ABSTRACT

This edition consists of three chapters of general introduction, followed by introduction, text and notes on each of the four divisions of Hildebert's poetry, namely the Shorter Poems, Biblical Epigrams, De Mysterio Missae and Life of St.Mary the Egyptian.

Hildebert was born at Lavardin around 1056. After a period as scholasticus at Le Mans he became archdeacon in 1091. In 1096, on the death of Hoel, he was elected bishop, though not without a contest. Hildebert's first test as bishop came in 1099 with the attack on Le Mans by Helias, count of Maine, which was then held by William Rufus. Rufus, having succeeded in dislodging Helias, suspected Hildebert of complicity in the attempt, and took him with him back to England. His threat to demolish the towers of the cathedral of S.Julien were however left unfulfilled at his death. When peace returned Hildebert journeyed to Rome and the Norman lands of S. Italy (1100). This peace was broken by the fighting between Henry I of England and Louis VI, and it was at this period that Hildebert was imprisoned at Nogent-le-Rotrou. A different kind of trouble faced Hildebert some years later in the shape of the heretic Henry of Lausanne, who by his preaching succeeded in turning the people completely against their clergy. Even after his ignorance in religious matters had been shown up by Hildebert it was a long time before his influence was eradicated from the diocese. In 1125 Hildebert, now an old man, was elected archbishop of Tours. Here his refusal to instal as dean and archdeacon the nominees of Louis VI, to whom Tours belonged led to the king cutting off the archiepiscopal revenues, and these were not entirely freed until 1130. Hildebert died in 1133.

Hildebert's vocabulary has the normal mixture of classical, patristic and liturgical elements. The last are more noticeable in the religious as distinct from the 'secular' poems. In his morphology and syntax Hildebert varies only slightly from the usage of classical authors, and many of such variations as these are, were already present in writers of late Antiquity. There is considerable ellipsis of verbs and omission of prepositions, and some confusions of tenses. Likewise

he varies between the use of the indicative and the subjunctive in subordinate clauses. His prosody does not differ very much from that of other poets of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Irregular quantities are very rare. He lengthens short syllables in arsi but unlike many of his contemporaries only does this before a caesura or diaeresis. Elision is not altogether avoided - there are 32 instances - but these appear only in the Shorter Poems and the De Mysterio. Hiatus does not appear at all in his quantitative verse. As one would expect in a twelfth century poet Hildebert has a strong preference for the penthemimeral caesura in his hexameters, though hephthemimeral caesuras do occur. The leonine rhyme of St. Mary compels the poet to make an artificial caesura in the third foot, when the real sense pause is in the fourth. Some irregular caesuras occur in the Biblical Epigrams. Hildebert has complete control of the two-syllabled rhyme, and is able to vary the monotony of the leonine line by introducing other forms of rhyming hexameter, including the versus dactylici used by Bernard of Cluny in his De contemptu mundi. How far Hildebert is original in his use of the last named metre is not clear. Hildebert's only long rhythmical poem is 55, and in this he masters the trochaic octosyllabic line so perfectly that some critics have cast doubts on his authorship for this very reason.

My attempt to set Hildebert off against the background of his literary contemporaries is based firstly on a comparison of the main characteristics of twelfth century poetry as seen in these authors. These characteristics are the close attention to style and influence of rhetoric; the innovations in both quantitative and rhythmical versifying; and the imitation of classical authors. I precede this comparison with a brief sketch of the peculiar features of literary life in twelfth century France, namely the exchange of literary epistles, the influence of patrons, especially noble ladies, and the so-called 'cult of friendship'. The rhetorical element in twelfth century poetry is drawn directly from the Ad Herennium and the Roman grammarians and theorists, and also indirectly from the classical writers whose works were on the curricula of the cathedral schools.

Hildebert makes sparing use of the rhetorical figures, yet of the poets under discussion his works have the strongest rhetorical content. Fulcoius of Beauvais, Godfrey of Reims and Baudri of Bourgueil are all alike in that they employ a smooth Ovidian style with very little rhetoric. More of the 'figures' appear in Marbod, and he employs the devices of 'membra' and 'articuli' which however, are found to a greater degree in Hildebert's poems. Hildebert too has a certain point and epigram not found in the others. We might well regard his style as the fore-runner of that which is found in its most exaggerated form in Pierre Riga or Matthew of Vendome. Thus Hildebert seems to be the first poet of the preiod to use the 'rapportati' so common fifty years after his death.

The main interest in comparing the metrical usage of our poets is to see how far they had advanced in the use of the two-syllabled rhyme. Here again there is the distinction between Godfrey, Fulcoius and Baudri who use very little rhyme, and Marbod and Hildebert who use it a great deal.

All of the poets under discussion are influenced in various degrees by classical authors. The whole subject matter and mechanism of Godfrey's poems are taken from classical literature, and they have an almost pagan atmosphere. Fulcoius does not go so far, but references to some 'odd' authors appear, and he shows some interest in the visible remains of Roman antiquity. Baudri is as thoroughly steeped in the atmosphere of the classics as Godfrey, though he does not depend so directly on the authors from which he draws. Ovid is his principal source. Despite his reputation as a rather dour, didactic poet, Marbod shows that he knew his classics as well as, if not better than Hildebert. Hildebert's use of classical authors is more subtle than, for example, Godfrey's. He owes most to Ovid, and has read Horace, Vergil and the other poets of the school curricula. Both epigram and elegic appear frequently in his works, but the general impression gained from a careful reading of them is that he is not so much of a humanist as he has been made out to be.

The chapter concludes with an enquiry into the actual influence of these poets on each other. Godfrey and Fulcoius stand quite apart,

but Baudri perhaps borrows from Hildebert and almost certainly from Marbod. There are strong grounds for supposing that Marbod is influenced by Hildebert's poems, and especially by their style.

In my introduction to the Shorter Poems I first of all give a list of manuscripts with descriptions, and then go on to consider the relations of the mss. to each other. These fall into two groups, and the extensive textual differences between these groups in many poems has led me to conclude that they represent two editions or recensions. I have tried to establish which of these recensions is the earlier. I then go on to discuss the canon of the Shorter Poems, dealing first with those poems which I consider genuine, and then with those which appear either in Beaugendre's edition or in Hauréau's Mélanges, and which I reject. The basis of the canon is formed by the long uninterrupted series of poems found in the two groups of MSS., K Z and Du B T. Where a poem is in both there can be no doubt of its authenticity, and where it is in one there can be very little, though sometimes an absence of supporting mss. has made discussion necessary. A few poems do not appear in either of these groups, but in the case of two at least (28 and 56) external evidence makes it certain that these are Hildebert's. Thus only a small margin of poems remain which we cannot definitely say belong to Hildebert or not. These have been put in the supplement. It will thus appear that the function of the second and third parts of this section is the rather negative one of setting out the reasons which have convinced me that the poems discussed there are not Hildebert's. The most convenient way of doing this was to take each in turn of the mss. used by Beaugendre, and discuss the poems brought from it into his edition, but for convenient reference I have placed an index of poems discussed at the end.

There are two main subjects of discussion in the introduction to the Biblical Epigrams; their source, and the manuscript tradition. I have tried to show that here Hildebert is principally versifying the allegorical interpretations of the Bible given by Gregory the Great and perhaps also Rabanus Maurus. There are three main groups

of mss.: those which retain an irrational order, presumably Hildebert's own; those in which the order has been more or less re-arranged to the order in which the subject matter comes in the Bible; and those which contain additional poems found only in that particular group. I have discussed whether these poems, which I print as a supplement, are in fact genuine, and have distinguished them from another group, also printed by Beaugendre, which appear in other mss. (though only a few), and which seem to have much less chance of being genuine. In the introduction to the De Mysterio Missae I have set Hildebert's work against the general background of earlier allegorists of the Mass, and shown his relationship to his immediate source, Ivo of Chartres. Similarly in the introduction to the life of St.Mary the Egyptian I have shown that Hildebert is following closely two earlier prose lives. A list of minor manuscripts forms an appendix, and there is a select bibliography of works used in this edition.

A CRITICAL EDITION OF THE POEMS OF HILDEBERT OF LE MANS

Thesis submitted for the degree of D. Phil.

by

A. B. SCOTT, Merton.

Trinity Term 1960.

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	i.
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	
Chapter I Life.	1
Chapter II Grammtical and metrical practise.	29
Chapter III Hildebert and his contemporaries.	47
SHORTER POEMS: INTRODUCTION.	
The manuscripts	118
The relationship of the manuscripts.	126
Titles of poems.	151
Canon I. Genuine poems.	154
Canon II. Other poems found in the Beaugendre -	
B Bourassé edition.	165
Canon III. Poems discussed by Hauréau, Mélanges cinp.III p.188 sqq.	188
List of genuine poems, and concordance with earlier numbers.	196
Index of poems discussed pp.165 - 187.	200
TEXT.	204
NOTES.	249
ETHICAL EPIGRAMS	
Introduction.	294
Text.	317
Notes.	345
DE MYSTERIO MISSAE	
Introduction.	362
Text.	381
Notes.	400

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Page
LIFE OF ST.MARY THE EGYPTIAN	
Introduction.	405
Text.	416
Notes.	440
APPENDIX I: List of minor manuscripts.	446
APPENDIX II: Manuscripts of the commentary on the De Mysterio Missae.	470
BIBLIOGRAPHY	471

PREFACE

It can hardly be denied that the time is ripe for a new edition of Hildebert. The editio princeps of Beaugendre (1708), though reprinted and to some extent re-edited in the Migne edition, has never been replaced. Scholars have often grumbled at its deficiencies, but have been forced to go on using it for want of any other. The present edition is limited to the poetry, as it is this which comes off worst in the earlier edition and at the same time is of most interest to scholars. I have omitted the Querimonia de conflictu carnis et spiritus, written in verse and prose, because I felt that its inclusion would have increased the amount of text to be edited beyond manageable proportions. From the outset I feel that I ought to underline the fact that in this edition I am reaping where others have sown, for without the preliminary work on the canon by Haureau and especially Dom A.Wilmart this edition could not have come into being.

It is almost five years since I undertook this edition, and this, coupled with the fact that the text was typed out by myself two years ago, has led to certain inconsistencies, and also to the retention of certain features which I would now be inclined to change or omit. Thus I began by using Roman numerals for the Shorter Poems, but realising later how cumbersome this is for reference in notes and introduction I have used arabic numerals everywhere except in the text. In my critical apparatus I have retained all variants, however trivial, of the mss. B Du K A; all variants which tend to show the relationship between the other mss; and all the variants of the edition of Beaugendre. Almost all variants in the last two categories and very many in the first could be omitted without the critical apparatus suffering any loss, this being especially true in the case of poems like 18 or 22 where I have collated a large number of mss. To make these changes would however have meant a complete re-typeing of the text.

In my orthography I have not ventured far from the norm employed in classical texts. The leonine rhyme makes it essential to give the diphthong ae as e. I have also altered t to c before the vowel i, but not when it occurs after c, for while 'avaricia' and 'constancia'

are found in the earlier mss. of Hildebert, 'colleccio' is I think rather later. But in this matter also I would like to revert to t in all cases, as being safest.

Chapter I Life

There are many short accounts of Hildebert's life to be found in ecclesiastical or literary histories. There are also several articles and books dealing exclusively with Hildebert. Beaugendre prefaces his edition with an inaccurate 'Vita'. Hebert-Duperron, in the first chapter of his thesis, De ven. Hildeberti vita et scriptis,[1] deals very concisely though accurately with Hildebert's life.[2] The work of F. X. Barth[3] is concerned rather with the events of Hildebert's life as seen from the standpoint of the canonist. However, he gives valuable accounts of Hildebert's attitude to reform and to the question of investitute. By far the most important work on the life of Hildebert is A. Dieudonné's Hildebert de Lavardin, sa vie, ses lettres.[4] Dieudonné begins by setting out the life fully from the documentary sources, and then examines each of Hildebert's letters, giving notes on the subject matter. He concludes with remarks on the grammar and style of the letters, and the scriptural and classical allusions which appear therein. The work of P. De Deservillers, Un évêque au douzième siècle, Hildebert et son temps, Paris 1876, though often uncritical, has its uses. Although where the two differ Dieudonné is always right, yet he is indebted to De Deservillers to a greater degree than he indicates in his introduction.[5] All later accounts, including those of Böhmer, Hauck's Realencyklopädie 8.67-71, J. Chartrou, L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151, pp.173-179, Ruby[6], and the more detailed one

2

of Scivoletto[7], are based on Dieudonné. Although the following account is based on Dieudonné, and would indeed be superfluous were it not for the comparative inaccessibility of his account, I have gone to the original sources as far as possible.

These sources fall into three categories. First, we have the charters on which Hildebert's name appears, listed by Dieudonné pp.8-14. These are helpful for fixing dates, especially that of Hildebert's election to the bishopric, but give us no other information. Our principal and most reliable source is obviously Hildebert's own letters, together with the few written to him which have been preserved. Next in order of importance come the chronicles, headed by the "Actus pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium," written on the model of the Liber Pontificalis. There are two manuscripts of this life, one now Le Mans 224 (s.XIII), and the other a modern copy by A. du Chesne[8] of a manuscript of the twelfth century. The only person to have studied both manuscripts in detail, J. Havet,[9] is of the opinion that both go back to an archetype completed around 1137. He is led to this conclusion by the presence in the Le Mans manuscript of a catalogue of Kings of France ending with the succession of Louis VII (1137), and a catalogue of bishops ending with the

vacancy after the death of Guy (1135). In the manuscript of Le Mans each life is designated as the Gesta of the bishop concerned, and this is the title by which the life of Hildebert is usually referred to. The author is dependent to some extent on the letters, but by no means exclusively so, and gives us a complete chronological account.[10] Orderic Vitalis is a completely independent source and a valuable corrective to the Gesta in that he is not very well disposed towards the inhabitants of Maine. For the comparatively brief part of Hildebert's life spent as archbishop of Tours, the Chronicon Turonense Magnum is the most useful authority, and other local chronicles give us brief glimpses of Hildebert's routine work of administration.

We have no means of knowing the exact date of Hildebert's birth. The Gesta (p.399) tells us "Ipse autem, ni fallor, nondum quadraginta annos aetatis excesserat, quando ad honorem episcopatus electus est." We know from two charters signed by him (Dieud. nos.4,5) one shortly before and one just after his election that he was made bishop after July 1096 and before June 1097. If we are to take the writer of the Gesta literally we should then place his birth in 1056. But as the writer seems to be giving a rough indication, and as his "ni fallor" betrays some doubt, we can only say that 1056 is

probably the earliest date to which we can assign his birth. He was born at Lavardin, between Blois and Le Mans. The Gesta describes him as "mediocribus quidem, sed honestis exortus parentibus," and a charter collected by Baluze[11] from the "Chartularium Cenomannense" tells us that his father, also called Hildebert, was "agens in rebus" to the lord of Lavardin. We know nothing of Hildebert's early life or even which of the cathedral schools he attended. Beaugendre's assertion[12] that he was a Cluniac monk is entirely baseless, but the view that he was a pupil of the heretic Berengarius deserves mention. This view seems to go back to William of Malmesbury who says,[13] "cujus verba propterea inserui, ut praedicabilis episcopi affectum in magistrum ostendam," and then quotes poem 18, the lengthy eulogy on Berengarius. But William seems to base his view that Berengarius was Hildebert's master solely on the composition of this poem, and in the poem itself there is no hint of any such relationship. The Gesta (p.398) tells us that he was made "scholarum magister" and then archdeacon by bishop Hoël. Hildebert himself says (Ep.III.22) "per quinque annos archidiaconus fuerim antequam praesul," so that we may place the beginning of his archidiaconate in 1091.

In July 1096 Bishop Hoël died, and as we have already seen, Hildebert was elected bishop shortly

5

afterwards.[14] The writer of the Gesta gives the impression that the election was unanimous (p.398), but this was very far from being the case, as we know from Ordericus.[15] There was another candidate for the bishopric in the person of Geoffrey the Dean. He had the support both of the suzerain William Rufus, and of Helias of La Flèche, the count of Maine. The author of the Gesta, in recounting the later quarrel between Hildebert and William Rufus, informs us (p.402) that "Quidam autem ex clericis, a principio promotioni praesulis invidentes," laid an accusation against Hildebert. This seems to indicate that Geoffrey found support among some members of the chapter, and to refute the statement of the Gesta regarding the unanimity of the election. Orderic tells us that Geoffrey was so sure of election that he had already set out the banquet given by the newly-elected bishop on such occasions. However the supporters of Hildebert rushed the election through, although the consecration was deferred in face of the violent opposition of Helias. In the meantime, the supporters of Geoffrey sent a letter to Ivo of Chartres alleging grave immorality in the previous life of Hildebert. We have Ivo's reply[16] in which he warns him of the sin which he will commit by entering upon his office if what his enemies have said is true.[17]

6

The position of the bishop of Le Mans was at this period somewhat precarious. The county of Maine lay between Normandy and Anjou, and both William Rufus, who had become Duke of Normandy by reason of his financing Robert Curthose's expedition to the Crusades, and Fulk le Réchin, count of Anjou since 1067, had interests there. Rufus was suzerain to Helias, lord of la Flèche, who had bought the countship for 10,000 sol. from his relative Hugh, an Italian ill-fitted for the constant strife of North West France. On the other hand Helias was allied to Fulk by reason of the betrothal of his daughter Héremburge to Fulk's son. Indeed somewhat earlier (1072) Fulk had occupied Le Mans at the request of the townsfolk who had revolted against Geoffrey of Mayenne.[18]

While Robert Courtehose had been Duke, the Norman influence had declined steadily, despite the misplaced loyalty to Robert of Hildebert's predecessor Hoël. But Rufus, having at last gained Normandy, wished to make his suzerainty over Maine more real. His opportunity came in April 1098 when Helias, the one man who stood in his way, was captured by Robert of Bellême,[19] who gave him up to Rufus. On hearing this, Fulk occupied the town with the consent of the citizens and left his son in it with a garrison. William Rufus advanced into

7

Maine, and fighting went on during the winter of 1098/9.[20] However in the summer peace overtures were made, for William was doubtless afraid of an attack on his flank from the French Vexin, and Helias in turn was afraid that Fulk of Anjou might come to some agreement with Rufus which would dispossess him entirely.[21] Accordingly, Helias with William's consent summoned Hildebert and other notables of the town to his prison at Bayeux, and asked them to treat with the king about his liberty. This they did successfully, and Rufus promised to set Helias free, if the city was surrendered to him. He was escorted into the town by Hildebert, the clergy and people,[22] and having left a garrison, departed for England. Helias however retired to his fortresses, and prepared to regain the town. In the late spring of 1099 he attached the Normans at Pontlieu[23], drove them before him into the town, and began besieging the Norman garrison in the citadel. They in turn threw down 'scoriam candentem' on their besiegers, and the flames caused by this were fanned by an east wind into a fire which burnt the entire town with a great part of the suburbs. This claimed the attention of the townspeople and so weakened Helias' support. At this juncture William Rufus appeared unexpectedly with a large force, having sailed hurriedly from England in a single ship. Helias and his troops were caught completely by surprise, and fled, leaving

8

those citizens who did not accompany them to the tender mercies of the Norman soldiery.[24] The misery which these events caused to the Bishop, clergy and citizens is graphically set out by the author of the Gesta and by Hildebert himself in his letter (II.8) excusing his absence from the council of Poitiers. In view of these prose accounts, we can hardly treat the description of his losses in 22 (ll. 35-8) as entirely rhetorical.

Having re-occupied the town, and set a garrison in the citadel once more, the king returned to England. But Hildebert's troubles were not over. Those members of the chapter who for reasons stated above were hostile to Hildebert accused him before Rufus of complicity in the rebellion.[25] Rufus thereupon demanded of him that he should raze the tower of the cathedral, from which he alleged, probably with good reason, that his troops had been assaulted, or else accompany him to England. This latter Hildebert did, albeit unwillingly.[26] This exile in England, which was not of more than a few months' duration, cannot have been very unpleasant for Hildebert. He may well have met at this time many of the English prelates who appear as addressees of his letters. From his letter II.8 we see that he contemplated going to Rome to argue his case. However it was by diplomacy that he got the better of Rufus.

9

Rufus offered him a great quantity of gold and silver for the adornment of the tomb of S. Julien, if only he would have the tower razed. Hildebert replied that there were no craftsmen in Maine worthy to work upon such a gift, and asked permission to return to France and consult his clergy. Once back in France he wrote a very diplomatic letter to Rufus, reporting that many of his clergy refused to be party to the demolition of the tower.[27] He was still awaiting a reply to this when news came that Rufus was dead. After the death of Rufus, Helias re-entered the town, either as a conqueror, after a siege of three months (Gesta 93A,404) or with the consent of the Norman garrison who despaired of any help coming from Henry (Order X, ch.xvii, p.99). Henry in fact recognized Helias as his vassal and gained a friend in both count and bishop.[28]

As soon as the affairs of Le Mans appeared settled, Hildebert undertook a journey to Rome (1100) where he was received by Pope Pascal II, and from there continued south to the Norman conquests of southern Italy and Sicily. There he met Roger Borsa, the weak duke of Apulia (1085-1111) and his uncle Roger I, count of Sicily, both of whom gave him costly presents for the adornment of the shrine of S. Julien. We learn

10

from a letter to Hugh of Cluny (III.7) that he narrowly escaped being captured by pirates on the return voyage. The literary historians usually connect with this visit the two poems on Rome, 36 and 38, but although it is probable that they were composed at this period, we cannot be altogether certain. Hildebert may have made at least one more journey to Rome[29] and could have composed the poems on this occasion. Besides we have no absolute guarantee that the poems were directly inspired by a visit to Rome.

The years following his return from Rome were given over to rebuilding and improvements. Hildebert used the presents he had brought from Italy to restore the cathedral, the bishop's palace, and his country house at Ivriacum (Yvré l'evêque). At this time too, Helias made rich presents to the cathedral and gave certain privileges to the clergy.[30] The return of Robert Courtehose in 1106 did not disturb the peace of Le Mans, since Helias held firm for Henry, and in fact was an intermediary with the king for Robert of Bellême after the defeat of Courtehose at Tinchebray. A more serious event from the point of view of Hildebert was the death in 1110 of Helias, who from being Hildebert's emeny had become his personal friend. Hildebert's epitaph, as well as the disinterested testimony of

11

Ordericus Vitalis,[31] show us that Helias was above the average nobleman of his time in courtesy and finesse. But his death meant to Hildebert and the people of Le Mans not only the removal of their friend and defender, but also a renewal of the rivalry between Norman and Angevin in Maine. As Helias had no sons, his son-in-law Fulk the Young of Anjou became count of Maine, in the same year as he became count of Anjou at his father's death. Louis VI was already (since 1109) at war with Henry of England, and enlisted Fulk of Anjou in his cause. But owing perhaps to the fact that the majority of the nobles of Maine allied themselves with Henry,[32] there does not seem to have been extensive fighting around Le Mans. At any rate Hildebert did not play the important role in these events which he did in the war of 1098/9. However this period of unrest did give rise to one of the best known incidents of his life, namely his imprisonment at Nogent-le-Rotrou. The writer of the Gesta gives us a brief account of the imprisonment, and then refers us to the letters for further information. It is these (II.17,18) which give us in detail an account of this singular event.

Rhtrou, the seigneur of Nogent, was, for some reason not stated, imprisoned in the keep of Le Mans. As he felt that death was approaching he summoned

33

12

Hildebert, confessed to him and made his will. He asked Hildebert to visit his mother in Nogent-le-Rotrou to acquaint her with the terms of the will and prevent anyone disturbing the settlement. This Hildebert did, accompanied, as the Gesta tells us, by Hugh the dean and Fulchard the precentor. He was received in a kindly manner by Rotrou's mother, but on the following day he was imprisoned in the keep by Hubert the steward.[34] Hildebert in his letter "Feliciter sunt miseri" (II.17) does not directly give any reason for this sudden imprisonment, but he does hint in the words "Nam de redemptione nihil ago. Semel Christi sanguine redemptus, iterum redimi non requiro," that he was being held to ransom. The writer of the Gesta tells us "In crastinum, Hubertus Capreolus, dapifer eiusdem comitis, existimans decanum captionis comitis conscium extitisse, episcopum cum omnibus suis cepit, eosque carcere mancipavit." Perhaps Hildebert's imprisonment was due originally to this suspicion of Hubert's, who then wished to make the most out of his capture by holding the bishop to ransom. However that may be, Hildebert felt the disgrace of his position keenly, especially as the excommunication of Hubert by Ivo of Chartres, who happened to be in Nogent at that time, was of no avail. Messages were sent to

13

Rotrou in Le Mans and he replied that Hubert in injuring Hildebert was injuring him. Hildebert also appealed to the bishop of Seez, in whose diocese lay the principal lands of Rotrou.[35] We do not know how long Hildebert was held in prison, or whether it was the intervention of Rotrou which obtained his release. Probably if he had been detained longer than a few weeks we would have more letters. Dieudonné makes the reasonable guess that Hildebert was probably released in November 1112, after Robert of Bellême who had imprisoned Rotrou was himself arrested by Henry I. In March of the following year the treaty of Gisors was signed, whereby Louis VI gave up the suzerainty of Maine to Henry I, and Le Mans was untroubled by any further fighting during the remainder of Hildebert's stay there.

However, some years later the bishop was involved in trouble of an entirely different kind. The Gesta[36] tells us that on a certain Ash Wednesday two men arrived in the town carrying, in the manner of teachers, staffs with iron crosses attached to the top, and dressed in the habit of penitents. Hildebert who was on the point of making a journey to Rome gave instructions to his archdeacons that the master of these men, a certain Henry, should be received in the town and given permission to preach. Henry in due course arrived and

14

began to preach from a dais to large and appreciative audiences. It is difficult to pick out what Henry's doctrines really were from the torrent of abuse which the author of the Gesta levels at him. For one thing he incited the people against the clergy "adeo quod famulis eorum minarentur cruciatus, nec eis aliquid vendere, vel ab eis emere voluissent: immo habebant eos sicut ethnicos et publicanos." Three clergy who tried to discuss matters with Henry were beaten and thrown into the gutter by the mob, and would have been killed had not the Duke's men from the castle intervened. The clergy were so hard-pressed that they did not dare confront Henry in public but sent a letter of excommunication by one of their number under escort of the Duke's steward. This document does not specify his offence, beyond that he had sowed seeds of discord between the clergy and people, and had brought forward "multa contra fidem catholicam." According to the chronicler, whose words are perhaps to be treated with caution, Henry and his followers went from one excess to another: women cut off their hair and burned their clothes in public; no dowries were given or taken, and there was general and promiscuous marriage among his disciples together with a complete renouncing of worldly possessions. Hildebert returned hurriedly, having

15

broken off his journey to Rome,[37] and Henry, hearing of his impending arrival, retreated to the suburbs where he continued to preach. The extent of the influence which Henry still had is indicated by the fact that the people refused Hildebert's benediction. Confidence in Henry was perhaps shaken by a fire which burned the suburbs in which he was staying. His influence must have been on the wane, for Hildebert was now able to meet him in public with the purpose of showing him up as an imposter. This he did by asking what office he had in the church, and on his replying "diaconus sum" requiring him to sing the psalms appointed for Matins on that day. As Henry did not know the Psalms, or even which day it was, his discomfiture was complete. Hildebert ordered him to leave his diocese, and he took himself off secretly. The bishop was then left with the task of reconciling the people and eradicating Henry's influence, which was so considerable that the chronicler says "Eos enim Henricus sic sibi illexerat, quod vix adhuc memoria illius et dilectio a cordibus eorum deleri valeat vel depelli." As the Gesta is our only source for this episode it is difficult to know how much importance to attach to it! The chronicler devotes over a quarter of his narrative to it, but as an ecclesiastic he is naturally more concerned with a

16

matter such as this touching on doctrine and the authority of the Church than with secular struggles.[38]

The remaining event of importance during Hildebert's episcopate at Le Mans was the dedication of the cathedral of S. Julien which had been begun by Hoël, and which was not yet complete. This ceremony took place in April 1120, in the Octave of Easter and was attended by Gilbert of Tours, Geoffrey of Rouen, Hildebert's former rival for the bishopric, Reginald of Angers, and Marbod of Rennes, now very old and blind.

In 1125 Gilbert, Archbishop of Tours, died, and Hildebert was unanimously chosen as his successor by clergy and people, Louis VI giving his consent (Gesta p.421). Tours was hardly the see in which an old man (and Hildebert was now around seventy years of age) might end his life peacefully. The political situation was not unlike that of Le Mans. The town of Tours itself belonged to the king of France, while Touraine formed part of the lands of Anjou, although the counts recognized the king as suzerain. Tours contained within its boundaries the community, to all intents and purposes another town, which had grown up around the collegiate church of St Martin, and was called Martinopolis or Chateau-neuf. The canons of

17

St. Martin's, han exempt house, had the king of France as their official head, and no love was lost between them and the less wealthy chapter of the cathedral of S. Gatien.

Hildebert had been archbishop for one year only when the trouble arose that was inevitable between a strong-minded king like Louis, and a reforming bishop. The offices of dean and archdeacon had been vacant when Hildebert entered upon the see,[39] and when he had been a year in office he received a letter from the king nominating two men of his own choice, and requiring that they should be installed as quickly as possible. Hildebert refused to receive them, thinking as he says "that it was better to obey God than men." He then went to the court with the intention of making the king see reason, but found him obdurate. Next he submitted his case to the judgement of his fellow bishops, but when both sides had been heard, and Hildebert was awaiting the verdict, Louis took matters into his own hands and prohibited him from taking any action in regard to the revenues of the vacant offices. Hildebert left the court and was followed by a herald who declared forfeit to the royal treasury all the revenues of the church of Tours which were in the power of the crown.[40] Relations between Hildebert and Louis must have remained

18

on this footing until at least 1129, for we find him writing to Pope Honorius II excusing his inability to hear a suit on the grounds that he has been invited to the coronation of Louis' son Phillip on Easter day (Lett.II.40). He was especially anxious to be present at this event because he hoped thus to pacify the king and obtain some relaxation of his decree against the revenues of the archbishopric. It was in the next year that the episcopal revenues were entirely freed,[41] and that was gained at a price,[42] though Hildebert does not say exactly what sacrifices he had to make to the king to obtain peace.

This affair, together with a coolness between Hildebert and Honorius II,[43] cast a cloud over the archiepiscopate of Hildebert, but did not prevent him carrying on his duties as metropolitan. The most important event in his tenure of office was the council over which he presided at Nantes (October 1127). Decisions were taken on the law of succession; on the rights of the seigneur over ships wrecked on his coast; and on marriage within the forbidden degrees of consanguinity. Most important of all, it was decreed that the sons of priests should under no circumstances inherit their father's living.[44]

This was only one of many duties undertaken as archbishop by Hildebert, whose powers do not seem

19

to have abated with old age. We hear of him contesting the right of Upper Brittany to have a separate metropolitan seat at Dol; assisting at the marriage of Geoffrey le Bel, son of Fulk of Anjou, to Matilda, daughter of Henry I; helping to found a new monastery at Fontaine-les-Blanches; and in February 1133 consecrating the chapel of the monastery infirmary at Redon, and presiding over a council of bishops in that town. The documents relating to this convocation are the last on which the bishop's signature appears, for he died some months later, aged almost eighty.

Hildebert, by reason of his office, had been caught up in many of the religious and political controversies of his time, and consequently his correspondence, addressed as it is to such diverse people as St Bernard, Geoffrey of Vendôme, Hugh of Cluny and William Rufus, cannot fail to be interesting. However, it is as a poet that he is best remembered, and it is in his poetry that we are especially interested.

NOTES

1 Bayeux 1855.

2 Cf. also Histoire Litteraire de la France XI.250-278.

3 Hildebert von Lavardin und das kirchliche Stellenbesetzungsrecht, Stuttgart, 1906.

4 Paris 1898, reprinted from the Rev. hist. archéol. de Maine, 1896-7, XL pp.225 sqq., XLI p.179 sq., XLII pp.5 sqq., 165 sq., 236 sq.

5 One must also mention the article by H. O. Taylor in the Annual Report of the American Historical Assoc., 1906, pp.53-60. The writer, who does not seem to have known of Dieudonné's work, is guilty of several considerable inaccuracies, the worst of which is his assertion that Hildebert was exiled twice, and his ascription of poem 22 to the second exile.

6 Christian Lat. Poetry pp.265,6. Secular I pp.317-329.

7 Spiritualità pp. 33 sqq.

8 Now Bibl. Nat. MS. Baluze 45.

9 Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes 54 (1893) pp.597-692.

10 In quoting I give the text of G. Busson and A. Ledru, Société des archives historiques du Maine 2, 1901, pp. 397-422, but add the Migne column numbers for convenience.

NOTES: 2

11 Miscellanea III p.64 (ed. of Mansi, Lucca 1762).

12 Vita p.18.

13 Gesta Regum, ed. Stubbs, bk. III.284, p.339.

14 There is no doubt about the dates of his election but there is a dispute over the date of consecration. We know from the Gesta that Hildebert was consecrated on Christmas Day, and the natural inference would be that it was Christmas Day 1096. Unfortunately in a charter confirming a donation made by Helias which is dated 1097 or 1098 we read that the grant was made 'In die consecrationis domni Hildeberti episcopi nostri' (Loyauté, Notae in Gesta, Migne 171, col. 107). This cannot refer to a mere anniversary of Hildebert's consecration. Yet Hildebert subscribed as bishop an act of the council of Saintes in March 1097. So Dieudonné (p.110,111) takes the view that Hildebert was installed before 1097, but that his consecration was put off until 1098. Latouche, on the other hand (Hist. du comte d. Maine p.151), considers that this distinction between installation and consecration was not observed, and that in any case the mere fact of having been installed would not give Hildebert the right to be called bishop of Le Mans. He suggests that Hildebert signed the act as bishop-elect. Both agree however

that the consecration did not take place in 1096, but, as in the document, in 1098. Barth (328 n.2) retains 1096 as the date. He agrees with Latouche over the possible separation of installation and consecration (Es ist an und für sich schon unwahrscheinlich, dass der Erzbischof die Inthronisation vornimmt, die Weihe aber (wegen der Gefangenschaft des Grafen und des Krieges) aufschiebt.). He also notes that the admittedly partial account of the Gesta makes Rufus begin the war because of the ordination of the bishop ("eine etwas einseitige Auffassung, aber in der Zeitbestimmung nicht ohne weiteres abzuweisen."). His explanation is that the charter quoted is really made up of two parts of which the 2nd. only dates from 1098. The second part would then begin with the words "Ego Goffridus," which indicates an entirely new donation. This seems to be the most reasonable answer.

15 Bk. X. ch. vii, p.41.

16 P.L. 162 ep.277.

17 On the question of Hildebert's morals prior to his election Dieudonné (pp.43-7) gives arguments for and against, while wisely abstaining from any verdict owing to lack of evidence.

18 For the clash between Norman and Angevin interests in Maine between 1051 and 1092 see Latouche ch.V,

19 Ord. Vit. Bk. X, ch.vii, p.43.

20 Gesta (p.400; col.900) states that war broke out between Helias and Rufus because of Hildebert's ordination, but this shows a natural tendency on the part of the author to place the bishop at the centre of events. Ordericus' account, (X, ch.vii, p.44), which indicates that Rufus did not officially declare war on Helias but merely took the chance offered him, is more likely.

21 Gesta p.401; col.91 B.

22 Gesta p.402; col.91 D.

23 Ordericus.

24 Gesta p.402; col.92 A.

25 Gesta p.402; col.92 B, tells us that Rufus returned to England. Then it mentions the incrimination of Hildebert and says that Rufus ordered him to go 'post ipsum' to England. This seems to indicate that when Rufus said this he was in France, so that either the chronicler is saying that Rufus made a second journey to Maine in the winter of 1099, or else his story is somewhat out of sequence, and Hildebert was accused before the king just after

his recapture of Le Mans. This seems more likely as the rebellion took place in the early summer of 1099, and Rufus was killed in August 1100. Hildebert was back in Le Mans before then, so that his stay in England would have been very short indeed if he had gone over only in the late autumn or winter of 1099.

26 Gesta p.402; col. 92 B.

27 In the letter Hildebert talks of 'illud preciosum vas, quod pro humilianda turre matris ecclesiae ad recondendum Beatissimi Juliani corpus regia vestra liberalitas promisit.' Dieudonné takes this to mean that Rufus, after his first offer had been rejected, renewed it in the form of a vessel to contain the relics of S. Julien. But the expression "preciosum vas" seems to be either a general term for any article of value, or to indicate the finished product which would be made from the gold and silver given by the king. Certainly the Gesta makes no mention of a second present.

28 Latouche is of the opinion that some sort of alliance was made between Helias and Henry. Certainly Helias supported Henry against Robert Courtehose at Tinchebray and before Bayeux.

NOTES: 6

29 We read in letter III.4 that Hildebert intended going to the Lateran council of 1123, but we have no proof that he went, and the Gesta is silent on the matter (cf. Dieudonné p.84).

30 Gesta p.406; col.93 C,D.

31 Bk.X ch.vii p.38 'Erat probus et honorabilis, et multis pro virtutibus amabilis.'

32 Ordericus Bk. XI ch.xliv p.304 (speaking of 1112-13 when Henry's star was in the ascendant) says 'Cenomannensium quoque procerum plurimi Henrico regi sese contulerunt, factaque fidelitate munitiones suas illi reddiderunt.'

33 Gesta p.406; col. 94 A.

34 Barth (p.382) is inclined to the view that Rotrou was to be blamed for this treachery. So too De Desservillers, who says rather dramatically 'Dans le silence de sa prison il i.e., [Rotrou] médita une terrible vengeance' (p.179). Of Hildebert's imprisonment Chartrou (p.174) makes the curious remark 'Il charma son emprisonnement en lisant les comédies de Térence comme il avait charmé son exil en Angleterre, en 1100, en écrivant des poèmes imités d'Ovide.'

35 Lett. II.18.

NOTES: 7

36 Pp.407-414; col.94 D - 98 A. Cf. also letter II.24 concerning two clerks who had succumbed to Henry's doctrines but had later recanted.

37 Both Barth (p.3) and De Deservillers suppose Hildebert actually to have been in Rome, but as Dieudonné points out, the Gesta says only 'qui Romam profectus fuerat.' De Deservillers puts Henry's preaching during Hildebert's absence in Rome in 1100-1101, but this contradicts the 'per idem fere tempus' of the Gesta.

38 Of Henry's career before coming to Le Mans we know only that he had been ejected from Lausanne (St. Bernard epist.241, P.L. 182, col.435). The same letter tells of his subsequent ejection from Poitiers and Bordeaux. He was finally imprisoned at Toulouse (cf. F. Vernet, Dict. Théol. Catholique VI. 2178-83, and R. Manselli, Studi sulle eresie del secolo XII, Instituto storico italiano per il medio evo, studi storici 5, 1953, pp.45-67). The latter is on safe ground in putting the 'idem fere tempus' between 1116 and 1120, but whether the year is 1116, and whether Hildebert was in fact going to attend the council held in Rome in March of that year, as he suggests, is a matter for some doubt.

NOTES: 8

39 Letter II.34, to the Papal Legate, giving a full account of the incident.

40 'Ne fructus possessionum Turonensis ecclesiae, quos regis potestas attingit, ad praefatam deferrentur ecclesiam, sed fisco deinceps ascripti regiis usibus deservirent' (III.34).

41 Letter II.46 to Henry I 'Nolo autem vestram latere maiestatem, ecclesiae nostrae pacem regis redditam, . . . nos in gratiam regis, gravamine ingenti rediisse, atque praeposituram, quam ecclesiae nostrae abstulerat, et per quatuor annos (i.e., 1126-30) retinuerat, . . . non tam redditam nobis quam redemptam a nobis.'

42 'Certum et taxatum obsequium nobis regem benignum exhibuit.' II.46.

43 Hildebert had written to Honorius, perhaps rather too freely, advising him not to admit superfluous appeals to the court of Rome (II.41).

44 Letter II.30 contains the decrees of this council sent to Honorius for ratification.

Testimonia

The poems of Marbod (Var.I.11, improved text of Bulst, Gott. Nachrichten IV.2 (1939) p.195) and Baudri (ed.Abrahams no.CXLIX).

Laurence of Durham, Hypognosticon, MS. Laud Misc 598 (S.C.1294), fol.184.

Inclitus et prosa, versuque per omnia primus,
Hyldebertus olet prorsus ubique rosam.

Alexander Neckam, De laudibus divinae sapientiae, line 611 (ed.Wright, Rolls Series p.454.

Iam Cenomannis adest, cui magnus praeficit Hildebertus, flos cleri, pontificumque decus.
Plurima festive scripsit dictamina, scripsit
'Sicut hyems laurum', 'Pergama flere volo',
Altarisque sacri docuit mysteria, necnon
Causam qua Christus et Deus est et homo.
Depinxitque stilo placide mores muliebres,
Multaque quae gravis est enumerare labor.

William of Malmesbury, Abbreviatio Amalarii, P.L.179.1774.
Sane moneo si de compendio vis scire significationes sacrarum missae, legas versus Hildeberti prius Cenomanensis episcopi, postea Turonensis archiepiscopi. Si significationes sacrarum vestium et... sermones Ivonis Carnotensis episcopi. Hi enim talia videntur intellexisse perspicacius, et texuisse pulchrius.

Ordericus Vitalis, Historia Ecclesiastica X.7 (ed. Le Prevost IV.42).
Hic mansuetus fuit ac religiosus, et tam divinarum quam saecularium eruditioni litterarum studiosus. Temporibus nostris incomparabilis versificator floruit, et multa carmina priscis poematibus aequalia, vel eminentia, condidit, quae fervidus calor philosophorum subtiliter rimari appetit, ac super aurum et topazion sibi conscisscere diligenter satagit. Eleganter enim et sapienter loquitur de Christo et ecclesia, de corpore et anima, de gestis Sanctorum et virtutibus eorum, de laude virtutum et vituperatione vitiorum. A Romanis Cardinalibus, qui frequenter Galliarum plagas adeunt, ... plurima Hildeberti carmina Romam transferuntur, quae dicacium scholis et didascalis Quiritum admiranda censentur.

Peter of Blois, epist. 101 (P.L.207 col.514A).
Profuit mihi, quod epistolas Hildeberti Cenomanensis episcopi styli elegantia, et suavi urbanitate praecipuas firmare, et corde tenus reddere adolescentulus compellebar.

The 'testimonium' taken by Beaugendre from William of Malmesbury, Gesta Pontificum I.67, refers not to Hildebert but to Ralph d'Escures, archbp. of Canterbury (d.1122), as can be seen from the context.

Chapter II

Grammatical and metrical practise.

I Vocabulary.

As has been shown in recent years, medieval Latin is not fixed in style or vocabulary, but depends on what extent the individual author is influenced by classical or patristic Latin, contemporary ecclesiastical and liturgical Latin, and finally popular Latin, with the Romance languages gradually taking the place of the last mentioned.[1] This is of course especially true in the case of vocabulary. In the shorter poems Hildebert's vocabulary does not diverge very greatly from the classical norm. He does not indeed avoid such everyday technical words as 'ecclesia' or 'missa' in the poems which deal with religious subjects. Naturally in the De Mysterio Misse we find many more of these technical words representing parts of the liturgy, e.g. introitus, officium, gloria, canon. However, quite apart from these necessary terms, his vocabulary in the religious poems has a considerably more patristic flavour. In 39, for instance, we have: carnales IV.5; presignans IV.6; fluviale lavacrum II.16, and in De Myst. indubitanter 160; repensant 173; refrigerium 455; scandala 542. But it is in the life of St.Mary especially that words not found in classical Latin appear. This may be due to the influence of the prose lives which Hildebert is paraphrasing, though he does not as a rule introduce words and phrases from them into his version (cf.p.406ff.). Curiously enough, although the Biblical Epigrams afford several instances of late Latin syntax, their vocabulary, as their style, is plain. Certain words, as 'historia', 'spiritualis', 'designat' recur constantly, being part of the standard language of allegory of this kind.

The following is a list of Hapax Legomena and words found seldom elsewhere. It is notable that most of them are words which have not yet come within the scope of the Thesaurus.

semibeatus 35.22; precomitor 59 III.51; presuspiro De Myst.16; superobnubo ibid. 220; palpaticus[2] St.Mary 281; subobsero[2] ibid.204; preconforto ibid.129; collambo ibid.867; stabularis ibid.508 (Habel gives 'stabularis: stabularius: Stellknecht, Gastwirt', but does not say where he found this. In any case, this is clearly not the meaning here, nor is that of Du Cange 'stabularis curia ubi stabula extracta.').

(St.Mary 373)

The noun salitor does not appear in any dictionary, although the verb, used exclusively of animals, is found seven times in Lewis and Short . Perparcus (ibid.618) is found elsewhere only in the Gloss of Cyril (cf. Forcellini IV.614, Quicherat 207), although the adverb appears in Terence (Andria 2.6.24). Appositus (42.11) is another very rare word occurring only in Arnobius, Contra nationes 2.67; Pliny, Nat.Hist. 25.164 (82); 24.30 (20); 25.117 (65); 24.22 (13); 24.24 (15) and Serenus Sammonicus 134.409, and in none of these places in the almost technical sense used by Hildebert. Other rare words are: utro (St.M.8100 Ovid Met.5.166; Pliny, Nat.Hist.18.179 (49).

perdurus (St.M.858) Digest 48.3.2; Augustine, De civitate Dei 22.5; Asconius in Hor.Sat.1.1.120.

intumulatus (St.M.872) Ovid Heroides 2.136.

procresco (St.M.670) Lucretius 1.715; 6.664; 2.566; Augustine, contra Cresconium 3.37.41.

sarculus (St.M.861), for the commoner sarculum, Palladius, Opus agriculturae 1.43.3; Greg.Turon. Vitae patrum 14.1.

multimodus (47.2; St.M.266,711,741) eight instances, all in Georges.

repedo (St.M.899) five instances in Lewis and Short.

celicus (St.M.463,797) only five instances in the Thesaurus.

iugo (59.III.30) Vergil Aeneid 1.345, with seven instances in Lewis and Short of its use in another sense.

subinfero (De Myst.485) ten references between Lewis and Short, Georges and Blaise.

duodennis (St.M.352) Augustine, in psalmos 101; serm.1.1 (cf. Thes. Ling.Lat. V.i.col.2248.64 and 2251.41).

II Morphology.

The only irregularity in the case endings of nouns appears in the word Ierosolimis, St.M.599. Here we would expect Ierosolima, accusative of motion towards. The present reading could only be the ablative plural of the usual inflected form or the accusative plural of a third declension form of which I can find no trace. But both these forms run counter to the metre, and the syllable -is would have to be shortened to make the line scan. But if we read Ierosolima, in

defiance of the manuscripts we would have an elision, the only one in the whole poem. It seems possible that Hildebert preferred to run counter to the rules of grammar in what is, after all, a word of foreign origin, and considered the shortening of a syllable in such a word less of a crime against metrics in this particular poem.

Hildebert usually leaves Jewish words undeclined, although he does decline some of those which were either more common, or lent themselves to such declension (e.g. Ioannes -is St.M.550, Samuelem B.E.4.1)[3]. Greek proper names for the most part retain their appropriate terminations. Thus Prothea (accusative) 28.3; Dane (nominative) 50.47 for Danáé; Zosima (ablative) St.M.688. But note Yantem for Yanten 32.1.

As regards verbs, Hildebert does seem to give us a few instances of what we may call medieval practise. We occasionally find compound tenses formed with fui instead of sum. Thus in 40.7 we find fuit querendus, and in St.M.584 fuit addita. He does not seem to use fore+ = esse, and in both these respects he agrees very much with the usage of Walter of Chatillon (cf.Christensen p.37). Similarly, like Walter, he makes a restrained use of forem = essem (30.8; 40.8; B.E.5.2; St.M. 137).

III Syntax.

Hildebert's noun syntax differs little from that of classical poets. Notable is his use of a singular noun with multus and similar words to express quantity: multa domus 33.2; pagina multa De Myst. 152; concuba multus St.M.511; res ampla 18.19 (cf. Christensen p.39). His use of personal pronouns on the other hand is fully medieval, for he makes little distinction between is, ille, iste, ipse (cf. Strecker p.63). Is = ille 39.IV.12. ille = is 22.69; B.E.2.3; 52.5; De Myst. 403,404; St.M.760. iste = is 45.9; B.E.49.4; 55.3. ipse = is 22.34, 35; B.E.68.2;. is = ipse St.M.847. idem = is B.E.44.6. In B.E.11.9 and 44.11 hic in conjunction with ille expresses 'the former' rather than the more usual 'latter'. [Twice the demonstrative is replaced by the participle as described by Norberg (Beiträge ch.7): by dictus, St.Mary 551, and by prefatus ibid.554.] We also find several instances of se, suus for is, eius: 18,47,48; 50.6; De Myst.80; St.M.857.

On three occasions we find the possessive pronoun expressed by proprius: 5.2; 22.24; //St.M.616.// Hildebert frequently uses a multiplicative combined with a distributive to represent a cardinal number: B.E.61.2 quater denis; De Myst.390 ter quinis; 474 bis sena; St.M.395 ter ternos, bisque quaternos; 570 quadrupliciterque novenos. Similar is St.M.610 trina triennia, bina tetrennia. This use of distributives by poets, mainly for metrical reasons, is not uncommon even in classical times (cf. Stolz p.493). More peculiar is the use of ter denum for the biblical tricesimum in B.E.59.9 (cf. Vulg.Matt.XIII.8). The singular form trinus is used for triplex in 20.1; B.E.4.5; 44.2; De Myst. 165, but again this is supported by several examples from classical poets.

In late and medieval Latin there was a tendency to join prepositions and adverbs, with the new compound word having in many cases simply the meaning of the adverb.[4] This tendency can be seen in Hildebert also, for we have extunc (St.M.353,4; 622,3, and de longe (B.E.49.4). Similarly we find double conjunctions (cf.Strecker p.65): sed et 40.2; De Myst.394; mox ut St.M.836. As we would expect there are few analytical constructions with prepositions: respexit ad B.E.23. 1; credit in istum B.E.55.3; corona de spinis B.E.63.3. But these may well be influenced by the Vulgate reading. For other instances of the curious phrase sub brevitate = breviter (De Myst.12) see Thes. Ling.Lat. II.col.2189.40. Hildebert uses the late Latin absque for sine on several occasions: 22.79; St.M.551,572,662,791 (cf. Stolz p.551, Thes.Ling.Lat. I.col.186). Although there is a tendency in poetry to do without prepositions more often than in prose, Hildebert does, I think, go somewhat further in this direction than the classical poets. Some instances of this suppression of prepositions are: iacet urna, regnat in aula 55.15; nostra fides Christo B.E.48.4; Ioab inguine percutit Abner B.E.51.7; thuribulo positis De Myst.300; ignem mente minister habet ibid.314. There are times when Hildebert seems to go rather further than the admittedly ill-defined classical use of the ablative of place: 22.67; 42,11,13,17,21; 55.2; B.E.42.1 (cf.Stolz p.450). This omission of prepositions may be accounted for

by the terseness and compression of the style of many of Hildebert's poems. It is however interesting to note that the same phenomenon is noticed by Dr.L.Bieler in his study of the grammatical practise of Hildebert's near contemporary bishop Patrick (Writings of Bishop Patrick, Script.Lat.Hib.I.p.50).

In his verb syntax also Hildebert varies from the classical norm, but only slightly. One has the impression that he is much more careful in his choice of tenses than writers of his period normally were. However there is some confusion, involving mainly the imperfect, perfect and pluperfect tenses. Thus we find an imperfect where we would expect a perfect (23.4), a pluperfect for a perfect (B.E.53.11), and a future simple for future perfect (St.M.54). However Hildebert does not vary his tenses so indiscrimenately as bishop Patrick (intro.p. 51) or Marcus Valerius (p.39). Owing to the compressed style often used by Hildebert there is very frequent and sustained ellipsis of verbs, and this is especially so in the Biblical Epigrams, where the number of cases of ellipsis of sum, designo and signo makes quotation of examples unnecessary. Twice we find the infinitives of possum and volo used as substantives: posse suum 50.54; velle suum B.E.15.12 (cf.Christensen p.50). Twice also Hildebert appears to treat as deponents verbs which were not so treated in classical Latin: orari De Myst.141,2; St.M.260; fletur St.M.334. It is difficult to distinguish between these and the frequent instances of the use of impersonal passives, of which Hildebert seems to be very fond. Curiously enough, all the examples of this appear in St.Mary: celebratur 156; itur 192; surgitur 246; eatur 410; pulsatur 539; respondetur 540. There is one instance of volo used with the infinitive to express futurity: St.M. 398 quo vellent ire (cf.Stolz p.557).

The syntax of Hildebert's subordinate clauses is again not fully in agreement with classical practise. Indirect statement is usually expressed by the accusative and infinitive, but on five occasions we find quod with the indicative: De Myst.64,485; St.M.278,436,445, Indirect questions have the indicative mood in the following places:

B.E.66.3; De Myst.388; St.M.841 and 293 (where the series of indirect questions begins in the subjunctive and continues in the indicative). In the great majority of indirect questions the mood is subjunctive. We find an for num, St.M.400, and an... annon for utrum... necne, B.E.3.1. (The latter is however found in classical Latin, cf. Thes. Ling.Lat.II.col.10, ll.54-8).

In his conditional clauses Hildebert seems to waver between the use of the subjunctive and the indicative in the protasis of open conditional sentences. Thus we have the subjunctive in 26.30; 39.IV. 33; B.E.47.4; De Myst.140; St.M.56,526,528,519,520 (though here it may have a certain potential force),528. At De Myst.190 sqq. we have in the same succession of clauses a sequence of indicative, subjunctive, indicative. Sometimes also the tenses are not those of classical usage. In 31.1; 52.3 and B.E.5.2 we have the imperfect for pluperfect subjunctive in past unfulfilled condition. This may be related to the tendency to confuse the tenses mentioned above. Notable also is 15.7 where we find the present indicative erro, but where we would expect the imperfect subjunctive.

In temporal clauses dum is often used as the equivalent of cum, meaning 'when' rather than 'while' : B.E.1.2; 40.1; 48.2; De Myst. 139,141,143,183,349,351,3,5,587 (with cum used in a parallel clause two lines further on). In its original sense of 'while' it takes the subjunctive: 23.1; B.E.55.1; St.M.171,815. In none of these cases is any idea of purpose implied. In its concessive sense, where we would expect the subjunctive, we find the indicative (B.E.7.4). Conversely, a concessive clause introduced by quamvis where we would expect the indicative has the subjunctive (St.M.467). Cum = when takes the indicative or subjunctive indifferently.

Hildebert uses the second person of the subjunctive for commands a great deal.[5] This is not a patristic or medieval innovation, but is found in classical poetry (Stolz p.572). Examples in Hildebert are 16.1,6; 35.26; St.M.65,65,75,78,199,238,527. He usually expresses prohibitions by ne or nec with the second person of the

present subjunctive, for example in 26.29 and St.M.60, although he also uses noli (St.M.672) and even ne and nec with the imperative (St.M.199; 35.1). Twice we find purpose expressed by means of the infinitive (St.M.32, B.E.30.1) where moreover the Vulgate text which Hildebert is expounding has 'ut videret'.

Metrics. I Prosody.

Metres used by Hildebert in the shorter poems.

Hexameter. 2,16,20,29,39 (partly caudati, with rhythmical preface), 42,57.

Elegaic. 1,4,5,7,8,9,11,15,17,18,19,21,22,25,24,26,27,28,30,33,35, 36,37,38,41,43,44,45,46,47,48,50,52,53,54,56.

Leonine Hexameter. 10,25,34.

Leonine Elegaic. 6,12,13,14.

Caudati. 3,31,32,40,49,51.

Rhythmical. 30.I,55.

(The Liber de conflictu carnis et animae contains five pieces in verse. It seemed best not to include these in our survey of Hildebert's verse. This may appear inconsistent, but a new edition of this work, while not so urgently needed as that of the shorter poems, would I think, be useful, and the proper place for any such discussion would be there. Of these poems the first is in elegaics, the second in lines made up from a dactylic trimeter catalectic + an adonic, no doubt imitated from Boethius, Phil.Cons.I.2, the third in caudati, the fourth and fifth in hexameters.)

Hildebert's prosody does not differ very much from that of other poets of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[6] An important point to be noted in the prosody of any medieval author is his treatment of the vowel o where it appears in the final syllable. In the Shorter Poems, Biblical Epigrams and De Mysterio he never lengthens the first person singular of verbs except before the caesura and once (23.7) before a bucolic diaeresis, where there is a strong sense pause. However in St.Mary he lengthens it on twenty-one occasions where there

is no caesura: 359,404,405,412,446,448,474,504,507,516,528,532,535, 546,549,593,631,642,681,682,795. Dative and ablative singulars in o are never shortened. Unlike the poet of the Ysengrimus Hildebert usually shortens the final o of the gerund, the only instance where we find it long being B.E.11.11. As regards the final o of the nominative singular of the third declension, Hildebert keeps only 16% long. With many of these Hildebert is extremely arbitrary, the same word having its final syllable long and short within the space of a few lines (cf.De Myst. 548,550 caro). Adverbs ending in o generally retain the o as long, exceptions being 45.12 sero, B.E.27.1 and poem 57.3 quando, B.E.59.5 illico, and St.M.674 quando. Hildebert always scans ergo (the only apparent exception being De Myst.493), leo and ego, with the exception of 26.23. Duo is found in seven places and duō only in two (27.2, where it precedes a pause, and St.M.585. Nemo is found seven times and nemō only once (St.M.74). Adverbs ending in a are long, with the exception of antea (cf.Thes.Ling.Lat.II.col.157. 69). The final syllable of adverbs ending in e is invariably long. Hildebert is quite arbitrary in his scansion of mihi, tibi and sibi.

In his treatment of short vowels standing before a mute and liquid Hildebert adheres very closely to classical usage. He lengthens such vowels on 52 occasions only, and 29 of these instances are accounted for by the oblique cases and derivatives of pater and uter, both of which Hildebert scans long or short at his convenience. His practise seems to be always to scan the first syllable of agricultura and of the oblique cases of ager as long, cf.B.E.44.9; St.M.290. Also the first syllable of quadraginta and quadriduanus is scanned as long B.E.61.3; 66.3, so also quadrupliciterque St.M.570. It is interesting to note how Hildebert scans the oblique cases of the word sacer, and its compounds and derivatives. He makes the first syllable of the adjective long in 39 cases and short in 42. Sacrifex always has its first syllable short (eleven instances), sacramentum long three times and short twice, sacrare long four times, short six, while sacrificare always has its first syllable long. Hildebert never

shortens a naturally long vowel in the middle of a word before a mute and a liquid. He does occasionally allow a short open vowel to stand before sc,sm,sp,st or z: 58.10,14; 42.7; B.E.1.3; 5.4; 44.8; De Myst. 31,137,474; St.M.216,655, but as Platnauer points out (Latin Elegaic Verse, Cambridge 1951, p.62) this was a license occasionally practised by the ancients. Only once does Hildebert lengthen such a vowel (27.2 duo studium), but he may regard the second syllable of duo as long here in any case.

The following quantities differ from the classical norm as modified by the licenses mentioned above:

B.E.36.1 precepit
St.M.358 Alexandriam
St.M.399 Ierosolimis.

The rarity of such irregular quantities says much for the technical efficiency of Hildebert, especially when we consider the nature of the subject in De Mysterio and the Biblical Epigrams.

As is usually the case with Latin poets of his time, Hildebert permits the lengthening of short syllables in arsi. But unlike many of the authors mentioned by Christensen (p.57) and Munari (p.50) he seems to lengthen the syllable only before a caesura or diaeresis, the great majority of cases being before the hephthemimeral caesura and the diaeresis in the pentameter. Of the syllables thus ~~mentioned~~ lengthened 99 occur before the penthemimeral caesura, 56 before the pentameter diaeresis, and only six and one (De Myst.481) before hephthemimeral and trihemimeral caesuras respectively. Hildebert then makes a sparing use of this lengthening in comparison with his contemporaries.

The Latin poets of the high Middle Ages did not care for elision, and many of them, e.g. the authors of the artes poeticae edited by Faral, avoid it altogether (cf.Munari p.48, and Sedgewick, Speculum 5, 1928, p.360 n.1). There are however in Hildebert 32 instances of elision. This represents a percentage of about 1.3 as compared with 18.4 for Marcus Valerius, 15.8 for the Alexandreis, and 18 for the Ysengrimus. The elisions are scattered through the

Shorter Poems and the De Mysterio, but curiously enough do not occur in St.Mary or the Biblical Epigrams. They are relatively more frequent in those poems which are influenced most by classical models. For instance 22 has five. The following is a list.

Short syllables elided: 15.7; 22,19,78; 29.4; 56.29; 59.III.15,IV.24; 46.1; De Myst.22,88,145,207.

Long syllables elided: 16.1; 40.8; 45.10; De Myst.61,64,180,508.

Elision of final m: 22.21; 45,3,24; 50.59; De Myst.102.

Elision of -que: 17.20; 22.21,78; 29.6; 40.6; 41.12; 42.10,22.

Hildebert shares the common medieval dislike of hiatus, and no example is found in his poems. He also avoids ending the pentameter of his elegaic couplet with a short open vowel (cf.Platnauer op.cit. p.64). The only exceptions to this which I have noticed are 15.14; 18.28; B.E.66.6. There is synezesis in 59.IV.35 perisse.. redisse; 49.26 adisti; B.E.32.5,7 mansuētudo; B.E.42.1 sepelisse; De Myst.268, 273 sacrifici, 388 sacrificium; St.M.360 deērat, 467 preēuntes. Syncope occurs in 49,1,2,11,12; B.E.38.1; B.E.50.6; De Myst.96,122, 154; St.M.47,279,320,365,377,389,448,793 (circueo cf.Thes.Ling.Lat. III.col.1135.62). Diaeresis occurs in the word neuter, possibly in 18.44 and De Myst.544, and certainly in De Myst.90 and 23.3 (for this see note ad loc.).

II Metric.

Hildebert, like all the medieval followers of Ovid, has a very strong preference for penthemimeral caesuras in his hexameters. However, he does vary these with considerable use of the hephthemimeral accompanied by trihemimeral. Out of the 2194 hexameters written by Hildebert there are 190, or 8.7 per cent, with hephthemimeral and trihemimeral caesuras. The leonine verse does not, properly speaking, admit hephthemimeral caesuras. Therefore if we leave out of consideration the life of St.Mary and the small amount of leonine verse in the S Shorter Poems we find that of the rest around 15 per cent have hephthemimeral and trihemimeral caesuras. Weak caesuras of either kind are comparatively rare.

At first glance there would appear to be a large number of lines with hephthemimeral caesuras alone. In these lines there is the possibility of a penthemimeral caesura, but the sense seems to indicate very strongly that the caesura is hephthemimeral. An example of what I mean is 54.5

Laetior explicuit radios, sparsitque serenas.

Such lines are especially frequent in St.Mary, where the leonine rhyme demands a pause in the middle of the third foot, while the real sense pause is in the fourth. Such lines are 45,83,148,733,747, 808. This artificial placing of the caesura where there is no sense pause is not confined to lines where the sense pause is in the fourth foot. Very many lines, especially in the Biblical Epigrams, have a very slight penthemimeral caesura with a strong pause at the bucolic diaeresis. Examples are De Myst.19, St.M.821,842. This lack of coincidence between sense pause and formal caesura is apparently not unique in 12th century poetry. The editor of the Milo of Matthew of Vendôme (La comédie latine au xiie siècle I p.162) remarks 'A une césure prosodique toujours correcte, et que précede une syllabe indifférente, ne correspond, sill'on peut ainsi parler, nulle césure de pensée'. A definite hephthemimeral caesura without trihemimeral is found only once in the Shorter Poems (9.5) but six times in the Biblical Epigrams (2.2; 5.5; 11.9; 21.2; 38.2; 45.5). Moreover, without exception, the lines which have awkward caesuras or no caesuras at all are in the Biblical Epigrams. We find four lines with trihemimeral caesuras supported by strong bucolic diaeresis (42.3; 53.12; 60.6; 65.2), three with trihemimeral caesura only (7.3; 14.4; 46.1), three with trihemimeral weak caesura (1.3; 45,2,4) and seven without any caesura at all (2.3; 12.7; 25.4; 26.1; 35.2 and 3, though there is perhaps a slight pause after 'opus'; 53.6). It is thus quite clear that the Biblical Epigrams are, metrically speaking, below the level of the other poems. There are three possible reasond for this; that Hildebert wrote these in his youth; that the difficulty of

the proper names is the reason for postponement or omission of caesuras; or finally that the poems are not Hildebert's, a view which will be discussed in connection with the canon of Biblical Epigrams.

Hildebert, like most of his contemporaries, (cf. the list given by Munari p.52) does not entirely avoid placing words of over three syllables at the end of the hexameter line. The frequency of such endings (254) is 11.6 per cent overall. If we examine the various parts of Hildebert's work we find that in the Shorter Poems there are 50 instances, of which 20 come from poem 39, leaving only 30 for the rest, an average of 6.3 per cent. In the Biblical Epigrams the percentage frequency is 8.1, in De Mysterio 8.3, but in St.Mary 16.1. This last figure is perhaps explained by the leonine hexameter being a more 'popular' and less strictly classical form. Poem 49, written in caudati, also has a comparatively large number (ten) of such endings. It is again noticeable that those poems which admit the licence least are those 'secular' poems which have the greatest affinity with classical poetry in other respects. Hildebert is also sparing in his use of monosyllables at the end of hexameters. We find only two instances in the Shorter Poems (24.5; 36.23), eight in the Biblical Epigrams , two in De Mysterio (67,243) and one in St.Mary (404). Only 4 per cent of Hildebert's pentameters end in words of three syllables or over, and there are three ending in monosyllables (5.2; De Myst. 180,208 sat est). Hildebert seems to avoid ending his verse with a preposition or adverb. Notable exceptions are: adverbs B.E.24.1; De Myst.54,214,275,368,370,387,428,555,606; St.Mary 83, prepositions B.E.36.8;53.5,11; De Myst.269,501,563.

III Rhyme.

Apart from his life of St.Mary Hildebert makes considerable use of rhyme. The shorter rhymed poems do not differ in any respect from St.Mary, and show equal ability as regards technique. More interesting because of its more complicated structure is 39. This poem is prefaced by the only rhythmical lines written by Hildebert outside 55. In the rest of the poem the modes of the rhyme change continually,

so that it is tempting to see in this poem an early attempt on Hildebert's part at that highly developed kind of rhymed hexameter which appears in St.Mary. Part IV is composed entirely of caudati. Part II begins with four unrhymed hexameters. Then in lines 5 and 6 we have trinini salientes with iambic rhyme a a b / c c b (Meyer's class III (A) 5.2, p.87). Lines 7-14 are caudati, and then in lines 15 and 16 we have two more trinini of the same type, the rest of this part consisting of caudati. Part III once more begins with unrhymed hexameters, but from line 8 on is written in caudati.

In St.Mary Hildebert varies the monotony of the leonine rhyme in several places. He employs caudati twice (460-471, 546-557). At line 610 there begins a whole series of varied forms. The four lines 610-615 are the only instance in Hildebert of the type of line named by Meyer Tripertiti dactylici caudati. These are verses in which there is internal and end rhyme in the pattern a a b / c c b as in the trinini salientes, but this time the internal rhyme is on the two short syllables of the second and fourth feet, while all the feet except the last are dactyls. (cf.Meyer I.p.88sqq. Section III.10.2). This is the metre used by Bernard of Cluny in his poem De contemptu mundi (ed.Hoskier, London 1929). In the prologue to this Bernard says 'Id enim genus metri, tum dactilum continuum exceptis finalibus trocheo vel spondeo, tum etiam sonoritatem leonicam servans, ob sui difficultatem iam pene, ne dicam penitus obsolevit. Denique Hildebertus de Lavardino, qui ob scientiae praerogativam prius in episcopum post in metropolitanum promotus est; et Wichardus Lugdunensis canonicus, versificatores praestantissimi quam pauca in hoc metrum contulerint palam est. Quorum Hildebertus, dum illam beatam peccatricem Mariam, loquor Egyptiam, exametris commendaret, hoc metro quattuor tantum elaboravit versus. Wichardus vero plus minus triginta in sua illa contra quosdam satyra'.

There is some doubt as to the identity of this Wichardus. Manitius (III.781), following E.Schroeder, Götting.Nachr.,1910,p.339 n.2, regards him as the author of the poem beg.'Sacrilegis monachis' which Böhmer (N.A.22.713, M.G.H., Libelli de lite III.699) assigns

to Serlo of Bayeux. The arguments employed by Schroeder are 1) that 'sacrilegis monachis' is a satire, and a very bitter one at that; 2) that it is about thirty lines long; 3) that it is written in this very uncommon dactylic metre, and that therefore it fits in with the description of the poem of Wichardus mentioned by Bernard so exactly that it must be his. Against this is the fact that Wichard's name is nowhere connected with the poem in the mss., and in fact, as Böhmer remarks, we do not even know who this Wichard was. Schroeder's third argument in particular hardly holds good. It is true that Meyer knew of only two other poems written in this form of hexameter, Misc.49 and 108. The latter is an imitation of Bernard's own poem (cf.p.179), while the author of the former is unknown (cf.Walther, Das Streitgedicht p.134). A third such poem by Pierre Peintre is pr. by Flacius Illyricus, Varia Poemata p.549. The poem cited by Böhmer (p.713) from MS.Vienna Nationalbibl.640 (fol.105^{v}) is a later imitation of 'sacrilegis monachis'. It is thus true to say that there is very little written in this metre which survives. But Bernard may be exaggerating the scarcity of poems written in this metre to give added lustre to his own efforts in this direction.

Unfortunately, Böhmer's arguments for Serlo's authorship are not much stronger than Schroeder's for Wichard. In the three related mss. Digby 65, Vitellius A.XII and Titus A.XX the poem is ascribed to 'Gualo Brito'. Bohmer thinks this may be a corruption of Serlo. Also he proposes to read 'Odo Baiocensis' for 'Hugo Suessionensis' in line 4, on the ground that first of all Odo was corrupted to Hugo on the analogy of the previous line, then as no Hugo Baiocensis was known another scribe rationalized the name by altering it to that of the well-known Hugh of Soissons. But even Böhmer himself has not very much confidence in this argument.

Thus the authorship must remain in doubt, but even if Serlo is the author this does not really tell us very much on the point which is at issue here, namely whether Hildebert is striking out into a new metrical form here. Serlo (b.1050) was almost an exact contemporary

of Hildebert, and might well have copied this peculiar metre from him.

After the dactylici we have trinini salientes again, lines 616-619. From 620-627 we have a form of collaterales, lines rhyming on the last syllable of the second foot and the first syllable of the third, and also on the last foot, with rhyme scheme a b; a b. These differ from those given by Meyer (p.83, division II.1) in that the rhyme in the third foot is only single in 620,1, while in 624,5 the rhyme is on the second syllable of the third and the first syllable of the fourth foot. There are more of these collaterales at lines 674-7, although the internal rhyme is not pure in the last two lines. Lines 678,9 are ordinary caudati. Finally, at 855,6 we have what may be a chance collocation of similar vowel sounds, but may also be an attempt at unisonni, leonines rhyming in pairs a a; a a (Meyer p.84, class II.4)

Meyer (p.79) remarks, quoting Du Meril,'die Dichter der besseren Zeit in den zweiten Fuss der leoninischen Verse nicht gern einen Daktylus setzten'. Only twelve out of Radewin's 131 leonines have a dactyl. Hildebert seems to have no objection to a dactylic second foot, for 19 per cent of his leonines have one. His vowel rhyme is always pure, the single exception being 49,16,17, 18 'Iohannes... perennes'. Some instances where it seems at first sight to be impure throw some light on the pronunciation of Latin in twelfth century France. Examples are comptus... sumptus St.M.95, abscondi... mundi ibid.511. Much the same can be said for the consonants which divide the two vowels in the two-syllable rhyme. These are almost always of similar sound, the apparent exceptions again showing the current pronunciation. Examples are captus... actus St.M.26; sanctum... tantum ibid.60; sumptis... euntis ibid.176; tandem... precantem ibid.421; nupsi... duxi ibid.513 (cf.39.III.12,13,24,25); ipsa... fixa 55.87,88; annus... magnus St.M.789; amnis...-annis ibid.550,551; mecum... equum ibid.474 (cf.25.2); peccat... equat ibid.763, 10.1. There are three examples of versus intercisi, i.e. leonines where the two

syllables which make up the rhyme are in two different words (Meyer p.79): St.M.235,284,404. Quite often, at a loss for a rhyme, Hildebert repeats the first word, or uses some compound of that word: 39.IV. 7,8; 51,19,20; St.M.38,46,134,258,414,415,598,667,772,785,801. This is especially frequent in 55, owing to the difficulty of the theological subject of the early part of the poem.

IV Rhythmical poetry.

The purity of form of Hildebert's only lengthy venture into rhythmical verse has elicited much admiration and raised some doubt as to whether he is in fact the author of a poem , the metrical perfection of which seems rather to belong to the generation of Adam of S.Victor and Abelard. But the trochaic octosyllabic line in which it is written was one of the first metres to be used by the rhythmical poets of the Middle Ages,[8] so that there is no metrical innovation on Hildebert's part.

One respect in which Hildebert differs somewhat from the later writers of rhythmical verse is his rather more frequent admission of hiatus. Meyer (p.275) remarks on the extreme reluctance of the twelfth century poets to employ hiatus, and observes that only one case of hiatus is found for every hundred lines of Adam of S.Victor and Abelard. Even hiatus between the half-lines is avoided by most poets.[9] Hildebert has twelve cases of hiatus in 204 lines, occurring at 1,71,75,83,155,155,156,162,163,194,203. However three of these, at 8,75 and 83, are at the end of the first half-line. Moreover the six which occur between 155 and 194 are all caused by the juxtaposition to an initial vowel of the pronoun tu, which in these cases has an emphatic value, and this may go some way towards explaining them.

Among poems of this period written in trochaic lines of eight syllables taktwechsel is very rare (Meyer I.p.262). At line 54, if we are to take natura and utraque as nominative- the only natural way of construing- then the accent will fall on the antepenultimate of utraque, and so we will be forced to scan the line:

sic utraque stat natura. In the first line of the poem Ω must be pronounced as o. Then we have the taktwechsel:

Alpha et Ω, magne deus.

The only remaining fact to be noted in connection with this poem is Hildebert's complete avoidance of monosyllabic endings.[10]

The other rhythmical poem of Hildebert's now extant is the short preface to 59. This is written in the fifteen-syllable metre (8- ∪ + 7∪ -, or 15 ∪ -), another metre very popular from early medieval times. There is no hiatus, but there is one case of taktwechsel in line five: uniret coniugium. In line seven augerent, a third conjugation verb, should normally be accented augerent. Perhaps Hildebert has fallen into the common error of regarding augeo as a second conjugation verb. It is noteworthy that although all the rhymes are two-syllabled none of them contain the consonant which usually intervenes between the two vowels. Otherwise the poem is on the same technical plane as 55.

metrum

ut augerent / castitatem / nuptiæ sub gratia

nuptiae

Notes

1 See especially C.Mohrmann, Latin Vulgaire, Latin des Chretiens, Latin Medieval, Paris 1955, and 'La langue et la style de la poesie chretienne, Revue des Etudes Latins 25 (1947),pp.280 - 297.

2 These words appear in Du Cange with Hildebert as their only reference.

3 Note that in 50.24 Salomon has the Greek accusative Salomona, cf. Juvencus, Hist.Evang.2.710.

4 Cf. Norberg's detailed study, Beitrage, chapter 8.

5 He also uses the future indicative (16.5). Cf.Stolz p.644.

6 Only a few have had any serious attention paid to their metrical practise by editors and critics. In trying to assess Hildebert's practise as compared with that of other poets who can be loosely termed his contemporaries I have been greatly helped by the introduction of Munari to his edition of Marcus Valerius, and of E.Voigt to the Ysengrimus, also by H.Christensen's Das Alexanderlied Walters von Châtillon, but this is obviously far too small and disparate a selection of authors to give us any real idea of twelfth century usage in general.

7 These figures, and those of other words ending in long vowels do not take into account the syllable before the caesura, which we shall see is often lengthened in any case.

8 Cf.Meyer I.213 sqq.

9 The initial h is treated as a vowel by twelfth century poets. On the other hand, few rhythmical poets made any effort to avoid the juxtaposition of final -am or -em with a following vowel (Meyer 189).

10 Meyer (p.271) notes another t.w. at line 141, citing it as an instance of a monosyllable forming the second unaccented syllable in a dactylic foot. However he is led astray here by Beaugendre's bad text, for the line is perfectly normal, when corrected.

Chapter III

Hildebert and his contemporaries.

The following is not an attempt to write an account of the renaissance of Latin Poetry in France between the middle of the eleventh and the first decade of the twelfth centuries, as this has already been done several times. What we will attempt here is an assessment of Hildebert's place in that renaissance. This can best be arrived at by taking the principal distinguishing features of the school poetry of the time and using these as yard-sticks whereby we can judge how Hildebert compares as a poet with his contemporaries and near-contemporaries.

The poetry of the first seventy years of the renaissance from around 1050 to around 1120, exhibits three main peculiarities, which are also present in varying degrees in the poetry written after this time. These are a close attention to style, with special regard to rhetoric; a tendency to innovation in metres and rhymes; and a strong interest in and imitation of the Classical authors. This account will perhaps serve as a comparison of the authors discussed, but it will also attempt to assess what if any influence the poets had on each other, and in this connection we shall examine any possibilities of actual borrowing of phrases or ideas as between the various authors.

Of these authors we are naturally concerned especially with the trio of Hildebert, Marbod,[1] and Baudri, but we have also taken account of Fulcoius of Beauvais, Godfrey of Reims and to a lesser degree Serlo of Bayeux.[2]

There is however one very characteristic feature of this revival which belongs not so much to the poetry as to the men who wrote it. This is the phenomenon of the literary circle, which is itself bound up with the re-appearance of the literary epistle. Brinkmann (Liebesdichtung, pp.4,5) traces in a masterly fashion the development of the literary epistle through Merovingian, and Carolingian times, and gives a vivid picture of the exchanging of poems within the narrow circle of the Carolingian court poets. The number of people who took part in the literary activity of the end of the 11th century was larger than that of the Carolingian Renaissance, but one suspects that though the ability and desire to read poetry was more widespread in the later period, not many more people actually wrote it. The poetry of this period seems to be limited, with some exceptions, to the area of Northern France. Specially prolific in poets appears to have been the Loire valley, Normandy, and the court of Manasses at Reims, although the Norman clergy of England also played their part. The general revival

of learning at this period derived from the cathedral schools, of which many were of a mediocre kind, while a few rose to greatness for a few years under some distinguished teacher. Such was the school of Reims under Herimann, Bruno and Godfrey. Thus the poets of this time were the products of a few schools, lived fairly near each other, and as we shall see, were mainly church dignitaries who had frequent dealings with one another. As will be seen in the following account, the ecclesiastical world of the eleventh century was a very small one, and we meet the same names time and time again. These conditions then were such as to produce little groups of poets who read and criticized each other's work. There was also among some at least of the members of these circles a revival of what may be called the "cult of friendship," the deliberate cultivation of friendship for its own sake and the writing of letters expressing or seeking for the same. This we see especially in Baudri's poems, but perhaps it is not as typical as Brinkmann imagines.

It is interesting to note the rank and status of the men who formed these literary coteries. In some contrast to the poets of the following generations who were for the most part solely schoolmasters, these were men who through their position as teachers in the cathedral schools attained to some dignity in the church. Thus

Marbod, Hildebert and Godfrey, all at one time teachers in cathedral schools, ended their careers as an archbishop, bishop and chancellor respectively. Baudri was first abbot of an important monastery, then archbishop of Dol, while Fulcoius was archdeacon of Meaux.

It is Baudri who furnishes us with the amplest evidence of the exchange of literary epistles, and indeed for all of the characteristics of the literary revival. But we must treat him as somewhat exceptional, in view of his notorious scribendi cacoethes. He is continually sending his poems to people, some of whom he scarcely knows, and asking for their poems in return. Thus he writes to Marbod (148.5) complaining that though they have talked with each other frequently, they have never exchanged poems. He has come upon some of Hildebert's poetry and writes to him (149) sending some of his own poems. He asks the poetess Muriel of Wilton to begin an exchange of letters (199), and says that if Gerald will write to him, he will write to Gerald (235.7,8).[3] He asks Godfrey of Reims to spare even a day in which to read the poems he is sending (161.32). Godfrey apparently does so, and promises to send some of his own poems, but a year passes and Baudri upbraids him for not replying (162). Again, he is frustrated by Bernerius (176) who has kept the poem which Baudri sent him without returning it. Hildebert too does not seem to have replied to Baudri's poem. We might gain

5

the impression that Baudri was a garrulous monk, continually writing to people who as often as not ignored him, but this sending of poems in the hope of starting a literary exchange is common to most of his contemporaries. Several of these now totally unknown to us send Baudri their poems, a fact which would seem to show that he was recognized as one of the masters of the craft, at any rate within a limited circle of monks and nuns. Thus we hear (231.6) that Galo has read some of Baudri's poems andhas now sent some of his own; Stephen, apparently a close friend, sends him a poem on a mole (152.22)'Cum mihi de talpa Naso novus recitas'). Robert has asked earnestly that Baudri should write to him, and return poem for poem (229.17,18). Even someone whom Baudri scarcely knows has sent poems (45.2 'vix scio cui debet pagina nostra vale.'). Then we have the curious letter allegedly written by Odo, but one suspects really by Baudri (242), in which Odo says that he has read Baudri's poetry and sends (1.23) "haec mea saepe tibi trivialia carmina." Rivallo sent verses to Marbod (Var I.22). Muriel also has sent her poems to Hildebert (37.15), though from the end of that poem it would appear that they had some kind of previous acquaintance.[4]

The idea in sending one's poems to another poet was not merely that he should read them, but that

he should criticize them, correct them and add polish. Thus Baudri (148.22) asks Marbod for criticism and asks

'Tu decus esto mei castigatorque libelli,
Gibossamque struem lima compesce fideli.
Tu tempestiva rimas infunde litura,
Et studio toto mutilum suffire memento.'

To Muriel (199.44) he says

'Divitis ingenii tibi copia dives abundat
Quo potes erratus attenuare meos.'

to Pagamus (II.48) 'Tu castigator codicis esto mei.' and to Gallus (31.23) 'Erratos nostros medicanti corrige dextra.' Marbod in his letter to Walter (Var II.33.17) says, speaking in the person of his poem:

'Si quid inurbane, si quid non dixero plane,
Judicio vatis fiam rea rusticitatis.
Huius censura dabitur mihi multa lâtura.'

It was no doubt with the same intent that Reginald of Canterbury hopefully sent his Malcus to Hildebert. The communications between Hildebert and Clarembaldus, canon of Exeter or Hexham have some bearing on this practice of correction. In Epist.III.3 we hear that Clarembaldus has sent Hildebert a copy of his Miracula ecclesiae Exoniensis "ut miracula quae in Exoniensi Ecclesia Dominus operari dignatus est juxta fidem destinati mihi exemplaris adnotare non taederet." Not only had Hildebert neglected to do this, but he had mislaid the manuscript. After

many recriminations on thepart of Clarembaldus the book was found, but by this time Clarembaldus had sent a second copy, whose text was slightly different to that of the first. What exactly was Clarembaldus asking Hildebert to do here? From the quotation given above and from Hildebert's final words "In his quae iuxta primum exemplar edideram, nil addere decrevi, nil demere, nil mutare," it would appear that he is correcting the text on a large scale, rather than copying the poem into another manuscript. This together with the re-writing or re-editing of the poem by Clarembald throws an interesting light on the manner of composition of the minor poets on the fringe of a literary coterie.

Despite this apparently close and thorough re-polishing it would appear that poets seldom got the kind of criticism for which they were looking. Thus Baudri (231.87) says of Galo's appraisal of his poems

"Haec laudando tamen speculatus ad astra tulisti,
Sed tua me multum iuvit amicitia :
Vere multus amor plus quam res favit amico."

He complains too that Emma is not criticizing his verses impartially but praising them (215.1-16). Marbod writing to Walter (Mar.II.34) says,

"Nam quod me celebras, illustrans luce tenebras,
Carmina diffundi perhibens mea per loca mundi,
Plus ideo dicis, verbis ut ducar amicis,
Quam quod sit verum, nisi fallor pondere rerum."

In point of fact it is a tradition in these literary epistles, that the poet's own poems should be deprecated, while those of the person addressed should be lauded to the skies. Usually he is compared to one or more of the classical poets. So Baudri tells Godfrey of Reims (161.5-12) that the gravitas of Vergil and the levitas of Ovid lives on in him, and enters upon a long list of self-deprecatory comparisons, while of Hildebert he says "Es nobis visus, nisi fallor, magnus Homerus" (149.18). Marbod writing to Hildebert (Var.I.11.1) says:

"Dum tua scripta legens oculos ad nostra reduco,
E coelo terras videor spectare iacentes."

We see then that one of the factors which went to make up the literary circles was the mutual exchange of poems. But an equally important part was played by the small group of patrons to whom and for whom these poets wrote. The two earlier poets, Godfrey and Fulcouis, are in a very real sense protégés of Manasses, archbishop of Reims, deposed in 1080; To his favour Godfrey owed his position as scholasticus at Reims[5] and Fulcouis followed him to Rome after he had been deposed. A somewhat similar patron of the arts was Odo of Bayeux, who despite his greed and worldliness seems to have had a genuine desire to foster poets among his entourage. Ord. Vitalis It was he

who assisted Serlo after he had lost everything in the capture of Bayeux, and who took his part in the law suit with abbot Gillebertus of Caen. Marbod's poem II.32 is addressed to an Odo who was both Bishop and count. Bulst points out that Odo as well as being bishop of Bayeux was count of Kent. Moreover he plausibly identifies (p.183) the William, Thomas and Samson of II.14 with William de Ros of Fecamp, Thomas, archbishop of York, and Samson of Worcester, also addressed by Marbod (I.21). These three men are mentioned by Ordericus as "discipuli" of Odo, and the French ecclesiastical world of the time being a small one it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that these are indeed Marbod's friends.

But at a time when the lay nobility had not the leisure to indulge in literature,[6] it was natural that the ladies of the royal and ducal households should play the part of patrons. The family most prominent in this respect was that of William the Conqueror and more especially his daughter, Adela, who married Stephen, count of Blois and Chartres, and acted as regent while her husband was absent on crusade, and after his death retiring to the convent of Marcigny in 1122. Speaking of her while she was still unmarried Godfrey of Reims tells of how his friend Ingelrann had written poems in her honour, and himself takes the opportunity of singing

her praises (poem I). It is to Adela that Baudri dedicates his long encyclopedic poem 196, and in fact the framework on which the information therein contained is hung is a description of Adela's bedroom; the tapestry depicting (amongst other subjects) the Norman conquest of England; the ceiling with representations of the constellations and signs of the zodiac, the mosaic mappa mundi; and the statues representing the seven liberal arts. Of her patronage of the arts he says:

"Versibus applaudat, scitque vacare libris.
Haec etiam novit sua merces esse poetis,
A probitate sua nemo redit vacuus." (38-40).

He tactfully reveals the purpose behind this long poem when he remarks near the end (line 1356)

"Cartula nuda venit, quia nudi cartula vatis
Da nudae cappam, sique placet tunicam."

Apparently nothing came of this for Baudri has to write another poem (197) repeating his request. Hildebert's relations with Adela were of a more personal kind. His sole poetic epistle to her (15) is full of courtly flattery which says very little. But in the prose letters which he addresses to her (I.3,4,5,6,10, III.2, 8) we see him as her friend and adviser. Thus, while she is acting as regent for her absent husband he praises her rule, and inculcates the virtue of clemency (I.3). The letter (III.8) asking for a safe conduct through her

domains also belongs to this period. Most interesting for us is the short letter in which he asks her for a chasuble ('planeta' III.2). This brings to mind Baudri's similar request, but Hildebert's is hardly so tactfully put.[7] The remaining letters are "letters of direction," giving advice to Adela, now a nun at Marcigny, on how to combat the dangers of self-complacency and worldly lust.

Another of William's daughters was Cecilia, who became abbess of the Holy Trinity at Caen in 1113. We have a letter to her from Baudri (198), and indeed it would be hardly right to view her as a patroness in the same sense as Adela, for apart from her birth and connections she was on the same plane as Emma, Beatrice and others of Baudri's female correspondents. It is as such that he addresses her, and after the usual paying of compliments, he asks her to greet a certain nun of her convent whose name he has forgotten but whose fame has reached his ears. If we are to trust the testimony of our manuscript K, Hildebert wrote his poem 46 to this same Cecilia, and here again the entire poem is taken up with a display of flattering epideictic rhetoric. It is tempting to identify, as does Miss Abrahams, either Cecilia or Adela with the daughter of William the Conqueror who was taught by Arnulf, the future patriarch of Jerusalem.[8]

William's son Henry Beauclerc married in 1100 Matilda, daughter of Malcolm Canmore, king of Scotland. She had been educated among the nuns of Wilton and Ramsey, and William of Malmesbury gives us a picture of her court thronged with versifiers (Gesta Regum, ed.Stubbs II.494): "Inde, liberalitate ipsius per orbem sata, turmatim huc adventabant scholastici tum cantibus tum versibus famosi; felicemque se putabat qui carminis novitate aures mulceret dominae."

Of all the poets with whom we are dealing Hildebert is the only one to write to Matilda, and no doubt this is partly due to his firm friendship with Henry. His two longer poems to her (35,37) are once again mere accumulations of compliments which do not tell us as much about their relations as do the four prose letters addressed by him to her. From III.12 we gather that Mathilda has been a benefactor to the church of Le Mans ("Ad altare quippe Domini tua me comitatur memoria, timentem ne mihi cedat ad iudicium, si eo interventu te defraudo, quem beneficus regina comparasti."). In I.9 Hildebert thanks Mathilda for the gift to the church of a pair of candelabra. This seems to hint at the sort of extravagant generosity in which according to William of Malmesbury the queen indulged.

Muriel, the poetess of Wilton, does not fall into the category of patroness. She is much more like Cecilia or the type of learned nun to whom Baudri writes. But like the patrons already mentioned she is the focus of literary epistles from several of our poets. Her life and literary associations have already been investigated thoroughly,[9] so it will be necessary to give only a brief account here. We have directed to her, Hildebert's no.26, the equally courteous poem of Baudri (199), and the curious effort of Serlo (Wright p.240). This can hardly be described as a literary epistle, as it rapidly degenerates into a long disquisition on the disadvantages of marriage. Just as the poets of the late twelfth century tended to be men of less importance, so the patron meant much more to them than to these earlier writers. No doubt Hildebert might hope to influence Henry through Matilda, or ingratiate himself with Adela who possessed considerable temporal power. In the main, however, the writer did not, like the later Archpoet or Hugh Primas, seek protection or sustenance from the patron. When they ask for anything at all it is not for the necessities but for gifts like Baudri's 'cappa' and Hildebert's 'planeta'. Likewise when Hildebert visited Roger of Sicily, whom he lauds in 41, he brought home

nothing for himself, but rather ornaments for his church. Serlo of Bayeux is indeed an exception to this to some extent, and it seems clear that Fulcoius too was dependent on Manassos for he says (26.68) "Cum tua sint, Manases, mea bracte, fibula, pelles". He tells us candidly that at the beginning of his career as poet he sent a copy of his poems to Reims, and another to Rome in an attempt to obtain patronage for himself.[10] Probably his letters to William the Conqueror and Richer of Sens (11 and 14) were similar efforts to attract patrons. Hildebert, Marbod and Baudri did not need to resort to such methods because by ~~the~~ reason of their position they came in contact with a wide variety of rulers temporal and spiritual.

One feature of these poems deserves mention here although it may seem to have little connection with what we have been saying. This is the insistence of the poets that the person to whom they are writing is going to be rendered famous for all time by their verse. This is of course a motif going back to classical times, and indeed not a few of the instances in our poets are influenced by Horace's "Exegi monumentum aere perennius." (Odes III.30.1-5 cf. Fulcoius 26.22). So in a sense it may be regarded as a purely formal feature to be taken with the excessive adulation of the subject

and self-abasement of the writer. But the authors make the claim so emphatically that they must be taken seriously. Thus Baudri says of Godfrey (161.113) "Te quoque quandoquidem potes aeternare tuosque." To Maiolus he says (179.3,4):

"Te si quid valeat mecum mea musa perennet,
Te quoque perpetuis perpetuet titulis."

and to Adela (197.7): "Te quoque maiorem formabunt carmina nostra". Fulcoüis sets the idea out rather differently when he says (26.14):

"Heroes prisci vivunt rebus bene gestis,
Et bene gesta quidem dumtaxat carmine vivant,
Carmina per vatem: Manases, tu carmine vate
Vives, mandatis istis geminis bene gestis."

His repeated assertion that he is going to build a triumphal arch for Manasses has in it something of the same idea. In talking of his friend Odo, and of his ability as a poet, Godfrey of Reims says of his writing (II.117): "Seu libeat laudum titulis attollere quemquam
Et studeat vite tempora longa dare."

Serlo, after describing Odo of Bayeux's kindness to him after the sack of that town says:

"Reddam thesaurum qui gemmas vincit et aurum,
Qui famat, servat, laudesque merentis acervat,
Dans infinitam post mortis tempora vitam."

(De capta Baj. civitate. Wright II, p.251.8).

This belief in the immortalizing power of their own verse is surely a characteristic of every poetic revival. If poets consider themselves only as feeble successors of a great past, as pygmies mounted on giants' shoulders, to use John of Salisbury's much quoted metaphor, then there is no possibility of their writing anything approaching good poetry.

Style

Perhaps that which is most obviously characteristic of the poetry of the eleventh and twelfth century renaissance is the style, for it is in this period that the rhetoric of silver age Rome is revived and invades style on a large scale. This rhetoric may be overemphasized by modern critics, but it is without doubt one of the most important elements which were consciously introduced into verse which had pretensions to stylistic elegance. There are clearly two ways in which Roman rhetoric penetrated to this period. First of all there were the textbooks used in the Cathedral schools. Of these the most important appears to have been the Epistola ad Herennium. Faral has shown that Matthew of Vendome and the other writers in his collection used chiefly the Ad Herennium, and to a lesser degree Horace's Ars Poetica. We can safely say that as early as the

third quarter of the 11th century, when Hildebert was a student at the Cathedral schools, it was the usual text-book. Marbod, presumably while teaching at Angers, versified the exempla from that part of Book IV which deals with the figures of speech.[11] The technical treatises of Cicero on rhetoric were also used, while his De Oratore and Orator, together with Quintilian, appear to have been somewhat neglected.

The second way in which Roman rhetoric came to the writers of the 11th and 12th centuries was through the close study in the schools of poets like Ovid, Lucan and Statius, not so much in the study of rhetoric proper but as examples useful in the teaching of grammar, within the scope of which rhetoric seems to have been usually included (cf. Lesne p.597). This ties in with the way in which these medieval poets show themselves influenced by the classics, for obviously we shall find more of the ornaments of rhetoric in poetry which is inspired by Ovid or Statius than elsewhere.

The element of rhetoric included in the works of poets with whom we are dealing is thus drawn from both sources and includes both the conventional ornaments of the theorists, and also the balance, antitheses and epigrammatic quality of the Silver Latin poets. A third ingredient which is more concerned with the subject matter than style is derived both from the rhetorical

theorists and from the progymnasmatists, the writers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D. who set out the preliminary exercises required for the practice of rhetoric. This is the descriptio, the technique of describing certain defined objects such as cities, countryside, beautiful boys or girls, or brave rulers. Not only were there certain subjects suitable for description, but there were fixed characteristics of the subject to be described in a fixed order.[12]

To deal first with the figures of speech and thought, it may be remarked generally that a few of these figures are used with varying frequency by these poets, while the majority, being more suitable to forensic than epideictic oratory, are ignored or little used.

Hildebert uses the following figures:

1) Repetitio and conduplicatio (Ad Herennium IV.13.8,28.5).[13]

17.9-10; 18.6-8; 36.7-9; 37.15,17,18,23,25,27,29; 49.7; 50.7,9,11,13,15; 51.18,19; 55 (Many instances.

In the first part at least, the repetitio is due rather to desire for antithesis and the necessities imposed on the language by the doctrine). St Mary 40,556.

Conduplicatio 22.15,63,82,83; 36.5; 41.12,13.

2) Apostrophe (Exclamatio. Ad Herennium IV.15.9).

Fortune 22.15,86; Rome 36.1; Anglia 37.1; Sara 39 III.10

Christ 45.19; St. Mary 144; Zosimas St.Mary 177.

But of these only the instances in 36,37,22 are important, and some of the others may be dictated by the metre. This is certainly the case with the apostrophe of Jewry De Myst.89 and of Judas De Myst 115.

3) Rhetorical Question (Interrogatio. Ad Herennium 15 (p.130).1).
25.3,4; 38.33-5; 47.4,6; St.M. 822,3.

4) Sententia (Ad Heremnium 17.4).
4, 11, 14, 22.19-30, 44. St. Mary abounds in sententiae, and many lines from St. Mary are to be found in the collection of proverbs edited from St. Omer MS. 115 by B. Voigt, Roman. Forsch. 6 (1888) pp.558-574.

5) Gradatio (Ad Herennium 25.19). 18.17.

6) (Tropes) a) Simile (Imago. Ad Herennium 49.21):
St Mary 1, 27, 34, 86, 502.
b) Metaphor (Translatio. Ad Herennium 34.28):
49.3,7,9,15,16; 51.4,13,14 (all biblical metaphors);
St. Mary 57,58,312,326,331,498,9,758,798.

7) Metonymy (Denominatio. Ad Herennium 32.5). The examples of this in Hildebert cannot be considered as stylistic ornaments, as they are merely conventionalized synonyms for the objects they represent. Thus, cancer St. M. 640, Hymen 39 III.36, Lieus De Myst. 103, Phebus St. M. 183.

8) Exaggeration (Superlatio. Ad Herennium 33.8). 22.53; but mostly found in eulogies of the living or the dead. Thus 18.9,10,16,39-41; 26.9-12; 41.1.

9) Personification (Conformatio. Ad Herennium 53.11) where the object personified actually speaks; Natura 1.2; 18.36; 37.8-34; the dead mother of Matilda 35.21; Rome 38 throughout. Where the object personified does not speak: pudor 18.33; virtus 37.20; natura 46.7-10; the ring sent to the bishop of Bayeux 54.

I have deliberately left until the end the figures of membrum and articulus (Ad Herennium 19,21), for Hildebert's use of these is particularly interesting. According to the definition of the Ad Herennium, the membrum is a short phruse which is taken up by one or more parallel phrases. Thus "et inimico proderas et amicum laedebas, et tibi non consulebas" is the example given. Examples of this in Hildebert are: 22.7,8,9; 49.22; 50.9,23,24,43; St. Mary 99-101.

The membrum in itself is not unusual even in classical oratory or poetry. Indeed such antithetical and parallel phrases are as common in Cicero as in Hildebert. But the related construction of articulus is not so favoured by the Roman orators or poets. The articulus consists of a number (unspecified by the Ad Herennium) of words in the same case and written asyndetically list fashion. Thus Ad Herennium loc.cit.

gives as an example of articulus "Inimicos invidia, iniuriis, potentia, perfidia, sustulisti." Obviously we must distinguish such deliberate asynđeton from asyndeton which is the result of chance, the necessities of the metre, or the incapacity of the writer. Even the juxtaposition of three words asyndetically may not be intentional on the part of an author, though obviously, if we know the tendencies of a particular author in that direction we may suspect that this is the case.

We cannot doubt but that the following instances of articulus in Hildebert are intentional: 9.1; 22.60; 46.15; 50.2,16; 51.5,6; St. Mary 41,43,85,91,92,107,110, 145,807.

As we shall see this is not exceptional for his time. However, this "grammatical" kind of style, as Brinkmann calls it, does not stop at articulus. The next step after the articulus is to write 2 or more verses of articuli in such a way that the words of the first verse construe with the corresponding words in the following verse or verses, son that one construes down rather than along. An example of the later extreme development of this style is the following poem by Pierre Riga on the Nativity (Migne 171 col.1390):

Natus, casta, nitens, exultans, perfidus, emptus,
Rex, virgo, sidus, angelus, hostis, homo,
Quaerit, nescit, dat, declarat, perdit, adorat,
Nos habem, lumen, gaudia, iura, Deum.

The instances found in Hildebert are much milder than these, and yet are of themselves sufficiently jarring, breaking up as they do his normally smooth style. They are as follows: 22.3-6,9,10,35-38; 30.3-4; 36.11,12, ~~23,24~~; 50.19,20,41,42; 52; Stm Mary 146,7. There also appears a kind of half-rapportati where the two parallel sets of words are found in the same verse, not in two succeeding verses. Thus: 49.12; 50.21,66.

A feature of silver Latin rhetoric which is not expressly set out in the rhetorical treatises is that love of point or epigram and conc~~e~~it which finds its fullest expression in Lucan's Pharsalia. There is much of this in Hildebert, in fact rather more, as we shall see, than in his contemporaries. He often combines this with antithesis, another feature of his style. Good examples of this epigrammatic quality are: 36.23,24; 27,28; 29,30; 33,34,37,38; 38.7; 50.12; 54.7,8; 46.10; 37.17; 26.28; 48.8. Poems which are in themselves epigrams and where this quality is at its highest are 7,8,9,24,43,47.

Of the descriptio there is very little evidence in Hildebert. The only clear instance is the description of the storm in 22.47-60.

This then is the rhetorical element in the style of Hildebert. Before comparing his style to that of his contemporaries, we should note that much of this rhetoric

is found in a limited number of poems. Even in the shorter poems there are many written in a plain style and these generally appear to be those with a religious, biblical or allegorical subject. Most of the examples given above come from the epitaph on Berengarius, the two poems on Rome, together with 22 and 50, and the courtly epistles 15, 26, 35, 37, 41, 46. It appears to be a general rule among these poets that the style is influenced by the subject.

Godfrey of Reims is a good example of this. His style suits his subject in that it is smooth, flowing, and, one suspects, more closely modelled on Ovid than Hildebert's. But there are practically none of the rhetorical devices mentioned above. There is repetitio, but of a rather singular kind whereby Godfrey repeats whole phrases and lines with a slight change.[14] There are two definite and one possible line of articuli (II.259, III.437, II.87) and in III we have instances of verses made up of an asyndetical row of verbs similar to those encountered sometimes in St. Mary (III.135,141, 425). We have some rhetorical point and conceit (I.131-4, II.225,6, IV.24), and the rhetorical exaggeration of the virtues of the subject of the poem appears (II.89), together with self-abasement (I.140) and Curtius' 'incapability topos.' But there is nothing like the amount

of rhetoric we find in Hildebert.

Perhaps the reason for this may be seen in the words which Godfrey uses to describe the kind of style at which he aims (II.101-110):

'Nil illic quod corda oneret, quod pregravet aurem,
Quodque supervacuum iure vocetur opus.
Aspera, difficilis obscenaque dictio longe,
Scriptaque qui vitiet turpis hiatus abest.
Nam lepido, facili pronoque fluentia lapsu
Nil in se linguam quod remoretur habent.
Postremo veteri sic sunt impressa moneta. . . .
Ut rear antiquos nondum occubuisse poetas,
Et superesse modo secula prisca putem.'

This would seem to indicate that he regards as ideal a plain, flowing style without rhetorical ornaments to check its flow. Besides, the fact that he modelled his style so closely on that of the ancients would mean that although some of the rhetoric used in those poets might well appear in Godfrey, we need not expect him to make any experiments in this direction.

We may say much the same for Fulcoius. Again there are some articuli and membra (IX.134,135, XIII.5), but apart from annominatio (I.27, II.8, V.169, XVIII,58,59), and one descriptio (X.176-189), there appears to be little by way of rhetorical ornament. In fact there is

less rhetoric in the 2000 lines of Fulcoius than the 1000 lines of Godfrey.

The chief characteristic of Baudri's style is its smoothness and clarity. In his epistles we find the same kind of easy style as appears in the literary epistles of Hildebert and Godfrey. He makes some use of rhetoric, but not to the vast extent which Miss Abraham's section on style would suggest. In this (XXX-XXXVI) she tabulates all the occasions on which she thinks that Baudri has introduced the figures of speech and thought. But if one investigates her list of instances of repetitio it becomes clear that about three-quarters of the instances cited by her are pure co-incidence, in which a word is repeated in the same line or the next quite by chance and without any premeditation on the part of the poet. Such is the case with 30.1; 35.1; 36.5,6: to take a few instances from the beginning of the list. Likewise it is not abnormal in Latin for a word to be repeated in the same line or the next with a change of case. But the editor has listed every such chance occurrence as traductio or annominatio. Many of the examples of annominatio appear also under repetitio: e.g., 36.1-3; 31.2-4; 37.43. Of the other ornaments there are comparatively few instances in such a large body of verse: eleven instances of apostrophe, five of

sententia,[15] one of gradatio[16] (42.70). There are around two dozen instances of metaphor or simile[17]. Though he writes so many courteous epistles to friends of both sexes Baudri makes surprisingly little use of the descriptio. There are descriptions of a young girl (238.56), of a boy (38.7), of a storm (236.1-6), of a country scene (188.25 sq., 191.7 sq.). This appears to be all. More frequent is personification, and as with Hildebert Natura is the most popular subject.[18] There is also some apostrophe: 47; 58.13,14; 59.1; 88.5; 91.1-4; 136.36,7,[19] but none of these examples are very striking except the first. Baudri appears to be as sparing as Godfrey in his use of membra and articuli. Most of the instances cited by Miss Abrahams are membra, and nearly all the articuli given by her consist of lists in the long encyclopedic poem addressed to Adela (196).[20] Again, considering the vast output of Baudri's verse, the instances of the "Ad Herennium" type of rhetoric are comparatively few.

Marbod's style varies like Hildebert's. In the more didactic and religious poems it is plain, without the brevity and compression characteristic of similar poems by Hildebert. But in what may be called the lighter "secular" poems, and in the Liber Decem Capitulorum figures of speech make their appearance. Marbod, as

befits the versifier of the Ad Herennium exempla, appears to use a more varied range of these than Hildebert. Thus we find:

repetitio	Var II.4.29,30 'tam bona' etc.; Decem cap.III.29-32.
gradatio	Decem cap.III.61.
ratiocinatio	Decem cap.V.49,50.
conversio	Decem cap.VI.74-7.
contentio	Bulst 22 (Werner, Beiträge p.5, item 6, ll.5-9).

Bulst 23.14-16 may be said to show a kind of word-play, though not falling strictly within the scope of the annominatio of the Ad Herennium. In Marbod too we see rather more frequent use of the articuli. Almost all of these are so striking as to leave no doubt but that they are the result of premeditation. They occur at Var I.33,6,7; II.2.7; II.29.11; Decem cap.V.124-5; VII.66,67,73; VIII.43; St. Maurelius 1638 B.3. There is, however, no instance of rapportati.

Marbod is not at all given to epigram or point. However we find several descriptions of women and boys in a rather condensed form in Var.I.16,1-6, II.4, Bulst no.37 (p.291), 21 (cf. l.21 of this poem with Var.II. 4 l.4). A beautiful youth is described Bulst 38 (p.292) ll.10-14, and a repulsive boy Bulst 20 (Werner, Beiträge

p.7, item 9, l.13 sq.). The description of Spring (Var II.2) might also be regarded as a development of the common topos, but the poet does not linger over it, and goes on to describe the other seasons in a general sort of way. As with Godfrey Marbod gives us a useful description of his own aims in style (Liber Decem Cap. I). As we shall see later, this owes much to Horace's Ars Poetica, but most of the views expressed appear to be really those of Marbod himself. Much stress is laid in the literary histories on Marbod's repenting of the frivolous themes of his earlier verse[21]. But equally important with "Tum quia materies inhonesta levisque videtur," is "Tum quia dicendi potuit modus aptior esse."[22] He is not satisfied with the style which he has previously used apparently because of its lack of ornament, for he says "Restat, ut in reliquum iam cautior esse laborem,

Ne quid inornate, vel ne quid inutile promam."

and "Ergo diversos scriptis adhibere colores,

Et variare stilum, plus laudis habere putamus"

(34,35). Both these examples show the influence of Horace, but we may take it that Marbod really meant what he said, from the fact to be noted later that just as he condemns in this passage his use of rhyme, so no rhyme appears in the Decem Capitula. Now it will be noticed that more of the figures of rhetoric appear in the Decem Cap. than

in his other (and probably earlier) poems. So we may argue that in the matter of style too, Marbod means what he says. In short he is deliberately changing from his former plainer style to a style which while not over-loaded ("ergo tenendo modum mediocris ubique figurae") will have more ornament.[23] Now we shall see that most of the passages in Hildebert and Marbod which are closely similar are in this same Liber Decem Capitulorum. It is therefore tempting to think that Marbod's style has been influenced by reading Hildebert's work, so that he has decided to adopt a style rather more like that of the more rhetorical poet.

To sum up this brief account of the differences in style between these poets, Godfrey, Fulcoius and Baudri do not employ very much rhetoric. This may be because they were writing rather earlier than Hildebert, or because they were very strongly influenced by the classics, so that the rhetorical element in their style is slightly different and drawn from the authors rather than the artes. Marbod is half way between these writers and Hildebert, and a great part of what rhetoric there is in his poetry may well have come into it at a late stage. Some of the Dec. Cap. is as late as 1100-1102 so that he might well have been influenced by Hildebert's style.

But most striking of all is the complete absence of the versus rapportati in any of these poets. These are common enough in writers of the succeeding generation like Matthew of Vendôme or Pierre Riga, but as far as one can be sure in the present state of knowledge of the poetry of the time, Hildebert is the first poet of the 12th-century renaissance to use them. The versus rapportati or something very like them appear, as we would expect, in the authors of late antiquity. We find lists of articuli occasionally in the authors of the African Anthology (e.g., A.L. I p.89 no.21 ll.107 sq., 176,177) and in Sidonius, e.g., II.412-4, XXIII.39-44,300-302. Müller in his opusculum "De ludibriis artis" (De Re Metrica, ed.2, pp.576-594) which deals with lusus poetici does not mention the rapportati. But in Sidonius the lists of articuli develop into something very like rapportati in several places (V.556,557, XI.18,19, XIII.17,18). Two instances are XXIII.46

"Lenaeum, Cererem, Palem, Minervam,
spicis, palmite, pascuis, trapetis."

and VII.80-82

'iuberent/ Sylla, Asiagenes, Curius, Paulus,
Pompeius,
Tigrani, Antiocho, Pyrrho, Persae, Mithridati,
patria, regna, fugam, vectigal, vincla, venenum.'

These are almost certainly rapportati. There are probably many more examples hidden among the 5th and 6th century authors. Thus it is clear that Hildebert is merely picking up the thread once more, and not innovating entirely, even supposing him to have been the first twelfth-century poet to use rapportati, though this cannot be satisfactorily proved.

30

Metre.

One of the clearest ways in which we can compare the practice of these poets and assess their influence on each other is by a consideration of their metrical practice. The period from 1050-1150 was above all one of innovation on the metrical side. This was two-fold, consisting of the gradual development of rhythmical verse, and the perfection of the pure two-syllabled rhyme. On the first of these there is not much to say, for our poets, perhaps because of their training in the classical authors, seldom indulge in rhythmical verse. Hildebert wrote in 55 a poem of perfect structure, but in a well-tried metre. Marbod appears to be capable of writing rhythmical verse as well as Hildebert, if we are to judge from his single effort in that medium (Var. I. 6). Indeed in this poem he uses the more difficult rhyme a a a a, though admittedly, over a much shorter distance than Hildebert. Baudri's two poems in honour of St. Samson (246,247) are written in the iambic eight-syllable metre and a curious dactylic eleven-syllable metre respectively. These are competent enough. But the really important question is that of the development of the pure two-syllabled rhyme, and the various forms of rhymed hexameter associated with it. Here there was room for innovation without abandoning

the classical forms. Meyer (Abhandlungen I, pp.278-280) in dealing with the pure two-syllable rhyme of this period remarks 'Doch der reine zweisilbige Reim hatte schon gegen Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts . . . mehrfach Anwendung gefunden.' However, while he is ready to admit that two-syllabled rhyme had its origin in Pre-Carolingian times, yet he does not put its revival and frequent application before 1100. For instance, he cannot believe that a poem of 300 hexameters with almost entirely pure two-syllable rhyme could have been composed in 1075. One cannot help thinking that he is putting the appearance of two-syllabled rhyme about twenty years too late.

It is indeed true that neither Godfrey nor Fulcoius can equal the performance of the later poets in this respect. Godfrey uses the leonine rhyme only in III (dated 1075-1084). There his rhymes are almost all pure,[24] but a good deal of the awkwardness of style and obscurity found in the poem seems to be due to his trying to fit his thoughts and words into the rhyme. Fulcoius seems to have a good control of double-rhyme in leonines, but he does use mono-rhyme, and also drifts in and out of rhyme, a practice which Meyer (p.280) suggests was characteristic of the earlier rhyme. On the other hand Serlo of Bayeux, at least two of whose poems were written around 1080, for all his defects as a poet has a perfect control of the two-syllabled rhyme.

As befits one who was such a close follower of Ovid, most of Baudri's poems are written in elegaics, which like his style are smooth and correct. As we would expect he uses rhyme much more rarely than Hildebert or Marbod. Here again Miss Abraham's examination of Baudri's use of rhyme is very misleading. Without stopping to consider that in Latin it is inevitable that certain common inflections should recur frequently, she lists every occasion on which two lines end with the same syllable as an instance of caudati. The fact that the great majority of her "caudati" have monosyllabic rhyme and are isloated doublets ought to have aroused her suspicions. Besides many of her instances occur in elegaics which would admit leonines but hardly caudati. As it is, if we take the first thirty alleged instances of caudati we find that there is one double rhyme (38.1,2) obviously intentional because isolated, and two double rhymes caused by fortuitous repetition of the same word (32.21,22; 37.122,123). All the rest are mono-rhymes. As far as one can see the same is true for most of the large number of "leonines," a fact first remarked on by Schumann.[25] Taking an average section of Baudri's poetry (nos.29-36) we find that of the forty instances of leonines given by Miss Abrahams under these poems only four (29.1; 31.25; 36.14,88) have two-syllabled rhyme. It might be argued that Baudri was not capable

of continuous two-syllabled rhyme. But poems 49,50,52, 151 are all in caudati, and all successfully double-rhymed, with only one impure rhyme between them.[26] The hymns 246,247 are double-rhymed a a b b with two impure rhymes in the second.[27] In the metrically very varied and intricate 136 the rhyme scheme for the first, third and fifth strophe is a a a b c, for the second and fourth a a a a c, and for the sixth and seventh a a, b b, c, d. The double-rhyme is kept up, but two of the rhymes do not have the consonant between the two vowal syllables.[28] Baudri once uses trinini salientes (205) and it is noteworthy that he did not finish the poem in the metre, and that there are three impure rhymes.[29] Of the examples of caudati ventrini given by the editor only 381-2, 5,6 is a possibility, but here Baudri is not so much intent on making the verses rhyme as on making a play on words which naturally results in this rhyme.[30] The conclusion would appear to be that Baudri is no innovator in matters of rhyme, not because he has not the equipment to be one, but because he has not much inclination, and his imitation of Ovid is against it. When he does attempt rhyme he appears to be almost on the same plane as Marbod and Hildebert.

The striking difference between Marbod and Hildebert is that Marbod in his Varia is far more given to leonines than Hildebert in his Shorter Poems. Yet

for all his fondness for the various kinds of leonine, his application of the two-syllabled rhyme is certainly not any better than Hildebert's, and in fact there are rather more frequent instances of impure rhyme in Marbod. The following are such instances of this as do not seem to be due to textual faults: Var. I.30.19 ('fletus - iuventus'), 28 (denigrant - dealbant); Var. I.47.1, col.1679 c.7 (iter - frequenter), col.1680 B.6 ('dixit - exit'), Bulst no.27 (p.290) l. 6, St. Thais l. 4,13, 33 (col. 1630 c.15), 61 (col.1631 B.12 'vitae - formae'), 69 (gazas - gemmas). Moreover, though he uses so much rhyme, he does not depart very often from the ordinary leonines. His only experiments are trinini sabbntes (Var.I.8, I.26[2](part only)[31], versus interciei (Meyer p.79) (Var.I.13), caudati (Var.I.45), trinini (Meyer p.86) (Var.I.37). We can hardly then think that Hildebert owed any of his skill in rhyme to the older poet. Indeed as we have already hinted, the fact that a mediocre poet like Serlo could produce good two-syllabled leonines would seem to show that by the 1080's it was part of the common stock of poets.

An interesting point which is not however strictly relevant to our subject is the fact that in the "De apto genere dicendi" Marbod not only renounces the subject-matter and style of his earlier poems, but also appears to reject his beloved leonine rhyme. The words

37

"Ergo propositum mihi sit neque lucicra quaedam/ scribere, nec verbis aures mulcere canoris." and "Sed ne, quod prius est, neglecto pondere rerum/ Dulcisonos numeros, concinnaque verba sequamur." can hardly be interpreted in any other way. This impression is reinforced by the complete absence of rhyme in the Liber Decem Capitulorum, of which the "De apto genere dicendi" is the preface. Why did Marbod react against the rhyme which he had used so much? Perhaps the classical influence which is so evident in this first chapter is the reason.[32] He may have been reading the Ars Poetica and been so influenced by it as not only to include many Horatian doctrines in the chapter, but to throw over his favourite verse form.

Classical influence

It would be strange if the poets of the cathedral schools, where so much was taught through the medium of the "auctores", did not show strong traces of being influenced by the classics. That this twelfth-century literary revival was above all founded on an appreciation of the classics has been often stated.[33] So it may be of service to use the influence which the

33

classics had over each author as another way of comparing their work and assessing their value. This classical influence is one of the more variable qualities to be found in our poets. Some are so deeply influenced by the classics that at times their work becomes a cento,[34] while in the case of others, though they are no less deeply steeped in classical literature, this is not so obvious. Thus the amount of classical influence in each poet's work is more a matter of personal choice than the other characteristics which we have discussed. There are several ways in which this classical influence can manifest itself. The most obvious is the appearance in a poet of references to classical mythology, or history, or mention of classical authors by name. But at the same time this is a rather uncertain criterion, for mention of classical poets does not mean that the poet has read them. Often Plato and Homer are brought into a poem to create effect, and who knows how often "Maro" or Horace are similarly introduced without the poet's ever having read them? Similarly certain myths, for example those concerning the Trojan war, were common stock. Most of the pupils of the cathedral schools had probably read their Metamorphoses, which could serve as a quarry for myths common or uncommon. References to Roman history are perhaps a safer indication of the extent of classical influence, for as far as one can judge, the historians

and even the later compilations were not so much read as the small group of favourite poets.

A surer criterion is provided by the study of the imitations and recollections of ancient authors in the actual phraseology of the texts. This can tell us what authors the poet was chiefly influenced by and to what extent he drew on them. Unfortunately this requires detailed analysis, and while this has been carried through for Godfrey and Fulcoius, and for Baudri to some degree, it does not come under the scope of Bulst's work on Marbod. A feature of this period which it shares with the Italian renaissance is that there is some interest in the remains of antiquity and especially in Rome as the former head of the Empire. This fact too can be of service. Moreover the influence which antiquity has over these poets gives rise to a "secular" atmosphere, and proportionately as a poet is so influenced, it becomes more difficult to see any trace of religion in his poetry.

Of all the poets of this period Godfrey of Reims is probably the one most soaked in the classical tradition. With him it is not only a question of frequent allusions to myths or history. The whole subject matter and mechanism of his poems are taken bodily from ancient literature. Thus the idea of II in which Odo appears to him in a dream comes from Ovid Ex Ponto III.3. Moreover

Odo goes on to recite a poem which he has composed on the subject of the Trojan war. Poem IV begins with Godfrey bidding his muse Calliope to go to Hugh of Langres bearing his poems. Calliope refuses but is won over by the promise of a cloak with various scenes embroidered on it. Then follow the various scenes depicted on the cloak: the struggle between Hercules and Cacus; Ganymede out hunting; the rape of Helen and the Trojan war. Poem III, the Satyra de quadam puella virgine, so impressed scholars with its classical style and subject that it has been included in an edition of Petronius.[35] He gives his definition of the ideal kind of poetry in the lines (II.107-110) already quoted:

"Postremo veteri sic sunt impressa moneta
Ut sit visa mihi vera poesis agi,
Ut rear antiquos nondum occubuisse poetas
Et superesse modo secula prisca putem."

It is not therefore surprising that J. R. Williams can find in Godfrey's phraseology extensive borrowing from the classics. From the analysis which he makes (Speculum 22, pp.39-45) we see that Godfrey knew most of Ovid, especially the Metamorphoses, and also used Vergil and to a lesser degree Horace, Statius, and Lucan. He may too have known some of Propertius from anthologies.[36] He mentions Cicero's Catiline, and Quintilian (I.73,91) and also Pliny (II.140).

But far more striking than all this is the completely secular atmosphere of the poems themselves. As Williams aptly remarks "He is intimately acquainted with all the residents of Olympus, but nowhere does he betray even distant acquaintance with Father, Son and Holy Ghost." Moreover his view of the austere monastic life is roundly put in the lines (II.51-56):

'ingl orius erret
Qui de mendaci relligione tumet.
Exulet in silvis taciturnus amarus et asper
Et comes Hircanis tygribus esse velit.
Par hiemi censendus erit Boreeque nivoso,
Gaudia qui dampnat tristiciamque probat.'

His philosophy is that of Horace's golden mean (II.44 'inter utrumque semita').

Hardly less "classical" in outlook is Fulcoius. He seems to have read rather more history than Godfrey or indeed any of his contemporaries. Thus in the 5th poem he deals at length with the struggle between Chosroes II and Heraclius.[37] In VI he speaks expressly about Josephus, and he shows that he is influenced by him throughout XII. Of the more common authors, he seems to be influenced most by Virgil. Colker has noted almost 60 reminiscences of Vergil, and 40 of Horace. About a third of these are from the Odes, which

Godfrey of Reims does not appear to have studied. Ovid takes a comparatively small place, as is the case with Godfrey. There are only 23 allusions, most of them to the Metamorphoses. Apparently we are still on the threshold of the Aetas Ovidiana. Other authors used by Fulcoius are Claudian (Gigantomachia), Juvenal (12 allusions) and Persius. But it is noteworthy that there are a large number of scriptural allusions, and many of the exempla which Fulcoius introduces into his letters are from the Bible.[38] Fulcoius seems to have a well-developed feeling for antiquity. Thus in I.102-109 he expresses finely his feeling for Rome. He says that he will be another Vergil to Henry's Octavian. Not however because Rome has no poets of her own, for Rome will always have poets "dum perstiterit mundi caput inclita Roma." On three occasions (I.93, V.109, XXVI.19) he mentions the figurative erection of triumphal arches. But the clearest expression of his interest in antiquity is his poem on the ruins of the Roman temple at Meaux (IV)[39]. In this Fulcoius tells how a god's head was uncovered near the ruins by a peasant and brought to him to be examined. Reasoning from the name of the place Fulcoius guessed this to be the head of the god Mars himself. But the rest of the poem shows us that Fulcoius is by no means the unreserved admirer of antiquity that we find in Godfrey, for he makes this find the occasion

43

for a series of moralizations of mythology and proofs that the gods of the antique world are not gods at all.

It is no accident that Baudri admired the poetry of Godfrey of Reims, for he is as thoroughly steeped in the classics and their atmosphere as is Godfrey. The classical background is more arresting in Godfrey because there is much less of his work extant, and the machinery which sets his poems in motion is classical. But one has the impression that while Baudri has absorbed his classics just as much as Godfrey, he is of a more independent turn of mind, so that he writes epistles which are in themselves more original, while having a classical style. However, several of his poems depend entirely on the classical world for their subject matter. Thus we have the letter of Florus to Ovid, and Ovid to Florus (159, 160), and letters from Paris to Helen and Helen to Paris (42, 43) inspired by Heroides 16, 17 respectively. In these latter the language and subject matter alike are taken over from Ovid. Also to be noted are the six epitaphs which Baudri devotes to Cicero (217-222). The long fragment moralizing ancient mythology (216) is a paraphrase of Fulgentius, while the encyclopedic part of 196 depends largely on Martianus Capella, and to a

lesser degree Isidore. Moreover, the whole idea and form of the literary epistles which are the backbone of his poetry is a classical, Ovidian one.

In his phraseology he seems to have borrowed heavily from the ancient authors. The instances of such borrowings given by the Editor (intro. XXVIII) by no means exhaust the list as her own notes to the poems show.[40] Naturally Ovid is his ~~fruitful~~ principal source, with Vergil and Horace coming next. There are at least two echoes of Juvenal[41] and one of Persius. Baudri seems to have read Lucan (Cf. 196.388 with Phars. 1.203 and 174.41 "acer et indomitus" with Phars. I.146.). Interesting to note is the poem (173) written about a friend who had borrowed his Ovid without giving it back. Although Baudri had been to Rome several times we do not find very much trace of any strong interest in the visible remains of the classical world. He does refer (37.61) to a "lapis antiqua caelatus graviter arte" in a simile, and talks vaguely about "Romana palatia" (71.1), but this appears to be all. For him the antique world is one of auctores only.

Baudri's poetry too has the secular air of Godfrey's. The majority of his poems do not touch on religious topics, and very few are expressly and entirely written in a religious vein. Baudri himself felt this,

as is clear from one of his best known poems, the "Contra detractores" (36). In this (ll.55-64) he answers those who think that he spends too much time in writing light verse, and that he should either turn to religious subjects or spend him time on his abbatial duties. His reply is that he has written some religious poetry and that in any case he writes only at night or on horseback. But above all, Baudri's religion was of a restrained, reasonable kind. All asceticism or fanaticism is foreign to him. Thus he writes to a young man seeking to dissuade him from the hard life of a hermit (156). An acquaintance who has refused flesh on the Sabbath receives from Baudri a strong invective (139). But perhaps most revealing of all is the poem "De sufficientia votorum suorum" (188). This picture of his life as he would best enjoy it leaves no room for matters spiritual. Indeed the whole tone is materialistic and Horatian.

When comparisons are drawn between Marbod and Hildebert, Marbod is often regarded as the more serious and didactic of the two poets as compared with the more "humanistic" Hildebert. Thus Raby says of him that "he had none of the vigour of Hildebert and little of his feeling for what was finest in antiquity. The didactic tendency drew him: he was a teacher and a moralist,"

while Manitius places Marbod's poems in his chapter on "Didaktik." It is true that many of his poems, especially in the first section of the Varia have an earnest, didactic purpose.[42] But there is a surprisingly large number of poems of a light and even erotic nature, and this is especially true of those edited by Bulst. In these lighter poems Marbod shows that he is influenced by the classics almost as much as is Hildebert. His references to Vergil (Dec. Cap. VI.33) and to Horace (Var. II.4) show that he really has read both authors.[42a] He also appears to have known something of Firmius Maternus, and of the Mathesis rather than the "De Errore," for in his disquisition on astrology he says (Decem Cap. VI.43) "Firmicus infirmis rationibus ista probare/ contendit, cuius michi temata falsa videntur."

Figures of antique mythology are introduced, sometimes rather unexpectedly. Thus the story of Damocles is introduced into a discussion "De bono mortis" (Decem Cap. IX.16). "Deus" is not only replaced by "Tonans" which is normal practice in the Fathers, but by "Jupiter" (Var. II.34.17). This poem is in fact a good illustration of how a poet could shift completely from the Christian to the Pagan world in these school exercises. Similarly we have a light-hearted appeal to "Cytherea" to stay away from his house (Var. I.17.29), and the "puer Cythereus" appears also (Bulst no.25.

Wilm. R.B. 51 p.175 l.3). Perhaps most striking of all because so unexpected is the appearance of the story of Venus and Mars in the middle of the Life of St. Maurilius (col.1658B). When Maurilius burns the heathen temple at Chalonnes, Marbod remarks with relish that Vulcan is now avenging the adultery of Venus and Mars by burning the effigies of both. Like Hildebert in his poem 50 Marbod (Dec. Cap. III.34-46) brings in the usual mixed classical and biblical exempla of the "femina perfida," but a few lines further on he compares women to Charybdis, Circe and the Siren, all encountered by Odysseus on his voyage home.

To note and collect all the instances where Marbod borrows from Classical authors would require a thorough analysis of his poems. The most obvious borrowing is the first of the ten Chapters "de apto genere scribendi," which appears to owe much to the Ars Poetica.[43] Manitius has discovered in the description of the feast in the "De voluptate" of the same work allusions to Aen.2.265, to Martial 6.93.86 in "silotrum" of l.73 and to Horace Ep.1.4.16, 1.139. A thorough investigation of Marbod's text from this angle might well yield a rich harvest of classical allusions. Marbod, like Fulcoius and Hildebert, was interested in antique works of art. In Var. I.59 he tells how while in Rome

he discovered a sapphire vase which he bought, only to have it broken through the carelessness of the carrier. The verse is worth quoting because it shows Marbod in the light of a connoisseur searching in the shops of the portico for "res novas."

The aspect of Hildebert most emphasized and stressed by those who have written about him is his love for and imitation of the classics.[44] Indeed it seems that this aspect is stressed most by those who have only a vague conception of what he wrote, and the words "humanist" or "humanism" serve as a cover for this vagueness. The reason for this emphasis is easy to see. The poems for which Hildebert is known today through the media of anthologies and literary histories are 36, 38, 22, 50 and 55. Of these the first four are precisely those in which the classical influence appears most. If we taken only into account the quantity of his poetry, Hildebert wrote almost three times as much religious poetry as he did secular, and generally speaking there are few signs of classical influence in the religious poems.

Quite apart from this large bulk of 'plain' religious poetry, which we find also in Marbod, it is difficult to assess exactly how much Hildebert owes to the Classics. He is now Radulphus Tortarius, stitching

together phrases from Ovid or Horace, but one who is so deeply imbued with the writings of Ovid or Martial that he can turn out poems so like theirs as to be printed in their editions, without consciously borrowing or imitating many phrases.[45] Thus it is always difficult to say for certain whether he is borrowing from a classical poet in any given place. However an examination of the borrowings cited in the notes will show that he owes most to Ovid. Most of the classical references which I have been able to detect are in the shorter poems, a few in St. Mary, and only a couple in the De Myst. Of these, around sixty are clearly drawn from Ovid, fifteen from Horace, four from Vergil (22.83; 36.20; 37.31; St. Mary 670), four from Lucan (18.25; 36.7,17; St. Mary 439) and one each from Prudentius (38), Claudian (38.19), Sallust (50.64) and possibly Suetonius (41.9). This is unfortunately only a part of Hildebert's debt to the classical authors. I have had time to read Ovid systematically with a view to Hildebertine quotations of him. For the rest I have had to content myself with working from Hildebert's text with the aid of the Dictionaries and lexica of Lucan, Juvenal, Horace, Vergil and Claudian. Obviously then there is a reason for the preponderance of Ovidian quotations, but it seems safe to say that this is not entirely due to my manner of proceeding. More informative are the borrowings from the prose writers, Lucan and Claudian. These show

Hildebert's range of reading.

In his letters[45] he cites Vergil as "doctissimus poetarum" (I.12, col.175), and also quotes "timeo Danaos et dona ferentes" of Aeneid II.49 (II.3.col.210). Ovid he quotes without naming (I.11.col.168 = Remedium 394) as also Horace (I.8.col.160 = A.P. 304). Terence he quotes twice as 'comicus' (II.17.col.226C = Eunuchus IV.6.32 and II.20.col.230. According to Dieudonné the latter = Adelphoe III.4.26, but I have been unable to trace the quotation in Terence), and quotes also 'plenus rimarum sum' of Eunuchus I.2.25 (III.5). The comic characters Menedemus and Thraso also appear. Of the prose writers Seneca is cited by name with a quotation (I.3.col.145, III.35.col.309A). Epictetus (I.12. col.176.D.7) and Symmachus (III.8.col.289) are both quoted, the first being referred to only as 'philosophus'.[46]

Besides these citations, quotations and borrowings from the ancient authors it is also true to say that Hildebert took the ancient forms as models for his own original poems. The most striking example of this is in the genre of epigram. The poems 7, 8, 9, 19, 43, 47 are all epigrams. Of these, three (7, 9, 47) have at various times been considered worthy of a place in editions of Martial, and 19 has appeared in the Anthologia Latina. Indeed the quality of the poems is far

above that of Godfrey of Winchester, who also tried to follow Martial, but with less happy results. The other classical genre which Hildebert practises is the elegaic epistle/so beloved by Baudri, (Nos. 15, 26, 35, 37, 41, 46) and here too he is successful in achieving a smooth, polished style.

Hildebert does not introduce any piece of classical myth or history which shows him to have read other than the normal "curriculum" authors. We do however find very much in his poetry that phenomenon of poems which have an entirely different and classical atmosphere, so much so that they might have been written by a pagan of the late empire rather than by a Christian bishop. We have already seen this assumption by the poet of a pagan mask in the case of Marbod, but Hildebert carries it further. So in 15.6 he hopes that Adela will be graciously pleased with his tiny gift and take the thought for the deed as happens "Cum cadit ad magnos hostia parva deos." In 26 he begins by calling Muriel the Sibyll of his own times. Keeping up this conceit, he says that the Gods are now speaking to men through her (7,8). Anyone taking either of these poems at their face value would naturally think they were written by a pagan. We have a similar situation in 36 where Hildebert speaking to Rome says (29,30):

"Cura hominum potuit tantam componere Romam,
Quantam non potuit solvere cura deum,"

and from that point until the end of the poem, refers to the gods in the present tense as if they were still active. This has led Pascal to say (Poesia, p.25), "Tutto questo è inconcepibile in bocca a un cristiano del XII secolo," What he does not realize is that neither Hildebert nor Muriel would take these references to the gods seriously. They were as much part of poems of this kind as the elegaics in which they were written.

Much of the discussion of Hildebert as a follower of the classics has centred around this last poem on Rome. As so much has been said about it, its value as a testimony to Hildebert's interest in the objects of antiquity need hardly be underlined. However we must remember that although the poem shows a great deal of such interest, it is answered by 38, so that far from being an effusion inspired by the sight of Rome, it is written to hint at a view common in late antiquity and refuted in Prudentius' Contra Symmachum, that Rome's degradation was due to her forsaking the old gods. In the first poem we hear of the Rome of the Caesars, but in the second there is a deliberate comparison between that Rome, and the far more powerful Rome of the Popes ("plus Cesare Petrus"). This is symbolical of Hildebert's poetry as a whole. Scholar and "humanist" he may be, but he is first and foremost a churchman. He has

certainly assimilated more of the classics than Marbod, but if we are to award a prize for the most "humanistic" of these poets of the end of the 11th and beginning of the 12th centuries, it should go rather to Godfrey of Reims or Baudri than to Hildebert.

So far we have been engaged in a comparison of the poets discussed in respect of style, metre and classical influence. It remains to examine the relationship of the poets to each other, and to try to discover what, if anything, they owe to each other. To aid us in this examination it will be necessary as a preliminary to consider, as accurately as we can, the period during which each of these poets was writing. Of the poets with whom we are concerned two may be said to belong to an earlier generation than the others. We know practically nothing about the life of Fulcoius. But of the ten poems dated by his editor, the earliest is XVIII written between 1055 and 1067, when Gervase was still archbishop of Reims. The latest datable work in prose or verse is an epitaph on Queen Matilda of England (d.1083), though XI could have been written any time before 1087 and XIV any time before 1096. However the rest of the datable poems lie in the period 1070-80. We know more about the life of Godfrey of Reims. He was appointed to assist Herimann in the cathedral school in the late 1050's and

early 1060's. He succeeded Bruno as head of the school in 1076/7 and died 1094/5. Of his poems I was written c. 1080, IV between 1080 and 1085, and the epitaph on Wido probably c. 1080. Both then were writing about the same time, Fulcoius perhaps a little earlier.

Marbod, the oldest of the three "poets of the Loire," was born c. 1035. He was made scholasticus at Angers in 1077 (Lesne p.126) and taught there until elected to the see of Rennes in 1096. In 1120 we hear of him, old, infirm and blind, helping to consecrate the cathedral of Le Mans (Gesta, Migne col.980; p.415, ed. Ledru), and in 1123 he died. We are not very well supplied with information which would date his poems. Baudri, writing when he was still at Bourgeuil (i.e., before 1107), complains (215.59) that Marbod is not writing any more. Marbod himself says in the "Liber Decem Capitulorum II l.1 "Post decies sextum currit michi septimus annus", so that he was still writing around 1102. Varia I.35 is addressed to a certain Godfrey, a monk, who had been a pupil at the school of Angers and who became abbot of the Trinity, Vendôme, in 1093. As he is still not an abbot (v.2. 'forsitan abba futurus') we may tentatively date this poem as prior to 1093. Varia I.21 is addressed to Samson, Bishop of Worcester 1096-1112. Bulst dates this poem

and it is very tempting to identify him with Godfrey of Vendôme

c. 1109, as he identifies the tuus of 38 with the son of Samson who became bishop of Bayeux in 1108. Also in l. 40 Marbod says "Urbem quippe rego, quam regit alter ego". We know from a charter that Marbod acted as vicar at Angers for Renaud de Martigné while he was absent at Rome in 1109. Varia I.22 is addressed to Ravallo, Archdeacon of Nantes (flor.1109),[47] and Varia II.32 to Odo of Bayeux ("Veri lucra boni Domino Marbodus Odoni / Praesulis et comitis gemino cum nomine sitis"), who died 1097.[48] Two of the poems, Varia II.30 giving instructions to a pupil, and the De Ornamentis Verborum, probably date from his teaching days before 1096. Similarly Var.II.3, written to a friend who is absent in Chalonnes, must have been composed while he was still at Angers, and Var.II.37 De civitate Redonis probably after his election to that see in 1096. Thus although Marbod is the oldest of the three by about ten years, such poems as can be dated are surprisingly late, at a date when both Baudri and Hildebert had been writing for some time. On the other hand we can hardly believe that the light, almost erotic poetry such as is contained in Bulst's edition was written when Marbod was a man of between fifty and sixty.

In the case of Baudri we are much better supplied with dates. He was born in 1046 and became

abbot of Bourgueil in 1089. In 1107 he was elected Archbishop of Dol and died in 1130. The table given by Miss Abrahams (Intro.p.xxii, xxiii) shows us that the earliest poem which can be dated was written shortly after 1076, for it is an epitaph of William of Angoulême who died in that year. The two hymns on St. Samson may be supposed to have been written for the dedication of the church of S.-Samson-sur-Rille in December 1129. But only a few poems can be dated to the period after his election to Dol in 1107.[49] In fact as the editor observes, he appears to have turned from verse to prose after that date. The majority of the datable poems appear to have been written between 1085 and 1100. Serlo of Bayeux was writing at about the same time. The dates of his poems range from 1079-1105 (Böhmer, loc.cit. pp.719-724).

Hildebert, born in 1056, is thus as much younger than Baudri as Baudri is than Marbod. His period of teaching was from around 1090 until his election as bishop in 1096. If we look at the list of poems which can be dated, it will be seen that the earliest datable poems are 18 (1088) and 53 (1085), and that 1 and 50 must have been written before 1096, 31 around 1095. But most of the poems which can be dated fall within the years 1100-1115, and the period round the

turn of the century seems to have been a particularly prolific one for Hildebert.

Thus when Hildebert was beginning to write, Godfrey and Fulcoius had probably stopped. In the last twenty years of the eleventh century the three poets Hildebert, Marbod and Baudri were all writing, but while Baudri's output was at its highest during these years, and Marbod had probably written most of his poetry by 1100, Hildebert, still only in his early forties, had perhaps as much as half of his poetry still to write.

We have seen that in matters of metre and style the poets of whom we have been speaking do not appear to have influenced each other, although Marbod in his last years may have been influenced by Hildebert's style in the Liber Decem Capitulorum. Having sketched briefly the relative periods at which they were writing, it now remains to be seen whether any of these authors owe a more direct debt to the others. To begin with we may exclude from consideration the two earliest poets, Fulcoius and Godfrey. There can be little question of their borrowing from the others. There does not appear to be any instance of the reverse, and indeed both Godfrey and Fulcoius stand apart from the poets of the Loire valley. Only Baudri had any contact with Godfrey, and as we have seen that was one-sided. In contrast,

Baudri, Hildebert and Marbod were all writing poetry simultaneously over a period of over twenty years, and were moreover living in the same part of France, so that it would be reasonable to expect some influence of the one on the other.

Despite thecomparative nearness of Bourgueil to Le Mans Baudri seems to have had little to do with Hildebert. The only communication to pass between them was the flattering letter which Baudri wrote to Hildebert while he was still archdeacon (149). From this we learn that Baudri had seen Hildebertis poems 18 and 50 (l.17,19), and probably others as well (l.11,12). Hildebert had not sent these but Baudri had come upon them by chance (l. 1). As far as we know Hildebert did not reply to this. His relations with Marbod appear to have been closer. If we are to believe him when he says (148) "Verborumque frequens nos alternatio pascit," then they had at least met, even if they were not the intimate friends suggested by "Marbodum quem me specialem testor habere" (l.18). In this poem once again we find Baudri sending Marbod his poems and asking for some of Marbod's in return. He twice couples Marbod's name with Godfrey's in a way which shows that he regarded them as the best contemporary poets.[50] He pays a last tribute to Marbod when, writing to Emma (215.59) he says "Quid modo

Marbodus vatum spectabile sidus? / Eclipsim luna, sol patitur tenebras."[51]

Coming now to the question of resemblance in the phraseology of the poems we find that there are a few instances where Baudri and Hildebert use the same phrases. Thus the phrase "Sigue iubere velis, nil est grave, nilque molestum" (42.266) recalls 41.5 "Difficilis labor est sed nil grave nilque molestum."

In describing the dangers of unnatural affection (139.95,96) Baudri writes "Per multas aedes discurrit adhuc Ganimedes, Multus homo lascivus adhuc vult Iuppiter esse." This vivid representation of the dangers is rather similar to the words of Hildebert on the same subject (33.2): "Multa domus multos fertur habere Ioves." But the similarity of wording is not so striking as to be conclusive. The same may be said in the case of lines 100-102 of Baudri's Confessio poenitentialis (184), where he says; "Ut quoque peccarem causas peccator emebam.

Namque facultatem peccandi prodigus emi,

Atque ut peccarent renuentes saepe coegi."

The idea of the first two lines is contained in St. Mary 373-375 and of the third in St. Mary 426. If we are justified in seeing a case of borrowing here, then it will be on Baudri's part, for the above phrases are ~~somewhat~~ very much out of place in a conventional poem of penitence. None of these similarities are so striking as to show

any influence of one poet by the other. Even if we knew for certain that they were borrowed by one from the other, the borrowing would in any case be on a very insignificant scale.

There is rather better evidence for borrowing as between Marbod and Baudri. Marbod wrote a poem (I.44) about needless superfluities on epitaphs, Baudri one (49) about superfluities on rotuli. Likewise both have written invectives against the bearer of the rotuli (Marbod Var.I.39, Baudri 58). It is hardly likely that their sharing of two uncommon subjects is co-incidence. In the case of the first two poems there is no verbal coincidence. Marbod's poem develops the theme more fully, and indeed is the more amusing. But in the second pair of poems Baudri's "Necnon bubo canens dirum mortalibus omen" (1.5) may be compared to Marbod's "Bubo ferum nomen, diro mortalibus omen" (1. 1). Both perhaps owe the conception to Vergil Aen.IV.462 "ferali carmine bubo", and even more to Ovid Meta. V.550 "ignavus bubo, dirum mortalibus omen." But it seems unlikely that they should both choose the same quotation by chance, unless as Bulst suggests, the derisive poem about the rolliger was a common genre. Unfortunately, though we can date both of Baudri's poems to just after 1096 (Noel and Audebert of Bourges both died in that year), we cannot date Marbod's.

51

There are also similarities between parts of Baudri's Confessio Poenitentialis (184) and Marbod's "Oratio poenitentis saepe lapsi" (Var.I.34).[52] Miss Abrahams (p.179) compares Marbod 7 with Baudri 3, but this seems to hinge on the occurrence of the word "cutis" in both. Even less convincing is her comparison of Marbod 9 with Baudri 4. The fact that Baudri's line five begins with "Infelix quid agam," which is part of the well-known first line of Marbod's poem, may be significant. In Marbod's poem the phrase "Quid agam" is meant to give the usual rhyme with plagam, while in Baudri it has no such purpose. This would tend to make us believe that Baudri is being influenced by Marbod, rather than that it is the other way around, providing the other parallels between the two poems are convincing. This we definitely cannot say about Baudri 7 and Marbod 10, except that they express a similar idea, one common enough in poems on this subject. But it is significant that both poems introduce the parable of the good Samaritan, Marbod (l. 26) merely in passing, but Baudri (27-46) at length. Moreover the phrase of Baudri (l. 32) 'Quem levita videns sprevit' is paralleled by the phrase of Marbod Lib. Dec. Capit. II.187 "Levites sprevit." The occurrence of the word ulcus in both (Marbod 22, Baudri 39) is perhaps not very significant, nor does

Marbod 2,3 bear much resemblance to Baudri 42,43. But in Baudri 45,6, Marbod 18,28,29 we have the same metaphor of healing by "divina medicina", pouring in wine and oil. Perhaps the 'ad cuius nutum' of Baudri 47 is connected with the 'per cuius nutum' of Marbod 35. Finally Marbod, Lib.Dec.Cap. VI line 67 "Fur latro sacrilegus raptor, periurus adulter" is reminiscent of Baudri 90 "Sum latro sacrilegus perjurus fur homicida". There thus seems to be a definite case for relating the two poems, despite what Bulst says. If we accept the phrase from the Liber Decem Cap. as common to both, then as Baudri in one poem "quotes" words which appear in two separate poems of Marbod, we could be even more strongly inclined to believe that it is he who is the debtor and Marbod the creditor. It is quite possible for Baudri to have been writing well after the appearance of the Liber Dec.Cap. But in the absence of any definite dates for these two poems we can not prove this definitely. One is thus left with the impression that generally Baudri is drawing on the older poet, but not very extensively.

It remains then to consider the relationship between Marbod and Hildebert. Being bishops in neighbouring dioceses they no doubt had frequent occasion to correspond or to meet to discuss matters of church administration. This side of their relationship is repre-

sented by the two letters which Hildebert directs to Marbod (II.3, III.36). That their relationship was also a literary one is shown by the poem which Marbod sends to Hildebert (Var.I.11), expressing admiration for Hildebert's style. It is noteworthy that he compares Hildebert's style to his at two points. First of all he says that Hildebert's poems can be understood only by the wise as they bind up hidden meanings in a style full of brevity: 'Arcanos sensus brevibus stringentia verbis.' This seems to allude to the Biblical Epigrams or the De Mysterio. Then he says of Hildebert's style "Vestra per antithesim flectit se musa frequenter, Exercens varios sinuoso schemate gyros", while of his own style he says "Nobis directo satis est procedere calle, / Quamlibet et crassa contexere verba Minerva."

It is quite possible that the Liber Decem Capitulorum is dedicated to Hildebert. Marbod's words (I.64) -- haec spectanda tibi, praesul doctissime, mitto -- are too indefinite for us to be certain. But it will be recalled that in the Liber Decem Cap. Marbod makes a conscious effort to colour his style and depart from his former plain and unadorned way of writing. This together with the lines quoted above, which show that he saw the difference between his style and Hildebert's, may mean that it is indeed Hildebert to whom is dedicated that poem in which he comes nearest to Hildebert's style.

Certain poems of Hildebert and Marbod share the same themes, without showing any signs of the influence of one poet upon the other. Thus in Var.I.26 Marbod deals with the miracle of feeding the five thousand, and at the end of the poem gives the same allegorical interpretation as Hildebert does in B.E.62; Var.I.45 deals with the same three classes of those in heaven, Hell and Purgatory as does Hildebert's 45; while Var.I.48 tells the story of Dina, and concludes with an allegorical interpretation different from that given in B.E.30. It is notable that almost all the occasions on which Hildebert and Marbod employ similar expressions are in the Liber Decem Capitulorum. Only two such instances occur among the Varia. The first is in Varia I.44.7 sq. where Marbod, speaking of the epitaph of Abbot John, says of his keeping of discipline, "Unguens et pungens et mitibus aspera iungens." This is very reminiscent of the instructions given by St. Mary to Zosimas for his abbot John: "Mulceat inimitis, denunciet aspera mitis; Hos coram pungat, modo verbis verbera iungat." (l. 772,773). Even more striking is the correspondence between Var.I.46.14 "Sed deus iratus differt punire reatus" and St. Mary 443 "Quod licet iratus, differt punire reatus." It seems clear then that Marbod had read the Life of St. Mary, and that phrases from it had stuck

in his mind. In the life of S. Mauritius the line "ista libens tolerat qui celica premia sperat" (col.1628, last line) reminds one of St. Mary 704 "Dura libens tolerat quisquis sublimia sperat", but this may be due to a co-incidence of rhyme.

In Liber Dec. Cap. III, l. 4,5:

"Femina triste caput mala stirps vitiosa propago
Plurima que totum per mundum scandala gignit."

and l. 26. "Femina dulce malum" may be compared with 50.13 "femina triste iugum". Moreover the repetition by Marbod of the word "femina" at the beginning of four successive lines may be compared with the repetitions of the same word at the beginning of lines 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 in Hildebert's poem. At Cap.IV.115 the words 'Casta suum ferro confoderat Arria pectus' recall 19.1 "Cum foderet gladio castum Lucretia pectus." This is reinforced by the fact that a few lines previously Marbod has been talking about Lucretia, and it looks as if his mention of her has brought to him mind the words of Hildebert. Marbod writing on friendship (cap.VIII ll.13, 14) says "Qua genetivus amor natas ligat atque parentes,

Et consanguineos sociali federe iungit."

The fact that this rather uncommon word 'consanguineus' appears also in Hildebert's 39.III.1 might well be a coincidence, but a little further on in Marbod we read (l. 16) "Hec vis et populos, et magnas continet urbes,"

which may be compared with 39.III.37 "Federat hic populas, ligat urbes, menia munit." In cap.II.132, speaking of fortune and God's providence, Marbod says "ipse manens semper, cum preterentia finxit." Hildebert's words on the same subject are "Ipse manens, dum cuncta movet mortalibus aegris" (22.83), the last phrase appearing in line 95 of Marbod's chapter. This is interesting because this part of Marbod's poem was written around 1102, while Hildebert wrote his poem on Fortune around 1099-1100. But we can only date the Liber Dec. Cap. in rather a vague way through Marbod's own statement as to his age when writing it (cap. II.1). As Marbod in one poem or series of poems uses phrases which are found in several different poems of Hildebert, the obvious conclusion to be drawn is that it is he who is in Hildebert's debt, and not the other way around. Of the poems in question, 50 was written before 1096, and 22 around 1100. Because of its stilted style, 39 may also be an early poem. These poems, together with the two mentioned by Baudri, 18 and again 50, give us perhaps an idea of the small collections of Hildebert's poems circulating at this comparatively early date. To sum up then, there is considerable borrowing from Hildebert by Marbod, but probably only in the last stages of his career as a poet.

From this consideration of the salient features of his own poetry and that of his contemporaries, it will be clear that in matters of style and metre Hildebert is not an innovator to any great extent. He does indeed introduce more rhetoric into his style than do the others, and he would seem to have more skill and confidence in handling the new rhyme, but with the possible exception of the introduction of rapportati he brings nothing new to the common stock of technical skill which his contemporaries had. On the other hand he does not appear to borrow from them either ideas or phraseology, while both Baudri and, especially, Marbod not only read his poems but also paid him the compliment of imitation to some slight degree. Although Marbod's poems have a kind of naïve and charming freshness and a vigour not found in Hildebert, yet in a few of his poems Hildebert reaches a height which Marbod's verse, dealing as it does with more homely subjects, cannot rival, while compared with either of these Baudri is a mere prattler, technically perfect, but with nothing to say.

Notes

1 I have followed Wilmart (R.B.48.250,1) in regard to the canon of Marbod's poems. Bulst, in his Studien zu Marbods Carmina Varia, Gottingen Nachrichten, Phil.Hist.Klasse, Fachgr.IV,N.F. 2 (1939), pp.175-241, is prepared to admit far fewer poems as genuine. He does not trust Wilmart's method of relying on the order of poems in the mss., but prefers internal evidence. He definitely rejects Var.I.28, mainly because of the absence of complete two-syllable rhyme. On the other hand, he is prepared to accept as genuine I.23 and I.60 on historical evidence which is plausible, though the ms. tradition is very weak. Despite the fact that of the Decem Capitula only I is ever expressly attributed to Marbod, and that we have no authority for 5,6,7,9 beyond the edition of Rennes, Bulst considers that they all belong to Marbod and probably owe their order to him (p.225). He comes to this conclusion after an examination of the themes which recur in the ten chapters, and also bearing in mind the fact that all ten are in unrhymed verse and all are written on serious topics, thus fulfilling the requirements set out in the first chapter, De apto genere scribendi.

2 It may be objected that this is a very arbitrary choice of authors. But the choice is limited by the small number of editions. The chance preservation of a single ms. of Baudri, of Fulcoius, Radulphus Tortarius, and to all intents and purposes of Godfrey also, shows that in these we probably have only a part of a much larger body of verse now lost.

3 Similar requests to Agnes (200.38), to Maiolus 179), to an unknown friend (34).

4 There is some indication that this literary activity was not confined solely to the sending of poems to each other, but that poets also recited their works to a select number of their fellows. The most interesting reference to recitation occurs in Baudri's poem to Muriel (199.8) where he says: 'O quam dulce sonat vox tua dum recitas'. He had in fact met Muriel, as we see from the beginning of the poem. To Bernerius he says (176.5) 'Si quod rescribas nostra recitabis in aure', and to Gerald (255.17)

'Volve, revolve libros, quae nescis quaere, require,
Fac aliquid dignum quod recites sociis'.

Rather different is his request to Avitus to recite, not Avitus', but Baudri's own poems (191.30 'multa reservo tibi quae tu recitabis, Alexi'.).

5 Baudri 161.105,6

'Gervasio princeps, princeps tuus ille Manasses,
Successit, qui te promovet ad studium'.

6 Cf. Lesne p.514 for discussion of the amount of education received by noblemen of the time.

7 'Planeta indigeo. Eam mihi promisisti. Sicut arbitror, non deseres promissum, quae etiam non promissa festinas erogare'. (III.2)

8 Guibert of Nogent, Gesta Dei VIII.1 (P.L.156.800C) 'Is (i.e. Arnulfus)... regis Anglorum filiam monacham... diu disciplina docuerat'.

9 See the bibliographical note on 26.

10 So he relates 26.41: 'misisti carmina Remis,
'Misisti Romae quo sint tibi commoda prome.
Cum te laudavit, cum te vehementer amavit,
Quid plus Roma dedit, quae plus tibi portio cedit?
Quid tibi divisit? Carmen pro carmine misit'.

11 For the view that too much emphasis has been put on the influence of the Ad Herennium cf. Brinkmann Wesen p.40. Of the three types of oratory recognized by the technical treatises, judicial, deliberative, and epideictic, only the last had any real use in the twelfth century, or indeed at almost any time since that of the Julian emperors.

12 The best treatments of the descriptio are those of Curtius pp.154-202 and Brinkmann Wesen pp.57-67.

13 As Brinkmann observes (Wesen p.74), these two figures are to be differentiated only by the different purposes which they serve. Their outward appearance is the same. Such niceties of definition are typical of the Hellenistic theorists. Because of their excessive definition and distinction, it is often difficult to know whether in fact the 'figure' is intentional on the part of the poet. In such doubtful cases I have not included the phrase in my list.

14 Cf. I.99-104, II.131-138, IV.71,72; 75,76. The numbers of the poems are those given by Boutemy R.M.A.L.5.340. No.IV is ed. by Wattenbach, Berl. Sitzungsbericht, 1891,p.107.

15 88,1,2; 159.184,5, both quotations from the same passage of Lucan, can hardly be called sententiae, while 161,33-44, a series of observations from Nature, seems too long drawn out to be covered by the definition of sententia.

16 Of the examples of gradatio given by the editor, two, 46.1-6, 216,966-7 are not gradatio at all. The third, 206.1-30 is a poem written in reciproci and is noted by her under that heading. None of the examples of similiter cadens given (p.xxxv) appears to comply with the definition and examples of Ad Herennium IV.20. From this latter the figure would appear to be a kind of parallelism.

17 161.35-8,39-40,143-6 are as stated above observations from Nature, hardly to be classed as similes. 216,405-12 is an allegorical comparison, and neither 179,9,10 nor 252.51-2 are metaphors or similes.

18 Some instances of this are given by the editor, poem 38, note 2, p.25.

19 We can hardly count 154.1,2 as apostrophe.

20 If, as the editor seems to think, lines 115-206 of this poem consisted of a series of membra or articuli, then it would be a great deal duller than it is. Articuli occur at 69.4; 74.2; 77.5; 78.1; 96.1-2; 100.3-5. Miss Abraham s has overlooked at least 233.8.

21 Cf. for instance Raby Secular I.333.

22 For this distinction between inventio and elocutio see Horace, Ars Poetica ed.Rostagni intro.lxxvi.

23 Delbouille notices this difference between the earlier and later style and tries to use it to date the poem to Walter. See Moyen Age 56.213,4, also Bulst op.cit.214.

24 Note however 341,382,420.

25 Revue in Zeitschrift für roman.Philol. 49 (1929) p.588.

26 151.17,18 compos, impos.

27 16,17 Dolensis, Britannis; 21,22 deitate, proli.

28 7 - 10 -ia, 26,27 -eo.

29 11,12 fastus, sanus; 15,16 nitar, utar; 23,24 -as me, -am te.

30 The 'serpentini' given by the editor do not appear to exist.

31 Bourassé makes two poems into 26. Dom Wilmart distinguishes them 26^1 and 26^2.

32 This is the view of Bulst op.cit.p.215.

33 Raby Secular I.p.338. 'This poetry flowed from two sources - antiquity, and the needs of the cultured society of the cathedral cities'.

34 For example, Thierry of S.Trond at a later date, or Radulphus Tortarius within our period.

35 R.Ellis, 'On the Anthologia Latina', Journal of Philology 9 (1880) p.189, could not believe 'that so classical a writer could have introduced a leonine rhyme'. Cf. the note of Boutemy, Latomus VI. 259.

36 Suggested by Williams due to the resemblance of III to Prop. I. 11.

37 His source for this odd reference does not appear to be known. Note also his introduction of Hannibal and Hasdrubal V.195.

38 E.g. Joseph in IX, Moses and Tharbis X.

39 See Boutemy and Vercauteren, Lat.I (1937) pp.175 - 186.

40 See also Manitius p.896.

41 Manitius loc.cit.

42 For example Var.I.26,27,28; II.30. Even the lyrical II.2 becomes didactic in the last lines.

42a On the other hand, in citing 'Maro' (Var.I.39.2) he gives a quotation from Ovid, cf.Bulst op.cit.p.230.

43 A full list of borrowings is given by Bulst op.cit.p.214.

44 For instance Pascal Poesia p.47 'Ildeberto non dimentica di essere un 'poeta doctus', imitatore degli antichi'. Raby Secular I.329 'a poet who responded so intensely to the spirit of antiquity that he made living poems out of the verse forms of the ancient poets'.

45 So Pascal says justly (Poesia p.50) 'Si tratta di una imitazione che non consiste già nel riprodurre coscientemente frasi e pensieri, ma nell' aver formato tutta la propria educazione artistica nel lungho studio del poeta preferito'.

46 For these citations see Dieudonné pp.278-284.

47 Wilmart R.B.51 p.172.

48 Bulst dates this poem befpre 1088, in which year Odo was forced to give up his count-ship. Marbod would hardly have called him comes after that date.

49 250 and 251-4.

50 2.19 'Andus Marbodum, Remis laudat Godefredum', and 188.7, where he wishes that he had 'Qualis Marbodo, vel qualis inest Godefredo,/ Qualis pontifici copia Biturico'(Audebert of Bourges).

51 The editor suggests that the reason for Marbod's giving up verse was his election to the bishopric in 1096, but at least the Liber Decem Capitulorum appeared after that date.

52 On this Bulst says emphatically (p.250) 'Die 13 hiezu angefuhrten 'parallelen' aus Marbod sind eine mussige Zusammenstellung ohne einen Schatten von Beweiskraft'.

INTRODUCTION TO THE SHORTER POEMS

The manuscripts of the Shorter poems.

Before proceeding to an examination of the manuscripts and their contents it is first necessary to explain the systems of numbering used for the poems by Beaugendre, Bourassé, Wilmart and the present edition. Beaugendre called the short poems of mixed content 'Miscellanea', a name which has since stuck to them, though it has no manuscript authority. This Wilmart and other critics have abbreviated to Misc. (For Wilmart's abbreviations see R.B.48.p.18,n.1). For want of a better name I have throughout referred to these poems as the Shorter Poems, thus distinguishing them from the longer De Mysterio Missae and life of St.Mary, and from the Biblical Epigrams. Generally, I refer to them only by their number, but where confusion with Biblical Epigrams or other poems cited might arise I have prefixed the number with the word 'poem'. At the end of the series of Miscellanea Beaugendre added a few 'Carmina indifferentia', called Ind. by Wilmart, and a further 'Supplementum' (Supp.) was added by Bourassé. Poems first edited in Hauréau's Mélanges pp.175 - 217 are designated Hau. by Wilmart. As the order of poems in the Beaugendre - Bourassé edition is purely arbitrary it seemed best to substitute for it that of the most suitable of the manuscripts. This is clearly Du, for not only does it contain more than any other ms., but it is early, and its order is that of a whole group of mss. Thus poems 1 - 43 are in the order of that ms., while 44 - 54 are in the order of the second most important pair of mss., K Z. Poems which are included in the editions of Beaugendre, Bourassé or Hauréau, and which I do not consider genuine retain their old names of Misc. Ind. and Hau.

In the Biblical Epigrams, Beaugendre has artificially divided the poems up into the classes of 'ex veteri testamento' and 'ex novo testamento', again with a supplement added at the end (Beaug. col.1229, P.L.171.1279). These Wilmart denotes by Vt, Nt, and Sup.I. Finally, there is the 'Inscriptionum Christianarum libellus (Ins) added by Bourassé. Once again it will be seen that many of the manuscripts have a certain order which, though illogical, must be followed.

As with the shorter poems I designate Biblical Epigrams which I regard as spurious by the abbreviations of Beaugendre's titles used by Wilmart. Those which I have edited as being very possibly Hildebert's I call Add. B.E. A concordance of old and new numbers of the B.E. is on p.294. The following then are the mss. of the Shorter poems.

Du Trinity College, Dublin B.2.17 (Abbott no.184). Written in a small neat hand of the second half of the 12th cent., 2 cols., 51 lines, with initials in red and green, though not in the part of the ms. which contains Hildebert's poems. The ms. contains the letters of Ivo of Chartres and of Hildebert, whose shorter poems occur (fol.159B - 142^{v}A) after the life of St.Mary. The order of the poems is 1 - 17, 'cum thetis et baccbus', 18 - 43. The text, while good, is inferior to that of B, and careless slips seem to become more frequent in the later poems.

This Gloucester (St. Peter's) ms. belonged originally to archbishop Cranmer, who may have acquired it at the dissolution of the monasteries, and passed, by way of Lord Arundel, Mary's High Steward, into the hands of his son-in-law John, Lord Lumley. It was no.496 in the 1609 catalogue of the Lumley library. When this was joined to the Royal Library in 1610, Patrick Young sold or gave away many duplicate volumes, and presumably he gave this one to archbishop Ussher, as it is in the number of his mss. that it came to belong to T.C.D. (For this information I am indebted to Catalogue of the library of John, Ld. Lumley, ed. Brit.Mus., 1956, pp.119,304).

B Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 14194 s.xii (end), provenance St. Germain des Prés. 32 - 5 long lines, with titles in majuscule and red initials with blue flourishes. After the letters of Hildebert there are (fol.160 - 164^{v}) poems 1 - 27, the fragment breaking off in the middle of the last poem. This ms. was known to Hauréau (Mélanges p.27 and passim), but not to Beaugendre.

(T) Tours 890, unfortunately destroyed in the last war, so that we have only the information on it given by Dom Wilmart. According to him it consisted of 125 leaves written by one person around 1175 - 80. Dom Wilmart gives a complete analysis of its contents (op.cit.pp. 20 - 40). The ms. contained the following poems rightly or wrongly attributed to Hildebert, the numbers in brackets being those of Wilmart's list: (1) St.Mary,(9) 44,11.4,5,(31) 20,(32) Misc 51,(36) 40,(37) 21,(48) B.E.67,(49) B.E.68,(50) 23,(51) 1,(52) 7,(53) 9,(54) 12,(55) 13,(56) 8, (57) 54,(58) 42,(59) 39,(61) - (125) Biblical Epigrams q.v., (274) 2, (275) 4,(276) 5,(277) 10,(278) 11,(279) 14,(280) 15,(281) 16,(282) 17, (283) 18,(284) 19,(285) 22,(286) 25,(287) 28,(288) 29,(289) 33, (290) 34,(291) 35,(292) 36,(293) 38,(294) 49.

A Paris, B.N. 7596A s.xii (first half), provenance Holy Trinity Monastery, Savigny. A large ms. (365 x 250 mm.), written in 2 cols., 42 lines, with small plain red and blue initials now much faded. The writing is faint in places, and at the inner edge of the ms. sometimes

invisible. After Isidore's Etymologiae there is a long series of Hildebert's poems (fol.164 - 171). Noteworthy is the dislocation after fol.166^{V}, where De Mysterio ends at line 160. Fol.167,168 contain the end of the poem, while fol.169,170 contain the middle portion. The correct order of the folios is thus 166,169,170,167,168. At fol.171 is Wilmart's A^{2}, a half column of short poems written in a different but contemporary hand. All of these have been attributed to Hildebert, but only the first and last are undoubtedly genuine. The ms. was used by Beaugendre (Colbert 1050), but not to the same extent as his Ebroicensis. The text is the best of any ms. of Hildebert. It comprises: 5, 5, 20, 21, 22, 25, 25, 54, 39, 40, Hau 50, De Quer. cantus IV,45, 42, 45, ~~Misc 150~~, De Myst.,6, Misc 68, 50, Misc 110^{2}, 'Garganus mons est', Misc 150. A^{2} has 16,'rex obit', Misc 132, Misc 124, Misc 133, 2.

Cl British Museum, Cotton Cleopatra C.I s.xii. Bound up with a 14th cent. register of deeds relating to the abbey of Peterborough. Written in a small, fine hand in 2 cols., 36 lines, with plain blue, green and red initials. Fol. 1 - 55 contain short poems, most of which are Hildebert's, the order being as follows: 51, 17, St.Mary, 36, 38, 22, 26, 37, 35, 18, 46, 50, 39, 40, 42. Then follow the series of Biblical Epigrams (fol.17), this being the only extant ms. to contain both B.E. and Shorter Poems in any number. Scattered through the B.E. are poems 34, 5, 20, 21, 45, 56.

Ko Copenhagen, University Library Fabric. 81 s.xii (end). An anthology first brought to light by P. Lehmann in the Hist. Vierteljahrschrift (N. Folge) XXX (1935),pp.20 - 58 and 415. Belonged originally to the Benedictine house of Sts. Cosmas and Damian at Liesborn in Westphalia, though Lehmann, judging from the script, thought that it might have been written in the vicinity of Liège. The contents relating to Hildebert are (fol.14 - 25) De mysterio missae, 39 IV, 40, 39 II, (fol.25^{V}) 1, 4, 11 / 12, 13, (fol.42) 55,21, B.E.67,'Sol hodie nobis', (fol.44) 20, / 3 / 34, (fol.45) 5 / B.E.66, Misc 132, (fol.72) 56, (fol.72^{V}) 50, (fol.73^{V}) 51, 58, 18, (fol.76) 25, (fol.95^{V}) B.E.67 and B.E.69.

He Hereford Cathedral Library P.1.XV s.xii mid. Belonged to the Franciscan convent at Hereford. Written in two cols., 30 lines, with titles identical with those of Du. After the letters of Gilbert Foliot we have (fol.155) St.Mary, poems 1 - 17,'cum Thetis et Bachus', 18 - 29, the fragment breaking of at the end of a page. Very closely related to, and probably copied from Du (see p.127.).

K British Museum Additional MS. 24199 s.xii end, provenance Bury St.Edmunds (cf. M.R.James, Cambridge Antiq. Soc. Publications 28, 1895, p.71). Written in a large, clear hand, 2 cols., 42 lines. Spaces left for the rubricator have not been filled. There are titles to all the poems, except 51 and 52, but after fol. 114 these are omitted, and have been supplied by a 15th cent. hand. One is tempted to regard these later titles as the work of the fifteenth century librarian of Bury, whose copious notes James discovered in several Bury mss., (op.cit. p.40), and whom he was inclined to identify with Boston of Bury, one of the earliest systematic cataloguers of mss.

However, a comparison of these titles with the title on fol.75^{v} of MS. Royal 8.B.IV which is in the librarian's hand seems to indicate that they have not been added by him. The occasional corrections in the text, also in brown ink, seem to belong to yet another, earlier hand.

The first part of the ms. is a well-known illuminated text of the Psychomachia of Prudentius, written in the 11th century. At fol.59 there begins a large collection of poems, mostly belonging to Hildebert and Marbod. There are descriptions of this in by Wilmart p.169 and A.Boutemy in Lat. II (1938) pp.50 - 52. The text is good, apart from some omissions of lines and other mistakes due to the carelessness of the scribe. Hildebert's poems (fol.39 - 56) are: De Myst.,44,45, 39,21,40,20,15,26,18,46,47,Misc 108,52,24,48,16,22,37, De Querimonia, St.Mary,54,1,43,25,2,49,56,50,51,'hec dicas laicis',52 / (fol.75) Misc 113,Misc 114.

Z Paris B.N. collection Baluze 120 (desc. Cat. des Mss.Baluze, Auvray, Poupardin p.121). This is a collection of collations and notes made by Baluze with the intention of preparing an edition of Hildebert. Attention was first drawn to it by Hauréau, whose chapter III consists mostly of poems which he saw there and which were not in the edition of Beaugendre. The poems begin on fol.518 after collations of the De Querimonia, sermons and letters, and are headed 'Carmina Hildeberti Ep. Cenom. nondum edita'. ~~It is~~ They are in two hands, neither of which looks like that of Baluze. The change from one hand to the other takes place suddenly at fol.527, in the seventh line of 56, and is maintained until fol.542^{v}, when the first hand seems to take over again. The pages, beside their modern numbering, have a 17th cent. pagination foliation from 1 to 52, which together with odd notes and observations may be in the hand of Baluze. Fol. 543,544 are not numbered and may come from another source. Various other letters and a further collation of the De Querimonia intervene, until at fol.567 we find the Biblical Epigrams in a hand different from the above, and which may be that of Baluze. These are followed (fol.571^{v} - 578) by a further series of seventeen poems in the same hand. This Wilmart designates Z^{2}.

The contents of Z are: 39,B.E.67,21,40,20,15,26,18,46,47,Misc 108,52,24,48,16,22,37,34,1,45,25,2,49,50,51,Hau 5,7,Misc 115,Misc 114, 14,9,33,Hau 9,Hau 10,44,52,56,58,25,8,Hau 12b,5,53,30,Hau 15,54,Hau 16, Misc 78,55,Hau 17,17,Misc 51,Hau 18,Hau 19,St.Mary,31,Hau 21,28,41,22, Ins 57. Z^{2} contains 21,B.E.67,Hau 25,'ara crucis',Ins 45,Ins 7^{2}, Hau 24,Misc 51,Misc 118,Marbod Varia I.25,'mundus abit' (Serlo of Wilton),34,22,Ins 57,56,58,Hau 25.

H British Museum Harley 2621 s.xiii. Written in a small, neat hand, 31 long lines, red and blue initials with a few flourishes, the initial letter of each line also picked out in red. First noted by Alton, Hermathena 46 p.147. The ms. gives the impression of having been executed with great care, an impression not borne out by the text, which is not as good as that of the related D. Most of the ms. is devoted to Horace's Epistles and Satires, but sandwiched between these (fol.53 - 55) are 'me faciem',17,8,47,Hau 17,48,23,46,26,1,51,53 incomplete.

D Paris B.N. 3761 s.xii^{2} or xiii^{1}. A minute ms. (120 x 80 mm.), written in a small fine hand. The initials have not been filled in. Between fol.62 and 75 is an anthology of approximately seventy poems or parts of poems. Hildebert's poems are in a continuous series (fol.66^{v} - 72) and their order is as follows: 28,17,9,30,Hau 17,Hau 5, 8,46,48,47,26,51,23,53,22,56,50. Many of the poems in this anthology were edited by Pressel in his 'Supplément à l'Anthologie latine', Revue de Philologie I (1845) 407 - 414. These include eight poems belonging to or ascribed to Hildebert: 9,Hau 17,Hau 5,8,46,48,47,22. Riese in his edition of the Anthologia latina (1894) recognized 46, 47 and 22 as belonging to Hildebert (vol.I.ii.pref.xxix), and Hau 7 as medieval, thus allowing into his collection only 48 and Hau 5.

E Paris B.N. 14867 s.xii^{2}, provenance S.Victor, 27 long lines to the page (with the exception of poem 55), red and blue flourished initials, larger in De Myst. and St.Mary than in the Shorter poems. In the two longer poems a 'catch-letter' appears at the end of each line. The ms. is composed entirely of Hildebert's works, containing De querimonia, letters, sermons, St.Mary, De Myst., and (fol.166 - 176) eleven of the shorter poems. Some epitaphs are added (fol.177^{v}- 178) by a contemporary hand. Hommey used this ms. for his partial edition in the Supplementum Patrum, pp.419 - 554, and Beaugendre mentions his indebtedness to Hommey (praef.v). As it is clear that Beaugendre had this ms.(which he calls S.Victor 272) before him, it is hard to say whether the very close co-incidence of wrong readings in E and in Beaugendre is due to his reliance on Hommey or on the ms. Despite its fine appearance E does not offer a good text. It contains: St.Mary, De Myst.,45,40,B.E.67,21,55,22,36,58,20,Misc 51,Marbod Varia I.11,50.

F Troyes Bibl.Mun. 887 s.xii^{2}, provenance Clairvaux, 2 cols., 30 lines, plain red initials. Hildebert's poems (fol.165^{vB} - 170^{v}) are De Mysterio,45,39,21,40,5,2,3,34,Misc 125,4,20,57,B.E.67, followed by 'Hic leo dormivit'. From this ms. is copied Berlin Staatsbibl. 170 (Phillip. 1685) s.xiv. Wilmart includes this latter ms. in his list as F, while he relegates its parent Troyes 887 to a footnote. Perhaps he was led to include it rather than our F by the presence there of the life of St.Mary at the end of the series of poems.

I Berlin Staatsbibl. 180 (Phillip. 1694) s.xii, provenance St.Arnulf, Metz, 2 cols.,42 lines, with small red,green and blue initials. Desc. in detail by W.Wattenbach (N.A.17, 1891,2, p.351, also by V.Rose Hs. Verzeichnisse I.p.597. The ms. begins with the letters of Ivo of Chartres, but beginning at fol.133 is an anthology in which the following poems of Hildebert appear: De Myst.,67 / 21,5 / 39,45, St.Mary / 19,34,50,22. +B.E.

P Munich Staatsbibl. 16075 s.xii^{2} or xiii^{1}, provenance Augustinian house of St.Nicholas, Passau. Some leaves are missing between fol.24 (the last of its quire) and 25. Thus the beginning of 50 is lost. Dreves used this ms. for his edition of 55,'salve festa dies', and Misc 51 in A.H.vol.L.p.409. Hildebert's poems (fol.1 - 29^{v}) are:

55,40,De Myst.,Add°B.E.10,Misc 132,57,Misc 119,'salve festa dies', 45,21,51,Sup 15,2 / 50,Misc 51,34,'sub tecto',39.

G Vienna Nationalbibl. 2521 s.xii, provenance Bamburg, written in a fine clear hand, with 23 long lines to the page, red initials, and the first letter of each line in red. Described in detail by Endlicher Catal.codd.philolog.Vindobon., pp.165-80. Of the 25 poems belonging to or ascribed to Hildebert, eight are scattered through the anthology between fol.54^{v} and 42, while the rest form an enclave at fol.66^{v}, with the De Myst. at fol.108^{v}, and interrupted only by poems of Marbod. The order of the poems is: 24 / 25 / 16,44 / 5,20 / 45,B.E.67,Misc 68 / 51,3,21,57,34,18 / 22,26,46,17,Hau 5 / 53,30,St.Mary / De Myst. The text is exceptionally good for an anthology.

L Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud.Lat.86.s.xiii, 25 long lines to the page, flourished red initials, and the first letter of each line picked out in red. The part which contains Hildebert's poems is written in two hands, the first between fol.97 and 110, the second between fol.110 and 116. The poems are: (fol.97) De Myst., (fol.110) 34,3,2,36,23,'Pyeridum ter trina' (epitaph of Abelard),8,'obscuros versus',33,7,9,5,22 / 24,'parvus erat limes',47,50,Misc 68.

M Bodleian Library, Rawlinson G.109 s.xiii^{1}, written in a small, neat, hand, with 30 long lines to the page, and small plain red and blue initials. Wilmart (op.cit.p.171) was of the opinion that this extensive anthology of around 144 poems may have been composed in France and then brought to England shortly afterwards. The ms. contains the poems of Primas, edited from here by W.Meyer, followed by the anthology, which is in turn followed by Bernardus Silvestris, Megacosmos (page 125), Ovid, De Remedio Amoris and Ex Ponto (incomplete), and Ranulph de Glanville, Tractatus de legibus. In the anthology Hildebert's poems are almost all contained in two remarkable enclaves, one at p.51 containing six poems, the other at p.89 containing four. The ms. contains: 50,25,'dum colo miliciam',48,22,38,36,'ius perit','insula Meldis',Misc 51,'morte professa' (cf.R.B.49.381),52,Ind.17,'nitor ad impar opus',Ind 1,Misc 27 / Misc 118 / Misc 77 / Misc 138 (at fol.69 not 58 as in Wilmart), / Ind.15,Ind.16 (pages 71,2 not 65 as in Wilmart) / Misc 137 / Misc 33 / 15 / Hau 25 / 4,9,10,25 / Misc 55,Misc 132 (p.96),'Diviciis ortu','Viribus arte minis',Hau 51 (p.99-111).

R Zurich Zentralbibl. C.58/275. Fully described by Werner, Beitrage. It consists of 185 folios, measures 290 x 200 mm., and the writing, which Werner dates as of the end of the twelfth century, is in 2 cols., 34 lines. Werner thinks that most of the ms. is the work of one hand, and considers the writer to have been a German clerk who had studied in France. The text is very poor indeed: ~~the~~ it often makes complete nonsense, and whole lines have been altered or interpolated. I have therefore ignored its aberrations, while using for collation the readings provided by Werner. Some indication of the way in which Hildebert's poems are scattered through this ms. will be given by the numbers of the poems in Werner, which I give in brackets. The

contents are as follows: Item (17)36, (69)50, (78)Misc 119,((82)54, (88)Hau 50,((115)21, (129)Misc 32, (151)8, (152)47, (153) Moralis Philosophia, (155) Life of St.Agnes, (156) De Susanna, (158)Ind 12, (175)40, (176)45, (180)21 bis, (181)57, (210)17, (211)8 bis, (212)47 bis, (215)Hau 17, (225)22, (270)2, (271)5, (555)Misc 124.

The following mss. have been collated for St.Mary and De Mysterio besides those listed above.

B Bodleian Library, ms.Bodley 605 s.xii^{2}- xiii^{1}, French provenance, written with 32 long lines to the page, plain green and red initials, and with the first letter of each line picked out in red. The ms. contains: St.Mary (fol.8), St.Laurence (Marbod),St.Agnes (Pierre Riga), St.Mauricius (Marbod), De s. eucharistia (Pierre Peintre), De Myst. (fol.129), followed by (fol.158^{v}) 59.IV,B.E.67,59.II,III,40,B.E.68,45, B.E.69,21. These last appear to form part of a little collection of poems all dealing with the eucharist and especially the fraction of the Host into three parts. Besides Hildebert's poems we find: 'Impia iudea ridet libamina sacra' (44 lines, fol.139), 'Ecclesie circa sacre solennia mense' (51 lines, fol. 140), 'Ecclesie partes credunt tres esse fideles, / Angelicum cetum Domino semper sociatum' (12 lines, fol.142), 'Dum divine bonitatis pulsarem ad ostia' (34 lines, fol. 142^{v}). There are extensive marginal and interlinear glosses both to these poems and the De Mysterio.

V Oxford, Corpus Christi College ms. 157 s.xii^{2}, 36 long lines to the page, large plain initials in green, blue and red. Contains De Mysterio (fol.60 - 68^{v}) and St.Mary (fol.70 - 82).

X Bodleian Library, ms.Bodley 866 s.xii^{1}, written in a small, clear hand, in 27 long lines, ruled with a hard point. Spaces left for initials have not been filled in. The text is excellent. The ms. contains (fol.154 - 164) De Myst., 39 II,III,IV.

L Bodleian Library,Laud Misc.515 s.xiii^{1}, provenance Holy Cross, Waltham. Written with 28 long lines to the page, and without any initials except for that at the first line of the poem. The life of St.Mary appears between fol.78 and 94, the title being supplied in a 15th cent. hand.

C British Museum Cotton Vitellius A.XII s.xii (end)(described by A.Boutemy, Lat. I, 1957,pp.278-315, and by Wilmart p.246), written in 2 cols., the number of lines varying. This large florilegium suffered somewhat in the fire of 1731, so that some lines at the tops of pages are now illegible. At fol.120 (line 469) the writing changes from a small neat hand to a rather larger contemporary hand, the smaller hand coming back at the end of fol.121^{v}. The text of St.Mary (fol. 117 - 122^{v}) agrees closely with that of K.

R B.M. Harleian 3016 s.xii^{2}, written in 2 cols.,42-3 lines, with red, blue and green flourished initials. This ms. of 74 leaves

contains the letters, sermons, De Mysterio, De Querimonia and St.Mary. The text is good, and seems to have some affinity to that of K. On fol.74^{V} in various 14th century hands are short poems, among which are to be found 34 and 57.

The Relationship of the manuscripts.

As we shall see later, the tradition of Hildebert's poems is divided into two editions or recensions. The first of these, the readings of which we shall designate by the letter a, is represented only by the manuscripts Du B T A Cl Ko (in part) He and Add. 3053. All the other known manuscripts examined have very different readings, amounting to another edition (x). Obviously it is the a group in which the relationship of the mss. to each other can be most readily determined. Within this group there are in turn two classes. The first, Du B T Ko He and Add. are distinguished by the similarity of the order of the poems. The other two, A Cl, have each an order dissimilar to the other and to that of the other mss. of the group, while retaining the distinctive readings of the a group. It will be obvious if one considers the order of the pieces in B and Du that they are very closely related. The order is exactly the same in both, except that B breaks off in the middle of 27 while Du gives us another seventeen poems. Moreover the poems have exactly the same titles in both manuscripts, and in both manuscripts the same poems, 20 and 25, are without titles. Only 18 has a different title in the two mss. and the difference is not great. Two poems (12, 13) have titles in B but none in Du. However, although closely related, the manuscripts can hardly be copied one from the other, as Du gives us the poem "Cum Thetis et Bacchus", which is not found in B, although scribal carelessness could account for this. The slight difference in the title of 18 does not have very much significance. However, the

readings where these two manuscripts vary afford us a clue. If the manuscripts were in direct line of descent we may presume, in view of the presence of "Cum Thetys et Bacchus", that Du is not descended from B. Therefore we may leave aside readings where in differing from its supposed archetype Du B is manifestly wrong, as these would prove nothing. What we require are readings where Du is clearly wrong, while B retains the correct text. Such readings are: 17. 14 quos Du: quod B, (CL); 17. 20 quemque Du; quamque all mss.; 25. 5 sibi Du: ibi all mss. Unless the scribe of B corrected these errors from another text, a most unlikely hypothesis, Du cannot be the archetype of B. In fact Du, while sharing a generally excellent text with B has rather more careless mistakes.

He is more closely related to Du than to B. It shares with the former msp. the poem "Cum Thetis et Bachus", and idiosyncratic readings at 12. 1; 17. 20; 18. 28; 22. 70 and 25. 5. These poems are also in B but its readings are the normal, correct ones. Specially notable is 17. 14 where Du and He share the x reading 'quos', while B has the a reading 'quod'. On two occasions He agrees with B against Du (17. 23 relinquit; 19. 2 egrederetur). The first reading can be easily explained as a common slip on the part of the scribe, the second is harder to explain, but as the egrederetur of B He is the usual and accepted reading the scribe may have compared his ms. with another. Despite this last reading, it seems safe enough to say that the series of poems in He is copied from Du, especially as both were written about the same time in the West Midlands.

The relation of T to these manuscripts is also very close if

we may judge from the only criteria now left to us, the order and titles of the poems as given by Dom Wilmart. He divided T into nine sections, each marked by a poem or group of poems rightly or wrongly attributed to Hildebert. Of these groups four, I II III (Biblical Epigrams) and VII contain series of genuine poems. Group I is very similar in contents to the E F I P class of manuscripts which we will discuss later, but group II in part and group VII in its entirety are series following the order of Du B. Perhaps the list will elucidate the comparative order of T and Du-B. The numbers which I give are those of Dom Wilmart's list.

	T	Order of Du
Group II	50	23
	51	1
	52	7
	53	9
	54	12
	55	13
	56	8
	57	not in Du
	58	42
	59	39
Group VII	274	2
	275	4
	276	5
	277	10
	278	11
	279	14
	280	15
	281.	16
	282	17
	283	18

T	Order of Du
284	19
285	22
286	25
287	28
288	29
289	33
II 290	34
II 291	35
II 292	36
II 293	38

Thus the procedure of the scribe who was compiling T was first to select nine poems from a manuscript similar to Du, in order of poems, and then to come back to the same ms. and copy another twenty, omitting those which he had already copied. He leaves out completely 3, 6, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 37, 41, 43, and three poems appear in the first section of the florilegium: 20 (I 31), 21 (I. 37), 40 (I. 36). However the series T II and T VII contain in turn poems which are not found in Du B. Given that T is an anthology, it is difficult to say whether in fact these (II 48, 49, 57, VII. 294) were in the manuscript similar to Du B which the anthologist had before him, or were brought in from another manuscript. This is very probably the case with VII. 294 at any rate, as it appears elsewhere only in K Z.

So far we have dealt only with the similarities in order between Du, B and T. But, although no further proof as to the close relationship of these mss. seems to be required, the close similarity of the titles must be mentioned. The vast majority of the 32 shared titles are identical. Some show slight differences;

4 De morte T; ad reginam anglorum Du B.

14 Ad avarum T; ad P. avarum Du B.

18 Epytafium Berengarii; De Berengario Du B.

22 De lapsu huius mundi T; de casu huius mundi Du.

42 De xii patriarchis et xii gemmis T

De xii lapidibus et nominibus filiorum israel Du.

However the only really striking difference is 10: Ad H reginam T; Ad A. committissam Du B. Here the scribe of T has been misled by the heading of 35.

Also belonging to the a family, but entirely dissimilar in composition and occasional readings are the manuscripts A and Cl. It is evident from the order of the poems that these manuscripts are not closely related either to the rest of the a group or to each other. They do not show any marked identity of readings as against the other members of the a family, their occasional variations from the readings of that class being idiosyncratic. Moreover, while A represents an unbroken series of poems belonging to Hildebert, Cl has a sprinkling of other poems among those of Hildebert. However, these two manuscripts share the poems 45, 50 and De Querimonia cantus IV, which do not appear in other manuscripts of the a group, and so would seem to have some slight affinity inside the larger family. The last six pieces in A are written in a different though contemporary hand, and there must be some doubt as to whether they have all been copied from one manuscript. At any rate they have nothing to do with the a tradition. The fact that Cl is the only early manuscript containing both a considerable number of the miscellaneous poems and the series of Biblical

Epigrams seems worthy of note. It would be tempting to regard this manuscript as the sum total of Hildebert's work at an early stage. However, the presence of 37 written between 1114 and 1118, and also of the poems which do not belong to Hildebert, would seem to rule this out. However that may be, it is very puzzling to find that in a group of manuscripts, all written well before the end of the century and having in common readings very different from those of the majority of the manuscripts, two of them should differ so much from each other and from the other manuscripts in the order of the poems.

An interesting apograph of part of Du is the Bodleian manuscript Barlow 10 (S.C. 6436*) (U). This manuscript is composed of papers belonging to Archbishop Ussher and at the beginning Thomas Barlow, librarian of the Bodleian Library and Bishop of Lincoln (1675-91) has written "Chartae Mss. e Bibliotheca Jac. Usseri Armachani". The part of this collection with which we are concerned (fol. 38-41^{v}) is written in the hand of Patrick Young. Now on fol. 38 we find the poem "Cum Thetys et Bacchus" (Du item 18) followed by Du 19-40. These poems are in almost the same order as those in Du allowing for the dislocation of a folio in U. The order as we see it in U is 18-21, 22, breaking off at the end of fol. 38^{v}. On 39 we have the title 'De eodem' of 38, with that poem, followed by 37 and 39 incomplete, on fol. 40 22 is concluded, and on 40^{v} there follow 23-36. Obviously fol. 39 should be placed after fol. 41, as then the title of 38 will have a meaning, and 39 will be continued on a folio now lost. This is not quite the order of Du which has 36, 37, 38, 39. Probably the transcriber himself altered the

order because of the identity of subject of the two poems. This small difference in order does not seem to me to affect the evidence for the transcription of U from Du. The titles are identical, and the two manuscripts share idiosyncratic readings such as 37. 31 cum defferat mundus D, and omit the same distichs, e.g. 37. 23, 4. In the few instances where the readings differ we can see the correcting hand of the transcriber (e.g. 18. 1 quem Du, quae U; 23. 3. Iunc Du, Iunoque U). However, any doubts as to whether U really is an apograph of Du should be dispelled when we consider the provenance of the latter manuscript. The manuscript T.C.D. B. 2. 17 (provenance St. Peter's, Gloucester) belonged successively to Cranmer, Lord Lumley and Archbishop Ussher, being purchased for Trinity along with Ussher's other manuscripts.

Another manuscript which seems to be connected in part with this group is Ko. Here again we have a large anthology like T drawing its contents from different sources. But unlike T it does not have the close contact with Hildebert's see, coming as it does from Liège.[2] The distance between the manuscripts in place if not in time is indicated by the broken nature of the series in Ko. It is the earlier part of the manuscript which interests us here, as the majority of the poems (probably from 55 onwards, fol. 42) seem to belong to the E F I P family. But the first seven of Hildebert's poems seem to indicate by their order some relationship with Du B. The order of these is (fol. 24) 39, 40; (fol. 25^{v}) 1, 4, 11, 12, 13. It is especially these last five pieces which give us an indication of relationship, for the order of the parts of 39 differs in the two manuscripts,

and the two pieces 39, 40 are often found together in other manuscripts. But the other poems are found in very few manuscripts, and the order here seems to indicate once more that the writer of Ko had before him a manuscript similar to Du B. This cannot be proved for any other pieces of the anthology as we have not the text in front of us. However it seems likely that only this little group belongs to the a tradition. Lehmann informs us that the manuscript is written in different hands, and it would be very helpful if we knew exactly where these hands begin and end.

One other manuscript of this group deserves mention, though not important for establishing the text. This is B.M. Additional 6158(s. xiv) which contains (fol. 146) ten poems in the order of Du B, namely 1-13, omitting 7, 9, 10.

Of the two groups of mss. those just described are few in number while the other group seems to embrace all the other mss. of Hildebert, important and unimportant. Yet the description of the relations between these will be briefer than that of the a group. There are several reasons for this. Of the principal mss. of this group only K and Z give us a long series of poems which have a similar order in each. The other mss. have at the most a resemblance to each other, contain the same pieces, and those usually not very rare ones at that, and afford us the same reading.

We can say that one ms. is related to another, but in no case can we probe any further into their relationship. / N.P. The most valuable mss. of this group are K and Z. The complex structure of K is as follows:- (1) series of poems by Hildebert; (2) (fol. 56 B) series of Marbod's poems; (3) (fol. 68^{v}) a very mixed

anthology, in which we find a sprinkling of Marbod's poems, and which concludes with two short enclaves of Varia.[3]

It may perhaps simplify the following explanation if we number the poems in K according to their order of appearance, and set out the comparative order of these in Z:

Order of K	Poem	Order of Z
Item 1	De Myst.	
2	44	
3	45	
4	39	1
5	21	Item 3
6	40	4
7	20	5
8	15	6
9	26	7
10	18	8
11	46	9
12	47	10
13	Misc 108	11
14	32	12
15	24	13
16	48	14
17	16	15
18	22	16
19	37	17
20	De Cher.	-
21	St. M.	55
22	34	18
23	1	19
24	43	20
25	23	21
26	2	22
27	49	23

Order of K	Poem	Order of Z
28	36	37
29	50	24
30	51	25
31	'hec dicas laicis'	-
32	52	36
33	Misc 113	28
34	Misc 114	29

(For further details see description of mss. pp 120, 121)

The above list will show that in the two mss. the order of the poems corresponds from K item 5 to item 30 with that of Z, items 3 - 25, K omitting Z 2, and Z omitting (in this series at any rate) K20, 21, 28 (= Z37). The poem K32, separated from the long series of Hildebert's poems by the piece 'Hec dicas laicis' appears as Z36. Now the rest of Z also shares a few poems with K and contains many more which are ascribed rightly or wrongly to Hildebert, mainly on the testimony of this ms. It is therefore important to know whether this second part of Z is in fact copied from the same ms. as the first. Both Wilmart and Manitius considered that part of Z is probably a copy of the lost ms. Ebroicensis which Beaugendre uses so often and of which he says, (Praefat. iii) "Sed ex omnibus Manuscriptis quos nobis videre licitum fuit, ... vix ullum melioris notae et ampliorem nacti sumus eo ... Vix quippe in aliis mss. undecumque nobis obvenerint, quidquam reperitur quod in hoc Ebroicensi desit, multa verò continet quae desiderantur in aliis."

To enable us to prove that at least the first part of Z can be identified with Ebroicensis two conditions are necessary. First of all, using the meagre information as to source which Beaugendre gives at the beginning of most poems, we must see whether all the pieces in Z are given by Beaugendre as being out of Ebroicensis, or at least are not expressly stated by him to come from another manuscript. Now, of the pieces which we find in this first part of Ebroicensis, nine, 20 (Misc 106) 26, (Ind 7) 46 (Ind 3), 47 (Misc 107) Misc 108, 37 (Ind 4), 43 (112), 51 (111) Misc 113, are said by Beaugendre to have come from this manuscript alone, six to have come from this manuscript among other, viz. 39 (Misc 79) 18 (Misc 40) 22 (Misc 75) 34 (Misc 122) 49, 50, and on four

Beaugendre gives no information. Only two, 15, and 23, are taken only from the Tours manuscript. May we not believe here that Beaugendre in the case of 23, which in his series (Ind 11) forms part of a group of poems taken from the Tours manuscript, forgot that this poem was also contained in Ebroicensis? The case of 15 (Ind 2) is more puzzling as it is difficult to see how Beaugendre could overlook this poem, while including its neighbours, 47 and Misc 108. However, I do not think that these two exceptions detract from the weight of this evidence.

Now the second way in which we can test the identity of Z is by an examination of the variants. If the variants which Beaugendre gives as belonging to Ebroicensis agree with the actual variants of Z then our thesis will be proved. Unfortunately this is subject to many reservations. First of all our examination obviously cannot work in the case of poems which Beaugendre took from Ebroicensis alone. Then, as is usual with Hildebert, the poems are mostly too short to afford any notable variants. Lastly, in some poems which are quite long, and where he must have found variants, Beaugendre refuses to record them. He seems to record variants only when they are very considerable, or help him out in the text. Therefore the absence of a variant of Ebroicensis where we know of one in Z cannot be conclusive. The following then is a list of the variants where (1) Z disagrees from Beaugendre without the latter noting a variant in Ebroicensis:

18. 2 moriturus Z: obiturus Beaug.

13 eum Z: cum Beaug.

31 textura Z: tectura Beaug.

(or (2) where Z agrees with Beaugendre against most of the other mss.)

50. donat Z: ditat Beaug.

40. 6 quo Z: quod Beaug.

9 creatrix Z: redemptrix Beaug.

46. 2 cum Z: dum Beaug.

On the other hand, in line 12 Beaugendre agrees with K Z against

all other mss.

46. 15 Z Beaug. resistent; all mss. resistant

46. 19 homo tanta Z: tanta quis Beaug.

22. 9 ager noted by Beaug. as reading of Ebr.: ager Z

22. 53 prope congerit noted by Beaug. as reading Ebr.,
prope congerit Z K M Z^3

5. 3 mater Z: radix Beaug.

49. 2 itur K Z: iter Beaug.

5 tutus K Z: totus Beaug.

8 fudit odorem K Z: fundit honorem Beaug.

9 condoluisti K Beaug.: consuluisti Z

28 celsia (IC) K Z: edita Beaug.

50. 9 intimus hostis E Z L Beaug.:
unica clades all other mss.

17 consumensque viros K E Z Beaug.:
omnia consumes (M) all other mss.

21 distich omit. all mss. except K Z E Beaug.

22 regum; rerum Z Beaug. only.

26 carc. spreta ios. K Z Cl E Beaug., comped.
ioseph all other mss.

45 disrumpit Z P Beaug. only.

60 excidioque Z Beaug.: exilioque all other mss.

From this it will be seen that although Beaugendre signalizes few of the variants of Ebr. which we know are in Z, yet he never gives us a variant of Ebr. where there is no corresponding variant of Z, and in fact Z and Beaug. are quite often combined against the other mss. This then seems conclusively to prove that the first part of K together with Z are closely related to Ebroicensis, if indeed Z is not a copy of that ms.

We are left then with the remainder of Z from item 25 onwards. Is it homogenous with the first part, or has Baluze taken these poems from various manuscripts? First we must consider what poems could belong to Ebroicensis. The number of the items is as shown in the table on p.149. Of the poems in Z outside the K Z series, Z48 is said by Beaugendre to have been taken solely from Ebroicensis and Z42, 49 and 52 from Ebroicensis among other manuscripts. Only Z58, 61 are expressly stated by the editors to have come from other manuscripts than Ebr., the former "E ms. Turon, a C.D. Dupoirier", the latter from Ms. 3550 of the French Imperial library. The last mentioned (Ins 57) is not in Beaugendre's edition but in that of Bourassé. Now item 60 (a repetition in a different hand of 22) cannot at all be regarded as homogenous with Ebroicensis. Items 56 and 59 appear elsewhere only in Du H and Du respectively, which seems to show that they belong to a different manuscript tradition

to K Z. Therefore the whole group after the life of St. Mary may be regarded as not belonging to Ebroicensis. On the other hand, St. Mary itself is a collation of Ebroicensis by Baluze. Beaugendre collated Ebroicensis for St. Mary, and states that his chapter-divisions are taken from those of the Evreux manuscript. These coincide with the divisions marked in Z as far as we have collated it. Moreover Beaugendre on this occasion gives copious variants in his text, and in the first hundred lines nine out of eleven variants given by him as readings of Ebroicensis are in Z. The two which differ do so only in slight detail (l. 23 memores Z, meaiores Ebr. in Beaug.; l. 122 gnatus Z, gnarus Ebr. in Beaug.). It is noteworthy that St. Mary appears far out of its place in the early series. In K it is item 21, and so one would expect it before K18, but it does not appear until Z 55, so that it has the appearance of being added by Baluze as an afterthought.

The question of homogeneity now seems to be narrowed down to that part of Z between Z 26 and Z 55. Poems before the first number are taken from Ebroicensis; poems after the second are not. Now in this part of the manuscript there are four kinds of poems: those which Beaugendre says he has taken from Ebroicensis; those on which we have no information from him, but which are also found scattered through K; those on which we have no information from Beaugendre and which are not in K, and finally those which Hauréau takes from this manuscript. I think it is reasonable to suppose, since Z 1-25 and Z 55 belong to Ebroicensis, that those poems which Beaugendre says he has taken from that manuscript also belong there. These are Z 28, 42, 48, 49 and 52. It also seems reasonable to suppose

that since K and Ebroicensis had a common archetype those pieces which occur in K and in Z should also be copied from Ebroicensis, although out of series in Z. This would include Z 29 (which is in any case closely connected in K Z Vi with Z 28, a poem which Beaugendre saw in Ebr.) 35, 36, probably also 34, which appears in Vi. A. xii., 37. Thus we have at least one sizeable group Z 34 - 37 which may safely be said to have been in Ebroicensis. We cannot say definitely whether the third group of poems, on which Beaugendre does not inform us, come from Ebroicensis or not. They could quite well do so of course, but if we consider the other manuscripts besides Z which contain them, it will be obvious that some at least can scarcely be from Ebroicensis. They are as follows. Z 30 (Du B T), Z 38 (Du T Cl Ko E M), Z 39 (Du B T A M), 240 (Du T D H), Z 46 (T), Z 51 (Du B T Cl D H). It will be seen from the list that the same is also true for the poems given by Hauréau.

This table should moreover show that of the poems which cannot definitely be stated to belong to Ebroicensis there are seven which can with some diffidence be said to belong to the ~~A~~ tradition of Du B T. These I have marked with an a. Some of these, 30, 32, 38, 39, and 46 one can be almost sure come from an a manuscript. Others appear in D or H or both and as these manuscripts do seem to have a connection with Ebroicensis, they might come from that manuscript. Such I have marked with X. Others again appear only in Z and we are left to conjecture where they came from. Now it must be emphasised that this division into pieces borrowed from an a manuscript on the one hand, and others either certainly or

possibly taken from Ebroicensis on the other is very tentative. However it would give us certain groups of pieces taken from similar manuscripts. Thus 30 - 32, 38 - 40 might come from the a tradition, and 34 - 37, 42 - 44, 48 - 52 from the Ebroicensis. The main objection to such a theory is that it supposes a very curious arrangement, with Baluze taking now a poem from one manuscript, now one from another. But even if we do not hold this theory we still have to explain why, if all these pieces represent Ebroicensis, Beaugendre did not publish them. Some of these might be rejected on the grounds of obscenity, but by no means all. No offence could be taken to Hau. 12 (poem 52), or 11 (44), 13 (53), 14 (30), 16, 18, 20 (31), 21, 22 (41) on moral grounds. Nor can we think that Beaugendre, having uncritically admitted much that is not Hildebert's into the edition from other manuscripts, should grow critical when confronted with Ebroicensis. If the pieces were together in Z we might think that Beaugendre had omitted them. But they are not together. The only alternative seems to be that suggested above. The crucial question is whether it is more likely that Beaugendre should omit these pieces after seeing them in Ebroicensis or that Baluze should insert in his notes here a piece from Ebroicensis, there one from another manuscript. The latter seems more likely, especially in view of the circumstances under which these copies were made. (For which see Wilmart op. cit. 175. n. 3).

Another pair of manuscripts related to each other within the general group are D H. We must first note that they differ somewhat from each other in composition, as H is more compact then the

anthology D. Moreover, although all the poems in H are contained in D, with the exception of 51, their order in the two manuscripts is completely different. However the constant identities of reading prove that the two manuscripts are closely related. There seems to be only one occasion when the readings of the two manuscripts support two different groups: 3.2 cum prece H R: per sacra D Z. There are of course frequent aberrations on the part of either D or H separately. Perhaps we may explain the different composition of the two manuscripts by supposing that H represents a fragmentary copy of a series, while D is an anthology selection of a longer portion of the same series.

It will be observed that K Z and D H share many poems, several of which appear in few other manuscripts. This leads us naturally to suppose that within the x class of manuscripts D H have some relationship with K Z. Yet the concurrences of readings tend to discourage this view. In the six poems which are found in K Z D H, we find five cases where H D and K Z differ. These are in poems numbers 46.1, 12; 26, 20, 29; 1.2. We do not find any reading where H K D Z agree together against other manuscripts of the x group. In 51, which would fulfill the necessary condition of having at least three of the four manuscripts together with others of the x tradition, D agrees constantly with F against K Z. Admittedly the number of opportunities for such agreement of K Z and D H is small, as there are few poems of any length which fulfill the conditions required. Yet it does tend to make us believe that despite the large number of pieces shared by K Z and D H they are not closely related.

From looking at the list of minor mss. it will be clear that many of these contain a few of his religious poems which appear again and again; for ex mple, 21, 40, 39. In the more important manuscripts, E F I P, we find that the same is true. All four have De Mysterio, 45 and 21; E F P has 40; F I P has 39. These manuscripts also have in common the fact that they have little value for ascertaining the genuineness of poems, and give us nothing that is not found elsewhere. They represent what might be called a vulgate edition of Hildebert. However, in point of view of actual relationship, we can be definite only about F I. Now F has an almost unbroken series of Hildebert's poems, beginning with De Mysterio. Closely related to this manuscript is Berlin Phill. 1685 s xiv, which has exactly the same order as F as far as the poem "hic leo dormivit". This would seem to indicate that the remainder of Phill. 1685, including the life of St. Mary is not homogenous with the beginning. Now I is a very different sort of manuscript, being in fact an anthology. A copy of this is in Reims (1275/743 of Wattenbach, N.A. 17 (1892) pp. 351-84, but may be passed over for our purposes. The majority of the poems in I are scattered here and there through the manuscript, but in fol. 121 we come upon an interesting little enclave of four pieces, numbers 19, 34, 50, 22. Of the earlier poems, De Mysterio may be related to P as these two mss. share notable variants: 130 unde P I Ed.: una mss.; 178 libet F I: licet mss.; 306 commemoranda P I: -ande mss.; 358 perpetuaque K F P I: -anque mss. In poem 39, on the other hand, I seems to be related to F as is shown by the variants: IV. 28 where F I Ed. have an entirely different line: III 35 istas

P I: illes mss., 36 stirps sua mss.: sanguine P: sanguis I.

For the remaining poems of I we can establish a relationship with no other manuscript. The manuscript P cannot be said to have any obvious relationship with any of the principal manuscripts, except possibly part of Ko which shares Misc 132 with it and also adds to 50 (fol. 73^{v}) the distich beginning "Absque deo nihil" which appears elsewhere only in P and R. This same Ko seems to have some connection with E, for we have (fol. 42) 55, 21, B.E. 67. E may also have a link with D as 22, 36, 50, i.e. the ninth, tenth and thirteenth poems in E, appear together in D as the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth of Hildebert's poems in that ms. Once again E seems to represent the homogenous series from which D took this little group. In 36 E follows the a tradition, while D follows x. In 22, on the other hand, the readings show striking concurrences, e.g. ll. 39, 46, 48, 53, 78. Again in 50 the two mss. follow different traditions. This shows us how eclectic the anthologies tend to be, even when they give us a fairly compact series of Hildebert's poems.

The interest of M lies in the fact that it contains several poems which appear in few other manuscripts. We find near the beginning (~~fol.~~ no. 48, contained only in K Z D M and further on 52 (K Z M Digby 65 only). The other poems of Hildebert in this section, all attested by numerous manuscripts, have the ~~[illegible]~~ x reading. The central portion of the manuscript contains many poems falsely attributed to Hildebert, which also appear in C, with which this manuscript shares at least ten poems. (cf p. 168) ~~(fol. 89)~~. Towards the end of M (fol. 89) we find an enclave of

four poems by Hildebert, numbers 4, 9, 10, 25. Of these, 10 appears elsewhere only in Du B, T and 25 in Du B T A Z. It seems likely then that this enclave is related to the a group, although the poems are too short to give us any divergencies of reading by which we might prove this definitely. The florilegia Q and R are so mixed that the poems are never in a continuous series, and Dom Wilmart considers the latter to be an anthology of anthologies. Another florilegium about which we can say little is L. It contains three poems (7, 9, 33) which are found respectively in B Du T Z, B Du T Z D M and Du T Z only. In 9.1 it sides with D Z against M R. So this middle portion of the manuscript might be related either to the a tradition or to D. The earlier poems definitely support the x tradition. In number 22 we have a curious situation, where the majority of the readings support the x group, but three (lines 11, 34, 53) the a group.

Now it will be already clear that we have two groups of manuscripts in which readings vary very considerably from each other, and which we have called the a group (Du B T A C1 Ko He) and the x group embracing all the other manuscripts. Moreover, if one looks at some of the variants it will be obvious that here we are dealing not with two diverging families of manuscripts but with two editions, or recensions. The extent of the differing passages and the fact that there is little to choose between the readings in point of view of style, syntax or metrics seem to indicate that this is not a recension by someone else but a second edition by Hildebert. Thus William of Malmesbury writing while

Hildebert was still alive[4] employs the x reading in quotations, while, as we shall see, Reginald of Canterbury, writing c. 1109, appears to draw upon a manuscript of Hildebert which belonged to the a group.

Having established that it is a first and second edition with which we are dealing, we must next consider (by examining the variants) which is the first edition, a or x. There are many poems in which a single member of the one group has disagreed with members of the other group. These may be true a x variants, but again they may not. Similarly divergences between A Cl on the one hand and x mss. on the other should be treated with some reserve, in view of what we have said above, regarding the relations of A Cl with Du B T. But even if we leave these doubtful variants out of consideration there are still 37 places where the a and x mss. definitely differ as groups. Some of these are puzzling in that single mss. stray temporarily from one group to another. The variants between the two groups are at: 8. 2; 17, 4, 13, 14, 16, 18, 22; 18. 6; 22. 2, 11 (½ has half the line in the a version, half in the x version), 16, 30, 34 (½ with a), 35, 37, 53 (½ with a), 63, 70, 81, 84, 90; 26, 8, 13 - 16 ~~omitting~~ a, 27; 36. 19 (with Z E), 25 ditto, 27 ditto, 28, 29 inverted in D M L Z^2, not inverted in Du Cl K Z; 39. I. 7; 50. 17?, 29?, 44? 50?.

A problem of considerable importance for the constitution of our text is the priority of the two editions. Consistency demands that we should adopt one or other series of readings throughout, and the natural edition to adopt in the text would be the last,

and presumably the most polished one. It is difficult to judge the priority of the editions without being subjective, thus considering one edition later because its readings seem better stylistically. Only such criteria as grammar and metrics may be used, and the indications which they give us are few. Let us take first the case for the priority of the x group, in which case we would expect the a group to give us better readings. In 22. 81 and 26. 8 the a version seems much more appropriate. But the x version is grammatically and metrically sound, and makes sense. On the other hand in 17. 18 the tense of x is much preferable. Much more convincing is the fact that in 22. 63, 84. we have elision in the a version, and none in x. Now, although Hildebert did not altogether avoid elision he was very sparing in his use of it and it seems unlikely that he would introduce it, where it did not exist previously. In 26. 27 the perfect tense of x seems much better than the present of a. Finally the ipse of a in 22. 35. is not as good as the illa of x. Although there is considerable confusion of demonstratives in the Latin of this period, (see p. 31) Hildebert does not often use ipse=ille. There is one other strong argument which is not taken from a comparison of the merits of the two readings. The monk Reginald of Canterbury, whose Life of Malcus is strongly influenced by Hildebert, begins a line of that life (III. 75) with the words "singula quid memorem". Now, this is taken from 22. 11, unless the two passages come from a common source, and the reading is that of the a version. Reginald had finished his work by 1107,[5] that is to say, not more than six years after the De exilio suo was written. Therefore this quotation does seem to indicate that the a reading is the earlier.

Notes

1 Also noteworthy is the reading of 18.6, where Du has the text of the x mss. against B Cl.

2 Lehmann, Hist. Vierteljahrschrift 30, p.23.

3 Worth noting in connection with K is B.M. Cotton Vitellius A.XII, desc. by Boutemy Lat.I (1937) pp.278-315. Though closely connected the mss. are not copied the one from the other, as K contains much not in Vi, and Vi continues the final series of Marbod's Varia further than K. As poem 54 is incomplete in Vi, while the first twelve lines of Marbod Varia I.46 are omitted, Boutemy has suggested that all the poems in K between these two pieces were originally in Vi but disappeared. This seems reasonable, especially as a 15th cent. hand has written 'vacat' at the foot of fol.122^{v}. As would appear from the long initial series of poems in K but not in Vi, the scribe of Vi was excerpting from a more extensive ms. which the scribe of K had copied in full for Hildebert at anyrate. Whatever the exact relationship may be it is clear that both mss. go back to a common archetype.

4 The date of the first edition of the Gesta Regum is fixed as pre 1125 by a reference to it in the Gesta Pontificum (cf.Stubbs G.R. I.pref. xix).

5 Lind p.11.

Order of poems in Z

Z item	new number	old number	MSS. other than Z
x 26		Hau 5	D G
a 27	7	Hau 6	Du B T
28		Misc 115	In Ebr.
29		Misc 114	In Ebr.
a 30	14	Misc 140	In Ebr.
a 31	9	Hau 7	Du B T D
a 32	33	Hau 8	Du T
33		Hau 9	Cott.Vitell.A.XII
34		Hau 10	In Ebr.
35	44	Hau 11	In Ebr.
36	52	Hau 12	In Ebr.
37	36	Misc 63	In Ebr.
a 38	38	Misc 64	Du T Cl Ko E M
a 39	25	Misc 61	Du T A M
a? 40	8	Ind.15	Du T D H
41		Hau 12^b	-
42	5	Misc 58	In Ebr.
x 43	33	Hau 13	D H
x 44	30	Hau 14	D
45		Hau 15	-
a 46	34	Misc 57	T
47		Hau 16	-
48		Misc 78	In Ebr.
49	35	Misc 71	In Ebr.
x 50		Hau 17	D R
x 51	17	Misc 60	Du B T Cl D H
52		Misc 51	In Ebr.
53		Hau 18	-
54		Hau 19	-
55	St.Mary		In Ebr.
56	31	Hau 20	Du H
57		Hau 21	-

Z item	new number	old number	MSS. other than Z
58	28	Misc 45	=Du T
59	41	Hau 22	Du
60	22	Misc 75	
61		Ins 57	-

Titles of K and B Du mss.

Of the important mss. of Hildebert's poems only four consistently bear titles. These are the group Du B T which, as we have seen, share titles which are substantially the same, and K. Of these two sets of titles those of K are more explicit, while those of Du B usually content themselves with giving the initials of the person addressed. The first question which arises is whether either of these sets of titles is due to Hildebert himself, or whether they are the work of a scribe. Despite its abbreviated names the Du series would seem to have more chance of going back to Hildebert. Several of the names indeed could be gleaned from a quick reading of the poem itself. This is the case with 27, 28, 29, 35. The title of 4 could have been seen from Letter 82 (Dieu-donné). The title of 41 "Ad Ducem R" could be a clever guess, in view of Hildebert's relations with the Normans of South Italy and the clear statement in the poem (l. 3) that it was directed to someone living in Italy. But several of the titles have a certain authority, derived from the fact that there is nothing in the poems which would lead the scribe to make similar guesses, so that these names come ultimately from Hildebert, unless we are to suppose that the scribe invented them and attached them arbitrarily to the poem. Thus there is no indication in l as to which Bishop Hildebert is addressing, yet Du unhesitatingly gives the title Ad G. episcopum. Similar instances are 14 Ad P. avarum, 15 Ad A. comitissam (though someone who knew Hildebert's correspondence with Adela might guess that she was the addressee), 33 Ad S. nepotem, 10 Ad A. comitissam. K, though more explicit, is less authoritative.

In 49 the name of Peter of Poitiers is given, and a careful reading of the poem, together with a knowledge of recent history, would lead to the title, Versus cuius supra de petro pictaviensi episcopo. Again, a knowledge of Hildebert's relations and correspondence with Geoffrey of Vendôme might lead the scribe to guess that he was the addressee of 43. In 46 by reading the poem he could see from l 16, and l 20 that this was a royal lady who had taken the veil. His choice of Cecilia might therefore be the result of a guess, as she may have been well-known as a literary lady. It is interesting to compare the few poems where both K and Du B provide titles. In 37 Du B gives "De Anglia" without mentioning the name of Mathilda, and K repeats this. For 26 Du B gives "ad M. literatam", while K has "Versus ad quandam virginem scilicet Muriel". In 15 it is the turn of Du B to be explicit with Ad A. comitissam, against K "Versus ad comitissam". For 1 Du B give "Ad C. episcopum" and K Versus eiusdem ad Will. dunel. epm.". Now the scilicet of 26 clearly shows that in this case K is guessing. In 37 he follows Du B so that it seems likely that he had before him the titles which we now see in Du B, and that seeing Ad M. literatam he guessed that this literary lady whose name began with M was Muriel. Similarly we are to suppose that seeing the "Ad C. episcopum" of Du B he guessed that this was William of Durham who had connections with Le Mans in any case. This series would appear then to be somewhat farther from the source than the series of Du B. How much confidence can we put in the guesses of this scribe? The answer would appear to be that they have every chance of being right. He was after all almost a contemporary of Hildebert's

and since the literary circle of the time was small must have known of the people to whom Hildebert would be likely to write. At any rate, his guesses, if guesses they are, are remarkably shrewd.

The Canon. I. Genuine poems.

Any attempt to form a canon of the genuine poems of Hildebert must rest very largely on the preliminary work done by Dom Wilmart. In his formation of the canon (R.B.48.pp.178-81) he first gives his estimate of the comparative weight and value of each manuscript, and then a list showing in which MS. each poem is found, allowing his readers to infer from that the grounds on which he has marked some poems as genuine and others as spurious. This is quite sufficient for most of the poems, but not for the small number which are on the border-line between the definitely genuine or spurious. For these it seems best to give some short explanation of their inclusion in the canon no less than of the exclusion of other poems which may seem to have as good a claim to belong to Hildebert.

The canon of Hildebert's poems rests on the firm basis of the two groups of MSS. which contain long uninterrupted series of his poems, namely Du B and K with the corresponding first part of Z. There should be no hesitation over including in the canon poems which appear in both these series. These are as follows:- 1,2,15,16,18,20,21,22,25,24,26,32,34,36, 37,39,40,43.

The second group of poems consists of those which appear only in Du B or K Z, but which are guaranteed as genuine by their presence in a large number of other MSS.or in MSS. independent of the group in which they are contained. In Du B they are:- 3 (A Cl Ko F G L), 4 (T Ko F M, and appears at the end of letter III.11 to Adela), 5(T A Ko Z F I G L R), 6 (A), 7 (T Z L), 8 (T Z D H L R), 9 (T Z D L M), 17 (T Cl Z D H G R), 19 (T I), 25 (T A Z M), 30 (Z D G), 33 (T Z L), 35 (T Cl, also the fact that the recipient is Mathilda, with whom Hildebert had considerable

dealings), 58 (T Cl Ko Z E M), 42 (T A Cl).

In K Z:- 45 (A Cl E F I P G R), 46 (Cl D H G), 47 (D H L R), 48 (D H M), 50 (A Cl Ko D E I P L M R, cited Baudri 149.21), 51 (Cl Ko D P G).

Next come those poems which appear either in Du B or K Z, but in no other ms., or at least in so few that some justification for their inclusion in the canon is required. In Du B they are :- 10 (M T), 11 (T Ko), 12 (T Ko M), 13 (T Ko), 14 (T Z), 27 (Du B only), 28 (T Z), 29 (T), 31 (Z H), 41 (Z). In K Z:- 44 (G), 49 (T), 52 (M, Digby 65).. Poems which do not appear in either of the homogenous lists are:- 53 (Z D H G), 54 (T Z), 55 (Ko Z E P), 56 (Ordericus, no mss. of Hildebert's poems), 57 (F G I P R).

Of the eighteen poems in these last two categories the genuineness of two can be established at once. The epitaph on Bruno (28) appears among the poems offered by the cathedral church of Le Mans as a contribution to his rotulus (Acta Sanctorum, Octobris III.p.761,'Tituli funebres de S.Brunone conf.'). It is admittedly anonymous there, as are most poems in such rotuli, but it seems very probable that the chapter would call upon Hildebert to make this contribution. The writer of the poem from S.Martin, Tours in the rotulus of Bertrand de Baux (d.1181)[1] draws heavily on this poem. This, though not conclusive in favour of its being genuine, shows that it was available to the scribe who made up the anthology T at Tours around this very time.

The epitaph on William de Ros (56) appears in no ms., but is guaranteed by the statement of Ordericus Vitalis Book 11, ch.XXX. After mentioning William's burial, Ordericus continues,'Fideles ergo et amici discipuli multa super illo prosa seu metro conscripserunt. Speciale tamen epitaphium,

quod Hildebertus Cenomannensis episcopus edidit, elegerunt, aureisque litteris caraxatum sic super illum imposuerunt', and then gives the poem.

The short poem 52 appears in K separated from the unbroken series by one poem, and also in the later part of Z. Its position in M (fol.40) is not good, for it occurs in an enclave of poems which appear to belong to the tradition of Elnonensis. However it is specifically cited as Hildebert's by Alexander Nequam (De Natura Rerum 39, Wright p.91) and by Geoffrey of Vinsauf (De arte versificatoria II.3.73). This, together with its presence in K Z seem to guarantee it as genuine.

Unfortunately none of the other poems are guaranteed in this way, so that we must rely on the meagre evidence of the MSS. Although 29 is found only in Du and T, it seems reasonable to regard it as Hildebert's. In the first place it appears in Du as in T in the middle of a long series of genuine poems (Wilmart's part VII) together with 28, which is definitely Hildebert's. Secondly, the fact that it appears only in two MSS., both of the same tradition, need not worry us if we consider that it is characteristic of epitaphs to appear only in one or two MSS. Thus 56 appears in no MS. of Hildebert's poems, and 28 only in Du T Z, yet we can be certain from external evidence that both are genuine. In view of their long friendship no one was more likely to write the epitaph of Helias than Hildebert. The only possible grounds for supposing that the poem does not belong to Hildebert is the grammatical irregularity in the last line. Unless Du is corrupt we must read 'excidit Elia patrieque et rebus adempto', which gives us a superfluous conjunction. This is not absolutely unknown even in classical Latin, though found mainly in Terence and Plautus and the Silver Latin prose writers (Kühner II.37e.). No doubt it was common enough in the Middle Ages, but it is surprising to find it in Hildebert.

Poems 12 and 13 appear in the series in Du B T, and in an isolated position in Ko, while 12 alone is found in M. The genuineness of these two leonine elegaic distichs is called in question by Haureau (p.51) who says that he has seen 13 at the end of a series of distichs which have never been attributed to Hildebert. In Ko (fol.25^{v})

the two distichs are followed by four leonine hexameters:

'ad patriam vite reditum procuro, redite:
quos ego mercor ita, mea mors est publica vita.
His ego tormentis paradysum pando redemptis.
Rex ego cui venti famulantur, cuncta regenti.'

The first distich is printed by Beaugendre as Misc.125, together with 15. He has taken them from Colbert 3019 = B.N.3088. But the difference in verse form between the lines quoted above and 12,13 inclines one to believe that they do not come from the same pen, and that their juxtaposition is due to some compiler of anthologies. Probably the similar juxtaposition of 13 with the distichs mentioned by Haureau is due to the attraction of like for like so common in anthologies.

Although Wilmart rejected 31, its presence in two MSS. belonging to different families (Du H) seems a conclusive proof that it is genuine.

There remain then five poems which are all in the same position, in that they appear only in Du or MSS. closely related to it and having no value as independent testimony to the genuineness of the poem concerned. The first of these is 41, which appears in Du, and was copied into Z by Baluze, probably from a MS. similar to Du. As with the epitaph on Helias we can support its claims from our knowledge that Hildebert had some dealings with Duke Roger of Apulia during his visit to Italy. The reference to the Alps (line 3) makes it certain that the recipient lives in Italy, while Du names him explicity as 'ducem R'.

The second, 10, is also in the series of T and in M (fol.89), forming an enclave with three other poems which are definitely Hildebert's. The juxtaposition of 9 and 10 here as in Du would lead us to suppose that the scribe of M is here using a similar MS., and so we cannot really say that in M we have the testimony of a MS. independent of Du. Poem 11 appears in Ko as well as Du and T, but as it is in that part of the MS. which has the same order of poems as the series of Du and is thus clearly related to that MS., it too carries little weight. Du shares 14 with T and that part of Z which is not copied consistently from

Ebroicensis. This poem may have been copied by Baluze from T. Finally, 27 is found only in Du B. So it is true to say that we retain or reject these poems accordingly as we set more or less value on Du B. It may seem dangerous to include poems in the canon on the strength of their appearing in one MS. out of many. However it seems to me that the authority of Du is far stronger than that of any other MS., and that these poems are as certainly Hildebert's as those which are supported by a greater number of MSS.

The next group of poems is that found in the series of K Z but in few or no other MSS. The first of these, 44, occurs before the beginning of the homogenous series in K, and in Z towards the end. Though it is not actually in the series of poems with the same order in both MSS., its presence in both shows that Baluze copied it from Ebroicensis. Thus it must have been in the common ancestor of K and Ebroicensis, and we must rely on its authority. The second poem to come under discussion is 49. This is found in MSS. of both the main traditions. In T it is at the edge of a'nest' of Hildebert's poems, but in K Z it is in a secure position. Therefore it would not seem to have required any comment had not Hauréau (pp.16-18) regarded it as spurious. He bases his opinion partly on stylistic grounds, and partly on the fact that Peter III of Poitiers, to the circumstances of whose life the poem obviously refers, died in 1115. According to Hauréau, Hildebert, then in his late fifties, would not have written 'cette insignifiante série d'hexamètres lourds, plats, et sans rythme.' It is true that 57, the one poem which we can date to this period, has a different and more polished style. But Hildebert's epitaphs are all written in a plain, sometimes ugly style, if we except 18, which is not strictly speaking an epitaph at anyrate. There is no very serious divergence from Hildebert's normal grammatical and metrical practise, except for the occurrence here (line 17 and 18) of the one case of impure rhyme to be found in Hildebert's rhyming verse. The only other point which might tell against Hildebert's authorship is the rather high number of metrical syncopes (four in 28 lines). Against this we can only argue that an epitaph or a piece for a rotulus would be

turned out as required, perhaps at short notice, without as much attention to style as is usual in Hildebert.

Of the poems which appear in neither of the two main series of Du B and K Z at least one, 55, seems to require little discussion, for it is found in the widely differing MSS.D G H Z. In both D and H it is in the middle of a compact series of Hildebert's poems, while in the large anthology G it forms part of a well defined group with 50 and the life of St.Mary. Much less well attested is 54 (T Z). It appears in that part of Z which Baluze has copied from several MSS., among them probably T. Thus we have in effect the testimony of T alone to vouch for its being genuine. Its insertion by the anthologist of T in the middle of a series of Hildebert's poems shows that he regarded it as genuine, and in view of the date and place of the writing of the anthology we may consider his views as fairly authoritative. As Haureau remarks, the style with its polished and pointed quality is reminiscent of Hildebert. Wilmart considers the poem genuine, and Haureau, without knowing T, does not decide conclusively for or against. In the absence of any extensive MS. evidence, the inclusion or rejection of this poem is more than that of any other a matter of personal choice.

There are several reasons why we might be inclined to doubt the genuineness of 55. First of all, as Dom Wilmart observes, its MS. tradition stands somewhat removed from that of the other poems. Moreover, apart from the introductory poem to 59, this is the only rhythmical verse of Hildebert extant. Again there is the question of whether the technical theological language of the poem would be likely to be used by a man like Hildebert at the time when Hildebert wrote this. The poem is regarded as Hildebert's by Vincent of Beauvais (Spec.Hist. XXV.ch.114), and among modern writers by Ussher (De Symbolis, 1645 ed.,p.36), Hommey (p.446), Beaugendre, Dreves (A.H.L p.409), Haureau (p.72) and Dom Wilmart. But Martène in his Amplissima Collectio (tom.IX.col.1092) ascribes it to Abelard after a MS. of Bec, and following him Cousin admitted it into his collection of Abelard's works (vol.1 p.551). The writers of the Histoire Litteraire, after

attributing it to Hildebert in vol.XI p.388, reverse their decision in favour of Abelard in vol.XII p.136. Their main reason for so doing is the rather curious one that Hildebert was never under suspicion of heresy in this matter, and so he would not need to write lines like 'Hec est fides orthodoxa;/ Non hic error sine noxa./ Sicut dico, sic et credo'.

As regards the metrical technique of the poem, it is not unduly advanced for its time. The trochaic eight-syllable line is not unknown even among poets of a much earlier period (cf.Meyer I p.215).[2] Unfortunately, hymns are apt to be anonymous and therefore hard to date, and the great twelfth century masters of rhythmical poetry, Abelard and Adam of S.Victor, belong to a later generation than Hildebert. But Hildebert was not the only writer of his generation to produce polished rhythmical verse, as is shown by the hymn of Marbod written in an identical metre, and perhaps in imitation of Hildebert.[3] Poems written in other metres attain a standard almost as high as Hildebert's. Some of Reginald of Canterbury's better verse is to be found in three hymns composed in fifteen-syllable lines (A.H. L.nos. 294-6). Hildebert's introductory poem to 39 is of an equally high standard.[4] A large part of the success of this poem lies in the perfect handling of the two-syllable rhyme rather than in any metrical innovation, and whatever doubts there may be about Hildebert's ability to handle the metre, his life of St.Mary shows that he had mastered this form of rhyme.

The technical theological language might seem to present a problem. It is true that nowhere else in Hildebert's verse do we meet such formidable words as 'intrinsecus' or 'consubstancialis'. Most of his religious poetry has allegory and not theology for its subject, the single exception being 40, which is couched in simpler language than this. But we must bear in mind the complicated nature of his subject, and also the influence on his language of his source, the Athanasian creed.

These are all rather negative arguments, and might not be

very impressive of themselves, if the MS. tradition did not support Hildebert's authorship. Among the MSS. collated for this edition this poem is found only in E P and Z, as also Ko, an important MS. for Hildebert, though not collated. It is not in the unbroken series of Du or K. But among the sixty odd MSS. which contain the poem we have nine explicit ascriptions to Hildebert:- Laon 146, Troyes 1002, Alencon 13 (fol.131), Cambrai 211, Munich 8304, B.N.2595 (fol.108), 13413 (fol.208), 14867 (fol.171), 15291 (fol.152), 17468 (fol.57). Moreover, in many of the MSS. which do not expressly attribute the poem to Hildebert it appears among undoubtedly genuine poems. Thus in S.Omer 710 (item 9) it appears immediately before St.Mary; in Berlin Phill.1734 we have the letters, 55, De Myst.; in B.N.2905 it precedes De Myst.; in B.N.13345 (fol.37) it appears before 39,40; in Laon 139 and Copenhagen Gl.Kgl.S.45 (fol.15) it follows De Myst.; in Vorau 53 (fol.52) it follows 16,17; in Mazarin 778 (fol.151) it appears with 45, and in Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge 54 it follows on a series of six poems by Hildebert. No doubt if we had fuller particulars about some of the other minor MSS. which contain 55 we would have even fuller proof of the close connection of this poem with others which belong to Hildebert. The fact that it does not appear in the more important MSS. may be due partly to its length, which puts it on a level with the life of St.Mary or the De Mysterio Misse. These are often found by themselves in MSS. which contain nothing else by Hildebert. Again several of the MSS. in which it appears are collections of hymns from different sources rather than collections of Hildebert's poems. Another explanation could be that the poem was written after the series represented by Du and K were 'published'. However we have no means of proving this in the present state of the evidence. Nevertheless there can be no doubt that the poem is really Hildebert's, though different in several respects from anything else written by him.

The last poem which requires discussion is 57. This has somehow escaped the all-embracing net of Beaugendre, and is not discussed by Hauréau in his Mélanges, though he knew of its existence.

Wilmart, in describing the MSS., notes its presence without comment and does not even consider the possibility of oits being genuine. Yet the MS. support for this poem appears to be as good as for some, e.g. Misc 132, which he accepted as genuine. Among the more important MSS. it is found in F G I P R. In F and the related Berlin 170 it appears at the end of a series of eleven genuine poems, and in Berlin 955 (Lat.Qu.106 s.xii, fol.26^{v}), another related MS., it comes at the beginning of the same series. In I (fol.125) it comes at the end of a group of Marbod's poems, but these are immediately preceded by the series of Hildebert's poems noted by Wilmart (p.169). Its position in the related Reims 1275 (fol.245) is similar. In G (fol.67) it is in the middle of what Wilmart called 'une enclave bien nette en faveur d'Hildebert'. In P (and Riant 36) its position is not so good, for it is preceded by Misc 132 and followed by Misc 119 and 'Salve festa dies'. Finally, in R (Werner item 181, fol.38) it follows 21 and is followed by Marbod's De Ornamentis Verborum.

Thus the evidence of the more important MSS. is on the whole favourable, and it is supported by that of the minor MSS. Certain of these indeed seem to belong to the same group as F and Berlin 955, so that they cannot count as independent testimony. Thus in Amiens, L'Escallopier 10 we find the series: De Myst.,59,40,57,21,5,3,20; and in Douai 533 with Troyes 215: 21,B.E.67,57,5,5. But apart from these MSS. it is found in B.N.3705 (fol.146) after four poems of Hildebert, in Bern 710 (fol.62^{v}, Werner p.190) separated from 3 and 2 only by Misc 129, and in Zurich 494 (Rh.124) following 45,21. It is also near to letters or poems of Hildebert in the following: S.Omer 710 item 18 (N.E.31.154) where it is removed from 50 by one poem; Douai 285, where it appears as item 11 with 43; B.N.18082, following 67; Oxford, Univ. Coll.45, preceded by De Myst. and Hau.32, and followed by 55; Vienna 160 (fol.40^{v}), removed from the letters by one poem only; St.Gallen 320 (fol.288) preceding 34; Grenoble 235 (fol.175), with 40; Rouen 1419 (fol.155^{v}), following 2,34. On the other hand in B.N.1249 (fol. 42), 5417 (H.N.E.1.211), 16699 (fly-leaf) and Cotton Titus D.XXIV

(fol.85, Mozley item 81c) it is in an isolated position.

It seems obvious then that in both major and minor MSS. the poem is very closely connected with others by Hildebert. Moreover, as Hildebert did not write any other poem on the canonical hours, if we except the dubious Misc.130, there would be no reason for scribes to father this poem on him, as was the case with Pierre Peintre's De Eucharistia or Hau.32. As nothing in the style or metre of the poem contradicts the evidence of the MSS. we must accept this and include it in the canon of genuine works.

Notes

1 Delisle, Rouleaux p.286.

2 For instance the 10th century poem 'Age, age iam Alberte' (pr. Du Meril, Poesies Populaires,1843,p.271) goes a considerable way towards the metrical standard attained by Hildebert, whatever its poetic value may be.

3 There is some doubt as to whether this poem (Var.I.6) really belongs to Marbod. Dom Wilmart considers it genuine on the testimony of T and the editio princeps.

4 For fuller information on Hildebert's metrical abilities see p. .

Occurrences of Shorter Poems in the mss.

1 Du B T Ko He K Z H

2 Du B T He K Z F P L R

3 Du B A Ko He F G L

4 Du B T Ko He F M

5 Du B T A Ko He Z F I G L R

6 Du B A He

7 Du B T He Z L

8 Du B T He Z H D L R

9 Du B T He Z D L M

10 Du B T He M

11 Du B T Ko He

12 Du B T Ko He

13 Du B T Ko He

14 Du B T He Z

15 Du B T He K Z M

16 Du B T A^2 He K Z G

17 Du B T Cl He Z H D G R

18 Du B T Cl Ko He K Z G

19 Du B T He I

20 Du B T A Ko He K Z E F G

21 Du B T A Ko He K Z E F I P G R

22 Du B T A Cl He K Z D E I G L M R

23 Du B T A Ko He K Z H D G L M

24 Du B He K Z G L

25 Du B T A He Z M

26 Du B Cl He K Z H D G

27 Du B He

28 Du T He Z D

29 Du T He

30 Du Z D G

31 Du Z H

32 Du K Z

33 Du T Z L

34 Du T A Ko K Z F I G L R

35 Du T Cl

36 Du T Cl Ko K Z D E L M R

37 Du Cl K Z

38 Du T Cl Ko Z E M

39 Du T A Cl Ko K Z F I P

40 Du T A Cl Ko K Z E F P R

41 Du Z

42 Du T A Cl

43 Du A K Z

44 T (2 lines only) K Z G

45 A K E F I P G R

46 Cl K Z H D G

47 K Z H D L R

48 K Z H D M

49 T K Z

50 A Cl Ko K Z D E I P L M R

51 Cl Ko K Z D P G

52 K Z M

53 Z H D G

54 T Z

55 Ko Z E P

56 No mss. of Hildebert's poems.

57 F P G R

Supp 1 (Misc 51) T Z E P

Supp 2 (Misc 130) A

Supp 3 (Hau 5) Z D G

Supp 4 (Hau 17) Z H D R

Supp 5 (Hau 30) A R

N.B. The lists of mss. which head the critical apparatus of each poem give the mss. collated only, and are not always identical with the above.

Canon II. Other poems found in the Beaugendre-Bourassé Edition

For his edition of the 'Miscellanea' Beaugendre used the following mss.:

1) A, his Colbert 1050, now B.N. 7596A
2) E, his St. Victor 272, now B.N. 14867 (In Omont's Concordances des Manuscrits Latins St. Victor 272 = B.N. 14502).
3) A ms. from S. Amand en Pévèle, which Beaugendre calls Elnonensis and Dom Wilmart C. Now B.N. 5129.
4) A ms. in the possession of Dr. J. Du Poirier of Tours.
5) T, although he avails himself of it very little.
6) An Evreux ms. (Ebroicensis) now lost (cf. P.).
7) A ms. from the Premonstratensian house of St. Mary at Auxerre also lost.
8) Colbert 6101, now B.N. 1249.
9) Colbert 3019, now B.N. 3088.
10) Colbert 6327, now B.N. 8484.
11) One of the Jumièges mss. already used for the B.E. Used for Misc. 67 and 68 only.
12) The papers of Baluze.

From all of these mss., except the little used E, poems were taken which cannot be regarded as belonging to Hildebert. Bourassé, though he did not substantially alter Beaugendre's work, added poems from T, from another Tours ms., and from printed sources which attributed certain poems to Hildebert.

Of these mss. the best is A, but Beaugendre has used it very uncritically, especially as he has ignored the fact that the last few poems are in a different hand, and copied from a different kind of mss. The earlier poems of A are in such a compact series that Beaugendre could scarcely go wrong. But when we come towards the end of that series, there are four poems whose genuineness must be queried, namely Misc. 129, 110[2], 130 and Hau. 30 (which

will be dealt with in part III). The first of these appears elsewhere in Beaugendre's edition (Misc 68), and there he has taken the text from his mss. Jumièges 77. This is only part of a much longer poem printed in editions of Ausonius and found in innumerable mss. (Walther, Verzeichnis, no. 15065). It appears in T (no. 47), G, and L. In T it is well placed before a long series of poems, and in L (fol. 116) it follows 50. But in G, and Cott. Titus D. xxiv. (desc. Mozley, Med. Aev. xi, 1942, item 66) it is isolated, while of the twelfth and thirteenth century mss. listed by Walther only in B.N. 2445 A (fol. 227), Bern 710 (item 5. 8), Vorau 33 (item 12) and Reims 431 (fol. 205^{v}) does it adjoin poems by Hildebert. It ought to be quite clear that this is an anthology poem which chance has occasionally thrown in the way of Hildebert's poems.

Next to come under discussion are the two distichs designated by Wilmart (op. cit. p. 33) as Misc. 110^{2}. As Haureau points out (p. 112) these four lines are really two separate distichs, appearing together only in Mazarin 593 (fol. 25). The second distich does not appear elsewhere, but the first is found in Bodl. Digby 53 (fol. 11^{v}), Reims 1275 (fol. 192^{v}), Douai 749, B.M. Cotton Titus D. xxiv (item 68 in Mozley's list) Douai 553 (item 96), Troyes 215 (item 82), B.M. Add. 35,112. In the Digby mss. and Add. 35,112 it follows 50 as in A, but elsewhere it is not connected with any of Hildebert's poems.

Thus Misc. 130 is placed at the end of the first part of A, and following two poems which are definitely not genuine. Dom Wilmart believed this poem to be Hildebert's, but then he was following Haureau (p. 126) in the belief that the poem in G described by Endlicher as "Versus de horis canonicis" was Misc 130, whereas it is in fact our no. 57. As it is we have no other copy of this poem, and one would reject it immediately were it not for a certain similarity of the style to that of Hildebert. The section on Matins is especially reminiscent of the concise, crabbed style of the Biblical Epigrams. Besides, A is our oldest mss., and it is just possible that this is an early poem which Hildebert did not wish to "publish" in later collections of his work. In

view of these considerations, I think it ought to be retained in the supplement of poems which may belong to Hildebert, in the hope that the discovery of new manuscript evidence may enable it to be re-instated in the canon.

We now come to the supplement, or A^2, containing six poems, of which the first and the last are certainly genuine. The single distich of 124 will be discussed when we come to deal with B.N. 3088 (Colbert 3019). There remain for discussion here Misc 132, 133. At first sight Misc 132 would seem to have strong manuscript evidence in its support, and in fact, while Haureau (p 127) rejects it, Dom Wilmart believes it genuine. (op. cit. p. 180). It appears in A^2 Ko P/M in the relative of I, Reims 1725 and in Wilmart's ms. L (op. cit. 171). However in this last manuscript, the poem comes in what Dom Wilmart calls the supplement, our ms. V^2 of the Biblical Epigrams, and is surrounded by short poems "qui semblant appartenir a Pierre Riga", its sole companion being the apocryphal Misc 81. In M it occurs (fol. 96) together with the genuine 12, but is followed by "Divitiis, regno, specie" and Hau 31. In P it forms one of a group of four poems (with 57, "salve festa dies" and Misc 119), only the first of which can definitely be considered genuine. Although isolated in Ko (fol. 48^V) from any considerable body of Hildebert's poems it follows the undoubtedly genuine B.E. 66. In Vienna 815, (fol. 74^V) it is followed by 3, and Cambrai 536/7 (fol. 145^V) and 860 (fol. 4) in which it also appears are both mss. with a number of Hildebert's poems in them, although rather mixed up throughout the mss. But in other mss.: B.N. 14893, 2874 (fol. 84^V), B.M. Royal 6.B.XI (fol. 62) B.M. Royal 7D.1 (fol. 42), Oxford Canon. class. lat. 37 (fol. 59) and Digby 104 (fol. 138^V) it is quite isolated. In both Reims 1275 and Vienna 275 (Endlicher's numbering) it is isolated in a mêlée of pieces. The manuscript evidence then seems to be against its being genuine, and yet it does seem to have been associated with Hildebert's poems, at any rate in anthologies. The possible explanation for this is that it became ascribed to Hildebert owing to its similarity in

subject to B.E.7. In fact, though the subject is the same, the treatment is different, for the writer of this poem merely states the facts, while Hildebert in his usual way gives an allegorical interpretation to the parable. The fact that Hildebert had definitely written one poem on the subject would not, of course preclude him from writing a second. But it seems reasonable to suppose, especialy in view of its position in V^2, surrounded by poems of Pierre Riga, that we have in this poem, an imitation by Pierre Riga of a poem by Hildebert, just as Misc 6 is an imitation of Hildebert's 20, and Misc 4 of B.E. 44. The distich Misc 133 is found also in mss. Lambeth Palace 176 s. xiii^1 (fol. 126).

Of all the manuscripts which led Beaugendre astray, that which contributed most to the bulk of poems assigned to Hildebert is the Elnonensis (B.N. 5129). Several of the poems in this ms. are attributed to Hildebert (wrongly, as we shall try to show), and Beaugendre was thus led to include much more than these in his edition, although in fact, as far as one can judge, going by the descriptions given by Dom Wilmart (p. 164) and A. Boutemy, Scriptorium II (1948) pp. 47 seq. - 55 the manuscript contains nothing which can be proved to belong to Hildebert. It is important to note that there seems to be some affinity between C, M and Ko, all three florilegia which share poems not found elsewhere. Probably the closer of these to C is M, for they share ten poems: Misc 27, 33, 137, 138, Ind 1, 15, 16, 17, Misc 51, 118. In both mss. the poems Misc 33, 137, 138, Ind 15, 16 form compact groups. Some connection can be seen between Ko and C, for they share Misc 50, Ind 1, Misc 138, 118, and Ham 31. But the poems are widely scattered in Ko and have probably come in by devious routes. Also in this group is Douai 825 sharing with C Misc 119^1, 50^{51}, 120, Ind 15, 16 and possibly more. The manuscript I may be connected with this group, for it contains the De operibus sex dierum^2 (fol. 89^v) and the life of Mahomet (fol. 105)

Of the poems introduced into Beaugendre's edition from Elnonensis, 14 can have no claim whatsoever to belong to

Hildebert, and I will merely list them, giving in brackets any other relevant mss. which contain them. These are: Misc 27 (M), 30 (Reims 1275, C), 31, 32, (R, Werner item 54), 33 (M), 44, 47,[3] 115, 120 (Douai 825, B.N. 3088 cf. Hau. p. 120), 137 (M) Digby 65, Ind 15 (M Douai 825), Ind 16 (M Douai 825), Ind 17 (M). (Ind 1, C M Ko), Misc 138 (M Ko Douai 749).[4]

Several of the longer poems included in Beaugendre's editions have come in from this manuscript. The "De Operibus Sex Dierum" (C: 86^{v} item 10 in Boutemy), an allegorical commentary on the days of the Creation in 101 distichs, is attributed to Hildebert in C, and in Douai 825 (fol. 157). Another Douai ms. 533 attributes it to Hildebert (fol. 206 R), but in Cotton Vespasian D.V (fol. 128) Leipsig 201 s. xiii (fol. 173^{v}), Vat. Reg. 421 s (fol. 1^{v}) and St. Omer 115 (fol. 11) it is anonymous. In I (fol. 89^{v}) it is attributed to a certain Odo, and its near relative Rheims 1275/743 (fol. 146^{v}) goes further and gives the title "incipiunt versus Odonis Aurelianensis". Wilmart takes this as showing conclusively that the poem belongs to Odo of Orleans, Bishop of Cambrai (p. 169), but neither he nor Manitius (III 239) gives any proof beyond the attribution of this one family of manuscripts. We can no doubt place more reliance on an attribution to a little-known author, for a great name like Hildebert's naturally attracted poems to it. The testimony of C and Douai 825 count for nothing, but it is rather disturbing to find it attributed in Douai 533, a ms. which does not seem to be related to C. The style is not very different from Hildebert's, and lines like 19, "Per tenebras pravos, per lucem concipe iustos",[5] 28 "divisum meritis conditione locis",[6] 59 "in firmamento stellas intellige iustos" recall similar allegorical passages in Hildebert. In view of the mss. evidence, this probably means that the writer was an admirer of Hildebert's poetry, or that both were using a style common to the allegorical interpretation of the Bible, rather than that this is Hildebert's work. Yet the chances of the poem being Hildebert's are not quite nil, and it does not appear to be absolutely certain that it is by Odo of Orleans. To prove either of these, we would require more manuscript

evidence.[7]

The authorship of the Phisiologus, also taken by Beaugendre from C (96^{v} Bout. item 14), but not attributed to him in that ms., presents no difficulty. The author himself tells us that his name is Theobald in the concluding lines "Carmine finito, sit laus et gloria Christo,

Cui si non alii placeant haec metra Tibaldi."

Neither the "De Ordine Mundi" (C fol. 122^{v}, item 42 in Boutemy) nor the "In primum Caput Ecclesiastes" (C fol. 121^{v} Boutemy item 41) appear in any other manuscript, and they are not even attributed to Hildebert in C.

The "De Mahumete" (C fol. 127^{v}, item 44 Boutemy) is ascribed to Hildebert in C and Douai 825, and in at least one medieval book list[8] it is coupled with the life of St. Mary, under the heading "Vita Egyptiace et Macumeti". But in I (fol. 111^{v}) and the Rheims mss. (fol. 159) it is accompanied by a short poem which gives the author's name as Embricho and tells us enough about him to enable us to identify him as the Embricho who was provost of Maintz, and became Bishop of Augsburg in 1064.[9]

The "Mathematicus" is not ascribed to Hildebert in C (fol. 135^{v} Boutemy 45), but nevertheless Beaugendre has given him this poem also. Haureau in his "Le Mathematicus de Bernard Silvestris et la Passio Sanctae Agnetis de Pierre Riga, Paris, 1895, tries to prove that this versified declamation belongs, not to Hildebert, or to Serlo of Bayeux, as the editors of the Hist. Litt. (xv p 12, 16) would have us believe, but to Bernardus Silvestris. As this book is not readily available, and as Haureau's first treatment of the subject in N.E. 29II 341 sq. is not so conclusive, it seems best to give a brief resumé of his arguments. Of the dozen mss. which he has found containing the Mathematicus, two, Cambrai 875 (fol. 156) and Vatican Reg. 370 (fol. 226^{v}) attribute the poem to Bernard. The Cambrai ms. merely gives his first name, "Haec metra composuit Bernardus de patricida", but the attribution of the Vatican ms. is "Incipit Mathematicus Bernardi Silvestris". A

third mss. of the xvth century (B.N. 11345) contains five extracts of the poem and all have the words "Bernardus Silvestris" opposite each (at foll. 15, 29, 32, 42, 66). Moreover in both B.N. 6415 and Vat. Reg. 370 the poem appears immediately after the Microcosmos of Bernard. Thus, although Haureau's arguments for Bernard as author are not completely convincing yet there can be no doubt that Hildebert is not the author.

~~J. G. Preaux, Thierry de S. Trond, Latomus 6 p 353. This appears to assign the De Nummo to Thierry, but does not seem definite and will require discussion.~~

The most debatable of all the poems introduced by Beaugendre from Elnonensis is Misc 50, the "De Nummo". In fact the Elnonensis, and in consequence, Beaugendre's edition contains only 206 lines of this poem of 1190 elegiacs. (fol. 94^2 item 13 in Boutemy). The first complete edition of this poem appeared in F. Otto's "Commentarii Critici in Codices Bibl. Gissensis", Gissen, 1842 pp. 98 - 108 and 163 - 198. Otto used four mss: the Elnonensis, Leipsig 1306, (Feller p. 299 no. 29) where the poem is attributed to "Mamucius",[10] Brussels 17018[11], and Marburg Dl. In these last two the poem is anonymous. The poem also appears in Vienna 848 (Phil. 390) s xiii (fol. 1 - 19^v), where it is followed by a fragment of St. Mary, and Vienna 857 (Phil. 391) s xii, (fol. 1), where the attribution seems to be by the cataloguers and not as Haureau indicates (p. 40) by the scribe. Wattenbach (Sitzungsber. der Konig. Bayer. Akad. III, 1873, p. 742) found the poem, unattributed, in a Scheftlarn manuscript (Munich 17142 s xii, fol. 126). In Ko, which we have already noted as being related to Elnonensis, the poem, again anonymous, is followed by 36. (fol. 64, Lehmann p. 42). Finally it is found without the name of the author in B.N. 16252 (fol. 15^v). The consensus of opinion until recently was that the poem was indeed Hildebert's. This is the view taken by Haureau (p. 41), who goes so far as to say "Ce poème est un des plus considérables que nous ait laissés Hildebert, et c'est peut-être le plus intéressant et le plus louable". Wattenbach did not realize that the poem had been edited and expressed no opinion as to author-

ship. Lehmann on the other hand considers it as Hildebert's and asserts (p. 42) "ist es in der Tat eine Jugend-Dichtung des 1059 geborenen Hildeberts". Scivoletto also considers the poem to be genuine, and rates it very highly, giving a detailed description of its contents (pp. 86 - 105). Otto (p. 101) inclines to the view that it may be Hildebert's, but leaves the matter open. Dom Wilmart does not appear even to entertain the idea that it might be his. In this he is followed for a different reason by M. J. Préaux who in the course of his article 'Thierry de Saint-Trond, auteur du poème pseudo-ovidien De mirabilibus Mundi, Latomus 6 (1947) pp. 353 - 365, adjudges this poem to belong rightly to Thierry. The chief purpose of the article is, as the title indicates, to prove that Thierry is the author of the De Mirabilibus Mundi ed. by M.R. James (Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway pp. 290 - 6). In mss. Brussels 10615/10729 s. xii, which contains the three poems which certainly belong to Thierry, namely the paraphrase of Solinus, the poem on his dog and on the tower of the winds at Athens (cf. Manitius III. 709 sqq.) Préaux noticed divided from these by a prose treatise the poem entitled 'Theodericus de fratre suo nummo', ~~translated~~ from Ko by Lehmann, Hist. Vierteljahrschrift 30. 48 - 53. This Lehmann had guessed to belong to Thierry, but its presence in the Brussels mss. seems to make this certain.

Préaux seems quite justified in claiming that the De Mirabilibus Mundi is Thierry's on the strength of the many parallel passages shared by it and by the paraphrase on Solinus. Incidentally to proving this he also tries to show that the De Nummo attributed to Hildebert is also Thierry's. His case for this is strong, for it appears both in Ko and the Brussels mss. not far removed from the shorter De Nummo already mentioned. Moreover Lehmann gives a large number of valid instances of what he calls Hildebert's influence on this latter poem, and this may well be a case of the one poet Thierry using in two different poems the same favourite phrases. The prominent place given to the catalogue of serpents in the Ps. Hildebert De Nummo is matched by a similar passage in Thierry's

paraphrase of Solinus. It is even more striking that lines on the lapidary properties of the urine of the lynx (De Mirabilibus Mundi 10, 11) which are repeated almost verbatim in the Paraphrase of Solinus should appear quite out of context in a slightly altered form in Ps. Hildebert 11. 649, 650. The other parallels brought forward by Preaux are more convincing and copious in the case of the De Mirabilibus Mundi than in that of our poem, but those mentioned above, together with Lehmann's examples seem to prove pretty conclusively that Thierry is the author.[12]

Another poem taken by Beaugendre from Elnonensis, 118 (fol. 106[2], Boutemy item 33) and which Dom Wilmart (p. ~~118~~ 180) considered genuine, though it had been rejected by Hauréau (p. 118), is Misc 118. This appears in the related mss. C M Ko and Douai 825. In M its position is isolated. In Ko (fol. 43[v]) it does indeed follow the enclave composed of 21, B.E. 67 and 56, but it is in turn followed by the spurious Misc 138, also shared by C, and other short poems, none of them Hildebert's. Outside this group it is found in Bodl. Digby 65 (fol. 28) next to a poem by Pierre Peintre, in Z^2 and in Tours 300 (fol. 75). Even if Z^2 were homogenous, the position of 118 there is again isolated. The last two lines of 118 as printed in Beaugendre form an entirely separate poem, probably taken by Beaugendre as by Bourassé (Ins. 7^2) from T (item 138 in Wilmart's list).

In a similar way Beaugendre has joined two separate poems to make Misc 119. Hauréau was the first to show that they are separate (p. 119), the first two lines constituting an elegiac distich, and the second two being hexameters. As far as can be seen, they appear together only in C (fol. 106, Boutemy item 34) and Douai 825, (fol. 80) but in the other manuscripts listed below there seems to be only the first distich. In R the first distich appears at the head of a poem of 18 lines. (Werner item 78 p. 34), but as these are hexameters they cannot be a continuation of the elegiac 119[1] as Wilmart (p. 174 n. 3) would have it. However that may be they are definitely not part of any group of Hildebert's poems there. It appears also in Bodl. Digby 65 (fol. 68 together with

Misc 66), St. Omer 115 (fol. 33), Berlin Theol. oct. 94, and Paris B.N. 3088.

A mss. from which many of the poems of Pierre Riga have come into Beaugendre's text is the Tours mss. belonging to Dr. J. Du Poirier. Beaugendre's practise seems to be to designate this mss. simply as Turonensis, and to refer to our T, which he uses but seldom, as "mss. S. Gatiani Turonensis". Of the poems designated as "Turonensis" only one, Misc 109, appears in T (item 296), and it is possible that Beaugendre really found this in T and not in Du Poirier's mss. Two poems (45, 46) which he says specifically that he has taken from the Du Poirier mss. also appear in T, and again it seems likely that Beaugendre has confused the two mss. This Du Poirier mss. appears to have contained the Floridus Aspectus, the selection of his own poems which Pierre Riga made for Archbishop Samson of Rheims in the middle years of the twelfth century. Many poems from the Floridus Aspectus have thus come into Beaugendre's edition via this manuscript. There can be no doubt as to Pierre's authorship of the Floridus Aspectus, some of the contents of which he has taken from his better known versification of the Bible, the Aurora.[13] The fullest mss. appears to be Arsenal 1136, and other mss. are Vat. Reginensis 344 (Wilmart Cod. Reg. Lat. pp. 281 - 290), S. Omer 115 (Pierville M.E. 31.1. pp. 90 - 99), Douai 825 fol. 143, Munich 257 fol. 135[v] and B.N. 15692.[14] The following then are the poems of the Floridus Aspectus attributed to Hildebert: 1 - 26 (= Boutemy items 1, 17, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 6, 3. Misc 19 - 26 are not in the Arsenal mss., but with the exception of the last look as if they may come from the Aurora. They are certainly not Hildebert's), 29 (Boutemy no. 50), 34 (Bout. 43), 35 (Bout. 45), 36 (Bout. 46), 37 (Bout. 49), 38 (Bout. 47), 39 (Bout. 48), Ind 8 (Bout. 14), Ind 9 (Bout. 15). Finally the longer poem De Susanna (Beaug col 1231 - 6) is also taken from the Floridus Aspectus via the Tours mss. This originally formed part of the Aurora, and is edited by Hauréau (N.E. 29.2.352 sqq.) and by J. H. Mozley (Studi Medievali VIII, pp. 30 - 36, 36 - 41), where he gives both the original form of the poem and the re-working by Aegidius.

Five other poems have come into Beaugendre's text from this ms. They are 49 (also in B.N. 6765, among poems by Serlo of Wilton), 135, 136, Ind 10 (the celebrated epitaph of Seneca, see Walther no. 3960 for mss.), Ind 12 (also in R items 158 and 360b). None of these can be seriously considered as Hildebert's.

As we have said above, it seems likely that Misc 109 was taken by Beaugendre from T rather than from the Du Poirier ms. It is obviously a fragment of a longer anti-feminist poem. Misc 70, which Beaugendre says he has taken "E mss. S. Gatiani Turonensis et aliis." cannot be Hildebert's, as the sentence on Ulger there referred to was not carried out until 1138. Also taken from T by Beaugendre is Misc 51.[15] At first sight there would appear to be a strong case for regarding it as genuine as it appears in T E P M Z Z^2 of our principal mss.[16] Let us first consider their evidence. Of these mss., the most reliable is E, and in E this poem stands well placed in the series and is attributed "cuius supra". In P it is preceded by 50 and followed by 34. As Beaugendre mentions that he took this poem from his Ebroicensis among other mss., it seems probable that it has been copied into Z from that source, but we cannot tell what its position was in that ms. In Berlin 170 (fol. 167) it is placed after two anthology pieces, and before the poem on S. Vincent given to Hildebert by Beaugendre on very doubtful authority. In M (fol. 39) it is not in any of the enclaves of genuine poems characteristic of that ms., and in Z^2 it appears with Misc 118 in a part of the ms. which does not contain any poems of Hildebert. In T (item 32) it immediately follows 20.

The testimony of the minor mss. is equally indecisive. In Bodl. Digby 65 (fol. 64) it is followed by 20, a poem "Cum de latrina", Misc 119 and Misc 66. In Douai 533[17] (fol. 210) it is preceded by 34 and followed, with one poem intervening, by 40. In B.N. 2445 A (fol. 228) it follows a fragment of 56, and is said by Hauréau (p. 46) to be attributed. In both Valenciennes 249 (fol. 70- and Berlin Phill. 1732 (181) (fol. 27) it appears at the end of a compact series of Hildebert's poems. According to Hauréau (loc. cit.) it is attributed also in B.N. 3088 (fol. 78) and

and 14867 (fol. 75). Finally in Valenciennes 152 (fol. 178) it is not next to but near 19 and 40. In Douai 882 (fol. 127) it is indeed attributed, but the fact that it is preceded by the Phisiologus and followed by the De Mahumete, in the same order as Douai 825 and with the De Mahumete, ascribed to Hildebert in both cases, seems to indicate a relationship between 882 and 825, and ultimately C. In two British Museum mss., Add. 35112 (fol. 103) and Cotton Titus xxiv (item 16 in Mozley's list, fol. 22^{v}) it is in an isolated position. While in Cambrai 404 (380) s. xii (fol. 36), Angers 304 s. xii (fol. 140) and Lambeth 199 s. xii (fol. 248) it is found not even among the usual anthology pieces but wedged between various theological works. Hauréau (loc. cit.) also mentions B.N. 3696 B (fol. 20), 13343 (fol. 40), 16699 (fol. 77) where it is anonymous.

From this conflicting evidence we can form no firm conclusions. The poem is not in any of the collections of the first order (e.g. Du or K). It is however in E and probably was in Ebroicensis. It is attributed only in E (and that not by name but by implication) and Douai 882, though we have it from Hauréau that it is attributed in three other mss. also. Yet it does seem to have a definite connection with undoubtedly genuine poems. Its close proximity to the poems of Hildebert in so many mss. can hardly be co-incidence, even though several of these are anthologies. It seems very possible that this poem may be Hildebert's but we cannot yet be sure enough to include it definitely in the canon as did Dom Wilmart. This exhausts the contribution of T to the edition of Beaugendre, though Bourassé introduced the entire series of Inscriptiones Christianae (Migne 1281 - 1288.) from that ms.

From his Auxerre manuscript, now lost, Beaugendre took several of the longer poems. The "In libros Regum" and "De Machabeis" do not appear in any other manuscript. However the Versus de S. Vincentio is found in Berlin 180, and in Chalons s. Saone 18. In Berlin 180 we have in a group, St. Mary, Marbod's passio S. Laurentii, De S. Vincentio, and Marbod's De Gemmis, and this

is certainly a favourable context.[18] In Chalons 18 (fol. 125[v]) it is anonymous as it is in the Berlin mss., and there are no other poems by Hildebert in the manuscript. There is thus very little reason for believing this to be Hildebert's. Nevertheless it is curious to note certain resemblances to the style of S. Mary, and these may not all be due to the exigencies of the rhyme. Thus we may compare S. Vinc. 243 contra votum ... totum with S. Mary 31, S. Vinc. 290 quem ventus iuvat impellitque iuventus with S.M. 414, S. Vinc. 129 praeponensque aequi with S.M. 6, S. Vinc. 213 dat pia oscula plantis with S.M. 627, (S. Vinc. l. 17 vincendum didicit mundum quem postea vicit with S.M. 25), S. Vinc. 305 femina res fragilis with 50. 7. Most probably we have to do here with an imitator of Hildebert's style.

The Passio S. Agnetis, like the De Susanna, is part of the Floridus Aspectus, being found in the mss. Arsenal 1136 fol. 49, Vat. Reg. 344 foll. 55[v] - 56[v]. There are editions by Hauréau (Le Mathematicus de Bernard Silvestris et la Passio Sanctae Agnetis de Pierre Riga), Werner (Beitrage pp. 67 - 74), and Mosley, Studi Medievali VIII pp. 30 - 36, 36 - 41.

The De Inventione S. Crucis is once again found in no extant mss., but is introduced from this lost Auxerre mss. Manitius (III 860) regards this no less than the Passio S. Vincentii as a genuine work of Hildebert's, and Soivoletto (pp. 106, 108) follows him in both cases.

Of the other poems introduced into Beaugendre's edition from this Auxerre mss., none are so well supported by mss. evidence as to warrant discussion, and I will merely list them, putting in brackets such other mss. as I have found them in. They are

Misc 42 M (fol. 114[v]), R (fol. 8[v]) Epitaph of Suger d. 1152
cf.
Misc 77 (M fol. 51) Vat. Reg. 344 (fol. 42[v])
Misc 80 Munich 12513, 17212 s. xiii (fol. 6), Douai 749 (fol 67)
(Boutemy Lat. III p. 195)
Misc 116 R (fol. 3[v], Werner 18) S. Omer 115 (fol. 32).
Misc 117
Ind 6

Most of the poems taken by Beaugendre from his Ebroicensis can be considered genuine, but a few remain either doubtful or definitely spurious. Among the former are Misc 113 and 114. Beaugendre does not expressly say that he has taken Misc 114 from Ebroicensis, but as it follows 113 in K as well as Z we may reasonably suppose that this is the case. In Z the poems are in that part of the ms. which is not homogenous,[19] but are separated from the series of poems shared with K by Hau 5 and 7. In K the poems are separated from the regular series by twenty folios.[20] Thus, since we know that the poems were in Ebroicensis, there are two alternative explanations of their position in K and Z. Perhaps they were in the regular series in Ebroicensis, (or a ms. similar to it) and the scribe of K, forgetting to put them in their proper place, remembered about them when he was copying the miscellany which makes up the last part of K. But it seems more probable that this part of K represents a part of Ebroicensis which had the nature of an anthology, that in fact these poems were in the anthology in Ebroicensis, and that Baluze for some reason has considered them genuine, and so put them in his manuscript close after the genuine series. Bearing this in mind we must reject them, despite the qualities of style noted by Hauréau (pp. 115, 116).

Although Beaugendre says that he has taken Misc 72 from Ebroicensis, it does not appear in K or Z, nor as far as can be seen, in any other manuscript. Ebroicensis has also furnished Beaugendre with Misc 78, but the lines belong to Ovid (Ex Ponto IV. 3. 11. 35, 36, 49, 50).

Misc. 108 might appear to have a strong chance of being genuine if we take into account the evidence of the manuscripts alone. Dom Wilmart remarks of it (p. 31) "Poème qu'on hésite à laisser au compte d'Hildebert, quoique certaines mss. soient favorables à l'authenticité". Of these mss. KZ present the poem in a very favourable context, surrounded by genuine poems. In T[21] (no. 186) Rheims 1275/143 (fol. 251) and I(fol. 125^{v}) it is in an isolated position, but in L (fol. 96) it immediately precedes De Mysterio. However, we have information about this poem which contradicts the rather

favourable evidence of the manuscripts KZ.

Hauréau denied that this could be Hildebert's, relying as he does in the case of all poems composed in this dactylic metre, upon the statement of Bernard of Morlas referred to above. As Pascal (Poesia p. 41) shows, this can carry no weight. More helpful are Pascal's own researches (op. cit. pp. 41 - 3,) into medieval misogyny in general and this poem in particular. He has found two other mss. which contain this poem, Ambrosian F 118. s. xv, fol. 44 and Laurent. Strozziano 88 s. xiii fol. 157. In these it forms part of a collection or cento which also includes lines from Bernard of Cluny's De Contempti mundi. This points a way to a solution of our problem. If we compare the second book of Bernard of Morlas with this poem we find that there are very close resemblances. After we compare Bernard l. 445 "Femina sordida, femina perfida.", l. 459 fossa novissima, vipera pessima, l. 461 horrida noctua, publica ianua, with lines 1, 3, 5 of our poem we cannot doubt that someone is guilty of plagiary. If we have two poems, both written in a rare form of rhymed hexameter, and the short poem has similarities with part of the longer one, it seems more logical to suppose that the writer of the short poem has been fired by enthusiasm to emulate the longer one than that the satirist should chance upon a poem both on the same subject and in the same metre as his own and draw upon it. It seems obvious then that Misc 108 is posterior to the poem of Bernard itself composed c. 1140, and draws upon it. One may wonder then how to account for the good position of the poem in K Z. The most reasonable theory seems to be that of Pascal, namely that Hildebert became so famous for his poem directed against women (50) that this second poem on the same subject became associated with his name from an early date.

From his Colbert 6101, now B.N. 1249 (foll. 37 - 38^{v}) Beaugendre has taken the poems 81 - 105 without any reason for attributing them to Hildebert, except that they follow immediately after the De Mysterio.[22] Some of these appear in other mss.: Misc 81 (Troyes 1331 item 2. 8); Misc 88 (Ko fol. 59) 105 (T 257). For 86 cf. Baudri de Bourgueil, ed. Abrahams no. CLXXXVII.

The first major contribution to the edition of Colbert 3019 (B.N. 3098) is the "De ornatu mundi". Henreem (N.E. 29.2.245 - 7) describes how Beaugendre was led into believing this to be Hildebert's. In the middle of the mss. (fol. 18) is a collection of verse transcribed in the seventeenth century, and among the poems the "De ornatu mundi" appears. This collection of verse has the following heading given by the transcriber "Sequebantur hi versus librum Hildeberti de sacramento altaris". This has led Beaugendre into the mistaken belief that this, along with several other poems belongs to Hildebert, a claim which the transcriber did not make. In fact the poem is found in the Floridus Aspectus of Pierre Rign (Arsenal 1136(fol. 11), Vatican 344 (fol. 29^{v} - 30). Boutemy, Moyen Age 54. 108 confirms the evidence of the mss. by comparing the style with that of the life of St. Agnes, noting also the first verse as peculiar to Pierre in other poems. Scivoletto (p. 119) is at some pains to correct Curtius on this point, but can give no proof that it is Hildebert's beyond vague "motivi interni".

Misc 123 probably appeared in this same Colbert 3019 after 3, 34 (Misc 121, 122), for Beaugendre has taken all three, together with Misc 124, from this mss. In F and the related Berlin 170 (fol. 161) it is in a very favourable context, after 34 and before 4, 20. In S. Omer 115 (fol. 84) it is followed by 40 and 39, in Cambrai 536 - 7 (fol. 142) it follows 21, 23, and in Bodl. Digby 65 (fol. 57^{v}) it occurs in a little group which begins with B.E. 66 and contains also poems nos. 22, 39. We find it also in a twelfth century manuscript of Ovid's Fasti, Vat. Lat. 1604, (fol. 1), accompanied by Misc 132 and in Salzburg S. Peter a vi s. xii (fol. 26) along with 20. The presence of 'hic lee dormivit' in this mss. links it with F and Berlin 170. In Douai 533 (item 100 fol. 209) and Troyes 215 (item 86) it is close to poems by Hildebert.

This is obviously a poem which at an early stage has become associated with the poetry of Hildebert. But as with other such poems, its absence in any of the long series of Hildebert's militates against it being genuine. The rather terse, narrative style is similar to Hildebert's. Probably from its biblical content it has become

has become affixed in some mss. to the poems of a writer who interested himself so much in the allegorical representations of biblical stories.

Misc 124 appears in A^2 and R(Werner, item 130). Haureau (pp. 123 - 4) cites quotations of the lines in medieval authors, including Herrade of Landsberg, and, since it has been connected with Malachy Archbishop of Armagh, suggests, without being able to offer any proof, that he is in fact the author. Certainly the poem is attributed to Malachy in Valenciennes 165 (fol. 1), and in 4625 (fol. 161) and 22248 (fol. 25) it is added to St. Bernard's life of Malachy. In most of the other mss. listed by Walther (p. 970) it appears on the fly leaf. Misc 76 is made up of lines from Ovid's Ex Ponto. Bk II (cf. Hau. p. 68).

The "Libellus de Quattuor virtutibus vitae honestae" (Beaug. col. 997, Migne col. 1055) was taken by Beaugendre from the manuscript Colbert 6327 (B.N. 3484). Beaugendre says he included this poem in Hildebert's works because he considered it as a metrical synopsis of the Moralis Philosophia which he also attributed to Hildebert. In Douai 533 (fol. 192) it is attributed to Hildebert, but a similar attribution of the Proverbia Senecae to Hildebert somewhat further on in the mss. indicates that we can put no trust in such an ascription here.

The other poem taken from this mss. by Beaugendre is the 'Liber de S. Eucharistia' (col. 1151 - 1168, P L . col. 1195 - 1212). This poem is generally regarded as Pierre Peintre's, this being the opinion of Haureau (H.H.E. 5.210, 1, 227, 8), Manitius (III. 879, 80), Wilmart, (Codd. Reg. Lat. II. 61) and Boutemy (Quelques oeuvres inedites de Pierre de Peintre, Lat. VII. 52). The text of the poem, beginning: Panis in altari verbi virtute sacratus, is in most mss. preceded by two prefaces, the one translated by Beaugendre beginning: Si deus elegit tria que sibi sacrificentur, and Quisquis nostri Redemptoris vestiris imagine respectively. But other mss. (Erfurt Ampl. Oct. 25, fol. 127; Digby 65, fol. 23^{v} and Heiligenkreuz 221, fol. 44^{v} and 90^{v}) replace these with another preface beginning: Omnibus in factis inceptis atque peractis, and this has

been printed among the works of Peter of Blois (P.L.207, 1135 - 1154). In the course of this the poet distinctly names himself as Petrus (l. 12, 13

'Materiam, metrum, mendacia, prospera, Petrum,
Presigna, forma, remove, concede, renorma',

and col. 1137 c. 5 'Duritiam frange Petri ... ut videam clare'.) This preface seems to be firmly established as an alternative and to be connected with the main text, though it might be said that it had been added by someone other than the author of the rest. One of the mss. which has this prologue, Lilienfeld 96 (fol. 52^{v}) gives as a rubric 'Incipit prologus magistri Petri Parisiensis', but it could be argued that this was mere deduction from the aforesaid prologue. The fact that the poem appears in one of the principal mss. of Pierre Peintre's poems, B.N. 16699, inclines one to agree that this particular Peter is the author, as does the line 'Quisquis nostri redemptoris...' strongly reminiscent of the beginning of Pierre's anti-feminist poem 'Quisquis male mulieris' (Boutemy, art. cit. p. 61). Yet this is a question which does seem to be worth working out in detail, especially with the aid of the new material provided by Walther. It would not have been mentioned here at all did not Oxford, Bodley 603 have the rubric (fol. 119)'Incipit liber primus domini ildeberti episcopi de corpore et sanguine domini', 'book two' being the De Mysterio, while poem 39 forms 'book three'. This single attribution to Hildebert seems to stem from the natural juxtaposition of the two similar poems in the mss. (e.g. Vitry-le-François 5., fol. 132; Troyes 215, item 74; I fol. 71^{v}).

Beaugendre alleges that he has taken Misc 41 from the papers of Baluze. But Hauréau[23] could not find it there, nor is it there to-day. It does appear in T (item 346) at the end of the mss., after Marbod's poems, and Beaugendre may well have taken it from there. It does not appear in any other mss.

Misc 74 is taken by Beaugendre from a printed edition of 1548 where the poem is ascribed to Hildebert. He is however, somewhat diffident about admitting it as Hildebert's (col. 1343 note a). In fact it is by Pierre Peintre to whom it is attributed in several mss., and in the Liber Floridus of Lambert of St. Omer.

Haureau (pp. 78 -80) and Deslisle (Notice sur les mss. du Liber Floridus N.E. 38 p.648) consider that a second poem begins at line 33 with "Orthodoxa fides personas tres probat esse",[24] but in Dreves (A.H. vol. 15, pp. 11, 12) it appears as in the edition.

This exhausts the list of poems which Beaugendre expressly mentions as coming from a certain ms.. or edition. But in several cases he does not say where he has taken the poem from, and we have difficulty in inferring their source from the context. Misc 48 is found in Arsenal 1136 (fol. 15^{v}, item 13 in Boutemy's list) and is thus very probably Pierre Riga's. Misc 65 is Pierre Riga's without any doubt, for it is an extract taken from the Aurora, (found, for instance in Bodl. Laud. Misc. 82, fol. 12$^{a\ v}$, Bodley Laud. Misc. 242, fol. 9).[25] Misc 66 appears incomplete (but longer than the poem as published by Beaugendre) in F, and also in L (fol. 147), Troyes 1331 (item 6), Douai 833,[26] Oxford Digby 65 (fol. 68^{v}), A~~v~~. UCT. ~~and~~ F.4. 29 (fol. 59) Troyes 215 (item 80). All these are anonymous and there is no reason for assigning this poem to Hildebert, despite its presence in F. It is edited by Haureau p. 68 - 70. Misc 73 occurs in no other ~~Oxford~~ mss. of Hildebert's poems.[27] Ind. 5 appears only in Oxford, Lat. misc. d. 15 (fol. 10) and Berlin theol. oct. 94 (fol. 121^{v}).

Bourassé, not being content to leave alone the large corpus of miscellaneous poems which he inherited from Beaugendre, actually added several more, making the edition more confusing than ever. One of these additions is the "Lamentatio peccatricis animae" (col. 1339) which he has taken from ~~from~~ Tours 1040 (fol. 122^{v}) (S. Gatien 222, also given the number 656 by Bourassé) where it is unattributed and unaccompanied by any other poem of Hildebert. His attribution to Hildebert appears to be entirely irrational.

Bourassé appears to have picked out poems at random for inclusion in his "Libellus Inscriptionum Christianarum" (Migne col. 1281 - 1288). Three of these happen by co-incidence to be

Biblical Epigrams (Ins. 3, 10, 55). Several others are found also among the Miscellaneous Poems. Thus Ins. 7 = Misc 118[2], Ins. 18 = Misc 110[2], Ins. 20 = Misc 105, Ins. 32 = Misc 86. For the rest, Hauréau (p. 153) appeared to consider the majority as genuine, expressly rejecting only 56, 57, 58. But as will be seen from Dom Wilmart's account of T (pp. 20 -40) not one of these "Inscriptions", apart from the Biblical Epigrams, even deserves consideration as genuine.[28]

Another considerable addition by Bourassé to the work of Beaugendre is his "Supplement" to the Miscellaneous poems (col. 1447 - 1458). The first piece of this supplement is the poem on Troy beginning "Divitiis, regno, specie". This is taken by Bourassé from the edition of Leyser (p. 398), and Leyser in turn took it from Leipsig 201 fol. 174[v] where, as in his edition, it follows the "De operibus sex dierum". Knowing that the first of these poems had been ascribed to Hildebert by Beaugendre, he says of the second, "forte Hildeberti etiam sunt". On this slender evidence Bourasse has included it. We must use "it" advisedly, for we have here two poems which because they happen to be together in the Leipsig mss. have been merged into one in the editions. The second poem begins (col. 1451) with the words "Viribus, arte, minis", and is written in leonines, while the first is elegiac. The first poem printed here is the first book of Simon Chèvre d'Or's work in two books on the Trojan war, (ed. Boutemy, Scriptorium I (1946) pp. 267 - 288). The poet gives his name ll. 494 sqq. The second poem, published separately by Du Meril (Poésies Pop. 400) is attributed by Richard of Poitiers to an otherwise unknown Peter of Saintes.[29] But we have no other authority for this, and as Haureau points out the name may be wrong, for we do not know of this poet from any other source.

The remaining items of this supplement are all taken by Bourassé from Chamart's edition of the poems of Philip of Bonne Espérance.[30] No doubt Chamart printed as belonging to Philip several poems which in fact were Hildebert's, but that did not warrant either Bourassé or the editors of the Histoire Litteraire (XI. 400)

(21)

taking these poems from the edition to give them to Hildebert. The first three of these belong neither to Hildebert or Philip but to Pierre Riga, for they make up a metrical declamation which appears among that author's works in Arsenal 1137, (fol. 26, item 21 of Boutemy's list). Boutemy (Moyen Age 54 p. 103 - 6) proves conclusively that this declamation is by Pierre, by comparing its style with that of the known poems of Pierre, such as the De s. Agnete and the De Susanna. Items five and six appear to have no connection whatever with Hildebert's poems in any mss., nor are they ever attributed to him. Item seven, an epitaph on St. Bernard, could not have been written by Hildebert. Item eight seems to have been written in imitation of Hildebert's poem, 22, on the instability of fortune. Thus l. 8 "Coniurasse putes in sua vota deos" is very similar to 22. 13 while l. 11 - 14 recall 22. 4 - 7. The ninth and last item of this supplement is 17, already edited by Bourasse at col. 1407.[31]

Notes

1 Cf. his introduction, col.xii, P.L.171.col.58B.

2 This work, which Beaugendre took from C is omitted by Wilmart in his description of that ms.

3 Not in G as stated by Wilmart p.178.

4 Douai 749 does not, as Hauréau says (p.129) attribute 138 to Hildebert (see Boutemy Lat.III.295).

5 Cf.B.E.11.1.

6 Cf. De Myst.579

7 The poem cited by Wilmart Codd.Reg.Lat. 2.510 as in ms.Vesoul 150 is not this one.

8 Manitius II p.586.

9 Manitius II p.582, Wattenbach Berliner Sitzungsber. 1891,p.115, Rose Verzeichnis Hss.Berl.I.p.204, Verfasserlexicon col.565.

10 Otto (p.101) wonders whether there is any connection between Mamucius and the Mauritius Senonensis to whom the De Mysterio is once or twice ascribed in German mss. More likely the name has been transferred here from the De Mahomete, where the servant of Mahomet is Mamutius.

11 He mentions also mss.Brussels 9800,10701 which he has not collated. I have not been able to trace these mss. in the catalogue under either the old or the new numbers.

12 Before coming upon Préaux's article I had investigated the style and language of the De Nummo, and found it to be so different from Hildebert's normal usage as to make it quite impossible that the poem should be his.

13 Boutemy, Moyen Age LIV.pp.89-112 begins by doubting whether all the poems in the Arsenal ms. are by Pierre Riga, but concludes 'Je crois... que nous pouvons sans plus hésiter désormais, adopter l'opinion d'Hauréau. He gives an analysis of the ms. in Lat.8 pp.159-168. For Pierre's life and works generally cf. Hauréau in Hist.Litt. 30 pp.608-614, and Manitius III.pp.826,7.

14 This is by no means an exhaustive list.

15 Beaugendre says that he took it also from Ebroicensis.

16 Wilmart regarded it as such p.178.

17 And the related Troyes 215 (item 93).

18 It does not appear in F. Both the Châlons and Berlin ms. refer to it as the Passio S.Vincentii. Walther Verzeichnis p.787 gives also Berlin lat.fol.591 (fol.84^{v}) which I have been unable to check.

19 Cf p.149.

20 The poem Misc 113 also appears in the related Vitellius A.XII (fol. 124^{v}) and Digby 65 (fol.60), where they occur in the same position as in K (see Boutemy Lat.I.284).

21 Not R as Wilmart would have it p.180.

22 Also from this ms. comes the prose work Liber de expositione Misse.

23 Pp.29,30.

24 There is a/second rubric 'Item de trinitate' at this line in the S.Omer ms.

25 In these mss. the text is somewhat different from that given by Beaugendre, and omits his last four lines. This may be due to the recension of Aegidius.

26 This is the number given by Hauréau, but Douai 833, a volume of humanist letters, does not seem to be a very likely context for this poem.

27 Cf.Mone Hymni II.p.65, no.372.

28 One other poem which does occasionally appear connected with Hildebert's poems is Ins 6 / 48[1], which seem to form one single poem, for though they are separated in T (items 34,44 in Wilmart), they appear together in H X Cotton Titus D.XXIV (fol.86),Reun 12 (fol.140) and in the ms. of the B.E.,Jo.

29 Hauréau pp.164,5.

30 For the unlikelihood of any of these poems really belonging to Philip see R.W.Hunt Medium Aevum XVI (1947) p.7.

31 It might be appropriate to mention here the other differences between the editions of Beaugendre and Bourassé. Bourassé adds to the edition the genuine poems Misc 139 (4),140 (14) and Ind 14. He intentionally leaves out the poem 'Quid thus designet'(Beaug.col. 1336, between 69 and 70),Misc 81[2](21) which appears in Beaugendre between 81 and 82, and the Biblical Epigram 'Hostia turturis' (58), which appears at col.1363 in Beaugendre's edition.

III. Poems discussed by Hauréau, Mélanges chapter III

The first of the poems given by Hauréau to require discussion is Hau. 5 (pp. 181 - 3), and before considering whether or not it is to be given to Hildebert, we must first attempt to decide whether it is as Hauréau says, medieval, or whether Pascal (Poesia pp. 53 - 59) is correct in assigning it to late antiquity. Pascal's discussion of the poem, consists of a point by point refutation of Hauréau's evidence as to medieval provenance.

Hauréau's first point is that in the lines:

"Muneribus vicit, quoniam natura vel usus
Praeter flagitium nulla dedere sibi." (11, 12),

we have sibi used where we would expect illi, a common feature of medieval Latin. The translation then is straightforward "He has conquered through his presents, for nature or experience endowed him with nothing but crime". Pascal would turn the quoniam clause into virtual indirect speech, translating "because he knew that he did not possess anything else by nature or experience".[1] This however, seems an artificial and forced interpretation, although he is correct in saying that the rule about se was not strictly observed even among Classical poets. The second point to which Hauréau refers is the scanning of gratĭis in line 6, where the classical quantity should be gratīs. He gives two examples of the correct classical scansion in Martial (P 183), but Pascal seems to regard these examples as admissions by Hauréau that gratĭis is found in classical authors. He says "L'Hauréau stesso apporta gli esempii de Marziale in cui la medesima quantità si riscontra". One would imagine that as gratis was in its original form the ablative plural of gratia, that it would be very unusual indeed to find gratĭis, and I can find no examples of such scansion in the Thesaurus, Forcellini or Lewis and Short. If we bear in mind Hildebert's strict adherence to classical rules in the scansion of closed vowels we may well consider this as some slight evidence that Hildebert is not the author of the poem. One is quite ready to grant Pascal his next point, namely that reatus is not as Haureau makes out, an exclusively

medieval or late Latin word in the sense of "culpa".[2] Salitor (l. 54) is a much rarer word. As Pascal observes, salio is used by Ovid (A. A. II. 485) for the copulation of animals, but the word "salitor" in its obscene sense seems to exist only elsewhere in the life of St. Mary l. 373. Pascal passes over its apparent absence in works of late antiquity by remarking vaguely "fu forse parola popolare". Perhaps Pascal's strongest argument for considering the poem antique is the use of expressions concerning the word crux at l. 28 "Qui non exilio, sed cruce dignus erat" and 35 "Crimen opes redimunt, reus est crucis omnis egenus". As Pascal points out crux is never used in any but its sacred sense in Hildebert. Moreover Christian authors in general seem to have avoided the use of crux in a derogatory sense, although we find at least one exception (Sidonius Epist. 4. 23. 1: "dignum ... cruce ... clamans"). Pascal's final argument is that the exempla introduced into this poem - Thais, Penelope, 'uxor Hectoris' - are all classical, whereas Hildebert in poem 50 11.23 ff. has biblical and classical characters side by side. If this is a valid argument at all it argues against the poem being Hildebert's, rather than against its being medieval. If we look at other authors of approximatley the same period as Hildebert, for example Godfrey of Reims, or Baudri, we will find poems containing only classical exempla. So it seems that while some of Hauréau's arguments are invalidated, most still stand. Moreover the strongest argument of all for the poem being medieval is that it is contained, as far as we know, in no mss. earlier than the twelfth century.

Having concluded that it must be medieval, it remains to see whether or not it is Hildebert's. The poem appears in D G Z. In Z it is in that part of the manuscript which is not homogenous. Since it does not appear in any mss. of the a group it seems clear that it has been taken by Baluze from the Ebroicensis, or even direct from D itself (Cf p. 149 .). So we must treat it as if it appeared in D G alone. In D it appears in a solid series of genuine poems along with Hau 17. Now it seems to me that the position of one is very much the same as that of the other as far as mss.

evidence goes, yet Dom Wilmart admits Hau 5 as genuine, while rejecting Hau 17. Hau 5 appears elsewhere only in G, and there again in a long series of Hildebert's poems, though at the end. Hau 17 is found not only in H, which is itself a very compact group in the middle of the poetry of Horace, but also in a surprisingly neat and clearly defined enclave in R. Moreover it appears also in B.N. 3652 (fol. 25^{v}), and there again the context is not altogether unfavourable.[3] Its position in Z is exactly that of Hau 5. Going on this somewhat scanty evidence, one would say that Hau 17 had, if anything, more chance of being genuine. It is possible that both these are early poems which Hildebert did not wish to publish. It seems best then to place them among the poems of doubtful authenticity, hoping that the very slight evidence of the mss. will be supplemented at a later date.

Several of the poems edited by Hauréau in his third chapter appear only in Z, and are not considered genuine either by Hauréau himself or by Dom Wilmart. These do not seem to require any discussion as to whether or not they are genuine. Such are: Hau 9, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24. After taking account of the poems which we have regarded as genuine, there remain to be discussed Hau 10, 18, 21, 25, 30, 31, 32. Hau 25 can be easily disposed of, for it is the beginning of the well known grammatical work of Serlo of Wilton (Manitius III. 906). In the case of another two of these poems, Hau 18 and Hau 21, Hauréau is unwilling to commit himself (p. 195, p. 200). They appear only in Z, and in that part of Z which is definitely not homogenous. They may therefore have been in the Sbroicensis, but in what position we cannot say. Yet Wilmart regards them both as genuine, while rejecting Hau 20 which he knew was in H as well as Z. It is difficult to see on what principle he introduced these into his canon, but it must be remarked that Hau 22 (41), which he considered genuine, and which was for him in exactly the same position as these other poems as regards mss. support, has since appeared in Du.

Hau 10 is specially interesting because of its appearance in Cotton. Vitellius A XII (fol. 131, Boutemy Latomus I p. 288), a manuscript which we have found (P. 148) to share with K an archetype which is either the Ebroicensis or a very similar mss. As both this and the previous item in Vitellius (Hau 9) appear in Z, it is reasonable to suppose that Baluze was taking these particular poems from Ebroicensis. If they were in Ebroicensis in the same position as they are in Vitellius the context was unfavourable. But the second of the two poems is ascribed "Episcopus Cenom. unde geniti sint Longobardi", and this is probably what made Baluze transcribe both the poems. This attribution, in a ms. which attributes correctly to Hildebert no. 34, and of which the relative K contains titles which appear both explicit and correct, would be a strong argument in the poem's favour, were it not for the evidence of the other mss. in which it appears. In Lambeth 451 (fol. 82) and Emmanuel Coll. 38 s. xii it occurs with 43. In the fifteenth century Munich German 379 (fol. 123^{v})[4] there are a few genuine poems near it, but also many anthology pieces. But in Reims 1275 (fol. 190^{v}), in Ko (fol. 89^{v}) and in Vorau 33 (111) (fol. 57) the context is entirely unfavourable. Therefore we must treat the ascription in Vitellius as a mistake of the copyist.

A poem which has been often discussed of recent years is Hau 31, better known under its incipit "Pergama flere volo". Hauréau (pp. 206 - 214) appears to have been the first to take the view that this poem might be Hildebert's. The previous attributions of Goldast[5] to Bernard and the editors of the Histoire Littéraire (VII. 387) to Berno of Reichenau are shown to be groundless. Hauréau then notes that a Vienna ms. (883) attributes a poem on the Trojan war to Hugh Primate of Orleans, and Richard de Fournival, Bibliononia refers to "Homeri libellus Iliados et versus Primatis Aurelianensis de eodem". On the other hand, Cotton Cleopatra A. VIII attributes this poem to Hildebert and Alexander Nequam wrote of Hildebert (De laudibus Divinae Sapientiae 613, ed. Wright p. 454) "Plurima festive scripsit dictamina; scripsit:

- 5 -

"Sicut hiems laurum", - "Pergama flere volo".

Since "Sicut hiems laurum" is the incipit of the genuine life of St. Mary, Haureau argues that the second poem also must be correctly attributed by Nequam. He then asserts that as we have two poems on Troy, "Pergama flere volo" and "Fervet amore Paris" (Carm. Bur. 102), and since both Hildebert and Primas have had poems on Troy attributed to them, therefore one of these poems must belong to Hildebert, and the other to Primate. Haureau is inclined to attribute the first to Hildebert because as he says "ainsi le témoinage conforme du manuscrit Cottonien et de Neckam obtiendra l'adhésion qu'il paraît mériter, celui de Richard de Fournival ne sera pas contredit, et le copiste du manuscrit de Vienne sera seul réprimandé, pour avoir imposé le nom de Primat à un poème dont le titre et le rythme sont exactement ceux d'un autre poème, vraiment composé par Primat". In saying these last few words, Haureau spoke more truly than he knew, for the ninth poem in Meyer's edition of the poems of Hugh Primate is a poem on the destruction of Troy, written in this same metre. It is clear then that this and not "Fervet amore Paris" is the poem to which Richard de Fournival refers, and that it is Primate's reputation as author of this poem which has led the scribe of the Vienna mss. to attribute Hau 31 to him. Thus one side of Haureau's argument falls down. It remains to discuss that which relates to Hildebert.

As Dom Wilmart remarks (p. 165 note 5), despite the literature on the subject there has been little advance on the lines indicated by Haureau. Pascal (Poesia 28) merely mentions it in passing, alleging that he can find resemblances between it and 36. G. Rossi (Scritti varii in onore di Rodolfo Renier, Turin 1912 pp. 725 - 30) gives a fuller list of mss. and editions than Haureau, but merely repeats Haureau's conclusion.[6] Hammer (Speculum VI (1931) p. 121 sq.)[7] through an inadequate examination of the mss. tradition is led into believing that the poem is written by the scribe Bernard of Douai 882. W. B. Sedgewick (Speculum 8 (1933) 81, 2) mentions the adoption of some of the lines into the Troilus of Albertus Stadensis,

and stresses the stylistic relationship between "Pergama flere volo" and the poem "viribus, arte, minis", attributed to Peter of Saintes. Boutemy (Latomus V. 233 - 244) takes up this point, and shows lines which are almost identical in each of the two poems. He points out that "Pergama flere volo" is a more ambitious poem than the other, and is much superior stylistically, so that it seems probable that "Pergama flere volo" is the prototype of the other poems written in this uncommon metre, namely "Viribus arte minis", "Fervet amore Paris", and the poem of Primate.

Thus, although we have a considerable amount of information and discussion of the poem, if we wish to consider whether or not it is Hildebert's we must still go back to Hauréau's arguments. He stresses the attribution to Hildebert in Cleopatra A VIII, but like Prof. Hammer, though to a lesser degree, he is hampered by lack of knowledge of the manuscripts. Of the large number listed and collated by Hilka and Schumann for this poem in the Carmina Burana (II. pp. 141 - 3), I have examined the context of the poem in those mss. of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, of which the contents are described with some accuracy in manuscript catalogues or articles. In the case of several manuscripts the poem is as we would expect in a "Trojan" context, often followed by the poems of Simon Chèvre d'Or or Peter of Saintes. These are: Cambridge, Corpus Christi 450, fol. 192; Gonville and Caius 402? fol. 245^{v}; Trinity R. 14. 22, fol. 44^{v}; British Museum Royal 13 A IV, fol. 22^{v}; Douai 882, fol. 142; B.N. 5129, fol. 126 (Cf. Boutemy Scriptorium 2. 51), Vat. Reg. 344, fol. 26. In Glasgow Hunt. 511, fol. 98^{v}; Bodl. Add. A44, fol. 222^{v}; Digby 53, fol. 30; Digby 65, fol. 17^{v}; it is close to poems by Hildebert, and in R (Werner item 13) it is removed from 36 by four poems. In Cotton Titus D. xxiv, fol. 125^{8} it appears close to St. Mary and 45 (no. 137). But in 14 mss. it is altogether isolated and unconnected with any poems of Hildebert. These are: Cambridge St. John's 184, fol. 11^{v}; Charleville 30; Douai 318, fol. 172; Einsiedeln 34, fol. 3; Göttingen Univ. Bibl. Theol 105, fol. 37; Kopenhagen Kgl. Gl.

kgl. S 2007, fol. 118^{v}; Cotton Cleopatra A VIII, fol. 56; Cotton Vesp. B xiv, fol. 18; B.M. Harley 3202, fol. 114^{v}; Munich 17212, fol. 21; B.N. 15155, fol. 144^{v}; Vitry-le-François 39, fol. 137^{v}; Vienna 861, fol. 84$^{v}_{v}$; Vienna 883, fol. 27. It is attributed to Hildebert in Cleopatra A. VIII and the related Digby 65 (both mss. making up the λ of Hilka-Schumann p. 146), and also in Cott. Titus D xxiv. But these are only three mss. out of a number of over sixty. The testimony of Nequam (1157 - 1217) is not very early. He may well have seen a manuscript such as Titus D. XXIV where St. Mary and "Pergama flere volo" are close together and the latter is attributed to Hildebert. Certainly if the mss. tradition were more favourable his citation would have carried great weight. As it is, Hildebert's reputation being what it was, it is no evidence for considering the poem genuine that three mss. attributed the poem to him. Moreover the poem is written in Unisoni, rhyming in couplets $\overset{a}{a}\ \overset{a}{a}$ (Cf. Meyer I p. 84). Hildebert never uses this form, and although that is not conclusive evidence against this poem's being an innovation on his part, yet one would imagine that it would be obvious to him that composing a poem of any length in this style would lead to great contortion and obscurity of language. One final and perhaps trivial stylistic point is that the poet here twice uses compounds formed with re; reamatur 27, reoccides 47. This unusual compound in re appears nowhere in the poetry of Hildebert except for the innocuous 'rebellavit' of St. Mary 566. We must then conclude with Dom Wilmart "Hildebert doit être mis tout à fais hors de cause", but we are no nearer to knowing who is the real author, nor does it seem likely that we ever shall, since most of the mss. evidence seems to have been collected already.

Hau 30 occurs in A in the middle of the series of genuine poems, and also in R (Werner no. 88). In Brussels, Bibl. Roy. 1435 (desc. Boutemy Revue Belge 17 (1938) 727 - 746), an anthology (from fol. 119^{v} on) which contains some Hildebert but also a great many short epigrams including some by Godfrey of Winchester, this poem appears, but not in any near proximity to Hildebert's poems. In this mss., as in R it is followed by the distich

'Poscis multa feris pauco contentus apud te
Largus in alterius, parcus in ede tua.'

and preceded by the poem beginning: 'Nec volo'. (Walther, no. 11707). Despite the authority of A I have put the distich in my supplement, as its authorship is not sufficiently proved, and probably never will be. Hildebert does not suffer very much from its omission from the canon of his poems.

Hau 32 is attributed in Berlin 170 (fol. 174) as 'Hyldebertus Cerom. ep. de vestibus ecclesie'. In fact only the first fourteen lines are concerned with the mystical significance of the sacerdotal vestments. These hexameters are followed by a hundred caudati, beginning: Adventum Christi patriarchas premonuisse which give a summary account of the Mass. Haureau did not know of this mss., but mentioned the poem (p. 214) because he noticed that it was attributed in Vienna 898. He did not consider it to be genuine, nor did Dom Wilmart.[9] In the Berlin mss. it appears in the part which is not shared by the related F. In the Vienna mss. (fol. 66 - 68^{v}) it is in a good context, but the ascription 'idem' is not explicit. In Montpellier, Ec. d. Medecin 413 s. xii/xiii, (item 19) it follows the De Myst., as it does also in Vatican Angel. 401 s. xiii^{1} (fol. 51), where it precedes 22, and in B.N. 14758 s. xiii (fol. 89). In Es. it appears towards the end of the Latin part of the mss. next to poems of Hildebert. Oxford Univ. Coll. 45 s. xiv contains this poem (fol. 51) at the end of De Myst., while on the next page we find 55. In Digby 53 s. xiii (fol. 20) it follows 34 while in the second column there appears the poem 'Arbore sub quadam dictavit clericus Adam' with the curious rubric 'Hildebertus episcopus magistro Adam ut ei sciberet aliquid causa edificacionis et ille' Bourges 128 s. xii (fol. 57^{v}) contains only the introduction, and the only other Hildebert in the mss. seems to be St. Mary at fol. 87. In Reims 1262 s. xv we have the enigmatic group of Hau 32, 'ara crucis' and 57. It appears also in Chalons s. Marne 7 s. xiii (fol. 41) and Cambridge Gonville and Gaius 349 s. xiii/xiv (fol. 121^{v}),

where there is nothing else by Hildebert. I have been unable to discover its immediate context in B.N.15155 (fol.86), 18569 s.xv and Mazarin 593 (fol.27). Despite this gap in the evidence I think we can confidently say that this poem is not by Hildebert. It is not in any of the principal mss. and is only once ascribed to him. Both this ascription and its occurence after the De Myst. are readily explained by the similarity in subject of the two poems.

At the end of his work on the canon of Hildebert's poems Hauréau says 'Nous avons terminé l'examen souvent fastidieux dont nous avions formé l'entreprise'. The preceding two chapters will no doubt appear equally tedious to those (fortunately few) who must peruse them in their entirety. Yet they are in their way just as essential as the first chapter in which we tried to define the canon of genuine poems. Though the person who has worked on Hildebert for several years may be quite convinced that none of the poems discussed here belong to Hildebert, yet the reader who comes fresh to his poetry will not be put off by assurances that a poem is not 'like Hildebert's' or 'in his style', but will want concrete proof from the manuscripts. This we have tried to give.

Notes

1 'ricorse ai doni, perchè sapeva di non possedere altro per natura o per esperienza'.

2 It is found frequently in classical authors in its strict legal sense of 'the state of being a reus'.

3 Cf. Wilmart p.181 n.2, Hauréau N.E.38 p.432.

4 As described by H.Walther, Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen XLIX p.275.

5 Ovidii Nasonis Peligni erotica et amatoria opuscula, 1610, p.193.

6 He misunderstands Hauréau who does not claim Hugh Primate as author of 'Viribus,arte,minis', which he has already assigned to Peter of Saintes.

7 Not IV as in Raby Secular II.380.

8 Mozley, Medium Aevum XI (1942) p.16. This ms., together with B.M. Additional 35295 s.xv (fol.3) seems to have escaped the eagle eye of Hilka-Schumann.

9 Op.cit.p.167 n.4.

Canon of Hildebert's Shorter Poems, and concordance with earlier numbers.

1 Misc 54	52 Hau 1
2 Hau 4	53 Hau 8
3 Misc 121	54 Misc 122
4 Misc 159	55 Misc 62
5 Misc 58	56 Misc 65
6 Hau 26	57 Ind 4
7 Hau 6	58 Misc 64
8 Ind 15	59 Misc 79
9 Hau 7	40 Misc 52
10 Hau 27	41 Hau 22
11 Hau 28	42 Misc 128
12 Misc 55	43 Misc 112 (order of K Z)
13 Misc 56	44 Hau 11
14 Misc 140	45 'Tollimur' (pr. with the De Myst. col.1149, P.L.col.1192D)
15 Ind 2	46 Ind 5
16 Misc 59	47 Misc 107
17 Misc 60	48 Hau 3
18 Misc 40	49 Misc 28
19 Ind 14	50 Misc 110
20 Misc 106	51 Misc 111
* 21 Misc 81[2]	52 Hau 12
22 Misc 75	53 Hau 13
23 Ind 11	54 Misc 57
24 Hau 2	55 Misc 71
25 Misc 61	56 Misc 43
26 Ind 7	57 'In matutino' (not pr. in the editions)
27 Hau 29	SUPPLEMENT
28 Misc 45	1 Misc 51
29 Misc 46	2 Misc 150
30 Hau 14	3 Hau 5
31 Hau 20	4 Hau 17
	5 Hau 30

* In Beaug. this came after what Bourassé numbered Misc 81. He omitted it as it had already appeared in the De Eucharistia (P.L.col.1198D).

Reverse Concordance

Misc	28	49
	40	18
	43	56
	45	28
	46	29
	52	40
	54	1
	55	12
	56	13
	57	54
	58	5
	59	16
	60	17
	61	25
	62	55
	63	36
	64	38
	71	55
	75	22
	79	39
	81[2]	21
	106	20
	107	47
	110	50
	111	51
	112	43
	121	3
	122	34
	128	42
	139	4
	140	14

Ind	2	15
	3	46
	4	37
	7	26
	11	25
	13	8
	14	19
Hau	1	32
	2	24
	3	48
	4	2
	6	7
	7	9
	8	33
	11	44
	12	52
	13	53
	14	30
	20	31
	22	41
	26	6
	27	10
	28	11
	29	27

Index of poems discussed in part II pp. 165 - 185.

Misc	page	Hauréau page	MS. usdd by Beaugendre-Bourassé.
1-26	174	1-14	Du Poirier
27	169	15	C
29	174	16-19	Du P.
30	169	19	C
31	"	21	C
32	"	22	C
33	"	22	C
34	174	22	Du P.
35	"	22	Du P.
36	"	23	Du P.
37	"	24	Du P.
38	"	24	Du P.
39	"	24	Du P.
41	182	29	Papers of Baluze ?
42	177	30	Auxerre
44	169	30	C
47	"	36	C
48	183	36	no ms. given
49	175	37	Du P.
50	171	39-45	C
51	175	45-47	T
53 = B.E.68			
65	183	67	no ms. given
66	183	67-69	no ms. given
67 list of names of the seven sages			
68 = 129			
69 = B.E.15			
70	175	71	T
72	178	76	Ebroicensis
73	183	77	no ms. given
74	182	78-80	ptinted edition
76	181	88	Colb.3019 (B.N.3088) Ovid
77	177	88	Auxerre
78	178	89	Ebroic. Ovid
80	177	94	Auxerre
81-105	179	95,101	Colbert 6101 (B.N.1249)
108	178	104-106	Ebroic.
109	175	106	T ?
110^2	166	112	A
113	178	115	Ebroic.
114	"	116	Ebroic.
115	169	116	C
116	177	117	Auxerre
117	177	117	Auxerre
118	173	118	C
119	173	119	C
120	169	120	C
123	180	123	Colb.3019 (B.N.3088)
124	181	123	Colb.3019
125	157	125	Colb.3019

Misc	page	Hau. page	MS. used by Beaugendre-Bourassé
126 = 61			
127 De Querimonia			
129	166	69	A and Jumieges 77
130	166	126	A
131 = B.E.65			
132	167	127	A
133	168	128	A
134 = B.E.44,26,53			
135	175	129	Du P.
136	"	129	Du P.
137	169	129	C
138	"	129	C
Ind.			
1	169	130	C
5	183	134	no ms.given
6	177	135	Auxerre
8	174	138	Du P.
9	"	139	Du P.
10	175	140	Du P.
12	"	147	Du P.
15	169	148	C
16	"	148	C
17	"	148	C
Supp.			
1	184	160-165	Edition of Leyser
2-4		165-167	Chamart's edition of Philip of Bonne Espérance
5		167	"
6		168	"
7		168	"
8		169	"

Corrigenda to apparatus criticus.

Shorter poems: III.1 for 'bono om. Ed.' read 'bono: bene Ed.'; VIII.2 Ed. reads submissis precibus with a ; XXII.81 illa Hau.; XXXIV.2 nocentior Hau.; XXXIX.ii.2 disparuit Hau.; XXXIX.iii.1 coniugia Ed., 55 aliud: alios Ed.; XXXIX.iv.55 hunc; hanc Ed.; XLIX.5 totus Ed., 18 perculit Hau.; L.29 alter to 'K Z Ed.: nec minus hac animi vires effeminat (immutat Ed.) aurum'; 64 parat Ed.; LI.14 subterfugiumque Ed.

Biblical Epigrams: 44.8 sponsus Ed.[1] ; 45.1 traduntur: dat dominus Ed.

Sigla

Du = Trinity College, Dublin B.2.17 s.xii^2

B = Paris, Bibl.Nat. 14194 s.xii^2

(T) = Tours, Bibl.Municipale 890, now lost.

A = Paris, Bibl.Nat. 7596A s.xii^1

Cl = London, British Museum, Cotton Cleopatra C.I s.xii

K = London, British Museum, Additional MS. 24199 s.xii^2

Z = Paris, Bibl.Nat. collection Baluze 120 s.xvii

Z^2 = Baluze 120, fol.371^v - 378.

H = London, British Museum, Harley 2621 s.xiii

D = Paris, Bibl.Nat. 3761 s.xii^2 or xiii^1

E = Paris, Bibl.Nat. 14867 s.xii^2

F = Troyes, Bibl.Municipale 887 s.xii^2

I = Berlin, Staatsbibl. 180 s.xii

P = Munich, Staatsbibl. 16075 s.xii^2 or xiii^1

G = Vienna, Nationalbibl. 2521 s.xii

L = Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud.Lat.86 s.xiii

M = Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson G.109 s.xiii^1

R = Zurich, Zentralbibl. C.58/275 s.xii^2

The letters a and x represent the readings of the two recensions of the text (for which see pp.145 - 7).

THE SHORTER POEMS

I

Ad G. episcopum. Du B (T) Versus eiusdem ad Will. Dunelm. epm. K

Ad decus ecclesie cum te Natura crearet:
"Sis expers vicii; cetera" dixit "habe."
Sic piger ad vetitum, celer ad concessa creatus,
Preter virtutem nil sinis esse tibi.

Du B K Z D H
2 vicii D H 3 ad vetitum: adventum H

II

Ad Petrum Du B (T) Cuius supra de conformacione humani seminis K De humano semine F De conceptu ad Petrum L

Susceptum semen sex primis, Petre, diebus
Est quasi lac, reliquisque novem fit sanguis. At inde
Id solidat duodena dies: bis nona deinceps
Effigiat, tempusque sequens augmentat in ortum.

Du B K Z F P L R A^2
2 novem:vovere B inde:illud P 3 insolidat P L R deinceps: subinde A 4 augmentat in: deducit ad Hau.

III

Cur bono male vel (valet Du) malo bene Du B Cur bono male et malo bene provenit F Cur malo bene vel bono male G

Est aliquando bono bene, ne gravibus superetur:
Est male quo maculas lavet, adversisve probetur.
Est aliquando malo bene, quo gravius feriatur:
Est male quo redeat, vel ut hic quoque iam paciatur.

Du B A Cl F G L
1 bono om.Ed. gravius B L 2 quo: quod Ed. adversisque G Ed. Ko.
4 vel ut hic G Hau: velut hic Du B A Cl L Ed: veluti quoque F

IV

Ad reginam Anglorum Du B De morte (T) M Quod mors omnes simili condicione trahat F

In ter opes et delicias populique favores
  Hoc animus recolat, hoc tua lingua sonet.
Mors dominum servo, mors sceptra ligonibus equat,
  Dissimiles simili condicione trahens.

Du B F M
1 favorem M 2 hoc tua: hec tria M lingua: mens F 3 servum d omino F

V

Unde malum Du B (T) F

Qui petis unde malum, cum sint bona cuncta creata?
  Defectu proprio sunt mala que mala sunt.
Cum radix vicio careat, vicium tamen ex se
  Et per se citius dulcia poma trahunt.

Du B A Z F I G L R
1 quid Z F Ed. 3 radix: mater Z F G L R 4 cadunt A

VI

De abbate Odone Du De Odone B

Cum iam purgatis et partim glorificatis,
  Terra cinisque modo, glorificetur Odo.
Sorti sanctorum precibus iungatur eorum,
  Pacificetque Deum penituisse reum.

Du B A

VII

De M. mercatore Du B De Milone mercatore (T)

Milo domi non est. Peregre Milone profecto,
  Arva vacant, uxor non minus inde perit.
Cur sit ager sterilis, cur uxor lactitet edam:
  Quo fodiatur ager non habet: uxor habet.

Du B Z L
1 peregre: longe Du B 2 minus inde perit: peritur inde minus L
3 sterilis sit L

VIII

Ad Hugonem Du B (T)

Si qua mihi scribis, ne cuiquam scripta revelem,
  Per sacra per superos, Hugo, rogare soles.
Ne timeas: numquam per me secreta patebunt.
  Cum relegam, nequeo scire quid ipsa velint.

Du B Z D H L R
2 per.... superos: submissis precibus a: cum prece cum lacrimis
H R 3 numquam, secreta inverted Z ne: non D 4 relego R
quod R

IX

Ad Milonem Du B (T)

Thura piper vestes argentum pallia gemmas
  Vendere, Milo, soles, cum quibus emptor abit.
Coniugis utilior merx est, que vendita sepe,
  Numquam vendentem deserit aut minuit.

Du B Z D M L
1 gemmas: vestes L 2 solet L 4 vendentem numquam B

X

Ad A.comitissam Du B Ad M.reginam (T)

Desipit et peccat qui te mortalibus equat.
Est in laude parum, sed eris mihi prima dearum.

Du B M

XI

De morte Du B

Mors oculis paribus tegetes scrutatur et aulas.
  Nil latet hanc, eque dives inopsque patent.

Du B

XII

De virgine Maria B (T)

Lacto creatorem: salvum mihi crede pudorem.
   Res nova: virgo parens, et caro patre carens.

Du B M
1 credo Du 2 patre: parem Du

XIII

Super crucem B (T)

Crux finis legis, via vite, passio regis,
   Cui dat interitum gracia, non meritum.

Du B

XIV

Ad P. avarum Du B Ad avarum (T)

Si bene res detur, quamvis data semper habetur,
   Nulla reservate, gloria magna date.

Du B Z

XV

Ad A. comitissam Du B (T) Versus ad comitissam K

Augusti soboles, serie sublimis avorum,
   Missa tibi placeant quantulacunque precor.
Nolo manus sceptris, vel cervix apta corone
   Ad mea flectantur munera: mente fave.
Ut satis est populo superum meruisse favorem,
   Cum cadit ad magnos hostia parva deos,
Sic implet votum tua gracia. Plus homine erro,
   Si plus affectem quam placuisse tibi.

Du B K Z M
2 placeat K Z 5 meminisse M 7 hominem M 8 placuis Du

XVI

Ad nepotem Du B (T) Cuius supra K

Formula vivendi presto est tibi: pauca loquaris,
Plurima fac: sit utrisque comes modus, utile, pulcrum.
Sobrius a mensis, a lecto surge pudicus.
Obsequiis instes: ea pro te premia poscant.
Ut decet et prodest, et amabis et oderis idem.
Stans casum metuas, speres prostratus, et illum
Quem colis in titulis, miserum abiectumque tuere.

Du B K Z G A^2
1 forma Ed. pulcrum: rectum a Hau. Ed: om. K 3,4 inverted K Z 3 surgo K 4 obsequus B premia: munera G poscat A: poscent Hau. 4,5 placed after 6,7 G 6 metuas: timeas a A Ed, 7 in titulis: insignem a Ed.

XVII

Ad Odonem Du B (T) De eo quod hoc tempore infructuosa studia litterarum sunt G

Moribus, arte, fide, celesti pectore dignus,
  Cum superes alios, desipis Ode tamen.
Credis enim populum versus curare disertos,
  Et placuisse putas moribus, arte, fide.
Dotibus his quondam sacri placuere poete,
  Ingeniumque dedit predia, nomen, opes.
Nunc aliud tempus, alii pro tempore mores,
  Nunc odium virtus, sceptra merentur opes.
Nil artes, nil pura fides, nil gloria lingue,
  Nil fons ingenii, nil probitas sine re.
Nullus inops sapiens, ubi res, ibi copia sensus.
  Res sapiunt: pauper nil nisi pauper erit,
Divitibusque reis non tollunt crimina nomen,
  Sed quos lex damnat, equat habere deis.
Hinc est quod populus aurum quasi numen adorans,
  Audet in ignotum sepe venire nefas.
Speque lucri tocions excedere ius et honestum
  Sustulit, ut gratis iam iuvet esse reum.
Ius ruit, ordo perit, sceleri placet ora manusque
  Vendere, quamque inopem tam pudet esse probum.
Non igitur mirum si quisquam pravus et excors
  Divinum carmen nullius esse putat.
Quem comitantur opes sapiencia vera reliquit,
  Semper nobilibus incomitata bonis.

Du B Cl Z D H G R
1 dignis B H Hau. 3 versus: vates D G amare Ed. 4 et placuisse: teque placere a Hau. Ed. 5 motibus H Z Ed 7,8 om. Cl D 8 odium: dudum H 9 pura: plura Cl 10 sapiens corr. ingenii B 11 ubi res: ubire B 12 semper corr. pauper Cl 13 a Hau. Ed: nec iam divitibus tollunt sua crimina nomen 15,14 om. H R 14 quos x Du: quod a Hau Ed. equat h. deis: gracia solvit opum a Hau. Ed. deis: dies D G: bonis Z 16 sepe: sponte a Hau. Ed. 17 spe Ed. 18 sustulit: sustinet a G Hau. Ed. ut: et Ed. iuv.e.reum: iuris e.ritum Ed. 19 perit: patet Cl placeat B 20 subdere H quemque Du 21 non: nil H 22 divinos vates a Z Hau. Ed. 25 relinquit B Hau. Ed. 24 numquam (illum D) mobilibus sueta (sepe R) coire bonis (boni R) D H R

XVIII

In Berengarii obitum Du De Berengario B Epytaphium Beringarii (T) Versus de Berengario K De magistro Berengario G

Quem modo miratur, semper mirabitur orbis,
Ille Berengarius non obiturus obit.
Quem sacre fidei fastigia summa tenentem,
Iani quinta dies abstulit, ausa nefas.
Illa dies damnosa dies et perfida mundo,
Qua decus et rerum forma ruina fuit;
Qua status ecclesie, qua spes, qua gloria cleri,
Qua cultor iuris, iure ruente, ruit.
Quidquid philosophi, quidquid cecinere poete
Ingenio cessit, eloquioque suo.
Sanctior et maior sapiencia, maius adorta,
Implevit sacrum pectus et ora deo.
Pectus cum voluit, vox protulit, actio prompsit:
Singula factori sic studuere suo.
Vir sacer et sapiens, cui nomen crescit in horas,
Quo minor est quisquis maximus est hominum;
Cui sensus peperit, partos servavit honores,
Cui potior pauper divite, iusque lucro,
Cui nec desidiam nec luxum res dedit ampla,
Nec tumidum fecit multus et altus honor.
Qui nec ad argentum nec ad aurum lumina flexit,
Sed doluit quociens cui daret hec aberat.
Qui non cessavit inopum fulcire ruinas,
Donec inops dando factus et ipse fuit.

Cuius cura sequi naturam, legibus uti,
Et mentem vitiis, ora negare dolis;
Virtutes opibus, verum preponere falso,
Nil vacuum sensu dicere, nil facere; v ko.
Ledere nec minimum, cunctis prodesse, favores
Et populare lucrum pellere mente manu.
Cui vestis textura rudis, cui non fuit unquam
Ante sitim potus, nec cibus ante famem.
Quem Pudor hospicium statuit sibi, quamque libido
Incestos superat, tam superavit eam.
Quem Natura parens cum mundo contulit inquit:
'Degenerant alii, nascitur iste mihi'.
Queque vagabatur, et pene reliquerat orbem,
Inclusit sacro pectore Iusticiam.
Vir sacer a puero, qui quantum preminet orbi
Fama, tam fame prefuit ipse sue.
Fama minor meritis, cum totum pervolet orbem,
Cum semper crescat, non erit equa tamen.
Vir pius atque gravis, vir sic in utroque modestus,
Ut livor neutro rodere posset eum.
Livor eum deflet quem carpserat antea, nec tam
Carpsit et odit eum, quam modo laudat, amat.
Quam prius ex vita, tam nunc ex morte gemiscit,
Et queritur celeres huius abisse dies.
Vir vere sapiens, et parte beatus ab omni.
Qui celos anima, corpore donat humum.
Post obitum secum vivam, secum requiescam,
Nec fiat melior sors mea sorte sua.

Du B Cl K Z G Will.= William of Malmesbury, Gesta regum III.284, ed. Stubbs. Single Mss. of the work which offer variants worth quoting are Ce^1= B.M.Royal 15.D.II, T = Troyes 294^2.
1 mirabiliter B 2 moriturus K Z 3 quem: hunc B Cl 6 so x Du Ed: qua rerum columen qua decus occubuit a Hau. forma: summa Z G Ed. 7 Qui.. quae.. quae Ed. status: decus Cl 8 Qui Ed. cultor: custos Cl Z G Ed. 11 sanctio B adorti Ed. 13 eum K Z: eam Will. (eum Ce^1): enim G 20 honos Du K 22 hic Ed. 28 nil fac.: vel Du Cl K Will. minimum: nimium Ed.: quenquam Will. 31 tectura K Ed. non: nec Ed. 35 postque Ed. 54 tum G Ed. eum Ed. 56 regenerant Ed. iste: ille Du B 40 prefuit: profuit Z: preminet G 44 possit G Will. 45 eum: enim Will.(eum T S) 50 donat: ditat Cl G Will.Ed.

29 f

Ko -

XIX

De Lucretia Du (T) De Lucrecia B De Lucretie morte I

Cum foderet gladio castum Lucretia pectus,

Sanguinis et torrens egrederetur, ait:
'Testes procedant me non favisse tiranno;
Ante virum sanguis, spiritus ante deos.
Quam bene producti pro me post fata loquentur,
Alter apud manes, alter apud superos.

Du B I V = Valenciennes 145 s.xii. Otto of Freising, Godfrey of Viterbo, Conrad of Mure (For these see notes).
1 dum Hau.Godf. gladio: ferro Otto Conr. 2 et: est Ed. egereretur Du 3 procedant testes Otto Conr.Godf. 4 ante v. sanguis: sanguis apud Manes V Otto Conr. 5 pro: per B Ed. 5,6 in Du B (T) I Ed. only.

XX

De triplici domo humani generis K

Trina domus nobis,lar,tumba,polusque paratur.
Ligna larem, ligo sarcofagum, devocio celum
Preparat. Occasus comes in lare, vermis in urna,
Angelus in celo. Lar pene, tumba sopori,
Celum leticie diversa sorte dicantur.
Culpa priora duo dat, gracia sola supremum.

Du B A Cl K Z E F G L
2 sacrofagum Du Cl K G 3 urna est K Z Ed. 4 sapori Cl 5 dicuntur Ed.

XXI

De tribus missis in natale (natali B) domini DU B G R
Cuius supra de missa in nocte natalis domini K
Quid signent tres misse in natale domini E
Cur tres misse celebrentur in natale domini cuius supra F
Cur tres misse celebrentur in natale domini I
Quid figurant tres misse in natali L
Eiusdem cur in natale dei tres celebrentur misse P

In natale sacro, sacre sollemnia misse
Quid signent, aut cur ter celebrentur habes.
Nocte prior, sub luce sequens, in luce suprema,
Sub Noe, sub templo, sub cruce sacra notant.
Sub Noe, sub David, sub Christo sacra fuere
Nox,aurora,dies,umbra,figura,Deus.

Du B A Cl K Z E F I P G L R
2 quid signent: cur tres sint Ed. signant E I L

habes:habe Cl K E I Ed. 5 placed after 5 Ed., om. L
4 templo: david Cl E I Ed. cruce:christo L 5 om. L

XXII

De casu huius mundi Du B De lapsu huius mundi (T)
Cuius supra de infortuniis qui sibi deciderant K
De infortunio suo D Conquestio eiusdem ep. cum exulatus fuisset E De infortunio suo Hildebertus I
Versus cuiusdam de exilio suo G Versus episcopi
Centionis R

Nuper eram locuples, multisque beatus amicis,
  Et risere diu fata secunda mihi.
Larga Ceres, deus Archadie, Bachusque replebant
  Horrea, tecta, penum, farre, bidente, mero.
Hortus, apes, famule, pulmento, melle, tapetis,
  Ditabant large prandia, vasa, domum.
Dextra laborabat gemmis, pomeria fructu,
  Prata redundabant gramine, lacte greges.
Agger opum, tranquilla quies, numerosus amicus,
  Delicias, somnos, consiliumque dabant.
Cetera quid referam mestos solancia vultus?
  Omnia captate prosperitatis erant.
Iurares superos intra mea vota teneri,
  Et res occasum dedidicisse pati.
Mirabar sic te, te sic, Fortuna, fidelem,
  Mirabar stabilem, que levis esse soles.
Sepe mihi dixi: "Quorsum tam prospera rerum?
  Quid sibi vult tantus, tam citus agger opum?"
Ei mihi. Nulla fides, nulla est constancia rebus.
  Res ipse quid sint mobilitate docent.
Res hominum atque homines levis alea versat in horas,
  Et venit a summo summa ruina gradu.
Cuncta sub ancipiti pendent mortalia casu,
  Et spondent propria mobilitate fugam.
Quidquid habes hodie, cras te fortasse relinquet,
  Aut modo, dum loqueris, desinit esse tuum.
Has ludit Fortuna vices, regesque superbos,
  Aut servos humiles non sinit esse diu.
Illa dolosa comes, sola levitate fidelis,
  Non impune favet, aut sine fine premit.
Illa mihi quondam risu blandita sereno,
  Mutavit vultus, nubila facta, suos,
Et velut eternam misero conata ruinam,
  Spem quoque leticie detrahit illa mihi.
Illa professa dolum submersit, diruit, ussit,

Culta, domos, vites, imbribus, igne, gelu.
Insuper exhausit, excussit, debilitavit,
Hoste, notho, morbis, horrea, poma, gregem.
Accessit damnis novus ille gravisque tirannus,
Quo Cenomannorum consule ius periit.
Cuius avos puduit scelerum genuisse patronum,
Fortuneque paren mobilitate, dolis.
Ille pudor patrie me, non impune tuentem
Iusticie leges, expulit a patria.
Inde ratem scando, vitam committo procellis:
Vela tument, gemina cimba iuvatur ope.
Portus erat longe, cum ventus fortior estum
Movit, et in tumulos Auster aravit aquas.
Crescit hiems, agit aura ratem, furit unda dehiscens,
Imbre madet velum, nox tegit atra diem.
Desperare iubent venti, mare, turbine, fluctu,
Occursu rupes, ignibus ipse polus.
In fragilem pinum totus prope congerit iras
Orbis, et est hostis quidquid obesse potest.
Dum sic sevit hiems, dum pallet et ipse magister,
Dum stupet, et fieri piscibus esca timet,
Ecce rapax turbo, tollens ad sidera fluctus,
Impulit ad litus iam sine puppe ratem.
Sic misere felix, quassa rate, rebus ademptis,
Evasi ventos, equora, saxa, Iovem.
Ecce quid est hominis, quid iure vocare paternam,
Qua miser ille sibi plaudere dote potest.
Hoc est hoc hominis, semper cum tempore labi,
Et semper quadam condicione mori.
Est hominis nudum nasci, nudumque reverti
Ad matrem, nec opes tollere posse suas.
Est hominis putrere solo, sanieque fateri,
Et miseris gradibus in cinerem redigi.
Istius est heres homo prosperitatis, et illum
Certius his dominum premia nulla manent.
Res et opes prestantur ei, famulantur ad horam,
Et locuples mane, vespere pauper erit.
Nemo potest rebus ius assignare manendi,
Que nutus hominum non didicere sequi.
Ius illis Deus ascripsit, statuitque teneri
Legibus, et nutu stare vel ire suo.
Ille simul, semel et solus previdit et egit
Cuncta, nec illa aliter vidit, agitque aliter.
Ut vidit facienda facit, regit absque labore,
Distinguit formis, tempore, fine, loco.
Crescendi studium rebus metitur, et illas
Secretis versat legibus, ipse manens.

Ipse manens, dum cuncta movet, mortalibus egris
Consulit, et qua sit spes statuenda docet.
Si fas est credi te quidquam posse vel esse,
O Fortuna, quod es, quod potes ipse dedit.
Pace tua, Fortuna, loquar: blandire,minare,
Nil tamen unde querar, aut bene leter ages.
Ille potens,mitis tenor et concordia rerum
Quidquid vult in me digerat, eius ero.

Du B A Cl K Z D E I G M L R Z^2
2 fata secunda: prospera fata a Hau. 4 testa: septa Z^2 Hau. 5 hortus: ornus Cl melle: male B 7,8 placed after 9,10 a H 7 pomaria Hau. Ed. 9 ager B Cl Z D E 11 singula quid memorem letos testancia casus a Hau: cetera quid referam letos testancia casus L 12 captivae Hau. erat Cl 13 iurires B inter K 14 dedicisse Du Cl K Z: iam dedicisse E: dedicisse corr. dededicisse I G: didicisse B L: dedidisse M 16 sic te sic te K Z L denique mirabar sic te fort. a Hau. 18 ager Cl Z M 19 si mihi Z Ed. 21 horas: auras Hau. 23 cunctas K 24 propriam K M 25 relinquit E D 26 desinet Du Cl D E G L 30 nec favet eternum nec sine fine premit a Hau. 31 risu: vultu Cl 34 illa: ipsa a L Hau. 35 illa: ipsa a diluit A 37 insuper exhausit: hec eadem fregit a Hau. concussit A Hau. 38 noto Cl D Ed. 39 gravis ille malusque E Z (corr.from reading of text): gravisque ferusque M om.ille M novus: malus D 40 cenomagnorum D: cynomannorum I: Cenomanorum Hau.Ed. 44 lectes K 45 commuto K 46 vela: uda Ed. gemina: duplici D E G 48 movit et: impulit D E 49 furit: fugit I M Z^2 50 om.E 52 rupes: nubes I Z^2 53 prope:pene I G Ed. congerit: digerit E G: degerit D: congregat a 54 orbis: urbis A_2 56 dum stupet: obstupet B_2 59 misere: miser et Z I L_2 Z^2 Ed. miser infelix K 61 quid: quod K 62 ille: ipse E Z^2 Hau. dote potest: dotest K 63 est hominis semper fluere et c. temp. labi: a hec est hec I hoc hoc est L 64 mori: trahi vel mori K Z_2 67 putrire A M: putere I G famemque Ed. 69 posteritatis I Z^2 70 predia Du L Ed. 71 opes: honor a prestant E 72 I ends 74 didiscere A: dedicere Hau. sequi: pati D E M 75 ascribit K Z E Ed. 78 nec: vel D E illa: ille Hau. 81 distinctis idem cursum metitur: a Hau. stadium K Z metitur: meatum B 82 secreti Cl 83 ipse: ille E

84 et qua sit: atque ubi sit a Hau. qua: quo D E G L: quia K corr. qua m^2 85 quicquam credi te E 86 quid... quod I Hau Ed: quod... que K 87 loquor K minare: in mare K 88 unde: inde D M: unum B 89 conc. et rerum B rerum: fervens Z: fratrum K 90 digerat: proferat a

XXIII

De ermafrodito Du B (T) Versus cuius supra de hermafrodito K Epitaphium ermofroditi H Ermafroditus G Versus androgeni sive hermofroditi L

Dum men me mater gravida gestaret in alvo,
  Quid pareret fertur consuluisse deos.
Phebus ait:'Puer est'; Mars:'Femina'; Juno:'Neutrum'.
  Iam quod sum natus hermafroditus eram.
Querenti letum dea sic ait:'Occidet armis';
  Mars:'Cruce'; Phebus:'Aqua'. Sors rata queque fuit.
Arbor obumbrat aquas: ascendo: labitur ensis,
  Quem tuleram casu, labor et ipse super.
Pes hesit ramis, caput incidit amne, tulique
  Vir,mulier,neutrum,flumina,tela,crucem.

Du B A K Z D H G M L

1 cum G 2 pararet corr. -eret B: pereret H consuluit superos quid paritura foret L 3 Junoque Hau.Ed. neutrum: nec uter D 4 quod: quo D H M: qui a iam: ex D M 6 aquis L G (corr.aqua G) 7 conscendo G 9 amne: anne Du B A D M 10 femina vir neutrum D M H D add: nescio quem sexum mihi lux extrema relinquet
felix si sciero cur utriusque fui
(sors extrema reliquit D)

XXIV

De quodam servo Du B Cuius supra K

Servus ait domino:'Gratis famulabor in annum,
  Si facis ut famula qualibet arte fruar'.
Poscit herus coitum, sibi ponit servula noctem.
  Ille thoro famulum collocat, hec dominam.
Res patuit casu, vir nuptam provocat in ius.
  Facta refert; risum facta relata movent.
Uxor et ancilla laudantur, virque monetur
  Ne messem famuli sic emat ulterius.

Du B K Z G L
1 annum: anno K 3 ponit sibi L Hau: poscit sibi K Z:
spondet sibi G 5 casu patuit a Hau: tandem patuit L
6 B ends 7 laudatur K Z

XXV

Non bene discernis, qui prefers ima supernis,
Nec satis es tecum, qui rebus subicis equum.
Quippe quid argentum? Quid forma? Quid ordo clientum?
Quid celebres fundi? Festum breve gloria mundi.
Nulla fides eius, hodie male, cras ibi peius.
Expedit hoc uti, sed non preferre saluti.

Du B A Z M
2 tecum: rectum M 5 ibi: sibi Du

XXVI

Ad M. litteratam Du Ad M. literatam B Versus ad quandam virginem scilicet Muriel K Laus cuiusdam virginis sanctimonialis G

Tempora prisca decem se iactavere sibillis,
  Et vestri sexus gloria multa fuit.
Unius ingenio presencia secula gaudent,
  Et non ex toto virgine vate carent.
Nunc quoque sunt homini quedam commercia divum,
  Quos puto, nec fallor, virginis ore loqui.
Mente tua posuere dei penetrale verendum,
  Osque sacrum vatem constituere suum.
Ore tuo quecumque fluunt vigilata priorum
  Transcendunt, solis inferiora deis.
Quidquid enim spiras est immortale, tumque
  Tanquam diviram mundus adorat opus.
Deprimis ingenio vates celebresque poetas,
  Et stupet eloquio sexus uterque tuo.
Carmina missa mihi decies spectata revolvens,
  Miror, et ex aditis illa venire reor.
Non est humanum tam sacros posse labores,
  Nec te, sed per te numina credo loqui.
Pondera verborum, sensus gravis, ordo venustus
  Vultum divine condicionis habent.
Cum miror quanta se maiestate tuentur,
  Parcius exilii triste recordor onus.
Forsitan ignoras, sed ego dum tutor honestum,
  Dum sacri partes ordinis, exul agor.

Exilii curas et pondera dura laborum
Alleviare tuo carmine virgo potes.
Allevies oro, nec quem fortuna reliquit
Linquere, fortune tu comes ipsa, velis.
Ne mihi verba neges; levius nil poscere possum.
Nil a te spero, si mihi verba neges.
Exulis obsequium nisi cuius forte recuses,
Exul in obsequium nitar ubique tuum.

Du B Cl K Z D H G
2 et: ut Cl multa: magna Hau.Ed. nostri Du 4 et: quod Hau. 8 sacrum: tuum a Hau. osque: teque Ed. 15 - 16 om. a 14 eloquio: ingenio D 17,18 placed after 19,20 a 19 venustas B Cl Z Ed. 20 vultum: multum D Hau. cognitionis K Z Ed.Wilmart 26 potes... tuo K Z Hau.Ed. 27 relinquit a Hau. alleves B H 29 poscere: querere a ne: nec D H G 30 spero: quero B: queram Cl a: abs Du 31,32 om. a 32 nitor K H Ed.

XXVII

Epitaphium B. virginis Du B

Bona mihi nomen, pudor optio, tempora vite
Lustra duo, studium pagina sacra fuit.
Hec mihi descripsit que sint incommoda nupte,
Quis vidue fructus, quid sibi virgo metat.
Hinc breve coniugium, thalamosque perosa doloris,
Virtutem subolem matre pudore tuli.
Quam bene virgo parit, nequeat licet edere Christum,
Que propter Christum negligit esse parens.

Du B U
2 B ends 5 nupte: vite U 6 pudore U: pudoris Du: pudori He

XXVIII

De Brunone Du (T)

Ad superos superum cultor sociusque recessit,
Commendans terre Bruno quod eius erat.
Sarcinulasque leves, et agentem Prothea mundum
Despicit, eternas pauper adeptus opes.
Suspicor angelicas hinc exultare cohortes,
Et celi cives plaudere cive novo.

Serta dies Octobris erat cum Bruno, professus
   Naturam, superos exoneratus adit.

Du Z
3 sarciculas Ed. Prathea Z After 1.4 Z inserts:
Depositum in terra cineri miscetur, idemque
   Sperat et expectat praemia sorte pari.
8 ad superos Ed. abit Ed.

XXIX

De H. comite Du De Helia comite (T)

Iura tuens, et pacis amans, et maximus armis,
Helias censor scelerum, patronus honesti,
Gloria nature, speculum quo vera refulsit
Iusticia, et quidquid in principe mundus adorat,
Occidit, et pariter pax et decus urbis et orbis
Excidit, Helia patrieque et rebus adempto.

Du
3 om. Ed. 6 petrieque: patrie heu Ed.

XXX

Super quandam matronam Du Epitafium G

Quam tegit hic tumulus felix cum coniuge vixit:
   Coniugis exequie cetera vita fuit.
Rebus,avis,specie,locuples,excelsa,celebris,
   Abstinuit luxu,fastibus,opprobriis.
Pauperibus sacravit opes, thalamosque pudori,
   Et docuit sexum non meminisse sui.
Illam sex lustris stupuit natura pudicam,
   Et dubitavit utrum femina nsone foret.
Illa quoad vixit sanctas imbuta Sabinas,
   Plena Deo nona luce Novembris obit.

Du Z D G
1 tumulus: titulus Z 3 et in specie Z 4 fascibus G
abstituit Du 6 sexus D Hau. 9,10 om. Du Z
9 quo advixit G

XXXI

De A. abbate Du

Si tibi Fulcho mori mitis natura negaret,
Fulta tuis humeris numquam Corbea labaret.

Que, quia non potuit tantum concedere munus,
Distulit ut potuit multo tibi tempore funus.
Solvit decrepitum, parcens evo iuvenili,
Ut satis atque diu prodesses pastor ovili.

Du Z H
1 mitis: miris Du 2 Corbeia Hau. humeris: humilis H
5 que om. H 5 solvit: solum H 6 prodessens Z:
prodesset Hau.

XXXII

Cuius supra K

Cum peteret puerum Saturnius, Yfis Yantem,
Cetus ait superum:"Scelus hoc." Illud voco culpam.
Quo prohibente nefas, ludum ridente virorum,
Altera fit iuvenis, fit femina neuter eorum.
Si scelus esset idem, sentencia celicolarum
Alterutrum transformaret, neutramve duarum.

Du K Z Bibl.Nat.Lat. 13343 (Pa)
1 iphis Du yante Z: hiantem Du: Iantha Hau.Pa 2 hoc:
est Pa Hau. 3 prohibente: damnante Du ludum: lapsum Du
4 neuter: nullus Du Pa neutreorum K

XXXIII

Ad S.nepotem Du (T)

Res male tuta puer, ne te committe quibusdam.
  Multa domus multos fertur habere Ioves.
Nolo tamen speres Ganimedis crimine celum:
  Hac modo milicia nullus ad astra venit.
Consecrat ethereas solis Iunonibus arces
  Lex melior: manes masculus uxor habet.
Cum doleat culpam suspecti Iuno mariti,
  Mercedem culpe non dolet esse polum.

Du Z L
1 ne: nec Z Hau: n̄ L 3 nolo: non Z Hau. speres: expectes
Z Hau: affectes L tamen: quod L 5,6 om.Du 5 Iunonibus L:
iunioribus Z 7 culpe Z

XXXIV

De plagis Egipti Du (T)L Incipiunt versus eiusdem episcopi de X plagis Egypto K De decem plagis Egypti F Z^2 De X plagis Egipti I Idem de X plagis Egypti P Versus de decem plagis Egipti G

Prima rubens unda: rane tabesque secunda.
Inde culex tristis: post musca nocivior istis.
Quinta pecus stravit: vesicas sexta creavit.
Pone subit grando: post brucus dente nefando.
Nona tegit solem: primam necat ultima prolem.

Du A Cl K Z F I P G L R Z^2
1 clades raneque G 4 pone: pene Ed. 5 necat: vexat Ed.

XXXV

Ad M. reginam Du (T)

Augustis patribus augustior orta Mathildis,
  Quaslibet in laudes ora diserta vocas -
Sed frustra, quia nemo tibi preconia solvet,
  Que genus, et mores, et bona forma petit.
Una loqui te lingua potest, que laudis opime
  Materiam linguis omnibus, una peras.
In vultu regina tuo est, redoletque Sabinam
  Non levis incessus, nec datus arte decor.
Non mores doctrina sacros, non virgo pudorem
  Prestitit - ex proavis fluxit utrumque bonum.
Cuncta tue genetricis habes, que clausa sepulchro,
  Illustrat meritis Anglica regna suis.
Neve simul caderet muliebris gloria sexus
  Te peperit, partu tota renata tuo.
Non semel orta parens iacet urna, regnat in aula,
  Hic homini, sursum collaterata Deo.
Collaterata Deo, quam sit nihil omne relictum
  Cernit, quam sit inops filia sceptra tenens.
Hanc sibi securam de te curare, suumque
  Taliter Auctorem sollicitare reor:
"Nondum me totam celesti sede recepi,
  Magne Deus, requie semibeata fruor.
Pars iacet in tumulo, pars Anglica regna gubernat,
  Divisamque tenent aula, sepulchra, polus.
Quam tenet aula iuva: quam clausa sepulchra reforma:
  Quam polus exaudi, sisque corona tribus."

Du Cl
2 deserta corr. diserta Cl 3 solet corr.solvet in marg.Du
8 non: nec Cl 9 virga Du Cl 10 prestitit: praeterit Ed.
12 regna: terra Cl 15 sexus: lingue Cl 15,16 om.Ed
17 omne: esse Cl 18 sceptra: regna Ed.

XXXVI

De Roma Du (T) Z Versus cuius supra de Roma K Cuius supra de Roma E Laus Rome L Versus de Roma meliores quam sit aroma R

Par tibi,Roma,nihil, cum sis prope tota ruina.
  Quam magni fueris integra, fracta doces.
Longa tuos fastus etas destruxit, et arces
  Cesaris et superum templa palude iacent.
Ille labor,labor ille ruit, quem dirus Araxes
  Et stantem tremuit, et cecidisse dolet;
Quem gladii regum, quem provida iura senatus,
  Quem superi rerum constituere caput;
Quem magis optavit cum crimine solus habere
  Cesar, quam socius et pius esse socer.
Qui crescens studiis tribus hostes,crimen,amicos,
  Vi domuit,secuit legibus,emit ope.
In quem,dum fieret,vigilavit cura priorum,
  Iuvit opus pietas, hospitis unda locum.
Materiem,fabros,expensas axis uterque
  Misit: se muris obtulit ipse locus.
Expendere duces thesauros, fata favorem,
  Artifices studium, totus et orbis opes.
Urbs cecidit, de qua si quidquam dicere dignum
  Moliar, hoc potero dicere:"Roma fuit."
Non tamen annorum series, non flamma nec ensis
  Ad plenum potuit hoc abolere decus.
Tantum restat adhuc, tantum ruit, ut neque pars stans
  Equari possit, diruta nec refici.
Confer opes marmorque novum, superumque favorem,
  Artificum vigilent in nova facta manus,
Non tamen aut fieri per stanti machina muro,
  Aut restaurari sola ruina potest.
Cura hominum potuit tantam componere Romam,
  Quantam non potuit solvere cura deum.
Hic superum formas superi mirantur et ipsi,
  Et cupiunt fictis vultibus esse pares.
Non potuit natura deos hoc ore creare,
  Quo miranda deum signa creavit homo.
Vultus adest his numinibus, potiusque coluntur
  Artificum studio quam deitate sua.

Urbs felix, si vel dominis urbs illa careret,
   Vel dominis esset turpe carere fide.

Du Cl K Z D E M L R Z^2
5 factus Du E M , 5 quem: quo Ed. 6 cecidisse: diruisse Ed.
7 iura: cura M Z^2 Hau: iura corr.cura R 9 crimine:
scelere Ed. 10 socius: socrus K 11 om.Cl K Z M
12 om.Cl K Z 14 locus E Hau. 15,16 om.Cl K Z E Ed.
15 materiam Du 16 ipse: ille M R Z^2 17 fata: facta K Z
19,20 a Z E Ed: pro dolor urbs cecidit cuius dum specto ruinas
penso statum solitus dicere roma fuit
19 occidit D qua: quam K 21 ensis: hostis D M Z^2
nec: non E 23,24 inverted with 29,30 R Hau. Will. D M Z^2 Vis
place 29,30 here, omitting 23,24 25-8 om.K 25 marmorq.
novum: ebur et marmor a Z E Ed. 26 vigilant Z
27 stanti: tanti D: tanto Z E machina: fabrica a Z E Ed.
29 tantum potuit M Z^2: tantam pot.L 35 nubibus E
his adest D 37 caret Ed.

XXXVII

De Anglia Du Versus cuius supra de Anglia K

Anglia terra ferax, tibi pax diuturna quietem,
   Multiplicem luxum merx opulenta dedit.
Tu nimio nec stricta gelu, nec sidere fervens,
   Clementi celo temperieque places.
Cum pareret natura parens, varioque favore
   Divideret dotes omnibus una locis.
Elegit potiora tibi, matremque professa:
   "Insula sis locuples, plenaque pacis," ait.
"Quidquid luxus amat, quidquid desiderat usus,
   Ex te proveniet, aut aliunde tibi.
Te siquidem, licet occiduo sub sole latentem,
   Queret et inveniet merce beata ratis.
Tempus erit, quo sceptra tibi promissa gubernet
   Henricus, nec avis, nec patre rege minor.
Rege sub hoc pax ecclesie, reverencia legi,
   Iudicium vicio, gloria rebus erit.
Rege sub hoc metuet latro vel mendicasse latronis;
   Rege sub hoc tutum preter honesta nihil.
Huic sociam dispono thori, cui prepare quidquid
   Agnoscit virtus in meliore suum.
Neve notam trahat ex vicio vel stirpe parentum,
   Sanguis erit regum, iustus uterque parens.

Hec ea nascetur quam purpura querat, et aula,
Ad quam confugiat pulsus ab orbe Pudor.
Hec ea nascetur, qua rex, qua regia proles,
Qua Cesar plaudat coniuge, matre, socru.
Hec ea nascetur que vivat et instet honesto:
Pauca viro pariet, pignora multa Deo.
Hec ea nascetur que maiestate coronam,
Sceptra manu, gemmas ore micante iuvet.
Hec perfusa genas, genio quem mundus adoret,
Ver geret in vultu, pectora legis erunt.
His ego principibus sum te factura beatam
Anglia: quod superest pandere nolo tibi."

Du Cl K Z
5 fervens: ferves K Z 4 clementa K 6 divideret: dividet illa K ~~7 eligit Ed.~~ 15 legi: regi Cl 17 metuit K latronis om.K 19 huic: hinc Ed. prepero: prepono Cl 20 Cl ends 22 utrique ZEd. 25,24 om.Du 25 quam... qua K: quam... quam Ed. 27 vivat: iuvat K 28 pariet: pariat Du 30 iuvet: vivet Ed. 31 genio cum deferat mundus Du 32 vergeret K 34 anglica Du

XXXVIII

De Roma Du Item iden de Roma (T) De eoden Cl Roma de se dicit Z Iterum idem de eoden E

Dum simulacra mihi, dum numina vana placerent,
Milicia, populo, menibus alta fui.
At simul effigies arasque superstitiosas
Deiciens, uni sum famulata Deo,
Cesserunt arces, cecidere palacia divum,
Servivit populus, degeneravit eques.
Vix scio que fuerim, vix Rome Roma recordor,
Vix sinit occasus vel meminisse mei.
Gracior hec iactura mihi successibus illis:
Maior sum pauper divite, stante iacens.
Plus aquilis vexilla crucis, plus Cesare Petrus,
Plus cunctis ducibus vulgus inerme dedit.
Stans domui terras, infernum diruta pulso;
Corpora stans, animas fracta iacensque rego.
Tunc misere plebi, modo principibus tenebrarum
Impero: tunc urbes, nunc mea regna polus.
Quod ne Cesaribus videar debere vel armis,
Et species rerum meque meosque trahat,
Armorum vis illa perit, ruit alta senatus
Gloria, procumbunt templa, theatra iacent,

Rostra vacant, edicta silent, sua premia desunt
  Emeritis, populo iura, colonus agris.
Durus eques, iudex rigidus, plebs libera quondam,
  Querit, amat, patitur, otia, lucra, iugum.
Ista iacent ne forte meus spem ponat in illis
  Civis, et evacuet spemque bonumque crucis.
Crux edes alias, alios promittit honores,
  Militibus tribuens regna superna suis.
Sub cruce rex servit, sed liber: lege tenetur,
  Sed diadema gerens: iussa tremit, sed amat.
Fundit avarus opes, sed abundat: fenerat idem,
  Sed bene custodit, sed super astra locans.
Quis gladio Cesar, quis sollicitudine consul,
  Quis rhetor lingua, que mea castra manu
Tanta dedere mihi? Studiis et legibus horum
  Obtinui terras: crux dedit una polum.

Du Cl Z E M Z^2
1 dum: cum Cl vana: multa E 5 superstitionis Cl
5 arceq: acies Z: alpes M 12 cinctis Hau.Ed. 15 modo:
nunc Z^2 17 quod: que E Hau. 18 et: ut E 19 armorum:
castrorum E 24 querit: odit Z M otia: classica Z:
clarifica M 26 evacuent Du 27 promisit Ed. 30 tremens Z
31 fenerat: si ferat Z^2 32 locaqs: locat Z Z^2 Hau. Ko M
sed^2: si M Z^2 Hau. 34 que: quis Z^2 Ed. manus E rhetor:
rector Z M 35 dedere: debere Z: delere potest E

XXXIX

De sacramento baptismalis coniugii altaris Du quod baptismus circumcisione successit E

Baptismalis quedam forma fuit in diluvio:
Huic successit, huic cessura carnis circumcisio.
Ut cognatos et affines uniret coniugium,
Raritate prime prolis fuit necessarium.
Ut augerent caritatem nuptie sub gracia,
Ad externos transierunt sacra matrimonia.
Ante legem pro peccato panis factus hostia
Legi cessit, et post legem redit ad altaria.
Ex his tribus sacramentis que sunt dicta brevius,
Sequens versus prosequetur et ostendet plenius.

Du A Cl Z E P
1,2 om.Z 4 caritate P 7 peccato: delicto Du A:
delictis Cl 8 lege Hau. 9,10 om.Z E P

II Versus cuius supra de sacramento hostie coniugii baptismi K
Item eiusdem quod baptismus et sacrificium novum veteri
concordat F Quod baptismum coniugium et sacrificium
novum veteri concordet I

Hostia,coniugium,baptismus qualia primo
Talia nunc: res ipsa redit, evanuit umbra.
Diluvium speciem baptismi gessit, et unda
Abluit excessus undis quandoque lavandos.
Prepucium post diluvium successio Thare
Deposuit, ritusque fuit sic prava piare.
Circumcisa caro lavit sub lege reatus,
Illud agens quod agit fons sub cruce sanctificatus.
Fons pueris,fons simplicibus,fons crimine mundis,
Ad vitam prodest: crux hoc accommodat undis.
Talibus aut meritis aut evo profuit ante
Circumcisa cutis, sed Christi morte iuvante
Ritus uterque sacer, quia sanguis utrumque sacravit.
Tempus utrique suum: corpus piat, umbra piavit.
Supplicium, sed misterium, sed tempore sacrum,
Preco fuit, quia precinuit fluviale lavacrum.
Preconem decuit, domino presente, silere,
Necnon et dominum, precone silente, iubere.
Sic ad se baptisma redit, cessante figura,
Sic involvit aquis sua circumcisio iura

Du A Cl K Z E F I P
1,2 placed after IV 36 Hau. 1 hostia: hinc Cl 2 redit
evanuit: dedit disparuit E: dedit sed vanuit P 6 prava:
sacra K Z 7 rege I 9 pueris: puris E 11 aut meritis:
augmentis P 12 cutis: caro E P 13 utrumq: uterq.K
14 umbra: unda E tempus: cursus F I suus F I 16 pre-
cecinit I 17 docuit I tacere I 18 silente: tacente F I:
iubente Cl et om.Du 19 sic: hic K Z 20 sic: hic K Z
aquis: agris Cl

III Coniugium Du De coniugii sacramento Z Cuius supra
de coniugii sacramento E De coniugio F

Affines,consanguineos conubia prima
Non susceperunt, nec plures una, nec unus.
Unius coniunx fuit Eva, vir unius Adam.
Precessit coitum benediccio, gracia prolem.
Nupta sequens non sic, cui copia parva virorum
Affinem,consanguineum fratremve iugavit.
Hinc etiam plures uni nupsere marito,
Non solum quia queque parem non inveniebat,
Sed quia Messiam proles paritura placebat.

Tu genetrix Ysaac, venturi prescia Christi,
Coniugii sociam pacienter sustinuisti.
Ante datam legem Iacob Rachel et Lia nupsit;
Uxores sub lege duas simul Helcana duxit.
Temporis illius si vis attendere nuptas,
Quesita est suboles, non affectata voluptas.
Non sibi,sed generi matrona satisfaciebat;
Unde Redemptorem venturum prospiciebat.
Hinc uni multe, non multis una maritis
Heserunt pariter, velut ulmo plurima vitis.
Unus enim multis ad prolem sufficiebat,
Pluribus una viris non quo generaret egebat.
Sic populum Domini peperere sacre mulieres,
Unde creandus erat suus ille Redemptor et Heres.
Illius adventus conubia prima reduxit;
Inde nec affinis nec proxima sanguine nupsit.
Nam descendentes ab eadem stirpe ligantur
Proximitate sua, carique sibi generantur.
Nil amplexus eis ad honestum prestat amorem,
Nam satis hunc fratrem, satis est hanc esse sororem.
Inter eos ideo conubia nulla iugantur,
Quos generis pietas et gracia preconitantur.
Vult Deus ut fiant qui non nascuntur amici:
Vult homines aliud quam cognatos sibi dici.
Illas uxores, istos vult esse maritos,
Ex alienigenis illas istosque petitos.
Hymen amicicia quos styrps sua seperat unit.
Federat hic populos,ligat urbes,menia munit.
Sic diffusus amor, sic res hec publica crevit,
Sic mundus discors quesita pace quievit.
Ut sacra sub Christo dileccio porrigeretur,
Femina sub Christo sic mubere lege iubetur.

Du A Cl K Z E F I P
5 unius eva fuit coniunx K Z Hau.Ed. unius et adam A: unus et adam F 5 parva: prava Z Ed. 6 fratremque E F I P after 6 I has: disposito legis propria de stirpe petito 7 om.Du A Cl K Z Ed. etiam: etenim E 12 rachel iacob Du A et r.et lia E Hau. 13 duxit: nupsit K 14 om.Cl 14,15 inverted E 17 inde A K Z Ed. 20 unus: non Ed. 21 quo: quod A Cl: que Du 24 prima: vera E 29 nam: iam K Z Ed. hunc: nunc K: est Z Ed.: est hunc P esse hanc K 32 non: nunc E F 34 istos: istas P 35 illas: istas F I 36 hymen amic: coniugale bonum Du Z P Hau.Ed. stirps sua: sanguine F: sanguis I 37 hic: hoc Du A Z P Hau. 40 sub: pro Cl 41 christi F I Ed.

IV De sacramento altaris Du Item eiusdem de sacrificio F De sacrificio panis et vini I Versus de Melchisedech G

Melchisedech Domino panem vinumque litavit:
Christus idem statuens pactum vetus evacuavit.
Inter utrumque diu fuit alter sacrificandi
Ritus, et obtinuit vim qualemcumque piandi.
Agnus enim legis carnales diluit actus,
Agnum presignans qui nos lavat, hostia factus.
Hoc semel oblato, cursum prior ille peregit,
Quodque fuit signum presens effectus abegit.
Quis locus aurore, postquam sol venit ad ortum?
Quis locus est votis, teneat cum navita portum?
Lex aurora fuit, bos et capra vota fuere,
Crux sol, crux portus: hec est, ea preteriere.
Crux clausit templum, crux solvit enigmata legis;
Sub cruce cessat ephot, et deficit unctio regis.
Hircus,ovis,passer,vervex et adeps vitulorum
Nil preconantur: Deus hostia finis eorum.
Parcat Hebreus ovi, caro carnes abstulit are;
Est pecudum pecudes post Christum sacrificare.
Mortuus ille semel licet ultra non moriatur,
Idem cotidie sine vulnere sacrificatur.
Que vegetet mentem, nisi Christus inania sanxit,
In Christi carnem panis substancia transit.
Panis in altari Deus in cruce: nil dubitetur:
Hoc verbo vite fieri vita ipsa fatetur.
Hac in carne nihil carnale, nihilve cruentum ;
Spiritus hanc tangit,videt,accipit ad monumentum.
Ordo sacer, bona tradicio, pia victima panis;
Inde procul facimus, procul horror et usus inanis.
Secretum felix, nova virtus, utile sacrum,
Quo factus sanguis, liquor est vitale lavacrum.
Nam quia peccantes medicina semper egemus,
Hanc pro peccatis medicinam semper habemus.
Hec datur ad vitam, sed si reus hunc verearis,
Qui patris ad dextram sedet, et mactatur in aris.
Ecce vides in lege tipos et signa perisse,
Ad propriumque caput tria sacramenta redisse.

A Cl K Z E F I P G
1 ligavit Z 5 diluit: debuit Cl: expiat F Ed.
6 designans F Ed. lavit A 10 quisve E P om. est E P
11 fuere: fuerunt K Z E P 12 est: et K P: hec omnia pret. E: hec illaque pret.Z preterierunt K Z E 13,14 inverted F Ed.
14 ephod E P Hau Ed: ephota K 17 ovi: eis P caro: crux F Ed.
21,22 inverted with 25,24 Ed. 21 nisi: nec Ed. 24 vite verbo F Ed.
25 nihilque F P Ed. 26 christus hanc tangit A: hanc christus tangit E monimentum Z E F I Ed. 27 panis: carnis P bona: pia Ed.

28 inde: unde Du Cl E PHau.F I Ed: qua veteris ritus cruor horridus extat inanis 29 decretum Hau. et utile sacratum A 31 nam: iam A: nos E: hac P 34 dexteram A 35 praeisse Hau. 36 et caput ad proprium Hau.

XL

Cur deus homo Du (T) Versus cur deus homo K Quod homo aliter salvari non poterat nisi deus carnem assumpsisset Z E(om.poterat) Cur deus homo cuius supra F

Ade peccatum que conveniens aboleret
Victima? Numquid homo? Sed et hic reus unde placeret?
Angelus,an fruges,an vacca? Sed hostia talis,
Natura dispar, precio minor esset inanis.
Hec eadem que displicuit natura placere
Debuit, atque aliquid quo pacificaret habere.
Ergo fuit querendus homo, cui preter id ipsum
Quod puri est hominis, quiddam foret unde placeret.
Unitur carni Deus, et natura creatrix
Que redimit recipit, fit et ipsa redempta redemptrix.
Par homini, quia verus homo, sed dignior ortu,
Dissimilis culpa, Deitate potentior idem.
Quem quia non genuit ex lapsu nata voluptas,
Iustus pro lapsis agit, occisusque perorat.
Hostia sufficiens, que celos cive replevit,
Qua furor offensi cecidit, qua gracia crevit;
Antidotum felix, quo vulnera nostra coherent,
Angelus exultat, homo gaudet, Tartara merent.

om. 7,8 Ko.

quem Ko.

Du A Cl K Z E F P
1 aboleret: abderet P 2 nonquid A: siquid E F placere Ed. 5 placere: manere E 6 quo: quod Du A F P Ed. 7 cui: qui K Z P Ed. idipsum Ed. 8 quod: quid F pueri E 9 creatrix: redemptrix F Ed. 10 om.Ed. que: quem Du E F: quod Hau. 11 dignitor Du 14 occidunusque K Z: occiosusq.F 16 offensus Ed.

XLI

Aducem R. Du

Magne pater patrie, maiorum maxime princeps,
Ad vigilata tibi carmina verte manus.
Carmina per scopulos, per plenas mortibus Alpes
Misimus, inque brevi, si licet ipse sequar.
Difficilis labor est, sed nil grave nilque molestum
Quod duce, quod domino precipiente feram.

Nil potuit gravius mihi cedere quam procul esse
A te, cui preter turpia nulla procul;
Qui nullum pateris a te discedere tristem,
Nec gaudes quociens gaudia nulla moves;
Qui ne degeneres, titulos equare paternos
Niteris, atque omnes vincere, patre minor.
Patre minor solo, maior quandoque futurus;
Dux sequeris, Cesar antefereris ei.
Magnum quid, supraque ducem prenuncia virtus
Spondet, et imperii vaticinatur onus.
Vult talem gradus ille virum, vir et ipse meretur
Talem successu prosperiore gradum.
Nolo tenere tuas longis sermonibus aures:
* * * sufficit hora mihi.

Du Z
5 mortibus: montibus Du 5 sed om.Z 7,8 om.Du
9 qui: tu Du 10 gaudet Du 11 qui: te Du. 15 quandoq.Hau:
quanque Z: virtute Du 16 vaticiatur Du 17,18 vult talem
successu prosperiore virum Du 18 successus corr.successui Z
prospicuiore Hau: prospiciore Z 19 linguis corr.longius Du

XLII

De XII lapidibus et nominibus filiorum Israel Du
De duodecim patriarchis et duodecim gemmis (T)

Ruben precedens in origine, iaspis in ede,
Virtutum simul et fidei primordia signat.
In partu Simeon, saphirus in ede secundus,
Triste cor insinuat, cui conversacio celum.
Tercius appositu calcedon, germine Levi,
Incrementa boni, sed adhuc occulta figurant.
In nascendo Iudas, et quartus in ede smaragdus,
Ora professa fidem, fideique loquuntur agones.
Appositi quinti Dan sardoniusque, paratos
Iudicio memorant, humilesque ac pectore puros.
Sardius appositu, Neptalim tempore sextus,
Martirium signant, et amoris duplicis ignes.
Crisolitus templo, Gad patri septimus ortu,
Accinctos in bella notant, signisque micantes.
Inde berillus, Aser octavus, uterque figurant
Iam requie mentis, operumque nitore beatos.
Nonus structura topazios, Ysachar ortu,
Contemplativos, et spe mercedis ovantes.
Hinc decimus Zabulon, crisopasusque recensent
In bello fortes, preciique virore refectos.
Undecimus iactu iascinctus, origine Ioseph,

Votis addentes, atque omnibus omnia factos.
Inde verecundos, humiles, longoque merentes
Martirio dextram Patris amplexusque, figurat
Beniamin et pariter ametistus, uterque supremus.

Du A Cl
2 semel Du signant Du 4 insinuant Du 5 appositi A Ed.
Levi: leni Ed. 6 figura Du 10 om.-que Du
11 appositus Ed. 12 duplices Du 14 accinctus corr.-os A
16 requiem Ed: re/// Du 17 topazius Du Ed. 18 orantes Ed.
19 hic Cl chrysoprasus Ed. recenset Ed. 20 virore:
nitore Ed. 22 addentes: ardentes Cl factus Ed.
23 merentes: mentes Du 24 figurant Cl

XLIII

Versus cuius supra ad Gaufridum abbatem Vindocinensis aecclesiae qui anulo et sandaliis utebatur episcopalibus K

Ars asino submisit equam, mixtureque mulum,
Lascivam subolem, prodigiosa dedit.
Sic tibi mixta honor, sic ex abbate simulque
Presule, nescio quis dicitur esse gradus.

misprint mistus.

Du A K Z
5 honos K Z 4 esse: iste Ed.

XLIV

Nullus in adversis hoc tempore perdit amicum:
Incipit a dubiis fallere quisque fidem.

K Z G

XLV

Versus cuius supra quare dominicum corpus in III partes frangatur K Tractatus de tribus partibus hostie E
Item versus cuius supra de corpore et sanguine domini F
Iterum de sacrificio misse I Quid significet hostia tribus partibus divisa P

Tollimur e medio, fatis urgentibus, omnes,
Et trahimur quo nos vita peracta vocat.
Hi nunquam, hi semper, alii plectuntur ad horam,
Purgatisque datur transitus ad requiem.
Hanc illis altare sacrum, vel criminis expers
Vita, vel obsequiis emptus amicus emit.

Perfectos valdeque malos nil vota suorum,
Nil impensa precum, nil holocausta iuvant.
Nam nec iustus eget, nec pessimus ista meretur:
In medio est veniam cui sacra mensa parat.
Ipsa tamen vivos a vite calle vagantes
Ut redeant saltem sero iuvare solet.
Inde fit ut quotiens sacris accedimus aris,
Particulis cedat hostia fracta tribus.
Pars intincta mero pro vivis orat, opusque
Sanguinis et carnis expiat, ipsa caro;
Pro bene defunctis, quorum purgatior unus
Hoc interventu non eget, alter eget.
Offerimus tibi, Christe, duas, sed propter eosdem
Oblate periter, non operantur idem.
Nam pars pro sanctis, pars est pro sanctificandis:
Illa refert grates, supplicat ista Deo.
Hostia pro iustis laus est, pro iustificandis
Mercio, pro reliquis causam agit alterius.
Vota precum ut citius detur eis requies
At reliquis quorum mala mors, ac improba vita
Promeruit poenam, non favet haec venia.
Fit cibus hic ex pane caro, Deus ex elemento,
Mysterio simplex, utilitate triplex.
Fit cibus hic ovis in ligno, leo fortis in urna,
Ales ad astra volans, rex super astra sedens.
Neve putes illi tumulumve crucemve deesse,
Ipse calix tumulum denotat, ara crucem.
Utque fides adsit, terrorque recedat et horror,
Fit cibus ipse caro, panis imago manet.

A Cl K E F I P G
2 quo: qui K attrahimur E 6 emptus: certus Cl 8 nil... nil corr.non...non K precum: procul I 12 solet: potest P 15 unde Cl K accedimus: assistitur Ed. sacris quotiens Ed. 14 cedet Cl ced.particulis F 15 orat: aptatur Cl orat et /// acta A 18 Christe: summe E Ed. 21 iustificandis E F 23-6 om.G 24 om.Ed. A Cl end causam agit alterius: proficit ecclesie A Cl 24abc appear only in Ed. 28 astra: alta K I volens K 29 crucem vedesse E illic I 30 ipse: ille E 31 horror: error E P: utque fides crescat horror tollatur ab aris G: utque fides assit horror tollatur ab ara 32 ipse: ipsa E P

XLVI

Versus ad Ceciliam abbatissam Cathemi K Item in laudem eiusdem virginis G

Qui solet ante homines Cicerone disertior esse,
Facundus mimus est, cum venit ante deos.

Sic ego,cum medie plebi loquar ore diserto,
In vultu potui dicere pauca tuo.
Maiestate tua stupui, totamque vagantI
Percurrens oculo, sum ratus esse deam.
Parcius elimans alias natura puellas,
Distulit in dotes esse benigna tuas.
In te fudit opes, et opus mirabile cernens,
Est mirata suas hoc potuisse manus.
Hec posuit vultuque deas, animoque parentes,
Quos homines solis posthabuere deis.
Quodque magis miror, pulcram castamque creavit,
Quo nihil hic sexus maius habere potest.
Quamvis sexus,opes,genus,etas,forma resistant,
Nil te reginam preter honesta iuvat.
Innumeros hostes et virgo vincis, et una
Vincis quod virgo vincere nulla potest.
Et quia non fuerat homo tanta coniuge dignus,
Coniunxit sponsam te sibi,virgo,Deus.
Ne pudeat,regina,tuas me dicere laudes,
Et dominam dici te paciare meam.

Cl K Z D H G
1 homines: alios Cl D H discretior K 2 dum H Ed.
fecundus H 5 medio plebis G deserto H 6 percurens H
7 elimanans Cl: eluminans H 8 tue D 9 fundit D
11 deos K D 12 solis: nunquam K Z Ed. 15 resistent Z Ed.
17 una: arma K 18 quod: quam K nulla: rata H
19 homo tanta: tanta quis Hau.Ed. 20 te: se Cl
22 dicite K

XLVII

Versus ad quendam K

In noctem prandes, in lucem,Turgide,cenas,
Multimodoque mades nocte dieque mero.
Cumque cuti studeas, uxorem ducere non vis,
Cur nolis? Dicis:"Vita pudica placet."
Turgide, mentiris: non est hec vita pudica.
Vis dicam quid sit vita pudica? Modus.

K Z D H L R
1 luce H 5 ducerei D

XLVIII

Lumina, colla, gene, flavi flexura capilli,
In Ganimede suo flamma fuere Iovi.
Iuppiter in puerum querens sibi pauca licere,
In puero statuit cuncta licere deus.
Oblitusque poli curas, et murmura divum,
Et linguam lese coniugis, atque Iovem,
Iliacum tulit ad superos, ad sidera sidus,
Et se tunc tandem credidit esse deum.
Utque puer pelex visu tactuque placeret,
Oscula nocte Iovi, pocula luce dabat.

K Z D H M
2 ganimede suo: regis puero H 5 puero K pauca licere: cuncta placere K 4 in puero: omnipotens H statuit: constituit H 5 divinorum H 6 iovem: levem K 7 iliacum: illatum K 8 tantum K 9 placeret: liceret D: placent M pelex: iussit H tactu visuque H

XLIX

Versus cuius supra de Petro Pictaviensi episcopo K

Petre, super petram nec inaniter edificasti,
Illic et turres quibus itur ad astra locasti.
Flaverunt venti, ruit imber, flumina, grando,
Nil tamen istorum concussit eas aliquando.
Tot tempestates frustratus es undique tutus,
Nec gravibus cedens, nec prosperitate solutus.
Tu vas electum, vas purum, vas in honorem,
Quod morum nectar, quod vite fudit odorem.
Tu ducis ulceribus medici vice condoluisti;
Palpatis frustra ferrum pius apposuisti.
De thalamo nuptam, sponsam de sede fugarat,
Templa, thorum, patriam, vi, pelice, labe gravarat.
Sepius hunc ut se sibi redderet admonuisti;
Spernentem Sathane sed merens exposuisti.
Hinc eger gravius secretis ignibus arsit,
Virus et invidie male saucia viscera carpsit.
Iezabel Helias, Herodiademque Iohannes
Pertulit: hinc ambo titulos meruere perennes.
Te similis sexus, te par furor egit ab urbe;
Hinc et tu vinclis, et res tua tradita turbe.
Inde palatinis canibus sacra contaminata,
Mores abiecti, ius fractum, lex violata.
Hinc et clerus ab his conflictus, ab his laceratus,
Qui facinus gratis adeunt, bona nemo rogatus.
Tu tamen immotus tot tantaque sustinuisti,

In quibus exultans iter omnis carnis adisti.
Presul in exilio mortalia nostra professus,
Ora pro nobis ad celica regna regressus.

K Z
2 itur: iter Ed. 8 fudit odorem: fundit honorem Ed.
9 condoluisti: consuluisti Z 12 si: in Z 17 herodiadenque K 18 pertulit: perculit Z: tulit K Ed.
19 sextus K 20 om.Ed. 26 om.Ed. 28 celica: edita Ed.

L

De tribus vitiis muliebri amore avaritia ambitione K
De malitia mulieris E Z De mulieribus D
De instabilitate mulieris Hildebertus Cynomannorum episcopus I

Plurima cum soleant sacros evertere mores,
Altius evertit femina,census,honos.
Femina,census,honos fomenta facesque malorum,
In scelus, in gladios corda manusque trahunt.
Felix expertus exemplo femina quid sit,
Quique suos aliqua suffugit arte dolos.
Femina res fragilis, numquam nisi crimine constans,
Numquam sponte sua desinit esse nocens.
Femina flamma vorax, furor ultimus, unica clades,
Et docet et discit quidquid obesse solet.
Femina vile forum, res publica, fallere nata,
Successisse putat cum licet esse ream.
Femina triste iugum, querimonia iuris et equi,
Turpe putat quotiens turpia nulla gerit.
Femina tam gravior, quanto privatior hostis,
Invitat crimen munere,voce,manu.
Omnia consumens, vicio consumitur omni,
Et predata viros, preda fit ipsa viris.
Corpus,opes,animos,enervat,diripit,angit,
Tela,manus,odium,suggerit,armat,alit.
Urbes,regna,domos,evertit,commovet,urit,
Unaque tot regum spem capit, arma premit.
Femina mente Parin, vita spoliavit Uriam,
Et pietate David, et Salomona fide.
Femina sustinuit iugulo damnare Ioannem,
Ypolitum letho, compedibusque Ioseph.
Femina mente gerit,lingua probat, actibus implet
Quo lex, quo populus, quo simul ipsa ruit.

De avaritia K I Quam grave sit vicium avaricie Z E

Non minus invitat animos, aut eruit aurum,

Nec minus illicitum currere monstrat iter.
Vix est quem pudeat auro pervertere rectum,
Quem pigeat precio quolibet esse reum.
Auro perficitur quidquid captatur inique,
Nemoque,pretenso munere,vana rogat.
Aurum corda movens, oculorum predo sacrorum,
In facinus puras armat agitque manus.
Auro sepe labat virtus et robor eorum,
Quorum corda Deus, cetera laudat homo.
Et quem iurares cervicem impendere recto,
Spe modici fructus cuncta licere putat.
Hostis atrox, iudexque gravis, tortorque severus,
Spe precii laxant prelia,iura,manus.
Aurum castra locat,classem parat,exerit enses,
Spernere vim,ventos,equora,tela docet;
Solvit coniugium, perrumpit claustra pudoris,
Sacras cede manus inquinat, ora dolis.
Auro periurus Polimestor, adultera Dane,
Perfida Tarpeia, trux Eriphyla fuit.
Auro Crassus obit, auro ruit Amphiareus;
Auro castra,duces,ius,populique cadunt.

De ambitione K De ambitione quam pessima sit E Z
De ambitu honoris I

Quem vero nec res, nec femina frangere possunt,
Ambitus expugnat, consceleratque pium.
Ambitus in vetitum mores deflectit, et infra
Posse sunm quemquam non sinit esse reum.
Huius opus turbare duces, mutare coronas,
Innocuis lethum, sceptra parare reis;
Urbibus excidium, templis properare ruinam,
Sternere patricios ensibus, igne lares;
Ludibrio reges exponere, regna rapinis,
Flagiciis matres, exilioque senes;
Naturam viciis, superos offendere ritu,
Parcere tunc tantum, cum nocuisse nequit.
Quem simul arripiunt tante contagia cladis
Cuncta licere putat, dum sibi regna paret.
Sustinet hic gladios in patrem ferre, nec unquam
Fraude,cruore,dolis,mens,manus,ora vacant.

A Cl K Z D E I P L M R Ko
1 mores evertere sacros K Z D L R Ed. 2 evertit: evertunt Z D I M R Hau.Ed. Ko 3 fomenta: momenta D R: monimenta I facesque: fomesque Ed. 4 et in glad.K 5,6 om.A Cl D Ko L M R Ed. 6 quique: qui E 7 nisi: sine A Cl L Hau. 9 unica clades: intimus hostis E Z L Hau.Ed. 10 solet: potest D Hau. 12 om.L 13,14 placed after 26 K 14 gerit: facit K

15 quarto corr.quanto K 16 P begins invitat: immutat I
17 omnia consumens: consumensque viros K Z E Ed.
18 et quos predatur preda E 21,22 om.A Cl D I P M R
21 urbes: arces E 22 capit corr.caput K: capit Z Ed:
cap̃ E: caput Hau.Hommey regum: rerum Z Ed. 23,24 in-
verted with 25,26 K Z D P R Ed. 25 pari E Ed. 13,14
repeated after 24 Z 26 compedibusq.Ioseph: carcere spreta
Ioseph Cl K Z E Ed. 27 lingua: vita D P M gerit: regit Ed.
29 invitat: immutat A Cl: enervat R K Z Ed: nec minus
hac animi vires effeminat aurum E Hau: nec minus internas
vires eff.aur. 31 prevertere K Z I 33 captatur: sper-
atur E After 33 Hau.has: Non caret effectu qui dare
multa potest./Auro flectuntur dux,miles,pareitur hosti,
35 preda I P L M 37 semper corr.sepe A 39 D ends
recte P: correcte D 41 severus: cruentus E Hau. tortoq.K Z :
terrorq.I 44 tela: sexa A Cl vim ventos: inventos Cl
vim: vi A 45,46 om.K 45 perrumpit: prorumpit E L Hau:
disrumpit Z Ed: dirumpit P 46 sacras: sacra A Z M I
47,48 om.A Cl L R 50 cadunt: ruunt A Cl R 52 pium:
virum L 53 deflectit: expugnat P 54 queque K
56 reis: regis K parere A 57 preparare Z P Ed 59,60
om.A Cl P L M R, inverted with 61,62 E I 60 exilioq:
excidioque Z Ed: excidioq.corr.exitioq.K 65 simul:
semel A P M: simul corr.semel Z 65 patrem: partem K P R add:
absq.deo quisquam se vincere si putat ista
quod sibi promittit noverit esse nihil

LI

De motu ecclesie D De pravis rectoribus P
Versus cuiusdam de pressura ecclesiarum G

Iam tot in ecclesias insurrexere procelle,
Quot vel quam magnas mulle cepere tabelle.
Tot sunt que mergant, tot sunt contraria letis,
Ut vix una queat portum sperare quietis.
Pax,dos,libertas,reverencia preteriere;
Bella,rapina,iugum,contemptus eis subiere.
Quos premit et spoliat predonum turba furentum,
Extulit et coluit sanctorum cura parentum.
Queque sacris patribus risere prioribus annis,
Flent modo subiecte simonibus atque tirannis.
Hi sibi venantes regumque ducumque favorem,
Non metuunt in eos legis laxare rigorem.
Sic lac et lanas ovium sibi diripientes,
Frena lupis laxant, subterfugiuntque silentes.
Speque lucri simulant scelus atque cavenda licere,
Queque licent, quasi non liceant, didicere cavere.
Gracia,Christe,tibi, quia nos hoc patre serenas,
Qui regat ecclesiam, qui ius, qui iuris habenas;

Qui didicit pastor non mercennarius esse,
Qui dum raptor adest, ovibus non novit abesse;
Qui sic errantes revocat, sic servit egenis,
Ut sit et his victus, et eis correccio lenis.
Illi,quod factis,quod mente,quod ore meretur,
Post annos Pilii requies eterna paretur.

Cl K Z D P G
1 nam Cl 2 ulle D P 3 tot^2: quot Cl 4 quietis: salutis D P 5 dos: et Ed. 7,8 om.Cl 7 et spoliat: expoliat D P: expol.vel et spol.G quos: quas P G 8 et coluit: excoluit D P: excol.vel et col.G 9 patribus: ducibus D P: duc.vel patr.G 10 subiecte: subtracta Cl 11 hi: his D: hinc K Z Ed. sibi: sunt Cl regum populique fav.Cl 12 om.laxare rigorem Cl 13 om.lac et Cl 14 subterfug: subeunt fugiuntque Cl: ipsi subterfugientes (om.silentes) G 16 queq.licent: quae liceant Z Ed. quasi: sive Ed. 17 quia: qui P Ed. 18 iuris: legis D P G Cl: qui legum nodos qui iuris novit habenas 22 sis Cl ei K correptio D G

LII

Virgo seni, generosa novo, prelarga tenaci
Iungitur, et differt tempore,gente,manu.

K Z M Bodl.Digby 65

LIII

Epitaphium G

Forma,prole,viris et Odone parente beata,
Hac scrobe Berta iacet, Cesare digna viro.
Consulibus nupsit totidem paritura duobus,
Vultu restaurans et probitate patres.
Quam licet in vetitum res,sexus,forma vocarent,
Non tamen in vetitum femine flexit iter.
Que pietate Deo, que grata pudore maritis,
Egit ne livor carpere posset eam.
Tecto,veste,cibo,potu recreavit egentes,
Ecclesiis aurum,pallia,vasa dedit.
Aprilis duodena dies hanc abstulit orbi,
Premissis opibus, mente manuque polo.

Z D H G
1 beato H 2 hac sub scrobe Z scribe H 4 vultibus G instaurans G 5 inventum H H ends 7 deo: decet D 8 capere Z 9 tectu Z 12 prae missis Hau.

LIV

Ad episcopum Baiocensem (T)

Amulus hic nuper merebat clausus in arca,
  Obscurusque lapis, et quasi tristis erat.
At postquam dixi:'Baiocas ibis, erisque
  Maioris, digitum presulis orbe ligans,'
Letior explicuit radios, sparsitque serenas
  Gemma faces, oculis exhilerata tuis.
Hoc ex te domino precium lucratur, adesque
  Plus lapidi presul, quam lapis ipse sibi.

Z
1 merebat clausus: solus plorabat Z 3 at: sed Z
plusquam Z 5 lector corr.laetior Z 7 adestque Ed.
nec mirum de te (om.domino) Z

LV

Oratio ad patrem composita ab eodem episcopo E
Hildeberti archiepiscopi de s. trinitate P

Alpha et Ω, magne Deus,
Heli,heli, Deus meus,
Cuius virtus totum posse,
Cuius sensus totum nosse,
Cuius esse summum bonum,
Cuius opus quicquid bonum.
Super cuncta, subter cuncta,
Extra cuncta, intra cuncta.
Intra cuncta, nec inclusus,
Extra cuncta, nec exclusus;
Subter cuncta, nec substratus,
Super cuncta, nec elatus.
Super totus presidendo,
Subter totus sustinendo,
Extra totus complectendo,
Intra totus es implendo.
Intra nusquam coarctaris,
Extra nusquam dilataris,
Subter nullo fatigaris,
Super nullo sustentaris.

Mundum movens, non moveris;
Locum tenens, non teneris;
Tempus mutans, non mutaris;
Vaga firmans, non vagaris.
Vis externa, vel necesse,
Non alternat tuum esse.
Heri nostrum, cras et pridem,
Semper tibi nunc et idem;
Tuum, Deus, hodiernum,
Indivisum, sempiternum.
In hoc totum previdisti,
Totum simul perfecisti,
Ad exemplar summe mentis,
Formam prestans elementis.

Oratio ad Filium E Z

Nate, Patri coequalis,
Patri consubstancialis;
Patris splendor et figura,
Factor factus creatura;
Carnem nostram induisti,
Causam nostram suscepisti.
Sempiternus, temporalis,
Morituras, immortalis,
Verus homo, verus Deus,
Impermixtus homo Deus.
Non conversus hic in carnem,
Nec minutus propter carnem;
Hic assumptus est in Deum,
Nec consumptus propter Deum.
Patri compar deitate,
Minor carnis veritate.
Deus pater tantum Dei:
Virgo mater sed et Dei.
In tam nova ligatura
Sic utraque stat natura,
Ut conservet quidquid erat,
Facta quiddam quod non erat.
Noster iste mediator,
Iste noster legislator,
Circumcisus, baptizatus,
Crucifixus, tumulatus,
Obdormivit et descendit,
Resurrexit et ascendit.
Sic ad celos elevatus,
Iudicabit iudicatus.

Oratio ad Spiritum Sanctum Z E

Paraclitus increatus,
Neque factus, neque natus,
Patri consors, Genitoque,
Sic procedit ab utroque,
Ne sit minor potestate,
Vel discretus qualitate.
Quanti illi, tantus iste;
Quales illi, talis iste.
Ex quo illi, extunc iste;
Quantum illi, tantum iste.
Pater alter, sed gignendo,
Natus alter, sed nascendo,
Flamen ab his procedendo;
Tres sunt unum subsistendo.
Quisque trium plenus Deus:
Non tres tamen Di, sed Deus.
In hoc Deo, Deo vero,
Tres et unum assevero,
Dans usie unitatem,
Et personis trinitatem.
In personis nulla prior,
Nulla minor, nulla maior.
Unaqueque semper ipsa,
Sic est constans atque fixa,
Ut nec in se varietur,
Nec in ullam transmutetur.
Hec est fides orthodoxa;
Non hic error sine noxa.
Sicut dico, sic et credo,
Nec in pravam partem cedo.

Inde venit, bone Deus,
Ne desperem, quamvis reus.
Reus mortis non despero,
Sed in morte vitam quero.
Quo te placem nil pretendo,
Nisi fidem quam defendo.
Fidem vides: hac imploro,
Leva fascem qua laboro.
Per hoc sacrum cataplasma,
Convalescat egrum plasma.

Extra portam iam delatum,
Iam fetentem, tumulatum,
Vitta ligat, lapis urget,
Sed si iubes, hic resurget.
Iube: lapis revolvetur;
Iube: vitta disrumpetur.
Exiturus nescit moras,

Postquam clamas:"Exi foras."

In hoc salo mea ratis
Infestatur a piratis.
Hinc assultus, inde fluctus;
Hinc et inde mors et luctus.
Sed tu, bone nauta, veni.
Preme ventos, mare leni.
Fac abscedant hi pirate;
Duc ad portum salva rate.

Infecunda mea ficus,
Cuius ramus ramus siccus.
Incidetur, incendetur,
Si promulgas quod meretur.
Sed hoc anno dimittatur,
Stercoretur, fodiatur;
Quod si necdum respondebit,
Flens hec loquor, tunc ardebit.

Vetus hostis in me furit,
Aquis mersat, flammis urit.
Inde languens et afflictus
Tibi soli sum relictus.
Ut hic hostis evanescat,
Ut infirmus convalescat,
Tu virtutem ieiunandi
Des infirmo, des orandi.
Per hec duo, Christo teste,
Liberabor ab hac peste.

Ab hac peste solve mentem,
Fac devotum, penitentem.
De timorem, quo proiecto,
De salute nil coniecto.
De spem,fidem,caritatem,
De discretam pietatem;
De contemptum terrenorum,
Appetitum supernorum.

Totum,Deus,in te spero:
Deus, ex te totum quero.
Tu laus mea, meum bonum,
Mea cuncta tuum donum.
Tu solamen in labore,
Medicamen in languore;
Tu in luctu mea lyra,
Tu lenimen es in ira;
Tu in arte liberator,
Tu in lapsu relevator.

Metum prestas in provectu,
Spem conservas in defectu.
Si quis ledit, tu rependis,
Si minatur, tu defendis.
Quod est anceps tu dissolvis,
Quod tegendum tu involvis.

Tu intrare me non sinas
Infernales officinas,
Ubi meror, ubi metus,
Ubi fetor, ubi fletus;
Ubi probra deteguntur,
Ubi rei confunduntur;
Ubi tortor semper cedens,
Ubi vermis semper edens;
Ubi totum hoc perenne,
Quia perpes mors Gehenne.

Me receptet Syon illa,
Syon David urbs tranquilla;
Cuius faber auctor lucis,
Cuius porte lignum crucis;
Cuius claves lingua Petri,
Cuius cives semper leti;
Cuius muri lapis vivus,
Cuius custos rex festivus.
In hac urbe lux solennis,
Ver eternum, pax perennis;
In hac odor implens celos,
In hac semper festum melos.
Non est ibi corruptela,
Non defectus, non querela;
Non minuti, non deformes:
Omnes Christo sunt conformes.
Urbs celestis, urbs beata,
Supra petram collocata;
Urbs in portu satis tuto,
De longinquo te saluto.
Te saluto, te suspiro,
Te affecto, te requiro.

Quantum tui gratulentur,
Quam festive conviventur,
Quis affectus eos stringat,
Aut que gemma muros pingat,
Quis calcedon, quis iacinctus,
Norunt illi qui sunt intus.
In plateis huius urbis,
Sociatus piis turbis,
Cum Moyse et Elia
Pium cantem alleluya.

Z E P B^1 B^2 B^3 B^4 B^5 Dr.
1 magne deus: deus meus E P et om.B^5 2 meus deus E
9,10 inverted P, placed after 11,12 P B^1 9 nec: non Dr.
10 nec: non Dr. 11,12 inverted Z Ed.Dr. 11 subtractus E P:
substractus Z 17,18 placed after 19,20, and inverted P
19,20 inverted Ed.Dr. 17,18 numquam: nusquam Ed. 25 externa:
alterna E: hesterna Z: eterna B^3 vel alterna vel necesse P
41 temporalis: immortalis P 42 immortalis: temporalis P
43 deus verus B^3 44,45 inverted E 46 minutus: consumptus E:
mutatus B^2 47 es E P 48 nec: non Dr. 51 tantum: tamen P
52 sed et: est sed Z Ed. et: non B^3 dei: ei B^2 54 uterq.P
58 noster iste P: noster isti E legis dator Z Ed. dator corr.
lator B^3 73,74 om.Z Ed. 74 om.Dr. 74 quanti illi tantus
iste B^3 80 tamen tres B^3 sed om. B^1 86 nulla maior nulla
minor E B^3 90 in ullam: in nullam E Z: in ulla Ed.
92 sine: sive Dr. 94 partem pravam Dr. 97 morte E P
100 defendo: ostendo E 101 hac: hanc Z Ed. videns P
102 qua: quo Z Ed.B^1 107 vita Z B^3 108 iubet Z 118 pre=
me: pro me Dr. mari B^2 124 quod: que E Dr. 128 hec: hoc E
Z B^1Ed. loquor: dico P 133,134 inverted Z Ed. 143 fidem
spem Z Ed. 148 totum deus ex te q.P: deus totum ex te q.B^3
149 laus: lux P 154 lenimen: solamen P 157 metum:
motum Z Ed. praestans Dr. 158 conservans P Dr. 159 defendis P
160 minetur E 168 confuduntur E 172 quia: quasi E,Z
176 signum E 183 odor: ordo E 184 festum semper B^3Dr.
festum: dulce P 186 non^2: nec Dr. 189,190 om.P
190 super Ed. 192 ex hoc mari te saluto B^3 195 grat-
ulantur E Ed. 196 convivantur E Ed. 199 quis: qui E
204 pium: presta E

MSS. COLLATED FOR THIS POEM ONLY:

B^1 Paris, B.N. 15291 s.xii, fol.155.
B^2 " 15545 s.xii^2 or xiii^1, fol.37^v.
B^3 " 2527 s.xii^2, fol.109^v.
B^4 " 12020 s.xiii, fol.138^v.
B^5 " 5588 s.xiii, fol.198^v.

LVI

Pauperibus locuples, et sacri nominis abbas,
Willelmus solo corpore cultor humi;
Liber ab Egipto rediens deserta reliquit,
Iamque Ierosolimam victor evansque tenet.
Cum viciis odium, cum moribus ille perennem
Pactus amiciciam: firmus utroque fuit.
Luce gravi nimium que sexta preibat Aprilem
Redditus est patrie spiritus, ossa solo.

Paris B.N.lat.10915, foll.288-288^{v}.

LVII

Versus de horis cottidianis G

In matutino damnatur tempore Christus,
Quo matutini cantantur tempore psalmi.
Quando resurrexit primam canit ordo fidelis:
Tercia cum canitur tunc est cruciamina passus.
Sexta sunt tenebre per mundi climata facte.
Redditus est nona divinus spiritus hora.
Vespere clauduntur Christi sacra membra sepulcro.
Christo bis sena custodia ponitur hora.

F G R S.Omer 710 (N.E.51.154).
6 redditus est: est missus R

Supplement

I (Misc.51)

Sol,cristallus,aqua dant qualemcunque figuram
  Virginei partus, edificantque fidem.
Si tingatur aquis et soli subiciatur,
  Scintillas profert integer ille lapis.
Si bene cuncta notes aqua,sol,cristallus et ignis
  Sunt flamen,verbum,virgo,Deusque puer.
Flamen aque, verbum soli, virguncula gemme,
  Stirps igni quadam condicione coit.
Flamen aqua est quia lavit eam, verbumque supernum
  Sol quia non violat, et tamen intrat eam.
Virgo lapis quia virgo parit, puer exprimit ignem,
  Nam virtute micat, lumine corda replet.
Sic umbra flamen, ingressu celibe verbum,
  Virgo fide, soboles carne Deoque simul
Conficiunt cataplasma novum, quo vita sepultis,
  Virtuti merces, moribus ordo redit.
Hoc aperit tumulos, hoc agmina sacra refundit,
  Hoc supplet casum, terra, gehenna, polus.
Ad celos hinc subsilient cinis, ossa, medulle:
  Hoc animam carni reddet, utrique Deum.

Collated M H = Hommey Ed.
1 aquae Ed. 4 profert M: prefert H Ed. 9 quia M: quod H
11 exprimit: unicus Ed. quia: quod H 13 umbram M 14 fide:
fiet Ed. 16 virtutis M 17 refudit M 19 crinis H: cuius Ed.
subsiliens M medulla H 20 omnia nunc carni M: hoc animam
carni H Ed. B.N.5129 = C (from Boutemy's description).

II (Misc.150)

Clauditur integra lux viginti quatuor horis.
Obsequio Domini septem sacrantur earum.
Horam qua primum solaris spera videtur
Astruimus primam. Sol factus in hac positusque
In celo, nobis diversos exhibet usus.
Hac hora Domino, qui tanta lampade mundum
Illustrat, laus est reddenda, deinde precandum
Ne scelerum tenebris obvolvi nos paciatur.
Tercia multimodo sullimis lumine fulget:
Hac est factus homo, data lex vetus, hac sinagoga
Ore Redemptorem crucifixit, spiritus almus
Discipulos docuit. Hora qua cepimus esse
Vas figulum laudet, studeatque precando mereri,
Ne veterem sapiat, sed eum circumferat Adam.
Qui preiudicium tunc pertulit, oret adesse
Adversum viciis et amicum moribus ignem.
In sexta deliquit homo, tulit in cruce Christus,

In genus humanum furit hostis meridianus.
Quisquis es, hac hora Crucifixi morte redemptus,
Munere pro tanto premissis laudibus ores
Ne draco, nactus in hac de primo patre triumphum,
Te sibi susternat, sed agat Deus hostia factus,
Ne carni cedas, aut hosti meridiano.
Exiit in nona reus homo de paradiso;
In nona Christus animam dedit, atque fideles
In tenebris, ut eos reduceret inde, revisit.
Spe factus consors tam lete sortis, eorum
Laudibus instet homo, reditum roget ad paradisum,
Qui clausus nona fuit et nona patefecit.
Lunam cum summa stellarum vespere factam,
Et firmamento positam scriptura recenset.
Glorificetur in his tam multi luminis auctor,
Qui variis facibus et celi lumina pinxit,
Et noctis tenebras ut oportuit irradiavit.
Vesper erat cum iam miser addictusque labori
Occasum solis, quem numquam viderat, Adam
Obstupuit, tenebrasque timens orasse refertur,
Ne divina sibi solacia forte deessent.
Is quoque qui iactat se sacro fonte renatum
Laudibus exhibitis et mente precetur et ore,
Ne sol iusticie super illius occidat ausus.
Complete; non est prefixum tempus in illa.
Laudandus tamen est Dominus votisque petendum,
Ut quod peccavit transacto quisque diurno
Gracia dimittat, eadem quoque gracia prestet,
Ne requiem noctis Sathan aut fantasmata rumpant.
Diluvium media prorupit nocte, gerensque
Baptismi formam scelerum contagia lavit.
Hac Moyses hora, merso Pharaone suisque,
Transiit exultans rubrum mare, David ad ymnos
Surrexit, pravos a iustis dividet ignis.
Nobis exemplum, miseracio, iudiciumque
Pretenduntur in his, quibus ad meliora vocemur.
David opus precis exemplum; miseracio ductus
Inter aquas Moyses; sentencia iudicialis
Fluctibus involvi vel plecti, iudice Christo.
Auctori rerum laus exhibeatur in istis,
Qui facit ut nobis operentur ista salutem.
Erudit exemplum, veniam miseracio prestat,
Iudicium terret. Memor horum quisque fidelis
Ad laudes Domini prescripto tempore surgat,
Laudibus et votis querens evadere noctem,
Qua circumfuso spes est ablata salutis.

Collated A

9 lumine Ed: munere A 29 qui clausus nona fuit nona et pa A: qui clausus nona est et tunc nonaque patebit Ed. 50 luna A Ed.
54 noctis: coeli Ed. 60 horum: hiis A

III (Hau.5)

Conquerar an sileam? Monstrabo crimen amice,
  An quasi iam sanus vulnera nostra tegam?
Non queror aut molles oculos aut aspera crura;
  Nec vicio quovis exteriora premo.
Quod queror est animi, laudaret cetera livor:
  Verba fide, viciis lubrica forma caret.
Illa decem menses mecum feliciter egit,
  Gratis in amplexus docta venire meos.
Emulus ecce meus, gemmis male fisus et auro,
  Hanc petit, ingeminat munera, flectit eam.
Muneribus vicit, quoniam natura vel usus
  Preter flagicium nulla dedere sibi.
Thersiten gerit in facie, gerit intus Oresten:
  Pulcrior iste tamen, mitior ille fuit.
Non prius incurrit leviores ille reatus,
  Nec gradibus certis destitit esse bonus,
Sed simul omne nefas auso puerilibus annis
  Iam preter facinus nulla licere putat.
Turpis atrox exlex, nature crimen et hostis
  In luctu ridet, flet nisi flenda videt.
Sufficit exemplis totum corrumpere mundum;
  Sufficiunt sceleri nomina nulla suo.
Quippe tot illicitis famam lacerare laborat,
  Ut nulla redimi laude vel arte queat.
Cur igitur placuit? Quid honesti vidit in illo
  Quem iam nulla sequi preter honesta pudet?
Cur inquam placuit? Dignusne placere puellis
  Qui non exilio, sed cruce dignus erat;
Lapsus in excessus tantos ut nulla putaret
  Deteriora fide, vel potiora dolis?
Cur placuit lethale nefas, cur dedecus orbis,
  ~~Qui non tam locuples rebus quam pauper honesto~~,
  Cur tam terribilis larva pudorque patris?
Qui non tam locuples rebus quam pauper honesto,
  Et minus informis quam viciosus erat.
Crimen opes redimunt, reus est crucis omnis egenus,
  Et laudes hominum pensat acervus opum.
Hic quoque nec vita, nec nobilitate parentum,
  Nec specie placuit, sed quia dives erat.
Divciis animum tenere turbavit amice,
  Divciisque patent ostia, crura, sinus.
Iam nec pura fides, nec largi gloria sensus,
  Nec probitas morum, nec bona ~~fama~~ iuvat. forma
Aurum, sinceras solitum pervertere mentes,
  Mortales animos in scelus omne vocat.

Aurum dum speret nil iam negat Hectoris uxor;
  Iam populo iungi sustinet asse dato.
Dona truces animos et verba severa relaxant:
  Penelope donis altera Thais erit.
Sed iam Thais erit Iunone severior ipsa,
  Si nullas habeat pulcer amator opes.
Vos igitur iuvenes, quos nondum fervor amoris
  Attigit, illarum laudo cavere dolos.
Nam licet uratur, tamen in complexibus ipsis
  Queque salitores querit habere novos.
Protea multiplicem solet ars retinere, sed illas
  Quin elabantur ars retinere nequit.

B = Baehrens, Poet.Lat.Min.V.no.LXXVI.2 (see notes).
4 nec: non Hau. 5 laudarit B 10 petit: adit Hau. 14 ille:.. iste Hau. 17 ausus Hau. 27 inquam: igitur Hau. 28 exitio B: exilio MSS. eat B: erat MSS. 34 infamis Hau. 45 sperat Hau. 47 animas Hau. 55 iam Hau. 55 solet MSS: valet Hau: sciet B.

IV (Hau.17)

Nullus amicorum posset meliora monere
  Quam tu, quo moneor parcere cervisie.
Cum bibo cervisiam nihil est turbacius illa,
  Sed cum mingo nihil clarius esse potest.
Torreor inde nimis, quoniam que spissa bibuntur
  Reddita clara gravi viscera fece replent.

H D R
2 quo: cum D 5 quoniam que: cum qualia D turbor R

V (Hau.30)

Indicat hic venter quia tu tibi non es avarus:
  At mihi sic numquam prodigus esse volo.

A R Text of Boutemy Revue Belge 17.757.
1 quod Hau.