

ANALECTA ROMANA
INSTITUTI DANICI

XXXIX

ANALECTA ROMANA

INSTITUTI DANICI

XXXIX

2014

ROMAE MMXIV

ANALECTA ROMANA INSTITUTI DANICI XXXIX

© 2014 Accademia di Danimarca

ISSN 2035-2506

Published with the support of a grant from:

Det Frie Forskningsråd / Kultur og Kommunikation

SCIENTIFIC BOARD

Ove Hornby (*Bestyrelsesformand, Det Danske Institut i Rom*)
Maria Fabricius Hansen (*Ny Carlsbergfondet*)
Peter Fibiger Bang (*Københavns Universitet*)
Thomas Harder (*Forfatter/ writer/ scrittore*)
Michael Herslund (*Copenhagen Business School*)
Hanne Jansen (*Københavns Universitet*)
Kurt Villads Jensen (*Syddanske Universitet*)
Mogens Nykjær (*Aarhus Universitet*)
Vinnie Nørskov (*Aarhus Universitet*)
Birger Riis-Jørgensen (*Den Danske Ambassade i Rom*)
Niels Rosing-Schow (*Det Kgl. Danske Musikkonservatorium*)
Poul Schülein (*Arkitema, København*)
Lene Schøsler (*Københavns Universitet*)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Marianne Pade (*Chair of Editorial Board, Det Danske Institut i Rom*)
Patrick Kragelund (*Danmarks Kunstmuseum*)
Gitte Lønstrup Dal Santo (*Det Danske Institut i Rom*)
Gert Sørensen (*Københavns Universitet*)
Anna Wegener (*Det Danske Institut i Rom*)
Maria Adelaide Zocchi (*Det Danske Institut i Rom*)

Analecta Romana Instituti Danici. — Vol. I (1960) — . Copenhagen: Munksgaard. From 1985: Rome, «L'ERMA» di Bretschneider. From 2007 (online): Accademia di Danimarca

ANALECTA ROMANA INSTITUTI DANICI encourages scholarly contributions within the Academy's research fields. All contributions will be peer reviewed. Manuscripts to be considered for publication should be sent to: accademia@acdan.it Authors are requested to consult the journal's guidelines at www.acdan.it

Contents

SIMONE NORBERTO PORTA: <i>Osservare l'inosservato. Considerazioni su un contesto funerario dell'Orientalizzante antico tarquiniese. Uno studio di archeologia funeraria</i>	7
JANE HJARL PETERSEN: <i>Openness and 'closedness' in Roman tomb architecture: Tomb E1 of the Via Laurentina necropolis at Ostia as a case study</i>	27
KARIN MARGARETA FREDBORG: <i>The Introductions to Horace's Ars Poetica from the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. Didactic Practice and Educational Ideals</i>	49
FAUSTA GUALDI: <i>Paesaggi inediti del romano Carlo Labruzzì (1748-1817) e influenze inedite in alcune sue incisioni anteriori</i>	77
GIULIA VANNONI: <i>Tycho Brahe. Il grande astronomo protagonista dell'opera musicale di Poul Ruders</i>	103

The Introductions to Horace's *Ars Poetica* from the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: Didactic Practice and Educational Ideals

by KARIN MARGARETA FREDBORG

Abstract. Beginning from the end of the eleventh century, the commentaries to Horace's *Ars poetica* usually included interpretive outlines providing the title of the work, the author's pedagogic purpose and subject matter, the relevance of the work and how it is presented and identifying the branch of knowledge to which the *Ars poetica* belongs. The main nine existing introductions or *accessus*, which are edited and/or translated below, provide a multi-faceted illustration of the way Horace's *Ars poetica* have been interpreted as a source of general instruction for writers in many genres, even prose. They express a particular concern for character delineation and the stylistic register (grand, middle or humble) appropriate to the authors' choice of subject matter and genre. Attention is granted not only to the arrangement of parts, but also uniformity, balance and decorum. By the second half of the twelfth century these *accessus* also included a practical check-list instructing writers how to avoid the common vices or forms of mismanagement in favor of the virtues of literary composition. The details of these, namely a discussion of narrative virtues and vices, how to handle arrangement and stylistic options, were inspired by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Cicero's *De inventione* and helped to shape the medieval *Poetics* of Geoffrey of Vinsauf and others.

Introduction

Three questions could rightfully be asked to position Horace's *Ars poetica* in the educational programme of the twelfth century: What was its place in the curriculum? Why was it studied? And how was this particular text read as compared to the study of Horace's *Odes*, *Satires* and *Epistles*, and other Latin classics?

A good place to look for medieval educators' answers to these questions is in the formal introductions to commentaries or glosses on the *Ars poetica*, the so-called *accessus*. An *accessus*, to cite a useful description by Marjorie Woods, is an academic introduction, often organized as a conventional series of questions and answers, sometimes long and extended, sometimes deliberately brief, both of which the edited introductions below

bear witness to.¹ In educational practice these introductions go back as far as to the grammarian Servius (fourth century A.D.) and the philosopher Boethius (fifth century A.D.), but they only become normal practice in the Latin commentary tradition from the late eleventh century onwards. Tenth-century Horatian gloss collections, such as Pseud-Acro and the *Phi Scholia*, display no such elaborate scholastic introductions to the *Ars poetica*. I shall therefore below edit and/or translate a number of such major Horatian *accessus*.

Formally, the introductions fall into two main types,² the first of which is an *accessus ad auctores*, usually called the type (C) *accessus*, which deals conventionally with a literary work under the topics of:

(1) the title, i.e., *titulus*,

- (2) the author's intention, perhaps followed by the specific justification for such an intention, i.e., *causa intentionis*,
- (3) the subject matter of the text, i.e., *materia/negotium*,
- (4) the usefulness, i.e., *utilitas/finis*,
- (5) the relation to classifications of knowledge often called "to which part of philosophy", *cui parti philosophiae*.

The order of this sequence is neither rigid nor unalterable, sometimes the title comes at the end, but there is a general tendency that the intention and subject matter come in early and are considered the most important. This type of *accessus* is very commonly used, and there exist several major studies of them; the most important of the recent ones is by Munk Olsen.³

The second type is called *accessus ad artem*, type (D), which deals with ten main themes: the definition, *quid*, and the *genus* of the art, its subject matter, *materia*, its main, obligatory tenets, *officium*, its aim, *finis*, its subdivisions and its indispensable, integral parts, *partes* and *species*, its instrument, its *artifex*, and didactic sequence, *ordo*. The *accessus ad artem* format is typically used in twelfth-century introductions to theology and the *artes*, e.g., to commentaries on Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae*, Cicero's *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, not to mention Dominicus Gundissalinus' *De divisione philosophiae* (ca. 1180), where it is the structuring programme for the whole treatise.⁴

Since the 1970s a number of such introductions have been edited and discussed, notably in one important edition by Huygens.⁵ It was not at all uncommon that these introductions circulated separately from the (deliberately anonymous) commentaries proper, or that more than one *accessus* would be attached to a commentary or gloss. For instance, amongst the nine introductions on Horace's *Ars poetica* edited below, the old-fashioned *accessus* of the *Hic liber intitultur* is attached to the sophisticated and expanded *accessus* of the *Materia* commentary; likewise *Hec inquirenda sunt circa artem accessus*, the only

one of the format *accessus ad artem*, is followed by a very brief *accessus ad auctorem*, probably written by somebody else.

The Place of the Ars poetica in the Curriculum

We do not know the details of the late-eleventh- and twelfth-century Arts curriculum in very great detail so far, even though the Trivium is much better known than that of the Quadrivium. From the point of view of when the text of *Ars poetica* was studied, it seems clear that Horace was placed amongst the more difficult Latin classics, and that the *Ars poetica* was very rarely the first Horatian text in the curriculum, but belonged to the middle of the course, since only one manuscript of the *accessus* edited below is preceded by a primary introduction, namely a *vita*, in Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Clm. 21.563, fol. 2v. Likewise, when the *Ars poetica* was transmitted in miscellany manuscripts, it rarely came first, but was generally preceded by the lyrical poems, which in turn are very often seen as "first texts" and preceded by a *vita Horatii*.

There could have been various, good didactic reasons for beginning with the *Odes* and teaching the *Ars poetica* after the lyrical poems. First of all, Horace himself repeatedly emphasized the innovation and originality of his particular introduction of Greek lyrics into Latin. Secondly, there existed in the Middle Ages a strong belief that the order of Horatian texts reflected the (supposed) time of composition. According to his medieval readers and commentators, the lyrics and the *Ars poetica* simply belonged to Horace's youth, next came the *Satires*, whereas the *Epistles* was a work of sober old age, since he in *Ep.* I.1.1-10 and *Ep.* II.2.214-16 juxtaposes the youthful lyrics with his aims in the *Epistles*.⁶ Medieval interpreters probably constructed this chronology on the textual tradition of Horace in manuscripts holding all his works. This tradition falls in two distinct groups, the first where the *Ars poetica* immediately follows the *Odes*, the

second where the *Ars* likewise follows the *Odes* but comes slightly later, after the *Epodes* and *Carmen saeculare*, unlike modern editions where the *Ars poetica* follows the *Epistles*.⁷ Since Horace was a very popular author, witnessed in more than 800 manuscripts,⁸ many of which are miscellany collections bound together and clearly encompassing elements from various origins, the order of texts, including the distinction between these two groups, could become changed and fortuitous by loss of texts and rebinding. However, that the *Ars poetica* must have been prior to Horace's alleged castigation of moral flaws in the *Satires*, and the ethical themes of the *Epistles* appeared absolutely certain to his medieval readers; this they, no doubt, built upon the fact that the *Ars poetica* (A.P. 83-85) referred back to the youthful themes of the *Odes* but not to his other works, and because its subject matter dealt specifically with the various aspects of literary artful composition, and linguistic, stylistic and metrical concerns, all of which are quite different themes from the moral and daily life topics of the *Satires* and (most of the) *Epistles*.

As it is, it appears that amongst the commentaries on the *Ars poetica* there exists only a single *accessus ad artem* (type D), albeit extant in two manuscripts, which is edited below, the *Hec inquirenda sunt circa artem poeticam*. All the others belong to the type *accessus ad auctores* (type C). Here, it could easily be argued that both *accessus* forms, formal criteria apart, and from the point of view of which topics are treated, are on equal footing. Whereas the *accessus ad auctorem* normally aligns literature to ethics, the *accessus ad artem* highlights the fact, discussed in both traditions, that the *Ars poetica*, unlike many other classical poems, is unconcerned with ethics, *ethica*, but deals with composition and literature, which in the medieval classification of arts and sciences would come under *logica* in the broadest sense. Thus the *Ars poetica* is not narrowly aligned with either the subspecies *grammatica* or *rhetorica*, which again were *artes* both in the sense of theoretical insights and practical

language usage.

As a result, one can easily subsume some of the headings of the *accessus ad artem* such as definition or *quid*, *genus*, and *officium* under the introductory discussion in an *accessus ad auctorem* of "what exactly is 'ars poetica'" and *cui parti philosophiae*, just as *finis* and *artifex* come under *intentio*, and *materia*, *partes*, *species* and *instrumentum* are easily dealt with under the *materia* of the *accessus ad auctorem*.

I have therefore put the edition of this independent *accessus*, *Hec sunt inquirenda circa artem poeticam*, at the end of my series, because it, both formally and chronologically, represents a kind of mature and comprehensive view, incorporating much of the development of these earlier ones. Moreover, this particular *accessus* is certainly dependent upon the late *Materia* commentary. Two early commentaries appear to belong to the very end of the eleventh century or the turn of the twelfth century, namely the *Scholia Vindobonensia* and the *Aleph Scholia*; the others, the *Sangallensis* A.P.2, *Hic liber intitulatur*, and *Ars dicitur ab artando*, according to the age of their respective manuscripts, date back to the first half of the twelfth century. The *Pisones* commentary, which is dependent upon the *Hic liber intitulatur*,⁹ and the *Incipit liber poetriae* commentary are both probably from the middle or second half of the twelfth century. The latest commentary appears to be the *Materia* commentary. This particular commentary has in recent research been shown to have greatly inspired Matthew of Vendôme's *Ars versificatoria* (1175) and Geoffrey of Vinsauf's (1200-1220) poetics.¹⁰ The *Materia* commentary belongs to the second half of the twelfth century, both according to internal evidence and because of its transmission together with a commentary on the *Satires* called the *Sciendum* commentary, mentioning Thierry of Chartres (dead ca. 1157), an *Odes* commentary called *Auctor iste Venusinus*, and one on the *Epistles* called the *Proposuerat*.¹¹

Why was the Ars poetica a Popular Classic in the Eleventh and Twelfth centuries?

Medieval teachers and students engaged in the study of Horace's *Ars poetica*, because, in default of other poetics, Latin and Greek, it was the only accessible and extant poetics with an authoritative status.¹² It was, unlike today, lifted out of the *Epistles* tradition, and its addressees, the Pisones, were not seen on par with the many other addressees of the *Epistles*, notably Horace's patrons, Maecenas and the Emperor Augustus. Instead the Pisones, in some interpretations, occasioned an important feature of the *Ars*, namely that it purported to discuss, in general terms, aspects of literary fiction as such, and that Horace intended it to be a basic instruction even for prose writers (mentioned specifically by the *Hic liber intitulatur*, and the *Pisones*), whereas the somewhat hazy Pisones, father and sons (*A.P.*6, 24, 235, 292) are connected by other commentaries with the genres of satire and comedy. According to the last view, the Pisones were considered interested in these two genres in particular, even though no actual works of theirs were known.

The reason for seeing the *Ars poetica* as an universal instruction in writing is the general twelfth-century practice of interpreting Horace by means of Horace himself, and by reading Horace's first lines as a prologue (*A.P.*1-37) dealing with *mimesis* as such, and as a principal discussion of the relation of nature to art, because of the introductory comparisons of writing with the visual or sculptural arts (repeated at *A.P.*361 *Ut pictura poesis*). In the very beginning of the poem, Horace starts out by humorously displaying a hopelessly misconceived, sick, unnatural composition. Especially the very first lines are easily memorized, since it is a colourful representation of an awkward, composite being, wrongly put together, the upper part pretty with a human female head, but attached to the strong mane and neck of a horse, the middle and lower parts ridiculously being dressed up in a variety of birds' feathers, the bottom part vilified as

a dark sea monster. In short, in the course of a couple of lines, this figure resembles a promising beginning hastening towards a terrible end. As an advocate of coherence and *decorum*, Horace further drives home his plea for unified compositions by three other similes, so that his medieval commentators think that the lines discussing "what is right" (*A.P.*8 and 25 *species recti*) are an index of major subjects to be discussed in the *Ars poetica*: viz. compositional uniformity, and command of literary setting, decorum, scope, characters, and narrative strategies in literary composition.

Horace's authority was underscored in the commentators' claim that he principally wanted to mould (*informare*), and even openly perfect (*in scribendo perfectos reddere*) the future serious students and budding writers, as below in *Aleph Scholia*, *Incipit liber poetria, Ars ab artando*.¹³ In particular the *Ars ab artando* picked up from Horace's use of the word *lex* (*A.P.*135) that Horace wanted to provide future writers with general laws of literary composition, with a quality stamp (*apposita forma et sigillum scribendi*), and a method (*iter*), and offer precise illustrations of what was right (*species recti*). In these efforts Horace was not seen as a solitary figure, but further support was sought in grammar, particularly in explaining his uses of figures and tropes, and in rhetoric.

Since the late eleventh century, rhetorical manuals had begun making much use of the commentary by Marius Victorinus on Cicero's *De inventione*, and on Victorinus' authority, the Horatian commentators pleaded that not only Cicero (*De inv.*1.23.32-33; 1.20.29) but also Horace used a double method of instruction, showing, on the one side, what should at all costs be avoided, and, on the other side, what is to be preferred and pursued (ed. Halm, 212.32-34, ed. Ippolito, 104.17-18; ed. Halm, 206.15, ed. Ippolito, 93.157). In the same period, the newly introduced *Rhetorica ad Herennium* became immensely popular because of its lively and well-illustrated discussion of stylistic virtues and flaws, so Cicero, Victorinus

and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* supported and enhanced the double authority of Horace, the poet, and Horace, the instructor in poetics. Accordingly, upon the medieval understanding of composition we find that, for instance, the *species recti* become the three canonical styles discussed in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.8.11-11.16. The grand, the middle, and the humble style are balanced against their occasional concomitant flaws: the bombast and turgid style, the unstable and drifting style, and the bloodless and arid style (*Sangallensis A.P.2* and *Materia* commentary § 4; *Hec inquirenda sunt*). Victorinus' name was, admittedly, only mentioned explicitly by the early *Scholia Vindobonensia*, but Victorinus' choice of words distinguishing between right and wrong, between the positive *tenenda* and the wrong *vitanda*, was repeated time and again during the twelfth century in the *Sangallensis A.P.2*, *Hic liber intitulatur* and the *Pisones*, later the *Materia* commentary, and in Huygens' *Accessus* too.¹⁴

How was the Ars poetica studied according to these Introductions?

The study of classical poetry, written by Horace and other classical poets, was normally necessitated by its end product, the students' command of a full, good, idiomatic Latin, a *lingua franca* to be used in everyday life of the church, amongst clerks and other educated people. But the *Ars poetica* does not teach its readers anything about life and ethics, but about literature. Some of the most vital parts of these *accessus* concern the actual core subject matter, *materia* / *negotium*, namely how to define and go about fiction (*fingere*) and literary composition (*dictare*). By the end of the twelfth century, the commentary *Hec inquirenda sunt* summed up many previous literary verdicts, and stated that the individual literary genres (epics, lyrics, elegy, satire, comedy, tragedy) were the individual, separate segments or "parts" of fictional / poetic writing, as distinguished from the three styles which were integrated into all fiction and therefore were the "species" of the art of

poetry. Much earlier, but for the same purpose, the *Sangallensis A.P.2* emphasized that the main quality of the *Ars poetica* was its instruction in correct choice of style, knowing when and how to use the grand, middle or humble style, exactly those features that are by the *Pisones* commentary called the *proprietaes diuersae poetriae*, the properties and characteristics to be used according the different types and genres of composition.¹⁵ The *accessus* of the *Incipit liber poetriae* commentary, edited and translated fully below (p. 63), is unusual in being very specific in emphasizing the role of the metrical choices as being of paramount importance not only in the choice of single lines and elements of these, but especially the concern for "measure" in the composition as a whole and how it meets the requirements of the audience:

Metro autem mensuramus non tantum sillabas uel dictiones sed etiam materiam, quia partem materie talem et tantam mensuram assumunt poete in quanta iudicent se auditoribus placere. Si enim sit longa materia, ipsi detractant aliquam partem tractando, ne prolixitas aures audientium offendat; si uero angusta sit materia, ipsi figmentis suis amplificant ut auditoribus satisfaciant.

What is new here, is especially the word *amplificant*, which might make a modern reader think of the medieval compositional exercises in restriction and amplification, discussed in the Poetics by Geoffrey of Vinsauf and others. But the same was, in fact, hinted at in the very brief remark of the early *Sangallensis A.P.2*, that the *modus* in poetry concerns deliberately planning the length and scope of the individual composition, by sometimes choosing brevity, or, conversely, expanding the composition at other occasions.

In some of the *accessus*, like in the *Dialogus super Auctores* by Conrad of Hirsau (1070?-1150?), edited by Huygens, Horace's *materia* of the *Ars poetica* just collapses into the *intentio*; Conrad's short description of the *Ars*

poetica is actually worth inspection in some detail, since he admirably summarizes many themes mentioned in the *accessus* edited below: “His subject matter is precepts for writing well in general (*generalibus usus est institutis* [...] *cuiuslibet poematis*) [...] his intention is to chastize supercilious writers who are unconcerned with the proper style (*indiscretus stilus*), nor give their works the proper quality (*modus*) and sequence of events (*ordo*). After criticizing their temerity or lack of skills, he teaches the quality in using variety (*qualitas digressionum*), the requirements (*lex*), the sequence of events (*ordo*), the tone (*tenor*), the style belonging to heroic action (*gesta rerum*), the right setting (*loci*), exigencies of age and time (*aetas, tempus*), how the characters should be chosen and their properties observed (*personarum*), how the parts (*membra*) should harmoniously cohere with the beginning, in short all the literary elements (*sententiae*) that are integrated in an uniform, thematically coherent composition (*uniformae materiae*). This is achieved by Horace’s many and varied comparisons illustrating both literary virtues (*virtutes*) as well as their corresponding and more easily detectible flaws (*errores*)”.¹⁶

In most of the other *accessus* below, Horace’s aim and intention with his *Ars poetica* was to teach how to avoid such errors and vices in writing fiction, in order to mould (*informare*) perfect writers so that they would know exactly what to do (*species recti*) and what to avoid (*uitia*).

Vitia VI

One commentary, the *Materia* commentary, fully developed the theory of the Six Virtues and Vices of poetry so that this *accessus* became a small poetic *summa* by itself. It was not the first commentary to focus upon Horace starting (*A.P.*1-37) by pointing out (three) vices (*uitia*) “inequality in the description of persons and subject matter, useless digression, and incongruous variation in style”.¹⁷ But the very influential *Materia* commentary canonizes the six vices with their corresponding virtues

as precepts that are then to be dealt with in greater detail in later sections of the *Ars poetica*.

I. VITIUM. *Incongruous (dis)position of parts*, (*A.P.*1 HUMANO CAPITI EQUINAM) with an especially sensitive attention to how the beginning of a literary work conforms with its other parts. Since the beginning of a literary work must clearly indicate both stylistic and compositional choices in order to foreshadow and contribute to a coherent, uniform piece of fiction, a wrong disposition of parts is a major fault and covers not only arrangement, but also *decorum*, harmony and balance.¹⁸ This first vice or rather its corresponding virtue has, unlike the next three vices, no rhetorical counterpart, but concerns strictly the Horatian *decorum* advocated both for tone of voice (INTERERIT MULTUM, DAVOSNE LOQUATUR AN HEROS *A.P.*114), choice of diction (DOMINANTIA VERBA *A.P.*234), arrangement of both beginning (TANTO HIATU *A.P.*138, AB OVO *A.P.* 147) and end (PARTURIENT MONTES, NASCITUR RIDICULUS MUS *A.P.*139), character delineation (AETATIS CUIUSQUE NOTANDI SUNT TIBI MORES *A.P.*156), metres (QUO SCRIBI POSSUNT NUMERO *A.P.*74), and genres (VERSIBUS EXPONI TRAGICIS RES COMICA NON VOLT *A.P.*89).

II. VITIUM. *Incongruous digression*, better known as the Horatian “purple patches” (*A.P.*15 PURPUREUS PANNUS) disfiguring a composition, has as its opposite virtue poetic variety, whereas incongruously grafted bits and pieces and various kinds of digressions, if admitted at all, should be made to serve immediately understood intentions and deliberate purposes. While it is a vice to stitch on “purple patches”, the opposite is recommended and is simply called *intextio*, i.e., well engrafted material bringing useful variety both to passages in Lucan based on historical truth and recreational episodes enlivening long poems like the *Aeneid*.¹⁹ The *Materia* commentary does not refer to rhetoric here, whereas it is done explicitly in other commentaries such as *Hic liber intitulatur* (digression should be avoided unless they serve the cause of argument from similarity,

or aim at delight or amplification (Cic., *De inv.* 1.19.27).²⁰ Compositional variety, on the contrary, betrays skilfulness and is accordingly a major asset, which could make a well-planned poem become outstanding among other poems, and even a part of the literary canon (*autenticum*) according to the *Incipit liber poetriae*:

(A.P.45), Bern, Ms Burgerbibliothek 648, fol. 27v, Paris, Ms BnF, n.a.l. 350, fol. 40v:

HOC AMET id est quoddam, quod uideat conueniens cum narratione sua, siue fictum siue uerum, HOC scilicet quoddam narratum, quod uideat neque prodesse neque obesse, SPERNAT, ille AUCTOR PROMISSI CARMINIS, id est ille poeta qui promisit se facturum carmen autenticum.

Not surprisingly, Virgil's *Aeneid* is very often used to illustrate this skilfully made poetic variety, and some commentators go out of their way to find especially good Virgilian examples, e.g., the *Anonymus Turicensis*,²¹ or the *Hec inquirenda sunt*'s quotation of the elegant simile in *Ecl.* 1.59 below.

III. VITIUM. *Obscure brevity*, that is brevity gone wrong (A.P.25 BREVIS ESSE LABORO, OBSCURUS FIO), is the first vice which directly corresponds to the obligatory virtues of a rhetorical narration, namely that it is the *virtus narrationis* to be (1) brief, (2) lucid and bear the mark of (3) probability and verisimilitude, but it should first and foremost be brief (Cic., *De inv.* 1.9.14). Some medieval rhetoric teachers, like Thierry of Chartres, readily compare the Horatian advice not to begin a story too far back (A.P.147AB GEMINO OVO) with narrative brevity;²² however, in the context of these six vices and virtues of poetry, it is important to note that it is exactly Victorinus' commentary on *De inv.* 1.20.28 that introduces not only the seminal theory of virtues and vices and the terms *virtutes narrationis* (ed. Halm, 203.14-23, ed. Ippolito, 88.2), but also the corresponding *vitia narrationis* (ed. Halm, 206.31, ed. Ippolito, 93.177). Victorinus furthermore emphasizes Cicero's deliberate use of double instruction,

showing both what should be done, and what should be avoided (ed. Halm, 206.15, ed. Ippolito, 93.157).

The second and third vices, incongruous digression and obscure brevity, have very convincingly been shown by Friis-Jensen to have influenced in particular Geoffrey of Vinsauf's theories of amplification and abbreviation in the *Documentum* and *Poetria Nova*,²³ and are good examples of how the *Materia* commentary influenced thirteenth- to fifteenth-century Horatian commentaries.

IV. VITIUM. *Incongruous variation of style* (A.P.27 PROFESSUS GRANDIA TURGET) marks a new (and perhaps to modern readers unwarranted) rhetorical infiltration on the topic of the three main styles with their concomitant flaws, theories that are imported directly from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. However, long before the *Materia* commentary was written, the very earliest commentary, the *Scholia Vindobonensia*,²⁴ discussed the three styles and took its point of departure from Servius (ed. Thilo-Hagen 1:202, 3:1-2, 3:207) and his examples of vocabulary indicating exalted style, like "golden chandeliers" (*aureus lychnus* from Virg. *Aen.* I.726), which in the middle style is called just "a lamp" *lux*, in the humble style "a burning clay lamp" (*testa ardente*, Virg. *Georg.* I.391), as has been very thoroughly discussed by Quadlbauer.²⁵ Quadlbauer distinguishes between a "material" and an "elocutionary" concept of style. In the first, grand subject matter confines literary stylistic choices and strategies to the grand and exalted style, humble subject matter to the humble style etc. In the second, the "elocutionary" concept of style, an author is allowed to vary and explore several stylistic possibilities, e.g. "to walk up and down a ladder of styles", as it is advocated by Thierry of Chartres.²⁶ The theory of the three styles is used in particular to interpret and promote further understanding of genre criteria as these occupy the main text of the *Ars poetica*.

V. VITIUM. *Incongruous change and variety of subject matter* (A.P.29 QUI VARIARE CUPIT REM PRODIGIALITER) might appear to be just a

doublet of *incongruous digression*, but the author of the *Materia* commentary explicitly rejects that, by arguing that the choice of subject matter is the prerogative of fiction and imaginative poetic composition, as opposed to historiography that is bound by truth and by what historically really took place in the true sequence of events - and therefore follows the real order of events, *ordo naturalis*. The example adduced to prove his point is, I think, an interesting one, namely that Virgil's insertion of the Dido episode as such, is a purely fictional (and intentionally unhistorical) topic inserted according to the artful narrative order, *ordo artificialis* (*Materia* commentary, the Fifth Vice below). We are here quite beyond what Servius tried to say, when he in the beginning of his commentary to the *Aeneid* recommended that the artful narrative order would be like what we enjoyed in Virgil's *Aeneid*, seeing how he starts *in medias res* moving back and forwards between past and future events (ed. Thilo-Hagen, 1:4.16-5.5).

VI. VITIUM. *Incongruous consummation of a work* (*A.P.*34 INFELIX OPERIS SUMMA). The last vice is only condonable, if an author is prevented from finishing his work by either death, exile, or illness. All other reasons for not providing a unified work, with the appropriate beginning, middle and end, are just reduced to the author's ignorance or alleged negligence of his authorial duties.

These six vices with their corresponding virtues from the *Materia* commentary were copied relentlessly the next three-hundred years, to the extent that even the most beautifully executed copies of the *Ars poetica*, showing few signs of daily use, like the one owned by Piero de Medici, son of Cosimo, now in Firenze, Ms Bibl.Laur., Plut.34.10. Piero's copy had the *vitia sex* carefully copied in the margins, and nothing else. Horace himself would probably have shuddered at this bombastic type of didactics, even though it was in all likelihood triggered by the Horatian "SPECIES RECTI" (*A.P.*25) and skilful handling of opposites "IN VITIUM DUCIT CULPAE FUGA, SI CARET ARTE" (*A.P.*31) (*viz.* Victorinus' rhetorical

VIRTUTES NARRATIONIS ET VITIA). To this should be added a time-old grammatical tradition of discussing genres, style, and narrative order within the tradition of Servius' commentaries to Virgil's *Aeneid*, *Eclogues* and *Georgica*, which themselves were steeped in Horatian poetics and rhetorical lore.

I have in this introduction to the *accessus* edited below tried not to reiterate what has been said so carefully by Karsten Friis-Jensen on the topic of the *Materia* commentary and its often subtle handling of details of diction and composition in the full course of the commentary proper.²⁷ Instead I have focused on two significant methods of medieval exegesis, the first that the commentators were primarily focused upon authorial intent,²⁸ so that they used Horace's oeuvre as much as they could in order to understand his exposition of ideas and literary choices, and, secondly, that, in consequence of a teaching tradition going back to Servius, they felt free to avail themselves of the didactically most useful body of rhetorical precepts available in their own day. These, as we have seen, they found in the newly introduced *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (three styles), the *De inventione* (on digressions, narrative orders, *virtutes et vitia narrationis*), and in Victorinus' didactic method of pointing out virtues and vices. In this process they seem to have followed Victorinus' method of illustrating Cicero's theories from Cicero's own speeches, just as Horace's poems (or those of his friend Virgil) were made to illustrate Horace's own theoretical dicta, something which is very noticeable in the main body of the commentaries, but also in the *accessus* of the *Materia* commentary and the *Hec inquirenda sunt*. It is my hope that the edition and translations of these nine *accessus* may deepen our knowledge of medieval literary appreciation, for which we for so long have mainly had to rely upon Huygens' fine old *accessus* edition from 1970 and the collection of new English translations by Copeland and Sluiter.

Nine accessus to Horace, Ars Poetica

Orthography and punctuation follow that of the editors of *Scholia Vindobonensia*, *Aleph Scholia* and the *Materia* commentary; in the other *accessus* I have used the orthography of the manuscripts, and, if possible and convenient, followed the punctuation of the manuscripts, except for the fact that none of these consistently indicate lemmata.

Scholia Vindobonensia ad Horatii Artem Poeticam, ed. Zechmeister, 1:

HUMANO CAPITI et caetera. in hoc libro est intentio Horatii tractare de poetica arte, id est, arte fingendi et componendi. poesis enim graece, latine dicitur figmentum; inde poetae, id est, compositores dicuntur. facit autem hunc librum amicis suis, patri ac filiis, quorum maior erat scriptor comoediarum. ideo istis facit, quia volebant scribere, ut Romano populo placerent et eorum fama tali modo cresceret. et quoniam multi scriptores reprehendebantur non habentes certam regulam dictandi, rogaverunt Pisones Horatium, ut certas poeticae artis daret praeceptiones; quas ipse, sicut Victorinus praecepit (ed. Halm, 212.32-34, ed. Ippolito, 103.16-104.18), dupliciter tradit, dicendo primum, quid vitandum, deinde quid tenendum sit. et hoc ostendit per similitudinem tractam a pictoribus (quia poetarum est loqui per similitudines sicut etiam oratorum) hoc modo incipiens.

WHEN TO A HUMAN HEAD. It is Horace's intention in this book to deal with the art of poetry, that is the art of fiction and literary composition. For 'poesis' in Greek is called 'figmentum' (poetic fiction) in Latin; from which is derived the word 'poets' or writers. For he made this book for his friends, a father and his sons, the eldest of whom was a writer of comedy. He did this for them, because they wanted to write in the

manner that could find favour with the Roman people, and so that their fame would rise accordingly. However, since many writers incurred criticism because they had no clear-cut guidelines on literary composition, the Piso friends had asked Horace to give them reliable rules for poetical composition. These rules Horace gave them in two-fold manner, just as Victorinus has taught us: So he is first saying what should be avoided, next what should be pursued. And this he shows by a simile drawn from painting - for poets, just like orators, are wont to use imagery when they speak. He begins as follows.

Aleph Scholia, ed. Botschuyver, 457:

HUMANO CAPITI] Hic intendit Horatius informare poetas, maxime Pisones, patrem videlicet et filios, docendo quae sunt facienda et reprehendendo quae sunt respuenda, partim communiter omnibus poetis, partim proprie ipsis comicis.

Descensio ad literam quasi intentio; materia est poetis et historicis generaliter ostendere, quemadmodum deceat eos observare uniformem materiam, specialiter vero comicis interdicere ne faciant ne derideantur.

[WHEN TO A HUMAN HEAD]. Here Horace intends to mould writers of poetic composition into perfection, more specifically the Pisones, father and sons, by teaching what ought to be done, and by criticizing what must be avoided, both in general by all writers of poetic composition, and in particular by writers of comedy.

The start of the text gives his intention. His subject matter is a general exposition aimed at poets and writers of history of how they must concentrate on the uniformity of their subject matter; and more specifically he writes for writers of comedy in order

to prevent them from proceeding in a manner that makes them objects of ridicule.

Sangallensis A.P.2

St. Gall, Ms Stiftsbibliothek 868 (= *siglum G*) p. 75; *ibid. manu altera* (= *siglum G2*) p. 54, www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/csg/0868:

In isto libro sex²⁹ requiruntur: intencio, causa intencionis, modus, qualitas carminis, utilitas, titulus. Iste autem liber intitlatur sic: Incipit Liber Poetriae id est liber ficticius. Nam ‘*poesis*’ Grece Latine dicitur fictio. Inde poeta fctor id est compositor.

Intencio principalis est dare precepta scribendi et hec duobus modis quorum primum in dicendo quid sit uitandum, post quid sit tenendum.

Causa est rogatu<s> Pisonum, duorum fratrum, filiorum Pisonis, a quo et ipsi dicti sunt Pisones, quorum alter scriptor erat comediarum quem maxime hic instruit, et per illum uniuersaliter omnes poetas³⁰, unde etiam dicitur Liber Poeticus.

Modus ut uel breuiter uel late dicat.

Qualitas quo stilo scribat, utrum grandiloquo aut mediocri aut humili.

Utilitas quod uult instruere poetas ad scribendum, et prius premittit similitudinem, quod etiam solet fieri in Sacra Scriptura, ut per hanc ornacius et competencius accedat ad hoc quod³¹ uult. Et sic dicit SI QUIS hoc est si aliquis pictor.

Titulus est: ‘Quinti Horacii Flacci carminum liber .IIII. explici³², incipit .V. ‘De arte poetica.’

In this book six items must be dealt with, Horace’s intention, the reason for this intention, the manner of treatment, the quality of the poem, the usefulness, and the title. The book is called ‘Here Begins the Book about Poetic Composition’, that is the Book about Fiction. For the Greek ‘*poesis*’ is in Latin *fictio*, hence a poet is a writer of

poetic composition or fiction.

His intention is first and foremost to give rules for writing, and in two distinct ways, of which the first is describing what must be avoided, the second teaching what should be done.

What caused him to write this was a request from the Pisones, two brothers, sons of Piso from whom they have their name. One of them was a writer of comedies, towards whom he here mostly directs his advice, and through him he instructs all writers in general, hence the title ‘The Book for Writers (*Liber poeticus*)’.

The manner of writing is either writing summarily or in great detail. The quality depends on which style one writes in, grand, middle or humble style.

The usefulness of the book is that he wishes to instruct poets how to write. And first he introduces a simile, which is also done in Sacred Scripture, by which he more elegantly and competently can come to what he wants to say: IF ANYBODY that is any painter. The title is: ‘This is the End of the Fourth Book of the Odes, and the Ars poetica Begins’.

Ars dicitur ab artando

Paris, Ms Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 7641, fol. 106r-v:

<Titulus>. ‘Ars’ dicitur ab artando, eo quod artis id est strictis preceptis constringat (Cassiodorus, *Gramm.*, GL7, 213.14-15).³³ Ars est enim comprehensio preceptorum ad utilitatem usui accommodata (Aemilius Asper, *Ars*, GL 5, 547.5). Artat uero Horacius in hoc libro poetas, ne contra haec precepta quae ponuntur hic infra aliquis eorum ulterius faciat, cum possit uideri in eis quae sunt euitanda ab eis in carminibus suis. Scribitur haec instructio specialiter ad erudiendos Pisones, ad patrem scilicet et filium (uterque enim Piso uocabatur) sed secundario generaliter uniuersis instruendis necessaria est et

utilis. Pisones erant filii Pisonis, ut a Camillo Camilli, quorum alter comicus, alter uero tragedus, [in]uidentes multos poetarum labi in uitia scribendi, et super hoc turpiter redargui, ut et hunc / fol. 106v / lapsum eiusque calumpniam declinarent, precibus se contulerunt ad Horatium, ut determinaret eis certos modos certaque precepta scribendi.

Unde Horacius hic maxime intendit eos per haec quae secuntur precepta in scribendo perfectos reddere. Sed quia diligentia doctorum communi uigilare utilitati exigit, dat precepta non solum comicis et tragedis, sed in omne genus scribendi. Quia uero duo sunt genera precipiendi, primum quo uitanda introducuntur,³⁴ alterum quo digna sequi precipiuntur, hoc ordine horum prius resecando uitiosa, dehinc subinferendo fructuosa. Et quoniam poetae et pictores per multa inter se conueniunt (cf. *A.P.* 361), similitudine incipit a uitio pictoris, per simile dicens HUMANO CAPITUL.

Negotium³⁵ est instruere omnes sub persona Pisonum, ostendendo quae uitia sunt uitanda poetis. Intencio est reddere poetas inexcusabiles, cum sit eis inscripta regula quam sequantur, et apposita forma (cf. *A.P.* 114-26) et sigillum (cf. *A.P.* 58-59) scribendi cui imprimantur, et lex (cf. *A.P.* 135) et iter quam teneant.

An art (*ars*) is so called from the verb to compress (*artare*) meaning, that is, to constrain by narrow (*artis*) precepts. For an art is a set of precepts brought together for usefulness and use. So in this work Horace constrains the poet and writer so that he does not deviate from his course and does not write something contrary to the precepts set forth below, since in these precepts he can find what he should avoid in his poems. These are written more specifically for the instruction and teaching of the Pisones

- both father and son are called Piso - but the instruction is also very useful and necessary for all writers in general. Just as Camilli are sons of Camillus, these Pisones are sons of Piso, of whom one was a writer of comedy, the other a writer of tragedy. They had turned to Horace asking him to show them precise methods and accurate precepts for writing, since they noticed that many poets unintentionally went astray, and consequently were severely criticized. By such precepts they hoped to avoid such hazardous lapses, and subsequent malicious accusations.

Accordingly, Horace's main aim is here to make them faultless writers by following the precepts he is going to set down further on in this poem. But since any teacher's diligent preoccupation is to safeguard the common good of all, he offers his precepts not only to writers of comedy and tragedy, but directs them towards every literary genre of composition. Since there are two manners of offering precepts, the first by which you deal with what should be avoided, the second by which you give rules for which tenets to pursue, his order of procedure is to first cut back and weed out what is wrong, thereafter bring in what will be advantageous and fruitful.³⁶ Furthermore, since there is a general similarity and accordance between writers and painters, he starts out by showing a comparable mistake made by a painter, in the simile saying: IF TO A HUMAN HEAD:

His matter and business here (*negotium*) is to instruct writers in avoiding mistakes in general under the *persona* of the Pisones, whereas his intention is to make poets above reproach, since now a rule (*regula*) has been written for them to follow, and they have been given a model (*forma*) and image (*sigillum*) for how to write - imprinted, so to say, on the authors' <minds> - and a law (*lex*)

which they must follow, and a road (*iter*)
they must walk.

Hic liber intitulatur

Manuscripts, in a roughly chronological order: Lucca, Ms Bibl. stat.1433 (s. XII¹) (= siglum **L**) fol.1r (*primum dimidium haud legitur propter maculas*); Munich, Staatsbibl., Clm 15962 (s. XII) (= siglum **M**) fol.1va, from which is copied the 15th c. Alba Julia, Ms B. Dioc. Batthyaneum II-77 (anno 1471-72) (= siglum **A**) fol. 118r; London, Ms BL, Harley 2732 (s. XII) (= siglum **H**) fol. 28vb; London, Ms BL, Additional 31.827 (s. XII) fol. 9vb (= siglum **Lo**); Munich, Bayer. Staatsb., Clm 29002 (c) f. 4ra (s. XII²) (=Siglum **Muc**); San Daniele de Friuli, Ms B. Guarneriana 133 (s. XIII) (= siglum **S**) fol.1ra. The first half of this *accessus* is identical with the one found in the *Accessus*, ed. Huygens, pp. 50-51. A significant selection of glosses from this commentary, but without the *accessus*, can also be found in Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Clm. 14693, fols. 2v-13r. The *Hic liber intitulatur* was evidently a very popular work and also greatly influenced the following commentary *Pisones*, not only in the *accessus* but throughout the commentary.³⁷

[HUMANO CAPITI]: Hic liber intitulatur³⁸
poetriae³⁹ seu '*poesis*' seu de arte poetica.⁴⁰
Intendit enim Horatius in hoc libro dare
quedam precepta in artem poeticam,
ut sciat quisquis poeta esse uoluerit,
quid debeat tenere, quid reicere.⁴¹ Sed
licet communi nomine liber intituletur
de poesi, tamen⁴² sciendum est
quod principaliter inceptus est causa
comediarum scribendarum, et in eas
quedam precepta specialia dat scribendi.
Scribit⁴³ enim ad Pisones nobiles uiros,
patrem et duos filios; qui scriptores
erant comediarum,⁴⁴ quorum
scripta⁴⁵ ne reicerentur publicata, sicut
quorundam aliorum comicorum, petit
pater ab Horatio proprias regulas
scribendi comedias. Huius rei gratia
altius incipit Horatius ut communiter
de poesi incipiat. Et sciendum est
quod - preter precepta metrorum - alia
precepta communia sunt etiam his qui

prosaice scribunt sicut liquebit.

Et cum duobus modis dentur
precepta scribendi, uel ostendendo
quid faciendum sit uel quid uitandum,
in primis ostendit quid sit uitandum
inducendo diuersas similitudines a
pictoribus, a figulis, a fusoribus quid
in his sit reprehensibile, ut per simile
intelligamus in scriptura quid dignum
sit reprehensione.⁴⁶

[TO A HUMAN HEAD.] The title of this work is 'On Poetry' or 'Poesis' or 'On the Art of Poetry'. It is the intention of Horace in this work to give a set of rules for the art of poetry, in order that whoever wants to become a poet would know what to follow and what to reject. Notwithstanding that the book is called 'On poetry' in general, you should know that it was originally undertaken more specifically for the sake of writing comedy, and special precepts are given for that. For it is written as a Letter to the noble Piso family, a father and two sons; they were writers of comedy, and in order that their writings would not be censured upon publication, as had happened to some other comedy writers, the father had requested proper rules for writing comedy. Accordingly, Horace starts out more generally about poetry in the wide sense. Furthermore, one should keep in mind that - apart from metrical rules - he gives other guidelines which, evidently would serve also writers of prose.

Since there are two methods of instructions for writing, either showing what must be done or what should be avoided, he starts out by showing what should be avoided, adducing several comparisons from the work of painters, makers of pottery, sculptors, so that we by these similes may see what in a similar way is incurring criticism in literary composition.

Pisones

Bern, Ms Burgerbibliothek 327 (= Siglum **B**), fol.7ra:

<P>isones, pater et filii nobilissimi Romani commediarum scriptores, cum uiderent comedias multorum reprehendi et contempni a Romanis, uel propter inornatam materiam uel propter proprietates personarum non bene seruatas, uel propter aliam causam male compositionis, sibi timentes ne incurrerent aliquod illorum uiciorum, rogauerunt Oratium ut facere<t> eis aliquod tractatum de proprietatibus et natura comediarum. Quapropter Oratius compulsus rogatu amicorum suorum ingreditur dare specialia precepta de comediis. Sed quia placuit ei respicere ad communem utilitatem, ideo incipit dare altius precepta non tantum⁴⁷ pertinentia ad comedias sed ad omnem poetriam, prosaicam seu⁴⁸ metricam, sed diuersim, modo ad metricam, modo specialiter ad comedias. Et hic potest notari causa intentionis.

Et intendit principaliter dare quedam de comediis gratia amicorum, et secundo generalia precepta ad omnem poetriam gratia communis utilitatis, ut sciat quisquis uoluerit esse poeta quid debeat tenere, quidque reicere. Et cum intentio sua sit dare communia precepta, ostendit in initio quid sit deuitandum omnibus poetis, inducendo diuersas similitudines de pictore, de figulo, de fusore, scilicet ne accipiant materiam non congruam suis ingeniis, quia non possent eam conuenienter describere nec ad finem usque perducere, ut malus pictor uel figulus uel fusor ad finem quod ceperit non perducit.

Materia sunt diuersae poetriae proprietates et principaliter naturae et proprietates comediarum unde principaliter tractat.

Utilitas bone compositionis comediarum noticia et omnimodae

'poesis'.

Iste liber intitulatur uel poetriae uel *'poesis'* uel de arte poetica.

The Pisones, a father and his sons, being very noble Romans and writers of comedy, had asked Horace to make them a treatise on the characteristics and very nature of comedy. They found that many authors' comedies were looked down upon and criticized by the Romans, either because of the too plain subject matter, or because the individual characters were not being properly delineated, or due to other literary mistakes. Accordingly, they feared themselves that they might incur similar censure in these matters. Therefore Horace, responding to his friends' request, takes this as his point of departure to give specific rules for comedy. But, because he wished to take into account a more generally useful instruction in literary composition, he starts out by going higher up and offering advice not only about comedy, but about any literary composition, be it in prose or bound by metre, but in various ways, since he now addresses the topic of metre, now more specifically matters belonging to comedy. And here we can find the reason for the aim of this work.

For his intention was originally to give advice about comedy for the sake of his friends, but, over and above that, some general precepts belonging to all literary composition for the sake of the common good, so that every would-be poet would know what to pursue and what to exclude. And since his intention was to give general rules, he shows in the beginning what must be avoided by every poet, by introducing various comparisons concerning a painter, a potter, a sculptor; for one should not accept a subject matter that does not correspond to one's skills, since poets

might end up by not describing their subject matter and finishing their work in a satisfactory manner, just as the bad painter or potter or sculptor did not complete the work as he had started it.

The subject matter of this work are the properties (*proprietas*) of the various types of composition, and the nature and characteristics of comedy which has been his principal intention of this work.

The usefulness is the understanding of composition of comedy, and, more generally, of any possible type of literary composition.

The title of the work is 'The Book of Poetry', or of 'Poiesis', or 'On the Art of Poetry'.

Incipit liber poetriae

Manuscripts: Bern, Ms Burgerbibliothek 648, fol. 27r (s. XII^{ex}) (= siglum **B**)] = *manuscript de base*; Paris, Ms BnF, n.a.l. 350, fol. 40r (s. XII^{ex}) (= siglum **P**); Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 14.125, fol. 218r (s. XV) (= **Mu**); *accessus* also in Oxford, Ms Magdalen College lat.15 (s. XII) (= siglum **M**) fol. 63v, in a slightly different version (in Friis-Jensen 1988, 137-38; tr. Copeland & Sluiter 2009, 557-58).

Commentarius in Librum de arte poetica. Incipit liber poetrie id est qui continet precepta quibus informantur poete⁴⁹ ad bene componenda sua poemata; et habet *materiam* ipsum poema de quo agit, dando precepta quibus imprimat nobis scientiam componendi poemata.

Modus qui dat⁵⁰ generalia precepta scilicet conuenientia tam comediis quam aliis poematibus. Vel dat propria precepta comediarum de quibus specialiter intendit. Intendit enim proprie formare⁵¹ Pisonem maiorem filium Pisonis ad scribendas comedias que tunc temporis male tractabantur tunc propter uilitatem materie tum propter uulgaritatem sermonis.

Et supponitur liber iste loice quia hic

instruuntur non de morum informatione sed de uerborum compositione ad facienda poemata.⁵²

Poema autem dicitur quod metricè componitur ita quod uel omnia ficta uel aliqua uera contineat, sic quidem ficta quod uerisimilia iudicentur secundum opinionem hominum. Sicut autem scriptores inducunt compositiones scilicet ornamenta rethorica, ut placeant opera sua et delectent auditores, ita etiam metra faciunt propter idem. Dicitur autem metrum a '*metron*' Greco, id est mensura. Metro autem mensuramus non tantum syllabas uel dictiones sed etiam materiam quia partem materie talem et tantam mensuram assumunt poete in quanta iudicent se auditoribus placere. Si enim sit longa materia, ipsi detractant aliquam partem tractando, ne prolixitas aures audientium offendant; si uero angusta sit materia, ipsi figmentis suis amplificanc ut auditoribus satisfaciant.⁵³

Attendendum est autem quia duobus modis ponit precepta, scilicet uel simpliciter precipiendo quid faciendum est, uel reprehendendo prius quid male fieri a quibusdam uidebat uel in oratione uel in materia, et postea in formando precepta, et hoc modo primitus utitur. Reprehendit enim prius eos qui unitatem materie non secuntur, premissa reprehensione pictorum qui in picturis suis unitatem non secuntur.⁵⁴

Bene confert pictorem et scriptorem.⁵⁵ Sicut enim pictor imitari debet naturam rerum uel in ueritate uel ita ut est in opinione hominum — ueluti si pingat centaurum faciat dimidium hominem et dimidium equum, sicut habet fabulosa hominum opinio, non faciat caput hominis, collum asini, pectus leonis et alia sic diuersa cui compositioni nulla opinio hominum consentiat, ita poeta, licet ficticia inducat, non tamen ab hominum debet dissentire opinione, et ita premittens

similitudinem dicit: SI PICTOR VELIT

'A commentary on the Book of Poetry'. Here begins the Book of Poetry, that is the book that holds the precepts by which poets are made perfect in composition of good poetry. The subject matter is the poem as such, which he writes about by offering rules by help of which the skill of composing poems is imprinted in us.

The manner is that of giving general rules for both comedy and other types of poetry. Or, alternatively, he gives particular precepts for comedy, as this is his specific purpose. For he intends to mould <viz. the skills of> Piso's eldest son Piso in particular, so that he can write comedies, which in their days were badly handled in two ways, due to the immoral nature of their subject matter and due to the vulgar idiom used.

The book belongs to the linguistic arts (*loice*), since his instructions are not concerned with the shaping of morals, but are about composition and making of poems.

A poem is defined as something that is composed metrically, and in such a way that it is either wholly fictitious or partly a work of fiction, or contains some truth, at least so far as the fictitious elements are credible and follow received opinion. Just as <prose> writers offer literary elements or compositions in ornate rhetorical style, so that their literary output will please and delight the audience, metrical compositions do the same and for the same reason. Metre comes from the Greek '*metron*', that is measure. By the metre we measure not only the length of syllables or utterances, but also the subject matter, because poets take up their subject matter of a chosen quality and length, according to what they believe the audience would like. If it is a long-winded subject, they

themselves abbreviate and shorten it in their treatment, in order that the extended length will not offend the ears of the audience. If, on the other side, the subject matter is limited in size, they extend it by amplification with their own creative compositions (*figmentis suis amplificanti*) in order to satisfy the audience.

It should be noted that he presents his precepts in two different ways, either by simply telling what is to be done, or by first criticizing what he noticed was badly done by some writers, be it in literary form or in choice of subject matter. He thereafter sets forth his rules. He follows the latter method in the beginning of the poem: for he starts out by criticizing those writers who do not attempt to pursue a uniform subject matter, with the introductory censure of painters who did not pursue uniformity in their paintings.

The comparison of painters and writers is well done. For just as a painter should imitate nature, either as it actually is or according to received opinion, e.g., if he were to paint a centaur, he should make it half man, half horse, since this is the common opinion about that particular fabulous creature, and he should not stick together a head of a man, the neck of an ass, the upper torso of a lion, and other diverse details that in common opinion do not belong together. Likewise a poet, even though he writes about fictitious matters, ought not to deviate from received opinion; he therefore starts with the simile saying 'If a painter'.

The Materia commentary, ed. Friis-Jensen 1990, 336-38.⁵⁶

¶ 1. Materia huius auctoris in hoc opere est ars poetica. Intentio uero est dare precepta de arte poetica. Causa huius intentionis est duplex: est enim communis, est specialis. Communis ut

doceat quoslibet poetas in arte poetica aberrantes. Specialis, id est priuata, ut doceat Pisones, quorum rogatu hoc opus incepit. Siquidem Pisones erant quidam nobilissimi filii Pisonis, qui uidentes aliorum scripta reprehendi et timentes idem contingere suis carminibus, optimum preceptorem artis poetice ut eos in scribendo instrueret Horatium rogauerunt. Quorum petitioni ipse acquiescens dare precepta in artem poeticam intendit. Quia uero ipsorum gratia tantum laborem suscepit, et alter eorum comedus, alter erat satiricus, idcirco dat quedam precepta specialia in comediam et quedam specialia in satiram. Ut autem omnibus in commune consulat, dat generalia precepta quibuslibet poetis pertinentia. Uerum quia precepta duobus modis dantur, prius scilicet ostendendo quid sit uitandum, deinde quid sit tenendum, idcirco preceptor iste primum uitanda docet, ut illis ab errore purgatis regulas preceptaque artis poetice subiungat. Ipse enim in *Epistolis* (Hor. *Epist.* I. 2.54) dicit: “Sincerum est nisi uas quodcumque infundis acescit”. Sex itaque sunt que dicit in carmine esse uitanda, non quod non sint et alia, sed ista precipue. Quorum primum est partium incongrua positio. Partes autem libri sunt principium, medium et finis. Que utique incongrue ponuntur “Cum primum medio, medium quoque discrepat imo” (*A.P.*152). Hoc autem uitium dampnat Horatius per similitudinem a pictore inductam, ubi ait (*A.P.*1) “Humano capiti” et cetera. Est autem congrua partium positio, cum primum medio, medium quoque congruit imo.

¶ 2. Secundum uitium est incongrua orationis digressio, que fit quando aliquis dimisso cursu orationis sue ad aliud quiddam quod ad rem non pertinet digreditur. Hoc autem uitium dampnat Horatius ubi ait (*A.P.*15) “Purpureus late qui splendeat unus et alter assuitur pannus”. Est autem congrua orationis

digressio que fit quando aliquis dimisso cursu sue orationis utilitatis causa et ad commodum sue cause ad aliud digreditur. Hanc exsequitur Tullius in *Uerrinis*, qui cum incepisset accusare Uerrem de adulterio quod fecerat in Sicilia, dimisso cursu sue orationis cepit describere terre illius amenitatem, dicens ibi esse fontes amenos, arbores pulcerrimas, prata uirentia, et hoc totum ad commodum cause sue, quasi per hoc ueri simile esset in tam delectabili loco Uerrem adulterium commisisse. Hoc etiam et Uirgilius in principio *Eneidos* facit: Cum dixisset Eneam patrem et deos deferentem multum tamen terra marique iactatum, multa quoque et bello passum, quoniam incredibile uideretur uirum tante pietatis tantis afflictum periculis, idcirco dimittens cursum sue orationis digreditur et inquit causam ire superiorum, et ait (Verg. *Aen.*I.8) “Musa mihi causas memora quo numine leso” et cetera. Magna enim debet esse ira dei que considerationem non habet pietatis. Hoc totum poteris notare in digressionibus ceterorum auctorum.

¶ 3. Tertium uitium est breuitas obscura, que fit quando aliquis breuiter loqui desiderat nec ea que dicere debet bene declarat. Hoc dampnat Horatius ubi ait (*A.P.*25): “breuis esse laboro, obscurus fio”. Est autem et congrua breuitas que aperte declarat, que obscuritatem non generat.

¶ 4. Quartum uitium est incongrua stili mutatio. Tres enim sunt manerie dicendi, quas alii stilos, alii figuras, alii characteres appellant: humilis stilus, mediocris et altus. Humilis stilus est quando aliquis de humilibus personis humilibus prosequitur uerbis, ut in comedia. Mediocris stilus est quando de mediocribus personis mediocribus agitur uerbis, ut in satira. Altus stilus est quando de altis personis altis agitur uerbis, ut in tragedia. Sed unus quisque istorum stilorum habet sibi collaterale et

proximum uitium. Mediocris stilus habet uitium fluctuans et dissolutum. Insistens itaque aliquis mediocri stilo in fluctuans et dissolutum cadit, cum sententias quidem seruat, sed nimie planitudini insistendo eas minime ligat; et ita sententie discisse sunt et dissolute. Hoc uitium dampnat Horatius ubi ait (*A.P.* 26] “sectantem leuia nerui Deficiunt animique”. Altus stilus habet hoc uitium, turgidum scilicet et inflatum. Insistens itaque aliquis alto stilo in turgidum et inflatum cadit, cum duris translationibus siue ampullosis utitur uerbis, ut est illud “Pelagus quantitatis procellosum nobis utcumque enauigandum est” et illud (*A.P.* 137) “Fortunam Priami cantabo et nobile bellum”. Hoc dampnat Horatius ubi ait (*A.P.* 27) “professus grandia turget”. Humilis stilus habet uitium aridum et exsanguie. Humili itaque stilo aliquis insistens in aridum et exsanguie decedit, quando compositio suorum uerborum sine succo est sententiarum, sicut in puerorum dictamine. Hoc dampnat Horatius ubi ait (*A.P.* 28) “Serpit humi tutus nimium timidusque procelle”. Hic autem sicut in ceteris fecimus nullam assignare possumus congruitatem.

¶ 5. Quintum uitium est incongrua materie uariatio, que fit quando dimissa materia aliquid aliud interseritur, sed in male uariando siue diuerso modo exponendo contrarietas inuenitur. Hoc dampnat Horatius ubi ait (*A.P.* 29) “Qui uariare cupit rem prodigialiter unam”. Est autem congrua materie uariatio, quando dimissa materia aliquid assumitur quod et materiam ornat et contrarietatem deuitat, sicut facit Uirgilius qui materiam suam dimittit et Eneam ad Didonem uenire fingit. Sed tam callide interserit quod legens Uirgilium de textu historie illud esse credit. Et materiam uariare solummodo poetis conuenit, qui figmentis suis ueritatem historie uariant. Unde poete, id est fictores, nominantur. Nam poire est fingere. Et

hoc interest inter uariationem materie et digressionem orationis, quod uariare materiam solummodo poetis, digredi uero ab oratione et poetis conuenit et historiographis.

¶ 6. Sextum uitium est incongrua operis imperfectio, que fit quando aliquis scribere incipit, sed uel ex ignorantia uel ex negligentia inceptum ad finem minime perducit. Hoc dampnat Horatius per similitudinem a fusore inductam ubi ait (*A.P.* 32) “Emilium circa ludum” et cetera. Est autem imperfectio congrua operis, id est non reprehendenda, quando aliquis quod incepit uel morbo uel exilio uel morte interueniente ad finem non perducit, sicut imperfectio Eneidos et Achileidos.

¶ 7. Utilitas huius operis est scientia poetandi, id est faciendi bona carmina. Titulus est: Incipit liber poetrie Horatii, uel Incipit liber Horatii de arte poetica, et idem ualet. Hoc enim est: incipiunt precepta de arte poetica. Nam ‘*poio, pois*’ (I make, you make) est fingo fingis. Inde ‘*poesis*’ uel poetria, id est fictio uel figmentum, et poeta id est factor.

The author’s subject matter in this work is the art of poetry. His intention is to give precepts about the art of poetry. The cause of this intention is bifurcated, general and particular. The general one is to instruct any poet erring in the art of poetry; the particular one, that is his private reason, is to teach the Pisones at whose request he started this work. They belonged to the nobility and were sons of Piso. Seeing that the works of other poets were exposed to severe censure, they had asked Horace, the most excellent teacher of that art, for instructions in writing, since they feared that the same could happen to themselves. In response to that request, his intention is here to give precepts for the art of poetry; but because one of them was a writer of comedy, the other a

writer of satire, and since it was for their sake that he underwent such a laborious task, he gives special rules for comedy and satire. However, in order to offer counsel to everybody, <Horace> gives general precepts relevant to any poet.

Precepts are given in two ways, that is first showing what to avoid, then what to pursue; accordingly, he first teaches what to avoid, so that he thereafter can provide rules about the art of poetry when these <compositions> have been purged from errors. For, as he says in the *Epistles*: 'Unless the vessel is clean, whatever you pour in turns sour (*Ep.*I.2.54)'.

According to Horace, there are six vices that should be avoided in a poem - not that there are not others as well, but these in particular should be avoided. The first of these is incongruous arrangement of parts, parts being the opening, the middle and the end of a literary work. These are indeed incongruously arranged 'when the beginning is discordant with the middle, and the middle with the end (*A.P.*152)'; Horace accordingly censures this fault by making the simile with the painter, where he says (*A.P.*1) 'To a human head' etc. But, conversely, a congruous arrangement of parts is when the opening is in harmony with the middle, and the middle with the end.

2. The second vice in composition is incongruous literary digression, which occurs when someone interrupts the course of speech to digress into something else that does not belong here. Horace censures this fault where he says 'one or two purple patches are sown on to them just to make a good show at a distance (*A.P.*15)'. On the other hand, a congruous digression occurs when somebody interrupts the course of his speech in order to digress into something else for utility's sake and to the advantage of his cause. This

kind of digression Tully employs in the *Verrines*. For, when he had started to accuse Verres of committing adultery in Sicily, he digresses and strays from the narrative, describing the loveliness of the surroundings, expanding on the beautiful springs, lovely trees, green fields, all to the advantage of his case, as though Verres was most likely to have committed adultery in such a delightful place.⁵⁷ Virgil does the same in the opening of the *Aeneid*. When he had mentioned that Aeneas was carrying his father and the <household> deities, after having been tossed around the world, at sea and at land, and after having been devastated by a multitude of obstacles and war, he digresses from the main theme - for it would have appeared most unlikely that such a pious man should have been afflicted by such perils - and says: 'Tell me, O, Muse, by whose heavenly rage he was struck (*Aen.*I.8)' etc. For it must have been due to the great wrath of the goddess that she had no consideration for piety. All this you will see in digressions made by other authors as well.

3. The third vice in composition is obscure brevity, which happens when somebody wants to speak succinctly, but does not succeed in making clear what he wants to say. Horace criticizes this where he says: 'Striving to be concise, I become obscure (*A.P.*25)'. Congruous brevity, on the other hand, makes the subject plain and lucid and does not generate obscurity.

4. The fourth vice in composition is incongruous variation of style. There are three kinds of speech. Some call them styles, others types (*figurae*), still others *characteres*: the simple, the middle and the exalted style. Simple style is to be used when somebody speaks of simple persons in simple words, such as is done in comedy. Middle style is when you talk of ordinary people belonging

neither to the top nor the bottom of society and do so in common, neither simple nor exalted, words, such as you find in satire. Exalted style is when you talk of highborn persons in exalted words, such as in tragedy.

Every single one of these styles has a cognate and closely corresponding vice of composition. The middle style degenerates into slack and drifting style. So when somebody is pursuing the middle style, his idiom degenerates into slack and drifting style by omitting to bind the sentences together in his efforts to achieve a plain idiom (*planitudo*), so that his sentences become abrupt and hackneyed. This vice Horace criticizes where he says: 'in the pursuit of lighter things, vigour and nerve disappears (*A.P.* 26)'. The exalted style degenerates into turgid and inflated language. So a writer aiming at the exalted style might drift into turgid and inflated style, using contrived metaphors or pompous words, e.g., 'Now we must - for better or for worse - bring our vessel through this stormy ocean of vast expanse'. This vice Horace criticizes where he says: 'professions of grandeur end in bombast (*A.P.* 27)'. The humble style degenerates into a dry and bloodless style. Accordingly, a writer aiming at the simple style, inadvertently drops into the arid and bloodless style, when his composition lacks vigour of meaning, as in school boys' exercises. This Horace criticizes where he says: 'He follows the shallow coast for safety, too much in fear of the stormy sea (*A.P.* 28)'. In neither of these instances can we find any stylistic congruity.

5. The fifth vice in composition is incongruous change in subject matter, which happens when the subject matter is suspended and something else is being inserted, so that the result is contradictory, due to clumsy variation and incoherent exposition. This is

criticized by Horace where he says: 'But whoever wants to create variety out of a unity in a monstrous fashion (*A.P.* 29)'. On the other side, congruous change in subject matter occurs when the subject matter is suspended and something is added with the result that both beauty is enhanced and contrariety avoided, for instance, as when Virgil suspends his subject matter and invents the story of Aeneas' arrival at Dido's place. But this is so elegantly inserted into the texture of the story that the reader believes it belongs to history. Only poets may introduce this kind of variation, because they may by their inventive fiction add variation to historical truth. That is why they are called poets, that is inventors of fictitious stories. For the etymology of '*poire*' (to compose) is to create fiction and poetic composition. And this is the difference between variation of subject matter and digression in speech, that only poets may make changes to the subject matter, whereas both poets and historiographers alike can avail themselves of digressions.

6. The sixth vice in composition is incongruous lack of completeness. This happens when somebody starts writing, but, either out of ignorance or negligence fails to finish what he has started on. Horace censures this by introducing the simile of a sculptor working on a bronze statue, where he says: 'Aemilius in the arena (*A.P.* 32)'. There is on the other hand a permissible lack of completeness when somebody, prevented by illness, or exile, or death, does not complete his work, as is found, for instance, in the incomplete state of the *Aeneid* and the *Achilleid*.

The usefulness of this work is the knowledge of making poetic composition, the title is: 'Horace's Book of Poetry Begins' or 'On the Art of Poetic Composition'. For the verb '*poio, pois*' (I make, you make) means to

make poetic composition (*tingo fingis*), from which comes 'poesis' or 'poetria' being 'fictio' (poetic composition) or 'figmentum' (a piece of fiction).

Hec inquirenda sunt

Vatican, Ms Bibl. Apost. Vat., Reg. Lat. 1431 (s. XII-XIII), fol. 36r-36v = **V**; another, truncated version is found in Naples, Ms Bibl. Naz., V.D.47, fols. 56v-57r (s. XIII-XIV).⁵⁸

Hec inquirenda sunt circa artem poeticam, quid sit ipsa ars, quod eius genus, que materia, quod officium, quis finis, que partes, que species, quod instrumentum, quis artifex, quare sic uocatur, que auctoris intentio in hoc libro, que libri utilitas, quo ordine tractetur in hoc opere. Exequamur igitur unumquodque.

Ars ista sic diffinitur: poetria est ars que docet scribere poetice, poetice autem ideo dictum est ut ostendatur⁵⁹ inter ipsam et gramaticam <differentia>. Gramatica namque docet scribere, sed sine soloecismo et barbarismo, poetria autem fingere docet. Nota quod aliud est poetria, aliud poesis, aliud poema. Quia poetria ars est, poesis scientia quam quisque habet faciendi poema, poema uero opus poetae, quod sic diffinitur. Poema est aliquid fictum causa delectationis aut utilitatis aut utriusque, qualitatem personarum aut negoti<or>um exprimens. Dictum est quid sit ars, de genere restat.

Genus huius artis est quod literalis est, quia litteratum facit et sub gramatica continetur.⁶⁰

Materia autem est ipsum poema ita quod unumquodque.

Officium est scribere poetice causa utilitatis aut delectationis aut utriusque. Nota hoc quod dicit (*A.P.* 333) PRODESSE VOLUNT AUT DELECTARE POETE.

Finis autem est utilitas aut delectatio aut utraque.

Partes autem sunt aut diuersa genera poematum ut heroicum aut lyricum aut

bucolicum et talia. Aut scientia faciendi poema de qualitate personarum aut de negotio, quia non poeta dicitur si careat una istarum scientiarum.

Species h<u>i<u>s artis dicuntur tria genera stilorum, que a quibusdam uocantur figure, a quibusdam characteres aut stili.⁶¹ Figure appellantur quasi compositiones uerborum. Tres sunt figure; dicitur una figura humilis, id est compositio uerborum pertinentium ad paruas <res> ut in Bucolicis inuenitur. Dicitur alia figura mediocris, id est alia compositio uerborum / fol. 36v **V** / pertinentium modo ad paruas res modo ad magnas. Dicitur alia figura alta, id est compositio uerborum pertinentium ad magnas res et altas. Hee, inquam, figurae dicuntur species a similitudine quadam. Quia sicut genus numquam extra suarum specierum aliquam reperitur, sic nullum poema reperitur extra aliquam istarum figurarum.

Instrumentum autem est narratio poetica cum duobus partibus suis, quia ipsa est in duobus, in personis et in negociis. Et, ut ait T<ullius> (*De im.* 1.24.34-28.43), quid sit esse in personis, quid in negociis, in rethorica bene dicitur, tamen hic breuiter dicamus. In personis est narratio cum poeta intendit qualitates personarum exprimere, in negociis autem cum intendit negocium explicare.

Artifex dicitur poeta quasi politor, quia uerbis rem polit sicut artifex manu. Vel poeta dicitur a '*poio, pois*' (I make, you make), quod est fingere. Ars ista poetria dicitur quia docet fingere.

Intentio auctoris est in hoc opere poetas instruere dando precepta de arte ista. Libri utilitas cognitio preceptorum.

Quo ordine tractetur hic restat. Ordo talis est. Prius docet quid non faciendum, postea quid faciendum quamuis faciat ordine conuerso. Arte tamen hunc ordinem magis apreciatius est, quia prius debemus uicia eradicare,

deinde uirtutes inserere, iuxta quod dicit 'Sincerum nisi uas quodcumque infundis acescit' (*Ep.*I.2.54).⁶² Iuxta hoc igitur Horatius in principio docet que uicia sint in materia uitanda, deinde docet que conseruanda. Videamus igitur que uicia notet in principio et quo ordine, et deinde que precepta et quo ordine.

Notat in principio sex uicia⁶³ esse uitanda in scriptura, non quod alia non sint, sed quia ista principaliter uitanda fient. Primum uicium appellatur incongrua posicio partium incongrue positarum. Quod notatur tam⁶⁴ in pictura quam in scriptura, et hoc notatur in primis duobus uersibus ubi dicit HUMANO et cetera. Secundum uocatur incompetens disgressio, quam notat ubi dicit INCEPTIS (*A.P.*14) et cetera. Tercium dicitur obscura breuitas quod notatur ubi dicit BREUIS ESSE LABORO (*A.P.*25) et cetera. Quartum uitium⁶⁵ affinitas tribus stilis de quibus supra diximus, quod notatur ubi dicit SECTANTEM LEUIA NERUI DEFICIUNT (*A.P.*26) et cetera. Quod affine humili aridum et exangue, quod autem est affine mediocri fluctuans et dissolutum dicitur, quod est affine alto uocatur turgidum et inflatum. Nota quod hec nomina assignat eis Tullius in *Rethorica* (*Rhet. ad Her.* 4.8.11-11.16), et hec omnia quasi pro uno uicio reputantur. Quintum est uiciosa affinitas prodigiali descriptioni. Quid sit prodigialis descriptio exemplo melius quam aliter docetur, ubi Vergilius, (*Ecl.*1.59): "Ante leues ergo pascentur in ethere cerui" et cetera. Docet Horacius facere prodigialem descriptionem ubi dicit QUI VARIARE CUPIT (*A.P.*29), et cetera. Sed monet uicium idem uitare, quod cicius possumus in uicium incurrere, cum dicit IN VICIUM <DUCTI> CULPE <FUGA> (*A.P.*31) et cetera. Cum possim hoc uicium exemplo ostendere quod <+++> in actoribus non reperitur, qui periti fuerunt in prodigiali descriptione,

sed credo quod hoc modo facta uiciosa essent. Si quis autem sic dixisset: Ante leues ergo pascentur nemore cerui (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 1, 59) – si quis autem sic dixisset, <non putaretur> uiciose dicere. Sextum est incongruus finis, quod contigit tum ex ignorantia tum e negligentia poete, quod notatur ubi dicit EMILIUM CIRCA LUDUM (*A.P.*32) et cetera. Hec sunt uicia que Horatius in principio artis poetice prelibat. Quo ordine iste actor tractet in sequentibus dicemus. Nunc ad litteram ueniamus./ fol. 37r / Liber iste intitulatur liber poetrie...

Concerning the Art of Poetry, the following points must be discussed: What is this particular art, what is its genus, what is its subject matter, what is its function, what is its aim, which parts does it have, and which species, what is its instrument, who is the artist, why is it called by this name, what is the intention of the author with this book, wherein lies its usefulness, what is the order of topics treated in this work, all of which we propose to deal with here.

The art is defined like this: the art of poetry is what teaches <us> to write fiction, this is said to distinguish it from grammar, since grammar teaches us to write without making mistakes, be it in the combination of words or in single, individual words, whereas the art of poetry teaches us to write fiction. Note the difference between the art of poetry, poetry and poem. For the art of poetry is an art, the poetry (*poiesis*) is that very knowledge that the individual authors have in making poems, the poem itself is the poet's oeuvre. It is defined thus: a poem is a piece of fiction made for the sake of delighting or instructing its audience, by its manner of describing the characters of the persons and describing the plot.

Here is said what the art is, now it remains to find its genus, which is the

art of literature, because it makes the practitioner into a literary person, and as such it belongs to grammar.⁶⁶ Its subject matter is the individual poems, its function is to write poetically for the sake of usefulness or delight or both.

The aim is usefulness, or delight, or both.

The constituent parts of the art of poetry are the individual genres, be it to write about heroes, write lyrics, or pastoral poetry, etc. Or, you may say, that it is the knowledge or skill to make poems focused upon character types or centred on the plot. For no one can be called a poet, if he is unskilled in either.

The species of the art of poetry are what is called the three literary styles, or forms, or characters. They are called literary forms as specific linguistic compositions. There are three, one of which is the humble style, that is the linguistic composition suited to lowly subject matter, as you find in bucolic poetry. Another is called the middle style, that is a different type of composition belonging to a variation of low and exalted subject matter. Yet another is called the high style and belongs to great things and exalted subject matter. These are called species by analogy: Just as no genus is found outside its species, similarly no poem is found that does not belong to one of these types.

The instrument is narrative fiction, which has two aspects in which it resides, characters and plot. In the same manner as Cicero says very well in his *Rhetoric*, namely about what resides in the characters and what in the actions, we shall, as succinctly as we can, say something about that topic here: Narrative linked to character is when the poet intends to go into details of the character types, narrative linked to plot is when he concentrates on plot.

The practitioner is called a poet, the

etymology of that word is closely linked to 'he who polishes', because he makes his literary subject matter come to light in the manner of somebody polishing something. Alternatively, a poet is called so from the verb 'to give shape' (*poio*, *pois*), which means to create fiction, so the art is called the art of poetry because it instructs us in fiction.

The intention of the author of this work is to give precepts for this art; the usefulness of the book is knowledge of such precepts.

The order of these precepts remains to be stated. It is the following: first he teaches us what we should not do, next what we must do, even though he could have done it in the opposite order. In the *Art (of Poetry)* he prefers this order: First we must root out vices, then plant virtues, according to his maxim: 'Unless the vessel is clean, whatever you pour in will turn sour'. Accordingly, here in the introduction Horace teaches (us) which serious mistakes or vices should be avoided concerning the chosen subject matter, secondly what we should look carefully for and preserve. So let us first look at the mistakes, then at the precepts and their order.

In the introduction, he points out six vices of composition to be avoided by writers – not that there are not other ones, but these are what first and foremost should be avoided. The first is called incongruous order of parts not being placed correctly, a mistake which is observable both in painting and writing, and singled out in the first two lines where he says: *WHEN TO A HUMAN HEAD* etc.

The second is called incompetent digression which is criticized when he says: *SERIOUS AND AMBITIOUS DESIGNS* etc.

The third is called obscure brevity, which is criticized where he says: *I TRY TO BE CONCISE* etc.

The fourth vice is the mistaken

affinity of the three styles, which we talked about above. Which he criticizes where he says: MY AIM IS SMOOTHNESS, BUT SINEWS AND SPIRIT FAIL etc. For what has affinity to the humble style becomes dry and bloodless, what is close to the middle style becomes slack and drifting, what resembles the exalted style becomes turgid and inflated, which is the Ciceronian terminology. And all these belong to the same category of mistake.

The fifth vice is the unwanted affinity to monstrous description, which is much more easily taught by example than in any other manner, e.g., as Virgil (*Ecl.*I.59) says: 'Sooner shall lightfoot stags go grazing in thin air' etc.⁶⁷ Horace instructs us in what is involved in a monstrous description where he says: THE WRITER WHO WANTS TO GIVE FANTASTIC VARIETY etc. He teaches us, however, to avoid this, since we could easily go wrong, when he says: THE FLIGHT FROM BLAME LEADS TO FAULTS etc. Even though I could show

this by example, this would not to be found in writers handling extraordinary description in a skilful manner, even though such things may go wrong. On the other hand, if somebody had put it thus: 'Sooner shall lightfoot stags go grazing in the forest', he would not be taken to say something wrong.

The sixth vice is the incongruous ending, which is a result due either to lack of experience or carelessness on the part of the poet; this Horace criticizes where he says: NEAR THE SCHOOL OF AEMILIUS etc. These are serious mistakes that Horace peruses in the introduction to his Art of poetry. The order in which he will deal with them will be said later on. Now let us start on the analysis of textual details. The title of the book is The Book of Poetry.

Karin Margareta Fredborg
Lektor, cand.mag.
Copenhagen
mfredborg1@gmail.com

ABBREVIATIONS

CCSL = *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*

CIMAGL = *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin*. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen 1969–
www.cimagl.dk since 2010.

GL = *Grammatici Latini*. Keil, H. 8 vols. Leipzig, 1855-1880. (Repr., Hildesheim, 1981)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary texts

Aemilius Asper, *Ars Grammatica*. In:

Keil, M. (ed.).

1868 *Grammatici Latini* 5, Leipzig, 547-54.

Aleph Scholia. In:

Botschuyver, H.J. (ed.)

1942 *Scholia in Horatium in codicibus Parisinis latinis 17897 et 8223 obvia quae ab Heirico Autissiodorensi profecta esse videntur*, Amsterdam.

Anonymus Turicensis. In:

Hajdu, I.

1993 "Ein Zürcher Kommentar aus dem 12. Jahrhundert zur *Ars poetica* de Horaz", *CIMAGL* 63, 231-93.

Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Documentum*. In:

Faral, E.

1971 *Les arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècle*, Paris 263-320.

Gundissalinus. In:

Baur, L. (ed.)

1903 *Gundissalinus, De divisione philosophiae* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters 4.2), Münster.

Materia commentary. In:

Friis-Jensen

1990 "The *Ars Poetica* in Twelfth-Century France.

The Horace of Matthew of Vendôme, Geoffrey of Vinsauf, and John of Garland", *CIMA-GL* 60, 319-388

Matthew of Vendôme, *Ars versificatoria*. In: Faral 1971, 106-93.

Pseudacro. In:

Keller, O. (ed.)

1902-04 *Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium vetustiora*, Leipzig.

Scholia Vindobonensia. In:

Zechmeister, J. (ed.)

1876 *Scholia Vindobonensia ad Horatii Artem Poeticam*, Vienna.

Thierry of Chartres. In:

Fredborg, K.M. (ed.)

1988 *The Latin Rhetorical Commentaries by Thierry of Chartres* (Studies & Texts 84), Toronto.

Victorinus, Marius, *Explanationes in Ciceronis Rhetoricam*. In: Halm, K.

1863 *Rhetores Latini Minores*, Leipzig, 1863 (reprint Frankfurt am Main, 1964).

Victorinus, Marius. In:

Ippolito, A. (ed.)

2006 *Marii Victorini Explanationes in Rhetoricam* (CCSL 132), Turnhout.

Secondary literature

Camargo, M.

2011 "From *Liber Versuum* to *Poetria nova*: The Evolution of Geoffrey of Vinsauf's Masterpiece", *Journal of Medieval Latin* 21, 1-16.

Camargo, M.

2012 "In Search of Geoffrey of Vinsauf's Lost 'Long Documentum'", *Journal of Medieval Latin* 22, 149-183.

- Copeland, R. & Sluiter, I. (eds.)
2009 *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric: Language Arts and Literary Theory AD 300-1475*, Oxford.
- Faral, E. (ed.)
1971 *Les arts poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe siècle*, Paris.
- Fredborg, K. M.
2000 "Ciceronian Rhetoric and the Schools". In: Van Engen, J. (ed.), *Learning Institutionalized. Teaching in the Medieval University*, Notre Dame, 21-41.
- Fredborg, K.M.
2009 "Petrus Helias's *Summa* on Cicero's *De inventionē*", *Traditio* 64, 139-82.
- Fredborg, K. M.
2014 "The *Ars Poetica* in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. From the *Vienna Scholia* to the *Materia Commentary*", *Aevum* 88/2, 399-442.
- Friis-Jensen, K.
1988 "*Horatius lyricus et ethicus*. Two Twelfth-Century School Texts on Horace's Poems", *CIMAGL* 57, 81-147.
- Friis-Jensen, K.
1990 "The *Ars Poetica* in Twelfth-Century France. The Horace of Matthew of Vendôme, Geoffrey of Vinsauf, and John of Garland", *CIMAGL* 60, 319-388.
- Friis-Jensen, K.
1991 "Addenda et Corrigenda to CIMAGL 60: 319-88", *CIMAGL* 61, 184.
- Friis-Jensen, K.
1993 "The Medieval Horace and his Lyrics". In: Ludwig, W. (ed.), *Horace, Poemre et les imitations. Un siècle d'interprétation (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 39)*, Geneva, 257-303.
- Friis-Jensen, K.
1995 "Horace and the Early Writers of Arts of Poetry". In: Ebbesen, S. (ed.), *Geschichte der Sprachtheorie 3. Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, Tübingen, 360-401.
- Friis-Jensen, K.
1997 "Medieval Commentaries on Horace". In: Mann, N. & Munk Olsen, B. (eds.), *Medieval and Renaissance Scholarship. Proceedings of the Second European Science Foundation Workshop on the Classical Tradition in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (London, The Warburg Institute, 27-28 November 1992), Leiden/New York/Köln, 51-73.
- Friis-Jensen, K.
2007 "The Reception of Horace in the Middle Ages". In: Harrison, S. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge, 291-304.
- Friis-Jensen, K.
2015 *The Medieval Horace* [eds. Fredborg, K. M. - Skaft Jensen, M. - Pade, M. - Ramming, J.] (*Analecta Romana Instituti Danici. Supplementum* 46), Rome.
- Hajdú, I.
1993 "Ein Zürcher Kommentar aus dem 12. Jahrhundert zur *Ars poetica* de Horaz", *CIMAGL* 63, 231-93.
- Hunt, R.W.
1948 "The Introductions to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century". In: *Studia Mediaevalia in Honorem admodum Reverendi Patris Raymundi Josephi Martin*, Bruges, 85-112. [Reprint in *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Collected Papers (Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 5)*, Amsterdam, 1980, 95-144].
- Hunt, R.W.
1982 "The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages: Additions and corrections, eds. by Gibson, M. T. & Hall, S. P.", *Bodleian Library Record* 11.1, 9-19.
- Huygens, R.B.C.
1970 *Accessus ad auctores, Bernard d'Utrecht, Conrad d'Hirsau, Dialogus super auctores*. Édition critique entièrement revue et augmentée, Leiden.
- Jeuneau, E.
1960 "Deux rédactions des gloses de Guillaume de Conches sur Priscien", *Revue de théologies ancienne et médiévale* 27, 5-49.
- Lewis, C.D.
1966 *The Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid of Virgil*, Oxford.
- Minnis, A.J.
1984 *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, Aldershot.
- Minnis, A.J. & Scott, A.B.
1988 *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism c. 1100 - c. 1375*, Oxford.
- Minnis, A.J. & Johnson, I. (eds.)
2005 *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism II: The Middle Ages*, Cambridge.
- Munk Olsen, B.
2013 "Accessus to the Classical Poets in the Twelfth Century". In: Ruys, J. et al. (eds.), *The Classics in the Medieval and Renaissance Classroom: The Role of Ancient Texts in the Arts Curriculum as Revealed by Surviving Manuscripts and Early Printed Books*, Turnhout, 131-43.
- Quadlbauer, F.
1962 *Die antike Theorie der Genera dicendi (Sitzungsberichte d. österreichischen Akademie des Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse 241.2)*, Wien.
- Reeve, M.D.
1983 "Horace". In: Reynolds, L.D. (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford, 182-86.
- Russell, D.A. & Winterbottom, M.
1972 *Ancient Literary Criticism. The Principal Texts in*

- New Translations*, Oxford.
- Villa, C.
1992-1994 "I Manoscritti di Orazio I-III", *Aevum* 66, 95-135; *Aevum* 67, 55-103; *Aevum* 68, 117-146.
- Ward, J.O.
2006 "A medieval 'lectio' introducing a lecture-course on the 'Rhetorica ad Herennium' by Magister Alanus". In: Cox, V. & Ward, J.O. (eds.), *The Rhetoric of Cicero in its Medieval and Early Renaissance Tradition*, Leiden, 413-27.
- Wetherbee, W.
2005 "From late Antiquity to the twelfth century". In: Minnis, A. J. & Johnson, I. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, Cambridge, 99-144.
- Woods, M.C.
2010 *Classroom Commentaries. Teaching the "Poetria Nova" across Medieval and Renaissance Europe*, Columbus.

NOTES

- ¹ Woods 2010, vii.
- ² Hunt 1948.
- ³ Munk Olsen 2013.
- ⁴ Gundissalinus, Hunt 1948, Jeuneau 1960, Ward 2006.
- ⁵ Huygens 1970, cf. Hunt 1982, Minnis 1984, Minnis & Scott 1988, Friis-Jensen 1988, 1990, 1995 (now all Friis-Jensen's essays on Horace in the Middle Ages have been collected in Friis-Jensen 2015); Wetherbee 2005, Woods 2010, Copeland & Sluiter 2009, Fredborg 2009, 163-75.
- ⁶ Friis-Jensen 2007, 291.
- ⁷ Reeve 1983, 184.
- ⁸ Villa 1992-1994.
- ⁹ Fredborg 2014.
- ¹⁰ Friis-Jensen 1995, cf. Camargo 2011, 2012. All references to manuscripts and sigla follow the main description of manuscripts below in the edition of these nine accessus.
- ¹¹ Cf. Fredborg 2014.
- ¹² See Huygens 1970, 112.1264-68.
- ¹³ See Conrad of Hirsau in Huygens 1970, 112.1266-68.
- ¹⁴ Huygens 1970, 50.
- ¹⁵ Cf. Fredborg 2014, 418-24.
- ¹⁶ Huygens 1970, 112.1300-113.1314.
- ¹⁷ *Accessus* in Huygens 1970, 50.30-33, cf. Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Clm 14.693 (s. XII), fol.1v: *Tria vitia*.
- ¹⁸ Friis-Jensen 1995, 368.
- ¹⁹ Fredborg 2014, 427-28, cf. *Sangallensis* A.P.1, St Gall, Ms Stiftsbibliothek 868, <www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/csg/0868>, p. 55, (A.P.15): Deberet enim satis aliquod uarium intexere, id est ita inmiscere, ut aliquo modo ad istud pertinere uideretur, ut Lucanus cum bellum habeat materiam, non tamen semper in cursum belli describendo inmoratur, sed etiam in describendo Appennino et Brundisio. Sed illud non est assucio, sed intextio. *Ars dicitur ab artando* Paris, Ms Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 7641, fol. 107r: Insuere; *Anonymus Turicensis*, ed. Hajdú, 248: Si contexatur; *Incipit liber poetrie*, Mss **B**, f. 27v, **P**, fol. 40v: Si autem conuenienter inducerentur, uocarentur intextio, non pannus assutus; *Materia* commentary, ed. Friis-Jensen 1990, 338: de textu historie; 340: intexta narratio.
- ²⁰ Cf. *Tria sunt* Ch.14 in Friis-Jensen 1990, 386-87.
- ²¹ *Anon. Turicensis*, ed. Hajdú 253, 259, 270, 271.
- ²² Thierry, ed. Fredborg, 121.81.
- ²³ Friis-Jensen 1990; 1995, 374-75.
- ²⁴ *Scholia Vindobonensia*, ed. Zechmeister, 2.
- ²⁵ Quadlbauer 1972, §§ 6a, 12, 25b-f, 34-37.
- ²⁶ Thierry, ed. Fredborg, 324.65.
- ²⁷ Friis-Jensen 1995.
- ²⁸ Wetherbee 2005, 128.
- ²⁹ sex] quattuor a.c. **G** quinque **G2**
- ³⁰ uniuersaliter omnes poetas] uniuersos poetas generaliter **G2**

- 31 hoc quod] hec que **G2**
 32 Carminum liber .IIII.explicit] liber **G2**
 33 Thierry of Chartres, ed. Fredborg, 71.41.
 34 introducuntur] introducuntur **P**
 35 intendit – negotium] cf. in the same manuscript, Paris, lat. 7641, the *Comm. In Carm* 3.30.1 <EXEGI MONUMENTUM
 AERE PERENNIUS> fol. 102v10: Horatius uidens se promotum in lyrico carmine - tres libros enim iam faecerat –
 habet tale *negotium* emulos suos confutare et recondere eo quod derogarent et detraherent operi suo, ostendendo
 quod nichil noceat sibi inuidia eorum. Ad hoc *intendit* ut faciat eos desistere. Vel ad hoc intendit ut ostendat quia
 numquam bonum opus inuidia opprimi poterit. Librum vero suum uocat ‘monumentum’ quia sicut monumentum
 id est sepulcrum facit haberi mortuum in memoria, ita liber suus post dissolutionem corporis [...] & fol. 102v26 in
Carm 4.1 VENUS MATER CUPIDINUM scilicet tam illiciti quam liciti amoris pungebat Horatium et incitabat stimulis suis
 eum inuitum, quamuis emeritus esset et senex, et ideo habet tale negotium in hac ode quod interpellat Venerem,
 dicens quod senex sit et impotens ulterius exercere uenerem et ideo parcat sibi, id est lenius tangat eum.
 36 Cf. the avowed aim of the *Epistles*: “to weed out vices and sow virtue”, as in Isidore, *Sententiae* 2.36.6, PL 83:637D,
 Jerome, PL 25:736C.
 37 Cf. Fredborg 2014, 406-408.
 38 hic liber intitulatur] hic est titulus *Huygens*.
 39 poetriae] poetria **AS**
 40 seu de arte poetica] *om.* **A** id est illa arte qua utuntur poetae in scribendo hic est titulus *add* Mss apud *Huygens* p.
 50.13-14 Quae omnia nichil differunt *add.* **H**
 41 quisquis – reicere] quisque poeta quid ei sequendum sit et quid fugiendum *Huygens*
 42 tamen **S**] *non legitur* **L** tantum **H** inde **M Lo**
 43 scribit] dirigit ... hunc librum *Huygens*
 44 *hic desinit* **Lo**
 45 scripta] *om.* **S** scriptura **M Muc**
 46 et sciendum – reprehensione] *aliter in Huygens*
 47 tantum] tamen **B**
 48 seu] scilicet **B**
 49 qui-poete] qui agit de instructione poetarum **M**
 50 et habet materiam - modus qui dat] dat uero in presenti libello **Mu**
 51 formare] informare **M Mu**
 52 Cf. the *Sicut in ceteris*, Bern, Ms Burgerbibl. 622, fol. 1r: Supponitur uero secundum quosdam logice principaliter, quia
 de uocali recitatione. Si quis igitur dicat: Hoc opus debet subponi logice, quia uel per dialecticam uel per rethoricam
 que nominantur logice partes, sic dicamus: Hic latius accipi logicam quam in dialectica et rethorica [...]. Potest e
 contrario subponi ethice, quia uiciosos mores poetarum et uiciosas consuetudines castigare intendit. Cf. Huygens
 1970, 50.24-27: Ethicae subponitur, quia ostendit qui mores convenient poetarum, vel potius logicae, quia ad noticiam
 rectae et ornatuae locutionis et ad exercitationem regularium scriptorum nos inducit.
 53 sicut autem scriptores - satisfaciunt] *om.* **M Mu**
 54 premissa-secuntur] *om.* (*homoioleuton*) **P Mu**
 55 et scriptorem] *om.* **B** scriptori **M Mu**
 56 I have in the translation of the *accessus* of the *Materia* commentary benefited from discussing various details with
 Karsten Friis-Jensen before his untimely death in 2012; for instance, he wanted to alter his older translation (Friis-
 Jensen 1995) of *uitia* into “vices”; I have also adopted some points of details from the translation by Copeland
 and Sluiter, and from the translation by Michael Winterbottom of the *Ars poetica*, in Russell & Winterbottom 1972,
 272-91.
 57 Also used by Matthew of Vendôme, *Ars Vers.*1.110 in Faral 1971, 147-48.
 58 Written by the same scribe that copied the *Materia* commentary fols.49r-56v: Circa artem poeticam sicut in ceteris
 artibus hec decem sunt considerata, scilicet quid ipsa ars sit, quod eius genus, que eius materia, quod officium,
 quis finis, que partes, que species, quod instrumentum, quis artifex, utrum etiam quare sit dicatur. Circa librum
 Horatii uero quem lecturi sumus, consideratur que auctoris intentio in hoc eius opere et que sit utilitas. Horum
 autem doctrina ars uocatur extrinsecus uel extrinseca. Una etenim et eadem ars est que et docet precepta traduntur. Duo-
 bus igitur modis his eadem arcetur in magistris. Exequamur ordine proposito singula que diximus. Ars igitur ista
 sic describitur. Poetria est ars que docet scribere poetice. <Poetice> autem dicitur ad differentiam (difram *a.c.* Ms)
 grammaticae. Grammatica namque licet doceat scribere, non tamen poetice, id est fingendo, sed sine soloecismo et
 barbarismo. Poetice autem scribere est fingere conuenienter. Genus uero huius et cuiuslibet artis est qualitas ipsius
 artificii secundum eius effectum. Genus igitur poetice artis id est qualitas eius hoc quod effectus est quod ipsa pars
 (pras Ms) est litteralis scientie. Litteralis enim scientia in duobus consistit per +excienciam+ in poetic... (4 *litt. non*
leguntur) id est grammaticam. Hec enim duo maxime litteratum faciunt. Sequitur uero de materia. Cuiuslibet ergo
 artis materia est id quod tractat suus artifex secundum artem sibi propositam. Materia ergo huius artis est ipsum
 poema, ita scilicet quod unumquodque; poema autem dicitur opus poete quod sic diffinitur. Poema aliquid fictum
 quod causa (quam Ms) delectationis <aut utilitatis> aut utriusque [quam utriusque] personarum aut negociorum
 qualitatem exprimens. Et notandum quod aliud poemata, aliud poesis, aliud poetria. Poema enim est fictum (fic-
 mentum Ms) aliquid quod causa (quam Ms) delectationis, utilitatis aut utriusque ut dictum est. Poetria autem ars
 est que docet scribere poetice. Poesis scientia quam habent faciendi poemata, que (quam Ms) consequitur ex arte.
 Officium autem artis poetice est scribere poetice causa (quam Ms) delectacionis uel utilitatis uel utriusque, iuxta
 illud “aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poete”. Finis uero est utilitas aut delectatio aut utrumque. Partes uero

diuersa <genera> poematum /fol.57r/ ... (6 *litt. non leguntur*) aut lyricum aut heroycum et alia. Vel partes sunt diuerse scientiae faciendi poemata de qualitate personarum aut negotiorum, quia non est poeta si careat una istarum scientiarum. Species quid huius artis dicuntur tria stilorum que a quibusdam dicuntur uocantur figure, characteres aut stili. Figure autem compositiones uerborum. Haeae autem figure, quarum una dicitur humilis, scilicet compositio uerborum pertinentium ad res humiles id est ... (5 *litt. non leguntur*) bucolicis inuenitur.

⁵⁹ ostendatur] ostenditur V

⁶⁰ Cf. Petrus Helias, ed. Reilly, 61.14-62.15, Dominicus Gundissalinus, ed. Baur, 46-47, tr. in Copeland & Sluiter, 472.

⁶¹ Cf. *Scholia Vindobonensia*, ed. Zechmeister, 2: species autem libri vocat tria genera stili: humile, mediocre et grave.

⁶² From the *Materia* comm., above.

⁶³ Cf. *Materia* commentary's six *vitia*, ed. K. Friis-Jensen 1990, 336-338; Geoffrey af Vinsauf, *Documentum* II.3.146-162, ed. Faral, 312-316.

⁶⁴ tam] tamen V

⁶⁵ uitium] uitiosum V

⁶⁶ *Vi* grammar in the large sense.

⁶⁷ Tr. Lewis 1983, 5.