KARIN MARGARETA FREDBORG

Interpretative Strategies in Horatian Commentaries from the Twelfth Century

The *Ars poetica* in the Carolingian Traditions and their Twelfth-Century Developments

Abstract

In this article I try to show how two different types of interpreting Horace's *Ars poetica*, which coexisted in French, German and Italian Schools of the eleventh and twelfth century to the fifteenth century, differ in aims and character. One tradition, here represented by the *Excerpta Monacensia*, continues the Carolingian efforts to explain through excerpts from Pomponius Porphyrio (third century CE) and the Pseudacronean corpus of glosses (ninth century) the historical and literary background of *Ars poetica*. The other tradition, represented by a set of free-standing, lemmatic commentaries on *Epodes*, *Carm.*, *A.P.* and *Epist.* by the *Anon. Parisinus*, emphasizes authorial intent, character delineation, and stylistic requirements of the different subject matter as the core subject matter of the *Ars poetica*. It upgrades Horace's lyrics 'from his youth' as pivotal for understanding the total oeuvre and his relationship to Maecenas and Augustus from his youth all the way to his 'maturest' work, the *Epistles*. The *Ars poetica* is interpreted both grammatically indicating figures and tropes, and rhetorically as a practical manual for teaching how to write good poetry and how to avoid errors of composition and style. Two appendices with short textual editions of passages discussed conclude the article.

In this article I want to show and discuss the two very different types of commentary traditions used for interpreting Horace in the twelfth century. If we may judge from the number of manuscripts, both traditions run parallel in the schools of France, Germany, and Italy.

One tradition is cast in the form of interlinear and marginal glosses surrounding Horace's text, a so-called 'variorum gloss,' which leans heavily on the late classical and Carolingian traditions and consists of excerpts from the third-century Horatian commentator Pomponius Porphyrio, inserted into the run of glosses in the two popu-

lar early commentaries, the long and detailed one by Pseudacro from the eighth or ninth century, and the medium-sized, so-called *PHI Scholia* from the tenth century. This Carolingian, very interpolated tradition, known from many other manuscripts (Noske 165, 170–72, 191–206) is here represented by a set of Horatian glosses, henceforth called *Excerpta Monacensia*, from which I shall here concentrate particularly on those to *Ars poetica*, carefully written in the margins of the late twelfth-century Munich manuscript, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 375 fols. 56r–75v (Klemm 206; Munk Olsen, *L'étude* 1:467–68). The marginalia are written by a different scribe from the one who provided the interlinear glosses, which also hold German glosses (Siewert 67–169).

The other tradition is that of a(n ideally) complete set of Horatian free-standing lemmatic commentaries, in some cases by the same author, such as is the case of those now extant (in a somewhat fragmentary form) in a miscellany manuscript of free-standing commentaries from the early twelfth century, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 7641, section **B** fols. 94r–139v (Chronopoulos 65–66 siglum **o.1**, Fredborg, "The *Ars Poetica*" 405–06 siglum **A.7**; "The Introductions" 58–60; "Sowing Virtue" 206 siglum **E.6**; Friis-Jensen, *The Medieval Horace*). In the modern rebinding, this Horatian section **B** is surrounded on both sides by another Horatian Section **A** on *Carm*. I. The section **B,** now accessible in a colour version on Gallica, the website of Bibliothèque nationale de France, is carefully written by a professional scribe, and consists of six numbered quaternions (I–VI) of which the third quaternion has lost two folios between fols. 112v and 113r. Since Horace's poetry spans several genres and many folios, the missing commentary to the *Satires* and most of the *Odes* need not surprise anybody. This is probably due to a fragmentary state of the exemplar from which it was copied, since the commentary on the *Odes* is inserted at an unusual position, after the *Epodes*, not before them, as can be seen at the table below:

Ms Paris, BnF lat. 7641, s. XII¹, [Munk Olsen, *L'étude* Cc. 19]

Horatian section **A**: Freestanding commentary to the first book of the *Odes* first quire fols. 86r–93v (*C*. I.1.1–I.18.6) and second quire fols. 140r–147r (*C*. I.18.7–I.38.8), written by a different, contemporary anonymous master and copied in a different hand.

Horatian section **B**: Freestanding commentary to *Epod*. 1–17, fols. 94r–101v, line 28,
    to *Carm*. III.28.1–IV.6.23, fol. 101v, line 28–fol. 105r, line 28,

to *Carmen saeculare* fols. 105v–106r,

to *Ars poetica* fols. 106r–116r,

to *Epist.* I.1–II.2.1, fols. 116r–139v (Munk Olsen, "The Production of the Classics" 13; Fredborg, "Sowing Virtue" 207).

For formal and linguistic reasons and because of their content, these commentaries from section **B** are best considered to have been composed by the same author. The format is idiosyncratic, since all the commentaries of section **B** share an unusual scholastic introduction type used for both the *accessus*, and the initial glosses, where the author throughout indicates the *negotium* and *intencio* of the individual poems, be it the *Epodes, Odes*, the *Carmen saeculare*, the *Ars poetica* or the individual *Epistles*. In the various *accessus*, edited below as Appendix I, the *negotium - intentio* sections are preceded by the etymologies of various genres: '*Epodon,*' '*Carmen saeculare,*' '*Ars*' and '*Epistolae*' respectively. Such an entry named *negotium* is not found in any other of the extant twelfth-century *Ars* or *Epistles* commentaries, but belongs to *Odes* commentaries as the author also points out, Appendix I, section **E**, §4 (Friis-Jensen, "*Horatius Liricus et Ethicus*").

It was frequently maintained in the Middle Ages that the *Odes* and other lyrics were a work from Horace's youth, in contrast to the *Epistles* belonging to his manhood years (Friis-Jensen, "The Medieval Horace and his Lyrics"). Accordingly, the *Epodes accessus* refers to Horace's affection for Maecenas going back to his youth, and the commentator mentions the first ode and the dedication of the volume of *Odes* to Maecenas, just as he points out in the beginning of the *Epistles accessus* that Horace had earlier been celebrating Maecenas in lyric metres.

The *negotium* sections introduce the main theme(s) of the individual poems, whereas the *intentio* sections cover more topics and often concern contemporary readers, *e.g.,* as in the introduction to *Ode* III.28, Appendix I, section **B** §§1–2:

> To Lidis. The *negotium* here is his address to his girlfriend Lidis, inviting her to sing hymns and drink wine in honour of Neptune, whose feast is celebrated that day. His *intention* is that we should be keen on the feast of any god, in the same manner as he is keen to celebrate the feast of Neptune. Accordingly he appears to direct our attention towards religion (*nos instruere ad religionem*).

Besides the general, formal idiosyncrasies of the *accessus* and initial glosses, there are linguistic similarities, *e.g.*, the unusual word (*mentualiter*) used for "mentally" (vs. 'physically'), Appendix I, section **A** §7–8, and "vernacular" in a variant medieval spelling fols. 108r, 130v (*vulgalitas* not *vulgaritas*).[1] The author also has the habit of using an introductory "indeed" (*Vere*) everywhere, underlining his conclusions; there some thirty occurrences of this in the *Epistles* commentary, roughly twenty in the one on the *Ars poetica*, and four in the *Odes* commentary. However, the most significant difference of this commentary from any other twelfth-century *Ars* commentary is the author's unabated interest in rhetoric, in *captatio beniuolentiae* and his very frequent indications of figures of speech. The short *Epodes* commentary mentions a number of figures: *hypallage* (fol. 94r: *Epod.* 1.24), *effexegesis* (fol. 94v: *Epod.* 2.33), *aposiopesis* (fol. 95r: *Epod.* 2.39), *silempsis* (fol. 95v: *Epod.* 4.5), and *afferesis, emphatice, yronice* (fol. 97v: *Epod.* 8.7). The *Ars* commentary includes a good deal more (Fredborg, "The *Ars Poetica*"), and particularly the longest commentary, that on the *Epistles*, indicates a long range of figures important for understanding the tone used by Horace. Here irony is very often pointed out, but also the use of metonomy, allegory and metaphor, understatement (*litotes*), *emphasis*, direct address involving change from third to second person in the verb (*apostrophe*), and the inner logic of word order in difficult passages is shown by indicating the use of *hyperbaton* and *endiadys* (Fredborg, "Sowing Virtue" 227–28).

Apart from rhetoric, figures and tropes, the author is also interested in showing the logical structure of Horace's arguments. He not only indicates topics for arguments, and specifies inductive argumentation, but also suppressed premises and omitted conclusions.[2] These rhetorical and quasi-dialectical strategies differ somewhat from the author's use of grammatical elucidations. In general, twelfth-century Horatian commentaries – in contrast to both ancient commentaries and the later Renaissance ones – supply a rather limited amount of grammatical help. In contrast this commentary offers a number of grammatical observations, such as pointing out deponent verbs cast in the form of active verbs (*meret* for *meretur*), noticing admired neologisms after a Greek pattern, the use of indicative or subjunctive in conditional clauses, use of particles and adverbs; however, we do not come across many grammatical rules and only implicit references to the grammarian Priscian and his *Institutiones grammaticae*.[3]

1. *Comm. Ars* fol. 108r (*A.P.*46): "[…] ut uulgalitas sonet; *Comm.Epist.*, fol. 130v (*Epist.* I.16.55): FABAE. Dicit secundum uulgalitatem Longobardorum." *Comm. Epod.* Fol. 95r *Epod.* 3: "℔ Horatius cenauerat in domo Mecenatis et comederat allium cum aliis herbis coctis crudum intermixtum, nescio an ex industria intermixtum, an ex ignorantia, quod sibi multum nocebat. Talis enim cibus insolitus est Longobardis."

2. Fol. 125r (*Epist.* I.8.1): "Laudabat illud medium, temperantiam scilicet, unde multi decipiebantur putantes haec duo immediata contraria," *cf.* Arist. *Cat.* 10, 13a13, AL 34.16). Fol. 101v (*Epod.* 17.66): "TANTALUS. Infidus pater apposuit filium suum Pelopem diis ad comedendum, quare habet penam in inferno qui uidet escas et non potest eas attingere. Contra inductiones quas posuit Horatius ut sibi parceret, ponit ipsa alias contrarias quod non parcet sibi;" fol. 109v (*A.P.* 118): "Colchus , Assirius secundum nationes inducuntur, Colchus est inducendus seuus;" fol. 124r (*Epist.* 1.7.46): "sub inductione;" fol. 131r (*Epist.* 1.17.1): "per inductionem;" fol. 96r (*Epod.* 5.1): "Poetae ponunt 'at' et 'igitur' in principiis suorum carminum, quae non respiciunt ad precedentia libri, sed continuantur extra librum;" fol.119v (*Epist.* 1.2.46), fol.125r (*Epist.* 1.8.16), fol.125v (*Epist.* 1.10.12), fol. 131r (*Epist.* 1.17.6), fol.135v (*Epist.* II.1.18), fol. 138r (*Epist.* II.1.162).

3. Priscian: The French commentator, fol. 137r (*Epist.* II.1.103) refers implicitly to Priscian's "Quanto iuniores, tanto perspicaciores," Prol. 1 (*Grammatici Latini* 2: 1.7), endorsing Horace's claim that modern Latin poets as inheritors from the ancient Greeks were more advanced than Plautus and his age.

Who was the Author of Paris 7641?

As in all medieval Horatian commentaries, the author is anonymous. He must have been French, since he occasionally uses French words such as 'musard' (idiot) in the *Epistles* commentary, and 'gobaudum' (drinking vessel). Perhaps he can be allocated to the region of Limousin in Haute-Marne, because he takes a stand against the neologism 'effrontare' (to address) in the *Ars poetica* commentary, where he mentions that it was a bishop of Langres, *episcopus Lingonensis*, who had criticised this 'effrontare' as "being as ugly in sound as in meaning" (Fredborg, "The *Ars Poetica*" 406).

Didactically the *Anon. Parisinus*, as I shall call him here, interprets and illustrates Horace from Horace's own poems, as in the *accessus*, Appendix I section *A* §9 and section *E* §1, but he also freely refers to other Latin poets within the school canon, such as Lucan, Virgil and Terence. Interestingly, in the *Ars poetica accessus*, Appendix I, section *D* §6, he emphasizes that the *Ars poetica* belongs to the linguistic arts in the broad sense (*logica*), not to ethics, under which classical authors were ordinarily classified (Chronopoulos 72). He likewise specifies *D* §5 that Horace's intention in the *Ars poetica* is a practical one, to render poets "blameless and without reproach", since they have been given from the *Ars poetica* a rule to follow (*regula*), formal guidance (*forma*) and a quality stamp or genre guidance (*sigillum*) impressed upon them, a set of laws (*lex*), and a method (*iter*) to follow.[4] After the *accessus*, in a later comment upon *Ars poet.* 131 'operis lex,' he makes clear that he by 'law' means unity of composition, taken to be the overriding theme of Horace's *Ars poetica* (Fredborg, "The *Ars Poetica*" 411). Such unity of composition, the *Anon. Parisinus* had earlier (*A.P.* 12–29) described as a matter of the right character delineation (*proprietates*), avoidance of "purple patches" (*A.P.* 15–16) and unnecessary digressions, and a sustained striving for stylistic unity, by not conflating the middle style with the humble or grand style in an inartistic manner. Unlike some of the contemporary German commentators, *e.g.*, the eleventh-century *Scholia Vindobonensia* (Zechmeister 2) and the twelfth-century *Anon. Turicensis* (Hajdú 248–50), he avoids the rather heavy-handed use of *virtutes* and *vitia dicendi* from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV.8.11–IV.11.16, that is the use of the grand, middle and humble styles with their concomitant vices, as when the grand style deteriorates into pomposity, the middle style loses momentum and cohesion, or the humble style degener-

4. Cf. Huygens 113, 1300–09: "Intendit autem in hoc opere poetarum aliquorum supercilium reprehendere, qui nomen quidem scriptorum usurpantes opus indiscreto stilo cuderunt nec modum vel ordinem debitum operi suo dedicarunt. Quorum notabili temeritate vel imperitia redarguta, qui modus, lex et ordo, qui tenor in qualitate digressioneum, quis stilus in gestis rerum, locis, aetate, tempore vel personis tenendus et observandus sit, quomodo membra capiti cohereant, id est diversae sententiae uniformi materiae, precepta dedit per multas et varias comparationes, auctorum probans vel virtutes vel errores."

ates into vulgarity (Fredborg, "The *Ars Poetica*" 429–33). Similarly, other theories that engaged many contemporaries, on the right use of digressions and natural vs. artificial narrative order, are briefly touched upon (Fredborg, "The *Ars Poetica*" 424–28), but then the *Anon. Parisinus* returns to examples from Virgil, *e.g.*, the Horatian rule concerning digressions: "Don't insert purple patches (*A.P.*14)" is illustrated by a quotation from the *Eclogue* I.73 that one should put together literary material as orderly as if one were grafting pear trees and vines.[5]

The intentions of many individual *Epistles, Epodes* and *Odes* are interpreted as ethical and moral concerns, ranging from the noblest of motives, striving for political stability, social and ethical perfection, and avoiding uncouth, uncivilized behaviour, down to everyday concerns caused by love, jealousy, and worldly pursuits. Since it is the hallmark of twelfth-century poetics to explore character delineation, *proprietates* (Friis-Jensen, "Horace and the Early Writers," Fredborg, "The *Ars Poetica*"), and authorial intent (Kelly 37–38), and since authorial intent involves an interest in the *persona* of the addressee in any poem, it is no surprise that in this twelfth-century tradition of Horatian commentaries, the *persona* in each poem is carefully accounted for by the *Anon. Parisinus*. Here particularly the *Epistles* and the *Epodes* cover a vast array of characters, ranging from the highest Roman nobility such as Horace's patron Maecenas, to mundane characters like Horace's former girlfriends – not to mention the murderous witch and master of poison Canidia (*princeps et magistra ueneficii*) of *Epode* 5 preparing to sacrifice a young boy and after his death to turn him into a love-potion for her faithless lover.[6]

Pseudacro and the *PHI Scholia*

In contrast, Horace's intentions played a very small part in the Carolingian versions of Pseudacro and the *PHI Scholia*; and these earlier commentaries carry no formal *accessus* dividable into such didactic headings as *intentio, negotium* and *cui parti philosophiae* (Hunt; Huygens; Munk Olsen, "*Accessus* to Classical Poets"). Instead, they address themselves to Horace's text immediately after the first sentence. In the *Excerpta Monacensia* we first have the short introductory lines from the *PHI Scholia*; then comes the initial gloss of Pseudacro, both leading the reader directly into the text, without any didactic specifications – for the emphasis lies elsewhere. Pseudacro

5. fol. 107r (*A.P.* 14): "Nam assuere dicimus inconuenienter apponere, insuere uero honeste inserere, unde Virgilius: Insere nunc, Melibee, piros et pone in ordine uites" (*Ecl.* 1.73).

6. Cf. Watson 100–03; see also Monika Otter's contribution in this issue of *Interfaces*.

and the *PHI* glosses offer many comparisons with other poets and are often antiquarian. Buried under a lot of later material they have preserved for us linguistic, prosopographic, geographical, historical, and literary information and insights into, for instance, some of the philosophical attitudes of the Stoics and Epicureans, not to mention reminiscences from the third-century commentator Pomponius Porphyrio's glosses. The shadowy third-century commentator Porphyrio's glosses to the *Ars poetica,* which have survived in a fifth-century abbreviated recension covering barely twenty pages in the modern edition (Diederich; Kalinina; Zetzel), are famous for indicating, for instance, Horace's indebtedness to the *Poetics* by the shadowy Aristotelian literary critic Neoptolemos of Parion, a piece of *Quellenkritik* that in fact figures very prominently already in Renaissance commentaries and fifteenth-century glosses (Pomponius Porphyrio 162.6–7; Buonocore 312, Tab. xxvi).

Pseudacro is often pedagogically interesting, as this commentary in certain respects sets the standard for teaching Horace, inviting contemporary medieval teachers to include indications of figures and tropes, as well as memorable cross-references to both prose and poetic usage in other Greek and Latin authors, be it authors now long forgotten, or household names such as Sallust, Cicero, Terence, Virgil, and the satirists. The literary comparisons became a shared subject matter in both exegetical traditions. Other matters, such as information on historical *realia* to be found in the Carolingian glosses, were often omitted by the twelfth-century commentators.

However, since Pseudacro by nature is a *variorum gloss,* transmitted in the margins of Horace's text until these glosses in the fifteenth century were collected into full lemmatic commentaries and called the work of Acro, the Pseudacronian corpus is vulnerable and susceptible to additions, omissions, and changes, and it lists many alternative possibilities of interpretation without opting for one or the other (Zetzel, Noske). Nor does Pseudacro, as did later the Renaissance commentaries, use even the most elementary textual criticism to help correct the vulgate text of *Ars poetica* (Kallendorf).

With particular regard to matters of different genre requirements concerning tragedy, comedy and satire (often confused with Satyr plays), Pseudacro offers little of independent value to contemporary Carolingian readers and the later Middle Ages, and we shall have to wait well into the Renaissance, especially Cristoforo Landino (*c.* 1424–98) for an historically based and genuine interest in classical drama (Landino 109, 144).

Let me give an example of this composite nature of Pseudacronian glossing: a quadripartite gloss (*A.P.* 288), of which the first section distinguishes between Roman tragedy and comedy, the second distinguishes between two kinds of comedy, of which the *togata* had a Greek origin (*sic*!), the other one a Roman origin, the third section lists some names of Roman dramatic authors, and the last distinguishes between drama with little and much movement (*stataria, motoria*), or indicates different social levels, the *palliata* normally being the one with Greek roots since *pallium* was taken to be a Greek costume, compared with the Roman *toga*, and the (*fabula*) *praetexta* signalling the world of noble Roman citizens in contradistinction to the *tabernaria* for the lower social level:

> Dicit quia illi, qui exemplaria Greca secuti non sunt, sed potius Latinos poetas[7] meruerunt maximum donum.[8] Pretextam *quidam* dicunt significare[9] tragoediam, togatam autem comediam. *Alii* autem dicunt praetextam et togatam comedias esse, sed togatas in quibus sunt Graeca argumenta.[10] Praetextas et togatas scripserunt Aelius Lamia, Antonius Rufus.[11] Comoediarum genera sunt sex: stataria, motoria, pretextata, tabernaria, togata, palliata. (*Excerpta Monacensia* fol. 71v, cf. Pseudacro *Scholia* 355.26–356.10 [*A.P.* 288])

(He says that those poets who did not follow the exemplary Greeks, but instead the Latin poets earned the maximum gift. Some people take the Praetextae to be tragedy, but more specifically those were called the Togatae in which there was a Greek story, the Praetextae in which there was a Latin one. These Praetextae and Togatae were written by Aelius Lamia, Antonius Rufus. There are six different types of comedies: the static one, those with movement, those of the Praetexta [a dress with a purple border, worn by the nobility and young boys], those belonging to the brothels, the Togata [adult, male Roman dress], and the Palliata [pallium = Greek cloak or the dress of a hetaira].)

It would be presumptuous, even wrong, to expect that a medieval Latin-speaking audience with no personal knowledge of Greek literature would have had any means to disentangle such information on Roman drama; after all, they had only access to a selection of comedies by Terence, albeit accompanied by medieval commentaries, and to a limited number of copies of Plautus (Reynolds 302–06, 412–20).

7. Dicit–poetas] cum desissent postea nostri Graecos imitari et historias Latinas scribere laudati sunt, id est et qui praetextas fabulas fecerunt uel togatas Pseudacro *Mss. apud Keller.*

8. maximum donum] nimium decus *Mss apud Keller.*

9. significare] om. *Mss apud Keller.*

10. *post* argumenta] praetextas in quibus [sunt] latina *add. Mss apud Keller.*

11. *post* Rufus] Gneus Melissus, Africanus Pomponius *add. Mss apud Keller.*

As a result, the Munich compiler in his version of Pseudacro copied the full gloss on *Ars poetica* 288, lock, stock and barrel, as a legacy from former authorities, and left it to the teachers expounding Horace to deal with it themselves.

Instead the redactor and compiler mostly highlight the conciseness of Pseudacro and the attempts of the *PHI Scholia* to organize Horace's text, as can be seen at the very outset of these *Excerpta Monacensia*:

12. librum] quintum *Mss apud Botschuyver.* The whole passage can be found in Botschuyver, *Scholia in Horatium Lambda* 423.3.

13. *post* rerum] suis dictis *add. Mss apud Botschuyver.*

14. instrui] institui *Mss apud Botschuyver.*

15. componit] compilat *Mss apud Botschuyver.*

16. inquiens] dicens *Mss apud Botschuyver.*

Istum librum[12] de arte poetica ad quendam Pisonem composuit, in quo uitia superstitiosorum poetarum cauenda esse docet, qui ordines et similitudines rerum[13] non seruant, simulque precepta poetriae tribuit quibus instrui[14] possunt studiosi quique poetarum. Unde in primordio dicit deridendum eum qui <de> una re disputare inchoans diuersitatem materiarum componit,[15] sicut, inquiens,[16] pictor si humano capiti ceruicem <equinam> dederit, superiorem partem uidelicet mulieris formosae speciem habentem pennis decorauerit et in piscem desinere fecerit, deridebitur, ita poeta si ultra modum materiam sumpserit et inordinatam sensu compilatam<que> verbis meruit derideri. (*Excerpta Monacensia*, fol. 65v)

(He composed this book on Poetics for somebody called Piso. In this he teaches one to beware of the faults committed by feebleminded poets, who do not observe the order and proportions of things. At the same time, he teaches preceptive poetics from which any studious poet would learn. Thus, in the very beginning he says that such a man is simply ridiculous and laughable, who, if he has started in one way, then introduces a diversity of topics, much in the manner of a painter is to be considered ridiculous, if he had first joined a horse's neck to a human head, and a beautiful woman's face at that, and then decorated her with a plumage of feathers, and completed the figure with a fish's tail. Accordingly, a poet likewise deserved to be ridiculed, if he had picked a disorganized topic, having no sensible meaning, and dressed up in <the wrong> words.)

Immediately after this introduction taken from *PHI* follows Pseudacro's first gloss:

<HUMANO> (*A.P.* 1) De inequalitate operis loquitur et dat preceptum scribendi poema. Et primum preceptum est de dispositione et conuenientia carminis. Scribit autem ad Pisones uiros nobiles et disertos, ad patrem et filium, uel ut alii dicunt ad fratres. <HUMANO CAPITI>. "Comparat poema, \dicens/ quod sine honore[17] sit pictura<e> eiusmodi quae habeat equinam ceruicem cum forma humana et diuersorum animalium membra et pennas uolucris habens "desinat in atrum piscem" etc. (*Ibid.* fol. 66r *marg. sup.* [from Pseudacro, ed. Keller, 309.4–12])

(He talks about lack of organization in a literary work, and he gives instruction in writing poetry. The first precept concerns disposition and coherence in a poem. He writes to some noble men and skilled speakers called Piso, a father and a son, or according to others to two brothers. To A HUMAN HEAD. He compares a poem, saying that if it has no claim to be respected, it will be like that kind of a picture which has a horse's neck and a human form and various parts of other animals and feathers of a bird and 'ends in a dark fish'.)

Who was the Munich compiler?

The Munich compiler is, as usual, anonymous, and only rarely deviates from excerpting Pseudacro and the *PHI Scholia* (roughly 10–15 per cent of each) by adding extra information from Isidore, Boethius and others. He is, furthermore, selective in the folios that cover the *Ars poetica*; he generally omits the glosses on figures of style adduced by Pseudacro, and the references to Greek and Roman poets. Instead he emphasizes mythological details and, occasionally, historical background material, including a few excerpts directly from Pomponius Porphyrio. A comparison with the corresponding passages in Pseudacro and *PHI Scholia*, as set out in the table below, shows that the compiler of this Munich manuscript actually had independent access to a copy of Pomponius Porphyrio, whose text in the twelfth century was otherwise only known indirectly either from the medieval manuscript of the Lobbes monastery (Belgium), from Sedulius Scottus's moral florilegium *Collectaneum Miscellaneum*,[18] or in the quotations and allusions in the *PHI Scholia* and Pseudacro. Otherwise, in the twelfth century, Porphyrio was only preserved in

two ninth-century manuscripts, one Italian now Vatican, BAV, lat. 3314 and another German now München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 181, together with a couple of small fragments in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 7978 (s. xii), fol. 1r, and Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, B.P.L. 28, (s. x), fol. 58r.

München, Bayer. Staatsb. Clm. 375 (s.xii²), *Ars poetica* fols. 66r–75r	Pomponius Porfyrio, ed. Holder	Ps.-Acro, ed. Keller & *PHI Scholia,* ed. Botschuyver
Fol. 68r marg, superiori *A.P.*102: <Dolendum est> {.H.} Demostenicum est hoc. Nam cum ad illum unus, qui uapulauerat accessisset peteretque summisse, ut causam suam ageret eo, quod cesus esset, negauit se facturum, quia non uapulasset. Illo autem adfirmante factum esse. Tunc tertio cum indignari uideret eum et cum lacrimis affirmare quod esset affectus uerbere,[19] tunc dixit illi se credere. Capiebat enim dicendi impetum ex irascente.	Holder 167.27–168.5: Hoc Demosthenicum est. Nam cum ad illum is, qui uapulauerat, accessisset peteretque summisse, ut causam suam ageret eo, quod caesus esset, negauit se facturum, quia ille non uapulasset. Illo adfirmante <cum lacrimis> factum esse, aeque superuacuas dixit eius qu[a]erellas. Tunc tertio cum indignari uideret [et tuto adfirmante cum lacrimis adfectu], dixit nunc se illi credere. Capiebat enim dicendi impetum ex irascente.	Keller, 326.22–25: Quia substantiae harum rerum sunt formatae in animis nostris a natura, ut illud Ciceronis (*de or.* 2.45.188) "Ardeat orator si uult iudicem incendere". Cf. *PHI Scholia,* ed. Botschuyver 430.3–12: Quod tractum est ex Demosthene. Qui dum intentus esset lectioni, et ueniret ad eum quis postulans causam suam ab illo defendi <in> suo iudicio, utpote qui flagellatus fuerat, dicit ei: "mentiris", inquiens, "non vapulasti". Cui ille: "in veritate qui vapulavi". Sed dum non fleret et Demosthenes saepius diceret: "non valupasti", ille ira commotus coepit flere dicens: "in veritate qui vapulavi", ait Demosthenes: "modo", inquit, "credo te verum dicere, causa tua laborabo simulque hoc permoneo, ut si vis me flere, tibi primum dolendum est".

19. et cum lacrimis affirmare quod esset affectus uerbere] et tuto affirmante cum lacrimis adfectu Porf, *quae del. Keller.*

Fol. 68v marg sin {.K} *A.P.* 146:
"Antimachus fuit cyclicus poeta. Hic aggressus est materiam, quam sic extendit, ut uiginti quattuor uolumina impleret, antequam septem duces usque ad Thebas perduceret" (=Porfyrio, ed. Holder 169.23–26).

Holder 169.23–26:
Antimachus fuit cyclicus poeta. Hic agressus est materiam, quam sic extendit, ut uiginiti quattuor uolumina implerit, antequam septem duces usque ad Thebas perduceret.

Keller 332.9–13:
Cyclicus poeta est, qui ordinem uariare nescit […] aut nomen proprium est Cyclicus et significat Antimachum poetam. Aliter: Cyclici dicunt poetae qui ciuitatem circummeant recitantes.
PHI Scholia, ed. Botschuyver 433.7–14: "Unde et dictus est cyclicus, quasi circulator, quia superfluas ambages et circumitiones in carmine suo posuit. Admonet ergo bonum poetam ut non sit eius imitator, sed breuitati studens ne sit legentibus oneri".

Epistles Comm. I.1.1.Incipit lib. I.1 fol. 90r:
Flacci Epistolarum libri tantummodo titulo dissimiles sunt a sermonum libro. Nam metrum et materia uerborum communis assumptio eadem est. Quos ultimos operis sui esse ipse testatur Mecenati cum dicit finire se uelle operam et philosophie malle inseruire.

Epistles Comm. Ed. Holder 317.3–7:
Flacci epistularum libri titulo tantum dissimiles a sermonum sunt. Nam et metrum et materia uerborum et communis adsumptio eadem est. Quos operis sui ultimos esset ipse testatur, Maecenati cum dicit finire se operam uellet et philosophiae malle inseruire.

Epistles Comm. Ed. Keller, 205.3–9:
Epistolarum libri tantum nomine dissimiles a libris sermonum sunt; nam et metrum et materia uerborum et communis assumptio eadem est (ex Porph.). Hoc solum distare uidentur, quod hic quasi ad absentes loqui uidetur, ibi autem quasi ad praesentes loquitur. Et hii ultimi sunt sui operis libri, licet scriptorum uitio in multis codicibus locum sermonum occupauerint (cons. Pseudacro)
Cf. *PHI Scholia*, ed. Botschuyver p. 340.3–6 (shortening the initial Porph. quotation) Epistularum libri tantum nomine dissimiles a libris sermonum excepto quod hic quasi ad absentes, ibi quasi ad praesentes loquitur, et hi ultimi sunt operis sui libri, licet scriptorum vitio locum sermonum occupaverint.

20. Clm. 375, fol. 73v: "Differunt autem oppida de castello et uico et pago magnitudine, menibus et legibus" = Isid. *Etym.* xv.2.5–7. References to Boethius, *De inst. Mus.* 1.1, are found in fol. 69v upper margin, and to *De inst. Mus.* 1.20, fol. 70r. Servius, *In Virg. Aen.* 1.337, ed. Thilo-Hagen 119.19–22, at fol. 71v *marg. sin.* (*A.P.*279).

21. Clm. 375, fol. 66v (*A.P.* 32): "Emilius ludus dicebatur locus in quo Emilius quidam gladiatores suos habuit. Circa hunc ludum erat quidam statuarius nomine Imus (= Pseudacro, ed. Keller 313.28–30.). Qui cum ungues et capillos bene formaret et multa alia membra, tamen in extrema perfectione statuae deficiebat (= Pseudacro. 314.2–3). Alii dicunt Imum id est breuem (= Pseudacro 313.30–314.2). Alii locum in extrema parte ludi positum (Pseudacro 314.2 =Porphyrio, ed. Holder 164.6)."

22. 'oeconomia' is a standard term for poetic composition with regard to narrative order, very commonly used in Servius' commentary to Virgil's *Aeneid*, and appears as early as Arist. *Poet.* 1453a29, and in Quintilian I.8.9, 1.8.17, and many times in Pseudacro too, ed. Keller 309.9 (*A.P.* 1), 311.16 (*A.P.* 164), 312.27 (*A.P.* 24), 324.4 (*A.P.* 86), 350.14 (*A.P.* 242).

How and where the compiler had access to Porphyrio at this time is quite a puzzle. Admittedly, he is himself neither unscholarly nor unlearned, since he also adds precise quotations from Boethius, *De institutione musicae*, Isidore and Servius.[20] But, on the other hand, he could also be a quite an ordinary type of compiler, as we saw above in the gloss on different types of Roman drama, be it *togata* representing a Greek tradition (*sic!*) or the *comoedia praetexta*. The compiler is also prepared to copy long, nonsensical tirades from Pseudacro, *e.g.*, concerning *A.P.* 32 "Faber imus," where it is stated that the 'imus' could either be a Latin proper name (*sic!*), or might indicate the remote position of this sculptor's workshop near the palaestra of Aemilius (a garbled piece of information ultimately derived from Pomponius Porphyrio), or, even worse since it has absolutely no bearing on the text, to mean that he was not a tall man (*imus = breuis*), all in the worst possible glossator tradition.[21] As a 'variorum gloss,' Clm. 375 is selective, but to a certain extent lacks an individual focus, and it is for the twelfth century rather old-fashioned by avoiding most of the innovations in Horatian exegesis that accumulated over the eleventh and twelfth centuries, including correcting *comoedia togata* back into a Roman tradition.

Conclusion

It is time to draw some conclusions from such formally different types of commentators represented by *Excerpta Monacensia* and *Anon. Parisinus* respectively. Both were compilers, relying on the work of their predecessors, and both perhaps fairly ambitious. The Munich compiler made quite a balanced selection of the short succinct Pseudacronian glosses and the fuller *PHI Scholia*, combining and adjusting, preferring and omitting. The compiler says nothing himself about his principles of selection and why he had combined Pseudacro and the *PHI Scholia*, but in the mainly abbreviating process he specifically omits grammatical glosses and illustrative quotations. Although a few passages venture to include some Greek, like the Demosthenes anecdote, the compiler generally omits the Greek names of figures of style used by Pseudacro, and he occasionally gets the Greek wrong as when he excerpts the first gloss in Pseudacro and substitutes such an important and often used notion of poetic composition ('oeconomia') by the nonsensical honour ('honore').[22] The *Excerpta Monacensia* belong firmly to the conservative tradition, cop-

ying each gloss in its entirety, including minor, but obvious, errors such as misreading 'oeconomia.' His independent use of Pomponius Porphyrio, however, is significant. A future editor of Porphyrio would probably find more Porphyrio fragments such as the one from the beginning of the *Epistles* in the table above, both in the sections of München, Clm. 375 dealing with the Horatian lyrics, *Satires* and *Epistles* that I have not transcribed, or in other manuscripts.[23] But, at least, now we know that Porphyrio was also read in Germany not only in the ninth century, but also in the twelfth century, and not only excerpted and alluded to by the Carolingians – actually, there are several more Porphyrian excerpts in the popular *PHI Scholia* than the editor Botshyuver has cared to indicate; these are therefore collected in Appendix II.

In comparison to the Munich compiler, the early twelfth-century *Anon. Parisinus* is more circumspect and careful; the author is directly commendable, when he consistently tries in many places to elucidate one Horatian passage with the help of another, as for instance in the reference to the first *Ode* in the *accessus* of the *Epodes* commentary, Appendix 1 section *A* §9, explaining that Maecenas was in the habit of being glorified in lyric metres. Furthermore, when he borrows from the Pseudacronian tradition, he does so selectively. In the very passage (*A.P.* 32) on the infamous sculptor 'imus' working near Aemilius' palaestra, he mentions the (standard = Pseudacronian) guesswork of 'imus' that 'Imus' could be a name, but otherwise he grasps the gist of the passage and suggests the alternative that 'imus' must mean 'lowest', 'the least accomplished' (*indoctus … infimus*).[24] Throughout his commentaries he takes care to be both specific and precise, as can also be seen already in the excerpts here represented by the different *accessus* in Appendix 1. He has a welcome understanding of Horace's frequent use of irony, and in accordance with the late classical tradition of both Porphyrio and Pseudacro, he pinpoints use of figures of thought and diction, as well as poetic method and the requirements of different genres and different subject matter. If he was also the author of the alternative *accessus* to the *Ars* added in the margin – which, so far, I doubt – he underlines exactly these stylistic requirements of the different subject matter (*proprietatem uniuscuiusque rei tractare*), Appendix 1, section *D* §6.

There is a very general conclusion that should be drawn too, mentioned often enough in the studies by the late Karsten Friis-Jensen: The medieval Horace is not our Horace, since, under the influence of twelfth-century rhetoric, the frequent importations from the

discussion of the three levels of style in the *Ad Herennium*, discussions of the natural vs. the artificial narrative orders, and the rhetorical rules for use of digressions, make the medieval Horatian commentaries different from modern appreciations of Horace and biased towards a standardized literary theory with a rhetorical bent – a trend that will continue even more vigorously in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Furthermore, the medieval commentators were very concerned not only with literature but emphasized religion and a moral reading: *e.g.*, in the *accessus* and in the initial comments to *Odes* III.28 §2 and IV.1§2 the *Anon. Parisinus* thinks that Horace intends to instruct us in religion, and mentions that when suffering from pangs of love we should seek the help of God, Appendix 1, section ***B** Ode xxviii, lib. III.*§2, ***B** Ode 1, lib. IIII.*§2; he even indicates that it was God (*Deus*), who had inspired Horace in the *Epistles* to turn away from mirth (*ludicra*), Appendix 1, section ***E*** §6. Such a naivety might ultimately be due to the age-group he was teaching, and I shall refrain from heaping up more examples of the commentator's attempts at Christianization and empathy with a young poet in love, as the medieval teachers saw it in Horace's lyrics and particularly in the rough and often very outspoken erotic and satirical sections of the *Epodes* in contrast to the more moralizing tone of (most of) the *Epistles*.

Finally, amongst innumerable glosses filling the margins of our more than eight hundred extant Horatian manuscripts, the *Anon. Parisinus* represents a rare type of commentator who allows us insights into how the same teacher would explain the lyrics and other genres represented by the *Epistles* and *Ars poetica* – even though he is not the only one to comment on more or less the complete oeuvre of Horace. The late eleventh-century author of the *Aleph Scholia* is another (Friis-Jensen, "Medieval Commentaries" 53). Normally, as with the transmission of the St. Gall commentaries and the very popular "Materia" commentary on the *Ars poetica* along with the contemporary "Sciendum" commentary on the *Satires*, the "Auctor iste Venusinus" on the *Carmina*, and the "Proposuerat" commentary on the *Epistles*, we have different authors' works in miscellany manuscripts. Even worse, very often we have fragmentary commentaries and fragmented collections, particularly for the lyrics (Munk Olsen, *L'étude* 1:435–522; Friis-Jensen, "Medieval Commentaries;" Chronopoulos 63–66). To judge from the most frequent order used in Horatian glossed texts and commentaries, the lyrics precede the hexameter works, and accordingly the *Odes* were planned to come first

(taught first?) as a work from Horace's youth. We know too little about details in a course on Horace, but it is not unlikely that at least some teachers relied upon their students becoming familiar with the lyrics before approaching the *Ars*, *Satires* and *Epistles*. This sequence, starting with the young Horace writing lyrics and eventually ending with the *Epistles*, would explain why the commentators emphasize the popularity of the lyrics in antiquity and offer many references to the *Odes* and *Epodes*, why compilers quote the lyrics in the moral florilegia like the *Collectaneum* of Sedulius Scottus (Dolbeau) and the *Moralium Dogma Philosophorum* (Holmberg 23, 30–32, 36–37, 39, 41, 45, 51, 53, 55–57, 61–64, 68) and that medieval illustrators picture Horace as a young armour-clad nobleman (Friis-Jensen, *The Medieval Horace*, München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 21.563 fol. 4r).

Some of the Horatian lyrics were sung, that is set to music and neumed (Lyons 73–79, 100–80, Friis-Jensen, "The Medieval Horace and his Lyrics" 284), and the commentators on the *Ars poetica* therefore take up the question of metre and music (Fredborg, "The *Ars Poetica*" 414–16). Accordingly, since all the Horatian texts presumably were read aloud in class and learned by heart, the oral side of the teaching of Horace and other Latin poets should not be underrated. In the oral rendering of a line of Horace, the reading indicated the character of Horatian *personae* partaking in dialogue, be it in the *Odes, Satires, Epodes,* and *Epistles*; the oral performance showed whether they were of high or low social status, and further individualized them according to their age, sex, occupation, national background, etc. (Marius Victorinus 188.17–21, Ziolkowski 165–67, 171–73, Fredborg, "The *Ars Poetica*" 416–24, Woods).

Since Max Manitius, it has been customary to discover most Horatian influence coming from allusions and quotations of the hexameter poems, which has mistakenly led some scholars to believe that the Horatian lyrics were of lesser impact – contrary to what is now pointed out by Chronopoulos, Friis-Jensen and others (Wetherbee 128, Chronopoulos, Friis-Jensen, "The Medieval Horace and his Lyrics"). In my opinion, the alleged popularity of the hexameter poems (Hermand-Schebat 208–09) over the influence of Horace's lyrics need not be generally true, because most editors will find it easy to detect any sequence of hexameter lines, since the hexameter springs readily to the eye, and is easily registered by the ear as a foreign element in prose sentences – more so, I believe, than loosely quoted lyric metres and iambics. So, in the light of the actual medieval commentaries on the whole or most of the oeuvre of Horace, the medi-

eval reading of one genre must not be divorced from that of another, and there are good reasons for including the lyrics in the general appreciation of Horace in the twelfth century as in *Excerpta Monacensia* and *Anon. Parisinus*. Horace was both a very influential Latin poet writing in many genres and the only available ancient writer on poetics in the Middle Ages. To his twelfth-century students, he was interpreted exactly in this dual and complex function, and imitated by Geoffrey of Vinsauf in the *Poetria Nova* – and that regardless of whether the masters utilized the tradition-bound Carolingian commentaries studded with reminiscences from Antiquity and offering historical information, or the new literary and more rhetorical exegesis in the many free-standing lemmatic commentaries written by the twelfth-century masters themselves.

Appendix 1*: The four Horace accessus and the initial Odes commentary sections of Paris, BnF, lat. 7641, section B, fols. 94r–139v*

A *<Accessus* to the *Comm. in Epodon>*, fol. 94r: [Incipiunt glosae in epodon.] §1 Horatius promotus in laudem et gratiam Romanorum per quattuor libros odarum quos composuerat quasi adeptus locum inter lyricos uates, subsequenter scribit epodon. §2 Finitis enim odis, *'epodôn'* composuit, *'epy'* Graece supra Latine. §3 *'Epôdôn'* metrum continuum iambeum habet, cui metro licitum est interponere spondeum, ita tamen ut in primo loco intermisceatur uel in tercio. §4 Vel 'epodon' <quasi ipodon> dicitur equestre, 'ip<p>os' enim Graece equus Latine, equestre ergo dicitur eo quod currat ad modum equi; iambus enim est citus pes (*A.P.* 252), quo pede scribuntur maledictiones ob uelocitatem maledicentis. 'Iambus' enim Grece maledictio Latine, inde dicimus iambizare maledicere. §5 Vel 'epodon' dicitur quasi sine pede, quia in secundo uersu est minus unus pes quam in primo, et ab illo nomen habet. §6 Vel 'epodon' dicitur clausulare (Uguccione da Pisa 2:383), eo quod minor uersus clauditur inter duos longiores, metrum est diuersum sed materia consimilis. §7 Mecenas erat iturus in expedicionem, et iusserat Oratio ut interim Romae moraretur, quod Horatius egre ferebat; uerum est enim quod quando amicus est cum amico corporaliter, sciens prospera et aduersa minus timet; nam cum prospera eueniunt minime timet. §8 Cum uero abest corporaliter ignorans quid amico euenerit pre nimio amore timet mentualiter[25] absque intermissione, quoniam pro

25. *Cf. Com. Epist.*, fol. 129r (*Epist.* I.15): "ad Numatium Valam. \ad Numatium Valam/. Iste uel indigena Salerni fuerat et habebat Horatius noticiam eius mentualiter, uel, quod melius est, Romanus fuerat et corporaliter habuerat noticiam eius et contulerat se modo ad Salernum causa experiendi medicinas […]."

timore amici plus presagit animus aduersa quam prospera. §9 Horatius diligebat Mecenatem uehementi amore, quia familiaris suus erat, et Augusto Cesari de morte auunculi sui reconciliauerat, quem Brutus et sui occiderunt in Aede Concordiae uiginti tribus uulneribus quibus ipse consensit, et ex nimio amore dixit in prima oda (*C.*1.1.2), "O et presidium et dulce decus meum". §10 *Negotium* est ostendere quanto karitatis uinculo astrictus sibi fuerat cum secum ire in maximum laborem desideraret, non tamen ut sic posset ab eo diuitias extorquere. §11 *Intentio* est ut sub exemplo suo, procul amota simultate diligamus dominos nostros.

B *<Comm. In Carminum librum III.>*

<Comm. In>\ Ode .xxviii. lib. III. \Festo quid potius die/ fol. 101v[28]: §1 ¶ *Negotium* est quod dirigit sermonem ad Liden amicam suam, quam hortando conatur impellere ad potacionem et ymnos cantandos in honore Neptuni cuius festum eo die celebrabatur; §2 ad hoc *intendit* ut innuat nobis ut quemadmodum ipse sollicitus est de colendo festo Neptuni, et nos sollicitemus de festo uniuscuiuslibet dei; igitur uidetur nos instruere ad religionem.

26. *manu* s. xiv

<Comm.> \Ode xxx.lib. III./[26] \exegi monumentum/ <aere perennius> fol. 102v[10]: §1 Horatius uidens se promotum in lyrico carmine – tres libros enim iam f[a]ecerat – habet tale *negotium* emulos suos confutare et recondere, eo quod derogarent et detraherent operi suo, ostendendo quod nichil noceat sibi inuidia eorum. §2 Ad hoc *intendit* ut faciat eos desistere; uel ad hoc *intendit* ut ostendat quia numquam bonum opus inuidia opprimi poterit.

<Comm.> Ode 1, lib.IIII. fol. 102v[26] §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. Ex affectu cordis ponit bis "parce, parce." §2 *Intencio* est quod quando suggestiones Veneris oboriuntur in corde alicuius, debet confugere ad Deum, ut auxilio eius eas effugiat.

C *<Accessus* to the *Comm. in Carm. Saeculare>,* fol. 105v.[Incipit Seculare Carmen]. §1 Ideo dicitur 'seculare carmen' quia post centum et undecim uel decem annos, ex quibus seculum constat, ludendo et delectando, ymnus cantabatur de simili materia compositus quattuor diebus et tribus noctibus, quod carmen cum celebraret Augustus se-

cundum priscam religionem a uirginibus puerisque pretextatis in Capitolio cantatum, meritus est reputari deus esse. §2 Pro duplici deuotione fiebat ymnus carminis seculo: §3 Nam aut pro sedanda et auertenda pestilencia, aut pro certo et constituto numero centum et decem annorum. §4 Centesimo enim et decimo anno in Capitolio a puellis et pueris inpubibus cantabatur. §5 Ideo numeraturus tempora ab Apolline et Diana principium sumit, quia per compotum numini solis et lunae tempora computantur et anumerantur; unde Virgilius in Georgicis (*Georg.* 1.5–6) in capite istos, solem et lunam, id est Phebum et Dianam, super alios inuocauit ita: "Vos, o clarissima lumina mundi labentem caelo quae ducitis annum". §6 *Negotium* est generaliter interpellare deos ut propitii et clementes sint populo Romano, et specialiter interpellare Dianam et Phebum, quia Romae colebantur precipue sicut potest hic notari in principio "colendi" in futurum et "culti" olim in preterito tempore. ⁊ "Tempore sacro" id est seculari festo. §7 ⁊ "Precamur" carmine: *per silensim* accipietur de carmine, carmen *extra librum*, quod carmen monuit Sibilla dicere dis Phebo et Dianae, quos monuit dicere: "Virgines et pueros". §8 *Intencio* est, ut captet beniuolentiam populi Romani, ostendendo se esse sollicitum circa utilitatem eius, cum ipse eligit, ut casti pueri et electae puellae, quae sunt personae dignae exaudicione, orent pro Romanis, et taliter retondit emulos suos, quod non poterunt sibi nocere, cum ipse habeat gratiam populi Romani, qui usquequaque tuebitur illum. §9 Ita adaptat Horatius ut hoc uideantur canere pueri in propria persona.

D <*Accessus* to the *Comm. in Artem Poeticam*>, fol. 106r (*A.P.* 1): [Explicit. Incipiunt glosae super librum Horatii, De arte poetriae] §1 *'Ars' dicitur ab artando, eo quod artis id est "strictis preceptis constringat"* (Cassiodorus, *Gramm.*, GL 7, 213.14–15). "Ars est enim comprehensio preceptorum ad utilitatem usui accommodata" (Aemilius Asper, *Ars, GL* 5, 547.5). §2 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. §3 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 [...]. §4 *Negotium* est instruere omnes sub persona Pisonum, ostendendo quae uitia sunt uitanda poetis. §5 *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 inprimantur, et *lex* (cf. *A.P.* 135) et iter quam

27. Munk Olsen, *L'étude* IV.1 72 &
Plate IX.

teneant. \§6 **Aliter:**[27] *Intendit* Horatius in hoc opere instruere Romanos poetas quomodo ipsi *scribentes debeant secundum proprietatem uniuscuiusque rei tractare.* Et conuenientes faciendo digressiones, quomodo debeant materiam suam unire et hoc instinctu Pisonis et filiorum suorum, qui quoniam scribere uolebant comedias, rogauerunt Horatium, ut eos de arte instrueret poetica. *Modus huius operis* est reprehensio quia reprehendit poetas non bene scribentes. Modus enim tractancium alius hortatorius, alius dehortatorius, alius correctorius prout ad rem pertinet proprie. *Materia sua*: poetae de quibus agit. Cum aliis plures tractatus ethicae supponantur, iste *loycae supponi uidetur.* Quaeritur a conpluribus qua de causa librorum fiant sectiones, ad quod sic respondetur: Tales quidem sectiones triplici de causa fiunt, uel propter hoc ut materiei diuersitas ostendatur; uel propter recitaciones quae intermittebantur et iterum pro conmoda uoluntate Romanorum alia uice repetebantur; uel ob hoc ne prolixitas fastidium generet auditoribus. Descensus ad librum sic: Vere poetae debent aptare (= text of same commentary fol. 106v Vere poetae debent aptare).

E <*Accessus* to the *Comm. In Epist.*>, fol. 116r–v: [Incipiunt Glosae Epistolarum primi libri Horatii] §1 'Epy' Grec[a]e, supra Latin[a]e, 'stola' id est missio. Epistolae id est missiones uel legationes proceden/fol.116v/tes ex precedentis materiei occasione, sicut potest notari in hac prima epistola, hoc modo considerato, quod Mecenas rogabat eum et monebat modo, sicut iam multociens f[a]ecerat in lyrico carmine, in odis scilicet, cuius rei testimonium habemus in illa ode "Nolis longa fere bella Numantiae" (*C.*II.12.1), ut tractaret de laudibus actuum suorum; §2 dico, quod rogabat eum et non ut alio genere scribendi laudaret eum, nisi carmine lyrico expetebat. §3 Notandum est quod hoc modo magis, ideo quod nouum genus erat scribendi, translatum de Greco in Latinum ad imitacionem Alcei et Saphos, et omnibus propter nouitatem studiosius placebat. §4 Notandum est etiam quod principes Romani semper uolebant prouehi ymnis et laudibus. *Unaquaeque epistola habet negotium suum et intencionem, sicut et in odis habentur.* §5 In hac igitur *negotium* est excusare se quod nullo modo potest obedire orationi suae, ut ulterius intromittat se de lyrico carmine sicut ipse expetebat, in qua excusatione adducit multas et ualentes causas, ut melius eum audiat Mecenas. §6 Hae sunt causae: Aetas sua […].[3] Alia causa: non est eadem mens, et uult prodesse populo Romano retrahendo a uitiis, quia in tempore suo multum malos mores habebant, et quod rudis uirga

signum cessationis et emeriti militis data erat sibi, et quod laudauit eum in odis, et laudabit in epistolis. Et quod Deus inspirauit eum ut postponeret ludicra. §7 *Intencio* est ut compellat eum cessare ab hac oratione.

Appendix II. The Dependence of the PHI Scholia *upon Porphyrio's commentary to* Ars poetica.

Porphyrio quotations, which are not already in the Pseudacro glosses, are all implicit in the *PHI Scholia*, whereas Pseudacro simply calls Porphyrio 'Commentator' at *A.P.* 120, ed. Keller 328.15 and refers to his opinions. There existed, probably quite early, a serious contamination between the *PHI* Scholia and Pseudacro (Noske, 181–205, 280–81). Since the editor of the *PHI Scholia*, Hendrik Botschuyver, indicates only less than half of these quotations, they are all edited below. Starred entries below show those entries for which Botschuyver has indicated a dependence on Porphyrio.*

(1)* 426.14–18 (*A.P.* 53) Si moderate verba Graeca derivata fuerint, grata erunt sicut 'triclinium' quod Latine dicitur cenaculum et 'inos' id est vinum, et 'celix' id est calix et +'cocite', cf. Porph. ed. Holder 165.15–19: Magis, inquit, auctoritatem mereri possunt noua uerba, si a Graeco fonte fuerint in Latinum deriuata, ut transtulimus triclinium (ante cenaculum illud uocabamus, quia ibi cenabatur), et ab '*oínô<i>*' uinum et a coelice calicem, at a co<lo>cy<n>the curcur-*bi*tam.

(2)* 426.20–21 (*A.P.* 53–55) Cur, inquit, concessum est Plauto et Caecilio quod non licet Vergilio et Varo, nova scilicet verba fingere, cf. Porph. ed. Holder 165.20–23 : Cum Plauto Caecilioque permissum sit, <si> uoluerant, uerba fingere, cur mihi minus liceat Latinum ampliare sermonem et nouis uti verbis?

(3) 426.23–24 (*A.P.* 56) 'Invideor' pro invidetur mihi, = Porph. ed. Holder 165.23: Inuideor posuit pro: inuidetur mihi.

(4) 429.23–24 (*A.P.* 96) Telephus et Peleus] […] in habitu mendici pompatice …, = Porph. ed. Holder 167.17: Neque enim debet in habitu mendici auxilium petens regaliter loqui.

(5)* 431.5 (*A.P.* 114) Unicuique personae actus aptandus est, = Porph. ed. Holder 168.12: Hoc est: unicuique personae actus aptandus est (also in Pseudacro).

(6) 433.7–9 (*A.P.* 136) Antimachum significat Graecum poetam; qui reditum Graecorum a Troia describens in xxiiii libros dilatavit,

antequam VII duces ad Graeciam adduceret, cf. Porph. ed. Holder 169.23–26: Antimachus fuit cyclicus poeta. Hic adgressus materiam, quam sic extendit, ut uiginti quattuor uolumina imple*r*it, antequam septem duces usque ad Thebas perduceret.

(7) 434.17-21 & 434.24–27 (*A.P.* 154b): Si vis, inquit, te aspectante turba laudari in theatro, donec aulaeum levetur et recitator dicat circumstantibus: "Vos plaudite," notandi sunt tibi mores uniuscuiusque hominis, ut ea de singulis narres quae singulis personis convenient, cf. Porph.ed. Holder 169.27–170.2: si uis te a[d]spectante audiri, donec aulaeum leuetur, et donec is, qui agit, dicat "Vos ualete et plaudite" quae consummatio et comoediae et tragediae est, haec intuenda sunt. (The continuation of the *PHI Scholia* 434.27–28 "Vos valete vos plaudite," quod in Plauto et Terentio frequenter habetur is from Pseudacro: = Pseudacro, ed. Keller 335.17)

(8) 435.22–26 (*A.P.* 179) Transit ad aliud praeceptum ostendens duo genera esse nuntiorum, unum enim est quod extra scenam acta nuntiat in scenam, alterum quod in scena peracta perfert extra scenam, cf. Porph. ed. Holder 170.4–9: In tale transit '*katholikón*': Duo sunt genera nuntiorum. Alter est qui extra scaenam acta nuntiat […]. Alter est, qui in scaena commissa perfert extra scaenam.

(9)* 436.24–25 (*A.P.* 189) Id est: ne incipiat comoedia vel tragoedia plus quam quinque partibus impleri, = Porph. ed. Holder 170.12–13: neue incipiat tragoedia plus quam quinque partibus impleri.

(10) 437.4–6 (*A.P.* 192–93) Quia tres personae loquentes tragoediam et comediam narrant […] Viros, inquit, uiri defendant, feminas feminae, cf. Porph. ed. Holder 170.23–28: Tres enim personae tragoediam itemque comoediam peragunt […]. ACTORIS PARTES CHORUS OFFICIUMQUE UIRILE DEFENDAT: Id est: ne uiris agentibus feminarum inducatur chorus, neue feminis uirilis; sed agentes <s>exus <s>u[h]as partes custodiant.

(11) 437.13–14 (*A.P.* 202) fabulas quoque priori tempore certiori lege conscriptas, from Porph ed. Holder 170.30–31: Colligit priore tempore certiori lege scriptas esse fabulas, quam hoc saeculo.

(12)? 437.9 (*A.P.* 196) ILLE BONIS FAVEAT ETC.] dat aliud catholicon, not in Holder's edition. Since only Porphyrio uses 'catholicon,' cf. Porph. ed. Holder 163.2; 169.11; 170.5, this is perhaps also taken from a Porphyrio passage now lost in the abbreviated fifth c. version of Porphyrio's commentary.

(13) 442.8–12 (*A.P.* 276) Thespis genere Atheniensis primum scripsit tragoedias, ad quas agendas plaustro vehebatur per urbes Graeciae […]. Tragoedia quasi tryga, quod sonat Latine 'faecem,' cf.

Porph., ed. Holder 172.28–30 & 173.2–3: Thespis primum tragoedias scripsit genere Atheniensis, ad quas agendas plaustro circa ciuitates [egregie] Graeciae uehebatur & Ex hoc etiam putant quidam tragoediam appellatam quasi trygadiam, quia faecem '*trýga*' Graeci appellant.

(14) 442.17–19 (*A.P.* 278) Ostendit Aesculum repertorem fuisse personarum, id est larvarum et syrmatum palpitorum quoque et cothurnorum, cf. Porph. ed. Holder 173.5–6: Aeschylus primus tragoedi[i]s coturos et syrma et personam dedit.

(15)* 444.3–4 (*A.P.* 302) Omnes enim verno tempore purgationem sumunt quod vocatur '*Kathartikon*', = Porph. ed. Holder 173.22–23: Omnes enim uerno tempore purgationem sumunt, quod uocatur '*kathartikón*'.[28]

(16) 444.14 (*A.P.* 309) Id est: scire quid scribas est sapere, = Porph. ed. Holder 173.25: Id est: scire quid scribas, hoc enim sapere est.

(17)* p.449.15–16 (*A.P.* 387) Maecius fuit quidam perdiligens carminum aestimator, = Porph. ed. Holder 176.11: Maecius perdiligens carminum fuit aestimator.

(18) 450.2–5 (*A.P.* 399) Ante usum pergamenarum ea quae servanda erant ligno incidebantur, quia aereae tabulae nondum erant in usu, quae apud Graecos axones dicuntur, cf. Porph. ed. Holder 176.22–23: unde adhuc Athenis legum tabulae axones vocantur.

(19) 450.14 (*A.P.* 401) Tyrtaeum poetam luscum et claudum, = Porph. ed. Holder 177.1: Tyrtaeum clodum et luscum, quem deformen [c]riderent.

(20) 452.3–5 (*A.P.* 431) Trenodii, = Porph. ed. Holder 177.20: hi ergo uocantur '*thrênô<i>doí*'.

28. Cf. Pseudacro ed. Keller 358.13–15: Idest qui propter purgandum bilem rado caput meum, qui catharticum accipio ad purgandum me (cf. Porph.).

Bibliography

Aleph Scholia see Botschuyver *Scholia in Horatium Aleph.*

Anon. Parisinus in Ms Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Latin 7641, fols.94r–101v. Online.

Anon. Turicensis see Hajdú.

Aristoteles, *Categoriae uel Praedicamenta.* ed. Laurentius Minio-Paluello. Bruges-Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1962. Aristoteles Latinus 1.1–5.

Botschuyver, Hendrik J. *Scholia in Horatium Lambda phi psi codicum Parisinorum Latinorum 7972, 7974, 7971.* Amsterdam: H.A. Van Bottemburg, 1935.

Botschuyver, Hendrik J. *Scholia in Horatium Aleph in codicibus Parisinis Latinis 17897 et 8223 obvia.* Amsterdam: H.A. Van Bottemburg, 1942.

Buonocore, Marcus. *Codices Horatiani in Bibliotheca Apostolica Valicana.* Città del Vaticano: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1992.

Chronopoulos, Tina. "The Ethics of Horace: A Twelfth-Century Schoolroom Commentary on Horace's Odes." *Viator* 46.3 (2015): 61–94.

Conrad of Hirsau, in Huygens. 71–131.

Diederich, Silke. *Der Horazkommentar des Porphyrio im Rahmen der kaiserlichen Schul- und Bildungstradition.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999.

Dolbeau, Francois. "Recherches sur le 'Collectaneum Miscellaneum' de Sedulius Scottus." *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (*Bulletin du Cange*) 48–49 (1989–1990): 70–82.

Fredborg, Karin Margareta. "The *Ars Poetica* in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: From the *Vienna Scholia* to the *Materia* Commentary." *Aevum* 88.2 (2014): 399–442.

---. "The Introductions to Horace's *Ars Poetica* from the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: Didactic Practice and Educational Ideals." *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 39 (2014): 49–76.

---. "Sowing Virtue: Commentaries on Horace's Epistles from the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries." *Journal of Medieval Latin* 25 (2015): 197–244.

Friis-Jensen, Karsten. "*Horatius Liricus et Ethicus.* Two Twelfth-Century School Texts on Horace's Poems." *Cahiers de l'institut du Moyen-Age grec et latin* 57 (1988): 81–147. Reprinted in Friis-Jensen, *The Medieval Horace.* 13–50.

---. "The Medieval Horace and his Lyrics." *Fondation Hardt: Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 39. Éd. Walther Ludwig. Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1993. 259–303. Reprinted in Friis-Jensen, *The Medieval Horace.* 103–21.

---. "Horace and the Early Writers of Arts of Poetry." *Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter. Geschichte der Sprachtheories* 3. Ed. Sten Ebbesen. Tübingen: Günter Narr, 1995. 360–401. Reprinted in Friis-Jensen, *The Medieval Horace.* 123–49.

---. "Medieval Commentaries on Horace." *Medieval and Renaissance Scholarship. Mittellatinische Studien und Texte* 21. Ed. Nicholas Mann & Birger Munk Olsen. Leiden: Brill, 1997. 51–71. Reprinted in Friis-Jensen, *The Medieval Horace.* 159–71.

---. *The Medieval Horace.* Ed. Karin Margareta Fredborg, Minna Skafte Jensen, Marianne Pade, Johann Ramminger. *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici. Supplementum* 46 (2015).

Hajdú, István, editor. "Ein Zürcher Kommentar aus dem 12. Jahrhundert zur Ars poetica des Horaz." *Cahiers de l'institut du Moyen Age grec et latin* 63 (1993): 231–93.

Hermand-Schebat, Laure. "John of Salisbury and Classical Antiquity." *A Companion to John of Salisbury.* Éd. Christophe Grellard et Fréderique Lachaud. Leiden: Brill, 2014. 180–214.

Holmberg, John. *Das "Moralium Dogma Philosophorum" des Guillaume de Conches. Lateinisch, altfranzösisch und Mittelniederfränkisch.* Paris: H.Champion, 1929.

Horatius, *Carmina.* Ed. Friedrich Klingner. Leipzig: Teubner, 1939.

Hunt, Richard W. "The Introductions to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century." *Studia Mediaevalia in honorem admodum Reverendi Patris Raymondi Joseph Martin.* Bruges: Societas edit. "De Tempel," 1948. 85–112. Reprinted in R.W. Hunt. *The History of*

Grammar in the Middle Ages. Collected papers. Ed. Geoffrey L. Bursill-Hall. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1980. 117–44. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science series 3. Studies in the History of Linguistics 5.

Huygens, Robert B. C. *Dialogus super Auctores. Accessus ad Auctores. Bernard d'Utrecht. Conrad d'Hirsau, Dialogus super Auctores. Édition critique entièrement revue et augmentée.* Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Kalinina, Antonina. *Der Horazkommentar des Pomponius Porphyrio. Untersuchungen zu seiner Terminologie und Textgeschichte. Palingenesia* 91. Stuttgart: Fr. Steiner, 2007.

Kallendorf, Craig. "Marginalia and the Rise of Early Modern Subjectivity." *On Renaissance Commentaries.* Ed. Marianne Pade. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 2005. *Noctes Neolatinae. Neo-Latin Texts and Studies* 4. 111–28.

Kelly, Douglas. *The Arts of Poetry and Prose.* Turnhout: Brepols, 1991. Typologie des sources du Moyen âge occidental 59.

Klemm, Elisabeth. *Die romanischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek II. Die Bistümer Freising und Augsburg.* 2 vols. (online) Wiesbaden, 1988.

Landino, Christoforo. *In Quinti Horatii Flacci Artem Poetica ad Pisones Interpretationes.* A cura di Gabriele Bugada. Firenze: SISMEL. Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2012.

Lyons, Stuart. *Music in the Odes of Horace.* Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2010.

Munk Olsen, Birger. *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux xie et xiie siècles*. 6 vols. Paris: CNRS Éditions, 1982–2014.

---. "The Production of the Classics in the Eleventh and Twefth Centuries." *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics: Production and Use*. Ed. Claudine Chavannes-Mazel and Margaret M. Smith. Leiden: Anderson-Lovelace & Red Gull Press, 1996. 1–17.

---. "*Accessus* to Classical Poets in the Twelfth Century." *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*. Ed. Juanita Feros Ruys, John O. Ward & Melanie Heyworth. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013. Disputatio 20. 131–43.

Noske, Gottfried. *Quaestiones Pseudacroneae*. München, Dissertation dactilographique, 1969.

PHI Scholia see Botschuyver *Scholia in Horatium Lambda*.

Pomponius Porfyrio. *Commentum in Horatium Flaccum*. Ed. Alfred Holder. Innsbruck: Wagner, 1894. Rpt. Hildesheim: Olms, 1967.

Priscianus, *Institutionum Grammaticarum libri Octodecim*. Ed. Martin Hertz. Leipzig: Teubner, 1855. Rpt. Hildesheim: Olms, 1961. *Grammatici Latini* 2–3.

Pseudacro. *Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora*. Ed. Otto Keller. Leipzig: Teubner, 1904.

Reynolds, Leighton D. Ed. *Texts and Transmission. A survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.

Scholia Vindobonensia, in Zechmeister.

Servius. *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*. Ed. Georg Thilo & Hermann Hagen. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1881–87.

Siewert, Klaus. *Die althochdeutsche Horazglossierung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1986.

Uguccione da Pisa. *Derivationes*. Ed. Enzo Cecchini, 2 vols. Firenze: SISMEL – Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004.

Ulery, Robert W. Jr., "Sallust's 'Bellum Catilinae' in the Edition of Venice 1500: The Medieval Commentary and the Renaissance Reader." *On Renaissance Commentaries*. Ed. Marianne Pade. Hildesheim: Olms, 2005. *Noctes Neolatinae. Neo-Latin Texts and Studies* 4. 7–28.

Villa, Claudia. "I manoscritti di Orazio I–III." *Aevum* 66 (1992): 95–135; *Aevum* 67 (1993): 55–103; *Aevum* 68 (1994): 117–46.

Watson, Lindsay. "The *Epodes*: Horace's Archilochus?" *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Ed. Stephen Harrison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 93–104.

Wetherbee, Wintrop. "From the Late Antiquity to the Twelfth Century." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism II: The Middle Ages*. Ed. Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 99–144.

Woods, Marjorie C. *Weeping for Dido. The Classics in the Medieval Classroom*. Revision of the 2014 Gombrich Lectures at the Warburg Institute. Forthcoming.

Zechmeister, Joseph. *Scholia Vindobonensia ad Horatii Artem Poeticam*. Vienna: C. Geroldus Filius 1977.

Zetzel, James. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2009.02.06 reviewing Antonina Kalinina, *Der Horazkommentar des Pomponius Porphyrio*. Online.

Ziolkowski, Jan M. "Performing Grammar." *New Medieval Literatures* 11 (2009): 159–76.