

## UC Davis

### UC Davis Previously Published Works

**Title**

Review of *Incipitarium Ovidianum: A Finding Guide for Texts in Latin Related to the Study of Ovid in the Middle Ages and Renaissance* by F. T. Coulson and B. Roy; and *Reading the Ovidian Heroine: "Metamorphoses" Commentaries, 1100-1618* by K. L. McKinl...

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/52f936bq>

**Journal**

Speculum, 78(3)

**Author**

Hexter, Ralph Jay

**Publication Date**

2003-07-01

Peer reviewed

## Medieval Academy of America

---

Incipitarius Ovidianus: A Finding Guide for Texts in Latin Related to the Study of Ovid in the Middle Ages and Renaissance by Frank T. Coulson; Bruno Roy; Reading the Ovidian Heroine: "Metamorphoses" Commentaries, 1100-1618 by Kathryn L. McKinley

Review by: Ralph J. Hexter

*Speculum*, Vol. 78, No. 3 (Jul., 2003), pp. 862-864

Published by: [Medieval Academy of America](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20060806>

Accessed: 13/11/2013 14:56

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Medieval Academy of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

FRANK T. COULSON and BRUNO ROY, *Incipitarium Ovidianum: A Finding Guide for Texts in Latin Related to the Study of Ovid in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. (Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin, 3.) Turnhout: Brepols, 2000. Paper. Pp. v, 208.

KATHRYN L. MCKINLEY, *Reading the Ovidian Heroine: "Metamorphoses" Commentaries, 1100–1618*. (Mnemosyne, Supplementum 220.) Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2001. Pp. xxviii, 187 plus black-and-white frontispiece and 4 black-and-white plates. \$69.

Even as Ovid's works have returned to the good graces of contemporary students of Latin, to judge from the number of new studies classicists are devoting to the ingenious Roman poet, so medievalists are working with increasing intensity on the "medieval Ovid." While this is a vast field for research that ultimately cuts across all the European vernaculars, even when one restricts one's purview to Ovid's reception in Latin, there is a dizzying array of material. If Ovid's own oeuvre is rich and various, add the medieval and Renaissance Ovidiana in Latin and we enter a world of hypertrophy. It is now well recognized that the medieval and Renaissance Ovids were themselves variegated, and recovering medieval and Renaissance modes of reading Ovid requires the inspection and elucidation of commentaries and other (often literally) marginal texts.

The two publications under review here could not be more different. The first, Frank Coulson and Bruno Roy's, is intended as a research tool, "a finding guide for texts related to the study of Ovid in the Middle Ages and Renaissance," as the volume's subtitle accurately announces. The authors, who between them have decades of careful collection and collation of these often fugitive pieces (for which all but the most recent library catalogues are notoriously unreliable), have organized the various commentaries, headnotes, and assorted Ovidian paratexts into a master record of 486 items (pp. 23–140). These are listed alphabetically according to the opening words of each selection, hence the appropriateness of the title "Incipitarium." The period covered is 400–1600, and the items include both anonymous entries to texts attributed to (and presumably by) just over one hundred individuals (from Bono Accorsi to Cristoforo Zaroto, as the index of persons, pp. 153–55, reveals). A few items are known from several dozen manuscripts and editions (all listed in each entry), such as Pierre Bersuire's *Reductorium morale* XV (item 2, pp. 24–27); the *Narrationes fabularum Ovidianarum* attributed to Lactantius Placidus (item 52, pp. 37–40); or Orico da Capriana's *Summa memorialis* of the *Metamorphoses* (item 168, pp. 64–66). The great bulk of items are known from multiple sources, but a significant number are now found in only one manuscript or printed source. For example, to pick a series almost at random, items 350–56, detailed on page 106, include three anonymous notes on the *Metamorphoses* found now in Brescia, Cambridge (Mass.), and Munich, respectively, an anonymous introduction to the *Epistula Sapphus* in the Vatican, an anonymous *Vita Ovidii* in Florence, Johann Cuspinian's notes on the *Remedia amoris* found in a manuscript in Vienna dated to 1491, and Vitus Amerbach's prose rendering of Ajax's speech from *Metamorphoses* 13, from a Basel edition of 1550. A page like this one opens a window on the scholarly activity on Ovid and the reception history of his works, whether it is the sovereign prominence of the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid as spur to rhetorical inspiration, the long life the *Remedia amoris* enjoyed in Latin classrooms, or the excitement in the fifteenth century when what we now know as *Heroides* 15 was suddenly (re)discovered. (For another page with six items each known from a single source, see p. 36.)

But this is not a volume to be read page by page, but rather a reference work. Only the careful sifting through the entire body of evidence will begin to bring the full and accurate picture to light. Nor does the compilation of the *Incipitarium Ovidianum* signify the closing of the field, a summation of all that can be known. Anything but. Many of these texts have yet to be worked on, and the first appendix (pp. 141–51) lists several hundred other manu-

scripts of Ovid's works that contain "isolated glosses." Coulson and Roy offer those working directly with the Latin sources an indispensable vade mecum and an inspirational invitation. By design it is to be augmented and revised by those who find that there are in fact more manuscripts of a certain item or that a certain text veers off in another direction at some point after the incipit that led Coulson and Roy to classify it as they now have.

Kathryn L. McKinley's *Reading the Ovidian Heroine: "Metamorphoses" Commentaries 1100–1618* is a very different type of book. McKinley is interested in "the Ovidian heroine and the representation of her mental, emotional, and psychological landscape in the *Metamorphoses*" (p. xiv), and her methodology is to focus on female "voice" and subjectivity as they emerge in two narrative sequences within the *Metamorphoses*, the one Medea's flight in book 7, the other the greater part of book 10, in which we read the tales of Pymalion, Myrrha, Venus and Adonis, and Atalanta and Hippomenes—as narrated by Orpheus, of course. After laying out her interpretation of these portions of the *Metamorphoses* in chapter 2 (pp. 17–50), McKinley follows the winding path of medieval and Renaissance Latin commentators, evaluating the subjectivities and voices they in turn evoke from these texts. In chapter 3 (pp. 51–105) her survey starts with Fulgentius's sixth-century *Mythologiae* but focuses primarily on twelfth- through fourteenth-century treatments, from the anonymous commentary in an Oxford manuscript and Arnulf of Orléans to the *Ovide moralisé*—the one vernacular text treated—and Giovanni del Virgilio's *Allegorie*. In chapter 4 (pp. 106–71) she begins with Pierre Bersuire of the fourteenth century, includes Thomas Walsingham and Raphael Regius from the fifteenth century, and concludes with Jacob Pontanus's 1618 *Metamorphoseon*.

It is certainly valuable to see what very different Medeas or Myrrhas, say, emerge from these contrasting readings, but in my view McKinley's study not only frustrates but founders in the vast sea she sets out to chart. McKinley offers valuable readings of individual figures and episodes, in Ovid and even more in the much less well known medieval and Renaissance commentators, but her very project drives her ever onward. She can offer bits and pieces of a John of Garland or William of Orléans, but we have no way of knowing if they are exemplary for those authors, and (therefore) whether the narrative of similarity and difference she constructs is plausible or specious.

Useful observations emerge. "In contrast to earlier summaries of the *Metamorphoses*, Walsingham's shows much greater interest in incorporating actual excerpts from Ovid's poem; . . . it shows an impulse to represent more fully the Latin text of Ovid which he was using" (p. 117). And there are interesting, if inevitably speculative, insights, such as her claim that pupils who used the so-called vulgate commentary "would be taught to consider the feminine in ways outside of polarizing approaches" (p. 87). But if McKinley had wished to convince us that medieval commentators on the *Metamorphoses* were truly alive to Ovid's subtle shifts, it would have been essential to analyze an entire commentary.

There were many more moments when I was unpersuaded, often because McKinley could not stick with one text or author long enough to understand it through and through. For example, she claims that Bersuire, "like some of his predecessors, had cut the monologues of Medea and Atalanta while giving more attention to the heroines engaged in a 'monstrous' passion" (p. 118). But this completely ignores the organizing principle of Bersuire's work. Likewise, her remark that Bersuire quotes "ecce virgo concipiet et pariet" from Isa. 7.14 apropos of Myrrha (p. 110) may suggest to readers that such a biblical quotation is anomalous in Bersuire, but of course that is precisely what he does at the end of every *fabula*.

Since McKinley does not actually quote the words of the manuscript of Bersuire she is using (Merton College MS 299) in her passing comment on Philomela's "incestuous" tongue (p. 122, n. 2), I cannot be positive that her interpretation of the Latin is erroneous, but it certainly would be if the manuscript offers what I find in the 1509 printing to which

I have access (“Et quia incestui repugnabat linguam ipsi praescidit,” fol. LIIIv.) Her translation of *Metamorphoses* 10.583–87, while not inaccurate, is painfully literal (p. 44), and of 10.308 not even translation (the Latin “costum” is simply repeated in the English). Some of her renderings suggest that she may not be entirely comfortable with the medieval usage of her commentators’ Latin. Some of the comments are turgid in the original, but at least once awkwardness gives way to error (p. 99, especially “as another” for “sicut alie”). One does not get the impression that McKinley has read widely in medieval Latin. For example, she turns to lines containing *crimen* in *Heroides* 7 and 17 for parallels to Giovanni del Virgilio’s “crimen amor nostrum si crimen amare maritos” (p. 102), but at least as relevant are medieval versions such as Baudri of Bourgueil’s (“quod sumus est crimen, si crimen sit quod amamus”) or *Carmina Burana* 121a.

It is probably just carelessness that on page 143 McKinley refers to “the disgruntled fifteenth-century author of the *Ovide moralisé*,” since she elsewhere places the text in the fourteenth century; that on page 148 she cites “relinquam” of *Metamorphoses* 7.52 as “reliquam”; or that for “fols. 82r–118v” she gives “fols. 824–118v” (p. 75, n. 62). However, it seems to me that she is on shakiest grounds when she is operating on strictly classical terrain. Though she mentions Catullus, I have no sense she knows or has seriously considered Catullus 64 (Ariadne), much less Catullus 63, which would at the very least complicate her contrast of presentations of female and male subjectivity, in both classical (Latin) and medieval literature (p. 4; Catullus 63 would also give the lie to a claim on p. 27). I wonder exactly how “popular” Callimachus’s *Hecale* was “through the thirteenth century” (p. 3). McKinley ought to know, when she titles her section on *Metamorphoses* 10.243–97 “Pygmalion/Galatea,” that Galatea in Ovid has nothing to do with the story of Pygmalion and that it was only much later that the name was attached to his transformed statue. (If John of Garland is referring to this character by the name Galatea [p. 72], that would be worthy of note.) Another bad slip occurs when she writes, “When Ovid looked to Euripides and Seneca . . .” (p. 9), as if Seneca the tragedian were a predecessor. Of course, there was Roman tragedy before Ovid, and one could have constructed an argument according to which Senecan tragedy reflects patterns already in existence in Ovid’s own day, but McKinley was apparently unaware of the problem.

McKinley can be a good reader of Ovid. Her comments on Medea’s flight (pp. 23–24) and Orpheus (p. 49) are particularly sophisticated and memorable. But in trying to construct a study that is neither strictly reception history nor literary interpretation, but rather a bit of both, what she offers in each category is less than entirely satisfying.

RALPH J. HEXTER, University of California, Berkeley

SEBASTIAN COXON, *The Presentation of Authorship in Medieval German Narrative Literature, 1220–1290*. (Oxford Modern Languages and Literature Monographs.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001. Pp. x, 254; 9 black-and-white figures. \$65.

In this excellent study Sebastian Coxon examines the “literary presentation of authorship” (p. 17) in medieval German narrative literature of the thirteenth century. By presentation of authorship he means the “medieval poetic practice of addressing the question of the authorship of a text within the literary work itself” (p. 2). Focusing on the century after the *Blütezeit* (flowering) of Middle High German literature, Coxon gathers evidence from the works of the two outstanding writers of the period (Rudolf von Ems, active 1220–55, and Konrad von Würzburg, active 1257–87) and from the heroic epics and secular short stories (*Mären*) after 1200. Supplying information about manuscript transmission and historical background when relevant, Coxon presents us with a lucid account of changing