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Horace, *Carmina* 2.20.1-3
I. Introduction

Thesis statement: With this study my aim is to ascertain what the edition of excerpts from Ovid in the Florilegium Sancticrucianum may tell us about contemporary 12th-century readership, study and use of Ovid. As part of this I shall create a diplomatic edition of the first part of this florilegium as found in the MS Heiligenkreuz 227-III.

In this thesis I have chosen to study a 12th-century poetry collection, the Florilegium Sancticrucianum contained in full in the Austrian manuscript Heiligenkreuz 227-III, which includes a large section of excerpts from the Roman poet Ovid. I have collated these excerpts into a diplomatic edition that is included as an appendix to this study (Appendix I). Few scholars have studied the Florilegium Sancticrucianum in detail, and no one has studied all the excerpts of Ovid (and their marginalia and glosses) contained in it. I have been interested in seeing what these excerpts can tell us about the reading practices, appreciation, understanding and use of Ovid during the 12th century, a period described as the Ovidian age in the sense that Ovid was in vogue at the time. Perhaps the greatest testimony to this is his ubiquitousness and centrality in the many contemporary florilegia. I have relied on the work of the main scholarly authorities on the Medieval commentary tradition; the pseudo-Ovidiana and imitations of Ovid and particularly on classical authors found in florilegia – I have especially been reliant upon the research of Birger Munk Olsen. These three areas all provide evidence in support of the 12th-century popularity of Ovid, all of which will be discussed in turn.

I will first provide a brief survey of Ovid and his work (chap. 1) and then go on to the medieval commentaries, Ovidian imitations and Pseudo-Ovidiana and florilegia (chap. 2); next I will present the manuscript and its historical setting, and describe my diplomatic edition of folios 73 recto-84 recto, containing the excerpts from Ovid introduced by three prefaces, this chapter will also deal with the glossae – glosses explaining individual words, and longer comments in the margins (chap. 3); finally I will analyse the excerpts and marginalia (chap. 4) and draw some conclusions (chap. 5).

---

1 The term aetas ovidiana – the Ovidian age, was first used to describe the 12th century by the pioneer of medieval Latin Ludwig Traube in his Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen, vol. 2, Munich, 1911: 113.
2 Florilegia (‘flower-collections’ after lat. flos – m. flower and lego – v. to collect, gather., collect), singular florilegium. This term is a modern construct, a so-called Latin calx based on the Greek equivalent anthology – which also means a gathering of flowers, as discussed by Beatriz Fernández De la Cuesta Gonzales, En la senda del Florilegium Gallicum, Louvain-La-Neuve 2008: 18.
All translations are my own. For the sake of convenience, all Latin words written with the modern letter \( v \) are rendered with the traditional \( u \), as in the MS.

II. Abbreviations

Works by Ovid may be referred to in the following standard abbreviations: *Amores* (Am.), *Heroides* (Her.), *Ars amatoria* (Ars), *Remedia amoris* (Rem.), *Medicamina faciei* (Med.), *Metamorphoses* (Met.), *Fasti* (Fast.), *Tristia* (Tr.), *Ibis* (Ib.), *Epistulae ex Ponto* (Pont.).

*MS* is used to abbreviate *manuscript* (plural MSS). *Folio* – the front and back of a manuscript page, is abbreviated *f* (pl. *ff*), the front page, *recto* as *R* and the reverse, *verso* as *V*. Columns are abbreviated as *A* (left) and *B* (right). *Century* is abbreviated *s*. *Bibliothèque*, *bibliotéca* etc. are abbreviated *bibl*.

The *Florilegium Sancticrucianum* is referred to as *FS*.

III. Manuscripts referred to in the text

MS Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, 65(64), s. XIII

MS Douai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 749-II, s. XII²

MS Escorial, Biblioteca del Real Monasterio de San Lorenzo del Escorial, Q I 14, s.XIII\textsuperscript{med}

MS Heiligenkreuz, Stiftsbibliothek, 227-III, s. XII²

MS Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, 1095, s.XIII\textsuperscript{in}

MS Lilienfeld, Stiftsbibliothek, 137, c. 1300

MS Munich, Bayerische Statsbibliothek, Clm. 7205, c. 1200

MS Munich, Bayerische Statsbibliothek, Clm. 6911, c. 1300

MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 7647, s. XII

MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 17903, s. XIII
MS Salzburg, St. Peter, a V 41, s. XIII

MS Vatican, Pal. lat. 957, s. XII

MS Vatican, lat. 4929, s. IX.

MS Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 277, s. IX

MS Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek, 33, s. XII
1. Ovid

His life

‘Ille ego qui fuerim, tenerorum lusor amorum, 
quem legis, ut noris, accipe posteritas.’ Tr.4.10.1-2.

Receive, Posterity, so that you may know whom you’re reading, this ‘me’ who I once was – a prankster of tender love.

This thesis is concerned with the 12th-century reception of Ovid as exemplified by a medieval collection of parts of his poetry. In order to gain some foothold from which to move further, it is necessary to first provide an introduction of the poet Ovid and then to proceed to his 12th-century setting. As with most writers of Antiquity, our knowledge of the life of Ovid is limited. The only contemporary witness is Seneca the Elder, who in his old age wrote a memoir about famous rhetoricians of his time, the Controversiae, in which we can read that the two men had met while still young. Ovid is included because of his talent for rhetoric, which can be seen as an important element in his poetry, particularly in the way he sometimes seems to write poems as if they were rhetorical school-exercises. However, the Elder Seneca is not to be fully trusted and his focus is on rhetoric, not biography. Some facts may be gleaned directly from Ovid’s own poetry, particularly the poem Tr. 4.10. However, Roman poets were writing in a sophisticated literary tradition fond of playing with the author’s literary persona, and we should not be overly confident in Ovid’s own testimony about his life. His own personae are truly manifold, as Holzberg comments: ’We must [...] acknowledge that Ovid actually takes on a different role in each of his works’. With his caveat in mind, this much seems to be reasonably certain:

---


4 Even the more serious Roman historians would include anecdotes and hearsay in their writings. For the reference and critique of the Controversiae, see Niklas Holzberg, Ovid – The Poet and His Work, Ithaca 2002[1998]: 21.

Publius Ovidius Naso was born on 20 March 43 B.C. in Sulmo (Sulmona), a small provincial town that was the regional capital of the Paeligni tribe. This italic tribe had played a leading role during the Social War (after lat. socii – allies) but were now an integral part of the Roman empire. The poet descended from an affluent equestrian family, who must have included some large-nosed individual in order to merit the cognomen *naso* – 'big-nose'. His full name is only found in medieval manuscripts. He was able to go to Rome and Athens to study rhetoric; a sure testimony of his family's affluence. As a member of the equestrian class, whose prospects were on the rise during the principate, he was expected to pursue a political career in accordance with his education. This he only partially did, holding two more or less important positions within the growing bureaucracy. Firstly he was part of the *tresviri capitales* (*Tr*.4.10.33-4), responsible for policing Rome, and later he held a judicial post as one of the *decemviri stlitibus iudicandis* (*Fast*. 4.383-4), a stepping-stone towards the quaestorship and senatorial status. Early in his life he chose to pursue poetry over politics and became a protegé of the influential orator, *littérateur* and politician, Mesalla. His patron would not so much have aided him financially as have helped him to gain entrance into the literary *milieu* of the time; rich by any standards! As an old man, Ovid writes about meeting the famous poets of his day:

"temporis illius colui fouique poetas,

quoque aderant uates, rebar adesse deos.

saepe suas uolucre legit mihi grandior aeuo,

quaeque nocet serpens, quae iuuat herba, *Macer*,

saepe suos solitus recitare *Propertius* ignes,

---

10Ibid. 5. It is still remarkable that Ovid was eligible for a quaestorship (a one-year financial magistracy) – the entrance ticket to the Senate, given his rebellious ancestry. Just becoming an *eques* – a knight, the second highest class in Rome, was a great achievement.
11 Lancelot Patrick Wilkinson, *Ovid Surveyed*, Cambridge 1962: 3. It is not surprising that Mesalla, the leading orator of his day, would attract a young poet with a rhetorical talent.
"I worshipped and cherished the poets of that time, and thought that all the bards present were as gods. Often *Macer*, greater in age, read his (poems) to me: birds, the snake that harms, the herb that heals. *Propertius* would often recite his flames, according to the law of friendship in which he was bound to me. *Ponticus*, famous for heroics, and *Bassus* too, famed for iambics, were sweet members of my party. And *Horace* held our ears, while he stroked Ausonian tunes on the cultured lyre. *Virgil*, I only saw, nor did the miserly fates give *Tibullus* time for my friendship. He was your successor, *Gallus*, and *Propertius* his, I myself was the fourth in the order of time."

Here Ovid places himself not only among the celebrated writers of his day, but also within the tradition of Latin love elegy, a poetic genre developed by the poet Gallus and where Propertius and Tibullus were Ovid’s immediate predecessors. The younger poet became popular, and for many years he led a leisured life away from the dangers of politics, or so he thought. He had written an unusually large amount of lucid poetry in different genres, had married three times and fathered a daughter, who herself gave him at least two grandchildren, when tragedy struck. We will probably never know exactly why, and this is one of the most notorious mysteries of Rome, but in the year 8 A.D. Ovid was relegated for life to Tomis (the modern day Constanza in Romania), a town at the limits of Roman civilization, and rather barbaric and cold. He was not deprived of his fortune. According to his own poems he was banished due to *carmen et error* (Tr.

---

13 Gareth Williams discusses whether Tomis really was as nasty as Ovid would make us believe in his exile poetry, and points to links with his early poetry and it’s insistence upon the suffering of excluded lovers, see his essay ‘Ovid’s exile poetry: *Tristia, Epistulæ ex Ponto* and *Ibis*’ in Hardie, Philip (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge 2003: 233-248.
2.207) – a poem and a mistake. Traditionally the poem was thought to signify his risqué Ars Amatoria – a poem not wholly unequal to the title of Roman Kama-Sutra (though much less explicit) and English Renaissance poets were still writing about an adulterious affair with the emperor Augustus’ daughter Julia as if this was the verifiable truth behind Ovid’s mistake:

”The Gracious Princess Julia, our great Empress,

And my best Friend is, in Trimerus, dead.”

(Aston Cokain, 1662, The Tragedy of Ovid 5.6.58-59)\textsuperscript{14}

Whatever the reasons behind his punishment, he was never pardoned, and died in exile during the reign of Tiberius, probably around year 17 or 18 A.D.\textsuperscript{15}

His poetry: general characteristics

The corpus produced by Ovid is large by most standards, encompassing 6 volumes in the Loeb Classical Library (more than any other poet), and it would probably have been another volume longer if all of his writings had survived up until our time. It is therefore very difficult, not to say foolhardy to generalise about his poetry, yet even so, some overarching characteristics may be helpful in coming to grips with his work.

Firstly: Ovid started out his poetic career focusing on people in love; this theme is central to all of his early works, which recount fictitious letters of mythical lovers as well as the equally fictitious erotic experiences of the author, both of which have a tragic and sometimes comic tone about them. The wit of Ovid is not wholly dissimilar from the Wildian, except in its insistent heterosexual nature; both authors favoured style, irrevent satire, and witty quotes above all else.\textsuperscript{16} Ovid wrote poems in which he assumed the role of love guru, teaching men how to love well and seduce women, and teaching the broken hearted individual of a suicidal disposition how to avoid loving all together. Secondly, Ovid was particularly fond of creating a polyphony within his texts,


\textsuperscript{16} It would be interesting to read Oscar Wilde’s The Ballad of Reading Gaol with Ovid’s exile poetry as a backdrop.
making them convey meaning on many different levels. As Holzberg notes: "the polyphony of his verse often results from the superimposition of *more* than two levels of meaning."\(^{17}\) Throughout his poetic career he always played with the generic characteristics of Latin love elegy, a genre focusing on the plight of a tragic lover. Even his later poetry written in exile has a certain degree of this, where the traditional roles of tragic (male) lover and capricious (female) object of affection is mimicked in that of exile and emperor, both relationships being characterized by one party’s refusal of access for the other, either to her bed (and body) or to his city (and freedom)\(^{18}\). Ovid was also a particularly *doctus poeta* – a learned poet, who would draw on the literary tradition he had inherited both from archaic Greece, hellenistic Alexandria and republican Rome. The textual relationships with older poets play a crucial part in his poetic strategy. Blackwell’s *A Companion to Ovid* notably features a section on 'Intertexts' accounting for a sixth of the whole companion. Lastly, he was no stranger to double entendres in the more typical sense; the obscene Ovid was once as proverbial as his obsession with love affairs. Political critique of his contemporary society may also have played in, though this is the hardest to access.

All of the things I have mentioned in this section go a long way in explaining his medieval popularity: there was a lot of him to be read, so more would plausibly be available; he mainly wrote about love, in particular, he wrote didactic poems on heterosexual, erotic love (with all the attractions of a taboo this would have had for chaste monks and others)—the closest thing available to handbooks, which was a typically medieval genre, and finally: he was a poet who could be (and probably intended to be) read on many levels, a process of reading not wholly unlike that of biblical exegesis, a discipline which was the medieval ideal for the study of literature. This would eventually lead to such peculiar creations as the *Ovide moralisé* – a 70 000 line 14th-century French-Burgundian attempt at rewriting the Ovidian *opus magnum*, the *Metamorphoses*, so as to transform it into "moral exemplum or spiritual allegory".\(^{19}\) Not only this: Ovid was an accomplished stylist with an unusual knack for writing in the


\(^{19}\) Ana Pairet surveys the history of this work in her essay: "Recasting the *Metamorphoses* in fourteenth-century France: The challenges of the *Ovide moralisé*" in Clark, James G., Coulson, Frank T, McKinley, Kathryn L.(eds.), *Ovid in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge 2011: 83.
elegiac and hexameter metres (how else could he have been so prolific?), which could win him approval even from hardline moralists. As an exile, Ovid also wrote nostalgically about Rome, a Rome which was equally distant from the lives of medieval readers. As we shall see, Ovid became an authority (or even the authority) on love, the elegiac metre, living as an exile, and myth for the Middle Ages. Hexter sums up these different roles in his article on Ovid in the Middle Ages for Brill’s companion on Ovid, which has the subtitle: 'Exile, Mytographer, and Lover.'

Establishing a fixed chronology of his oeuvre is no easy task when dealing with a writer working a good one and a half millenia before Gutenberg. Add to that the fact that some scholars believe that Ovid himself made efforts to edit his work retrospectively, reducing the five book *Amores* to the three we have today:

"Qui modo Nasonis fueramus quinque libelli,

tres sumus; hoc illi praetulit auctor opus." *Am.* 1. prol. 1-2.

"We that just now were five booklets of Naso

are three, the author preferred this work over that".

Therefore, I will here merely distinguish between three chronological and thematic stages of his career. I will give a brief outline of each part of his poetic output in turn, in no particular order, focusing on those which later reappear in the 12th-century MS of the FS.

---


21 Niklas Holzberg instead sees this as an hommage to Callimachus who famously said that 'a big book is a big evil’ and he questions the existence of a written 'first edition’ in *Ovid – The Poet and His Work*, Ithaca 2002[1998]: 31-34. The words *libelli* and *modo* are reminscent of *Catullus* 1.1-2: 'Qui dono lepidum novum *libellum*, arida *modo* pumice *exploitum*, this programmatic poem places Catullus within a Callimachean aesthetics, and uses neoteric (a group of Roman poets mainly inspired by Callimachus) keywords, of which *lepidum* and *libellum* are typical, see Brian A. Krostenko’s essay 'Elite Republican Discourse’ in Skinner, Marilyn B. (ed.), *A Companion to Catullus – Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World*, Oxford 2007: 212-232. The prologue of the *Amores* is clearly also a programmatic poem.
Early – amatory poetry

Heroides

The *Heroides* or *Epistulae Heroidum* consists of two parts, which probably initially were published separately. The first part contains 15 elegiac letters from heroines to heroes of Greek mythology, mainly drawn from attic tragedies.\(^{22}\) This was a revolutionary new genre, to write a whole collection of verse letters from mythological women was a novelty in Ovid’s day.\(^{23}\) At their best they can transmit the psychological anguish of these women, who all long for their lovers (many of which have betrayed them), whilst playing a highly skilled literary game with Ovid’s predecessors, and at their worst they have been seen as little more than clever *ethopoeia* – rhetorical school-exercises in characterization.\(^{24}\) If nothing else, it was a bold effort to take on themes that had already been treated by the very superstars of Greek and Roman literature, and to do so in such a novel way. They are replete with literary allusions, which often are used to create irony. For an example, Ovid does not mention explicitly that Medea will murder her own children fathered by Jason; the readers know this (viz. Euripides’ *Medea*). Ovid plays with this fact and makes Hypsipyle, Jason’s other love interest, write that she is afraid that Medea will kill her, Hypsipyle’s, children. In this way she is ironically foreshadowing the tragic infanticide of Medea’s children.\(^{25}\) The authenticity of the last of the single *Heroides*, the letter from Sappho to Phaon, has been challenged repeatedly, but is thoroughly defended in the most recent research by Thorsen.\(^ {26}\)

The second part, the so-called *Double Heroides*, is a more refined work; it consists of 3 pairs of elegiac letters, where we get something closer to miniature epistolary novels. The theme is once more problematic love affairs from mythology. Famous is the pair of

\(^{22}\) Lancelot Patrick Wilkinson also points to the links with epic (Briseis from the *Iliad*, Penelope from the *Odyssey*, Hypsipyle and Medea from the *Argonautica*), *Ovid Surveyed*, Cambridge 1962: 36.


\(^{24}\) According to the rather negative reading of Wilkinson, see *Ovid Surveyed*, Cambridge 1962: 37.

\(^{25}\) Fulkerson notes the differences between rhetorical school-exercises; i.e. in terms of form: verse vs. prose and in subject matter: a narrow focus on heroic female lovers’ plight; additionally she points to how recent scholarship has a more positive take on the supposed ‘monotony’ of the collection, see her “The Heroides: Female Elegy?” Knox, Peter E. (ed.) *A Companion to Ovid – Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World*, Oxford 2009: 80.

letters between Paris and Helen. There has been much controversy about whether these additional *Heroides* were written by Ovid or by some later imitator. Some have even questioned the authenticity of some of the single letters, but scholarly opinion is now turning firmly in favour of the authenticity of all the *Heroides*. Perhaps the greatest strength of the *Heroides* is their exploration of female psychology, something which largely is a *terra incognita* in most of classical literature (Sappho’s first-person lyrical poetry is a notable, early exception). Holzberg notes Ovid’s change of perspective: “he no longer speaks as a *poeta/amator*, but adopts an elegiacally enamored woman’s role.”

Perhaps due to its catalogue of famous women from mythology and less actively erotic content, the *Heroides* became quite popular in the Middle Ages. As is the case today, since many of Ovid’s sources for the stories had disappeared by the end of the so-called ‘Dark Ages’, the letters must have gained in appeal through their unique status what they lost through literary allusions to older poets. Hexter points to their suitability as part of the medieval curriculum: the collection was of a manageable size and had little need for allegorization or moralizing alterations since they were written from a first person perspective, which obviously did not convey the sentiments of Ovid himself.

**Amores**

The *Amores* is often seen as Ovid’s literary debut. In the prologue poem he even writes about having tried his hand at (martial) epic poetry but being twarted by Cupid into writing elegiac love poetry instead, thus signalling the start of his poetic career as an elegist. The *Amores* is in many ways Ovid’s way of integrating himself within the tradition of Latin love elegy while at the same time breaking its rules through satire, effectively ending the genre by overdoing it (the genre of Latin love elegy *proper* ends with him). This genre had several general characteristics shared by its main propagators:

---

30Niklas Holzberg puts it parallel with the *Heroides*, but argues that the *Amores* probably was published first, around 15 B.C., see his *Ovid – The Poet and His Work*, Ithaca 2002[1998]: 34.
31 This is a typical example of a recusatio – ‘excuse’: a poetic refusal to do something i.e. to write epic poetry in order to make the alternative course of action seem better, i.e. writing elegy.
(Catullus)\textsuperscript{32}, Gallus, Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid. Thorsen sums them up as follows: it was defined by the overaching theme of heterosexual love for love’s sake, something which was untypical of the literary heritage of Greece and of the cultural heritage of the practically-minded Rome; the genre had a definable canon and location (Rome) and shared a single poetic form, the elegiac couplet, consisting of one hexameter paired with a pentameter. \textsuperscript{33} The genre also had a distinctive political side to it. In a changing political landscape, with an autocratic ruler (Augustus) stifling the political aspirations of the Roman aristocracy, poets created a countercultural literary movement with a clearly escapist, anti-political and peace-loving tendency: 'The tension between the world of love elegy and the world of war is a key element in the genre’ in the words of Harrison.\textsuperscript{34} Ovid writes about his \textit{militia amoris} – his military service of love, rather than of martial values traditionally expressed in epic poetry.

The \textit{Amores} consists of 3 books\textsuperscript{35} that center on the author’s literary persona’s failed love affair with a married woman called Corinna. Their affair follows all the stages typical of the genre and all the initial bragging promises and tricks of the trade employed by the narrator are turned topsy-turvy – irony is omnipresent. As with the \textit{Heroides}, intertextuality is central to the collection, not only do the poems stand in a close relationship and are dependent upon one another, but there are many references to earlier writers. Famous is the analogy between Ovid and Corinna’s pet parrot, which is eulogized in \textit{Am}.2.6: the parrot becomes a clever homage both to Catullus and Tibullus.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{32} Catullus wrote poems that were precursors of the genre (particularly \textit{Cat}. 68A-B), but he would write similar poems in a variety of meters, thus distancing himself from the later elegists. He is variously included and excluded from the canon of Latin love elegy by scholars, as seen in the Cambridge Companion were he is included by Paul Allen Miller and excluded by Federica Bessone. Thorsen, Thea Selliass (ed.) \textit{The Cambridge Companion to Latin love elegy}, Cambridge 2013: 39-58 (Bessone), 166-179 (Miller).
\textsuperscript{33} Thea Selliass Thorsen, 'Introduction - Latin love elegy’ in Thorsen, Thea Selliass (ed.) \textit{The Cambridge Companion to Latin love elegy}, Cambridge 2013: 2-4. The elegiac couplet adds a distinctive \textit{flavour} and irregular tone to the poems, which suits the highly irregular theme of illicit love affairs (particularly irregular for the Romans that is).
\textsuperscript{34} Stephen Harrison 'Time, place and political background’ in Thorsen, Thea Selliass (ed.) \textit{The Cambridge Companion to Latin love elegy}, Cambridge 2013: 137.
\textsuperscript{35} In Classics, a 'book' denotes a long section of a work of literature, typically 500-1000 lines, a remnant of the book scrolls, the medium on which the ancients wrote. This medium forced students of literature to learn a lot by heart, since it was very laborious to look up specific passages in a text.
\textsuperscript{36} The \textit{Amores} also offer valuable glimpses of everyday life during the early Principate, a rare subject for poetry.
**Ars Amatoria**

Having written a poetry collection where the author’s fictitious *amours* was the theme, as well as a collection of love letters, Ovid now turned to writing yet more poems concerned with love, but this time using a different artistic device as a vehicle for his poetry: the didactic poem. Foremost among these new creations was the *Ars Amatoria* – or *Ars Amandi* as it is sometimes called – ‘the art of love/loving’, which is ‘both an elegiac and a didactic poem’. 37 This poem was important because of its presumed role in Ovid’s exile, as well its subsequent role as *love-manual* combined with *primer of grammar* in the Middle Ages. 38 In three books, two directed towards men and one towards women, Ovid acts as a kind of teacher of loving, a *praecceptor amoris* (*Ars* 1.17). The concept of love in the *Ars* is radically different from the earlier elegiac poems, it is a game to be enjoyed rather than an ‘overpowering *furor* resulting inevitably in misery’. 39 In the opening of the poem it is now the *praecceptor amoris* (Ovid’s literary *persona*) that controls Cupid, and not the other way round, as in the opening of the *Amores*. Making love into a discipline, an art to be taught and learned, has been seen as catastrophic for the project of Latin love elegy. Some scholars have seen it as destroying the genre by showing the ridiculousness of the elegiac lover 40, or at the very least showing the unreality of the elegic genre’s setting, despite its realistic backdrop (life in contemporary Rome). 41 Alternatively, by using the elegiac couplet and the erotic thematics of Latin love elegy, Ovid can be said to be ‘appropriating this “great” genre [didactic poetry] for Latin love elegy.’ 42

The first two books give men a mixture of cynical and comical instructions on how to seduce women, married or not, with the goal of a succesful and lasting sexual relationship, while the third book teaches women (ostensibly only *meretrices* –

38 Ralph J. Hexter notes that the *Ars* was the earliest ‘significantly glossed Ovidian text’, which shows its early use in the Medieval schoolrooms, see his *Ovid and Medieval Schooling. Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid’s Ars Amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, and Epistulae Heroidum*, Munich 1986: 25.
40 Ibid. 148.
42 Ibid. 124. Didactic poetry traditionally dealt with themes such as religion, agriculture and philosophy, and were written in a different meter, the *hexameter*. 
courtesans, but equally applicable to all women) similar and complementary skills. Ovid’s readers have often been dumbfounded by the apparent ironic distance and blatant cynicism with which the poet treats such a heartfelt theme as love. The irreverence towards love is however balanced by the way the poem pokes fun at the discipline of love-making: those that set out to play disinterestedly often find themselves absorbed by the game, and lose control. So also the narrator who has made all the mistakes in love affairs that he now tries to teach others how to avoid. Another issue has been the supposed obscenity of the poem, which became highly problematic both in Antiquity and during the Middle Ages. There are two sections devoted to sex, 2.703-732 and 3.769-808. The first mainly deals with refining the pleasures of sex from a male perspective, assuming that the male readers already ‘knew the basics’, while the latter section was more provocative, since it taught advanced sexual techniques to women – running wildly in the face of traditional Roman attitudes towards female sexuality: Roman matronae – married women, were famous for their pudor – bashfulness, modesty; and their role in sex should to all intents be limited to a passive one. The Romans had chaste priestesses, the Vestal virgins at the centre of their state cult, whose chastity was sacrosanct. Augustus pictured himself as a supporter of traditional Roman virtues, and had introduced legislation on marriage, punishing adulterers – he was bound to be irritated by Ovid’s irreverence towards marriage in the Ars. By teaching women how to play a more active part, Ovid could be accused of: ‘teaching them not merely adultery, but a whole range of sexual techniques which were considered the province of courtesans’. The role of women in the work in general is dubious, and the poem has variously been seen as feminist or misogynistic.

45 Raping Vestal virgins was harshly punished; even crossing underneath their litters was a capital offence, and a vestal caught doing voluntary sexual acts could be buried alive, see Vesta, Vestals in Hornblower, Simon, Spawforth, Antony and Eidinow, Esther (eds.) The Oxford Classical Dictionary, Oxford 2012 [1948]: 1544.
47 Addressing a poem to professional prostitutes is certainly not the most straightforward thing to reconcile with a feminist agenda, nor is discussing rape in terms of ‘women may like it’ which is a recurring theme in many of the myths Ovid refers to in his poems (the gods are notorious rapists). Holzberg thinks the references to rape are a kind of jokes, in the Ars he speculates whether they are a way
Remedia Amoris

The flipside of Ovid’s Ars Amatoria was, as we have seen, that the disciplined, disinterested game of love could get out of hand. For those suffering the pangs of unhappy love affairs, to the point of entertaining suicidal thoughts, Ovid wrote another didactic poem in elegiac couplets; a ‘cure for love’ – the Remedia Amoris – filling a single book. It is a cure, in the sense that the author’s persona in addition to being a praeceptor amoris also plays the role of physician. Watson notes how this is shown through frequent references to medicine and to an invocation of Apollo, the god of healing.\textsuperscript{48} She also sees the Remedia as a comic effort, whose narrator is equally unable to provide a full-good education in avoiding love – the opposite of the purpose with his Ars.\textsuperscript{49} His best advice is to take up serious work: agriculture, war or law, in order to forget the unreciprocated love-affair. This is an ironic twist on the ethos of the elegiac lover: to avoid love-affairs he has to live like an arch-Roman aristocratic farmer/soldier/politician. Yet he is not fully successful, for in the praeceptor’s description of agricultural pursuits the verses share strong links with both Virgil (more of a supporter of traditional Roman values) as well as with Greek pastoral poetry; typically concerned with unhappy love – exactly what was to be avoided! In this section Ovid ’both parodies didactic poetry and also by the incongruous introduction of pastoral elements undermines the efficacy of the praeceptor’s advice.’\textsuperscript{50} The Remedia is more than an inversion of the Ars: it is a continuation of Ovid’s experimentation with elegy and mock-didactic poetry, playing with metaphors of disease and healing. The overall tone is mocking, yet between the lines there is an occasional note of a more serious strain.\textsuperscript{51} The intertextuality is particularly dense in this poem; between the Remedia and the other elegiac poems of Ovid, the Amores and the Ars; between the works of Virgil (the epic Aeneid, the didactic poem on agriculture, the Georgics and the

\textsuperscript{49} Ibid. 164.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid. 165.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid. 165.
pastoral collection of elegies, the Eclogues or Bucolica) as well as Lucretius’ didactic poem, De rerum natura – to mention the most noteworthy.  

Medicamina Faciei Femineae

In this group of didactic elegiac poetry we must not forget the Medicamina Faciei Femineae – ‘cosmetics for the female face’. This poem is only preserved in a fragmentary state, comprising 100 lines out of a probable 500 or so original lines. It deals with cosmetics, and seems to be written on the basis of textbooks on the production and application of cosmetics and serves as an interesting precursor of the Ars and the Remedia, illustrating the poet’s ability to treat a ‘dry’ theme in an interesting fashion. It is addressed to matronae, married women, and includes an apology for cosmetics, while admitting that character outweighs appearances.

Middle period – mythography and ritual chronology

Fasti

Ovid’s next poetic venture seems an odd one: to write a poetic description of the Roman calendar, focusing on its festivals and rites. Originally this elegiac poem was envisaged as one book covering each month, but we have only preserved the first six, which may or may not be the only ones completed. Two aspects of this rarely read work (only recently has the Fasti received a proper revival of scholarly attention) are worth noting: the political importance of the Roman calendar and the poem’s role in the literary tradition. Augustus had adopted a conservative propaganda in order to secure his revolutionary new political status as de facto autocratic monarch. Above all he focused on his role as a restorer of the old Roman religion and republican traditions, as Citroni

52 Barbara Weiden Boyd mentions the recent reappraisal of the Remedia as well as discussing the main intertextual references of the work in her essay 'Remedia Amoris’ Knox, Peter E. (ed.) A Companion to Ovid – Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, Oxford 2009: 104-119.
54 Ibid. 144-146.
55 Ovid claims to have written all twelve, Tr.2.549-552. If the second half ever was published it would rank high on the list of lost works of Antiquity; the Fasti are invaluable for religious historians.
56 He was proudest of his offices as Pontifex Maximus, the highest priestly office, and of being a tribunus plebis – ‘tribune of the plebs’, a magistrate whose role was to be a defender of the common people. He assumed the offices permanently in 12 B.C. and 23 B.C., respectively, see Howard Hayes Scullard, From the Gracchi to Nero, London, 1964: 224, 221. These two offices would be adopted by the subsequent emperors.
points out: ‘in order to gain lasting success it was necessary to present himself as the guarantor of the republican civic institutions and the ethical and religious tradition on which, according to the Roman and Italic collective conscience, these were based.’

The maintenance of the Julian Calendar was an important part of his policy, since this secured his popular support by providing stability to the lives of ordinary people, who hitherto had been plagued by the governing classes’ power to alter the dates of elections, festivals etc. according to their needs. The calendar included many erotically explicit popular festivals, which seemed an odd thing for Augustus to support, and even restore. Ovid seems to be accentuating the problematic role of these festivals in his Fasti, but Herbert-Brown argues against seeing this as political critique, since the festival’s lewder roles mainly are limited to low-class prostitutes and entertainers, meretrices/mimae, which serve to uphold the strict Augustan legal code surrounding the sexual life of married women. She even argues that the Fasti has a didactic purpose of explaining ’Augustus as a semi-divine champion of the lower orders against the senatorial, governing class of Rome’. The work was dedicated to Augustus and his family.

The literary pedigree of the Fasti is mainly to be found among Hellenistic predecessors. Callimachus, the foremost poet of Alexandria, had written an opus magnum called the Aetia – ’reasons, explanations’, a work focusing on a catalogue of myths of origins explaining festivals, rituals etc. The poem also contained a famous story of catasterism – transformation into a starsign, the Coma Berenices – ’The Lock of Berenice’ – recounting how a queen’s lock of hair appeared on the night sky. The intertextual references to the Aetia in the Fasti are many, not only in reminiscences of its prologue, but also in its mythic/religious-themes and repeated use of catasterisms.

---

58 pontifices [priests], had the power to manipulate the old calendar with arbitrary intercalations for partisan political purposes’, Geraldine Herbert-Brown ’Fasti: the Poet, the Prince, and the Plebs’ Knox, Peter E. (ed.) A Companion to Ovid – Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World, Oxford 2009: 121.
60 Ibid. 131.
Metamorphoses

During Ovid’s middle period he seems to have become obsessed with temporality and change. The description of repetitive time as seen in the Fasti is complemented in his major poetic creation, the ‘epic’ Metamorphoses – 'transformations’, which focuses on teleological, non-cyclical time, while sharing the focus on mythography. This poem is the second largest extant classical Latin poem, totalling 15 books; 3 more than the Aeneid. It is written in the epic meter of hexameter, but is no conventional epic. Firstly, its narrative structure is not focused on any individual’s story, such as the Iliad (on Achilles), Odyssey (on Odysseus) or Aeneid (on Aeneas), but rather on a catalogue of gods, heroes and humans that have undergone some kind of transformation or metamorphosis. The proem – 'introduction’ sets out the goal as:

"In noua fert animus mutatas dicere formas
corpora: di, coeptis (nam uos mutastis et illa)
aspirate meis primaque ab origine mundi
ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen."  

(My) mind brings me to describe forms changed into new bodies, o Gods – for you have also changed them – breathe towards the task begun by me and lead a perpetual song from the first beginning of the cosmos up until my times.

All the gods are invoked to make sure that the poet is able to complete his truly mammoth enterprise of describing metamorphosis throughout time. Most epics were confined to a relatively brief time frame (the rage of Achilles, lasting little over a month; the 10 years of Odysseus’ homecoming); Horace strictly warned against starting an epic too far back (Ars Poetica 146-147), yet Ovid was undeterred by these chronological conventions of the genre. The task was initiated by his own mind, not the gods or Muses, in true Ovidian arrogance he merely asks for a little divine support. As Kenney sums it up: "The gods have their uses.. – but when it came to writing poetry

---

63 The 17-book epic poem Punica by the Silver Age poet Silius Italicus is a few hundred lines longer..
Ovid was his own man. His poetic task involved collecting a vast array of myths and legends, fitting them into a chronological framework and finding a way to tie them all together. Collecting the stories may have involved the use of mythographical handbooks. The myths existed in a variety of forms and with no standardized chronology, so Ovid had to create one almost from scratch. In organizing the material he divided it between three rough categories: gods (1.452-6.412), heroes (6.413-11.193) and 'historical' men and women (11.194-15.870). In tying the episodes together he employed all the tricks of the trade common to serial novelists. 'The secret was to keep the narrative moving and the reader guessing.' In allowing the stories to unfold he uses a variety of internal narrators, even a written letter, and creates a 'narrative mode defined by rambling curiosity and story-telling.', as Barchiesi puts it. The 'plot' is notoriously difficult to pin down. The episodes are themselves written without any concern for neat divisions between lines or books, as we can see in the rough triadic schema (gods, heroes, history) where the transitions between the parts occur in the middle of books. The different levels of internal narratives are even more convoluted than those of the Odyssey (Homer narrates that Odysseus listens to the bard Demodocus relate Odysseus’ own lifestory – three narrative levels), Barchiesi points to the story of Arethusa, noting a total of five levels of internal narrators: 'Ovid'; a muse; Calliope; Arethusa; Alpheus.

To the ancient and perhaps most of the modern audiences, the Metamorphoses exhibit a delightfully unserious character, the stories contained within it have 'something of the quality of A Midsummer Night’s Dream’ as Wilkinson put it. Their brevity dissuades from too deep an emotional engagement, and the 'serialized' narrative style makes it clear that the many miniature stories are meant to be read in quick succession. This approach to the work is in many ways the exact opposite of the medieval reader. He would find time to ponder at length over individual stories, in particular those that seem more serious; the initial cosmogony followed by the Noa-like flood in the story of

---

66Ibid.146.
68Ibid.188-189.
Deucalion and Pyrrha were particularly interesting for a christian readership. The *Metamorphoses* was probably the most easily ‘christianized’ of his works because of these early stories, while at the same time making Ovid the prime medieval source for ancient myths. The medieval mind did however share one characteristic with modern readers, namely a considerable distance in time from ‘the Rome that was’. The last part of the *Metamorphoses* centers on the foundational myths surrounding Rome and in many ways heralds in a golden age. Reading about this ‘golden age’ in retrospect of its demise gives the work a tragic tinge, and makes the overaching theme of transformation and volubility even more poignant to later readers. As Holzberg sums it up: ’the theme of the work is, rather, man in a world caught up in a process of constant change’. 70

*Late – exile poetry*

*Tristia*

If Ovid really was banished in part because of something he wrote (the *Ars*), then his continued poetic efforts appear as the obsessive, futile efforts of a *poeta/amator* who continues to love in vain. Writing elegiac poetry helps him cope with his exile, Ovid writes in a collection of elegiac letters, the *Tristia* – a collection encompassing five books – yet he observes the irony in continuing to pursue that which partially caused his banishment: 4.1.35-36:

> nos quoque delectant, quamvis nocuere, libelli,

> quodque mihi telum vulnera fecit, amo.’

Those small books delight me, even though they were harmful, and I love that weapon which caused my wounds.

The *Tristia* are on the face of it the melancholy, autobiographical memoirs sent to Rome from an exiled poet, yet even this tragic facade show signs of the humorous, witty poet at work. These *Sad tales* are perhaps not so sad after all. Holzberg compares the collection with the *Odyssey* in relating the strange and terrible details of Ovid’s new life 71

---

at the edge of the civilized world, lines 3.8.37-38 alludes directly to the opening of the *Odyssey*:71

> 'cumque locum moresque hominum cultusque sonumque
cernimus...'

and when I saw the places and manners of men and both their culture and sounds..

compare line 1.3 of the *Odyssey*:

> πολλῶν δ’ ἄνθρωπον ἱδὲν ἀστέα καὶ νόσον ἐγνω,

he saw many towns of men and learned their minds.

Even in the traumatic existence of an exile, Ovid seemed to have relished the opportunity to play literary games; to be able to compare himself with his literary heroes. A lot of the elegies in the *Tristia* are concerned more with metapoetical questions than with the tedium of his new home, Tomis. As we saw in my introduction of the main characteristics of Ovid’s work, the elegiac world of the *amator* and the *puella* is mirrored in the relationship between emperor and exile, as noted by Holzberg. In many of the elegies, the poet tries to woo the emperor to be pardoned and be allowed to return to Rome, in particular the second book of the collection is concerned with this. The longing for Rome is again a theme that would find sympathetic ears among readers of later ages; so also another theme of the *Tristia*: the supposed loss of proficiency in Latin (the inhabitants of Tomis mainly spoke Getic), as in lines 5.12.57-58:

> 'Ipse mihi uideor iam dedidicisse Latine:
nam didici Getice Sarmaticeque loqui.'

I seem myself to have already unlearnt Latin, for I have learnt to speak in Getic and Sarmatian.

The witty side of Ovid is not far off even here; this line is written in immaculate Latin, and manages to use excessive alliteration in order to mimic the stammering of someone suffering from lack of practice of a language. The *Tristia* play an important part in the later reception of Ovid because of the autobiographical information we can glean from it, as exemplified above all by poem 4.10: ’famous as Ovid’s autobiography’.72 For

---

medieval readers, the tragic, tedious existence in exile could also be read as an allegory of the Christian concept of a miserable earthly existence, not least since Ovid refers to his new life as a shadow existence and compares it with living in the underworld in book 5, again a reference to the *Odyssey*, with its famous *katabasis* – journey to the underworld. As Hexter points out: 'The monastic life was itself an exile from the world. Man’s earthly life itself a "peregrinatio", an exile from the "patria" of heaven'.

*Epistulae ex Ponto*

Ovid implored Augustus in the *Tristia* to pardon him, or at the very least to relegate him to somewhere less harsh and remote. This theme was continued in another poetry collection of elegiac letters, the *Epistulae ex Ponto* – in many ways a sequel to the *Tristia*, but also important as an independent collection. The addressees are here stated, while in the *Tristia* they were anonymous. The addressees are his wife and close friends, poets in the main, as well as prominent political figures, notably the young imperial prince Germanicus, 'the emperor that never was' (he died young). The themes of the *Tristia* recur; life in exile, poetics, friendship and matrimony. The collection is normally seen to be composed of two parts, books 1-3 and book 4. The first part is 'extremely homogenous [...] it represents the various ways in which Ovid seeks to relate his current situation to the different personalities of the individuals to whom he addresses his letters.' The last book was for a long time thought to have been published posthumously; it has a different structure than books 1-3 and is longer, but the final epistle (16) provides rather too much closure for an unfinished collection. Holzberg argues that the uneven number of elegies is a deliberate sign of the book’s status as a closing act: both the first books of Ovid’s *Tristia* and his elegiac predecessor Propertius’ last book have an ‘odd’ number of poems, whereas other elegiac collections

---

75 Germanicus, father of the emperor Caligula, and his circle is the focus of book 4, Ovid may have hoped that Germanicus would obtain his pardon. Luigi Galasso ‘Epistulae ex Ponto’ in Knox, Peter E. (ed.) *A Companion to Ovid –Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World*, Oxford 2009: 196-99.
have multiples of five. The overaching theme of the collection, especially the last part, seems to be the power of poetry, not only to entertain, but to shape the world. This positive view of poetry is contrasted with a ‘tone of disenchantment’ – his poems are only mildly effective in lifting his mood. The Epistulae ex Ponto – ‘letters from the Black Sea’ are important as the defining, and in all likelyhood, last work of Ovid. They are intimately concerned with the poet’s status in society, and are in many ways the closest thing Ovid came to writing ethically laden poems. This would make them particularly palatable to the medieval reader. The last poem is both proud and tragic,

4.16.2-4:

'non solet ingeniis summa nocere dies, 
famaque post cineres maior uenit. et mihi nomen 
tum quoque, cum uiuis adnumerarer, erat.’

The last day does not usually harm talents, 
and greater fame comes after the ashes;

and I too had a name then, when I was counted among the living.

Ibis

If the Tristia and the Epistulae ex Ponto were poetic products of Ovid’s melancholy in exile, then Ibis represents another sentiment; anger. The poem is a long invective poem aimed at an anonymous enemy, whose name is given the pseudonym ‘Ibis’ – the Egyptian bird. Invective poetry was associated with the archaic Greek poet Archilochus, whose iambics were supposed to have caused his opponents’ suicide due to shame. Ovid’s immediate literary predecessor was here Callimachus, the Alexandrian scholar-poet, who wrote a lost invective poem also titled Ibis. The identity of Ovid’s addressee is a mystery, though many hypotheses have been put forward; the most ingenious is perhaps that it’s addressed to himself, to sibi – an anagram of Ibis. The poem is exaggerated out of all proportions, containing a catalogue of curses and analogous

myths, and cannot be taken too literally. Perhaps Ovid wrote the poem as a form of therapy; as had partially been his objective in writing the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*? Lines 637-8 may provide a clue:

'denique Sarmaticas inter Geticasque sagittas

his precor ut uiuas et moriare locis.'

Finally I pray that you may live and die in these places,

among the Sarmatian arrows and the Getae.

---

2. The *aetas ovidiana*.

*Background of the concept*

The 12th and 13th centuries were a time of renewal and pioneering activity within many areas of human enterprise in Western Europe. This was the age of the gothic cathedrals: potent symbols of these great achievements; including the foundation of new centres of learning, i.e. the cathedral schools and universities which would transmit the wisdom and culture of antiquity to ever-wider circles. The transmission of classical authors was secured through increased production of MSS. Intellectual feats like these would lead Haskins to popularise the term ’the 12th-century renaissance’ when describing this period.82

The German professor of medieval Latin (the first such academic chair) Ludwig Traube created a set of terms used to describe trends in the medieval reception of classical authors. His main concern was the canonical Latin poets’ influence on medieval poets, and he singled out the 12th and 13th centuries as the *aetas Ovidiana* – ’the Ovidian age’.83 This can be seen not only in the creation of new poetry in imitation of Ovid, but also in a veritable renaissance of the study of Ovid, of which the production of school commentaries and his inclusion in *florilegia* are the most important testimonies. Birger Munk Olsen showed that there is little backing for calling the 12th and 13th centuries an ’Ovidian age’ merely by looking at the surviving 12th-and 13th-century MSS of whole poems by Ovid84, yet as we shall see, in the three other areas, there is much to be said for using Traube’s term in an even broader sense than he himself employed it. The FS is an important part of this wider picture.

---

84 Only the *Metamorphoses* appears in a considerable number of copies during this time, while almost as many MSS exist from the 11th century as the 12th and the first half of the 13th century for the other poems, Birger Munk Olsen, ’Ovide au Moyen Age’, *La réception de la littérature classique au Moyen Age (IXe - XIIe siècle)*, Copenhagen 1995: 71-80.
**Pseudo-Ovidiana and Ovidian imitations**

'Dixisti...Tempus erit, cum me spectabis laeta redire,' Deidamia Achilli 19-20.\(^{85}\)

You said there will be a time when you, with joy, will see me return.

Ovid was a source for imitation and a victim of outright forgery from an early stage of his literary Nachleben (afterlife). He himself mentions one Sabinus in *Amores* 2.18 who is to have produced twin-letters to some of the single *Heroides*, a clear imitation of Ovid’s model.\(^{86}\) Overall, however, the major part of this literary activity belongs in the Middle Ages. When describing these later literary products, it is difficult to distinguish too precisely between different categories. I will follow Kretschmer in distinguishing only between spurious texts that were ascribed to Ovid in at least one MS, i.e. 'pseudo-Ovidiana' and 'Ovidian imitations' – imitations of Ovidian lines, themes or topics.\(^{87}\) Hexter challenges the use of the *pseudo*-term, and proposed to replace it with a more neutral *para* – ('texts that go beyond’) free from any concern with deception on part of the authors.\(^{88}\)

Some early examples of pseudo-Ovidiana are difficult to date, and some may have been written within Ovid’s lifetime or during the first centuries thereafter. The *Halieutica* – 'On fishing’, is a didactic poem on fishing that Pliny the Elder probably falsely attributed to Ovid, (*Nat.* 32.11), a 130 line fragment of this exists in a Carolingian MS.\(^{89}\) The *Nux* 'the Walnut tree’ is another candidate for the earliest pseudo-Ovidian work. This 182

---


\(^{86}\) Some, like Holzberg think this to be factual, and such a thing was not unheard of in a time when originality of execution was more important than originality of subject, see Niklas Holzberg, *Ovid – The Poet and His Work*, Ithaca 2002[1998]: 90.


\(^{88}\) Hexter also points out the dubious authenticity of variant readings in even the ‘authentic’ Ovidian works, which have gone through a long and problematic history of transmissions, Ralph J. Hexter, 'Shades of Ovid' in Clark, James G., Coulson, Frankt T. and McKinley, Kathryn L. (eds.) *Ovid in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge 2011: 291-292.

line elegy depicts the lament of a sentient walnut tree that is pelted with stones, a theme found in Aesop.\footnote{Peter E. Knox 'Lost and Spurious Works' in Knox, Peter E. (ed.) \textit{A Companion to Ovid – Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World}, Oxford 2009: 212-213.}

The next time we encounter pseudo-Ovidiana or Ovidian imitations is in the 9\textsuperscript{th} century Loire Valley. A bishop of Orléans, Theodulf, was a good representative of the renaissance of classical education initiated under Charlemagne. In 820, after having been deposed as bishop, he wrote a letter of complaint to his friend Modoin, ‘the “Naso” of Charlemagne’s court’; a letter full of references to Ovid’s exile poetry.\footnote{Ralph J. Hexter, ’Ovid and Medieval Schooling. \textit{Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid’s Ars Amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, and Epistulae Heroidum}, Munich 1986: 90.}

Sigmund Tafel hypothesized that the archetype of Ovid’s amatory works was taken by the same Theodulf from Spain to France around the end of the 8th century.\footnote{Vicente Cristóbal Ovid in medieval Spain’ in Clark, James G., Coulson, Frankt T. and McKinley, Kathryn L. (eds.) \textit{Ovid in the Middle Ages}, Cambridge 2011: 231.} Theodulf was not only influenced by the style of Ovid, he even recommended reading Ovid for his ‘philosophical truths’.\footnote{James G. Clark ’Introduction’ in Ovid in Clark, James G., Coulson, Frankt T. and McKinley, Kathryn L. (eds.) \textit{Ovid in the Middle Ages}, Cambridge 2011: 11.} This would become a hallmark of the medieval reception of Ovid. The Loire Valley would also become the epicentre of the \textit{aetas Ovidiana}. A string of elegiac comedies inspired by Ovidian ‘themes, language, style and metrical techniques’ appeared from around the 12th century, many of these were connected with writers from the Loire Valley, while some anonymous ones (attributed to Ovid) may have a connection with either the Loire Valley or south-west Germany (Tegernsee).\footnote{Marek Thue Kretschmer ‘The love elegy in medieval Latin literature’ in Thorsen, Thea Selliias (ed.) \textit{The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy}, Cambridge 2013: 273-275.}

This was only one of a wide set of genres that were revived in an Ovidian vein during this period. The influence of his didactic love poems was large, resulting in the creation of the \textit{Facetus}, a poem by a certain Aurigena that included both a veritable pseudo-\textit{Ars} and a pseudo-\textit{Remedia}; focused above all on how to find flaws with all women. This poem has been dated to the 1130s or 1140s and is plausibly sourced to south-west Germany –the ‘other’ centre of the \textit{ars Ovidiana}.\footnote{Marek Thue Kretschmer ‘The love elegy in medieval Latin literature’ in Thorsen, Thea Selliias (ed.) \textit{The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy}, Cambridge 2013: 276. As we shall see, there clearly existed a Germanophone centre for Ovidian studies during the 12th century, not only is this evident in the surviving Ovidian MSS from the area, but also in the surviving commentaries and \textit{florilegia}.} The \textit{Facetus} was parallelled by other more satiric poems, notably the \textit{Concilium Romarici Montis} ‘the (Love) Council...
of Remiremont’ (ca. 1150), a parody of a church council which discusses clerical vs. knightly love. A somewhat later (ca. 1180s -1230s) prose treatise on love, De Amore, composed by the French Andreas Capellanus for a love-stricken friend, deals with similar topics. The whole tradition of courtly love is closely tied to Ovid’s erotic poetry, as the De Amore is an example of, while the satiric side of his poetry would make Ovid the patron of the goliardic poets.

Ovid wrote much ‘autobiographic’ poetry, and this too would give rise to pseudo-Ovidiana and imitations. Exceptionally long and popular was the De vetula, possibly written by Richard de Fournival (1210-1260), chancellor of the cathedral of Amiens. This 2,400 verse hexameter poem is a complex pseudo-Ovidian autobiography, depicting Ovid’s ‘own metamorphosis’.[...] of Ouidius praeceptor amoris into Ouidius ethicus and Ouidius christianus." The poem is often found in MSS complete with an accessus relating how the poem was ‘buried with him in his tomb’. Similarly with the near-contemporary 12th-century allegorical epics of Bernardus Silvestris, Alain of Lille and John of Hauteville, the De vetula tries to propagate a philosophical doctrine that supports Christian doctrine.

Ovid’s early poetry inspired several medieval imitators: the Heroides influenced another set of Loire poets. Around the year 1070, an anonymous poet wrote a leonine verse epistle based on the story of Deiadamia and Achilles as found in Statius’ Achilleid. This Deiadamia Achilli draws on intertextual relations with Ovid’s Briseis Achilli, the third of the Heroides, contrasting the different status of Achilles’ wife Deiadamia and his
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97 The goliardic poets were identified as a loose-knit school of 12th century satirists who wrote humorous secular Latin poems imitating the bohemian lifestyle advocated by the Roman elegists; most famous are Hugh Primas and the Archpoet, one connected with Orléans, the other with the court of Frederic Barbarossa. Their poems are available in Latin with English translations in Fleur Adcock, Hugh Primas and the Archpoet, Cambridge 1994. The influence of Ovid on the goliards is manifest in their most famous creation, the Carmina Burana, a 13th century German collection of goliardic poetry, see Ralph J. Hexter 'Ovid in the Middle Ages’ in Boyd, Barbara Weiden (ed.) Brill’s Companion to Ovid, Leiden 2002: 435. Peter Godman recently criticises the application of this label upon the Archpoet, The Archpoet & Medieval Culture, Oxford 2014: 248.
concubine Briseis. This poem in turn seems to have influenced one of the greatest of Ovidian imitators, Baudri of Bourgeuil, who composed some 256 poems between the 1080s and 1107 while he was the abbot of the Loire monastery Saint-Pierre of Bourgeuil; including four poems in the tradition of the *Heroides*. His poems 7-8 are sophisticated imitations of *Heroides* 16-17, which playfully associates the Paris-Helen-love affair of Troy with his contemporary Loire, while his poems 200-201 are fictive love-letters of Baudri and his ‘spiritual’ love-interest, the nun Constance. In his letter to Constance, Baudri refers to the supposed ‘spiritual truth’ available through an allegorical reading of the classics. Reminiscences of the *Amores* appear in the poems of Baudri’s supposed teacher, Marbod of Rennes. Marbod taught at the cathedral school of Angers from 1069 and wrote poems ‘*ad amicam*’ or ‘*ad puellam*’, verse letters to girls, possibly real-life penfriends, in the ‘spirit of the *Amores*’. A 12th-century grammar teacher at Paris, Serlo of Wilton wrote love poems in which he tried to outdo Ovid as a fictional *casanova*. This link between grammarian-poets and Ovid is perhaps most acute in the case of an Aurelian master, the 12th-century *goliardic* poet Hugh Primas, who appears together with Ovid in the 13th-century allegorical French poem *La bataille de VII arts* by Henri d’Andeli, lines 320-322:

'Le Primat d’Orliens & Ovide
Ramenonent en lor aide
.X.M. vers de grant randon..'

The Primas of Orléans and Ovid gather to their aid 10 000 verses of great force..

Hugh Primas would write scathing poems replete with classical references; one target of his satire was the influential commentator on Ovid, Arnulf, though Hugh tries to hide this identification:

---
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'Quis fuerat taceo, si quis de nomine querat;
sed qualis possum dicere: rufus erat'  *Hugh Primas 1.3-4. (ed. Adcock)*

I hold my tongue about *who* he was, if someone should ask about the name; but *how* he was, I can say: he was *red-haired*.

Arnulf of Orléans, who probably taught grammar in Orléans at the same time as Hugh, was indeed nicknamed 'the Red'! Hugh’s poems contain several references to Ovidian themes, but their style is more influenced by the Roman epigrammatarian Martial, and can not really be called Ovidian imitations.  

*Commentaries and accessus: grammar and the medieval commentary tradition*

*Ethice subponitur.*

It belongs to ethics.

Medieval education was largely the natural heir to the Greco-Roman education system. Roman education was based on the study of grammar and rhetoric, the former was a preparation for the latter, which was an essential skill for young Roman aristocrats with political or juridic aspirations, even after the Principate had destroyed a political climate of free speech and competition. In the Middle Ages, rhetoric would be useful for the new class of clerics in preparing sermons among other things. What about grammar? Grammar was an advanced subject, it entailed far more than the simple business of learning to read and write – that belonged to elementary education. Grammar was together with rhetoric and dialectic (logic) the first half of upper education, the so-called *trivium* of the seven *liberales artes* – liberal arts. Grammar was supposed to teach students not only good Latin, even stylish Latin with poetic potential, but, together with the other arts of the *trivium*, grammar was supposed to impart a moral education.
its usefulness in understanding the Bible and transmitting that knowledge to others.\textsuperscript{109}
This was the central argument in favour of studying pagan authors: their message may have been contrary to Christian doctrine, but their language and style was necessary for transmitting Christian doctrine in the first place. Yet, the pagan authors read in grammar classes were always seen to be problematic. Three strategies were applied to counter any such difficulties: 'Christianising' the \textit{auctores} (authors); as we saw with Ovid's pseudo-biographical \textit{De vetula}, reassembling the texts to make them more suitable to Christian doctrine (\textit{florilegia} are often examples of this strategy) or finding veiled, allegorical messages behind the texts literal message (as with the \textit{Ovide moralisé}).\textsuperscript{110}
The medieval school curriculum was based on introductory handbooks in grammar, rhetoric and dialectic, typically Priscian's \textit{Institutio grammatica} or Donatus' \textit{Ars minor} or \textit{Ars maior}\textsuperscript{111} or the \textit{Rhetorica ad Herennium}\textsuperscript{112}. These were supplemented by longer texts by poets and prose writers, pagans and Christians. Among these, there was a clear divide between \textit{auctores maiores} and \textit{auctores minores} (major and minor authors), the minor ones belonged to elementary education; Ovid belonged mainly to the major ones – and the higher echelons of education.\textsuperscript{113}

During the 12th century there was a great renaissance in the systematic study of Ovid in Western Europe. Orléans was at the centre of this age of grammar; Engelbrecht describes it as the 'main bastion of classical philology – or authorial learning as the Middle Ages called it.'\textsuperscript{114} In the schools of Orléans a line of great masters of grammar taught the classics in a more indepth and expansive manner. They introduced new authors and works into the curriculum, above all, the works of Ovid. These teachers would write their own line-by-line or section-by-section commentaries, particularly on Ovid. The commentaries tried to explain different aspects of a text; Coulson distinguishes between four modes of literary exegesis or \textit{explanatio}: allegorical
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commentary, philological commentary, purely literary explication or prose paraphrase. The ranged from simple 'cribs', designed to explain the grammar of individual passages and provide information on obscure mythological or geographical references, to intricate, allegorical commentaries, which would culminate in the *Ovide moralisé*.

Commentaries are important for giving us an insight into the standards of grammar teaching in the Middle Ages, but more important for understanding contemporary educational or literary theories are the introductions the grammarians wrote to individual poems or books, the so-called *accessus* (pl./sg.). The *accessus* of the 12th century commentaries would (usually) include six elements: *intentio* (intention), *utilitas* (usefulness), *ordo* (order of the oeuvre), *nomen auctoris* (the name of the author), *titulus* (title) and *pars philosophiae* (genre). This is similar to what Minnis et al. call the 'over-all literary-theoretical apparatus’ and ‘critical idiom’ of the 12th-century renaissance, which entailed a process of analyzing these items as well as *materia* – the theme of a work, and its *modus agendi/tractandi* – didactic and stylistic mode of approach. This vocabulary was largely dependent on Boethius and ultimately on Aristotle. This type of *accessus* is called the 'type C’-prologue by Hunt, and other variations existed, such as ones which included considerations of the *vita poetae* – the life of the poet or the work’s *circumstantiae* – background setting.
Orléans

We know little more than the name of one of the pioneering teacher at the cathedral school of Orléans, Hilary of Orléans (ca. 1075 – ca. 1150). Yet we know a lot more about one of his students; the most famous Orléanese philologist; Arnulf. Arnulf, 'Rufus' – 'the Red', possibly gained his nickname more because of his quarrelsome temper than because of his appearance; he was criticized by contemporary poets: Matthew of Vendôme claims that Arnulf was a son of a whore and kept a concubine! He wrote commentaries on several of Ovid’s poems, at least two on the Metamorphoses, as well as commentaries on the Amores, Ars, Remedia, Ex Ponto and even the Fasti; and these are only the ones we have preserved today – he may have written others in addition. Arnulf was hugely influential in the medieval study of Ovid: of all the accessus – medieval introductions to a work, preserved from the 13th and 14th centuries, in excess of 20% derive from his commentaries. Modern scholars have created editions of many of his commentaries. Arnulf was notable for his allegorizing of the Metamorphoses, this approach would lead the way in later Ovidian scholarship of the Middle Ages. Arnulf seems to have adopted his allegorizing approach for other reasons than to avoid censorship, he was in fact criticized for his "heathenism". Another master at Orléans was Fulco, a rival teacher of grammar of Arnulf. Both taught during the 1170s, during which time Orléans boasted two leading schools: the cathedral school of the Cathedral of the Holy Cross, and the monastic school of the Victorine monastery of St. Euverte. Fulco wrote commentaries at least on the Ars, Remedia, Amores, Heroides and the Tristia. We know of a later Aurelian master, William (fl. ca. 1200), who wrote a handbook to Ovid, called the Bursarii Ouidianorum or Versus bursarii: 'the pocketbook on Ovid'. Orléans would remain an important centre for the study of Grammar until the late 13th century; an anonymous compiler, based largely on the work of Arnulf and William, created the so-called Vulgate commentary on the
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Metamorphoses, which became the 'most authoritative 'reading' of the epic in the high Middle Ages'.

To write a commentary a scholar obviously needed a manuscript of the text to comment on it. If the Aurelian masters wrote their commentaries in Orléans (which is probable),
What attitude towards studying Ovid do we find among the Aurelian commentators?
Arnulf writes on utilitas in his accessus to the Amores:

'Ethice supponitur, quia ad moralitatem spectat maximam loquendo de suis moribus et amicarum et pelicum et rivalium, maritorum quoque et lenarum.'\(^{133}\)

It belongs to Ethic, for he looks towards the greatest moral in talking of the manners of himself and girlfriends, concubines and rivals, married men and also of seductresses.

The ethical insight of a text is a common theme with the commentators. Fulco’s accessus to the same text also reads:

'Intencio eius est delectare. Ethice supponitur.'\(^{134}\)

His intention is to entertain. It belongs to ethic.

Arnulf is not squeamish about discussing the 'obscener’ passages of τvid, which William in contrast seems to avoid commenting on altogether.\(^{135}\) In general, the Aurelian masters’ commentaries show a quite inddept erudition, and are able to explain some particularly taxing allusions to obtuse geography etc., but sometimes they fall painfully short of modern scholarly standards, writing something wrong rather than not commenting at all, as when Arnulf and William try to identify 'Lesbys’ in Amores 2.18:

Arnulf: 'Lesbis amica fuit Briseis.' William: 'Sapho de Lesbo insula que dilexit Herculem.'\(^{136}\)

'Lesbia was a friend of Briseis.’ 'Sappho from the island of Lesbos, who loved Hercules’.

Sappho was a poet from Lesbos, but she was not in love with Hercules.

The German tradition:

Secondary in importance, but to us, even more relevant, was the Germanophone part of the aetas Ovidiana. We know of fewer commentators on Ovid in Germany, Switzerland or Austria (during this period all these countries were of course part of the Holy Roman

\(^{134}\) Ibid. 62.
\(^{135}\) Ibid. 68-69.
\(^{136}\) Ibid. 69.
Empire

, but interestingly, some of the commentaries and *accessus* from the Orléanese masters appear in south German MSS. One of the earliest (dated ca. 1200) MS containing Arnulf of Orléans’ commentary on the *Metamorphoses* is found in the MS Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 7205. Indeed, many of the most important MSS for the transmission of Ovidian texts are from the Germanophone area. The expanding study of Ovid must have spread eastwards from an early age, and there is indeed possible to see the Germanophone side of the *aetas Ovidiana* as a precursor to the Aurelian masters of grammar. The *locus* (site) for this renaissance of Ovid was not so much the cathedral schools, but rather the monastic schools, with which the FS probably was connected.

Conrad of Hirsau (ca. 1070 – ca. 1150?) was a schoolmaster connected with the Benedictine abbey of St. Peter and St. Paul at Hirsau in Bavaria. His foremost commentary work was his *Dialogue on the Authors*, dated sometime between 1100-1150, this draws on a series of *accessus*, concerning some 21 authors. This work in dialogue form on the study of grammar is divided between three parts: one on basic literary terms, one consisting of *accessus* on christian and pagan authors arranged according to their supposed increasing difficulty, and one section on the place of grammar within the broader hierarchy of knowledge. Conrad is concerned with showing the utility of reading pagan literature, in his dialogue a teacher tells his student of the four levels of *explanatio* (explanation): the literal one, in terms of philological meaning, allegorical meaning and finally moral explanation; (these are roughly the same four modes of exegesis noted by Coulson):
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'the moral is when what is said is adapted to encourage and cherish good moral qualities.'\textsuperscript{141}

He distinguishes between four central questions to be asked by contemporary writers, concerning: matter, intention, final cause of the work and its location within philosophical disciplines:

'\textquote{the final cause is the profit derived by the reader.}'\textsuperscript{142}

The direct profit would be to learn Latin; secondarily the students of grammar were supposed to gain moral insight from literature. Yet in his treatment of Ovid Conrad makes his pupil quite critical of any such moral profit in reading Ovid:

'Pupil: Why should the young recruit in Christ’s army subject his impressionable mind to the writing of Ovid, in which even though gold can be found among the dung, yet the foulness that clings to the gold defiles the seeker, even though it is the gold he is after?

Teacher: Your aversion to the error of falsehood is grounded in good sense. Even though some of the writing of that same author Ovid might have been tolerated up to a point, namely the \textit{Fasti}, \textit{The Letters from Pontus}, \textit{The Nut}, and some others; who in his right mind would endure him croaking about love, and his base deviations in different letters? Should I not name him as the inventor of a large part of idol-worship in his \textit{Metamorphoses}?\textsuperscript{143}

Conrad’s approach to Ovid represents a more negative stance on his supposed utility in promoting a christian moral code, but he does not criticise the form of his poetry –the style is \textit{gold}.

\textit{Florilegia: the florilegium genre}

\textquote{..inter fabulosa eorum deliramenta quasdam sententias memoria dignas repperi.’} (\textit{From the first line of the prologue to the FS, to be edited later in the thesis})

..among their fabulous ravings I have found some sentences worthy of memory.

\textit{Florilegia} are medieval anthologies of parts of prose and verse texts that were created not merely out of concerns for economy (parchment books were incredibly expensive), but in order to organise knowledge for specific purposes. These collections are

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid. 56
multiform, some contain only excerpts from Christian authors but this is not typical of the genre as such. Most florilegia contain a mix of authors, and very few are exclusively 'classical'. Birger Munk Olsen distinguishes between a wide range of florilegia containing classical authors: A: Prosodic florilegia – metrical handbooks, B: Florilegia organized by authors in verse and prose, C: Florilegia arranged by authors in prose, D: Florilegia arranged by authors in verse (of which the *Florilegium Sancticrucianum* is a good example), E: Florilegia of mixed excerpts, F: Florilegia without apparent order, G: Mini-florilegia, H: Isolated classical citations in poetic florilegia, I: Isolated classical citations in patristic or biblical florilegia, J: Systematic florilegia, K: Alphabetic florilegia. The florilegia descend from a long tradition of collections of excerpts, beginning at least with the Roman collections of quotes and proverbs, such as the widely read *Disticha catonis* – the sayings of Cato, if not earlier: with the many quotes from Greek poetry found in Greek and Roman prose texts. There are examples of poetry collections from Antiquity, i.e. the so-called *Greek Anthology* – mainly a collection of epigrams (short elegiac poems), but this is a different genre to the medieval florilegia. Anthologies mainly consist of autonomous works, therefore, shorter poems or prose passages are typically chosen, whereas florilegia contain parts or extracts of texts which lose their autonomy and are converted into parts of a new literary work.

The genre is not easily definable. Fernández de la Cuesta González identifies eight characteristics of the medieval florilegia: they consist of central extracts that have been compiled according to specific criteria of the compiler in order to make them more manageable; the extracts are therefore very short (plausibly so they could be memorized by heart, imparting moral or stylistic insight); most florilegia are anonymous; their source-material is heterogeneous and often include earlier florilegia in a 'horizontal tradition'; they are new literary creations in themselves, much like *collage* art works are separate from their component parts –their novelty lies not only in their *dis-
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contextualisation but often also in the rewriting of extracts to make them more general, ‘christian’ etc.; the florilegia are created by compilators who act as a kind of secondary author in selecting, ordering, connecting and modifying excerpts, thus giving them a new, different significance; florilegia are part of a dynamic tradition where each copyist usually acted as a secondary compilator in adding or subtracting existing florilegia (there are few ‘identical’ MSS of individual florilegia); florilegia were created both as personal tools as well as for public, text-book use.\textsuperscript{148}

Florilegia containing classical authors were originally studied for their role in transmitting minor or rarer Latin authors, as was the case with Ullmann who studied the transmission of Tibullus in florilegia, particularly in the \textit{FG}, which accounts for two of the five surviving medieval MSS containing Tibullus.\textsuperscript{149} Ullman noted the central role of florilegia within the literary culture of the Middle Ages: 'It is well known that the Middle Ages [...] depended largely on anthologies for their literary culture [...] the bulk of past literature was too great for the majority of readers, and so the books of selections [...] met with great favor. They were also particularly suitable for the instruction of youth.'\textsuperscript{150} He noticed that a medieval author of such stature as the 13th century Vincent of Beauvais, who had composed one of the largest encyclopedic oeuvres prior to the Enlightenment, was dependent upon florilegia for his knowledge of not just Tibullus, but even of Ovid.\textsuperscript{151} Since the time of Ullman, florilegia have been studied more as literary works in themselves, and particular emphasis has been put on studying their production and use.

As previously noted, the two most famous and important florilegia, the \textit{FG} and the \textit{FA} were plausibly compiled at Orléans during the same time as Arnulf, Fulco and William were teaching grammar at the city’s schools (late 12th century). It is difficult to tie any of them to the creation of these florilegia, but it is at least possible to see a link between their study of grammar and the compilation of florilegia containing large amounts of excerpts from classical authors. One of the plausible uses of florilegia was, as Ullman pointed out, the education of the young. Florilegia could be composed with a clear
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\textsuperscript{151} Ibid.154.
purpose in mind, such as the florilegia in Munk Olsen’s category A: prosodic florilegia. These were written to teach the quantities of different vowels, and were above all destined for memorisation by their students.\textsuperscript{152} The florilegia could also be multipurpose, and this is probably the case with the majority of the other varieties of florilegia. Many would have an ethical outline, as is the case with the FS, this could be indicated in an introduction to the florilegium, by chapter headings or by the nature of the content itself, which could deal with moral settings if not necessarily ethical discussions. In the case of our MS, the FS does have both such an introduction, as well as chapter headings. At the same time, these ’ethical’ florilegia could spend time and space on excerpts that were chosen purely on stylistic grounds. This is indeed the case with the FS, as we shall see, which properly may be classed as a florilège éthico-stylistique – as defined by Munk Olsen.\textsuperscript{153} Some florilegia would even claim to be intended purely for entertainment, to provide oblectatio – delight, as the preface to the Anthologia Valerio-Gelliana puts it.\textsuperscript{154} Others were destined to impart philosophical learning, rhetorical learning or were even written for didactic purposes.\textsuperscript{155} The educational aim of florilegia seems to be more or less omnipresent, even those that were meant purely to be used to produce new texts, such as sermons or letters (this purpose does not often appear explicitly, but particularly the FA seems to have been designed for preparing sermons or letters\textsuperscript{156}) may hint at an educational purpose – though not necessarily aiming at school use. Florilegia were certainly highly suitable as text books. They offered a less expensive path to a classical education, which opened up the very highest career opportunities within the Church or courts; they were particularly suitable for the earlier stages of grammar, being ’expurged’ of the obscener or more difficult parts of a text.\textsuperscript{157} However, according to Munk Olsen, those florilegias that were most likely to have been used in schools were associated more often with monastic schools than with the emergent cathedral schools. Florilegia of a reasonably certain origin point
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towards benedictine, cistercian or regular canon monasteries. The appearance of glosses in the text is the best indicator of school use; this is the case with the FS.

If a florilegium was intended to be used in the schoolroom, how would it have been used? A rough sketch of the early parts of a 12th century education can be found in the *Metalogicon* 1.24 (1159 A.D.) by John of Salisbury: this passage on the cathedral school of Bernard of Chartres is summarized by Murphy in the following eight elements, which I will quote in full:

'A: The pupil started with sounds, not rules. B. Meanings were taught before grammatical rules. C. Syntax paralleled the 'parts of speech'. D. A christian motivation was presented to the student where possible – but motivation also came from secular career objectives. E. Memorization preceded understanding for the very young, and followed understanding for the older. F. As students advanced, the distinctions between grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic were demonstrated by exercises (not merely by abstract statements). Corollary: dialectic and rhetoric were elementary subjects in [the] 12th century. This pattern changed when the dialectically-oriented university took over in [the] 13th; this remains a story only partly told. G. Writing skills and speaking skills were treated equally from the beginning, were used to reinforce each other, and were in turn reinforced by listening skills. H. Models of good writing were presented from the outset.'

The teaching of grammar in the Middle Ages was focused around memorisation of models, this is evident in element E) of Murphy’s schema. For this elementary purpose, florilegia containing verse would have been excellent tools. The christian motivation, element D), would also have been catered for in the 'ethical' outlook of many florilegia. The last element H) goes hand-in-hand with florilegia: they provide models of good writing throughout, not only for memorisation but for aiding composition of texts. What if a florilegium was intended for personal use; to be used as a repertory of quotable lines in composing sermons, letters or scholarly works, like the encyclopedia of Vincent of Beauvais? This usage does seem to be even more congruent with the nature of many florilegia. In particular this seems applicable to the two major FG and FA. The FA’s introductory letter (found in the MS Roma, Bibl. Angelica 1895-I, s. xii²) to a pope claims that the collection was aimed towards the composition of sermons:
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And I thought that this would be very convenient for your singular excellence, that you always could have that from which you could adapt sermons (*sermones*) to persons, places and occasions.

As for the possibly usages of the FS, this will be discussed in detail later in this thesis.

**Ovid in florilegia**

Ovid is found in many florilegia of the 12th century: in the most important florilegium, the FG (in all the central four MSS: Paris, Bibl. Nat., lat. 7647, s. XII; Paris, lat. 17903 s. XIII\(^1\); Arras, Bibl. Municipale, 65(64), s. XIII; Escorial, Bibl. del Real Monasterio de San Lorenzo del Escorial, Q I 14, s. XIII\(^{med} \text{162}\); in the larger part of the main florilegium found in the MS Douai, Bibl. municipale, 749-II, s. XII\(^2\); as well as in the *Florilegium Morale Oxoniense*, Oxford, Bodleian, Bodley 633-II, s. XII\(^2\).\(^{163}\) He is most central, however, in the FS, where 4 out of 14 ‘books’ of the florilegium are devoted solely to him. How is Ovid presented in these other florilegia?

**Ovid in the Florilegium Gallicum**

The FG is in all likelihood the largest florilegium compiled prior to the 13th century, it is also the most important, as it is plausibly the Magnus opus of the Aurelian grammarian masters of the 12th century and an important textual witness for rarer authors such as Tibullus. It encompasses extracts from some 89 works, both poetry and prose, christian and classical.\(^{164}\) The FG has been studied more than any other single florilegium and several partial editions of it have been produced.\(^{165}\) Ovid ranks

---

\(^{161}\) Birger Munk Olsen ‘Note sur quelques préfaces de florilèges latins du XII\(^{e}\) siècle’ Revue Romane, Vol. 8 (1973) 1-2: 195.

\(^{162}\) These are called MSS *p.n.a* and *e* by by Beatriz Fernández De la Cuesta Gonzales in *En la senda del Florilegium Gallicum*, Louvain-La-Neuve 2008: 137

\(^{163}\) Birger Munk Olsen ‘Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au xiii\(^{e}\) siècle’ in *La réception de la littérature classique au moyen âge (IX\(^e\)-XII\(^e\) siècle)*, Copenhagen 1995: 191-192, 257-258.

\(^{164}\) Birger Munk Olsen ‘Les florilèges d’auteurs classiques’ in *La réception de la littérature classique au moyen âge (IX\(^e\)-XII\(^e\) siècle)*, Copenhagen 1995: 174.

\(^{165}\) Munk Olsen lists 14 articles or doctoral thesis written about it in the period between 1928-1978, Birger Munk Olsen ‘Les florilèges d’auteurs classiques’ in *La réception de la littérature classique au moyen âge (IX\(^e\)-XII\(^e\) siècle)*, Copenhagen 1995: 174. to which may be added *Classical poets in the "Florilegium Gallicum"*, Burton, Rosemary, Frankfurt am Main, 1983. Rackley (Proctor), Sally A.: *The amatory poetry of Ovid in the Florilegium Gallicum: Evidence of the knowledge of this poet in the*
prominently among the extracts, in the most valuable MS, the Paris, Bibl. Nat., lat. 7647, s. XII., there are Ovidian extracts to be found both on ff. 59RB- 66RA as well as ff. 67VA – 81RB (at 47 lines per folio with two columns this translates to roughly 4000 lines) – encompassing excerpts from 8 of the poems by Ovid (all except the *Heroides* or *Medicamina*). However, the only in-depth study of the reception of Ovid in the collection is the work of Rackley (Proctor). In her 1986 article she made a partial edition of the excerpts from the amatory poetry of Ovid found in the FG. Rackley notes the many alterations by the compiler to the excerpts, that either were made intentionally 'or as a result of careless error'. The excerpts are divided into sections, corresponding to individual poems, some of which furthermore have been given chapter headings such as 'Contra mulieres que sponte faciunt abortiva' or 'De obsequii utilitate'. The alterations to the excerpts take away much of the sting and wit of Ovid, Rackley several times describes it as a 'bowdlerized Ovid', the product of an compiler who was 'a poet himself'. These alterations fall into two general categories: those driven by a desire for generalisation – turning individuals verses or couplets into general statements – and those driven by a moralising zeal. To the first category, Rackley confines the omissions of coordinating conjunctions; the elimination of personal references, pronouns and names, female genders; as well as stylistic simplifications. To the second category belong such changes as when *Ars* 2.519 is changed from 'litore quot conchae, tot in amore dolores' into 'tot..*mala* ’– a line changed so at to lose both its metrical integrity and particular significance. The double entendres of the didactic poems appear to have been removed, there is even an example of how the compiler

---

166 Birger Munk Olsen 'Les florilèges d’auteurs classiques’ in *La réception de la littérature classique au moyen âge (IXe-XIIe siècle)*, Copenhagen 1995: 176-177.
168 Ibid. 80.
169 Ibid. 90.
170 Ibid. 71, 104, 106.
171 Ibid. 105.
172 Ibid. 106.
has taken *militia amoris* – the metaphor of love as military service – very literally, altering excerpts from the *Ars Amatoria* so as to make Ovid ‘a spokesman for the harsh realities of a soldier’s life’.\footnote{173}{Rackley, Sally A.: The amatory poetry of Ovid in the Florilegium Gallicum: Evidence of the knowledge of this poet in the twelfth century, Florilegium vol. 8. (1986) : 108.}

On the purpose of the FG, Rackley sees it as twofold: transmitting moral *sententiae* and, as proposed by Burton and others: aiding Latin verse composition.\footnote{174}{Ibid. 74. Rosemary Burton, The Classical Poets in the "Florilegium Gallicum", Frankfurt am Main, 1983: 27.} Given the breadth of the collection, the text may have been used in a number of ways, as a text book for grammar classes, as a quick reference for scholars, poets, preachers or politicians, and a single MS may have been used in a variety of manners during its lifetime.

*Ovid in the MS Douai, Bibl. Municipale, 749-II*

There is a large florilegium of classical authors found in the MS Douai, Bibl. Municipale, 749. This codex contains three parts, the first part, written in a late caroline minuscule and dating from the second half of the 12th century, contains the *Institutiones grammaticae* of Priscian (ff 1-22), the second part contains a florilegium of classical (23-60) and medieval authors, mainly poets, and is written in two scripts by two hands (gothic ff. 23-45 and f. 54, late caroline minuscule 46-53, 54-61), the third part, dating from the first half of the 13th century, contains a patristic florilegium, mainly consisting of christian authors.\footnote{175}{Beatriz Fernández de la Cuesta González, *'Ovidio en el florilegio de Douai’* in Muñoz Jiménez, María José (ed.) *El florilegio: espacio de encuentro de los autores antiguos y medievales*, Porto 2011: 100-101.} The classical florilegium contains excerpts from: Horace, Vergil, Juvenal, Persius, Lucan, Statius, Terence, Sallust and Ovid (in that order). It has a title heading claiming that:


Proverbs from the books of several authors, collected into a single one, begin [here], which will set offer to teach manners and destroy vices.
The ethical outline of the florilegium is typical of the genre, as we have seen. Boutemy proposed that this florilegium was composed at the monastery of Saint-Amand (in Saint-Amand-les-Eaux, Nord, France, formerly part of Flanders) based on 12th century catalogues of available MSS at the monastery (all the authors are accounted for except Statius and Ovid).\textsuperscript{177} Fernández de la Cuesta Gonzáles considers that this codex constitutes a teaching manual containing the necessary material for a quite complete education, starting from elementary grammar, via the classical poets, prosaists and ending with theological texts, thus accounting for most of the \textit{trivium} as well as theology, the high-point in the medieval hierarchy of knowledge.\textsuperscript{178} Ovid accounts for more than one third of the excerpts in the classical florilegium: \textit{Her.} ff. 47-48VA, \textit{Am.} ff. 48V – 50RB, \textit{Ars.} 50R – 52VB, \textit{Rem.} 52V – 53VA, \textit{Nux} 53VA, \textit{Met.} 53VA – 54VA, \textit{Trist.} 54VA – 56VB, \textit{Pont.} 56VB-58RB, \textit{Fast.} 58RB – 60RA. This ordering of individual works as well as genres distinguishes between the 'frivolous' amatory poetry and the more 'serious' middle and later poetry. The excerpts from the \textit{Heroides} contain marginal rubrics indicating the speaker, the longest excerpts are from \textit{Her.} 17 – Helen’s letter to Paris – indicating a particular interest in the matter of Troy.\textsuperscript{179} The excerpts from the \textit{Amores}, which mainly concern the 'erotodidactic' parts of the collection, are provided with marginal notes on similar \textit{loci} (sitations) found elsewhere in Ovid as well as in the Bible, as well as with marginal titles of theme: '\textit{De fraude}' (on fraud), '\textit{De simplicitate}' (on simplicity) etc., which help to discontextualise the excerpts further; in line with the ethical didactics of the collection.\textsuperscript{180} However, in the excerpts from the \textit{Ars}, the compiler provides contextual references in order to do the opposite, specifying rather than generalising. The longest passage here concerns wine and intoxication.\textsuperscript{181} The excerpts from the \textit{Remedia} have variant readings in the margin written in a different hand, and show some effort at generalising the theme of passion or madness beyond the amatory.\textsuperscript{182} The excerpts from the \textit{Metamorphoses} are interesting in that they show signs of contemperaneous hands in different styles of script (representing perhaps

\textsuperscript{179} Ibid. 107.
\textsuperscript{180} Ibid. 107-109.
\textsuperscript{181} Ibid. 109-111.
\textsuperscript{182} Ibid. 112.
scribes from different generations, but working in the same *scriptorium*. In the excerpts from book 1 the compiler(s) shows a tendency towards aligning the creation myths with those of Genesis, while those from book 2 focus on examples of good behaviour, such as *pudor* – the feeling of modest shame, propriety, and by omitting contextualising lines, he presupposes a knowledge of the individual myths; vs. 846-847a are used as a maxim, typical of some manuals of good manners called *chriae*, there is also a long passage from the description of Livor (jealousy), possibly included as an example of exemplary style. ¹⁸³ In the exile poems, the compiler focuses on the theme of friendship in the *Tristia*, whereas the excerpts from the *Epistulae ex Ponto* are aligned with themes such as *senectus* (old age) and various emotions; these latter excerpts are often extremely abbreviated, showing the importance of memorisation in learning poetry (the abbreviations are not standard, the reader is reliant on other texts to learn their meaning). ¹⁸⁴ The excerpts exhibit signs that the compiler(s) have used whole poems of Ovid, other sources (the Bible) and possibly also previous florilegia, they are in general faithful to the original text. ¹⁸⁵ As we shall see, this florilegium’s treatment of Ovid is comparable to that of the FS, both MSS are written within a generation or two of each other, and, the MS Douai, Bibl. Municipale, 749-II is also connected with a monastery.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid. 118-120.
¹⁸⁵ Ibid. 121.
3. The MS Heiligenkreuz 227-III

**Palaeographical and codicological description**

The MS Heiligenkreuz 227 contains three\(^{186}\) or alternatively four\(^{187}\) sections. The last part of the codex, ff. 73-110, contains what is probably the oldest surviving textual witness of the FS. This MS is dated to the third quarter of the 12\(^{th}\) century, and is written in a late Carolingian minuscule script with predominantly 39 lines and two columns of text per page. The text encompasses a space of some 205 × 140/150 mm. The MS is written in a number of similar hands typical of Heiligenkreuz at the period.\(^{188}\) The MS is written on parchment. There are many examples of minor corrections as well as a single gloss on the *Metamorphoses* in medieval German (f 74VA l.26: ‘buchin’ for *fagineus*). There are many marginalia and glosses in the same script, as can be read towards the end of my edition, which are dated to the same or a somewhat later period.\(^{189}\) The text is written in black ink with many rubrics, alternating between red and black initials for each verse. The codex was rebound in 1959.

In addition to the FS, the first part (ff.1-55), which is contemporaneous with the FS, contains several prose texts by late antique and medieval writers: Godfrey of Auxerre’s *Declamationes de colloquio Simonis cum Iesu* – Sayings from Simon Peter’s conversation with Jesus (1V-24V), Pseudo-Ambrose: *De dignitate sacerdotali* – On clerical dignity (25R-30V), a letter by Peter Damian (30V-42V), a prose florilegium of the letters of Symmachus (43R-54R) and Adalbertus Samaritanus: *Praecepta dictaminum* – The precepts of *dictamen* (54V-55R), while the second part, dating to the first half of the 13\(^{th}\) century, consists of a sermon by Odo of Morimond (56RA-72RA). There are occasional anonymous texts, such as a 14\(^{th}\) century addition: a poem on the office of choir song: *De chori officio* (72RA-72VB).\(^{190}\) The FS consists of 14 books, each of which as a general rule is devoted to excerpts from a single classical or

---


\(^{187}\) Birger Munk Olsen, ’Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au xiii\(^{e}\) siècle’ in *La réception de la littérature classique au moyen âge (IX\(^{e}\) - XII\(^{e}\) siècle)*, Copenhagen 1995: 115.

\(^{188}\) Though Munk Olsen questions this: ’I am not quite sure that it was copied there’, Birger Munk Olsen, ’The Cistercians and Classical Culture’ in *La réception de la littérature classique au moyen âge (IX\(^{e}\) - XII\(^{e}\) siècle)*, Copenhagen 1995: 109.


medieval poet. Books 1-4 contain excerpts from Ovid (my edition), books 5-6 contain excerpts from Horace, 7 contains excerpts from Virgil and Lucan, 8 contains excerpts from Persius and Maximian, 9 contains excerpts from Juvenal, 10-14 are devoted to the orthodoxores – christian writers: Boethius (10), Sedulius (11), Prudentius (12), Arator and Alcimus (13) and Venantius (14). There are many prefaces to the individual auctores as well as a general preface and a preface to the christian writers. This makes the MS unique, in the number and length of these anonymous prefaces supposedly written by the collection’s compilator.

The medieval library catalogues of Heiligenkreuz

In the oldest library catalogue from Heiligenkreuz there is no mention of the FS (unless 'Item sententie diversorum in unum collecte' refers to poetry, rather than philosophy or theology, which is more likely). This catalogue dates most probably from the reign of abbot Godschalcus (1134-1147). Nor is it mentioned in a catalogue dating from the period 1363-1374 which lists some 311 volumes (unless the FS is concealed as 'Excerpta cuiusdam monachi de virtutibus'). In a catalogue from 1381 MS H is mentioned explicitly, with the proper title: Flores excerpti ex diversis poetis. (Though the MS reads de diversis rather than ex diversis). It is here listed under the books of one abbot Bernhardus. From this and the palaeographical evidence we may conclude that the MS was produced at Heiligenkreuz sometime between 1147 and the last quarter of the 12th century. That the MS goes unmentioned for 200 years may well be due to one of three possible reasons: either the MS was kept separately from the main book collection of the monastery – perhaps in a school? or it was sold to some other library some time before the late 14th century and brought back to Heiligenkreuz under the reign of abbot Bernhardus; or, perhaps least likely of all, it was forgotten in the second preserved catalogue.

---

Previous research on the MS

The MS has mainly been studied as a prime example of a 12th century florilegium from the Germanophone area, which falls into Munk Olsen’s category D: Florilegia with sections of verse authors. The MSS containing the whole or parts of the FS have been catalogued by Günther Glauche who distinguishes between six MSS, with the appropriate sigla:

H=Heiligenkreuz – our MS.
K=Klosterneuburg 1095 s. XIIIth ff.1RA-31VB.
S=Salzburg, St. Peter a V 41 s. XIII2 ff.1R-53V in init. mutil.
M=Munich, Clm. 6911 c. 1300 (Fürstenfeld) ff. 102VB-121RB.
V=Vorau 33 s. XIIex ff. 61VA-65VB.
L=Lilienfeld 137 c. 1300 ff. 206VA-214VB.

The oldest complete MS is the MS Heiligenkreuz 227-III, and this may be the source for the partial MS found in V, which is the second oldest. Glauche notes the towering presence of Ovid in the collection (4 out of 14 books) as well as the suitability of the work as a school text. He proposes the existence of an earlier original MS which in all likelihood must originate within the Germanophone area, sometime prior to the writing of H, which is his terminus ante quem of its creation.

Glauche was not the first to study the FS. In 1881, Johannes Huemer wrote an article where he provided an edition of the prefames composed by the compiler, of whom he noted: ‘der selbst Dichter war’ – he was a poet too. Based on his study of the MS he concluded that the MS was German, not Austrian, due to its German gloss on f.74VA.

---

197 Ibid. 305-306.
198 Ibid.
200 Ibid.
(a weak argument, and probably not applicable; Heiligenkreuz was within the
Germanophone area of the time), he further noted the dominance of Ovid among the
extracts (to the point that Huemer once exaggerated the number of the Ovidian books to
five\textsuperscript{201}) and how this was an example of the \textit{ars Ovidiana} (though he does not use this
term).\textsuperscript{202} His arguments in favour of studying the FS are of particular interest for us.
These were mainly that it would provide an interesting addition to the history of
classical reception in the Middle Ages, based on three elements: the ranking of the
authors, the choice of excerpts and the form of the excerpts.\textsuperscript{203} This last point is typical
of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century attitude towards the study of florilegia; viewing them mainly as
ancillary sources for classical texts, which might provide variant readings, as was the
case with the FG that in some cases is one of very few sources for the works of
Propertius and Tibullus. The ranking of authors and their relative status would
eventually lead to the research by Traube and Munk Olsen into the relative popularity of
classical authors, and Traube’s medieval \textit{aetates}. The choice of excerpts is a more
intricate subject, and Huemer only studied a small portion of the total, focusing on
Virgil and Sedulius.\textsuperscript{204} No one has ever studied the excerpts of Ovid in detail. Huemer
concluded that though the FS in the Heiligenkreuz MS generally does not provide good
readings, still its readings deserve to be studied:

‘..doch verdienen die Lesearten zu den verschiedenen Autoren gekannt zu sein, deren
Wert je nach der Textgeschichte dieser Autoren verschieden zu bemessen ist.’\textsuperscript{205}

- ..nevertheless, these variant readings for the various authors deserve to be
known, their value in the textual history of these authors must be variously
measured.

This argument is adequate for creating an edition of the FS, however, it may be of even
greater importance to provide an edition in order to study the particular reception of
individual authors, and to provide researchers on \textit{florilegia} an important addition to
their sources. As the MS Heiligenkreuz 227-III is the best preserved MS of the FS, to all

\begin{footnotes}
\item[201] Johannes Huemer, Zur Geschichte der classischen Studien im Mittelalter. Zeitschrift für die
österreichischen Gymnasien 32 (1881): 420.
\item[202] Ibid. 416.
\item[203] Ibid. 415.
\item[204] Ibid. 418-419.
\item[205] Ibid. 420.
\end{footnotes}
intents complete and by far the oldest (it is also the only one to include all the chapter headings and prefaces in the appropriate order), I think there is much to be said for a diplomatic edition based on this single MS.
Introduction to the edition

In my edition (Appendix I) I have followed the medieval Latin spelling (i.e. most diphtongal, classical *ae*-syllables are written as *e*). However, the two words: *aër, aeris* m. air. and *aes, aeris* n. copper, bronze are spelt with ae throughout as in the MS, where the latter is spelt using the abbreviated *e-caudata*. In book 1 the numbering of the chapters in the MS are erroneous, chapter XX is actually XIX, XXI is actually XX etc. (this affects chapters XIX and onwards (XIX itself is apparently overlooked), XXIII is written twice, so the error is repeated from chapter XXV onwards). This error may be due to a second scribe, or is, perhaps less likely, the fault of the original compilator.

Three chapters concern false friends and two concern ‘fama’ and ‘fames’, which may be the cause of this confusion. The chapter headings to other books, in particular book 4, are occasionally misplaced, I have changed the numbering accordingly. The excerpts are originally devoid of any name, line number etc. – I have tried to identify their origins, giving the abbreviated name of each poem and modern line numbers in brackets. Lines in pentameter are indented; hexameter lines are not. Lines that differ greatly from modern, critical editions, which may or may not represent conscious alterations by the compilator of the *florilegium*, are singled out by asterisks.

I have followed a syntactical, modern punctuation, in accordance with the critical text editions I have used, except where the text in the MS is radically different from modern editions, to the point that punctuation is affected, this affects above all the medieval verses included.

The glosses to the text are given over the following four pages and in the edition the corresponding words are written in bold for easy reference. In the MS, some glosses are written directly above the words; others in the margins (typically the longer ones). 
Rubrics and illuminations

73RA: C(nicely decorated)um 1. Argumentum generale ...36.

73RB: Incipit..2. Large D(in de), 3. Alternating rubrics for initial capitals after this.

79VB: drawing of a bird (pheasant or dove?) 17.

Glosses to the text:

73RA: **punctum:** "Moris erat aput romanos, postquam aliquid scriptum collaudatum erat, hominis ordo ad firmationem punctum fecit in fine scriptis. Erant autem ordines uel patres conscripti, consulares, senatores, equites, plebs.

73VA: **toto naturae uultus:** rerum natura unum.

**dixere:** post.

**rudis:** instabilis.

73VB: **porrexerat amphitrites:** circumterens neptunus.

**frigida..calidis:** terra uel aqua cum igne uel aere.

**humentia..siccis:** aer uel aqua cum igne uel terra.

**mollia..duris:** ignis uel aer uel aqua cum terra.

**sine pondere:** igne uel aere.

**habentia pondus:** terra uel aqua.

**deus et melior:** uel meliorans omnia.

**ultima:** uel terrarum.

**possedit:** uel circumdit.

**ambite:** uel circumdate.
liberioris aque: maris.

onus: uel terra.

74RA: his: uentis.

tellus: Tellus in contraria parte habet austrum, uel ameridie

quae madesscit ab eodem austro, scilicet haec tamen in nostris partibus.

mortales: Mortales uocat homines, quia mors illorum magis quam ceterorum

animalium plangitur. Uel mortales quasi pessimos.

74RB: arbuteos: Arbutea est arbore idem arbusta poma rubra siluarum.

74VA: fagineus: buchin (Old German gloss).

baca: Baca uel oliue arboris minerue.

intiba: intiba quasi intus caua, genus habere, quae et excorea, cuius radices

necant segetem. algam iamque stantibus ulua uel ripus circa fontes et palludes

nascuntur.

74VB: carica: Carice caricarum a copia dicitur arboris fici. Nam ficus a fecunditate

dicta, ceteris arboribus fertilior est.

75RA: aconita: aconitum herba in saxis uel cotibus nascitur.

incurrit in annos: occidendo illum.

75RB: humanis: rebus.

manes: Manes deus mortuorum, per antifrasis dicitur, quasi mites, uel quia late

manant prae reo*.

tabo: quod inuidi infecti sunt tabo, tabitabo diptongum est.

inuidie: descriptio inuidie e**so h*bi** c*1*** (Gloss in later hand, cursive
script).

75VB: **consternatique timores**: *consternantes homines* .

    **crate**: cateni dicit costas *inhaerentes spinis.*

76RA: **pullo**: nigro.

76RB: **natura**: *quia* ibi *natura purior est aeris.*

77RB: **animal**: camelion.

78RA: **taxo**: arbores

    **senta**: sentuosa, *uel recentes*, anime.

78VA: **domitum**: *prolapsum*

78VB: **Da...opus.** contra ociosos.

    **Rura..colendi;**: rusticorum.

    **Aspice..ramos.**: infirmorum delicatum.

    **Uel...recessit**: uenatorum

79RA: **Aspice..oues.**: *pastorum*,

    **Uel..ore;**: piscatorum.

79VA: **Regis..lapsis,**: ad potentem.

79VB: **amico**: patroclo. *Interfecit hec strem, qui illum interfecerat*, scilicet, *patroclum*.

    **hostis**: fortuna (over hostis)

    **Est..priores**: exempla *uere amicitie.*

80RA: **pennis**: uentis.

80RB: **achimenidem**: archimenides fuit socius unus ulixis *qui cum* rediret a *troia*

dimisit in loco ubi poliphemus *interfecit uel hunc sucepit licet esset eneas
inimicus.

duci: telepho.

80VA: Sit..uelox: oratio uel? ceteris mundi postestatibus.

Sic..parantur,: de imperi talibus.

80VB: Si..mittat: de discucione.

82RA: Miles..armis,: de remissione senum.

pulmone: quando digerit pulmonem.

Variant words and corrections by a second scribe

73RA 29: add. paucis.

73RB 25: mentes for mores, 38: add. prima.

73VA 33: indiuisa for indigestaque.

74RA 32: add. tollere.

74RB 16: quercu for illice, 23: add. u in ustus.

74VB 23: corr. aenea.

75RA 28: corr. hac to has. 36: cadet for cadit.

75VA 6: corr. arua. 10: opibus for operibus.

76RA 4: corr. tamen, 6: corr. somnos.

76VA 23: corr. destruitis.

77RA 4: corr. nonne.

77VB 6: add. te.

78VA 1: add. the whole line.

79RA 2: corr. pauidos. 17: corr. parua.

80RB 2: corr. exarat.

80VB 40: add. the whole line.

81RA 13: comitauit for comitatur.

82RB 11: corr. ex. 34: add. ubi.


83RA 1: corr. hac, 9: corr. the word order.


83VA 12: corr. hamis.

83VB 21: corr. in.

*Lines emphasized through symbols in the margin*

**Guide to symbols:**
- bars: |  
- braces: {  
- clubs: ♠  
- crosses: X

75RA: 3 X; 26, 28 ♠

75RB: 25 |

75VA: 25 ♠

76VA: 22-24 {

77RB: 8 ♠; 29, 38 |; 33-38/39 {

77VA: 13-15 {; 29 X

77VB: 9, 13, 16, 28, 36, 39, X
78RA: 7, 19 X

78VA: 8, 11 X; 34, 37 X; large asterisk next to line 6.

78VB: 7 X

79RA: 4, 13, 39 X

79RB: 4, 32 X; 11 |

79VA: 11, 39 X; 18 |

79VB: 15 |; 10, 23, 33 X; 10-13 { 

80RB: 7, 18, 36 X; 30, 31 ∗

80VA: 7, 14, 16, 19, 24, 29, 30, 33 X

80VB: 1, 14, 18, 24, 25, 37 X; 2 |

81RA: 3, 6 X

81RB: 1, 24, X; 26-39 { 

81VA: 3, 7, 33, 37 X

81VB: 2 ∗; 25, 28 X

82RA: 13 X

82RB: 1, 9, 15, 19, 24, 28 X; 36 ∗

82VA: 17, 21, 23, 31 X; 30 |

82VB: 17, 24, 32 X

83RB: 1, 9, 19, 26 X
4. Analysis of the Ovidian excerpts in the FS.

I intend to analyse the particular reception of Ovid in the FS: seeing how the compilator’s intentions unfold, not merely based on what is proposed in the prefaces, but also in his choice of excerpts and in his use of chapter headings. Where appropriate I shall try to understand how the often highly christian headings may alter the reading of the excerpts when placed over purely pagan content. Next I will analyse the excerpts themselves, and in particular take note of what may be deliberate changes by the compilator and how these excerpts may change in meaning, not only through alterations of content, but also of context and ordering.

The prose preface

The general preface to the FS (73RA 1-32) exhibits a number of features typical of medieval florilegia. It is concerned with preserving some verses worthy of memory and the compilator compares this activity with picking out precious flower buds from among the thorns: ‘et quasi preciosos flos-culos de medio spinarum eripui’ (73RA 5-6). This flower-picking analogy is the classical topos for poetry collections. The compilator goes on to mention why these excerpts supposedly are (more) worthy of memory: some are more useful for teaching eloquence: ‘in eloquentia plus nitoris habentia’ (73RA 8-9), but may have a less ”wholesome” message and their meaning has therefore been altered in order to aid moral edification: ‘ut edificatione pro-ficerent saniori sensui coaptati.’ (73RA 9-10). Trying to identify these alterations of content is somewhat challenging since we do not know the exact source material available to the compilator, but as we shall see, the compilator shows his hand quite clearly at certain instances. From the very outset, the preface shows a preoccupation with ensuring its readers that the collection provides moral insight. The compilator notes that Ovid criticized his own work in two prefaces, a reference to the opening poems of books II and III of the Tristia, and was concerned with censuring his earlier poems in order to promote his exile poetry and their pleading for mercy: ‘cetera opera sua proprio iudicio dampnat,’ (73RA 13-14). Ovid is mentioned here as the poet par excellence (indeed he is the only poet mentioned by name, i.e. Naso, in the preface) – we see an argumentum ad auctoritatem – if the great Ovid purportedly saw ethical problems with his own poems, then it is right for others to try and improve them. The compilator says that he has
included Ovid’s own arguments from these prefaces in the FS (the preface to Ovid), albeit in a different order ‘que singula [the prefaces] licet non eodem quo dixi ordine in ipsis prologis inuenies’ (73RA 17-18). The compiler now proceeds to mention the remaining contents of the collection, how he has organized the collection according to author: ‘Deinde quicquid in sin-gulis auctoribus inuenire potui, in unum conferens ipsorum quo nominibus attitulai.’ (73RA 18-20) and has included Christian poets after the Classical poets: ‘ad orthodoxos metrorum dumtaxat scriptores manum misi’ (73RA 23-24). According to the preface’s moral argumentation, the Christian poets do not need any alteration, and since everything they write supposedly is edifying, there is less incentive for making a collection of excerpts, so the compiler has merely presumed to excerpt some of the more familiarly ‘moral’ verses: ‘tamen fami-liarius moralitati seruientia excerpere praeumpsi.’ (73RA 25-27). At the end of the preface, the compiler professes his desire that the collection may be learned by heart by himself (and supposedly his readers), and finally, that he has endeavoured to provide amusement for contemporary poets by offering them ‘ludicra’ (73RA 32) supposedly as models for their own poems: ‘quibus metro ludere iocundum est’ – for those who like to play around in verse (73RA 31).

The alleged purpose of the florilegium can be said to be threefold. The compiler distinguishes between three intended reader responses of the excerpts: they may be read as amusing artistic models for poets (though he claims that only a small minority of the excerpts are very amusing: ‘pau-ca ad delectationem’ (73RA 20-21)), they may be memorized as morally edifying proverbs and they may be quoted by the readers in writing or speech in order to make them seem more eloquent. The contents and purpose of the collection is summarized by quotes from the poets Juvenal and Horace that succeed the prose preface: the content is a manifold stew of all human actions, like Juvenal’s ‘farrago’ (73RA 34 Sat. 1.86) whose purpose is to please and instruct its readers, as summarized in the famous line from Horace’s Ars Poetica: ‘simul et iocunda et ydonea dicere uite’ (73RA 38 Ars Poetica 334).
The verse preface to Ovid

The elegiac verse preface that comes next is an interesting use of two Ovidian poems, mixing direct quotes with verses that have been slightly altered by the compilator in order to convey his message, as well as what may be the compilator's own elegiac verse. The opening line of this passage: 'De tot nasonis si non tibi displicet unus,' shows the influence possibly from the first half of a line from the Heroides (5.85): 'nec de tot Priami.' (this epistle is quoted later in the collection, 79RB 12-13) and from the second half of a line from the popular late antique collection of moral quotes, the Disticha Catonis (7b): '.tibi displicet uni'. Some alterations are quite small: in 73RB 6, amare has been altered to the less dangerous iniqua: 'Nullus in hac carta uersus iniqua docet. ' (Trist. 3.1.4) but there seems to be a conscious replacement of subjects in many of these lines: the personified liber speaking in the first person in the first quotes from Tristia 3.1. is changed to third person: in Tristia 3.1.3 sim becomes sit (73RB 5) etc., so as to tie these excerpts together with those drawn from Tristia 2, where Ovid is the speaker. This simple alteration successfully masks the twofold origin of these excerpts.

The compiler’s verse preface to book II

At the beginning of the second book of Ovidian excerpts we find a third preface (75RB 2-15), again in verse, also drawing on Tristia 2 and 3, but this time with a lot more of what must plausibly be the compilator’s own creations. 'Non equidem ludi pars fuit ista mei.' (78RB 3) is quite similar to Trist.3.3.54, and there are also seven recognisable excerpts from Tristia 2. These are surrounded by elegiac couplets, possibly the compilator’s.

The chapter headings: vices and virtues

The main bulk of the Ovidian quotes in the FS are organized into four books, each of which have a number of chapters with headings added by the compilator. These chapter headings provides an insight into contemporary interpretations of Ovid, how the pagan content of his poems could be read through a christian lense and change in meaning. The first heading: 'i. de summa dei potencia et uoluntatis eius efficatia.' (73RB 35) corresponds to 73VA 23-24; a discussion about the power of the gods (they are given in plural, superi) which introduces the story of pious Baucis and Philemon towards the end
of book 8 of the *Metamorphoses*. This is quite straightforward: there are no apparent alterations to these excerpts, but already at the third chapter heading: ‘de contemplatione iii.’ (73RB 37) we can see how the new christian context of the heading forces the compilator to alter a line: ‘Et quasi cum uero lumine posse loqui. (Pont.2.8.10)’ (73VA 30) has the more mystical and christian *lumine* replace the Classical *numine* (just think of the light mentioned at the beginning of the Gospel of John). The letters *N* and *I* are perhaps that bit too distinguishable in most scripts for this to be a scribal error.

The chapter headings of the first book are primarily focused on what may be called natural philosophy, e.g. ‘de confusione prīma elementorum iiiii’ (73RB 38), ‘de mutabilitatō rerum temporālium xxxi’ (73VA 16); vices and virtues, e.g. ‘xii. descriptio pauperis conuiuii.’ (73VA 5), ‘xxii. de auaritia’ (73VA 11); and the human condition, e.g. ‘de homine. viii.’ (73VA 2). The last chapters deal with eschatological concerns: death; ‘xxxvii. de morte.’ (73VA 20) and hell; ‘descriptio inferni. xxxviii.’ (73VA 21). The excerpts in this book are primarily drawn from the *Metamorphoses* and the exile poetry. The chapter headings of the second book are again connected with vice and virtue, and once again with the eschatological, since the last chapter of this book deals with death: ‘xxi. De morte.’ (78RB 27-28). The excerpts in book two are mainly drawn from the *Remedia* and the exile poetry. The third book takes up the theme of study and scholarly activities: ‘i. De studio’ (81RA 17), ‘v. De scrībentibus.’ (81RA 19), added to the recurrent theme of vices, particularly that of envy: two chapter headings (xiii and xvi) are labelled ‘De inuidis’ (81RA 22,23). This book ends with a chapter not about death, but the related *topos* of the passing of time, ‘De tempore. xxiii.’ (81RA 25-26).

This book contains the largest breadth of Ovidian excerpts, mainly drawn from the exile poetry. Book four also follows the model layout of vices and virtues and an eschatological heading to round it off: ‘xxiii. De requie spirituali.’ (82VB 13). Given that the vast majority of the chapter headings of the first four books of the FS can be pinned down into the dichotomy between vice and virtue, it is perhaps possible to
reevaluate the library catalogue listing from 1363-1374 mentioned earlier: 'Excerpta cuiusdam monachi de uirtutibus'\textsuperscript{206}.

*The excerpts; selection and alterations*

How has the compilator gone about turning the Ovidian poetic corpus into a collection of quotes on vices and virtues? What parts of Ovid has he chosen and what has he rejected? The excerpted lines that are more or less clearly recognisable as lines from Ovid amount to some 1550-1565 lines, or about 4.5\% of the complete corpus.\textsuperscript{207} In addition to these there are some lines that are either spurious, too corrupt in the transmitted MS used by the compilator or have been altered extensively by the compilator. Lastly, some of the lines are actually from two Medieval poems (74RB 29-37 and 79RA 21-30), and may or may not be the compositions of the compilator himself. The second of these is also found in MS Munic, Clm. 6911, s. xiii/xiv, f. 107VB (18 verses).\textsuperscript{208} One line may also be a misattribution to Ovid: line 77RB 26 is actually from Horace, *Sat.* 2.2.136. The excerpts derive from seven of the ten canonical poems of Ovid, the *Heroides*, *Ars Amatoria*, *Remedia Amoris*, *Fasti*, *Metamorphoses*, *Tristia* and the *Epistuale ex Ponto*, as presented in the following table:


\textsuperscript{207} Counting the lines as in the *Loeb* editions of Ovid, discounting all pseudo-Ovidiana: 33 951 lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POEM</th>
<th>EXCERPTED LINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pont.</td>
<td>1.2.121-126 1.3.16-26, 33-42 1.4.1-3, 7-22 1.5.5-7, 18, 23-26, 35-40, 43-48 1.6.29-46, 51-53 1.7.21, 63-64 1.8.53-60 1.9.39-40 1.10.3-10, 21-24, 27-32 2.1.9-10, 13-14, 47-48 2.2.25-28, 31-34, 53-54, 57-58, 117-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.5,8</td>
<td>1.5.25-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.7-14, 47, 65, 69, 71, 73, 75-76</td>
<td>1.8.1-18, 41-46, 49-50, 1.9.5-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.9-10</td>
<td>2.1-2, 9-12, 33-38, 80, 117-120, 139-142, 211-212, 241-242, 257-258, 266-274, 301, 313-316, 343-344, 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.11-18, 21-32, 35-36, 39-40, 47-48</td>
<td>3.1.2-4,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.21-22</td>
<td>3.3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.91-92, 99-103, 157-158</td>
<td>3.4a.3-5, 9-10, 25-26, 43-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.9-14, 31-34, 45-46, 49-100</td>
<td>3.5.31-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.101-102, 105-108.</td>
<td>3.6.31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.29-30, 79-82</td>
<td>3.7.41-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.17-20</td>
<td>3.11.21-24, 29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.23-24</td>
<td>4.3.37-38, 75-76, 79-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.13-24</td>
<td>4.10.5-7, 36, 81-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.35-36</td>
<td>4.11.17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The excerpted lines are a broad selection from seven of the Ovidian poems. Most books and individual poems/epistles are represented, the main exception is the *Fasti*, with excerpts from only two out of six books in the collection (the total lines drawn from the *Fasti* is quite small). 12 out of 15 books of the *Metamorphoses* make an appearance and the exile poetry is also well represented, with excerpts from 34 out of the 46 poems of the *Epistulae ex Ponto* and 22 out of the 50 poems of the *Tristia*. Perhaps the most conspicuous omission is the *Amores*, which is a key, programmatic work in the Ovidian corpus. This poem could hardly be incorporated into a framework such as 'vices and virtues'; it relates the ups and downs of an extramarital love affair which inherently was seen as highly suspect not just in an Augustan context, let alone within a medieval, Christian context. Perhaps the greatest obstacle is the more or less naturalistic, 'amoral' character of the poem; the other amatory poems of Ovid could at least be seen to have explicit didactical aims (serious or satiric), whereas the *Amores* does not. When it comes to the selection of excerpts within individual poems, there is a distinct tendency towards continuous passages punctuated by shorter omissions. These holes in the longer passages are interesting for a number of reasons.

**Excerpts from the Metamorphoses**

In the excerpts from the *Metamorphoses* the focus is on the beginning of book 1, the end of books 2, 8 and 11; and in particular upon book 15, the excerpts of which represents the largest group from any single book or Ovidian poem in the FS (194 lines – roughly 25% of book 15). The main themes of these excerpts can be grouped around concepts of change, descriptions of the passing of time, personified vices (Rumour and Envy) and a sprinkling of the fantastic or exotic, as the verses describing the chameleon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trist. cont.</th>
<th>4.6.1-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8.3-4, 19-22, 45-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.49-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5.49-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7.47-48, 67-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.12.21-28, 37-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.13.21-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.14.11-12, 25, 27-32, 45-46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15.411-412 that are included (77RB 6-7). There are very few female characters, no naked nymphs, no budding love affairs and the only battle scenes are from the section on the Gigantomachy in book 1.

The single longest passage is from the beginning of book 1 (86 and 61 lines, separated by a three-line hiatus). The very first excerpts of the collection proper (73VB 23-24) are two lines from book 8 (Met. 8.618-619). The prooemium (Met.1.1-4) shares a characteristic with these excerpts in that they both can be said to deal with a theme of divine power, in the former case, the power to inspire poetry: ’adspirate meis [poems]’ (Met.1.3); the prooemium is however rejected as a starting point. This can not be because it mentions the plural, polytheistic (read: problematic) di; as the first excerpts (73VB 23-24) include the synonymous superi. The identification of the speaker in the prooemium with the poet ’himself’ could possibly be the reason for this omission. By concealing the identity of the speaker, a passage of poetry can more easily be incorporated into a new context, such as when quoting a short excerpt in a letter, sermon or speech.

The next part of the Metamorphoses we encounter is the creation myth in book 1 (roughly 1. 5-150). This was highly popular with Medieval readers, not least because of its many similarities with the creation myth in Genesis. The omitted lines of this passage (1.91-93) deal with the Golden Age when there was no need for a punitive judiciary ’poena metusque aberant’ or a written penal code ’nec uerba minantia fixo aere legebantur’. Perhaps the lack of fear of punishment sounded jarring in a Judaeo-christian context, where the equivalent Golden Age of Paradise included the prospect of punishment from the very outset? Perhaps this passage was seen to be too similar to the preceeding lines of the poem?

The succeeding longish passage from the Metamorphoses is a description of Inuidia – Envy, 2.760-811, which has a number of hiatuses (2.765-768, 773-774, 783-787, 789, 797-798 and 802-804). This passage concerns four identifiable persons and one location: the personified Envy, the goddess Minerva, the princesses Herse and Aglauros and the city of Athens. The omitted passages, as well as several alterations: in lines 788/790 (the first half of this line is tagged onto the second half of line 790, 75VA 5), 794 (Athens changed to the anonymous ’siquos cernit uirtute uigentes’ 75 VA 9) and
809 (‘excruciatur’ replaces ‘uritur Heres’, 75VA 19) reduces this number to just one: Envy (and an anonymous victim). Again we can see a concern with generalising an excerpt by removing given names, in this case to the extreme – by chipping away a third of the lines from a continuous passage and changing the remaining lines that originally identified its location and supporting cast. Similarly, in the long passage from book 8, recounting the story of the pious old Philemon and Baucis (74RB 38-74VB 22), the exact identification of the place where the transformed couple rest as oak trees is omitted (8.620-625), so that the pious couple can be envisaged as having lived anywhere and everywhere. There is more to these alterations than a desire for generalization; in a medieval context where Minerva often could be identified with wisdom (a heritage perhaps of Martianus Capella), her appearance in the passage from book 2 would seem confusing; why would Wisdom spur on Envy? This way of thinking of the gods as personified concepts was a fruitful way of dealing with the pagan poets’ polytheism for the medieval readers. The alterations and omissions in a later passage in the florilegium can equally be explained by this. In book 11.592-673 of the *Metamorphoses* there is an account of how the goddess Iris, the rainbow, seeks out the personified god Sleep (Somnus) who in turn sends his son Dream (Morpheus – from the Greek μορφεῦς: ’shapes’) to do his bidding. Again we can see that two personified concepts have been written out in order to make the excerpts more general and focused. Iris and Morpheus are nowhere in sight, Iris is removed with the omission of lines 11.616-617, 622-623 and line 648 has been altered to remove any hint of Morpheus (this is the end of the passage that introduces him, he is selected by his father Somnus; ’eligit [Morpheus] et’, which is altered to ’Cur parua’ 76RA 25). However, this strategy of simplification is not found throughout the FS: in the passage from book 12 on Rumour (Fama), 12.39-63, there are plenty of examples of other personified deities being mentioned by name, but they are equally mentioned as concepts: ’credulitas’ (Credulity), ’error’, ’leticia’ (Joy), ’timores’ (Fears), ’sedicioque’ (Sedition), ’susurri’ (Whispers) (75VB 7-9). The setting here is very different from the previous passages treated, in that this is a catalogue of related concepts where the point is to convey a baroque abundance which serves to complement the central character, Fama.

The longest chapter of the first book of the FS contains a description of the transmutability of all things, approximately corresponding to what may be called the...
'quasi-philosophical’ section of the *Metamorphoses*:15.259 - 430, chapter XXXI 'de mutabilitate rerum temporalium’ (73VA 16). Book 15 returns to topics from natural philosophy as the cosmological model found in book 1, focusing on the character Pythagoras; a philosopher only vaguely similar to the historic Samian philosopher. The excerpts from book 15 all relate to Pythagoras, who is approached by the legendary Roman king Numa Pompilius (very anachronistically) and who teaches him natural philosophy, recounts the first ages of precious metals, the changing nature of things (in a Heraclitean fashion), reincarnation and vegetarianism (these latter *were* hallmarks of his philosophic school), 15.60-478. The FS gives us lines 15.60-72, 150, 179-253, 259-272, 296-308, 340-355, 362-402, 411-430, or about half of the total of this Pythagorean section. Missing are the sections on vegetarianism 15.75-142, 173-175 and 453-478 (perhaps less relevant in a Northern European setting where preserved meat was essential for surviving the long winter months – and these lines would thus detract from the authority of Pythagoras), then there are two lines (150-152) drawn from a section on taking a sublime perspective on existence, *sub specie aeternitatis* as it where, 15.143-152. The second of these lines has been altered, it is one dactyl short of a hexameter 'Exhortabatur et moribus instituebat’ (76RB 37); 'seriemque evoluere fati!’ has been completely replaced, so as to tag this line on to the preceding introduction of Pythagoras and his role as a teacher (15.60-72). There is nothing left of the reincarnation mentioned in lines 15.153-172, nor the long section on fantastic rivers 15.309-339. The focus is on the transmutability of natural phenomena, including the effects of aging. Line 15.233 has also been altered, aged Helen who wonders 'cur sit bis rapta’ – why she was twice kidnapped (or raped...) has been turned into an anonymous woman who has lost the vestiges of her beauty: '[Flet quoque] Femina *et* antiques *u*estigia forme’ (76VA 21). This line is very similar in form to line 1.237, where Lycaon *re*ains traces of his human form, 'ueteris seruat uestigia formae’. In this sense, we can se how the compilator is influenced by other verses in Ovid when he alters the extracts according to his purposes. He uses Ovid to censure Ovid.
Excerpts from the Epistulae ex Ponto

The excerpts from the exile poetry are the second most prominent in the Ovidian books of the FS; a large proportion of the excerpted lines in the second and third books are drawn from them. The excerpts from the Epistulae ex Ponto represent the vast majority of that collection’s poems, focusing particularly on poems from the first book, 1.3-6 and 1.10, as well as poems 2.3, 2.7 and 2.9; 3.2; 4.3 and 4.8, all of which account for 14 lines or more. Once again, we see a tendency towards making the excerpts more universally applicable. A long analogy between depression and physical disease as well as a description of homesickness found in Pont.1.3 are included without alterations, lines 16-26 and 33-42 (82RA 25-35 and 81VB 5-14). The lines that are left out from this poem are all personal, relating directly either to Ovid or to his addressee, Rufinus. The description of homesickness includes a number of references to Geography (Rome and Scythia) and Mythology (Odysseus and Philomela), which are left intact. From poem 1.4 there are more personal excerpts on ageing and misery, lines 1-3, 7-22 (81VB 24-25, 28-31 and 80VA 6-17) but still, they stop short of identifying Tomis or Pontus, so as to not limit the position of the speaker to a specific location. This too is evident in the selection from poem 1.5, lines 5-6, 18, 23-26, 35-40 and 43-48 (81RA 38-39, 82RA 20-24, 81RB 2-13), which omits lines 1-4 that introduce the speaker and addresse, lines 12 and 41-42, dealing with the Muses as well as the end of the poem which concerns Ovid’s plight as a defamed poet living among the barbaric Getae. There is an interesting line (81RB 1) added to the analogy between the negative effect of too much rest and stagnant water in lines 5-6, that either may originate from a corrupt MS or has been rewritten more or less wholesale by the compilator to replace 1.5.7: 'Sic perit ingenium studii si demperis usum’. This changes the theme from the composition of poetry (the subject of this poem) to the pursuit of study in general. The selections from poem 1.6. focus on a description of hope, lines 29-46 (75RA 13-28), personified as a a goddess, and the support from a true friend, Graecinus, who is made anonymous by the words 'uir fidus’ in line 53 (79VB 7), again, to make these lines more generally applicable. Similarly, the addressee of poem 2.3, Maximus is rebranded as 'Prelatus’ in line 1 (80VA 32), which is one syllable short of a full hexameter. Ovid himself is replaced in 4.3.10 by 'sepe’ (77VA 36). The sequence of themes can also have an impact on the excerpted lines. The description of depression at the beginning of poem 1.10 has been
altered, so as to approach the negative description of old age and its ailments in the preceding excerpts, the original denial of physical disease ’nec dolor ullus adest, nec febribus uror anhelis’ has become the exact opposite: ’Iam dolor omnis adest, et febribus uror amaris’ (81VB 34).

The longest continuous passage from the Epistulae, totalling 54 lines, is taken from poem 3.2, lines 45-46 and 49-100 (79VB 37 - 80RB 12). The first half of this poem is presented in such a way as to conceal the speakers and addressee of the poem, only lines 9-14 and 31-34 (82RB 7-12 and 81RA 11-14) are admitted into the FS. The passage in question relates the story of Iphigenia in the far away Tauri and how she is approached by her brother Orestes and his close friend Pylades, and how the three eventually escape with the statue of Diana. Orestes and Pylades are presented as paragons of friendship when they quarrel over who shall sacrifice himself to save the other and both offer to die. Here we find an interesting textual variant that may well be inherited from the compillator’s source MSS, in line 63 the FS reads ’equora’ for the more common ’aethera’, a variant found in MS Scrin. 52, Hamburg, s. ix m., and some recentiores.209

Line 68 reads ’seua’ for ’nostra’, this is clearly an alteration by the compillator to conceal the nature of the speaker of this passage, an old inhabitant of Tauri. Line 97 is likewise altered, so as to read ’Illos busta tegunt sed uiuit fama perhennis’ instead of ’fabula narrata est postquam uulgaris ab illo’, thereby removing any trace of the old man referenced in ’illo’. The focal point of this passage becomes the bonds of friendship and kinship and everything extraneous to this is omitted or replaced.

There are a few examples of more drastic alterations to the excerpts from the Epistulae. In the excerpts from poem 1.10 the couplet in 31-32 has been altered from ’non epulis oneror: quaram si tangar amore, est tamen in Geticis copia nulla locis’ to ’Nil superest leti, procul omnis abacta uoluptas, Mors utinam ueniat et mala tanta leuet’ (82RA 9-10). This radically alters the theme from a lack of appetite to a general loss of desire, except the desire for death. It also removes any reference to location. Another significant change occurs in the two lines that succeed 4.3.50, ’Hec te debuerant infelix praemonuisse, Ne me desereres forsan et ipse cades’ (77VB 30-31). These lines may

be supposed to replace 4.3.57-58, but are more direct, speaking of downfall rather than a change from joy to grief. An even more radically altered line is 3.3.10κ, 'in quorum numero me, precor, esse uel is.' which now reads 'Non onerosa tibi sint aliena bona.' – don’t let other people’s goods weigh you down, (82RB 18). This change achieves two things: it makes away with a reference to a specific speaker, 'me' and ties the succeeding lines from the Remedia on jealousy closer together with this section from the Epistulae. Apart from such intended alterations we find examples of lines from the Epistulae that well may have been spurious or highly corrupt in the MS sources of the FS. Lines 2.2.33-34 are included, with just two words found in other MSS 'qui' and 'fretum' and a linked theme of shipwreck. These lines well may be an attempted emendation of a corrupt MS in order to link these lines with the succeeding passage, there is nothing in the content of this couplet that seems to call for censorship. The spurious line Pont.4.3.44 is included in the FS (77VB 23).

Excerpts from the Tristia

The excerpts from the Tristia are found spread throughout the first three of the four books, starting with the excerpts from Trist.3.1 and Trist.2.1 that are used in the preface to the Ovidian books. These excerpts originate from about half of the individual poems in the Tristia. The opening poems of all five books are represented, all of which can be categorized as apologetic; and so is the last poem in the collection too. The vast majority of these excerpts appear in short bursts, mostly in pairs or on their own: the only Tristia-poems that are excerpted at some length are Trist.1.1, 1.8, 1.9, Trist.3.4a, Trist.4.1 and 4.6, Trist.5.1, 5.12 and 5.14 – in addition to the above mentioned Trist.2.1. We encounter the beginning of Trist1.8 rendered without any alteration, lines 1-18 (77VB 32-39, 78RA 1-10), followed immediately by the end of the same poem, lines 41-46, 49-50 (78RA 11-18). The latter half skips a number of lines that reference geography (33, 36-37, 39-40), probably to make the excerpts seem more generally applicable. The treacherous friend that is the intended addressee, already anonymous in the poem, now becomes a treacherous friend in general, at any time or place. Similarly, the excerpts from poem 3.4a, are devoid of all given names, and focus on the theme of living inconspicuously, illustrated by a single nautical metaphor: a stormwrecked ship will fare better with lowered sails and the smaller the sails, the better, lines 9-10 (79VA
The analogies drawn from myth, lines 19-24 and 27-30, are not included; not even the famous aeronautical pioneers Daedalus and Icarus are mentioned. As we can see from these examples, the *Tristia* seems to have been quite congenial to the compilator’s tendency towards the general and universally applicable. This poetry collection has relatively few given names beyond examples from myth and geography and deliberately tries to conceal not just the true cause of Ovid’s exile but also the names of some of his friends and even his wife. The only easily identifiable person involved is the poet himself (or his persona). As such, all the compilator had to do was to excerpt those lines that were devoid of given names and suited his choice of themes.

**Excerpts from the Remedia Amoris**

The *Remedia Amoris* is perhaps the poem that is most in tenor with the project of the compilator. It speaks against futile love, or rather futile desire, but only half-heartedly, since even the descriptions of the best remedies procures negative results. Notably, a move to the countryside will serve only to remind you of your lost love when you see all the love-making animals – much of this pastoral section of the *Remedia* is included, lines 169-182, 187-204 and 207-210 (78VB 15-23, 25-39; 79RA 1-3, 12-20; ). The excerpts from this poem have undergone few alterations. Line 93 has seen the erasure of Venus ‘delectat Ueneris decore fructum’ has been transformed into ’delectat prauos deuince re motus’ (78VA 16). This transforms the meaning radically, from the humane realisation of our inability to give up our desires, into a celebration of moralism. The son of Venus suffers equally in line 108, where ’uetus in capto pectore sedit amor’ has been altered into: ’pectus domitum proh pudor hostis habet’ (78VA 21). The enemy in question may well be a reference to the devil. However, this alteration may not be intended to draw a comparision between the devil and love. There is a great leap from the half-hearted wish to relinquish love in Ovid’s poem into a christian persecution of carnal desire, which is likened with Satan. The feeling of love itself is not censured in the FS, and as such, line 137 has to be changed from ’Haec, ut ames, faciunt; haec, quod fecere, tuentur;’ into ’Nec te inmunit faciunt; ad tela patere;’ (78VA 32). The words for desire ‘cupido’ or its object ‘uenus’ seem to be included only in those verses that speak against them, whereas the feeling of love ‘amor’ is protected from censure. This does not spare the personified deity, Amor, from appearing in such negative lines as
'Affluit incautis isidiosus amor' (78VB 4). The verb 'amo' appears in some negative contexts; in lines 161-168 where loving is contrasted disparingly with warfare as the cowardly Aegisthus remains in Argos and becomes an adulterer, but again, this is explicitly carnal love; not the sensation, but the act (78VB 7-14); the personified deity is mentioned in the last line, 'ille puer'. An example of a line that has been altered to become more generally applicable is the obscure 366, which refers to a critic of Homer, Zoilus: hardly a household name. This line instead reads 'Letis atque bonis obuiat hoc uicium.' – this vice attacks both happy and good people, (82RB 20) and sums up the theme of jealousy in more general terms. The parts of the Remedia that have been excluded from the FS seem partly to deal with the female body and sex, such as the advice on finding faults with your mistress, particularly her bodily traits, in general, in lines 315-360, and especially during or after sex, 399-434. The only excerpted lines from these sections constitute generally applicable proverbs: lines 421-422 'don’t underestimate minor things' (80VB 27-28) and lines 427-428 'different people are offended by different things' (80VB 19-20). The excerpts focus on the beginning of the poem and its precepts on avoiding love altogether, while the second half of the poem is avoided. In general this part of the poem deals with how to end a love affair through interaction with your mistress, as well as a lot of mythological examples and an apology for amatory poetry, whereas the excerpts try not to mention the mistress at all. The last excerpts from the Remedia have been heavily censored, 755-756 have been altered from 'illic assidue ficti saltantur amantes quid caueas auctor qua iuuet arte docet' (the second line is a locus desperationis – a line that is left unemended by the editor, Kenney) to 'Blandicias pariter risus et mollia uerba, Sanus ut euadas sollicite refuge' (79RB 6-7). The compilator avoids all mention of lovers, and instead elaborates the description of things that 'enervate the mind', from which he advices abstination.

Excerpts from the Ars Amatoria

The excerpts from the Ars Amatoria pose particular problems for the compilator. How is he to include lengthy passages from a poem ostensibly devoted to the teaching of sexual courtship of courtesans in a florilegium that is to edify its readers? For one thing, how could he have included the kamasutraesque catalogue of sexual positions in lines 3.769-788? His solution seems to be to focus on the many analogies, typical of the
didactic genre of poetry, but to make radical alterations of content when he sees necessary. The first excerpts from book 1 of the poem are good examples. Lines, 1.45-48 are excerpted so as to lose sight of the original target of this hunting analogy; knowing where to find prey is just like finding good hunting grounds for a love-affair (49-50). The references to hunting and fishing become just that when left on their own (83VA 2-5). Similarly to the congenial analogies between hunting and dating in book 1 of the Ars Amatoria, there are many excerpts with agricultural references from book 2 that are missing their target and so have lost their function as analogies: line 2.352 'Dat requiem: requietus ager bene credita reddit'(κ3VA 30) becomes a simple proverb on the benefits of leaving the soil fallow when taken out of context, namely that you shouldn’t see your girlfriend too often or she will tire of you. Radical changing a target of an analogy can preserve it within the compilator’s edifying framework. Lines 1.93-97 is originally an analogy between crowds of women converging on the theaters and busy bees or ants, but the last line has been altered from 'Sic ruit ad celebres cultissima femina ludos' to: 'Ad celebres ymnos sic pia turba ruit;' (83VB 20) – a pious crowd rushing towards celebrated hymns.

Another solution seems to be to change the object of the poem into that of a man, supposedly transforming the references to purely amicable relationships, such as those between male students and masters. The amusing trick Ovid teaches about removing dust from a woman’s clothes, even if there is no dust to be removed, 1.149-154, has been given this treatment, so that the object of the action has become the cloak of a master: 'domini..Uestitu’ (83RA18-19). The chapter heading for this section changes the meaning into something purely negative: ‘viii. Ubi uicium adulationis uel hypocrisis hyronice docetur ut quam detestabile sit ostendatur.’ (82VA 39, 82VB 1-2) – 'where the vice of adulation or hypocrisy is taught ironically so that it may be shown how detestible it may be'. The personnel of this scene has now become a master and a toady bootlicker. Female illa is also changed into male ille in lines 2.200 and 2.202 (83RB 2,4) which belong in the same chapter. The female object(s) of the poem can also be transformed to abstract concepts, as in the excerpts from 2.9-14, which speak of the difficulties in maintaining the puella – girl, that 'uenisse tibi me uate’ – 'came to you with me as poet’. She has in the FS been replaced by the abstract ‘sancte uirtutis opem meruisse:' (83VB 23) – the aid of holy virtue. When the subject of the poem becomes
women in book 3, the excerpted lines occasionally undergo a gender change or the
gender of the subjects is effaced altogether: 'discunt etiam ridere puellae,' – 'girls even
learn to smile', line 3.281 is transformed to: 'Prudentes etiam discunt ridere decenter'
(82VB 17) – the prudent learn how to smile well. Yet, Helen of Troy is not tampered
with when she is an object of consideration for Priam in line 3.759 (82VB 26).

Another aspect of the excerpts is the treatment of deities in this book of the FS. Venus is
replaced by 'dolus' in 1.362 (83VA 27) and Bacchus is replaced by 'mero' in 1.242
(83RA 17), while Juno and Juppiter escape untouched, as in line 3.654 (83RB 20)
'Placatur donis iupiter ipse datis'. Female deities and heroines seem to be particularly
suspect whenever they are representatives of sexual desire; homely Juno escapes
censure. The proverbially chaste Penelope is used as an example of how even the most
prudish woman can be seduced given enough time and effort, just as water hollows the
hard rock and an iron ring is worn through use in lines 1.471-478, which are excerpted
wholesale except for Penelope who is replaced by 'Que sunt dura tibi' (83VA 38). The
analogy is thus given a generally applicable twist: troubles fade away in time, just
persist!

Excerpts from the Heroides and the Fasti

The excerpts from the Heroides and the Fasti are few and far between in the selection.
The lines from the Fasti avoid hinting at specific speakers, but do not otherwise appear
to be altered. The couplet excerpted from Fasti 6.463-464 (82RB 36-37) may well be a
sign of a corrupt MS, it has 'nec' instead of 'ne’, which removes a sense of purpose
from this line and 'scilicet interdum’ is replaced by 'Asperra pacatis’, which removes
any indication of frequency from the preceeding line. The most severely altered excerpt
from the Heroides, line 13.123, is changed to omit a reference to a specific place,
changing 'Sed cum Troia subit, subeunt uentique fretumque’ into 'Omnibus in rebus si
plus iusto trepidabis,' (75RB 35). This cange also makes the couplet more widely
applicable, referring to anxiety in general instead of focusing on the dangers of the
Trojan war.

An interesting thing happens when we encounter line 1.72 from the Heroides (80RB
38). The preceeding lines from Pont.3.1. are addressed to Ovid's wife, who is compared
favourably with Penelope in lines 107-108, which are not included (the excerpts stop at 103). The succeeding line is from Penelope’s epistle in the *Heroides*! In this way there is a clever intertextual play, which is very much in the spirit of Ovid, if a bit subtly executed, since there is no mention of Penelope, and there are no indications of the origins of the excerpts.

*Transitional lines between sections*

There are many examples of lines that have been altered, or have been completely replaced in order to tie succeeding sections of excerpts together. This is evident in the inserted couplet at 80RB 39 – 80VA 1, 'Quod si uota facis sacrís altaribus astans, Pro quais causa ferre preces cupiens’, which is thematically linked with the preceding line from *Her.* 1.72 (concerning the grieving Penelope), but also with the succeeding lines from *Pont.* 3.1.157-158. This explores the existing links between two poems, one addressed to Ovid’s wife and the other addressed from Penelope, while erasing any mention of either women, and focusing all attention upon grief and the efficacy of tears when praying. Any reference to the speaker, 'Ovid', is removed from *Epist.* 2.2.53 (80VB 17), where the original ’hanc ego, non ut me defendere temptet, adoro’m is replaced completely by 'Quamuis oppressos releues, miseros tuearis,’ – shifting attention towards the addressee of this poem, never mentioned in the FS, who 'lifts up the oppressed and defends the weak’, and links him with the implicit everyman addressee of the *Remedia* in the next couple of excerpts (80VB 19-20). The second half of *Met.* 6.351 has been altered to go with an inserted couplet at 80RB 18-20. These three lines together create a thematic link with the succeeding excerpts from *Pont.* 2.2., all of which deals with fair dealing and mutual advantages, even between enemies, such as the king of Mysia who is both wounded and healed by Achilles 'Profuit et misso pelias hasta duci’ (80RB 24). There are also examples of inserted lines that link sections of excerpts taken from the same poem, as at 74RB 29-37, where there is a veritable poem in hexameter, probably composed by the compilator, which ties the preceeding and succeeding passages from books 1 and 8 of the *Metamorphoses* together by elaborating on the theme of pious simplicity shared by humans of the Silver Age and Philemon and Baucis. A less volumous example can be found at 78VB 24, where we find an inserted line ’Quere uoluptates licitas fugiendo nefandas’ – seek licit joys through avoiding
criminal ones. This serves to put the surrounding lines (scenes of pastoral bliss excerpted from the *Remedia*) in relief.

*Use and production of text: glosses, lines singled out in the margin*

MS H, like most High Medieval MSS containing classical authors, includes a number of glosses to text. These provide us an insight into two things: Firstly, that the text was subjected to a master of grammar who elaborated some difficult points, or alternatively and perhaps less likely, the text was supplied with notes drawn from a commentary. Secondly, this shows us that the text had a didactic purpose; it was supposed to be studied, either by individuals or by a class. The glosses allowed for private reading, while also facilitating lecturing. The longer glosses comment on the hierarchy of Roman society (73RA), on the etymology of words such as 'mortales' (74RA), 'carice' or 'ficus' (74VB) or explain references to mythology; as Patroclus (79VB) or Archimenides (80RB). The appearance of a German gloss (74VA 26) has been noted; this too shows that the text had a didactic purpose.

In addition to the glosses we find a number of lines that have been singled out by what seems to be a conscious system of four different symbols: clubs, crosses, braces and bars. These symbols in the margins are written in black ink and must be medieval, if not contemporary with the creation of the MS. They constitute proof of secondary compilations, 'mini-florilegia' within the florilegium, where someone (possibly up to four individuals – if each symbol corresponds to a single reader) have selected a small number of lines for easy reference (66 lines have crosses in the margin, 8 have clubs, 10 bars and 30-31 are enclosed by braces). This activity seems to be guided purely by taste, there seems to be no striking links within the four categories, neither thematically nor stylistically. Theses lines may have been singled out in order to be memorized, to be used at a later time, or they may have been used simultaneously in the composition of letters, lectures, sermons or as models for poetry.
5. Conclusion

The Ovid presented in the FS is in many ways similar to the ‘bowdlerized’ Ovid found in other florilegia of the same period, such as the French FG and the MS Douai, Bibl. Municipale, 749-II. His poems are extracted with a view towards creating universally applicable, quotable lines. To do so, the *dramatis personae* have been reduced in number, often so far as to anonymise the poet as speaker. This process is perhaps most conspicuous in the excerpts from the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, which have been rendered so that all speakers and addressees have been effaced, including Ovid himself. There are few examples of censorship in the alterations to the excerpts, the very christianized line at 80VB 20 is perhaps the most extreme example. However, the choice of excerpts has served to remove all traces of sexual innuendo and conceals the wit and frivolity of Ovid. He is presented as a monkish, straight-faced, serious philosopher, a voice of reason, humility and loyalty – but altogether a bit dull. By removing most geographical and mythological references, the FS achieves much the same as Burton writes about the FG: 'The effect of the selection process is to obscure the differences in culture and values between the ancient author and the medieval reader'\textsuperscript{210}. The individual poems are presented as a true collage, without their original titles. Instead, the florilegium is arranged into chapters that provide easy access to sections on specific themes. These sections are tied together by alterations to existing lines or the inclusion of entirely novel lines. The choice of themes for the chapter headings is highly apt for the clerical audience at the time, they focus on vices and virtues, study, writing, good and bad friendship, hell, death, the passing of time and the mutability of all things mundane. This organisation of the text as well as the explicit statement of purpose in the prefaces; coupled with the evidence of close study found in the margins of the MS, goes a long way in hinting at the intended multifarious purpose of the compilator when composing the FS. The FS is highly suitable for teaching Latin composition, where individual lines or couplets could be included in poems, sermons or speeches concerning a number of different themes. The moralizing selection of excerpts may be a sign that the text was intended for younger students, either in a cathedral or monastic school. The compilator may even have provided us with an example of his own poems inspired by Ovid, in

particular the first medieval poem inserted as an elaboration of the Silver Age in the first book of the *Metamorphoses*.

Given the considerable breadth of the excerpts, the compiler of the FS must have had access to a large library (or a number of libraries) containing 7 out of the 10 canonical poems of Ovid. Such large libraries were few and far between in the 12th century. There are a number of rare, if not otherwise valuable, textual variants in the FS, which may provide some clues into the origins of the FS. *Pont*.4.3.44 (77VB 23) is also found in the margin of MS B, Bav. Mon. Lat. 384, Munich, s. xii, \(^{211}\) the oldest surviving MS to contain this line. The origin of this MS is Germany, probably somewhere reasonably close to Munich, yet another rare variant (for its time), *Pont*.3.2.63 (80RA 14), points to another part of Germany: Hamburg. The number of scribes involved, the apparent lack of local sources at Heiligenkreuz and the nature of MS Heiligenkreuz 227-III (the misplaced chapter numbering; the lack of any graphic differences between Ovidian excerpts and the medieval poem at 74RB 29-37) all seem to point to the existence of an earlier, German archetype, as proposed by Glauche.

We will perhaps never know exactly where the FS was compiled, or the identity of the compilator, but we can at least conclude that his composition shows the extent of the *aetas ovidiana* in the Germanophone area, in a manner very similar, and in no way inferior to the creations of French scholars at the time. The full merits of his work can only be appreciated through a complete study of all the poets found in the FS.
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Appendix I: Text edition
73RA: Flores excerpti de diversis poetis:

Cum pro exercicio ingenioli mei poetarum scripta lectitarem inter fabulosa corum deli-ramenta quasdam senten-

tias memoria dignas reperti, et quasi preciosos flos-
calos de medio spinarum eripui. Quas dum col-

erem quodam etiam uerba minus quidem in sen-

su utilitatis set in eloquentia plus nitoris

5.  tias memoria dignas reperti, et quasi preciosos flos- 
calos de medio spinarum eripui. Quas dum col-

ligerem quae dam senten-

tias memoria dignas reperti, et quasi preciosos flos- 
calos de medio spinarum eripui. Quas dum col-

ligerem quae dam senten-

5. Neue reformida, ne sit tibi forte pudori: (Tr. 3.1.3)

Nullus in hac carta uersus iniqua docet.* (Tr. 3.1.4)

Inspice quid portet: nichil hic nisi triste uidebis, (Tr.3.1.9)

Non arridebit musica iocosa tibi.* (Tr.2.354)

Sed mihi quid prosunt, infelix cura, libelli,* (Tr.2.1)

10.  Ingenio perii qui miser ipse meo? (Tr.2.2)

Deme mihi studium, uitam quoque carmine demes;* (Tr.2.9)

Acceptis referor uersibus esse nocens, (Tr.2.10)

Hoc precium uite uigilatorumque laborum* (Tr.2.11)

Cepimus: ingenio est pena reperta meo. (Tr.2.12)

15.  Quo uidear quamuis nimium iueniliter usus, (Tr.2.117)

Grande tamen toto nomen ab orbe fero; (Tr.2.118)

Turbaque doctorum nasonem nouit, et audet (Tr.2.119)

Non fastiditis annumerare uiiris. (Tr.2.120)

Sed ne te celere sub turpi crimine letus* (Tr.2.211)

73RB

Lectorem delectando pariterque monendo. (Ars Poetica 344)

Incipit prologus in librum i. florum Publilii o. nasonis.

De tot nasonis si non tibi displicit unus,* (Her.5.82/ Disticha Catonis 2.7)

Da placidam libro, lector amice, manu m;* (Tr. 3.1.2)

5.  Neue reformida, ne sit tibi forte pudori: (Tr. 3.1.3)

Nullus in hac carta uersus iniqua docet.* (Tr. 3.1.4)

Inspice quid portet: nichil hic nisi triste uidebis, (Tr.3.1.9)

Non arridebit musa iocosa tibi.* (Tr.2.354)

Sed mihi quid prosunt, infelix cura, libelli,* (Tr.2.1)

10.  Ingenio perii qui miser ipse meo? (Tr.2.2)

Deme mihi studium, uitam quoque carmine demes;* (Tr.2.9)

Acceptis referor uersibus esse nocens, (Tr.2.10)

Hoc precium uite uigilatorumque laborum* (Tr.2.11)

Cepimus: ingenio est pena reperta meo. (Tr.2.12)

15.  Quo uidear quamuis nimium iueniliter usus, (Tr.2.117)

Grande tamen toto nomen ab orbe fero; (Tr.2.118)

Turbaque doctorum nasonem nouit, et audet (Tr.2.119)

Non fastiditis annumerare uiiris. (Tr.2.120)

Sed ne te celere sub turpi crimine letus* (Tr.2.211)
20. conferens ipsorum quo nominibus attitulaui. pau-
ca ad delectationem, omnia pene ad edifi-
cationem conuertere studui. Quibus exple-
tis ad orthodoxos metrorum dum taxat scrip-
tores manum misi. et licet in his nichil ab
25. edificatione sit uacuum, quedam tamen fami-
liarius moralitati seruientia excerpere
presuppsi. Quia enim omnia pro sui magnitu-
dine et diuersitate ac mea tenuitate capere
nequeo. hiis saltem paucis per usum me-
30. morie incultatis recreari cupio. Meis igitur solu-
modo coetaneis quibus metro ludere iocundum est.
hecofferre ludicra curaui. “Clauicu-
la sequentis OPERIS.”
Quicquid agunt homines, uotum, timor, ira, uoluptas. (Juvenal. 1.85)
35. Gaudia decursus, nostri est farrago libelli. (Juvenal 1.86)
Argumentum generale in scripita poetarum.
Aut prodesse uolunt, aut delectare poete. (Ars Poetica 333)
Aut simul et iocunda et ydonea dicere uite. (Ars Poetica 334)
Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci.(Ars Poetica 343)
20. Arguor obsceni doctor adulterii, (Tr.2.212)
illa quidem fator frontis non esse seure (Tr. 2.241)
Carmina, nec teneris cordibus apta legi:* (Tr.2.242)
Quodcumque attigerit mala mens studiosa sinistri,* (Tr.2.257)
Ad uicium mores aedruet inde suos. (Tr.2.258)
25. Omnia peruersas possunt corrumpere mentes: (Tr.2.301)
Nil prodest, quod non ledere possit idem. (Tr.2.266)
Igne quid utilis? siquis tamen urere tecta (Tr.2.267)
ceperit, audaces inuertet igne manus. (Tr.2.268)
Eripit interdum, modo dat medicina salutem, (Tr.2.269)
30. Quequiuuet, monstrat, quequiuuet sit herba nocens. (Tr.2.270)
Et latro et cautas precingitur ense uiator, (Tr.2.271)
Ille sed insidias, hic sibi portat opeam. (Tr.2.272)
Discitur innocuas ut agat facundia causas: (Tr.2.273)
Protegit et sones, inmeritosque premit. (Tr.2.274)
35. C.i. De summa dei potentia et uoluntatis eius efficatia.
ut creatura omnis creatori subiaceat. ii.
De contemplatione iii.
De confusione prima elementorum iiiii.
De divisione eorumdem v.
De subtiliori distinctione creature. vi.
De diuisione animalium vii. De homine. viii.
De prima etate. viiiii. De secunda. x.
De gratia hominum illius etatis. xi.
5. Ut quam erat et tellus illic et punctus et aer, (Met.1.15)
Sic erat instabilis tellus, innabilis unda, (Met.1.16)
Lucis egens aer: nulla sua forma manebat, (Met.1.17)
5. Obstabatque aliis aliiad, quia corpore in uno (Met.1.18)
Frigida pugnabat calidis, humentia siccis, (Met.1.19)
Mollia cum duris, sine pondere habentia pondus. (Met.1.20)
Hanc deus et melior litem natura diremit; (Met.1.21) 
Nam celo terras et terris abscedit undas (Met.1.22)
10. Et liquidum spisso secreuit ab aerre celum, (Met.1.23)
Que postquam evolut exemit acerus, (Met.1.24)
Disassociata locis concordi pace ligauit. (Met.1.25)
Ignea conuexi uis et sine pondere celi (Met.1.26)
Emicuit suumqae locum sibi legit in arce; (Met.1.27)
15. Proximus est aer illi leuitate locoque, (Met.1.28)
Densior his tellus elementaque grandia traxit (Met.1.29)
Et pressa est grauitate sui; circumflus humor (Met.1.30)
Ultima possedit solidumqae cohercuit orbem. (Met.1.31)
Sic ubi dispositam, quisquis fuit ille deorum, (Met.1.32)

Descrip[...]

Incipit liber primus publii o. nasonis.

Eminet: inmensa est finemque potestia celis (Met. 8.618)

Non habet et, quicquid superi uoluere peractum est. (Met. 8.619)

25. Nil adeo ualidum, est adamas licet alliget illud, (Tr. 4.8.45)

Ut maneat rapido firmius igne dei;* (Tr. 4.8.46)

Nil ita sublime est supraque pericula uenit, (Tr. 4.8.47)

Non sit ut inferius suppositumque deo. (Tr. 4.8.48)

Est aliq[...]

30. Et quasi cum uero lumine posse loqui.* (Po. 2.8.10)

Ante mare et terras et, quod tegit omnia, celum (Met. 1.5)

Unus erat tuto nature uultus in orbe, (Met. 1.6)

Quem dixere cahos, rudis indigestaque moles (Met. 1.7)

Nec quicquam nisi pondus iners congestaque eodem (Met. 1.8)

35. Non bene iunctarum discordia semina rerum. (Met. 1.9)

Nullus adhuc mundo prebebat lumina titan (Met. 1.10)

Nec noua cresendo reparabat cornua phebes, (Met. 1.11)

Nec circumfuso pendebat in aere tellus (Met. 1.12)

Ponderibus librata suis, nec brachia longo (Met. 1.13)

20. Congeriem secuit sectamque in menbra redegit, (Met. 1.33)

Principio terram, ne non equalis ab omni (Met. 1.34)

Parte foret, magni speciem glomeratae in orbis; (Met. 1.35)

I Tum freta diffudit rapidisque tumescit e ventis (Met. 1.36)

Iussit et ambite circumdare litora terre. (Met. 1.37)

II 25. Addidit et fontes et stagna inmensa lacusque (Met. 1.38)

Fluminaque obliquae cinxit decliviae ripis, (Met. 1.39)

Que diuersa locis partim sorbentur ab ipsa, (Met. 1.40)

In mare perueniunt partim campoque recepta (Met. 1.41)

III Liberoris aque pro ripis litora pulsant. (Met. 1.42)

30. Iussit et extendit campos subsidere ualles, (Met. 1.43)

IV Frondem tegi siluas, lapidosos surgere montes; (Met. 1.44)

Utque due dextra celum totodemque sinistra (Met. 1.45)

Parte secanet zone, quinta est ardentior illis, (Met. 1.46)

Sic unus inclusum numero distinxit eodem (Met. 1.47)

35. Cura dei, totidemque plaga tellure premuntur. (Met. 1.48)

Quarum que media est, non est habitabilis estu; (Met. 1.49)

Nix tegit alta duas: totidemque intra utramque locauit (Met. 1.50)

Temperiemque dedit mixta cum frigore flamma. (Met. 1.51)

Iminet his aer; qui quanto est pondere terre, (Met. 1.52)
Pondere aque leuior, tanto est onerosior igne. (Met.1.53)
Illic et nebulas, illic consistere nubes (Met.1.54)
Iussit et humanas motura tonitrau mens (Met.1.55)
Et cum fulminibus facientes frigora uentos. (Met.1.56)
5. His quoque non passim mundi fabricator habendum (Met.1.57)
Aera permisit; uix nunc obsistitur illis, (Met.1.58)
Cum sua quisque regat diuerno flamina tractu, (Met.1.59)
Quin lanient mundum: tanta est discordia fratrum. (Met.1.60)
Eurus ad auroram nabethaque regna recessit (Met.1.61)
10. Persidaque et radiis iuga subdita matutinis; (Met.1.62)
Uesper et occiduo que litora sole tepescunt (Met.1.63)
Proxima sunt zephiro; scuthiam septemque triones (Met.1.64)
Horrifer inuasit boreas; contraria tellus (Met.1.65)
Nubibus assiduis pluuoque madescit ab austro. (Met.1.66)
15. Hec super inposuit liquidum et gravitatem carentem (Met.1.67)
ethera nec quicquam terrene fecit habentem. (Met.1.68)
Uix ita limitibus disperserat omnia certis,* (Met.1.69)
Cum, que pressa diu massa latuere sub illa,* (Met.1.70)
Sidera ceperunt toto effuuescere celo; (Met.1.71)

Nondum precipites cingebant oppida fosse, (Met.1.97)
Non tuba directi, non eris cornua flexi, (Met.1.98)
Non galee, non ensis erat: sine militis usus (Met.1.99)
Mollia secure peregebant otia gentes. (Met.1.100)
5. Ipsaque inmunis rastroque intacta nec ullis* (Met.1.101)
Sautia uomeribus per se dabat omnia tellus, (Met.1.102)
Contentique cibis nullo cogente creatis (Met.1.103)
Arbuteos fetus montanaque fraga legebant (Met.1.104)
Cornaque et in duris habentia mora rubetis (Met.1.105)
10. Et, que deciderant patula iouis arbore, glandes. (Met.1.106)
Uer erat eternum, placidique tepentibus aures (Met.1.107)
Mulcebant zephiro natos sine semine flores; (Met.1.108)
Mox etiam fruges tellus inarata ferebat, (Met.1.109)
Nec renouat aegraudis canebat aristis: (Met.1.110)
15. Flumina iam lactis, iam flumina nectaris ibant, (Met.1.111)
Flauaque de uiridi stillaba ilice mella. (Met.1.112)
Est ubi saturno tenebrosa in tartara missa* (Met.1.113) X
Sub ioue mundus erat, subiit argentea proles, (Met.1.114)
Auro deterior, fuluo preciosior aere. (Met.1.115)
20. Neu regio foret ulla suis animalibus orba, (Met 1.72)
   Astra tenent celeste solum formaeque deorum, (Met 1.73)
   Cesserunt nitidis habitande piscibus unde, (Met 1.74)
   terra feras cepit, uolucre agitabilis aer. (Met 1.75)
   Sanctius his animal mentisque capitius alte (Met 1.76)
25. Deerat adhuc et quod dominari inter cetera posset: (Met 1.77)
   Natus homo est, siue hunc diuino semine fecit (Met 1.78)
   Ille opifex rerum, mundi melioris origo, (Met 1.79)
   Siue recens tellus seductaque nuper ab alto (Met 1.80)
   Ethere cognati retinebat semina celi; (Met 1.81)
30. Pronaque cum spectent animalia cetera terram, (Met 1.84)
   Os homini sublime dedit celumque uidere (Met 1.85)
   Iussit et erectos ad sidera tollere uultus. (Met 1.86)
   Sic, modo que fuerat rudis et sine imagine, tellus (Met 1.87)
   Induit ignotas hominim conuosa figuras. (Met 1.88)
35. Aurea prima sata est etas, que uiindice nullo, (Met 1.89)
   Sponte sua, sine lege fidem rectumque colebat. (Met 1.90)
   Nondum cesa suis, peregrinum ut uiseret orbem, (Met 1.94)
   Montibus in liquidas pinus descendere at undas, (Met 1.95)
   Nullaque mortales preter sua litora notant. (Met 1.96)
Terrenasque domos lustrat pausare uolentes, *(Met. 8.628)*

Hos casa permodica set *non* indigna recepit, *(Met. 8.629)*

Arta *quidem* stipulis *et* canna tecta palustri, *(Met. 8.630)*

*Sed* pia baucis anus parili *ue* etate pylemon *(Met. 8.631)*

5. Illa sunt annis iuncti iuuenilibus, illa *(Met. 8.632)*

Consenuere casa paupertatemque fatendo *(Met. 8.633)*

Effecere leuem nec iniqua mente ferendam. *(Met. 8.634)*

*Non* refert, *dominos* illic famulosne requiras: *(Met. 8.635)*

Tota domus duo sunt, idem parentque iubentque. *(Met. 8.636)*

10. Ergo ubi celicole paruos tetigere penates *(Met. 8.637)*

Submissoque humiles intrant uerctiae postes, *(Met. 8.638)*

Menbra senex posito iussit releuare sedili, *(Met. 8.639)*

Quo *superiniecit* textum rude sedula baucis, *(Met. 8.640)*

Inde foco tepidum cinerem dimouiit et ignes *(Met. 8.641)*

15. Suscitat hesternos foliisque *et* cortice sicco *(Met. 8.642)*

Nutrit *et* ad flammis anima perducit anili *(Met. 8.643)*

Multifidasque faces ramaliaque arida tecto *(Met. 8.644)*

Detulit *et* minuit paruoque admouit aeno, *(Met. 8.645)*

Quodque suus coniunx rigido collegerat orto, *(Met. 8.646)*

Ouaque *non* acri leuiter uersata fauilla, *(Met. 8.667)*

Omnia fictilibus; post *hec* celatus eodem *(Met. 8.668)*

Sistitur argento crater fabricataque fago *(Met. 8.669)*

Pocula, que caua sunt, flauentibus illita ceris. *(Met. 8.670)*

5. Parua mora est, epulasque focis misere calentes, *(Met. 8.671)*

Nec lange rursus referant uruina senecte *(Met. 8.672)*

Dantque locum mensis paulum seducta secundis. *(Met. 8.673)*

Hic nux, hic mixta est rugosis *carica* palmis *(Met. 8.674)*

Prunaque *et* in patulis redolentia mala canistris *(Met. 8.675)*

10. Et de purpureis collecte uitibus uue; *(Met. 8.676)*

Candidus in medio faus *est*: super omnia uultus *(Met. 8.677)*

Accessere boni nec iners pauperque voluntas. *(Met. 8.678)*

Interea tociens haustam cratera repleri *(Met. 8.679)*

Sponte sua per seque uident sua crescere uina:* *(Met. 8.680)*

15. Atoniti nouitate pauent manibusque supinis *(Met. 8.681)*

Accipiant baucisque preces timidusque pylemon *(Met. 8.682)*

*Et* ueniens dapibus nullisque paratibus orant. *(Met. 8.683)*

Unicus anser erat, minime custodia uille, *(Met. 8.684)*

Quem diis hospitibus domini maectae parabant; *(Met. 8.685)*
20. Truncat holus foliis; furca leuat ille bicorni (Met.8.647)

Sordida terga suis nigro pendentia tigno (Met.8.648)

Seruatoque diu resecat de tergo partem (Met.8.649)

Exiguam sectamque domat feruentibus undis. (Met.8.650)

Interea medias fallunt semonibus horas (Met.8.651)

20. Ille celer penna tardos etate fatigat (Met.8.686)

Eluditque diu tandemque est uisus ad ipsos (Met.8.687)

Effugisse deos: superi uetuere necari (Met.8.688)

Tercia post illam successit aenea piales, (Met.1.125)

Seuior ingeniis et ad horrida prompтор arma, (Met.1.126)

25. Sentirique moram prohibent. erat alueus illis. (Met.8.652)

fagineus, dura clauo suspensus ab ansa: (Met.8.653)

Is tepidis impletur aquis artusque fouendos (Met.8.654)

Accipit in medio thorus est de mollibus uluis (Met.8.655)

Inposta lecto sponda pedibusque salignis; (Met.8.656a)

25. nec scelerata tamen; ... (Met.1.127)

De duro est ultima ferro. (Met.1.127)

Protinus erupit uene peioris in euum (Met.1.128)

Omne nefas, fugere pudor uerumque fidesque; (Met.1.129)

In quorum subiere locum fraudesque dolique (Met.1.130)

30. Uestibus hunc uelant, quas non nisi tempore festo (Met.8.657)

Sternere consuerant, sed et hec uilisque uetusque (Met.8.658)

Uestis erat lecto sed non indigna saligno:* (Met.8.659)

Occubuere dei. mensam succinta tremensque (Met.8.660)

Ponit anus, mense sed erat pes tertius inpar: (Met.8.661)

30. Insidieque et uis et amor sceleratus habendi. (Met.1.131)

Longa mora est, quantum noxe sit ubique repertum, (Met.1.214)

Enumerare: minor fuit ipsa infamia uero. (Met.1.215)

Uela daban uentis nec adhuc bene nouerat illos (Met.1.132)

Nauita, queque diu steterat in montibus altis, (Met.1.133)

35. Testa parem fecit; que postquam subdita cliuum (Met.8.662)

Sustulit, equatum mente extersere uirentes. (Met.8.663)

Ponitur hic bicolor sincere baca minerue (Met.8.664)

Conditaque in liquida corne autumnalia fece (Met.8.665)

Intibaque et radix et lactis massa coacti ((Met.8.666)

35. Fluctibus ignotis insultauere carine, (Met.1.134)

Communemque prius ceu lumina solis et aure (Met.1.135)

Cautus humum longo signauit limite mensor. (Met.1.136)

Nec tantum segetes alimentaque debita diues (Met.1.137)

Poscebatur humus, sed itum est in uiscera terre, (Met.1.138)
Quasque recondiderat stigiisque ad mouerat umbris, (Met.1.139)
Effodiunt opes, irritamenta malorum; (Met.1.140)
Namque nocens ferrum ferroque nocentius aurum (Met.1.141)
Prodierat: prodit bellum quod pugnat utroque, (Met.1.142)
5. Sanguinea manu crepitantia connudivit arma. (Met.1.143)
Uiuitur ex rapto; non hospes ab hospite tutus, (Met.1.144)
Non socer a genero, frater quoque gratia rara est. (Met.1.145)
Imminet exicio uir coniugis, illa mariti; (Met.1.146)
Lurida terribiles miscens aconita nouerece; (Met.1.147)
10. Filius ante diem patrios incurrit in annos. (Met.1.148)
Uicta iacet pietas, et uirgo cede madentes, (Met.1.149)
Ultima celestum, terras astrea reliquit. (Met.1.150)
Set spe cum fugerent sclereras numina terras,* (Pont.1.6.29)
et diis inuisas sola remansit humo. (Pont.1.6.30)
15. Hec facit ut uiiuat fossor quoque compede uinctus, (Pont.1.6.31)
liberaque a ferro crura futura putet. (Pont.1.6.32)
Hec facit ut, uideat cum terras undique nulas, (Pont.1.6.33)
Naufragus in mediis brachia iactet aquis. (Pont.1.6.34)
Sepe aliquem sollers medicorum cura reliquit, (Pont.1.6.35)

Ne foret humanis securior arduus ether,* (Met.1.151)
Affectasse ferunt regnum celeste gigantes (Met.1.152)
Altaque congestos struxisse ad sydera montes, (Met.1.153)
Quos pater omnipotens latum dispersit in orbem* (Met.1.154)

5. Heu quam difficile est crimen non prodere uultu! xx. (Met.2.447)  XIX
Uix oculos attollit humo mens conscia culpe,* (Met.2.448)
Proh superi, quantum mortalia pectora cece xxii. (Met.6.472)  XX
Noctis habent! ipso scelib molimine quiuis* (Met.6.473)
Creditur esse pius laudemque a crimine sumit. (Met.6.474)

10. Non metuunt leges, sed cedit uiribus equum, xxii. (Tr.5.7.47)  XXI
Uix ego saturo regnum abest. (Tr.5.7.48)
Uix ego saturo quemquam regnante uidebam xxii. (Fast.1.193)  XXII
Cuias non animo dulcia lucra forent. (Fast.1.194)
Tempore creuit amor, qui nunc est summus, habendi: (Fast.1.195)

15. Uix ultra quo iam progre Dimitur habet. (Fast.1.196)
Pluris opes nunc sunt quam prisci temporis annis, (Fast.1.197)
Cum populus pauper, dum nova roma fuit, (Fast.1.198)
Creuerunt et opes et opum furiosa cupido, (Fast.1.211)
et, cum possideant plurima, plura petunt. (Fast.1.212)
20. Nec spes huic uena deficiente cadit. (Pont.1.6.36)
Carcere dicuntur claudi sperare salutem, (Pont.1.6.37)
Atque aliquis pendens in cruce uota facit. (Pont.1.6.38)
Hec dea quam multos laqueo sua colla ligantes (Pont.1.6.39)
Non est propita passa perire necel (Pont.1.6.40)

25. Conante Arguit injecta ignis, (Pont.1.6.41)
In pectore sua sedest, macies ignaui plenissima frigoris, (Pont.1.6.42)
Proximus humus gradus est male desperare salutem, (Pont.3.7.23)
Seque semel uera scire perisse fide. (Pont.3.7.24)

30. Quaecumque ex merito spes uenit, equa uenit. (Her.2.62)
Quamuis est igitur meritis indebita nostris, (Pont.1.6.45)
Magna tamen spes est in bonitate dei. (Pont.1.6.46)
Nusquam recta acies, liuent rubigine dentes, (Met.2.762)

35. Omnibus in rebus si plus iustus trepidabis,* (Her.13.123)
Spes bona sollicito uicta timore cadet. (Her.13.124)
Crede mihi, miseros prudentia prima relinquit, (Pont.4.12.47)
et sensus cum re consiliumque fugit. (Pont.4.12.48)

Crimina multimoda terris ubi preualeturum? XVIII

20. Querere ut absumant, absu mpta requirere certam, (Fast.1.213)
Atque ipse uitiis sunt alimenta uices: (Fast.1.214)
Sic quibus intumuit suffusa uenter ab unda, (Fast.1.215)
Quo plus sunt poete, plus siciuntur aque. (Fast.1.216)
In precio precium nunc est: dat census honores, (Fast.1.217)

25. Census amicicias; pauper ubique iacet. (Fast.1.218)
Sed quamuis opes chresi sibi centumpli carit.* (Tr.5.14.11)
Nil feret ad manes diuitis umbra suos. (Tr.5.14.12)
Exstant inuidie nigro squalentia tabo (Met.2.760)
Tecta procul: domus est imis in uallibus huius (Met.2.761)

30. Abdita, sole carens, non nulli per sui uento, (Met.2.762)
Tristis et ignau plenissima frigoris, et que (Met.2.763)
Igne uacet semper, caligine semper abundet. (Met.2.764)

35. Surgit humo pigre passuq incedit inertia,* (Met.2.771/772)
Pallor in ore sedet, macies in corpore toto, (Met.2.775)
Nusquam recta acies, liuent rubigine dentes, (Met.2.776)
Pectora felle uirent, suffusa est lingua ueneno. (Met.2.777)
Risus abest, nisi quem uisi mouere dolores, (Met.2.778)
Non fruitur somno uigilantibus excita curis, (Met.2.779)

Sed uidet ingratos intabescitque uidendo (Met.2.780)

Successus hominum carpitque carpit una (Met.2.781)

Supliciumque suum est. (Met.2.782)

5. Murmura sepe mouet, adopertaque nubibus atris* (Met.2.788/790)

Quacumque ingreditur, florentia proterit arua (Met.2.791)

Exuritque herbas et summa papauera carpit (Met.2.792)

Afflatuque suo populos urbesque domosque (Met.2.793)

Polluit, et siquis cernit uirtute uigentes.* (Met.2.794)

10. Ingeniis opibusque et festa pace nitentes (Met.2.795)

Uix retinet lacrimas, quia nil lacrimabile cernit. (Met.2.796)

Uulnerat hamatis precordia sentibus inplens (Met.2.799)

inspiratque nocens uirus piceumque per ossa (Met.2.800)

Dissipat et medio spargit pulmone unenum, (Met.2.801)

15. Cunctaque magna facit; quibus irritata, dolore (Met.2.805)

Tormentis diris torquetur et anxia nocte,* (Met.2.806)

Anxia luce gemit lentaque miserrima tabe (Met.2.807)

Liquitur, ut glaties incerto saucia sole, (Met.2.808)

Utque breui dicam non lenius excruciatur,*(Met.2.809)

Atria tertia tenet: ueniunt, leue uulgus, euntque (Met.12.53)

Mixtaque cum uiris passim commenta uagantur (Met.12.54)

Milia rumorum confusaque uerba uoluntan. (Met.12.55)

E quibus hi uacuas inplent sermonibus aures, (Met.12.56)

5. Hi narrata ferunt alio, mensuraque ficti (Met.12.57)

Crescit, et auditis aliquid nouus adicit auctor. (Met.12.58)

Illic credulitas, illic temerarius error (Met.12.59)

Uanaque leticia est, consternatique timores (Met.12.60)

Sedicioque recens dubioque auctore susurri. (Met.12.61)

10. Ipsa, quid in celo rerum pelagoque geratur (Met.12.62)

Et tellure, uidet totumque inquiri in orbem. (Met.12.63)

Est locus extreminus scithie glacialis in horis, (Met.8.788) XXVI

Triste solum, sterilis, sine fruge, sine arbores tellus; (Met.8.789)

Frigus iners illic habitant pallorque tremorque (Met.8.790)

15. Et ieium fames: lapidosa uiuit in agro* (Met.8.791/8.799)

Unguibus et duris conuellit dentibus herbas. (Met.8.800)

Hirtus inest crinis, cauca lumina, pallor in ore, (Met.8.801)

Labra incana siti, scabre rubigine fauces, (Met.8.802)

Dura cutis, per quam spectari uiscera possint; (Met.8.803)
20. Qua m cum spinosis igni supponitur herbis, (Met.2.810) Que neque dant flammamas lenique tepore cremantur, (Met.2.811) Quam male inequaules ueniant ad araratra iuvenci, (Her.9.29) Tam premittur magno compare quisque minor.* (Her.9.30) Non honor est sed unus species lesura ferentem: (Her.9.31) Uentris habet pro uentre locus; pendere putares (Met.8.805) Pectus et a spine tantummodo crate teneri; (Met.8.806) Articulos auget macies, genuum quoque turget (Met.8.807) No honor est sed unus species lesura ferentem: (Her.9.31) Inde, quod est usque, quamuis regionibus absit, (Met.12.41) Inspicitur, penitratque causas uox omnis ad aures. (Met.12.42)  

XXIII  

20. Ossa sub incuruis exstant arentia lumbis, (Met.8.804)  

XXV  

25. Queris, amicicias iungere iunge pares,* (Tr.3.4A.44) Hec inimica homines geminis amplectitur alis* (Met.8.818)  

XXVII  

25. Hec inimica homines geminis amplectitur alis* (Met.8.818)  

30. Fama tenet summaque locum sibi legit in arce (Met.12.43)  

Innumerosque aditus ac mille foramina tectis (Met.12.44)  

Addidit et nullis inclusit limina portis: (Met.12.45)  

Nocte dieque patet; tota est ex aere sonanti, (Met.12.46)  

Nota fremit uocesque refert iteratque, quod audit. (Met.12.47)  

30. Oraque una mouent dentemque indente fatigant (Met.8.825)  

Exercentque cibo delusum guttur inani (Met.8.826)  

Proque epulis tenuis nequiquam carpitur aura; (Met.8.827)  

Est prope chimerios longo spelunca recessu, (Met.11.592)  

XXVII  

35. Nulla quius intus nullaque silentia parte, (Met.12.48)  

Nec tamen est clamor, sed parue murmura uocis, (Met.12.49)  

Qualia de pelagi, siquis procul audiat, undis (Met.12.50)  

Esse solent, qualemue sonum, cum iupiter atras (Met.12.51)  

Increpuit nubes, extrema tonitrua reddunt. (Met.12.52).  

35. Quo numsquam radiis oriens mediusue cadensue (Met.11.594)  

Phebus adire potest; nebulare caligne mixte (Met.11.595)  

Exalantur humo dubieque cepuscula lucis. (Met.11.596)  

Non uigil ales ibi cristati cantibus oris (Met.11.597)  

Prouocat auroram, nec uoce silentia rumpunt (Met.11.598)
75VB cont: 40. Sollicitiue canes canibusue sagatior anser; (Met.11.599)

76RA: DI  Garrulla non progne stertenua pectora mulcet* (P. in. mrg. Met.11.599)
Non fera, non pecudes, non moti flame ro rami (Met.11.600)
Humaneue sonum reddunt conuicia lingue: (Met.11.601)
Muta quies habitat; saxo tamen exit ab uno (Met.11.602)
5. Riuus aque lethes, per quem cum murmure labens (Met.11.603)
Inuitat somnos crepitantibus unda lapillis. (Met.11.604)
Ante fores antri secunda papauera florent (Met.11.605)
Innumereque habere, quaram de lacte saporem* (Met.11.606)
Mox legit et spargit per opacas humida terras; (Met.11.607)
10. Ianua qua uerso stridorem cardine reddat: (Met.11.608)
Nulla domo tota est, custos in limine nullus; (Met.11.609)
At medio thorus est hebeno sublimis in antro, (Met.11.610)
Plumeus, unicolor, pullo uelamine tectus, (Met.11.611)
Quo piger ipse cubat membris languore solutis. (Met.11.612)
15. Pax animi, quen cura fugit, qui corpora duris (Met.11.624)
Fessa ministeriiis mulcet reparaque labori, (Met.11.625)
Hunc circa passim uarias imitantia formas (Met.11.613)
Sommia uana iacent totidem, quot messis aristas, (Met.11.614)
Silua gerit frondes, eiectas litus harenas. (Met.11.615)
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Mane rubet, terraque rubet cum conditur ima; (Met.15.193)
Ipse dei clipeus, terra cum tollitur ima, (Met.15.192)
Candidus in summo est, melior natura quod illi (Met.15.194)
Etheris est terreaque procul contagia fugit. (Met.15.195)
5. Nec par aut eadem nocturne forma diam (Met.15.196)
Esse potest umquam semperque hodierna sequente, (Met.15.197)
Si crescit, minor est, maior, si contra hit orbem. (Met.15.198)
Quid? non in species succedere quatuor annum (Met.15.199)  XXVIII
Aspicis, etatis peragentem imitamina nostre? (Met.15.200)
10. Nam tener et lactens puerique simillimus euo (Met.15.201)
Uere nouo est: tunc herba recens et roboris expers (Met.15.202)
Durget et insolida est et spe telecctat agrestes. (Met.15.203)
Omnia tunc florent, florunque coloribus almus (Met.15.204)
Ludit ager, neque adhuc uirtus in frondibus ulla est. (Met.15.205)
15. Transit in estatem post uer robustior annus (Met.15.206)
Fitque ualens iuenis: nec enim robustior etas (Met.15.207)
Ulla nec uberior nec, que magis ardeat, ulla est. (Met.15.208)
Excipit autumnus posito feruore iuuenre (Met.15.209)
Maturus mitisque inter iuuenemque senemque (Met.15.210)
20. Qui quotiens aliquam domui disponere temptat* (Met.11.616)
   
   Erigitur, tardaque oculos grauitate iacentes* (Met.11.618)
   
   Uix tandem attolens iterumque iterumque relabens (Met.11.619)
   
   Summaque percutiens nutanti pectora mento (Met.11.620)
   
   Denegat ad modicum sibi se cubitoque leuaturs,*(Met.11.621)

25. Cure parua mora est rursum languore solutis*Met.11.648)

   Deponitque caput strato recondit in alto. (Met.11.649)
   
   Assiduo queque labuntur tempora motu,* (Met.15.179)
   
   Non secus ac flumen. neque non consistere flumen* (Met.15.180)
   
   Nec levis hora potest, sed ut unda impellitur unda (Met.15.181)

30. Urgeturque eadem ueniens urgetque priorem, (Met.15.182)

   Tempora sic fugiunt pariter pariterque secuntur (Met.15.183)
   
   Et noua semper sunt; nam quod fuit ante, reliquum est, (Met.15.184)
   
   Ecque, quod haut fuerat, momenta cuncta nunantur. (Met.15.185)
   
   Cernis et emergit us in lucem tendere noctes,* (Met.15.186)

35. Et iabar hoc nitidum nigre succedere nocti; (Met.15.187)

   Nec color est idem celi, cum lassa quieta (Met.15.188)
   
   Cuncta iacent media cumque albo lucifer exit (Met.15.189)
   
   Clarus equo, rursusque alio, cum preua lucis (Met.15.190)
   
   Tradendum phebo palliantias inficit orbem. (Met.15.191)

20. Temperie medius, sparsus quoque tempora canis. (Met.15.211)

   Et non senilis hiemps tremulo uenit horrida passu (Met.15.212)
   
   Aut spoliata suos, aut, quos habet, alba capillos. (Met.15.213)
   
   Pytagoras ortu sami; pariter fugiebat*(Met.15.60)
   
   Et samon et dominos odioque tyrannidis exul (Met.15.61)

25. Sponte erat; isque licet celi regione remotus (Met.15.62)

   Mente deos adiit et que natura negabat (Met.15.63)
   
   Uisibus humanis, oculis ea pectoris Hausit. (Met.15.64)
   
   Cunque animo et uigili perspexerat omnia cura, (Met.15.65)
   
   In medium discenda dabat. cetuse silentum (Met.15.66)

30. Dictaque mirantium magni primordia mundi (Met.15.67)

   Et rerum causaque, quod natura, docebat. (Met.15.68)
   
   Quid deus, unde nives, que fulminis esset origo, (Met.15.69)
   
   Iupiter an uenti discussa nube tonare, (Met.15.70)
   
   Quid quateret terras, qua sidera lege mearent, (Met.15.71)

35. Et quodcumque latet; praudes didicit docuitque*(Met.15.72)

   Palantesque homines passim et rationis egentes (Met.15.150)
   
   Exhortabatur et moribus instituebat.*(Met. 15.152)
   
   Nil rerum durare diu sub imagine eadem (Met.15.259)
   
   Crediderim: sic ad ferrum uentistis ab auro, (Met.15.260)
Secula; sic tociens uersa est fortuna locorum. (Met.15.261)

Nec species sua cuique manet, rerumque nouatrix (Met.15.252)

Nosstra quoque ipsorum semper requieque sine ulla (Met.15.214)

Ex aliis alias reparat natura figuras, (Met.15.253)

Corpora uertuntur, nec, quod fuimus sumusue, (Met.15.215)

Uidi ego, quod fuerat quondam solidissima tellus, (Met.15.262)

Cras erimus. fuit illa dies, qua, semina tantum (Met.15.216)

Esse fretum, uidi factas ex equore terras, (Met.15.263)

Corporea uiseribus distente condita matris (Met.15.219)

Quodque fuit campus, uallem decusus aquarum (Met.15.266)

Fecit, et eluie mons est deductus in equor, (Met.15.267)

Et ucidu in montibus anchora summis; (Met.15.265)

Eque paludosa siccis humeres, (Met.15.268)

Artifices natura manus admouit, et angi (Met.15.218)

Etuetus inuenta est in montibus anchora summis; (Met.15.264)

Corpora uiscebris distente condita matris (Met.15.219)

Quodque fuit campus, uallem decusus aquarum (Met.15.266)

Fecit, et eluie mons est deductus in equor, (Met.15.267)

Et procul a pelago conche iacuere marine, (Met.15.224)

Et uetus inuenta est in montibus anchora summis; (Met.15.265)

Noluit eqve domo uacuas emisit in auras. (Met.15.220)

Flumina prosiliunt aut exsiccata residuunt.* (Met.15.272)

Editus in lucom iacuit sine uiribus infans; (Met.15.221)

Est prope phiceam tumulos trobena, sine ullis*(Met.15.296)

In de ualens ueloxque fuit spaciumque iuuent (Met.15.225)

Flumina prosiliunt aut exsiccata residuunt.* (Met.15.272)

Transit, et emeritis medii quoque temporis annis (Met.15.226)

Est prope phiceam tumulos trobena, sine ullis*(Met.15.296)

10. Mox quadrupes rituque tulit sua membri ferarum, (Met.15.222)

Et uetus inuenta est in montibus anchora summis; (Met.15.265)

Paulatimque tremens et nondum poblite firmo (Met.15.223)

Hic fontes natura nouos emisit, at illic (Met.15.270)

Constitit adiutis alio comamine neruis; (Met.15.224)

Clausit, et antiquis tam multa tremoribus orbis (Met.15.271)

Inde ualens ueloque fuit spaciunque iuuent (Met.15.225)

Flumina prosiliunt aut exsiccata residuunt.* (Met.15.272)

Transit, et emeritis medii quoque temporis annis (Met.15.226)

Est prope phiceam tumulos trobena, sine ullis*(Met.15.296)

10. Queque situm tulerant, stagnata paludibus hument. (Met.15.269)

5. Spesque hominum prime, matrisque habituimus aluo. (Met.15.217)

Artifices natura manus admouit, et angi (Met.15.218)

Quodque fuit campus, uallem decusus aquarum (Met.15.266)

5. Et procul a pelago conche iacuere marine, (Met.15.224)

Secula; sic tociens uersa est fortuna locorum. (Met.15.261)

5. Ex aliis alias reperat natura figuras, (Met.15.253)

5. Uidi ego, quod fuerat quondam solidissima tellus, (Met.15.262)

5. Liberiore frui celo, cum carcere rima (Met.15.301)
20. Flet quoque, ut in speculo rugas aspexit aniles, (Met.15.232)
   Femina et antiquae perdit uestigia forme,* (Met.15.233)
   Tempus edax rerum, tuque, inuidiosa utestas, (Met.15.234)
   Omnia destructitis uiciataque dentibus eui (Met.15.235)
   Paulatim lenta consumitis omnia morte. (Met.15.236)

20. Nulla foret toto nec peruia flatibus esset, (Met.15.302)
   Extentam tumefecit humum, ceu spiritus oris (Met.15.303)
   Tendere uesicas solet aut directa bicornis (Met.15.304)
   Terga capri; tumor ille loci permansit et alti (Met.15.305)
   Collis habet speciem longoquo induruit uo. (Met.15.306)

25. Hec quoque non perstant, que nos elementa uocamus: (Met.15.237)
   Quasquae uices peragant, animos adibete docebo. (Met.15.238)
   Quatuor hic presens genitalia corpora mundus* (Met.15.239)
   Continet. ex illis duo sunt onerosa quoque (Met.15.240)
   Pondere in inferius, tellus atque unda, feruntur, (Met.15.241)

25. Non, que sulphureis ardet fornacibus, ethna (Met.15.340)
   Ignem semper erit; neque enim fuit ignea semper. (Met.15.341)
   Nam siue est animal tellus et uiiuit habetque (Met.15.342)
   Spiramenta locis flamman exalantia multis, (Met.15.343)
   Spirandi mutare uias, quociensque mouet, (Met.15.344)

30. Et totidem graviitate carent nullaque premente (Met.15.242)
   Alta petunt, aer atque aerer purior ignis. (Met.15.243)
   Que quamquam spacio distant, tamen omnia fiunt (Met.15.244)
   Ex ipsis et in ipsa cadunt, resolutaque tellus (Met.15.245)
   In liquidas rarescit aqunas, tenuatur in auras (Met.15.246)

30. Has finire potest, illas aperire cavournas. (Met. 15.345)
   Siue leues imis uenti choibentur in antris (Met.15.346)
   Saxaque cum saxis et habentem semina flamme (Met.15.347)
   Materiem iactant, ea concipi ictibus ignem, (Met.15.348)
   Antra relinquuntur sedatis frigida uentis; (Met.15.349)

35. Aeraque humor habet, dempto quoque pondere rursus* (Met.15.247)
   In superos aer tenuissimus emicat ignes. (Met.15.248)
   Inde retro redeunt, idemque retexitur ordo: (Met.15.249)
   Ignis enim densum spissatus in aera transit, (Met.15.250)
   Hinc in aqunas, tellus glomerata cogitur unda. (Met.15.251)

35. Siue bituminee rapiunt incendia uires, (Met.15.350)
   Puteaue exiguis ardescunt sulphura fumis: (Met.15.351)
   Nempem, ubi terra cibos alimentaque pingua flamme (Met.15.352)
   Non dabit absumpitis per longum uiribus euum (Met.15.353)
   Natureque suum nutrimen deedit edaci, (Met.15.354)
Non feret illa famem, desertaque deserit ignes. (Met.15.355)

Plurima cum subeant audita aut cognita nobis. (Met.15.307)

Pauca super referam. nature lege probata.* (Met.15.308)

Nonne uides, quaecumque mora fluuidoque calore. (Met.15.362)

5. Corpora tabuerint, in parua animalia uerti? (Met.15.363)

In quo, delectos maecatos obrue tauros (Met.15.364)

(Cognita res usus): de putri uiiscere passim. (Met.15.365)

Florigere nascuntur apes, que more parentum. (Met.15.366)

Rura colunt operique fauent in spemque laborant; (Met.15.367)

10. Pressus humo bellator equus crabronis origo est; (Met.15.368)

Concaua littoreo si demas brachia cancro. (Met.15.369)

Cetera supponas terre, de parte sepulta. (Met.15.370)

Scorpius exibit caudaque minabitur unca. (Met.15.371)

Queque solent canis frondes interexere filis. (Met.15.372)

15. Agrestes tinee (res obseruata colonis). (Met.15.373)

Ferali mutant cum papilione figuram. (Met.15.374)

Semina limus habet uirides generantia ranas. (Met.15.375)

Et generat truncas pedibus, mox apta natando. (Met.15.376)

Crura dat, utque eadem sint longis saltibus apta. (Met.15.377)

Quo simul ac casias et nardi lenis aristas. (Met.15.398)

Quassaque cum fulua substrauit cinnama murra. (Met.15.399)

Se super inponit finitique in odoribus euum. (Met.15.400)

Inde ferunt, totidem qui uiuere debeat annos. (Met.15.401)

5. Corpore de patrio paruum fenica renasci. (Met.15.402)

Id quoque, quod uentis animal nutritur et aura. (Met.15.411)

Protinus assimulat, tetigit quosqcumque, colores. (Met.15.412)

Uicta racemifero linca dedit india bacho; (Met.15.413)

E quibus, ut memorant, quicquid uesica remisit. (Met.15.414)

10. Uertitur in lapides et congelat aere tacto. (Met.15.415)

Sic et coralium, quo primum contigit auras. (Met.15.416)

Tempore, durescit; mollis fuit sub undis.* (Met.15.417)

Desinet ante dies, et in alto phebus anhelos. (Met.15.418)

E quibus, ut viuiuere, quicquid uesica remisit. (Met.15.419)

15. In species translata nouas. sic temporae uertit. (Met.15.420)

Cernimus atque illas assumere robora gentes. (Met.15.421)

Concidere has; sic magna fuit censuque uirisque. (Met.15.422)

Perque decepot dutum dare sanguinis annos. (Met.15.423)

Nunc humilis ueteres tantum modo troia ruinas. (Met.15.424)
20. Posterior superat partes mensura priores. (Met.15.378)

Nec catulus, partu quem reddidit ursa recenti, (Met.15.379)

Sed male uiiua caro ext: labendo mater in arctus (Met.15.380)

Fingit et in formam, quantam capit ipsa, reductit. (Met.15.381)

Nonne uides, quos cera tegit sexangula, fetus. (Met.15.382)

25. Melliferarum apium sine membris corpora nasci (Met.15.383)

Et serosque pedes serasque assumere pennes? (Met.15.384)

Iunonis uolucrem, que cauda sydera portat, (Met.15.385)

Armigerumque iouis citereidasque columbas (Met.15.386)

Et genus omne auium mediis e partibus oui, (Met.15.387)

30. Ni sciret nasci fieri, quis posse putaret?* (Met.15.388)

Sunt qui, cum clauso putrefacta spina sepulcro, (Met.15.389)

Mutari credant humanas angue medullas. (Met.15.390)

Hec tamen ex aliis generis primordia ducunt, (Met.15.391)

Una est, que reparet seque ipsa reseminet, ales: (Met.15.392)

35. Assirii fenica uocant; non fruge neque herbis, (Met.15.393)

Sed thuris lacrimis et suco uiiuit amoni. (Met.15.394)

Hec ubi quinque sue compleuit tempora uite, (Met.15.395)

Illicis in ramis tremuleque cacumine palme (Met.15.396)

Unguibus et rastro nidum sibi consrruit ipsa,* (Met.15.397)

20. Et pro diuitis tumulos ostens auorum. (Met.15.425)

Clara fuit parte, magne iugiere micene, (Met.15.426)

Nec non et cecrops, nec non amphonis arces: (Met.15.427)

Uile solum parte est, alte cecidere micene; (Met.15.428)

Edipodionie quid sunt, nisi nomina, thebe? (Met.15.429)

25. Quid pandionie restant, nisi nomen, athene? (Met.15.430)

Fortes aduersis animos oppositie rebus. (Hor. Sat.2.2.136)  XXXII

Nam mala creuerunt asperiora fide!* (Pont.4.10.36)

Uere prius flores estu nueris aristas, (Tr.4.1.57)

Poma per autumnum frigibusque niues, (Tr.4.1.58)

30. Quam mala, que toto miseri patiuntur in orbe,* (Tr.4.1.59)

Scilicet ut fuluam speratur in ignibus aurum, (Tr.1.5.25)  XXXIII

Tempore sic duro est inspicienda fides. (Tr.1.5.26)

Dum iuuat et uultu ridet fortuna sereno, (Tr.1.5.27)

Indelibatas cuncta sequuntur opes: (Tr.1.5.28)

35. At simul intonuit, fugiunt nec noscitur ille,* (Tr.1.5.29)

Agminibus comiitum qui modo cinctus erat. (Tr.1.5.30)

Donec eris felix, multos numerabris amicos: (Tr.1.9.5)

Tempora si fuerint/iuent nobila, solus eris. (Tr.1.9.6)

Aspicis, ut ueniant ad candida tecta colume, (Tr.1.9.7)
Accipiat nullas sordida turris aues. (Tr.1.9.8)
Horrea formice tendunt ad inania numquam: (Tr.1.9.9)
Nullus ad amissas ibit amicus opes. (Tr.1.9.10)
Utque comes radios per solis euntibus umbra est, (Tr.1.9.11)
5. Cumque latet pressus nubibus, illa fugit, (Tr.1.9.12)
Mobile sic sequitur fortune lumina uulgus: (Tr.1.9.13)
Que simul inducta nocte teguntur abit. (Tr.1.9.14)
Nempe dat et quodcumque iuuat fortuna rapitque, (Tr.3.7.41)
Irus et est subito, qui modo crescis erat.* (Tr.3.7.42)
10. Hector erat tunc cum bello certaret; et idem. (Tr.3.11.29)
Vinctus ad hemonios non erat hector equos. (Tr.3.11.30)
Quis se cesaribus notus non fingit amicum? (Pont.1.7.21)
Turpe enim est dicit, sed si modo uera fatemur,* (Pont. 2.3.7)
Uulgus amicicias utilitate probat. (Pont.2.3.8)
15. Cura quid expediat, prius est, quam quid sit honestum, (Pont.2.3.9)
et cum fortuna statque caditque fides. (Pont.2.3.10)
Nec facile inuenias multe e milibus unum, (Pont.2.3.11)
Uirtutem precium qui putet esse su. (Pont.2.3.12)
Ipse decor, recti facti si premia desint, (Pont.2.3.13)

Et tibi iocundis primum ad esse iocis: (Pont.4.3.14)
Ille ego, qui iam nunc an uium, perfide, nescis, (Pont.4.3.17)
Cura tibi de quo querere nulla fuit. (Pont.4.3.18)
Siue fui numquam carus, simulasse fateris: (Pont.4.3.19)
5. Seu non fingebas, inuenisse leuis. (Pont.4.3.20)
Aut age, dic aliquam, que te mutauerit, iram: (Pont.4.3.21)
Nam nisi uista tua est, iusta qui rela mea est. (Pont.4.3.22)
Quod te nunc crimen simililem uetat esse priori? (Pont.4.3.23)
An crimem, cepi quod miser esse, vocas? (Pont.4.3.24)
10. Uix equidem credo: sed et insultare iacenti (Pont.4.3.27)
Te mihi nec uerbis parcer fama refert. (Pont.4.3.28)
Quid facis, o! demens? cur, si fortuna recedit, (Pont.4.3.29)
Naufragio lacrimas erripis ipse meo? (Pont.4.3.30)
Omnia sunt hominum incerto fluitantia motu,* (Pont.4.3.35)
15. et subito casu que ualuere, ruunt. (Pont.4.3.36)
Diuitis audita est cui non opulentia cresi? (Pont.4.3.37)
Nempe tamen uitam captus ab hoste tuliit. (Pont.4.3.38)
Ille syracusia modo formidatus in urbe (Pont.4.3.39)
Uix humili durum repulpit arte famem (Pont.4.3.40)
20. **Non mouet, et gratis penitet esse probum.** (Pont.2.3.14)

*Et nisi quod prodest carum: nil detrahe menti* (Pont.2.3.15)

Spem fructus auide, nemo petendus erit. (Pont.2.3.16)

At reditus iam quique suos amat, et sibi quid sit (Pont.2.3.17)

Utile, sollicitis supputat articulis. (Pont.2.3.18)

**Et nisi quod prodest carum: nil detrahe menti** (Pont.2.3.15)

Spem fructus auide, nemo petendus erit. (Pont.2.3.16)

At reditus iam quique suos amat, et sibi quid sit (Pont.2.3.17)

Utile, sollicitis supputat articulis. (Pont.2.3.18)

25. **Iliad amicicie quondam uenerabile nomen** (Pont.2.3.19)

**Prostat et inquestu pro meretricé sedet.** (Pont.2.3.20)

Conquerer, an taceam? ponam sine nomine crimen, (Pont.4.3.1)

An notum quis sis omnibus esse uelimus? (Pont.4.3.2)

Nomine non utar, ne commendere querela, (Pont.4.3.3)
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**Prostat et inquestu pro meretricé sedet.** (Pont.2.3.20)

Conquerer, an taceam? ponam sine nomine crimen, (Pont.4.3.1)

An notum quis sis omnibus esse uelimus? (Pont.4.3.2)

Nomine non utar, ne commendere querela, (Pont.4.3.3)

30. **Queraturque tibi carmine fama meo.** (Pont.4.3.4)

**Duum mea puppis erat ualida fundata carina,** (Pont.4.3.5)

Qui mecum uelles currere, primus eras. (Pont.4.3.6)

Nunc, quia contraxit uultum fortuna, recedis, (Pont.4.3.7)

Auxilio postquam scis opus esse tuo. (Pont.4.3.8)

35. **Dissimulas etiam, nec me uis nosse uideri,** (Pont.4.3.9)

Audito, quis sim, nomine, sepe, rogas. (Pont.4.3.10)

Ille ego sum, quamquam non uis audire, uetusta (Pont.4.3.11)

Pene pueru pueru nexus amicicia: (Pont.4.3.12)

Ille ego, quin primus tua seria nosse solebam (Pont.4.3.13)

20. **Quid fuerat magno maius? tamen ille roguat** (Pont.4.3.41)

Submissa fugiens uoce clientis opem. (Pont.4.3.42)

**Cuique uiro totus terraram paruit orbis,** (Pont.4.3.43)

Indigus effectus omnibus esse magis.* (Pont.4.3.44 u.adult.)

Ille iugurtilo clarus cimbroque triumpho, (Pont.4.3.45)

25. **Quo victrix tociens consule roma fuit,** (Pont.4.3.46)

In ceno marius iacuit cannaque palustri, (Pont.4.3.47)

**Pertulit et tanto multa pudenda uiro.** (Pont.4.3.48)

Ludit in humanis diuina potentia rebus, (Pont.4.3.49)

Et certam presens uix habet hora fidel. (Pont.4.3.50)

30. **Hec te debuerant infelix premonuisse,** (?)

Ne me desereres forsan et ipse cades. (?)

In caput alta suum labenter ad equore retro (Tr.1.8.1)

Flumina: conuersis solque recurrit equis: (Tr.1.8.2)

Terra feret stellas, celum scindet aratro. (Tr.1.8.3)

35. **Unda dabit flammas, et dabit ignis aquas:** (Tr.1.8.4)

Omnia nature prepostera legibus ibunt, (Tr.1.8.5)

**Parsue suum mundi nulla tenebit iter:** (Tr.1.8.6)

Omnia iam fient, fieri que posse negabam, (Tr.1.8.7)

Et nichil est, de quo non sit habenda fides. (Tr.1.8.8)
‘Explicit liber primus sententiarum. Incipit prologus libri alterius.

Hec ego uaticinor, quia sum deceptus ab illo, (Tr.1.8.9)

Laturum misero quem mihi rebar opem. (Tr.1.8.10)

Tantane te, fallax, cepere obliuia nostri, (Tr.1.8.11)

Afflictumque fuit tantus adire timor, (Tr.1.8.12)

5. Et neque respiceres, nec solare iacentem, (Tr.1.8.13)

Dure, nec exequias prosequerere meas? (Tr.1.8.14)

Illud amicicie sanctum uenerabile nomen (Tr.1.8.15)

Re tibi pro uili sub pedibusque iacet? (Tr.1.8.16)

Quid fugis, ingenti prostratum mole sodelam (Tr.1.8.17)

10. Usere et alloquii parte leuare tui, (Tr.1.8.18)

Sed tua sunt silices circum precordia nati,* (Tr.1.8.41)

Et rigidum ferri semina pectus habet: (Tr.1.8.42)

Queque tibi quondam tenero ducenda palato (Tr.1.8.43)

Plena dedit nutrix ubera, tigris erat: (Tr.1.8.44)

15. Haut mala nostra minus quam non aliena putares, (Tr.1.8.45)

Dure, nec exequias prosequerere meas? (Tr.1.8.14)

Illud amicicie sanctum uenerabile nomen (Tr.1.8.15)

Re tibi pro uili sub pedibusque iacet? (Tr.1.8.16)

Quid fugis, ingenti prostratum mole sodelam (Tr.1.8.17)

10. Usere et alloquii parte leuare tui, (Tr.1.8.18)

Sed tua sunt silices circum precordia nati,* (Tr.1.8.41)

Et rigidum ferri semina pectus habet: (Tr.1.8.42)

Queque tibi quondam tenero ducenda palato (Tr.1.8.43)

Plena dedit nutrix ubera, tigris erat: (Tr.1.8.44)

15. Haut mala nostra minus quam non aliena putares, (Tr.1.8.45)

Dure, nec exequias prosequerere meas? (Tr.1.8.14)

Illud amicicie sanctum uenerabile nomen (Tr.1.8.15)

Re tibi pro uili sub pedibusque iacet? (Tr.1.8.16)

Quid fugis, ingenti prostratum mole sodelam (Tr.1.8.17)

10. Usere et alloquii parte leuare tui, (Tr.1.8.18)

Sed tua sunt silices circum precordia nati,* (Tr.1.8.41)

Et rigidum ferri semina pectus habet: (Tr.1.8.42)

Queque tibi quondam tenero ducenda palato (Tr.1.8.43)

Plena dedit nutrix ubera, tigris erat: (Tr.1.8.44)

15. Haut mala nostra minus quam non aliena putares, (Tr.1.8.45)

Dure, nec exequias prosequerere meas? (Tr.1.8.14)

Illud amicicie sanctum uenerabile nomen (Tr.1.8.15)

Re tibi pro uili sub pedibusque iacet? (Tr.1.8.16)

Quid fugis, ingenti prostratum mole sodelam (Tr.1.8.17)

10. Usere et alloquii parte leuare tui, (Tr.1.8.18)

Sed tua sunt silices circum precordia nati,* (Tr.1.8.41)

Et rigidum ferri semina pectus habet: (Tr.1.8.42)

Queque tibi quondam tenero ducenda palato (Tr.1.8.43)

Plena dedit nutrix ubera, tigris erat: (Tr.1.8.44)

15. Haut mala nostra minus quam non aliena putares, (Tr.1.8.45)

Dure, nec exequias prosequerere meas? (Tr.1.8.14)

Illud amicicie sanctum uenerabile nomen (Tr.1.8.15)

Re tibi pro uili sub pedibusque iacet? (Tr.1.8.16)

Quid fugis, ingenti prostratum mole sodelam (Tr.1.8.17)

10. Usere et alloquii parte leuare tui, (Tr.1.8.18)

Sed tua sunt silices circum precordia nati,* (Tr.1.8.41)

Et rigidum ferri semina pectus habet: (Tr.1.8.42)

Queque tibi quondam tenero ducenda palato (Tr.1.8.43)

Plena dedit nutrix ubera, tigris erat: (Tr.1.8.44)
20. Quis labor est puram non temerasse fidem? (Pont.4.10.82)

Uiium ne laudes, quia scilicet ultima semper* (Met.3.135)

Expectanda dies homini est, dicique beatus (Met.3.136)

Ante obitum nemo suppremaque tempora debet.* (Met.3.137)

Est uia decluis, funesta nubila taxo: (Met.4.432)

25. Duci ad infernas per muta silentia sedes; (Met.4.433)

Stix nebulas exalat iners, umbreque recentes (Met.4.434)

Discedunt illac simulacraque functa sepulcris; (Met.4.435)

Pallor hiempsque tenent loca senta, nouique, (Met.4.436)

Qua sit iter, manes stigiam quod duci ad urbem, (Met.4.437)

XXXVIII

30. Ignorant, ubi sit nigri fera regia ditis. (Met.4.438)

Mille capax aditus et apertas undique portas (Met.4.439)

Urbes habet, utque fretum de tota flumina terra, (Met.4.440)

Sic omnes animas locus accipit ille nec ulli (Met.4.441)

Exiguus populo est turbamque accedere sentit. (Met.4.442)

35. Errant exangues sine corpore et ossibus umbre, (Met.4.443)

Parsque forum celebrant, pars mi tecta tiranni, (Met.4.444)

Pars aliquas artes, antique imitamina uite, (Met.4.445)

XXXVIII

40. Nam mora dat uires: teneras mora percoquit uuas (Rem.83)
78VA: O.  Et ualidas segetes, que fuit herba, facit. (Rem.84)

Que prebet latas arbor spaciontibus umbras, (Rem.85)

Quo posita est primum tempore, uriga fuit; (Rem.86)

Tum poterat manibus summa tellure reuelli, (Rem.87)

5.  Nunc stat in immensum uribus acta suis.* (Rem.88)

Utile propositum est suas extinguere flammam (Rem.53)

Nec serum uicii pectus mense tibi. (Rem.54)

Principis obsta: sero medicina paratar, (Rem.91)

Cum mala per longas coronaluerre moras. (Rem.92)

10.  Sed propea nec nocturnas differ in horas:* (Rem.93)

Qui non est hodie, cras minus aptus erit. (Rem.94)

Flumina magna uides paruis de fontibus orta;* (Rem.97)

Plurima collectis multiplicatuar aquis. (Rem.98)

Uidi ego, quod fuerat primum sanabile, uulnus (Rem.101)

15.  Dilatam longe damna tulisse more. (Rem.102)

Sed, quia delectat praeos deuincere motus,* (Rem.103)

Dicimus assidue ’cras quoque fiet idem.’ (Rem.104)

Intererea tacite serpunt in uscera flamme (Rem.105)

Et mala radices altius arbor agit. (Rem.106)

20.  Si tamen auxilii perierunt tempora primi (Rem.107)

78VB: VI.

Languor et immodici sub nullo uindice somni (Rem.145)

Alea et multo tempora quassu mero (Rem.146)

Eripient omnes animo sine uulnere neruos; (Rem.147)

Affluit incautis insidious amor. (Rem.148)

5.  Desidiam puer ille sequi solet, odict agentes: (Rem.149)

Da uace menti, quo teneatur, opus. (Rem.150)

Queritis, egístus quare sit factus adulter? (Rem.161)

In promptu causa est: desidiosus erat. (Rem.162)

Pugnabant alii tardi apud ylion armis; (Rem.163)

10.  Transtulerat uires grecia tota suas. (Rem.164)

Siue operam bellis uellet dare, nulla gerebat, (Rem.165)

Sui foro, uacuu litibus argus erat. (Rem.166)

Quod potuit, fecit ne ni agetetur, amauit.* (Rem.167)

Sic uenit ille puer, sic puer ille manet. (Rem.168)

15.  Rura sed oblectant animos studiumque colendi; (Rem.169)

Queliber huic cure cedere cura potest. (Rem.170)

Colla iube indomitos oneri supponere taurus,* (Rem.171)

Sauciet ut duram uomer aduncus humum; (Rem.172)

Obrue uersata cerealia semina terra, (Rem.173)
Et pectus domitum proh pudor hostis habet,* (Rem.108)

Maius opus superest; sed non, quia serior egro (Rem.109)

Aduocor, ille mihi destituendus erit. (Rem.110)

Qua Jesus fuerat, partem pheantius heros (Rem.111)

20. Que tibi cum multo fenore reddat ager. (Rem.174)

Aspice curatos pomorum pondere ramos, (Rem.175)

Ut sua quod peperit uix ferat arbor onus; (Rem.176)

Aspice labentos iocundum murmur riuos; (Rem.177)

Quere voluptates licitas fugiendo nefandas. (?)

Post tamem hic multos sanatus creditur annos (Rem.113)

Suppexam bellis inposuisse manum. (Rem.114)

Qui modo nascentes properabam pellere morbos, (Rem.115)

Admoueo tarde nunc tibi lentus opem. (Rem.116)

25. Poma dat autumnus; formosa est messibus estas; (Rem.187)

Uer prebet flores; igne leuat hiemps. (Rem.188)

Temporibus certis maturam rusticus uuam (Rem.189)

Colliget, et nudo sub pede musta fluunt;*(Rem.190)

Temporibus certis desectas alligat herbas (Rem.191)

30. Et tonsam raro pectine uertit humum. (Rem.192)

Specie potes riguis plantas deponere in hortis;*(Rem.193)

Ipse potes riuos ducere lenis aque. (Rem.194)

Uenerit insicio, fac ramum ramus adoptet (Rem.195)

Stetque peregrinis arbor operta comis. (Rem.196)

35. Cum semel hec animum cepit mulcre uoluptas, (Rem.197)

Debilibus penmis irritus exit amor. (Rem.198)

Uel tu uenandi studium cole: sepe recessit (Rem.199)

Turpiter a phebi uieta sorore uenus. (Rem.200)

Nunc leporem pronum catulo sectare sagaci, (Rem.201)
Nunc tua frondosis retia tende iugis; (Rem.202)
Aut pauidos terre uaria formidine ceruos, (Rem.203)
Aut cadat aduersa cuspide fossus aper. (Rem.204)
Sunt fora, sunt leges, sunt quos tueries amici: (Rem.151)

5. Uade per urbane splendida castra toge. (Rem.152)
Sed tu sanguinei iuuenilia munera martis (Rem.153)
Suscipe: delicie iam tibi terga dabunt. (Rem.154)
Ecce fugax parthus, magni noua causa triumphi, (Rem.155)
Iam uidet in campis cesaris arma suis. (Rem.156)
10. Uince cupidineas pariter parthique sagittas (Rem.157)
    Et referunt ad patrias bina tropheia domos.* (Rem.158)

Aspice tondentes fertile gramen oues. (Rem.178)
Ecce, petunt rupes prerruptaque saxa capelle: (Rem.179)
    Et referunt hedis ubera plena suis. (Rem.180)
15. Pastor inequali moduletur carmen auena,* (Rem.181)
    Nec desint comites, sedula turba, canes. (Rem.182)
Letius con studium, studium tamen, alite capta (Rem.207)
    Aut lino aut calamis premia parua sequi, (Rem.208)

Uel, que piscis edax auido male deuoret ore, (Rem.209)

Mentibus infirmis causa pusilla nocet.*(Rem.730)
Ut, pene extinctum cinerem si sulphure tangas, (Rem.731)
Uiuit et e minimo maximus ignis erit, (Rem.732)
Enuerant animos cithare cantusque lirque*(Rem.753)
5. Et uox et numeris brachia mota suis. (Rem.754)
Blandicias pariter risus et mollia uerba.*(Rem.755)
Sanas ut euadas sollicite refuge.* (Rem.756)
Ut corpus redimas, ferrum patieris et ignes, (Rem.229)
Arida nec sitiens ora laubis aqua: (Rem.230)
10. Uince cupidineas parit parthique sagittas (Rem.157)
    At precium pars hec corpore maius habet. (Rem.232)
    Leniter, ex merito quicquid patiare, ferendum est: (Her.5.7)
    Que uenit indigne pena dolenda uenit. (Her.5.10)
Hectora quis nosset, felix si troia fuisse? (Tr.4.3.75)
15. Publica uirtutis per mala facta uia est. (Tr.4.3.76)
    Que latet inque bonis cessat non cognita rebus, (Tr.4.3.79)
    Apparet uirtus arguitque malis. (Tr.4.3.80)
Tempore ruricole patiens fit taurus aratro, (Tr.4.6.1)
    Prebet et in curuo colla premenda iugo; (Tr.4.6.2.)
20. Abdere suprems ora recurua cibis.* (Rem.210)

Si legis aut scribis fugit hic inuisa uoluptas, (Medieval verse*)

Cum te finitimis hostis circumsonat armis (cont.)

Dextra manus calamum teneat, tabulasque sinistra, (cont.)

Uerba soluta moris uel metri lege ligata, (cont.)

25. Scribere, corrigere, studio fallente labore, (cont.)

25. Belua, seruiciu tem por e victa subit. (Tr.4.6.8)

Curas euincit, et perdomat ignea tela, (cont.)

Hoc dentem terram tenuat semouentis aratrum, (Rem.4.6.13)

Hoc rigidos silices, hoc adamanta terit; (Tr.4.6.14)

Hoc etiam seuas paulati mitigat iras, (Rem.4.6.16)

30. Hec opera, atque uenus, refugit nec perstat in istis. (cont.)

Dura alicuius precepta uocet mea; dura fatemur (Rem.225)

Esse, sed ut ualeas multa dolenda feres. (Rem.226)

Sepe bibi sucos quamuis inuitus amaros (Rem.227)

Eger, et oranti mensa negata mihi est. (Rem.228)

35. Sed tum est artis tristissima ianua nostrre, (Rem.233)

Et labor est summus tempora prima pati. (Rem.234)

Aspicis ut pressos curuent iuga prima iuuenços* (Rem.235)

Et noua uelocem cingula ledit equum? (Rem.236)

De qua temptaris rem uita sepe uiderere. (?)
Exige, amicicias et tibi iunge pares, (Tr.3.4a.44)

Crede mihi, bene quod latuit bene uixit, et intra (Tr.3.4a.25)

Fortunam debet quisque manere suam. (Tr.3.4.26)

Usibus edocto si quicquam manere suam. *(Tr.3.4a.3)

5.  Uiue tibi et longe nomina magna fuge. (Tr.3.4a.4)

Effugit hyberas demissa antemna procellas, (Tr.3.4a.9)

Lataque plus paruis uela timoris habeant. (Tr.3.4a.10)

Omnia quaeque adeo possunt afferre pudorem, (Tr.3.6.31)

10.  Illa tegi ceca condita nocte decet. (Tr.3.6.32)

Ut desint uires, tamen est laudanda uoluntas: (Pont.3.4.79)

Rem facis, afflictus non aduersatus amicum, (Pont.2.3.5)

5.  Nam prius incipient turres uitare columbe, (Pont.1.6.51)

Antra fere, pecudes gramine, mergus aquis, (Pont.1.6.52)

Quam male se prestet ueteri uir fidus amico.*(Pont.1.6.53)

10. Sponte sua probitas officiumque ueniit.* (Pont.2.3.34)

6.  Judice te mercede caret persequre petenda est (Pont.2.3.35)

Externis uirtus incomitata bonis. (Pont.2.3.36)

Turpe putas abici, quia sit miserandus, amicum, (Pont.2.3.37)

15. Mitius est lasso digitum supponere mento, (Pont.2.3.39)

Mergere quam liquidus ora natantis aquis. (Pont.2.3.40)

Regia, crede mihi, res est succurrere lapsis, (Pont.2.9.11)

Conuenit in tanto, quantus es ipse, uiro. (Pont.2.9.12)

Fortunam decet hæc istam: que maxima cum sit, (Pont.2.9.13)

Cerne quid eacides post mortem prestat amico: (Pont.2.3.41)

Instar et hanc uitam mortis habere puta. (Pont.2.3.42)

Perithoum teseus stigias comituit ad undas: (Pont.2.3.43)
20. Esse posset animo uix tamen equa tuo. (Pont.2.9.14)

Conspicitur numquam meliore potentia causa, (Pont.2.9.15)

Quam quociens uanas non sinit esse preces. (Pont.2.9.16)

Hoc nitor iste tui generis desiderat, hoc est (Pont.2.9.17)

A superis orte nobilitatis opus. (Pont.2.9.18)

25. Hoc tecum commune diis, quod utrique rogati (Pont.2.9.21)

Supplicibus uestris ferre soletis opem. (Pont.2.9.22)

Nam quid erit, quare solito digne uorum honore (Pont.2.9.23)

Numina, si demas uelle iuuare deos? (Pont.2.9.24)

Iupiter oranti surdas si prebuit aures, (Pont.2.9.25)

30. Uictima pro templo cur cadet icta ioui? (Pont.2.9.26)

Si pacem nulla pontus mihi prestet eunti, (Pont.2.9.27)

Irrita neptuno cur ego thura ferae? (Pont.2.9.28)

Uana laborantis si fallat uota coloni, (Pont.2.9.29)

Accipiat graude cur suis exta ceres? (Pont.2.9.30)

35. Nec dabit in meritum iugulum caper hostia bachis,* (Pont.2.9.31)

Musta sub adducto si pede nulla fluant. (Pont.2.9.32)

Utilitas igitur magnos hominesque deosque (Pont.2.9.35)

Efficit, auxiliis quoque fauente suis. (Pont.2.9.36)

Conueniens homini est hominem seruare uoluntas, (Pont.2.9.39)
Perque quater denos itur in illa gradus. (Pont.3.2.50)

Fama refert illic signum celeste fuisse: (Pont.3.2.51)

Quoque minus dubites, stat basis orba dea: (Pont.3.2.52)

Araque, que fuerat natura candida saxi, (Pont.3.2.53)

Decolor affuso tincta cruore rubet. (Pont.3.2.54)

Femina sacra facit tede non iuncta iugali,* (Pont.3.2.55)

Que superat sciticas nobilitate nurus. (Pont.3.2.56)

Sacrificii genus est, sic instituere parentes, (Pont.3.2.57)

Aduenauirgineo cesus ut ense cadat. (Pont.3.2.58)

Regna thoas habuit meothide clarus in hora, (Pont.3.2.59)

Nec fuit eusinis notior alter aquis. (Pont.3.2.60)

Sceptrum tenente illo liquidas fecisse per auras (Pont.3.2.61)

Nesioquam dicunt ephigenian iter. (Pont.3.2.62)

Quam leuibus pennis sub nube per equorum uectam*(Pont.3.2.63)

Creditur hiis phebi deposuisse locis. (Pont.3.2.64)

Prefuerat templo multos ea rite per annos, (Pont.3.2.65)

Inuita per agens tristia sacra manu: (Pont.3.2.66)

Cum duo uelifera iuuenes venere carina (Pont.3.2.67)

Presseruntque suo litora sua pede.* (Pont.3.2.68)

Cum peragunt iuuenes pulcri certamen amoris, (Pont.3.2.89)

Ad fratrem scriptas exarit illa notas. (Pont.3.2.90)

Ad fratrem mandata dabat. cuique illa dabantur (Pont.3.2.91)

(Humanos casus aspice) frater erat. (Pont.3.2.92)

Clamque per inmensas puppe feruntur aquas. (Pont.3.2.94)

Mirus amor iuuenum: quamuis periere tot annis.*(Pont.3.2.95)

In scytia magnum nunc quoque nomen habent.’ (Pont.3.2.96)

Illos busta tegunt sed uidit fama perhennis.*(Pont.3.2.97)

Colaudant omnes facta piamque fidem. (Pont.3.2.98)

Scilicet hac etiam, qua nulla fortior hora est.*(Pont.3.2.99)

Nomen amicicie barbara corda mouet. (Pont.3.2.100)

Cur inmanusetus persistet mortalis in ira,* (Pont.2.1.47) VIII

Cum uideat mites hostibus esse deos? (Pont.2.1.48)

Iupiter utilibus quociens iuuet imbrabas agros, (Pont.2.1.13)

Mixta tenax segeti crescere lappa solet. (Pont.2.1.14)

Nec solem propriam natura nec aera fecit (Met.6.350)

Nec tenues undas: hec malus atque bonus* (Met.6.351)

Accipit equali communia condicione, (?)
20. Par fuit his etas et amor, quorum alter horestes, (Pont.3.2.69)   20. Nam nec gratus plus, nec minus hostis habet. (?)   
   Et pilades alter: nomina fama tenet. (Pont.3.2.70)   
   Confugit interdum templi uiolator ad aram, (Pont.2.2.27)   
   Protinus immitem triuie ducuntur ad aram. (Pont.3.2.7)   
   Nec petere offensi numinis horret opem. (Pont.2.2.28)   
   Euincti geminas ad sua terga manus. (Pont.3.2.72)   
   Puppis achimenide graia troyana recepit, (Pont.2.2.25)   
   Nec petere offensi numinis horret opem. (Pont.2.2.28)   
   Euincti geminas ad sua terga manus. (Pont.3.2.72)   
   Puppis achimenide graia troyana recepit, (Pont.2.2.25)   
25. Ambiat ut fuluas infula longa comas. (Pont.3.2.74)   
   Rectaqve cu&m sociis me duce nauis eat. (Rem.70)   
   25. Me duce sollicitas, homines, compescite curas,* (Rem.69) X   
   Dumque parat sacrum, dum uelat timpora uittis, (Pont.3.2.75)   
   Rectaeqv sociis me duce nauis eat. (Rem.70)   
   Dum tardae causas inuenit ipsa more, (Pont.3.2.76)   
   Optimus ille fuit uindex, ledentia pectus* (Rem.293)   
   'Non sum crudelis, iuuenes, (ignoscite)’ dixit (Pont.3.2.77)   
   Sed cui tam animi est, illum mirabor et ipse (Rem.295)   
   'Sacra suo facio barbariora loco. (Pont.3.2.78)   
   30. Ambiat ut fuluas infula longa comas. (Pont.3.2.74)   
   Rectaqve cu&m sociis me duce nauis eat. (Rem.70)   
   30. Ritus is est gentis. qua uos tamen urbe uenitis? (Pont.3.2.79)   
   30. Et dicam 'monitis non eget iste meis.' (Rem.296)   
   Qua ne parum fausta puppe petistis iter?' (Pont.3.2.80)   
   Qua ne parum fausta puppe petistis iter?' (Pont.3.2.80)   
   Dixit, et audito patrie pia nomine uirgo (Pont.3.2.81)   
   Quis quis permittis nobis suadere quod optes (Pont.1.7.63)   
   Consortes urbis conperit esse sue. (Pont.3.2.82)   
   Ut des quam reddas plura precare deum. (Pont.1.7.64)   
   'Alter ut e uobis’ inquit 'cadat hostia sacrig, (Pont.3.2.83)   
   Gratia si nulla est, lacrime tibi gratia fient. (Pont.3.1.99) XI   
   35.  Ad patria sedes nuntius alter eat.’ (Pont.3.2.84)   
   Hoc negat, inque uicum pugnat uterque mori. (Pont.3.2.86)   
   Extitit hec unum, quod non conueniret illis: (Pont.3.2.87)   
   35. Que tibi ne desint, mala per diuera caueto:* (Pont.3.1.101)   
   Ire iubet pilades carum periturus horestem; (Pont.3.2.85)   
   Nam sceleris flendi copia diues adest;* (Pont.3.1.102)   
   Hoc negat, inque uicum pugnat uterque mori. (Pont.3.2.86)   
   Ut mundi res sunt, omui, puto, tempore flebis.* (Pont.3.1.103)   
   Extitit hec unum, quod non conueniret illis: (Pont.3.2.87)   
   Extitit hec unum, quod non conueniret illis: (Pont.3.2.87)   
   Cetera pars concors et sine lite fuit. (Pont.3.2.88)   
   Quod si uota facis sacrig altaribus astans, (?)
Non, tua si fletu scindat uruerba, nocebit: (Pont.3.1.157)

Corripis ut debes subiecti criminam presul:* (Pont.2.6.5) XV

Aspera confesso uerba remite reo. (Pont.2.6.8)

Si tamen horteris, fortius ibit equus. (Pont.2.11.22)

5. Acer et ad palme per se cursurus honores, (Pont.2.11.21)

Si tamei horteris, fortius ibit equus. (Pont.2.11.21)

10. Laudat et hortatu comprobat acta suo. (Tr.5.14.46)

Si, quotiens peccant homines, sua fulmina mittat (Tr.2.33)

Dux bene pugnantes incitat ore uirum. (Pont.3.1.92)

Qui monet ut facias, quod iam facis, ille moneo (Tr.5.14.45)

15. Iudicis officium est ut res, ita tempora rerum (Tr.1.1.37) XVI

Querere. ut ex ipris iudicium statuat.* (Tr.1.1.38)

Quamuis oppressos releues, miseros tuearis,* (Pont.2.2.53).

Non est confessi causa tuae rei. (Pont.2.2.54)

Quo tua non pessunt offendi pectora facto, (Rem.427)

20. Forsitan hoc alio judice crimine erit. (Rem.428)

---

(Tr.4.3.38) XII

Non, tua si fletu scindant uruerba, nocebit: (Pont.3.1.157)

Corripis ut debes subiecti criminam presul:* (Pont.2.6.5) XV

Aspera confesso uerba remite reo. (Pont.2.6.8)

Si tamen horteris, fortius ibit equus. (Pont.2.11.22)

10. Laudat et hortatu comprobat acta suo. (Tr.5.14.46)

Si, quotiens peccant homines, sua fulmina mittat (Tr.2.33)

Dux bene pugnantes incitat ore uirum. (Pont.3.1.92)

Qui monet ut facias, quod iam facis, ille moneo (Tr.5.14.45)

15. Iudicis officium est ut res, ita tempora rerum (Tr.1.1.37) XVI

Querere. ut ex ipris iudicium statuat.* (Tr.1.1.38)

Quamuis oppressos releues, miseros tuearis,* (Pont.2.2.53).

Non est confessi causa tuae rei. (Pont.2.2.54)

Quo tua non pessunt offendi pectora facto, (Rem.427)

20. Forsitan hoc alio judice crimine erit. (Rem.428)
20. Sit piger ad penas princeps, ad premia uelox, (Pont.1.2.121)
   Qui doleat, quotienns cogitare esse ferox: (Pont.1.2.122)
   Qui uincat semper, uictis et parciere possit, (Pont.1.2.123)
   Claudat et eterna ciusca bella serus: (Pont.1.2.124)
   Multa metu cohibens, sed pena paucu cohercens, (Pont.1.2.125)

25. Mutat ab inuita fulmina rara manu.* (Pont.1.2.126)
   Qui cum triste aliquid statuat, sit tristis et ipse, (Pont.2.2.117)
   Cuique fere penam sumere pena sua est. (Pont.2.2.118)
   Scilicet eiusmodem, quanuis pugnare uidentur, (Pont.4.6.31)
   Supplicibus facilem, sibi cens esse trucem. (Pont.4.6.32)

30. Sic agitur censura et sic exempla parantur, (Fast.6.647)
   Cum iudex, alios quod monet, ipse facit. (Fast.6.648)
   Prelatus, claris nomen uirtutibus equit* (Pont.2.3.1)
   Nec falli pectus laudis amore sinat.* (Pont.2.3.2)
   Quo quiaest maius, magis est placabilis ius, (Tr.3.5.31)

35. Et faciles motus mens generosa capit. (Tr.3.5.32)
   Corpora magnanimo sat est prostrasse leoni, (Tr.3.5.33)
   Pugna suum finem, cum iacet hostis, habet: (Tr.3.5.34)
   At lupus et turpes instant morientibus ursi (Tr.3.5.35)
   Et quecumque minor nobilitate fera est,* (Tr.3.5.36)
81RA: DI
Cur igitur, cum meuideam delinquere, peccem, (Pont.3.9.13)
Et pati crimen inesse, rogast*(Pont.3.9.14)
Non eadem ratio est sentire et demere morbos. (Pont.3.9.15)
Sensus inest cunctis, tollit arte malum. (Pont.3.9.16)
5. Sepe et enim mores cupiens mutare relinquo,* (Pont.3.9.17)
Iudicium uires desitique meum. (Pont.3.9.18)
Sepe piget (quid enim dubitem tibi ueri?) (Pont.3.9.19)
Corrigere et longi ferre laboris onas. (Pont.3.9.20)
Cuncta prius temptanda, sed inmedicabile uulnus*(Met.1.190)
10. Ense recidendum est, ne pars sincera trahatur. (Met.1.191)
Corpora debentur mesta exanguia bustis: (Pont.3.2.31)
Effugiunt structos nomen honorque rogos. (Pont.3.2.32)
Occidit et theseus et qui comitauit horeste,(Pont.3.2.33)
Sed tamen in laudes uiuit uterque suas. (Pont.3.2.34)
15. Explicit liber secundus florib publib Ouidii N.

81RB: VS.
XVIII Sic perit ingenium studii si demisperis usum. (?)
Scilicet est cupidus studiorum quisque suorum, (Pont.1.5.35) II
Tempus et assuetu ponere in arte iuuat. (Pont.1.5.36)
Saucius eiurat pugnas gladiator, et idem (Pont.1.5.37)
5. Immemor antiqui uulneris arma capit. (Pont.1.5.38)
Nil sibi cam pelagi dicit fore naufragus undis, (Pont.1.5.39)
Et ducit remus qua modo nautiam aqua. (Pont.1.5.40)
Cur non desudem? non sum, qui segnia ducam*(Pont.1.5.43) III
XX Ocias: mors nobis tempus habet iners. (Pont.1.5.44)
10. Nec iuaat in luce nimio marcescere uino, (Pont.1.5.45)
Nec tenet incertas alea blanda manus. (Pont.1.5.46)
Cum dedimus sonno corpus quas postulat horas, (Pont.1.5.47)
Quo ponam uigilans tempora longa modo? (Pont.1.5.48)
Ipse ego, ne uacuis insistant pectora curis,* (Pont.1.8.53)
15. Ducam ruricolas sub iuga curua boues; (Pont.1.8.54)
Et discam gnari que norunt uerba iuuenci,* (Pont.1.8.55)
Assuetas illis adiciaque minas. (Pont.1.8.56)
Ipse manu capulum prensi moderatus aratri (Pont.1.8.57)
Experiar motu spargere semen humo. (Pont.1.8.58)
   x. De patria. xi. De habitu uirilis. xii. Querela senis 
   languidii. xiii. De inuidis. xiii. De infirmis. xv. De 
   timidis. xvi. De inuidis. xvii. De uicio iactantie 
   xviii. De commotione iustorum. xviii. De tristicia. xx. De inpa-
   tientia. xxi. Miserenda esse afflictis. xxii. De tem}

25. tientia. xxi. Miserenda esse afflictis. xxii. De tem
   xxiii. Clausula operis acti. INCIPIT TERTIUS LIBER
   FLORUM PUBLII OUIDII NASONIS.
   Quodlibet ingenium longa rubige lesum*(Tr.5.12.21)
   Torpet et est multo, quam fuit ante, minus. (Tr.5.12.22)
   30. Fertilis, assiduo si non remouetur aratro, (Tr.5.12.23)
      Nil nisi cum spinis gramen habebit ager. (Tr.5.12.24)
      Tempore qui longo steterit, male currit et inter (Tr.5.12.25)
      Carceribus missos ultimus ibit equus. (Tr.5.12.26)
      Uertitur in teneram cariem rimisque deisicit, (Tr.5.12.27)
      35. Siqua diu solitis cunba uacabit aquis. (Tr.5.12.28)
      Denique "non paruas animo uigilantia uires,"* (Tr.5.12.37)
      Adicit et pectus excolit ipse labor."* (Tr.5.12.38)
      Cernis ut ignauum corrupcant ocia corpus, (Pont.1.5.5)
      Ut capiant uicium, ni moueantur aque. (Pont.1.5.6)

20. Nec dubitem longis purgare lignibus herbas, (Pont.1.8.59)
   Et dare iam siciens quas bibat hortas aquas. (Pont.1.8.60)
   Scilicet ingenii aliqua est concordia iunctis, (Pont.2.5.59)      III
   Et seruat studii federa quiseque sui: (Pont.2.5.60)
   Rusticus agricolam, miles fera bella gerentem, (Pont.2.5.61)
   25. Rectorem dubie nauita puppis amat. (Pont.2.5.62)
      Carmina perueniunt animo diducta sereno: (Tr.1.1.39)        V
      Carmina secessu sibi et sociaque querunt: (Tr.1.1.41)
      Carminibus quere miserarum oblivia rerum: (Tr.5.7.67)
      Premia si studio precipis ista, sat est. (Tr.5.7.68)
   30. Sed non officio uatum per carmina facto (Pont.4.8.43)
      Principibus res est aptior uilla uiris. (Pont.4.8.44)
      Carmina uerarum peragunt preonia laudum,* (Pont.4.8.45)
      Neue sit actorum fama caduca cauent. (Pont.4.8.46)
      Carminibus fit uiuax uirtus, expersque sepulcri (Pont.4.8.47)
   35. Noticeiam sere posteritatis habent,* (Pont.4.8.48)
      Tabida consumit ferrum lapidenque uetustas, (Pont.4.8.49)
      Nullamque res maius tempore robur habet. (Pont.4.8.50)
      Scripta fertunt annos. scriptis agamemnona nosti, (Pont.4.8.51)
      Et quiesquus contra uel simul arma tulit. (Pont.4.8.52)
Quis thebas septemque duces sine carmine nosset. (Pont.4.8.53)

Et quicquid post hoc quicquid et ante fuit? (Pont.4.8.54)

Scribentem iuuat ipse labor minuitque laborem. (Pont.3.9.21)

Cumque suo crescens pectore feruet opus. (Pont.3.9.22)

5. Corrigere at res est tanto magis ardua quanto (Pont.3.9.23)

Magnus aristarcho maior homerus erat. (Pont.3.9.24)

Semper in optutu mente ne sterne malo rum. (Tr.4.1.39)

Presentis casus immemoremque geret. (Tr.4.1.40)

Hoc est cur cantet uinctus quoque comede fossor, (Tr.4.1.5)

10. Indocili numero cum graue mollit opus. (Tr.4.1.6)

Cantat et inritens lunose prouus harene, (Tr.4.1.7)

Aduerso tardam qui uehit amne ratem. (Tr.4.1.8)

Quique refert pariter lentos ad pectora remos, (Tr.4.1.9)

In numerum pulsa brachia pulsat aqua. (Tr.4.1.10)

15. Fessus ubi cubuit baculo saxoque resedit (Tr.4.1.11)

Pastor, arundineo carmine mulcet oues. (Tr.4.1.12)

Canatantis pariter, pariter data pensa trahentis, (Tr.4.1.13)

Fallitur ancille decipiturque labor. (Tr.4.1.14)

Cum traheret siluas orpheus et dura canendo (Tr.4.1.17)

5. Nescioqua natale solum dulcedine cunctos (Pont.1.3.35)

Ducit et immemores non sinit esse sui. (Pont.1.3.36)

VII Non dubia est itaci prudentia, sed tamen optat (Pont.1.3.33)

Fumum de patriis posse uidere focis. (Pont.1.3.34)

Quid melius roma? scitico quid frigore peius? (Pont.1.3.37)

10. Huc tamen ex illa barbarus urbe fugit. (Pont.1.3.38)

Cum bene sit clause cauea pandione nate, (Pont.1.3.39)

Nititur in siluas illa redire suas. (Pont.1.3.40)

Assuetos tauri saltus, assueta leones (Pont.1.3.41)

(Nec feritas illos inedit) antrea petunt. (Pont.1.3.42)

15. Sint procul a nobis iuuenes ut femina compiti: (Her.4.75)

Fine coli modico forma uirilis amat. (Her.4.76)

Te tuus iste rigor positique sine arte capilli (Her.4.77)

Et leuis egregio puluis in ore decet. (Her.4.78)

Nostraque, quod duris horrendi densissima setis* (Met.13.846)
20. Saxa, bis amissa coniuge mestus erat. (Tr.4.1.18)

Dii quoque, ut a cunctis hylari pietate colantur, (Pont.2.1.9)

Tristiciam poni per sua festa iubent. (Pont.2.1.10)

Nulla dies adeo est australibus humida nimbis, (Pont.4.4.1)

Non intermissis ut fluat imber aquis. (Pont.4.4.2)

20. Corpora, ne reproba: turpis sine frondibus... (Pont.2.7.73)

Nil ibi, quod nobis esuriatur, erit. (Pont.1.10.10)

25. Nec sterilis locus ullus ita est, quod non sit in illis (Pont.4.4.3)

Mixta fere duris utilis herba rubis. (Pont.4.4.4)

Nil adeo fortuna grauis miserabile fecit, (Pont.4.4.5)

Ut minuant nulla gaudia parte malum. (Pont.4.4.6)

Temporis officium est solatia dicere certi, (Pont.4.11.17)

30. Dum dolor incursu est et petit eger opem. (Pont.4.11.18)

At cum longa dies sedauit uulnera mentis, (Pont.4.11.19)

Intempestiue qui mouet illa, nouat. (Pont.4.11.20)

Quod caret alterna requie, durabile non est: (Her.4.89)

Nec reparat uires fessaque membra leuat. *(Her.4.90)

35. Artibus ingenuis quesita est gratia multis:* (Pont.2.7.47)

Est aliquid patriis uicinum finibus esse: (Pont.2.7.65)

Tempus in agrorum cultu consumere dulce est: (Pont.2.7.69)

Temperie celi corpusque animusque iuuatur: (Pont.2.7.71)

Est in aqua dulci non inuidiosae uoluptas: (Pont.2.7.73)

30. Nam mea per longos si quis mala digerat annos, (Pont.1.4.9)

Crede mihi, pilio nestore maior ero. (Pont.1.4.10)

Longus enim curis uiciatum corpus amaris (Pont.1.10.3)

Non patitur uires languor habere suas. (Pont.1.10.4)

Iam dolor omnis adest, et febribus uror amaris,* (Pont.1.10.5)

35. Nec peragit soliti uena timoris iter:* (Pont.1.10.6)

Os hebes est positeque mouent fastidia mense, (Pont.1.10.7)

Et queror, inuius cum ueni hora cibi. (Pont.1.10.8)

Quod mare quod tellus appone quod educat aer, (Pont.1.10.9)

Nil ibi, quod nobis esuriatur, erit. (Pont.1.10.10)
Is quoque, qui gracili cibus est in corpore, somnus (Pont.1.10.21)

Non alit officio corpus inane suo. (Pont.1.10.22)

Sed uigilo uigilantium mei sine fine laubes, (Pont.1.10.23)

Quorum materiam dat mea uita mihi. (Pont.1.10.24)

5. Paruus in exiles succus mihi permanet artas. (Pont.1.10.27)

Membraque sunt cera pallidiora noua. (Pont.1.10.28)

Non ilic in modico contraxi dampna lieo, (Pont.1.10.29)

Namque mihi sole pene bibunt aquae. (Pont.1.10.30)

Nil superest leti procul omnis abacta uoluptas. (Pont.1.10.31)

10. Mors utinam ueniat et mala tanta leuet. (Pont.1.10.32)

Console longeuous: non omnia grandior etas. (Met.6.28)

Que fugiamus, habet: seris uenit usus ab annis. (Met.6.29)

Iura senes norint et, quid licantque nefasque (Met.9.551)

Fasque sit, inquirrent leguntique examina seruant. (Met.9.552)

15. Miles ubi emeritus non est satis utilis armis. (Tr.4.8.21)

Ponit ad antiquos, que tulit, arma lares. (Tr.4.8.22)

Ne cadat et multas palmas inhonestet adoptas, (Tr.4.8.19)

Languidias in pratis gramina carpit equus. (Tr.4.8.20)

Cum senibus quasse languent in corpore uires. (Pont.1.4.3)

Qui semel est lesus fallaci piscis ab hamo. (Pont.2.7.9)

Omnibus unca cibis aera sub esse putat. (Pont.2.7.10)

Sepe canem longe uisu fugit agna lupumque (Pont.2.7.11)

Credit, et ipsa suam nescia uitat opem. (Pont.2.7.12)

5. Membra reformidant mollem quoque saucia tactum. (Pont.2.7.13)

Uanaque sollicitis incitat umbra metum. (Pont.2.7.14)

Cum feriunt unum, non fulmina terrent. (Pont.3.2.9)

Iunctaque percussa terba pauere solet: (Pont.3.2.10)

Cumque dedit paries uenture signa ruine, (Pont.3.2.11)

10. Sollicito uacuus fit locus ille metu. (Pont.3.2.12)

XIII Quis non e timidis egri contagia uitat, (Pont.3.2.13)

Uicinum metuens ne trahat inde malum? (Pont.3.2.14)

Liuor, iners uicium, mores non exit in altos. (Pont.3.3.101)

Utque latens ima uiipera serpit humo. (Pont.3.3.102)

15. Ergo alii noceant miseri opentique noceri. (Pont.3.3.105)

Tinctaque mandaci spicula felle gerant. (Pont.3.3.106)

Sit tua supplicibus manus haut insueta iuuanis, (Pont.3.3.107)

Non onerosa tibi sint aliena bona. (Pont.3.3.108)

Ingenium magni livor detractat homeri: (Rem.365)
20. Mensque pati durum sustinet egra nichil. (Pont.1.5.18)
Parcendum est animo miserabile uulnus habenti. (Pont.1.5.23)
Subducunt oneri colla perusta boues. (Pont.1.5.24)
Et, puto fructus adest, iustissima causa laborum, (Pont.1.5.25)
Et sata cum multo fenore reddit humus? (Pont.1.5.26)

20. Letis atque bonis obuiat hoc uicium.*(Rem.366)
Summa petit lior: perfiant altissima uenti,(Rem.369)
Prospera sunt cuncta rumpere lior edax;*(Rem.389)
Plausibus ex ipsis populi letoque fauore (Pont.3.4.29)
Stultorum mentes gloria falsa leuat.*(Pont.3.4.30)

Parcendum est a ni mo mis erabile uulnus habent.* (Pont.1.5.23)
Summa petit lior: perflant altissima uenti, (Rem.369)
Prospera sunt cuncta rumpere lior edax;*(Rem.389)
Plausibus ex ipsis populi letoque fauore (Pont.3.4.29)
Stultorum mentes gloria falsa leuat.*(Pont.3.4.30)

25. Horrent admotas uuln er a cruda manus. (Pont.1.3.16)
Non est in medico sem per releuetur ut eger: (Pont.1.3.17)
Interdum docta plus ualet arte malum. (Pont.1.3.18)
Cernis ut e molli sanguis pulmone remissus (Pont.1.3.19)
Ad stigias certo limite ducat aquis. (Pont.1.3.20)

25. Excitat auditor studium, laudataque uirtus (Pont.4.2.35)
Crescit, et inmensum gloria calcar habet. (Pont.4.2.36)
Nulla quidem sane gravior mentique potenti (Tr.2.139) XVIII
Pena est, quam iusto displicuisse uiro: (Tr.2.140)
Sed nouit citius fieri placabilis idem:* (Tr.2.141)

30. Afferat ipse licet sacras epidaurius herbas, (Pont.1.3.21)
Sanabit nulla uulnera cordis ope. (Pont.1.3.22)
Tollere nososam nescit medicina podagram, (Pont.1.3.23)
Nec formidatis auxiliatur aquis. (Pont.1.3.24)
Cura quaque interdum nulla medicabilis arte est: (Pont.1.3.25)

30. Nube solet pulsa candidus ire dies. (Tr.2.142)
Afflictii quique callent quia grande doloris (Met.6.574) XVIII
Ingenium est, miserisque ueniti solertia rebus. (Met.6.575)
Interdum spernent nam dum peiora timentur,* (Met.14.488)
Est locus in uoto; sors autem ubi pessima rerum,* (Met.14.489)

35. Sub pedibus timor est securaque summa malorum. (Met.14.490)
Aspere pacatis miscentur tristia letis,* (Fast.6.463)
Nec populum toto pectore festa iuuant:* (Fast.6.464)

35. Sub pedibus timor est securaque summa malorum. (Met.14.490)
Aspere pacatis miscentur tristia letis,* (Fast.6.463)
Nec populum toto pectore festa iuuant:* (Fast.6.464)

XV 'Tu poteras' inquis 'leuus' mala ferre silendo,* (Tr.5.1.49) XX

Et tacitus casus dissimulare tuos.' (Tr.5.1.50)
Exigis ut nulli gemitus tormenta sequantur, (Tr.5.1.51)
Acceptoque graui uulnere flere uetas? (Tr.5.1.52)
Ipse perilleo phalaris permissit in aere (Tr.5.1.53)
Eedere mugitus et bouis ore queri. (Tr.5.1.54)

5. Cum priami lacrimis offensus non sit achilles, (Tr.5.1.55)
Tu suades duros patienter ferre dolores?*(Tr.5.1.56)
Cum facet er niobam latonia proles, (Tr.5.1.57)
Non tamen et siccas iussit habere genas. (Tr.5.1.58)
Est aliquid, graue quodque malum per uelba leuare:* (Tr.5.1.59)

10. Hoc etiam proges alcionesque facit.*(Tr.5.1.60)
Hoc erat, in gelido quare peantius antro (Tr.5.1.61)
Uoce fatigaret lempnia saxa sua. (Tr.5.1.62)

XXI 15. Quodlibet ingenium placida mollitur ab arte (Ars.3.545)
   Et studio mores conuenienter eunt. (Ars.3.546)
   Prudentes etiam discunt ridere decenter,* (Ars.3.281)
   Queritur atque illis hac quoque parte decor.* (Ars.3.282)
   Sint modici rictus parueque utrimque lacune, (Ars.3.283)
20. Multa potest iterum restituisse dies.* (Pont.3.6.36)
   Laudamus ueteres, sed nostris utimur annis: (Fast.1.225)
   Mos tamen est eque dignus uterque coli. (Fast.1.226)
   Tempora labuntur, tacitisque senescimus annis. (Fast.6.771)
   Et fugiunt freno non remorante dies. (Fast.6.772)
20. Et summos dentes ima labella tegant, (Ars.3.284)
XXII  Nec sua perpetuo contendant ilia risu, (Ars.3.285)
   Carpe cibos digitis (est quidam gestus edendi), (Ars.3.755)
   Ora nec inmunda tota perunge manu; (Ars.3.756)
   Neue nimis presume cibos, sed desine citra* (Ars.3.757)
20. Tempus ut extentis tumeat facit uua racemis, (Tr.4.6.9)
XXII  Quam cupiens: paulo, quam potes esse, minus.* (Ars.3.758)
   Priamides helenen auide si spectet edentem, (Ars.3.759)
   Oderit et dicat 'stulta rapina mea est.' (Ars.3.760)
   Pertinet ad studium rabidos comespere motus:* (Ars.3.501)
   Candida pax homines, truc decret icago, (Ars.3.502)
25. Quam cupiens: paulo, quam potes esse, minus.* (Ars.3.759)
XXIII Luxuria niant a nimis rebulmque secundas, (Ars.2.437)
   Nec facile est una commoda mente pati. (Ars.2.438)
   Forma bonum fragile est, quantumque accedit ad annos, (Ars.2.113)
30. Ora tulent ira, nigrescunt saxiue uene, (Ars.3.503)
   Lumina gorgoneo seuius igne micant. (Ars.3.504)
   Nec facile est una commoda mente pati. (Ars.2.438)
   Forma bonum fragile est, quantumque accedit ad annos, (Ars.2.113)
35. Fit minor et spacio carpitur ipsa suo. (Ars.2.114)
   Nec uiole semper nec hiantia lilia florent, (Ars.2.115)
   Et riget amissa spina relicta rosa: (Ars.2.116)
   En tibi ueniunt cani, formose, capilli,* (Ars.2.117)
   Iam ueniunt ruge, que tibi corpus arent. (Ars.2.118)
Iam molire animum, qui duret, et hac strue formam:*(Ars.2.119)

Solus ad externos permanet ille rogos. (Ars.2.120)

Nec leuis ingenuas pectus coluisse per artes (Ars.2.121)

Cura sit et linguas edidicisse duas. (Ars.2.122)

5. Non formosus erat, sed erat facundus ulixes. (Ars.2.123)

Ergo age, fallaci timide confide figure. (Ars.2.143)

Quisquis es, ac aliquid corpore pluris habe.* (Ars.2.144)

Anguibus exuitur tenui cum pelle uetustas, (Ars.3.77)

Nec faciunt ceruos cornua iacta senes; (Ars. 3.78)

10. Nona sine auxilio fugiunt bona: spernite florem,* (Ars.3.79)

Qui, nisi spretus erit, turpiter ipses cadit. (Ars.3.80)

Uina parant animos solito plus uiribus aptos,* (Ars.1.237)

Cura fugit multo diluiturque mero. (Ars.1.238)

Tunc uenient risus, tunc pauper cornua sumit, (Ars.1.239)

15. Tunc dolor et cure rugaque frontis abit. (Ars.1.240)

Tunc aperit mentes euo rarissima nostro (Ars.1.241)

Simplicitas, artes excuciente mero.* (Ars.1.242)

Ut solet, in domini tenuis si puluis adheret* (Ars.1.149)

Uestitu, digitis excuciendus erit;*(Ars.1.150)
20. Etsi nullus erit puluis, tamen excute nullum: (Ars.1.151)

Quelibet officio causa sit apta tuo. (Ars.1.152)
Pallia si terre nimium demissa iacebunt, (Ars.1.153)
Collige et inmundas sedulas effit humo: (Ars.1.154)
Omnia respondere, nec tantum si quam rogantur;*(Ars.1.221)

20. Placat ur donis iupiter ipse datis. (Ars.1.662)

Iustus uterque fuit, neque enim lex iustior ulla est*(Ars.1.655)

25. Heus facinus! non est hostis tantum metuendus;*(Ars.1.751) XI

Quos credis fidios, effuge: tutus eris. (Ars.1.752)

Cognatum fratemque caue carumque sodalem; (Ars.1.753)

Prebebit ueros hec tibi turba metus. (Ars.1.754)

Non auis aucupibus monstrat, qua parte petatur, (Ars.3.669) XII

30. Non docet infestos currere cerua canes. (Ars.3.670)

Dicitur egiptus caruisse iuuantibus arua (Ars.1.647) XIII

Ymbribus atque annis sicca fuisse nouem. (Ars.1.648)

Cum trasus busirin adit monstratque piari*(Ars.1.649)

Hospitis effuso sanguine posse iouem. (Ars.1.650)

35. Illi busiris 'fies iouis hostia primus' (Ars.1.651)

Inquit 'et egipto tu dabis hospes aquam.' (Ars.1.652)

Et phaliris tauro uiolenti membra perilli (Ars.1.653)

Torruit; infelix horru auctor opus.*(Ars.1.654)

Iustus uterque fuit, neque enim lex iustior ulla est*(Ars.1.655)
Quam necis artifices arte perire sua. (Ars.1.656)

Scit bene uenator, ceruis ubi retia tendat; (Ars.1.45)

Scit bene qua, frendens ualle moretur aper. (Ars.1.46)

Aucupibus noti frutices; qui continet hamos,* (Ars.1.47)

5. Non tellus eadem parit omnia; uitibus illa (Ars.1.757)

Conuenit, hec oleis, hic bene farra uirent. (Ars.1.758)

Pectoribus mores tot sunt, quot in orbe figure:* (Ars.1.759)

Qui sapit, innumeris moribus aptus erit, (Ars.1.760)

10. Atque leues protheus modo se tenuabat in undas,* (Ars.1.761)

Numc leo, numc arbor, numc aper hirtus erat. (Ars.1.762)

Hic iaculo piscis, illic capiuntur ab hamis, (Ars.1.763)

Hos caua contento retia fune trahunt. (Ars.1.764)

Nec tibi comueniet cunctos modos unus ad annos; (Ars.1.765)

15. Flectitur obsequio curatus ab arbore ramus; (Ars.2.179)

Franquis, si uires experiare tuas. (Ars.2.180)

Obsequio tranantur aque, nec uincere possis (Ars.2.181)

Flumina, si contra quam rapid unda nates. (Ars.2.182)

Obsequium tigresque domat tumidosque leones;* (Ars.2.183)
20. Rustica paulatim taurus aratra subit. (Ars.2.184)

Non auis utiliter fiscatis effugit alis, (Ars.1.391)

Non bene de laxis cassibus exit aper. (Ars.1.392)

Saucius arrepto piscis tenuatur ab hamo: (Ars.1.393)

Mens erit apta capi tum cum, letissima rerum, (Ars.1.359)

20. Ad celebres ymnos sic pia turba ruit;*(Ars.1.97)

Non be laxis cassibus exit aper. (Ars.1.392)

Ad celebres ymnos sic pia turba ruit; *(Ars.1.97)

Non poterit ferrum nec edax abolere uetustas. (Met.15.872)

XXII Arte bona capta est, arte tenenda bona.*(Ars.2.12)

25. Ut seges in pingui luxuriabit humo. (Ars.1.360)

Pectora dum gaudent nec sunt astricta dolore, (Ars.1.361)

Ipsa patent; blandum subit arte dolus.* (Ars.1.362)

Tum, cum tristis erat, defensa est ilios armis, (Ars.1.363)

Militibus grauidum leta recepit equum. (Ars.1.364)

XXII Nec minor est uirtus, quam querere, parta tueri: (Ars.2.13)

Casus inest illic, hic erit artis opus. (Ars.2.14)

Hoc opus exegi, quod nec iouis ira nec ignes* (Met.15.871)

Nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere uetustas. (Met.15.872)

Hoc opus exegi: fesse date serta carine; (Rem.811)

XXIII

30. Dat requiem: requietus ager bene credita reddit, (Ars.2.351)

Terraque celestes arida sorbet aquas. (Ars.2.352)

Tempore difficilem ueniunt ad aratra iuuenci, (Ars.1.471)

Interit assidua uomer aduncus humo. (Ars.1.474)

Tempore lenta pati frena docentur equi. (Ars.1.472)

35. Ferreus assiduo consumitur annulus usu, (Ars.1.473)

Quid magis est saxo durum, quid mollius unda? (Ars.1.475)

Dura tamen molli saxa cauantur aqua. (Ars.1.476)

Que sunt dura tibi, perstas modo, tempore uinces:* (Ars.1.477)

Capta uides sero pergama, capta tamen. (Ars.1.478)

30. Contigimus portus, quo mihi cursus erat. (Rem.812)

Carminis optatum iam uult mea ponere finem (Ccompiler’s)

XIII Extra musa plicam quod bene gessit opus. (Compiler’s)

EXPLICIT LIBER FLORUM PVBLII OVIDII NASONIS.

INCIPIT LIBRI QUINTILII...