MARGINALIA CRITICA TO OV. MET. 13

Luis Rivero García
Universidad de Huelva
lrivero@uhu.es
http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7140-2072

Summary
Textual variants in different passages of Book 13 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are analysed and discussed.

Resumen
Se analizan y discuten variantes textuales en distintos pasajes del libro 13 de las *Metamorfosis* de Ovidio.

Key words
Ovid; *Metamorphoses*; textual criticism.

Palabras clave
Ovidio; *Metamorfosis*; crítica textual.

Ovid's *Metamorphoses* still contain a great number of passages whose text is unclear, or at the very least open to further discussion. After a thorough analysis of Book 13, I have selected some forty problematic issues, some more complex than others. For this debate, I have brought together a selection of passages in which the critics tend to differ between two or three variants. In each case I point out and clarify my choice. More detailed reasoning will be available in the forthcoming publication of the textual commentary[1].

19-20²:

iste tulit pretium iam nunc certaminis huius,
quod, cum uictus erit, mecum certasse feretur.   20

• **19** certaminis *Ω, edd. ss. XV-XIX* : temptaminis *MN(uid., a.c.)*
Mo(cert- i.l. p.c. Mo²) Bo3 Lr27, prob. Merkel 1875, edd. post. •

In his 2ⁿᵈ edition (1875), Merkel rejected *certaminis*, the widespread paradosis of the mss., which was unanimously chosen by previous editors, and adopted *temptaminis* backed up by the *potissimus Mediceus*, *M* (s. XI², as so often in the text of this edition), though no argument was given.[3] All the later editors have kept *temptaminis*. I suppose that they consider it *difficilior*, but using this Ovidian neologism in the singular would be a hapax in Latin texts, as the expression *pretium temptaminis* would be, notionally understood as "payment in return for an endeavour". The allusion here is to the *certamen*, as Ulysses then says in his speech (l. 129): *non foret ambiguus tanti certaminis heres*; (l. 159): *operum certamen*. For the expression, cf. also *Her.* 16.263: *di facerent, pretium magni certaminis esses.*

234-5:

Erigor et trepidos ciues exhortor in hostem
amissamque mea uirtutem uoce repono.   235

• **235** repono *P2²(mg.)S2 Ld²(i.l.)Tu Bs2, coni. Marcilius 1604, Bentley, prob. Bothe 1818², Riese 1872, Merkel 1875, Korn 1880, Zingerle 1884, Polle 1888, Simmons 1889, Lejay 1894, H-K-E 1898, Edwards 1905, Goold 1984, Huyck 1991, Tarrant 2004, R. de Verger 2005, dub. Hopkinson 2000(in notis)* : reposco *Ω, Aler. 1471, edd.* : roposco *Ph2* : reposto *Bo²(i.l.)* : refundo *M2P2T A4GLr7Mo(mg.)OTrV9²(mg.)   DSo²(mg.)V16   BoCs3Es2²(i.l.)*

> *Mt5 Bo2Vt AsCvEs6F2P38PsZ, "pri. Moret. ... multique alii"*
> *test. Heinsius 1659, Puteol. 1471, Venet. 1472, Calph. 1474,*
> *Regius 1493* : refirmo *"unus Mediol." test. Heinsius 1659* : reformo
> *Go²(i.l.), "unus Voss." test. Heinsius 1659* : rependo *"unus meus"*
> *test. Heinsius 1659* : reprendo *dub. Heinsius 1659* •

Most manuscripts and editors have *reposco*, a form which had previously appeared in the same position in ll. 180 and 200. However, both in these two passages and elsewhere in Ovid, the verb has its own meaning of "to demand the return of something which is one's own" (cf. *OLD* s.u., 1620-1). Here Ulysses in fact claims to have *restored* the lost bravery of his people, and so the appropriate verbal form is *repono*, as Marcilius remarked in his note to Hor. *carm.* 3.5.29-30[4]: "Cvrat reponi virtvs. *Ouidius lib. xiii in Oratione Vlyxis. Amissamque mea uirtutem uoce reposco, Errore librarii reposco ibi male pro,* repono. *Atque ita rectius quam ut alii correxere,* refundo. *Vt* uirtutem addere *apud Sallustium in concione C. Marii in Iugurth. & adlocutione Catilinae ad milites in Catilinario, sic* uirtutem reponere". None of the other variants transmitted or proposed as amendments is preferable. Thus, read *repono*.

238-40:
Denique de Danais quis te laudatue petitue?
at sua Tydides mecum communicat acta,
me probat et socio semper confidit Vlixi.   240

> • **240** ulixi *M(p.c.)S2²(p.c., i suprascr.) Lr27* : ulixe *Ω, edd.* : ulixes
> *uel* ulixe *M(a.c.)* •

Most manuscripts, and all editors, have *ulixe*, although in *M* this was corrected to *ulixi* (as is copied in the apograph *Lr27*, a. 1456), the same correction made by *S2²* (*S2* dates from s. XII). Though *confido* may be constructed with both the dative and ablative cases, the latter is almost unique to prose-writers (the first clear example in verse is Luc. 4.406: *illic bellaci confisus gente Curictum*) and tends to refer to things and not to animated beings (*TLL* 4.207.28: "*c. abl. (aliqua re)*"). Ovid's work shows a clear preference for the dative (*Her.* 17.173: *uitae confidit*; *ars* 2.143: *confide figurae*; *met.* 10.69: *confisa figurae*), so we should consider the two cases in doubt as dative (*am.* 3.9.39: *carminibus confide bonis*; *fasti* 3.569: *hospitio regis confisa uetusto*). Then we are just left with the passage of *Her.* 9.99: *et male confisum pedibus formaque bimembri*, in which the mss. also have

---

[4] Th. Marcilius, *Ad Horatii Flacci opera omnia, quotidiana & emendatae lectiones*, Parisiis 1604, 52.

confixum and *confusum*[5]. Yet, they do seem to be unanimous in reading *forma*, whose referent is in any case non-animate. Therefore, in our passage I choose *Vlixi*.

> 523-4:
> At, puto, funeribus donabere regia uirgo
> condeturque tuum monumentis corpus auitis...
>
> • **523** donabere *MN MoO Go(*dotabere *u.l. Go²) Vt Go2 Lr27, prob. Magnus 1914, Lafaye 1930, Trepat-de Saav. 1932, Segura 1983* : dotabere *Ω, edd.* : dotabile *Ab(*dotabere *p.c. Ab²)* : doctabere *Gg Bo* : dotalem *Mt* : dotabereis*(uid.) Vd(a.c.)* •

The vulgate of the manuscripts and editors is *dotabere*, but some mss. (among them the *potissimi MN*: *uid. app.*) have *donabere*. Commentators, who here remark the "motivo tragico delle nozze come funerali"[6], consider that this verse is indebted to Verg. *Aen.* 7.318-9: *sanguine Troiano et Rutulo dotabere, uirgo, / et Bellona manet te pronuba*. Bömer also recalls *Her.* 6.137-8: *Quid refert, scelerata piam si uincet et ipso / crimine dotata est emeruitque uirum?*[7], and Hardie adds the parallel of A. *Ag.* 406: ἄγουσά τ' ἀντίφερνον Ἰλίῳ φθοράν. What may not be taken into account is that in these passages (especially in the first two, as Aeschylus' does not refer to a *uirgo* but to Helen) there is a reason for irony: i.e., the *uirgo* can receive her dowry (also in the passage of Hos. Get. *Med.* [*Anth. Lat.* 17] 104, cited by Bömer[8]: *o digno coniuncta uiro dotabere uirgo*). Hecuba's irony lies in supposing that her daughter can still receive a funeral in accordance with her royal status, as later Hecuba herself denies (525-6, and note *munera*), but to allude to the corpse's dowry would be plainly and simply a sign of bad taste, akin to "funerali come nozze". Of course, the passage of Virgil and the same allusion to the *uirgo* have favoured the very slight change *donabere > dotabere*.

Magnus was the first to defend *donabere*[9]. He upheld this with the parallels of *Her.* 11.99-100: *his mea muneribus, genitor, conubia donas? / Hac tua dote, pater, filia diues erit?*, and Sen. *clem.* 2.6.2: *donabit lacrimis maternis filium*. This last passage had been pointed out by Heinsius, who had defended *dotabere* by comparing it with Manil. 4.140[10]:

[5] H. Dörrie, *P. Ouidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum*, Berlin-NewYork 1971, 133.

[6] Ph. Hardie *et al.*, *Ovidio, Metamorfosi*, Milan 2015, VI, 294.

[7] F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen. Buch XII-XIII*, Heidelberg 1982, 331 ("ähnlich ironisch").

[8] Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso*, 331.

[9] H. Magnus, ed., *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV*, Berolini 1914, 505.

[10] *Nic. Heinsii Commentarius in P. Ouidii Nasonis Opera omnia.* Tomus II: *Nic. Heinsii Commentarius in Ouidii Metamorphoseon libros XV*, Lipsiae 1758, 699 (P. Burman, ed., *P. Ouidii Nasonis Opera omnia*, vol. II: *Metamorphoses*, Amstelodami 1727, 896-7).

Taurus simplicibus dotabit rura colonis, which has the same alternation[11]. Yet in any case this parallel does not prove the prevalence of *dotabere* in our passage. Moreover, it was Heinsius himself who left open the possibility of reading *donabere*: "*si* donabere *leges, erit ut illud Sen. II de Clem. 6*". Read, then, *donabere* here.

> 538-42:
> Troades exclamant, obmutuit illa dolore
> et pariter uocem lacrimasque introrsus obortas
> deuorat ipse dolor, duroque simillima saxo   540
> torpet et aduersa figit modo lumina terra,
> interdum tollit toruos ad aethera uultus,
>
> • **542** tollit toruos *N* : toruos tollit *A3Ph2 F2 Ca2* : toruos extollit *Ω*, Puteol. 1471, Venet. 1472, Calph. 1474, Accurs. 1475, Regius 1493, Aldina 1502, Lugd. 1546, Lugd.1565, Bersm. 1596, Loers 1843, Weise 1845, Koch 1866, Anderson 1982, Tarrant 2004 : toruos sustollit *M Mo N2 Lr22Lr27V30, Aler. 1471, Naug. 1516, Heinsius 1659, edd.* : toruos attollit *B4* : toruos extendit *CO4O5* : toruos intendit *"Oxon." test. Heinsius 1659, "Vossian." test. Burm. 1727* •

The editors are divided between *toruos sustollit* (the majority), which is in turn the reading of *M* and a small group of recentiores, and *toruos extollit* (fewer editors), which is the reading of the majority of manuscripts (*uid. app.*). But Ovid does not use either *extollo* or *sustollo* in any other passage and neither of the two verbs is ever used in classical literature referring to the face or the regard. The expression is obviously *tollere uultus/oculos* etc.: 1.86: *iussit et erectos ad sidera tollere uultus*; 731: *tollens ad sidera uultus* (*fast.* 2.75). Perhaps the perfect of this verb, *sustulit*, is the origin of the corruption made in *M*, as the perfect *extulit*, of *effero*, is the origin of *extollit*. In this case, *N*'s (s. XI^ex-XII^in) is the only correct reading[12], and other recentiores have the reverse, non-metric sequence, *toruos tollit*. Probably the copyists tried to remedy the meter from an antigraph with this reading, using the majority variant *extollit* or *sustollit*.

> 665-6:
> non hic Aeneas, non qui defenderet Andron   665
> Hector erat, per quos decimum durastis in annum.
>
> • **666** per quos *Ω, Puteol. 1471, Venet. 1472, edd. ss. XV-XIX* : per quem *LuMM2(*per quos *p.c., suprascr.* duos*)N(*per quos *mg. u.l. N3)*

[11] See A. E. Housman, *M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Quartus*, Londinii 1920, 19.
[12] Burman, *Ouidii Nasonis Opera*, 898 adduces the testimony of other "*quatuor*" for *tollit toruos ad sidera*.

V2(p.c., -em i.ras.; per quos *i.l. V2³) A2B2²(i.l. u.l.)Fe*(quos *mg. u.l.*)
*L4Lr3MoPr²V6V7 Lr8²(i.l. u.l.) P28 Bo3(uid., a.c.)Lr22Lr27V30,
Plan., "septem libri" test. Burm. 1727, Aler. 1471, Merkel 1875,
edd. post.* : pro quo *L3* : quid *V2 a.c. n.l.* •

Taking into account that Anius is speaking specifically to Anchises and Aeneas, it would hardly be delicate – to say the very least – for him to attribute the merit of the Trojan resistance only to Hector, when it should be really attributed to both of them. This had been enshrined by the Virgilian Diomedes (*Aen.* 11.289-90): *Hectoris Aeneaeque manu uictoria Graium / haesit et in decimum uestigia rettulit annum*, who in turn relied on Homer's irrefutable statement (*Il.* 17.513): Ἕκτωρ Αἰνείας θ᾽, οἳ Τρώων εἰσὶν ἄριστοι. Versus this reading of the majority of mss., adopted by virtually all editors until the 1st ed. of Riese[13], a minor – but very authorized – number of manuscripts have the variant *per quem*. This was adopted by Joh. Andreas de Buxis, known as *Aleriensis*, in his edition of 1471[14] (in accordance with *Lr22* and *V30*, a couple of 15th c. mss. which are quite close to that edition) and by Merkel in his 2nd ed. (1875, once again following the text of *M*), and by all the later editors. However, this reading (no doubt also based on the reality of the Trojan deeds), probably comes from Verg. *Aen.* 9.155: *decimum quos distulit Hector in annum*, words not in vain put into the mouth of Turnus. Perhaps the copyist also had in his mind the near passage of *met.* 12.76-7: *decimum dilatus in annum / Hector erat*. It must thus be read *per quos*.

717-8:
Chaoniosque sinus, ubi nati rege Molosso
impia subiectis fugere incendia pennis.

• **718** subiectis] subuectis *A Es3(a.c.), mauult Heinsius 1659(in notis)*
: subrectis *B8* : sub rectis *V16(a.c.)* : subiectos *P8(a.c.)* : subietis *P10* :
sub tectis *Es4* : tam subitis *coni. Ellis* : *fort.* suppositis •

The participle *subiectis* is clearly strange applied to *pennis* and it is of no use recalling the passage of Verg. *Aen.* 2.235-6[15]: *pedibusque rotarum / subiciunt lapsus*, where the verb is used in the proper sense, as the comparison with *met.* 6.220[16]: *duraque mollierat subiectas ungula glaebas* is not

---

[13] A. Riese, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Carmina*, Lipsiae 1872.

[14] *P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera Omnia cum epistola Jo. An. Episcopi Aleriensis in Cyrno*, Romae, per Conradum Sweynheym et Arnoldum Pannartz, 1471.

[15] Like Ch. Simmons, ed., *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon XIII. XIV*, London-New York 1889 [= 1887²], 155.

[16] Proposed by Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso*, 397.

completely convincing either. Somewhat closer is the parallel of Luc. 7.574[17]: *ipse manu subicit gladios ac tela ministrat*, but here the action of the subject concords better with the lexeme of *subicio*. This inconvenience led R. Ellis to make a proposal included in that same commentary of Simmons: "I suspect a corruption: the obvious word is *subitis*. Perhaps *tam* fell out after –*ta* of *irrita*". However, the meaning of *tam* is not satisfactory, serving rather as a necessary metric completion. I believe that *suppositis*, paleographically close to the majority reading (*supoîtis*), would fit better both for its own spatial meaning (cf. *Her.* 15.179: *tu quoque, mollis Amor, pennas suppone cadenti*) and its known proximity to the semantic field of substitution or supplanting[18]. The variant of *A* (s. XII[1]) and *Es3* (s. XIV), that Heinsius himself had proposed in his notes[19], could be considered: "*malo etiam* subuectis pennis. *quanquam aliter libri*" (the same variation *subiecta-subuecta* is in 6.422), but I consider that it has defects which are similar to those of *subiectis*, as the meaning of *subueho* ("to convey upwards from below": *OLD* s.u., 1854) cannot be adapted to the idea of the sprouting or emerging of wings, as Ovid wishes to say here.

> 762-3:
> quid sit amor sentit nostrique cupidine captus
> uritur oblitus pecorum antrorumque suorum
>
> • **762** nostrique *Ω, Plan., Puteol. 1471, Aler. 1471, edd. plurimi, dub. Tarrant 2004(in app.)* : ualidaque *M L4²(mg. u.l.)MoN2 Bo3Lr27Vd11, prob. Riese 1872, edd. post. plerique* : nostri *Lr2(a.c.) B2(p.c.) Lu2* : nostris *B2(a.c.)* : uterque *Mt* : nostro *Vd(ex itin. corr.)* : quoque nostri *Mt3(uid.)* •

M and some of the manuscripts related to it have the variant *ualidaque*, which was recovered by Riese and after him by the majority of editors[20]. The reading of *M* has been endorsed by Tarrant with the parallels of 7.9[21]: *concipit interea ualidos Aeetias ignes*, and 14.352: *ut primum ualido mentem conlegit ab aestu*, both in amorous contexts (add *ars* 3.543: *ualidoque perurimur aestu*), although Tarrant also immediately shows his sympathies

---

[17] It is cited by Ch. H. Keene, *The Thirteenth Book of the Metamorphoses*, London 1898, 110.

[18] *OLD* s.u. *suppono*, 6-7, 1883-4; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.24-5: *hic crudelis amor tauri suppostaque furto / Pasiphaë*, or 7.282-3: *quos daedala Circe / supposita de matre nothos furata creauit*, with N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary,* Leiden 2013, 94-5, and *Virgil, Aeneid 6: A Commentary*, Berlin 2000, 202; Ou. *met.* 12.34: *supposita fertur mutasse Mycenida cerua* (*tr.* 4.4.67).

[19] N. Heinsius, *Operum P. Ovidii Nasonis editio nova*, Amstelodami 1659, 350.

[20] Riese, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Carmina*, Lipsiae 1872.

[21] R. J. Tarrant, *P. Ouidi Nasonis Metamorphoses*, Oxford 2004, 401 *in app.*

("*fort. recte*") for the reading *nostrique*. As for Hopkinson[22], he considered *ualidaque* "the superior reading: the emphasis hereabouts is not on Galatea, but on the violence of Polyphemus' passion. There may be a reference to Theocr. 11.11, where the Cyclops is said to love with 'real madness' (ὀρθαῖς μανίαις)". Both readings certainly make perfect sense and are supported by Ovidian *usus*, as *nostrique* also has the syntactic and metric endorsement of *fast.* 6.119: *uisaeque cupidine captus*. The problem is, in my view, that in principle neither of the two readings can be explained as a mistake which has come from the other, although in this case, as in others, the solution may perhaps be in the text of *N*. Indeed, the copyist initially made a mistake and transcribed (apparently from an abbreviation) *utrique* (cf. the reading *uterque* in *Mt*), which in Beneventan script can be also read as *uarique*. What is more, the group *-ri-* (*rj*) is not far from the spelling of *-li-* (*lj*), which leads us to a symptomatic *ualique*, which could be the source – mediate or immediate – of the variant of *M*. For this reason I believe that we should keep *nostrique*[23].

786-8:

> ... Latitans ego rupe meique
> Acidis in gremio residens procul auribus hausi
> talia dicta meis auditaque uerba notaui:

• **788** dicta] uerba *Gf P8* • uerba *Ω, edd.* : mente *Lr2M2(i.l. u.l.) A4B4(*uerba *mg. B4²)HdL4(*uerba *i.l. u.l. L4²)Ld2²(i.l. u.l.) Lr4Lr6V6V8 B8Go(*uerba *mg. u.l. Go²) BoMt4P28Vt Lu2, test. Viuianus (1522, ad loc.), prob. Heinsius 1659(qui et "Oxon. ... et complures alii" test.), Burm. 1727, Walch. 1731, Gierig 1807, Bothe 1818², Lemaire 1822, Richter 1828, Jahn 1832, Baumg.- Crus. 1834, Bach 1836, Loers 1843, Merkel 1850, Koch 1866, Riese 1872, Goold 1984, Hill 2000, Hopkinson 2000, Tarrant 2004* : monte *Vd* : dicta *P8* •

The vast majority of manuscripts and editions have *uerba*, but *Lr2M2(u.l.)*, s. XI-XII, and some recentiores have *mente*, a reading which was retrieved by Heinsius in 1652 and defended by comparing it with *fast.* 5.10: *silent aliae dictaque mente notant*, and 3.178: *memori pectore dicta nota*[24]. Bach adds *met.* 9.778: *memorique animo tua iussa notaui* to these passages[25]. Heinsius' proposal was followed by some editors until the 1st edition of Riese (1872)[26], and was only restored by Goold (1984), Hill (2000),

---

[22] N. Hopkinson, *Ovid: Metamorphoses Book XIII*, Cambridge 2000, 213.

[23] A similar case can be found in l. 802: pauone *N p.c.* : paone *N a.c.* : phitone *M*.

[24] N. Heinsius, *Operum P. Ovidii Nasonis editio nova*, Amstelodami 1652, II, 707.

[25] E. C. Chr. Bach, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV*, Hannover 1836, II, 355.

[26] Riese, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Carmina*.

Hopkinson (2000) and Tarrant (2004)[27], and recently defended by Hardie with arguments concerning the composition[28]: "Il bilanciamento di *auribus hausi* e di *mente notaui*, a indicare le due fasi nella ricezione del canto, favorisce la lezione *mente*". The sequence *auribus hausi / talia d i c t a meis auditaque u e r b a notaui* is undoubtedly redundant, and it could therefore also be argued that the end of the verse is a mechanical recollection of 3.369: *ingeminat uoces auditaque uerba reportat*, derived in turn from Verg. *Aen.* 2.115: *haec tristia dicta reportat.*

   Nevertheless, it does not seem that matters are so simple: Latin authors have long found a certain delight in the simultaneous combination of *uerba* and *dicta*: (Pl. *asin.* 524-5) *an tu tibi / uerba blanda esse aurum rere, dicta docta pro datis?*; (Lucr. 4.578-9) *ita colles collibus ipsi / uerba repulsantes iterabant dicta referri*; (Sil. 11.83-4) *ut saeuo adflictus saxo spectante piaret / tristia dicta Ioue et lueret uerba impia leto?* And what is more significant, Ovid himself shows that he is fond of it: 1.656-7: *dicta refers, ... / ... ad mea uerba remugis*; 8.133-5: *ecquid ad aures / perueniunt mea dicta tuas, an inania uenti / uerba ferunt ...?*; *fast.* 2.845-6: *illa iacens ad uerba oculos sine lumine mouit, / uisaque concussa dicta probare coma*; *fast.* 3.695-6: *inde ioci ueteres obscenaque dicta canuntur, / et iuuat hanc magno uerba dedisse deo*; *Ib.* 87-8: *ut non mea dicta, sed illa / Pasiphaës generi uerba fuisse putet.* Let us remember, finally, this last passage which is similar enough for it to be more prudent to keep the majority reading in our passage: *Her.* 20.19-20: *tua uerba notauit / et uisa est mota dicta tulisse coma.*

> 916-9:
> Sensit et innitens quae stabat proxima moli
> "non ego prodigium, non sum fera belua, uirgo:
> sum deus" inquit "aquae, nec maius in aequore Proteus
> ius habet et Triton Athamantiadesque Palaemon.
>
> • **917** non[2] *AGfV3   A3BaBe2CDeDrEEsFH2HdLdLd2Ld3LsMt O3O4P3P4V5V6V9Vd   B8Bs3Li3Mo3Mt2P5P8SoSpV16   Bo2(nec p.c.)Es2McMt4To2 B14CvEs6Go2Ps Mv7, Venet. 1472, Heinsius 1659("meliores"), Burm. 1727, Walch. 1731, Gierig 1807, Bothe 1818², Lemaire 1822, Richter 1828, Jahn 1832, Baumg.-Crus. 1834, Bach 1836* : nec *Ω, Puteol. 1471, Aler. 1471, edd.* • **918** sum *AGf(i.l. p.c.)V2V3   A3A4BaBe2CDeEEsFH2LdLd2Ld3LsO4P3P4V5V6 Ds2Ld7Li3Lr8Mo3Mt2To²V16 Cs3Es2Gf8Mt5To2 AsB14Es5Es6 Mv7, "Dresd."(sed hab. Dr) test. Jahn 1832, Puteol. 1471, Venet.*

---

*1472, Calph. 1474, Heinsius 1659, Burm. 1727, Walch. 1731,
Gierig 1807, Bothe 1818², Lemaire 1822, Richter 1828, Jahn
1832, Baumg.-Crus. 1834, Bach 1836, Weise 1845, Koch 1866* : sed
Ω, Aler. 1471, edd. : si *B5* •

In l. 917 the manuscripts are split between *non ... nec* and *non ... non,* and
this is the case in l. 918 between *sed* and *sum*, although a tendency is noted
to have *sum* among the mss. which include *non ... non* (*uid. app.*). With the
exception of the edition of the *Metamorphoses* published in Venice in 1472,
Heinsius (as early as 1652[29]) was the first to publish *non ... non ... / sum*, and
his proposal was only followed until the edition of Bach (1836)[30]. The rest of
the editors have opted for *non ... nec ... / sed.*

The choice is difficult, since the lack of a paleographic criterion is added
to the vagueness of the mss., the alternation of the *nec-non* forms being
systematic. Even so, it seems to me that the variant *non ... nec* is more
logical in its coordination than the anaphora *non ... non*, and that this
anaphora offers a more unhurried tone, which is therefore better suited to the
exordium of an amorous *suasoria* where the most urgent need of Glaucus
is to dissipate the fear that his appearance has caused in Scylla. As a possible
origin of the variant, as well as the greater syntactic evenness of *non ... nec*,
there is Ovid's reiterated use of the sequence *non ego ... nec* in the rest of his
work and, in particular, in his amorous poems. This is also frequently used
with a persuasive tone: cf. *Her.* 20.25: *non ego natura nec sum tam callidus
usu* (1.7-8; 5.81; 7.165-6; 8.67-8, 93-4; 9.49-50; 16.173-4; *am.* 1.11.25-6; *ars*
1.25-6, 51-2, 381-2; *rem.* 699-700; *fast.* 3.55-6; *tr.* 2.1.563-4; *Pont.* 3.4.57).
In turn, *non ... non* is defended by Ovid's use of this anaphora (7.545-6, 558;
9.752; 10.91, 172; *am.* 1.3.15; 2.11.11; *tr.* 3.3.9; *Ib.* 209), and even of the triple
(*met.* 11.600: *non fera, non pecudes, non moti flamine rami*, with variants
nec[31]), and by the fact that he again puts it into the mouth of Glaucus in ll.
928-9 (there also with the variant *non ... nec*). He moreover resorts to it at
times in the same sequence *non ego* (1.513): *non ego sum pastor, non hic
armenta gregesque* (cf. *am.* 2.16.37-8: *non ego Paelignos uideor celebrare
salubres, / non ego natalem, rura paterna, locum*).

The same uncertainty affects the decision between *sed* and *sum*, as both
variants can come from erroneously reading the other and both can be
interpreted as having originated in a gloss of the contrary. Nonetheless, also
in order to persuade, *sum deus* seems preferable. This is because it sounds
more rotund in this absolute phrasing at the beginning of the verse, where
it is only nuanced by *aquae* after the intercalation of *inquit* ("I am god",

---

[29] N. Heinsius, *Operum P. Ovidii Nasonis editio nova.*
[30] Bach, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri.*
[31] See S. Díez Reboso, *Edición crítica y comentario textual del libro XI de las* Metamor-
fosis *de Ovidio*, Ph.D. thesis University of Huelva 2014, 412.

he said to her, "of the water"), thus contributing to the "proud claim to importance" which will characterise all his speech (Hopkinson 2000, 233). We find an equally expressive use of the repetition of *sum* in *Her.* 17.135: *ergo ego sum uirtus, ego sum tibi nobile regnum*; and in *Pont.* 1.2.33-4: *Ille ego sum lignum qui non admittar in ullum; / ille ego sum frustra qui lapis esse uelim.*

In short, I believe that we must read *non ...., non ..., / sum ...*