



---

Ovidian "Correction" of the Biblical Flood?

Author(s): K. F. B. Fletcher

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Classical Philology*, Vol. 105, No. 2 (April 2010), pp. 209-213

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](http://www.uchicago.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/655630>

Accessed: 02/04/2012 07:14

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*.

at Rome [Cambridge, 1979], 63) and J. C. McKeown (*Ovid, "Amores": Text and Prolegomena* [Liverpool, 1987], 37–45). It is perhaps interesting to note that, while the window reference ordinarily involves some contextual point of contact between the text of the alluding poet and those of the intermediate and ultimate sources, neither Jacques nor Brown was able to find any such contextual point of contact between Aratus and Homer or between Vergil and Homer. I would argue, however, that the acrostic was the point of contact. If Jacques was right, as he certainly was, to suggest that Aratus' acrostic was an allusion to Homer's unintentional acrostic, then Vergil needed no motivation to recall Homer's acrostic beyond Aratus' allusion to it.

## OVIDIAN "CORRECTION" OF THE BIBLICAL FLOOD?

In his account of the flood in *Metamorphoses* 1, Ovid catalogues nameless individuals suffering the effects of Jupiter's wrath (*Met.* 1.293–96):

Occupat hic collem, cumba sedet alter adunca  
et ducit remos illic, ubi nuper **ararat**;  
ille supra segetes aut mersae culmina villae  
navigat, hic summa piscem prehendit in ulmo

295

This one occupies a hill, another sits in a curved skiff  
And leads his oars there, where recently he had plowed;  
That one sails over crops or the roof of a submerged farmhouse,  
This one catches fish in the top of an elm.

In these artfully balanced and crafted lines the word *ararat* has drawn the attention of scholars because it is a direct transliteration of the name of the mountain where Noah lands in the Hebrew flood myth. The version in the Septuagint—one of the sources theoretically available to Ovid for this information—is as follows: καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἡ κιβωτὸς ἐν μηνὶ τῷ ἑβδόμῳ, ἑβδόμῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνὸς, ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ Ἀραράτ (*"And the chest settled in the seventh month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, on Mt. Ararat,"* Gen. 8:3).<sup>1</sup> It is worth looking a bit more at the odd form *ararat*.<sup>2</sup> First, the reading *arabat* does appear in the manuscript tradition, but not widely; if *ararat* is an error, it entered the tradition fairly early, and for no obvious reason.<sup>3</sup> If we retain *ararat*—as most editors, including Richard Tarrant, do—then we have to consider the significance of its appearance here.

T. T. B. Ryder, in an article on just this passage, notes that this specific form is unattested in extant Latin literature. The odds, as he says, of this particular form's

I express here my gratitude to Dave Kutzko, Ruth Scodel, and Jay Reed, as well as the editor and her two anonymous referees.

1. West (1997, 493) believes that Ovid was at least indirectly influenced by the Semitic account, though he does not elaborate. He also discusses Greek knowledge of the Near Eastern flood myth more generally (489–93). In West 2004, 249–54, he is more specific in highlighting parallels between Ovid's account and oriental accounts (see especially 254). Ryder (1967, 128) mentions the appearance of the flood narrative in the *Sibylline Oracles* (1.125–282; Ararat appears at line 262), to which Ovid may have had access. On Ovid's use of Genesis, see Speyer 1986, who also discusses the possible ways Ovid could have known about Jewish beliefs (93); Hilhorst (1999) argues conclusively that some Greek (and thus some Roman) authors knew about Noah. For the sources available to a Graeco-Roman author writing about the flood, see Lightfoot 2003, 338–42; West (2004) gives a short overview of sources for the flood myth in Greece and the Near East, with relevant bibliography.

2. Bömer (1969, ad loc.) notes that syncopated forms of *arare* are rare. Cf. Ryder 1967, 126.

3. The primary witness for *arabat*, according to Tarrant (2004), is a conjectured, pre-correction reading of the late-eleventh- or early-twelfth-century Neapolitan MS (his N<sup>ac</sup>).

appearing in another flood account are astronomical, and so he concludes (without going much further):

There can, I think, be only two possible alternative explanations: either Ovid was aware of the play on words and included *ararat* as a learned *jeu d'esprit* in his retelling of a story already well known from Greek literature; or that the poet was in some way divinely inspired to include unwittingly a reference to the sacred version of his story.<sup>4</sup>

Alan Griffin, in an article arguing for Ovid's knowledge of the biblical account of the flood, views the *ararat* situation differently:

There is clearly some Ovidian humour here: the survivor is ploughing the sea where recently he ploughed the soil. . . . But could there also be an allusive reference to Mount Ararat in *ararat*? It seems unlikely. Ovid's Greek source for the Deucalion legend almost certainly named Parnassus as the mountain on which Deucalion's raft came to ground (*Met.* 1.316–17) and an allusive Ovidian reference to the name of a different mountain (*Ararat*) in another version of the story seems pointless.<sup>5</sup>

Because he sees no purpose in Ovid's alluding to Ararat in this way, Griffin presumably takes this word as a coincidence, despite his desire to see Ovid following the Genesis version.<sup>6</sup> While it is true that Ovid follows one of the Greek traditions available to him by having Deucalion land on Parnassus, could he not, at the same time, be pointing out that he knows the Hebrew version but has not followed it?

I suggest that the only explanation for such an unlikely coincidence is Ovidian "correction" of the biblical account. Richard Thomas, one of the first scholars to explore this phenomenon in depth, describes correction as follows: "the poet provides unmistakable indications of his source, then proceeds to offer detail that contradicts or alters that source."<sup>7</sup> While many of Thomas' examples do involve one author's correcting a perceived error in another author, the term as he defines it can also apply to an author's pointing out his awareness of another version that he is not following.

For a reader who knew the Hebrew flood story (from whatever source), the word *ararat* (conspicuous at line end) would function as an "unmistakable indication" that Ovid, too, knew this account. Indeed, "Ararat" would be the best choice to make such knowledge clear; only "Noah" would be more recognizable, though harder to include. In Ovid's version, however, there is no role for Ararat the mountain to play, as Deucalion lands on Parnassus (316–19).<sup>8</sup> The playful reference to this mountain comes instead in a list of unnamed people dealing with the flood (*hic . . . alter . . .*

4. Ryder 1967, 126.

5. Griffin 1992, 44. Griffin alludes here to the use of *arare* meaning "to sail," as at Verg. *Aen.* 2.780 and 3.495, Ov. *Am.* 2.10.33 and *Tr.* 1.2.76 (always at line end).

6. Griffin attempts to show that "The Ovidian parallels to Genesis are detailed and specific, showing similarities of theme, sentiment, motif, emphasis, tone and characterization" (1992, 41). As should be clear, I disagree in terms of what Ovid does with his knowledge of the Pentateuch and rely on the fact that *ararat* is the most obvious marker of this knowledge.

7. Thomas 1986, 185 (see 185–88 more generally on correction in Vergil). Cf. Thomas 1982, 146–54. For correction in Ovid, see, e.g., Boyd 1990; Myers 1994, 104. Both of these instances focus on Ovid's correction of Vergil, though Ovid also treats his Roman elegiac predecessors in a similar way; cf. Reed 1997.

8. On the mountains in versions of the flood myth, see West 2004, 249. Ovid's flood narrative is almost entirely devoid of geographical names; other than Parnassus, he includes only the names in line 313: *separat Aonios Oetaeis Phocis ab arvis*. Study of this line is complicated by multiple readings of the names in it; clearly these Greek geographic terms gave scribes trouble.

*ille . . . hic*). In a narrative centered on Parnassus and what Deucalion will do, Noah is for all intents and purposes just another nameless victim of the flood.

Also suggestive is the possibility of reading the line as *ducit remos illic, ubi nuper Ararat [fuerat]* ("he leads his oars there, where recently Ararat had been"). There would be no real distinction between *ararat* and *Ararat* on the page, so the line is ambiguous. This latter reading is possible in part because of the focus on place (*illic, ubi*), to which Ovid draws attention with the odd phrase *ducit remos*, which appears nowhere in extant Latin before this passage (and only again in *Ov. Pont.* 1.5.40).<sup>9</sup> The oddity of this phrase and the focus on place may be enough to make us think about the line a half second longer—just long enough to catch Ovid's hint.

If we accept the use of *ararat* as proof that Ovid was aware of the Hebrew flood narrative, then it opens the gates to exploring other elements of the *Metamorphoses* flood. One of the most memorable details of the Hebrew flood, of course, is the pairs of animals on the ark as a way of explaining how animals could survive the flood. Ovid is unique among Greek and Roman authors in explaining the same thing (in a different way), possibly as a correction of the admittedly odd two-by-two story.<sup>10</sup> According to the (pseudo-) scientific account at *Metamorphoses* 1.416–22, the earth itself creates all the other animals on its own, remaking some of the old ones as well as producing new ones (434–37).<sup>11</sup> Ovid thus accounts for the same things as the Hebrew version: how human beings and animals can exist after the flood.

Other details might suggest knowledge of the Pentateuch specifically: the rainbow appears at the beginning of Ovid's flood and Deucalion continues to fear rain, while in the Bible the rainbow is a mark of the flood's end and the covenant (*Met.* 1.270–71, 356–57; *Gen.* 9:8–17);<sup>12</sup> Ovid's bird dies with tired wings at the culmination of the flood while the dove's finding dry land marks the end of the biblical flood (*Met.* 1.307–8; *Gen.* 8:6–12);<sup>13</sup> Deucalion and Pyrrha are pious (seemingly first in Ovid), as is Noah (*Met.* 1.1.322–23, 327; *Gen.* 6:9);<sup>14</sup> finally, Deucalion and Pyrrha turn backward when throwing the stones of their "great mother," while Shem and Japheth turn backward to avoid seeing their father's nakedness (*Met.* 1.1.381–83, 394, 398–99; *Gen.* 9:23).<sup>15</sup> Not all of the above need be considered corrections, but in general they

9. The focus on place derives also from the balance of pronouns in these four lines. If we ignore—for a moment—the *alter* of line 293, there is the chiasmic pattern *hic . . . illic . . . ille . . . hic*, with each description so introduced receiving one line. The *illic* alone does not refer to a person, thus emphasizing a place. The person of that clause is the *alter*, or second possibility, Deucalion's other: Noah.

10. On Lucian *Syr. D.* 12, which has the two-by-two version, Lightfoot (2003, 346) observes: "The animals are quite absent from other classical versions; this is the clearest evidence of the influence of Near Eastern tradition on Lucian's account." Cf. Hilhorst 1999, 62. If such is the case, then Ovid's taking the time to explain the postdiluvian existence of animals is another marker of correction.

11. On the scientific nature of Ovid's creation accounts of the universe and of humans see, e.g., Myers 1994, 43–44. The inclusion of the animals also fits Ovid's tendency to follow ideas to their logical—and often ridiculous—conclusion.

12. Barchiesi (2005, ad 1.270–74) notes this difference in uses of the rainbow.

13. West (2004, 252) notes the similarity in phrasing regarding birds in Ovid, *Gilgamesh* (11.148), and *Genesis*.

14. Lucian (*Syr. D.* 12) also calls Deucalion pious and prudent (he is saved εὐβουλῆς τε καὶ τοῦ εὐσεβέος εἶνκα), but his account is clearly dependent upon Semitic tradition and significantly later than Ovid. See Lightfoot 2003, 345, on the piety of the flood's survivor. The added focus on Pyrrha may be Roman; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6.41, Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.6. The focus on them as a couple may be part of the correction, though we need not assume with Griffin (1992, 55) that Ovid is "less sexist than the author of *Genesis*."

15. For another attempt to outline the similarities between the two accounts, see Griffin (1992, 41–44), who focuses on much broader criteria, as when he suggests that Ovid knew the *Genesis* account because

show Ovid constructing a narrative meant to acknowledge specific aspects of the Genesis flood account.

Could Ovid have read the Pentateuch? It is impossible to prove, but it is not a priori unlikely that Ovid (and at least some of his readers) could have gotten his hands on what is a type of Alexandrian literature. And, while "Roman writers either treated Jews with indifference or regarded them with scorn and disdain,"<sup>16</sup> Ovid exhibits more than average interest, for example, in the Sabbath (the *actio* for which happens to be at Gen. 2:1–3). Ovid refers to the Sabbath three times in his amatory poetry, pairing it with days of note on the Roman calendar (*Ars am.* 1.413–16; *Rem. am.* 219–20) and other foreign festivals (the Adonia; *Ars am.* 1.75–76), suggesting that he considered the Sabbath as on par with other foreign rituals that he had treated elsewhere. Even more suggestive, however, is his advice at *Remedia Amoris* 219–20 not to let anything delay you from traveling, including the Sabbath, thus showing an awareness of travel restrictions on the Sabbath.<sup>17</sup> While none of these references prove that Ovid knew the Bible, they add circumstantial weight to the possibility.<sup>18</sup> And, if Ovid could have known the Pentateuch, then so, too, could some of his readers. After all, not all allusions are meant for all readers.<sup>19</sup>

Ultimately, such correction by Ovid of a Roman predecessor, or an Alexandrian poet, would not surprise us. Should it surprise us if Ovid uncovered other accounts of the flood, including foreign ones, while doing his research for *Metamorphoses* 1? My Ovid is an author who read anything and everything he could get his hands on, and where better to show off his knowledge of Jewish legend than in the *Metamorphoses*, where he collects so many myths from so many locations?

K. F. B. FLETCHER

Louisiana State University

---

he, too, has the floodwater come from the sky and the rivers (43). Ryder (1967, 128), however, says "apart from the word under discussion [i.e., *ararat*] there is no evidence in Ovid's account of the flood that he had read the Hebrew version. . . . The possibility of a learned joke must indeed be exceedingly remote." Throwing something behind the back also appears in Hes. *Theog.* 180–82, where Kronos throws Ouranos' genitals behind his back. For parallels, see West 1966, ad loc.

16. Gruen 2004, 52, in the best recent account of Roman views of the Jews (15–53).

17. Tibullus (1.3.17–18) also mentions the Sabbath (*Saturni dies*) as a reason not to travel (which he mentions along with a festival of Isis at 23–32). Augustus seems to have known about dietary restrictions on the Sabbath (Suet. *Aug.* 76.2). Other Roman references to the Sabbath include Pers. 5.179–84; Juv. 6.157–60; Sen. *Ep.* 95.47; Plin. *HN* 31.2.18.

18. It is also possible—though I consider it less likely—that Ovid came by this information from other sources, like Berossus (*FGrH* 680 F4, which discusses the flood but does not name Ararat), or even by word of mouth. Cf. n. 1 above.

19. Cf. Koenen (1976), who shows how Tib. 1. 7 depends on Delia's and (more importantly) Messalla's knowledge of the cult of Isis. It would also seem likely that the Egyptian elements in Alexandrian poetry were not intended for Greeks on the mainland. For the creation of a text's meaning as being partially dependent on the reader's knowledge, see Edmunds 2001, esp. 46–47: "The intertextual dimension of a Roman poem is, then, in the first place historical information that the reader may or may not possess at the time of the first reading, and intertextuality thus, as said, discriminates between one reader and another."

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Barchiesi, A., ed. 2005. *Ovidio: "Metamorfosi," Volume I (Libri I–II)*. Trans. L. Koch. Milan.  
 Bömer, F., ed. 1969. *P. Ovidius Naso: "Metamorphosen," Buch I–III*. Heidelberg.  
 Boyd, B. W. 1990. *Non hortamine longo*: Ovidian "Correction" of Virgil. *AJP* 111: 82–85.  
 Edmunds, L. 2001. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore.

- Griffin, A. 1992. Ovid's Universal Flood. *Hermathena* 152: 39–58.
- Gruen, E. 2004. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Hilhorst, A. 1999. The Noah Story: Was It Known to the Greeks? In *Interpretations of the Flood*, ed. F. G. Martínez and G. P. Luttikhuisen, 56–65. Leipzig.
- Koenen, L. 1976. Egyptian Influence in Tibullus. *ICS* 1: 127–59.
- Lightfoot, J., ed. and trans. 2003. *Lucian: "On the Syrian Goddess."* Oxford.
- Myers, K. S. 1994. *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the "Metamorphoses."* Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Reed, J. D. 1997. Ovid's Elegy on Tibullus and Its Models. *CP* 92: 260–69.
- Ryder, T. T. B. 1967. Ovid, the Flood, and Ararat. *G&R* 14: 126–29.
- Speyer, W. 1986. Spuren der "Genesis" in Ovids Metamorphosen? In *Kontinuität und Wandel: Lateinische Poesie von Naevius bis Baudelaire; Franco Munari zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. F. Wagner et al., 90–99. Hildesheim.
- Tarrant, R. J., ed. 2004. *P. Ovidius Nasonis "Metamorphoses."* Oxford.
- Thomas, R. 1982. Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (64.1–18). *AJP* 103: 144–64.
- . 1986. Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference. *HSCP* 90: 171–98.
- West, M. L., ed. 1966. *Hesiod: "Theogony."* Edition with prolegomena and commentary. Oxford.
- . 1997. *The East Face of Helicon*. Oxford.
- . 2004. The Flood Myth in Ovid, Lucian and Nonnus. In *Mitos en la literatura griega helenística e imperial*, ed. J. A. López Férez, 245–59. Madrid.

#### NOTES ON MARCUS ANTONIUS POLEMO *DECLAMATIONS* 1.15–17 and 2.21

Among the few preserved writings of the famous second-century C.E. sophist Marcus Antonius Polemo is a pair of declamations in which the fathers of two Athenians killed in the battle of Marathon compete for the right to deliver the state funeral oration over the dead.<sup>1</sup> The premise is a fictitious law: "there being a law at Athens that the father of the man who died most bravely in a war delivers the funeral oration" (νόμου ὄντος Ἀθηναίων τοῦ ἄριστα ἀποθανόντος ἐν πολέμῳ τὸν πατέρα λέγειν τὸν ἐπιτάφιον).<sup>2</sup> In *Declamation* 1, Euphronion, the father of Cynegirus, argues that he deserves to deliver the speech because his son died when the Persians whose ship he was trying to prevent from fleeing the battle cut off his hands. In *Declamation* 2, the unnamed father of the polemarch Callimachus argues that, in addition to considerations of his son's superior rank, he is entitled to deliver the speech because his son died after being shot by so many arrows that his corpse remained standing. This note offers a new interpretation of the argument about rank and privilege in *Declamation* 1.15–17, which I argue has been misunderstood by previous translators and commentators.<sup>3</sup> It will help clarify not only the argument of this section, but also the argument intended to counter it in *Declamation* 2.21.

In *Declamation* 1.14–17, the father of Cynegirus argues that the father of Callimachus has no right to deliver the funeral speech merely on the basis of his son's

I wish to thank Jeffrey Beneker, Jason Osborne, Joshua D. Sosin, and the editor and anonymous readers of *CP* for their helpful suggestions.

1. On Polemo's life and writings, see Reader 1996, 7–46.

2. Greek text from Reader 1996, 98. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

3. Possinus 1637; Orellius 1819; and Reader 1996, 203–6. I was not able to see Possinus' edition and am dependent on Orellius' reprinting of his paraphrase.