

# The Bavarian Commentary and Ovid

ROBIN WAHLSTEN BÖCKERMAN

**Q**um multa possint inquiri i ca  
pice unicuiq. libri moderni  
qda gaudentes buntate. tria pn  
cipalit ingrenda statuere. idest  
materia. intentione. & cui par  
ti philosophie supponat. Cu di  
ximus parti. estat philosophia  
aliqua totu ee unde partes possit  
preede. Hec pmo agamus de ethi  
mologia ipsius uocabuli. Olin so  
phi id sapientes dicebant. s. pika  
goras hoc uidens nimis arrogans  
apposuit qda remediū. i. sopho.  
qd e amor. inde philosophus ama  
tor sapientie. Huc usq. egunt de  
ethimologia ipsi uocabuli. Hec aut  
dicant qd sit ipsa res. Philosophia  
e ars t naturalis t artificialis. na  
turalis e que omibz in e. ut abula  
re. loqui. Artificialis que ama  
gistro docet & ad discipulo discit.  
& hec eade artificialis diuidit in  
duas partes. scilicet in literale q.  
literalem. In literalis est. ut scire.  
arare. Literalis que pote dici uera  
philosophia diuidit in tria. scilicet in  
physica logica ethica. Physica gree.  
latine natura. Inde physica natu  
ra. que diuidit in. iiii. partes sci  
licet geometria arithmetica. musi  
ca. astronomia. Ge. eni gree lat  
terra. ometria. dicitur mensura. in de  
geometria mensura terre. A res. gree

t uirt. methuca numerus. in de  
arithmetica uirt. numeri. Olin  
gree. hebraice aq. inde musica aq.  
tica dr. qd omis uox ab humore &  
aeris repercussione chit. astrono  
mia. i. astrorum scientia. Logi  
ca diuidit in. iiii. scilicet grammatice.  
rethorica. dialectica. Grama eni g  
ee. lat littera. in de grammatice li  
terat. Rethor gree. lat orator.  
Dia gree. lat duo. logos sermo in  
de dialectica. sermo duos. Ethica  
diuidit in duo scilicet in bonos mo  
res & malos. Ethus eni gree. lat  
mores. inde ethica moralis. Omis  
auctor. t pragmatice. t eregrina  
rice. t cinomice. Pragmaticon  
ide fabulosu. & est ubi in trodus  
re plone locunt ut terentiu. Ex  
agmatico. ide enarratiuū. ubi  
auctor loquitur priscian. Terciu  
geni poematis e. Cinomice. i.  
comune. ut ovidius iste scribit.  
**Q**uidā philosophi fuerunt qui  
mundū de nichilo deū fecisse  
crederunt. Quidā uero alii ex  
athomis. & in auitate. que duo  
semp fuerunt. dicit dñm mundū  
fecisse. Alii aut philosophi. sicut  
ovidius & con similes. tria ee semp  
dixer. scilicet dñi. & .iii. elementa simul  
compta. & formas omniū rerū i men  
te di existentes. i. ideas. 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.

## 5. Clm 4610 and the Commentary Tradition

This chapter explores the relationship between clm 4610 and commentary material found in two other types of text; first the marginal commentaries found in *Metamorphoses* manuscripts older than or contemporary with clm 4610, second the other freestanding commentaries from the twelfth century.

### Marginal Commentaries in Early *Metamorphoses* Manuscripts: A Prehistory of clm 4610?

As far as we know, the commentary in clm 4610 is the oldest freestanding commentary on the *Metamorphoses*. However, as we have discussed earlier, we know of the metamorphosing relationship between freestanding commentary and marginal commentary. During the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries, for instance, the same commentary could exist both as a freestanding commentary and as a marginal commentary.<sup>245</sup> As far as earlier material is concerned, the tradition of the *Metamorphoses* itself is admittedly of a rather late date, but several of the manuscripts still predate 1100. This naturally invites the question as to whether there are any traces of clm 4610 in the margins of the early *Metamorphoses* manuscripts.

The commentary genre is in many aspects an open one, and even though clm 4610 shows signs of being a copy it is unlikely that we can expect to find a complete exemplar in the margins. The composite nature of commentaries would rather lead us to expect at most a version of the commentary, or, if that is not the case, perhaps material shared by marginal and freestanding commentaries. If we find material in common, and depending on the extent of this material, what can it tell us about the transmission and early reception of the *Metamorphoses*?

The following section will first survey the early *Metamorphoses* manuscript and then examine the marginal commentaries in some of

---

<sup>245</sup> For an example of this see David T. Gura, 'From the Orléanais to Pistoia: The Survival of the Catena Commentary' in *Manuscripta: A Journal for Manuscript Research* 54.2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.MSS.1.100987>; or Frank T. Coulson 'Ovid's Transformations in Medieval France' in *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. A. Keith and S. Rupp (Toronto: CRRS Publications, 2007).

them. This study is not an in-depth analysis of the relationship between these marginal commentaries; its purpose is rather to investigate the possible relationship between them and clm 4610 as well as the Bavarian B family (discussed in the next section).

### Survey<sup>246</sup>

Earliest *Metamorphoses* fragments:

9<sup>th</sup> century:

Bern, Burgerbibliothek Bern: 363, middle of 9<sup>th</sup> c., insular scribe.

Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig: Rep. I 74, France (possibly Orléans).<sup>247</sup>

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France: lat. 12246, France.<sup>248</sup>

10<sup>th</sup> century:

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana: Vat.Urb.lat. 342, middle of 10<sup>th</sup> c., France or Germany.

The oldest manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses* are only extant as fragments. They are four in number, but only one of them, lat. 12246, contains a small amount of interlinear gloss. The fragment consists of only two folios and the margins have been cut, which makes it impossible to conclusively state whether it originally included more and longer comments than those on the extant leaves. The glosses that we have are of a simple type, for example, above the word *quadripedes* (*Met.* 2:82) on line 18 on 2<sup>ra</sup> the word *equos* has been written. Lactantian *tituli* and *narrationes* are also included and have been incorporated with the main text, but marked with a slight indentation.<sup>249</sup> Based on the material we have, there is nothing to suggest a more substantial commentary.

From the late tenth to the early twelfth century, twelve manuscripts survive, which constitute the basis of Tarrant's edition of the

<sup>246</sup> The information in this survey is gathered from Tarrant 2004 and Munk Olsen 1985 combined with my own observations.

<sup>247</sup> Digitised copy: <https://www.ub.uni-leipzig.de/forschungsbibliothek/digitale-sammlungen/mittelalterliche-handschriften/handschriften-der-rep-signaturenreihe-leihgabe-leipziger-stadtbibliothekw/>.

<sup>248</sup> The fragment is bound (upside down) into a manuscript with St. Gregory's *Moralia in Iob*. A reproduction is available at: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10721618t.r=12246>.

<sup>249</sup> For a further discussion of the Lactantian material see chapter 4, under the section The Nature of the Commentary.

*Metamorphoses*. Nine of them contain glosses, of which I have examined all but one:<sup>250</sup>

Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana:

**Plut. 36.12 (L)**, 11<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> c., Germany(?): Main text in pregothic script with a marginal commentary and interlinear gloss also in pregothic script.<sup>251</sup> Much of the marginal commentary is too faded to read. There may be more than one pregothic hand commenting in the margin. There is also a large amount of commentary by a later hand writing in a large and untidy script, which is often too faded to read. The text also contains Lactantian *tituli* in the margins. From 60<sup>r</sup> (Book 10) the commentary decreases to only scattered words. Size: 27,6x14,8. 72 fol. Contains *Met.* 1-12:298.<sup>252</sup>

**San Marco 223 (F)**, late 11<sup>th</sup> c., Italy/France/Germany: Main text in pregothic script and marginal commentary and interlinear glosses by a pregothic hand. There is also a second pregothic hand commenting in the margin, but much less frequently than the first one (e.g. on 25<sup>r</sup>). The occurrence of fusion of the letter combination *pp* may point to these glosses being from the mid to the latter part of the twelfth century.<sup>253</sup> Besides the pregothic hands, there are also some scattered glosses by later hands (also visible on 25<sup>r</sup>). The text is also supplied with Lactantian *tituli* in both Latin and Italian. The marginal commentary is much less frequent in the latter part of the text. Parts of the text have been lost and replaced by text written by a fifteenth-century humanist hand. The replaced folios (1<sup>r</sup>-2<sup>v</sup>, 10<sup>r</sup>-12<sup>v</sup> and 14<sup>r</sup>-15<sup>v</sup>) carry no commentary

<sup>250</sup> Information regarding date and provenance are taken from Tarrant and Munk Olsen 1985. The bracketed letters signify the sigla used by Tarrant and earlier editors. The only manuscript containing glosses, which I have not had the chance to examine, is the following:

London, British Library: Harl.2610 (H), 10<sup>th</sup> c., Germany.

The three remaining older manuscript (without glossing) are the following:

Copenhagen, Det kongelige Bibliotek: NKS 56 2o, late 11th c., Germany/Speyer.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: Clm 29208, late 11th c., Tegernsee.

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana: Pal. lat. 1669, late 11th c., France.

<sup>251</sup> I use the term pregothic for the transitional script of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which shows characteristics of both the Carolingian and the Gothic scripts. For a further discussion of this see the manuscript description in Part II.

<sup>252</sup> Digitised copy:

<http://teca.bmlonline.it/ImageViewer/servlet/ImageViewer?idr=TECA0000423990&keyworks=Plut.36.12#page/1/mode/1up>.

<sup>253</sup> Erik Kwakkel 'Decoding the material book: cultural residue in medieval manuscript' in *The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches*, ed. M. Johnston, M. Van Dussen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 62, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107588851.004>.

except for a few interlinear glosses. Size: 34x23. 66 fol. Contains *Met.* 1-15. (Also contains parts of *Nux*, *De medicamine faciei* and *Tristia*.)

**San Marco 225 (M)**, late 11<sup>th</sup> c., Italy: Main text in pregothic script with scattered marginal commentary and occasional interlinear glosses. The more substantial marginal commentaries are found on: 2r-v, 19r, 33r, 51r, 68r, 73r, 81v. Besides these only scattered words or single line notes are to be found. The marginal commentary is written by several different hands, the oldest of which may be contemporary with the main text, but does not seem to be by the same hand. On 1v what may be diagram can be seen in the bottom, left margin, but it is too faded to make out properly. Lactantian *tituli* and *narrationes* are also included and have been incorporated with the main text, but marked with a slight indentation. 119 fol. Contains *Met.* 1-14:830 (Missing some lines in Books 8, 13, and 14.)

London, British Library:

**Add. 11967 (E)**, 10<sup>th</sup> c., Italy: Main text in Carolingian script with a small amount of marginal commentary and interlinear glossing by a later hand (pregothic script). Lactantian *tituli* and *narrationes* are also included and have been incorporated with the main text. Size: 27,5x18. 29 fol. Contains *Met.* 2-6 (mutilated, also with missing passages in the extant text).

Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli:

**IVE.3 (N)**, 11<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> c., southern Italy: Main text in beneventan script with Lactantian *narrationes* by the same hand in the margin. The *narrationes* are always enclosed in a red frame. There is marginal commentary by several different hands throughout the text. There is one marginal commentary in pregothic script and interlinear gloss by what looks like a similar or the same hand. Another commentary in a later gothic script by one or several hands (e.g. on 149<sup>v</sup>). This commentary seems to increase in the second half of the manuscript. The manuscript is also richly illuminated (which makes it unique among the manuscripts listed here). Size: 27,5x16,5. 189 fol. Contains *Met.* 1-15. Book 15 is written by a later Gothic hand. (Also contains an excerpt from *Tristia*.)<sup>254</sup>

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France:

**lat. 8001 (B)**, 12<sup>th</sup> c., Germany: The text consists of two parts. The first part has a pregothic main text with a small amount of commentary (c. ten glosses longer than one line) written by at least two hands. Some of the older marginal commentary is either faded or has been erased (e.g. 8<sup>r</sup>, 11<sup>r</sup>). The second part has a main text of a later date (early thirteenth century?) with a contemporary commentary. First part: 1<sup>r</sup>-16<sup>v</sup>. Second part: 23<sup>r</sup>-69<sup>r</sup>. Between the first and the

<sup>254</sup> Digitised copy: <http://www.wdl.org/en/item/4524/>.

second parts of the *Metamorphoses* text, on fol. 17-22, a *catena* commentary written by two hands has been inserted. The text contains the *accessus*, parts of the *glosulae* and *Allegoriae* of Arnulf of Orléans. Size: 26,5x19. 69 fol. Contains *Met.* 1-15 (1: 1-6:590; 2: 6:591-15:879). (Also contains an excerpt from *Tristia*.)<sup>255</sup>

St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek:

**Cod. Sang. 866 (G)**, 12<sup>th</sup> c., Sankt Gallen: Pregothish main text with commentary by two different hands. One possibly by the same or a very similar hand as the main text; the other seems to be of a much later date. The commentary text is not very dense, but runs throughout the text. However, it is often too faded to read. Size: 26,5x18,5. 109 fol. Contains *Met.* 1-15 (but with eight folios containing *Met.* 8:548-10:428 missing).<sup>256</sup>

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana:

**Vat.Urb.lat. 341 (U)**, late 11<sup>th</sup> c., southern Italy: Main text in beneventan script, only scattered commentary. Size: 31x19. 176 fol. Contains *Met.* 1-15.<sup>257</sup>

In addition, I have also examined two manuscripts from Tarrant's group of later manuscripts:

**Kings 26**, early 12<sup>th</sup> c., Italy: Main text in pregothish script with marginal commentary and interlinear glossing by several hands, the oldest of which may be contemporary with the main text (most of the glossing is found in Books 1-5). Lactantian *tituli* in the margins. Size 25,5x14,5. 134 fol. Contains *Met.* 1-15.

**Vat.lat. 11457 (r)**, late 12<sup>th</sup> c., German:<sup>258</sup> Pregothish main text with two layers of commentary, one looks to be contemporary with the main text and the other of a later date. Size: 23,5x11,5. 135 fol. Contains *Met.* 1-15. (Also contains excerpts from *Fasti* and *Tristia*.)<sup>259</sup>

## The Marginal Commentaries and clm 4610

As mentioned above, the marginal commentaries often consist of strata of commentaries. In this section, I will concentrate on marginal commentary that could be earlier or of the same age as the freestanding commentary. However, it should be kept in mind that the

<sup>255</sup> Digitised copy: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10724052j.r=8001>.

<sup>256</sup> Digitised copy: <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/de/list/one/csg/0866>.

<sup>257</sup> Digitised copy: [https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Urb.lat.341](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Urb.lat.341).

<sup>258</sup> Note on selection: From the late twelfth and early thirteenth century we have at least twenty-five preserved manuscripts. Vat. lat. 11457 was chosen because it is believed to be of German origin; it contains glosses and was accessible.

<sup>259</sup> Digitised copy: [https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Vat.lat.11457](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.11457).

continued addition and accretion of further marginal comments throughout a manuscript's lifetime is evidence of the reception, reaction, and interpretation of Ovid's text and would make an interesting study on its own.

The result of my analysis of the relationship between the commentary in clm 4610 and the marginal comments in the early manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses* is presented here in the form of three categories: close matches, commonplaces, and interpretative focal points.

### Close Matches

This category is defined by the primary concern of this section, namely whether any significant parts of clm 4610 can be found in the margins of the early *Metamorphoses* manuscripts. It turns out that only a handful of close matches exist. Our first example revolves around the closest match between clm 4610 and a marginal commentary I have been able to identify thus far, which is found in the manuscript San Marco 223. This manuscript contains some interesting pieces of commentary, which at times seem to be quite close to clm 4610, although comparison is made more difficult by the fact that parts of the original text in San Marco 223 have been lost: for example, the beginning of the text where two folios seem to be missing. These folios have been replaced by a new bifolium with *Met.* 1:1-445 written by a humanist hand.

In *Met.* 2:1 the palace of Apollo is described with the noun *pyropus* (bronze). This word triggers the following explanation in clm 4610:

**clm 4610:** *Piropos est metallica species ex tribus denariis auri et sex eris. Pyr enim Grece, Latine ignis. Opous Grece, Latine uideo. Vnde piropos quandam similitudinem et uisionem quasi ignis pretendit. (2:1)*

Bronze (*pyropus*) is a sort of metal, [made] from three denars of gold and six of copper. *Pyr* in Greek is fire in Latin. *Opous* in Greek, 'to see' in Latin. Whence bronze presents a similitude and vision of fire.

Almost exactly the same explanation is found in San Marco 223 written by the main glossing hand, which seems to be contemporary to the hand of the main text. The marginal gloss is keyed to the text with the letter A:

**San Marco 223:** *A. Pyropos metallica species est ex tribus denariis auri et sex eris. Pyr enim grece dicitur ignis, opo uideo. Hinc pyropus, quia similitudinem quandam et uisionem pretendit ignis.* (5<sup>va</sup>)<sup>260</sup>

This explanation is also present in the Bavarian B manuscripts, but not in the other marginal commentaries. The manuscript Plut. 36.12 comments on this passage but with the following words:

**Plut. 36.12:** *Pyropus lapis preciosus ignei coloris siue metallum quoddam ignei coloris.* (7<sup>v</sup>)

*Pyropus* is a fire coloured precious stone, or it is a fire coloured metal.

In terms of sources, the closest match found so far is a passage from John Scotus Eriugena's commentary on Martianus Capella:<sup>261</sup>

*Per 'calceos' Apollinis 'ex piropo', repercusio radiorum de terra aut de nube significatur. 01. De sex enim aureis denariis et sex unseis argenteis efficitur piropum. 03. Opo enim uideo dicitur, pir ignis. 03. Sic ergo piropos quasi species ignis dicitur.*<sup>262</sup>

The match between clm 4610 and San Marco 223 concerns only a very short explanation, and also one for which there seems to be a plausible source. However, the close match between the two commentaries at this point would indicate that they either share a source, which would be a different one than the Martianus commentary, or that the one is a copy of the other.

We have a second parallel between clm 4610 and San Marco 223 in the commentary to *Met.* 9:408. This gloss in San Marco 223 is written by a different hand than in the previous example. This hand occurs in only a few places and, judging by the script, seems to be of a later date (see the description of the manuscript above). This parallel includes the longest explanation in clm 4610 which tells the story of Oedipus and the Thebes cycle. It stretches over several pages in clm 4610 and consists of one coherent story, making it unique as regards both length and coherence in style.

<sup>260</sup> Glosses/explanations with almost identical content will not be translated.

<sup>261</sup> Although Isidore (*Etymologiae* 16:20) and later medieval dictionaries such as, for example, Talleur also mentions *pyropus/piropus*.

<sup>262</sup> *Eriugena Glossae in Martiani*, ed. Édouard Jeuneau (1978) I:162: 23. (The paragraph numbering seems to be wrong with 03 appearing twice.)

The text in clm 4610 and San Marco is very similar, but not identical. The two iterations share all the basic facts of the story but differ in such things as verb forms, conjunctions, and spelling. Furthermore, clm 4610 tends to include more details and is slightly longer. The margins in San Marco have been cut, which has resulted in missing words at the beginning of each line of the marginal commentary (marked with a dash in the transcription below).

In the example below we see the beginning and the end of the explanation in both commentaries:

**clm 4610:** NATVS ERAT FACTO PIVS ET SCLELATVS EODEM. *Laius rex Thebarum, pregnante Iocasta uxore sua, dormiens uidit bestiam unicornem de camera sua egredientem et se ad mensam sedentem interficientem. Hac uisione cognita dixerunt sapientes quod interficeretur ab illo, qui nasceretur de Iocasta. Ideo preceptum est puerum nasciturum uel puellam interfici. Nato puero non est interfectus a matre, quia pulcher uisus est, sed pannis inuolutus bene et in silua proiectus pede forato cum plumbo. (l. 1015) [...] (l. 1114) Et accepto monili aliter quam sperare accidit, quia potius a fratre matris sue Euriphile, qui dicitur Flegias, occisus est. Quare Callioe, que fuerat coniunx Almeonis, petiit a Ioue, ut infantes, quos ex Almeone habuerat, adultos faceret et confortaret ad hoc, ut patrem suum, uel Almeonem, ulciscerentur. Quod donum Iupiter iussit primigenam Hebem dare illi, et factum est.*<sup>263</sup> (9:408)

**San Marco 223:** *Lag- rex Thebarum pregnante Iocasta uxore sua dormiens uidit bestiam unicornem de camera sua egredientem et se ad mensam sedentem interficientem. Hac uisione cognita dixerunt sapientes quod interficeretur ab illo, qui nasceretur ex Iocasta, ideo | — puerum nasciturum uel puellam interfici. Nato non est a matre interfectus, quia pulcher uisus est, sed bene pannis inuolutus et in insulam proiectus est pede forato cum plumbo. [...] et accepto munili aliter quam speraret, | quia potius a fratre matris sue qui dicitur Flegias occisus | Cariloe coniunx Almeonis peciit a Ioue ut (sup. lin.) in|<fante>s, quos ab Almeone habuerat, adultos faceret | -et ut patrem suum Almeonem ulciscerentur. | -um ip- iussit privigne Hebe dare illi, et factum est.*<sup>264</sup> (31<sup>v</sup>)

The beginning is almost identical, except for the spelling of names, the word position in two cases (*interfectus a matre/a matre interfectus*; *pannis inuolutus bene/bene pannis inuolutus*) and one preposition (*de/ex*). There

<sup>263</sup> For a translation, see edition 9:408.

<sup>264</sup> The dashes in the transcription signifies words or parts of words that are illegible.

also seems to be a word omitted in San Marco (*nato puero* in clm 4610 and in San Marco just *nato*). On account of the trimmed leaves in San Marco, several words at the beginning of each line are missing at the end of the explanation, which makes comparison more difficult. The same sort of small differences seen here are, however, also present at the end of the selection, namely different prepositions, verb form, and case endings (*ex/ab*, *ulciscuntur/ulciscerentur* and *Hebem/Hebe*), as well as general spelling variations.

To show a more significant difference we need to use a slightly longer example:

**clm 4610:** *Ethiocles autem, quia maior erat, prior regnavit. / Et interim Pollinices ad Arastrum regem militare iuit. Contigit quod egrediente eo ciuitatem Argon adeo magna inundatio pluuię superuenit. In qua, cum aliquam domum ospitium habere nequiret, tandem ueniens ad quandam porticum Adrastri. Hospitatus est in ea. Tideus uero, quia in uenatione et uolendo non interfecerat fratrem suum Menalippum, exulabat. Consuetudo enim erat, ut exularet quicumque interficeret consanguineum suum, licet nolendo. Accidit, ut eadem pluuię et eadem nocte imminente, licet paulo post, Tideus ingrederetur Argon et ueniret ad eandem porticum, in qua hospitatus est cum Pollinice. Cum quo, quia equi eorum ceperant se inuicem percutere, iurgatus est. Et, quia inuentionem sui gladii Tideus non habuit, non <in>terfecit eum. In ullo enim tam paruo corpore tanta uirtus latuit, quanta in corpore Tidei. Tunc rex Arastus non ualens dormire, tum quia uetus erat, tum quia responsionem Apollinis in animo uoluens, scilicet quod unam filiam marito traderet leoni, aliam apro, audiuit illos rixantes. Et accensis lucernis, dum illos iret uidere et prohiberet, uidit in scuto Pol- / -linices leonem pictum et in Tidei scuto aprum. Consuetudo enim erat, ut, si aliquis magnus aliquam probitatem faceret, omnes consanguinei eius ferrent signum eius probitatis, quod isti duo fecerunt. Hercules interfecerat leonem, quem Pollinices pictum ferebat in scuto, quia de progenie Herculis descenderat. Meneager aprum interfecit, quem Tideus pictum in scuto habebat, quia frater eius erat. Et cognouit Arastus, quod, quia de istis duobus dixerat Apollo, suam filiam Argiam dedit Pollinici, aliam Tideo tradidit. (Ed. l. 976-999)*

**San Marco:** *Teocles uero, quia maior erat, prior regnavit, Polinices ad l.... -gem iuit Contigit quod ingrediente eo ciuitatem Argon l .... tio aque superuenit ueniens ad domum Arastri hospi l ... Tideus uero quia occiderat fratrem suum Menalippum exu l ...*

*deuenit ad domum Arastri et ibi inuenit Pollinicum ha- | -em in  
scuto et ipse habebat aprum. Tunc rixari ceperunt | .... -ctus est.  
Tunc Arastrus, non valens dormire, audiuit pu- | -nsis lucernis,  
uidit illos et somniauerat quia filiam suam le | .... dedit Argiam  
Pollinici. (31<sup>v</sup>)*

The most obvious difference, the length, is immediately noticeable. The two manuscripts tell the same basic story but San Marco 223 lacks the dispute between Polynices and Tydeus, the story of Tydeus's exile and of the ornaments on their shields. There are also the same minor differences as have already been noted at the beginning and the end of this story.

However, even with these differences in mind, it seems clear that the two texts here are related somehow. The gloss in San Marco 223 seems to be written by a later hand than clm 4610. Here we must ask ourselves if it is a question of a common source or if San Marco 223 has been influenced by clm 4610. While the short *pyropus* explanation shares an almost word-for-word likeness in the two commentaries, this longer example is not similar enough to suppose a direct copying process. It is more plausible to posit the existence of an intermediary text, perhaps a source text in the shape of a mythological compendium or something similar.<sup>265</sup>

The manuscript Naples IV.F.3 also has a long gloss in the margin to this passage (cf. 118<sup>v</sup>). This gloss revolves around the same story, but it focuses on different details and with a different style, which indicates only a common interest but not a textual relationship with clm 4610 and San Marco 223. It does, however, signal an interest in the Thebes material and access to some sort of compendia.

Our next point of comparison is the manuscript Vat. lat. 11457, a twelfth-century manuscript, possibly of German origin. In the beginning of clm 4610, we have two short explanations, both to *Met.* 1:5, which closely match a gloss in Vat. lat. 11457, as seen in the following example.

**clm 4610:** ANTE MARE ET, *id est antequam istud, quod modo est mare, sic esset diuisum, ut nunc est.*  
ET TERRAS. *Ideo posuit 'terras' pluraliter et non 'mare', quia notior est nobis diuisio terrarum quam marium, quia tota habitabilis terra in tres diuiditur partes. (1:5)*

<sup>265</sup> For example, in Hyginus's *Fabulae*, this story is told over several chapters and it partially, but not verbatim, matches the content of explanations above, cf. Hyginus *Fabulae* LXVI-LXXIII, ed. P. K. Marshall (1993).

BEFORE THE SEA AND, that is before this, which is just sea, had been divided as it is now.

AND THE LANDS: He puts 'lands' in the plural and not 'sea' because the division of the lands is more known to us than the division of the seas, since the whole habitable earth is divided into three parts.

**vat. lat. 11457:** *Ante mare, scilicet quia terra esset diuisum, ut nunc est. Et ... ideo ponit pluraliter ..., quia notior est nobis diuisio terrarum quam maris. Terra enim in tres diuiditur partes*<sup>266</sup> (3<sup>r</sup>)

Another similarity is found at the end of Book One at the explanation to 1:749:

**clm 4610:** *PERQVE VRBES IVNCTA PARENTI TEMPLA TENET, id est ubicumque Iupiter tenet templa et filius suus Epaphus habet capellas.* (1:749)

AND THROUGHOUT THE CITIES HAS TEMPLES CONNECTED TO THE PARENT, that is wherever Jupiter holds temples [there] his son Epaphus also has chapels.

**vat.lat 11457:** *Qui ubicumque habet templum, ibi Epaphus habet capellam.* (11<sup>r</sup>)

Though not verbatim matches—the explanations in Vat. lat. 11457 are slightly shorter and uses different forms in some cases (e.g. singular *templum* instead of plural *templa*)—these similarities are nevertheless close enough to warrant interest. What makes these examples even more interesting is the fact that these types of explanations are not simple mythological or lexicon-style extracts, but a more direct reaction to the text in the *Metamorphoses* in the shape of an explanation of both grammar and background. Vat.lat. 11457 also contains copious amounts of marginal commentary on 3<sup>r</sup>, the beginning of the *Metamorphoses*. This text is too faded to be legible, but it is not impossible that it could be an *accessus* or commentary that could prove further connection with clm 4610.

Vat.lat. 11457 is almost certainly of a more recent date than clm 4610. This means that the relationship between these could be a transfer from freestanding to marginal commentary, or a case of a common source. The slight format of Vat.lat. 11457, an oblong manuscript with the dimensions 23,5x11,5 cm (the smallest of those

<sup>266</sup> The ... signifies illegible words or parts of words.

studied here), may give support for the idea of a type of school manuscript.<sup>267</sup>

### Commonplaces

This category derives from the realisation that many of the explanations in the commentaries provide the reader with information, often mythological, that is so general it could be thought of as a commonplace. This fact, of course, makes it difficult to use these explanations to establish relationships between different manuscripts. This group is considerably larger than the group of close matches.

The following example concerns a typical short mythological explanation to *Met.* 1:690:

**clm 4610** *INTER AMADRIADES. Amadriades sunt dee montium, Nonacrine, possidentes nouem montes, qui sunt in Archaida. Secundum quosdam nonacrine dicuntur dee fontium, naiades dee fluminum, driades dee siluarum.* (1:690)

**AMONG THE HAMADRYADS.** The Hamadryads are the goddesses of the mountains, the Nonacrians, inhabiting the nine mountains in Archadia. According to some, the goddesses of the springs are called Nonacrians, the goddesses of rivers Naiads, the goddesses of the forests Dryads.

This can be compared to the following short gloss:

**Sang. 866:** *Amadriades dee montium, driades siluarum, nonacrine fontium. Naiades nimphe dicuntur.* (Sang. 866, 9<sup>ra</sup>)

And the following tidy list found in the upper part of the right margin of **Naples IV.F.3**:

*Omnia nimpharum sunt hee  
Amadriades dicuntur ille dee que cum  
arboribus nascuntur et moriuntur  
Driades dee siluarum  
Oreades dee montium  
Napee dee florum  
Nereydes dee maris*

<sup>267</sup> This format is suitable for handheld use and is close to the format of the holster book thought to have been used in the schoolroom in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Cf. Erik Kwakkel 2015, pp. 71-73.

*Humades dee camporum*  
*Naiades dee fontium uel camporum*  
*Potamides dee fluuiorum*  
*Nymphe aquarum dee*  
 (Naples IV.F.3 15<sup>r</sup>)

Both San Marco 223 and Plut. 36.12 have glosses to these lines, but they are not legible. San Marco seems to have three or four short lines, and Plut. 36.12 has five short lines here that seem to be concerned with explaining *syrix*. Paris lat. 8001 also has a gloss to this passage, but it seems to have been erased.

These glosses on the nymphs can be compared to a passage from Isidore and a longer one from the second Vatican Mythographer:

*Nymphas quippe montium Oreades dicunt, siluarum Dryades, fontium Hamadryades, camporum Naidēs, maris Nereides.* (Isid. *Etymol. lib.* 8:11)

Nymphs of the mountain are called Oreads, of the forest Dryads, of the springs Hamadryads, of the fields Naiads, of the sea Nereids.

*DE NYMPHIS Nympe moncium dicuntur Oreades, que inter siluas habitant et arboribus delectantur, Driades, que cum arboribus nascuntur et pereunt, Amadriades, plerumque enim incisa arbore uox erumpit, sanguis emanat, uirgultorum autem et florum Napee, fontium Naidēs, fluminum Potamides, maris uero Nereides.*<sup>268</sup> (Vat. Myt. 2, 64)

ON NYMPHS. The nymphs of mountains are called Oreads. Those who dwell in forests and delight in trees are Dryads. Those who are born and die in trees are Hamadryads, for very often, when a tree has been cut, a voice bursts forth and blood flows out. The nymphs of wooded vales are Napaeae, those of springs are Naiads, those of rivers are Potamids, and those of the sea are Nereids.

We note that clm 4610 and Sang. 866 both consider the Hamadryads to be mountain goddesses, while Naples IV.F.3 is more in agreement with the Vatican mythographer when it comes to the Hamadryads being tree goddesses. Naples IV.F.3 also uses the phrase *que cum arboribus nascuntur et moriuntur* (who are born and die in trees) which matches the mythographer's *que cum arboribus nascuntur et pereunt*

<sup>268</sup> Translation Ronald E. Pepin (2008), p. 126.

(although in the latter case the description is used for the Dryads, not the Hamadryads).

Finally, the Bavarian B family also has this explanation but used for another line in the *Metamorphoses*:

**clm 14482c:** §*Oreadas NIMPHAS. Oreade nimphe sunt dee montium, driades siluarum, amadriades arborum. Que cum arboribus nascuntur et pereunt. Naiades uel napee foncium, nereides maris.* (1:320)

This example illustrates a typical explanation of the mythological background type. We have two possible sources here and, judging from the phrase *Que cum arboribus nascuntur et pereunt* from the Vatican Mythographer and the almost exact phrasing in Bavarian B and the marginal commentary of Naples IV.F.3, we can see a link between the Mythographer and the commentaries here. Also of interest is that clm 4610 and Sang. 866 share a factual ‘error’ in describing the Hamadryads as mountain goddesses, a fact not found in any other source. This error could be a lead to a possible common source. The Bavarian B example also serves as an important reminder of the modular nature of the explanations; an explanation can be used wherever the commentator saw fit and not only to one specific passage in the *Metamorphoses*.

### Focal Points

This last category, of which I have found only a few examples, explores a phenomenon that could be thought of as focal points in the *Metamorphoses*, that is, lines, phrases, or words that seem to have caused a reaction and hence created a special need for an explanation. None of the early commentaries comment on every single line or even every individual story of the *Metamorphoses*. Why did some passages attract special attention from the commentators? The explanations in this category are not necessarily similar to each other, but the different reactions provide us with an interesting insight into the reception of the *Metamorphoses*.

The following example from clm 4610 consists of two separate explanations to *Met.* 1:562-563, where Apollo is talking about the newly transformed Daphne:

**clm 4610:** *POSTIBVS AVGVSTIS E<ADEM> F<IDISSIMA> CVSTOS. Ad similitudinem dicitur custos laurus, quia sicut fores custos custodit, sic laurus ante fores erat propter suum bonum odorem.*

MEDIAMQVE TVEBERE QVERCVM. *De quercu, qua prius nobiles coronabuntur, pleps a modo coronabitur. De lauro uero tantum nobiles, et ideo dicit 'tuebere quercum mediam', id est communem, quia omnes communiter solebant accipere. 'Tuebere', id est: dignior eris quam quercus. Et est dictum ad similitudinem, quia, qui aliquem tuetur, dignior est illo. (1:562)*

BY THE AUGUSTAN DOOR-POSTS THE SAME MOST TRUSTY GUARDIAN. The laurel is said to be a guardian as a simile, since as a guardian guards the doors, so a laurel was placed before the doors on account of its good smell.

AND YOU SHALL WATCH OVER THE MIDDLE OAK. From now on the common people will be crowned with oak, with which first the nobles will be crowned. But only the nobles [are crowned] with laurel, and therefore he says 'you shall watch over the middle oak', that is the common one, since everyone used to receive it together. 'You shall watch over', that is: you shall be more worthy than the oak. And this is said as a simile, since he who watches over someone, is more worthy than he.

Three of the manuscripts with marginal commentary (San Marco 223 is remarkably uninterested in this passage) have reacted to these lines in different ways with both short marginal commentary and interlinear glosses:

**Plut. 36.12:** *Vel quia postes augusti fient de te uel quia eris plantata ante -tum uiridarii illius.*

*Tu eris causa quod quercus non tam sepe incidetur. Que quercus non tam sepe incidetur, que quercus est media, id est communis omnibus, quasi diceret uilis, quia multum habetur de ea.*

*interlinear glosses: augustis + regalis; eadem + aderis; mediamque tuebere + communem defendes*<sup>269</sup> (5<sup>v</sup>)

Or since Augustus's door posts will be made from you, or since you will be planted in front of the gate(?) of his tree plantation. You will be the reason that the oak is not so often cut down. The oak is the middle, that is public to all, as though he would say common, since much will be produced from it. /interlinear glosses: augustan + regal; the same + you shall be there; you shall watch over the middle + you will defend the common/public.

<sup>269</sup> In the interlinear glosses the first word is the word from the *Metamorphoses*, which is followed by the gloss.

Plut. 36.12 gives two alternatives as to why the laurel is the ‘most trusty guardian’ and then gives an explanation to why the oak is ‘middle’ (*mediamque quercum*). These short explanations are completely different from clm 4610. In the interlinear glosses, it uses synonyms to explain *augustis* and *mediamque tuebere*.

Naples IV.F.3 reacts with a very short explanation that gives yet another explanation of why the laurel is a guardian:

**Naples IV.F.3:** *SVt fidus custos numquam mouetur a limine.*

*interlinear glosses: augustis + nobilibus; eadem + tu; tuebere + defendes; quercum + communem uilem (13<sup>r</sup>)*

Just as a trusty guardian you will never move from the threshold. /interlin.: augustan + noble; the same + you; you will watch over + you will defend; oak + public base/cheap.

The interlinear gloss reacts to almost the same words, but in a different way. As does the interlinear gloss in Sang. 866 and Kings ms 26:

**Sang. 866:** *Ante foris + quia te plantabunt homines S-; mediamque + communis scilicet ad coronas faciendas; tuebere quercum + id est sub potestate tua habe eam (7<sup>r</sup>)*

Before the gates + since the men planted you; middle + public, namely for the purpose of making crowns; oak + that is keep it under your power.

**Kings ms 26:** *Ante foris + q<uasi> d<iceret>: tu laurus stabis in quercum positam mediam (11<sup>r</sup>)*

This passage also attracts much attention in the Bavarian B commentary, where each version of the commentary contains an explanation of varying length that focuses on *ante fores*, *quercum*, *mediam* and *tuebere*. An example of this can be found in the edition on lines 413-436.<sup>270</sup>

These extracts show that this particular passage attracted attention from the commentators in various ways, which makes it possible to speculate about the causes and effects here. Do we find explanations in many manuscripts to certain passages in the *Metamorphoses* because of the fact they all go back to one or several older commentaries that commented upon this passage, or do these explanations reveal a more general interest during this time? Would an unsatisfactory

<sup>270</sup> See Appendix 1.

explanation, acting as an irritant, give rise to even more new explanations?

## Conclusions

The primary aim of this section was to find the answer to whether substantial parts of clm 4610 could be found in the margins of older manuscripts. The result shows that nothing in the marginal commentaries investigated point to them being directly related to clm 4610. Furthermore, all of the *Metamorphoses* manuscripts investigated here are either from the late eleventh century or from the twelfth century and their marginal commentary is sometimes of the same date, but often later. This means that, except for the scattered glosses in the earliest manuscripts, there is no real evidence for a solid commentary tradition on the *Metamorphoses* predating clm 4610.

What did crystallise during this study, however, were some interesting similarities that could be divided into three categories. The first category, the close match, consists of the few examples I have been able to find where passages in clm 4610 and marginal commentaries seem to be the same. Whether these matching explanations were extracted text from an even earlier, possibly freestanding, *Metamorphoses* commentary, or if they derive from some sort of mythological compendium or from a commentary on a different author is at the moment quite impossible to say.

The second category, the commonplace, consists mainly of mythological information, which perhaps does not allow us to establish connections between specific manuscripts. What the commonplace does suggest, however, is the existence and the uses of 'databases' of knowledge/facts/explanations available to the commentators in the form of entries from dictionaries, snippets from grammatical and mythological compendia, *summae* and similar works.

The third category, the focal point, is extrapolated from the fact that many different commentaries often comment on the same passage, but with different explanations. Whether this category is a sign of a fascination for a certain topic in the time period in question or if a convenient tradition of explanations was available to the commentators is difficult to say. Whatever the case, I believe we have the most to gain by investigating this category, if we wish to chart networks of explanations extending over different commentary texts.

## Next Steps

As far as the marginal glosses in the eleventh- and twelfth-century *Metamorphoses* manuscripts are concerned there is, I think, more work

to be done. I have established that they are not directly related to the freestanding commentary in clm 4610, but it would still be valuable to edit one or several of these marginal commentaries. The problem is often legibility, due to the small script and the often damaged or cut margins of the manuscripts.

A further step would be to investigate the *Metamorphoses* manuscripts from the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries to establish their possible connection to the twelfth-century freestanding commentaries. It is not practical to do this before the freestanding commentaries have been edited, but to assist future research I will list the manuscripts listed by Munk Olsen as containing glosses.<sup>271</sup>

**List of glossed *Metamorphoses* manuscripts from 12th/13th c.:**

**Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Allgemeinbibliothek:**

Amplon. 2:o 1., late 12th c., German?, Met. 1<sup>r</sup>-58<sup>v</sup>, with glosses.

**Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana:**

San Marco 238, 12th/13th c., Italy, 3<sup>r</sup>-150<sup>v</sup>: Met. some glosses.

Strozzi 121, second part of 12th c., Italy, 5<sup>r</sup>-139<sup>v</sup>: Met. some glosses.

**Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek:**

S. Barthol. 110, c. 1200, unknown, 12<sup>r</sup>-90<sup>v</sup>: Met. no contemp. glosses.

**Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek:**

Palat. lat. 1661, 12th/13th c., France or Germany, 1<sup>r</sup>-116<sup>v</sup>: Met. some glosses.

**København, Det kongelige Bibliotek:**

Gl. kgl. S. 2008 4:0, second part of 12th c., Italy, 4<sup>r</sup>-156<sup>r</sup>: Met. with glosses.

**Lausanne, Bibliothèque cantonale et universitaire:**

403, 12th c., France?, 1<sup>r</sup>-113<sup>v</sup>: Met. with glosses.

**Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit:**

Voss. lat. O. 51., second part of 12th c., France, 1<sup>r</sup>-148<sup>r</sup>: Met. some glosses.

**Lucca, Biblioteca Statale:**

1417, first part of 12th c., Italy?, 1<sup>r</sup>-98<sup>r</sup>: Met. with glosses.

**Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana:**

F 102 sup., 12th/13th c. unknown, 1<sup>r</sup>-171<sup>r</sup>: Met. with glosses.

R 22 sup., end of 12th c., unknown, 1<sup>r</sup>-130<sup>v</sup>: Met. with glosses.

**München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek:**

Clm 23612, end of 12th c., Germany?, 1<sup>r</sup>-39<sup>v</sup>: Met. with glosses.

Clm 29208, 12th c., Tegernsee, 1<sup>r</sup>-41<sup>v</sup>: Met. some glosses.

**New Haven, Yale University Library:**

Marston 47, 12th/13th c., France or Northern Italy?, 1<sup>r</sup>-120<sup>v</sup>: Met. no info on glosses.

**Oxford, Bodleian Library:**

<sup>271</sup> The list is extracted from Munk Olsen 1985. I have included mentions only of manuscripts that are described as having glosses, or where information about glosses is missing.

Auct. F.4.30., 12th c., England?, 1<sup>r</sup>-72<sup>r</sup>: Met. some glosses.

**Paris, Bibliothèque nationale:**

lat. 8000, end of 12th c., France?, 2<sup>r</sup>-151<sup>r</sup>: Met. with a few glosses.

**Savignano di Romagna, Biblioteca Comunale:**

7., 12th c., unknown, 1<sup>r</sup>-42<sup>v</sup>: Met. no info on glosses.

**Tortosa, Bibliotheca catedralica:**

134., 12th/13th c., unknown, 1<sup>r</sup>-116<sup>v</sup>: Met. no info on glosses.

**Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana:**

Palat. lat. 1669, second part of 11th c., France, 1<sup>r</sup>-63<sup>r</sup>: Met. no info on glosses.

Vat. lat. 1593, 12th/13th c., Italy, 1<sup>r</sup>-146<sup>v</sup>: Met. some glosses.

Vat. lat. 1596, 12th/13th c., Italy?, 1<sup>r</sup>-152<sup>v</sup>: Met. with glosses.

**Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek:**

4.11. Aug. 4:o (2942)-VI, 12th/13th c., Germany, 141<sup>r</sup>-199<sup>v</sup>: Met. no contemp. Glosses.

**Zürich, Zentralbibliothek:**

Rheinau 46., 12th c., Germany or Switzerland, 3<sup>r</sup>-91<sup>v</sup>: Met. with some glosses.

## The Twelfth-Century Commentaries on the *Metamorphoses*

In the previous section, it was established that clm 4610 does not have any definite predecessor. In the following section, the aim is to investigate the relationship between clm 4610 and the other *Metamorphoses* commentaries from the twelfth century. The main focus will be on a contemporary commentary extant in four manuscripts. I have named this family Bavarian B (clm 4610 being Bavarian A, but more easily referred to by the name of the only manuscript).

To begin this section, I present a list of all known twelfth-century commentaries on the *Metamorphoses* (none of these commentaries can be dated exactly, so it is not impossible that some of them may be from the early thirteenth century):

### **Clm 4610**

#### **Bavarian B family:**

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14482b and c.

Freiburg im Breisgau, Universitätsbibliothek, 381.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14809.

Salzburg, Stiftsbibliothek St. Peter, AV4.

#### **The Franco-German family:**

Prague, Státní knihovna CSR, VIII H32.

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, lat. oct. 68.

Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg.lat. 221.<sup>272</sup>

#### **Arnulf of Orléans:**

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 7205.

Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. lat. XIV.222 [4007].

Weimar, Herzogin Anna Amalia Bibliothek, Q 91.<sup>273</sup>

#### **Unrelated commentaries/minor families:**

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14482a.

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4:o 540.

<sup>272</sup> Versions of this commentary have also been found in three later manuscripts:

Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Est. lat. 306 (W.4.13), fol. 199 (1467); Padua, Biblioteca del Seminario Vescovile, 142, fols. 352r-354r (1456); Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, CCXLVIII (219), fols. 3r-5r (15th c.). The *accessus* can be found in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 1757, fols. 104v-105r (s. XII). The *accessus* to VIII H32 has been edited by F. Coulson as an appendix to the article 'The Catena commentary and its Renaissance Progeny' in *Manuscripta: A Journal for Manuscript Research* 54.2 (2010).

<sup>273</sup> Arnulf's commentary can also be found in many later manuscripts. For the purpose of this study only clm 7205 has been consulted. For more information see David Gura's forthcoming edition and his articles listed in the bibliography.

San Daniele del Friuli, Biblioteca Guarneriana, Guarner s. n.  
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 14748.

All of these texts are simple and utilitarian, with almost no decoration besides an occasional coloured initial. Almost all of them are today found in manuscripts of the miscellanea type created during a later period containing many different kinds of texts. The condition of the first and last page, usually faded, damaged and/or darkened, tells us that they were probably originally created and used as simple, unbound booklets. The largest is only a little larger than a modern paperback.<sup>274</sup> In terms of length, the following table presents a simple quantitative comparison of four manuscripts from the four main families:

#### Comparison of length

Ms.	Fol.	Words
Clm 7205	29	unknown
Clm 4610	23	16,500
Freiburg 381	14	26,000
Prague VIII H32	13	33,300

As we can see, the version of Arnulf's commentary in clm 7205 is the longest as far as manuscript folios are concerned, while the Prague version of the Franco-German family has the shortest commentary. However, if we compare the number of transcribed words, we get a different result. Leaving clm 7205 aside, since I do not have the relevant information available, we can see that clm 4610, which appears to be the second longest, is actually only half the length of Prague VIII H32 in this comparison.<sup>275</sup>

---

<sup>274</sup> Clm 7205: 240x170

Clm 14482: 230x170

Clm 4610: 215x175

Berlin 540: 205x140

Prague VIII H32: 190x125

Freiburg 381: 165x110

Clm 14809: 140x100

Salzburg AV4: 140x100

Berlin 68: c. 210x90

<sup>275</sup> The word count is based on my transcriptions of these manuscripts. The numbers are not exact, since some text-critical information in the transcriptions may have distorted the word count, but the information should hold up on a relative scale. I have not transcribed all of clm 7205, which is why the information on the number of words is lacking.

What follows is a more detailed overview of the Bavarian B family with brief manuscript descriptions, then an analysis of the relationship between the different manuscripts and their versions of the Bavarian B commentary, and finally an analysis of its relationship to clm 4610. After this the remaining groups of commentaries are briefly described and discussed.

## Bavarian B—Manuscript Description

### Freiburg im Breisgau, Universitätsbibliothek, 381

Provenance unknown

127 fol.

16,5x11

Later part of the 12<sup>th</sup> century

48 lines/page, 1 column

Content:

1: (paper, dated to 1475-78)

1<sup>r</sup>-30<sup>v</sup>: Argumenta to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

31<sup>r</sup>-33<sup>v</sup>: empty

2: (parchment, later part of 12<sup>th</sup> century)

34<sup>r</sup>-48<sup>v</sup>: Commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

49<sup>r</sup>-63<sup>r</sup>: Commentary on Ovid's *Heroides*

63<sup>r</sup>-71<sup>v</sup>: Commentary on Cicero's *De amicitia*

72<sup>r</sup>-98<sup>r</sup>: Commentary on Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto*

98<sup>r</sup>-107<sup>r</sup>: Arnulf of Orléans's commentary on Ovid's *Remedia amoris*

107<sup>v</sup>-125<sup>r</sup>: Arnulf of Orléans's commentary on Ovid's *Amores*

125<sup>v</sup>-127<sup>v</sup> + back pastedown: fragments of commentary on *Metamorphoses*

Remarks: I have not had access to the complete manuscript but to a digital reproduction of 34<sup>r</sup>-48<sup>v</sup> and the catalogue. According to the catalogue, the manuscript has a late medieval half-leather binding.

Catalogue: W. Hagenmaier, *Die lateinischen mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Freiburg im Breisgau* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1980)

### Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 14482<sup>276</sup>

Regensburg, Benediktinerkloster St. Emmeram

159 fol

23,1x17,2

---

<sup>276</sup> The basic information in the manuscript description is extracted from my own observations, the library catalogues, and Munk Olson 1985. Dating is from Munk Olsen 1985, except in the case of clm 14482c, which has been dated by Dr Teresa Webber, Cambridge. Dating and information about mise-en-page concern the *Metamorphoses* commentary only.

11<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> century

36 lines/page, 1 column

Content:

1<sup>rv</sup>: Eberhard of Béthune, verses from *Graecismus* (10:174-240)

2<sup>r</sup>–51<sup>r</sup>: Three different commentaries on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*:

2<sup>r</sup>–12<sup>r</sup>: commentary a

12<sup>r</sup>–26<sup>r</sup>: commentary b

27<sup>r</sup>–51<sup>r</sup>: commentary c

51<sup>v</sup>: illustration of a world map (T-O shape)

52<sup>r</sup>–57<sup>v</sup>: Ovid, *De remedio amoris* (with marginal commentary)

58<sup>r</sup>–80<sup>r</sup>: Horace, *Liber epistolarum* (with marginal commentary)

80<sup>v</sup>: empty

81<sup>r</sup>–117<sup>r</sup>: Geoffrey of Vinsauf, *Poetria nova* (with marginal commentary)

117<sup>v</sup>: additional notes to *Poetria nova*

118<sup>r</sup>–150<sup>v</sup>: Cornutus, *Commentum in Persium*

151<sup>r</sup>–159<sup>r</sup>: Aelius Donatus (Grammaticus), *Vita Vergilii*

159<sup>v</sup>: empty

Remarks: Old shelf sign: Em. E 105. Cardboard binding with a leather spine from 18<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> century (spine possibly older).

14482: <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0004/bsb00046312/images/>

Catalogue: Bauer-Eberhardt, Ulrike: *Die illuminierten Handschriften italienischer Herkunft in der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek. Teil 1: Vom 10. bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2010)

The oldest example of the Bavarian B commentary seems to be found in the manuscript clm 14482, which consists of eight booklets from different times containing texts by classical authors, commentaries, and grammatical texts. It includes three commentaries on the *Metamorphoses*, of which the longest is found on 27<sup>r</sup>–51<sup>r</sup>. The first of the two shorter commentaries on 2<sup>r</sup>–12<sup>r</sup> is not related to the others, and the second one on 12<sup>r</sup>–26<sup>r</sup> is an abbreviated version of the longer commentary on 27<sup>r</sup>–51<sup>r</sup>. All three commentaries are written by different hands. The section containing the first two short commentaries is a separate codicological unit to the section containing the longer commentary. These commentaries are referred to as clm 14482a, b and c, according to their order in the manuscript.

### **Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 14809**

Regensburg, Benediktinerkloster St. Emmeram

114 fol

14,3x10

End of 12<sup>th</sup> century

32 lines/page, 1 column

## Content:

1<sup>r</sup>-17<sup>r</sup>: Vergil, *Bucolica*

18<sup>r</sup>-47<sup>r</sup>: Horace, *Odes* (Excerpts)

48<sup>r</sup>-64<sup>v</sup>: Ovid, *Remedia amoris* (with marginal commentary)

**65<sup>r</sup>-81<sup>r</sup>: Commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses***

82<sup>r</sup>-90<sup>v</sup>: Vitalis of Blois, *Geta*

91<sup>r</sup>-99<sup>v</sup>: Horace, *Ars poetica* (with marginal commentary)

100<sup>r</sup>-114<sup>v</sup>: Grammatical texts and poems (100<sup>r</sup>-105<sup>v</sup> Donatus, *Ars grammatica* (excerpts); 106<sup>r</sup>-107<sup>r</sup> *Te spondee loco primo tunc dactile pono*; 107<sup>v</sup>-108<sup>v</sup> *Longa fit. a. semper ponenda frequenter*; 109<sup>rv</sup> empty; 110<sup>r</sup>-112<sup>r</sup> Serviolus, *Opusculum de primis syllabis* (excerpts); 112<sup>v</sup>-114<sup>v</sup> on the pronunciation and names of the Greek letters and numbers).

Remarks: Old shelf sign Em. g 10. Leather binding on wooden boards, seems to be medieval.

14809: <http://daten.digital-e-sammlungen.de/~db/0006/bsb00060108/images/>  
 Catalogue: U. Bauer-Eberhardt, *Die illuminierten Handschriften italienischer Herkunft in der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek. Teil 1: Vom 10. bis zur Mitte des 14. Jahrhunderts*, (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2010).

Clm 14809 consists, just as clm 14482, of booklets from different ages containing both works by classical authors and grammatical texts. This *Metamorphoses* commentary is shorter than the others, but contains some unique connections to clm 4610, as will be seen below. The commentary ends with an *explicit* on 79<sup>v</sup> (l.13) but is followed on 79<sup>v</sup> to 81<sup>v</sup> by a new collection of explanations to the *Metamorphoses* written by the same hand. Clm 14809 also shows the most marginal text, which is for the most part faded and often impossible to read, and in some cases even written upside down. The marginal text is found on 65<sup>r</sup>, 66<sup>rv</sup>, 67<sup>r</sup>, 71<sup>v</sup>, 72<sup>v</sup>, 73<sup>rv</sup>, 74<sup>r</sup>, 76<sup>r</sup>, 78<sup>v</sup>, 79<sup>r</sup>, 80<sup>v</sup>, 81<sup>rv</sup>.

**Salzburg, Stiftsbibliothek St. Peter, AV4**

Austria

48 fol

14,2x9,8

End of 12<sup>th</sup> century

23-25 lines/page, 1 column

Content:

Commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

1<sup>r</sup>-1<sup>v</sup>: *accessus*

2<sup>r</sup>-5<sup>v</sup>: *accessus* with some glosses

5<sup>v</sup>-48<sup>v</sup>: *accessus* and commentary

Remarks: I have had access only to a microfilm copy of this manuscript. No modern catalogue exists. The type of binding is not visible on reproduction.

The manuscript AV4 is the odd one out, as its sole content is a *Metamorphoses* commentary. It is written in irregular script with many idiosyncrasies. The commentary text has no paragraph markers and sometimes omits the lemma. It has the appearance of being quite hastily copied from another *catena* commentary or perhaps a *Metamorphoses* manuscript with marginal and interlinear commentary. Just like the commentary in clm 14809, this commentary also ends with an *explicit* on 46<sup>r</sup> and then starts commenting on book one of the *Metamorphoses* again on 46<sup>r</sup> to 48<sup>v</sup>.

It should be noted that the dating of these manuscripts is uncertain. I used the information in the catalogues and the dating given in Munk Olsen vol. 2, which place all of them at the end of the twelfth century, except for clm 14482 which is simply dated to the twelfth century. Dr Teresa Webber dates clm 14482c to the end of the eleventh or beginning of the twelfth century, which makes it contemporary to clm 4610.<sup>277</sup>

## Bavarian B: The Other Bavarian Commentary

Before we investigate the relationship between clm 4610 and the Bavarian B family, it is necessary to establish which texts exactly constitute the Bavarian B family. In the four manuscripts described above, we have five representatives of the family. They vary in length to the extent that the longest one (Salzburg AV4) is about double the length of the shortest (clm 14482b).<sup>278</sup> Three of them, clm 14482b, clm 14482c, and Freiburg 381, start with an *accessus* followed by a commentary from Books 1 to 15, while two, clm 14809 and Salzburg AV4, have a small collection of additional glosses at the end of the commentary. Furthermore, Salzburg AV4 has one *accessus* on fol. 1<sup>rv</sup>, another *accessus* and a small separate commentary on Book 1 on 2<sup>r</sup>-5<sup>r</sup>, before the proper commentary starts with a third *accessus* and the commentary text. Above the third and last *accessus*, the same hand has written *Incipiunt glose ouidii prologus*. These are the main structural differences. When it comes to content, the five texts need to be studied

<sup>277</sup> Teresa Webber, e-mail message to author, 27 May 2015.

<sup>278</sup> Approximate length of commentaries (number of lines: words per line): Salzburg AV4: 2387:10; clm 14482c: 1740:16; Freiburg 381: 1119:17; clm 14809: 1019:15; clm 14482b: 1007:13. All commentaries have roughly the same number of abbreviated words, but Salzburg AV4 has less text density than the others, so may in the end be about the same length as clm 14482c.

closely and carefully to establish how they relate to each other. In the following, I will analyse them with regard to their *accessus*, Book 1, and Book 6.

To provide a more substantial sample of the Bavarian B commentary than the short examples given in this study and the next, I have edited the *accessus* and Book 1 of the text in 14482c. This edition is found in Appendix 1.

### *Accessus*

The Bavarian B family includes a total of eight *accessus*. As mentioned above, clm 14482c, clm 14809 and Freiburg 381 each have one *accessus*, while clm 14482b has two and Salzburg AV4 three. Of the headings normally included in a medieval *accessus*, which have been discussed above in the chapter Form and Function, the Bavarian B family presents subject matter (*materia*), intention (*intentio*), utility (*utilitas*) and part of philosophy (*cui parti philosophie*). However, these topics are treated in a more or less arbitrary order and number of times, which yet again shows the modular nature of the commentary. They appear to have been rearranged freely by the scribe or commentator, and the same topic might reappear several times, but with a different explanation each time; clm 14482c, for example, covers the topic *intentio* five times.<sup>279</sup> There does not seem to be any apparent order behind these modules of topics, but rather a piling on of yet another possible argument.

Clm 14809 and clm 14482c have the highest number of topics with about eighteen to nineteen each, while Freiburg 381 only has ten. Each *accessus* in the five texts also contains one or several unique topics; clm 14809, for example, has a long *vita*, which is not found in any of the other commentaries. However, except for the first *accessus* in Salzburg AV4, which is unrelated to any of the others, all of the *accessus* share enough material for it to be possible to discern a common base text of some sort. From where this text derives is another question. Perhaps one of these manuscripts could even be that base text, or the text could stem from a different and now lost Ovid commentary.

It is also worth mentioning that the modules in the different *accessus* show that they have, to varying degrees, been adapted to fit into the text. The *accessus* in Freiburg 381 is probably the one that presents the most edited or structured text. It introduces the topics to be examined (although it diverges from them), and it uses connective words or phrases such as *secundum hanc finalis causa est* (according to this the final cause is), clarifying markers such as *sciendum quod materia* (it

<sup>279</sup> See Appendix 1, l. 33-80.

should be known that the subject matter), and markers that recognise that the same topic has been covered many times: *intencio est ... uel intencio sua est ... summa intentio est* (the intention is ... or his intention is ... the highest intention is).<sup>280</sup> In comparison, clm 14482c simply piles these topics one upon the other, at most using the phrase *alia intentio* to signal that this topic has been covered before. Freiburg 381 is likely of a later date than clm 14482c, and it is thus possible to speculate about an active scribe/editor in this case, one that has read one or several other *accessus* and decided to structure the text slightly.

Similarities regarding the *accessus* are not significant on their own when it comes to establishing textual relationships between the texts in their entirety, since the *accessus* can have a transmission history quite separate from that of the main text, which is clearly proved in Frank Coulson and Bruno Roy's *Incipitarius ovidianum*.<sup>281</sup> However, since all of the Bavarian B *accessus* have several shared topics, this still speaks of a possible common source at least for these parts.

## Book 1

The commentary to Book 1 is the longest portion of the commentary of the texts treated here.<sup>282</sup> Besides a general tendency in most commentaries to comment more heavily in the beginning, the cosmological theme in Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses* seems to have attracted special attention from the commentators.

Directly after the *accessus*, all manuscripts in the Bavarian B family continue with a type of commentary that diverges from the normal style of the commentary, which usually conforms to a strict paragraph marker followed by the lemma and then explanation arrangement. The extent of this irregular section differs from manuscript to manuscript.

In clm 14482c, we find the longest version of this irregular section, almost two pages long in the manuscript and over a hundred lines in the edition.<sup>283</sup> The other manuscripts have shorter versions of this text. The commentary at this point revolves around the first twenty-five lines of Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses*, with special emphasis on the first ten lines. In clm 14482c, the first lines are explained using the rhetorical categories *proponens* (*propositio*) and *invocatio*. The commentary uses paraphrase and synonyms to explain the first two

<sup>280</sup> Freiburg 381, 34<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>281</sup> Coulson and Roy 2000.

<sup>282</sup> The *accessus* and commentary to Book 1 are found on the following folios: Freiburg 381: 34<sup>r</sup>-36<sup>r</sup>; clm 14482b: 12<sup>r</sup>-14<sup>v</sup>; clm 14482c: 27<sup>r</sup>-31<sup>r</sup>; clm 14809: 65<sup>r</sup>-68<sup>v</sup>; Salzburg AV4: 5<sup>v</sup>-12<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>283</sup> 27<sup>v</sup>-28<sup>v</sup>, Appendix 1 l. 92-203.

lines and then proceeds to discuss what a transformation is. Then follow lines with more regular lemmatic commentary, but this text is not separated by paragraph markers. After this comes a long explanation of *Met.* 1:25, which centres on the properties of the elements and their numerical counterpart.<sup>284</sup> This seems inspired by Calcidius's *Timaeus*, and almost the same explanation can be found in contemporary commentary on Boethius.<sup>285</sup> After this long explanation, the text reverts to analysing the first lines of the *Metamorphoses* with terminology borrowed from the study of rhetoric, for example, *prologus* and *captatio benevolentiae*.<sup>286</sup> This part of the commentary then ends with a new close reading of the first couple of lines. This time, the commentary even manages to include some Christian interpretation by mentioning that Ovid says 'gods' in plural, but in reality knew that there was only one god.<sup>287</sup>

The other manuscripts have shorter texts at this point, but with the same general content. For example, all of them except for clm 14482b include the long numerological explanation of the elements.

Clm 14482b is an interesting case regarding the beginning of the commentary. Folios 2<sup>r</sup>-12<sup>r</sup> in the manuscript consist of a short commentary similar to, but not related to the others; then on the second half of 12<sup>r</sup> another hand has started a new commentary. The new hand has copied an *accessus* and a short collection of glosses in a style similar to that of the beginning of the other Bavarian B texts. These glosses are then interrupted by another *accessus*, which ends with the cryptic phrase *Vtilitas quod quisquis ex eo intendit negotio commodum insequitur Huius sunt partes incolomitas potentia*.<sup>288</sup> The last part of the phrase seems to carry an echo of Cicero's *De inventione*, in which he uses the words *incolumitas* (security) and *potentia* (power) as the two subdivisions of *utilitas* (utility or advantage).<sup>289</sup> The *accessus* is then followed by explanations of *Met.* 1:89, 101, 106, 117, 128 and 313, after which follows an explanation of *Met.* 1:82. From this explanation onwards, the text in 14482b is comparable to the other texts in the family, especially 14482c.

An exceptional aspect of clm 14482b is its inclusion of two Middle High German glosses. On 13<sup>r</sup> two words from *Met.* 1:101 are glossed

<sup>284</sup> Appendix 1, l. 111-146.

<sup>285</sup> *Saeculi noni auctoris in Boetii Consolationem Philosophiae commentaries*, ed. E. T. Silk (Rome, 1935), p. 160.

<sup>286</sup> Appendix 1, l. 138-140.

<sup>287</sup> See Appendix 1, l. 167-170.

<sup>288</sup> Clm 14482b, 13<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>289</sup> *Quare utilitatis duae partes videntur esse, incolumitas et potentia*. Cicero *De Inventione* 2:56, ed. E. Stroebel (1915).

thus: *corna hufen mora bram bere*. The first couple is somewhat perplexing; *corna* means cherries, but since *hufen* means ‘hoof’, it would seem to have been confused with *cornu* (horn or hoof). The second couple is easier: the Latin *mora*, which is mulberries or blackberries, has been glossed with *bram bere*, which means blackberry.<sup>290</sup> This is the only appearance of German or any other language besides Latin in the commentary texts and it would seem to suggest that this particular section is a copy of a marginal commentary with interlinear glosses, which have been included in the *catena* commentary.<sup>291</sup>

After this somewhat unorganised first part follows the commentary that is more representative of the structure of the rest of the commentary texts. Our comparison will start by looking at the length of the commentaries. The number of explanations indicates the length of each commentary text:<sup>292</sup>

Clm 14482c:	66
Freiburg 381: C:	63
Salzburg AV4: D:	49
Clm 14482b:	47
Clm 14809:	37

Here we can immediately see that there is a general difference in how much the different commentaries comment on Book 1. Clm 14482c has the longest text with the greatest amount of explanations. Using it as a base, I have compared matching lemmata and explanations between the commentaries and arrived at the following numbers:

	Freiburg 381	AV4	14482b	14809
14482c: 66	63/63	47/49	45/47	32/37

(The figures in the table show the number of explanations shared by clm 14482c and the other manuscripts/the total number of explanations in Book 1 in the manuscripts)

What we can see here is a very close agreement between all the manuscripts when it comes to which lines in the *Metamorphoses* they

<sup>290</sup> For a good collection of Middle High German dictionaries see:

<http://woerterbuchnetz.de>.

<sup>291</sup> There are of course also some references to Greek words in the etymological explanations.

<sup>292</sup> This part of the commentary is considered to start with the second *Amphitrites* explanation, which starts on l. 203 in the edition of clm 14482c.

react upon. Another fact that speaks to these five texts being closely related is that the lemma and the explanations are in the same order in the manuscript even when the order is wrong, for example, in all commentary texts (including clm 4610) the explanation to 1:117 has been inserted between those to 1:111 and 1:113. There is no thematic or other obvious connection between 1:111 and 1:117 to justify placing 1:117 before 1:113. This may indicate a common source text or exemplar.

Clm 14482c and Freiburg 381 are the closest match. Clm 14482c comments on two more passages from the *Metamorphoses* than Freiburg 381, but, of the sixty-three passages commented upon that they have in common, only two are significantly different. The first one is the explanation to *Met.* 1:563, where clm 14482c has a much longer explanation than Freiburg 381. The second is the explanation to *Met.* 1:682 where clm 14482c has only a short explanation and Freiburg 381 has extended it with detailed background information. Salzburg AV4 and clm 14482b both frequently omit the lemma and provide only the explanations. They are also the only commentaries that do not use paragraph markers. These two facts may point to them being copies of another *catena* commentary through dictation or from a marginal commentary that perhaps did not use lemma. Except for these two traits, clm 14482b and Salzburg AV4 do not seem to have anything more in common. There are no other significant subgroups that are discernible in Book 1.

The similarities and differences between the manuscripts are either a matter of the number of explanations, that is, one manuscript might have more explanations than another, or a matter of added (or possibly subtracted) information in a particular explanation. There are no instances where the different manuscripts comment on the same passage but do so in completely different ways. The following example gives a good illustration of the small differences that exist in phrasing between the manuscripts:

**clm 14482c:** *NABATHVS uel Nabath fuit filius Ismahelis filii Abrahe, qui regnauit in oriente, a quo dicta est regio Nabaioht.* (1:61, 29<sup>r</sup>)

NABATHUS or Nabath was the son of Ismael, son of Abraham, who ruled in the east. The region is named Nabaioth after him.

**clm 14809:** *NABATHVS uel Nabath uel Nabaioth fuit filius Ysmahelis filii Abrahe, qui regnauit in oriente, a quo dicta est regio Nabaioth.* (67<sup>r</sup>)

**Freiburg 381:** *NABATVS uel Nabant fuit filius Ismahel filii Abrahe, qui regnavit in origente, a quo dicta est regio Nabathon.* (35<sup>r</sup>)

**Salzburg AV4:** *NABATVS vel Nabath fuit filius Ismaelis filii Abrahe, qui regnavit in oriente, unde dicta est civitas.* (8<sup>v</sup>)

Here we see that the texts are virtually the same with the exception of spelling, the inclusion of a third alternative for a name in clm 14809 (*uel nabath uel nabaioth*), and the ending of Salzburg AV4 compared to the others.

The next example shows a grouping of manuscripts:<sup>293</sup>

**clm 14482c/14809:** *NOMINE PARNASVS. Parnasus mons habet duos uertices, dextrum Heliconem et sinistrum Cytheronem, sed in Helicone est Cirra ciuitas, in Citherone est Nisa, in qua Bachus colitur. Vnde Bachus dicitur Niseus et Venus Citharea in Cirra Apollo et Muse (1:317, 30<sup>r</sup>)*

[A MOUNTAIN] NAMED PARNASSUS. Mount Parnassus has two peaks, the right one is Helicon, the left Cytheron. But the city Cirrha is on Helicon, on Cytheron is Nysa, where Bacchus is worshipped. Wherefore Bacchus is called Nysean and Venus Cytherean. In Cirrha Apollo and the Muses [are worshipped].

**Freiburg 381/ clm 14482b:** *NOMINE PARNASVS. Parnasus habet duos uertices, dextrum Heliconem sinistram Citherinem, sed in Helico est Cirra ciuitas, in qua colitur Apollo et Muse et in Citherine est Nisa, in qua colitur Bachus. Vnde Bachus dicitur Niseus et Venus Citherea.* (35<sup>v</sup>)

In this example, clm 14482c and clm 14809 agree with each other word for word, except for spelling, and the same with Freiburg 381 and clm 14482b. The interesting thing here is that the first group is united by a common error: they have somehow misplaced the phrase *in Cirra Apollo et Muse* (underlined in the example), which the second group has placed in the more likely position on the second line, directly after *Cirra ciuitas*. This error is significant, but thus far the only one I have found uniting these two manuscripts.

Although clm 14482c has the longest text, it does not mean that it has the 'best' text. In fact, clm 14482c contains many textual errors that

<sup>293</sup> When two or more manuscripts agree with each other, I list only the folios for the first manuscript mentioned.

can sometimes be detected with the help of the other manuscripts. The following example shows one such errors:

**clm 14482c:** *Nam QVA, id est in ut erat illud, quod modo dicitur TELLVS, ILLIC in eodem erat AER.* (1:16, 29<sup>v</sup>)

For IN THAT WHICH, that is ?in so that? (381: there where) this existed that recently is named THE EARTH, THERE in the same place was also AIR.

**Salzburg AV4:** *Nam QVA, id est ibi, ubi erat illud, quod modo dicitur TELLVS, ILLIC, id est in eodem loco, ubi erat AER.* (8<sup>r</sup>)

Here the nonsensical reading *in ut* (in so that) in clm 14482c can be remedied with the help of Salzburg AV4, where the reading is *ibi ubi* (there where).<sup>294</sup> Perhaps this phrase, abbreviated to only an *i* and an *u*, may have been mistakenly understood as *in ut* by the scribe of 14482c. If this is true, then this would suggest that clm 14482c, although older than the others, is nevertheless a copy of earlier material, or that the other texts have been corrected somewhere in the copying chain. A second example strengthens the argument that clm 14482c is a copy that may have had difficulties with the abbreviations in its exemplar:

**clm 14482c:** *OMNIA TELLVS. Telluris est numerus terre.* (1:102, 29<sup>v</sup>)

EARTH [GAVE] EVERYTHING. Tellurus is a number of the earth.

**Freiburg 381:** *OMNIA TELLVS. Telluris est numen terre.* (35<sup>r</sup>)

That *numerus* (number) is wrong for *numen* (divinity) can be detected with the help of Freiburg 381. Again, we have reason to suspect a possible misinterpreted abbreviation: *numen*, perhaps abbreviated to *num*, has probably been wrongly interpreted as *numerus*.

## Book 6

Since the commentary to Book 1 diverges from the normal pattern of the commentary with its length, extensive individual explanations, and the varying structure of its explanations in the beginning of the text, it may be useful to investigate one of the other books to reach a fuller understanding of the relationship between manuscripts in the Bavarian B family. I have chosen Book 6 because it is short (only about one and a half pages in each manuscript) and contains many brief

<sup>294</sup> Freiburg 381 also has a reading similar to Salzburg AV4 in this case.

explanations that are more representative for the commentary in general.<sup>295</sup>

The number of explanations is as follows:

Freiburg 381:	73
Clm 14482c:	60
Salzburg AV4:	55
Clm 14809:	45
Clm 14482b:	19

Comparing the explanations in the same way as above, but this time with Freiburg 381 as a base we get the following result:

	14482c	AV4	14809	14482b
Freiburg 381 (73)	55/60	50/55	42/45	16/19

We see that different texts agree with each other to quite a high degree. What is not shown by this little table is the interesting fact that Freiburg 381 and Salzburg AV4 agree with each other in seventeen unique instances. This subgroup was not discernible in Book 1. The readings of this subgroup are never exactly the same. They can be similar and of almost the same length as in the following example:

**Freiburg 381:** *Mars idem Gradius dicitur, quia gradatim descenditur ad bellum.* (6:427, 40<sup>r</sup>)

Mars is called Gradivus since he descends to war gradually.

**Salzburg AV4:** *Mars dicitur Gradius gradotim iter ad bellum.* (24<sup>r</sup>)

Alternatively, they can be an example of one having an expanded explanation where the other has only a short one:

**Freiburg 381:** *Icarus primum plantavit vineam, cuius filia Erigone, cum in vinea uagaretur, Bacchus mutavit se in pulchram uivam, quam, cum illa uellet decerpere, Bacchus de uiva uersus in hominem concubuit cum ea, sed cum rustici bibissent de uino, hinc inebriati putabant se uenenum bibisse et Icarum eis obuiantem interfecerunt et in puteum quandam miserunt. Canidea autem, que semper insequibatur eum, rediens duxit illum Erigenem filiam eius, que tandiu ibi lamentabant donec Bacchus Icarum et filiam et canem transtulit in celum. Et pro tali scelere rusticis imisit corruptum*

<sup>295</sup> The commentary to Book 6 is found on the following folios: Freiburg 381: 39<sup>v</sup>-40<sup>r</sup>; clm 14482b: 17<sup>r</sup>-17<sup>v</sup>; clm 14482c: 35<sup>v</sup>-36<sup>v</sup>; clm 14809: 73<sup>v</sup>-74<sup>r</sup>; Salzburg AV4: 22<sup>v</sup>-24<sup>r</sup>.

*aerem, qui responso accepto quod querendo Icarum possent placare  
Bachum, quem, dum satis quasierant, in terra ligauerunt funes per  
aerem et ita quarebant eum. (6:125, 40<sup>r</sup>)*

**Salzburg AV4:** *Icarus primus cultor uinae Bachi. Filiam  
Erigonem habuit, quam Bachus mutatus in uuam uiciauit. (23<sup>v</sup>)*

Besides this group, the following agreements can be noticed: clm 14482b always appears together with clm 14482c with virtually the same reading every time, with a single exception where clm 14482b instead agrees with Freiburg 381 and Salzburg AV4:

**clm 14482c/14809:** *NOBILIS est C<ORINTHVS>. Cum Hannibal  
cepisset Corinthum, omnes statuas aureas, argenteas, ereas in  
unum rogam conguessit et incendit. (6:416, 37<sup>v</sup>)*

CORINTH is FAMED. When Hannibal had taken Corinth, he gathered all statues of gold, silver, and bronze on one pyre and set fire to it.

**clm 14482b/Salzburg AV4/Freiburg 381:** *Cum Hannibal  
cepisset Corinthum, omnes statuas aueras et argenteas et ferreas in  
unum rogam conguessit et incendit, ex qua commixtione preciosa  
uasa facta sunt. (17<sup>v</sup>)*

To conclude this investigation into the relationship in the Bavarian B commentary group we can now state that, although there is variation in terms of the length of the texts in general and the number and extent of explanations, what the different manuscripts have in common is still large enough to allow us to speak of a Bavarian B commentary.

## Bavarian B and clm 4610

To investigate the connection between clm 4610 and Bavarian B, I have compared the *accessus*, Books 1, 6, and parts of other books.

When comparing clm 4610 to the Bavarian B family, I will start with the closest match and then move on to the more distant connections. The closest match in this case is the commentary in clm 14809, which has a special connection to clm 4610 not shared with any of the other manuscripts.

The first connection between these two texts is not immediately evident, because the matching passages are not found in the same book. The very last explanation in Book 1 is a long description of the Egyptian gods:

**clm 14809:** NVNC DEA LANIGERA. *Postquam uenit in Egyptum secundum fabulam humanitate derelicta et in Nilo purgata facta est Ysys dea lanigera, quia cooperuit Osirin mari lana uel lino. Inuenit eum membratim discerptum a fratre Osyris maritus Ysidis siue Io a fratre suo, qui dicitur Absirtus uel Tiphon interfectus fuit, quamdiu Ysis siue Io quesium et tandem inuentum in lineis uel laneis pannis collegit a fratre suo frustratim spersum. / Vnde adhuc Ysis celebrat festum eius in unaquaque noua lunatione pro gaudio illius reperitionis, et tunc exit de Nilo quidam taurus, qui lingua Egyptia apis dicitur, habens in dextro armo maculam ad modum lune factam. Istuc sacrificatur et tamen idem uel eius similis omni anno in alio festo similiter exit de Nilo, qui similiter sacrificatur, et sic fit in quolibet festo. Hoc de tauro testatur secundum Augustinum De Ciuitate Dei. Pingitur aut Ysis cornuta, id est cornua lune habens, et ei seruit sacerdotissa Bubastis et Anubis, id est Mercurius, qui sic apud Egyptios uocatur, et canino ibi depingitur capite et apis et quidam alius famulus, qui famulus dum primum suum os digito omnes alii ministri Ysidis tacent. Cum uero ab ore remouet digitos, tunc ipse et alii omnes cantant. Aspis quoque dicitur Isidem comitari et Osiris suus uir. Et ideo dicitur numquam satis quesitus esse, quia in unaqua noua luna festum eius presentatur ab Yside et ministri eius illum dolorem, quem tunc habuerunt, quando eum quesierunt, representant et simulant. (1:747, 68<sup>r</sup>)*

NOW THE WOOL-BEARING GODDESS. According to the story after Isis came to Egypt her human form was put aside and she was cleansed in the Nile and made into the wool-bearing goddess Isis, since she covered her husband Osiris with wool or linnen. Isis's husband, was killed by his brother Absirtus or Tisiphon. Isis, or Io, searched for him for a long time. Finally she found him dimemembered by the brother and she wrapped him up in linen or woollen cloths and hindered his being dispersed by his brother. Whence they still at every new moon celebrate his feast for the sake of the joy of finding him. And then a bull, which is called apis in the Egyptian tongue, comes from the Nile having on its right shoulder a mark made in the shape of the moon. The bull is then sacrificed, and still the same one, or one similiar to it, comes in the same manner from the Nile every year at every feast, and it is sacrificed in the same manner. And this happens at every feast. In *De Civitate Dei* St Augustine testifies this about the bull. Isis is portayed with horns, that is having the horns of the moon. A priestess, who is called

Bubastis, belongs to her service. And Anubis, that is Mercury, who is called thus among the Egyptians, and he is portrayed there with the head of a dog. And Apis and someone who then presses his mouth with his finger. All the other priests of Isis are silent when he removes his finger from his mouth. Then he and the others sing. There is also a viper who is said to accompany Isis. And Osiris, who is her husband. And therefore he is said to never be sought after enough, since at every new moon his feast is performed by Isis, and the attendants perform and imitate the grief they felt when they searched for Osiris.

Clm 4610 does not react to this passage in the *Metamorphoses* at all, but the same explanation is instead found almost verbatim in the explanation to *Met.* 9:693.<sup>296</sup>

As previously mentioned, clm 14809 contains a collection of explanations placed at the end of the work, after the commentary on Book 15. These explanations turn out to match those in clm 4610 in some cases. The following explanation of *Met.* 2:755 shows a match that even helps to solve a problematic passage in clm 4610:

**clm 4610:** *Secundum autem quasdam fabulas, dicitur egis esse theca, id est tforist lorice Palladis, sed sepe pro lorica illius ponitur.* (2:755)

According to other stories, *aegis* is said to be a case, that is the *tforist* of Pallas' cuirass, but it is often used for her cuirass.

**clm 14809:** *Alii dicunt egam esse tecam, id est foramen lorice, quod ponitur pro lorica.* (80<sup>r</sup>)

Others say that *aegis* is a case, that is a hole in cuirass, which is used for the cuirass.

This parallel shows us a possible emendation to the word *foris* (door; outside) in clm 4610, which makes no syntactical or lexical sense in the text. The reading *foramen* (opening) in clm 14809 does make both syntactical and lexical sense and it is possible to imagine that an abbreviation of *foramen* was wrongly expanded by the scribe of clm 4610.

<sup>296</sup> To identify this type of similarity, every paragraph of two or more texts needs to be compared. Doubtlessly, more of these matching explanations will be found when more commentaries are edited.

The next example concerns an explanation of *Met.* 9:432 where the text in clm 14809 can again help us understand the text in clm 4610, but where the reading in clm 4610 is not necessarily erroneous, perhaps only awkward.

**clm 4610:** *NON AMBITIONE NEC ARMIS. Non sunt isti facti iuuenes 'ambitione', id est honore, scilicet ut Hebe aliquem honorem tamen habeat. 'Nec armis', id est non propter arma illorum iuuenem exercendum ad utilitatem, sed super factum est.* (9:432)

AND NOT BY AMBITION NOR BY ARMS. They were not made youths because of 'ambition', that is honour, that it to say so that Hebe still would receive some sort of honour [from this]. 'Nor by arms', that is not for the purpose of a youth using their arms for her gain, *?sed super factum est?*.

**clm 14809:** *NON AMBITIONE NEC ARMIS. Non sunt isti facti iuuenes ambitione, id est honore, ut Hebe aliquem honorem inde habeat. 'Nec armis', id est non propter arma illorum iuuenum exercenda ad suam utilitatem, sed secundum fata factum.* (80<sup>v</sup>)

The last phrase in clm 4610, *sed super factum est*, is rather obscure as regards meaning, but it is clearly written in the manuscript and leaves no room for an alternative transcription. I have interpreted it as 'but it happened above' with 'above' in the sense of 'as by divine will' or 'by the actions of the gods', or 'above in the text'. Clm 14809 gives us the much more understandable *sed secundum fata factum* ('but it happened according to fate'), which echoes the preceding line in the *Metamorphoses*: *fatis iuuenescere debent | Calliroe geniti* (*Met.* 9:431). If we suppose a common source for clm 4610 and clm 14809, it could be imagined how *super* is a mistake for *secundum* with *fata* omitted because of confusion from the following *factum*. On the other hand, this could be the intended although obscure text. Whatever the case might be, clm 14809 gives us a parallel that allows us to better understand the meaning of this passage.

Besides these two instances, the explanations at the end of 14809 also contain parallels to the following explanations in clm 4610 (listed in the order in which they appear in clm 14809): 2:153; 3: 269; 2:239; 2:527; 2:646; 2:566; 5:378; 8:182; 7:444; 8:564; 9:476; 10:90; 10:215; 10:223; 10:240; 1:69; 1:255; 10:206. These are not exact matches to corresponding passages in clm 4610, but similar enough to suggest a common source.

The third connection between clm 4610 and clm 14809 is related to the mysterious Manogaldus (Manegold), who is the only

contemporary authority mentioned by name in clm 4610.<sup>297</sup> Manegold appears five times in clm 4610, but not once in the Bavarian B texts, except for clm 14809, which has a parallel passage to clm 4610 in the commentary of *Met.* 7:759.

After the close matches and parallels in clm 14809, we move on to more general parallels between clm 4610 and the Bavarian B family. First, we will consider the *accessus*. Clm 4610 has an overall unique *accessus*, but it nevertheless has a few passages in common with the Bavarian B family.<sup>298</sup> The paragraph beginning with *Quidam philosophi* is present in all manuscripts, the *intentio Ouidii* in all except for one of three *accessus* in Salzburg AV4, and the paragraph *Vtilitatem nobis confert Ouidius* in all except for Freiburg 381.<sup>299</sup>

Turning to Book 1 and examining the quantity of commentary, we find that out of the fifty-nine explanations in clm 4610 and around seventy in clm 14482c there are about twenty-one instances of the two commentaries commenting on the same passage. None of these, however, are an exact match. Rather, they show different degrees of likeness in the way they explain the passage. Sometimes, they are quite close, at others completely different. The following example illustrates explanations that are very close, but not identical:

**clm 4610:** *QVOD FACIT AVRATVM EST, quia qui amat, pulchrum ei uidetur. Qui uero non amat, amor est PLVMPVM scilicet pondus.* (1:470)

THE ONE THAT CAUSES IS GOLDEN, since it seems beautiful to him who loves, but for the one who does not love, love is LEAD, that is to say a burden.

**clm 14482c/Freiburg 381/Salzburg AV4/clm 14482b:** *QVOD factum miratum EST, quia amanti uidetur pulchrum, non amanti graue quasi PLVMBVM.* (30<sup>v</sup>)

This explanation of *Met.* 1:470 from the two families contain the same information but expressed in different ways. In clm 4610, the explanation uses a relative clause (*qui amat/Qui uero non amat*) and in Bavarian B a participle is used (*amanti/non amanti*), while the final lemma is explained by providing the synonym *pondus* ('weight') in clm 4610 and by the adjective attribute *graue* ('heavy') in Bavarian B.

<sup>297</sup> See chapter 4, section: The Commentary and its Sources for more on Manegold.

<sup>298</sup> These paragraphs are found on lines 34-56 in clm 4610 and lines 33-34, 47-59, and 60-63 in clm 14482c (Appendix 1).

<sup>299</sup> The *quidam philosophi* is also present in the margin of the late twelfth-century *Metamorphoses* manuscript: Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliotek, GKS 2008 4:0.

The next example shows an explanation of the mythological background type:

**clm 4610:** *ET QVE DECIDERANT. Quercus dicuntur esse sacrata Ioui, quia super illas dabat responsum in Dodona silua, in qua ipse nutritus fuit.* (1:106)

AND [ACORNS] THAT HAD FALLEN. Oaks are said to be sacred to Jupiter, since on top of them he gave an oracle reply in the Dodonian forest, where he was raised.

**clm 14482c/Freiburg 381/Salzburg AV4/clm 14482b:** *IOVIS ARBORE. Quercus dicitur arbor Iouis, uel quia de glandibus suis pascebat homines, uel quia per eam dabat responsa.* (29<sup>v</sup>)

JUPITER'S TREE. The oak is called Jupiter's tree either because he fed men with its acorns, or because he gave oracle replies through it.

This explanation of *Met.* 1:106 is identical in four texts of Bavarian B and is partially similar to clm 4610, which offers only one alternative. In the next example, we see a reaction to the same line, *Met.* 1:21, but with completely different content.

**clm 4610:** *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 accadat, 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 realised 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'.

**clm 14482c/Freiburg 381:** *HANC DEVS. Ipsa quidem obstabant, sed deus DIREMIT, id est separauit, illa ligantia et fecit coadunantem naturam ipsorum elementorum, qui post diuisam sunt. NATVRA, dico, que MELIOR, id est efficator, facta est ad procreationem rerum, postquam erant diuisa, que prius commixta.* (28<sup>v</sup>, AV4 has a different explanation here.)

GOD THIS [STRIFE]. These things did indeed stand against, but God divided, that is separated, those things that were bound together and he made a joined nature of these elements that existed after the division. I say a nature made

better, that is more efficacious, for the procreation of things after those that were previously mingled had been divided.

Here, clm 4610 offers one of its rare theological explanations, while Bavarian B stays closer to the text and explains that this concerns the mingled elements that were then divided. Although the theological mode of explaining things is very rare for clm 4610, this type of difference between clm 4610 and Bavarian B is typical, namely commenting on the same line in the *Metamorphoses*, but with different explanations.

The types of similarities we have found between clm 4610 and Bavarian B thus far seem to remind us of the pattern of similarities between clm 4610 and the marginal glosses.

An analysis of Book 6 gives virtually the same result as for Book 1. There are twenty-one explanations in clm 4610 and, compared with the lemma in Bavarian B, there is a match in sixteen instances. However, as in the case with Book 1, very few of these are matching explanations. The following explanation of *Met.* 6:70 shows the closest match in this book:

**clm 4610:** *CECROPIA PALLAS. Apollo habet templum Athenis iuxta litus maris. Pallas in medio, Mars in altiori parte arcem, id est templum, habebat. Locus, ubi Mars templum habebat, dicitur Arispagus, id est 'uirtus uille'. Aris enim est uirtus, pagus uilla. Inde sanctus Dionisius dicitur Ariopagita, quia ibi docuit. (6:70)*

PALLAS ON THE CECROPIAN. Apollo has a temple next to the seashore in Athens. Pallas had a castle, that is a temple, in the middle, Mars in a higher place. The place where Mars had his temple is called the Areopagus, that is 'the virtue of the village'. For *aris* is virtue, *pagus* is village. From this St Dionysius is called the Areopagite, since he taught there.

**Salzburg AV4:** *Templum habet Apollo Athenis iuxta litus maris. Pallas in medio, Mars in altiori parte, id est in arce habet templum. Locus uero, ubi Mars habebat t<emplum>, dicebatur Ariopagus. Aris enim uirtus, pagos uilla. Vnde sanctus Dionisius Argiopagita dicebatur et docuit Athenis. (22<sup>v</sup>)*

This match is only between clm 4610 and Salzburg AV4. As so often is the case, Salzburg AV4 has left out the lemma and gives only the explanation, which matches clm 4610 almost verbatim. However, this is the only case of a verbatim match; more often the match is only in lemma commented upon and not the explanation itself, as in the following explanation of *Met.* 6:393:

**clm 4610:** *ET SATIRI FRATRES ET TVNC QVOQVE CLARVS OLIMPVS, id est habitantes iuxta Olimpum. 'Clarum' uocat eum, quia nubes excedit. Ideo omnes isti flebant, quia Marsia multum illos delectauerat suo cantu. (6:393)*

AND THE BROTHER SATYRS AND THEN ALSO THE CLEAR OLYMPUS, that is those living next to Olympus. He calls it 'clear' since it rises above the clouds. All these were crying, since Marsyas had delighted them a lot with his song. **Freiburg 381/clm 14809/Salzburg AV4:** *ET TVNC QVOQVE C<LARVS> O<LYMPVS>, quia postea clarior effectus est propter crebriores mutationes et miracula, que ibi contigerunt. Interpretatur autem Olympus totus ardens. Quod nomen propter altitudinem suam habet a celo, quod totum est ardens. (40<sup>r</sup>)*

AND THEN ALSO THE CLEAR OLYMPUS, since later it was made clearer because of more frequent transformations and miracles, which happened there. The Olympus should be interpreted as 'completely burning'. It has this name because of its height from heaven, which is completely burning.

Here clm 4610 explains both *clarus Olympus* and *Satyri fratres* [...] *flerunt* (the verb is on the next line in the *Met.* and not included in the lemma), while Bavarian B is focused solely on *clarus olympus* and gives a more complex explanation of this phrase.

The final example from Book 6 shows yet another occurrence of similar explanations attributed to different passages of Ovid's text:

**Salzburg AV4:** *Icarus primus cultor uinae Bachi filiam Erigonem habuit, quam Bachus mutatus in uuam uiciauit. (23<sup>v</sup>)*

**Freiburg 381:** *Icarus primum plantauit uineam, cuius filia Erigone, cum in uinea uagaretur, Bachus mutauit se in pulchram uuam, quam, cum illa uellet decerpere, Bachus de uua uersus in homine concubuit cum ea. Sed cum rustici bibissent de uino, hinc inebriati putabant se uenenum bibisse et Icarum eis obuientem interfecerunt et in puteum quandam miserunt. Canidea autem, que semper insequibatur eum, rediens duxit illuc Erigenem filiam eius, que tandiu ibi lamentabant, donec Bachus Icarum et filiam et canem transtulit in celum. Et pro tali scelere rusticis imisit corruptum aerem, qui responso accepto quod querendo Icarum possent placare Bachum, quem dum satis quasierant in terra ligauerunt funes per aerem et ita quarebant eum. (40<sup>r</sup>)*

**clm 4610:** PRIMVS TEGIS, ICARE, VVLTVS. Bacus per Icarum Atheniensem rusticis Atheniensibus uinum misit. Vnde post quod rustici biberunt putantes se uenenum uel aliam potionem malam bibisse, Ycarum in puteum proiecerunt. Canis autem suus, qui secum iuerat, domum reuersus duxit Erigonem, filiam Icari, ad puteum. Iam uero rusticis tantam Bacchus pestem inmisit, ut omnia fere perdedissent, quare, ut a peste posse<n>t liberari, Icarum de puteo extraxerunt. Et statim Icarus et filia et canis in celum translati sunt. (10:450)

YOU, ICARUS, COVER YOUR FACE FIRST. Bacchus sent wine to the Athenian peasants through Icarus the Athenian. And after they had drunk the wine, they threw Icarus into a pit, thinking that they had been drinking poison or some other bad drink. But his dog, which went with him, returned home and brought Erigone, Icarus's daughter, to the pit. Bacchus sent such a pestilence against the peasants that almost everything died, wherefore the peasants pulled Icarus from the pit, so that they would be freed from the pestilence. And immediately Icarus, his daughter, and the dog were transferred onto heaven.

The first part of this explanation is found in Salzburg AV4 and Freiburg 381; the latter then expands the explanation with a long story about Icarus, which is similar to an explanation in clm 4610, but not to Book 6:125 – rather to Book 10:450. As in the example above with clm 14809 and the explanation of *Met.* 1:747 matching the commentary to *Met.* 9:693 in clm 4610, this is a reminder of the sometimes loose and modular structure of the commentaries.

## The Other Twelfth-Century Commentaries

Here follows a brief description of the remaining twelfth-century commentaries.

## The Franco-German Family

### Manuscript Description

**Prague, Státní knihovna CSR, VIII H32**

Provenance unknown

91 fol.

19x12,5

1150-1250

53 lines/page, 2 columns

Content:

1<sup>r</sup>-53<sup>v</sup>: Macrobius's commentary on *Somnium Scipionis*

54<sup>r</sup>-69<sup>r</sup>: Adelard of Bath *Questiones Naturales*

70<sup>r</sup>-77<sup>r</sup>: (Pseudo-)Seneca, excerpts from letters

77<sup>r</sup>-v: excerpts from different texts

78<sup>r</sup>-91<sup>v</sup>: Commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

91<sup>v</sup>: A few verses in Old French

Remarks: Manuscript consists of four different booklets by different hands. Information gathered from my observation from the digitised manuscript and the manuscript information on the website. The manuscript seems to have been brought to the university in Prague in 1370 during the reign of Charles IV.

Available digitised at:

[http://www.manuscriptorium.com/apps/index.php?direct=record&pid=AIPDI G-NKCR\\_\\_VIII\\_H\\_32\\_\\_\\_4DKIY63-cs#search](http://www.manuscriptorium.com/apps/index.php?direct=record&pid=AIPDI G-NKCR__VIII_H_32___4DKIY63-cs#search)

### **Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, lat. oct. 68**

24 fol.

21x9

Twelfth century

54 lines/page, 1 column

Content:

1-22<sup>v</sup>: Commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

23<sup>r</sup>: Part of a commentary on something relating to Greco-Roman mythology (inc. Dardanus fuit qui ex ioue et electra filia athlantis)

23<sup>v</sup>: Two different texts. Top half: on natural philosophy. Bottom half: rhetorical figures

24<sup>r</sup>: Part of a commentary on Lucan

24<sup>v</sup>: Part of a commentary on Ovid's *Heroides*

Remarks: The *Metamorphoses* commentary ends on line 15:535. The commentary in the Prague manuscripts continues until line 15:870. One folio might be missing from Berlin 68.

Available digitised at: [https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN768030854&PHYSID=PHYS\\_0001](https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht?PPN=PPN768030854&PHYSID=PHYS_0001)

### **Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 221**

Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg.lat. 221

74 fol.

1<sup>r</sup>-6<sup>v</sup>: Commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

7<sup>r</sup>-8<sup>v</sup>: Unidentified text on Roman history

9<sup>r</sup>-12<sup>v</sup>: Unidentified text (Inc. *presentatur unde frater quantis testimonis remedia*)

13<sup>r</sup>-33<sup>v</sup>: Unidentified text (inc. *eundem - - e peciconibus satisfacere cupiens columbam cuius penne...*)

34<sup>r</sup>-40<sup>v</sup>: Hymns (inc. *Magnificat anima mea*)

41<sup>r</sup>-74: Augustine Ad Orosium and other texts

Remarks: Commentary starts with 9:284 and ends with 15:870.

Available digitised at: [https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Reg.lat.221](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Reg.lat.221)

I have given this family the tentative name 'the Franco-German family', since it seems to have divided origin; some evidence suggests a French origin and some a German one. Besides the commentary by Arnulf of Orléans, this is the longest and most complex of the twelfth-century commentaries. It contains a substantial amount of philosophical or cosmological explanations and seems to be quite well structured compared the Bavarian commentaries. The texts in the Prague manuscript and in the Berlin manuscript seem to be fairly closely related. When it comes to its relationship to the other commentaries, this family seems to have some sort of connection to the Bavarian B family. I am currently editing this family and can thus only offer a few preliminary observations here.

**Freiburg 381:** §*Hemus rex Tracie usurpauit sibi nomen Iouis et Rodope, uxor sua, Iunonis, quare mutati sunt in montes.* (39<sup>v</sup>, Met. 6:87)

§Haemus, a king in Thrace, appropriated Jove's name and his wife, Rhodope, Juno's. For this reason they were transformed into mountains.

**Prague VIII H32:** §*Hemus usurpauit sibi nomen Iouis, Rodope regina uxor sua Iunonis, quare in lapideos montes mutati sunt.* (84<sup>rb</sup>)

The first example shows a very close match between the Franco-German family and the Bavarian B family. This is also partially the case in the next example:

**Freiburg 381:** §*TENVES VMBRE, id est imagines.* (39<sup>v</sup>, Met. 6:62)

**Prague VIII H32:** §*TENVES VMBRE, imagines, PARVI DISCRIMINIS, id est parue differentie quantum ad colorem. Talis erat qualitas picture, QVALIS ARCVS SOLET INFICERE L<ONGVM> C<VRVAMINE> cum PERCVSSIS, id est percussis, SOLIBVS, id est claritati solis, AB IMBRE, id est ab aquosis nubibus.* (84<sup>rb</sup>)

This example illustrates a typical difference between these commentaries. The Franco-German family tends to have longer and more complex explanations compared to the Bavarian B family.

There are also a few similarities with clm 4610:

**Prague VIII H32:** *§LATOIVS, Phebus. Pallas cantauit fistula in nuptis Iouis, cumque irrisa fuisset propter inflatas buccas, uenit ad Tritonem paludem ibique se aspexit et reiecit. Marsias inuenit a Phebo uictus excoariatus.*

*§Tunc (tum Met.) QUOQUE C<LARVS>, quia postea clarior a ludis habitus est et interpretatur totus ardens, quod nomen propter altitudinem suam habet a celo, quod totum est ardens.*

*§BUCCERA, bouina; caprarius, opilio; subulcus, porcorum; armentarius, equorum. (84<sup>va</sup>, Met. 6:384, 393, 395)*

**clm 4610:** *QVEM TRITONIACA. Pallas, ut delectaret Iouem patrem suum, tibia canere cepit et fistulis. Quam cum uidissent alii dei genis inflatis ridere ceperunt. Vnde cum uellet uidere utrum dedeceret eam, uenit ad Tritonem paludem ibique cantauit sicut ante Iouem primitus cantauerat. Et uidit se turpem pro bucca inflata. Ideo in Tritonidam paludem tibiam proiecit. Quam postea Marsia accepit et Appolinem ad certamen prouocauit. Et ab Apolline uictus excoariatus est.*

*ET SATIRI FRATRES ET TVNC QVOQVE CLARVS OLIMPVS, id est habitantes iuxta Olimpum. 'Clarum' uocat eum, quia nubes excedit. Ideo omnes isti flebant, quia Marsia multum illos delectauerat suo cantu.*

*LANIGEROSQVE G<REGES> A<RMENTA>QVE BVCERA P<AVIT>, id est omnia illa armenta dicuntur 'bucera', de quorum cornibus bucina potuit fieri, id est cornu.*

WHOM THE TRITONIAN. Pallas began playing on a flute and pipes to delight her father, Jupiter. When the other gods saw this they began to laugh at her inflated cheeks. Whereupon she went to the Tritonian swamp, because she wanted to see if this was unbecoming of her, and there she played just as she had played for Jupiter before. And she saw that she was ugly on account of her inflated cheeks. Therefore she threw the flute in the Tritonian swamp. Marsyas later took this [flute] and challenged Apollo to a contest. And when he was defeated he was flayed by Apollo.

AND THE BROTHER SATYRS AND THEN ALSO THE CLEAR OLYMPUS, THAT IS THOSE LIVING NEXT TO OLYMPUS. He calls it 'clear' since it rises above the clouds.

All these were crying, since Marsyas had delighted them a lot with his song.

AND [WHOEVER] TENDED TO THE WOOL-BEARING HERD AND THE OX-HORNED CATTLE, that is all cattle are called 'ox-horned' (*bucera*), from whose horns a trumpet (*bucina*), that is a horn, can be made.

This example is interesting because I have thus far not found many instances of these two commentaries reacting to similar passages in the *Metamorphoses*, and here they are reacting to the same three passages. However, just as in several of the previous examples, not exactly in the same way. In the first explanation it is definitively the same background story being told, but the one in clm 4610 contains more details. In the second and third explanations the two commentaries focus on different things. The Bavarian B family also has an explanation very close to the third explanation in the Franco-German commentary here.

## The Shorter Commentaries and Fragments: clm 14482a, Berlin 540, Guarner s. n., and clm 14748

### Manuscript Description

**Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 14482a:** see above under the Bavarian B family.

**Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4:o 540**

France

15 fol.

20,5x14

End of twelfth century

67-71 lines/page, 1 column

1<sup>rv</sup>: John of Garland

2<sup>r</sup>-5<sup>ra</sup>: Commentary on Juvenal

5<sup>b</sup>: Commentary on Virgil (Ecloges)

10<sup>r</sup>-15<sup>r</sup>: Commentary on *Metamorphoses*

Remarks: Fragments of three different booklets by different hands from different ages. The *Metamorphoses* commentary is incomplete; it covers Book 1-11:157.

Available digitised at: <https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN768028965>

**San Daniele del Friuli, Biblioteca Guarneriana, Guarner s. n.**

Germany

8 fol.

13x20

Twelfth century

55 lines/page, 2 columns

Content:

1<sup>r</sup>-5<sup>vb</sup>: Commentary on *Metamorphoses*

5<sup>vb</sup>-8<sup>vb</sup>: Commentary on *Metamorphoses*

Remarks: Same hand in both texts. The first text contains a type of *accessus* focused on transformations and then brief commentary on all fifteen books of the *Metamorphoses*. The second text is incomplete; it starts with an *accessus* and then covers Books 1-8:288.

### **Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 14748**

Germany/Regensburg

144 fol.

22,5x17

Twelfth century

Remarks: This manuscript contains texts by Sallust and other authors. On 38<sup>r</sup> the end of a commentary on Sallust is followed directly and in the same hand by a commentary on the *Metamorphoses*, which covers half or 38<sup>r</sup> and 38<sup>v</sup>. This fragment consists of an *accessus* and some commentary on the first lines of Book 1. It seems to be unique; the *accessus* is similar to the other twelfth-century *accessus*. On 38<sup>v</sup> Macrobius is mentioned. The text is faded and difficult to make out.

Available digitised at: <https://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0009/bsb00094604/images/>

These four manuscripts do not seem to belong to any of the four larger families, nor is it possible to group them together more than occasionally (see below). Of these four only clm 14482a is complete, but very short compared to the other families. The other three commentaries also seem to be short. I estimate that all of these commentaries are no more than half the length of clm 4610, which is quite interesting in itself. Were they perhaps abridged versions or extracted from marginal notes?

First, we will consider clm 14482a and Berlin 540. The first of the three commentaries in clm 14482 does not show any strong resemblance to the Bavarian B family or clm 4610. However, in the same way as with the relationship between clm 4610 and the Bavarian B family, it does frequently comment on the same passages in *Metamorphoses*, but in a different way. The following example shows three different versions of an explanation to *Met.* 6:90:

**clm 4610:** *ALTERA PIGMEE, id est Pigmee, id est que fuit mater illorum priorum populorum, qui uocantur Pigmei. Vel proprium nomen regine Pigmeorum.* (6:90)

THE OTHER [SHOWS] THE PYGMAEAN, that is 'of the Pygmaean', that is she who was the mother of the earlier people, who are called Pygmies. Or it is the proper name of the queen of the Pygmies.

**Bavarian B:** *ALTERA PIGMEE, populi. Pigmei, id est cubitales, quia sunt cubiti unius abitudinis. De quibus quedam mulier preferebat se Iunoni. Quam ipsa mutauit in gruem insuperque precepit, ut singulis annis cum aliis gruibus pugnaret contra suos compatriotas.*

THE OTHER [SHOWS] THE PYGMAEAN, a people. Pygmies, that is cubit-long (*cubitales*), since they are one cubit long in appearance. One woman among them favoured herself before Juno, who transformed her into a crane and in addition ordered that every year she had to fight together with other cranes against her own countrymen.

**clm 14482a:** *Pigmei sunt populi cubitales, quibus grues bellum ingerunt. Et sic exponitur Pigmee matres, id est matres Pigmeorum, vel ut proprium nomen illius mulieris, que fuit regina Pigmeorum dicta Pigmea.* (5<sup>r</sup>)

The pygmies are a cubit long people, against which the cranes waged war. 'The Pygmean mothers' should be interpreted thus: that is the mother of the Pygmies, or as a proper noun for the woman called Pigmea, who was the queen of the Pygmies.

In another instance, clm 14482a has the same explanation as Berlin 540. This passage is of interest since it helps us make sense of the obscure phrasing of clm 4610 in the explanation of *Met.* 2:11:

**clm 4610:** *DORIDAQVE ET NATAS. Secundum rei ueritatem Doris quidam rex Grecus fuit, qui in mari cum exercitu submersus fuit. Et ideo secundum fabulam Doris dicitur dea et exercitus dee.* (Ed. I. 224-226)

DORIS AND HER DAUGHTERS. In reality Doris was a Greek king, who was drowned in the sea with his army. Therefore, according to the story, Doris is called a 'goddess' and the army 'goddesses'.

**clm 14482a:** *DORIDAQVE. Secundum rei ueritatem Doris fuit quidam rex Grecus, qui in mari cum omni suo exercitu perit. Secundum fabulam autem dicitur Doris dea et exercitus filie iii/inde uel Doridis. (3<sup>r</sup>)*

**Berlin 540:** *Secundum rei ueritatem Doris rex Grece fuit, qui cum omni exercitu suo mari submersus fingitur. Secundum fabulam in marinam deam conuersus et exercitus filie Doridis uocantur. (10<sup>v</sup>)*

When we compare clm 4610 to these two commentaries, it allows us to understand better what clm 4610 probably means with *exercitus dee*, namely, *dee* (*deae* goddesses) as in *filiae* (daughters), and not *dee* as in ‘of the goddess’, which is also a possible interpretation.

The commentaries in clm 14482a and Berlin 540 seem not to be closely related to each other or clm 4610 or the Bavarian B family, but they nevertheless have some instances of matching content in their explanations.

The third text we must mention is the so-called fragment Guarner. s. n. (*sine numero*). This text is today located at the Biblioteca Guarneriana in San Daniele del Friuli. The library collection is described in an excellent modern catalogue, but, unfortunately, this commentary has been described as a fragment.<sup>300</sup> This is not the case. Instead, we are dealing with a unique case where the commentary text has been preserved in its original booklet form. All other commentaries I have investigated, except possibly for Salzburg AV4, have been bound together with other texts at some point during the middle ages. This little booklet consists of only eight folios comprising two short commentaries on the *Metamorphoses*. Granted, the text is not complete, the second commentary seems to be missing about three folios, but this still does not make it into a fragment. This little booklet may have been the form in which the commentaries were actually used in the twelfth century.

As far as the text of this booklet is concerned, the first commentary may be a version of the *Narrationes*. It is not related to clm 4610 or the Bavarian B commentary. The second commentary, however, seems vaguely related. The *accessus* is definitively a version of the *accessus* found in the Bavarian B commentary. It contains six topics, all of which are found in some form in the Bavarian B commentary. As for the rest of the text, it seems to comment on many of the same passages as both clm 4610 and Bavarian B, but with explanations that are too

<sup>300</sup> *La Libreria di Guarnerio D'Artegna*, ed. L. Casarsa, M. D'Angelo and C. Scaloni (Udine: Casamassima, 1991), p. 462.

different for it to be considered a close relation to the Bavarian commentaries. It is, however, thought to be of German origin.

The following explanation may serve as an example of the two commentaries when the explanations are the most similar:

**clm 14482c:** *NABATHVS uel Nabath fuit filius Ismahelis, filii Abrahe, qui regnauit in oriente. A quo dicta est regio Nabaioth.* (1:61, 29<sup>r</sup>)

NABATHUS or Nabath was the son of Ismael, son of Abraham, who ruled in the east. The region is named Nabaioth after him.

**Guarner s. n.:** *EVRS AD AVRORAM N. Q. R., id est ad regna Nabathi. Nabathus erat filius Ismaelis filii Abrahe, qui regnauit in oriente, de quo tam pagani quam Christiani religionis uiri legunt in historis.* (6<sup>r</sup>)

EVRS AD AVRORAM N. Q. R., that is the kingdoms of Nabathus. Nabathus was the son of Ismael, son of Abraham, who ruled in the east. Both pagan and Christian men have read about him in historical works.

## Arnulf of Orléans

### Manuscript Description

**Munchen, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 7205**

112 fol.

24x17

29<sup>r</sup>-58<sup>v</sup>: Arnulf of Orléans commentary on the *Metamorphoses*

Remarks: I have only been able to consult reproductions on the booklet containing Arnulf's commentary.

The last example of the twelfth-century commentaries is the most famous, and the only one with a name attached to it: the commentary of Arnulf of Orléans. Arnulf's commentary exists in many different manuscripts from several different centuries, of which the manuscript listed above, clm 7205, is probably the oldest and only complete version among the older manuscripts. This is the family about which I must confess I know the least. Instead, we must wait for the forthcoming edition being prepared by David Gura, University of Notre Dame, for Brepols until a proper analysis of the relationship between this family and the other families can be undertaken. For the purpose of this book I have examined only the version of the commentary preserved in clm 7205 and I will limit myself to presenting a few brief examples.

**clm 4610:** 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 Amphitrionis. (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 diphtong. 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 Oeagrius’s son, as Hercules is Amphitryo’s.

**Freiburg 381:** §DEAIGVS mons, HEMVS est mons, in quo Cicones Trace mulieres Orpheum Oeagri decerpserunt, etiam inde mons post ea dictus est Oeagri. (36<sup>r</sup>)

**Prague VIII H32:** ... Hic NONDVM OEAGRIVS dictus est a patre Orphei (post corr. ex arphei). In hoc Orpheus dilaniatus est, et ideo nomen a patre accepit. (81va)

**clm 7205:** he<mus> non<dum> eagrius mons qui diuidit Macedoniam a Thessalia. Oea<grius> dictus est ab Orpheo ibi a mulieribus dilacerato, sed hoc nondum contigerat, immo futurum erat. Et bene dictus est Oeagrius, quia Oeager pater fuit Orphei putatus, Phebus uero uerus. (32<sup>vb</sup>)<sup>301</sup>

Not yet oegrian Haemus, a mountain that divides Macedonia from Thessaly. Oeagrian, named after Orpheus who was torn to pieces by women there, but this had not yet happened, indeed it was going to happen. And ‘Oeagrian’ is well said, since Oeager was believed to have been Orpheus’s father, but Phoebus was his true father.

Here is a rather rare example of all four major families commenting on the same passage, although none of them are very much alike. All four

<sup>301</sup> All of my examples from Arnulf come from my transcriptions of clm 7205. This manuscript marks lemma by underlining the relevant words (while the other commentaries signal lemma with a paragraph marker), which I have reproduced in the transcription.

commentaries focus on explaining *Oeagrius* in connection with Orpheus. Clm 4610 has the longest explanation, and together with Arnulf explains that Phoebus was Orpheus' real father. The next example also gathers all four families:

**clm 4610:** §DVLCE DEDIT TOSTA QVOD TEX<ERAT> ANTE POLENTA[M]. *Tostam uocat polentam panem subcinericium; tostam, qua dulcem liquorem anus cooperuerat.* (5:450)

§SHE GAVE SOMETHING SWEET, THAT SHE HAD COVERED WITH PEARL-BARLEY ROASTED BEFORE. He calls the bread baked under the ashes parched barley; the parched [barley] with which the old woman had covered the sweet liquid.

**Freiburg 381:** §DULCE DEDIT *quodam scilicet POLENTA QVOD ANTE, id est prius, COXERAT in TESTA. Quod polenta, indeclinabile. Aliter: dedit quodam dulce, quod coxerat in testa, sed ante dedit polenta, id est prius, quod est genus panis.* (39<sup>r</sup>)

§SHE GAVE something SWEET, namely PEARL-BARLEY THAT SHE HAD COOKED BEFORE, that is earlier, in A POT. This pearl-barley, indeclinable. Alternatively: she gave something sweet that she had cooked in a pot, but before that she gave the pearl-barley, that is before, which is a type of bread.

**Prague VIII H32:** §DULCE DEDIT, *scilicet POLENTA, QVOD COXERAT ANTE, id est prius in TESTA. Vel DEDIT ei quoddam DULCE, id est dulcem potum, quem coxerat cum TOSTA POLENTA, id est subcinericium panem, id est et panem et potum dedit, sed <secundum> priorem lectionem indeclinabile est polenta.* (84<sup>ra</sup>)

§SHE GAVE THE SWEET, that is the PEARL-BARLEY THAT SHE HAD COOKED BEFORE, that is earlier, in A POT. Or: she gave him something sweet, that is a sweet drink, which she had boiled with roasted pearl-barley, that is bread baked under the ashes, that is she gave both bread and drink, but according to the earlier reading pearl-barley is indeclinable.

**clm 7205:** dulce sic construe: *dedit quiddam carnes frixe et contuse polenta, que dulce coxerat in tosta.* (38<sup>va</sup>)

sweet, construe it thus: she gave some roasted meats and some crushed pearl-barley that she had cooked sweetly in a pot.

This is an explanation to a passage in Book 5 in which Proserpina is searching for Persephone and is offered a drink by an old lady. The drink is said to be covered by roasted barley (perhaps in the sense of ‘infused with barley’, or simply a piece of bread placed in the drink). Clm 4610 is the only commentary that has the reading *texerat* in the lemma, which is found in four of the older *Metamorphoses* manuscripts (and is the one used in modern editions), while the other commentaries have the more common reading *coxerat*. The commentaries seem to be having trouble both with the concept of *tosta polenta* (roasted barley) and the general syntax of the sentence. Freiburg 381 seems to be basing its explanation on a manuscript that besides *coxerat*, also has *testa* (pot or jug) instead of *tosta*. This reading seems fairly rare. The commentator tries to explain the grammar by making *polenta* indeclinable. Freiburg 381 then gives an alternative explanation where *polenta* is described as a type of bread, which is also mentioned by clm 4610. The Franco-German commentary combines explanations from both clm 4610 and Freiburg 381. It is aware of both the readings *testa* and *tosta*, and agrees with Freiburg 381 that *polenta* needs to be indeclinable to work grammatically if the text reads *testa*. It agrees with clm 4610 in mentioning the *subcinericium panem* (ash-baked bread). Finally, Arnulf has a short explanation that is entirely different. Arnulf used the readings *coxerat* and *tosta*, but he also brings roasted meat (*carnes frixe*) into the explanation.<sup>302</sup>

These brief examples illustrate the fact that the commentaries sometimes agree which are the passages that need to be explained, and that the explanations sometimes are close enough to suspect direct contact between the different commentaries. It should also be noted that the examples above do not do justice to Arnulf’s commentary, which is usually the most polished, and the most stylistically and pedagogically refined of the twelfth-century commentaries.

## Conclusions

This section has considered the other twelfth-century commentaries, especially the Bavarian B family, a commentary family that seems to be from the same geographical area and almost contemporary to or slightly later in time than clm 4610.

I have shown that although individual manuscripts in the Bavarian B family shows many idiosyncrasies, it can convincingly be argued that they constitute a family. The difference between the family

<sup>302</sup> It should be pointed out that the text in the manuscript seems to contain some errors. The translation is an interpretation of what the original meaning might have been.

members is largely a matter of added (or possibly omitted) explanations or parts of explanations. As regards the relationship between manuscripts in this family, we also have reason to speculate about what determines the variation between the texts. When the variation is large, it is easy to imagine additions from a third source, but when it is small, just a matter of phrasing, then a third source seems unlikely. In the latter case, we could instead perhaps factor in orality, like dictation or some sort of schoolroom exercise. The Bavarian B family has survived in more copies than the unique commentary in clm 4610. Whether this means that the Bavarian B family was more popular than clm 4610 due to its content or for other reasons, or whether this is just a coincidence is difficult to say. I can see no easy answer to this question based on style or content of the two commentary families. So, I would hazard to guess that it is a coincidence. There could, of course, also exist other, as-yet undiscovered relatives to clm 4610.

As far as the other commentaries are concerned, more work remains to be done. There is a noticeable connection between the Bavarian B family and the Franco-German family, and Arnulf of Orléans's commentary occasionally seems to pick bits and pieces from the other commentaries (or shared sources). The shorter commentaries, which are not as easy to group in families, also share traits with the other commentaries, but I have not as of yet been able to establish any closer connection.

The nature of the relationship between clm 4610 and Bavarian B family reminds us of the relationship with the marginal commentaries in the previous study. There are a few close matches (particularly with the manuscript clm 14809), many cases of commonplaces, and finally a shared number of focal points, where a certain passage in the *Metamorphoses* acts as an irritant on the interpretative eye of the high middle ages and causes a multitude of explanations that warrant further investigation.

Clm 4610 does differ somewhat from the other commentaries by having fewer, but longer explanations. The other commentaries contain long strings of explanations consisting of just one word up to a short sentence, among which are scattered longer explanations. These strings of shorter explanation are gloss-like in appearance and could very well have been copied from a *Metamorphoses* manuscript or other source. In addition, the other commentaries, at least the Bavarian B family, seem to use more material directly excerpted from Servius and Isidore. As an example to support this last point we can compare the commentary to Book in clm 4610 and the Bavarian B family, where I have identified at least fourteen excerpts or parallels to Isidore (many

of them verbatim) in Bavarian B and only four in clm 4610. Even though the commentary to Book 1 is almost twice as long in Bavarian B compared to clm 4610 this is still significant. These differences aside, it could be said that in general all of the twelfth-century commentaries are more alike than they are different. None of them adopts a completely different approach to Ovid's text, instead they all seem to focus most of their explanations on providing background information and help with construing the text.

