

More missing letters in Ovid's Metamorphoses

Autor(en): **Luck, Georg**

Objekttyp: **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): **66 (2009)**

Heft 2

PDF erstellt am: **15.05.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-98982>

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.

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 efferuere caelo*

Here, L and U (man. 3) have *feruere*, and A.E. Housman suggested *ecferuere*; 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, *feruere* never appears in Ovid, and *efferuere*, 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.

(3) 1,739 *fugiunt e corpore saetae*

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 conl., 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 | et colus et fusi (N B G) digitis cecidere remissis*; 6,706 *pauidam ... metu*; 9,248–249 *ne pectora uano | 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 <iunctura> *dies hominis* 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 v₃ (= 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*
 Naiades 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 *tyrrhena e* 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 hederæ 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 M P U (?) 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 uolucrum 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.

(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 *-eiūs, -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* (*emittitur* vel *emittitur* 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 added> see *OLD* s.v. 15(a).

- (25) 4,443–446 *errant exsanguis sine corpore et ossibus umbrae,*
 parsque forum celebrant, pars imi tecta tyranni,
 pars aliquas artes, antiquae imitamina uitae
 <...>
 [*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
eiecat flammamque ferox uomit ore Typhoeus.*

Some editors read *eructat* in M (man.1 in ras.), and this is Heinsius’ conjecture for *eiecat* (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 eiecatantemque 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 eiecant* and Stat. *Silu.* 3,3,89 *quidquid ab auriferis eiecat 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, flammās*): 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, whereas 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, | obrutaeque 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 Hennaëis 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 atos*. 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. <*propior*>. 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. Håkanson, *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 Nyctei da 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 ei aculatus in altum*
emicat

Again, it is not clear from T.'s apparatus, that *seque ei aculatus* is only preserved in a small part of Ω , viz. M (?) B e (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 lustrō,*
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), *uolucrumque sedebat*; 13,780–781 *huc ferus ascendit Cyclops mediusque resedit | lanigeræ 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 *pauido* 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* (U [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 *subuectaque* (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 upstream [*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*
oraeque deuolat miserae pudibunda sororis
amplexumque petit

Heinsius (on *Her.* 14, 69) preferred *amplexuque* (ex 1, 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 parau;
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* (Ω, 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* (Ω). 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* 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 handsome. 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. l.), *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 con.).

(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 Erectheidis 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 *Aeacidæ 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 *Troezenius 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, *tri-* may 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 Cenario sacra parabat*
 uota Ioui

Read *Caenario*, as proposed by Hermolaus Barbarus. The first *-e* was omitted. Something similar happened in [Sen.] *Herc. Oet.* 783 *annosa fulgent templa Cenario 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 eversaue, 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 Mycenae, | 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 decedit 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. <praesto>. 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 *turbæ* with the Vat. Lat. 5179 (s. XIII), Bentley and Heinsius and punctuate *concilio, medius turbæ, uolucrumque* with Bentley and Wakefield. We have to construe as follows: *uates in concilio ferarum et uolucrum, medius turbæ, 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 Ω) 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 | lanigeræ pecudis (-es Ω) nullo ducente secutæ*; 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. : *Acheloidumque* 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 *extinctum 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 fontes dubitavit 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 Caesenae and the extant p (reported by A., but not by T.) in reading *Stygius* ... *undis*. Ovid uses both sg. (e.g. 11,500) and pl. forms (e.g. 2,101), but here, the pl. is more likely, because *Stygius* could easily have lost its final -s before *fontes*; 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 *Stygius* 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 siccant).

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 paradox:

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 notauit*; 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 *adfixit*. There is a difference between *affligere* (sc. *terrae*), ‘dash to the ground’ and *affigere* ‘fix, attach’. In our passage *adflixit* is confirmed by 14,206 (*vidi ter quarter adfligi sociorum corpora terrae* (see *Myrtia* 21 (2006) 119); [Sen.] *Oct.* 685; Sil. It. 7,613. Forms of *affigere* 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 *I*.

- (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 Pyllo referente dolorem
praeteriti Alcidae tacito non pertulit ore*

Read *placido ... ore* with N ante corr. (ut vid.), the Laurentianus 36.14, the ‘prior Strozzae’ (= s), the ‘primus Moreti’ 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.* 1,721–22, 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 ovanter*
 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*

- (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 Berolinen-sis. 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.* 2,711–12. On the sequence *uellem ... 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 *diuulsaque* (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 conl., 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 Cynus 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 M W 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 affligit 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 F T 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 *Laios* (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 *Naiades*

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 relictā
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 includite 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 pavidos 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. 3 W 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 *hysteronproteron*. 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 con. 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 <castigationes> 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 amiciores 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 parcat* (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 Naugerus had *Mithridatisque* or *Metridatisque*; the correct form is also found, before Heinsius, in the Ed. Bersmanniana. Naugerus 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