

The Bavarian Commentary and Ovid

ROBIN WAHLSTEN BÖCKERMAN

Qum multa possint inquiri i ca
pice uniuersiq. libri moderni
qda gaudentes butate. tria pn
cipalit inqrenda statuere. idest
materia. intentione. & cui par
ti philosophie supponat. Cu di
ximus parti. estat philosophia
aliqua totu ee unde partes possit
preede. Hc pmo agamus de ethi
mologia ipsius uocabuli. Oim so
phi id sapientes dicebant. s. pitha
gora hoc uident nimis arroganti
apposuit qda remediū. i. sopho.
qd e amor. inde philosophy ama
tor sapientie. Huc usq. equi de
ethimologia ipsi uocabuli. Hc aut
dicant qd sit ipsa res. Philosophia
e ars t naturalis t artificialis. na
turalis e que omib. in e. ut abula
re. loqui. Artificialis que ama
gistro docet q ad discipulo discit.
q hec eade artificialis diuidit in
duas partes. scilicet in literale q.
litteralem. In literalis est. ut siere.
arare. Litteralis que pote dici uera
philosophia diuidit in tria. scil in
phsica logica ethica. Pnsin gce.
latine natura. Inde phsica natura
lis. que diuidit in. iiii. partes sci
licet geometria arithmetica. musi
ca. astronomia. Ge. eni gce lat
terra. ometria. dicit mfsura. in de
geometria mfsura terre. A res. gce

t uirt. medica numerus. in de
arithmetica uirt. numeri. Omsin
gce. hebraice aq. inde musica aq.
tica dr. qa omis uox ab humore &
aeris repercussione chicit. astrono
mia. i. astrorum scientia. Logi
ca diuidit in. iiii. scil. grammaticeam.
rethorica. dialectica. Grama eni g
ce. lat. littera. in de grammaticeam li
terat. Rethor gce. lat. orator.
Dia gce. lat. duo. logos sermo in
de dialectica. sermo duox. Ethica
diuidit in duo scil in bonos mo
res q malos. Ethic eni gce. lat.
mores. in de ethica moralis. Omil
auctor. t pragmatice. t eregrina
rice. t cinonitice. Pragmaticon
ide fabulosu. q est ubi in trodus
re plone locunt ut terentiu. Ex
agematice. ide enarratiuū. ubi
auctor loquit pnsican. Terciu
geni poematis e. Cinoniticeon. i.
comune. ut ouidius iste scribit.
Quidā philosophi fuerunt qui
mundū de nichilo deū fecisse
crediderunt. Quidā uero alii ex
athomis. q in auitate. que duo
semp fuerunt. dicit dñm mundū
fecisse. Alii aut philosophi. sicut
ouidius q. con similes. tria ee semp
dixer. scil. dñi. & .iiii. elemta istmal
compta. & formas omniū rerū i men
te di existentel. i. ideal. hoc e disse

Iste liber e Monasterij Benedictenperoren



<https://www.openbookpublishers.com>

© 2020 Robin Wahlsten Böckerman



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC BY 4.0). This license allows you to share, copy, distribute and transmit the text; to adapt the text and to make commercial use of the text providing attribution is made to the authors (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).

Attribution should include the following information:

Robin Wahlsten Böckerman, *The Bavarian Commentary and Ovid: Clm 4610, The Earliest Documented Commentary on the Metamorphoses*. Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0154>

Copyright and permission for reuse of many images included in this publication differ from the above. Copyright and permissions information for images is provided separately in the List of Illustrations.

In order to access detailed and updated information on the license, please visit <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0154#copyright>

Further details about CC BY licenses are available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

All external links were active at the time of publication unless otherwise stated and have been archived via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine at <https://archive.org/web>

Updated digital material and resources associated with this volume are available at <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0154#resources>

Every effort has been made to identify and contact copyright holders and any omission or error will be corrected if notification is made to the publisher.

ISBN Paperback: 978-1-78374-575-3

ISBN Hardback: 978-1-78374-576-0

ISBN Digital (PDF): 978-1-78374-577-7

DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0154

Cover image: Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München, Munich, clm4610 61v. All rights reserved.

Cover design: Anna Gatti.

4. Form and Function

This chapter focuses on clm 4610 itself, first at a more general level with a discussion about the genre of commentaries, then more specifically about the different aspects of the function of the commentary.

Short Conceptual History of Medieval Commentary Terminology

The preferred word during Antiquity was *commentarius* (sometimes *commentarium*), which originally signified a notebook and then came to mean a treatise or commentary. Examples of the earlier use can be found in Cicero and Suetonius, who both refer to Caesar's works as *commentarii*. Cicero also refers to *commentarii* in his work *De officiis*:

*Quamquam hi tibi tres libri inter Cratippi commentarios tamquam hospites erunt recipiendi.*¹⁵⁰

And yet you must welcome these three books as fellow-guests, so to speak, along with your notes on Cratippus's lectures.

The more specialised meaning *commentarius/commentarium* as a commentary or exposition on a literary work is found later in Gellius, who mentions *commentaria in Virgilium*.¹⁵¹ Another term for commentary, *commentum*, is derived from the verb *comminiscor* (to devise something by careful thought).¹⁵² This word originally had a negative meaning, signifying an invention or a falsehood, as can be seen in the following line from *Metamorphoses* where it is used almost as an antithesis to truth:

mixtaque cum veris passim commenta vagantur. (*Met.* 12:54)

¹⁵⁰ Cicero, *Brutus* 262:80, ed. E. Malcovati (1970); Suetonius *Caesar* 56, ed. M. Ihm (1908); *De officiis*, 3:33, ed. C. Atzert (1963). Translation Walter Miller, *Cicero On Duties* Loeb Classical Library 30, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913.

¹⁵¹ *Nonnulli grammatici aetatis superioris, in quibus est Cornutus Annaeus, haut sane indocti necque ignobiles, qui commentaria in Virgilium composuerunt.* Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 2:6:1, ed. F. Serra (1993).

¹⁵² *commentarius* is thought to be derived from *commentor*, which has virtually the same meaning as *comminiscor*.

Fictions/falsehood (*commenta*) mixed with truths roam at random.

Later, the meaning of the word changed to become one of the two most common words to signify a commentary, the other being *glossa*. Isidore, in his *Etymologiae*, explains that *glossa* is essentially an explanation by means of a synonym, while a *commentaria* or *commenta* is an interpretation.¹⁵³

By the time of the High Middle Ages, the meaning of *commentum* and *glossa* had been modified and developed by the philosophers and grammarians, as has been shown by Rita Copeland in this quotation from William of Conches:

*Ut ait Priscianus in Praeexercitaminibus puerorum, comminisci est plura, studio vel doctrina in mente habita, in unum colligere. Unde commentum dicitur plurium studio vel doctrina in mente habitorum in unum collectio. Et quamvis, secundum hanc diffinitionem, commentum possit dici quislibet liber, tamen non hodie vocamus commentum nisi alterius libri expositoryum. Quod differt a glossa. Commentum enim, solam sententiam exequens, de continuatione vel expositione litere nichil agi. Glossa vero omnia illa exequitur. Unde dicitur glossa, id est lingua. Ita enim aperte debet exponere ac si lingua doctoris videatur docere.*¹⁵⁴

As Priscian says in his *Praeexercitamina* for boys, *comminisci* (to devise) is to collect together many things that are held in the mind by study or teaching. Whence a collection of many things held together in the mind by study or teaching is called a *commentum*. While according to this definition any book can be called a *commentum*, nevertheless today we do

¹⁵³ *Glossa Graeca interpretatione linguae sortitur nomen. Hanc philosophi adverbium dicunt, quia vocem illam, de cuius requiritur, uno et singulari verbo designat. Quid enim illud sit in uno verbo positum declarat, ut: 'conticescere est tacere'. Etymologiae 1:30, ed. W. M. Lindsay (1911); Commentaria dicta, quasi cum mente. Sunt enim interpretationes, ut commenta iuris, commenta Eoangelii. (Etymologiae 6:8:5); Isidore also gives us the meaning of *scholia*, which, although a frequently used term in modern research, does not seem to be much in use during the period that concerns us. He defines *scholia* as a brief explanation of something obscure or difficult. *Primum genus excerpta sunt, quae Graece scholia nuncupantur; in quibus ea quae videntur obscura vel difficilia summatim ac breviter praestringuntur.* (Etymologiae 6:8:1).*

¹⁵⁴ Text and translation from Rita Copeland, 'Gloss and Commentary', in *Oxford Handbook of Medieval Latin Literature*, ed. R. Hexter and D. Townsend (Oxford: 2012), <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.SA-EB.3.4872>.

not call it a *commentum* unless it is an exposition of another book. This is the difference between *commentum* and *glosa*: a *commentum* only pursues the sense, but is not at all concerned with the context (*continuatio*) or with exposition of the letter. A *glosa* deals with all these matters. Whence it is called *glosa*, that is, tongue. For truly a gloss ought to expound clearly, as if seeming to teach from the speech of the scholar.

In this instance, the two terms would seem to have the opposite meaning to that in Isidore, where *commentum* is the term signifying interpretation, while in this case it is *glossa*. However, in drawing conclusions from how commentary texts were actually labelled during the period, Munk Olsen has shown that there was no strict or consistent distinction in the use of the terms. The plural *glosse* is used most frequently (with the diminutive *glossule* modestly used for longer commentaries), while *commentum* is generally reserved for supposedly ancient commentary texts, for instance Servius's commentary on Virgil.¹⁵⁵ Many other less frequent and more specialised terms were also in use, e.g. *expositio*, *interpretationes* or *tractatus*.¹⁵⁶

The prologue to a commentary, in modern scholarship commonly referred to as *accessus*, was often not labelled as such. The word *accessus* is rare and is found in only a few manuscripts.¹⁵⁷ One such manuscript is the *Metamorphoses* commentary in the manuscript Prague VIII H32, which is discussed further in the next chapter.¹⁵⁸

When discussing the medieval terminology, it should be noted that, with one single exception, neither clm 4610 nor any of the texts belonging to the Bavarian B family, or any other twelfth-century *Metamorphoses* commentary I have examined, carry a contemporary title with a genre designation. The exception is the manuscript Salzburg AV4 where a rubric, which seems to be written by the same or a contemporary hand, designates the commentary as *glosse*. Where

¹⁵⁵ Munk Olsen 2009, pp. 6-7.

¹⁵⁶ For a thorough survey of the medieval usage, see Munk Olsen vol 2009, pp. 3-9. Munk Olsen discusses the usage and definition of different commentary terminology by different medieval authors, both famous and anonymous. He also conducts a survey of what terms the medieval library catalogues use. See also Copeland 2012. To this I can add my observation that if one searches through the collections in DMGH, the digital version of Monumenta Germaniae Historica, *commentarius*, usually in the accusative plural *commentarios*, seems to be more common than *commentum*.

¹⁵⁷ Munk Olsen 2009, p. 7.

¹⁵⁸ Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky VIII H32. The word appears as the final word of the *accessus* on 78^{va}.

the other commentaries are concerned, in the few instances where they do carry a title, these have all been added by a later medieval hand. Thus, with regard to the *Metamorphoses* commentaries, we mainly have access to later terminology.¹⁵⁹

Terminology Used in This Book

The terminology I employ when discussing the commentary encompasses the following:

When discussing different formats of commentaries, *catena* commentary is used to signify a freestanding commentary. The other type of commentary found in the margins of the commented-upon text is referred to as just that, marginal commentary (with the added term ‘interlinear gloss’ used when needed). The term *catena* was first developed to describe Biblical commentary, but seems to have been transposed to the description of commentaries on ancient authors by John Ward in 1996.¹⁶⁰ It is possible, perhaps even preferable, to instead speak of ‘freestanding lemmatic commentary’, but I have chosen to use *catena* commentary since it is the term used by other Ovid scholars.¹⁶¹ It is also preferable to be able to distinguish between different types of freestanding commentaries, such as the lemmatic commentary and a commentary with a freer relationship to the target text (for instance Fulgentius’s *Expositio Virgilianae continentiae secundum philosophos moralis*). This is another reason why *catena* serves a purpose as far as terminology is concerned. Other scholars have chosen different terminology; James Zetzel, for instance, uses simply ‘commentary’ for *catena*, and *scholia* and *glosses* for marginal and interlinear commentary.¹⁶²

When I speak of the text itself ‘commentary’ denotes the whole text, in this case clm 4610. The commentary consists of smaller parts, namely:

lemma: word/-s from the commented upon text

¹⁵⁹ Later medieval hands have labelled clm 4610 as *commentum*.

¹⁶⁰ J. O. Ward ‘From marginal gloss to *catena* commentary: the eleventh-century origins of a rhetorical teaching tradition in the medieval West’ in *Parergon*, vol 13:2 (1996), 109-120. For a brief survey of the biblical *catena* see Nigel G. Wilson ‘A Chapter in the History of Scholia’ in *The Classical Quarterly*, vol .17:2 (1967), pp. 252-254.

¹⁶¹ Particularly in Frank T. Coulson’s work on later Ovid commentaries, for a list of such see bibliography.

¹⁶² James E. G. Zetzel, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: The Commentum Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius*, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement, 84 (London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2005), p. 4-8.

explanation: the main text in the commentary, which usually follows directly after the lemma. In circa seventy-five percent of the commentary, each lemma is provided with one explanation, which may be either short or long. In the remaining twenty-five percent, the lemma is provided with more than one explanation, which sometimes take the appearance of a string of explanations not always necessarily related to the original lemma.

While lemma is an established term, there does not seem to be a generally agreed upon term for the text that follows the lemma. Mariken Teeuwen, among others, uses the Latin term *interpretamentum*.¹⁶³ This term, however, does not seem to be in widespread usage in English-speaking literature on commentaries. Birger Munk Olsen prefers to use ‘glosses’ (*gloses*) instead of ‘explanations’, while I have chosen to use ‘gloss’ only when referring to marginal or interlinear commentaries.¹⁶⁴ In this book ‘explanation’ is thus to be understood as a technical term denoting the different units that, together with the lemma, make up the commentary. As a term it is convenient in being immediately understandable, but also inconvenient since it can be confused with other uses of ‘explanation’. I have not, however, found a better word for a part of the text I most often need to refer to.

The Nature of the Commentary: What is clm 4610?

What does the text preserved in manuscript clm 4610 represent? This question leads to further questions, such as whether it is an original or a copy; whether it descends from a marginal commentary; or whether perhaps it has generated a marginal commentary instead? Or simply: who made the text and for what purpose?

To delve deeper into the question of the origin of a commentary, one must look closer at what could be termed the commentary technology itself, which presents itself in the form of the freestanding commentary and the marginal commentary or scholia. These two formats have always existed in a state of flux, where freestanding commentary can be contracted, abridged and chopped up to marginal commentary, then to be reassembled at a later point into a freestanding commentary with new ingredients. James Zetzel, who has made the sharpest analysis of this process in his work on the *Commentum Cornuti* on Persius, describes the historical process as having three steps. Due

¹⁶³ Mariken Teeuwen ‘Carolingian Scholarship on Classical Authors: Practice of Reading and Writing’ in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Book Culture: Manuscripts of the Latin Classics 800-1200*, ed. Erik Kwakkel (Leiden University Press 2015).

¹⁶⁴ Munk Olsen 2014, pp. 9-10.

to the technological restraint of the papyrus roll, the oldest commentaries are believed to have been freestanding. These freestanding commentaries were then transformed into marginal commentaries in late antiquity. During the Carolingian period, with its surge in manuscript production, the marginal commentaries were again copied into freestanding form. After this period, the commentaries could be copied either as a freestanding or a marginal commentary.¹⁶⁵ This is only a rough sketch of a complicated process, regarding which Zetzel formulates some important restrictions: for example, when considering a freestanding commentary, we cannot assume that the marginalia and other types of texts used to create the new text travelled from margin to commentary via the simple process of excerpting, nor that marginalia in its turn derived from a single ancient commentary.¹⁶⁶

Even if it is in a commentary's nature to be constantly adopted and changed, a commentary can, for different reasons, become stabilised, and from a certain point in time more or less only copied in its stable form. Whether or not this is the case with clm 4610 is difficult to say, since we only have access to this one copy. The other families, discussed further in the next chapter, show some signs of being stable, but there always seems to be room for additions.

When speculating about the origin of clm 4610 we can turn to older commentaries on Ovid, older commentaries on other authors, and/or other types of texts. Sources used in the commentary will be discussed in the last section of this chapter, and the relationship to the material found in the margins of older *Metamorphoses* manuscripts is the subject of the next chapter. Besides these there only exists one older commentary-like text, the so-called Pseudo-Lactantian *Narrationes*, which does not seem to have had any greater impact on clm 4610. This text has been ascribed to many different authors, of which Lactantius Placidus is the name most commonly used, for example in Hugo Magnus's edition of the *Metamorphoses*, which also includes an edition of the *Narrationes*.¹⁶⁷ The attribution to Lactantius cannot be found in any of the medieval manuscripts and is today considered spurious, which has led some scholars to rename this text. For example, instead

¹⁶⁵ Zetzel 2005, p. 6-8. Zetzel also makes a valid point as to why there are several manuscripts with marginalia preserved from late antiquity and not freestanding commentaries. This is because the preserved manuscripts are big and expensive showpieces, which have been preserved because of their value, while simpler texts, although perhaps more representative, have not.

¹⁶⁶ Zetzel 2005, p. 86.

¹⁶⁷ P. Ovidi Nasonis *Metamorphoseon libri XV: Lactanti Placidi qui dicitur Narrationes fabularum Ovidianarum*, ed. Hugo Magnus (Berlin: Weidmann, 1914).

of using Pseudo-Lactantius as a placeholder name, Alan Cameron uses *Narrator* to refer to the compiler of the *Narrationes*.¹⁶⁸ The *Narrationes* has come down to us either as marginal text in *Metamorphoses* manuscripts, as text interspersed in the *Metamorphoses* text or as a separate text. The *Narrationes* has been dated to no earlier than the sixth century and is considered to be derived from a lost Late Antique commentary; however, Cameron argues that the *Narrationes* is, in fact, a mythographic companion to the *Metamorphoses* composed around 150-250 A.D.¹⁶⁹ Regardless of whether the *Narrationes* was composed in the second to third century or in the sixth century, it is the only text of a commentary nature we have on the *Metamorphoses* before around 1100 and clm 4610. As can be seen in the manuscript description in the next chapter, the *Narrationes* can be found in many of the older *Metamorphoses* manuscripts and it is highly likely that the person or persons compiling clm 4610 would have had access to it. Perhaps it is for this very reason there are no significant traces of the *Narrationes* in clm 4610.

Another aspect of clm 4610 that needs considering is who might have made and used the commentary. There is no explicit voice of the author, scribe or other person available in clm 4610 to tell us who created the commentary and to what end. This holds true for all the twelfth-century *Metamorphoses* commentaries except for Arnulf of Orléans's commentary. In this case the author makes himself visible and claims authorship at the very end of the commentary by incorporating the last line of the *Metamorphoses* in a type colophon where he also gives his name paired with Ovid's.¹⁷⁰ A text such as clm 4610 opens itself up to being interpreted in several different ways, such as:

1. A student's notes taken from a master's teaching and/or private reading.
2. A schoolmaster's lecture notes.
3. A schoolmaster's or other intellectual's private study notes.
4. An archival document compiled in order to preserve information from one or several sources.

¹⁶⁸ Alan Cameron *Greek mythography in the Roman world* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 3-33.

¹⁶⁹ Cameron 2004, p. 311. For a discussion of alternative dating of the *Narrationes* see R. J. Tarrant 'The *Narrationes* of 'Lactantius' and the Transmission of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*' in *Formative Stages of Classical Traditions: Latin Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, ed. O. Pecere and M. D. Reeve (Spoleto 1995), pp. 83-115.

¹⁷⁰ Clm 7205, 58v. For more on this see Engelbrecht 2008.

The first three alternatives can be summarised as commentary for the schoolroom or for private use. The question of which it was led to a series of articles in the 1980s, where Michael Lapidge, on the one hand, argued for private use, and A.G. Rigg and G.R. Wieland, on the other hand, argued for schoolroom use.¹⁷¹ This debate has been analysed by Malcolm Godden in a chapter in the 2011 volume *Rethinking and Recontextualizing Glosses* and he concisely sums up the debate like this:¹⁷²

Lapidge argued that such glosses had nothing to do with the activities of the Anglo-Saxon classroom, whether as the responses of the students or as aids to the teacher, but if they had any contemporary function at all, which he doubted, were aids for private reading, while Wieland argued that they were records of, and aids for, the activities and concerns of the Anglo-Saxon teacher.¹⁷³

Godden then proceeds to show some proofs for scholarly use of glossed Boethius manuscripts. He shows how four different scholars from the tenth and eleventh centuries used glosses from specific Boethius manuscripts in their own texts, which proves that the glosses were not necessarily used to explain Boethius' text but to produce new knowledge; in short, it proves they were not used only for teaching. These arguments allow for a new way of seeing the commentary, which allows for more leeway than only regarding it as a schoolroom document.

However, Godden and the others are all discussing a very specific type of commentary: the glossed text. The freestanding commentary is quite a different thing, especially if we keep the fact about Arnulf the

¹⁷¹ Michael Lapidge 'The Study of Latin Texts in Late Anglo-Saxon England, I. The Evidence of Latin Glosses', N. Brooks, ed., *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain* (Leicester: University Press 1982), pp. 99-140. (Reprinted in Lapidge, *Anglo-Latin Literature 600-899*, (Hambledon Press, 1996), pp. 455-498).

A.G. Rigg and G.R. Wieland, 'A Canterbury Classbook of the Mid-Eleventh Century', *Anglo Saxon England* 4 (1975), p. 113-130. A. G. Wieland 'The Glossed Manuscript: Classbook or Library Book?', *Anglo Saxon England* 14 (1985), pp. 153-173.

¹⁷² Malcolm Godden 'Glosses to the *Consolation of Philosophy* in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Their Origins and their Uses' in *Rethinking and Recontextualizing Glosses: New Perspectives in the Study of Late Anglo-Saxon Glossography*, ed. Patrizia Lendinara, *Textes et Études Du Moyen Âge*, 54 (Porto: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, 2011), pp. 67-93, <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.TEMA-EB.4.00835>. Many of the chapters in this volume can be said to be strong contributions to this debate.

¹⁷³ Godden, p. 68.

schoolmaster in mind. If we also consider the material aspect, the high cost of parchment makes it highly unlikely that a commentary text is a student notebook, even though the *Metamorphoses* commentaries are only little booklets. The equivalent to today's student notes would have been made on wax tablets or, at most, parchment scraps. The students were also often left to simply memorise everything the masters expounded to them. As for the teachers, Pierre Riché points out that the schoolmasters often travelled with their own books and continuously sought new books to use in their teaching.¹⁷⁴ In preparation for their lessons, the masters took down their own notes (or had a student copy them) and in so doing they also reused previous masters' material in their own work.¹⁷⁵

However, the teacher-student dichotomy need not be so sharp. We could also imagine a more mature student, a junior intellectual, who has recorded some new findings, perhaps while travelling from one master to another, or when visiting a particular monastery or cathedral. In this scenario the commentary could have belonged to a type of student.

We must also realise that memory and oral culture are essential in understanding the interaction between master and student, between written text and spoken word. Mary Carruthers has shown us the vast amount of information that could, and was, memorised during the medieval period.¹⁷⁶ To this we must add the supposition that, just as today, the majority of the 'teaching actions' in the schoolroom were oral rather than textual (even though the final goal might have been to foster competent Latin composition). This means that we can never use the commentary as anything more than an incomplete record of the actions in the schoolroom, if it was ever used there.

¹⁷⁴ Riché 1979, pp. 216-219.

¹⁷⁵ As a short digression, it may be worth mentioning that one of the few authors who discusses the actual composing of a commentary during this time is Guibert of Nogent. When he composed his commentary, 1083-1086, he did so as a monk with acknowledged intellectual capabilities, but not as a schoolmaster. He did not write a commentary on the Roman authors, but on the first books of Genesis. He writes of how he first composed a prologue of sorts and then wrote his analysis in a tropological mode, from beginning to end directly on the parchment page, without first writing drafts. This manner of composing a commentary, writing without a draft, must not be taken completely seriously, or at least not as representative of the standard way of composing a commentary. See Guibert de Nogent, *Autobiographie*, ed. E.-R. Labande (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1981), pp. 142-146.

¹⁷⁶ Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

The fourth option, the archival document, is analytically quite sterile, since it presents an end to a discussion rather than a beginning. However, we must still keep in mind the possibility that all knowledge was not necessarily gathered to be used in a calculated way, but could also be gathered for the sake of gathering.

The Language of the Commentary

In this chapter, I will make a brief overview of the language of the commentary in terms of vocabulary and grammatical structure, which will serve as a basis for the discussion of the function of the commentary.

The explanations are usually given in a short, compact language, not displaying any particular attempts at style. The explanations are either very short or work as a chain in which detail after detail is linked to the preceding with the help of attributes or dependant clauses. One and the same lemma can also be elucidated by a string of explanations, with words signifying alternatives. In a few cases, the explanations are longer and take a more narrative form.

The commentary is transmitted as an anonymous work and the voice in the commentary is usually an impersonal third-person form, but every now and then an 'I' appears. However, this form is a part of standard commentary style and not indicative of an author's voice or anything similar. This 'I' appears five times in the shape of a first-person verb.¹⁷⁷ In these cases the first-person form of the verb functions as an emphasis when the syntax is explained, e.g. VENERIS, *dico*, PROSPICIENTIS. Here *dico* signals that these two forms belong together and it also serves the function of referring back to an earlier part of the explanation where *veneris* is discussed, but not in relation to the word *prospicientis*. There are also several other first-person forms appearing in the commentary, but these are all used in the paraphrasing explanations, which will be discussed below under Function of the commentary.

Vocabulary

The vocabulary in the commentary is, usually, not complicated. It employs standard expressions most of the time, e.g. *interficio* is almost always used for 'to kill', *colo* for 'to venerate'. Intercourse (the explanations often triggered by the 'adventures' of Jupiter) is denoted by either *rem habere* or *concumbere*.

The vocabulary can get technical when cosmographical matters are discussed, as well as in some other cases. In the *accessus*, for instance,

¹⁷⁷ *dico*: edition l. 214, 335, 859, 1731; *puto*: edition l. 1514.

we have the following words: *naturalis* – *artificialis*, *literals* – *inliterals* (natural – artificial, literal – non-literal), *dragmatice*, *exagematice*, *cinomitice* (dramatic, explanatory and mixed style) taken from the philosophical and aesthetical realm. In Book 1, we have *intellegibilis* (hypothetical) and in Book 2 *dimidium signum* (astrological half sign).

In Book 9, we have the rare *werra* for the more common *guerra* (war) and the even rarer *inventicius* (foundling). Besides these, the commentary contains three words that are not found in any of the dictionaries. In Book 2 *lavilis* (probably meaning ‘ability to clean’), in Book 9 *inethos* (which seems to mean ‘unethical’) and in Book 11 *sigere*, a word which is not found anywhere else, although the explanation makes it clear that it is formed from the place name Sigeum and is meant to be a synonym for *latere* (to hide/lurk). This word is probably a misunderstanding, because, in Servius, we read that the place was named after *sige*, which Servius claims is the Greek word for ‘silence’.¹⁷⁸ Silence has then been confused with ‘to hide/lurk’, which is what was done at Sigeum.

There are a few examples of specific Christian Latin words being used, such as *capellas* (chapels) in Book 1 and *reliquiis* (relics) in Book 13.

In Books 4 and 8, we have two instances of what might be signs of native German speakers’ mistakes or variants, namely *fas* for *vas* and *fatem* for *vatem*. F for v is usually associated with German, but according to Peter Stotz, the use was not limited to the German lands but can, for example, also be observed in manuscripts from England.¹⁷⁹ Another possible indication of German speakers could be the abovementioned word *werra*. It is Old High German, which in other texts has then been Latinised to *guerra*.¹⁸⁰

In Book 6, we have the rare form *faxanum* for *phasianus*. This form, according to Du Cange, is only reported in a charter without provenance from 1345.

Language on Sentence Level

The first example illustrates the simplest possible language in an explanation:

¹⁷⁸ Servius in *Aen.* 2:312, ed. Thilo-Hagen (1881-1902).

¹⁷⁹ Peter Stotz *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters. Bd. 3, Lautlehre.* (München: Beck, 1996) pp. 272-273.

¹⁸⁰ Stotz 1996, p. 152.

DENSIOR H<IS> T<ELLVS> ELEMENTA G<RANDIA> T<RAXIT>, scilicet truncos, lapides et cetera, que sunt partes terre. (1:29)¹⁸¹

The earth heavier than these dragged the larger elements along, that is to say: tree trunks, stones and other things that are parts of the earth.

The explanation is signalled by *scilicet* (that is to say) and then *elementa grandia* (larger elements) is explained by adding concrete examples (tree trunks, stones and other things). These are then further explained with a relative clause (that are parts of the earth).

The following sentence is an example of the use of prepositional phrases in the commentary:

Ipolitus fuit acusatus Theso patri suo a nouerca Phedra, quia, cum ipse, puer, rogatus esset ab ea, ut iaceret secum, et nollet, illa dixit Theso, quod ex hoc rogata esset ab illo, sed abiecit eum. (2:646)

Hippolytos was accused by his mother-in-law Phaedra in front of his father Theseus, since when as a boy he was asked by Phaedra to sleep with her and he refused, she told Theseus that he had asked her about this, but that she had rejected him.

This sentence may look clumsy, but it is constructed to achieve maximal precision. The names, as so often, have epithets (*Theso patri suo*), which makes the sentence seem crowded. Here he is asked by her (*rogatus esset ab ea*) to sleep with her (*ut iaceret secum*) and when he refuses, she turns it around and claims that she was asked by him (*rogata esset ab illo*) regarding this thing (*ex hoc*). The use of the same prepositional construction might not look very elegant, but it makes the order of events and the players involved unequivocally clear to the reader.

The last example is of a longer and slightly more complex passage (I have arranged each sentence on a new line for maximum clarity):

*PHRIXEAQVE VELLERA.
Athemas de quadam marina dea habuit Frixum et Hellem.
Qui secum manere nequerunt pro afflictione nouerce I[u]nonis.
Et cum recedendo uenirent ad mare, mater eorum dedit eis arietem
habentem aureum uellus et ualentem tam ire per mare quam per*

¹⁸¹ When entire passages from the edition are quoted, reference is given to the lemma by book and line in the *Metamorphoses* (listed in the left margin in the edition).

terram, ut in eo sedentes transirent mare, predicens illum esse submersurum, qui retro aspiceret.

Et quia Helle retro aspexit, submersa est, unde mare, in quo cecidit, Hellespontiacum dicitur.

Phrixus transiens per mare, quod est inter Sexton et Abidon, ad Cholcon insulam iuit et ibi arietem Marti consecrauit uel sacrificauit.

Et <eo> sacrificio translatus est signum celeste.

Vellus uero positum in sumitate cuiusdam arboris custoditur a dracone in ea inuoluto, ne uellus inde auferatur, quia, si aufereretur, non esset ibi caput mundi, sed locus ille, in quo fuerit uellus. (7:7)

THE PHRIXEAN FLEECE.

Athamas had Phrixus and Helle from a sea goddess.

They could not stay with him because of oppression from their step-mother, Ino.

And when they were departing and came to the sea, their mother gave them a ram that had a golden fleece and could walk on water as well as on land, so that they might cross the sea sitting on it and she warned them that the one who looked back would be drowned.

Since Helle looked back, she was drowned, wherefore the sea into which she fell is called the Hellespont.

Phrixus crossed the sea between Sestos and Abydos and came to the island of Colchis and there he consecrated or sacrificed the ram to Mars.

When the ram had been sacrificed it was transformed into a heavenly sign.

The fleece was placed in the top of a tree and is guarded by a serpent wrapped around it, so that the fleece cannot be carried away, because, if it were to be carried away, then the centre of the world would not be there, but in the place where the fleece would be.

This explanation is around eleven lines long and consists of seven complete sentences in the edition. The subordinate clauses used are relative, temporal with *cum*, final *ut*-clause and final *ne*-clause, causal clause with *quia*, and a conditional clause. This example also contains an ablative absolute, several participles and one gerund.

The explanation is not linked to the lemma with any words, but consists of reactions to the words in the lemma. *Phrixeaque* in the

lemma is explained with the differently spelled *Frixum* in the first sentence, and *vellera* is picked up in the third sentence.

The language is not sophisticated, but correct and precise. It aims at including a maximum amount of detail with a minimum of ambiguity. There are not really any unusual or irregular words or phrases, except perhaps for *recedendo* in the third sentence, which I interpret as a modal ablative, but this form is otherwise rarely used in the commentary. The *uel* connecting the last two verbs in the fifth sentence, *consecrauit uel sacrificauit*, tells us that this might have originally been a marginal gloss introducing an alternative synonym, but its inclusion in the running text does not affect the grammar. The last sentence contains four subordinate clauses and is fairly complex.

The examples above describe what the sentences used in explanations to the lemma in the commentary look like. Where the connection between the lemma and the explanations is concerned, this is done by either the use of a *id est* or a *quia* and a subsequent explanation, or simply by starting the explanation without any specific connectors in the beginning, but the explanation may then instead pick up one or several words from the lemma.

Sometimes pronouns, nouns or verbs can also be added directly to the lemma and are used as a very compact type of explanation. This will be described further in the next section.

Function

The commentary in clm 4610 fills twenty-three folios and numbers, in total, circa 16,500 words, which comment on around 460 passages from all fifteen books of the *Metamorphoses*. The following sections aim to investigate the form and function of the entire commentary. The first thing to be discussed is the prologue to the commentary, the *accessus*, which has a distinct character compared to the rest of the commentary and is therefore best treated separately. After this the function and, finally, its use of sources will be discussed.

The *accessus*

The *accessus* is a general introduction to the work in question and can function as a separate text with its own transmission history. The *accessus* in general is short and more discursive than the commentary text it precedes, so it has received far more scholarly attention than the long, difficult commentary texts. A significant amount of research has therefore been conducted on the *accessus*, which, in turn, attracts further research, while the commentary texts themselves are neglected: this has created an imbalance in the research on, for instance, the

reception of Ovid.¹⁸² The *accessus* provides good material for the study of the medieval theory of interpreting text, but to study the practice of interpreting the text more editions of commentary texts are needed.

The *accessus* in clm 4610 spans over circa fifty lines in the manuscript and two pages in the edition. It consists of a short introduction and then eight different parts, which are not linked to each other in any particular manner. The *accessus* is never followed up in the commentary itself, which seems to be typical for most *accessus* and the texts they introduce. However, it is important to note that the *accessus* is an integrated part of the commentary in this manuscript; it is written by the same hand and there is no division between the end of the *accessus* and the beginning of Book 1.

It most closely follows the schemes for the so-called philosophical and the modern type of *accessus*.¹⁸³ The philosophical type, thought to be derived from Boethius, applies the following topics when analysing a work: intention of the author; utility and order of the work; name of the author; title and part of philosophy under which it is classified. The modern type adopts intention, utility and part of philosophy from the philosophical type and adds to them the topic of subject matter.

The *accessus* in clm 4610 begins with acknowledging the different traditions for composing an *accessus* by mentioning that many things can be investigated regarding any book, but that 'the moderns' prescribe three topics only: subject matter (*materia*), intention (*intentio*) and to which part of philosophy the work belongs to (*cui parti philosophiae*).¹⁸⁴ Of these three, subject matter is never treated, but intention and 'part of philosophy' as well as the unannounced topics utility (*utilitas*) and title (*titulus*) are discussed.

Intention is treated twice. The first time the *accessus* echoes Horace, claiming that Ovid's intention is, just as any other author's, to entertain and by so doing also to give some moral instructions.¹⁸⁵ This

¹⁸² For more on the medieval theory of interpretation see *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, volume 2 The Middle Ages*, ed. Alastair J. Minnis and I. Johnson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

¹⁸³ The following is based on Wheeler's introduction to *Accessus ad auctores* (p. 2). Wheeler gives ample references to previous research, of which the most commonly referred to works are: R. W. Hunt 'The Introduction to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century' in *Studia Mediaevalia in Honorem Admodum Reverendi Patris Raymundi Josephi Martin* (Bruges: De Tempel, 1948); and Alastair J. Minnis *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988). I use Wheeler's translation of the Latin terms in the following.

¹⁸⁴ Edition I. 1-3.

¹⁸⁵ Horace, *Ars poetica* l. 333, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey (1995).

is then combined with the topic ‘part of philosophy’ by stating that most authors lean towards ethics.¹⁸⁶ The second time intention is treated it does not concern Ovid specifically. Instead, it is said that poets, in general, are *correptores* (stern correctors) and *immitatores* (imitators) of the Latin language.¹⁸⁷ This is a somewhat strange expression. It could be an error, and is indeed treated as such by Meiser, who emendated it to *correctores* and *emendatores* (correctors and emendators), which is easier to understand.¹⁸⁸ *Correptores* as a scribal error for *correctores* is, of course, easily understandable, but it is nevertheless possible to make a sensible reading out of *correptores* and *immitatores* in the sense of authors imitating and handing down good classical Latin to new generations.¹⁸⁹

The utility of the work is said to be twofold: Ovid brings to light forgotten stories and he helps the reader with Latin composition.¹⁹⁰

The last paragraph brings up the topic ‘title of the work’.¹⁹¹ The fact that it states the title as *Incipit liber Ouidii Metamorphoseos* has led previous researchers to mistake it for a sign that the commentary actually starts here, but this is simply a reference to the title of the work as written in the manuscript the commentator used.¹⁹² This is then followed by an etymological explanation of the title, which is typical for this topic.

The main body of the *accessus* does not concern Ovid, but is rather a short, general treaty on what philosophy is, triggered by the phrase *cui parti philosophie* in the introduction. The *accessus* continues by carefully describing these parts, along with an etymology for *philosophus*, which ascribes the word to Pythagoras.¹⁹³ This etymology seems to have been immensely popular during the Middle Ages and is used by, among others, Roger Bacon, who ascribes it to Augustinus.¹⁹⁴ Then follows a description of the different parts of philosophy and the etymology of these different parts.

The division of philosophy according to the *accessus* is as follows:

¹⁸⁶ Edition I. 53.

¹⁸⁷ Edition I. 58.

¹⁸⁸ Meiser 1885, p. 51.

¹⁸⁹ I have thus chosen not to correct this phrase in the edition.

¹⁹⁰ Edition I. 54.

¹⁹¹ Edition I. 59-62.

¹⁹² For examples of medieval titles, see Tarrant 2004, p. 1 (apparatus).

¹⁹³ Edition I. 4-28.

¹⁹⁴ Roger Bacon *Opus maius pars secunda*, ed. J. H. Bridges (1900), 3.61. Bacon mentions Augustinus’s *De Civitate Dei* Book 8, but I have not found the relevant passage. Chapter 8:4 does, however, treat Pythagoras and the other ancient philosophers.

Philosophia: naturalis vel artificialis

aritificalis: inliterals vel literalis

literals: phisica, logica, ethica

phisica: geometria, arithmetica, musica, astronomia

logica: gramatica, rhetorica, dialectica

ethica: boni et mali mores

In this taxonomy, the liberal arts have been inserted under the general header *philosophia*. The category *philosophia literalis phisica* equates to the quadrivium and the *logica* the trivium. A similar division is found in a contemporary work by Rupert of Deutz in the chapter *De scientia* (book 7:3) of *De operibus spiritus sancti*.¹⁹⁵

After having described these and their sub-categories, we get a seemingly unrelated paragraph describing the different modes of writing, an *accessus* topic that Ralph Hexter calls *modus recitandi*.¹⁹⁶ Here we learn that Ovid writes in the mixed mode, which is a mixture of two modes: the dramatic (where characters speak) and exegematic (where only the authors speak). This division is also found as *accessus* 26 in the *Accessus ad auctores*, the *accessus* to *Heroides*, where there is textual corruption at the very place where the mixed mode is described using the same word as in clm 4610, *cinamicticon*.¹⁹⁷ This word, *cinomenticon* in clm 4610, *cinamicticon* in the *Heroides accessus*, is of Greek origin and is probably related to the following passage from Bede's *De arte metrica*:

*aut commune uel mixtum, quod graeci coenon uel micton
uocant.*¹⁹⁸

Common or mixed, which the Greeks call *coenon* or *micton*.

From this passage, it would appear as though a compound word has been constructed in the *accessus* from the two alternatives suggested by Bede (*coenon* or *micton*). A similar description, but without the Greek words, is found in Servius on the *Bucolica*, and, in the fifth century, the Virgil commentary of Junius Philargyrius, which uses only *micton* in this case.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁵ *De sancta Trinitate et operibus eius. Libri 1-9*, ed. R. Haacke (1971).

¹⁹⁶ Hexter 1986, p. 161. Ed. 1. 29–33.

¹⁹⁷ *Accessus ad auctores*, p. 90.

¹⁹⁸ Beda Venerabilis *De arte metrica* 25:4, ed. C. B. Kendall (1975).

¹⁹⁹ Thilo-Hagen vol. 3:1, 29 and vol. 3:2, 2. Hexter discusses this passage, but seems to have the wrong reference. He refers to Thilo-Hagen 3.1-2, where I can find nothing relating to this. cf Hexter 1986, p. 162.

After this follows a three-paragraph description of three different schools of philosophers and their compatibility with Christianity, some of which appear to be derived from Macrobius or an intermediary.²⁰⁰ This section of the text, which begins *quidam philosophi fuerunt*, can be found in all of the manuscripts in the Bavarian B family as well as in the margin of a late twelfth-century *Metamorphoses* manuscript.²⁰¹

The *accessus* in clm 4610 is unique in that the majority of the text is not related directly to Ovid or the *Metamorphoses*. The different *accessus* in the Bavarian B family stay much closer to the typical form of the *accessus* and primarily focus on Ovid and the *Metamorphoses*.²⁰² This also seems to be the case with all the other *Metamorphoses accessus* from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.²⁰³ The fact that clm 4610 is the oldest preserved commentary and that the *accessus* mainly discusses different aspects of philosophy may be a sign of what sort of associations the readers made when they read and discussed the *Metamorphoses*.

Function of the Commentary: Categories of Explanation

The following contains a discussion of an inventory of all the explanations in the entire commentary, and what sorting them into different explanatory categories can tell us about what purpose they might have served.

A similar method has also been employed in previous scholarship. The scholar best known for applying a strict set of categories to his material is G. E. Wieland in *The Latin Glosses on Arator and Prudentius*.²⁰⁴ Wieland has defined five major categories of glosses: glosses on prosody, lexical, grammatical, syntactical and commentary glosses. These categories contain several sub-groups, for example, the category 'commentary glosses' contains seven sub-categories. Wieland's explicit purpose is to 'reach conclusions about *all* the functions of Latin

²⁰⁰ For more on this see chapter 2 The Fate of Ovid Until the Twelfth Century. See also Herren 2004, pp. 221-223. Macrobius, *Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis* 1.2.14, ed. J. Willis (1970). Edition I. 34-50.

²⁰¹ Copenhagen, Det kongelige bibliotek, GKS 2008 4:0. The *accessus* is edited by Paule Demats, pp. 179-184.

²⁰² The *accessus* of the Bavarian B family is also discussed in chapter 5.

²⁰³ For examples of other *accessus* to the *Metamorphoses* see *Accessus ad auctores* and Frank T. Coulson 'Hitherto Unedited Medieval and Renaissance Lives of Ovid' I-II in *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987) pp. 152-207; 59 (1997) pp. 111-53.

²⁰⁴ Gernot R. Wieland, *The Latin glosses on Arator and Prudentius in Cambridge University library, Ms GG.5.35* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1983).

glosses'.²⁰⁵ He seeks to do this as a reaction to older research, which, in his opinion, has been overly focused on vernacular or bilingual glossing.

The empirical material in Suzanne Reynolds and her *Medieval Reading: Grammar, Rhetoric and the Classical Text* consists of commentaries on Horace, but the categories she uses as well as her other analytical methods are focused on arguing in favour of her overarching research object, namely medieval reading.²⁰⁶ Reynolds uses at least seven categories, each of which contains several sub-categories. A third example, and most relevant to research on Ovid, is Ralph Hexter and his work *Ovid and Medieval Schooling*.²⁰⁷ Hexter explores several different commentaries on three of Ovid's works by using the categories 'replacement', 'identification', and 'expansion'. Each of these then contains at least three sub-categories.

What is evident from the work of these scholars is that nobody uses the same categories. Instead, different categories are used according to the analytical focus they provide and the possibilities offered by the examined texts. Furthermore, of these three scholars, only Hexter treats the *catena* format, the other two only treat marginal and interlinear glossing, which often consists of very short pieces of text keyed to the target text. The latter format, because of its direct relation to the target text, seems to be more attractive to analyse than the *catena* commentary. Even Hexter uses most of his categories when discussing glossed Ovid manuscripts and much fewer when discussing the *catena* commentary.

Inspired by the scholars mentioned above, I have grouped the ten categories I first postulated after having analysed the text under four overarching categories of function into the following scheme:

Background: mythological background explanations

Grammar: grammatical explanations, paraphrase

Lexical: patronymics, lexicon, etymology

Interpretative: Euhemeristic, natural philosophy, narrative, plot

These categories are not absolute, since the commentary contains circa 460 explanations and many of these can belong to more than one category at the same time. In addition, some explanations fall outside these main categories, either because they are a mixture of explanations belonging to different categories or because they are of a unique character that would demand a category of its own. These

²⁰⁵ Wieland 1983, p. 2 (my emphasis).

²⁰⁶ Reynolds 1996.

²⁰⁷ Hexter 1986.

explanations are discussed under the headings ‘complex explanations’ and ‘explanations outside the categories’. The purpose of this inventory is to provide the reader with a heuristic aid to the commentary. Each category below is given a general introduction, then discussed with the help of examples from the commentary, and finally provided with a short conclusion with regard to what function they might have filled. A complete list of all explanations belonging to each category is listed at the end of the discussion of each of the four groups.²⁰⁸

Background: Mythological Background

With 190 explanations fitting into this category, it is the biggest by far. It would be possible to further subdivide it, but that is not strictly necessary in order to perform this analysis.

The general characteristic of this category is to provide a background or explanation to characters and events that may only be mentioned in passing or alluded to in the *Metamorphoses*. They are written in reasonably clear language and tend to be the longest type of explanation. The basic type consists of just one background story, but quite often the explanation may provide an alternative, which is signalled by a *sed* (but) or *vel* (or) and some type of reference like *quidam dicunt* (some say), *secundum* (according to) + a name of an authority or just a reference to a story, or simply by writing *aliter* (alternatively) or *vel* (or) and then giving the alternative story. These explanations rarely interact with the lemma directly. Usually a name in the lemma functions as a trigger for the explanation. These explanations are also among those where it is possible to find a source and where indeed a source may sometimes even be given.²⁰⁹

The first example illustrates a simple and short form of mythological background story:

1. MONICHIOSQVE VOLANS. *Monichius fuit gigas et dicitur iuisse in constructione murorum Athenarum.* (2:709)

AND FLYING [HE LOOKED DOWN ON] THE MUNYCHIAN [FIELDS]. Munychius was a giant and he is said to have aided in the construction of the walls of Athens.

²⁰⁸ The explanations are identified by the book and line in the *Metamorphoses*, to which they react (these numbers can be found in the left margin in the edition). Sometimes several different explanations are given to the same line, in which case, e.g., the second explanation is given a x:2 to identify it in the inventory.

²⁰⁹ See the section entitled The Commentary and its Sources.

This explanation simply tells us who Monichius is and gives the reason why the name is used in this instance.

Example 2 shows a typical mythological background story:

2. *ANDROMEDAN PENAS. Cepheus rex habuit coniugem Casiope<m>, que dixit se pulcriorem esse Iunone uel deabus marinis. Pro quo peccato belua exiens mare commedebat suum regnum. Iudicauit Iupiter, ut filiam suam Andromedam daret belue ad commedendum, et sic homines ulterius non commederentur. (4:671)*

THAT ANDROMEDA [SHOULD PAY] THE PENALTY. King Cepheus had a wife, Cassiope, who said she was more beautiful than Juno or the sea goddesses. For this sin a monster came from the sea and devoured his kingdom. Jupiter decided to give his daughter, Andromeda, to the monster to be eaten, and thus the people were no longer eaten.

The explanation is triggered by two words in the lemma and describes who Andromeda is, as well as the background and the nature of her penalty. The phrase *uel deabus marinis* signals that there are two different versions of this story. In one version, Cassiopeia claims that she is more beautiful than Juno and, in the other, more beautiful than some sea-goddesses.

The third example is of a slightly longer explanation:

3. *PALLAS ERICTONIVM. Dum Pallas faciebat Athenas, Vulcano complacita est, cum qua dum uellet concumbere, sed Pallade respuente uel renuente cecidit ex Vulcano semen in terram, unde Erictonius creatus est. Sed quidam dicunt, quod Erictonius fuit gigas, qui uoluit cum Pallade concumbere in silua. Illa uero interposuit nubem. Qui existimans se rem habere cum ea iecit semen in terram, uel in nubem, quod illa suscipiens posuit in cista. Vnde creatus est Erictonius, iuxta quem posuit draconem, qui enutrit eum. (2:553)*

PALLAS [ENCLOSED] ERICHTHONIUS. When Pallas made Athens she was very pleasing to Vulcan, who wanted to sleep with her, but when Pallas rejected or refused him the semen fell from Vulcan on the ground, from which Erichthonius was created. But some say that Erichthonius was a giant, who wanted to sleep with Pallas in the forest. She placed a cloud between them. He, thinking that he was having intercourse with her, ejected his semen on the ground

or into the cloud, which she took up and put in a chest. From this Erichthonius was created, next to whom she placed a snake to nurture him.

Here we yet again see that the explanation reacts to both of the words in the lemma. In this explanation, we are provided with two different versions of the story behind Erichthonius birth. In the first version, he is said to have Vulcan as father and, in the other story, a giant by the same name as himself, Erichthonius. The second version is signalled by the typical vague marker of an alternative source *sed quidam dicunt* (but some say). Both versions also contain one alternative fact each. In the first it says that Pallas rejected Vulcan, or that she refused him (*vel renuente*), which has been written above the line as an alternative. In the second version, we are told that the giant ejected his semen either on the ground or into a cloud.

The longest example of a background story is the explanation to lemma 9:408. This explanation concerns the lines 408-412 in Book 9 of the *Metamorphoses* and it presents the entire Thebes cycle on three pages in the manuscript (by far the longest explanation in the commentary). It is more or less told in the manner of a continuous story, where in simple yet effective and dramatic language, it goes through the Thebes cycle from the birth of Oedipus to the start of the war on Thebes. The story roughly corresponds to the three first books of the Thebaid, ending with a tale of a cursed necklace and the misfortunes that befell its owners, which gives a background to *Met.* 9:411-412.²¹⁰

In some cases, the background explanations display an interpretative characteristic, as in the following example:

4. SAXVM SISIPHON GRAVE VRGET. *Antidia dicitur fuisse mater Vlixis. Que ante Leherte nuptias eum ex Sisipho, filio Eoli, concepit. Sed non est uerum, rapta quidem a Sisipho fuit, sed intactam eam reddidit.* (13:26)

THE HEAVY STONE PRESSES SISYPHOS. Anticlea is said to be Ulysses' mother. She conceived him from Sisypnos, the son of Eolus, before her marriage to Laertes. But this is not true, she was indeed carried off by Sisypnos, but he returned her unviolated.

²¹⁰ This explanation is also discussed in relationship to other twelfth-century commentaries in chapter 5.

Here the explanation not only provides us with a background to Sisyphus, but also interprets the information for us. In this case, the commentator seems to have access to information from two different sources and decides that one is true and the other false. However, while this example displays an interpretative element, this mainly revolves around interpreting different background stories and not the story in the *Metamorphoses* itself, which is the characteristic of the category Plot.

Function: These background stories appear to be meant to provide the reader with a grasp of ‘the big picture’ of the Greco-Roman mythological world (as it was available at this period) in its entirety.

Mythological background explanations: **1:10**, 81, 106, 188, 231, 313, 563, 580, 624, 690, 694, 763; **2:139**, 239, 247, 247:2, 264, 539, 545, 544, 553, 555, 642, 646, 685, 709, 755; **3:13**, 14, 111, 126, 132, 269, 665; **4:19**, 291, 333, 457, 458, 460, 461, 463, 501, 671, 786; **5: 347**, 352, 407, 424x2, 499; **6:70**, 99, 108, 111, 112, 115, 117, 178, 384, 415, 652; **7:1:2**, 3, 7, 74, 149, 361, 363, 435, 437, 438, 444; **8:179**, 182, 183, 261, 276, 313, 316, 305; **9:67**, 88, 123, 183, 184, 187, 187:2, 188, 189, 190, 192, 197, 232, 233, 294, 397, 403, 404, 405, 408, 647, 693, 690, 694; **10:10**, 13, 65, 68, 90, 91, 151, 168, 196, 206, 224, 240, 450; **11:25**, 46, 69, 106, 211, 214, 279, 393, 413, 583, 745, 763; **12:35**, 109, 112, 401, 606, 610; **13:2**, 26, 39, 46, 53, 56, 98, 99, 217, 386, 399, 444, 626, 628, 629, 631, 635, 690, 693, 710, 714, 715, 716, 717, 720; **14:82:2**, 103, 114, 119, 155, 331, 449, 452, 457, 468, 472, 565, 533, 639, 694:2, 712, 720, 773, 774, 776, 799, 830; **15:13**, 164, 309, 326, 462, 475, 552, 836.

Grammar

This category consists of two sub-categories: grammatical explanations and paraphrase. This is the second biggest category. Together, the two sub-categories occur 172 times in the commentary (grammatical: 112 and paraphrase: 60).

Grammatical Explanations

This sub-category usually consists of short explanations that provide help in construing the sentence or in understanding certain features of the text on a purely linguistic level. This type of explanation sometimes works by simply rearranging the word order of the lemma so as to make the syntactical relationship clearer to the reader. This is the case in the following example, where the rearranged lemma itself constitutes the grammatical explanation and the rest belongs to the natural philosophy category.

5. CIRCVMFLVVS HVMOR POSSEDIT VLTIMA et COHERCVIT SOLIDVM ORBEM, *id est terram, quia nisi aqua circumdaret terram, terra esset solubilis et arenosa.* (1:30)

THE FLOWING WATER OCCUPIED THE LAST PLACE and ENCLOSED THE SOLID ORB, that is the earth, since if water did not enclose the earth, the earth would be soluble and sandy.

In the *Metamorphoses*, the passage reads as follows: *circumfluus umor ultima possedit solidumque coeuit orbem*. The explanation has simply moved the verbs so as to make their relation to their objects clearer. The commentary has also removed the enclitic *-que* and replaced it with a normal *et* (and).

The grammatical explanations may also interject words into the lemma to explain how the sentence should be understood. Example 6 shows a more complex example that uses a rearranged lemma, extra words and some other strategies.

6. SERVAT ADHVC SALAMIS. *Ordo: Salamis ciuitas seruat illud SIGNVM VENERIS QVOQVE TEMPLVM HABET illud SIGNVM NOMINE, id est sub nomine, hoc est nomen inscriptum ostendat signum fuisse ANAXETES. VENERIS, dico, PROSPICIENTIS, id est uidentis ultionem.* (14:760)

SALAMIS STILL KEEPS. Order: Salamis's city keeps this IMAGE OF VENUS AND THE TEMPLE HAS the SIGN WITH THE NAME, that is under this name, that is an inscribed name shows that the sign was OF ANAXARETES. OF VENUS, I say, LOOKING OUT FOR, that is with her mind set on vengeance.

In this explanation, the lemma preserves the word order from the *Metamorphoses*, then the key word *ordo* (order) signals that what follows is how the sentence should be construed. Demonstrative pronouns are supplied to add clarity to the construction. The word *nomine* is further explained by the prepositional phrase *sub nomine* introduced by *id est*. Following this, yet further explanation is added by a sentence declaring that this refers to Anaxarete, who is mentioned by name in the *Metamorphoses* ten lines before this passage. Finally, *Veneris* and *prospicientis* are declared to belong together by inserting a declarative verb *dico* (I say) between them and then as a last addition, these words are rephrased in the last *id est*-phrase (the last part could be considered as belonging to the next sub-category).

There are a few instances of a more formal grammatical explanation, which often seems to be inspired or taken directly from Servius or Priscian. In example 8, Servius is even called upon by name:

7. *RECIDIT IN SOLIDAM. Re- ante consonantem literam, si producitur, non est nisi cum positione, ut 'relique', 'reccido' et etiam 'retineo'. Si produceretur, oportet esse duo tt ibi scripta. (10:180)*

IT FELL AGAIN (*RECIDIT*) TO THE SOLID [GROUND]. Re- before a consonant, if it is lengthened, it can only be by position, such as *relique*, *reccido* and also *retineo*. If it (*retineo*) were to be lengthened, then there should be two t's there.

8. *DIXIT ET INSANIS. Seruius dicit 'insanus' pro 'magnus', sicut insana Iuno pro magna. (12:510)*

HE SPOKE AND THROUGH [AUSTER'S] RAGING [POWERS]. Servius says that 'raging' [can be used] for 'great', as in raging Juno for great Juno.

In the final example in this sub-category the commentary mentions the rhetorical figure *pars pro toto*. Discussion of rhetoric and meter is otherwise almost completely absent in this commentary.

9. *EXCIPIT ET NVRIBVS. 'Nuribus' ponit pro mulieribus, partem uidelicet pro toto. (2:366)*

IT RECEIVES AND TO THE BRIDES. 'Brides' is used for women, clearly as a part for the whole (*pars pro toto*).

Paraphrasing

This sub-category of explanations explains grammar by paraphrasing the commented-upon passage in the *Metamorphoses*. Generally, the paraphrase is written in the same person as the relevant passage, i.e. if it is a first-person speaker in the *Metamorphoses*, then the paraphrase will also be in the first person. The paraphrases are often signalled by a phrase such as *sic* or *quasi diceret*.

In example 10, we find an explanation that combines a grammatical explanation in the same style as that in example 6 above with a paraphrase explanation.

10. *SOLA CONIVNX IOVIS et NON TAM ELOQVITVR, an PROBET, an CVLPET QVAM GAVDET CLADE, hoc est non eloquitur, ut uel culpet uel laudet, sed gaudet. (3:256)*

ONLY JUPITER'S WIFE DID NOT SPEAK SO MUCH TO APPROVE or TO BLAME, AS SHE REJOICED IN THE DISASTER, that is she does not speak so as to blame or praise, but she rejoices.

Example 11 shows an explanation that operates with paraphrase only:

11. *EXCVSAT, sic dicens: O dii omnes uos scitis, quod non potui aliud facere, quin fulmina mitterem.* (2:397)

[JUPITER] EXCUSES, saying thus: O gods, you all know that I could not do anything else but to throw my thunder bolts.

In this example, the single verb *excusat* is expounded in an entire sentence, which states what this excuse might have sounded like.

Function: If the background category was meant to help the reader to grasp the entire world, of which the *Metamorphoses* is an expression, then this category serves the purpose of helping the reader to navigate the text by clearing up textual difficulties. The explanations in this category are the ones closest in style to interlinear glosses.

Grammatical explanations: 1:4, 3, 6, 24, 29, 53, 69, 73, 190, 211, 231, 371, 562, 563, 578, 593, 670, 763; 2:153, 219, 272, 544, 561, 626, 802, 844; 3:32:2, 88, 256; 4:33, 199, 333, 509, 801; 5:19, 370, 372, 371, 378:2, 450; 6:71, 90, 233, 237, 393, 506, 538, 539; 7:1, 3, 121, 438, 444, 759, 794, 759:2; 8:182, 421, 655; 9:23, 33, 51, 69, 83, 88, 245, 248, 248:2, 348, 432, 448, 476, 735; 10:25, 68, 127, 168, 180, 196, 223, 240, 252, 284, 287, 596; 11:3, 48, 101, 150, 380, 410, 627; 12:401, 432, 510; 13:187, 408, 569, 611, 635, 638, 653, 714, 720, 804; 14:233, 324, 729, 739, 760; 15:39.

Paraphrasing: 1:190, 470, 563, 587, 615; 2:397, 533, 566, 596, 626, 802; 3:253; 4:641; 5:372:2; 7: 54, 76, 149, 687, 704, 794; 8:131; 9:23, 83, 182, 248, 248:2, 275, 299, 326, 327, 403, 404, 432, 649, 735, 755; 10:25, 168, 221:2, 310, 628, 727; 11:150, 380, 390, 763, 783; 12:399; 13:141, 187, 408; 14:324, 331, 337, 657, 722, 724, 725, 729, 827.

Lexical

This category consists of the sub-categories: patronymics, lexicon and etymology. Together they occur 113 times (patronymics: 42, lexicon: 34, etymology: 37).

Patronymics

This sub-category of explanations revolves around family relations and identifying characters. It is often caused by Ovid's poetic phrasing

when names of places and characters are concerned. In this category, we may include strict patronymics, but also other explanations that identify family ties.

12. *AT REX ODRISIVS. Odrisius fuit rex Tracie. Inde Tracia uocatur Odrisia. Inde reges Odrisii uocantur.* (6:490)

BUT THE ODRYSIAN KING. Odrysius was the king of Thrace. From this Thrace is called Odrysia. From this kings are called Odrysian.

Patronymics sometimes occur on their own, but quite often they are only a part of a bigger explanation. In this category, I have also included other explanations that revolve around kinship and origin of names. Some of these converge with the mythological background category (and are listed doubly in my inventory).

In the following example, only the first sentence explains the patronymic *Belides*. The remainder belongs to the mythological background category.

13. *ASIDVE REPETVNT QVAS PERDANT BELIDES VNDAS. De semine Beli natus est Egistus et Danaus. Cuius Danai asensu quinquaginta filie sue acceperunt uiros quinquaginta filios Egisti. Et eos omnes interfecerunt, excepta una, que uirum suum interficere noluit. Pro hoc peccato fas sine fundo de aqua implere debe<n>t.* (4:463)

THE INCESSANT BELIDES SEEK AGAIN THE WATER THAT THEY LOSE. Aegistus and Danaus were born from the seed of Belus. With Danaus's approval his fifty daughters took as their husbands Aegistus's fifty sons. And they murdered them all, except for one [daughter] who did not want to murder her husband. For this sin they must fill a vase without bottom with water.

Lexicon

This small sub-category of explanations consists of either a simple synonym or a slightly longer explanation in a style typical of dictionaries. Here, the object explained is not mythological.

14. *Phoce sunt uituli.* (2:267)
Phocae are sea-calves.

This short explanation carries a strong resemblance to an interlinear gloss.

Example 15 shows a longer lexicon explanation:

15. *PARS SECRETA DOMVS EBORE ET TESTVDINE CVLTOS. Testudo proprie est quoddam concavum, ubi aliud quoddam continetur, sed hic pro hoc laqueari ponitur. (2:737)*

A SEPARATE PART OF THE HOUSE WERE [CHAMBERS] ADORNED WITH IVORY AND TORTOISE-SHELL. Tortoise-shell is strictly speaking something concave, in which something else may be contained, but here it is used for the panelled ceiling.

Here we are presented with a definition of the relevant word (*testudo*) and then we are told that this is not the intended use in this case, but that it is rather an example of metonymy. This category is related to the etymology type, but it does not contain etymological derivation. Example 15 is also related to the grammatical explanation since what this explanation actually does is to explain the figure metonymy, but without using that term.

Etymological

This sub-category consists of an explanation of the origin of a word, usually by means of connecting it to a Greek word, but sometimes just by explaining the verb from which it is derived. Examples 16 and 17 illustrate the two types:

16. *'Centaurus' Grece, Latine equus dicitur. (2:636)*

Centaur in Greek. In Latin it is called 'horse'.

17. *Apricus et Aprilis ab 'aperio' dicuntur. Hic uero dicitur APRICA frondosa. (4:331)*

Apricus (sunny, sheltering) and *Aprilis* (April) are named from *aperio* (to open). But here *APRICA* means leafy.

Many but not all of these etymologies can be traced back to Isidor's *Etymologiae*. Often the explanations have made connections to the wrong Greek words, as witnessed in this section of a longer explanation:

18. *Yppocentauri deberent dici. 'Yppo' enim Grece, Latine 'subtus'. 'Centaurus' 'equus', sed Latini breuitate Centaurum pro utroque acceperunt, scilicet pro 'subtus' et 'equo'. (12:210)*

They should be called Hypocentaurs. Hypo in Greek, 'below' in Latin. Centaurus means 'horse', but for the sake of brevity the Latins use Centaur for both, namely for 'below' and 'horse'.

Here the Greek *hippo* (horse) has been confused with *hypo* (under).

The opposite is true in the following example, where the place name Taenarius in *Metamorphoses* has been changed (at some point) to Trenareus and the changed form defended by a rather sound Greek etymology.

19. *ET Trenareus EVROTAS. Trenareus est mons Laconie, ubi est descensus ad inferos. 'Trene' Grece, id est lamentationes. (2:247)*

AND Trenarian EUROTAS. Trenareus is a mountain in Laconia, where there is a descent to the underworld. *Trene* in Greek, that is 'lamentations'.

Function: These three sub-categories may not, at first glance, have that much in common, but if we suppose that the function of these explanations was to generate vocabulary, then we can start to see a common denominator.²¹¹ In example 12, we can see a chain of derivation from the name Odrisius, which could teach the student how to create similar derivations. The sub-category lexicon is cruder and, at a basic level, works by forcing the student to learn synonyms. Finally, the etymological sub-category must be understood as teaching the students a method for how to handle and how to explain strange words.

As in many other cases, the borders between categories are not clear-cut. This category also contains elements of the background explanation, but if the latter serves the purpose of familiarising the students with the world of the text, then this category is more active and teaches the student how to extract knowledge from the text.

Patronymics: 1:670; 2:441, 509, 545, 743, 757, 844; 3:126, 132; 4:291, 463; 5:363, 378:2; 6:90, 112, 113, 176, 117, 176:2, 384, 490; 7:668, 672, 685; 8:207, 316; 9:12, 421, 448; 10:91, 148, 221, 284, 297; 11:383, 413; 13:596, 728; 14:83, 233, 426, 694.

Lexicon: 1:219, 332, 690; 2:2, 266, 267, 737, 854, 854:2; 3:132, 665; 4:501, 505, 667, 750; 5:450; 6:254; 8:25, 244, 564, 655; 9:341, 694; 10:1, 106, 267, 708; 11:25, 46, 599; 13:589, 653, 804; 14:720.

²¹¹ Suzanne Reynolds makes this point regarding a bigger group of categories relevant to her material, Reynolds 1996, p. 79.

Etymology: 1:14, 69, 180, 371, 694; 2:2, 153, 247:2, 264, 340, 416, 636, 721, 755, 854:2; 3:32; 4:291, 331; 5:347, 499, 555; 6:70, 395, 587; 7:3; 9:33, 690; 10:219, 223; 11:215; 12:210; 13:455, 569, 619; 14:44, 90, 457.

Interpretative

This category consists of the sub-categories: Euhemeristic, natural philosophy, narrative and plot. Together they occur 135 times (Euhemeristic: 12, natural philosophy: 30, narrative: 18, plot: 75).

Euhemeristic

Explanations belonging to this sub-category describes mythological phenomena as natural. This type is not very common and does not follow a consistent pattern. Some phenomena are explained euhemeristically, while other similar phenomena are not.

The quintessential Euhemeristic explanation can be found in Book 12:

20. DVXERAT YPODAMMEN coniugem A<VDACI> NATVS YXIONE. Laphite et Centauri, quorum rex Perithous fuit de genere Yxionis, fuerunt forte genus hominum, non tamen gigantes. Centauri uero dicti sunt quidam ex illis ideo, quia quadam die sedentes super e<qu>os ablatis bubus, cum alii insequerentur eos uenientesque ad quandam aquam equos suos potarent, uisi sunt et dicti ab indigenis illius terre capita equorum non uidentibus semihomines et semiequi. Et ex illo tempore appellati sunt Centauri. (12:210)

THE SON OF BOLD IXION HAD TAKEN HIPPODAME as a wife. The Laphits and the Centaurs, whose king, Pirithous, descended from Ixion, were a strong tribe of humans, [they were] not, however, giants. Some of them are called Centaurs, since one day - after they had left their cows, since others were coming after them - sitting on their horses, they came to some water and allowed the horses to drink, and they were then seen and named half men and half horse by the inhabitants of this country who had not seen the heads of the horses. From this time onward they were called Centaurs.

Here we see a natural explanation to the origin of the mythological creature the centaur.

In example 21 we find a common marker for the Euhemeristic explanation, the phrase *secundum rei ueritatem* (in reality), which is then followed by the explanation.

21. *FIDIBVSQVE MEI COMMISSA MARITI et cetera. Cadmus fecit Thebas. Amphion uero adauxit. Et dicitur etiam mouisse cum suis fidibus lapides ad muros faciendos. Sed secundum rei ueritatem non fuit aliud, nisi quia Amphion fuit homo sapiens et docuit rudes homines facere ciuitatem. Ciuitas enim est collectio hominum ad iure uiuendum.* (6:178)

ENTRUSTED TO MY AND MY HUSBAND'S LYRE et cetera. Cadmus founded Thebes, but Amphion enlarged it. And he is even said to have moved stones for the construction of the walls with his lyre. But in reality this was nothing other than that Amphion, being a learned man, taught the unskilled men to build the city. For a city is an assembly of men with the purpose of living according to the law.

The Euhemeristic explanations do not need to be very elaborate. Example 22 presents a very short explanation in which it is simply stated that this is an exaggeration (this could also be considered to belong to the category of plot). Following that, in example 23, we have a short explanation in which the long list of the Fury's magical ingredients described in the *Metamorphoses* is reduced to *integumenta et inuolucra* (obscure expressions and veiled utterances) and then explained to be a means of simply describing that the characters involved in this story went insane.

22. *TRIPlici STANT ORDINE DENTES. Non stant triplici dentes ordine, sed ideo hoc dicit, ut magnitudinem eius exageret.* (3:34)

THE TEETH STAND IN A TRIPPLE ROW. The teeth do not stand in a triple row, he says this to exaggerate its size.

23. *ERRORESQVE VAGO<S>. Per talia integumenta et inuolucra nihil aliud nobis dicit, nisi quod fecit eos furere.* (4:502)

AND VAGUE DELUSIONS. By such obscure expressions and veiled utterances he tells us nothing else than that it made them mad.

Natural philosophy

This sub-category consists of explanations taken from the realm of natural philosophy, often cosmography. They do not occur very frequently and are mainly to be found in Books 1, 2 and 15. They tend to revolve around the elements and things that have to do with astrology. Example 24 is probably the most sophisticated of these explanations, while example 25 shows a more typical, short explanation.

24. *HEC QVOQVE NON PER<STANT> QVE NOS HELEMENTA VOCAMVS. Hoc dicunt philosophi, ut Plato et ceteri, quod non proprie helementa uocentur hoc, quod uidemus, scilicet terram, aquam et alia, sed ideas quasdam in dei mente. Entes proprie helementa dixerunt, quod numquam mutarentur. Sed hic non dicunt de illis helementis. (15:237)*

AND NOT EVEN THESE WHICH WE CALL THE ELEMENTS PERSIST. The philosophers, such as Plato and others, say that these things that we see, that is to say the earth, water and other things, should not strictly speaking be called 'elements', but rather ideas in the mind of God. Strictly speaking they called elements entes, since they never change. But here they do not speak about this kind of elements.

25. *NAIADES HESPERIE TRIFIDA. Trifida dicit, quia flat, findit, urit. Hec tria fulmen habet. (2:325)*

THE WESTERN NAIADS BECAUSE OF THE THREE-FORKED. He says three-forked because it blows, cleaves and burns. Lightning has these three properties.

The explanation in example 25 occupies itself with the number three and elemental powers. This type reoccurs here and there in the commentary. Example 26 is the first of this type:

26. *AMPHITRIDES dicitur Neptunus, ex amphi, id est circum, et tridente. Tridentem enim habet propter tres aque diuersitates. Aqua est labilis, mobilis, lauilis. Lauat et non lauatur. (1:14)*

AMPHITRIDES is a name for Neptune, from amphi, that is 'around', and trident. For he has a trident on account of the three characteristics of water. Water is flowing, mobile and has the ability to clean. It cleans and is not cleansed.

As stated above, there are not that many explanations that can be said to belong to this group, but the style of the explanation, calling upon the vocabulary and style of natural philosophy, calls for a separate category.

Narrative

In the narrative sub-category, we find explanations that clarify or even criticise the plot structure or the order of events in the *Metamorphoses*. It is not a very common type of explanation, but it is an important type, because it gives us a glimpse of the style of literary criticism used by the commentator. Frequently, the narrative element may only be a small part of the explanation.

The following example is typical of this sub-category:

27. TVNC ADERAS ELIM. *Nota, quod hic dicit Phebum exutum a diuinitate adhuc Esculapio filio suo uiuente. Secundum uero aliam, post mortem Esculapii Phebus diuinitatem dicitur amisisse. Hoc non est mirandum, quia fabule quedam sic commiscentur.* (2:679)

YOU WERE [NOT] PRESENT [YOU LIVED IN] ELIS. Note that here he says that Phoebus was stripped of his divinity while his son Aesculapius was still alive. According to another version Phoebus is said to have lost his divinity after Aesculapius's death. It is not strange, since these stories are confused in this way.

In example 27, two versions of the event are compared and then a final remark simply states that existing alternatives contribute to the confusion of the stories.

Example 28 makes a direct mention of Ovid. This two-part explanation starts with a grammatical explanation of the lemma and then tells us how we must understand the sentence if we want to keep a working chronology of the stories. The commentator then states the consequence if we do not accept this, namely that Ovid simply did not care about the order of the stories.

28. NVNC QVOQVE, VT ATTONITOS *non solum MVTAVIT crines IN IDROS, sed etiam nunc fert idros IN PECTORE ADVERSO. Perseus pro constanti habebat, quod daturus erat Palladi caput Gorgonis. Ideo dicit quod iam ferebat 'in pectore', id est in lorica, que antiquitus tantum in pectore habebatur. Vel Ouidius non curauit ordinem.* (4:801)

AND NOW ALSO TO [SCARE] THE TERRIFIED SHE not only CHANGED her locks INTO SERPENTS, but she also now carries the serpents ON THE FRONT OF HER BREAST. Perseus knew for sure that he was going to give the head of the Gorgon to Pallas. Therefore Ovid says that she already carried it 'on her breast', that is on the cuirass, which in former times was carried on the breast only. Or Ovid did not care about the order of the stories.

In the last example, the explanation states that this part of the story sets the scene for what is to come. This refers to a passage in the *Metamorphoses* circa sixty lines later, where Cyane reappears in the story in the form of the pool where Ceres finds her daughter's girdle.

29. EST MEDIVM CIANES. *Istud ad hoc perstruit, quia ualebit future narrationi, quia ibi Cores post reperit uestimenta filie sue, id est zonam.* (5:409)

THERE IS BETWEEN CYANE [AND PISAEAN ARETHUSA]. That builds up to this, because it will be of importance for the story to come, because this is where Ceres later finds her daughter's clothes, that is the girdle.

As we have seen, this sub-category is concerned with the general narrative structure of the *Metamorphoses*, as well as whether Ovid is presenting the mythological stories correctly and coherently.

Plot

This sub-category shares traits with the background and grammatical categories, but the main criteria for this sub-category is that the explanation is derived from the *Metamorphoses* itself. The plot is explained in a manner that does not draw as much on external knowledge or sources as it performs a reading of the text, in the manner of a more mature and experienced reader who would have already been familiar with the plot of the *Metamorphoses*, explaining to a less mature reader what is happening. Thus, the explanations belonging to this category signify a different hermeneutical method, an interpretation or elucidation instead of an addition of facts as in the mythological background category. This sub-category is also intimately related to the text of the *Metamorphoses*. Whereas a background explanation could be taken from anywhere and applied to a passage that seemed relevant to the commentator, the plot

explanation is derived from the *Metamorphoses* and cannot easily be applied to another work.

In examples 30 and 31, the information provided is not background information, but rather a conclusion drawn from the content.

30. *TIMVERE DEI PRO VI<N>DICE T<ERRAE>. Merito, quia terram uindicabat Hercules a pluribus monstris. Ideo timuerunt dei, ne eo mortuo monstra contra eos surgerent. (2:118)*

TITAN COMMANDED THE QUICK HOURS TO YOKE HIS HORSES. Justly 'Hours', since hours remain throughout the day or the night and throughout [the orbit of] the sun.

31. *NON INTELLECTAM VOCEM, id est Cinara intellexit quod filia talem uellet uirum, in quo plus non ardere quam in se, id est in patre, deberet, scilicet putauit in castitate uelle manere. (10:365)*

THE MISUNDERSTOOD VOICE, that is Cinyras understood that his daughter wanted such a man for whom she would not burn more than for him, that is her father, that is to say he thought she wanted to remain chaste.

Example 32 may look like a typical mythological background explanation. It reacts to *clavigeram* (the club bearing) in the lemma and, without explicitly saying so, it gives the reader the information as to whom this refers. However, all of this information is already available in the *Metamorphoses* and therefore this explanation should rather be considered to belong to the category plot.

32. *CLAVIGERAM V<IDIT>. Vulcanus quendam filium pessimum habuit, qui Epidauriam uastabat. Quem Theseus interfecit. (7:437)*

SAW THE CLUB-BEARING. Vulcan had an evil son, who laid Epidaurus to waste. Theseus killed him.

The last two examples are simple explanations of what is happening in these scenes. The first simply recaps a three-line description of a compass, which does not mention the word compass itself. In the second, the commentator has interpreted the verb in the lemma (*variat*) to mean 'to waver' and explains that this has to do with the throwing of spears.

33. *ALTERA PARS STARET. Fecit circinum. (8:249)*

ONE PART STOOD STILL. He made a compass.

34. *AT MANVS EONIDE VARIAT. Scilicet et in iaculando unam hastam, nunc aliam.* (8:414)

AND THE HAND OF THE OENEAN WEVERS. Namely in throwing now one spear and now another.

Function: The name of this category makes its function quite clear; it provides an interpretation of the text in the *Metamorphoses*, either by applying a Euhemeristic or natural philosophical perspective, or by interpreting the structure of the text. These types of explanation bring to mind a lecture-style means of delivering information.

Euhemeristic: 2:11, 850; 3:34, 34:2, 269; 4:502; 6:178; 9:233; 11:208; 12:210; 13:730; 14:88.

Natural philosophy: 1:5:2, 5:3, 6, 14, 17, 21, 25, 30, 45, 73, 89, 111, 117, 255, 408; 2:26, 118, 153, 325, 527, 848; 3:397; 4:199; 10:78, 106?, 206?, 704; 15:237, 249, 251.

Narrative: 1:3, 32, 78; 2:527, 679; 3:269; 4:409, 750, 801; 5:409, 499; 7:149, 687; 8:201; 9:186; 10:223; 12:309; 15:622.

Plot: 1:29, 106:2, 113, 133, 150, 237, 513, 615, 749; 2:272, 510, 544, 642, 846; 3:101, 572; 4:509, 510; 5:378; 6:72, 393; 7:306, 361, 794; 8:171, 201, 222, 244, 249, 414, 744; 9:123, 184, 192, 232, 241, 245?, 274, 275, 326, 341, 348, 403, 476, 694; 10:65, 215, 252, 284, 297, 365, 444, 708; 11:25, 48, 211, 380, 410, 599, 673; 12:35, 104, 399, 583; 13:230, 398, 619, 700; 14:83:2, 119, 149, 153; 15:5, 39, 41.

Complex Explanations

It is possible to roughly label almost all explanations in the commentary using the above categories. The fact that an explanation often contains more than just one mode has been touched upon in exploring the individual categories above. In the following, we will continue to explore explanations with a focus on the complex.

The first example includes explanations belonging to three different sub-categories.

35. *VISVS ERAT PHINEVS, subaudi 'ab Argonautis'. Fineus fuit quidam diues, qui de uxore iam mortua duos filios habebat, quos instinctu nouerca / illorum, que nouerca Nubes dicebatur, excecauit. Ideo dii irati fuerunt et eum lumine priuauerunt et tres arpias, que uocabantur Aello, Cillerio, Occipete, sibi apposuerunt. Que cibos suos omnes conmacularent ad quem fine[u]m, cum Hercules et Argonaute uenerunt. Ab eo arpias Hercules auertit et*

iussit filiis Boree, ut illas fugarent. Qui usque ad Strophados insulas eas fugauerunt, qui aureum uellus rapiendum uenerunt. Strophos Grece, Latine dicitur 'conuersio'. (7:3)

PHINEUS HAD BEEN SEEN, supply 'by the Argonauts'. Phineus was a rich man who had two sons from his now dead wife. These he blinded on the instigation of their stepmother, this stepmother was called Nubes. Therefore the gods were angered and deprived him of his sight and placed with him three harpies, called Aello, Celaeno, Ocypete, who were to pollute all his food. When Hercules and the Argonauts came to this Phineus, Hercules took the harpies off him and commanded the sons of Boreas to chase them away. They, who came to snatch the golden fleece, chased the harpies all the way to the Strophades islands.

Here, we first encounter a short grammar explanation in the form of the *subaudi*-phrase. Then a mythological background explanation provides the necessary background, and finally, an etymological explanation is added to explain something in the commentary text itself.

Example 36 contains even more categories:

36. *VIRGINEVSQVE DICON, quia ibi habitabant Muse, ET NONDVM OEAGRIS HEMVS. Adiectiuum pro fixo hic ponitur. OEAGRIVS pater Orphei fuit – sed oe est diptongus. Ideo dicit 'nondum Oeagris', quia Orpheus, filius Oeagri, interfectus fuit a mulieribus in Hemo monte, unde postea dictus est mons Oeagrius consecratus Orpheo. Orpheus licet dicatur Apollinis filius, sicut Hercules Iouis, tamen dicitur filius Oeagrii, ut Hercules Amphitryonis. (2:219)*

AND MAIDENLY HELICON, since the Muses lived there AND NOT YET OEGRIAN HAEMUS. An adjective is used for a noun. OEAGRUS was Orpheus's father – but oe is a diphthong. He says 'not yet Oeagrian', since Orpheus, Oeagrus's son, was killed by women on Mount Haemus, wherefore the mountain was called Oeagrian, consecrated to Orpheus. Even though Orpheus may be called Apollo's son, as Hercules is Jupiter's, he is nevertheless called Oeagrus's son, as Hercules is Amphitryon's.

Example 36 starts with a grammar explanation injected into the lemma. Following this comes a grammatical/patronymic explanation with an oddly placed, brief appendix in the form of the statement that

the 'oe' in Oeagrius is a diphthong (this statement may have originally been an interlinear gloss that was adopted into the main text in this copy). We are then provided with a background story about why the mountain is 'not yet Oeagrian'. Finally, Orpheus's double fathers are explained with a parallel to Hercules.

In example 37 from Book 3, among other things, we find one of the few text-critical explanations in the commentary.

37. FERT VTERO ET MATER QVOD VIX MIHI CONTIGIT VNI uel VNO. Si dixerimus, quod Iuno dicat 'uix mihi contigit uni' Iunoni, ut essem mater de Ioue, cum alie plures fuerint matres, tunc dicemus, quod Ouidius non caret peruertere fabulas. Vel 'contigit mihi in [i]uno', id est in Vulcano, quem de Ioue habuit, ut esset mater.

Dicitur de lactuca comedisse, et inde Hebem genuisse. Hebe dicitur translata in celum, ut Iouis pincerna esset, sed quia, secundum rei u<er>itatem, de aliquo adultero illam Hebem habuit Iuno, ideo a Ioue / expulsa fuit et in loco eius Ganymedes, filius Troili, positus fuit. (3:269)

SHE CARRIES IN THE WOMB AND [WISHES TO BE MADE] A MOTHER, WHICH HAS BARELY HAPPENED TO ME ALONE (*uni*) or WITH ONE (*uno*). If we say that Juno says 'which has barely happened to me, Juno, alone' (*uni*) that I have been made a mother from Jupiter, although many others have been made mothers - then we will say that Ovid does not abstain from corrupting the stories. Or [Juno says] 'that has happened to me with one' (*uno*), that is with Vulcan, whom she had from Jupiter, so that she is a mother.

She is said to have eaten lettuce and from this to have given birth to Hebe. Hebe is said to have been transferred to heaven, to be Jupiter's cupbearer, but since Juno, according to reality, had Hebe from some sort of adultery, she was banished by Jupiter and Ganymede, Troilus's son, was put in her place.

In this example, the lemma offers two alternatives, *uni* or *uno*. Both are extant in manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses* (although *uno* only as a correction or addition). Here the commentator argues for the plausibility of the different readings by adding further attributes to *uni* and *uno*. In the first case, he adds a noun and then two dependant clauses; in the second, an attribute in the form of an *id est*-clause and then two dependant clauses can be found. The first alternative seems to be ruled out in a conditional clause, which states that, if this

alternative is valid, then Ovid has the stories wrong. Here the commentator presents two alternatives, but rules out the first. In contrast, the second alternative is backed up by a mythological background explanation, where we learn about Juno's child Hebe. In this explanation, the basic myth (Juno became pregnant by eating lettuce) is presented first and then, by the use of a Euhemeristic explanation, we learn that in fact Hebe was born from an act of adultery.

Examples 36 and 37 are fairly short but in a way act as a small lecture in themselves. They contain a dialogicity, for instance, in example 36, the passage that states that Oeager is Orpheus's father is thought to raise the question 'but is not Apollo his father?', which is then answered.

In the last, longer example of a complex explanation, we will take a look at a complicated case:

38. *EPIRROS REGNATA[T]QVE VATI scilicet Butro. Pirrus, filius Achillis, accepta Andromache, uxore Hectoris, in coniugium post Troianam uictoriam Epirum possedit. Postea duxit Hermionem, filiam Menelai, quam ipse Menelaus apud Troiam sibi desponsauerat et etiam constituit diem. Heleno uate frustra deortante eum licet captiuum eum duxisset. Horestes autem, filius Agamemnonis et Clitemeste, dolens Hermionem desponsatam sibi ab auo suo Tindareo alii contingere flateris postquam dea aramt Pirrum de tosicata sagitta uulnerauit, sed tamen Pirrus uiuus reuerssus est. Ibiq; inter cetera, que moriturus disposuit Heleno uati, quia fideliter eum, ne iret, monuit, Andromachen in coniugium et partem regni dedit, quam olim quidam uates nomine Brutus possederat.*

Literam sic construe: AB HIS Grecis TENETVR EPIRRVS QVONDAM REGNATA BRVTO VATI, sed tum regnata FRIGIO uati, id est Heleno. Et tenetur ab his TROIA SIMVLATA, que Ericon dicitur. Ideo dicit 'simulata', quia Helenus omnia edificia in Egipto facit ad similitudinem Troianorum edificiorum et etiam nomina fluuuorum transtulit inde. Eneas adueniens patriam se uidere putauit. (13:720)

EPIRUS RULED BY AN ORACLE, namely Butros. After Pyrrhus, Achilles' son, had taken as wife Andromache, Hector's wife, and after the Trojan victory, he took possession of Epirus. After this he married Hermione, Menelaus's daughter, whom Menelaus himself had betrothed to him in Troy and even set the day [for the marriage]. The oracle Helenus dissuaded him in vain,

although he (Pyrrhus) had taken him away as a prisoner. Orestes, the son of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra, who grieved that Hermione, who had been engaged to him by her grandfather Tyndareus, would belong to another †lateris postquam dea aram† wounded Pyrrhus with a poisoned arrow, but Pyrrhus nevertheless returned alive. And there among the other things that he had arranged for the oracle Helenus when he was about to die, since Helenus had faithfully advised him not to go, he gave him Andromache's hand in marriage and that part of the kingdom, which once an oracle named Brutus had possessed.

Construe the text thus: EPIRUS IS NOW HELD BY THESE Greeks, ONCE RULED BY THE ORACLE BRUTUS, but then ruled by the PHRYGIAN oracle, that is by Helenus. And the COPIED TROY, which is called Ericon, is held by them. He says 'copied' since Helenus made every building in Egypt in the likeness of the Trojan buildings and he even transferred the names of the rivers from there. When Aeneas arrived he thought that he saw his homeland.

The explanation begins in the grammatical mode by attempting to clarify the lemma by connecting *uati* and *Butro*. The *Metamorphoses* manuscripts have many different readings at this point, none of them *Butro*, but by matching its case to *uati*, it is clear that the commentary considers the name *Butrus* to be valid, although it later uses the form *Brutus* instead. The first part of the explanation consists of a mythological background story concerning Epirus and the fate of Pyrrus, Hermione, Orestes and Helenus. The language in this explanation is complicated and obscure and furthermore seems to contain a corrupt passage (marked by *cruces* in the edition). The explanation is then restarted with the phrase *literam sic construe*, after which the lemma is ordered and made clearer by additional words. Finally, a supplementary explanation follows to explain the word *simulata*.

This explanation reminds us that we cannot always seek to find coherent meaning in the text as it stands. Clm 4610 shows signs of being a copy or assemblage of other texts and it contains errors and distortions. This has to be kept in mind when analysing the text and trying to understand how it operates.

Explanations Outside the Categories

Since the categories described above cannot possibly encompass all the individual features of the commentary, we will, in the following, discuss some unique explanations.

A theological Explanation?

39. *HANC LITEM D<EVS> ET M<ELIOR> NATVRA, id est uoluntas Dei, filius Dei, DIREMIT. Et sic quantum ad effectum, id est secundum <eos>, qui uidebant, non quod Deo aliquid accidat, ut sit 'melior'. Dictum est de Ihesu: 'Puer Ihesus proficiebat etate et sapientia apud Deum et homines'. (1:21)*

THIS STRIFE GOD, AND THE BETTER NATURE, that is the will of God, the son of God, SETTLED. And thus with respect to the effect, that is according to those, who realized that nothing can happen to God, so that he would become 'better'. It is said about Jesus: 'The boy Jesus advanced in wisdom and age and grace with God and men'.

This explanation is unique in that it is the only one containing a Bible quotation, thus relating the *Metamorphoses* explicitly to a Christian context. It concerns the part of the first book of the *Metamorphoses* that treats the creation of the world, and reacts to the fact that the god/God is paired with the phrase *Melior natura* (a better nature), which is said to be the will of God, that is the son of God. The explanation then states that *melior* (better) in no way means that God can be made better, but that this must refer to Jesus, who increased in wisdom as he grew older. Were there more cases like this they would merit a theological category of explanations. This explanation, however, is unique.

Allegory

40. *INNICERE ANGVIPEDVM. Gigantes pedes habuisse dicuntur anguineos surgere a terra non ualentes, et significat illos, qui semper adherent terrenis. (1:184)*

[EACH] OF THE SERPENT-FOOTED [WAS IN ACT] TO LAY. Giants are said to have had snake-legs, not being able to rise from the ground, and this signifies those who always cling to earthly things.

This short example may be one of two allegorical explanations in the commentary. It reacts to the phrase 'each one of the snake-legged ones'

(*quisque anquipedum*) in the *Metamorphoses* and first explains that this is said about the giants, a common enough type of explanation, but then it goes on to say that this signifies those who always adhere to earthly things. This is a very short and compact allegorical explanation. In Book 9, we have the second allegorical explanation:

41. QVOQVE CHIMERA IVGO. Chimera est mons, in cuius summitate habitant leones et ideo dicitur ET HORA ET PECTVS LEENE habere. Et in medio habitant homines cum capris habentes ignem. Et ad radices eius morantur serpentes in lacu. Et metaforice dictum est. Serpens latitando incedit sic et luxuria primum incedit latitando temptans adinuenire, quod uult. Leo fortis est et petulans. Post inceptam delectationem fortitudinem exhibet, si necesse. Capra est fetida et inethos tandem nefarium opus fetet. (9:647)

AND ON THE RIDGE WHERE CHIMAERA. Chimera is a mountain on whose top lions live, and therefore it is said to have BOTH A LION'S HEAD AND CHEST. And in its middle men, who keep a fire, live with goats. And by its foot snakes dwell in a lake. And this is said metaphorically. The serpent advances by hiding, so also excess first advances by hiding, trying to find what it wants. The lion is strong and wanton. If necessary, it displays strength after a commenced pleasure. The goat is stinking and amoral, as an impious deed stinks in the end.

Here the explanation seems to argue that Chimera is an attribute or apposition to *iugo* (the Chimeran hill, or the hill Chimera) and the passage is interpreted metaphorically. It is said that lions live at the top, which explains 'both a face and chest of a lion'. In the middle of the hill men tending goats live. These men keep fires, which explains 'fire in the middle parts' (*mediis in partibus ignis*) and finally at the bottom serpents dwell, which accounts for 'the tail of a serpent' (*serpentis caudam*). In the *Metamorphoses* this is a direct description of the Chimera (the confusion may be caused because the correlative *iugo* (ablative) is drawn into the relative clause), but the commentary interprets this as a metaphor. What is even more interesting is that it then goes on to interpret the Chimera allegorically. The serpent is associated with *luxuria*, the lion with *fortitudo* and the goat with *nefarium opus*.

An Unidentified Quotation?

42. QVAM SATVS IAPETO. *Dii erant et sunt et erunt Prometheus et filius eius, antequam homo fuisset creatus, et hoc secundum philosophos.* (1:81)

[THE EARTH] WHICH THE SON OF IAPETUS. Prometheus and his son were, are and shall be gods before man had been created, and this is according to the philosophers.

This short explanation makes it clear to whom *satus Iapeto* refers, but it does so in a very strange way. It calls Prometheus and his son (Deucalion) gods using the strange phrase *erat et sunt et erunt* (they were, are and will be). It is primarily this phrase that makes this explanation stand out. It could, of course, be used mainly for dramatic effect, but if so, this style is not found anywhere else in the commentary. The vague reference to the philosophers also gives this explanation a twist. The entire explanation looks very much like a quotation, but I have not been able to find anything that resembles it.

The Commentary and its Focus on the *Metamorphoses*

The categories discussed in the previous section allow us to discern the general function of the commentary. However, with a few exceptions, they do not tell us much about the relationship between the commentary and the *Metamorphoses* in its entirety, which is the main focus in this section.

First, we need to consider the entire commentary as a unit to see whether we can justifiably speak about a proper commentary or just a collection of notes. The commentary fills over twenty-three folios and is introduced by an *accessus*, but contains no *explicit*, colophon or other means to signal its end. Instead, after the explanation to *Met.* 15:836, the same hand seamlessly continues with a short commentary on a text related to the Bible.²¹² Even though the end of the commentary is not announced, the fact that the explanation is on one of the final lines (line 836 of a total of 876) of the *Metamorphoses*, and the fact that the commentary contains explanations to all fifteen books of the *Metamorphoses*, makes it likely that the text in cdm 4610 is a complete text with no substantial parts missing. However, as we will see in the next chapter, commentaries that are extant in different versions often display a great variation between the texts, often in the form of additional information to supplement individual explanations, or even

²¹² See Part II Manuscript description.

additional explanations. This means that, even though the commentary in clm 4610 may be considered a complete work, this does not mean that another copy of this commentary, if found, would be of the same length.

The fact that commentaries can, in general, possess a highly modular nature in which passages can be added freely from other sources when a new copy of the commentary is made, is reason to be cautious when trying to discern how clm 4610 as a whole relates to the *Metamorphoses*. However, this modular nature does not exclude the possibility that the commentary was composed as a unified text. One indication that this might have been the case is the existence of internal references.

The first reference occurs in the second explanation to *Met.* 7:759 with the words *dixerim superius* (as I said above), which seems to refer to the first explanation to this lemma found only five lines above in clm 4610. The second mention is the explanation to *Met.* 9:186 with the phrase *sicut superius notauimus* (as we have noted above), but in this instance, the place mentioned is not to be found. Just a couple of lines later in the second explanation to *Met.* 9:187, the words *ut superius diximus* refer us all the way back to 7:3. Both explanations are shown here with the latter first and the explanation it refers to below it.

VESTRVM STIPHALIDES VNDE. *Apud Stiphalides undas, scilicet apud Phineum, Hercules arpias fugauit cum sagittis suis. Et filiis Boree, ut superius diximus, iussit eas persequi usque ad Strophados insulas. Dicitur tamen quod apud Stiphalides undas Hercules duos serpentes interficeret. (9:187)*

YOUR [WORK] THE STYMPHALIAN WAVES. Near the Stymphalian waves, that is to say near Phineus, Hercules chased the harpies away with his arrows. And, **as we have said above**, he commanded the sons of Boreas to follow them all the way to the Strophades islands. However, it is [also] said that Hercules killed two snakes near the Stymphalian waves.

VISVS ERAT PHINEVS, subaudi 'ab Argonautis'. *Fineus fuit quidam diues, qui de uxore iam mortua duos filios habebat, quos instinctu nouerca illorum, que nouerca Nubes dicebatur, excecauit. Ideo dii irati fuerunt et eum lumine priuauerunt et tres arpias, que uocabantur Aello, Cillerio, Occipete, sibi apposuerunt. Que cibos suos omnes conmacularent ad quem fine[u]m, cum Hercules et Argonaute uenerunt. Ab eo arpias Hercules auertit et iussit filiis Boree, ut illas fugarent. Qui usque ad Strophados insulas eas*

fugauerunt, qui aureum uellus rapiendum uenerunt. Strophos Grece, Latine dicitur 'conuersio'. (7:3)

PHINEUS HAD BEEN SEEN, supply 'by the Argonauts'. Phineus was a rich man who had two sons from his now dead wife. These he blinded on the instigation of their stepmother, this stepmother was called Nubes. Therefore the gods were angered and deprived him of his sight and placed with him three harpies, called Aello, Celaeno, Ocypete, who were to pollute all his food. When Hercules and the Argonauts came to this Phineus, Hercules took the harpies off him and commanded the sons of Boreas to chase them away. They, who came to snatch the golden fleece, chased the harpies all the way to the Strophades islands.

These references could, of course, belong to passages copied from elsewhere, but the fact that the explanations in the last example are quite far apart in the manuscript would seem to indicate some sort of planned composition of the text.

In the explanations to *Met.* 2:527 and 15:326, the commentary uses the phrases *superius etiam dictum est* (it has also been said above) and *in alio loco [...] dicuntur* (in another place [...] they are called). These are references to passages in the *Metamorphoses*, not internal references. These phrases actualise the relationship between the commentary and the target text and its author.

The explicit references to the *Metamorphoses* are not many, but there are a few references directly to Ovid. He is mentioned by name in the *accessus* and nine times in the commentary. Of those, nine times, five of these explanations belong to the narrative sub-category described in the previous section.²¹³ The four remaining mentions of Ovid are either in Euhemeristic explanations, as in the explanations to *Met.* 1:89 and 2:850, or in mythological background explanations, as in the ones to *Met.* 13:635 and 15:836.

Furthermore, the *accessus* in clm 4610 does not contain the topic *vita auctoris*, a short biography of the authors, which is often found in the *accessus*. This topic is treated twice in the *accessus* in clm 14809, which belongs to the Bavarian B family. In clm 4610, the only piece of biographical information on Ovid is one of the final explanations, where it is said:

hoc, quasi proemium, Ouidius ad laudem Augusti Caesaris premittit, ad cuius honorem librum suum scripsit (15:622)

²¹³ Narrative: 1:3, 3:269, 4:801, 7:687, 15:622.

Ovid starts by saying this as an introduction to the praise of Augustus Caesar, in whose honour he wrote his book.

The Euhemeristic explanation to *Met.* 2:850 could also be interpreted as being biographical, since it makes a statement about Ovid's relationship to his contemporaries:

INDVITVR FACIEM TAVRI. Hic Ouidius plane Iouem / deridet, non credens illum esse summum deum, sicut et alii philosophi non credebant, sed propter impera[re]tores sic locuti sunt dicentes Iouem esse summum deum (2:850)

HE ASSUMED THE FORM OF A BULL. Here Ovid clearly makes fun of Jupiter. He does not believe that Jupiter is the highest god, just as other philosophers did not believe this, but on account of the emperors who said that he was the highest god, they said this.

If we look at how the explanations in the commentary are apportioned in relation to the books of the *Metamorphoses*, we see that, although some books receive a very brief treatment (Book 5 being the briefest with only thirty-four lines of commentary in the edition), overall all books receive almost equal attention from the commentator. However, the number of explanations of the fifteen individual books of the *Metamorphoses* is not symmetric. The commentary on Book 1 contains the most explanations, fifty-nine on 154 lines in the edition, while Book 12 gets the least and only receives thirteen on forty-six lines.²¹⁴ The commentary seems to place most focus on Books 1, 2, 9, 10, 13 and 14, all of which contain around forty to sixty explanations each.

In the more commented-upon books, almost every story is covered, and this is also true for some of the less commented-upon books, but in these cases, some stories may get only a single explanation (e.g. in Book 8). By cross-referencing the inventory of categories of explanations in the previous section to the stories in the *Metamorphoses*, we can draw some conclusions about the focus of the commentary: in Book 1, the creation story receives a significant amount of attention, with twenty explanations to eighty-three lines in the *Metamorphoses*. Of these, the grammatical and natural philosophy categories dominate (nine and ten occurrences each) while the otherwise dominant

²¹⁴ Most explanations: 1 (59 expl.), 2 (53), 9 (51), 13 (43), 14 (41), 10 (38), 11 (26), 6 (25), 7 (24), 4 (23), 8 (20), 3 (17), 5 (16), 15 (15), 12 (13).

Longest: 9 (272 lines), 13 (168), 2 (160), 1 (154), 14 (122), 10 (105), 7 (94), 4 (77), 11 (73), 8 (67), 6 (64), 3 (57), 15 (54), 12 (46), 5 (34).

mythological background category only appear twice.²¹⁵ The short story of Pan and Syrinx on twenty-three lines produces six explanations.

Book 2 is dominated by the story of Phaeton, as is the commentary to this book, but there are also plenty of explanations to the story of the raven, Coronis and the crow and other stories. The story of Phaeton attracts nineteen explanations, with almost every single category of explanation being represented. Here explanations from the etymological and lexicon sub-categories, among others, appear quite frequently, which may indicate that this was a passage with difficult vocabulary that needed to be assimilated. The story of the raven is dominated by background and grammatical explanations.

In Book 3, the commentary focuses on the story of Cadmus, with little attention paid to the other stories. In Book 4, the story of Athamas and Ino receives the most attention, while not a single explanation is given to, for example, Pyramus and Thisbe.

Book 5 is unique in having all of its focus (except for one single explanation) on one story, that of the rape of Proserpine. Of these explanations the grammatical and lexical dominate.

The focus in Book 6 is quite evenly divided, with a main focus on Minerva and Arachne. Book 7 skips several stories and gives priority to Medea and Jason and the story of Cephalus and Procris. Book 8 favours the long story of Meleager and the Calydonian Boar.

The long commentary to Book 9 comments upon every story, but with seventeen explanations dedicated to the story of the death of Hercules (told on 138 lines), of which the background category features most strongly.

The commentary to Book 10 is also evenly divided with explanations for every story. The short stories of Cerastae and the Propoetides receive five explanations for its twenty-two lines, the following story of Pygmalion the same for fifty-five lines, while the story of Myrrha only four explanations for its over 200 lines. The commentary to Book 11 is short, but with the focus evenly divided. The commentary to Book 12 is very short and contains the least amount of explanations, most of which are dedicated to the story of the battle between the Lapiths and Centaurs.

Book 13 is the longest book in the *Metamorphoses* and the second longest book in the commentary. Here almost every story receives several explanations. The story of Scylla and Glaucus is, however, neglected, as is the story of Galatea and Polyphemus.

²¹⁵ Each explanation can belong to more than one category, thus the total of categories identified will usually be more than the number of explanations.

Book 14 contains many explanations with a discernible emphasis on the latter part of the book. Book 15 is short, with most of its explanations dedicated to the long story about the doctrines of Pythagoras.

Conclusions

By sorting the explanations in the commentary into four categories with sub-categories, a framework for the function of the explanations in the commentary is created. The commentary seems to prioritise familiarising the reader with the world of the *Metamorphoses* by giving background information about the stories contained within. Another prominent function is helping the reader to understand the actual text by giving grammatical help. A lesser function of the commentary is to enable the reader to generate a vocabulary based on the text, which it primarily does by using derivations and etymologies. Finally, the commentary provides a steady stream of interpretations ranging from Euhemeristic to interpretations concerned with the narrative structure of the *Metamorphoses*.

The categories developed here must not hide the fact that these categories often interact and intersect with each other and that not all explanations fit into the framework.

By analysing the function of the commentary through categories, we can also see that some types of explanation, which we might expect to find, are missing. Most noticeable is the almost complete absence of ethical and allegorical explanations, both of which become important in the later tradition of Ovid commentaries. I can see no simple reason for this absence. As remarked above, there are a few rare allegorical explanations, which means that the commentator was not unfamiliar with that mode of explaining, but perhaps simply did not find it relevant here. It could be that the *Metamorphoses* was not yet integrated enough into the curriculum to form a possible threat with its pagan material and thus require a defence in the form of allegorical and ethical explanations.

The second part of this section demonstrated that, by comparing the categorised explanations with the stories in the *Metamorphoses*, we can discern a focus on certain stories in the *Metamorphoses* and the dominance of certain categories of explanations to certain passages. Some stories, for instance the creation of the world in Book 1, receive high levels of attention, but overall, there does not seem to be any evident patterns of preference throughout the commentary. This study could well be broadened to include comparisons to other commentaries, which would then perhaps allow us to see a more general pattern from which we can draw conclusions about the focus

of the twelfth-century text users. For now, however, this study remains to be done.

The Commentary and its Sources

An anonymous commentary of a composite nature is itself an excellent example of medieval intertextuality, wherein older texts are assimilated, borrowed and quoted. This section explores the sources of clm 4610 and the way the commentaries use its sources.

It goes without saying that the *Metamorphoses* is the most important source for the commentary. This point would never have to be raised in a marginal commentary where the commentary is an obvious paratext. However, in a freestanding commentary it is possible, although not easy, for the commentary to function on its own, separated from the text on which it comments. In a more general way, Virgil and the other ancient authors that were more widely read than Ovid at this point in time are also important sources. It was through these authors that the medieval mind encountered the ancient world and learned 'good' Latin. Virgil has always been first among the ancients and the medieval reader's familiarity with him could easily be applied to Ovid, when, for instance, themes or narratives sometimes overlap with the stories in the *Metamorphoses* (e.g. Book 13 and 14 of the *Metamorphoses* concerns the adventures of Aeneas). The same could be said about Statius and Lucan, the other great epic poets. More important for clm 4610 than Virgil himself is his most famous commentator, Servius, whose influence on the medieval commentaries cannot be underestimated. Not only does this incredibly expansive commentary contain a wealth of material from which the later commentaries could pick and choose, but Servius also constitutes an important model for how to comment on ancient Roman literature. He will be addressed more below. In passing we should also note that several of the other ancient authors have an older or greater commentary tradition, from which the Ovid commentator could draw inspiration or simply extract material. Sadly, the interconnection between different commentaries is very difficult to identify, but hopefully this can be done more effectively in the future with the help of searchable databases.

In second place to Servius as far as a source of material is concerned, we can safely place Isidore of Seville and his twenty-book *Etymologies* (*Etymologiarum sive Originum libri xx*), in which the medieval reader could find information about virtually everything, from grammar to weapons. Narrower in scope and much later than Isidore, but still important, are the Latin lexicographers, e.g. the mid-eleventh century

Papias and his *Elementarium*, which gives short, concise definitions of words and is thus perfect for gathering excerpts for a commentary. More specifically relevant to a mythologically themed commentary (which would include commentary on almost all Roman poetry and much of the prose) are the mythographers, such as Hyginus (*Fabulae* and *De astronomia*), Solinus (*Collectanea rerum mirabilium*) and Fulgentius (*Mythologiae*) from the Ancient and Early Medieval era, and later the so-called Vatican Mythographers. The collection of ancient myths, often retold in a brief and simple style in these authors' works, often functioned as a handy reference for the commentators.

As a general source of inspiration for the philosophical or cosmological interest shown in the commentary, it is easy to imagine Martianus Capella, Macrobius, Boethius and Calcidius's translation and commentary on *Timaeus*. The latter was becoming increasingly popular at the end of the eleventh century, while the others had been popular for a long time. Martianus Capella's *De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* must have been an especially attractive text to match with the *Metamorphoses*, given its framework story populated with mythological beings and the handbook-like nature of the main part of the work. All four of these authors also have a rich commentary tradition of their own, which may have influenced clm 4610.²¹⁶

To this list of general inspiration may be added the grammatical literature, for example, Priscian, inherited from the ancient world and much commented upon throughout the centuries. Besides the pagan literature, there are also the vast amount of biblical, patristic and liturgical commentaries to be reckoned with, such as St Augustine and his *De Civitate Dei* and its long discussion of pagan religion and philosophy.

These are some general suggestions of the type of literature that would have been included in the cultural sphere of clm 4610. These are authors and works that can only be suggested based on their popularity during this period and their relevance for the commentary. As for more concrete evidence of sources used, it would seem as though clm 4610 makes use of what seems to be considered as a sort of intellectual public property, where it is difficult to decide what is more or less a direct copy of older material and what is an adaptation of that

²¹⁶ For Martianus Capella see Cora E. Lutz's articles in vol. 2 and 3 of *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum* (available at: <http://catalogustranslationum.org/>). For a wide-ranging study of the reception of Martianus see *Carolingian Scholarship and Martianus Capella: Ninth-century Commentary Traditions on De nuptiis in Context*, ed. M. Teeuwen, S. O'Sullivan (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011). For Boethius see *A Companion to Boethius in the Middle Ages*, ed. N. H. Kaylor jr., P. E. Phillips (Leiden: Brill, 2012), <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004225381>.

material. However, we can still draw some conclusions. It is possible to discern three categories of sources in the text:

1. Explicit sources (*secundum Manogaldum*).
2. Vague sources (*quidam dicunt*).
3. Implicit sources.

1. Explicit Sources

To this group belong all named sources and direct quotations in the commentary.²¹⁷ They appear twenty-two times, with a maximum frequency of four times per book in Books 7 and 11. Thirteen of them appear in mythological explanations, seven in grammar explanations and one each in the sub-categories narrative and natural philosophy.

The mysterious Manegold earns first place with five mentions, followed by Servius with four mentions. Where ancient authors are concerned, Virgil, Statius, Ovid himself and possibly Horace are mentioned by name.²¹⁸ There are also several quotations without the authors being mentioned in the text, for instance *libat oscula* in 1:371, which is from Statius (*Theb.* 10:61). Among the grammarians, Priscian is mentioned once. One source is mentioned twice, but with only the first part of the name extant, Teo- or Theo. Two famous Christian *auctores* are referred to: St Jerome in Book 4 and St Augustine in Book 9. In the first case, it is quite possible that we are dealing with a mistake and that Jerome has been confused with Hyginus, who has a passage that fits well with the explanation in the commentary. The reference to Augustine is one of the clearest; both author and work are quoted.

There are also two mentions of a 'history': 'old history' and 'Roman history'. These could be general sources and thus belong to the second category, or they could be references to the *Homerus Latinus* material (*Ilias Latina*, *Dictys Cretensis* and *Daretis Phrygii de excidio Trojae historia*), since in both instances we are dealing with the Homeric part of the *Metamorphoses*.

When examining how sources are used, the composite nature of the commentary makes it difficult to say if the sources mentioned are collected and reported by the commentator/compiler who created clm 4610, or if they are the result of texts pieced together, that is a quotation within a quotation.

²¹⁷ These sources are also discussed by Meiser, cf. Meiser 1885, pp. 71-81.

²¹⁸ The reference to Horace is uncertain, since the reference only consists of the phrase *dicit or*, where *or* may stand for *oratus*.

Manogaldus—Manegold

The first source that must be addressed in greater depth is Manegold. Five times throughout the commentary, references are made to one Manogaldus. This is significant because it could be the only contemporary name referred to in the commentary. It is even more significant because it refers to a name to which some scholars would like to attribute the entire commentary. The name Manogaldus is believed to refer to Manegold of Lautenbach (c. 1030/40-1112).²¹⁹ Manegold was an itinerant teacher in France and later a monk in Rottenbuch in Bavaria and Marbach in Alsace. Of the works attributed to him only two survive, the two polemical texts *Liber contra Wolfhelmum* and *Liber ad Geberhardum*.²²⁰ Through these texts, we get a picture of Manegold as a man opposed to the neo-platonic intellectual environment of his time, but also a man who had expert knowledge of those very texts.

Manegold of Lautenbach has attracted a lot of scholarly attention for an author with only two surviving complete texts. He has been studied by scholars, usually by those interested in the history of philosophy and theology, since the nineteenth century until the present day, with the most recent work known to me being Irene Caiazzo's two articles from 2011.

The association of Manegold with clm 4610 stems from Karl Meiser's article from the late nineteenth century, which has been the main secondary literature on this commentary ever since.²²¹ Some earlier scholars have assumed that the entire commentary in clm 4610 is the work of Manegold, including E. H. Alton who states: 'his notes on the *Metamorphoses* are disappointing; in criticism he is very often puerile; and he continually tries to substitute the figments of his

²¹⁹ For a survey of his life and work, see Manitius 1931, pp. 175-180. See also Ziolkowski 2002, which contains a useful introduction and a bio- and bibliographical appendix. The most recent research on Manegold known to me are two articles by Irene Caiazzo from 2011, of which one contains a good updated bibliography, which should be used together with Ziolkowski. Irene Caiazzo, 'Magister Menegaldus, l'anonyme d'Erfurt et La Consolatio Philosophiae', *Revue d'histoire Des Textes*, N.S., 2011.6, 139-65, <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.RHT.5.101218>; Irene Caiazzo, 'Manegold: Magister Modernorum Magistrorum', in *Arts Du Langage et Théologie Aux Confins Des XIe-XIIE Siècles*, pp. 317-49, <https://doi.org/10.1484/M.SA-EB.3.4872>.

²²⁰ *Liber contra Wolfelmum*, ed. W. Hartmann (1972); *Liber ad Geberhardum* in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum saeculis xi et xii vol. 1*, ed. K. Franke (Hannover, 1891), pp. 308-430.

²²¹ Meiser 1885, pp. 71-72.

imagination for real knowledge'.²²² Michael Herren, in a much more recent article, is very clear about his position that clm 4610 is the product of an anonymous compiler, but that the compiler excerpts from Manegold, which can be seen both in named references and in passages where his name is not mentioned, but that show some similarities to *Liber contra Wolfelmum*.²²³ In addition to the five explicit references to Manegold, Herren suggests that the *quidam philosophi* paragraph in the *accessus* and a few other explanations (the *Melior natura* and *Hic Ouidius plane Iouem deridet* explanations)²²⁴ might stem from Manegold, but he wisely concludes with the following statement, with which I fully agree:

There is not a lot one can do about this kind of compendium. One has neither the right to assume that identified scholia are drawn from complete commentaries (as opposed to lecture notes), nor to assign unassigned scholia to particular authors.²²⁵

If we turn to clm 4610 itself and investigate how Manegold is used, we find that he is referred to in both grammar explanations and for mythological background. The two grammar explanations are of a quite rudimentary nature.

Secundum Manogaldum, qui non uult ullam diptongon Latinam diuidi, aliud nomen est Eneus et aliud Aeneus, et Eripiēs et Aeripiēs, et sic etiam in consimilibus. (7:121)

According to Manegold, who does not want to divide any Latin diphtong, Eneus and Aeneus, and Eripiēs and Aeripiēs are different names, and so also with similar words.

CODICE QVI MISSO. Dicit M<anegaldus> quod 'codex' pro 'caudex' fit lapis uel aliquando ramus arboris. Et diptongus mutatur in o. (12:432)

HE [CRUSHED] WITH A THROWN TREE-TRUNK. Manegold says that codex for caudex is a stone or sometimes a tree-branch. And the diphtong changes into o.

²²² Alton 1960, p. 26.

²²³ Herren 2004, p. 223.

²²⁴ Edition I. 92-96, 410-413.

²²⁵ Herren 2004, p. 220.

Here, his authority is called upon for orthographical or phonological matters. In the second example only an initial is used, but since the content again concerns diphthongs, just as in the preceding example, it is reasonable to assume the M. stands for Manegold.

He is also mentioned three times when mythological background is concerned. In the first two instances, he is used to introduce the explanations and in the third, he is used to voice an alternative version.

Secundum Manogaldum Diana fecerat quedam carmina ambigua.
(7:759)

According to Manegold Diana had made some uncertain verses.

Secundum Manogaldum quondam Dedalus Theseo ense et globos piceos consilio Adriagnes dederat. (8:183)

According to Manegold Daedalus once gave Theseus a sword and pitched balls following Ariadne's advice.

Manogaldus autem dicit Esionem religatam et ab Hercule liberatam et a Telamone ductam fabulosam esse totum. (11:214)

However, Manegold says that it is completely fictitious that Hesione was tied up and freed by Hercules and married to Telamon.

The first of these three examples also has a parallel in another commentary, clm 14809.²²⁶ These are, as far as I know, the only explicit mentions of Manegold in the twelfth-century *Metamorphoses* commentaries.

Based on these five references to Manegold we get a glimpse of what looks like a schoolmaster who is concerned with correct use of Latin and who also provides alternative explanations of the ancient myths. Herren and Caiazzo argues convincingly that a few of the more philosophical explanations match quite well with what we believe to be Manegold's position on these matters.

It is interesting and probably significant for the origin and creation of clm 4610 that a contemporary name is mentioned several times, but this does not mean that clm 4610 should be considered Manegold's commentary or necessarily even very closely related to him, just as we would not call it Servius's commentary because of the references to

²²⁶ Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 14809: *secundum magister manag.* (75r). See next chapter for more information on this.

him.²²⁷ However, Manegold is a contemporary authority and as such important.

Teo/Theo – Theodontius?

Vel aliter, secundum Teo- asia fuit mulier (9:448)

Or differently: according to †Teo† Asia was a woman

Vel aliter: Secundum Theo-, quia non conueniebat superos orare pro mortuis, sed infernales. (11:583)

Or differently: according to †theo-†, since it is not fitting to pray to the gods above for the dead, but to the ones below.

This Teo- or Theo- shows up in two passages; the first time in an explanation from the grammatical and patronymic categories and the second time in a mythological background explanation. In the second case, Theo- functions as an alternative to an explanation that is supported by invoking Servius.

Marianne Pade has argued that this Teo might be the Teodontius mentioned in Boccaccio's *De natura gentilium deorum*, but in my opinion the references in clm 4610 are far too short to draw any conclusions regarding this matter.²²⁸

Servius

In the explicit mentions, Servius is used twice in grammatical explanations and twice in mythological background explanations. Where the grammatical explanations are concerned, the following explanation in Book 12 consists entirely of a reference to Servius:

Servius dicit 'insanus' pro 'magnus', sicut insana Iuno pro magna. (12:510)

Servius says that 'raging' [can be used] for 'great', as in raging Juno for great Juno.

²²⁷ Ascribing the commentary to Manegold only reveals the modern anxiety over handling the anonymous and amorphous texts of which much of medieval literature consists. It is, of course, tempting to use a name, even though a 'pseudo' may have to be inserted in front of it, just for ease of reference. However, in this case it is my opinion that we should refrain from it so as not to create a false image of a 'master's text'.

²²⁸ Marianne Pade 'The Fragments of Theodontius in Boccaccio's *Genealogie Deorum Gentilium Libri*' in *Avignon & Naples. Italy in France - France in Italy in the Fourteenth Century*, (*Analecta Romana Instituti Danici Supplementum* 25) ed. M. Pade and others, 149-182. (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1997).

In a reference in Book 9, he is inserted at the very end to provide a solution to the discussion in the explanation.

Remedium habemus Seruii, quod dicit: post 're-' communiter poni.
(9:51)

We have Servius's solution that says: *post re communiter poni.*

In the mythological explanations, things are slightly more complicated. In his first appearance in Book 11, I have not been able to trace the source.

Seruius dicit, quod non licet alicui sacrificare diis pro mortuo aquo, donec faciens sacrificium purgauerit se aliqua purgatione. (11:583)

Seruius says that nobody is allowed to sacrifice to the gods for a dead person until the one performing the sacrifice has cleansed himself with some sort of purification.

In the second case, however, a source can be found, but it would seem as though Servius says the exact opposite of what the commentary reports.

Mulcifer VREBAT. Seruius dicit quod MVLCIBER est Iupiter, Mulcifer est Vulcanus. (14:533)

Mulcifer burned. Servius says that Mulciber is Jupiter; Mulcifer is Vulcan.

This can be compared to the following passage in Servius:

MVLCIBER Vulcanus, ab eo quod totum ignis permulcet (in Aen. 8:724)

MULCIBER, Vulcan. From the fact that fire tames everything.

These are the only the explicit references to Servius in the commentary, which does not give an accurate picture of his influence. It is, however, interesting to consider what made the commentator decide to refer to Servius by name in these instances and not in others. In the explanations mentioned above there is a reference to authority of a type, which is not needed when only using another text for background material, but there are many other explanations where an

authority could be used, but is not. Whether this is only coincidence or because of a choice or a result of the compiling of the text, is almost impossible to say.²²⁹

2. Vague Sources

Hoc dicunt philosophi, ut Plato et ceteri (15:237)

The philosophers, such as Plato and others, say

The last explicit source in the commentary is to be found in Book 15. This source functions as a bridge between the two categories of explicit and vague. It is explicit in the sense that it mentions a source by name, i.e. Plato, but it does so in a very general and vague manner. Plato is mentioned as just one of the philosophers who make a certain statement. The vague and unspecific *dicunt philosophi* is typical for this category. There are at least twenty mentions of vague sources, of the type 'some say' or 'according to another story'. In some of these cases, especially when the phrase is *secundum aliam* or *quandam fabulam* it has been possible to find a parallel source.²³⁰

The majority of vague sources are used in explanations of mythological background and they then serve as introductions to an alternative story.²³¹

The vague references are also used in a few instances when grammatical or text critical matters are discussed, for example:

Quidam dicunt, quod 'Nixi' referatur ad Perseum (8:182)

Some say that 'of the Kneeler' refers to Perseus

This could refer to another commentary or authority of some sort (but to which specific text is unknown). I have chosen to label the types of

²²⁹List of explicit sources: 2:685: *dicit or-* (possibly Or<atius>) (*Odes* I 10, 9-12 according to Meiser); 4:19 *Hoc est quod sanctus Ieronimus testatur* (Not identified, possibly wrong for Hyginus, *De Astronomia* 2:5); 7:121: *Secundum Manogaldum*; 7:363: *hanc fabulam dicit Vergilius*, (*Aeneis* Book 7); 7:687: *in Ovidio epistularum plane inuenitur*, (*Heroides* 4:93); 7:759: *Secundum Manogaldum*; 8:183: *Secundum Manogaldum*; 9:51: *remedium habemus Seruii*; 9:448: *Vel aliter, secundum Theo-*; 9:693: *Hoc de tauro sanctus Augustinus testatur in libro de ciuitate Dei*. (*De ciuitate Dei*, 18:5); 10:10: *Sicut legitur in quarto libro georicorum*, (*Georgica* 4,485); 11:3: *teste Prisciano*; 11:214: *Manogaldus autem dicit*; 11:583: *Seruius dicit - secundum Theo-*; 12:432: *Dicit M<anegaldus>*; 12:510: *Seruius dicit*; 12:610: *ut in ueteri legitur historia*; 13:2: *legitur in statio thebis*; 13:626: *secundum romanam historiam*; 14:533: *seruius dicit*; 15:237: *Hoc dicunt philosophi, ut Plato et ceteri*.

²³⁰ cf. 1:10; 1:690; 4:291; 6:117; 13:690; 13:716.

²³¹ Alternative stories may also be introduced without mentioning a vague source. In those cases, words such as *vel*, *aliter*, *tamen dicitur* are used.

references discussed above as ‘vague sources’. They could also be regarded as markers for the *variorum*-commentary, which is James Zetzel’s position.²³² Clm 4610 is an excellent example of a *variorum*-commentary, a commentary that consist of different layers of previous material, some of which may be conflicting and therefore introduced with the help of phrases such as *quidam dicunt*. Of interest here might be that, according to Zetzel, different phrases can be dated to different periods, for example *aliter* seems to be a product of the Carolingian period.²³³ The *variorum*-marker *aliter* only appears six times in clm 4610. Much more common is the listing of alternative explanations with a simple *vel* (forty-one times) and the appeal to authority with the phrases *quidam dicunt* (ten times) and *secundum x* (thirty-five times).²³⁴

3. Implicit Sources

Explicit and vague sources are found in less than ten percent of all the explanations. The rest of the explanations make no mention of sources at all, although it is obvious that they must have drawn upon some sources in many cases. In a few cases, however, it is actually possible to imagine explanations without external sources. The grammatical explanations as well as the paraphrasing, narrative and plot-based explanations could be written without any other sources.

Finding implicit sources involves sifting through a vast amount of literature. Today this is made a great deal easier by the use of searchable databases.²³⁵ However, it must be pointed out that there is still a certain amount of guesswork involved when it comes to what to look for and where.

Parallels to some of the explanations in the commentary have been found in the works of Servius, Hyginus, Isidore, the Vatican Mythographers and a few others. As far as natural philosophy and the Euhemeristic explanations are concerned, there seem to be some parallels to William of Conches (2:26, 2:527) and possibly to Eriugena (2:2, 2:246 and 15:533) and Remigius of Auxerre (1:255). In Book 1, we also find some explanations that, in part, correspond to Calcidius and an anonymous commentary on Boethius (1:25, 1:117).

²³² Zetzel 2005, p. 75-78.

²³³ Zetzel 2005, p. 75.

²³⁴ The *quidam dicunt* phrase can also be expressed with the verbs *volunt* and *habent*. The preposition *secundum* can be followed by a name or simply a *quosdam* (‘according to some’). The *secundum*-phrase is used frequently in clm 4610. In the much longer commentary in Freiburg 381, one of the manuscripts in the Bavarian B family, the phrase is only used nineteen times.

²³⁵ I have mainly made use of Brepols’ Cross Database Search Tool.

Servius

Servius appears both as an explicit source (discussed above) and as an implicit one. I have thus far identified fifteen parallel passages in clm 4610 to Servius's Virgil commentaries.²³⁶ Of these passages, eight are to his commentary on the *Aeneid*, four to the *Georgics* and one to the *Eclogues*. The explanations in clm 4610 using Servius's texts belong to many different categories, but mainly to the mythological background category. At the time the commentary was composed, Servius commentaries were available both in their 'normal' form and in an expanded form, usually referred to as *Servius auctus* or *Servius Danielis*. The expanded Servius, which is believed to have been created in the Carolingian period, contains material from Donatus's lost commentary as well as other sources.²³⁷ All the parallels found thus far are, however, to the shorter, older version of Servius.

Isidore

Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* can always be expected to make an appearance in a text like this. I have identified twelve parallel passages to his work.²³⁸ As expected from the title it is frequently used when etymologies are concerned (but not always), and also for other encyclopaedic type facts.

Hyginus

As of yet, I have identified one parallel passage in Hyginus's *De astronomia* (i.e. 4:19 discussed above) and eleven to his *Fabulae*, all of which relate to typical mythological background information.²³⁹ However, the *Fabulae* is highly problematic, since it has only survived in the form of an early printed edition from 1535 by Iacobus Micyllus. Micyllus based his edition on one single Beneventan manuscript, with which he apparently had some difficulties and treated quite freely. Only two damaged fragments of this Benevetan manuscript survive.²⁴⁰

The textual problems with the *Fabulae* also make it possible to imagine that the *Fabulae* that survived to this day was composed largely from material from the time of clm 4610 or later, rather than

²³⁶ Accessus; 1:14; 1:117; 1:188; 1:580; 1:624; 4:461; 9:51; 9:183; 9:691; 10:90; 13:46; 14:44; 14:103; 14:331; 15:326.

²³⁷ Ziolkowski and Putnam 2008, p. 625.

²³⁸ Accessus l. 18, 20, 21; 1:38; 1:89; 1:332; 1:690; 4:750; 5:347; 5:555; 10:206; 10:223.

²³⁹ 1:10; 1:580; 2:219; 3:665; 4:219; 5:499; 6:117; 9:408; 11:745 12:610 and 13:399.

²⁴⁰ Cameron 2004, pp. 33-35.

being ancient material. If this were the case, then the parallels to *Fabulae* bears a resemblance to all the parallels that can be found to passages in the thirteenth-century *Fabularius* by Conrad of Mure.²⁴¹ In the latter case, I have not reported the parallels in the apparatus, since it is a text of more recent date than clm 4610, but in the former, I have reported parallels, because of the presumed antiquity of the text.

The Vatican Mythographers

I have identified seventeen parallel passages to the so-called Vatican Mythographers. These mythographers are named after the Vatican manuscripts used by their first editor, Angelo Mai, in 1831.²⁴² They are three in number, with the first two believed to be from the Carolingian period. Of the first, only one twelfth-century manuscript survives but, of the second, at least eleven manuscripts are known. The third mythographer is thought to be from the late twelfth century (at the earliest) and has thus been excluded from this study. The first two mythographers' texts read much like a catalogue or a lexicon of ancient myths organised more or less alphabetically by name. The length of the stories told ranges from a few lines to a page or two. The content consists of prose retelling of the myths, but there is also a distinct commentary element to the texts, with many interpretative comments to be found throughout. Since the mythological background story is the most common form of explanation, a closer study of the treatment of mythography would be valuable. However, I believe that such a study would be better served by having more commentaries, as well as more mythographical material available. The Vatican Mythographers are far from the only mythographers available for this period: another possibly relevant text, the so-called *Liber de Natura Deorum* by an anonymous twelfth-century scribe, is another example.²⁴³

Of the nine identified parallels (more could probably be found), four are from the first mythographer and five from the second.²⁴⁴ Virtually all the parallels are found in mythological background explanations.

²⁴¹ *Conradi de Mure Fabularius*, ed. Tom van de Loo (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006).

²⁴² The following information is taken from the introduction to Ronald E. Pepin *The Vatican Mythographers* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008).

²⁴³ Virginia Brown 'An Edition of an Anonymous Twelfth-Century *Liber de Natura Deorum*' in *Mediaeval Studies* vol. 34, 1972. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, p. 1-70.

²⁴⁴ Myt. 1: 1:106; 3:269; 6:652; 7:3; 13:716.

Myt. 2: 1:10; 1:14; 1:690; 4:457; 4:458; 4:460; 4:461; 5:532; 6:384; 6:415; 9,187; 9:647.

Conclusions

In this section, we have briefly discussed the general literary backdrop for the commentary and then analysed the sources using three categories: explicit, vague and implicit sources. As far as the explicit sources are concerned, the most controversial one is that of Manegold, the only contemporary source to be mentioned by name. Although a contemporary authority is interesting, I still maintain that it does not mean that *clm* 4610 should be considered a Manegold commentary. The vague sources are used to introduce an alternative explanation and also perhaps to confer authority to the commentary by mentioning predecessors, even though they are unnamed. The implicit sources are the most difficult to identify. Not unsurprisingly Servius, Isidore and the compendia of Hyginus and the Vatican Mythographers feature heavily in the text, with the latter leading with seventeen identified parallels; Servius sharing second place with Isidore, both with fifteen parallel passages; and Hyginus last, with twelve. I do not doubt that several more parallels could be found, but the aim here is not to provide a complete catalogue of every single source of the commentary. Rather, it is to suggest possible inspirations as well as to try to find parallels to passages that contain some sort of textual difficulty, which may be resolved with the help of another text.

