

XVIII. Introduction to the Pseudo-Ovidian *De Vetula*

DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

Some years ago an eminent German scholar designated the twelfth century as the *aetas Ovidiana*, indicating the important place held by Ovid among classical authors in that period. More recent research has shown, however, that Ovid's popularity reached even greater heights in the following century and that Traube's phrase is applicable to "this period which includes the twelfth century and runs the length of the thirteenth."<sup>1</sup> Although the corpus of this poet is by no means slight, and although it contains diversified material that appeals to readers of varied interests, apparently the desire for still more Ovidian poetry in the Middle Ages led to the composition of a number of spurious works, which, in some cases, were for many years considered genuine. The longest of these pseudo-Ovidian poems, entitled *De Vetula*, consists of 2390 hexameter verses and is divided into three books.<sup>2</sup> It purports to have been written by Ovid shortly before his death and to have been found in his tomb near Tomi. An introduction in prose found in some of the manuscripts explains that when the poet's tomb was opened centuries after his death this book was found in an ivory capsule *nulla tempestate consumpta*. The natives who discovered it, being unable to read Latin, took it to Constantinople, where there were presumably officials at the court sufficiently literate to cope with it.<sup>3</sup>

As the sub-title *De Mutatione Vitae* found in some manuscripts suggests, the *Vetula* gives the reasons for the poet's change in his manner of living as a result of an unfortunate love affair. This is the tale of a hoax in which an old lady (*Vetula*) substitutes herself for the beautiful maiden with whom Ovid had an assignation. Twenty years later, upon the death of her husband, Ovid marries his lady, but by that time she too

<sup>1</sup> E. K. Rand, *Ovid and His Influence* (Boston 1925) 112-13. Cf. also Hilda Buttenwieser, "Manuscripts of Ovid's *Fasti*: the Ovidian Tradition in the Middle Ages," *TAPA* 71 (1940) 45-51.

<sup>2</sup> I am working on a critical edition of the *De Vetula*. Printed editions known to me besides the incunabula cited below (see note 18) are: Cologne 1534; Frankfurt 1610 (in Goldast's *Erotica et Amatoria Opuscula*); Wolfenbüttel 1662 (ed. by S. Closius with *Brunellus Vigelli*).

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of this proemium see F. Ghisalberti, "Mediaeval Biographies of Ovid," *Jour. Warburg Inst.* 9 (1946) 50-51.

is *Vetula*. Disillusioned he turns his back on the frivolous life he has been leading, embraces a good mediaeval curriculum of mathematics, music, and philosophy; turns for consolation to religion; and in Book III predicts the Virgin birth of Christ and becomes a Christian.

Although the work is rife with mediaeval material, it was accepted as genuine by Roger Bacon (1214–*ca.* 1292), whose quotations from it in the *Opus Maius* are the earliest mention that I have found in literature.<sup>4</sup> In discussing the conjunction of the planets at the time of the birth of Christ Bacon notes that Ovid, a pagan, had predicted the Virgin birth and quotes some lines from Book III of the *Vetula* in support of his assertion. In another passage from the same work his discussion of the divinity of Christ includes another reference to Ovid's espousal of Christianity.<sup>5</sup>

In the following century a more astute critic cast doubt upon Ovidian authorship in no uncertain terms. Petrarch in his *Epistolae Seniles* makes the following comment, which anticipated the skepticism of some fifteenth-century scholars: *Librum cuius nomen est De Vetula* dant Nasoni; mirum cui vel cur id in mentem venerit nisi hoc fortasse lenicinio clari nominis obscuro fama operi quaeratur et quod vulgo fit, ut gallinis pavonum ova subiciant.<sup>6</sup>

In Petrarch's own century, however, a group of Roger Bacon's compatriots found quotations from the *Vetula* pertinent to the subjects they were discussing. Richard Bury in his treatise *Philobiblon* (composed in 1344) quotes from Book I of this work, which he ascribes to Ovid.<sup>7</sup> His contemporary, Robert Holkot, who has been suspected of writing the *Philobiblon* under Bury's name, uses one of the same quotations in his commentary on *Sapientia* and concludes another passage

<sup>4</sup> The fact that passages from the *Vetula* occur in an edition of the *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais (*ca.* 1250) is not significant, since the edition in which they appear (Venice 1494) is obviously interpolated. (Cf. B. L. Ullman, "A Project for a New Edition of Vincent of Beauvais," *Speculum* 8 [1933] 325.) No quotations from the *Vetula* are found in the following editions of the *Historiale*: Strassburg 1473 (C 6246), Augsburg 1474 (C 6247), Douai 1624, nor in three fourteenth-century manuscripts which I have examined: BM Roy D VIII, Vat. Lat. 1962, Laur. Faes. 142.

<sup>5</sup> Introduced as follows: *et in libro qui dicitur de mutatione vitae Ovidii qui inscribitur de Vetula propter quam fuerat facta, refertur Ovidius Naso locutus fuisse de hac coniunctione . . . loquens igitur Ovidius de coniunctione maiore et fere maxima dicit* (ed. J. H. Bridges [Oxford 1897] 1.263). *Et in illo libro qui inscribitur Ovidius de Vetula deum incarnari in Christo colligitur* (*ibid.* 267).

<sup>6</sup> P. de Nolhac, *Pétrarque et Humanisme* (Paris 1907) 1.179.

<sup>7</sup> Amplius sicut Ovidius primo de *Vetula* lamentatur (ed. A. Altamura [Naples 1954] 106).

from the *Vetula* with the words: an sit Ovidii deus novit.<sup>8</sup> Another friend of Bury, Thomas Bradwardine (1290–1349), in his celebrated work *De Causis Dei*, amid a discussion of some astronomical problems, introduces an extended passage from the third book as well as one from Book I.<sup>9</sup> A fourth Englishman of the same period, Walter Burley (1257–1337), assigns the *Vetula* to Ovid in his *De Vita et Moribus Philosophorum*, but does not quote from the work.<sup>10</sup>

On the other side of the channel we find that Piero di Dante Alighieri in his commentary on his father's *Divina Commedia*, written about the middle of the fourteenth century, quotes twice from the *Vetula*, introducing the lines with the words "Ovidius de Vetula dicit" and "Unde Ovidius ait." These quotations are not the same as those used by the English scholars whom we have just mentioned.<sup>11</sup>

Not only in literary references, however, but in catalogues of mediaeval and renaissance libraries mention of the pseudo-Ovidian work is found. The earliest such dated list in which it appears is that of the Sorbonne catalogue of 1338.<sup>12</sup> The title also occurs in a list of books found in a manuscript which was once in the library of Pierre Limoges, who died in 1306, leaving his library to the Sorbonne.<sup>13</sup> While there is no proof that this inventory described Pierre's own library, it dates from the thirteenth century and may be the earliest mention of the *Vetula* in a non-literary source. The title also occurs in a list of books of Nicola Acciaioli, which were left to the Certosa of San Lorenzo in Florence and may have been drawn up in 1359.<sup>14</sup>

In manuscripts of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries several anonymous comments show that Ovidian authorship was by no means taken for granted by scholars of that time. For example, in a manuscript in the Biblioteca Laurenziana in Florence (36.2, f.255) are found

<sup>8</sup> Ms. BM Roy D IV (s.14) f.214v. For a discussion of Holkot's relationship to the *Philobiblon* cf. Altamura (above, note 7) 10.

<sup>9</sup> Introduced by the words: si autem testimonium Ovidii illius De Vetula ad auctoritatem vel ad voluptatem acceptare voluerit, in hac parte ecce libro 3 de Vetula loquens generaliter de huiusmodi magnis coniunctionibus et specialiter de hac una sic scribit (ed. H. Savilius [London 1618] 73). Quamobrem et Ovidius I de Vetula refert ita (*ibid.* 332).

<sup>10</sup> Chapter 113 (ed. H. Knust [Tübingen 1886] 354–56).

<sup>11</sup> *Petri Allegheri super Dantis ipsius Genitoris Comoediam Commentarium*, ed V. Nannucci (Florence 1845) 101, 174–75.

<sup>12</sup> L. Delisle, *Cabinet des Manuscrits* 3 (Paris 1881) 77.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* 2 (Paris 1874) 168–69.

<sup>14</sup> R. Sabbadini, "I libri del gran sinascolo Nicola Acciaioli," *Il Libro e la Stampa* 1 (1907) 33–40.

the words: *Insaniunt vero qui eum dicunt scripsisse . . . de Vetula* (Ovidius), nam ea oportuit fuisse infantis et ignorantissimi. A codex in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Naples (IV.F.13, f.51) bears the succinct verdict: *talia nec fecit nec vidit carmina Naso*. And a group of manuscripts now in various libraries in Italy and in England (e.g. Ambros. G. 130 Inf.; B.M. Harl. 5263, Add. 22014) bears a metrical exposition of the problem of authorship appended to the text:

Singula dum contemplor in hoc descripta libello  
 Illum vix possum credere, Naso, tuum . . .  
 Sed tum inspiciens quod nemo pectoris alti  
 Rem falso vellet intitulare suam  
 Praesertim si pulcra foret sicut liber iste  
 Corrigo mea verba . . .  
 Nempe placet mihi non modicum quod Naso propheta  
 Sic fuerit Christi.

In one fifteenth-century manuscript where these words occur the following comment is added in a later hand: *Revera hoc opus nihil Ovidii stylum sed plurimum huiusdem licentiam redolet. . . A scriptore igitur Christiano praefectum est ut patet pluribus et praesertim in III libro licet Christum propheticè a Nasone praenuntiatum narret.*<sup>15</sup>

In similar strain is a description of a manuscript which existed in the fourteenth century in the convent of San Domenico in Bologna: *Ovidius de Vetula, opus hexametro ignobili carmine Ovidio ascriptum . . . quod aliquis frater composuit et Ovidio in Getis degenti ascripsit.*<sup>16</sup>

In spite of such disparaging views of the *Vetula*, however, it is obvious from surviving texts that it enjoyed a certain amount of popularity during the early Renaissance. In the fourteenth century a Frenchman named Jean Lefevre brought out a version of the poem in his own language, which is an adaptation rather than a translation, as was noted by its modern editor, H. Cocheris, in 1867.<sup>17</sup> E. P. Goldschmidt in his *Mediaeval Texts and Their First Appearance in Print* lists only two editions from the fifteenth century.<sup>18</sup> With regard to manuscripts, however, the situation is different. To date I have collated thirty-four codices, one

<sup>15</sup> Ambros. G. 130 Inf. on paper endleaf.

<sup>16</sup> M. H. Laurent, "Fabio Vigili et les Bibliothèques de Bologne," *Studi e Testi* (1943) 56.

<sup>17</sup> *La Vieille ou les dernières Amours d'Ovide* ed. H. Cocheris (Paris 1867).

<sup>18</sup> *Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's Transactions* 16 (London 1943) 65: "The *Vetula* is not frequently met with. It is a book liable to destruction." The incunabula are: Perugia [P. Petri and Jo. Nicolai] ca. 1474 (H 12253 BMC VI 877); Cologne: J. Koelhoff 1479 (H 12254).

of which I am willing to assign to the thirteenth century. Of the others half were written in the fifteenth century.<sup>19</sup> The best textual tradition is found in manuscripts which originated in France, although some of them have migrated to other countries. It is interesting to note that of the sixteen manuscripts which date from the fifteenth century, eight contain Book III alone; of only two of the earlier codices is this true.

Let us look for a moment at the contents of this third book to see why it was so often circulated separately. We note, in the first place, that it contains a great deal of Aristotelian philosophy which was so popular during the Middle Ages. There are also echoes of Augustine, Boethius, the Arabic astronomers, and a passage from Ecclesiastes. Similarities between the theory of Light as set forth here and in the *De Luce* of Robert of Lincoln have been pointed out by a Polish scholar, A. Birkenmajer.<sup>20</sup> The familiar conception of man as a microcosm also appears in much the same form in which it is found in the writings of the Bishop of Lincoln. The position of the planets and their properties come in for detailed discussion leading to the explanation of the conjunction of the planets at the time of the birth of Christ. The book ends with an invocation to the Virgin. Thus it seems clear that in the fifteenth century the philosophical, religious, and scientific content was more attractive than the erotic element that is so conspicuous in the first two books. Although the poem sometimes occurs in manuscripts of Ovid's genuine works, we find it more often with such companions as Lactantius, Hugo of St. Victor, Robert of Lincoln, Aristotle, treatises on mathematics and astronomy, and works of a theological nature.

Thus it is not surprising to find that in the fifteenth century some scholars, in spite of their disbelief in Ovidian authorship, make use of the material contained in this anonymous source. Such is the case with the French humanist, Pierre d'Ailly (1350-1420). Chancellor of the University of Paris and author of one hundred and seventy-four works, d'Ailly has been called "the precursor of Descartes".<sup>21</sup> In his *Tractatus contra Astronomos* he discusses the Lex Mercurialis as it is set forth in the *Vetula* and adds: bene consideranti perspicuum est librum illum non ab Ovidio sed ab alio longe post adventum Christi fuisse scriptum et in adulationem Fidei.<sup>22</sup> The same opinion is expressed in a later passage

<sup>19</sup> See list of manuscripts appended to this paper. I expect to discuss their relationships at another time.

<sup>20</sup> "Robert Grosseteste and Richard Fournival," *MedHum* 5 (1948) 36-41.

<sup>21</sup> E. Salembier, *Le Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly* (Paris 1932) *passim*.

<sup>22</sup> Published in J. Gerson, *Opera Omnia* (Antwerp 1716) 1. App. 778.

in the same monograph and also in the *De Falsis Prophetis*, where the *Vetula* is spoken of as: liber . . . qui false imponitur Ovidio.<sup>23</sup>

The opinions of d'Ailly on this subject have a special interest for us because of his relationship with a Dutch humanist, Arnold Gheyloven of Rotterdam, who was one of the leading scholars of the fifteenth century in the Low Countries.<sup>24</sup> A protégé of Cardinal Francesco Zabarella, at whose home he lived while studying in Padua, Gheyloven became an admirer of Pierre d'Ailly (who was made a cardinal at the same time as Zabarella), composed his epitaph, and fell heir to part of his library. The relationship between these two scholars would not be of particular significance for students of the *De Vetula* were it not for the following fact. Among the people of various nationalities in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries who have left evidence of their unwillingness to accept Ovidian authorship of the poem, Arnold Gheyloven alone designates a particular individual as the man who composed this mediaeval "forgery". Among Arnold's unpublished works there exists in the Mazzarine Library in Paris an autograph manuscript of part of an encyclopedic work entitled *Vaticanus* (derived from *vates* and accented on the first syllable as the author informs us) which he composed in 1424.<sup>25</sup> In discussing the authors of the Augustan Age Gheyloven lists among Ovid's compositions the *De Vetula* and continues: quem librum scripsit magister Ricardus de Furnivallis cancellarius Ambianensis et imposuit Ovidio.<sup>26</sup> As a result of this statement the authorship of the *Vetula* has been assigned, at least tentatively, to Richard de Fournival by modern bibliographers since Gheyloven's ascription was discovered by Cocheris in 1867.<sup>27</sup>

Whatever Arnold's source for this information (and so far all efforts to trace it have failed) modern critics have pointed out that Richard de

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* 530.

<sup>24</sup> For biographical details see P. Lehmann, "Die Schriftenstellerkatalog des Arnold Gheylhoven von Rotterdam," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 58 (1938) 34-54; M. Dykmans, "Les premiers rapports de Pétrarque avec les Pays Bas," *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 20 (1939) 109-22; M. Dykmans, *Obituaire du Monastère de Groendael dans le forêt de Soignes* (Brussels 1940) 238.

<sup>25</sup> The first part of this work is in the Bibliothèque Mazzarine in Paris (ms. 1563); the second part is in the Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels (ms. 1169). An apograph of both parts was discovered by P. Lehmann in Vienna (Bib. Nat. S. n.12.703, formerly 311-312).

<sup>26</sup> Mazzarine f.68; Vienna f.77v.

<sup>27</sup> Cocheris (above, note 17) xxiv; G. Paris, *Histoire Littéraire de la France* 29 (1885) 456; B. Nogara, "Di alcune vite e commenti medievali di Ovidio," *Miscellanea Ceriani* (Milan 1910) 421; P. Lehmann, *Pseudo-antike Literatur des Mittelalters* (Leipzig 1927) 13; J. H. Mozley, "Le *Vetule* poème pseudo-Ovidien," *Latomus* 11 (1938) 53.

Fournival would be a plausible choice for this distinction. Little is known of his life except that he was Chancellor of the church of Notre Dame at Amiens in 1246 and that he died about 1260. As the author of a number of metrical works as well as some prose compositions and perhaps of a romance that exists under his name, Richard de Fournival is well known to students of mediaeval French literature.<sup>28</sup> To another group of mediaevalists, however, Fournival's name suggests the authorship of a treatise called the *Biblionomia*.<sup>29</sup> Unique of its kind, this work is a bibliographical canon, indicating the titles which would be found in a well-stocked library of the thirteenth century. That some, at least, of the manuscripts actually existed, has been proved from details of the descriptions which correspond with codices now extant. In the Bibliothèque Nationale, to which Fournival's library passed by way of the Sorbonne, as the gift of another French scholar, Gérard d'Abbeville, who inherited them, there have been identified about half of the one hundred and sixty-two works described in the *Biblionomia*.<sup>30</sup>

Significant for the question of Fournival's authorship of the *Vetula* is the fact that the *Biblionomia* includes, besides a large number of treatises on medicine (Richard was the son of a doctor and studied medicine himself), manuscripts of an astronomical and mathematical nature. These two interests are closely associated with the author of the pseudo-Ovidian work.<sup>31</sup> Since the *Vetula* was undoubtedly composed in France about the middle of the thirteenth century, Richard de Fournival seems a likely person to have been the author. He was pre-eminently interested in some of the scientific subjects which are contained

<sup>28</sup> C. Hippeau, *Le Bestiaire d'Amour par Richard de Fournival* (Paris 1860); E. Langlois, "Un document relatif à Richard de Fournival," *MélRom* 10 (1890) 123-25; T. Link, "Le Roman d'Abladane," *Ztschr. f. romanische Philologie* 17 (1893) 215-32; E. Langlois, "Quelques oeuvres de Richard de Fournival," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 65 (1904) 101-15; P. Zarifopol, *Kritischer Text der Lieder Richards de Fournival* (Halle 1904); W. McCleod, "The *Consaus d'Amour* of Richard de Fournival," *Studies in Philology* 32 (1935) 1-21; A. Långfors, "Le Bestiaire d'Amour en Vers par Richard de Fournival," *Mémoires de la Société neo-philologique de Helsingfors* 7 (1924) 219-317; A. Birkenmajer, "Pierre de Limoges Commentateur de Richard de Fournival," *Isis* 40 (1949) 18-31.

<sup>29</sup> Published by Delisle (above, note 13) 518-35.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. B. L. Ullman, *Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (Rome 1955) 45-47.

<sup>31</sup> Mention has been made of astronomical passages in the *Vetula* (p. 201). Interest in mathematics is shown by the following terms: *alcugrabbula*, algebra (and reference to its origin in India), *ritmimachia* (a detailed description of this game), a lengthy discourse on the laws of chance as applied to gambling with dice, and a set of instructions for playing chess. They all occur in Book I.

in the work, and he was also the author of some amorous compositions which suggest Ovidian inspiration.<sup>32</sup>

Are there, on the other hand, any facts which seem to oppose this hypothesis? We may note, for what it is worth, that among the works of Ovid listed in the *Biblionomia* the *De Vetula* is missing, although some other pseudo-Ovidian titles are included. If the latter were composed by Richard in his youth, as has been surmised,<sup>33</sup> it would antedate the bibliographical treatise and we might have expected the author to give some publicity to Ovidian authorship, which the *Vetula* itself seeks to promote. Another phase of the *Vetula*, which we have noted, is the emphasis upon religion, particularly in Book III. While the *Biblionomia* includes a number of works of a theological nature, the descriptions of these manuscripts are less exact than those referring to philosophical and medical works. As chancellor of the church at Amiens Fournival was undoubtedly conversant with contemporary religious problems and could have written the passages in the *Vetula* of this nature. On the other hand, the verses which deal with the conversion of Ovid to Christianity give the impression of being written by some one more emotionally concerned (*aliquis frater*) rather than by a scientist like Richard de Fournival.

One other point should be mentioned in connection with Gheylouven's attribution of the *Vetula* to Fournival. There exists in the University Library at Amsterdam another composition by Arnold, which is also an autograph.<sup>34</sup> Internal evidence makes it clear that the *Somnium Doctrinale* was composed after the *Vaticanus*.<sup>35</sup> In the prologue to Part II of the later work where there is a discussion as to whether people ought to study for the purpose of making money, we find the following statement: Et contra tales scribit Ovidius de Vetula, followed by lines used by Bury and Holkot.<sup>36</sup> Careful study of the *Somnium* and examination of pertinent topics in the lengthy *Vaticanus* have led me to believe that Arnold did not use the *Vetula* anywhere else in these works, although there were a number of places where quotations would have been apposite.<sup>37</sup> It seems likely then that at the time he wrote these lines in

<sup>32</sup> McCleod (above, note 28).

<sup>33</sup> Lehmann (above, note 27) 14.

<sup>34</sup> Ms. 472 (s.15) entitled *Speculum Doctrinale* (Tit. f.1) or *Somnium Doctrinale*: Hoc opusculum quod sompnium doctrinale appello (f.1).

<sup>35</sup> E.g. Vide latius in Vaticano in prima parte c.xxviii (f.32v); de istis et aliis quam plurimis posui in Vaticano in prima parte (f.60).

<sup>36</sup> Amsterdam f.26v (the exact lines quoted by Bury, above, note 7).

<sup>37</sup> E.g. in *Vaticanus* under such topics as *alea*, *avaritia*, *castitas*, *fortuna*. Citations



the *Somnium* he was using as a source one of the fourteenth-century English writers where the same quotation occurs, and that he did not recall his earlier ascription of the *Vetula* to Fournival.

But where could Arnold Gheyloven have picked up the information that has led modern scholars to assign to Richard de Fournival the authorship of this poem? We have noted Arnold's friendship with Pierre d'Ailly, which might suggest that the attribution originated in Fournival's native land. D'Ailly, however, in his own quotations from the *Vetula* makes no such identification. It is also possible that the ascription came from an Italian source. In the introduction to the *Valicanus*, which Arnold composed *in silva Zonie prope Bruxellam*, the author tells us that he has compiled his material: *ex diversis libris et ex diversis historiographis quos vidi et audiui in Italia tam Bononie quam Padue dum eram ibidem studens*.<sup>38</sup> We have noted that there was a *Vetula* in the fourteenth century in the library of San Domenico in Bologna and other manuscripts of the work exist in Italian libraries today. None has come to light, however, which gives any clue to Arnold's source for this statement. Still another possibility suggests itself. We know that Gheyloven was acquainted with some works of the English humanists of the preceding century. That he also used Walter Burley's *De Vita et Moribus Philosophorum*, which was a popular source book for fifteenth-century encyclopedists, is attested by the fact that he includes in the introduction to Part I of the *Valicanus* a paragraph taken word for word from Walter Burley's introduction.<sup>39</sup> Another link with this author may be significant. In Arnold's list of works of Ovidian authorship along with the mention of the *Vetula* and its unique ascription to Fournival occurs a title *De Fortuna*. This unknown work is also ascribed to Ovid in some of the editions of the *De Vita et Moribus Philosophorum*.<sup>40</sup> If Gheyloven was merely copying Burley as a source for his material on writers of the Augustan Age, the responsibility for the ascription of the

---

occur from all of Ovid's genuine works and from the pseudonymous *De Medicamine Faciei* and *De Philomela*. In the *Somnium* there is discussion of *paupertas*, *castitas*, *luxuria* etc. Many mediaeval authors are cited in both works.

<sup>38</sup> Mazzarine f.2v; Vienna f.2v.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* De moribus et vita philosophorum veterum tractaturus multa quae ab antiquis auctoribus in diversis libris de ipsorum gestis sparsim scripta reperi in unum colligere laboravi. Plurima quoque eorum responsa notabilia et dicta elegantia huic libro inserui, quae ad legentium consolationem et morum informationem inferre valebunt. Knust (above, note 10) 2.

<sup>40</sup> Knust (above, note 10) 356; Cologne 1470 (H 4112), Cologne 1479 (HC 4121), Louvain 1479/80 (HC 4120), Hagenau (H. Grau) 1510. In some early editions this title is lacking.

*Vetula* to Fournival may have to be shifted to Burley. Is there lurking somewhere among the manuscripts of Burley's work one which has the *De Vetula* in the text with perhaps a marginal note including Fournival's name, which Gheyloven incorporated into his account?<sup>41</sup> Pending the discovery of any such palaeographical gem, we shall have to continue to accept provisionally the name of Richard de Fournival as the author of the pseudo-Ovidian *De Vetula*.<sup>42</sup>

#### MANUSCRIPTS OF THE *DE VETULA*

(\* indicates that I have used photostats, \*\* that I have used microfilm. All other manuscripts have been collated on the spot.)

##### Thirteenth Century

Paris Bib. Nat. 16252 ff.109r-134r

##### Fourteenth Century

Angers Bib. Mun. 506 ff.1r-43v\*

Auxerre Bib. Mun. 243 ff.210v-224r\*

Berlin Oeff. Wissen. Bib. Phill. 1796 ff.115r-144r\*\*

Erfurt Stadtbib. Amplon. Q. 1. ff.115r-159v\*\*

Erfurt Stadtbib. Amplon. Q. 2 ff.1r-37v\*\*

London B. M. Add. 22014 ff.1r-17r

London B. M. Cott. Vesp. 23 ff.53r-77v

Montpellier Bib. Éc. Méd. 366 ff.1r-41r\*

Paris Bib. Nat. 8256 ff.52r-59v (formerly 91r-98v) + 14805 ff.99r-132r

Vatican City Vat. Lat. 4362 (Book III) ff.43r-56v

Vatican City Vat. Reg. Lat. 1559 ff.8r-53r

Venice Bib. Marc. XII.57 ff.1r-34r

Vercelli Bib. Sem. Arciv. (unnumbered) 1r-39r

##### Fourteenth/Fifteenth Centuries

London B. M. Arun. 384 (Book III) ff.223r-242v

London B. M. Harl. 5263 ff.1v-48r

<sup>41</sup> It is a satisfaction to learn that a new edition of Burley's work is in prospect (Cf. J. O. Stigall, "The Manuscript Tradition of the *De Vita et Moribus Philosophorum*," *MedHum* 11 [1957] 44-57). Knust's edition leaves much to be desired, especially on the palaeographical side.

<sup>42</sup> I am indebted to Professor Chauncey Finch for information concerning a reference to the *Vetula* "by Domenico di Bandino in the early part of the fifteenth century in the section of his *Fons Memorabilium Universi* called *De Viris Claris*. . . . This work contains an article on Ovid in the course of which Domenico remarks '... dicint (sic) multi quod Ovidius ediderit librum De Vetula.' This wording would seem to imply that Domenico himself (or his source) had some doubts as to whether Ovid was actually the author of the work." (Codex Vat. Chig. G VIII 236, f.327r.).

Milan Bib. Ambros. G 130 Inf. ff.81r–109v

Paris Bib. Nat. 3245 ff.46r–63r

#### **Fifteenth Century**

Cambridge Jesus Coll. Q. G. 22 (Book III) ff.111v–121v

Cambridge Sidney Sussex Coll. Δ 3.11 (Book III) pp. 149–170

Cambridge Trin. Coll. O.8.24 (Book III) ff.25r–43v

Cambridge (Mass.) Harv. Houghton Lib. Lat. 214 ff.1r–51v

Copenhagen Bib. Reg. Thot. 400 ff.15r–40v\*\*

Florence Bib. Laur. 89.35 (Book III) ff.92r–106r

Florence Bib. Laur. Conv. Soppr. 186 (Book III) ff.172r–185v

Göttingen Bib. Univ. Phil. 130 ff.5r–47v\*\*

London B. M. Harl. 2745 ff.153r–160v; 1r–31r (bound in this order)

Milan Bib. Ambros. Q. 59 Sup. ff.1r–44v

Munich Bayer. Staatsbib. 21076 (Book III) ff.106v–110v

Paris Bib. Nat. 5055 (incomplete) ff.140r–151v

Vatican City Vat. Barb. Lat. 26 (Book III) ff.157r–172r

Vienna Bib. Nat. 3219 (Book III) ff.102r–118r

Wolfenbüttel Landesbib. Helm. 299.2 ff.48r–81v\*\*

Zurich Zentralbib. Car. XI.93 ff.1r–31r\*\*

#### **Excerpts**

London B. M. Harl. 3353 (s.14) ff.147r–147v

London Roy 7 FVII (s.13) f.83v

Paris Bib. Nat. 7368 (s.14) ff.65r–68v

Vatican City Vat. Reg. Lat. 314 (s.14) ff.104r–105r

Vatican City Vat. Reg. Lat. 2120 (s.13) ff.24r–24v

Vatican City Vat. Pal. Lat. 924 (s.15) f.54r

#### **Known to me but Unstudied**

Cracow Jagellonian Library 5230