

REVIEW ARTICLE

EDITING OVID'S *METAMORPHOSES*: PROBLEMS AND POSSIBILITIES*

The appearance of a new Teubner edition of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is a major event in classical studies. No genuinely new critical edition of this fundamental poem had been published since 1914, and for some time the only editions readily available have been unsuitable for scholarly purposes.¹ The task of producing a new critical text has been undertaken and subsequently abandoned several times in the past half-century; W. S. Anderson has now faced it intrepidly and completed it with remarkable dispatch,² thereby earning the congratulations of all readers of the *Metamorphoses*.

The reviewer of a critical edition must attempt to answer two questions: how does the text printed by the editor differ from those already in existence and how fully and reliably does the apparatus record the evidence on which the text is based? Most users of editions will naturally be more interested in the answer to the first of these questions, but the second is arguably even more important: an edition that accurately records all important manuscript variants and conjectures has a value independent of the quality of its text, since its readers have the means with which to dissent from the dubious or eccentric choices of the editor. That is one reason for devoting much of this discussion to the apparatus of the new Teubner text. There are two further reasons for this emphasis: first, A.'s text is relatively free of novelty and so calls for little comment on that score; second, I am myself preparing a critical text of the *Metamorphoses* for the Oxford Classical Texts series, and that edition, together with a projected companion volume of notes on disputed passages, will provide a full account of the places in which I would print a text different from A.'s.

The main purpose of this review is thus to consider how A.'s edition adds to the evidence available for editing the *Metamorphoses*, to assess how well it pre-

* *P. Ovidii Nasonis "Metamorphoses."* Edidit WILLIAM S. ANDERSON. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: BSB B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1977. Pp. xxviii + 419. Mk. 65.

1. The previous Teubner edition of R. Ewald (Leipzig, 1915), the Budé of G. Lafaye (Paris, 1928–30), and the Paravia of P. Fabbri (Turin, 1922–24) made no substantial additions to the information gathered by Hugo Magnus in his Weidmann edition (Berlin, 1914). The Loeb edition of F. J. Miller (Cambridge, Mass., 1916) is based on Ewald, and the bilingual Latin-German texts of E. Röscher (Munich, 1952) and H. Breitenbach (Zürich, 1958) draw their knowledge of MSS from earlier editions; the convenient one-volume edition by D. E. Bosselaar (Leyden, 1939–41; second and subsequent editions revised by B. A. van Proosdij) offers a text of unstated origin marred by numerous misprints. The best text without apparatus now available is the recent revision of Miller's Loeb by G. P. Goold (Cambridge, Mass., 1977); unfortunately only the first volume (containing Books 1–8) has so far appeared.

2. One assumes that A. had not embarked on his edition when he wrote in the introduction to his text and commentary of Books 6–10 (Norman, Okla., 1972) that "there might even be one reader of this text who will pick up the challenge and some day produce the definitive critical text which all admirers of the *Metamorphoses* so crave" (p. 34).

sents and uses that evidence, and to suggest some ways in which further progress in this area is feasible. Less detailed remarks on the character of A.'s own text will follow, with specific attention given to the problem of interpolated verses.

I

The most formidable obstacle confronting an editor of the *Metamorphoses* is the sheer bulk of the manuscript evidence: more than four hundred codices, the great majority not yet closely examined.³ Not only do large tracts of this area remain unexplored; there is not even the comfort of knowing that the present age has advanced beyond all its predecessors. No modern editor of the *Metamorphoses* has yet been able to draw upon a knowledge of the manuscript tradition as broad and deep as that possessed by Nicolaus Heinsius.⁴ In the course of diplomatic missions in various parts of Europe during the years 1640–52, Heinsius collated more than a hundred manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses*; in addition, information about other manuscripts was communicated to him by friends and correspondents.⁵ Heinsius' diligence was matched by his discernment; in an age of rudimentary paleographical skills he had a remarkable ability to identify the oldest and most interesting among the manuscripts he saw. (This feel for the worth of manuscripts has a bearing on Heinsius' eclectic method of choosing readings; the more that is learned of the manuscript tradition, the more often a reading he commended turns out to have the support of good manuscripts.) The extent of Heinsius' achievement may be gauged by the fact that, of A.'s core group of nine manuscripts, all but two were singled out by Heinsius for special regard. The manuscripts taken most seriously today are essentially the ones he recognized as preeminent, but three centuries passed before even these few witnesses were properly collated in an edition. Heinsius was far ahead of his contemporaries in the extent and accuracy of his collations, but in his editorial technique (perhaps under pressure from his publisher, Elsevier) he adhered more closely to the practice of his times, taking as a base text his father's edition of 1629 and altering it unsystematically.⁶ His collations did not therefore form the basis of his edition, and their richness emerges only occasionally in his notes.

The process of identifying old and good manuscripts had to begin again. By 1914, when the elaborate Weidmann edition of Hugo Magnus appeared, three of

3. There is, however, an excellent handlist with short descriptions by F. Munari: *Catalogue of the MSS of Ovid's "Metamorphoses"* (London, 1957). Two supplements have appeared: "Supplemento al catalogo dei manoscritti delle *Metamorfosi* ovidiane," *RFIC* 93 (1965): 288–97, and "Secondo supplemento al catalogo dei manoscritti delle *Metamorfosi* ovidiane," *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi Sexagenario Oblata* (Rome, 1970), pp. 275–80. More recent investigations have so far added only a handful of MSS to Munari's total. A brief account of modern scholarly work on the MSS appears in A.'s preface (pp. xx–xxii); a fuller but less lucid one was given by F. W. Lenz, *Ovid's "Metamorphoses": Prolegomena to a Revision of Hugo Magnus' Edition* (Dublin and Zürich, 1967).

4. I should, however, mention that Dr. M. Pulbrook of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, is producing an edition of Book 4 based on collation of all the surviving MSS.

5. F. F. Blok, *Nicolaas Heinsius in Dienst van Christina van Zweden* (Delft, 1949).

6. E. J. Kenney, *The Classical Text* (Berkeley, 1974), pp. 57–63, augmented and corrected in some details by A. T. Grafton, "From Politian to Pasquali," *JRS* 67 (1977): 173–74.

the manuscripts esteemed most highly by Heinsius were once more in use: Marcianus Florentinus 225 (M, saec. xi ex.),⁷ Laurentianus 36. 12 (L, saec. xii¹), and Neapolitanus B. N. IV. F. 3 (N, saec. xii in.). To these later investigators had added a fourth not seen by Heinsius, Marcianus Florentinus 223 (F, saec. xi/xii), as well as a number of fragments and incomplete manuscripts earlier in date than MNFL. These formed the basis of Magnus' text, and to them he added collations of several twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts, most notably Erfurtanus Amplon. fol. 1 (e), Hauniensis Bibl. Reg. Gl. kgl. S. 2008 (h), and Heidelbergensis Palatinus 1661 (p), all of which had figured in Heinsius' notes. Although Magnus' editorial principles were very different from those of Heinsius, his respect for Heinsius was so great that he frequently cited manuscripts he judged (rightly) to be worthless solely because Heinsius had thought better of them,⁸ and painstakingly noted in his apparatus which readings Heinsius had preferred or commended. At the time Magnus' edition was published, D. A. Slater of St. John's College, Oxford had been working for several years on a text intended for the OCT series. Whereas Magnus drew most of his information about Heinsius' manuscripts from printed sources,⁹ Slater examined the collations themselves, the most important of which are still preserved in the Bodleian Library.¹⁰ Slater was thus able to identify many of Heinsius' manuscripts, among them three that are fit to stand alongside MNFL: Parisinus B. N. Lat. 8001 (P, saec. xii¹), Vaticanus Palatinus 1669 (E, saec. xi/xii?), and Vaticanus Urbina 341 (U, saec. xii in.). Slater also used collations made by or for Heinsius of two other now lost manuscripts of some significance, the Codex Spirensis (S, of which one quire is extant in Copenhagen, Hauniensis Bibl. Reg. Ny kgl. S. 56 fol., saec. xi/xii) and a mysterious Codex S. Johannis in Viridario, which Heinsius thought had great value, but which he saw only briefly and from which very few readings are on record.¹¹ Slater's edition was never published, apparently because the editor found it impossible to condense the mass of his information into the limited space of an OCT apparatus. Still, Slater did leave behind an impressive monument of his labors, a volume¹² containing an elegant Latin preface and a hand-lettered critical apparatus, but no text (the apparatus is keyed to Riese's second Tauchnitz edition). Slater used the freedom of this arrangement to display more prominently than Magnus had done Heinsius' collations of manuscripts other than EFLMNPS. Since few of these secondary manuscripts had then been identified, Slater retained their Heinsian designations, and so through his pages parade such resoundingly

7. For convenience I use A's sigla in this discussion, but I propose to use a somewhat different and, I hope, more rational set in the OCT edition. The main advantages of my proposed sigla are that Greek letters are reserved for hypothetical witnesses (in accordance with general practice) and that the sigla refer wherever possible to the present location, place of origin, or former owner of an MS. The dates tentatively assigned to MSS in this review are my own except where otherwise noted.

8. E.g., the Lovaniensis (= Brussels B. Roy. 2100 [Munari 61]) and the Sprotianus (= Oxford Bodl. Auct. F. 4. 22 [Munari 218]).

9. In particular the variorum edition of P. Burman (Amsterdam, 1727); Magnus had, however, seen some manuscript notes of Heinsius in Berlin Diez 1075.

10. For details, see M. D. Reeve, "Heinsius's Manuscripts of Ovid," *RhM* 117 (1974): 133–66, 119 (1976): 65–78.

11. The MS was notable for containing in all fifteen books at least some of the matter (*tituli* and *narrationes*) that goes under the name of "Lactantius"; in this it is no longer unique (see p. 346).

12. *Towards a Text of the "Metamorphoses" of Ovid* (Oxford, 1927); the manuscript was completed in 1920.

named entities as the Rottendorphianus, the Gronovianus tertius, the Twisdenianus alter, and the still elusive Zulichemianus.¹³

The editions produced between Slater and Anderson brought to light no new manuscripts of basic importance,¹⁴ but progress continued on another front. Franco Munari, in addition to publishing his invaluable catalog of known manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses*, also carried further the task of matching manuscripts cited by Heinsius with extant codices.¹⁵ Other identifications were added by Lenz¹⁶ and, most recently and substantially, by M. D. Reeve.¹⁷ As a result, most of Heinsius' references to manuscripts can now be checked against their sources and these can be cited, where necessary, by their proper modern names.

Against this background the contributions of the new Teubner edition can be briefly set forth. Before now anyone wishing to learn the readings of the oldest extant manuscripts (EFLMNPU) could do so only by laborious consultation of both Magnus and Slater, since Slater had perversely ignored F and L. A.'s edition is thus the first in which all these manuscripts are fully reported; in addition, Slater's account of P was taken at second hand from Heinsius, while A. has obtained a microfilm (and profited from an inspection of the manuscript itself by C. E. Murgia). The reporting of EFLMNPU is a fundamental advance, which gives A.'s edition a clear superiority over all its modern predecessors. A. has also given a full account of one manuscript not previously reported: Vat. Lat. 5859 (W).

These eight manuscripts (EFLMNPUW),¹⁸ together with six older fragments and incomplete codices (*αβελπυ*), form the basis of his text. To supplement them A. has turned first to twelve later manuscripts ("codices qui auxilio sunt"), of which three (Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana Acquisiti e doni 343 [d], Vat. Ottob. Lat. 3313 [o], and Vat. Lat. 11457 [r]) have never before been used in a critical edition.¹⁹ Finally, seventeen other manuscripts and fragments are listed in the preface as being of occasional use. Eight of these were known to Heinsius, eight are fairly nondescript *recentiores* from the Vatican, and the last is the Greek translation made around 1300 by Maximus Planudes, a source of which Slater made much and which A. has correctly demoted to a minor role.²⁰

13. The first three are now more prosaically known as Wolfenbüttel B. Duc. 4427 (123 Gud. Lat. 20), Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Diez B. Sant. 10, and London B. L. Burney 224.

14. Lafaye and Fabbri restricted their investigations to the resources of nearby libraries: Lafaye collated Paris B. N. Lat. 8000 and the two Parisian copies of the *Florilegium Gallicum*, Fabbri Lucca B. Civ. 1417.

15. "Manoscritti ovidiani di N. Heinsius," *SIFC* 29 (1957): 98–114, 265, and *Ovidiana*, ed. N. Herescu (Paris, 1958), pp. 347–49.

16. "Die Wiedergewinnung der von Heinsius benutzten Ovidhandschriften," *Eranos* 51 (1953): 66–88, 61 (1963): 98–120.

17. Above, n. 10. The number of outstanding items continues to shrink. A. in "Identification of Another Heinsian Manuscript," *CQ* 26 (1976): 113–14, identified the fragmentum Theatinorum as Rome B. Vallicelliana F. 25. While looking at the Heinsian material in East Berlin in May 1977, I was able to match the Codex Menardi with Diez B. Sant. 11.

18. On the Spirensis (S), see p. 350.

19. The others are Magnus' ehp, London B. L. King's 26 (Slater's a), Vat. Lat. 1593 (Heinsius' Vaticanus primus), the two Codices Strozziiani (120, 121) that, for no apparent reason, kept turning up in modern editions, the Tegernsee fragment (τ in Magnus, t in Anderson) on which see n. 30, and the extant quire of the Spirensis (called κ).

20. The preface does not mention other MSS cited on occasion in the apparatus, e.g., London B. L. Harley 2737, 2742, Bologna B. Univ. 2278, Florence B. Laur. 36. 6, 36. 7, 36. 8, 36. 17, Copenhagen Gl. kgl. S. 2009. Readers should therefore resist the temptation to correct the references to "Bodl. F. 4. 31" (not listed in the preface) at 7. 498, 7. 636, 7. 777, etc. to "Bodl. F. 4. 30" (p. xviii): the former is Heinsius' fragmentum Vossianum, the latter is his fragmentum Boxhornianum.

A's. remarks on the relations of the manuscripts are brief and essentially negative (pp. v–xii). He is skeptical of any attempts at a stemma, arguing that extensive contamination had blurred family relationships long before the time of the earliest complete manuscripts (pp. ix–xi). An editor must therefore proceed eclectically and not attribute authority to any single manuscript or group. There can be little doubt that A. is correct in his general conclusions; more thorough study of the transmission will probably yield a clearer picture at some points, but it will not bring the soundness of A.'s editorial policy into question.²¹

In establishing his text A. has faithfully observed his own precepts. Magnus had accorded a systematic preference to the closely related manuscripts MN, sometimes called the "Lactantian" family because of the presence in them of a set of ancient titles and prose summaries attributed to a "Lactantius";²² A. gives due weight to the value of MN without repeating Magnus' error of regarding them as *codices optimi*. A.'s only addition to the select group of basic manuscripts, Vat. Lat. 5859 (W), is also a member of the "Lactantian" group; its importance derives from that fact—the "Lactantian" strain is quite rare—rather than because it contains many good readings not found in the other core manuscripts (dozens of *recentiores*, if collated in full, would equal or excel it in this respect). W presents a "Lactantian" text closely related to that of M²³ but frequently agreeing with other branches of tradition (most often that represented by EU); my own survey of the manuscripts has turned up two similarly debased "Lactantian" manuscripts, Naples B. Naz. IV F. 2 (saec. xii³) and Vienna Nat. ser. nov. 12246 (ca. 1470). None of these manuscripts deserves to be placed on the same level as MN, but each on occasion helps to identify the "Lactantian" reading where it has been lost in one or both of the prime "Lactantian" witnesses: most notably in Book 15, missing in MN¹. (The lost Spirensis and the Codex S. Johannis in Viridario last seen by Heinsius also seem to have belonged to this group.)

In all A. makes at least some use of more than sixty witnesses, an impressively large fraction of the entire body of material. It thus becomes even more remarkable that his apparatus takes up much less space than that of Magnus and is only a small fraction of the size of Slater's compilation. Distilling a selective critical apparatus from so great a mass of manuscript information involves countless small choices, more often decided by the editor's own judgment and taste than by adherence to some generally accepted set of rules. The results will never please everyone and may not even satisfy the editor at all points; at best they will seem generally reasonable. Assessing another editor's apparatus can thus be a delicate

21. I hope to discuss the transmission in a separate publication.

22. This material has been provisionally edited by both Magnus and Slater; cf. also B. Otis, "The *Argumenta* of the So-Called Lactantius," *HSCP* 47 (1936): 131–63.

23. The relationship of W and M can be convincingly established, though not with the evidence cited in A.'s preface (p. xvi). Of the twenty-two shared readings of MW from Book 7 adduced to show MW's close connection, nineteen are either clearly or possibly correct readings and so offer no basis for affiliation, two others are too slight to bear much weight (714 *cum* for *dum*, 818 *sum* for *sim*, also in F¹LPe and as a variant in N), and only one is a genuine candidate for a conjunctive error (372 *cignius* for *phyllius*). For additional shared errors, note, e.g., 7. 850 *deserit hostem* M¹W¹ for *deserat*, oro, 6. 62 *tenuis paru(a)e* M¹W (plus London B. L. Add. 11967, a near-twin of M) for *tenues parui*, 6. 508 *salutet* MW¹ for *salutent*, 8. 4 *actis* M¹N¹W¹ (plus the related Urb. Lat. 342) for *acti*. Note also that M and W² begin Book 2 after 1. 747 rather than 1. 779. W cannot be a copy of M because it contains "Lactantian" material in Book 15, which seems to have been missing in the "Lactantian" source of MN.

business, made even more difficult in the case of this edition by the absence of any explanation whatever of the policies A. has followed in framing his notes.

Let me therefore begin, not with criticism, but with praise and agreement. The leanness of A.'s apparatus results in large part from the wise decision not to emulate Magnus' policy of exhaustive reporting. Magnus registered not only every reading of MNFL^e, whether possible or not, but also every variant and almost every correction, however trivial (exceptions are probably due to inadvertence rather than conscious exclusion). As a repository of detail Magnus' apparatus has a real and lasting value, but a glance at its bulk shows that the ideal of full reports soon becomes impractical, even when the manuscripts involved are few. An editor like A., basing his text on nearly twice the number of complete manuscripts used by Magnus, must of necessity be more selective in his accounts. Fortunately, the information compiled by Magnus and, to a lesser extent, by Slater remains available to those who require it, allowing their successors to adopt less expansive methods with a clearer conscience.

I pass next to three points on which I might favor a procedure different from A.'s, without suggesting that his policy is indefensible.

(1) Virtually all the manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses* contain readings explicitly entered as variants, that is, added above the line or in a margin and preceded by *uel*, *aliter*, or an equivalent. Some of these "variants" were almost certainly meant as corrections to the original reading, but many (perhaps especially those added by a hand contemporary with or even identical to that of the scribe) may already have existed as variants in the exemplar of the manuscript in which they appear. For this reason it seems to me reasonable to record their existence, using an abbreviation (e.g., superscript *v*) to mark them as variants and noting where possible whether they are the work of a later hand or of one close to that of the scribe. A. omits these readings more often than he cites them and almost never describes them as variants: "M²" thus covers both corrections and variant readings. Important information is not, perhaps, often lost by A.'s procedure (although it can be: see p. 349 below on 1. 2 and 2. 485), but a slightly more complete picture of the manuscript evidence can be provided with very little added expenditure of space, for example, "M^v" or "M^{2v}" for "M²". (The matter is admittedly not always so straightforward. N was written in Bari-type Beneventan script in the early twelfth century; in the late twelfth or thirteenth century it underwent systematic comparison with another manuscript, resulting in hundreds of variant readings which often agree with the readings of other manuscripts, particularly U and E. A. cites a few of these later variants in N—perhaps 10–20 percent—with the siglum "N³". I have provisionally opted to report them regularly, but a more tough-minded editor—or a cost-conscious publisher—could reasonably argue that this information is not essential.)

(2) Readings found in only one of the major manuscripts are a perennial problem for editors: recording all such variants would load an apparatus with rubbish, but it is not always possible to suppress them all (except, of course, those that are certainly or arguably true) without omitting some potentially useful information. Like many editors, A. steers between the extreme positions; beyond that, however, it becomes difficult to say what his policy is. He seems generally to exclude readings that are impossible on grounds of sense or meter, although some exceptions get in (e.g., 2. 167 *ruuntque* U, 2. 849 *metu* β, 5. 494 *et om.* Lv, 5. 588 *imum* pv, 5. 628 *quiue prelatu* E, 7. 63 *-que om.* Lv, 8. 111 *clara* W, 8. 667 *leniter* N²U, 8. 699 *parua casa* hv). With possible readings I can discern no consistent criterion of selection, as shown by these examples from the first one hundred lines or so of the poem: the Bern fragment's *locauit* for *ligauit* (1. 25) is in, but not its more plausible *eductaque* for *seductaque* (1. 80) or *Euris* for *auris* (1. 107, also P^{2v}—not mentioned). M's

tum for *cum* (1. 70) is in, but not its *minacia* for *minantia* (1. 91, *ante correctionem*). *L's feruescere* for *effervesce* (1. 71, with U³) is in, but not its *leges* for *tuti* (1. 93 L¹ mg.). Codex e's *diremit* for *exemit* is in (1. 24), but not its *non militis usus* for *sine militis usu* (1. 99). The treatment of isolated variants is ultimately a matter of personal taste: I would prefer to omit them unless there seems to be a good reason for retaining them, and consequently would include only a small fraction of those registered by A. The same treatment can be extended without loss to the less notable variants of related manuscripts, for example, NU or FL, and perhaps even more widely to insignificant variants spontaneously produced in several witnesses (e.g., *obortus/abortus*, *propior/proprior*, some cases of *ne/nec*, *nequiquam/ne quicquam*, etc.).²⁴ (Here, too, some cases may require special handling. Many readings unique to E in A's core group are widely diffused among manuscripts of the second rank, for example, *aehprv*, and therefore have a stronger claim to attention than the isolated readings of FLMNPUW. The most economical way of meeting this claim might be to report these as readings of E alone—instructing the reader to understand "E" as including at least some of the manuscripts related to it—while disregarding E's truly singular variants.)

(3) The *Metamorphoses* abounds in Greek proper names, which have been variously deformed by the medieval scribes. A. is at times punctilious in registering such variants, for example, 5. 268 "Mnemonidas ex β (cf. 280) memonidas M meonidas N alii peiora,"²⁵ 6. 116 "Enipeus edd. Ἐνιππεύς Plan. enipheus A," 8. 308 "Phyleus Heinsius phileus L pyleus E pileus A." More often, however, information of similar or even greater importance is omitted or abbreviated to the point of mystification. To give an extreme example, at 5. 252 *Cyntho* is in the text with no note revealing that all the manuscripts read *Cypro*; ten lines earlier (5. 242) *Polydecta* is printed without a note, although the paradoxis is *Polyde(c)te*. At 7. 352 *Philyreia* receives this note: "philyreia Leid. Voss. O.51 (Const. Fanensis) philireia EPUW peiora alii." No reader would infer from this that *all* the major manuscripts except P (but including EUW) have added *-que* as a result of reading *-eia* as a bisyllable. At 6. 677 Planudes is given as the authority for the spelling *Erechtheus*; a puzzle unless one knows that what is at issue is *Ere-* (rather than *Eri-*), not the solecism *-chth-*, which A. consistently prints against the testimony of the oldest manuscripts.²⁶ There is no note to show that at 8. 153 *Curetida* the variant *creteida* is in FLN^{2c}P^c(W¹); that at 8. 317 *Tegeaea* appears as *tegea* in all the older manuscripts; that at 8. 349 *Pagasaesus* is only found in P, *pegaseus* in the other manuscripts, although the same division is noticed at 7. 1.²⁷ As with the previous points of method, absolute consistency is neither possible nor perhaps desirable. Two policies that seem reasonable are to ignore the most banal misspellings (e.g., intruded or omitted *h*, single vowels for diphthongs, etc.) and to give readers notice when a significant part of a word's form is not attested in the paradoxis (as, e.g., in 5. 242, 5. 252, 7. 352, 8. 317, 8. 349).

I come now to three ways in which, even with proper allowance made for differences of editorial policy, A.'s apparatus does not always make full use of the available manuscript evidence.

Incomplete or inaccurate reporting of manuscript readings. In a text as long as the *Metamorphoses* an editor can justly claim indulgence for a limited number of errors and omissions. Serious mistakes in A.'s apparatus are in fact relatively few. At 2. 620 A. prints *sensit* with the note "*sensit*] vidit U." In fact *uidit* is the reading of *all* manuscripts, *sensit*

24. The tiresome vacillations between *tum* and *tunc* also seem dispensable; an editor might well decide to print *tum* everywhere except before vowels and leave it at that.

25. More precisely, *mnemonidas* β¹, *memōnidas* M^c, *mennonidas* (uel *memn-*) EF¹LP, *meonidas* β^cNU.

26. He also retains the inferior spellings *gnosius* for *cnosius* (cf. 3. 208, 8. 40, 8. 52, 8. 144) and *cygnus* for *cynus* (cf. 2. 367, 12. 72). The correct *procne* (*progne* MSS) is, however, adopted.

27. The apparatus records "pegasaea FLN¹" but *pegasea* is also in P.

being a (perhaps unnecessary) conjecture of Heinsius. (Magnus reported the facts correctly, but Ehwald put *sensit* in the text with nothing to show that it is a conjecture; if A. used Ehwald's text as a point of departure, his oversight is more readily explained.) In his note on the controverted passage 1. 544–47, A. states that M omits the line “qua nimium placui mutando perde figuram”; the line is in fact present in M, with the last three words underscored and with “tellus ait isce uel istam” written above them in a later hand. (Magnus' account is again essentially correct.²⁸)

Much more often the error or omission is venial in that it has no effect on the soundness of the text printed. For example, at 1. 641 A. duly records the variant *seseque exterrita* for *seque externata* in LNPU but does not note that those manuscripts also replace *refugit* with *fugit*. Similarly at 6. 690–92, where FLP turn a series of indicatives into subjunctives, three of the variants are cited and the other two (690 *pellam*, 691 *conculiam*) are not. At 7. 613 the correct reading *tumulos* is attributed to Planudes and EFLMNPuw are said to read *tumulo*; the consensus of manuscripts is actually *tumulo est* (and *tumulos* is in Graz 1415 and Paris 8008).

Other examples could be culled from various parts of the poem, but to do so might exaggerate the importance of these minor inaccuracies. It seems better to present a complete account of the flaws for a short stretch of the text, and for this purpose I have chosen the opening hundred lines (α = Bern 363 [saec. ix], ε = Harley 2610 [saec. x]). 1. 2 “vos] di *aeEP*”: the reading of P seems to be *di P*¹, *uos P*^{2c}. 1. 14: the correct *amphitrite* is credited to U³ (U actually has *amphitrides* with *te* a supralinear variant) but is also in α . 1. 15 “utque] utqua ε ”: *utqua* is a corrected reading, and ε ¹ may have had *utque*. 1. 15 “aer α LW ε h aether εA ”: L reads *ether*, not *aer*, and E reads *aer*, not (as implied) *aether*; *aer* is in M² *mg.*; the addition of ε to A (= *consensus codicum*) is a slip. 1. 18 “corpora in unum *e*”: *e* is a slip for ε , a confusion repeated at 1. 437; *corpora in unum* is also the reading of P¹. 1. 23: *aethere* seems to have been the original reading of N as well as ε MW. 1. 30: *sui* is cited from F²U³eh but is also in P. 1. 52: *igne* appears as a variant of ε F²N³e, but is also in LPU³ (and M, perhaps *ex correctione*). 1. 69: there is no reference to *discreuerat*, the reading of L^{1v}F²U³N^{2v}. 1. 91–93 “praebent *F*²MW om. A (in marg. LN²PU)”: the lines were added by later hands in P and U. 1. 105 “mora] Aoma α ”: presumably a misprint, since α has *poma*.²⁹

In none of the passages just listed do the flaws or omissions affect the constitution of the text; they do suggest, however, that the accounts of the major manuscripts given by the apparatus are often capable of improvement.

Individual witnesses incompletely exploited. (a) In a tradition notable for a dearth of early manuscripts, it seems a cruel jest of fortune that one of the very few codices written before the end of the eleventh century should derive in part from another extant manuscript. Munich 29007a (Munari 321) is an incomplete set of leaves from an eleventh-century Tegernsee manuscript (τ); in the small surviving portions of Books 1 and 2, τ is beyond doubt a direct descendant—perhaps even a direct copy—of Harley 2610 (ε), a tenth-century manuscript of German origin which now acquires a probable link with Tegernsee.³⁰ Where ε is extant A. very properly ignores τ . But ε gives out at 3. 622 and the great majority of τ comes from later books. If τ were a descendant of a once complete ε , there could be no question of its importance in ε 's absence, but that is not the case. The character of τ in

28. Some errors are tralatitician, e.g., crediting M with *illa* at 8. 79 (it has *ille*), F with the correct order of lines at 8. 305–6 (it inverts with the other MSS), and L alone with *panopeusque* at 8. 312 (the correct reading is also in FPW).

29. For the omissions at 1. 2 and 1. 36, see below.

30. The dependence of τ on ε seemed clear even when only 1. 135–89 and 1. 295–350 were extant in both; recently another bifolium of τ was found on the back flyleaf of Cgm. 4286, adding 1. 524–88, the first half of 2. 68–99, and the ends of 2. 100–131. A full discussion (with photographs of ε and τ) by A. appears in “On the Tegernsee MS of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Munich Clm 29007),” *CSCA* 11 (1978): 1–19.

Books 4–15 is not what would be expected of a relative of ϵ ; instead it seems related to the strain of text represented by FLP and shows particular affinity to F. A. therefore excludes it entirely: his decision, although defensible, is open to the objection that τ is *earlier* than FLP and therefore entitled at least to parity with them on the ground of age.³¹ (b) Vatican Urb. Lat. 342 is a codex of Juvenal with a bifolium sewn in at the end (ff. 77–78) containing parts of Books 4, 5, 7, and 8. The fragments (= ν) are of interest for their early date (saec. x/xi?); they often agree with MN and M in particular. These agreements are especially notable in the first part of Book 8, but several of them are not recorded by A.:³² 8. 4 acti] “actis MN¹W¹” *actis* ν (and M¹, since the *s* has been deleted by expunction); 8. 7 praetemp-
tatque] “praetereaque M¹(N¹?)” so ν ; 8. 21 mora] “mora(s add. N²) Ne” *moras* M¹, ν (*s add.*
*v*²?); 8. 58 “certe” placidus (*ex* 57) M¹] *placido* ν (*certe* ν); 8. 61 reseret] “reserat ν ” also M¹?
(*reseret* M^c *in ras.*) N¹? (*reseret* N^c *in ras.*); 8. 63 impensa] “incessaque M¹” *incensa*que
 ν ; 8. 65 “tam” modo N” add ν !, perhaps M¹ (*tam* M^c *in ras.*); 8. 87 “om. ν MN¹W¹” rather
 ν M¹. The omissions do not put the true reading in doubt, but they do obscure the closeness
of the relationship between ν and MN. (c) Elsewhere A. conclusively demonstrated (1) that
Florence Bibl. Laur. 36. 5 (Munari 124, saec. xiii) is a direct copy of N, (2) that it was
copied before the leaves containing 1. 198–255 and 2. 121–81 fell out of N and were replaced
by a fourteenth-century hand (N⁴), and (3) that at several places in those passages Laur.
36. 5 allows us to bypass N⁴ and recover the text of N¹.³³ This discussion is referred to in
the preface (p. xiii, n. 2), but no use is made of its results in the edition: at 1. 198–255 and
2. 121–81 A. cites only N⁴, with no mention of Laur. 36. 5. (d) The most remarkable of
these missed opportunities concerns the Spirensis (S), now lost except for the quire in
Copenhagen containing 9. 324–10. 707 (called κ by A.), and therefore known only from
Langermann’s collation (now in the Bodleian Library, Auct. 2 R VI. 23). Some confusion
in the treatment of S is evident in the preface, where S (κ) at one point (p. xvi) appears
among the second-level manuscripts and at another (p. xxviii) joins the select company of
“codices qui semper citantur.” In the event matters are even more puzzling. Langermann’s
collation seems to have extended from 3. 506 to 12. 278,³⁴ and at 3. 506 S is duly added
to the list of *sigla* at the head of the apparatus showing which of the core manuscripts are
available. But of the dozen readings of S cited by Slater in the remaining part of Book 3,
not one appears in A.’s apparatus. Three or four are admittedly trifles that a selective
apparatus could do without, but it is hard to justify omitting S’s reading at 540 *cavior*, 596
altos, and 602 *ducat*. In Books 4–8 S is cited very sporadically, and many of its most
significant readings do not appear in the apparatus (e.g., 8. 527 *eveninae*, 544 *althee*, 572
epulas mensis, 595 *mundi*, 634 *ferendo*, 838 *faces*). On the other hand, the extant quire of
S (= κ) is reported in full, and for the portion of S after κ gives out (10. 708–12. 278) A.
cites all the readings available in Slater, even those that yield no sense.

Manuscript readings reported as modern conjectures. The first instance coincides with

31. In the preface to his edition (p. xviii) A. dated τ “saec. XII” (as did Munari), but in his more recent article he reports that “the traditional twelfth-century date of Tegernsee has now been lowered to the second half of the eleventh on the authority of B. Bischoff and his student C. E. Eder” (p. 17, n. 3). The earlier dating (obviously correct) undermines part of A.’s argument for excluding τ in Books 4–15. Speaking of τ ’s good readings at 15. 675 and 15. 718, he writes (p. 19, n. 23): “we now know that the latter two . . . are attested by MSS earlier than τ : *castos* appears in *Eavv*, *Antium* in *War*.” None of the MSS mentioned is as early as τ , and one of them (W) is two centuries later.

32. The last verso of ν is faded and hard to read, and several of the readings listed were only visible under ultraviolet light. At 8. 58, 8. 63, and 8. 87, my account of ν tallies with the incomplete collation published by C. Hosius, “Symbola ad poetas latinos,” *RhM* 46 (1891): 292–93. At line 60 it seems possible that ν originally read *qui si* (also in E and arguably correct) rather than *quis enim*, but I cannot confidently assert this.

33. “Studies on the Naples Ms. IV F 3 of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*,” *ICS* 2 (1977): 261–74.

34. The source of the readings cited with the same *siglum* by Heinsius in Book 1 remains a mystery (cf. Slater, p. 34).

the first textual problem in the poem. In all editions including A.'s, the text begins "in noua fert animus mutatas dicere formas / corpora; di, coeptis (nam uos mutastis et illas) / adspirare meis." The syntax of *et illas* has not yet been satisfactorily accounted for, and E. J. Kenney has recently made a powerful case for reading *et illa* (sc. *coepta*); Ovid would then be neatly alluding to the fact that the *Metamorphoses* represented a departure from his customary elegiac poetry.³⁵ What is the status of *illa*? A. cites it as a conjecture of Lejay, but Magnus had noted that *illa* appears in e as a variant reading (entered by a very early hand, in my opinion perhaps that of the scribe), and *illa* is also the corrected reading of U (here U³, since the first leaf of U is missing and has been replaced by a fourteenth-century copy). These two appearances show that *illa* is not a modern conjecture but a medieval variant; if it is to be cited at all—and it certainly ought to be—surely its manuscript support deserves to be recorded.

A similar case occurs at 2. 485 in the story of Callisto, which A. prints as follows: "mens antiqua manet (facta quoque mansit in ursa)." The repetition *manet . . . mansit* is remarkably feeble, and several scholars (Edwards,³⁶ Slater, Von Albrecht, Goold) have preferred *tamen* for *manet*, with the parentheses removed. A. attributes *tamen* to Heinsius, but Magnus and Slater had traced it to several manuscripts, including U (a late superscript addition) and h (a variant). (It also appears in Graz 1415, Vat. Lat. 11457 [A.'s r], as a variant in Gotha Bibl. Duc. II 58 and in N, and almost certainly elsewhere.)

Other examples, with A.'s attribution in parentheses: 1. 36 *diffundi* (Heinsius) is in U³; 1. 72 *animantibus* (Heinsius) is in at least three *recentiores*; 2. 454 *uenatrix* (Heinsius) is in Leyden Voss. Lat. Q. 25 and others; 2. 691 *tenuit* (Ellis) is in e, the oldest extant witness at that point; 2. 437 the punctuation attributed to Jahn is in fact that of eNUFP; 2. 871 *primis* (Heinsius) was cited by Heinsius from "meliores" (not specified by Magnus or Slater; I have found the reading in the Graz and Gotha manuscripts mentioned above); 3. 501 *lacus* (Heinsius) is cited by Magnus from two manuscripts, one of them Leyden Voss. Lat. Oct. 51; 4. 282 *Celmi* (Scaliger) was credited by Jahn to two manuscripts, one of them the still unidentified Codex Rhenovanus,³⁷ also said to contain several other readings attributed in A. to modern scholars, for example, 4. 786 *fratrem* (R. Regius), 7. 463 *Cimoli* (Regius again), 9. 755 *uana* (Naugerius), 10. 271 *pandis* (Gronovius), 12. 625 *Laertaeque* (Heinsius); 4. 691 *amens* (Heinsius) is cited by Slater from Harley 2742 and Basle F. II. 26; 5. 80 *hamato* (Heinsius) is a superscript addition in the Lovaniensis; 6. 660 *mentis* (Riese) appears in Magnus as the reading of three manuscripts and two early editions; 7. 190 *uhulatibus* (Heinsius) was traced by Magnus to the Sprotianus and by Slater to the Graevianus (I have noted it in three other manuscripts, including A.'s r); 7. 712 *quam si* (Heinsius) is assumed by Planudes' translation (as is *sputantem* at 12. 256, also attributed to Heinsius); 8. 8 *Alcathei* (Heinsius) was in fact cited by Heinsius from a "uetustus codex" (and is the corrected reading of Gotha Bibl. Duc. II. 58); 9. 771 *capitis* (Heinsius) may well have been the original reading of M, and Magnus also cited it from a Codex Gothanus (i.e., Bibl. Duc. II. 58 again); 10. 359 *primo patriisque* (Heinsius) is in Magnus as the reading of unspecified *recentiores* and of the Venice edition of 1486 (it is also in Naples Bibl. Nat. IV. F. 2); 13. 490 *uulnera* (Heinsius) is the reading of P (and of the Gotha manuscript mentioned several times above); 14. 4–5 ("edd.") are found in the correct order in the Tegernsee fragments, as Magnus noted.

In the foregoing passages A.'s apparatus gives the impression that readings already as-

35. "Ovidius Prooemians," *PCPS* 22 (1976): 46–53. To his arguments can be added the fact that the words "nam uos mutastis et illa," coming at the end of the second line, mark the point at which the meter reveals itself as hexameters rather than elegiacs.

36. I.e., the text edited by G. M. Edwards for Postgate's *Corpus poetarum latinorum* (London, 1905), a sensibly constructed text that deserves more consideration than it seems to get.

37. Not identical with Zürich Zentralbibliothek Rheinau 46 (Munari 329, saec. xii¹), an MS resembling Vat. Lat. 11457 in both appearance and text.

cribed to manuscript sources by Magnus and Slater are the products of scholarly conjecture. As is only to be expected, other readings now credited to modern critics can be shown to survive in manuscripts not yet exploited by editors. Two examples will serve to make the point. In several places in the above paragraph reference is made to Gotha, Bibl. Duc. II. 58 (101 in Munari's catalog, saec. xii ex.). The same manuscript has other points of interest; for example, it records as a marginal variant the reading *deerantque* at 8. 876, a probably true reading now attributed to Burman (not adopted by A.). At 6. 489 the Gotha manuscript anticipates Housman's *tempora* for *corpora*, another very plausible reading. In 5. 405 it gives (again as a marginal variant) *sacros* for *altos*; the reading is not correct but must be ancient, since the line is so cited by the grammarian Diomedes (*GLK*, 1. 319). The presence of these and other unique readings would suggest that the Gotha manuscript (or a parent) was corrected against a source independent of the main branches of the tradition. The Gotha manuscript is obviously exceptional, but even a fairly ordinary specimen of the *recentiores*, such as Tortosa, B. Cath. 134 (Munari 73, perhaps saec. xiii med.), can offer occasional assistance: 2. 496 *parenti* (Heinsius), 7. 343 *cubito* as a marginal variant ("ex codd. Naugerius, Ciofanus, Heinsius" A.), 9. 49 *belli*, again as a variant ("nonnulli Naugerii"), 11. 153 *numina* (Bentley), 13. 410 *antistita* ("edd."), 14. 711 *edis* (= *Haedis*) as a superscript gloss (Constantius Fanensis).³⁸

In addition to the normal apparatus of variant readings, A. provides a second apparatus of testimonia, including both citations and imitations of the *Metamorphoses* in later writers. This was also a feature of Magnus' edition, and most of A.'s testimonia figure in Magnus' notes; besides adding some items, A. has set an earlier cutoff point for his material (A.D. 1200). Obviously, once the notion of testimonium is broadened to include imitation as well as direct quotation, there is no hope of comprehensive treatment for a much-read poem like the *Metamorphoses*. Certainly A.'s data fall far short of completeness: for example, three or four passages from Seneca's *Hercules Furens* are cited out of the hundreds of imitations of the *Metamorphoses* in the corpus of Senecan tragedy; Claudian, Ausonius, and Avitus receive one citation each, although scores of borrowings from the *Metamorphoses* are on record in the editions of T. Birt, C. Schenkl, and R. Peiper; several prominent classicizing works of the twelfth century (e.g., John of Hautville's *Architrenius*, Joseph of Exeter's *Bellum Troianum*, and Bernard Silvester's *Megacosmos*) do not appear at all; and so on. One may reasonably doubt whether the limited space at an editor's disposal is well spent in cataloging echoes and imitations of a text; it would seem sufficient to mention in the critical apparatus the few testimonia containing significant variants.

II

What kind of text does the new Teubner edition offer? The keynotes are caution and sobriety. A. prints only one suggestion of his own (7. 687–88), an attempt to rescue the paradoxis by repunctuation; his other proposals are confined to the apparatus (6. 201, 6. 399, 10. 225, 14. 671, 15. 804). In general conjectures are

38. I am grateful to Prof. Anderson for lending me his microfilm of the Tortosa MS, which reached him after his edition had appeared. This is only one of several ways in which he has generously shared information and resources with me.

sparingly adopted: I have counted 116 readings in the text attributed to modern scholars (some of which, as noted earlier, are in fact manuscript readings); of these nearly half are corrections of orthography (e.g., 1. 69 *dissaepserat* for *dissepserat* and 15. 399 *murra* for *mirra/myrra*, both credited to Merkel) or adjustments in the form of proper names (e.g., 9. 356 *Amphissos* for *amphisos* [Heinsius] and 12. 9 *Boeotaque* for *boet(h)aque* etc. [R. Regius]). Most of the rest have long been generally accepted: of the total of 116 "conjectures," all but sixteen appear in Ehwald's Teubner text of 1915. These are not the only places in which A. doubts the soundness of the paradosis: a few passages are obelized (e.g., 6. 201, 10. 225, 14. 671, 15. 838) and in several others the apparatus dubs the reading in the text "suspectum" (e.g., 1. 712, 1. 719, 3. 716, 4. 663, 6. 27, 6. 582, 13. 554, 13. 890, 14. 489, 14. 666, 15. 39, 15. 271); at 8. 190 the text printed is admitted to be nonsense ("quod contra sensum videtur") and A. says that he would gladly have bracketed 13. 333 ("libenter secluserim") although he does not do so. On the whole, though, A. has been about as conservative as an editor of the *Metamorphoses* can be without falling into mere crankiness. This is not the only way to edit the work, but it is a defensible approach which will please many readers and is perhaps preferable to reckless and unskilled emendation.

One aspect of A.'s conservative approach does seem open to objection on general grounds: from time to time he adheres to the paradosis in a passage that good critics have thought corrupt, without mentioning these doubts in the apparatus. At 1. 52–53, for example, the manuscripts give "imminet his aer, qui quanto est pondere terrae, / pondere aquae leuior, tanto est onerosior igni"; the blatantly false assertion that earth and water are of equal weight troubled Renaissance scholars ("hi uersus multos diu torserunt," said Constantius Fanensis), who produced the elegant and accurate substitute *pondus aquae leuius*. This reading was commended by Heinsius and Housman and appears in the text of several modern editions of the *Metamorphoses*, but it does not figure in the apparatus of the new Teubner. Similarly, at 8. 777–79 "attonitae dryades damno nemorumque suoque, / omnes germanae, Cererem cum uestibus atris / maerentes adeunt," the flatness of *omnes germanae* has often been noticed;³⁹ A. cites the useless manuscript variant *et nece germanae* but no conjecture, not even the clever *suaeque* that he momentarily considered in his 1972 commentary and that J. Diggle simultaneously published.⁴⁰ In these and other places (e.g., 1. 441, 3. 671–73, 7. 699, 8. 57, 11. 674, 14. 385) the edition would be more useful if A. had alerted his readers to the misgivings of other scholars.

This is not the place to discuss the several hundred passages in which I might prefer a different reading or conjecture to the text printed by A.: the factors involved differ from passage to passage, and no general conclusions can profitably be drawn from them (except, of course, that it is possible to be much less confident than A. of the soundness of the tradition as represented by the oldest manuscripts). Instead I shall draw attention to a single problem confronting editors of the *Metamorphoses*, the question of interpolated verses.

39. Cf. F. R. D. Goodyear, rev. of "*Metamorphoses*" Book VIII ed. by A. S. Hollis, *JRS* 61 (1971): 307.

40. "Ovidiana," *PCPS* 18 (1972): 40–41.

In his text and notes Heinsius deleted or cast doubt on scores of lines in the course of the poem. Two centuries later the hunt for spurious verses was renewed in the Teubner texts of Rudolf Merkel (1861, second edition 1875). Merkel bracketed hundreds of verses, often for quite insufficient reasons. Many of these excisions were vigorously defended (and new ones proposed) by a pupil of Günther Jachmann, Siegfried Mendner, in his 1939 Cologne dissertation, *Der Text der "Metamorphosen" Ovids*, but Mendner is virtually the only scholar of the past hundred years who has adopted Merkel's radically skeptical approach. Merkel's dismemberment of the text provoked a violent critical response which not only reinstated the lines he had cavalierly ejected but which also rehabilitated almost all the verses that Heinsius and other early critics had found suspect. The important critical editions of Magnus and Ehwald presented a text of the *Metamorphoses* nearly devoid of excisions, and A. stands squarely in this conservative tradition: he brackets only one line with widespread manuscript support, 6. 294, and this line is unanimously condemned by modern editors.

I am inclined to think that the conservative tendency of most⁴¹ modern editorial work on the *Metamorphoses* is an extreme response to the excesses of nineteenth-century skepticism and that (to paraphrase Housman) error has not been overthrown by truth but by error of an opposite kind. Even when allowance has been made for Ovid's rhetorical exuberance and the allegedly unpolished state of his poem, a number of the lines bracketed by Heinsius, Merkel, or other critics seem to me to warrant excision on grounds of un-Ovidian style, unsuitability to context, or (as often happens) both. I even suspect that more than a few interpolated lines still await detection, having escaped both Heinsius' scalpel and Merkel's blunderbuss. The passages considered in the next few pages are only a small fraction of those in which I think that a strong case for deletion can be made out.

I defer to another place discussion of the passages where the manuscripts offer what look like alternative sets of verses and an editor must decide whether to reject one as an interpolation, accept both as separate drafts by the author, or (least likely of the three) accept both as Ovid's final version. Magnus forcefully defended the position that in each case only one transmitted version is authentic, but almost all recent writers have been willing to see two Ovidian versions in several places, or in every possible instance. A. does not apply any general policy, treating each passage on his view of its merits; he thus recognizes two Ovidian recensions in 1. 545–47, perhaps 6. 281–82, 7. 145–46, 7. 186–87, and 8. 652–56, but finds for interpolation at 4. 767–68, 8. 285–86, 8. 597–600, 8. 603–8, 693–94, and 697–98—all lines with questionable manuscript support. Here, too, it seems possible to advocate a more skeptical approach, since in every instance the hypothesis of interpolation is to my mind at least as plausible as that of two Ovidian recensions.

In each of the following discussions A.'s text is used as a starting point.

1. 343–45 iam mare litus habet, plenos capit alueus amnes,

41. Exception must be made for the complete edition of G. M. Edwards and A. S. Hollis' edition of Book 8 (Oxford, 1970), both of which recognize the presence of interpolated verses in the poem. I should also mention the 1971 Heidelberg dissertation of Inge Marahrens, *Angefochtene Verse und Versgruppen in den "Metamorphosen"*, a useful discussion of ninety suspected passages which finds cause for deletion in seventeen cases.

flumina subsidunt collesque exire uidentur,
surgit humus, crescunt loca⁴² decrescentibus undis . . .

Riese's deletion of line 344 has gone almost unnoticed, but two features of the line raise suspicions. First, the unadorned *flumina subsidunt*, coming after the pointed *plenos capit alueus amnes*, is worse than tautologous. Second, the *-que* of 344 clearly disrupts a planned sequence of clauses in asyndeton; it could be justified if it linked two facets of a single action, but it obviously does not (the hills are not in the middle of the rivers). Since *-que* is not needed for meter, one could simply delete it, but how is its insertion then to be explained? I think it more likely that line 344 is a fragment of another poem that has been accidentally intruded at the corresponding point in Ovid's narrative; the telltale *-que* presumably had a part to play in the line's original context.

1. 474–80 protinus alter amat, fugit altera nomen amantis
 siluarum latebris captiuarumque ferarum
 exuuiis gaudens innuptaeque aemula Phoebes.
 uitta coercebat positos sine lege capillos.
 multi illam petiere, illa auersata petentes
 impatiens expersque uiri nemora auia lustrat
 nec quid Hymen, quid Amor, quid sint conubia curat.

Line 477 is missing in the major "Lactantian" manuscripts (εM¹N¹), but the decisive arguments for deleting it are provided by diction and relation to context. The entire passage from 474 to 489 concerns the character of Daphne and in particular her devotion to Diana's cult of virginity; her appearance, alluded to in general terms in 488–89 (*decor iste, tua forma*), is first described in detail from the standpoint of Apollo in 497–502. The isolated physical detail in 477 is therefore out of place, as can be seen from the recurrence of that detail in 497 *inornatos collo pendere capillos*. It might be objected that the *uitta* is mentioned at 477 as a mark of Daphne's connection with Diana, but the line would still be open to attack on the ground of style. *Ponere capillos* means "to arrange one's hair"; one can arrange hair elaborately or artlessly (e.g., *positique sine arte capilli* of Hippolytus in *Her.* 4. 77), but "hair arranged without order" (*sine lege*) is a contradiction in terms. (The correct verb to describe disordered hair is *iacere*, as in *Epist. Sapph.* 73 "iacent sparsi sine lege capilli"; *Sen. Pha.* 803–4 "breuior coma / nulla lege iacens."⁴³) As often happens with interpolated lines in Ovid, the elements that are here faultily combined may be seen in their proper relation elsewhere in his work, *Metamorphoses* 2. 411–15 (of Callisto): "non erat huius opus lanam mollire trahendo / nec positu uariare comas; ubi fibula uestem, / uitta coercuerat neglectos alba capillos / et modo leue manu iaculum, modo sumpserat arcum, / miles erat Phoebes." (For another spurious line omitted in the "Lactantian" family, cf. 8. 87.)

2. 610–11 hactenus, et pariter uitam cum sanguine fudit;
 corpus inane animae frigus letale secutum est.

42. Heinsius' correction *sola*, independently proposed by Housman in "Emendations in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*," *TCPS* 3 (1890): 141, has been adopted by Edwards and A. G. Lee in his edition of Book 1 (Cambridge, 1953).

43. I am grateful to Pamela Marshall for drawing my attention to these passages, as well as for discussing the problems of this line with me.

Line 611 was deleted by Gierig, Merkel, and Hartman; all modern editors retain it, and it has been defended by Marahrens. Earlier doubters were struck by the fact that 610 forms an effective conclusion to the account of Coronis' death (cf. the Virgilian antecedents *Aen.* 2. 532 and 4. 621, both in concluding position). This fact, however, would not be sufficient cause to bracket an otherwise blameless line; the real difficulties (as Marahrens recognized) are linguistic, and not all seem to have been noticed. Ovid uses *letalis* elsewhere in the sense "bringing/causing death," but here it would bear a much weaker meaning ("of death"); the contrast is clearest if 827–28 below are compared: "sic letalis hiems (= frigor) paulatim in pectora uenit / uitalesque uias et respiramina clausit." The use of *secutum est* is also remarkable; Bömer compares Virgil *Georgics* 3. 564–65 "immundus olentia sudor / membra sequebatur," but there the literal meaning of *sequor* can still be felt (the limbs provide the paths which the sweat follows). Marahrens more helpfully adduces Lucretius 3. 929–30 "nec quisquam expergitus exstat / frigida quem semel est uitai pausa secuta," where the word means "overtake" or "catch up with." This comes close to the meaning required here, but there is a significant difference between the image of death overtaking a live body and of death's chill "overtaking" a body from which life has already departed. Two oddities of expression in a rhetorically anticlimactic line seem to me sufficient grounds for suspicion. (Note also that *corpus inane animae* looks threadbare alongside 13. 488 "corpus . . . animae tam fortis inane.")

3. 393–401 spreta latet siluis pudibundaque frondibus ora
 protegit et solis ex illo uiuit in antris;
 sed tamen haeret amor crescitque dolore repulsae:
 et tenuant⁴⁴ uigiles corpus miserabile curae,
 adducitque cutem macies, et in aëra sucus
 corporis omnis abit; uox tantum atque ossa supersunt:
 uox manet; ossa ferunt lapidis traxisse figuram.
 inde latet siluis nulloque in monte uidetur,
 omnibus auditur: sonus est, qui uiuit in illa.

Lines 400–401 were first bracketed by Heinsius, followed not only by Merkel but also by several editors of more moderate tendencies (e.g., Haupt, Riese, and Edwards); even the cautious Marahrens has pronounced them spurious (pp. 61–64). Their most obvious weakness is the lame repetition, made worse by *inde*, of *latet siluis* from 393; this is not defended by the argument that between 393 and 401 Echo changes from a nymph to a voice: *latet siluis* is entirely apt for a person, quite unlikely for a disembodied voice. Then there is the phrase "nulloque in monte uidetur, / omnibus auditur": as Bömer observes, *omnibus* must mean *omnibus in montibus*, but the words can be (and usually have been) taken to mean *omnibus hominibus*, "she is heard by all." Ambiguity of this kind is not a mark of subtlety, but of clumsiness.⁴⁵ Finally, "sonus est qui uiuit in illa" is, as Marahrens notes, a failed attempt to express the idea "her voice is the only part of Echo that remains"; *in illa* only makes sense if a body still exists; cf. *Meta-*

44. Either *attenuant* or *extenuant* (both in *recentiores*) seems required.

45. Note also that *omnibus auditur* (however understood) explicitly treats Echo as a universal phenomenon, whereas the rest of Ovid's account neatly evades the awkwardness of making a single nymph responsible for echoes in all parts of the world.

morphoses 1. 428–29 “eodem in corpore saepe / altera pars uiuit, rudis est pars altera tellus.” At the least a defender of the lines ought to consider Castiglioni’s *illis* for *illa*, although that diverts emphasis from Echo, where it might seem to belong. One might apply to these two lines as a whole the revealing remark of Bömer on *illa*: “Die Lesart der Hss. lässt sich nur durch den consensus ihrer Überlieferung verteidigen”; perhaps only an editor for whom the appearance of a verse in all manuscripts is a sufficient proof of genuineness need hesitate to concur with Heinsius in deleting 400–401.

The account of the plague on Aegina (*Met.* 7. 523–660) was either left in an especially crude state by Ovid or else has suffered to an unusually great extent from interpolation. I mention just four passages here.⁴⁶

7. 523–32

Dira lues ira populis Iunonis iniquae
incidit exosae dictas a paelice terras.
dum uisum mortale malum tantaeque latebat
causa nocens cladis, pugnatum est arte medendi;
exitium superabat opem, quae uicta iacebat.
principio caelum spissa caligine terras
pressit et ignauos inclusit nubibus aestus,
dumque quater iunctis expleuit cornibus orbem
luna, quater plenum tenuata retexit orbem,
letiferis calidi spirarunt aestibus austri.

Lines 525–27 arouse suspicion first by their wording, then by their failure to cohere with their surroundings. The normal meaning of *mortale malum* would be “an evil with human causes, within human capability” (hardly “malum originibus naturalibus ortum,” which is what it must mean here, in Bömer’s words); *causa nocens* is even more peculiar; *quae uicta iacebat* is (as Heinsius saw) mere filler. More serious, where is the contrast implied by *dum uisum*. . . ? This only makes sense if at some point the true cause of the plague is discovered, which never happens in Ovid’s narrative. Finally, the lines ineptly anticipate 561–67 by introducing futile attempts at medical treatment before the plague has even begun. These lines look like a poor variation on Ovid’s account of the plague in Latium at 15. 626–30, in which the failure of human remedies and the resulting appeal for divine aid are lucidly described: “dira lues quondam Latias uitiauerat auras, / pallidaque exsanguis quaelebant corpora morbo. / funeribus fessi postquam mortalia cernunt / temptamenta nihil, nihil artes posse medentum, / auxilium caeleste petunt. . . .” The passage from Book 15 might have been appended as a marginal parallel (perhaps because of the use of *dira lues* in each), prompting a reader to an unhappy effort of composition; or the lines might come from a lost plague description written under Ovidian influence.

It is not sufficient, though, to delete 525–27, since (as E. J. Kenney points out to me) that would leave two consecutive lines ending with *terras*, a repetition unjustified by any rhetorical point. If the case against 525–27 is sound, one of the occurrences of *terras* is probably to be suspected. In 524 the word is perfectly in place and is confirmed by *dictas*. In 528 things are less clear, especially when one

46. I discussed these and other passages of Book 7 at a Departmental Seminar in the University of Toronto in November 1979; I am grateful to those present for several useful comments and suggestions.

notices that the surrounding context (as far as 532) is concerned with disturbances *above* the earth. I first thought of replacing *terras* with *solem* (appealing to Sen. *NQ* 3. 27. 4 on the *dies diluvii*: “*primo immodici cadunt imbres et sine ullis solibus triste nubilo caelum est nebulaque continua et ex umido spissa caligo numquam exsiccantibus uentis*”) but now prefer to read *uentos* (a conjecture of my colleague D. F. S. Thomson), giving a characteristically Ovidian variation *uentos-aestus-austri*.

7. 573–81 prosiliunt aut, si prohibent consistere uires,
 corpora deuoluunt in humum fugiuntque penates
 quisque suos, sua cuique domus funesta uidetur
 et, quia causa latet, locus est in crimine paruus.
 semianimes errare uiis, dum stare ualebant,
 adspiceres, flentes alios terraque iacentes
 lassaque uersantes supremo lumina motu
 membraque pendentis tendunt ad sidera caeli,
 hic illic, ubi mors deprenderat, exhalantes.

Heinsius entertained doubts about three lines in this section (576, 580, and 581); in all three cases his suspicions seem justified. The victims of the plague desperately try to leave their beds and homes, thinking that the houses themselves are the cause of the sickness. Ovid expresses the idea in two meticulously balanced phrases: “*fugiuntque penates / quisque suos, sua cuique domus funesta uidetur*.” Now comes 576, which A. prints in its most widely transmitted form. Defenders of the *paradosis* (e.g., Bömer, Marahrens) explain *locus paruus* as “lack of space,” but no true parallel for this bizarre locution has yet been offered (*Met.* 8. 637 *paruus . . . penates* is simply equivalent to *paruam domum*). The manuscripts produce several variations on *paruus*, all useless (*paruo, prauo, falso, notus, totus*). If there is any hope for 576, it lies in ending a sentence with *crimine* (*locus est in crimine* = “the place gets the blame”) and starting a new one with the last word in the line. Among modern editors only Goold takes this step, adopting Korn’s *partim*, impossible for Ovid (he uses *partim* only in pairs and never of persons). Heinsius’ *notis* is neater and is based on a manuscript variant (*notus*); if 576 is to be retained, this (or a similar conjecture) is the way to do it. But should the line be saved? Its flatness would be disturbing in any context, but it seems especially unlikely that Ovid would have followed the carefully symmetrical phrases of 574–75 with a third statement of the same point in such feeble language (e.g., the vague *locus* after the specific *penates* and *domus*). This result, though, is quite plausible for an interpolator using fragments of Ovidian language without Ovid’s control: *causa latet*, for example, might have been borrowed from *Metamorphoses* 4. 287 “*causa latet, uis est notissima fontis*,” where context supplies the qualification missing here.

Having fled their houses, the dying Aeginetans might have been seen wandering the streets as long as they had the strength to stand; others were lying on the ground weeping and rolling their exhausted eyes in a final movement. The explicitness of *supremo . . . motu* in 579 makes it appear odd that in the next line the same people are stretching their limbs out to the sky, but that is only one of several peculiar features of 580. The finite verb *tendunt* disrupts a series of emotionally charged participles (*flentes, iacentes, uersantes*), and the combination

It is not immediately clear whether 581 should share the fate of 580. *Exhalantes* at first looks quite in place as the conclusion to the participial series *flentes–iacentes–uersantes*, but on the other hand Ovid nowhere else uses *exhalo* without an object and the concluding *spondeiazon* in *exhalantes* is an effect used elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses*, in the account of the death of Niobe's children (6. 245–47): “ingemuere simul, simul incuruata dolore / membra solo posuere, simul suprema iacentes / lumina uersarunt, animam simul exhalarunt.” It can hardly be a coincidence that this passage also speaks of a final flickering of the eyes, as well as containing a reference to the *membra* of the dying (here used correctly). With a possible source for the wording of 581 found, I think it far more likely that the writer responsible for *membra tendunt* and *pendentis caeli* would venture an intransitive *exhalantes* than that Ovid would repeat his earlier phrases in such an uncharacteristic form.⁴⁷

The second half of 657 lamely repeats the thought of the first half; furthermore, *reservo* in the sense of “save up” (which must be the sense intended here) invariably has in Virgil and Ovid a complement in the dative or with *ad*; finally, the whole line adds nothing to what Ovid has already conveyed by *parcum genus*.⁴⁸

It is astonishing that Hollis is so far the only editor or commentator who has followed Merkel in deleting line 190. Its incoherence is generally admitted, with varying degrees of uneasiness: *a minima coeptas* conveys ascending order of size, *longam breuiore sequenti* the reverse, *ut cliuo creuisse putes* ascending order again. The only conjecture so far proposed, Holland's *longa* ("with the long one shorter than the one following"), replaces the illogical with the grotesque and may be ignored. In all the discussion of the second half of the line the latinity of *a minima coeptas* has escaped close scrutiny. *Coeptus* is used of objects or actions to which the idea of completeness (or its opposite) is appropriate, for example,

48. I must thank Michael Reeve for alerting me to the spuriousness of this line.

iter, opus, sacra: thus the wings that Daedalus starts to fashion could be described as *coeptae*, but not the feathers out of which they are made. (Bömer cites two parallels for *coeptas*, neither of which helps: *Met.* 1. 405 *forma . . . de marmore coepta*, 8. 276–77 *coeptus . . . honor*; the former approximates to *coeptum opus*, the latter to *coepta sacra*. It may not be accidental that the only other instance of *coeptus a* in Ovid occurs within one hundred lines of the present passage.)

8. 211–16

dedit oscula nato

non iterum repetenda suo pennisque leuatus
ante uolat comitique timet, uelut ales, ab alto
quae teneram prolem produxit in aera nido,
hortaturque sequi damnosasque erudit artes
et mouet ipse suas et nati respicit alas.

Of 216 Hollis writes, “the whole line has been transferred from *A. A.* ii. 73.” Certainly, but by Ovid or another? Here is the context in the *Ars amatoria*:

monte minor collis, campis erat altior aequis;
hinc data sunt miserae corpora bina fugae.
et mouet ipse suas et nati respicit alas
Daedalus et cursus sustinet usque suos.

The *et . . . et* construction of *Ars amatoria* 2. 73 coheres perfectly with its surroundings (a third *et* in 74), but clashes with the *que . . . que . . . que . . . que* of *Metamorphoses* 8. 212–15. In addition, the plain language of the line is in keeping with the stylistic level of the *Ars* but not with the much more heightened emotional tone of the passage in the *Metamorphoses* (note, e.g., the phrase *oscula . . . non iterum repetenda*, the simile of the bird, the ominous *damnosasque erudit artes*). In a passage where other lines from the *Ars* have been repeated by the author (217, 227), it is not surprising either that an interpolator should have tried his hand at the game or that his effort should have escaped notice until now.

The foregoing pages have, in the manner of reviews, been grudging with praise and lavish with dissent. There is no hiding the fact that another editor might often disagree with A., both in constructing the text and in deciding how best to report the evidence on which it is based. These differences, however, should not be allowed to obscure the achievements of A.’s edition. His reports of the oldest manuscripts place the criticism of the poem on a firmer basis than ever before and his text is entirely free of bias and eccentricity. Above all, one may hope that the appearance of this new edition will add to the lively interest now being shown in the *Metamorphoses* and so foster the appreciation of this most humane and engaging poem.

R. J. TARRANT
University of Toronto