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1.- Paris B.N. Lat. 7517, 12th century, fol. 1r ......lxxvii
In the establishment of the text of the first twenty-six folia of the Paris B.N. Lat. 7517, which as yet is the only ms. containing PC’s works, I have tried to adhere to the principles and methods of textual criticism outlined by Paul Maas in his book *Textual Criticism*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1958. As far as the apparatus criticus is concerned, I have in the main limited it to the listing of words incorrectly written in the manuscript and marginalia. I do not list all the instances of words written with an e for ae or oe, since this is the usual practice of the scribe, occurring in over ninety per cent of the cases. However, when ae or oe is written as such in the manuscript, this is noted in the apparatus as well as all cases where minuscule v is employed for u. Note that the latter is the chief use. Majuscule V is used. In accordance with Paul Maas’s principles, I have endeavored to correct the manuscript, which is the codex unicus, according to what I believe to be the author’s intention, based on a study of the ideas and regular usage of the author. There are times, however, when I have not emended if the particular reading as it stands is a significant
representation of PC's understanding of a certain grammatical principle or of a line of poetry cited.

I have written the notes in the apparatus criticus in English, following the practice of Mario Esposito in his edition Itinerarium Symonis Semeonis Ab Hybernia Ad Terram Sanctam, Dublin, The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1960. In the apparatus criticus I first refer to the relevant word by paragraph number followed by a comma and then the number of the sentence of the established text. Then comes the word underlined, which is followed by the exact reference in the 7517. Manuscript references, unless otherwise stated, always refer to the 7517.

Usually I have punctuated PC's text and the other sections of this thesis according to the principles outlined in the MLA style sheet (1968 edition), and I use the reference words and abbreviations found on p. 18 - 20 of this style sheet. I have followed the principles outlined in R.H. Shevenell's Research and Theses, Ottawa, Univ. of Ottawa Press, 1963 for footnoting, format, and bibliography. The abbreviations of pagan and Christian authors with their works are based on those appearing in the T.L.L., 1, 1-109 (1900 edition). The abbreviations for the periodicals are those in the 1967 edition of the Année Philologique, p. XV - XXIX.

The question of orthography in this edition presents a
problem. On one hand we have those who, like Mario Esposito in his *Itinerarium Synonis* ... Ad *Terram Sanctam* and Bengt Lüfstedt in his edition of *Malsachanus*, adopt the particular spelling of the manuscript with its mediaeval orthographical characteristics depending on the period such as e for ae and oe, i for e and *vice versa*, f for ph, and y for i. On the other hand, there are those, like Cora Lutz (see her edition *Remigii Autissiodorensis Commentum in Martianum Capellam*, Leiden, Brill, 1962), who employ classical orthography in the editions of mediaeval writings. The ms. of PC though exhibiting mediaeval orthographical peculiarities, does show a knowledge of classical spellings. Therefore, I have adopted the orthography of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, 1968 - 1969, fasc. 1 - 2 and have employed the spellings of the T.L.L. and the Latin Dictionary of Lewis and Short (1962 publication) where the O.L.D. is lacking. For Late Latin words not appearing in any of these dictionaries, I have used F.K. Niermeyer's *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, Leiden, Brill, 1954 - 1964, fasc. 1 - 11 and the *Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch, Bis zum Aussgehenden 13. Jahrhundert*, edited by Otto Prinz, vol. 1, Munich, Beck, 1967.

In rare instances I have maintained the mediaeval spelling for good reasons usually listed in the commentary. However, in order that my text of PC's grammatical treatise have some usefulness for a philologist I have listed the peculiar spellings, aside from the e for ae kind, in the *apparatus criticus*. It is
to be understood that any word with ae or oe in the text has e in the ms. Those instances when ae or oe does appear correctly in the ms. have been noted in the apparatus criticus. I have left PC's Greek words written with Roman letters as such, since nowhere in the 7517 does any Greek letter appear.

I have divided PC's text into numbered paragraphs and sentences. At the beginning of each paragraph appears a number separated by three typed spaces from the first sentence in that paragraph. In referring to a paragraph and sentence, the number of the paragraph first appears followed by a comma which is then followed by the number of the sentence; for example, 55, 3 means paragraph 55 sentence 3. Division by folium in the text is shown by two diagonal lines and marked in the margin where it occurs. Roman numerals are transcribed as such.

The section of the thesis called Fontes et Testimonia (separate for the prologus) is an attempt to list the probable sources from which PC has drawn his material as well as a few later mss: which offer the same treatments. In this latter case the grammatical treatise on Donatus of Sedulius Scottus (f1. 848 - 859) is chiefly involved, whose treatise is preserved in the B.M. Arundel 43 of the thirteenth century.¹ In the presentation of the Fontes et Testimonia each separate reference within the same paragraph or sentence is separated
from the other by a semi-colon. A colon precedes a reference. To alleviate the strain and monotony on the reader's eye I have written the abbreviations of authors' names in capital letters, which practice is followed in the Commentary. However, in the Commentary an author's name may also be written in full with the normal practice of the first letter being a capital and the succeeding ones in small type; hence, Sedulius instead of SED. I have attempted to list the possible sources and testimony as far as possible in chronological order. In the case of unpublished material, prime consideration is given to the date of the codex. As a rule, those references identified by the abbreviation cf. denote a text similar enough to PC's to indicate that he used it directly with only a few minor changes. Many of these 'cf.' references concern texts in Donatus, Sedulius, Remigius, Muridac, and Priscian. A reference marked v. indicates that a text is somewhat less related, that is, although it may have similar ideas or the same ideas, these are presented in such a manner that there is some notable change in wording. There is some use of the lemma technique similar to that found in Servius and the Donatan commentaries by Remigius, Sedulius Scottus, and Muridac. A Lemma is indicated by an absence of any sign. Thus, 65, 4-7: DON., 355, 6-7 indicates that paragraph 65 sentences 4-7 are exactly the same text appearing in Donatus (Keil's edition), p. 355, lines 6-7. A reference marked 'see'
means that special attention ought to be brought to whatever source or testimony cited. Moreover, I have intended that the Fontes et Testimonia be consulted together with the Commentary, that is, in the latter section whenever a particular source or testimony is dealt with, the exact reference to this author is that which is found in the corresponding place of the Fontes et Testimonia; for instance, in the Commentary for 138, 2 where I speak about Priscian, I have intended that the reader consult the Fontes et Testimonia for paragraph 138, the whole of which is referred to PRIS., 2, 538, 1 - 17 and to PROBUS CA., 39, 26. So, sentence 2 of 138 obviously has a reference. However, in order to avoid confusion there are times when an exact reference is repeated in the Commentary which is already in the Fontes et Testimonia. In quoting codices other than the 7517 I adhere strictly to the ms. spelling but punctuate and capitalize according to English language usage.

In the section called Commentary I am chiefly concerned with PC's relationship to the possible sources listed in the Fontes, that is, to what degree he has borrowed from them and above all which of the possible sources is the closer or the closest to PC compared with the others. To substantiate these arguments I have tried to quote significant texts. Also, I deal with PC's statements—their degree of conformity with the statements of the other grammarians and their relationship with the sources and
Moreover, in this section I call attention to possible neologisms and difficult phrases. Part of the Commentary is devoted to a summary or paraphrase of the contents, or to a translation of difficult phrases. In the Commentary to the Prologus the discussion is chiefly concerned with a thematic explanation and a comparison with other prologues of didactic works of the twelfth century.

The Index Nominum et Rerum et Verborum is according to strict alphabetical order as well as the other indices to the combined text of the Prologus and the grammatical treatise. In the Index Locorum Classicorum atque Vulgatae are listed all references to quotations from the Classical authors and from the Vulgate. In the index of Greek words that appear in the manuscript written in Roman letters I have included even those words erroneously conceived as Greek. In the left-hand side of this index of Greek or pseudo-Greek words appears the Greek word as it is found in the text, and in the right-hand side I have written what the correct equivalent should be. The letters ū and ṝ are considered the same in the indexing.
INTRODUCTION

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CAMALDOLITES
FROM THEIR ORIGINS TO THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

The monastery of Camaldoli, situated thirty miles southeast of Florence and at a short distance from Arezzo, \(^2\) was founded by a St. Romuald in 1012. \(^3\) Romuald was a novice of the Benedictines, \(^4\) and his mission was to reform the Benedictine monasteries in several provinces and to create hermitages for vocations more especially penitent and contemplative. \(^5\) According to Romuald the chief occupation of the hermit was to remain in the cell and to devote time to reading and to prayer, in which pursuits the spiritual intelligence had to occupy as much place as possible. \(^6\) According to Hieronymus Pragensis's account of the founding of the monastery Camaldoli given in Bollandus and Henschenius, p. 103 the name Camaldoli for the monastery came about in the following way. While Romuald was ascending a very high mountain in the Apennines looking for an ideal spot for a monastery, a certain man named Maldulus came running to him and offered him a pleasant area which Maldulus called Campus-bellus. Maldulus offered this location to Romuald on the condition that it be called henceforth Camaldolus. Romuald accepted his offer,
having seen a vision of white-robed monks descending and ascending a ladder to heaven, and subsequently built a church there which a bishop named Theodaldus Arethinus consecrated. Around this church were cells constructed for monks.

Also in Bollandus and Henschenius, _loc. cit._, is recorded the account of Augustinus Florentinus (fl. 1575) who states that while Romuald was making his way through the Apennines he came to a pleasant spot called _Campus Malduli_ popularly meaning _speciosus et amabilis_ and named after a citizen of Arethinum. After he had rested there and had experienced the vision of the monks of the ladder as reported by Hieronymus Pragensis, he decided to begin a congregation there. He then descended and met Maldulus who owned this land. Romuald succeeded in converting Maldulus who then donated his goods and land to this cause, becoming Romuald's disciple. Hélyot (p. 156), however, criticizing these traditional accounts says that Maldolus was not the one who donated this land but Theodaldus in 1027. (Three major historians who deal with the history of the Camaldolite order and whose works are scrutinized by Hélyot are Maurolic, Guido Grandi and Mabillon in his _Annales Bénédictines._)

Monastic life under Romuald was strict. He taught his monks to live three days a week on bread and water, to recite the Psalter in song every day, to observe silence, to endure flagellation in the cells, to repent, to genuflect _often_ , to pray
in tears, and to shun the world while wearing the lowliest clothing. 7 Hieronymus Pragensis (Bollandus and Henschenius, p. 138), however, gives the following reported speech by Romuald who shows leniency towards the newcomer:

Ingressus autem cellulam, non statim omnem consuetudinis Regulam permittatur inplere; sed diu quaerat, quod difficulter inventum, carius teneat. ... si quando de saeculari habitu aliquid converti voluerit ad eremum, nolite ei juxta monasterii normam ardua quaæque dura vel aspera proponere: quia adhuc fragilis mens, a rigore eremiticae vitae facilius frangitur, etiamsi levis injuriae summotenus occasio praebetur: .... Sed si devotio vera patuerit, in eremo, quam flagitat, conversationis ei aditus statim pateat.

After Romuald died in 1027 Peter Daguinus became the prior of the Camaldolites, and upon him Theodaldus Aretinus confirmed the donation which he had made to Romuald of the Church of the Sanctus Salvator on the mountain top where Romuald had constructed five cells and an oratory which Theodaldus had consecrated. 8 In confirming the area of Camaldoli for Romuald and his disciples Theodaldus gave to them half of the church of St. Miniat in the village of Alina along with the tithes from Alina. In 1033 Theodaldus accorded to the eremites of Camaldoli the tithe of all the goods bought and sold in Arezzo, and four years later, Immon, Theodaldus's successor, confirmed all of
these donations. The Camaldolite order was officially approved in 1072 by Pope Alexander II, and according to his bulla there were nine monasteries of this order in that year. The original one at Camaldoli is referred to as Campus amabilis. The prior of Campus amabilis was the general of the entire order, and his office was a perpetual one. After Peter Daguinus came Albizzi, then Rustici and Rodolphus.

Until Rodolphus drew up the first constitutions of the Camaldolite order in 1102, the ermite rule established by Peter Damianus for the monastery of Avellana which was founded around 1000 by Ludolphus, a disciple of Romuald, prevailed. The two monasteries of Avellana and Camaldoli under Damianus's rule joined in mutual association, dress and hospitality. Indeed, Damianus had great influence over many other monasteries founded by Romuald, and the persuasive eloquence of Peter Damianus was a prime factor for the widespread influence of the monasteries of Camaldoli and neighboring Vallombrosa in the north of Italy. These two monasteries were together famous for combatting the evils of simony among the higher clergy.

Notable among the notable rulings of Rodolphus was the modification to a small extent of the old rigor of the order. He abrogated the practice of living on bread and water for three days a week and ordered that the sick in the hermitage be cared for in the monastery of Fontebuono. This monastery had
originally been built in Romuald's time as a guest house at the foot of the mountain upon which was situated the hermitage.\textsuperscript{17} Under Rodolphus the order grew considerably. In a letter of Pope Adrian IV written in 1154 to Rodolphus a total of forty-five monasteries, hermitages and churches were placed under the direction of the prior of Camaldoli.\textsuperscript{18} He obtained from Pope Pascal II the confirmation of the goods and of the monasteries given by Pascal's predecessors, chiefly the monasteries and goods of Poppiàne of Prato – Vecchio, of St. Salvator, of St.Martin, of St. Friar of Pisa and of Anghiari. He also instituted the order of the Camaldolite nuns in 1086.\textsuperscript{19} In 1105 Rodolphus made new regulations which were still less rigorous.\textsuperscript{20} Further modifications occurred in 1174. The subsequent priors made additional modifications of the great austerity of this order: under Martin in 1254 and Bonaventura in 1353.\textsuperscript{21}
INTRODUCTION -  

PC'S LIFE AND WORKS

PREVIOUS STUDIES ON PC

The most extensive note on PC is that found in Charles Thurot, *Extrait de divers manuscrits latins, pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au Moyen Age*, Paris, 1869 (reprint Frankfurt am Main, Minerva, 1964), 540 pp. *passim*. Thurot (p. 24 - 25) briefly says that PC was an Italian Camaldolite monk who lived during the twelfth century and that he (Thurot) has found nothing on PC in the *Annales Camaldulenses*. Thurot notes that PC composed a work where he treats the parts of speech, metrics and the art of writing letters, and subsequently cites the opening and closing passages of each of these sections. On p. 6 Thurot notes that PC drew all of the questions appearing in his grammatical treatise from the ms. Paris B.N. 7491 A. This ms. he considers anonymous and to have been written by someone from Auxerre. However, in my Commentary and *Fontes et Testimonia* I will show that this is not the case, that many times grammatical questions in the 7491 A which are similar to comparable ones in PC's treatise are not as close to PC as certain grammatical
questions in the Donatus commentary of Sedulius Scottus in B.M. Arundel 43, in C.M. 14488, and even in Vat. Reg. 1586. Furthermore, PC's grammatical questions of the type "A r m a quae pars orationis est?" are not to be found in the 7491 A. The authorship of the 7491 A and of the 1586 is attributed to Muridac by Bengt Lüfstedt in his Grammatiker Malsachanus, Uppsala, 1965, p. 74. On p. 76 Thuot tries to show that PC's grammatical treatise is representative of the grammatical treatises of the eleventh century, although appearing to have been written in the twelfth century because it shares none of the speculative grammatical influences that deeply affected grammar after the middle of the twelfth century. In my Commentary and Fontes et Testimonia I will point out how PC draws his material from the "auctores," the Late Latin grammarians, Remigius, Muridac, the C.M. 14488, the Ars Anonyma Bernensis, and Sedulius Scottus. On p. 90 and 91 Thuot points out that in the twelfth century at Bologna the teaching of law was done by the grammarians and that the study of law was connected with the study of rhetoric or more particularly so with the Ars dictandi or Ars dictaminis. Thuot calls special attention to PC's practice of joining an Ars dictaminis to his grammatical treatise. Thuot also states (p. 36, 90 and 91) that the grammatical works of the thirteenth century Boncompagnus, a professor of grammar at the University of Bologna, have rapport with the Ars dictandi. Elsewhere in his
book Thuot's discussions on PC concern the latter's treatise on versification. Thuot, by citing significant passages from the 7517 and comparing them with passages from other mss., tries to show how typical PC's teachings on versification are of the twelfth century.

Over sixty years later Max Manitius's Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, vol. 3, Munich, Beck, 1931, p. 182 - 183 does little more than abridge what Thuot says concerning PC's treatises on grammar, versification, and the art of letter writing. However, on p. 183 Manitius appears to have either seen the mss. or used the mss. catalogues, for he treats in more detail than Thuot that part of the 7517 called the Registrum (59⁷ - 85⁶) which is a register of letters in three books pertaining to the Papacy. These are not authentic letters by or to Popes but rather seem to be an elaboration by PC, but for that reason are no less interesting than the originals. Concerning the first letter which deals with the preëminence and sublimity of the Apostolic See against those who are not well disposed towards it, Manitius (p. 183) states that this might either refer to the time of Paschal II or Eugenius III. On that same page Manitius says in conclusion that somewhere the letters have Zeitkolorit and may very easily throw light on PC's era. On p. 1059 (vol. 3) Manitius places PC's date around 1178, but does not substantiate this on p. 183 by citing from these
"Papal" letters events that point to that date. In fact these letters given by PC are not dated nor addressed to anyone.

However, this first letter which Manitius states might refer either to the era of Paschal II or Eugenius III is assigned to an Adrianus. If PC is writing in the twelfth century, which Thurot and Manitius admit, one might suppose that PC has Adrianus IV in mind who was the only Pope of the twelfth century with this name. But I have not been able to ascertain whether any of the letters assigned to Adrianus pertain to Adrianus IV. Nor have I been able to verify that the letters assigned to a Lucius pertain to either of the two twelfth century Popes Lucius II (reigned 1144 - 1145) or Lucius III (reigned 1181 - 1185). Also the letters assigned to a Gregorius might or might not pertain to Gregorius VIII who reigned in 1187. Moreover, Manitius's proposed date of 1178 falls within the Papacy of Alexander III; but I have not been able to locate any historical event within the letters to prove this.

As for the Zeitkolorit to which Manitius alludes, in the letter assigned to Lucius on 75° with the heading Ad Pontifices uel Alios Quoslibet pro Causis Committendis appears the following (lines 31 - 32) concerning a controversy that had arised between two monasteries: "Inde est siquidem quod controversiam quae inter canonicos Sancti Fidriani [sic for Fridiani or Frigdiani] et dilectos filios nostros Sancti Donati diutius est agitata ...."
The monasteries referred to here are probably San Donato in Lucca of the Tuscany region and that of St. Fridian in Lucca, which monastery in the year 1154 was placed under the prior of Camaldoli according to a letter of Adrianus IV (PL, vol. 188, col. 1397). There is a monastery San Donato in Lucca mentioned in Cottineau's Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés col. 1671. In vol. 2 of the Regesto di Camaldoli, p. 179 appears a letter of Pope Eugenius to Açonus, prior of Camaldoli, dated February 7, 1147. In this letter Eugenius confirms to Açonus the goods and privileges which the monastery of Camaldoli had received from Popes Honorius and Innocent. Among these goods is the church called St. Donatus. However, I have not been able to ascertain the date or special circumstances of this controversy. On 76r in lines 6 - 7 of a letter assigned to Lucius and dealing with the same topic as cited above appears the following note: "Inde est quod controversiae distantiam que inter dilectos et venerabiles filios nostros ecclesie Lucane canonicos et honestum sancti Fridiani conuentum super quibusdam parochianis tam uiiis quam defunctis agitari noscitur ...." In lines 21 - 23 we read in another letter under the same heading: "Inde siquidem procedit quae controversiam inter canonicos sancti Martini dilectos filios nostros et venerabile sancti Fridiani clerum diutius agitatam uuestre laudabili prouidentie dirigimus ...." It appears likely that sanctus Martinus and ecclesia Lucana are one and the same because in four letters by Innocent II (letters 297 - 300, in the PL,
vol. 179, cols. 344 - 346) Innocent II is concerned about the activities of the priests and canons of the church of Sanctus Martinus Lucensis who are putting pressure upon the brothers of the monastery of St. Fridianus to obtain possession of a church of St. Pantaleon that had already been entrusted to the monastery of St. Fridian by the Papacy. In another letter assigned to Lucius on 697 under the heading Pro Praelatis ut Se Inuicem Vient Informandis one reads in lines 19 ff.: "Quo contra peruenit ad nos qui parotheni [sic] uestri bona possessiones ecclesie Sancti Martini Lucensis episcopatus frequenter offendunt, et ea nullatenus in pace manere permittunt." In fact, there might be a correlation between letter 300 of Innocent II (dated January 1138) and a letter assigned to Gregorius on 84x 21 - 23 which deals with the illegal acquisition of the brothers addressed in this letter of possessions belonging to the brothers of St. Fridian. PC writes: "Quorundem relationem nostras peruenit ad auraes [sic] quasdam possessiones ignorantie prorsus a cremenate fratrum suorum capitulo uos a priore Sancti Fridiani minus dimidio iusti pretii quod fieri non licet emisse." Innocent II addresses certain clergymen and priests of the church of Sanctus Martinus Lucensis (col. 345): "Perlatum est ad auras nostras quod institutioni quam de S. Pantaleonis Ecclesia fecimus committendo eam S. Fridiani canonicis, contraitis." Three letters by Paschal II (PL, vol. 163, col. 431) refer to a controversy between the clerics of St. Fridian and St. Martin of Lucca that took place during
his reign from 1099 - 1118. On the other hand, a letter by
Pope Clemens III found on p. 437 of vol. 3 of Paul Kehr's Italia
Pontificia, dated 1187 - 1191 and addressed to the clergy of this
monastery of St. Fridian reads thus:

Clemens III prohibet priori et fratribus, quominus
possessiones et thesauros ecclesiae, nisi pro manifeste necessitate
et consideratione maioris commodi, absque consilio et sanioris
partis capituli distrahere possint.

As for PC's references to the quarrels between the monasteries
of St. Martin and St. Fridian, I need to mention that the latest
twelfth century date for a controversy between these two
monasteries which I have been able to find is in an act dated
August 9, 1173 in vol. 2 of the Regesto del Capitolo di Lucca
(vol. 9 of the series Regesta Chartarum Italiae published 1912)
p. 189 - 192. This act alludes to a controversy over the celebration
of the festivals of St. Martin, St. Regulus, Easter, the Mass, the
festivals of the saints Fridian and Laurentius, the rites for the
deceased, and the consecration of two chapels.

The following five authors mention PC to a small extent.
Ulysse Chevalier's note (Répertoire des sources historiques du
Moyen Age, vol. 2, Paris, Picard, 1907, col. 3536) on PC reads
thus: "Paul, moine CAMALDULE, littérat., XIII° s." I have come
to the conclusion that XIII° is a typographical error for XII°
since Chevalier's only reference is to Thurot. Karl Polheim (Die Lateinische Reimprosa, Berlin, Weidmann, 1963, p. 431) citing Thurot, p. 452 notes in his chapter on the high point in the history of rhymed prose that PC uses *ad similitudinem leonis* with examples in his treatment of the leonine rhyme.

J. De Ghellinck (L'Essor de la littérature latine au XIIe siècle, Brussels and Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1955, p. 268) only makes brief mention of the works of PC, noting that he explains in a second-hand manner Priscian and Donatus.

Bernhard Bischoff in his article on Muridae ("Ein Irischer Grammatiker des IX. Jahrhunderts," in Celtica, vol. 5, issue of 1960, p. 44) says that Paulus Camaldulensis did not write before the last third of the twelfth century. This statement he substantiates with a footnote to Carl Erdmann ("Leonitas, Zur Mittelalterlichen Lehre von Kursus, Rhythmus und Reim," in Corona Quernea, Festgabe Karl Strecker, Leipzig, Hiersemann, 1941, p. 19) who makes this observation. Erdmann does not adduce palaeographical evidence, however, to substantiate this claim. He merely states that he has seen a greater part of a photocopy of the 7517, and has concluded that it is of the thirteenth century. Nevertheless, in his article which deals with the development and history of the leonine verse in the Middle Ages Erdmann refers to PC's use of the term *versus leonini* as a proof that this term appears somewhere between 1030 and 1200. Of course Erdmann cites other twelfth
century and early thirteenth century authors to strengthen this latter argument.

In the Regesto di Camaldoli, ed. by L. Schiaparelli and F. Baldasseroni, vol. 2, p. 202 appears the following entry containing a mention of a Paulus Camaldulensis, which entry, however, does not indicate that Paulus Camaldulensis the grammarian and the other Paulus are the same:

Donnus Almericus de Sasone cum ff. suis Carsilio et sasso cum aliis consortibus per se suosque heredes in perpetuum donaverunt donno Paulo monacho Cam. recipienti nomine donni Rodulphi prioris Cam., hospitale Cava de Collis cum omnibus rebus et possessionibus et iuribus suis, pos. in dyocesi Foropopiliensi.

The date of this transaction is July 13, 1152. Also, in the same volume on p. 292 appears the following entry dated September 2, 1192 with the mention of a Paulus Camaldulensis:


This entry is similar to the following one taken from
vol. 4, p. 148 of the Annales Camaldulenses, ed. by Mittarelli and Costadoni:

Berardus Anconitanus episcopus finem fecit hoc anno die secunda septembris Paulo monacho Camaldulensi recipienti pro eremo Camaldulensi et pro monasterio sanctae Helenae ad flumen Aesinum litium omnium et controversiarum ortarum occasione rerum, quas episcopus existimabat ad jus spectare ecclesiae suae; manu Pellegrini notarii. Plura siquidem bona et ecclesias possidebat monasterium sanctae Helenae in episcopatu Anconitano, ut videbimus anno 1199.

It is clear, however, that these last two entries do not show definitely that the Paulus Camaldulensis, the grammarian, is the Paulus Camaldulensis mentioned in conjunction with Berardus Anconitanus.

I have in addition checked the following sources for Camaldolite history and have found no mention of a Paulus Camaldulensis:


*Cenni storici del s. eremo di Camaldoli*, ..., Florence, S. Antonio, 1864.


--------, *Teatro storico del sacro eremo di Camaldoli*, ..., Lucca, 1723.


Lucas, Francisco, Romualdina, seu Eremetica Montis Coronae Camaldulensis Ordinis ..., Patavii, 1587.


Mabillon, Jean, Analecta Benedictina, vols. 4 – 6.

Mini, Tommaso, Le Vite de' santi Giovanni e Benedetto, discepoli del padre S. Romualdo, Florence, 1605.

Mugnotius, A., Eremi Camaldulensis Descriptio, Rome, 1570.


Razzi, Silvano, Vite de santi e beati toscani, Florence, Sermartelli, 1627.


**THE B.N. LAT. 7517**

The text of PC's grammatical treatise entitled the *Liber tam de Prisciano quam de Donato a Fratre Paulo Camaldulense Monacho Compositus* occupies *folia 1\textsuperscript{r} 12 - 26\textsuperscript{v} 9* of the Paris B.N. Lat. 7517. The prologue to the treatise is contained in *1\textsuperscript{r} to the first eleven lines of fol. 1\textsuperscript{v}. Folia 26\textsuperscript{v} 10 - 33\textsuperscript{v} 27 contain an *ars metrica* entitled *Introductiones de Notitia Versificandi*, which is followed by the introduction (33\textsuperscript{v} 28 - 34\textsuperscript{r} 15) to that part of PC's *ars metrica* called the *Exemplar de Notitia Longitudinis et Breuitatis quo Prime Syllabe Breues an Lange Sint* (34\textsuperscript{r} 16 - 54\textsuperscript{v} 33). This *Exemplar* consists of two parts. The first is a list of words drawn from pagan and Christian authors. A *b* for *breuis* is placed above certain syllables of these words, or an *l* for *longa*. These words are registered under the names of the authors who use them in their verses. The second part of this
Exemplar is a list of these verses for each of the following authors: Vergil, Horace, Juvenal, Persius, Lucan, Statius, Caelius Sedulius, Prudentius, Arator, Ovid, and Prosper. The first list is contained in fol. 34r 16 - 42r, and the second in 42r - 54v 33.

Then an ars dictaminis follows in fol. 54v 34 - 59r 27. In this ars PC constantly cites Horace's Ars Poetica. From fol. 59r 28 to the end of the manuscript (85v 36) one finds the Registrum of "Papal" letters.

The ms. is of parchment and appears to have been written in the twelfth century. It is preserved in a modern green binding, and on the spine of the binding is engraved IN GRAMAT PRISC ET DONATI. An extra folium has been attached to the inside of the front cover on the left side and has what appears to be in seventeenth or eighteenth century cursive script:

Fratris Pauli Monachi/ Camaldulensis commentarius/ in Priscianum et Donatum/ Eiusdem introductiones in Notitiam Versificandi/ Eiusdem introductiones dictandi/ Eiusdem de primatu et sublimitate Sedis apostolicae/ Codex annorum circ. 500

The red seal of the Bibliotheca Regia has been stamped at the bottoms of 1r and 85v, and at the bottom of the latter near the seal appears a note in a seventeenth or eighteenth century hand: "de hoc capitulo \| ea pars istius." On the blank page, which is the right-hand front cover of the manuscript opposite the extra
folium on the left side, appears the number 5\textsuperscript{2}13 at the upper right-hand corner, and towards the middle appears the number 7517 in what seems to be a seventeenth or eighteenth century hand.

The folia proper are 245 mm. long and 180 mm. wide. There are thirty-six lines of writing per page, each line of writing being close to seven mm. in height. The ruling seems to have been done by the indentation of a sharp point, and the prickings are continental. The minuscule letters in the manuscript are generally three mm. high, and the majuscules, outside of the decorated initials which I will describe in detail later and excluding other initials preceding paragraphs and changes of topic, run from five to twelve mm. in height. The large majuscule letters are Roman capitals, but on l\textsuperscript{v} 14 and q\textsuperscript{r} 33 the first few opening words beginning a discussion of a part of speech are uncials. The folia are so arranged that opposite pages are alternatingly both of the hair or flesh side of the parchment, fol. 1\textsuperscript{r} being hair, then l\textsuperscript{v} and 2\textsuperscript{r} being flesh and so forth. Each folium has a margin. On the recto side the right margin is thirty-five mm. wide; the bottom margin is thirty-three mm. wide; the top margin is twelve mm. wide and the left margin is twenty mm. wide. These measurements are the same for the verso side, but are exactly reversed. The ms. is easily readable except for a triangular incision on 80\textsuperscript{v} which was then covered up by a triangular piece of parchment on the recto side. The result is that portions of lines 31 - 35 on the recto side and 31 - 34 on the
verso side are cut out. There is a folium with the number 86 written in Arabic numerals at the upper right-hand corner, but the number is crossed out by a single diagonal stroke. This folium is merely a blank page with rulings. The entire ms. is numbered regularly in the upper right-hand corner on the recto side with Arabic numerals, but in the text only Roman numerals appear, and these in red ink. The text of the entire ms. is written in black ink which has turned brown in many places. Red ink is used for decorative strokes on initials and majuscules as well as for incipit's and explicit's. Initial capital letters are usually written with red ink, but there also occur those written in black ink with red strokes for decoration. Headings like Solutio and Quaestio, written in red ink, occur so frequently in the grammatical treatise. In the list of "Papal" letters the lines are alternatingly red, then black. The decorated initials, with the exception of the Ν on 17\textsuperscript{r} and the Ο on 48\textsuperscript{v}, are entirely red.

In the grammatical treatise are five decorated initials. These appear on 1\textsuperscript{r}, 1\textsuperscript{v}, 9\textsuperscript{r}, 16\textsuperscript{v}, and 17\textsuperscript{r}. In the rest of the manuscript appear decorated initials on 33\textsuperscript{v}, 59\textsuperscript{r}, 59\textsuperscript{v}, 53\textsuperscript{v}, 55\textsuperscript{r}, 62\textsuperscript{v}, 68\textsuperscript{v}, and 69\textsuperscript{r}. I shall describe these initials in the order listed.

On 1\textsuperscript{r} there is a V. The right-hand vertical stroke is 28 mm. long and 4 mm. wide, and there is a thin white line that
runs the length of this stroke. This white line is in reality
the unpainted portion of the parchment. The left-hand stroke of
this V is a curve, and the greatest width of the letter from the
extremity of the curve to the extremity of the vertical bar is
17 mm. Within the interior of the curved stroke, which thickens
at the center, appears a triangle made by the white of the
parchment. From the two bases of this triangle extend white lines
running nearly the length of the curved stroke of the V. The
greatest width of the curved stroke is 10 mm. In the well of the
V are two vine-like shapes that resemble sea-horses. They both
emanate from a central point on the curved left-hand stroke. The
one vine curves in an upward fashion, and it is 12 mm. in height.
The other vine curves in a downward fashion, and it is 11 mm.
long. From the upper left-hand side of the left-hand curved stroke
emanate three leaves. The maximum width of the right-hand vertical
stroke of the V is 5 mm. and the minimum is 3 mm.

On V appears a P. The length of the left-hand vertical
bar is 72 mm. long to a dot on the lower end where a vine begins
to sprout. There is a vine that trails off from the upper left-
hand corner at the tip of the vertical bar, and the distance
between the extremity of this vine and the extremity of the lower
vine is 150 mm. The greatest thickness of the vertical bar is
5 mm. The width of the paunch is 25 mm, and its length is 32 mm.
The right-hand curve forming the paunch thickens at the middle,
and this thickness is 10 mm. at the most. Within the paunch appear series of vines more complex than those in the previous initial described. One might notice a certain resemblance between the two vines in the paunch which (vines) sprout leaves and nearly form two complete circles to form an "8" (with one of the vines ending in a clover) and the interior of the A which begins the Book of Judith in the Stavelot Bible (British Museum, Add. Ms. 28107) of the period 1093 - 1097. The vines of this A also similarly sprout leaves and form a circle terminating in a clover. David Diringer (The Illuminated Book, Its History and Production, new ed., rev and aug., London, Faber & Faber, 1967, p. 438) observes that the Stavelot Bible is the most representative manuscript of the Flemish school of illumination at Stavelot.

Another pair of vines within the paunch are of the seahorse type which I have described. Running the length of the left-hand vertical bar of the P are two white lines parallel to each other and enclosing a red area. This design becomes two spiral shapes which are separated from each other by the simple bar-like configuration.

On 9r there is a P. The left-hand vertical bar is 50 mm. long, and its minimum width at the center is 4 mm. and maximum width at the top and bottom is 5 mm. The width of the P, that is, from the right-hand side of the curved stroke of the paunch to the left-hand side of the vertical bar is 20 mm. The length of the
paunch is 23 mm. The curved stroke forming the paunch thickens on the right-hand side, and this thickness is 8 mm. at its greatest. There is a white line and triangular design within this thickness similar to that within the curved left-hand stroke of the \( V \) on \( 1^r \). A white line also runs the length of the vertical bar of this \( P \), and a vine terminating in two leaves sprouts from the upper left-hand extremity of the bar. Within the paunch and emanating from a central point on the right-hand side is a sea-horse pattern like the one in the well of the \( V \) on \( 1^r \).

There is a \( V \) on \( 16^v \). The right-hand vertical bar is 20 mm. long, and its minimum width at the center is 3 mm. and maximum width at the top and bottom is 4 mm. The maximum width of the letter across the well is 15 mm. The left-hand stroke is a curve, and its greatest thickness at the center is 8 mm. Within this thickness appears a white line and triangular design like the one in the curved bar of the \( V \) on \( 1^r \). Within the well of the \( V \) on \( 16^v \) is a sea-horse pattern like the one described for \( 1^r \).

The \( N \) on \( 17^r \) is 18 mm. in height. It is entirely red except that a black zigzag line runs the length of the middle stroke. The width of the entire letter is just over 12 mm.

On \( 33^v \) there is a decorated \( N \). Its height is 22 mm. and greatest width is the same. Running the length of the middle stroke which is 20 mm. long is a white line. Sprouting from the upper left-hand corner of the right-hand vertical bar of the \( N \) is a sea-horse shaped vine spreading downwards. Sprouting from
the bottom right-hand corner of the farthest left-hand vertical bar of the \( N \) is also a sea-horse type of vine, but oriented upwards. Trailing in the left direction from the upper left-hand corner of the farthest left-hand vertical bar is a vine which sprouts two leaves.

On 59\(^r\) appears a lightly decorated \( I \). It is 32 mm. high and 4 mm. wide. Running the length of the vertical stroke is a white line. A vine of 5 mm. in length sprouts from the upper left-hand corner of the vertical bar. The vertical bar at the bottom tapers off into a vine that curves in the left direction. This vine occupies \( \frac{1}{4} \) lines of writing and resembles the bottom vine that trails off at the bottom of the vertical hast of the \( P \) on 1\(^v\). There appears a similar \( I \) on 59\(^v\) but smaller, and there is no white line that runs the length of the vertical bar.

Not strictly speaking a decorated initial but a highly stylized one appears on 53\(^v\) 8. It is an \( E \) which resembles a lyre. Its length from left to right is 10 mm., and its height is from 3 to 4 mm. The strokes are extremely thin, and the middle horizontal line has two knots on it in the center. The right-hand extremity of this horizontal line is crossed by a vertical line.

On 55\(^r\) there is a \( C \), 17 mm. high and 17 mm. wide. It is merely a large Roman capital except that a snail-like figure sits on the inside, attached to the bottom curve of the \( C \). A
similar configuration likewise is attached to the upper curve, but it appears similar to a snail hanging from a ceiling.

On 62\textsuperscript{v} 35 appears an \textsc{a} which is only ornamented by a vine sprouting three leaves which (vine) forms the lower part of the left-hand vertical stroke that curves. The right-hand vertical stroke does not curve. The right-hand stroke is 18 mm. high and the greatest height of the letter is 25.875 mm.

Two \textsc{i}'s appear on 68\textsuperscript{v} 31 and 69\textsuperscript{r} 11 respectively. They are both similar to the \textsc{i} on 59\textsuperscript{v} except that the one on 68\textsuperscript{v} is slightly smaller while the one on 69\textsuperscript{r} is slightly larger than the \textsc{i} on 59\textsuperscript{v}.

Not to be considered a decorated initial but worthwhile to notice is the large \textsc{p} on 52\textsuperscript{r} 17. It is unique in that around this letter of 17 mm. in height appear black ink lines which seem to be an attempt to sketch a more complicated \textsc{p}.

Throughout the manuscript appear capital initials undecorated and ranging in size from 5 mm. in height (the \textsc{c} on 21\textsuperscript{v} 27) to 35 mm. in height (the \textsc{t} on 14\textsuperscript{r}).

As for the provenance of the manuscript, we know only that Mabillon brought it from Italy to Paris in 1686 where under the number 5513, 2 it was added to the Bibliotheca Regia.\textsuperscript{27} There are no colophons in the ms. nor other signs that identify its origin. The writing resembles that which Bischoff calls "minuscule gothique primitive."\textsuperscript{28} The Gothic traits are clear:
the fusion of opposite curves, limited as usual to the combinations \oe, \oc, \do, \po, and the presence of uncial \c and \g which are similar to those which Battelli calls "pure gotichi." The writing is characterised by rounded, well proportioned letters, typical of Italian Gothic. One can find certain characteristics of twelfth century writing: the presence of the straight minuscule \d and of the \d which has the hast inclined towards the left like the uncial, and the double \i with hair-strokes: \i\i. The sign of punctuation most frequently employed is the low point and rarely the high or middle point. This low point is placed at the end of a subordinate phrase, at the end of a word in a series, at the end of a rubric, and is used as a breath mark. The point is placed before and after a Roman numeral, and it is found above a letter to be deleted. Moreover, a letter to be deleted can have two points: one point placed above and one below. After the point, the punctuation mark most widely employed is a type of question mark inclined towards the top right. This punctuation mark is especially used in the grammatical treatise on account of the numerous questions. A sign similar to \is employed as a pause before an additional remark, that is, before a supplementary idea coming after an otherwise complete sentence. It is also used as a breath mark. One finds the sign \,\ used as a final stop and \ as an indication that the scribe wishes two
words to exchange places; for example, on 31\textsuperscript{v} 9 we have
\textit{compositis cum suis} which ought to be read as \textit{cum compositis suis}.

Signs of insertion include a mark similar to our comma which is placed between two words, and above this mark appears the word to be inserted; for example, on 18\textsuperscript{v} 6 one has the following: "Illa uero \textit{quaes} tertiae ...." P\textsuperscript{C} (or the scribe) features a sign similar to \textit{\textsuperscript{\textsc{a}}} used in conjunction with an arrow pointing upwards: \textsuperscript{\textsc{a}}. The arrow pointing upwards at the sign \textit{\textsuperscript{\textsc{a}}} signifies that the marginalia preceded by \textit{\textsuperscript{\textsc{a}}} is to be inserted at the place of the arrow. For instance, on 1\textsuperscript{v} 16 we have the following: "... uel communem \textsuperscript{\textsc{a}}." In the right-hand margin appears a note preceded by this sign \textsuperscript{\textsc{a}}. Another insertion sign is \textsuperscript{\textsc{r}}. This comes after a word in the text and refers to a note in a margin preceded by this same sign. An example of this procedure appears in 9\textsuperscript{r} 31. The arrow is also used in conjunction with a cross to denote insertions. On 10\textsuperscript{v} 1, for example, an arrow points upward to a cross which hovers over the \textit{t} in \textit{habeant} which is the final word of a sentence. Another similar cross is in the left-hand margin near the first word of line 1 which is \textit{omnia}. These crosses evidently refer to a note at the bottom of 10\textsuperscript{v} which is to be inserted after \textit{habeant}.

The text is frequently punctuated, the words are on the whole clearly separated, and sentences generally begin with a capital letter.
Usually the orthography in the first twenty-six folia with which we are chiefly concerned is correct according to Classical norms with the exception of e for ae and oe. Also, ae and oe may appear as they should and even as hyper-corrections for e. These latter two instances are noted in the apparatus criticus. The following is a list of other orthographical peculiarities.

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a for e, i, and o} & \text{aff for adf} \\
\text{amm for adm} & \text{c omitted between n and t} \\
\text{c for q} & \text{ci for ti} \\
\text{e for i} & \text{e omitted before a} \\
\text{f for ph} & \text{h omitted and superfluous} \\
\text{hii for hi} & \text{i for e} \\
\text{i for u} & \text{i for y} \\
\text{i omitted before another vowel as in the word quaestio} & \\
\text{icc for ide} & \text{ii} \text{ (regular occurrence)} \\
\text{k for c} & \text{l omitted before s} \\
\text{m for n} & \text{m omitted at the end of a word} \\
\text{n for m} & \text{n omitted after a vowel} \\
\text{n omitted before s} & \text{n superfluous before a vowel} \\
\text{nt for mpt} & \text{r for l} \\
\text{s for x} & \text{s for z} \\
\text{s final, omitted} & \text{t for d at the end of a word} \\
\text{u for o} & \text{u omitted in the combination ue}
\end{array}\]
u omitted in the diphthong au  

x for ch  

v for i  

Other peculiarities are double letters for single letters and vice versa, the omission of intervocalic syllables, itacisms, and metastheses. All occurrences of these peculiarities I have noted in the apparatus and in the text itself by means of deletion and addition brackets. Minuscule u is used throughout as a vowel and as a consonant. Majuscule V is used as its capitalized version. Exceptions to this are noted in the apparatus. I have not noted every instance of inp which is very frequent.

In the following list I have tried to give a representative picture of the methods of abbreviations, suspensions, and contractions prevalent in the first twenty-six folia.

\begin{align*}
\text{ablat} = \text{ablatium} & \quad 22^{r}\ 35  \\
\text{accuti} = \text{accusatiui} & \quad 10^{v}\ 7  \\
\text{ad} & \quad 12^{v}\ 11  \\
\text{ante} & \quad 13^{r}\ 3  \\
\text{aplice} = \text{apostolice} & \quad 1^{r}\ 33  \\
\text{bene} & \quad 17^{v}\ 1  \\
\text{celis} & \quad 8^{r}\ 2  \\
\text{conjugatiois} = \text{conjugationis} & \quad 13^{v}\ 25  \\
\text{corra} = \text{correptam} & \quad 7^{v}\ 8  \\
\text{De} & \quad 5^{v}\ 10  \\
\text{acc} = \text{accusatiuo} & \quad 22^{r}\ 27  \\
\text{actm} = \text{actium} & \quad 25^{v}\ 13  \\
\text{altm} = \text{alterum} & \quad 21^{r}\ 28  \\
\text{ap} = \text{apud} & \quad 9^{r}\ 5  \\
\text{aut} = \text{autem} & \quad 2^{r}\ 14  \\
\text{casib;} = \text{casibus} & \quad 9^{r}\ 15  \\
\text{jug} = \text{conjugationis} & \quad 14^{v}\ 8  \\
\text{jugatiois} = \text{conjugationis} & \quad 13^{r}\ 30  \\
\text{corpa} = \text{correptam} & \quad 7^{r}\ 7  \\
\text{duatiua} = \text{deriuatiua} & \quad 8^{v}\ 23
\end{align*}
diēs = deinde 19r 13
dīr = dicitur 5r 26
ē = est 1r 11
eligible = eligere 21r 28
ē = etiam 3v 7
igitur = igitur 10v 31
gnālia = generalia 2r 35

H and h = haec 7v 5 and 21v 20 respectively

hae = habere 10r 36
ideo = ideo 6r 34
igitur = igitur 1r 10
imperfecti = imperfecti 19v 25
legantes = legentes 20v 25
modo = modo 8v 11
masculini = masculini 4r 4

an "over" abbreviation multū = multitū 17v 32 (sole occurrence)

non = non 1r 6
Noto = Nominatiuo 8v 9

notō = nominatiuo 4v 4
nusquā = nusquam 3r 17
optatiuo = optatiuo 26r 35
productam = productam 13v 11
pars = pars 11v 15

nōatiuo = nominatiuo 9r 3
Nrrm and nrrī = Nostrum and nostri 10r 10
num = numerum 5r 35
ōīs = omnis 8v 34
pro = pro 9r 33
pluraliter = pluraliter 23v 1
patis and pata = patriis and patriam 2v 3
pd = productum 6\textsuperscript{v} 13
plā = plura 5\textsuperscript{r} 23
p\textit{līquamperfectī} = plusquamperfecti 19\textsuperscript{v} 26
ps = praeenti 23\textsuperscript{v} 36
psoā = persona 11\textsuperscript{v} 2
\textit{qā} = quae 9\textsuperscript{r} 18
\textit{qī} = quae 9\textsuperscript{v} 6
\textit{qū} = quod 5\textsuperscript{v} 1
\textit{qē} = quia 17\textsuperscript{r} 35
\textit{qē} = quid 9\textsuperscript{v} 6
qd = quid 19\textsuperscript{r} 1
\text{quā and qundo = quando 18\textsuperscript{v} 2 and 9\textsuperscript{r} 26 respectively qppe = quippe 12\textsuperscript{r} 36
}
\text{oīt = quot 1\textsuperscript{v} 20
recipē = recipit 10\textsuperscript{r} 10
requīrēt = requirunt 20\textsuperscript{v} 1
sēt = sed 22\textsuperscript{v} 13
sō = sed 9\textsuperscript{r} 6
sequēsē = sequendus 22\textsuperscript{v} 13
signīficat = significat 9\textsuperscript{r} 34
simplicī = simplicis 10\textsuperscript{v} 2
singūlāē = singularī 16\textsuperscript{v} 25
solēt = Solutio 9\textsuperscript{r} 35
subīs = subiunctius 21\textsuperscript{r} 17
\text{tā = tam 1\textsuperscript{r} 1
p̄c = perfecto 23\textsuperscript{v} 12
p̄r = pluraliter 6\textsuperscript{v} 8
p̄r = pluraliter 23\textsuperscript{v} 27
psente = praeente 10\textsuperscript{v} 15
pto = praeterito 24\textsuperscript{r} 27
q̄ = quae 22\textsuperscript{v} 16
\text{or = quattuor 20\textsuperscript{v} 13
qē = quoque 4\textsuperscript{r} 23
qā = quia 3\textsuperscript{r} 5
qō = quod 9\textsuperscript{v} 28
qūm = quoniam 1\textsuperscript{r} 4
quotē = quarte 16\textsuperscript{r} 27
regam = regulam 8\textsuperscript{v} 3
respondēdi = respondendi 19\textsuperscript{r} 18
sūm = sunt 3\textsuperscript{v} 35
scūm = secundum 1\textsuperscript{r} 18
sicē = sicut 19\textsuperscript{r} 15
similēt = similiter 1\textsuperscript{v} 8
singē = singularis 10\textsuperscript{v} 8
singūlē = singulis 1\textsuperscript{r} 31
spēs = species 17\textsuperscript{v} 22
substantēt = substantiui 12\textsuperscript{r} 5
tā = tanquam 18\textsuperscript{v} 13

Throughout appear the following symbols for the names of the cases nominativus, genetivus, dativus, accusativus, vocativus, ablativus:
N. G. D. A. V. A. These symbols appear usually when PC is declining a noun. The following are the abbreviations for the nomina sacra: dés for Deus 22\textsuperscript{v} 6, dēns for Dominus 11\textsuperscript{r} 16, ἸΗΥ for Iesus 11\textsuperscript{r} 16, and Χ for Christus 11\textsuperscript{r} 16.

**GRAMMATICAL THEORY FROM DONATUS TO PC**

The Late Latin grammarians, of whom the two chief representatives are Priscian and Donatus, mainly limited themselves to collating the grammatical doctrines of their Latin and particularly Greek predecessors, adding nothing new to Latin grammatical and linguistic theory. They illustrate their grammatical statements with quotations chiefly from the "Golden Age" writers like Cicero and Vergil. Priscian’s grammar is the largest and most complex grammar of the Greco-Roman world and is regarded as the "culmination of late Latin grammatical scholarship." It not only describes the parts of speech and illustrates each description with numerous quotations, but also
deals considerably with morphology. His work appears based mainly on Apollonius\textsuperscript{36} and bears similarities to the treatise of Dionysius Thrax.\textsuperscript{37} Donatus's grammar is far shorter, written with a didactic purpose, and not entailing much discussion of morphology.\textsuperscript{38}

Until the rise of speculative grammar, the Medieval grammarians were content to comment and expound Priscian and Donatus and a few others without adding anything \textit{basically new to grammatical theory}.\textsuperscript{39} However, in their method of presentation, two innovations should be noted: the use of Biblical quotations along with Classical ones and the \textit{lemma} type of commentary derived from Servius's \textit{Commentary on Vergil}, exemplified by Sedulius Scottus's commentary on Donatus (\textit{Année Philologique}, vol. 39, issue of 1968, p. 245). In this type of commentary a phrase of Donatus is given, and then followed by comments drawn from authors like Remigius or Servius, Isidore, Priscian, and the Late Latin grammarians like Pompeius.

In the pre-Carolingian period Cassiodorus, Isidore, Aldhelm and Bede abridge and make compilations of the Late Latin grammarians.\textsuperscript{40} Vergilius Grammaticus, notorious for his unique coinages and invented quotations,\textsuperscript{41} chiefly influences the ninth century Insular grammarians.\textsuperscript{42}

The ninth and tenth centuries were famous for the Irish grammarians like Malsachanus (Bengt Löfstedt, \textit{Der Hibernolateinische}

In the tenth century Abbo of Fleury is noteworthy for his Quaestiones Grammaticae, a work based on Priscian and Donatus. Gautbert wrote on the nature of grammatical studies from the seventh to the tenth centuries, and this work is considered to be important in the history of science. Aelfric of Winchester edited Priscian, added excerpts from Donatus, and translated the entire results into Anglo-Saxon. Aynard of St. Evre wrote a glossary in which he makes use of Servius, glosses on Remigius and Paulus's epitome of Festus.

According to Thurot (p. 16) one of the most prominent
eleventh century grammarians is Baudry of Bourgueil who in a poem addressed to Adele, the Countess of Blois, describes briefly the liberal arts and particularly grammar. The articles on grammar appearing in Papias's lexicon (ca. 1060) are drawn from Remigius, Isidore and Priscian.47

In the twelfth century there is Lambertus Pultariensis who in a letter on grammar uses Priscian and Isidore.48 Osborn of Gloucester is famous for his versified grammar in which he employs Priscian, Festus, Isidore, Macrobius and Martianus Capella.49 Robins (p. 75) notes that the teaching of Latin grammar in verse enjoyed an immense popularity in the late twelfth century. The most celebrated versifier of grammatical doctrines at that time was Alexander of Villa Dei with his Doctrinale.50 Hugutio of Pisa wrote a Summa Artis Grammaticae which is not a speculative work but is in what Robins (p. 70) calls the "formative" tradition of grammatical exposition. Hugo of St. Victor's grammar is based for the most part on Priscian, Donatus and Isidore.51 PC is to be included in the Latin grammatical tradition which was engaged chiefly in copying and commenting Priscian and Donatus without adding anything new to grammatical theory. His grammatical work, as far as I have been able to discern, is not at all influenced by the speculative tendencies of the twelfth century, which sought a basis in logic and philosophy.52
THE CONTENT OF THE PROLOGUS AND THE GRAMMATICAL TREATISE

Although the incipit to the Prologus reads "Incipit prologus in Libro tam de Prisciano quam de Donato a fratre Paulo Camaldulense monacho composito," the Prologus really describes what the author wishes to write in the entire manuscript. But prior to this explanation of what PC wishes to write, PC gives a eulogy of sapientia, illustrating his praise with Biblical quotations. The theme of this eulogy is that sapientia is to be treasured above all material things. PC then points out that it is his friends' desire for wisdom that he write first a treatise based on Priscian and Donatus, then a work on the length of syllables appearing in poetic verse, a treatise on the art of letter writing based on the precepts of Cicero, and finally a series of letters on different subjects, in the Papal style. These letters, assigned to Adrianus, Lucius, and Gregorius, are in separate sections for each of these three names in that order. The section of letters pertaining to Adrianus, for instance, is preceded by a table of contents listing all the headings under which these letters fall, three letters to each heading. So, each series of three letters after the table of contents is preceded by the appropriate heading in the table of contents. There are twelve headings in the table of contents for Adrianus; thus, thirty-six letters are assigned to him. There are twelve headings for Lucius and thirty-six letters. Gregorius has only ten headings, but there are twenty-five
complete letters - three letters apiece for the first eight letters plus the first letter for the ninth heading. The second letter of the ninth heading is incomplete. PC concludes the Prologus on a note of humility, stating that he does not write with ornate skill but like an infant trying to speak and begs his readers' pardon for any imperfections in his works. He uses Biblical quotations and the collect "Deus cui proprium est misereri ...." from the contemporary Officium Defunctorum while begging his readers' pardon.

The grammatical treatise is virtually a synthesis of material taken from Priscian and Donatus, enlarged by commentary chiefly from texts similar to those of Remigius, Muridac, Sedulius Scottus, Malsachanus, the C.M. 14488, and to a lesser extent the Ars Anonyma Bernensis, Clemens, the C.M. 14737, Paris B.N. Lat. 7558, Boethius, the Vulgate, Servius and [Sergius] of vol. 4 in Keil's Grammatici Latini, Diomedes, Charisius, and Vergilius Grammaticus. PC treats the eight parts of speech in the order noun, pronoun, verb, adverb, participle, conjunction, preposition and interjection, first secundum Priscianum and then secundum Donatum. The section secundum Priscianum always, as is the practice of the C.M. 14737 and the B.N. Lat. 7558, begins by asking to what part of speech a word belongs. For example, 92, 1 (the beginning of the treatment on the verb secundum Priscianum) reads: "'Amo' quae pars est?" This type of question seems to go back ultimately to
the practice in Priscian's *Partitiones*. After this beginning, however, the definition of the particular part of speech under discussion, the explanation of its function and the etymology of its name are not always necessarily from Priscian. The sections *secundum Priscianum*, moreover, are larger than those *secundum Donatum* because they contain much more than the sections *secundum Donatum* many questions and answers similar to those in the grammatical treatises of Muridac, Sedulius Scottus, the C.M. 14488, and Remigius. The sections *secundum Priscianum* also feature a large amount of material similar to that in Donatus. A prominent feature of the structure of the *secundum Priscianum* discussions is that in the first paragraph where PC begins his treatment he asks how many accidents the particular part of speech has. Then, having stated the number and enumerated the various accidents, he deals in great detail with each of the accidents and discusses the model word according to each of the accidents. A notable exception to this is in the section on the conjunction *secundum Priscianum* where the accident *figura* is not treated in depth. He is also preoccupied with the etymologies of the names of the accidents: *genus*, for instance, is said to be derived from *generandum* and *numerus* from *Numa Pompilius*; and he may also be concerned about etymologies of various model words under discussion. For example, the model word for the section on the noun *secundum Priscianum* is *poeta*. PC in 1, 16 states that *poeta*
comes from the Greek ποιο [ποιο] which is fingo. These individual
treatments on the accidents can reach extensive proportions, like
the discussion on the various endings of a noun, which gives him
the opportunity to make an extended discourse on gender
(paragraphs 11 - 43). In the verbs, included within his extended
treatment on conjugations we have the very long discussion on endings
of verbs and to what conjugation they belong in paragraphs 102 -
154. Both of these treatments do not seem to be closely related
to Priscian, although their order of presentation bears a
resemblance to what is found in Priscian. Moreover, the material
appears to be related to what Priscian gives in many cases, but is
usually re-worked.

The sections secundum Donatum are on the whole shorter
and are closer to Donatus in their continuity and similarity. An
exception to this is the lengthy section on the pronoun secundum
Donatum from paragraph 77 - 91. There is also less material from
sources other than Donatus.

At the end of the discussion of the eight parts of speech
is a series of conjugations of amo, doceo, lego, audio, and sum.
Donatus's conjugation of lego is very close to PC's, which might
lead one to suppose that all of the other conjugations follow the
analogy of lego. However, Malsachanus conjugates all five of these
verbs in a manner similar to PC's, abbreviating many of his verbs
in the same way as PC.
THE SOURCES AND TESTIMONIA FOR THE PROLOGUS AND THE GRAMMATICAL TREATISE

The main source for the quotations of the Prologus seems to be the Vulgate. At times, however, it is difficult to determine which text PC used, the Vetus Latina, or the Vulgate. Sometimes he appears to be citing from a defective memory, because some of the references to the Bible are not direct lemmata but are what appear to be re-workings. Another source for the Prologus is the collect of the funeral mass.

Most of the 'cf.' references in the Fontes et Testimonia are to Donatus, Priscian, Sedulius Scottus, Muridac, the C.M. 14488, Remigius and Malsachanus.

DONATUS:

PC's definitions and explanations of the separate parts of speech in the sections secundum Donatum are usually almost all Donatus—either the Ars Maior or Minor. Furthermore, there are numerous readings which are often exactly the same or nearly the same as those in the Donatus ms. Codex Monacensis Emmeramus G. 121 which Keil (vol. 4, p. 354) calls M. The unchanged borrowings in the grammatical treatise are chiefly from Donatus. Sometimes PC seems to be using Donatus directly or at other times second-hand, since there are occasions when material from Donatus appears in discussions that are closely related to those appearing in the
treatise of Sedulius (Arundel 43), the C.M. 14488, Remigius, and Muridac. However, continuous passages from Donatus which are not augmented by any commentary are frequent in PC's grammatical treatise, and I have not yet discovered a similar commentary on Donatus that has the same amount of continuous Donatus as appears in PC's work. Moreover, R.W. Hunt ("Studies on Priscian in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," in MRS, vol. 1, 1941-1943, p. 194) observes that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the two most commonly studied grammarians were Priscian and Donatus and that many mss. of these two existed in the libraries of Europe.

PRISCIAN:

There are few verbatim quotations from Priscian. Moreover, the material similar to that in Priscian shows frequent signs of greater re-working than material which is close to Donatus. In addition, in the extended sections on the various endings of nouns and their genders and in the section on the various endings of verbs and in their conjugations, there seems to be a similarity in the order of presentation. What is most significant, however, is that PC has many questions of the nature of "A r m a quae pars orationis est?" \(^{55}\) and of the type "Quid est pronomen?" \(^{56}\) and "Cuius est speciei tu?" \(^{57}\)

REMIGIUS OF AUXERRE:

Remigius is chiefly important for his collections of etymologies, some of which reappear in PC's grammatical treatise.
Some etymologies in turn are drawn ultimately from Isidore of Seville, Varro, and Boethius, as pointed out in the *Fontes et Testimonia* and *Commentary*. The texts of Remigius (*Commentum Einsidlense* and the Fox edition) also feature morphological explanations accounting for the formations of words like *idem* and of certain participles of active verbs.

**SEDULIUS SCOTTUS AND THE C.M. 14488:**

These two possible sources present complex problems in connection with PC. Prof. Hengt Löffstedt (p. 18) says that the C.M. 14488 is very similar to Sedulius Scottus's *In Donatum Maiorem* and that one may show that the former is in large part an abbreviation of the work of Sedulius. Now, the C.M. 14488 dates from the tenth century whereas the surviving text of Sedulius *In Donatum* is preserved at the British Museum in the thirteenth century ms. Arundel 43. Moreover, as I shall attempt to show in my *Commentary*, it appears that considerable material, chiefly in the form of a series of questions that require complicated answers and which material also contains texts from Donatus and discussions from earlier grammarians like Diomedes, Remigius, and Pompeius, is common to PC and the C.M. 14488; and usually the 14488 is closer to PC than the corresponding text in Sedulius is. Moreover, PC's text at times makes the same scribal errors as the 14488. Therefore, it is not unfair to suppose that the author of the 7517 might have seen the 14488 or at least a text like it. Since the
Arundel 43 is later than the 7517, it is obvious that the scribe of the latter did not copy the former, but he might have viewed an earlier version of Sedulius's work since there are times, which I will try to show in the Commentary, when PC is closer to Sedulius than to the C.M. 14488.

MURIDAC:

The grammatical treatises of Muridac are contained in the mss. Paris B.N. 7491 A and the Vat. Reg. 1586. Both are of the Carolingian period. Since both contain the same text, I have cited only the 7491 A to avoid unnecessary duplication. However, I cite both texts when there are significant differences that would indicate that PC's treatment is closer to either of the two mss. The material cited in Muridac is related to that cited in the C.M. 14488 and in Arundel 43 but is less closely related to PC than the Sedulius/14488 tradition. Thus Muridac's contribution is chiefly in the form of the complex questions and answers of the type in 82, 7 - 10.

MALSACHANUS:

The chief similarity to the text of Malsachanus is the fact that both authors conjugate by way of example the same verbs and in the same part of their respective treatises, namely after the discussion of the eight parts of speech. There is also a striking coincidence in the manuscript abbreviations of the verb forms.
OTHER SOURCES:

Other references are to Clemens, the C.M. 14737, the B.N. Lat. 7558, Pompeius, Diomedes, the Vulgate, the Ars Anonyma Bernensis, Servius, Dositheus, Tours Lat. 843, Varro, Cicero, Vergil, Isidore, Petrus Grammaticus, Sergius (vol. 8 of Keil), Vergilius Grammaticus, Probus, the C.B. 123, the C.B. 207, Audax, Symphosius's Aenigma de Vipera (see 80, 15). Sergius, Probus, Charisius, Maximus Victorinus, De Libris Turicensibus, Asper, and Saccordus. In the Fontes et Testimonia the number of times sources are traced back ultimately to Vergilius Grammaticus is sixteen. There never appears a direct borrowing from this author whose Fortleben, Manitius (vol. 1, p. 127) notes, waned after an immense popularity among the ninth century Insular grammarians.

There is the strong possibility that the majority of these texts which already exist as part of the commentary in the treatises of Sedulius, Muridac, the C.M. 14488, Remigius, Priscian, and Donatus, are consulted only at second-hand.

THE GLOSSES:

The Glossaria Latina (ed. W.M. Lindsay) and the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum (ed. George Goetz) are pertinent to PC's work only insofar as they throw light occasionally upon examples of words which he uses in his section on the various types of
letters in which nouns may end. There is no evidence to suppose, however, that PC (or the scribe) actually consulted the manuscripts cited in these two series. However, the Glossa Codices Bernensis 386 (see my commentary to 44, 8) offers a reading closer to PC than the text of the Commentum Einsidlense as edited by Keil.

STYLE:

The style is essentially a synthesis of the straightforward style of the Late Latin grammarians and the clarity of the ninth century commentators. PC really exhibits no distinctive style of his own but follows the treatments of his possible models and even their word order. His vocabulary in the grammatical treatise is therefore a composite of that kind used by Priscian; Donatus; the important ninth century grammarians like Malsachanus, Clemens, Muridan, Sedulius, and Remigius; the Late Latin grammarians like Pompeius, Servius and Sergius; and notably the texts cited from the Anecdota Helvetica and the Bible (especially paragraph 195).

In the sections of the Prologus which are not based on the Bible PC exhibits a style far more complex and subordinated than in the grammatical treatise. He does use, however, Christian Latin terms like sacris ... paginis (1, 1), sedis apostolicae (2, 4), fraternae deuotionis (3, 1), caritatem (3, 1), apostolici
dicti (3, 1), and aeternae beatitudinis regnum (3, 2). In the grammatical treatise there are words (especially in the section 11 - 43) that may be possible neologisms like Venopia. So far, I have not been able to locate them in any lexicon, glossary, or dictionary used in this work. Moreover, when any Greek words are written, they appear in Roman letters. It cannot be shown that PC knew Greek first-hand.

PC'S VALUE AS A GRAMMIAN:

PC's treatise is a synthesis of texts drawn largely from Donatus, Priscian and their ninth century commentators. PC belongs therefore to the last century of what R.H. Robins (p. 70) calls the "formative" period of Latin grammatical studies in the Middle Ages - beginning around the eight century - when Donatus and Priscian were copied and "expounded without much original thinking on methods and problems of grammar." The real value of PC lies in the way he copies Donatus and Priscian and his relationship with the large, continuous passages in the Irish grammarians such as Sedulius Scottus, Muridac, and the C.M. 14488, the C.M. 14737, the B.N. 7558 and Remigius of Auxerre. This relationship, which is detailed in the commentary, gives us an insight into the methods employed in copying and commenting on the text of Priscian and Donatus in northern Italy in the twelfth century and is a step in the compilation of the text history of the Donatus and Priscian commentaries in the twelfth century.
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TEXTUAL SIGNS

< > additions

[ ] deletions

† incorrigible or illegible readings
[Text in Latin from an old manuscript page]
INCIPIT PROLOGUS IN LIBRO TAM DE PRISCIANO QUAM DE DONATO A FRATRE PAULO CAMALDULENSE MONACHO COMPOSITO.

1 1 Verissimis rerum quam plurimis nouimus experimentis et multotiens in sacris etiam paginis auduimus quoniam melior est sapientia cunctis opibus pretiosissimis et omne desiderabile non potest ei comparari. 2 Melior est fructus eius auro et lapide pretioso et geminina illius argento electo. 3 Hoc quoque in sapientia satis est laudabile quia facile uidetur ab his qui diligunt eam. 4 Ostendit se illis alacriter, et omnibus se offerticens: 'Ego diligentes me diligo, et qui mane me quaesierint inuenient me.' 5 Cogitare igitur de illa sensus est consummatus. 6 Nam qui ugilauerit propter illam cito erit sapiens et securus. 7 His siquidem causis quidam mei amicissimi studio sapientiae accensi caritatiua deuotione me Paulum Camaldulessem monachum rogauerunt ut tam de Prisciano quam de Donato eis taliter librum componerem, ut prius secundum Priscianum quod sit nomen, quare dicatur et unde deriuetur, quot nominem accidant, quomodo unumquodque accidens nominis definiatur, et diuidatur, et unde dicatur breuiter monstrarem. 8 Deinde uero secundum Donatum quae sint nominis accidentia subiungerem et eandem formam doctrinae in reliquis partibus orationum et earum prosequerer accidentibus.
2 1 His utique peractis regulas longitudinis et breuitatis notificarem, et quomodo possent ad scientiam uersificandi peruenire breuiter manifestarem. 2 Postulauerunt quoque praedicti mei amicissimi ut exemplar uersificandi laudabile opus et optimum, sed negligentia et ignorantia partim corruptum, diligentem emendarem, et post regulas longitudinis et breuitatis in eodem volumine supponerem. 3 Introductiones quoque dictandi prosaice de rh¡ethorica Tullii taliter componerem ut quidquid Tullius bono dictatori praecipit fugere uel sequi, uerbis de poetria H¡oratii sumptis fugiendum sequendumue demonstrarem. 4 Ac postmodum de triginta diuersis materiis de unaquaque materia tres epistulas scriberem, et in singulis materiis titulos earum praenotando in modum registri diuersis personis prout res deposceret consuetudine sedis apostolicae mittendas ordinarem.

3 1 His itaque fraternae deuotionis petitionibus auditis quoniam iubemur per caritatem seruire inuicem et unusquisque gratiam quam percepit, in alterutrum diligenter illam praecipitur ministrare, postulata siquidem compleui non lucido//peritorum uiuorum sermone, non artificiosa phaleratae locutionis profunditate, sed simplicem rerum perquirendo ueritatem pro fraterna utilitate, affectu infantium more balbutientium qui quaecumque audierint fari gestiunt, cum necdum possint ad plenum uerba formare, quapropter uos huius operis lectores tota mentis humilitate flagito quatenus siqua superflua siqua neglegenter aut minus humiliter
uel non satis utiliter protuli, cuncta clementer ignoscatis
memores apostolici dicti quo praecipimini libenter sufferre
insipientes, cum sitis ipsi sapientes. 2 Petò similiter ut
apud summum iudicem cui proprium est misereri semper et parcere
me uestra commendet oratio ut aeternae beatitudinis regnum quod
meis meritis consecui non ualeo, munere divinae largitatis per
uestras orationes adiutus, adipisci promerear. 3 Explicit
prologus.
INCIPIT LIBER TAM DE DONATO QUAM DE PRISCIANO A FRATRE
PAULO COMPOSITUS. ET QUONIAM AD UTILITATEM OMNII EST DATUS,
IDEO 'DONATUS' EST UOCATUS.

1 1 'Poeta' quae pars est?  2 Nomen est.  3 Quare?
4 Quia significat substantiam uel qualitatem propriam uel communem.
5 Nomen quod est?  6 Pars orationis quae unicumque subjectorum
corporum seu rerum communem uel propriam qualitatem distribuit.
7 'Nomen' unde dicitur?  8 A 'notamine' siue a 'notione' eo
quod aliquid noscatur ab eo, siue a Graeca ethymologia; 'onoma'
enim Graece, 'nomen' dicitur Latine.  9 Nomini quot accident?
10 Quinque.  11 Quae?  12 Species genus numerus figura casus.
13 Cuius speciei?  14 Deriuatiuæ.  15 Unde deriuatur?
16 A 'poë' Graeco quod Latine sonat 'fingo,' inde dicitur poeta
factur carminis.  17 Quaestio de specie.  18 Quid est species?
19 Discretio utrum sit primae an secundae impositionis.  20 Alia
quaestio.  21 'Species' unde dicitur?  22 A 'specifying' hoc
est a 'dividendo' eo quod per ipsam partes orationis specificamus,
hoc est diuidimus.  23 Quaestio.  24 Quot sunt species nominum?
25 Duae: primituva quae primae positionis dicitur quoniam a
nullo sumit originem ut 'mons,' alia deriuatiua quae secundae
impositionis est quia a fonte primitiuorum uelut de fluido riuiulus
nascitur ut a 'monte monticulus.' 26 Propriorum quoque
nominum secundum Latinos quattuor sunt species: nomen praenomen cogno-
men agnomen. 27 Nomen est quod imponitur rei non habenti nomen.
28 Praenomen est quod causa differentiae nominis proprio additur.
29 Cognomen est cognitionis commune. 30 Agnomen est quod ab
aliquo eventu imponitur.

2 1 Deriuatiuorum autem nominum multae sunt species.
2 De patronymicis. 3 Alia namque sunt patronymica quae a
propris nominibus patrum deriuantur, et significant filios uel
nepotes cum genetio sui primitioi ut a 'Priamo Priamides'.

4 De possessiuis.//5 Alia sunt possessiua quae cum genetio
primitiiu significant aliquid ex his quae possidentur ut
'Euandrius ensis' pro 'Euandrii ensis.' 6 Differentiae. 7 Hoc
autem interest inter possessiua et patronymica quod patronymica
filios uel nepotes significant. 8 Possessiua uero non solum filios
sed quae omnia in possessione esse possunt. 9 Patronymica
quoque a propriis nominibus tantummodo deriuantur, et ad homines
tantum pertinent uel ad deos. 10 Possessiua uero etiam ab
appellativius ueniunt, et ad omnes res pertinent. 11 Vnde fiant?
12 Fiunt etenim possessiua uel a nominibus ut a 'Caesar Caesareus'
uel a uerbis ut 'opto optatiuus,' ab aduerbiis ut 'extra extraneus.'
13 Ex quibus alia sunt mobilia ut 'Caesareus Caesarea Caesareum;
alia quidem fixa uelut 'sacrarium donarium.'
3 1 De diminutiuis. 2 Alia sunt diminutiua ut a 'rege regulus.' 3 Diminutiuæ uero dicuntur quae deminutionem sui primitiui demonstrant, unde 'regulus' 'rex paruus' dicitur. 4 De comparatiuis. 5 Alia quoque sunt comparatiua quae cum aliquo participe sensu posituii magis aduerbium significant ut 'doctior,' hoc est 'magis doctus.' 6 Vnde fiant? 7 Haec autem comparatiua si positiuos secundae declinationis habuerint, formantur a genetiuis suorum positiuorum 't' mutata in 'c' et addita 'or' ut 'doctus docti'; 't' in 'c' et addita 'or' fit 'doctior.' 8 Si uero a positiuís tertiae declinationis uenerint, formantur a datiuis eorum, apposita 'or' ut si dicas 'felici' addita 'or' fit 'felicior.'

4 1 De superlatiuis. 2 Alia quidem nomina sunt superlatiua, et dicuntur superlatiua quoniam comparatiuo superferuntur ut 'doctissimus.' 3 Superlatiuis quoque est quia comparatus ad plures sui generis omnibus superponitur ut si dicas 'Achilles fortissimus Graecorum fuit,' hoc est 'super omnes Graecos.' 4 Per se autem prolatum intellectum habet cum 'ualde' aduerbio positiui ut cum dicitur 'Achilles fortissimus fuit,' intellegi debet 'ualde fortis.' 5 Superlatiua uero si appositiuis secundae declinationis uenerint, formantur a genetiuis suorum positiuorum, interposita 's' et addita 'simus' ut 'doctus docti,' interposita 's' et addita 'simus' fit 'doctissimus.' 6 Si autem positiuii tertiae declinationis fuerint, superlatiui a
datiuis posituorum formantur, interposita 's' et addita 'simus'
ut 'felici felicissimus.' 7 A quibus excipitur 'fragillimus
agillimus gracillimus humillimus simillimus.' 8 Quod si
superlatiui in 'rimus' desinent, sunt a nominatius posituorum,
addita 'rimus' ut 'miser miserrimus.'

5 1 De denominatiuis. 2 Alia sunt denominatiua ut ab
'aeterno aeternitas.' 3 De uerbalibus. 4 Alia uerbalia ut
ab 'amo amor.' 5 De participiali. 6 Alia participiali
ut a 'docto doctior.' 7 De aduerbialia. 8 Alia aduerbialia
ut a 'cras crastinus.' 9 De speciali. 10 Alia specialia
quae speciem demonstrant ut 'homo.' 11 De generali. 12 Alia
generalia quae in diversas species possunt diuidi ut 'animal.'
13 De adiectuis. 14 Alia sunt adiectiuas quae addiciuntur
ut '//magnus paruus.' 15 Haec autem 'epitheta' dicuntur Graece,
Latine 'superposita.' 16 De gentilibus. 17 Alia sunt
gentilia quia gentem demonstrant ut 'Graecus Hispanus.' 18 De
patriis. 19 Alia dicuntur 'patria' quoniam patriam designant
ut a 'Roma Romanus.' 20 De numeralibus. 21 Aliud nomen
'numerale' dicitur quia numerum notat ut 'unus duo tres.'
22 De ordinali. 23 Ordinale quoque nomen est quod ordinem
figurat ut 'primus secundus tertius.' 24 Sed 'primus' de multis,
de duobus autem 'prior' dicitur. 25 'Primus' siquidem merito
de multis dicitur quia superlatiuius est, et proprium est
superlatiui ut plures in suo genere proferantur.
1 Differentia. 2 Hoc etiam distat inter nomina ordinis et numeri quia in numero omnes accipimus ut cum dicimus: 'Centum ecce omnes.' 3 Cum autem 'centesimus' dicitur, unus solummodo demonstratur. 4 Ad aliquid dicta. 5 Sunt alia ad aliquid dicta ut 'pater frater.' 6 'Ad aliquid' namque dictum est quod sine illius intellectu ad quod dictum est proferri non potest. 7 Nam dicendo 'patrem' etiam 'filium' et dicendo 'fratrem,' 'alium fratrem' uel 'sororem' intellego. 8 Quod si intereat, interimit una illud quod intellegitur. 9 Sunt item alia nomina ad aliquid aliter se habentia ut 'dexter sinister.' 10 Ad aliquid aliter se habentia. 11 'Ad aliquid aliter se habens' dictum est quod quamuis habeat aliquid contrarium et quasi semper adhaerens, tamen non ipso nomine significat etiam illud. 12 Neque enim ex illo nominationem acceptit. 13 Nam quamuis intereat, non interimit secum illud quod ei adhaerere intellegi ut 'dies nox.' 14 De interrogatuis. 15 Aliud quoque est interrogativum ut 'quis,' aliud demonstrativum uel relatitum ut 'quae.' 16 Aliud collectivum ut 'populus,' diuiduum ut 'alter,' facticiūm uel 'tintinnabulum.' 17 Locale ut 'propinquus,' tempore ut 'mensis,' absolutum ut 'deus.' 18 Item alia sunt homonyma quae sub una appellazione plura significant ut 'nepos' quod 'filium filii' et 'luxuriosum' figurat. 19 Alia synonyma uel polyonyma quorum in diversis nominibus una significatio sicut 'terra <h>umus' et 'tellus.'
7 1 De generibus. 2 Cuius generis? 3 Masculini. 4 Quare? 5 Quia praeponitur ei in declinatione articulare pronomen 'hic.' 6 Quaestio. 7 Genus quid est? 8 Exploratio sexus quae fit per uocem caretem genere, nam illa uox non est genus sed id quod per eam intellegitur. 9 'Genus' unde dicitur? 10 A 'generando' siue a 'ge' Graeco id est a terra qua procreantur cuncta. 11 Genera nominum quot sunt? 12 Septem: masculinum cui praeponitur 'hic,' femininum cui 'haec,' neutrum cui 'hoc,' commune cui 'hic' et 'haec.' 13 Est praeterea trium generum quod 'omne' dicitur cui 'hic' et 'haec' et 'hoc' praeponitur ut 'hic' et 'haec' et 'hoc felix.' 14 Est et epicoenon quod promiscuum ideo dicitur quia sub una uocis litteratura marem ac feminam comprehendit et sub uno articulo profertur ut 'hic passer' et 'haec aquila mustela' et 'hic miluus.' 15 'Passer' etenim siue masculus siue femina sit, sub masculino proferri debet/articulo quo vocabulo cunctae minores auiculae uocantur. 16 Nam a paruite corporis passer adeptus est nomen. 17 Aquila quoque sub feminino tantum articulo etiam masculinum demonstrat, et dicitur 'aquila' ab acumine oculorum eo quod ceteris auibus acutius uideat. 18 Mustela uero 'mus longus' dicitur quia 'telon' Graece, 'longum' appellatur Latine. 19 'Muluus' autem a 'molli uolatu' nuncupatur, et sub masculino articulo femininum et masculinum declinatur.
'passerem' et 'mīlum' genere masculino, 'aquilam' uero et 'mus-
telam' feminino pronuntiamus? 3 Solutio. 4 Quoniam auctori-
tas et usus loquacitas ordinavit ut nomina quae per 'r' uel
's' terminantur masculino genere, quae autem in 'a' finiunt,
feminino pronuntientur. 5 Interrogatio. 6 Interrogandum quoque
est quod distat inter commune genus et epicoenon quod utrumque
marem ac feminam comprehendit. 7 Differentia prima. 8 Prima
quippe differentia est quoniam commune in magnis animalibus
dignoscitur, uidelicet in homine, in cane. 9 Epicoenon uero
in paruis siquidem, hoc est in mustelis et in auibus atque omnibus
reptilibus. 10 II: secunda etiam est differentia quia commune
natura cognoscimus quippe cum uideris hominem uisu; et natura
utrum masculus uel femina fuerit animaduertere poteris, epicoenon
uero nusquam. 11 III: tertia quoque differentia est quoniam
commune duos recipit articulos, epicoenon autem uno utitur articulo.
12 Est et septimum genus nominum quod 'incertum' dicitur quia
nulla ratione cogente sola ueterum auctoritas sub diverso
articulo declinauit ut 'hic' uel 'haec finis.'

9 1 Sunt praeterea nomina in singulari numero alterius
generis et alterius in plurali ut 'balneum Tartarus caelum porrum
caepe locus iocus forum' et 'aether.' 2 'Balneum' quippe a
(a)po tu balnein,' hoc est a recreacione mentis et corporis.
3 'Tartarum' autem a 'turbo turbas' dicitur quoniam illic omnia
sunt turbata. 4 'Caelum' uero a 'caelo caelas.' 5 'Porrum'
quoque dicitur ideo quod 'porro' uidelicet 'longe' sit in terra.  
6 'Caepe' autem a Graeco 'cephalim' scilicet 'capite' quoniam in capite melius ualent. 7 Cum itaque haec et alia quam plurima diuersorum generum et declinationum antiqui facerent, dicebant 'hoc balneum huius balnei et 'haec balnea huius balneae hic Tartarus huius Tartari et 'hoc Tartarum huius Tartari hic caelus huius caeli' et 'hoc caelum huius caeli hic porrus huius porri' et 'hoc porrum huius porri' et 'haec porra' pluraliter. 8 'Hoc caepe' indeclinabile et 'haec caepa huius caepae hic iocus huius ioci hoc iocum' et 'haec ioca.' 9 'Hic forus huius fori' et 'hoc forum huius fori' et 'haec fora' tam pro 'prelo' quo uua calcatur quam pro 'mercato' quod a Foroneo rege inuentum est, et inde 'forum' dicitur. 10 'Aether' similiter in singulari masculini generis faciebant. 11 Unde Ouidius in libro de Ibide: 'Ipse meas aether accipe summe preces.' 12 In plurali autem neutrum asserebant sicut quidam sapiens ait: 'Splendida sincerum producunt aethera lumen.'

10 1 Videntes siquidem quoniam unus sonus idemque sensus in his diuersorum generum nominibus esset, quod congruum et sonorius//habetur retinuimus, et quod superfluum erat abiecimur. 2 Et ideo non unum sub diuersis generibus inclusimus sed alterius generis in singularitate, alterius autem in pluralitate iudicauimus. 3 Scienendum praeterea quoniam multa genera a natura, multa sunt ab auctoritate. 4 Illa autem quae a natura
sunt communi sensu quandoque discernimus ut 'uir mulier.'

5 In his quippe nec Vergilio nec Cicerone nec aliquo doctore nobis opus est, sed solam naturaliter sequimur rationem.

6 Scimus enim quod 'hic uir' et 'haec mulier' dicere debemus.

7 In illis quidem quae ab auctoritate sunt non tantummodo naturalem rationem sed etiam auctoritatem sequi conuenit.

11 1 Verbia gratia. 2 De generibus in 'a.' 3 Omnia nomina desinentia in 'a' in nominatiuo singulari sunt feminini generis ut 'Musa' praeter propria nomina uirorum, ut fluuiorum, quae sunt masculini generis ut 'Catilina' et 'Venopia'; praeter nomina officiorum utriusque generis sexus naturae pertinentium et exceptis a nomine et uerbo compositis quae sunt communia ut 'scriba collega'; praeter Graeca quae sunt neutri ut 'sophisma' cum nominibus litterarum ut 'a.' 4 Pluralia quoque neutri sunt generis ut 'arma,' e quibus excipiuntur numeralia quae sunt omnis generis ut 'triginta.'

12 1 In 'e.' 2 Omnia nomina desinentia in 'e' in nominatiuo casu singulari sunt neutri generis ut 'monile' praeter accentata in fine quae sunt feminini ut 'Agathe.'

13 1 In 'i.' 2 Omnia nomina desinentia in 'i' in nominatiuo singulari sunt generis neutri ut 'gummi' aut trium generum ut 'frugi.' 3 Similiter composita a genetiuis, omnis sunt generis ut 'huieu[s]cemi' qui uero masculini est generis.
14 1 In 'o.' 2 Omnia nomina desinentia in 'o' in nominatiuo singulari habentia 'g' uel 'd' ante 'o' et mutata 'o' in 'i,' in genetiuo sunt feminini generis ut 'dulcedo dulcedinis' praeter 'cardo ordo' et 'Cupido' pro 'filio Veneris' quae sunt masculini. 3 Excipitur 'uirgo' quod est commune et 'margo' quod est incerti. 4 Verbalia uero et participia alia similiter sunt feminina. 5 Cetera uero sunt masculini generis ut 'stellio,' a quibus excipitur 'homo latro nemo' et 'bubo' quae sunt communia.

15 1 In 'u.' 2 Omnia nomina desinentia in 'u' in nominatiuo singulari neutri sunt generis ut 'cornu genu' praeter barbarae quae sunt masculini ut 'Esau.'

16 1 In 'b.' 2 Omnia nomina in nominatiuo singulari terminantia in 'b' masculini sunt generis ut 'Iob' et 'Iacob.'

17 1 In 'c.' 2 Omnia nomina desinentia in nominatiuo singulari in 'c' neutri sunt generis ut 'lac' et 'al' ec.

18 1 In 'd.' 2 Omnia nomina terminantia in 'd' in nominatiuo singulari sunt neutri generis ut 'quod' et 'aliud' praeter barbarae quae sunt masculini ueluti 'Dauud' et 'Bogud.'

19 1 In 'al.' 2 Omnia nomina quae desinunt in 'al' sunt generis neutri ut 'animal' praeter propria nomina uirorum ut 'Hananibal' et praeter 'sal' quod etiam masculinum quandoque reperitur.
20 1 In 'el.' 2 Omnia nomina quae nominativiun
singularem faciunt in 'el' sunt generis neutri ut 'mel' et 'fel'
praeter barbara nomina quae sunt masculini ut 'Michael' et praeter
'Rachel' quod est femininum.

21 1 In 'il.' 2 Omnia nomina quae nominativium singula-
rem faciunt in 'il' sunt feminini generis ut 'Tanaquil. 3 'Pug-
gil' autem masculini reperitur, 'uigil' uero commune, 'n[i][c]hil'
uero neutrum.

22 1 In 'ol.' 2 Omnia nomina quae nominativium singula-
rem finiunt in 'ol' sunt masculini generis ut 'sol' praeter barbara ut 'Michol'
quae est feminini generis.

23 1 In 'ul.' 2 Omnia nomina quae desinunt in 'ul'
sunt masculini generis ut 'consul' praeter due communia: 'praesul'
et 'exul.'

24 1 In 'am.' 2 Omnia nomina quae nominativium singula-
rem finiunt in 'am' sunt omnis generis ut 'nequam' praeter
barbara quae sunt masculini generis ut 'Adam.'

25 1 In 'im.' 2 Omnia nomina terminantia nominativium
singularem in 'im' sunt generis neutri ut 'Cim' praeter barbara
quae sunt masculini ut 'Ioachim.'

26 1 In 'um.' 2 Omnia nomina terminantia singularem
nominativium in 'um' neutri sunt generis ut 'templum' et 'scannum'
praeter pauc a propia quae sunt feminini ut 'Dorci um.'
27 1 In 'an.' 2 Omnia nomina nominatiuum singularem finientia in 'an' masculini sunt generis ut 'Titan.'

28 1 In 'en.' 2 Omnia nomina quae in nominatiuo singulari terminant in 'en' sunt neutra ueluti 'carmen.'
3 Excipiantur haec masculini: 'pecten' et 'flamen' (non pro 'flamine' sed pro 'Veneris sacerdote'), 'ren' quoque et 'splen lien <h>ymen' et propria nomina uiorum et praeter composita a 'cano canis' ut 'tibicen' quae sunt communia. 4 'Siren'
quoque et 'Troezen' feminina sunt.

29 1 In 'on.' 2 Omnia nomina quae in nominatiuo singulari finiunt in 'on' masculini designantur generis ueluti 'Simon.' 3 Excipiantur nomina insularum, uestium, et ciuitatum quae feminina iudicantur ut 'Sindon' et 'Sidon' praeter paucu Graeca ut 'Ilion Pelion' et 'Dorion' quae neutra dicuntur.

30 1 In 'ar.' 2 Omnia nomina terminantia in 'ar' in nominatiuo singulari sunt generis neutri ut 'laquear lacunar'
praeter nomina uiorum ut 'Caesar. 3 'Lar' quoque et 'Nar'
masculini sunt generis. 4 'Par' uero cum suis compositis
omnis erit generis

31 1 In 'er.' 2 Omnia nomina nominatiuum singularem terminantia in 'er' si secundae declinationis uel tertiae fuerint,
masculini sunt generis ut 'pater magister.' 3 Excipitur
'mater mulier linter' quae sunt feminini, et adiectiva quae sunt communis ut 'alacer' et 'pauper' siue omnis. 4 'Iter' autem
'spinter' et 'iuger' et fetuum terrae ut 'cicer laser siler' et 'papauer' et 'piper' neutra iudicantur. 5 Excipitur 'acer' quod femininum habetur. 6 Illa quoque quae habent 'u' uel 'b' ante 'r' neutri sunt generis ut 'uer' et 'tuber' praeter 'imber' cum suis compositis ut 'Septembrem' et 'beber.'

32 1 In 'ir.' 2 Omnia nomina desinentia in 'ir' tertiae declinationis sunt neutri generis ut 'hir' et 'Gaddir' praeter 'martir' quod est communis.

33 1 In 'or.' 2 Omnia nomina in nominativo singulari in 'or' terminantia sunt masculini generis ut 'odor' praeter composita a 'colore corpore' et 'decere' ut 'discolor tricorpor' et 'indecor.' 3 'Memor' quoque et 'inmemor' cum suis compositis et comparativa ut 'doctior' quae sunt communis. 4 E quibus excipitur 'senior' quod est masculini tantum et tria feminini: 'uxor soror' et 'arbor.' 5 Quattuor neutra- 'marmor equor ador' et 'cor'- esse iudicantur.

34 1 In 'ur.' 2 Omnia nomina desinentia in 'ur' in nominativo singulari si tertiae declinationis fuerint, neutri sunt generis ut 'murmur' praeter nomina uiorum et auium habentia 'x' uel 't' uel 'f' ante 'ur' quae sunt masculini- 'anxur turtur' et 'furfur' - et uerbalia tertiae declinationis data utrique sexui quae sunt communis ut 'augur Ligur' et 'fur.'

35 1 In 'as.' 2 Omnia nomina in nominativo singulari in 'as' desinentia sunt feminini generis ut 'pietas'//praeter
'uas uadis as assis mas maris' et praeter propria nomina
uirorum ut 'Aeneas Andreas' quae sunt masculini.  3 'Vas'
autem 'fas' et 'nefas' sunt neutri.  4 'Nugas' uero omnis est
generis.  5 Nomina quoque gentilia ut 'Rauennas Arpinas' communia
esse iudicantur.

36  1 In 'es.'  2 Omnia nomina in nominativo singulari
desinentia in 'es' si tertiae fuerint declinationis et non
crescent in genetivo, sunt feminini generis ut 'lues caedes'
praeter 'Verres' quod est masculini generis.  3 Et si crescent
in genetivo et habent 'e' correctam, sunt feminini ut 'seges sege-
tis teges tegetis' et 'compes compedis.'  4 Et si iunguntur
utrique sexui, sunt communis ut 'miles.'  5 Si autem masculino,
feminino, et neutro iungitur, erit omnis generis ut 'locuples.'
6 Alia omnia sunt masculini ut 'aries paries.'

37  1 In 'is.'  2 Omnia nomina desinentia in singulari
nominativo in 'is' sunt masculini generis ut 'panis' praeter
'clunis' et 'canis' quae sunt communis et 'finis' incerti.
3 Habentia duas consonantes uel unam duplicem ante 'is' sunt
masculini ut 'postis' et 'axis' praeter 'uestis pestis neptis
febris restis' et 'orexis' quae sunt feminini.  4 Alia in 'is.'
5 In 'is' crescentia in genetivo sunt masculini ut 'finis
sanguis lapis lapidis' praeter 'cassis cuspis lis clamis' et
'pyxis' quae sunt feminini.  6 Si uero desinentia in 'is'
adiectiua fuerint, sunt communis generis ut 'fortis ciuis' et
'Sannis'. 7 Cetera sunt feminini ut 'clavis' et 'securis.' 8 Excipitur 'moralis' et 'aedilis' quae sunt masculini. 9 Cetera omnia qualia sunt apud Graecos talia in genere remanent apud nos ut 'Paris Thetis.' 10 Alia in 'is.' 11 In 'is' si penultima desinat in aliquam ex liquidis, sunt masculini generis ut 'collis pollis' praeter 'pellis peluis pollis uallis' et 'turris' quae feminina iudicantur. 38 1 In 'os.' 2 Omnia nomina nominatium singularum in 'os' terminantia sunt masculini ut 'mos flos nepos ros' praeter 'cos dos glos' quae sunt feminini. 3 'Sacerdos' autem et 'custos bos compos' et 'inpos' sunt communis. 4 'Os' uero 'oris' et 'os ossis melos' et 'Chaos' sunt neutri. 39 1 In 'us.' 2 Omnia nomina secundae declinationis in 'us' correetam desinentia in nominatuum singularum sunt masculini generis ut 'dominus' praeter nomina arborum ut 'populus pirus' et 'ulmus' et praeter nomina mulierum ut 'Pylus' et 'Berytus' et nomina ciuitatum uel insularum ut 'Andrus' et 'Aegyptus' et haec nomina 'diphtongus nardus costusque phaselus aluus synodus balanus' quoque 'uannis carbasus' atque 'colus' et abyssus humus' et 'byssus' quae sunt feminini generis. 3 Quattuor etiam inueniuntur neutra: 'pelagus vulgus pus' et 'uirus'. 4 Licet quandoque 'uulgus' masculini inueniatur. 5 Alia in 'us.' 6 Omnia nomina declinationis tertiae in 'us' productum si sunt monosyllaba, sunt neutri generis ut 'tus' et 'crus'
praeter 'mus' quod est masculini, 'grus' et 'sus' quae communia
iudicantur. 7 Si uero ultra syllabam fuerint, habentur
feminini generis ut 'tellus' et 'seruitus.' 8 Alia in 'us.'
9 Omnia nomina tertiae declinationis in 'us' nominativum

singularem in 'us' correetam terminantia/sunt neutri generis ut
'pectus' praeter 'lepus' quod est masculini, et 'Venus' feminini
inuenitur generis. 10 Omnia nomina quartae declinationis in
'us' correetam singularem nominativum facientia masculini sunt
generis ut 'uisus luctus' praeter 'porticus' atque 'tribus nurus
manus' aut 'anus'. 11 Sic 'acus' atque 'domus penus' et
'specus': excipe 'socrus.'

40 1 In 'x.' 2 Omnia nominativum singularem nomina
in 'x' terminantia sunt generis feminini ut 'pax nix lux faex
nox' et 'nux' praeter habentia 'e' ante 'x' ultra syllabam quae
sunt masculini: 'cimex pulex culex.' 3 Excipiuntur 'paex
supplex' et 'uibex' et nomina fetuum terrae ut 'carex' quae sunt
feminini praeter 'cortex silex' et 'calix' quae masculini sunt
et feminini. 4 'Greix' quoque 'uarix' et 'fornix' et pertinentia
tantum uiris ut 'rex iudex' sunt masculini. 5 Pertinentia uero
ad utrumque sexum quae sunt communia ut 'dux' et 'coniunx.'
6 Adiectiua uero in 'x' sunt omnis generis ut 'contumax uelox'
et 'audax.' 7 Cetera qualia sunt apud Graecos talia remanent
apud nos ut 'calix' et '(ph)inx.' 8 Quando pro 'monstro'
accipitur, est masculini. 9 Quando pro 'acu', feminini generis
habetur.
41 1 Alia de desinentibus in duas consonantes. 2 Omnia
nomina desinentia in duas consonantes in nominativō singulari
si sint monosyllaba, sunt feminini generis ut 'puls' et 'frons'
praeter 'mons fons pons dens Mars' quae sunt masculini.
3 'Stirps' quoque masculinum et femininum inuenitur. 4 Si
uero ultra syllabam fuerint, et sunt propria nomina 5 uirorum
et cum his etiam 'Ar(t)ons dōd[a]rans triens' et 'quadrans'.
5 Desinentia quoque in 'bs' ut 'Chalybs Chalybis' uel in 'ps'
ut 'forceps forcipis' sunt similiter masculini generis. 6 Pert-
tinentia sīquidem utrique sexui communis habentur generis ut
'caelebs' et 'princeps'. 7 Adiectiua autem omnis sunt generis
ut 'insons inops' et 'expers'.

42 1 Alia in 'aes.' 2 Nominum desinentium in 'aes' dip(h-
t(h)ongo unum inuenitur masculinum ut 'praes'.
et unum neutrum 'aes'.

43 1 In 'aus.' 2 Omnia nominativum singularem in 'aus'
facientia feminini sunt generis ut 'laus' et 'fraus.' 3 De
generibus sīquidem possent plura dīci sed haec ad praesens
sufficiant.

44 1 Cuius numeri? 2 Singularis. 3 Quare? 4 Quīa
singulariter profertur. 5 Quīs est numerus? 6 Forma dic-
tionis in uoce, discretio quantitatis in significacione.
7 Quaestio: 'numerus' unde dicitur? 8 A 'numerando' uel a
'Numeria dea' quam antiqui de am numeri esse dixerunt, siue a 'Numa Pompilio' qui primus inuenit numerum apud Romanos.

9 Item de eodem. 10 Siue 'numerus' dicitur quasi 'nummorum riuus.' 11 Antiqui enim nescientes numerare sua tempora suosque dies ex lapillis numerabant in prosperitate candidis, in adversitate nigris. 12 Hinc Persius ait: 'Hunc Macrine diem numeram meliore lapillo.'

45 1 Numeri nominum quot sunt? 2 Duo. 3 Qui?
4 Singularis ut 'hic poeta,' pluralis ut 'hi poetae.' 5 Singularis quippe dicitur quoniam ad unum, pluralis eo quod ad plurales dicitur, eo quod singulariter proferri non potest.
6 Secundum quosdam tertius est numerus qui 'dualis' dicitur ut 'hi duo' et 'ambo.' 7 Sed nos hunc numerum non recipimus quia quicquid singularitatem excedit, inter pluralitatem computatur, et ideo pluralis est. 8 Item quidam numerum singularem dixerunt non esse numerum quia numerus a pluralitate non in uno proprie dicitur, cum omnis numerus collector est unitatum, ab uno ad plurales//praecedens. 9 Nos autem numerum singularem, unde numerum esse dicimus, eo quod geminatus et multiplicatus omnes numeros facit et quia omnes numeri ex ipso componuntur; et etiam in ipso dissoluuntur.

46 1 Nunc uero quoniam de numero habetur ratio, quaerendum est quae dictiones habent numeros. 2 Illae uidelicet quae personas habent finitas uel infinitas ut sunt nomina, pronomina,
uerba et participia. 3 Inde contingit quia si uerbum deficit
personis, deficit et numero sicut in infinitius inpersonalibus
gerundius et supinis liquido patet.

47 1 De communibus numero. 2 Sunt etiam nomina numero
communia ut 'res nubes dies.' 3 Numero dicuntur ideo esse
communia quia sub terminazione quae est 'es' tam nominatium
singularem quam nominativum pluralem habent. 4 Dicimus enim
'haec res' in singulari numero et 'hae res' in plurali.

48 1 De singularibus numero. 2 Sunt etiam nomina
semper singularia generis masculini ut 'puluis sanguis.' 3 Sed
quare dicimus haec nomina semper esse singularia cum legamus in
Psalmis, 'Libera me de sanguinibus' et in Evangelio: 'qui non
ex sanguinibus'? 4 Ad quod dicendum quod in illo loco maluit
interpres frangere regulam grammaticorum quam reticere pro-
prietatem Graecae interpretationis. 5 Ceterum 'sanguis' apud
Latinos singulariter semper effertur propter unitatem sui; si-
militer 'puluis.' 6 Res enim ista individua est, nec potest
habere sectionem. 7 Et quoniam non potest habere sectionem,
non potest habere pluralem numerum. 8 Numquid enim potest
esse hoc in loco dimidius puluis uel in loco illo dimidius
sanguis? 9 Naturaliter enim res ista individua est et ideo
numeri singularis est. 10 Igitur 'puluis' uel 'sanguis' quando
pluraliter proferuntur, non proprie sed usurpatione fit hoc.
49 1 De semper pluralibus masculinis. 2 Sunt item
semper pluralia generis masculini ut 'Manes Quirites cancelli.'
3 'Manes' dicuntur dii infernales per antiphrasin eo quod
minime sunt boni. 4 Antiqui enim dicebant 'manum' 'bonum.'
5 'Quirites' uero dicuntur Romani a 'Quirino Romulo' qui semper
astā utebatur quae lingua Sabinica 'quiris' dicitur.
6 Item 'cancelli' dicuntur eo quod canentes celent et quia ex
diuersis conficiuntur rebus merito semper pluraliter proferuntur.

50 1 De semper singularibus femininis. 2 Item sunt quaedam
semper singularia ut 'pax' et 'lux' quae sunt feminini generis
et numeri semper singularis, eo quia si una non fuerit pax,
erit discordia. 3 Similiter lux quamuis diuero genere rerum
conficitur, non est tamen certa lux nisi diei.

51 1 De semper pluralibus. 2 Sunt item semper pluralia
feminini generis ut 'kalendae nundinae feriae quadrigae nuptiae
scopae scalae.'

52 1 De semper singularibus neutrorum. 2 Item sunt
semper singularia neutri generis ut 'pus aurum uirus argentum
oleum uinum plumbum ferrum triticum' et fere cetera quae ad
mensuram uel pondus pertinent quamquam multa consuetudine
usurpatum sit ut pluraliter 'uina mella' 'ordea' dicamus.

53 1 De semper pluralibus neutrorum. 2 Sunt semper
pluralia eiusdem generis ut 'arma moenia Floralia Saturnalia.'
54  1 De singularibus uoce non sensu.  2 Item sunt quaedam uoce singularia intellectu pluralia ut 'populus plebs contio' et 'uulgus.'  3 De pluralibus uoce non sensu.  4 Sunt etiam item et alia uoce pluralia, intellectu singularia ut 'Athenae Cumae.'

55  1 De figura.  2 Cuius figurae?  3 Simplicis.  
4 Quare?  5 Quia non potest duidi in duas intelligibiles partes, quarum sensum habeat; nec deriuatur a composito.  
6 Quaestio.  7 Quid est figura?  8 Discrimen simplicium compositarumue dictionum.  9 'Figura' unde dicitur?  10 A 'fingendo' id est a 'componendo.'  11 'Fingere' namque 'componere' dicimus; unde et compositores luti 'figulos' uocamus.  
12 Figurae nominum quot sunt?  13 Duae.  14 Simplex et composita.  15 'Simplex' uero dicitur quasi 'semel' uel 'sine plica plexa' ut 'iustus.'  16 Composita quoque simul posita uocatur quae uidelicit in duo intelligibilia duidi potest ut 'iniustus.'  17 Additur a quibusdam et tertia quae decomposita nuncupatur eo quod a composito deriuatur ut 'iniustitia.'

56  1 Quaestio.  2 Quot modis nomina componuntur?  
3 Quattuor.  4 Quibus?  5 Ex duobus integris ut 'suburbanus.'  
6 Modus I: 'sub' namque integra pars est.  7 Similiter 'urbanus'; inde componitur 'suburbanus.'  8 Modus II: item fit compositio ex duobus corruptis ut 'efficax' scilicet 'effectum
capiens.' 9 Utrumque etenim hoc est 'effectus' et 'capiens'
ibis corrumpitur. 10 III: tertio modo fit compositio ex
integro et corrupto ut 'ineptus' quod componitur ex 'in' et 'aptus.'
11 Cum itaque dicimus 'ineptus,' 'in' siquidem integrum
remanet; 'aptus' uero corrumpitur. 12 IIII: ex corrupto
iterum et integro fit compositio ut 'nugigerulus.' 13 'Nuge'
namque corruptum, 'gerulus' uero integrum remanet. 14 Ali-
quando fit compositio ex pluribus ut 'inexpugnabilis imperter-
ritus.'

57 1 In declinatione compositorum nominum animaduertere
deboemus quod ea quae ex duobus nominatiuis composita fuerint,
ex utraque parte declinantur per omnes casus ut 'eques urbanus equitis
urbani.' 2 Excipitur 'alteruter.' 3 Quae ex nominatiuo et quolibet alio cas
composita fuerint, ea parte declinari tantum possunt qua fuerit
nominatiuus casus ut 'praefectus equitum praefecti equitum.'
4 Quaestio. 5 Quaeritur si ex duobus nominatiuuis sint
nomina composita et ex utrisque declinantur et flectantur lateribus,
cui sint assignanda declinationi. 6 Solutio. 7 Ei quidem
declinationi ea dare debemos cuius fuerit ultimum nomen ut
'praetor urbanus praetoris urbani.' 8 Illa uero declinatio
nominum quae ex nominatiuo et quolibet alio casu composita fuerint
ex nominatiuo cognoscitur ut 'praefectus equitum praefecti
equitum.' 9 Praeterea scire nos conuenit cum quibus partibus
nomina componuntur: cum omnibus praeter interiectionem. 10 Nomen
namque componitur cum nomine ut 'paterfamilias,' cum pronomine
ut 'huiusmodi,' cum aequo ut 'Lucifer,' cum aduerbio ut
'satisfactio,' cum participio ut 'plebis scitum,' cum coniun-
tione ut 'uterque,' cum praepositione ut 'perfidus.'

58 1 Cuius casus?  2 Nominatiui.  3 Quare?  4 Quia
in tali casu declinando reperitur et eius sensum retinet.  5 De
casu.  6 Quid est casus?  7 Leuis inflectio uocis quae fit
per varias terminations declinationis.  8 'Casus' unde
dicitur?  9 A 'cadendo' eo quod unus cadat ab alio: genetius
a nominatiuo et sic alii.  10 Nominatiuus uero non ideo dicitur
casus quod cadat ab aliquo, sed quia alii cadant ab alio.
11 Quaestio.  12 Casus nominum quot sunt?  13 Sex.  14 Qui?

15 Nominatiuus, genetiuus, datiuus, accusatiuus, uocatiuus,//
ablatiuus.  16 Nominatiuus est per quem nominamus.  17 Qui
primus ideo ponitur quoniam alii ab illo regulam sumunt; unde
'rectus' uocatur.  18 Genetius est per quem genus demonstramus.
19 Datiuus a 'dando,' accusatiuus ab 'accusando,' uocatiuus a
'uocando,' ablatiuus ab 'auferendo' dicitur.  20 ideo autem
sunt sex casus quoniam principalia sex negotia homines habent:
nominant, generant, dant, accusant, uocant, auferunt.  21 Per
casus, nominia declinantur hoc modo.  22 Prima declinationi:
nominatiuo 'hic poeta,' genetiuo 'huius poetae,' datiuo 'huic
poetae,' accusatiuo 'hunc poetam,' uocatiuo 'O poeta,' ablatiuo
'ab hoc poeta.'  23 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'hi poetae,'
genetiuo 'horum poetarum,' datiuo 'his poetis,' accusatiuo ' hos poetas,' uocatiuo ' 0 poetae,' ablatiuo ' ab his poetis.'

59 1 Cuius declinationis? 2 Primae. 3 Quae est agnitio primae declinationis? 4 Haec est cuius genetiuous et datiuous singularis, nominatiuous et uocatiuous pluralis in ' ae ' dip(\text{h})-t(\text{h})ongum desinunt, accusatiuous singularis in ' am ' correptam.

5 Vocatiuous similis est nominatiuous, ablatiuous in 'a' productam, genetiuous in 'arum' correptam. 6 Datiuous et ablatiuous in 'is' productam exceptis quibusdam femininis in 'abus' causa differentiae terminantibus ut 'anima animabus.' 7 Accusatiuous in 'as' productam. 8 In his equidem nominibus quibus sexus femininus discernitur si substantialia fuerint, datiuum et ablatiuum pluralem primae declinationis non in 'is' sed in 'bus' terminamus ut 'anima animabus' ne, si 'animis' dixerimus, 'animos' non 'animas' significare uideamur. 9 Quaestio. 10 Quaerendum est autem cur ea nomina in quibus discernuntur genera et notantur substantialia in 'bus' terminari debeant cum adiectiua nomina mobilia, licet in masculino, datiuum et ablatiuum in 'is' mutant, femininum similiter faciunt. 11 Cur eadem regula non seruatur in omnibus ut sicut ad differentiam 'animorum animabus' dicimus sic etiam ad differentiam 'sanctorum sanctabus' pronuntiemus? 12 Solutio laudabilis. 13 Adiectiua quippe nomina fixis semper adhaerent nominibus uel superposita, unde etiam 'epitheta' hoc est 'super- posita' uocantur. 14 Manifestum est igitur ea amittere omnem dubietatem discernendi generis, unde etiam 'epitheta' hoc
est 'superposita' uocantur. 15 Manifestum est igitur ea amittere omnem dubietatem discernendi generis dum enucleantur fixis nominibus ut 'sanctis mulieribus sanctis uris.' 16 Substantia- lia uero nomina non est necesse semper adiectuis iungi nominibus quoniam per se substantiam qualitatemque significant et absque adiutorio adiectuorum pandunt. 17 Hac utique re indigent feminina substantialium nominum aliam habere litteraturam qua a masculinis distare probentur. 18 Quaestio. 19 Item quaeritur cur haec mutatio potius in feminino quam in masculino fiat. 20 Sed ad haec breuiter respondendum est quoniam femininus sexus semper facilius mouetur quam masculinus.

60 1 Secunda declinatio: nominatiiuo 'hic magister,'
genetiuo 'huius magistri,' datiuo 'huic magistro,' accusatiuo 'hunc magistrum,' uocatiuo 'O magister,' ablatiuo 'ab hoc magistro.' 2 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'hi magistri,' genetiuo 'horum magistrorum,' datiuo 'his magistris,' accusatiuo 'hos magistros,'// uocatiuo 'O magistri,' ablatiuo 'ab his magistris.' 3 Secunda declinatio. 4 Quae est agnitio secundae declina-
tionis? 5 Haec est cuius genetiueus singularis, nominatiueus et uocatiueus pluralis in 'i' productam desinit, datiueus et ablatiueus singularis in 'o' productam, accusatiueus in 'um' correptam. 6 Quando nominatiueus in 'r' uel in 'm' desinit, similis est ei uocatiueus. 7 Quando in 'us,' mutatur in 'e' praeter 'deus agnus populus pelagus' et 'uulgus.' 8 Quando
uero in 'ius,' si sunt propria nomina, abiecta 'us' fit uocatius
in 'i' ut 'Vergilius O Vergili.' 9 Et unum appellatiuum quod
est 'filius' similiter facit uocatium in 'i' ut 'O fili.'
10 Genetius pluralis in 'orum' correptam, datiuus et ablatius
in 'is' productam. 11 Accusatius in 'os' productam nisi sint
neutra nomina quae nominatiuum, accusatiuum et uocatiuum
pluralum faciunt in 'a' breuem. 12 Nominatiuo 'hoc scamnum,'
genetiusu 'huius scamni,' datiuo 'huic scamno,' accusatiusu 'hoc
scamnum,' uocatiusu 'O scamnum,' ablatiusu 'ab hoc scamno.' 13 Et
pluraliter nominatiuo 'haec scamna,' genetiusu 'horum scamnorum,'
datiuo 'his scamnis,' accusatiusu 'haec scamna,' uocatiusu 'O
scamna,' ablatiusu 'ab his scamnis.'

61 1 Nominatiuo 'hic' et 'haec sacerdos,' genetiou 'huius
sacerdotis,' datiou 'huic sacerdoti,' accusatiusu 'hunc'et 'hanc
sacerdotem,' uocatiusu 'O sacerdos,' ablatiusu 'ab hoc'et 'ab hac
sacerdote.' 2 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'hi' et 'hae sacerdotes,'
genetiou 'horum' et 'harum sacerdotum,' datiou 'his sacerdotibus,'
accusatiusu 'hos' et 'has sacerdotes,' uocatiusu 'O sacerdotes,'
ablatiusu 'ab his sacerdotibus.' 3 Cuius declinationis?
4 Tertiae. 5 Quae est agnito tertiae declinationis? 6 Haec
est cuius genetiusu singularis in 'is' correptam desinit excepto
'uuis,' datiuus in 'i' productam, accusatiusu in 'em' correptam
uel in 'en' productam. 7 Vocatius similis est nominatiuo;
ablatiusu in 'e' (excepto 'fame') correptam uel in 'i' productam;
nominatiuo, accusatiusu et uocatiusu plurales in 'es' productam
nisi sint neutra quae faciunt in 'a' breuem; genetiuus pluralis in 'um' uel in 'ium' correptam; datiuus et ablatiuus in 'bus' correptam. 8 Nominatiuo 'hic' et 'haec fortis' et 'hoc forte,' genetiuo 'huius fortis,' datiuo 'huic forti,' accusatiuo 'hunc' et 'hanc fortem' et 'hoc forte,' uocatiuo '0 fortis' et '0 forte,' ablatiuo 'ab hoc' et 'ab hac' et 'ab hoc forte' uel 'forti.' 9 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'hi' et 'hae fortis' et 'haec fortia,' genetiuo 'horum' et 'harum' et 'horum fortium,' datiuo 'his fortibus,' accusatiuo 'hos' et 'has fortis' et 'haec fortia,' uocatiuo '0 fortes' et '0 fortia,' ablatiuo 'ab his fortibus.'

62 1 Nominatiuo 'haec manus,' genetiuo 'huius manus,' datiuo 'huic manui,' accusatiuo 'hanc manum,' uocatiuo '0 manus,' ablatiuo 'ab hac manu.' 2 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'hae manus,' genetiuo 'harum manuum,' datiuo 'his manibus,' accusatiuo 'has manus,' uocatiuo '0 manus,' ablatiuo 'ab his manibus.' 3 Cuius declinationis? 4 Quartae. 5 Quae est agnitio quartae declinationis? 6 Haec est cuius genetius singularis, nominatius, accusatius et uocatius plurales in 'us' productam desinunt, datiuis singularis in 'ui' productam, accusatiis in 'um' correptam. 7 Vociiuis similis est nominatiuo, ablatius in 'u' productam, genetiuis pluralis in 'uum' correptam, datiuis et ablatiuis in 'bus' correptam. 8 Tria tamen causa differentiae in 'ubus' terminant ut 'partus partibus' per differentiam 'pars partis partibus'; 'artus artibus' ad differentiam 'ars artis
artibus'; 'arcus arcubus' pro differentia 'arx arcis arcibus.' //

9 Alia quoque sola auctoritate in 'ubus' faciunt ut 'acus acubus
lacus lacubus specus specus' et siqua sunt huius modi.

63 1 Quinta declinatio: nominativus 'haec species,' genetivus
'huius speciei,' dativus 'huic speciei,' accusativus 'hanc speciem,'
udativus 'O species,' ablativus 'ab hac specie.' 2 Et pluraliter
nominativus 'hae species,' genetivus 'harum specierum,' dativus 'his
speciebus,' accusativus 'has species,' udativus 'O species,'
ablativus 'ab his speciebus.' 3 Cuius declinationis? 4 Quintae.
5 Quae est agnitio quintae declinationis? 6 Haec est cuius
genetivus et dativus singularis in 'ei' diuisas syllabas desinit,
accusativus in 'em' corrigiert. 7 Vocativus similis est
nominativus, ablativus in 'e' productam, genetivus in 'erum'
corrigiert, dativus et ablativus in 'bus'corrigiert.

64 1 De formis nominum. 2 Sunt autem formae nominum
casuales sex. 3 Formas quidem hoc est similitudines declina-
tionem sex esse dicimus eo quod tot habent varietieses quot sunt
casus. 4 Ex quibus alia est monoptota quae pro omni casu una
eademque terminatione funguntur ut sunt nomina litterarum et
numerorum a 'quattuor' usque ad 'centum' et siqua sunt similia ut
'hoc a huius a hoc alpha huius alpha'; 'hi' et 'hae' et 'haec
quattuor'; 'horum' et 'harum' et 'horum quattuor.' 5 Alia est
diptota quae duos diuersos casus tantummodo habent ut 'tabi' et
'tabo.' 6 Alia est triptota quae tres casus habet dissimiles
ut 'Musa Musae Musam scannum scanmi scanmo.' 7 Alia est
tetrapoteta quae quattuor habet diversos casus ut 'uir uiri
uiro uirum.' 8 Alia est pentapota quae terminationes quinque
diversas comprehendit ut 'dominus domini domino dominum domine.'
9 Alia est exaptota quae sex casus continet dissimiles
ut 'unus unius uni unum une ab uno.'

65 1 De nomine secundum Donatum. 2. 'Dominus' quae
pars est? 3 Nomen est. 4 Nomini quot accident? 5 Sex.
6 Quae? 7 Qualitas, comparatio, genus, numerus, figura,
casus. 8 Cuius qualitatis? 9 Appellatiuae. 10 Quare?
11 Quoniam commune est multorum. 12 'Petrus' cuius
qualitatis? 13 Propriae. 14 Quare? 15 Quoniam unius
nomen est. 16 Qualitas nominum in quo est? 17 Bipertita
est. 18 Quomodo? 19 Aut enim unius nomen est et 'proprium'
dicitur ut 'Roma'; aut multorum et 'appellatiuim' ut 'urbs.'
20 Comparatur? 21 Minime. 22 Quare? 23 Quia non
recipit a gmentum, nec patitur detrimentum, nec est uere
adjectium. 24 Quid est comparatio? 25 Rerum similium
uel dissimilium assimulatio. 26 'Comparatio' unde dicitur?
27 A 'comparando.' 28 Quae nomina comparantur? 29
Appellatiua dumtaxat qualitatem aut quantitatem significantia:
qualitatem ut 'bonus malus,' quantitatem ut 'magnus paruus.'
30 Cuius generis? 31 Masculini. 32 Cuius numeri?
33 Singularis. 34 Cuius figureae? 35 Simplicis. 36 Cuius
casus? 37 Nominatiui. 38 Quomodo declinantur?
39 Nominatiuo 'hic dominus.'
66 1 Laudabilis quaestio. 2 Quaeri debet cur nomen omnibus orationis partibus praeponerimus. 3 Solutio.
4 Ideo scilicet quia omnis creatura ex suo nomine cognoscitur; nisi enim scierit quis rei nomen, cognitio rerum perit.
5 Ut enim nascitur homo, antequam rem aliquam agat uel discat, nomen illi indicitur. 6 Hac utique causa conueniens fuit ut de nomine prius tractaretur. 7 Alia. 8 Nomen quoque significat substantiam. 9 Substantia uero dignior est actione, unde merito ceteris partibus orationis debuit praeponi. //

fol. 8r

67 1 Quare inuentu sunt pronomina. 2 Pronomen uero ideo inuentum est, et officio fungitur nominis ne repetitio nominis audienti fastidium faceret si semper nomen et non pronomen poneretur ut est: 'Laudate Dominum de caelis, laudate eum in excelsis.' 3 Post tractatum igitur nominis de pronomine loquamur.

68 1 Tractatus de pronomine secundum Priscianum.
2 'Ego' quae pars est? 3 Pronomen. 4 Quare? 5 Quia ponitur in loco nominis sicut proconsul in loco consulis et certam significat personam. 6 Pronomen quid est? 7 Pars orationis quae pro nomine posita, tantundem paene significat, personamque interdum recipit. 8 'Pronomen' unde dicitur?
9 Ex 'pro' et 'nomine.' 10 Pronomini quot accident?
11 Sex. 12 Quae? 13 Species, genus, numerus, figura,
persona, casus. 14 Cuius speciei? 15 Primitiae.
16 Quare? 17 Quia primae impositionis est. 18 Cuius
22 Cuius figurae? 23 Simplicis. 24 Cuius personae?
25 Primae. 26 Quare? 27 Quia omnia pronomina sunt
tertiarum personarum exceptis 'ego' quod est primae et 'tu'
quod est secundae cum his quae deriuantur ab eis. 28 Cuius
casus? 29 Nominatiui.

69 1 Quomodo declinantur. 2 De prima persona: 'ego
mei' uel 'mis mihi me a me.' 3 Et pluraliter 'nos nostrum'
uel 'nostri nobis nos 0 nos a nobis.' 4 De secunda: 'tu tui'
uel 'tis tibi te 0 tu a te.' 5 Et pluraliter 'uos uestrum'
uel 'uestri uobis uos 0 uos a uobis.' 6 De tercia: 'sui
sibi se a se.' 7 Et pluraliter 'sui sibi se a se.'
8 Cuius modi pronominis? 9 Primi. 10 Primus modus
pronominis est cuius genetiuus singularis in 'i' uel in 'is.'
11 Datiius in 'i' naturaliter desinit ut 'ego tu sui.'
12 Secundus modus pronominis est cuius genetiuss singularis
in 'ius' et datius in 'i' naturaliter desinit ut 'ille illius
iste istius ipse ipsius hic huius huic,' quod cum deberet
facere 'hui assumit sibi 'e' causa differentiae 'hui'
interiectionis. 13 Octo quoque nomina sequuntur hunc modum
deciliationis cum suis compositis et sunt 'unus ullus totus
solus alius alter uter' et 'quis.' 14 Tria ex his habent
uocatiuum: 'unus totus solus.' 15 Quae nomina et pronomina
sic declinantur? 16 Nominatiuo 'ille illa illud,' genetiuo 'illiis,' datiuo 'illi,' accusatiuo 'illum illam illum,' ablatiuo 'ab illo ab illa ab illo.' 17 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'illi illae illa,' genetiuo 'illorum illarum illorum,' datiuo 'illis,' accusatiuo 'illos illas illa,' ablatiuo 'ab illis.' 18 Nominatiuo 'iste ista istud,' nominatiuo 'ipse ipsa ipsum.' 19 Nominatiuo 'hic haec hoc,' genetiuo 'huius,' datiuo 'huic,' accusatiuo 'hunc hanc hoc,' ablatiuo 'ab hoc ab hac hoc.' 20 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'hi hae haec,' genetiuo 'horum harum horum,' datiuo 'his,' accusatiuo 'hos has haec,' ablatiuo 'ab hi[...]s.' 21 Nominatiuo 'is ea id,' genetiuo 'eius,' datiuo 'ei,' accusatiuo 'eum eam id,' ablatiuo 'ab eo ab ea ab eo.' 22 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'ei eae et 'ea,' genetiuo 'eorum earum eorum,' datiuo 'eis,' accusatiuo 'eos eas ea,' ablatiuo 'ab eis.' 23 Nominatiuo 'idem eadem idem,' genetiuo 'eiusdem,' datiuo 'eidem,' accusatiuo 'eundem eandem idem,' ablatiuo 'ab eodem ab eadem ab eodem.' 24 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'eodem eadem eadem,' genetiuo 'eorumdem earundem, eorumdem, datiuo 'eisdem,' accusatiuo 'eosdem easdem eadem,' ablatiuo 'ab eisdem.' 25 Nominatiuo 'unus una unum,' genetiuo 'unius,' datiuo 'uni,' accusatiuo 'unum unam unum,' uocatiuo '0 une 0 una 0 unum,' ablatiuo 'ab uno una uno.' 26 Nominatiuo 'totus tota totum,' genetiuo 'totius,' datiuo 'toti,' accusatiuo 'totum totam totum,' uocatiuo '0 tote tota
totum,' ablatiuο 'a toto tota toto.'   27 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'toti totae tota,' genetiuo 'totorum totarum totorum,' datiuο 'totis,' accusatiuo 'totos totas tota,' uociatiuo '0 toti totae tota,' ablatiuο 'ab his totis.'   28 'Alius alia aliud,' genetiuo 'alius,' datiuο 'aliī,' accusatiuo 'alium.'
29 'Alter altera alterum,' genetiuo 'alterius,' datiuο 'alteri.'
30 'Alteruter alterutra alterutrum.'   31 'Quis' uel 'qui quae quod' uel 'quid,' genetiuo 'cuius,' datiuο 'cui,' accusatiuo 'quem quam quod' uel 'quid,' ablatiuο 'a quo' uel 'a qui a // qua' uel 'a qui a quo' uel 'a qui.'   32 Et pluraliter 'qui quae quae quorum quarum quorum quis' uel 'quibus quos quas quae a quis' uel 'a quibus.'

70 1 De tertio modo pronominis.  2 Tertius modus pronominis est qui per omnia sequitur regulam mobilium nominum sic: nominatiuo 'meus mea meum,' genetiuo 'mei meae mei,' datiuο 'mee meae meo,' accusatiuo 'meum meam meum,' uociatiuo '0 mi mea meum,' ablatiuο 'meo mea meo.'  3 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'mei meae mea,' genetiuo 'meorum mearum meorum,' datiuο 'meis,' accusatiuo 'meos meas mea,' uociatiuo '0 mei meae mea,' ablatiuο 'a meis.'  4 Nota.  5 Notandum autem quia cum deberet 'meus' facere uociatiuum '0 mee,' causa melioris sonoritatis convirtit duas 'éé' breues in 'i' longam et facit 'O mi.'  6 Intènde eodem.  7 Nominatiuo 'tuus tua tuum,' genetiuo 'tui tuae tui,' nominatiuo 'suus sua suum,' genetiuo 'sui suae sui,' 'noster nostra nostrum,' genetiuo 'nostri
nostrae nostri,' datiuo 'nstro nostrae nostro,' 'uester uestra uestrum.'

71 1 De quarto modo. 2 Quartus modus pronominis est qui per omnes casus sequitur declinationem nominum tertiae declinationis ut 'hic' et 'haec nostras' et 'hoc nostrate,' genetiuo 'huius nostratis,' datiuo 'huic nostrati,' nominatiuo 'hic' et 'haec uestras' et 'hoc uestrate' remoto uocatiuo solummodo non alio.

72 1 Quot sunt pronomina de quibus nulla dubitatio potest esse apud Latinos? 2 XV: octo primituia et VII deriuatiua. 3 Primituia: 'ego tu sui ille ipse iste hic is'; deriuatiua: 'meus tuus suus noster' et 'uester nostras' et 'uestras.' 4 Quomodo deriuantur . 5 A genetiuo 'mei': 'i' mutata in 'us' uenit 'meus.' 6 Mutata 'us' in 'a' fit 'mea,' conuersa uero 'a' in 'um' dicimus 'meum.' 7 A genetiuo 'nostrum' uel 'nostri': 'i' mutata in 'ster' fit 'noster.' 8 'Ster' autem conuersa in 'stra' fit 'nostra.' 9 'Stra' uero in 'strum' dicimus 'nostrum' et 'nostras nostratis.' 10 A genetiuo 'tui' deriuatur 'tuus tua tuum.' 11 A genetiuo 'uestrum' uel 'uestri' uenit 'uester uestra' et 'uestras uestratis.' 12 Quot ex his habent uocatiuum casum? 13 IIII: unum primituium 'tu' et tria deriuatiua: 'meus noster' et 'nostras.'
Quaestio. 2 Quaeritis autem potest cum prima
persona non habet uocatium uidelicet 'ego mei,' cur in plurali
habeat eam. 3 Prima persona in singulari uocatium ideo non
habet quia nullus se ipsum uocat quoniam semper sibimet
praesens non eget uocatione aliqua. 4 Cur igitur in plurali
numero uocatium habet? 5 Propter consodalitatem scilicet
quoniam non iam sola sed cum aliis uocatur ut 'O nos.' 6
Quaestio. 7 Merito etiam quaeritis debet qua ratione
possessivus pronomina quae deriuantur a prima persona uocatium
habeant cum ipsa prima persona hunc utique casum minime teneat,
'meus' enim 'mei' quod deriuvatur ab 'ego' uocatium facit
'O mi.' 8 Solutio. 9 Sciendum est nobis quia ideo
uocatium habet possessivum primae personae quoniam uocatius
eius transitum facit ad secundam personam uelut cum dico
'O mi fili, O mi pater.' 10 Item alia quaestio. 11 Cum
autem natura sit omnis nominatiui in 'eus' desinentis uocatium
in 'e' duplicem terminare ut 'ligneus 0 ligneus,' cur hoc
pronomen 'meus mei' non facit uocatium '0 mee'// 12 Solutio.
13 Duabus causis. 14 Prima quidem causa est quoniam antiqui
nominatiuum in 'ius' proferebant. 15 Quapropter uocatium
in 'i' faciebant. 16 Secunda uero causa est haec. 17
Moderni uero 'meus' in nominatio dicentes cum uocatium
deberent facere 'O mee,' duas 'e' breues mutuerunt in
'i' longam et dicunt 'O mi' causa euphoniae. 18 'Eu' 'bonum,'
'phone' uero apud Graecos 'sonoritas' dicitur. 19 Causa igitur euphoniae uidelicet bonae sonoritatis in uocatium non 'mee' sed 'mi' dicimus.

74 1 Quaestio. 2 Haec pronomina 'tuus tua tuum' cur carent uocatium cum eorum primitiium uidelicet 'tu' uocatiuum habeat? 3 Solutio. 4 Nullum pronom en habet uocatium nisi illud cui prima persona loquitur uel cui persona secunda uerbi potest adiungi. 5 Neque enim qui loquitur, neque de quo loquitur habet uocatium. 6 Possessiua uero secundae personae uocatium propter hoc produnt quoniam uox transit ad tertiam personam, cum enim dico 'tuus' subauditur 'seruus' aut 'equus' aut quidlibet aliud. 7 Alia quaestio. 8 Item quaeriri debet cur duos genetiuos habeat hoc pronom en 'ego' uel quare sit 'mei' genetiuus illius cum in superficie litterae nullam prorsus habeant similitudinem. 9 Solutio. 10 Sciendum igitur nobis est nominativum istum uidelicet 'ego' secundum antiquos obliquus caruisse casibus. 11 Obliqui quoque eius sine nominativo fuerunt. 12 Videntes autem moderni concordare illos in sensu, quamuis dissimiles forent litteratura, coniunxerunt illos taliter. 13 Ideo etiam duos genetiuos habet quoniam genetiuus 'mei' dicit de re quae in praesenti possidetur tempore. 14 Mis' autem genetiuus de re uentura dicit debet. 15 'Nos' quoque cum antiquitus singulare non haberet, sicut 'ego' nec plurale habebat, placuit modernis ut 'ego' et 'nos' simul
iuncta pro uno pronomine computarentur.

75 1 Alia quaestio. 2 Item quaeerendum uidetur cur hoc pronomem 'sui' nominativum non habeat. 3 Solutio. 4 Propter hoc siquidem 'sui' nominativum habere non potuit quoniam si diceremus 'suus' nulla foret inter primitium et derivativum differentia. 5 Item si diceremus 'sus' non facile posset discerni utrum nomen uel pronomem esset. 6 Si uero 'sis' diceretur, secunda uerbi persona putaretur. 7 Notandum autem quoniam fuerunt qui dicerent huius pronominis 'sui' uidelicet 'si' nominativum fore. 8 Sed quia dubium remaneret quando pronomem uel coniunctio foret, merito talis sententia displicet.

76 1 Quaestio. 2 Est aliqua differentia inter genetivum primitii et possessui horum pronominum 'mei tui sui nostri uestri'? 3 Solutio. 4 Est utique, quoniam genetivus primitii simplicem possessionem significat, possessui autem genetivus duplicem. 5 Si enim dicam 'mei est seruus' pro 'meus est servus' simplicem demonstro possessionem. 6 Si uero proferam 'mei filii est servus' duplicem est demonstrata possessio si mea quae est in filio, filii autem in seruo.

77 1 De pronomine secundum Donatum. 2 Pronomen quid est? 3 Pars orationis quae pro nomine posita, tantundem paene significat, personamque interdum recipit. 4 Quaestio. 5 Quare dixit 'paene'? 6 Solutio. 7 Quoniam nomen plenam orationem facere sine pronomine potest, pronomem uero//
sine nomine nunquam. 8 Quaestio. 9 Cur autem 'interdum' adiunxit? 10 Solutio. 11 Propter infinita pronomina quae personam non habent sed inquirunt substantiam ut 'quis quae quod.' 12 Pronomi qui accident? 13 Sex. 14 Quae? 15 Qualitas, genus, numerus, figura, persona, casus. 16 Qualitas pronominum in quo est? 17 Bipertita est. 18 Quomodo? 19 Aut enim finita sunt pronomina aut infinita. 20 Quae sunt finita? 21 Quae recipiunt personas ut 'ego tu ille.' 22 Quae sunt infinita? 23 Quia non recipiunt personas ut 'quis quae quod.' 24 Genera pronominum quot sunt? 25 Eadem fere quae et nominum: masculinum ut 'quis,' femininum ut 'quae,' neutrum ut 'quod,' commune ut 'qualis talis,' trium generum ut 'ego tu sui.' 26 Quaestio. 27 Quare dixit 'fere.' 28 Solutio. 29 Propter epicoenon quia non est in pronomine. 30 Quare? 31 Quoniam cum constructio fit ex fixo nomine et adiectuo et pronomine, antequam perueniatur ad pronomen, iam per adiectium cognoscitur cuius generis sit fixum. 32 Verbi gratia: 'Aquila magna erat quae uolabat in partibus orientis.' 33 Antequam peruenias ad pronomen, iam per adiectium cognoscis cuius generis fixum fuerit.

78 1 Quaestio. 2 Quaeri etiam rationabiliter debet 'quis talis' et 'qualis' cum secundum Donatum pronomina dicantur et a Prisciano nomina iudicentur, cui potius assensus
debeat praeberi? 3 Solutio. 4 Ad quod respondemus quoniam Donatus haec esse pronomina dixit quia non egent articulis. 5 Pronominibus enim articuli non iunguntur. 6 Didymus quoque Donati magister propter declinationem inter pronomina numeravit. 7 Sed declinatio mutare partem non potest. 8 Si enim posset, multa pronomina fuissent nomina, et iterum multa computarentur nomina inter pronomina. 9 Melius est igitur ut secundum Priscianum nomina iudicentur quia substantiam significant.

79 1 De numero. 2 Numeri pronominum quot sunt?
3 Duo. 4 Qui? 5 Singularis ut 'hic,' pluralis ut 'hi[i].'

80 1 De figura. 2 Figurae pronominum quot sunt?
3 Duae. 4 Quae? 5 Simplex ut 'quis,' composita ut 'quisque.'
6 Nota. 7 Hoc quoque notandum quoniam composita pronomina secundum formam nominum ex ea parte declinantur qua pronomen fuerit casus nominatiui. 8 Cuius rei exempla sunt 'aliquis quisque quisnam quispiam.' 9 Nec hoc neglegenter praetereundum quinque adiectiones esse cum 'quis' et non cum 'qui' ut 'quisnam quispiam quisputas quisquam' et 'quisque.'
10 Quat(Ex)uor autem cum 'qui' et non cum 'quis' ut 'quidam quuius quislibet' et 'quicumque.' 11 Tria quoque composita cum 'quis' mutant litteraturam in singulari feminino et in plurali neutro ut 'siqua nequa aliqua.' 12 'Idem' uero quod pro duobus accipitetur generibus uidelicet pro masculino et
neutro, componitur ex duobus corruptis; et cum producitur, masculinum; cum corripitur, neutrum est. 13 At uero si ita est, quaerendum est in quo genere naturaliter proferatur uel in quo corrumpatur. 14 Sed sciendum est quia in neutro genere naturaliter profertur uidelicet correptum. 15 In masculino autem contra naturam producitur ut: 'uiuo nocendo quidem, sed me manet exitus idem.' 16 In neutro corripitur ut: 'Esset par aetas et idem si robur in annis.'

81 1 Vnde igitur scire poterimus utrum uera sint haec? 2 Facile utique si respiciamus ad compositionem eiusdem pronominis. 3 'Idem' namque cum est masculinum, componitur ex 'is' et 'demum.' 4 Et liquet omnibus 'is' syllabam per se positam correpTam esse. 5 Cum autem fuerit neutrum, ex 'id' et 'demum' componitur. 6 Ex quo apparret in neutro naturaliter corripi, in masculino autem naturam produci. 7 Quaestio. 8 Ut quid ergo producitur? 9 Solutio. 10 Ut discretio uidelicet fiat inter masculinum et neutrum. 11 Quaestio. 12 Si igitur 'idem' ex 'is' et 'demum' in masculino manet compositum, cur non ita fertur ut dicatur 'isdem'? 13 Solutio. 14 Euphoniae quidem causa auffertur inde 's' quia melius sonat 'idem' quam 'isdem' uel quia 'd' littera in nominativo casu in media parte non potest poni nisi inter duas vocales. 15 Et ob hanc causam proicitur inde 's.'

82 1 Sunt item alia composita ut 'egomet.' 2 Compositum
est ab 'ego' et 'met' quae est adiectio syllabica. 3 Declinatur igitur ex parte nominatiui, et 'met' indeclinabiliter manet per omnes casus. 4 Similiter in plurali 'nosmet.'
5 'Nostrum' uel 'nostri' genetius pluralis non recipit 'met' syllabam ne putetur esse possessium. 6 'Tu' quoque 'met' in nominatiuo non recipit ne putetur esse uerbum. 7 Quaestio la(d)abilis. 8 Quaeritur cur Donatus haec pronomina composita appellet cum nulla pars recte ualeat composita dici nisi ea quae denuo redintegrari potest. 9 Non enim maiorem habent sensum nisi tantum quantum simplicia, maxime cum ceteri doctores non compositionem illam uocent, sed potius syllabicam adiectionem esse dicant quae ob decorum artis metricae ab antiquis poetis sunt inventae. 10 Sciendum igitur est quoniam Donatus haec pronomina ideo composita esse dicit quia similitudinem aliarum partium exprimunt et quodam modo uidentur uberiorem et pulcroriorem sonum habere quam simplicia.

83 1 De personis pronominum. 2 Personae pronominum quot sunt? 3 Tres. 4 Quae? 5 Prima ut 'ego,' secunda ut 'tu,' tertia ut 'ille.' 6 Cur dixit 'tres' cum non sit amplius quam una uidelicet prima? 7 Persona enim per se sonat. 8 Si igitur 'persona' ideo dicitur quia per se sonat, non sunt dicendae nisi una uidelicet prima. 9 Prima namque loquitur de tertia ad secundam, nec alia sonat praeter primam. 10 Omnis itaque persona quae per se loquitur prima est, nec
alia ualet emittere uocem nisi prima. 11 Nam si coeperit loqui secunda uel tertia, statim erit prima. 12 Solutio. 13 Ad quod respondendum quod prima quidem propria persona dicitur, ceterae uero translatiuae ob collocutionem quam habet cum eis. 14 Aliter. 15 Alio quoque modo potest dici quoniam haec definitio propter uocem non propter substantiam data est. 16 Inuenitur enim prisco tempore fuisse concessum istrionibus ut quibuscumque uellent in commeediis et tragodiis insultarent. 17 Quod cum potentioribus quibusdam displicuisset, permissum est illis ut laruis adhibitis ex corticibus arborum quorumcunque uellent personas repraesentarent ut est Hecubae, Chremetis, et ceterorum. 18 Ergo iuxta definitionem soni 'persona' dicta est a concavitate laruarum quoniam quo maior erat concavitas eo prolixior sonus reddebatur. 19 Secundum uero substantiam persona est individua uniusculiusque rei praesentatio. 20 Prima igitur persona est quae de se ipsa loquitur uel sola uel cum aliis ut 'ego nos.' 21 Secunda ad quam prima loquitur. 22 Tertia est de qua fit sermo inter primam et secundam.

84 1 De casibus. 2 Casus item pronominum quot sunt? 3 Sex. 4 Quemadmodum et nominum per quos omnium generum nomina, pronomina, participia declinantur. 5 Quaestio.

fol. 10v 6 Cur dixit sex casus habere pronomem cum non//omnia pronomina sex casus habeant? 7 Prima enim et tertia persona plus
quinque casibus habere non ualent, cum uocatiuus in eis
inueniri non possit. 8 Solutio. 9 Donatus posuit totum
pro parte quia quamuis non omnia pronomina tantum aliqua sex
casus recipiunt. 10 De prima persona. 11 'Ego' pronomen
finitum generis omnis, numeri singularis, figurae simplicis,
personae primae, casus nominatiui quod declinabitur sic: 'ego
mei' uel 'mis mihim me a me,' et pluraliter 'nos nostrum' uel
'nostri nos o nos a nobis.' 12 De secunda. 13 Personae
secundae, generis omnis, numeri singularis, figurae simplicis,
casus nominatiui et uocatiui quod declinabitur sic: 'tu tui'
uel 'tis tibi te 0 tu a te,' et pluraliter 'uos uestrum' uel
'uestri uobis uos o uos a uobis.' 14 De tertia. 15 Personae
tertiae, generis omnis, numeri utriusque, casus genetiui, datiui,
accusatiui et ablatiui quod declinatur sic: 'sui sibi se a
se,' et pluraliter 'sui sibi se a se.' 16 Item personae
tertiae, generis masculini, numeri singularis, figurae simpli-
cis: 'ille illius illi illum ab illo,' et pluraliter 'illi
illorum illis illos ab illis.' 17 Generis feminiui: 'illa
illius illi illam ab illa,' et pluraliter 'illae illarum illis
illas ab illis.' 18 Generis neutri: 'illud illius illi illud
ab illo,' et pluraliter 'illa illorum illis illa ab illis.'

85 1 Quaestio. 2 Quare dicitur haec pronomina
finita? 3 Solutio. 4 Quoniam definiunt certam personam
ut puta quando dico 'ego,' non potes aliquem intellegere alium
nisi me qui dirigo semonem. 5 Similiter de 'tu tui' dici potest. 6 'Ille' autem quamuis secundum Donatum inter finita computetur, aliquotiens est minus quam finitur. 7 Cum enim de praesente loquitur, tunc est finitur ut: 'Videsne illum?' 8 Si uero de absentia fiat mentio, minus quam finitur. 9 Quaestio. 10 Quaeritur etiam cur prima et secunda persona non egent diuersis uociibus. 11 Eo quod inter se semper praesentes sunt et demonstratiuæ. 12 Tertia uero persona modo demonstratiua est ut 'hic iste,' modo relatiua ut 'is ipse,' modo praesens ut 'iste,' modo absens ut 'ille.'

86 1 De minus quam finitis. 2 Minus quam finita generis masculini: 'ipse ipsius ipsi ipsum ab ipso,' et pluraliter 'ipsi ipsorum ipsis ipsos ab ipsis.' 3 Generis feminini: 'ipsa ipsius ipsi ipsam ab ipsa,' et pluraliter 'ipsae ipsarum ipsis ipsas ab ipsis.' 4 Item minus quam finita generis masculini: 'iste istius isti istum ab isto,' et pluraliter 'isti istorum istis istos ab istis.' 5 Generis feminini: 'ista istius isti istam ab ista,' et pluraliter: 'istae istorum istis istas ab istis.' 6 Generis neutri: 'istud istius istud ab isto,' et pluraliter 'ista istorum istis ista ab istis.' 7 Quaestio. 8 Quare autem 'ipse' et 'iste' 'minus quam finita' dicuntur? 9 Solutio. 10 Quoniam non semper praesentia sunt. 11 'Ipse' namque si per se proferatur in tertia persona, relatiuum est. 12 Vnde Vergilius
in tertio Aeneidos: 'Ipse arduus altaque pulsat sidera.' 13
Si uero cum aliis pronominis iungatur, eorum accipit significationem ut idem poeta in quinto: 'Ipse ego paulisper pro te tua munera inibo.' 14 Est hic demonstratium quoniam 'ego' cui adiungitur, est demonstratium. 15 'Minus quam finita' igitur dicuntur quoniam non semper praesentiam ostendunt.

87 1 De articularibus. 2 Item articulare pronomen praepositiuum uel demonstratium generis masculini: 'hic huius huic hunc abhotel, et pluraliter 'hi horum his hos ab his.' 3 Generis feminini: 'haec huius huic hanc ab hac,' et pluraliter 'hae harum his has ab his.' 4 Generis neutri: 'hoc huius huic hoc ab hoc,' et pluraliter 'haec horum his haec ab his.' 5 Quaestio. 6 Quare praedicta pronomina fol. 11r 'articularia' uocantur? 7 Quoniam pro articulis ponuntur. 8 Graeci autem partem articulorum habent quam nos non habemus, et in ultimo loco eam ponunt ubi nos ponimus interiectionem. 9 Pro illis igitur articulis haec pronomina ponimus, unde ipsa 'articularia' uocamus. 10 'Praepositiua' ideo dicuntur quoniam semper praeponuntur. 11 'Demonstratiaua' uero appellantur quia rem praesentem ostendunt. 12 Sciendum etiam quoniam 'hic' pronomem semper corripitur; 'hic' aduerbium productur. 13 Vnde Virgilius: 'Hic uir hic est tibi quem promitti saepius audis.' 14 Alia quaestio. 15 Quaerendum nicihominus uidetur de eodem pronomine quod est 'hic' quando
sit pronomen uel quando articulus tantum. 16 Solutio. 17 Sed notandum tunc est pronomen tantum quando officio nominis fungitur ut: 'Hic est uir de quo dixeram tibi.' 18 Tunc uero est articulus cum coartat nos ad cognoscendum genus, numerum uel casum.

88 1 De subjunctio. 2 Item subjunctiuem uel relatiuum generis masculini: 'is eius ei eum ab eo,' et pluraliter 'ei eorum eis eos ab eis.' 3 Generis feminini: 'ea eius ei eam ab ea,' et pluraliter 'eaerum eis eas ab eis.' 4 Generis neutri: 'id eius ei id ab eo,' et pluraliter 'ea eorum eis ea ab eis.' 5 Quaestio. 6 Qua ratione subjunctiuem 'is' pronomen uocatur? 7 Solutio. 8 Quia semper subjungitur. 9 Praecedit enim nomen et sequitur pronomen ut: 'Aeneas filius Veneris, is uicit Turnum.' 10 Dicit etiam 'relatiuum' quoniam praecedens nomen reuocat ad memoriam ut: 'Dominus Iesus Christus, is est qui uicit Diabolum.'

89 1 De infinitis. 2 Item infinita generis masculini: 'quis' uel 'qui cuius cui quem a quo' uel 'a qui,' et pluraliter 'qui quorum quis' uel 'quibus quos a quis' uel 'a quibus.' 3 Generis feminini: 'quae' uel 'qua cuius cui quam a qua' uel 'a qui,' et pluraliter 'quae quorum quis' uel 'quibus quas a quis' uel 'a quibus.' 4 Generis neutri: 'quod' uel 'quid cuius cui quod' uel 'quid a quo' uel 'a qui,' et pluraliter 'quae quorum quis' uel 'quibus quae a quis' uel
'a quibus.'  5 Quaestio.  6 Cur praedicta pronomina dicuntur 'infinita'?  7 Solutio.  8 Quoniam referuntur ad omnem substantiam et requirunt personam sed non demonstrant.  9 'Quis' autem et 'qui' duo sunt nominatiiui, sed in hoc distant quoniam 'qui' pro 'quis' ponitur.  10 'Quis' uero pro 'qui' numquam, sed interrogatium est tantum ut: 'quis heri legit? Ipse qui et hodie.'

90  1 De possessiuis ad aliquid dictis.  2 Item possessiua finita ad aliquid dicta: 'meus mei meum 0 mi a meo,' et pluraliter 'mei meorum meos 0 mei a meis.'  3 Generis feminini: 'mea meae meae mean 0 mea a mea,' et pluraliter 'meae mearum meis meas 0 meae a meis.'  4 Generis neutri: 'meum mei meo meum 0 meum a meo,' et pluraliter 'mea meorum meis mea 0 mea a meis.'  5 Nota.  6 Ratio exiguit ut quare possessiua 'finita ad aliquid dicta' uocentur paucis uerbis dilucidetur.

7 Solutio.  8 'Possessiua' dicuntur quoniam possessionem demonstrant ut 'meus equus'; 'finita' quia rem praeuentem notant.  9 Ad aliquid dicta.  10 Vocantur eo quod praeter se alid figurant uelut si dicis 'patrem,' iam intellegis 'filium.'  11 Ita cum dicis 'meus,' semiplenum adhuc pendet usque dum dicas 'homo' uel 'equus.'

91  1 De secunda persona.  2 Personae secundae, generis masculini: 'tuus tui tuo tuum a tuo,' et pluraliter 'tui tuorum tuis tuos a tuis.'  3 Generis feminini: 'tua tuae
tuæ// tuam a tua,' et pluraliter 'tuæ tuarum tuis tuas a tuis.'
4 Generis neutri: 'tuum tui tuo tuum a tuo,' et pluraliter
'tuæ tuorum tuis tua a tuis.' 5 De tertia persona. 6 Per-
sonae tertiae, generis masculini: 'suus sui suo suum a suo,'
et pluraliter 'sui suorum suis suos a suis.' 7 Generis
feminini: 'suæ suæ suæ suam a suæ,' et pluraliter 'suæ
suarum suis suas a suis.' 8 Generis neutri: 'suum suí suo
suum a suó,' et pluraliter 'suæ suorum suis suæ a suis.'
9 Item possessiua finita ad aliquid dicta generis masculini:
'noster nostri nostro nostrum 0 noster a nostro,' et pluraliter
'nostri nostrorum nostris nostros 0 nostrí a nostrís.' 10
Generis feminini: 'nostra nostrae nostram 0 nostra a
nostra,' et pluraliter 'nostrae nostrarum nostris nostras 0
nostræ a nostrís.' 11 Generis neutri: 'nostrum nostrí
nostro 0 nostrum a nostro,' et pluraliter 'nostra nostrorum
nostris nostra 0 nostra a nostrís.' 12 Personae secundae,
generis masculini: 'uester uestri uestro uestrum a uestro,'
et pluraliter 'uestri uestrorum uestrés uetros a uestris.' 13
Generis feminini: 'uestra uestrae uestram a uestra,'
et pluraliter 'uestrae uestrarum uestras a uestris.'
14 Generis neutri: 'uestrum uestri uestro uestrum a uestro,'
et pluraliter 'uestra uestrorum uestrís uestra a uestris.'
15 Da horum composita. 16 'Egomet tuīmet suīmet' et
cetera ut 'eccine quisnam quispiam.'
92  1 'Amo' quae pars est?  2 Verbum.  3 Quare?
4 Quia cum temporibus et persona sine casu aut agere aliquid
aut pati aut neutrum significat.  5 Verbum quid est?  6
Pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu agendi uel pa-
tiendi aut utriusque significatiua.  7 'Verbum' unde
dicitur?  8 A 'uerberando' eo quod ipsum proferendo saepius
aerem uerberamus.  9 Quaestio.  10 Cum ceterae partes
uerberatione aeris fiant, cur haec sola pars hoc sibi prae
ceteris nomen asciscit?  11 Solutio.  12 Ideo haec sola
pars hoc nomine nuncupatur quia frequentius ea in omni oratione
utimur ut est illud: 'Volo ire uidere amicum' et in Proverbiis,
'Discurre, festina, suscita amicum tuum.'

93  1 De accidentibus.  2 Verbo quot accidunt?  3 Octo.
4 Quae?  5 Genus, tempus, modus, species, figura, coniugatio,
persona cum numero.  6 Quaestio.  7 Cum non dixerit 'genus
cum tempore' et sic de reliquis, cur post modum subiungit
'persona cum numero'?  8 Solutio.  9 Quoniam haec duo
accidentia uidelicet persona et numerus sic inter se concordant
ut quodcumque uerbum personam habuerit, habeat et numerum.
10 Et si persona caruerit, careat similiter et numero, quod
de ceteris accidentibus non euenit.  11 Cuius generis?
12 Actiui.  13 Quare?  14 Quia desinit in 'o' et potest
facere transitionem ad aliquod rationale animal, unde possit
fieri conuersa locutio accepto 'r.'
94 1 'Amor' cuius generis? 2 Passiui. 3 Quare?

4 Quia desinit in 'r' et potest demittere 'r' et redire in actium et iterum sumere 'r' et facere ex se passiuum.

5 'Sedeo' cuius generis? 6 Neutri. 7 Quia desinit in 'o' nec potest facere. 8 'Gaudeo' cuius generis? 9 Neutropassiui. 10 Quare? 11 Quia in praeteritis perfectis et in his quae formantur ab eis retinet litteraturam passiuorum, in ceteris uero neutrorum. 12 Sunt autem numero quinque: 'gaudeo gaudes gauisus sum audeo audes ausus sum soleo solitus sum fio factus sum fido fisus sum.' 13 Neutra passiua.

14 'Vapulo' cuius generis? 15 Neutropassiui. 16 Quare?

fol. 12r 17 Quia cum desinat in 'o,' non potest// facere transiti<tronem, et in litteratura neutrorum sensum retinet passiuorum cum nec etiam in praeteritis habeat litteraturam eorum. 18 Sunt uero haec: 'uapulo exulo ueneo paueo pauesco expauesco.'

95 1 De deponentibus. 2 'Loquor' cuius generis?

3 Deponentis. 4 Quare? 5 Quia deponit unam significacionem et retinet aliam uidelicet sub litteratura passiui sensum demonstrat actiui. 6 De neutris substantiui. 7 'Sum' cuius generis? 8 Neutri substantiui. 9 Quare? 10 Quia in 'um' terminatum nec actiuium nec passiuum sed substantiam significat. 11 De communibus. 12 'Osculor' cuius generis?

13 Communis. 14 Quare? 15 Quia sub una litteratura tantum uidelicet sub passiua utramque retinet significacionem hoc est actiui et passiui. 16 Sunt autem octo. 17 Quae?
Largior experior ueneror moror osculor mortor criminor amplector' tibi sint com unia lector.

De genere. 2 Quid est genus in uerbo? 3 Actionis uel passionis determinatio. 4 'Genus' unde dicitur? 5 A 'generando' eo quod unum generetur ab altero. 6 Quot sunt genera. 7 Genera uerborum quot sunt? 8 Septem. 9 Quae? 10 Actiuum ut 'amo,' passiuum ut 'amor,' neutron absolutum ut 'sedeo,' neutropassiuum ut 'gaudeo,' neutron passiuum ut 'ueneo.' 11 His etiam additur neutron substantiuum ut 'sum' et ab eo composita ut 'absum obsum praesum possum' et 'desum' et cetera. 12 Sunt et neutra defectiua in 'i' terminantia ut 'memini.' 13 Sunt item alia neutra quae in 't' desinunt ut 'pudet taedet' quando indeclinabilia inueniuntur et impersonalia uocantur. 14 Ex his autem desinentia in 'it' datiuo casui serviumt ut 'contingit mihi.' 15 Quae uero in 'et' modo datiuum modo accusatiuum requirunt ut 'libet mihi; decet me.'

De tempore. 2 Cuius temporis 'amo'? 3 praesentis. 4 Quare? 5 Quia praesentem rem designat. 6 'Amabam' cuius temporis? 7 Praeteriti imperfecti. 8 Quare? 9 Quia rem inceptam sed nondum perfectam demonstrat. 10 'Amaui' cuius temporis? 11 Praeteriti perfecti. 12 Quare? 13 Quia praeteritum perfectum. 14 'Amaueram' cuius temporis? 15 Praeteriti plusquamperfecti. 16 Quare? 17 Quia praeteritum. 18 'Amabo' cuius temporis? 19 Futuri. 20 Quare? 21 Quia
futurum.  22 Quid est tempus?  23 Rerum mirabilium
transitus.  24 'Tempus' unde dicitur?  25 A 'temperando.'
26 De temporibus.  27 Quot sunt tempora in declinatione
uerborum?  28 Quinque: praesens, praeteritum imperfectum,
perfectum, plusquamperfectum et futurum.  29 Quaestio.
30 Cur autem posuimus praesens tempus primum et non per ordinem
ut prius praeteritum ac deinde praesens posuissemus?  31 Sol-
lutio.  32 Ideo nempe praesens ante praeteritum posuimus
quia quod praeteritum est praesens ante fuit, et praeteritum
non potest esse nisi prius praesens fuerit.

98  1 De modis.  2 'Amo' cuius modi?  3 Indicatiui.
4 Quare?  5 Quia indicat.  6 'Ama' cuius modi?  7
Imperatiiui.  8 Quare?  9 Quia imperat.  10 'Amarem'
14 'Amem' cuius modi?  15 Subiun<st>tiui.  16 Quare?
17 Quia subiungit.  18 'Amare' cuius modi?  19 Infinitiiui.
20 Quare?  21 Quia nec personas definit nec numerum.  22 Quid
est modus?  23 Varia inclinatio animi; varios eius affectus
demonstrans.  24 'Modus' unde dicitur?  25 A 'moderando.'
26 Modi uerborum quot sunt?  27 V: indicatiuius, imperatiuius,
opatiuius, subiun<st>tiuius et infiniitiuius.  28 Quaestio.
29 Quare taliter ordinati sunt?  30 Solutio.  31 Indica-
fol. 12^v tiuius quippe primus ideo ponitur// quia perfectior ceteris
est omnibus tam personis quam temporibus et quia ex ipso omnes
modi regulam excipiunt et deriuatiua nomina seu uerba uel
participia ex hoc nascuntur ut 'duco ducens duxi ductus dux.'

32 Imperatiuus autem ideo secundum tenuit locum in declinatioine uerborum quia non indiget auxilio alterius partis ad plenam significacionem licet per tempora, et significaciones naturaliter deficiat. 33 Caret enim prima persona et praeterito tempore. 34 Solemus autem non solum imperantes sed etiam orantes saepissime illo uti ut est: 'Libera me de sanguinis.' 35 Optatiuus uero quamuis temporibus et personis perfectior esse uideatur imperatiuo, merito tamen post eum ponitur quia eget aduerbio optandi ut plenum significet sensum. 36 Iure etiam praededit imperatiuus optatiuum quam optat inferior esse uideatur imperante. 37 Quarto loco ponitur subiunctiuus. 38 Et merito quoniam eget aduerbio uel coniunctione uel subiungit aut subiungitur alteri uerbo.

39 Infinitiuus ultimus est quia nec personas definit nec numerum. 40 Post infinitiuum autem sequitur uerbum impersonale.

99 1 Quod ideo 'impersonale' dicitur? 2 Quia certam personam non definit. 3 Quaestio itaque oritur. 4 Cum 'infinitiuus' dicitur quia non definit numerum certum uel personam, impersonalis autem similiter, quare non unus modus dicitur uel sub una litteratura comprehendit an forte differt inter se aliquid? 5 Differt utique quattuor modis 6 Vno modo quia impersonalis a tertia persona indicatui nascatur, infinitiuus uero a[\text{d}] secunda. 7 Alio modo quoniam
impersonalis non uenit nisi a duobus uerbis: actiuo uidelicet et neutro ut quibusdam placet. 8 Infinitius autem ab omnibus uerbis. 9 Tertio modo quia impersonalis per omnes modos et per omnia tempora currit; infinitius autem non ita. 10 Quarto modo impersonalis extrinsecus accipit adiumentum a personis pronominum ut 'legitur a me' (id est 'ego lego'). 11 Infinitius autem ab ipso quo ortur uerbo. 100 1 Cuius speciei? 2 Primitiuae. 3 Quare? 4 Quia a nullo deriuatur. 5 Cuius figurai? 6 Simplicis. 7 Quare? 8 Quia non potest diuidi. 9 Quaestio. 10 Quot modis uerba componuntur? 11 Quattuor. 12 Quibus? 13 Ex duobus integris ut 'adamo,' ex duobus corruptis ut 'intellogo.' 14 'Inter' namque et 'lego' utrumque ibi corrumpitur. 15 Ex integro et corrupto ut 'discuto' ex 'dis' et 'quatio.' 16 Ex corrupto et integro ut 'diffido' ex 'dis' et 'fido.' 17 Quaedam etiam sunt decomposita ut 'conticesco' quod a 'conticeo contices,' ex 'con' et 'taceo taces' composito, deriuatur addita 'co.'

101 1 Cuius coniugationis? 2 Primae. 3 Quare? 4 Quia in secunda persona, praesentis temporis, indicatiui modi habet 'a' ante 's' in actiuo, et neutro: in passiuo uero communi et deponenti habet 'a' ante 'ris' ut 'amo amas amor amaris.' 5 Quaestio. 6 Quid est coniugatio? 7 Solutio. 8 Consequens uerborum declinatio. 9 'Coniugatio' unde dicitur? 10 A 'coniugando' eo quod sub una regula quasi
sub uno iugo plurima uerba coniungat. 11 Coniugationes uerborum quot sunt? 12 Quattuor. 13 Prima quae indicatiuo modo in secunda persona, tempore praesenti habet 'a' productam ante nouissima[l] litteram 's' in actiuo et neutro.// 14 Passiuo uero communi et deponenti habet 'a' productum ante nouissimam syllabam 'ris' ut 'amo amas amor amaris.' 15 Secunda quae habet 'e' productum ut 'doceo ces' et 'doceor doceris.' 16 Tertia quae habet 'i' correp-tum ante 's' in actiuo et neutro ut 'lego legis.' 17 In passiuo autem communi et deponenti habet 'e' correp-tum ante 'ris' ut 'legor legeris.' 18 Quarta est quae habet 'i' productum ut 'audio audis audior audiris.'

102 1 Quaestio. 2 Prima coniugatio quot formas praeteritas habet? 3 Tres. 4 Quas? 5 In 'ui' ut 'amaui,' in 'ui' ut 'tonui,' in 'i' antecedentes consonantes praesentis temporis ut 'dedi.' 6 Quot sunt uerba primae coniugationis praeteritum in 'ui' facientia? 7 Duodecim. 8 Quae? 9 'Cubis bas cubui mico micas micui frico cas fricui plico cas plicui seco cas secui neco cas necui ueto tas uetui domo mas domui tono nas tonui sono nas sonui crepo pas crepuex nexo xas xui.' 10 Quaestio. 11 Quot sunt uerba primae coniugationis quae faciunt praeterita in 'i' antecedente consonante praesentis temporis? 12 Quattuor. 13 Quae? 14 'Dedi steti laui' et 'iuui.' 15 Omnia alia
uerba faciunt praeterita in 'ui' ut 'amaui,' et mutant 'ui' in 'tum' et inde faciunt supinum ut 'amaui tum' praeter 'laui' quod facit 'lotum lautum' et 'lauatum.' 16 Facientia praeteritum in 'ui' mutant 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' ut 'domui domitum' praeter 'nectum sectum frictum'; et 'micui' facit 'micatum,' et 'plicui' 'plicatum' et 'plicitum.'

17 Sed quando componitur cum nominibus facit 'duplcaui duplicatum.' 18 Et quando componitur cum praepositionibus facit 'explicui explicitum.' 19 Verba primae coniugationis praeteritum in 'i' antecedente consonante praesentis temporis facientia mutant 'o' in 'a' et addita 'tum' supinum faciunt ut 'do datum sto statum.'

103 1 De uerbis secundae coniugationis. 2 Omnia uerba secundae coniugationis in 'ui' praeteritum facientia mutant 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' supinum faciunt ut 'monui monitum' praeter 'doctum tentum excelsum tostum cassum passum.'

104 1 Quae finiunt in 'deo.' 2 Omnia uerba secundae declinationis in 'deo' desinentia mutant 'deo' in 'sum' in supino ut 'ardeo arsum suadeo suasum rideo risum uideo uisum sedeo sessum.' 3 Interposita 's': 'tondeo tonsum mordeo morsum sp[...]o[deo sponseo prandeo pransum' praeter ea quae faciunt praeterita in 'ui' mutant 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' faciunt supinum ut 'splendui splendidum' si haberet. 4 Omnia uerba secundae coniugationis in 'si' praeteritum facientia mutant 'si' in 'sum' ut 'alsi alsum' praeter 'mulgeo mulsi' quod facit
'mulsum' et 'multum,' et 'indulgeo indulsi' quod facit 'indulsum' et 'indultum,' et praeter 'urgeo' quod facit 'ursum,' et 'torsi' quod facit 'tortum' et 'torsum.'

105 1 Terminantia in 'beo.' 2 Omnia uerba coniugationis II in 'beo' desinentia et faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'habeo habui' praeter 'iubeo' quod facit 'iussi' et 'forbeo forsi' et 'forbui.' 3 De his itaque facientia praeteritum mutant 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' supinum faciunt ut 'habui//habitum.' 4 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'si,' mutant 'si' in 'sum' ut 'iussi iussum.' 5 Quod si fecerint praeteritum in 'psi,' mutant 'psi' in 'ptum' ut 'sorpsi sortum' et 'sorptum' et 'sorbitum.'

106 1 Desinentia in 'ceo.' 2 Omnia uerba secundae coniugationis desinentia in 'ceo' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'doceo docui' praeter 'mulceo mulsi' et 'mulxi' et 'luceo luxi.' 3 Facientia igitur de his in 'ui' praeteritum mutant 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' supinum formant ut 'nocui nocitum' praeter 'docui' quod mutat 'ui' in 'ctum' et facit 'doctum.' 4 Facientia uero praeteritum in 'xi' mutabunt 'xi' in 'tum' ut 'mulxi multum luxi luctum.'

107 1 In 'deo.' 2 Omnia uerba secundae coniugationis desinentia in 'deo' si habent 'ar' uel 'a' uel 'i' longam ante 'deo,' faciunt praeteritum in 'si' ut 'ardeo arsi suadeo suasi rideo risi' praeter 'strdeo' quod facit 'stridi.' 3 Et si
habent 'e' uel 'i' breuem ante 'deo,' mutant 'eo' in 'i' produc-
tam et faciunt praeteritum in 'di' ut 'uideo uidi praeuideo
praeuidi sedeo sedi' quod in composito seruat praeterito 'e'
productum. 4 Et si geminantur in praeterito, faciunt in
'di' ut 'tondeo totondi morordi spondeo sponpondi.'

5 Omnia alia faciunt in 'ui' ut 'splendeo splendeui' praeter
'prando' quod facit 'prandi' et 'pransus.' 6 Et si faciunt
praeteritum in 'si,' mutant 'si' in 'sum' ut 'ardeo archem
suasi suasum.' 7 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'di,' mutant
'di' in 'sum' ut 'uideo uisum sedi sessum' interposita 's.'
8 Et si geminantur in praeterito, mutant 'deo' in 'sum' ut
'tondeo tonsum.' 9 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ui,'
mutant 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' supinum faciunt ut 'splendui
splendiditum.'

108 1 In 'geo.' 2 Omnia uerba secundae conjugationis
desinentia in 'geo' si habent 'r' uel 'l' ante 'geo,' faciunt
praeterita in 'si' ut 'turgeo tursi algeo alsi.' 3 Et si
habent uocalem longam ante 'geo,' faciunt praeteritum in 'xi'
ut 'frigeo frixi lugeo luxi augeo auxi.' 4 Omnia alia
faciunt praeterita in 'ui' ut 'indigeo indigui egeo egui.'
5 De his itaque facientia praeteritum in 'si' mutant 'si' in
'sum' ut 'alsi alsum.' 6 Quae autem praeteritum in 'xi'
terminant mutata 'xi' in 'ctum' supinum faciunt ut 'frixi frictum.'
7 Quod si fecerint in 'ui,' mutabunt 'ui' in 'i' et per adiccionem
'tum' supina formabunt.
Desinentia in 'peo.' 2 Omnia uerba secundae conjugationis quae in 'peo' finiunt, in 'ui' praeterita faciunt ut 'torpeo torpui'; et mutata 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' supinum faciunt ut 'torpui torpetum.'

In'queo.' 2 Omnia conjugationis secundae uerba in 'queo' terminantia faciunt praeteritum in 'ui'; et mutant 'ui' in 'i' et assumpta 'tum' supinum faciunt ut 'liqueo liqui liquitum' si haberet. 3 Quae autem in 'si' praeteritum faciunt, mutant 'si' in 'sum' in supino ut 'torpi torsi torsum'; licet et 'tortum' inueniatur.

Omnia uerba secundae conjugationis desinentia in 'teo' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'miteo mitui'; et mutata 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' supinum faciunt. 2 Excipitur 'pateo patui passum.'

Desinentia in 'leo.' 2 Omnia secundae conjugationis uerba in 'leo' desinentia si sunt composita ab 'oleo' uel a 'leo' uel a 'pleo,' faciunt praeterita in 'ui' ut 'adoleo adoleuiimplei deleui deleui' praeter 'redoleo' et 'adoleo aboleo' et 'exoleo,' quae in 'ui' et in 'ui' faciunt.

Tamen omnia alia faciunt in 'ui' ut 'calleo callui dole dolui.' 4 Sed 'excelleio' facit 'ex//cellui' uel 'exculi.' 5 Facientia itaque in 'ui' praeteritum mutant 'ui' in 'tum' et inde formant supinum ut 'adoleui adoleui deleui deleui' doletum.' 6 Quod si praeteritum in 'ui' fecerint, mutant 'ui' in 'i'
et addita 'tum' formant supinum ut 'abolui abolitum,' quamuis 'excellui' faciat 'excelsum.'

113 1 Quae finiunt in 'meo.' 2 Omnia conjugationis secundae uerba terminantia in 'meo' faciunt praeterita in 'ui' ut 'umeo umui'; et mutata 'ui' in 'i' assumpta 'tum' fit supinum ut 'umui [i]umitum.'

114 1 In 'neo' terminantia. 2 Omnia uerba secundae conjugationis quae desinunt in 'neo' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'moneo monui teneo tenui.' 3 Excipitur 'maneo mansi' et 'neo neui.' 4 Ex his igitur facientia praeteritum in 'ui' mutato 'ui' in 'i' et assumpto 'tum' supinum formabunt ut 'monui monitum.' 5 'Tenui' tamen faciet 'tentum.'

6 Facientia uero in 'si' mutant 'si' in 'sum' ut 'mansi mansum.' 7 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ui,' mutant 'ui' in 'ctum' ut 'neui nectum.'

115 1 De his quae desinunt in 'reo.' 2 Omnia uerba conjugationis secundae terminantia in 'reo' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'horreo horruui praeter 'haereo haesi.'

3 Facientia igitur praeteritum in 'ui' mutant 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' supinum faciunt ut 'horruui horritum.'

4 Verumtamen 'torruui facit 'tostum' et 'carui' cassum.'

5 Quae ergo faciunt in 'si' mutant 'si' in 'sum' ut 'haesi haesum.'

116 1 Desinentia in 'seo.' 2 Omnia uerba secundae
conjugationis in 'seo' desinentia faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'denseo' et 'censeo censui.' 3 Et mutant 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' supinum faciunt ut 'densui densitum censitum,' quamuis 'censum' inueniatur.

117 1 In 'ueo.' 2 Omnia conjugationis secundae uerba in 'ueo' terminantia faciunt in 'ui' ut 'foueo foui faueo faui' et 'caueo caui' praeter 'coniueo' quod facit 'conixi.' 3 Quae itaque praeterita in 'ui' faciunt, mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'foui fotum'; sed 'caui' facit 'cautum' et 'faui' 'fautum.' 4 Et si fecerint praeteritum in 'xi,' mutato in 'ctum' faciunt supinum ut 'conixi conictum' si haberet.

118 1 De tertia conjugatione. 2 Tertiae autem conjugationis uerba desinunt in 'atho' ut in 'etho' faciunt praeteritum in 'xi' ut 'traho traxi uetho uexi'; et mutant 'xi' in 'ctum' ut 'traxi tractum' et 'uexi uectum.'

119 1 Desinentia in 'uo.' 2 Omnia uerba conjugationis tertiae in 'uo' terminantia faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'nuo nui' praeter 'fluo fluxi struo struxi' et 'pluo pluxi' uel 'pluui.' 3 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ui', mutant 'i' in 'tum' ut 'nui nutum' praeter 'rui' quod assumit 'tum.' 4 Sed in compositis mutat 'i' in 'tum' ut 'obrui obratum.' 5 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'xi,' mutant 'i' in 'um' ut 'fluxi fluxum'; sed 'struxi' facit 'structum.' 6 Et si fecerint praeterita in 'ui,' mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'pluui plutum.'
120 1 In 'cio.' 2 Omnia uerba coniugationis tertiae desinentia in 'cio' faciunt praeteritum in 'ci' antecedente 'e' ut 'facio feci iacio ieci.' 3 Et si sunt composita a 'licio' uel a 'spicio,' faciunt praeteritum in 'xi' ut 'aspi-cio aspexi' et 'illicio illexi' praeter 'allicio' quod facit 'allicui' et 'elicui' 'elicui' et 'prolicio' 'prolicui.'

4 Quae uero faciunt praeteritum in 'ci' antecedente 'e,' mutant 'io' in 'tum' ut//'facio factum iacio iactum.' 5 Sed in compositis mutant 'i' praeteriti in 'tum' ut 'conieci coniectum confeci confectum.' 6 Quod si praeteritum in 'xi' fecerint, mutant 'xi' in 'ctum' ut 'aspxe aspectum.' 7 Si autem praeteritum in 'ui' habuerint, mutant 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' supinum faciunt ut 'prolicui prolicitum.'

121 1 In 'dio.' 2 Omnia coniugationis tertiae uerba terminantia in 'dio' faciunt praeterita in 'di' ut 'fodio fodi odio odi'; et mutant 'di' in 'sum' ut 'fodi fossum,' interposita 's,' 'odi osum.'

122 1 Desinentia in 'gio.' 2 Omnia uerba tertiae coniugationis in 'gio' desinentia faciunt praeterita in 'gi' ut 'fugio fugi'; et mutant 'o' in 'tum' ut 'fugio fugitum.'

123 1 In 'pio.' 2 Omnia coniugationis tertiae uerba quae desinunt in 'pio,' praeteritum in 'pi' faciunt ut 'capio cepi' praeter 'cupio cupiui rapio rapui' et 'sapio sapui.'

3 Et mutant 'io' in 'tum' ut 'capio captum' et 'rapio raptum.'

4 Sed in compositis mutant 'i' praeteriti in 'tum' ut 'concepi
conceptum'; licet 'eripui' 'ereptum' et 'diripui' 'direptum' faciat. 5 Quae autem praeterita habent in 'ui,' mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'cuiui cupitum.'

124 1 In 'tio.' 2 Verba tertiae conjugationis omnia in 'tio' terminantia faciant in 'si' geminata 's': 'quatio quassì.' 3 Et mutant 'si' in 'sum.' 4 Quaestio. 5 Est aliquod deponens in 'tior'? 6 Est: 'potior potiris.'

125 1 In 'rio' terminantia. 2 Conjugationis tertiae uerba si in 'rio' finierint, faciunt praeteritum in 'ri' ut 'pario peperi'; et mutant 'io' in 'tum' ut 'pario partum.'

126 1 Omnia uerba conjugationis tertiae desinentia in 'bo' si habent uocalem longam ante 'bo,' faciunt praeteritum in 'psi' ut 'nubo nupsi scribo scripsi.' 2 Omnia alia praeterita faciunt in 'bi' ut 'lambo lambis lambi scabo bis bi bibo bis bi' praeter composita a 'cubo bas' quae faciunt praeterita in 'ui' ut 'recumbo bis recubui concumbo bis concubui.' 3 Et si faciunt praeterita in 'bi,' mutant 'o' in 'i' et addita 'tum' supinum faciunt ut 'lambo lambitum scabo bitum bibo bitum.' 4 Si uero praeterita in 'psi' fecerint, mutant 'psi' in 'tum' ut 'nupsi nuptum scripsi scriptum.' 5 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ui,' mutant 'ui' in 'i' et addita 'tum' supinum formabunt ut 'recubui bitum concubitum biti.' 6 Quaestio. 7 Est aliquod deponens in 'bor'? 8 Est utique: 'labor beris.'
127 1 In 'co' desinentia. 2 Coniugationis tertiae
uerba quae in 'co' desinunt si habuerint 'n' ante 'co,' faciunt
praeteritum in 'ci' uel in 'qui' abstracta 'n' ut 'uincu uici
linguo liqui.' 3 Et si hab(uerint 's' ante 'co,' faciunt
praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'pasco paui quiesco quiuei' praeter
'conquinisco' quod facit 'conquexi,' et praeter 'posco' cum
suis compositis quod facit 'poposci,' et 'disco' etiam cum
suis compositis quod facit 'didici,' et praeter 'compesco'
quod, ut certum est, cum suis compositis facit 'compescui.'
4 Et si habent uocalem longa ante 'co,' faciunt praeterita
in 'xi' ut 'duco duxi dico dixi' praeter 'ico' quod facit
'i[n]ci' et praeter 'parco' peperci.' 5 Et si faciunt
praeterita in 'ci,' mutant 'i' in 'tum' ut 'uici uictum.'
6 Quod si praeteritum in 'qui' fecerint, mutant 'qui' in
'ctum' ut 'liqui uictum.' 7 Et si praeteritum in 'ui'
fecerint, mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'paui pastum (interposita 's')
quiesci quietum.' 8 Et si geminant in praeterito, mutant 'o'
in 'i' et assumunt 'tum' ut 'posco poscitum disco discitum'
si haberet. 9 Quod si praeteritum in 'ui' fecerint, mutabunt
'ui' in 'i' et assumunt 'tum' ut 'compescui compescitum.'

fol. 15r 10 Si/ autem praeteritum in 'xi' fecerint, mutant 'xi' in
'tum' ut 'dixi dictum.'

128 1 Verba tertiae coniugationis omnia in 'do' t(eminantia
si habent uocalem longa ante 'do,' faciunt praeteritum in
'si,' 'ludo lusi' praeter 'cudo di' (licet etiam 'cusi' inueniatur),
et praeter 'caedo cecidi,' et 'bedo pepedi,' et 'sido sedi' quod accipit praeteritum a 'sedeo des.' 2 Suum enim praeteritum deberet esse 'sisi.' 3 Omnia alia siue geminant praeteritum siue non, faciunt praeteritum in 'di' ut 'cado cedici reddo reddidi' praeter 'fundo fudi findo fidi scindo scidi.' 4 Excipitur etiam 'diuido divis.' 5 Quae igitur faciunt praeteritata in 'si,' mutant 'si' in 'sum' ut 'clausi clausum.' 6 Omnia alia mutant 'do' in 'sum' ut 'cado casum' praeter 'comedo' quod facit 'comesum' et 'comestum' et praeter 'tendo' quod faciet 'tensum' et 'tentum.' 7 Excipitur etiam 'edo' faciens 'esum' et 'estum'; praeter 'pando' a quo 'passum.' 8 Excipiuntur quoque composita a 'do das' quae mutant 'o' in 'i' et accipiunt 'tum' ut 'reddo redditum.'

129 1 Quaestio. 2 Est aliquod deponens in 'gor'? 3 Solutio. 4 Est utique: 'fungor fungeris functus.' 5 Coniugationis tertiae uerba terminantia in 'go' si habent 'r' ante 'go,' faciunt praeteritum in 'si' ut 'mergo mersi tergo si.' 6 Quod si fuerint composita a 'rego gis,' faciunt praeteritum in 'xi' ut 'porrigo porrex.' 7 Omnia alia faciunt praeterita in 'xi' ut 'clango clanxi ringo rinxi pingo pinxi fingo finxi,' praeter 'lego' cum suis compositis quod facit in 'gi' ut 'lego gi perlego gi,' praeter 'intellego intellexi neglego xi diligo xi,' praeter 'ago' cum suis compositis facientibus in 'gi' ut 'ago egi exigo exegi.'
8 Excipitur etiam 'pango' cum suis compositis quod facit in 'gi' ut 'pango gis pepigi compingo gi' et 'frango gi confringo confre-gi.' 9 Similiter 'tango tetigi contingo contigi' et 'pungo gis pupugi repungo gis repupugi' et 'repunxi.' 10 Sed 'compungo' facit tantum 'compunxi.' 11 Facientia igitur praeteritum in 'si' mutant 'si' in 'sum' ut 'mersi mersum.' 12 Omnia alia mutant 'go' in 'ctum' ut 'lego gi lectum rego rectum pango pactum frango fractum tango tactum pungo punctum porrigo porrectum dirigo directum,' licet ' figo' faciat ' fixum.'

130 1 Desinentia in 'po.' 2 Verba tertiae conjugationis in 'po' desinentia si habent 'e' uel 'l' aut etiam 'r' ante 'po,' faciunt praeteritum in 'psi' ut 'repo repsi scalpo scalpsi carpo carpsi.' 3 Verumtamen 'strepo' facit 'strepui' et 'rumpo' 'rupi.' 4 Ex his ergo praeteritum in 'psi' terminantia[m] mutant 'psi' in 'ptum' ut 'repsi reptum clepsi cleptum scalpsi sculptum carpsi caprtum.' 5 Quod si praeteritum in 'ui' fecerint, mutabunt 'ui' in 'i' et assumunt 'tum' ut 'strepui strepitum.' 6 Et si fecerint praeteritum in 'pi,' mutant 'i' in 'ptum' ut 'rupi ruptum.'

131 1 In 'quo.' 2 Omnia uerba conjugationis tertiae finsientia in 'quo' faciunt praeterita in 'xi' ut 'coquo coxi'; et mutant 'xi' in 'ctum' ut 'coquo coxi coctum.' 3 Quaestio. 4 Est aliquod deponens in 'quor'? 5 Est utique: 'loquer loquers is locutus.'
132 1 Desinentia in 'to.' 2 Omnia conjugationis tertiae uerba in 'to' terminantia si habent 'c' ante 'to,' faciunt praeteritum in 'xi' ut 'plexi flexi,' praeter 'pecto pexui' et 'necto nexui' (licet etiam 'nex[u]i' inueniatur). et praeter 'meto messui sterto sterti' et 'sisto' quod facit 'statui' et 'steti,' et praeter 'uerto ti' et 'mitto misi.'
3 Excipitur etiam 'peto' faciens 'petii' uel 'petiui.'

fol. 15v 4 Quae igitur praeteritum in 'xi' faciunt, mutant//'i' in 'um' ut 'plexi plexum flexi flexum.' 5 Si uero praeteritum in 'ui' habuerint, 'ui' mutabant in 'um' ut 'pexui pexum nexui nexum.' 6 'Meto' autem facit 'messum' et 'sisto' faciet 'statutum' et 'uerto' 'uersum.' 7 Quod si praeteritum in 'si' fecerint, mutatur 'si' in 'sum' et interponitur 's' ut 'misi missum.' 8 Si autem praeteritum in 'i' uel in 'ui' habuerint, mutant 'i' uel 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'petii' uel 'petiui petitum.' 9 Est aliquod deponens in 'tor'? 10 Est siquidem: 'utor uteris.'

133 1 In 'lo.' 2 Omnia uerba tertiae conjugationis desinentia in 'lo' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'colo colui molo molui uolo uolui sallo sallui.' 3 Et si geminant praeteritum, faciunt in 'li' ut 'falio fefelli pello pepuli tollo tuli.' 4 Sed 'percello' 'percellui' et etiam 'perculi,' et 'excello' 'excellui' et 'exculi.' 5 'Vello' quoque fecit 'uelli' et 'uulsi,' et 'psallo' 'psalli.' 6 Quae
igitur praeteritum in 'ui' faciunt, mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'colui cultum.' 7 'Sallui' tamen facit 'salsum' et 'molo' 'multum' si haberet. 8 Si uero guminant in praeterito, mutant 'lo' in 'sum' ut 'falio falsum pello pulsum.' 9 Sed 'tollo' facit 'latum' et 'percello' 'perculsum' et 'excello' 'excelsum' et 'uelle' 'weulsum.'

134 1 Desinentia in 'mo.' 2 Omnia uerba coniugationis tertiae quae desinunt in 'mo' si habent uocalem longam ante 'mo,' faciunt in 'psi' ut 'como compsi promo prompsi.' 3 Et si habent uocalem breuem ante 'mo,' faciunt praeterita in 'ui' ut 'uomo uomui gemo genui tremui.' 4 Sed 'emo' facit 'emi,' 'premo' quoque 'pressi.' 5 Ex his igitur facientia praeteritum in 'psi' mutant 'psi' in 'ptum' ut 'compsi comptum.' 6 Quae autem in 'ui' faciunt mutato 'ui' in 'i' assumunt 'tum' ut 'uomui uomitum.' 7 Quod si praeteritum in 'mi' fecerint, mutabunt 'i' 'in' 'ptum' ut 'emi emptum.' 8 Et si fecerint praeteritum in 'si,' mutant 'si' in 'sum' ut 'pressi pressum.'

135 1 Finientia in 'no.' 2 Coniugationis tertiae uerba terminantia in 'no' si habent 'o' uel 'g' ante 'no,' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'pono posui gigno genui.' 3 Composita quoque a 'cano' faciunt praeterita in 'ui' ut 'concino concinui'; sed 'cano' facit 'cecini,' 'temno' 'tempsi.' 4 Omnia alia faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'lino liui sino siuui cerno creui sterno streui.' 5 Et si faciunt
praeteritum in 'ui,' mutato 'ui' in 'i' assumunt 'tum' ut
'posui positum genui genitum.' 6 Verum tamen 'concinui'
'concentum' facit, et 'recinui' 'recentum,' et 'cano' 'cantum,'
et 'temno' tem 
'tum.' 7 Facientia uero in 'ui' mutant 'ui'
in 'tum' ut 'liui litum siui situm creui retum strau
stratum.'

136 1 Omnia uerba coniugationis tertiae desinentia in
'ro' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'tero triui sero seu.'
2 Sed in compositis facit 'inserui' uel 'inseui' praeter
'uro ussi gero gessi' et 'uerro uerrri' et 'curro cucurri.'
3 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ui,' mutant 'ui' in tu 
'triui tritum'; 'seui,' 'ui' in 'tum' et 'e' in 'a' fit 'satum.'
4 Sed in compositis facit 'insertum' et 'insitum.' 5 Et
si faciunt praeterita in 'si,' mutant in 'tum' ut 'ussi ustum
gessi gestum.' 6 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ri,' mutant
'ro' in 'sum' ut 'curro cursum uerro uersum.'

137 1 Terminantia in 'so.' 2 Omnia uerba coniugationis
tertiae desinentia in 'so' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut
'lacesso laccsiui arcesso arcessui' praeter 'capesso' quod
facit 'capessi,' et 'facesso' 'si,' et 'quaeso' 'si,' et
'uiso' 'si,' et 'pinso' 'pinsui.' 3 Facientia igitur
praeteritum in 'ui' mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'lacesssiui
laccsitum arcessui tum.' 4 Et si faciunt in 'ui,' mutant
'ui' in 'tum' et abstracta 'n' ut 'pinsui pistum.'

138 1 In 'xo' finientia. 2 Omnia tertiae coniugationis
uerba in 'xo' fimentia faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'nexo
nexui texo texui' quorum supina aliud 'stum' et aliud in
'xum.'

139 1 In 'vo.' 2 Omnia tertiae conjugationis quae
in 'uo' desinunt, faciunt praeteritum//in 'ui' ut 'uoluo ui'
praeter 'uiuo uixi' et 'conniuo connixi.' 3 Et si faciunt
praeterita in 'ui,' mutant 'i' in 'tum' ut 'uoluo uolutum.'
4 Quod si praeteritum in 'xi' fecerint, mutant 'xi' in
'ctum' ut 'uixi uictum.'

140 1 In 'io.' 2 Omnia uerba conjugationis tertiae
termiantia in 'io' faciunt praeterita in 'ii' ut 'meio meis
meii.' 3 Facientia itaque in 'ii' mittunt ultimum 'i'
in 'tum' ut 'meii meitum.'

141 1 De quarta coniugatione. 2 Quarta conjugationis
uerba in 'bio' desinentia faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'ambio
bis ambiui' praeter 'cambio campsi.' 3 Quae igitur praeteri-
tum in 'ui' faciunt, mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'ambiui ambitum.'
4 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'psi,' mutant 'psi' in 'psum'
ut 'campsi campsnum.'

142 1 In 'cio.' 2 Omnia uerba quartae conjugationis
in 'cio' terminantia si habent ante 'cio' 'n,' faciunt
praeterita in 'xi' ut 'sancio sanxi uincio uinxi sarcio sarxi
farciu farsi.' 3 Omnia alia faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut
'cio ciui.' 4 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'xi,' mutant
'xi' in 'tum' ut 'sanxi sanctum uinxi uinctum.' 5 Quae autem faciunt in 'si' praeteritum, mutant 'si' in 'tum' ut 'sarsi sartum farsi tum'; sed 'rausi' facit 'rausum.' 6 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ui,' mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'ciui citum.'

143 1 Coniugationis quartae uerba in 'dio' terminantia faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'audio diui'; et mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'audiui tum.'

144 1 In 'gio.' 2 Omnia uerba quartae coniugationis in 'gio' desinentia faciunt praeterita in 'ui' ut 'rugio giui'; et mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'rugiui tum.'

145 1 Terminantia in 'pio.' 2 Omnia quartae coniugationis uerba quae desinunt in 'pio' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'sopio piui' praeter 'saepio' quod facit 'saepsi.' 3 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ui,' mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'sopiiui pitum.' 4 Et si fecerint in 'psi,' mutant 'psi' in 'tum' ut 'saepsi saeptum.'

146 1 In 'quio.' 2 Verba coniugationis quartae terminantia in 'quio' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'inquio inquiuui'; et mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'inquiiui inquitum.'

147 1 Desin[i]entia in 'tio.' 2 Omnia uerba coniugationis quartae in 'tio' finientia faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'singultio singultiui' praeter 'sentio sensi.' 3 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ui,' mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'singultiui
singultitum' si haberet. 4 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'si,' mutant 'si' in 'sum' ut 'sensi sum.'

148 1 Terminantia in 'fio.' 2 Omnia uerba quartae coniugationis in 'fio' quae desinunt, faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'suffio suffiui'; et mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'suffiui fitum' si haberet.

149 1 In 'lio.' 2 Omnia coniugationis quartae uerba terminantia in 'lio' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'sallio salluiui' praeter 'satio' quod facit 'saliui.' 3 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ui,' mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'salliuui sallitum.' 4 Excipitur 'sepelio' quod mutat 'io' in 'tum' et 'e' in 'u' facit 'sepultum.' 5 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ui,' mutavit 'io' in 'tum' ut 'satio saltum.'

150 1 Finientia in 'mio.' 2 Omnia uerba quartae coniugationis quae terminant in 'mio' faciunt praeterita in 'ui' ut 'redimiio redimiuii'; et mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'redimi mitum.'

151 1 Desinentia in 'nio.' 2 Omnia uerba coniugationis quartae quae desinunt in 'nio' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'linio liniuii' praeter 'uenio ni.' 3 Quae igitur praeteritum in 'ui' faciunt, mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'liniui nitum.' 4 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ni,' mutant 'ni' in 'tum' ut 'ueniuentum.'

152 1 Terminantia in 'rio.' 2 Omnia uerba quartae
coniugationis desinentia in 'rio' faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'ligurrio ligurriui' praeter șaurio șausi,' et praeter 'aperio aperui,' et 'cooperio cooperui,' et 'reperio' quod facit 'reperti,' et 'comperi' 'comperi.' 3 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'ui,' mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'ligurriui ritum.'
4 Et si faciunt praeteritum in 'si,' mutant 'si' in 'stum' ut 'ausii austum.' 5 Omnia alia mutant 'io' in 'tum' ut 'aperio apertum cooperio coopertum reperio repertum comperio compertum.'

fol. 16v

153 1 In 'uio.' 2 Omnia uerba coniugationis quartae quae in 'uio' desinunt, faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'seruo uuiui'; et mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'seruiui tum.'
154 1 In 'eo.' 2 Omnia uerba coniugationis quartae in 'eo' desinentia faciunt praeteritum in 'ui' ut 'queo quiui'; 'eo' in 'ui': 'ueneo ueniui.' 3 Et mutant 'ui' in 'tum' ut 'ueniui nitum.'
155 1 De personis uerborum. 2 Cuius personae 'amo'? 3 Prima. 4 Quare? 5 Quia ipsa est quae loquitur, hoc autem de rebus. 6 De dictione uero ita dici potest. 7 Prima persona est quia utimur ad dicendum de nobis ipsis qui loquimur. 8 'Amas' cuius personae? 9 Secundae. 10 Quare? 11 Quia ipsa est ad quam prima loquitur. 12 De dictione ita quia utimur illa ad dicendum de eo ad quem fit locutio. 13 'Amat' cuius personae? 14 Tertiae. 15 Quare?
16 Quia tertia persona est de qua loquimur prima. 17 Secundum dictionem hoc modo: quia utimur ea ad dicendum de illo unde fit sermo. 18 Quid est persona? 19 Quae per se sonat et per se sonando se ipsam uel aliam demonstrat. 20 Vnde dicatur 'persona.' 21 'Persona' unde dicitur? 22 A 'per se sonando.' 23 Personae uerorum quot sunt? 24 Tres. 25 Quae? 26 Prima, secunda, tertia. 27 Cuius numeri 'amo'? 28 Singularis. 29 Quare? 30 Quia singulariter profertur.

156 1 De uerbo secundum Donatum. 2 Verbum quid est?
3 Pars orationis cum tempore sine casu aut agere alicquid aut pati aut neutrum significans. 4 Verbo quot accident?
5 Septem. 6 Quae? 7 Qualitas, coniugatio, genus, numerus, figura, tempus, persona. 8 Qualitas uerorum in quo est?
9 In modis et in formis. 10 Modi uerorum qui sunt?
11 Indicativus ut 'lego,' imperativus ut 'lege,' optativus ut 'legerem,' subjunctivus ut 'cum legam,' infinitivus ut 'legere,' impersonalis ut 'legitur.' 12 Formae uerorum quot sunt? 13 Quattuor. 14 Quae? 15 Desiderativus ut 'uis[io] uisis,' meditativa ut 'lecturio,' frequentativa ut 'lectito,' inchoativa ut 'feruesco cal esco.' 16 Coniugationes uerorum quot sunt? 17 Tres: prima in 'a,' secunda in 'e,' tertia in 'i.' 18 Prima quae est? 19 Quae indicativus modo, tempore praesenti, numero singulari, secunda persona, uerbo actiue et neutrali habet 'a' productum ante
nouissimam litteram; passiuo, communi et deponenti ante nouissimam syllabam ut 'amo amas amor ris.' 20 Et futurum tempus eiusdem modi in 'bo' et in 'bor' syllabam mittit ut 'amo amabo amor amabor.' 21 Secunda quae est? 22 Quae indicatius modo, tempore praesenti, numero singulari, secunda persona, uerbo actiuo et neutrali habet 'e' productum ante nouissimam litteram; passiuo, communi et deponenti ante nouissimam syllabam ut 'doceo ces doceor ris.' 23 Et futurum tempus eiusdem modi in 'bo' et in 'bor' syllabam mittit ut 'doceo docebo doceor cebor.' 24 Tertia quae est? 25 Quae indicatius modo, tempore praesenti, numero singulari, secunda persona uerbo actiuo et neutrali 'i' corректum uel 'i' productum habet ante nouissimam litteram. 26 Passiuo communi et deponenti pro 'i' littera 'e' corректum uel 'i' productum habet ante nouissimam//syllabam ut 'lego gis legor geris audio dis audior diris.' 27 Et futurum tempus eiusdem modi in 'am' et 'ar' syllabam mittit ut 'lego legam legor gar.' 28 Haec in imperatius modo et infinitius modo statim discerni possunt utrum 'i' litteram corректam habeant an productam. 29 Nam corректa 'i' littera in 'e' conviertitur. 30 Producta si fuerit, non mutatur. 31 Est quando tertia conjugatio futurum tempus eiusdem modi non in 'am' tantum sed etiam in 'bo' syllabam mittit. 32 Interdum cum 'i' litteram non corректam habuerit sed productam ut 'eo is ibo queo quis quibo' et 'eam' uel
De generibus uerborum. 2 Genera uerborum quot sunt? 3 Quinque. 4 Quae? 5 Actiua, passiua, neutra, communia, et deponentia. 6 Actiua quae sunt? 7 Quae in 'o' desinunt; et accepta[m] 'r' littera[m] faciunt ex se passiua ut 'lego legor.' 8 Passiua quae sunt? 9 Quae in 'r' desinunt et ea dempta redeunt in actiua ut 'legor lego.' 10 Neutra quae sunt? 11 Quae in 'o' desinunt ut actiua; sed accepta 'r' littera Latina non sunt ut 'sto curro,' nam 'storum curror' non dicitur. 12 Sunt praeterea neutra passiua ut 'gaudeo gausus sum audeo ausus sum soleo solitus sum fio factus sum fido fisus sum.' 13 Deponentia quae sunt? 14 Quae similiter ut passiua in 'r' desinunt; sed ea dempta Latina non sunt ut 'luctor sequor loquor.' 15 Communia quae sunt? 16 Quae in 'r' desinunt littera ut deponentia; sed in duas formas cadunt patientis et agentis ut 'osculor criminor.' 17 Dicimus enim 'osculor te' et 'osculor a te criminor te' et 'criminor a te.' 18 Numeri uerborum quot sunt? 19 Duo. 20 Qui? 21 Singularis ut 'lego,' pluralis ut 'legimus.' 22 Figurae uerborum quot sunt? 23 Duo. 24 Quae? 25 Simplex ut 'lego,' composita ut 'perlego.' 26 Tempora uerborum quot sunt? 27 Tria. 28 Quae? 29 Praesens ut 'lego,' praeteritum ut 'legi,' futurum ut 'legam.' 30 Quot sunt tempora in declinatione uerborum? 31 V 32 Quae?
33 Praesens ut 'lego,' praeteritum *imperfectum* ut 'legebam,' praeteritum perfectum ut 'legi,' praeteritum plusquamperfectum ut legeram,' futurum ut 'legam.' 34 Personae uerborum quot sunt? 35 Tres. 36 Prima ut 'lego,' secunda ut 'legis,' tertia ut 'legit.'

158 1 De aduerbio secundum Priscianum. 2 'Nunc' quae pars est? 3 Aduerbium. 4 Quare? 5 Quia stat iuxta uerbum et semper nititur uerbo. 6 Aduerbium quid est? 7 Pars orationis quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat atque implet. 8 'Aduerbium' unde dicitur? 9 Ex 'ad' et 'uerbo.' 10 Si 'aduerbium' ex 'ad' et 'uerbo' componitur, quare non dicimus 'aduerbium' sed 'aduerbium'? 11 Ideo scilicet ne uiderentur esse duae partes uel etiam ne uideretur 'ad' per ap<sup>p</sup>sitionem seruiire hoc in loco accusatiuo casui et non per compositionem. 12 Ac ne aliqua dubitatio remaneret contentiosis interpositum est 'i!' et dicimus 'aduerbium.' 13 Quaestio. 14 Si 'aduerbium' dicitur eo quod iuxta uerbum sit et eius explanat significationem, ergo aduerbium maior pars est uerbo? 15 Non ideo dicitur ut maior sit, sed quia dubium sensum uidetur habere uerbum antequam addatur ei aduerbium. 16 Cum enim dico 'Priscianus docet; Cicero legit,' dubius permanet sensus antequam addam aduerbium//bene' aut 'male.' 17 Cum autem adiunctum fuerit illi aduerbium, non iam dubius sed perfectus permanet sensus ut: 'Priscianus
bene docet; Cicero bene legit.'

159 1 A quibus ueniunt. 2 Aduerbia aut a se nascuntur hoc est a nullo sumunt originem ut 'heri nuper'; aut ab aliis partibus orationis ueniunt. 3 Veniunt autem a nomine appellatiuo ut a 'docto'; mutato 'o' in 'e' productum fit aduerbiu

'mocte.' 4 Alia ueniunt a proprio nomine ut a 'Tullio'; mutato 'o' in 'a' et addita 'ne' fit 'Tulliane.' 5 A pronomine ut 'meatim,' a uerbo [ε]ut a 'curro cursim,' a nomine et uerbo ut a 'pede' et '†empto' uenit 'pedetemptim,' a participio ut ab 'indulgentem indulgenter.' 6 Aduerbia nomine uenientia aut in 'a' exequant ut 'una,' aut in 'e' productum ut 'docte,' aut in 'e' correctum ut 'rite,' aut in 'i' ut 'uesperi,' aut in 'o' productum ut 'falso,' aut in 'o' correctum ut 'modo,' aut in 'u' ut 'noctu,' aut in 'm' ut 'strictim,' aut in 'l' ut 'semel,' aut in 'r' ut 'breuiter,' aut in 's' ut 'funditus.'

160 1 Quaestio. 2 Quare dicuntur haec aduerbia uidelicet 'una modo' et 'semel' a nomine uenire cum non eundem sensum retineant illa aduerbia quem habent nomina? 3 'Vna' enim nomen 'solam rem' significat, et habet accentum in priori syllaba[м]. 4 'Vna' uero aduerbiu 'simul' significat, et accentatur in posteriori syllaba. 5 'Modo' nomen 'mensuram'; 'modo' autem aduerbiu 'statim' significat. 6 Ad quod dicendum quia tribus modis deriuantur partes a partibus. 7 Solutio: sensu uidelicet et litteratura ut 'quater' a 'quattuor,' litteratura sine sensu ut 'modo' aduerbiu a 'modo' nomine, [sine] sensu sine litteratura ut 'semel' aduerbiu ab 'uno' nomine.
161 1 De accidentibus aduerbii. 2 Aduerbio quot accident? 3 Tria. 4 Quae? 5 Species, significatio et figura. 6 'Nunc' cuius speciei? 7 Primitiae. 8 Quare? 9 Quia primae impositionis. 10 Quid est species? 11 Discretio et cetera. 12 Cuius significations? 13 Temporis. 14 Significationes aduerbiorum multae sunt et diversae quia sunt aduerbia aut loci aut temporis. 15 Loci ut 'hic' uel 'ibili illuc' uel 'intra intro' uel 'foras.' 16 Da temporis. 17 Vt 'hodie heri nunc nuper cras aliquando olim tunc cum dum modo iam quondam semper.' 18 Sunt alia interrogandi ut 'cur quare quamobrem,' alia prōhibendi ut 'ne,' aut negandi ut 'non neque nec haud minime nequaquam,' aut afirmandi ut 'profecto scilicet quippe uidelicet quidni certe. 19 Aut iurandi ut 'edepol castor hercle medius fidius,' aut optandi ut 'utinam,' aut portandi ut 'eia age agite,' aut remissiui ut 'pedetemptim paulatim.' 20 Aut qualitatis ut 'bene male docte pulchre innocenter fortiter,' aut quantitatis ut 'multum parum nimium minimum modicum.' 21 Aut dubitandi ut 'forsan forsitans fortassi fortasse,' aut eventus ut 'forte fortuitu.' 22 Aut congregandi ut 'simul una pariter,' aut discretiui ut 'seorsum istorum sinistrorum.' 23 Aut similitudinis ut 'quasi ceu sic sicut sicut uelut ueluti.' 24 Aut or'/dinandi ut 'inde deinde deinceps,' aut intentiui ut 'ualde prorsus penitus omnino.' 25 Aut
comparandi ut 'magis' uel 'tam quam plus' uel 'minus,' aut superlatiui ut 'maxime minime ocissime.' 26 Aut numeri ut 'semel bis ter quater quinques totiens quotiens,' aut personalia ut 'meatim tuatim.' 27 Aut deminiutiui ut 'clanculum belle,' aut uocandi ut 'heus 0,' aut respondi ut 'hui,' aut demonstrandi ut 'en ecce,' aut eligendi ut 'potius immo.'

162 1 De figura. 2 Cuius figurae? 3 Simplicis. 4 Quare? 5 Quia non potest. 6 Quid est figura? 7 Discrimen simplicium. 8 Figurae aduerbiaorum quot sunt? 9 Tres. 10 Quae? 11 Simplex ut 'diu huc,' composita ut 'interdum adhuc,' decomposita uero hoc est a compositis derivata ut a 'potente potenter,' a 'misericorde misercorditer.' 12 Quot modis aduerbia componuntur? 13 Quattuor: ex duobus integris ut 'indocte,' ex duobus corruptis ut 'sufficienter,' ex integro et corrupto ut 'inaniter,' ex corrupto et integro ut 'biduo.'

163 1 De dubiis dictionibus. 2 Sunt multae dictiones dubiae inter aduerbia et nomen ut 'falso.' 3 'Falso' namque nomen est datuii casus et aduerbia qualitatis. 4 Sed tamen ita discernitur. 5 Quando enim nomen est, significat substantiam alicuius ut: 'Falso homini dedi praemium.' 6 Quando uero aduerbia, sensum uerbi explanat ut: 'Falso legit.' 7 Inter aduerbia et pronomine ut 'quo.' 8 Ponitur enim quando aduerbia est 'quo' pro 'ubi,' et est infinitum ut:
'Quo uadis?' 9 Quando autem pronomen est, ponitur pro nomine ut: 'A quo audisti lectionem?' 10 Inter aduerbium et uerbum ut 'pone.' 11 Quando enim aduerbium est 'pone,' significat 'iuxta' et est aduerbium loci. 12 Quando uero uerbum est, imperativus est modus, et uenit a 'pono ponis.' 13 Inter aduerbium et participium ut 'profecto.' 14 'Profecto' aduerbium est affirmantis, et ponitur pro 'certe,' et est participium ut: 'Profecto homini mit(ere) dedimus.' 15 Inter aduerbium et coniunctio ut 'quando.' 16 Est enim 'quando' aduerbium temporis, et est coniunctio causalis, et 'quoniam' pro 'quando.' 17 Inter aduerbium et praepositionem ut 'propter.' 18 Cum enim 'propter' significat 'iuxta,' est aduerbium loci; cum enim praepositio fuerit, seruit accusatuo casui ut: 'Propter amicum uenit.' 19 Inter aduerbium et interiectionem ut 'heu.' 20 Est enim 'heu' aduerbium respondentis, et est interiection dolentis. 21 Horum quaedam sensu discernimus, quaedam autem accentu. 22 Sensu discernuntur quae praedicta sunt omnia. 23 Vnum tantum accentu discernitur uidelicet 'pone.' 24 Nam quando est uerbum, habet accentum in priori syllaba ut 'pone.' 25 Cum autem aduerbium fuerit, accentabitur in fine et dicetur 'poné.' 26 Sunt item aduerbia loci quae imprudentes nomina forte putant, ideo quia litteraturam nominis habent. 27 In loco ut, 'Romae sum'; de loco ut, 'Roma uenio'; ad locum ut,
'Romam pergo'; per locum ut, 'Roma transeo.' 28 His praepositio non anteponitur quia pura aduerbia sunt. 29 Anteponitur uero aduerbiis quae prouinciis, locis, regionibus solent adiungi. 30 Solutio praedictorum. 31 Merito igitur nominibus ciuitatum quae in aduerbia transeunt, praepositio non adiungitur. 32 Nominibus autem prouinciarum, regionum praeponitur quia de significatione nominis non rece- dunt ut: 'De Africa uenio, /ad Siciliam pergo, in Italia sum.'

164 1 Quaestio. 2 Cum nomina ciuitatum in aduerbia transeant, quarendum est quando in loco uel ad locum, per locum, uel de loco significent. 3 Solutio. 4 Ad quod dicendum quia quando primae uel secundae sunt declinationis, in loco per genetivum responderi debet ut, 'Romae sum, Mediolani sum'; ad locum per accusatiuvm ut, 'Romam pergo, Mediolanum uado'; per locum ut, 'Roma transeo'; de loco ut, 'Roma, Mediolano uenio.' 5 Illa uero quae tertiae sunt declinationis, in loco et de loco et per locum per ablativum significant ut, 'Cartagine sum, Cartagine uenio, Cartagine transeo'; ad locum ut, 'Cartagine pergo' per accusatiuvm 6 Similiter proferuntur et illa quae semper pluralia sunt ut 'Thebae Cumae Mycenae.'

165 1 Praeposito separatim aduerbiis non applicabitur quamuis legerimus 'de repente de sursum de subito' et 'exinde' et 'ab unde' et 'dehinc.' 2 Quare praeposito separatim
non applicatur aduerbiis? 3 Quia si praeposito separatim
hoc est per appositionem in geretur aduerbiis, putaretur pro
duabus partibus haberi. 4 Quid igitur? 5 Haec tanquam
unam partem orationis pronuntiabimus sub uno accento quia
una pars orationis est, et uno accento pronuntiari debet.

166 1 Notandum est praeterea quia sicut sunt nomina
homonyma uel polyonyma, sic etiam inueniuntur aduerbia uel in
una significatione diuersas habentia uoces ut 'olim dudum
quondam aliquando cito propere celeriter,' uel in una uoce
diuerse habentia significationes ut 'O ubi quando.' 2 'O'
enim aduerbiuim uocandi aliquando est ut Vergilius in primo
Aeneidos: 'O regina nouam cui condere Iupiter urbem!'
3 Aliquando est aduerbiuim optandi ut idem ipse in octauo:
'Adsis 0 iuenis, et tua numina firmes.' 4 Est etiam 'O'
interiectio admirantis ut Iuuenalis in quarto: 'O qualis facies!'
5 'O' quoque est praeposito inseparabilis qua componitur
'omito.' 6 Est iterum interiectio indignantis ut Cicero
dicit: 'O tempora 0 mores.' 7 Est etiam nomen ipsius litterae.
8 Similiter 'ubi' est aduerbiuim loci, et est aduerbiuim
temporis.

167 1 De ordine aduerbiu. 2 De ordine quoque aduerbiu-
orum quaeritur utrum praeponi an supponi uerbis possint. 3 Et
manifeste sciri debet quoniam aptius praeponi ualent quomodo
adjectiua nomina ut: 'Bonus homo bene agit, fortis imperator
fortiter pugnat.' 4 Licet tamen tam adjectiua nomina quam aduerbia praepostere proferri exceptis monosyllabis omnibus ut 'non ne dum cum.' 5 Sed et demonstratiua quoque et interrogatiua aduerbia et similitudinis et optandi atque uocandi semper praeponi debent.

168 1 Nota. 2 Sed notandum quia etiam aliae partes accipiuntur pro diversis aduerbiorum significationibus, et est quando duae pro una ut 'nonnullo nullatenus'; quando quoque etiam aduerbia loco nominum posita inuenimus ut 'mane nouum.'

169 1 Item alia nota. 2 Item notandum quoniam aduerbia localia discretas uel communes habent: significationes. 3 Discretas ad locum ut 'huc illuc,' in loco ut 'hic illic ibi,' per locum ut 'hac illac,' de loco ut 'hinc illinc.' 4 Communes uero sunt ut: 'peregre sum, peregre habeo, peregre aduenio, peregre transeo.'

fol. 19F

170 1 De aduerbio secundum//Donatum. 2 Aduerbium quid? 3 Pars orationis quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat atque implet. 4 Aduerbio quot accident? 5 Tria. 6 Quae? 7 Significatio, comparatio et figura. 8 Significatio aduerbiorum in quo est? 9 Quia sunt aduerbia aut loci aut temporis aut numeri aut negandi aut affirmandi aut demonstrandi aut optandi aut ortandi aut ordinis aut interrogandi aut similitudinis aut qualitatis aut quantitatis aut dubitandi aut personalia aut uocandi aut respondendi aut
separatiui aut iurandi aut eligendi aut congruendi aut prohibendi aut eventus aut comparandi. 10 Da aduerbia loci. 11 Vt 'hic' uel 'ibi illuc' uel 'inter intro' uel 'foras.' 12 Da temporis. 13 Vt 'hodie heri nunc nuper cras olim aliquando tunc cum dum quondam modo iam semper.' 14 Da numeri. 15 Vt 'semel bis ter quater.' 16 Da negandi. 17 Vt 'non neque.' 18 Da affirmandi. 19 Vt 'etiam quidni.' 20 Da demo(n)strandi. 21 Vt 'en ecce.' 22 Da optandi. 23 Vt 'utinam.' 24 Da ortandi. 25 Vt 'eia.' 26 Da ordinis. 27 Vt 'deinde deinceps.' 28 Da interrogandi. 29 Vt 'cur quare quamobrem.' 30 Da similitudinis. 31 Vt 'quasi ceu tamquam uelut ueluti sic sicut sicii.' 32 Da qualitatis. 33 Vt 'docte pulchre fortiter.' 34 Da quantitatis. 35 Vt 'multum parum modicum minimum.' 36 Da dubitandi. 37 Vt 'forsan forsitan fortassis fortasse.' 38 Da personalia. 39 Vt 'mecum tecum secum nobiscum ubiscum.' 40 Da uocandi. 41 Vt 'heus.' 42 Da respondendi. 43 Vt 'heu.' 44 Da separandi. 45 Vt 'seorsum istorsum deorsum.' 46 Da iurandi. 47 Vt 'edepol castor(he)rcle medius fidius.' 48 Da eligendi. 49 Vt 'potius immo.' 50 Da congregandi. 51 Vt 'simul una pariter.' 52 Da prohibendi. 53 Vt 'ne.' 54 Da eventus. 55 Vt 'forte fortuitu.' 56 Da comparandi. 57 Vt 'magis uel tam quam maxime.'
171 1 De comparatione. 2 Comparatio aduerbiorum in quo est? 3 In tribus gradibus comparationis: positivuo, comparatiuo, superlatiuo. 4 Da aduerbium positivui gradus. 5 Vt 'docte.' 6 Da comparatiui. 7 Vt 'doctius.' 8 Da superlatiui. 9 Vt 'doctissime.'

172 1 Figurae aduerbiorum quot sunt? 2 Duae. 3 Quae? 4 Simplex et composita. 5 Simplex ut 'docte prudenter,' composita ut 'indocte imprudenter.'

173 1 Aduerbia localia uel in loco sunt uel de loco uel ad locum uel per locum. 2 Sed in loco et de loco eandem significationem habent ut: 'Intus sum, intus exeo, foris sum, foris uenio.' 3 Ad locum autem aliam significationem habent ut: 'Intro eo, foras eo.' 4 'De intus' autem et 'de foris' sic non dicitur quomodo 'ad foras' uel 'in foras.' 5 Per locum ut 'hac illac' quia in aduerbio nulla praeposition separatim a diungitur.

174 1 De participio secundum Priscianum. 2 'Legens' quae pars est? 3 Participium est. 4 Quare? 5 Quia partem capit nominis partemque uerbi. 6 Recipit enim a nomine genera et casus, a uerbo tempora et significationes, ab utroque numerum et figuram. 7 Partici\textsuperscript{um} quid est? 8 Pars orationis partem capiens nominis partemque uerbi. 9 'Partici-pium' unde dicitur? 10 A 'parte' et 'capio capis.' 11 fol. 19\textsuperscript{V} Quaestio//lausdabilis. 12 Cum omnes partes orationis natura
protulerit, merito quaeritur cur participium a nomine genera et casus, a uerbo tempora et significatones habere dicatur. 13 Solutio. 14 Ideo participium a nomine genera et casus habet quia praesentis temporis participium non terminat certum genus certumque casum donec nominibus iungatur ut 'amans.' 15 Cum enim dico hoc participium, dubium est utrum pertineat ad marem an ad feminam uel ad mancipium, uel utrum sit uocatiuus an nominatiuus casus. 16 Nomine addito haec ambiguitas procul habetur, et certitudo mentibus nostris infunditur ut: 'Amans me Cato docetur; diligens me Martia loquitur; uenerans mancipium dominum suum ministrat ei.' 17 Quaeritur item cur numerum et figuram ab utroque uidelicet a nomine et uerbo participium recipiat. 18 Solutio. 19 Ideo aequo quia illae duae partes haec accidentia sibi uindicant.

175 1 De accidentibus. 2 Participio quot accidunt? 3 Sex. 4 Quae? 5 Genus, casus, tempus, significatio, numerus et figura. 6 'Legens' cuius generis? 7 Omnis, et in hoc loco masculini. 8 Quare? 9 Quia sic est illud cui adhaeret. 10 Quid est genus in participio? 11 Exploratio sexus. 12 'Genus' unde dicitur? 13 A 'generando.' 14 Genera participiorum quot sunt? 15 IIII. 16 Quae? 17 Masculinum ut 'lectus,' femininum ut 'lecta,' neutrum ut 'lectum,' omne ut 'legens.' 18 Quaestio. 19 Quare participia unius tantum generis non reperidunt ad similitudinem
nominis ut unius generis est 'Priscianus'? 20 Solutio.

21 Ideo quoniam adiectiuam sunt, et necesse est ut aut in un
uoce aut in divisione uocum omnia genera comprehendant sicut
uerba a quibus derivantur ut 'lego' pertinet ad uirum, ad
mulierem, ad mancipium. 22 Huius igitur uerbi participium
si unius esset generis, nequaquam officium uerbi, a quo
deriuvatur, per omnia completere ualent.

176 1 Cuius casus? 2 Nominatiui. 3 Quare? 4 Quia
in tali. 5 Quid est casus? 6 Lexis inflexio uocis.
7 'Casus' unde dicitur? 8 A 'cadendo.' 9 Casus parti-
cipiorum quot sunt? 10 Sex. 11 Qui? 12 Nominatiuius,
genetiuius, datiuius, accusatiuius, uocatiuius et ablatiuius.

177 1 De temporibus. 2 Cuius temporis? 3 Praesens.
4 Quare? 5 Quia omne participium desinens in 'ns,' praesens
et praeteriti imperfecti temporis est. 6 'Lectus' cuius
temporis? 7 Praeteriti perfecti et plusquamperfecti. 8 Quare?
9 Quia omne participium desinens in 'tus' et in 'sus' et in
'xus' et unum in 'us,' quod est 'mortuus,' praeteriti perfecti
et plusquamperfecti temporis est. 10 'Legendus' cuius
temporis? 11 Futuri. 12 Quare? 13 Quia omne participium
desinens in 'rus' et in 'dus,' futuri temporis est.

178 1 De significatione. 2 Cuius significationis?
3 Actiuae. 4 Quare? 5 Quia ab activo uerbo derivatur
quod est illud 'lego gis.' 6 'Lectus' cuius significationis?
7 Passiuae. 8 Quare? 9 Quia a passiuo uerbo uenit quod est illud 'legor ris.' 10 'Sedens' cuius significationis?
11 Neutralis. 12 Quare? 13 Quia a neutrali uerbo deriuatur. 14 'Loquens' cuius significationis? 15 Depo-
mentis quia a deponen[en]ti uerbo uenit. 16 'Criminans'
cuius significationis? 17 Communis. 18 Quare? 19 Quia a communi uerbo descendit.

179 1 De numero. 2 Cuius numeri? 3 Singularis. 4 Quare? 5 Quia singulariter profertur. 6 Quid est numerus? 7 Forma dictionis. 8 'Numerus' unde dicitur? 9 A 'numerando.'

fol. 20r 180 1 De figura. 2 Cuius//figurae? 3 Simplicis. 4 Quare? 5 Quia non. 6 Quid est figura? 7 Discrimen. 8 'Figura' unde dicitur? 9 A 'figu[gendo].'

181 1 De nominibus speciem participiorum habentibus. 2 Sunt nomina speciem participiorum habentia ut 'tunicatus galeatus.' 3 Speciem enim participiorum uidentur habere quia in 'tus' ad similitudinem participii praeteriti temporis desi-
nunt, sed tamen pura nomina sunt. 4 Quaecumque enim a uerbo non ueniunt, participiis applicanda nomina sunt. 5 Ex quibus sunt etiam illa quae cum participia uideantur, uerborum tamen significatione priuata sunt ut 'pransus cenatus placita nupta triumphata regnata.' 6 Quaestio. 7 Quare priuata sunt significatione uerborum? 8 Solutio. 9 Nam 'prandeor
cenor regnor placeor nubor triumphor' non dicitur. 10 Si
enim dicere tur, ista poterant homines aestimare quod ab
illis uenirent. 11 Quaestio. 12 Sed si et ista uerborum
significatione priuata sunt et superiora, quare non simul
comprehenduntur ut dicatur in una serie 'tunicatus galeatus
pra sus cenatus' et cetera? 13 Solutio. 14 Ideo scilicet non simul comprehenduntur quoniam illa uidelicet 'tunicatus
galeatus' semper nomina sunt, quamuis speciem participiorum
uideantur habere. 15 Ista uero sequentia quamuis nomina
sunt, utcumque tamen participia dici possunt uinentia sensum
antiquorum uerborum passiuorum sicut legimus: 'Italia olim
regnata Lycurgo.' 16 Et illa quidem superiora uidelicet
'tunicatus' et 'galeatus' nulla ratione uerbum recipiunt; nec
'tunico' enim nec 'tunicor' dicitur. 17 Haec autem quae
sequentur id est 'placita nupta regnata triumphata' licet non
habeant propria uerba unde originem sumant, habent tamen uicina
unde nasci uidentur. 18 Nam quamuis 'nubor triumphor regnor'
non dicamus, dicimus tamen 'nubo triumpho regno.' 19 Alia
solutio. 20 Vel certe aliter uerborum significatione priuata
esse dicuntur, uidelicet quae nunc habentur in usu hoc est
'prandeo' et 'ceno' quae neutra sunt et participia praeteriti
temporis habere non possunt. 21 Sunt item alia participia
quae accepta praepositione et a uerbis et a participiis recedunt.
22 Hoc est tam diu sunt participia quam diu non componuntur,
ut 'nocens' participium est a 'noceo.' 23 'Innocens' autem nomen quia 'innoceo' non dicitur.

182 1 De nominibus quae participia uidentur esse. 2 Sunt uelut participia quae a uerbo ueniunt et quia tempus non habent, nomina magis quam participia iudicantur ut 'furibundus moribundus.' 3 Ab eo enim uerbo quod est 'furio' uenit 'furibundus' hoc est 'similis furienti.' 4 Similis a 'morior mori\(\)eris' uenit 'moribundus' similis morienti.' 5 Haec autem nomina sunt non participia quoniam tempus non habent uidelicet futurum participium. 6 Illa namque uerba a quibus ueniunt, carent futuro participii in 'dus.'

183 1 De his quae participia sunt et nomina. 2 Sunt multa participia eadem et nomina ut 'uisus.' 3 'Visus' enim quando nomen est, quartae est declinationis. 4 Quando autem participium fuerit, dividet tria genera ut 'uisus uisa uisum.' 5 Quaerii debet quot modis nomina a participiis different. 6 Solutio. 7 Tribus utique: comparatione, declinatione et casu. 8 Participia enim cum in nomina transeunt, recipiunt comparationem ut 'amans amantior amantissimus,' et requirunt genetium casum ut 'amans illius.' 9 Quando autem par\(\)/ticapia sunt, significant tempus et requirunt eundem casum quem et sua uerba ut 'amans illum.'

\(\text{fol. } 20^v\)

184 1 De defectiuis. 2 Sunt participia defectiua quae per omnia tempora ire non possunt ut 'coeptus urgendor.' 3 A
uerbo defectuio 'coepi' uenit participium praeteriti temporis 'coepit.' 4 Quod praesens non habet quia uerbum a quo uenit caret praesenti tempore. 5 Similiter 'urgendus' uenit ab 'urgeo' et caret praeterito et futuro in 'rus' quia supinis, a quibus participia ueniant, deficit.

185 1 De inchoatuus. 2 Inchoatua uero participia praesentis temporis sunt tantum ut 'horrescens tepescens.' 3 Ideo enim praeteritum non habent quia quae inchoantur, praeteritum non habent. 4 Futuro autem idcirco carent quoniam supina non habent a quibus praeterita et futura participia formatur.

186 1 De participio secundum Donatum. 2 Participium quid est? 3 Pars orationis partem capiens nominis partemque uerbi. 4 Recipit enim a nomine genera et casus, a uerbo tempora et significationes, ab utroque numerum et figuram. 5 Participio quot accidunt? 6 Sex. 7 Quae? 8 Genus, casus, tempus, significatio, numerus et figura. 9 Genera participiorum quot sunt? 10 III. 11 Quae? 12 Masculinum ut 'hic lectus,' femininum ut 'haec lecta,' neutrum ut 'hoc lectum,' commune trium generum ut 'hic' et 'haec hoc legens.' 13 Casus participiorum quot sunt? 14 Sex. 15 Qui? 16 Nominatiuus ut 'hic legens,' genetiuus ut 'huius legentis,' datiuus ut 'hui legenti,' accusatiuus ut 'hunc legentem,' uocatiuus ut '0 legens,' ablatiuius 'ab hoc legente'

187 1 Da declinationem participii. 2 'Legens' participium ueniens a uerbo actiuo, temporis praesentis, generis omnium, numeri singularis, figurae simplicis, casus nominatiui et vocatiui quod declinabitur sic: nominativiio 'híc' et 'haec' et 'hoc legens,' genetiuiio 'huius legentis,' datiuiio 'huic legenti,' accusatiuiio 'hunc' et 'hanc legentem' et 'hoc legens,' vocatiuiio 'O legens,' ablatiuiio 'ab hoc' et 'ab hac' et 'ab hoc legente'
uel 'legenti.' 3 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'hi' et 'hae legentes' et 'haec legentia,' genetiuo 'horum' et 'harum' et 'horum legentium,' datiuo 'his legentibus,' accusatiuo 'hos' et 'has legentes' et 'haec legentia,' uocatiuo 'O legentes' et 'O legentia,' ablatiuo 'ab his legentibus.' 4 'Lecturus lectura rum' participia uenientia a uerbo activo, temporis futuri, generis masculini feminini et neutri, numeri singularis, figurae simplicis, casus nominatiui et uocatiui quod declinabitur sic: nominatiuo 'lecturus ra rum,' genetiuo

'lecturi rae ri,' datiuo 'lecturo rae ro,' accusatiuo 'lecturum/ra rum,' uocatiuo 'lecture ra rum,' ablatiuo 'ab hoc lecturo ra ro.' 5 Et pluraliter nominatiuo 'lecturi rae ra,' genetiuo 'lecturorum rurum turorum,' datiuo 'lecturis,' accusatiuo 'lecturos ras turas,' uocatiuo 'lecturi rae turas,' ablatiuo 'ab his lecturis.' 6 'Lectus ta tum' participia uenientia a uerbo passiuo, praeteriti temporis, generis masculini, numeri singularis, figurae simplicis, casus nominatiui et uocatiui quod declinabitur sic: nominatiuo 'lectus ta tum,' genetiuo 'lecti tae ti,' datiuo 'lecto tae to.' 7 'Legendus da dum' participia uenientia a uerbo passiuo, temporis et futuri quod declinabitur sic: nominatiuo 'legendus da dum,' genetiuo 'legendi dae di.'

188 1 De coniunctione secundum Priscianum. 2 'Igitur' quae pars est? 3 Coniunctio. 4 Quare? 5 Quia coniungit

189 1 Quot sunt species coniunctionis? 2 Decem et octo. 3 Quae? 4 Copulatiua quae copulat tam sensum quam uerba ut 'et que atque ac ast,' continuatiua quae ordinem rerum demonstrat in consequentia cum dubitatione ut: 'Si stertit, dormit.' 5 Subcontinuatiua est quae caudam continuationis ostendit consequentem cum rerum essentia ut: 'Quia sol est super terram, dies est' et 'Quando ambulant, mouetur.' 6 Adiunctiua est quae adiungitur uerbis subiunctiuis proprie cum dubitatione ut, 'Si ueniat, faciam. Ut prosit tibi facio' quae tamen et possunt esse causales. 7 Causales sunt proprie quae adiunctae indiciuo uerbo significant effectum antecedentem ut: 'Doctus sum nam legi.' 8 Effectiua est quae adiuncta indicatiuo uerbo significat effectum praecedentem ex causa ut: 'Legi nam doctus sum.' 9 Approbatiua est quae approbat rem cui adiungitur ut: 'Equidem merui nec deprecor.' 10 Disiunctiua quae quamuis dictiones coniungat, sensum tamen disiungit et alteram quidem rem esse, alteram non esse significat ut: 'Aut dies est
aut nox; uel est sanus uel est aeger." 11 Subdisiunctiua est quae quamuis uoces disiunctiarum habet, utrumque tamen esse significat in eodem uel in diverso tempore ut, 'Alexander siue Paris iuit pro Helena' id est, 'Alexander qui et Paris dicitur'; 'Vel legit uel scribit' id est, 'Legit et scribit.' 12 Disertiua uel electiua quae de duobus praepositis unum eligere et alterum refutare ostendit ut: 'Malo esse diues quam pauper.' 13 Aduersatiua est quae aduersum convenienti significat ut 'tamen quamuis' et 'si' ut: 'Ego multum servuiui tibi; tu tamen habes me [h]odio pro seruitio cui conveniret praemium.' 14 Distributiua est quae diversis diversa distribuit ut: 'ego lego; tu uero dormis.' 15 Abnegatiua est quae adiuncta uerro subiunctiua aliquod posse fieri ostendit, nisi sit impedimentum ne fiat ut: 'Comedere[m] si haberem. Gaudeat Priamus si audet.' 16 Collectiua uel rationalis uel illatiua quae colligit supradicta cum ratione uel inferitur aliis praepositis ut 'ergo igitur itaque,' ut: 'Cicero solus Catilinam sapientia domuit; solus igitur Cicero pa//triam seruauit.' 17 Dubitatiua est quae dubietatem significat ut 'ne an.' 18 Completiua est quae causa ornatus uel metri et nulla causa necessitatis ponitur ut si dicam: 'Aeneas quidem pius fuit.' 19 De minimiua est quae deminutioem significat ut: 'Si non Byzantium, saltem commoda denarium.'

190 1 Quot sunt ordines coniunctionum? 2 Tres. 3 Qui? 4 Praepositiuus, subiunt[iu]us et communis. 5 Quot sunt
coniunctiones praepositiui ordinis?  6 XV.  7 Quae?
8 'At ast aut ac uel nec neque si quin quatenus sin seu siue
ni.'  9 Quare dicuntur praepositiui ordinis?  10 Quia semper
possunt praeponi tantum et numquam supponi in ordine orationis.
11 Quot sunt coniunctiones subiunctiui ordinis?  12 Sex.
13 Quae?  14 'Que ue ne quidem quoque aut em.'  15 Sed
ex his tres sunt encliticae hoc est inclinatiuae, 'que ue ne,'
quia inclinant ad se accentum praecedentis syllabae ut
'dixitque audisne.'  16 Communitiuae ceterae omnes sunt
communis ordinis quia possunt praeponi et supponi in ordine
orationis ut 'ergo igitur' et cetera.  17 Quaestio.  18
Quaeri merito debet quare coniunctioni euenit hoc accidens quod
'potestas' uocatur cum haec pars ceteris omnibus minor et
inferior esse uideatur.  19 Alia.  20 Vel cur nomini aut
pronomini uel uerbo non accidit potestas sed soli coniunctioni?
21 Solutio.  22 Ad hoc dicendum est quia haec pars quae
coniunctio uocatur more regum procerumque ordinata est.
23 Reges enim quos uolunt praeponi praeponunt, et quos
uolunt supponi supponunt.  24 Quos uolunt ut praecedant praec-
cedunt, et quos ordinant ut sequantur sine dubio sequuntur.
25 Ita haec pars quas partes uult ut praecedant facit praecedere,
et quas uult ut sequantur facit supponi.  26 Vnde merito sicut
'rex' a 'regendo' sic utique 'coniunctio' a 'coniungendo'
dicitur.  27 Quaestio.  28 Si 'coniunctio' dicta est a
'coniungendo' ut praemisimus, quaerendum est quare hanc speciem intra se contineat quae 'disiunctiva' uocatur. 29 Quid enim est tam contrarium quam disiunctio coniunctioni? 30 Solutio. 31 Notandum autem quoniam disiunctiva coniunctiones licet sensum disiungant, uerba tamen coniungunt, unde 'coniunctiones' appellatur.

191 1 De coniunctione secundum Donatum. 2 Coniunctio quid est? 3 Pars orationis nectens ordinansque sententiam. 4 Coniunctioni quot accident? 5 Tria. 6 Quae? 7 Potestas, figura, ordo. 8 Potestas coniunctionum quot species habet? 9 V. 10 Quas? 11 Copulatius, disiunctius, expletius, causales, rationales. 12 Da copulatius. 13 'Et que atque ac ast.' 14 Da disiunctius. 15 'Aut ue uel ne nec an neque.' 16 Da expletius. 17 'Quidem equidem saltém uidelicet quamquam quamuis quoque autem porro licet tamen ueruntamen sin autem.' 18 Da causales. 19 'Si etsi etiam etiamsci acsi tametsi siquidem quando quandoquidem quin quinetiam quatenus sin seu siue neue nam namque ni nisi nisisi enim etenim ne sed interea quamobrem praesertim item itemque ceterum alioquin praeterea.' 20 Da rationales.

fol. 22r 21 'Ita//itaque enimuero quia quapropter quoniam quoniam-quidem quippe ergo ideo igitur scilicet uidelicet propterea idcirco.' 22 Figurae coniunctionum quot sunt? 23 Duae. 24 Quae? 25 Simplex ut 'nam,' composita ut 'namque.'
26 Ordo conjunctionum in quo est? 27 Quia aut praepositiuae
conjunctiones sunt ut 'ac ast,', aut subjunctiae ut 'que ue
ne autem,' aut communes ut 'ergo igitur.'

192 1 De praepositione secundum Priscianum. 2 'Per'
quae pars? 3 Praepositio. 4 Quare? 5 Quia
praeponitur aliis partibus orationis. 6 Praepositio quid est?
7 Pars orationis quae praeposita aliis partibus orationis
significationem earum aut complet aut mutat aut minuit.
8 'Praepositio' unde dicitur? 9 A 'praeponendo.' 10 Nam
nomini praeponitur ut 'impius,' aut uerbum praecedit ut 'pro-
fero' aut aduerbium ut 'indocte' uel participium ut 'praecedens,'
conjunctionem ut 'absque' uel se ipsam ut 'circumcircia.'

193 1 Quaestio. 2 Si 'praeposito' dicta est eo
quod praeponatur, quare etiam non 'suppositio' dicitur cum
pleraeque praepositiones non solum praeponantur sed etiam
supponuntur ut 'cum' et 'tenus'; dicimus enim 'mecum' et
'pube tenus'? 3 Solutio. 4 Haec pars licet aliquando
supponatur; frequentius tamen praeponitur, unde merito non a
minor part 'suppositio' sed a maiori uoci debuit 'praeposi-
tio.' 5 Alia solutio. 6 Potest etiam dici quia cum hae
praepositiones supponuntur, non natura praepositionis sed
euphoniae causa consideratur.

194 1 De accidentibus. 2 Praepositioni quot accidentum?
3 Vnum. 4 Quid? 5 Casus tantum. 6 Quot casus? 7 Duo.
8 Qui? 9 Accusativus et ablativeus. 10 Da praepositiiones casus accusatiui. 11 'Ad apud ante aduersus cis citra circum circa contra erga extra inter intra infra iuxta ob pone per prope propter secundum post trans ultra praeter supra circiter usque secus penes.' 12 Da praepositiones casus ablatiui. 13 'A ab abs cum coram clam de e ex pro prae palam sine absque tenus.' 14 Da utriusque casus praepositiones. 15 'In sub super' et 'subter.'

195 1 Nota. 2 De 'in' praepositione quot diversitates habet diligenter notari debet. 3 'In' namque cum diurnitatem temporis significat, accusatuo casui seruit ut est: 'Veritas Domini manet in\[n\] aeternum; iusti autem in perpetuum uiuunt.' 4 Quando interminatam infinitatem demonstrat, similiter accusatuo iungi desiderat ut est: 'In longa tempora prophetat.' 5 Item cum 'ad in usque' subauditur, accusatuo casui iungitur, unde dicitur: 'Potens est depositum meum seruare in illum diem.' 6 Ponitur 'in' pro 'iuxta,' et tunc accusatium requirit sicut legimus: 'In hunc modum (hoc est 'iuxta hunc modum') contendebant coram rege.' 7 'In' etiam 'secundum' significat; accusatium habet, unde est:'Misit ad Ezechiam in haec uerba,' scilicet 'secundum haec uerba.'

8 Similiter 'in' quando ponitur pro 'per,' accusatuiuo seruit quemadmodum legimus,'Aperite mihi portas iustitiae, ingressus in eas (hoc est 'per eas') confitebor Domino.' 9 'In' si pro
'super' ponitur, accusativum iungitur ut 'Ambrosius in Lucam, Augustinus in Iohannem.' 10 Quotiens homo in aliquo loco uel in urbe uel in campo est, nequaquam per accusativum dicit debet sed per ablativum ut, 'Currit in ciuitate uel in campo,' quia non de uno loco fit in alterum motio, sed ipso//decurrere loco. 11 'In' quando pro 'inter' ponitur, casum ablativum requirit ut est, 'Propheta magnus surrexit in nobis,' uidelicet 'inter nos.' 12 'In' si pro 'intra' ponitur, ablativum iungitur sicut legitur: 'Nec conclusisti me in manibus inimicis.' 13 'In' quando pro 'super' inuenitur, ablativum iungitur ut est: 'Posuisti Domine in capite eius coronam.' 14 Inuenitur autem cum pro 'super' ponitur 'in,' multotiens accusativum seruire sicut scriptum est: 'Loquetur pacem in plebem suam.' 15 Item 'in' pro 'per' ponitur et ablativum iungitur, unde est, 'Multifarie multisque modis olim Deus loquens patribus in prophetis (hoc est 'per prophetas') nouissime diebus istis loquitus est uobis in Filio,' scilicet 'per Filium.' 16 'In' pro 'ad' ponitur et ablativum iungitur ut: 'Ibi sicut oculi seruorum in manibus dominorum suorum.' 17 'In' quotiems cumque pro 'ante' reperitur, ablativum iungitur ut: 'Intret in conspectu tuo oratio mea.' 18 Haec autem ideo assignauimus quoniam plurimi qui uidentur aliquid scire de grammatica, de hac praepositione in errore indicuntur eo quod Donatus dixit, 'in' praepositio quando motionem significat,
seruit accusatiuo casui; quando significat 'in loco,' ablatiuo tantum. 19 Sed in hoc non est sequendus quoniam aliter in auctoribus inuenitur.

196 1 Sunt praepositiones quae separatae numquam ponuntur sed semper coniunctae ut 'di dis re se am con o.'

197 1 De praepositione secundum Donatum. 2 Praepositionis quid est? 3 Pars orationis quae praeposta aliiis partibus orationis significationem eorum aut complet aut mutat aut minuit. 4 Praepositionis quot accidunt? 5 Vnum.

6 Quid? 7 Casus tantum. 8 Quot casus? 9 Duo. 10 Qui?

11 Accusatiuus et ablatiuus. 12 Da praepositiones casus accusatiui. 13 'Ad apud ante adversus cis citra circum circa contra erga extra inter intra infra iuxta ob pone per prope propter secundum post trans ultra praeter supra circiter usque secus penes.' 14 Quomodo? 15 Dicimus enim 'ad patrem apud uillam ante aedes adversum inimicos cis Rhenum citra forum circum uicinos circa templum contra hostem erga propinquos extra terminos inter naves intra moenia infra tectum iuxta macellum ob augurium pone tribunal per parietem prope fenestram propter disciplinan secundum for[aes post tergum trans ripam ultra fines praeter officium supra caelum circiter annos usque Oc[e]anum secus uos penes arbitros.' 16 Quae ex his 'in loco esse' significant? 17 Vt 'apud.' 18 Quae 'ad locum'? 19 Vt 'ad.' 20 Quomodo? 21 Dicimus enim: 'Apud amicum
sum,' et 'Ad amicum uado.'

198 1 Da praepositiones casus ablatiui. 2 'A ab abs
cum coram clam de ex e pro praem palam sine absque tenus.'
3 Quomodo? 4 Dicimus enim 'a domo ab homine abs quolibet
cum exercitu[m] coram testibus clam custodibus de foro e iure
ex praefectura pro clientibus prae timore palam omnibus sine
labore absque iniuriae tenus pube' quod nos dicimus 'pube tenus.'
5 Da praepositiones casus utriusque. 6 'In sub super' et
'subter.' 7 Quando accusativus casus seruit? 8 Quando
uel nos uel quoslibet ad locum ire, isse ituros esse signi-
ficamus. 9 Quando ablatiui? 10 Quando uel nos uel

fol. 23r

quoslibet in/loco esse, fuisse uel futuros esse significamus.
11 'In' accusatiui casus ut: 'itur in antiquam.' 12 'In'
ablatiui casus ut: 'stans celsa in pup[i].' 13 'Sub'
accusatiui casus? 14 Vt: 'Postesque sub ipsos nituntur
gradibus.' 15 'Sub' ablatiui casus ut: 'Arma sub aduersa
posuit radiantia quercu[m].' 16 'Super' quam uim habet?
17 Ubi locu[m] significat, magis accusatiuo casus seruit
quam ablatiuo; ubi mentionem alicuius facimus, ablatiuo
tantum ut: 'multa super Priamo rogitans, super Hectore multa.'
18 'In' quam uim habet? 19 Etiam tunc accusatiuo casus
seruit cum significat 'contra' ut 'in adulterum' et 'in deser-
torem.' 20 'Subter' quam uim habet? 21 Eandem quam et
superiores 'ad locum' et 'in loco' significantes. 22 Quae
praespositiones sunt quae ad exercitationibus separari non possunt? 23 Vt 'di dis re se an con o.' 24 Quomodo? 25 Dicimus enim 'diduco distraho recipio secubo amplerector congrideri o.' 26 Quae sunt quae coniungi non possunt? 27 Vt 'apud' et 'penes.' 28 Quae coniunguntur et separantur? 29 Reliquae omnes.

199 1 De interiectione secundum Priscianum. 2 'Papae' quae pars? 3 Interiectio. 4 Quare? 5 Quid est interiectio? 6 Pars orationis significans mentis affectum uoce incondita. 8 Vnde dicitur 'interiectio'? 9 Ab 'inter' et 'iaceo iaces.' 10 Alia ratio. 11 'Interiectio' nomen est sortita quia cum de aliis partibus loquimur, subito inter eas interiectio proferimus. 12 Item aliter. 13 Dicitur etiam ut quibusdam uidetur interiectio quasi interius iacens ratio dum uox plerumque inpraemeditatui exterius emergitur.

200 1 Interiectionibus nulli sunt certi accentus; siue enim dicas 'euax' acuto paenultimo uel 'euax' ultimo acuto, idem est. 2 Sic et 'heu' et 'euge' et 'papae.' 3 Quaestio. 4 Quare non potest esse certus accentus in interiectionibus? 5 Solutio. 6 Quia nulla praemeditatione mentis sed subito et improuise semper interiectiones proferuntur. 7 'Heu' aliquando est bisyllabum, unde Vergilius: 'Heu quam pingui macer est mihi taurus in aruo!' 8 Aliquando est monosyllabum
sicut metri necessitas postulauerit, licet etiam pro interiectione alias partes orationis ponere ut 'pro nefas pro dolor Deo gratias.' 9 Haec etiam et his similia inconsiderate prolata pro interiectionibus ponuntur.

201 1 Interiectio secundum Donatum. 2 Interiectio quid est? 3 Pars orationis significans mentis a[effectum] uoce incondita. 4 Interiectioni quot accidunt? 5 Vnum. 6 Quid? 7 Significatio tantum. 8 Significatio interiectionis in quo est? 9 Quia aut laetitiam mentis significamus ut 'euaex' aut dolorem ut 'heu' aut admirationem ut 'papae' aut metum ut 'attat' aut optantis ut '0' aut admirantis ut 'euge' aut indignantis ut 'uah' aut irascentis ut 'heu' aut despicientis ut 'he,' et si qua sunt similia.

202 1 Prima coniugatio. 2 'Amo amas mat' et pluraliter 'amam[us] tis mant.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'amabam has bat' et pluraliter 'amabamus tis bant.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'amaui sti uit' et pluraliter 'amauidmus stis runt' uel 're.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'amaueram ras//rat' et pluraliter 'amaueramus tis rant.' 6 Futuro 'amabo bis bit' et pluraliter 'amabimus tis bunt.' 7 Imperativus modo, tempore praesenti ad secundam et tertiam personam 'ama met' et pluraliter 'amemus mate ment.' 8 Futuro 'amato tu amato ille' et pluraliter 'amemus amatote amanto.' 9 Optativus modo, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'utinam amarem
res ret' et pluraliter 'utinam amaremus tis rent.' 10 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'utinam amauissem ses set' et pluraliter 'utinam amauissemus tis sent.' 11 Futuro 'ut\<inam\>amem mes met' et pluraliter 'utinam amemus tis ment.' 12 Subiunctivo modo 'cum amem mes met' et pluraliter 'cum amemus tis ment.' 13 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum amarem res ret' et pluraliter 'cum amaremus tis rent.' 14 Praeterito perfecto 'cu\<m\>amauerim ris rit' et pluraliter 'cum amauerimus tis rint.' 15 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'cum amauissem ses set' et pluraliter 'cum amauissemus tis sent.' 16 Futuro 'cum amauero ris rit' et pluraliter 'cum amauerimus tis rint.' 17 Infinitivo modo, numeris et personis, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'amare.' 18 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'amausse.' 19 Futuro 'amatum ire' uel 'amaturum esse.'

203 1 De uerbis \<imp\>ersonalibus. 2 Verbo \<imp\>ersonalii, tempore praesenti 'amatur.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'amabatur.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'amatum est' uel 'fuit.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'amatum erat' uel 'fuerat.' 6 Futuro 'amabitur.' 7 I eratiuo 'ametur.' 8 Futuro 'amator.' 9 Optatiuo modo, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'ut\<inam\>amaretur.' 10 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'utinam amatum esset' uel 'fuisset.' 11 Futuro 'utinam ametur.' 12 Subiunctivo modo 'cum ametur.' 13 Praeterito i perfecto 'cum ameretur.' 14 Praeterito perfecto 'cum amatum sit' uel 'fuerit.' 15 Praeterito
plusquamperfecto 'cum amatum esset' uel 'fuisset.' 16 Futuro 'cum amatum erit' uel 'fuerit.' 17 Infinitiuo impersonali, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'amari.' 18 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'amatum esse' uel 'fuisse.' 19 Futuro 'amatum iri.' 20 Gerundia uel participium alia nomina sunt haec: 'amandi do dum.' 21 Supina sunt haec: 'amatum tu.'

204 1 Quot participia transit hab hoc uerbo actiuo? 2 Duo. 3 Quae? 4 Praesentis temporis et futuri. 5 Da praesentis. 6 Vt 'amans.' 7 Da futuri. 8 Vt 'amaturus.' 9 'Amans' unde formatur? 10 A prima persona, praeteriti imperfecti, indicatui modi. 11 Quomodo? 12 'Amabam': 'bam' in 'n,' 'ns' fit 'amans.' 13 'Amaturus' unde? 14 Ab ultimo supino. 15 Quomodo? 16 'Amatum': 'tu' addita 'rus' fit 'amaturus.'

205 1 Verbum passium. 2 'Amor amaris' uel 're matur' et pluraliter 'amamur mini tur.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'amabar ris' uel 're batur' et pluraliter 'amabamur mini bantur.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'amatus sum' uel 'fui eq' uel 'fuisti est' uel 'fuit' et pluraliter 'amati sumus' uel 'fuimus estis' uel 'fuistis sunt fuerunt' uel 'fuere.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'amatus eram' uel 'fueram eras' uel 'fueras erat' uel 'fuerat' et pluraliter 'amati eramus' uel 'fueralus eratis' uel 'fueratis erant' uel 'fuerant.'
6 Futuro 'amabor ris' uel 'bere bitur' et pluraliter 'amabimur bimini buntur.'

206 1 De imperatiuo. 2 Imperatiuo modo, tempore praesenti ad secundam et tertiam personam 'amare metur' et pluraliter 'amemur mamini mentur.' 3 Futuro 'amator tu for ille' et pluraliter 'amemur amaminor mantor.'

207 1 De optatiuo. 2 Optatiuo modo, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'utinam amarer reris' uel 'rere tur'/et pluraliter 'utinam amaremur mini rentur.' 3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'utinam amatus essem' uel 'fuissem esses' uel 'fuiisses esset' uel 'fuiisset et pluraliter 'utinam amati essemus' uel 'fuissemus essetis' uel 'fuiissetis essent' uel 'fuiissent.' 4 Futuro 'utinam amer ris' uel 'amere metur' et pluraliter 'utinam amemur mini mentur.'

208 1 De subjunctiuo. 2 Subjunctiuo modo, tempore praesenti 'cum amer ris' uel 'amere tur' et pluraliter 'cum amemur mini tur.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum amarer reris' uel 'rere retur' et pluraliter 'cum amaremur mini entur.'

4 Praeterito perfecto 'cum amatus sim' uel 'fuerim sis' uel 'fueris sit' uel 'fuerit' et pluraliter 'cum amati simus' uel 'fuerimus sitis' uel 'fueritis sint' uel 'fuerint.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'cum amatus essem' uel 'fuissem esses' uel 'fuiisses esset' uel 'fuiisset.' 6 Et pluraliter 'cum amati essemus' uel 'fuissemus essetis' uel 'fuiissetis essent'
uel 'fuissent.' 7 Futuro 'cum amatus ero' uel 'fuero eris'
uel 'fueris et' uel 'fuerit' et pluraliter 'cum amati
erimus' uel 'fuerimus eritis' uel 'fueritis erint' uel
'fuerint.'

209 1 Infinitivum modo, numeris et personis, tempore
praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'amari.' 2 Praeterito
perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'amatum esse' uel 'fuisse.'
3 Futuro 'amatum iri.'

210 1 Quot participia transitur ab hoc uerbo passiuo?
2 II. 3 Quae? 4 Praeteriti temporis et futuri. 5 Da
praeteriti. 6 Vt 'amatus.' 7 Da futuri. 8 Vt 'amandus.'
9 'Amatus' unde formatur? 10 Ab ultimo supino. 11 Quomodo?
12 'Amatum': 'tu' addita 's' fit 'amatus.' 13 'Amandus'
de? 14 A genetivo sui praesentis participii. 15 Quomodo?
16 'Amans amantis': 'tis' in 'dus' fit 'amandus.'

211 1 Verbum actiuum, secunda coniugatio. 2 'Doceo
docescet' et pluraliter 'docemus tis cent.' 3 Praeterito
imperfecto 'dоеbam bas bat.' 4 Et pluraliter 'docebamus
tis bant.' 5 Praeterito perfecto 'docui sti it' et pluraliter
'docuimus stis runt' uel 'ere.' 6 Praeterito plusquamperfecto
'docueram ras rat' et pluraliter 'docueramus tis rant.'
7 Futuro 'docebo bis bit' et pluraliter 'docebimus tis bunt.'

212 1 De imperatiuo. 2 Imperatiuo modo, tempore
praesenti ad secundam et tertiam personam 'doce at' et pluraliter
'doceamus cete ant.' 3 Futuro 'doceto tu to ille' et pluraliter 'doceamus docetote cento.'

213 1 Optatiuo modo, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'utinam docerem res ret' et pluraliter 'utinam doceremos tis rent.' 2 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'utinam docuissem ses set' et pluraliter 'utinam docuissemus tis sent.' 3 Futuro 'utinam doceam as at' et pluraliter 'utinam doceamus tis ant.'

214 1 De subiunctiuo. 2 Subiunctiuo modo 'cum doceam as at' et pluraliter 'cum doceamus tis ant.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum docerem res ret' et pluraliter 'cum doceremos tis rent.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'cum docuerim ris rit' et pluraliter 'cum docuerimus tis rint.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'cum docuissem ses set' et pluraliter 'cum docuissemus tis sent.' 6 Futuro 'cum docueri ris rit' et pluraliter 'cum docuerimus tis rint.'

215 1 De infinitiuo. 2 Infinitiuo modo, numeris et personis, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'docere.' 3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'docuisse.' 4 Futuro 'doctum ire' uel 'docturum esse.'

216 1 De impersonali. 2 Verbo impersonali, tempore praesenti 'docetur.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'docebatur.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'doctum est' uel 'fuit.' 4 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'doctum erat' uel 'fuerat.' 5 Futuro 'docebitur.'
217 1 De imperatiuo. 2 Imperatiuo modo, tempore praesenti 'doceatur.' 3 Futuro 'docetor.'
218 1 De optatiuo. 2 Optatiuo modo, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'utinam doceretur.' 3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'utinam doctum esset' uel 'fuisset.' 4 Futuro 'utinam doceatur.'
219 1 De subiunctiuo. 2 Subiunctiuo modo, tempore praesenti 'cum doceatur.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum doceretur.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'cum/doctum sit' uel 'fuerit.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'cum doctum esset' uel 'fuisset.' 6 Futuro 'cum doctum erit' uel 'fuerit.'
220 1 De infinitiuo. 2 Infinitiuo, impersonali, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'doceri.' 3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'doctum esse' uel 'fuisse.' 4 Futuro 'doctum iri.'
221 1 De gerundiuis. 2 Gerundia uel participia nomina sunt haec: 'docendi do dum.' 3 Supina sunt haec: 'doctum tu.'
222 1 Quot participia trahuntur ab hoc uerbo activo? 2 II. 3 Quae? 4 Praesentis temporis et futuri. 5 Da praesentis. 6 Vt 'docens.' 7 Da futuri. 8 Vt 'docturus.' 9 'Docens' unde formatur? 10 A prima persona, praeteriti imperfecti, indicatiui modi. 11 Quomodo? 12 'Docebam': 'bam' in 'ns' fit 'docens.' 13 'Docturus' unde? 14 Ab
ultimo supino. 15 Quomodo? 16 'Doctum': 'tu' addita 'rus' fit 'docturus.'

223 1 Verbum passuum. 2 'Doceor ris' uel 're tur' et pluraliter 'docemur mini centur.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'docebar ris' uel 're batur' et pluraliter 'docebamus mini bantur.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'doctus sum' uel 'fui es' uel 'fuisti est' uel 'fui[]t' et pluraliter 'docti sumus' uel 'fuimus estis' uel 'fuistis sunt fuerunt' uel 'fuere.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'doctus eram' uel 'fueram eras' uel 'fueras erat' uel 'fuerat' et pluraliter 'docti eramus' uel 'fueramus eratis' uel 'fueratis erant' uel 'fuerant.' 6 Futuro 'docebor ris' uel 'bere bitur' et pluraliter 'docebimus bimini buntur.'

224 1 De imperativo. 2 Imperativo modo, tempore praesenti ad secundam et tertiam personam 'docere atur' et pluraliter 'doceamur mini antur.' 3 Futuro 'docetor tu tor ille' et pluraliter 'doceamur doceminar centor.'

225 1 De optativo. 2 Optativo modo, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'utinam docerer reris' uel 'rere tur' et pluraliter 'utinam doceremur mini tur.' 3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'utinam doctus essem' uel 'fuissem esses' uel 'fuisses esset' uel 'fuisset' et pluraliter 'utinam docti essemus' uel 'fuissemus essetis' uel 'fuissetis essent' uel 'fuissent.' 4 Futuro 'utinam docear ris' uel 'ceare
atur' et pluraliter 'utinam doceamur mini antur.'

226 1 De 'subiunctiuno. 2 Subiunctiuno modo, tempore praesenti 'cum docear ris' uel 're tur' et pluraliter 'cum doceamur mini antur.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum docerer reris' uel 'rere tur' et pluraliter 'cum doceremur mini rentur.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'cum doctus sim' uel 'fuerim sis' uel 'fueris sit' uel 'fuerit' et pluraliter 'cum docti simus' uel 'fuerimus sitis' uel 'fueritis sim' uel 'fuerint.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'cum doctus essem' uel 'fuissem esses' uel 'fuisse esset' uel 'fuissest' et pluraliter 'cum docti essemus' uel 'fuissemus essetis' uel 'fuissetis essent' uel 'fuiissent.' 6 Futuro 'cum doctus ero' uel 'fueris eris' uel 'fueris erit' uel 'fuerit' et pluraliter 'cum docti erimus' uel 'fuerimus eritis' uel 'fueritis erint' uel 'fuerint.'

227 1 De infinitiuno. 2 Infinitiuno modo, numeris et personis, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'doceri.' 3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'doctum esse' uel 'fuisse.' 4 Futuro 'doctum iri.'

228 1 Quot participia transitur ab hoc uerbo passiuno? 2 II. 3 Quae? 4 Praeteriti temporis et futuri. 5 Da praeteriti. 6 Vt 'doctus.' 7 Da futuri. 8 Vt 'docendus.' 9 'Doctus' unde formatur? 10 Ab ultimo supino. 11 Quomodo? 12 'Doctum': 'tu' addita 's' fit 'doctus.' 13 'Docendus' unde?
14 A genetiuo sui praesentis participii. 15 Quomodo?
16 'Docens docentis': 'tis' in 'dus' fit 'docendus.'

229 1 Verbum actium, tertia coniugatio. 2 'Lego gis
   git' et pluraliter 'legimus tis gunt.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'legebam bas bat' et pluraliter 'legebamus tis bant.'
   4 Praeterito perfecto 'legi sti git' et pluraliter 'legimus
   stis runt' 'uel 're.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'legeram
   ras rat' et pluraliter 'legeramus tis rant.' 6 Futuro 'legam
   ges get' et pluraliter 'legemus tis gent.'

230 1 De imperatiuo. 2 Imperatiiuo modo, tempore
   praesenti ad secundam et tertiam personam 'lege gat' et
   pluraliter 'legamus gite legant.' 3 Futuro 'legito tu to
   ille' et pluraliter 'legamus tote gunto.'

231 1 Optatiuo. 2 Optatiuo modo, tempore praesenti
   et praeterito imperfecto 'utinam legerem res ret [ret]' et
   pluraliter 'utinam legeremus tis rent.' 3 Praeterito perfecto
   et plusquamperfecto 'utinam legissem ses set' et pluraliter
   'utinam legissemus tis sent.' 4 Futuro 'ut (inam) legam gas
   gat' et pluraliter 'utinam legamus tis gant.'

232 1 De subiunctiuo. 2 Subiunctiuo modo similiter.
   3 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum legirem res ret' et pluraliter
   'cum legeremus tis rent.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'cum
   legerim ris rit' et pluraliter 'cum legerimus tis rint.'
   5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'cum legissem ses set' et pluraliter
'cum legissemus tis sent.' 6 Futuro 'cum legero ris rit'
et pluraliter 'cum legerimus tis rint.'

233 1 Infinituuo modo, numeris et personis, tempore
praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'legere.' 2 Praeterito
perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'legisse.' 3 Futuro 'lectum
ire' uel 'lecturum esse.'

234 1 De impersonali. 2 Verbo impersonali, tempore
praesenti 'legitur.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'legebatur.'
4 Praeterito perfecto 'lectum est fuit.' 5 Praeterito
plusquamperfecto 'lectum erat' uel 'fuerat.' 6 Futuro
'legetur.' 7 I peratiuuo modo, tempore praesenti 'legatur.'
8 Futuro 'legitor.'

235 1 De optatiuuo. 2 Optatiuo modo, tempore praesenti
et praeterito imperfecto 'utinam leg(er)tur.' 3 Praeterito
perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'utinam lectum esset' uel 'fuisse.'
4 Futuro 'utinam legatur.'

236 1 De subjunctuuo. 2 Subjunctuuo modo, tempore
praesenti 'cum legatur.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum lege-
retur.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'cum lectum sit' uel 'fuerit.'
5 Praeterito plus quam perfecto 'cum lectum esset' uel 'fuisse.'
6 Futuro 'cum lectum erit' uel 'fuerit.'

237 1 Infinituuo modo, numeris et personis, tempore
praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'legi.' 2 Praeterito
perfecto et plus quam perfecto 'lectum esse' uel 'fuisse.'
3 Futuro 'lectum iri.'
238 1 Gerundia uel participia alia nomina sunt haec: 'legendi do dum.' 2 Supina sunt haec: 'lectum tu.' 3 Quot participia tranuntur uerbo actiuo? 4 Duo. 5 Quae?
6 Praesentis temporis et futuri. 7 Da praesentis. 8 Vt 'legens.' 9 Da futuri. 10 Vt 'lecturus.' 11 'Legens' unde formatur? 12 A prima persona, praeteriti imperfecti, indicatiui modi. 13 Quomodo? 14 'Legebam': 'bam' in 'ns' fit 'legens.' 15 'Lecturus' unde? 16 Ab ultimo supino.
17 Quomodo? 18 'Lectum': 'tu' addita 'rus' fit 'lecturus.'

239 1 Verbum passium. 2 'Legor geris' uel 're gitur' et pluraliter 'legimur mini guntur.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'legebar ris' uel 'bare tur' et pluraliter 'legebamur mini bantur.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'lectus sum' uel 'fui es' uel 'fuisti est' uel 'fuit' et pluraliter 'lecti sumus' uel 'fuimus estis' uel 'fuistis sunt fuerunt' uel 'fuere.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'lectus eram' uel 'fueram eras' uel 'fueras erat' uel 'fuerat' et pluraliter 'lecti eramus' uel 'fueramus eratis' uel 'fuertis erant' uel 'fuerant.' 6 Futuro 'legar geris' uel 're tur' et pluraliter 'legemur mini gentur.'

240 1 De imperatiuo. 2 Imperatiuo modo, tempore praesenti 'legere gatur' et pluraliter 'legamur mini gantur.' 3 Futuro 'legitor tu tor ille' et pluraliter 'legamur minor guntor.'
241 1 De optatiuo. 2 Optatiuo modo, tempore praesenti
'utinam legerer reris' uel 'rere tur' et pluraliter 'utinam
legeremur mini rentur.' 3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquam-
perfecto 'utinam lectus essem' uel 'fuissem esses' uel 'fuisses
esset' uel 'fuisset' et pluraliter 'utinam lecti essemus' uel
'fuissemus essetis' uel 'fuiissetis essent'/ucl 'fuissest.'
4 Futuro 'utinam legar ris' uel 're tur' et pluraliter 'utinam
legamur mini gantur.'

242 1 De subiunctiuo. 2 Subiunctiuo modo similiter.
3 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum legerer reris' uel 'rere tur'
et pluraliter 'cum legeremur mini rentur.' 4 Praeterito
perfecto 'cum lectus sim' uel 'fuerim sis' uel 'fueris sit'
uel 'fuerit' et pluraliter 'cum lecti simus' uel 'fuerimus
sitis' uel 'fueritis sint' uel 'fuerint.' 5 Praeterito
plusquamperfecto 'cum lectus essem' uel 'fuissem esses' uel
'fuisses esset' uel 'fuisset' et pluraliter 'cum lecti essemus'
uel 'fuissemus essetis' uel 'fuiissetis essent' uel 'fuissest.'
6 Futuro 'cum lectus ero' uel 'fuerdo eris' uel 'fueris erit'
uel 'fuerit' et pluraliter 'cum lecti erimus' uel '(fuerimus
eritis' uel 'fueritis erint' uel 'fuerint.'

243 1 De infinitiuo. 2 Infinitiuo modo, numeris et
personis, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'legi.'
3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'lectum esse' uel
'fuisse[m].' 4 Futuro 'lectum iri.'
244 1 Quot participia transuntur ab hoc uerbo passiuo?  
2 II. 3 Quae? 4 Praeteriti temporis et futuri. 5 Da praeteriti. 6 Ut 'lectus.' 7 Da futuri. 8 'Legendus.'  
9 'Lectus' unde formatur? 10 Ab ultimo supino. 11 Quomodo?  
12 'Lectum': 'tu' addita 's' fit 'lectus.' 13 'Legendus' unde? 14 A genetiuo praesentis participii. 15 Quomodo?  
16 'Legens tis': 'tis' in 'dus' fit 'legendus.'  
245 1 Verbum actium tertiae conjugationis. 2 'Audio dis dit' et pluraliter 'audimus tis unt.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'audibam bas bat' et pluraliter 'audiemus tis bant.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'audiui sti uit' et pluraliter 'auduiimus stis runt' uel 'uere.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'audiueram ras rat' et pluraliter 'auduiueramus tis rant.'  
6 Futuro 'audiam es et' et pluraliter 'audiemus tis ent.'  
246 1 De Imperatiuo. 2 Imperatiuo modo, tempore praesenti 'audi at' et pluraliter 'audiamus te diant.' 3 Futuro 'audito tu to ille' et pluraliter 'audiamus tote unto.'  
247 1 De optatiuo. 2 Optatiuo modo, tempore praesenti 'utinam audirem res ret' et pluraliter 'utinam audiremus tis rent.' 3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'utinam audiuissem ses set' et pluraliter 'utinam audiuissemus tis sent.' 4 Futuro 'utinam audiam as at' et pluraliter 'utinam audiamus tis ant.'  
248 1 De subjunctiuo. Subjunctiuo modo, tempore praesenti
similiter.  3 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum audirem res ret'
et pluraliter 'cum audiremus tis rent.'  4 Praeterito perfecto'
'cum audiuerim ris rit' et pluraliter 'cum audiuerimus tis
rint.'  5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'cum audiuissem ses set'
et pluraliter 'cum audiuissemus tis sent.'  6 Futuro 'cum
audiuero ris rit' et pluraliter 'cum audiuerimus tis rint.'

249  1 De infinitiuo.  2 Infinitiuo modo, numeris et
personis, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'audire.'
3 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'audisse.'  4 Futuro 'auditum
ire' uel 'auditurum esse.'

250  1 Verbum ἐπιπersonale.  2 Verbo ἐπιpersona, tempore
praesenti 'auditur.'  3 Praeterito imperfecto 'audiēbatur,'
praeterito [in]perfecto 'auditum est' uel 'fuit.'  4 Prae-
terito plusquamperfecto 'auditum erat' uel 'fuerat.'  5 Futuro
'audietur.'  6 Imperativiuo modo, tempore praesenti 'audiatur.'
7 Futuro 'auditor.'

251  1 De optatiuo.  2 Optatiuo modo, tempore praesenti
'utinam audiretur.'  3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto
'utinam auditum esset' uel 'fuisset.'  4 Futuro 'utinam
audiatur.'

252  1 De subjunctiuo.  2 Subjunctiuo modo, tempore
praesenti 'cum audiatur.'  3 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum audi-
retur.'  4 Praeterito perfecto 'cum auditum sit' uel 'fuerit.'
5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'cum auditum esset' uel 'fuisset.'
6 Futuro 'cum auditum erit' uel 'fuerit.'
253 1 De infinitio. 2 Infinitu impersonali, tempore praesenti 'audiri.' 3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'auditum esse' uel 'fuisse.' 4 Futuro 'auditum iri.'


255 1 Passuum uerbum eisdem conjugationis. 2 'Audiorris' uel 're tur' et pluraliter 'audimur mini tur.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'audiebar baris' uel 're batur' et pluraliter 'audiebamur mini bantur.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'auditus sum' uel 'fuì es' uel 'fuisti est' uel 'fuit' et pluraliter 'auditis sumus' uel 'fuimus estis' uel 'fuistis sunt fuerunt' uel 'fuere.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'auditus eram' uel 'fueram eras' uel 'fueras erat' uel 'fuerat' et pluraliter 'auditis eramus' uel 'fueramus eratis' uel 'fueratis erant' uel 'fuerant.' 6 Futuro 'audiar eris' uel 'ere etur' et pluraliter 'audiemur mini entur.'
256 1 De imperatiuo. 2 Imperatiuo modo, tempore praesenti 'audire atur' et pluraliter 'audiamur mini antur.'
3 Futuro 'auditor tu tor ille' et pluraliter 'audiamur minor untor.'

257 1 De optatiuo. 2 Optatiuo modo, tempore praesenti 'utinam audirer ris' uel 'rere retur' et pluraliter 'utinam audiremur mini rentur.'
3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'utinam auditus esse' uel 'fuisset esse' uel 'fuisset' et pluraliter 'utinam audit esse' uel 'fuissetis esse' uel 'fuissetis essent' uel 'fuisset.'
4 Futuro 'utinam audiar ris' uel 're atur' et pluraliter 'utinam audiamur mini antur.'

258 1 De subjunctiuo. 2 Subjunctiuo modo similiter.
3 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum audirer reris' uel 'rere retur' et pluraliter 'cum audiremur ni rentur.'
4 Praeterito perfecto 'cum auditus sim' uel 'fuerim sis' uel 'fueris sit' uel 'fuerit' et pluraliter 'cum auditi simus' uel 'fuerimus sitis' uel 'fueritis sint' uel 'fuerint.'
5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'cum auditus esse' uel 'fuisset esse' uel 'fuisses esset' uel 'fuisset et pluraliter 'cum audit esse' uel 'fuissent.'
6 Futuro 'cum auditus ero' uel 'fuero eris' uel 'fueris erit' uel 'fuerit' et pluraliter 'cum audit erimus' uel 'fuerimus [ue]l 'fuerimus eritis' uel 'fueritis erint' uel 'fuerint.'
259 1 De infinitu. 2 Infinitu modo, numeris et personis, tempore praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'audiri.' 3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'auditum esse' uel 'fuisse.' 4 Futuro 'auditum iri.'

260 1 Quot participia trahuntur ab hoc uerbo passiuo? 2 II. 3 Quae? 4 Praeteriti temporis et futuri. 5 Da praeteriti. 6 Vt 'auditus.' 7 Da futuri. 8 Vt 'audiendus.' 9 'Auditus' unde formatur? 10 Ab ultimo supino. 11 Quomodo? 12 'Auditum': 'tu' addita 's' fit 'auditus.' 13 'Audiendus' unde? 14 A genetiuo sui praesentis participii. 15 Quomodo? 16 'Audiens audi(ens)itis': 'tis' in 'dus' fit 'audiendus.'

261 1 Verbum anomalum. 2 'Sum es est' et pluraliter 'sumus estis sunt.' 3 Praeterito imperfecto 'eram ras rat' et pluraliter 'eramus tis rant.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'fuisti it' et pluraliter 'fuimus stis runt' uel 'fuere.' 5 Praeterito plusquamperfecto 'fueram ras rat' et pluraliter 'fueramus tis rant.' 6 Futuro 'ero eris erit' et pluraliter 'erimus eritis erint.'

262 1 De imperatiuo. 2 Imperatiuo modo, tempore praesenti ad secundam et tertiam personam 'sis' uel 'es sit' et pluraliter 'simus estis sint.' 3 Futuro 'esto tu esto ille' et pluraliter 'simus este' uel 'estote sint' uel 'sunto.'

263 1 De optatiuo. 2 Optatiuo modo, tempore praesenti 'utinam essem esses essest' et pluraliter 'utinam essemus essetis'.
essent." 3 Praeterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto 'utinam
fuisset ses set' et pluraliter 'utinam fuissemus/ setis sent.'
4 Futuro 'utinam sim sis sit' et pluraliter 'utinam simus
tis sint.'

264 1 De subjunctio. 2 Subjunctio modo similiter.
3 Praeterito imperfecto 'cum essem esses esset' et pluraliter
'cum essemus essetis essent.' 4 Praeterito perfecto 'cum
fuerim ris rit' et pluraliter 'cum fuerimus tis rint.' 5 Prae-
terito plus quam perfecto 'cum fuissem ses set' et pluraliter
'cum fuissemus tis sent.' 6 Futuro 'cum fuero ris rit' et
pluraliter 'cum fuerimus tis rint.'

265 1 Infinitivo modo, numeris et personis, tempore
praesenti et praeterito imperfecto 'esse.' 2 Praeterito
perfecto et plus quam perfecto 'fuisse.' 3 Futuro caret.
4 Vnum participium habet 'ens.' 5 'Ens' unde formatur?
6 A secunda persona, praesentis, indicatui modi. 7 Quomodo?
8 'Sum': 'es' interposita 'n' fit 'ens.'

266 1 Explicit Liber tam de Donato quam de Prisciano a
fratre Paulo compositus; et quoniam ad utilitatem omnium est
datus, ideo 'Donatus' est uocatus.
APPARATUS CRITICUS PROLOGI

1, 5: consumatus \textsuperscript{1r} 11

7: diffiniatur \textsuperscript{1r} 17

8: In the manuscript on \textsuperscript{1r} 18 two dots appear over the \textit{u} to represent the \textit{m} in the name Donatum.

2, 2: negligentia \textsuperscript{1r} 24

3: Introductiones: the second \textit{n} on \textsuperscript{1r} 26 is partially erased;
\textit{Componerem: re} on \textsuperscript{1r} 28 is partially erased.

3, 1: falarate \textsuperscript{1v} 1; farigestiunt \textsuperscript{1v} 3; negligentem \textsuperscript{1v} 5;
quatinus \textsuperscript{1v} 6
APPARATUS CRITICUS LIBRI TAM DE PRISCIANO QUAM DE DONATO

1, 4: In the right-hand margin of 1\(^V\) there is a comment: "proprium substantiam ut 'Socrates', communem ut 'homo,' proprium qualitatem ut 'Socracitas,' communem ut 'humanitas.'"

7: 'όνομα in Greek letters

8: ethimologia 1\(^V\) 20

12: On 1\(^V\) 21 the abbreviation for numerus is nūs.

16: noic is the correct Greek form.

25: On 1\(^V\) 28 the abbreviation for quīa is qa.

28: In the left-hand margin on 1\(^V\) reads this comment to the mentioning of the agnomen, praenomen and cognomen: "Euenit agnomen sed nomen convenit uni. Praenomen differt. Cognomen nominat omnes."

2, 2: patronomicis 1\(^V\) 34

3: patronomica 1\(^V\) 34; genitiuo 1\(^V\) 36

5: genitiuo 2\(^R\) 1

7: patronomica twice on 2\(^R\) 3

9: patronomica 2\(^R\) 5

10: The abbreviation for omnes is os on 2\(^R\) 6.

3, 1: diminutius 2\(^R\) 10

2: diminuïa 2\(^R\) 10

3: Diminuitia and diminutionem 2\(^R\) 11

7: genitius 2\(^R\) 15 In the right-hand margin near line 16 on 2\(^R\) appears a note in 17th or 18th century cursive referring to this sentence: "Quid in! Horrui!" The second and third lines of this comment are illegible
except for illa verba in the third line. Lines 4 - 5 of this comment read: "'t' mutata in 'c' et addita 'l.'" Line 6 is illegible. In the text (2r 16) the portion from 't' mutata in 'c' to the second addita is underlined.

4, 4: intelligi 2r 23
5: genitiuis 2r 25

5, 2: denominatius: the second a (2r 31) is nearly obliterated.
15: epytheta 2v 1
23: The abbreviation on 2v 5 for figurat is odd: figuat.

6, 7: intelligo 2v 13
8: intelligitur 2v 14
9: dester 2v 15
13: intelligi 2v 19
18: omonima 2v 22
19: sinonima and polionima 2v 24

7, 6: Questio in right-hand margin of 2v near line 27 and referring to this question
8: intelligitur 2v 28
10: The Greek form is \( \hat{\nu} \).
12: communem 2v 31
14: epykenon 2v 33 and comprehendit 2v 34
18: The second 1 in Mustela on 3r 4 written in red ink has been erased.

8, 3: appears in the right-hand margin on 3r referring to line 8
6: epycnonon 3r 11
8: A note to this in the right-hand margin on 3r appears illegible and unintelligible.
9: Epykenon 3r 14
10: epykenon 3r 16
11: epychenon 3r 18

9, 2: The Greek expression is ἀνδ ὁ τοῦ βαλλε εν.
6: The Greek for cephalim is properly χεφαλή.
7: On 3r 27 the abbreviation for haec in the phrase haec balnea is ἕ.
12: plurari 3r 34
10, 5: Virgilio 3v 5
11, 3: catelina 3v 11 and suphisma 3v 13

13, 2: odd abbreviation for nominatius on 3v 17: noto
3: genitius 3v 18

22, 2: que 4r 1
26, 2: scannum 4r 7 and Dortium 4r 8
28, 4: trisen feminina 4r 12
31, 6: beuer 4r 25

36, 2: On 4v 4 de appears to have been written before nominatius in red and black inks but subsequently erased. In desinentia on 4v 4 the space between n and t has an erased e.
37, 5: piths 4v 15
6: sannis 4v 16
39, 2: pilus and berithus 4\textsuperscript{v} 27; diptongus 4\textsuperscript{v} 28; 
\textit{xristallum} crossed out on 4\textsuperscript{v} 29; \textit{sinodus} and \textit{abissus} 4\textsuperscript{v} 29; bissus 4\textsuperscript{v} 30

3: vulgus: first time in the ms. (4\textsuperscript{v} 31) that PC uses \textit{\textit{v}} as a consonant

6: monosillaba 4\textsuperscript{v} 32

7: sillabam 4\textsuperscript{v} 34

40, 2: sillabam 5\textsuperscript{r} 6

41, 2: monosillaba 5\textsuperscript{r} 14

4: sillabam 5\textsuperscript{r} 16

5: calibs calibis 5\textsuperscript{r} 18

6: celeps 5\textsuperscript{r} 19

44, 6: In the right margin on 5\textsuperscript{r} near lines 25 and 26 is a note: "Nota quid sit numeros et unde dicatur." This refers to some lower marginalia found illegible, although the first word is quod.

8: ponpilio 5\textsuperscript{r} 27

46, 2: quae for quae 5\textsuperscript{v} 4

3: \textit{deficit} deficit et numero 5\textsuperscript{v} 5 The first deficit of these two is deleted by a line drawn through it.

47, 3: On 5\textsuperscript{v} 9 pluralem is abbreviated as \[\text{\texttt{platr}}\,\text{\texttt{c}}\].

4: The abbreviation for \textit{plurali} on 5\textsuperscript{v} 9 is \textit{ptari}.

48, 3: In the left-hand margin on 5\textsuperscript{v} nearly coinciding with line 11 where this sentence begins appears the word Nota referring to a lower note that says: "Ratio satis, bona et naturalis omnia esse homogenea. Sunt numeri singularis."

49, 3: antifrasin 5\textsuperscript{v} 21
51, 2: calende 5V 28

52, 2: plumbum 5V 31

54, 3: prarib; for pluralibus 5V 35


58, 9: genitius 6r 34

15: genitiuus 6r 36

18: genitiuus 6v 2

22: huic poetae 6v 7

59, 4: in 6v 11

6: odd abbreviation for productum on 6v 13: pd

8: pāre for pluralem 6v 15

13: epytheta 6v 23

14: epytheta 6v 25

60, 5: Hec for Haec 7r 2

8: Virgilius O Virgili 7r 6

9: acute accent over the 0 in 0 fili on 7r 7

12-13: Every occurrence of scamnum and its inflected forms is written with mn for mn on 7r 9 – 12.

61, 1: In the right-hand margin on 7r near line 12 is written tertia declinatio referring to the declension of sacerdos. Also, in the left-hand margin appears uel sacerdoti written before sacerdote on 7r 14 and shown by two hair-strokes that it ought to follow sacerdote on 7r 14.
6: hæc 7r 16

7: The first occurrence of the correct spelling of the abbreviation of pluralis which is plæs appears on 7r 20.

7: plæs for pluralis 7r 21

62, 1: Quarta in the right-hand margin of 7r near line 26 refers to the declension of manus.

7: pdct on 7r 32 not normal abbreviation for productam; plæs for plurales (7r 32) which I emendate to pluralis

63, 6: sillaæas 7v 6

64, 6: scanneæ scannæ scanno 7v 15–16

68, 29: nτοι 8r 11

69, 13: secuntur 8r 19

21: On 8r in the right-hand margin after the second ab of line 27 which corresponds to the second ab in line 21 of the edited text appears what seems to be an awkward insertion: "Nominativus 'is ea id.'" This refers to the declension appearing in the left-hand margin on 8r: "genetivus 'eiis,' dativus 'ei,' accusativus 'eum eam id,' ablativus 'ab eo ab ea ab eo.' Et pluraliter nominativus 'ei eae' et 'ea,' genetivus 'eorum earum,' dativus 'eis,' accusativus 'eos eae ea,' ablativus 'ab eis.'

70, 2: The second meææ of this sentence appears as mee on 8v 4.

3: The first meææ of this sentence appears as mee on 8v 5.

5: mee 8v 8

71, 2: uocatiuæum 8v 14

72, 5: genitiuæ 8v 18
The abbreviation for the first *cur* is *cu* on 8\textsuperscript{v} 24.

The majuscule *M* in *Merito* looks like an *N* on 8\textsuperscript{v} 29 and is in bright red ink.

meg  8\textsuperscript{v} 36

*habet* 9\textsuperscript{r} 9

The abbreviation for *cur* on 9\textsuperscript{r} 12 is *cu*. *Quare* on 9\textsuperscript{r} 13 is abbreviated as *qr*.

diruitium 9\textsuperscript{r} 23

" *mei filii est* " - " quae est " in left-hand margin on 9\textsuperscript{r} near lines 30 - 33.

*persona* in the right-hand margin of 9\textsuperscript{v} near line 3

epikhenon 9\textsuperscript{v} 8

*Didimus* 9\textsuperscript{v} 16

*negligenter* 9\textsuperscript{v} 24

*Ad* 9\textsuperscript{v} 30

*sillabica* 10\textsuperscript{r} 8

*plirali* 10\textsuperscript{r} 10

diffinitio 10\textsuperscript{r} 26

diffinitionem 10\textsuperscript{r} 30

This is marginalia at the bottom of 10\textsuperscript{v} written in a gloss hand.

*diffiniunt* 10\textsuperscript{v} 12; *me qui*; In the right-hand margin on 10\textsuperscript{v} indicated to be inserted between *nisi* and *dirigo* of line 13; *intelligere* 10\textsuperscript{v} 13
86, 3: pluraliter: in the left-hand margin on 10 v shown that it must be inserted between et and ipsae ipsarum of line 22

7: in the left-hand margin on 10 v preceding line 26: " Quare autem 'ipse' " etc.

12: *Virgilius* 10 v 27 and *eneudos* 10 v 28

13: wrong syllabification of *paulisper* on 10 v 29 which is *pa-ulisper*

87, 16: This sentence appears in the left-hand margin of 11 r and indicated to precede " Sed notandum tunc est pronomen " etc. on line 8.

88, 3: ee for eae 11 r 12

90, 10: *intelligis* 11 r 34

91, 10: The first and second nostrae 's in this sentence are written having an e for ae in 11 v 7.

93, 6 – 9: On 11 v 24 Solutio is written for Quaestio, but the former is faintly crossed out and *qstio* written over it. Between *numero* and *quoniam* appears solutio which is very faded.

94, 2 – 7: A marginal note in the left-hand side on 11 v near lines 30 – 31 reads: " Nota bene quae dicuntur hic de uerbis. "

4: *dimittere* 11 v 30

9: *netri passiui* 11 v 32

95, 15: *utranque* 12 r 8

96, 10: *neutrum passium ut 'gaudeo,' neutropassium ut 'ueneo'* 12 r 14

11: *assum* 12 r 15

15: *acensatium* 12 r 19
Amobo 12\textsuperscript{F} 23

A note in the right-hand margin on 12\textsuperscript{F} (near lines 28 and 30) to this sentence says: "ratio quare tempus praesens a gram\textsuperscript{m}tico ponitur ante praeteritum."

diffinit 12\textsuperscript{F} 32

A note in the right-hand margin of 12\textsuperscript{F} (near line 33) to this sentence reads: "naturabile bona."

On 12\textsuperscript{V} in the left-hand margin appears the note: "Nota que hic dicuntur de antepositione et pos\textsuperscript{t}positione uerborum."

Optauiuus 12\textsuperscript{V} 7

diffinit 12\textsuperscript{V} 13

diffinit 12\textsuperscript{V} 14

diffinit 12\textsuperscript{V} 15

intelligo 12\textsuperscript{V} 26

sillabam 13\textsuperscript{R} 1

correctum 13\textsuperscript{R} 3

praeteritos 13\textsuperscript{R} 6

fecirint 13\textsuperscript{V} 1

doleo 13\textsuperscript{V} 34

conexi 14\textsuperscript{R} 21

so 14\textsuperscript{R} 25

Iaceo 14\textsuperscript{R} 33
124, 4: This word appears in the right-hand margin on 14\textsuperscript{V} near line 14 (spelled 'questio') and is preceded by a cross referring it to another cross used as an insertion sign in line 14.

125, 1: Questio (14\textsuperscript{V} 15) preceding In 'rio' terminantia has been erased.

127, 3: \underline{conquessi} 14\textsuperscript{V} 28

128, 2: \underline{sesi} 15\textsuperscript{R} 4

3: The \underline{n} in f\underline{indi} (15\textsuperscript{R} 6) has been erased.

129, 7: \underline{intelligo} and \underline{negligo} 15\textsuperscript{R} 16

8: Above the space between \underline{confringo} and \underline{confrungi} on 15\textsuperscript{R} 19 is written \underline{cfre}.

130, 4: \underline{sclapsi sclaptum} 15\textsuperscript{R} 27

135, 3: \underline{compositc} 15\textsuperscript{V} 19

4: \underline{str\grave{u}i} 15\textsuperscript{V} 22

137 : \underline{capesco} 15\textsuperscript{V} 31

139, 1: This is the second time in the ms. (15\textsuperscript{V} 36) that \underline{v} is used.

149, 5: The second \underline{a} in \underline{mutat}\textless a\textgreater has been deleted by two dots—one above and one below the letter—and erased.

151, 3: The first \underline{ui} (16\textsuperscript{R} 30) is slightly erased.

156, 17: \underline{secunda in s} 16\textsuperscript{V} 24

19: \underline{sillabam} 16\textsuperscript{V} 27

20: \underline{sillabam} 16\textsuperscript{V} 28

22: \underline{sillabam} 16\textsuperscript{V} 31
23: sillaba 16v 32
26: sillabam 17r 1
27: sillabam 17r 2
31: sillabam 17r 6

157, 17: Decimus 17r 18

158, 12: contenciosis 17r 32
16: Insular sign on 17r 35 for enim: $\mu$

159, 5: tento 17v 7

160, 4: sillaba 17v 16

161, 19: agite age 17v 30
20: mutum: incorrect, hyper-abbreviation for multum on 17v 32
25: superlatiue 18r 2
27: diminutiui 18r 4

164, 4: genitiuum 18v 3; accusatio 18v 4
6: cube nicene 18v 9

166, 1: omonima uel polionima 18v 15
2: Virgilius 18v 18
3: \underline{Assis} 18v 20
4: ammirantis 18v 21

5: In the left-hand margin on 18v near lines 22 - 25 appears the reading in this sentence.

167, 4: monosillabis 18v 27
168, 2: Set 18\textsuperscript{v} 30

169, 2: natandum 18\textsuperscript{v} 33

170, 16: nagandi 19\textsuperscript{r} 11
37: forsam 19\textsuperscript{r} 16
57: tan quan 19\textsuperscript{r} 22

173, 4: afforas 19\textsuperscript{r} 30

174, 19: uendicant 19\textsuperscript{v} 11

175, 17: Masculinus 19\textsuperscript{v} 16

176, 12: The abbreviations for genetius\textsubscript{u}, datius\textsubscript{u}, accusat\textsubscript{u}ius, vocat\textsubscript{u}ius and ablati\textsubscript{u}us on 19\textsuperscript{v} 24 are respectively G D A V A.

179, 3: Simgularis 19\textsuperscript{v} 35

181, 15: ligurro 20\textsuperscript{r} 16
17: secuntur 20\textsuperscript{r} 18
22: tandiu and quandiu 20\textsuperscript{r} 24

186, 7: appearing on 20\textsuperscript{v} 12 as G.C.T.S.N.7 F.
15: Que? 20\textsuperscript{v} 15
46: negligens 20\textsuperscript{v} 26

187, 3: et hee legentes 20\textsuperscript{v} 31

188, 7: ac nectens 21\textsuperscript{r} 9

189, 6: causuales 21\textsuperscript{r} 18
7: causuales 21\textsuperscript{r} 18
9: Abprobatio 21r 21

12: wrong syllabification of pauper on 21r 28 which is pa-uper

15: impedimento 21r 33

16: praepositus aliis 21r 35; catelinam 21r 36

19: bizantium 21v 4; Diminutiu 21v 3; diminutionem 21v 3

190, 8: quatinus 21v 7

15: encletice 21v 10

24: secuntur 21v 20

191, 16: expletuius 21v 32

19: quatinus 21v 34; uene (21v 35) instead of neue

21: iccirco 22r 2

193, 6: hee 22r 16

194, 10: circa 22r 19

195, 8: ammodum 22r 32

14: im plebem 22v 5

17: intes 22v 10

197, 15: citra for curta 22v 23

200, 7: bissillabum 23r 23 and Virgilius 23r 23

8: monosillabum 23r 24

202, 1: Prima coniugatio in the right-hand margin of 23r near line 33 following et si qua sunt similia

10: amauissem set set 23v 5
221, 3: rū 24v 3

222, 14: supimo 24v 8

228, 6: lectus 24v 31

238, 12: indacatiui 25r 23

244, 4: praesentis (25v 10) instead of praeteriti
5: praesentis (25v 11) instead of praeteriti

250, 1: ipersonali 25v 27

258, 5: false syllabification of auditus on 26r 19 - 20: a-uditus
1, 1: melior ... comparari: cf. PROV., 8, 11.

2: cf. PROV., 8, 19.

3: facile ... eam: SAP., 6, 13.

4: 'Ego ... inuenient me.': cf. PROV., 8, 17.

5 - 6: cf. SAP., 6, 16.

3, 1: unusquisque ... ministrare: cf. 1 PETR., 4, 10.

1: libenter ... sapientes: cf. 2 COR., 11, 19.

2: cui proprium ... par cere: the collect of the former
funeral Mass in the section entitled In Die Obitus or
Depositionis Defuncti.
1, 1 – 6: v. C.M. 14737, 164\textsuperscript{v} 17 – 21; v. PARIS 7558, 139\textsuperscript{r} 1 – 4.


5: cf. DON., 355, 5.


7: v. SED., 1, 14, 7; cf. REM., 8, 18*.

8: cf. SED., 1, 15, 1 – 2; cf. MUR. 7491 A, 2\textsuperscript{v} 20; cf. REM., 8, 18 – 21; v. PRIS., 2, 57, 2 – 3; v. [Serg.], 488, 3; v DIOMEDES, 320, 26 – 27.

9: DON., 355, 6.


16: cf. REM., 16, 12 – 13 and esp. line 13* for fictor: v. ISIDORUS, 8, 7, 2; v. MARIUS, 56, 16; v. FUNAIOLI, 366, 443.

18: C.M. 14737, 156\textsuperscript{v} 6.


22: v. [CORNELIUS], 525, 21; v. C.M. 6413, 24\textsuperscript{r} 25 – 26.


2, 1: cf. DON., 373, 11.

2: PRIS., 2, 62, 14.


4 – 5: cf. PRIS., 2, 68, 14 – 16.

5: 'Euandrius ensis': VERG., 10, 394.

7: cf. PRIS., 2, 68, 17 – 18 and note line 14* for patronomico appearing in the Priscian mss. D and L.
2, 8 - 13: cf. PRIS., 2, 68, 18 - p. 69, 4.
3, 1 - 3: cf. PRIS., 2, 101, 2 - 4 and line 2*.
4 - 5: cf. PRIS., 2, 83, 1 - 3.
7: v. ARS, 77, 24 - 25; v. IULIAN. DON., 327, 22 - 30; v. PRIS., 2, 86, 15 - 18.
8: v. PRIS., 2, 89, 9 - 14; v. PROBUS, 69, 10 - 19 and p. 70, 4.

4, 1: PRIS., 2, 94, 14*.
2: et ... 'doctissimus': cf. ARS, 76, 25 - 26.
3 - 4: cf. SED., 1, 129, 3; cf. PRIS., 2, 94, 15 - 19.
5: v. PRIS., 2, 95, 7 - 9.
8: v. PRIS., 2, 95, 1 - 6; v. PROBUS, 63, 33 - 35.

5, 1: PRIS., 2, 117, 1.
4: v. ARS, 74, 11 - 12; v. PRIS., 3, 215, 23 - 26; 'amo amor': ARS, 74, 10 - 11; EUTYCHES, 453, 10.
6: v. DON., 374, 12 - 13; v. PROBUS, 142, 12 - 18.
8: v. DIOMEDES, 322, 20.
12: cf. PRIS., 2, 61, 28.
14: v. ARS, 72, 13; v. ISIDORUS, 1, 7, 22; v. DON., 374, 2 - 4.
15: cf. C.M. 14488, 10V 28; v. ISIDORUS, 1, 7, 22.
17: v. PRIS., 2, 61, 3; v. SERVIUS, 430, 17; v. DON., 374, 5 - 6.
19: v. SERVIUS, 430, 17 - 18; v. DON., 374, 6.
23 - 24: cf. PRIS., 2, 90, 19 - 20; cf. DIOMEDES, 322, 16 - 17; cf. DON., 374, 6 - 8.
25: cf. SED., 1, 103, 9; cf. C.M. 14488, 11V 3 - 5.

6, 2 - 3: v. SED., 1, 103, 12 - 14.
5 - 12: cf. C.M. 14488, 11V 7 - 20.
   5: cf. DON., 374, 9 - 10.
   6: cf. PRIS., 2, 60, 19 - 20.
   7: cf. PRIS., 2, 60, 20 - 21 and 20* for 'patrem' etiam 'filium'.
   8: cf. PRIS., 2, 60, 21 - 22.
   9: cf. DON., 374, 9 - 10; see LINDSAY 2, 169 for destra and MUR. 7491 A, 8V 17 for dexter.
11 - 13: cf. SED., 1, 111, 1 - 3; cf. PRIS., 2, 60, 23 - 27.
15: Aliud quoque ... 'quis': cf. PRIS., 2, 61, 5;
   aliud demonstratum ... 'quae': cf. PRIS., 2, 59, 22.
16: cf. PRIS., 2, 61, 21 - 27.
17: cf. PRIS., 2, 62, 5 - 8.
18: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 7F 6 - 7; cf. PRIS., 2, 59, 14 - 15;
   cf. DON., 373, 21 - 22.
18: cf. ARS, 71, 31 - 32; cf. DON., 373, 22 - 23; see MUR. 7491 A, 7F 10 for polionima and sinonima and MUR. 1586, 20V 15 for the same.
7, 1: PRIS., 2, 141, 1.
   5: v. IULIAN. DON., 318, 34 - p. 319, 2; v. CLEDONIUS, 39, 16; for articulare pronomen see PRIS., 2, 141, 10 - 11.
   8: cf. SED., 1, 34, 3 - 4; REM., 19, 22 - 24; v. CLEDONIUS, 10, 18 - 19.
10: cf. SED., 1, 159, 2; v. ISIDORUS, 11, 1, 2; v. SERVIUS, 407, 39; v. FESTUS, 219; v. VARRO, 192, 8.
11: DON., 355, 14.
13: Est ... dicitur: DON., 355, 16 - 17; cui ... praeponitur: cf. DOSITHEUS, 391, 10; ut 'hie' ... 'felix':
   DON., 355, 17.
14: Est ... comprehendit: cf. DON., 375, 22 - 24; et sub ... 
   'miilus': cf. REM., 18, 26 - 27; cf. PS-AUG., 505, 43 - p. 506, 1 and 5; v. CHARISIUS, 194, 18 - 19.
15: 'Passer' ... sit: cf. REM., 18, 26; cf. [SERG], 494 1 - 2; sub ... uocantur: cf. REM., 18, 26 - p. 19, 1.

16: cf. SED., 1, 176, 4; REM., 19, 1 - 2; v. ISIDORUS, 12, 7, 68.

17 - 19: cf. REM., 19, 2 - 9; v. ISIDORUS, 12, 3, 3 and 12, 7, 10; v. SERVIUS VER., 2, 376, 28 - 29.

17: et ... oculorum: cf. SED., 1, 176, 4.

18: cf. SERVIUS VER., 2, 376, 28 - 30.

8, 2: cf. SED., 1, 174, 1;
    cf. REM., 19, 27 - 29 and esp. REM. DE, cix.

4: cf. SED., 1, 176, 1;
    cf. REM. DE, cix; v. PRIS., 2, 142, 19 - 20;
    v. PS-AUG., 498, 10 - 12 and 15 - 16 and p. 496, 18 - 19; v. VARRO, 194, 1 - 5.

6: cf. SED., 1, 172, 2;
    cf. MUR. 7491 A, 11V 8 - 10;
    cf. REM. EIN., 235, 15 - 16; v. POMPEIUS, 161, 8.

8 - 10: v. SED., 1, 173, 3 - 6.

8: cf. REM. EIN., 235, 21 - 22; v. [SERG], 494, 12 - 13;
    v. SERVIUS, 408, 9 - 10.


10: cf. REM., EIN., 235, 23 - 24;
    cf. REM., 19, 17 - 21; v. POMPEIUS, 163, 13 - 14.


12: Est ... dicetur: v. ARS, 83, 26 - 28; quia ...
    'haec finis': cf. PRIS., 2, 141, 16 - 17.


2: cf. SED., 1, 194, 3 - 5;
    cf. REM. EIN., 237, 5 - 6 and 5*; v. ISIDORUS, 15, 2, 40.

3: v. SED., 1, 194, 6 - 7; v. REM. EIN., 237, 6 - 7;
    cf. ISIDORUS, 14, 9, 8; v. SERVIUS VER., 2, 80, 23 - 25.
9, 4: v. SED., 1, 195, 1 – 3; cf. REM., 85, 12 – 13; v. ISIDORUS, 13, 4, 1; v. NONIUS, 3, 702, 15 – 20; v. FUNAIOLI, 59, 7 and 223, 91.

5: v. SED., 1, 196, 1 – 2; v. REM. EIN., 237, 10 – 11.

6: v. SED., 1, 196, 3 – 4; cf. REM. EIN., 237, 12 – 14; v. ISIDORUS, 17, 10, 12.

7 – 9: *haec fora*: cf. C.M. 14488, 18\(^\text{V}\) 23 – 19\(^\text{R}\) 8; v. BEDE, 276, 9 – 10; v. DIOMEDES, 327, 2 – 10; v. CHARISIUS, 40, 13 – 14, p. 90, 21 – 28, and p. 41, 21; v. SACERDOS, 473, 16.

7: antiqui ... *haec fora* of sentence 9: cf. SED., 1, 192, 4 – 5.

9: *tam ... dicitur*: v. REM., 82, 22 – 23; v. ANSILEUBUS, 456; v. ISIDORUS, 18, 15, 1 and 11*; v. ISIDORUS, 18, 1, 10 and 20, 14, 12.

11: OVID., 72.

10, 1 – 2: cf. SED., 1, 193, 1 – 2; cf. C.M. 14488, 19\(^\text{H}\) 8 – 13; v. PETRUS, 162, 21 – 22; cf. REM. EIN., 237, 3 – 4.


4: v. PRIS., 2, 141, 5 – 6 and PRIS. PT., 465, 7 – 9.


4: Pluralia ... *arma*: v. PRIS. PT., 461, 24 – 26; v. PROBUS AP., 196, 2 and PROBUS DE, 209, 3 – 5; e ... *triginta*: v. PRIS., 2, 145, 8 – 9.

12, 2: v. PHOCAS, 413, 1 – 2; v. POMPEIUS, 165, 3 – 6; v. PS-AUG., 496, 23 – p. 497, 9; v. DON., 376, 12 – 14; v. CHARISIUS, 58, 1 – 4.
13, 2: Omnia ... 'gummi': v. PRIS., 2, 145, 13; v. POMPEIUS, 165, 9; v. PS-AUG., 497, 11; v. DON., 376, 14 - 16; v. CHARISIUS, 78, 28; aut ... 'frugi': cf. DON., 376, 16.

3: v. PRIS., 2, 145, 13 - 14 and p. 564, 3 - 5.

14, 2: Omnia ... 'dulcedinis': v. PRIS., 2, 145, 19 - 21; v. PHOCAS, 413, 18 - 22; v. PROBUS CA., 10, 1 - 8; v. [PALAEMON], 537, 10 - 15; praeter ... masculini: v. PRIS., 2, 145, 21 - 23; v. PHOCAS, 413, 22 - 24; v. CHARISIUS, 79, 7 & 9.

3: et ... incerti: v. PRIS., 2, 145, 24 - 25.


5: Cetera ... 'stellio': cf. PRIS., 2, 146, 3 - 4; a ... communia: v. ARS, 110, 8; v. PRIS., 2, 141, 18 & p. 146, 6 - 8 & p. 207, 2 - 3; v. PS-AUG., 501, 39 - p. 502, 3; v. [PALAEMON], 537, 12.

15, 2: Omnia ... genu': v. FRAGMENTUM, 564, 23 - 26; v. PRIS., 2, 146, 15; v. DON., 376, 19 - 20; v. CHARISIUS, 82, 28 - 30; v. PROBUS CA., 31, 23 - 24.

17, 1 - 2: v. PRIS., 2, 146, 16; v. PROBUS CA., 7, 3 - 12.

18, 2: v. ARS, 123, 24 - 29; v. PRIS., 2, 146, 17 - 19; 'David': PRIS., 2, 148 10.

19, 2: v. FRAGMENTUM, 557, 36 - 40; v. PRIS., 2, 147, 1 - 8; v. PHOCAS, 414, 16 - 19; v. PS-AUG., 500, 31 - 37; v. CHARISIUS, 58, 14 - 16 and p. 135, 17 for 'sal.'

20, 2: v. ARS, 112, 12; v. FRAGMENTUM, 558, 1 - 7; v. PRIS., 2, 147, 9 - 12; v. CHARISIUS, 28, 3 - 4.

21, 2 - 3: v. FRAGMENTUM, 558, 8 - 14; v. PRIS., 2, 312, 21 - 23, and p. 147, 13 - 16; v. PHOCAS, 414, 19 - 22; v. PS-AUG., 503, 20 - 24; V. PRIS, 523, 10 - 12.

22, 2: v. PRIS., 2, 147, 17; v. PHOCAS, 414, 22 - 23; v. CHARISIUS, 30, 10.

24, 2: v. PRIS., 2, 148, 4 - 5; v. PS-AUG., 505, 40 - 42.


27, 2: v. PRIS., 2, 216, 3 - 8; v. PHOCAS; 425, 4 - 10; v. CHARISIUS, 25, 11 - 14.


29, 2 - 3: v. HRABANUS, 636; v. MALSACHANUS, 180, 21; v. PRIS., 2, 220, 10 and p. 215, 15 and 17.

30, 2 - 4: v. FRAGMENTUM, 558, 30 - 36; v. PRIS., 2, 149, 10 - p. 150, 10; v. PHOCAS, 415, 8 - 13, v. CHARISIUS, 26, 9 and lines 20 - 25.


32, 2: v. PRIS., 2, 153, 19-p. 154, 6; v. PHOCAS, 416, 1 - 5; v. CHARISIUS, 23, 7 - 11.

33, 2 - 5: v. PRIS., 2, 154, 7 - 23.


4: v. PRIS., 2, 156, 13 - 16.
36, 5: v. PRIS., 2, 159, 11 - 12.

6: v. PRIS., 2, 158, 4 - 6; v. [PRIS.], 524, 22.

37, 2: Omnia ... 'panis': v. PRIS., 2, 159, 27 - p. 160, 1 ff.; praeter ... incerti: v. PRIS., 2, 160, 10 - 12.

3: v. PRIS., 2, 161, 6 - 8 and p. 348, 9 - 10.

5: v. PRIS., 2, 161, 8 - 13 and p. 275, 15* for chlamis and clamis; v. CLEDONIUS, 48, 15, for pyxis.

6: v. PRIS., 2, 159, 16 - 22.


39, 2: v. PRIS., 2, 161, 26 - p. 163, 6 and p. 169, 8 - 13; 'byssus' ... generis: cf. GOETZ, 5, 50.

3 - 4: v. PRIS., 2, 163, 9 - 11.

6 - 7: v. PRIS., 2, 163, 23 - p. 164, 2.

9: v. PRIS., 2, 163, 19 - 22.

10 - 11: v. ASPERUS, 44, 12*; v. PRIS., 2, 162, 9 - 10, p. 163, 7 - 12 and p. 171, 7 - 8; v. CHARISIUS, 55, 28 - p. 56, 5; v. DIOMEDES, 308, 4 - 5; MAXIMUS, 200, 29 - 30 and p. 201, 1.


3: Excipliantur ... quae sunt feminini: v. PRIS., 2, 164, 20; praeter ... et feminini: v. PRIS., 2, 164, 12 - 13 and line 24 and p. 165, 11.
40, 4: v. PRIS., 2, 164, 8, p. 165, 11 - 12 and p. 166, 1.

5: v. PRIS., 2, 166, 21 - 23.

6: v. PRIS., 2, 166, 19 - 21.

7: v. PRIS., 2, 166, 24 - p. 167, 1.

41, 1 - 2: v. PRIS., 2, 168, 5 - 11; Omnia ... consonantes:
   cf. PRIS., 2, 167, 10; si sint ... generis;
   cf. PRIS., 2, 168, 5.


3: v. PRIS., 2, 168, 11; v. POMPEIUS, 163, 26:
   v. CONSENTIUS, 346, 32 - p. 347, 1 and p. 345,
   26 - 30.

4: v. PRIS., 2, 168, 13 - 14; v. PHOCAS, 422, 7.

5: Desinentia ... 'calibus': v. FRAGMENTUM, 561, 29 -39;

6 - 7: v. PRIS., 2, 167, 10 - 13; v. PHOCAS, 422, 4;
   v. PS-AUG., 503, 8 - 13.

42, 2: v. PRIS., 2, 169, 4 - 5.

43, 2: v. PRIS., 2, 169, 3.


5: cf. ARS, 84, 4: cf. CLEMENS, 35, 15.

6: cf. SED. TRACT., 78r 21 - 22; cf. REM., 12, 27 - 29;

8 - 12: cf. SED., 1, 34, 6 - 9.

8: cf. REM., 12, 23 - 26; cf. REM. EIN., 240, 7 - 8
   and lines 7* and 8*.

10 - 12: cf. REM., 12, 29 - p. 13, 4; cf. REM. EIN., 240, 7*


12: 'Hunc ... lapillo': PERSIUS, 2, 1.

5: Singularis ... unum: cf. REM., 21, 4 - 5.

6: ut ... 'ambo': cf. REM., 21, 1.

7: cf. SED., 1, 227, 6; Sed ... computatur: cf. REM., 21, 2 - 4; cf. REM. EIN., 240, 14 - 15; v. PRIS., 2, 172, 2 - 3; v. CHARIStUS, 195, 2 - 3.

8: v. SED., 1, 101, 4 - 7; Item ... dicitur: cf. SED., 1, 220, 4 - 5; cf. REM. EIN., 240, 10*; esse ... dicitur: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 13* 9; v. PRIS., 2, 172, 4 - 5; cum ... unitatum: cf. REM., 12, 26 - 27; ab ... praecedens: cf. DIOMEDES, 301, 19.

9: cf. PRIS., 2, 172, 20 - 22; eo ... dissolvuntur: cf. SED., 1, 221, 2.

46, 1 - 3: cf. SED., 1, 226, 1 - 3; cf. C.M. 14488, 22r 7 - 13; cf. PRIS., 2, 173, 5 - 8.

47 - 54: cf. C.M. 14488, 22r 28 - 23v 23.

47, 2 - 4: cf. SED., 1, 228, 1 - 3.

2 - 3: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 13r 17 - 19; see MUR. 1586, 27r 23 for numero communia.

2: DON., 376, 24 - 25.


3 - 10: cf. SED., 1, 229, 6 - 13.


3: 'Libera ... sanguinibus': PS., 50, 16; 'qui ... sanguinibus': IOAN., 1, 13, and see MUR 1586, 27r 28 for the reading qui.

4: see MUR. 1586, 27r 28 - 29 for frangere regulam.

6 - 10: cf. POMPEIUS, 176, 12 - 17.

9: ideo: POMPEIUS, 176, 13*.

   3 - 5: cf. REM. EIN., 241, 1 - 6; cf. ISIDORUS, 10, 139.
   3 - 4: cf. SERVIUS VER., 1, 60, 13 - 15.
   4: cf. VARRO, 58, 12.
   5: cf. ISIDORUS, 9, 2, 84.

50 - 53: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 13\(^r\) 27 - 13\(^v\) 16.

   2: \textit{semper} ... 'lux': cf. DON., 376, 26 - 27; \textit{eo} ...


55, 1: C.M. 14488, 24\(^r\) 1; REM. EIN., 242, 13.
   5: cf. REM., 21, 16.
   7: cf. CLEMENS, 70, 8.
   8: v. ARS, 85, 15 - 16; v. REM. EIN., 242, 14 - 16; v. CONSENTIUS, 349, 21 - 22.


   15: v. MUR 7491 A, 14\(^r\) 10 - 11; cf. REM., 21, 16 - 17.
   16: cf. REM., 21, 15 - 16 and see REM. EIN., 242, 18*.
55, 17: Additur ... muncupatur: cf. REM., 21, 9 and REM. EIN., 242, 18*; eo ... 'inuisititia': cf. REM., 21, 12 - 13.


6 - 7: cf. ARS, 85, 28 - 29; cf. REM., 22, 4 - 6 cf. SERG., 495, 2 - 3.

8: ex ... 'efficax': REM., 22, 9 - 10; DON., 377, 5 - 6; scilicet ... 'capiens': cf. SED., 1, 248, 2: cf. PETRUS, 163, 1.

9: v. PETRUS, 163, 2 - 3; v. REM., 22, 9 - 12; v. REM. EIN., 242, 23.

10: ex integro ... 'ineptus': DON., 377, 6; quod ... 'aptus': v. ARS, 85, 31 - 33; v. REM., 23, 6.

11: 'in' ... corrumpitur: cf. SED., 1, 249, 2; 'in' ... remanet: v. REM., 23, 1; 'aptus' ... corrumpitur; cf. REM., 23, 6.


13: v. SED., 1, 250, 5; cf. SERGIUS, 146, 10 - 11; v. REM., 23, 8 - 11; v. SERG., 495, 9 - 10.

14: cf. REM., 23, 11 - 12; cf. DON., 377, 7 - 8.

57, 1 - 3: cf. SED., 1, 254, 1.

1: cf. DON., 377, 8 - 10.


4 - 10: cf. C.M. 14488, 26X 6 - 9, 13 - 19 and 26Y 22 - 27X 1.

4 - 8: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 15X 16 - 22 and 26 - 27.

5: cf. SED., 1, 255, 1.

7: cf. SED., 1, 255, 4; ut ... urbani': v. DIOMEDES, 309, 29.

8: v. POMPEIUS, 179, 11 - 14.

57, 9: *cum omnibus ... interiectionem*: v. PRIS., 2, 178, 19 - 21.

10: cf. PRIS., 2, 179, 11 - 16.


5: cf. REM. EIN., 243, 7.

6 - 7: cf. ARS, 86, 17 - 19.

7: v. SED., 1, 24, 22.

9: v. SED., 1, 263, 2; v. ARS, 86, 20 - 21; v. PETRUS, 163, 9 - 17; v. REM., 23, 23 - p. 24, 1; v. REM. EIN., 243, 7; v. ISIDORUS, 1, 7, 31; v. AUDAX, 341, 21; v. POMPEIUS, 170, 28 - 30; v. MARIUS, 189, 22; v. DIOMEDES, 301, 32 - 33; v. SERVIUS VER., 1, 622, 10.

10: v. SED., 1, 268, 4; v. REM., 24, 22 - 23; v. POMPEIUS, 170, 31 - 34.


17: cf. REM., 24, 8 - 10 and REM. EIN., 243, 11; v. POMPEIUS, 170, 31 - 34; v. DIOMEDES, 302, 2.

18: cf. SED., 1, 269, 2; cf. REM., 24, 17 - 18; cf. POMPEIUS, 171, 9.

19: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 16r 2 - 8; *Datiuus a 'dando':* cf. SED., 1, 270, 2, REM., 24, 29 and REM. EIN., 243, 15; v. POMPEIUS, 171, 10; *uocatiuus a 'uocando':* cf. SED., 1, 272, 2; cf. REM., 25, 13 and REM. EIN., 243, 19; v. POMPEIUS, 171, 11 - 12; *ablatius ... dicitur:* cf. REM., 25, 21 and REM. EIN., 243, 19; v. POMPEIUS, 183, 9 - 10.


22 - 23: v. PROBUS CA., 4, 6 ff.


4 - 6: v. esp. ARS, 91, 21 and line 35 - p. 92, 1; v. PRIS. INST., 447, 18 - 24.


5: Vocatiuus ... nominatiuo: cf. PRIS., 2, 287, 7 and line 19: ablatiuus ... productam: cf. PRIS., 2, 290, 11.

6: cf. ARS, 92, 6 and v. p. 93, 30 - p. 94, 3; v. ASPERUS, 45, 9 - 12; cf. PRIS. INST., 447, 22 - 24 and v. PRIS., 2, 293, 3 - 11; v. DON., 378, 9 - 10; cf. PROBUS CA., 4, 10.

7: v. PRIS., 2, 294, 14 - 15.

8: v. ARS, 93, 30 - p. 94, 3; v. ASPERUS, 45, 9 - 12; ne ... videamur: cf. DON., 378, 7 - 10.


13 - 14: v. POMPEIUS, 307, 24 - 25; v. CONSENTIUS, 340, 7 - 8; v. CHARISIUS, 197, 22 - 25.

15 - 17: cf. SED., 1, 305, 6 - 8.


17: v. DIOMEDES, 304, 24 - 25.


3 - 4: cf. ARS, 99, 18.


5: Haec est cuius: ARS, 99, 18; datiuus ... productam: cf. PRIS., 2, 297, 8 - 9.

6: cf. PRIS, 2, 300, 8 - 9.

7: Quando ... 'e': v. ARS, 104, 21 - 23.

8: cf. PRIS., 2, 301, 17 - 18.
60, 9: v. [SERG.], 497, 5 - 7.
12 - 13: DON., 356, 10 - 16.
3 - 4: v. PRIS. PT., 462, 26 - 27.
5 - 7: cf. ARS, 108, 5 - 18; cf. C.B. 123, xxxv;
cf. PRIS. INST., 448, 12 - 25.
7: Vocatius ... 'fame': v. SED., 1, 307, 3.
62, 1 - 2: cf. ARS, 125, 33 - 35.
3 - 4: v. PRIS. PT., 462, 26 - 27.
5 - 9: v. ARS, 124, 31 - p. 125, 15.
6 - 7: v. PRIS. INST., 448, 26 - 32.
6: Haec ... desinunt: v. PRIS., 2, 362, 23 and p.
363, 27 - p. 364, 1 - 3; datius ... productam:
v. PRIS., 2, 363, 7 - 8; accusatius ... correpctam:
v. PRIS., 2, 363, 18 - 19.
7: Vocatius ... nominativus: PRIS., 2, 363, 21;
ablatius ... productam: v. PRIS., 2, 363, 24;
genetius ... 'em' correpctam: v. PRIS., 2, 364,
5 - 6; datius ... arcibus of sentence 8; v. PRIS.,
2, 364, 21 ff.; v. SERVIUS, 434, 28 - 29.
9: v. PRIS., 365, 1 - 5; sola auctoritate: SERVIUS,
434, 11.
63, 1 - 2: cf. ARS, 131, 6 - 8.
3 - 4: cf. 62, 3 - 4 and 61, 3 - 4.
5 - desinit of sentence 6: cf. ARS, 130, 33 and lines 36 - 37.
6 - 7: v. PRIS. INST., 448, 33 - 39.
6: accusatius in 'em' correpctam: cf. ARS, 131, l;
63, 7: Vocatiuus ... nominatiuo: PRIS., 2, 366, 24;
   ablatius ... productam: cf. ARS, 131, 3;
   v. PRIS., 2, 367, 2 - 3 ff.; genetius in 'erum'
   correptam: cf. ARS, 131, 3 - 4; v. PRIS., 2,
   367, 14 - 15; datius ... 'bus' correptam: cf.
   ARS, 131, 4 - 5; v. PRIS., 2, 368, 5 - 6.

64, 1: cf. DON., 377, 23*.

2 - 3: cf. SED., 1, 281, 1 - 2 and 5; cf. MUR.7491 A, 16f
   27.

2: cf. DON., 377, 23.

3: v. REM. EIN., 244, 2 - 3; v. POMPEIUS, 171,
   34 - 36; v. SERVIUS, 433, 26 ff.: eo ... casus:
   SED., 1, 280, 5.

4: cf. SED., 1, 281, 1 - 3; cf. PRIS., 2, 184, 15 - 19;
   Ex ... monoptota: cf. DON., 377, 23.

5: cf. PRIS., 2, 183, 3 - 9; Alia est diptota:

6 - 7: cf. C.M. 14488, 29v 5 - 13.

6: cf. SED., 1, 24, 16; v. DE LIBRIS, lxiv; v. REM.
   EIN., 244, 5 - 6; v. PRIS., 2, 188, 10 - 11;
   Alia est triptota: cf. DON., 377, 24; scamnum ...
   scamno': SED., 1, 283, 2.

7: v. PRIS., 2, 188, 14 - 15; alia est tetrapota:
   cf. DON., 377, 24; uir ... uirum: SED., 1, 284, 3.

8: v. ARS, 90, 7 - 10; v. PRIS., 2, 188, 16 - 18;

9: cf. SED., 1, 24, 13; cf. C.M. 14488, 29v 17 - 20;
   v. ARS, 90, 11 - 13; v. PRIS., 2, 188, 19 - 21;
   v. POMPEIUS, 172, 7 - 8; Alia est <h> exaptota:
   cf. DON., 377, 24 - 25; unus ... uno: SED., 1,
   286, 3.

65, 2 - 3: cf. PRIS. PT., 498, 16.
4 - 7: DON., 355, 6 - 7.
8 - 10: v. PRIS. PT., 475, 13.


12 - 13: v. PRIS. PT., 498, 16.
65, 15: cf. PÓMPEIUS, 137, 30.


18: REM., 13, 23.


23: v. SED., 1, 126, 1 and 136, 3; v. PÓMPEIUS, 150, 36 – p. 151, 1; Quia ... augmentum: v. REM. EIN., 231, 24 – 26; v. [SERG], 491, 7; nec ... adiectium: v. IULIAN. DON., 318, 7 – 9; v. CONSENTIUS, 342, 6 – 7.

24: cf. ARS, 76, 15.

25: v. SED., 1, 34, 2; v. REM., 12, 7 – 8 and p. 14, 5 – 6; v. REM. EIN., 231, 19 – 21.

28 – significantia of sentence 29: DON., 355, 10 – 12.

29: qualitatem ... paruus': cf. REM., 15, 14 – 16; v. CHARTSTUS, 198, 20 – 21.


66, 2: cf. SED., 1, 21, 2; v. ARS, 63, 33; v. VERG. GR. EX., 191, 12.


4: Ideo ... cognoscitur: cf. ARS, 63, 33; cf. VERG. GR. EX., 191, 12; nisi ... perit: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 2v 21; cf. REM., 8, 22; cf. VERG. GR. EX., 191, cf. ISIDORUS, 1, 7, 1.

5: cf. VERG. GRAM., 26, 8 – 9.

8: cf. SED., 1, 16, 10; v. REM., 8, 23.

9: v. SED., 1, 21, 5; v. C.M. 14488, 5r 17 – 19.

67, 1 – 2: cf. SED., 1, 335, 3 – 6.
67, 2: cf. ARS, 134, 1 - 3; cf. C.M, 14488, 37V 13 - 15; cf. CLEMENS, 52, 12 - 14; cf. MALSAHANUS, 187, 4 - 6; cf. ISIDORUS, 1, 8, 1; cf. POMPEIUS, 199, 21 - 23; v. SERG., 488, 16 - 17; 'Laudate Dominum ... exce<s>is': PS. 148, 1.

68, 2 - 4: cf. C.M. 14737, 169V 5; cf. PARIS 7558, 139R 1; cf. C.B. 207, xxv; v. PRIS. PT., 491, 6.

5: Quia ... 'consul': cf. REM, EIN., 246, 11 - 12; et ... personam: v. PRIS., 2, 55, 13 - 14.

6 - 7: DON., 357, 1 - 2.


9: v. REM., 29, 13 - 14; v. PRIS. PT., 491, 7 & 11; v. SERG., 498, 36; v. SERVIUS, 409, 35.


24 - 25: C.M. 14737, 170F 4.

27: v. PRIS., 2, 577, 14 - 16; v. PRIS. PT., 491, 14 - p. 492, 8.


69, 2 - 5: cf. DON., 357, 17 - 20.

6: cf. DON, 380, 33.

7: DON., 357, 20*.


12: Secundus ... huc': v. PRIS., 3, 5, 17 - 19; quod ... interjectionis: cf. PRIS. INST., 449, 29 - 30.

69, 14: v. PRIS., 2, 188, 21 and p. 189, 1 - 4;
28: datiue 'alii': see FRAGMENTUM, 566, 7.
29 - 30: v. DIOMEDES, 333, 4 and lines 8 - 9; v. CHARISIUS,
   202, 5 - 6 and lines 12 - 13.
31: 'quod' uel 'quid': CHARISIUS, 206, 30.

70, 1: cf. PRIS., 3, 11, 2*.

2: Tertius ... 'meus mea meum': cf. PRIS., 3, 11,
   2 - 3; 'meus ... 'a meis' of sentence 3:
   v. DON., 358, 14 - 19.
5: cf. PRIS., 3, 11, 4 - 7.


72, 1 - 3: cf. PRIS. INST., 449, 7 - 10; v. DIONYSIUS, 68,
   3 - 4.

5 - 11: v. PRIS., 2, 580, 16 - 20.
13: v. REM. EIN., 249, 18; v. PRIS., 2, 582, 13 - 20;
   v. [SERG.], 547, 24.

73, 2 - 9: cf. SED., 1, 400, 2 - 401, 3; cf. C.M. 14488,
   46r 10 - 26.

2: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 23v 26 - 24r 1; v. REM. EIN.,
   249, 9 - 10.
73, 5: v. REM. EIN., 249, 18 - 19; v. PRIS., 2, 584, 23 - 25; v. DIOMEDES, 329, 37 - p. 330, 1; v. CHARISIUS, 201, 4 - 5.

7: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 24r 1 - 5; 'meus' ... 'omitt': v. REM. EIN., 249, 18 - 19.


11 - 17: v. SED., 1, 402.

11: v. C.M. 14488, 46v 5 - 9; v. MUR 7491 A, 24r 10 - 12; see MUR 1586, 38r 13 - 14 for ut ligneus o ligneae.


17: cf. PRIS., 3, 11, 5 - 6.

18: cf. SED., 1, 322, 2; v. ISIDORUS, 3, 20, 4.

74, 2: v. MUR. 7491 A, 24r 5.

4 - 5: cf. SED., 1, 401, 5 - 6; cf. C.M. 14488, 46v 1 - 5; cf. MUR. 7491 A, 24r 8 - 10 and see 1586, 38v 10.

4: uel ... adiungi: cf. PRIS., 3, 2, 3 - 5.

5: v. REM., 34, 12 - 15; v. PRIS., 3, 1, 3 - 4.

6: cf. SED., 1, 401, 4; cf. C.M. 14488, 46r 26 - 46v 1; cf. MUR. 7491 A, 24r 7 - 8 and MUR. 1586, 38v 8 for aut equus.

8 - 14: cf. SED., 1, 414, 1 - 4; cf. C.M. 14488, 48r 10 - 22; cf. MUR. 1586, 39r 21 - 27; cf. MUR.7491 A, 24v 9 - 14.


12: v. VERG. GRAM., 122, 5 - 7.

13 - 14: v. BONIFATIUS, 495; v. VERG. GRAM., 47, 7 - 10.
74, 15: v. VERG. GRAM., 122, 2 - 4.

75, 2: cf. SED., 1, 409, 2; cf. MUR. 1586, 39\textsuperscript{r} 16;
   cf. MUR. 7491 A, 24\textsuperscript{v} 5 - 6; cf. PRIS., 3, 16,
   12 - 14.


7 - 8: cf. SED., 1, 409, 4 - 5.

8: v. PRIS., 3, 4, 29 - 30.

76, 2 - 6: cf. SED., 1, 365, 1 - 4; cf. C.M. 14488, 41\textsuperscript{v}
   18 - 25.

2: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 22\textsuperscript{r} 24; cf. PRIS., 3, 173,
   21 - 22.

4 - 6: cf. PRIS., 3, 173, 23 - 27.

77, 2 - 3: DON., 357, 1 - 2.

5 - 7: cf. C.M. 14737, 170\textsuperscript{r} 1 - 3; cf. REM. EIN., 246,
   19 - 21.

7: v. POMPEIUS, 200, 1.

11: cf. AUDAX, 343, 14 - 15; sed ... substantiam:
   v. REM., 30, 10 - 11; sed ... substantiam:
   v. REM.EIN., 246, 23.

12 - 25: cf. DON., 357, 3 - 10.


29: v. SED., 1, 376, 3,

31: cf. SED., 1, 378, 1: quando ... fixum.

32: cf. SED., 1, 378, 8; v. PRIS., 3, 125, 16 - 17.

33: cf. SED., 1, 378, 4.

78, 2: Quaerit ... dicantur: v. DON., 357, 7 and 9; et a
   ... iudicentur: v. PRIS., 2, 61, 5 - 6 and line 10.

4: v. DON., 381, 9 - 11.

78, 6: cf. REM., 30, 22 - 24.

7 - 8: v. SED., 1, 339, 2 - 3; cf. REM., 30, 24 - 27.

9: *Melius ... iudicentur: cf. REM., 32, 3 - 4 and REM. EIN., 204, 14; quia ... significant: v. PRIS., 2, 61, 10 - 12.

79, 1: PROBUS, 131, 16.

2 - 5: DON., 357, 10 - 11.

80, 1: PROBUS, 131, 12.

2 - 5: cf. DON., 357, 11 - 12.

7 - 8: cf. DON., 380, 19 - 22.

9: v. CLEMENS, 58, 15 - 17.

11: v. ARS, 92, 28 - 32.


13 - §81, 15: cf. SED., 1, 393 - 395.

13 - 14: cf. C.M. 14488, 45\(^r\) 27 - 45\(^v\) 3; cf. MUR. 7491 A, 23\(^v\) 11 - 13 and MUR. 1586, 38\(^r\) 11 - 13.

15: In ... ut: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 23\(^v\) 13; v. DON., 380, 23; 'uiuo ... idem': REM., 40, 14 basing this on Symposiach, Aenigma # 15 (Vipera), in the Variae Collectiones Aenigmatum Merovingicæ Aetatis (Pars Altera), ed. Fr. Glorie, of the Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 133 A, Turnholt, Brepol, 1968, p. 636.

16: cf. REM., 40, 18 - 19; In neutro ... ut: v. DON., 380, 23; 'Esset ... annis': VERG., 11, 174.

81, 3: cf. C.M. 14488, 45\(^v\) 3 - 19.

3: cf. REM., 40, 12 - 13 and REM. EIN., 205, 8 - 9; v. PRIS., 2, 589, 14 - 15; componitur ... 'demum': cf. SED., 1, 391, 5.

6: v. VERG. GRAM., 44, 11 - 12.

8 - 15: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 23\(^v\) 18 - 23.


82, 2: cf. REM. EIN., 204, 27; cf. [PRIS.], 528, 22 - 23.

3: cf. REM., 39, 26 - 27.

4: v. REM., 39, 28 - 29.


6: cf. REM., 40, 1 - 2; cf. REM. EIN., 204, 40 - p. 205, 1; v. PRIS., 2, 591, 5 - 6.

8 - 10: cf. SED., 1, 390, 1 - 3; cf. C.M. 14488, 44v 23 - 45r 8; cf. MUR. 7491 A, 23r 26 - 23v.

8v, DON., 358, 40 - p. 359, 2; cum nulla ... inuentae

10: Sciendum ... dicit: v. DON., 358, 40 - p. 359, 2.

83, 1: PRIS., 2, 584, 10#.


6 - 9: cf. SED., 1, 398, 1 - 3.


9: Prima ... secundam: v. REM., 34, 2 - 3; v. PRIS.,
2, 584, 12 - 13.


16 - 18: v. SED., 1, 396, 6 - 11.

16: cf. REM., 33, 16 - 18.

17: Quod ... displicuiisset: REM., 33, 21 - 22;
permissum ... arborum: v. REM., 33, 19 - 20:
quorumcumque ... ceterorum: v. REM., 33, 20 - 21
and line 21#, v. BOETH. EUT., 3, 17 - 21.


20–22: cf. SED., 1, 397.


20: Prima ... loquitur: cf. REM., 33, 27–p. 34, 1 and REM. EIN., 202, 5–6; uel sola ... 'nos': v. REM., 34, 23–p. 35, 1–2.

21: cf. REM., 34, 1–2; cf. REM. EIN., 202, 6.


84, 1: REM. EIN., 249, 13.


6–7: cf. SED., 1, 403, 2–3; cf. C.M. 14488, 46ª 16–21.


7: cf. PRIS., 3, 1, 3–4.


10–18: cf. DON., 357, 16–25 and line 20ª; see PROBUS, 131, 33 and line 36 for figurae simplicis in connection with tu and ille.


5: v. PROBUS, 131, 28; v. DON., 357, 6.

6: 'ille' ... computetur: v. CHARISIUS, 200, 13; v. DON., 357, 6; aliquotiens ... finitum: v. [SERG.], 500, 8–9.
85, 7 - 8: cf. C.M. 14488, 40\(^V\) 3 - 5; v. ARS, 135, 34 - p. 136, 2; cf. POMPEIUS, 202, 25 - 26; v. [SERO, 500, 7 - 9.]

10 - 12: cf. SED., 1, 351, 5 - 8; cf. C.M. 14488, 40\(^V\) 14 - 20; cf. PRIS., 2, 577, 14 - 20.

86, 1: cf. PROBUS, 132, 6.

2 - 6: DON., 357, 25 - 35.

8 - 15: cf. SED., 1, 352, 2 - 8; cf. C.M. 14488, 40\(^V\) 22 - 41\(^F\) 3.


12: 'Ipse ... sidera': VERG., 3, 619 - 620.

13: 'Ipse ... intimo': VERG., 5, 846.

15: cf. SED., 1, 352, 11.

87, 2 - 4: DON., 357, 35 - p. 358, 3.


7: cf. DON., 381, 8.

8 - 9: v. SED., 1, 18, 4 - 8.

8: cf. SED., 1, 417, 3; cf. REM., 36, 28 - p. 37, and line 1\(^a\); cf. REM. EIN., 203, 22 - 23; v. PRIS., 3, 11, 25; v. PRIS. PT., 492, 9 - 10.


10: cf. C.M. 14488, 40\(^F\) 17 - 18; cf. REM., 37, 2 - 3; cf. REM. EIN., 203, 25; v. [ASPER], 551, 2.

11: cf. SED., 1, 373, 4; cf. REM., 37, 7 - 8; cf. DON., 380, 6 - 7.


87, 13: cf. C.M. 14488, 40\textsuperscript{r} 19; \textit{Hic uir ... audis}:
VERG., 6, 791. This line from Vergil also appears
in SED., 1, 355, 5 and 373, 5; REM., 37, 5 and
POMPEIUS, 203, 26.

15 - 18: cf. SED., 1, 416, 2 - 3; cf. C.M. 14488, 48\textsuperscript{v} 13 - 21.

17: v. REM. EIN., 249, 30 - 31; \textit{officio ... fungitur}:
cf. [\textit{SERG.}], 498, 36; \textit{Hic ... tibi}; cf. MUR. 7491
A, 24\textsuperscript{v} 22 - 23.

18: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 24\textsuperscript{v} 16 - 17; cf. POMPEIUS, 211, 7 - 8.

88, 2 - 4: DON., 358, 3 - 7.

6 - 9: v. MUR. 7491 A, 21\textsuperscript{r} 18 - 20.

8: REM., 37, 16 and REM. EIN., 203, 31; v. CLEDONIUS,
15, 15.


9: \textit{Praecedit ... pronomen}: cf. REM., 37, 17 - 18;
\textit{ut ... Turnum}': cf. SED., 1, 374, 6; cf. REM., 37,
16 - 17 and REM. EIN., 203, 31 - 32.

10: cf. REM., 37, 18 - 20 and REM. EIN., 203, 33 - 35.

89, 1: cf. PROBUS, 133, 14.


2: \textit{'quis' uel 'qui'}: cf. CHARISIUS, 201, 23; cf. PROBUS,
133, 20.


8: \textit{Quoniam ... substantiam}: cf. REM. EIN., 204, 12 - 13;
v. PRIS., 3, 131, 13; v. SERVIUS, 410, 9 - 10; \textit{et ...}
demonstrant: cf. REM., 38, 12 - 13; v. DON., 357, 7.

9 - 10: cf. REM., 38, 15 - 18 and REM. EIN., 204, 14 - 17.

9: \textit{'Quis' autem ... nominatiui}: v. PROBUS, 133, 18 - 20;
\textit{sed ... ponitur}: v. VERG. GRAM., 130, 30 - p. 131,
6; v. PRIS., 3, 127, 7; v. SERVIUS, 410, 34.

10: \textit{'Quis' uero ... numquam}: cf. PRIS., 3, 127, 7 - 8;
\textit{sed ... tantum}: v. PRIS., 3, 129, 5.

90, 1: cf. PROBUS, 136, 19.


10: Vocantur ... figurant: cf. REM., 38, 27 - 28; uelut ... 'fillum': v. PRIS., 2, 60, 20; v. POMPEIUS, 148, 12 - 14.

11: v. SED., 1, 364, 4; cf. REM., 38, 28 - 29; v. CHARISIUS, 200, 24 - 25; 'homo' uel 'equus': cf. REM. EIN., 204, 23 - 26.


5 - 6: cf. PRIS., 2, 369, 2 - 3; cf. DON., 359, 4 - 5 and p. 381, 14 - 15.

8: v. REM., 41, 9 - 10; v. PRIS., 2, 369, 5 - 6; v. POMPEIUS, 212, 6 - 7; v. SERGIUS, 488, 22 - 23; v. SERVIUS, 405, 14 - 15; A 'uerberando': SED., 1, 15, 6; MUR 7491 A, 24V 26; REM., 41, 9 - 10.

10 - 12: cf. SED., 1, 421, 1 - 3; cf. C.M. 14488, 49R 9 - 14; v. MUR. 7491 A, 2V 25 - 26; v. SERGIUS, 150, 14 - 18.

12: cf. MALSACHANUS, 196, 7 - 10; cf. CLEMENS, 61, 7 - 10; v. REM., 41, 19 - 23; v. PRIS., 2, 369, 7 - 8; v. POMPEIUS, 97, 12 and p. 212, 8 - 9; v. SERVIUS, 405, 16 - 17.

12: 'Volo ire uidere amicum': SED., 1, 17, 10; 'Discurre ... tuum': PROV., 6, 3.

93, 2: DON., 359, 5.

3 - 5: cf. PRIS., 2, 369, 16 - 17.

9 - numero of sentence 10: v. PRIS., 2, 451, 3 - 5.
93, 11 - 12: v. PRIS. PT., 466, 21.

14: v. DON., 359, 35 and p. 383, 2 - 3; 
transitionem ... animal: cf. PRIS., 2, 375, 16 - 17.


4: v. SED., 1, 498, 6; v. REM., 43, 26 - 27;
va ASPERUS, 49, 32 - p. 50, 1; v. PRIS., 2, 374,
13 - 16; v. CHARISIUS, 210, 14 - 15 and p. 215,
7 - 8; v. DON., 383, 4 - 5.

5 - 6: v. REM., 49, 7 - 8; v. PRIS., 2, 375, 11;
v. CHARISIUS, 210, 31.

7: v. SED., 1, 501, 3; v. MUR 7491 A, 27\textsuperscript{T} 24 - 25;
v. REM., 51, 15 - 16; v. ASPERUS, 50, 1 - 2;
v. PRIS., 2, 375, 11 - 12; v. POMPEIUS, 228, 14 -
15; v. CHARISIUS, 210, 29 - 31.

8 - 12: v. SED., 1, 512, 1 - 5.

8 - 9: v. REM., 51, 21; v. PRIS., 2, 573, 23; v. SERVIUS,
437, 13; v. DON., 360, 2*.

10: cf. MUR 7491 A, 27\textsuperscript{V} 5.

11: v. PRIS., 2, 420, 8 - 9; v. PHOCAS, 431, 3 - 7.

12: cf. PRIS., 2, 420, 9 - 11; v. PROBUS, 187, 16;
'gaudeo ... solitus sum: cf. DON., 360, 2* and p.
383, 9*; fio ... fisus sum: DON., 383, 9*.


14 - 17: v. SED., 1, 502, 1.

95, 1: v. PROBUS, 157, 4.

2 - 3: cf. PRIS. PT., 484, 32 - 33; v. POMPEIUS, 228, 29.

5: v. PRIS., 2, 374, 5 - 6 and p. 378, 24; v. [SERC],
507, 7 - 8; v. DON., 383, 10 and p. 360, 3;
v. PROBUS, 157, 7.

6 - 10: v. SED., 1, 509, 2.

7 - 10: v. ASPERUS, 53, 9 - 11; v. PRIS., 2, 414, 14 - 15;
95, 11: PRIS., 2, 378, 18*.


16 - 18: v. PRIS., 2, 392, 6 ff.

96, 1: cf. PROBUS, 156, 10.

3: v. C.M. 14488, 55* 20; v. POMPEIUS, 227, 5 - 6; see REM., 51, 13 for Actionis uel passionis.


7: DON., 359, 33 - 34.

10: Actium ut 'amo': v. PRIS., 2, 374, 20; passium ut 'amor': v. PRIS., 2, 374, 24*; neutrum absolutum ut 'sedeo': v. PRIS., 2, 375, 11; neutropassium ut 'gaudeo': v. PRIS., 2, 420, 10; v. DON., 383, 9*; neutrum ... 'ueneo': v. SED., 1, 502, 1.


12: cf. POMPEIUS, 229, 27; v. DON., 383, 7 and line 9.

13: Sunt ... taedet': cf. POMPEIUS, 229, 28 - 29; cf. DON., 383, 8 - 9; et ... uocantur: cf. DON., 383, 8.


97, 1: PROBUS, 155, 36.


5: v. POMPEIUS, 235, 6 - 7; v. SERG., 507, 38 - 39; v. SERVIUS, 414, 7; v. PROBUS, 155, 36 - 37.


13: v. PRIS., 2, 406, 4 - 5; v. POMPEIUS, 235, 11 - 12. 25: SED., 1, 537, 9; v. VARRO, 58, 4 - 6.


98, 1: PRIS., 2, 421, 16.

2 - 3: cf. PRIS. PT., 466, 14.

5: v. REM., 44, 14 - 15; v. VERG. GRAM., 51, 14;
v. PRIS., 2, 421, 20 - 21; v. POMPEIUS, 214, 7;
v. CLEDONIUS, 54, 6 - 7; v. SERVIUS, 411, 30.

9: v. PRIS., 2, 423, 26; v. POMPEIUS, 214, 9; v.
\[\text{SERG.}\], 503, 29.

13: v. REM., 45, 11 - 12; v. PRIS., 2, 424, 10;
v. \[\text{SERG.}\], 504, 4.

17: v. \[\text{§}\] 98, 38.

21: v. REM., 45, 22 - 23; v. PRIS., 2, 425, 9;
v. PS-AUG., 510, 38 - 41; v. \[\text{SERG.}\], 504, 10.

23: cf. SED., 1, 439, 1; v. REM., 43, 20 - 21;
cf. PRIS., 2, 421, 17.


26: cf. DON., 359, 7.

27: cf. PRIS., 2, 421, 18 - 19.


32: cf. SED., 1, 450, 3; cf. PRIS., 2, 424, 1 - 3.

33: Caret ... persona: v. REM. EIN., 207, 1 - 4;
v. SERVIUS, 414, 28; \text{et} ... tempore:

34 - 36: cf. SED., 1, 450, 4 - \[\text{§}\] 451, 2.

34: cf. PRIS., 2, 424, 3 - 4; \text{'Libera ... sanguinibus'}:
PS., 50, 16.

35 - 36: cf. PRIS., 2, 424, 8 - 11.

37 - 38: v. SED., 1, 446, 4 - 5; cf. PRIS., 2, 424, 12 - 13.

39: cf. SED., 1, 447, 2; cf. PRIS., 2, 425, 9.

99, 2: cf. SED., 1, 448, 2; cf. C.M. 14488, 51\textsuperscript{V} 1 – 2; cf. POMPEIUS, 216, 10.

3 – 11: cf. SED., 1, 448, 4 – 11; cf. C.M. 14488, 51\textsuperscript{V} 4 – 17.

4: 

\textit{quia ... similiter: v. PRIS., 2, 413, 23, p. 450, 1 and p. 596, 23 – 24; v. CHARISIUS, 212, 18 – 19; v. MAXIMUS, 198, 1 – 3.}

6: \textit{Vno ... nascatur: v. REM., 46, 17 – 19.}

7: v. VERG. GRAM., 147, 15 – 16; v. PRIS., 2, 425, 13 – 16 and p. 432, 9; v. CONSENTIUS, 372, 14 – 16.

9: v. \textit{\textsuperscript{[SERG.]}, 504, 22; Tertio ... currit: cf. REM., 56, 25; v. SERGIUS, 151, 30; v. PRIS., 2, 413, 23; v. POMPEIUS, 216, 25; v. CHARISIUS, p. 331 – 335; per omnia ... currit: v. CONSENTIUS, 371, 17 – 18.}

10: cf. REM., 46, 15 – 16; v. POMPEIUS, 216, 19 – 21; v. CLEDONIUS, 16, 18 – 20; v. \textit{\textsuperscript{[SERG.]}, 504, 23; v. CHARISIUS, 331, 16 – 21.}

100, 1 – 4: v. PRIS., 2, 427, 12 – 13.

1 – 2: PRIS. PT., 497, 12.

5 – 6: PRIS. PT., 466, 30.


17: \textit{Quaedam ... 'conticesco': cf. CLEMENS, 70, 11 – 12.}


4: v. DON., 359, 13 – 16.

6: SED. TRACT., 92\textsuperscript{E} 17; cf. MAXIMUS, 198, 31.

8: cf. SED. TRACT., 92\textsuperscript{E} 17; cf. PRIS., 2, 442, 18.

10: cf. REM., 48, 12 – 14; v. VERG. GRAM., 58, 12 – 15.

11: DON., 359, 12.

101, 12 - 17: for the fourth conjugation.

102, 2: cf. CLEMENS, 73, 18 - 19.

3 - 5: v. PRIS., 2, 459, 4 - 6.

6 - 9: v. PRIS., 2, 468, 24 - p. 470, 14.


15: Omnìa ... in 'ui' ut 'amaui': v. DE LIBRIS, lxv;
v. PRIS., 2, 468, 21 - 22; et mutant ... 'amaui tum':
v. DE LIBRIS, lxv; v. HRABANUS, 655; v. PRIS., 2, 472, 9 - 11; praeter ... 'laustum': v. DE LIBRIS,
lxv; v. PRIS., 2, 459, 6 and 10.

16: Facientia ... domitum': v. PRIS., 2, 473, 10 - 11;
praeter ... 'plicitum': v. DE LIBRIS, lxv;
v. PRIS., 2, 472, 12.

17: v. DE LIBRIS, lxv; v. PRIS., 2, 473, 2 - 3.

18: v. PRIS., 2, 473, 3; v. PHOCAS, 431, 17.

19: v. PRIS., 2, 474, 8 - 10.

103, 2: Omnìa ... monitum': v. PRIS., 2, 480, 14.

104, 1 - 3: v. PRIS., 2, 483, 1 - 10.

4: v. PRIS., 2, 486, 26 - p. 487, 16; Omnìa ...
alsum': v. HRABANUS, 655.

105, 1 - 'habeo habui' of sentence 2: v. PRIS., 2, 491, 3 - 5
and p. 461, 23.

2: praeter ... 'issi': v. PRIS., 2, 491, 13 and p. 461, 24.


4 - 5: v. PRIS., 2, 492, 21 - 22.

106, 4: v. PRIS., 2, 487, 17 ff. and p. 486, 8 ff.;
v. CHARISIUS, 317, 28.

107, 1 - 3: v. PRIS., 2, 481, 5 - 12.

2: Omnìa ... desinentia in 'deo': cf. DE LIBRIS, lxvii.
107, 4: v. PRIS., 2, 481, 24 - 29.
5: v. PRIS., 2, 483, 6 - 8 and lines 21 - 22 for pransus.
6: v. PRIS., 2, 483, 2 and p. 481, 6.
7: v. PRIS., 2, 483, 1 - 6.
8: v. PRIS., 2, 483, 3; v. supra 107, 4.
9: v. PRIS., 2, 483, 8 - 10.
110, : v. DE LIBRIS, lxvii.
3: v. PRIS., 2, 488, 10 - 14.
3: 'excellui' uel 'exculi': v. PRIS., 2, 526, 19.
6: abolitum': v. DE LIBRIS, lxvii.
117, 2: v. DE LIBRIS, lxv.
118, 2: v. PRIS., 2, 526, 3 - 6.
3: v. PRIS., 2, 504, 28 - p. 505, 1 and 10 ff.
5: v. PRIS., 2, 505, 23 - 25.
6: v. PRIS., 2, 505, 19 - 23.
120, 1 - 2: v. PRIS., 2, 496, 10 - 11.
120, 5: v. PRIS., 2, 497, 18 - 20.


7: \textit{prolicui prolicitum}: v. PRIS., 2, 497, 25 - 26 for \textit{elicui}.

121, : v. PRIS., 2, 498, 5 - 10.

2: see CHARISIUS, 338, 3 for \textit{osus}.


123, 1 - \textit{cepi}' of sentence 2: v. PRIS., 2, 498, 24 - 25.

2: \textit{praeter ... sapul}: v. PRIS., 2, 499, 5 - 6 and line 12.


4: Sed ... \textit{conceptum}: v. PRIS., 2, 498, 28 - 29; \textit{licet ... faciat}: v. PRIS., 2, 499, 4.

5: v. PRIS., 2, 500, 17 - 18.

124, 1 - 3: v. PRIS., 2, 502, 6 - 8.

6: v. PRIS., 2, 502, 16 ff.


127, 1: \underline{queui}' of sentence 3: v. PRIS., 2, 507, 26 - p. 508, 4.

3: \textit{praeter 'conquinisco' ... 'conquexi'}: v. PRIS., 2, 508, 28; \textit{et praeter 'posco' ... 'didici'}:

v. PRIS., 2, 509, 11 - 12; \textit{et praeter 'compesco' ... 'compescui'}: v. PRIS., 2, 509, 8.

4: v. PRIS., 2, 509, 13 - 23.

5 - 6: v. PRIS., 2, 510, 4 - 6.

7: v. PRIS., 2, 510, 8 - 9 and p. 511, 15.

8: v. PRIS., 2, 511, 15 - 18.

127, 10: v. PRIS., 2, 511, 22 – 23.

128, 1: Verba ... lusi': v. PRIS., 2, 514, 12 – 13; praetor 'cudo ... inueniatur': v. PRIS., 2, 515, 16 – 17; et praetor 'caedo ... pepidi': v. PRIS., 2; et 'sido ... 'sisi' of sentence 2: v. PRIS., 2, 522, 5 – 7.

3: 'cado cecidi: v. PRIS., 2, 518, 22 and line 11; reddo redidi': v. PRIS., 2, 516, 7; praetor ... scidi': v. PRIS., 2, 516, 14 and p. 517, 13.

4: v. PRIS., 2, 519, 2 – 3.

6: Omnia ... casum': v. PRIS., 2, 519, 5 – 7 and line 15; praetor 'comedo' ... 'comestum': v. PRIS., 2, 520, 2; et praetor 'tento' ... 'tentum': v. PRIS., 2, 520, 8.

7: Excipitur ... 'estum': v. PRIS., 2, 522, 19; praetor ... 'passum': v. PRIS., 2, 519, 22.

8: v. PRIS., 2, 519, 3 – 5.

129, 4: v. PRIS., 2, 526, 1 – 2.

5: v. PRIS., 2, 523, 3 – 5.

6: v. PRIS., 2, 523, 7 – 10.

7: Omnia ... finxi': v. PRIS., 2, 523, 5 – 7; praetor 'lego' ... perlego gi': v. PRIS., 2, 523, 12 – 16; praetor 'intellego ... diligo xi': v. PRIS., 2, 523, 15 – 17; praetor 'ago' ... exegi': v. PRIS., 2, 523, 12 – 14.

8: v. PRIS., 2, 523, 17 – 24.

9: v. PRIS., 2, 524, 1 – 2 and line 11 ff.; v. CHARISIUS, 319, 8.

11 – directum of sentence 12: v. PRIS., 2, 525, 5 – 23.

12: licet ... 'fixum': v. DIOMEDES, 377, 12.

130, 1 – 2: v. PRIS., 2, 531, 19 – 22.

3: v. PRIS., 2, 531, 17 and line 19.

4: v. PRIS., 2, 532, 2 – 4.
130, 5: v. PRIS., 2, 532, 1 - 2.
6: v. PRIS., 2, 531, 24.

5: v. PRIS., 2, 505, 26 - p. 506, 1.

132, 1 - inueniatur of sentence 2: v. PRIS., 2, 536, 5 ff.

2: et praeter 'meto ... 'steti': v. PRIS., 2, 418, 27 - p. 419, 4 and p. 537, lines 6, 11, and 14 - 15; et praeter 'uerto ... misi': v. PRIS., 2, 537, 11 and 14.
3: v. PRIS., 2, 537, 6.

4 - 5: v. PRIS., 2, 537, 19 - 20.
6: 'Meto' ... 'messum': v. PRIS., 2, 537, 23; et 'uerto' 'uersum': v. MACROBIUS, 607, 2.

7: v. PRIS., 2, 537, 24.

8: v. PRIS., 2, 537, 22 - 23.

10: v. PRIS., 2, 537, 26 - 27.

133, 1 - 2: v. PRIS., 2, 526, 7 - 8 and p. 528, 2 for uolo and uolui.
3: Et si ... 'li': v. PRIS., 2, 526, 12 - 15.

4: v. PRIS., 2, 526, 18 - 19.

5: v. PRIS., 2, 526, 18 and line 20.

6 - 7: v. PRIS., 2, 527, 19; v. DIOMEDES, 375, 17.

8: v. PRIS., 2, 527, 19 - 20.

9: Sed ... 'latum': v. PRIS., 2, 528, 1 - 2; v. CHARISIUS, 328, 9 ff.; et 'percello' ... 'uulosum': v. PRIS., 2, 527, 20 - 21.

134, : v. PRIS., 2, 528, 5 - 18.

135, 3: *composita ... 'ecinii': v. PRIS., 2, 529, 3 - 4; 'temno' 'tempsi': v. PRIS., 2, 529, 9.

4 - 5: v. PRIS., 2, 529, 10 - p. 530, 3.

6: v. PRIS., 2, 530, 4 - 7.

7: v. PRIS., 2, 530, 8 - 10.

136,

1: v. PRIS., 2, 532, 5 - 6.

2: *Sed ... 'inseui': v. PRIS., 2, 532, 9 - 10; 
praeter ... 'cucurri': v. PRIS., 2, 532, 22 - p. 533, 2.

3: v. PRIS., 2, 533, 16 - p. 534, 2.

4: v. PRIS., 2, 534, 10 and line 15.

5 - 6: v. PRIS., 2, 534, 16 - 19.

137, 1 - arcessui' of sentence 2: v. PRIS., 2, 534, 20 - 21;

2: praeter 'capesco' ... 'pinsui': v. PRIS., 2, 535, 12 - 21; v. DIOMEDES, 373, 3 - 9; v. CHARISIUS, 320, 4 - 5.


4: v. PRIS., 2, 536, 3 - 4.

138,

: v. PRIS., 2, 538, 1 - 17; v. PROBUS CA., 39, 26.

139,

: v. PRIS., 2, 506, 7 - 15.

140,


2: v. DIOMEDES, 369, 11; v. CHARISIUS, 319, 10; v. PROBUS CA., 36, 3.

141, 1 - 2: v. PRIS., 2, 541, 13 - 14; v. EUTYCHES, 451, 8; v. CHARISIUS, 321 - 323.

3: v. PRIS., 2, 547, 4.

4: v. PRIS., 2, 542, 26 - 27.


2: farcio farsi': v. PRIS., 2, 502, 12.
142, 3: v. PRIS., 2, 539, 12.
4: v. PRIS., 2, 542, 17 – 18.
5: Quae ... farsi tum': v. PRIS., 2, 542, 21 – 23; sed ... 'rausum': v. PRIS., 2, 542, 27.
6: v. PRIS., 2, 543, lines 6 and 15.

143, : v. PRIS., 2, 543, 8.
145, : v. PRIS., 2, 543, 2.
146, : v. PRIS., 2, 495, 14 ff.
147, 2: v. PRIS., 2, 542, 27 and p. 540, 5.
148, : v. PRIS., 2, 539, 22.
149, : v. PRIS., 2, 545, 26 – p. 546.
151, : v. PRIS., 2, 543, 3.
152, 2: praeter ... (h) ausi': cf. PRIS., 2, 540, 3; aperio ... 'comperi': cf. PRIS., 2, 540, 9 – 13.
4: v. PRIS., 2, 543, 1.
5: v. PRIS., 2, 543, 3 – 5.

154, : v. PRIS., 2, 543, lines 13 and 18 and p. 539, 15.

2: ut 'queo quiui': v. PRIS., 2, 539, 15.
3: v. PRIS., 2, 543, 5 – 6 and lines 18 – 19.

155, 1: cf. PRIS., 2, 448, 10; cf. PROBUS, 156, 8.
2 – 3: cf. PRIS. PT., 469, 35.

5: v. REM., 34, 1 – 3; v. PRIS., 2, 448, 11 – 14; v. DIONYSIUS, 51, 4 – 5; v. \( \text{SERG.} \), 507, 35.
7: cf. REM., 33, 27 – p. 34, 1 and p. 54, 19; v. PRIS., 2, 448, 11 – 12.
11: cf. REM., 34, 2 – 3 and p. 54, 19 – 20; v. PRIS., 448, 12; v. \( \text{SERG.} \), 507, 35.
13 – 14: cf. PRIS. PT., 469, 35.

19: Quae ... sonat: cf. REM.; 33, 13 - 14.

22: cf. SED., 1, 549, 2; v. REM. EIN., 248, 33; v. BOETH. EUT., 3, 9 - 10.


156, 2 - 15: cf. DON., 359, 4 - 10.


16 - 32: cf. DON., 359, 12 - 33 and see lines 29* and 33*.

157, 1: v. PROBUS, 156, 13.

2 - 7: DON., 359, 33 - 37.

8 - 11: DON., 359, 36 - p. 360, 2.

12: REM., 51, 17*; DON., 360, 2*.


158, 2 - 3: cf. C.M. 14737, 178V 11; cf. PARIS 7558, 155V 4 - 5; cf. PRIS. PT., 484, 19.

5: Quia ... uerbum: cf. REM., 60, 3 - 4; v. SERVIUS, 406, 1 - 2; v. DON., 385, 11; v. undergo [SERG.] 509, 19 - 20; et ... uerbo: v. REM., 60, 6 - 7.

6 - 7: DON., 362, 15 - 16.

9: cf. REM., 60, 11 - 12.

10 - 12: cf, SED., 1, 593, 3 - 5; cf. MUR. 7491 A, 29* 4 - 7.

10: quare ... 'aderbium': cf. MUR. 1586, 44V 18 - 19.

14 - 17: cf. SED., 1, 594, 3 - 6; cf. MUR. 7491 A, 29* 7 - 11; see MUR. 1586, 44V lines 23, 25 and 27.

15: sed ... aderbium: v. REM., 60, 6 - 7; v. AUDAX, 347, 23 - 24.

16: cf. REM., 60, 10 - 11; cf. DIOMEDES, 403, 18 - 19.
158, 17: Cicero bene legit': v. [SERG], 509, 28 - 31.

159, 2 - 6: cf. SED., 1, 595 - 610; cf. MUR. 7491 A, 29\r
15 - 29\textsuperscript{1} 4 and MUR. 1586, 44\textsuperscript{2} 3 - 22; cf. DON.,
385, 12 - 21 and see line 18*.

2: hoc ... originem: cf. SED., 1, 595, 3.

3: cf. SED., 1, 596, 1 - 2; v. PRIS., 3, 63, 9.

4: cf. SED., 1, 597, 2.

5: [ca] ut a 'curro cursim': cf. SED., 1, 600, 1 - 2;
v. PRIS., 3, 63, 9; a nomine ... 'pedetemptim':
cf. SED., 1, 601, 1 - 2; cf. PRIS., 3, 63, 18.

160, 2 - 7: cf. MUR. 1586, 44\textsuperscript{2} 22 - 32 and 7491 A, 29\textsuperscript{3} 4 - 12.

2 - 4: cf. SED., 1, 611, 1 - 2.

3: v. CHARISIUS, 287, 5 - 6.

5: cf. SED., 1, 611, 6 - 7; 'modo' autem ... significat:
v. PRIS., 3, 81, 2 ff. and esp. line 7.

6 - 7: v. SED., 1, 103, 18; cf. REM., 62, 5 - 13.

7: v. SED., 1, 611, 3 - 6.

161, 2 - 5: cf. DON., 362, 16 - 17.

5: Species: PRIS., 3, 63, 6.

6 - 7: cf. PRIS. PT., 479, 19 - 20.

9: cf. PRIS. PT., 474, 31; v. DIONYSIUS, 73, 1 - 2.


14: Significationes ... diversae: v. PRIS., 3, 80, 30;
quia ... temporis: DON., 362, 17 - 18.

15: cf. DON., 362, 22 - 23 and 23*.

16 - 17: see REM., 61, 28 and p. 62, 2; cf. DON., 362,
23 - 24 and 23*.

18: Sunt alia ... quamobrem': cf. DON., 362, 26; alia
prouidendi ut 'ne': cf. DON., 362, 31; aut negandi
... quam': cf. DON., 362, 24 and line 24*;
183

161, 18: aut af irmandi ... certe': cf. DON., 362, 24 - 25 and see p. 386, 10*.

19: Aut iurandi ... fidius': cf. DON., 362, 30; aut optandi ut 'utinam': cf. DON., 362, 25; aut ortandi ... agite': cf. DON., 362, 25 - 26; aut remissiui ... paulatim': v. PRIS., 3, 86, 20.

20: cf. DON., 362, 27 - 28 and line 27*.

21: Aut dubitandi ... fortasse': cf. DON., 362, 28; aut euentus ... fortuitu': cf. DON., 362, 31 - 32.

22: Aut congregandi ... pariter': cf. DON., 362, 31; aut discretiui ... sinistrorum': v. PRIS., 3, 87, 14; cf. DON., 362, 29 - 30; see REM., 64, lines 7, 8 and 98 for istorsum and sinistrorum.


24: Aut ordinandi ... deinceps': cf. DON., 362, 26 and 26*; aut intentiui ... omnino': cf. PRIS., 3, 87, 27.

25: Aut comparandi ... minus': cf. DON., 362, 32 and 32*; aut superlatiui ... ocissime': cf. PRIS., 3, 88, 4.

26: Aut numeri ... quotiens': cf. DON., 362, 24 and 24*; quater ... quotiens': v. PRIS., 3, 88, 17 ff; aut personalia ... tuatim': v. DON., 362, 28 - 29 and esp. p. 385, 15; 'meatim tuatim': see [PRIS], 528, 25 - 26 and CHARISTIUS, 240, 13.

27: Aut deminutiui ... belle': v. PRIS., 3, 88, 21 - 22; aut uocandi ... o': cf. DON., 362, 29; aut respon <den> di ut <h> eu': cf. DON., 362, 29; aut demonstrandi ... ecce': cf. DON., 362, 25; aut eligendi ... immo': cf. DON., 362, 30 - 31.

162, 1: PROBUS, 154, 3.

2 - 3: PRIS. PT., 482, 17.

6: cf. CLEMENS, 70, 8.

7: v. ARS, 85, 15 - 16; v. CONSENTIUS, 349, 21 - 22.

8: DON., 363, 5.


12: v. REM., 22, 3*.

13: ex duobus integris: PRIS. PT., 475, 3;
ex integro et corrupto: PRIS. PT., 480, 28.

163, 2 - §167: cf. C.M. 14488, 61\textsuperscript{V} 24 - 63\textsuperscript{F} 16.

2 - §165: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 31\textsuperscript{F} 11 - 31\textsuperscript{V} 7 - 8.

2 - 20: cf. SED., 1, 678, 1 and §679 - 685.

2: DON., 387, 4.


3: datiui casus: MUR. 1586, 46\textsuperscript{V} 11.

7: DON., 387, 5*.


8: v. PRIS., 3, 123, 19 and p. 134, 8; v. CHARISIUS, 279, 11 - 16; 'Quo uadis': POMPEIUS, 248, 13.


10: DON., 387, 5.


14: cf. REM. EIN., 261, 17 - 19; v. POMPEIUS, 251, 13 - 17; v. SERVIUS, 439, 30 - 32.

15: DON., 387, 5 - 6.


17: DON., 387, 7.

18: v. ARUSIANUS, 502, 3; v. PRIS., 3, 31, 21 - 22; v. CLEDONIUS, 69, 9 - 11.
163, 19: DON., 387, 7 - 8.

20: cf. REM., 64, 1 - 2; v. CHARISIUS, 311, 7 and p. 249, 20 - 21; v. MAXIMUS, 201, 29; v. SACERDOS, 442, 22.

21 - 25: cf. SED., 1, 687.


26: ideo ... habent: cf. SED., 1, 688, 4.

27: per ... transeo': cf. REM., 66, 24.

28: cf. SED., 1, 689, 1 - 2; v. SERG., 511, 1 - 2; v. SERVIUS, 416, 2.

29: cf. SED., 1, 690, 1; v. SERG., 511, 21; v. SERVIUS, 415, 37.

31: cf. SED., 1, 690, 3.

32: cf. SED., 1, 691, 1; v. POMPEIUS, 254, 7 - 9; v. DIOMEDES, 405, 14 - 16.


4: cf. REM., 66, 20 - 25; cf. PRIS., 3, 66, 4 ff.; v. DIOMEDES, 404, 35 - p. 405, 1; v. CHARISIUS, 243, 26 - 27; in loco per genetium: v. SERVIUS, 416, 6 - 7; ad locum per accusatium: v. DON., 387, 10 - 11; per locum ... transeo': v. PROBUS, 154, 34 - 35; de loco ... uenio': v. SERVIUS, 416, 5; cf. DON., 387, 10.

5: cf. REM., 67, 1 - 4; cf. PRIS., 3, 66, 9 - 10; Cart agine uenio: SERVIUS, 416, 5; ad locum ... actium: cf. REM., 67, 4; v. SERG., 511, 4; v. SERVIUS, 416, 4.


2 - § 166, 4: cf. SED., 1, 695 - 698, 6.
5: cf. DON., 387, 15 – 16.
166, 2: 'O regina ... urbem': VERG., 1, 522 and see PRIS., 3, 89, 4* for iupiter.
3: 'Adsis ... firmes': cf. VERG., 8, 78.
6: 'O tempora O mores': CIC. CAT., 1, 1, 2.
7: cf. SED., 1, 594, 4.
168, 2: cf. SED., 1, 631, 1 – 2; nullatenus': v. PETRUS, 167, 22; quando quoque ... nouum': v. PRIS., 2, 552, 8.
170, 2 – ortandi of sentence 9: cf. DON., 362, 15 – 19 and 19*.
11: cf. REM., 61, 9 – 11; cf. DON., 362, 23 and 23* and see SERVIUS, 415, 17 for intro and foras.
16 – 17: cf. DON., 362, 24*.
173, 1: *per locum*: DON., 363, 7*.

4: *dicitur*: DON., 363, 10*.

5: *Per ... illac*: DON., 386, 22; *quia ... adiungitur*: cf. ΣERΓ., 510, 23 – 24.


5: cf. REM., 67, 21; cf. PRIS. PT., 512, 26; cf. DON., 387, 18 – 19.


12: cf. SED., 1, 703, 4; *a uerbo ... dicatur*: cf. SACERDOS, 443, 20.

14 – 16: cf. SED., 1, 704, 1 – 3.

14: *Ideo ... habet*: v. REM., 68 – 12 – 13; v. PRIS. 2, 552, 19; v. DIOMEDES, 401, 12 – 13; v. DON., 363, 14; v. SACERDOS, 443, 19 – 20; *quia ... 'amans'*: v. PRIS., 2, 555, lines 6 – 9 and 24, and p. 556, 1 – 4; v. CHARISIUS, 231, 2 – 4.

15: *Cum ... mancipium*: v. PRIS., 2, 555, 27.

19: cf. SED., 1, 706, 1; cf. MUR. 7491 A, 32R 2; v. ISIDORUS, 1, 11, 1; v. PRIS., 2, 568, lines 12 – 14 and 16.

175, 1: cf. PRIS., 2, 555, 20.


5: DON., 363, 15*.


11: see supra § 7, 8.
175, 13: REM., 12, 20.
14 - 22: cf. C.M. 14488, 64\textsuperscript{r} 12 - 25.
14 - 17: cf. DON., 363, 16 - 19; omne: [\textsuperscript{SERG.}], 513, 13 - 14; SERVIUS, 416, 33.

176, 1 - 2: C.M. 14737, 180\textsuperscript{r} 3; cf. PRIS. PT., 473, 20 - 21.
6: cf. ARS, 86, 19.
8: ARS, 86, 20: REM., 13, 10.

177, 1: PRIS., 2, 557, 1.
2 - 3: cf. C.M. 14737, 180\textsuperscript{r} 8; cf. PRIS. PT., 487, 19.
5: v. [\textsuperscript{SERG.}], 513, 23; v. SERVIUS, 417, 11; v. SACERDOS, 444, 7 - 8.
6 - 7: v. PRIS., 2, 564, 22 - 23.
11: v. DON., 363, 23.
13: v. REM., 69, 7 - 8; v. PRIS., 2, 557, 28 - p. 558, 1; v. SERVIUS, 417, 12; v. CHARISIUS, 230, 26 and p. 232, 18 - 19; v. [\textsuperscript{SERG.}], 513, 25; v. SACERDOS, 444, 8 - 10.

178, 1: DON., 387, 27*.
6 - 9: v. PRIS., 2, 558, 8 - 10.
13: v. PRIS., 2, 435, 12; v. CHARISIUS, 232, 16 - 17.
19: v. PRIS., 2, 567, 3 - 4; v. CHARISIUS, 230, 15 - 17.

179, 1: PRIS., 2, 568, 11; DON., 388, 8*.
6 - 7: cf. supra 44, 5 - 6.
8 - 9: cf. supra 44, 7 - 8.

180, 1: DON., 388, 9*
6 - 9: cf. supra 55, 7 - 10.

181, 2 - 23: cf. SED., 1, 738 - 742.
2: DON., 388, 12.
9: DON., 388, 16.
12: 'truncatus galeatus: DON., 388, 12; pra(<>) sus
cenatus': DON., 388, 15.
15: 'Italia ... Lycurgo': cf. VERG., 3, 14.
16: nulla ... dicitur: cf. POMPEIUS, 262, 26 and line 28.
22: Hoc . . . nomen of sentence 23: cf. POMPEIUS, 263,
29 - 35; v. PRIS., 2, 568, 20 - 21;
v. SACERDOS, 444, 16 - 17.
23: guia ... dicitur: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 33^ 16;
cf. DON., 388, 18; v. SACERDOS, 444, 18.
182, 2 - \(\xi\) 183, 3: cf. C.M. 14488, 66\(^v\) 8 - 18.

2 - 6: cf. SED., 1, 743; cf. MUR. 7491 A, 33\(^r\) 18 - 22.

2: cf. DON., 388, 19 - 20; habent: MUR. 1586, 49\(^r\) 2.

3: 'furibundus' ... morienti' of sentence 4; cf. PRIS., 2, 137, 18.

4 - 6: cf. SED., 1, 743, 4 - 5.

5: v. REM., 70, 17.


3 - 4: cf. SED., 1, 744, 3; cf. C.M. 14488, 66\(^r\) 24 - 27; cf. MUR, 7491 A, 33\(^r\) 27 - 28; v. REM. EIN., 263, 5 - 7; cf. POMPEIUS, 257, 4 - 5; v. SERVIIUS, 441, 16 - 18.

7: v. SED., 1, 745, 1; v. ARS, 75, 30 - 32; v. REM., 70, 10 - 11; v. CHARISIUS, 59, lines 8 and 13 and p. 126, 22 - 27.


8: recipiunt ... amantissimus': v. SED., 1, 748, 5; et ... illius': v. [SERG.], 515, 4 - 5.


184, 2 - 5: cf. SED., 1, 747, cf. C.M. 14488, 67\(^r\) 5 - 14; cf. MUR. 7491 A, 33\(^v\) 1 - 6.

2: DON., 388, 22 - 23.


5: v. PRIS., 2, 560, 7 - 9.

185, 2 - 4: cf. SED., 1, 723.


2: DON., 388, 2.


47: v. CLEMENS, 92, 22; v. PRIS., 2, 568, 17 ff.

188, 2 - 4: cf. C.M. 14737, 180\textsuperscript{v} 11 - 13; cf. PARIS 7558, 159\textsuperscript{r} 10 - 11; cf. PRIS. PT., 465, 37.

5: v. REM., 70, 21 - 24; v. PRIS., 2, 551, 16 and vol. 3, 93, 13 - 14 and line 17 ff. and p. 97, 17 ff.; v. \textsuperscript{[SERG.]}, 516, 9 - 11.

6 - 7: cf. DON., 364, 33.

9: SED., 1, 15, 16 and § 760, 4: PETRUS, 168, 32; REM., 70, 21.

10 - 13: cf. DON., 364, 34 - 35; see PRIS., 3, 93, 9 for species.


16 - 17: PRIS. PT., 466, 1.


19: v. PRIS. PT., 500, 7.

189, 2: cf. the list in PRIS., 3, 93, 13 - 16.

4: \textit{Copulatìua ... ast'}: cf. PRIS., 3, 93, 17 - 18; \textit{et ... ast'}: DON., 364, 36 - 37; \textit{continuatiua ... dormit'}: v. PRIS., 3, 94, 12 - 22.


6: cf. PRIS., 3, 95, 15 - 18 and lines 23 - 24; \textit{Vt prosit ... facio'}: SED., 1, 773, 1.


8: cf. PRIS., 3, 95, 5 and line 15.

9: cf. PRIS., 3, 97, 4 - 5; \textit{Equidem ... deprecor'}: VERG., 12, 931.

189, 11: cf. PRIS., 3, 98, 3 - 12.
14: cf. PRIS., 3, 102, 19 - 20.
15: cf. PRIS., 3, 100, 5 - 10.
18: cf. PRIS., 3, 102, 12 - 16.

8: PRIS., 3, 104, 21 - 22.
24: cf. MUR, 1586, 49v 27.
26: Vnde ... 'regendo': v. ELDER, 140; v. ISIDORUS, 9, 3, 1; v. CHARISIUS, 111, 18 - 20; 'comiun <c>tio' ... dicitur: cf. REM., 70, 20 - 21.
31: cf. REM., 72, 21 - 23; v. PRIS., 3, 97, 17 - 18.

15: see DON., 364, 37*.

19: see DON., 364, 39*.

21: see DON., 365, 5*.

27: see DON., 365, 8*.


2 - 5: cf. PRIS. PT., 468, 21 - 23.

5: cf. PRIS., 3, 24, 13 - 14; cf. CLEDONIUS, 10, 12; cf. ASPER, 553, 31.

6 - 7: DON., 365, 10 - 11.

9: SED., 1, 15, 17 and 796, 3; MUR. 7491 A, 35\(R\) 2; REM., 78, 31; v. CHARISIUS, 299, 14 - 15.


193, 2 - 4: cf. SED., 1, 800, 5; cf. C.M. 14488, 70\(R\) 8 - 15.

2: Si ... supponuntur: cf. MUR. 7491 A, 35\(R\) 3 - 4; Si ... praeponatur: cf. POMPEIUS, 269, 27; cf. CLEDONIUS, 75, 16; cf. CHARISIUS, 299, 14 - 15; sed ... 'pube tenens': v. POMPEIUS, 270, 8; v. DIOMEDES, 409, 16 - 17 and p. 410, 17; v. CHARISIUS, 302, 23 - 26.

4: v. SED., 1, 800, 7; v. REM., 79, 4 - 6 and REM. EIN., 264, 24 - 26; v. POMPEIUS, 270, 5 - 6.

6: v. SED., 1, 15, 18; v. REM., 79, 2 - 3; v. POMPEIUS, 270, 22.

194, 2 - 14: cf. DON., 365, 10 - 27 and see line 15*.

195, 3: 'Veritas ... aeternum: PS., 116, 2; iusti ... uiuunt': cf. SAP., 5, 16.

5: Item ... casui: v. PRIS., 3, 53, 14 - 21;
5: v. DOSITHEUS, 415, 16; 'Potens ... diem': 2 TIM., 1, 12.

8: 'Aperite ... Domino': PS., 117, 19.


12: 'Nec ... inimicis': cf. PS., 30, 9.

13: 'Posuisti ... coronam': cf. PS., 20, 4.

14: 'Loquetur ... suam': PS., 84, 9.

15: 'Multifarie ... Filio': cf. HED., 1, 1 - 2; 'Multifarie: see Guillelmus de Antona, Postillae in Vetus Testamentum, contained in B.N. Lat. 526, 14th cent., fol. 6, col. 2 - 6, col. 1: "Multifarie multisque modis olim loquens deus patribus in prophetis novissime diebus istis locutus est nobis in filio."

16: 'Ibi ... suorum': cf. PS., 122, 2.

17: 'Intret ... mea': PS., 87, 3.


197, 2 - 198, 6: DON., 365, 10 - 27 and see lines 15* and 20*.


11: 'itur in antiquam': VERG., 6, 179.

12: 'Stans ... pup<]>i': VERG., 3, 527.

14: 'Postesque ... gradibus': VERG., 2, 442.
198, 15: 'Arma ... quercu[m]': VERG., 8, 616.

17: 'multa super ... Hector multa': PRIS., 3, 45, 27; VERG., 1, 750.

199, 1 - 3: cf. C.M. 14737, 183\textsuperscript{r} 21-183\textsuperscript{v} 4; cf. PARIS 7558, 162\textsuperscript{r} 21.

5: cf. SED., 1, 15, 9; v. PRIS., 2, 551, 16 - 17.


9: v. PRIS., 2, 551, 16 - 17.

11: cf. SED., 1, 943, 2; cf. REM., 90, 10 - 14.

13: cf. SED., 1, 943, 4; cf. REM., 90, 16 - 17 and esp, line 16*.


6: v. MUR. 7491 A, 37\textsuperscript{v} 1 - 2; v. PRIS., 3, 91, 20 - 22.

7: cf, REM., 91, 1 - 3 and see lines 4* and 7*;
   'Heu quam ... aru\o': cf. VERG. BUC., 3, 100, and for aruo'see line 100*.

8: Aliquando ... postulauerit: cf. REM., 91, 7 - 9;
   licet ... gratias': cf. SED., 1, 943, 3; cf. REM.,
   90, 14 - 16; cf. DIOMEDES, 419, 14 - 15;
   v. CHARISIUS, 314, 28 - p. 315, 2 for pro.


4 - 'attat' of sentence 9: cf. DON., 366, 14 - 16 and see line 15*.

9: aut optantis ut 'O!: DON., 391, 27; aut irascentis
   ut 'heu': v. SACERDOS, 447, 4 - 5; et si ...
   similia: DON., 366, 16 - 17.

202, 1 - 203: cf. MALSACHANUS, 211, 18 - p. 212, 25; v. DON.,
   360, 17 - p. 361, 11.


12: Subiunctivo: see PRIS., 2, 408, 18.

203, 20: Gerundia: see REM., 56, 26 and DON., 361, 9*.
203, 21: Supina: see PRIS. INST., 454, 4 and PHOCAS, 436, 22.

204, 2 - 4: cf, DON., 362, 10 - 11.
   12 - 14: v. SED., 1, 724, 1.
   12: v. PRIS., 2, 557, 14.
   14 - 16: v. SED., 1, 726, 1; cf. REM., 69, 30 - 31;
   v. PRIS., 2, 557, 26 - 27.

   SACERDOS, 436, 35 - p. 437, 35.


206, 3: amaminor: ALCUIN, 381; v. BONTFATIUS, 501, 8
   with laudaminor; v. DON., 361, 26 with legimimor.

210, 2 - 16: v. ASPERUS, 56, 2 - 3; v. DON., 362, 10 - 12.
   10 - 12: v. SED., 1, 727, 1.
   12: v. PRIS., 2, 558, 7 - 8.
   14 - 16: v. SED., 1, 726, 2.
   14: cf. REM., 69, 32.
   16: 'tis' ... 'amandus': cf. REM., 69, 32 - p. 70, 1;
   v. PRIS., 2, 558, 4.

211 - 228: v. DON., 360, 15 - p. 362, 12; v. PROBUS, 164,
   14 - p. 167, 26. The same applies for doceo,
   audio, and esp. lego.


   10 - 12: v. SED., 1, 724, 1.
   12: v. PRIS., 2, 557, 14.
   14 - 16: v. SED., 1, 726, 1; cf. supra 222, 14 - 16.

223 - 227: cf. supra § 205 - 209.

224, : doce minor: cf. supra 206, 3.

228, 2 - 16: cf. supra 210, 2 - 16.

10 - 12: v. SED., 1, 727, 1.

12: cf. supra 210, 12.

14 - 16: v. SED., 1, 726, 2.

14: cf. supra 210, 14.

16: cf. supra 210, 16.


229 - 238: v. MALSACHANUS, 224, 19 - p. 225, 14.

230, 3: 'legito ... ille': see DON., 360, 26*.

238, 12 - 14: v. SED., 1, 724, 1.

16 - 18: v. SED., 1, 726, 1.

240, 2: 'legere ... gantur': cf. DON., 361, 24*.

3: 'legitor ... guntor': cf. DON., 361, 25*.

244, 10 - 12: v. SED., 1, 727, 1.

14 - 16: v. SED., 1, 726, 2.

16: cf. REM., 69, 32 - p. 70, 1.

245 - 260: cf. PC's previous conjugations of amo, doceo, and lego; v. BONIFATIUS, 508 - 510.


254, 12 - 13: v. SED., 1, 724, 1.

16 - 18: v. SED., 1, 726, 1.

260, 10 - 12: v. SED., 1, 727, 1.

14 - 16: v. SED., 1, 726, 2.

1 - 3 Here begins the prologue to the Book Based on Priscian as well as on Donatus written by the monk Brother Paul the Camaldolite.

1, 1 We know by the most convincing of matters as well as by very many experiences and have often heard even in the Sacred Pages that wisdom is better than all of the most precious riches and that no desirable thing can be compared with her.

2 Her fruit is better than gold and precious stone, and her issue better than choice silver. 3 This fact also is laudable enough in wisdom, that she is easily seen by those who love her. 4 She shows herself to them eagerly and presents herself to all saying: 'I love those who love me, and they who seek me in the morning shall find me.' 5 By reflecting upon her, therefore, the sense is perfected. 6 For he who keeps watch near her will quickly be wise and free from care. 7 Because of these reasons certain of my most beloved friends, kindled by the zeal for wisdom, out of charitable devotion have asked me, Brother Paul the Camaldolite monk, that I write a book for them based on both
Priscian and Donatus in such a fashion: that first according to Priscian I briefly show what a noun is, why it is thus called and whence it is derived, how many accidents a noun has, how each accident of the noun is defined and distinguished and why it is thus named; and that then according to Donatus I add what are the accidents of the noun and that I proceed with the same form of teaching in the remaining parts of speech and in their accidents.

2 1 At any rate, after these things are finished, they have asked me that I make known the rules of long and short syllables and that I briefly show how they can arrive at a knowledge of versification. 2 My above-mentioned most beloved friends have also asked me to emendate with care a model of versification, a work highly laudable but partly corrupted out of negligence and ignorance, and to place it after the rules of long and short quantity in the same volume. 3 I have also been requested to write in prose form an introduction to the art of letter writing inspired by the rhetoric of Tullius, in which introduction I would show everything that Tullius prescribes for the good letter writer to avoid or to observe and that which according to Horace's Ars Poetica ought to be shunned or observed. 4 And afterwards I have been requested to write three letters concerning thirty different matters, that is, three letters concerning each of these matters, and to entitle each matter with
a heading and arrange these letters with their headings in the
form of a register like the kind used by the Holy See when
the situation should demand that letters ought to be sent to
various persons.*

3 1 Having heard the petitions of fraternal devotion,
inasmuch as we are ordered by charity to serve one another and
each one is instructed to administer diligently to his fellow-
man the grace which he has received, since I have completed that
which was requested of me not by the brilliant speech of skillful
men, not by an artificial grandeur of ornate elocution but by a
striving for a simple truth of matters for the advantage of my
brothers with the disposition of stammering infants who make an
effort to speak whatever they have heard although they cannot yet
form full speech, therefore with all the humility of my mind I
beseech you, the readers of this work, if in any way I have
uttered anything superfluous or anything negligently or not humbly
or not in a sufficiently useful way, that you overlook all
of this with clemency, mindful of that which the Apostle spoke
by which you are taught to endure fools gladly because you are
wise yourselves. 2 Likewise I ask that your prayer will commend
me to the highest Judge whose providence it is to take pity always
and to spare, in order that I, aided by the divine gift of
generosity through your prayers, may deserve to reach the kingdom
of eternal blessedness which by my own merits I am not able to
obtain. 3 Here ends the prologue.

* The letters are assigned to three different Popes, and PC at the beginning of each of the three series of letters which is assigned to a possible author gives a list of the subject-headings to be developed. There are twelve subject-headings assigned to Adrianus, twelve to Lucius, and ten to Gregorius, which makes thirty-four and not thirty. In the case of the letters assigned to Gregorius, the manuscript leaves off at a portion of the second letter dealing with the ninth subject-heading.
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INCIPIT PROLOGUS IN LIBRO ... A FRATRE PAULO CAMALDULENSE
MONACHO COMPOSITO

In this incipit the title of the grammatical treatise is stated and its authorship, although there is no reason to prove or disprove that PC was the actual scribe responsible for the writing of the treatise as it exists in Paris B.N. Lat. 7517. 1 - 3: The prologus can be divided into three parts: the first part in 1, 1 - 6 is an eulogy of sapientia characterized by several citations from Proverbs and the Book of Wisdom; the second part in 1, 7 is detailed account of what shall be written and the reason for writing it; the third part in 3, 1 is an expression of inadequacy for the task, a seeking of the readers' pardon for anything amiss in the work, and a request to pray for his salvation. As for the beginning of the prologus proper with an eulogy of sapientia, it is worthwhile to note that PC is not the first to do this. CLEMENS, 3 and VERG. GRAM., 3 also commence their works by praising sapientia. William of Conches (1080 - 1145) in the preface to his De Philosophia Mundi (the PL, vol. 172, col. 41 - 43) also begins by underlining the importance of sapientia
combined with *eloquentia*: "Quoniam, ut ait Tullius in prologo Rhetoricorum, 'eloquentia sine sapientia nocet; sapientia vero sine eloquentia, etsi parum, tamen aliquid cum eloquentia autem maxime prodest,' errant qui, postposita proficiente et non nocenti [sic], adhaerent nocenti et non proficienti. .... Id etiam est gladium semper acuere, sed nunquam in praelio [sic] percutere."

In col. 100 Conches states that the road to the *studium philosophiae* begins with instruction in *eloquentia* that consists of three parts: *grammatica*, *dialectica* and *rhetorica*. G. Paré and alii (La Renaissance du XIIe siècle, Les Ecoles et l'enseignement, vol. 3 of the *Publications de l'Institut d'Etudes Médiévales d'Ottawa*, Paris, J. Vrin, 1933, p. 195) observe that William of Conches is the most ardent representative of the twelfth century scheme of the classification of the sciences in which the *artes sermocinales* are considered to be preparatory disciplines, which is also expounded by Hugo of St. Victor in his *Didascalion*. (Paré et alii, p. 194 - 195.)

1, 7: PC's alleged reason for writing — because his friends have asked him — seems to be the conventional modesty topos used by many medieval writers who claim that they write on request, i.e. of a "friend, patron, or a superior." (Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, New York, Harper and Row, 1953, p. 85.)
1, 7 - 8: PC's treatment of the eight parts of speech in the order noun, pronoun, verb, adverb, participle, conjunction, preposition, and interjection is the order used by Virgilius Maro Grammaticus and by the grammarians in the Grammatici Latini, (Clement Orestes Meredith, The Partes Orationis as Discussed by Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, Ph.D. dissertation submitted to the John Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1912, p. 14.) except PROBUS, 57, 18 who discusses the verb last and PRIS., 2, 55, 6 ff. who discusses the verb second, then the participle and pronoun, omitting the interjection. (Meredith, p. 14.)

7: ut prius ... nomen

In the grammatical treatise the section 1, 1 - 6, with the exception of sentence 5 which is from DON., 355, 5, defines the noun secundum Priscianum as is evident in the Fontes.

quare ... deriuetur

This refers to the text in the grammatical treatise 1, 7 - 8.

Sentence 7, however, is not based on Priscian but is similar to REM., 8, 18.* Sentence 8 seems likely to be based on a text like REM., 8, 18 - 21 which in turn, however, is reminiscent of PRIS., 2, 57, 2 - 3 and DIOMEDES, 320, 26 - 27.

quot ... accidant

This refers to the section in the grammatical text 1, 9 - 12.

Sentence 9 is from DON., 355, 6, but 10 - 12 is based on PRIS. PT., 464, 24 - p. 465, 1 and PRIS., 2, 57, 8.
1, 7: quomodo ... monstrarem

PC actually does not adhere strictly to the order which he proposes here, for instance, in the grammatical treatise 1, 21 - 22 in his discussion of species he speaks about the etymology of species before he divides it into the two types in sentence 25: primitiua and deriuiatiua. Likewise, in 7, 9 ff. he treats the etymology of genus before discussing in detail the divisions and types of genus. Moreover, as can be seen in the references in the Fontes, Priscian is not the unique source for all of 1, 17 ff., which is a discussion on species.

8: As far as the noun is concerned, PC begins in 65, 2 allegedly secundum Donatum with "'Dominus' quae pars est?" which appears similar to PRIS. PT., 461, 23: "'Arma' quae pars orationis est?" And as will be seen in the references to 65 in the Fontes not all of this section is strictly secundum Donatum. One may notice, however, that some sections like the discussions on the interjection and the preposition secundum Donatum are nearly entirely secundum Donatum.

2, 1: See 26\textsuperscript{v} 11-33\textsuperscript{v} 27.

2: See 33\textsuperscript{v} 28-54\textsuperscript{v} 33.

3: See 54\textsuperscript{v} 34-59\textsuperscript{r} 27.

Richard William Hunt ("The Introductions to the 'Artes, in the Twelfth Century," Studia Mediaevalia in Honorem Admodum
Reverendi Patris Raymundi Josephi Martin, Brussels, De Tempel, 1948, p. 85) notes that the exposition of grammar according to Priscian and Donatus and that of rhetoric according to the Rhetorica ad Herennium formed an essential starting point for instruction in the twelfth century.

4: This refers to 59\textsuperscript{r} 28 - 85\textsuperscript{v} 36 (the end of the manuscript). Please see my discussion in footnote 1 for the Prologus.

3, 1 - 2: PC's apology for, and avowal and admission of inadequacy of language and style appears to be a topos of affected modesty which Curtius (p. 83) notes had wide diffusion in the exordia of classical and mediaeval Latin writers. He points out that this is excellently illustrated in the exordium to Cicero's Orator.
"Et quoniam ad utilitatem omnium est datus, ideo 'Donatus' est uocatus."

The most noticeable aspect of this sentence which is a part of the incipit is the pun on the meanings of the past participles datus and Donatus.

If one were to examine the ending of this sentence, he would notice that there seems to be a metrical character to the phrase est uocatus by virtue of its pattern ——ʊ. Eduard Norden (Die Antike Kunstprosa, Stuttgart, Teubner, vol. 2, p. 930) notes that this type of ending was frequently employed in pre-Ciceronian prose endings. However, on p. 929 he observes that Martianus Capella recommends this ending as a bona clausula, and on p. 951 Norden states that the cursus velox of the Middle Ages is based ultimately upon the Greek prose ending ——ʊ. Even the phrase omnium est datus with its pattern /ʊ\ /ʊ is similar in its metrical pattern to the phrase cernitur et in terra, which Norden (p. 951) cites as an example of the cursus velox.
Note also the three rhymed *cola* ending respectively in *datus*, 'Donatus', and *uocatus*. (For a discussion on prose-rhyme see Karl Strecker's *Introduction to Medieval Latin*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1957, p. 85–86.)

*Datus* refers to *Liber*: "And because it was given for the benefit of all, it has been called *Donatus*." It may be possible to justify the present tense *est* and the participle on the grounds that in Vulgar Latin there existed the double meaning of *domus clausa est* as discussed by Veikko Välimäinen (*Introduction au latin vulgaire*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1967, p. 138).

PC's etymological explanation of why his work is called Donatus might perhaps be reminiscent of what Edwin A. Quain ("The Medieval Accessus ad Auctores," *Traditio*, issue of 1945, vol. 3, p. 219) observes about the twelfth century *accessus* to Classical authors - namely, that the *titulus* of a Classical author is usually explained as to its etymological origin as is evident in the following selection from the *Monac. lat. 19475* quoted by Quain on p. 219: "Iste [referring to the title of Ovid's *Epistolae*] quoque a materia sumitur, intitulatur enim a quibusdam 'Ovidii epistoluarum' [*sic*] propter hanc causam, quia diversae sunt epistolae in hoc volumine, quae poterant mitti vel mittebantur .... 'Epi': Graece, Latine: supra; 'stola': missa."

1: PC begins his treatment of the noun by first asking
what part of speech poëta is. This type of beginning is similar to the beginning of the discussion on the noun in C.M. 14737, 164\textsuperscript{v} 17 - 21: "'Magnus' que pars orationis est? Nomen. Nomen quid est? Pars orationis cum casu et reliqua. Quid est proprium nominum? Proprium nominis est significare certam substantiam cum certa qualitate." It is worthwhile to note that the C.M. 14737 begins every discussion of each of the eight parts of speech in this manner, which appears to go back ultimately to the practice in Priscian's \textit{Partitiones}, where, for example, on p. 461, 23 he gives: "A r m a, quae pars orationis est? Nomen." On p. 464, 32 - 34 we read: "V i r u m, quae pars orationis est? Nomen. Quid est nomen? Pars orationis unius cuiusque rei suppositae \textvert| communem vel propriam qualitatem significans." Another grammarian whose usual practice is to begin his discussions on the eight parts of speech in this manner is the author of Paris B.N. \textit{Lat. 7558}. From the \textit{Fontes}, the chief source, direct and indirect, (as in sentence 8 for instance) is Priscian's \textit{Institutiones Grammaticae} and \textit{Partitiones}. Sentences 7 - 16 which mainly concern the etymology of nomen have chiefly Remigius of Auxerre as the apparent source, who appears to derive his material possibly from Sedulius Scottus, Sergius, Diomedes, Priscian, Marius Victorinus, Varro and Isidore. For sentence 8 Muridac may also be a possible source for the etymology of nomen. Since we can assign Muridac only to the ninth century,
it is therefore difficult to establish whether sentence 8 was borrowed from Muridac who in turn might have borrowed from Sedulius Scottus or whether the possible link is as follows: PC, Sedulius, Muridac. James F. Kenney (The Sources for the Early History of Ireland, Shannon, Irish University Press, 1968, p. 554 - 555) gives 848 - 860 or 874 as Sedulius's date, and on p. 543 he observes that the name Moridach may possibly be identifiable with Smaragdus, whose floruit Kenney (p. 542) gives as ca. 819. However, Bengt Ljöfstedt in his edition of Malsachamus does not identify Smaragdus with Muridac or Moridach. Manitius (vol. 1, p. 462) hints at the possibility of Smaragdus and Muridac being one person.

There appears to be no identifiable source as yet for sentences like 17 and 20 which occur many times in the treatise often along with Solutio as in 8, 1 and 8, 3.

5: Concerning the use of quod as an interrogative, Meredith (p. 41) states that Vergilius Grammaticus in his listing of the qui and quis forms on p. 46, lines 16 - 17 of his Opera at first pairs them in the order: relative - interrogative. However, on p. 130, line 25 Vergilius gives quis qui, quae qua and quod quid. PC also uses quod as an interrogative in the Prologus.

7: According to REM., 8, 18* it appears that PC may very well have seen a text similar to the Codex Monacensis Latinus 14763.
1, 10 - 12: DIOMEDES, 320, 27 - 28 lists the same five accidents of the noun which Priscian gives, except for *qualitas*. According to Diomedes and Donatus (p. 373 - 374) *qualitas* is two-fold, embracing the two main categories of proper and appellative nouns. Within these two categories are discussed the *praenomen*, *nomen*, *cognomen* and *agnomen* (see DIOMEDES, 321, 3 ff.); and included in the appellatives are the two divisions of corporal and incorporeal nouns and the various ways by which they originate: whether they be prototypes or derived (DIOMEDES, 323, 18 ff.), and if derived, whether they be possessives, patronymics, *paronyma*, *ἐνθατικά*, comparatives or diminutives (DIOMEDES, 324, lines 8, 10, 14 and 25).

In the fashion of Diomedes and Donatus, CHARISIUS, p. 193 to 194 uses *qualitas* as one of the five accidents and speaks of nouns as being either appellative or proper. Although Priscian (see the Fontes) as PC lists *species* instead of *qualitas*, he does not give *qualitas* as a synonym for *species* in the PT., 464, 34. Moreover, the listing of these five accidents by Priscian and PC is in the tradition of Dionysius of Thrax, p. 24, 15:

\[\text{Παρένεματα δὲ τῶν ὄνοματος πέντε: ἑνὸς, ἐκόματα, ἐκόμας, πτέρες.}\]

1, 19: Concerning the definition of *species* which PC gives, it is worthwhile to note that MUR. 7491 A, 6\(^6\) 26 - 27 seems to have the closest reading to PC, for Muridac has: "Prime autem positionis uocitantur nomina a quo alia originem ducunt. Secunde
positionis dicitur illud quod diruatur." CONSENSIUS, 338, 20 - p. 339, 1 observes that the division of qualitas into prima positio and derivatio is Greek. SERVIUS, 429, 17 - 19 speaks of nouns of the prima positio and of the derivata, which are just two of the twenty-seven types of appellatives which he proposes in line 15 on p. 429. But, as will be seen in sentence 25, it appears that a text like Priscian's (see the Fontes for 1, 25) is likely the ultimate source for PC's two categories within species: the prima positio and the secunda positio or derived nouns. MUR. 7491 A, 5r 9 - 10 is like DON., 373, 7 and SERVIUS, 406, 32 - 33 and p. 429, 1 and 15 who view the two categories as properly the proper and appellative nouns, the latter containing the derived nouns, for Muridac says: "aut enim propria sunt nomina aut appellativa [sic]." The editor's note in CONSENSIUS, 338, 20* states that the division of nouns into prima positio and derivatio is Greek, whereas the Latin grammarians divide the noun into appellative and proper nouns.

2 - 5: In these paragraphs PC discusses the various types of derived nouns.

In 2 he deals with patronymics (sentences 2 - 3), the possessives (sentences 4 - 5), the differences between these two (sentences 6 - 12). The predominant source for paragraph 2 is a text based on Priscian's although an excerpt from Donatus appears in the first sentence as a heading. The reading
De patronomica on 1 34 for 2, 2 is the same as in the
Priscian mss. K and L. (See PRIS., 2, 62, 14*.)

2, : The reading patronomica occuring twice on 2¹ 3 for
2, 7 is significant in that the Priscian mss. D and L have
this reading. (See Pris., 2, 68, 14*.)

3, : In this paragraph PC treats the derived nouns that
are diminutives and comparatives. The heading in 3, 1
corresponding to 2 10 is found in the Priscian mss. PBK
(See Pris., 2, 101, 2*.)

Sentence 7 presents difficulties with "'t' mutata in
'c' et addita 'or' ut 'doctus docti'; 't' in 'c' et addita 'or'
fit 'doctior.'" A line is drawn under this phrase which leads
to the comment in the margin on 2¹: "Quid in! Horrui!"
Lines 4 - 5 of this margin note add a correction to this awkward
phrase "'t' mutata in 'c' et addita 'i'." However, the phrase
after the semicolon tries to make it clearer that 'doctior'
comes from docti plus or.

PC in stating that t changes to c must be thinking of
changes in pronunciation. TULIAN. DON., 327, 22 - 30 discusses
the substitution of ti for ci in pernicies to yield pernities and
that there is a pinguis sonus of the i after c and a gracilis
sonus of the i after t. C.H. Grandgent (An Introduction to
that by the fifth century k'\text{y} had become t'\text{y} and then t's' or t's in the seventh or sixth centuries. Grandgent also observes (p. 118) that the k'\text{y} combination was regularly assimilated by the fifth or sixth century; so it appears that PC might be giving insight into the Latin pronunciation of 12th century northern Italy, namely, that \text{ti} + a vowel sounded the same as a \text{ci} + a vowel and that both \text{ti} and \text{ci} were in these circumstances a sibilant form.

4: This paragraph on the superlatives has as its main sources Priscian and Sedulius Scottus. To a lesser degree for possible sources are the \text{Ars Anonyma Bernensis} (which borrows from Isidore of Seville), and Probus.

6: PC in this sentence states that nouns of the third declension (and he gives \text{felix} as the example) form their superlatives by adding an \text{s} to the dative and then \text{simus}. PROBUS, 69, 33 - 36, however, treats nouns ending in \text{x} as forming their superlatives by adding \text{simus} to the genitive: \text{audacis audacissimus}.

5: The remaining categories of derived nouns cited in this paragraph are the \text{denominativa, verbalia, participialia, aduerbialia, specialia, generalia, adiectiva, gentilia, patria, numeralia, and ordinalia}. With the exception of sentence 1, the headings in sentences 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18, 20, and 22
do not appear in any other source.

5,  2: PRIS., 2, 127 27 - p. 128, 22 treats the denominativa (those that end in as) but is not the source for PC's aeterno aeternitas.

6: Neither Probus nor Donatus as cited in the Fontes give 'docto doctior' as an example of a participialium formed from an inflected form as such. Probus however in line 18 mentions docens doctior as nouns since (lines 12 - 18) they can be made into comparatives or superlatives or adverbs, or can be joined to the genitive case. SERVIUS, 430, 31 - 32 states that demens is a noun because it accepts a comparison, whereas legens is a participle since it cannot be compared. POMPEIUS, 243, 26 says that indulgens, the participle, can form the noun indulgentior.

8: PRIS., 2, 75, 25, contrary to PC, classifies crastinus among the nomina possessiva originating from temporal adverbs. DIOMEDES, 322, 20, however, is nearly in accordance with PC since he states that crastinus comes from an adverb and he lists it in the species incorporalis of the appellative nouns. PC lists it as a denominative noun, and the T.L.L., 5, 535 defines denominativus as derivatus.

9 - 12: Concerning the problem of specialia and generalia the ARS, 73, 23 - 24 states that nouns like homo, equus, lapis etc.
show a portion of generalitas and are therefore specialia."
DON., 374, 11 - 12; SERVIUS, 430, 25 - 26; PRIS., 2, 62, 1 - 2
and POMPEIUS, 148, 33 ff. along with PC subscribe to this line
of thinking. PROBUS, 119, 28 - 29, however, takes a different
viewpoint. He classifies as specialia nouns like Cato, columba,
and pinus and in line 27 puts homo in the category of generalia.

5, 25: It is impossible to determine whether this sentence
was borrowed from a text like SED., 1, 103, 9 or C.M. 14488,
11\^{V} 3 - 5 since both of these appear more related to each other
than to PC's sentence. Sedulius writes: "PRIMUS autem merito
DE MULTIS quia superlativus est et proprium est superlativi, ut
pluribus in suo genere praefatur, ...." C.M. 14488 has
however praefeat instead of praefatur and omits est between
proprium and superlativi. PC differs greatly by having siquidem
in place of autem, proferantur for praefatur and plures. Yet
like the C.M. 14488 he has plures but keeps the est which it omits.

6, : Sentences 1 - 3, which bear relationship in ideas to
the Codex Bernensis 123, Muridac, and Sedulius Scottus and do
not appear to be borrowed directly from these sources, concern
the differences between ordinal and cardinal numbers. Centum
signifies plurality whereas centesimus signifies one-hundredth.
The heading in sentence 1 does not appear to have an identifiable
source.
6, 4–8: This section deals with the nouns *ad aliquid dicta*
'those that refer to something else,' for, as PC states in
sentence 7, if one were to say "father," "son" would be implied
and *vice versa*. The same analogy applies to *soror* and *frater*.
As may be gathered from the *Fontes*, it appears that the C.M. 14488
is the latest direct source for sentences 5–8 and even 9–13.
The C.M. 14488 in turn has borrowings from Donatus and Priscian.
In sentence 7 it is interesting to note that the phrase *'patrem'
etiam'filium'* is a reading of the Priscian ms. G (see PRIS., 2,
60, 20*), but this also appears in C.M. 14488, 11<sup>F</sup> 10. Sentence 4
has no identifiable source.

9–13: The nouns dealt with in this section are those *ad
aliquid aliter se habentia* 'referring to something else in a
contrary manner,' like *left* and *right*. PC appears, moreover,
to have based sentence 9 more on a text like the C.M. 14488 11<sup>V</sup>
7–20 which has "aliter se habentia" whereas DON., 374, 9 has
"qualiter se habentia." In sentences 11–13 PC points out
that the contrary meaning is not signified by the same word which
denotes the one meaning, that is, by saying *right* one does not
signify *left* although *left* almost always adheres to *right*.
Neither (sentence 12) does a word of one meaning derive its
name from that of the opposite meaning, for although (sentence 13)
daylight comes and night disappears as a result, the day is
still entitled to be called thus, for the contrary meaning *night*.
still adheres to day. The reading deister on 2\textsuperscript{v} 15 for sentence 9 does not appear in any of the Donatus mss. in Keil, but appears in MUR. 7491A, 8\textsuperscript{v} 17: "Quid contrarium potest esse plus quam deister sinistro, lux tenebris?" The form destra is to be found in LINDSAY 2, 169. Grandgent (p. 105) observes that "by the second or third century ks before a consonant was reduced to s: ...." Wübinger (p. 64) likewise notes that deister was a popular pronunciation giving rise to the Old French, Provençal, and Catalan destre, Spanish diestro and Portuguese destro.

6, 14 – 19: This section (based primarily on Priscian) is concerned with various categories of appellative nouns: interrogatives, demonstratives and relatives (14 – 15), collectives, dividua 'divisibles' and factici\[li\]a 'onomatopoeics' (16), nouns of place, time and absolute nouns (17), homonyms (18), and synonyms or polyonyms (19). Line 18 does not seem to have been drawn directly and wholly from either Priscian, Donatus, and Muridac (see the Fontes), for on one hand PC's wording is similar to DON., 373, 21 – 22: "Sunt alia homonyma, quae una appellatione plura significant, ut nepos acies aries: ...." Yet, PC's phrase "'nepos' ... 'luxuriosum' " is similar to PRIS., 2, 59, 14 – 15: "'nepos' filius filii et 'nepos' luxuriosus." MUR. 7491 A, 7\textsuperscript{r} 6 – 7 has: "Sunt alia omonima id est uninomina eo quod in una significacione id est in una litteratura
plures habeant sensus. 'Nepos' dicitur filius filii et nepos luxuriosus et nepos prodigus, id est dissipator substantiae.'

PC on 2\(^\circ\) 23 gives omonima, and MUR. 1586, 20\(^\circ\) 10 has homonima; so it might appear that the spelling without the \(h\) is influenced by the ms. Paris Lat. 7491 A, although the omission of \(h\) and the substitution of \(i\) for \(v\) in Late Latin was common. (See Grandgent, p. 80 - 81 and 106 - 107.)

7, . This paragraph begins the discussion on gender, in the noun which will continue up to and including 43. PC begins his treatment (sentences 1 - 4), as can be seen in the Fontes, according to Priscian. His definitions of genus, however, in sentence 8 appears to be closely related to the texts cited in the Fontes of Sedulius Scottus and Remigius of Auxerre and in a remoter way to Cledonius' definition. Sentences 9 - 10 are concerned with the etymology of genus and appear to be closely related again to the texts of Sedulius and Remigius who are preceded by Paulus's epitome of Festus, Clemens, Iulianus [Toletanus], Isidore of Seville, Servius Grammaticus, and Varro. Sentences 12 - 14 are concerned with the enumeration of the seven genders: masculinum, femininum, neutrum, commune, omne, 'all-inclusive' epicoenon,'indiscriminate' and the incertum genus 'uncertain gender' is mentioned in 8, 12. PC's idea of seven genders is correct according to the ARS, 83, 27 - 28 although from 12 - 14 it can be seen in the Fontes that the discussion seems closely drawn
together from a composite principally from Donatus, Dositheus, Remigius, and the Pseudo-Augustine but also in 14 from Charisius. Sentences 15 - 19 give examples of words of the epicoenon gender, these words are names of small animals and birds like passer, miluus, aquila, and mustela. What PC means by epicoenon is that haec aquila can either pertain to a male or female eagle and so forth with hic miluus and hic passer. Texts like Remigius and Sedulius appear to be the immediate source for sentences 15 - 19 and they in turn have treatments reminiscent of mainly Isidore and to a lesser extent Sergius and Servius as can be seen in the Fontes.

7, 8: It might be advisable to translate this sentence thus: "An examination of the sex which occurs when a word lacks gender; for the word itself is not gender but that which is understood by it." CLEDONIUS, 10, 18 - 19 states: "genus, ut discernamus sexus," and the ARS, 82, 9 - 11 says: "Quid interest inter genus verbi et nominis et pronominis et participii? Hoc interest: genus verbi dicitur exploratio actus ...." Again the Ars, 82, 1 observes about genus: "Ita: genus est indicatio creandi corporum agnitorum et rerum agnitarum," and in lines 3 - 4 he cites a text almost the same as in ISIDORUS, 11, 1, 2. ARS, 82, 5 says that there are properly only two genders, and attributing a text to Isidore observes that since only male and female can engender, ratio and auctoritas have wanted genus to
apply to other nouns. POMPEIUS, 159, 23 - 26 and CONSENTIUS, 343, 7 - 10 also hold this opinion.

7, 12: DON., 375, 13 ff. begins by stating that there are four genders: _masculinum, femininum, neutrum_ and _commune_, but actually adds later on the _omne genus_ and the _epicoenon_. He does treat the _incertum genus_ cited in 8, 12 which the ARS, 83, 27 - 28 recognizes as a seventh gender; PRIS., 2, 141, 16 calls an example of _hic_ and _haec finis_ of doubtful gender but does not categorically believe that this is a _septimum genus_ in its own right.

8, : In sentences 1 - 4 which (see the _Fontes_) seem related to similar material in Remigius and Sedulius and to a second-hand extent Priscian, Pseudo-Augustine, and Varro, PC asks in essence why we say _hic passer, hic miluus, haec aquila, and haec mustela_, to which the answer is that _auctoritas_ 'authority' or better 'grammatical authority' and _usuali loquacitas_ 'customary speech' have set down the regulation that nouns ending in _r_ or _s_ take _hic_ and those ending in _a_ take _haec_. Sentences 5 - 11 are a series of questions and answers, appearing to be based largely on Remigius and also closely related to the texts of Sedulius and Muridac in sentence 6, concerning the differences between the _commune_ and _epicoenon genera_. Sentence 12 treats the _incertum genus_ already discussed in the commentary to 7.
8, 10: epicoenon uero nusquam:

[SERG.], 494, 10 - 12 observes, however, that some birds are easily identifiable as to their sex like the hen and the rooster.

9: Paragraph 9 concerns itself with nouns singular in one gender but plural in another like balneum, caelum and porrum. The nouns listed also are explained etymologically with the exception of aether. It can be seen from the Fontes that Donatus, Remigius, Sedulius, Isidore, and the C.M. 14488 appear to be the sources more directly related to PC's text supported by references of the v. category to Nonius Marcellus, Charisius, Bede, Diomedes, the Glossaria Latina, and a direct quotation from Ovid's In Ibin (sentence 11), the intermediate source of which I have not yet been able to identify.

1: caelum and 'aether.'

CHARISIUS, 38, 3 - 4 states, contrary to PC who is here modelling his phrase on DON., 375, 29 - 31 (Donatus does not list aether) that the elements are always singular, among which are caelum and aether.

2: According to REM. EIN., 237, 5 - 6 the etymology of balneum is traced to ἀπὸ τοῦ βάλλειν. ISIDORUS, 15, 2, 40 appears to be slightly closer to PC's understanding of the Greek: "Balneis vero nomen inditum a levatione maeroris; nam Graeci βαλανείον dixerunt, quod anxietatem animi tolit." SED., 1,194, 3 gives the etymology ἀπὸ τοῦ βαλανείου.

9, 3: According to SERVIUS VER., 2, 80, 23 - 25 ISIDORUS, 14, 9, 8 and REM. EIN., 237, 6 - 7 PC is incorrect in his etymology of Tartarus. It comes from $\tau\alpha\rho\tau\alpha\epsilon\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ which REM. EIN., 237, 6 - 7 defines as tremor for confusio and about which Isidore says (14, 9, 8): "Tartarus vel quia omnia illic turbata sunt, $\delta\alpha\rho\omicron\nu$ $\tau\alpha\epsilon\tau\alpha\epsilon\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$, aut, quod est verius, $\delta\alpha\rho\omicron\nu$ $\tau\alpha\epsilon\alpha\xi\omicron\nu$ id est a tremore frigoris, ...." It is apparent that PC is giving Isidore's Latin meaning turbata as the origin of Tartarus. Lewis and Short, p. 1843 give, however, $\tau\alpha\epsilon\tau\alpha\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron$ as the etymology of Tartarus.

4: The references to FUNAIOLI, 59, 7 and 223, 91 refer respectively to L. Aelius Stilo and Varro. Concerning the former, Myra L. Uhlfelder (De Proprietate Sermonum vel Rerum, A Study and Critical Edition of a Set of Verbal Distinctions, of the series Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, vol. 15, Rome, American Academy, 1954, p. 2) states that Stilo's etymology of caelum from caelo is a Stoic definition by opposites ($\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\tau\iota\phi\epsilon\alpha\varepsilon\iota\nu$).

5: 'longe' ... terra:

REM. EIN., 237, 10 - 11 explains that porrum is defined as a
virgultum and the former is thus called by virtue of the length of the virgultum 'slip for planting.'

9, 6: As for cephalim there appears to be no identifiable source for PC's misunderstanding of the proper form ἄραλή which REM. EIN., 237, 13 and even a variant reading (see 13*) give as cephale.

9: quod a Foroneo rege inuentum est:
An etymology reminiscent of this appears in the Isidore ms. T (see ISIDORUS, 18, 15 11*). It appears then that PC or the scribe may have used either a text of Isidore or Remigius having a reading like this or perhaps a glossary definition not existing in those cited in the Fontes.

11: I have not yet been able to identify any intermediate source for Ovid's quotation.

12: Sentence 12 presents two problems. It is not yet locatable in any source, and I have not yet been able to locate this verse in any of the collections of proverbs, sayings, and riddles. The T.L.L., 1, 1149 states the form aether a is badly understood and referred to as if it were neuter plural or feminine singular, and THEANDER, 170 gives the plural form aether a as a synonym for caelos.

The form plurari on 3r 34 appears to be an assimilation of the second 1 to the r, which is the reverse of the dissimilation r → r > r → 1 cited by VNNnNnen, p. 73.
10, 

: Paragraph 10, dealing with natural gender, may be translated thus:

1. Seeing indeed that one sound and the same meaning were in these nouns of diverse genders, we have retained that which is considered harmonious and euphonious; and we have discarded that which was superfluous. 2. And therefore we have included not one noun under various genders but in the singular of one gender; however, we judged it to be in the plural of the other gender. 3. One must know, moreover, that many genders exist by nature, many by authority. 4. Those, however, which exist by nature we distinguish now and then by common understanding like uir mulier. 5. In these nouns we truly need neither Vergil nor Cicero nor any other instructor but we naturally follow only reason, for (sentence 6) we know we must say hic uir and haec mulier. 7. In those genders, however, which exist by authority not only is it suitable to follow natural reason but even authority.

As may be seen from the Fontes, the chief sources bearing close relationship to the text in this paragraph are Sedulius, the C.M. 14488 and Remigius. Supporting references, that is, those related in a more distant way are Petrus Grammaticus, Priscian, and the C.B. 207.

10, 7: auctoritate and auctoritatem:

Concerning the forms auctoritate and auctoritatem on 3v 7 - 8 it
is interesting to note that according to Vähnänen (p. 40) the reduction of *au* to *a* in Vulgar Latin in the initial syllable of a word happened when the following syllable contained *u*, which is not the case in *actoritas*. However, although PC writes *o* for the pronunciation is closer to *o* than to *u*. Vähnänen (p. 36) notes that in Late Latin, especially during the Merovingian period, written *o* for *o* was frequent. PROBUS AP., 198, 4 gives an example of the confusion between *o* and *u*: "turma non torama" and line 23 "puella non poella."

11, : The nouns ending in *a*.

This paragraph, concerned with the gender of nouns ending in *a* does not appear to be closely derived from any known source, although sentence 3 from Omnia to nominativum bears resemblance in wording to MUR. 7491A, 12 23 ff.: "Omnia nomina in 'a' desinentia in nominativum casu ...." Musa in sentence 3 is found in C.B. 207, 19, and Catilina appears in PRIS., 2, 143, 6, but the name Venopia is so far unlocatable in any source.

3: On 3 13 PC gives *suphisma* (see my previous discussion of the interchange of *o* and *u* for 10, 7). Vähnänen (p. 37) observes that the initial prothetic *o* had the tendency to become an *u* and that this remained characteristic of Italian.

12, : The nouns ending in *e*.

PC agrees with PRIS., 2, 145, 11 – 12, DON., 376, 12 – 14,
CHARISIUS, 58, 1 - 4 and p. 77, 27 - 30 and POMPEIUS, 165, 3 - 6 that these nouns are either neuters or Greek feminines. PS-AUG., 496, 23 - p. 497, 9, however, states that the only masculine in e is that formed with a preposition like proconsule. PHOCAS, 413, 1 - 2 recognizes only the neuter nouns. No source appears to be identifiable for the name Agathe which however is listed in the T.L.L., 1, 1276 as the woman's name from Ἁγαθή.

13, : The nouns ending in i.

The sources (see the Fontes) appear to be largely Priscian and Donatus and to lesser extent Pompeius, Charisius and the Pseudo-Augustine. Although the content is mainly Priscian, the style of phrasing is largely after Donatus. But PC's order of treatment of these various endings and his examples used resemble more closely the text of Priscian, which I will point out in the remaining commentary for the paragraphs up to 44.

I should like to note that PC's paragraphs 11 - 15 treat respectively the nouns ending in a, e, i, o, and u, which is the practice of PRIS., 2, 143 - p. 146. After the interlude of nouns ending in b, PC continues treating in 17 - 26 c, d, al, el, il, ol, ul, am, im and um, which one sees in PRIS., 2, 146 - p. 148. Paragraph 27 is out of its normal order according to PRIS., 2, 216, but then PC 28 continues with en (on is also out of traditional order; see PRIS., 2, 220 and p. 215) ar, er, ir, or, ur, as, es, is, os us, x (PRIS., 2, 164 ff. treats x as ax, ex, ix, etc.), those
ending in two consonants the second of which is s, aes, and aus
(PRIS., 2, 169 treats aus followed by aes). This order is
comparable, with the exceptions noted, to that in PRIS., 2,

13, 3: 'huiu[s]cemodi':
Although PC agrees with PRIS., 2, 564, 3 – 5 about this word's being
masculine, PS-AUG., 497, 10 – 11 observes that there is no
masculine noun ending in i.

14, : The nouns ending in o
This paragraph also appears to bear the closest resemblance to
PRIS., 2, 145, 16 – p. 146, 14, for instance, PC here only
considers the inis genitive of nouns, which also only appears in
PRIS., 2, 145, 16 – p. 146, 14, whereas PROBUS CA., 10, 3 observes
as well the onis ending as in cerdo cerdonis and pedo pedonis.
PC's list of nouns ending in o may all be found in the Priscian
section just cited. In addition nemo of sentence 5 may be
found in PRIS., 2, 207, 2 – 3 and bubo on p. 141, 18. PC's
assumptions and observations in this paragraph are correct
according to the sources cited, e.g., in sentence 5 he states
that latro is commune, which is correct according to PRIS., 2,
146, 9; [PALAEMON], 537, 12; PS-AUG., 501, 39 – p. 502, 1; and the
ARS, 110, 8. In sentence 3 PC says that margo is of the
incertum genus. PRIS., 2, 145, 24 – 25 notes that margo may be
feminine or masculine according to *auctoritas poetica*. CHARISIUS, 81, 23 says *margo* is feminine but on p. 82, 5 - 9 remarks that Ovid and Varro give *margo* as masculine. [*PALAEMON*], 537, 13 remarks that *margo* is commune. However, PC's statement in sentence 3 that *virgo* is commune is not in accordance with PROBUS CA., 10, 5 - 6 nor with PRIS., 2, 145, 20 nor CHARISIUS, 81, 23 nor with [*PALAEMON*], 537, 14 who say it is feminine. Lewis and Short, (p. 1995) note that *virgo* may pertain to males in the writings of the Ecclesiastical fathers like Tertullian, Jerome and Paulus Nolinus.

15, : The nouns ending in *u*

The paragraph on the *u* nouns with respect to its ideas is in accordance with the *Fragmentum Bobiense*, Priscian, Probus, Donatus and Charisius. The *Fragmentum*, 564, 23 - 26 observes, however, that *genu* for *genu* and *cornu* could be found in antiquity. The name *Esau* is not found as an example of a noun ending in *u* in any of the authors in the *Grammatici Latini*.

16, : The nouns ending in *b*

No author in the *Grammatici Latini* has such a section. However, PRIS., 2, 148, 7 - 9 lists *Iacob* but not as a noun ending in *b* but as one of the *barbara indeclinabilia* ending in letters with which Latin and Greek nouns do not end.

17, : The nouns ending in *c*

PROBUS CA., 7, 3 - 12 is more detailed than PC and Priscian
because he considers the possibility of lact instead of lac, notes the change of gender in lactes, and cites loci classici upon which to base his arguments.

18, : The nouns ending in d


19, : The nouns ending in al

The possible sources here, as may be seen from the Fontes, are the Fragmentum Bobiense, Priscian, Phocas, Pseudo-Augustine, and Charisius. Although the words like Hannibal and animal and the assumptions about their genders are common to these sources, it does not appear, if one were to compare the texts cited in the Fontes to this paragraph, that any of these is the direct source for 19.

20, : The nouns ending in el

The possible sources for this are the Ars Anonyma Bernensis, the Fragmentum Bobiense, Priscian and Charisius. The Ars Anonyma Bernensis reference is important chiefly for the Biblical name Rachel appearing in this paragraph. Michael, however, appears in PRIS., 2, 147, 11. PRIS., 2, 147, 9 – 12 with its differentiation of the 'el' correptam and 'el' productam does not seem to have
much influence here, and the different phrasing between PC and
Priscian points to the likelihood that the Priscian text was
not the immediate source, e.g., PRIS., 2, 147, 9 - 10 writes:
"In 'el' correptam neutri sunt generis, 'mēl', 'fēl', 'subtēl',
τὸ κοῖλον τοῦ ποσός ." This is obviously not the same
as what one sees in 20 except for mēl and fēl. These two words
appear, however, in the other sources cited in the Fontes.

21, : The nouns ending in ēl
The following are the ways in which PC differs from the possible
sources listed in the Fontes. The FRAGMENTUM, 558, 8 - 10 considers
vigil masculine, whereas PC as PS-AUG., 503, 20 - 21 and PHOCAS,
414, 21 and PRIS., 2, 147, 14 considers it commune. PHOCAS, 414,
19 - 20 as PC recognizes pugil as masculine as well as PRIS.,
2, 147, 13; but PS-AUG., 503, 24 considers pugil to be commune and
mentions no neuter.

21, 3: 'nīchil';
Grandgent (p. 107) observes that in Vulgar Latin, forms such as
michi and nichil arose because medial h had ceased to be
pronounced, and a k pronunciation grew up as a result which he
notes "has persisted in the Italian pronunciation of Latin."

22, : The nouns ending in ol
From among the three possible sources listed for this in the
Fontes, the name Michol is not derived. FORCELLINI, 6, 270 says
it is a Hebrew woman's name and lists the places where it appears in the Vulgate, e.g., in 1 Samuel, 14, 49.

23, : The nouns ending in ul
Among the possible sources for this paragraph listed in the Fontes there is disagreement as to the gender of consul, praesul and exul. PC is in agreement with Priscian concerning their genders. Charisius however states that praesul and exul are masculine. The Pseudo-Augustine agrees with PC and Priscian, but Phocas states that exul is commune while praesul and consul are masculine.

25, : The nouns ending in im
Priscian lists both Cim and Ioachim. Cim is, however, treated officially by Priscian as a noun ending in im whereas Ioachim is listed along with other barbarae indeclinabilia like Loth, Ruth, and Abraham.

26, : The nouns ending in um
Priscian lists templum and Dorcium, Pompeius scamnum and the Pseudo-Augustine templum and scamnum, so it appears that PC does not adhere exclusively to any of these as his source.

2: 'scamnum':
This appears as scamnum on 4R 7. Väyrynen (p. 64 and 66) notes that mn in popular usage tended to become nn like dannum and dannum.

2: 'Dorcium':
This is dortium on 4R 8 which is also a reading in the Priscian
mss. R and A. (See Pris., 2, 148, 16*.) The t before iu instead of c before iu is another instance of the Vulgar Latin tendency in pronunciation to palatalize the c to sound like a t, from which instance confusion in spelling could occur. (See the commentary for 3.)

28: The nouns ending in en

Among the sources cited in the Fontes, carmen appears only in PS-AUG., 498, 6 and PHOCAS., 415, 5. Priscian has all the other words ending in en, but unlike PC differentiates between en and en. The Codex Bemensis 207 has pecten, flamen, and tibicen. Phocas has flamen, pecten, lien and tibicen. Charisius has lien, flamen, pecten, and tibicen. The Pseudo-Augustine has flamen, pecten, lien, splen, Siren, and tibicen. So it appears that PC's examples are closer to the lists of the Pseudo-Augustine and Priscian.

3: (non pro 'flamine')

J. F. Niermeyer (Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus, Leiden, Brill, 1957, fasc. 5, p. 437) gives two ninth century instances where flamen in the neuter gender means 'church banner.'

3: sed pro 'Veneris sacerdote')

PRIS., 2, 149, 4 and PHOCAS, 415, 3 give "[sacerdos Iovis]" as well, VARRO, 26, 20 - 21 and p. 106, 10 - 12 lists no flamen Veneris among the other flamines of Mars, Vulcan, Juppiter, Furrina and Falacer. Carl Koch ("Venus," in RE, 2nd series,
vol. 8A, pt. 1, issue of 1955, cols. 836 - 837) observes that in Campania, Capua and Abella there are inscriptions with the phrase \textit{sacerdos Veneris et Cereris}. He also (col. 873) notes the phrase \textit{sacerdos Veneris Felici} occurring in an inscription at Peltuinum of the second century A.D.

28, 4: 'Troezen' feminina

This appears on 4\textsuperscript{r} 12 as \textit{trisen feminina}. I emendate \textit{trisen} to \textit{Troezen} for the following reasons: (1) PRIS., 2, 221, 19 mentions \textit{Troezen} after \textit{Siren}; (2) \textit{trizen} is a variant reading in the Priscian mss. RADHGL (see PRIS., 2, 221, 19\textsuperscript{*}); (3) for the substitution \textit{ı} for \textit{e} see \textit{Vănănăn}, p. 36 and Grandgent, p. 71 and 83; (4) for the monophthongization of \textit{œe} to \textit{e} consult \textit{Vănănăn}, p. 39; (5) for the substitution of \textit{ς} for \textit{z} see Grandgent, p. 124 - 125 and 140 and \textit{Vănănăn}, p. 50. DU CANGE, 1, 563, attests the fourteenth-century form \textit{baptisare}.

29, : The nouns ending in \textit{on}

Among all the possible sources for this paragraph in the \textit{Fontes}, PRIS., 2, 215, 15 and 17 has only \textit{Pelion}. Malsachanus has \textit{Simon} and Hrabanus Maurus has \textit{Sidon}. But the other names listed do not appear in the sources cited for this paragraph nor in the other authors in the Grammatici Latini.

3: 'Sindon'

This word is listed as a variant of \textit{sindo} by FORCELLINI, 4, 381 who describes it as a \textit{pannus lineus} 'linen garment' or \textit{lintea}
tunica 'linen tunic' worn in the Orient by men and women especially during the summer. Valerius Probus (De Nomine Excerpta in vol. 4 of the Grammatici Latini, p. 211, 19 - 20) states that sindo is usually of the masculine gender whereas Forcellini observes it is ordinarily feminine, which latter opinion PC holds.

30, : The nouns ending in ar

Priscian has all the examples given by PC who is in accordance, moreover, with Priscian's assumptions about the genders of these ar nouns. Phocas gives only laquear, lacunar and Caesar and is in agreement about their genders with PC and Priscian. The Fragmentum Bobiense also has the same ideas as Phocas but not worded similarly. The reference to Charisius has only Caesar, lar, and par.

31, 2: The nouns ending in er

There is a slight similarity in the phrasing in SED. TRACT., 7 9v 22 - 23: "Omnia vero nomina secunde declinationis in 'er' desinentia masculini generis esse non dubium est." The Fragmentum Bobiense lists pater as do Priscian, Phocas, and Charisius (see p. 56, 23); but magister appears only in CHARISIUS, 56, 17.

3: Priscian is the only source cited having all of the er words in this sentence; mater and mulier are in Phocas;
CHARISIUS, 28, 27 and the Fragmentum Bobiense have *mater* Linter appears in Priscian only. PS-AUG., 502, 27 and line 30 has *pauper* and *alacer* which the Fragmentum Bobiense and Phocas have. CHARISIUS, 104, 9 has *alacer*.

31, 4 - 6: Priscian has all the examples listed by PC in these sentences and the latter's assumptions about the genders of these are also in accordance with Priscian.

6: 'beber'

This word appears as *beuer* on 4r 25. Niermeyer (fasc. 1, p. 88) lists *beuer* as a Germanic way of writing *beber*. R.E. Latham (Revised Medieval Latin Word-List, From British and Irish Sources, London, Oxford Univ. Pr., 1965, p. 49) states that *beuer* as a form appears ca. 1191. For *beuer* and its variant spellings consult also Otto Prinz, ed., Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch, vol. 1, München, Beck, col. 1459. A note in DU CANGE, 1, 646 indicates that Petrus Damianus used *biverus* and that the Italian is *bevero*. For the interchange of *b* and *v* see Joseph Hermann, Le Latin vulgaire, of the series "Que sais-je?" n° 1247, Paris, P.U.F., 1967, p. 53.

32, : The nouns ending in *ir*

Although all the sources cited have *<h>ir* (PHOCAS, 416, 5 omits the *h*), PRIS., 2, 154 is the only one featuring *Gaddir*. Furthermore, I have left *martir* as it is in the manuscript since
this spelling represents PC's understanding of the category of nouns in which it ought to belong. Also, with the ARS, 101, 29 and p. 114, 23 - 24 PC is in agreement about the gender of martir.

33, : The nouns ending in or
All of PC's assumptions are in agreement with Priscian.

2: PRIS., 2, 154, 21 states that discolor, tricorpor, and indecor are communia.

3: This assumption is correct according to PRIS., 2, 154, 7 - 8.

4: E quibus ... 'senior'
This is in agreement according to PRIS., 2, 154, 8.

'uxor soror' et 'arbor'
This is correct according to PRIS., 2, 154, 11.

5: For this statement see PRIS., 2, 154, 18 - 19.

34, : The nouns ending in ur
Priscian lists every noun PC uses except Ligur. Charisius does not have anxur or Ligur.

35, : The nouns ending in as
Priscian has all the examples of words ending in as which PC gives except Andreas and Aeneas. The assumptions of Priscian and PC about the genders are also in agreement with each other.
Phocas disagrees with these two in stating that nouns of cities ending in _as_ are masculine. [Palaemon] and the _Fragmentum Bobiense_ discuss the plural of these _as_ nouns like _Arpinas_ but do not state their genders. [Palaemon], however, has _Andreas_ which Priscian does not have. Phocas gives _Arpinas_, and _pietas_. The _Fragmentum Bobiense_ has _as_, _fas_, _negas_, and _vas_. Charisius has _vas_, _as_, _fas_, _negas_, _nugas_, and _mas_; and any observations he makes concerning these nouns, are in harmony with those of PC and Priscian.

36, _The nouns ending in _es_

The assumptions about the genders of these nouns are correct according to Priscian; and the examples that PC uses to illustrate his point are to be found in Priscian. Priscian and Charisius, unlike PC, consider the nouns ending in _es_ first according to the _es correptam_ and then according to the _es productam_.

37, _The nouns ending in _is_

2: _Omnis ... 'panis'_

There is a resemblance between this phrase and PRIS., 2, 159, 27 - p. 160, 4 since Priscian is here speaking about a wider grouping of nouns ending in _is_ like _panis_ (this word comes first in his list of those _is_ masculine nouns which he notes have _n_ or two consonants in the same syllable or a double consonant before _is_ and which in the penultimate syllable terminate in a
liquid), then he cites more masculine nouns; and in line 4 on p. 160 says "excipitur 'haec bipennis', quod ideo feminimum est," just as PC continues with praeter ... incerti.

37, 2: praeter ... incerti

Priscian, as cited in the Fontes, notes that canis is commune but does not call finis incertum, although he remarks that auctoritas (and he cites Juvenal) uses it in both the masculine and feminine genders. He makes the same observation about clunis. Phocas, 418, 4 - p. 419, 2 states that clunis is masculine, canis is common, and that finis is masculine.

3: In Goetz, 5, 654 which is the Glossae Juvenalianae edited from the ms. Paris 7730 of the tenth century (see Goetz, 5, 652) orexis is defined as the "comestio et desiderium qui extra naturam uel consuetudinem amplius comedit." Rexis is a variant of orexis appearing in the Codex Sangallensis 902 of the tenth century (see Goetz, 3, p. 2 and 603). Goetz, 7, 31 refers to rexis in volume 3, 603 which is from the Hermeneumata Codicis Vaticani Regiae Christianae 1260 of the tenth century, and here it is defined as "delectatio ciborum insatiabilis." Priscian does not mention orexis, and of the published sources the glossaries afford more information on this word than do the Grammatici Latini.

5: I have left clamis as it is on 4V 15 since this represents PC's understanding of the category of nouns to which
this word belongs. PRIS., 275, 15 lists chlamys in the category of the nouns ending in *ys*, and it is interesting to note that clamis is a reading in the Priscian mss. RDG.

37, 6 – 11: As can be seen from the Fontes, Priscian appears to be the most likely source for these sentences because he gives all the examples of *is* words used by PC and agrees with him in his ideas about their genders.

6: 'Samnis'

This appears on 4v 16 as sannis and again like scannum for scamnum represents the Vulgar Latin tendency for *mn* to yield *nn*. (See Vænænæn, p. 64 and my discussion on Samnum in the commentary to 26.)

38, : The nouns ending in *os*

Priscian appears to be the most likely source since he gives all the nouns in *os* which PC lists with the exception of melos, and because all of their assumptions correspond. Charisius gives flos, custos, nepos, sacerdos, dos, ros, os oris and os ossis, but these nouns are not all presented in one continuous section on the *os* nouns as in Priscian. There are, however, three different sections on these nouns in Charisius. His assumptions about the genders of the nouns he lists which appear in PC are also in agreement with PC's assumptions. Phoca lists all the nouns which PC lists except glos, inpos, melos and Chaos. His assumptions
about the others agree with PC's.

39, : The nouns ending in us

2: The Priscian source cited in the *Fontes* has not the nouns listed as examples of us nouns by PC: *dominus*, *Andrus*, *Aegyptus*, *dipthongus*, *synodus*, *balanus*, *abyssus*, and *byssus*. PC notes that *colus*, *populus*, *carbasus*, *aluus* and *humus* are feminine whereas PRIS., 2, 169 ff. states that they could either be masculine or feminine according to the *vetustissimi*. POMPEIUS, 162, 25 - 26 remarks that *carbasus* is feminine in the singular but neuter in the plural as well as PHOCAS, 426, 17. CHARISIUS, 49, 22 gives βάλανος which he renders as *glaes*. For the statement that *Aegyptus* and *abyssus* are feminine see the ARS, 103, 26 - 27. The gender of *synodus* is not discussed in any of the authors of the *Grammatici Latini* or in the mss. I have examined in this research. The spelling *sinodus* which PC has on 4 V 29 appears in THEANDER, 124 and is defined as "congregatio semum."

2: 'byssus' quae ... generis

Inasmuch as *byssus* appears on 4 V 30 as *bissus*, it may appear significant that a similar statement is to be found in GOETZ, 5, 50: "Bissus generis est feminini." This phrase is from Placidus, *Libri Glossarum* which was edited from the mss. Paris 11539 and 11530 of the 8th and 9th centuries respectively.(GOETZ, 5, 43). According to GOETZ, 5, 424, *byssus* is a snowy-white wool that grows on bushes in Africa.
39, 3 - 4: The source is Priscian or at least an excerpter of Priscian, because of the similarity in phrasing. Sentence 4 reads: "Licet quandoque 'vulgus' masculini inuenitur." PRIS., 2, 163, 9 - 10 reads: "... et 'vulgus', quod tam masculini quam neutri generis inventur."

5 - 7: The content is in accordance with Priscian, and there is a similar phrasing. PC writes in 7 for example: "Si uero ultra syllabam fuerint, habentur feminini generis ut 'tellus' et 'seruitus.' PRIS., 2, 164, 1 - 2 has: "supra syllabam autem feminina sunt, ut 'servitūs', ... 'palūs', 'tellūs'." However, in 6 from Omnias to tertiae the text resembles REM., 28, 21: "Omnia nomina tertiae declinationis ...".

9: The wording of this sentence bears some similarity to PRIS., 2, 163, 19 - 22, for example, Priscian begins with: "In 'us' correptam tertiae declinationis nomina neutra sunt, ut 'munūs', 'opūs', excipitur 'hic lepūs', 'haec Venūs', ..., quod femininum ... ." PC's sentence 9 reads: "Omnia nomina tertiae declinationis in 'us' nominatium singularem in 'us' correptam terminantia sunt neutri generis ut 'pectus' praeter 'lepus' quod est masculini, et 'Venus' feminini inuenitur generis." PC's pectus, however, does not appear in this text of Priscian.

10 - 11: Compared with PRIS., 2, 163, 7 - 12 PC is incomplete since he does not specify the genders of porticus, anus, acus, penus, domus, and specus. PC states that luctus of the fourth declension
is masculine like *uisus*. CHARISIUS, 55, 28 observes that *luctus*
is feminine; but he is incorrect according to Lewis and Short, p. 1081 who state that it is masculine. Asperus Grammaticus lists both *luctus* and *uisus* as fourth declension masculine nouns. Maximus Victorinus gives *uisus* as a fourth declension masculine noun. The references to Priscian do not give *uisus* or *luctus*. Moreover, the phrasing of these two sentences appears to have no similarity with the Priscian texts cited, although all the nouns PC lists except *uisus* and *luctus* are in Priscian. Also, the other sources listed do not appear to have phrasing closely similar to PC's, although the nouns that the other grammarians list ending in *us* are the same. Charisius gives *domus*, *manus*, *anus*, and *luctus*. Diomedes has only *domus* in common. Asperus Grammaticus gives *visus* and *domus*. Maximus Victorinus gives only *visus*.

40, : The nouns ending in *x*

2: The only similarity which PC appears to have in common with the *Fragmentum Bobiense* is that the latter begins on p. 562, 23 with: "Omnia 'x' littera terminata …." PC begins this sentence thus: "Omnia nominatium singularem nomina in 'x' terminata …." Phocas's presentation (p. 420, 23 – p. 421, 27) treats nouns ending in *x* according to the preceding vowel, so his categories are *ax*, *ex*, *ix*, *ox*, and *ux*. This is nearly the same basis of classification used by *PROBUS*, 69, 10 ff. The Pseudo-Augustine as in sentence 2 gives *fex* (this is PC's spelling on 5¹ 5)
and *pax*. He too treats these *x* nouns as ending in *x* and not in categories of *ax* and *ix* etc. Priscian's presentation is, however, according to the tradition of Probus and Phocas because he also lists the nouns ending in *x* by the categories of *ix*, *ax*, *ox* etc. However, he is the only one of the sources listed for this sentence who has nearly all the nouns used as examples of *x* nouns by PC in this sentence. The ARS, 119, 18 has *pulix*, which does not appear in Priscian.

40, 3: Priscian has *pelex*, *carex*, *cortex*, *silex*, and *calix*. According to PRIS., 2, 165, 11 and CHARISIUS, 116, 4 *calix* is only masculine. The T.L.L., 3, 161 notes that it may be either masculine or feminine. Concerning the gender of *supplex* which PC regards as feminine, PRIS., 2, 340, 11 observes that it may be either masculine or feminine. Forcellini, 4, 619 states that it is an adjective of any gender. Lewis and Short (p. 1814) note that *supplex* may be an adjective or a masculine noun. *Vibex* occurs in the Priscian mss. D and h. (See PRIS., 2, 164, 20*.)

4: Except for *iudex*, Priscian has all the nouns in *x* listed in this sentence; and his assumptions about their genders are the same as those of PC. *Iudex* does not appear in the authors in the Grammatici Latini, when they treat the nouns ending in *x* nor in the unpublished mss. used in this research.

5: The text of Priscian reads: "... ad utrumque sexum hominum pertinentia communia utriusque, ut 'hie' et 'haec coniunx, dux', ... ."
40, 6: Priscian gives velleox and audax and agrees with PC as to their genders, although the phrasing of these two is dissimilar.

7: The wording of Priscian and PC does not present the likelihood that PC borrowed directly from Priscian, but the assumptions in this sentence are the same as those of Priscian.

8 - 9: FORCELLINI, 4, 448 states, contrary to PC, that when Sphinx means monstrum, it is masculine. DU CANGE, 7, 553 defines Sphinx as a fibula and refers the reader to spinulus on p. 557 where he states that it means the same as spinula 'small needle' and quotes from an 11th century text defining Sphinx as a fibula. The modern lexicographers are silent on the question.

41, 1 - 2: Other nouns ending in two consonants

1 - 2: As may be seen from the Fontes, there appear to be two instances of similarity in phrasing with Priscian. As far as the nouns listed are concerned which PC uses to illustrate his point, these may all be found in Priscian as cited; and PC's views on their genders are those of Priscian.

3: Although this assumption is in agreement with all the sources listed in the Fontes for this sentence, the wording appears to have more similarity with Priscian: "... 'stirps', quod etiam masculinum invenitur ... ."
Priscian and Phocas give only Arruns in common with PC. The ARS, 121, 6 gives dodrans as a feminine noun. It is worthwhile to note that aruns which appears on 5r 17 is also the reading in the Priscian mss. DGLk. (See Pris., 2, 168, 14*.)

5: The Fragmentum Bobiense treats as a class of nouns in their own right those that end in bs, but does not give Chalybs. ISIDORUS, 16, 21, 1 states that this is a name of a river where iron is found. FORCELLINI, 2, 370 states that Chalybs is a variant of Chalybes. SERVIUS VER., 3, 147, 19 ff. observes that the Chalybes are people among whom iron is found and that chalybs is consequently misused for ferrum.

5: uel in 'ps' ... generis
There appears to be slight similarity with Priscian's text:
"... vel in 'ps' desinentia, masculina sunt: ..., 'forceps', ... ."

6: The Priscian text cited does not give caelebs. PS-AUG., 503, 8 - 13, as PC, considers caelebs to be either masculine or feminine. PHOCAS, 422, 4 observes, however, that it may also take the neuter gender. The observations about the other nouns in sentences 6 - 7 are in agreement with those of Priscian.

The nouns ending in aes
The content is in accordance with Priscian; and there seems even to be some slight similarity in phrasing because Priscian writes:
"In 'aes' diphtongum unum masculinum: 'praes praedis', et unum neutrum: 'aes aeris'."
43, : The nouns ending in aus

Laus and fraud are both given by Priscian who also says they are feminine. However, the phrasing of Priscian and PC here is not similar enough to warrant a more detailed comparison.

44 - 54: These paragraphs concern number as one of the accidents of the noun.

44, : In sentences 1 - 2 which bear similarity to texts in Priscian one sees that PC is beginning his discussion of number secundum Priscianum. However, from sentences 5 - 12 one may see from the Fontes that the texts which seem to furnish the most material used by PC are of the Remigius type. There are also borrowings from texts similar to Clemens, the Ars Anonyma Bernensis, Sedulius Scottus, Alcuin, and Persius second-hand by way of texts like Sedulius and Remigius. Though not appearing to be similar in phrasing to the text of PC, there are ideas related to those found in Priscian and Varro, for example, concerning the etymology of numerus Varro (as recorded by Augustine's De Civitate Dei, 4, 11 or the Anecdota Helvetica, p. 248) says (FUNAIOLI, 245, 168): "Numeria quae numerare doceat," and"...; quod etiam in partu precabantur Numeriae, quam deam solent indigitare etiam pontifices." (p. 227, 107). Also, one may see from the Fontes that the text from lines 8 - 12 appears to be related to a similar one in Sedulius; and this text from Sedulius is composed in turn
from texts resembling for the most part those in Remigius, so it may be safely hypothesized that PC in this instance may have derived his Remigius and Persius via a text like Sedulius.

6: Of all the possible sources listed for this sentence, it appears that Alcuin's treatment is the closest to PC's, for he says: "Dictionis forma, discretio quantitatis[AL., distinctionis forma, quantitatis discretionis]." Sedulius gives: "Numerus est dictionis forma quae discretionem quantitatis facere potest." Remigius has the same text as Sedulius except that he says forma dictionis as PC. (The text in Sedulius is the same as in Priscian.)

8: It is important to note (see my introduction, p. lvii) the role of Glossae in manuscripts and how a gloss in an early manuscript becomes incorporated into the text of a later manuscript. As far as the Commentum Einsidlense is concerned, the content and wording in this sentence appears to be somewhat similar to a marginal note in the Glossa Codicis Bernensis 386: "Dicitur enim numerus a numerando uel a Numeria dea paganorum quae fertur numerum inuenisse uel a Numa Pompilio (ponp~), qui fuit auctor numerandi: antiqui nescientes numerare lapillis omnia computabant, in adversitate nigris, in prosperitate candidis, unde Persius: 'Hunc, Macrine, diem numera meliore lapillo.' " (See REM. EIN., 240, 7* and cf. 8*.) A text similar to this appears in Sedulius and in Fox's edition of Remigius. These two texts represent a
substantially more detailed treatment of the material than is found in the Commentum Einsidlense.

45, : In this paragraph PC discusses how many numbers a Latin noun can take: singular and plural. He points out the possibility that there may be a third number - the dual - but then discredits this idea saying that as soon as there is more than singular, we have plural. He proceeds to state that some people think that one cannot logically call "singular" a number since *numerus* is properly spoken of in terms of plurality and because every number is an accumulation of *unitates* 'states of being one.' He prefers, however, to consider *unus* to be a number because it can be doubled and multiplied to make other numbers which can even be dissolved into it. (For a discussion of the attitude of the Late Latin grammarians to Greek grammatical categories see Robins, p. 58.)

As may be seen from the Fontes, PC begins this paragraph (sentences 1 - 4) *secundum Donatum* but then borrows from texts similar to those in Muridac, Remigius, Sedulius, and Diomedes both in ideas and in phrasing. However, there are similar ideas in the texts of Priscian, Charisius, and Sedulius, but little evidence of immediate borrowing; for instance, CHARISIUS, 195, 2 - 3 writes: "dualis enim apud Romanos non est," and PRIS., 2, 172, 2 - 3 has: " ... , nam dualis apud Latinos non invenitur." This idea is the same as in sentence 7.
46,    : In this paragraph PC discusses what parts of speech take number as an accident. He states that those take number which have finite or infinite persons like the nouns, pronouns, verbs and participles. If a verb does not have person, it will not have a number, which is also the case among the infinitives, impersonal verbs, gerundives and supines.

Of all the three sources cited for this paragraph, it appears that PC used a text similar to that in Sedulius or the C.M. 14488 rather than a ms. or excerpt of Priscian, e.g., Sedulius writes: "Sed quia de numeris ratio est, quae dictiones habent numeros. Illae videlicet, quae personas habent vel infinitas, quae sunt nomina, pronomina, verba, vel participia."
The text in the C.M. 14488 is the same except that there are a few uninteresting orthographical variations. Priscian writes: "Numeros autem hae habent dictiones, quae personas quoque habent vel finitas vel infinitas, id est nomina, verba, participia, pronomina."

47,    : Although this paragraph plus the succeeding ones up to and including 54 appear similar to a text of corresponding length in the C.M. 14488, it is worthwhile to note other possible sources both close to the text of PC and more distantly related.

Paragraph 47 begins the discussion of the many types of special plurals and singulars; and it is concerned with the *nomina numero communia* 'the nouns common in number,' that is, those like
nubes and dies that end in es and may either be singular or plural. Except for sentence 1, the whole paragraph is similar to a text in Sedulius, and sentences 2 - 3 are similar to a text in Muridac. Sentence 2, however, is a Donatus lemma obviously common to the C.M. 14488, Sedulius, and Muridac.

48: PC is discussing here the nouns like sanguis and puluis that may only be singular. He poses as challenges to this doctrine instances from the Vulgate when sanguinibus appears, but then explains these away by saying that the interpreter preferred to break the rules of grammar rather than to conceal the propriety of the Greek interpretation. (For the classic statement of this theory see Saint Jerome, LVII "Ad Pammachium de Optimo Genere Interpretandi," chapter 5, in his Lettres, vol. 3, ed. by Jerome Labouret, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1953: "Ego enim non solum fateor, ... non uerbum e uerbo sed sensum exprimere de sensu.") He proceeds to observe that the Latins always considered puluis and sanguis to be singular because of the unity of these substances, i.e., they cannot logically be cut into various sections and thus have a plural number.

2: The text of Donatus does not appear to be closer to PC's than that of Muridac who writes: "Sunt etiam singularia subauditur nomina generis masculini ut 'puluis sanguis.'" Donatus has: "sunt semper singularia generis masculini, ut pulvis sanguis, ... ."
PC writes: "Sunt etiam semper singularia generis masculini ut 'puluis sanguis.'" The C.M. 14488, 22\(\tilde{\text{r}}\) 3 - 4 gives a reading that appears to be the closest to PC's: "Sunt nomina semper singularia generis masculini ut 'puluis sanguis.'"

48, 3: Sed quare ... Psalms

MUR. 7491 A, 13\(\tilde{\text{r}}\) 21 - 22 writes: "Queritur quare dicuntur esse nomina singularia semper cum legamus in Psalms ... ." MUR. 1586, 27\(\tilde{\text{r}}\) 26 - 27 has the same text except that he seems to be closer to PC with "haec nomina esse singularia semper" which is also the reading in the C.M. 14488, 22\(\tilde{\text{v}}\) 5 - 6. The text of SED., 1, 229, 6 is also close to PC, MUR. 1586, and the C.M. 14488 with "... haec nomina dicuntur esse ... ." However, none of these possibilities appears to be the direct source for this phrase, since none of them begins with: "Sed quare dicimus ...?"

3: 'qui non ex sanguinibus'?

MUR. 1586, 27\(\tilde{\text{r}}\) 8 and SED., 1, 229, 8 both have this reading in common with PC. However, MUR. 7491 A, 13\(\tilde{\text{r}}\) 22 and the C.M. 14488, 22\(\tilde{\text{v}}\) 7 have quia instead of qui.

4: With the exception of PC's single m which I have emended to mm in gram(m)aticorum plus e for ae in Graece and in illo loco instead of illo in loco, PC's text is the same as the one in the C.M. 14488, 22\(\tilde{\text{v}}\) 7 - 9. SED., 1, 229, 9 - 10 has the same text as that in the C.M. 14488 except it has quia
instead of *quod*. However, it is difficult to ascertain whether MUR. 7491 A or MUR. 1586 is the one that is more related to Sedulius, the C.M. 14488, or to PC. Both Muridac texts (see MUR. 7491 A, 13.22 ff. and 1586, 27 28 ff.) have *quod* in common with PC and the C.M. 14488. Both, however, have *ille in loco* which is nearly the same as *illo in loco* used by Sedulius and the C.M. 14488; but PC has *illo loco*. Everybody gives *frangere regulam grammaticorum* as opposed to the reading in MUR. 1586, *frangere regulam grammaticae* and to the reading in MUR. 7491 A, *regulam grammaticorum frangere*.

48, 5: This sentence seems to have the text of the C.M. 14488, 22 10 - 11 as its closest relative since it reads: "Ceterum 'sanguis' apud Latinos semper singulariter effertur propter unitatem sui; similiter 'puluis.'" SED., l, 229, 10 - 11 omits Ceterum 'sanguis' and gives *effertuntur*. The two Muridac texts likewise omit Ceterum 'sanguis', have *effertur* but omit similiter 'puluis'.

6 - 10: If one were to compare the texts of Sedulius, the C.M. 14488, and Pompeius with PC's treatment, he might notice that Sedulius's text offers the greatest similarity to PC's; for example, the C.M. 14488, 22 16 - 17 writes: "Igitur 'puluis' uel 'sanguis' quando pluraliter proferuntur, non proprie, usurpatiue haec fit." SED., l, 229, 14 gives: "Igitur PULVIS et SANGUIS, quando pluraliter
proferuntur, non proprie, sed usurpative hoc fit." POMPEIUS, 176, 16 - 17 has a phrase vaguely reminiscent: "ergo usurpative ille posuit."

49, : This paragraph deals with the masculine nouns that are always found in the plural. The C.M. 14488, 22V 17 - 27 offers a text that appears in its entirety to be closely related to the one offered by PC. The text of Sedulius in ideas appears also to have a relationship with PC's text but not as close as the one in the C.M. 14488 in some sections; for example, Sedulius writes: "MANES dicuntur animae mortuorum vel dii infernales: 'manum' dicebant antiqui bonum; inde 'mane' prima hora diei."
The C.M. 14488 gives, however: "'Manes' dicuntur per antifrasin, sunt dii infrenales [sic] eo quod minime sint boni. Antiqui enim 'manum' 'bonum' dicebant." Sedulius writes: "Hinc etiam[per] κατὰ ἀντιφρασίαν, id est per contrarium, MANES dicuntur, eo quod non sint boni." Cf. also SERVIUS VER., I, 60, 13 - 15. Moreover, sentence 2, appears to have more direct relationship with the text in the C.M. 14488, 22V 17 - 18: "Sunt nomina semper pluralia generis masculini ut 'Manes Quirites cancelli.'" SED., 1, 230, 1 has the more simple lemma from DON., 376, 26 with Sunt before it.

3 - 5: Remigius's text cited in the Fontes is essentially the same as the text in SED., 1, 230, 2 - 3. The content in ISIDORUS, 10, 139 appears to have influenced Paulus by the
the phrase *minime boni*. However, in the case of sentence 5 with the phrase *qui ... dicitur* ISIDORUS, 9, 2, 84 seems to have a more direct relationship because of the phrase: "... quod semper hasta utebatur, quae Sabinorum lingua curis dicitur." The text of the C.M. 14488 has no such related treatment. SED., 1, 230, 4 - 5 seems to offer the second closest text to PC's: "QUIRITES Romani dicuntur a Quirino id est a Romulo, qui et ipse Quirinus ab hasta dicitur quam semper portabat in manu. 'Quiris' enim lingua Sabinorum hasta vocatur; ...".

49, 6: So far, only Sedulius and the C.M. 14488 appear to be the texts that offer a similar treatment. Yet, because neither of them feature the etymology *canentes caelent*, it is likely that PC saw a source other than Sedulius or the C.M. 14488 for this sentence or that this is an original contribution on his part. At any rate, Niermeyer, p. 125 observes that the *cancellus* or *cancelli* was a grill or balustrade dividing the raised sanctuary of a church from the area open to the public. According to DU CANGE, 2, 80 this is evidently the wall that closes off the choir. Niermeyer notes that *cancellus* or *cancelli* can mean 'choir.' DU CANGE proceeds to allude to the thirteenth century Durandus, Gulielmus, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, book 1, chapter 3, n° 35 (I am quoting from the 1859 edition, p. 29, published at Naples by Joseph Dura): "... in primitiva Ecclesia, peribolus, idest paries qui circuit chorum, non elevabatur, nisi usque ad appoULATIONEM,
quod adhuc in quibusdam Ecclesiis observatur, quod ideo fiebat, ut populus videns clerum psallentem inde bonum sumeret exemplum." PC's phrase et quia ... rebus 'and because they are fabricated from diverse things' may perhaps be explained by the quotation DU CANGE, 2, 80 makes from the lexicographer Papias who observes that the cancelli may be made either of wood, iron or stone. (See De Ghellinck, p. 235 and 273 for the importance of Papias in the twelfth century.)

50, : In this paragraph PC deals with the feminine nouns which always take the singular. He points out that if peace were not one, discord would result; and that although light may be made from a diverse kind of things, there is no certain light except that of the daytime.

2: Item ... singularis
A passage of related interest is found in MUR. 7491 A, 13r 27: "Sunt semper singularia generis feminini ut 'pax lux.'" SED., 1, 231, 1 features this exact sentence as Muridac gives, which is the lemma from DON., 376, 26 - 27 plus Sunt. The C.M. 14488, 22v 27 - 23r 1 has the pure Donatus lemma.

2: eo ... discordia
Neither Sedulius nor Muridac nor the C.M. 14488 as cited has a text that would indicate that PC borrowed directly from any one of them; for instance, MUR. 7491 A, 13v 1 writes: "Ideo pronuntiantur singulari semper quia si certa non fuerit pax, discordia erit."
MUR. 1586, 27\textsuperscript{v} 2 - 3 has: "Quamuis pronuntiantur singulariter semper, quia si certa non fuerit pax, discordia erit." SED., 1, 231, 2 - 3 has: "Ideo SINGULARIA//pronuntiantur, quia (nī) si una vel certa, non fuerit pax; vel si dividatur pax, discordia erit." The C.M. 14488, 23\textsuperscript{r} 1 - 3 has: "Ideo singulariter semper pronuntiantur quia si una vel certa non fuerit pax, discordia erit."

50, 3: This sentence, however, appears to have more in common with the text in the C.M. 14488, 23\textsuperscript{r} 3 - 5 than with SED., 1, 231, 4. The text, furthermore, in MUR. 7491 A (same as in 1586) 13\textsuperscript{v} 1 - 2 is like the one in the C.M. 14488; but the C.M. 14488 seems to have the closest relationship to PC's text; for example, Muridac writes: "Similiter lux quamuis ex plurimis conficiatur materiis, non certa est lux nisi diei." The C.M. 14488 offers: "Similiter lux quamuis ex pluribus conficiatur materiis, non tamen certa est lux nisi diei." Sedulius is more elaborated: "Lux similiter singulariter declinatur. Nam si dividatur, tenebrae semper maneunt, et lux, quamvis ex plurimis conficiatur materiis, non tantum certa lux nisi diei."

51, : This paragraph concerns the nouns that are always plural. The C.M. 14488, 23\textsuperscript{r} 5 - 7 has the closest relationship with PC's text than the other sources cited: "Sunt nomina semper pluralia generis feminini ut Kalende nundine ferie quadrie\textsuperscript{sic} nuntie scope scale." SED., 1, 232, has this \textit{lemma} from Don., 376,
27 – 28 with Sunt preceding it. MUR. 7491 A, 13\(\textsuperscript{v}\) 2 – 3 gives the same treatment as Sedulius.

52, : Here PC treats the neuter nouns that are always singular. Of all the texts cited which amplify DON., 376, 28 – 31, it appears that the C.M. 14488 presents a reading which is the closest to PC's. Moreover, because Muridac omits DON., 376, 30 – 31 "quamquam ... hordea," it seems that Muridac is the least likely to be PC's immediate source although he writes (7491 A, 13\(\textsuperscript{v}\) 11 – 12): "Sunt semper singularia generis neutri ut 'pus uirus aurum argentum oleum ferrum triticum' et fere cetera qu\(\`\) ad mensuram pondusue referuntur pluralem numerum non habent." Oleum and ferrum are omitted in MUR. 1586, 27\(\textsuperscript{v}\) 13.

53, : These are the neuter nouns that are always plural. Sentence 2 is a lemma from DON., 376, 31 – 32 which is amplified in the other sources cited, with nouns like Vulcanalia and Compitalia.

54, : Sentences 1 – 2 concern the nouns singular in form but plural in meaning. Sentences 3 – 4 concern the nouns plural in form but singular in meaning.

2: The Donatus text cited is exactly the same in SED., 1, 239, 1 and in the C.M. 14488, 23\(\textsuperscript{v}\) 18 – 19. PC, then makes only the minor additions of item and uulgus and uoce for positione.
54, 4: *Sunt ... uoce*
cf. DON., 367, 5 - 7 for *uox* meaning 'sound.'

55 - 57: These paragraphs deal with the accident called *figura.*

55, : "On figure. 2 Of what figure is it (*poeta*)? 3 Simple. 4 Why? 5 Because it cannot be divided into two intelligible parts, the meaning of which two parts it has; neither is it derived from a compounded word. 6 Question. 7 What is figure? 8 The distinction between simple and compounded words. 9 Whence is *figura* derived? 10 From *fingendo,* that is from 'putting together.' 11 We say *fingere* to mean 'to put together'; for which reason we call potters *figulos.* 12 How many figures of nouns are there? 13 Two. 14 Simple and compound. 15 *Simplex* is derived as if it is from *semel* 'once' or *sine plica plexa* 'braided without a fold' like *iustus.* 17 Some add a third figure which is called *decomposita* because it is derived from a compound word like *iniustitia.*"

With the exception of sentence 1, the opening three sentences follow the style of PRIS. PT. As may be seen from the *Fontes,* however, the remaining portion of this paragraph seems to be derived from texts similar to Remigius and to a lesser extent Sedulius and Donatus. Sedulius and Remigius, and in a more distantly related way Muridac and Isidore are important for the etymologies of *figura* and *simplex.* Donatus is important for questions and
answers of general information like sentences 12 - 14. This method achieved greater refinement with Alcuin and his successors. (De Ghellinck, p. 273.)

55, 3: Simplicis

For the transcription of simplic cf. 12v 23 - 25 concerning amo: "Cuius figurae? Simplicis." Simplicis (referring to amo) is written siplicis in the ms.

8: Of the three sources marked v. and cited for this sentence, it appears that for PC the text of Consentius is the most similar: "per has intelligimus, utrum simplex nomen sit, an compositum." The Ars Anonyma Bernensis gives two definitions of figura, the second of which is in harmony with PC's idea: "Item alia definitio: figura est habitus uocum, per quas corpora aut res significantur, utrum sua natura an per artem enuntiantur." Remigius gives: "... , uel figura dicitur res artificialis, quae aut ex una parte constat et simplex dicitur, aut ex pluribus et composita uocatur."

16: The reference to the Commentum Einsidlense points to the Glossa Codicis Bernensis 386 which has a treatment similar to the one in this sentence. The same observation also applies for sentence 17 of this paragraph.

15: I have divided sineplica on 6r 6 into sine plica because this is a possible etymology for simplex according to
FORCELLINI, 4, 374. For plica meaning involutio and plicatura see DU CANGE, 6, 372. For a modern treatment see Ernout and Meillets' treatment on plecto.

56, : With the exception of sentence 1, PC begins this paragraph on the four ways a noun may be compounded secundum Donatum. Apparently basing his discussion upon texts related to those of Remigius, Sedulius, the ARS, Petrus Grammaticus, Sergius], and Donatus, he proceeds to treat these four ways:

(1) from two whole words like sub and urbanus we obtain suburbanus,
(2) from two words about to be altered like effectum and capiens we derive efficax, (3) from a whole word like in plus a particle like eptus, the altered form of aptus, we have ineptus, and (4) from a word like nugae altered to nugi plus a word like gerulus we obtain nugigerulus. In addition, PC notes that there are nouns compounded from several words like inexpugnabilis and inperterritus.

6 - 7: By comparing the texts of Remigius, the ARS, and of Sergius], we notice that none of these, although offering treatments similar to PC's, seems to have been directly employed by PC or preferred by him.

8 - 9: REM., 22, 10 - 13 gives a more plausible explanation for efficax: "Efficax dicitur quasi effectus capax: effectus corrumpitur et facit effi, capax similiter et facit cax. Dicitur
autem *efficax*, cui ad votum omnia veniunt." The ARS, 85, 29 - 31 appears to offer the second best explanation: "...; *efficax enim, idest effectus capax, siue a praepositione ex et a uerbo capio compositum; ...." PETRUS, 163, 1 so far seems to be the only locatable source for *effectum capiens*.

56, 12: PC appears to be using a text more similar to that of Remigius than to Donatus. Remigius writes: "Ex corrupto et integro: ut nugigerulus: ... ." Donatus, however, says: "...; ex corrupto et integro, ut pennipotens nugigerulus."

13: Of the three less related sources for this sentence, it appears that none of them is closer than the other two to PC. PC does not state whether *nuge* is a shortened form of *nugax* (Remigius and [Sergius]) or of *nugas* (Sedulius). Neither does Sergius (Keil, v. 8) state whether it is *nugax* or *nugas*.

14: PC's text here is closer to the one cited in Remigius rather than to that in Donatus.

57, : "In the declension of compounded nouns we ought to take heed that those nouns which have been compounded from two nominatives are declined in each part throughout all the cases like *eques urbanus equitis urbanis* 2 except *alterutere*. 3 Those which have been compounded from the nominative and any other case can be declined only in that part where there has been the nominative case like *praefectus equitum praefecti equitum*. 
4 Question. 5 It is asked to what declension ought compound nouns be assigned if they have been compounded from two nominatives, declined in each part and inflected by their endings. 6 Solution. 7 Truly we should assign them to that declension to which the second noun belongs like praetor urbanus praetor urbani. 8 However, that declension of nouns which have been compounded from the nominative and any other case is recognized from the nominative case like praeffectus equitum praefecti equitum. 9 Besides, it is fitting for us to know with which parts of speech nouns can be compounded: with all of them except the interjection. 10 The noun is compounded with a noun like paterfamilias, with a pronoun like huiusmodi, with a verb like Lucifer, with an adverb like satisfactio, with a participle like plebis scitum, with a conjunction like uterque, and with a preposition like perfidus."

57, 1 - 3: With the exception of Excipitur 'alteruter' PC appears to be basing this section on Donatus and Sedulius. If one were to compare closely a sample of these latter two, he might assume that the text of PC seems to be more like Sedulius's text in one respect, which has: "... DEBEMUS QUOD EA QUAE EX DUOBUS ...", as opposed to Donatus: "... debemus ea quae ex// duobus ..." Yet, because PC has "... ex utraque parte declinantur per omnes casus" as opposed to Donatus's "... ex utraque parte per omnes casus declinari, ... ." which appears in Sedulius, there seems to be a source other than Sedulius or Donatus.
57, 2: The scribe separates *eques urbanus* into two words.

4 - 10: If one were to compare the texts of Muridac as cited for sentences 4 - 8 with those of the C.M. 14488, he would notice that 4 - 8 appear likelier to have been modelled on a source similar to the C.M. 14488; for example, for sentence 5, MUR. 7491 A, 15⁰ 16 - 17 writes: "Quod ex utrisque declinantur et flectunt lateribus, cuius sint adsignando [sic] declinationi?"
The C.M. 14488, 26⁰ 6 - 9 says: "Queritur si ex duobus nominatuis sint nomina conposita ex utrisque declinentur et flectantur lateribus, cui sint adsignanda declinationi."

7: I have translated *fuerit* as a present tense in English. See H.P.V. Nunn (An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin, Oxford, Blackwell, 1963, p. 40 - 41) for the future perfect tense with the force of a present. Grandgent notes that the perfect subjunctive and the future perfect were often confused in Late Latin and that "in some dialects of Italy" (p. 55 - 56) the future perfect could be used as a subjunctive or a future indicative. See also Wähnl, p. 140 - 141.

9: Among the 'cf.' references listed for this sentence, it seems that Sedulius is the closest. He writes: "Praeterea scire nos convenit cum quibus partibus nomina componuntur. Cum omnibus dumtaxat, praeter interiectionem." The C.M. 14488 gives the exact treatment with the substitution of *propterea* for
praeterea. Clemens offers a less related text: "Cum quibus
partibus componuntur nomina? M Cum omnibus praeter interie-
tionem; ... ."

57, 10: The text of PC relies most heavily on the C.M.
14488, then on Sedulius, Clemens, and Priscian in that order.

58 — 64: These paragraphs concern case endings in the noun.
In paragraph 58 PC is concerned with the definition of case, its
etymology, how many cases there are, their functions and why they
are thus called by their respective names. He ends this paragraph
with the declension of poeta, similar to the treatment in PROBUS
CA., 4, 6 ff. Although paragraph 59 begins by asking to what
decension poeta belongs, it is really about the endings of the
first declension and includes a lengthy discussion on why
adjectives that are feminine are not inflected with the bus
ending in the dative and ablative cases. Paragraph 60 discusses
the "tell-tale" endings of the second declension and then ends
with the inflexion of scamnum. Paragraph 61 deals likewise with
the third declension, including the inflexions of the noun
sacerdos and the epithet fortis. Paragraph 62 is in the same
manner concerned with the fourth declension, and inflects manus.
Paragraph 63 is concerned with the fifth declension, and inflects
species. Paragraph 64 is concerned with categorizing nouns according
to how many cases a noun can take; for instance, unus is an
hexaptote because it may take six different case endings, whereas Musa is a triptote since it only has three distinct case endings: a, ae, am.

58, 10: "The nominative is not truly called a case because it "falls" from something else but because the other cases each succeedingly fall from the preceding one." The texts of Remigius and Sedulius agree with this method of exposition, whereas in the text of Pompeius we note: "et si hoc est, nominativus non erit casus, ea ratione, quia per ipsum non cadit nomen, sed sic est, quo modo fuerat. sed quamvis per ipsum non cadat, tamen per ipsum scimus, quid sit cadere."

19: In SED., 1, 270 - 274 we notice that the etymologies are given a detailed treatment with commentary; PC's text is only an excerpt. Muridac's text is also an abbreviated version of Sedulius. Remigius is unlike Muridac and PC because he too gives the etymologies separated widely from each other by commentary. An exception to this is in the Commentum Einsidlense (p. 243, 21): "Vocativus dicitur a uocando, ablatiuus ab auferendo."

20: None of the three sources cited [the C.M. 14488, 27r 15 - 18 appears in SED., 1, 264, 1 - 2] is alone the direct source.

59, 4: The ARS, 91, 35 - p. 92, 1 writes: "...: cuius genetiuus et datiuus singularis et nominatius et uocatius pluralis
in a e dipthongon desinunt, ... ." This is obviously so close to PC's text that one may be led to the conclusion that PC borrowed his material right from this place in the ARS. However, PC's Haec est cuius appears in the ARS, 91, 21. PRIS. INST., 447, 18 - 19 offers a treatment that indicates that PC more likely used a text similar to the ARS. Priscian writes, for instance: "Primae declinationis genetivus et dativus singularis in ae dipthongon desinit, ... ."

59, 4: accusatiuus ... correptam

The ARS, 92, 4 states that a is long. PRIS. INST., 447, 19 says: "..., accusativus in am, ...." It is therefore a problem to decide whom PC is following. However, PC's assumption is correct according to Ferdinand Sommer, Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre, p. 323 and Manu Leumann, Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, p. 266.

5: genetiuus in 'arum' correptam [scilicet, syllabam]

PC seems to indicate that the syllable um is short. Neither PRIS. INST., 447, 21 nor the ARS, 92, 5 say anything enlightening about this. DON., 378, 6 has "genetivum pluralem in rum syllabam mittunt." See also PROBUS CA., 4, 9; Leumann, p. 278 and W. Sidney Allen, Vox Latina, p. 74.

6: The ARS, 92, 6 has a simple observation that the dative and ablative plural ends in is. Probus does likewise. PRIS. INST., 447, 22 - 24, however, notes the same thing, and in addition
says: "...: differentiae causa notantur deabus ... animabus: ...."

However, Priscian's phrasing is too different from PC's to conclude that the latter made direct use of the former's text here.

59, 7: productam

The abbreviation for this on 6v 14 is ῥω, and I have expanded this abbreviation in all instances to productam by analogy with 59, 4 - 5 where one has in 'am' correptam, in 'a' productam, and in 'arum' correptam, which are indicated clearly in the ms. as such. Furthermore, on 7r 18 appears the abbreviation ῥω + ἀ for productam in connection with the phrase: "Accusativus in 'em' correptam uel in 'en' productam."

8 - 16: "In the nouns in which the feminine gender is discerned, if they be substantives, we put the ending bus not on the dative and ablative plural of the first declension like anima animabus lest, if we should say animis, we seem to mean animos and not animas. 9 Question. 10 In those nouns, in which the genders are discerned and in which they are noted as substantives it must be asked why they ought to end in bus while the moveable adjectival nouns, notwithstanding the fact that they change the dative and ablative to is in the masculine gender, make their feminine form in the same way. 11 Why is the same rule not observed in all the nouns so that, just as we say animorum animabus to make a differentiation, we say sanctorum
sanctabus? 12 The solution is praiseworthy. 13 Indeed adjectival nouns always adhere to 'fixed' nouns or are 'placed over them'; whence even they are called epitheta, that is, superposita. 14 Therefore it is evident that every doubt as to the discernment of their gender is lost: wherefore they are called epitheta, that is, superposita. 15 Wherefore there is no doubt as to the gender as long as they are explained along with the 'fixed' nouns like sanctis mulieribus sanctis uiris.

16 It is not always necessary for substantives to be joined to adjectival nouns because they signify substance and quality by themselves and explain themselves without the help of adjectives.

59, 17 – 20: "17 For this reason feminine substantives need to have some other letter by which they may be shown to be different from the masculine nouns. 18 Question. 19 Again one must ask why this change occurs in the feminine noun rather than in the masculine. 20 To this it is necessary to reply briefly that the female sex is always more easily moved than the masculine."

8: If one were to compare the y texts of Asperus and the ARS, he would notice that neither one of them resembles PC's treatment enough to be deemed a likely direct source.

10 – 14: On examination of the texts of Sedulius, Muridac, and the C.M. 14488 I have found that PC's text bears a close
enough resemblance in syntax and content to these texts but
not to one more than to the others. The method of contamination
remains unclear; for example, SED., 1, 305, 1 writes: "Quaerendum
est, cur ea nomina, in quibus genera sunt discernenda et sunt substanc-
tialia, dixit Donatus esse declinanda contra regulam superius
dictam, cum inveniamus adiectiva nomina mobilia, hanc rationem
non servantia, ut 'sanctus, sancta', 'bonus, bona'." This is
essentially the same text in Muridac and the C.M. 14488. MUR.
1586, 31 17 - 18 offers a reading, however, not in common with
the other three possible sources "... datium et ablatium
pluralem in his mutant ...." The other texts have mittant.

59, 15 - 17: The texts of Muridac, Sedulius, and the C.M. 14488
cited for this section appear to have a close interrelation with
each other and to the text of PC. In sentences 10 - 14 it seems
more likely that PC borrowed from sources close to these which,
with minor variations like "itaque pro re" in Sedulius and "hac
itaque pro re" in the C.M. 14488 and "ac pro re" in MUR. 7491 A
and "hac pro re" in MUR. 1586, 31 31, essentially offer the same
text.

20: Compare the thought in Lucius Annaeus Seneca,
"Ad Gallionem Fratrem de Remediis Fortuitorum," XVI, 3 in Otto
Rossbach's De Senecae Philosophi Librorum Recensione et Emenda-
tione ..., Bratislava, Koebner, 1888 (1969 Olms repr.), p. 108,
lines 11 - 12: "nihil est tam mobile quam feminarum voluntas, nihil tam vagum." Also, see the related idea expressed in Pseudo-Chrysostomus, "In Matthaeum Homilia # 44," in vol. 56, col. 880 of Migne's PG: "Sexus mulierum incautus et mollis est. Incautus quidem, quia non omnia quae videt, aut audit, cum sapientia et ratione considerat: mollis autem, quia facile flectitur, vel de malo ad bonum, vel de bono ad malum." (For the authenticity of the Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum, of which this homily is a part, see the SEJG, vol. 3, issue of 1961, p. 162.)

60, 10: Meredith, p. 31 - 34 discusses at length what cases were used by the Late Latin grammarians as criteria for discerning the declensions of nouns.

10: correptam

Note the special abbreviation for this on 7r 7 is corpt.

61, 5 - 7: Upon an examination of the three possible sources listed for this section, it appears that the ARS offers the most similar text. The C.B. 123 has only a text close to sentence 5. Priscian, however, has a treatment closely reminiscent of sentences 6 - 7, although it does not seem likely that PC borrowed directly from him; for example, Priscian writes in lines 15 - 17: "vocativus similis est nominativo, ut hic rex et o rex. in Graecis autem nominibus licet et vocativo esse Graeco, sicut supra dictum est, ut o Tiberi pater."
61, 6: 'en' productam

This assumption appears in none of the possible sources. See the remark by Sommer who on p. 373 in his discussion of the Latin accusative forms of the third declension points out the Homeric Greek form ζην related to diem. Leumann, p. 67 also discusses this point. However, it is too hazardous to assert that PC was familiar with Greek first-hand since all of his Greek words are written in Roman letters and appear in possible sources like Remigius, the Ars Anonyma Bernensis, and Sedulius. It is better to suppose that this phrase was borrowed from a source.

62, 6: datiuus ... productam

Priscian just states that the dative ends in ui. However, PC must be speaking about the i. (See Sommer, p. 387.)

8: causa differentiae

See Hofmann and Szantyr, p. 133 who note that causa followed by the genitive is found in isolated instances in Ennius, Terence and in Cicero. Only in Late Latin does it become more frequent.

63, 7: genetiuuus in 'erum' correpuntam

The ARS has "... genetiuuus pluralis in rum correpunt desinit, ...." (See Sommer, p. 382.) This makes it clearer that PC is referring to the last vowel in the instances of arum, and also in <ium for the fourth declension, ui for the fourth declension, and ium for the third declension where these occur.
Aside from sentence 2 which is a pure Donatus lemma except for nominum, it appears that PC's text is more likely to have been borrowed from a text like SED., 1, 280, 1 - 2 & 5 than from MUR. 7491 A, 16R 27. Muridac writes: "Sunt autem formas casuales VI. Formæ dicuntur imaginæ VI. VI autem ad numerum casuum quot habeant tot varietates." Sedulius, on the other hand, offers: "SUNT ENIM FORMAE CASUALES SEX. FORMAE dicuntur imaginæ.... Sex enim dicuntur ad numerum casuum, eo quot tot habeant varietates, quot sunt casus."

These two paragraphs, being a discussion of the noun secundum Donatum, conclude PC's treatment on the noun. Although PC states in 65, 1 that this discussion is according to Donatus, he really begins secundum Priscianum. However, he uses Donatus in 65 in enumerating how many accidents a noun has and in dealing with the bipartite nature of qualitas. He also uses Priscian for material in his discussion of qualitas, but, as sentences 8 - 10 and 12 - 13 indicate, it appears that Priscian was not borrowed directly, although the ideas are intact. Furthermore, a whole series of questions concerning gender, number, figure, case, and declension in sentences 30 - 37 of paragraph 65 appear related to a text in Priscian's Partitiones. Three other 'cf.' possible sources from where PC might have taken material for 65 are Pompeius, Remigius, and the ARS. The reference to Pompeius concerns the definition of a proper noun. The reference to Remigius concerns
a Donatus lemma which in sentences 16 - 19, because of Quomodo appearing in PC and Remiges but not in Donatus, may indicate that Remigius or a text like his was used by PC. The 'cf.' reference to the ARS concerns the question on what comparatio is (sentence 24).

Paragraph 65 concerns on the whole a general discussion of the noun. PC briefly outlines the accidents of the noun, what qualitates is, the nature and definition of comparatio and its etymology, what nouns may be compared; and he concludes 65 with a series of questions from 30 - 34.

Paragraph 66, none of which has any references to Donatus, is concerned with why PC treats the noun first. He states that he does so because as soon as someone is born, a name is given to him and that every creature is known by its name. This is in the best tradition of Isidore of Seville. Furthermore, a noun signifies substance and is worthier of action.

65, 8 - 10: According to PRIS. PT., 464, 34 species is a synonymn for qualitas.

23: Although it is evident that PC did not copy SED., 1, 126, 1 and paragraph 136, 3 or POMPEIUS, 150, 36 - p. 15, 1, the text of SED., 1, 126, 1 has a greater similarity; "Sciendum autem quot illa nomina quae substantiam significant non comparantur, quia incrementa, id est augmenta, vel diminutiones accipere non possunt."
23: Quia ... augmentum
Although [Sergius] uses the word augmentum, it does not seem likely that PC used a text similar to his, nor to Remigius's.

23: nec ... adiectiium
None of the Grammatici Latini cited disagree on this point.

25: "A demonstration of likeness of similar or dissimilar things." Both Sedulius and Remigius define assimulatio (or assimilatio) as a comparatio. In the Commentum Einsidlense one reads the remark: ". . . assimilatio, i. coaequatio, eo quod assimilando unum alteri praefert et ab eo, quod est comparo, i. coaequo, uenit comparatio."

66, 4 - 5: It appears that Clemens's text is the least related; that of Sedulius and the C.M. 14488 are nearly the same and show closer similarity with PC's text than the Clemens one does. However, because Sedulius has: "Ideo scilicet, quia omnis ..." and the C.M. 14488 omits the quia, there is the possibility that PC used a text more similar to Sedulius's than to the C.M. 14488.

4: Ideo ... cognoscitur
Vergilius Grammaticus has the wording: "... nis [the ms. is deficient here] creatura ex nomine suo cognoscitur: ...," whereas we read in the ARS: ". . . , quia ex nomine suo omnis creatura cognoscitur." It seems, therefore, that the former text has a closer relationship with PC's than the ARS.
66, 4: nisi ... perit

None of the possible sources listed for this phrase has the exact phrasing of "nisi enim scierit quis rei nomen, ...." All have either scieris nomen or nomen scieris.

9: Sedulius and the C.M. 14488 state: "Et ideo verbum quae principalis pars est praecedit, quia maior est substantia quam sit actio." PC's wording is somewhat different than that found in any of the sources noted.

67, : This paragraph concerns why pronouns were invented—to avoid any boredom on the reader's part from a constant repetition of the noun. PC departs from his usual style of introduction at this point. This raises the question as to whether or not this section was originally found somewhat later in the text. The purpose of this paragraph is to show the importance of the pronoun as a stylistic alternative to the repetition of the noun.

2: Malsachanus, the ARS, Clemens, the C.M. 14488 and Sedulius have related texts to this sentence (only Sedulius has a text related to 1 and 2). Having examined all of these texts I have concluded that PC borrowed most heavily from texts like Sedulius, then the ARS and Malsachanus (whose texts are the same), and then Clemens. The other texts cited do not have the Biblical quotations.
68 - 76: This section concerns the pronoun secundum Priscianum.

68: This opening paragraph begins in the order of the Partitiones although there are similar treatments (for sentences 2 - 4) from the C.M. 14737, Paris 7558, and the C.B. 207 that ask what part of speech ego is. None of them, however, exactly give PC's text. Priscian asks what part of speech tu is. Then PC defines the pronoun and outlines its functions (sentence 7):

"It is a part of speech that is a substitute for a noun, it almost only signifies a noun, and sometimes takes a person."

Sentences 8 - 9 concern the etymology of pronomem, namely, that it comes from pro and nomine. Sentences 10 - 13 outline the accidents of the pronoun. Sentences 14 - 29 are a series of questions and answers about the type of each particular accident or attribute ego takes. Priscian and the C.M. 14737 represent the greatest portion of possible sources for this last section.

9: Although all the 'v.' sources cited for this section state that the pronoun is so called because it is placed pro nomine, it is clear that PC has not directly copied any of these.

17: Consentius observes that the Greek division of nouns is according to prima positio and derivatio. PRIS. PT., 491, 14 - 17 mentions that ego is primitivum and meus derivativum.

69: Here PC is concerned first of all with the declension of the primitive pronouns, which treatment is very close to Donatus.
Sentences 8 - 11 deal with the first *modus* of pronouns — those whose genitive singular ends in *i* or *is* and whose dative ends in *i* like *ego*, *tu* and *sui*. Sentence 12 states that the second *modus* of pronouns entails those that take the genitive singular in *ius* and the dative in *i*. The rest of this paragraph consists of declensions of pronouns that follow the *secundus modus*.

69, 7: This phrase appears in the Donatus ms. M, which, or a ms. in its tradition, PC might very well have regarded.

14: PRIS., 3, 2, 20 - 21 observes the very contrary, that these three pronouns cannot take the vocative. However, in vol. 2, 188, 21 he lists *une* and on p. 189, 2 the ancient form *sole*. Probus lists the form *tote* on p. 136, 14, and on p. 101, 23 and 27 while not stating directly that * unus* and * solus* take the vocative, nevertheless observes that they are nouns and after the dative, decline like *taurus*.

20: "ab hi[7]s."
The spelling *hii* appears in MALSACHANUS, 174, 25. Thurow (p. 139) notes that in the 12th century forms like *hii* and *hiis* were written thus but pronounced as if spelt with one *i*.

70, 2: "The third mode of pronouns is that which through all genders, cases and number follows the rule of the moveable nouns ...."
70, 6: "Pay heed to the same thing." *Intende* may have the meaning of 'Pay attention' and takes the dative. (See the T.L.L., 7, pt. 1, 2113 - 2114.)

71, : The fourth *modus pronominis* entails those like *nostrostratis* that follow throughout the third declension of the nouns. Although Priscian offers a similar treatment, it does not appear that PC borrowed directly from him. PC does not mention that the final syllable in *nostras* takes the circumflex, for example. Also, Priscian is not the source for the phrase "remoto ... alio."

2: *remoto ... alio*

"No other case is absent except the vocative."

I have emended *uocatiuom* on 8v 14 to *uocatiuo* to agree with *remoto*, which thereby makes an ablative absolute phrase.

72, : In this paragraph PC states that there are fifteen pronouns in Latin-eight primitive and seven derived. He discusses the means by which *meus, noster, tuus* and *uester* are derived. This treatment is in accordance with the ideas of Remigius and Priscian and ultimately to Dionysius Thrax. In sentences 12 - 13 PC observes that only *tu, noster, meus*, and *nostras* can take a vocative.

1 - 3: Dionysius was the first to give the idea of primitive and derived pronouns.
72, 5 - 11: Although PC is in general agreement with Priscian as to the formation of the derived pronouns, PC's detailed account of the morphological changes like the i in nostri becoming ster is so far not to be found in any manuscript or author in the Grammatici Latini used in this research. Moreover, the observation in sentence 7 at face value appears absurd. PC must mean that stri in nostri becomes ster; otherwise, i changed into ster gives nostrster. Sentences 8 - 9 appear, however, plausible. (See Leumann, p. 220 and 284.)

13: Remigius gives tu and mi as the only possible vocatives among the pronouns. Leumann, p. 233 observes that nostras is a masculine denominative, but says nothing as to whether it may take a vocative. However, according to Sergius PC is correct about nostras.

73, : "Question. 2 Nevertheless it can be asked since the first person, that is ego, mei, does not have a vocative, why does it have one in the nominative? 3 The first person in the singular does not have a vocative because no one calls himself inasmuch as he who is always present does not need any calling. 4 Why therefore in the plural number does it have the vocative? 5 Because of the grouping together, that is, because it is no longer alone but it is called together with others as for example o nos. 6 Question. 7 Deservedly one even ought to ask by what reason the possessive pronouns which are derived
from the first person take the vocative when the first person itself does not at all take this case, for meus mei which is derived from ego makes the vocative 0 mi? 8 Solution. 9 We must know that the possessive pronoun of the first person has the vocative because its vocative makes a transition to the second person as when I say: "O mi filii, o mi pater." 10 Likewise another question. 11 Since, moreover, it is the nature of every nominative ending in eus to terminate the vocative in double e like ligneus O ligneew, why does this pronoun meus mei not make the vocative 0 mee? 12 Solution. 13 For two reasons. 14 The first reason indeed is that the ancients used to bring forth the nominative in ius. 15 Wherefore they would make the vocative in i. 16 The second reason is truly this. 17 The moderns while saying meus in the nominative, although they ought to have made the vocative 0 mee, changed the two short e's into a long i and say 0 mi for the sake of euphony. 18 Ew means bonum (in Latin); 'good' in Greek, and phonew means sonoritas 'sound.' 19 Thus for the sake of euphony, that is of bona sonoritas 'good sound,' we say in the vocative not mee but mi."

73, 2 - 9: The C.M. 14488 and Sedulius have the longest related texts, but neither is more closely related than the other, and neither seems to have been copied directly or completely in the text of PC.
73, 2: Muridac has: "Quare prima persona non habet uocatium casum?" The same sentence appears in Sedulius and in the C.M. 14488.

3: Remigius appears to offer a text which has similar content to PC's sentence, although in a vague manner: "Sciendum est, quod prima persona in singularitate deficit in uocatium, quia nemo potest se ipsum uocare, ...."

5: Remigius appears to offer a text which has similar content. It seems, however, that neither Priscian, Charisius nor Diomedes offers a discussion more related to PC's than the other two.

7: The Muridac text cited is the same as in the C.M. 14488. It may appear significant, however, that the MUR. 1586, 38° 3 has quod derivatur which PC has, whereas the 7491 A has quo derivatur.

9: From a comparison of the texts of MUR. 7491 A and 1586 it seems that the former offers a text closer to PC's than the latter. Furthermore, that of the 7491 A is the same as that in the C.M. 14488, except that the 7491 A has ideo uocatium habere instead of the grammatically correct ideo uocatium habere in all the other references concerned.

11: Neither the C.M. 14488 nor the two Muridac texts, although offering treatments similar to PC's, seem likely to have
been directly used by PC. However, the 1586 and the 14488 have
lignes 0 ligne in common as opposed to ligneus ligne of the
7491 A. Sedulius also has lignes 0 ligne. The texts of
Muridac are nearly the same for sentences 11 - 17 as those of
Sedulius and the C.M. 14488, none of them obviously offering a
treatment parallel in content and style. But PC's assumptions
agree with them. The other 'y.' texts cited for 11 - 17 have texts
that agree in ideas with PC but which approximate PC's treatment
less closely than Muridac, Sedulius and the C.M. 14488.

74, : "Question. 2 Why do the pronouns tuus tua tuum
lack the vocative while their primitive pronoun, that is to say,
tu has the vocative? 3 Solution. 4 No pronoun has the
vocative except that to which the first person speaks or to
which the second person of the verb can be joined. 5 For neither
does he who is speaking nor he about whom one speaks takes the
vocative. 6 Truly on this account the possessives of the second
person produce the vocative because that which is said is transmitted
to the third person, for when I say tuus, either seruus, or equus,
or something else is understood. 7 Another question. 8 Likewise
one ought to ask why the pronoun ego has two genitives or why mei
is a genitive of it since in appearance the letters have no
similarity at all. 9 Solution. 10 We must know that the
nominative, that is to say, ego lacked the oblique cases according
to the ancients. 11 Its oblique cases also were without the
nominative. 12 The moderns, however, upon seeing that they agreed in meaning, although they were dissimilarly written, joined them together in such a manner. 13 Therefore it even has two genitives because the genitive mei tells about the matter which is possessed in the present time. 14 Mis, however, ought to be said concerning that which is to come. 15 Although nos in ancient times did not have a singular, just as ego did not have a plural, it pleased the moderns that ego and nos joined together would be considered as one pronoun."

74, 4 - 5: Having examined the 'cf.' references to Sedulius, the C.M. 14488, and MUR. 7491 A and 1586 I have come to the conclusion that they approximate PC's treatment in the following degree (the most important coming first) : the C.M. 14488, Sedulius, MUR. 1586, MUR. 7491 A.

4: uel ... adiungi

The related text of Priscian is not as close to PC's comparable phrase as the 'cf.' references cited for 4 - 5; Priscian says: "..., possessiva pronomina, quia secundae adiungi non possunt, carent vocativo."

6: According to Sedulius the possessives of the second person do not take the vocative. PC's assumption, however, is in accordance with the C.M. 14488 and the two Muriad mss., all of which have nearly the same text as SED., 1, 401, 4: "Possessivum
vero secundae personae idcirco non admittit vocativum, quia transit vox ad tertiam personam; ...." Everybody else omits the non, thereby offering an assumption in harmony with PC's. PC is unlike the Muridac mss. which omit personam and merely have ad tertium. Sedulius continues: "...; cum dico 'tuus', subaudis enim 'servus', aut 'equus', aut quodlibet." The Muridac mss. have subauditur as PC, whereas the C.M. 14488 has subaudis; but the Muridac mss. both lack aut quodlibet common to Sedulius and the C.M. 14488. MUR. 1586 is slightly closer than the 7491 A in that it has aut equus as opposed to the latter's uel equus.

74, 8 - 14: As far as sentence 8 is concerned, SED., 1, 414, 1 offers: "Interrogandum tamen videtur, cur duos habeat genetivos hoc pronomen quod est 'ego', vel, quare sit 'mei' genetivus illius, cum in superficie nullam videatur habere communionem."

This is the same text in the other texts cited for this passage, except that the MUR. 1586 text is much more readable and less abbreviated than the 7491 A and therefore would have been easier for a copyist to read. Sentence 10 up to ego is very close to similar texts in the sources cited; Sedulius writes: "Sed scienendum est nobis istum nominativum, quod est 'ego', ...." The C.M. 14488 has the same. MUR. 1586 omits quod est; and the 7491 A omits quod est ego. The remainder of sentence 10 does not appear to have been borrowed directly from these sources. Sentence 12 seems closely related to Sedulius who offers: "Videntes enim moderni concordare illos in sensu, quamvis dissimiles forent littera, coniunxerunt illos taliter." The C.M. 14488 which has tamen
sliter for taliter appears slightly less related to PC's treatment. However, in the C.M. 14488 for sentence 12 one reads litteratura which PC and the Muridac mss. have. One ought to dismiss the idea, moreover, that the Muridac mss. were used by PC for sentence 12 because they substitute antiqui for moderni. Sentences 13 - 14 are close in syntax and vocabularly to Sedulius, the C.M. 14488 and the Muridac mss. which all have in common with each other the same text with uninteresting variations, but PC's text in these two sentences is not close enough for us to conclude that he borrowed directly from any of them.

74, 8: I have translated in superficie as 'in appearance' because of a definition given in the ARS, 63, 35 - p. 64, 1: "Nomen quomodo definitur secundum sonum, hoc est secundum superficiem."

14: Vlahn (p. 133) makes note of the formes réduites of the possessive adjectives: sus, mus, mi, ti, etc. which apparently account for the development of the French possessive adjectives. These reduced forms are attested by VERG. GRAM., 47.

75, : "Another question. 2 In like manner it seems necessary to ask why the pronoun sui has not a nominative. 3 Solution. 4 For this reason sui cannot take a nominative because if we should say suus, there would be no difference between the primitives and the derivatives. 5 Likewise if we should say sus, it would not be easy to decide whether it is a noun or a
pronoun. 6 If indeed one said *sís*, it would be thought of as the second person of a verb. 7 It must be noted, however, that there have been those who said that the nominative of this pronoun, that is, *sui* should be *sí*. 8 But because doubt would remain when it would be a pronoun or a conjunction, such an opinion may be deservedly displeasing."

75, 2: Sedulius gives: "Quaeritur, quare non habent nominativum; poterat enim facere 'is, sui', vel 'si, sui'." Muridac offers: "Querendum est quare non habent nominativum. Potuit enim habere 'si sui' aut 'his sui.' " PC's text, however, appears more likely to be an excerpted version of the text cited in Priscian: "Quaeritur igitur, cur, ..., 'sui', ..., non habeat nominativum?"

4: *potuit*
See Blaise (*Manuel du latin chrétien*, p. 135 - 136) for the gnomic aorist usage of the perfect tense.

7: *fore*
Nunn (p. 62) states that the employment of the tenses of the infinitive is not too precise in Church Latin, but on p. 63 he proceeds to say that the future infinitive is used when the time of the main verb precedes that of the future. Here it might be said as far as the translation *should be* is concerned, that this fact does indicate a futurity. Hofmann and Szantyr (p. 312) note
that the future infinitive with the meaning of soll developed frequently since Classical times.

76, : "Question. 2 Is there any difference between the genitive of the primitive and of the possessive of these pronouns mei, tui, sui, nostri, and uestri? 3 Solution. 4 There surely is, because the genitive of the primitive signifies simple possession; that of the possessive, however, shows double possession. 5 For if I say mei est seruus for meus est seruus 'the slave is mine,' I show simple possession. 6 If on the other hand I state mei filii est seruus 'the slave belongs to my son,' certainly double possession has been shown if my possession which consists of my son also consists in having the slave of my son."

2: On one hand the phrasing of Muridac appears to resemble PC's more closely than the other possible sources cited for this sentence: "Estne aliqua differentia inter genitium primitium quod est 'mei' et diriuitium quod est 'mei'?' SED., 1, 365, 1, who has the same text as the C.M. 14488 with uninteresting variants, has a less closely related syntax at the beginning but then a syntax and content more similar to PC's: "Quae est differentia inter genetivum primitivi et possessivi 'mei, tui, sui, nostri, vestri'?' PRIS., 3, 173, 21 differs from Sedulius only in that he begins: "Quaeritur, quae sit differentia ...."
77 - 91: The pronoun according to Donatus

77, : As may be seen from the *Fontes*, this paragraph begins another discussion of the pronoun but *secundum Donatum*. However, the part *secundum Donatum* is sustained for only the first few sentences of this paragraph. The remaining content is based on sources other than Donatus. Other paragraphs up to 91 also begin with material from Donatus like 79 - 80, 83 - 84, and 86 - 91. Of course in these other paragraphs Donatus is not the only source. The entire section (77 - 91) is in the *lemma* style of commentary. In this paragraph PC, having asked what a pronoun is, defines it adding why it nearly signifies a noun and why it sometimes receives a person. He then mentions the six accidents of the pronoun, and finishes by discussing *qualitas* and *genus*.

5 - 7: The C.M. 14737 gives: "Cur dixit 'pene'? Quia nomen plenam orationem facere potest sine pronomine. Pronomen uero sine nomine numquam." The text in the *Commentum Einsidlense* has a less closely related text than the C.M. 14737, except that the former (like PC) has *Quare* and not *Cur*.

11: "On account of the infinite pronouns which do not have person but ask about essence like *quis quae quod*." Of the sources cited for this sentence, Audax appears to offer the closest treatment: "...; infinitum, quod certam personam non habet, ut quis quae quod." The two texts of Remigius do not say that
infinite pronouns ask about essence but after persons, and
both of them use the word inquirunt.

77, 31: "Because inasmuch as a grammatical connection occurs
with an unmoved noun, adjective and a pronoun, before one
arrives at the pronoun, it is already known through the adjective
its pre-determined gender."

Sedulius offers a more similar treatment than
Remigius, for the former writes: "..., quando contractio sit
ex fixo et adiectivo nomine et pronomine, antequam perveniatur
ad pronomen, iam cognoscitur per adiectivum cuius sit generis
fixum." REM., 32, 11 - 14 offers: "..., quia si feceris
constructionem ex fixo nomine et adiectivo et pronomine, antequam
pervenias ad pronomen, per adiectivum intellegis, cuius generis
sit fixum."

32: The quotation about the flying eagle appears closer
to the text of Remigius and of Sedulius than to that of Priscian.
The texts of Remigius and Sedulius are the same except for minor
variations in syntax.

78, : PC brings up the question of whether we ought to
believe Donatus who says that qualis, talis and quis are pronouns
or Priscian who states that they are nouns. Donatus, PC reports,
bases his teaching on the fact that they do not need articles.
His teacher Didymus also held this theory. In opposition to this
idea PC brings up the argument that a declension cannot alter a part of speech, for if this were so, many pronouns would be considered nouns and vice versa. Therefore, it is better to adhere to Priscian's teaching.


79, : This short paragraph, derived from Donatus with the exception of the rubric, concerns how many categories of number there are among the pronouns – singular and plural. Moreover, again PC has the spelling hii for hi. (See Thurot, p. 139 and my commentary to 69, 20.)

80, : PC observes that there are two figurae of pronouns: the simple like quis and the compound like quisque. Compound pronouns are declined according to that part of the word, as in the nouns, which is in the nominative case. There seems to be a contradiction here with paragraph 78 where he stated that it is better to follow Priscian by admitting that quis is a noun. Here it is stating that quis is a pronoun in a type of lemma from Donatus. In sentences 8 – 11 he enumerates several pronouns compounded with quis and qui. There so far does not seem to be a close source for sentence 9, although Clemens lists all of them except quisputas. Sentences 12 – 16 deal with the compounded pronoun idem. This pronoun is formed from two shortened forms, and when it (PC does not state here that the i is involved) is
masculine, a lengthening occurs; but when *idem* is neuter, it is short. He then discusses at some detail in what gender *idem* is naturally lengthened or shortened. In the neuter gender he discusses how *idem* is by nature shortened.

In the masculine gender it is lengthened against its nature. These ideas are in accordance with those of *SED.*, 1, 393. He states in sentence 16 that *idem* becomes shortened. (See *Leumann*, p. 285). *SED.*, 1, 393, 3 observes that this shortening in the neuter is according to nature. Further explanation of this comes in the next paragraph.

80, 13: The Sedulius text offers the closest treatment to PC's. Practically the same text as Sedulius's exists in the C.M. 14488 which seems to offer the second closest similarity to PC's treatment. The two Muridac mss. have essentially the same text common to each other with uninteresting variations but which offer a text the least related to PC's.

14: For this sentence it is the C.M. 14488 that gives the closest text, followed by Sedulius, then the text of Muridac in both mss.

15: The text of *SED.*, 1, 393, 6 - 7 offers a treatment closest to PC's: "...; in masculino vero genere contra naturam produci, sicut est:

Vivo nocendo quidem, sed me manet exitus idem."
This verse should be a key to identifying just exactly what material formed part of the common store of mediaeval grammatical comment.

Muridac offers only: "In masculino autem contra naturam productum."

The C.M. 14488, 45\textsuperscript{V} 2 - 3 gives: "... in masculino contra naturam orum \textit{sic} id est productum." Both Remigius and Sedulius quote the line of poetry exactly as PC.

81, : "How, therefore, shall we be able to know whether these things are true? 2 Easily indeed if we give heed to the composition of the same pronoun. 3 For when \textit{idem} is masculine, it is composed from \textit{is} and \textit{demum}. 4 And it is clear to all that the syllable \textit{is} placed by itself is shortened. 5 However, when it is neuter, it is composed from \textit{id} and \textit{demum}. 6 Wherefore it is apparent that it is naturally shortened in the neuter but in the masculine lengthened against its nature. 7 Question. 8 Why is it lengthened? 9 Solution. 10 In order that there be a distinction between the masculine and the neuter. 11 Question. 12 If therefore \textit{idem} in the masculine remains compounded from \textit{is} and \textit{demum}, why is it not so rendered to be pronounce \textit{isdem}? 13 Solution. 14 Truly for the sake of euphony the \textit{s} is taken away because \textit{idem} sounds better than \textit{isdem} or because the letter \textit{d} in the nominative case cannot be placed in the middle except between two vowels. 15 And for this reason the \textit{s} is rejected."

Having examined all the texts of the 'cf.' references cited I have come to the conclusion that Sedulius's treatment in 393, 4 -
395 offers a text that bears the greatest similarity to PC's.

Sedulius, for example, in 395 writes: "...: 'd' littera in nominativo casu, in media parte ponit non potest, nisi inter duas vocales; et ob hanc causam proicitur inde 's'." The C.M. 1448 has proiect for proicitur; MUR. 7491 A, 23\(^V\) 23 has: "Ob hanc causam producitur, inde 's.' " The MUR. 1586 omits even the inde 's.'

81, 6: I have added contra before naturam because this is what is written in all the 'cf.' sources cited for this sentence and because being omitted would have the author contradicting himself.

8: Vt quid

Hofmann and Szantyr (p. 460) point out that this form of introducing a question in Late Latin can also be found in Cicero and is often found in Church Latin since the writing of the Itala and the Vulgate Bibles under the influence of the Greek ευρισκω.

82, 2: "Likewise there are other compounded pronouns like egomet. It is composed from ego and met which is a syllabic addition. Therefore it is declined on the nominative part, and met remains indeclinable through all the cases. The same applies to nosmet in the plural. The genitive plural nostrum or nostri does not receive the syllable met lest it be thought
to be a possessive.  6 Tu also in the nominative does not receive met lest it be thought to be a verb.  7 The question is laudable.  8 It is asked why Donatus calls these pronouns compound since no part of speech can rightly be called compound except that which can again be made whole.  9 For they do not have the greater meaning except only so much as the simple words have, especially since other scholars do not call that part of speech compound but rather say that it is a syllabic addition, which additions were invented by ancient poets because of the decorum of the art of metrics.  10 Thus it must be known that Donatus says that these pronouns are compound because they express a similitude of other parts and in a certain way seem to have a sound richer and more beautiful than the simple words."

82,  2: The text of Remigius is closer to PC's than Priscian's is. Remigius writes: "M. E g o m e t, compositum est ab ego et met, quae est adjectio syllabarum." Priscian offers: "...: met namque adjectio syllabica est in ego,..."

6: It does not appear that PC borrowed from either of the two Remigius texts directly. The Commentum Einsidlense has: "... non facit 'tumet' in nominativo, ne uerbum esse putetur; ...", The other Remigius text has the same except for putetur esse.
82, 8-10: Among all the 'cf.' references cited for this section, it appears that the the C.M. 14488 has the closest text to PC's, followed then by Sedulius and Muridac (his two texts are identical with uninteresting variations). For example, the 14488 writes: "Queritur cur Donatus hæc pronomina composita appellat ... cum composita nulla pars recte dici posset nisi ea quae denuo potest uideri retintegrari [sic]." Sedulius offers: "Quaeritur, cur Donatus hæc pronomina COMPOSITA appellat, ..., cum composita nulla pars recte dici possit, nulla quae denuo redintegrari potest." Muridac begins, on the other hand, with: "Mirum igitur uidetur cur Donatus hæc pronomina composita appellat cum composita nulla pars dicitur nisi quæ ad integritatem potest redigi."

8: ualeat ... dici

Blaise (Manuel du latin chrétien, p. 185) points out the Late Latin usage of valeo plus the infinitive to mean possum.

83, : In this paragraph which begins secundum Donatum PC discusses the three persons of the pronoun. He brings up the argument that there logically can only be one person—the first person—who talks by himself. The first person talks about the third to the second; and while he is talking, no other person is heard. PC notes that as soon as the second or third person begins speaking, he becomes the first person. He gives, however, the explanation of why we call the second and first persons so: out of a transference
from the first person and the conversation the first person has with the others. Moreover, another definition given is historical. In former times actors used to use masks made of bark to represent those persons whom they intended to insult. **Persona** is thus called from the hollowness of the mask, for the more concave it was, the greater the sound of the voice. However, according to the substance and not the voice, a **persona** 'mask' or 'character' is the individual presentation of each matter. The first person is that which talks about itself alone or with others. The second person is addressed by the first; and the third is the subject of conversation between the first and the second persons. (Cf. the etymology of **persona** in Ernout and Meillet, p. 500.)

83, 6 – 9: SED., I, 398, seems to have a text more similar to PC's than the C.M. 14488 is; for example, Sedulius writes: "... nec alia sonat praeter primam." The C.M. 14488, 45\(^V\) 26 has: "... nec alia sonat praeter illam." Muridac has the same reading as Sedulius. Sedulius and Muridac with reference to sentence 7 (quoting SED., I, 398, 2) have: "'Persona' enim dicitur, eo quod per se sonat." The C.M.14488,45\(^V\)22-23 replaces **enim** with **autem** and **sonat** with **sona**. However, SED., I, 398, 1 appears, with reference to sentence 6, to give the closest text: "Cur dixit TRES, cum non sit amplius quam una?" The C.M. 14488, 45\(^V\) 21 – 22 offers the identical text with the exception of the omitting of **non** and the addition of **persona** after **una**. MUR. 749l A,
23 gives a text less related to PC's than Sedulius's is:
"Cur dixit tres cum non sit amplius nisi una?" As far as the
reference to Remigius in sentence 7 goes, his text does not seem
to be closer than the others for he offers the same treatment
as SED., 1, 398, 2 except that he omits enim.

83, 10 - 13: On the whole SED., 1, 550, 3 - 5 gives a text
more similar to PC's than Muridac's is; for example, Sedulius
writes: "Omnis denique persona, quae per se loquitur prima est,
nec alia valet emittere vocem nisi prima. Nam si secunda vel
tertia coeperit loqui statim erit prima. "MUR. 7491 A, 28
2 - 3 gives: "Omnis persona que loquitur prima est, nec alia
ualeat emittere uocem nisi prima. Nam si coeperit loqui persona
secunda ad tertiam, statim erit prima." However, in regards to
collucutionem of 13, SED., 1, 550, 5 has locutionem as opposed
to collucutionem in MUR. 7491 A, 28 5 and conlocutionem in MUR.
1586, 43 24.

22: The C.M. 14488 offers: "Tertia iam de qua loquitur
minus quam finita ostenditur eo quod sermo inter prima [sic] et
secundam personam fiat." REM., 34, 2 - 3 gives: "..., tertia
vero, de qua prima suum sermonem dirigit ad secundam." REM. EIN.,
202, 6 - 7 has: "..., tertia quoque, ad quam prima suum sermonem
dirigit." It therefore appears that PC is using a text more
like that of the 14488.
84: In this paragraph PC, beginning secundum Donatum asks how many cases there are, then answers that there are six in the pronouns just as there are in the nouns and participles. He brings up the question of why Donatus says there are six cases when all the pronouns do not have six. "For the first and third persons cannot have more than five since the vocative cannot be found in them." The solution to this problem is simply that Donatus, as PC relates, made a general statement based on the six cases of one part of speech, that is the nouns. The rest of the paragraph consists of declensions of various pronouns that appear to be similar to a treatment by Donatus.

6: This sentence appears exactly as it is in SED., 1, 403, 2. The C.M. 14488, 46^v 16 - 17 offers a less related treatment: "Cur dixit habere pronomen sex casus cum non omnia pronomina sex casus habeant?" MUR. 7491 A, 24^r 14 - 15 offers the least related 'cf.' text: "Cur dixit sex cum non omnia pronomina habeant sex casus?"

7: The text of SED., 1, 403, 3, which is the same in the 14488, gives a treatment more similar to PC's than to Priscian's. Sedulius writes: "Prima enim et tertia persona, sicut Priscianus dicit, plus quinque casibus habere non possunt, quippe cum vocativus in eis nullo modo possit inveniri, ...." Priscian has the same text for "quippe ... inveniri" but not for
the rest: "Et prima quidem persona et tertia plus quinque casibus habere non possunt, ...."

84, 9: Muridac only has: "Sed Donatus totum pro parte posuit." Sedulius, however, offers a more extended treatment like PC's: "Pro parte enim totum posuit, quia, quamvis non omnia pronomina sex casus habeant, tamen sunt quaedam quae sex casus recipiunt."

15: This sentence, which does not form part of the Donatus text as established by Keil, nevertheless has close resemblance to a similar one added by a second hand to the Donatus ms. L. (See DON., 357, 20.*

85, : "Question. 2 Why are these pronouns called finite?
3 Solution. 4 Because they define a certain person, as for instance, when I say, ego, you cannot understand any other person unless myself who am directing the speech. 5 The same can be said about tu tui. 6 Ille, however, although according to Donatus is considered to be one of the finites, at other times it is less than finite. 7 For when it is spoken to mean somebody who is at hand, then it is finite like: "Videsne illum?" 'Do you see him?' 8 If, however, it is mentioned with respect to somebody absent, it is less than finite.
9 Question. 10 It is asked why even the first and second persons do not need various words. 11 Because among themselves
they are always present and demonstrative. 12 Truly the third
person at times is demonstrative like hic, iste, at times relative
like is, ipse, at times present like iste, at times absent like
ille."

85, 4 - 5: SED., 1, 350, 1 - 2 gives: "Finita dicuntur
pronomina quae definit certam personam, ut puta quando dico
'ego': non potes aliquem intelligere alium, sed me qui loquor.
Item 'tu' quando dico, non alium intelligere nisi te ad quem
dirigo sermonem." The same treatment as Sedulius gives exists
in the C.M. 14488, 40r 23 ff.

[Sergius] offers: "finita dicuntur, quae definit
certas personas, quando dico ego, me tantum intelligis; quando
do tu, te tantum intelligis." It seems therefore that PC is
using a source more similar to that of Sedulius/the C.M. 14488.
POMPEIUS, 202, 19 - 22 offers a treatment more similar than
that of [Sergius] but bearing slightly less close resemblance
than that of Sedulius/the C.M. 14488: "finitum autem dicitur
pronomen, quando definit personam ut puta ego: quando dico ego,
non potes aliquem intelligere alium, sed me, qui loquor. item tu
quando dico, non potes intelligere alium, sed ipsum solum, ad
quem dirigis sermonem." From among the 'v.' sources cited for
these two sentences, Charisius is the most reminiscent with:
"finita est quae notat certam personam, ut ego tu ille."
85, 6: SED., 1, 350, 3 gives: "'Ille' vero quamvis secundum Donatum inter finita computetur pronomina, tamen aliquotiens accidit ut minus quam finitum sit pronomem." The C.M. 14488 has the same text as Sedulius except that it omits pronomina and the phrase following accidit. It therefore appears that PC is modelling on a text more in the tradition of Sedulius than of the 14488.

7 - 8: SED., 1, 350, 5 - 6 offers: "Ex hoc scilicet quando de praesente loquimur, tunc finitum est pronomem, ut 'videsne te illum?'. Si vero de absente sit relatio, minus quam finitum est, ...." On one hand PC is closer to Sedulius here than to the 14488. Sedulius and PC have de praesente, whereas the 14488 omits the de. However, the 14488 as PC omits the tu before illum. Furthermore, while Sedulius has sit, the 14488 has fit, and PC has fiat. Pompeius offers: "..., quando de praesente loquimur, tunc finitum sit pronomem, si autem de absente sit relatio, minus quam finitum sit." This phrase from Pompeius appears to be closely related to the treatments in Sedulius, the 14488 and PC, that is, it seems to be the original source later augmented. Of the two 'v.' references, it appears that the ARS offers a related discussion. There is as yet no identifiable source for PC's use of mentio.

10 - 12: Having compared the text of PC with the three
'cf.' references listed for this section I have come to the conclusion that although PC's style and content are in agreement with all of them (except that he does not define praesens as iuxta), none of them offers a treatment that is the closest to PC's. He either has abridged one of these three treatments on his own or has used an unknown source. Priscian writes, for example: "quaeritur tamen, cur prima quidem persona et secunda singula habeant pronomina, tertiam vero sex diversae indicent voces? ad quod respondendum, quod prima quidem et secunda persona ideo non egent diversis vocibus, quia semper praesentes inter se sunt et demonstrativae, ...."

86: Here PC discusses, having begun secundum Donatum, the less than finite pronouns ipse and iste. The portion up to sentence 7 is a series of declensions based on Donatus. In sentence 8 he asks why ipse and iste are less than finite pronouns, and then answers himself, saying that they do not always concern persons who are present. He points out, illustrating his discussion with a citation from Vergil, that ipse is a relative if it always refers to the third person. If, however, it is used with other pronouns, it refers to the person concerned; for instance, in the quotation from Vergil, ipse is a demonstrative in connection with ego.

8 - 15: It appears that PC is using a text closer to the
one in Sedulius than that in the 14488. Sedulius writes: "Ideo videlicet quia non semper praesentia sunt." The 14488 offers on the other hand: "Ideo uidelicet quia semper non sunt in praesentia." Furthermore, where PC and Sedulius have dicuntur, the 14488 has dicitur.

86, 11 - 14: It appears that the text of the C.M. 14488, 40\textsuperscript{v}
23 - 41\textsuperscript{r} \textit{l} offers a text closer to what PC might have used than the one in SED., 1, 352, 4 - 8. But such an observation is based on a very slight difference in the treatments of Sedulius and the 14488. The latter, for instance writes: "'Ipse' enim sicut Priscianus dicit, si per se proferatur in tertia persona, relativum est ut Virgilius in tertio Eneidos: ...." Sedulius offers the same discussion except that he has profertur as opposed to proferatur in PC, the C.M. 14488 and Priscian. As far as the text of Priscian is concerned, it seems that PC derived his treatment from Priscian second-hand via a manuscript resembling the C.M. 14488. Priscian writes, for example: "'ipse' vero, si per se proferatur in tertia persona, relativum est - Virgilius in III: ...."

87, : This paragraph concerns those pronouns used as articles hic, haec and hoc. PC states that such pronouns are prepositive and then proceeds to decline hic, haec and hoc. He then states that these pronouns are called articularia because they are used for articles. He notes that the Greeks have the
article proper which the Latin language does not have. Moreover, in sentence 8 he says that the Greeks place last the article in the final position, whereas the Latin grammarians place the interjection last. PC, the ninth century grammarians, and the writers in the *Grammatici Latini* with the exception of Priscian treat the interjection as the last part of speech to be discussed; therefore it follows that what is meant in sentence 8 is that the Greeks discuss the article last of all. However, Dionysius of Thrax (see p. 99) speaks about the conjunction last of all. PC points out, furthermore, that these *articula* are called prepositives because they are always *praeponuntur* 'placed before.' They are also called demonstratives because they show a present matter. He goes on to say that *hic* has its macron shortened to become the pronoun, whereas *hic* has its *i* lengthened to become the adverb. This point is illustrated with a quotation from Vergil. PC brings up the problem of when *hic* is a pronoun or only an article. He answers saying that it is only a pronoun when it functions as a noun as in the sentence: "Hic est uir de quo dixeram tibi," 'He is the man about whom I had spoken to you.' PC notes, employing a word-play on *coartat* and *articulus*, that the article compels us to recognize gender, number or case.

87, 7: It seems that PC is employing a text closer to Remigius's than to Donatus's. REM. EIN., 203, 21 writes: "... eo quod pro articulis ponuntur." Donatus has: "... et pro articulis et pro demonstratione ponuntur."
87, 8: Among all the 'cf.' references cited for this sentence, the text of the Commentum Einsidlense is the closest to PC's. It has the exact text, except that it gives interiectionem ponimus for PC's ponimus interiectionem. The Fox edition of Remigius has the second closest text: "Graeci partem articulorum habent, quam nos non habemus, et in ultimo eum ponunt, ubi nos interiectionem." It ought to be noted that loco after ultimo appears in M2 P as regards to the Fox edition. (See REM., 37, 1.*) SED., 1, 417, 3 offers the least related 'cf.' text: "Graeci habent partem prolixam de articulis, quam ponunt in ultimo loco, ubi nos interiectionem ponimus et in loco articulorum."

9: The Commentum Einsidlense bears the greatest reminiscence: "Ergo haec pronomina, i. hic haec hoc, articularia uocantur, quia pro articulis ponuntur." The Fox Remigius seems to bear the second greatest similarity: "Sed pro illis articulis nos pronominibus utimur." It is difficult, however, to decide whether Sedulius or Priscian has the third greatest resemblance. SED., 1, 417, 4 offers: "Nos vero illam partem articulatam non habentes, ista pronomina et in demonstratione ponimus et in loco articulorum." Priscian has: "..., articulos connumerabant pronominibus et articularia eos pronomina vocabant, in quo illos adhuc sequimur Latinis, ..." Pompeius gives the least related treatment: "nam et illi funguntur officio interiectionis in adverbio et nos officio articuli in pronomine."
87, 10: The Fox Remigius seems to have the most similar text to PC's: "Prae poziti va dicuntur, quia semper praeponuntur, ...." The C.M. 14488 has the second closest text: "Prepositiua dicitur [sic] hec pronomina quia semper praeponuntur id est ante collocantur." The Commentum Einsidlense of the three 'cf.' references seems to have the least resemblance to PC's treatment: "'Praepositiu m' dicitur eo quod primum ponatur; ...."

11: The text of Sedulius seems to be the closest to PC's mainly because of vocabulary: "DEMONSTRATIVA dicuntur, quia semper demonstrationem significant et rem praeuentem ostendunt, ...." Yet, Remigius on account of his syntax seems closer to PC: "Demonstrativa dicuntur, quia rem praeentem demonstrant, ...." Donatus has the least related text: "sunt alia demonstrativa, quae rem praeentem notant, ...."

12: SED., 1, 355, 3 bears a greater reminiscence to PC than Donatus does. Sedulius writes: "HIC aliquando adverbum est loci et tunc producitur; quando pronomen est corripitur et aliquando praeponitur, aliquando supponitur." Donatus offers: "... hic correptum pronomen est, productum adverbum loci."

15 - 18: Although it seems that PC used directly neither SED., 1, 416, 2 - 3 nor the C.M. 14488, 48V 13 - 21 for this passage, it appears that Sedulius's treatment is closer to PC's than the 14488 is. Sedulius writes: "...// quaerendum tamen
nihilominus videtur de hoc eodem pronomine quod est 'hic', quando sit pronomem vel quando articulus. Sed sciendum est tunc esse pronomem, quando officio nominis fungitur, ut 'hic vir de quo dixeram tibi'; tunc vero articulus cum coartat nos, id est colligit, ad cognoscendum casum, genus, vel numerum." The C.M. 14488 has the same text as Sedulius but unlike PC and Sedulius has quando sit articulus (48V 16), whereas PC gives quando articulus tantum and Sedulius quando articulus. Moreover, the 14488 unlike Sedulius and PC inserts Que between dixeram tibi and Tunc uero. However, PC and the 14488 feature nihilominus which is spelled in the edition of Sedulius as nihilominus; and PC has: "'Hic uir hic est de quo dixeram tibi,'" while the 14488 has: "'Hic uir est de quo dixeram tibi.'" Also, MUR. 7491 A, 24V 22 – 23 features: "'Hic est ille uir de quo dixe [sic] tibi.'" MUR. 1586, 35V 7 offers a text less similar than that of the 7491A: "'Ille homo iste est. Hic est de quo dixi.'"

87, 18: The corresponding lines of SED., 1, 416, 3 and the C.M. 14488, 48V 19 – 21 are the same and appear to be the closest treatment to PC's text in comparison with Muridac who offers: "Iste ille uero articuli cum nos arcent id est colligunt ad cognoscendum casum, genus et numerus [sic]." Pompeius seems to have the earliest suggestion for an etymology with: "..., articulus est quod coartat nos."
88, In this passage PC discusses the so-called "subjunctive" pronouns like *is*, *ea* and *id*. They are called thus because the noun precedes and the pronoun follows. This principle PC illustrates with quotations from Remigius. PC notes, furthermore, that these pronouns are also called relatives because they bring one back to the recall of the preceding noun.

9: From among the 'cf.' references cited for this sentence, it is likely that PC used a text resembling REM. EIN., 203, 31 - 32 which reads: "Praecedit enim nomen, subsequitur pronomen, ut: 'Aeneas filius Veneris; is uicit Turnum.' REM., 37, 17 - 18 gives a less closely related treatment: "...: 'Aeneas filius Veneris is est qui uicit Turnum'; praecedit enim nomen et subsequitur pronomen." SED., I, 374, 6 features a close version of the quotation about Aeneas and Turnus, but it is in a different context.

10: The *Commentum Einsidlense* reads: "Dicitur et relatiuum, eo quod praeecedens nomen uel praeecedentem personam reuocat ad memoriam, ut: 'Dominus Iesus Christus; is est, qui uicit diabolum, ...." The Fox Remigius offers: "Re lati v um dicitur .i. reportativum, quia reportat nomen ad memoriam, ut: 'Dominus Iesus is est qui vicit mundum, ...." It therefore follows that PC is using a text here more similar to the *Commentum Einsidlense* than to the other Remigius text.
89: Here PC deals with the 'indefinite' pronouns quis, qui, quae, quod, and quid. He explains that they are thus named because they refer to every substance and seek for a person but do not show it. He points out that qui may be used as an interrogative like quis but that the latter may never be used as a relative. This principle he illustrates with quotations from Remigius. He begins this section with a rubric similar to one in Probus and then declines the quis forms in a fashion like Donatus's.

2 - 4: Donatus does not give, as PC does, quis and qui but only quis as the masculine singular infinite pronoun; moreover, he likewise only gives quae for the feminine singular and quod for the neuter. CHARISIUS, 201, 23 gives: "quis et qui cuius." PROBUS, 133, 20 gives: "qui vel quis."

6: It seems that PC is more in the tradition of Donatus who considers only the simple quis forms to be the infinite pronouns. Probus, on the other hand, lists other compounded forms with quis and qui as well.

8: The assumption about the quis forms referring to substance is correct, for Priscian says: "...: substantiae, ut 'quis', ...." Concerning PC's observation that these pronouns seek after a person it is worthwhile to regard Servius's note: "generaliter infinita sunt quae cuicumque personae aptari possunt, ut est quis; ...."
89, 9 - 10: The Fox Remigius writes thus: "Quis et qui duo nominativi sunt, sed hoc distat, quoniam qui pro quis ponitur, quis pro qui nusquam, sed tantum interrogativum est, ut: 'Quis legit heri? Ipse qui et hodie'." The Commentum Einsidlense offers: "'Quis' et 'qui' duo nominativi sunt, sed hoc distat, quia 'qui' pro 'quis' ponitur, 'quis' uero pro 'qui' nusquam, sed tantum interrogativum est, ut: 'quis legit?' 'Ipse, qui et hodie.'" It therefore appears that, with the exception of uero which PC and the Commentum Einsidlense have in common, PC is using a text more like the Fox edition. Moreover, the reading in hoc distant appears in M². (See REM., 38, 16.*)

9: VERG. GRAM., 130, 30 - p. 131, 6 states that some people use qui for every gender, number and case. Further on, to line 11 on p. 131 he observes that some try to keep quis and qui separate. PRIS., 3, 127, 7 notes that qui is accepted for quis both as an interrogative and as a relative. SERVIUS, 410, 34 likewise remarks that this principle is true, illustrating his point with examples, for he says: "... 'quis tibi fecit iniuriam' et 'qui tibi fecit iniuriam'." It seems, however, that Priscian's phraseology is more reminiscent of PC: "et 'qui' quidem pro 'quis' infinito vel interrogativo accipitur, 'quis' vero pro relativo nusquam." But it must be noted that Priscian does not seem to be the exclusive source in these two sentences.
This paragraph concerns the possessives that refer to something else. Before PC explains this, he declines meus, as found in Donatus. Then he notes that reason demands that there be an explanation of why the possessives which are finite pronouns are considered to be referring to something else. First of all, they are called possessives because they show possession like meus equus. They are called finite because they make note of a present matter. Last of all, they are called ad aliquid dicta 'referring to something else' because they imply something which completes their meaning. For the sake of comparison PC brings up the instance of the nomina ad aliquid dicta like pater which automatically implies filius. Il "Thus when you say meus, the sense remains half-full until you should say homo or equus."

8: The Commentum Einsidlense offers: "'Possessiva' dicuntur ista pronomina, eo quod possessionem demonstrant, ut 'meus equus'. Finita dicuntur ista, quia, qui dicit 'meus', in praesentia est. ... Ad aliquid dicta, i. ad aliquid se habentia; praeter se enim aliud demonstrant, quemadmodum si dicas patrem, intelligis filium, ita et cum dicis 'meus', semiplenum est, adhuc pendet sensus, usque dum dicas 'meus homo' uel 'equus'." The Fox Remigius gives: "Possessiva dicuntur, quia possessionem demonstrant, ut 'meus ager et liber'; finita, quia rem praesentem demonstrant: qui dicit meus, in
praesentia est. Ad aliquid dicta i.e. ad aliquum se habentia, quia praeter se alium demonstrant. Non enim plenum est, cum dicis meus, sed adhuc pendet quoadusque addas equus aut liber aut servus." It seems, therefore, that PC is using a text more similar to the *Commentum Einsidlense* than to the other Remigius text.

90, 10: uelut ... 'filium'

Upon an examination of the texts of Pompeius and Priscian according to both of whom PC's assumptions here are correct, it does not appear that either one of the 'v.' references cited is more reminiscent of PC than the other.

91: PC now takes up in discussion the other possessive pronouns ad aliquid dicta like tuus, suus, noster, and uester. The entire text which appears to be based on Donatus, is chiefly a series of declensions of these pronouns. Sentence 16, however, gives a sample of pronouns compounded from ego, tui, sui, ecce and quis.

15: Donatus does not give tuimet nor suimet, nor are these readings present in any of the mss. used by Keil. *Eccine* also does not appear, but quisnam and quispiam do.

92 - 155: This is the section on the verb according to Priscian although such a title nowhere appears. This continues until paragraph 156 which begins: "De uerbo secundum Donatum." Then PC
asks in paragraph 92 what part of speech amo is and says that it is a verb because it has tenses and person but no case. Again the verb signifies that something is either acting or being acted upon or neither; he continues with the etymology of uerbum, from uerberando because with the verb we most often make the air reverberate. All of this material is part of the common lore of grammarians from at least the time of Servius.

92, : He then, basing his discussion closely on texts related to the ninth and tenth century Irish grammarians, asks why only the verb is thus called, inasmuch as the other parts of speech make the air reverberate. To this he replies that the verb is the most widely used part of speech. This principle he illustrates with a quotation from the Book of Proverbs which also appears in certain of the sources cited and with a quotation ultimately traced back to POMPEIUS, 97, 12: "... 'volo ire et videre amicum meum ad forum', ...."

1 - 2: PRIS. PT., 466, 11 has: " C a n o quae pars orationis est? Verbum." The C.M. 14737, 171^V 19 - 20 reads "'Lego' que pars est? Uerbum." The Paris 7558, 141^V 13 - 14 gives: " 'Doceo' quae pars orationis est? Uerbum." It thus seems that PC's text is slightly more reminiscent of the C.M. 14737.

1 - 4: This treatment appears as a whole to be similar to PRIS. PT., 482, 27 - 29 but even more similar to the Paris 7558,
141V 13 - 17. The Priscian text gives, for example: "Verbum. Verbum quid est? Secundum Donat(mum) pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu, secundum alios pars orationis cum tempore et modis sine casu actum vel passionem significans." The 7558 gives on the other hand: "Uerbum. Uerbum quid est? Pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu aut agere aliquid aut pati aut neutrum significans." This section from the 7558 is also similar to sentences 5 - 6. In these latter two sentences, however, PC is more in the tradition of the treatment of PRIS., 2, 369, 1 - 2 which reads: "Verbum est pars orationis cum tempore et modis, sine casu, agendi vel patiendi significativum." The text of Donatus as cited for sentence 4 is the same as the one in the Paris 7558, 141V 13 - 17; and sentence 4 in PC is also the same text as DON., 359, 4 - 5: "Pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu aut agere aliquid aut pati aut neutrum significans," except that PC uses significat.

92, 8: Granted that A 'uerberando' is found in Sedulius, Muridac and Remigius, none of the possible sources cited for this sentence as a whole offers a parallel treatment. However, PC's assumptions are in harmony with all of the grammarians who state in one way or another that we reverberate the air; wherefore the word verbumn.

10 - 12: On the whole SED., 1, 421, 1 - 3 offers a text
closer to PC's than the C.M. 14488, 49r 9 - 14 is. Sedulius writes: "Sed, cum ceterae partes verberatione aeris fiant, quaerendum est, cur haec sola pars hoc sibi prae ceteris nomen asciscit. Ideo nempe haec sola pars hoc nomine nuncupatur, quia ea frequentius in omni ratione utimur, ut est illus: 'volo ire videre amicum'; et in pluribus: 'discurve festina suscita amicum'. The C.M. 14488 offers the same text as Sedulius, except that the big difference is that the former omits the phrase in Sedulius from Sed to fiant. Also, while Sedulius has asciscit as PC, the C.M. 14488 has adscissit. However, the 14488 shares certain features with PC which are not found in the text of Sedulius; for instance, the 14488 gives in omni ratione as opposed to Sedulius's in omni ratione. PC and the 14488 have in Proverbiis as opposed to Sedulius's in pluribus, and both PC and the 14488 have amicum tuum. SERGIUS, 150, 14 - 18 offers a treatment that is more similar to PC's than MUR. 7491 A, 2v 25 - 26 is, but which is not as close to PC as Sedulius and the C.M. 14488. For example, Sergius writes: "Et quare specialiter ista pars sibi hoc nomen adsumpsit? hac ratione, quia in elocutionibus frequenter hoc utimur: ..., 'volo ire ad forum et uidere amicum': ...." Muridac offers: "Quare ergo hæc pars præe ceteris sibi hoc nomen uindicat? Ideo nempe quia amplius ex illa quam ex ceteris aer uerberatur."

92, 12: The texts of Malsachanus and of Clemens offer treatments similar to this sentence though not as close as Sedulius
or the C.M. 14488. It seems on one hand that Clemens bears more resemblance to PC than Malsachanus does. Clemens writes:

"et ideo haec pars specialiter vocabulum, quod commune est aequo omnibus partibus orationis, accipit, quia ea frequentius in omni oratione utimur, ut est 'volo ire et videre amicum meum' et iis similia." Malsachanus offers: "Ideo autem haec sola meruit hoc nomen, quod frequentius ea in loquendo, ut est, 'volo ire et uidere amicum meum' et in Proverbiis recurre festina, suscita amicum tuum et alia." Although one might observe that while Malsachanus has the Biblical quotation, Clemens does not. However, Löffstedt (p. 164) notes that the Clemens ms. called R gives the reading: "in Proverbiis curre festina suscita amicum." However, the reading in sentence 12:

"Volo ire uidere amicum" appears as such only in Sedulius and the C.M. 14488 out of all the references cited for this phrase.

93, : PC notes in this paragraph that there are eight accidents to the verb: gender, tense, mood, species, figure, conjugation, and person with number. He brings up the point that person and number always go together because whenever one has person, number is automatically understood. PC states that if person is lacking, so also will number be. 11 "Of what gender is it? 12 Active. 13 Why? 14 Because it ends in o and is able to make a transition to some rational animal, whence, the phrase is able to become changed."
93, 8 - 10: This assumption, although it is in harmony with the teachings of Priscian, nevertheless seems to bear so far no direct relationship with any source regarded in this research.

11 - 12: Priscian's Partitiones employs the term significatio, which, in the Institutiones Grammaticae vol. 2, 373, 10 he admits to be the synonym for genus.

14: Neither of the Donatus references cited seem to indicate evidence of close borrowing by PC, although the ideas are in agreement with those of PC.

94, : The discussion in this paragraph consists of a series of questions about the genders of certain verbs. He states that amor is passive because it ends in r and can lose the r to become active, then regain it to become passive. Sedeo is neutral because, although it ends in o, it cannot (here in sentence 7 PC leaves his explanation incomplete) take r to become passive. Gaudeo is a neutropassium because in the preterite perfects and in those tenses formed therefrom it retains the letter of the passives, but in the other tenses it keeps the letter of the neuters. PC lists five neutropassium: gaudeo, auteo, soleo, fio, and fido. He also calls such verbs like uapulo, exsulo and ueneo by the term neutropassium or neutra passiua because, although they end in o, they cannot make a transition to the passive and in the letters of the neuters they
retain the passive sense although in the preterite tense they do not have the passive forms.

4: Among all the 'y.' sources cited, though they agree with the assumptions of PC, nevertheless none of them offer a text close enough to PC's to be considered as a possible direct source. However, the phrase: "sumere 'r' et facere ex se passium" is reminiscent of ASPERUS, 49, 31: "accepta r littera faciunt ex se passiua," of PRIS., 2, 374, 14: "assumpta r facientia ex se passiva," of CHARISIUS, 210, 14: "adsumpta r littera facit passivum," and of DON., 383, 3: "accepta r littera faciunt ex se passiva."

5 - 6: None of the possible sources listed for this offer a type of question similar to this one. They do, however, state that sedeo is neuter.

7: After facere one ought to understand a phrase like: "passium in 'r.'" (Consult the Fontes.)

8 - 12: PC's assumptions in this section are in accordance with SED., 1, 512, 1 - 5. However, it does not seem that PC borrowed directly from Sedulius for these sentences, except that there is a similarity of sentences 10 - 11 with SED., 512, 4 - 5: "Quare dicuntur NEUTRA PASSIVA? Ideo scilicet, quia in praeterito et in his quae a praeterito derivantur, secundum passivi generis regulam declinantur."
94, 8 - 9: This statement is in harmony with the 'v.' references cited for these two sentences. It is interesting to note that DON., 383, 14 - 15 refers to a verb like gaudeo as an inaequalium, but that (see DON., 360, 2*) gaudeo listed as a neutropassium occurs as an addition by a second hand to the Donatus ms. L.

11: PHOCAS, 431, 3 - 7 offers a text, the ideas of which are in agreement with those of PC, but PRIS., 2, 420, 8 - 9 writes that the neutropassiva in the preterite perfect can only be illustrated by the participle.

12: Note that PC seems to have been using material, which appears in PRIS., 2, 420, 9 - 11, and in the tradition of the Donatus ms. L with additions in a second hand and θ.

14 - 17: PC follows the orientation of Sedulius rather than that of Priscian. SED., 1, 502, 1 speaks of certain verbs listed in 18 thus: "Aliquando enim NEUTRA 'passiva' dicuntur extrinsecus, ut 'vapulo a te', 'fio a te', 'exulo a te', 'veneo a te'; ...." PRIS., 2, 377, 14 - 15 offers this discussion: "quaedam vero ex eisdem neutralibus passivam, ut ...." So, neutropassium is used for both classes of verbs like gaudeo and uapulo. And in 96, 10 neutrum passium is used also for ueneo.

95, 1: PC observes that the deponent verbs put away one significance and retain the other, that is they show the sense
of the active with the passive form. He notes that the 'neutral substantives' like sum signify neither the active nor the passive but only substance. The common verbs, he proceeds to relate, retain both the passive and active meanings under the passive form. There are eight of these: largior, experior, ueneror, moror, osculor, hortor, criminor and amplector.

95, 2 - 3: Priscian seems to be close to PC as far as phrasing is concerned, but Pompeius states that loquor is a deponent.

5: Among all the 'v.' references cited for this sentence, only Donatus does not state that the deponents signify the active voice, but merely that they end in r and are not Latin verbs without the r.

6 - 10: PC's ideas about the nature of the verb sum do not seem to have been drawn directly from any of the 'v.' sources listed, although he is correct according to them. Priscian on the subject of these substantive verbs offers, evidently, the nearest complete treatment. Among certain notable aspects of the substantiua, one that PRIS., 2, 414, 19 - 20 treats is their relationship to the vocativa. Priscian observes that vocativa like vocor in "Priscianus vocor" have a similar force as the combination of a substantive verb plus a passive participle.

11: This reading appears in the Priscian ms. L. Sedulius
seems to offer the closest text to PC: "Sub una litteratura et activum et passivum sensum habent ista." Priscian offers the second closest text: "communem, quae una terminatone tam actionem quam passionem significat, ..." Donatus gives the least related text: "communia sunt quae r littera terminantur et in duas formas cadunt, patientis et agentis, ut scrutor criminor." It ought to be noted that PC is correct about osculor according to PRIS., 2, 378, 20 - 22 and about the other common verbs according to PRIS., 2, 392, 6 ff. and DON., 383, 9* (for a similar list in the ms. S).

95, 18: *tibi sint com(unia) lector*  
"may they be common verbs as far as you are concerned, reader."  
I have thought it best to render *tibi* as a dative of interest.  
(See Blaise, Manuel du latin chrétien, p. 87.)

96, : PC defines gender in a verb as the distinction between acting or being acted upon. He notes that *genus* is derived from *generandum* because the one voice is engendered by the other. This explanation is in harmony with 94, 4. PC observes that there are seven genders: active, passive, neuter absolute, the neutropassive (which he also calls *neutrum passivum*), 'neutral substantive,' neuter defective, and the *impersonalia.*

3: Although Remigius offers the phrase "actionis vel passionis," it does not appear in the context of defining *genus*
or significatio. The C.M. 14488, however, offers such a context: "Notandum est quod significatio uerborum Plinio secundo testante proprie in actione uel passione est." Pompeius presents a text that seems to be less related in vocabulary and syntax to PC's than that of Remigius or the 14488 is, but which nevertheless has the same ideas as PC's: "ceterum omne verbum duas res significat, aut agentis aut patientis, nec potest alia inveniri significatio. quicquid est in significacione verborum, aut agentis est aut patientis."

96, 5: It seems that PC's text is closer to the one in the Commentum Einsidlense that is identical with the text in the Fox edition and reads: "Genera dicuntur a generando, eo quod unum generetur ab altero, ..." Sedulius gives: "GENUS dicitur a generando. Genera dicuntur proprie in nomine masculinum et femininum, quia generant et generantur, sic et in verbo genera dicuntur, eo quod se mutuo generant et generantur: ...."

8: In paragraphs 93 - 95 PC speaks about the active, passive, neuter, neuterpassive (neutropassium), deponent, 'neutral substantive,' and 'common.' In this sentence, however, he does not mention the genera like the deponents and the common verbs. Moreover, he introduces other categories like the neutra defectiva and the impersonalia. PC, furthermore, does not seem to be modelling exactly on DON., 359, 34 - 35 who lists five types of genera: "Activa passiva neutra deponentia communia."
96, 11: PC is right about his observations concerning sum according to the references listed. But none of them appear to be a possible direct source. (But see Leumann, p. 308 for sum being active.)

13: Sunt ... taedet'
A comparison of the texts of Donatus and of Pompeius cited for this phrase brings us to the conclusion that neither treatment is the closer to PC. Pompeius gives: "sunt quae in et exeunt, ut pudet taedet," and Donatus: "item quae in t litteram exeunt [et inpersonalia dicuntur], ut pudet taedet paenitet libet."

97, : The first portion of this paragraph (to sentence 24) is concerned with defining the tenses. Amo is of the present tense because it describes the thing present. Amabam is of the imperfect because it shows action begun but not completed. For Amaui the definition is circular: "Quia praeteritum perfectum," making us wonder whether or not the text is deficient at this point. He also gives an inadequate definition of the past perfect- that it shows that which has passed. Amabo is future since it shows future time. PC then defines tense in terms of an etymology from tempero. He enumerates the five tenses: the present, imperfect, perfect, past perfect, and future. Next, he brings up the question of why we do not place the preterite tense before the present since
that which happened comes before that which is happening. He attempts to solve this by stating that which took place in the past was at that time in the present, and the past cannot have existed unless it itself was of the present time; again a circular argument.

97, 2 - 3: Priscian is not the source for amo but his text bears analogy to PC's treatment in these two sentences. Priscian gives: "Cuius est temporis? Praesentis."

5: All the references cited for this sentence agree with PC's assumptions, but they do not define the present tense with a word derived from praesens, which PC does. Pompeius, for example, says: "puta praesens est quod agitur, quod in re est penitus, quod tunc est, cum fit: hoc est praesens, si dicas lego; nemo tibi potest dicere lego, nisi qui adhuc agit hoc officium."

13: Priscian, unlike PC, avoids defining the preterite perfect with praeteritum perfectum: "in quo res perfecta monstratur," and Pompeius has the phrase in line 12: "iam tamen re peracta'."

23: The sentence rerum mirabilium transitus has no previous echo that I can trace. However, in connection with sentence 25 where PC says that tempus is derived from temperandum
one ought to consider VARRO, 58, 1 - 8, where, besides stating that *tempus* comes from *temperatum*, Varro notes: "tempus esse
dicunt in<te> vallum mundi [et] motus. id divisum in partes
aliquot maxime ab solis et lunae cursu. itaque ab eorum tenore
temperato tempus dictum, unde tempestiva; et a motu qui toto
caelo coniunctus mundus. duo. motus *** casu venit, quo tempus
id ab hoc deo dies appellatur. meridies ab eo quod medius dies."

30 - 32: The text of Sedulius is closer to PC's than Muridac's
is. Sedulius offers, for example: "Ideo nempe praesens primum posuit,
quia quod praeteritum est praesens ante fuit, et praeteritum non
potest esse nisi prius praesens fuerit." The corresponding
text of Muridac reads, however: "Quia illud quod praeteritum est
praesens ante fuit, et praeteritum non potest esse antequam
praesens fiat."

98, : This paragraph is about the moods. PC begins (aside
from the heading) by extracting from Priscian. He asks to what mood
*amo* belongs. Priscian does not use *amo*. Using the analogy of the
preceding paragraph where PC asked what tense *amo, amabam, amauit* etc.
were, he now asks to what mood the various forms of *amo* belong.
He notes that *amo* is indicative because it 'indicates,' that *ama*
is imperative because it commands, that *amarem* is optative
because it wishes, that *amem* is subjunctive since it 'subjoins,'
and that *amare* is an infinitive because it defines neither persons
nor number. PC defines a mood as being a changing alteration of the intellect (varia inclinatio animi). This alteration shows the mind's various feelings. He then is preoccupied with the etymology of modus. The remainder of the paragraph deals with the five moods - the indicative, imperative, optative, subjunctive, and the infinitive - and why they are arranged in that order of presentation.

98, 5: PC is in accord to all the sources cited for this sentence which also all agree with each other, but it cannot be said that PC definitely borrowed directly from any of them.

9: The observation made in the commentary to 98, 5 may also be made to apply here.

13: PC is in agreement with the references cited, but his text does not appear to be borrowed directly from any of them.

21: The text of Priscian bears the closest resemblance to that of PC: "quod nec personas nec numeros definit."
Moreover, [Sergius] agrees with Priscian: "est etiam infinitivus, ubi non discernitur persona nec numerus." Pseudo-Augustine mentions that the infinitive has no persons. Remigius says that the infinitive has neither persons nor number.

23: The text of Sedulius which is essentially the same as the one in Priscian reads thus: " Modi sunt, sicut Priscianus dicit,
diversae inclinationes animi, varios eius affectus demonstrantes." On the basis of this reading I have emended demonstraris on 12\textsuperscript{r} 33 to demonstrans to agree with modus.

98, 25: Remigius elaborates on the etymology of modus:

"Modus a moderatione dicitur vel a motione, eo quod unus moveatur in alium." The C.B. 207 gives a different explanation:

"Modus a quodam (quadam) moderamine sui nuncupatus est, quoniam, quod indicamus uel imperamus siue optamus, quibusdam discriminibus conjugationum et temporum atque personarum certis numeris et generibus moderatur."

31: The C.M. 14488, 51\textsuperscript{v} 19 - 24 offers this text:

"Indicatius igitur idcirco primus ponitur quia perfectior est omnibus tam in personis quam in temporibus et quia ex ipso omnes modi accipiant regulam et diriuatia nomina siue uerba uel participia ex hoc nascentur ut 'dico dicens duxi ductus dux ...." However, PC's presentation is slightly closer to PRIS., 2, 421, 21 - 24: " ..., qui ideo primus ponitur, quia perfectus est in omnibus tam personis quam temporibus et quia ex ipso omnes modi accipiant regulam et derivativa nomina siue verba vel participia ex hoc nascentur, ut 'duco ducens duxi ductus dux', ...."

32: It appears that the C.M. 14488, 51\textsuperscript{v} 28 - 52\textsuperscript{r} 3 offers the text closest to PC's: "Imperatiuus autem ideo secundum tenet locum in declinatione uerborum quia ... non indiget auxilio
alterius partis ad plenam significationem licet per tempora et personas deficiat naturaliter." Sedulius gives a text that is somewhat less related (1, 450, 3 - 4): "Sed ideo tenuit secundum locum in declinatione verborum quia ..., non indiget auxilio alterius partis ad plenam significationem, licet per tempora et personas deficiat naturaliter." PRIS., 2, 424, 1 - 3 gives the least related text cited: "..., qui ideo secundum tenuit locum, quod ..., non indiget auxilio alterius partis ad plenam significationem, licet per tempora et personas deficiat naturaliter."

98, 34: None of the 'cf.' sources cited have the quotation from the Psalms to illustrate the use of the imperative, but they all cite VERG., 1, 8.

35 - 36: SED., 1, 451, 1 - 2 offers such a text: "Optativus autem, quamvis temporibus et personis perfectior esse videatur imperativo, tamen imperfectior est in sensu, ..., merito tamen post eum ponitur, quia eget adversbio optandi, ut plenum significet sensum, ...." This text of Sedulius can also be found in the C.M. 14488. The text of Priscian is not as close to PC's as the one of Sedulius is, for one reads in Priscian: "Tertius est optativus, qui quamvis et temporibus et personis perfectior videatur esse imperativo, tamen eget adversbio optandi, ut plenum significet sensum, ...."

39: The text of Sedulius offers a slightly greater degree
of similarity to PC's text than the one of Priscian does. Sedulius writes: "INFINITIVUS dicitur, eo quod non est infinitus; non definit numerum nec personam certam." Priscian has: "Infinitus est, qui et personis et numeris deficit, ...."

98, 40: Although neither Priscian nor Remigius seems to be the direct source for this sentence, they both deal with the impersonal verb last.

99, : PC observes that the impersonal is so called because it does not define a certain person. He then brings up the question of why the infinitive and the impersonal are not considered as one mood since they both neither define a certain number or person. This problem he solves by citing the four usual ways by which the infinitive and the impersonal are different: (1) the impersonal is derived from the indicative third person, whereas the infinitive is derived from the second person of the same mood; (2) the impersonal is derived from the active and neutral genders, whereas the infinitive comes from all the genders; (3) the impersonal can take all the moods and tenses, but the infinitive cannot; (4) the impersonal needs an outside aid from the pronouns like me in "legitur a me," whereas the infinitive accepts aid from the very verb of its origin.

2: Sedulius writes: "IMPERSONALIS dicitur, eo quod
certam personam non definiat." This is the same as in the C.M. 14488. The text of Sedulius is slightly closer to PC's text than Pompeius's is which reads: "Impersonalis dicitur modus, quod non definit certas personas."

99, 3 - 11: It seems that the text of the C.M. 14488, 51V 4 - 17 bears greater resemblance to PC's text here than the treatment of Sedulius does. Sedulius offers, for example: "...: uno modo, quia impersonale formatur a tertia persona indicatiivi; infinitivus a secunda persona imperat vivi. Alio modo, quia impersonale verbum suae cuiusdam significationis est, et nascitur a neutris activam vel absolutam vim habentibus, ut 'statur, vivitur', vel ab activis, ut 'amatur', vel a passivis vel communibus vel deponentibus numquam; infinitivus enim ab omnibus verbis." The C.M. 14488, however, gives: "Vno modo quia impersonalis a tertia persona indicatiui nascitur. Infinitiuus uero a secunda persona. Alio modo quia impersonalis non uenit nisi a duobus uerbis actiuo uidelicet et neutrali; infinitiuus autem ab omnibus uerbis."

4: The combined references to Priscian for this sentence state that the infinitives and the impersonal verbs lack person and number. Charisius says that the impersonal verbs lack person. Maximus Victorinus states that the infinitives are uncertain as to their number and person.

6: REM., 46, 17 - 19 mentions that the impersonal
comes from the indicative of the third person.

7: Vergilius Grammaticus offers: "G a l b u n g i autem auditoribus nonnisi ab activo et neutrali uerbo impersonalem modum procidere posse." The references to Priscian also say that the impersonal mood is derived from the active and neutral verbs. Priscian, PC, Vergilius Grammaticus, Sedulius and the C.M. 14488 agree on this latter point.

9: Sergius states that the impersonal may run through all the moods, which the infinitive cannot do.

9: Tertio ... currit

Remigius with the phrase "Sic per omnes modos currit" is somewhat similar to the phrase of PC but is not likelier than the C.M. 14488 to be the source. The latter reads (51 V 13 - 14): "... per omnes modos et per omnia tempora currit." PC mentions that the infinitive does not have all the tenses. Of course one must understand that he is merely speaking of the present infinitive form which cannot decline, because in paragraph 227, for example, he discusses the past and future infinitives of doceo.

10: Remigius writes: "..., sed accipit supplementum a personis pronominum, ut 'legitur a me a te ab illo a nobis a vobis ab illis'." This appears to be on one hand less closely related to PC's text than what Sedulius or the C.M. 14488, 51 V
15 - 17 which offers: "Quarto modo quia inpersonalis extrinsecus accipit adiumentum ad se complendum. Infinitius ab ipso a quo oritur uerbo." However, the phrase "legitur a me" in Remigius might indicate that PC is using a text combining both the aspects of Remigius and the similar texts of Sedulius and the C.M. 14488.

100, PC begins by asking what species amo belongs; and he answers himself saying that it is primitive because it is derived from nothing. He notes, furthermore, that amo is of a simple figure because it cannot be divided. Then he proceeds to discuss the four ways by which verbs are compounded. This discussion seems to be based on Donatus. Clemens accounts for the mentioning of the decomposites which like conticesco are derived from compounded verbs.

1 - 4: PC is in accord with the ideas of Priscian in the Fontes cited, but there is no comparable source of questions in the Partitiones, although this type of questioning follows the style of Priscian; for example, PRIS. PT., 497, 12 speaking about the noun signum asks: "Cuius speciei? Primitivae."

11 - 16: I have not yet discovered in any other commentary the examples of compounded words which PC uses.

101, In this paragraph PC treats the characteristics of the four conjugations. However, before this discussion, he begins the paragraph in the manner of Priscian by asking to what
conjugation amo belongs. He notes that it belongs to the first, outlining the characteristics of this conjugation. Then, he concerns himself with the definition of conjugatio, noting that it is the consequens uerborum declinatio 'consequent declension of verbs (that follows logically).’ He observes that the etymology of conjugatio is that it comes from coniugandum because under one rule as if under a jugum 'yoke' it joins many verbs. The remaining portion of the paragraph treats in detail the characteristics of the four conjugations.

101, 8: Priscian states: "Coniugatio est consequens uerborum declinatio, ...." The same text appears in the SED. TRACT.

10: Vergilius Grammaticus offers also the etymology to jugum: "quidam quidem hoc in fine habent, quod ideo coniugatio uocetur, quia tota latinitas his tribus conjugationibus velut quodam iugo sustentatur." PS-AUG., 511, 41 - 42 gives a different view: "nam inde dicitur coniugatio, quod sibi ad unum sonum multa coniungat ...."

12 - 17: PC considers that there are four conjugations. Donatus although acknowledging only three conjugations, admits that there are those who make a fourth conjugation of the verbs in long i, while he classifies all the verbs in i as being of the third conjugation. Priscian and Consentius, however, mention that there are four conjugations. CHARISIUS, 215, 19 observes
that there are four ordines verborum, and according to the
EXCERPTA, 563, 6 ordo is a synonym for conjugatio.

102, : In this paragraph PC discusses the various forms
of the past preterite that the first conjugation takes. He notes
specifically that the first conjugation has three types of the
preterite and that there are twelve preterites that end in ui.
There are, furthermore, four verbs which take the preterite in
i: dedi, steti, laui, and iuui. He notes that those verbs that
take the preterite in ui form the past participle in tum, having
changed the ui to i and added tum. As for the verbs of the
first conjugation that end in i, these form the supine by changing
the o of the first person to a and adding tum, which happens to
do, datum. Moreover, it is apparent that PC's treatment in this
whole paragraph is not borrowed directly from Priscian but is
either a re-working of the Priscian texts cited or perhaps drawn
from an unidentified commentary on Priscian.

3 - 5: Priscian states that first conjugation preterites
are characterized by having one extra syllable and gives the
verbs accusavi, domui, and steti as examples. Iuvi and lavi,
however, are the exceptions.

6 - 9: Priscian lists the verbs which PC gives here, but
he deals with them categorically as the preterites ending in 'ui'
divisas.
102, 11 - 14: PRIS., 2, 460, 10 - 11 treats these four verbs as those which duplicate the stem. On p. 471, 1 - 2, having treated of the preterites of the first conjugation that end in \( \text{id} \) and \( \text{ui} \), he speaks thus about these four verbs: "Excipiuntur praeterea haec quattuor: 'stetet', 'do dedi', 'iuviveri', 'lave lavi', ...."

15: Omnia ... in 'ui' ut 'amaui'

The text from the Libri Turicenses appears to bear a slightly greater similarity to PC's text than Priscian's does, for one reads: "Omnia ubera primae conjugationis et actiuae terminationis a secunda persona praesentis temporis formant praeteritum perfectum abiecta s littera et addita ui silla, ut amas amauui ...." The text of Priscian reads: " ..., tam in activa quam in neutrali significatione abiecta s et addita 'vi' faciunt praeteritum perfectum, ut 'amo amas amavi', ...."

15: et mutant ... 'amaui tum'

Hrabanus Maurus and the Libri Turicenses offer texts closer to PC's than Priscian. Hrabanus says: "Omnia primae conjugationis verba quae in \( \text{vi} \) praeteritum terminant, \( \text{vi} \) in \( \text{tum} \) convertentia faciunt supina penultima producta, amavi, amatum; ...." The Libri Turicenses reads thus: " ... ui mutata in tum faciunt supina, ut amauui amatum." Priscian offers, for example: " ..., 'vi' in 'tum' convertentia faciunt, ut 'amavi amatum', ...."
102,  15: praeter ... 'laudatum'
Although PC is in agreement with the ideas of the Libri Turicenses and Priscian concerning laudatum, neither of the two latter appear to be closer than the other to PC.

16: praeter ... 'plicitum'
The Libri Turicenses gives the forms plicitum and sectum but says that mico has no supine. PC, however, is correct according to Priscian concerning all the forms except micatum. Priscian notes, moreover, (p. 472, 20 ff.) that mico ought to make the form mictum but that since mictum is also the supine of mino, confusion would result. Thus mictum as the supine of mino is not found in usage, although we have dimicatum. The T.L.L., 8, 929 gives mictum as the past participle but also on p. 928 gives the fourth declension noun micatus.

17: The Libri Turicenses offers a text more similar to PC's than Priscian's is. One reads in the Libri: "Conposita cum nominibus faciunt praeteritum in ausi, ut multiplicauerit." Priscian gives: "ex eo igitur composita paenultimam a vel i habent in supino: ||'duplicavi duplicatum', ...."

18: The phrasing in Phocas appears to offer a text somewhat reminiscent of PC's phrasing: "..., et si qua adnexis praepositionibus componuntur." Priscian, however, gives the phrase "'explicui explicitum.' "
102, 19: Priscian states that the _ in _atum is long, whereas the _ in _atum is short.

103 - 117: This section deals with the formation of the preterites and the supines of the second conjugation.

103, 2: Omnia ... monitum

Although Priscian's treatment cited does not seem likely to be the source identifiable for PC's text, it does state that the supines of the verbs like moveo and foveo are formed from the preterite when the _i_ becomes _um_.

104: The second conjugation verbs that end in _eo_ PC notes that a general feature is the formation of the supine when the _eo_ becomes _um_ as in ardeo, arsum or when the _s_ is interposed as in tondeo, tonsum. Those verbs that have the preterite in _ui_, however, change the _ui_ to _i_ and add _um_. Those verbs that take the preterite in _si_ change the _si_ to _um_ to form the supine. To this principle he enumerates the exceptions in sentence 4.

1 - 3: Although the text of Priscian does not appear close enough to PC's to indicate direct borrowing, nevertheless there is some similarity in treatment. Priscian offers: "Omnia autem supra dicta verba 'deo' in 'sum' convertentia faciunt supina: 'rideo risum', 'ardeo arsum', 'video visum', 'mordeo morsum',
'pendeo pensum', 'tondeo tonsum', 'respondeo responsum', 'audeo ausum': ...." It is evident that suadeo is not from Priscian.

104, 3: faciunt ... si haberet

For this type of conditional sentence see Hofmann and Szantyr, p. 416.

4: Hrabanus Maurus speaks about the si and the xi preterites together: "In si quoque vel in xi terminantia praeterita penultimam supini aut natura aut positione semper producunt, ut risi, risum; indulsi, indultum, vel indulsum; lusi, luctum; auxi, auctum; duxi, ductum; dixi, dictum; vinxi, vinctum; ...." Although Priscian lists the nouns in this sentence except tordeo he treats them under the category of geo verbs.

105, : The verbs ending in beo

PC notes that those beo verbs taking the preterite in ui change ui to i and add tum to form the supine. Those ending the preterite in si change si to sum; and those ending in psi change psi to ptum.

2: The references to Priscian for this sentence, although they offer observations in harmony with those of PC, nevertheless do not give a close enough text to indicate direct borrowing. Indeed, Priscian does not have a section devoted to the beo verbs.
105, 2: praeter ... 'iussi'

PRIS., 2, 491, 13 offers a text with a little similarity:
"excipiuntur haec: 'iubeo iussi', 'sorbeo' vel etiam ...."
The text on 46, 13 is less similar: "B manet: 'bibo bibi',
'habeo habui': ..., 'iubeo iussi'."

4 - 5: Although PC's ideas agree with Priscian's, PC
does not appear to be using Priscian's text directly. The
latter, in fact, does not deal with psi-type second conjugation
verbs as PC does here.

106, : The second conjugation verbs ending in ceo
Those forming the preterite in ui, PC points out, change the ui
to i and add tum. However, those ending in xi in the preterite,
change xi to tum for the supine. Moreover, there is no separate
section on ceo verbs in Priscian or any source used in this
research. However, nevertheless the Priscian references cited
deal with mulceo and xi preterites in separate discussions.

107, : The verbs ending in deo
PC notes that deo verbs take the preterite in si if ar or long
a or i is before deo. If short i or e is before deo, eo is
changed to long i to form the preterite as in uideo, uidi.
Reduplicated preterites end in di like totondi. PC notes that all
other deo verbs take the preterite in ui like splendui, except
prandi. Those that end in si, change si to sum for the supine.
Verbs like *tondeo* which have a reduplication of the stem in the preterite, change *deo* into *sum*. The *ui* preterites change the *ui* into *i* and add *tum* to form the supine.

107, 1 - 3: In theory PC's observations follow Priscian, although the wording is somewhat different. However, as far as the phrase in sentence 2 goes, which is cited in the *Fontes*, there is a close reading in the *Libri Turicensis*: "Omnia uerba secundae conjugationis in deo desinentia ...."

4: Priscian gives a more complicated explanation. He states: "sin autem prima syllaba in 'deo' terminorum post mutam aliquam vel m semivocalem e vel o correpit in aliquam liquidam de//sinentes, duplicatur, sic tamen, ut priori geminatarum extrema consonans subtrahatur, et sic 'eo' in i conversis fit praeteritum perfectum, ut 'pêdeo pependi', ...."

5 - 9: Although PC's assumptions here agree with the ideas of Priscian contained in the texts cited in the *Fontes*, sentence 5 seems to be the only one with slight similarity in phrasing as compared with PRIS., 2, 483, 6 - 8: "alia vero omnia in'deo' desinentia per 'ui' divisas proferunt praeteritum, ut 'candeo candui', 'studeo studui', 'frondeo frondui', 'splendeo splendui', ...."

108, : The verbs ending in *geo* PC observes that those *geo* verbs having *l* or *r* before *geo* make
the preterite end in *si*. If they have a long vowel before *geo*
they make the preterite end in *si*. All others have *ui* as the preterite
ending. Preterites ending in *si* form the supine by changing
the *si* to *sum*. Those taking the *xi* preterite change the *xi* to
*ctum*. Preterites ending in *ui* change the *ui* to *i* and add *tum*
to form the supine.

108, 1 - 2: Priscian discusses (see the *Fontes*) the category
of *geo* verbs: "In 'geo' desinentia, l vel r antecedentibus,
'geo' in 'si' conversa faciunt praeteritum perfectum, ut 'indulgeo
indulsi', ...."

3: PC notes that the *geo* verbs having a long vowel
before *geo* take the preterite in *xi*. PRIS., 2, 486, 22 observes,
however, that it is the long syllable before *geo* that accounts
for this phenomenon.

4: There appears to be some slight similarity in
phrasing with PRIS., 2, 486, 24 - 25: "Alia vero omnia in 'geo'
desinentia in 'ui' divisas mutant in praeterito, ut 'egeo egui',
'indigeo indigui', 'rigeo rigui', ...."

6: Priscian treats in a vaguely familiar way the
*geo* verbs taking the preterite in *xi*: " In 'xi' vero proferentia
praeteritum, cuiuscumque sint coniugationis, 'xi' in 'ctum'
vertentia faciunt supinum, ut ... 'frixī frictum', ...."
109, : The verbs ending in peo

Although there is as yet no identifiable source for this paragraph, PC is correct about torpeo having the preterite in torpui, (See CHARISIUS, 317, 7 and FORCELLINI, 4, 750), but torpium is so far unlocatable.

110, : The verbs ending in queo

PC remarks that the ui preterites of this class form the supine by changing ui to i and adding tum. Those that form the preterite in si change si into sum.

2: Omnia ... praeteritum in 'ui'

The Libri Turicenses offers a greater resemblance to PC's phrase than PRIS., 2, 488, 10 - 11. In the Libri we read: "Omnia uerba in queo desinentia faciunt praeteritum in si, ...." Priscian reads thus: "In 'queo' desinens unum inventur secundae coniugationis in 'si' terminans praeteritum, ...."

111, : The verbs ending in teo

PC notes that a verb like miteo forms the preterite in ui and makes the supine by changing ui to i and adding tum; an exception to this is pateo. Miteo is so far unlocatable. PC, according to FORCELLINI, 3, 592 is correct about patui, and correct according to PRIS., 2, 573, 21 about passum.

112, : The verbs ending in leo

Verbs in this category, as PC observes, that are compounded with
oleo, leo or pleo form the preterite in ui like adoleo, adoleui. PRIS., 2, 488, 16 - 20 notes that some leo verbs take the preterite in ui and some in vi; and indeed, he makes the observation that oleo can form the preterite in either ui or vi. The Libri Turicenses (p. lxvii) makes this comment: "... et in eo faciunt praeteritum eo mutata in ui, ut fleo fleui, deleui aboleui. Alia omnia in leo desinentia per ui diuisas faciunt praeteritum, ut doleo dolui."

112, 2: Omnia ... desinentia

There appears to be a similarity of structure in the following treatment from the Libri Turicenses (p. lxvii): "Omne uerbum secunde conjugationis in leo desinens ...."

113 - 116: These paragraphs dealing respectively with the second conjugation verbs ending in neo, neo, reo, and seo do not so far have a possible identifiable source, except for 114. Indeed, Priscian does not deal with these categories. However, I shall comment on the validity of PC's observations.

113, : It is uncertain whether PC is correct about the forms umui and [h]umitum. They are neither attested in Lewis and Short, the Grammatici Latini nor in the lexicons and glossaries used in this research.

114, : PC notes that these verbs generally form the preterite in ui with the exception of maneo and neo. The ui
preterites form the supine by changing \textit{ui} to \textit{i} and adding \textit{tum}; but \textit{tenui} makes \textit{tentum}. The \textit{si} preterites form the supine by changing \textit{si} into \textit{sum}. A verb like \textit{neo}, \textit{neui}, however, has the supine \textit{nectum}. The past participle according to PRIS., 2, 492, 27 is \textit{netum}.

114, 2: PC is correct in his assumptions according to the Priscian reference cited except for \textit{nectum}, but his presentation is not close enough to Priscian's to warrant the conclusion that he borrowed directly from Priscian; the latter, for instance, writes: "in verbis quoque cum // omnia in 'neo' desinentia secundae coniugationis in 'nui' faciant praeteritum perfectum, ut 'teneo tenui', 'moneo monui', differentiae causa 'maneo mansi' facit, ne 'manui' dativus 'manus' putetur, et 'neo nevi', ne, si 'nui' diceremus, a 'nuo' esse videatur, ...."

4: For the form \textit{monitus} see PRIS. PT., 463, 25.

5: For \textit{tentum} see PRIS. PT., 483, 29.

6: PRIS. PT., 484, 7 gives \textit{mansus}.

115, : The verbs ending in \textit{reo}

PC notes that all of these except for \textit{haereo} form the preterite in \textit{ui}, and change \textit{ui} to \textit{i}, and add \textit{tum} to form the supine.

\textit{Haesi} has its \textit{si} changed to \textit{sum} to form the supine. There are also the forms \textit{torrui tostum} and \textit{carrui cassum}.
2: PC is correct about *haereo* taking the preterite *haesi*. (See the T.L.L., 6, pt. 3, 2493.)

3: *Horritum* is not attested elsewhere in the *Grammatici Latini*, the T.L.L., FORCELLINI, Lewis and Short, and the other lexicons and glossaries employed in this research.

4: PC agrees with PRIS., 2, 573, 3 about *tostum* and also about *cassum*. (PRIS., 2, 573, 21.) For *carui* see PRIS., 2, 492, 6. PC also agrees with PRIS., 2, 492, 21 about *haesum*.

116, : The verbs ending in *seo*

These verbs, PC notes, form the preterite in *ui*; and they change *ui* to *i* and add *tum* to make the supine. He attests both *censitum* and *censum*. Moreover, PRIS., 2, 492, 17 admits the existence of *censum*. The T.L.L., 3, 786 gives *censui* the preterite and *censum* as the regular supine and *censitus* as that belonging to *censio* *censire*. The T.L.L., 5, pt. 1, 542 gives *densi* as the preterite and *densetum* as the supine.

117, : The verbs that end in *ueo*

PC notes that all of these verbs except for *coniueo* form the preterite in *ui*. The *ui* preterites change *ui* to *tum* to form the supine, with a few exceptions. The *xi* preterites change *xi* into *ctum* to form the supine.

2: *Omnia* ... *terminantia*

There is a similarity to the following phrase from the *Libri*
Turicensis (p. lxxv): "Omnia uerba secundae conjugationis in ueo desinentia ...." PC, moreover, is in agreement with PRIS., 2, 22, 4 - 5 about foueu foui, caueo caui and faueo faui. His assumptions about coniveau are also in accordance with PRIS., 2, 478, 11 - 12. Concerning coniveau and conixi the T.L.L., 4, 320 states that in some codices coniveau is found and that certain ancient writers had the form conivo. It also refers to the two types of preterite: conivi and conixi, which PRIS., 2, 478, 11 attests.

3: PC's ideas about the supines mentioned in this sentence are in harmony with what PRIS., 2, 480, 14 ff. teaches. Although conictum is unlocatable, the T.L.L., 4, 320 has a note telling the reader to compare nictare, nictus.

118 - 140: This section concerns the verbs of the third declension.

118, : The third conjugation verbs ending in aho and eho They take the preterite in xi and form the supine by changing xi to ctum.

2: PC's observations agree with the Priscian text cited: "In 'ho' desinentia mutant 'ho' in 'xi' et faciunt praeteritum, ut 'veho vexi', ...."
119, PC points out that generally verbs of this type take the preterite in *ui* with a few exceptions. The *ui* preterites form the supine by changing *ui* into *i* and adding *tum*. The *xi* preterites form the supine by changing the *i* into *um*. He notes the forms *pluui plutum*.

1 - 2: Priscian, in fact, speaks about this category in the same terms, and PC's text seems to bear a similarity, if only second-hand. The Priscian text reads: "In 'uo' divisas quacumque consonante desinentia mutant o in i, ut 'acuo acui', 'imbuo imbui', 'induo indui', 'diluo dilui', .... excipiuntur 'struo struxi', 'fluo fluxi', 'pluo pluvi'."

3: PC's teachings here agree with the texts of Priscian cited. However, PC does not point out that the supine of *ruo* may be *rutum*. This is correct according to PRIS., 2, 505, 10.

5: Although PC's assumptions agree with Priscian's, it does not appear that PC used the latter verbatim as his source. Priscian writes: "alia vero supra dictae terminationis verba extremam syllabam praeteriti in 'ctum' convertunt, ut 'struxi structum', ...; excipitur 'fluxum', ut iam supra dictum est."
119, 6: PC gives a somewhat different explanation about *plutum* than Priscian who says that although such a form could be coined by analogy with *erutum*, it is not found in usage. Moreover, I have not found *plutum* in any of the lexicons used in this research.

120, : The verbs that end in *cio*

PC notes that *cio* presents have the preterite in *ci* if there is an *e* before *ci*. Verbs compounded from *licio* and *spicio* take the preterite in *xi* with a couple of exceptions. The *ci* preterites form the supine by changing *io* (as in *facio*) to *tum*. However, verbs compounded from verbs like *facio* and *iacio* that have the *e* preceding the *ci* in the preterite, form the supine by changing the *i* to *tum* as in *confeci confectum*. Those that take the preterite in *xi* form the supine by changing *xi* to *ctum*. The *ui* preterites form the supine by changing *ui* to *i* and adding *tum*.

1 - 2: Priscian offers a more complicated explanation in a text comparable to the one in sentences 1 - 2: "In *'cio' a antecedente mutant eam in e productam et abiecta o productaque i faciunt praeteritum perfectum, ut *facio feci*, *iacio ieci*".

3: PC agrees with the list of Priscian and adds the supplementary example of *prolicui*. 
4: PC and Priscian agree that in verbs like facio and iacio io becomes tum to form the supine. Priscian, however, unlike PC who observes that they are of the type that have e before ci categorizes these verbs as those having a before cio.

5: Though PC lists the usual supines for the verbs of the type treated in this sentence, his explanation of their formation is different from that of Priscian who says: "ex his composita, quae in praesenti mutant a in i, ut 'facio ..., et in supino a in e convertunt, ut 'factum infectum', ...."

6: Priscian gives the same explanation for the formation of the supines treated in this sentence as PC does. Moreover, there even seems to be a slight resemblance between PC's and Priscian's treatment. The latter offers: "...; quae vero in 'xi' terminant praeteritum secundum praemonstratam regulam, 'xi' in 'ctum' convertentia faciunt supinum, 'aspeXi|| aspectum', ...."

7: Prolicitum is unattested in the dictionaries, mss., lexicons and glossaries used in this research.

8: The verbs of the third conjugation that end in dio PC notes that all of them form the preterite in di and the supine in sum by changing di to sum with an additional s interposed.
121, 2: Priscian accounts for the formation of the supine by saying that it ends in sum with a double s, and states, moreover, that fodio is the only dio third conjugation verb he has found.

122, 2: The third conjugation verbs that end in gio

2: Priscian accounts more explicitly for the formation of the preterite: "In 'gio' similiter producta antepaenultima et ablata o extrema faciunt praeteritum perfectum, ut 'fugio fugi', ...." Furthermore, his account of the formation of the supine has a resemblance to PC's discussion: 'supinum o in 'tum' convertit: 'fugio fugitum', ...."

123, 2: The third conjugation verbs ending in pio

PC observes that all of these type of verbs form the preterite in pi with certain exceptions. Io becomes tum to form the supine. In compounded verbs, however, the i of the preterite is changed to tum. Those that have the preterite in ui change this to tum.

1 - cepi of sentence 2

The account of PRIS., 2, 498, 24 - 25 is more explicit: "In 'pio' 'ca' antecedente mutant a in e productam et abiecta o productaque i faciunt praeteritum perfectum, ut 'capio cepi'."
123, 2: \textit{praeter 'cupio cupiui}

The explanation of PRIS., 2, 499, 5 ff. is more complex in his method of derivation: "'Cu' vero ante 'pio' habentia o in 'vi' convertunt et producunt paenultimam in praeterito, ut 'cupio cupivi' vel 'cupii' et ex eo composita, 'concupio concupivi' vel 'concupii'."

2: \textit{rapio rapui'}

Concerning \textit{rapio} and the formation of its preterite PRIS., 2, 499, 11 - 12 observes in a detailed fashion: "in 'ui' divisas faciens praeteritum unum invenio supra dictae terminationis, 'rapio rapui' et ex hoc composita, 'eripio eripui', ...."

2: \textit{et 'sapio sapui'.}

PRIS., 2, 499, 16 ff. observes the forms \textit{sapii} and \textit{sapivi} and illustrates their usage with quotations from Naevius, Terence, Afranius, and Plautus.

3 - 4: Although PC gives the correct forms of the supines cited in this sentence, his discussion of their formation is different from that of Priscian which reads: "supinum tam eius quam omnium in 'pi' vel 'psi' vel 'mi' terminantium praeteritum per 'ptum' profertur, ut 'cepi||captum', ...."

5: PC's treatment on the formation of the supine of a verb like \textit{cupio} is in accordance with the text of Priscian cited.
124, : The third conjugation verbs that end in *tio*
PC remarks that all of these verbs take the preterite in *ssi.* To form the supine they change *si* to *sum.* He observes that there is a deponent *potior* in this category of verbs.

1 - 3: There is a similarity both in method and discussion between PC and Priscian. The latter writes: "In 'tio' desinens per 'si' facit praeteritum geminata s: 'quatio quassi', .... supinum secundum regulam in 'si' terminantium perfectum in 'sum' exit, 'quassum', ...."

6: Priscian likewise observes the existence of a deponent in *tior:* *potior.* He states: "In 'tior' deponens tam tertiae quam quartae conjugationis unum inventur, 'potior'." However, one notices that he more emphatically states that only one such example is found and that it is either of the third or fourth conjugation.

125, : The third conjugation verbs that end in *rio*
These verbs, PC points out, form the preterite in *ri* and make the supine by changing *io* to *tum.* Priscian points out that he has found only one verb of the third conjugation that ends in *rio:* *pario peperi.* He does, however, remark that some of the ancient writers conjugated this verb as if it were of the fourth conjugation. Moreover, Priscian does not explain as PC does his conception of the morphological changes that occur to *pario*
to render it as a preterite and as a supine.

126, : The third conjugation verbs ending in bo
All of these verbs, PC notes, form the preterite in psi if
they have a long vowel before bo. All the others take the
preterite in bi with some exceptions in ui. The bi preterites
form the supine by changing the o of the present tense to i
and adding tum. The psi preterites form the supine, PC points
out, by changing psi to tum as in scriptum. He continues, saying
that the ui preterites form the supine by changing ui to i
and adding tum. He concludes this paragraph, saying that there
is a deponent of this conjugation: labor.

1: PRIS., 2, 506, 17 - 18 offers a similar type
of explanation: "In 'bo' desinentia verba vocali longa antecedente
'b' in 'ps' convertentia faciunt praeteritum perfectum, ut
'scribo scripsi', 'nubo nupsi': ...."

2: PC, unlike Priscian, does not offer the
explanation that verbs like bibo change the o to i to form the
preterite. PRIS., 2, 506, 19 says: "alia vero o in i mutant in
praeterito, ut 'bibo bibi'." However, concerning verbs like recumbo
PRIS., 2, 507, 3 ff. right after his discussion on bibo has
the statement: "unum excipitur 'incumbo incumbis', quod etiam
'incubo incubas' secundum primam coniugationem profertur, quod
'incubui' facit praeteritum, et omnia a 'cubo' composita, sive
primae sive tertiae sint conjugationis, ut 'accumbo' ...."

126, 3: Actually, PC's explanation in this sentence is an elaboration of the one in PRIS., 2, 507, 11 - 12 which reads: "... in 'bi' vero assumunt 'tum', 'babitum, accubitum', ...."

4: PC is not in agreement with PRIS., 2, 507, 15 who claims that it is si that becomes tum and not psi, for the p obviously remains as in nuptum.

5: Although the morphological account given in this sentence is not to be found in Priscian, nevertheless the pattern cubui cubitum is in accord with PRIS., 2, 507, 12.

127, : The verbs of the third conjugation that end in co PC observes that those that have an n before co lose the n and add ci or qui to form the preterite. Those that have an s before co, form the preterite in ui with some notable exceptions. If there is a long vowel before co, the preterite is in xi with the exception of peperci. The ci preterites, he points out, form the supine by changing the i to tum. The qui preterites form the supine by changing qui to ctum; and those that take the preterite in ui change ui to tum. Verbs like posco that reduplicate the stem in the preterite, form the supine by changing the present tense o to i and adding tum. A verb like compesco compescui forms the supine by changing ui to i and
adding *tum*. The *xi* preterites form the supine by changing *xi* to *tum*.

127, 2: Unlike PRIS., 2, 507, 26 – p. 508, 2 PC does not state specifically that the *o* becomes *i* to form the preterites of such verbs nor that the vowel of the penultimate is long as in *vici*. Otherwise, PC's observations here are in harmony with those of Priscian.

3: *Et si ... quieui'*

PRIS., 2, 508, 2 ff. notes that *sco* becomes *vi*.

3: *'conquexi'*

This form appears in the ms. on 14V 28 as *conquessi*. Väinönen (p. 68) observes that the form *visit* in a Late Latin inscription stands for *vixit* and notes the Italian *dissi* from *dixi*.

3: *et praeter *posco* ... *didici'*

PRIS., 2, 509, 11 – 13 offers the following text that has a somewhat similar treatment to PC's: "excipitur praeterea 'disco didici', 'posco // poposci' et ex eis composita, quae similiter faciunt praeteritum, 'dedisco dedidici', 'deposco depoposci'."

5: PRIS., 2, 510, 4 – 5 also observes the same as PC though not using the exact phrasing: "Supina in 'ci' quidem terminantium praeteritum i in 'tum' convertunt: 'vici victum', 'convici convictum'."
6: PRIS., 2, 510, 6 – 8 offers an explanation different from PC's: "..., 'reliqui relictum', 'deliqui delictum'. nec mirum, cum post quae posita vim literae amittat, in 'ci' desinentium regulam sequi."

7: PRIS., 2, 510, 8 – 9 gives the following text: "quaer vero in 'vi' syllabam proferunt praeteritum perfectum, mutant eam in 'tum' et faciunt supinum, 'requievi requietum' ...

8: Priscian does not make the observation formally that posco and disco are the kind of verbs that reduplicate in the preterite, but he agrees with PC concerning the formation of their supines: "... faciunt supinum mutatione o in i correetam et additione 'tum': 'posco poscitum', ..., 'disco discitum'."

9: PC and Priscian share the same view about compescitum being the supine of compescu, but the latter places this verb in the category of posco and disco as discussed in 127, 8.

10: This assumption is in accord with the text of Priscian cited in the Fontes, although the text is entirely reworked and reworded.

128: The third conjugation verbs that end in do
In this paragraph PC notes that all verbs of this type, with
a few notable exceptions, that have a long vowel before do form the preterite in si. All others form the preterite in di except fundo, findo, scindo, and diuido. The si preterites form the supine by changing si to sum. Nearly all the others form the supine by changing do to sum. Sentences 6 - 8 enumerate the several exceptions to this rule.

128, 1: Verba ... lusi'

The text of PRIS., 2, 514, 12 - 13 offers the following explanation that accounts more explicitly for the si preterite: "In 'do' desinentia, si paenultimam naturaliter longam habuerint, 'do' in 'si' convertentia faciunt praeteritum perfectum, ut 'lūdo lusi', ...."

1: et 'sido ... 'sisi' of sentence 2

PRIS., 2, 515, 8 remarks that he has not found a preterite derived from sido. However, on p. 522, 5 - 7 Priscian does state that nisi ought to be the preterite of sido but that the preterite of sedeo which is sedi is used instead.

3: All the observations in this sentence are correct according to the Priscian texts cited for them. However, it cannot be shown that PC borrows directly from Priscian here; for example, the latter writes (vol. 2, 516, 13 - 14) in connection with scindo and fundo: "N vero ante 'do' habentia o in i mutant in praeterito perfecto et, si ante n u vel i habuerint,
amittunt n, ut 'fundo fudi', 'scindo scidi'."

128, 4: Priscian's phrase cited appears to have a resemblance in method of presentation: "excipitur etiam 'divido', quod praeteritum 'divisi' facit."

6: _Omnia ... casum_
There appears to be some evidence of borrowing from PRIS., 2, 519, 5 ff.: "alia vero omnia 'do' in 'sum' convertunt, ut 'ludo ...." And in line 15 we read: "'cado' quoque 'cāsum' facit, 'ca' tamen paenultima producta."

6: _praeter 'comedo' ... 'tentum'_
Although PC and Priscian share the same observations, the text of Priscian is not the most immediate source.

7: It seems that PC has either reworked Priscian or may have borrowed Priscian at second-hand; for instance, the latter writes in vol. 2, 519, 22: "... et 'pando' 'passum' faciunt, quamvis etiam a 'patior' et a 'pateo' 'passum' dicimus."

8: The same type of explanation offered by Priscian is repeated in this sentence. Now, the phrase in PRIS., 2, 519, 4 reads: "... mutant o in i correpturn et assumpunt 'tum', ut 'reddo reddatum', ...." This bears a resemblance to PC's phrase in this sentence which reads: "... mutant 'o' in 'i' et accipiunt 'tum' ut 'reddo reddatum.'"
The third conjugation verbs that end in *go* PC first mentions the deponent in *gor:* *fungor.* Then he proceeds to discuss the *go* verbs, saying that if there is an *r* before *go,* the preterite ends in *si.* He notes that verbs compounded from *rego* take the preterite in *xi.* He then enumerates several verbs other than the latter type mentioned that take the preterite in *xi.* *Lego,* however, and its compounds have the *gi* preterite as well as *ago.* In sentences 8 - 9 he lists other *gi* preterites. Also, there is *compunxi* and *repunxi.* The *si* preterites form the supine by changing *si* to *sum.* To form the supine all the others, except *figo,* change *go* to *ctum.*

5: Priscian gives a similar explanation but notes that *go* is changed to *si.*

6: Priscian's explanation of the morphology is different: "a 'regendo' composita, quamvis in praesenti syncopam et paenultimae patiuntur, tamen in praeterito perfecto eam euphoniae causa servant, ut 'porgo porrexi', 'pergo perrexi', ...."

7: *Omnia ... finxi'*

There appears to be a slight resemblance in the discussion in PRIS., 2, 523, 5 ff.: "alia vero in 'xi' convertunt 'go' praesentis et faciunt supra dictum tempus, ut 'rego rexii', 'cingo cinxi', 'ango anxi', 'tingo tinxi', 'pingo pinxi'." *Clanxi* is nowhere else attested.
129: *praeter 'lego' ... exegi.*

PC's observations about all the forms listed in this portion of sentence 7 are correct with respect to Priscian, but the former's presentation is not close enough to Priscian's to warrant an assumption that he borrowed directly from the latter.

8: Priscian notes in addition to *pepigi* that there are the preterites *pegi* and *panxi*. Priscian does not say that the compounds of *pango* all end in *gi* but states that the preterite of *imparingo* is *impegi*. The T.L.L., 3, 2071 lists *compingo, -pegi*.

8: *'frango gi confringo confregi.'*

PRIS., 2, 523, 12 and 13 gives the forms *fregi* and *confregi* as the preterites of these verbs.

9: PC's ideas are in agreement with Priscian and Charisius. There is also an echo in the phrase from PRIS., 2, 524, 11: "... 'repungo repupugi' et 'repunxi.'"

10: Sommer (p. 570) and the T.L.L., 3, 2172 note the attested form *compugi*. The latter also adds *compunxi*.

11 — *directum* (of sentence 12)

All of the supines listed here are in the Priscian text cited, with the exception of *directum*. However, *directum* is listed in
the T.L.L., 5, 1232. Furthermore, as for the account of the
catum supines dealt with in the beginning of sentence 12, PRIS.,
2, 525, 8 offers a similar text: "alía vero omnia 'go' in 'ctum'
convertunt, ut 'rego rectum', ...."

129, 12: licet ... 'fixum.'
Diomedes gives the forms fictus and fixus.

130, : The verbs that end in po
PC observes that the verbs of this category having e, l, or r
before po form the preterite in psi. He notes the forms, however,
strepui and rupi. The psi preterites change psi to ptum in order
to form the supine. The ui preterites change ui to i and add
tum; and the pi preterites, PC notes, change the i to ptum.

1 - 2: PC's treatment is not as explicit as Priscian's
account, for the latter states that the e preceding po to give
rise to the psi preterite is lengthened.

3: Though the forms given in this sentence are
correct according to Priscian, the latter gives a detailed
account of the formation of strepui and rupi not used by PC.

4: Priscian says that si changes to tum. PC's
supines given in this sentence are all listed by the text of
Priscian cited for this sentence.
130, 5: Priscian notes that ui is separatae and that u is taken away and tum added to form the supine of strepo.

6: PC's observation here is in accordance with Priscian's. There is even some similarity in phrasing: "... mutata i in 'tum', ut 'rupi ruptum'; ...."

131, : The third conjugation verbs that end in quo PC points out that all verbs of this category take the preterite in xi and change this xi to ctum in forming the supine. He mentions loquor as a deponent in this category.

1 - 2: Eutyches in his discussion of the quo and quor verbs does not deal with the formation of their supines and preterites. In fact, his presentation of these type of verbs is not limited to third conjugation ones but includes some in the first conjugation. PRIS., 2, 505, 26 ff. deals with the category of the deponents; however, on p. 504, 1 he mentions coxi and coco as the alternative form of coquo.

5: Priscian gives another deponent in quor: sequor. EUTYCHES, 480, 22 gives sequor, loquor, and liquor.

132, : The third conjugation verbs ending in to If such verbs, PC notes, have a c before to, they make the preterite in xi with a few exceptions. PC also is aware of the preterites of meto, sterto, sisto, uerto, mitto, and peto.
Those that take the preterite in xi change the i to um to form the supine. The ui preterites change this ui to um. To this latter principle there are a few exceptions. The si preterites change si to sum and interpose an s. Those that take the preterite in i or ui' (PC's way of writing vi as distinguished from what Priscian often calls ui divisas) change this i or ui' to tum. PC concludes with the example of the deponent utor.

132, 1 - inueniatur) of sentence 2

Priscian's text cited for this portion presents opinions that are in agreement with PC's, although it is evident that Priscian's text is not directly used or else could have been worked over in an original fashion, for he writes: "In 'to' c antecedente invenio 'pecto', cuius praeteritum plerique 'pexui', A s p e r tamen 'pectui', C h a r i s i u s 'pexi' protule // runt. .... similiter 'necto nexui' et 'nexi'."

2: et praeter 'meto messui'

This is correct according to PRIS., 2, 537, 6 - 7, but the latter's presentation is very different from that of PC who does not include peto in the same category as meto, which Priscian does: " e brevi antecedente in 'to' desinentia duo inveni: 'pëto petivi' et 'mëto messui'."

2: stereto sterti'

PC is alone about sterti. The form stertui is found in PRIS., 2, 537, 11.
2: *et 'sisto' quod facit 'statui' et 'steti,*
PRIS., 2, 418, 27 - p. 419, 4 states that *sisto* along with several others does not have a preterite nor any other form derived from the preterite. This lack is because of usage and not because it would be irrational for *sisto* to have its own preterite. However, he notes the use of *statui* and *steti* as the preterites of *sisto*. These two preterites are properly the preterites of *statuo* and *sto* respectively.

2: *et praeter 'uerto ti'*
PRIS., 2, 537, 10 - 11 offers the following about *uerto:* "r antecedente similiter duo inveni, 'vero verti', 'ster to stertui' ...." PC does not present a category like this which includes these two verbs.

2: *et 'mitto misi,'*
PRIS., 2, 537, 14 categorizes this verb as one that geminates the *t* before the *o*.

3: Priscian categorizes *peto* as having a short *o* before *to* like *meto.* PC's *petii* and *petiui* are correct according to Priscian.

4 - 5: PC's treatment is an elaboration of PRIS., 2, 537, 19 - 20 because PC accounts for the changes of the perfect into the supine. Priscian writes: "Supina eorum, quae in 'xui' vel
'xi' praeteritum terminant, per 'xum' exeunt, ut 'nexui nexum', 'pexui' vel 'pexi pexum', 'flexi flexum'."

132, 6: PRIS., 2, 537, 25 states that sisto has no supine of its own. The form statutum which PC cites is the supine of statuo. (See Sommer, p. 601.) FORCELLINI, 4, 390 - 391 gives statum, but he observes that in certain manuscripts status and statutus are often interchangeable.

7: Priscian says that in the supine of mitto the s is doubled.

10: Priscian gives nitor as well as utor.

133, : The third conjugation verbs that end in lo PC remarks that all verbs of this type take the preterite in ui. Those that feature a reduplication like fallo fefelli take the preterite in li. There are exceptions to these two principles in verbs like percello and excello, for example. The ui preterites form the supine by changing ui to tum with a few exceptions. He notes that the verbs like fallo change lo to sum to form the supine. Sentence 9 lists some irregular formations of supines.

1 - 2: PRIS., 2, 526, 7 - 8 notes that such verbs dealt with by PC in these two sentences take their preterites in lui.
Concerning sallo sallui Charleton T. Lewis and Charles Short (A Latin Dictionary, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1962, p. 1619) give it as a third conjugation verb, a variant spelling of which is salo. They refer the reader to salio 'to salt' of the fourth conjugation. Salio, they note, may be spelled with two 1's, which is a feature in 149, 2 where salio is also given. Lewis and Short observe that the salio or sallo meaning 'to salt' has no perfect tense. However, there is another salio listed by Lewis and Short which means 'to leap'; and this salio has a perfect tense salui. It may therefore be possible that PC is confusing the two verbs salio, taking the preterite of the one that means 'to leap,' doubling the 1 by analogy with sallo, and using sallui as the preterite of the verb meaning 'to salt.'

3: Et si .. pepuli
PRIS., 2, 526, 12 ff. offers a much more detailed account:
" excipiantur duplicantia l, quae si a muta incipient, geminant principalem syllabam, etsi non servent ubique eandem vocalem, ut 'pello pepuli', 'falio fefeli', 'tollo tetuli', ...." For -tuli the manuscript has tuli. It is clear from parallel instances that his should be read as the last two syllables of tetuli and not from fero. Such parallel instances occur, for instance, in paragraph 129: "'pungo gis pupugi repungo gis.'"
5: Concerning the verbs in sentence 5 as well as in 4, PRIS., 2, 526, 17 says that they are the type that change the present o to i to form the preterite.

7: Diomedes says that salsus may be considered as the past participle of sallior.

8: Priscian merely says that those verbs which duplicant 'double' take the supine in sum. Then he gives a list of those adhering to this principle.

9: According to PRIS., 2, 528, 1 and CHARISIUS, 328, 9 ff., PC is incorrect about tollo latum. The supine of tollo is sublatum. The other supines given by PC in this sentence are correct according to Priscian.

134: The verbs of the third conjugation that end in mo Those that have a long vowel, PC observes, before mo form the preterite in psi. Those that have a short vowel before mo form the preterite in ui, with the exception of premo. The psi preterites make the supine by changing psi and ptum. The ui preterites form the supine by changing ui to i and adding tum. Those that have the preterite in mi change the i to ptum; and those that take the preterite in si form their supines by changing si to sum. Moreover, Priscian's order of treatment appears to have a similarity with PC's. Priscian first speaks about the preterites in psi formed from the mo presents having a long vowel before mo. Then, having dealt with how their supines are
formed, which treatment, however, is non-parallel since it is comparable with PC's sentence 5, he treats those that take the preterite in **ui divisas** like **vomo**; but unlike PC he does not say that the vowel in these verbs before **no** is short. Priscian follows this discussion with: "excipiuntur 'emo emi' et 'premo pressi'." Sentence 5 from PC is comparable with PRIS., 2, 528, 7 - 9; but PC differs from the latter because he says that **psi** becomes **ptum**, while Priscian notes that **si** becomes **tum**. Sentences 6 - 8 from PC present a discussion parallel to PRIS., 2, 528, 11 - 18. Priscian, however, has a slightly different explanation from that in sentence 6, for he says that **ui** becomes **itum**. Concerning sentence 7 one also notices a different explanation in Priscian: "'emi' vero 'emptum' facit, quod ideo assumpsit p, quia non potest m ante 'tum' sine p inveniri euphoniae causa, ut ...." As for sentence 8, Priscian notes that in the case of **pressi pressum** the **i** becomes **um**, while PC notes that **si** becomes **sum**.

135: The third conjugation verbs ending in **no**
PC observes that in this category if an **o** or **g** precedes **no**, the preterite ends in **ui**. All those verbs compounded from **cano** form the preterite in **ui** except **cano** itself. Temno's preterite is **tempsi**. PC further notes that all the other **no** verbs take the preterite in **ui** and they form their supines by changing **ui** to **i** and adding **tum**. In sentence 6 he mentions the
supines of concinui, recinui, cano and temno. Those that take the preterite in vi (PC writes this as ui) change ui to tum. Priscian begins his discussion with observations on those preterites in ui as in posui. Verbs like pono, Priscian notes, either have an o or g before no. Then Priscian discusses the preterites of verbs compounded from cano and then immediately afterwards treats the psi preterites like temno tempsi. This is followed by an account of the preterites in 'vi' coniunctas, a discussion comparable to PC's sentence 4. Priscian finally ends his lengthy discussion of these vi preterites on p. 530, 1 and then proceeds to discuss the supines of the preterites in 'ui' divisas, which analysis is comparable to sentence 5 of this paragraph. Beginning with line 4 on p. 530 Priscian discusses the supines of the verbs that are compounds of cano and then deals briefly with the supine of temno. This is followed by a very long treatment (from p. 530, 8 - p. 531, 14) on the supines of the vi preterites like crevi. This discussion is comparable to sentence 7.

135, 1 - 2: PRIS., 2, 528, 19 ff. also has a similar treatment; and it ought to be noticed that he speaks of 'ui' divisas as in the case of posui as opposed to 'vi' coniunctas (p. 529, 10). Also, although PC gives only genui as the preterite of signo, on p. 528, 28 Priscian notes that Lucretius has the form geni.
3: PC is correct in his observations in this sentence according to the Priscian texts cited. However, the phrase about *temno* and *tempsi* seems to be awkwardly presented, being without an introduction to explain the morphological changes to give rise to *tempsi*: PRIS., 2, 529, 8 - 9, indeed, offers an explanation: "m antecedente 'no' in 'psi' conversa facit praeteritum perfectum, ut 'temno tempsi'."

4: There appears to be a similarity with the presentation in PRIS., 2, 529, 9 - 11: ... 'temno tempsi'. alia omnia per 'vi' coniunctas proferunt praeteritum: 'sino sivi', 'sterno stravi', 'cerno crevi'."

5: The explanation of the supines of *posui* and *genui* is explained differently by PRIS., 2, 530, 1 - 3: "supina in 'ui' quidem divisas terminantium praeteritum subtracta u et additum 'tum' proferuntur, correta tamen paenultima, ut 'posui posītum', 'genui genītum'."

6: PC is merely content to give the supines of verbs compounded from *cano*. PRIS., 2, 530, 4 ff. offers details on certain morphological changes, e.g.,: "a 'cano' tamen composita primitivi // servant in supino terminationem; 'cantum' enim et 'succentum' dicimus, quamvis in ipso verbo a in i convertunt ex eo composita, sed in supino iterum i in e transferunt: 'succino succentum', 'occino occentum'; ...."
Concerning *temno temptum* PRIS., 2, 530, 7 – 8 notes that all
the *psi* preterites take the supine in *ptum*.

135, 7: PC’s morphological accounts in this sentence
are in agreement with Priscian’s.

136, : The verbs of the third conjugation that end in *ro*
PC remarks that the verbs of this type take the preterite in
*ui* as in *tero triui*. In sentence 2 he especially notices the
preterites of a few compounded verbs as well as those of *uro*,
*gero*, *uerro*, and *curro*. He continues, saying that the
supines of the *ui* preterites mentioned in sentence 1 form the
supine by changing *ui* to *tum*. *Satum*, he notices, is a special
case, as are *insertum* and *insitum*. The supine of *vi* preterites
is *tum*; and that of *ri* preterites is *sum*.

On the whole, again PC and Priscian seem to treat of the
same topics in an identical order. PRIS., 2, 532, 5 ff.
commences his narrative by speaking about the *vi* preterites
like *trivi*. Then in line 7 he begins to discuss the preterites
of verbs that are compounds of *tero*, which treatment ends on
line 20; and line 21 sees the beginning of a discussion on
*gero*, *uro*, *verro*, and *curro*. Then, commencing on p. 533, 16,
having treated at length these four verbs, he deals with the
supines of the verbs like *trivi*, citing *satum* immediately
afterwards on p. 534, 2. Lines 2 – 9, which do not have a
comparable part in paragraph 136, concern participles like *datus*, *ratus*, *status*, *lassatus*, and *potatus*. Then beginning on line 10 Priscian deals with the supines and participles of compounds like *desero* and *insero*. This treatment lasts till line 16 where he also commences his discussion of the supines listed by PC in sentences 5 and 6.

136, 1 – 2: Although all of the observations that PC makes in these two sentences are in harmony with those of Priscian, it cannot be shown that PC's text is directly borrowed from Priscian's. PRIS., 2, 532, 21 ff. offers, for example: "duo inveniuntur supra dictae terminationis verba, quae duplicant s ante i in praeterito: 'gero gessi' et 'uro ussi'; ...."

Concerning, furthermore, _uerro_ and _uerri_ it is worthwhile to note that PRIS., 2, 532, 23 attests _versi_ according to Servius.

3: Concerning _seui_ and _satum_ PRIS., 2, 533, 18 notes that _seui_ by analogy ought to make _setum_ but that because the name _Setum_ was used in 'antiquity' for _Zetum_, the form _satum_ became the supine.

5: PRIS., 2, 534, 16 ff. notes that verbs like _gero_ and _uro_ have a doubled _s_ before _i_ in the preterite and that they change _si_ to _tum_ to form the supine.

6: PRIS., 2, 534, 17 – 19, which is the text
comparable to the one in this sentence, does not have the statement that verbs like verro have a ri preterite, but Priscian does state that ro is transformed into sum, as PC says. However, PC, unlike Priscian, does not specifically mention that a verb like verro has rr before o.

137, : The third conjugation verbs terminating in so PC begins by stating that all verbs of this type have the preterite in ui with some notable exceptions in si. The ui preterites change ui to tum in forming the supine. The ui preterites (Priscian would have called this 'ui' divisas) like pinsui lose the n and change ui to tum. PRIS., 2, 534, 20 starts off, treating the preterites of verbs like accesso.

He is more explicit in his account than PC is in sentence 1 for he says: "... o in i convertentia assumunt 'vi' et faciunt praeteritum perfectum: ...." Moreover, PRIS., 2, 535, 1 notes that some authors feature the forms lacessi and facessi. CHARISIUS, 320, 4 – 5 gives these forms. On p. 535, 14 Priscian notes the forms quaesi and visi, which PC also mentions, but in addition attests quaesivi. Having justified as better the use of quaesivi by adducing Probus and citing Sallust, Priscian mentions pinso pinsui, and unlike PC, again justifies his observation by referring to precedent. The reference to Diomedes also has pinsui. Then, beginning on p. 536, 1 Priscian discusses the supines of verbs like lacesso, noting, unlike PC,
that the supines are in situ and not stating that ui becomes tum. Then he observes (line 3) that pistum ought to be the supine of pinso. He does not offer a morphological explanation of pistum.

138, : The third conjugation verbs ending in xo PC says that all of these verbs have the ui preterite and that one of the supines is in stum and the other in xum.

2: Priscian first begins by stating that there are only two verbs in xo: texo texui and nexo nexui. He also attests nexas in addition to nexis. These observations are consequently illustrated by quotations from Cicero, Livy, and Accius. Then in line 17 he offers a text concerning the supines that bears a similarity with what PC says: "supina alterum per 'tum', alterum per 'xum' finiunt: 'textum', 'nexum'." This principle Priscian then illustrates with quotations from Vergil. It ought to be noted, however, that PROBUS CA., 39, 25 - 26 enumerates the xo verbs of the first and third conjugations. He observes that enixas is of the first conjugation and only gives "nexo nexis nexui" for the third conjugation.

139, : The verbs of the third conjugation that end in vo PC remarks that all verbs of this type have the preterite in ui with two exceptions. The ui preterites form the supine by
changing \( i \) to \textit{tum}. Those that take the \( xi \) preterite change \( xi \) to \textit{ctum}.

On the whole, one may witness an order of treatment of topics in PC which is similar to Priscian's. The latter commences his discussion by treating the \( ui \) preterite in verbs like \textit{volvo}. Then he proceeds to treat the \( xi \) preterites and how they are formed. He subsequently treats the supines of the verbs taking the \( ui \) preterite and ends his discussion with a comment on the formation of the supines of the verbs having the preterite in \( xi \).

139, 2: \textit{Omnia ... 'volo u\textit{i}'}

The text in Priscian (lines 8 ff.) is much more explanatory: "In 'vo', u loco consonantis posita, in l \( // \) quidem desinente paenultima, o extremam in i convertunt et faciunt praeteritum, ut 'solvo solvi', ...."

2: \textit{praeter ... connixi}.'

Likewise Priscian (lines 10 - 11) offers a more explicit explanation, namely that the \( xi \) preterites are formed from verbs having a vowel long by nature before \textit{vo}.

3: PC's observation agrees with that of Priscian (lines 12 - 13) but does not state that when the \( i \) becomes \textit{tum}, the \( y \) by necessity becomes a vowel.
139, 4: Priscian (line 15) does not say that the syllable \textit{xi} is transformed into \textit{ctum} but only that \textit{vixi}, regularly following the rule of the preterites ending in \textit{xi}, takes the supine \textit{victum}.

140, : The verbs of the third conjugation that end in \textit{io} Here PC notes that all of the verbs of this type have the preterite in \textit{ii}. To form the supine, the last \textit{i} of the preterite is changed to \textit{tum} as in \textit{meitum}.

Compared with the discussion of PRIS., 2, 494 ff., PC's treatment is only an outline. He speaks for all \textit{io} verbs, giving \textit{meio} as the only example, which PRIS., 2, 494, 16 ff. discusses as being the only third conjugation \textit{io} verb with an \textit{e} preceding \textit{io}. In the first paragraph on p. 494 he discusses \textit{aio} which he has found to be the only \textit{io} verb of the third conjugation with an \textit{a} before \textit{io}.

2: PRIS., 2, 495, 5 remarks that there are some who think \textit{meio meias} should be the forms used in current speech. Diomedes features \textit{meio meias meia\textit{vi} as well as \textit{meio meis meii}. The text of Probus gives \textit{meio meis m\textit{exi}}. Charisius gives the forms \textit{meio meis mixi}. PRIS., 2, 495, 6 notes that \textit{minxi} from \textit{mingo} is used as the preterite of \textit{meio}. Therefore, it is evident that PC adheres to the observation of Diomedes.
140, 3: I have not found meitum attested elsewhere. The T.L.L., 8, 604 gives mictum.

141 - 154: This series of paragraphs concerns the verbs of the fourth conjugation and deals with them, as in the case of the first to the third conjugations preceding, by the present tense endings of the first person singular. A direct source for paragraphs 143 - 153 has not yet been traced. However, isolated words and morphological considerations occur here and there in PC's text that agree with certain observations made by Priscian. Moreover, it ought to be noted that beginning with paragraph 142 - 145 inclusive PC's categories treated in the succession cio, dio, gio and pio present a similar order of treatment to PRIS., 2, 496, 10 - 498, 24. In this section Priscian dealing with the third conjugation verbs also treats the categories cio, dio, gio, and pio in that order. Sometimes PC erroneously discusses third conjugation verbs like inquio as belonging to the fourth conjugation.

141: The fourth conjugation verbs that end in bio PC notes that they take the preterite in ui except cambio, and that to form the supine they change ui to tum. He adds that the verbs taking the preterite in psi form the supine by changing psi to psum.
2: The forms *cambio campsi* are found in PRIS., 2, 541, 13 - 14 and in CHARISIUS, 321, 19 - 20. *Ambio ambis* are found in EUTYCHES, 451, 8.

3: *Ambitum* is found in PRIS., 2, 547, 4 but Priscian does not give the same explanation of its formation.

4: Priscian says that the fourth conjugation preterites in *si* end the supine in *sum* like *sensi sensum*. However, *campsam* is so far not attested elsewhere.

142, : The fourth conjugation verbs that end in *cio*
The verbs of this type, PC points out, form the preterite in *xi* if they have an *n* before *cio*. He then in an awkward fashion lists *sarcio sarxi* *farcio farsi* in the list of these *ncio* verbs.

PC observes that all other *cio* verbs form the preterite in *ui* like *ciui*. Those that have the *xi* preterite transform *xi* to *tum*; and those that have the *si* preterite change *si* to *tum* except *rausi*. PC last of all notes that the *ui* preterites change *ui* to *tum*.

PRIS., 2, 538, 24 - 539, 7 offers a text concerning *cio* verbs and appears to present a slight parallelism in method of treatment with PC. Priscian begins by noting that *cio* verbs having an *n* before *cio* form the preterite in *xi* like *vincio vinxi* and *sancio sanxi*. But he also adds that *this* type of verbs has more than two syllables, and notes that there are the
ancient forms sancti and sancti. Then having discussed the
*si* preterites (line 30 of p. 538 to line 7 of p. 539) which
PC does not treat at length but mentions sarcio, he begins
(p. 539, 8) to speak about the *vi* preterites like civi and scivi,
adding many more examples than what PC offers. Priscian's
discussion of these *vi* preterites blends into one on the *vi*
preterites of *io* verbs other than those with a *c* preceding *io*.
As for sentences 4 - 6, there is a parallelism with PRIS., 2,
542, 17 - 543, 10. Priscian at the beginning of this section
speaks about the supines of the *xi* preterites. Then he mentions
the *si* preterites and their supines. Beginning on p. 543, 5 he
discusses the supines of the verbs having *ui* in the preterite
tense.

142, 2: Farcio *farsi* is found in PRIS., 2, 502, 12.
However, *sarxi* is not given in Ernout and Meillet, p. 594 but
*sarsi*.

4: PC's observations here are somewhat misleading.
At face value, if *xi* becomes *tum* the result is *uintum*, for
example, and not *uintcum*. PRIS., 2, 542, 17 - 18 says that the
*xi* preterites form the supine in *ctum*.

5: Quae ... *farsi tum*;
Priscian observes that the *si* is transformed into *tum* when the
preterite in *si* has an *l* or *r* preceding *si*.
142, 3: PRIS., 2, 539, 8 ff. in his discussion of the \textit{vi} preterites says that he is speaking for all the other verbs of the fourth conjugation besides the \textit{ncio} ones. Moreover, his explanation of the morphological process is this: "... verba secundae personae praesentis abiecta finali s et addita 'vi' faciunt praeteritum perfectum, quod tamen etiam subtracta u consonante et corre//pta paenultima i licet proferre, ut ...."
6: PRIS., 2, 543, 6 notes that the vi preterites as well as those in ii take the supine in itum.

The fourth conjugation verbs ending in dio PC remarks that the verbs of this class take the preterite in ui and to make the supine change ui to tum.

Moreover, although Priscian does not deal with dio verbs categorically as PC, nevertheless in vol. 2, 543, 8 Priscian observes that audio takes the preterite forms audivi and audii and the supine auditum.

The verbs of the fourth conjugation that end in gio PC notes that all the verbs of this category take the preterite in ui and to create the supine they transform this ui into tum as in rugitum.

The verbs of the fourth conjugation that terminate in pio PC begins, saying that all the pio verbs have the preterite in ui except saepio. He then adds that if they take the ui preterite, they form the supine by changing ui to tum, and if they have the psi preterite, they change psi to tum. It ought to be noted that this last statement is inaccurate, since if psi changes to tum one would have saetum; therefore this statement would have been more accurate had it read that si becomes tum.
Although Priscian does not have a separate section dealing exclusively with this *pio* type, he does give the forms *saepsi* and *saeptum*.

146, : The verbs of the fourth conjugation that end in *quio* PC notes that all verbs of this type take the preterite in *ui* and change *ui* to *tum* to form the supine. Priscian, however, notes that this is the only verb of its kind, having an *u* before *io*, and he classifies it among the verbs of the third conjugation. Priscian (p. 496, 8 - 9) also observes that there is no supine form for this verb and does not list *inquivi* as the preterite. PRIS., 3, 191 ff. observes that the form *inquio* is rare in usage, and CLEDONIUS, 59, 2 states that *inquam* has no related form *inquio*. PRIS., 2, 495, 14 ff. notes that many writers of the arts do not consider it to be in usage but all the same gives an example of its use in Cicero. The forms *inquii*, *inquisti*, and *inquiverunt* are attested; *inquitum* is not attested in the lexicons or the *Grammatici Latini*.

147, : The verbs of the fourth conjugation that end in *tio* PC says that all verbs of this type take the preterite in *ui* except *sentio*. He adds that if they have the *ui* preterite, they form the supine by changing *ui* to *tum*; and if they have the *si* preterite, they change *si* to *sum*. PC's observations about *sentio* are in agreement with the Priscian texts cited.
Singultitum is not attested in any of the dictionaries lexicons, glossaries, the Grammatici Latini and mss. used in this research.

148, : The verbs of the fourth conjugation that end in fio All the verbs of this type, PC notes, take the preterite in ui and form the supine by changing ui to tum. Furthermore, PC is correct about suffiui according to Priscian, and the latter also gives the form suffii.

149, : The fourth conjugation verbs that end in lio PC commences, stating that all the verbs of this category take the preterite in ui with the exception of salio. If they take the ui preterite, they form the supine by changing ui to tum. Sepelio, however, is an exception, PC relates. He continues, saying that those that take the preterite in ui like salio form the supine by changing io to tum.

It ought to be noted that Priscian has all the forms PC gives in this paragraph except sallui. Furthermore, Priscian also offers sepelitum, salii for salui and the future participles salliturus and salsurus. However, Priscian is not the source for PC's morphological explanations in this paragraph. For salio and sallo see paragraph 133.

150, : The verbs of the fourth conjugation that end in mio PC notes that these types of verbs take the preterite in ui and
change ui to tum to form the supine.

151, : The verbs of the fourth conjugation that end in nio
PC observes that the verbs of this type take the preterite in
ui except uenio. Those that have the ui preterite form the
supine by changing ui to tum, and the verbs having the ni
preterite change this ni to tum.

PC is in accord with PRIS., 2, 543, 2 about ueni and uentum
although the wording is different. As for lino and its
preterite and supine, PRIS., 2, 543, 13 - 14 has the following
to say: "...,'lino livi' vel 'lii', quod in rarissimo usu
est, 'litum'."

152, : The fourth conjugation verbs ending in rio
PC in this paragraph remarks that all the verbs of this type
have the ui preterite with some notable exceptions. Those that
take the ui preterite, PC continues, transform ui into tum to
create the supine. Those of the si preterite change si to
stum. All the other rio verbs change io to tum.

2: praeter ... <h>ausi,'
Priscian offers: "excipluntur 'haurio hausi' ...," but in a
far different context. In the same line Priscian also notes
haurivi and haurii.
152,  2: 'aperio ... 'comperi.'

The text of Priscian reads in the following manner: "igitur ex eo composita, si principalem syllabam puram nec ex integra praepositione habuerint, 'io' in 'ui' convertunt in praeterito, ut 'aperio aperui', 'cooperio cooperui'; ..., 'reperio repperi'. ...
 'comperio comperi'.'" This discussion of Priscian's is not, however, part of an exclusive discourse on rio verbs.

4: Priscian offers: "'haurio hausi haustum'
differentiae causa assumpsit t, ...." This phrase comes in the wake of a previous discussion on all the fourth conjugation verbs that take their preterites in si and form their supines in sum.

5: PC is actually more detailed in his morphological explanation here than is Priscian who writes: "'veni ventum' et 'aperui apertum' faciunt, sicut 'pario partum' et omnia ex eis composita: 'advenio adventum', ..., 'comperio compertum', 'experior expertum'.'"

153,  : The fourth conjugation verbs that end in uio
These verbs, PC states, take the preterite in ui and create the supine by changing ui to tum.

154: The fourth conjugation verbs that end in eo
PC says that all of these verbs take the preterite in ui, changing
eo to ui, and they form their supines by transforming ui into tum.

It ought to be noted that although Priscian does not feature a separate treatment of this type of verbs, nevertheless all of the forms PC lists are in Priscian. However, Priscian on p. 543, 18 - 19 says that by analogy venitum ought to exist but that venum is preferred in usage.

155, : This paragraph chiefly concerns the persons that a verb takes. PC begins in sentence 2 in Priscian's style asking to what person amo belongs. However, amo does not appear as a model verb in the Partitiones. He answers, saying that it is of the first person because the first person is the speaker. He further notes that the first person is that which we use to speak about ourselves when we speak. Then, he asks to what person amas belongs; and having explained that it is of the second because the second person is that to whom the first person is talking, he concludes about amat in the same manner. PC notes that the third person is that about which the first person speaks, namely to the second person. He defines person as that which makes a sound through itself, quae per se sonat. This etymological explanation appears in Remigius, Sedulius and goes back to Boethius. Sentences 23 - 26 are based upon Donatus and concern how many persons the verbs may have. Sentences 27 - 30 deal with the number of amo; and they have a
similarity to a text of Priscian.

155, 5: Although PC's assumption agrees essentially with all the references cited for this sentence, it appears that the text of Remigius offers the greatest similarity in presentation: "..., quae de se ipsa loquitur, ...." Priscian comes second with: "..., quae de se loquitur ..."

16: It appears again that the text of Remigius, even if it is not close enough to PC's to indicate that PC directly used it, nevertheless is the most reminiscent of the three references cited, for he offers: "Tertia est, de qua loquitur prima ad secundam ...." Priscian comes second with: "..., tertia, de qua extra se et illam, ad quam dirigit sermo // nem, posita loquitur prima, ...." The problem with the phrase loquimur prima disappears if we consider prima (sc, persona) in apposition to the subject of loquimur.

156 - 157: This is the section dealing with the verb secundum Donatum. As may be seen from the Fontes, paragraph 156 is based almost exclusively on Donatus and 157 which deals with the genera of verbs is mostly based on Donatus with minor similarities to Probus and Remigius. Paragraph 156 begins by asking what a verb is and then defining it. Then PC (sentences 4 - 7) enumerates the number of accidents that belong to the verb and proceeds to treat in some detail each of the accidents,
beginning with *qualitas* consisting of modes and forms. He does not arrive at a synthesis of certain conflicting opinions of Priscian and Donatus; for example, PC says there are seven accidents belonging to the verb in 156, but in 93 he stated that there are eight. Also, he says according to Donatus that there are three conjugations, although in the large section on the verb *secundum Priscianum* he admits there are four.

Paragraph 157 is a continuation of PC's detailed treatment *secundum Donatum* concerning the accidents of the verb. In this paragraph he treats *genus, numerus, figura, tempus*, and *persona*.

156, 11: Instead of *subiunctius* which PC uses and which may be found in Priscian, DON., 359, 9 gives *coniunctivus*.

15: PC's presentation here is the same as DON., 359, 10 - 12 except that the latter has "perfecta, ut lego" in place of "desideratiua ut 'uis[i]o uisis.'" However, Muridac says: "Addebant formam desideratiuam ut 'facco et 'uiso.'"

27: SED. TRACT., 93* 11 writes as PC "legor gar."

28: *utrum ... productam.*

Since this reading appears in the Donatus ms. M (DON., 359, 29*), it may be possible to assume that PC's copy of Donatus for this section on the verb (156 - 157) is in the tradition of that ms.
156, 32: quibo ... 'queam.'

This reading also appear in the Donatus ms. M (DON., 359, 33*).

157, 3: Here again PC does not attempt to present a consistent account, for in 96, 8 ff. he outlines seven genera, among which the deponents do not appear, nor do the communia like osculor and criminor.

12: This sentence is nearly identical with a reading in the Donatus ms. L which was added by a second hand; and Remigius has this Donatus reading supplemented with his own commentary.

13 - 36: The only significant changes made by PC from the Donatus text is the mentioning of sequor in 14 and perleto in 22 instead of negleco which is in DON., 360, 9. These changes, plus the addition of littera after desinunt in 16 and the observation that PC has readings like those in the Donatus ms. M and a reading close to one added by a second hand to L, might indicate that PC's copy of Donatus was not exactly like any of the Donatus mss. referred to by Keil.

158 - 169: The adverb secundum Priscianum

158, : PC begins his discussion of the adverb in the style of Priscian by asking to what part of speech nunc belongs. PRIS. PT., 484, 19 does not have nunc but sic. Furthermore,
it must be realized that Priscian uses this type of questioning in analyzing verse from the Aeneid. The Paris 7558 and the C.M. 14737 also give texts similar to this Priscian style of questioning; but what is more important, they use this type of questioning to introduce their discussions on the adverb and on the other parts of speech. After PC asks this question, he explains the function of the adverb (sentence 5): "Because it stands next to the verb and is always dependent upon it." He then defines the adverb as a part of speech which when added to the verb explains and makes complete its meaning. PC afterwards concerns himself with the etymology of adverbum, noting that it is derived from ad and verbum and giving the reason why the result of the combination is not adverbum. This etymology is similar to that found in Sedulius and Muridac. In sentences 5 - 7 where he is defining the functions of the adverb and its definition he is using texts similar to Remigius and Donatus for the most part.

In sentence 14 PC brings up the question of why an adverb is not considered greater than the verb. He attempts to solve this, stating that the adverb only takes away the doubtful meaning of the verb. The material for this section (14 - 17) is largely based on texts similar to Muridac and Sedulius.

158, 2 - 3: None of the three possible sources cited feature nunc.
158, 5: Quia ... uerbum

Of all the 'v.' references it appears that the one in [Sergius] is the most similar: "..., quia semper verbo cohaeret, ...." Servius comes next with: "..., invenias adverbia verbis cohaerentia."

10 - 12: Although the text of Sedulius is not exactly the same as PC's, still it is closer to PC's than Muridac's. Sedulius offers: "Quare igitur non dicitus 'adverbum', sed potius 'adverbium'? Ideo scilicet ne viderentur duae esse partes quae utraque 'verbum' vocarentur; vel etiam ne videretur 'ad' per appositionem servire hoc loco accusativo casui et non per compositionem. Ac, ne aliqua dubitatio remaneret contentiosis, interpositum est 'i', et dicitus 'adverbium', non 'adverbum'."

MUR. 7491 A, 29r 4 - 7 has: "Quare ergo non dicitur 'aduerbium' [sic] sed immo 'aduerbium'? Ideo ne uiderentur esse duae partes quae utraque uerba dicentur et prius prolxius sequens uero minus. Uel quid uerius est uideretur neque 'ad' per adpositionem sereire accusativus casui et non per compositionem. Et ne alia dubitatio remaneret contentiosis ideo inter, dicitur 'aduerbium' non 'aduerbium.'"

10: It is significant that MUR. 1586, 44v 18 - 19 offers a text more similar to sentence 10 than the 7491 A is. The 1586 gives: "Quare ergo non dicitus 'aduerbium' sed immo 'aduerbium'"
158, 14 - 17: The text of Sedulius again is more similar to PC's than Muridac's. For instance, Sedulius offers: "Sed si 'adverbium' dicitur eo quod sit iuxta verbum et eius explanat significationem, ergo maior pars est quam verbum." The 7491 A has: "Si adverbium dictum ideo est ut sedeat iuxta uerbum et eius explanet dubietatem, ergo maior pars est positum est quam sit uerbum" [sic]. The text of the 1586 is the same as the 7491 A except that in a few instances there are readings in the former which are the same as in Sedulius and PC as opposed to what is found in the 7491 A. The first item is that whereas Sedulius has "explanat significationem" as PC and the 7491 A gives "explanet dubietatem," MUR. 1586, 44\textsuperscript{r} 23 features "explanat dubietatem." The second item to be discussed is that whereas Sedulius gives "videtur habere verbum, antequam et addatur adverbium," MUR. 7491 A, 29\textsuperscript{r} 9 gives "antequam additur ei aduerbium." MUR. 1586, 44\textsuperscript{r} 25, on the other hand, offers in this case the closest text to PC's: "antequam addatur aduerbium."

The last item of interest concerning the 1586 is that while Sedulius, PC and the 1586, 44\textsuperscript{r} 27 offer "'bene' aut 'male,'" MUR. 7491 A, 29\textsuperscript{r} 10 gives "'bene' uel 'male.'"

15: sed ... aduerbium.

Of the two 'v.' references cited for this phrase, Remigius features an idea closer to PC's than the one of Audax is. Remigius has: "Nam qualitas verbi per se ignoratur sine adverbio." Audax gives: "Pars orationis, qua adiecta verbo
manifestior oratio redditur, ...."

159, : In this paragraph PC deals with the many ways in which adverbs may be derived. He notes that some seem to be derived from no other word, some from appellative nouns, some from proper nouns, some from pronouns, some from verbs, some from the combination of a noun and a verb, and some from participles. Sentence 6 briefly points out the several typical endings of adverbs. This whole section seems to be based on a text close to a comparable one in Muridac, Sedulius and Donatus.

2 - 6: For a comparison of Sedulius, Donatus, MUR. 7491 A and 1586 towards an understanding of the source problems of this section, it seems that MUR. 1586 offers the text that is closer to PC's than Donatus's is. The 1586 is followed by the 7491 A and then Donatus in similarity to PC. The 1586 offers: A d u e r b i a a u t a se nascuntur ut 'heri hodie nuper cras'
... aut ab aliis partibus orationis. Ueniunt enim a nomine appellativio ut 'doctus docte.' A datiuo enim docto mutato 'o' producto in 'e' productum fit aduerbium 'docte.' A proprie [sic] ut 'Tullius Tulliane.' A datiuo qui est 'Tullio' uersum 'o' in 'a' addita 'ne' fit aduerbium 'Tulliane.' A uerbo ut 'cursim strictim,' a nomine et uerbo ut 'pedetemptim' quare dicitur a nomine et uerbo cum pede tempto. A participio ut 'indulgens indulgenter,' a nomine uenientia aut in 'a' exequent
ut 'una,' aut in 'e' productam ut 'docte,' aut in 'e' correetam ut 'rite,' aut in 'i' ut 'uesperi,' aut in 'o' productum ut 'falso,' aut in 'o' correetum ut 'modo,' aut in 'u' ut 'noctu,' aut in 'l' ut 'semel,' aut in 'im' ut 'stratim,' aut in 'r' ut 'breuiter,' aut in 's' ut 'funditus.'

The text of the 7491 A is the same, except that in areas there are lacunae; for example, PC, the 1586, and Donatus have "a nomine et verbo ut 'pedetemptim,'" whereas the 7491 A omits verbo. The other instance occurs with the phrase "'s' ut 'funditus'" which appears as such in PC, the 1586 and in Donatus. The 7491 A, 29\(^V\) 4 gives: "'es' **'funditus.'" Moreover, one sees in the latter on 29\(^V\) 10 - 11: "aut in 'er' ut 'breuiter.'" PC, Donatus and the 1586 say r and not er. There is a minor variation, however, in the 7491 A which agrees with PC and not with the 1586. The 1586 has "a proprie ut 'Tullius'" while the 7491 A, 29\(^R\) 17 properly as in Donatus gives "a proprie ut 'Tullius.'" I have considered PC's text to be more similar to the Donatus text which is in Muridac and Sedulius rather than to the direct Donatus text itself for this reason: Donatus does not feature a phrase or idea similar to what PC writes in sentence 4: "...; mutato 'o' in 'a' et addita 'ne' fit 'Tulliane.'" Both Muridac texts, however, give: "A datuuo qui est 'Tullio' uersum 'o' in 'a' addita 'ne' fit aduerbium 'Tulliane.'" SED., 1, 597, 2 gives even a closer text than Muridac: "... 'Tullio',
mutato 'o' in 'a' et addita 'ne' fit Tulliane: ...."

Sedulius gives the same text as DON., 385, 12 - 21 in paragraphs 595 - 610; and it appears that his text, however large an area he spreads it out with his prolific commentary, unlike the fashion of Muridac and PC and Donatus, seems to be the closest to what PC has to offer. Indeed, PC's phrase in sentence 2 - hoc ... originem - has no counterpart in any of the 'cf.' sources cited for this whole paragraph except in SED., 1, 595, 3. Moreover, in sentence 3 the observation of PC concerning the formation of docte from docto has a resemblance only to a Sedulius text (596, 1 - 2). We have already discussed how sentence 4 is closer to Sedulius than to Muridac. As for the derivation of cursim from curro mentioned in sentence 5, one ought to note that SED., 1, 600, 2 says: "A verbo quod est 'curro' venit CURSIM: ...." Such an explanation appears in none of the other sources. Also, the treatment in sentence 5 about the derivation of pedetemptim is closer to SED., 601, 2: "A 'pede' nomine et verbo 'tempto' venit PEDETEM<PTIM." PRIS., 3, 63, 18 also gives: " ..., vel a nomine et verbo, ut a 'pede' et 'tempto: pedetemptim', ....

159. 6: aut in 'e' correpturn ut 'rite,'

This is the reading that appears in the Donatus ms. S. (See DON., 385, 18*.) Correpurn also is in MUR. 7491 A, 29V 2. Correpuram, however, appears in MUR. 1586, 44V 20, in SED., 1, 605, 1 and in DON., 385, 18.
2 Why are the adverbs una, modo, and semel said to come from nouns when the adverbs do not retain the same meaning which the nouns have? 3 The noun una, indeed, means 'an only thing' and carries the accent on the first syllable. 4 However, the adverb una means 'together' and is accented on the last syllable. 5 The noun modo means 'measure,' but the adverb modo signifies 'at once.' 6 To this one must reply that in three ways parts of speech are derived from other parts of speech. 7 Solution: by sense, you see, and spelling like quater from quattuor; by spelling without meaning like the adverb modo from the noun modo; by meaning and without the spelling like semel from the noun unus.

For the Roman attitude to accent see Allen, chap. 5, and for the attitude of mediaeval Latin grammarians on accent see Thurot, p. 392 - 407.

2 - 7: MUR. 1586, 44V 22 - 32 offers a text that is far closer to PC's than the 7491 A is. For example, the latter writes (29V 4 - 8):

***** dicuntur haec aduerbia que sunt 'una' et 'modo' et 'semel' dicunt a nomine cum non eundem sensum retineant illa aduerbia ***** habent ***** nomina a quibus dicuntur ***** ? 'Una' enim nomina [sic] 'solam' significat et ***** accentum in penultimo loco. 'Una' uero aduerbium significat 'simul' et ***** accentum in ultimo loco.
The 1586, 44\textsuperscript{v} 22 - 25 fills in the lacunae in the 7491 A text, and as far as the phrase "'una' enim nomina 'solam' " is concerned, one reads the more logical reading in the 1586, 44\textsuperscript{v} 24 - 25: "'Una' enim nomen 'solum' significat." However, the 1586 does not feature the phrase which the 7491 A has: "'Una' uero aduerbium significat 'simul' et **** accentum in ultimo loco." This phrase is comparable to sentence 4 in paragraph 160.

160, 2 - 4: The text of Sedulius cited in the Fontes appears closer to PC's than that in the 1586. Sedulius writes:

Quare dicuntur haec aduerbia, id est UNA, et MODO, et SEMEL, a nomine venire, cum non eundem sensum retineant illa adverbia, quem habent nomina? UNA enim nomen 'solam' significat et habet accentum in paenuultimo loco; UNA autem aduerbium 'simul' significat et habet accentum in ultimo loco.

5: MUR. 7491 A, 29\textsuperscript{v} 7 - 8 offers the following text: "'Modo' aduerbium a 'modo' nomen [sic] quia 'modo' 'mensuram' significat. 'Modo' aduerbium temporis est." The 1586, 44\textsuperscript{v} 26 - 27 gives the same text, but it seems that PC is more likely copying a text similar to the 7491 A because the 1586 gives: "... quia 'modus' nomen 'mensuram' significat." SED., 1, 611, 6 - 7 has: "... ab eo quod est 'modus' nomen, venit MODO adverbiu. 'Modus' nomen mensuram significat; inde MODO adverbiu temporis, id est 'statim'; ...." Neither the 7491 A nor the 1586 has a
phrase like Sedulius's saying that *modo* means *statim*.

160, 6 - 7: Of the texts of Muridac and Remigius the 1586 appears to have the greatest similarity to PC, followed by the 7491 A and then Remigius. The 1586, 44\textsuperscript{V} 28 - 32 has:

Ad quod dicendum quia tribus modis deriuantur partes a partibus: sensu uidelicet et litteratura, litteratura sine sensu, et sensu sine litteratura. Sensu et litteratura ut 'quartus' a 'quattuor' et 'quintus' a 'quinque.' Litteratura sine sensu ut 'modo' aduerbium a 'modo' nomine et 'una' ab 'una.' Sensu autem sine litteratura ut 'semel' ab 'uno' uenit.

The 7491 A, 29\textsuperscript{V} 9 - 12 features the same text but with corruptions and what appear to be scribal errors in several areas:

Ad quod dicendum est quia tribus modis deriuantur partes a partibus: sensu uidelicet uel litteratura, litteratura sine sensu, et sensu sine litteratura. Sensus et litteratura ut a 'quat\textsuperscript{I}' 'quartus' et a 'quinto' 'quintus.' Litteratura sine sensu ut 'modo' aduerbium a 'modo' nomine et 'un\textsuperscript{I}t' ab 'una.' Sensu autem sine litteratura ut sensu 'semel' ab 'uno' uenit.

REM., 62, 5 - 13 is not in the PC/Muridac tradition with his text; for example, Remigius writes: "Notandum est, quia tribus modis veniunt adverbia a nominibus, ..."
161: This paragraph concerns the three accidents of the adverb: *species*, *significatio*, and *figura*. Although, excluding the rubric, he begins (sentences 2 - 5) his discussion proper according to Donatus, enumerating the accidents, he then changes to discussing material from Priscian (6 - 13) when he asks of what *species nunc* is. Sentence 14 to the end of the paragraph, which is largely based on a text close to Donatus's, lists the numerous *significationes* of the adverbs: some adverbs of time, some of place, some of quality, similitude etc. PC does not actually adhere strictly to the order of Donatus's continuous passage enumerating the many kinds of adverbs as the *Fontes* show, nor does he simply reproduce Donatus. Moreover, there are occasions when PC's material is reminiscent of Priscian, Remigius, Charisius, and readings in Donatus mss. which are not used in the established text of Keil.

5: Priscian gives *species*, as PC, in place of *comparatio* which is in Donatus. However, it is interesting to note what PRIS., 3, 63, 7 - 9 says about *species*, which bears a relevance to *comparatio*: "Species primitiva et derivativa. ...; derivativa vero, quae ab aliis nascitur, ut 'clanculum, saepius saepissime, ...."

11: Since PC in sentence 9 states that *nunc* is of the primitive species, which species, according to PRIS., 3, 63, 7 - 8
is contrasted with the derived kind like saepissime, it is apparent that "discretio et cetera" may mean 'a distinction and so forth,' that is, a distinction between the primitive and derived adverbs. This idea of primitive and derived adverbs is also related to what appears in DIONYSIUS, 73, 1 - 2 who states that some adverbs are ἄνλα and some ἕνθητα.

161, 15: Illuc is a reading in the Donatus ms. L. (See DON., 362, 23.*)

16 - 17: The text that Keil gives for DON., 362, 23 - 24 features only the following adverbs of time: hodie, nuper, and aliquando. However, the Donatus ms. M (see line 23*) gives all of the adverbs of time that PC features and in his order with the exception of tunc ... semper. REM., 61, 26 - p. 62, 3 has hodie and aliquando as the Donatus text but gives in addition, though not in a series as is the case with the Donatus ms. M, nuper, nunc, heri, and cras.

18: aut negandi ... nequaquam,' DON., 362, 24 merely has non but the Donatus ms. M (see line 24*) gives non neque.

18: aut affirmandi ... certe.' DON., 362, 24 - 25 gives etiam and quinni, the former of which two PC does not have. However, PC's spelling quidni is the same
as in the Donatus mss. M and SP. (See DON., 362, 25* and p. 386, 10.*).

161, 19: aut(rew)ortandi ... agite,'  
DON., 362, 25 - 26 has only eia.

19: aut remissiui ... paulatim.'  
PC does not appear to be slavishly copying Priscian who writes:  
"Remissiva sunt superioribus contraria, ut 'pedetemptim,  
paulatim, sensim'."

20: Although the established text of Donatus cited  
gives only docta pulchre and multum parum, the Donatus mss. MS  
feature docta pulchre fortiter, and the ms. M has multum parum  
minimum.

21: Aut dubitandi ... fortasse,'  
DON., 362, 28 lacks fortassi and forsan.

22: Aut congregandi ... pariter,'  
DON., 362, 31 lacks pariter.

22: aut discretiui ... sinistrorsum.'  
It is apparent that PC is perhaps consulting a text similar to  
PRIS., 3, 87, 14 - 15 which reads: "Discretiva 'seorum' secus,  
...." DON., 362, 29 - 30 gives: " ...; separandi, ut seorum;  
...."
161, 23: Donatus only gives quasi ceu.

24: Aut ordinandi ... deinceps,'
The established Donatus text only gives deinde, but the Donatus ms. M has deinde deinceps. Inde appears in neither of the two.

24: aut intentiui ... omnino.'
PC has all the adverbia intentiva listed by Priscian as cited for this phrase with the exception of nimium.

25: Aut comparandi ... 'minus,'
The established text of DON., 362, 32 does not list quam, plus, or minus, but qua is added by another hand to the ms. M.

25: aut superlatiui ... ocissime.'
Priscian offers the following observation about the superlatives of the adverbs which category he considers among the various types of significationes: "Superlativa 'maxime,/ minime, ocissime'." Donatus speaks about the adverbial superlatives, however, in his discussion on comparatio (p. 362, 32 - p. 363, 3):
"Comparatio adverbiorum in quo est? In tribus gradibus comparationis, positivo comparativo superlativo. ...; superlativi, ut doctissime."

26: Aut numeri ... quotiens,'
DON., 362, 24 gives semel bis, but the ms. M has semel bis ter.
PRIS., 3, 88, 15 - 19 discusses the adverbs of number which PC
lists with the addition of sexies and septies. However, Priscian does not present them in an ordinary list as PC does but treats them in numerical order in a commentary.

161, 26: aut personalia ... tuatim.'

The presentation in DON., 362, 28 - 29 does not account for meatim and tuatim for it lists the personal adverbs of the mecum type. However, on p. 385, 15 of Donatus in the section that deals with the parts of speech from which adverbs may be derived we read: "...; a pronomine, ut meatim tuatim; ...."

(PRIS.), 528, 25 - 26 lists meatim tuatim as adverbs derived from nouns. CHARISIUS, 240, 13, however, considers meatim and tuatim to be adverbs derived from pronouns. So, PC is in agreement with Donatus and Charisius.

27: Aut diminutiui ... belle,'

PC is following Priscian (vol. 3, 88, 21 - 22) who treats the diminutives clanculum and belle (Priscian adds bellissime) as a category in the significatio. The text of DON., 386, 31 - 32 does not list belle and clanculum and speaks about adverbial diminutives as a category of comparatio.

27: aut uocandi ... 0,'

The comparable text of Donatus cited lists only heus. The remaining portion of this sentence agrees with the texts of Donatus cited except for the addition of aut.
This paragraph concerns itself with the accident of the adverb called figure. Aside from the rubric (sentence 1) PC begins the discussion proper in the form of Priscian's Partitiones, asking of what figure nunc is. The sentence 162, 5 only makes sense if we consider that PC has the adverb nunc in mind. (See 161, 6.) He then proceeds to ask what figure is and answers that it is a distinction of simplicia. He asks how many figures of adverbs there are (sentence 8 which is from Donatus) and notes that there are three, discussing these briefly with material similar to Priscian's. The remainder of the paragraph (sentences 12 - 13) concerns how many ways adverbs may be compounded. This treatment bears similarities to texts in Remigius, Priscian, and Donatus.

5: Since PC in sentence 11 mentions the simple adverbs diu and huc which are not the result of compounding like interdum and adhuc, one might understand diuidi after potest.

7: Here PC's statement to the effect of 'a distinction of simple factors' might be clarified by the text cited for the ARS: "Item alia definitio: figura est habitus uocum, per quas corpora aut res significantur, utrum sua natura an per artem enuntiantur." The text of Consentius aids our understanding: "per has intellegimus, utrum simplex nomen sit, an compositum. simplex est quod ex una parte orationis constat, ...: compositum quod ex duabus, ...."
162, 12 - 13: The text of Donatus cited for these two sentences offers a similar treatment in form, except that Donatus is speaking about the nouns.

12: It is interesting to note that the text of DON., 355, 21 ff. used by REM., 22, 3 ff. is characterized by "quot modis nomina," while the text in Keil has quibus. The reading Quot appears in the Remigius mss. MM² z. (See REM., 22, 3.*

13: The isolated instances of ex duobus integris and ex integro et corrupto in the Partitiones might be significant for PC's treatment inasmuch as they are used by Priscian in analyzing the adverbs postquam and interea.

163, : This paragraph begins the discussion on dubiae dictiones 'doubtful expressions,' that is, it is a treatment on the differences between the use of the same word as an adverb and as another part of speech. PC notes that falsa as a noun is in the dative case and signifies substance. When it is an adverb, it is one of quality. Quo may be either a pronoun or an adverb. When it is the latter, it means 'where' and is infinite. When it is the former, it is used in place of a noun. The word pone may be an adverb of place and signify 'near'; but as a verb it is the imperative of pono. Profecto can be an adverb of affirmation meaning 'certainly' and is also able to
serve as a participle as in the sentence: "Profecto homini mit(ε)ere dedimus." PC then continues with *quando*, saying that it may be an adverb of time and a causal conjunction meaning 'inasmuch as.' He notes that *propter* as an adverb of place signifies 'near' and as a preposition it governs a word in the accusative case. Finally, PC points out the instance of *heu* which may be either an adverb of reply or an interjection of sorrow.

163, : Sentences 21 - 25 are concerned with the differences in accentuation between some of these usages of the same word. He notes that the verb *pone* takes the accent on the first syllable: /pone/. The adverb, however, is accented on the last syllable.

Sentences 26 to the end of the paragraph treat certain adverbs of place which, PC points out, are mistaken by some *imprudentes* for nouns because they have the appearance of nouns: *Romae* as in "Romae sum," *Roma* as in "Roma uenio," *Romam* as in "Romam pergo," and again *Romam* as in "Romam transeo." He notes that no prepositions are placed before these forms of *Roma* because they are pure adverbs. However, he notes that prepositions are indeed placed before the adverbs used in conjunction with names of provinces, places, and regions. He ends this paragraph, stating that the preposition is not joined to names of cities which become adverbs but that prepositions
are joined to names of provinces and regions because these names still keep the meanings of nouns.

This paragraph, together with paragraphs 164 - 167, is similar to a comparable continuous text in the C.M. 14488. Muridac presents a text similar to 163 - 165, and there are long sections related to texts in Sedulius.

163, 2: The Donatus lemma here appears as such in the C.M. 14488, 61⁷ 24, but in SED., 1, 678 - 679, 1 and in MUR. 7491 A, 31⁸ 11 - 12 it is augmented by commentary.

3 - 6: It appears that the treatment in the C.M. 14488, 61⁷ 26 - 62⁸ 1 offers the text that bears the greatest resemblance to PC's from among all the references cited. Then comes SED., 1, 679, 2 followed by MUR. 7491 A, 31⁸ 12 - 14, and the least related of the 'cf.' references is the text in the Commentum Einsidlense. Moreover, although the text in MUR. 1586, 46⁷ is identical with that in the 7491 A, it is interesting to note that the latter has: "Falso enim et nomen est datius kasus ...." The 1586, 46⁷ 11 gives, however "datius kasus." Of all the 'v.' references cited for these four sentences, the text in Servius is the closest: "nam invenimus plerumque id esse adverbium, qui datius est casus, ut falso. haec autem ambiguitas elocutione discernitur. quando enim dico 'falso homini dedi', erit nomen; quando dico 'falso loqueris', erit
adverbium." The other 'v.' references cited have observations in support of the ideas presented in 3 - 6.

163, 7: This Donatus reading appears in the Donatus ms. S. (See DON., 387, 5.*) MUR. 7491 A, 31r 14 gives qua; but the C.M. 14488, 62r 2 and SED., 1, 680, 1 have quo like PC and S.

8 - 9: The text of the C.M. 14488, 62r 1 - 4 reads thus:
"Inter aduerbium et pronomen ut 'quo' est. Similiter quoque quando aduerbium est, ponitur pro 'hubi' [sic] et est infinitum ut: 'Quo ualis?' [sic]. Quando pronomen est, ponitur pro nomine ut: 'Quo audisti lectionem?'' Except for ualis instead of uadis and the h added to ubi, this text seems to be the closest to PC's out of all the 'cf.' texts cited. SED., 1, 680, 1 - 2 is the second closest; he offers, for example: "INTER ADVERBIUM ET PRONOMEN, UT QUO. Similiter QUO. quando adverbiu est, ponitur pro 'ubi' et est infinitum adversium loci, 'quo pergis?'; et 'quo ibo a spiritu tuo?'; 'quo vadis?'; quando pronomen est, ablativeus casus est ab eo quod est 'quis' et ponitur pro nomine, ut 'a quo audisti lectionem?'; 'a quo magistro didicisti?'."

The text of MUR. 7491 A, 31r 14 - 16 is chiefly characterized by its lack of model sentences using quo, although the structure of the presentation is like PC's. The text of REM. EIN., 261, 11 - 13 appears to be less related to PC's presentation than Muridac's because the phrasing is not as similar, although
Remigius illustrates his point with model sentences using *quo*, although the sentences are different. Although Priscian and Charisius do not feature texts similar to PC's here, their observations cited in the *Fontes* for 8 - 9 lend support to his teachings.

163, 11: Again PC's text appears to be closer to a comparable one in the C.M. 14488, 62\(r\) 4 - 6 than to the other 'cf.' sources cited. One reads in the C.M. 14488: "Inter aduerbium et uerbum ut 'pone.' Quando aduerbium est 'pone,' ponitur pro 'iuxta' et est aduerbium loci. Quando uero uerbum est, imperatiuus est modus et uenit a 'pono ponis.'" SED., 1, 681 gives the same text as the 14488, except that Sedulius augments the text with additional commentary. The text of MUR. 7491 A, 31\(r\) 16 - 17 is the third greatest in similarity to PC's text: "Inter aduerbium et uerbum ut 'pone.' Quando aduerbium est, ponitur pro 'iuxta' et est aduerbium loci. Quando autem uerbum est, imperatiuus modus." The 1586 offers the same text except that its reading of "uerbum quando autem, imprimis est modus" on 46\(v\) 16 makes the 1586 appear to be less related to the text of PC than the 7491 A is.

13 - 14: The text of MUR. 7491 A, 31\(r\) 17 - 18 reads: "Inter aduerbium et participium ut 'profecto.' Aduerbium adfirmantis est. Quando uero participium, datiuus est siue
ablativeus casus ut: 'Profecto homini dedi munus.'" This text does not seem to be as close to PC's as the one in SED., 1, 682 which, for example, reads: "INTER ADVERBIUM ET PARTICIPIUM, UT PROLECTO. PROLECTO adverbium est affirmantis, et ponitur pro 'certe', ut: 'Profecto pervenit in vos regnum Dei'; et ...

'Profecto homini in itinere dedi munus.'" The C.M. 14488, 62⁷ in the right-hand margin features a text similar to that of Sedulius. The text of Sedulius and the C.M. 14488 bears close relationship to the one in REM. EIN., 261, 17 - 19, but none of the 'cf.' texts cited is shown to be the direct source for PC.

163, 15 - 16: SED., 1, 683 offers: "INTER ADVERBIUM ET CONIUNCTIONEM, UT QUANDO. QUANDO adverbium temporis infinitum, ut 'quando veniet?'; et est coniunctio causalis, et ponitur pro 'quoniam'; et pro 'siquidem.'" The presentation in the C.M. 14488, 62⁷ 7 - 8 is more similar to PC's than the one in Sedulius because it is characterized by less commentary than that in Sedulius. The 14488 has: " Inter aduerbium et coniunctionem ut 'quando.' 'Quando' aduerbium est temporis infiniti, et est coniunctio causalis et ponitur pro 'quoniam.'" The 'y.' references to 15 - 16 offer similar ideas but do not appear to have a direct or nearly direct presentation to PC's observations.
163, 17 - 18: It seems that in this instance the text of the C.M. 14488, 62\textsuperscript{r} 8 - 11 offers the most similar treatment to PC's, and that the least similar of the 'cf.' sources cited is either SED., 1, 684 or MUR. 7491 A, 31\textsuperscript{r} 19 - 21. The 14488 offers: "Inter aduerbium et praepositionem ut 'propter.' 'Propter' aduerbium est loci et ponitur pro 'iuxta' - 'propter stat' - id est 'iuxta.' Et est praepositio serviens accusativus casui ut: 'Propter amicum uenit.'" Muridac has: "Inter aduerbium et praepositionem ut 'propter.' 'Propter' enim est aduerbium loci ut 'propter stat,' id est 'iuxta'; et praepositio accusativi casus ut: 'Propter dominum uenit.'" Sedulius has: "INTER ADVERBIUM ET PRAEPOSITIONEM, UT PROPTER. PROPTER adverbum est loci et ponitur pro 'iuxta', ut 'propter stat', id est iuxta: 'Ecce ego sto propter fontem aquae', id est iuxta; et est praepositio serviens accusativo casui, ut 'propter eum venit', 'propter augurium.'" Of all the 'v.' references cited for these two sentences, the text in CLEDONIUS, 69, 9 - 11 has a certain reminiscence of Sedulius as one reads: "...: propter adverbum est, ut 'propter te veni'; praepositio, ut 'pr o p t e r a q u a e r i v u m', hoc est iuxta ...."

19 - 20: The text of MUR. 7491 A, 31\textsuperscript{r} 21 - 22 offers the following: "Inter aduerbium et interiectionem ut 'heu.' 'Heu'
aduerbium respondentis et interiectio dolentis." The text of the C.M. 14488, 62\textsuperscript{r} 11 - 12 features the same text with uninteresting variations. The text in SED., 1, 685 is, however, not as close to PC's text as the one in the 14488 is. Sedulius writes: "INTER ADVERBIO ET INTERIECTIONEM, UT HEU. HEU et adverbium est respondentis quando sequitur verbum; alias inter\textsuperscript{(iec)}tiō est dolentis." The least related 'cf.' reference seems to be the presentation in REM., 64, 1 - 2 which reads: "Respondendi, ut heu. Heu et adverbium est respondentis et interiectio dolentis."

163, 21 - 25: The text of the C.M. 14488, 62\textsuperscript{r} 12 - 16 seems to offer a text having greater resemblance to PC's than the one in MUR. 7491 A, 31\textsuperscript{r} 22 - 24 does. One reads in the 14488: "Sunt horum quaedam accenti \textsuperscript{sic} discernimus, quaedam sensu. Sensu discernuntur haec omnia ut dictum est, accentu uero unum tantum discernitur, id est 'pone.' Nam quando uerbum est, habet accentum in penultimo loco; quando uero aduerbium est, in ultimo loco." The text of Muridac offers: "Horum quaedam accentu discernimus, quaedam sensu. Sensu uero discernuntur ut dictum est. Accentu uero unum tantum 'pone.' Quando uerbum est, in penultimo loco. Quando aduerbium, in ultimo habet accentum." The only significant variation in the 1586 is that on 46\textsuperscript{v} 23 there is an acute accent mark over the e in pone. The text of SED., 1, 687 is the same as that of the 14488
except that there is additional commentary.

It ought to be noted that REM., 84, 10 - 13 speaks about the accentuation of *pone* using a circumflex instead of an acute as in the 14488, the 1586, and PC. DON., 371, 28 - 29, however, points out that it is the acute accent that is used.

163, 26: The presentation in this sentence has no exact equivalent in any of the 'cf.' sources cited in the Fontes. All of them have essentially the text that reads thus in DON., 387, 9 - 10: "sunt [*item*] adverbia loci, quae inprudentes putant nomina: in loco, ut Romae sum; de loco, ut Roma venio; ad locum, ut Romam pergo." PC's phrase *ideo* ... *habent* is encountered in a comparable text in MUR. 7491 A, 31½ 24 in this context: "Ideo imprudentes, id est indocti putant nomina esse quia litteraturam habent nominis." This presentation by Muridac is closer to PC's than the one in the C.M. 14488, 62½ 18 - 20 is, which reads: "Ideo imprudentes, id est indocti putabant haec adverbia nomina esse quia litteram tamen habent nominis." The text in SED., 1, 688, 4 seems to bear the third greatest resemblance to PC. It reads: "Ideo imprudentes, id est indocti, putant haec adverbia nomina esse, quia tantum nominis litteraturam retinent."

27: The phrase "*per locum ut, *Roma<m> transeo*" appears to have a related text, so far, only in REM., 66, 24
which reads: "... et per locum, ut: Romam pergo, Romam transeo, ..."

163, 28 - 32: The text in the C.M. 14488, 62r 20 - 28 appears on the whole to bear a greater resemblance to PC's presentation than the discussion in MUR. 7491 A, 31r 26 - 29 does. For example, in the 14488, 62r 22 ff. one reads: "Anteponitur autem his quae provinciis, locis, regionibus adici solent. Iunctio talis est: anteponitur autem praeposito his scilicet nominibus quae nomina solent adici, hoc est adiungi provintiis [sic], aduerbia transeunt, praeposito non anteponitur."

MUR. 7491 A, 31r 27 - 29 gives: "Anteponitur autem is[sic] quæ provinciis, locis regionibus adici solent. Quare? Quia de significacione ...." The text of SED., 1, 690 is the same as that in the 14488 with uninteresting additional commentary.

31: PRIS., 3, 66, 12 ff. observes, however, that there are instances when prepositions are used with names of cities, especially among the historians.

164, : "Question. 2 Since the names of cities become adverbs, it must be asked when they signify in a place, to a place, through a place, or from a place. 3 Solution. 4 To which it ought to be said that when they are of the first or second declension, one must reply that they signify in a place by means of the genitive like 'Romae sum, Mediolani sum'; to a place by means of the accusative like 'Romam pergo, Mediolanum uado'; through a place like 'Roma(m) transeo';
from a place like 'Roma, Mediolano uenio.' 5 Those indeed which are of the third declension signify in a place and from a place and through a place by means of the ablative like 'Cart(h)agine sum, Cart(h)agine uenio, Cart(h)agine transeo'; to a place, like 'Cart(h)agine pergo' by means of the accusative. 6 In the same way one uses those nouns which are always plural like Thebae, Cumaee, and Mycenae."

164, 2 - 6: Despite the several orthographical divergencies in the C.M. 14488, 62\textsuperscript{V} 1 - 12, it appears that PC's text is closer to it than to the text in SED., 1, 692. For example, the 14488 writes: "Ad quod dicendum quia quando prime uel secundae sunt declinationis, in loco per genitium, ad locum per accusatium, per locum et de loco per ablativeum significant."

The corresponding portion in Sedulius reads: "Ad quod sciendum, quod propr\'ia civitatum nomina, si primae vel secundae declinationis sint, genetivo casu pro adverbio IN LOCO accipiuntur, 'UT ROMAE SUM', vel 'Tarenti'; ...." The 14488, 62\textsuperscript{V} 4 has "in loco per genitium"; and PC on 18\textsuperscript{V} 3 has the spelling genitium appearing in the comparable text.

4: MUR. 7491 A, 31\textsuperscript{F} 29 - 31\textsuperscript{V} 2 seems to offer a text closer to PC than the one in SED., 1, 692 but not as similar as the one in the 14488. Muridae writes: "Sed nomina ciuitatum quando prime sunt uel secunde declinationis, in loco
per genetium, ad locum per accusatium, de loco uero et per locum per ablatium significant ut 'Rome sum, Autissioderi, Romam pergo, Autissioderum pergo, Roma uenio, Roma preeo, Autissiodero uenio, Autissiodero praeeo,' id est, 'transeo.'" It is interesting to note the use of Autissioderum as an example, associated perhaps with Remigius. It is significant that the text in MUR. 1586, 46\textsuperscript{V} 30 - 31 has transeo in place of preeo and praeeo, since PC does not have praeeo but only transeo as in the 1586. The C.M. 14488, 62\textsuperscript{V} 3 - 8 offers:

Ad quod dicendum quia quando prime uel secundae sunt declinationis, in loco per genetium, ad locum per accusatium, per locum et de loco per ablatium significant. In loco ut 'Rome sum, Mediolani sum,' ad locum ut 'Romam pergo, Mediolanum pergo,' per locum ut 'Roma transeo, Mediolano transeo,' de loco ut 'Roma uenio, Mediolano uenio.'

164, 4: The text of Sedulius, which appears to be modelled on PRIS., 3, 66, 4 ff., bears the least similarity to PC in comparison with Muridac and the C.M. 14488. REM., 66, 20 - 25 also has a treatment worthy of a 'cf.' reference, but it seems unlikely that it is the direct source used by PC, and it is difficult to discern whether Remigius or Sedulius is closer to PC. Moreover, Remigius considers that per locum for the first and second declensions takes the accusative,
whereas PC, Muridac, Sedulius, and the 14488 say that it takes the ablative.

4: in loco per genetium ... 'Romae sum,'

All of the 'cf.' and 'v.' sources cited for this observation agree that Romae is in the genitive. [SERG.], 511, 10 - 11, however, thinks that Romae is in the dative. But in lines 6 - 8 he agrees with the others that in loco using a second declension noun takes the genitive.

5: The text in the C.M. 14488, 62 V 8 - 12 has the closest text to PC's from among all of the other 'cf.' references cited. One reads: "illa uero que tertiae sunt declinationis in loco et de loco et per locum per ablatium significant ut 'Cartagine sum, Cartagine uenio, Cartagine transeo.' Ad locum uero per accusatiuim ut 'Cartaginem pergo.'" The text of Sedulius (692, 3) which itself seems most likely to be based on PRIS., 3, 66, 9 - 10 bears the least similarity to this sentence. Second greatest in similarity is the text in MUR. 1586, 46 V 31 - 33 which reads: "Quando uero tertie sunt declinationis, in loco et per locum et de loco per ablatium, ad locum uero per accusatiuim significant ut 'Cartagine sum, Cartagine uenio, Cartagine transeo'; ad locum uero 'Cartaginem pergo.'" The text in MUR. 7491 A, 31 V 3 ff. is the third in degree of similarity to PC's text. The 7491 A presents the same text as the 1586.
but has declinationes for the correct declinationis common to
PC and the 1586 and preeo for transeo. The discussion in REM.,
67, 1 - 4 seems to be more similar to PC's text than the one
in Priscian or Sedulius is, but not as close as either of the
two Muridac texts appears.

164, 5: 'Cartagines sum,
Sergius] in his Explanationes, 511, 10 - 11 observes, as
opposed to the other 'v.' and 'cf.' references, that the proper
phrase is "Cartagini sum."

5: per actium: I transcribe actm as accusatium;
see sentence 4. It is tempting to see if actium would suffice.
Clemens (39, 17 - 19) says the following about activus being
used for accusativus: "accusativus vero ab aliis activus vocatur,
quia Virgilio testante a verbo 'accuso' id est 'ago' derivatur."

6: A line comparable to this does not appear in any
of the two Muridac texts nor in the C.M. 14488. SED., 1, 692,
4 does have, however: "Idem et in semper pluralibus inventitur--
quae semper pluralia sunt, ut 'Athenae, Thebae, Mycenae', ...."
The list of these names of cities is related to what Donatus
(377, 1 - 2) has: "Sunt quaedam positione pluralia, intellectu
singularia, ut Athenae Cumae Thebae Mycenae." This sentence of
Donatus is in the discussion of the accident of number in the
nouns.
165, : PC notes in this paragraph that a preposition is not applied separately to an adverb, although there are expressions like *de repente, de sursum, de subito*, etc. He then asks why this is so, and answers, saying that an adverb and a preposition existing side by side separately would be considered as two parts of speech. However, he concludes, stating that they are in such a situation considered as one part of speech and have one accent.

2 - 5: I have examined the texts of the C.M. 14488, 62v 15 - 21; of SED., 1, 695 - 696; and of MUR. 7491 A, 31v 6 - 8 and have come to the conclusion that in degree of similarity with PC's text beginning with the closest they ought to be listed as follows: the C.M. 14488, Sedulius, Muridac. The 14488 reads, for example: "Set [sic] hoc tamquam unam partem orationis sub uno accentu pronuntiabimus quia igitur una pars orationis est. Unus non duo accentus pronuntiari debet."

The comparable text in Sedulius (696) seems to be less related to PC's because of the additional commentary, although the text in the 14488 is also in Sedulius. Muridac offers: "Ipsa subiungit sed hoc tamquam unam partem orationis sub uno accentu pronuntiabimus."

2: From among the 'v.' references listed for this sentence, the one in REM. EIN., 262, 2 - 4 offers the closest
text to PC's and reads: "Praepositio aduerbiis nusquam apponitur per appositionem, sed per compositionem, ut 'derepente' sub uno accentu pronuntiatur et cetera."

Although the texts of the C.M. 14488, 62° 21 - 63° 8 and SED., 1, 697 - 698 are nearly identical with each other and present closely resembling texts to PC's, it seems that the text in the 14488 is closer to PC because of the following reasons: like PC (see the apparatus criticus) the 14488 features the spellings omonima and polionima, the phrase "diversas habentia uoces" instead of Sedulius's "diversas voces habentia," and the spelling Jupiter as contrasted to Iuppiter in the edition of Sedulius. The text of PRIS., 3, 88, 23 - p. 89, 13, is evidently the inspiration, though second-hand, for the entire paragraph 166.

5: I have inserted this before sentence 6 because on 18° the beginning of this reading appearing clearly in the left-hand margin on line 22 precedes the reading in what is now sentence 6.

"Concerning the order of the adverb. 2 About the order of the adverbs it is also asked whether they can be placed before or after the verbs. 3 And it ought to be known clearly that they can more suitably be placed before, in the same manner as the adjectival nouns like: 'Bonus homo
bene agit, fortis imperator fortiter pugnat.' 4 To be sure, however, adjectival nouns as well as adverbs can be placed before with the exception of all the monosyllables like non, ne, dum, cum. 5 But both the demonstrative and the interrogative adverbs and those of similitude, wishing and calling always ought to be placed before."

167, 2 - 5: Upon an examination of the text in PRIS., 3, 89, 14-23 I have come to the conclusion that PC more likely drew his Priscian material from a text similar to either the one in the C.M. 14488, 63r 8 – 16 or in SED., 1, 699. On one hand, PC has in common fortis imperator with the 14488 and Priscian, while Sedulius has fortis rex. Also, both PC and the 14488 have the spelling monosyllabis. However, PC, Priscian and Sedulius give the list "non ne dum cum," whereas the 14488 omits dum.

168, : "Note. 2 But it must be noted that even the other parts of speech are accepted in place of the diverse significations of the adverbs, and this happens when two are used for one like nullomodo and nullatenus; and also when we even find adverbs like mane nouum in place of nouns."

This whole paragraph so far seems to be related only to the text of Sedulius cited in the Fontes. The phrase about mane nouum, however, is also related to the one cited for Priscian.
169, : In this paragraph PC, basing his discussion on a text similar to one in Priscian as cited in the *Fontes*, notes that adverbs of place have either distinctive meanings like, for instance, *huc*, *illac*, *ibi*, and *hac*. The so-called common meanings are attached to an adverb like *peregre* 'abroad'.

170 - 173 : This is the section on the adverb *secundum* Donatum. The material, as may be seen from the *Fontes*, appears to be drawn largely from Donatus, although there are instances of close relationship to Remigius, Servius and [Sergius].

170, : PC in the discussion here which is based largely upon Donatus first, having asked what an adverb is, defines it; a part of speech which, added to a verb, explains and completes its meaning. Then he asks how many accidents of the adverb there are, and enumerates the three: *significatio*, *comparatio*, and *figura*. The rest of the paragraph, from sentence 8 to 57, is a lengthy discussion on the many types of *significationes*. Sentence 9 gives the long list of the many types of *significationes*, and sentences 10 - 57 give an example or examples of each type. A deviation from Donatus's text is PC's frequent use of *da*. Donatus uses *da* only before *adverbia loci* and *temporis*. However, it is significant that *da* appears as well before all of the types of *significationes*.
of adverbs beginning with "da numeri ut semel bis ter" in the Donatus manuscript M. (See DON., 362, 24*.) Also, I note that PC has many readings in common with M and Remigius.

170, : 2 -hortandi of sentence 9

On 19r 5 PC writes Aut optandi, Aut ortandi' which is the reading in the Donatus ms. M. (Keil, however, gives the spelling hortandi.) (See DON., 362, 19*.)

2: For the omission of est, especially in 'Irish' Latin, see Löfstedt's introduction to Malsachanus, p.121 - 122.

11: Illuc appears in the Donatus ms. L. (See DON., 362, 23*.) The text as edited by Keil reads: "Vt hic vel ibi, intus vel foris, illic vel inde." However, the Donatus text as represented in the commentary of Remigius (Fox edition, p. 61, 10 - 11) is closer to PC's text. Remigius has: "Ut hic vel ibi, intus vel foris, illuc vel inde, intro vel foras."

13: The text of Keil for DON., 362, 23 merely has: "Vt hodie nuper aliquando; ...." However, the reading in the Donatus ms. M (see line 23*) gives a far closer text to PC's: "ut hodie heri nunc nuper cras aliquando olim."

15: DON., 362, 24 gives only semel bis. Ter, in addition, is seen in M (See line 24* of this Donatus text.) and in REM., 62, 4; but the latter also mentions quater in
supplementary commentary.

170, 17: While DON., 362, 24 has only non, the ms. M (see line 24* of this Donatus text) adds neque.

19: PC's spelling quidni is that in the Donatus ms. M (See DON., 362, 25*) while quinni appears in the Donatus mss. LS. Quidni is also the reading in REM., 62, 15.

26: Deinceps appears in addition to deinde in REM., 62, 27 and in the Donatus ms. M. (See DON., 362, 26*.)

31: The series of adverbs after cee appear neither in Remigius, the Donatus ms. M, nor in the Keil text.

33: Fortiter appears in addition to docte pulchre in the Donatus mss. MS (See DON., 362, 27*) and in REM., 63, 5.

35: The Donatus ms. M (See Don., 362, 27*) features multum parum minimum, while the established text of Keil omits minimum. REM., 63, 10 - 11 has the reading of M. Modicum included by PC may either be an original contribution on his part or drawn from an undiscovered Donatus ms. or treatise based on Donatus.

37: The list given here by PC is not that which appears in Donatus or Remigius, both of which feature only forsitan fortasse. REM., 63, 18, however, cites fortassis by way of additional commentary.
170, 45: Both DON., 362, 29 – 30 and REM., 64, 2 give: "Separandi, ut seorsum" (quoting from the Donatus lemma in the latter). Remigius, however, cites deorsum and istorsum in consequent commentary.

51: Simul una pariter appears in REM., 65, 1. DON., 362, 31 lacks pariter.

57: REM., 65, 14, as DON., 362, 32, lacks quam maxime in the series. However, the former cites quam and maxime in consequent commentary. But one reads in the Donatus ms. M (DON., 362, 32*): "magis uel tam qua maxime." Keil points out, moreover, that qua was added by another hand to M.

171, : This paragraph is a continuation of PC's detailed discussion on the accidents of the adverb which he began in 170, 8. Now he is concerned with comparatio. He notes that there are three degrees of comparison – the positive, comparative, and the superlative – and illustrates each category with a form of docte.

172, : Here he is concerned with figura, noting that there are two types: the simple like docte and prudenter; the compounded like indocte and imprudenter.

173, : PC remarks in this paragraph that adverbs of place signify in a place, from a place, towards a place, or
through a place. He proceeds to say that adverbs signifying in or from a place have the same meaning like intus and foris, but that the adverbs meaning to a place have a different meaning like: "Intro eo, foras eo" 'I go inside, I go outdoors.' What PC, or for that matter Donatus, means by significatio may perhaps be illustrated by what Sedulius says in vol. 1, 662, 2-4 explaining DON., 386, 21: "Ecce "DE LOCO". Quare dicit QUASI IN LOCO? Ideo scilicet, quia adverbia DE LOCO unam eandemque habent litteraturam, ut adverbia IN LOCO, et nisi verba quae motionem vel stationem significant illis adicerentur adverbiis, nequaquam esset discretio inter adverbia DE LOCO et adverbia IN LOCO." PC in sentence 4 observes that one cannot say expressions such as de intus, de foris, ad fores, and in foras. He notes that per locum is expressed by hac and illac and that no preposition may be joined separately to adverbs.

173, 1: Per locum appears in the Donatus ms. M.

4: Dicitur appears in the Donatus mss. MS.

5: quia ... adiungitur

It does not appear that the text of [Sergius], although it is close to PC's here, can be considered definitely PC's direct source, for he writes: "nam praeposito separatim adverbio numquam potest // adiungi."
174 - 185: This section deals with the participle *secundum Priscianum*.

174, : In this paragraph PC is concerned with the general aspects about the participle. He begins in the manner of Priscian by asking to what part of speech *legens* belongs. However, the text referred to in *Partitiones* for sentence 2 does not have *legens*. Moreover, the C.M. 1473, 179r 21 begins its discussion on the participle in a manner similar to PC's: "Incipit de participio. 'Legens' quae pars orationis est? Participium. Participium quid est? Pars orationis partem capiens et reliqua." The Paris 7558 (157v 11 - 16) although not featuring *legens*, nevertheless seems to offer a text more similar if one were to take into consideration its scope: "De participio. 'Docens' quae pars orationis est? Participium. Participium quid est? Pars orationis partem capiens nominis, partem uerbi. Recipit enim a nominī [sic] genera et casus, a uerbo tempora et significationes, ab utroque numerum et figuram."

Having finished by sentence 8 defining the participle, PC explains the etymology of *participium*, noting that it is derived from *pars* and *capio capis*. This etymology is similar to a kind given by Remigius and Muridac. Sentences 11 - 19 (the end of the paragraph) are a series of questions and answers about the observation that the participle has gender and case from the noun, and the verb's tenses and voices.
Indeed, he asks in sentence 12 why this is so and answers in 13, stating that this is the situation because the participle of the present tense does not determine a definite gender and case until it is used in connection with a noun; for example, when one says *amans*, it is uncertain whether it is masculine, feminine, or neuter or whether it is of the nominative or vocative case. PC shows by model sentences that these ambiguities of *amans* are cleared up, when it is used with a noun. Then, in sentence 17 he asks why the participle receives number and figure from the verb. He answers saying that the participle makes a claim to these two accidents.

174, 5: The text in Priscian's *Partitiones*, 512, 26 gives: "Pars orationis partem capiens nominis partemque verbi." This is more similar to PC's text than the one in DON., 387, 18 - 19: "Participium est pars orationis dicta, quod partem capiat nominis, partem verbi." Remigius (67, 21) is even closer to PC than Priscian is: "eo quod partem capit nominis partemque verbi."

10: Neither etymological explanation given by Muridac or Remigius is exactly that featured by PC. However, both Remigius and Muridac offer similar ideas.

12: I have examined the texts in MUR. 1586, 42^Γ^ 17 - 20, the C.M. 14488, 63^V^ 4 - 7 and SED., 1, 703, 4 and have
come to the conclusion that the text of Muridac is the closest to PC's, but only because of very minor considerations: all three texts of Muridac, the 14488 and Sedulius—present the same treatment which has enough similarity to PC's to be worthy of a 'cf.' reference; the discussion in Muridac, however, like PC's, omits sed which Sedulius and the 14488 have before the phrase "cum omnes partes ... natura protulerit." The text of the MUR. 7491 A, 31^v^ 19 - 21 is far less likely than the one in the 1586 to have been the source for PC, for it reads: "Cum omnes partes orationes [sic] natura simul protulerit, merito queritur quare dicat Donatus recipere participium a nomine genera et casus eo quod ad similitudinem nominis genera habeat et casus." Furthermore PC's phrase "a uerbo ... dicatur" is also related, though undoubtedly through intermediate transmission, to what Sacerdos (443, 20) writes: "...: a verbo duo, tempora et significationem ...."

174, 14 - 16: Although the 'cf.' references cited for this section—Sedulius, the two Muridacs, and the C.M. 14488—offer presentations that are essentially like each other with a few uninteresting variations and which are close enough to PC's discussion to indicate possible if not probable direct borrowing, it appears most likely that none of them is closer than the other to PC and that PC possibly made use of another yet identified text. However, MUR. 7491 A, 31^v^ 25 and 28
presents readings not in common with PC and the others. In line
25 he writes "donec nominibus iungantur" while the others
have iungatur; and in 28 he gives: "Diligens me Marce Marcia
loquitur; uenerans mancipia ...." However, the C.M. 14488
and Sedulius have "non terminat certum genus," while the two
Muridac texts have determinat.

174, 19: It seems that the text in Sedulius cited for
this sentence, which gives the same presentation as found in the
C.M. 14488, is closer to PC's treatment than that text in MUR.
7491 A. The latter writes: "... ille partes hec duo
accidentia sibi vindicant." But Sedulius gives: "... quia
aeque illae partes haec duo accidentia sibi vindicant." This
type of presentation in PC, Muridac, Sedulius, and the 14488
seems to go back ultimately to what one reads in Isidore who
writes in 1,11, 1: "A nomine enim vindicat sibi genera et
casus, ...." PC's ideas are in accordance with those of Priscian,
but the former's method of presentation is different.

175, : Here PC is concerned about the accidents of
the participle. Following Donatus he asks how many accidents
there are and answers, saying that there are six: gender, case,
tense, voice, number and figure. Then in a style reminiscent
of Priscian but more likely to be imitating a text similar to
the C.M. 14737 he asks to what gender legens belongs. He
explains that in the particular circumstance it is masculine
because that is the gender which is adhering to *legens*. He defines gender briefly as the discovery of the sex of something. He then gives the etymology of *genus*, stating that it is derived from *generandum*. The rest of the paragraph is still concerned about *genus*. Sentences 14 - 18 enumerate the four types of gender in a participle: masculine, feminine, neuter, and the all-inclusive gender 'omne.' In sentence 19 he begins treating the question of why a participle is not of one unique gender as a noun is:

19 Why are participles of only one gender not found in the same way as nouns, just as *Priscianus* is of one gender? 20 Solution. 21 Because they are adjectives, and it is necessary that either in one sound or in a distribution of sounds they encompass all the genders just as the verbs from which they are derived, as *lego* pertains to a man, to a woman, to a slave. 22 If the participle of this verb were therefore of only one gender, in vain would it be able to accomplish the duty of the verb, from which it is derived, through all the genders.

175, 5: The Donatus ms. M has *et*. (See DON., 363, 15*.)

6 - 7: Priscian has *lacrimans*, and his treatment is not similar to PC's in the degree that the 14737 is. Priscian writes: "Cuius est generis? Communis trium generum." The
C.M. 14737 has: "Cuius generis 'legens'? Omnis."

175, 14 - 17: The text of DON., 363, 16 - 19 is far closer to PC's text than the one in the C.M. 14488, 64. 12 - 14 is. However, it should be noted that whereas Donatus and the 14488 have legens being of the commune genus, Servius and Sergius use the term omne as PC does.

19 - 22: The most similar text is the C.M. 14488, followed by Sedulius, Muridac, and the C.M. 14737. The 14488 offers (line 21) the following reading: "... aut in diuisione uocum omnia genera comprehendant sicut uerba ...." Sedulius has the same text but says comprehendantur and sicuti. The comparable readings in the 14737 and Muridac are the same as in the 14488 except that Muridac also has sicuti. I have placed Muridac third in degree of similarity to PC because, whereas Sedulius has "... ad similitudinem nominis vel verbi. Nam unius generis est nomen, ut 'Priscianus' " (and the same text appears in the C.M. 14488), Muridac gives: "... ad similitudinem nominum uel uerbi. Est enim nomen unius generis ut 'Donatus'?"

The 14737 has the following text: "Quare participia non recipiuntur [the others have either reperiantur or reperiantur] unius generis ad similitudinis nominis uel uerbi?" After this sentence, no example like the observations about Donatus and Priscianus are made, but the 14737 proceeds with a solution comparable to PC's sentence 21.
176, : "Of what case is it? 2 Of the nominative.
3 Why? 4 Because it is in such __. 5 What is case?
6 A light inflexion of a word. 7 Whence is derived casus?
8 From cadendum. 9 How many cases of participles are there?
10 Six. 11 What are they? 12 The nominative, genitive,
dative, accusative, vocative, and the ablative."

1 - 2: The C.M. 14737 has this exact statement, and it
is about legens. Priscian, however, has: "Cuius est casus
intenti? Nominativi; idem tamen est et vocativus."

4: There would seem to be some sort of lacuna in the
source which PC is using. It is tempting to understand structura
with _tali_. (See PRIS. PT., 462, 11.)

6: PC's brief definition seems to be only an
abbreviated definition of the text in the Ars Anonyma Bernensis:
"Hoc est dictio gradatim pergens nouissima parte nominis; aliter:
casus est uarietas denominationis a nominatiuo inclinata. Item
alia definitio: casus est flexio uocis per varias qualitates
nominandi corporis, ...."

177, : Still speaking about legens PC, in this paragraph
which deals with tense, asks to what tense legens belongs. He
replies that it is present tense because the participle of the
present tense and the imperfect ends in _ns_. Then he asks the
same about lectus, and answers, saying that it is of the
preterite perfect and pluperfect because these are the particles ending in *tus*, *sus*, *xus*, and one in *us* which is *mortuus*. Last of all, he asks about *legendus*, and replies that it is future because every participle ending in *rus* and *dus* is future.

177, 2–3: Priscian offers: "Cuius est temporis? Praesentis: ..." He is speaking, however, about *lacrimans*. The 14737 gives: "Cuius temporis? Praesentis." This reading in the 14737 is about *legens*.

5: It appears that of all the 'v.' references cited for this sentence, the text in Servius has the greatest resemblance to PC, for he writes: "nam praesens unam habet, quam diximus, ns, ut legens; ..." Although Sacerdos and [Sergius] have similar ideas, it is difficult to discern whether either of them is the closer to PC.

6–7: Priscian does not offer a comparable treatment, but he does note that the preterite perfect and the pluperfect participle are the same.

9: Although PC's observations about these various endings of *xus*, *sus*, and *tus* are in harmony with the texts of Priscian and Sacerdos, it does not seem that PC borrowed directly from either of them. However, it ought to be noted that Sacerdos does not cite the example of *mortuus*, which
Priscian does. Otherwise, Sacerdos offers a text bearing this treatment: "...: temporis praeteritī aut tus, ut amatus, aut xus, ut nexus, aut sus, ut visus tersus mersus." The presentation in PRIS., 2, 558, 7 - 8, however, seems to be more reminiscent of PC: "praeteritī vero temporis participia, quae in 'tus' vel 'sus' vel 'xus' desinunt, ...."

177, 13: Remigius presents a treatment reminiscent of PC's: "...quia est participium futuri temporis desinens in rus vel in dus." This seems to be the closest of the 'v.' texts cited for this sentence. The next in degree of similarity appears to be either Servius or [Sergius], the former of which offers: "...; futurum vero tempus duas habet regulas, rus et dus, ut lecturus legendus." The latter gives: "...; futurum in duas regulas exit, rus et dus, rus ab activo, dus a passivo, lecturus legendus." Priscian appears to give a text less related than Servius or [Sergius]: "a communi quoque verbo, quod in future tempore duo habet participia, unum quidem activum in 'rus', alterum vero passivum in 'dus', ...." Sacerdos seems to be the last with the following text: "..., aut rus temporis futuri activitatis, ut amatus, aut dus temporis futuri passivitatis, ut amandus: ...."

178, : "Concerning signification (or voice). 2 Of what signification is it (i.e., legens)? 3 Active. 4 Why? 5 Because it is derived from the active of the verbs, which is
lego gis.  6 Of what signification is lectus?  7 Passive.
8 Why?  9 Because it comes from a passive verb, which is
legor ris.  10 Of what signification is sedens?  11 Neutral.
12 Why?  13 Because it is derived from a neutral verb.
14 Of what signification is loquens?  15 Deponent, because it comes from a deponent verb.
16 Of what signification is criminans?  17 Common.  18 Why?  19 Because it is descended from a common verb."

178,  1: De significatione appears as a title in the Donatus ms. S (See DON., 387, 27*) before Donatus's discussion on the signification of verbs.

2 - 5: The C.M. 14737 offers a text very close to this section in only the following way (about legens): "Cuius significationis? Actiue." Priscian, however, though treating lacrimans, accounts for the fact that lacrimans is active: "Cuius est significationis? activae: nascitur enim a verbo lacrimo lacrimas lacrimat."

6 - 9: Priscian as cited does not present a comparable treatment but does make observations concerning the formation of passive participles; PC has adopted all of the ideas.

13: PC is in agreement about sedens according to the texts of Priscian and Charisius.
178. 19: PC's teachings about criminans are correct according to Priscian and Charisius as cited, though neither of these two references is likely to account entirely for PC's text here.

179. : Still describing the accidents of the participle, PC is now concerned with number and asks in the manner of the Partitiones to what number legens belongs. He gives a circular answer, saying that it is singular because it is mentioned as singular. This explanation appears in no other text I have consulted. Then, basing sentences 6 - 9 on a previous discussion in paragraph 44 he deals with the etymology of numerus, stating that it comes from numerandum.

1: This heading appears in the Donatus ms. S as well as in Priscian in connection with their discussions on number in participles.

2 - 3: Priscian has, speaking about lacrimans: "Cuius est numeri? Singularis, figulae simplicis."

180, : "On figure.  2 Of what figure is it (i.e., legens)?  3 Simple.  4 Why?  5 Because not ___.  6 What is figure?  7 A distinction.  8 Whence is figura derived?  9 From fi<ν>gendum."
180, 1: This reading appears in the Donatus ms. S as a heading before a discussion on figura in participles.

2 - 3: The reading in these two sentences appears exactly so in the 14737 as cited; and what is more, the 14737 reading concerns legens. The reading cited in the Partitiones reads as follows (about intenti): "Cuius figurae? Compositae."

5: This inadequate answer seems likely be an abbreviated form of sentence 5 in paragraph 55.

181, 1: "Concerning the noun - (adjectives) that have the appearance of participles. 2 There are nouns having the appearance of participles like tunicatus and galeatus. 3 They seem to have the appearance of participles because they end in tus in the manner of the past participle, but still they are pure nouns. 4 All those which do not come from verbs as nouns must be connected with participles. 5 There are even those from among the nouns which, although they seem to be participles, nevertheless have been deprived of the verbal significance like pransus, cenatus, placita, nupta, triumphata, and regnata. 6 Question. 7 Why have they been deprived of the verbal significance? 8 Solution. 9 Because one does not say prandoeor, cenor, regnor, placeor, nubor, and triumphor. 10 If moreover, one said them, people would think that they are the verbs from which those nouns are derived.
Question. But even if the above-mentioned nouns have been deprived of their verbal meanings, why are they not at the same time understood so that one may say in a series tunicatus, galeatus, praehus, cenatus, and so forth? Solution. Therefore, indeed, they are not all at the same time understood because, to be sure, tunicatus and galeatus are always nouns, although they seem to have the appearance of participles. Truly the following, though they are nouns, nevertheless at one time or another can be used while retaining the meaning of the ancient passive verbs just as we read: 'Italia olim regnata Lycurgo.' And those above-mentioned nouns, that is, tunicatus and galeatus, in no way take a verb, for neither tunico nor tunicor is said. These, however, which follow, that is, placita, nupta, regnata, and triumphata, granted that they do not have their own verbs from which to derive their origine, nevertheless have similar verbs from which they seem to originate. For although we do not say nubor, triumphor, and regnor, we say, however, nubo, triumpho, and regno. Another solution. Certainly otherwise, in addition, they are said to have been deprived of their verbal significance, that is to say those which are now in use like prandeo and ceno which are neuters and cannot have the participles of the preterite tense. Likewise there are other participles which, having accepted a preposition,
cease to be both verbs and participles. 22 That is, as long
as they are participles they are not compounded, as nocens is
the participle of noceo. 23 Innocens, however, is a noun
because one does not say innoceo."

181, 2 - 3: Aside the lemma taken from DON., 388, 12 which
is sentence 2 and which is reproduced faithfully by all the
'cf.' references cited for these two sentences, it appears
that the text of SED., 1, 738, 2, which is the same presentation
as that found in the C.M. 14488, 65\textsuperscript{v} 21 - 22, is closer to
PC's sentence 3 than the text of MUR. 7491 A, 32\textsuperscript{v} 28 ff. Sedulius
writes: "SPECIUM PARTICIPIORUM videntur habere, quia in 'tus'
ad similitudinem participii praeteriti temporis desinunt, sed
tamen pura nomina sunt, ...." Muridan offers: "Speciem
participiorum uidentur habere, id est praeteriti temporis;
tamen pura nomina sunt ...."

4: Donatus (388, 13) writes: "..., quae quia a
verbo non veniunt, non sunt participiiis applicanda." This is
the presentation followed by all the 'cf.' references for this
sentence. It therefore appears that either PC's sentence 4
is an original rewording of the Donatus lemma on his part or
else a borrowing from an unknown commentary on Donatus.

5 - 15: The text of the C.M. 14488, 65\textsuperscript{v} 24 - 66\textsuperscript{r} 9 appears
to offer the closest treatment to PC's than the other 'cf.'
references cited. The 14488 is followed by the text of MUR. 7491 A, 33\textsuperscript{r} 1 - 6 in degree of similarity, and the presentation in SED., 1, 739 - 740, 9 bears the least degree of similarity to PC in comparison with Muridac and the 14488. Sedulius has: (paragraphs 739 - 740, 1): "EX QUIBUS SUNT ETIAM ILLA QUAE, CUM PARTICIPIA VIDEANTUR, VERBORUM TAMES SIGNIFICATIONE, id est intellectu et sensu PRIVATA SUNT, id est alienata et extranea, UT PRANSUS CENATUS PLACITA NUPTA TRIUMPHATA REGNATA. PRANSUS simile participio, sed quia 'prandeor' non facit, participio non applicatur; CENATUS nomen est, quia 'cenor' non facit. Quare PRIVATA SUNT SIGNIFICATIONE VERBORUM, ...." The comparable text in the 14488 offers: "Ex quibus sunt etiam illa que cum participia videantur, uerborum tamen significatione privata sunt ut 'pransus cenatus placida\textsuperscript{sic} nupta triumphata regnata.' Quare privata sunt significatione uerborum?" Also, concerning the use of regnata in sentence 15 one ought to note that SED., 1, 740, 8 - 9 has: "REGNATA; unde Vergilius: 'Acri quondam regnata Lycurgo.'" The 14488, 66\textsuperscript{r} 9 has, however: "'Italia olim regnata Ligurco.'" PC on 20\textsuperscript{r} 16 writes ligurro and MUR. 7491 A, 33\textsuperscript{r} 8 and the 1586, 48\textsuperscript{v} 19 feature Ligurco in the same line of poetry used by the 14488, except that they add in before Italia. The concurrence of the metasthesized forms suggests a similarity to the 14488, the 7491 A, and the 1586; likewise with the assimilation of the second r to the
first r to transform Ligurco into ligurro. The reading in the Arundel 43 is ligurido. (See SED., 2, p. 27*.) Furthermore, the 14488, 66r 2 - 4 has: "Set [sic] et ista uerborum significatione priuata sunt et superiora, quare non simul comprehenduntur ut dicatur una serie 'tunicatus galeatus pransus canatus' et cetera?" This treatment, corresponding to PC's sentence 12, is more related to what PC writes than what MUR. 7491 A, 33r 4 - 6 presents: "Si et ista uerborum significatione priuata et superiora, quare simul non comprehenduntur ut dicamus in una serie 'tunicatus galeatus pransus cenatus' et cetera?" This is an example where the 14488 is closer to PC than Muridac is. However, Muridac features on the whole the continuous text of the 14488 closely without the additional commentary of Sedulius; and what is more, Muridac has, as has been discussed, Italia like PC and the 14488 as opposed to Acri in Sedulius.

181, 14: The treatment in Pompeius (262, 14 - 15) might be the ultimate Late Latin source for sentence 14: "sed ista tamen non possunt esse participia. quid ergo? nomina sunt similitudinem participiorum habentia."

16 - 20: The comparable texts in SED., 1, 740, 10 - 741, 3 and of the C.M. 14488, 66r 10 - 20 are the same, but a minor distinction between these two might perhaps point to the hypothesis that PC is using here a text more in the tradition
of Sedulius rather than in that of the 14488. SED., 1, 740, 11 writes: "Nec 'tunico' enim, nec 'tuincor' dicitur." The 14488, 667 11 gives: "Nec 'tuincato' nec 'tuincor' dicitur."

181, 16: Pompeius (262, 26) seems to be the ultimate source for "nulla ... recipiunt" with: "...; quae nulla ratione verbum recipiunt, ..." "In line 28 he says, furthermore: "...; sed tunico non possum dicere nec tunicor, ...."

17: Diomedes (402, 23 - 24) seems to be the ultimate source with: "quae quoniam verbi originem non habent, ...."

23: It appears that SED., 1, 742, 4 - 5 is more likely than either Donatus or Muridac offering a text closer to PC's than the one in either Donatus or Muridac is. Sedulius has: "...; cum autem componitur cum praepositione et dicitur INNOCENS, iam non participium sed nomen est. NAM, et ipse dicit, NOCEO DICITUR, INNOCEO NON DICITUR." MUR., 337 16 merely gives: "'Innoceo' non dicitur." DON., 388, 18 offers: "...: nam noceo dicitur, innoceo non dicitur."

182, : This paragraph concerns itself with those nouns that seem to be participles. PC begins his discussion, according to material in Donatus but which also reappears in Sedulius, Muridac, and the C.M. 14488, stating that there are nouns which like participles have a verbal origin, but because they have no tense, they are judged to be nouns rather than participles.
He gives the examples furibundus and moriens. He specifies that they are not future participles because the verbs of their origin lack the future participle in dūs.

The possible sources for this paragraph in its entirety include comparable texts in Sedulius, Muridac, and the C.M. 14488. I have examined and compared all three of these texts with PC's, and the one in the 14488 is the most closely related, aside from a slightly changed syntax of the Donatus lemma from 388, 19 which is intact in the other sources including PC. The 14488, 66 10 ff. reads, for example: "Ab eo enim uerbo quod est 'furio' hoc est 'insanio,' uenit 'furibundus.' Nomen est, id est 'similis furientis' [sic], et ab eo quod est 'morior' uenit 'moribundus,' id est 'similis morientis' [sic].' Although Sedulius gives the correct forms furienti and morienti and has the same material as the 14488, nevertheless he features between "'similis furienti'" and "et ab eo quod est 'morior'" some commentary on ludibundus not to be found in the 14488 nor in PC. Otherwise the text in Sedulius for this whole paragraph is the same as that in the 14488; but because of the extra note on ludibundus the Sedulius text has the second greatest of similarity to PC. Last of all in degree of similarity comes MUR. 7491 A, 33 18 - 20 who writes, for example: "A uerbo enim quod est 'furio' id est 'insanio,' uenit 'furibundus' ...."

But both Sedulius and the 14488 write (quoting Sedulius):
"Ab eo enim verbo quod est 'furio', ...." The text in MUR. 1586, 49r is the same as that in the 7491 A, except that the former correctly has in line 2 "et quia tempus non habent" (see PC's 182, 2) while the 7491 A, 33r 19 erroneously gives habet.

182, 5: Pompeius and Remigius write that amans functioning as a participle may have tense, but Remigius proceeds, remarking that the noun amans has no tense.

183, : In this paragraph PC deals with the words which are participles and nouns. He points out that uisus, when it is a noun, is of the fourth declension, but that when it is a participle, it may be of either of the three genders represented thus: uisus, uisa, uisum. PC asks in how many ways nouns differ from participles, and he answers, saying that they differ in three ways: by comparison, declension, and case, for when participles are used as nouns, they may be compared and they take the genitive case. However, PC adds that as participles they have tense and take the same case as the verb would take, which verb is their origin.

2: The text in Donatus (388, 20 - 21) reads:
"sunt multa participia eadem et nomina, ut passus visus cultus, quae tamen et in casibus discrepant et de temporibus dinoscuntur." MUR. 7491 A, 33r 22 ff. has the same treatment
as Donatus's, except that the former adds *sapiens* and *indulgens* after *cultus*.

183, 3 - 4: If one were to compare the texts of the C.M. 14488, 66*V* 24 - 27 and that in SED., 1, 744, 3 with these two sentences of PC he would notice that neither Sedulius, who presents nearly the same text as the C.M. 14488, nor the 14488, is any closer to PC than the other. From among the two 'v.' references cited for this text - REM. EIN., 263, 5 - 7 and SERVIUS, 441, 16 - 18 - it appears that the former is closer to PC than the latter, for Remigius writes: "'Passus' *si quartae declinationis est*, tunc nomen est et significat mensuram pedum; 'passus' *si participium est*, significat ipsum pati et est mobile per tria genera in us in a in um, ut 'passus est heri'." Servius has: "Nomina similia participiis praeteriti temporis quartae sunt declinationis, ipsa autem participia secundae, ut hic visus huius visus nomen est, hic visus huius visi participium est." The 'cf.' texts cited for Pompeius and Muridac for these two sentences do not seem to be the likely direct source used by PC in preference to the others, and neither Pompeius nor Muridac appears less or more related to the presentation of PC than the other 'cf.' texts cited.

7: Sedulius states that the three distinguishing factors are comparison, declension, and tense; and although he
does not list case formally, nevertheless he points out (746) that the noun *amans* takes *illius*, whereas the participle *amans* takes *illum* because *amo* also takes *illum*. PC is opposite in his treatment compared with Sedulius because the former, though not formally listing tense in sentence 7, nevertheless in sentence 9 points out that participles signify tense. Remigius, furthermore, lists the three distinguishing factors as case, comparison, and tense. Remigius does not bring in declension, which is understandable in view of the fact that he is using *amans* as a model. Sedulius, however, is using *visus*. PC in 7 lists declension but in the following sentences does not treat it at length because he is using *amans*. However, in sentences 1 - 4 PC did discuss *visus*. The criteria listed in the *Ars Anonyma Bernensis* include *significatio*, *comparatio*, *servitus*, *declinatio*, and *tempus*. *Servitus* is synonymous with *casus*, and *significatio*, pertaining to the noun, shows the quality of the person or creature described by the noun like *sapiens*. *Significatio*, pertaining to the participle, distinguishes between whether one is acting or acted upon. Charisius specifically points out two criteria: comparison and case.

184, : "On the defectives. 2 There are defective participles which are not able to go through all the tenses like *coeptus* and *urgendus*. 3 From the defective verb *coepi*
comes the participle of the preterite tense: coeptus. 4 It does not have a present because the verb from which it came lacks the present tense. 5 Likewise 'urgendus' comes from 'urgeo' and lacks the preterite and future in 'rus' because it is deficient in the supines from which participles come."

184, 2 - 5: It appears that PC's presentation is related in the greatest degree to the C.M. 14488, 67 5 - 14, then to SED., 1, 747, and last to MUR. 7491 A, 33 1 - 6. The C.M. 14488 has, for instance: "A uerbo enim defectiuo quod est 'cepi' uenit participium praeteriti temporis quod est 'ceptus.' Presens autem participium non habet quia et illut [sic] uerbum a quo oritur caret praesenti tempore. Similiter 'urguendus' [sic] uenit ab eo uerbo quod est 'urgeo' et caret praeterito et futuro tempore in 'rus' et non sine causa. Deficit enim in duobus membris [sic] ultrimis gerundii modi quibus praeterita et futura participia formantur." The text in Sedulius, aside from the orthographical deviations in the 14488, is the same. However, I have placed Sedulius second in degree of similarity because between "a quo oritur caret praesenti tempore" and "Similiter URGENDUS" comes additional commentary on coeptus; and Sedulius inserts "id est 'cogendus'" between "Similiter URGENDUS" and "venit a verbo quod est 'urgeo'." The text of Muridac appears to be the least related of the 'cf.' references; he writes, for example: "Ab eo quippe uerbo defectiuo quod tam
actionem quam passionem significat, et est fere praeteriti temporis, uenit participium quod est 'ceptus.' Presens uero ideo non habet participium quia illud uerbum a quo oritur istud praesens tempus non habet." Certain opinions expressed by PC and these 'cf.' references might go back ultimately to the texts of Priscian cited for sentences 4 and 5. PRIS., 2, 560, 14 - 15 offers: "'coepi' non habet praesens et futurum nec participium, sed tantummodo 'coemptus'. similiter 'odi', ...." In lines 7 - 9 of that same page Priscian gives: "et alia tamen multa inveniuntur deficientia in aliis quoque significationibus vel generibus verborum tam supina quam ex eis nascentia, ut 'urgeo', ...."

185, : PC deals with the inchoatives here. He notes that these types of verbs can only have present participles because that which begins cannot have the preterite. Inchoatives, he continues, also lack the future participle because they do not have the supines from which to form the past and future participles.

Aside from the heading in sentence 1, PC appears to be basing this discussion on a text similar to the one found in SED., 1, 723. It appears, moreover, that none of the 'v.' references cited for this paragraph seems to be the ultimate source through the 'cf.' texts, although the observations made in these 'v.' texts have the same ideas. However, there
may be some vague similarity in what is written in SERVIUS, 440, 21 - 22: "ideo autem [in] futuro carent, quoniam regulamutura participia a praeterito ducunt participio, ...."

186 - 187: The participle according to Donatus

Paragraph 186, which appears to be based on Donatus or at least to be drawn from a commentary using Donatus, deals in a general way with the characteristics of the participle. PC, aside from the heading in sentence 1, begins his discussion by asking what a participle is and then defining it as a part of speech that takes a part of a noun and a portion of a verb, that is, it takes gender and case from the former but tense and signification from the latter. In sentence 8 he enumerates the six accidents of the participle: gender, case, tense, signification, number and figure. Sentences 9 to the end (47) treat separately each of these accidents in the order of their mention in 8. To sum up briefly, it is necessary to point out that PC states that there are four genders: masculine, feminine, neuter and common, i.e., of the three genders. He then observes the six traditional cases and illustrates each with a form of legens. In sentences 17 - 19 he enumerates and illustrates the three tenses of the participle: past, present, and future. Sentences 21 - 39 deal with significatio, which has to do with the categories of active, passive, neuter, deponent, and common participles, hence, the voice of the
participles. Then, he mentions that participles are either singular or plural in number and concludes with a brief discussion on figure, in which discussion he says that there are two types: simple and decomposite.

The entire paragraph is close to Donatus on the whole, but after sentence 22 the text diverges from the edition of Keil; for instance, DON., 363, 13 - 16 writes: "Participium quid est? Pars orationis partem capiens nominis, partem verbi; nominis genera et casus, verbi tempora et significationes, utriusque numerum et figuram. Participio quot accidunt? Sex. Quae? Genus casus tempus significatio numerus figura. Genera participiorum quot sunt?" This section is comparable with sentences 2 - 9. However, comparable with PC's sentences 20 - 38, DON., 363, 23 ff. offers a text more divergent from PC's treatment on the significatio than in the degree of divergence from PC's sentences 2 - 9: "Significationes participiorum in quo sunt? Quia ab activo verbo duo participia veniunt, praesens et futurum, ut legens lecturus; a passivo duo, praeteritum et futurum, ut lectus legendus; a neutro duo, sicut ab activo, praesens et futurum, ut stans staturus, a deponenti tria, praesens praeteritum et futurum, ut loquens locutus locuturus; a communi quattuor, praesens praeteritum et duo futura, ut criminans criminatus criminaturus criminandum."

Moreover, there are readings in PC which are not part of
the text established by Keil but which appear as variant readings in a few of the Donatus mss. used by Keil. PC's numerus et figura is a reading in M. (See DON., 363, 15*.) In sentence 3 PC's ab utroque which is in mss. M and a is contrasted to Keil's utriusque appearing in mss. LS. (See DON., 363, 14 and 15*.) In 12 PC gives commune trium generum which appears in M. (See DON., 363, 18*.)

186, 47: DON., 363, 32 has: "... composita, ut neglegens." PC's idea about the two types of figurae being simplex and decomposita agrees with what Priscian teaches: "ergo vel simplicia sunt vel decomposita plerumque, ..., id est a compositis verbis derivata, ut 'efficio efficiens', ...." Clemens also, though officially stating that the two types are simple and compound, alludes to Priscian's teaching.

187, : This final paragraph, concluding the section on the participle according to Donatus, is a series of declensions based on Donatus (363, 32 - 364, 31) of legens, lecturus, lectus, and legendus. The most notable aspect about PC's borrowing, whether it be first or second-hand, is his abbreviations of the various forms of lecturus, lectus, and legendus; for example, in sentence 7 he writes: "'Legendus da dum' ...." Another important feature is his lack of declining in full lectus and legendus in all the forms as featured in Donatus.
He gives only the nominative, genitive and dative singulars of all three genders for lectus and only the nominative and genitive singulars of all three genders for legendus.

188 - 190: The conjunction according to Priscian

188: In this paragraph PC briefly outlines the major characteristics of the conjunction, beginning his discussion in the manner of Priscian by asking to what part of speech a certain word belongs. In this instance it is igitur. As cited in the Fontes for sentences 2 - 4, the C.M. 14737 and the 7558 also begins their discussions on the conjunction by asking what part of speech a certain conjunction is. The 14737 gives ast, Priscian que, and the 7558 gives ad, which is probably a variant of at. (See Grandgent, p. 119 for his note that final d and t in Late Latin could be confused.) From sentences 5 - 7 PC defines the conjunction as a part of speech that either joins together or disjoins other parts of speech in an order and which connects and puts in order a sentence. He then occupies himself with the etymology of coniunctio, observing that it comes from coniungendum. Afterwards, he notes that the conjunction has three accidents: species, figure, and order. Sentences 15. - 19 (the end) are a series of questions and answers in the style of Priscian on igitur. PC in these sentences says that igitur is of the illative
species, of the simple figure, and of the common order. Though most of the paragraph seems to be based largely on texts like Priscian's, there are also indications of the influence of Donatus, Remigius, Sedulius, Petrus Grammaticus, and Sergius.

188, 5: Concerning the disjunctive force PRIS., 3, 17 ff. states that it is the meaning or sense that is disjoined when the disjunctive conjunction like ve, vel, or aut show that some matter is so and that some other is not so. Sergius also agrees with Priscian. Concerning the joining force, Remigius has the following note: "..., et dicitur coniunctio a coniungendo, eo quod praecedentia subsequentibus coniungat et compaginiet, si quidem huiusmodi proprietatem habet, ut dissidentes et dissolutas contineat partes."

10 - 13: Donatus gives potestas instead of species found in Priscian who states that species and potestas in the matter of the conjunctions are synonymns.

189, : This long paragraph deals with the eighteen species of the conjunctions and appears very likely to have been modelled on a text similar to the presentations of Priscian as cited in the Fontes. PC enumerates and explains the species as follows:

4 The copulative which links the meaning as well as the words like et, que, atque, ac, ast; the continuative
which shows the order of things in a sequence with doubt like: "Si stertit, dormit" 'if he is snoring, he is sleeping.'

5 The subcontinuative is that which shows the consequential cause of the continuance with the essence of the matters like: "Quia sol est super terram, dies est" 'Because the sun is above the earth, it is day' and "Quando ambulat, mouetur" 'When he walks, he moves.'

6 The adjunctive is that which is adjoined to subjunctive verbs properly with doubt like: "Si ueniatur, faciam. Vt pro sit tibi facio" 'If he should come, I may do it. I am doing it so that it may be of profit to you.' These, however, may also be causal.

7 The causals are properly those which, having been joined to the indicative verb, signify a prior effect like: "Doctus sum nam legi" 'I am learned for I have read.' 8 The effective is that which, having been joined to the indicative verb, signifies a preceding effect as a result of a cause like: "Legi nam doctus sum" 'I have read for I am learned.'

9 The approbative is that which lends approbation to the matter to which it is joined, like: "Equidem merui nec deprecor" 'Truly I have merited it, nor do I avert it by pleading.' The disjunctive is that which, although it joins words, nevertheless disjoins the sense and signifies that one thing is so and that something else is not, like: "Aut dies est aut nox; uel est sanus uel est aeger" 'Either it is day or night; either he is well or sick.'

11 The
subdisjunctive is that which, although it has the sounds of
the disjunctives, nevertheless signifies that one as well as
the other exists in the same or in a different time, like:
"Alexander siue Paris iuit pro Helena," that is, 'Alexander
who is also called Paris went for Helen,' "Vel legit uel
scribit," that is, 'He is reading and writing.' 12 The
discursive or elective is that which shows that out of two
propositions it chooses the one and refuses the other, like:
"Malo esse diues quam pauper" 'I prefer to be rich than poor.'
13 The adversative is that which signifies something contrary
to that which is fitting like tu, tamen and si as in: "Ego
multum seruiui tibi; tu tamen habes me hodo pro seruitio cui
conueniret praemium" 'I have served you much; you, however,
hold me in hatred for the service for which a reward would
be fitting.' 14 The distributive is that which distributes
diverse things to various persons, like: "Ego lego; tu uero
dormis" 'I read; you, indeed, sleep.' 15 The abnegative is
that which joined to a subjunctive verb shows that something
can happen unless there be an impediment so that it does not
result, like: "Comederem si haberem. Gaudeat Priamus si
audet" 'I would eat if I were able. Priam may rejoice if he
hears it.' 16 The collective, rational, or illative is that
which brings together in a rational way matters mentioned
before or which is inferred from other propositions, like:
"Cicero solus Catilinam sapientia domuit; solus igitur Cicero patriam seruuit" 'Cicero alone overcame Catiline with wisdom; thus only Cicero saved his country.' 17 The dubitative is that which signifies doubt like ne and an. 18 The compleptive is that which by virtue of adornment or meter and because of no necessity is put, as if I should say: "Aeneas quidem pius fuit" 'Aeneas was certainly devoted.' 19 The diminutive is that which signifies diminution like: "Si non Byzantium, saltem commoda denarium" 'If not a Byzantius, at least give a denarius.'

189, 2: PRIS., 3, 93, 13 - 16 lists seventeen species, all of which PC treats, except the ablativa and the praesumptiva; but PC's eighteenth one, the diminutiva, is not mentioned by Priscian as a separate category. (See ahead to the commentary for 189, 13.) Indeed, saltem, which PC in sentence 19 considers to be a diminutive, is classified as an adversative in PRIS., 3, 99, 13. PC's order of treating these species also parallels the list given by Priscian as mentioned. Moreover, PC's statement that there are eighteen is inconsistent with his presentation that treats seventeen.

3: Priscian does not offer a treatment on the effectiva that is similar enough to PC's in order to merit a 'cf.' reference that might indicate direct or nearly direct borrowing from Priscian.on PC's part.
However, PC's assumptions about the *effectiuam* as far as his model sentence is concerned are correct, for one reads in PRIS., 3, 95, 5: "...; effectionis: 'movetur, ambulat *enim*'."

189, 11: *in eodem uel in diuerso tempore*

Although Priscian is not the source for this statement, he does, however, feature the following (3, 98, 4) that substantiates PC's idea: "... vel simul, ut copulativa, vel discrete."

13: Priscian's discussion on the adversatives mentions that some of these *adversativa* have a diminutive force, and he includes *saltem* among these diminutive adversatives. However, Priscian is not the source for sentence 19.

14: While PC merely says that the distributive are those which distribute diverse things *diuersis* 'to various persons,' Priscian more specifically says *diversis personis*.

15: *'Comederem si haberem.*

This phrase as yet is unlocatable in a possible source.

19: Otto Prinz (*Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1, München, Beck, 1967, col. 1637) has *Byzantius* as a coin minted at Byzantium and made nearly of gold or silver.

190, : "How many orders of conjunctions are there?

2 Three. 3 What? 4 Prepositive, subjunctive and common.
189, 7: PC must have in mind 'Doctus sum as the effectum antecedentem as far as its position in his model sentence is concerned. But see PRIS., 3, 96, 23 for [causam antecedentem].
5 How many conjunctions are there of the prepositive order?
6 Fifteen. 7 What? 8 .... 9 Why are they said to be of the prepositive order? 10 Because they can always be placed only before and can never be subjoined in the syntax of a speech (clause). 11 How many conjunctions are there of the subjunctive order? 12 Six. 13 What? 14 Que ue ne guidem quoque aut(æm). 15 But out of these three are enclitic, that is prone to bend - que, ue, ne - because they bend to themselves the accent of the preceding syllable like dixitque, audisne. 16 All of the remaining ones - the "committives" - are of the common order because they can be placed before and subjoined in the syntax of a speech like ergo, igitur and so forth. 17 Question. 18 It deservedly ought to be asked why this accident which is called potestas 'power' befalls the conjunction when this part of speech seems to be less than and inferior to all of the others? 19 Another question. 20 Or why does potestas not fall to the lot of the noun or pronoun or verb but only the conjunction?
21 Solution. 22 To this it must be said that this part of speech which is called the conjunction was ordained in accordance with the custom of kings and noblemen. 23 The kings place in pre-eminence those whom they want to; and those whom they wish to be subjected they subordinate. 24 Those whom they want to go before others, do so; and those whom they ordain to
follow, follow without a doubt. 25 Thus this part of speech makes those parts of speech to precede which it wants; and it makes those to be subjoined when it wants them to follow. 26 For this reason, just as *rex* is said meritoriously to come from *regendum*, likewise *coniunctio* from *coniungendum*. 27 Question. 28 If *coniunctio* is said to come from *coniungendum* as we have gone over before, it must be asked why do the so-called disjunctives contain this species within themselves. 29 Indeed, what is so contrary as a disjunction is to a conjunction? 30 Solution. 31 It must be noted, however, that the disjunctive conjunctions, granted that they disjoin the sense, nevertheless join together the words; whence they are called conjunctions."

190, 1 - 4: PC's assumptions about there being three types of orders of conjunctions is in accordance with all of the sources cited for sentence 4. It cannot be shown that any of them is his direct source however, for these four sentences.

6: PC actually lists fourteen in sentence 8.

14: Concerning *quidem*, *quoque*, and *autem* Priscian has the following to say: "..., quod tamen antiqui solebant etiam praeponere."

16: The text in Remigius, although it is not close
enough to PC here to merit a 'cf.' reference, still has a small similarity with this presentation: "sunt quae communes dicuntur, quia et praepoñi et supponi possunt, ut ergo igitur: ....." The text cited for Priscian seems to bear the second degree of resemblance with: "aliae paene omnes indifferenter et praepoñi et supponi possunt, ut 'et, atque', quae poëtice postponuntur, ...."

190, 17 - 25: I have examined the 'cf.' references for these sentences and have come to the conclusion that the text in the C.M. 14488 is the closest presentation on the whole to PC. The 14488 is then followed by Sedulius, Muridac (7491 A) and Muridac (1586). Sedulius and the 14488 offer the same text; but the following differences might lead to the conclusion that PC is closer to the 14488. Sedulius has: "..., cum haec pars paene omnibus aliis minor atque inferior esse videatur." The 14488 has the same; but like PC has et instead of atque. Sedulius continues with: "Vel cur nominis aut pronominis vel verbo non accidat POTEVAS, ....?" The C.M. 14488 like PC gives accidit. On the other hand, Sedulius has a few minor readings like PC's as opposed to those in the 14488. Sedulius gives: "Ad quod dicendum, quia ...." The 14488 has quod instead of quia, which is common to PC and Sedulius. Moreover, Sedulius continues with: "... more regum procerumque est ordinata." The 14488 has the same text but has et inserted
between regum and procerum. However, the biggest reason for assuming that PC is closer to the 14488 than to Sedulius is that in the 14488 in the right-hand margin (68\textsuperscript{r}) appears what seems to be: "subponi subponuntur." This is referred to an insertion in line 9 that reads: "et quos uolunt." The text in Sedulius offers no similar treatment. However, it is interesting to note that in MUR. 1586, 49\textsuperscript{v} 27 we have: "Reges enim quos uolunt praeponi, praeponunt. Et quos subponi, subponunt." The 7491\textsuperscript{A} has the same with the omission of: "Et quos subponi, subponunt." Nevertheless, the tradition of this text as represented by the two Muridac mss. is further from PC's presentation than Sedulius. For example, MUR. 7491\textsuperscript{A} begins his comparable presentation with: "Hic questio uidentur oriri quare huic parti eueniat accidens quod 'potestas' nuncupatur, cum hec poene [sic for paene] et in sensu et in superficie minor ceteris uidentur esse ...."

190, 26: As far as the etymology of rex is concerned, one ought to note that all the 'v.' references for this etymology agree with PC. PRIS., 2, 466, 21 – 22, however, states that rex regis comes from the preterite form rexi.

28: Remigius offers the following: "Quaerendum, si conjunctio dicitur a coniungendo, quare posuit Donatus disiunctivam speciem:" MUR. 7491\textsuperscript{A}, 34\textsuperscript{r} 16 – 17 gives: "Si
'coniunctio' dicta est a 'coniungendo,' quare hanc speciem intra se continet ...?" It therefore appears that PC is more in the tradition of Muridac here than in that of Remigius.

191, : The conjunction according to Donatus

This section is based largely on Donatus, though not strictly the text as established by Keil. I will elaborate further on this. In this paragraph PC begins the discussion proper by asking first what a conjunction is and then defining it as a part of speech that connects and puts in order a sentence. He then asks how many accidents the conjunction has, and notes, answering that there are three: power, figure, and order.

Sentences 8–21 discuss the five species in the category of power or potestas: the copulatives, disjunctives, expletives, causals, and rationals. Each of these species is illustrated with examples. Sentences 22–25 deal with the accident of figure, of which there are two, PC notes, simple and compounded.

Finally, PC concludes this paragraph, noting that there are three orders of conjunctions: prepositive, subjunctive, and common.

PC, as in the case of his discussions of the other parts of speech, does not attempt to present a synthesis of the teachings in Priscian and Donatus, but rather separate parallel statements of the seventeen types according to Priscian and of
the five according to Donatus. If one were to attempt to do this, he might arrive at the table below. The categories in capital letters are those of Donatus: and those in small type are of Priscian.

1 COPULATIUA E
   copulatiuae
2 DISIUNCTIUA E
   disiunctiuae
   subdisiunctiuae
   dubitatiuae
3 EXPLETIUA E
   aduersatiuae
   distributiuae
   deminutiuae
   completiuae
4 CAUSALES
   causales
   continuatiuae
   subcontinuatiuae
   adiunctiuae
   effectiuae
   approbatisiuae
   abnegatiuae
5 RATIONALES
   rationales (or collectiuae or illatiuae)

191, : The species disertiua (or electiua) mentioned by Priscian but not by Donatus is represented by quam but is difficult to fit into any one of the Donatus categories since Donatus does not mention quam as a conjunction. It might
logically go with Donatus's category DISIUNCTUAE since the phrase which PC features with quam in 189, 12 does imply a sense of disjoining in that the person prefers to be rich and rejects the wish to be poor.

191, 15: The reading nec an neque appears in the Donatus mss. l (Codex Leidensis Bibliothecae Publicae 122, manus secunda) and M (Codex Monacensis Emmeramus G. 121).

19: 'Si ... siquidem

This reading is that which appears in the Donatus ms. L; moreover, etiam and tametsi were added by a second hand to L. Also, there is a similar reading in M; and etiam and tametsi are not the addition of a second hand to this Donatus ms. However, M inserts si between tametsi and siquidem

21: scilicet ... idcirco.'

The same reading occurs in the Donatus ms. L.

27: 'que ue ne autem,'

The Donatus ms. M has all of these except ne. The text as established by Keil has only que and autem.

192 - 196: This is the section dealing with the preposition according to Priscian.

192, : In this paragraph PC begins his discussion in
the manner of the Partitiones and of the C.M. 14737 and the Paris 7558 by asking to what part of speech per belongs. The 14737 uses apud and the Paris 7558 ad. Priscian has ab. PC says that per is a preposition because it is placed before the other parts of speech and either completes, changes, or diminishes their significance. He then concerns himself with the etymology of praeposito, stating that it is derived from praeponendum, which explanation is related to ones in Sedulius, Remigius, Muridac and Charisius. In sentence 10 he enumerates the instances in which a preposition precedes a noun like impius, a verb like profero, an adverb like indecte, a participle like praecedens, and a conjunction like abscque and before another preposition like circum circa.

192, 1 - 7: It appears that the text cited for the Paris 7558 offers a passage which is on the whole closer to PC than the one in the C.M. 14737 is. Moreover, the passage in the 7558 is like that in PRIS. PT., 468, 21 - 23. The 7558 writes: "De praepositione. 'Ad' quae pars orationis est? Praepositio. Praepositio quid est? Pars orationis quae praeposta[sic] aliis partibus orationis significationem earum aut complet aut mutat aut minuit." The 14737 gives: "Incipit de preposizione [sic]. 'Apud' quae pars oracionis est? Preposicio. Preposicio quid est? Pars oracionis quae praeposita alliis[sic] partibus oracionis et reliqua." PRIS. PT., 468, 21 - 23 offers: "A b quae pars orationis est? Praepositio. Quid est praeposito?
Pars orationis quae praeposita aliis partibus orationis
significationem earum aut complet aut mutat aut minuit; ...."

192, 5: I have examined the 'cf.' references of PRIS.,
3, 24, 13 - 14, CLEDONIUS, 10, 12 and of [ASPER], 553, 31 and
have come to the conclusion that PC is the closest in this
sentence to Priscian, then to Cledonius, and then to [Asper].
Priscian offers: "Est igitur praeposito ..., quae praeponitur
aliis partibus ...." Cledonius gives: " ...; praeposito,
quae omnibus partibus praeponatur ...." The text in [Asper]
reads: "Praeposito est pars orationis quae praeposita aliis
partibus orationis ...."

9: Although all the references cited for this
etymology have a praeponendo, the text from Charisius has
the following to say: "De praepositionibus P a l a e m o n
i t a d e f i n i t : praepositiones sunt dictae ex eo quod
praeponantur tam casibus quam verbis; ...."

10: This idea put forth by PC, the presentation of
which is similar to the one in Donatus as cited, may be
substantiated by what is found in PRIS., 3, 24, 13 - 14: "Est
igitur praeposito ..., quae praeponitur aliis partibus vel
appositione vel compositione." CHARISIUS, 299, 23 gives: "et
sunt verborum propriae hae, di diducere ..., dis dispergere ...."
Also, Charisius (p. 300, 17 ff.) has: "eaedem praepositiones
et adverbio et participio et pronomini praeponuntur: adverbio quidem ita, adprimo inscriptus; participio vero ita, inscriptus descriptus; pronomini etiam ita, ad illum, pro me, de hoc."
The text in Dosithesus states that there are three types of prepositions: those like con, co and re which do not exist as insolated forms but always in composition with something else like conplerector, those like apud and penes which are never compounded with other words, and those like sub, ex, in, de, pro, and ab which may either be uncompounded or compounded. Concerning circumcrica PRIS., 3, 41, 15 ff., having cited DON., 389, 30 - 24, defines it as ἀγρίον. 193, "Question. 2 If praeposition is called because it is placed beforehand, why is it not even called supposition since several prepositions are not only placed beforehand but even subjoined like cum and tenus; for we say mecum and pubetenus? 3 Solution. 4 Granted that this part of speech is at times subjoined; more frequently, however, it is placed beforehand, whence deservedly it ought not to be named supposition from the lesser part but praeposition from the greater part. 5 A second solution. 6 It can even be said that since these prepositions are subjoined, it is not the nature of the preposition which is taken into consideration but the reason of euphony.
193, 2 - 4: The texts of SED., 1, 800, 5 and of the C.M. 14488, 70F 8 - 15 are identical except for the following orthographical peculiarities in the latter not existing in Sedulius and PC: subpositio, plerique prepositiones, subponatur, and frequentiu [sic].

2: Si ... supponuntur:
MUR. 7491 A, 35F 3 - 4 offers the following text: "Si enim 'praeposito' dicta est quia praeponitur, quare non dicitur 'subpositio' cum aliquem [sic] non praeponatur sed subponantur?" This presentation is not as close to PC's as the one in SED., 1, 800, 5 which reads: "Sed si praeposito dicta est eo quod praeponatur, quare etiam non 'suppositio' dicitur, cum pleraeque praepositiones non solum praeponuntur, sed etiam supponuntur, ut 'cum' et 'tenus'?"

2: Si ... praeponatur.
This phrase, which is represented in the Sedulius/14488 tradition as (quoting from Sedulius) "Sed si praeposito dicta est eo quod praeponatur," seems to be closely related to CLEDONIUS, 75, 16 ff.: "praeposito dicta est eo, quod praeponatur ...." After Cledonius, Charisius (p. 299, 14 - 15) offers a text not nearly as similar to PC and Sedulius/the 14488: "praepositiones sunt dictae ex eo quod praeponuntur ...." The text in POMPEIUS, 269, 27 is even less related: "Praeposito dicta est eo, quod
in loquendo praeponitur, ...."

193, 2: sed ... 'pubetenus'?

POMPEIUS, 270, 8 says that tenus pube and pube tenus are both in usage. CHARISIUS, 302, 23 - 26 lists the mecum and tecum type forms and only gives pube tenus. DIOMEDES, 409, 16 - 17 states that in ancient times prepositions were used in conjunction with the genitive case and cites an example from the Aeneid where crurum tenus is employed.

4: Although the assumptions in this sentence agree with all the 'v.' references cited for it, it appears that the phrase "sed a maior iucari debutit 'praeposito' " is related to SED., 1, 800, 7: "A maiore itaque parte debutit nomen accipere." REM. EIN., 264, 25 gives a similar reading: "... sed a maiore parte dicitur praeposito a praeponendo, ...." REM., 79, 4 ff. features: "Persaepe enim talis suppositio agitur, sed a maiori et nobiliori parte hoc nomen ascivit, eo quod frequentius praeponatur."

6: Both the 'v.' texts cited of Remigius and Sedulius say that prepositions are never subjoined except on account of euphony. The 'v.' text of Pompeius says that this happens on account of meter.

194, : PC, basing his discussion on Donatus, notes that
there is only one accident for the preposition: case. Having stated that the preposition takes only the accusative and ablative cases, he proceeds to list the prepositions taking the accusative case, then those taking the ablative, and finally those taking either.

194, 11: prope ... penes.'

This is the list given in the Donatus ms. M (DON., 365, 15*).

195, : In this paragraph PC enumerates the many uses of the preposition in. He illustrates his ideas with quotations from the Vulgate. PC notes, first of all, that in with the accusative case may signify a long duration of time. Then he enumerates other significances of in plus the accusative: indeterminate infinity; ad, in and usque; luxta with the sense 'according to'; secundum also with the meaning 'according to'; per 'though'; and super 'concerning.' In sentence 10 PC notes the use of the ablative with in to signify motion within a designated spot and not motion beginning in one area and ending up in the other. He observes further that in the ablative may signify inter, intra, and super 'upon.' PC says that in plus the accusative may signify super 'to.' (Hofmann and Szantyr, p. 281 say that super may mean ad.) Also, he observes that in with the ablative may mean per, ad, and ante. PC ends, saying that he has enumerated all these usages of in
to convince those who hold strictly to the viewpoint of Donatus that \textit{in} takes the accusative when signifying motion and the ablative when signifying 'in a place,' that this is not always necessarily the case since exceptions to this rule can be found in the 'auctores.'

195,

The reference to Dositheus has the following about \textit{in} meaning \textit{usque} and \textit{adhuc}: "ponitur et pro spatio temporali, cum significat usque adhuc, ..." Moreover, the reference to Priscian in the \textit{Fontes} seems to bear a slight similarity to PC's presentation in this sentence: "'In' quando \textit{ei}s vel \textit{kara} significat, id \textit{est si} 'ad locum' vel 'contra' demonstrat, accusativo iungitur, .... inventur tamen etiam pro 'ad', cum huic casui praeponitur \{\textit{id est accusativo/}, ...."\textsuperscript{6 - 7}

Hofmann and Szantyr (p. 236) observe that \textit{iuxta} means \textit{secundum} in Biblical quotations from Lactantius and in the \textit{scholia} to Horace. On p. 274 Hofmann and Szantyr note the use of \textit{in modum} in Cicero. The T.L.L., 7, pt. 1, 754 gives \textit{secundum} as a meaning of \textit{in}.

8: For \textit{in} with the force of \textit{per} see the T.L.L., 7, pt. 1, 754.

9: The usage described here seems to be related
to that described in the T.L.L., 7, pt. 1, 748 where *in* is
used after verbs of writing, with the meaning *contra* 'against.'
Blaise (*Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens,
p. 417) notes the use of *in* with the accusative to mean *sur*
and *au sujet de*, and on p. 793 Blaise notes a meaning of
*super* as the same.

195, 9: 'Ambrosius in Lucam, Augustinus in Ioannem.'
This seems to refer respectively to a work attributed to a
pseudo-Ambrose entitled "Sermo in Lucam" or to one of Ambrose's
exegetical works *Expositio Euangelii Secundum Lucam* and to
Augustine's *Tractatus in Euangelium Ioannis*. (See SEJG, vol. 3,
issue of 1961, p. 30, 38, and 72.)

10: *Quotiens ... ciuitate uel in campo*
PC's assumptions here are in accordance with those mentioned
in the texts of Priscian and Charisius. However, neither one
of them is the source for PC's sentence 10, although Charisius
does use the phrase "in civitate" in speaking about *in* taking
the ablative to signify *in loco*.

11: Of the two *'v.*' references cited for this
sentence, it seems that neither the C.B. 83 nor Dositheus offers
a text more similar to PC's than the other. One reads in the
C.B. 83: "Beatus quoque Augustinus 'in' pro
'inter' in libris confessionum ponit ...."
Dosithesus has: "ponitur et pro eo quod est inter, ...." See also the T.L.L., 7, pt. 1, 776 for the application of this assumption.

195, 12 - 13: For the application of these assumptions see the T.L.L., 7, pt. 1, 769.

15: This type of usage is also mentioned by Nunn (p. 110) who notes that in the Vulgate it is employed to denote instrument or agent in imitation of the Hebrew ר.

18: As may be seen from the Fontes, this sentence is actually closer to the Donatus commentary in the Fox Remigius than to the text of Donatus itself. Remigius writes: "In accusativi casus .i. quando accusativo casui servit et quando motionem ad locum significat, .... In ablative casus, ut ...."

19: The text of Priscian offers: "frequenter et Romani 'in' praepositionem, quae ε is quidem significat accusativo praeposa, ἐν vero ablative, accusativo pro ablativo iungentes hoc imitantur. T e r e n t i u s i n e u n u c h o: ...."

196, : In this very brief paragraph, the assumptions of which are correct according to Pompeius and Donatus, PC
lists the prepositions which are never found un compounded: \textit{di, dis, re, se, am, con, o.}

197 - 198: The preposition according to Donatus

197, : This entire paragraph is based entirely on Donatus. Here PC begins his discussion by asking what a preposition is, and then defines it as a part of speech which placed before the other parts of speech either completes, changes, or lessens their significance. He notes that the preposition has only case as the accident and that the preposition may take the ablative and accusative cases. In sentences 12 - 15 he is concerned with listing the prepositions governing the accusative case and illustrating each usage with the preposition concerned followed by a noun in the accusative case. In sentences 16 - 20 he discusses the use of \textit{apud} and \textit{ad} to signify \textit{in loco}.

13: \textit{prope ... penes}

This is the reading appearing in the Donatus ms. M. (See DON., 365, 15*.)

15: \textit{prope fenestram ... secundum for[ajes}

Apart from the \textit{a} in \textit{fores}, which may be an hypercorrection, this reading appears in the Donatus manuscripts MS. (See DON., 365, 20*. )
197, 15: ultra fines ... 'A ab abs' of 198, 2

This is the reading that appears in the Donatus ms. M and is not part of Keil's text. (See DON., 365, 20∗.) However, PC differs slightly from this reading by substituting in 197, 21 uado for eo after ad amicum.

198, : From sentences 1 - 6 PC is basing his text exclusively upon Donatus. In these six sentences he gives the prepositions used only with the ablative case, giving an example of how each is employed with a noun in the ablative case. He also gives the prepositions that may take both the ablative and accusative cases. In sentence 7 he begins to discuss when these prepositions, that may have either case, take the ablative or accusative. He notes (sentence 8) that the accusative is used when motion towards a place is denoted, and in sentence 10 he says that the ablative is employed when existence in a place is implied. Sentences 11 - 12 give examples of how in is used with first the ablative and then with the accusative. Sentences 13 - 16 treat sub in a similar manner. In sentence 16 he notes that super when it is used in connection with place, takes the accusative, but when it is used in connection with mentioning someone, the ablative is employed. In sentence 19 he observes that in with the accusative means contra when we speak about persons, like in adulterum. Next he says that subter takes either case as the
others when it means in or to a place. In sentence 23 he
lists the prepositions that must always be compounded with
another word, and in 25 he lists some of these compounded
words like diduco and recipio. Next, he notes that spud and
penes, on the contrary, may never be joined with anything
else. He concludes this paragraph, observing that the remaining
prepositions may be separate or joined.

198, 7: The Donatus text represented in the 'v.'
reference to Remigius is closer to PC's sentence 7 than the
comparable text in Keil's Donatus. Remigius offers: "In
et sub quando accusativo casui serviunt?" Donatus has the same
except that he has intunguntur instead of serviunt.

17: VERG., I, 750 as cited by PC does not appear thus
in DON., 366, 4 which only gives: "multa super Priamo
rogitans'.' PRIS., 3, 45, 27, however, has the whole line
which PC has.

199, : "On the interjection according to Priscian.
2 What part of speech is papae? 3 An interjection. 4 Why?
5 Because it lies between the other parts of speech. 6 What
is an interjection? 7 A part of speech signifying a mood of
the mind by an irregular sound. 8 Whence is interiectio
so called? 9 From inter and iaceo iaces. 10 Another
reason. 11 The name interiectio came about because while
we are speaking with the other parts of speech, suddenly we bring forth among them the interjection. 12 Likewise another explanation. 13 It is even said that to some the interjection appears as almost an inner, latent mental action while a sound emerges, for the most part, on the outside without premeditation."

199, 2 - 3: It is interesting to note that nowhere in Priscian's Partitiones do we have an interjection treated in a similar way. In fact, this type of presenting the discussion on the interjection, though having the style of Priscian, is a characteristic of the Paris 7558 and the C.M. 14737. The Paris 7558 begins: "De interiectione. 'Euax' quae pars est? Interiectio. Interiectio quid est? Pars orationis significans mentis affectum uoce incondita. Interiectionis quid accidit?"

9: Priscian states that interiectio is named after interiacet, whereas DIOMEDES, 419, 4 gives the etymological key word interiaci. It therefore appears that PC agrees with Priscian's teaching rather than with that of Diomedes. SED.,
1, 943, 2 and REM., 90, 12 agree with Diomedes, giving the parent word *interiaciendum*.

199, 11: The text of Remigius reads: "Igitur interiectio, ..., ab interiaciendo nomen sortita est, quia, cum de aliis loquimur partibus, subito inter eas proferimus interiectionem." The text cited for Sedulius is the same with uninteresting variants.

13: Sedulius offers: "Dicitur etiam, ut aiunt, 'interiectio', quasi 'interius iacens (e) ratio'; plerumque impraemeditative exterius emergit." This text actually does not appear closer to PC's than the one in REM., 90, 16 - 17 which reads: "Dicitur etiam, ut aiunt, interiectio quasi interius iacens oratio, dum vox impraemeditata exterius emergit." However, the Remigius mss. PE have *plerumque impremeditative.* (See REM., 90, 17*.)

200, 2: "Interjections have no certain accents; for whether you say *euax* with an acute accent on the penultimate or *euax* with an acute on the ultimate, it makes no difference. 2 In the same way are *heu* and *euge* and *papae*. 3 Question. 4 Why can interjections not have certain accents? 5 Solution. 6 Because interjections are always rendered with no preméditation but suddenly and in an unforeseen manner. 7 At times *heu* is bisyllabic, wherefore Vergil has: 'Heu quam
pingui macer est mihi taurus in arvo!' 8 At other times it is monosyllabic as the necessity of meter may demand, granted that even for the interjection other parts of speech are used, like *pro nefas*, *pro dolor*, and *Deo gratias*. 9 Truly these and others similar to them which are boldly brought forth are used in place of interjections."

200, 1 – 2: It appears that the 'cf.' text of Remigius is close to the 'v.' presentation cited for Donatus: "accentus in interiectionibus certi esse non possunt, ...." The 'v.' text cited for Priscian paraphrases this treatment of Donatus but is less close to PC than Remigius and Donatus.

6: Muridac has a somewhat more related text:
"Accentus in interiectionibus certi esse non possunt non sine ratione quia nulla praemeditatio in his est." Priscian offers: "... quod non // sunt certi, quippe, cum et abscondita voce, id est non plane expressa, proferantur et pro affectus commoti qualitate, confunduntur in eis accentus."

7: *Arvo* is a reading in the Vergil mss. *Rbdery*. (See VERG. BUC., 3, 100*) and in the Remigius mss. *PF*. (See REM., 91, 4*.) Otherwise the regular reading is *ervo*. Also, it is important to note that this line from Vergil in the text of Vergil itself and in Remigius's quoting of it has *heu* twice preceding *quam*. I have not added the other *heu* since this
line as PC has it represents PC's understanding of Vergil which might have arisen from having seen a text similar to that in the Remigius ms. M²: "... heu interdum una syllaba, ..., interdum divisa syllaba ..., ut 'heu quam pingui'."
(See REM., 91, 7*.)

200, 8: licet ... gratias.'
The 'cf.' reference to Diomedes gives: "etiam aliae partes orationis // pro interiectione singulares plusesse ponuntur, ut est o mi, ellum, amabo, nefas, pro nefas, malum, miserum, infandum." This text does not appear as close to PC as that in REM., 90, 14 - 16 (the same as SED., 1, 943, 3) which has:
"Unde et aliae partes, quae subita voce proferuntur, interiectioni deputantur, ut 'pro dolor', 'pro nefas', 'Deo gratias'."

201, : In this paragraph which deals with the interjection secundum Donatum and which is therefore largely based on Donatus PC begins by asking what an interjection is and defines it as in 199, 7. He points out that the interjection has only one accident: signification, for euax may signify happiness of mind, heu sadness, papae admiration, attat fear, o wishing, euge admiration, uah indignation, heu anger, he disdain.

9: Quia aut laetitiam mentis significamus
This is the reading appearing in the Donatus ms. M. (See DON., 366, 15*.)
201, 9: aut admirantis ut 'euge,'

No locatable source for this has yet been found. However, both REM. EIN., 218, 14 - 15 and SED., 1, 949, 4 say that euge expresses joy. DIOMEDES, 419, 9 gives "praise" as the meaning of euge. This word is used to express approbation in Plautus's Amphitruo, verse 802; PERSIUS, 1, 75 and 1, 111; and in Ennodius, book 2 of his Carmina, poem 60, verse 7.

9: aut indignantis ut 'uah,'

PROBUS, 146, 33 - 34 says that uah may be used as an adverb of anger. FORCELLINI, 4, 905 notes that uah signifies indignation in Plautus's Adelphoe.

9: aut despicientis ut 'he,'

So far no source has been located for this; however, [ASPER], 554, 13 - 14 gives he as an interjection of indignation.

202 - 265: This section, following PC's commentary on the eight parts of speech, consists of the conjugations of amo, doceo, lego, audio and esse. No single source seems to be the sole text from which PC likely borrowed. It is important to note, however, that all of the verbs conjugated in this section are also conjugated in Malsachanus. Two common features to PC's conjugation and to those of Malsachanus are the extensive use of abbreviations and the order of the moods according to which PC and Malsachanus conjugate their verbs.
Probus employs a slightly different ordering of the moods, and PC's order is that used by Sacerdos, Alcuin, Boniface, and Diomedes, all of whom, as will be noted, offer conjugations similar to PC's. Moreover, PC's conjugation of _lego_ is so similar to Donatus's (excluding the former's morphological discussions on the formation of the various participles, which discussions are reminiscent of those in Sedulius, Remigius, and Priscian). Furthermore, PC's treatment of _lego_ seems to provide the model for the other conjugations.

202 – 203: In these paragraphs PC conjugates the active voice of _amo_ and the impersonal. On one hand, the presentation in SACERDOS, 435, 31 – p. 436, 25 offers certain features in common with PC which are not found in the text in MALSACHANUS, 211, 18 – p. 212, 25. Sacerdos (p. 435, 31) gives: "amo amas amat et pluraliter amamus amatis amant, ...." The comparable text in MALSACHANUS, 211, 20 omits _et pluraliter_ but features abbreviations like those of PC: "Amo as at mus tis mant; ...." Moreover, the text of Sacerdos regularly has _et pluraliter_ as PC, whereas Malsachanus usually omits it. PC's sentence 12 in 202 is more similar to the text in SACERDOS, 436, 14 ff. than to the text in MALSACHANUS, 212, 4 ff. Sacerdos offers: "...: modo subjunctivo, qui et conjunctivus vocatur, tempore praesenti cum amem ...." Malsachanus has: "Coniunctatiuo modo tempore praesenti cum amem ...." PC's sentence 19 in 202 is
identical with a phrase in SACERDOS, 436, 24-25. MALSACHANUS, 212, 11-12 also features the identical phrase except that it is preceded by "eodem modo tempore," which phrase is not in PC or Sacerdos. On the other hand, Malsachanus in his conjugations uses to a great extent abbreviated forms as PC, which is not the practice of Sacerdos. For example, comparable with sentence 6 in 202 one reads in MALSACHANUS, 211, 25: "... tempore futuro amabo bis bit bimus bitis bunt." Also, comparable with sentence 10 in 202 one reads in MALSACHANUS, 212, 7-8: "... plusquamperfecto cum amauisset ses set semus setis sent ...."

Moreover, though Donatus does not conjugate amo but only lego, I have given a 'v.' reference to DON., 360, 17 - p. 361, 11 for paragraphs 202 - 203 because it appears that there is a similarity between PC's conjugation of amo and Donatus's lego. For instance, comparable to 202, 2 - 4 in PC, DON., 360, 17 ff. offers: "lego legis legit, et pluraliter legimus legitis legunt: eodem modo tempore praeterito imperfecto legebam legebas legebat, et pluraliter legebamus legebatis legebant: eodem modo tempore praeterito perfecto legi legisti legit, et pluraliter legimus legistis legerunt vel legere: ...." Unlike Malsachanus and PC who feature similar conjugations of the impersonal amatur, Sacerdos (p. 436, 30 ff.) limits himself to citing the gerundives amandi, amando and amandum as impersonalia.
204, : The participles of the active voice of amo PC notes that there are two: the present and the future. He explains that amans is formed when bam of amabam becomes n and then ns. Amaturus is created when the supine amatum takes rus after tu. The explanations of the derivations of these types of participles are close to those in Remigius and to those explanations in Priscian and Sedulius. REM., 69, 30 - 31 discusses lecturus: "Lecturus formatur ab ultimo membro gerundivi modi, ut lectu addita rus fit lecturus." SED., 1, 724, 1 offers: "... id est 'bam' in 'ns', ut 'amabam, amans', ....." Concerning amaturus we read in SED., 1, 726, 1: "Futuri vero temporis participia, in 'rus' terminantia, fiunt ab extremo supino addita 'rus', 'amatu amaturus', ...," These explanations seem likely to be derived ultimately from PRIS., 2, 557.

205 - 210 : This section is the conjugation of the passive forms of amo, beginning with amor. The text is similar to those featured by Sacerdos and Malsachanus, and the same observations made for 202 - 203 concerning how in some respects PC is more like Sacerdos than Malsachanus and vice versa may also be applied here. Sacerdos regularly uses et pluraliter and Malsachanus is prolific with abbreviated forms. Moreover, in 205 - 209, as cited in the Fontes, there is a similarity with Donatus's conjugation of legor. A significant departure from Donatus here and in his other conjugations is
PC's use of subiunctivum for coniunctivum.

205, 4: Concerning the forms like amatus fui and amati fuerunt, which type Donatus (361, 18) refers to as the ulterior modus, Vulcahn (p. 138) says that "domus clausa fuit" had the primitive meaning of a result acquired after a specified duration of action in the past, but that in Vulgar Latin this nuance disappeared and that the resulting significance is a simple passive perfect with fuit replacing est.

210, : PC observes that amatus and amandus are the two passive participles of the passive form amor. He notes that amatus is formed from amatum when an s is added to amatu.

Also, he observes that amandus is engendered when tis of amantis becomes dus. These changes are accounted for, as cited in the Fontes, by Remigius, Sedulius and Priscian.

211 - 228: The conjugation of doceo

211 - 215: The active voice: doceo

The conjugation of doceo (active voice) in Malsachanus, 219, 17 - p. 220, 7 as compared with the one in SACERDOS, 437, 36 - p. 438, 21 in this respect presents a text closer to PC than the presentation in Sacerdos gives: the scribe of Malsachanus uses abbreviated forms as in lines 17 ff. on p. 219: "...: Doceo
ces cet cenus cetis cent; eodem modo tempore praeterito imperfecto docebam bas bat bamus batis bant; ... docui isti it ...; docueram ras rat reliqua; ... docebo bis bit reliqua."

On the other hand, Sacerdos is more like PC than Malsachanus because he gives the singular plus the plural forms, which is not always the case with Malsachanus. For instance, while Malsachanus (p. 219, 20 - 21) gives "docueram ras rat reliqua; ... docui isti it et reliqua," Sacerdos (p. 438, 2 - 4) has "docueram docueras docuerat docueramus docueratis docuerant, ... docebo docebis docebit docebimus docebitis docebunt." The active conjugation of doceo in PROBUS, 164, 14 - p. 165, 20 has nearly the same order of presentation which is common to PC, Sacerdos, and Malsachanus in the matter of doceo, except that after having listed the forms of the present, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect, future and then imperative, Probus cites the infinitive, optative, and conjunctive moods in that order. PC, Sacerdos and Malsachanus, however, having treated the present, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect, future and then the imperative, proceed to deal with the optative, subjunctive (or conjunctive), and infinitive moods.

216 - 221: The conjugation of the impersonal: docetur

While Sacerdos (p. 438, 14 - 15) merely says that the supina or gerundia docendi docendo docendum are impersonalia, a conjugation
of docetur similar to PC's may be found in PROBUS, 165, 20 - 28 and in MALSACHANUS, 220, 8 - 15. The presentation in PC, however, is more like that of Malsachanus than of Probus, because Malsachanus lists all the moods that PC lists for the impersonal, and in the same order too, whereas Probus omits treating the imperative, optative, subjunctive and infinitive.

223 - 228: The passive conjugation: doceor
PC's order of treatment - indicative, imperative, optative, subjunctive, infinitive, and participles - is that followed by Sacerdos and Malsachanus in their conjugations of doceor. Probus's order is indicative, imperative, infinitive, optative, conjunctive, and participles.

229 - 244: The conjugation of lego
As one may see from a glance at the Fontes, the presentation here is modelled closely with the exception of 238 and 244, on Donatus's conjugation of lego, which type of presentation might be the pattern for the other verbs. It is worthy to note, moreover, in the matter of Donatus's text that PC's treatment of the impersonal is larger than that in Donatus who (p. 361, 6 - 9) lists the indicative forms plus the gerundives. However, on p. 361, 8* a note by Keil says that the Donatus ms. M lists the forms of the remaining moods. The conjugation of the impersonal legitur by Malsachanus lists the forms lacking in Donatus.
PC and Malsachanus, unlike the text in Keil's Donatus, abbreviate many of their forms; for example, comparable with PC's 229, 2 one reads in MALSACHANUS, 224, 19: "...: Lego git legimus gitis gunt; ...."

230, 3: 'legito ... ille'
The reading in the Donatus ms. M and s is similar: "legito tu legito ille ...." (See DON., 360, 26*.)

238, : PC's account of the formation of the participles dealt with here is in accordance with the texts cited in Sedulius.

240, 2: 'legere ... gantur.'
The Donatus ms. S (DON., 361, 24*) has: "legere legatur et pluraliter legamur legamini legantur." The ms. M has the same as S except for legamini instead of legamini; therefore, PC is closer in this instance to S than to M.

3: 'legitor ... guntor.'
This reading is similar to the one appearing in the Donatus ms. M (DON., 361, 25*): "legitor tu legitor ille et pluraliter legamur legimior uel leguntor." The text established by Keil reads: "... legitor vel legaries legitor vel legatur, et pluraliter legamur legimini vel legimior legantur vel leguntor."
245 - 260: The conjugation of audio

As may be seen from the Fontes, Malsachanus and Bonifatius conjugate audio, but it cannot be shown that either of these two is definitely PC's exact source. However, unlike PC, Malsachanus considers audio to be of the fourth conjugation. PC, Bonifatius, and Donatus consider it to be of the third. In PRIS., 2, 16, 3 and in CHARISIUS, 220, 13 one reads that it is of the fourth. The structure of the presentation of the conjugation of audio is like the presentations of the preceding verbs amo, doceo and lego by PC. Moreover, as usual, PC's account of the formations of the various participles and gerundives is in accordance with the texts of Remigius and Sedulius as cited.

261 - 265: The conjugation of the irregular verb sum

As may be seen from the Fontes, Malsachanus, Alcuin, Diomedes, and Dositheus feature a conjugation of sum. It cannot be shown, however, that PC draws his treatment exclusively or directly from any of them. It ought to be noted, however, that PC's order of presentation by the moods concerned is that order followed by Malsachanus, Alcuin (he lacks a discussion on participles) and Diomedes. Dositheus treats only the forms of the indicative mood.

265, 3: DIOMEDES, 360, 12, MALSACHANUS, 236, 24, and ALCUIN, 884 attest, however, the following forms for the future

265, 4 - 8: Concerning the present participle for sum, MALSACHANUS, 236, 24 - 25 states that there is none. PHOCAS, 436, 27 agrees with Malsachanus. PS-AUG., 494, 24 ff., however, states that sum lacks a present participle but that the learned men of a more recent time coined essendum and essens out of a necessity to interpret and explain great, divine matters. In Hunt's (see the Fontes for 265, 4) transcription of Priscian Glosule on p. 225 there is a discussion on the verb sum which is considered by the Glosule to be substantive. In the text of the Glosule it is stated that inasmuch as sum is considered by some to signify many actions and is many verbs, ens likewise is not one noun, since it does not signify a substance or even substances with any one property, but many nouns. On p. 231 in a text of Peter Helias which is the one transcribed from Paris Arsenal 711, ens is given as a substantive. A note to line 13 in the apparatus on p. 231 refers to uel esse written above ens, apparently serving to define ens. Moreover, in line 17 of the Helias text there is the following reading to illustrate the substantive status of ens: "Albedo est ens." However, ens is not the exclusive invention of the speculative
grammarians, for in Julius Caesar's *Fragmenta, De Analogia ad M. Tullium Ciceronem Librorum II* appears: "Caesar non incongrue protulit ens a verbo sum es, quomodo a verbo possum potes, potens." (FUNAIOLI, 156, 28.) PRIS., 3, 239, 5 ff. also discusses *ens*, citing the same quotation from Caesar.

266, : "Here ends the Book Based on Donatus as well as on Priscian, written by Brother Paul; and because it was given for the benefit of all, it is therefore called "Donatus."
INDEX NOMINUM ET RERUM ET VERBORUM

a, characteristic letter of the first conjugation 101, 4; 156, 17 & 19.

ending of the second declension 60, 11.
ending of the third declension 61, 7.
feminine termination 8, 4; 11, 3.
name of letter 64, 4.
nouns ending in 11.
preposition 194, 13; 198, 2.

ab producta, ending of the first declension 59, 5.
ab 194, 13; 198, 2.
ab unde 165, 1.
aboleo 112, 2.
abs 194, 13; 198, 2.
absque 192, 10; 194, 13; 198, 2.
absum 96, 11.
abus, ending of the first declension 59, 6.
abyssus 39, 2.
ac 189, 4; 190, 8; 191, 13 & 27.
accidens (pro1) 1, 7.
accusandum 58, 19.
accusus 58, 20.
acer 31, 5.
Achilles 4, 3.
acsi 191, 19.

*This index does not include references to anonymous sources like quidam dicunt, auctoritas poetica, and secundum auctores.*
actio  66, 9; 96, 3.
acumen  7, 17.
acus  39, 11; 40, 8; 62, 9.
ad  158, 10; 194, 11; 195, 5 & 16; 197, 13.
ad foras  173, 4.
ad locum  198, 10.
Adam  24, 2.
adamo  100, 13.
adjectiva  59, 13.
admiratio  201, 9.
adoleo  112, 2.
ador  33, 5.
aduerbia in una significatione diversas habentia uoces et uice uersa  166.
aduerbia localia  169.
aduerbia loci  163, 26 ff.
aduerbium, definition of  158, 5 - 7; 170, 3.
  accidents of  161 - 162; 170, 7 - 172.
  comparatio  171.
  etymology of  158, 9 - 10.
  figura  172.
aduerbium optandi  98, 35.
aduerbium, ordo  167.
aduerbium positium  4, 4.
aduerbium secundum Donatum  170 - 173.
aduerbium secundum Priscianum  158 - 169.
aduerbium, significatio  161, 14 - 27; 170, 8 - 57.
  species, definition of  161, 11.
  species primitia  161, 7 - 9.
  the ways by which adverbs are derived  159.
aduerbum  158, 10.
aduersitas  44, 11.
aduersus 194, 11; 197, 13.

ae, ending of the first declension 59, 4.

aedes 197, 15.

aedilis 37, 8.

Aegyptus 39, 2.

Aeneas 35, 2; 88, 9; 189, 18.

aes 42, 2.

aes, nouns ending in 42.

aeternae beatitudinis regnum (pro1) 3, 2.

aeterno aeternitas 5, 2.

aether 9, 1 & 10 - 12.

Africa 163, 32.

Agathe 12, 2.

age 161, 19.

agillumus 4, 7.

agite 161, 19.

agnomen 1, 30.

agnus 60, 7.

ago 129, 7.

aho, third conjugation ending 118.

al, nouns ending in 19.

alacer 31, 3.

Alexander 189, 11.

algeo 108, 2.

alioquin 191, 19.

alia 80, 11.

aliaquando 161, 17; 166, 1; 170, 13.

aliaquis 80, 8.

aliud 18, 2.

alius 69, 13 & 28.

allec 17, 2.

allicio 120, 3.
alpha 64, 4.
alsi 104, 4.
alter 6, 15.
alterutus 57, 1; 69, 13 & 30.
aluus 39, 2.

_ending of the first declension_ 59, 4.

**nouns ending in** 24.
am, _its_ modus 98, 7 - 9.
amabam, _its_ tempus 97, 7 - 9.
amabo, _its_ tempus 97, 19 - 21.
amans 174, 14; 183, 8 ff.
amare, _its_ modus 98, 19 - 21.
amarem, _its_ modus 98, 11 - 13.
amas, _its_ persona 155, 9 - 11.
amat, _its_ persona 155, 14 - 16.
amaueram, _its_ tempus 97, 15 - 17.
amauri, _its_ tempus 97, 11 - 13; 102, 5.
ambio 141, 2.
ambo 45, 6.
Ambrosius 195, 9.
amem, _its_ modus 98, 15 - 17.
amicus 197, 21.
amo 92, 1; 101, 4; 156, 19.
amo amor 5, 4.
amo, _complete conjugation of_ 202 - 210.

_its_ figura 100, 6 - 8.
_its_ genus 93, 10 - 13; 96, 10.
_its_ modus 98, 3 - 5.
_its_ numerus 155, 27 - 29.
_its_ persona 155, 3 - 5.
_its_ species 100, 1 - 4.
_its_ tempus 97, 3 - 5.
amor, its genus  94, 2 - 4; 96, 10.
amplector  95, 18; 198, 25.
an, conjunction  189, 17; 191, 15.
   nouns ending in  27.
Andreas  35, 2.
Andrus  39, 2.
anima  59, 6.
animal  5, 12; 8, 8; 19, 2.
animus  59, 8.
anni  197, 15.
ante  194, 11; 195, 17, 197, 13.
antiphra  49, 3.
antiqui  44, 8; 49, 4; 74, 10.
anus  39, 10.
anxur  34, 2.
aperio  152, 2.
apostolicum dictum (prol)  3, 1.
appellatiua  2, 10.
aptus  56, 10.
apud  194, 11; 197, 13.
aquila  7, 14; 8, 2, 77, 32.
ar, nouns ending in  30.
arbitri  197, 15.
arbor  33, 4.
arcesso  137, 2.
arcus  62, 8.
ardeo  104, 2; 107, 2.
argentum (prol)  1, 2; 52, 2.
arles  36, 6.
arma  11, 4; 53, 2.
Arpinas  35, 5.
Arruns  41, 4.
ars 62, 8.
ars metrica 82, 9.
articulus 78, 5.
articulus, function of 87, 18.
artificiosa (prol) 3, 1.
artus 62, 8.
arum, ending of the first declension 59, 5.
arx 62, 8.
as 35, 2.
as, ending of the first declension 59, 7.
nouns ending in 35.
aspicio 120, 3.
ast 189, 4; 190, 8; 191, 13 & 27.
at 190, 8.
Athenae 54, 4.
atque 189, 4; 191, 13.
attat 210, 9.
auctoritas 8, 4 & 12; 10, 3 & 7.
audax 40, 6.
audeo 94, 12; 157, 12.
audio 101, 18; 143, 1; 156, 26.
audio, complete conjugation of 245 - 260.
aues 8, 9.
auerendum 58, 19.
aufero 58, 20.
augeo 108, 3.
augmentum 65, 23.
augur 34, 2.
augurium 197, 15.
Augustinus 195, 9.
auculae 7, 15.
aurum (prol) 1, 2; 52, 2.
aus, nouns ending in 43.
aut 189, 10; 190, 8; 191, 15.
autem 190, 14; 191, 17 & 27.
axis 37, 3.
b, nouns ending in 16.
balanus 39, 2.
balneum 9, 1 – 2 & 7.
beber 31, 6.
belle 161, 27.
bene 158, 16; 161, 20.
beo, second conjugation ending 105.
Berytus 39, 2.
bibo 126, 2.
bio, fourth conjugation ending 141.
bis 161, 26; 170, 15.
bo, third conjugation ending 126.
Bogud 18, 2.
bonus 65, 29; 73, 18.
bos 38, 3.
breuerer 159, 6.
bs, nouns ending in 41, 5.
bubo 14, 5.
bus, ending of the fifth declension 63, 7.
ending of the fourth declension 62, 7.
ending of the third declension 61, 7.
why adjectives do not have this ending 59, 10 ff.
byssus 39, 2.
Byzantius 189, 19.
c, letter added to hui 69, 12.
nouns ending in 17.
calendarum 58, 9; 176, 8.
cado 128, 3.
caedes  36, 2.
caedo  128, 1.
caelebs  41, 6.
ciaelo caelas  9, 4.
ciaelum  9, 1 & 4; 197, 15.
ciaelus  9, 7.
ciape  9, 1 & 6.
Caesar  2, 11; 30, 2.
Caesareus  2, 12.
cialecalesco  156, 15.
cialex  40, 3 & 7.
cialeco  112, 3.
cambio  141, 2.
campus  195, 10.
cancelli  49, 2.
canis  8, 8; 37, 2.
cano canis  28, 3; 49, 6; 135, 3.
capesso  137, 2.
capio  123, 2; 174, 10.
carbasus  39, 2.
cardo  14, 2.
carex  40, 3.
caritas (prol)  3, 1.
carmen  28, 2.
carpo  130, 2.
Carthago  164, 5.
carui  115, 4.
cassis  37, 5.
cassum  103, 2; 115, 4.
castor  161, 19; 170, 47.
Catilina  11, 3; 189, 16.
Cato  174, 16.
caueo 117, 2.
celeriter 166, 1.
cenatus 181, 5.
cenor 181, 9.
censeo 116, 2.
censum 116, 3.
centesimus 6, 3.
centum 6, 2; 64, 4.
ceo, second conjugation ending 106.
cerno 135, 4.
certe 161, 18; 163, 14.
ceterum 191, 19.
ceu 161, 23; 170, 31.
Chalybs 41, 5.
Chaos 38, 4.
Chremes 83, 17.
cicer 31, 4.
Cicero 10, 5; 158, 16; 189, 16.
Cim 25, 2.
cimex 40, 2.
cinis 37, 5.
cio 142, 3.
cio, fourth conjugation ending 142.
circa 194, 11; 197, 13.
circiter 194, 11; 197, 13.
circum 194, 11; 197, 13.
circumcircum 192, 10.
cis 194, 11; 197, 13.
cito 166, 1.
citra 194, 11; 197, 13.
ciuis 37, 6.
ciuitas  195, 10.
clam    194, 13; 198, 2.
clientes 198, 4.
clamis   37, 5.
clanculum 161, 27.
clango   129, 7.
clauis   37, 7.
clausi   128, 5.
clementer (proli)  3, 1.
clepsi    130, 4.
clunis    37, 2.
co, third conjugation ending  127.
coepi    184, 3.
coceptus 184, 2.
cognitio  66, 4.
cognomen  1, 29.
collectio  45, 8.
collega   11, 3.
collis    37, 11.
colo      133, 2.
color     33, 2.
colus     39, 2.
comedo    128, 6.
communis coniunctio  190, 4 ff.
communis sensus  10, 4.
como      134, 2.
comoediae  83, 16.
comparandum  65, 27.
comperio   152, 2.
compes    36, 3.
compesco   127, 3.
compingo   129, 8.
componendum 55, 10.
componere 55, 11.
compos 38, 3.
compositores luti 55, 11.
compungo 129, 10.
concepì 123, 4.
concino 135, 3.
concumbo 126, 2.
confringo 129, 8.
congregior 198, 25.
coniecì 120, 5.
coniuæo 117, 2.
conjugandum 101, 10.
coniunctio abnegatiua 189, 15.
coniunctio, accidents of 188, 13 - 190.
coniunctio adiunctiua 189, 6.
coniunctio aduersatìua 189, 13.
coniunctio approbatìua 189, 9.
coniunctio causalìs 189, 7; 191, 18 - 19.
coniunctio collectìua uel rationalìs uel illatiua 189, 16.
coniunctio completiua 189, 18.
coniunctio continuatiua 189, 4.
coniunctio copulatiua 189, 4; 191, 12 - 13.
coniunctio, definition of 188, 5 - 7; 191, 3.
coniunctio deminiutiua 189, 19.
coniunctio disertiua uel electiua 189, 12.
coniunctio disiunctiua 189, 10; 191, 14 - 15.
coniunctio distributiua 189, 14.
coniunctio dubitatiua 189, 17.
coniunctio efectiua 189, 8.
coniunctio, etymology of 188, 9.
coniunctio expletiua 191, 16 - 17.
coniunctio, figura 191, 22 - 25.
 ordo 190; 191, 26 - 27.
potestas 190, 18; 191, 7 ff.
potestas, species 191, 8 ff.
coniunctio secundum Donatum 191.
coniunctio secundum Priscianum 188 - 190.
coniunctio, species 189.
coniunctio subcontinuatiua 189, 5.
coniunctio subdisiunctiua 189, 11.
coniungendum 188, 9; 190, 28.
coniunx 40, 5.
conixi 117, 2.
conniuo 139, 2.
conquinisco 127, 3.
consonant plus s, nouns ending in 41.
consul 23, 2; 68, 5.
conticesco 100, 17.
contingit 96, 14.
contingo 129, 9.
contio 54, 2.
contra 194, 11; 197, 13.
contumax 40, 6.
cooperio 152, 2.
cquo 131, 2.
cor 33, 5.
coram 194, 13; 195, 6; 198, 2.
cornu 15, 2.
corpus 33, 2.
cortex 40, 3.
cortices 83, 17.
cos 38, 2.
costus 39, 2.
cras 161, 17; 170, 13.
cras crastinus 5, 8.
creatura 66, 4.
crepo 102, 9.
crinmins criminatus criminandus criminaturus 186, 39.
crinmins, its significatio 178, 17 - 19.
crminor 95, 18; 157, 16.
crus 39, 6.
cubo 102, 9; 126, 2.
cudo 128, 1.
culex 40, 2.
cum 161, 17; 167, 4; 170, 3; 193, 2; 194, 13; 198, 2.
Cumae 54, 4; 164, 6.
Cupido 14, 2.
cupio 123, 2.
cur 161, 18; 170, 29.
curro 136, 2; 157, 11; 159, 5.
cursim 159, 5.
cuspis 37, 5.
custos 38, 3; 198, 4.
d, littera 81, 14.
d, nouns ending in 18.
dandum 58, 19.
Dauid 18, 2.
de 194, 13; 198, 2.
de foris 173, 4.
de intus 173, 4.
de repente 165, 1.
de subito 165, 1.
de sursum 165, 1.
decet  96, 15.
decinatio  57, 5.
decus  33, 2.
dehinc  165, 1.
deinceps  161, 24; 170, 27.
deinde  161, 24; 170, 27.
deleui  112, 2.
demum  81, 3.
denarius  189, 19.
dens  41, 2.
denseo  116, 2.
deo, second conjugation ending  104; 107.
deorsum  170, 45.
desideratiua  156, 15.
despiciens  201, 9.
desum  96, 11.
detrimentum  65, 23.
deus  6, 16; 60, 7; 200, 8.
dexter  6, 9.
Diabolus  88, 10.
dico  127, 4.
dictio  44, 6.
diduco  198, 25.
Didymus  78, 6.
dies  6, 12; 47, 2; 50, 3; 189, 5.
diffido  100, 16.
dii infernales  49, 3.
diligo  129, 7.
dio, fourth conjugation ending  143.
  third conjugation ending  121.
diphthongus  39, 2.
diptota  64, 5.
diripui 123, 4.
disciplina 197, 15.
disco 127, 3.
discolor 33, 2.
discordia 50, 2.
discrimen 55, 8.
discutio 100, 15.
disjunctiua 190, 28.
distraho 198, 25.
diuidendum 1, 22.
diuído 128, 4.
diuina largitas (prol) 3, 2.
diuturnitas temporis 195, 3.
do 58, 20; 102, 5, 15 & 19; 128, 8.
do, third conjugation ending 128.
doceo 101, 15; 106, 2; 156, 23.
doceo, complete conjugation of 211 – 228.
docte 159, 3 & 6; 161, 20; 170, 33; 171, 5; 172, 5.
doctior 3, 6; 33, 3.
doctissime 171, 9.
doctissimus 4, 2.
doctius 171, 7.
docto 159, 3.
docto doctior 5, 6.
doctor 10, 5; 82, 9.
doctrina (prol) 1, 8.
doctum 103, 2.
doctus 3, 5; 189, 7.
dodrans 41, 4.
dolor 200, 8; 201, 9.
dominus 39, 2; 64, 8; 65, 2; 67, 2.
domo 102, 9.
domus 39, 11; 198, 4.
donarium 2, 12.

Donatus incipit to the Prologus; incipit to the grammatical treatise; 65, 1; 78, 2; 82, 8; 84, 9; 85, 6; 195, 18; 266.

Dorcium 26, 2.

Dorion 29, 3.

dos 38, 2.
dubiae dictiones 163 - 166.
duco 127, 4.
duco, its principle parts 98, 31.
dudum 166, 1.
dulcedo 14, 2.
dum 161, 17; 167, 4; 170, 13.
duo 5, 21; 45, 6.
duplico 102, 17.

dus, future participle ending 177, 13; 182, 6.
dux 40, 5.

e, characteristic letter of the second conjugation 101, 15; 156, 17 & 22.

characteristic letter of the third conjugation 101, 17.

ending of the fifth declension 63, 7.

ending of the second declension 60, 7.

ending of the third declension 61, 7.

nouns ending in preposition 12.

preposition 194, 13; 198, 2.

ecce 161, 27; 170, 21.
eccine 91, 16.
edepol 161, 19; 170, 47.
edo 128, 7.
effectum capiens 56, 8.
efficax 56, 8.
egeo 108, 4.

ego 68, 2; 72, 3; 73, 2 & 7; 77, 21 & 25; 82, 2 & 5; 85, 4.
ego, declined 69, 2 - 3; 84, 11.
  its casus 68, 29.
  its figura 68, 23.
  its genus 68, 19.
  its modus 69, 9.
  its numerus 68, 21.
  its persona 68, 25.
  its species 68, 14 - 17.
  why it has two genitives 74, 8 - 15.

egomet  82, 1; 91, 16.
eho, third conjugation ending 118.
ei, ending of the fifth declension 63, 6.
eia 161, 19; 170, 25.
el, nouns ending in 20.
elicio 120, 3.
em, ending of the fifth declension 63, 6.
  ending of the third declension 61, 6.
emo 134, 4.
en, adverb 161, 27; 170, 21.
  ending of the third declension 61, 6.
  nouns ending in 28.
encliticae 190, 15.
enim 191, 19.
enimuero 191, 21.
ens 265, 5.
ensis 2, 5.
eo, fourth conjugation ending 154.
  verb 156, 32.
epistulae (prol) 2, 4.
epitheta 5, 15; 59, 13.
eques urbanus 57, 1.
equidem 189, 9; 191, 15.
equor 33, 5.
equus 74, 6; 90, 8.
er, nouns ending in 31.
erga 194, 11; 197, 13.
ergo 189, 16; 190, 16; 191, 21 & 27.
eripui 123, 4.
erum, ending of the fifth declension 63, 7.
es, ending of the third declension 61, 7.
nouns ending in 36; 47, 3.
Esau 15, 2.
et 189, 4 & 11; 191, 13.
et, ending of the impersonal verbs 96, 15.
etenim 191, 19.
etymologia 1, 8.
etiam 170, 19; 191, 19.
etiamsi 191, 19.
etsi 191, 19.
Euander 2, 5.
Evangelium 48, 3.
euax 200, 1; 201, 9.
euge 200, 2; 201, 9.
euphonia 73, 19; 81, 14; 193, 6.
eus, nominative ending 73, 11.
ex 194, 13; 198, 2.
excelleo 112, 4.
excello 133, 4.
excelsa 67, 3.
excelsum 103, 2.
exercitus 198, 4.
exigo 129, 7.
exinde 165, 1.
exoleo 112, 2.
expauesco 94, 18.
experimenta (prol) 1, 1.
experior 95, 18.
expers 41, 6.
explico 102, 18.
exploratio sexus 7, 8; 175, 11.
exsulo 94, 18.
extra 194, 11; 197, 13.
extraneus 2, 11.
exul 23, 2.
Ezechias 195, 7.
facesso 137, 2.
facio 120, 2.
faex 40, 2.
fallo 133, 3.
falso 159, 6; 163, 2 ff.
fames 61, 7.
fas 35, 3.
fastidium 67, 2.
faueo 117, 2.
febris 37, 3.
fel 20, 2.
felicior 3, 7.
felicissimus 4, 6.
felix 3, 7.
fenestra 197, 15.
fere 77, 27.
feriae 51, 2.
ferrum 52, 2.
feruesco 156, 15.
fictor carminis 1, 16.
vido 94, 12; 100, 16; 157, 12.
figo 129, 12.
figuli 55, 11.
filius 60, 9; 73, 9; 76, 6; 90, 10.
findo 128, 3.
fines 197, 15.
figendum 55, 10; 180, 9.
fingere 55, 11.
fingo 129, 7.
finis 8, 12; 37, 2.
fio 94, 12; 157, 12.
fio, fourth conjugation ending 148.
flamen 28, 3.
flexi 132, 2.
Floralia 53, 2.
flos 38, 2.
fluo 119, 2.
fluumium 1, 25.
fodio 121, 2.
follis 37, 11.
fons 41, 2.
foras 161, 15; 170, 11; 173, 3.
forbeo 105, 2.
forceps 41, 5.
fores 197, 15.
foris 173, 2.
forma 44, 6.
fornix 40, 4.
Foroneus 9, 9.
forsan 161, 21; 170, 37.
forsitan 161, 21; 170, 37.
fortasse 161, 21; 170, 37.
fortassi 161, 21.
fortassis 170, 37.
forte 161, 21; 170, 55.
fortis 37, 6; 61, 8 - 9.
fortissimus 4, 3.
fortiter 161, 20; 170, 33.
fortuitu 161, 21; 170, 55.
forum 9, 1; 197, 15; 198, 4.
forus 9, 9.
foveo 117, 2.
fragillimus 4, 7.
frango 129, 8.
frater 6, 5.
fraterna deuotio (prol) 3, 1.
fraterna utilitas (prol) 3, 1.
fraus 43, 2.
frico 102, 9.
frigeo 108, 3.
frons 41, 2.
frugi 13, 2.
fur 34, 2.
furfur 34, 2.
fugio 122, 2.
funditus 159, 6.
fundo 128, 3.
fungor 129, 4.
furibundus 182, 2.
furio 182, 3.
Gaddir 32, 2.
galeatus 181, 2.
gaudeo, its genus 94, 9 - 11; 96, 10; 157, 12.
gemo 134, 3.
generandum 7, 10; 96, 5; 175, 13.
genero 58, 20.
genimina (pro1) 1, 2.
genu 15, 2.
genus 58, 18.
geo, second conjugation ending 108.
ger 136, 2.
gerulus 56, 13.
gigno 135, 2.
gio, fourth conjugation ending 144.
third conjugation ending 122.
glos 38, 2.
gor, third conjugation deponent ending 129, 2 - 4.
gracillimus 4, 7.
Græci 4, 3; 87, 8.
Græcus 5, 17.
gratia (pro1) 3, 1.
gratiae 200, 8.
grex 40, 4.
grus 39, 6.
gummi 13, 2.
habeo 105, 2.
hac 169, 3; 173, 5.
hæreo 115, 2.
Hannibal 19, 2.
hasta 49, 5.
haud 161, 18.
haurio 152, 2.
he 201, 9.
Hecuba 83, 17.
hercle 161, 19; 170, 47.
heri 159, 2; 161, 17; 170, 13.
heu 161, 27; 163, 19 ff.; 170, 43; 200, 2; 201, 9.
heus 161, 27; 170, 41.
hexaporta 64, 9.
hi 79, 5.
hic, adverb 87, 12; 161, 15; 169, 2; 170, 11.
   article 7, 5; 87, 2 – 4.
   pronoun 69, 12 & 19 – 20; 79, 5; 85, 12; 87, 12.
hinc 169, 3.
hir 32, 2.
Hispanus 5, 17.
histriones 83, 16.
hodie 161, 17; 170, 13.
homo 5, 10; 8, 8; 14, 5; 66, 5; 90, 11; 167, 3; 198, 4.
Horatius (prol) 2, 3.
hordea 52, 2.
horreo 115, 2.
horrescens 185, 2.
hortor 95, 18.
hostis 197, 15.
huc 169, 3.
hui 69, 12.
huiuscemdi 13, 3.
huiusmodi 57, 10.
humilimus 4, 7.
humus 6, 18; 39, 2.
hymen 28, 3.
i, characteristic letter of the fourth conjugation 101, 18.
   characteristic letter of the third conjugation 156, 17 & 25.
   ending of the modus primus of the pronouns 69, 10 ff.
   ending of the modus secundus of the pronouns 69, 12.
   ending of the neutra defectiua 96, 12.
   ending of the second declension 60, 5.
i, ending of the third declension 61, 6.
nouns ending in 13.
vocative ending 73, 15.
used in the formation of the word aduerbium 158, 12.
iaceo 199, 9.
iacio 120, 2.
Iacob 16, 2.
iam 161, 17; 170, 13.
ibi 161, 15; 169, 3; 170, 11.
id 81, 5.
idcirco 191, 21.
idem 69, 23 - 24; 80, 12 - 16.
idem, how it is derived 81.
ideo 191, 21.
Iesus Christus 88, 10.
igitur 188, 2; 189, 16; 190, 16; 191, 21 & 27.
igitur, its species, figura and ordo 189, 14 - 19.
ignorantia (prol) 2, 2.
il, nouns ending in 21.
Ilion 29, 3.
ilac 169, 3; 173, 5.
ille 69, 12 & 16 - 17; 77, 21; 83, 5; 84, 16 - 18; 85, 6; 85, 12.
illic 169, 3.
illicio 120, 3.
ilinc 169, 3.
illoc 161, 15; 169, 3; 170, 11.
im, nouns ending in 25.
imber 31, 6.
immo 161, 27; 170, 49.
imperator 167, 3.
impius 192, 10.
impleui 112, 2.
imprudenter 172, 5.
in 56, 10; 194, 15; 195; 198, 6.
in foras 173, 4.
in hunc modum 195, 6.
in loco 195, 18; 198, 10.
inclinatio animi 98, 23.
inde 161, 24.
indecor 33, 2.
indigeo 108, 4.
indignans 201, 9.
indocte 172, 5; 192, 10.
indulgentem 159, 5.
indulgenter 159, 5.
indulgeo 104, 4.
ineptus 56, 10.
inexpugnabilis 56, 14.
infantes balbutientes (prol) 3, 1.
infectio 58, 7.
infra 194, 11; 197, 13.
inimici 197, 15.
inuria 198, 4.
inustitia 55, 17.
inustus 55, 16.
inmemor 33, 3.
inoccens 181, 23.
inocenter 161, 20.
inops 41, 6.
inperterritus 56, 14.
inpos 38, 3.
inquio 146, 2.
inserui 136, 2.
inseui 136, 2.
insipientes (prol) 3, 1.
insons 41, 7.
invelle 100, 13; 129, 7.
inter 100, 14; 170, 11; 194, 11; 195, 11; 197, 13; 199, 9.
interdum 77, 9.
intererea 191, 19.
interiectio 87, 8.
interiectio, definition of 199, 5 - 7; 201, 3.
its accents 200.
interiectio secundum Donatum 201.
interiectio secundum Priscianum 199 - 200.
interiectio,·significatio 201, 7 - 9.
interpres 48, 4.
intra 161, 15; 194, 11; 195, 12; 197, 13.
intro 161, 15; 170, 11; 173, 3.
introductiones dictandi (prol) 2, 3.
intus 173, 2.
io, third conjugation ending 140.
ioachim 25, 2.
Iob 16, 2.
iocum 9, 8.
 locus 9, 1.
Iohannes 195, 9.
ipse 69, 12 & 18; 85, 12; 86, 2 - 3 & 11.
ir, nouns ending in 32.
irascens 201, 9.
is, ending of the first declension 59, 6.
ending of the modus primus of the pronouns 69, 10.
ending of the third declension 61, 6.
final syllable 81, 4.
nouns ending in 37.
pronoun 69, 21 - 22; 81, 3; 85, 12; 88, 2 - 4.
isdem 81, 12.
iste 69, 12 & 18; 85, 4 - 6 & 12.
istorum 161, 22; 170, 45.
it, ending of the impersonal verbs 96, 14.
ita 191, 21.
Italia 163, 32.
itaque 189, 16; 191, 21.
item 191, 19.
itemque 191, 19.
iter 31, 4.
iucoe 105, 2.
iudex 40, 4.
iuger 31, 4.
iium, ending of the third declension 61, 7.
ius, ending of the modus secundus of the pronouns 69, 12.
    ending of the second declension 60, 8; 73, 14.
    noun 198, 4.
iustus 55, 15.
iuuo 102, 14.
iuxta 163, 11 & 18; 194, 11; 195, 6; 197, 13.
Kalendae 51, 2.
labor, noun 198, 4.
    verb 126, 8.
lac 17, 2.
lacceso 137, 2.
lacunar 30, 2.
lacus 62, 9.
laetitia 201, 9.
lambo 126, 2.
lapilli 44, 11.
lapis (prol) 1, 2; 37, 5.
laquear 30, 2.
Lar 30, 3.
largior 95, 18.
laruae 83, 17.
laser 31, 4.
latro 14, 5.
laeo 102, 15.
laus 43, 2.
lectio 163, 9.
lectito 156, 15.
lector 95, 18.
lectores (prol) 3, 1.
lecturio 156, 15.
lectus 175, 17.
lectus, its significatio 178, 7 - 9.
its tempus 177, 7.
legam 156, 11.
lege 156, 11.
legendus 177, 11.
legens 174, 2.
legens, all participial forms of 186, 12 - 187.
its casus 176, 2.
its figura 180, 3 - 5.
its genus 175, 7 - 9.
its numerus 179, 2 - 3.
its significatio 178, 3 - 5.
its tempus 177, 3.
legere 156, 11.
legerem 156, 11.
legitur 99, 10; 156, 11.
lego 100, 14; 129, 7; 156, 11 & 26; 157, 21 ff.
lego, complete conjugation of 229 - 244.
leo, second conjugation ending 112.
lepus  39, 9.
leuis inflexio uoci  176, 6.
libet  96, 15.
licet  191, 17.
lien  28, 3.
ligne  73, 11.
ligneus  73, 11.
Ligur  34, 2.
ligurrio  152, 2.
linio  151, 2.
lino  135, 4.
linquo  127, 2.
linter  31, 3.
lio, fourth conjugation ending  149.
liqueo  110, 2.
lis  37, 5.
lo, third conjugation ending  133.
locuples  36, 5.
locus  9, 1.
locutus locuturus  186, 35.
longe  9, 5.
loquacitas  8, 4.
loquens  186, 35.
loquens, its significatio  178, 15.
loquor  131, 5; 157, 14.
loquor, its genus  95, 3 - 5.
Lucas  195, 9.
luceo  106, 2.
Lucifer  57, 10.
luctor  157, 14.
luctus  39, 10.
ludo  128, 1.
lues  36, 2.
lugeo  108, 3.
lux  40, 2; 50, 2 - 3.
luxuriosus 6, 17.
m, ending of the second declension 60, 6.
macellum 197, 15.
magis 161, 25; 170, 57.
magister 31, 2; 60, 1 - 2.
magnus 5, 14; 65, 29.
male 158, 16; 161, 20.
malus 65, 29.
mane nouum 168, 2.
maneo 114, 3.
Manes 49, 2.
manum bonum 49, 4.
manus 39, 10; 62, 1 - 2.
margo 14, 3.
marmor 33, 5.
Mars 41, 2.
Martia 174, 16.
martir 32, 2.
mas 35, 2.
mater 31, 3.
maxime 161, 25; 170, 57.
meatim 159, 5; 161, 26.
mecum 170, 39; 193, 2.
Mediolanum 164, 4.
medius fidius 161, 19; 170, 47.
mee 70, 5; 73, 11, 17 & 19.
mei 73, 2, 7 & 11; 76, 2 & 5 - 6.
meio 140, 2.
mel 20, 2; 52, 2.
memini 96, 12.
memor 33, 3.
mensis 6, 16.
mensura 52, 2; 160, 5.
mentis humilitas (prol) 3, 1.
meo, second conjugation ending 113.
mercatum 9, 9.
mergo 129, 5.
met, adiectio syllabica 82, 2.
meto 132, 2.
metus 201, 9.
meus 72, 3 & 13; 73, 7, 11 & 17; 76, 5.
meus, declined 70, 2 - 3; 90, 2 - 4.
   how it is derived 72, 5 - 6.
mī 70, 5; 73, 7, 17 & 19.
Michael 20, 2.
Michol 22, 2.
mico 102, 9.
miles 36, 4.
miluus 7, 14; 8, 2.
minime 161, 18 & 25.
minimum 161, 20; 170, 35.
minus 161, 25.
mio, fourth conjugation ending 150.
mīs 74, 14.
miser miserrimus 4, 8.
miteo 11, 1.
mitto 132, 2.
mo, third conjugation ending 134.
moderni 74, 12.
modicum 161, 20; 174, 35.
modo 159, 6; 160, 2 ff.; 161, 17; 170, 13.
moenia 53, 2; 197, 15.
mollis uolatus 7, 19.
molo 133, 2.
moneo 103, 2; 114, 2.
monile 12, 2.
monoptota 64, 4.
mons 1, 25; 41, 2.
monstrum 40, 8.
monticulus 1, 25.
moralis 37, 8.
mordeo 104, 3; 107, 4.
moribundus 182, 2.
morior 182, 4.
moror 95, 18.
om 38, 2.
omio 195, 18.
mulceo 106, 2.
mulgeo 104, 4.
mulier 10, 4; 31, 3; 59, 15.
multiplicatus 45, 9.
multum 161, 20; 170, 35.
mulxi 106, 4.
murmur 34, 2.
mus 39, 6.
mus longus 7, 18.
Musa 11, 3; 64, 6.
mustela 7, 14; 8, 2 & 9.
Mycenae 164, 6.
nam 189, 7; 191, 19 & 25.
namque 191, 19 & 25.
Nar 30, 3.
nardus 39, 2.
natura 10, 3; 73, 11; 81, 6.
naues 197, 15.
ne 161, 18; 167, 4; 170, 53; 189, 17; 190, 14; 191, 15, 19 & 27.
nec  161, 18; 190, 8; 191, 15.
neco  102, 9.
necto  132, 2.
nefas  35, 3; 200, 8.
neglegentia (prol)  2, 2.
neglego  129, 7.
nemo  14, 5.
neo, second conjugation ending  114.
    verb  114, 3.
nepos  6, 17; 38, 2.
neptis  37, 3.
nequa  80, 11; 161, 18.
nequam  24, 2.
nequaquam  161, 18.
neque  161, 18; 170, 17; 190, 8; 191, 15.
neue  191, 19.
nexo  102, 9; 138, 2.
ni  190, 8; 191, 19.
nihil  21, 3.
nimum  161, 20.
nio, fourth conjugation ending  151.
nisi  191, 19.
nisisi  191, 19.
nix  40, 2.
no, third conjugation ending  135.
nobiscum  170, 39.
nocens  181, 22.
noceo  106, 3; 181, 22.
noctu  159, 6.
nomen, accidents of  1, 9 ff.; 65, 7.
    casus  58, - 65, 7
    casus accusatius  58, 19.
    casus datius  58, 19.
    casus, definition of  58, 7.
nomen, casus, _etymology of_ 58, 9.
casus genetius 58, 18.
casus rectus 58, 17.
casus nominativus 58, 10 & 16 - 17.
casus vocativus 58, 19.
casus, _why there are six cases_ 58, 20.
comparatio 65, 7.
comparatio, _definition of_ 65, 25.
comparatio, _etymology of_ 65, 27.
comparatio, _nouns that can be compared_ 65, 28 - 29.
declinatio prima 59.
declinatio quarta 62.
declinatio quinta 63.
declinatio secunda 60.
declinatio secunda, _formation of the vocative_ 60, 6 - 9.
declinatio tertia 61.
definition of 1, 5 - 6 & 27.
_etymology of (prol)_ 1, 7; 1, 7 - 8.
figura 55 - 58; 65, 7.
figura composita 55, 5, 14 & 16.
figura, _declension of compounded nouns_ 57, 1 - 8.
figura decomposita 55, 17.
figura, _definition of_ 55, 8.
figura, _etymology of_ 55, 9 - 11.
figura, _parts of speech used in compounding_ 57, 9 - 10.
figura, _quot modis nomina componuntur_ 56.
figura simplex 55, 3 - 5 & 14 - 15.
formae casuales 64.
genus 7 - 53; 65, 7.
genus commune 7, 12; 8, 6.
genus, _definition of_ 7, 8.
genus, _differences between the commune and epicoenon_ 8.
nomen, genus *epicoenon* 7, 14; 8, 6.
genus, *_etymology of* 7, 9 - 10.
genus incertum 8, 12.
genus *names of* 7, 12 - 8, 12.
genus omne 7, 13.
genus promiscuum 7, 14.
genus septimum 8, 12.

*its relationship to the infinitive* 98, 21.
numerus 44 - 54; 65, 7.
numerus, *definition of* 44, 6.
numerus dualis 45, 6.
numerus, *_etymology of* 44, 7 - 12.
numerus, nomina numero communia 47.
numerus, nomina semper singularia 48.
numerus, pluralia uoce non sensu 54, 3 - 4.
numerus pluralis 45.
numerus, semper pluralia feminini generis 51.
numerus, semper pluralia generis masculini 49.
numerus, semper pluralia generis neutri 53.
numerus, semper singularia feminina 50.
numerus, semper singularia neutri generis 52.
numeris singularis 45.
numerus, *the parts of speech having number* 46.
numerus, uoce singularia intellectu pluralia 54, 1 - 2.
qualitas 65, 7.
qualitas appellativia 65, 8 - 11 & 19.
nomen secundum Donatum 65 - 67.
nomen secundum Priscianum 1 - 64.
nomen, species 1, 13 ff.

*species, definition of* 1, 18 - 19.
species derivatiuae 1, 25.
nomen, species deriuatiuae, absoluta 6, 16.
species deriuatiuae, ad aliquid aliter se habentia 6, 9 - 12.
species deriuatiuae, ad aliquid dicta 6, 4 - 8.
species deriuatiuae, abjectua 5, 13 - 15.
species deriuatiuae, aduerbialia 5, 6 - 8.
species deriuatiuae, collectia 6, 15.
species deriuatiuae, comparatiua 3, 4 - 7.
species deriuatiuae, deminutia 3, 1 - 3.
species deriuatiuae, demonstratiua uel relatiua 6, 14.
species deriuatiuae, denominatiua 5, 1 - 2.
species deriuatiuae, diuidua 6, 15.
species deriuatiuae, facticia 6, 15.
species deriuatiuae, generalia 5, 11 - 12.
species deriuatiuae, gentilia 5, 16 - 17.
species deriuatiuae, homonyma 6, 17.
species deriuatiuae, interrogatiua 6, 13 - 14.
species deriuatiuae, localia 6, 16.
species deriuatiuae, numeralia 5, 20 - 21; 6, 2 - 3; 11, 4.
species deriuatiuae, ordinalia 5, 22 - 25; 6, 2 - 3.
species deriuatiuae, participialiua 5, 5 - 6; 14, 4.
species deriuatiuae, patria 5, 18 - 19.
species deriuatiuae, patronymica 2, 2 - 3.
species deriuatiuae, possessiua 2, 4 - 5.
species deriuatiuae, specialia 5, 9 - 10.
species deriuatiuae, superlatiua 4; 5, 25.
species deriuatiuae, synonyma uel polyonyma 6, 18.
species deriuatiuae, temporalia 6, 16.
species deriuatiuae, uerbialiua 3 - 4; 14, 4.
species, etymology of 1, 22.
species primitiua 1, 25.
species propriorum nominum 1, 26.
why it is treated first 66.
nomina appellatia 65, 29.
nomina homonyma 166, 1.
nomina polyonyma 166, 1.
nomina propria 2, 9.
nomina quae transeunt in aduerbia 163, 26 - 164.
nomino 58, 16.
non 161, 18; 167, 4; 170, 17.
nos 73, 5; 74, 15; 84, 11.
nosmet 82, 4.
noster 70, 7; 72, 3 & 13; 91, 9 - 11.
noster, how it is derived 72, 7.
nostra, how it is derived 72, 8.
nostras 72, 3 & 13.
nostras, declined 71, 2.
how it is derived 72, 9.
nostri 76, 2; 82, 5.
nostrum 82, 5.
nostrum, how it is derived 72, 9.
notamen 1, 8.
notio 1, 8.
ox 6, 12; 40, 2.
ns, present participle ending 177, 5.
nubes 47, 2.
nubo 126, 1.
nubor 181, 9.
nugas 35, 4.
nuge 56, 13.
nugigerulus 56, 12.
nullatenus 168, 2.
nullomodo 168, 2.
Numa Pompilius 44, 8.
numerale 5, 21.
numerandum  44, 8; 179, 9.
numerare  44, 11.
Numeria dea  44, 8.
ummorum riuus  44, 10.
nunc  158, 2; 161, 17; 170, 13.
nunc, its significatio  160, 13.
    its species  161, 7 - 9.
numiniae  51, 2.
nuo  119, 2.
nuper  159, 2; 161, 17; 170, 13.
nupta  181, 5.
nuptiae  51, 2.
nurus  39, 10.
nux  40, 2.
O, aduerbium uocandi  161, 27; 166, 1.
o, ending of the active voice  157, 7.
    ending of the neutropassiuia  94, 17.
    ending of the second declension  60, 5.
    ending of the uerba neutra secundum Donatum  157, 11.
o, interjection  201, 9.
o, nouns ending in  14.
ob  194, 11; 197, 13.
obraio  119, 4.
obsum  96, 11.
Oceanus  197, 15.
ocissime  161, 25.
od  121, 2.
odio  121, 2.
odor  33, 2.
officium  197, 15.
ol, nouns ending in  22.
oleum 52, 2.
olim 161, 17; 166, 1; 170, 13.
omitto 198, 25.
omnes 198, 4.
omnino 161, 24.
on, nouns ending in 29.
optans 201, 9.
or, nouns ending in 33.
ordo 14, 2.
orexis 37, 3.
oriens 77, 32.
orum, ending of the second declension 60, 10.
oss, ending of the second declension 60, 11.
nouns ending in 38.
oss oris 38, 4.
oss ossis 38, 4.
oscular 95, 13 - 15 & 18; 157, 16.
paelex 40, 3.
paene 77, 5.
palam 194, 13; 198, 2.
pando 128, 7.
pango 129, 8.
panis 37, 2.
papae 199, 2; 200, 2; 201, 9.
papauer 31, 4.
par 30, 4.
parco 127, 4.
paries 36, 6; 197, 15.
pario 125, 2.
Paris 37, 9; 189, 11.
pariter 161, 22; 170, 51.
pars 62, 8; 174, 10.
partes orationis 1, 22.
partes orationum (prol) 1, 8.

participium, accidents of 175 - 180; 186, 8.
casus 186, 13 - 16.
casus, definition of 176, 6.
casus, etymology of 176, 7 - 8.
definition of 174, 5 - 8; 186, 3 - 4.
etymology of 174, 10.
figura 180; 186, 44 - 47.
figura decomposita 186, 47.
figura, definition of 180, 7.
figura, etymology of 180, 9.
genus 186, 9 - 12.
genus, definition of 175, 11.
genus, etymology of 175, 13.

nouns having the appearance of participles 181 - 182.
numerus 179; 186, 40 - 43.
umerus, definition of 179, 7.
umerus, etymology of 179, 9.
participia defectua 184.
participia inchoatiua 185.

participium secundum Donatum 186 - 187.
participium secundum Priscianum 174 - 185.

participium, significatio 178; 186, 21 - 39.
tempus 177; 186, 17 - 20.
the words which are both participles and nouns 183.

why the participle has certain accidents from the nouns and the verb 174, 12 - 19.

partus 62, 8.
parum 161, 20; 170, 35.
paruus 5, 14; 65, 29.
pasco 127, 3.
passer 7, 14; 8, 2.
passio 96, 3.
passum 103, 2; 111, 2.
pastum 127, 7.
pateo 11, 2.
pater 6, 5; 31, 2; 73, 7; 90, 10; 197, 15.
paterfamilias 57, 10.
pauoe 94, 18.
pauesco 94, 18.
paui 127, 7.
paulatim 161, 19.
Paulus Camaldulensis incipit to the Prologus and to the grammatical treatise.
pauper 31, 3.
pax 40, 2; 50, 2.
pecten 28, 3.
pecto 132, 2.
pectus 39, 9.
pedetemptim 159, 5; 161, 19.
pedo 128, 1.
pelagus 39, 3; 60, 7.
pellis 37, 11.
pello 133, 3.
peluis 37, 11.
penes 194, 11; 197, 13.
penitus 161, 24.
pentatopta 64, 8.
penus 39, 11.
peo, second conjugation ending 109.
per 192, 2; 194, 11; 195, 8 & 15; 197, 13.
percello 133, 4.
peregre 169, 4.
perfidus  57, 10.
perlego  129, 7; 157, 25.
perquirendum (pro)  3, 1.
Persius  44, 12.
persona  77, 3 & 11; 83, 17; 89, 8; 92, 6.
persona, etymology of  83, 7 - 8 & 18 - 19.
it's relationship to the infinitive  98, 21.
persona prima, secunda and tertia, functions of  83, 20 - 22.
pes  159, 6.
pestis  37, 3.
peto  132, 3.
Petrus  65, 12.
phalerata locutio (pro)  3, 1.
phaselus  39, 2.
pietas  35, 2.
pingo  129, 7.
pinso  137, 2.
pio, fourth conjugation ending  145.
third conjugation ending  123.
piper  31, 4.
pirus  39, 2.
placeor  181, 9.
placita  181, 5.
plebis scitum  57, 10.
plebs  54, 2.
plexa  55, 15.
plexi  132, 2.
plica  55, 15.
plico  102, 9.
plumbum  52, 2.
pluo  119, 2.
plus  161, 25.
po, third conjugation ending  130.
poesa  1, 1; 45, 4; 59, 1 - 2.
poesa, declined  58, 21 - 23.
poeta, etymology of 1, 16.
  its casus 58, 1 - 4.
  its figura 55, 2 - 5.
  its genus 7, 3 - 5.
  its species 1, 14.
poeutia (prol) 2, 3.
pollis 37, 11.
pondus 52, 2.
pone 163, 10 ff. & 23 ff.; 194, 11; 197, 13.
pono 135, 2; 163, 12.
pons 41, 2.
populus 6, 15; 54, 2; 60, 7.
populus, name of tree 39, 2.
porrigo 129, 6.
porro 9, 5; 191, 17.
porrum 9, 1 & 5.
porrus 9, 7.
porticus 39, 10.
posco 127, 3.
positii 3, 6.
possessio 90, 8.
possessio duplex 76, 4 - 6.
possessio simplex 76, 4 - 6.
possum 96, 11.
post 194, 11; 197, 13.
postis 37, 3.
potior 14, 6.
potius 161, 27; 170, 49.
prae 194, 13; 198, 2.
preeceius 192, 10.
prefectura 198, 4.
prefectus equitum 57, 3 & 8.
praemium 189, 13.
praenomen 1, 28.
praeponendum 192, 9.
praepositio 163, 28; 165; 173, 5.
praepositio, definition of 192, 5 - 7; 197, 3.
etymology of 192, 9.
it its sole accident casus 194; 197, 4 ff.
praepositio secundum Donatum 197 - 198.
praepositio secundum Priscianum 192 - 196.
praepositio, why it is not applied separately to adverbs 165, 2 - 5.
praepositiones semper coniunctae 196; 198, 22 - 25.
praepositius 190, 4 ff.
pres 42, 2.
presentia 86, 15.
presertim 191, 19.
praesul 23, 2.
presum 96, 11.
praeter 194, 11; 197, 13.
praeterea 191, 19.
praetor urbanus 57, 7.
praeuido 107, 3.
prandeo 104, 3; 107, 5; 181, 20.
prandor 181, 9.
pransus 181, 5.
prelum 9, 9.
premo 134, 4.
pretiosus (prol) 1, 2.
Priamides 2, 3.
Priamus 2, 3; 189, 15.
prima impositio 68, 17; 161, 9.
prima positio 1, 25.
primus 5, 23.
princeps 41, 6.
prior 5, 24.
Priscianus (prol) 1, 7; 78, 2; 158, 16; 175, 19; 266.
pro 194, 13; 198, 2; 200, 8.
proceres 190, 22.
proconsul 68, 5.
profecto 161, 18; 163, 13 ff.
profero 192, 10.
profunditus (prol) 3, 1.
polkien 120, 3.
promerar (prol) 3, 2.
promo 134, 2.
pronomen absens 85, 12.
pronomen, accidents of 68, 10 ff.; 77, 13 ff.
casus 77, 15; 84 - 91.
definition of 68, 7; 77, 3 & 7.
etymology of 68, 9.
figura 77, 15; 80 - 82.
genus 77, 15 & 24 ff.
genus epicoemon 77, 29.
pronomen interrogatiuum 89, 10.
pronomen, modus primus 69, 10 - 11.
modus quartus 71.
modus secundus 69, 12 ff.
modus tertius 70.
numerus 77, 15; 79.
persona 83.
persona secunda 91.
persona tertia 85, 12.
pronomen praepositiuum 87, 2 & 10.
pronomen, qualitas 77, 15 - 23.
pronomen relatiuum 85, 12; 86, 11; 88.
pronomen secundum Donatum 77 - 91.
pronomen secundum Priscianum 68 - 76.
pronomen, species primitiua 68, 15 - 17.

why it was created 67.
pronomina articularia 87.
pronomina composita with met 82.
pronomina deriuiatiua 72, 3.
pronomina finita 77, 19 - 22; 85, 2 - 6.
pronomina infinita 77, 11 & 19 - 22; 89.
pronomina minus quam finita 85, 6; 86.
pronomina possessiua ad aliquid dicta 90.
pronomina praesentia et demonstratiua 85, 11; 86, 14; 87, 11.
pronomina primitiua 72, 3.
pronomina subiunctiua 88.
prope 194, 11; 197, 13.
propere 166, 1.
propheto 195, 4.
propinqui 197, 15.
propinquus 6, 16.
propria nomina 60, 8.
propter 163, 17 ff.; 194, 11; 197, 13.
propterea 191, 21.
prorsus 161, 24.
prosperitas 44, 11.
prudenter 172, 5.
ps, nouns ending in 41, 5.
psallo 133, 5.
Psalmi 48, 3.
pubes 198, 4.
pube tenus 193, 2; 198, 4.
pudet 96, 13.
pugil 21, 3.
pulchre 161, 20; 170, 33.
pulex 40, 2.
puls 41, 2.
puluis 48, 2-10.
pungo 129, 9.
pus 39, 3; 52, 2.
Pylus 39, 2.
pyxis 37, 5.
quadrans 41, 4.
quadrigae 51, 2.
quae 6, 14; 77, 11, 23 & 25.
quaeo 137, 2.
qualitas 1, 6; 59, 16.
qualis 77, 25; 78, 2.
quam 161, 18 & 25; 170, 57; 189, 12.
quamobrem 161, 18; 170, 29; 191, 19.
quamquam 191, 17.
quamuis 189, 13; 191, 17.
quando 163, 15 ff.; 166, 1; 189, 5; 191, 19.
quandoquidem 191, 19.
quantitas 65, 29.
quapropter 191, 21.
quare 161, 18; 170, 29.
quasi 161, 23; 170, 31.
quatenus 190, 8; 191, 19.
quater 160, 7; 161, 26; 170, 15.
quatio 100, 15; 124, 2.
quattuor 64, 4; 160, 7.
que 189, 4; 190, 14; 191, 13 & 27.
queo 154, 2; 156, 32.
queo, second conjugation ending 110.
qui, 80, 9.
qui, differences between it and quis 89, 9 - 10.
quia 189, 5; 191, 21.
quicumque 80, 10.
quid 77, 11, 23 & 25.
quidam 80, 10.
quidem 189, 18; 190, 14; 191, 15.
quidni 161, 18; 170, 19.
quiesco 127, 2.
quilibet 80, 10.
quin 190, 8; 191, 19.
quinetiam 191, 26.
quinquies 161, 26.
quio, fourth conjugation ending 146.
quippe 161, 18; 191, 21.
Quirinus Romulus 49, 5.
quiris 49, 5.
Quirites 49, 2.
quis 6, 14; 69, 13; 77, 11, 23 & 25; 78, 2; 80, 5 & 9.
quis, declined 69, 31 - 32; 89, 2 - 4.
quilibet 198, 4.
quisnam 80, 8; 91, 16.
quispiam 80, 8; 91, 16.
quisputas 80, 9.
quisquam 80, 9.
quísque 80, 5 & 8.
quíuis 80, 10.
quo 163, 7 ff.
quo, third conjugation ending 131.
quod 18, 2.
quondam 161, 17; 166, 1; 170, 13.
quoniam 163, 16; 191, 21.
quoniam quidem 191, 21.
quoque 190, 14; 191, 17.
quor, third conjugation deponent ending 131, 4 - 5.
quoetiens 161, 26.
x, ending of the passive verbs 94, 4; 157, 9.
    ending of the second declension 60, 6.
    ending of the uerba communia 157, 16.
masculine termination 8, 4.
Rachel 20, 2.
ratio 123, 2.
ratio 8, 12; 10, 5; 46, 1; 90, 6.
rausi 142, 5.
Rauennas 35, 5.
recentum 135, 6.
recinui 135, 6.
recipio 198, 25.
recreatio 9, 2.
recumbus 126, 2.
reddo 128, 3.
redimio 150, 2.
redintegrari 82, 8.
redoloe 112, 2.
regendum 190, 26.
reges 190, 22.
registrum (pro1) 2, 4.
regnata 181, 5.
regnor 181, 9.
rego 129, 6 & 12.
regulae longitudinis et breuitatis (pro1) 2, 1 - 2.
regulus 3, 3.
rei praesentatio 83, 19.
ren 28, 3.
reo, second conjugation ending 115.
reperio 152, 2.
repo 130, 2.
reptilia 8, 9.
repungo 129, 9.
res 47, 2.
res individua 48, 6.
res praesens 74, 13; 87, 11; 90, 8.
res ventura 74, 14.
restis 37, 3.
rex 40, 4; 190, 26; 195, 6.
Rhenus 197, 15.
rideo 104, 2; 107, 2.
ringo 129, 7.
rio, fourth conjugation ending 152.
  third conjugation ending 125.
ripa 197, 15.
ris, passive, common and deponent ending 101, 4 ff.
rite 159, 6.
riuulus 1, 25.
ro, third conjugation ending 136.
Roma 65, 19; 163, 27; 164, 4.
Romanus 5, 19; 44, 8.
ros 38, 2.
rugio 144, 2.
rui 119, 3.
rumpo 130, 3.
rus, future participle ending 177, 13; 184, 5.
s, letter of the second person in the verbs 101, 4 & 13 - 16.
s littera 81, 14.
s, masculine termination 8, 4.
Sabinica lingua 49, 5.
sacerdos 38, 3; 61, 1 - 2.
sacrae paginae (prol) 1, 1.
sacrarium 2, 12.
saepio 145, 2.
sal 19, 2.
salio 148, 2.
sallio 149, 2.
sallo 133, 2.
saltem 189, 19; 191, 17.
Samnis 37, 6.
sancio 142, 2.
sanctabus 59, 11.
sanguis 37, 5; 48, 2 - 10.
sanus 189, 10.
sapientia (prol) 1, 1.
sapio 123, 2.
sarcio 142, 2.
satisfactio 57, 10.
satum 136, 3.
Saturnalia 53, 2.
scabo 126, 2.
scalae 51, 2.
scalpo 130, 2.
scammum 26, 2; 60, 12 - 13; 64, 6.
scilicet 161, 18; 191, 21.
scindo 128, 3.
scopae 51, 2.
scriba 11, 3
scribo 126, 1.
seco 102, 9.
sectio 48, 6.
secubo 198, 25.
secum 170, 39.
secunda declinatio 3, 6.
secunda positio 1, 25.
secundum 194, 11; 195, 7; 197, 13.
secundus 5, 23.
securis 37, 7.
secus 194, 11; 197, 13.
sed 191, 19.
sedo 104, 2; 107, 3; 128, 1.
sedeo, its genus 94, 5 - 7; 96, 10.
sedis apostolica (prol) 2, 4.
seges 36, 3.
semel 55, 15; 159, 16; 160, 2 ff.; 161, 26; 170, 13.
semper 161, 17; 170, 13.
senior 33, 4.
sentio 147, 2.
seo, second conjugation ending 116.
seorsum 161, 22; 170, 45.
sepelio 148, 4.
September 31, 6.
sequor 157, 14.
sero 136, 1.
seruo 153, 2.
seruitus 39, 7.
seruus 74, 6; 76, 6.
seu 190, 8.
seue 191, 19.
si 189, 4, 6, 13 & 15; 190, 8; 191, 19.
si, hypothetical pronoun 75, 7.
sic 161, 23; 170, 31.
Sicilia 163, 32.
sicut 161, 23; 170, 31.
sicuti 161, 23; 170, 31.
sido 128, 1.
Sidon 29, 3.
siler 31, 4.
silex 40, 3.
similimus 4, 7.
Simon 29, 2.
simul 160, 4; 161, 22; 170, 51.
sin 190, 8; 191, 17 & 19.
Sindon 29, 3.
sine 194, 13; 198, 2.
singulariter 45, 5.
singultio 147, 2.
sinister 6, 9.
sinistrorum 161, 22.
sino 135, 4.
siqua 80, 11.
siquidem 191, 19.
Siren 28, 4.
sis, hypothetical pronoun 75, 6.
sisto 132, 2.
siue 189, 11; 190, 8; 191, 19.
so, third conjugation ending 137.
socrus 39, 11.
sol 22, 2; 189, 5.
sola res 160, 3.
soleo 94, 12; 157, 12.
solus 69, 13.
sonoritas 73, 18.
sophisma 11, 3.
sopio 145, 2.
soror 6, 7; 33, 4.
sorpsi 105, 5.
sorptum 105, 5.
species, declined 63, 1 - 2.
specificandum 1, 22.
specus 39, 11; 62, 9.
Sphinx 40, 7.
spinter 31, 4.
splen 28, 3.
splendeo 104, 3; 107, 5.
spondeo 104, 3; 107, 4.
stans 186, 31.
statim 160, 5.
statui 132, 2.
staturus 186, 31.
stellio 14, 5.
sterno 135, 4.
stereto 132, 2; 189, 4.
steti 132, 2.
stirps 41, 3.
sto 102, 14 & 19; 157, 11.
strepo 130, 3.
strictim 159, 6.
strideo 107, 2.
struo 119, 2.
studium (prol) 1, 7.
suadeo 104, 2; 107, 2.
sub 56, 6; 194, 15; 198, 6.
subiunctuus, pertaining to the conjunction 190, 4 ff.
substantia 1, 4; 59, 16; 66, 8; 77, 11; 83, 19; 89, 8.
substantialia nomina 59, 16.
subter 194, 15; 198, 6.
suburbanus 56, 5.
suffio 148, 2.
sui 76, 2; 77, 25.
sui, declined 69, 6 - 7; 84, 15.
sui, why it lacks the vocative 75.
suimet 91, 16.
sum, complete conjugation of 261 - 265.
its genus 95, 8 - 10; 96, 11.
summus index (prol) 3, 2.
super 194, 15; 195, 9 & 13 - 14; 198, 6.
superficies 74, 8.
superfluum 10, 1.
superposita 5, 15; 59, 13.
supplex 40, 3.
suppositio 193, 2 & 4.
supra 194, 11; 197, 13.
sus 39, 6.
sus, hypothetical pronoun 75, 5.
past participle ending 177, 9.
suus 72, 3; 76, 5.
suus, declined 70, 7; 91, 6 - 8.
synodus 39, 2.
t, ending of impersonal verbs 96, 13.
tabi 64, 5.
tabo 64, 5.
taceo 100, 17.
taedet 96, 13.
talis 77, 25; 78, 2.
tam 161, 25; 170, 57.
tamen 189, 13; 191, 17.
tametsi 191, 19.
tamquam 170, 31.
Tanaquil 21, 2.
tango 129, 9.
Tartarum 9, 7.
Tartarus 9, 1 & 3.
tectum 197, 15.
tecum 170, 39.
tegas 36, 3.
tellus 6, 18; 39, 7.
temno 135, 3.
temperandum 97, 25.
templum 26, 2; 197, 15.
tempto 159, 5.
tempus 92, 6.
tendo 128, 6.
teneo 114, 2.
tentum 103, 2.
tenus 193, 2; 194, 13; 198, 2.
teo, second conjugation ending 111.
tepescens 185, 2.
ter 161, 26; 170, 15.
tergo 129, 5.
tergum 197, 15.
terminiatio 58, 7.
terni 197, 15.
tero 136, 1.
terra 6, 18; 189, 5.
tertia declinatio 3, 7.
tertius 5, 23.
testes 198, 4.
tetrapota 64, 7.
texo 138, 2.
Thebae 164, 6.
Thetis 37, 9.
tibicen 28, 3.
timor 198, 4.
tintinnabulum 6, 15.
tio, fourth conjugation ending 147.
    third conjugation ending 124.
Titan  27, 2.
to, third conjugation ending 132.
tollo  133, 3.
tondeo 104, 3; 107, 4.
tono  102, 5 & 9.
tor, third conjugation deponent ending 132, 9 - 10.
torpeo 109, 2.
torrui 115, 4.
torsi  104, 4; 110, 3.
tortum 110, 3.
tostum 103, 2; 115, 4.
totiens 161, 26.
totus  69, 13 & 26 - 27.
tragoediae 83, 16.
traho  118, 2.
trans  194, 11; 197, 13.
transitio 94, 17.
tremo  134, 3.
tres  5, 21.
tribunal 197, 15.
tribus, noun  39, 10.
tricorpor  33, 2.
triens  41, 4.
triginta 11, 4.
tripotta  64, 6.
triticum  52, 2.
triumphata 181, 5.
triumphor 181, 9.
Troezen 28, 4.
tu    68, 27; 72, 13; 77, 21 & 25; 80, 6; 83, 5; 85, 5.
tu, declined 69, 4; 84, 13.
tuatim 161, 26.
tuber 31, 6.
tui 76, 2; 85, 5.
tuinmet 91, 16.
Tulliane 159, 4.
Tullius (prol) 2, 3; 159, 4.
tunc 161, 17; 170, 13.
tunicatus 181, 2 ff.
turbo turbas 9, 3.
turgeo 108, 2.
Turnus 88, 9.
turris 37, 11.
turtur 34, 2.
tus 38, 6.
tus, past participle ending 177, 9; 181, 3.
tuus 72, 3.
tuus, declined 70, 7; 91, 2 – 4.
how it is derived 72, 10.
why it lacks the vocative 74.
u, ending of the fourth declension 62, 7.
nouns ending in 15.
uah 201, 9.
ualde 4, 4; 161, 24.
wallis 37, 11.
unnus 39, 2.
uapulo, its genus 94, 15 – 17.
uarix 40, 4.
uas 35, 2.
ubi 163, 8; 166, 1.
ubus, ending of the fourth declension 62, 8.
ue 190, 14; 191, 15 & 27.
ueho 118, 2.
uel 170, 57; 189, 10; 190, 8; 191, 15.
uelle 133, 5.
uelox 40, 6.
uelut 161, 23; 170, 31.
ueluti 161, 23; 170, 31.
ueneo 94, 18; 96, 10; 154, 2.
Veneris sacerdos 28, 3.
ueneror 95, 18.
uenio 151, 2.
Venopia 11, 3.
Venus 14, 2; 39, 9; 88, 9.
ueo, second conjugation ending 117.
uer 31, 6.
uerberatio 92, 10.
uerbum 158, 9.
uerbum, accidents of 93; 156, 4 ff.
uerbum anomalous 261, 1.
uerbum, coniugatio 93, 5.
    coniugatio, definition of 101, 8.
    coniugatio, etymology of 101, 10.
    coniugatio prima 101, 1 - 14.
    coniugatio prima, preterites and supines 102.
    coniugatio quarta, preterites and supines 141 - 154.
    coniugatio secunda, preterites and supines 103 - 117.
    coniugatio tertia, preterites and supines 118 - 140.
    conjugationes tres secundum Donatum 156, 16 - 32.
    definition of 92, 4 - 6; 156, 3.
    etymology of 92, 8.
figura 93, 5; 157, 22 - 25.
figura simplex, definition of 100, 8.
uerbum, genus 93, 5; 94 - 96; 157, 1 - 17.
genus actium 96, 10.
genus actium, definition of 93, 11 - 13.
genus commune, definition of 95, 15.
genus cum tempore 93, 7.
genus, definition of 96, 3.
genus deponens, definition of 95, 5.
genus, etymology of 96, 5.
genus impersonale 96, 13.
genus neutropassium 96, 10.
genus neutropassium, definition of 94, 11 & 17.
genus neutrum absolutum 96, 10.
genus neutrum defectium 96, 12.
genus neutrum, definition of 94, 7.
genus neutrum passium 96, 10; 157, 12.
genus neutrum substantium 96, 11.
genus neutrum substantium, definition of 95, 10.
genus passium 96, 10.
genus passium, definition of 94, 2 - 4.

uerbum impersonale 98, 40.

uerbum impersonale, definition of 99, 2.

how it differs from the infinitive 99, 5 - 11.

uerbum, modus 93, 5; 98; 156, 9 - 11.
modus, definition of 98, 23.
modus, etymology of 98, 24 - 25.
modus imperatiuus, definition of 98, 9.
modus indicatius, definition of 98, 5.
modus infinitius, definition of 98, 21; 99, 4.
modus optatius, definition of 98, 13.
modus subjunctius, definition of 98, 17.

numerus 157, 18 - 21.

persona 155, 1 - 25; 157, 34 - 36.
uерbum, persona cum numero 93, 5.
persona, etymology of 155, 19 - 21.
persona prima, definition of 155, 5 - 7.
persona prima, definition of 155, 5 - 7.
persona secunda, definition of 155, 11 - 12.
persona tertia, definition of 155, 16 - 17.
qualitas, definition of 156, 9.
quot modis uerca componuntur 100, 10 - 17.

uерbum secundum Donatum 156 - 157.
uерbum secundum Priscianum 92 - 155.
uerbum, species 93, 5.
species primitiua, definition of 100, 4.
tempus 93, 5; 97; 157, 26 - 33.
tempus, definition of 97, 22 - 23.
etymology of 97, 24 - 25.
tempus futurum, definition of 97, 21.
tempus praesens, definition of 97, 5.
tempus praesens, why it is treated before the preterite 97, 30 - 32.
tempus praeteritum imperfectum, definition of 97, 9.
tempus praeteritum perfectum, definition of 97, 13.
tempus praeteritum plusquamperfectum, definition of 97, 17.

ueritas (prol) 3, 1.
uero 189, 14.
Verres 36, 2.
uerro 136, 2.
uersificandum (prol) 2, 2.
uersificandum, scientia versificandi (prol) 2, 1.
ueruntamen 191, 17.
uesperi 159, 6.
uester 72, 3.
uester, declined 70, 7; 91, 12 - 14.
how it is derived 72, 11.
uestis 37, 3.
uestras 72, 3.
uestras, declined 70, 2.
    how it is derived 72, 11.
uestri 76, 2.
ue to 102, 9.

ui, ending of the fourth declension 62, 6.
    preterite ending of the first conjugation 102, 5.
    preterite ending of the second conjugation 103.
uibex 40, 3.
ucini 197, 15.
uidelicet 191, 17 & 21.
uideo 104, 2; 107, 3.
uigil 21, 3.
uiilla 197, 15.
ui uncio 142, 2.
ui nco 127, 2.
ui num 52, 2.

ui o, fourth conjugation ending 153.
uir 10, 4; 59, 15; 64, 7.
Vergilius 10, 5; 60, 8; 86, 12; 200, 7.
ui rgo 14, 3.
ui r us 39, 3; 52, 2.
ui s 61, 6.
ui sio 156, 15.
ui so 137, 2.
ui sus 39, 10; 183, 2 ff.
ui uo 139, 2.
ui l, nouns ending in 23.
ullus 69, 13.
ul mus 39, 2.
ultra 194, 11; 197, 13.
un, ending of the fourth declension 62, 6.
um, ending of the second declension 60, 5.
  ending of the third declension 61, 7.
  nouns ending in 26.
umeo 113, 2.
una 159, 6; 160, 2 ff.; 161, 22; 170, 51.
unus 5, 21; 45, 5; 64, 9; 69, 13; 160, 7.
unus, declined 69, 25.
vo, third conjugation ending 139.
úo, third conjugation ending 119.
uobiscum 170, 39.
uocatio 73, 3.
uoco 58, 20.
uolo 133, 2.
uoluo 139, 2.
uomo 134, 3.
uos 69, 5; 84, 13; 197, 15.
ur, nouns ending in 34.
urbanus 56, 7.
urbs 65, 19.
urgendus 184, 2.
urgeo 104, 4; 184, 5.
uro 136, 2.
us, ending of the fourth declension 62, 6.
  ending of the second declension 60, 7.
  nouns ending in 39.
  past participle ending 177, 9.
usque 194, 11; 195, 5; 197, 13.
uterque 57, 10.
utilnam 161, 19; 170, 23.
utor 132, 10.
uulgus 39, 3; 54, 2; 60, 7.
uum, ending of the fourth declension 62, 7.
uxor 33, 4.
x, nouns ending in 40.
xo, third conjugation ending 138.
xus, past participle ending 177, 9.
## INDEX LOCORUM CLASSICORUM ATQUE VULGATAE

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CIC. CAT.</strong></td>
<td>1, 1, 2</td>
<td>166, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IUVEN.</strong></td>
<td>4, 10, 157</td>
<td>166, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVID.</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSIUS</strong></td>
<td>2, 1</td>
<td>44, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERG.</strong></td>
<td>1, 522</td>
<td>166, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 750</td>
<td>198, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2, 442</td>
<td>198, 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3, 14</td>
<td>181, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3, 527</td>
<td>198, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3, 619 - 620</td>
<td>86, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5, 846</td>
<td>86, 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6, 179</td>
<td>198, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6, 791</td>
<td>87, 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8, 78</td>
<td>166, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8, 616</td>
<td>198, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10, 394</td>
<td>2, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11, 174</td>
<td>80, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERG. BUC.</strong></td>
<td>3, 100</td>
<td>200, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vulgata**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEB.</strong></td>
<td>1, 1 - 2</td>
<td>195, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IOAN.</strong></td>
<td>1, 13</td>
<td>48, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LUC.</strong></td>
<td>7, 16</td>
<td>195, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 PETR.</strong></td>
<td>4, 10</td>
<td>(prol) 3, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulgata</td>
<td>PROV.,  6, 3</td>
<td>92, 12</td>
<td>(prol) 1, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>(prol) 1, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8, 19</td>
<td>(prol) 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS., 20, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>195, 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>195, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>48, 3; 98, 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>195, 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>195, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>195, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117, 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>195, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>195, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>67, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP., 5, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>195, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>(prol) 1, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>(prol) 1, 5 – 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TIM., 1, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>195, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX VERBORUM GRAECORUM

ET PSEUDO-GRAECORUM LITTERIS LATINIS SCRIPTORUM

apo 9, 2
balnein 9, 2
cephalim 9, 6
eu 73, 18
ger 7, 10
onomata 1, 8
phone 73, 18
poo 1, 16
telon 7, 18
tou 9, 2

ἀπό
βάλλειν
κεφαλή
ἐὖ
ἡ
ὄνομα
φωνή
ποιῶ
Τῆλον
Τοῦ
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Allen tries to determine the rules of pronunciation of Latin during the Golden Age, basing his discussion upon principles set down by the Latin grammarians and other writers, word-plays, inscriptions, and derivatives of Latin words in the Romance languages. The work is noted for its lucidity and practical value for English-speaking students and teachers of Latin.


In this handbook of Latin palaeography Battelli has employed the results of the most recent publications on the subject and fully used the studies of contemporary eminent scholars. The work is especially noteworthy for its ample bibliography, indices and amount of information contained in the account of writing materials. This handbook proved useful in my discussion of the writing in the Paris Lat. 7517.

This work is essentially a series of observations on the comparison of the style of Christian and Classical texts as well as on the morphology and syntax of Christian Latin. The bibliography is useful but needs to be edited with greater care in the matter of names of persons and titles of works.


These pages are valuable for their recount of the life of St. Romuald and of the founding of Camaldoli because conflicting versions are given, and there are accounts that enable one to gain almost an intimate knowledge of the saint and the quality of the life at Camaldoli.


Chevalier's entry on PC is meager and incorrect concerning the date of the grammarian.


The author attempts to trace a continuing influence of the Classical tradition throughout the Latin Middle Ages and even into the Renaissance. In this endeavor he has had to revise certain traditional concepts. Curtius presents his facts in a scholarly and skillful manner to support his thesis. However, there tends to
be an overemphasis on the Classical influence and the author's methodology can lend considerable repetition.


De Ghellinck in this work which deals with the Latin literature of the twelfth century by genres does mention the existence of PC and of the latter's writings in the Paris *Lat. 7517*, but contributes nothing new to our knowledge of this author.


Although this book chiefly deals with the development of handwriting in England and Wales during the Middle Ages, nevertheless certain pages in it were found to be extremely useful in establishing the date of the hand in the Paris *Lat. 7517*.


Diringer's treatment on the various schools of 12th century illumination could appear relevant to the illustrations in the Paris *Lat. 7517*. Diringer attempts in this comprehensive study of manuscript illustration and illustration in the Middle Ages to cite representative manuscripts for the various schools.

This etymological dictionary of Latin words utilizes the fruits of conscientious scholarship in the fields of descriptive, comparative and historical linguistics. Succeeding editions are characterized by corrections and additions made in the light of more recent scholarship. The information given for each entry is succinctly essential and detailed. There is provision made for hypotheses, doubts, and rejection of former arguments. A researcher in Latin linguistics may find this work valuable in the discovery and formulating of problems, on which further studies need to be done.


Grandgent's book appears to be an attempt to give a succinct and uncomplicated presentation of the development of Late Latin from Classical Latin. The book has the merit of being lucid and systematic and valuable for the references on each treatment of a certain aspect in Late Latin to more detailed monographs.

Grandi, Guido, Dissertatio de S. Petri Damiani et Avellanitarum Instituto Camaldulensi, in vol. 144 of the PL, Paris, Migne, 1867, cols. 17 - 88.

This work is chiefly a prolegomenon to the works of Petrus Damianus and concerns the founding of the monastery of Avellana to which Petrus Damianus was connected and which was founded on the same principles as Camaldoli. The merit of this work is Grandi's weighing of various sources and opinions. He illustrates his point with numerous quotations, and he appears to have written a history which could be useful in a comparative study of 12th century monastic life of Avellana and Camaldoli.

In this history of the European monastic orders, the author carefully weighs his sources and often criticizes and endeavors to refute traditional views.


*Le Point des connaissances actuelles*, no. 1247,

In this work Hermann wishes to give a brief outlook on the peculiarities and the development of Vulgar Latin. One could claim that this work truly fulfills its modest aims. The author investigates and clearly brings to the forefront essential points, which, however, are not understandably dealt with in depth due to the size of the book.


This volume consists of three essential parts: the first is the treatment on syntax and stilistik; the second is an index to the preceding; the third deals with the history of the Latin language and the general function of Latin grammar. For my thesis I used the syntax section of the first part. It is a comprehensive Latin grammar strongly devoted to the historical aspect, that is, there are comparisons with related Italic and other Indo-European forms. However, thorough use of Late Latin scholarship is evident in this book which is noted for two merits: prolific bibliographical references and the noting of problems needing research.

The particular pages from this book cited in my thesis proved helpful in establishing the date of the Irish grammarian Sedulius Scottus and in citing the problem of whether Smaragdus ought to be identified with Muridac.


Koch's article on Venus is well documented with both primary and secondary sources. He treats first of the etymological problems connected with Venus and its derivatives, and then proceeds to give a history of the cult of Venus as it was practiced in the Italian peninsula during Roman times. He attempts to describe the essential differences and similarities that existed in the various Roman provinces.


Leumann's work concerns historical Latin phonetics and morphology. It is characterized by a richness of information that does not hinder the author from maintaining his personal views and judgments. The work is noted for its new ideas and ingenious suggestions and solutions. However, Leumann's ideas about the spoken language tend to be undeveloped, and his method of exposition concerning the spoken language is too simplified.

Manitius's work deals with the history of Latin literature from Justinian to the end of the 12th century. The book is given a general introduction which treats of the major historical developments and how they affect literature. Then, the author divides the book into sections that deal with each genre, and in each of these sections are treated the writers individually. The work is to be commended for its vast scope and bibliography after the treatment of each author. Such bibliographies feature, among other things, the listing of the manuscripts containing the writings of an author.


Meredith discusses Virgilius Grammaticus's treatment of the parts of speech with reference to a selected number of grammarians in the Grammatici Latini of Keil. Many of Meredith's references are unreliable.


The particular, few pages which I used from this book for my thesis proved to be an aid in discussing a possible attempt by
PC to end the *incipit* of his grammatical treatise metrically.
Norden's work on the art of prose from sixth century B.C. Greece
(in two volumes) to the Renaissance is comprehensive, lucidly
written and well documented.

Nunn, H.P.V., *An Introduction to the Study of Ecclesiastical Latin*,

This book is primarily for students who are learning to
read Biblical Latin. The first part deals with the grammatical
peculiarities of the Vulgate and the second part features extracts
from ecclesiastical writers like Bede, Jerome and hymn writers.
Nunn's work proved to have value in this thesis in the commenting
upon particular types of usages employed by PC.

Omont, H., *Concordances des numéros anciens et des numéros actuels*
des mss. latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale
précédées d'une notice sur les anciens catalogues,

The introduction gives an informative, succinct and well
documented history of the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale. This
section, moreover, proved useful for this thesis in the matter
of the provenance of the Paris Lat. 7517. The concordance in
this book dealing with the old and new numbers of mss. in the
Bibliothèque Nationale is indispensable for research in the mss.
added to this library before 1903.

Paré, G. et alii, *La Renaissance du XIIe siècle, Les Ecoles et*
l'enseignement*, vol. 3 of the *Publications de*
l'Institut d'Etudes Médiévales d'Ottawa*, Paris,
Vrin, 1933, 324 p.
The authors of this book have given an historical sketch, large in scope and provocative, of the 12th century in western Europe. The information is abundant, and the traditional sources have not been overlooked.


This book which deals with the history of Christianity in the Middle Ages is directed towards an educated public which is concerned with apologetic questions, the influence of Christianity upon customs and civilization and of the adaptation of the Christian morality in the various areas where the Roman Church existed. The author is to be commended for the judicious citations of his sources and the development of certain questions which have been greatly neglected.


Robins outlines the chief developments in the history of ancient Greek, Roman and Mediaeval Latin grammatical studies. In his narrative he points out both the merits and erroneous aspects of ancient and mediaeval grammatical theories with respect to modern linguistic doctrine. His emphasis on the achievements of ancient and mediaeval grammatical studies as forerunners of present-day linguistic theory often accounts for his neglecting to mention certain important names and schools connected with ancient and mediaeval grammatical studies as cited by H.M. Hoenigswald in *Language*, vol. 29, issue of 1953, p. 181. Robins's exposition is to be commended for its balance, conciseness, and lucidity.

Sommer's work entails a discussion of the phonetic and morphological history of Latin. The author presents his abundant material in a lucid manner. Inspite of the fact that Sommer's book does not incorporate the latest (for his time) fruits of research in comparative Indo-European linguistics, nevertheless, the work was helpful in ascertaining the validity or falsity of some of PC's grammatical assumptions.

Thurot, Charles, Extraits de divers manuscrits latins, pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au Moyen Age, Paris, [Imprimerie Impériale], 1869, 592 p.

In this book Thurot examines numerous mediaeval mss. on Latin grammar to be found in the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale. He groups his discussions of these mss. according to periods. In his discussions he cites copious extracts from the mss., comparing the mss. cited with other mss. and attempting to relate how pertinent and representative the extracts are of the period concerned. Thurot's book is of basic importance for anyone who wishes to do research in Mediaeval Latin grammatical studies.

Uhlfelder's work is an edition of a fourth or fifth century collection of *differentiae*. The particular usefulness of this book is the editor's comment on a Stoic etymology of a word used by PC.


This introduction to the study of Vulgar Latin is designed for the non-specialist. The book is completely dedicated to a theoretical exposition, and the author applies himself studiously towards the utilization of the proofs given in written documents. Vähninen always presents the facts in the proper historical perspective.
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SECONDARY SOURCES - ARTICLES


This article deals with the ninth century Irish grammarian Muridac. Its guiding purpose seems to be to confirm the existence of this author as distinct from a Smaragdus and to inform the reader of the mss. bearing any writings by Muridac. Bischoff mentions the date of PC en passant and in connection with the latter's possible borrowing from Muridac, but Bischoff does not substantiate PC's date with either adequate historical or palaeographical data.

Bischoff, M.B., "La Nomenclature des écritures livresques du IX\textsuperscript{e} au \textsuperscript{XIII}\textsuperscript{e} siècle," in Nomenclature des écritures livresques du IX\textsuperscript{e} au XVI\textsuperscript{e} siècle, Paris, C.N.R.S., 1954, p. 7 - 14.

This article discusses the names of the bookhands of Latin mss. from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries. The study proved valuable in this thesis in my attempt to classify the hand of the Paris Lat. 7517 since there are in this article representative photocopies of similar writing.

The geographical description of the Camaldoli monastery is really the only worthwhile information here. The historical account is credulous and uncritical.


Erdmann discusses the history and etymology of the leonine verse in the Middle Ages. In his giving the date of PC he does not, however, adduce palaeographical evidence in the 7517, but his connecting PC with other 12th century writers who use the term versus leonini is substantiated with quotations from relevant passages.


This article is devoted to the study of the missionary ideals of St. Romuald and was useful in this thesis in the aperçu of Camaldolite history, although Leclercq's article does not concern the Camaldolite order as such.


Pettucci studies the criteria of dating codices of the 11th and 12th centuries and connects the characteristics of these types of hands with early 9th century Carolingian minuscule. The author is systematic, taking each period in three steps: general
characteristics, typical elements, abbreviations and orthographical peculiarities with illustrations. This article proved useful in determining the date of the 7517.


In this article Quain deals with the Mediaeval introductions to Classical works. The particular sections upon which I concentrated are those dealing with the 12th century introductions. Although PC's works are in no way introductions to Classical authors, still certain etymologies appearing in the extracts significant for 12th century accessus were found to have a certain relevance with a practice of PC in the matter of explaining the origin of Donatus.
ABSTRACT OF

The Liber tam de Prisciano quam de Donato a Fratre Paulo Camaldulense Monacho Compositus: First Edition with Commentary

The dissertation consists of the first edition of the Liber tam de Prisciano quam de Donato a Fratre Paulo Camaldulense Monacho Compositus compiled by the twelfth century monk Paulus Camaldulensis. The edition and study are divided into eight parts: Introduction; Sigla and Abbreviations; Latin text; Apparatus Criticus; Fontes et Testimonia; Commentary; Index Nominum et Rerum et Verborum, Index Citationum, Index Verborum Graecorum et Pseudo-Graecorum; and Annotated Bibliography.

The Liber tam de etc., preserved in a twelfth century manuscript of northern Italy now B.N. Lat. 7517, is a treatise on the eight parts of speech formally attributed to the Camaldolite monk Paulus Camaldulensis, whose identification remains inconclusive. The grammatical text is preceded by a prologue which is a table of contents for the entire contents of this manuscript which contains other works by Paulus Camaldulensis. The principles of textual edition are established along with the text history and
are discussed in the Introduction. Emendations are made according to what are the regular facts, usages and ideas of the author. The system of orthography used for this edition is essentially the general practice of the Oxford Classical Texts and Teubner editions, since the manuscript itself with few exceptions follows "Classical" spelling.

The Introduction entails a discussion on the methodology of the dissertation, a brief history of the Camaldolites from their origins to the thirteenth century by way of information, a narrative on the author's life and works, the dating and description of the manuscript, observations on the content, sources, and style of the treatise. The major conclusions about the author's value as a grammarian reached after a study of the manuscript are that Paulus Camaldulensis belongs to the last century of what scholars like R.H. Robins call the "formative" period of Latin grammatical studies in the Middle Ages and that the real value of Paulus Camaldulensis lies in the way he copies Donatus and Priscian and other Late Latin grammarians and his relationship with the large, continuous passages in the ninth century Irish grammarians and Remigius of Auxerre. In the Commentary this relationship is treated in detail and gives us further information on the methods employed in copying and commenting on the texts of Priscian and Donatus in northern Italy in the twelfth century and is a step in the compilation of the text history of Donatus and Priscian commentaries during the twelfth century.