

Ovidiana

Autor(en): **Watt, W.S.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica**

Band (Jahr): **52 (1995)**

Heft 2

PDF erstellt am: **21.09.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-40568>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

Ovidiana

By W. S. Watt, Aberdeen, Scotland

I. *Heroides*¹

4.85f. (Phaedra to Hippolytus)

*tu modo duritiam siluis depone iugosis:
non sum materia digna perire tua.*

If *materia* is sound, it must mean *indoles*, ‘character’, ‘disposition’, carrying on *duritiam* (‘harshness’) in the previous line; this is certainly the sense which is required (‘I do not deserve to die because of your character’). Whether *materia* can have this sense has been justly doubted, all the more so because *materia* can so easily be confused with what would be the *mot juste* in the context, viz. *natura*; for this confusion cf. Quint. *Inst.* 7.1.20, Plin. *Nat.* 7.65, Sen. *Nat.* 2.52.1.

9.41f. (Deianira to Hercules)

*aucupor infelix incertae murmura famae,
speque timor dubia spesque timore cadit.*

Dubia was apparently first queried by W. Camps, *ClRev* 4 (1954) 206: “Deianira’s husband Hercules is away, and she is anxious both about his safety and about his fidelity. She listens eagerly, she says, to catch each breath of rumour, though it keeps changing, and alternately fear gives place to hope in her heart, and then hope again to fear. To the expression of this idea the epithet *dubia*, attached to *spe*, does not contribute anything”; he proceeds to propose *dubiae*, dative referring to Deianira. Another idea was suggested by J. B. Hall in *ICS* 15 (1990) 276: “If hope is wavering, it will not bring down fear ...; fear will only be brought down by hope if fear is wavering. ... Logic will be restored if *dubius* is written for *dubia*.” I do not believe that any form of *dubius* is appropriate: *dubia* is a simple corruption of *subi*<*t*>*a*²; the changes of rumour are reflected in her rapid changes of mood (with *timore* supply *subito*). For the confusion of initial *s* and *d* cf. Sen., *Herc. O.* 536 *datum/satum*; *Benef.* 4.12.1

1 The following modern editions are referred to: A. Palmer (Oxford 1898); G. Showerman, revised by G. P. Goold (Loeb edition, London 1977). – I am very grateful to Professor E. J. Kenney for commenting on an earlier version of the notes in Section I.

2 So too at *Met.* 14.508 *dubiarum* is (as Heinsius realized) a corruption of *subitarum*; cf. Tac., *Agr.* 18.4 *subitis* / *dubiis*.

dicimus/scimus; *Dial.* 11.7.2 *somnos/domos*; other instances are given in Housman's note on *Manil.* 1.355 (*dign-/sign-*); see also my note on 21.157ff. below (*deque/saepe*).

9.105ff. (Deianira to Hercules)

*i nunc, tolle animos et fortia gesta recense:
quod tu non esses iure uir illa fuit;
qua tanto minor es quanto te, maxime rerum,
quam quos uicisti uincere maius erat.*

Deianira reproaches Hercules with having been conquered by Omphale.

In 106 the first hand of P wrote *quem*, which is certainly a mistake, presumably for the vulgate *quod*; but with *quod* the subjunctive *esses* is unintelligible. It remains unintelligible if one reads *quo*, as do Palmer (who calls the subjunctive 'descriptive', whatever that may be) and Showerman/Goold, who translate 'she has proved herself a man by a right you could not urge'. But that sense (at least if one substitutes 'cannot urge' for 'could not urge') is good, and would be elucidated by the following couplet: Hercules is as much inferior to Omphale as it was a greater achievement to vanquish Hercules than to vanquish those whom Hercules vanquished. All that is necessary is to change the impossible *esses* to *ipse es*. "Esse and *ipse* are so often interchanged that I have ceased to note examples", says Housman (*Classical Papers* 649), who proceeds to note more than a score, including *Her.* 20.50 and 124. Elision at this point in the pentameter is not allowed (Housman *ib.* 1119), but for the prodelision of *es* Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Cambridge 1951) 87, n. 1, cites Prop. 3.23.12.

11.45f. (Canace to Macareus)

*iam nouiens erat orta soror pulcherrima Phoebi,
nonaque Luciferos luna mouebat equos.*

The time comes for Canace to give birth.

The context demands not 'a ninth' but 'a tenth' moon; hence the vulgate correction of *nonaque* (P) to *denaque*. But *denaque* is impossible because, as Housman in his note on *Manil.* 4.451 explained, *dena luna* would mean not 'a tenth moon' but 'ten moons'. Housman tentatively emended *nonaque* to *et noua*; this is approved of by G. P. Goold (*Gnomon* 46, 1974, 478), who (in order to rule out Bentley's conjecture *pronaque* by establishing the exact sense of *mouebat equos*) adduces *Met.* 14.228 *proxima post nonam cum sese Aurora mouebat*. That passage suggests *proxima* as a possible emendation in ours; if it were corrupted, as it very frequently is (see Housman's note on *Manil.* 5.218), to *prima*, then *nonaque* might have been due to a deliberate attempt to correct both sense and metre.

13.153f., 157f. (Laodamia to Protesilaus)

*illi blanditias, illi tibi debita uerba
dicimus, amplexus accipit illa meos. ...
hanc specto, teneoque sinu pro coniuge uero,
et, tamquam possit uerba referre, queror.*

Laodamia has a waxen image of her absent husband to remind her of him.

Queror comes as a surprise after the caresses and embraces of 153f.; should it be *loquor*? The two words are variants at 14.91 and at *Met.* 1.637, 14.280, Martial 3.80.1; see also my note on *Met.* 9.303f. below. The process of corruption is well illustrated by Cic., *Verr.* 5.40 *loqueretur*>*queretur*>*quereretur*.

15.5ff. (Sappho to Phaon)

*forsitan et quare mea sint alterna requiras
carmina, cum lyricis sim magis apta modis.
flendus amor meus est: elegi quoque flebile carmen;
non facit ad lacrimas barbitos ulla meas.*

Sappho's reason for writing in elegiac, instead of her usual lyric, verse.

The paradosis is *elegi*, and this should certainly be retained (not altered to some form of *elegia*) because *elegi* is the only word which the elegists themselves use for elegiac verses (for them *Elegia* is always the personification of the *genre*). But *quoque* is meaningless; as Baehrens saw, it is an intrusion designed to repair the metre after the loss of *sunt* before *flebile*. This stopgap *quoque* is much commoner than is sometimes realized; see my note on *Met.* 6.26f. below.

16.213f. (Paris to Helen)

*quid tamen hoc refert si te tenet ortus ab illis?
cogitur huic domui Iuppiter esse socer.*

Paris has just contrasted his own glorious ancestors with those of Menelaus, scandalous figures like Atreus, Pelops, Tantalus. But what does this freedom from scandal matter to him if Menelaus is still Helen's husband? On the credit side Menelaus can claim Jupiter as his father-in-law.

Cogitur is quite devoid of meaning and not easy to replace. Perhaps *creditur*.

17.79f. (Helen to Paris)

*et modo suspiras, modo pocula proxima nobis
sumis, quaque bibi, tu quoque parte bibis.*

Pocula proxima nobis is apparently always taken as 'the cup nearest me'.

But there was only one cup, and Paris drinks from it immediately after (*proxima* for *proximus*) Helen. This is clear from *Amor.* 1.4.31f. *quae tu reddideris ego primus pocula sumam, / et, qua tu biberis, hac ego parte bibam.* Even Bentley must have misunderstood, because instead of *nobis* he wanted *nostris*, which is impossible on the correct interpretation of the passage.

19.11f. (Hero to Leander)

*aut fora uos retinent aut unctae dona palaestrae,
flectitis aut freno colla sequacis equi.*

Hero lists male occupations from which she is excluded.

Dona palaestrae, ‘the gifts of the wrestling-school’, is a totally unconvincing phrase, justifiably queried by Heinsius. For *dona* I suggest *dura*, ‘hard toils’; for this neuter plural see *ThLL* V 1. 2307.19ff. At *Sil.* 3.597 I believe that *donabit* is a corruption of *durabit*.

19.71f. (Hero to Leander)

*est mare, confiteor, nondum tractabile nanti,
nocte sed hesterna lenior aura fuit.*

Nondum has aroused suspicion for two reasons: (a) in P it is written over an erasure, (b) the pentameter would lead us to expect a reference not to the future but to the past. Hence Bentley proposed *non nunc*, which has been adopted by Showerman/Goold. Equally possible, and perhaps preferable, would be *non iam*.

19.115f. (Hero to Leander)

*o utinam uenias, aut ut uentusue paterue
causaque sit certe femina nulla morae.*

The latest discussion of this couplet is that of E. Courtney in *SOSlo* 64 (1989) 126; in order to eliminate *ut* in the sense of *utinam* he proposes to replace it with *heu*. Perhaps a second *o* would be preferable.

20.13f. (Acontius to Cydippe)

*nunc quoque idem timeo, sed idem tamen acrius illud
adsumpsit uires auctaque flamma mora est.*

This couplet also has been discussed by Courtney (l.c.): “*timeo* makes no sense; there must once have stood there a verb meaning ‘desire’, and accordingly Bentley suggests *cupio*, Palmer *studeo* – neither plausibly, but both better than Housman with his $\langle auemus \rangle$ *idem [timeo]*”. Courtney himself adds *uoueo*. I think that *tento* or *tempto* would be preferable. Acontius is still *trying*

to get Cydippe to promise to marry him, as he was when he threw the apple towards her; cf. *7 coniugium pactamque fidem ... posco* and 33f. Much the same corruption, of *tenet* to *timet*, has probably occurred at *Met.* 2.691 and 3.642; the opposite corruption, of *tim-* to *ten-*, has occurred at *Fast.* 5.46 and at *Stat., Silu.* 5.2.74.

20.53f. (Acontius to Cydippe)

*aut esses formosa minus, peterere modeste:
audaces facie cogimur esse tua.*

Aut is rejected on good grounds by S. J. Heyworth (*Mnemosyne* 37, 1984, 105ff.), who proposes to replace *aut esses* with *esses si* or *esses sed* or *sin esses*; none of these has any special attraction. I suggest *nata esses* (cf. *Amor.* 2.14.19 *nasci formosa*); *au* for *na* is a very easy slip, especially when the preceding line begins with *ut* and the following one with *aud-*.

21.19f. (Cydippe to Acontius)

*ante fores sedet haec, quid agamque rogantibus intus,
ut possim tuto scribere, 'dormit' ait.*

This is the traditional punctuation. In *ClQu* 43 (1993) 261 P. A. M. Thompson proposes to punctuate:

*quid agamque rogantibus (intus
ut possim tuto scribere) 'dormit' ait.*

The correct punctuation, I think, is

*quid agamque rogantibus 'intus',
ut possim tuto scribere, 'dormit' ait.*

For Ovidian hyperbata see Housman, *Classical Papers* 140, 415ff.

21.157ff. (Cydippe to Acontius)

*ter mihi iam ueniens positas Hymenaeus ad aras
fugit et a thalami limine terga dedit,
uixque manu pigra totiens infusa resurgunt
lumina, uix moto concutit igne faces;
saepe coronatis stillant unguenta capillis
et trahitur multo splendida palla croco.*

158 a (cf. *Fast.* 6.481) Ehwald: *e π* 160 *concutit* Burman: *corripit π*

Cydippe's wedding has thrice been postponed because of her illness.

In 161 *saepe* has justifiably been suspected because it does not go at all well with *stillant* and because it appears to clash with *ter* (157). It is easy to

emend it to *deque* (*stillare de* occurs at *Met.* 1.112 and 2.364); for the confusion of initial *d* and *s* see my note on 9.41f. above.

21.165ff. (Cydippe to Acontius)

*proicit ipse sua deductas fronte coronas,
spissaque de nitidis tergit amoma comis;
et pudet in tristi laetum consurgere turba.*

Because of the gloom caused by Cydippe's illness Hymenaeus realizes that his presence is inappropriate.

It is impossible to attach any clear meaning to *consurgere*, 'rise', and Burman's *consistere*, 'hold his ground', is not a great improvement. I suggest <os> *ostendere*; the confusion of *d* and *g* is not uncommon, and an unfortunate recollection of *resurgunt* in 159 may have played a part in the corruption.

21.193ff. (Cydippe to Acontius)

*iam quoque nescioquid de te sensisse uidetur;
nam lacrimae causa saepe latente cadunt,
et minus audacter blanditur et oscula rara
†accipit† et timido me uocat ore suam.*

Cydippe describes to Acontius his rival's half-hearted wooing of her.

Since the context demands not 'receives' but 'gives' few kisses, *accipit* must be wrong. The available conjectures are *admouet*, *appetit*, *applicat*, *arripit*; these are reviewed (and another one, *eripit*, added) by P. A. M. Thompson (l.c. 263f.). I suggest that the true emendation is *occupat*, 'appropriates to himself'; cf. *Stat.*, *Ach.* 1.575 (of Achilles kissing Deidamia) *occupat ora canentis*.

21.203ff. (Cydippe to Acontius)

*ei mihi, quod gaudes et me iuuat ista uoluptas!
ei mihi, quod sensus sum tibi fassa meos!
205 †at mihi lingua foret† tu nostra iustius ira,
qui mihi tendebas retia, dignus eras.*

In 203 *me* (for *te*) is the conjecture of P. A. M. Thompson (l.c. 265), which enables us to retain *ista uoluptas* instead of altering it to *illa uoluntas* or *illa simultas* (cf. E. J. Kenney, *ClQu* 29, 1979, 421).

As handed down, these four lines begin *si mihi, si mihi, at mihi, qui mihi*. In 203 and 204 *mihi* is certain (as is Gronovius's correction of *si* to *ei*); *mihi* is also certain in 206, but in 205 it may well be the result of assimilation to the other three. Most attempts at emending 205 (and there have been many) have taken the form of importing a conditional clause; the easiest way of doing so is

to write *nisi* (\acute{n}) for *mihi* (\acute{m}). I therefore suggest *at nisi lenta forem* (*forem* is due to Gronovius), comparing 17.249f. *tu fore tam iusta lentum Menelaum in ira / ... putas?* For *lentus* used of *ira* itself see 3.22 and *ThLL* VII 2.1164.54.

21.227f. (Cydippe to Acontius)

*sed tamen aspiceres uellem, uelut ipse rogabas:
et discas sponsae languida membra tuae.*

uelut Francius: *prout* π

For the corrupt *et discas* either Bentley's *aspicias* or Ehwald's *adspiceres* is worthy of consideration. A more pointed sense, I suggest, would be obtained from *des*⟨*pi*⟩*cias*, which would carry on the theme of 221–226 ('if you saw me now, you would not want to marry me'). For the loss of medial *pi* (*et* being a consequential insertion to repair the metre) cf. Quint., *Decl. mai.*, 13.11 (p. 277.6 H.), where the loss of *pi* has reduced *dispicite* to *discite*.

II. Amores

3.7.55f. †*sed, puto, non blanda*† *non optima perdidit in me
oscula, non omni sollicitauit ope?*

At least half-a-dozen attempts have been made to heal the first half of the hexameter; none has won much favour. It seems most probable that the couplet consists of three short questions, each introduced by *non*. In that case parenthetic *puto*, which cannot stand in a question, must be eliminated; in my view it has been intruded because of an unfortunate recollection of line 2 *at, puto, non uotis saepe petita meis!* (which likewise cannot be a question, although it has often been taken as such). To fill the gap we require a main verb parallel to *perdidit* and *sollicitauit*; I suggest *sed non blanda* ⟨*fuit*⟩?

A clear instance of *puto* inserted to repair the loss of another word in the line will be found at *Met.* 15.497; see my note on *Met.* 6.26f. below.

III. Ars Amatoria

3.269 *pallida purpureis tangat sua corpora uirgis.*

A pale girl should offset her pallor by wearing clothes with bright purple stripes.

Modern editors generally retain the paradosis *tangat*, although it is not obviously the most appropriate word for the sense which is required. The alternative *spargat* is better (it could have lost its initial *s* by haplography after *purpureus*), but I suggest that the *mot juste* is *pingat*, the corruption being due to the very common *p/t* interchange.

3.287f. *est quae peruerso distorqueat ora cachinno;
cum risu laeta est altera, flere putes.*

Risu laeta, 'joyful in her laughter', is not a very convincing phrase, and the various substitutes for *laeta* listed by the editors are palaeographically hardly credible. Much more credible would be *in risu tota est*; this use of *totus* is found at *Fast.* 6.251 *in prece totus eram* and at *Met.* 6.586 (= 13.546) *poenaeque in imagine tota est*.

3.725f. *ecce, redit Cephalus siluis, Cyllenia proles,
oraque fontana feruida pulsata aqua.*

The pentameter is taken to mean that he dashed spring water over his glowing cheeks. My suspicion of *pulsata* is increased by the occurrence of *pulsantur* in 722; I would read *mulsit*, and take the meaning to be that he assuaged his thirst; *ora mulcere* = *ora leuare*, as at *Rem.* 230 *arida nec sitiens ora leuabis aqua*.

3.761ff. *aptius est deceatque magis potare puellas
(cum Veneris puero non male, Bacche, facis),
dummodo qua patiens caput est, animusque pedesque
constant, nec quae sunt singula bina uides.*

Drinking can be more becoming for girls than eating, but only within due limits.

In the text given above I have put 762 in parenthesis so as to link 763f. with 761. I have also introduced two conjectures:

- (a) In 763 *dummodo* for *hoc quoque*, which is quite unintelligible. For the interchange of *modo* and *quoque* see Housman, *Classical Papers* 514 (and add *Met.* 1.361). The corruption of *dum* to *hoc* is not inconceivable; initial *d* and *h* are confused at *Sen., Ben.* 7.19.2 (*habeat/debeat*), *Epp.* 90.18 (*durum/horum*). *Dummodo* without a verb expressed occurs at *Amor.* 1.6.47 and 2.16.20; *Fast.* 5.242.
- (b) In 764 *uides* for *uide*. The effects of drunkenness are then conveyed, as they should be, in three parallel clauses (the *-que* after *animus* is connective, not prospective).

IV. *Metamorphoses*³

2.482f. *neue preces animos et uerba precantia flectant,
posse loqui eripitur.*

³ The following modern editions are referred to: H. Magnus (Berlin 1914); F. Bömer, 7 vols. (Heidelberg 1969–1986); F. J. Miller, revised by G. P. Goold (Loeb edition, London 1984).

Juno robs Callisto of the power of speech, so that she should not be able to appeal to Jupiter for help.

To eliminate ‘the disgusting tautology’ of *preces* followed by *uerba precantia*, D. R. Shackleton Bailey (*Phoenix* 35, 1981, 332) would change *precantia* to *querentia*; other conjectures are *potentia* and *rogantia*. However, *uerba precantia* occurs three times elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses* (each time in this metrical position), and three times in other works of Ovid; so it may be *preces* that is at fault (due to erroneous anticipation of *precantia*). One might think of *querela*, adducing 486 *adsiduoque suos gemitu testata dolores*.

2.562ff. *pro quo mihi gratia talis
redditur, ut dicar tutela pulsa Mineruae
et ponar post noctis auem.*

The crow complains of being supplanted by the owl as a protégée of Minerva.

Dicar is interpreted either as ‘I hear people say’, which is ridiculous in the context, or as ‘I am sentenced’ (by Minerva), which is a strange use of *dicere* not supported by *Trist.* 3.14.9 *est fuga dicta mihi*. Perhaps it should be *laedar* (*dicar* being an erroneous expansion of *dar*, after the loss of *le*); *laedere* is a word of which Ovid is exceptionally fond.

Alternatively, *uincar*, ‘defeated by the owl’; for the enmity between the two birds see Bömer’s note. Initial *u* and *d* are confused at *Sen.*, *Phoen.* 297 (*diris/uiris*) and *Med.* 718 (*dirus/uirus*); *Sil.* 9.600 (*ductor/uictor*).

2.576f. *fugio densumque relinquo
litus et in molli nequiquam lassor harena.*

Bömer notes that elsewhere the reflexive use of *lassor* is confined to the perfect stem. Should we read *luctor*? Both verbs are Ovidian.

3.592ff. *mox ego, ne scopulis haererem semper in isdem,
addidici regimen dextra moderante carinae
flectere et Oleniae sidus pluuiiale Capellae
Taygetenque Hyadasque oculis Arctonque notau
uentorumque domos et portus puppibus aptos.*

Acoetes learns the art of navigation.

For *notau* I should read *notare*, parallel to *flectere*.

6.26f. *Pallas anum simulat falsosque in tempora canos
addit et infirmos baculo quoque sustinet artus.*

Baculo quoque has been justly suspected; among conjectures are *baculo quos* and *baculum quod*. I think that *quoque* is an insertion to fill the gap left by

the loss of a small word before *sustinet*; perhaps (as Professor Delz has suggested to me) *male*, a word of which, in its various senses, Ovid is extremely fond (its omission could be explained by the similarity of the endings of *baculo* and *male*).

This stopgap *quoque* is found elsewhere in the poem (see also my note on *Her.* 15.5ff. above):

12.369 *fraxineam misit contentis uiribus hastam,*

where *contentis uiribus* is due to Heinsius. The paradosis is *mentis quoque uiribus*, which has usually been adopted, incredible though it is. After the loss of the *con*-symbol the gap was filled with *quoque* and *tentis* was changed to *mentis*.

12.545 *ille quidem maiora fide (di!) gessit.*

Here *di* likewise is due to Heinsius. In most manuscripts it has been lost after *fide* and replaced with *quoque*.

15.364 *i quoque, delectos mactatos obrue tauros.*

Here too *quoque* may be a space-filler, but there is no agreed solution of the problems posed by the tradition. It is also possible that *quoque* is a mistake for *modo* (see my note on *Ars* 761ff. above).

15.497ff. *fando aliquem Hippolytum uestras si contigit aures*
 / ... / occubuisse neci.

Here *si* is a minor variant; the paradosis is *quoque*, inserted to fill the gap left by the absorption of *si* in *uestras* (so J. P. Postgate, *Journ. Philol.* 22, 1894, 146). A rival stopgap, found in a few manuscripts, is *puto* (see my note on *Amor.* 3.7.55f. above), which has been wrongly adopted by some editors.

Another instance is *Trist.* 1.2.63f. *si quam commerui poenam me pendere uultis, / culpa mea est ipso iudice morte minor.* Here *commerui* (Heinsius' conjecture) lost its first three letters after *quam*, and the loss was repaired by the insertion of *quoque* (*si quoque quam merui* is the paradosis).

6.537ff. *omnia turbasti: paelex ego facta sororis,*
 tu geminus coniunx, hostis mihi debita poena.
 quin animam hanc, ne quod facinus tibi, perfide, restet,
 eripis?

Philomela addresses Tereus.

In the latter half of 538 most editors accept the paradosis, but it yields no satisfactory sense. Bömer records 8 attempts to emend it; each of the four words has been altered to something else, most often *poena* to *Procne*. I think that the trouble lies in *hostis*, which I would replace not with *non haec* (so some dett.) but with *mors est*, which gives an excellent connection with what follows.

6.581f. *euoluit uestes saeui matrona tyranni
fortunaequae suae carmen miserabile legit.*

Procne reads the message woven by Philomela.

Both *fortunaequae* and *carmen* were emended long ago (in some dett.) to *germana* and *fatum* respectively; these emendations were again made by Housman (in Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*), and are adopted by Miller/Goold. A question remains about the origin of *carmen*; I suggest that it is a misguided attempt to make a word out of *german*, a marginal note intended to correct *fortunaequae* to *germana*.

7.574ff. *corpora deuoluunt in humum fugiuntque penates
quisque suos, sua cuique domus funesta uidetur,
et, quia causa latet, locus est in crimine paruus.
semianimes errare uiis, dum stare ualebant,
adspiceres, flentes alios terraque iacentes.*

The plague of Aegina.

The latest discussion of this passage is that of R. J. Tarrant (*ClPh* 77, 1982, 358), who is inclined to excise 576. "If there is any hope for 576", he says "it lies in ending a sentence with *crimine* (*locus est in crimine* = 'the place gets the blame') and starting a new one with the last word in the line. Among modern editors only Goold takes this step, adopting Korn's *partim*, impossible for Ovid (he uses *partim* only in pairs and never of persons). Heinsius' *notis* is neater and is based on a manuscript variant (*notus*); if 576 is to be retained, this is the way to do it." I find it difficult to accept *notis* (with *uiis*) because the emphasis which the word derives from its position seems misplaced. Korn's *partim*, on the other hand, supplies a subject for the infinitive *errare* which balances *alios* in 578; the same function would be fulfilled by Sedlmayer's *multos* or (and I suggest that this is the best solution) by *paucos* (only a few can stand on their feet); *paruus* and *paucus* are variants at *Pont.* 3.1.60 and at *Mart.* 7.49.1.

With this reading I should accept the line as genuine: *locus est in crimine* reminds one of Hor., *Epp.* 1.14.12f. *uterque locum immeritum causatur inique:
/ in causa est animus.*

9.37f. *et modo ceruicem, modo crura micantia captat
aut captare putes, omnique a parte lacessit.*

The river Achelous tells of his struggle with Hercules.

D. R. Shackleton Bailey (*Phoenix* 35, 1981, 333), objecting to the various senses which have been given to *micantia*, would replace it with *modo ilia*. Perhaps we should rather look for another epithet of *crura*, e.g. *madentia*, an attribute of a river being applied to the personified Achelous; so at Sidon.,

Carm. 2.335ff. the personified Tiber has a chin which drips with water and a belly which is wet (*madidam aluum*), *ib.* 22.46 the personified Ganges has *bracchia roscida*, and *ib.* 7.26 the Nymphs are *umentes*.

9.303f. *moturaque duros*
uerba queror silices.

All editors retain *uerba queror*, an unexampled use of the verb (Bömer finds a parallel in *Prop.* 1.5.17 only by misconstruing that passage). The variant *loquor* should be adopted; for the confusion of the two see my note on *Her.* 13.158 above.

9.507f. *at non Aeolidae thalamos timuere sororum.*
unde sed hos noui? cur haec exempla parauit?

Byblis quotes the children of Aeolus as a precedent for incest.

There is no obvious point in Byblis asking herself about the source of her own knowledge of the Aeolidae. I suggest that *unde* means 'from what motive', almost a synonym of *cur*, and that in place of *noui* we want *moui*, 'brought up', 'brought into the discussion', a meaning of *mouere* for which *OLD* (sense 18) adduces *Pont.* 2.2.56. For the *moui/noui* variation cf. *Fast.* 2.490 and 6.760.

10.224ff. *ante fores horum stabat Iouis Hospitis ara*
†inlugubris sceleris†, quam si quis sanguine tinctam
aduena uidisset, mactatos crederet illic
lactantes uitulos Amathusiacasque bidentes:
hospes erat caesus!

An altar of Jupiter in Cyprus which the Cerastae polluted with the blood of a guest.

For the corrupt passage in 225 Magnus lists, in addition to manuscript variations, 15 modern conjectures. I add another, *nomine 'Lugubris'*; similar phrases, in the same metrical position, are 1.317 *nomine Parnasos*, 3.156 *nomine Gargaphie*, 5.386 *nomine Pergus*, 11.295 *nomine Daedalion*. One is reminded of the *saxum* at Eleusis which *Cecropidae nunc quoque 'Triste' uocant* (*Fast.* 4.504). It is quite possible that *in* derives from a contraction of *nomine*, but the origin of *sceleris* (*celeri* M) remains obscure; perhaps *celebris*, 'famous', part of a marginal note.

11.67ff. *non inpune tamen scelus hoc sinit esse Lyaeus*
amissoque dolens sacrorum uate suorum
protinus in siluis matres Edonidas omnes
70 *quae uidere nefas, torta radice ligauit;*
quippe pedum digitos, in quantum est quaeque secuta,
traxit et in solidam detrussit acumina terram.

Bacchus changes to oak-trees the Thracian women who had chased Orpheus to his death.

I think it probable that *uidere* in 70 should be emended either to *fecere* (a manuscript variant), or to *iuuere* (Capoferreus).

In quantum “nemodum explicauit”, says Housman (on Manil. 3.249), thereby (I presume) abjuring his own earlier conjecture (in Postgate’s *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*) *uia quam tum*. I suggest that *quantum* may conceal *q<uis> uatem*, ‘the feet with which each pursued Orpheus’ (*in* being a metrical insertion); about a dozen instances of *quis* in Ovid are listed by Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre* 2.469.

11.369f. *qui quamquam saeuit pariter rabieque fameque,
acrior est rabie.*

The subject is a ravening wolf.

Although Bömer’s quotations amply illustrate the use of *acer* ‘de bestiis’, I think that *rabie* is probably an erroneous repetition from the preceding line and would read *rabie<s>*; cf. Plin., *Nat.* 7.5, Sil. 11.516 (*furor*).

11.482ff. *“ardua iam dudum demittite cornua” rector
clamat “et antemnis totum subnectite uelum”.
hic iubet; inpediunt aduersae iussa procellae.*

Should *hic* be *sic*?

13.600ff. *Iuppiter adnuerat, cum Memnonis arduus alto
corrui igne rogos, nigrique uolumina fumi
infecere diem, ueluti cum flumina natas
exhalant nebulas, nec sol admittitur infra.*

To replace the meaningless *natas* a large number of adjectives have been proposed: *gratas, latas, lentas, nigras, opacas, uastas*. A different approach may be suggested, *flumina in auras*; cf. Sil. 12.137 *Stygios exhalat in aera flatus*.

13.956f. *hactenus acta tibi possum memoranda referre,
hactenus haec memini, nec mens mea cetera sensit.*

I should punctuate *referre, / hactenus; haec memini*. Just as *hactenus* in 957 repeats *hactenus* in 956, so *haec* repeats the *hac* element of *hactenus*.

14.383ff. *“non inpune feres, neque” ait “reddere Canenti,
laesaque quid faciat, quid amans, quid femina, disces
rebus” ait, “sed amans et laesa et femina Circe!”*

Circe to Picus, who has scorned her in favour of his beloved Canens.

The repetition of *ait* is unparalleled, as is pointed out by E. J. Kenney, *ClRev* 38 (1988) 248. To eliminate it Postgate proposed *rebus; at est et amans*, where *et* is very convincing but *at* much less so. I suggest *rebus: adest et amans*; for the menacing tone of *adest* see *OLD* sense 15 and Verg., *Aen.* 4.386 (of Dido's ghost) *omnibus umbra locis adero*.

14.426f. *ultimus aspexit Thybris luctuque uiaque
fessam et iam longa ponentem corpora ripa.*

The nymph Canens lies down to rest on the bank of the Tiber.

Nowhere else is *longus* applied to a river-bank, and its meaning is obscure. I wonder if *iam longa* conceals <g>*raminea*.

14.488ff. *nam dum peiora timentur,
est locus in uoto; sors autem ubi pessima rerum,
sub pedibus timor est securaque summa malorum.*

Prayer is in place only where it is feared that still worse may befall.

Est locus in uoto must be corrupt because it can only mean 'a place is prayed for'. Yet Bömer convincingly defends both *est locus* and some case of *uotum*; most probably *uoto* is dative. In that case *in* must be wrong, but it is not clear what should replace it; perhaps *est*, the repetition possibly conveying the suggestion 'there is, I admit'.

14.656ff. *adsimulauit anum cultosque intrauit in hortos
pomaque mirata est "tanto"que "potentior!" inquit,
paucaque laudatae dedit oscula, qualia numquam
uera dedisset anus.*

Vertumnus in the guise of an old woman woos Pomona.

The idiomatic use of *tanto* with a comparative is well established (see Bömer's note), but *potentior* must be the wrong comparative. Miller/Goold translate 'you are far more beautiful'; where does *potens* mean 'beautiful'? Yet that is the sort of sense which is required: a compliment to the lady which will lead up to the kissing in the next line. *Petitior* (Capoferreus), 'more desirable', is on the right lines, but more convincing, I suggest, would be *p<l>acentior* (cf. Hor., *Carm.* 2.14.21 *placens uxor*), even though this comparative is apparently not found elsewhere (Ovid uses *placitus* instead at *Ars* 1.37 and *Her.* 20.37).

15.477f. *perdite siqua nocent, uerum haec quoque perdite tantum:
ora uacent epulis alimentaque mitia carpant.*

Pythagoras forbids the eating of animal flesh. "Was this to abstain from feasting? Not at all. It was to abstain from feasting on forbidden meats; 75 *dapibus temerare nefandis / corpora*: not a word against other feasts; 81

prodiga diuitias alimentaque mitia tellus / suggerit atque epulas sine caede et sanguine praebet. It is these feasts, the feasts of blood, that are forbidden.” So J. P. Postgate, *Journ. Philol.* 22 (1894) 152, who therefore proposes *ora* <*cruore*> *uacent*, which has been adopted by Miller/Goold. I suggest *ora uacent illis* (the animals mentioned in the previous line), *epulis* having originated in an explanatory note.

15.838f. *nec nisi cum senior similes aequauerit annos
aetherias sedes cognataque sidera tanget.*

Jupiter prophesies long life for Augustus.

“Neither *similes* nor *aequauerit* has any sense, for there is nothing in the context to which the years of Augustus’ life can either be likened or equalled”, says Housman (*Classical Papers* 932). Among many attempts to emend the line, the most favoured idea has been that of Heinsius, that there is an allusion to the longevity of Nestor: adducing *Pont.* 2.8.41 *in Pylios ... annos* and *Trist.* 5.5.62 *aequarint Pylios cum tua fata dies*, he proposed *senior Pylios*. To this Housman objects (a) that *senior* is redundant (“if a man is to die as old as Nestor ..., what need to tell us that he will then be well stricken in years?”), (b) that *Pylios* for *similes* is a violent alteration. Perhaps the violence of the alteration is irrelevant: it may be no coincidence that *senior* is an almost perfect anagram of *Nestor*; and perhaps *senior similes* has its origin in a gloss “Nestori similis” (or “similes”). If so, another word, in addition to *Pylios*, has been ousted; *felix* is one of many possibilities.

V. *Fasti*⁴

3.229f. *inde diem quae prima meas celebrare Kalendas
Oebaliae matres non leue munus habent.*

Mars explains the origin of the Matronalia, celebrated on 1 March.

Line 229 has not been satisfactorily elucidated. The fullest discussion is that of Bailey; he points out that any reading which makes Mars say that 1 March is the first Kalends of the year is not admissible, since Ovid’s treatment of this point was concluded at line 150; like some other modern editors (e.g. Bömer, Schilling), he adopts Rappold’s conjecture *inde diem, quae prima mea est, celebrare Kalendas*. This is a very easy change, but the information that the first day of the month is the Kalends seems more likely to derive from an explanatory note than from Ovid. I would obelize *Kalendas* in the belief that it has supplanted another word; perhaps *quotannis*, which is used by Ovid at

4 The best edition is that of E. H. Alton, D. E. W. Wormell, and E. Courtney (Teubner edition, Leipzig 1978). Other modern editions referred to are those of C. Bailey (Book 3, Oxford 1921), F. Bömer (Heidelberg 1957/58), and R. Schilling (Budé edition, Paris 1992/93).

5.629, likewise of an annual celebration. For glosses in the *Fasti* see Alton/Wormell/Courtney, *Praef.* p. XII and critical note on 4.47.

3.303f. *ad solitos ueniunt siluestria numina fontes
et releuant multo pectora sicca mero.*

I think that *pectora* should be *guttura*; for *guttur* used in drinking contexts see 6.138 and the other Ovidian passages listed in *ThLL* VI. 2375.22–27. At *Juv.* 1.156 *guttur* has been corrupted to *pectore* in some manuscripts, and in general such words of dactylic form were liable to be interchanged; see Housman on *Manil.* 1.416, R. G. M. Nisbet in *BICS* Suppl. 51 (1988) 107, and Alton/Wormell/Courtney on *Fast.* 2.29 and 33.

3.765f. *cur anus hoc faciat quaeris? uinosior aetas
†haec erat et† grauidae munera uitis amat.*

Why do old women sell honey-cakes in honour of Bacchus?

At the end of the pentameter the manuscripts vary between *amat* and *amans*; the former should be accepted, because the latter should not (a point made by E. Courtney, *ClQu* 23, 1973, 146). At the beginning of the line *erat* is still retained by conservative editors (Bömer, Schilling), but the tense is wrong; a present tense, parallel to *amat*, is demanded by the sense. Hence most editors read *est* (a minor variant), but this solution is too facile; deeper corruption has, I think rightly, been suspected by Alton. I suggest *uinosior aetas / natura, et grauidae* (or, perhaps better, *natura est: grauidae*). For *aetas* = *senecta* cf. *Medic.* 45; *Met.* 12.448; and *OLD* sense 4b; *uinosior natura* is paralleled by *Her.* 20.25 *natura callidus*. Initial *h* and *n* are easily confused (e.g. *haec/nec, hu(n)c/nunc*), and it is possible that *haec* may have seemed necessary to someone who misunderstood *aetas*.

3.843f. *an quia perdomitis ad nos captiua Faliscis
uenit? et hoc signo littera prisca docet.*

Does Minerva Capta derive her name from the capture of Falerii?

The manuscripts are divided between *signo* and *ipsum*, of which the former seems the better indication of the truth. I suggest *uenit, ut in signo* (the cult-statue in the shrine); in the usual reading (given above) both *et* and the bare ablative are awkward. I assume that *in* dropped out after *ut* (for the confusion of these two see Housman's note on *Manil.* 4.608), and that *hoc* is a space-filler.

Similarly at 4.778 *dic ter et in uiuo perlue rore manus*, when *in* dropped out after *et* and before *ui-*, the metre was repaired by changing *ter* to *quater*, which is not consistent with what we know of ancient ritual.

4.625ff. *luce secutura tutos pete, nauita, portus:*
uentus ab occasu grandine mixtus erit.
scilicet ut fuerit, tamen hac Mutinensia Caesar
 628 *grandine militia perculit arma sua.*

In 628 *grandine* cannot mean 'im Hagelsturm' (Bömer), not can it go with *hac* ('sous pareille grêle', Schilling); with *hac* one must supply *luce* (cf. 622 and 623). I believe that *grandine* is an erroneous gloss on *hac* which has supplanted another word, now irrecoverable; the most obvious possibility is an epithet of *Caesar*, e.g. *felix* or *uictor*.

5.479ff. *Romulus obsequitur, lucemque Remuria dicit*
illam qua positis iusta feruntur auis.
aspera mutata est in lenem tempore longo
littera quae toto nomine prima fuit.

The Lemuria, a festival in honour of the dead, was originally called Remuria in honour of Remus.

Toto is ignored by the translators; not surprisingly, because it conveys nothing. *Prisco* would give good sense (cf. *Met.* 14.850f. *priscum ... nomen / mutat*), but is palaeographically remote. Closer would be *ficto*, 'the named which Romulus had coined'; for this sense of *ingere* see *ThLL* VI. 774.14ff., and for the confusion of *f* and *t* cf. *Met.* 7.741 *fictus/tectus*; *Prop.* 4.7.15 *furta/tecta*; *Sen.*, *Herc. f.* 697 *ferax/tenax*, id. *Phaed.* 379 *ferebant/tenebant*.

VI. *Tristia*

3.14.13ff. *Palladis exemplo de me sine matre creata*
carmina sunt; stirps haec progeniesque mea est.
hanc tibi commendo, quae quo magis orba parente est,
hoc tibi tutori sarcina maior erit.
tres mihi sunt nati contagia nostra secuti:
altera fac curae sit tibi turba palam.

Ovid entrusts his offspring, i.e. his literary works, to the protection of a friend. The three which are to be treated differently from the rest are the three books of the *Ars*.

In *Euphrosyne* 16 (1988) 134 J. B. Hall rightly queries whether *contagia nostra secuti* can mean 'have caught pollution from me'. This sense of *secuti* is incredible, as is the idea that the poet himself is somehow contagious. I think that both *contagia* and *secuti* are corrupt, and would read *nati, conuicia nostra, tegendi*. His books 'bring reproach' upon him; Ovid uses *conuicia* in this sense, and in apposition to another noun, at *Met.* 5.676 *aere pendebant, nemorum conuicia, picae*; both *ui* and *ta* consist of three minims, and the *c/g* confusion is

one of the commonest. *Tege di* provides the required contrast to *palam* in the next line; for the ‘hiding away’ of Ovid’s works see *Trist.* 1.1.111 *tres procul obscura latitantes parte uidebis* and *Pont.* 1.1.4.

4.5.31ff. *sic iuuenis similisque tibi sit natus, et illum
moribus agnoscat quilibet esse tuum;
sic faciat socerum taeda te nata iugali,
nec tardum iuueni det tibi nomen aui.*

Ovid’s good wishes for the son and daughter of a loyal friend.

“The position of *iuuenis* and the presence of *-que* discountenance translations like ‘dein jugendlicher Sohn soll dir ähnlich sein’”, says D. R. Shackleton Bailey (*ClRev* 32, 1982, 394), who therefore takes *iuuenis* as a predicate co-ordinate with *similis*; Ovid then prays that the son, presumably still a child, will grow to manhood. This is, I believe, the right construction (i.e. *-que* is not co-ordinate with the following *et*), but I desiderate an adjective other than *iuuenis*, which may well be an erroneous anticipation of *iuueni* in 34. I suggest *felix*.

It is possible that the *et* before *illum* should be *ut*.

5.1.23ff. *quod superest, numeros ad publica carmina flexi,
et memores iussi nominis esse sui.
si tamen ex uobis aliquis tam multa requiret
unde dolenda canam, multa dolenda tuli.*

23 *numeros* Ehwald: *animos uel socios* codd. 24 *sui uel mei* codd.

Ovid has changed his use of the elegiac metre from themes of love to themes of lamentation. In doing so, he has reverted to what the ancients believed was its original use; cf. Hor. *Ars* 75f. *uersibus impariter iunctis querimonia primum / ... inclusa est*. In ‘ordering’ the metre ‘to be mindful of its name’, he is thinking of the traditional derivation of ἔλεγος from εὖ λέγειν or ἔ ἔ λέγειν used of the lament for the dead. So far as I can discover, only Bentley saw the drift of the passage; he proposed to change *publica* (to which no one has given a satisfactory meaning) to *tristia*. This fits the context admirably, but is palaeographically remote. Closer would be *propria*, ‘proper’, ‘appropriate’ (i.e. original); both *proprius* and *publicus* are words which were regularly abbreviated. I do not think that this suggestion is ruled out by the occurrence of *propriis* just below (28). (Professor Delz has pointed out to me that Ovid elsewhere does not lengthen the first syllable of *proprius*, and has suggested *pristina* instead.)