: *þeud* (“people”) + *bald* (“bold”). Cf. the manuscript London, British Library, Harley 3093, saec. XI/XII, fol. 36r, which identifies the author of the *Physiologus* as *Thetbaldus*. Theobaldus or Theobald is formed by analogy to names like Theodorus.

2. “Whether it is short or long”: see Servius, *De finalibus* (*GL* 4:450.1): “for it is asked, whether the syllable is long or short” (*quaeritur enim, utrum syllaba longa sit an breuis*).

5. The title takes the form of an elegiac distich with one-syllable leonine rhymes.

6. “Serviolus”: in the fourth line of the poem, Thebaldus says that he decided to append his “new rule” for first syllables to Serviolus (*quam mihi Seruiolo placuit subscribere libro*; text in Hurlbut, “Forerunner of Alexander de Villa-Dei,” p. 261, transmitted under the title *Regulae Seruioli de quantitate* (“The Rules of Serviolus on Quantity”) in Clm 17212, fol. 48r. Hurlbut (p. 259) takes Serviolus to be Servius’s short prose treatise *De finalibus* (“On Final Syllables”) or a prose treatise based on it, which excerpts the rules for the quantity of first, middle, and last syllables from Donatus’s *Artes* (*GL* 4:449–55).

7. The first line is slightly misquoted: *ante per exempla* (which is unmetrical) should be *ante per exemplum*. The error appears to have been generated by the phrase *per exempla* which appears earlier in the *accessus*.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> For the text’s transmission and readership, see Tarrant, “Ovid,” pp. 268–70; Kenney, *Heroides*, pp. 26–27; Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 141–42.

<sup>2</sup> On the date of Ovid’s inclusion in the curriculum, see Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 87; Clark, “Ovid in the Monasteries,” p. 177.

<sup>3</sup> See Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors,” p. 215, no. 119; Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 99n86; Newton, *Scriptorium and Library*, pp. 112–13; Clark, “Ovid in the Monasteries,” p. 177.

<sup>4</sup> *MBK* 1:19.34–20.1: Ouidius fastorum et notulae eiusdem. Atque idem in epistolis. Idem de Ponto. Idemque de sine titulo. Pariter de amore et de amoris remediis (“Ovid of the *Fasti* and the commentary of the same. And the same in the *Epistles*. The same *From Pontus*. And the same about *Without a Title*. Equally *About Love* and *About the Remedies of Love*”); see Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 102–3.

<sup>5</sup> *Carmina* 7 and 8; for discussion of Baudri’s Ovidianism, see Bond, *Loving Subject*, pp. 61–62; Dörrie, *Der heroische Brief*, pp. 98–99; Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 95; Lehmann, *Pseudo-antike Literatur*, pp. 10–11.

<sup>6</sup> For Arnulf’s ordering of Ovid’s works, see his *accessus* to the *Metamorphoses* edited by Ghisalberti, “Arnolfo d’Orléans,” pp. 180–81; see Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” p. 36 and n. 1. On the didactic advantages of the *Heroides*, see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 142–43.

<sup>7</sup> On the function and translation of the genitive case, see Woodcock, *New Latin Syntax*, pp. 50–51; for the genitive of definition, p. 53.

<sup>8</sup> See Horsfall, “Some Problems of Titulature,” p. 107; see Knox, *Heroides*, p. 5 and n. 8; Tarrant, “Ovid,” p. 268n1.

<sup>9</sup> Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, p. 148.

<sup>10</sup> Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 146, 148, 149, 154. For a six-heading introduction to the *Heroides*, see *Acc.* 26.

<sup>11</sup> Text in Meiser, “Über einen Commentar,” p. 49; see Young, “Chaucer’s Appeal

to the Platonic Deity,” pp. 4–5; Ghisalberti, “Mediaeval Biographies,” p. 17n3; Hunt, “Introductions,” p. 97n1; *Incipitarius Ovidianum*, p. 44, no. 76.

<sup>12</sup> I owe this parallel to Frank T. Coulson, who has edited the text for a forthcoming publication.

<sup>13</sup> This is a common type of remark in Servius’s commentary on the *Aeneid*: see his notes on *Aen.* 2.243, 2.602, 7.807, 11.243, and 11.378; on *obiectio*, see his commentary on *Aen.* 2.646, 4.569, and 9.138.

<sup>14</sup> For the use of *uel* (“or”) as a connector in commentaries that indicates the addition of material from another source with an alternative, but not necessarily exclusive, explanation, see the note to *Acc.* 8.7.

<sup>15</sup> In the preface to his *Life of St. Martin*, Venantius Fortunatus remembers Prudentius for the *Peristephanon* (18–19; MGH Auct. ant. 4:295–96). On the metrical variety of the Prudentian corpus, see Isidore, *Versus* 11.3–4 (CCSL 113A:223); and Theodulf, *Carm.* 45.15–16 (MGH Poetae 1:543).

<sup>16</sup> The Trier codex, copied in Esternach after 1049, contains many of the canonical authors in the *Accessus ad auctores*, including the works of Prudentius (fols. 1r–114v), Boethius’s *Consolatio philosophiae* (115r–168r), Sedulius’s *Carmen paschale* and *Hymni* (169r–196v), Arator’s *Historia apostolica* (168v–231v), Avianus’s *Fabulae* (232r–240v), and the “Cato” (*Disticha Catonis*) (241r–245r). All of these authors, with the exception of Sedulius, are glossed in Latin and Old High German (“Cato” in Latin only). Remigian commentaries accompany Prudentius, Boethius, Arator, and “Cato.” For a description of this important codex, see Baldzuhn, “Avian im Gebrauch,” pp. 186–87 and 194–95; see Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors,” p. 214, no. 109; Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 55.

<sup>17</sup> Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 33, 35, 70–72.

<sup>18</sup> For the need to reexamine Prudentius’s literary historical importance as a precursor of Dante in the area of figural allegory, see Mastrangelo, *Roman Self*, pp. 170–75.

<sup>19</sup> On Venantius Fortunatus, see Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 5–6.

<sup>20</sup> See Victorinus, *Explan. in Rhet.* 1. *praef.* (RLM, 156.7–8); Isidore, *Etym.* 2.24.6.

<sup>21</sup> Alcuin’s alteration of the Ciceronian definition of prudence is probably not a case of poor memory but rather a theologically motivated expansion of the virtue’s meaning to include both the recognition of God and the knowledge of good and evil, on which see Mähl, *Quadrige virtutum*, p. 105; pp. 116–25.

<sup>22</sup> See Lutz, “Remigius’ Ideas,” pp. 76–77 and n. 71. The same idea is also present in the commentary copied in the manuscript Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 413 (Burnam, *Commentaire anonyme sur Prudence*, p. 87), where the lemma “arms of the heart” (*arma pectorum*) in *Psych. praef.* 52 is glossed as the “virtues.”

<sup>23</sup> The title *Disticha Catonis* derives from Erasmus’s edition *Catonis disticha moralia*.

<sup>24</sup> See Marrou, *History of Education in Antiquity*, p. 270; Hazleton, “Christianization of ‘Cato,’” pp. 157–59 (see bibliography to *Acc.* 5).

<sup>25</sup> Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors,” pp. 196–97; Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 26, 31–36; Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, p. 66. “Cato” is the second author treated after Donatus in the curriculum of Conrad of Hirsau (*Dialogus super auctores*, pp. 82–84.328–81).

<sup>26</sup> Boas, “*De librorum Catonianorum historia*,” coins the term *liber Catonianus* to designate thirteenth-century manuscripts that present an introductory curriculum of six poets, beginning with “Cato” and including such authors as Avianus, Theodolus, Maximianus, and “Homer” (*Ilias Latina*). For discussion of this label, see Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors,” pp. 198–99, and Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, pp. 67–79.

<sup>27</sup> E.g., Trier, Stadtbibliothek 1093, discussed by Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 55–56; Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1470 (O. 32), saec. X–XI, discussed by Manitius, “Zur karolingischen Literatur,” pp. 49–50, and samples of which Manitius published in “Remigiusscholien,” pp. 109–13; Lucca, Bibliotheca Statale 1433, excerpted by Mancini in “Un commento ignoto di Remy d’Auxerre,” pp. 179–81, 370–74; Lincoln, Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library MS 132, saec. XIII, fols. 20ra–28vb, discussed by Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, pp. 66 and 71.

<sup>28</sup> A similar text is copied in Lucca, Biblioteca Statale 1433, fol. 83r (Mancini, “Un commento ignoto di Remy d’Auxerre,” p. 179), and Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale 1470, fol. 73r (Manitius, “Remigiusscholien,” p. 109).

<sup>29</sup> See Holzberg, *Ancient Fable*, pp. 61–71 (with bibliography); see Cameron, “Macrobius, Avienus, and Avianus.”

<sup>30</sup> See Boas, “*De librorum Catonianorum historia*,” pp. 17–46; see Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors,” pp. 198–99; Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, pp. 66–67.

<sup>31</sup> See Baldzuhn, “Avian im Gebrauch,” pp. 185–86; *Texts and Transmission*, p. 29; Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 25–30, 33–35.

<sup>32</sup> Oldfather, “New Manuscript Material,” pp. 114–17. For the citation of Avianus by Remigius, see Manitius, “Remigiusscholien,” p. 111.

<sup>33</sup> For further details on Libyan and Aesopic tales, see West, “Ascription of Fables to Aesop,” pp. 114–15.

<sup>34</sup> See Schneider, *Die elegischen Verse von Maximian*, pp. 21–36, to whose treatment of Maximianus at pp. 36–40 and 151–55 I am also indebted in my discussion below.

<sup>35</sup> Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 73–74.

<sup>36</sup> Curtius, *European Literature*, p. 50.

<sup>37</sup> See Thiel, “Mittelateinische Nachdichtungen,” pp. 127–28; Thiel, “Beiträge,” p. 133. It should be pointed out that Thiel did not realize that the Ovidian imitations were extracts from the pseudo-Ovidian *Facetus moribus et vita* whose author identifies himself as Aurigena; on Thiel’s error and the *Facetus*, see Dronke, “Pseudo-Ovid,” pp. 126–31.

<sup>38</sup> Szövényfi, “Maximianus,” pp. 365–66.

<sup>39</sup> See Butrica, Review of *Die elegischen Verse*, p. 563: “Or perhaps the real theme is regret in old age over a life of sexuality first rejected, then misused outside its proper purpose, which—as the *Graia puella* reveals, too late, of course, for Maximianus—is procreation within marriage; on this reading, it is a thoroughly moral poem compatible with both pagan and Christian philosophies.”

<sup>40</sup> The name of the translator Pindarus first appears in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson G. 57 and is later transmitted by Conrad of Hirsau, *Dialogus super auctores*, p. 118.145–52.

<sup>41</sup> Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 15.

<sup>42</sup> *Vita S. Christophori* 1.93 (MGH Poetae 5:19); Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 75–76.

<sup>43</sup> Curtius, *European Literature*, p. 464.

<sup>44</sup> See the overview of Munk Olsen, *Classici*, pp. 63–65 and Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors,” p. 244, s.v. *Ilias Latina* (to whose list should be added no. 312).

<sup>45</sup> See Wilson, “Chapter in the History of Scholia,” pp. 249–52.

<sup>46</sup> See Henkel, *Studien zum Physiologus*, pp. 40–41.

<sup>47</sup> On the question of Theobaldus’s identity, see Eden, *Physiologus*, pp. 5–7, who reviews Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3:731–32.

<sup>48</sup> On the Christian allegoresis of nature, see Ohly, “Dew and Pearl,” pp. 235 and 247–48.

<sup>49</sup> Auerbach, “Figura,” pp. 54–55.

<sup>50</sup> See London, British Library, MS Harley 3093, fols. 36r–38r, and Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS VIII.H.7 (1625), saec. XII, fols. 8r–10r.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Herrmann, “Thiébauld de Vernon.”

<sup>52</sup> For the medieval idea that an *auctor* should be ancient, see Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, p. 12.

<sup>53</sup> Boas, “*De librorum Catonianorum historia*.”

<sup>54</sup> See Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase*, pp. 86–92.

<sup>55</sup> On the medieval fortunes of Arator, see Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 9–16, 23–35, 67; Green, *Latin Epics of the New Testament*, pp. 356 and 359–66.

<sup>56</sup> See Alcuin, *Versus de patribus regibus et sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae* 1550–54 (MGH Poetae 1:204); Theodulf, *Carm.* 45.13–18 (MGH Poetae 1:543); and Rabanus Maurus, *De institutione clericorum* 3.18 (PL 107:396A).

<sup>57</sup> See Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors,” p. 203, no. 3, and p. 206, no. 24.

<sup>58</sup> See Curtius, *European Literature*, pp. 464–65.

<sup>59</sup> See Curtius, *European Literature*, p. 51.

<sup>60</sup> On the medieval reception of Prosper, see Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 11–12, 24–30, and 127n53. See Alcuin, *Versus de patribus regibus et sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae* 1550–54 (MGH Poetae 1:204).

<sup>61</sup> For the scant details about Sedulius and the date of his epic, see Green, *Latin Epics of the New Testament*, pp. 135–43, and Roberts, *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase*, p. 77.

<sup>62</sup> Green, *Latin Epics of the New Testament*, pp. 356–57.

<sup>63</sup> See Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors,” p. 206, no. 24; Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 30.

<sup>64</sup> On Remigius’s *accessus* and commentary, see Glauche *Schullektüre*, pp. 51–52, 56n101, and 90. For an edition of the *accessus*, see Manitius, “Zur karolingischer Literatur,” p. 74.

<sup>65</sup> Curtius, *European Literature*, p. 51.

<sup>66</sup> On this text known as “St. Dunstan’s Classbook,” see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 26–41.

<sup>67</sup> Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 82, 92–93, 98.

<sup>68</sup> On the *Facetus moribus et uita*, see n. 37 above; Elliott, “*Facetus*”; Dronke, “Note on *Pamphilus*,” pp. 229–30.

<sup>69</sup> Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 92–93, 102.

<sup>70</sup> See Boas, “*De librorum Catonianorum historia*,” pp. 39–46; Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors,” p. 200; Pellegrin, “Le ‘Remedia amoris’ d’Ovide”; Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 18–19; Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, p. 70.

<sup>71</sup> In the dictionary of ecclesiastical vocabulary titled by its first words, *Sacerdos ad altare accessurus* (“The Priest Going to Approach the Altar”), now attributed to Alexander Nequam (1155–1217), and accompanied by its own commentary, the author prescribes a reading list of authors which includes Ovid’s elegies (unspecified), *Metamorphoses*, and above all the *Remedia amoris*: see Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, pp. 250, 269–70; see Haskins, “List of Text-Books,” p. 91; Alton and Wormell, “Ovid in the Mediaeval Classroom,” pp. 30–31.

<sup>72</sup> On the popularity of the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, see Hexter, *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 86–93.

<sup>73</sup> On the manuscript tradition, see Tarrant, “Ovid,” pp. 262–65; Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 102, observes that the Pontic letters are present in the school library catalogue at Blaubeuren Abbey at the end of the eleventh century, but the *Tristia* are not.

<sup>74</sup> See *Pont.* 2.9.71–76, 3.3.61–74; Gaertner, *Epistulae ex Ponto*, pp. 14–15.

<sup>75</sup> On the textual history of the *Tristia*, see Tarrant, “Ovid,” pp. 28–84.

<sup>76</sup> Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 81–82 and 103. Hexter (*Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 97–99) suggests that the *Tristia* may have been less popular than the *Epistulae ex Ponto* in the eleventh and twelfth centuries because their title may have been associated with the cardinal sin of *acedia* (“spiritual dejection” or “sloth”).

<sup>77</sup> *Amores* 3.5, now often thought spurious, circulated with the title *De somnio* in the Middle Ages and may have entered the curriculum earlier; it was generally transmitted as a separate Ovidian work. See Tarrant, “Ovid,” pp. 260–61; Sanford, “Use of Classical Latin Authors,” p. 200 and 245 s.v. “Ovid.”

<sup>78</sup> For text and discussion, see Engelbrecht, *Filologie in de Dertiende eeuw*, 1:177–81 (text and discussion), 2:40 (text); see *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 51, no. 107 (with further references). See also the *accessus* to the *Amores* in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 631, fol. 148v, edited by Hexter (*Ovid and Medieval Schooling*, pp. 223–25), which also appears in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 7994, fols. 58v–59v, edited by Ghisalberti (“Mediaeval Biographies,” p. 46); *Incipitarium Ovidianum*, p. 115, no. 394.

<sup>79</sup> *MBK* 1.19.31–34. *Ouidius fastorum et notulae eiusdem* (“Ovid’s *Fasti* and notes for the same”), on which see Alton, “Medieval Commentators,” p. 120n3.

<sup>80</sup> See Alton, “Medieval Commentators,” pp. 124–28; Ghisalberti, “Arnolfo d’Orléans,” pp. 161–66; Holzworth, “Hugutio’s *Derivationes*.”

<sup>81</sup> Tarrant, “Lucan,” pp. 215–18.



<sup>82</sup> See Sanford, "Use of Classical Latin Authors," p. 206, no. 26; Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 27.

<sup>83</sup> See Sanford, "Manuscripts of Lucan," p. 235; Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 63.

<sup>84</sup> See Sanford, "Manuscripts of Lucan," p. 238.

<sup>85</sup> Werner, "On the History of the *Commenta Bernensia*," pp. 367–68.

<sup>86</sup> See the *accessus* of the *Glosule super Lucanum*, 4.1–4. In the *Sacerdos ad altare accessurus* (on which see n. 71), Alexander Nequam classifies Statius, Virgil, and Lucan both as historians and as poets concerned with the *nobilis gesta eroum* ("noble deeds of heroes"); he calls Lucan a *uates* ("poet") and says that he should not be neglected after the reading of the *Thebaid* and *Aeneid*: see the text in Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, p. 269.

<sup>87</sup> On the *summa historiae*, see Sanford, "Manuscripts of Lucan," pp. 289–90.

<sup>88</sup> This Ciceronian florilegium is uniquely preserved in the manuscript Vatican City, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1762, saec. IX, whose contents are discussed by Beeson, "Collectaneum of Hadoard," pp. 201–3.

<sup>89</sup> Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, p. 270; see Haskins, "List of Text-Books," p. 91. On the *Sacerdos*, see nn. 71 and 86.

<sup>90</sup> See Ronnick, *Cicero's "Paradoxa Stoicorum"*, pp. 59–64.

<sup>91</sup> See Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 112, 116, 120, and 123.

<sup>92</sup> See Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 43–44.

<sup>93</sup> On the Remigian tradition, see Lutz, *Commentum in Martianum Capellam*, 1:14n16; Courcelle, *Consolation de la Philosophie*, pp. 241–99; Bolton, "Remigian Commentaries"; Wittig, "'Remigian' Glosses."

<sup>94</sup> See Troncarelli, *Tradizioni perdute*, pp. 28–29.

<sup>95</sup> See Hunt, "Studies on Priscian I"; Minnis and Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory*, pp. 122–23, 130–34.

<sup>96</sup> Hunt, "Studies on Priscian II," p. 30; Hunt, *History of Grammar in the Middle Ages*, p. 68.

<sup>97</sup> See Thurot, *Notices et extraits de divers manuscrits*, p. 243; Black, *Humanism and Education*, pp. 72–73.

<sup>98</sup> The original date and title of the work are uncertain. The problem of the work's title is discussed by Brink, *Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena*, pp. 233–34, and Frischer, *Shifting Paradigms*, pp. 5–16.

<sup>99</sup> Pomponius Porphyrio, *Commentum*, p. 162. Testimonia for Neoptolemus's poetic theory first came to light in the Herculaneum papyrus fragments of Philodemus's *On Poets*, enabling scholars to map correspondences between the poetic views of Horace and Neoptolemus: see Brink, *Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena*, pp. 43–74.

<sup>100</sup> Traube, *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters*, p. 113.

<sup>101</sup> See Tarrant, "Horace," p. 183.

<sup>102</sup> Glauche, *Schullektüre*, p. 63.

<sup>103</sup> See Glauche, *Schullektüre*, pp. 52, 54, 114.

<sup>104</sup> For Porphyrio, see n. 99 above. The Horatian scholia are available in Keller, *Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium uetustiora*; see Noske, *Quaestiones Pseudacroneae*, pp. 280–81.

<sup>105</sup> See Reynolds, *Medieval Reading*, p. 13; Friis-Jensen, “Medieval Commentaries on Horace.”

<sup>106</sup> Friis-Jensen, “Reception of Horace in the Middle Ages,” p. 291.

<sup>107</sup> Friis-Jensen, “Reception of Horace in the Middle Ages,” p. 300.

<sup>108</sup> On the twelfth- and thirteenth-century phenomenon of the “elegiac comedy,” see Elliott, *Seven Medieval Latin Comedies*, pp. xiii–xxvi; Blumenthal, “Untersuchungen zur Komödie ‘Pamphilus,’” pp. 278–82; Hunt, “Chrestien and the *Comediae*,” pp. 122–29.

<sup>109</sup> For discussion of the evidence, see Dronke, “Note on Pamphilus”; Blumenthal, “Untersuchungen zur Komödie ‘Pamphilus,’” pp. 275–78; Hunt, “Chrestien and the *Comediae*,” pp. 129–32.

<sup>110</sup> See Hunt, “Chrestien and the *Comediae*,” p. 130, who counters the objection that John of Salisbury quotes Virg. *Georg.* 1.145–46.

<sup>111</sup> On the reception of *Pamphilus*, see Blumenthal, “Untersuchungen zur Komödie ‘Pamphilus,’” pp. 283–97; Hunt, “Chrestien and the *Comediae*,” pp. 131–36.

<sup>112</sup> Lehmann, *Pseudo-antike Literatur*, p. 12; Morawski, *Pamphile et Galatée*, p. 14n1.

<sup>113</sup> See Roy, “Arnulf of Orléans,” pp. 258–66; Dronke, “Note on Pamphilus,” pp. 226–27.

<sup>114</sup> The length is taken from Hurlbut, “Foreunner of Alexander Villa-Dei,” p. 261. Later revised versions of the poem were around 258 hexameters according to Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, p. 123.

<sup>115</sup> Hurlbut, “Foreunner of Alexander Villa-Dei,” p. 261.

<sup>116</sup> Hurlbut, “Foreunner of Alexander Villa-Dei,” p. 263. Examples of the revised work, titled by its incipit *Regula splendescit*, are treated by Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin*, pp. 123–25.



# Bibliography

## Primary Sources

- Aeschylus. *Fragments*. Edited by Hans Joachim Mette as *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959.
- Aimeric. *Ars lectoria*. Edited by Harry F. Reijnders as “Aimericus, *Ars lectoria* (1),” *Vivarium* 9 (1971): 119–37; “Aimericus, *Ars lectoria* (2),” *Vivarium* 10 (1972): 41–101; “Aimericus, *Ars lectoria* (3),” *Vivarium* 10 (1972): 124–76.
- Alcuin. *De dialectica*. PL 101:949–76.
- . *De rhetorica et de uirtutibus*. RLM, pp. 525–50.
- . *De uirtutibus et uitiiis*. PL 101:613–38.
- . *Versus de patribus regibus et sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae*. Edited by Ernst Dümmler in *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, MGH *Poetae* 1:169–206.
- Alexander Nequam. *Sacerdos ad altare accessurus*. Edited by Tony Hunt in *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England*, vol. 1: *Texts*, pp. 258–72. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1991.
- Alexander of Villa Dei. *Doctrinale*. Edited by Dietrich Reichling as *Das Doctrinale des Alexander de Villa-Dei*. Berlin: A. Hofmann, 1893.
- Ambrose. *De Abraham*. Edited by Carl Schenkl. CSEL 32:499–638.
- . *De Paradiso*. Edited by Carl Schenkl. CSEL 32:263–336.
- Arator. *Historia apostolica*. Edited by A. P. Orbán as *Aratoris Subdiaconi Historia apostolica*. 2 vols. CCSL 130 and 130A.
- Arnulf of Orleans. *Glosule super Lucanum*. Edited by Berthe M. Marti as *Arnulfi Aurelianensis Glosule super Lucanum*. Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1958.
- Avianus. *The Fables of Avianus*. Edited by Robinson Ellis. 1887. Reprint, Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1966.
- Avitus. *Carmina*. Edited by Rudolf Peiper in *Alcimi Ecdicii Aviti Viennensis episcopi Opera quae supersunt*. MGH Auct. ant. 6.2.
- . *De uirginitate*. Edited by Rudolf Peiper as *Poematum liber sex de uirginitate*. MGH Auct. ant. 6.2:197–294.
- Baudry of Bourgueil. *Carmina*. Edited by Karlheinz Hilbert as *Baldricus Burgulianus, Carmina*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1979.
- Bernard of Utrecht. *Commentum in Theodolum* [Dedicatory epistle and introduction]. Edited by R. B. C. Huygens in *Accessus ad Auctores. Bernard d’Utrecht. Conrad D’Hirsau: Dialogus super auctores*, pp. 55–69. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
- Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*. Edited by Robert Weber with Bonifatius Fischer,

- H. I. Frede, Johannes Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks, and W. Thiele. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.
- Boethius. *De consolatione philosophiae*. Edited by Claudio Moreschini as *Boethius, De consolatione philosophiae, Opuscula theologica*. 2nd ed. Munich: G. K. Saur, 2005.
- . *De consolatione philosophiae*. Edited by Rudolf Peiper as *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii Philosophiae consolationis libri quinque*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1871.
- . *De differentiis topicis*. PL 64:1173–1216.
- . *In Isagogen Porphyrii commenta*. Edited by Samuel Brandt as *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii In Isagogen Porphyrii commenta*. CSEL 48.
- Cassiodorus. *De anima*. Edited by James W. Halporn as *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori De anima*. CCSL 96.
- . *Institutiones*. Edited by R. A. B. Mynors as *Cassiodorus, Institutiones*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- . *Variae*. Edited by A. J. Fridh as *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Variarum libri XII*. CCSL 96.
- Cicero. *De inuentione*. Edited by E. Stroebel as *M. Tulli Ciceronis Rhetoric libri duo qui vocantur De inuentione*. 1905. Reprint, Leipzig: B. G. Teubner 1965.
- . *De officiis*. Edited by M. Winterbottom as *M. Tulli Ciceronis De officiis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- . *Paradoxa Stoicorum*. Edited by Otto Plasberg in *M. Tulli Ciceronis Paradoxa Stoicorum, Academicorum Reliquiae cum Lucullo, Timaeus, De Natura Deorum, De Diuinatione, De Fato*, pp. 3–26. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1908.
- Conrad of Hirsau. *Dialogus super auctores*. Edited by R. B. C. Huygens in *Accessus ad Auctores. Bernard d'Utrecht. Conrad D'Hirsau: Dialogus super auctores*, pp. 71–131. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
- Digesta*. Edited by Theodor Mommsen in *Corpus iuris ciuilis*, vol. 1. 1893. 25th ed. Reprint of 17th ed. Berlin, 1963. Hildesheim: Weidmann, 1993.
- Disticha Catonis*. Edited by Marcus Boas and Hendrik Johan Botschuyver. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing, 1952.
- Donatus, *Ars minor*. GL 4:355–66.
- . *Ars minor*. Edited by Louis Holtz in *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: Étude sur l' "Ars Donati" et sa diffusion (IV<sup>e</sup>–IX<sup>e</sup> siècle) et édition critique*, pp. 585–602. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1981.
- . *De comoedia*. Edited by Georg Kaibel in *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, vol. 1, fasc.1:67–71. Berlin: Weidmann, 1899.
- Eberhard the German. *Laborintus*. Edited by Edmond Faral in *Les Arts poétiques du XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle: recherches et documents sur la technique littéraire du Moyen Age*, pp. 336–77. Paris: É. Champion, 1924.
- Erasmus. *Catonis disticha moralia*. Louvain: Dirk Martens, 1514.
- Excerpta Valesiana*. Edited and translated by John C. Rolfe in *Ammianus Marcellinus*, 3:508–69. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.

- Florus, Lucius Annaeus. *Epitome rerum Romanarum: English and Latin*. Trans. E. S. Forster. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947.
- Horace. *Ars poetica, Sermones, Epistulae*. Edited by D. R. Shackleton Bailey as *Q. Horatii Flacci Opera*. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1985.
- Hugh of Trimberg. *Registrum multorum auctorum*. Edited by Karl Langosch in *Das "Registrum multorum auctorum" des Hugo von Trimberg: Untersuchungen und kommentierte Textausgabe*. Berlin: E. Ebering, 1942. Reprint, Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus, 1969.
- Ilias Latina*. Edited by E. Baehrens and F. Vollmer in *Homerus Latinus id est Baebii Italici Ilias Latina*. In *Poetae Latini Minores*, vol. 2, fasc. 3. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner 1913.
- Isidore. *De illustribus uiris*. PL 83:1084–1106.
- . *Differentiae*. PL 83:9–98.
- . *Etymologiae*. Edited by W. M. Lindsay as *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- . *Versus*. Edited by José María Sánchez Martín as *Isidori Hispalensis Versus*. CCSL 113A.
- John of Salisbury. *Metalogicon*. Edited by Clemens C. I. Webb as *Ioannis Saresberien-sis episcopi carnotensis Metalogicon libri IIII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.
- Jordanes. *De summa temporum*. Edited by Theodorus Mommsen in *Iordanis Romana et Getica*. MGH Auct. ant. 5:11–52.
- Julius Caesar. *Commentarii*. Edited by Alfred Klotz as *C. Iuli Caesaris Commentarii*, vol. 3, *Commentarii belli Alexandrini, Belli Africi, Belli Hispaniensis*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927. Reprint, 1982.
- Lucan. *Bellum ciuile*. Edited by D. R. Shackleton Bailey as *M. Annaei Lucani De bello ciuili libri X*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1997.
- Manilius. *Astronomica*. Edited by G. P. Goold as *M. Manilii Astronomica*. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1985. Corrected ed., 1998.
- Martianus Capella. Edited by J. Willis as *Martianus Capella*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1983.
- Maximianus. *Elegiae*. Edited by E. Baehrens in *Poetae Latini Minores*. 5:313–48. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1883.
- Ovid. *Amores, Ars amatoria, and Remedia amoris*. Edited by E. J. Kenney in *P. Ouidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994. Corrected ed., 1995.
- . *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Edited by J. A. Richmond as *P. Ouidi Nasonis ex Ponto libri quattuor*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1990.
- . *Fasti*. Edited by E. H. Alton, D. E. W. Wormell, and E. Courtney as *Ouidius, Fasti*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1978.
- . *Heroides*. Edited by Heinrich Dörrie as *P. Ouidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroi-dum*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.
- . *Tristia*. Edited by J. B. Hall as *P. Ouidi Nasonis Tristia*. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1995.

- Pamphilus*. Edited by Franz G. Becker as *Pamphilus: Prolegomena zum Pamphilus (de amore) und kritische Textausgabe*. Ratingen/Düsseldorf: Henn, 1972.
- Physiologus*. Edited by P. T. Eden as *Theobaldi "Physiologus"*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Pomponius Porphyrio. *Commentum*. Edited by Alfred Holder as *Pomponi Porphyrii Commentum in Horatium Flaccum*. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1894. Reprint, Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1967.
- Priscian. *Institutiones*. Edited by Martin Hertz as *Prisciani grammatici Caesariensis Institutionum grammaticarum libri XVIII*. 2 vols. GL 2–3.
- Procopius. *History of the Wars*. Edited and translated by H. B. Dewing in *Procopius*, vols. 3–5. London: W. Heinemann; New York: Macmillan, 1914–40. Reprint, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: W. Heinemann, 1962–78.
- Prosper. *Epigrammata*. Edited as *S. Prosperi Aquitani Epigrammatum ex sententiis S. Augustini liber unus*. PL 51:497–532.
- Prudentius. *Aurelii Prudentii Clementis Carmina*. Edited by Johan Bergman. CSEL 61. *Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium uetustiora*. Edited by Otto Keller. 2 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1902. Reprint, Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1967.
- Querela magistri Treuerensis*. Edited by Ludwig Gompf as “Querela magistri Treuerensis” (Das sogenannte ‘Carmen Winrici’).” *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 4 (1967): 100–21.
- Quintilian. *Institutio oratoria*. Edited by Michael Winterbottom as *Quintilian, Institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Rabanus Maurus. *De institutione clericorum*. PL 107:297–402.
- . *De institutione clericorum*. Edited by Detlev Zimbel as *Rabanus Maurus, De institutione clericorum = Über die Unterweisung der Geistlichen*. 2 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 2006.
- Remigius of Auxerre. *Commentum in artem Donati minorem*. Edited by Wilhelm Fox as *Remigii Autissiodorensis in Artem Donati minorem Commentum*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1902.
- . *Commentum in Martianum Capellam*. Edited by Cora E. Lutz as *Remigii Autissiodorensis Commentum in Martianum Capellam*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1962–65.
- Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Edited by Harry Caplan as [*Cicero*] *Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium)*. 1954. Reprint, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Sedulius. *Carmen paschale*. Edited by Johann Huemer as *Sedulii opera omnia, una cum excerptis ex Remigii expositione in Sedulii Paschale carmen*. 2nd ed. edited by Victoria Panagl. CSEL 10.
- Servius. *In Vergilii carmina commentarii*. Edited by Georg Thilo as *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina Commentarii*, vols. 1–3.1. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1881–1902.
- . *De finalibus*. GL 4:449–55.
- Sulpicius Severus. *Vita S. Martini*. Edited by Karl Halm in *Sulpicii Severi Libri qui supersunt*. CSEL 1:109–37.

- Tertullian. *De carne Christi*. Edited and translated by Ernest Evans as *Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani De carne Christi liber: Tertullian's Treatise on the Incarnation*. London: SPCK, 1956.
- . *De spectaculis*. Edited by August Reifferscheid and Georg Wissowa in *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera*. CSEL 20:1–29.
- Theodolus. *Ecloga*. Edited by J. Osternacher as *Ecloga Theoduli*. Linz-Urfahr, 1902.
- Theodulf. *Carmina*. Edited by Ernst Dümmler in *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*. MGH Poetae 1:445–581.
- Venantius Fortunatus. *Life of St. Martin*. Edited by Friedrich Leo in *Venanti Honori Clementiani Fortunati presbyteri italici Opera poetica*. MGH Auct. ant. 4.1:293–370.
- Victorinus. *Explanationes in Ciceronis rhetoricam*. RLM, pp. 153–304.

### Secondary Sources

This is a selected bibliography of works referred to in the introduction and notes that are not listed in the abbreviations or the bibliographies for each *accessus*.

- Allen, Judson Boyce. *The Ethical Poetic of the Later Middle Ages: A Decorum of Convenient Distinction*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.
- Alton, E. H. "The Medieval Commentators of Ovid's *Fasti*." *Hermathena* 44 (1926): 119–51.
- Alton, E. H., and D. E. W. Wormell. "Ovid in the Mediaeval Classroom." In *Ovid*, edited by William S. Anderson, pp. 23–36. New York: Garland, 1995. Originally published in *Hermathena* 94 (1960): 21–38.
- Auerbach, Erich. "Figura." In *Scenes from the Drama of Western Literature: Six Essays*, pp. 11–76. New York: Meridian Books, 1959.
- Baldzuhn, Michael. "Avian im Gebrauch. Zur Verwendung von Schulhandschriften im Unterricht." In *Der Codex im Gebrauch*, edited by Christel Meier, Dagmar Hüpper, and Hagen Keller, pp. 183–96. Munich: Fink, 1996.
- Beeson, Charles. "The *Collectaneum* of Hadoard." *Classical Philology* 40 (1945): 201–22.
- Berschin, Walter. *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages: From Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa*. Translated by Jerold C. Frakes. Washington: Catholic University Press, 1988.
- Black, Robert. *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Bond, Gerald A. *The Loving Subject: Desire, Eloquence, and Power in Romanesque France*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.
- Bras-de-fer, Jean. *Pamphile et Galatée*. Edited by Joseph de Morawski. Paris: H. Champion, 1917.
- Brink, C. O. *Horace on Poetry: The "Ars poetica"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

- . *Horace on Poetry: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Brinkmann, Hennig. *Mittelalterliche Hermeneutik*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1980.
- Camargo, Martin. "Latin Composition Textbooks and *Ad Herennium* Glossing: The Missing Link?" In *The Rhetoric of Cicero in its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition*, edited by Virginia Cox and John O. Ward, pp. 67–88. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2006.
- Cameron, Alan. "Macrobius, Avienus, and Avianus." *Classical Quarterly* 17 (1967): 385–99.
- Copeland, Rita. "Ciceronian Rhetorical Tradition and Literary Theory." In *The Rhetoric of Cicero in Its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition*, edited by Virginia Cox and John O. Ward, pp. 239–65. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2006.
- . *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Coulson, Frank T. "Addenda and Corrigenda to *Incipitarius Ovidianum*." *Journal of Medieval Latin* (2002): 154–80.
- . "Giovanni Francesco Picenardi and the Ovidian Commentary on the *Metamorphoses* in Modena (Bibl. Estense, Lat. 306)." *Revue d'histoire des textes* 26 (1996): 251–52.
- . "Hitherto Unedited Medieval and Renaissance Lives of Ovid (I)." *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987): 152–207.
- . "Hitherto Unedited Medieval and Renaissance Lives of Ovid (II)." *Mediaeval Studies* 59 (1997): 111–53.
- . "Hitherto Unedited Medieval and Renaissance Lives of Ovid (III): The Earliest *Accessus*." Forthcoming.
- . "Transformations of Ovid in Medieval France (ca. 1100–ca. 1350)." In *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, edited by Alison Keith and Stephen Rupp, pp. 33–60. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2007.
- . *The Vulgate Commentary on Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1991.
- Cox, Virginia, and John O. Ward, eds. *The Rhetoric of Cicero in Its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1953.
- Delhaye, Philippe. "L'enseignement de la philosophie morale au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle." *Mediaeval Studies* 11 (1949): 77–99.
- . "'Grammatica' et 'Ethica' au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle." *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 25 (1958): 59–110.
- Demats, Paule. *Fabula: trois études de mythographie antique et médiévale*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1973.

- Dimmick, Jeremy. "Ovid in the Middle Ages: Authority and Poetry." In *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, edited by Philip Hardie, pp. 264–87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Dronke, Peter. "A Note on *Pamphilus*." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 42 (1979): 225–30.
- . "Pseudo-Ovid, *Facetus*, and the Arts of Love." *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 11 (1976): 126–31.
- Elliott, Alison Goddard. "Accessus ad auctores: Twelfth-Century Introductions to Ovid." *Allegorica* 5 (1980): 5–48.
- . "The *Facetus*: or, the Art of Courtly Living." *Allegorica* 2 (1977): 27–57.
- Engelbrecht, Wilken. *Filologie in de Dertiende eeuw: De Bursarii super Ovidios van Magister Willem van Orléans (fl. 1200 AD). Inleiding, editie en commentaar*. 2 vols. PhD diss., Utrecht, 2003. Reprint, Olomouc: Nákladatelství Univerzity Palackého, 2003.
- Faral, Edmond. *Les Arts poétiques du XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle: recherches et documents sur la technique littéraire du Moyen Age*. Paris: É. Champion, 1924.
- Frischer, Bernard. *Shifting Paradigms: New Approaches to Horace's "Ars Poetica"*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Ghisalberti, Fausto. "Arnolfo d'Orléans: un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII." *Memorie del Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere* 24 (1932): 157–234.
- Gnilka, Christian. *Studien zur Psychomachie des Prudentius*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrasowitz, 1963.
- Green, Roger P. H. *Latin Epics of the New Testament: Juvenecus, Sedulius, Arator*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Halm, Karl, Georg von Laubmann, and Wilhelm Meyer, eds. *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis*, vol. 2, bk. 3, *Codices num. 15121–21313*. Munich: Royal Library, 1878. Reprint, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz, 1969.
- Haskins, Charles H. "A List of Text-Books from the Close of the Twelfth Century." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 20 (1909): 75–94.
- Herrmann, Léon. "Thiébauld de Vernon." *Le Moyen Age* 50–51 (1940–41): 30–43.
- Hexter, Ralph. "From the Medieval Historiography of Latin Literature to the Historiography of Medieval Latin Literature." *Journal of Medieval Latin* 15 (2005): 1–24.
- Holzworth, Jean. "Hugutio's *Derivationes* and Arnulfus' Commentary on Ovid's *Fasti*." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 73 (1942): 259–76.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. "Some Problems of Titulature in Roman Literary History." *Bulletin of Classical Studies* 28 (1981): 103–14.
- Hunt, Tony. *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Collected Papers*, edited by G. L. Bursill-Hall. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1980.
- . "Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries, I: Petrus Helias and his Predecessors." *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 1 (1941–43):



- 194–231. Reprinted in Tony Hunt, *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Collected Papers*, edited by G. L. Bursill-Hall, pp. 1–38. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1980.
- . “Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Century, II: The School of Ralph of Beauvais.” *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 2 (1950): 1–56. Reprinted in *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Collected Papers*, edited by G. L. Bursill-Hall, pp. 39–94. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1980.
- Huygens, R. B. C. *Ars edendi: A Practical Introduction to Editing Medieval Latin Texts*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000.
- Irvine, Martin. *The Making of Textual Culture: ‘Grammatica’ and Literary Theory, 350–1100*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Jaeger, C. Stephen. “Cathedral Schools and Humanist Learning, 950–1150.” *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 61 (1987): 569–616.
- Kantorowicz, Hermann. *Studies in the Glossators of the Roman Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- Kelly, Douglas. *The Arts of Poetry and Prose*. Turnhout: Brepols, 1991.
- Kennedy, D. C. “The Epistolary Mode and the First of Ovid’s *Heroides*.” *Classical Quarterly* 34 (1984): 413–22.
- Luck, Georg. *The Latin Love Elegy*. 2nd ed. London: Methuen, 1969.
- Lutz, Cora E. “One Formula of *Accessus* in Remigius’ Works.” *Latomus* 19 (1960): 774–80.
- . “Remigius’ Ideas on the Classification of the Seven Liberal Arts.” *Traditio* 12 (1956): 65–86.
- Mähl, Sibylle. *Quadrigena virtutum: Die Kardinaltugenden in der Geistesgeschichte der Karolingerzeit*. Cologne: Böhlau, 1969.
- Manitius, Max. “Remigiusscholien.” *Münchener Museum für Philologie des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* 2 (1913): 79–113.
- . “Zur karolingischen Literatur.” *Neues Archiv* 36 (1911): 43–75.
- Marrou, H. I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George Lamb. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956. Reprint, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982. Translation of *Histoire de l’éducation dans l’antiquité*. 3rd ed. Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1948.
- McKie, D. S. “Ovid’s *Amores*: The Prime Sources for the Text.” *Classical Quarterly* 36 (1986): 219–38.
- Meiser, K. “Über einen Commentar zu den Metamorphosen des Ovid.” *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philologisch- und historische Classe* (1885): 47–89.
- Michalopoulos, Andreas. *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid’s “Metamorphoses”: A Commented Lexicon*. Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1997.
- Minnis, Alastair J., and Ian Johnson, eds. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. Vol. 2, *The Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Munk Olsen, Birger. “Ovide au moyen âge (du IX<sup>e</sup> au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle).” In *Le strade*



- del testo*, edited by Guglielmo Cavallo, pp. 67–97. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1987.
- Noske, Gottfried. *Quaestiones Pseudacroneae*. PhD diss., Munich, 1969.
- O'Hara, James J. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Ohly, Friedrich. "Dew and Pearl: A Lecture." In Friedrich Ohly, *Sensus Spiritualis: Studies in Medieval Significs and the Philosophy of Culture*, edited by Samuel P. Jaffee, translated by Kenneth J. Northcott, pp. 234–50. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Oldfather, William Abbot. "New Manuscript Material for the Study of Avianus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 42 (1911): 105–21.
- Quadlbauer, Franz. *Die antike Theorie der genera dicendi im lateinischen Mittelalter*. Vienna: H. Böhlau Nfg., Kommissionsverlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1962.
- Rand, Edward Kennard. *Ovid and His Influence*. Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1925. Reprint, 1928.
- Reynolds, Suzanne. *Medieval Reading: Grammar, Rhetoric and the Classical Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Riva, Anna. *La Biblioteca Capitolare di S. Antonino di Piacenza, secoli XII–XV*. Piacenza: Tip.Le., 1997.
- Roberts, Michael. *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity*. Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1985.
- Robertson, D. W. "A Note on the Classical Origin of 'Circumstances' in the Medieval Confessional." *Studies in Philology* 43 (1946): 6–14.
- Rosa, Lucia, "Su alcuni commenti inediti alle opere di Ovidio." *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Napoli* 5 (1955): 191–231.
- Sabbadini, Remigio. "Il commento di Donato a Terenzio." *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 2 (1894): 1–134.
- Sandkühler, Bruno. *Die frühen Dantekommentare und ihr Verhältnis zur mittelalterlichen Kommentartadition*. Munich: Hueber, 1967.
- Sharpe, Richard. *Titulus: Identifying Medieval Latin Texts. An Evidenced-Based Approach*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2003.
- Shoener, Hugues-V. "Les *Bursarii Ovidianorum* de Guillaume d'Orléans." *Mediaeval Studies* 43 (1981): 405–24.
- Silvestre, Hubert. "Le schéma 'moderne' des *accessus*." *Latomus* 16 (1957): 684–89.
- Stroh, Wilfried. *Ovid im Urteil der Nachwelt: eine Testimoniensammlung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969.
- Thiel, Erich Joseph. "Mittelateinische Nachdichtungen von Ovids 'Ars amatoria' und 'Remedia amoris.'" *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch* 5 (1968): 115–80.
- . "Beiträge zu den Ovid-Nachdichtungen 'Pseudo-Ars amatoria' und 'Pseudo-Remedia amoris.'" *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch* 6 (1970): 132–48.
- Thomson, Samuel Harrison. *Latin Bookhands of the Later Middle Ages, 1100–1500*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

- Thurot, Charles. *Notices et extraits de divers manuscrits pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au moyen âge*. Paris, 1868. Reprint, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1964.
- Traube, Ludwig. *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie des Mittelalters*. Vol. 2 of *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, edited by Paul Lehmann. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1911. Reprint, 1965.
- Trout, Dennis E. "Latin Christian Epics of Late Antiquity." In *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, edited by John Miles Foley, pp. 550–61. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.
- Tunberg, Terence O. "Conrad of Hirsau and His Approach to the *Auctores*." *Medievalia et Humanistica*, n.s., 15 (1987): 65–94.
- Usener, Hermann. *Anecdoton Holderi: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Roms in ostgothischer Zeit*. Bonn: C. Georgi, 1877.
- Wallach, Luitpold. "Alcuin on Virtues and Vices: A Manual for a Carolingian Soldier." *Harvard Theological Review* 48 (1955): 175–95.
- Walther, Hans. *Initia carminum ac versuum Medii Aevi posterioris Latinorum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.
- . *Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters in alphabetischer Anordnung*. Vol. 3, *N–P*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Ward, John O. "Cicero's *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*." In *The Rhetoric of Cicero in Its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition*, edited by Virginia Cox and John O. Ward, pp. 3–75. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2006.
- Werner, Shirley. "On the History of the *Commenta Bernensia* and the *Adnotationes super Lucanum*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 96 (1994): 343–68.
- West, M. L. "The Ascription of Fables to Aesop in Archaic and Classical Greece." In *La Fable: huit exposés suivis de discussions*, edited by Francisco Rodríguez Adrados and Olivier Reverdin, pp. 105–28. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1984.
- Wetherbee, Winthrop. "From Late Antiquity to the Twelfth Century." In *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. 2, *The Middle Ages*, edited by Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson, pp. 99–144. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Wheeler, Stephen. "Before the *Aetas Ovidiana*: Mapping the Early Reception of Ovidian Elegy." *Hermathena* 177/178 (2004/5): 9–26.
- . "Poetry in Motion: The Semantic Transformation of *poetria* in Medieval Latin." In *Studies in Classical Linguistics in Honor of Philip Baldi*, edited by B. Richard Page and Aaron D. Rubin, pp. 149–64. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2010.
- . "Von der Lüge zur Wahrheit: die Verwandlungen von Ovids *Metamorphosen* im Mittelalter." In *Carmen perpetuum: Ovids Metamorphosen in der Weltliteratur*, edited by Henriette Harich-Schwarzbauer and Alexander Honold, pp. 89–110. Basel: Schwabe Verlag, 2013.
- White, Caroline. *Early Christian Latin Poets*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Whitbread, Leslie G. "Conrad of Hirsau as Literary Critic." *Speculum* 47 (1972): 234–45.

- Wilson, N. G. "A Chapter in the History of Scholia." *Classical Quarterly* 17 (1967): 244–56.
- Wittig, Joseph, "The 'Remigian' Glosses on Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae* in Context." In *Source of Wisdom: Old English and Early Medieval Studies in Honour of Thomas D. Hill*, edited by Charles D. Wright, Frederick M. Biggs, and Thomas N. Hall, pp. 168–200. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.
- Woodcock, E. C. *A New Latin Syntax*. London: Methuen, 1959. Reprint, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press; Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1985.
- Wright, Neil. "Arator's Use of Caelius Sedulius: A Re-examination." *Eranos* 87 (1989): 51–64.
- Young, Karl. "Chaucer's Appeal to the Platonic Deity." *Speculum* 19 (1944): 1–13.
- Zetzel, James E. G. *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: The Commentum Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2005.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# Index

- Abraham (Abram), in Prudentius's *Psychomachia*: as exemplary figure, 11, 30–31 (*Acc.* 4.14), 119, 125, 127, 128; as subject matter, 28–29 (*Acc.* 3.7), 119–20, 127; virtues and vices fight, in soul of, 10, 119–20
- accessus* (“introduction”): *argumentum*, as connotation of, 129; commentary, in relation to, 1–3; definition of, 1, 2, 18n1; as entry point into author's text, 173; excerpt of, includes part of commentary, 52–53 (*Acc.* 16.10–12), 70–79 (*Acc.* 22.10–101), 92–93 (*Acc.* 26.40–42), 176, 178–79, 207, 225, 231; excerpt of, includes transition to commentary, 126, 128–29, 240; headings in, 28–29, 116, 120. See also *accessus ad auctores*; *argumentum*; *exordium*; headings; *initium*; introduction; *principium*
- accessus ad auctores*: anthologies of introductions to authors, 1, 3, 18n2; and Conrad of Hirsau's *Dialogus super auctores*, 4; tradition preceding anthology in Clm 19475 (T), 7. See also Bischoff, Bernard; Huygens, R. B. C.
- Accessus ad auctores*, in T: and anthologies in Pal. lat. 242 (P) and Clm 19474 (M), 3, 6; arrangement of, 5–8, 221; authors not introduced in, 9; earlier editions of, 14–16; intentions of, 8–11; introductions to Ovid's elegiac works predominate in, 8; compilation of, 5, 12, 17; title of, 18n2, 19n4. See also Bischoff, Bernard; Huygens, R. B. C.
- accessus Ouidiani*: anthologies of, 3, 11; anthology edited by Przychocki, 14
- addressee: absent or present, 99, 100, 240; Brutus, 205, 207; Cato's son, 132; general and specific, 176–77, 240; Maecenas, 240; Pisones, 238; recipient of epistle, 111, 174, 176. See also audience
- Aelius Donatus. See Donatus, Aelius
- aetas Horatiana*, 232
- aetas Ouidiana*, 9, 140, 145
- Aimeric, *Ars lectoria*: canon of authors, Christian, 155; pagan, 8–9, 20n26, 140, 143–44, 155
- Alcuin, *De rhetorica el uirtutibus* and *De uirtutibus et uitiiis*, 123; on cardinal virtues, 125
- Alexander of Villa Dei (Villedieu), *Doctrinale puerorum*, 140, 246
- aliter* (“alternatively”), as heading, 30–31 (*Acc.* 4, title), 42–43 (*Acc.* 8.7), 72–73 (*Acc.* 22.30), 88–89 (*Acc.* 26.17–20), 126, 146, 208, 228, 230
- Alithia (“Truth”), in Theodolus's *Egloga*, 11, 45 (*Acc.* 10.11–12), 150, 153–54
- allegory: Christian, in *Physiologus*, 147, 149, 150; moral, in Avianus's *Fabulae*, 35; personification, in Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, 118, 119,

- 128–29; scriptural, in Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, 119; in Sedulius, 160
- Amores*, of Ovid: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 3, 6–8; in *Acc.* 18, 54–57, 183–87; in *Acc.* 25, 86–87, 222–24; and *Ars amatoria*, 183, 223, 224; *De amore*, also titled as, 185, 223; prefatory epigram of, 186, 224; *Sine titulo*, also titled as, 185, 222; transmission of text, 166. *See also* prologue, as introductory poem of book
- animals. *See* allegory, Christian; *Physiologus*
- anthologies, of *accessus*. *See accessus ad auctores*; compilation
- Arator: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 7; *Acc.* 11, 44–47, 156–57; conversion of, 10, 157; *Historia apostolica*, 154–56; prefatory epistles of, 157
- argumentum*, as term for plot summary, 106, 107, 129, 246
- Arnulf of Orléans: commentary on Lucan, 192; on Ovid, 103–4, 170, 188, 190, 227
- Ars amatoria*, of Ovid: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 7; in *Acc.* 14, 48–51, 166–70; *De amore*, also titled as, 177, 185; offends Romans, 10, 50–51 (*Acc.* 15.3–5), 52–53 (*Acc.* 16.6), 54–57 (*Acc.* 17.9, 18.3, 19.5), 86–87 (*Acc.* 25.8), 88–89 (*Acc.* 26.21), 166, 172–73, 177, 182, 185; regretted by Ovid, 173. *See also Amores*; exile, of Ovid; *Pamphilus*; *Remedia amoris*
- ars dictaminis*, 9
- ars extrinsecus* and *intrinsecus*, 221
- ars grammatica*. *See* grammar, art of
- Ars poetica*. *See* Horace, Works; poetry, art of; rhetoric, art of
- auctor*: definition of, 3–4; as moral exemplar, 10. *See also* authors
- audience: as addressee, of prologue, 32–33 (*Acc.* 5.11–13), 68–69 (*Acc.* 22.7–8), 133–34, 207; age-groups, divided into two, 238; poetry, responds to, 157
- Augustine: on interpreting pagan literature, 5, 20n24; and Prosper of Aquitaine, 158, 159 authors, in grammar curriculum: Christian, 3; pagan, 3–4; of twelfth century, 8. *See also* Aimeric; Conrad of Hirsau; Eberhard the German
- Avianus, *Fabulae*: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 7; in *Acc.* 6, 34–41, 134–36; Conrad of Hirsau, discussed by, 161; prefatory epistle of, 136
- Baudri of Bourgeuil, 21n43, 103
- Bede, *De arte metrica*, 155, 158, 160, 201–2
- Bernard of Utrecht, *Commentum in Theodolum*, 19–20n15, 151; on *poema*, *poesis*, and *poeta*, 239; on schemes of introduction, 106, 120–21; on *titulus*, 163–64
- bestiary. *See Physiologus*
- Bischoff, Bernard: on *accessus ad auctores*, manuscript tradition of, 14; text emended by, in *Acc.* 1.5, 26, 108; in *Acc.* 3.5, 29, 118; in *Acc.* 3.7, 120; in *Acc.* 20.35, 62, 197; in *Acc.* 20.47, 64
- Blaubeuren, Benedictine abbey of: and manuscripts of Ovid, 103, 170, 188, 252n73
- Boethius: *Consolatio philosophiae*, in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 8; in *Acc.* 23, 80–83, 211–13; on causes of Aristotle, 112; life of, 10, 211–17; mentioned by Maximianus, 139; name of, etymologized, 159, 216–17
- , Works: commentary on Cicero's *Topica*, 112; *De differentiis topicis*, 121, 221; introduction of

- commentary to Porphyry's *Isagoge*, 2, 106–7
- Brutus: and Cassius, 62–65 (*Acc.* 20.26, 41–43), 196, 198; Decimus, 60–61 (*Acc.* 20.15), 196–97; as addressee of Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, 68–69 (*Acc.* 21.4, 22.9), 204, 205, 207, 208; founder of the Roman Republic, 209–10; friend and literary executor of Ovid, 52–53 (*Acc.* 16.8), 177–78; revered by Horace, 92–93 (*Acc.* 27.2), 231
- captatio benevolentiae*, 133–34 (*Acc.* 5.11–13); 68–69, 207 (*Acc.* 22.7); 98–99, 241 (*Acc.* 27.50); 170 (*Acc.* 14.3)
- Carmen paschale*, of Sedulius: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 7; in *Acc.* 13, 46–49, 160–66; books, number of, 165; prefatory letter of, 163, 165; prose version of, 157, 160
- “Cato” (*Disticha Catonis*): in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 7, 22n48; in *Acc.* 5, 32–33; addressee of, in epistolary preface, 32–33, 129, 132, 133–34; Christianization of, 133; ethics of, 32–33, 133, 159, 203, 229, 238; etymology of, 133; first poet in grammar curriculum, 4, 5, 135, 140, 144, 148, 155, 161, 233, 242, 249n16, 250n26; persona of, 32–33, 131–32; and *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, 203; and Priscian, 218; work titled as, 129–30; 249n23. See also *liber Catonianus*
- Cato the Censor: in *Acc.* 5.1–4, 32–33, 131–32; *Disticha Catonis* attributed to, 129
- Cato the Younger (of Utica): *Acc.* 5, 32–33; *Acc.* 21, 68–69; *Acc.* 22, 70–73, 78–79; life and death of, 78–79, 196, 204–6; maxims of, 205, 207–8
- , as “author”: of *Disticha Catonis*, 131–32; of paradoxes in Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, 204–5
- Christianity: conversion of author to, 10, 11, 117, 118, 163; prefiguration of, 119; secular ethics, consistent with, 4, 11, 128, 132, 211. See also authors, Christian; epic, biblical; poetry, Christian; poets, Christian
- Cicero: 4, 11, 62–63 (*Acc.* 20.35); 68–69 (*Acc.* 21.4–10, 22.4); defines virtues, cardinal, 123–24
- , Works: *Brutus*, 205; *Cato*, 205; *De amicitia*, 86–87, 177; *De finibus*, 209; *De inuentione*, 73, 121, 123–24, 206, 208, 221; *De officiis*, 122, 124; *Philippicae*, 62, 63, 197; *De senectute*, 143; *Tusculanae disputationes*, 128. See also *Paradoxa Stoicorum*
- circumstances, seven: as scheme for introduction of author/work, 2, 116, 120–21 (*Acc.* 3.9–10), 131–32 (*Acc.* 4.1–4); in oratory, 70–71 (*Acc.* 22.22)
- comedy: definition and etymology of, 64–65 (*Acc.* 20.55), 200; elegiac, 8, 166, 238, 242, 254
- commentary: *accessus*, includes beginning of, 13; 52–53 (*Acc.* 16.10–12), 176, 178–79; 70–79 (*Acc.* 22.10–101), 207; 92–93 (*Acc.* 26.40–42), 226, 231; on Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, 7–8, 15, 16, 70–79; on Ovid's *Heroides*, 8, 10–11; glosses, distinguished from, 19n8; grammatical, on classical authors, 1, 2, 128–29. See also *accessus*; *argumentum*; Boethius; Remigius of Auxerre; Servius
- commentators, ancient versus modern, 120

- compilation: of *accessus* in T, 5, 22n48, 109, 110, 206; of different sources in an *accessus*, 116, 126, 238. See also *aliter*
- Conrad of Hirsau, *Dialogus super auctores*: and *Accessus ad auctores*, 4–5, 9; on Arator, 155; on Avianus, 136; on “Cato,” 249n25; on etymology of *liber* (“book”), 122; on final cause, 112; on “Homer” and Pindarus, 146; on “modern” introduction, 2, 110; on Ovid, 4–5, 18, 188; on Prosper, 158; on Prudentius, 127; on Sedulius, 161; on Theodolus, 151, 153
- Consolatio philosophia*. See Boethius *continuatio* (“connection”), of argument, explained in commentary: 70–71 (*Acc.* 22.17), 72–73 (*Acc.* 22.39), 74–75 (*Acc.* 22.53, 57), 78–79 (*Acc.* 22.93, 100), 84–85 (*Acc.* 24.3) 208, 220
- conversion, religious: of Arator, 44–45 (*Acc.* 11.4), 157; of Prudentius, 28–29 (*Acc.* 3.4), 30–31 (*Acc.* 4.4), 117–18; of Sedulius, 48–49 (*Acc.* 13.3), 163
- Corinna: in Ovid’s *Amores*, 183; as subject matter, 86–87 (*Acc.* 25.2), 223; as pseudonym for Livia, 182, 223
- delectari* (“to take pleasure in”), instead of *delectare* (“to please”), in the Horatian dictum about poets, 137, 149–50, 229
- Diomedes, late antique grammarian, 145, 200, 201, 237, 239
- Disticha Catonis*. See “Cato”
- Donatus, Aelius, 4, 218, 233, *Ars minor*, 121, 130, 135, 161, 239; commentary on Terence, 227; *De comoedia*, 200; commentary on Virgil in Servius *auctus*, 200; on the quantity of syllables, 247–48; *Vita Vergilii*, 153, 201
- Eberhard the German, *Laborintus*, 140, 144, 155, 161, 242
- Egloga*. See goat, and etymology of *Egloga*; Theodolus
- elegy: Ovidian, 9, 56, 57, 140, 184, 186, 187; personified as goddess of poetry (*Acc.* 18.9–12, 14), 56–57, 186, 187; as goddess of woe, 187
- epic: allegorical, 113; biblical, 154–55, 160–61; definition of, 187; historical, 19; martial, 184; mythological, 9; Ovid’s attempt at, in *Amores*, 184–85, 224; tripartite division of: 129, 145, 147, 166, 169, 170, 230
- epistle, kinds of: letter addressed to friend, requesting help, 7, 52–55 (*Acc.* 16–17), 174, 176, 179, 181; letter addressed to reader, as prologue to work, 47, 136, 156; love letters, 9, 26–29 (*Acc.* 2), 88–91 (*Acc.* 26.19, 26), 103, 113, 229, 230; moral letters, 98–99 (*Acc.* 27.45), 241. See also *ars dictaminis*; *epistola*; *Epistulae*; *Epistulae ex Ponto*; *Heroides*; letter writing; Penelope
- Epistulae*: as title of Horace’s last work (*Acc.* 27.41), 98–99, 240; as title of Ovid’s *Heroides*, 9, 86–89 (*Acc.* 26.6–9), 10. See also *Heroides*; Horace, Works
- Epistulae ex Ponto* (*Ouidius de Ponto*): in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6–7, 9, 11; in *Acc.* 16, 52–54, 174–79; canonization of, 5, 174; title of, medieval, 176; and *Tristia*, 11, 174, 178–79. See also exile; letter writing, Ovid as first Roman example of; Ovid; *Tristia*
- epistola*, etymology of: in *Acc.* 2.2,



- 26–27, 111, 113; in *Acc.* 26.9, 88–89; in *Acc.* 27.41, 98–99; 236, 240
- epistolography. See *ars dictaminis*; letter writing
- error: as falsehood, propagated by Ovid, 5; in moral conduct, “Cato” sees (*Acc.* 5.4, 13), 32–33, 132; 159–60, 172; in Roman calendar, Ovid corrects, 58–59 (*Acc.* 19.13); Prudentius frees reader from, 28–29 (*Acc.* 3.13); Sedulius stamps out, 48–49 (*Acc.* 13.3); unspecified, Ovid commits, 177. See also scribal error
- ethics: Christian, in pagan poets, 4, 11, 132; definition of, 107, 116, 123–24; teaching of, through *auctores*, 20n25, 114, 140, 232. See also *auctor*; virtues
- e tymologizing: of proper names, 117 (*Acc.* 3.3), 126–27 (*Acc.* 4.1–2), 152, 154 (*Acc.* 10.12, 15), 159 (*Acc.* 12.3), 178–79 (*Acc.* 17.11), 214, 216–17 (*Acc.* 23.19–24), 245 (*Acc.* 28.7–8); of titles, 116, 122 (*Acc.* 3.13), 149 (*Acc.* 9.1), 153–54 (*Acc.* 10.5), 163–65 (*Acc.* 13.4–5), 207. See also Remigius of Auxerre
- exemplarity: of Abraham, 11, 30–31 (*Acc.* 4.14), 119 (*Acc.* 3.7), 125, 127, 128; of apostles, 156; of *auctores*, 10, 95, 215; of biblical and pagan stories, 11, 150; of letter writers in Ovid’s *Heroides* (*Acc.* 2.4), 26–27, 106, 107; of Penelope, 10–11, 26–27 (*Acc.* 1.4, 2.4), 104, 106, 231 (*Acc.* 26.38)
- exile: of Ovid, 7, 9, 11, 52–53 (*Acc.* 16.6), 54–55 (*Acc.* 17.5, 8–9), 172–73, 177; letters written in, by Ovid, 174, 176; types of, 54–55 (*Acc.* 17.10–11), 182–83
- exordium*: as “introduction” of author or work, 18n1, 159, 226, 244; in rhetoric, 133 (*Acc.* 5.11–13), 207 (*Acc.* 22.6)
- fables: Aesopic and Libyan compared, 136; as elementary readings, 4. See also Avianus
- Fasti*, and *Ars amatoria*, 72–73 (*Acc.* 19.5), 190.
- figura*, and allegorical interpretation, 150. See also allegory
- figures of speech. See rhetorical figures final cause. See *utilitas*
- Florus, *Epitome of Roman History*, 195, 196, 199, 217
- friend(s): Avianus moralizes about, 36–37 (*Acc.* 6.24, 28), 40–41 (*Acc.* 6.42); help each other, 52–53 (*Acc.* 16.2), 176–77; Horace advises, 98–99 (*Acc.* 27.51), 241; Ovid offends, 50–51 (*Acc.* 15.5), 172–73; Ovid seeks help from, to intervene with Caesar, 54–55 (*Acc.* 17.4–5), 181; of Ovid, unnamed, 179; Ovid writes letters to, 7; as Ovid’s subject matter, 52–55 (*Acc.* 16.3, 17.3), 181
- friendship: Horace’s with Maecenas, 92–93 (*Acc.* 27.3), 237; Lucan’s with Nero, 200
- Fulco of Orléans, commentary on Ovid, 166, 170
- girlfriend(s), of Maximianus, 141–42; in Ovid’s *Ars amatoria*, 48–49 (*Acc.* 14.1–5), 169–70; as Ovid’s subject matter, 54–55 (*Acc.* 18.4), 86–87 (*Acc.* 25.1–2), 186, 223; in *Remedia amoris*, 50–51 (*Acc.* 15.1, 5); and utility of *Pamphilus*, 98–99 (*Acc.* 28.4), 244–45
- Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria noua*, 233, 238, 239

- Gerbert of Reims: on Horace, 232; on Lucan, 192
- goat: and etymology of *Egloga*, 44–45 (*Acc.* 10.5), 153; and etymology of tragedy, 64–65 (*Acc.* 20.53), 200
- grammar: art of, 2, 19n5, 85, 86, 219, 222; curriculum, 3, 5, 10, 11, 150, 160, 192, 210; error 84, 85; as one of the liberal arts, 215
- grammarians: “ancient” and “modern,” 107; Carolingian, 2, 19n5; late antique, 133, 187, 200, 201, 233, 237; medieval, 1, 111, 151, 166. *See also* Aimeric; Alexander de Villa Dei; Diomedes; Donatus; Helenius Acro; Priscian; Rabanus Maurus; Remigius of Auxerre
- grammatica*. *See* grammar, art of
- Greek: authority of, 74, 75; common nouns in, glossed, 76, 77, 145, 163, 187, 190; epistles in, as model for Ovid’s letter writing, 26–27 (*Acc.* 2.1), 86–87 (*Acc.* 26.5), 110–11; errors in, 112–13; 127, 209, etymologizing of, 117, 126–27, 133, 163–64, 245; “heroines” in, 228; knowledge of, in Middle Ages, 113; literary terms in, etymologized, 42–43, 64–65, 200, 222; myth, 11, 187; orthography of, 17–18, 107–8, 112–13; 202, 244; proper names in, glossed, 82, 83; 122, 154, 164, 178–79, 216–17; titles in, glossed, 26, 27, 30, 31, 42, 43, 44, 45, 68, 69, 88, 89, 111, 118, 149, 153–54, 207, 217; transmission of, in T, 208; vocative, 92, 93, 231. *See also* scribal error, Greek
- handbooks (*libri manuales*): of authors, 3, 114, 140, 144, 148, 151, 155, 161, 192, 218; of literary criticism, 1, 11
- headings, in *accessus*: rubrication of, 12; schemes of, 2
- Helen: as example of unchaste love, in Ovid’s *Heroides*, 88, 89, 107; and Paris, double letters of, in Ovid’s *Heroides*, 103, 107, 228; as subject matter, in “Homer,” 42, 43, 145, 146
- Helenius Acro, 92, 93, 233, 237
- Heroides (Epistulae)*, of Ovid: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 5–7, 10–11; in *Acc.* 1, 26–27, 103–9; in *Acc.* 2, 26–29, 109–13; in *Acc.* 26, 86–93, 225–31; commentary on, in T, 8, 106; letter writing, model for, 9, 230
- heroines (*heroides*), 9, 10, 88–89 (*Acc.* 26.11), 103, 105, 107, 151; in Greek, 228; as title of Ovid’s *Epistles*, 103
- history: evangelical, 160; mythological, 150, 151; Roman, 7, 59–67 (*Acc.* 20.1–50), 194–200. *See also* literary history
- “Homer” (*Ilias Latina*): in *Acc.* 8, 42–43, 143–47; in *Accessus ad auctores* 6, 7; in grammar curriculum and handbooks, 4, 161, 218, 233, 250n26; and Ovid’s *Heroides*, 146
- Horace: in *Accessus ad auctores* 6, 8, 11; in *Acc.* 27, 92–98, 231–41; commentaries and scholia on, 232–33; in grammar curriculum and handbooks, 4, 9, 191, 218, 232
- , Works: *Ars poetica*, introduced (*Acc.* 277–20), 92–95, 237–39; *Epistulae*, introduced (*Acc.* 27.36–55), 96–99, 233, 240–41; and Ovid’s *Heroides*, 110; poetics and rhetoric, source for, 119, 128, 137, 149, 187, 205, 229, 231; and virtues, pursuit of, 233, 236, 240; *Sermones (Satirae)*, introduced (*Acc.* 27.24–35), 96–97, 239–41; title of,

- 232, 235–37; and vices, avoidance of 233, 236, 240
- Hugutio, *Derivationes*, on the etymology of *nefastus*, 190
- Huygens, R. B. C., editor of *Accessus ad auctores*: commentary on Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, abridges, 14, 16, 208; editorial principles of, 14–16; emendations of Bischoff, adopts, 118, 120, 197; first edition, revises, 14–15, 17, 18n2, 118, 120; reading of M, prefers, 205; readings of B, prefers, 15, 198; readings of F, prefers, 236, 241; readings of P, prefers, 126, 133, 137, 138; readings of Przychocki, adopts, 26, 54, 86, 88, 108, 223, 224, 230; readings of T, corrects and emends, 137, 162, 168, 178, 225, 229; readings of T, omits, 16, 149; readings of T, reports falsely, 16, 23n67, 222, 245; retitles *accessus* in T, 16, 168, 222, 225
- incipit*: etymology of, 122; indicates title, 116, 121–22, 152, 185, 237, 238, 246
- initium*, as term for “introduction” of author or work, 18n1
- intention: general and specific, in Ovid's *Heroides*, 90, 91, 226; as heading, in different schemes of introduction, 2; “of the work,” as opposed to “of the writer,” 106–7, 145; twofold, of Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, 68, 69, 204
- introduction, to author/work: headings for, 2; modern, with three headings, 106; rhetorical, 131–32; Servian, 162. See also *accessus*
- inuentio*, 169–70. See also Cicero, Works: *De inuentione*; circumstances
- Isidore of Seville: on etymology of *epistola*, 111; on etymology of *liber*, 122; on fables, 136; on grammar and liberal arts, 19n6; on love, division of, 111; on philosophy, 124; on virtues, cardinal, 123–24; on vices, 125
- item*, as heading, 26, 27, 30, 31, 110, 126
- Jean de Beauvais, 246
- Juvenecus, 160; in Conrad of Hirsau's *Dialogus super auctores* 3, 4; in grammar curriculum, 3; and Sedulius 160, 161
- leonines, 150
- letters. See epistle
- letter writing: models for, 9, 21n43, 110–11; Ovid, as first Roman example of, 26–27 (*Acc.* 2.1), 86–87 (*Acc.* 26.5), 110–11
- liberal arts, 2, 29n24, 159, 215
- liber Catonianus*, 120, 134, 151, 171, 250n26
- libri manuales*. See handbooks; *liber Catonianus*
- literary criticism, 1, 4, 11
- literary history, 8, 11, 21n36
- literary theory, Hellenistic Greek, 231
- locus amoenus*, 186
- logic (*logica* or *loyca*): and grammar, 2; philosophy, branch of, 68–69 (*Acc.* 21.10), 94–95 (*Acc.* 27.14), 100–101 (*Acc.* 29.4), 206, 235, 239; and rhetoric 70–71 (*Acc.* 22.20)
- love: foolish 26–27 (*Acc.* 1.1, 2.4–5, 7), 88–91 (*Acc.* 26.14, 16, 26, 28), 106–8, 111, 143, 228; illicit, 10, 26–27 (*Acc.* 1.1, 2.4–5, 7), 50–51 (*Acc.* 15.6), 88–91 (*Acc.* 26.14–16, 26, 28), 106–8, 111, 143, 146, 172, 173, 174, 228; lawful, of

- Penelope, 10, 26–27 (*Acc.* 1.4, 2.4–5, 7), 90–91 (*Acc.* 26.28–29), 107, 108, 111, 228; sexual, 140, 141–42; tripartite typology of, 26–27, 107, 108, 228; unchaste, 88–91 (*Acc.* 26.14–15, 17–18, 23–24), 228, 229; virtuous, 26–27 (*Acc.* 2.7), 88–91 (*Acc.* 26.17, 23, 27)
- Lucan: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 7, 11; *Acc.* 20, 15, 58–67, 191–202; commentaries and scholia on, 192; as epic poet, 129, 147, 201, 202, 253n86; in grammar curriculum 4, 9, 192; as historian, 192, 194; punishment of, 10
- Lupus Ferrières, commentary of, on Boethius's *Consolatio philosophiae*, 212
- Manegold of Lautenbach, on the “modern” introduction, 106
- marriage: illicit, 42–43 (*Acc.* 8.8), 145, 146; lawful, 26–27 (*Acc.* 2.2)
- Martianus Capella, *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, 215
- materia*. See headings, in *accessus*, schemes of; subject matter
- Maximianus: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 7; *Acc.* 7, 40–43, 139–43; girlfriend(s), of Maximianus, 141–42; in grammar curriculum and handbooks, 103, 140, 155, 171, 218, 242, 250n26; as moral exemplar, 10; on old age, 40–41 (*Acc.* 7.3–6), 139–43; on sexuality, 140, 141–42
- Metamorphoses*, of Ovid: commentary on, 106, 179, 207, 208, 229; in grammar curriculum 5, 252n71; moral interpretation of, 21–22n44; not introduced in *Accessus ad auctores*, 9; source for Theodolus, 11
- modus* (“method”), in headings, 48–49 (*Acc.* 14.3), 74–75 (*Acc.* 22.52), 84–85 (*Acc.* 24.9), 169, 207
- Monte Cassino, Benedictine abbey of, 103
- mores*, English translation of, 107
- mythological epic, not introduced in *Accessus ad auctores*, 9
- natural philosophy (*physica*), branch under which author/work is classified, 42, 43, 58, 59, 150, 191
- ode*: glossed as *carmen* (“song”), 64–65 (*Acc.* 20.55), 200; glossed as *laus* (“praise”), 42–43 (*Acc.* 8.1), 145
- old age. See Maximianus
- orthography: of classical proper names, 107–8; in edition of *Accessus ad auctores* 12, 14, 17–18. See also Greek, orthography of; scribal error, Greek, in orthography of
- Ovid: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 7, 10; in *Acc.* 1 (*Her.*), 26–27, 103–9; in *Acc.* 2 (*Her.*), 26–29, 109–13; in *Acc.* 14 (*Ars*), 48–51, 166–70; in *Acc.* 15 (*Rem.*), 50–52, 170–74; in *Acc.* 16 (*Pont.*), 52–54, 174–79; in *Acc.* 17 (*Trist.*), 52–55, 179–83; in *Acc.* 18 (*Am.*), 54–55, 183–87; in *Acc.* 19 (*Fast.*), 56–59, 187–91; in *Acc.* 25 (*Am.*) 86–87, 222–24; in *Acc.* 26 (*Her.*), 86–93, 224–31; Conrad of Hirsau, censored by, 4–5; and elegy, 9, 56, 57, 184, 186, 187; epistles, first Roman to have written, 26–27 (*Acc.* 2.1), 110–11; error of, 177; ethical reading of, 9–10, 21–22n44, 172; in grammar curriculum, 3–5, 103, 223; life of, 10, 11; moral conversion of, 7, 9, 11; Roman morality, undermines, 182. See also *aetas Ovidiana*;

- Amores*; *Ars amatoria*; *Epistulae ex Ponto*; *Fasti*; *Heroides*; *Metamorphoses*; *Remedia amoris*; *Tristia*
- Pamphilus (and Galathea)*: in *Accessus ad auctores* 6, 8; in *Acc.* 28, 98–101, 242–46; Ovid's *amatoria*, influenced by, 8, 238, 242
- Paradoxa Stoicorum*: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 7–8, 11, 22; in *Acc.* 21, 68–69, 202–6; in *Acc.* 68–79, 206–11; commented on, 14, 70–79; complements “Cato,” 202–3; in grammar curriculum, 4; and virtues, cardinal, 123–24
- Paris. See Helen
- Penelope, in Ovid's *Heroides*: intention of, as letter writer, 27–28 (*Acc.* 2.8), 106, 110, 112, 113; lawful love of, 10, 26–27 (*Acc.* 1.4, 2.4–7), 90–91 (*Acc.* 26.28–29), 104, 107, 108, 111, 228; moral exemplarity of, 10–11, 26–27 (*Acc.* 1.4, 2.4), 104, 106, 231
- personification: in Boethius's *Consolatio philosophiae*, 211; in Ovid's *Amores*, 185, 187. See also allegory, personification; *prosopopoeia*
- Petrus Helias, 218
- philosophy, three branches of, 123–24. See also ethics; logic; natural philosophy
- physica*. See natural philosophy
- Physiologus*: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 7, 8; in *Acc.* 9, 42–43, 147–50. See also leonines
- poet: definition of, 239; in exile, 174; life of, as heading in *accessus*, 159; as lover, 183; Lucan identified as one, 192, 202
- Poetria*, as title of Horace's *Ars poetica*, 92–93, 94–95 (*Acc.* 27.7, 21), 237–38
- poetry: art of, 86–87 (*Acc.* 26.4), 94–95 (*Acc.* 27.8), 227, 231, 238; Christian, 118; composition of, 9, 140, 233, 238; definition of, 94–95 (*Acc.* 27.21), 239; delight in writing, 90–91 (*Acc.* 26.23), 150, 229; didactic, 8; elegiac, 8, 157; elementary readings in, 4; epic, 9, 113, 129, 143, 154, 160, 184, 187, 191–92, 224; on love, 185–86; lyric, 98–99 (*Acc.* 27.51), 114, 231–33, 236, 241; misogynistic, 142; as subject matter, 94–95 (*Acc.* 27.11); theory of, 231. See also *Ars poetica*; elegy; epic; poet; poetry and prose
- poetry and prose: arts of, 9, 159, 233; in *Consolatio philosophiae* of Boethius, 80–83 (*Acc.* 23.8, 16); two versions of same work in, 157
- poets: in art of grammar, 2, 223; Christian, 3, 4, 7, 8, 114, 151, 154–55, 158, 160–61; Horatian dictum about, 137, 149–50, 205; medieval Latin, 9; pagan, 4, 7, 8
- Pontus, regarded as an island, 176
- preface (*praefatio*): and *accessus*, 18n1; as prose epistle to patron, 82–85 (*Acc.* 24.2), 134, 136, 160, 163, 165, 219; as prose introduction to Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, 202–3, 204, 205, 206, 207 (*Acc.* 21.1–2, 4, *Acc.* 22.6); as verse epistle to patron, 156; as verse introduction to Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, 114, 119, 120; 128, 129; as title of Prudentius's verse autobiography, 114, 117–18, 120. See also prologue
- principium*, as introduction to author/work, 1, 18n1, 46–47 (*Acc.* 13.1), 50–51 (*Acc.* 15.8), 86–87 (*Acc.* 26.1), 162
- Priscian (*Priscianus minor*): in *Accessus*

- ad auctores*, 6, 8; in *Acc.* 24, 82–85, 217–22
- prologue (*prologus*), of author to his own work: in relation to *accessus*, 2, 18n1; as epistle addressed to reader, 32–33 (*Acc.* 5.4, 8, 11), 46–47 (*Acc.* 11.11), 68–69 (*Acc.* 22.3, 7), 131–34, 156; as introductory poem of poetry book, 54–57 (*Acc.* 18.8–9, 18.12), 98–99 (*Acc.* 27.49, 54), 160, 186, 223–24, 236; as introductory section of first poem, 100–101, 149–50, 247; as introductory section of prose work, 207; Servian, prefixed to commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid*, 2, 145, 159, 162, 200–201; as *uita* of author, 212, 232. See also *captatio beneuolentiae prosopopoeia* (“personification”), 86–87, 224
- Prosper of Aquitaine, *Epigrammata*: in *Accessus ad auctores* 6, 7; in *Acc.* 12, 46–47, 157–60; and Augustine, 159; name in title, etymologized, 159
- Prudentius: in *Acc.* 3, 28–30, 113–25; in *Acc.* 4, 30–32, 126–29; as Christian poet, canonical, 3–4, 114; conversion of, spiritual, 10, 118; life and works of, 114, 116–18; as moral exemplar, 10; *Praefatio*, 117–18, 120, 125. See also Juvencus; *Psychomachia*; Remigius of Auxerre
- Przychocki, Gustav, *Accessus Ovidiani*, 14; corrections of T, 23n68, 26, 50, 56, 86, 90, 108, 173, 223, 230; errors, paleographical, 54, 86, 88, 224, 230; errors, typographical, 23n58; *thesaurizator*, on meaning of, 178
- Pseustis (“Falsehood”), in Theodolus's *Egloga*, 11, 44–45 (*Acc.* 10.11–12), 150, 153. See also goat, and etymology of *Egloga*
- Psychomachia*, of Prudentius: in *Accessus ad auctores* 5–7, 10–11; in *Acc.* 3, 28–30, 113–25; in *Acc.* 4, 30–32, 126–29; commentary on, by Remigius of Auxerre, 118, 128; in grammar curriculum, 114, 148; title of, etymologized, 28–31 (*Acc.* 3.12–13), 121–23. See also Abraham (Abram); Prudentius
- Quain, Edwin: on *accessus ad auctores*, 18n2; correction of T, 88; on Ovid, 10
- Rabanus Maurus: *De institutione clericorum*, 155, 160; *De laudibus sanctae crucis*, 157
- Ralph of Beauvais, commentary on *Priscianus minor*, 218
- readers: of *Accessus ad auctores*, 12, 105; benefited, by utility of authors, 112, 181; corrections made by, in text of T, 13, 17; dissuaded from illicit love, 146; exhorted to a virtuous life, 156; as grammar students, 5, 8–10, 11, 134; lacking Greek, 143; learned, 103; as letter writers, 9, 230; as listeners (*auditores*), 173. See also addressee, audience
- reading practices, in twelfth and thirteenth centuries, 3–4
- Remedia amoris* (*De remedio amoris*), of Ovid: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6–7, 10; in *Acc.* 15, 50–52, 170–74; commentary on, 242; in grammar curriculum and handbooks, 10, 22n46, 103, 171; as recantation for *Ars amatoria*, 173
- Remigius of Auxerre: on Avianus, 134–35; on Boethius's *Consolatio philosophiae*, 212, 213, 216; on

- “Cato,” 121–22, 130, 131–32, 134–35, 233; on Donatus’s *Ars minor*, 121, 163, 239; on Martianus Capella, 120, 125, 205, 216, 238; on Prudentius’s *Psychomachia*, 114, 119–20, 125, 129; on Sedulius, 160–61, 166, 201; on seven circumstances, 2, 120, 161; on *titulus*, etymology of, 121, 163–64
- Rhetorica ad Herennium*: and the arts of poetry 233, 239; and Cicero, 206; as source for rhetorical doctrine in *accessus*, 124, 134, 201, 207, 211
- rhetoric, art of, 40–41 (*Acc.* 7.2), 70–71 (*Acc.* 22.20), 94–95 (*Acc.* 27.19) 140, 142, 237, 239; in commentary on Cicero’s *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, 206, 208–9; and grammar, 2; in Ovid, 169–70, 186–87, 223, 224; study of, 86–87 (*Acc.* 26.4), 227. *See also* Cicero; *exordium*; *inuentio*; styles
- rhetorical figures: in *Acc.* 25.3, 86–87; *circuitio*, 211; *expolicio*, 208; *obiectio*, 112
- Richer of Reims, on Lucan as historian, 192
- satire: in *Acc.* 27.31, 96–97; genre of, 232, 240; Juvenal and Persius, authors of, not in *Accessus ad auctores*, 9; Menippean (or prosimetric), 11, 81–82 (*Acc.* 23.6–8), 215; on old age, 140. *See* Horace, Works: *Sermones*; Maximianus
- Satires (Satinae)*, of Horace. *See* Horace, Works: *Sermones*
- scribal error: classical names, in orthography of, 23n56, 112–13, 126–27, 195; Greek, in orthography of, 127, 227–28; transmitted by tradition, 111–12, 137, 139, 145–46, 165, 190, 211
- Sedulius, author of *Carmen paschale*: and Arator, 154, 155; as Christian Virgil, 162; conversion to Christianity, 10, 163; in grammar curriculum and handbooks, 3, 4, 148, 151, 155, 158, 161; intention of, 160; and Juvencus, 160, 161; as moral exemplar, 10. *See also* *Carmen paschale*
- sermo* (“conversation” or “speech”): *caprinus* (“about goats”), 44–45 (*Acc.* 10.5); Cicero’s *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, term for, 68–69 (*Acc.* 22.9); definition of, 96–97 (*Acc.* 27.28–30), 239–40; *naturalis* (“about nature”), 42–43 (*Acc.* 9.1), 149
- Sermones*, of Horace. *See* Horace, Works
- Serviulus (Servius, *De finalibus*), 248
- Servius: epic speech, on three types of, 129, 145, 162, 166, 169, 170, 230; Greek and Roman legends, as source for, 83–84 (*Acc.* 20.81, 87), 209–10, 230; on *locus amoenus*, 186; on Lucan *historiographus*, 192; on Pamphilus, name of, 245; prologue to *Aeneid* of, as model for *accessus*, 2, 145, 159, 162, 200, 201–2; on reciting, three modes of, 201, 230; on style, three kinds of, 201; on *titulus*, 48–49, 163–64; on tragedy, 200. *See also* prologue, Servian
- style, three kinds of, in rhetoric, 201
- subject matter (*materia*): primary and secondary, 28–29 (*Acc.* 3.7), 119–20; indicated by *title* in Servian scheme, 162, 165; title derived from, 86–89 (*Acc.* 26.7). *See also* headings
- Tegernsee, Benedictine abbey of, 1, 5, 8, 11, 160, 170
- textbooks. *See* handbooks; *liber Catonianus*



- Thebaldus: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6, 8, 9; in *Acc.* 29, 100–101, 246–48
- Theodolus (*Ecloga Theoduli*): in *Accessus ad auctores* 6, 7; in *Acc.* 10, 44–45, 150–54; exemplary figures treated by, in biblical and pagan literature, 11; in grammar curriculum and handbooks, 4, 10, 103, 151, 155, 158, 171, 218, 242; name of, etymologized, 154, 159. *See also* Bernard of Utrecht
- Theodulus. *See* Theodolus
- titles, of *accessus*: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 13, 17; changed by Huygens, 16; rubrication of, 12
- titulus* (“title”), etymology of, 28–29 (*Acc.* 3.11), 48–49 (*Acc.* 13.4), 121, 163–64
- tragedy: definition and etymology of, 65–66 (*Acc.* 20.53–54), 200; personified as goddess, 56–57 (*Acc.* 18.11–13), 185, 186, 187
- Trevet, Nicholas, commentary on Boethius, *Consolatio philosophiae* 212
- Tristia*, of Ovid: in *Accessus ad auctores*, 6–7, 9; in *Acc.* 17, 52–55, 179–83; and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, 11, 174, 177–78; in grammar curriculum, 174, 179; as source for Ovid’s offense against Rome, 177, 180–82. *See also* *Epistulae ex Ponto*; exile, of Ovid; letter writing; Ovid
- Trojan War, 42–43 (*Acc.* 8.4–6), 145, 146
- Troy: destruction of, 28–29 (*Acc.* 1.5), 28–29 (*Acc.* 2.9), 42–43 (*Acc.* 8.2, 8), 108; secret of, 44–45 (*Acc.* 10.3); siege of, 88–91 (*Acc.* 26.8, 12, 33–35); as subject matter, 42–43 (*Acc.* 8.4)
- Tullius, name by which Cicero was known in Middle Ages, 204. *See also* Cicero
- utilitas* (“utility”), 32–33 (*Acc.* 4.16, 5.9–10), 34–35 (*Acc.* 6.8), 42–43 (*Acc.* 7.6, 8.6, 9, 9.4); 44–45 (*Acc.* 10.8), 46–47 (*Acc.* 11.9, 12.6), 52–53 (*Acc.* 16.1, 4, 17.1), 54–55 (*Acc.* 17.6), 66–67 (*Acc.* 20.73), 68–69 (*Acc.* 21.7, 9), 86–87 (*Acc.* 25.3, 26.1), 90–91 (*Acc.* 26.26, 28), 98–99 (*Acc.* 28.1, 4), 100–101 (*Acc.* 29.3), 143 (*Acc.* 7.6), 145 (*Acc.* 8), 181 (*Acc.* 17.6); as cause of intention, 174 (*Acc.* 15.9), 191 (*Acc.* 19.18), 244–45 (*Acc.* 28.4); erotic, 244–45; as ethical goal, 32–33 (*Acc.* 5.10), 133; as final cause, 112 (*Acc.* 2.7), 159 (*Acc.* 12.1), 230 (*Acc.* 26.26); as heading in *accessus*, 2; as heading omitted from *accessus*, 106; of writers, 64–65 (*Acc.* 20.52), 200
- versification, 9; Maximianus, as model for, 140; Ovid, as model for, 9; *Physiologus*, as model for, 147; of prose texts, 159; rules for, 9; Theodolus, as model for, 155. *See also* Bede, *De arte metrica*; Thebaldus
- uia* (“way”), as metaphor, 32–33 (*Acc.* 5.8, 13), 46–47 (*Acc.* 12.3), 48–49 (*Acc.* 13.8), 128, 132, 133, 159–60, 165, 169
- vices, 30–33 (*Acc.* 4.8–13, 15–16), 38–39 (*Acc.* 6.32), 40–43 (*Acc.* 8.3–4), 88–89 (*Acc.* 26.20), 96–99 (*Acc.* 27.26, 32–35, 38–39, 45–47), 127–28, 138, 142, 229, 240; dissuasion from, 233, 236; and goats, in Theodolus’s *Egloga*, 153; of poetic composition, 233; subject matter and title of Prudentius’s *Psychomachia*, in relation to, 118–20; virtues, in relation to, 10, 113–14, 118–19, 125, 173, 229, 245



- Victorinus: on *ars extrinsecus* and *intrinsicus*, 221; commentary of, on Cicero's *De inuentione*, 121, 124, 221; glosses *ode*, 145
- Virgil, not introduced in *Accessus ad auctores*, 9
- virtues, 30–33 (*Acc.* 3.17–22, *Acc.* 4.8–13, 15–16), 46–47 (*Acc.* 11.5), 88–89 (*Acc.* 26.20), 96–99 (*Acc.* 27.32, 37–39, 45), 123–25, 127–28, 229; cardinal, 31–32 (*Acc.* 3.17), 116, 123–25; reading, attained through, 4; vices, in relation to, 10, 113–14, 173, 244
- William of Conches: commentary on Boethius, 212; commentary on Priscian, 218, 221
- William of Orléans, *Bursarii super Ouidios*: on *Amores*, 185; on *Ars amatoria*, 166; on *Remedia amoris*, 170
- Zetzel, James E. G., 15–16

Typeset in 11/13 Adobe Garamond Pro  
Composed by Tom Krol

Medieval Institute Publications  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Western Michigan University  
1903 W. Michigan Avenue  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5432  
<http://wmich.edu/medievalpublications>



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY



## Secular Commentary Series

The Secular Commentary Series provides modern English translations of medieval texts that analyze, annotate, and explicate classical and vernacular works. Dating from the fourth through the sixteenth century, these texts represent various traditions (grammatical, allegorical, exegetical, academic, and humanistic). The works they elucidate include poetry, fiction, history, philosophy, and scientific treatises. Each volume of the series contains a critical introduction and select bibliography, a clear prose translation, and notes designed to gloss difficult passages. The aim of the series is to support teaching in the broadest sense: the volumes are suitable for the classroom and serve as an aid for scholars and generalist readers across the full range of the humanities.

Medieval commentaries typically included an *accessus*, a standard type of introduction to the author or book. In the twelfth-century these introductions began to be excerpted and collected in anthologies, referred to by modern scholars as *accessus ad auctores* (“introductions to the authors”). In turn, these served as the first handbooks of literary criticism. The earliest and most comprehensive example, appearing in Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19475, saec. XII, is presented here for the first time in a faithful critical edition, with a new translation and explanatory notes addressing different aspects of the text. This book’s aim is to present an accurate version of the text while respecting the arrangement and integrity of the anthology as a whole, and includes previously unpublished material from the anthology.

Stephen M. Wheeler (BA, Yale College; MA, PhD, Princeton University) is an associate professor at Pennsylvania State University. He is interested in early and late imperial Latin poetry; the idea of Rome in literary, cultural, and historical contexts; and the literary reception of classical authors in theory and practice.

Cover illustration: Georg Pencz, German, c. 1500–1550; *Grammatica*, from the series *The Liberal Arts*, c. 1541; engraving; 2 15/16 x 2 inches; Saint Louis Art Museum, Museum Purchase 67:1914