Zeitschrift: Museum Helveticum: schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische

Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité

classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft

Band: 66 (2009)

Heft: 2

Artikel: More missing letters in Ovid's Metamorphoses

Autor: Luck, Georg

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-98982

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 03.12.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

More Missing Letters in Ovid's Metamorphoses

By Georg Luck, Baltimore

Abstract: In einem Artikel in Myrtia 21 (2006) 114–121 habe ich zwölf Stellen in Ovids «Metamorphosen» behandelt, die in der Paradosis offenbar einen oder mehrere Buchstaben verloren haben. Die Vulgata ergibt jeweils einen Sinn, aber vermutlich nicht das, was Ovid geschrieben hat. Das Prinzip, das man aus dieser Erfahrung ableiten kann, ist einfach: Das längere Wort ist vermutlich die bessere Lesart, denn es kommt naturgemäss häufiger vor, dass ein Schreiber etwas auslässt, als dass er etwas hinzufügt. In dieser Form trifft dies natürlich nicht immer zu, aber doch sehr oft. Besonders am Anfang und am Ende von Versen ist mit dem Ausfall von Buchstaben zu rechnen. In diesem neuen Aufsatz werden hundertzwanzig Stellen besprochen, die nach demselben Prinzip, wie es scheint, emendiert werden können. Ziemlich häufig sind Namen (vor allem griechische) verkürzt worden. So finden wir «Amyclide» statt «Amyclaide», «Cephea» statt «Cepheia», «Cytherea» statt «Cythereia» usw. Manche Korruptelen erklären sich durch das Zusammenwirken dieses Faktors mit anderen (falsche Worttrennung, falsches Präfix usw.).

In an article in *Myrtia* 21 (2006) 114–121, I have offered a dozen cases from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* where the addition of a letter or two to the text as preserved in some or most MSS. seems to be needed to restore the original text. Not all of these cases may be equally evident, but since then I have been able to collect many more examples in the text of the work, and I would like to present them here. Anyone who was not convinced by the passages assembled in the earlier paper will now, I hope, be more inclined to recognize the «Missing Letter» syndrome as a major cause of corruption in Ovid's work.

Incidentally, some textual problems in Ovid's other works can also be solved by applying this principle. I will only mention Ars 1,618 (620) blanditiis animum furtim deprendere nunc sit, | ut pendens liquida ripa sube (s) tur aqua. Here, the verbal form we need, subestur, was found by B. Axelson (Hermes 86 (1958) 127–129). The main witnesses vary between subetur, sudetur and subitur (the last form was adopted by Heinsius; cauatur and salitur seem to be old conjectures; see the 2003 Teubner edition of A. Ramírez de Verger ad loc.).

A curious case of missing letters in Propertius was discovered by Housman (CP 288–289). In 3,22,25 N has Albanus lacus et socii Nemorensis ab unda. The line was changed in various ways, until Housman realized that ab unda was the residue of an original abundans, «the two last letters [having been] ... lost through injury to the margin». All that was left was to change the meaningless socii to foliis. This is what Housman did – at the end of the word a letter was lost, and

at the beginning f was read as s – and thus he recovered what the poet wrote: Albanus lacus et foliis Nemorensis abundans. This seems to me a stroke of genius, based on pure intuition, and clearly right.

One would have expected L. Havet to deal at length with omitted letters in his massive *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris 1911, repr. Rome 1967), but I only found a few examples here and there, e. g. §§ 583–584; 1242–1244. Havet apparently did not believe that this type of error is very frequent, and where he admits it, his reconstruction of intermediate phases is rather fanciful. Perhaps there is more to be gained from his volume, but it is not very easy to use.

In the following passages the text first printed is that of Tarrant's recent OCT(2004).

(1) 1,71 sidera coeperunt toto efferuescere caelo

Here, L and U (man. 3) have *feruescere*, and A.E. Housman suggested *ecferuescere*; cf. J. M. Trappes-Lomax, *Catullus: A Textual Approach* (Wales 2007) 9 who restores *ec-*, mostly before *f-*, but he also reads *ecgelidus* in a number of passages. As far as I can see, *feruesco* never appears in Ovid, and *efferuesco*, the reading of most MSS., is only found here. The *TLL* 5,2,154,5 lists this passage (<de sideribus, i.q. emicare>); on the spelling *ec-* see *ibid.* 153,24–26. Cf. also *Met.* 2,144 *et fulget* (*effulget* Heins. ex Gronoviano primo, Merkel: *ecfulget* Housman).

(2) 1,478–479 illa auersata petentes impatiens expersque uiri nemora auia lustrat

Heinsius and Burman preferred *nemorum auia* which they had found in e and the 'Tertius Gronovianus'. It corresponds to 594 *nemorum secreta*. Daphne does not seek 'pathless groves' but the 'pathless areas of groves'; there is a difference. Cf. also 8,692 *ardua montis*; Apul. *Met.* 1,2,2.

U and other witnesses have *de* which deserves to be considered. In 14,754–755 *calidusque e corpore sanguis* | *fugit* the laws of metrics make *de* impossible. 9,344–345 *uidi guttas e flore cruentas* | *decidere* apparently all MSS. have *e*, and no one seems to have proposed a change, although *decidere* might support the idea. A case where *de* is probably better than *e*, 15,592, has been discussed in: *Myrtia*, op. cit. 120.

(4) 2,95–97 denique quidquid habet diues circumspice mundus eque tot ac tantis caeli terraeque marisque posce bonis aliquid

In v. 95 we should probably place *circumspice* between parentheses. In v. 96 P, as reported by Anderson, has *deque*. A letter could easily get lost at the beginning of a line; on the other hand, *posce* stands for *elige* which would support *e*.

(5) 2,132 effugit australem iunctamque aquilonibus Arcton

In the article in *Myrtia* 113–115 I made a case for *effugito* (Heinsius ex P p, uno Basileensi et tribus aliis, Bentley ex coni., ut vid.). Afterwards, I remembered a similar case in Sueton. *Diu. Iul.* 33 iacta alea est(o). The ending -o was added by Erasmus to establish the analogy to the Greek verse Caesar is quoting; see R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism* (Harvard U. P. 1969), para. 47. Incidentally, in Ovid, australem ... aquilonibus should both be capitalized, in analogy to *Arcton*, it seems to me.

(6) 2,144 et fulget | effulget | ecfulget

See above on 1,71.

(7) 3,99–100 ille diu pauidus pariter cum mente colorem perdiderat

In this context, diu makes no sense at all, and Liberman was right in postulating metu; cf. 4,228–229 pauet illa $metuque \mid et$ colus et fusi (N B G) digitis cecidere remissis; 6,706 pauidam ... metu; 9,248–249 ne pectora $uano \mid fida$ metu paueant. In our passage, U L P have substituted uoce to mente; but see Burman on Ars 2,450. Twice in the same line, a longer word has been replaced by a shorter one. What exactly happened, is not clear to me.

(8) 3,135–137 sed scilicet ultima semper expectanda dies hominis, dicique beatus ante obitum nemo supremaque funera debet.

Most MSS. have *homini est* (perhaps written as *hominist* by Ovid; see J.M. Trappes-Lomax, *Catullus*, 8–9, *passim*), and that is what A. prints, while T. follows the *Scholia Bernensia in Lucanum* 8,29; L and Lips. (s. IX) have *hominis*. Assuming the loss of one or two letters, we may restore *est* which seems necessary here; the <code>dies hominis</code> is redundant and trivial. On *suprema* see Orelli on Hor. *Epist.* 2,1,12.

(9) 3,298–300

ergo maestissimus altum aethera conscendit uultuque sequentia traxit nubila

For *uultuque* Heinsius preferred *nutuque* «ex fragmento antiquae notae»; the reading is also reported from v_3 (= Roman. Bibl. Vallic. F.25) by A., although T. does not record it. The words look very much alike, and I am not sure whether, in this case, the longer one is better.

(10) 3,402–403 sic hanc, sic alias undis aut montibus ortas luserat hic nymphas, sic coetus ante uiriles

For *coetus* H (s. X) offers *coeptus*. This was accepted by Slater and recently proposed as a conjecture by Liberman. It must be right; cf., e.g., Stat. *Theb*. 12,644.

(11) 3,416–417 dumque bibit, uisae correptus imagine formae, [spem sine corpore amat, corpus putat esse quod unda est]

Heinsius found rem for spem in some of his MSS. (Cod. Thysii, unus Mediceus, unus Argentinus), and it is reported from h (man. 2). This is probably what Ovid wrote, wishing to bring out the paradox. In Greek res sine corpore would be χρῆμα ασώματον. In this case, the shorter word seems to be the better reading, but it is the first word of the line which often creates a special situation. In the same line, we should probably read umbra (B man. 2, F man. 4, L man. 2, W); cf. 434 ista repercussae, quam cernis, imaginis umbra est; Reeson on Her. 14,93. It is true that unda regularly stands for aqua in poetry; cf., e.g., 8,737 (Bömer ad loc.; Galán on Mart. 7,15,1–2), but as a reading it is inferior to the longer word which forms the proper contrast to corpus. Read:

rem sine corpore amat, corpus putat esse quod umbra est.

There is no need to delete the verse in this form (Merkel).

(12) 3,505–506 planxere sorores Naides et sectos fratri posuere capillos.

The editors distinguish between *Nais* and *Naias*, and both A. and T. list this passage under *Nais* in their *Index Nominum*, though some witnesses have *Naiades* (see T., p. 490). This is clearly a wide-spread uncertainty which cannot be solved by restoring a presumably missing *-a-* here and there. The problem needs to be addressed in another context, I think. Let me just add here that Housman (*Class. Papers* 171) was convinced that Ovid wrote *Nais* and that the scribes introduced the longer form against metre in 14,557 and 786. In our passage, most witnesses

have *imposuere* for *posuere*. A prefix beginning with *i*- could easily get lost after the final -*i* of *fratri*, but Heinsius was probably right to adopt *posuere* from e and three other MSS. It seems that *ponere* is the idiomatic term for <to dedicate> (an offering to a deity or a last tribute to the dead).

(13) 3,576 [sacra dei quondam Tyrrhena gente secutum.]

T. deletes the line, following Heinsius, and G. Liberman tends to agree, but A. Barchiesi, in the Mondadori adaptation of the *OCT* considers it genuine. With two small changes, the line makes good sense and forms part of the period that begins in v. 574. Read *quendam* (W alii, Heins. vel Jahn ex coni.) and *Tyrrhena* (e) gente (Vollmer, but *tyrrhenae* is actually reported from M by A., and this probably stands for *tyrrhenae* in «scriptio continua»). Incidentally, we should also read *quendam* (R, Housman ex coni., «non male» T.) for *quondam* in 9,669 proxima Cnosiaco nam quondam Phaestia regno | progenuit tellus ignotum nomine Lygdum.

(14) 3,626–627 is mihi, dum resto, iuuenali guttura pugno rupit

Read probably *persto* with Schepper. The same error has been found in *Fa.* 4,515; *ex P.* 4,9,92; Lucan 5,210 (see *TLL* 10,1,1751,13–14).

(15) 3,664–665 impediunt hederae remos nexuque recuruo serpunt et grauidis distingunt uela corymbis.

For distingunt the Paris. 8000 and some other witnesses have distringunt; Heinsius proposed destringunt and Liberman constringunt. We need the idea that the sails are miraculously affected in the same way that the oars are, and constringunt would fit very well, although the verb does not seem to occur in Ovid. Another possibility, perhaps a little closer to the paradosis, would be restringunt. This could be a case of the wrong prefix as well as the missing letter.

(16) 3,693 ut ira moras uires absumere posset

The correct reading, absumere, is preserved in M (man. 1) N (corr.) B (v.l.) W and others, the variants are assumere, consumere and sumere. The phrase uires absumere is attested in 1,543 uiribus absumptis expalluit illa; 15,353 absumptis per longum uiribus aeuum; Ars 2,439. Vires adsumere is, of course, the opposite (cf., e.g., 13,886 fecimus, ut uires adsumeret Acis auitas) and does not make any sense here. Consumere would be possible but could not be corrupted so easily into ass- as abs-. The unmetrical simplex sumere reflects, perhaps, the uncertainty about the prefix.

(17) 3,728 clamat 'io comites, opus hoc victoria nostra est!'

Read *opus haec victoria nostrum est* with U G al., Edwards ex codd., fort. recte> (T.). See Heins. on *Her.* 17,256. This is, perhaps, not a simple case of missing letters (*haec* becoming *hoc*, *nostrum* becoming *nostra*), but a misunderstanding of the distribution of nouns and pronouns.

(18) 4,45 Derceti

The rare name (only here in the *Met.*) is preserved in MPU (?) and was restored *ope ingenii* by Hermolaus Barbarus (on Pliny, *NH* 5,23,81 = II, p. 364 Pozzi). It was corrupted to *decerti*, *dirce* and *dercen* in the paradosis. The first form shows a transposition of letters, the second is the substitution of a more familiar name, and the third probably derives from a misreading of *DERCETI*, where *-TI* was seen as *-N*. If this explanation is correct, the mistake is not, strictly speaking, due to the omission of a letter.

(19) 4,131–132 utque locum et uisa cognoscit in arbore formam, sic facit incertam pomi color

Visa seems weak and repetitious and can hardly be defended by ex P. 1,10,25 uix igitur possis uisos agnoscere (cognoscere pars codd.) uultus. We should probably read uersam (Ciofani ex cod., Heins. ex o [= Arundeliano] et 10 aliis) ... formam. Ovid uses uertere in the sense of mutare; e.g. 4,45–46 Derceti, quam uersa squamis uelantibus artus | stagna Palaestini credunt motasse figura; 593–594 cur non | me quoque, caelestes, in eandem uertitis anguem?; 604–606 sed tamen ambobus uersae solacia formae | magna nepos dederat (fuerat Heins. ex codd.); 6,94–95 quam regia Iuno | in uolucrem uertit; Fa. 1,369; Tr. 2,64; 556 in facies corpora uersa nouas; etc. Forms of uis- and uers- are often confused in the Met.; cf., e.g. 9,231–232 arcum pharetramque capacem | regnaque uersuras (Heins.: uisuras codd.) iterum Troiana sagittas where uertere means <to destroy>. See below. In our passage, Postgate proposed uersa (<non male> T.), and it is difficult to decide between this and uersam, though the latter is closer to the broad paradosis (uisam; apparently only M, followed by A. and <dubitanter> by T., has uisa). Veram (Waddel) is unlikely. It seems that VERSAM lost the R and E was read as I.

(20) 4,167–168 desierat, mediumque fuit breve tempus, et orsa est dicere Leuconoe

Heinsius found *subit* in a Leidensis as a v.l. and liked it but hesitated to adopt it. *Subeo* can mean <to come next> (*OLD* 8); cf. *Tr.* 4,8,3 *subeunt anni; ex P.* 1,9,11. On the other hand, *fuit breue tempus*, <there was a short time (of silence)>, is perfectly possible, and no one would have felt any need to change it, if Heinsius had not find that isolated v.l. which may be a conjecture.

94

(21) 4,190 exigit indicii memorem Cythereia poenam

The form Cythereia seems to be the reading of Ω (only M is reported to have Cytheria which was corrected by man. 2). It is adopted by the recent editors here as well as in 10, 529. So is Cythereius heros (= Aeneas) in 13,625 and 14,584. See also Fa. 4,195; German. fr. 2,2; Mart. 8,45,7; Stat. Theb. 4,554; Sil. Ital. 3,683 where editors agree on this form. On the other hand, we find Cytherea in 10,640; 717; 14,487; 15,803; 816 as well as in Am. 1,3,4; Ars 2,15; 607; 3,43; Her. 15,20, etc. Editors should be consistent and restore the forms in -eius, -eia in all these passages, also, e.g., in Hor. Carm. 1,4,5; 3,12,4; [Tib.] 3,13,3; Stat. Silu. 1,5,31; cf. Paul. Fest. p. 52 M. Recently, J. M. Trappes-Lomax (Catullus (2007) 14–15; 208) has made a case for the longer forms which are derived from Hellenistic poetry. We should also read Cepheiaque (Heins. ex codd.) in 669 infra, I think. Similar Greek names often lose a vowel in the paradosis, as we shall see.

(22) 4,226 'ille ego sum' dixit 'qui longum metior annum

(The Sun is speaking). Some witnesses (F L, Heins. ex codd.) have the longer form *emetior*, and the prefix *e*- could easily be omitted between *m*- and *m*-. Heinsius also read *emensis* in 15,226 where Ω has *emeritis*, but the context is different. In 8,565 *iamque duas lucis partes Hyperione menso* the metre excludes the compositum. But it is well attested in Lygd. 4,17 *nox aetherium* ... *emensa* ... | *mundum*; Sen. *NQ* 7,23,3 (cometes) *emetitur* (*emititur* vel *emititur* vv. ll.) *spatium suum*; Sil. Ital. 4,478 *emenso terras* ... *sole*; Ps. Quint. *Decl.* 4,13 (*sidera*) *uagos cursus certis emetiuntur erroribus*; Firm. Mat. *Err.* 17,1; 8,13. Hence, in our passage, where the metre allows it, the longer word would be appropriate.

(23) 4,283 et Crocon in paruos uersum cum Smilace flores

Most MSS. have *milace* (T., p. 493), and the longer form was introduced by Burman, following R. Regius and <recc.>. However, this may not be a scribal error, for both forms were known; see *OLD*, p. 1776; Hermolaus Barbarus on Plin. *NH* 16,36,153 (ed. G. Pozzi II (1974) 767).

(24) 4,441–442 sic omnes animas locus accipit ille nec ulli exiguus populo est turbamue accedere sentit.

Dziatzko proposed *accrescere* for *accedere*, but no change seems necessary. Ovid says that the underworld is never too small or too crowded a place, nor is the steady increase in population noticeable in any way. This, of course, is one of the mysteries of after-life. *Turba* has the same meaning as *populus* (cf. 6,197–200). *Accrescere* is not found anywhere in Ovid, as far as I can see; on *accedere*, <to be addedy see *OLD* s.v. 15(a).

(25) 4,443–446

errant exsangues sine corpore et ossibus umbrae, parsque forum celebrant, pars imi tecta tyranni, pars aliquas artes, antiquae imitamina uitae \langle...\rangle [exercent, aliam partem sua poena coercet.]

T. assumes a missing line after 445, following Bentley; he also deletes 446, following D. and N. Heinsius. The two proposals may be considered separately, but to combine them makes no sense. The whole passage can be saved with two small changes, suggested by Slater and Pulbrook, both mentioned by T. in the app. crit. Ovid has in mind V. Aen. 6, 653ff (see also *Tr.* 4,10,87–88). Read:

antiquas (Slater) artes, antiquae imitamina uitae, exercent alii, partem (Pulbrook) sua poena coercet.

What happened? The variation in the sequence parsque ... pars ... alii was misunderstood. As a consequence, in 445 antiquas became aliquas (alias is a reading reported by Ciofani and Heinsius from their MSS.), and pars was inserted in analogy to parsque in 444. The play on words exercent ... coercet should certainly not be sacrificed. On the punishments in Hades see now E. Petteno, Cruciamenti Acherunti (Rome 2004) and the review by E. Bielfeldt, in: Gnomon 79 (2007) 549–556.

(26) 4, 660–661 tum partes altus in omnes creuit in immensum

As T. notes, *altus* can hardly be right; *auctus* (h alii, Heins., Slater) would certainly be better; cf. *Rem.* 88; *Her.* 1,95; Sil. It. 17,490. Another possibility would be *actus*; cf. 4,254–255 *virgaque radicibus actis* | *turea surrexit*; 10,491–492 *porrigitur radix* ... | *ossaque robur agunt*; *Ars* 3,186: *Fa.* 4,128; *OLD s.v.* <*ago>* 10; Luck, in: *MH* 64 (2007) 118.

(27) 4,668–669 gentibus innumeris circumque infraque relictis Aethiopum populos Cepheaque conspicit arua.

We should probably read *Cepheia* (Heins. ex v aliisque, Burman on *Am.* 3,10,20). Since Aethiopia actually is the country of Cepheus *-que* is superfluous and unmetrical, if we restore *-eia*. It has been taken as an «explanatory *-que*», as in Prop. 4,6,78 *Cepheam hic Meroen fuscaque regna canat*, where we should read *Cepheiam*; cf. 1,3,3 *qualis et accubuit* ... *Cepheia* ... | ... *Andromede*. But in Ovid we ought to take *Cepheia* ... *arua* as an apposition, I think. After *-i*- had been omitted, *-que* was added to restore metre. The longer form is in analogy to *Cythereia* (4,190), *Philyreia* (7,352), etc. See also *Am.* 3,3,17; *Her.* 15,35; Luck, in: *Ex. Class.* 12 (2006) 50.

(28) 5,216–218 'uincis' ait, 'Perseu; remoue tua monstra tuaeque saxificos uultus, quaecumque est, tolle Medusae, tolle, precor'.

Est is only found in e (man. 1) and, in the form of est ea (a variant embodied in the text), in W, according to A. who prints ea (fort. recte) T.). But the longer form is what we need; cf. 260; 9,312; 10,405; V. Aen. 5,835 quicumque est ... Thybrin (also before a name). Est lost its -t before tolle through haplography, and the meaningless es was changed to ea. We find a similar case in 8,235 est tellus a nomine dicta sepulti, where U P d, according to A. and T. have est, whereas the main tradition has et. Obviously, the need for est was felt, for B e h p supply it after sepulti, whereas Polle restored it by conjecture at its proper place. A. prints et.

Two opposite types of corruption may be illustrated by 5,260–263 where the Muse Uranie says to Athena: 'quaecumque est causa uidendi | has tibi, diua, domos, animo gratissima nostro es. | uera tamen fama est; est Pegasus huius origo | fontis'. Here, es at the end of v. 261 became est in Ω or was left out; Heinsius restored it, based on V. Aen. 12,142. On the other hand, in v. 216, the second est became et in most representatives of Ω by a form of haplography; N and U, along with a few others, are the exception. The error was probably caused by the sequence ESTEST.

(29) 5,352–353 degrauat Aetna caput, sub qua resupinus harenas eiectat flammamque ferox uomit ore Typhoeus.

Some editors read *eructat* in M (man.1 in ras.), and this is Heinsius' conjecture for *eiectat* (Ω , Plan.); the analogy to *uomit* seems to support the change. One could also cite Lucr. 3,1012 *Tartarus* ... *eructans faucibus aestus*. In 14,210–212 *me tremor inuasit; stabam sine sanguine maestus*, | *mandentemque uidens eiectantemque cruentas* | *ore dapes et frusta mero glomerata uomentem* where the same two words appear together, Heinsius also changed to *eructantemque*. But it seems that Ovid avoids *eructo*, and we have two perfectly good parallels to *eiecto* in 5,353, Sen. NQ 1,1,8 *copia corpusculorum quae terrae eiectant* and Stat. *Silu*. 3,3,89 *quidquid ab auriferis eiectat Hiberia fossis*; cf also Liberman on Val. Fl. 2,30 who sees no need for a change in either passage. On the other hand, the eruption of a volcano is often described as *eructare* (sc. *ignes, flammas*): see TLL 6,2,826,42ff, where, e.g., V. *Aen*. 3,576 and Sil. It. 14,58 are cited.

In 5,353, ferox has become fero in part of the paradosis, wheras in 3,213 an original fero (Lips., Heins.) has been corrupted to ferox; here, the epithet is appropriate to the boar (cf. Am. 3,9,16; 10,40).

(30) 5,378–379 at tu pro socio, si qua est ea gratia, regno, iunge deam patruo.

In my article in *Myrtia* I argued that we should read *mea* for *ea* with Heinsius (ex codd.), to restore an idiom. To the parallels listed there, one could add 13,445–445 'immemores' que 'mei disceditis' inquit, 'Achiui, | obrutaque est mecum uirtutis gratia nostrae? ...'

(31) 5,405–406 perque lacus altos et olentia sulphure fertur stagna Palicorum

The true reading, sacros, is preserved by the indirect tradition (Diomedes Grammaticus) and, possibly, one or several direct witnesses, but T.'s generic group χ does not tell us much. Ovid calls springs (5,469; Her. 15,158; Am. 3,1,3; Ars 3,688, etc.) and rivers (8,597, etc.) «sacred»; cf. also Liv. 24,38,8 di, qui hos sacratos lacus lucosque colitis. One cannot defend altos by 385–386 haud procul Hennaeis lacus est a moenibus altae, | nomine Pergus, aquae where Ω has altus, and Trist. 3,10,72 is different, because here lacus is a deep trough in which the young wine ferments. Slater thought of atros which could be supported by V. Aen. 6,238; Sil. It. 13,516 sic uates gressumque lacus uertebat ad atros. But the corruption of sacros is more easily explained by the loss of S- after -S by haplography; the remaining letters ACROS then were read as ALTOS.

(32) 5,597–598 nescioquod medio sensi sub gurgite murmur territaque insisto propiori margine fontis.

That something must be wrong with *propiori* has been pointed out by Bömer *ad loc*. and by Ramminger, TLL s.v. $\langle propior \rangle$. The reading preserved by the majority of Ω , including the Trier fragment, is actually *propioris*. This does not work with *fontis;* hence, we have to consider the alternate verse ending *ripae* (Urb [man. 2 corr.] U G L W p). That *propioris* ... *ripae* is the original reading, is confirmed by *altera* ... | *ripa* three lines later where *altera* corresponds to *propior*. This is not an interpolation on the basis of 1,729, as T. doubtfully considers. We find the confirmation in Stat. *Silu*. 2,3,17 *posuit se margine ripae*; Statius clearly has in mind Ovid's Arethusa episode (see L. Håkonson, *Statius' Siluae* (Lund 1969) 68–70). *Propioris* probably lost its -s, and the ending of the line was adjusted to make sense. But it is also possible that the last word of the line had become illegible in an early copy, and *fontis* was introduced to make some sense of the text.

(33) 5,669 rident Emathides spernuntque minacia uerba

RIDENTEMATHIDES in the archetype, as restored by Heinsius, produced by wrong word division, omission of letters and interpolation a variety of bad readings, such as *ridentemque athides*, *ridentque athides*, *rident athides*, *rident tespiades*, etc. A similar case is 7,209 where *PALLETAVI*, also restored by Heinsius, became *pallet aut*, *pallet at* and *pallet et*, but here no word omission is involved.

(34) 6,110–111 addidit ut satyri celatus imagine pulchram Iuppiter implerit gemino Nycteida fetu.

T. gives us no clue that part of Ω has *pulchra* for *pulchram*. According to A., the last letter of the last word of the line is missing in N F (man. 1) W. In fact, this was the vulgate before Constantius Fanensis who corrected the error. In the same line we should probably write *Satyri*, with a capital *S*-; cf. 393; 1,193; 692; 4,25; 11,89; 14,637. This seems to be T.'s standard spelling.

(35) 6,259–260 expulit hanc (sc. sagittam) sanguis seque eiaculatus in altum

Again, it is not clear from T.'s apparatus, that *seque eiaculatus* is only preserved in a small part of Ω , viz. M (?) Be (see A.), while the majority is split between *seque iaculatus* (E L W v) and *se qui iaculatus* (N U F). What happened is that *e*- was lost after -*e* which produced an unmetrical line; therefore, in the common ancestor of N U F, *que* was changed to *qui*. On *eiaculari* see 4,124; *Fa.* 1,270; Plin. *NH* 10,112 and McKeown on *Am.* 1,1,30.

(36) 6,324–326 dum pascua lustro, ecce lacu medio sacrorum nigra fauilla ara uetus stabat

Heinsius adopted *lacus* for *lacu* from the Barberinianus at one time, and he was probably right; cf., e.g., 6,409 *cui locus est iuguli medius summique lacerti*. But *medius* with gen. is not generally recognized by the MSS. and the editors, and in some passages, it has to be introduced by conjecture, I think: 2,31 *loci* (Heins.: *loco* Ω) *medius*; 10,143–144 *inque ferarum* | *concilio, medius turbae* (Vatic. 5179, Bentl., Wakefield: *turba* Ω), *volucrumque sedebat*; 13,780–781 *huc ferus ascendit Cyclops mediusque resedit* | *lanigerae pecudis* (Luck: *pecudes* Ω). See Burman on *Ars* 1, 113; Luck, in: *Exemplaria Class.* 9 (2005) 263; 267. Another possibility would be to assume the loss of *in* before *m*- (very common) and read *lacu* (*in*) *medio*; cf. 7,789–791 *reuocataque rursus eodem* | *rettuleram*: (*in*) (ins. Magnus) *medio* (*mirum*) *duo marmora campo* | *aspicio*; 10,167–168 *orbe* | *in medio positi caruerunt praeside Delphi*.

(37) 6,327–328 restitit et pauido 'faueas mihi' murmure dixit dux meus

The reading of the common ancestor of B F G L has been corrupted to *paulo* in E M N U P, to *paruo* in U (man. 3 vel 4) and others and to *pauio* in a Mediceus. It seems that, at one point, d was lost, and the remaining letter could be read as *paulo* or *paruo*. A similar case is 9,568–569 deque suis unum famulis pudibunda uocauit | et pauidum blandita 'fer has, fidissime, nostro' | dixit, where pauidum is the reading of W, while the main paradosis has *paulum*.

(38) 6,331–334 non hac, o iuuenis, montanum numen in ara est: illa suam uocat hanc, cui quondam regia coniunx orbem interdixit, quam uix erratica Delos orantem accepit ...

In v. 332 regia coniunx is sufficient to identify Juno in this context, as in 9,259 and 14,592, or Persephone, as in 10,46, a different context, though in 13,483 these words describe Hecuba, a queen among mortals (see also Her. 12,103). Heinsius, following some MSS., preferred regia Iuno (cf. 6,94; 14,829; ex P. 1,4,39), but this may be a glossa. In 332–333, Naugerius and Heinsius, preferred quam ... orbe, the reading of some of their MSS., to cui (perhaps written quoi by Ovid) ... orbem. These MSS. are no longer known, and the variant is not recorded in A. and T. See my article on Naugerius in: Exempl. Class. 9 (2005) 186. The change does not seem to impose itself, but the reading, backed by two eminent critics, should not completely disappear. In v. 334, we have a choice between orantem (Ω) and errantem (Ω [man. 3] e v alii, Merkel) which I would prefer, not only because it is the longer word, but because it stresses the similarity between Delos and Latona (there is, perhaps, a play on words – erratica/errantem), and because the first word of the line could have been influenced by the first word of the preceding line, orbem.

(39) 6,392–394 illum ruricolae, siluarum numina, Fauni et Satyri fratres et tum quoque carus Olympus et Nymphae flerunt

I have argued in favor of clarus (Ω , Heins.) in: Myrtia 21 (2006) 116 but did not mention that Heinsius, at one time, proposed (ad Art. 2,3) tu quoque, carus Olympe, taking carus as a vocative; later, he seems to have given up this idea and decided in favor of clarus. There is nothing wrong with tum quoque, «even then», that is, when he was still studying with Marsyas. It should be noted that many MSS. have tunc, and that the recent editors read tum on Housman's authority.

(40) 6,418 et Nelea Pylos neque adhuc Pittheia Troezen

The name *Troezen* appears as *trezen* in M N, but a second hand has written o over the first e in N, according to Ehwald. In 8, 567 (see below), most MSS. have *trozenius*, with a missing e; similarly, in 15,296 and 506 Ω offers *trozena*. In each case, one or several witnesses have the correct form, perhaps by conjecture.

(41) 6,421–423

solae cessastis Athenae. obstitit officio bellum, subuectaque ponto barbara Mopsopios terrebant agmina muros.

For *subvectaque* (P, ut vid., W e [man. 2] veteres quidam Ciofani, Heins.) most witnesses have *subiectaque*. Here, not a whole letter, but a stroke, that is, part of a letter, seems to be missing. The same error is found in 8,796. The OLD (p. 1854,1; 2,b) attributes a special meaning to subuehi, to sail upsteam [sic for 'upstream']. This does not actually fit our passage, because the enemy sails across the sea. Actually, subuehi is more or less = uehi, with an indication of the direction or the goal.

(42) 6,603–605 nacta locum Procne sacrorum pignora demit oraque deuelat miserae pudibunda sororis amplexumque petit

Heinsius (on *Her.* 14,69) preferred *amplexuque* (ex l, duobus Mediceis et uno Boschiano), sc. *sororem*, while the more recent editors seem to supply *sororis*. Read probably *amplexusque* (3 codd. Heinsii, Plan., Riese) which seems more idiomatic; cf. *Her.* 14,69. Ovid also writes *amplexus dare* (4,597; 9,560; 11,459). The plural may be more appropriate, because two people and two pairs of arms are involved.

(43) 6,614–619 aut ego, cum facibus regalia tecta cremabo, artificem mediis immittam Terea flammis, aut linguam atque oculos et quae tibi membra pudorem abstulerunt ferro rapiam, aut per uulnera mille sontem animam expellam. magnum quodcumque paraui; quid sit, adhuc dubito.

Procne is planning the punishment Tereus deserves. The enumeration of possibilities begins with $aut\ ego\ (614)$ and continues with $aut\ (616)$, but then, instead of reading $aut\ (\Omega, Heins.)$ in the same line, followed by $aut\ quae\ (U, Heins.)$ ex multis), the editors now print $atque\ (codd.\ nonn., Rappold\ ex\ coni.)$ and $et\ quae\ (\Omega)$. This cannot be right. Read $aut\ ego\ ...\ aut\ linguam\ aut\ oculos\ aut\ quae\ ...\ aut\ per.$ At this point, she hesitates between burning his palace, cutting off his tongue, blinding him, castrating him or killing him. These are several drastic forms of revenge, but they have to be separated, not (partly) combined. In v. 618 she repeats her determination to do something enormous, though she keeps up the suspense by not saying what. In the end she does none of things she threatened to do but something even more atrocious. The structure of the whole period demands est after $magnum\ (U\ man.\ 2\ G\ P\ e)$. The omission of est in part of the paradosis serves as an illustration of our theory; the misunderstanding of $aut\ ...\ aut\ ...\ aut\ ...\ aut\ is\ a\ different\ matter.$

(44) 6,642 nec uultum uertit

Read (a) uertit (Heinsius ex uno Vossiano). I have dealt with the passage in Myrtia 21 (2006) 116–117 and would like to add a few parallels to uultum (uultus, ora) auertere: Am. 3,9,45; Ars 2,616; Met. 5,179; 15,587, etc. It happens occasionally that the truth survives in a single witness, perhaps by conjecture.

(45) 6, 663–664 et modo, si posset, reserato pectore diras egerere inde dapes semesaque uiscera gestit

Ω has emersaque, but we probably need demersaque, as proposed by R. Regius who remembered 15,105 corporeas... dapes auidam demersit in aluum. It seems that d- was lost at an early stage. Various other readings have survived, e.g. immersaque N G, emensaque (Ciofani ex suis, Sulmonensis 1 et 2, Jahn), semesaque h (man. 2) h alii, Heinsius. Emensaque is explained as a form of mandere and associated with comesa by Ehwald, a very unlikely derivation. See Ex. Class., op. cit. 53f.

(46) 7,26–28 quem nisi crudelem non tangat Iasonis aetas et genus et uirtus? quem non, ut cetera desint, ore mouere potest?

Jason is young, he is of noble birth, he is brave, but above all: he is very hand-some. Read forma (U [man. 3] B k, Plan., Heins.) for ore (Ω), ora (M [ante corr.] [S]) and igne (h [man. 2], Heins. olim). How could forma become ore in the main paradosis? The two words have two letters in common, -OR-. Perhaps in an early copy the beginning, F-, and the ending, -MA, of the first word of the line had become illegible, and the rest was supplied by guesswork. Ora is a little closer to forma than ore (which may have been influenced by ore at the end of v. 29) but makes no sense, whereas igne makes sense but looks suspicious. Medea is struck by Jason's exceptional good looks: cf. 44 $gratia\ formae$; 84–85 $formosior\ Aesone\ natus\ |\ illa\ luce\ fuit$; Maximian 1,17; A. Perutelli (1997) on Val. Fl. 7,108. Forma, mentioned with a fort recte> by T., should be restored in the text where it stood until it was ousted by «exaggerated respect for MS 'authority' – a dubious concept in this tradition» (E. J. Kenney, CR 57 (2007) 413).

(47) 7,160–162 congesta ... flamma tura liquefaciunt inductaque cornibus aurum uictima uota cadit

For *inductaque* several witnesses, e.g. B (ante corr.) F L, have *indutaque*, but here, the shorter form may not be due to negligence (it is corrected in M and U) but could be a deliberate change. *Inductaque* is confirmed by 10,271–272 pandis

inductae cornibus aurum | conciderant ictae ... iuuencae as a technical term; see *OLD*, p. 887, nr. 16.

(48) 7,232 carpsit et Euboica uiuax Anthedone gramen

 Ω has *carpsit*, but Heinsius preferred *carpit* from some MSS. The shorter form is reported from F and L, but the longer one is better, I think; it corresponds to *contribuere* in v. 231.

(49) 7,240 statuit aras e caespite binas

This is the reading of Ω , but N U and a few other witnesses, followed by Ehwald, have de which seems idiomatic where it indicates origin or cause (see Markland on Stat. Silv. 5,3,126) and where the metre allows it. 13,395 purpureum uiridi genuit de caespite florem is different, but Fa. 4,397 carpebant uiuax (d)e caespite gramen de is in Band a few 'recc.'; see, e. g. Culex 393 gramineam uiridi foderet de caespite terram and Pers. 6,73–74 de caespite uiuo | frange aliquid. 15,593, discussed in Myrtia, op. cit. 120, is a similar case: we should read de more, not e more.

(50) 7,320–321 nec mora, balatum mirantibus exsilit agnus lasciuitque fuga lactentiaque ubera quaerit.

In *Myrtia*, op. cit. 117, I argued that we should read *fugax* with Heinsius. The missing -x somehow survived in *fugam* (M N ante corr.). I should have pointed out that the v. l. *exiit*, for *exsilit* cited by Slater from N (man. 2) could also be listed as a case of «missing letters», though it may be a deliberate change, not an error caused by negligence. Incidentally, we should read *lactantiaque* (N B), not *lactentiaque* (Ω), as Glareanus made clear in his commentary: «*Lacto*, *i. e. lac praebeo. Lacteo*, *i. e. lac sugo.*» This is made clear by 6,342 *ubera ... ebiberant auidi lactantia nati.* The two passages support each other, and T. was wrong to print *lactentia* in both places, without any critical note. Ehwald and A. correctly print *lactantia*. On the other hand, *lacteo* is the proper verb in 10,227 and 13,547. The *OLD*, pp. 994–995, distinguishes *lactans* from *lactens*, but gives both forms the meanings «unweaned, sucking» *and* «full of milk». It correctly lists 6,342 under «full of milk» but puts 10,227 in the wrong place. The difference is fairly obvious.

(51) 7,365–367 Ialysios Telchinas, quorum oculos ipso uitiantes omnia uisu Iuppiter exosus fraternis subdidit undis.

The verb *uitiare* in the sense of *fascinare* is not totally surprising in this context, but the MSS. are divided between *uitiantes* (N B man. 2, v. 1.), *uitantes* (M B

man. 2, ex corr. F G ante corr. L), *mutantes* (U G man. 3, Plan.) and *minitantes* (B man. 1, ut vid., T. dub. ex coni.).

(52) 7,368 transit et antiquae Cartheia moenia Ceae

Several names of places mentioned in Bk. 7 of Ovid's *Met.* also occur in Book 4 of Pliny's *NH*. This may be coincidence, but it is possible that Pliny followed Ovid or that both used the same source. As far as the town of Carthaea on the island of Ceos (or Cea) is concerned, the adjective derived from the name should be *Carthaeius*, as restored by Hermolaus Barbarus on Pliny *NH* 4,12,2 (ed. Pozzi (1973) 269). Therefore, we should read *Carthaeia* in our passage and in 10,109 (for *Carthaea* or *Carcheia* or *Carchesia*). In *Her.* 19,221 *Carthaeiis* ... *nymphis* is possible by synizesis and should be considered the correct form, I think.

(53) 7,430–431 nullus Erecthidis fertur celebratior illo illuxisse dies

Read *Erectheidis* with E.J. Kenney who also restored *Achaeidos* for *Achaidos* in 7,504 (see below). Greek names often lost letters in this paradosis, e.g. in 4,190 and 669, etc. (see above) as well as in 10,162; 309; 14,87; 15,386, etc. (see below).

(54) 7,504 imperiumque peti totius Achaidos addit

This is a similar case; read *Achaeidos* (Aldina a. 1502, Kenney, in: *ClQu* 51 (2001) 546). The corresponding forms should be restored also in 3, 511; 5, 306; 577 and 15, 293 where the *-e-* is missing. *Acha(e)is* (sc. terra) seems to be a synonym of *Achaia*; cf. *Troas* or *Troias* (sc. *terra*) the region of Troy>, but also <a Trojan woman> (sc. *femina*). The *OLD*, p. 27 labels *Achais* a <poetic adjective> in 3,511; 5,306; 15,203 and a <poetic name for Greece> in 7,504 which complicates the issue, especially since the *OLD* also recognizes a form *Achaeias*, <Greek> in *Her.* 3,71 *inter Achaeidas longe pulcherrima matres.* Would it not make more sense to agree on a (poetic) adjective *Achaeis* or *Achaeias*, <Greek>?

(55) 7,649–651 qualesque in imagine somni uisus eram uidisse uiros, ex ordine tales aspicio noscoque.

In *Myrtia*, op. cit. 117–118, I have made a case for Heinsius' conjecture *agnoscoque*. To the parallels cited there one could add 7,494–495 *Aeacidae longo iuuenes post tempore uisum* | *agnouere tamen Cephalum* and 11,696–697 *uidi agnouique manusque* | *ad discedentem cupiens retinere tetendi.* In all three cases, if we accept Heinsius' change, a form of *uidere* is followed by a form of *agnoscere*.

(56) 8,567 Troezenius heros

 Ω has *Trozenius heros*; the missing -e- is supplied by W and Planudes. Cf. 6, 418 (discussed above); 15,296; 506.

(57) 8,816–819 protinus intrat sacrilegi thalamos altoque sopore solutum (noctis enim tempus) geminis amplectitur ulnis seque uiro inspirat

U (man. 3) P e n have alis for ulnis. In the last word of the line, -n- was omitted and a- was read for u- in the common ancestor of the witnesses. The medieval poet Gunther, Ligurinus 2,77–8 expansis hinc inde fideliter ulnis | amplecti, knew the authentic form of the line. At the beginning of 818 read (noctis erat tempus), as preserved in B e h g alii and accepted by Heinsius, not (noctis enim tempus) as transmitted in Ω . A similar case is 4, 330 (nescit quid sit amor), as preserved in U B F man. 4 G L e, not (nescit enim quid amor), as transmitted in E M N. We need the verb that was omitted by negligence, and enim, made unnecessary by the parenthesis, seems to be an interpolation.

(58) 9,65 cum ... fero movi linguam stridore bisulcam

Read probably *trisulcam* with Burman who found this reading in 6 MSS. He notes *(ita fere semper poetae de serpentibus)* and compares V. Ge. 3,439 arduus ad solem et linguis micat ore trisulcis. See also Apul. Met. 6,15 trisulca uibramina draconum. If trisulcam is, indeed, the original reading, the omission of a letter may have produced bisulcam in the last word of the line; on the other hand, trimay have been changed for metrical reasons by someone who was not familiar with Ovid's practice (muta cum liquida) does not lengthen the preceding syllable).

(59) 9,136–137 uictor ab Oechalia Cenaeo sacra parabat uota Ioui

Read *Caenaeo*, as proposed by Hermolaus Barbarus. The first -e was omitted. Something similar happened in [Sen.] *Herc. Oet.* 783 annosa fulgent templa *Cenaei Iovis* where the Etruscus has caenae Iovis which represents CAENAEI-IOVIS through wrong word separation and omission of -i. See also 102. In Plin. NH 4,5,18 Hermolaus Barbarus restored Caenites for Chenites (ed. G. Pozzi I (Padua 1973) 202).

(60) 9,211–212 ecce Lichan trepidum latitantem rupe cauata aspicit

We need *trepidum et* U B F L P W e. The reading of M N, accepted by the more recent editors, is a solecism, and *trepidus*, suggested by G. Liberman (*RPh* 78 (2004) 89), cannot, in my opinion, be applied to Hercules who remains the great hero to the end, while it is Lichas who trembles in fear and turns pale (214–215).

(61) 9,229–234 at tu, Iouis inclita proles, arboribus caesis quas ardua gesserat Oete inque pyram structis, arcum pharetramque capacem regnaque uisuras iterum Troiana sagittas ferre iubes Poeante satum, quo flamma ministro est

subdita

Read *uersuras* for *uisuras* with Heinsius whose conjecture is mentioned by A. in the app. crit. What we need is not a form of *uidere* (which seems a bit weak) but of *uertere* in the sense of *euertere*, <to overturn, ruin> (*OLD*, p. 2043, nr. 5), <simplex pro composito>. The letter -r- was lost, and -i- was read for -e-. Cf. 13,169 quid dubitas ingentem euertere Troiam? 623–624 non tamen euersam Troiae cum moenibus esse | spem quoque fata sinunt; Fa. 1,523 victa tamen vinces eversaque, Troia, resurges; Her. 1,24; ex P. 2,1,37; V. Aen. 2,365; Manil. 4,563 nunc statuet, nunc idem moenia uertet: Stat. Theb. 1,262–263 exscinde Mycenas, | uerte solo Sparten. In 4,131 (see above) ut ... locum et uisa cognoscit in arbore formam, Heinsius preferred uersam, found in o and some other witnesses, while Postgate suggested uersa. At the end of v. 233 in the passage we are dealing with, est is only preserved in M U, it seems, while most other witnesses, followed by A., leave it out, but we definitely need it.

(62) 9,344–345 uidi guttas e flore cruentas decidere et tremulo ramos horrore moueri

Read probably *de flore*, a reading which Heinsius reports from a Vaticanus and one of his MSS. See above on 1,739. It seems that *de* became *e* more than once in this paradosis; see my note on 15,593 in *Myrtia*, op. cit. 120; see also *Her.* 13,103; *Am.* 3,2,14. One would expect *de* with *decidere*, but *Fa.* 2,350 *e summo decidit ille toro* metre allows only *e* and Cic. *Sen.* 71 writes *poma ex arboribus decidunt* without metrical constraints. But Livy uses *de* in 40,59,8 *decidit de mensa*. It seems that both *e* and *de* are possible, but Ovid seems to have a preference for *de*, if the metre permits it.

(63) 9,451–453 filia Maeandri totiens redeuntis eodem cognita Cyanee praestanti corpora forma, Byblida cum Cauno, prolem est enixa gemellam.

Read praestantia (M ante corr. S, Riese), because the ablative with praesto expresses the nature of the superiority, as in Hor. Sat. 2, 4, 7 facie praestant; cf. 10, 562–3 nec dicere posses | laude pedum formaene bono praestantior esset; 15, 130 uictima labe carens et praestantissima forma; TLL s.v. \(\praestantistima \) Incidentally, the phrase is proleptic and does not refer to \(Cyanee \), as Breitenbach (Artemis 1958) translated, but to her twins, as v. Albrecht (Reclam 1994) understood. We should make this clear by placing (with Anderson and other editors, but not Tarrant) a comma after \(Cyanee \):

Cyanee, praestantia corpora forma, Byblida cum Cauno, prolem est enixa gemellam.

(64) 9,568–570 deque suis unum famulis pudibunda uocauit et paulum blandita 'fer has, fidissime, nostro' dixit et adiecit longo post tempore 'fratri'.

For fer has M S L (ante corr.) have feras, an error which was corrected by Daniel Heinsius from some MSS. It was caused by the omission of h and by wrong word division. The true reading was then discovered in other MSS. (N U B F P and in L as a correction). In the same line, Ω has pauidum for paulum (only in W and in the Ed. Gryph., it seems), and this was accepted by A., although blandiri requires the dative. In this case, the longer word seems to be wrong (unless pauidum can be taken = pauide), but in 6,327 restitit et pauido 'faueas mihi' murmure where it is the reading of B F G L (the other witnesses are divided between paulo and paruo) it must be right.

(65) 10,143–144 tale nemus uates attraxerat inque ferarum concilio medius turba uolucrumque sedebat.

In my review of Tarrant's edition in *Exemplaria Classica* 9 (2005) 263 I have argued that we should read *turbae* with the Vat. Lat. 5179 (s. XIII), Bentley and Heinsius and punctuate *concilio*, *medius turbae*, *uolucrumque* with Bentley and Wakefield. We have to construe as follows: *uates in concilio ferarum et uolucrum*, *medius turbae*, *sedebat*. For *medius* c. gen. cf. 8,182 *qui medius Nixique genu est Anguemque tenentis* where all MSS agree. The genitive has been introduced by Heinsius in 2,31–32 *inde loci* ($loco\ \Omega$) *medius rerum nouitate pauentem* | *Sol oculis iuuenem quibus aspicit omnia uidit* and proposed by me (op. cit. 267) in 13,780–781 *huc ferus ascendit Cyclops mediusque resedit* | *lanigerae pecudis* (*-es* Ω) *nullo ducente secutae*; this reading has now been found in the Turonensis 879, as Antonio Ramírez de Verger very kindly informs me. See also *Fa.* 5,67–68 *et*

medius iuuenum non indignantibus ipsis | ibat; OLD, p. 1091 (3). See Ex. Class., op. cit. 57–58.

(66) 10,162 te quoque, Amyclide, posuisset in aethere Phoebus

Read *Amyclaide* with Unger; cf. 4,1 *Minyeias* (M man. 2., Scaliger, Heinsius: *minyas* vel *mineias* vel similia Ω); 14, 87 *Acheloiadumque* (U ex corr. W, Constant. Fanensis et Naugerius ex coni.: *Acheloiadumque* Ω); 15,386 *Cythereiadasque* (b man. 2 k man. 2, Constant. Fanensis et Naugerius ex coni.); T., pp. 483; 486; 490.

(67) 10,309 Panchaia tellus

Read probably *Panchaica* (N ut vid. L P T W v). In 478 both A. and T. print *Panchaea* ... rura. In Culex 87 the MSS. vary between *Panchaia*, *Pancheia* and *Panchasia*. Oudendorp (on Apul. De Deo Socr., p. 702; De Mundo, p. 368) explains *Panchaia* as *«gentile pro possessivo poetarum more»*. See also V. Ge. 2,139; Lygdamus 3,2,23 and Bömer on Met. 10,309.

(68) 10,595–596 haud aliter quam cum super atria uelum candida purpureum simulatas inficit umbras

In my article in *Myrtia* (p. 119) I made a case for the reading *simul et dat et inficit umbras* which Heinsius cites from the <Primus Moreti> and seven other MSS. I would like to add that it is also found in the Trier fragment and that the phrase *dare umbras* occurs 5,590–591; 15,564; *Am.* 1,12,19; see *TLL 5,1,1683,39–40*.

(69) 10,638 iam solitos poscunt cursus populusque paterque

In his edition, with a German verse translation, H. Breitenbach (Artemis 1958) proposed patresque for paterque, a striking improvement (I think) which no one seems to have noticed. It is the formula SENATUS POPULUSQUE in poetic form; cf. 15,486–487 exstinctum Latiaeque nurus populusque patresque | defleuere Numam; Lucilius fr. 1229 populusque patresque. Similarly, in 15,572–573 we ought to read seu laetum est, patribus laetum populoque Quirini, | siue minax, mihi sit with Bentley (on Hor. Carm. 3,6,20) for patriae laetum. In 10,638 Ovid projects contemporary Roman customs into the mythical past, as he often does. Cf. also 15,645 where the Roman envoys negotiate with the Senate of Epidaurus: concilium Graiosque patres adiere.

(70) 10,640

For *Cytherea* we should probably read *Cythereia*, as in 717; 4,190 (see above, and see also above on 4,669, etc.

(71) 10,696–697 sacra retorserunt oculos, turritaque Mater an Stygia sontes dubitauit mergeret unda

First, we ought to read *signa* for *sacra*, following the excellent suggestion by G. Liberman (*RPh* 78 (2004) 80). Second, as I pointed out in my review of Tarrant's edition (op. cit. 264), we ought to follow the lost Caesenas and the extant p (reported by A., but not by T.) in reading *Stygiis* ... *undis*. Ovid uses both sg. (e.g. 11,500) and pl. forms (e.g. 2,101), but here, the pl. is more likely, because *Stygiis* could easily have lost its final -s before *sontes*; then the remaining form was changed to *Stygia*, and *undis* was adjusted. Or else the ending of *undis*, the last word of the line, was not clearly legible, and the scribe of an early copy opted for *unda*, whereupon *Stygiis* had to be adjusted.

(72) 10,717 *Cytherea*

Read Cythereia; see above on 640; 4,190.

(73) 11,361–362 Nereides Nereusque tenent [sc. templa] (hos nauita templi edidit esse deos, dum retia litore siccat).

I was dealing with this passage in *Ex. Class.*, op. cit. 59–60, proposing *templis* for *templi*. It seems that the last word of the line lost its last letter. Heinsius had suggested *templo*. Many witnesses have *ponti* which is an interpolation. We must imagine two temples, one for Nereus, the other for the Nereids (see 359).

(74) 11,446–447 sed neque propositos pelagi dimittere cursus nec uult Alcyonen in partem adhibere pericli

Alcyone insists on accompanying Ceyx on his sea voyage, and he almost gives in to her, but then he decides to go alone, after all – never to return alive. For *uult*, Heinsius found *tulit* in a Mediceus which sounded better to him (*numerosius*) and which would fit very well; cf. 13,460 *scilicet haud ulli seruire Polyxena ferrem* (*uellem* M N B F G T); *Her.* 5,12 and Heins./Burm. on 16,155; 157. The forms *uult* and *tulit* look reasonably alike in some scripts, and the shorter form could be seen as a corruption of the longer one. Two lines later, the last word of the line seems to have lost its last letter in part of the paradosis:

multa ... respondit timidum solantia pectus, non tamen idcirco causam probat; addidit illis hoc quoque lenimen

where M F G L have *illi* (but the pronoun refers to *multa*).

(75) 11,608–609 ianua ne uerso stridorem cardine reddat, nulla domo tota est.

This is from the description of the residence of Somnus. There is not a single door in it, in order to avoid the creaking sound of turning hinges. This must be the meaning. The translation of F.J. Miller (1916) avoids the problem: «There is no door in all the house, lest some hing should creak», but this makes cardo, not ianua, the subject. T.'s text, printed above, follows Ω , while A. prints the version offered by N (man. 2 F (man. 2) e h, nec ... reddit). Both versions seem to me awkward. How can a non-existent door make a sound? And how does nec ... reddit fit into the period? Read quae ... reddat with the Lausannensis, s. XII ex. and 8 of Heinsius' MSS. For some reason quae (perhaps abbreviated or written que) became ne.

(76) 11,712–715 dumque moratur ibi dumque 'hic retinacula soluit, hoc mihi discedens dedit oscula litore' dicit dumque notata locis reminiscitur acta fretumque prospicit

Alcyone has gone to the sea shore early in the morning, and Ovid tells us what she does just before she sees her husband's body floating on the waves. Vv. 712–714 have been deleted by Korn and Merkel, v. 714 alone at one time by Heinsius who later changed his mind, reading notata oculis with Ω (notata locis, reported from M, was also the reading of S, it seems) and changing acta to ante. This makes sense, I think; cf. 3,594–595 flectere et Oleniae sidus pluuiale Capellae | Taygetenque Hyadasque oculis Arctonque notaui; 15,660 perspice et usque nota uisu (uisum codd. nonn.), ut cognoscere possis (and Burman ad loc.), and ante (also considered by Burman) is supported, as Madvig (Adv. Crit. 2,6) saw, by Quint. Inst. Or. 11,2,17 cum in loca aliqua post tempus reuersi sumus, ... etiam quae in his fecerimus reminiscimur personaeque subeunt.

(77) 12,25–26 et sunt qui parcere Troiae Neptunum credant, quia moenia fecerat urbi.

In M N U the first hand wrote *urbi* which was corrected in all three witnesses to *urbis*, and F L P W p alii offer the corrected reading (a prima manu), (fort. recte) (T.). *Urbi* has been explained as (dativus commodi), but the genitive seems to be idiomatic in such a context; cf. 15,770 nunc male defensae confundant moenia Troiae; sometimes an adjective takes the place of the genitive, as in 13,176 Lyrnesia moenia; 14,253 Circaea ad moenia, etc. An original -s was lost at the end of the line. Perhaps we should also read fecerit (Heinsius) for fecerat.

(78) 12,139–140 quem super impulsum resupino corpore Cycnum ui multa uertit terraeque adflixit Achilles.

For adflixit (M N ante corr. S F L) Ω offers adflixit. There is a difference between affligere (sc. terrae), dash to the ground and affligere dix, attach. In our passage adflixit is confirmed by 14,206 (vidi) ter quarter adfligit sociorum corpora terrae (see Myrtia 21 (2006) 119); [Sen.] Oct. 685; Sil. It. 7,613. Forms of affligere are required in 4,553 or 12,387 where there are no vv. ll. It seems that, in our passage, L was lost between F and L

(79) 12,277–279 (ferrum), quod forcipe curua cum faber eduxit lacubus demittit; at illud stridet et in tepida submersum sibilat unda.

Read *trepida* U B ante corr. F P Bernensis 345 (s. XIII), Heins. Whether the water into which the blacksmith plunges the red-hot iron is lukewarm or not seems irrelevant. Ovid, like V. Ge. 1,296 (cited by Heins. ad loc.) describes the trembling surface of the water at this moment. See also G. Liberman on Val. Fl. 5,430 trepidum globus ibat in amnem who translates «vers les eaux inquiètes». The word lost an r between t and e. I wonder whether T.'s punctuation would not be improved by inserting a comma after eduxit (sc. ex igni), as A. does, and placing a comma (not a semicolon) after demittit.

(80) 12,327–328 uidi ego Petraeum conantem tollere terra glandiferam quercum

Read probably euellere N man. 2 U P W, Aldina prima, Heinsius. The Ed. Romana of 1471, followed by Merkel, printed uellere, but cf. 341–342 ultor adest Aphareus saxumque e monte reuulsum | mittere conatur; 356 solidoque reuellere fundo | annosam pinum mango molimine temptat where the readings dumo and terra seem to have pushed out an original fundo (Wakefield; see Liberman in: RPh 78 (2004) 83–84). Ovid seems to use reuellere in the same sense of euellere when it is convenient metrically; for euellere cf. also Liv. 33,5,7 arborem ... euellebant. In our passage, the first three letters of euellere were probably omitted after -em, and the rest was read as tollere in the main tradition. Vellere in the Ed. Romana may be a conjecture.

(81) 12,536–538 haec inter Lapithas et semihomines Centauros proelia Tlepolemus Pylio referente dolorem praeteriti Alcidae tacito non pertulit ore

Read *placido* ... *ore* with N ante corr. (ut vid.), the Laurentianus 36.14, the \langle prior Strozzae \rangle (= s), the \langle primus Moreti \rangle and others. M ante corr. has *pacico* which preserves the initial p-. Tlepolemus is resentful that his father, Hercules, was not

given due credit by Nestor in his narrative, and his anger shows on his face. For placido ore cf. 3,146–147; 8,703; 11,282; 15,693 (of Asclepius) placido ... uultu; Fa. 4,661; 5,23, etc. Another view is presented by Bömer ad loc. and by McKeown on Am. 1,7,21–22, but to me it seems that placido lost the l between p and a and that pacido first became pacico and then, by interpolation, tacito.

(82) 13,58–60 quem ...

prodere rem Danam finxit fictumque probavit

crimen et ostendit quod iam praefoderat aurum.

Odysseus accused Palamedes of a crime that he had not committed and produced for the Greeks as evidence the gold that he had buried beforehand himself. Read clam for iam with Burman. The idea of iam is expressed in the prefix prae-, and clam fits Odysseus' actions very well; see, e.g. infra 103–104 quo tamen haec Ithaco, qui clam, qui semper inermis | rem gerit et furtis incautum decipit hostem? see also supra 32;60–61 and Hygin. Fab. 105. It seems that clam lost its initial c and l was read as i.

(83) 13,85–86 hunc (sc. Hectora) ego sanguineae successu caedis ovantem eminus ingenti resupinum pondere fudi.

Ajax recalls one of his heroic deeds. We need *comminus*. This is the word that Heinsius found in some of his MSS. and this is what Plan. translates. Prefixes are often unreliable in this paradosis, and in this case, the prefix at the beginning of the line may have become illegible.

(84) 13, 231–233 nec Telamoniades etiam nunc hiscere quidquam audet; at ausus erat reges incessere dictis Thersites etiam, per me haud impune, proteruis.

Audet at is the reading of o and the Hauniensis 2009, it seems, and Plan. translates it. M U and others have audeat, B G T and others have audet ut, a few witnesses offer audet et, and Heinsius proposed ausit, at. Looking at all the evidence, audet at seems to be the most plausible reading, because it explains the others. It appears that AVDETAT became AVDEAT through the loss of T between E and A, and the division between the words was not recognized.

(85) 13,439–440 litore Threicio classem religarat Atrides, dum mare pacatum, dum uentus amicior esset.

Read probably *placatum*. I have seen this reported as a variant but cannot find the source at the moment. At any rate, *placare* seems to be the proper verb, especially when divine intervention is implied. Forms of *placare* have been pushed out by forms of *pacare* because of a false metrical doctrine. Cf. 11,431–432 *quod socer*

Hippotades (i.e. Aeolus) tibi sit, qui carcere fortes | contineat uentos et, cum uelit, aequora placet; 15,723 aequore placato (pacato pars codd.) patrias Epidaurius aras | linquit (Aesculapius, in the form of the sacred snake, has just visited a sanctuary of his father, Apollo, because of rough weather). See below on 15,723 and Burman on Her. 10,65. In the same line, amicior has become mitior in h v through the loss of the initial a See also Burman on Ars 1,585.

(86) 13,471–472 genetrici corpus inemptum reddite, neue auro redimat ius triste sepulcri

The original reading has become *redimatis triste sepulchrum* in M and N ante corr. What happened is that REDIMATIVSTRISTE lost the V, the remaining letters were read as one word, and SEPVLCRI was adjusted accordingly. A similar case is 15,39 o cui ius caeli bis sex fecere labores (from Myscelos' prayer to Heracles) where Scaliger or Muretus brilliantly emended the reading of Ω cuius caelum. Here, CVIIVSCAELI lost an I, and the ending of the noun was changed to produce some sort of sense. On the <code>sequitivus</code> objectivus with ius see Bömer ad loc.

(87) 13,517–519 quid ... moror? quo me seruas, annosa senectus? quo, di crudeles, nisi uti noua funera cernam, uiuacem differtis anum?

This is from Hecuba's lament. For *annosa*, the Aldina of 1502 prints *damnosa*, and that reading, also found in the Gryphiana, appealed to Heinsius. Perhaps it was felt that *annosa* did not add anything to *senectus*, that it was, in fact, tautological. But it could express the idea of very old age. We find *annosa senecta* in 7,237; while *damnosa* could be supported by *Tr.* 3,7,35 where the metre confirms it; cf. also 5,2,11–12 *scilicet exiguis prodest damnosa uetustas:* | *grandibus accedunt tempore damna malis*, where the context confirms it. *Damnosus* seems to be rare in epic poetry. Ovid uses it in the *Met.* in 8,215; 10,707; 11,376, but with other nouns (see Dewar on Claud. *VI Cons. Honor.* 297 and cf. also Manil. 1, 115; Stat. *Silv.* 4,3,163). One could argue that, in our passage, *damnosa* lost its *d-*, but I see no need for the change.

(88) 13,706–707 Creten tenuere; locique ferre diu nequiere Iouem

For *Iouem* M and W man. 3 have *Iuem* which makes no sense. *IOUEM* lost its *O*, and *I* was read as *L*. See Galán on Mart. 7,36,1.

(89) 13,793–794 solibus hibernis, aestiua gratior umbra, nobilior palma, platano conspectior alta

The Cyclops is praising Galatea's beauty. Palma was suggested by Siebelis for pomis (Ω) and accepted by T. It is certainly better than pomis, printed by Ehwald and A., but I suspect that what Ovid wrote is palmis, preserved in a Berolinensis. The word lost the l, and pamis became pomis. The change from sg. to pl. is no problem; cf., e.g., plumis in v. 796. In his useful commentary on Book XIII (London 1929, repr. 1948) Ch. Simmons, building on Madvig's $mobilior\ damma$, suggested $mobilior\ flamma$.

(90) 13,805 et, quod praecipue uellem tibi demere possem

B F W have *posse*. The last word of the line lost its last letter. Other variants, clearly wrong, are *possum* and *possim*. See Heinsius and McKeown on Am. 2,7,11–12. On the sequence *vellem* ... *possem* see Simmons' note on 13,462.

(91) 13,865–866 uiscera uiua traham diuisaque membra per agros perque tuas spargam (sic se tibi misceat!) undas.

Read divulsaque (N man. 2 U man. 2 B F P h v, \(\) fort. recte\(\) T.); cf. Tr. 3,9,27. DIV-VLSAQUE lost a V, and L was read as I. In the following line, sic appears as si in N man. 1 U B man. 1 F P corr. SIC lost its last letter before S- in part of the paradosis. See Galán on Mart. 7,89,4.

(92) 13,890–891 tum moles tacta dehiscit, uiuaque per rimas proceraque surgit harundo.

For tacta Heins. found fracta in MSS., and this reading was accepted by Gierig (fort. recte>T.). Other possibilities are iacta (o, Plan., Glarean ex coni., ut vid., Heins. ex codd.) or icta (Burm. ex 4 codd. Heinsii). Tracta (Canonic. VII, man. pr.), taetra (Merkel, 2nd ed.) and tota (Hardie) are, perhaps, less plausible, though tracta is very attractive, as Robinson Ellis (cited by Simmons ad loc.) pointed out. He added: «It is very difficult to imagine an original fracta becoming either tracta or tacta». It seems to me that 12,487–488 plaga facit gemitus ut corpore marmoris icti | fractaque dissiluit percusso lamina callo can be used to support fracta, although the text is uncertain, too, and we probably should read with H.A. Koch ceu uerbera marmoris icti.

(93) 13,920–921 ante tamen mortalis eram, sed scilicet altis deditus aequoribus, iam tum exercebar in illis.

Bentley objected to *deditus* and suggested *debitus*, but what we need, in my opinion, is *creditus* (see my review of Tarrant's edition in *ExClass* 9 (2005) 267); cf. 900–901 *Scylla redit* (neque enim medio se credere ponto | audet); 2,378 fit noua Cycnus auis nec se caeloque Iouique | credit; 4,627–628 iamque cadente die ueritus se credere nocti | constitit ...; 14,221–222 tu quoque pande tuos, comitum gratissime, casus | et ducis et turbae, quae tecum est credita ponto; Sen. HF 152 with M. Billerbeck's note. In his note, Ch. Simmons defends Bentley's conjecture by referring to 13,54 debita Troianis ... spicula fatis and Hor.Carm. 1,14,16, but he also cites Robinson Ellis who remained doubtful: «The conjecture [debitus] cannot be thought certain. See my note on *Ibis* 30, and Birt on *Halieut*. p. 31». If we read *creditus* instead, we have to assume that *cr*- at the beginning of the first word of a line became *d*- which is not improbable at all.

(94) 14,88 Acheloiadum ... reliquit
Sirenum scopulos

Acheloiadum is preserved in U man. 3 and W; the correct form was also found by Const. Fanensis and Naugerius by conjecture. Ω has Acheloidumque. The name lost a letter. Cf. above on 4,668–669 and 10,162 and see below on 15,500.

(95) 14,130–132 'nec dea sum' dixit 'nec sacri turis honore humanum dignare caput. neu nescius erres, lux aeterna mihi carituraque fine dabatur'

Neu lost its last letter and appears as ne in part of the paradosis (M N U h). Neu and neue often introduce a final clause which precedes the main clause; cf. 16–18; 32–35; 759–766; Staffhorst on ex P. 3,3,45. Editors who print neu should not begin a new period, as T. does, but separate caput and neu by a comma, as in A.'s Teubneriana.

(96) 14,158–159 hic quoque substiterat per taedia longa laborum Neritius Macareus, comes experientis Ulixis.

M h have *per* which T. prints, most other MSS. have *post* which was adopted by Heins., Merkel and A. It appears that *POST* lost its *-T* before the *T-* of *TAEDIA*, and the meaningless *POS* became *PER*.

(97) 14,204–206

mentique inhaeret imago temporis illius quo uidi bina meorum ter quater affligi sociorum corpora terrae

I have dealt with this passage in $Myrtia\ 21\ (2006)\ 199-120$ and explained the form affigi found in MW through the loss of L between F and I. While here most MSS. have the correct form, the opposite is true in 12, 138–9 $Cycnum\ |\ ui\ multa\ uerrit\ terraeque\ afflixit\ Achilles\ where\ only\ L\ and\ a\ few\ other\ witnesses\ preserve\ the\ correct\ reading, but\ most\ witnesses\ have\ affixit\ See\ above\ and\ see\ also\ Drakenborch\ on\ Sil.\ It.\ 1,674;7,613.\ In\ v.\ 205\ read\ probably\ uiua\ (U\ P)\ for\ bina.$

(98) 14,261–263 ad dominam ducunt. pulchro sedet illa recessu sollemni solio pallamque induta nitentem insuper aurato circumuelatur amictu.

The main paradosis is about equally divided between *sollemni* (M N man. 1 F G) and *sublimi* (N v.l. U ante corr. B P). Both A. and T. print *sollemni*, but a case could be made for *sublimis* (U corr.), following J.B. Hall. Cf. 6,650 *ipse sedens solio Tereus sublimis auito*; 11,610 at medio torus est ebeno (ebeni Heins.) sublimis in antro; Her. 12,179 Tyrio iaceat sublimis in ostro; Lucan 5,16 Lentulus e celsa sublimis sede profatur. It seems that sublimis lost its -s before solio and that sublimi was read as sollemni in the ancestor of M N F G.

(99) 14,389–391 pennas in corpore uidit seque nouam subito Latiis accedere siluis indignatus auem

 Ω and Plan. have *latis* for *Latiis* (B FT h k) which lost an *I* after the *T* in the broad textual tradition. Cf. 326 *Latiis* (U man. 1 B F P: *latis* M N ante corr. G h: *altis* U man. 2); 422 *Latios* (Heins ex 4 suis: *latos* Ω , Plan.); 15,742 *de Latia* G h v: *delata* Ω).

(100) 14,431–432 luctibus extremum tenues liquefacta medullas tabuit inque leues paulatim euanuit auras.

Read probably *teneras* (N corr. U P W) for *tenues*; cf. Am. 3,10,27, but see McKeown on 2,14,41–42. Tener is close enough to mollis (Catull. 45,16), it seems.

(101) 14,487 *Cytherea*

Read probably Cythereia; see above on 4,190; 669.

(102) 14,557 Naides

Read probably *Naiades* (M N W); cf. 786; T., p. 490; but see also Housman, CP 490.

(103) 15,39 o cui ius caeli bis sex fecere labores

This is Muretus' (or Scaliger's) emendation of CVIVSCAELUM (Ω). See above on 13,471–472. The corruption was caused by three factors: (1) omission of a letter; (2) wrong word division; (3) wrong ending interpolated to establish some sort of sense.

(104) 15,148–149 iuuat terris et inerti sede relicta nube uehi ualidique umeris insistere Atlantis.

According to Bömer ad loc., there are no parallels to ualidus Atlas. One is tempted to read ualidisque (n and Ehwald's Gothanus I); cf. 12,515–516 robora duris | fert umeris; V. Aen. 9,634 umeris ... fortibus. On the other hand, V. writes Aen. 4,247 latera ardua cernit | Atlantis duri caelum qui uertice fulcit and Val. Fl. 5,409 calls Atlas ferreus (see G. Liberman (2002) ad loc.). Hence, we probably have to accept the lack of parallels and leave the text as it is. Ovid may have wished to avoid the sequence ualidisque umeris.

(105) 15,225 inde ualens ueloxque fuit spatiumque iuuentae

I thought of *fugit* for the awkward *fuit*, but this was already proposed by Farnaby (1650), also quoted by Jahn (1832), as G. Liberman pointed out to me. See MH 64 (2007) 118–119.

(106) 15,277–278 et Mysum capitisque sui ripaeque prioris paenituisse ferunt

Only a few witnesses (e man. 2 h n and an Ambrosianus) preserve *et Mysum*; most MSS. have *emissum*. This error cannot be explained by a simple omission of one or several letters; it also involves a Greek name and wrong word division. Incidentally, *caput* is not = *fons*, but = *os*; cf. *Tr.* 3,10,28; Lucan 3,202 *multifidi Peucen unum caput adluit Histri*; Bömer on our passage.

(107) 15,281–282 ante bibebatur, nunc quas contingere nolis fundit Anigros aquas

Read bibebantur (sc. aquae) with Heins. and Burm. ex codd. Most editors seem to take Anigros as the subject, but surely the subject is aquae in the following line.

(108) 15,296 est prope Pittheam tumulus Troezena

The form found in Ω is *Trozena*, the *-e-* having been lost. It is corrected in W n and other witnesses. Cf. 506; 8,567 where the shorter form is found in Ω and the correct name is owed to single witnesses or to Planudes. A. and T. record no

variants for 6,418 but other editors report *trezen* from M and N a prima manu, ut vid. See above.

(109) 332 est locus Arcadiae (Pheneon dixere priores)

Here, we have two cases of missing letters next to each other. Before Heinsius who introduced *Arcadiae* from U (it seems) and others (nothing in A. and T.), the vulgate had *Arcadia*. The name *Pheneon* was also restored by Heinsius (ex tribus) and from Planudes. *Pheneum*, probably the conjecture of a humanist, is found in a few witnesses and in the Aldina prima. The main tradition offers *Phenum*.

(110) 15,386 Cythereiadasque

The proper form was introduced by Constant. Fanensis and Naugerius (perhaps independently); it is also found (a manu secunda) in b and in k. Heinsius discovered it in a Cantabrig. and the Laurent. 36.14. The main tradition has *Cythereidasque*. Cf. 6, 414 *Pelopeiadasque*; 7,430; 10,162 *Amyclaide*; 14,87 *Acheloiadumque*.

(111) 15,475 nec formidatis ceruos inludite pennis

Read includite (B F G P T p v, Plan.); see Myrtia 21 (2006) 120. To the parallels cited add Lucan 4, 437–438 sic, dum pauidos formidine ceruos | claudat odoratae metuentes aera pinnae. In Ovid we should also read pinnis for pennis, as found in G (teste Bach) and introduced by Heinsius from Grattius and Nemesian; cf. Sen. De Clem. 1,12,5; Dial. 4,11,5, etc.

(112) 15,498 credulitate patris, sceleratae fraude nouercae

We need et after sceleratae, as preserved in U man. 3W and other witnesses, e.g. h n, Canon. VII, Plan. Hippolytus' tragedy is caused both by Phaedra's deceit and by Theseus' naïve acceptance of it; this combination of causes is presented by the poet in the form of a hysteron proteron. It seems that ET was omitted after -E and before F-.

(113) 15,500 *Pasiphaeia*

The correct form is found in a few MSS. It was introduced by Naugerius ex coni. See above on 14,87 and 15,386 etc. Ω has *Pasipheia*.

(114) 15,593 e more

Read de more from two of Magnus' MSS. See Myrtia, op. cit. 120. I suspect the loss of d before e in other passages as well: 1,739; 7,240; 681; 9,344. Mos priscus

is equivalent to *mos maiorum*; see V. Aen. 11,142; Dewar (1996) on Claudian, VI Cons. Honorii, v. 136.

(115) 15,641–642 iussa dei prudens postquam accepere senatus, quam colat explorant iuuenis Phoebeius urbem

The plural *explorant* (U man. 3 P W v «castigatiores» Heinsii) is required with *senatus* («constructio ad sensum») as shown by *accepere*. The *-n-* is missing in the majority of witnesses. Cf. 2,688; 12,53.

(116) 15,685 tum gradibus nitidis delabitur

Here the majority is right, and *elabitur* is only reported from W h v by A. *De*- is necessary, for the sacred snake glides down over the steps in front of the temple of Epidaurus. Cf. 15,593; 7212; 4,495; V. *Aen.* 5,86; 7,349.

(117) 15,723 *aequore placato*

The form *pacato* is found in F man. 2 and 16 MSS. inspected by Heins. who gave it preference, as did Edwards in his edition (1894, 2nd ed. 1905). Here, *placatum aequor* forms a contrast to *asper pontus* (720). It is also implied that Aesculapius, in the form of the snake, interrupts his trip to intercede with his father, Apollo, to provide smooth sailing for the rest of his voyage to Italy. In other passages, one has to decide between forms of *pacare* and *placare*. The latter verb seems to have been avoided by a certain school of scribes for metrical reasons; it was assumed that *pl*- lengthens the preceding syllable in Ovid which is not the case. In 11,432 *quod socer Hippotades tibi sit, qui carcere fortes* | *contineat uentos et, cum uelit, aequora placet*, no v. l. *pacet* seems to be reported; and in 13,440 *dum mare pacatum, dum uentus amicior esset* there is no indication of a v. l. *placatum*. Heinsius compared *Her.* 10,65 to support *pacato* in our passage, and one could also cite *Tr.* 1,2,73–74 *ut mare subsidat ventisque ferentibus utar* | *et mihi pacatis* (nescio quis: *ut mihi parcatis.*(codd.)), *num minus exul ero?*; Liv. 24,8,15; 28,4,3; Veg. *Epit.* 4,31,1. See A. Ramírez de Verger, in: *Collection Latomus* XIII (Bruxelles 2006) 330.

(118) 15,742–743 huc se de Latia pinu Phoebeius anguis contulit

The correct reading has survived in G h v; most MSS. have se delata pinu. See above on 14,390.

(119) 15,755–756

Mithridateisque tumentem

nominibus Pontum

The vulgate before Naugerius had *Mithridatisque* or *Metridatisque*; the correct form is also found, before Heinsius, in the Ed. Bersmanniana. Naugerius who wrote accomplished Latin verse realized that the metre required one more syllable, in this case, one more letter.

(120) 15,803–804 tum uero Cytherea manu percussit utraque pectus.

Read probably *Cythereia*; cf. 816; 4,190; 10,640; 14,487. But editors are not unanimous. See, e.g., *Her.* 16,241; *Ars* 2,15; 607; 3,43 (where A. Ramírez de Verger prints *Cytherea*); *Fa.* 4,673 and Bömer on 3,611 *Cythereius heros*.

(121) 15,813–814 inuenies illic incisa adamante perenni fata tui generis

We should probably read *inclusa*, following B F U man. 3 h k. *Includere* means <to incorporate in a document> (*OLD*, p. 870 [8a]); cf. Cic. *Catil.* 1,4 *inclusum in tabulis*; Aug. *Anc.* 2,21 *nomen meum ... inclusum est in Saliare Carmen.* On the other hand, since the material (*adamante*) is mentioned, *incisa* may be better; cf. *CE* 965,2 (a. 10 AD) *incisum et duro nomen erit lapide*; Claudian. *Bell. Gild.* 202 *uoces* [sc. *Iouis*] *adamante notabat* | *Atropos*.

Correspondence: Georg Luck Department of Classics Johns Hopkins University Baltimore, Maryland, 21218–2685 ghbluck@jhu.edu