

CRITICAL DISCUSSION ON THREE PASSAGES
OF OVID’S METAMORPHOSES 13
(LL. 129, 432, 653)

Abstract: Textual variants in three passages of Book 13 of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* are analysed and discussed.

Keywords: Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, textual criticism, interpolation

In these pages three passages of Book 13 of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* are discussed, where I diverge from the majority of editors.¹

128–130:

*Si mea cum uestris ualuissent uota, Pelasgi,
non foret ambiguus tanti gestaminis heres,
tuque tuis armis, nos te poteremur, Achille.*

129 *gestaminis Lu² (i. l. u. l.) F² (i. l. u. l.), malit Magnus 1914 (in app.),
prob. Fabbri 1923 : certaminis Ω, edd., def. Huyck 1991 : certamis (per
comp.) V6*

Magnus did not feel at ease with the majority reading *certaminis*, so he wrote (1914, 486 in app.): “*gestaminis* (cf 116. 347) malim”. His intuition was backed up by the occurrence of this reading – albeit by a second hand and as a *uaria lectio* – in the ms. *Lu* (Lucensis Bibl.

1) The text and apparatus criticus are from my book: A Textual Commentary on Book XIII of Ovid’s “Metamorphoses” (forthcoming). In the apparatus I limit myself here to providing only the critical information relevant to the passage under study, excluding other data which the reader will be able to find in the future volume. For the sigla, dating and description of the manuscripts (also of the editions), I refer the reader to the webpage: <http://www.uhu.es/proyectovidio/esp/in dex.html>. In any case the manuscripts are listed in chronological order and grouped by period. The abbreviations TLL (Thesaurus linguae Latinae), LSJ (Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon) and OLD (Oxford Latin Dictionary) are also used. The text of Planudes is cited following the edition of Papat homopoulos / Tsavare 2002. This work, developed in the first half of 2015 at Rome thanks to a four-month scholarship of the Spanish Government, forms part of the Research Project FFI2013-42529. I wish to thank G. Collinge for the revision of the English text.

Govern. 1417, s. XI/XII), and this encouraged Fabbri to put the reading into his text, with this justification (1923, 144 in app.): “*certaminis heres male congruit*”. I have also found this variant – again by a second hand and as a *u.l.* – in the ms. *F* (Francofurtanus Bibl. Ciu. et Uniu. Barth. 110, ca. 1200).² It is true, as Fabbri says, that the expression *certaminis heres* sounds somewhat odd, because it is too condensed.³ The expression *gestaminis heres* would be clearly more natural, as is proved by the parallel passages of this book adduced by Magnus. In the first of them (l. 116), Ajax alludes to this very armour as *gestamina tanta*, while in the second (l. 347) Ulysses refers to Ajax's shield in this way: *gestasset laeua taurorum tergora septem*.

It is worth remembering that the term *gestamen* was coined by Virgil for a couple of passages in the *Aeneid*, where he uses it to refer to a shield:⁴ *aere cauo clipeum, magni gestamen Abantis* (3,286), and to Priam's whole⁵ attire for solemn occasions: *hoc Priami gestamen erat cum iura uocatis / more daret populis: sceptrumque sacerque tiaras / Iliadumque labor uestes* (7,246–8). The next author to use the term was Ovid, who employed it three times, all of them in the *Metamorphoses* (1,457; 13,116; 15,163).⁶ Unlike Virgil, Ovid always uses it in the plural (the singular is recovered by the authors of s. I–II). But it is no less true that the form *gestaminis* maintains the metrical structure of *gestamina*, the form used in the other three Ovidian passages.

In short, Ovid clearly wanted to appropriate this Virgilian coinage, but he used it as a tetrasyllable. A parallel case is that of the noun *munimen*, which is used by Virgil in this form (georg. 2,352), while Ovid again shows his preference for tetrasyllabic forms, either in the singular or in the plural (am. 1,6,29: *munimina*; met. 4,773: *munimine*; 13,212: *munimina[-e]*).

2) Heinsius says nothing in his collation of this ms. in *Berolinensis* Diez. B Sant. 148 e, 355rb.

3) Cf. the forced attempts (quoted by Burman 1727, 865) by Ciofanus to understand *heres* “quasi herus, id est, dominus”; see also Keene 1898, 65; Bömer 1982, 238; Huyck 1991, 136. For his part, Hopkinson (2000, 108) tries to take *certamen* as “A matter in dispute, point of contention”, in accordance with *OLD* (s. u., 5), but in all the passages cited there this word has a dialectic or intellectual sense, not a material one. Hardie (2015, 236) feels forced to introduce a gloss as well: “*ossia «erede (del premio) di una gara tanto grande»*”.

4) See Horsfall 2006, 228, with bibliography.

5) Not only to the sceptre (Horsfall 2000, 185, is of the same opinion).

6) In the same metrical position in the passages of Books 1 and 15.

On the other hand, Ovid always uses the noun *heres* in its proper sense, and with an odd frequency it is determined by a genitive⁷ that implies no conceptual image (am. 3,15,5; tr. 4,10,7: *ordinis heres*; ars 3,459: *Thesei criminis heres*; epist. 2,78: *heredem patriae ... fraudis*; 9,110: *heres laudis*; met. 3,589: *studii successor et heres*; 6,239: *aviti nominis heres*; 15,819; fast. 5,155; fast. 1,615: *tanti cognominis heres*; Ib. 253: *Herculis heres*). Nor do other authors seem to use it in the figurative sense, apart from the obvious metonymy *funeris heres* that we find in Luc. 6,595 and Pers. 6,33. One could object that in all these cases the genitive is an ‘abstractum’, whereas *gestamen* is a ‘concretum’. Yet it should also be observed, first, that when the genitive refers to the contents of the inheritance it is completely logical that these specific contents could be referred to in the genitive, as e. g. in the usual expression *heres regni*.⁸ Furthermore, *gestamen* is not strictly speaking more a ‘concretum’ than *regnum*, *pars*, *pecunia*, *bona* or *opes* in the passages just cited. This is proved by the Virgilian use itself, where it must be literally understood as the “carriage” or “conveyance”, and hence the same semantic evolution as these English terms, since *gestamen* ended up referring also to the vehicle of this transport (TLL 6.2.1955.48–1956.34; OLD s. u., 763).

Nonetheless, it is worth considering Huyck’s witty interpretation (1991, 136 f.), according to which this “exceptional use of *certamen* in the sense “prize” was probably inspired by the similarity of the Greek nouns ἀθλος and ἀθλον (“contest” and “prize” respectively)”. To illustrate this he compares Hom. Od. 11,543–9, a passage also dealing with Achilles’ armour, where Huyck thinks there is a probable ambivalence of ἀέθλω in l. 548: ὣς δὴ μὴ ὄφελον νικᾶν τοιῶδ’ ἐπ’ ἀέθλω.⁹ Yet this thesis stands on the supposition that Ovid might be imitating an ambiguity of which there is no sure

7) Without the genitive it only appears in fast. 6,646 and met. 13,154. In the latter, the noun is applied to Peleus and Pyrrhus in its primary sense of Achilles’ direct heirs.

8) Cf. e. g. Cic. Att. 14,21,3: *regni heredem* ([Caes.] Alex. 66,5; Liu. 1,40,4, 1,48,2; 1,53,6; 39,53,6; 41,23,11; 41,24,4; 42,16,8; Curt. 6,5,30). Cf. similar expressions, such as Hor. serm. 2,5,100 f.: *‘quartae sit partis Vlixes’ / audieris ‘heres’*; Cic. inu. 2,64: *unius heredes pecuniae*; Liu. 1,34,4: *omnium heredi bonorum*; Curt. 10,6,23 *harum enim opum regiarum utique populus est heres*.

9) This ambivalence is not mentioned by Heubeck (1992, 110, to ll. 548–51), who interprets the noun just as a ‘prize’.

or objective evidence. What we do know, instead, is that the confusion of these two words (see LS s. uu.) was explicitly caricatured by Lucian in his *Solecist* (Sol. 2) as an example of a wrong use of language, and this does not seem to be the best support for Ovid: {ΛΟΥΚ} Λέλεκται καὶ σεσολοίκισται τετραπλῆ, σὺ δ' οὐκ ἔγνωσ. μέγα οὖν ἄθλον κατέπραξας ἄν, εἶπερ ἔγνωσ. {ΣΟΦ} Οὐ μέγα μὲν, ἀναγκαῖον δὲ τῷ ὁμολογήσαντι. {ΛΟΥΚ} Ἄλλ' οὐδὲ νῦν ἔγνωσ. {ΣΟΦ} Πότε νῦν; {ΛΟΥΚ} Ὅτε τὸ ἄθλον ἔφην σε καταπράξαι. {ΣΟΦ} Οὐκ οἶδα ὅ τι λέγεις. {ΛΟΥΚ} Ὅρθῶς ἔφης· οὐ γὰρ οἶσθα.

In short, the dense expression *certaminis heres*, though not abnormal in itself, is at odds with the general use of *heres* in Latin texts and particularly in Ovid's. On the other hand, *tanti gestaminis heres* is a more natural expression. Furthermore, it is another homage to Virgil (albeit adapted to Ovid's metrical preferences), more precisely to Aen. 3,286 (cf. *magni – tanti*), and it should be remembered that in this passage Virgil is probably alluding to Abas paradigmatically as the inventor of the shield.¹⁰ In this episode Aeneas, not by chance in a place close to Ulysses' homeland,¹¹ makes the significant offering of weapons that had belonged to the victorious Greeks: *Aeneas haec de Danaïis uictoribus arma* (3,288).¹²

430–2:

... *Polymestoris illic*
regia diues erat, cui te commisit alendum
clam, Polydore, pater Phrygiisque remouit ab aruis

432 aruis O3 Bo2Es2Mc Es6P41 Ca2, "quatuor" test. Burman 1727, prob. Bothe 1818²: agris C: armis Ω, edd.: amis B5 (a. c.): aurus Mt: horis Mt2: aris V10 (uid.)

10) See Horsfall 2006, 227 f.

11) Cf. Aen. 3,272 f.: *effugimus scopulos Ithacae, Laertia regna, / et terram altricem saeui exsecramur Vlixī.*

12) As far as the function of these words by Ulysses is concerned, note that they are the second phraseological echo or *responsio* to refute Aiax's words: cf. 13,116 *gestamina tanta trahenti*. The first echo appears in the very first line of Ulysses' speech: 128: *si mea cum uestris ualuissent uota, Pelasgi, and cf. 88 f.: sortemque meam uouistis, Achiui, / et uestrae ualuere preces*. For other echoes of this kind, see Rivero 2016, n. 2.

In this passage a minor variant must prevail and Bothe's reasoning must be seriously taken into account.¹³ I limit myself here to adding some factual data. The majority reading in manuscripts and editions is *armis* and, apart from other variants, only some recs. transmit *aruus*, while *C* gives *agris*.¹⁴ With the support of "quatuor" attested by Burman (1727, 891), Bothe adopted *aruus* in his edition (²1818), and he added this reasoning in his *Vindiciae* (1818, 136): "a Phrygum armis Phrygi nihil timendum erat. Recte igitur *aruus* libri quatuor, plane ut Euripides Hecub. 6: – ὑπεξέπεμψε Τρωικῆς χθονός". The instability of the paradigms of *arma* and *arua* is systematic in the manuscripts, and the latter is the less common term. The expression *ab armis* is recurrent in prose (mostly with *discedere* or *dimittere*), and in the hexameter it always appears in this final position. As there is an affinity between their characters (Polydorus – Ascanius), the well-known model of Verg. Aen. 10,46f.: *liceat dimittere ab armis / incolumem Ascanium, liceat superesse nepotem*, might have influenced our passage as well.¹⁵

On the other hand, Ovid is the first author to use the expression *ab aruis*, and he does so up to five times,¹⁶ not always in the final position. After him, it recurred only in three other passages in the classical period, namely in Flavian epic.¹⁷ Since the main model for this episode, along with the opening of Book 3 of the *Aeneid*, is Euripides' *Hecuba*,¹⁸ I think that the parallel adduced by Bothe is certainly to be taken into account. Compare Ovid's ll. 429–36 with the opening of Euripides' play (ll. 3–15):

Πολύδωρος, Ἐκάβης παῖς γεγώς τῆς Κισσέως
 Πριάμου τε πατρός, ὅς μ', ἐπεὶ Φρυγῶν πόλιν
 κίνδυνος ἔσχε δορὶ πεσεῖν Ἑλληνικῶ,
 δείσας ὑπεξέπεμψε Τρωικῆς χθονός
 Πολυμήστορος πρὸς δῶμα Θρηκίου ξένου,

5

13) On the matter of minor variants, see Wilson 1987.

14) Vid. app.; the reading *aris* in *V10* is not entirely clear.

15) Cf. also Aen. 12,844; Sil. 3,68; 13,815; 14,526. For the line-ending, cf. Aen. 3,51 f.: *cum iam diffideret armis / Dardaniae*.

16) See met. 1,313; 8,585; fast. 3,151; 5,251; Pont. 1,9,45.

17) Stat. Theb. 6,753; Sil. 4,554; 16,25.

18) See Venini 1952; Stampacchia 1968; Bömer 1982, 308–12; Stok 1990, 85–8; Hopkinson 2000, 23 f.; Hardie 2015, 277 f.

ὄς τήνδ' ἀρίστην Χερσονησίαν πλάκα
 σπείρει, φίλιππον λαὸν εὐθύνων δορί.
 πολὺν δὲ σὺν ἐμοὶ χρυσὸν ἐκπέμπει λάθρα 10
 πατήρ, ἴν', εἴ ποτ' Ἰλίου τείχη πέσοι,
 τοῖς ζῶσιν εἴη παισὶ μὴ σπάνις βίου.
 νεώτατος δ' ἦ Πριαμιδῶν, ὃ καὶ με γῆς
 ὑπεξέπεμψεν· οὔτε γὰρ φέρειν ὄπλα
 οὔτ' ἔγχος οἴος τ' ἦ νέφ βραχίονι. 15

As can be seen, Polydorus affirms twice that his father took him far from his homeland: ὑπεξέπεμψε Τρωικῆς χθονὸς (l. 6); ὃ καὶ με γῆς / ὑπεξέπεμψεν (ll. 13 f.).¹⁹

652–4:

... *nam tactu natarum cuncta mearum
 in segetem laticesque meri †canaeque† Mineruae
 transformabantur, diuesque erat usus in illis.*

653 meri] meo ride *M* (a. c.): mori *Mt*: merū *Lr7O3*, “*Patau. et Moreti*”
test. Burman 1727: mei *Dr(mi)V7 P5 Lu2*: om. *Ab*: quid *Mo a. c. n. l.*
canaeque M (baca mg. *M*²) *Lr27, Korn 1880, Zingerle 1884, Polle 1888,*
Riese 1889 (bacamque 1872), *Simmons 1889, H-K-E 1898, Edwards*
1905, Magnus 1914, Ehrwald 1915, Lafaye 1930, Trepas-de Saav. 1932,
Breitenbach 1964, H-K-E-A 1966, Anderson 1982, Segura 1983, Goold
1984, Hill 2000, Hopkinson 2000, Tarrant 2004, R. de Verger 2005:
 ba(c)c(h)amque *Ω, edd., dub. Riese 1889 (in app.)*: baccasque *Gf Bo2*²:
 baccaque *Bo2*: baccâque *Ab*: bactoque *Vd*: uaccamque *Mc*: oleamque
Plan.: fort. donumque

The only manuscript to support the variant *canaeque* is *M* (Marcianus Florentinus 225, s. XI², Heinsius’ “Florentinus S. Marci optimus”).²⁰ This reading was adopted by Korn (1880) and it has since had an increasing acceptance,²¹ and has even broken certain affinities that can be clearly traced among the editors of this poem. In his last, posthumous article Magnus (1925, 136) defended *canaeque*

19) I find it less likely that the reference to his incapability to take arms (l. 14: οὔτε γὰρ φέρειν ὄπλα ...) might have provoked the corruption of the Ovidian text.

20) And its copy *Lr27* (a. 1456).

21) Riese, who had kept *bacamque* in his first edition (1872) and adopted *canaeque* in his second (1889), nonetheless showed some doubts about the genuineness of *bacamque* (1889, XXVI in app.: “recte?”).

with the support of some parallels as met. 6,81: *edere cum bacis fetum canentis oliuae*, or 8,275: *Palladios flauae latices libasse Mineruae*.²² He took *bacamque* to be a mere interpolation, furthermore, an inexact one (“non in *bacam*, sed in *laticem Mineruae* = Öl wurde verwandelt”), that would have been brought from 8,664: *sincerae baca Mineruae*, or from ars 2,518: *caerula quot bacas Palladis arbor habet*.²³ In the opinion of Magnus, this interpolation of the family “X” (i. e., the majority of manuscripts) would have leaked into family “O” (i. e., that of *MN*), and he explains its presence in *N* (Neapolitanus Bibl. Nat. IV.F.3, s. XI^{ex}–XII^m) in this way.

Yet this reconstruction of facts does not explain, first, why the interpolator should be interested in replacing a reading that works well with a reading that works clearly worse.²⁴ This thesis would at any rate be more convincing if the readings of *M* and *N* were as clear as they are supposed to be; that is, if they could reflect a clear split produced in a non-immediate past in the transmission.

The reading *bacamque* is quite clear in *N*, but in *M* the variant *canaeque* follows a correction in the preceding word.²⁵ Magnus (1914, 511)²⁶ thought that in *M* a reading *meorum* had been corrected to *meri*, but the fact is that after the *-o* that follows *me-* there is a blank space: that is, the reading was *meo*. The stroke of a *d* followed by an *-e* (or, perhaps, a *-t* or an *-o*) can still be distinguished after *ri*: i. e., *ride*. If my reading is correct, in the predecessor of *M* after *meri* there was a word beginning with a (small) high-stroke letter, and that would support *bacamque* or, even better, perhaps a gloss, such as *oleique* or *oleum/-amque*, that could have leaked into the text.²⁷

Be that as it may, it seems that the copyist of *M* found a text corrupted by a false word-break, and under these circumstances it

22) Add epist. 11,69: *ramisque albentis oliuae*.

23) Mendner 1939, 37, subscribes verbatim to this thesis of the “Verbalinterpolation”.

24) The reference must obviously be to the oil and not to the olive: see Hopkinson 2000, 31, and, for the metonymy Minerva = oil, Rosati 1996, 182–4, to epist. 19,44.

25) Another hand has written *baca* in the margin and probably *ba* over *caneque*.

26) As well as Ehwald (1915, 405).

27) Cf. Planudes’ translation: εἶς τε σίτον καὶ χύσιν οἴνου καὶ ἐλάαν Ἀθηναῖς μετεβάλλετο.

is more likely to suppose that he was the one who felt compelled to reconstruct the text, introducing this brilliant *canaeque* that is supported by the aforementioned parallels.²⁸

Note also that, if we keep the reading *canaeque*, the repetition of *-que* does not work as a polysyndeton. The first *-que* would instead join *segetem laticesque*, while the second would connect *meri canaeque Mineruae*,²⁹ a construction that is no doubt irreproachable (cf. e. g. 13,704: *dant pateram claramque auro gemmisque coronam*), but certainly less to be expected than a tricolon with its two last members linked by this polysyndeton, a structure of which Ovid is very fond, as e. g. in 13,78: *redde hostem uulnusque tuum solitumque timorem*.³⁰ If this reconstruction is correct, the genuine reading should be a noun in the accusative referring to oil. Taking into account the correction of *M*, *donumque* could perhaps be conjectured, which would be an audacious remake of the Virgilian *donum exitiale Mineruae* (Aen. 2,31).

References

- Bömer 1982: P. Ovidius Naso. *Metamorphosen*. Kommentar von F. B., Buch XII–XIII, Heidelberg 1982.
- Bothe 1818: F. H. Bothe, *Vindiciae Ovidianae, siue annotationes in P. Ouidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon lib. XV*, Gottingae 1818.
- Bothe ²1818: F. H. Bothe, *P. Ouidii Metamorphoseon libri XV*, Manhemii 1818.
- Burman 1727: P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera omnia, IV voluminibus comprehensa, cum integris Jac. Micylli, Her. Ciofani, Dan. et Nic. Heinsiorum, et excerptis aliorum notis, quibus suas adjecit Petr. Burmannus. Tom. II: met., cum eorumdem et Constantii Fanensis et Glareani notis, Amstelodami 1727.
- Ehwald 1915: R. Ehwald, P. Ovidius Naso. Opera. Vol. II, *Metamorphoses*, editio maior, Lipsiae 1915.
- Fabbri 1923: P. Fabbri, P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XI–XV, Torino 1923.
- Hardie 2015: Ovidio, *Metamorfosi*, volume VI (libri XIII–XV), a cura di Ph. H., testo critico basato sull'ed. oxoniense di R. Tarrant, trad. di G. Chiarini, Milano 2015.

28) See Hardie 2015, 320.

29) Pace Hopkinson 2000, 198: “*-que ... -que* are here disjunctive, ‘either ... or’”.

30) See also ll. 282, 328, 384, 489, 711, 768, 832, 940, to mention only passages of this same book. Cf. again Hopkinson 2000, 198: “*bacamque*, a noun [...] which gives an attractive tripartite structure to the line”.

- Heubeck 1992: A. Heubeck, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. II (Books IX–XVI), Oxford 1992.
- Hopkinson 2000: *Ovid: Metamorphoses. Book 13*, ed. by N. H., Cambridge / New York 2000.
- Horsfall 2000: *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary* by N. H., Leiden 2000.
- Horsfall 2006: *Virgil, Aeneid 3: A Commentary* by N. H., Leiden / Boston 2006.
- Huyck 1991: *A Commentary on Ovid's *Arma Iudicium*, *Metamorphoses* 12.612–13.398*, Diss. Harvardiana by J. R. H., Cambridge (Mass.) 1991.
- Keene 1898: *The Thirteenth Book of the Metamorphoses. With Introduction and Notes* by Ch. H. K., London 1898.
- Korn 1880: *P. Ovidius Naso, recensuit O. K. Tomus II*, Berolini 1880.
- Magnus 1914: *H. Magnus, P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV*, Berolini 1914.
- Magnus 1925: *H. Magnus, Ovids Metamorphosen in doppelter Fassung? II*, *Hermes* 60, 1925, 113–143.
- Mendner 1939: *S. Mendner, Der Text der Metamorphosen Ovids*, Diss. Köln 1939.
- Papathomopoulos / Tsavare 2002: *M. Papathomopoulos / I. Tsavare (edd.), Οβιδίου περὶ Μεταμορφώσεων ὁ μετήνεγκεν ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων φωνῆς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα Μάξιμος μόναχος ὁ Πλανούδης*, Athens 2002.
- Riese 1872: *P. Ovidii Nasonis Carmina*, edidit A. R. Vol. II. Editio stereotypa, Lipsiae 1872.
- Riese 1889: *P. Ovidii Nasonis Carmina*, edidit A. R. Vol. II. Editio stereotypa iterum recognita, Lipsiae 1889.
- Rivero 2016: *L. Rivero García, Requests as Orders: On *Ou. met.* 13.377–379*, *Mnemosyne* 69, 2016, forthcoming.
- Rosati 1996: *Heroidum epistulae XVIII–XIX: Leander Heroni, Hero Leandro*, a cura di G. R., Firenze 1996.
- Stampacchia 1968: *G. Stampacchia, La tragedia di Ecuba nelle Metamorfosi ovidiane. Nota per uno studio del monologo in Ovidio*, Pisa 1968.
- Stok 1990: *F. Stok, Le Troiane di Ovidio (Met. 13,408–428)*, in: L. Nicastri (ed.), *Contributi di filologia latina*, Napoli 1990, 85–101.
- Venini 1952: *P. Venini, L'Ecuba di Euripide e Ovidio, Met. XIII 429–575*, *RIL* 85, 1952, 364–377.
- Wilson 1987: *N. Wilson, Variant Readings with Poor Support in the Manuscript Tradition*, *RHT* 17, 1987, 1–13.

Huelva

Luis Rivero García