

LUIS RIVERO GARCÍA

“Two suggestions on the text of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (13.8; 13.94)”¹

ABSTRACT: Critical discussion of two passages of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*

1. Ov. *Met.* 13.7–8:

at non Hectoreis dubitavit cedere flammis,
quas ego sustinui, quas hac a classe fugavi.

In line 8 some mss. omit *hac* or *a*, as is habitual in a sequence such as *quas hac a cla-*. But in my opinion the omission of *a* conceals a long-standing problem. It therefore alternates with interesting variants such as that in Cs (s. XII²–XIII¹; for this manuscript, see RIVERO 2016; the variant is also in A₃Lr6P₃ Ld8Li₃²P16, ss. XII–XIII), which compensates for the initial omission by adding an interlinear *ego*. With the support of the “*Leid. unus*” cited by BURMAN (1727, 855), which I have been able to identify as Ld8, BOTHE incorporates the reading *quas hac ego* into his edition and defends it in his *Vindiciae* (1818, 127): “*propter periautologiam, quae inest in repetito pronomine*” (the reference to the “*periautologian*” is already found at least as early as CIOFANUS 1575, 167).

The reading is certainly worthy of consideration, since repetition is an obvious stylistic resource in Ovid (WILLS 1996, 489–94) and in this passage, by means of the anaphora *quas ... quas*, it would have the effect of insisting on Ajax’s real contribution to the common interests of the Achaeans (see HARDIE 2015, 220), in contrast with the cowardly flight of Ulysses (compare an equally expressive repetition in Pl. *Asin.* 148 *te ego ulciscar, te ego ... perdam*).

While it is true that the omission of the genuine word might be better explained mechanically from an original reading *a* (i. e. from the sequence *hac a classe*), it is also the case that *a* could well have been a grammatical gloss on the separative *hac [ego] classe*, and this interpretation would be reinforced by other attested variants such as *de* (V₉ Ld6 – the “*Vossian.*” cited by BURMAN 1727, 855 –, s. XIII) and even *ab* (GLd3, s.

1 We work from the text by TARRANT 2004; the text proposed here is from my book: *A Textual Commentary on Book XIII of Ovid’s “Metamorphoses”* (forthcoming). The manuscripts and editions are cited in abbreviated form, following the proposals to be found at <http://www.uhu.es/proyectovidio/esp/index.html>. The text of Planudes is cited following the edition of PΑPATHOMOPOULOS-TSAVARE 2002. This work forms part of the Research Project FF12013-42529, and was developed in the first half of 2015 at the American Academy in Rome and at the Biblioteca Vaticana thanks to a four-month scholarship of the Spanish Government. I wish to thank Profs. A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER, J. A. ESTÉVEZ and J. A. BELLIDO for reading a draft, and J. J. ZOLTOWSKI for the English version.

XII–XIII; this preposition is written above as a gloss for example in *N*, s. XI^{ex}–XIIⁱⁿ). The appearance of this *ab* can be explained better by its function as a gloss than by its form within the line (I cannot find in any manuscript or edition the preposition *e* which appears in BÖMER 1982, 207 with no arguments presented to defend it. It is certainly not in his reference edition, i. e. that of EHWALD 1915).

It is also worth considering the testimony of *Lr5* (s. XII^{ex}–XIIIⁱⁿ), which initially gives this text: *quas ego sustinui, quas nostra fugauit*; then the *manus prima* writes *classe* in the margin (i. e. *quas nostra classe*, a reading which BURMAN 1727, 855 states he has also read in a ms. “*Moreti*”) and only later writes *a* above (i. e. *quas nostra a classe*). Clearly, in the context of the intervention of Ajax, who has just referred (ll. 5f.) to the presence of the ships, the demonstrative *hac* has much greater force (“*δεικτικῶς*”: SIMMONS 1889, 79; cf. l. 5: *intendensque manus*) and *nostra* is simply a gloss. Also noteworthy is the procedure of the scribe of *Mt2* (s. XIII), who goes out of his way to eliminate *a*, even at the cost of leaving an unmetrical text.

It is true that the sequence *hac a* with its corresponding noun is scarcely used in Latin texts (I can only find it in Mart. 5.60.11: *nos hac a scabie tenemus ungues*, and in a late text: Ps. Ou. Vet. 2.48: *hac a lege*), while *hac ego* is used by Ovid in at least 12 passages in his work (e. g. *am.* 1.4.32: *et, qua tu biberis, hac ego parte bibam*; *epist.* 19.128; 20.63; *ars* 2.138; 2.547; 3.178; *fast.* 1.235; 4.685; *Pont.* 2.1.12; 3.2.47; 3.4.70; 3.4.80), but this frequency can equally be taken as support, and as the source of the spurious introduction of *ego* into our passage here. As regards Ovid’s *usus scribendi*, we find the verb *fugare* with a separative complement governed by the preposition *a* only in *ars* 3.637 (*fuget a templis*), by *de* in *met.* 9.502 (*nostro uetitus de corde fugabitur ardor* [assuming that *de corde* does not depend also on *uetitus*]) and by *ex* in *rem.* 358 (*ex omni est parte fugandus Amor*). However, it more usually appears without a preposition: (*met.* 7.4) *ore fugarant*; (14.517) *Apulus has illa pastor regione fugatas*; (*medic.* 78) *ore fugant maculas*; (*Pont.* 1.3.79) *Calydone fugatus*; (4.14.59) *patria quae sede fugatis*; (*ars* 3.126) *nec quia caeruleae mole fugantur aquae* (whether it indicates physical or causal distancing, *mole* is separative in either case).

In addition, the resulting metrical scheme sheds little light on the matter, because even if DDSS (*hac a*) is the most frequent pattern in the *Metamorphoses*, with 13.02% of the total number of patterns possible, DDSD (*hac ego*) occupies the fourth place of the 32 in the complete list, with 11.24% (see DEE 2006, xvi). What can be stated clearly, however, is that in the whole poem there is no other line with the pattern DDSS (*hac a*) that contains anaphora analogous to the relative-interrogative (see *ibid.*, 377f.), whereas we do find an exact verbal metrics parallel for DDSD in this very book (13.964): *quid tamen haec species, quid dis placuisse marinis*, and another even closer example in 15.154: *quid Styga, quid tenebras et nomina uana timetis*.

Now, I believe that there is a third way to read the passage, one which seems preferable to *hac ego* and even more so to *hac a*. In view of the reading of the *Neapolitanus potissimus*, *N*: *hacac* (later corrected into *haca*), partially backed by the valuable ms. *Hd* (s. XII–XIII): *hac ac*, we can consider the possibility of an emphatic gemination: *quas ego sustinui, quas hac hac classe fugauit* (the reading of Cs3 [ca. 1381–1400] *a. c.*: *hac*

hac a, could thus have an origin other than the usual dittography). If this resource of gemination is particularly appropriate for dramatic scenarios, in this context it would help Ajax, in conjunction with the expressive reinforcement of the above-mentioned anaphora *quas ... quas*, to present the *evidentia* of the audacity of Ulysses, who aspires to the prize *in the very place* where Ajax demonstrated his superiority (cf. a similar interpretation in LORENZETTI 2001, 225), and would be met with a response from Ulysses in the form of another analogous *evidentia* in l. 284: *his umeris – his inquam umeris – ego corpus Achillis*, as well as in the final rounding-off, *huic date*, in a sort of “Ringkomposition” (HUYCK 1991, 203 ad 381).

We need hardly recall (see WILLS 1996, 76–9, 110 f.) that the Latin demonstratives were already used for this device in the archaic period (e.g. Pl. *Bacch.* 1099: *hoc hoc est quod...*) and later in the classical (e.g. Catull. 64.195: *huc huc aduentate*; Cic. *Cat.* 3.22: *ille, ille Iuppiter*; Flacc. 3: *hoc, hoc, inquam, tempore*; Hor. *epod.* 4.20: *hoc, hoc tribuno militum*; Ou. *am.* 3.1.20: *hic, hic est, quem ferus urit Amor*), and that the resource became widespread in the postclassical period (e.g. Sil. 2.302: *nunc hoc, hoc, inquam, tempore*) and in particular (WILLS 1996, 78 f.) in Seneca (e.g. *Thy.* 101: *hunc, hunc furorem*, with TARRANT 1985, 103; *Tro.* 625: *hac, hac parte*, with KEULEN 2001, 367; *Phaed.* 9: *Hac, hac alii qua nemus*, with COFFEY-MAYER 1990, 91; *Phaed.* 83: *hac, hac pergam*). It is true that the phenomenon usually occurs in independent clauses, but even in the early period it also appears in subordinates (Pl. *Poen.* 1135): *Pol satis scio, impetrarunt, quando hic hic adest* (cf. Sil. 15.362 f.: ‘*Summe deum, Libyco, faxis, de praeside nunc his, / his umeris tibi opima feram*’ [and cf. Ou. *met.* 13.284]).

In short, the corruption must have stemmed from a haplography: *hac classe* (favoured, in addition, by the cacophony of the context: *hac hac cla-*, the first such example offered by the speech of the unrefined Ajax; cf. e.g. the endings of 118–20 and see DUC 1994). This haplography would then have been corrected by the copyists by means of the incorporation either of prepositions (*a, de*), or of the possessive *nostra* (with double omission of the deictic), or of *ego* to reproduce a very Ovidian sequence. An example that is analogous up to a point can be seen in 3.539, where the correct reading *hac Tyron*, *hac* was replaced by, among other minor variants, *hac Tyron ac* in *M* (thus NAUGERIUS 1516) and by *a Tyro hac* in the majority of mss. (see SUÁREZ 2015, 376–9).

I therefore propose the following text:

At non Hectoreis dubitavit cedere flammis,
quas ego sustinui, quas hac hac classe fugavi!

2. Ov. *Met.* 13.93–94:

nempe ego mille meo protexi pectore puppes,
spem uestri reditus; date pro tot nauibus arma.

The expression *date pro tot* has been transmitted in three different sequences. The most common in mss. and edd. is *date pro tot*; secondly, a considerable number of mss. and some editions of all periods give *date tot pro*, in accordance with the customary inversion of the adjective (cf. e.g. l. 864: *tanto pro corpore*); finally, *Lr22V30* (s. XV)

and the ed. ALERIENSIS 1471 stand apart from the tradition as a whole with the daring inversion *pro tot date*.

As can be seen, the expression with the most backing of the three: *spem uestri reditus: date pro tot nauibus arma*, is at the same time the one with the weakest support from verbal metrics: of all the different line positions in which Ovid places the form *date* in his texts (21 passages), it appears only once in this same metrical position, and even there it is not followed by a spondee but a dactyl (*fast.* 4.869): *cumque sua dominae date grata sisymbria myrto*. As for the other positions, the most frequent (10 passages) is at the end of the fourth foot, at times involving hyperbaton (13.370): *uigili date praemia uestro* (cf. 4.383; *rem.* 811; Verg. *Aen.* 6.883: *manibus date lilia plenis*). But what is most significant is that in lines where *date* appears, Ovid generally avoids opening the sentence with this imperative, and on the four occasions on which this does happen the verb significantly occupies the position immediately before the fifth foot (13.534): *'date, Troades, urnam!'* (cf. 9.791; 14.732; *ars* 1.203). But as if this were not enough, the reading *date pro tot* in our line makes the ictus and the hephthemimeral caesura fall precisely on the preposition, inopportunately emphasizing it and disassociating it to some extent from its complement.

This effect is at least avoided by the variant *date tot pro*, duly placing the emphasis on *tot* (the importance of the benefit brought by Ajax) and linking *pro nauibus* more smoothly (cf. the intuitive defence by HARTMAN 1905, 153: "*Nemo unquam demonstrabit sed semper sentient omnes unice uerum esse Heinsii illud tot pro nauibus*"). In short, the best-constructed line is *spem uestri reditus: pro tot date nauibus arma*, where the benefit brought about (*uestri reditus*) and the just compensation (*pro tot*) are juxtaposed and an excessively direct opening request (*date*) is avoided. For these reasons, and even though we are dealing with three very late witnesses, I believe this is the genuine reading. I base my supposition first of all on the consciousness that the copyists of these texts are not affected by the *studium emendandi nouandiu* that was so widespread in the 15th century; and secondly, on the evidence that the copyists of *Lr22* or *V30* (and hence GIOVANNI ANDREA BUSSI, *Aleriensis*, for his Roman *editio princeps*) had an ancient manuscript in front of them, one which was close, but not identical, to *M*.

I therefore propose to edit as follows:

Nempe ego mille meo protexi pectore puppes,
spem uestri reditus: pro tot date nauibus arma.

References

- ALERIENSIS 1471: IOH. ANDREAS DE BUXIS, episc. Aleriensis, *Editio Romana*, Pars I.: *Metamorphoses*, Romae: imp. Sweynheim & Pannartz (ISTC No. i000127000).
- BÖMER 1982: *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen. Buch XII–XIII*, Kommentar von F. BÖMER, Heidelberg.

- BOTHE 1818: F. H. BOTHE, *Vindiciae Ovidianae, sive annotationes in P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon lib. XV*, Gottingae.
- BOTHE 1818²: F. H. BOTHE (ed.), *P. Ovidii Metamorphoseon libri XV*, Manhemii.
- BURMAN 1727: P. BURMAN (ed.), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera omnia*, IV voluminibus comprehensa [...], II: *Metamorphoses*, Amstelodami.
- CIOFANUS 1575: *Herculis Ciofani, Sulmonensis*, in *P. Ovidii Metamorphoseon ex XVII antiquis libris Observationes (...)*, Venetiis: apud Aldum Nep.
- COFFEY-MAYER 1990: M. COFFEY, R. MAYER, *Seneca. Phaedra*, Cambridge: CUP.
- DEE 2006, J. H. DEE, *Repertorium Ovidii Metamorphoseon hexametricum. A Repertory of the Hexameter Patterns in Ovid, Metamorphoses*, compiled by ..., Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann.
- DUC 1994: TH. DUC, “Postulat, ut capiat, quae non intellegit arma’ (Ov., *Met.* XIII, 295): Un Discours Programmatique?”, *Latomus* 53, 126–31.
- EHWALD 1915: R. EHWALD (ed.), *P. Ovidius Naso. Opera*. Vol. II, *Metamorphoses*, editio maior, Lipsiae: Teubner.
- HARDIE 2015: *Ovidio. Metamorfosi. Volume VI (libri XIII–XV)*, a cura di PH. HARDIE, testo critico basato sull’ed. oxoniense di R. TARRANT, trad. di G. CHIARINI, Milano: Mondadori (Fond. Lorenzo Valla).
- HARTMAN 1905: J. J. HARTMAN, *De Ovidio poeta commentatio*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- HUYCK 1991 J. R. HUYCK, *A Commentary on Ovid’s Armorum Iudicium, Metamorphoses 12.612–13.398*, (Diss. Harvardiana), Cambridge (Mass.).
- KEULEN 2001: A. J. KEULEN, *L. Annaeus Seneca Troades*. Intr., Text and Comm. by ..., Leiden: Brill.
- LORENZETTI 2001: E. LORENZETTI, “L’*Armorum Iudicium* di Ovidio. Appunti sulla Tradizione Epica nelle *Metamorfosi*”, *AFLM* 34, 219–47.
- NAUGERIUS 1516: A. NAUGERIUS (ed.), *Ovidii Opera ed. Aldina II*, 3, Venetiis.
- PAPATHOMOPOULOS-TSAVARE 2002: M. PΑPATHOMOPOULOS – I. TSAVARE (edd.), ΟΒΙΔΙΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΜΕΤΑΜΟΡΦΩΣΕΩΝ ὁ μετήγεγεν ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων φωνῆς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ Ο ΠΛΑΝΟΥΔΗΣ, Athens: Academy of Athens.
- RIVERO 2016: L. RIVERO GARCÍA, “N. Heinsius’ *fragmentum Caesenas* of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* rediscovered”, *CQ* 66, forthcoming.
- SIMMONS 1889: CH. SIMMONS (ed.), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon XIII. XIV*, London-New York (= 1887²).
- SUÁREZ 2015: Á. SUÁREZ DEL RÍO, *Edición crítica y comentario textual del libro III de las Metamorfosis de Ovidio*, Tesis Doctoral, Huelva: Universidad.
- TARRANT 1985: R. J. TARRANT, *Seneca’s Thyestes*, edited with introduction and commentary by ..., Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- TARRANT 2004: R. J. TARRANT (ed.), *Ovid Metamorphoses*, Oxford: OCT.
- WILLS 1996: J. WILLS, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

LUIS RIVERO GARCÍA
Universidad de Huelva

