PROBLEMS IN OVID'S *FASTI*

OVID's *Fasti* are preserved in well over a hundred manuscripts, of which five are of primary rank. These are:

A Vaticanus Reginensis 1709 saec. x, which breaks off at 5. 24.
U Vaticanus Latinus 3262 (Ursinianus) saec. xi.
I Fragmentum Ilfeldense saec. xi, which contains 2. 568–3. 204, 4. 317–814, and bits of the latter half of Book 1 and the beginning of Book 2.
G Bruxellensis 5369–5373 saec. xi, which begins at 1. 505.
M Oxoniensis Bodl. Auct. F. 4. 25 saec. xv.

IGM form a unified group and we denote their consensus by the sign Z; in the absence of I we signify the consensus of GM with ζ. It will be seen that in the earlier part of Book I this family is reduced to M. Here one may sometimes call on the help of Harleianus 2564 saec. xv, which we call h; this manuscript, though overlaid with the vulgate text, shows a number of striking readings which reveal a source closely related to G. At the end of the poem we lack the guidance of A, which, though not free from interpolations, is by far the most sincere witness; here the testimony of Cantabrigiensis Pembrokianus 280 saec. xii, which we call F and which in the earlier books shows more fidelity to the A-tradition than any other manuscript, is sometimes useful, though it cannot be relied on without grave reservations. Editors usually quote Monacensis 8122 (D) as if it were a primary witness; it is nothing of the sort, but rather a much corrupted and interpolated offshoot of the A-tradition diluted by some contamination from Z. We use ω to indicate the mass of the vulgar manuscripts and ς to indicate some of them.

Three serious attempts have been made to survey in full the manuscript evidence for this poem. The first was by Nicolas Heinsius, who inspected a vast number (including AUM and a collation of G) and recorded their readings in his notebooks and editions with a standard of accuracy still remarkable in view of the methods and circumstances of his work and his times. The second was by Rudolf Merkel, who in his edition of 1841 published an enormous mass of material partly derived from collations made by or for him (including one of I) and partly from the notebooks of Heinsius; he is not entirely responsible for the many errors and confusions of his apparatus. The third was by E. H. Alton, for many years Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin and Professor of Latin in Dublin University. Alton devoted much of his life to investigating and collating the manuscripts of this poem with a standard of detail and accuracy which puts all previous work in the shade, and our checks have left us completely convinced of his reliability; *inter alia* he drew attention to h and rediscovered GM (*Hermathena*, xx [1926], 101). His appointment as Provost of Trinity College, Dublin prevented him from producing his projected edition of the poem, but his materials have passed to us and will form the basis of a new Teubner text.

This paper consists of two parts. In the first we publish a number of conjectures by Alton which we found supported with arguments in his papers; others not so supported are reserved for our edition. In view of the scrappy nature of his notes and typescript, and the fact that some of the material was

composed to be delivered orally (to the Oxford Philological Society in 1940), we have found it impossible to adhere to Alton's wording; we have also tried to concentrate the matter and in some cases have brought it up to date. The substance, however, is entirely his; additional remarks by us are clearly marked off. In the second part E. C. puts forward observations on some passages.

I. EMENDATIONS BY E. H. ALTON

1. 49   nec toto perstare die sua iura putaris;
                     qui iam fastus erit, mane nefastus erat.

   die A^c (by erasure) UMω: dies A^{ac} perstare Uω: prae- AMhς toti perstare die Kreussler: totos praestare dies Baehrens

The emendation of Baehrens (*Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, 1 [1874], 302a), who did not bestow on it a single word of explanation, is to be accepted, with *iura* taken as subject of the infinitive; 'nec putaris diei cuique sua iura praestare ut totus sive fastus sive nefastus exhibeatur', 'Don't imagine that their special privileges keep these days inviolate throughout the twenty-four hours.' *Praestare* is a favourite word with Ovid; cf. e.g. 5. 46 and 134.

(Kreussler's emendation should disappear from the apparatus; Sommer, *Handbuch*, p. 399 'Der dat. von *dies* fehlt in klass. Dichtung überhaupt, erst Manilius V 699 hat *diēī*'. Ovid has no fifth-declension dative in -*e*—E. C.)

1. 305   admovere oculis distantia sidera nostris
              aetheraque ingenio supposuere suo.

Nostris (written n̄ris in many manuscripts) is weak and gives a pointless antithesis to *suo*; it should be altered to *mentis*(m̄tis). For Ovidian parallels see especially *Met.* 15. 63:

               isque licet caeli regione remotos
          mente deos adiit et quae natura negabat
          visibus humanis oculis ea pectoris hausit.

Cf. also *Her.* 10. 135, 16. 37; *Fasti* 6. 204; *Tristia* 4. 2. 57; *Ex Ponto* 1. 8. 34, 2. 4. 7–8, 4. 4. 45, 4. 9. 41 ff. The idea goes back to Plato (*Rep.* 533 d, *Soph.* 254 a–b) and is also Ciceronian (*Orat.* 101, *De Orat.* 3. 163, *Cato* 42) and Manilian (see Housman on 2. 122).

3. 601   iam pius Aeneas regno nataque Latini
            auctus erat populos miscueratque duos.
         litore dotali solo comitatus Achate,
            secretum nudo dum pede carpit iter,
         aspicit errantem, nec credere sustinet Annam
            esse; quid in Latios illa veniret agros?

Ovid is describing how Anna came to Latium and met Aeneas and Lavinia. The war is over, and Aeneas is enjoying a quiet walk with his old friend. The picture is perfect except for one detail, to which Heinsius took exception: Aeneas is barefooted. Aeneas was not a Naiad, nor a Proserpine dancing across flowery meads, nor some old dame performing a special rite, nor a heroine in distress (1. 410, cf. *Met.* 8. 571; 4. 426; 6. 397; *Amores* 3. 6. 50); *Ars* 2. 698 is quite general. Philosophers and some others, who were cranks, dispensed with

footwear (e.g. Cato; Hor. *Epist.* 1. 19. 12, Plut. *Cato Minor* 6); but this has no relevance to Aeneas.

Ovid, says Peter, is emphasizing the simple fashion of ancient days, and at the same time transferring Greek customs to a Roman environment. But did Homer's heroes go about out of doors barefoot (except, perhaps, on shipboard)? Mars Ultor was represented as barefooted; so also Augustus in the famous statue from Prima Porta. There, however, we have to do, as Stuart Jones says (*Companion to Roman History*, p. 386), with 'a piece of frank idealism, borrowed, no doubt, from Hellenistic art'. There is no such idealism in Ovid.

The position of the adjective makes it emphatic. There is just one word which will suit the context perfectly; that word is *domino*. Aeneas is now master of the kingdom of Latium and husband of Lavinia. Ovid has *dominas manus* at *Amores* 2. 5. 30 and thrice *domina urbs*; see also the Thesaurus s.v. *dominus* 1941. 31, and compare 4. 858 *victor pes* and the adjectival use of *famulus* at 1. 286, with the note of Heinsius there and at *Her.* 3. 100. A copyist would be tempted to read *secretūdno* as *secretum nudo*; *nudo pede* is a frequent combination, and the adjectival use of *dominus* might be unfamiliar.

(Alton was unacquainted with the conjecture of John Jortin [*Tracts*, 2. 294] *dubio*, i.e. Aeneas was out for a walk without any particular goal in mind—E. C. Perhaps the Romans on occasion enjoyed walking about barefoot; cf. Pliny, *Ep.* 2. 17. 15 'vinea tenera et umbrosa nudisque etiam pedibus mollis et cedens'. *Secretum* will then indicate that the place was lonely, *nudo pede* that Aeneas was relaxed, and this perhaps enhances the shock of surprise on seeing Anna—D. E. W. W.)

3. 765   cur anus hoc faciat quaeris? vinosior aetas
                    haec erat et gravidae munera vitis amans.

erat AUMω: est Gς   amans Uζς: -at Aω

Read thus: '... vinosior aetas: | cratera et ... amat', 'Her years increase her taste for wine; she loves the bowl and the bounty of the grape.' *Crater* was frequently written compendiously *craĩ* and then corrupted into *erat*. Thus at 2. 244 M, at 2. 266 D (and evidently also Leid. Voss. Lat. 27, known as B), at 5. 522 (where most manuscripts write *craĩ*) M again have *erat*.

(With this emendation it becomes possible to eliminate the illegitimate [Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 45] participle at the end of the pentameter and restore *amat*, and we are not reduced either to accepting the impossible combination of tenses *erat ... amat* or to adopting the obvious interpolation *est*. *Haec* was introduced to prop up the metre after *craĩaet* became *eratet*—E. C.)

5. 129   Praestitibus Maiae Laribus videre Kalendae
                    aram constitui parvaque signa deum.
                    voverat illa quidem Curius, sed multa vetustas
                    destruit: et saxo longa senecta nocet ...
137   at canis ante pedes saxo fabricatus eodem
                    stabat: quae standi cum Lare causa fuit? ...
143   bina gemellorum quaerebam signa deorum
                    viribus annosae facta caduca morae.

131 multa ζς: longa Uω   132 interpunxit Housman ap. Davies, cf. *Anth. Pal.* 9. 704. 1

The reading given above in 131 *voverat . . . Curius* is the only one with re-spectable authority, and the only one which will account for the variants. Some manuscripts (F among them) have a completive gloss *arā* over *destruit*. The combined influence of this, of 130, and of the variant *Curibus* (so F and others, because Cures is mentioned four times in the poem and Curius nowhere else) has caused B, Bodl. Auct. F. 4. 29 (known as C), and a number of others to fabricate the reading *ara erat . . . Curibus*, which D (corrected back to *ara erat* by D²) has corrupted to *ars erat*; out of this Jordan and Haupt developed the popular reading *arserat . . . Curibus*, which, as can now be seen, has no eviden-tial basis whatever. It is moreover unsatisfactory in sense. First, Ovid is in-terested only in the statues, not in the altar; they are intended by *illis* in 133, and it is most natural to suppose that *illa* in 131 also refers to them. (Secondly, the clauses related by *quidem* and *sed* do not cohere logically; one might say either 'arserat illa quidem Curibus sed Romam translata est' or 'stabat illa quidem diu sed ⟨nunc⟩ vetustas destruit', but not the hybrid offered by the manuscripts; the fact that an altar has been in use at Cures before being brought to Rome tells us nothing about its *vetustas*—E. C.) Admittedly Ovid is the only testimony for the dedication by Curius; but there are a number of facts for which Ovid is the only authority.

But consider now the rest of the distich, assuming for the moment that *longa* in 131 is merely an anticipation from 132. If *multa* is construed, as Heinsius took it, as nominative, it is passable in itself, and the object of *destruit* will then be *signa*. In that case, however, the verb ought to be *destruxit*, for we cannot either assume a historic present or suppose Ovid to mean that the statues were crumbling as he wrote; clearly they had vanished completely (note the tenses in 137–8. When Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.* 51, speaks of them in the present tense, he is merely reflecting his source—E. C.). If *multa* is taken as accusative, then the present *destruit* can be, as it ought to be, a general proposition (*Met.* 15. 234–5 'tempus edax rerum tuque, invidiosa vetustas, | omnia destruitis'), but *multa* is wrong in fact, as Ovid himself shows (*omnia Met.* l.c.; *Tristia* 4. 6. 17–18 'cuncta potest igitur . . . vetustas . . . attenuare'). Time can soften pains ('multa vetustas | lenit' *Ars* 2. 647, a passage which perhaps caused *multa* to be interpolated here; cf. also *Met.* 14. 695), but there is no limit to time's power of annihilation.

When Ovid refers, as like other poets he often does, to the destructive agency of time, he generally illustrates this by its effect on metal or stone (e.g. *Amores* 1. 15. 31, *Ars* 1. 475, *Tristia* 4. 6. 14, *Ex Ponto* 4. 8. 49). Ovid was looking for the *signa* (which were of stone; see 137—E. C.), but could not find them at Rome. We should restore them to his text and read: 'sed signa vetu-stas | destruit', 'time destroys statues; length of time does damage even to stone.' Coming after *s;*, *si* was readily lost, leaving *gna*.

(This discussion seems to leave one difficulty unsolved; Merkel, p. cxxii: 'displicet . . . "vovere" cum de dedicatione quaeratur.' I can meet this diffi-culty only by supposing a gap in the text, which may once have contained something like this:

> voverat illa quidem Curius, sed longa ⟨gerentem
>   bella ante effectum sustulit atra dies.
> debita post solvere patres; sed cuncta⟩ vetustas
>   destruit.

Curius had vowed the statues, but had never had time to see to their actual dedication; after his death this was done, but the statues have now crumbled. One might alternatively read at the end of the supplement *sed⟩ multa vetustas* (for I am not entirely convinced that Alton's objection to *multa* accusative is conclusive) or even *sed signa⟩ vetustas*, which would account for the omission by the homoeoteleuton *-nga, -gna*—E. C.)

6. 785   ecce suburbana rediens male sobrius aede
           ad stellas aliquis talia verba iacit:
        'zona latet tua nunc et cras fortasse latebit;
           dehinc erit, Orion, aspicienda mihi.'
        at si non esset potus dixisset eadem
           venturum tempus solstitiale die.

<div align="center">potus U𝑠: pulsus ζω</div>

One feels that if the returning reveller was able to prophesy the rising of Orion his drunkenness should not have prevented him from mentioning the far more easily remembered fact of the solstice. But are these Ovid's words? *Potus* rests on the testimony practically of U alone; the only other manuscript with this reading earlier than the 15th century is Par. 8245, not a very sound witness. And U is always determined to get some intelligible meaning—intelligible to the copyist, who is consequently guilty of many reckless alterations (see below on 4. 709—E. C.). The weight of evidence is in favour of *pulsus*, which in itself is unintelligible.

Astronomical predictions are expressed in the *Fasti* with a certain amount of modesty. It may be suggested that in this passage Ovid represented the speaker as using the same type of language as himself. Therefore read *falsus* and interpret *dixisset* as jussive; 'he should have said that, unless he was mistaken, the same day was the date of the summer solstice.' Cf. 5. 493:

        quorum si mediis Boeotum Oriona quaeres
          falsus eris.

For the position of the conditional clause see Housman's note on Manilius 5. 338, and add *Fasti* 3. 803, *Ex Ponto* 4. 8. 3–4.

(This conjecture does not seem to remove Alton's objection to the sense of the passage; it is still odd for the man to mention the rising of Orion and not the solstice. However the text is established, it must be accepted that Ovid makes the man do just this, and doubts are caused only by the state of the tradition. There seem to be two arguments against Alton's conjecture. First, in phrases like *nisi fallor*, the conjunction appears to be almost invariably *nisi*; the Thesaurus 6. 1. 184. 13 quotes *si non* only from Augustine and Cassian. Secondly, it is harsh to divorce the two subjunctives from each other. Nevertheless we think it worth while to publish the conjecture because it emphasizes the suspicion which must attach to *potus*—E. C.)

<div align="center">II. REMARKS BY E. C.</div>

1. 54   est quoque qui nono semper ab orbe redit.

The sense of this line is clear, but the wording is obscure and seems to lack good parallel; Kreussler suggested *nonus*, which still leaves some difficulty.

I cannot completely solve this problem, but should like to suggest tentatively that Ovid may have had in mind a fantastic etymology of *nundinae*, from *nonus* and δίνη. He does not always think it necessary to signal Greek derivations (e.g. 1. 327–8).

2. 748   quantum de bello dicitur esse super?
       postmodo victa cades; melioribus, Ardea, restas,
        improba, quae nostros cogis abesse viros.

Alton, *C.R.* xxxii (1918), 19 quite reasonably cast doubt on *restas*, a word not used with a dative in the sense *resistere* by Ovid, though occasionally attested elsewhere (e.g. Livy 23. 45. 9 'paucis plures vix restatis'). He pointed out that U wrote *restat*, and in his unpublished notes drew attention to the fact that in C, the glosses of which often account for variants in the tradition, *esse super* is explained *quid restat?*, in F *restat adhuc*, in the Edinburgh manuscript *restare*. One might therefore suppose a displaced gloss and replace *restas* (*-at*) with Alton's *certas* (for which he compared Hor. *Serm.* 2. 5. 18–19 'haud ita Troiae | me gessi, certans semper melioribus') or Weise's *castris* (*cades melioribus castris*). However *restas* can be brought into conformity with Ovidian usage by placing a question-mark after it: 'are you waiting for more noble conquerors?', i.e. you may as well give in now and obtain the credit of being defeated by men as noble as Collatinus—

    hoc tamen infelix miseram solabere mortem:
    Aeneae magni dextra cadis.

4. 681 cur igitur missae vinctis ardentia taedis
     terga ferant volpes causa docenda mihi est . . .
 703 is capit extremi volpem convalle salicti
     (abstulerat multas illa cohortis aves).
    captivam stipula faenoque involvit et ignes
     admovet: urentes effugit illa manus:
    qua fugit, incendit vestitos messibus agros;
     damnosis vires ignibus aura dabat.
 709 factum abiit, monumenta manent; †nam dicere certam†
     nunc quoque lex volpem Carseolana vetat.

709 dicere certam Aω: dicere curtam IM et ut vid. G sub ras.: vivere captam Uς

The only manuscript reading which makes an approach to sense is that of U (the other sources which present this reading are few, late and unimportant), but the words in question do not belong to the original context of the manuscript. They are written by the first hand, but were added by him later to the main body of the text, and squeezed into a space really too narrow for them. In view of this, and the proclivities of U mentioned by Alton above on 6. 785 sqq., it is hard to doubt that U here presents one of its noteworthy interpolations; this means that all conjectures based on *captam* will also have to be eliminated. Nothing can be made out of A's reading; Frazer changed to *certa* and translated 'a certain law of Carseoli forbids to name a fox', but *dicere* so used is not correct Latin. What then about Z's reading? There is one detail in this which catches the attention. A *curta volpes* would be like the *curtus equus* of Prop. 4. 1. 20 (Horace's *curtus mulus* is probably not relevant), one deprived

of its tail. Now what could be more appropriate in this context than the mention of the tail or the lack of it? This is the part of the fox which is best adapted to burning crops; compare the Book of Judges 15 : 4 'And Sampson went and caught three hundred foxes and took firebrands, and turned tail to tail, and put a firebrand in the midst between two tails.' I propose therefore to read *nisi adurere curtam*; the law of Carseoli only allows burning of foxes after the removal of their tails. The process of corruption was *n̊a durere c., nā dicere c.*

No one is more conscious than the author of this conjecture of the weak points in it; in particular, there is no mention of the tail in the rest of the narrative, and the Biblical parallel is not exact. The conjecture however may at least stimulate someone to produce a better solution, if one can be found.

5. 101   Semicaper, coleris cinctutis, Faune, Lupercis,
                 cum lustrant celebres verbera secta vias.

All respectable authority is for *verbera*; *vellera* is read by U[3] and a few other sources of no weight, followed by all editors known to me. Why? *Verbera secta* is perfectly correct Latin for what would more fully be expressed as *verbera secando facta*; see Fraenkel, *J.R.S.* lvi (1966), 145–6.

5. 149   est moles nativa, loco res nomina fecit:
                 appellant Saxum; pars bona montis ea est . . .
153   templa patres illic oculos exosa viriles
                 leniter adclivi constituere iugo.
            dedicat haec veteris Crassorum nominis heres,
                 virgineo nullum corpore passa virum.

In 155 all respectable manuscripts have *Crassorum*; again *Clausorum* is read by U[3] and some other worthless sources (an obvious interpolation from 4. 305, where the old Sabine form of the name has its point), again they are followed by all editors, and again we must ask, why? We have no record of any connection between any Claudia and a temple of the Bona Dea; on the other hand we do know of the dedication of a shrine by a Vestal called Licinia—'CRASSORUM nominis heres' (Cic. *De Domo* 136 'cum Licinia virgo Vestalis . . . aram et aediculam et pulvinar sub Saxo dedicasset', the *pontifices* decided 'quod in loco publico Licinia C.f. iniussu populi dedicasset, sacrum non viderier'). Admittedly this deconsecrated *aedicula* hardly looks like the official *templum* restored by Livia; but Cicero, arguing for the deconsecration of his house, is scarcely an impartial reporter, and Ovid is no paragon of accuracy.

5. 559   perspicit Armipotens operis fastigia summi
                     et probat invictas summa tenere deas.

A third case of similar character. The two primary manuscripts which present this couplet, U and G, both read as above, and so does F; the rest are about equally divided between this and *invictos . . . deos* (so U[3] etc.), followed without comment by the editors. Now a relief survives showing the temple of Mars Ultor, reproduced e.g. in E. Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, i. 76, Plate 78, and P. Hommel, *Studien zu den röm. Figurengiebeln der Kaiserzeit* (diss. Heidelberg, 1954), Fig. 2 (cf. the discussion pp. 22 ff.). This shows quite plainly a figure of Νίκη standing on one side of the pediment (Hommel, p. 29); Hommel, p. 91, n. 267 remarks: 'Das linke (Akroter) wird dem rechten entsprechen haben.' In fact the reproduction in G. Lugli, *Roma*

Antica, Il Centro Monumentale, p. 267 shows a second figure of Victoria on the other side; but I presume this to be somehow erroneous. We have, however, abundant reason to retain the feminine and refer it to two figures of Victoria.

6. 433   seu gener Adrasti, seu furtis aptus Ulixes,
          seu †pius† Aeneas, eripuisse ferunt;
          auctor in incerto, res est Romana.

Ovid is talking about the Palladium. Uζ and about half the rest in 433 have *gener*, U^3 and the other half (including F) *genus*, which editors, recalling that Diomede was the grandson of Adrastus, accept. But some authorities declared his wife Aegialea to be the daughter of Adrastus (Homer, *Iliad* 5. 412, Apollodorus 1. 8. 6; the latter passage was adduced by Alton, *C.R.* xxxii [1918], 156b); so we should retain *gener*, which has considerably better authority.

The nominatives in 433–4 require a verb; this is most easily obtained by altering *pius*, a Virgilian interpolation, to *fuit*; i.e. 'seu fuit Aeneas ⟨qui eripuit⟩', cf. e.g. 3. 275 'Egeria est quae praebet aquas'.

2. 119   nunc mihi . . .
          vellem, Maeonide, pectus inesse tuum,
          dum canimus sacras alterno carmine Nonas.

alterno AUς: aeterno $\zeta\varsigma$ carmine $\zeta\varsigma$: pectore AUς: pectine U$^3\varsigma$

Now that the character of U^3 has been seen, we can return to discuss this passage. All editors except one, hankering after a compromise, have adopted *pectine*; the exception is Gierig, who notes: 'ALTERNO PECTINE CANERE foret carmen lyricum scribere quo nunc gravius, nunc remissius argumentum tractatur. Pro argumenti enim varietate nunc levius (Hor. Od. ii. 1. 40) nunc gravius (id. iv. 2. 33, Met. x. 150) plectrum, cuius species pecten, adhibebatur. In carmine autem elegiaco pectinis nullus est usus.' This is conclusive; we must return to *alterno carmine*, the alternating hexameter and pentameter. *Pectore* can be totally discounted as a 'Perseverationsfehler' from 120, a particularly common type of error in the manuscripts of the *Fasti*.

Trinity College, Dublin   †E. H. ALTON
King's College, London   D. E. W. WORMELL
                                                                   E. COURTNEY