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The editions and translations with commentaries that follow have been produced as a team effort over more than fifteen years. Encouraged by Rodney Dennis, who was for much of that time Curator of Manuscripts in Houghton Library, Jan M. Ziolkowski was first drawn to Houghton MS Lat 300 in the late 1980s. In 1990 he published in a journal article the poems in Group Two, along with a provisional description of the other contents. From the early 1990s through the present, Ziolkowski encouraged three Harvard University graduate students, now both present and former, to study the long poems in Group Five. This book represents a fusion of all this work, and its dedication conveys gratitude on the part of its editors to a bookman who would have been delighted to see a manuscript he loved made better known to a larger world. We regret that Rodney did not live to see the publication of this book.

Within Group Five, Poem 90 has been primarily the responsibility of Bridget K. Balint, Poem 91 of Justin Lake, and Poem 92 of Prydwyn Piper, but there has been considerable sharing among the three and equally active involvement at all stages from Ziolkowski. The general introduction incorporates the codicological work of Laura Light, but most of it embodies the efforts and insights of Balint, who also produced the introduction to Poems 90 to 95, with indispensable contributions from both Lake and Piper. To complete the work of editing the materials unique to Houghton MS Lat 300, Piper edited Group One, the rhythmic poem on the first folio, while Balint took in hand Group Six, the prose prophecy on the final folio. Balint also edited a small cento of moralizing aphorisms found on an earlier folio. Since Groups Three and Four comprise poems that have been edited already elsewhere and that consequently do not require full presentation here, the text for the whole of Houghton MS Lat 300 is now readily available in modern editions.
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INTRODUCTION

The parchment leaves of Houghton MS Lat 300 make up a booklet that in its present state comprises only five bifolia and a singleton, for a total of eleven folios that may have once formed (and indeed probably did constitute) part of a larger manuscript. It transmits an anthology of twelfth-century Latin compositions, with ninety-four poems in quantitative verse (all different types of dactylic verse), flanked by a rhythmic poem at the beginning and a prose work at the end.

These ninety-six items have been subsumed into six groups. The poems in Groups Three (Poems 18 through 87) and Four (Poems 88 and 89) have long been available in print, as edited from other manuscripts, while an editio princeps with at least provisional texts and English translations of the poems in Group Two was published in 1990 in Harvard Library Bulletin.¹ This study not only revises the first edition of Group Two, but also completes the process of disseminating the contents of MS Lat 300 by offering editions, translations, and commentaries for all six poems in Group Five (all in elegiac distichs and all apparently unique to this manuscript) as well as for the rhythmic poem that by itself has been labeled Group One and the prose text that has been tagged as Group Six.

For whom will the items in this assembly be enticing? Historians of France will encounter in the occasional poems of Groups Two and Five collections of praise and blame poems that shed light on individuals from the first half of the twelfth century, a few of them quite prominent, others barely familiar or altogether unknown. Literary historians who explore this verse will also find grist for their mills, especially since the poet or poets who composed these items shared acquaintances and preoccupations, both literary and otherwise, with the so-called Loire Valley poets, such as Hildebert of Lavardin (1036–1133), Baudri of Bourgueil (1046–1130), Marbod of Rennes (1035–1123), and Fulk of Beauvais (born in the first half of the eleventh century).² Palaeographers may be intrigued by the distinctive characteristics of the script employed by the scribes, as well as by the slightly enigmatic character of the manuscript as a whole. Last but not least, the path followed by the booklet as it wended its way across centuries and continents to reach Houghton Library holds mysteries that warrant further study. [JZ]

2. Baudri’s name is sometimes spelled Baudry. Alternative spellings of Fulk’s name include Fulcoius, Fulco, and Fulcoie. For two attempts from the past decade or so to set the love lyrics of such poets in a broader context, see Gerald A. Bond, The Loving Subject: Desire, Eloquence, and Power in Romanesque France (Philadelphia, 1995), 42–98; and Thomas C. Moser Jr., A Cosmos of Desire: The Medieval Latin Erotic Lyric in English Manuscripts (Ann Arbor, 2004), 17–65.
**Codicological Description**

Parchment (several different types, of moderate to poor quality), fols. ii (paper; fol. i, marbled) + i (unnamed parchment, blank, but ruled) + 11 (parchment leaves, foliated in pencil, bottom, inner corner, 1–11 [cited]; now interleaved with modern paper leaves that are continuously foliated together with the original parchment leaves, top, outer corner in pencil, 1–21) + i (blank, ruled parchment, foliated top, outer corner, as fol. 22), + ii (paper; fol. ii', marbled). Outer dimensions vary; assembled from unevenly shaped leaves, often notably irregular along the bottom and outer margins, 208–167 × 147–130 mm.

Layout varies. Poetic texts, fols. 1–10v, ruled space (158–140 × 123–103 mm.). Two columns, 31–25 lines. Ruled in hard point (fols. 1–2v, 5rv, 9v, 10rv) with full-length double vertical bounding lines inside, outside, and between the columns, used for the first letter of each line of verse, horizontal rules full across; or in brown crayon (fols. 3rv, 4v, 6v, 7rv, 8) or lead (fols. 4, 6, 8v, 9, 11v), generally with double full-length vertical bounding lines inside, outside, and between the columns; horizontal rules are not full-length. Ruling indiscernible, fol. 11, and very faint, fols. 7 and 9rv. Prickings for vertical bounding lines, top and bottom margins, on most folios ruled in crayon or lead. Fol. 11 (prose text), written space (145 × 113–110 mm.), 32 long lines; fol. 11v (prose text), ruled space (145 × 92 mm.), 24 long lines.

1⁰ (−3, following fol. 2; possibly canceled since there is no obvious loss of text; original parchment leaves now interleaved with modern paper leaves): see Figure 1.

Written above the top line by at least three scribes. The first scribe copied fols. 1–2v and fols. 4v–10v in a very small, upright twelfth-century minuscule. Fol. 3r–v⁰ was copied in a mature twelfth-century minuscule, approaching gothic; letter forms are fuller and ascenders and descenders notably smaller, giving the script a two-line appearance. Fol. 3v⁰–4 was copied in a script that is larger and less controlled than the script identified with the first scribe; it has been suggested that this may be the work of a third scribe. However, the similarity of the letter forms suggests that this is also the work of the first scribe. In parallel fashion, the prose text on fol. 11r is copied using very similar letter forms to fols. 3v–4 and is thus likely also by this first scribe. Fol. 11v seems to have been copied by another scribe, whose hand is not found elsewhere in the manuscript.

Each poem, fols. 1v–4, begins with 1-line red initials; red rubrics, fols. 1v–2. Blank lines for rubrics and spaces for initials in the remainder of the manuscript. Marginal ink drawings by the first scribe, fol. 2v (fox or dog), fol. 8r (animal heads), fol. 8v (fox head with long tail), and fol. 9v ("caper," "leo," and "aries").

---

Bound, s. XIX, in mottled green leather, now rubbed; gold tooled borders, front and back covers; front cover: “Poésies latines avec lettres initiales et finales distinctes. Manuscrit du XIe siècle appartenant à Monsieur Monteil.” Rebacked; spine preserved in library files with red leather label titled “Accrostiches” [sic], and added green paper label at bottom: “3[?]25.” Marbled paper endleaves. [LL]

Figure 1
Collation: Houghton Library, MS lat 300

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H = hairsdie; F = fleshside

Note that the missing leaf posited between fol. 2 and fol. 3 would have been positioned fleshside/hairsdie, preserving Gregory's rule. The quire is unusual in that Gregory's rule is broken between the first two and last two leaves.
Written in France in the second half, probably in the final third, of the twelfth century. Brief added notes, s. XII–XIII, in a number of hands include fol. 1v (bottom margin; possibly by the second scribe), fol. 4 (far outer margin, mostly trimmed, s. XIII5), fol. 7v (top margin, “Ave maria gratia,” s. XIII), fol. 8 (added cento of moral aphorisms in prose in bottom margin [see Appendix], s. XIII5, possibly English; top line, fol. 3, probably also in this hand), and fol. 11 (bottom margin, s. XII/XIII).

Provenance

Dealers' notes: in ink, s. XIX, front paper flyleaf, fol. ii: “Satirae Epigrammata et alia. XIe siècle”; and in pencil on added paper leaf (p. 18): “Feuilletts séparés d'un Ms du XI e siècle avec dessins à la plume.” Purchased by Houghton Library from Nicolaus Rauch, Switzerland; received February 23, 1965.

The manuscript belonged to a collector and amateur historian named Amans-Alexis Monteil (1759–1850), who obtained it from a private collection in Paris and who interleaved the manuscript with paper leaves. Monteil attempted, not very successfully, to produce transcriptions (most of them partial) and published a description of the manuscript as well as an edition of one poem.4 It was not included in the 1833, 1850, or 1851 sale catalogues of his library.5

As the foregoing information indicates, MS Lat 300 has been at Harvard for little more than forty years. Before its acquisition by Houghton Library from the Swiss bookdealer, the only certainty is that it belonged in the 1830s to the library of Monteil, who offered it for sale in Paris in 1836. It appears to have remained in private hands through the middle of the twentieth century, when it was reportedly in a Parisian collection.6

Monteil was a pioneer in the study of French national history, in which he was exceptional (though not unique) in aspiring to trace the history of the French people as a whole rather than exclusively of kings and ecclesiastics.7 His signal

4. Monteil, 2:177–179. Although Monteil replaced the title page of this book with a new one to claim that the first edition had been exhausted and that a second one had been produced in 1836, the first and allegedly second editions are otherwise identical.


6. In the only published notice of the manuscript, André Vernet described it as being in the hands of “un amateur parisien.” “Séance du 16 Avril,” Bulletin de la société nationale des antiquaires de France (1952–53): 52–53.

achievement was the ten-volume *Histoire des Français des divers états aux cinq derniers siècles* (Paris, 1827–1844), in which he endeavored to characterize the different classes of French society from the High Middle Ages down to his own day. To facilitate his historical researches, he collected manuscripts in great numbers. Often he rebound manuscripts, which he interleaved with sheets of paper, as was done with Houghton MS Lat 300. Although this interleaving causes those who work with manuscripts today to shudder, one of Monteil’s aims in having leaves of paper placed between the folios was to protect the parchment from damage. Another was to furnish a convenient place for the transcriptions and translations that he often attempted.8

The resale of manuscripts from his working collection generated revenues for Monteil to underwrite his own expenses, his further researches, and his further acquisitions. In fact, his description of Houghton MS Lat 300 was published in the sale catalogue of his manuscripts he had printed in 1836. Although many of these manuscripts passed into the library of the celebrated bibliomane, Sir Thomas Phillipps (1792–1872), this was not one of them.

As Monteil assembled his holdings, the libraries and archives of France persisted in the upheaval into which they had fallen in the aftermath of the Revolution. Paper and parchment were sometimes sold in bulk for commercial purposes, while in other cases unscrupulous officials gutted collections on the sly in order to line their own pockets with the proceeds from the sales. Millions of volumes were lost or destroyed, while additional millions changed ownership. Against this backdrop, it is not surprising that the provenance of MS Lat 300 is murky. Since Monteil did not keep systematic records of his suppliers, we cannot divine where he obtained MS Lat 300, whether it was already a separate booklet (although this would seem unlikely), or whether it was detached by him or by his supplier from a larger manuscript. The tantalizing annotation, penciled in French on one of the added paper leaves (fol. 18r), that refers to “separated leaves of an eleventh-century manuscript” (or “leaves separated from an eleventh-century manuscript”?) is the only modern discussion of the matter.

Perhaps the booklet belonged to the Bibliothèque municipale of Tours, a library that suffered infamously after the Revolution.9 We know of many instances of manuscripts stolen from there around 1830 that came somehow into the possession of Monteil.10 In one case Monteil dismembered a manuscript and rebound it in three volumes.11 Although Monteil was hardly alone in profiting from the disorder

into which the library of Tours had fallen, he stands out for his activity in retailing codices pilfered from the Bibliothèque municipale to the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris.

The final folio side of MS Lat 300 contains, below the prose text written there, an erasure that could represent an attempt to abrade an *ex libris*. Would the writing obliterated have pointed to the celebrated abbey of Saint-Martin of Tours? This location would dovetail ideally with the places mentioned repeatedly in the anthology. [LL and ]Z]

**Script**

Of the three scribes who wrote this manuscript, the first contributed the most. He produced a small, labored, and somewhat inconsistent example of a twelfth-century transitional script that has been labeled "protogothic documentary" or, more generally, "praegothica." His inconsistency is evident, for instance, in his final $s$, which takes on a wide variety of shapes and sizes, sometimes superscript, sometimes not—even within the same line. Characteristics of the documentary script include the persistent use of the uncial $d$ (round, shaft angled left), the 7-shaped Tironian sign, the lengthening of ascenders in the top line of text and of descenders in the bottom one, and superscript final $s$, which is simply the top half of the long two-stroke $s$ often seen in documents of this period. The first scribe has the habit of extending letters at the bottom of columns four or even five lines toward the lower edge of the folio. According to M. T. J. Webber, traits that allow more specific dating of this particular protogothic script to the last third of the twelfth century include the long undulating tail of $g$ (fol. 1v8, line 14), the trailing round $s$ (fol. 2v8, line 14), the very long limb of $h$, and the narrow initials: "The first two features can be found in documents of the 1160s, but are very rare; they become more common from the 1170s onwards."
Abbreviation is common throughout the manuscript, but it is not uniform. For example, the first scribe occasionally writes the ending -bus as b with modern semicolon (Poem 5, fol. 1v, line 7, and Poem 90, fol. 9r, line 19), but elsewhere in the same poems (for example, fol. 2r, line 10, and fol. 9r, line 20) he resorts to the more common b with an apostrophe-shaped superscript. The ligature known as the de-monogram, which figures so prominently in this manuscript, is not as unusual as once proposed, but its frequency here nonetheless remains notable. In other manuscripts it generally appears at line ends where a scribe would otherwise run out of room, and it is employed almost exclusively for the preposition de. Our scribe, however, incorporates the monogram within words as well (for example, videre, fides). (He also includes the Tironian et within words—for example, docet—and in combination with the ilde for the ending -ent.) The scribe of a Paris manuscript dated 1167 also found the de-monogram versatile, using it six times in five lines on one folio, in such forms as videbat and corde, a similarity that lends further support to the proposed dating of 1160–1190.

Orthography

The first scribe occasionally reveals something about the local conventions of pronunciation by the way he spells his words. These spellings include the very common substitution of c for t before i (for example, iusticie, 90.34, tucius, 90.42), which would presuppose a [ts] or even [s] pronunciation of t in this position. The scribe presents evidence as well for homophonic c, s, and sc (for example, sciet, 90.43, ceptna, 91.14). One of the more arresting and less common orthographic variations marks the scribe as Francophone: the substitution of a for e before a nasal consonant (and on a few occasions, e for a), reflecting an equivalence or near-equivalence in

---


17. S. Harrison Thomson, Latin Bookhands of the Later Middle Ages, 1100–1500 (Cambridge, 1960), pl. 4 (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 2702, fol. 102, dated 1167) provides this example of a proto gothic documentary hand used to copy an anthology, in this case a collection of prose works.

18. The interchange of c and t is attested before the end of the fourth century; assimilation of c also perhaps had begun to occur by that early date. See Józef Herman, Vulgar Latin, trans. Roger Wright (University Park, 2000), 43–45.
then-current (and present-day) French pronunciation. Examples of a for e include Burdegalamnes (12.2); attandit and sentancia (90.23); and sapiancia (92.13), niiandi (95.1), and splandentes (Tiburtina, fol. 11r [line 13]). One instance of the less usual e for a is testens (92.9). These spellings were not always deemed acceptable by others involved in the manuscript production, however: several are expunged and corrected in the manuscript. For example, sapiancia is corrected above the line to sapiencia in the Sibylline text (Tiburtina, fol. 11r [line 10]).

Obviously such spellings could have resulted from sheer ignorance, but that is not the only feasible explanation. The variation in the vowels could be due to the scribe’s being more accustomed to penning charters than belles lettres. In charters the spelling of place names would have sometimes reflected their pronunciation in the spoken language, and it is easy to see how the acceptability of such onomastic forms could have led scribes to employ similar orthography in regular Latin words. 19 [BKB]

**Drawings**

Drawings accompany four of the poems. 20 Since all of the drawings appear on folios where hand 1 wrote the text, hand 1 could have been the draftsman. In this case the drawings would take us into what remains largely a terra incognita in scholarship, especially at this early date:

One as-yet-little-studied form of marginal imagery is the product of the scribe rather than the illuminator. As the work of scribes such imagery consists largely of pen-drawn text articulations, responses, explications, and commentaries, which range in form from manacles to figural vignettes. 21

Whoever devised these unsophisticated drawings, it would be a mistake to regard them as impromptu sketches. In the twelfth century, and especially in a humble manuscript like Houghton MS Lat 300, drawings take the place of illuminations for

---


20. In the words of Monteil, 2:178, “Je veux du bien à ce poète du XIe siècle, qui dessinait mal, de ne pas s’être cru un grand dessinateur, d’avoir mis par dessus la représentation de quelques animaux qu’il a figurés sur les marges leurs noms, *leo, caper*.”

reasons of economy. Such drawings are likelier to hew to model-books than to a draftsman’s imagination or to observation of nature.

These drawings may have served several possible functions, none of which excludes any of the others. Ornament could have been one aim. Although the parchment of Houghton MS Lat 300 is of poor quality, the compiler took pains to collect and arrange the texts. Those involved in the production of the manuscript may have wished to add a bit of visual variety to relieve the drabness of the parchment. At the same time, the images look to be more than simply ornamental.

On 2v a barking dog or open-mawed wolf is drawn between Poems 13 and 17, perhaps to exemplify the poor hospitality of the Diomedes described in Poem 13. In the left margin of 8r two open-mouthed grotesques face the text: one is placed to signal a transition in the De genellis (line 53); the other to indicate a change of speakers in the same poem (line 65). In the left margin of 8v, beside the first column of Poem 90 (“Omnibus in rebus quas, mi Philippe, uidemus” lines 11–19), is a serpentine drollery with two loops in its tail. At the foot of 9r is a picture of a rampant lion (labeled leo) with its right paw and claws pressing into the right flank of a goat (caper) before it and its left paw and claws on the verge of doing so to a ram (aries) beneath it—perhaps a comment on political events related or implied in Poem 91 (“Francia dulcis, aue, regio bona, bella, salubris”).

The drawings could have served any and all of these purposes—to furnish ornament pleasing to the eye, to signal textual divisions, and to comment on matters of content—but they could have also functioned as mnemonic devices, helping readers to remember the texts more readily. Such use as aides-mémoire does not necessarily presume that the texts of MS Lat 300 either originated in a classroom or ended up being employed there. [JZ]

INFERENCES ABOUT MS PRODUCTION

Whether or not the scribes consciously implemented abbreviation to save space, there are certainly symptoms that this manuscript was assembled with efficiency in mind. The irregular shapes and sizes of the leaves and the poor quality of the parchment may presuppose that the producers of the manuscript welcomed whatever materials came to hand. Fol. 11r, most strikingly, may have been pressed into service already as a scrap before it reached our scribe: the decorative lengthened descenders seem carefully to avoid words already written at the foot of the page, which look to be pen-tests for a liturgical text. The scribes also began columns in campo aperto, above the top line of the writing frame, but this practice cannot be construed as an effort


to utilize writing space efficiently; scribes routinely began above the top line in the twelfth century and indeed until about 1230.

The compilers appear to have assembled the quire in stages, perhaps as additional leaves became available. This hypothesis would help to explain why the layout varies, since the folios may have been obtained at different times from different sources. Even poor parchment of irregular shape was acceptable to the compilers and was used with efficiency by the scribes. At the same time, the efficiency was hardly obsessive. It would be an exaggeration to argue that the manuscript was ruthlessly economical of space since the verse is written as verse, with adequate if not generous spacing between columns.

The picture that emerges is paradoxical. Although Monteil termed Houghton MS Lat 300 a “manuscrit autographe,” there are too many mistakes throughout the manuscript for any part of it to have been a poet's holograph.24 The texts in the manuscript are not authorial fair copies. They were selected by an individual, possibly one of the scribes, who employed or at least involved others in the production of the manuscript. The quire was not written exclusively by one person in a hand that would have been readable by him alone, but by the same token the script shows signs of being less formal and more reliant on abbreviations than many bookhands would have been. All in all, the evidence points toward the possibility that the manuscript was produced at the instigation of an individual (and perhaps for him or even with his participation) by a small coterie of scribes who relied for their parchment on institutional leftovers, which might otherwise have been coopted for the classroom, use in binding, or other purposes.

Although the letter forms and the manner and extent of abbreviation reflect the habits of the chancery more than the scriptorium, the scribe made concessions to the conventions of book writers, most notably by writing the first letter of every line of verse in the outside left margin, separated from the body of the text, and, in several poems, attaching the concluding rhymed syllables of a couplet to both lines of verse with long pen strokes. The generous distance between the columns emphasizes the beginnings and endings of the lines—a visually pleasing effect that shows consideration for the particular experience of someone reading verse. [BKB]

MS Lat 300 as a Booklet or Libellus

Although MS Lat 300 may have been conceived and maintained as a separate little volume, the odds are stronger that it was bound with other gatherings into a bigger manuscript, from which it was later separated. But this supposition cannot be either proved or denied on the basis of the frustratingly equivocal note penciled in a

nineteenth-century hand on the recto of the interleaved page facing 9v, numbered 18: “Feuillet séparé d’un Ms du Xie siècle avec dessins à la plume.”

George Rigg, expert on poetic anthologies, especially in the Anglo-Latin context, notes that many of them were compiled in one- or two-page booklets that were later bound together. Such booklets—in vernacular languages as well as in Latin—have attracted growing attention over the past quarter century from a strictly codicological point of view, from the perspective of the motives and principles that governed the selection and presentation of their poetic contents, and from the vantage point of the fiendishly intertangled relations among the surviving manuscripts. Much work remains to be done before we will have attained a comprehensive understanding of the progressions that led from their assembly as individual units to their inclusion in larger codices.

MS Lat 300 may well be part of such a libellus, although whether it was ever actually bound with similar booklets is not known. Another engaging question is, How much, if at all, did conceptions that motivated production of this and other libelli of Latin poetry in the twelfth century influence the thinking of authors and collectors who assembled songs in the vernacular languages, especially but not solely those of Occitan troubadours and Old French trouvères known variously today as Liederbücher, chansonniers, and canzonieri?

Whatever may be discovered about the relationship of MS Lat 300 to any extant manuscripts or parts of manuscripts, the booklet that has survived may well have started out as a collection of epigrams by Hildebert. Codicological evidence

---

25. The note could mean either that the folios were detached from a larger manuscript or that the folios of the manuscript were detached from one another during the process of interleaving.


points toward a separate initial production for fols. 3–8, which contain the epigrams, from fols. 1–2 and 9–11. For instance, crayon ruling appears only on fols. 3–8, even though not on every folio side there. Likewise, the arrangements of hairside and fleshsdie on fols. 3–8 and 9 follow “Gregory’s rule,” while those on fols. 1–2 and 10–11 do not.\(^9\) The presence on fol. 2v of Poem 17, which serves as a preface to the biblical epigrams that begin on fol. 3r, does not necessarily disprove the idea of production in two stages, since it could have been an addition by a clever compiler with the aim of incorporating the earlier collection more comfortably into the new whole. It is also possible (see Figure 1) that the manuscript originally contained a leaf between the present fol. 2 and fol. 3, which, if oriented with its fleshsdie first and hairsdie second, would have meant that the only leaf in violation of Gregory’s rule would have been the bifolium comprising fol. 1 and fol. 11. [BKB and JZ]

**MS Lat 300 as an Anthology**

In the twelfth century, anthologies were the most common form in which short poems in Latin such as lyrics, epigrams, and occasional verse circulated in written form among the reading public.\(^10\) One vast Latin anthology from the early thirteenth century is famous throughout the West. German composer Carl Orff’s oratorio of 1937 made the *Carmina Burana* a household word—if it had not attained this status as soon as the first edition appeared in 1847.\(^11\) Yet Orff’s twenty-five songs are just a small sampling of the anthology’s more than two hundred twenty-five quantitative and rhythmic poems, which are organized in four groups: moral-satirical poems (1–55), love lyrics (56–186), and, less distinctly, first drinking and gaming poems and then religious dramas (187–228).\(^12\)

Beyond the possible quality and the certain diversity of the poetry they contain,

---

29. Gregory’s rule is named after the nineteenth-century German scholar, Caspar René Gregory (1846–1917). Gregory was the first to observe that medieval manuscripts present a regular alternation, in which every opening has facing each other a verso and a recto that are both either hairsdie or fleshsdie. For discussion, see Jacques Lemaire, *Introduction à la codicologie* (Louvain-la-Neuve 1989), 46–47.


anthologies are important for many reasons. No two medieval Latin anthologies are exactly the same. Rather, they vary according to the tastes and values of individuals or communities. Thus they are literary museums or, to take a metaphor from within the world of books, they are scrapbooks or commonplace books that reveal what was available and considered worth preserving and displaying. Accordingly, the anthologies sometimes constitute useful guides to medieval reading tastes and of cultural influences.\(^{33}\) In many cases they provide tacit bestseller lists for their periods, since their contents indicate which poets and poems were in vogue in a given time and place. In short, anthologies have been recognized to hold considerable value for understanding the literary milieus of the Middle Ages.\(^{34}\)

Since in the manuscript culture of the Middle Ages every anthology is unique, each one may provide insight into the relationships among other anthologies. Even a quick survey of the poems in Houghton MS Lat 300 suggests that the collection could eventually help in determining the filiation of some other, later anthologies. For instance, it is noteworthy that Houghton MS Lat 300 shares with Rg six items, Poems 2, 3, 7, 11, 12, and 88. Rg is itself closely connected with T: the two have in common sixteen items.\(^{35}\) In turn, Houghton MS Lat 300 shares two items with T, Poems 5 and 88, the *De genellis*; but the first piece is not found in Rg.

To look in a different direction, Houghton MS Lat 300 shares with Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 115 (s. XII\(^{\text{2}}\)) both Poems 18 through 87, which are the biblical epigrams (including the “Natus homo, uitulus moriendo, leoque resurgens”), and Poem 89, *De paupere ignatio*.\(^{36}\) Another codex that shows many proximities to Houghton MS Lat 300, more in themes and poetic language than in specific individual poems, is Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, MS C 58.\(^{37}\)

The complex relationships between the Houghton manuscript and various other manuscripts confirm how freely Latin anthologies circulated and medieval anthologists rearranged, added, and subtracted poems in assembling new anthologies.

---


34. For a sampling of the approaches that have been taken to medieval anthologies in recent years, see Roberto Antonelli, ed., “L’antologia poetica,” special issue, *Critica del testo* 2/1 (1999).

35. See Rigg, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (IV),” 480.


on the basis of old ones. The tradition we should envisage is one in which compilers blended their choice of poems from a constantly changing reservoir of regionally, nationally, or even internationally popular poems with the best of their own poems or those of local poets.\textsuperscript{38}

Some anthologies present the collected or selected works of a single poet. Others are concatenations of poems that were employed as models in composition classes, poems that were produced in such classes, and poems such as epitaphs and eulogies that were composed by local artists for local audiences or addressees.\textsuperscript{39} Houghton MS Lat 300 combines features of both these sorts of anthology. It also sheds light on medieval thinking about genres. Complementing the theoretical statements that can be found in Latin grammarians and rhetoricians, it offers concrete evidence about the kinds of poems that at least one medieval reader—namely, the compiler—associated with one another.\textsuperscript{40} To commemorate the library that houses Houghton MS Lat 300, the poems have been given the name \textit{Carmina Houghtoniensia} in the title of the present book. [JZ]

\textsuperscript{38} A slightly later anthology, probably from the area of Leicester and dating from 1180–1230, that is loosely comparable with Houghton MS Lat 300 is found in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.i.17 (1): see John Stevens, ed., \textit{The Later Cambridge Songs} (Oxford, 2005).

\textsuperscript{39} André Wilmart, "Le Florilège de Saint-Gatien . . . Première partie," p. 11, defines the Tours florilegium as "un livret quasi officiel, où l'enseignement qui avait été donné de la rhétorique, au cours d'une assez longue période, vingt, trente ans peut-être, dans l'école capitulaire, se trouve mis au net et codifié, sous forme d'exemples variés."

\textsuperscript{40} A. G. Rigg, "Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (I)," \textit{Mediaeval Studies} 39 (1977): 281.
Principles of the Edition

This edition aims to provide the Latin text and English translations, together with commentaries on literary features and discussions of historical contexts, for all the unedited items in Houghton MS Lat 300. For texts edited elsewhere, incipits and bibliographical information are supplied.

Each poem has a general introduction that furnishes literary and historical analysis, as appropriate. Before presenting the Latin texts, the editors offer guidance on where readers may find previously edited items, as well as on their incipits, the numbers assigned to them in Walther and in the electronic database In principio: Incipit index of Latin texts, manuscripts not listed in the incipitarium, and their lengths and metrical forms. Numbers for In principio are not provided for the poems by Hildebert, for which we supply incipits as well as references to the standard edition and to the numbers in Walther.

Within the editions, italics indicate letters or words that have been supplied or modified by the editors. The obelus † is placed before and after uncertain readings. Square brackets [ ] enclose indications of the folio, recto or verso, and column. These indications are preceded by a backslash \ if the column begins at that point.

The translations that come after the Latin texts do not pretend to be literary, but instead to convey the literal sense of the Latin. The English prose translations are followed in turn by textual notes. Then each section concludes with line-by-line commentary. The commentary is meant to gloss individual words and constructions that may pose especial difficulties, as well as to identify sources and analogues for wording and thinking in the texts. In presenting information on formulaic expressions and phrases, the commentary makes no effort to list all occurrences before the twelfth century. When an expression or phrase is documented widely, the commentary instead lists its earliest known occurrence in Latin literature. Obviously, such a listing does not necessarily indicate that the earliest occurrence of the expression or phrase is to be regarded as the source for its use in the Houghton anthology. [JZ]
Group One: “Medicamen et solamen”

Codicological Information

On the recto of the first folio is Poem 1, “Medicamen et solamen est paupertas homini.” Although written in the same hand that copied Poems 2 through 17, “Medicamen et solamen” was probably added later: although it appears to be complete, it has neither a title, nor a red initial, nor even the unfilled space for a red initial. The folio is ruled in the same way as the others, but whereas the other folios with poems have few empty lines, this one has nearly twenty unfilled lines in the second column. These facts suggest that “Medicamen et solamen” was written after the other poems, on a folio side that had been left blank originally because the compiler intended or expected it to be placed at the front of his manuscript, where it would receive heavy wear.

Accentuation and Rhyme

Whereas all the other poems in the Houghton anthology are quantitative, this one is rhythmic. It is written in forty-four fifteen-syllable lines. Technically these lines are trochaic septenarii, usually described as having the pattern 8p + 7pp, where p signifies paroxytone—a word that carries an accent on the penultimate syllable—and pp, proparoxytone—a word accented on the antepenultimate syllable. 39

These lines are end-rhymed in fifteen strophes of three lines (except lines 34–35). These tercets have been called sometimes versus catapultini, since the appearance of the three lines drawn from the common ending bears more than a slight resemblance to a singular—little catapult. 40 In addition, each line is rhymed internally: (4p + 4p) + 7pp or (4pp + 4pp) + 7pp. With / indicating a syllable with a primary accent, ~ an unaccented syllable, and \ a syllable with a secondary accent, the line may be represented as / ~ / ~ || / ~ / ~ || / ~ / ~ / ~ . This combination of internal and end-rhyme became popular from the early twelfth century.


Content

The poem, which satirizes the power of money, belongs to the genre that is known as venality satire. The power of money is embodied in the coin, designated most often as nummus but also three times as denarius (which could be translated slavishly as denier, after an old French coin with a name that derived ultimately from the Latin). The potential of coins to breed corruption, especially within the system of ecclesiastic justice, attracted much witty comment from the late eleventh century on. Line 4, line 13, and others suggest that this whole poem may be spoken in the voice of Nummus, the coin personified. [JZ]

POEM 1 Incipit "Medicamen et solamen est paupertas homini." Not included in Walther. *In principio*, reference 223363. Forty-four lines of fifteen syllables.

[114] Medicamen et solamen est paupertas homini
Qui sincere uult tenere caritatem Domini,
Ne molestus ac infestus fiat eis nomini.

Si quis credat, ut me ledat, munda cogitatio
Quo minuat uel destruat numnum, maliloquo,
Nunc audiat quid ueniat mali pro denario.

Quid ualeat, quid habeat nummus efficatie,
Ecclesias, provincias quas corrumpat sanie:
Si queritur, disnoscitur in hac libri serie.

Paruus nummus princeps summus in Romana curia:
Causas regit, culpas tegit potestate regia;
Et disponit et exponit prout nil consilia.

Papa Rome fecit pro me: uidet nummi speciem!
Omnes uolunt, omnes colunt ipsius effigiem;
Imperantes et regnantes timent nummi faciem.

Optimates et primates nummi uoluntatibus
Obsecuntur, et nituntur maximis conatibus
Ut placèrent et fuauent nummosis hominibus.

Quod est iustum fit iniustum si nummo placuerit;
Inimici sunt amici si nummus dictauerit;
Inhonesti sunt honesti si nummus decreuerit.

Inter reges, inter leges fit quod nummi cupiunt;
Denario cum gaudio canones obediant;
Tam clerici quam laici prompte nummo seruiunt.

Ut cineres carteres atque priuilegia
Estimantur et dampaniantur absente pecunia;
Carte stabunt quibus dabunt nummorum obsequia.

Criminales cardinales fiunt pro denario;
Qui furantur ordinantur mediante precio;
Qui dampaniantur liberantur procurante premio.

[tr²]

Expectatur et amaturs inter causas precium:
Qui rogabit nec donabit fundet uainloquium;
Qui prebebit, hic placebit tenenti consilium.

Compelleris et trahebis ad cause negocium.
Denarius fit preuius: molliet iudicium.

Hostis premit, tua demit, et iniusta pateris;
Tua capit, tua rapit, et ad causam traheris;
Nec prebebit, nec spondebit; frustra loqui niteris.

Si ueneris nec dederis, iudex dicit, “Languo.
Inducias ut capias opus est; uix sedeo.
Nunc habito. Cras redeo, quia caput doleo.”

Si redeas nec habeas quid possess tribuhere,
Stultus redeis et incedis, quia cares munere;
Ad ultimum stultissimum poteris te dicere.
Poverty is remedy and solace to a man
who truly wishes to retain the Lord's affection,
so that he doesn't become troubling or hostile to His name.

If anyone, in order to damage me, gives credence to the disparagement
by which pure thinking aims to diminish or destroy the coin,
let him now hear what evil comes in return for cash.

Of what the coin is capable, what potency it has,
the churches and provinces it corrupts with its venom:
if this is sought, it will be discerned in the contents of this book.

The little coin is the highest prince in the Roman curia:
with regal power it rules over lawsuits, conceals guilt;
it arranges and expounds counsels, as if they were nothing.

The pope of Rome has acted in my behalf: he sees the beauty of the coin!
All desire, all worship its image;
those who command and those who rule fear the face of the coin.

Magnates and prinates are submissive to the coin's
desires, and they strive with their utmost efforts
to be pleasing and well disposed to coinful men.

What is just becomes unjust if it is pleasing to the coin;
enemies are friends if the coin so dictates;
the dishonest are honest if the coin decrees it so.

Among kings, among laws what the coins desire happens;
with joy canons obey cash;
clerks as well as lay folk readily serve the coin.

As so many ashes are warrants and privileges
appraised and condemned where money is absent;
charters will stand firm, for which [people] grant the services of coins.

Criminals become cardinals in return for cash;
when payment intervenes, those who steal are ordained;
when a reward serves to things, those condemned are set free.
Payment is expected and loved in lawsuits:
whoever pleads and doesn’t give will squander empty speech;
whoever offers, he will please the one who holds counsel.

You will be summoned and dragged to the action of the suit.
Cash leads the way; it will soften the judgment.

Your enemy oppresses, he takes what’s yours, and you suffer injustices.
He seizes what’s yours, snatches what’s yours, and you’re dragged into a
lawsuit;
he’ll neither offer, nor pledge; in vain you’ll strive to speak.

If you come and do not give, the judge will say, “I’m tired.
You have to take a recess; I can hardly stay in my seat.
For now, go off! Come back tomorrow, because I have a headache.”

If you return and do not have something you can pay,
then you return and enter as a fool, because you lack a gift;
to the end you’ll be able to call yourself most foolish.

Textual Notes

1] solamen: solamen, with second o expunged. paupertas: papertas.
2] uelt tenere: uultenere written as single word.
4] ledat: legat, with gat underlined, and correction dat added above line.
12] nil, with extra minin preceding.
22] cupiunt: cupitunt, with first t expunged.
25] The first word of this line is extremely unclear.
30] procurante: precurarante (initial p with a stroke above to signify re).
32] uaniloquium: Between fundet and loquium three letters have been erased in
an uncompleted correction. Sense and meter are both well-served by uaniloquium
(compare frustra loqui niteris in line 30), although maliloquium (compare line 5)
would be another possibility.
38] prebebit: prem, with m underlined and bebit written supralinearly. niteris: miteris.
40] uix sede: indicio written on the line, uix sede added above it although without
any indication of deletion.
41] capit: capit.
44] stultissimum: stultissimum.
Commentary

2. **scincere = sincere.**

4. **credat, ut me ledat:** The syntax of this line is embroiled. **me:** Here as in line 13, the personal pronoun refers to a personified “Coin,” who serves as the narrator of the poem.

5. **numnum:** By “the coin” is perhaps meant more broadly “(the power or the influence of) the coin.” **maliloquium:** Franz Blatt, *Novum glossarium mediae Latinitatis ab anno DCCC usque ad annum MCC* (Copenhagen, 1969–), “Ma,” col. 75, lines 35–40, and David Howlett, *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, fasc. 6 “M” (London, 2001), 1694.

6. **denario:** The coin in question is strictly speaking a *denier*.


17. **Obsequuntur (Obseqtur in MS) = obsequuntur.**


30. **procurante:** The MS reading is clearly *procurante*, which could be construed as meaning “tending to beforehand” or “taking care of in advance.” But rather than struggle with an awkward hapax legomenon, it is worth noting that the preceding line ends with *precio* and that the following word is *premius*, either of which could have easily led the scribe to dittography for the initial word element.

34–35. These verses are not written as part of a thresome. Presumably a verse has dropped out, which could have happened easily since 31–35 share the same rhyme. Alternatively, two verses may have been added here to a shorter, earlier version. [PP]
Group Two

Poems 2 through 17 (fols. 1v-2v) amount to an anthology within the anthology. The arrangement of these poems evinces a deliberate thematic progression that should probably be credited to the care of the anthologist in the selection (or composition?) and organization of his materials. Although nine of these pieces bear titles (Poems 2 through 6 and 8 through 11), in no case here or elsewhere in the manuscript is authorship indicated. The first three poems in this group, Poems 2 through 4, handle the interrelated topics of illness, medicine, and death. In this connection, Inez Lynn has noted that Rg contains two clusters of poems concerned both with the status of poets and their sources of inspiration and with antimedical satire. These themes come to the fore in Rg 55/57-61 and 126-128. Interestingly, these runs of poems contain four that also appear in Houghton MS Lat 300: Rg 60 = Poem 2, Rg 126 = Poem 3, Rg 57 = Poem 7, and Rg 55 = Poem 88. But the relationship between the two manuscripts is not a simple one, in which either is directly indebted to the other or even in which the two clearly derive from a common ancestor. Instead, the two derive from different but perhaps related exemplars.

The poems in Group Two provide a pleasing sample of the various techniques available to medieval writers of dactylic verse. Seven of the sixteen poems are in elegiac couplets, the others in hexameters, and all but three (Poems 6, 7, and 8) use rhyme as a principle of composition. Rhyme is incorporated in several different ways. Verses with end-rhyme, known as caudati, occur in a few different configurations. Three of the poems use a single end-rhyme throughout (2: -ore, 9: -orum, 15: -eri). Another two are grouped in quatrains of end-rhymed verses (12, 13), and there are three poems written in rhymed pairs (4, 11, and 14, with 4 and 11 more specifically designated as elegi caudati). A second species of medieval dactylic rhyme occurs within the line of verse. When, as in Poems 3, 16, and 17, the rhyme falls at the penthemimeral caesura and the line-end, the verses, whether hexameter or elegiac, are categorized as leonine (leonini). Poem 5 has the most complex rhyme structure (versus bicipites or sivodati) with each line containing two rhyming pairs, one in the

---


43. Lynn, “Critical Edition,” 32, points out that in lines 10-11 the Houghton manuscript and R share a reading against Rg, whereas in lines 4 and 6 R and Rg are opposed to the Houghton manuscript. She reaches the conclusion that I have restated in the sentence that follows above.
first penthemimer, the second in the final hepthemimer; each line-division ends with a rhyme. This form, along with the leonines, marks out the main caesura in each verse as the most important point of articulation. Such a well-defined sense of the division of the line was not characteristic of dactylic poetry before the Middle Ages.

Adherence to the classical norms of dactylic composition varies. Elision is infrequent, found only twice in Group Two, in the unrhymed elegies (7.2, 8.2). Hiatus does not occur. The poets represented here were generally careful about quantities: even lengthening of short syllables at a caesura is rare, though it does occur (tortoris, 15.4; cupis, 17.1). Strong fifth-foot caesuras, resulting in a word-group of four syllables at the line end, were avoided by classical poets, and here too, for the most part, they are absent. The classicizing authors of poems 7 and 8 allowed four-syllable Greek names at the line-end, however (Eliconem, 7.1; Epicurus, 8.3). This convention also gives way when faced with the exigencies of leonine and bicipital rhyme: fifth-foot caesuras occur with some frequency in the leonines (e.g., 3.3 and 5; 16.3), and quite often in Poem 5, where the rhyme scheme makes the greatest demands on the poet's Latinity (lines 3, 6, 11, 23, 26, 29, 30, 36, 37, 38). Poem 5 is also the only poem in Group Two whose verses sometimes end with monosyllables. In general then, the poems of Group Two hold carefully to basic prosodic conventions, although the construction of rhyme within a verse may take precedence over these.


In R this poem is immediately preceded by one that is closely related in both form and content: twenty end-rhymed hexameters on the topic of a persistent fever.45


In Rg an unrelated poem intervenes between the two. Primarily “Flebilis hora redit,” which begins by mentioning that a fever is returning (redit), was a sequel to the other poem, which the compiler of the Houghton manuscript did not include.

IV

De accessu febris

Flebilis hora redit: reditum fle flebilis hore,
In cuius reditu febris incumbente calore
Afficitur curis animus corpusque labore.
Vis perit exterior, quia ui caret interiore;
Singula membra iacent, proprio uiduata uigore.
Lux caligat, hebent aures nec gaudent odore
Naris, et esca gulum non mitigat ualla sapore,
Priuanturque manus tactu rerumque tenore.
Forma decens roseo spectabilis ante decore
Quam deorsum macies, fugiete rubore,
Posset specantes subito turbare timore,
Et me terribili perterret bubo canore,
Et super humano strix uisa dolere dolore,
At quociens quouis soluntur membra sopore,
Me terrent leumares aspersaque monstra cruore,
Et furie que corda mouent humana furore
Tesifoneque minax et peior utrique sorore
Verbena seu parat Stigio perfusa liquore,
Et Stigium carmen laruali personat ore,
Hirta comas uultuque ferox et opaca colore.

About the Onset of Fever

The mournful hour returns: lament the return of the mournful hour,
at the return of which, as the heat of a fever attacks,
the soul is afflicted by cares and the body by distress.
Outward strength perishes, because it lacks inward strength.
All the limbs lie idle, bereft of their characteristic vigor.
Vision grows blurred, hearing turns dull, the nose takes no pleasure
in scent, no food assuages the throat with taste,
and the hands lose their capacity for touching and holding objects.
One’s graceful appearance, formerly outstanding for rosy beauty,
could alarm onlookers with sudden fright,
 once gauntliness has disfigured it and dispelled its ruddiness.

The horned owl frightens me with frightful song
and, in addition, the owl seems to grieve with human grief;
but however often my limbs are released in any sleep,
ghosts and blood-spattered monsters frighten me,
and furies which stir human hearts with madness;
and Tisiphone, threatening and worse than either of her sisters,
readies savage blows, drenched in the water of the river Styx;
and, shaggy-haired, fierce-faced, and dark-colored,
she sounds out a hellish song with ghoulish mouth.

Textual Notes

Title and initial letter rubricated.

1] fle: fleo R, Rg.
2] incumbente: incombente Rg.
3] exterior: interior R, Rg. ui: omitted Rg. interiore: exteriore R.
5] roseo: reose Rg.
7] strix: strix Rg.
9] asperaque: asperaque Rg.
10] Tesifone que: Thesiphoneque R, Tesiphoneque Rg.
12] stigium: stygium Rg. laruali: laruali Rg. persona: personat ore R, Rg.
13] et opaca added above line in same hand.

Commentary

6-8. These lines detail the effects of the fever upon the five senses.
11. turbare timore: The same ending is attested from Lucretius, *De rerum natura* 1.106, ed. Bailey (unpaginated).
canens"); and Marbod, *Carmina* 1.39.1, in PL 171.1672D ("Bubo ferum nomen, dirum mortalibus omen").

13. **humano . . . dolore:** This adjective and noun appear in these metrical positions already in Propertius, *Carmina* 1.16.25 and 2.1.57, ed. Barber, 22 and 32, and in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 1.246, ed. Tarrant, 10. **dolore dolore:** Compare the pentameter ending "dolore dolor" in Ovid, *Heroides* 20.4, ed. Kenney, 66.

14. **membra sopore:** A line ending repeatedly (with variations in the case of the final word) after Lucretius, *De rerum natu*ra 4.453, ed. Bailey.

17. **Tesifoneque:** For metrical reasons the name appears most often in this metrical position in dactylic poetry, and there is no allusion here to any specific earlier appearance. **utraque sorore:** Allecto and Megaera.

18. **Verbera seu:** This phrase, attested first as a hexameter ending in Vergil, *Georgics* 3.252, ed. Mynors, 72, appears first as a line opening in Ovid, *Ibis* 157, ed. Owen (unpaginated). **perfusa liquore:** Attested as a hexameter ending already in pseudo-Vergil, *Calex* 14, ed. Clausen, 10.

19. **personat ore:** This line ending is attested first in Silius Italicus, *Punica* 2.43, ed. Delz, 29.

20. **Hirta comas:** Compare Lucan, *De bello civili* 8.680, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 218 ("Regibus hirita comas"). **uultuque ferox:** It may be chance that the similar phrase "uultu ferox" appears as a line ending in Seneca the Younger, *Troades* 1152, ed. Zwierlein, 94.

---

**POEM 3.** Incipit "Ne uetitis cenis inhiet gula, comprime frenis!" Ten lines of internally rhymed elegiac distichs. Not in Walther. *In principio*, reference 2075502. Edited from Rg by Rigg, "Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (IV)," 493, no. 126.

The compiler happens (or is determined?) to create a medical section of sorts within his anthology, for he follows Poem 2 ("Flebilis hora redit") with a composition that describes a major cause of illness and its consequences. The third poem tells of two perennial battles, with the waistline and with doctors.

[1v\(^a\)]

```
De custodia diete et falsis medicis

Ne uetitis cenis inhiet gula, comprime frenis!

Comprime, ni malis non caruisse malis.

Si mihi cauissem, si frene gule posuissem,

In me quartanas non reuocasset anas.

Quot tot Cloto notat uexatque febris, gula potat;

    Ergo si sapias, frene gule facias.  
5

[1v\(^b\)]

Viscera torquentur, quia felle hurtique replentur:

    ad medici nutum fel bibo, ceno lutum.
```
Hec mihi causa necis sit amare potio fecis,
sed pereat per eam quod facit ut peream!

About Adhering to a Diet and about False Doctors

The gullet opens wide for forbidden foods. Clamp it shut!
Clamp it shut, unless you prefer to suffer illnesses.
If I had watched out for myself, if I had clamped my gullet shut,
a duck would not have caused my quartan fever to return.
The gullet absorbs just as many as Clotho marks and as fever ravages.
Therefore, if you have your wits, clamp your gullet shut.
My intestines are tortured, because they are filled with bile and mud.
I drink bile, I eat mud at the doctor's behest.
This potion of bitter drags may be the cause of my death,
but may it perish, because it causes me to perish through it!

Textual Notes

Title and first letter in rubrics.
1] De: Ne Rg.
3] cauisse: cauisem H.
5] notat: necat Rg, secat conjectures Rigg, potat (emended to fit rhyme scheme): portat H, necat Rg (against the meter). Probably the scribe incorrectly wrote notat and then produced portat in order to supply a rhyme, of sorts.
7–10] Transposition rubric after 6 leads to rubric below column two, where the four lines are written (in a different hand?)
7] ciboque: lutoque Rg.
9] Hec (with first letter corrected and third one difficult to interpret): Hoc Rg. An additional sit written above potio.
10] pereat Rg; perit H (against the meter).

Commentary

2. caruiisse malis: Compare the pentameter ending in Ovid, Ex Ponto 1.3.46, ed. Owen (“caruiisse malum”).
3. frena gule posuissem: Compare this phrase as well as the similar “frena gule facias” in 6 with Hildebert, Carmina miscellanea 27.12, in PL 171.1391D (“Frena gulae posuit, non gula frena viro”). Lynn, “Critical Edition,” 153n90, makes the case for interpreting gula in this poem as carrying connotations of greed, on the grounds that greed was viewed in ancient and medieval medical theory as being conducive to fever.
5. “just as many people as Clotho marks for death.”
7. Viscera torquentur: This line opening is attested first in Venantius Fortunatus, Carmina 9.2.57, ed. Leo, 207; ed. Reydellet, 2:17.
9. **Hec**: The reading **Hoc** in Rg could be translated as having the neuter *fel* in line 8 as its antecedent and as being in apposition to *potio*; “This [poison], a drink of bitter dregs." But construing the words in this fashion seems tortured. Although the reading *Hec* is uncertain in both its first and its last letters, it produces better sense. **causa necis**: A phrase commonplace from Ovid, *Heroïdes* 10.144 (pentameter line ending), ed. Knox, 72, on.

10. **quod**: Determining what should be understood as the subject of this line and what as the antecedent of *eam* is tricky. The strongest likelihood is that both *pereat* and *fauit* have as their subject *gula*, while *eam* refers to *potio*. Since both manuscripts read *quod*, this word would have to be emended to *qui* to allow for the possibility that the line means “may he perish through it who causes me to perish.” Without emendation it could also be translated as “but may he perish through it because he causes me to perish,” in which case the “he” would refer to the *medicus* mentioned two lines earlier (in 8).

**POEM 4.** Incipit “Mors furit et mortis emancipat omne furori.” Four lines: two hexameter couplets with end-rhyme. Not in Walther. Not in *In principio*. Published from this manuscript by Monteil, 2:178.

```
De morte

Mors furit et mortis emancipat omne furori.
   Nil morti demens, mors facit omne mori.
Mors indiscrète maiora minoribus equat;
   Omnia mors equa condicione necat.

About Death

Death rages and frees everything from the rage of death.
   Depriving death of nothing, death causes everything to die.
Death renders the great equal to the humble, without distinction;
   death slays all on the same terms.
```

**Textual Notes**

*Title and first letter in rubrics. Published from this manuscript by Monteil, 2:178.* “Mors furit et mortis somnificat omne furo / Nil morti dirimus, mors facit omne mo / Mors indistincte maiora cratieribus equat / Omnia mors equa conditione necat.”
Commentary

1. **Mors furit**: A similar idea, though expressed differently, appears in Baudri, *Carmina* 46.1, ed. Tilliette, 1:55 ("Mors uelut effrenis ruptis bacchatur habenis").

2. **Nil mort**: A common line opening.

3–4. These two lines could function well as a versified gloss on Horace, *Odes* 1.4.13–14, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 7: "pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas / regunque turris." Horace’s *sententia* was much cited in the Middle Ages: see Hans Walther, *Proverbia sententiaeque Latinitatis mediæ aevi: Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sentenzen des Mittelalters in alphabetischer Anordnung*, vol. 3 (Göttingen, 1965), 695, no. 20578.

4. **Omnia mors**: Routinely found as an opening from Seneca the Younger, *De qualitate temporis* 7, in *Anthologia Latina*, no. 224, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 164.

**POEM 5.** Incipit "Ve, quid agam? Plagam sub mesto pectore gesto." Thirty-nine hexameter lines, internally rhymed with the pattern aabb. In medieval handbooks on metrics such verses were designated *bicipites* and *sinodati*. In the medieval definition cited by Meyer, the consonances are purportedly at either end of the verse, in the first and second and in the fifth and sixth feet, respectively; but Meyer points out variations in this pattern. Here the consonances in the first half of the line most commonly rhyme the first foot with the end of the second and beginning of the third, in the second half of the line the fourth foot with the sixth. But the placement of the consonances varies considerably, not only falling sometimes at the beginning and sometimes at the end (or even in the middle) of a foot, but also even moving to another foot altogether. Thus the consonance that usually joins together the fourth foot with the sixth may begin instead with a rhyme that runs from the end of the third to the beginning of the fourth or from the end of the fourth to the beginning of the fifth foot or, exceptionally, that falls in the third (see 25) or fifth (see 9) foot. What might appear to be the most daring departure from the usual scheme comes on a single occasion when the four rhymes are concentrated in the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth feet, but this unique arrangement is likely to have arisen from a textual corruption (see 21). Not in Walther. *In principio*, references 412392, 412437 (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 3343, fol. 93v [fifteenth century]), and 412438. Also extant in T: see Rigg, "Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (I)," *Mediaeval Studies* 39 (1977): 307, no. 58.

---


48. Before the manuscript came into the possession of the Houghton Library, this poem was listed by Dronke, *Medieval Latin and the Rise of European Love-Lyric*, 2:575 (on the basis of Vernet’s brief description).
Conquestio amantis

Ve, quid agam? Plagam sub mesto pectore gesto;
Saucius interius, doleo nimis ossibus imis;
Torqueor et teneor, laqueo captus Cithereo;
Sollicitus penitus, loris constringor Amoris.
Quem sequor, ille decor me lesit et intus adhesit.
Hic meus est laqueus, hinc cure non habiture.
Constituam statuam Veneri morboque mederi.
Qui dolet, intro uolet; cadet hinc data uictima grata.
Igne nec indigna ponam deuous ego tus,
Hancque colam solam, si purget dura quod urget.
Hactenus ergo, Venus, fer opem, queso, michi lesso.
Quero michi misero, michi mesto, micor esto.
Quod peto, completo. Gere morem, pelle dolorem;
Vulnera letisera, dea, comprime, rede michi me.
Nam tenere, misere sum captus, sum michi raptus.
Me tenet ut penet Ioue digna superba Corigna.
Querit sponte, gerit michi bella superba puella.
Cum fleo, cum doleo miser eque nocte dieque,

erior asperior id curat ut acrur urat.
Enecor, exccor, quia quod precor inflat er eor.
Tu cor ad hoc, dea, uelle pelle rebelle puelle.
Expuit et reuit michi mente pari sociari.
Ridet quando uidet commotum me fore totum.
Estus et questus lacrimantis ridet amantis.

Mens igitur quatitur, foris extant signa doloris,
Nec latet, iramo patet certis signis meus ignis.
Nam caro dum raro quod uul habet, arida tabet.
Risus abest, uisus lacrimis tabescit optimis.
Sed dolor, ira, color, gemitus tociens repetitus.
Quid sibi namque cibi? Cibus eius quod michi peius.
Est rudis in ludis, effrenis parque leenis.
Tu, dea nectarea, distilla nectar ut illa
Effrenis lenis, infesta sit inde modesta.
Muneribus, precibus cum templo domumque frequento,
Quid paro? Litus aro, cui tandem semina mandem?
Cum secor atque precor, aures claudit, nichil audit.
Plus ideo doleo, crescit furor et magis uror.
Fessus et oppressus tandem morbum fero grandem.
Mors prope: nudus ope, utoinam cerno ruinam.

A Lover's Lament

Alas, what am I to do? I bear a wound within my sad heart;
snitten within, I grieve exceedingly to the very marrow of my bones;
I am tortured and held fast, captured by the snare of Venus;
troubled through and through, I am bound by the bonds of Love.
The beauty that I follow has wounded me and has clung to my heart.
It is my snare, from it come cares that will not pass away.
I will erect a statue to Venus and will arrange to be healed of sickness.
Let the person who suffers pain hurry inside: a pleasing sacrificial animal
    given by him
will fall and, not undeservedly, I will place incense devoutly in the fire.
I will worship he: alone, if she dispels the trouble she harshly threatens.
Therefore bring aid, Venus, I ask, to me here because I am wounded.
I ask, be gentler to me, sad and wretched as I am.
Carry out what I ask. Indulge me, banish my sorrow;
bind my fatal wounds, goddess, return me to myself;
for I have been lovingly captured, wretchedly wrenched from
    myself.

Haughty Corinna, fit for Jupiter, holds me to punish me.
Of her own free will the proud girl seeks and wages war against me.
When I weep and grieve, wretched equally by night and day,
she grows keener and harsher; and she takes care that passion burns me
    more keenly.
I am tortured and blinded, because my entreaties puff up the heart of
    my mistress.

Impel you, goddess, the rebellious heart of the girl to this wish.
She spurns and refuses to be joined with like mind to me.
She laughs when she sees that I am entirely distraught;
she laughs at the frenzy and lamentation of a weeping lover.
Therefore my mind is shattered: the signs of grief can be seen
    outwardly,
and my passion is not hidden, but is displayed with sure indications;
for when the flesh seldom has what it wishes, it withers and wastes away.
Laughter is gone, power of sight wastes away from plentiful tears.
But grief, passion, the flush of emotion, and moans are many times repeated.
What is her food? Her food is what is worst for me.
She is graceless and unruly in play, no different from lionesses.
You, goddess, sweet as nectar, sprinkle nectar so that that
unruly and violent girl may then be gentle and mild.
When I court her with gifts and entreaties and visit her home constantly,
what do I achieve? I plow a shore, to which in the end I should
consign seeds?
When I follow her about and beg, she shuts her ears and hears nothing.
Therefore I grieve more, the frenzy grows, and I am inflamed more.
Tired and overpowered, at length I suffer a great illness.
Death is close: stripped of resources, I see my demise nearby.

Textual Notes

Title (in red): not in T.
1] Ve initial in red. iesto (i expunged, g above line): gesto T.
2] ossibus: ositus H.
2–3] Or punctuate “Saucius interius doleo nimis; ossibus imis / Torqueor et
tenero . . .”
5] ille decor: iste decor T.
6] hinc cure non habiture: hec insita corde sagitta T.
7–8] Or punctuate “Constituam statuam Veneri; morboque mederi / Qui dolet . . .”
10] dura: diua T.
12] michi s misero (s expunged): michi miser T.
13] gere morem: gero morem T.
14] Vulnera: Winera T.
17] gerit: ierit H, gerit T.
18] cum doleo or condoleo: cum doleo T. docteque (d expunged, n above line)
dieque: nocte dieque T.
21] dea, uelle: uelle dea T.
24] Estus et questus: us written in red on line, et questus written in red in margin.
25] foris extant signa doloris: ink thick.
26] patet written above line. In T the letters before signis are smudged and ignis is oddly
abbreviated ig's.
29] tociens: tecies T.
cibus: cibet T.
34] cum tempto or contempto: cum tempto T.
semina: femina $H$, feminine $T$.
Cum secor or consector: Cum sequor $T$
tandem morbum: morbum tandem $T$.
Final letter of Mors smudged $T$.

Commentary

1. Ve, quid agam: The comparable opening “Heu, quid agam” is commonplace in hexameter poetry.

2. ossibus innis: A line ending in Ilias Latina 25.

3. Torqueor: To open a line with this word is characteristically Ovidian. Iaqueo captus Cithereo: The net or toils of Venus are a commonplace image. Compare pseudo-Ovid, De Pirano 2.17, ed. Lehmann, 47 (“Cipridis in laqueo captius uterque iacebat”).

4. loris constringor amoris: For a very close parallel (or source of inspiration?), see Marbod, Carmina 1.17.1 (incipit “Strictus eram loris vesani nuper amoris”), in PL 171.1655D. The poem is also found in Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, MS C 58, fol. 40v, ed. Jakob Werner, Beiträge zur Kunde der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters aus Handschriften gesammelt, 2nd ed. (Aarau, 1905; repr., Hildesheim, 1979), 88, no. 199.

The phrasing shows similarities to the “elegiac comedy” known as Pamphilus de amore 4.55, ed. Rubio and González Rolán, 138 (“Spes mea me leset! Per spem Venus ossibus hesit!”).

5. Although the combination of cure and habitude is by no means unique, it may be significant that Marbod was fond of it: see Versus de sancto Laurentio 31, in PL 171.1608B, and Carmina 1.4.19, in PL 171.1718B.

6. It is probably merely fortuitous that a poem attributed to Hildebert has a pentameter ending “constituit statuas”: see Carmen in libros Regum 4.530, in PL 171.1261C. Morboque mederi: The line ending “morboque medere” is attested already in Cyprian of Gaul, Heptateuchos, “Numeri” 313, ed. Peiper, 127. Although medeo was only a deponent verb in Classical Latin, in Late Latin and Medieval Latin it is also attested as a regular transitive verb: see Howlett, Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources, fasc. 6 “M,” 1741. If understood as a deponent here and not in a passive sense, it could be translated alternatively here as “[for her] to heal the sickness.”

7. Victima grata: This phrase is Ovidian in origin (Fasti 1.440, ed. Alton, Wormell, and Courtney, 15), but was also used at least twice each by Baudri (Carmina 142.22 and 210.4, ed. Tilliette 2:51 and 143) and Hildebert (De mysterio missae 194, in PL 171.1182C, and (possibly pseudo–Hildebert) Inventio sanctae crucis 262, in PL 171.1319D).

8. Hactenus ergo: This opening is attested at the latest from Milo of Saint-Amand (Elnonensis: died 871/872), Vita Amandi 2.190, ed. Traube, 583.
15. **tenere**: Emending *tenere* (tenderly) to *tenere* (recklessly) could be tempting, but preserving the manuscript reading allows for a hyperbaton that alludes to the bittersweet effects of love.

16. **Corinna**: This is Corinna, subject of many of Ovid’s love poems (*Amores* 1.5, 1.11, 2.6, 2.8, 2.11–13, 2.17, 2.19, 3.1, 3.7, and 3.12, ed. Kenney, 11–12, 26–27, 43–45, 46–47, 51–56, 61–62, 64–66, 66–69, 82–85, 94–96).


20. **inflat**: puff up (with pride).

21. The line has evidently suffered in transmission, as the violation of the rhyme scheme and as the false quantity in *uelle* betoken. The reversal of two words to “uelle, dea” in T fixes the latter shortcoming (since the prolongation of the second vowel in *uelle* is permissible in its new metrical position at the penultimate), but does not resolve completely the former (because the first half line still lacks a rhyme).

   One approach, in keeping with T, would be to endeavor to redistribute the unique congestion of four rhymes in a row at the end of the hexameter, so that two words would be shifted to positions earlier in the line and consistent with what the rhyme pattern allowed. The resultant line would be extraordinary, like its immediate predecessor, in being monorhymed. And what rearrangement of the words would serve? “Pelle rebelle cor ad hoc, tu dea, uelle puelle” comes close, but the second rhyme in the first half of the line is placed irregularly.

   Another tack would be to ignore the arrangement of words in T as a failed attempt to correct the problems and to emend instead so as to create a rhyme that builds upon the sounds in “Tu cor.” For example, consider “Tu cor (ad hoc duco), dea, pelle rebelle puelle.” Two drawbacks to this emendation are that it provides no noun to specify *hoc* and that it leaves the three rhymes as the end of the line.

   In any case, it makes best sense to construe “ad hoc” as two separate words together with “uelle” (the infinitive used as a neuter noun). To understand them as one word “adhoc” (= *adhuc*) that modifies “rebelle” would render interpretation of “uelle” highly problematic.

25. **signa doloris**: This phrase is Ovidian in origin: see *Heroides* 19.107 (hexameter line ending), ed. Kenney, 63, and *Tristia* 4.3.28, ed. Owen (at the beginning of the second half of a pentameter).

26. The phrase *certis signis* is linked with *ignis* uniquely in the *Historia Theophili* ascribed to Marobod, 393 “Hic certis signis erit omne probans opus ignis,” in PL 171.1601A.

28. **Riusus abest**: The line opening is Ovidian: see *Metamorphoses* 2.778, ed. Tarrant, 60. **uisus . . . tabescit**: This conceit is attested already in Catullus, *Carmina* 68.55–56, ed. Mynors, 83 (“maesta neque assiduo tabescere lumina fletu / cessarent”). Here it is difficult to gauge whether the poet means to
refer to the physical appearance of the eyes, marred by frequent weeping, or to the vision that they would enable, if not clouded by tears. **lacrimis . . . optimis:** The pairing appears often in dactylic poetry, perhaps most relevantly in Baudri (Carmina 36.3, ed. Tilliette, 1:50), Hildebert (Vita beate Marie Egiptiae 316, ed. Larsen, 252), and Embrico of Mainz, Vita Mahumeti 543, ed. Cambier, 69.

29. **color:** It would be tempting to interpret color as referring to the pallor, the lack of color, that was conventionally associated in ancient and medieval medicine and literature with the lovesick, but the Latin noun was employed routinely to describe the presence rather than the absence of coloring.


36. **nichil audit:** A line closing attested already in Catullus, Carmina 17.21, ed. Mynors, 15.

39. **Mors prope:** Although not as a line opening, the phrase is found in Seneca the Younger, Tuedes 575, ed. Zwierlein, 73, and in Hildebert (or pseudo-Hildebert), Carmen in libros Regum 4.12, in PL 171.1252C.


The topic of love leads to a sixth poem, which focuses upon lust and gluttony. The poet of this poem emphasizes a moral point, but he does so with touches of both crudity and elegance. The former quality is evident in his description of the interaction between the gullet (gula / venter) and phallus (priapus / mentula). The latter shows in his casual but deft allusions to classical poets such as Ovid and Horace. The most important of these allusions (in line 5) draws a parallel between a man named Landri and an Ovidian glutton, Eryxichthon, who was stricken with insatiable hunger as punishment for violating a sacred grove. The poet’s easy familiarity with Latin poetry may extend even to the works of contemporaries, since lines 7–8 seem to imitate the opening of Bernard Silvestris’s Cosmographia.

The Landri in the sixth poem could have been a real person, since some of the poems in Group Two are directed against actual people. Alternatively, he could have been a literary figure of some sort, and once again this section of the anthology would offer parallels. If Landri is a fictitious character, he could have been a stock scoundrel, as he appeared in Latin poetry,49 or a burlesque of the hero in a lost Old

49. For a possible example of such a poem, see Wilmart, “Le Florilège de Saint-Gatien,” Revue
French chanson de geste that is known from four or five witnesses to have existed in the twelfth century and that has been hypothesized to have been about Count Landri of Nevers, about Landri le Timonier, or about either or neither. In any event, Landri seems to have been old hat to twelfth-century audiences of poetry, for in a passage about the repertoires of minstrels Peter the Chanter (about 1120–1197) commented:

Qui videntes cantilenam de Landrico non placere auditoribus, statim incipiunt de Narcisso cantare, quod si ne placuerit, cantant de alio.°

[These minstrels] when they see that their song [or chanson de geste] about Landri fails to please their listeners, at once begin to sing about Narcissus; and if that doesn’t work, they sing about another character.

De Landrico edace et luxurioso

Infelix duplici Landricus peste laborat;
Aliterius uires altera pestis alit.
Clades prima gule cladesque secunda Priapi.
Mentula nec nouit nec gula frena pati.
Quod prebet tellus, nutrit mare, sustinet aer,
Id recipit uenter, mentula spargit idem.
Res elementorum sedem confundit in unam,
Cogit in anticum sic elementa cahos.
Ventris cun: dampnosa lues, dampnosa libido
Priuat amicitia presulis atque domo.
Vendidit ergo domos, prebendas uendidit idem,
Et iam principibus disIpriet ille uiris.
Quod stomacus commisit edax commisit et inguen,
Fabula Landricus factus in urbe luit.

benedictine 48 (1936), 20, no. 8: “Landricus medicus faciens quod factor iniquus. / De muliere uirum fit merito neutrum. / Amodo claret et quid medicina ualeret: / Vertere si neutrum posset in alterutrum.”


About Gluttonous and Lecherous Landri

Unfortunate Landri labors under a two-fold affliction:

one affliction builds the strength of the other.

The first pestilence is of the gullet, the second of the phallus.

Neither the penis nor the gullet can endure restraints.

What the land offers, sea nourishes, and air sustains,

the stomach receives and penis shoots it out.

He conflates the substances of the four elements into one location,

he compels them into primordial chaos.

Ruinous corruption of the stomach and ruinous lust

deprive him of the bishop’s friendship and home.

Therefore he sold his homes and sold his prebends;

and now he is displeasing to the leading men.

For that which the ever-hungry stomach and loins caused,

Landri, having become the talk of the town, atones.

Textual Notes

Title and first letter in rubrics.

8] anticum: ti written again above line.

9] damnpnosa libido: damp libido H.

14] Ink thick Landricus and urbe rewritten above line.

Commentary

2. Alterius uires altera pestis alit: This line plays upon Ovid, Remedia amoris 444, ed. Kenney, 222 (“Alterius uires subtrahit alter amor”).

5. Quod prebet tellus, nutrit mare, sustinet aer: The closest parallel to the thought is Ovid, Metamorphoses 8.830–831, ed. Tarrant, 248: “quod pontus, quod terra, quod educat aer / poscit et appositis queritur ieiunia mensis” (“he demands what the sea, land, and air bring forth, / and he complains of hunger even when the tables are laden”). For similar constructions, see Lucretius, De rerum natura 1.278, ed. Bailey, and Ovid, Ex Ponto 1.10.9, ed. Owen. For the line ending, compare Marius Claudius Victorius, Alethia 2.442, ed. Hovingh, 162 (“Qua sua tellus alit, qua non sua sustinet aer”).

6. Id recipit uenter, mentula spergit idem: This association between an overindulged appetite for food and a sexual hyperactivity is often drawn in patristic (especially Jerome) and medieval sources. See for example Bernard Silvestris, Commentary on the First Six Books of the “Aeneid” of Vergil, Book 4, ed. Jones and Jones, 24, lines 7–21; trans. Schreiber and Maresca, 25–26.

7. confundit in unum: Compare Ovid, Metamorphoses 4.472, ed. Tarrant, 111 (“Imperium, promissa, preces confundit in unum”).
8. The wording of this line reflects Ovid, particularly the opening of *Metamorphoses* 2.299, ed. Tarrant, 42 (“in Chaos antiquum confundimur”), but also the opening of *Fasti* 1.103, ed. Alton, Wormell, and Courtney, 4 (“me Chaos antiqui”).

9. *dampnosá libido*: The ending was known through Horace, *Epistles* 2.1.107, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 296.


The seventh poem contains one further substantiation of the hypothesis that the anthology originated near Tours. With their mention of a philosopher named Thierry these couplets bring us again to the neighborhood of this town, since this fellow is likely to be Thierry of Chartres. Thierry taught philosophy in Chartres (one of his students styled him “totius Europae philosophorum praecipuus”), and from 1142 to 1150 or thereabouts he was chancellor of the cathedral chapter there. One of his predecessors in the second capacity was a man known as Bernard of Chartres (died around 1126), who was long presumed (without any convincing evidence) to have been Thierry’s brother. Whereas identifying Thierry is easy, the poet Gualo (Galo) is elusive. The most widely preserved Medieval Latin poem that is attributed to a Galo is an *Inventio in monachos* (Invective against Monks), but nothing certain is known of this supposed author except that he was a Breton (as was Thierry).

---


53. On the extreme unlikeliness that Thierry of Chartres was Bernard of Chartres’s brother, see Paul Edward Dutton, *The Glosses super Platonem* of Bernard of Chartres (Toronto, 1991), 40–42.

This “Gualo the Breton” (“Gualo Brito”) could be identical with Galo, a bishop of Léon (and monk of Landévennec?) in Brittany whose existence is attested during a twenty-year period between 1108 and 1128.\textsuperscript{55} This bishop has been credited with a poem of hexameters in tercets De mundi contemptu.\textsuperscript{56} In a poem found in at least three anthologies an otherwise unspecified Galo laments the absence of his friend Girard.\textsuperscript{57} To complicate matters, another Galo (who seems to have had an uncle with the same name) is mentioned in an epitaph entitled “Gualo ad episcopum successorem patrui sui.”\textsuperscript{58} And a philosopher and dialectician in Paris who appears to be one more Galo is discussed in two other poems.\textsuperscript{59} Once more evidence has been collected, it should be possible to sort out the biographies and writings of the various Gualos.

The author of the anthology poem to Girard is probably the Gualo to whom Baudri of Bourgueil (1046–1130) addressed two of his poems.\textsuperscript{60} Once again, there is reason to believe that Gualo was a Breton: from 1107 Baudri was bishop of Dol in Brittany, where one of the Galos attended a council in 1128.\textsuperscript{61} But is Baudri’s Gualo one and the same as Bishop Galo? And is Bishop Galo the author of the Inuictio in monacho? And is any of these identical with the Gualo to whom Rodulfus Tortarius (about 1063–1114), monk of Fleury, addressed one of his letters?\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{57} On the manuscripts of this twenty-six-line poem (Walther 13561), see Rigg, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (IV),” 485–486, no. 41. Rigg notes: “Galo regrets Girard’s absence and advises him not to work too hard. Galo and Girardus may be the friends of Baudri of Bourgueil to whom he addressed his poems. . . .”
\textsuperscript{61} See \textit{Gallia christiana}, ed. Hauréau, 14: col. 975.
\textsuperscript{62} Rodulfus Tortarius is also known as Raoul Tortarius, Raoul Le Tourtier, and similarly. For his letter to Gualo, see \textit{Epistola} 7, “Ad Gualonem,” ed. Ogle and Schullian, 298–316. Manutius identifies this Galo with Bishop Galo of Paris and dates the verse epistle to 1108, when Galo and
Another intriguing question is the identity of the anonymous poet who studied under both Thierry and Gualo. Although younger than Baudri, he could have been a member of Baudri’s circle of friends and correspondents. A definite trace of Baudri’s coterie in Houghton MS Lat 300 is Poem 93, three elegiac distichs that eulogize a certain Frodo: Baudri left three eulogies in distichs for a scholar named Frodo who left Anjou to seek his fortune in England. Both Baudri and the poet of the Houghton poem use the commonplace of referring to Frodo as an “Aristotle.”

\[24^{b}\] Exposuere suum mihi Pierides Eliconem
Atque aditus aperit Philosophia suos.
Non ars una tamen, non unus contulit actor
Ut uates fierem philosophusque simul.
Carmina Gualo mihi, Terricus philosophiam
Inspirat. Nostrum pectus utrumque sapit.
Lingua diserta sonat Terrici philosophiam;
Gualonis redolent carmina nostra stilum.

The Muses exposed their Helicon to me
and Philosophy opened her approaches to me.
But, just the same, one single art, one single author did not contribute
to my becoming at once poet and philosopher:
Gualo inspires me with poetry, Thierry with philosophy.
My heart smacks of both men.
(My) eloquent tongue sounds out the philosophy of Thierry;
my verses have the air of Gualo’s style.

Textual Notes

5] Carmina Gualo mihi: Carmina conuallo mihi H, Carmina Galo michi Rg. philosophiam: corrected in same hand to philosophiam by addition of phi above last syllable.
Commentary


2. **aditus aperit**: Compare *Carmina Burana* 102.7.2, ed. Hilka and Schumann, 160 (“Fraus aditas aperit, hostis ab hoste perit”).

3. **ars**: In conjunction with *Philosophia*, the noun must refer to a liberal art. The seven liberal arts were understood allegorically to be the daughters of Lady Philosophy. **actor**: On the nuances of this word in medieval usage, see M.-D. Chenu, “Auctor, actor, autor,” *Bulletin du Cange: Archivum Latinitatis medii aevi* 3 (1927): 81–86.


5. **Lingua diserta**: The first medieval attestations of this phrase are in Baudri, *Carmina* 173.4, ed. Tilliette 2:104, and Marbod, *Carmina* 2.22.4, in PL 171.1721C.

6. **carmina nostra**: The phrase is jejune in this metrical position (to open the second half of a pentameter), from Ovid, *Ars amatoria* 3.792, ed. Kenney, 199.

**POEM 8.** Incipit “Materiam rerum proponit Eraclitus ignem.” Two elegiac distichs. Not in Walther. Not in *In principio*.

Mentioning the philosopher Thierry induces the anthologist to include the eighth poem, a brief exposition of the doctrines of prominent ancient philosophers.

[210]

Ponit opiniones philosophorum
Materiam rerum proponit Eraclitus ignem,
Aera Anaximenes primo fuisset putat,
Id Tales ascribit aquis, athomis Epicurus,
Pitagoras numeris Esiodusque solo.

*He puts forward the opinions of the philosophers*

*Heraclitus proposes that the substance of things is fire,*
*Anaximenes thinks that air was first,*
*Thales attributes it to water, Epicurus to atoms,*
*Pythagoras to numbers, Hesiod to earth.*
Textual Notes

Title and first letter in rubrics.
2] Anaximenes: last a expunged and e added above line. fuisse: fuisse H.
4] Pitagogas: corrected through addition of or above line. numeris: could be read alternatively as minimis.

Commentary

1–4. Two parallels to the first three lines of this listing can be found in Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem libri quinque, 1.13, ed. Kroymann, 307 (“... pronuntiauerunt, ut Thales aquam, ut Heraclitus ignem, ut Anaximenes aerem, ut Anaximander uniuersa caelestia, ut Strato caelum et terram, ut Zeno aerem et aetherem, ut Plato sidera”) and Augustine, De civitate Dei 8.5, ed. Dombart and Kalb, 1:328, lines 9–14 (“... alii quoque philosophi, qui corporalia naturae principia corpori deditis mentibus opinati sunt, cedant his tantis et tanti Dei cognitoribus uiris, ut Thales in umore, Anaximenes in aere, Stoici in igne, Epicurus in atomis, hoc est minutissimis corpusculis, quae nec diuidi nec sentiri queunt...”).

4. Because of the succession of minims and the ambiguity of the abbreviation signs, it is hard to be certain that the second word in the line was written as “numeris” (num/is) rather than as “minimis” (mini/is). Whatever the scribe wrote here, the poem must originally have had “numerus.” In the Middle Ages Pythagoras was credited with having established all four of the so-called mathematical arts in the quadrivium, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and, above all, music. An ancient legend ascribed to him the discovery of a numerical relationship among basic musical intervals. See Barbara Münxelhaus, Pythagoras musicus: Zur Rezeption der pythagoreischen Musiktheorie als quadrivialer Wissenschaft im lateinischen Mittelalter (Bonn, 1976). It is Epicurus whom we might expect to find associated with “smallest (particles).”

POEM 9. Incipit “Basse pilos odis neque cernis quanta pilorum.” Four lines of end-rhymed hexameters. Not in Walther. Not in In principio. From praise of wisdom the anthologist passes to invective. The full sense of these four lines may have been impossible to decode outside a small coterie, even before a scribe who had trouble reading, writing, or both, copied the text.

The ninth poem bears the no-nonsense title “An Invective against Bassus” (Innectio ad Bassum). The name would seem to reflect classical poetry, since a drinker with the cognomen Bassus occurs in the verse of both Horace and Martial, and poets of the same name also appear in the works of Propertius and Ovid.66 Bassus

66. For drinkers named Bassus, see Horace, Odes 1.36.14, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 39, and Martial, Epigrams 1.37, ed. Lindsay (unpaginated). For poets, see Ovid, Tristia 4.10.47, ed. Owen (unpaginated);
also carries social connotations. Not only does the Late Latin adjective *bassus, -a, -um* (low, lowly) have a social application, in reference to juridical inferiority, but in addition *bassus* is an alternative spelling of *vassus* (vassal): compare *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch*, 1 (Munich, 1963), 1390, lines 57–63, and 1391, 4.

The key to the poem may well be the Bassus (Caesius Bassus, to be exact) to whom Persius casts his sixth satire as a letter. The opening of Persius’s satire presents this Bassus, a friend of the satirist’s who reportedly perished in the eruption of Vesuvius (79 CE) and who is reputed in Quintilian’s *Institutio oratoria* to be a lyric poet, as a master of stringed instruments and as a good artisan. 67

In Poem 9 Bassus may well be a pseudonym. Interestingly, the name is often used by Martial to mock people and it can be impossible to determine whether in these cases the name is real or fictitious. 68 The twelfth-century poet here makes matters equally uncertain as to whether Bassus is the actual name of a real person, a pseudonym for a real person, or a name borrowed from earlier literature as part of a poetic game that has no connection with reality.

The poem has a riddling quality and might involve a play on words. Could the word *pilos* nod toward the horsehair of a bow for a stringed instrument or to horsehair strings of a harp? A major impediment to either interpretation is that any component of a stringed instrument that could be described as a vessel would not be the bow or any other part that could be produced with horsehair. No more easily determinable is the precise shortcoming of the person designated as Bassus in Poem 9. Maybe he created strings made of horsehair rather than of catgut, but he could not however realize the value of his creation.

All the uncertainties notwithstanding, the fact remains that Poem 9 has a notable density of terms relating to music, with *canorum, strepitus, modus*, and *sonorum* (as well as perhaps the uncertain *nox*). Furthermore, the adjective *bassus* and the noun *bassum* both acquired in Medieval Latin senses that anticipate their usage in modern music: see *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch*, 1. 1390, lines 52–56 and 63–65, and *Lexicon musicum Latinum medii aevi = Wörterbuch der lateinischen Musikterminologie des Mittelalters bis zum Ausgang des 15. Jahrhunderts = Dictionary of Medieval Latin Music Terminology to the End of the 15th Century*, ed. Michael Bernhard (Munich, 1992–), fasc. 3, cols. 211, lines 44–212, line 63.

---

67. *Quintilian*, *Institutio oratoria* 10.1.96, Russell, 4:304–305. For information on Bassus that could have been known through the commentary tradition, see *Commentum Corneli in Persium*, ed. Clausen and Zetzel, 141. For close commentary on the opening lines, see Hugo Beikircher, *Kommentar zur VI. Satire des A. Persius Flaccus* (Vienna, 1969), 17–20, and Aules Persius Flaccus, *Satiren*, ed. and trans. with commentary by Walter Kissel (Heidelberg, 1990), 763–788.

The neuter substantive *bassum* is documented in the thirteenth century as a designation for a saddle-pad or neck-pad (for a horse): see R. E. Latham, *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, fasc. 1 “A-B” (London, 1975), 186. Not only is this word attested too late to hold much hope of being relevant, but in addition its relation to horses does not prove that it had anything to do with horsehair.

[2r**]

**Inuictio ad Bassum**

Basse, pilos odis neque cernis quanta pilorum  
Munere gaza tibi. Pater olim pauper, equorum  
Rarificans caudas, uas texuit inde canorum,  
Cui nomen: tribuit strepitusque modusque sonorum.

*Invective against Bassus*

*Bassus, you hate hair and you do not see how great  
a treasure you have, by the munificence of hair. [Your?] father, once poor,  
thinning the tails of horses, constructed by this means a melodious vessel,  
to which the loud noise and tune granted a resounding name.*

**Textual Notes**

*Title and first letter in rubrics.*

2] Munere gaza tibi: *Gaza (with large initial) tibi, with munere (reading uncertain)* written above.

3] uas: uax *H. inde: . in (preceded by full stop) H.*


**Commentary**

*Title Inuictio ad Bassum:* Even the title has its puzzles. How exactly does the poem qualify as an invective? On a more mundane level, *inuictio* is usually paired with *in* or *contra:* see *Thesaurus Linguarum Latinarum* 7/2: 124, lines 37, 40, 42, 44, 49, 60, 62 (in) and 45–46 (contra). Although forms of *inuictio* are occasionally juxtaposed to the preposition *ad,* the constructions are not to express “invective against” but rather “invective to the purpose of” or another unrelated meaning.

1. pilos odis: Why does Bassus hate hair? Does this assertion allude to an assertion or episode in an earlier, perhaps classical, poem, or does it represent a private joke for which the context has been lost? odis: The verb *odi, odisse* acquired present, fourth-conjugation forms already in late antiquity, which became entirely routine in the Middle Ages: see Peter Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, vol. 4 (Munich, 1998), 219, VIII § 126.1.
2. Munere gaza: Two arguments speak in favor of inserting munere as the initial word in the line. One is that munere is written directly above Gaza tibi. Another is that this opening is attested at least once, in Arnulf of Orléans, Miles gloriosus 48, ed. Pareto, 62. Yet it remains difficult to construe munere syntactically in the first clause. Gaza tibi, pater olim munere pauper equorum: Although munere (if the reading is correct) is written above gaza, a case could be made for this alternative placement, the only other that is metrically possible. First, it seems likelier that a word other than the initial one would be omitted. Second, the phrase munere pauper is attested in Propertius, Carmina 2.16.9 (line ending), ed. Barber, 53, and Ovid, Ex Ponto 4.9.122 (as opening of the second half in a pentameter), ed. Owen. But if munere is placed in this position, there is no caesura. Pater olim pauper, equorum: The combination of the father’s poverty and the horses’ tails suggests that the father worked as a groom. This humbleness of the father’s profession would add a social dimension to the lowness to which Bassus’s name alludes.

2–3. equorum / Rarificans caudas: The plucking of hairs from the tail of a horse is mentioned by Horace, Epistles 2.1.45–46, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 293, to exemplify the kind of logical conundrum known technically as a sorites. The question posed implicitly by the Roman poet seems to be: how many hairs constitute a tail? If the hairs of a tail are removed one by one, the moment comes when the tail is no longer a tail—but what determines that moment? Does the dividing line between what is and what is not a tail depend upon a single hair, or is such an approach mere hairsplitting?

To different effect, Plutarch relates in The Parallel Lives an anecdote about how, so as to demonstrate the superiority of perseverance over abrupt action, Sertorius had a weak man who by plucking hairs one by one stripped bare the full tail of a healthy horse more easily than did a strong man who tried to tug out all the hairs at once from the thin tail of a weak, old horse: see Sertorius 16.5–11, ed. Konrad, 16–17. The same anecdote is also related in Valerius Maximus, Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem, 7.3.6, ed. Kempf, 337, and in Sextus Iulius Frontinus, Strategemata, 1.10.1, ed. Ireland, 23.

3. uas: The manuscript reading uax, if correct, is nonsensical. Emendation to uix would help little, since it would necessitate either construing canorum as a substantive or making another emendation elsewhere to produce a different object for the verb. The palaeographically minimalistic change to uox would accord with the other musical terminology (and with Persius, Satire 6), but makes little sense. I emend to uas, on the grounds that final -x for -s is attested in some manuscripts. For example, see Hugh Primas, The Oxford Poems, 9.2 ("ligustrix" for "ligustris"), ed. McDonough, 41. On the interchangeability of s(š) and x, see Stotz, Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters, vol. 3 (Munich, 1996): 316–317, VII § 279.5, and 320–322, VII § 281.9–282.2. Furthermore, the scribe may have slipped under the influence of the following texuit.
A problem could remain, in that a “vessel” is not the part of a stringed instrument that horsehair would produce—and *inde* seems to connect this clause to the preceding mention of horse tails. In the plural, *uas* is attested, albeit dimly, in reference to musical instruments. For instance, Osbern of Canterbury (died about 1094) writes in the *Vita et miracula S. Dunstani*, Chap. 8, ed. Stubbs, 79: “Sicut ergo David nostri simphonista vasa cantici habuit, quia usum illorum non nisi in divinis laudibus expendit.” Bartholomew the Englishman (Bartholomaeus Anglicus, died 1250) makes reference to “vasorum omnium musicorum”; see *De proprietatibus rerum* 19.132, published under the title *De genuinis rerum coelestium, terrestrium et infernorum Proprietatibus libri XVIII* (Frankfurt am Main, 1601; repr. Frankfurt am Main, 1964), 1254. But although both of these passages confirm a possible connection with music, neither refers explicitly to horsehair as used in either the manufacture of the instruments or the devices used to extract sounds from them. Could *uas* mean more generally “implement” (*OLD* 2014, *uas* 2a: usually plural, but note Cicero, *Letters to Quintus* 1.1.13, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 7)? In this case it could designate the string of a musical instrument.

Last but not least, could the conjectural *uas* be a sort of pot? The scholiast on Persius, *Satires* 5.148 has a relevant comment on *sessilis obba*: “obba genus uasis ex sparto factum.” This conjures up the idea of a vessel made from reeds or marsh grass. A vessel plaited of horsehair or made of leather stuffed with horsehair, like a saddle, is no less plausible. In any case, leather buckets and pots were surely common, and if such a bucket or pot served as a chamberpot, the sounds emitted by its user when relieving himself could explain the references to noise in the final line of this poem. Supporting the supposition that the container signified here is a “night bucket” is Martial, *Epigrams* 1.37, ed. and trans. Shackleton Bailey, 1:66–67, a single elegiac couplet that faults Bassus (or Bassa, in other manuscripts) for defecating into a gold chamberpot more valuable than the glass out of which he drinks: “Ventriss onus misero, nec te pudet, excipis auro, / Bassa, bibis vitro: carius ergo cacat” (You receive your belly’s load, Bassa, in gold—unlucky gold!—and are not ashamed of it; you drink out of glass. So it costs you more to shit). The clever twist of the poet here would be to present the chamberpot as being made of an exceedingly humble material, rather than of a precious metal. *texuit*: The verb *texit* “covered” might be more appealing for some interpretations, but it is not possible metrically. If the reading is correct, the poet makes a transition from the second-person forms *odis* and *cernis* to the third person here, perhaps because he is speaking no longer of his addressee, Bassus, but rather of this man’s father. *inde canor*: This line ending appears in Optatus Porphyrius (third or fourth century), *Carmina* 10.2, ed. Polara, 118 (“*inde canoros*”).

4. *streptus*: Persius, *Satires* 6.4 refers to *streptus* in a positive sense, which may have inspired the use of the word here. *sonorum*: Proximity would argue that it should be construed as a genitive plural with both *streptus* and
modus: “to which the loud noise and manner of sounds granted a name.”
Yet since the line as a whole seems to imply that Bassus deserved to receive
a name connoting the deep sound still associated with the word “bass” in
musical usage, sonorum is here construed as an adjective agreeing with nomen.
strepitusque modusque: The hemiodyas could be put into English as “noisy
music.”

POEM 10. Incipit “Vis tua fracta perit fracto de cornibus uno.” Four elegiac distichs.
Not in Walther. Not in In principio.
The main device of this poem is to mock an unspecified person for being like
the mythological Acheleous, a river-god who lost a horn when struggling in the form
of a bull with Hercules. The poet’s familiarity with the ancient myth is apparent in
line 4, where he alludes slyly to the cornucopia, which was reported to have been
created from Acheleous’s lost horn. The poet’s awareness of Ovid in particular stands
out in the second line.
The inspiration to identify the vicious person with Acheleous probably came to
the poet as a result of reading a commentary on Ovid. No similar identification
appears in early commentaries on Ovid, such as those of Arnulf of Orléans (late
twelfth century), John of Garland (thirteenth century), or anonymous ones, such as
the “Vulgate” commentary;69 in early mythographic works, such as those of the three
Vatican mythographers;70 or in such literary works as the poetry of Theodulf or the
Elega Theoduli (or in Bernhard of Utrecht’s commentary on the last-mentioned).
The only tenuous leads to any particular preoccupation with Acheleous before the High
Middle Ages are that the anonymous St. Gall commentator on Boethius’ Consolation
of Philosophy mentions Acheleous, out of confusion with Acheron, and that one of
the ivory panels, “very likely made up in the Carolingian ivory workshop,” on the

69. For Arnulf, see Fausto Ghisalberti, “Arnolfo d’Orléans, un cultore di Ovidio nel secolo XII,”
Memorie del R. Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Classe di Lettere, scienze morali e storie 24,
fasc. 4 (1932): 157–234; for John of Garland, see Integumenta Ovidii: Poemetto inedito del secolo XIII,
ed. Fausto Ghisalberti (Messina and Milan, 1933). For checking on the “Vulgate” commentary,
I am much beholden to Frank Coulson, who generously sent me his transcription of the text
from Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. lat. 1598, fol. 90v. In addition, he confirmed
that nothing is said of Acheleous’s moral character in the commentary on the Metamorphoses
in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 4610, or in the three commentaries in Munich,
Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 14482.

70. The antiquated standard edition of the three Vatican mythographers was Georgius Henricus
(First Vatican Mythographer), 1:74–151 (Second), and 1:152–256 (Third, referred to as Alberic
of London). The first two have been reedited in Mythographi vaticani I et II, ed. Péter Kulcsár
(Turnhout, 1987), 3–33 (First) and 33–62 (Second). For information on the dates of the three
Vatican mythographers, see Richard M. Krill, “The Vatican Mythographers: Their Place in Ancient
so-called *cathedra sancti Petri* represents the combat between Hercules and Aachelous, which the *cathedra* integrates with the list of the Twelve Labors.\(^7\)

In contrast to the dearth of evidence from the earlier centuries, a close parallel is found in the fourteenth-century moralization of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* by Petrus Berchorius (Pierre Bersuire), who equates Aachelous with the devil, Deianira with the human soul, and Hercules with the son of God. Bersuire writes that Hercules broke Aachelous’s “horn of power” (“cornu suæ potentiae”), and he cites Psalm 74.11: “I will break the horns of sinners” (“Cornua peccatorum confringam”).\(^7\) The existence of this parallel raises the possibility that the inspiration for this poet’s treatment of Aachelous may derive from the commentary tradition, although evidence for similar interpretations of the mythological figure from the eleventh or twelfth century are lacking.\(^7\)

[2r\(^8\)]

Ad quemdam superbum et inuidium

Vis tua fracta perit fracto de cornibus uno;
Frons, Aacheloe, suo truncà decore caret.
Frangitur ir: fracto frangenda superbia cornu
Et te tota simul copia deseruit.
Erepto cornu uis est erepta nocendi.
Posse cares sed non uelle nocere cares.
Impia mens assuetà malis celerumque magistra,
Immo parent scelerum, corripit omne scelus.

*To a Certain Haughty and Invidious Man*

*Your might is broken and perishes when one of (your) horns is broken; (your) mutilated forehead, Aachelous, lacks its (usual) charm.*

---


Pride that should be broken is broken when a horn is broken
and all night at once forsook you.

When one horn is taken away, the power to injure is taken away;
you lack the power to cause harm, but you do not lack the desire
to do so.

An impious mind, accustomed to wickednesses and the mistress of crimes—
oh, the parent of crimes—seizes hold of every crime.

Textual Notes

Title and first letter in rubrics.

2] aquilone H: corrected above line to Aechloe.

Commentary

1. **Vis tua:** A line opening attested from Ovid, *Fasti* 4.915, ed. Alton, Wormell, and Courtney, 112.


6. **uelle nocere:** The wording is found repeatedly in dactylic verse, with the most important and earliest instance being pseudo-Ausonius, *Septem sapientum sententiae septem versibus explicate* (incipit “Quaenam summi boni est? mens quae sibi conscia recti”), 7, ed. Schenkl, 247 (“quid stulti proprium? non posse et uelle nocere”).

7. **celerumque:** *celerumque.*

**POEM 11.** Incipit “Errant qui credunt gentem perisse Ciclopum.” Six end-rhymed elegiac distichs. Not in Walther. *In principio*, reference 123788. Also extant in Rg: see Rigg, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (IV),” 487, no. 63. These twelve lines, lightly ornamented with classical borrowings, are in end-rhymed elegiac distichs. The rhymes are brought home by the presentation of the text in the manuscript, since the rhyming final syllable is written only once and is connected by lines to the verses that it completes.

Like the tenth poem, this one equates an unnamed person with an ancient mythological figure. Although the Polyphemus here could be any selfishly grasping person, the poem later reveals that he is indeed, as the title proclaims, “A Certain Lustful and Greedy Prelate.”* His failure may be emphasized in Christian terms, if the last verse is meant somehow to echo the Bible.

---

74. The title is written in the right margin, beside the last verse of Poem 10.
At least as important as the mythological backdrop is the specific historical context for Poem 11, which is also linked closely with that for Poems 12 and 13. Poem 11 deals with a high-ranking clergyman, presumably a bishop. Both Poems 11 (line 11) and 13 (line 5) refer to a papal legate. Poem 12 (line 1) places prominently a mention of “Hilarians” (Hilarienses), canons of Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand of Poitiers, dedicated to Saint Hilary (about 315–367; feast day, January 13), the patron saint of Poitiers, and (line 2) touches upon someone who holds power over the people of Bordeaux.

Putting together the scraps of information, we may hypothesize that Poems 11 through 13 relate to a particular violent episode as the Gregorian reform spread through France. In 1073–1074 the canons of Saint-Hilaire were pitted in a severe conflict against the bishop of Poitiers, the simoniac Isembert. He would be the Polyphemus singlec in Poems 11 and 12. The papal legate who intervened against him was the energetic Amatus (died 1101), bishop of Oloron (1073–1089), archbishop of Bordeaux (1089–1101). As legate of both Popes Gregory VII and Urban II, Amatus, who oversaw the renewal of the Church in Bordeaux in 1080, was particularly vigilant against simony. His efforts were appreciated, at least by Baudri, who wrote a poem in praise of him. At the instigation of Amatus, Isembert was compelled to go to Rome to justify himself. Gozlin, the bishop of Bordeaux, was eventually charged with executing the measures that were to be taken against Isembert.76

De quodam prelato cupidō et auaro

Errant qui credunt gentem perīsse Ciclopum:
En, Poiphemus adest multiplicator opum,

\[2v^A\]

Excedens alios uultuque minisque Cicopes,
Tantali alter, inops esurit inter opes.
Cum sit tam capitis quam mentis lumine cecus,
Dedecus omne docet, dedocet omne decus.
Rupe caua latitans cupiendo, timendo laborat;
Quosque tenere potest, ossa citemque uorat.
Ecclesiam lacerat, deglutit publica fratrum,
Nec saciare potest mentis hians baratrum.

---

75. For information on Amatus of Oloron, see Theodor Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Vertrage von Meersen (879) bis zum Schisma von 1130 (Berlin, 1935), 88–152 (esp. 89–91 and 110–115), and Alfons Becker, Studien zum Investiturproblem in Frankreich; Papsttum, Königttum und Episkopat im Zeitalter der gregorianischen Kirchenreform (1049–1119) (Saarbrücken, 1955), 69, 73–74, 77, 80.

76. On the episode involving Isembert, Amatus, and Gozlin, see Augustin Fliche, La réforme grégorienne, vol. 2 (Louvain, 1925), 166ff.
Pontificum legate, decus, pater optime patrum,  
Ad solutum: redeat, coge nefas, aratrum.

About a Certain Lustful and Greedy Prelate

Those people are mistaken who believe that the Cyclopes’ clan died off:  
look, a Polyphemus is here who makes his wealth manifold.  
Outdoing the other Cyclopes in both his demeanor and threats,  
he is a second Tantalus, hungering needly amid abundance.  
Since he is blind spiritually as well as physically,  
he teaches every dishonesty and unteaches every honor.  
Lurking in a cliffside hollow, he toils in desire and fear;  
and those of whom he can lay hold, he devours their bones and flesh.  
He tears apart the Church, he gobbles the brothers’ communal property,  
but he cannot satisfy the yawning chasm of his mind.  
Pontifical legate, glory, best father of fathers,  
force this wicked person to return to the usual plow.

Textual Notes

Title and first letter in rubrics. Last letter of title, which is written not on a line of its own but in the margin to the right of the final line of Poem 10, cropped away.

1] periisse: periisse H, periisse Rg.
2] En: Et H, En Rg. Pholiphemus H; first h expunged.
4] ater H; al written above line. inops esurit: iops esurit (suspension mark omitted) H, inops exurit Rg.
8] Quosque H: Quemque Rg.
10] hiens: hiens H, lians Rg.

Commentary

4. esurit inter opes: compare Baudri, Carmina 5.29–30, ed. Tilliette 1:13 (“Quodsi diues eges, te tota sequatur egestas, / Ad mensam esurias, in Ligeri sitias”).
5. mentis lumine: The earliest occurrence of the phrase in this particular metrical position is in Hildebert, De mysterio missae 718, in PL 171.1193C. lumine cecus: Though the line ending is cliché, the closest parallel to the thought here is in Hildebert, Carmina miscellanea 49, in PL 171.1401C (“Exterius velut interius fit lumine caecus”). To turn from wording to thought, was Isembert, the simoniac bishop of Poitiers, blind in one eye?
6. Dedecus omne and omne decus: Both wordings are commonplace.
7. **Rupe caua latitans**: The phrase seems to fuse Ovid’s characterization in *Metamorphoses* 13.786, ed. Tarrant, of Polyphemus as “latitans ego rupe” (third, fourth, and fifth feet of a hexameter) with Vergil’s description in *Aeneid* 3.641, ed. Mynors, 173, of the monster’s cave as “cauo ... in antro” (third-fourth and sixth feet of a hexameter).

8. **tenere potest**: The phrase originated as a pentameter line ending in Ovid, *Ars amatorius* 2.388, ed. Kenney, 156, and *Heroïdes* 1.106 (as a variant reading), ed. Knox, 44.

9. **pater optime**: The vocative comes in the same metrical position as the same phrase in Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.710, ed. Mynors, 175.


Following directly upon the Polyphemus poem are eight hexameters, end-rhymed in two groups of four lines, which are marked by a red initial as a new poem (the twelfth). In these lines, a poet calls upon an unidentified “father” to discipline a miscreant similar to the ones described in Poems 9 through 11.

Despite the change of meter between Poems 11 and 12 and the fact that the scribes of both the Houghton manuscript and Rg copy them as separate poems, the links between the two are so strong that a recent reader has argued for considering them a single poem. The two poems are stylistically related: for example, the vocative “pater optime” appears in 12.4 in the same metrical position as in 11.11. More important, the poems are clearly concerned with the same malefactor, since 12.7 mentions the Polyphemus who is the topic of Poem 11.

If the title of Poem 12 is correct, then Polyphemus was probably a bishop of Poitiers who oppressed the Hilarienses (the monks or canons of Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand at Poitiers). The episode in question was a conflict that pitted the canons of the cathedral against the canons of Saint-Hilaire. According to a traditional custom,

---


78. Rigg, “Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (IV),” 487, no. 63.

the canons of the cathedral would go on All Saints’ Day to the church of Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand, where the bishop or, failing that, the dean or another dignitary would celebrate the Mass. In 1073 the canons of Saint-Hilaire ventured to impede the performance of this ritual. The business was taken ultimately to the pope, who settled in favor of the canons of the cathedral.\textsuperscript{80}

Although Poems 11 and 12 were no doubt composed by the same author, the first poem is addressed to the pontifical legate, whereas the second invokes for aid “Father Hilary.” The addressee—the one expected to restore peace and order to the people of Bordeaux, particularly to the monks of Poitiers—is probably not Amatus of Oloron, the legate mentioned at the end of Poem 11, but Archbishop Gozlin of Bordeaux.\textsuperscript{81}

In any event, Poem 12 is the only one in Group Two to take us out of the region running from Anjou through Île de France (where most of the other poems in the manuscript seem to have been composed), since it refers to the people of Bordeaux (\textit{Burdegalenses}, here spelled \textit{Burdegalanses}) as well as to the religious of Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand.

\begin{verbatim}
[2v\textsuperscript{A}] Exilaras mestos, hilaris pater, Hilarienses, Cuius uirga regit, docet accio Burdegalanses: Iura foues reprimisque dolos, sed digna repenses Qui delere uolunt que tu, pater optime, censes. Luce tua remove tenebras animosque serena; Dumque redis nobis redeant solacia plena Afficiatque semel Polifemuem debita pena. Tam caput elatum confringe minasque refrena.
\end{verbatim}

\textit{You gladden, glad father, the sad followers of St. Hilary, you whose rod rules the people of Bordeaux, whose conduct teaches them: you cherish laws and restrain treachery, but may you make fitting returns to those who wish to destroy what you recommend, best father. Through your light remove darkness and brighten hearts; and as you return, may complete solace return to us, and may due punishment cause harm to Polyphemus once and for all. Shatter the head that has risen so high and restrain the threats.}

\textbf{Textual Notes}

1] \textit{Initial rubricated. exilaras: exilares with e expunged and a above line in same hand H, exhilaras Rg.}

2] docet H: beat Rg. Burdegalenses Rg: Burdegalanses H.
4] volunt que tu pater: volunt pater no lacuna in H, volunt que tu pater Rg.
8] minasque H: minaque Rg.

Commentary

1. **Exilaras mestos**: The line opening echoes Baudri, *Carmina* 194.22, ed. Tilliette, 2:117 ("Exilaras mestos et stolidos reprimis"). **hilaris**: The choice of the verb *Exilaras* as well as of the adjective *hilaris* sets the stage for the closing mention of the *Hilarienses*, the canons of Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand. There is no natural way in English to convey the dense wordplay (for which the technical term would be *annominatio*) of *Exilaras-hilaris-Hilarienses*; the closest would be the unnatural and inaccurate "You exhilarate, hilarious father, the sad Hilarians [=denizens of Saint-Hilaire]."

2. **Burdegalanses**: The same substantive is used to close a hexameter by Baudri, *Carmina* 202.11, ed. Tilliette, 2:136.

3. **digna repen**: This line ending was common from Statius, *Thebaid* 9.50 and 11.182, ed. Klotz and Klinnert, 318 and 411, on.


**POEM 13.** Incipit "Edibus in nostris ferae hospitibus Diomedes." Eight hexameters, end-rhymed in two groups of four lines. Not in Walther. Not in *In principio*.

The untitled thirteenth poem lingers over the topic of ecclesiastical corruption, charging that an unnamed prelate turns over church property to his Ganymede—that is, his male lover. The reference to the legate in the fifth line recalls the eleventh line of Poem 11. As mentioned in the discussion of Poem 11, in both cases it is reasonable to infer that the pontifical legate Amatus is meant. Amatus, future successor of Gozlin to the see of Bordeaux, was the addressee of at least two poems by Baudri.

Poem 13 is also closely related to Poem 11 in form, inspiration, and technique. Like Poem 11, Poem 13 commences with a mythological allusion—this time to Diomedes, a Thracian king who fed his mares on the flesh of his visitors. The episode of "the horses of Diomedes" was conventionally one of the Twelve Labors of Hercules, who fulfilled the task by killing the king and feeding his body to the horses. After eating Diomedes, the horses became tame and could be led by Hercules to Argos.

---

82. This suggestion was made by Vernet, "Séance du 16 Avril," 53.
Like Achelous in Poem 10, Diomedes appears in Book 9 of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. As was the case with Achelous, the sort of interpretation advanced in this poem is not found in the early commentaries on Ovid by Arnulf of Orléans and John of Garland, or in the three Vatican mythographers; but it resembles Bersuire’s moralization of the passage (*Metamorphoses* 9.194):

...Diomedes significat mundi tyrannos qui equis id est stipendarijs
dant comedere carnes hominum laceratorum id est substantias
hominum miserorum. Itaque prespecia talium equorum id est talium
oppressorum cadaueribus id est bonis sunt plena.

...Diomedes signifies the tyrants of the world who give the flesh of men
torn apart—that is, the possessions of miserable men—to their horses—that
it, tributaries—to eat. And so the stables of such horses—that is, of such
oppressors—are filled with bodies—that is, with goods.54

The allusion in the twelfth-century poem has a particular appropriateness, since
male homosexuals were sometimes associated with mares in medieval literature.55

One further similarity between the eleventh and thirteenth poems is that both
introduce into their mythological allusions a figure from an unrelated myth: just as
the rapacious Polyphemus of Poem 11 is “another Tantalus,” the Diomedes of Poem
13 has a protégé who is a Ganymede.

[2v8] Edibus in nostris ferus hospitibus Diomedes
Intulit insidas, fécit manus impias cedes;
Nunc moriens hostis nostras sibi uindicat edes
Ut suus in dotes proprias habeat Ganimedes.
Iusticiæ legate rigor, defensor ueri,
Arbitrio cuius pendet moderatio cleri:
Hoc tantum facinus prohibe dignum prohiberi;

---

54. Petrus Berchorius, *Ovidius moralizatus* Book 9, Fable 9; see *Metamorphosis Ovidiana* (1509),
fol. LXIXv. The translation is quoted, with modification, from William Donald Reynolds,
“The Ovidius moralizans of Petrus Berchorius: An Introduction and Translation” (Ph.D. diss.,
University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, 1971), 333.

55. Such an association seems to underlie the comment in Geoffrey Chaucer’s General Prologue
(line 691) to *The Canterbury Tales*, ed. Robinson, 23, that the Pardoner resembled “a geldyng or
a marc.” For information on the same association in early Scandinavian societies, see Preben
Meulengracht Sørensen, *The Unmanly Man: Concepts of Sexual Defamation in Early Northern
Society* (Odense, 1983).
In our household a savage Diomedes
laid snares for guests, an impious hand caused bloodshed;
and the enemy, now dying, claims our house for himself
so that his Ganymede may have it as his dowry.
Legate, rigor of the justice, defense of truth,
upon whose judgment depends the governance of the clergy:
forbid this great crime, which deserves to be forbidden;
break the threats of the enemy and keep the habit of protecting us.

Textual Notes
1] Initial rubricated.
4] Squeezed between lines 3 and 5. in dote (without final s) proprias H.
7] facinus: facinus H.

Commentary
2. manus impia: This phrase appears in the same metrical position in Ovid, 
3-4. edes . . . Ganimedes: The name of the mythological Ganymede as a
shorthand for a young male paramour is particularly common in the poems of Baudri. The same rhyme is found (within a leonine hexameter) in Baudri, 
Carmina 77.95, ed. Tilliette, 1:73, and in pseudo–Hildebert, incipit “Tot scelerum morbis totus prope subjacet orbis;” line 37 in Hauréau, Les mélanges poétiques, 69. But the most relevant parallel in rhyme and thought is Hugh
Primas, Oxford Poems 23.159–161, ed. McDonough, 72 “Qui, quod sacre
datur edi / Aut inperit Palemedi / Aut largitur Ganimedi.” Iusticie legate 
rigor: The wording may be compared with Hildebert (or pseudo–Hildebert),
Carmina miscellanea 49 (“Versus de quodam paupere”), line 4, in PL 171.1400B
(“Iustitiae rigor et fidei uigor omnibus aequis”).

POEM 14. Incipit “Intus et exterius uirtute lauemur et unda.” Two end-rhymed
nationale, MS lat. 3343, fol. 93 [fifteenth century]).
The mythological poems began with the pure invective of Poem 10, and they shifted in Poems 11 through 13 to balancing complaints with pleas for the
punishment of the malefactors. In the last few poems before the biblical epigrams
the anthologist guises the reader away from the acrimony of the mythological
poems toward penance and theology. This route begins in the fourteenth poem, a
single rhymed couplet on the theme of purity. In the remaining poems in the second
group, the anthologist continues to escort the reader on a penitential path, so that
the shift to the biblical epigrams seems in no way abrupt.
The poem bears a striking resemblance to opening words of the similarly proportioned and end-rhymed antiphon (Psalm 50.9) sung by the choir in the ceremony of the Asperses, as the priest sprinkles holy water during the purification of the altar at the beginning of the Mass: “Asperges me, Domine, hyssopo, et mundabor. Lavabis me, et super nivem dealbabor” (You will sprinkle me, Lord, with hyssop, and I will be cleansed. You will wash me, and more than snow will I be whitened).

[2vB] Intus et exterius uirtute lauemur et unda;
Exteriora liquor, uirtus facit intima munda.

Inwardly and outwardly let us be washed by virtue and water;
water makes the outside pure, virtue the inside.

Textual Notes
1) Initial rubricated.

Commentary
1. Intus et exterius: A stock line opening.

POEM 15. Incipit “Solue graues penas celerum, committe, Loteri” (ductus of first three letters in last word uncertain). Six hexameters, all with the same end-rhyme. Not in Walther. Not in In principio.

Much is unclear about Poem 15, but no one would dispute that it opens with a firm directive to the addressee to accept punishment for his wrongdoing and concludes with a blunt statement of his failings. Presumably it is to be fitted within the same general context of the Gregorian reform as are Poems 11 through 13. This context would help to explain the mention of the appearance at Rome that the addressee is obliged to make, the crime of simony with which he is taxed, and the condemnation of the clergy that falls upon him. But who is the addressee?

[2vB] Solue graues penas celerum, committe †loteri†;
Solue graues, sed que digne poterunt adhiberi.
Excicium maius te censet Roma mereri
Quam quod tortoris excogitet ira seuern.
Te simonia notat, domus eruta morsque Rogeri:
Quodlibet istorum te dampnat in ordine cleri.

Pay the heavy penalties for crimes, undertake to †confess† them;
pay the penalties, heavy but which will be able to be applied rightly.
Rome resolves that you deserve a greater destruction
than that which the anger of a stern torturer can devise.
Simony is charged against you, the destroyed house and death of Roger: any one of these condemns you in the rank of the clergy.

Textual Notes
1] Initial rubricated, loteri (or lioteri), with two-letter erasure afterward (apparently of letters ri, unnecessary because of markings to indicate shared rhyme of lines 1-3) H.
3] moueri corrected above line to mereri H.
4] simonia written poorly H. eruta. mors written above line H.

Commentary
1 (and 2). *Solue graves penas*: Compare Seneca the Younger, *Phoenissae* 645, ed. Zwierlein, 121 (“Ne metue. Poenas et quidem soluet graves”). *celerum = sclerum. loteri*: The reading of the final word in the line is problematic. The first shaft resembles that of some bs and hs rather than h, although in the text of this poem it is most like the l in “Solue.” It is followed by a short upward stroke that fails to produce a typical b, a typical h, or a typical l.

“Loteri” would make sense only as a variant spelling of Lotari (vocative of the name Lothar). This interpretation would lead to the late 1130’s, since shortly before dying Emperor Lothar III (1075–December 4, 1137) in fact attacked and harassed King Roger II (1095–1154) of Sicily in 1136–1137. Such a variant spelling, although rare, is attested elsewhere, since “Lothero” is found in the final position of a hexameter, in a phrase that designates Lotharingia as having received its name from Lothar: see Gunther of Pairis, *Ligurinus* 7.207–208, ed. Assmann, 376 (“Francia seu magno nomen sortita Lothero / terra”). But since Lothar predeceased Roger, this interpretation of the word would have to assume (most tenuously) that the poet wrote these six hexameters during a brief interval when people thought mistakenly that Lothar had gotten the better of Roger and killed him. The name Boterius is attested, but this reading of the letters would be equally strained.

The solution assumed in the translation is to emend to *fateri*, which places at the end the word with the ending -teri that is most commonly found at the ends of hexameters. An alternative way of proceeding would be to emend *sclerum committe* to *sclera commissa*, but this approach would still leave the problem in the final word of the line. Furthermore, *sclera commissa* appears not to be attested in this *sedes*, whereas *scelerem commisso, sclera commissa, and scleris comitissa* are found in this metrical position.


5. *simonia*: Scan short-short-long-short? *Rogeri*: If the name were taken as a vocative (which morphology could allow), Roger would be the addressee of the poem. In this case our thoughts might turn to Roger of Hainaut (died
1093), bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne in Champagne (1066–1093), who was summoned to Rome by Pope Gregory VII at the same time as Isembert of Poitiers: see Fliche, *La Réforme grégorienne*, 2:238. But Roger could be the person whose death is being laid at the feet of the addressee, as an additional misdeed on his part. In this case it is not clear who the Roger would be. Both Baudri and Hildebert left poems in praise of a Roger, but in each instance scholars disagree over the identity of the man to whom the poems were addressed. See Baudri, *Camina* 192, ed. Tilliette, 2:111–113 (text) and 273 (discussion, in favor of Roger “Borsa” and against King Roger II), and Hildebert, *Camina minora* 41, “Ad ducem R<ogerum>,” ed. A. Brian Scott, 2nd ed. (Munich: K. G. Saur, 2001), 33 (text) and XXIX–XXX (discussion, in favor of King Roger II).

6. **ordine cleri**: A stock ending in Medieval Latin hexameters.


The mention of Rome in Poem 15 connects it to Poem 16, which is fortunately easier to decipher and interpret. Although most of Poem 16 describes the travails of the route that a wayfarer must travel to reach Rome, it is no mere verse itinerary. The phrase *curia diues* calls attention to the venality of the papal court, which was criticized for encouraging pilgrimages simply to increase its wealth. The two words cast doubt upon the entire enterprise of risking life and limb to see the *menia Remi*, if they are nothing but the walls of a greedy and corrupt city.

[2vB] Per loca culta parum, per aquas, per lustra ferarum,
Per iuga perque niues trait orbem curia diues.
Difficilis callis ubi nix, ubi mons, ubi uallis
Inpedit, infestat, trahit artus, corda molestat.
Dum tremulos pontes, gelidos dum transeo montes
Nil habeo tuti, proprie diffido saluti;
Undique cerno minas nemorum montisque ruinas.
Cladibus his emi quod uidi menia Remi.

The wealthy papal court drags the world through scarcely cultivated places—
through waters, lairs of wild beasts, mountain ridges, and snow.
A difficult path troubles the heart, where snow hinders,
a mountain assaults, and a valley drags down the limbs.
As I cross tottering bridges and frozen mountains,
I hold nothing safe and I fear for my own safety.
Everywhere I perceive the threats of groves and the ruins of a mountain.
Through these disastrous experiences I paid for seeing the walls of Remus.

Textual Notes

1) Initial rubricated. culta pa H: culta parum added above line in same hand.
2) trait H: trahit G.
3) trahit artus iH: terit artus G.
4) Undique cerno H: Unde cerno G.

Commentary


3–4. The translation is intended to preserve what appears to be a deliberate matching of three subjects (snow, mountain, valley) and three verbs (hinders, assaults, drags down). Alternatively, we could supply *est* with “Difficilis callis” to construe as: “Difficult [is] the path where snow, mountain, [and] valley hinders, assaults, and drags down the body, [and] troubles the heart.” Finally, it is worth considering the reading “terit artus” in G, which would encourage the translation “wears out the body.” Palaeographically it is easy to see how *trahit* could have entered the text in place of an original *terit*, especially under the influence of *trait* in line 2.


8. *Cladibus his*: A stock opening, *menia Remi*: This line ending plays upon that of Vergil, *Aeneid* 1.7, ed. Mynors, 103 (“moenia Romae”). The *variatio* achieved by the transformation of *Romae* into *Remi* could express a polemic intention, by implying that the walls have been contaminated by the blood of the fratricide who founded the city.

POEM 17. Incipit “Mira uidere cupis? Ascende cacumina rupis.” Six lines: two elegiac distichs, followed by two hexameters. In each distich a leonine hexameter is followed by a pentameter with a different internal rhyme (... b ... b ... b). The two hexameters at the end are leonine. Walther 11074 cites Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cgm 17212 (s. XII/XIII), fol. 22 (also 6 verses). See “Codices latinos

Poem 16 contains three mentions of mountains. These afford the anthologist a link with Poem 17, which is set upon a mountain. Apart from their settings, the two poems have little common ground. Whereas Poem 16 is concerned with the routes that the poet follows to the papal court in Rome, 17 reformulates one verse in the Canticle of Moses:

Constituit eum super excelsam terram ut comederet fructus agrorum, ut sugeret mel de petra oleumque de saxo durissimo (Dt 32.13: compare Ps 81.17).

*He set him upon high land: that he might eat the fruits of the fields, that he might suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the hardest stone.*

At first sight a poem based on this verse in Deuteronomy seems an odd choice for inclusion in the anthology, but this impression may be dispelled by two considerations. One is that the poem may be understood as celebrating a visit to the Holy Land, just as its predecessor dealt with pilgrimage to Rome. The other is that the poem may serve as preface to the text of the biblical epigrams, which begins on the next folio. In this light, Poem 17 becomes a hermeneutic exhortation to the reader to be prepared to interpret the Old Testament meaningfully. Possibly the poet had in mind the typological understanding of Deuteronomy 32.13 that Rabanus Maurus urged:

Sed nusquam tale aliquid juxta historiam legitur, si tota Testamenti series Veteris recenseatur. Nusquam de petra mel, nusquam oleum populus ille suxit. Sed quia juxta Pauli vocem, petra erat Christus, mel de petra suxerunt, qui ejusdem Redemptoris nostri facta et miracula viderunt.87

*But nothing of the sort can be read anywhere on the literal level, even if the whole progression of the Old Testament is considered. Nowhere did that people suck honey from a stone, nowhere oil. But because according to Paul’s statement the rock was Christ, they who saw the deeds and miracles of this selfsame redeemer of ours sucked honey from a stone.*

87. *Enarrationes super Deuteronomium* 4.2, in PL 108.975CD.
Rabanus Maurus’s interpretation is especially relevant to the biblical epigrams, which are arranged in an irregular alternation between Old Testament and New Testament topics. But Rabanus is hardly the only plausible source of inspiration for the poet, since the metaphor of drawing honey from rocks is commonplace in medieval discussions of biblical exegesis. In fact, the second verse reveals a possible debt to Paulinus of Aquileia.

    Non alibi quam ibi dat petra mella tibi.
Quid sit et unde stupes quod manat nectare rupes:
    Non dedit illud apis quod capis immo lapis.
Ex apium cellis non est data copia mellis,
Fundit mella silex plus quam caua quercus et ilex.

You wish to see marvels? Climb the peaks of the mountain.

Nowhere but there does a rock produce honey for you.
You are stunned why and for what reason it should be, that a crag
flows with nectar.
Not a bee, but a stone produced the honey that you take.
The abundance of honey was not produced by cells of bees.
Flint, rather than a hollow oak or holm-oak, pours forth honey.

Textual Notes

1] Initial rubricated. cacumina mo, with rupis added above line. Probably the scribe began automatically to write mortis, since the phrase cacumina montis was a hexameter line ending common after Lucretius, De rerum natura 6.464, ed. Bailey, and Vergil, Aeneid 3.274, ed. Mynors, 161.

Commentary


---


89. Carmina 4.37–38, ed. Norberg, 109: (37) “Haec est illa petra, Moses de qua sanctus cecinit: / ‘Suxerunt de petra melia, de saxo durissimo / Oleum,’ quod docet sanctum per enigma spiritum, / Quem post gloriam triumphi fluit in discipulos. / (38) Potest accipi doctrina per mellis dulcedinem, / Quam roruit totus dulcis et desiderabilis / Jesus, esset cum infima passioni dedita / Eius caro, que surgendo facta est fortissima.”
3. The line could be punctuated alternatively “Quid sit et unde? Stupes quod manat nectare rupes?” and translated “What could it be and where does it come from? Are you astounded that a crag flows with nectar?” The arguments against this alternative include the fact that it breaks the line into two sense units which do not coincide with the internal rhymes. *nectare rupes*: The line ending is identical with that of Statius, *Silvae* 2.2.99, ed. Courtney, 43. If the identity is a sign of indebtedness rather than a mere coincidence, then it could be relevant to a determination of the extent to which the *Silvae* were known in the Middle Ages. For the most current information on the transmission of Statius’s texts during this period, see Birger Munk Olsen, “La réception de Stace au moyen âge (du IXe au XIIe siècle),” in *Nova de veteribus. Mittel- und neulateinische Studien für Paul Gerhard Schmidt*, ed. Andreas Bihrer and Elisabeth Stein (Munich, 2004), 230–246.

Group Three

Poems 18 through 87 (fols. 3r⁻²⁻⁷r⁻³⁰) are epigrams. Poem 18, only two lines, is an anonymous versification of Gregory the Great, Moralia in Job 31.47: "Natus homo, utius moiendo loque resurgens, / In pennis aquile Christus ad astra volat" (Walther 11625). It stands in a close relation to all the rest—Poems 19 through 87—of the sixty-nine biblical epigrams by Hildebert. The epigrams in the Houghton manuscript follow the same order as those in the new edition, with the following exceptions: nos. 4⁻⁵ and 22⁻²³ are reversed, and nos. 50.1 and 61.1 are included, but not 50.2 and 61.2. This arrangement does not follow the biblical sequence of the passages to which the poems refer, and was probably the author’s own. Comparing the text of the poems in Houghton MS Lat 300 with the text in other early manuscripts could offer an additional means of localizing the anthologist (or the manuscripts upon which he drew). Several variants in the Houghton text also appear, for instance, in Saint-Omer, Bibliothèque municipale 115, a late twelfth-century manuscript from the Cistercian abbey of Clairmarais (Scott’s C), and London, British Library, MS Royal 8.B.iv, from Bury St. Edmunds in the thirteenth century (Scott’s D). While their commonalities are suggestive, they are not definitive, since they are so few. Aside from the question of localization, the text of MS Lat 300, which presents all sixty-nine Epigrams, arranged quite nearly in the order supposed to be original, should also be taken into account by readers.

90. The poem was published in André Bouteymy, “Notes additionnelles à la notice de Ch. Fierville sur le manuscrit 115 de Saint Omer,” Reine belge de philologie et d’histoire 22 (1943): 25.


92. Wilmart, “Le Florilège de Saint-Gatien . . . seconde partie,” 150. Four other extant manuscripts and three fragments share this arrangement. In another twelve manuscripts of the Epigrams, scribes attempted to rearrange them sequentially; their results vary: see Scott, “Biblical Allegories,” 409.

93. In Epigram 17, line 2, the words gentis dux are reversed to dux gentis, as in C, D, and Houghton MS Lat 300. In Epigram 59, line 4, MS Lat 300, D, and K (London, British Library, MS Cotton Cleopatra C.i) presents aetet, for Scott–Baker–Rigg’s aet. In Epigram 65, line 3, C, D, MS Lat 300, and A (London, British Library, MS Cotton Julius D.iii) have tounusa, for Scott–Baker–Rigg’s nasuna. C and D, along with X (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 14938), invert the order of Epigrams 22 and 23, as does MS Lat 300; D also reverses 3 and 4, while MS Lat 300 exchanges Epigrams 4 and 5. MS Lat 300 and C also share some other compositions: Poem 18 (“Natus homo, utius moriendo loque resurgens,”) appears in C separately from Hildebert’s Epigrams, and the declamatio and controversia that compose Group Four (Poems 88 and 89) are present in C as well.
of the Scott-Baker-Rigg edition, e.g., in Epigram 31, line 1, where MS Lat 300 has beato, for the otherwise universal latino.

The presence of the epigrams in MS Lat 300 may point toward a provenance for the manuscript in Tours, where Hildebert was archbishop from 1125 until his death in 1134—and where the invaluable Saint-Gatien anthology (Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 890, destroyed in 1940), with its ample samplings of Hildebert’s and Marbod’s poems, originated. This anthology had also contained all but two of the epigrams, in their original order.94

Below are listed the Epigrams as they occur in MS Lat 300, with the Scott-Baker-Rigg number in parentheses, and incipit. Where the first line in MS Lat 300 differs from the printed edition, the variant incipit is noted. Red initials decorate the incipits on 3r–4r; blank spaces are left for them thereafter.

fol. 3r
20. (2) “Quattuor esse reum faciunt: suggestio primum.” Walther 15296.
H: Ter Dominus Petrum Dominus rogat an seiligat; an non added above the line
27. (9) “Sunt hydrie mentes doctrine fonte replete.” Walther 18334.
ager H: hodor

fol. 3v
29. (11) “Per Iacob patrem, per Ioseph concipe Christum.” Walther 13941.
mundus Pharao H: Pharao mundus
Compare Walther 6085 “Exit de Iericho Christus cecisque duobus,” which Scott prints as the standard version (giving “dat lumen utrique” as part of a variant), and 6072a “Exit de Iericho” (three-word incipit only).
34. (16) “Mentis in excessu datus est liber Ezechieli.” Walther 10960.

---
94. See Wilmart, “Le Florilège de Saint-Gatien ... Première partie,” 5.
After the opening line of Epigram 17, lines 10-11 of Epigram 11 were recopied here and canceled. On fol. 4r, line 12 of Epigram 11 and the first five lines of Epigram 12 were recopied and canceled; then Epigram 17 continues.
H: Asa Caleph animam nobis
38. (20) “Mons fumat, Deus hic loquitur, stat turba deorum.” Walther 11186.
40. (23) “Respexit Dominus ad Abel, respexit ad eius.” Walther 16659
(“Respexit Deus ad Abel, respexit ad eius: Scott prints “Dominus”).
41. (22) “Iudicium per aquam transituit, eritque per ignem.” Walther 9922.
42. (24) “Coram pennatis tenduntur retia frustra.” Walther 3306.

fol. 4v
44. (26) “Celum factum firmamentum mistica res est.” Walther 2988.
45. (27) “Quando facit mihi iustitiam pro munere iudex.” Walther 15216.
Dina H: digna
49. (31) “In mensa Domini phiale ciatique parantur.” Walther 8999.
50. (32) “In base sunt cherubim sunt et bos et leo sculti.” Walther 8828a
(three-word incipit).
52. (34) “Loth figit ardentem Sodomam, montesque requirit.” Walther 10396.

fol. 5r
54. (36) “Accinctis gladio de porta precepit ire.” Walther 236
(“Accinctus gladio de porta praecipit ire”: Scott prefers “Accinctis”).
55. (37) “Cum multas pecudes habuissent, pascua querunt.” Walther 3679.
diebus H: duobus
58. (40) “Dum poscunt solui Baraban Christumunque necari.” Walther 3717
(“Cum poscunt”: Scott prefers “Dum poscunt”).
59. (41) “Cum sponsor Rebecca uideret, uecta camel.” Walther 3808.
60. (42) “Spelunca duplici Sarram sepelisse uir eius.” Walther 18478.
61. (43) “Per Nabuzardan destruxit rex Babilonis.” Walther 13952.
salvandi H: saluandi
63. (45) “Traduntur seruis unum, duo, v talenta.” Walther 19346a
(three-word incipit).
64. (46) “Exprimitur per timpana mortificatio carnis.” Walther 6134.
65. (47) “Accepit fruges ad semen serius ad esum.” Walther 228.

fol. 6r
67. (49) “In Sion ignis, in Ierusalemque caminus.” Walther 9106.
68. (50) “Patrem significat Abraham, sua uictima Christum.” Walther 13827.
latino H: beato
70. (52) “Archa Noe sursum fuit arcta, sed ampla deorsum.” Walther 1423.
71. (53) “Israel est Moises et uirga superna potestas.” Walther 9594a
(three-word incipit).

fol. 6v
72. (54) “Angelus in uictu candorem, fulgur in ore.” Walther 998.
73. (55) “Dum staret Moises in petra, pretereventis.” Walther 4962b
(two-word incipit).
74. (56) “Nostre nature deitas unita refertur.” Walther 12303.
75. (57) “Ut fertur salices sunt in medio Babilonis.” Walther 19797.
76. (58) “Hostia turturis atque columba mistica res est.” Walther 8488.
77. (59) “Petra capit semen, uia, sentes, optima terra.” Walther 14025.
78. (60) “Absorbet fluuium Behemoth, speratque quod ori.” Walther 198.

fol. 7r
dat quinque H: dat quisque
81. (63) “Quomodo suscepit Salomon a matre coronam?” Walther 16341.
82. (64) “Doctrinam per aquam, per nubes sume prophetas.” Walther 4686.
83. (65) “Ut capitis rasura docet, rex atque sacerdos.” Walther 19775.
rasura H: tonsura
84. (66) “Mens mala, mors intus; malus actus, mors foris; usus.” Walther 10911.
86. (68) “Scignant tres partes de Christi corpore; prima.” Walther 18193.
87. (69) “Quid statio dextra signat, uel parte sinistra.” Walther 15912 (with
“signet”). [BKB and JZ]
Group Four

Poems 88 and 89 (folios 7v–8r) are modeled on ancient exercises in forensic rhetoric. Both of these declamations are sometimes ascribed to Bernard Silvestris.95 Bernard’s interest in such materials is confirmed by the fact that he took as source for his Mathematicus a pseudo-antique declamation: pseudo-Quintilian, Declamatio maior 4.96 Although the attribution of these two forensic declamations to Bernard is insecure, they can certainly be considered the product of the “school of Bernard” or of the “school of Tours.”97 Thus they may well have originated in the same region as did Hildebert’s epigrams.

Poem 88 is the De gemelliis (although it is not entitled in Houghton MS Lat 300), based on pseudo-Quintilian, Declamatio 8.98 Eighty-two hexameter lines. Incipit “Roma duos habuit, res est, non fabula vana.”99 Explicit “Definiuit eam sententia iudicialis.” The text in MS Lat 300 is lacking lines that are found in other manuscripts, such as Rg.100 Walther 16848. In principio, reference 1284121.

Poem 89 is De pauper ingнатo, also known as Pauper ingнатus (although it is not entitled in Houghton MS Lat 300), based on Seneca the Elder, Controversia 5.1.101 Twenty-eight lines (14 elegiac couplets). Incipit “Mesta parens misere paupertas anxietatis.” Explicit “Res est iudicibus discuicienda datur.” Walther 10559.102 In principio, references 226187–226191, 1283465, 2069603–2069607, 2072968–2072969.

---


96. Declamationes XIX maioris Quintiliani falsa scriptae, ed. Håkanson, 60–84.


98. The fullest study of the Declamatio is I gemelli malati: Un caso di vivisezione (Declamazioni maggiori, 8), ed. Antonio Stranaglia (Cassino, 1999).


100. For a table of the correspondences (in which MS Lat 300 is designated H and Rg is O), see Edwards, “Poetic Invention,” 202.

101. For the source text, see Seneca the Elder, Declamations, ed. and trans. Winterbottom, 1:470–485.

102. The best edition is Edwards, “Poetic Invention,” 211–213. At 213 Edwards prints the explicit more intelligibly as “Res hec iudicibus discuicienda datur,” but he notes the variant “est” in this manuscript and “ea” in another.
Group Five

Contents

This section of the manuscript (fol. 8v–10v) encompasses six occasional poems, none of them listed in Walther, all in elegiac distichs, and all written to mark beginnings and endings. The poems celebrate a young count and a new king, and they mourn or mock some less widely known personages. As in the other sections of the manuscript, the poems are arranged in a thematic progression, so that each one has a relation of similitude or contrast with its predecessor and often relates by counterpoint of one sort or another to earlier and later poems within the section. In addition, the order of the poems follows a chronological progression.

Poems 90 and 91 open the section with glory and optimism, praising two young rulers, both of whom hold promise of surpassing their fathers. Poem 90 presents Geoffrey Martel le Jeune (about 1071–1106), scion of the house of Anjou (count of Anjou, 1103–1106), who is depicted as restoring to his territories the benefits of a golden age: pax (peace), pietas (devotion), lex (law), ondo (order), fides (faith), and concordia (harmony)—all are attributed to his rule and opposed to earlier disorder. Poem 91 continues in a panegyrical mode, elaborating on the justice tempered with mercy that characterizes (or that the poet hopes will characterize) the young Louis, crowned king in 1108. Both Poems 90 and 91 complete their portraits with comparisons to noted historical and legendary figures from Greco-Roman antiquity: Aemilius Paulus, Scipio, Laelius, and the Caesars in the first poem, and Aeneas, Cato, Socrates, Nestor, Ajax, Ulysses, and Paris in the second. The more intricate, illustrious, and numerous comparisons in Poem 91 befit the higher rank of the king.

Poem 91 develops at length a theme that appeared only briefly in 90: the superiority of the new ruler over his base father. For example, the poet gives free rein to his ire in describing King Philip I of France (1052–1108) as the “badly twisted vine” from which the flower, King Louis VI (1081–1137), has sprung. The nexus between the incompetent fathers of Poems 90 and 91—Fulk “Rechin” (count of Anjou, 1043–1109) and Philip I, respectively—is Bertrada of Montfort (1059–1117), who was Fulk’s fourth wife before abandoning him in 1102 for Philip. Bertrada also lay behind attempts made to prevent both Geoffrey Martel and Louis from taking power. Fulk had conspired to disinherhit Geoffrey Martel, son of Ermengarde of Bourbon (born about 1045), in favor of a son by Bertrada, and Louis too had to surmount a challenge to his kingship by Bertrada and her partisans.

With Poem 92, an elegy for a certain Milo, the mood turns somber. The identity of this particular Milo has been debated and is discussed further below in the introduction to the poem, but the evidence for Milo II of Bray is reasonably
convincing. The phrase “a victor even over himself” (“victor et ipse sui”) might, for example, be seen as referring to Milo’s somewhat inconstant support of Louis VI, with the poem’s emphasis on his obedience to the king meant in turn to focus attention on the state of affairs at the time of his death. The statement (25–26) that Milo elected to die rather than forsake justice bespeaks a death in some kind of conflict; and the date of his death in October meshes with what we know of Milo II of Bray’s history, namely, that he was strangled in October of 1116 or 1117 by his cousin Hugh of Crécy in a conflict over the possession of the castle of Monthéry, which Louis VI had bestowed upon Milo in 1109.

A connection with the intrigues of Bertrada emerges, as well: Monthéry had been ceded to the crown in 1104 by Guy II Trousseau (died 1109), Milo’s older brother, on the condition that his daughter and heir, Elisabeth (died after 1141), marry the adolescent Philip of Melun, who was the son of Bertrada and Philip I, and the younger half-brother of the future Louis VI.103 Eventually Monthéry came into the younger Philip’s hands, and he gave it to Hugh of Crécy. Given Philip’s (and through him Bertrada’s) own regal ambitions, Louis VI was unwilling to see this important castle in the possession of a partisan of his half-brother, and thus he confronted Hug’s at Monthéry in 1109: the outcome of Louis’ victory was the installation of Milo II of Bray, at this moment a partisan of Louis, as seneschal of Monthéry.104 Hugh’s subsequent murder of his cousin was widely deplored; Louis himself was present at Milo’s interment at Longpont-sur-Orge, and his grief and subsequent revenge upon Hugh are well attested.105

In sum, Poem 92 is linked to 91 through Milo’s association with Louis, and through the treachery of the king’s enemies, including of course Bertrada and her son Philip. If Poem 90 was a lesson meant for the young Philip, perhaps Poem 92 spells out the consequences of neglecting such lessons. Milo’s death at the hands of a traitorous enemy also resonates with the eventual fate of Geoffrey Martel, who was assassinated in 1106. Thus Poem 92 also interlocks with Poem 90.

Milo’s epitaph sets the tone for the three brief poems that conclude this section. Poem 93, an epitaph for Frodo, plausibly refers to the scholar from Angers who was mourned by Baudri of Bourgueil in three epitaphs of his own.106 Baudri

103. Once the marriage took place, King Philip and his heir Louis confirmed Philip “de Melun” as count of Mantes; hence his more familiar title, Philip of Mantes.


105. For the record of the royal itinerary, see Jean Dufour, Recueil des actes de Louis VI, roi de France (1108–1137), vol. 3 (Paris, 1993), 209.

writes of Frodo's "mors inopina" (unexpected death), which likens the deceased to both Milo and Geoffroy, perhaps insinuating that death is equally unforeseeable and unavoidable, whether for a knight or a scholar.

Poem 94, the epitaph for one Julian, remains more mysterious. The name refers not to St. Julian, patron of monasteries in Le Mans and Tours, but rather to a real person. Yet despite forays into various cartularies and historical indices, no one by this name has surfaced who died at this time. Thus for the time being Julian remains unidentified.

Poem 95 is an epitaph for a man called Maurice that satirizes the deceased's engagement in bribery and perhaps also in simony. Two possible identifications tie this poem as well to the Angevin sphere of influence. In a letter written between 1107 and 1110, Geoffroy of Vendôme (about 1070–1132) complained to Ivo of Chartres (about 1040–about 1116) about the grasping practices of one Maurice, and about his controversial election, probably around 1106, as abbot of Saint-Laumer in Blois.\footnote{Letter 109, ed. and trans. Giordanengo, 210–211.} Apparently the abbot of Saint-Laumer, one Geoffroy, decided to retire to a hermitage, and named Maurice to replace him. Later the retiree decided that he preferred his former position, which resulted in several years of uncertainty about just who was in charge at Saint-Laumer.\footnote{Some further details have been assembled in Noël Mars, Histoire du royal monastère de Saint-Laumer de Blois de l'ordre de Saint-Benoist (Blois, 1869), 139–141 and 283–284.} A suspicion may have arisen that Maurice had suborned the former abbot, which would account for the unflattering portrait of Maurice here.

Another greedy Maurice in Vendôme is the baron named Maurice of Craon, whose unjust appropriations of revenues belonging to the abbey of La Trinité, Vendôme, were stopped by the cooperation of Geoffroy Martel and Renaud of Martigné, bishop of Angers (1102–1125).\footnote{Olivier Guillot, Le comte d'Anjou et son entourage au XIe siècle, 3 vols. (Paris, 1972), 276.} Though it is unknown whether this Maurice committed bribery as well, it sounds as if doing so would have been in character for him. If the poem were indeed about him, we could identify the author of this poem, and possibly of the poem about Geoffroy Martel (Poem 90) as writers with a particularly vendômois outlook. Regardless of whether the Maurice named here is the sometime abbot, the greedy baron, or someone else entirely, the corruption criticized by the poet here contrasts nicely with the evenhanded justice meted out by Geoffroy Martel and Louis VI in Poems 90 and 91. [BKB]

**Authorship and Style of Poems 90 through 92**

The authorship of all these poems is undetermined. Also uncertain is whether all six of them, Poems 90 through 95, are the work of a single author. André Vernet (1910–1999) posited that one and the same writer should be credited with Poems 90
through 92, though he did not reveal his reasons for this surmise. Much in their style upholds the view that two or even more of these three poems are indeed by the same poet or at least by poets from within the same circle, as can be verified most easily by close comparison of individual poems in word choice and style, but even within the smaller cluster of Poems 90 through 92 it is not yet possible to assert firmly that one poet wrote all or even two of the poems.

Observations about stylistic tendencies and tone can point readers toward identification of an author, but by themselves such subjective determinations do not constitute proof. Criteria that are (or at least seem) more objective, such as statistical analysis of metrical and linguistic characteristics, often carry greater conviction in arguments about authorship, but here the sample—a grand total of 266 lines for Poems 90 through 92 together—proves to be unworkably small for many purposes. Still, a closer scrutiny of the word choice (and particularly of word choice influenced by phrasing in earlier literature) and style (especially rhetorical figures cultivated by the writer or writers) may suggest whether the three poems share an author, even if it does not permit a definitive answer.

Both consciously and reflexively, writers of Medieval Latin commonly drew upon their readings in earlier literature to furnish their own writings with elegant turns of phrase that sometimes facilitated the act of composition and often displayed the quality of their education. Patterns in the incorporation of borrowed words can help to distinguish one writer from another. While certain earlier authors belonged to the standard curriculum and so are quoted almost involuntarily by later writers, others were less widely read. As a consequence, a writer who habitually quotes less well-known texts stands out from the crowd. Additionally, if a poet turns out in his phraseology to echo texts nearly contemporary with him, that circumstance may enable an educated guess about when he composed his poem and maybe about his locality or literary circle as well.

In Poem 90, by far the most visible presence from earlier literature is Ovid, especially for phrases that fit in elegiac half lines. The poet of Poem 90 also frequently calls upon the Latin epic tradition, most often in the description of heroic traits and deeds. Vergil, Lucan, and Statius stand out, as would be expected. Poem 90 also announces its contemporary models, borrowing from some well-known classicizing poets of late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, particularly the so-called Loire Valley poets. On occasion, the verses of Poem 90 incorporate the same classical tidbits of which these earlier poets had availed themselves.

Poem 91 employs tags familiar from Ovid and Statius, and possibly from Vergil and Lucretius as well. One phrase ("ne quid nimis") is unmistakably Terentian in its origins, but it had become proverbial at the latest by the eleventh century: in his

Proverbia the poet Wipo states outright: “Prouerbium ‘Ne quid nimis’ laudatur in primis” (The proverb “Nothing to excess” is praised above all). Clichés that derive directly or indirectly from Avienus and the Ilias Latina emerge. Like the author of Poem 90, the composer of 91 may evidence knowledge of works by the Loire Valley poets: his language may contain reminiscences of Baudri and Marbod, and the style of his panegyric, with an address to the ruler’s country, follows that of Hildebert’s panegyric on Henry I and Matilda of England.

Poem 92 conforms with much the same pattern, with many phrases that are commonplace in Medieval Latin hexameter poetry but that may point particularly to Hildebert, Baudri of Bourgueil, and the canonical poems that were favored in their circles.

In some ways comparison is easiest between Poems 90 and 91 since both are praise poems for the politically powerful. All three poems, however, devote a goodly number of lines to delineating the virtues of their respective subjects. Poems 90 and 91 emphasize justice and courage as displayed by Geoffrey Martel and Louis VI, respectively. Each poet borrows phrases from poets such as Lucan to describe his subject’s virtues, and each compares the ruler with a catalogue of classical figures to align the count and the king with heroes of ancient epic and history.

The chief difference between these two poems and Poem 92 is that in Poem 92 the virtues singled out for praise reflect an ecclesiastical point of view rather than a political one. The deceased Milo is lauded as a student of Holy Wisdom, a rich man who gave to the poor, and a moralist who remained on the straight and narrow, imposing a manner of modesty upon himself and playing host to Modesty personified. The praises heaped upon Milo come across as more appropriate for a bishop, an abbot, or an ecclesiastic of another kind, than for a lay nobleman. For instance, the epithet *uenerabilis* (3) would better qualify a prelate than a layman. Likewise, the assertion that “He overcame the world, a victor even over himself” (10) could describe a person who has made a monastic profession. The same surmise may hold true to a limited extent for the accentuation of Milo’s purity (31–32) and modesty (33–40), which leads into the personification of Modesty as his inseparable companion. The remark about “the good things he taught” (42) may presume that Milo was a teacher or preacher; and the virtues singled out in the grand finale of panegyric (45–46)—*pietas* (righteousness), *spes* (hope), *pax* (peace), *gloria* (glory), and *fides* (faith)—again sound more ecclesiastical than political, though *gloria* may imply a prelate rather than just an everyday churchman. Such a reading calls into question the identification of the subject as Milo II of Bray, since according to what little we know of his life he was not any more preoccupied with virtue than the average nobleman. Still, his political conversion might have been accompanied

---

111. Line 60, ed. Bresslau, 70.
by a religious one that the present eulogist wanted to acknowledge; and a poet more familiar with monastic virtues than aristocratic ones might well have chosen his laudatory epithets according to his own experience, not necessarily that of his subject.

The Ovidian distichs of all three poems have been enlivened by the liberal application of rhetorical figures of speech and thought. Medieval Latin poets in general displayed a predilection for devices that highlighted repetition and variation. Twelfth-century poets especially favored forms of ornamentation such as anadiplosis (reduplicatio), asyndeton, and ammoninitio. Poems 90 through 92 all employ anadiplosis in combination with another variety of iteration, such as anaphora or epistrophe. For example, a phrase that caps the ending of one line may be repeated to begin the next. In one case the repetition is extended by later reusing the same ending:

Nil gerit utilius principec terra bono.
Principec terra bono colitur . . . (90.2–3)
cum uiet et floret principec terra bono (90.10)

Similar constructions appear in 91.106–107 and 91.109 (where the phrase repeated is “maior erit”), and 92.4–5 and 7 (“Milo ruuit”).

A second rhetorical device in which the poet or poets delight is asyndeton. Sometimes it is restricted to a single hexameter, but in other instances its exuberance cannot be contained and spills over into the next line:

Pax, pietas, lex, ordo, fides, concordia regnant (90.9)
. . . bona, bella, salubris,
deliciosa, potens, fertilis, ampla satis (91.1–2)

Extending plain and simple asyndeton are instances of a more elaborate omission of conjunctions, in which one series of nouns or phrases is matched with another one of verbs. Such an arrangement went in the Middle Ages by the name of versus rapportati.\(^\text{113}\) Cases in point would be the following:

Principec terra bono colitur, seruatur, habundat,
Agricols, armis, deliciis opibus. (90.3–4)

and

Lingua, mente, manu clamauit, creditit, egit
Quod rex, quod ratio, quod pia iura docent. (92.15–16)

This type of asyndeton may have become a vogue owing to the influence of Hildebert, who resorts to a related form of zeugma often in his poetry. A memorable example is *Carmina minora* 22.3–4. Hildebert’s zeugma differs, in that it features different clauses that share the same verb, but it is similar in presenting the other elements in groups of three.

A third favored effect is *annominatio*, which entails the repetition of similar sounds. This device is typical of much Medieval Latin writing. Very often it plays upon a noun and verb with the same root, in which case the ornament is categorized as *figura etymologica*. All three poems apply this technique freely, as the emphasized elements in the following lines from Poem 90 exemplify:

Martellus *consul* qui talia *consulit* orbi
Ut meritis plenis se *prohet* esse *probum*.
Qui *patrie* *patrocinium* felicibus horis . . . (90.13–15)

Among numerous other instances in the three poems, compare 91.29 (“supplicibus supplicet”) and 92.22 (“suscept suscipientem”).

With these general similarities in mind, we can undertake direct comparison of the poems. A closer inspection of Poems 90 and 91 reveals some word choices and ideas that appear in both, but other stylistic mannerisms that differ. To begin with verbal similarities, 90.33 and 91.31 both begin “scit quia continuo” (knows that . . . at once). Both poems use the phrase “morum floribus” (flowers of good morals) in the same metrical position, near the end of each poem, at 90.88 and 91.98. 90.94 has the ending “nobiliwmque deus” (ornament of nobles), similar to 91.20 “iusticieque deus” (ornament of justice).

Although the resemblance may reflect the conventions of panegyric rather than common authorship, both Poems 90 and 91 praise their respective subjects in similar terms. For example, they both dwell on the leader’s zeal for justice that can become *ferox* (fierce), at 90.32 and 91.23. The concluding lines of both also have much in common: 90.96 “cuius in eternum nobile nomen erit” (his name will be renowned forever) sounds very much like 91.12: “nomen propterea nobile semper erit” (your name will therefore be always renowned). Admittedly, a panegyric that concludes with the notion of immortal fame takes us into the territory of the commonplace, where we linger through the concluding couplets:

Interea longum ualeat Martellus et omnis
Qui pro Martello uota benigna facit (90.99–100)

Meanwhile, may Martel long prosper, together with everyone
who offers kind prayers for Martel.

---

Ergo diu uiat rex Lodouicus et omnis
Qui super hoc uerbo uota benigna facit. (91.115–16)

Therefore long live King Louis and everyone
who after this discourse offers kind prayers.

Yet clichéd or not, the overlap between the lines from “et omnis” to the end is too remarkable to be merely coincidental.

Although these similarities are striking, certain stylistic traits that may not result from conscious effort on the part of the poet seem to differ from Poems 90 to 91. The second poet reuses certain words repeatedly: satis occurs six times (2, 11, 15, 17, 27, 69), and nimium/nimis four times (5, 26, 37, 111). Nichil occurs six times (4, 7, 55 [twice], 62, 65), while maior appears seven times in lines 106–110, as well as thrice earlier in the poem (15, 69, 72). Repetition to this extent does not happen in Poem 90, where satis, nimium, and maior each are used only once (67, 81, 90), nil and nichil a total of four times (2, 42, 70, 81).

The author of Poem 91 is also decidedly fond of geminatio (55 “uile nichil, nichil indignum”) and the repetition of sounds generally, with some jingling results (13 “atqui...alii precii tibi...alti”; 81 “eras eremus”; 91 “proauos abauos atauosque”; 93–103 “Carolum Carolique patrem pater illi / Pipinus ... / Pipinus Carolusque ... / Pipini Carolique”). In particular, the recurrence of satis and nimium/nimis marks the writer of the second poem in this section as less skilled than that of the first: he seems reliant on nonce words to fill metrical space. The poet of 91 adheres less closely to classical norms of prosody. One useful index is the occurrence of a strong caesura in the fifth foot, which classical poets avoided, although it was more permissible if the fifth foot began with a monosyllable. Poem 90 contains four such caesuras, three with leading monosyllables (45 “et prior instat”; 53 “quot legiones”; 77 “hoc ego plane”). The fourth occurrence is a proper name (85 “Scipione”). In contrast, Poem 91 permits twice as many fifth-foot caesuras, five of them without the mitigating monosyllable (7 “nichil umquam”; also 55, 65, 77, 93). The author of Poem 91 also lengthens short vowels at the pentameter break several times (34, 38)—a common enough practice, but one not shared by the author of Poem 90. Disparities in the prosody of Poems 90 and 91, then, point to two different authors, as do the slight differences in the usage of rhetorical figures, as detailed above. While certainly some expressions are repeated word for word and some ideas recur, the overlaps may well signify imitation rather than identity. Taken together, the differences and coincidences might offer evidence that Poem 91 was composed by a student imitating Poem 90, in a clumsy replication of a model by a teacher.

The similarities and dissimilarities between Poems 90 and 91 are so complex and inconsistent that they make any determination regarding authorship a challenge. In turn, Poem 92 has less in common with either 90 or 91 than 90 and 91 have with
each other. Since Poem 92 is an epitaph, whereas 90 and 91 were written in praise of the living, some differences in tone are to be expected. Poems 91 and 92 reveal a few verbal and conceptual parallels, but they share only a single identical phrase, “esse cupit” (91.72 and 92.30 “desires to be”), which is generic enough to be chance.115

Reading Poems 90 and 92 together, we find that they share only a single very brief phrase of the sort that might have been deployed by almost any Medieval Latin poet: 90.2 “nil gerit utilius” (begins line: “produces nothing more useful”) and 92.38 “nil gerit iste locus” (ends line: “This place contains nothing”). In comparison with the close verbal resemblances between Poems 90 and 91, these correspondences are weak. Just as the composition processes of Poems 90 and 91 were clearly related somehow, it is equally apparent that 92 does not share their origin.

The most striking difference between Poem 92 and its two predecessors in the manuscript is the frequent alliteration used in Poem 92. This trait stands out especially in lines 11–23, which feature ten instances of alliteration, eight of them implicating adjacent words. Cases in point would be “sacra sacrum sicut sapiancia” (13) and “dives, dans qvoeicius cui darect et quid erat” (18). The most flamboyant is not in lines 11–23 but in a later hexameter: “sic suscepta semel suscepit suscipienst” (39). No comparable lines come to the fore in Poems 90 or 91. In those poems alliteration is certainly an occasional adornment, but for the most part an unobtrusive one (an exception would be 91.93–94). The difference is especially noticeable when the poems are spoken aloud. To conclude, the use of alliteration in Poem 92 demonstrates a distinct esthetic sensibility from what is displayed in Poems 90 and 91. Whatever the authorship of Poems 90 and 91, 92 is likelier by another poet (whether a third or a second).

In summary, these three poems provide some piquant examples of literary praise and blame from the twelfth century. Possible identifications of the subjects of the poems reveal interests along an east-west trajectory in northern France, from Anjou through Île de France and Champagne. Also notable is a subtle but persistent expression of enmity toward Bertrada of Montfort and her partisans. [BKB, with JL and PP]


The subject of Poem 90, named as “Martellus consul” in line 13, is most probably Geoffrey Martel le Jeune, count of Anjou (1103–1106). Stylistic as well

115. Among the tenuous parallels are 91.41 (“cor duplex scriptamque manum, linguamque loquacem”) and 92.15 (“lingua, mente, manu clamat, credit, egit”); 91.39 (“ipse sibi”) and 92.10 (“ipse sui”), and 91.45–46 (mention of Nestor: “reddidit . . . Nestora consilio”) and 92.28 (“consilioque potens,” the phrase used in Ilias Latina 177 to describe Nestor).
as historical considerations make it unlikely that the poem refers to an earlier count Geoffrey of Anjou (1040–1060), who was also known as Martel. The poet’s many reminiscences of Ovid, for one, suggest a date of composition after 1050, rather late for the celebration of the first Martel’s youth. Moreover, since the elder Geoffrey Martel consolidated and expanded upon the political successes of his father, Fulk Nerra (972–1040, count 987–1040), the contrast implied between the peaceful new regime and the lawless old one (for instance, in lines 69–70) would not be appropriate. A few later Angevin Geoffreys were also on occasion given the cognomen Martel (such as Geoffrey Plantagenet, 1113–1151, and his younger son Geoffrey, 1134–1157) but they too avoided notable conflicts with their fathers, and so can be discounted as subjects.

Geoffrey Martel le Jeune enjoyed a brief but apparently brilliant heyday as coruler of the county of Anjou. His father, Fulk IV “Rechin,” had tried to disinherit him in favor of Fulk V the Younger (1095–1143, count 1109–1129, king of Jerusalem 1131–1143). Fulk V the Younger was a son of Bertrada of Montfort, the wife Fulk IV took in 1089. After defeating Fulk IV in the attempted disinheritance, Geoffrey figures in charters from 1103 to 1106 as comes (count). The old count had been troubled by rebellious barons throughout his rule, and the resulting battles had devastated the countryside. Orderic Vitalis reports that Fulk rather enjoyed the pillaging and profited from it. Fulk’s reputation was thus hardly chivalric, and his disorderly personal life only gave clerical chroniclers more of which to disapprove. Geoffrey’s success against his father and subsequently against several of the barons quieted the rebellions and foretold a more peaceful existence for the people of Anjou.

Alas, Martel’s promise was sadly short-lived. On May 19, 1106, while besieging Candé, he was struck and killed by an arrow as he made his way to a parley. One chronicler attributed his death to the treachery of his father and Bertrada. Contemporary sources do not speculate further about the forces behind the unknown archer, but they are unanimous in extolling his victim. They describe Martel as “an admirable man, distinguished in justice, a cultivator of the whole of goodness, who was a terror to all his enemies” and as “a subduer and conqueror


120. Chronica de gestis coussilem anegavonum, ed. Halphen and Poupardin, 66.
of tyrants, protector and defender of churches.” The portrait conveyed in Poem 90, then, while conventional, echoes the sentiments of contemporary observers, and Martel’s reputation as a “protector of churches” makes it all the likelier that a scholar-cleric would praise him in verse.

Because the poem is emphatically not an epitaph, and because it refers to Martel as “count,” it can be dated with some certainty to the years 1103–1106. It was probably written to commemorate some triumph of Martel’s, perhaps his power-sharing agreement with his father or his successful cooperation with Renaud of Martigné, bishop of Angers, against Maurice of Craon.

Determining the addressee of the poem is more of a challenge. Poem 90 is introduced as a verse epistle, addressed by the poet to “[his] Philip.” The name Philip is rare in France before the birth of Philip I in 1052, and for the next generation or so it is attested primarily in families connected with Anne of Kiev (1024–about 1089), the mother of Philip I. Obvious candidates for the addressee of Poem 90 would then include Philip I himself; his son by Bertrada, Philip of Melun (born 1093); and Philip, bishop of Troyes (1081–1121).

The tone of the poet’s address to Philip can help to narrow this field a bit. Poets of the period use the vocative mi + a name when writing to someone considered an intimate friend, usually a fellow poet or a former student. Our Philip, then, is either a scholarly contemporary of the poet, perhaps associated with one of the cathedral schools, or perhaps a student—a young literate nobleman—for whom Martel might serve as an example. These circumstances would rule out Philip I, who in 1103 was neither youthful nor particularly connected with the schools.

Identification of the addressee as Bishop Philip is conceivable, especially if we allow that the poet himself might have been a bishop, writing to a colleague, perhaps


125. For example, Baudri writes “mi Marbode” (86.20, ed.Tilliette, 1:82) but does not so address Audebertus (87, ed.Tilliette, 1:83–84), with whom he cannot yet claim friendship. Baudri also uses mi in writing to his former student Peter (145.22, in Tilliette, 2:55); Galo, fellow poet and bishop of Léon (193.3, in Tilliette, 2:113); and Odo, cardinal of Ostia (206.2, ed.Tilliette, 2:138). Baudri addresses his “advice to the young” (93, ed.Tilliette, 1:90–92) to Philip, brother of Stephen, the count of Blois; but since Baudri’s Philip lived from 1065 to 1100, a poem in praise of a current count Martel could not be directed to him.
to boast about the cooperation achieved with the new count. Taking the rest of the poem’s first line into account makes the bishop seem less promising as an addressee, however. “Omnibus in rebus” (in all things) is a sententious phrase, used commonly in both proverbs and the incipits of didactic poems. Its presence warns the reader of a moralizing lesson to follow, in this case about the virtues of a “princeps bonus” (good ruler). This hint of the schoolroom encourages an identification of “mi Philippe” as Philip of Melun, who at the time would have been between ten and thirteen years old, just the right age for reading and construing Latin poetry that conveniently provides a model of political virtue. Whether Bertrada would have approved of her young son’s reading a panegyric on her former stepson is impossible to know. Perhaps, as the king and the counts of Anjou continued to make common cause against the Normans, Martel’s valor took precedence over Bertrada’s personal preferences, and a tutor’s Martellian sympathies found expression. An additional piece of evidence possibly bolstering the identification with Philip of Melun is that he held for a time the castle of Monthéry, the same castle that led to the strangling of Milo II of Bray, who may be the Milo elegized in Poem 92. This overlap between Poems 90 and 92, although minor and conjectural, would tighten the constitution of Group Five as a whole.

One other possible Philip has come to light. The Anglo-Norman writer Philip of Thaon was active as a poet and translator from about 1100 to about 1140. Among the first writers of literary French, he won a name for his translations of current Latin “best-sellers,” including a lapidary, a computus, a body-and-soul debate, a bestiary, and, perhaps, the prophecies of the Tiburtine Sibyl (a Latin version of which appears at the end of MS Lat 300). 126 It is not impossible that a poet-friend, perhaps even a former teacher, should have sent this enthusiast of learned literature an example of Angevin panegyric poetry. For the moment, however, the addressee of Poem 90 eludes positive identification.

[BKB]

[8v4] Omnis in rebus quas, mi Philippe, uidemus,
Nil gerit utilius princepe terra bona.
Principe terra bona colitur, seruatur, habundat,
Agricolis, armis, deliciis, opibus.
Cum princeps bonus est, secure terra quiescit
    Et procul abcedunt furta, rapina, dolus.
Cum bonus est princeps, si subdita colla repugnant,
    Sternuntur facile uiiris ipsa suis.

Pax, pietas, lex, ordo, fides, concordia regnant
Cum uiuet et floret príncipe terra bono.

Astat in exemplum consul Martellus, ab ipsis
Partibus inuidie magnificatus homo.
Martellus consul qui talia consulti orbi
Ut meritis plenis se probet esse probum,
Qui patrie patrocinium felicibus horis
Suscepit iuuenis corpore, mente senex.
Hunc tu si uideas ciuilia iura tenentem,
Sublimem dicas et simul egregium.

Circumstant illum populus procerumque senatus
A quibus ut distat corpore, sic animo.
Audit et attandit quid sancti ille uel ille,
In medium quociens res trutinanda uenit.

Ultima que reliquas omnes sentencia claudit
Est sua quod nunquam uel titubare potest.
Pauca quidem loquitur sed circumcisa, sed ampla,
Sed que sunt plene pondere fixa suo.
Tamquam de celo, tamquam de uertice ueri
Suscipitur quicquid consulis ore sonat.
Errantes reuocat, miseri miseretur, honorat
Dignos, insequitur crimina, non homines,
Et quem perfecte fecit natura benignum,

[8v^p]

Scit quia continuo uicii laxantur habene
Si de iusticie partibus una perit.
Peruigil ad curs alientes, peruigil, inquam,
Ut pius, ut sapiens, ut pater, ut dominus.
Si bellis opus est, si tandem tempus in hostem,
Tunc uero quam sit maximus ille docet.
Non uelud ignau latebras meditatur et umbras,
Non precibus pacem queritat aut spacificum,
Sed quasi de sursum victoria certa paretur,
Nil reputat bello tuciis esse sibi.
Convocat heroes, populos sciet, ordinat agmen,
Instruit, hortatur nomine quemque suo.
Ipse prior rapit arma, prior ferit, et prior instat,
Et reliquis amplexas preparat ense uias.
Ut leo quem uius gladius propulsat in iram
Infremens erigitur, circuit, accelerat,
Sic ubi bellorum Martellus sentit odorem,
Hostibus a facie mox metuendus aest.

Nec prius abscedit quam pulsis omnibus, et pax
Et requies celebris reddita sit patrie.

O quantas acies, quot milia, quot legiones,
Quos animos secum praeuis ipse trait.

Iliius ad nutum prouincia tota mouetur,
Dum properant omnes bellica signa sequi.

Et nosti que sit nostro constancia gentis,
Quam metuenda manus, quam celeres gladii.

Degenerem uilemque timet se poss probari
Quisquis post primos primus in arma uenit.

Difficile uices de tot ceruicibus unam
Cui durum sit eo precipiente mori,

Sic ad se populi totos apellat amores

Consul, consilii regula magnifici.

Qui tociens uincit quociens ad prafia uenit
Et uinict quociens resque locusque uocat,

Opida que nimium manus et natura tuetur
Non posunt eiuis sustinuise manus.

Iustitiam summis patriae plantuit in horis
Qua custode nichil rustica turba timet.

Securos iubet ire boues securus arator,
Securas pasct pastor inermis oues.

Nemo uiatorum timet aduantare latronem,
Nemo larociniis audet adire uias.

Multiplicare loqui non est opus: omnia paucis,
Pax est conclusa integra, firma, potens.

Dicere quisque potest que sensit; hoc ego plane,
Martello semper debitor orbis erit,

Debitor ut laudet, recolat, miretur, honore
Et dignum ducat nomine precipuo.

Ergo nichil peccat quisquis maioribus illum
Comparat ac summis patribus annumeral.

In quo complacuit sibi uirtus unica; cuius
Nondum uiderunt tempora nostra parem,

Qua uel in antiquis Paulo, Lelio, Scipione
Qua uel in Augustis Caesaribusque fuit.

O caput excelsum dignum rutilante corona
O animam morum floribus egregiam,
O hominem mira probitatis luce choro scum
Quem laudare satis nulla camera potest.
Cuius honestates sic secula nostra deaurant
Ut mundi possint reddere principio.

Hunc ego non metum celorum pace uocari
Splendorem procerum nobiliumque decus,
Cuius non poterit laudes delere uetustas,
Cuius in eternum nobile nomen erit.
Sit licet ad patres rapiendus legibus eui
Sed meritis eius fama perhennis erit.
Interea longum ualeat Martellus et omnis
Qui pro Martello uota benigna facit.

In all things we see, my dear Philip,
the land produces nothing more useful than a good ruler.
Under a good ruler the land is cultivated by farmers, is preserved by
means of arms, and abounds in delight and benefits.
When a ruler is good, the land is at peace without care,
and thefts, pillaging, and fraud depart far away.
When a ruler is good, subjects who throw off the yoke
are easily overwhelmed by his might.
Peace, mercy, law, order, trust, and harmony reign
when the earth burgeons and blooms under a good ruler.
Count Martel stands as an example—
a man esteemed even by the factions that envy him.
Count Martel, who gives such decrees to the world
that by his abundant good deeds he proves his righteousness—
who took up the protection of his fatherland in auspicious times,
young in body, yet mature in mind.
If you should see him maintaining civil laws,
you would say he was both eminent and noteworthy.
Around him stand the people and the senate of nobles,
from whom he differs as much in body as in spirit.
He hears and considers what one side and the other confirms,
whenever a case to be weighed comes before him.
The final decision that caps all others
is his, because it can never even falter.
He speaks few words, and those concise, but sufficient,
and weighted with his full authority.
Just as if from heaven, as if from the height of truth,
whatever sounds forth from the count’s mouth is accepted.

He recalls the wandering, pities the lowly, honors
the worthy, hunts down crimes (not men),
and he whom nature made perfectly kind
is compelled by the sins of men to be fierce.

He knows that the reins of vice slacken at once
if a single part of justice perishes.
He is ever watchful of others’ interests, watchful, I say,
like a beneficent father, like a wise lord.

If there is need for wars, if at last it is time to proceed against the enemy,
then, truly, he shows how very great he is.

He does not plot subterfuge or pretence, as cowards do,
nor does he seek peace or delay with petitions,
but just as if sure victory might be arranged from on high,
he deems nothing safer for himself than war.

He summons the warriors, rouses the people, draws up an army,
equips it, and exhorts each soldier by name.
He is the first to take up his weapon, he strikes first, charges first,
and opens wide paths for the rest with his sword.
As a lion, propelled to anger upon seeing a sword,
is roused, roaring, circles, and attacks,
just so, when Martel catches the scent of wars,
he is there straightaway, fearsome, facing down the enemy.

Nor does he leave the field before all are defeated, and
its famed peace and repose have been returned to the land.
O how many troops, how many thousands, how many legions,
what courage he brings with him, as he goes in the vanguard!

The entire province responds to his nod,
as all men hasten to follow the battle standards.
And you know how great is the steadfastness of our people,
how fearsome the hand, how quick the swords.

Each man fears to be shown unworthy and base
if he first enters the fray after the first onslaught.

You would hardly see one among so many bold men
who thought it hard to die under his command,
to such an extent he summons to himself the people’s entire love,
the count, a model of magnificent counsel.

Who conquers as many times as he goes to battle,
and conquers as often as the circumstances and the place demand,
even towns well fortified by nature and by arms
    cannot withstand his army.
He has fixed justice at the farthest borders of the land:
    under its protection, the peasantry need fear nothing.
Free from care, the plowman bids the oxen go carefree,
    the shepherd unwarmed grazes his flock in peace.
No traveler fears a brigand’s attack:
    no one dares to approach the highways for banditry.
There is no need to say more: to state everything in a few words,
    the peace reached is complete, solid, and strong.
Everyone can speak his judgment: I myself say clearly,
    the world will be forever indebted to Martel,
so let the debtor praise, recall, admire, honor,
    and consider him worthy of his eminent name.
So it is no mistake for anyone to compare him with his forefathers
    and number him with his greatest ancestors.
In him virtue alone has pleased itself, virtue of which
    our times have yet seen no equal,
virtue as it was among the ancients, Aemilius Paulus, Laelius, Scipio,
    or among the Caesars Augustus.
O lofty head, worthy of a glittering crown,
    O soul, outstanding in its flowers of good morals,
O man, brilliant with the wondrous light of integrity,
    whom no muse can praise enough!
His virtues make our age so golden
    that they can return us to the beginning of the world.
I won’t hesitate to call him—with heaven’s permission—
    the splendor of princes, the ornament of nobles.
Age will not be able to destroy his praises,
    his name will be renowned forever.
Though he must be gathered to his fathers according to the law of time,
    his fame for his accomplishments will be everlasting.
Meanwhile, may Martel long prosper, together with everyone
    who offers kind prayers for Martel.

Textual Notes
1] Initial missing.
2] utilius: ultius corrected above line.
6] abcedunt: accedunt expunged, first c corrected to b above.
A Garland of Satire, Wisdom, and History

11] Marcellus: Marginal dog-headed creature barks, open-mouthed, at this line, calling
attention to Martel's name.

23] sentencia: scantancia with sca expunged, corrected to se above. claudit: cladit.

37] belli: belli emended for meter and grammar.

38] docet: dolet expunged I corrected to c above.

51] Nec: Ne missing final c.


76] Pax est conclusa: Concluda pax est, with abbreviation stroke through d.

78] orbis appears to read urbis (with two minims preceding rbis).

88] a animam s, with first a and final s expunged.

91] deaurent corrected at line end to -runt.

92] mundi: mudi missing abbreviation stroke.

Commentary

1. Omnibus in rebus: This phrase was a common building block of hexameter
poetry from the classical period onward. The three words are grouped
repeatedly as a metrical unit, always as a line opening. In late antiquity and
the Middle Ages the phrase became a common incipit, especially of didactic
poems. "Omnibus in rebus" also came to be a convenient beginning for a
metrical proverb: the standard compendium boasts seventeen examples, all
but two of which are in verse. See Walther, Proverbia sententiaeque latinitatis
medii aevi, 3:629–630, nos. 20147–20152, and Paul Gerhard Schmidt, Proverbia
sententiaeque Latinitatis medii ac recentis aevi, nova series/Latinische Sprichwörter
und Sentenzen des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit in alphabetischer Anordnung,
3 additional vols. (Göttingen, 1983), 8:944, nos. 39253c–39255.

2–3. princeps terra bono: The poet employs a device similar to epanalepsis by
beginning a hexameter with the half line with which the preceding couplet
ended. In line 10 he repeats the same phrase as a line ending. The repetition
emphasizes this phrase, which encapsulates the subject of his poem: under
a good ruler the land (thrives). On the matter of epanalepsis, see Carmela
Vircillo Franklin, "O sacrata dies: A New Typological Poem in Epanaleptic

4. deliciis, opibus: A conventional line opening used in a dactylic pentameter
by Hildebert, Querimonia meter 1. 28, ed. Orth, 73 ("deliciis opibus nomine
lactat heram"). Here translated as "delights and benefits," it could also be
interpreted as a hendiadys meaning "delightful benefits." The latter approach
has the advantage of glossing over the break in symmetry that results from
having three verbs followed by four nouns.

5. princeps bonus: Prudentius, Peristephanon 12.47, ed. Cunningham, 380;
Baudri, Carnina 211.3, ed. Tilliette, 2:143. secure terra quiescit: Compare
Ovid, Fasti 6.734, ed. Alton, Wormell, and Courtney, 161 (pentameter:
"plenaque securae terra quietis erit").
6. **abcedunt = absedunt. furta, rapina, dolus**: A certain Guiardinus or Guido, whose poem on the virtues and vices (incipit “Care nepos! tibi quod sequitur mea cura ministrat”) appears in a late thirteenth-century manuscript, also uses these words as the ending of a pentameter in line 626: see Jakob Werner, “Guiardinus: Bruchstücke eines lateinischen Tugendspiegels nach der Basler Handschrift,” *Romanische Forschungen* 26 (1909): 449. His word choice duplicates Poem 90 in two other passages (see notes on lines 9 and 11 below). A single parallel could be mere happenstance, but three to such a short passage as lines 6–14 raise the distinct possibility that Guiardinus had encountered this poem. Unfortunately, little information about Guiardinus can be gleaned from his text, except that he admired Henry I “le Liberal” (count of Champagne 1152–1181) as a paragon of generosity (lines 141–150), which suggests that the poet lived in northern France in the mid to late twelfth century. Werner hypothesized that Guiardinus might be identical with Guiard of Laon (about 1170–1248), a bishop of Cambrai, but no evidence undergirds such an identification apart from the proximity of the two names.


8. **uiribus ipsa suis**: A half line of a pentameter common since Ovid, *Remedia amoris* 88, ed. Kenney, 208 ("uiribus aucta suis" ["uiribus ipsa suis" in E]; line ending); compare *Tristia* 4.10.104, ed. Owen ("viribus usa suis"; line ending), and *Ex Ponto* 3.5.14, ed., Owen ("viribus illa suis": line opening); also pseudo-Vergil, *Culex* 36, ed. Clausen, 20 ("uiribus apta suis": opening of hexameter).

9. **pax, pietas**: Also a line opening in Guiardinus, line 639, ed. Werner, "Guiardinus,” 430.

**concordia regnant**: *concordia regn* as a line ending occurs in Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina* 6.1.141, in Leo, 129; in Reydellet, 2:50 (“concordia regn”) and in many later poets.


14. Play on **prob**: Compare Baudri, *Carmina* 228.8–9, ed. Tilliette, 2:112; Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, MS C 58, fol. 36, in Werner, *Beiträge*, 78, no. 163, lines 3–4; and Guiardinus, in Werner, “Guiardinus,” 459, Anhang II, line 24 (“Et falsum reprobat et probat esse probum”).

15–16. The poet's joy at Martel's early accession to power (while his father Fulk is still alive) constitutes an implicit criticism of the old count, who was neither a
kindly father to his son (attempting to disinherit him in favor of his younger half-brother) nor a successful ruler (waging war continually with one or another of his vassals). Compare 36.


17. **iura tenetem:** The line ending “iura ten*” is commonplace.

19. **populus procerumque:** First attested in Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum* 2.1104, ed. Cunningham, 249 (“populi procerumque salutem”).

21. **Audit et attandit:** Also as a line opening in John of Garland, *Epithalamium beate virginis Marie* 5.614, ed. Saiani, 446. The orthography *attandit* is typical of MS Lat 300.


25. **paucæ quidem loquitur:** Ovid, *Ibis* 639 “paucæ quidem, fateor” (line opening), ed. Owen. Thereafter “paucæ quidem,” especially with verbs of speaking, is common. **circumcisa:** Probably the adjective is used mainly in a rhetorical sense, to mean “concise.” In the Vulgate, *circumciso* is paired metaphorically with *mentes* (Lv 26:41), *cordes* (Dt 10:16, 30:6, Jr 9:26, Ez 44:7, Acts 7:51, Rom 2:29), and *aures* (Jer 6:10, Acts 7:51); and Moses asks the Lord (Ex 6:12), “Quomodo audiet Pharaon, præsertim cum incircumcisus sim labiis?” (“How will Pharaoh hear me, especially as I am of uncircumcised lips?”). The circumcised tongue is a later monastic image, related to the importance of silence in monastic practice: for example, see Haimo of Auxerre, *Homiliae IV in circuminzione Domini,* in PL 118.96B (“Circumcidenda est lingua a maleductioneibus, petjuris, falsitatis, mutatisinibus et a consuetudine otiosi sermonis”) and Bruno of Segni, *Expositio in Genesim* 17, in PL 164.193A (“Lingua circumcissa non loquitur mendacium”).


27. **de uertice ueri:** A remarkable metaphor, if written and transcribed correctly. It is not attested elsewhere, although the similar “culmen ueritatis” was used earlier by Alcuin in a comparable context: *Commentaria in s. Joannis evangelium,* 6.37 (at Jn 15.27 “Cum autem venerit paracletus”), in PL 100.949D (“Ipse nuncue Spiritus corda eorum et ad scientiam veritatis illustravit, et ad docenda quae nossent, culmine veritatis erexit”). Alcuin is not entirely


29. **Errantes reuocat**: Common line opening from the early Middle Ages onward, first in Paulinus of Périgueux, *Vita sancti Martini* 3.244, ed. Petschenig, 72 (“Errantes reuoci”). Hildebert begins a line “Qui sic errantes revocat,” in *Carmina minora* 51.21, ed. Scott, 44. The idea involved relates to the Parable of the Lost Sheep in Matthew 18.10–14. **miser* miser*: This pairing is understandably common in Christian Latin poetry.


32. **cogitur esse ferox**: Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 1.2.121–122, ed. Owen, amid similarly flattering lines that praise the emperor Augustus for his reluctance to anger: “sed piger ad poenas princeps, ad praemia uelox, / quique dolet, quotiens cogitur, esse ferox.”

33. **laxantur habene**: As a line ending in Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* 2.35, ed. Ehlers, 32. Slackening the reins is a fairly common expression for loss of control, most notably, Vergil, *Aeneid* 7.600, ed. Mynors, 275 (“rerumque reliquit habenas”: line ending). The closest contemporary parallel is probably Hildebert (or pseudo–Hildebert), *De sancto Vincentio* 220–221, in PL 171.1306A (“Littora nota tene, ne, si laxantur habenae, / praevaleant undae graviore / atque profundae”). Compare Simon Aurea Capra (also known as Simon Chèvre d’Or), *Ylias* (B), line 495, ed. Parrott, 127 (“Si laxare velim Muse diffusus habenas”). This dissertation is available at the University of Toronto, dated 1975, with different pagination: this line is on p. 138.

35. **peruigil ad**: Also a line opening in Maximian, *Elegies* 5.9, ed. Sandquist Öberg, 126, widely read as a school text beginning in the eleventh century.


42. Compare Lucan, *De bello ciuli* 3.371–372, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 63 (“et nihil esse meo discetis tutius aevi / quam duce me bellum”). Ovid betrayed a penchant for using the phrase *tutius esse* with a two-syllable word following to form the second half of a pentameter: see *Heroides* 19.162, ed. Kenney, 64 (“tutius esse fretum”); *Tristia* 5.2.78 (=5.2b.34), ed. Owen (“tutius esse miser”); and *Ex Ponto* 1.1.10, ed. Owen (“tutius esse putant”), and 2.2.58, ed. Owen (“tutius esse puto”).

43. **Conuocat heroes**: The same line opening (with the Greek accusative form *heros*) is found in Odo of Magdeburg, *Ernestus* (second decade of the thirteenth century) 7.68, ed. Klein, 148. *sciet* = *ciel*.

44. **nomine quemque suo**: A tag encountered more often as a line opening, but first as the second half of a pentameter in Ovid, *Tristia*, 3.4.64 (=3.4b.18), ed. Owen (“dicere quos cupiam nomine quemque suo”).

45. **ipse prior**: A line opening since Lucan, *De bello ciuli* 4.703, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 100.

46. **preparat ense uias**: Lucan, *De bello ciuli* 4.43, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 78 (“caedunt ense viam”).


49. **sentit odorem**: A line ending also in Reginald of Canterbury, *Carmina* 2.34, ed. Wright, 2.261, and *Physiologus* 1.3, ed. Eden, 26.

50. **metuendus adest**: Claudian, *De seixo consolatu Honorii* 216, ed. Hall, 272 (“Ipse manu metuendus adest inopinaque cunctis”).

51. **preuius ipse**: Hildebert (or pseudo-Hildebert), *Carmen in libros Regum* 4.260, in PL 171.1250D, in the same metrical position.


57. **nostrae constancia gentis**: The poet proclaims his partisanship here. For the phrasing, see Lucan, *De bello civili* 10.490, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 283 (“tanta est constancia mentis”: line ending).

58. **metuenda manus**: Silius Italicus, *Punica* 1.390, ed. Delz, 15 (“O metuenda manus”), and Statius, *Thebaid* 10.812, ed. Klotz and Klinnert, 396 (“haec erat, haec metuenda manus”). Since the transmission of Silius Italicus was very limited in the Middle Ages, Statius is likelier to be the ultimate source of inspiration.


63. **apellat = appellet**.


69. **horis = oris**.


73. **aduuntare = aduentare**.

74. **adire uias**: A very common line ending.

75. **multiplicare loqui**: The ultimate source is 1 Sm 2:3 (“nolite multiplicare loqui sublimia”). Compare Winrich of Trier, *Confictus ovis et lini* 30, 60, 92, ed. Haupt, 216–218 (“ulterius noli multiplicare loqui”).

77. **Dicere quisque potest**: Marbod, *Liber decem capitulorum* 4.53, in *De ornamentis verborum: Liber decem capitulorum*, ed. Leotta, 42 (“Dicere quisque potest se matrem non habuisse?”).

78. **debitor orbis**: Compare the line endings in the *De martyrio Macabaeorum* (ascribed sometimes to Cyprian of Gaul, Hilary of Poitiers, Hilary of Arles,

80–82. **Et dignum nomine . . . maioribus illum comparat:** Following the repetition of his cognomen Martel in line 78, this formulation is likely a glance back at the count’s great–uncle, Geoffrey Martel.

81. **Ergo nichil:** A line opening attested already in Martial, Epigrams 3.46.11, ed. Lindsay.

83. **Uirtus unica:** Compare Juvenal, Satires 8.20, ed. Clausen, 106 (“nobilitas sola est atque unica uirtus”).

84. **Tempora nostra:** Ovid, Tristia 2.484 (as the opening of the second half in a pentameter). **Nondum uiderunt** as opposed to **necum:** Compare Silius Italicus, Punica 11.583, ed. Delz, 295 (“cur nondum viderit orbis”) and Statius, Thebaid 8.67, ed. Klotz and Klinnert, 283 (“quod nondum viderit aether”).

85. C. Laelius (about 190–after 129), and P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus (184/5–129) are often associated in Latin literature on account of their remarkable friendship, most notably in Cicero, Laelius de amicitia, ed. Simbeck. L.Aemilius Paul(lius) (died 160), the father of Scipio, is an unusual but not problematic addition. A successful military leader who ended the Third Macedonian War at Pydna, he is also an exemplar of virtue. On his virtue, see Cicero, De officiis 2.22.76, ed. Atzert, 81, which mentions the integrity of Paulus and his son Scipio—in this context, for declining to keep rich spoils of war.

Since all three figures are known for military successes (Laelius defeated Virdathus of Lusitania: see De officiis 2.11.40, ed. Atzert, 68) as well as for personal virtue, they constitute appropriate models for Martel. The three are named, along with others, in a list of virtuous men in Cicero, Tusculanae disputationes 1.46.110, ed. Pohlenz, 274, perhaps the poet’s immediate source: “Multo autem tardius fama deseret [i.e., their fame outlives them] Curium Fabricium Calatinum, duo Scipiones duo Africanos, Maximum Marcellum Paullum, Catonem Laelium, innumerables alios, quorum similitudinem aliquam qui arripuerit, non eam fama populari, sed vera bonorum laude metiens, fidenti animo, si ita res feret, gradietur ad mortem . . .” The threesome also appears in Cicero, De natura deorum 2.165, ed. Ax, 116, in a list of particular individuals whom the gods cherish. Relating the ancestry of a thoroughly French noble to heroes of Rome is an instance of the **translatio imperii** (“transfer of rule”) motif.

87. O caput: Statius, Thebaid 8.739, ed. Klotz and Klinnert, 314. **Rutilante corona:** Similar line endings are found in Silius Italicus, Punica 16.119, ed. Delz, 424 “rutilante coruscunt” (see also on line 91); Flodoard of Reims, De
Christi triumphis apud Italian 11.6.33, in PL 135.797C ("rutilante coronam"); and Hrotsvitha cf Gandersheim, Passio sancte Agnetis virginis et martiris 420, ed. Berschin, 129 ("rutilante corona").

88. morum floribus: Tertullian, De pudicitia, ed. Munier, 144, begins "Pudicitia flos morum." Philip of Harvenst (died 1183) uses the phrase morum floribus in his commentary on the Song of Songs 2.16, in PL 203.279B.


90. Quern laudare satis: Compare the line opening in Statius, Thebaid 7.379, ed. Klotz and Klinnert, 259 ("Nec laudare satis"). In content, this line offers in miniature what Curtius would call an incapacity or inexpressibility topos: European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, 159–162 and 409–412.

91–92. secula nostra deaurant: Vergil introduced the idea of a "new" Golden Age, in which a virtuous ruler institutes and presides over a return to the paradiaskal state that existed before Jupiter overthrew Saturn. For example, see Aeneid 6.792–793, ed. Mynors, 252 ("Augustus Caesar, diui genus, aurea condet / saecula"). The topos appears often in panegyric thereafter. Our poet offers a clever and unusual variation on this theme, in which Martel's virtues figuratively provide the gilding for the age; his use of the verb deauro, which rarely appears in a figurative sense, is also striking. This is not to say that he was unique in associating the reign of Geoffrey Martel le Jeune with the return of the Golden Age, since Baudri resorts to similar terms in one of his epitaphs for the prince: see Carmina 211.3, ed. Tilliette 2:143 ("Tempora reddiderat princeps bonus aurea mundo").

94. nobiliumque decus: Compare Ovid, Heroides 17.54, ed. Kenney, 45 ("Tyndareique decus"): pentameter line ending.

95. delere uetustas: Ovid, Metamorphoses 1.445 (also a line ending), ed. Tarrant, 18.


97. legibus eui: Lucan, De bello civili 2.82 (line ending), ed. Shackleton Bailey, 27; Arator, De actibus apostolorum 1.308, ed. McKinlay, 30.

98. fama perhennis: Ovid, Amores 1.10.62, ed. Kenney, 26 ("fama perennis erit": second half of a pentameter).

100. uota benigna: Baudri, Carmina 62.12, ed. Tilliette, 1:62. [BKB]

Subject and Genre

Poem 91 is a panegyric celebrating the accession of Louis VI (1081–1137) to the throne of France. Louis was consecrated king after the death of his father, Philip I, in 1108, and the poem was likely composed around this date, since the poet claims in line 79 that the kingdom was recently ruled by Philip (“Recently you went astray, wretched, under a gray-haired king”). Louis was born in 1081, the son of Philip and Bertha of Holland. Though the records of Louis’ childhood are limited, we are fairly well informed when it comes to the decade that preceded his accession. This period, from roughly 1097 to 1108, serves as the historical background of “Francia dulcis, aue.” Whether or not the poet drew on actual events for the subject matter of his panegyric, Louis had ample opportunity during the decade preceding his coronation to prove his mettle to any future encomiast.

Louis first demonstrated his skill as a military leader in 1097–1098, when he led a successful campaign in the Vexin against King William Rufus of England. As rex designatus, Louis began to play an increasingly active role in the affairs of the kingdom, as evidenced by his participation in a further series of military campaigns.

After 1100 Louis established himself as an energetic defender of ecclesiastical and monastic rights against the encroachments of secular lords. In 1101 he took the side of Adam, the abbot of Saint-Denis (1099–1122) in a dispute over customary rights (consuetudines) with Burchard of Montmorency (about 1070–circa 1124). In the end Louis forced Burchard to submit to royal authority. Shortly thereafter Louis led an attack against the castle of Drogo (Dreux) III of Mouchy (born about 1070), an ally of Burchard’s who had persecuted the canons of Saint-Pierre of Beauvais. In 1102 Louis warred against Count Ebles II of Roucy (1063–1104),

---

127. Suger, Vita Ludovic 1, in Wquet, 4–15; Deeds of Louis the Fat, 24–28. See also Luchaire, 5–6, no. 6.
129. Vita Ludovic 2, in Wquet, 14–19; Deeds of Louis the Fat, 29–30. See also Luchaire, 8–10, no. 16.
130. Vita Ludovic 2, in Wquet, 14–19; Deeds of Louis the Fat, 29–30. See also Luchaire, 10–11, no. 18. The campaign against Drogo took place in 1101 or 1102.
who had plundered lands belonging to the churches of Reims and Laon.131 Louis’ swift and decisive campaign stood in notable contrast to the previous inaction of his father in punishing Ebles.132 In 1103 Louis besieged the castle of Léon of Meung (died 1103), an unruly vassal of Orléans, and burned it to the ground with the rebel and his unfortunate garrison still inside.133

Such forceful actions to protect the rights of the Church made a favorable impression on the French clerics who were responsible for preserving Louis’ memory in writing. Suger of Saint-Denis (1081–1151)—Louis’ biographer, friend, and advisor, and an invaluable source for our understanding of his reign—notes approvingly that Louis “took care that the churches prospered and zealously sought peace for those who prayed, those who toiled, and the poor, which had not been done for a long while.”134

Louis’ defence of the rights and possessions of the Church may have been motivated by political concerns as much as by personal piety. Bishops were a traditional source of support for the heretofore weak Capetian kings, and Louis was, like his father, intent on pacifying unruly lords and expanding the authority of the monarchy. By curbing the anarchy that had characterized eleventh-century France and in particular by protecting Church property, he won the admiration of many, including Suger and our own poet. Suger’s unabashed glorification of Louis makes him a useful basis of comparison with the anonymous author of Poem 91. Though his biography of Louis VI was written some thirty years after Louis’ accession (and thus probably after the writing of “Francia dulcis, aue”), it approximates the poem in its tone and in its “legitimizing, myth-making aspect of royal history.”135 Suger’s Vita Ludovici is a kind of panegyric in its own right and helps in turn to illuminate the thoughts of the poet of “Francia dulcis, aue.”

The poet follows conventions in his praise of Louis: he speaks of the new king’s physical attractiveness (16); his zeal for justice but moderation in executing it (20–34); his temperance, thrift, and diligence (35–40); and his bravery and wisdom (43–44). Nor does the poet scruple to highlight the virtues of Louis by criticizing his

131. Vita Ludovici 5, in Waquet, 24–29; Deeds of Louis the Fat, 34–35. See also Luchaire, 12, no. 20.
133. Vita Ludovici 6, in Waquet, 28–29; Deeds of Louis the Fat, 36. See also Luchaire, 15, no. 25.
134. Vita Ludovici 2, in Waquet, 14 (“ecclesiarum utilitatis providit, oratorum, laboratorum et pauperum, quod diu insolitum fuerat, quieti studebat”); Deeds of Louis the Fat, 29.
135. See Gabrielle M. Spiegel, The Chronicle Tradition of Saint-Denis: A Survey (Leiden, 1978), 45. Like our poet, Suger “presents the Capetian monarch as the realization of the highest ideals and goals of medieval kingship, as an exemplar to present and future rulers, and as the focal point of French history, carrying on the work of his illustrious ancestors and extending it by his ceaseless labors in behalf of the spiritual aims of medieval society.” For Suger’s relationship with Louis and their common political vision see Lohrmann, “Louis VI,” 130.
father, Philip. The latter is characterized as “a king in name only” (53), foolish (58), and wicked (67), and so he was held to be by many chroniclers of his reign.

Philip I, who was born in 1052 and ruled from 1060 to 1108, rose to power when the fortunes of the royal house were at a low ebb, and he interested himself primarily in increasing the power of the monarchy and enlarging the royal demesne. “Nearly all the enterprises of Philip I,” summarizes one historian, “show the same character, at once inglorious and practical.”136 Philip, reluctant to give up the power of appointing bishops, displayed scant sympathy for the ecclesiastical reform movement of the second half of the eleventh century. Nor did he hesitate to appropriate for the royal coffers the income of bishoprics that stood temporarily vacant, or whose bishop was absent.37 More scandalous even than Philip’s overt sale of Church offices was his abduction of, and subsequent marriage to, Bertrada of Montfort, the wife of Fulk Rechin of Anjou, in 1092.138 Having repudiated his first wife, Bertha of Holland, Philip failed to confirm the legitimacy of his new marriage and was excommunicated in 1095 by Pope Urban II (1088–1099). After promising that he would renounce Bertrada, Philip reneged, and in 1097 Urban not only renewed the excommunication of the king but even placed his entire kingdom under interdict. Philip’s quarrel with the papacy dragged on under Urban and his successor, Paschal II (1099–1118), and the affair was resolved only in 1104, when Philip swore once again to give up Bertrada (a vow he did not keep) and was once again absolved by the pope.

Though Philip retained the support of most of his bishops throughout these turbulent times, his quarrels with Rome and his personal conduct garnered for him an unsavory reputation among later chroniclers of his reign. Suger criticizes both Philip’s adulterous marriage and his self-indulgent behavior, depicting the king in his last years as given over to the sins of the flesh: “He indulged himself too much and did not take care of either his kingdom or the health of his noble and handsome body.”139 Philip’s behavior, in Suger’s account, stands in stark contrast to the piety of Louis, a defender of the Church and protector of the poor. Both Suger and our poet were keen to emphasize the disparities between father and son.

---


138. Bertrada herself may well have been complicit in the arrangement. Both Orderic Vitalis and William of Malmesbury report that she initiated the liaison with Philip. For a discussion of Philip’s marriage to Bertrada, see Fliche, Le règne de Philippe Ier., 40–77.

139. Vita Ludovici 13, in Waquet, 82; Deeds of Louis the Fat, 61.
The Genre of Panegyric

The poet of “Francia dulcis, aue” need not have concerned himself overly with the historical details of the reigns of Philip and Louis in producing his panegyric. To find suitable material he could have resorted instead to the conventions of praise poetry.⁴⁰ Praise poetry in the Middle Ages fell under the antique rhetorical classification of epideictic oratory, known in the Latin handbooks as the genus demonstrativum. The Rhetorica ad Herennium (first century BCE), now regarded as anonymous but thought in the Middle Ages to be the work of Cicero, sets out a comprehensive inventory of the subjects appropriate for praise (laus). Its exposition was particularly important, since this treatise served as one of the most important textbooks of classical rhetorical theory in the medieval period. According to the Rhetorica ad Herennium the appropriate topics to be considered in a speech of praise fell into three categories: res externae (circumstances, like genus [descent], over which the subject had no control), res corporis (physical appearance), and res animi (qualities of mind, often organized around the four cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude).⁴¹ Thus in “Francia dulcis, aue” we find praise of Louis’ ancestors (91–104) and his physical features (16), along with extensive discussion of his bravery (43–44, 47, 50), wisdom (43–44, 46, 109–112), zealous pursuit of justice (19–20, 23–24), and moderation (27–34). The conventions of the genre also dictated that the different periods of the subject’s life should be treated separately.⁴² Accordingly, our poem makes a division between Louis’ present virtues (chiefly at 15–18, 21–50), his youth (19–20), and his future greatness (106–110).

Poem 91 corresponds to a model of panegyric that became increasingly widespread in late eleventh and early twelfth centuries in which praise of a ruler was connected to the land over which he or she ruled.⁴³ Hildebert of Lavardin’s panegyric on Henry I and Matilda of England provides a contemporary analogue.⁴⁴ The introduction to Hildebert’s poem closely recalls “Francia dulcis, aue” in its praise of the riches and temperate climate of the land:

Anglia, terra ferax, tibi pax diuturna quietem,  
Multiplicem luxum merx opulenta dedit.

---

⁴⁰ For medieval panegyric on kings and nobles in general, see Franz Bittner, Studien zum Herrscherlob in der mittelalterlichen Dichtung (Bamberg, 1962). For a summary of the literary conventions of panegyric, see esp. 161–165.


⁴² See Quintilian, Institutio oratoria 3.7.10, ed. and trans. Russell, 2:106–107. Isidore of Seville, Etymologiae 2.4, defines the three tempora as ante ipsam, in ipsam, and post ipsam.

⁴³ Annette Georgi, Das lateinische und deutsche Preisgedicht des Mittelalters (Berlin, 1969), 88–89, notes the development of this form of praise from an earlier tendency to emphasize the king’s associations with divine rule.

⁴⁴ Canmina minora 37.1–4, ed. Scott, 24.
Tu nimio nec stricta gelu, nec sidere fervens,
Clementi celo temperieque places.

England, fruitful land, a long peace has made you tranquil,
Your costly wares have given you great wealth.
You, neither bound overmuch with ice nor scorched by the sun,
Are pleasing through your moderate weather and climate.\textsuperscript{145}

The language chosen to characterize Henry and his rule in this poem recalls the praise of Louis in “Francia dulcis, aue.” While according to Hildebert, Henry is “not inferior to his grandfathers and his father the king” (14), Louis is here described as being the equal of his Carolingian ancestors: “no less is he, although young and a novice” (105).\textsuperscript{146} Under Henry Hildebert predicts that “there will be peace in the Church, reverence for the law, justice for wrongs, and glory in the affairs (of England)” (15–16). Likewise, the poet of “Francia dulcis, aue” details the flowering of peace, justice, and respect for the law under Louis (85–90).

In both of these praise poems the author associates the virtues of the ruler with the natural productivity of the land while avoiding the usage of explicitly Christian language or imagery. We might expect the poet of “Francia dulcis, aue” to thank God for Louis’ accession to the throne, but he gives credit instead to natura:

\begin{quote}
Plus satis es: quod te natura beavit in illo
Quam quicquid seclis pluribus ante dedit. (17–18)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
It is enough \textit{that} Nature blessed you \textit{in him} more
Than whatever she had granted to many generations before.
\end{quote}

Later the poet writes:

\begin{quote}
Nec dubium cuiquam solers natura relinquet
Hunc hominem plene complacuisse sibi. (113–114)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Nor will resourceful Nature leave anyone in doubt
That this man has wholly won her over.
\end{quote}

The \textit{natura} topos—the conception that the virtues of a region and its ruler are attributable to Nature—becomes more common in the panegyric of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.\textsuperscript{147} Most of Hildebert’s panegyric to \textit{Anglia} and its rulers comes in the guise of a monologue spoken by \textit{natura}, who appoints both Henry and his consort to rule over England:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{145} Praise of the land was also treated in the rhetorical handbooks of antiquity. Quintilian, \textit{Institutio oratoria} 3.7.27, ed. and trans. Russell, 2:114–115, briefly mentions the \textit{laus locum}, noting that both appearance (\textit{species}) and usefulness (\textit{utilitas}) are sources of praise.
\item \textsuperscript{146} \textit{Illo} refers either to the glory (\textit{deus}) of Charlemagne and Pepin, or to one of the two kings.
\item \textsuperscript{147} See Georgi, \textit{Das lateinische und deutsche Preisgedicht}, 93–94.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Tempus erit, quo sceptrum tibi promissa gubernet
Henricus . . . (13–14)

*The time will come for Henry to control the scepter promised to you*

Huic sociam dispono thori . . . (19)

*I appoint a companion for his bed . . .

His ego principibus sum te factura beatam
Anglia . . . (33–34)

*I am going to make you blessed with these rulers, England.*

In making *natura* responsible for blessing the land with such capable rulers, both Hildebert and the poet of “Francia dulcis, aue” steer clear of religious imagery. Our poem, then, does not testify to the incipient development of the French “royal ideology” of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, an ideology that emphasized the sacred elements of monarchy and that served to consecrate the authority of the king.148

In one respect, our poet’s glorification of *Francia* diverges noticeably from the praise of *Anglia* in Hildebert’s poem: “Francia dulcis, aue” reveals a heightened national pride. During the period of this poem’s composition the expansion of the French royal demesne and the consolidation of royal power under the Capetians gave rise to an increasing French pride and national consciousness.149 This patriotism manifests itself in the poet’s commendation not only of the land for its fertility and bountifulness (1–9) but also of the *Franci* themselves for their independence from foreign control. The second boast is certainly not one that early twelfth-century *Anglia* could make.

As well as disclosing strong nationalistic sentiment, Poem 91 shows how the Capetian kings of the twelfth century strove to impart some of the glory of the Carolingian past to their own dynasty. Our poet compares Louis (91–104) favorably with the illustrious Carolingians Pepin III (died 768) and Charlemagne (742–814), who handed down to future French kings the mantle of empire (99) and undying fame (103–104). While the comparison of a newly crowned Louis VI with the great emperor Charlemagne may strike modern readers as fanciful, the poet was merely articulating a crucial component of Capetian royal ideology.


Though the earliest Capetians had emphasized their links to the Carolingian kings, initiatives to appropriate some of the glory of Charlemagne grew more overt toward the end of the eleventh century.\footnote{\textit{From the time of Louis VI at the latest, we find the entourage of the reigning family seeking to exploit for the latter's benefit the legend of the great emperor which, thanks to the epics, flourished in France at that time ... From this heritage, the Capetians derived above all the high prestige of sacred kingship." Marc Bloch, \textit{Feudal Society}, trans. L.A. Manyon (Chicago, 1961), 388. See also Jean Dunbabin, \textit{France in the Making 843–1180} (Oxford, 1985), 265: "It is inevitable that the kingship of the Louis should be discussed in terms of a return to the past, for this was the way they themselves justified it."} Even Philip's choice of the name Louis for his eldest son, a name that harked back both to Clovis (about 466–511) and Louis the Pious (778–840), evoked the Merovingian and Carolingian past.\footnote{\textit{Andrew W. Lewis, Royal Succession in Capetian France: Studies on Familial Order and the State} (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), 47–48.} Suger makes the bond between Louis and Charlemagne explicit in the first chapter of the \textit{Vita Ludovici}, where he remarks that Louis "followed the ancient custom of Charles the Great and other hitherto kings" in his reverence toward Saint-Denis, the royal abbey that functioned as a burial-place of French kings and that furnished an education to both Louis and Suger. Later, when Pope Paschal II visited the abbey of Saint-Denis and sought help from Louis and Philip against the German emperor, Suger reports, "He asked that they follow the established custom of their predecessors, Charles the Great and other kings of the French, and make a bold stand against tyrants, enemies of the Church, and above all the emperor Henry" (\textit{Vita Ludovici}, 10).

We can only speculate about the circumstances surrounding the composition of Poem 91, but conceivably the poem was written in an atmosphere of uncertainty about Louis' accession. Though Louis was pronounced the heir apparent at some stage between 1098 and 1100, he had not yet been crowned when Philip died in 1108. As an unconsecrated heir to the throne, Louis' claim depended on his status as Philip's eldest son, but this relationship could not necessarily guarantee an uncontested succession. Ivo (about 1040–1116), the bishop of Chartres at the time of Philip's death, recognized the potential for powerful magnates to stir up trouble during this uncertain period and arranged for the archbishop of Sens to consecrate Louis at an assembly of bishops in Orléans immediately after Philip's burial. The archbishop of Reims disputed the legitimacy of these hasty proceedings and asserted the unique right of the occupants of his see to crown the king-designate. According to Suger (\textit{Vita Ludovici}, 14), Ivo justified his actions by pointing to the danger from certain "regni perturbatores" (disturbers of the realm). In addition to the possible peril from these fractious nobles, Louis also had to worry about the possibility of a plot to place on the throne his half-brother, Philip of Mantes (living in 1123), son of Philip I and Bertrada. Although the young king soon solidified his control of the monarchy and
exercised his authority decisively, "Francia dulcis, aue" could have been written when the prospects of the new ruler seemed to hang in the balance.\footnote{52}

**Style**

The poet of "Francia dulcis, aue" draws on a number of classical authors, such as Ovid, Statius, and probably Vergil, Lucretius, and Silius Italicus. One phrase ("nequid nimis") is ultimately Terentian (Andria 61 [1.1.34], ed. Kauer and Lindsay). In several places (3, "incla bellorum"; 20, "commune bonum"; 32, "meruere mori"; 116, "uoita benigna") the poet's language appears to echo the panegyric epic on Louis the Pious by the ninth-century poet and courtier Ermoldus Nigellus.\footnote{53} Although a shared indebtedness to Vergil may account for some of the resemblances, the similarities between the poems seem to go beyond such an obvious common source. Ermoldus's poem, which like Poem 91 is written in elegiac couplets, celebrates the deeds of the most famous royal Louis up to the time of our poem, and it could have provided the poet with a worthy stylistic model. Beyond style, the poet could have been drawn to Ermoldus because of resemblances in their circumstances. Ermoldus was in exile when he wrote his epic and was trying to win his way back to court. In addition, the Carolingian poet, like the poet considered here (see lines 79–80), wished to make the young king whose favor he was currying appear good by contrast to his father.

The poet's style and diction recall those of the so-called Loire Valley poets, Marbod of Rennes, Baudri of Bourgueil, and Hildebert. His language resembles that of Baudri and Marbod in several places (for example, 6, "perpetui ... ueris," and 17, "natura beaui"), and the form of panegyric in which ruler and land are extolled together is also present in Hildebert's poem to Henry and Matilda.\footnote{54} Like the Loire Valley poets, the author of Poem 91 employs a classicizing style. He eschews explicit mention of the gods or the saints, highlighting Louis VI's virtues with reference to a catalogue of classical figures: Aeneas, Cato, Socrates, Nestor, Ajax, Ulysses, Paris, and Hector. The indiscriminate mingling of historical and mythical figures reminds us that the story of Troy and Vergil's Aeneid were treated as history, not myth, in the Middle Ages.

The poet manifests a predisposition for lists (1–3, 36–40, 45–48), in which he often employs asyndeton (1–2, "regio bona, bella, salubris, / deliciosa, potens, fertilis, ampla satis"), and evidences a fondness for tricola (as in 7, 36, 41, 85–86, 91) and isocola in general (5, 7, 16, 20, 43, 66, 77, 90, 102). Still more incessant is his use of various types of repetition, including anadiplosis (55, "uile nichil, nichil

\footnote{52} For details concerning the accession of Louis VI, see Lewis, *Royal Succession in Capetian France*, 52–54; Lohrmann, "Louis VI," 132–133; and Luchaire, 30–31, no. 57.

\footnote{53} *Carmen in honorem Hludowici Christianissimi Caesaris Augusti*, ed. Dümmler; ed. and trans. Faral (with different line numbering).

\footnote{54} *Carmina minora* 37, ed. Scott, 24–25.
indignum”, 110, “consilio maior, maiorem et ingenio”), anaphora (63, “de corde ferro, de pleno corde uenenis”; 77, “solet esse, solet reperiri”; 79/81, “nuper oberrabas... nuper eras eremus”; 91/93, “respicit ad praauos... respicit ad Carolum”; 109, “maior erit sensu, maior probatis amore”), polyptoton (93–94, “Respicit ad... patrem; pater illi / Pipinus”; 97, “reges in regibus ambo”; 107, “maior erit, quoniam longe maiora parabit”), derivatio (27, “pro tempore temperat iram”; 28 “iusticie iustior”; 30, “supplicibus supplecit”; 97, “patres patriae”; 100, “milia mille”; 103, “manet decus atque manebit”), and chiasmus (44, “ut fortis reprimit, coripit ut sapiens”; 59–60, “sepe decorus / de male distorto palmite flos oritur”). Alliteration is evident but not obtrusive. In sixteen instances two consecutive words alliterate, while in six cases three words in the same line do so. [JL]

[91A] Francia dukis, aue, regio bona, bella, salubris, Deliciosa, potens, fertulis, ampla satit, Inclita bellorum titulis populoque feroci, Qui nichil indomitum contremuisset potest. Te nium nec stringit hiems nec cauma resoluit, Sic prope perpetui gaudia ueris habes. Non portenta creas, non monstra seris, nichil umquam Horrendum usiu uel generare soles. Innumeratas horientis opes uel in hoc superasti, Quod numquam superat gens aliena tuam. Sed, fateor, sunt ista satit preciosae tuumque Nomen proptererea nobile semper erit. Atqui plus aliis precii tibi uandicat ali Quod Lodouicus rex tua ceptra gerit. Quem dignum maio re satis defandit honore Tunc celebris facies, tunc probatis amor. Plus satis est quod te natura beatur in illo Quam quicquid seelis pluribus ante dedit. Qui regni curam teneris suscepit in annis Ad commune bonum iusticieque decus,

[93A] Mirus homos uitas hominum mortesque tuerei, Et cum momentis pondera discutere. Iusticie studiis asper similisque feroci, Et radice tenus criminis tota secans, Scit quia non prestat plenam medicina salutem, Que nor. ad niummum uulnern persequitur.

Sepe tamen pro re, pro tempore temperat iram;
   Parcit iusticie iustior ipse satis.
Obuius et facilib precibus lacrimisque reorum
   Ut pro supplicibus supplicet ipse sibi.
Scit quia continuo bona pars nudabitur orbis
   Si pereant omnes qui meruere mori.
Sic igitur iustus, sic clemens optat haberī,
   Ut uirtus neutra destruat alterutram.
Natus amare bonos, hic culpas odisse malorum,
   Pacem ferre, sequi iura, tenere modum,
Dapsilis et parus ne quid nimis, ocia semper
   Detestans, aliquid utile semper amans,
Non inconsultus, non lubricus aut uiolentus
   Non ex abrupto quelibet accipiens,
Cor duplex scriptamque manum linguamque loquacem
   Causas pestiēri criminis esse putat.
Ceruices rigides et desipiencia corda
   Ut fortis reprimit, coripit ut sapiens.
Reddidit Eneam pietate, rigore Catonem,
   Ingenio Socratem, Nestora consilio,

[9v]

Aiacem factis, dictis imitatur Ulixem.
   In uultu Paris est, Hectora mente gerit,
Hectora non qualem post currum traxit Achilles,
   Sed qualis Danaas terruit igne rates.
Certe non talem se prebuit ante Philipus,
   Qui pater est huius sanguine, non meritis.
Ille tuus non rex, quoniam rex nomine solo
   In manibus gladii teque tuosque dedit.
Hic quia uile nichil, nichil indignum meditatur,
   Omnino rex est nomine reque tuus.
Vere non semper sapiunt quicumque patris sunt;
   Est aliquid stultos dissimulare patres.
Exemplum natura dedit, quod sepe decorus
   De male dissorto palmite flos oritur.
Sepe per alueolum deformem fons preciosus
   Oritur et uicii contrait inde nichil,
Et de corde fero, de pleno corde uenenis
   Multociens uerbum dulce piumque sonat.
Unde nichil mirum si consimili ratione
   Delituit nequam, surgit honestus homo.
Degenerat non qui peruersum non imitatur,
Sed qui post iustum despicit ire patrem.
Immo satiis maior laus illi surgit in euum
Qui uiultute sua se trait in precium.
Sicut in extremum miser est qui primus in euum,
Maiori semper pessimus, esse cupid,

Sic, cum sunt nati precii, defenditur omnis
Qui generis speculum nititur esse sui.
Hoc Lodouicus plene fecisse probatur
Et faciet, quoniam sic placet ipse sibi.
Sensus in antiquis solet esse, solet reperiri;
Nunc alius quidam tamquam nostra canunt.
Nuper oberrabas cano sub rege misella;
Nunc iuuensis ducit te meliore uia.
Nuper eras emus, predatio uasta latronum,
Quantus ut irriguis nunc tua claustra uirent,
Et quasi post hiemem uernans tibi redditur aestas,
Dum post tristitia gaudia plena tenes.
Undique bella silent et per castella, per urbes,
Per uicos legum sancio sancta uiget.
Rex tuus iste tui sic te facit esse potentem,
Ut iam remo tuis obuiet imperius.
Ille tibi pacem rigidam firmamque paruit,
Quam seruare salus, quam uiolare mori.
Respicit ad prouos abauos atauosque parentum
Qui te regnorum constituere caput.
Respicit ad Carolum Carolique patrem; pater illi
Pipinus, nanus corpore, mente gigas.
Pipinus Carolusque uelud duo lumina mundi
Omnibus exemplum grande suere boni.
Ambo patres patrie, reges in regibus ambo
Depicti morum floribus et radiis.
Sub quibus imperii multum creuisse decorem
Argumentorum milia milile probant.
 Unde sue fames titulos emere perhennes,
Quos memorare pium, quos numerare labor.

Pipini Carolique manet decus atque manebit,
Quippe perhennat eos nescia fama mori.
Non minor hic illo, quamuis tener atque nouellus;
Immo, si liceat uiuere, maior erit.
Maior erit, quoniam longe maiora parabit,
Temporis ut nostri multiplicetur honos.
Maior erit sensu, maior probatissi amore,
Consilio maior, maior et ingenio.
Sensus alta nimus virtus requieuit in illo,
Que se continuo proferet in medium.
Nec dubium cuiquam solers natura relinquet
Hunc hominem plene complauisse sibi.
Ergo diu uiuat rex Lodouicus et omnis
Qui super hoc uerbo uota benigna facit.

Hail, sweet France, fortunate region, beautiful, wholesome,
delightful, powerful, fruitful, very spacious,
renowned for distinctions in war and for a fierce people,
who are not capable of fearing anything unvanquished.
Winter does not bind you overmuch, nor heat melt you;
thus you have the joys of an almost everlasting spring.
You do not create monsters; you beget no monstrosities; nor are
you accustomed even to produce anything frightful to see.
In this you have surpassed the countless riches of the Orient,
that a foreign race never overcomes yours.
But, I admit, these are very precious things, and your
name will therefore be always renowned,
and yet that King Louis bears your scepter lays claim
for you to high praise in greater quantity than the other things;
both a famous physical appearance and a love of prowess
protect him, well enough worthy of greater honor.
It is enough that Nature blessed you in him more
than whatever she had granted to many generations before.
He, while in tender years, undertook responsibility for ruling
for the common good and ornament of justice,
a marvelous man to watch over the lives and deaths of men,
and to examine burdens upon the scales.
Harsh and almost fierce in his zeal for justice,
and cutting off all crimes at the root,
he knows that the medicine does not provide complete health
that does not deeply penetrate wounds.
Often, nevertheless, he moderates his anger in accordance with the time
and situation;
he himself, quite just, refrains from doing damage to justice.
He is accessible and accommodating to the prayers and tears of the guilty, so that he himself entreats on behalf of his suppliants.

He knows that a good part of the world will be laid bare at once if all should perish who deserved to die.

Therefore he wishes to be considered just in this way, merciful in this way, so that neither virtue destroys the other.

This man was born to love the good, hate the faults of the wicked, bring forth peace, follow the law, and keep moderation, abundant and thrifty, lest anything be excessive, always hating leisure, always loving something useful, not incautious, not deceitful or violent, not dealing with anything precipitately, he deems a twofold heart, a written hand, a chattering tongue to be the causes of deadly crime.

Stiff necks and foolish hearts
as he is brave, he subdues, as he is wise, he chides.

In his devotion he has made Aeneas live again; in his strictness, Cato; in his intellect, Socrates; in his wisdom, Nestor.

In deeds he imitates Ajax, in words Ulysses.

In appearance he is Paris; in his mind he acts as Hector, not the kind of Hector whom Achilles dragged behind the chariot, but the one who terrified the Danaean ships with fire.

Surely Philip did not show himself as such a one earlier, who is the father of this man in blood, but not in deserts.

That one is not your king, since, a king in name only, he gave you and your people into the hands of the sword.

Since this man thinks nothing cheap, nothing unworthy, he is fully your king, in both name and reality.

Truly, anyone who is a father is not always wise; it is something to disregard foolish fathers.

Nature has provided the example, that often a lovely flower is born from a badly twisted vine.

A precious fountain often springs up through an ugly channel and acquires no flaw from it, and from a savage heart, from a heart full of venom, many times sweet and pious speech rings out.

For this reason it is nothing marvelous if, by a similar principle, the wicked man has vanished, the noble comes forth.

He does not slip who does not imitate a wicked father, but rather he who scorns to follow a just one.
Instead, greater praise is won in perpetuity for him
  who by his own virtue advances himself toward reward.
Just as he is wretched to the end who desires to be first in perpetuity,
  ever most wicked to his forebear,
so, when there are children of value, each one is protected
  who strives to be the model of his kin.
Louis is confirmed to have done this fully,
  and he will do it, since in that way he pleases himself.
Understanding usually exists, usually is found in olden times;
  now our time; sing of something else.
Recently you went astray, wretched, under a gray-haired king;
  now a young man leads you along a better path.
Recently you were a desert, the empty spoil of robbers,
  to the same degree as your cloisters are now green with waterings,
and, as if after winter, the warmth of spring returns to you,
  while after sorrows you are full of joy.
On all sides war are silent, and throughout castles, throughout cities,
  throughout towns the holy sanction of law flourishes.
Thus this king of yours makes you powerful over yourself,
  so that now no one opposes your commands.
He has compacted a strong and steady peace for you,
  which it is safety to preserve and death to violate.
He looks back to the great-grandfathers of his kinsfolk, and their fathers
  and grandfathers
  who have made you the head of kingdoms.
He looks back to Charles and the father of Charles; this man's father was
  Pepin, a dwarf in stature, but a giant in mind.
Pepin and Charles, like two lights of the world,
  were a great example of goodness to all.
Both were fathers of the fatherland, both kings among kings,
  adorned by the flowers and radiance of their good morals.
Under them a thousand thousands of proofs confirm
  that the distinction of the empire grew greatly,
whence they procured the everlasting claims to their fame,
  which it is righteous to recall, but laborious to count.
The glory of Pepin and Charles remains and will remain,
  since a fame that cannot die immortalizes them.
No less is he, although young and a novice, than that man;
  rather, if it should be granted him to live, he will be greater.
He will be greater, since he will accomplish things greater by far, so that the distinction of our age will be multiplied.

He will be greater in understanding, greater in the love of what is right, greater in wisdom, greater too in intelligence.

In him has come to rest an exceedingly profound strength of understanding, which will soon become widely known.

Nor will resourceful Nature leave anyone in doubt that this man has wholly won her over.

Therefore long live King Louis and everyone who after this discourse offers kind prayers.

Textual Notes

1] Initial missing.
15] defundit, with first f expunged.
35] Natus amare bonos, hic: Hic Natus amare bonos (to be emended metri causa and because the scribe’s use of a second large initial indicates his awareness that he had put the wrong word first).
38] amans: After amans is written agens, which is here omitted (for rhyme and meter).
44] ut fortis written over two-word ensure.
46] Below the last line of 9v^A is a drawing of, from left to right, a goat, ram, and lion, labeled: caper, aries, leo.
58] disimulare, with si added supralinearly with ligature to s: extra minim disregarded.
65] si de consimili, with de monogram expunged.
72] semper: sepe, with oddly formed p and m added supralinearly.
78] canunt: canit.
79] oberrabas glossed supralinearly id est francia.
86] per vicos written above per vicos.
87] rex tuus iste viget et facit esse potentem, corrected supralinearly to rex tuus iste sic, potentem expunged, with potentem written again supralinearly.
91] abauos ad atauosque, with ad expunged.
92] regnorum: regorum.
102] memorare: memorare (with ditography).
111] Sensus: S.

Commentary

1. **Francia:** The exact geographical area designated by this term depends on context, since the definition of *Francia* changed over time and was employed differently even by writers of the same period. In the Carolingian era (about 750–900) *Francia* referred to a region extending from the Loire to the
lower Rhine and upper Maine. In the tenth century, *Francia* designated the zone between Lotharingia and the Seine, or, more commonly, between Lotharingia and the Loire; it was not used to denote the whole kingdom of West Francia. This area, *Francia* writ large, comprehended regions (the most significant being Normandy, Gascony, Brittany, Septimania, Catalonia, Burgundy, and Aquitaine) that maintained high degrees of autonomy throughout the tenth and early eleventh centuries, and, in some cases, for longer. The correspondence between the term *Francia* and the whole West Frankish kingdom was established decisively only in the second half of the twelfth century, and even then the modifier *tota* was usually supplied to express the idea of the whole kingdom. Suger of Saint-Denis, for example, in the *Vita Ludovici*, still employs *Francia* to designate the royal demesne centered on the Île de France. One contemporary poet who uses the term *Francia* seems to have excluded Aquitaine from its territories. Baudri of Bourgueil’s poem on the death of Gerhard of Corbie, the founder and first abbot of the monastery of La Sauve-Majeure in Aquitaine, mentions that Gerhard left *Francia* to come to Bordeaux:

_Francia natalis sibi sorduit hancque reliquit_  
_Silvestres saltus Burdegalaev veniens (79.7–8)._  

*His native France grew dreary and he left her,  
Coming to the wooded glades of Bordeaux._

Yet, in certain contexts *Francia* might be interpreted more generally, even in the first half of the twelfth century. In a panegyric, *Francia* might well have been meant in its broadest sense in order to enhance Louis’ prestige.

**Francia dulcis:** Compare Baudri, *Carmina* 82.7, ed. Tilliette, 1:78 and 1:19515. **dulcis . . . bella:** In French the description of France as sweet (*douce*) and beautiful (*belle*) became standard after the appearance of the first _chansons de geste_ at the beginning of the twelfth century. _Douce France_ occurs for the first time in the _Song of Roland_, called to mind by a dying Roland.

160. Baudri, _Carmina_ 79.7–8, ed. Tilliette, 1:77.

**populoque ferocti**: The ferocity of the Franks was proverbial, at least among French authors. According to the *Chronicle* of Fredegar, the Franks were originally a group of Trojan refugees who derived their name from their leader, a certain Francio: see *Chronicon libri IV*, 2.5 and 3.2, ed. Krusch, 46 and 93. However, a parallel etymology also held that *Franci* derived from *feritas* (“ferocity”). The poet likely draws on this latter tradition in his reference to the “fierce people” of Francia.

A passage in Ermoldus Nigellus may also resonate in our poet’s use of the *feritas* etymology. Early in Book 1 of the *Carmen in honorem Hludowici*, Zado, the Moorish ruler of Barcelona, prepares to defend his city against the Frankish army, led by Louis the Pious. When he hears from one of his men that Louis is leading the Frankish host, Zado breaks out in a despairing monologue, ed. Dümmler, 1:15–16 (as 1.364–383), ed. Faral, 32 (as 1.329–348) in which he touches upon the well-known ferocity of the Franks, ed. Dümmler, 1:15 (as 1.378–379), ed. Faral, 32 (as 1.343–344): “Namque ipsum nomen Francorum horresco recensens: / Francus habet nomen a feritate sua” (I shudder to recall the name of the Franks: ‘Frank’ takes its name from their ferocity). Included in Zado’s speech is the phrase *inclita bello*, which our poet uses to describe the people of *Francia* in line 3.

5. **cauma**: A borrowing from Greek, *cauma* denotes a burning heat, especially that of the sun. The more common *aestas* means both “summer” and “summer heat,” and would seem to offer a closer parallel to *hiems*. As a spondee, however, *aestas* would not scan before *resolutum*. *Cauma* is postclassical; it appears in the Vulgate (Job 30.30) and frequently in patristic authors like Jerome. Compare also Aldhelm, *Aenigmata* 100.73, in *Collectiones aenigmata Merovingicae etatis*, vol. 2, *Tutuini opera omnia; Variæ collectiones aenigmata Merovingicae etatis; Anonymus de dubis nominibus*, ed. F. Glorie (Turnhout, 1968), 539 (“Siccor aestivo torrentis caumate solis”); and *Carmen de virginitate* 1192, in *Aldhelmi opera*, ed. Ehwald, 403 (“torrida flammantis laturum caumate solis”).

Annales de gestis Karoli Magni imperatoris 4.380, ed. von Winterfeld, 55 ("ora madent lacrimis falsa inter gaudia veris").

7. portenta . . . monstra . . . horrendum uisu: The idea that France alone was free from monsters derives from Jerome, Contra Vigilantium, in PL 23.339A [= 353A, in other printings] ("Sola Gallia monstra non habuit, sed viris semper fortibus, et eloquentissimis abundavit"). For the phrasing, see Lucretius, De rerum natura 5.837, ed. Bailey ("multaque tum tellus etiam portenta creare"), and 5.845, ed. Bailey ("cetera de genere hoc monstra ac portenta creabat").

8. horrendum uisu: Compare Status, Thebaid 6.939, ed. Klott and Klinnert, 238 ("horrendum visu per quas modo fugerat auras").

9. horientis = orientis.

13. Atqui plus alis precii tibi uendicat alti: Alii makes no sense without emendation, since it cannot fit logically as either a dative singular (neither "to another . . . for you" nor "to another you" signifies) or a nominative plural. The minimalist approach is to supply a final s so that it may be construed as an ablative of comparison, with reference to all the preceding advantages that France is said to possess: Louis surpasses them all.

If the line underwent more than one change between its composition and the text as it is presented in the Houghton manuscript, the last word of the line may also need attention. The phrase vindicat acta is found as a line ending in pseudo-Vergil, Culex 276, ed. Clausen, 30. Even closer is the line ending "sibi vindicat actus" in Hildebert, Querimonia meter 4.1, ed. Orth, 91, which Migne prints as "sibi vindicat actus" when he supplies another version of this metrum in Hildebert's Carmina miscellanea 127.1, in PL 171.1437.B. But to accommodate either of these constructions would require substantial reworking of the line, which produces adequate sense with the addition of the single s.

14. ceptra = sceptra.

16. probatidis amor: Compare Purchad of Reichenau, Gesta Witigwonis 198, ed. Strecker, 269 ("Purchardus, doctior, summae probatidis amor").

17. natura beavit: This phrase occurs most often as a hexameter ending. For instance, see Marbot, Carmina 24.21, in PL 171.1660D ("praestat habere palam, quo te natura beavit"); the anonymous Rapularius 2, line 81, ed. Gatti, 6:340 ("Maternc dum me gremio natura beavit"); and Robert Partes, incipit "Ut quid lingua silet," line 99, in "The Poems of Robert Partes," ed. Cornog, 230 ("his exornavit, his te natura beavit"). Guaedinus uses this phrase in his poem on the virtues and vices, line 875, in Werner, "Guaedinus," 437 ("te licet innumeris felix natura beavit").

19. qui regni curam teneris suscepit in annis: At the age of sixteen Louis had been assigned a military command by Philip, who was becoming increasingly physically infirm. Louis was named rex designatus between 1098 and 1100. The phrase "teneris . . . in annis" is attested routinely from antiquity.
on in this metrical position. The pairing “regnī cura,” although medieval rather than classical in origin, is also common.


22. **cum momentis pondera discutere**: The rare expression *pondera discutere* derives from Gregory the Great’s *Moralia in Job* 28.10, ed. Adriaen, 3:1413: “alius in ura lingua quam novit sermonum pondera interpretando prudenter discutit, et tamen reliquis bonis quae non habet patienter caret” (“Another, in a language that he knows, skillfully weighs the values of words through interpretation, and yet he patiently does without the rest of the goods, which he lacks”). Gregory uses the phrase *pondera discutere* figuratively to refer to the evaluation of the “weight” of words.

Since in this section of “Francia dulcis, aue” the author praises Louis’ marvelous ability to dispense justice, it makes sense to understand *pondera discutere* as referring to legal decisions of some sort. While *discutere* clearly means “to assess” or “value,” the precise meaning of *pondera* is more difficult to determine. It may refer to a balance, or set of scales: see the *OLD* 1400, *pondus* 3b. The *momenta*, in this interpretation, would be the weights in the scales, and hence to “examine the scales with their weights” would be to evaluate judicial claims of some sort, perhaps to weigh justice against mercy or to decide between life and death. Cicero uses “rationis momenta” to mean the weights) of an argument at *De natura deorum* 1.5.10, ed. Dyck, 25. He also employs “momenta rationum” similarly at *Academica* 1.12.45, ed. Plasberg, 19.

Alternatively, *momenta* and *pondera* could be taken as synonyms that refer to the value of a person or a claim, or to “weighty matters” in general. In Classical Latin, *pondus* typically denoted the weight or bulk of an object and *momentum* its downward force, but the distinction between these terms is often blurred in late antique and medieval authors. Compare Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina* 7.12.5, ed. Leo, 165, ed. Reydellet, 2:103 (“cuncta mouens secum momenta et pondera rerum”); and Andrew of Saint-Victor, *Expositiones historicae in libros Salomonis: Expositio historia in Ecclesiasten* 1446–1447, ed. Lohr and Berndt.


25. **medicina salutem**: *Medicina* followed by an oblique form of *salus* occurs routinely at the end of hexameters, from Ovid, *Tristia* 2.269, ed. Owen (“eripit interdum, modo dat medicina salutem”).


32. **meruere mori**: This phrase occurs at the same position in Ermoldus Nigellus, *Carmen in honorem Hludowici* 4.228, ed. Dümmler, 2:64, and Faral, 160 (as line 2106) (“perculit ut pueros qui meruere mori”).

37. **dapsilis et parcus**: Compare Plautus, *Pseudolus* 1266 (5.1.21), ed. Lindsay (“dari dapsilis, non enim parce promi”).


38. **amans**: The manuscript presents *agens*, which makes the line hypermetric and violates the rhyme scheme. Although neither participle has been expunged, *agens* is omitted here. The scribe may have added it to explain the following line of adjectives that are attached to no participle, but its presence is not necessary for sense.

41. **linguamque lequacem**: Compare Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, 2.540, ed. Tarrant, 51 (“lingua fuit damno; lingua faciente loquaci”). The thought expressed in the line may be that a twofold heart reveals itself by writing one thing but saying another.

43. **ceruices rigidas et desipiencia corda**: For the first phrase see Ovid, *Tristia* 1.4.14, ed. Owen (“cervicis rigidae frena remittit equo”). Suger remarks (*Vita Ludovici* 8) that during his period as king-designate Louis “subdued the disobedient and either seized troublesome castles or made them submissive by any means possible.”

44. **fortis**: Suger provides several instances of the king’s personal bravery. For instance (*Vita Ludovici* 2), Louis fights his way into the middle of Drogo of Mouchy’s castle and wins glory in battle as a “brave champion” (*fortissimus palestrita*) and a “marvelous swordsman” (*spectabilis gladiator*). In a later engagement (*Vita Ludovici* 12) with the forces of Humbald, lord of the castle of Sainte-Sévère, the king-designate proves himself to be singularly courageous.

The main thrust of the couplet is to confirm that Louis embodies the combination of *sapientia* and *fortitudo*, the two greatest desiderata in a king. For a recent study that refers to earlier scholarship on this platitude, see Thomas D. Hill, “The Crowning of Alfred and the Topos of Sapientia et Fortitudo in Asser’s Life of King Alfred,” *Neophilologus* 86 (2002): 471–476.

“Hic Paris in facie, statura Nestor, Ulixes / consilio, belli viribus Hector erat: / Croesus divitiis, in causis Quintilianus, / eloquio Cicero, versibus ipse Maro.”

48–50. The comparisons with Paris and Hector here may well relate to the prestige of Trojan origins, to which Capetian monarchs began to lay claim. For instance, the epitaph of Philip I declares him as arising “ex genere Priami” (from the race of Priam).


54. **in manibus gladii teque tuosque dedit**: The expression *manus gladii* (“hands of the sword”) is biblical. Compare Job 5.20, Ps 62.11, Isa 18.21, and Ezek 35.5. Both the ablative *manibus* and the accusative *manus* are attested after *in* with a verb of motion in the Vulgate (for the rarer ablative form, see Judges 2.14 and 2.23). Presumably the poet uses the ablative *manibus* here for metrical reasons, since the phrasing “in manus gladii” cannot be accommodated in dactylic poetry.

57. **patris = patres**.

58. **stultos dissimulare patres**: Although the poet emphasizes that, as king, Louis did not follow the example set by Philip, the son seems to have avoided alienating his father while the latter remained alive. Suger of Saint-Denis remarks (*Vita Ludovici* 13) that Louis “had taken care never to displease his father in any way while he lived. Nor had he upset his father’s lordship over the kingdom by any sort of plot, as other young men customarily do.” He also describes how, at Philip’s funeral, Louis wept with “appropriate filial affection.”

79. **oberrabas**: A scribe glossed the word with the explanation “that is, France” to clarify that the verb in the second person was addressed to the personification of France.

83. **et quasi post hiemem**: Compare Reiner of Liège, *De conflictu duorum duorum et animarum* 1.131–132, in PL 204.83D (“nunc quasi post hiemem verno redeunte sereno / post adversa, secunda deo radiante redibunt”).

85. **bella silent**: Louis waged war frequently during the period of time between his acquisition of a military command (1097–1098) and his coronation (1108). For the wording, see Silius Italicus, *Punicus* 5.461–462, ed. Delz, 129 (“...Murrarum ille eminus hasta / perculerat, quo non alius, cum bella silentent”).


93. **Carolum Carolique patrem**: Charlemagne (742–814) and his father, Pepin III (714–768).


95. **lumina mundi**: A common hexameter ending.
98. *depicti morum floribus et radiis*: Compare Poem 90.88 “morum floribus” (see commentary). For *radii morum* see Walther, *Proverbia sententiaeque*, 1:53, no. 430 (“ad racios morum laxatur hiems animorum”). For *flores morum* see Walther, 5:373, no. 31674 (“tu morum flores cape virtutumque deores, laude decorari si gliscas et decorari”).


104. *perhennat = perennat*

111. *requieuit in illo*: This hexameter ending originated in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 4.662, ed. Tarrant, 118.


116. *uota benigna*: The phrase is found in Ermoldus Nigellus, *Carmen in honorem Hludovici* 4.74, in *Poetae Latini aevi Carolini* 2:60; and *Ermold le Noir*, 148, as line 1955; and in Florus of Lyon, *Carmina*, 24.37–38, ed. Dümmler, 552. [JL]


Poem 92, a eulogy for a certain Milo, has elicited at least two guesses as to whom its subject might be. In the description of MS Lat 300 provided to the Houghton Library by bookseller Nicolaus Rauch, and produced apparently by André Vernet, the Milo in question is identified as Cardinal Bishop Milo of Palestrina.64 Created a cardinal by Pope Urban II, Bishop Milo was sent to France as a papal legate with the special charge of addressing the issue of simony. His activities as legate in France stretched at least between the years 1095 and 1103, and he is believed to have died in 1112.65 In an apparently earlier discussion of the poem, however, Vernet states that its subject is “without doubt” Milo II of Bray, the seneschal of the castle of Montlhéry assassinated by his cousin Hugh of Crécy in October of 1116 or 1117.66 The career of this Milo, as far as i: intersects the political considerations that seem to underlie the collocation of poems in Houghton MS Lat 300, has already been sketched out in some detail above, in the discussion of the contents of Group Five.

The conventionality of form and heavy reliance on cliche generally evident in poems of the *planctus* genre can often pose difficulties for extracting from a poem

164. Ziolkowski, “A Bouquet of Wisdom and Invective,” 261n35. The bookseller’s description of the manuscript accompanied it upon its sale to the Houghton library in 1965.


of this type trustworthy biographical details about the subject of its eulogistic praise. Milo is described, for example, as having been pious (13, 45–46), morally upright (9–12, 31–32), and generous (17–18). His modesty is marked out for special mention (19–20, 33–40), with a personified Modesty even taking up her residence in the vessel of himself that Milo provided. As has already been noted, the singling out of such qualities might reasonably incline one to seek the poem’s subject in the ranks of ecclesiastical rather than secular society. Yet while one would not wish to cast doubt on the sincerity of the panegyrist, there is little in this catalog of praises—as much a “mass of goodnes”s” (43) as Milo himself is said to have been—that might not conceivably have found a place in the eulogy of almost any lay or ecclesiastical magnate of the time. Even if the poet’s description of “his holy breast . . . nurtured by holy wisdom” (13) might perhaps be seen as excessive were it meant to be applied to a worldly figure of primarily secular influence, still such conventional laudations as these afford little help in the struggle to establish or confirm the identity of the poem’s subject.

However, Poem 92 contains a number of more specific indications as to the position and activities of the person whose demise it laments. The poet lays particular stress on Milo’s “great burden of public affairs” (4), saying that the deceased was celebrated as “the glory of public affairs” (5). Milo’s activities obviously entailed involvement in the administration of justice. Alongside the general statement that he was “the renown of justice” (6), for example, it is asserted that his death will have compromised the very stability of “public laws, which through his agency had stood for a long time” (8).

That such remarks are more than just the stock-in-trade of eulogy is confirmed by the detailing of Milo’s generosity. Although he is qualified as being wealthy himself and as bestowing his wealth upon others (18), it is stated even more specifically that among his benefactions was the lavishing upon the needy of “the wealth of the condemned” (17). Such a statement can only imply a figure actively engaged in the legal system, with the power to distribute as he saw fit the financial proceeds that accrued from the assessment of judicial penalties.

It would be difficult to reconcile such a description with a claim that Poem 92 was composed upon the death of Cardinal Bishop Milo of Palestrina. While “righteous laws” (16) are listed among Milo’s guiding forces, little in the poem conjures up the issues of canon law with which Bishop Milo’s papal commission would surely have preoccupied him, whereas the mention of “public laws” (8) would seem to imply far more the laws of the res publica than the laws of the Church. A eulogy for Cardinal Milo by Bishop Marbod of Rennes includes, alongside declarations of holiness that border upon sanctification, much about the campaign of the papal legate against simoniacs.\footnote{167. This poem (incipit “Roma beata nimir, que sic excrevit ab imis”), composed in rhyming}
Roma...
Cernens Ecclesiam turbari per simonium,
Misset legatum per Gallica regna probatum,
Contra Simonem iussit pugnare Milonem. (1, 6–8)

Rome...

discerning the Church to be troubled by simony,
sent a proven legate throughout the Gallic realms,
ordered Milo to fight against Simon

Or again:

Sed fidei pilo penetrauit ad intimae Milo...
Emptores uidi uerbi mucrone recidi,
Et Simon immundus sibi succubuit pudibundus. (40, 43–44)

But with the spear of faith Milo pierced through to the heart...
Purchasers I saw cut back by the blade of the word,
and impure Simon yielded to him shamefaced.

Milo’s combat against simony was clearly perceived to form the central and most important facet of his work in France, and to find no mention of simony in Poem 92, or indeed no explicit reference at all to service to the Church, argues against equating the poem’s Milo with Bishop Milo. Similarly, the assertion that Milo “proclaimed, believed, did / what king...instructed” (15–16) indicates a man whose duty lay first and foremost with the secular power. This is in sharp contrast with the man who, as Marbod’s eulogy points out, had been sent to France by, and was thus directly answerable to, the papal administration in Rome.

Of the two persons nominated as its possible subjects, the portrait drawn in the poem finds a much better match in the person of Milo II of Bray. This

hexameters, is edited by Walther Bulst, in “Studien zu Marbods Cammina varia und Liber decem capitulorum,” Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen (1939): 205–206. For brief discussions, see Histoire littéraire de la France, 10:20, and Mani, Gesichte, 3:36 and 644. For its praise of Milo’s holiness, consider lines 49–51: “Nunc capis in coelis tua praemia, serue fidelis. / Nunc super astra situs, diademate nunc redimitus, / nostros oratus audi” (Now you receive your rewards in heaven, faithful servant. / Set now above the stars, crowned now with a diadem, / hear our prayers).

168. The biographical details that follow concerning Milo II of Bray are drawn from Abbot Suger’s biography of King Louis VI, Vita Ludovici chaps. 8, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 23. An epitaph for Milo II appears in a manuscript of Saint–Amand (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 5129, fol. 103r) that is best known for its dossier of texts on the Crusades. Though the epitaph names a date in May, the month could refer not to when Milo died but instead to when he was interred at the Cluniac priory of Longpont-sur–Orge (not far east of Monthéry), which took place most likely in the “premiers mois” of 1118 (Miot, La Chronique de Morigny, 2314; see also Cusimano, A Translation of the Chronicle of the Abbey of Morigny, 184n16).
Milo's engagement in the political affairs of the realm cannot be doubted, and as viscount of Troyes and, later, seneschal of Monthléry he would certainly have been a man who, like the poem's addressee, played a part in the rendering of public justice on the estates under his control. As seneschal, holding Monthléry at least in theory at the will of Louis VI, he would also obviously have been in a position to receive instruction from the king. Milo II's career as a king's man was, however, far from unblemished. The castle of Monthléry had been ceded to the crown in 1104 by Milo's elder brother Guy II Trousseau (died 1109), and in 1105 Milo, claiming ancestral right, endeavored to wrest control of the castle from Philip I's seneschal Guy I, count of Rochefort (about 1055–1108). Milo's siege of Monthléry was broken, however, and Milo himself constrained to flee in despair, by the actual arrival of forces under the command of Guy of Rochefort and the feared approach of additional troops under the command of the future Louis VI, whose fiancée had been trapped within the castle by the besiegers. In 1109 Louis, by then on the throne, bestowed the seneschalship of Monthléry upon Milo. This was largely, however, an act of expediency, to counter attempts by the king's enemies (including Louis' half-brother Philip of Melun) to confer possession of the strategically important castle on their partisan, and Milo's cousin, Hugh of Crécy (died 1147).

Although Milo swore fealty and allegiance to the king at that time, the years 1111 to 1113 found Milo, along with Hugh of Crécy, allied with Count Thibaud IV of Blois (1093–1151) and Henry I of England (about 1068–1135) in their wars against Louis. At the conclusion of those wars Milo was humbled through the forced annulment of his marriage to Count Thibaud's sister, but he retained possession of Monthléry and does not seem to have opposed Louis in any significant way between then and the time of his death. Indeed, the sorrow expressed by Louis at the interment of Milo II of Bray, and his subsequent vengeance on Milo's murderer, Hugh of Crécy, are both recorded in the Chronique de Morigny.\(^{169}\) If Milo II is in fact the subject of Poem 92, then his characterization as one who "did / what king . . . instructed" (l. 15–16) may well represent the state of affairs at the time of his death, overlooking conveniently a string of less fortunate episodes from his earlier career.

The assassination of Milo II in October of 1116 or 1117 also agrees with the single bit of absolutely firm biographical information in Poem 92, the poet's statement that "the first day of his death and the last of his life was / the first day following the tenth of October" (l. 49–50). Ironically, however, it is also the circumstances surrounding Milo II's death that would perhaps bring most seriously into question

\(^{169}\) On the circumstances of Milo's murder, and the treachery ascribed to Hugh of Crécy, see Mirot, La Chronique de Morigny, 22–24 and Cusimano, Chronique de Morigny, 46–51. Milo, who would appear to have been in his early thirties at the time of his death, is there described as "optime indolis et strenuissimum in armis juvenem" (a young man of highest inborn quality and a most valiant warrior).
his identification as the subject of the poem. Seeing that he was murdered in the course of a power struggle with his own cousin, it is hard to imagine that a lament for the death of Milo II would not draw upon the emotional force of these events, emphasizing the untimeliness of his demise, its violent nature, or the treachery of his own kin in bringing it about. In fact, the poet placed at the literal center of his fifty-line poem the assertion that Milo "chose sooner to perish / than to forsake the sure ways of right" (25–26). Yet whereas this statement does hint at a death brought about by taking the side of right in some unnamed conflict, as the only allusion in the poem to the assassination of Milo II it would represent an example of severe understatement, in a genre where such was not necessarily either goal or commonplace. Similarly, it might be seen as somewhat curious that no direct reference is made in the poem to military prowess, if indeed the death it laments is that of a man whose career was marked, as was Milo’s, by a number of significant martial episodes. Perhaps, given Milo’s unfortunate choice of allegiance and pronounced lack of success in several of these conflicts, it was thought most politic to avoid mention of such subjects in the lament. There would obviously have been additional impetus for such omission were the poem originally intended to be recited at Milo’s interment, where Louis VI, as we have seen above, was in attendance.

Some doubt must obviously remain as to the precise addressee of the poem. The Milo whose death is lamented may be neither the cardinal bishop nor the viscount of Troyes, but rather some as yet unidentified namesake of both. If this is the case, then the evidence of the poem might very well lead the would-be seeker to search among the ranks of chronologically eligible bishops and abbots for a Milo of sacred inclination yet bearing some secular authority, the details of whose life and death accord with those found in the poem. Yet while allowing for this possibility, it must also be admitted that no person likelier than Milo II of Bray has yet been proposed for identification as the addressee of Poem 92. His biography corresponds reasonably well with the content and likely date of the poem, and the thematic threads that appear to interweave the placement and ordering of Poems 90 through 92 in MS Lat 300 add further weight of logical probability to his candidacy. It is certainly imaginable that the poet may have had some practical or political motivation for playing down the circumstances of Milo II’s assassination, or that those circumstances may have been so well known to a contemporary audience as to obviate the need for anything more than the oblique mention with which we are presented. Or perhaps in the face of a violent and unfortunate death the poet chose to focus on the celebration of a life and its achievements.

One further piece of evidence may tie Poem 92 to Milo II of Bray. Describing Milo’s attempt to capture Montlhéry in 1105, Abbot Suger tells how the men of Montlhéry, despite their more recent oaths of allegiance, are willing to accept

170. Wàquet, 40.
Milo as their lord in recognition of his familial ties to the castle. To this observation he prefixes the following quotation from Horace: “Quo semel est imbuta recens servabit odorem / testa diu” (A jar will keep for a long time the fragrance with which it was once imbued when new). Although Suger’s biography of Louis VI was written twenty or more years after the death of Milo II of Bray, is it possible that his employment of this Horatian tag, introducing the most substantial appearance by Milo in the *Vita*, was influenced by a familiarity with our Poem 92, and its description of its subject as a “new vessel, and one without dregs” (35)? Or, given the ubiquity of such citations of Horace in medieval literary culture, might the attempt to see such a resonance across decades be a concession to a misty romanticism more appropriate for a poetical composer of panegyric than for a hard-nosed critic of literature? [PP]

[10r<sup>6</sup>] *Flete senes, plorate uiri, iuuenes lacrimentur*  
   Cum pueris, dolet sexus uterque simul.  
   Ille uir egregius, toto uenerabilis orbe,  
   Cum magno rerum pondere Milo ruit.  
   Milo ruit, qui forma boni, qui gloria rerum,  
   Qui laus iustitie, qui favor orbis erat.  
   Milo ruit, cum quo longas traxere ruinas  
   Que per eum steterant publica iuera diu.  
   Qui certum uiciis se restens moribus hostem  
   Deuicit mundum uictor et ipse sui.  
   Cuius facta modum, mores tenuere decorum;  
   Cuius sermo frequens de probitate fuit,  
   Cuius sacra sacrum fuit sapiancia pectus,  
   Assistent docili digna magistra uiro.  
   Lingua, mente, manu clamauit, credidit, egit  

[10v<sup>A</sup>] Quod rex, quod ratio, quod pia iura docent.  
   Sparsit opes dampnatorum sibi pauper egenis,  
   Diuies, dans quociens cui daret et quid erat.  
   Incola terrarum, celorum ciuis, honorem  
   Quem peperit probitas grande putauit onus.  
   Assertor ueri falsos et falsa repressit,  
   Firmus et ex uoto que retenenda tenens.  
   Non timor hunc, non spes certo de tramite torsit,  
   Non favoer uiciit, non uiolauit amor.  
   Justiciam sicius elegerat ante perire  
   Quam certas equi desueruisse uias.

---

Tristibus, iratis reuocaut gaudia, pacem,
Eloquio placidus consilioque potens
Et quo pene nichil uaelt artius esse, negauerit
Se sibi duri reliquis utilis esse cupit.
Cauit amicicia inhonestas cultor honesti;
Cauit ab immundis uiuere mundus amans.
Viure mundus amans luxum ferit, omnia spreuit
Seque pudicitie prebuit hospicium,
Que mirata nouum uas et sine fetibus inquit,
"Ad mores certe nec facit iste modos.
Non est migrandum de sedibus his. Maneamus!
Oppositum nobis nil gerit iste locus."
Sic suscepta semel suscepit suscipientem,
Indivisa corne et sine fine manens.
O uere felix et celo teste beatus,
Qui bona que docuit fecit et ipse prior.

Non fuit hic aliquis nisi quaedam massa bonorum,
Natus nature, nobile principium,
Quem fuit pietas, spes iuuit, pax adamauit,
Gloria nutruit sustinuitque fides.
Mercibus his plenus nostra de ualle recessit
Ad superos, carnis uellere deposito.
Prima fuit mortis illius et ultima uite
Octobris decimam prima secunda dies.

Weep, elders! Lament, men! Let young men shed tears
along with boys, let both sexes grieve together!
That outstanding man, honored throughout the entire world,
Milo, has fallen, with his great burden of public affairs!
Milo has fallen, who was the image of goodness, the glory of public affairs, 5
the renown of justice, the favor of the world!
Milo has fallen, and with him the public laws (which through his agency
had stood for a long time) have collapsed into vast ruins.
Holding himself out as a sure enemy against vices through his morals,
he overcame the world, a victor even over himself. 10
His deeds held in moderation, his morals to seemliness;
his conversation was often of goodness;
His holy breast was nurtured by holy wisdom,
worthy mistress standing by a man ready to learn.
With tongue, with mind, with hand, he proclaimed, believed, did
what king, what reason, what righteous laws instructed.

A poor man to himself, he spread about the wealth of the condemned to
those in need,
a wealthy man in giving whenever there was someone to whom
and something to give.

Earthly inhabitant, heavenly citizen, the honor
that goodness produced he reckoned a great burden.

Defender of truth, he checked false men and false things,
firm and holding by desire to those things that should be held fast.

Fear did not, hope did not wrench him from the unerring path,
favor did not overcome him, passion did not harm him.

Thirsting for justice, he chose sooner to perish
than to forsake the sure ways of right.

He restored joys to the sad, peace to the wrathful,
gentle in eloquence and capable in counsel.

And, than which almost nothing can be more difficult, he denied
himself to himself as he desired to be useful to others.

A devotee of decency, he was on guard against indecent friendships;
desiring to live purely, he was on guard against impure men.

Desiring to live purely, he snubbed extravagance, spurned everything,
and showed himself to be a haven for Modesty,
who, having marvelled at her new vessel, and one without dregs, said:

“Surely this man does not place limits on morals.

One must not depart from these abodes. Let us stay!
This place contains nothing antagonistic to us.”

Having been once received in this way, Modesty received him
who received her,
a companion inseparable and remaining without end.

O truly happy and—with heaven as witness—blessed one,
who himself was first to do the good things he taught!

This man was nothing if not, as it were, a mass of goodneses,
born of nature, a noble beginning,
whom righteousness cherished, hope aided, peace longed for,
glory nourished, and faith sustained.

Filled with these assets, he has departed from our valley
to those dwelling in heaven, having laid aside the fleece of the flesh.

The first day of his death and the last of his life was
the first day following the tenth of October.
Textual Notes

1. Initial missing; l expunged after viri.
4. pondere: pondе with correction dere added above line.
8. publicа fac diu with iura written above fac diu.
11. fata: fata.
14. magistra: magistra, with a supralinear i above the g, followed by an i on the line with a ligatured supralinear s.
23. torsit appears at the end of the line above traxit. The first syllable of tramite probably led the scribe to write traxit.
28. placidus: pladus with correction ci written above line.
30. dum: ddum, without indicated deletion of the additional d.
33. ferit: frit.
42. fecit: feget corrected above the line to fecit
47. ualle written with a smudged second letter, apparently an a, expunged and with a clear a added above the line.
48. ad superos written twice, with the first occurrence struck out by a stroke through the words.
49. mortis written supralinearly with a line to mark the place of insertion.
50. secunda is a correction (by the original scribe, in the right margin) for a word that begins sed. [PP]

Commentary


2. **sexus uterque**, a cliché in dactylic poetry, appears in this same metrical position in both Hildebert, *Carmina minora* 26.14, ed. Scott, 17, and Baudri, *Carmina* 99.186, ed. Tilliette, 1:110; the latter also uses it elsewhere: 97.45 and 98.64, ed. Tilliette, 1:97 and 101.

3. **uir egregius** is found occasionally in this metrical position. **toto uenerabilis orbe**: The rest of the line is almost a formula that goes back to Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina* 8.16.3, in Leo, 198; in Reydellet, 2:158; and *Vita sancti Martini* 3.175, in Leo, 336.

4. **forma bon** is a common pairing. Even more so is the line ending **gloria rerum**, especially in Hildebert (*Carmen in libros Regum* 1, prologue 1; *Vita
beate Marie Egiptiae 2, ed. Larsen, 231; and Carmina miscellanea 7.11 and 50.1, in PL 171.1388D and 1402B).

7. The line ending traxere ruinas dates to Vergil, Aeneid 8.192, ed. Mynors, 288 (“scopuli ingentem traxere ruinam”). Trabere ruinam or -s, like the more common dare ruinam or -s, meant “to collapse” (OLD, 1666, ruina, 1b, 2b, and especially 3c). See Vergil, Aeneid 2.465–466, ed. Mynors, 141 (“ea [turris] lapsa repente ruinam / cum sonitu trahit”).

8. publica iura is a cliché.

9. restens: The spelling may speak to the same influences of pronunciation as do the more frequent cases in which an -en in standard Latin is spelled -an in MS Lat 30c. The line ending moribus hostem may be indebted or related to Baudri, Carmina 87.19–21, ed. Tilliette, 1:84 (“Denuo dixisti quoniam tria moribus obsint, / Quae tria, si superent, ducunt in perditionem: / Femina, census, honos, ferales moribus hostes”).

10. uictor et ipse: Common in this metrical position, as in Baudri, Carmina 94.24, ed. Tilliette, 1:93.

probitate: An exceedingly difficult word to translate since its meanings cover a range from “moral worth” to “prowess.”

13. sapiancia = sapientia.


16. pia iura: Stock in this metrical position.

22. retenenda = retinenda.

23. certo de tramite: In this metrical position in Horace, Satires 2.3.49, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 218.

25. iustitia* siti* occur now and then in conjunction, most notably as a line ending in Hildebert, De operibus sex diemum 3.4. Ultimately the image of the “thirst for justice” derives from the Beatitudes (Mt 5:6 “Beati, qui esuriunt et sitiunt iustitam”).

26. deseruisse uias: Compare the line ending of Prosper of Aquitaine, Epigrammatum ex sententiis s. Augustini liber unus 97.19, in PL 51.528C (“deseruisse viam”).

28. consilioque potens: A line opening already in Ilias Latina 177.

32–33. mundus amans: Ever so slight a wrinkle on the cliché mundus amat.

33. omnia spreuit: A line ending in Waltharins 853, ed. Strecker, 59, and Hildebert or pseudo-Hildebert, Inventio sanctae crucis 143, in PL 171.1317D.

35. fetibus = fecibus. In this sort of instance it can be impossible to ascertain whether the manuscript presents a variant spelling or a copyist’s slip.


41. sine fine mane*: Cliché.

42. ipse prior: Cliché.
43. **quedam**: Translated here “as it were”: see OLD 1551, *quidam* 3b.

**massa bonorum**: In this challenging phrase the first noun could refer to a lump of raw material, which would accord well with the nearby characterization of Milo as a “beginning.”

44. **nobile principium**: Compare William of Conches, *Glosae super Boetium*, In Consolationem III metrum 6, ed. Nauta, 137 (“omnia est nobile principium, sed mali degenerant ab eo per vitium, et ita sunt ignobiles”). [JL]

**POEM 93.** Incipit “Flos, decus, exemplum iuuenum, patriae, probatatis.” Three elegiac distichs. Not in Walther. Not in *In principio*.

[10v\textsuperscript{b}] *Flos, decus, exemplum iuuenum, patriae, probatatis,*

Occidit heu multis Frodo ruina bonis.
Alter Aristotiles, Paris alter, et alter Homerus
Ingenio, forma, carmine Frodo fuit.
Martis prima dies, Egipto teste, nefanda
Frodonis utram clausit aitque uale.

*Flower of youths, grace of the fatherland, model of goodness,*

*Frodo has perished, alas! a disaster for many good men.*

*Frodo was in talent another Aristotle, in appearance another Paris,*

*in poetry another Homer.*

*The first day of March, unspeakable (as Egypt can attest),* 5

concluded Frodo’s life and said “Farewell.”

**Textual Note**

1] *Initial missing.*

**Commentary**

1. **Flos, decus**: A cliché for opening hexameters. **Flos . . . iuuenum**: In an epitaph by Baudri for a canon of Tours named Alexander, the deceased is characterized as being the “flos iuuenum” (*Carmina* 41.4, ed. Tilliette 1:53). **exemplum iuuenum**: In the same metrical position there appears in pseudo-Ovid, *Consolationio ad Liviam* 13, ed. Amat, 60: “Occidit exemplum iuuenis uenerabile morum” (especially interesting since the line contains the verb *occidit*, with which line 2 in Poem 93 begins).

2. **Frodo**: Baudri left three eulogies in distichs (*Carmina* 28–30, ed. Tilliette, 1:46–48) for a scholar named Frodo who left Anjou to seek his fortune in England, where he died or at least was buried (*Carmina* 29.2, ed. Tilliette, 1:47). **Occidit, heu**: Found in a few poems as a line opening, with the first being Ennodius, *Carmina* 2.1.9, ed. Vogel, 46.
3. **Alter Aristotiles**: Baudri also refers to Frodo as an “Aristotle.” **Paris alter**: In Vergil, *Aeneid* 7.321 (line ending), ed. Mynors, 266, and Baudri, *Carmina* 10.18, ed. Tilliette, 1:35. **et alter Homerus**: Line ending in Horace, *Epistles* 2.1.50, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 293. “Alter Homerus” is also a line ending in Baudri, *Carmina* 201.31, ed. Tilliette, 2:131, and a line opening in an anonymous poem (with the incipit “Viribus, arte, minis, Danaum clara Troia ruinis”) that was printed erroneously as a continuation of Simon Aurea Capra, *Ylias* 235, the composite poem being entitled *Versus de excidio Troiae*, in PL 171.1452C. For the origin of the error, see Parrott (1975), 70; for a discussion of the relationship between the anonymous poem and Simon’s, see 67–71. The preferred edition of “Viribus, arte, minis” is in *Poésies populaires latines antérieures au douzième siècle*, edited by Edélestand du Mériel (Paris, 1843; reprint, Bologna, 1969), 400–405. The poem, attested in more than a dozen manuscripts, has been attributed to Peter of Saintes (who flourished about 1145), among others: see Faral, “Le manuscrit 511 du ‘Hunterian Museum’ de Glasgow,” 47.


5. **Martis prima dies**, *Egipto teste*, nefanda: This verse assumes an unusually close familiarity with a poem, probably from the eight or ninth century, that has the incipit “Bis deni binique dies scribuntur in anno.” See *Anthologia Latina*, no. 680a (previously no. 736), ed. Buecheler and Riese, 156–157. Interestingly, the same tradition recorded there is also handled in Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, MS C 58, fol. 7, in Werner, *Beiträge*, 34–35, no. 79. The first two lines of the eighth- or ninth-century poem refer to twenty days of the year in which one hour is to be feared by mortals. Lines 5–6 explain the association with Egypt: “Si tenebrae Aegyptus Graeco sermone uocantur, / Inde dies mortis tenebrosos iure uocamus.” Last but not least, line 9 of the poem begins “Martis prima necat, cuius sub cuspidre quarta est.”

The poem gives voice to a belief held for more than a millennium in the unluckiness of certain days at certain hours. These days were sometimes marked in calendars as “dies Aegyptiaci” (Egyptian days), so-called because the Egyptians were associated with expertise in the calendar and astrology. See Bonnie Blackburn and Leofranc Holford-Strevens, *The Oxford Companion to the Year* (Oxford, 1999), 590–591.


[10vb] Reddere sufficerent plures, Iuliane, beatos
Queue simul intolerant se satis ampla tibi;
Sed quam fragil pendebant omnia filo!
Ecce iacent casus pondera lapsa tui.
Nunc te suscipiat uernans et amena ulunctas
Et foueat animam pax requiesque tuam.

Julian, the things that once presented themselves to you in much abundance
would have been enough to make many people happy;
but how frail was the thread on which everything was hanging!
Look now, the weights of your fall lie collapsed.
Now may a delightful and flourishing goodwill bear you up,
and may peace and repose cherish your soul.

Textual Note
1) Initial missing.

Commentary
1. The Julian in the first line is a puzzle. The notion that the poet could be
alluding to a place such as Saint-Julien, the Benedictine abbey in Tours, is
ruled out by the closing mention of a soul. Who could be meant? In this
instance the Loire Valley poets, who sometimes afford clues about personages
named in poems in MS Lat 300, offer no help. The poetry of Baudri makes
no reference to any Julian. Whereas Hildebert names Julian several times, but
always Julian the Apostate, and Rodulfus Tortarius mentions only the saint
named Julian, Poem 94 seems to refer to a contemporary.
2. satis ampl*: A stock phrase in hexameter poetry.
3. fragili: Normally the first two syllables of the adjective are short, but here
all three must be scanned long. If this violation of prosody signals a textual
corruption rather than authorial incompetence, what remedies are possible?
Although filum is often found modified by the adjective tenuis, replacing fragili
with tenui does not improve the meter here. The word that could replace
fragili to save the scansion would be subtili, used in conjunction with filo
since Lucretius, De rerum natura 4.88, ed. Bailey (“Quae vulgo volitant subtili
praedita filo”). The phrase “subtili filo” appears in the same metrical position
as here in Fulk of Beauvais, De nuptiis Christi et ecclesiae 5.340, ed. Rousseau,
Fulcoii Beluacensis Utroque De nuptiis Christi et ecclesiae libri septem, 100 (also
numbered 182).
4. The image seems to be of the weights on a balance-scale, which has tipped
so that Julian’s situation is no longer in the balance but has fallen. Compare
Poem 91.22.
5. pax requiesque: This wording appears twice in this metrical position in
Ermoldus Nigellus, Carmen in honorem Hludowici 1.154 and 3.498, in Poetae
Latini aevi Carolini 2:9 and 55; and Ermold le Noir, 18 and 132, as lines 189 and
1751.

Mauricius locuples uiuandi lege peracta
Mortuus est, sed non hec sua culpa fuit:
Si licuisset ei precio corrumpere fata,
Nequaquam uiuos deseruisset adhuc.

Rich Maurice died when the law of life was finished,
but through no fault of his own:
if he had been allowed to tamper with fate by bribery,
he would by no means yet have left the living.

Textual Notes

1. Initial missing. uiuandi: uuiadi.

Commentary

1. These two elegiac distichs are an epigram or epitaph for a dead man named Maurice. The orthography uiuandi for uinendi is typical of this manuscript.

   culpa fuit: A common cliché in dactylic poetry. Two interesting incidences are in an epitaph by Marbod, Carmina 2.19.3–4, in PL 171.1721A (“Se tibi culpa fuit, quod nullum laedere velles, / Quale tuum meritum cum bona culpa fuit”).

3. corrumpere fata: This pairing rings a slight change on the ending “rumpere fata,” stock since Lucan, De bello ciutil 2.107, ed. Shackleton Bailey, 28. [PP and JZ]
Group Six: Prophecy of the Tiburtine Sibyl

MS Lat 300 presents its readers one final surprise by ending with a text unexpected in a poetic anthology. The only prose piece in the collection, on fol. 111r-v, is a version of one of the all-time “best-sellers” of the Latin Middle Ages—the prophecy of the Tiburtine Sibyl (Sibylia Tiburtina). The Greeks had identified nine of these prophetesses: the Persian, Libyan, Delphic, Cimmerian, Eythraean, Samian, Cumaean, Hellespontine, and Phrygian. To these the Romans added a tenth, the Tiburtine Sibyl. As with the rest, she is named after her location, in this case the Etruscan town of Tibur (known today as Tivoli). A recent survey found 112 extant manuscripts of the Latin text of the prophecy, dating from the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries.172

Although the exact wording of the Tiburtina, as the text is customarily designated, varies greatly from one version to the next, the contents are more or less stable. The Tiburtina begins with a presentation of the background and character of the Sibyl and proceeds to describe her encounter with a group of Roman senators, who ask her to interpret their shared dream-vision of nine suns appearing. The Sibyl’s prophecy, whose wording often echoes that of the apocalyptic discourse in the synoptic Gospels (Matthew 24, Mark 13, Luke 21), describes each of the nine successive “generations” of humanity that correspond to these suns. The fourth generation includes a retelling of the life of Christ that is often referred to as the “Sibylline Gospel,” and the later generations contain a species of political prophecy known as “prophecy after the fact” (vaticinium ex eventu). In this case the prophecy after the fact focuses on rulers from various periods of history, who are for the most part identified by their initials, including Roman emperors, Charlemagne, and Lombard, Ottonian, and sometimes French rulers, depending on when and where a particular version of the Tiburtina was written. The text concludes with an apocalyptic vision of the last emperor, the advent and defeat of Antichrist, and the triumph of Christ and the saints.

With almost none of the Sibylline Gospel and very little historical prophecy, the version in MS Lat 300 is shorter than most of the others. It mentions only a few rulers and no contemporary ones. The redactor of this version was clearly more interested in the vision of the end of the world than in remarking on the contemporary political scene, but even the apocalypse is somewhat abbreviated. The abridgment is so severe in some passages that the text becomes cryptic. For example,

in the Gospel section, the appearance of the priests of the Hebrews is sudden and unexplained. A few lines later is the “iniciam quale non fuit ab inicio mundi” (a beginning such as there has not been from the beginning of the world), which is nonsense until compared with fuller versions of the text, which have “initium dolorum quale non fuit” (a beginning of suffering, such as there has not been).

The text that circulated as the prophecy of the Tiburtine Sibyl developed in stages over a long period of time. A Greek version appeared in the fourth century, and the first version of the Latin from which the text in MS Lat 300 descends was probably written around 1000.173 Many variants of the text are extant, and it is a major scholarly task to separate the strands from one another to determine what was written when and by whom. A text that originated about 1030, edited by Ernst Sackur in the late nineteenth century, is now held to be the second of at least four Medieval Latin versions.174 A variant of this version from about 1190 is known as the “Bedan recension” because it was printed in Patrologia Latina 90 with works of Bede, although Migne ascribed the Tiburtina to “auctor incertus” (an unknown author).175 Bernard McGinn published an edition of the fourth version, which dates from about 1100, based on Chicago, Newberry Library, MS f.6 (early twelfth century).176 McGinn’s edition is the one that has most in common with the text in MS Lat 300. Among the known manuscripts of the Tiburtina, Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, MS R. 436 (s. XI–XII?), fol. 143–146v, in particular has many verbal and structural similarities to the Houghton text, although it contains the usual elaborations of political prophecy, and so is about three times as long.177

Why was the Tiburtina included on the last folio here? Recalling that the


177. Anke Holdenried deserves thanks for having drawn attention to this manuscript in an e-mail of December 19, 2005. Although the Wrocław MS reveals many similarities to MS Lat 300, enough small differences remain (in the form of words added, different orthographical quirks, and small changes in word order) to make unlikely a direct dependency of either on the other.
poems were arranged so that some thematic relationship links each one to another near it, we might try to find some similar connection between the Tiburtina and the occasional poems that precede it. The historical flavor of Poems 90 through 95 contains a piquant note of memento mori beginning with the formulaic lines near the close of Poem 90, “though he must be gathered to his fathers according to the law of time, / his fame for his accomplishments will be everlasting.” The lament for Milo in Poem 92 situates panegyric in the context of death, and the short epitaphs that follow bring the first of the four last things—death, judgment, heaven, and hell—into ever sharper focus. The climactic passage of the Tiburtina, its breathless catalogue of the events that will end the world, occurs here as a natural consequence of musing about death.

The arrangement of the entire manuscript also reveals a development of perspective that culminates in apocalyptic vision. From the solipsistic concerns about sickness and love, the poets’ vision has become ever broader, encompassing the scriptural knowledge and book learning that are embodied in the biblical epigrams; contemporary politics and history; death, which is of course universal; and, finally, in the Tiburtina, the end of the world, which too is universal for the living, the dead, and for Christ and Antichrist as well. Rulers, their triumphs and failures, and the sufferings they impose on the population, will come and go through successive generations, but in the end, Christ will triumph with the saints and rule forever. As the scribe concludes the anthology with this blissful image of the inevitable end of history, it is no wonder he feels compelled to end his text with the word “Amen” writ large. [BKB]

fol. 11r


Quo audito principes Romanorum nunciauerunt regi suo. Ecce deprecati sunt ut eam manda- / ret; et fecit sic. Que cum uenisset Romam, omnes Romani intanderunt in eam. Pulcritudinem eius admirabantur. / Capilli eius sicut aurum fulgebant, cilia eius super oculos nigra, caro eius et gula sicut lac candida. / Tunc dixerunt: O magistra et domina, quam decorosum est corpus tuum! Volumus te

Tunc regina: Nouem inquit soles / ix generationes sunt.
Tunc erit inicium quale non fuit ab inicio mundi. Erunt mul- [30] te tribulaticnes, sanguinis effusio, terre motus per regiones, multe ciuitates captiubuntur / et non erit qui resistat, quia Dominus erit iratus in populum. Erunt autem rapaces cupidi tiranni /
There were ten Sibyls, who are made famous by learned authors. They are called Sibyls in Greek, prophets in Latin, vates in Hebrew. This Sibyl came from a noble family: she is said to have been the daughter of Manasses during the fourth age, the age of David. In Greek she is called Tiburtina; in Latin, Haburnea. Her birth was announced by an angel, and she lived as a virgin. With the passage of time, after she had made the circuit of Asia, Macedonia, Postatia, Agathoula, Cilicia, Pontus, Pamphilia, and Galacia, she traversed Egypt, Ethiopia, Bagdad, Babylonia, and Africa, and prophesied, saying: “Evil comes from evil men, and [5] good from good.”

The Roman nobility, when they heard this, announced it to their king. Lo and behold, they beseeched him to summon her; and he did so. When she came to Rome, all of the Romans gazed at her. They wondered at her beauty. Her hair glistened like gold, her brows were black above her eyes, her flesh and throat were milk-white. Then they said, “O mistress and lady, how comely is your appearance! We wish to question you about our dream, for we have heard the report of your name and your wisdom.” In answer, she said, “Let us depart [10] from this place of dung, and go up to the Aventine Hill, and there I will explain your dream.” When they arrived there, she said, “Now, you hundred elders, tell me your dream.” They said, “We saw seven suns shining over all
the earth. The first was very bright, and large. The second, more brilliant and
clear. The third, bloody, fiery, and very brilliant. The fourth, entirely bloody.
The fifth, dark, as if containing thunder. The sixth, very dark, with sharp
points like [15] scorpions. The seventh, with a terrible bloody color. The eighth,
all brilliant and bloody. The ninth, very dark but with one bright ray.”

Then the queen replied, “The nine suns are nine generations. The first
sun is the first generation, in which there will be simple, honorable men,
loving true liberty, gentle, kind, loving the consolation of the poor, and wise.
The second sun is the second generation, in which there will be men growing
brilliantly, youth worshipping God, living without malice in the earth. [20]
The third sun is the third generation, when nation will rise against nation.
The fourth sun is the fourth generation, in which a virgin coming from the
East will conceive a son named Jesus. Then Caesar Augustus will arise and
will subject all the earth; and afterward all the priests of the Hebrews will
convene. And there will be a great city, and many people will live in it, and
fifty-two languages. After this will arise a king from his own tribe, vowing
vows and making burnt offerings. Lo and behold, he will be killed immediately.
Afterward other kings will arise, one of whom his enemies will kill by fire.
Afterward a king will arise having a name beginning with C. [25] He will be
strong in battle, judging justly, and he will destroy the temples of idols. In those
days there will be holy temples in the name of the Lord, and churches will be
constructed in honor of the apostles and martyrs. In the eighth generation, then,
a Salian from Francia will arise having a name beginning with K, and he will be
pious, great, most noble, powerful, and merciful, dealing justice to the poor.
Afterward will come another king who will invade Rome and capture it. After
this, another from the race of the Lombards will rule for a hundred years.

Then there will be a beginning such as there has not been since the
beginning of the world. There will be [30] much suffering, shedding of blood,
earthquakes in different regions. Many cities will be captured, and there will be
none to resist, since the Lord will be angered against the people. There will be
plunderers, grasping men, tyrants,

fol. 11v

and those who hate the poor. After this will arise the king of the Romans with
a beautiful and brilliant appearance, tall in stature, with shining limbs and
eyes like the morning star; and he will reign for ten years. Then there will be
wealth and abundance throughout all the earth. He will destroy the temples of
the idols; he will convert everyone to baptism. Behold, all cities will be adorned
with altars and crucifixes. [5] After this will arise a prince from the tribe of
Dan, a son of destruction, who will overturn everything. Then a prince from the
north will arise with an army beyond number where Alexander has enclosed Gog and Magog. And when the king of the Romans sees this, he will go to the house of the Lord on Mount Calvary itself, and he will take the crown from his head, and he will hand over the kingdom [10] of the Christians to God. And the holy cross will be taken up to heaven with the crown of the king. And when the Lord comes to judge the world in fire, a sign of the son of man will appear in the sky, that is, the holy cross; then Elijah and Enoch will battle with Antichrist, and will be beaten by him. And the Lord will come, and will kill the son of destruction with the breath of his mouth, and will judge [15] the world in fire. This is the end of the world and the day of judgment. Happy are they who have prepared for this hour. And there will be a kingdom of saints unto eternity; and they will reign with Christ unto eternity. Amen.” [18]

Textual Notes

fol. 11r

1] Initial D missing, propheta (as if from a neuter *prophetum) emended to prophete.
10] nostrum in blotted and corrected above line; audimus supralinear correction to audiuiimus; sapiaciae, a and ae expunged and corrected to en and em above line; inquit supplied above line; exemus added a above line.
18] gennentones second n expunged, re supplied above.
29] post haec alius de genere: post haec de genere H.

fol. 11v

Possibly different scribe: lager ductus, long i, and two-stroke s.

1] ex . . . rex r . . . orum text abraded and smudged. McGinn: unde erit rex Romanorum; Sackur: rex grecorum.
8] qua later corrected to qua.
11] Huc: Apparently Huc became Uc, which in turn became Ut (the manuscript reading).

Commentary

fol. 11r

1–2. prophete latine, hebraice uates: The etymologies here combine information from Isidore of Seville and Rabanus Maurus: Isidore, Etymologiae 7.8.1, ed. Lindsay (“Quos gentilitas vates appellant, hos nostri prophetas vocant, quasi praefatores”), and Rabanus Maurus, De universo 15.3, in PL 111.420B (“Sibyllae generaliter dicuntur omnes feminae vates lingua graeca . . . Decem autem Sibyllae a doctissimis auctoribus fuisset traduntur”). The curious assignment of uates to Hebrew and propheta to Latin stems from the author’s
understanding of Isidore's *gentilitas* not as "pagans" but as "Jews," speakers of Hebrew, in contrast to "our" people, who, in the mind of the author, must be Christian Latin-speakers. This etymological invention does not appear in other editions of the Tiburtina.

2. **filia Manasse**: In Sackur and PL 90 the Sibyl is the daughter of Priam and Hecuba. The Newberry MS names Manasses and Papilia as her parents. Manasses was the eldest son of Joseph and Aseneth (Genesis 41:50–51; 46:20).

**quarta etate Daudii**: That is to say, during the fourth of the six ages of the world. According to a scheme outlined by Augustine, the fourth age runs from King David to the Babylonian Captivity: see *De catechizandis nudibus* 22.39, ed. I. B. Bauer, 163–164. Bede, *De temporibus* 20, ed. Jones, 605, lines 19–20, informs us that Manasses ruled for 55 years during the fourth age.

The Newberry text begins with a summary of the ages of the world, placing the Sibyl in the age of David: see McGinn, "Oracular Transformations," 616 and 636.

3–4. Most of the places are listed occur in the same order in the printed editions. "Postatiam" appears elsewhere as Erostachiam, Erastochiam, Heresteciam (Sackur variants, PL 90) and Perhostiam (McGinn). Agagaldeum is seen as Agaguldeum (Sackur, McGinn), Agagaldeam, Agagusdeam (Sackur, PL 90), and Agagul (Sackur). Pontus is an addition not printed elsewhere.

The second part of the list in MS Lat 300, from Egypt onward, contains only the first five of the nine or more place names that appear elsewhere. The list has some similarities with the nationalities enumerated in Acts 2:9–11. Just as the Galilean disciples of Jesus, "filled with the Holy Spirit," miraculously speak so that people of various nations and languages can understand what they say, the divinely inspired Sibyl also communicates with people in a number of different nations.

3. **tiburtina, haburnea**: Here, as though they are alternative names. Lactantius transmits Varro's list of ten Sibyls, in which Albunea is the name of the Tiburtine Sibyl: see *Divinae institutiones* 1.6.12, ed. Brandt and von Laubmann, 1:22, lines 15–16. *Ipsa per angelum . . . in virginitate permansit*: These details, present in the Newberry version, are here greatly condensed: compare McGinn, "Oracular Transformations," 637.

6–7. The beauty of the Sibyl is proverbial, but the features that are singled out for comment here—golden hair, dark brows, white skin—differ from those elsewhere. In Sackur, the Sibyl's appearance is recounted after the narrator tells the dream of the senators, and she is "venusto vultu, aspectu decoro, eloquens in verbis atque omnis pulcritudine satis composita" (with a charming countenance and comely appearance, articulate in words and altogether well put together in beauty); the Bedan recension is similar. The Newberry text has an extensive description of the Sibyl's appearance in the sentence before her parentage is given: "erat autem vul tus eius multum splendidus, capilli eius sicut purpura, oculi eius sicut stella mututina fulgentes, corpus eius gracile,
statura eius equalis, caro eius et gula candida sicut lac” (furthermore, her countenance was very brilliant, her hair like purple cloth, her eyes flashing like the morning star, her body slim, her height average, her skin and throat bright white like milk).

The detail about the Sibyl’s eyebrows, which is peculiar to the Houghton version, conforms to a well-established ideal of attractiveness in the twelfth century, according to which a blond person would have dark brows. Alice M. Colby, The Portrait in Twelfth-Century French Literature (Geneva, 1965), 68–69, summarizes the components of male and female beauty, which include blond hair, white skin, sparkling eyes, and dark brows. She lists seven instances of fine dark eyebrows on blond heroes or heroines, noting that when the color of eyebrows is mentioned at all, it is brown or black (p. 38).

9. O magistra: The dialogue between the senators and the Sibyl occurs in different places in different versions of the text. In MS Lat 300, as in the Newberry version, the senators narrate their dream directly, whereas in Sackur and the Bedan recension, the narrator relates it in the third person, before the dialogue begins. In this, the Houghton/Newberry version agrees with the Greek text: see McGinn, “Oracular Transformations,” 618.

12. vii: This first mention of the vision of multiple suns has seven; hereafter, there are nine, the usual number. Sackur notes that a Syrian version of the Sibyl’s interpretation of the hundred Romans’ vision of multiple suns has seven.

178. Sackur, Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen, 143, no. 453. The transmission to Syria must have occurred during Roman imperial rule, which Sackur takes as convincing evidence that the Sibylla Tiburtina has its basis in an ancient sibylline text. Why seven in Syria? Sackur (p. 144) associates them with the seven Babylonian planetary gods.

truly humble might look forward in the next life, rather than, as Seneca and Peter imply, an manifestation of vanity that is just as blameworthy as blushing on account of shabbiness.

**Illum facit:** Compare Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Job* 10.28, ed. Adriaen, 570, lines 33–35 ("quia illum facit humana derisio Deo proximum, quem ab humanis praeititibus uitae innocentia seruat alienum").

**Cum omnis fortuna:** Compare Peter of Blois, *De duodecim utilitibus tribulationis*, in PL 207.989C ("Unde dicit Gregorius: 'Etsi omnis fortuna timenda est, magis tamen timenda est prospera quam adversa'").

**Prospera quam adusta:** The core of the sentence derives ultimately from Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Job* 5.1, ed. Adriaen, 219, lines 34–36 ("Vnde fit ut sancti uiri magis in hoc mundo prospera quam adusta formident").

The phrase *aduersitas premens* appears in Peter Comestor, *Sermo* 14 “In hebdomadé media vel dominica Laetare,” in PL 198.1763D, within a passage that examines the dangers of adversity and prosperity. An earlier passage that contains the phrase *adversa premunt* and that is likewise beholden to Gregory is Odo of Cluny, *Collationes* 3, in PL 133.617D ("Sancti ergo viri magis in hoc mundo prospera quam adversa formident. Sciant enim, quod adversity dum premunt, ad coelestia concupiscenda, quo plena requies est, mente eos impellunt"). [BKB]
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Introduction

HOUGHTON MS LAT 300, the manuscript presented in this facsimile, is also available on the web in a digitized form, freely accessible through the electronic catalog of Harvard College Library. Like the digitization, the facsimile in the present volume includes not only the eleven parchment leaves that are all we possess of the medieval manuscript, but also the nineteenth-century interleaves on which Amans-Alexis Monteil attempted to transcribe all or parts of some poems. The combination of the parchment and paper is what constitutes the body of the manuscript as it now exists. From one perspective it is lavish to reproduce the paper leaves, together with the cover and Monteil’s title page. Then again, they could prove to be useful for understanding the nineteenth-century history of the manuscript, and they also shed light on Monteil’s skills and interests in reading medieval manuscripts.

The eleven parchment leaves are foliated in pencil at the bottom on the inner corner of each recto. It is to this count that reference is made in this edition and translation. On the printed pages these numbers have been supplied at the bottom of the facsimile pages, to the left. The parchment and paper leaves have also been foliated continuously together. In the manuscript itself this foliation appears in pencil at the top on the outer corner of each recto. On the printed pages these numbers have been placed at the bottom of the facsimile pages, to the right. The reader should beware of becoming confused by the discrepancies between the two foliations, since the numberings diverge after the first folio and the numbers of the parchment leaves alone are progressively lower. One note of warning is in order: the manuscript has been reduced very slightly, to 95 percent of its original size. For precise information on the dimensions of MS Lat 300, remember to consult the codicological description on pp. 2-3 of the introduction.

The facsimile is intended to serve at least three functions. First, someday it may catch the eye of a reader who is familiar with one or more other codices related to this manuscript. Although MS Lat 300 may remain forever shrouded in mystery, there is always a possibility that by happy chance other gatherings from which it became separated have survived or that its scribes wrote in other extant manuscripts about which we have more information. A reader of our book may alight upon the missing link.
A second purpose of the reproductions is to provide materials for class study. For example, the poems in Groups Three and Four are not transcribed, edited, or translated here, although they are available in print elsewhere. With the help of the editions, English versions, and commentaries provided in this book, students could familiarize themselves with the peculiarities of the hands in MS Lat 300 by studying poems in Groups One, Two, or Five, or the prose in Group Six. Then they could set out to transcribe the other poems, in part or in toto. Although some may prefer the convenient anachronism of reading this book with the medieval manuscript glowing on a nearby computer screen, others may find it more congenial to experience the codex on printed pages. In either case, with the reproduction of the folios of the medieval manuscript, the nineteenth-century leaves and binding, and an early twenty-first century edition with philological trimmings, this book is meant to offer something to everyone.

The final aim of the facsimile is as a kind of *captatio benevolentiae*, to secure the goodwill of the Latinists who may be tempted to find fault with the editions that precede this section of the book. Those of us who have grappled with MS Lat 300 may not have always deciphered the manuscript in the best way possible, but we have given our all in an attempt to make sense of its many enigmas. Fair-minded readers who compare the text presented in the facsimile with our editions, translations, and commentaries may not always agree with our decisions, but we trust that they will credit us at least with having made an honest effort in coming to terms with scribes and scripts whose strong suit was not always clarity. May those who come after us carry forward the process of understanding, both the manuscript and the Latin, since we hope very much to furnish an honest and mostly reliable basis for further investigation rather than to pretend that our labors have precluded any additional discoveries. On the contrary, the time has now come for study of the *Carmina Houghtoniensia* to begin in earnest. [JZ]
POÈSIES LATINES AVEC
LETTRES INITIALES & FINALES
DISTINCTES,
MANUSCRIT DU XIÈME SIÈCLE
APP. À M. MONTÉIL.
Sativa Epigrammata
et dia.
XI"me Siecle
De accessu fœbris.

De morte.

Mors fœrit et morti somnicipat omnes fiunt, ne re nil morti dæmas mort quæsit omnes max.

Mors indistincte majora staturibus equa omnia mort quæ conditione neca

Conquestus amantis.

Naris et oea gala non mitigat ullam sap.

Corquœstus teneor laqueo captus aethero,

Solicitus penitus haris confessus amoris.

Qua sequor illud poës in uelum et eum ahesit

De custodia diœte et falsis medici.
Sonit opiniones philosophorum.

De haudico dace et luxurioso,
In fels duplici haudico peste laborat,
alterius vias altera pestis iact.

ded prima gula clade que secund a.

De quendam superbum et invicem,
Virtute fracta petit sanctum in cornibus unum.

Sunt in deo regi sua superba correl
et de tota similia copia deservit.

cornua vestra praedita nesciui.

De quodam pelato cupidissimo et avaro.

Xuns double malo de un se de malheureux. L'ourson
la prunier mal occuvt le vinicatu de secund,
les souffrances de gourmandise avec la piste de Prange,
chez nos et le gaufre, et leur intrusion de concert.
Namque prophetae sacros sunt, et ista futura
saepe dicunt, si pontificem vocat auctorem prophetae.

quattuor esse rerum faciunt: suggestio primum
Delectatio, condensationem. Deben, Dem
suggestit, et case Delectatio, specie illi
consentit, culsum deponente lingua
sive simul, sive simul Delectatio virgo
Adam consentit, nisi Deponente culsum.

Cui Dominus Petrus Dionysius respondit, Virgine
Dominum Petrum sepeliri amare voluit,
non sine re fuit hoc eidem Domnus responderat illum.
Trinagali, sive conscius trina piavit.
Cui voluit Deponente Virgine nasci
causa fuit, quia respexit munus pignard
vaec lapidarium quod est divinitas opleat.
unde Dominus manifestum virginitatis est.
prael Deponente, sive conscius parentem
pati Joseph non posset numerando scriptura respondet.

quare te Samuelum prae divina vocavit.
audiet sub prima voce vocante,
ecclesiasticum notat ista vocatio trina.
Egiptius Pharao, mundus, labor, mortali
Nos baptisma rubrum mergit rex mare sub orbis
et fragmentum further
et riablem populum. Si pedes desertae vagans
non pedem desertum mundi vivendo vaga sunt
et hiemum patriam obstans plurima restant
his caritatis plura spiritu in nobis.
qui re munusas pro religione relinquit,
Angius hunc vestis alpecta sedone crudeli.
mundi di nolit recipere
blandiciis multet corruptos, patria mundi
abscens multus quae modo retineat labrat.

Exit ignotas mulieres digna videre
opprimit hanc tamen, dux terrae multet cadam
blandiciis anima resignata, dura vagantes
exit propositum corruptum, prophetus illis.

Loth fugit, sed terrae domos montes que
requisit,
se fugiens vestem mundum petit a dua vite.
Dissertus populi habitanti fertile regnum.

Dum sponsum Rebecca vierat vecta camelo
descendens faciem seam suffusa subura.

Exploratores Herici tardasse quosbus
... cum ad castra Ddvent.

Judicis laudant regionis fertilitatem,
ne credant denua arguit hos incredulitatem
quonque dies habuit legales...
affertus postulata sursum vetu.

Vestis infelix affertur in igno.

sed facit sibi mulierem, et

affertur vestis infelix in igno.

sed facit sibi mulierem, et

affertur vestis infelix in igno.

sed facit sibi mulierem, et

affertur vestis infelix in igno.

sed facit sibi mulierem, et
Expeditias mortificatio
in canis coriis concors cum religiosis
mortificat canere discors amarissimum
cum quibus laudat Domini
vocis chori laudus in utraque referre jubet
ut se mortificant concors cum fratibus addit.
null
fol. 7v (PARCHMENT ONLY)

fol. 13v (PARCHMENT AND PAPER)


fol. 8v (PARCHMENT ONLY)
Feuillet séparé
d'un ms. du XIe siècle
avec dessins à la plume.
Index of Latin Words and Phrases

A
acrius urat, 34
actor, 41
ad prelia uenit, 91
adire uias, 91
aditus aperit, 41
alter Aristotiles, 126
alterius uires altera pestis alit, 37
aratum, 52
ars, 41
audit et attandit, 88

B
bassum, 43–44
bassus, 43
bellica signa sequi, 90
bubo, 25
Burdegalanses, 54

c
caecumina rupis, 62
canorius, -a, -um, 43
caracteres, 21
carmena nostra, 41
caruisse malis, 27
caua, 110
causa necis, 28
certis signis, 34
certo de tramite, 124
ceruices rigidas et desipiencia corda, 113
circumcisus, -a, -um, 88
cladibus his, 60
cogitut esse ferox, 89
color, 35
commune bonum, 112
concordia regnant, 87
confundit in unum, 37
consilioque potent, 124
constituit statuas, 33
conuocat heroes, 90
corrumpere fata, 128
culmen ueritatis, 88
culpa fuit, 128
cum omnis fortuna, 140
cum uenerit dominus iudicere seculum
per ignem, 138
cum uiret et floret, 87
cure . . . habitura, 33
curia diues, 59

D
dampnosa libido, 38
dapsilis et parcus, 113
de uertice ueri, 88
debita pena, 54
debitor orbis, 91
dedecus omne, 51
delere uetustas, 93
delicis, opibus, 86
denarius, 17, 21
depicti morum floribus et radiis, 115
deseruisse uia, 124
dicere quisque potest, 91
digna repenses, 54
dinoscitur, 21
dolere dolore, 26
Douce France, 109

E
equorum rarificans caudas, 45
ergo nichil, 92
erigere, 90
errantes recucat, 89
esurit inter opes, 51
et alter Homerus, 126
et quasi post hiemem, 114
exciicum, 58
exemplum uuenum, 125
exilaras mestos, 54
morboque mederi, 33
moribus hostem, 124
mors furit, 29
mors prope, 35
mortuus est, 128
morum floribus, 93, 115
multiplicare loqui, 91
mundus amans, 124
munere pauper, 45

N
natura beauit, 111
natura benigna, 89
natura tuetur, 91
ne quid nimis, 72–73, 113
nectare rupes, 63
Nestora consilio, 113
nichil audit, 35
nil morti, 29
nobile nomen, 93
nobile principium, 125
nobiliumque decus, 93
nomine quemque suo, 90
nomine solo, 114
nondum uiderunt, 92
nostrae constancia gentis, 91
nummus, 17, 21

O
O caput, 92
occidit, heu, 125
odis, 44
omne decus, 51
omnia mors, 29
omnia spreuit, 124
omnibus in rebus, 80, 86
ordine cleri, 59
ore sonat, 89
ossibus imis, 33

P
Paris alter, 126
pascit ... oues, 91
pater optime, 52
pausa quidem loquitur, 88
pax requiesque, 127
pax, pietas, 87
perfusa liquore, 26
perpetui ... ueris, 110
personat ore, 26
peruigil ad, 89
Philosophia, 41
pia iura, 124
pilus, 43
pondera discutere, 112
pondera fixa suo, 88
populus procerumque, 88
posse probari, 91
precurante, 21
preparat ense uias, 90
preius ipse, 90
primus in arma, 91
princeps bonus, 86
principe terra bono, 86
probate, 124
probitatis amor, 111
precurante, 21
proferet in medium, 115
prospera quam adversa, 140
provincia tota, 90
publica iura, 124

Q
quem laudare satis, 93

R
radii morum, 115
requieuit in illo, 115
resque locusque, 91
restens, 124
risus abest, 34
rupe caua latitans, 52
rustica turba, 91
rutilante corona, 92
Index of Latin Incipits and Titles

Page numbers in italics indicate editions of texts, with translations and commentaries.

A
Abner presbiteros signat; sermone latino
(Poem 69), 67
Absorbet fluumium Behemoth, speratque quod ori (Poem 78), 67
Academia (Cicero), 112
Accipit fruges ad semen serus ad esum (Poem 65), 67
Accinctis gladio de porta precepit ire (Poem 54), 66
Achilleid (Statius), 90
Ad plus viii solent celebrari festa diebus (Poem 79), 67
Ad quendam superbum innidum. See Vis tua fracta perit fracto de cornibus uno (Poem 10)
Adversus Marcionem libri quinque (Tertullian): 1, 42
Aeneid (Vergil), 101; 1, 6c, 112; 2, 110, 124; 3, 52; 4, 89; 6, 93; 8, 124; 9, 25; 10, 91
Aenigmata (Aldhelm), 110
Alethia (Victorius), 37
Amores (Ovid): I. 4, 91; I. 5, 34; I. 10, 87, 93; I. 14, 34; I. 14, 91; II. 6, 34; II. 8, 34; II. 9, 34; II. 12, 34; II. 13, 34; II. 17, 34; II. 19, 34; III. 1, 25; III. 7, 34; III. 12, 34
Andria (Terence), 101, 113
Angelus in cultu canore, fulgur in ore (Poem 72), 67
Annales de gestis Karoli Magni imperatoris (Poeta Saxo): 4, 111
Anthologia Latina, 126
Anticus serpens mihi serpit pectore si quid (Poem 47), 66
Apotheosis (Prudentius), 88
Aratea (Avienus), 115
Archa Noe sursum fuit acta, sed ampla deorsum (Poem 70), 67
Argonautica (Valerius Flaccus): 1, 93; 2, 89
Ars amatoria (Ovid): 2, 52, 91; 3, 41
Asa Caleph nobis animam designat, asellus (Poem 36), 66
Asperges me, Domine, hyssopo, et mundabor, 57
Aurea pontificis pendebant insita uesti (Poem 53), 66
Aurora (Peter Riga), 123
Axa Caleph animam nobis. See Asa Caleph nobis animam designat, asellus (Poem 36)

B
Basse pilos odis neque cernis quanta pilorum (Poem 9), 42–47
Bis deni binque dies scribuntur in anno, 126

C
Canterbury Tales (Chaucer), 55n85
Canticle of Moses, 61
Care neposl tibi quod sequitur mea cura ministrat (Guiardinus), 87
Carmen de virginitate (Aldhelm), 21, 110
Carmen in honorem Hludowici (Ermoldus Nigellus), 101; 1, 110, 127; 2, 112; 3, 127; 4, 115
Carmen in laudem Anastasii Imperatoris (Priscian), 113
Carmen in libros Regum (Hildebert of Lavardin): 1, prologue 1, 123; 4, 33, 35, 90
Carmina (Alcuin): 9, 110; 89, 124
Carmina (Baudri of Bourgueil): 5, 51; 7, 110; 10, 126; 23, 5, 25; 28, 701106, 125; 29, 701106, 125; 30, 701106, 125; 36, 35; 46, 29; 62, 93; 77, 56; 79, 109; 82, 109; 86, 791125; 87, 791125, 124; 93, 791125; 94, 124; 99, 88, 123; 122, 90;
De Landrico edace et luxuriose. See Infelix
duplci Landricus peste laborat (Poem 6)
De morte. See Mors furit et mortis
e emancipat omne furiis (Poem 4)
De mundi contemptu (Galo of Léon), 39
De mysterio missae (Hildebert of Lavardin),
33, 51
De natura deorum (Cicero), 92, 112
De nuptiis Christi et ecclesiae (Fulk of
Beauvais), 87, 127
De officis (Cicero), 92
De operibus sex dierum (Hildebert of
Lavardin), 124
De paupere ingrato. See Mesta parentis misere
paupertas anxietatis (Poem 89)
De Piramo (pseudo-Ovid), 33
De proprietatibus rerum (Bartholomew the
Englishman), 46
De pudicitia (Tertullian), 93
De qualitate temporis (Seneca the Younger),
29
De quondam prefato cupido et avare. See
Errant qui credunt gentem perisse
Ciclopos (Poem 11)
De rerum natura (Lucretius): 1, 25, 37; 2, 91;
4, 26, 127; 5, 111
De sancto Vincentio (Hildebert of Lavardin),
89
De uniuerso (Rabanus Maurus), 135
Divinae institutiones (Lactantius), 136
Doctrinam per aquam, per nubes sume
prophetas (Poem 82), 67
Draco Normannicus (Stephen of Rouen),
113, 115
Dum poscunt solui Barata Christumque
 necari (Poem 58), 66
Dum staret Moises in petra, pretereuntis
(Poem 73), 67

E
Elogiae (Vergil), 91
Elogiae Theoduli, 47

Edibus in nostris ferus hospitibus
Diomedes (Poem 13), 9, 50, 54–56
Egiptus mundus, Pharao Sathan, Israelite
(Poem 30), 65
Elegies (Maximian): 1, 90; 5, 89
Enarrationes super Deuteronomium (Rabanus
Maurus), 61
Epigrammata ex sententiat s. Augustini
(Prosper of Aquitaine), 124
Epigrams (Martial): 1.37, 42, 46; 3.46, 92
Epistles (Horace): 1.2, 120; 1.13, 38; 1.16,
63; 2.1, 38, 45, 126
Epistolae morales (Seneca the Younger), 139
Epithalamium heate virginis Marie (John of
Garland), 88
Ernestus (Odo of Magdeburch), 90, 92
Errant qui credunt gentem perisse
Ciclopos (Poem 11), 13, 49–52, 54–55
Est Abrahae dictum: Terramque tuosque
relinque (Poem 35), 66
Est certum quod quinque modis gula
damnata edacem (Poem 33), 65
Est ratio quod pars altaris dexteram misse
(Poem 85), 67
Etymologiae (Isidore of Seville): 2.4,
971142; 7.8, 135
Exiit ignotas mulieres Dina uidere (Poem
48), 66
Exilaras mestos, hilaris pater, Hilarienses
(Poem 12), 13, 50, 52, 54
Exit de Iherico Christus, dat lumen
utrique (Poem 32), 65
Exploratores Iherico tardasse diebus
(Poem 56), 66
Ex Ponto (Ovid): 1.2, 89; 1.3, 27; 1.10, 37;
2.8, 90; 3.5, 87; 4.9, 45
Expositio in Genesim (Bruno of Segni), 88
Expositiones historicae in libros Salomonis
(Andrew of Saint-Victor), 112
Exposuere suum mihi Pierides Eliconem
(Poem 7), 13, 22, 23, 38–40
Exprimitur per timpana mortificatio
carnis (Poem 64), 67
M
Mactatam uiturum comitantur cedrus,
isopus (Poem 66), 67
Materiam rerum proponi: Eraclitus ignem
(Poem 8), 22, 23, 41–42
Mathematicus (Bernard Silvestris), 68
Mauricius locuples (Poem 95), 71, 128, 131
Medicamen et solamen est paupertas
hominii (Poem 1), 16–17, 17–20, 20–21
Mens mala, mors intus; mals actus, mors
foris; usus (Poem 84), 67
Mentis in excessu datus est liber Ezechiel
(Poem 34), 65
Mesta parens misere paupertas anxietatis
(Poem 89), 13, 68, 139
Metamorphoses (Ovid), 47n69, 48: 1, 26, 93;
2, 34, 38, 113; 4, 37, 115; 5, 110; 8, 37;
56, 87; 9, 49, 55; 11, 25
Miles gloriosus (Arnulf of Orléans), 45
Minacula (Nigel of Canterbury), 25
Mira uidere cupis? Ascende cacumina
rupis (Poem 17), 12, 22, 60–63
Mons fumat, Deus hic loquitur, stat turba
deorsum (Poem 38), 66
Moralia in Job (Gregory): 5, 140; 10, 139;
28, 112; 31, 64
Mors furit et mortis emancipat omne
furorem (Poem 4), 28–29

N
Natus homo, uitulus moriendo, leoque
resurgens (Poem 18), 13, 64
Ne uetitis cenis iniet hula, comprime
frenis (Poem 3), 13, 22, 23, 26–28
Nostre nature deitas unita refetur (Poem
74), 67

O
Odes (Horace): 1.4, 29; 1.36, 42n66
Omnibus in rebus quas, mi Philippe,
uidemus (Poem 90), 9, 69–70, 71–77,
77–93, 115, 131
Ovidius moralizatus (Petrus Berchorius), 48,
55n84

P
Panphilus de amore, 33
Panus quinque duos pisces dat quinque
uirorum (Poem 80), 67
Panis significat scripturam. Frangere
panem (Poem 39), 66
Panaetius (Godfrey of Viterbo), 130n175
Paracletus (Warner of Basil), 88
Passio sanctae Agnetis uiginis et martiris
(Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim), 93
Patrem significat Abraham, sua uictima
Christum (Poem 68), 67
Pauper ingratus. See Mesta parens misere
paupertas anxietatis (Poem 89)
Peccatum sanies. Sanies hec defuit extra
(Poem 31), 65
Per Iacob patrem, per Joseph concipe
Christum (Poem 29), 65
Peristephanon (Prudentius), 86
Per loca culta parum, per aquas, per lustra
ferarum (Poem 16), 22, 59–60, 61
Per Nabuzardan destruxit rex Babylonis
(Poem 61), 67
Petra capit semen, uia sentes, optima terra
(Poem 77), 67
Phoenixiae (Seneca the Younger), 58
Physiologus (Theobald), 90
Pierus aeger floruit plenum uirtutibus
orbem (Poem 28), 65
Ponit opiniones philosophorum. See
Materiam rerum proponit Eraclitus ignem
(Poem 8)
Proverbia (Wipo), 73
Pseudoiulus (Plautus), 113
Punica (Silius Italicus): 1, 91, 93, 114; 2, 26;
5, 114; 6, 123; 10, 90; 11, 92; 16, 92

Q
Quando facit mihi iustitiam pro munere
iudex (Poem 45), 66
Quare ter Samuelem uox diuina uocavit
(Poem 23), 65
Quattuor esse reum faciunt: suggestio
primum (Poem 20), 65
V
Ve, quid agam? plagam sub mesto pectore
gesto (Poem 5), 13, 22–23, 29–35
Versus de excidio Troiae. See Ylias (Simon
Aurea Capra)
Versus de sancto Laurentio (Marbod), 33
Vestem contextam lana linoque recusa
(Poem 46), 66
Vicit Adam ueterem gula, gloria uana,
cupido (Poem 19), 65
Vinea culta Dei plebs est. Infancia mane
(Poem 25), 65
Viribus, arte, minis, Danaum clara Troia
ruinis, 126
Vis tua fracta perit fracto de cornibus uno
(Poem 10), 47–49, 55, 56
Vita Amandi (Milo of Saint-Amand), 33
Vita beatæ Marie Egiptiacæ (Hildebert of
Lavardin), 35, 123–124
Vita et miracula S. Dunstani (Osbern of
Canterbury), 46
Vita Ludovici (Suger), 70n104, 95, 100, 109,
113, 114, 117n168, 120
Vita Malhumeti (Embrico of Mainz), 35
Vita sancti Martini (Venantius Fortunatus),
123
Vita sancti Martini (Paulinus of Péagineux),
89
Vult intrare, nequit fera gens Sodomita
domum Lot (Poem 51), 66

W
Waltherius, 124

Y
Ylias (Simon Aurea Capra), 89, 90, 126
Carmina Burana, 12
cathedra sancti Petri, 48
Cato, 69, 101, 106
Catullus, 34, 35
caudati, 22
Châlons-sur-Marne, 59
chansonniers, 11
chansons de geste, 109
Charlemagne, 98n146, 99, 107, 114, 129, 138
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 55n85
chiasmus, 102
Cicero, Marcus Tullius, 6013, 46, 92, 97, 112
Clairmarais, 64
Clairvaux, 89
Claudian, 91
Clotho, 27
Clovis, 100
Cluny, 115n165
Constantine I (emperor of Rome), 138
Corinna, 31, 34
Coulson, Frank, 47n69
Crusades, 117n168
Curtius, Ernst Robert, 93
Cyclops, 51
Cyprian of Gaul, 33, 91

elegi caudati, 22–23
Elijah, 135
Elisabeth (daughter of Guy II Trousseau), 70
elision, 23
Embrico of Mainz, 35
Ennodius, 123
epanalepsis, 86
Epicurus, 41, 42
epideictic oratory, 97
epistrophe, 74
Ermengarde of Bourbon, 69
Ermoldus Nigellus, 101, 110, 112, 113, 115, 127
Erysichthon, 35

F
figura etymologica, 75
Fleury, 39, 40n62
Flodoard of Reims, 92
Florus of Lyon, 115
Francia, 108–109
Francio, 110
Frodo (scholar), 40, 70, 125
Frontinus, Sextus Julius, 45
Fulk IV Rechin (count of Anjou), 69, 78, 96
Fulk of Beauvais, 87, 127
Fulk V the Younger, 78

G
Galo. See Gualo
Galo (bishop of Léon), 39, 79n125
Galo (bishop of Paris), 39n62
Ganymede, 55, 56
genus demonstrativum, 97
Geoffrey II Martel, 92
Geoffrey Martel le Jeune, 69–71, 73, 77–80, 93
Geoffrey of Anjou, 78
Geoffrey of Vendôme, 71
Geoffrey Plantagenet, 78
Gerald of Wales, 36n51
Gerhard of Corbie, 109

dactylic verse, 22–23
David, 136
Deianira, 48
derivatio, 102
dies Aegyptiaci, 126
Diomedes, 9, 54–55, 56
doctors and medicine, 22, 26, 27, 35
Dol, France, 39
Dracontius, 112, 115
Dreux III. See Drogo III of Mouchy
Drevin, Helmut, 8n19
Drogo III of Mouchy, 94, 113
E
Ebles II (count of Roucy), 94–95
provenance, 4–6, 65
scribal hands, 2, 6–7, 9–10, 16
Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim, 93
Hugh of Crécy, 70, 115, 118
Hugh of Mâcon, 41
Hugh Primas, 56
Humbald, 113

I
inexpressibility topos, 93
Initia carminum ac versuum mediæ ævi
posterioris latinorum (Walther), 15
In principio: Incipit Index of Latin texts, 15
Isembert (bishop of Poitiers), 50, 51, 59
Isidore of Seville, 97n142, 135
isocolon, 101, 102n155
Ivo of Chartres, 71, 100

J
Jerome, Saint, 37, 110, 111
Jesus Christ, 134–135, 136
John of Garland, 47, 55, 88
Joseph, 136
Julian, Saint, 71
Julian (addressee and subject of Poem 94),
71, 127
Julian the Apostate, 127
Jupiter, 31
Juvenal, 89, 92

L
Lactantius, 136
Laelius, Gaius, 69, 85, 92
Landri, 35–36, 37
Landri le Timonier, 36
Landri of Nevers, 36
Laon, France, 95
La Trinité, Vendôme, 71
laus locorum, 98n145
Leicester, England, 14n38
leonine hexameter, 22, 23
Léon of Meung, 95
lex salica, 138

liberal arts, 41
Liederbücher, 11
lion similes, 90
Loire Valley poets, 1, 72–73, 101, 127
Longpont-sur-Orge, France, 70, 117n168
Lothar III (Holy Roman emperor), 58
Louis the Pious, 100, 101, 110
Louis VI (king of France), 69–71, 73, 76,
Lucan, 72, 88, 90, 91, 93, 128
Lucretius, 25, 26, 37, 91, 111, 127
Lynn, Inez, 22

M
Manasses, 133, 136
Manitius, Maximilian, 39n54, 39n62
Marbod of Rennes, 1, 16n40, 33, 34, 65, 73,
90, 91, 101, 111, 116–117, 128
Martel, 75, 77–78, 83–85, 87, 93. See also
Geoffrey Martel
Martial, 42, 43, 46, 92
Matilda (queen of England), 73, 97, 101
Maurice (addressee and subject of Poem
95), 71, 128
Mauricius of Craon, 71, 79
Maximian, 89
McGinn, Bernard, 130
medicine. See doctors and medicine
Megaera, 26
Meyer, Wilhelm, 29
Migne, J.–P., 111, 130
Milo (addressee of Poem 92), 69–71, 73,
115–117, 119, 121–122, 125, 131
Milo II of Bray, 69–71, 73–74, 80, 115,
117–120
Milo of Palestrina, 115–117
Milo of Saint-Amand, 33
model-book drawings, 9
Monteil, Amans-Alexis, 3, 4–6, 10
Monthéry, castle of, 70, 80, 115, 118,
119–120
mountains, 60–61
music, 42
Latin Verse from Twelfth-Century France

Q
quadrivium, 42
quantitative verse, 22–23, 72–73
Quintilian, 43, 97n142, 98n145

R
Rabanus Maurus, 61–62, 124, 135
Raoul Tortarius. See Rodulfus Tortarius
Rauch, Nicolaus, 4, 115
reduplicatio, 74
Reginald of Canterbury, 90
Reims, France, 95
Reiner of Liège, 114
Remus, 60
Renaud of Martigné, 71, 79
rhetorical figures. See specific terms
rhyme, 22, 49
rhythmic verse, 16
Richard of Grandseelve, 89
Riga, Peter, 123
Rigg, George, 11, 12n30
Robert Partes, 111
Rodulfus Tortarius, 39, 127
Roger, 58
Roger “Borsa,” 59
Roger II (king of Sicily), 38, 59
Roger of Hainaut, 58–59
Rome, 50, 57, 58, 59, 61, 92, 96, 117, 133–134
Rouse, Richard, 2n13, 6n15

S
Sackur, Ernst, 130, 136, 137
Saint-Amand, 117n168
Saint-Denis, 94, 100
Saint-Gatien anthology, 65
Saint-Hilaire-le-Grand, Poitiers, 50, 52–53, 54
Saint-Julien, Tours, 127
Saint-Laumer, Blois, 71
Saint-Martin, Tours, 6
Saint-Pierre of Beauvais, 94
Sainte-Sévère, 113
Samaran, Charles, 7n16
Sauer, Hans, 137
La Sauve-Majeure, 109
Scipio Aemilianus Africanus, P. Cornelius, 69, 85, 92
Seneca the Elder, 68, 139
Seneca the Younger, 26, 29, 35, 58, 60, 139–140
Sens, France, 100
Serenus, 91
Sertorius, 45
Sibylline Gospel, 129, 137
Sibyls, 129, 133
Silvius Italicus, Tiberius Catius, 26, 90, 91, 92, 93, 114, 123
Simon Aurea Capra, 89, 90, 126
simony, 57, 58, 71, 115
Socrates, 69, 101, 106
sorites, 45
St. Gall, 47
Statius, 54, 63, 72, 90, 91, 92, 93, 111, 115, 123
Stephen of Rouen, 113, 115
Stotz, Peter, 8n19
Suger (abbot of Saint-Denis), 70n104, 95–96, 100, 109, 113, 114, 117n168, 119–120
synoptic Gospels, 129

T
Tantalus, 51
Terence, 101, 113
Tertullian, 42, 93
Thales, 41
Theobald, 90
Theodulf, 47
Theophilus, 16n40
Thibaud IV (count of Blois), 118
Thierry of Chartres, 38, 40, 41
Third Macedonian War, 92
Thomson, S. Harrison, 7n17
Tibur, 129
Tiburtina. See Tiburtine Sibyl
Tiburtine Sibyl
appearance of, 136–137
prophecy of (Tiburtina), 80, 129–131,
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