

LUIS RIVERO GARCÍA, *Book XIII of Ovid's Metamorphoses. A Textual Commentary*, Sammlung Wissenschaftlicher Commentare, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2018, vii+532 pp., €149.95, ISBN 978-3-11-061010-9.

Much has changed in the field of classical studies since the 1970s. In addition to the incremental effects of obvious sweeping demographical changes and their impact on educational policies and practices, the world of classics itself has been profoundly redefined; indeed, even the newest versions of its identity are subject to an ongoing interrogation about meaning, purpose, and value. Classics is no longer a discipline laser-focused on texts and their interpretation within the context of predominantly literary study; rather, it offers a wide range of access points that in turn produce a scholarly conversation that is not only multivocal but even Babel-like at times within its own echo chamber.

Not all of this noise has been detrimental to the field, however; indeed, many of the changes that accompanied my earliest years as a classicist have been profoundly beneficial, both for me individually and for the field as a whole. One small but deeply telling example is the rehabilitation of the textual and commentary traditions of the poetry of Ovid, whose reputation had so long been determined by Quintilian's verdict, *nimum amator ingenii sui* (*IO* 10.1.88). The dismissive attitude embedded in this judgment had a profound impact on Latinists in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, a great many of whom thereby felt justified in excepting Ovid from serious study. Of course, this was not true across the board; exceptional instances of Ovidian scholarship began to emerge in the 1950s and 60s, starting with E.J. Kenney's OCT of the *Amores*, *Ars amatoria*, *Medicamina faciei femineae*, and *Remedia amoris* (1961; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1994) and Franz Bömer's voluminous tribute, beginning with a two-volume edition of the *Fasti* (1957-58) and culminating in a multivolume commentary on the *Metamorphoses* (1969-2006), to mention only the two most striking examples. This period also saw the first serious attempt in almost a century at a scholarly edition of the text of the *Metamorphoses*, W.S. Anderson's Teubner (1977); indeed, it could be argued that, in spite of the criticism it received, this edition spurred a paradigm shift in the study of Ovid more generally, and in a new determination to take the poet on his own terms rather than on those of Quintilian or in comparison to the preeminence of Virgil's poetry in scholarly taste. The culmination—to this point—of all of this effort has been the publication of Richard Tarrant's OCT of the *Metamorphoses* (2004), a scholarly achievement that, while laying no claim to ultimate authority—after all, long gone are the days of

Housman—establishes on a sure footing an eminently workable and reliable text for scholars and readers alike.

But lack of closure is inherent in the work of the editor of texts: new discoveries of manuscripts and fragmentary texts (rare, but not unheard of); new (re)readings and collations of the manuscripts; new emendations and conjectures—all this is the stuff of textual criticism, an ongoing enterprise that is always aspirational, never quite done. And the revolution in data collection and analysis made possible in the digital age opens up the text even further, as information is not only accumulated but studied in new and ambitious ways. For Ovidians, the single most striking instance of this ambition comes to us from Spain, where a noteworthy group of scholars has labored for nearly two decades on an Ovidian project of vast proportions: the Nicolaus Heinsius Research Group, based at the University of Huelva and generously supported by the Spanish government, European cultural funding agencies, and the regional government of Andalucía. Under the direction of Professor Antonio Ramírez de Verger, this team of scholars has undertaken to compile virtually all the discoverable information on the transmission of the text of the *Metamorphoses* and to make it available, in various formats, to the international community of scholars. With it, they both return us to a most traditional idea of the text as *fons et origo* and look forward to an ever-expanding universe of textual studies.

An introduction to the project is available online at <http://www.uhu.es/proyextovidio/esp/index.html>.

The volume under review is the first component of the project to be completed and published in physical form. Professor Luis Rivero García (LRG), a colleague of Ramírez de Verger and his close collaborator, has written a commentary that is at once both novel and profoundly traditional, a book by a scholar and for scholars that attempts to accomplish the impossible by reporting all the information available on the manuscript tradition of *Metamorphoses* 13. The appellation “commentary” is perhaps a misnomer, at least insofar as this is decidedly not a guide to Ovid’s poem as a literary work participating in an intertextual matrix of ancient texts; for that, readers are advised to look elsewhere, since in fact two fine commentaries on the reading and interpretation of Book 13 are readily available (Hopkinson’s “green and yellow” (2000) and Hardie’s contribution to the Fondazione Valla series, covering Books 13–15, 2015). This is not to imply that LRG is not interested in or sensitive to literary nuance; in my comments below, I will touch on a few examples of this awareness in his work. But LRG’s book is, if anything, a para-paratext, in that it gives pride of place to matters of transmission and emendation. In this context it is perhaps worthwhile to ask who the intended audience is: presumably, scholars of the future who want to aim for an even better (by which I mean, closer to what Ovid himself wrote) text of the *Metamorphoses* than that available from Oxford will wish to look at the

manuscripts and preceding editions themselves to ascertain that the evidence is correct as it has been reported. In such a situation, LRG's book can serve as a *terminus a quo*, providing as it does a very broad picture of both the manuscript tradition and the history of emendations and conjectures; but it can never completely substitute for a subsequent editor's *ipse vidi*. This book can also have some usefulness in the context of professional training, since the historical framework of LRG's work often provides a detailed map to the processes of change and the patterns of logical thought that shape a given text's *status quo*, particularly when the text in question has a tradition that is almost as metamorphic as the poem's subject itself. In short, this is not a commentary about Ovid in the usual sense, nor does it sustain the reading of the poem as a product of a particular literary tradition and/or historical context; rather, this is a commentary that offers, in extremely fine detail, a picture of how the text we have has achieved its current appearance.

Before looking in detail at the commentary, I offer a brief description of the structure and contents of the volume. The Introduction (1-30) begins with an overview of the manuscript tradition and the most important editors from the 15<sup>th</sup> century to today; continues with an extensive list of the manuscripts used in this book, divided into six groups; and is followed by a chronological list of editions and textual commentaries consulted. (All of this information is also available at the *proyectovidio* website noted above.) A 17-page Bibliography follows; to this is appended a list of the abbreviations used throughout the book. The Commentary itself takes up 51-412, and is followed by a very useful, albeit brief, index of notable textual phenomena (e.g., Latin words often alternating for each other in the mss. such as *luminal/liminal/litora*; frequently alternating conjunctions, such as *dum/cum* and *ne/nec*; unstable words, such as *-que* before an initial vowel; and links between mss., 413-16). The book concludes with an Appendix critica (417-532) to which frequent reference is made in the Commentary. Readers of this review should be aware that I have not spent any significant time with this last component, which should nonetheless be of interest to textual scholars in the future.

The commentary is structured around short excerpts of Ovid's text: i.e., a passage of roughly 3-6 verses is presented, and is followed by an apparatus criticus, after which appear the textual notes. This segmentation would not be a good choice for a commentary the primary goal of which is to support the reading and appreciation of Ovid's poem, but is a sensible choice here, where LRG's primary purpose is to examine the textual concerns that have arisen—or that should be raised—in such small excerpts.

In order to characterize the book for future readers, I offer a list of seven dominant features, with selected examples. I precede the comments below with a disclaimer, viz., that the exhaustive aspirations of the volume exceed the limitations of a single reviewer, and indeed, would require the competence of Pierre Menard, the author of Borges' *Don Quixote*. I therefore

offer a modest list of specific examples, chosen in order to give a sense of the project as a whole for my readers.

1. LRG displays everywhere a deep, even intimate knowledge of the manuscripts and offers hypotheses about their antigraph(s): *inter alia* see the notes on 100; 113; 268-9; 289; 301-5; 448-536; 563; 666; 704; 846-53; 847; 857-918; 859; 890.
2. In consequence, LRG offers new information on the mss. and on their relationships with each other; new or corrected readings; and other important observations on the various hands found in each: e.g., 94; 108; 129; 161; 554; 589; 602-3; 653; 666; 682; 692; 715; 718; 758-87; 802; 944-5; 961.
3. LRG also displays an equally impressive familiarity with Heinsius' manuscripts and emendations: e.g., at 496, LRG reports that in his 1659 edition Heinsius appears to have misunderstood his own annotation in the collation of P2, and that that misreading entered his text and was followed by other editors for centuries; besides LRG himself, only Tarrant recognizes the slip. *Inter alia*, see also the discussions of Heinsius on 86; 157 (where LRG attempts to recreate Heinsius' thought process); 189-90; 158; 216; 289; 305; 470; 491; 581; 649; 682; 711; 731; 738; 826; 866; 875; 903; 915.
4. LRG frequently seeks to cut a clear path through the thicket of centuries of readings and conjectures, e.g., on *repono* at 235, from Planudes through Marcilius, Bentley, Heinsius, Bothe, Jahn, Riese, Merkel, Hellmuth, Zingerle, Simmons, Edwards, and Magnus all the way to Holzberg (2017), working through the reasoning (sometimes faulty) of the scholars mentioned; see also, e.g., on 50-1; 100; 175; 212; 404-7; 542; 748; 770-1; 794; 843-4; 845; 884; 894; 910-11; 928. I note for the record that the thicket thus penetrated often remains difficult for the reader to negotiate, especially since LRG's comments, however lengthy, are often aporetic.
5. LRG makes occasional space for interesting notes on Latin usage: e.g., on 547 LRG notes differences between *lactante* and *lactente* in the mss. and quotes the distinction between the two made by Servius on *Geo.* 1.315 (together with the observation that Servius' reliability here is questionable). LRG also includes fascinating quotations of opinion from earlier editions, such as Baumgarten-Crusius (1834) on 892, concerning Heinsius' fondness for the dative; and Regius (1526) on 562, concerning his preference for *expilat* over *expellit* on the basis of his knowledge of female nature (*sic*).
6. On occasion LRG reveals poetic or stylistic awareness when it is essential to the textual issue under discussion: thus, e.g., 28 on *a Iove* vs. *ab Iove*; 491 on *osculum*; 393 on *telum* vs. *ferrum*; 558 on the

polyvalence of *truculenta*; 653 on the alternation between singular and plural paired nouns; 769 on polysyndeton; 880 on Ovid's frequent use of the phrase *fer opem*; 917-18 on anaphora.

7. Many of LRG's notes concern themselves with the punctuation of the text: e.g., 40; 42; 150-3; 189-90; 198; 290 (where a welcome nuance of irony is thereby introduced); 297; 446; 463-4; 589; 663-6; 679; 750; 781; 808-9; 869; 935. Not all of these will be equally welcome or convincing to every reader.

In the face of such a comprehensive presentation of the textual evidence, it would be pointless of me to tinker around the edges of LRG's accomplishment unless I were myself in a position to revisit each of the manuscripts and editions examined here. I offer a very few extremely minor observations about a few extremely minor details, selected from the very many thoughts pencilled in the margins of my copy of the book. On 142 (*esse Iouis pronepos, nostri quoque sanguinis auctor*) LRG discusses the mss. variants *esse/ipse* as "undoubtedly a simple error in the expansion of the abbreviation"; he does not however point to the possibility that *ipse* might well be a faulty correction based on *ipsi* two lines earlier. Similarly, on 637 (*caesarumque boum fibris de more crematis*) LRG notes that some mss. have the "nonsensical" *creatis* for *crematis*, and attributes this to an error stemming from an abbreviation; he does not however draw a connection here to his own support of *creatas* in place of *retentas* two lines earlier. At 440 (*dum mare pacatum, dum uentus amicior esset*) LRG discusses the rationale for and against *placatum* (in some *recentiores*) vs. *pacatum*, without noting the potential contamination from *placet* in 448. On 801 (*his immobilior scopulis, uiolentior amne*), LRG discusses the variant *angue* for *amne* as "just a misspelling," without observing the possibility that it began life as a gloss on *hydro* in 804. On 695-6 (*pulchris ... funeribus*), LRG defends *pulchris* against the charge of "bad taste" (Lieberman) and Bömer's observation that the phrase is unparalleled; to this he might add the potential echo of the pun known from *sepulcrum hau pulcrum* (*CIL* 1.1007).

De Gruyter is to be congratulated for its fine work with what must have been a challenging publication indeed. The editing, as far as I can tell, is remarkable, and the only change in format that I would like to see is a larger typeface used for the Appendix critica (presumably scaled in parallel with the apparatus criticus that follows each excerpt, but a daunting collection of minute details nonetheless). I noticed only a handful of typos, none of which affects readability or comprehension (in the Latin text of 13.226, the vocative *o socii* is printed as *or socii*; a quotation mark is missing from the end of an *Aeneid* quote in the note on 495; the word *syllable* in the note on 684 is misspelled; the word *decisive* in the note on 713 is misspelled; the note on 734 refers to the cacophony of *-la la-* in 731—this should be

730; the name *Maltby* in the note on 853 is misspelled; a concluding 's is missing from the word *mountain* in the note on 868). There are, finally, a very few spots where the English idiom is not quite right, but again, there is no problem with comprehension (on 37, "in the measure that" = "insofar as"; on 60, "refers" should be "reports"; on 749, "can be explained for" = "can be explained by"; on 836, "misspelling" should be "misreading"; on 884, "outwith" should be "outside").

BARBARA WEIDEN BOYD  
Bowdoin College  
bboyd@bowdoin.edu