

PHILIP HARDIE, *Ovidio, Metamorfosi*. Volume VI, Libri XIII–XV. A cura di Philip Hardie. Testo critico basato sull'edizione oxoniense di Richard Tarrant. Traduzione di Gioachino Chiarini. Scrittori greci e latini. Milano: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla - Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 2015, lxxv+717 pp., € 30.00, ISBN 978-88-04-65162-8.

Only ten years after the appearance of the first volume in the ambitious project of a multi-authored commentary on the *Metamorphoses* sponsored by the Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, the series has been brought to its conclusion with Philip Hardie's contribution on Books 13–15. The completed commentary is an extraordinary accomplishment, to be celebrated by students and scholars of Latin literature in general and not only of Ovid. Under the supervision of the general editor Alessandro Barchiesi, the commentary has the texture of a harmonious whole. This is a remarkable achievement in and of itself, in as much as the project represents the labors of five distinguished Ovidian commentators (Barchiesi himself, Gianpiero Rosati, E. J. Kenney, Jay Reed, and Philip Hardie), two translators (Ludovica Koch and Gioachino Chiarini), and the eminent literary critic Charles Segal, who supplied the general introduction to the series in its first volume. Not to be forgotten is the contribution of Caterina Lazzarini, who compiled the indices that appear at the end of the final volume and will be a welcome tool to many a relieved reader. The completed series is a worthy tribute to Segal and Koch, the dedicatees of its first volume, whose untimely deaths deprived us of even greater contributions.

The final volume of commentary by Philip Hardie (H) is a trove for all who have admired his many contributions to Latin literary scholarship. The contours of the volume follow the now familiar pattern of the earlier books. The text and apparatus are taken from Richard Tarrant's Oxford Classical Text of 2004. As with other volumes in the series, the editor has diverged from that text, with differences duly noted in the introduction (pp. LIX–LXI). H registers 54 instances in which he prints a text different from Tarrant's in Books 13–15, not a very high percentage in 2,629 lines of verse. For the most part these differences amount to relatively insignificant changes in punctuation, or preferences in choice of variants without major interpretative consequences. One such difference in 14.196 is probably a slip, as it is not reflected in the notes or translation. Of the 22 lines bracketed as interpolations in these books by Tarrant, H restores 13, and although there are good grounds for finding Tarrant overly aggressive in such cases, in two instances H may have been better advised to follow his lead.

In 14.645 ff. Ovid describes how Vertumnus disguises himself as a rustic to gain access to Pomona, the object of his unwanted attentions:

tempora saepe gerens faeno religata recenti	645
desectum poterat gramen uersasse uideri;	
saepe manu stimulos rigida portabat, ut illum	
iurares fessos modo disiunxisse iuuenos;	
false data frondator erat uitisque putator;	
induerat scalas lecturum poma putares.	650
miles erat gladio, piscator harundine sumpta.	651
denique per multas aditum sibi saepe figuras	
repperit, ut caperet spectatae gaudia formae.	

Tarrant discusses the passage in an article that appeared in advance of his edition, arguing that line 651 should be bracketed as a “collaborative interpolation,”¹ probably originating in a marginal notation that contained a line remembered from elsewhere. In this case the surviving intertext intertext is Prop. 4.2.27 and 37, although it is entirely possible that the interpolated line is a citation from some lost text. The line is rhetorically weak, without verbal or intellectual point as a conclusion for the six-line period preceding it, and it is contextually out of place as a disguise for Vertumnus in Pomona’s garden. But for H, as for other recent commentators he is following,² the intertext doesn’t call the passage into question, it guarantees it. The same process of thought may be observed in a number of other textual decisions. At 14.817 the parallel at *Trist.* 2.35 vouches for H’s preference for *orbem* here, even though *urbem* suits the context better.

Since textual criticism is not the primary goal of this project or this volume, and because the commentators’ interventions are relatively sparse and leave the interpretation of the poem largely unaffected, there is no need to linger on such points. But they do serve to underscore the principal focus of this volume, which lies in Ovid’s engagement with contemporary and predecessor poets, in both Latin and Greek. And in the 415 pages of H’s commentary, the student and the scholar will find a rich collection of materials in notes that bristle with H’s characteristic panache for teasing out unexpected connections.

A collective verdict on the six volumes of this commentary will require a sustained period of digestion. H’s contribution is clearly a capstone achievement. Readers will appreciate the rich and detailed analyses of

¹ R. J. Tarrant, “The soldier in the garden and other intruders in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*”, *HSCP* 100, 2000, 425-7.

² K. Sara Myers, *Ovid: Metamorphoses, Book XIV*, Cambridge 2009, 651, who in turn follows L. Galasso, “L’edizione di Richard Tarrant delle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio: una discussione”, *MD* 56, 2006, 119-20.

the debate over the arms of Achilles in Book 13, with ample reference to the Homeric intertexts as well as tragedy, both Greek and Roman. Ovid's extensive allusion to the narrative of the *Aeneid* in 13.623-14.608 provides rich material for H's engagement with Ovid's approach to intertextuality. On occasion one might wish, or at least I might wish, for H to be more explicit in signaling how he interprets Ovid's deployment of intertextual alerts. For example, on Ovid's famous four-line digest of the story of Dido and Aeneas at *Met.* 14.78-81, he refers to Sergio Casali's excellent paper on "other voices,"³ but does not himself explicate the negative reading that Ovid encapsulates here. This is not the only occasion on which H refrains from noting how Ovid manipulates the intertextual background to offer commentary on his predecessors. For example, at 13.444 his reluctance to allow for Ovidian editorializing leads him to accept Slater's banal emendation *infesto* in place of the pointed *iniusto* of the paradoxos.

More typical of H's approach are his exemplary treatments of episodes such as Iphis and Anaxarete (14.698-764), which plays out against a complex background of literary influences, ranging from Latin elegy to Hellenistic narrative, much of it lost. Exemplary, too, is H's deployment of the Callimachean intertexts in the final metamorphosis of the poem, the apotheosis of Caesar (15.745-870). H will not be surprised that I sometimes find him pressing the intertextual button too hard, but even some readers less skeptical than I may find the notion of Ovid as Cicero incarnate (p. 621) in the Epilogue (15.871-9) a text too far. Quibbles are the stuff of any reading of an outstanding commentary, and the marginalia that H's volume will generate will be full of them. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Ovid aspired to a broad readership—*ore legar populi*. As H notes, "Ovidio avvicina a sé il *populus*, a differenza di Orazio," and the evidence in the ancient reception teaches us that he achieved this goal. Readers have always responded to the miraculous qualities of the *Metamorphoses*, even when scholars have not. H's final volume in this wonderful series signals that we now live in a period when those two audiences have converged.

PETER E. KNOX
Case Western Reserve University
Peter.Knox@Case.edu

³ "Altre voci nell' 'Eneide' di Ovidio", *MD* 35, 1955, 59-76.

