

in Horace.³ The couch, on the other hand, is called *bibulus* because, situated in an inn, drink is constantly brought to it, and consumed by the patrons upon it; this is not to say that each and every one of these worthies is himself *bibulus*. The speaker wants to attract the traveller, not turn him away.⁴ A bold transference, but intelligible.

The objection to the "parallel" *quietis toris* (Val. Flacc. 1.294–95), "the effect caused by the couch is ascribed to it as a quality, which is much more natural a transference than that in *bibulo . . . toro*," is a valid one.⁵ Better to compare, e.g., Ovid's lament that, unable to rise to the occasion, he is on a *pigro toro* (*Am.* 3.7.4); or, the *obsceno toro* (*Tr.* 2.378), on which, says Ovid, Venus and Mars had their celebrated tryst. In these examples, as in the present passage, the *torus* receives the adjective which properly describes the activities taking place thereon.

With regard to the balance of the couplet the poet, it seems to me, has taken care to contrast the two ablatives *pulvere* and *bibulo*; cf. Pliny, 18.110, *terra . . . pulvere summa, inferior bibula* (as cited in *OLD*, s.v. *bibulus*).

A final point. Since Horace seems to be alone in using *bibulus* of a person, the use of the word in the *Copa* is, in one respect at least, quite usual.

ALLAN KERSHAW

Pennsylvania State University

3. *Potatorem*: Pseudo-Acron's note on *bibulum*; cf. *Gloss. Lat.* 2.29, 32 "ebriosum." So at *Epist.* 1.18.91 *potores bibuli*, if it is Latin, as Thomas asserts, would mean "heavy drinkers."

4. Of the suggested interpretations (see Thomas, "*Copa*," pp. 41–42) the notion that the couch is splashed with wine would, in this context, be as ludicrous to the ancients as it is to us today.

5. Thomas, "*Copa*," p. 42, n. 6.

OVID AMORES 2.13.17–18: *QUAE OEDIPUM REQUIRANT INTERPRETEM*

So Heinsius, on the pentameter of the following couplet:

saepe tibi sedit certis operata diebus,
 qua tingit laurus Gallica turba tuas.

The principal manuscript witnesses are (the select apparatus uses J. C. McKeown's *sigla*):¹

17 sedit Z, Heinsius: dedit PYPf¹: seruit ObPh (v.l.): meruit ySø
 18 qua PYSø: quis ç: quam D: quas Pf tingit PYF¹Vb: tangit SF²
 (ut vid.): cingit yø turba PYSç: turba yç

A. Ramírez de Verger is the first for many a year to have responded to Heinsius' daunting challenge by reading in line 18 *quis tangit laurus candida turba tuas*,²

I should like to record my thanks to J. G. Griffiths, E. J. Kenney, A. G. Lee, and W. J. N. Rudd for their stimulating criticism of an earlier draft of this paper.

1. *Ovid: Amores*, vol. 1: *Text and Prolegomena* (Liverpool, 1987), pp. 131–33.

2. "The Text of Ovid, *Amores* 2.13.17–18," *AJP* 109 (1988): 86–91. Though I cannot agree with his conclusions, I am much indebted to Professor Ramírez de Verger for a pre-publication draft of his paper, which initially stimulated me to re-examine these *verba obscurissima* (Heinsius, in Burman's variorum edition of 1727).

but I contest his claim to have made the riddle-solver redundant and offer some observations and ideas of my own, which, though scarcely Oedipal, I think are new.

First, briefly, the problem. The couplet 17–18 comes after 10 lines of prayer to the Egyptian goddess Isis to save the life of Ovid's mistress, Corinna, desperately ill after an abortion, and immediately precedes the following lines (their importance will emerge shortly) of appeal and vows to one addressed as *Ilithyia* (19–26):

tuque laborantes utero miserata puellas
 quarum tarda latens corpora tendit onus,
 lenis ades precibusque meis fave, Ilithyia:
 digna est quam iubeas muneris esse tui.
 ipse ego tura dabo fumosis candidus aris,
 ipse feram ante tuos munera vota pedes;
 adiciam titulum SERVATA NASO CORINNA:
 tu modo fac titulo muneribusque locum.

When *sedit*, the only sensible reading, is adopted in 17, the natural assumption is that this line refers to Corinna's dutiful incubation *ad Isin* at the prescribed times (*certis . . . diebus*) for her devotees (for the expression, cf. especially Ov. *Ars* 3.635 *cum sedeat Phariae sistris operata iuvencae*).³ But no permutation of the MS readings produces a pentameter which can be seen to make much sense in an Isiac context: no "Gallic troop" (*turma*) or "crowd" (*turba*) is known to have been involved in any Isiac ritual, and the laurel does not appear to have had any function or association with the cult or temple of Isis so peculiar or so celebrated as to justify calling it the goddess' own (*tuas*).⁴ Nor is the problem confined to the internal obscurities of line 17: as R. P. Oliver first pointed out, the couplet 17–18 is "a miserably anti-climactic addition to the plea already made,"⁵ which ends with the clichéd, but emotionally arresting, "in una parce duobus: / nam vitam dominae tu dabis, illa mihi" (15–16).

Oliver's proffered solution deserves discussion. Believing *Gallica turma* to allude to the eunuch priests known as *Galli*, who officiated in the mystery cult of Cybele, the *Magna Mater*,⁶ and thinking (rightly) that Ovid is unlikely to have confused her cult with that of Isis,⁷ Oliver suggests that Cybele was in fact the second of three goddesses altogether addressed by Ovid in this poem, the first being, of course, Isis, and the third Ilithyia, the goddess of childbirth, sometimes called by the Roman name Lucina. *tuque*, which in line 19 refers to the one addressed as *Ilithyia*, always indicates elsewhere in Ovid's poetry a change of

3. Cf. also Tib. 1.3.30, Prop. 2.28.45, Ov. *Tr.* 2.297, *Pont.* 1.1.52. For the ritual see further R. E. Witt, *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World* (London, 1971), p. 191.

4. *laureis* at Apul. *Met.* 11.10 is a conjecture, and, even if right, may be due to the association there of Isis with Artemis, and hence Apollo; see further J. G. Griffiths' note *ad loc.* (*Apuleius of Madauros: The Isis Book ("Metamorphoses" XI)* [Leiden, 1975]). G. Némethy's explanation of the reference to laurel (in his commentary, *P. Ovidii Nasonis "Amores"* [Budapest, 1907]) has no basis in reality; G. Showerman, however, essentially accepts it in his Loeb edition of 1921, and G. P. Goold lets it stand in his revision of 1977.

5. "The Text of Ovid's *Amores*," in *Classical Studies presented to B. E. Perry* (Urbana, 1969), pp. 152–53.

6. See M. J. Vermaseren, *Cybele and Attis* (London, 1977), pp. 96–100; Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* 4.182 (with further bibliography).

7. Especially when he has in the immediately preceding lines (7–16) meticulously delineated aspects of the Isiac cult; cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.685, 701, 773–84. Apuleius, moreover, has his narrator Lucius, Isiac *par excellence*, make very clear his contempt for the rites of Cybele, and particularly the activities of the *Galli* (*Met.* 8.24–30).

addressee,⁸ and this would seem to confirm that it is correct to regard *Ilithyia* here as the name of a separate goddess, rather than as a cult-title of Isis, an otherwise tempting notion.⁹ As for lines 17–18, Oliver posits that they are all that remains of Ovid's appeal to Cybele after the omission of "one or more couplets" after line 16 in the lost common ancestor of all our extant MSS.¹⁰ This initially seems promising, given that Cybele, as well as Isis, did have a role as protectress of women, in sickness and in childbirth.¹¹ But reference to the cult of Cybele in 17–18 is in fact improbable: (a) because ritual incubation of devotees was, as far as we know, by no means as celebrated a part of her cult as it was of that of Isis;¹² (b) because Cybele's *Galli* were far better known for their outlandish appearance and behavior¹³ than for anything they did with laurel;¹⁴ and (c) because there is no compelling reason to understand *Gallica turma* as an allusion to the priests of Cybele at all, orthodox though this interpretation has become.¹⁵ *Gallicus* appertaining to the eunuch *Galli* is unparalleled in Latin literature,¹⁶ and the only instance of *turma* = "a group of people," rather than "a military unit" (usually, though not invariably, of cavalry), is at Horace *Odes* 3.4.47,¹⁷ where it is in any case used as a conscious military metaphor, much as, say, "squadron" may be in English. The indications are, then, that the most natural, and perhaps the only possible, meaning of *Gallica turma* would be "troop/contingent of Gauls."¹⁸ So Oliver's theory of an appeal to Cybele in 17–18 must be rejected, though, as we shall see, his suspicion of a lacuna could well be correct.

The laurel is as good a starting-place as any for a new investigation; for, apart from the troublesome *Gallica, laurus . . . tuas* are the only words in the line on which all the MSS agree. They do not, of course, agree on what is being done to the laurel, but in fact I see no reason to doubt *tingit*; laurel branches were sometimes used to sprinkle water in ritual lustrations, Isiac ones included (cf. especially Juvenal 2.157–58 *cuperent lustrari . . . / . . . si foret umida laurus*).¹⁹ Thus

8. Professor Kenney kindly draws my attention to this point. For *tuque* cf. *Met.* 7.194, 10.69, 13.130, 15.234. It is worth noting that Ovid distinguishes between Isis and the birth-goddess (called *Lucina*) at *Met.* 9.696–701.

9. Isis is called "Lochia," the Greek epithet of Artemis as goddess of childbirth, in an inscription from Beroea (*SEG* 12 316; photograph in Witt, *Isis*, plate 15).

10. For a concise account of the tradition see McKeown, *Amores: Prol.*, pp. 124–25.

11. Diod. 3.58. See also Schwenn, *RE*, vol. 11 (Stuttgart, 1935), cols. 2254–55.

12. Though Juv. 9.23 and Lucian *Amores* 42 arguably contain oblique references to it.

13. See Vermaseren, *Cybele*, pp. 96–97.

14. No more specifically Cybelean than it was Isiac, though there are some iconographical representations of priests and attendants of Cybele wearing laurel wreaths on their heads; see Vermaseren, *Cybele*, pp. 99, 108.

15. Burman's reporting of Douza's annotation *pro Gallo flumine* (cf. *Ov. Fast.* 4.361–66) seems to have started the hare which practically everyone has subsequently chased; a significant exception is Heinsius, who apparently ignored it. The *OLD* s.v. *Gallicus* and *turma* compounds the error by referring the phrase to priests of Isis.

16. If it had been possible for it to bear this meaning, Ovid would have had ample scope for using it at *Fast.* 4.361–66; as it is, vv. 362–63 "cur igitur Gallos, qui se excidere, vocamus, / cum tanto a Phrygia Gallica distet humus?" suggest, I think, that whatever the noun *Gallus* could mean, the adjective *Gallicus* for Ovid meant "belonging to Gaul."

17. Here, too, some MSS give *turbas*.

18. For a territorial or ethnic adjective with *turma* cf. Liv. 22.42.4 *turma Lucana*, and for this type of epithet with *ala*, *legio*, etc. see M. Speidel, *Roman Army Studies*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam, 1984), p. 110.

19. See further E. Courtney's note ad loc. (*A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal* [London, 1980]); M. B. Ogle, "Laurel in Ancient Religion and Folklore," *AJP* 31 (1910): 289–90; this generally purificatory use of the laurel, and not any special function in Isiac ritual, may well be what Seneca has in mind, when he

Ovid could well have described Corinna here as having taken up residence on the prescribed days "where (= *qua*)²⁰ X wets its laurel" (*suas* would be an easy correction of the offending *tuas*; scribal confusion of these possessives is not uncommon, as witness McKeown's apparatus for e.g., *Amores* 2.4.18, 6.8, 9.38, but, as I shall explain below, this may not in fact be responsible for the error here). But who or what is X? Ramírez de Verger proposes reading *candida turba*, "the shining-white congregation," instead of *Gallica turba*. This in itself is attractive; *turba* (= *γς*) of Isiac devotees at their rituals is easily paralleled (cf. especially Ov. *Met.* 1.677 *nunc ea linigera colitur celeberrima turba*),²¹ and the conjectured *candida* would aptly describe their traditionally linen-clad appearance.²² But *Gallica* would seem to have been anything but "an easy substitute"²³ for *candida*, even supposing *turba* to have been corrupted to *turma* first, and in fact, although some MSS do corrupt the relatively rare *turma* to the much commoner *turba* on the two other occasions in his poetry when Ovid uses it (*Ars Am.* 3.2, *Pont.* 4.10.51), on none of the 27 occasions on which he uses *turba* in the *Amores*, *Ars Amatoria*, and *Remedia Amoris* alone is it ever corrupted to *turma*. So, if the attractive *turba*, at least, is right here, something more than simple miscopying is needed to account for its corruption to *turma*. And still there remains the baffling *Gallica*.

What, then, could have happened? Like Oliver, I believe that a portion of text has been lost, though after rather than before lines 17–18. Other factors besides the above-mentioned rootlessness of this couplet point to a substantial lacuna. Lines 7–26 display most elements of the formal prayer or hymn, which provides the framework for many a Latin poem or passage.²⁴ But two of these elements seem oddly underweight here. First, the conventional statement of "services rendered"²⁵ (to Isis) in 17–18 is peculiarly brief, given both Ovid's well-known tendency never to content himself with one point when several might be made and, more particularly, the supposed exigency of the circumstances—which would surely have called for every possible effort to impress upon Isis her obligations to one as devoted as Corinna (cf. Delia's range of Isiac ritual observances at Tib. 1.3.23–32). And second, it would be seen as an elementary mistake on the part of an ancient

describes one who is probably to be recognized as a priest of Isis as a "linen-clad old man carrying laurel and a lamp" at *Dial.* 7.26.8. I am not impressed by Ramírez de Verger's support ("*Amores*, 2.13.17–18," pp. 89–90, and nn. 19, 20) for *tangit*: a reference to the "touching of laurel" in a description (by Proclus) of the *Daphnephoria* is hardly surprising and is not relevant to the rites of Isis as described by Ovid, and Bömer's note on *aram complecti* at *Met.* 9.772, to which Ramírez de Verger refers, does nothing to establish the status of *tangere laurus* as a *gestus precantium*.

20. *quis* (= *quibus*), preferred by Ramírez de Verger, is unpersuasive not least because this archaic form of the ablative plural is unparalleled in Ovid.

21. Cf. also Tib. 1.3.32; Apul. *Met.* 11.10, 23.

22. White clothing was in fact not confined to the worshippers of Isis, but *de rigueur* as a sign of ritual purity for participants in a wide range of religious cults and ceremonies; cf. line 23 of our poem (referring to a suppliant of Ilithyia), *Fast.* 2.654 (to worshippers of Terminus) and *Fast.* 4.906 (to propitiators of *Robigo*).

23. Ramírez de Verger, "*Amores*, 2.13.17–18," p. 89.

24. For identification of the basic elements see E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur religiöser Rede* (Stuttgart, 1923; repr. 1956), pp. 143–63, 168–76; and for some Latin examples, G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 133–34, 139–56. M. Swoboda, "De Ovidii carminum elegiacorum fragmentis hymnico-precatoriis," *Eos* 66 (1978): 73–90, offers a useful collection of Ovidian specimens but very little analysis.

25. Cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.39–41; Catull. 76.19; see further R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: "Odes," Book I* (Oxford, 1970), p. 360.

suppliant dealing with reputedly touchy and jealous beings to offer only Ilithyia of two goddesses invoked (in the text as we have it) the thank-offerings and commemoration which Ovid vows in 23–25 (note the second person singulars in these lines).²⁶ Furthermore, the two poems of an Ovidian dramatic pair such as is formed by our piece and the next, *Amores* 2.14,²⁷ are generally of roughly even length, and the present poem as it stands is 16 lines shorter than its sequel.

I therefore suggest that between 18 and 19 some lines (though not necessarily as many as 16) have been lost, in which Ovid elaborated on Corinna's devotional services to Isis and promised her thank-offerings comparable with those vowed to Ilithyia in 23–25. I also suggest that one of the lines in this missing passage may have contained the phrase *Gallica turma* in its most natural sense of "troop of Gauls." And why might Ovid have been referring to a troop of Gauls in an Isiac context? Because he could well have promised to Isis, in return for her favor, sacrifice to her (possibly by the recovered Corinna herself)²⁸ of geese, celebrated in Rome above all else, of course, for their legendary saving of the Capitol by their timely cackling when the GAULS attempted to occupy it in 390 B.C.²⁹ Although the sacrificing of geese to Isis is well enough attested in itself,³⁰ the idea of any poet connecting it with the Gallic invasion might seem impossibly far-fetched—until it emerges that Ovid himself made that very connection at *Fasti* 1.453–54: "nec defensa iuvant Capitolia, quo minus anser / det iecur in lances, Inachi lauta [i.e., Isis],³¹ tuas."³²

Gallica turma from a section of the poem now lost could, I surmise, have been accidentally substituted for a phrase containing the look-alike *turba* at the end of line 18. Why might this have happened? If the word which preceded *turba* in 18 was not the conjectured *candida*, but *dedita*, "devoted,"³³ a scribe who had erroneously written *dedit* (= PYFP¹) for *sedit* in 17 may well have been about to finish 18 with *dedita turba suas*, words he had already mentally registered, when he

26. This was what lay behind the frequent tendency to invoke all the deities who could be interested in the suppliant's petition, to include as many of their cult-titles as possible, and sometimes to include an "escape-clause" in case of any sin of omission. See further Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 144–63; Williams, *Tradition and Originality*, p. 133; Nisbet and Hubbard, *Horace: "Odes,"* 1, pp. 366–67.

27. I.e., a two-"scene" sequence, in which an easily imagined development following the first "scene" (here Corinna's weathering of the crisis) prompts a change of stance in the second poem, whose language and attitudes frequently establish points of contact and contrast with the first. Into this category fall certainly *Am.* 1.11 and 12, and 2.7 and 8, and probably *Am.* 2.2 and 3, and 2.9.1–24 and 25–54; the disputed *Am.* 3.11 I incline to think is a single poem. If *Am.* 2.2 and 3 do form a pair, it is admittedly one which constitutes an exception to the general "parity of length" rule, but in this case the unevenness of length is so marked that I think it may have a special point, a sudden switch from garrulous cajolery to caustic brevity underlining Ovid's abrupt change of attitude when he fails to prevail upon his addressee. The whole vexed question of paired poems in the *Amores* has recently been re-examined by C. Damon, "Poem Division, Paired Poems, and *Amores* 2.9 and 3.11," *TAPA* 120 (1990): 267–90.

28. This would neatly balance Ovid's promise of offerings on his own part to Ilithyia at vv. 23–25; the repeated *ipse* in 23–24 must otherwise be regarded as purely mechanical.

29. Cf. Liv. 5.47.1; Bömer on *Fast.* 6.185.

30. See Paus. 10.32.16; Aelius Arist. *Or.* 25 (p. 500, 10 Dindorf); see further Courtney's note on Juv. 6.540, where the reference is to sacrifice of a goose to Osiris, and T. Hopfner, *Fontes Historiae Religio-nis Aegyptiacae* (Bonn, 1922–25), s.v. *anser*.

31. See Bömer on *Fast.* 5.619.

32. Note, moreover, his phraseology when he describes the Gallic invasion elsewhere: "ante domus Manli fuerat, qui GALLICA quondam / a Capitolino reppulit ARMA Iove" (*Fast.* 6.185).

33. For the absolute use of *deditus* cf. Sen. *Ben.* 3.5.2; Juv. 6.181; the dative *tibi* is in any case easily supplied here from the previous line.

paused, thinking *dedita* suspicious in the wake of *dedit*, and looked back at his exemplar to check; whereupon his eye fell upon the subsequent and similar *Gallica turma* (? *tuas*), with which he then went on, assuming that he had initially wrongly registered *dedita* and had misread *turma* as the commoner *turba*.³⁴ My tentative reconstruction of the text, then, would be:

saepe tibi sedit certis operata diebus 17
qua tingit laurus dedita turba suas. 18

.....
(up to 15 lines possibly missing, though probably no more than 4–6)³⁵

... Gallica turma tuas
tuque laborantes utero miserata puellas 19

Lines 19–26 contain two of the solemn *tu*... clauses standard in prayers and hymns;³⁶ if the passage I think has been lost before line 19 also contained one or more of these clauses, its omission would have been all the more likely to have remained unnoticed by the copyist.³⁷

My suggestion is radical and speculative: but I venture to think it may be preferable to total silence, with still no Oedipus in sight.

JOAN BOOTH

University of Wales, Swansea

34. Either accidental or deliberate scribal alteration may account for the *turba* with appears in some *rec.*

35. 16 more lines of appeal to Isis in addition to the surviving 12 would be unduly out of proportion with the 8 lines of appeal to Ilithyia, but an address to Isis at least twice the length, say, of that to Ilithyia would not be inappropriate, given the exceptionally wide-ranging nature of Isis' powers; see Apul. *Met.* 11.5.

36. See e.g., Catull. 34.13–20, Apul. *Met.* 11.2 (to Isis herself); and for further instances Nisbet and Hubbard, *Horace*: “*Odes*,” I, p. 131.

37. Cf. especially in the *Amores* the omission of 2.2.18–27 in all the oldest MSS owing to the confusion of *consci*us at the beginning of line 17 with *consci*us at the beginning of line 27.

BACALUSIAS: A TRANSITIONAL HAPAX IN PETRONIUS *SATYRICON* 41.2

Although the reading *bacalusias* at Petronius *Satyricon* 41.2 has attracted much attention, most of the explanations and emendations proposed have led to the same conclusion: Encolpius uses the term to describe the variety of “silly conjectures” which he exhausts before finally asking his neighbor why Trimalchio's roast boar is wearing a cap. The word may be cognate with Greek βάκηλος, in the sense of *baceolus* (= *stultus*; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 87), and therefore mean “foolish guesses.”¹ Some see in *bacalusias* a corruption of Greek βαυκαλήσεις “lullabies”: Encolpius recites to himself the “nonsense words” which one hums while lulling a

1. See the second edition of L. Friedlaender, *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 247, citing F. Bücheler, and followed tentatively by M. S. Smith, *Petronius: Cena Trimalchionis* (Oxford, 1975), p. 95. It remains unclear, however, how βάκηλος (“eunuch”) comes to mean “silly”: Hesychius glosses βάκηλος with ἀνόητος, ἀπόκοπος, γάλλος, ἀνδρόγυνος, παρεμμένος, γυναικώδης.