

MUSSATO'S COMMENTARY ON SENECA'S TRAGEDIES:

NEW FRAGMENTS

ALEXANDER MacGREGOR

In 1969 Anastasios Ch. Megas published from the single MS then known 104 fragments of the Commentary on Seneca's tragedies by Albertino Mussato (d. 1329), along with an edition of his Arguments to each play.¹⁾ In 1975 I uncovered three new MSS containing 70 different Commentary fragments among them, including 20 hitherto unknown. These last will be published here, along with a fresh recension of the MSS.

Out of some 370 extant MSS of Seneca's tragedies only three contain more than a single fragment of Mussato's Commentary:²⁾

-- British Library Add. 17381 (membr.; written 1475 by Raphael de Marcatellis, abbot of St. Bavon, Ghent.) Illuminated; angular Flemish gothic. The Seneca-text primitive: A- and V- readings abundant.³⁾ Arguments of Mussato; 104 fragments of the Commentary,

1) *Albertini Mussati Argumenta Tragoediarum Senecae; Commentarii in L.A. Senecae Tragoedias Fragmenta Nuper Reperta*, ed. Anastasios Ch. Megas (Salonika 1969); rec. A. MacGregor, *CP* 67.1 (1972) 64-69; R. Desmed, *Scriptorium* 25 (1971) 82-84, who prizes Leo's authority on the A-vulgate. Megas' 1969 publication contains the remains of Mussato on the Senecan corpus; Mussato's work on the *Octavia* had been published separately: *O Prooumanistikos Kuklos tes Padouas kai oi Tragodies tou L.A. Seneca* (Salonika 1967), 64-68, 82-87. For a description of MSS used by Megas see *Albertini Mussati Argumenta* etc., 1f. For his recension, 3-25, with a stemma on 22.

2) I have seen 365; adequate reports (by Stuart among others) exist for 12 more. Megas lists 18 MSS containing the Arguments; add Bologna B. Univ. 2405; Br. Libr. Arundel 116 (fragment only); Paris Bibl. Nat. 8261; Paris Bibl. Arsenal 1048.

3) For V(at. Lat. 2829) as the ancestor of the vulgate (A) rec., see MacGregor, *TAPA* 102 (1971) 327-56; contra Tarrant ed. *Agamemnon* (Cambridge 1976), 74-81, who concedes that V is the extant MS closest to that ancestor. See also Philip, *CQ* n.s. 18 (1968) 150-79.

set off with his name; also excerpts from Treveth's Commentary, likewise set off by name. Published by Megas (1969); siglum Lo. there and here.

-- Göteborg B. Univ. 26 (membr.; xiv) Minuscula gothica; Italian. Ff. 172, a rescript (the original text has not been recovered).⁴⁾ Des. *Herc. Oet.* 1802; stray leaves lost earlier: *Theb.* 627 -- *Hipp.* 991-1056; *Med.* 682-746. The Seneca-text is primitive; the A-lacunae (including *Med.* 1009-27) are present 1 m. Arguments of Mussato for seven plays: *Thy.*, 20^v; *Theb.*, 38^r; *Oed.*, 67^r; *Tro.*, 83^r; *Ag.*, 114^r; *Oct.*, 129^v; *H.O.*, 145^r. There are 67 fragments of Mussato set off by name, 19 of these not in Lo.; as in Lo., there are also extracts from Treveth set off by name. MS not known to Megas; siglum Got.

-- Vat. Lat. 1641 (membr.; xv) A fine (Roman?) humanistica.⁵⁾ Ff. 219. The Seneca-text is virtually identical to that of Lo. Six fragments of the Commentary, all found in Lo. or Got. as well; Megas used Vat. for the Arguments and fr. 1 only. Copious scholia from Treveth, who goes unnamed.⁶⁾ Siglum in Megas, V₁; here, Vat.

Two MSS contain fr. 1 only:

-- Laur. 37.1 (membr.; xiv). Gothica rotunda; Italian. Ff. 201, Arguments of Mussato ff. 2^r-6^v. A heavily interpolated ψ -text, unlike that of cett. Known to Megas but not used; the MS preserves a longer version of fr. 1 than that printed by Megas. Copious scholia from Treveth, along with the Arguments of "Lutatius" (potted from Treveth).⁷⁾

4) Cf. Tønnes Kleberg, *Catalogus Codicum Graecorum et Latinorum Bibliothecae Universitatis Gothoburgensis* (Göteborg; ed. 2, 1974), pp. 51f. Kleberg identifies the Arguments but not the scholia as Mussato's; he refers to E. Pellegrin, *Manuscrits d'auteurs latins de l'époque classique conservés dans les bibliothèques publiques de Suède* (Paris 1955), pp. 7-33; and to Ezio Franceschini's edition: *Studi e Note di Filologia Latina Medievale* (Milan 1938); but not to Megas, unfortunately. The Göteborg MS, of unknown provenance, was bought in London in 1920; its features do not square with Stuart's descriptions of MSS in private hands ca. 1908-14 (Trinity College Cambridge MS Add. d 63).

5) Cf. Stuart's evaluation: "But the text is not careful: many words in wrong order, some omissions and a few mistakes. Many readings of *psi*... Its text is rather disappointing, but far from bad... Seems somewhat closely related to Barb. 138" (Trinity College Cambridge MS Add. b57). So, e.g., *Phae.* 718 *nephas* (shared with Barb. 138 alone of 330 MSS); 831 *pariter* Vat., *pari* Barb. (V ψ). On balance Vat. resembles Lo. more than Barb.

6) I tracked down 28 unattributed lengthy scholia in Vat.; nothing of Mussato, all belonged to Treveth's Commentary. Absent a printed text, I collated Vat. against Vat. Lat. 1650: cf. Marco Palma, *It. Med. e Uman.* 16 (1973) 317-22, for its date. Vat.'s marginalia at *H.F.* 560 = Ussani 88.13 -- 89.9; at *H.F.* 1071 = Ussani 149.4 -- 149.13. Cf. Vincenzo Ussani, Jr., ed., Nicolai Treveti *Expositio Herculis Furentis* (Rome 1959).

7) First edited by Rudolf Peiper, *De Senecae Tragoediarum vulgari Lectione (A) Constituenda* (Breslau 1893), 161-64; then Franceschini, *op. cit.*, 36-39, whose version hews closer to Treveth.

-- Ambros. L 53 sup. (membr.; xv). Gothica rotunda; Italian. A miscellany: the Arguments of Mussato, used by Megas, ff. 4-12^v; fr. 1, f. 13. No Seneca-text. Siglum in Megas, A4.

The authenticity of the Commentary fragments is easily established.⁸⁾ With two exceptions (fr. 1A and 5A) each fragment in Got., as in Lo., is a separate marginal scholium signed with Mussato's name. This with good reason; Got. also contains scholia derived from the Commentary of Treveth (fl. 1316);⁹⁾ these are signed *Trev.* Someone at the head of the tradition thought to distinguish the competing scholiasts; at times their contradictory views of the same passage are cited. Vat. is slipshod: only two of its Mussato fragments are signed (viz., fr. 7 and fr. 14).

The MSS carrying the fragments are clearly independent of each other. Got. has 19 fragments not in Lo.; Lo. 56 not in Got.; Vat. enjoys one found in Got. but not Lo., one found in Lo. but not Got.; since it gives no sign of conflation, it too is independent. Finally, the new text from Laur. is unique.

Fortunately for recension, many fragments exist in two or three MSS; see *Table I*. The variants therein are collected in *Appendix II*, but, given the dubious integrity of scholia in general, the variants usually demonstrate the willfulness of an individual scribe, not the mutual relationship of the MSS.

8) There is no difference between the contents of the old fragments and the new. Mussato's scholia fall into six categories, roughly: allegorical, metrical, paraphrastic, genealogical, scriptural parallel, and Ovidian parallel. Lo. and Got. both enjoy a fair share of each; there is a high overall correlation between the MSS: $r = +.94$. If totals in each category for Got. and Lo. are compared $\chi^2 = 8.8$, $p. \approx .05$ (possibly significant) with 3 d.f.; understandable: the new fragments do include rather more parallels, from Ovid and from Scripture. Space does not permit full discussion; for χ^2 and r , cf. M.J. Moroney, *Facts from Figures* (Baltimore 1968), pp. 258 and 286f.

9) Cf. Palma, *op. cit. supra* (n. 6) for the definitive account of the early history of Treveth's text; he identifies Vat. Lat. 1650 as a presentation codex of 1317. See also his *Nicola Trevet Commento alle Troades di Seneca* (Rome, "Temi e Testi" 22, 1977).

Table I

Number of fragments in:		Total number of fragments in:			
		Lo.	Got.**)	Vat.	Laur.
Lo. solus	54*)	54	-	-	-
Got. solus	18	--	18	-	-
Vat. solus	0	--	-	-	-
Laur. solus	1	--	-	-	1
Lo. Got. ($N_{\gamma\lambda}$)	45	45	45	-	-
Lo. Vat.	1	1	-	1	-
Got. Vat.	1	-	1	1	-
Lo. Got. Vat.	3	3	3	3	-
Lo. Got. Laur.	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total number of different frags.	124*)	104*)	67 (N_{λ})	6	Total number of 2 frags.in each MS. (N_{γ})

*) includes five fragments after H.O. 1802 **) des. H.O. 1802.

N.B.: Estimated original length of Mussato's Commentary is 138.2 fragments. Disregarding fragments after H.O. 1802, original total $X = (N_{\lambda} N_{\gamma}) / N_{\lambda\gamma}$.

Got., Lo., and Vat. are available together in Fragments 7, 19, and 94. Small omissions (or additions) apart, Got. stands alone 5 times (preferable variant at 7.5; indifferent ones at 7.5 and 7.13; variant word order at 19.1 and 94.2); Lo. thrice (indifferent variant at 7.14, corruptions at 7.6 and 7.12); Vat. once (at 7.14). Got. emerges somewhat more correct than is Lo.; Vat. is about on a par with Got., but appears a little closer to Lo. than to Got. (so also in fr. 19 and 94, where Vat. and Lo. agree in lacunae; see below).

To turn to pairings: first Got. and Lo. Got. is slightly better at spelling (e.g., 9.4 *Cadmus*; 86.2 *Niger Pons*; 89.2 et al., *supra*; 90.3 *Pyrrhyn*; the sum offset by such as 80.1 *Calci-one*). Got. usually enjoys the preferable word order (e.g., 62.1; 69.9; 69.10; 77.2), although it ruins a pentameter with a transposition at 84.5. The reading of Got. is right, anticipating Megas, at 37.2 *clamat* and 63.4 *solus*; right also at 43.2; 66.2; 80.3; 84.6 and 99.3 *vestros*; indifferent or

wrong at 12.4 and 71.3; wrong at 5.4; 9.1; 88.9; 92.2; 93.2; and 99.3 *illa* 1 m. At 99.3 its *favores* is a clear interpolation.¹⁰⁾ In sum, Lo. and Got., quarreling over littles, are of roughly equal worth; Lo. is perhaps a little too dull, Got. a little too correct.

More striking is the lacuna in Lo. and Vat. in fr. 19 (*Med.* 301), a scheme for anapaestic dimeters: ...*tertium daptilum vel spondeum, quartum et ultimum anapesticum spondeum vel iambum et raro troceum*: so Got. (presumably the fourth foot iamb reflects corruption or medieval orthography -- *loco* in 328, say, or *ether* in 310). But Lo. and Vat. give only *tertium daptilum vel spondeum et iambum vel raro troceum*. Here *et* must do the work of the ordinal; even then the scheme is incorrect. Clearly, a *saut du même au même* occurred: *tertium daptilum vel spondeum [quartum ... spondeum] vel iambum et raro troceum*. A subsequent scribe knew that two dimeters make four feet, and interchanged *vel* and *et*.

This lacuna tells us two things: (1) the common ancestor of Vat. and Lo. was capable of willful interpolation; (2) the retention here by Got. of text lost elsewhere helps to establish the *bona fides* of Got. wherever it has the longer text.

Vat. can be paired against Lo. *solus* in Fragments 1 and 14, where it spells *Tros* and *Astianactem* better than Lo. does; but its omission of *et* from *Iulum et Ascanium* smacks of interpolation based on the *Aeneid*. In Fragment 1 Vat. and Lo. are joined by Laur. and Ambros. L 53. Vat. avoids unique blunders of Lo. at 1.1, of Ambros. at 1.8 and 1.17, having one of its own at 1.19. Vat. and Laur. agree at 1.5 and 1.12

10) Whatever Mussato had in mind here, it was not Seneca. Alcmena says that if her son Hercules can die, a *fortiori* the gods should fear death themselves. Mussato instead starts with irrelevancy *nescit quis quid sibi evenire debeat*. He goes on: *Et quare habeatis timere, quia ille, qui faciebat timores nostros, evanuit in modicum cinerem*. This can only be paraphrasing her address to the gods: 'What reason do you have to fear? For he who made ... has shrunk into a bit of ash.' He who what? Who made the gods afraid, I suppose: *faciebat vestros timores*, combining the best in Got. and Lo. Whatever the case, Mussato is a far fetch from Seneca; Got.'s desperation is understandable.

phy(sici).¹¹⁾ But Vat. is badly worsted by Got. in their one pairing (fr. 7A); Vat. has six blunders against it.

The various MSS pairings thus yield a "circular triad":¹²⁾ Vat. bests Lo. in *their* pairings; Lo. bests Got. in *theirs*, only Got. bests Vat. in the last. The fact means that the MSS are too erratic to be ranked in order of preference. Both Vat. and Got. interpolate; Lo. itself does not, apparently. Laur. can be dismissed in a word. It is strikingly careless, standing alone 18 times; it is closer to Vat. than to the others. In sum, the four MSS, clearly independent to start with, each appear descended from the archetype at a few removes at most; Got. stands isolated, both because of interpolation on its part and the conjunctive lacunae of Lo. and Vat.¹³⁾

A little additional light can be shed on the kinship of the MSS by the Arguments. To discuss the *Arg. in Thy.*, available in all the MSS, enough that Got. stands with Lo. and Vat. against Megas' subfamilies α and χ (five MSS in sum) some 60 times, against his A_3 and P_1 22 times. Got. thus belongs in the ϵ -subfamily, along with Lo., Vat., and Ambros., the only other Commentary-carrying MSS. The disagreements among the ϵ -MSS are instructive:

- 6 *illos filios ad aram* Got. Lo. Ambros.: a. a. i. f. Vat.
- 7 *et* Got.: ac Lo. Vat. Ambros.
- 10 *advertant* Got. Ambros., Lo. p.c.: av- Vat. Lo. a.c.
- 14 *suggestione* Got. Ambros.: subg- Lo. Vat.
- 16 *sene suo* Got.: suo sene Lo. Vat. Ambros.
- 20 *mandet* Got. Lo. Vat.: -at Ambros. a.c.
- 24 *revocet via* Got. Ambros.: r. viam Lo. Vat.
- 37 *suspiciosa* Got. Lo. Ambros.: suspitione Vat.
- 40 *parati* Got. Lo. a.c. Vat. Ambros.: patrati Lo. p.c.
- 43 *consistit* Got. Vat. Ambros.: constitit Lo.
- 56 *ut* Got.: quod Lo. Vat. Ambros.
- 56 *sepe lienda* Got. Lo. Vat.: -o Ambros.
- 58 *illius* Got. Lo. Ambros.: om. Vat.

11) *Phy* could be the abbreviation for *philosophi* or for *physici*: cf. A. Cappelli, *Dizionario de Abbreviature Latine ed Italiane* (Milan 1973) 272.

12) See Moroney, *op. cit.*, (n. 8) 343.

13) Vat. and Lo. are gemelli in their Seneca-texts, as in their Mussa- to Commentary-texts (v. supra, p.153). In both realms Got. is sometimes more primitive; it seems their uncle, not a parent.

Each MS stands alone two or three times: Vat. is interpolated, the others desert the subarchetype ϵ for "correct" readings found in other subfamilies. At 10, 14, and 24 Got. and Ambros. stand against Lo. and Vat., as in the Commentary. Lo. and Ambros. were gemelli in Megas' stemma, with Vat. their nephew; Got., Ambros., and Lo. now stand together. Vat. remains inferior, qualitatively if not stemmatically, as before.

Thus the MSS which carry more or less of Mussato's Commentary form the equally cohesive ϵ -family on the basis of his Arguments. But Megas has ϵ depend on no fewer than five subarchetypes in turn, the ancestors of the remaining extant MSS as well, which possess nothing of the Commentary. Consequently, either the Commentary was deleted from the other Argument-MSS, this many times independently, to survive only in the ϵ -family at the very bottom of the stemma; or the Commentary had a tradition separate from that of the Arguments, whence the ϵ -family derived it. Neither alternative is very attractive.

(1) It is unlikely in the extreme that the non- ϵ scribes, trying to weed all Mussato out of their scholia, should severally succeed at that task the while they severally succeeded in *preserving* all ten of his equally conspicuous Arguments. If the Commentary did in fact descend along the same stemma as the Arguments, the largest chunks might perhaps be found in the stemmatically most remote family, but we should expect traces to survive in stemmatically superior families. We do not have traces, we have nothing whatsoever.

(2) Or suppose that the Commentary had a tradition separate from the Arguments; then it is a coincidence that Lo., Got., and Vat. bear the same relationship to each other in the Commentary as in the Arguments. But such a coincidence is highly improbable.¹⁴⁾

14) If it is assumed that the Arguments and the Commentary have independent, uncorrelated traditions, then it is a coincidence that the three MSS enjoy the same relationship to each other in their text of the Arguments as they do to each other thanks to the fact that they possess the Commentary. Now, each MS with the Commentary enjoys a 1/12

There is a way over the horns of the dilemma. Granted that Megas' stemma is useful as a way of *classifying* the MSS, as a description of their descent it is highly improbable.¹⁵⁾ It must be modified so as to allow ϵ -- viz., Lo., Got., Vat., and Ambros. -- direct access to ϵ for their Arguments and Commentary-fragments both, without going through the subarchetypes of seven alien MSS. So much for recension. It boils down to the fact that the MSS, each in possession of fragments not in the others, are ipso facto independent and indispensable. But none is especially trustworthy.

In presenting the new fragments I have followed Megas' 1969 numeration; his numeration for the *Octavia* fragments of 1967 was superseded in 1969 by one encompassing all ten plays. The new fragments are put into the series of 1969, with A, B, etc. to mark them as coming after the original fragment of that number; I have also counted as new fragments any continuation at least a sentence long. Freshly discovered material can thus be distinguished at a glance. An apparatus for the new fragments is given in *Appendix II*; for those already known, in *Appendix III*.

ALBERTINI MUSSATI COMMENTARII
FRAGMENTA NUPERRIME REPERTA

Fr. 1A (Herc. Fur. 1). Sed cum ista teneat allegoriam ideo aliqua de ipsa allegoria sentimus, unde notandum est quod pro ioue debemus assumere hominem uirtuosum qui uirtutes amplectitur in hac uita et eas reinuenit

chance of having a given MS its closest kin with respect to the Arguments, there being 13 MSS in all with the Arguments. So, if Vat. is Lo.'s closest kin with respect to the Commentary, there is only 1/12 chance that we would find that Vat. is also Lo.'s closest kin with respect to the Arguments. Probabilities are multiplicative for simultaneous occurrence: the probability is $(1/12)^3$ or .00058 that the three MSS would have the same MSS their closest kin in Arguments and Commentary both. This is the likelihood that Arguments and Commentary descend by separate channels, and it is safely below the generally accepted maximum for statistical significance, .001.

15) For the difference between a mere classification and a taxonomy that reflects descent, see Ernst Mayr, *Principles of Systematic Zoology* (New York 1969), 68f.

5 collocatas apud deum in sede stabili et renitenti sicut
stelle sunt. iunonem uero hic debemus capere pro carna-
litate fragili et ignara que semper hanc odit uirtutem
et exertitia uirtuosa. iuxta illud caro semper aduersa-
tur spiritui et spiritus carni. ideo bene poete finxe-
10 runt (et in hoc quasi omnes concordant) iunonem rabio-
sam et quod semper querimoniis conterat uerba sua, ut
patet apud uirgilium in primo enide, dum conqueritur de
salute enee, ubi dicit *gens inimica michi thironum nauicat*
equor [1.67]. est et alia naturalis hystoria suma ratio,
15 per quam poete illam sic rabiosam fingunt quod iuno po-
nitur pro aere. et aer dicitur ab *a*, quod est *sine*, et
heris, quod est *lis*, quasi *sine lite* per contrarium: nam
aer est semper in aliqua uentorum et tempestatum lite
quod calida semper expugnant cum frigidis et humida cum
20 siccis. sic carnis fragilitas numquam quiescit quin ali-
quo uexetur impetu auaritie uel ambitionis uel superbie
odiositatis miserie uel tedii et similium. conqueritur
ergo iuno, id est caro, de ioue, id est de uirtute et
contemplatione, quod patet per introductionem istarum
25 concubinarum, et primo de cynosura que interpretatur
prudentia, cuius remigio nauigant mare tempestatum uite
parentis. refugiunt incomoda turbinum. per europam que
uenit de partibus orientalibus intelligas iustitiam que
depellit omnem sensualitatem, quod homo iustus non de-
30 clinat a dextris neque sinistris. per athlantides debe-
mus capere temperantiam que depellit omnem superfluita-
tem, quod, quando sol transit per eas, producuntur plu-
uie que irrigant siccitatem. similiter deificauit iupiter
orionem qui ortus est sine amixtione, quod impetra-
35 tur fortitudo que aduersitatibus non frangitur nec pros-
peris elevatur, sed omnia uincit et omnia superat. as-
sumpsit iupiter damnem, per quam debemus intelligere do-
num spiritus sancti, qui refulget surgente uirtute fidei
que pingitur aurata. deificauit etiam tindaridas geminos,
40 per quod signum significatur caritas, que duo precepit,
id est, ut diligas dominum deum et proximum tuum sicut

te ipsum. insuper assumpsit iupiter et deificari fecit
 puellam ygnasiacam, que interpretratur spes. et sic qui-
 libet uirtuosus assummit omnes istas vii uirtutes, qua-
 45 tuor cardinales et tres theologas. *Nota de inuentiua.* sci-
 endum est quod inuentiue sicut inuestigatiue actus sunt
 ingeniari, experiri, apprehendere, concipere, raciocina-
 ri. ingenium autem est extensio intellectus ad incogni-
 torum cognitionem. experientia uero est certitudo rerum
 50 facta per sensum. apprehensio uero est acceptio complexa
 intellectus ut quam homo est animal uel homo est animal
 risibile. raciocinatio uero est acceptio argumentiua in-
 tellectus ut si homo contra animal est, ut, si homo est
 animal, homo est sensible et patet numerus. nam inuesti-
 55 gatio aut extenditur ad cognoscendum et tunc est inge-
 nium.

Fr. 5A (Herc. Fur. 592). Allegorice: in parte ista Her-
 cules ab inferis reversus impetrat veniam a Phebo ex eo
 quia Cerberum extulit qui eius aspectu celum et aerum
 infecit, et spuma oris eius cicuta exorta est. qui Cer-
 5 berus dicitur *Creos boros* grece, id est carniū vorator
 [Isidore *Etym.* 11.3.33] habens tria guttura. ideo autem
 dicitur Herculem ab inferis extulisse Cerberum quia ipse
 Hercules uirtuosissimus devicit Cerberum et extrassit
 ab inferis, qui interpretatur voracissimus et pro vitio
 10 gule ponitur, quod vitium infernale est et triplex gut-
 tur habere dicitur propter triplicem conditionem vitii
 gule: nam gulosi aliqui in quantitate, aliqui in quali-
 tate, et aliqui in utroque sunt.

Fr. 7A (Phae. 275). *Geminus cupido:* dicitur a gemina fare-
 tra seu sagipta scilicet plumbea et aurea; faretratus
 depingitur cum geminis sagiptis: nudus, quia voluptas a
 nudis peragitur; pharetratus, ut Remigius¹⁶⁾ ait, quia
 5 criminis perpetrati conscientiam stimulat tandem; puer,
 quia magis dominatur in pueris, uel quia sermones aman-
 tium scimpleni sunt sicut inuolationes infantium.

16) I.e., Remigii Autissiodorensis *Commentum in Martianum Capellam*,
 ed. Cora Lutz (Leiden 1962), p. 81 (ad 1.8.22).

Fr. 7B (*Phae.* 1123). Chorus Actheniensium metro anapestico querelam fudit.

Fr. 7C (*Phae.* 1156). Hic ponitur flebilis lamentatio phedre circa funus Ypolititi.

Fr. 7D (*Phae.* 1167). *Amore coniugum*: quia Anthiopem uxorem suam et matrem Ypolititi occidisti gladio, Adrianam deseruisti, me nimium dilexisti, qua filium tuum propter me occidi fecisti et semper es nocens.

Fr. 50A (*Oct.* 481). *parentis*: Iulii cesaris quia sibi successit.

Fr. 62A (*Oct.* 706). *Talis emersam*: Tangit fabulam qualiter peleus pater achillis habuit Thetim dum ipsa Thetis mutaretur in uarias figuras. tamen oportuit quod ipsa consentiret. quere xi ovidii metha. ubi dicitur "Tum demum
5 ingemuit." [*Met.* 11.263]

Fr. 69A (*Oct.* 927). Construe sic. dies est semper metuenda nobis que dies uoluitur per uarios casus.

Fr. 75A (*Herc. Oet.* 173). Metrum anapesticum est supra notatum et est conquestio Ioles dicentis ego dimitto flere omnia communia mala et alia.

Fr. 82A (*Herc. Oet.* 233). Nutrix loquitur in Deianiram intra se clamans sub interiectione (*sic*) exclamantis seu dolentis. quod quando uxor et pellex alicuius ducte sunt in uno domo ut se uicissim uideant seuissime sunt. et
5 ponit duas comparationes, primo de Silla et Cercidi. que sunt duo maria in Sicilia apud Ethnam que cum iunguntur obuia secum luctantur et semper inquieta sunt. dicit quod nulla fera magis timenda est quam uxor et pellex.

Fr. 82B (*Herc. Oet.* 366). *Archadia*: in Archadia rapuit unam Corebantem de palestra et strupauit eam et illa excidit, id est relicta fuit.

Fr. 84A (*Herc. Oet.* 404). *Facibus* et alia *Heuristeus licet*: Heuristeus hystorialiter fuit rex Magne Grecie et erat tantus et posset imperari (*sic*) Herculi quicquid uellet; et timens eum quasi emulum ne maior eo efficeretur,
5 iubebat ei ut ad monstra et tyrannos quicumque appare-

bant iret, ut uictus succumberet, quemadmodum Saul imperabat David graua per que eum de mundo tolleret. et fingitur quod Juno ut malus spiritus suadebat Sauli. et tamen succubuit Saul David et Heuristeus Herculi sicut
 10 habetur intra finem huius tragedie, ubi dicit Hercules deificatus matri, et penas Euristeo dabit.

Fr. 85A (Herc. Oet. 773). Procedere: id est, dic michi an sit mortuus; quod si Hercules non est mortuus, bene possum inde precedere (*sic*) et sic si ipsum gladio demum perfodit. unde Ovidius Heroydum in ultimo epistole Deianire "Et tu lux oculis hodierna nouissima nostris Virque sed o possis et puer Ille, uale." [*Her. 8.167-68*]

Fr. 88A (Herc. Oet. 1139). Ne quis: de gigantibus etiam concordat diuina Scriptura, quod fuerunt ab initio temporum de quibus Salomon, libro Sapientie, c. 18, "Sed ab initio cum perirent superbi gigantes." [*18.12, ut.vid.*]

Fr. 89A (Herc. Oet. 1185). Vires Amazon: similem querelam fecit Ovidius de morte Achillis qui mortuus fuit manu Paridis ut legitur 13 methamorphoseon ubi dicitur "At si femineo fuerat tibi marte cadendum / Thermodonthiaca malles cecidisse securi." [*12.610-11*]

Fr. 90A (Herc. Oet. 1247). Quid per tonantem: poterat Hercules dicere verba Ecclesiastes 2 capite "Quid enim proderit homini de universo labore suo et afflictione spiritus qua sub sole cruciatus est? cuncti dies eius doloribus et erumnis pleni sunt, nec per noctem mente quiescit." [*2.22-23*]

Fr. 92A (Herc. Oet. 1309). Titanas: fabulam de gigantibus qui voluerunt preliari cum diis habes primo libro methamorphoseon: "Neve foret terris securior ordinis ether Affectasse ferunt regnum celeste gigantes." [*1.151-52*]

Fr. 95A (Herc. Oet. 1554). Sic habetur in Job. "homo mortuus nudatus atque consumptus ubi quaeso est?" [*14.10*]

Fr. 99A (Herc. Oet. 1790). Tracis: id est, siquis voluerit vindicari pro gregibus adeptis per Herculem a Gerione.

APPENDIX I:
REGISTER OF FRAGMENTS

Got.: 5 7-10 12 17 19 21 27 37 40 43 44 46 48 57 62-66 68 69 71-73
76-82 84-86 88-97 99; 5A 7A 7B 7C 7D 50A 62A 69A 75A 82A 82B
84A 85A 88A 89A 90A 92A 95A 99A

Vat.: 1 7 7A 14 19 94

Laur.: 1 1A

Lo.: 1-104; Lo. solus: 2-4 6 11 13 15 16 18 20 22-26 28-36 38-39 41
42 45 47 49-56 58-61 67 70 74 75 83 87 98 100-04

APPENDIX II:

APPARATUS FOR NEW FRAGMENTS FROM GOT., VAT., AND LAUR.

Fr. 1A (Laur. solus); 7 *odit scripsi: odio*; 45 *Nota de inventiva ad finem: spurium, ut videtur, eadum manulitteris paullo minoribus exaratum.* - Fr. 5A sine nomine Mussati; 9 *voracissimus scripsi: voracissis*³. - Fr. 7A (Got. et Vat.) continuum e fr. 7 in Got.; 2 *pharetratus et alatus* Vat.; 3 *cum om. Vat.*; 4 *ut Remigius ait: ut remugiat* Vat.; 5 *consciam* Vat.; *tandem Got.: mentem* Vat.; 7 *seimpleni* Vat.; 7 *mutilationes* Vat. - Fr. 7D cont. e fr. 7C. - Fr. 69A cont. e fr. 69.; 2 *uoluit textus tragoediarum.* - Fr. 89A; 5 *securi: bipenni* vulg. - Fr. 92A; 3 *ordinis ether: arduus aether* vulg. - Fr. 99A; 1 *Traces textus tragg.*

APPENDIX III:

APPARATUS FOR KNOWN FRAGMENTS IN GOT., VAT., AND LAUR.

N.B.: the fragments in question stand in Lo. and Got. only unless otherwise noted. - Fr. 1 (Lo. Vat. Gothanus Laur.). 1 *sciendum* Laur. 2 *multifariam* Vat. Gothanus Laur.; *perfigurat* Laur.; *nam quandoque* Laur. 4 *planta* Laur.; *quia ipse* codd. 5 *dicitur: vero accipitur* Laur.; *autem benignitas: pro benignitate* Laur.; *pra(c)tica* Vat. Gothanus Laur.; *poetica* Lo., Vat. mg.; *vita practica* Laur. 8 *ut enim* codd. 11 *cathe- nis aureis a Jove coniunctam: a J. convinctam* c. a. Laur. 12 *phy* Vat. Laur. (= *physici, i.e. alchemistae*); *ethyci* Laur. 13 *etiam: esse* Laur. 14 *nam a iuvando* Laur. 15 *et infra, quia; quod* Laur.; *sunt Gothanus a.c., Laur.: sint* cett. 16 *semper: divitie* Laur.; *regenerantur* Laur. 17 *ut* codd. 18 *testuali* Laur. 19 *assumanus* Vat. 21 *de om.* Laur. - Fr. 5 2 *anapestico* Got. passim (fr. 19, 40, 88). 4 *sequitur: loquitur* Got. 5 *dicens, o fortuna* Got. - Fr. 7 (Lo. Got. Vat.). 1 *Diva non miti* Vat. 5 *lacunam* Got. 6 *intelligitur* Got.; *precelle* Lo.: *pro-* Got. Vat.; *corpore humano* Lo. Vat.: *h. c.* Got. 9 *et om.* Got. 12 *spuma: suma* Got. 13 *veneris: venereo* Got. 14 *igitur: ideo* Got.; *elicit: eijcit* Vat. 15 *et om. Vat.; nichil om* Vat. - Fr. 8. 3 *non tu om.* Got. - Fr. 9. 1 *etc. om. Got.; quidem* Got. 4 *Cadinum. Cadi. Cadmus. Cadmum* Got.; *Polidorus om.* Got. - Fr. 10. 7 *planctis: plantis pedum* Got.; *sibi datum* Got.; *etc. om.* Got. - Fr. 12. 4 *ut: et* Got. - Fr. 14 (Lo. Vat.) *Ad Tro. 1 Musactus. Quicumque regno &c. sine scholiis* Vat. *Ad Tro. 17 Fr. 14, inc. Omnis fumat Assaraci domus* Vat. 4 *Tantalum om.*

Vat. 6 Tros Vat. 7 et ante Ascanium om. Vat. 12 Enee item Priamus c. Vat.; genuit om. Vat. 13 Caunum Vat. 15 Astianactem Vat. 16 Athaman-tem et Vat. 18 unde dicit Quicumque regno &c (= Tro. 1) Vat. - Fr. 17. 2 soluit in fine clamoris. eronee soluit Got. - Fr. 19 (Lo. Got. Vat.). 1 audax etc. Vat.; hinnun Lo. Got.: ymn- Vat. (passim). 2 scan-sionem si Got. 3 2^m anapestum vel spondeum. 3^m daptilum om. Vat. 4 spondeum, quartum et ultimum anapesticum spondeum vel iambum et raro troceum Got.: spondeum et iambum vel raro troceum Lo. Vat. (iambicum Vat.) - Fr. 21. 3 loquitur. pavet Got. - Fr. 37. 2 id est in qui-buslibet Got.; clama: clamat Got., Megas corr. 4 iuvenes etc. Got. - Fr. 40. 5 obmisimus Got. - Fr. 43. 1 in lamento Got. 2 malum om. Got. 8 etc. om. Got. - Fr. 44 = Oct. 1. 2 suo om. Got. - Fr. 46 = Oct. 3. 2 etc. om. Got. - Fr. 48 = Oct. 5. 1 me om. Got. 7 dicens Quid Got. - Fr. 62 = Oct. 19. 1 nunc om. Got. 2 dicendum est de Popea Got. - Fr. 63 = Oct. 20. 2 formam ... Europam ... formam Got. 4 so-lis Lo.: solus Got. recte. - Fr. 64 = Oct. 21. 3 hic ... haberet om. Got. - Fr. 66 = Oct. 23. 2 relinquerat Got. - Fr. 68 = Oct. 25. 4 et ei om. Got. - Fr. 69 = Oct. 26, continuum e 68 Got. 9 esset sic Got.; esset add. post predestinatum Got. corr. 10 occise essent Got. - Fr. 71. 2 etholorum Got. (passim). 3 et felix et Got. - Fr. 72. 1 nos om. Got.; deflendum Got.; et dolet ... moriendi om. Got. - Fr. 77 2 que ante mutata om. Got.; mutata fuit in saxum in Sicilia Got.; sem-per Got. - Fr. 78. 1 in ante edonas om. Got. 2 plorans semper Got.; progne Got. 3 Methamorphoseos om. Got. - Fr. 79. 1 ciprias lacrimas om. Got. 2 cinere Got. - Fr. 80. 1 sum Got.; calcione Got. 3 ll li-bro Got.; agit: ait Got. - Fr. 82. 1 quid regina om. Got. - Fr. 84. 1 thmoli om. Got. 5 facta lido Got. 6 habuit Got. - Fr. 85. 3 trans-ducta fuit Got. - Fr. 86. 1 tellus om. Got.; scilicet illa Got. 2 Ni-gerpens: niger pons Got. - Fr. 88 1 est: etc. Got. 9 durable: -ilia Got., corr. 2 m. - Fr. 89. 1 time om. Got. 2 supra Got. (passim). 3 Jove, non times vana etc. Got. - Fr. 90. 3 Pirrin: Pyrrhyn Got.; servas? Got. 4 eo, id est in hercule Got. - Fr. 91. 1 supra dictum est Got. 2 declamationibus. dicit chorus, quid. Got. - Fr. 92. 2 ip-sam ut vid. Got. - Fr. 93. 2 interfecit. dixit hei mihi. Got. - Fr. 94 (Lo. Got. Vat.). 1 sed ecce lapsam hab. Lo. Got., om. Vat.; lapsam hiis ita dicentibus hercules excitatus dixit 'ego dormivi et somnus reliquit' Got.; om. Lo. Vat. 2 hic incipit col. herculis Got. - Fr. 95. 4 etc. om. S. - Fr. 96. 3 molestiam etc. quod tenuit purum ferrum, id est faciens justitiam, et non est dignus puniri Got.: om. Lo.; puniri scripsi; puniti Got. - Fr. 97. 4 quenam Got. - Fr. 99. 3 illa Got., corr. 2 m; timores Lo.: favores Got. 4 nostros Lo.: v<est>ros Got., ut vid. Def. Got. post Herc. Oet. 1802.