The Bavarian Commentary and Ovid

ROBIN WAHLSTEN BÖCKERMAN

https://www.openbookpublishers.com

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

Part II: THE TEXT

In editing a single manuscript tradition of an anonymous high medieval text, we are quite far removed from the classical Lachmannian method of textual criticism as famously described by Martin West and Paul Maas.[303] We are instead much closer to the method employed by Joseph Bédier, although he chose one manuscript among many, while in this case we have no choice. Much more recently, several editors of medieval texts have engaged with the problems of editing single manuscript texts of different kinds in the volume *The Arts of Editing Medieval Greek and Latin: A Casebook*, in which a diverse group of scholars discuss methods for editing a diverse multitude of medieval texts.[304] In this volume, scholars such as Brian M. Jensen and Claes Gejrot discuss the possibilities and difficulties of their specific single manuscript texts.[305] My project fits within this context. Although we each employ different methods of documenting the text, editors of single manuscript texts usually share the goal of carefully documenting their single manuscript, as well as perhaps a slight scepticism towards the traditional philological dream of uncovering the *ur*-text.

Manuscript Description[306]

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 4610
Date: 1: Second half of the 11th century; 2: around 1100
Provenance: Benediktbeuren Benedictine monastery
Origin: Germany
Material: Parchment
Size: 21,5x17,5 cm
Writing area: 1: 17x14, 1 column, 25-27 lines; 2: 18x13, 2 columns, 32-33 lines
Folios: 84

---

[303] Martin L. West, *Textual Critcism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973) and Paul Maas (transl. B. Flower), *Textual Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958)

[304] *The Arts of Editing Medieval Greek and Latin: A Casebook*, ed. Elisabet Göransson et al. (Totonto: PIMS, 2016)

[305] Brian M. Jensen 'A Modified Diplomatic Edition of *Lectionarium Placentinum*', pp. 198-218; Claes Gejrot 'Original Value: On Diplomatics and Editorial Work', pp. 122-138 in Göransson 2016.

[306] Based on the information in Glauche's catalogue with some of my own observations from microfilm and on site.

Quires: 1: (V-1) + 3 IV^{32} + (V-2)^{40} + IV^{48} + (IV-1)^{55} + (IV-3)^{60}; 2: IV^{76} + III^{82} + (III-3)^{84}

Binding: Medieval binding. Light brown, undecorated leather, traces of clasp and chain. Three pairs of bands are visible on the spine. Pastedown consists of a page from a ninth-century lectionary.

Contents:

1:

1^r-60^r: Anonymous commentary on Lucan: *Manneus lucanus patrem habuit manneum menelam ex prouincia betica ... est magnus quam pro eius capite debere*

2:

61va-84rb: Anonymous commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: *Cum multa possint inquiri in capite uniuscuiusque libri ... idcirco iubilet domino circulus uniuerse fabrice mundi*

84rb-84vb: Anonymous text on the quantity of Latin syllables: *Omnia latina in a producuntur ut ama excepto nomninativo ... Omnia in x et i z producuntur*

Remarks on clm 4610[307]

The manuscript clm 4610 consists of two separate booklets. The first booklet (4610:1) is a commentary on Lucan and is dated to the second half of the eleventh century in the catalogue.[308] The second booklet (4610:2) is a commentary on Ovid and is dated to around 1100 in the catalogue (more on dating below).

An owner mark (*iste liber est Monasterii Benedictenpeuren* [sic]) written in a later Gothic script can be found on 1^r, 60^r, 61^{rv} and 84^v. This mark is also found on the back pastedown. The front pastedown carries the text *Commentum in lucanum / Commentum in Ouidium Metamorphoseos* in the same Gothic script. The spine of the manuscripts carries an old library number, 110.

There are also more recent owner's marks on the manuscript. The front pastedown carries a *Biblioteca regia Monacensis* stamp and a sticker with Cod. lat. 4610 on it. The stamp occurs again on fol. 1^r and 84^v.

The microfilm has been digitised and is available at: https://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/bsb00006777/images/

Catalogue:

G. Glauche, *Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München: Die Pergamenthandschriften aus Benediktbeuern: Clm 4510-4663* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1994)

---

[307] These remarks are based on examinations of the digitally scanned black-and-white microfilm reproduction of the manuscript as well as my examinations of the manuscript on site in Munich.

[308] This booklet is one of the manuscripts used in the edition *Adnotationes super Lucanum*, ed. J. Endt (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1969).

Detailed Description of clm 4610:2

In the following description I will begin with general features and conclude with a discussion of the script and the text itself, which are most relevant for the editorial principles that follow directly afterwards.

Physical Aspects and Paratextual Observations

The parchment is of a rough quality. The hair side is dark and has a rough structure. There are several holes and tears as well as some faded spots (e.g. on 64rb and 66^v), which are not always visible on the black-and-white scan. There are also some blank spaces consisting of clean, unharmed parchment. An example of this can be found before *proprie uocatur* on 66ra (and on 68ra, 69vb and 83vb). I have no explanation for these empty spaces.

The manuscript has been trimmed when bound together, but the pricking from the blind ruling is still visible.

The ink is in two different shades. The main text is written in a dark blackish brown ink, while the additions are written in a lighter brown ink.

The initials are in red, but now almost black from oxidation, and extend over two lines. There are no decorations.

There is no mark for where the commentary ends. Instead (on 84rb, line 3), what looks like the same hand continues seamlessly with fifteen lines of Bible-related commentary.[309] After this, on the rest of 84rb and all of 84^v, the same or a similar hand has written on the quantity of syllables in a smaller script. This little text, which I have not been able to identify, seems to treat the Latin alphabet from a to z with regard to quantity.

At each lemma in the commentary, a reference to book and line have been made with a led pencil by a much later hand. This could probably be the work of Karl Meiser, who worked on the manuscript in the late nineteenth century and presented a list of most of the lemmata in a published lecture.[310]

---

[309] *Iurauit et predistinauit /dominator dominus et penitus / nihil penitebat eum Tu es sa-/-cerdos in conspectu illius offerens / libamina in eternum secundum morem / diuinum et iuxta ordinem regis / et sacerdotis Melchisedec Ab- /-scultate omnes ubique fideles /Propagator noster et auctor eternus / dolens male nosmet perisse / a patria longe exulasse Coe- / -ternum sibi filium misit ut eripe- / -ret homines Idcirco iubilet / domino circulus uniuerse fabrice / mundi.*

[310] Meiser 1885.

Mise-en-page and Punctuation

The text has a two-column layout, which makes it unique among the early *Metamorphoses* commentaries. The text clearly marks a new explanation with a paragraph marker, usually followed by a capital letter.[311]

Commentary on each new book is marked by the scribe with the phrase *incipit liber X* or just *liber X*. The only exception is at the start of the commentary to Book 1, which follows upon the *accessus* almost seamlessly.

In two instances the *incipit liber* seems to be wrongly placed. The end of the commentary on Book 4 includes an explanation to 5:19 and in the beginning of the commentary on Book 8 there are two explanations to 7:794 and 7:759.

The scribe uses both different punctuation marks and capital letters to mark a new section. The marks used are the *punctus* (both on the baseline and in the middle, between base and headline) and the *punctus elevatus*. Both marks correspond partially with the comma and full stop in modern syntactic punctuation. Capital letters are used in the four following ways:

- always in the first word of a lemma
- sometimes in the first word after a lemma (especially if the first word is a repetition of a word from the lemma, e.g. NVNC QVOQVE CORALIIS. *Coralii sunt species...*)
- after *punctus*
- sometimes when several alternative explanations are given to one lemma

Marginal and Interlinear Additions and Corrections:

The manuscript contains some additions in the margin which seem to be written by the same hand or by a hand contemporary to that of the rest of the text. These are usually complete explanations, but sometimes just a word or two. On 62va we find an example of a short addition in the form of a correction. A single word (*accidat*) with an insertion mark has been added in the margin next to the line where it is meant to be inserted. On 64ra we find the first longer marginal addition. This one is a short but complete explanation, and the insertion sign places it at the right place in the text. The additions in the margin appear in clusters in the manuscripts. They are found in Book 2 on 64r-65v, Book 6 on 68v and Book 14 on 83r. Book 2 is by far the book with most marginal and interlinear additions. Except for

---

[311] In some cases, for example, 10:127 on 76ra, the paragraph markers are very faint and difficult so see on the microfilm.

these there are only scattered one-word notes in the margins or between lines.

There are also some interlinear additions. Usually, these additions consist of simple corrections, for example on 64[rb] *iunget* is corrected to *iungere* in the normal way by placing a mark under *-t* and adding *-re* above the line. On the same side *uel per noctem* has been added after the words *per diemı*, which can be regarded as a correction or as added information. It is not possible to say whether this is a correction of a phrase accidentally omitted by the scribe or an added gloss. Such possible glosses or additions seem partly to coincide with the clusters of marginal additions. Perhaps these were places were the scribe checked the copy against an exemplar or where a second reader or corrector had gone through the text.

On the Scribe and the Script

The catalogue dates clm 4610:2 to around 1100. Earlier scholars have dated it to both the eleventh and the twelfth centuries.[312] The latest editor of *Metamorphoses*, R. J. Tarrant (drawing on both Meiser and Munk Olsen), dates clm 4610 to the end of the eleventh or beginning of the twelfth century.[313]

According to Dr Teresa Webber, the script points to a date at the end of the eleventh century (with the reservation that a long-lived and conservative scribe could have written in such a style at a later date).[314] There is no textual evidence to help with the dating except for the reference to one Manegaldus. If this refers to Manegold of Lautenbach (c. 1030- c. 1103), then it gives us a rough *terminus post quem*, but not much as far as the *terminus ante quem* is concerned.

According to the catalogue the text is written in Carolingian minuscule, but we could perhaps call it a transitional script, or pregothic with Derolez's terminology, simply because of the plausible time frame for the manuscript. As Derolez points out, the term pregothic is relative, and the scripts identified as such are Carolingian scripts that show some new features, which are then fully developed in the gothic script.[315] The script in clm 4610 contains some features that point to an early transitional stage, such as long ascenders and descenders (about twice the length of the x-height), which were not

---

[312] cf. Meiser 1885, p. 48; Haupt 1873, p. 190.

[313] Tarrant 2004, p. xiv.

[314] Teresa Webber, e-mail message to author, 27 May 2015.

[315] Albert Derolez, *The Palaeography of the Gothic Manuscript Books: From the Twelfth to the Early Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) p. 57.

common at a later stage. The bodies of the letters are still quite square, compared to the later more rectangular shape, but with some lateral compression of letters such as *h, n,* and *u,* which would suggest later eleventh century rather than the middle.[316] Some other features of the script, which Derolez characterises as pregothic, are the use of both vertical and Uncial *d* (e.g. on fol. 62vb) and double i often marked íí.[317] Some other features of the script that may be worth mention are:

- clubbing on the ascenders
- closed loop *g*
- Carolingian *st-* and *ct-*ligatures
- ampersand is used throughout to represent *et* and *-et-* (e.g. for the *-et* in *ualet* on 71vb)
- *linea nasalis* always drawn as a tilde rather than a straight line.

Abbreviations: In addition to the standard set of abbreviations, the scribe uses some that are rather idiosyncratic. These are the *q* and *h* abbreviations (abbreviations for the relative and demonstrative pronouns), for example as *q* with a line through the descender may stand for either *quod* or *qui.*

The ampersand *et* is leaning in such a way that it may be mistaken for a *quia*-abbreviation. My impression, which has been confirmed by Dr Webber, is that it is unique to this scribe and could perhaps be used to identify the same scribe or perhaps school in other manuscripts.

The spelling of the scribe is quite normal for the time. The scribe makes use of *e-caudata* for the ae and oe diphthong consistently throughout the manuscript and distinguishes clearly between *t* and *c* in most cases when the combination *-ti-/-ci-* is concerned, but with some exceptions (e.g. *penitentia* on fol. 65[vb], but *tristicia* on fol. 63[rb]). As usual with scribes of the period, *h* is sometimes missing and sometimes added where it does not belong (ex. *honerosior* for *onerosior* on 62[vb]). Somewhat less usual is the fact that the scribe (or a similar hand) also sometimes corrects missing aspiration with a sign above the line. The first of these corrections appears on 63[ra] in the explanation to 1:117. The scribe often uses *i* for *y* (*phisin* for *physin* on 61[va], *Pirra* for *Pyrrha* on 63[va]), but rarely the other way around. Y is rarely used and almost always in names, and then in a way that does not agree with classical spelling (e.g. *Ypodammen* and *Yxione* for *Hipodamen* and *Ixione* on 78[rb]). The consonant *b* is sometimes used for *v.* (*acerbo* for *acervo* on 62[va]), and *p* is sometimes used for *b* (*pleps* for *plebs* on 63[vb]). In two cases, the scribe uses *f* where *v* would be expected, which may be indicative of a

---

[316] I would like to thank Dr Webber for pointing this out.
[317] Derolez 2006, pp. 60-65.

German speaking scribe (*fas* for *vas* on 67va and *fatem* for *vatem* on 70va). In many cases, the scribe uses single consonant where classical Latin would have double (ex. *vacam* for *vaccam* on 64ra and *literas* for *litteras* on 69rb), and sometimes double consonants where classical Latin would have single (*peccuniam* for *pecuniam* on 69vb).

The scribe represents numbers either by writing them as a word or by using Roman numerals (*tres, bis, iii, iiii:or*).

On Errors

There are quite a few scribal errors in the manuscript. I have identified about 300 in the entire commentary, some of which show a pattern of difficulties with certain letters/letter combinations, which tell us that the text is a copy and might even tell us something about the exemplar.

However, even though these errors tell us that the commentary in clm 4610 is a copy of some sort, it is still difficult to say whether it is a copy of another *catena* commentary or an assemblage made from one or several marginal commentaries, for example.

In the following, I will discuss the errors concerning names, errors in the lemma, and complex and simple errors in the main text.

When the errors concern names, it is difficult to tell if the errors were made by the scribe or if they are part of a tradition. The error *ortigianti* for *ortigiam* is a clear example of a scribal error where the scribe has confused the minims. The errors *ciclides* for *eclides* (ci/e) and *euboream* for *euboicam* (re/ic) could easily be judged as simple scribal errors, but they could also be part of a tradition. We have no proof of the latter, but the type of error is analogous with the error *Antidia* for *Anticlea*. The error, *d* for *cl*, is easy to explain on palaeographical grounds, but the spelling *Antidia* also occurs in the thirteenth-century *Fabularius* by Conrad of Mure (Conradus de Mure).[318] If we disregard the fact that the *Fabularius* could be directly influenced by clm 4610:2, this would be an indication of a tradition of spelling.

As concerns the spelling *eticina* for *ericina* and *dicon* for *elicon*, the reason for the errors is equally easy to understand. The interesting thing here, however, is that the errors occur in the lemma, and the correct form is found in the explanation. This could either be because the scribe realised his error, or more likely copied the lemma directly

---

[318] *Conradi de Mure Fabularius*, Lexicon A:Anticlinia, ed. Tom van de Loo (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006) p. 110.

from an exemplar or a *Metamorphoses* manuscript, which may have been written in a script with difficult letterforms.[319]

The error *herecinthius* for *berecinthius* found in the explanation of 11:106 is an interesting example. Forms of the name appear once in the lemma and three times in the short explanation. In the lemma, the word is spelled *herecinthius* and the first time it appears in the explanation the spelling is *herecinthia*, but it has then been corrected by the scribe or a contemporary hand to *berecinthius*, which is the spelling used in the final two occurrences of the word. This example gives us a glimpse of an active scribe or corrector.

The lemmata involve an extra difficulty since they are often heavily abbreviated; words are often reduced to a single or a couple of letters only. About a sixth of all the errors identified in the text are in the lemma. We do not know if the form of the lemma is the creation of the scribe of this particular manuscript or the form found in an exemplar.

The most extreme error to appear in a lemma is *sed primus natas* for *spinas notatas*. We can draw the conclusion that the *s* in *spinas* has been mistaken for an abbreviated *sed*, -*pinas* has then been interpreted as *primus*, while *notatas* (perhaps abbreviated in the original) dropped the first syllable (*n[ot]atas*).

This type of more complex copying errors is not restricted to the lemma. In the explanations we have the following:

uenam ut for *ueniunt* (a/i, mu/un)
ad buceras for *adhuc erat* (b/h, s/t)
in aurem for *matrem*   (in/m, u/t)

These are essentially two or more errors in one: the words have been mistakenly divided and letters confused. I have found no common denominator for these errors, such as the type of letters confused, for example.

There are also some errors that concern abbreviated conjunctions and adverbs, most notably: *sed* for *secundum* and *non* for *con* (e.g. *non sedere* for *con-sedere*).

Besides these, there are many one-letter errors where we see a tendency to confuse b with h; t with c and c with t; d with the ligature ct; r seems to be problematic in several cases. Some examples:

cum for *eum*
laduca for *lactuca*
aeripiunt for *accipiunt*

---

[319] The Naples manuscript IV.F.3 can serve as an example here. It has no proven connection with the commentary in clm 4610, but it is a *Metamorphoses* manuscript written in a Beneventan script with additional marginal commentary in a pregothic script, which proves that either the manuscript or the scribes travelled and that different scribes and their scripts interacted with each other.

acrocissimo for *atrocissimo*
cantis for *tantis*
fortes for *fontes*.

Besides these errors, there are also many simple scribal errors that consist of missing or misplaced letters or syllables (e.g. *strupata* for *stuprata*, *uolemque* for *uocalemque*), or sometimes even superfluous words/parts of words (mainly at the end or beginning of a page, e.g. *cre / credentes*). However, it is difficult to judge if some of these errors are scribal errors or errors in the exemplar, as in the case with wrong word forms (e.g. *causa* for *cause*; *quadam* for *quodam*).

Editorial Principles

The present edition contains the complete text of the commentary of *Metamorphoses* in clm 4610. The edition is accompanied by two sets of apparatus and a translation with notes.

The aim of the edition is to document as many features of the text in clm 4610 as possible, since this commentary exists, as far as we know, only in the manuscript clm 4610. At the same time, the aim is also to interpret (e.g. by way of introducing a syntactical punctuation and correcting perceived errors) the text in a way that makes it accessible to modern readers since the text in the manuscript offers many challenges as far as individual words, syntax, and textual errors are concerned. While the documentary aim of the edition is important, it is important to realise, as William Robins reminds us in 'Toward a Disjunctive Philology', that an edition always emphasises some features of the edited text while at the same time excluding others in order to serve its purpose.[320] Thus the purpose should be clearly stated. While working with the text, I quickly realised that due to its difficulty the interpretative purpose must gain priority over the documentative purpose. This means that I have structured the text in a way I feel gives clarity to the individual explanations in it as well as the interplay between lemma and explanation. This also means that I opted not to document some other features of the text, for example, the original punctuation.

In the following, the different documenting and interpreting procedures of the edition are described.

---

[320] William Robins 'Toward a Disjunctive Philology' in *The Book Unbound: Editing and Reading Medieval Manuscripts and Texts* ed. S. Echard and S. Partridge (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), pp. 144-158, https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442659933-009.

N.B. At some points in the text the line and word spacing will appear irregular, this is due to the technical constraints involved in presenting the edition with a facing page translation. The irregular spacing is not meant to convey any features of the manuscript.

Errors and Emendations

For the purposes of this edition, I consider such passages or phrases that disagree with the internal logic of the text to be textual errors, or, to borrow Hans Zeller's phrasing: 'The textual fault is an element in the text as documented and transmitted that is contradictory to the structure of the work in question.'[321] This means that I am not interested in possible errors of the author or factual errors.

However, as Eric Cullhed has pointed out in his article 'Editing Byzantine Scholarly Texts in Authorized Manuscripts', the procedure of discovering and handling Zeller's textual faults is a highly subjective and historical event.[322] To put it another way, even though the search for authorial intention is long since dead, the editor is in a sense battling with 'scribal intention'. Through the paleographical arts we have good tools for judging when individual letter forms or words may be erroneous, but, when we encounter words that may be an error or an alternative reading (no matter how obscure), we enter a grey zone in which it is the editor's duty to report and if possible argue the editorial actions taken.

The present edition is based on a sole surviving manuscript, which makes the discovery of errors much more difficult than in the case with two or more manuscripts, since there are no alternative readings to help.

An example of a factual error can be found in the explanation to 10:214/215 where Hercules and his comrades are said to have hidden in the promontory of Sigeum and from this 'to hide' is called *sigere*.[323] There is parallel to this passage in Servius where it is told that the promontory is named after Hercules' quietness, which is *sige* in

---

[321] Hans Zeller 'Record and Interpretation: Analysis and Documentation as Goal and Method of Editing' in *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*, ed. H. W. Gabler, G. Bornstein and G. Borland Pierce (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995) p. 36.

[322] Eric Cullhed 'Editing Byzantine Scholarly Texts in Authorized Manuscripts' in *The Arts of Editing Medieval Greek and Latin: A Casebook*, ed. E. Göransson et al. (Totonto: PIMS, 2016), p.76.

[323] *Repulsi sunt a Laomedonte et in Sigeo promunctorio latuerunt, unde sigere latere dicitur.*

Greek.[324] From this, we may draw the conclusion that the commentary in clm 4610, or the source it draws upon, has misunderstood Servius's explanation. However, the explanation in the commentary is constructed in such a way that it makes sense linguistically. The word *sigere* has a proper infinitive suffix, which indicates that it was regarded as a verb and thus, even though no dictionary supports the verb itself, it makes sense in its context and is not to be corrected.

Discrepancies in the text, such as variation between single and double consonants in a word, are not judged to be errors as long as they do not affect the understanding of the text. These discrepancies are not corrected but commented upon in the apparatus where needed so that the reader will not think it an error of transcription.

Discrepancies that do affect the understanding of the text are judged to be errors and corrected. I employ a method of correcting errors where the correction is always made visible so that the reader will not confuse the documented text with the interpreted text. I use three methods for representing corrected errors in the edition:

1. When possible, words are corrected in the edition by means of pointed and square brackets to indicate necessary additions or deletions.
Example: con<t>igerat and in the apparatus *correxi*

2. A majority of all the errors consist of simple one-letter/syllable error. The corrected letter or syllable is marked with italics in the text, and the original reading is reported in the apparatus.
Example: *a*gitur and in the apparatus *correxi* igitur *cod.*

3. More complex errors are corrected and the correction marked by showing the entire corrected word in italics and the original reading in the apparatus.
Example: *habentes* and in the apparatus *correxi* hiemes *cod.*

It could be argued that since italics are used in methods two and three, then why not also for the first method of correcting errors. The type of errors corrected by the first method is after all almost the same as the second (i.e. errors consisting of a lacking, surplus, or misplaced letter or syllable). Furthermore, not using the pointed and square brackets would present a more pleasant page for the reader. However, the use of these markers is long since established, and I have thought it a good idea to continue that praxis.

Where names are concerned, I use the same methods as mentioned above, but further justification is needed to correct an error in this case since it is difficult to separate a scribal error from a general tradition of spelling. Proper names are often spelled in ways quite far removed

---

[324] cf. Servius *in Aen*. 2:312, ed. Thilo, Hagen (1881-1902), and *Mytographi Vaticani 2*, 227, ed. P. Kulcsár (1987).

from what we deem the classical spelling. Sometimes, the names might be corrupted in the copying process and sometimes a variant of the classical spelling is given. In these cases, I do not correct, but I give the classical spelling in the apparatus. I correct, however, case endings in names lest the syntax would be faulty (e.g. 2:802: *Herse* for *Herses* and 8:316: *Pollinicem* for *Pollinices*).

In some cases, I make corrections if the same name appears in several different forms in the same passage. Here, a balance must be reached between an internal logic in the text and preserving the variation of the text. I have judged that these errors are minor scribal errors and not part of a tradition of spelling. Examples of these corrections are:

2:555: *Cerope* corrected to *Cecrope* (*Cecrops* in same passage)
4:458: *Pelapis* corrected to *Pelopis* (*Pelopis* in same passage)
4:786: *Pesagon* corrected to *Pegason* (*Pegasus* in same passage).

Besides these corrections, there are also a few instances where I have marked a word with *cruces desperationis* († †) when I cannot make sense of it syntactically. I have also chosen to mark unidentified letters in the lemma with *cruces* (e.g. 4:291). Had these letters occured in the explanations, I may have chosen to delete them, but since we cannot rule out that they are meant to refer to some part of the *Metamorphoses* when they are found in the lemma, I have chosen the *cruces* instead of the square brackets for deletion. Passages marked with the *cruces* are also generally commented upon in the translation.

Apparatus

Apparatus Fontium

The apparatus fontium has four functions. The first is to report explicit sources. However, there are not very many of this type of source in the text. Instead, the main function of the apparatus fontium is to report possible parallels or implicit sources; these are marked with a *cf.*(*confer*). The number of implicit sources could potentially be enormous and those reported in the apparatus are best regarded as a sample and not a definite list.

The commentary also contains some cross-references to different parts of the *Metamorphoses*, which are marked in the apparatus wherever I have been able to identify them.

Finally, the commentary also includes some internal cross-references, which have been noted in the apparatus with reference to a page in the edition as well as in the manuscript.

Apparatus Criticus

The apparatus criticus contains details about editorial interventions, clarifying information about medieval spelling, marginal and interlinear additions and corrections, missing or surplus paragraph markers, and about manuscript features that might affect the text.

Corrections made in the main text are always marked in the apparatus, as are the few instances where other scholars have differing readings. To clarify an unusual spelling of names and other words *i.e.* (*id est*) is used. As a general rule, I do not clarify simple medieval spelling (e.g. e for ae, or a missing h), but if two instances of these features occur in one word, thus making it difficult to identify, I make a comment in the apparatus. When variant forms are concerned, I use *pro* to give the standard form of the word (e.g. mare *pro* mari). An erroneous form of a word, most often when names are concerned, is marked with *perperam pro*. The word form may be easily detectable as an error, but that error may be part of a tradition and thus not corrected. *Perperam pro* is also used in a few instances to suggest a possible conjecture, but one not strong enough to have been implemented in the edition. In these cases, the phrase is marked with a question mark (e.g. Inuolucione *perperam pro* motione?). For suppressed words, a note is made in the apparatus preceded by *scil.* (*scilicet*) (e.g. fixo *scil.* fixo nomine). Finally, *cf.* (*confer*) is used to show the reading in Tarrant's *Metamophoses* in a section where the lemma differs (e.g. prebet *cf.* praebebat *Met.*).

Orthography and Punctuation

As a basic principle, I follow the orthography of the manuscript with the exception of the *e-caudata*, which is rendered by a simple *e* in the edition. Following the manuscript, I use *u* to represent both vowel and consonant (when capitals are used, *V* represents both vowel and consonant). Likewise, *i* is used for both vowel and consonant. As a general rule, I have kept the scribe's spelling of names with a note on the classical form in the apparatus (see Errors and emendations above for exceptions). I have also preserved the scribe's way of writing numbers in the edition, although Roman numerals are represented in capitals so as to make them easily distinguishable. Abbreviations are expanded without comments in the apparatus.

I have introduced a syntactic punctuation into the text as well as the use of capital letters at the beginning of a new sentence and for proper names, nationalities, and language names. The text in the manuscript uses a system of punctuation (described above), and it could be argued that the original punctuation should be documented in the edition.

However, to properly interpret the text and to attain a maximum of transparency in that interpretation, I have chosen to adopt strict syntactic punctuation. Furthermore, the medieval punctuation is not consistent.

In addition to the features described above, other interpretative actions/markers employed in the edition are the use of italics, quotation marks, and the special treatment of the lemma.

Single quotation marks are used to mark words in a language other than Latin, usually Greek.

Single quotations marks are also used to denote a meta-word, that is, when the commentary discusses a word that may or may not form a grammatical part of the sentence, for example, 1:5 and 1:6.

Single quotation marks are also used when a word or a phrase from the lemma is repeated in the explanation, for example, 1:24, which is, in fact, the most common function of the meta-word.

Finally, quotation marks (preceded by a colon) are also used for direct quotes, for example, 1:371.

Lemmata from the text of the *Metamorphoses* are given in small capital letters. Words that are found either in the text or in the apparatus of Tarrant's edition are judged to be lemmata. References to Tarrant's edition are given in the margin. Although the lemma may extend over several lines in the *Metamorphoses*, the reference in the margin refers to the first line where the lemma can be identified.

The lemmata have been expanded using pointed brackets and without comments in the apparatus, for example, *Et quod tegit o<mnia> c<elum>* for *Et quod tegit o. c.* (on 62[rb]). The Latin in the expansion strives to conform to the Latin in the commentary. Thus *c<elum>* and not the classical *c<aelum>*.

As mentioned above, the lemmata contain a fairly high number of errors and must therefore be treated carefully. On the other hand, sometimes it is possible to deduce that a word is meant to be part of the lemma even though the reading cannot be found in Tarrant. In these cases, a reference to the corresponding passage in Tarrant is given in the *apparatus criticus*. These readings might be the result of either a mistake when copying the original or a reading from a *Metamorphoses* manuscript not reported in Tarrant. In these instances, it may be tempting to mark these words as lemma as well (as they well might have been intended), but I have thought it wise to mark only words supported by Tarrant's edition.

To complicate the matter further, the lemmata sometimes contains inserted clarifying words, which function as commentary, and it is important not to assume that these were thought to be part of the original *Metamorphoses* text.

Mise-en-page

The edition uses a one-column layout compared to two columns in the manuscript. I have chosen to follow the paragraph division of the manuscript, but add or delete paragraph marks where necessary, always with a comment in the apparatus.

In some cases, where the commentary gives a long explanation, I have made further divisions of the text using new lines and indentations to facilitate reading.

Marginal Additions and Corrections by the Scribe in the Edition

The marginal additions have been incorporated into the main text according to the guidance given by the insertion markers in the manuscript. In the cases where there are no markers, I have inserted the addition where it fits based on content of the comment. In the edition, the marginal additions are marked with a slight indentation. They are also reported in the apparatus. In one unique case (*accidat* on 62va), a single word has been added in the margin. This word is treated as the interlinear additions described below.

The interlinear additions are inserted in the text and marked by being underlined as well as reported in the apparatus. This is not the case with corrections above the line, which are usually just concerned with correcting one letter or syllable. These are simply incorporated and reported in the apparatus with the phrase *post corr. ex* + the form of the word before the correction.

List of Abbreviations and Signs

add.	addidit
cf.	confer
cod.	codex
coni.	coniexit
cum signo inser.	cum signo insertionis
(used to mark marginal additions)	
cum signo h sup. lin.	cum signo h supra lineam
(used by the scribe to mark aspiration)	
del.	delevit
emend.	emendavit
i.e	id est
in marg.	in margine
inter lin.	inter lineas
perp. pro	perperam pro
post corr. ex	post correctione ex

(i.e. the scribe has corrected)

scil.	scilicet
scr.:	scripsit
sugg.	suggerit
sup. lin.	supra lineam
ut vid.	ut videtur
§ adest	presence of paragraph marker where it should not be
§ deest	absence of paragraph marker where it should be

In the edition:

<x>	supplied by editor
[x]	deleted by editor
xxx	text above line in manuscript
/	new column or page (+ number of fol./column)
†x†	*cruces desperationis*

in the translation:

[x]	supplied by editor

Principles for the Translation

Some Considerations Regarding the Translation

The aim of the translation is twofold. It is meant to be able to stand on its own and as such provide non-Latinate readers with a version of the commentaries that will give them not only an idea of what the commentary expresses, but also how it expresses it.

A second aim of the translation is to give an extra interpretative dimension to the edition. The transcription, punctuation, emendation, and all other editorial practices make up the first hermeneutical stage; the translation takes the interpretation a step further by rendering my interpretation of the commentary into English. In this interpretation, I have made adaptations, partly to clarify the Latin text (and thus the translation works as an extra apparatus) and partly to provide readable English.

To transfer the commentary into English is no easy task, since Latin and English, in general, offer very different possibilities for authors to express themselves; in the commentaries in particular the ability of the Latin language to be compact is sometimes taken to an extreme. Furthermore, the explanations in the commentary are composite in

nature and often consist of several explanations linked together (sometimes in a less obvious way).

When translating shorter extracts of a commentary, it may be attractive to rephrase and reshape the language in it to highlight the effects or message one wants to discuss. However, when dealing with an entire commentary, I feel that this is not the right way to go if we want to get an accurate view of the text. Instead, the style of translation I have chosen to adopt is one that focuses on what Eugene Nida calls 'formal equivalence', which means that the focus is on the message itself in both form and content.[325]

The example below shows the explanation's precise, but a first sight clumsy, way of using prepositional phrases.[326] It would be tempting to translate a sentence like this more freely, but that would not translate the form, only the message, and thus a big part of how the commentary functions would be lost.

> *Ipolitus fuit acusatus Theso patri suo a nouerca Phedra, quia, cum ipse, puer, rogatus esset ab ea, ut iaceret secum, et nollet, illa dixit Theso, quod ex hoc rogata esset ab illo, sed abiecit eum.*
>
> Hippolytos was accused by his mother-in-law Phaedra in front of his father Theseus, since when as a boy he was asked by Phaedra to sleep with her and he refused, she told Theseus that he had asked her about this, but that she had rejected him.

The same is true for the many brief explanations that make use of a short and often tedious way of expressing things. There should be no delighting variation in the English, if none exists in the Latin.

Another challenge when translating the commentary are the explanations that consist of lemma with explanatory words inserted into it, as in the following:

> *CANDIDA PVRPVREVM SIMILIS EDAT. Non ALITER CORPVS Athlante traxit RVBOREM IN PVELLARI CANDORE, QVAM tenuissimum VELVM rubicundum positum SVPER CANDIDA ATRIA, scilicet super parietem album. EDAT, id est ostendit, VMBRAM, que ex repercussione scilicet rubicunda et alba fit.* (10:596)
>
> A SIMILAR BRIGHT [COURT] PRODUCES A PURPLE [AWNING]. Atalanta's BODY catches a REDNESS IN ITS

---

[325] Eugene A. Nida, *Towards a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating* (Leiden: Brill, 1964), p. 159. | [326] It is also discussed in the chapter 4, section: The Language of the Commentary.

> GIRLISH WHITENESS NOT DIFFERENTLY THAN a very
> fine red AWNING placed OVER A BRIGHT COURT, that is
> to say over a white wall. IT PRODUCES, that is it shows, A
> SHADOW which is red and white from the reflection.

To show what is going on in the Latin here, the translation needs to match the Latin sentence structure quite closely. This type of explanation should not be paraphrased, since that would hide the main strategy in the explanation: that of using the target text (the *Metamorphoses*) mixed with explanatory text.

The reader should be aware that the explanations in the commentaries are of many different sorts. Some will be easy to follow, while others are much more difficult to grasp (both in Latin and English) for a reader with no prior experience of commentary language. For help to understand the peculiarities of the commentary, its language, and explanations I refer the reader to the chapter Form and function.

A caveat: The translation by its very nature solidifies the many potential meanings of the Latin text into one. This is always the nature of a translation, but in this case. I feel it is important to point this out. The reason is that the commentary uses such compact language, sometimes only a simple synonym or small insertions to clarify the syntax, that the 'wrong' choice on the part of the translator might give a faulty perception of the commentary.

Translation Principles

On a sentence level, I strive to follow the Latin as far as the length of the sentence is concerned and to preserve the general structure of dependent clauses. I also strive to match the Latin at word level. This means that I match the use of set phrases in the Latin with the same in English (e.g. *rem habere* is always translated as 'to sleep with') and in general avoid variation if there is none in the Latin.

One noticeable divergence from the principle of reflecting the Latin of the commentary is my treatment of names in the translation. I have chosen to render the names in their English or classical Latin form in the translation rather than using the spelling used in the commentary (e.g. Horace for Horatius, and Ephialtes for Offialtes). The spelling of names during the period and the possible tradition of a certain spelling is interesting, but I have chosen to document that in the Latin text and to use the translation as a way to clarify the spelling in the Latin text. The reader should, however, be aware that this is not the form in which they appear in the Latin.

Square brackets in the translation mark additions. They are most frequently used to make additions to the lemma so as to create a lemma sentence that is on some level understandable. However, it should be understood that the lemmata are not complete sentences and even if they were, the explanations usually react to a much larger portion of the text in the *Metamorphoses* than what is shown in the lemma. Therefore, the commentary should be read together with the *Metamorphoses* for optimal understanding of the text. I do not mark the addition of words commonly left out in Latin, for example, a supplied form of *esse*.

Round brackets are used to supply a Latin or English word when, for example, an etymology is discussed. The principles for etymologies are as follows:

1. In etymologies where the form of the Latin word is important, the Latin is retained in translation and the English translation is put in brackets.

2. In Greek-Latin etymologies, the Greek is retained in italics and not translated and the Latin word translated into English.

3. In all other cases, the words are translated into English and the Latin put in brackets, if needed.

Brackets are sometimes also used to clarify who is doing what to whom, by adding the name of a person or a thing when only pronouns or pure verb forms are used in the Latin (e.g. 13:217).

When Latin words are retained in the translation, they are shown in their dictionary form (i.e. first person singular for verbs and nominative singular for nouns).

Passages marked with *cruces desperationis* in the edition are represented in the original Latin in the translation, with speculation about possible meaning in the notes when possible (e.g. 4:199).

The main function of the notes on the translation is to provide the reader with contextual information. This information could easily turn into a full-length commentary on its own and, for this reason, I have restricted the notes to particularly dense sections in the text.