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TEXTUAL NOTES

On the editorial treatment of the Latin text, see the Preface. Matters of secondary importance, such as periods in the middle of sentences (e.g. after bello and venatu, l. 10; after promittunt, l. 12), insignificant erasures and corrections (vehat, l. 19), accents on words (e.g. on in, l. 44, to indicate a separate word), and question marks are usually not noted here. These Textual Notes should furnish ample evidence that the author composed as he wrote, even though he probably had a previous rough draft.

The leaves of the Munich manuscript are folded and the pages generally in octavo format. The eighteen double leaves consist of leaves 1 and 4, 2 and 3, 4a and 4b, 5 and 8, 6 and 7, 9 and 12, 10 and 11, 13 and 18, 14 and 17, 15 and 16, 19 and 24, 20 and 23, 21 and 22, 26 and 29, 27 and 28, 25 and 30, 31 and 34, and 32 and 33, respectively. Most of the pages are about 17½ by 12½ cm., more or less. But the first six leaves (1, 2, 3, 4a, and 4b) are about 2½ cm. or more shorter than most of the rest, and also somewhat narrower. Leaves 9 and 12 have about 21 ½ cm. cut from the top. 18 through 21 are only 9 to 10 cm. wide, and like 1, 2, 3, 4a, 4b, 14, 15, 16, 19 and 24, 20 and 23, 21 and 22, 26 and 29, 27 and 28, 25 and 30, 31 and 34, and 32 and 33, respectively. Most of the pages are about 17½ by 12½ cm., more or less. But the first six leaves (1, 2, 3, 4a, and 4b) are about 2½ cm. or more shorter than most of the rest, and also somewhat narrower.

After a fashion the whole manuscript is (or was) arranged in fascicles, as the right lower margin usually indicates. Leaves 1 to 4 (11 contains irrelevant scribbling and part of a devotional, 1§ the first four epigrams) are marked A1, A3, A5, A7; leaves 5 to 8 are C1 to 7; leaves 9 to 12, D1 to 7; leaves 13 to 18, E1 to 11; the lower right corners of 19 and 20 are missing; 21 to 24 are G1 to 7; 25 is I1; 26 is N; 27 P; 28 R; the edge of 29 is cut off; 30 is U; 31, IV; 32, Y; 33 has no mark, and 34 is AA.

Leaf 21, opening Chapter VII, has the numeral 30 in red and an m in black ink in the upper left corner, 21 a n in black ink in the upper right corner, 22 has a 30 (crossed out) and after it a 31, both in red, also an o in black ink, and 22 a p in black ink. 25 has a c in black ink and a 24 in red in the left top margin; 25 a d in black ink in the right top margin. 26 reveals a faint red 20, 29 a faint red 19, and in pencil: 12 x. 29 has about eight irrelevant letters. 30 has a faint red 25 and a black e, 30 a black f. 31 has a black a and a red 26, 31 a black b. 32 has a black h and a red 18, 32 a black i. 33 has a black k and a red 19, 33 a black l. 34 has a red 26, changed to 27, and a black g. All these symbols seem to be traces of early attempts to number and sort the leaves, but their present significance is open to question.

Although the writing seems to be in a single hand throughout, the ink changes often, being heavy at times and at others thin and pale. 1§ e.g. reveals several quills and inks, as does 91.

I, 1. The first line, badly blurred, is repeated in Docen’s hand.

16. Two small worm holes in the right margin under the last two letters. On the other side of the leaf they are under cuius, l. 38.
23. The line starts *Ad fodrum* (for *fodder*), but over these words, the correction *Anmonae* (of fodder).
25. Two small breaks caused by the erasure of l. 1 on the other side.
26. Seiler’s (and Langosch’s) reading *Accinctus*, while fitting in well, is not clear in the manuscript, which seems to have *-ct victus* or *vinctus*.
50. The manuscript has *polebro*.
56. An indentation mark in the left margin.
63. *faiadas* underlined in red; *faida* in l. 88 seems to have a pencil mark under it.
71. At the top of the page (3°) this line, which is second on the page and quite blurred, is repeated in Docen’s hand.
92. As usual, *quoniam* is written *quod*.
95. Before this line, at least one verse has been cut away at the top of 4°.
98. Blurred over an erasure and on a fold with three small holes.
101. After *cui*, *te (=tunc)* is erased.
114. *demonstras* corrected from *declaras*.
116. In the margin next to *coniciébas*, to explain it, is the German gloss *rat*. It is in the same ink as the correction in l. 114.
119. is cut away at the top of 4°.
120. *dando sibi firmi*, practically all cut away, but cleverly restored by Seiler. In the right margin of this page, from bottom toward top: *Attinet monasterio Tegernsee* (belongs to Tegernsee monastery).
122. The note on l. 97 above applies here too.
11. 1–5. The first five lines of Chapter II are blurred by other writing imprinted upon them from the time the leaf was pasted into another volume. There are numerous small insignificant worm holes and cuts in leaves 4a and 4b. In the right margin of l. 5 the word *ferventi* (ardent). After l. 5 a line is drawn across the page, and in front of l. 6 the symbol N and an indentation mark appear.
10. *Sed* looks more like *Si*.
14. The second *e of circumcinerere* looks more like *o*.
27. Beside an indentation mark, a B in the left margin, and a line across the page above l. 27.
42. *scandebant . . . residebant* were originally *scandentes . . . residentes*, corrected.
43. The symbol for *et* was added above the line.
51. Both Seiler and Langosch put *dum* before *regnun*.
65. Only the right top curl of P is left, the rest was cut away.
III, 2. *susit*: An erasure, leaving a considerable gap before *tua* on a cut, also a fold in the parchment.
22. *ne* corrected from *non*.
27. An indentation mark in the left margin.
33. There are imprinted characters above this line and to the right of l.
36 (a slight imprint also to the right of l. 17).
35. This line, on a fold, and to some extent l. 36 are blurred.
46. *dic* is over *ingue*, which is underlined, i.e., deleted.
52. *redit* is blurred.
55. *trans hoc*, Seiler’s conjecture, is nothing more than that. *mihi* too is doubtful.
62. *bina* stands over *gemina*.
65. *convenient* stands over *venerunt*.
67. –*manes* over *ingesns*. A note (by Schmeller?) in the lower right margin of this page (4b°) relates how this section (i.e., Chaps. II and III) was found on the von Moll estate in 1840. See Introduction, p. 2.
IV, 7. After *quid*, written *qd* with a bar through the *q*, a gap with erasure.
12. In the right margin a Latin gloss: adub. loc. (any place)?.
20. A period after direxit.
25. Inserted in the right margin next to l. 26 and erroneously put after it by Schmeller.
33. ff. This entire page (5th, 11. 33–63) is in very bad condition, as are 61st and 7th (11. 94–156). They are brown and faded, having been loosened from the volumes in which they had been pasted, whereby part of the surface of the parchment was damaged. Most of the writing, though, is so deeply ingrained that it is still legible. Leaf 5 has been cut all the way across, near the middle, affecting Chap. IV, 17 and 48.
49. After detur, erasure of ve, and space before que.
64. Over this, the first line of 61st, there is a line of imprinted characters, partly cut away.
67. The latter half on an erasure. Under recedunt the word rediebant is discernible.
70. After regis, qui is crossed out.
97. After captivantes is –tos.
103. After locispletibus an erasure, and in the left margin r (= rectificandum, to be corrected). I have inserted my own conjecture.
108. The last three letters are above the line.
117. reparetur over firmetur.
119. induciat: the ci above, and the n of responsa written out over the o.
129. Originally cum prae stamus is, but now indistinct. se and veniamus above the line.
142. In the right margin veneret next to timetur.
149. rex inserted over post.
157. Illegible imprint above this line, top of 7th.
161. chrusennis underlined in red ink.
176. sibi seems to be corrected from tibi.
178. tres over ait, which is crossed out.
187. temptat corrected from temptans.
194. The l of tabulam repeated above the line.
211. A space between de and posuit.
212. Above, between posuit and pisa, a second quod. Part of line indistinct.
223. Dixi non into margin above line, which began: Nunquam consuevi.
224. The entire line is in the left margin. Originally [all underscored in faint ink to indicate deletion]: Donec inter nos sis, fac ut viue utelut nos. This, as well as the correction to l. 223, is written with a fairer ink, which comes into regular use (except on erasures) with l. 236.
226. In the right margin the interesting German gloss (in the same hand?): sugifprechoto, an Old High German explanation of the term lorifregi, I resisted (broke the reins).
234. After this line, an entire line, now too hazy to be clearly made out, is erased. Schmeller conjectured: . . . plumque . . . simul . . ., but like Seiler I can make out only disjointed letters. It may have been something like: Statuit exemplumque bonum bene suave simulque (and he set an example good and at the same time sweet).
244. The n of famulantur was added above the line.
248. bene has a mark referring to the left margin, where we read the gloss: guo optime posint (as best they can), and under it pro cooprantr (for ‘cooperate’)?.
At bottom of p. 8th, in pencil: 8 b.
234. After this line, an entire line, now too hazy to be clearly made out, is erased. Schmeller conjectured: . . . plumque . . . simul . . ., but like Seiler I can make out only disjointed letters. It may have been something like: Statuit exemplumque bonum bene suave simulque (and he set an example good and at the same time sweet).
244. The n of famulantur was added above the line.
248. bene has a mark referring to the left margin, where we read the gloss: guo optime posint (as best they can), and under it pro cooprantr (for ‘cooperate’)?.
At bottom of p. 8th, in pencil: 8 b.
V. Leaf 9, opening Chapter V, has a horizontal cut or tear near the top (ll. 4–7 and 39), but only half-way across. Individual lines (e.g. 45), words (e.g. pontifices, l. 32) and letters have been gone over in blacker ink.
1. Strecker’s conjecture.
6. *de quo* as one word. In the right margin, next to *podium*, the German gloss *gang* (*walk*).

11. In the right margin, next to *sinaxis*, the gloss *cursus vel hora* (*course or hour*). The Greek word here, as in l. 6 above, seems to be for purposes of embellishment. See Introduction, p. 23.

34. There seems to be an *i* after *sapienter*; perhaps a colon.

38. The first *t* of *dimittamus* written in above.

45. From here on, about a dozen lines are in heavier ink.

59. ff. Ll. 59–63 are now very difficult to read, but thanks to Schmeller and Seiler, the reading is well established.

74. *ibi* over the sign for *et*.

76. *disponit* corrected from *disponunt*.

78–84. At the left of each of these lines, an indentation mark.

81–83. The eight nouns and adjectives *multi, falerati, quindeni* ... as far as *bini* were all corrected from –*os* forms.

87. *digitis* over *manibus* (*hands*).

88. *neumas* underlined in red.

115. This line inserted in smaller letters between ll. 114 and 116.

130 ff. This leaf 11, beginning at l. 130, has a diamond-shaped patch about two-thirds way down (ll. 148–153), and the right margin is completed with a long triangular strip, which is written on in several top lines, especially ll. 132 ff. The gloss on 110, *sint haec*, l. 175, is mostly on the strip, which was probably torn off when the sheet was removed from a book cover.

133. Written in crabbed form in the right margin next to *marina* of l. 132.

134. The upper part of this page (111) is in bad condition. Only the *o* of *volucrum*, which Schmeller conjectured to be *nobili*, is clear; the second half-line too is blurred.

138. *munera* *dat* was originally in place of *dona reponit*. An indentation mark on the left.

144. *alter* replaces *alius*.

150. After this line, an entire line is deleted by the author.

169. *et* ... *conexus* (one *n*) on an erasure; a long space before *linea*.

173. Above *monedula*, the gloss *taha*, as a synonym.

175. After *praesulibus*, *istaec* and over it *ast* (?) *haec*, both crossed out. *sint haec* is in the left margin.

180. This line is in the right margin beside l. 179.

182–194. These clauses were originally conceived as independent, so that in 11. 183, 187, and 190 *dat* stood in place of *dei*; the *a* was then corrected to *e* in each case, in dependence on *quin* (l. 181). Similarly in l. 193 *mittat*, written in the left margin, replaces *misit*.

183ff. Under ll. 183, 186, and 188 lines are drawn from the left margin.

184. *ponit*, quite blurred, on an erasure.

221. *his* above the line between *placet* and *patriando*.

223. The name *Ruodlieb*, spelled *Rodlieb* with a *v* over the *o*, written on an erasure, is not in Docen’s hand, as has been claimed. See Introduction, p. 15. The name is faintly underlined in (red?) ink, not written in red as Langosch says (Corona Quernea, p. 287), but in black ink as old as the original.

228. *facit* corrected from *fecit*; *hanc* on an erasure. From *hanc* on, some of the words and lines (e.g. ll. 228–234) are in blacker ink.

241. Last word in smudge.

242. *mihi* more likely than Schmeller’s *cum*.

243–247. The ink is blurred. In l. 244 *Partim* is repeated in the left margin. In l. 245 *plus sunt nocturi* repeated above the line (*plus* replacing *non*), as is *citius* in l. 246.

247. A gap between *tecum* and *pacificenus*, in which *paci* has been erased.
249. In the right margin denique, to replace utique, but a symbol above utique seems to indicate that on second thought this was to stand.

250 ff. The first five lines of this page (131) are now almost wholly illegible. As a nineteenth-century note (1834) in the left margin, by Schmeller, indicates, the page was peeled from the back cover of another codex from Tegernsee (No. 601) in 1834.

255. maccum inserted above the line, over fueras.

258. miseram written over vitam.

260 To qui an a was originally added but has been erased

269 is written in the right margin, from apparitorum up Below it, the Munich library stamp

277. Actually, speciali followed by an erasure; perhaps it was specialis, and the writer forgot to change i to e.

278. An indentation mark in the left margin.

283. At the bottom of this page (131), in a more recent hand, in pencil and in bold characters: Ruodlieb. From 131 on through 18 (end of Chapter V) the leaves have strips pasted over the bottom, with the final line of 161 (V, 347) appearing on the strip. After the last line of 151 (l. 408) the illegible imprint of three lines from another volume is visible. The last line of 161 (l. 467) is partly covered by the strip, while 162, 172, and 182 contain irrelevant writing imprinted on the strip.

288. quod crossed out, and quae written in the margin in front of it.

292. Between the last two words, an erasure (probably et); vel is inserted above consoleris

301 The whole line on an erasure.

308 An indentation mark in the left margin.

310 atque is above the line in darker ink, to the right of tot, and is faintly repeated in the right margin.

311. panes sint is corrected from panis sit.

315. Before Et the gloss: s. replet = he fills (them) so...

320. Indentation marks before ll. 320, 331, and 340.

329. illum on an erasure, with part of hunc still visible.

343. que added above the line.

345. in written above deleted a.

350. Seiler’s conjecture (Lata fuit) makes sense, but the letters before merito (n, in?) do not bear it out. The new conjecture is mine.

355–358. The conjectures are my attempt to improve on those of Laistner, which seem to me to make little sense. Seiler does not even venture conjectures here. I use lacernam on the analogy of pecunna, l. 423.

357. The ne has an acute accent (to mark it as a separate word see I, 44), and there is no space before stet, but in the next line st sint also looks like one word. In the right margin of this page (142) the word “Tegernsee” under two symbols, which carry over to page 171.

368. Ignibus is Laistner’s conjecture.

376. Nobilibus is Laistner’s conjecture.

378. On a fold, hard to read.

405. amicus is my conjecture. Schmeller has in istic.

410. omnia was originally omnibus; – bus has been erased.

423. The second n of pecunna was squeezed in.

425. Non supplied by Laistner.

431. pia was originally piae, and sophia was sophiae.

435. Seiler’s opibus is doubtful. There seems to be an n or ii before s.

446. Here and before each succeeding lesson (except Nos. 5 and 6, ll. 472 and 476) is an indentation mark, but even ll. 472 and 476 start with a larger majuscule.
479. The space after prae is caused by an erasure. In the right margin (in a modern hand, in pencil): “Aus clm. 18601 Vorderdeckel.”

502. This and the next six lines are written on a slight slant upwards.

511. tam is written above the line.

524–526. These lines are blurred because of three heavy impressions of writing in small characters running upwards through them.

534. Written in the left-hand margin downward from Atque of l. 533.

542. dubium corrected from dubius.

560. The h of enthec am is added above the line.

565. The last letter of noctem (written nocte) and of medium (written medias) seem to have been corrected. Was it noctis medium?

568. lacrimando: the last four letters have apparently been corrected.

573. cito on an erasure, and quod (written qd) above the line.

588. After vellet the rest is practically obliterated.

602. quovis is my conjecture.

617. The i of ni is blurred.

619. The conjecture, by Laistner (Qui dat iter), reads well, but before callem the manuscript seems to have e (=em), not -er. Hence my new conjecture.

VI. 6. My conjecture. The top of this page (19a) is in bad condition.

20. An illegible gloss or correction on the right.

21. illius is my conjecture.

29. Before quae the word nunc is deleted by underlining.

32. The missing letters can be made out from the impression they have left in the volume (clm 18557) into which the page had been pasted.

33. The line, on a fold in the parchment, is quite illegible. Schmeller did nothing with it, Seiler thought it was –ralta at the end. The next three lines too are blurred.

39. praeiriae over underlined horum.

40. The m mark over seraque has probably faded.

49. –ear is still legible. coclear is Schmeller’s conjecture, accepted by me.

54. The space between ait and ore in an erasure. Schmeller and Seiler conjectured haec, but a –d is showing. Id is my conjecture.

68. The –tur mark of datur is written very faintly over the line, sibi is in an erasure, and dabatur et alter was originally datur alter.

86. This and the next six lines at the bottom of 20r are now quite blurred. Seiler made them out. This leaf as well as 19 are dark brown all around the edges. In the left margin of 20r in pencil: clm. 18557.

87. My conjecture.

92. At the bottom of 20r three illegible lines imprinted from another volume.

93. furca repeated more clearly in the right margin.

103. What is showing of Sordidior (?) is not at all clear.

111 f. There is a space before amorem and before –uenientes.

118 ff. The last six lines of this page (20s) are quite blurred.

121. The m mark is missing over stulta.

VII. 21. Beginning here the ink changes; it is darker for most of the page, and the characters are a trifle bolder than usual. After 1. 20 an entire line is heavily crossed out. It can be deciphered: Cuius in (above and under it, a line) amore dederat (above it, sibi sibi (underlined, quatinus over it) quae bibat ips[e (in whose love he had offered it to him as he drank).

23. Sicque tacens extends into the left margin on an erasure, a space after it.

32. Extending into the left margin and written at the bottom of the page (21r), after comitem, around a seam in the parchment.

33. In the right margin, near the top of 21r, there is an illegible lateral imprint of six lines from another volume.
48. Schmeller, Seiler, and Langosch, who as usual copies Seiler, all misread rediens, instead of ridens. My conjecture at the beginning of the line replaces Seiler's, which becomes meaningless now that the reading ridens, about which there can be no doubt whatever, is established.

62. Written from longum (l. 61) on up along the right margin.

67. Leaf 22, beginning here, has an erased in the right margin and, in red ink, vero.

75. cras is written over mox, to replace it.

76. sibi is written over tam.

79. Before agat, mea is underlined and crossed out; placabit apparently corrected from placebat.

84. In the right margin, R (i.e., Rufus), which should be at l. 85.

85. After laudes, in a modern hand (probably Docen's?): geloben (to vow).

86. In the right margin, N (i.e., neptis).

87. In the right margin, R.

89. In the right margin, H (i.e., herus) ductor.

91. In the right margin, H, and l. 92: N.

106. Originally praecipit edendum, with the right marginal correction iussit. Sat. Over the o of pueros is an i.

107. istorum was originally tillorum.

115. In the right margin the gloss ad latrinam.

122. Tuncque is somewhat indented. An erased in front of it.

126. After multis a space (erasure).

VIII, 1. A small worm hole between ll. 1 and 2.

6. Seiler and Langosch arbitrarily have exhalans.

9. Inspires seems to have been Inspira; —es above the line. faciant has the n above the line.

26. mihi dempersat repeated in the right margin.

31. The missing words can be read from the impression they have made in the volume (clm 18557) into which the page had been pasted. The last six lines of 23¹ and 23² (VIII, 26 ff. and 50 ff.) are on badly crumpled parchment; some of the letters have been gone over in black ink. At the bottom of 23² several illegible lines are imprinted from another volume.

50 ff. These two lines are written in the right margin, Ne iubar on a line with l. 49, the rest upward. The symbol for per is squeezed in. Without comment all three editors from Schmeller on have sol aut aer. Perhaps the dots over these words indicate inversion.

52. The last two letters of submergere are written above.

57. Schmeller read fumosam (instead of -um), which he changed to famosam but in Lateinische Gedichte, p. 385, Grimm conjectures that the former is correct because the culprit is already veiled in smoke before entering the furnace.

60–64 are blurred.

68. In front of rector, dom (=dominus) is crossed out.

76. Non crossed out at the beginning of the line.

79. In the space between nares and truncate, abscei—is erased.

86. me was originally mei.

97. The first three lines of 24² are blurred by an imprint of other writing.

IX. What is preserved (page 28¹) is on a mere clipping of parchment about 12 cm wide and 4 cm high. As far as flebat (l. 8) the writing runs across the page, the other eight lines were in the margin, there having been two verses on each line of writing. But only the front half of every other verse is preserved, the rest is cut away.

2. My conjecture.

5. me is written in above.

X. The reverse of the same mere snippet (page 28) as far as what we call l. 26, followed by a full page (29), containing 30 lines plus 19 more crowded into the right margin, then followed in turn by 29, which is just as crowded. A modern note at the top of 29 indicates that the page was purchased by Schmeller from Docen's estate.

3. The s of quis above the line.

7. Dum seems originally to have been Qui.

8–26 were in the right margin (see on Chap. IX above), but again only the front half of every other line is preserved.

8. My conjecture.

10. The o of quos is above the q.

29. is badly blurred.

30. A considerable gap between ouat and in (erasure).

31. One n of cachinnus is above the line.

41–47. All the fish names in these lines are capitalized. In l. 41 and 42 the fish names are underlined in red, as are uuabra (l. 43), asco, rinanch (l. 46), and agapus (l. 47), but tincus and barbatulus (with the s over the u) in l. 41 are underlined in what appears to be black, very faint ink.

49. In each margin a P; on the right there are two vertical strokes over it.

50. After this, two lines are erased.

58. My conjecture.

60. For sed, Langosch has the misprint se.

67. My conjecture.

71. My conjecture.

73. My conjecture.

74. Postmodo is Laistner's plausible conjecture.

75. In the right margin after illas (l. 74), crowded in diagonally.

76. My conjectural attempt to finish what is in itself very faint.

78 ff. Another very crowded but on the whole quite legible page (29), in two different inks, containing 55 lines, some of the 20 marginal ones partly cut off.

91. The last two letters of mouendo are written above, to save more margin.

102. nimium, in the margin, takes the place of serio (seriously).

114. Lukka underlined in red.

130. Mantel underlined in red.

131. My conjecture.

XI. This chapter has come down to us only in the St. Florian copy. Together with part of Chapter XII (see below) it forms a folded double parchment leaf (F 11–1 and F 21–3). See Introduction, p. 1. It was first published by Moritz Haupt in Exempla poesis Latinae medii aevi (1834). As for the first leaf (i.e., Chapter XI): The first two lines (XI, 1 and 2) are badly browned; to a less extent the bottom two of the first page (XI, 34 and 35); badly browned are also the first two lines of the second page (XI, 38 and 39). Lines 2, 6, and 62 have indentation marks in black ink in the left margin, while ll. 14, 20, 25, 30, 46, and 68 have red and black indentation marks in the same margin. In ll. 14, 20, 25, and 30 each initial letter also has a red line in it. In the right margin are the following: Between ll. 7 and 12, written in black ink from top to bottom, in a later hand, a smudged, illegible word (Cumias)?; l. 14, in red ink: XXXVI; l. 20, in red ink; XXXVII; l. 25, in red ink: XXXVIII; l. 30, in red ink: XXXVIIII; l. 46, in red ink: XL, and before it a red indentation mark; l. 62, in red ink: XLI, and before it a red indentation mark; l. 68, in red ink: XLII, and before it a red indentation mark.

There are many worm holes and cuts in the leaf F 1, and its second page (F 1') has numerous blots and smudges on its lower half. It measures 19 1/2 by 14 cm.
1. My conjecture. *satis* was Seiler’s conjecture. Haupt and Schmeller have
the metrically impossible *illae*.

4. Corrected from *quid* to *quod* (qd to qd).

7. There is a gap (erasure) between *resi*- and *-deni*. Haupt and Schmeller
read *datum*.

8. *fiunt* was originally *sunt* (so Haupt and Schmeller).

9. The manuscript, as well as Haupt, Schmeller, and Seiler, all have
*subierunt*. Laistner and Langosch arbitrarily write *subiere*, to save the leonine
rhyme.

11. *non* and *sileure* are run together.

13. A mark after the *-d of quid* to separate it from the next word, *omne*.
Similarly in l. 14 between *in* and *domicella*.

14. *limpha stat* was originally *aqua stant* (so Haupt and Schmeller).

16. The *t of Ut* is very faint over the line.

19. Haupt and Schmeller read *quae* for *qui*. The manuscript has a space
between *ad* and *hiabant*.

22. The *-i of qui* and the *es* are significantly an erasure. The author was
troubled by the hiatus but offers no solution. *-lis of the last word is also in an
erasure.

29. The *t of *fiuiiiset* was added.

31. The manuscript runs *In* and *qua* together, with the *a* above, as it does
*si* and *plus* in l. 29.

36f. Here F 1* should begin, but apparently two lines were cut away.

38. Completed by Seiler, the entire line is very indistinct. See introduc-
tory note to this Chapter, above.

41. Originally *neunas*, corrected.

44. *taciti* faintly corrected from *tanti*.

46. A letter erased between *s* and *c* in *poscit*.

53. The *n of cernitur*, also the first *a of natasse* were corrected.

61. The *a of sermocinare* inserted above the line.

63. There were two *ns* in *anuslus*, but the first seems to have been erased.

The latter part of *dometur* is on a blot.

66. Only the *H of Haece* is visible; there is a blot on the rest of the word.

67–70. The unclear letters are on a long smudge.

71. *intro* makes sense but looks more like *inis* or *inut*, while *fuerat* is on a
cut.

72. Haupt and Schmeller have *nisi* for *ni*.

XII, 5. The latter half on an erasure.

11. *habet* on an erasure, with the syllable *-rat* still visible.

32. All but the last two words are partly cut away, but Schmeller made the
line out.

33. This line opens 26*4, which contains the rest of the chapter. Through l.
66 the text reads down, with the front half of the lines cut away. Then there
seem to be about nine lines missing at the bottom, and in the right margin
are lines now known as 67–90.

73. Completed by Seiler in his notes.

78. The name *Ruodlieb* is written as in V, 223 (see these Notes).

Here and in l. 84 below it is underlined in red.

83. My conjecture, as is l. 85.

XIII. The Munich scrap known as 27*1 (8 by 5 cm), contains only the first
nine lines and bears a note that Schmeller purchased it from Docen’s estate.
Lines 10–81 (except 45 and 46) are in the St. Florian copy (see general
Introduction and these Notes on Chapter XI), while fragments of ll. 31–38
(the second half) and the first half of the odd lines from 39–55 are also in the
Munich codex (the scrap known as 27*2). The missing lines in the Munich
codex (like ll. 45–46 in the St. Florian manuscript) have been cut away.
Line 46, it is to be noted, is missing entirely. The St. Florian leaf, F², has its outside margin and a little of the writing cut off and, while the same length as F¹ (194 cm.), is only 9½ cm. wide. In the left margin, 11, 18 and 24 have indentation marks in black ink, while ll. 33 and 41 have red and black indentation marks in that margin. The first letters of ll. 18 and 33 have red marks on them. The first two lines (10 and 11) are badly browned, as is the first line of F 2² (47). In the right margin of F 2², l. 56 has an indentation mark and the numeral LXX, all in red ink, while l. 77 has an indentation mark and LXXI, also in red. Like F 1, this leaf has many worm holes and cuts.

1. My conjecture. At least three syllables are needed before scābit (the preterite form): – – –. Seiler has a misprint (plus for pilus), and the symbol at the end of the line is not a question mark, as he believed; it curves in the opposite direction.

6. Exierant butinam corrected from Exierat e butina.

10. This line, the first in F 2¹, is quite illegible. A heavy black ink spot to the right makes matters worse. My conjecture.

12. matriis is on a cut, as is velut.


19. The manuscript clearly reads uno, not una, despite the editors.

21. Above monedula the gloss taha.

23. Perspaciens corrected from Perspaciens. The a of mensam is repeated above.

30. sanum corrected from samum by erasure.

31. Haupt and Schmeller have consuletur (F.)

35. What is left of the line in M is quite blurred.

36. conclue corrected from concluere (F).

39. In M (27⁺) chrusinis is underlined red.

40. The -cis– in nancissebatur occurs twice in F. The last word of the line is on a hole.

41. peras blurred in M.

42. Extrahat corrected from Extrahit (F).

45. Seiler has nunc for modo, Schmeller merely n . . (M).

49. The last two letters of dissecat (Schmeller: –et) are missing because of a hole in F.

52. –tos should be –tas (F).

56. We write Ruotlieb because F always writes the name so. See also l. 78 below.

58. The second i of mimtim is repeated above; the whole word again in the right margin.

60. A period after –stupuit.

69. The –are of the second word corrected from –ere (or –aere).

70. No question mark in the manuscript.

77. The h of haec on a hole. The letter before –denter looks like n.

78. The h of hac above the line.

80. The c of quiquid on an erasure.

XIV, 2. Quidam corrected from Partim.

3. The a of quando above the line.

4. Laistner errs: the manuscript has vos.

6. Both venisset and stetissent have been corrected.

10. A vertical erasure in the right margin down to l. 16.

20. In the right margin of ll. 20 f. the first three words of l. 22 are repeated, quod twice. Lines 21 and 26 are joined by a curved line at the left.

34 ff. through l. 49 are in the right margin, written from the bottom up, eight lines of two verses each, set off by periods and capitals.

49. After this line, which is quite blurred, one verse is cut from the top of 30².
50. My conjecture.
79. quantumcunque changed from quantumque, with the tum written above, and t changed to c.
87 ff. The last thirteen verses are in the margin, taking up 6½ lines. Beneath them are a bar of music, with the syllables cu – ras under it, the date 1494, the words Unum est quod spero (there is one thing I hope), and a proper name (M. Sagker).
90. Possibly it is Ruohlief, with d and l run together.
94. The editors write spinthra, contrary to the manuscript.
XV, 13 f. In the manuscript the order of the verses is 12, 15–17, 13, 14, 18, etc., but 13–14 are marked to go up after 12. Perhaps the author copied the present manuscript from an earlier, rougher draft, and the fact that ll. 14 and 15 both begin with Stat caused his eye to roam, so that after l. 12 he skipped to ll. 15–17 before noting that he had omitted 13 and 14. Schmeller changes the order to 11, 13, 14, 12, 15, etc.
17. The editors write succi, contrary to the manuscript.
18. After nates, sibi is crossed out. Seiler conjectured that there was a qui in the right margin (now cut off) to replace it.
26. Calculata, indented, on an erasure. uluti above between fabas and pullum.
28. laxa was originally arta (narrow). ligo ceu over nimis (underlined, i.e., deleted).
35. is cut off from the top of 25².
36. celsior corrected from cluior.
42. My conjecture.
44. tussi added in the right margin.
59. non to be inserted from the right margin.
60 f. My conjectures.
63. I follow Loewenthal’s conjecture. The first visible letter is n, not m, which eliminates Laistner’s Haec nam lex domat . . . , accepted by Langosch.
XVI, 11. From here on through XVII, 31 (bottom of leaf 32) the ink is mostly darker.
23. After praetermittam an erasure and space.
25. After suscepti, Seiler’s –que sibi sunt is definitely wrong. The new conjecture is mine. –nim shows on the right end. All the printed texts incorrectly read ventunt.
33. Heavy black lines under laudem and omni.
34. An incision at the bottom of the leaf (31) cuts off the –am of vitam.
35. This is the first line of 31², almost completely cut off. Only the bottom of the letters is discernible. Seiler’s conjecture.
45. A period after –cta.
47. amodi is in an erasure, as is all of l. 48.
XVII, 13. The last letter of vvunne (?) is crossed out, and an a inserted above.
33 ff. Schmeller did not attempt to complete ll. 33–39, 41–42, 47–50, 53–61, and 64.
34. Quite blurred.
37 f. remeat and fuerint are conjectures of Docen, adopted by Seiler.
49. My conjecture.
51. remeat is my conjecture instead of Schmeller’s abscedit because I sense –at, not –it.
52. illum corrected from illam.
55. For little reason Seiler was doubtful about haesita. The writer seems to have started a t after the final a.
56. Actually there seems to be an i before -se.
57–59. All three conjectures are mine.
64 f. These two lines, legible to Seiler, are now badly blurred.
83. The Ne- of Nunc is in a brownish red smudge. In the left margin: Ro (with a v above the o).
85. Here and in 87, curiously enough, ruodlieb has a small r; also in XVIII, 30.
103. Langosch has a misprint; instead of the last two words, the last two of l. 104 are anticipated.
127. An N in the left margin.
128. The a of da repeated above.
XVIII, 5. me on an erasure (non -oc still visible), as are all of l. 10 (eius . . . heres . . . superstes visible), resoluau in l. 13 (resorue visible), occidendus in l. 14, and regn- in l. 18.
8. The capital I of Immunch was corrected to J in darker ink. From l. 13 on the ink is heavily black, the I of lucranda (l. 12) is also traced in blacker ink.
Page 34* contains epigrams 5–11 (see Introduction, p. 4). The manuscript is accompanied by 18 pages of the text (not in sequence) copied in Docen’s hand.
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