

NOTES ON OVID'S *TRISTIA*, BOOKS I-II¹

When I refer to 'modern editors' I mean the following: (i) S. G. Owen, who edited the *Tristia* thrice (*Tristium libri v*, Oxford, 1889; in Postgate's *Corpus poetarum Latinorum*, 1894; Oxford Classical Text, 1915) and produced a small commentary on the first book (Oxford, 1885) and a large one on the second (Oxford, 1924); (ii) C. Landi (*Corpus Paravianum*, 1917); (iii) R. Ehwald-Fr. W. Levy (Teubner, 1922); (iv) A. L. Wheeler (Loeb edn., 1924); (v) J. André (Budé edn., 1968);² (vi) Georg Luck (Heidelberg, 1967 (text and translation), 1968-72 (commentary on Books 1-2), 1977 (commentary on 3-5)).³

The apparatus criticus which I append to passages discussed is based on that of Luck. But I use the sigla ω and ς , where he uses *pl.* and *al.*, to designate a majority and a minority of unspecified manuscripts, and I use these same sigla in referring to the manuscripts of Ovid's other works or those of other authors.

About individual manuscripts I need say little here. Our oldest manuscript is T_r (Θ in Owen's Oxford Text), the Fragmenta Trevirensia, written in the tenth century, which contains only 1.11 and 2.1-21 (I mention this manuscript once, on 1.11.15). The next oldest is M (Owen's L), written in the eleventh century; but large parts of the original manuscript are missing, and (in Books 1-2) the portion from the beginning to 1.5.10 was added in the fifteenth century. Of the other manuscripts GAHPV form a group deriving from a common source, which Luck calls N, Owen (Oxford Text) Γ. Another group is formed by TDKG². The rest defy classification. In spite of the large number of manuscripts available, the textual tradition is poor.

Since I shall often have cause to differ from Georg Luck, I must make clear that in my view Luck's text is not only by far the best text available but is also a very good text. Luck's own emendations are of a high quality. I give the palm to *quaerent si plura legentes* (*quaerenti plura legendum* codd.) at 1.1.21; and I also regard as certain his proposals at 1.3.99, 1.5.11, 1.9.32, 2.8, 2.303-6, 2.383, 2.542.

1.1.11-12

nec fragili geminae poliantur pumice frontes,
hirsutus sparsis ut uideare comis.

12 sparsis $G^{ac}KL_rT\omega$: passis $G^{pc}AB_nPV\varsigma$

All modern editors accept *sparsis*; and it is a generally held belief that *sparsus* and *passus*, applied to hair, are interchangeable epithets. 'Die Handschriften . . . zeigen, daß *sparsus* und *passus* ohne Unterschied angewandt wird', says F. Bömer on *Fast.* 3.560. On the contrary, the evidence of Ovid's manuscripts suggest that he used these epithets in distinctly different circumstances; and the evidence of

¹ I am indebted, for a variety of helpful comments and criticisms, to Professors F. R. D. Goodyear, H. D. Jocelyn, E. J. Kenney, Mr A. G. Lee, and Dr J. C. McKeown.

² On André's edition see E. J. Kenney, *CR* N.S. 20 (1970), 340-2, E. Courtney,

Gnomon 44 (1972), 80-2.

³ Luck had published a text of *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, with a translation by W. Willige, four years earlier (Zürich, 1963). There is a valuable review of it by M. von Albrecht, *Gnomon* 37 (1965), 491-6.

the manuscripts of other authors suggests that the distinction which I shall postulate for Ovid, if it was ever blurred, was not blurred until after Ovid's time. The evidence of Ovid's manuscripts suggests that he used *sparsus* when he added a local ablative or a prepositional phrase which explains *where* the hair is 'spread', and that when such a local reference is absent he used *passus*.

sparsus is the reading of all the manuscripts, and conforms to the rule which I have proposed, in these places: *Am.* 3.9.11 *sparsi per colla capilli*, *Ars* 1.541 *sparsis in terga capillis*, *Her.* 15.73 *iacent collo sparsi sine lege capilli*, *Met.* 1.542 *crinem sparsum ceruicibus*, 3.169 *sparsos per colla capillos*. Editors accept *sparsus* in these places.

passus is generally printed, in conformity with the rule which I have proposed, in these places: (i) *Ars* 3.709 *passis furibunda capillis* (*p*- R, *sp*- cett.); (ii) *Her.* 6.89 *passis discincta capillis* (*sp*- ω); (iii) *Met.* 2.238-9 *nymphae passis* . . . *defleuere comis* (*sp*- ς); (iv) *Met.* 4.521 *passisque fugit male sana capillis* (*sp*- ω, all the less likely since *sparsi causa ueneni* appears in the preceding line);⁴ (v) *Met.* 5.513 *passis stetit inuidiosa capillis* (*sp*- ς); (vi) *Met.* 6.531 *passos laniata capillos* (*sp*- ς); (vii) *Met.* 7.257 *passis Medea capillis* (*sp*- ω); (viii) *Met.* 8.107 *passis furibunda capillis*: here again *sp*- is a variant, but there is a further variant *fusis*, which is accepted by the latest editor (W. S. Anderson, Teubner, 1977) and is certainly possible (cf. *Ars* 3.236, *Rem.* 594, *Met.* 9.90, *Fast.* 4.458; F. W. Lenz, *Ovid's Metamorphoses: Prolegomena to a revision of Hugo Magnus' edition* (1967), 34), though *passis* is supported by *Ars* 3.709 ((i) above); (ix) *Met.* 9.772 *passis aram complexa capillis* (*sp*- ς); (x) *Met.* 11.49 *passosque habuere capillos* (*sp*- ς); (xi) *Fast.* 1.645-6 *passos Germania crines / porrigit* (*sp*- ς, accepted by Bömer, although *passos*, accepted by Alton-Wormell-Courtney (Teubner, 1978) is supported by *Tr.* 4.2.43 *crinibus* . . . *Germania passis*, where ς have *sp*- against the metre); (xii) *Fast.* 2.813 *passis sedet illa capillis* (*sp*- ς, accepted by Bömer but not by Alton-Wormell-Courtney); (xiii) *Fast.* 3.219 *ut medium campi passis* (*sp*- ς: *scissis* Aω) *tetigere capillis* (*scissis* could be right, and is accepted by Alton-Wormell-Courtney; but *passis* is supported by 213 and 257: see Frazer's note and F. Peeters, *Les Fastes d'Ovide* (1939), p. 367); (xiv) *Fast.* 5.453 *passis Acca capillis* (*sp*- ς, which not even Bömer accepts, since the next word is *spargebant*); (xv) *Tr.* 1.3.43 *passis* (GB_nTV ς: *sp*- ADK ω) *adstrata capillis* (the same editors who accept *sparsis* at 1.1.12 on the evidence of a majority of manuscripts accept *passis* here on the evidence of a minority; though I applaud their change of heart, I do not understand their inconsistency); (xvi) *Tr.* 4.2.43 *crinibus* . . . *Germania passis* (*sp*- ς unmetrically).

Next the evidence of other authors. *passus* has sole support from the manuscripts in all but three of the following passages, and in those three passages it has much the best support, and in none of them is a local reference attached: *Ter. Heaut.* 290 (for the various readings here see the end of the next paragraph), *Ph.* 106, *Verg. Aen.* 1.480, 2.403-4, *Quadrig. Ann.* 19 (i, p. 215 Peter), *Caes. B.G.* 7.48.3, *Liv.* 1.13.1, 7.40.12, 26.9.7 (*sp*- ς), *Hor. Sat.* 1.8.24, *Sen. Med.* 803, *Petron.* 44.18, 54.2, 111.2 (*sp*- ς), *Paneg. Lat.* 11 (3).10.3.⁵ Here are the places where *sparsus* has better or sole support: (i) *Prop.* 2.1.7 *ad frontem*

⁴ Rather, *sparsum* . . . *uenenum* (Tanaquil Faber); cf. E. J. Kenney, *CR* N.S. 28 (1978), 252.

⁵ OLD s.u. *passus* cites *Enn. Ann.* 349

as an instance of *comis passis*, but this phrase depends upon a speculative reconstruction of the fragment by Vahlen.

sparsos errare capillos: this conforms with the rule proposed; (ii) Liv. 39.13.12 *crinibus sparsis*: *passis* ς , which I should accept, since the phrase *crinibus passis* is used by Livy in the three passages listed above; (iii) St. *Ach.* 1.348 *sparsosque tumet* (Gronovius: *timet* uel *studet* codd.) *componere crines*; (iv) Claud. *de r. Pros.* 2.324 *sparsos religant crines*; (v) *Ilias* Lat. 87 *tunc genibus regis sparsis affusa capillis*. I forbear to emend the three last passages.

Readers may be puzzled by Luck's comment that '*sparsis* . . . scheint durch Auson. Technop. 13,22 *totum opus hoc sparsum crinis* bestätigt zu werden'. The reference is to Auson. *Technop.* 14 (*sic*).22 (p. 168 Peiper) *totum opus hoc sparsum, crinis uelut Antiphilae: pax*, which is an allusion to Ter. *Heaut.* 290-1 *capillus passus (sparsus p²: pexus A, Donatus) prolixus circum caput / reiectus neclegenter: pax*. The Ausonian passage, which Bentley adduced in support of *sparsus* in Terence, has no relevance to Ovid.

1.1.17-18

siquis, ut in populo, nostri non immemor illi,
siquis qui quid agam forte requirat erit.

17 illi G¹ V ς : illo AT ς : extat G² DK ς

extat may be dismissed as a borrowing from *Ex P.* 4.15.1 *siquis adhuc usquam nostri non immemor extat*, for neither do we need a verb nor, if Ovid had given us one, would it have been corrupted to *illi* and *illo*. We may equally dismiss *illo*, since its addition ruins the idiomatic phrase *ut in populo*: the idiom is illustrated (here and on 2.158) by Owen and Luck.

All modern editors, with the exception of Landi, accept *illi*, the archaic form of *illic*, frequent in comedy but only precariously attested elsewhere in verse.⁶ Owen and Luck claim that there is an Ovidian instance at *Tr.* 2.373 *quid prius est illi flamma Briseidos* . . .?, where *illic* is well attested. In his note on 2.373 Luck alleges a further instance at *Met.* 9.463 *si qua est illi formosior*, but there *illi* is dative ('in his eyes'): see Haupt-Korn-Ehwald ad loc. and Kühner-Stegmann, 1.322, Anmerk. 9. Owen adds *Fast.* 6.424 *hoc superest illi*. Here Bömer appears to wish to take *illi* as dative, which is impossible; Alton-Wormell-Courtney accept *illic* from the majority of manuscripts.

There is little evidence for adverbial *illi* in other Augustan verse or verse of the silver period. Luck refers to Verg. *Georg.* 3.17, where *illi* (R has *illic*) may quite naturally be taken as dative ('in his honour'),⁷ and to Man. 3.309, where Fayus and Bentley restored *illic*, the normal Manilian form (see Housman's note). At Juv. 5.42, if *illi* is right (half the manuscripts have *illic*), it may be taken as dative, as Housman observes (ad loc. and in his Addenda to Man. 3.309). For a suitably sceptical attitude to adverbial *illi* see *TLL* s.u. 368.9 ff.

Since the concordance to Ovid lists about a hundred instances of *illic*, it is a very irrational procedure to prefer *illi* at *Tr.* 1.1.17, 2.373, and *Fast.* 6.424, in only one of which passages is *illic* not a well-attested variant. At *Tr.* 1.1.17 *illic* was written by the second hand of O and conjectured by J. Zinzerling in 1610 and again by Heinsius. Landi, alone of modern editors, accepts it.

⁶ It is not clear how well attested *illi* is here. Luck ascribes it to 'G¹ Val.', but Owen ascribes it only to 'GV ξ ' (ξ is Luck's O_r).

⁷ Ribbeck printed *illi* from one manu-

script of Arusianus Messius (vii.485 Keil) at Verg. *Georg.* 1.54 (*illic* the MSS of Vergil) and proposed *illi* for *illic* at *Georg.* 1.251.

1.1.37-40

iudicis officium est ut res ita tempora rerum
 quaerere: quaesito tempore tutus eris.
 carmina proueniunt animo deducta sereno:
 nubila sunt subitis tempora nostra malis.

His poetical talent, says Ovid, has been stifled by adversity. The disappointed reader must make allowances. It is the duty of a judge to investigate not only the facts (*res*) but also the circumstances (*tempora rerum*). 'Poetry comes forth successfully when drawn from a mind that is tranquil; my *tempora* are clouded with sudden misfortunes.'

tempora in 40 picks up *tempora rerum* in 37 and *tempore* in 38 well enough; and *tempora* is again given the epithet *nubila* at 1.9.6. But, for all that, the antithesis between hexameter and pentameter in 39-40 is less than perfect. *sereno* and *nubila* balance each other (cf. *Ex P.* 2.1.5-6 *tandem aliquid pulsa curarum nube serenum / uidi*, *Plin. H.N.* 2.13 *humani nubila animi serenat*), but *carmina* and *tempora* do not. Heinsius's *pectora* for *tempora* is a stroke of divinatory genius which restores the antithesis to perfection. The conjecture is ignored by all modern editors⁸ with the exception of Luck, who prints it in his text and then ignores it in his commentary, where he writes as if *tempora* were in the text.

pectus is the seat of the poetical talent: 2.561-2 *aspicies quantum dederis mihi pectoris ipse / quoque fauore animi teque tuosque canam*, 4.1.43-4 *sic ubi mota calent uiridi mea pectora thyrsos, / altior humano spiritus ille malo est*, 5.12.38 *et fecunda facit pectora laudis amor*; cf. *Ex P.* 3.9.21-2, *Fast.* 2.119-20. The noun is used in contexts similar to the present one at 1.11.34-5 *pectora sunt ipso turbidiora mari. / quo magis his debes ignoscere, candide lector*, 5.12.1-5 *scribis ut oblectem studio lacrimabile tempus, / ne pereant turpi pectora nostra situ. / difficile est quod, amice, mones, quia carmina laetum / sunt opus et pacem mentis habere uolunt. / nostra per aduersas agitur fortuna procellas*, *Ex P.* 4.2.19-20 *pectora sic mea sunt limo uitata malorum / et carmen uena pauperiore fluit*, *ibid.*, 25-6 *impetus ille sacer, qui uatum pectora nutrit, / qui prius in nobis esse solebat, abest*; similarly *Juv.* 7.63-5 *quis locus ingenio, nisi cum se carmine solo / uexant et dominis Cirrhae Nysaeque feruntur / pectora uestra duas non admittentia curas?* With the sentiment and language compare also 48 below, *ingenium tantis excidet omne malis*.

With *nubila . . . pectora* (antithetical to *animo . . . sereno*) Heinsius compared 1.9.40 *pectora . . . serena* and 1.3.13 *animi nubem*; note also *Pl. Cist.* 210 *nubilam mentem animi habeo*, *St. Silu.* 1.3.109 *omni detersus* (Heinsius: *detectus* *cod.*)⁹ *pectora nube, Theb.* 2.321-2 *talem sub pectore nubem / consilii uoluens*.

'*corpora pectora tempora passim confunduntur*', said Housman on *Man.* 1.416. And it is well known how often words of dactylic shape are confused: for plentiful illustration see, in addition to Housman, Markland, Preface to *St. Siluae*, ix-xi, and J. Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism* (1972), p. 76. From the *Tristia* may be cited 1.2.25 *murmure / turbine*, 1.2.91 *carbasa / corpora*, 1.3.35

⁸ It is not even recorded by Owen in the repertory of conjectures appended to his 1889 edition.

⁹ Housman's treatment of this passage

(*CR* 20 (1906), 37 = *Classical Papers*, 637-8) is supplemented by L. Håkanson, *Statius' Siluae: Critical and Exegetical Remarks* (1969), pp. 44-5.

uulnera / funera, 2.213 *pectora / numina / corpora*, 2.295 *munera / numina / nomina*. In the very line which we are discussing K has *carmina* for *tempora*.

1.1.123-4

plura quidem mandare tibi, si quaeris, habebam:
sed uereor tardae causa fuisse morae.

124 morae $G^2 D\omega$: uiae $G^1 ATV\zeta$

Heinsius preferred *morae*. Of the modern editors only Wheeler and Luck (in 1963, but not 1967) have followed him. It is to be preferred for two reasons, of which the second is more important than the first. (i) Ovid commonly joins *tarda* with *mora*: *Tr.* 4.6.32, *Ars* 2.718, *Her.* 19.38, 21.22, *Ex P.* 3.2.76, *Fast.* 2.170, 2.256.¹⁰ At *Ex P.* 3.2.76 he has the same phrase as here, *tardae causas . . . morae*, and *causa morae* recurs at *Met.* 2.468 and *Her.* 19.116. Nowhere does he join *tarda* with *uia*.¹¹ (ii) If Ovid gives more instructions to his book, he will not cause its journey to be *tarda*; rather, it is the delay before the journey can start which will be prolonged. I add that 127 *longa uia est, propera* comes in much better if *uia* has not preceded.

On the infinitive with *habeo* see Robert Coleman, *CQ* N.S. 21 (1971), 215-32, A. S. Gratwick, *ibid.*, 22 (1972), 388-98, Coleman, *ibid.*, 26 (1976), 151-9.

1.2.51-6

nec letum timeo: genus est miserabile leti.
demite naufragium: mors mihi munus erit.
est aliquid fatoue suo ferroue cadentem
in solida moriens ponere corpus humo,
55 et mandare suis aliqua et sperare sepulcrum
et non aequoreis piscibus esse cibum.

53 -ue . . . -ue Heinsius: -que . . . -que *codd.* cadentem $O_p R(u.l.)$: cadendum *cett.*

54 solida $BT\zeta$: solita $N\omega$ 55 aliqua et $B_n D\zeta$: aliquid et $N\omega$: aliquid $L_n L_o T\zeta$

Death, in itself, would be a boon. It is death at sea which is pitiable. 53-4: 'It is something, whether one dies naturally or by the sword, to lay one's dying body on *solid* (or *familiar*) ground.'

Two explanations of *solita* were offered by Pontanus (1610): 'in natali solo, ubi natus, educatus sis, & uitam omnem uixeris, apud tuos denique . . . Aliter, in *solita humo*, quae hominum propria sedes est, ut caelum Deorum, aer uolucrum, aqua piscium.' The latter explanation is not seriously to be entertained, though André adopts it ('la terre, notre élément'). The former explanation was adopted by Heinsius, who paraphrased *solita humus* as *tacta nascenti humus*, in reference to *Tr.* 4.3.45-6 *et cinis in tumulo positus iacuisset auito / tactaque nascenti corpus haberet humus*. He also compared Verg. *Aen.* 9.213-14 *sit qui me raptum pugna pretioque redemptum / mandet humo solita aut si qua id Fortuna uetabit . . .* The reading in 214 is uncertain; the one certainty is that *solita* is not to be constructed with *humo*.¹² According to Luck, *solita* 'läßt sich zwanglos als

¹⁰ Cf. also *Cat.* 63.19, *Tib.* 1.3.16.

¹¹ Nor, as far as I can see, does any other author.

¹² See J. Henry, *Aeneidea*, iii, 832-5 and R. D. Williams (ed. *Aen.* 7-12 (1973)) ad loc.

"heimisch, vertraut" verstehen; es ist die Erde, die er als neugeborenes Kind berührt hat . . . die Grabstätte seiner Familie, die er oft besucht hat und die ihm deshalb vertraut ist (3,3,31 f. *quantum erat, o magni, morituro parcere, diui, /ut saltem patria contumularer humo?*)'.

But Heinsius changed his mind, as we learn from the posthumous notes of his which were published by Burman: 'sed & altera scriptura optime se habet. ut *solidam tellurem dixeris, respectu maris.*' Burman supplied a reason for preferring *solida*: 'non enim hic tam sollicitus erat Naso de morte in patria obeunda, quam ut, modo naufragio uitato, ubicumque in terra obiret; etiam in Scythica, uide uers. 62. & qui ferro cadunt, id est bello, plerumque extra patriam mortem obeunt.' This is well said. Ovid is not here expressing a desire to die at home. Such a wish is foreign both to the immediate and to the wider context. It is foreign to the immediate context because in this passage Ovid is contrasting the horror of death at sea, where one's body becomes food for fishes (56), with the consolation of death on land, where one may at least hope for a tomb (55).¹³ A contrast between death at sea and death in one's homeland destroys this simple point. It is foreign to the wider context because there is not question in this poem of Ovid wishing to be buried at home. All that he can hope for is that he may reach his destination: 61-2 *quamque dedit uitam mitissima Caesaris ira, /hanc sinite infelix in loca iussa feram*, 91-4 *ferre (quid hic facio?) rapidi mea carbasa uenti: / Ausonios fines cur mea uela uolunt? / noluit hoc Caesar: quid quem fugat ille tenetis? / aspiciat uultus Pontica terra meos.*

Luck (who in 1963 had accepted *solida*) objects that '*Solida* im Sinne von *firma, stabili* (als Gegensatz zum Meer denkbar) kommt sonst nur in anderem Zusammenhang vor (etwa Fasten 2,648; 3,442; 6,404).' I see nothing very different about the Zusammenhang of *Met.* 14.48-9 *undas, / in quibus ut solida ponit uestigia terra*, 15.262 *uidi ego, quod fuerat quondam solidissima tellus, / esse fretum*, *Fast.* 6.404 *nunc solida est tellus, sed lacus ante fuit*. Ovid attaches *solida* to *humus* at *Am.* 1.8.18, *Her.* 12.94, *Fast.* 2.648, 3.442. Nowhere does he attach *solita* to *humus, terra, or tellus*.

In 55 there is a problem of which editors are unaware.¹⁴ For *aliqua* used as a noun *TLL* s.u. *aliquis* 1608.39 ff. cites from authors before Ovid only *Pl. Pe.* 759a (a meaningless and ill-attested reading in a corrupt passage) and *Lucilius* 552 (682 Marx, 639 Krenkel). From authors later than Ovid it cites only prose instances. *aliqua* is used as an adjective by Cato, Varro, Cicero, Livy, and Seneca, but not in verse. The point of *aliqua* in 55 is not obvious. If it is what Ovid wrote, Owen probably conveys its intended meaning: 'some kind of instructions however hasty and inadequate: Pont. i.1.4, "dumque aliquo, quolibet abde loco;" F. iii.598, "aliquam corpore pressit humum" ("dry land of some kind," even though the grave).' But most of the manuscripts have not *aliqua* but *aliquid* (*et*), and I suspect that the truth is still to seek. Heinsius's *est mandata suis aliquid sperare sepulcra*, which he based on *Fast.* 5.657 *mandati cura sepulcri*, does not satisfy.

¹³ For the wish to die on dry land uttered by a person in danger of shipwreck see *Hom. Od.* 5.306-12, *Verg. Aen.* 1.94-6, *Met.* 11.539-40, *Fast.* 3.597-8, *Sen. Ag.* 514-19; and cf. F. Bömer in *Ovid* (edd. M. von

Albrecht and E. Zinn (1968)), 181-2, and Nisbet and Hubbard on *Hor. carm.* 1.28.23.

¹⁴ Luck's text (1967) has the misprint *sepulcra* for *sepulcrum*.

1.2.101

quod licet et minimis, domui si fauimus illi . . .

quod licet et *GK*ς: quod licet e *AHPTV*ω: quod licet in *D*ς: quamlibet e *G_oO_d*

minimus 'of a person . . . lowest in rank or authority, humblest' (*OLD* s.u. § 6b) is well enough attested, though in the passages cited the word is not used (as it is here) in isolation but either with a contrasted word (*Pl. Ps. 776 a minimo ad maximum*, *Juv. 6.349 eadem summis pariter minimisque libido*) or with a definition of the class in which the individual is *minimus* (*Am. 1.7.29 minimum de plebe Quiritem*, *Sen. Phaed. 201 minimus e superis*). Perhaps the lack of a parallel for *minimus* used in isolation is not important. But the sentiment—'If I have supported the imperial house, as even the humblest are allowed to do'—is not an entirely happy one. If even the humblest are allowed to show their support for the imperial house, Ovid gains little credit for claiming to have shown such support himself.

Heinsius preferred the weakly attested *quamlibet e minimis*: 'if I have supported the imperial house in matters however small'. This is a more pertinent remark in this context (it prepares the way for Ovid's statement in the lines which follow of the small services which he has rendered the emperor), and *quamlibet* restores, as Heinsius described it on *Her. 6.140*, a 'loquendi modus unice in deliciis . . . Nasoni, sed ut plurimum e vulgatis libris per incultos librarios iussus exulare'. But *e* will hardly do. I suggest that we take *in* from '*D*ς' (Owen reports *in* from six manuscripts) and write *quamlibet in minimis*. Compare *Ars 2.535 quid moror in parvis?*, *Tr. 1.3.25 in paruo*, *Prop. 2.10.6 in magnis et uoluisse sat est*. For the coupling of *quamlibet* with a word indicating size or number compare *Tr. 4.6.36 quamlibet exiguo . . . imbre*, *4.7.4 quamlibet in paucos*, *Ex P. 4.8.27 quamlibet exigua . . . aura*, *4.13.9 quamlibet in multis positus noscere libellis*.

quamlibet will have been corrupted to *quod licet* by way of *quam licet*. If we put together the information presented by Owen and Luck, the variety of readings offered by the manuscripts will be seen to be as follows: *quamlibet* *G_oO_d*: *quam licet* *BKL_nL_e*: *qua licet* *P_a*: *quolibet* *C*: *quilibet* *E*: *quod licet* *cett.* Compare *Tr. 1.9.24* where most manuscripts have *quolibet* for *quamlibet*, and *Her. 6.140* where both *quodlibet* and *quod licet* are variants for *quamlibet*.

1.3.1-2

cum subit illius tristissima noctis imago,
quae mihi supremum tempus in urbe fuit.

2 quae *EB_n*: qua *cett.*

Heinsius preferred *quae*, and Luck alone of modern editors follows him. *qua* will certainly not do; but even neater than *quae* will be *quod*, which Owen (1889) reports as the reading of *Q*. For the attraction of the relative to the gender of the predicate compare *Met. 1.409-10 quod solidum est flectique nequit mutatur in ossa*, / *quae (quod Heinsius) modo uena fuit sub eodem nomine mansit*, *8.99-100 Creten*, / *qui (quae ς) meus est orbis*, *Enn. Thy. 301 Jocelyn aspice hoc sublime candens quem uocant omnes Iouem*, *Ann. 23 Vahlen est locus Hesperiam quam*

mortales perhibebant, Lucr. 3.94 *animum . . . mentem quam* (Charisius, *GL* 1.210.5: *quem* codd.) *saepe uocamus*, 4.132 *caelo qui dicitur aer*, Cic. *in Pis.* 57 *iustam gloriam, qui est fructus uerae uirtutis honestissimus*. Numerous examples from prose are quoted by Kühner-Stegmann 1.37 and A. Draeger, *Hist. Synt. der lat. Spr.* (ed. 2, 1878), 1.187–8; for Greek see Kühner-Gerth, 1.76–7.

1.3.52

uel quo festinas ire uel unde uide.

festines ε

All modern editors accept the indicative. Luck refers to Haupt-Korn-Ehwald on *Met.* 10.637, where there are listed, besides this passage, fifteen alleged Ovidian instances of indicative for subjunctive in an indirect question.¹⁵ Seven of them are not indirect but direct questions, of this type: *dic mihi, quid feci?* (*Her.* 2.27; so *Am.* 3.3.15, *Ars* 3.96, *Fast.* 1.91, 1.149, *Ex P.* 3.3.53, 3.5.37).¹⁶ Two are not indirect questions but relative clauses: *Her.* 16.78 *banc esse ut scires, unde mouetur amor*, *Ars* 3.115 *aspice, quae nunc sunt, Capitolia, quaeque fuerunt*. In two passages the subjunctive is attested: *Ars* 3.529–30 *uos quoque, de nobis quem quisque erit* (RA ω, Kenney: *sit* N, Heinsius) *aptus ad usum, / inspicite*, *Met.* 12.471–3 *nec te natalis origo / commonuit, mentemque subit, quo praemia facto / quaque uiri falsam speciem mercede parasti (pararis ω)?*¹⁷ At *Fast.* 6.367 *at si respicerent, qua uos habitatis in arce*, editors assume that we have a relative clause with the antecedent (*arcem*) attracted into it. This may be right; but it would be easy to write *habitetis*, which Merkel reports as the reading of one manuscript (for an indirect question after *respicere* see *Ex P.* 1.9.25–6). One passage is a notorious crux: *Her.* 10.86 *quis scit an . . . insula habet?*, on which see Housman, *CR* 11 (1897), 241 = *Classical Papers* 401–2. At *Her.* 15.4 *hoc breue nescires unde mouetur opus*, believers in Ovid's authorship of the *Epistula Sapphus* may accept the variant *ueniret*, while disbelievers may be content with *mouetur*. So much for fourteen of the fifteen passages listed by Haupt-Korn-Ehwald. Only one passage appears to be an irresistible instance of indicative for subjunctive: *Ex P.* 1.8.25 *memor unde abii*. The passage upon which their list is hung, *Met.* 10.637 *quid facit ignorans*, is another well-known crux, for which Housman's solution (*TCPHS* 3 (1890), 148–9 = *Classical Papers*, 169) is as plausible as any which has been offered.

1.3.99

et uoluisse mali moriendo ponere sensum . . .

mali *Madvig*: *mori uel mori et codd.*

sensum *Luck*: *sensus codd.*

Luck (*Philologus* 103 (1959), 105–6) has perfected *Madvig's* admirable emendation. To the Ovidian parallels for the language and sentiment which are offered by Luck I add the following Greek ones: Aesch. fr. 255N (399 Mette) ἀλγος δ'

¹⁵ M. von Albrecht in his revision of this edition (1966) has expressed reservations about some of these instances. For the use by other authors of the indicative in indirect

questions see Kühner-Stegmann, 2.494.

¹⁶ See Kühner-Stegmann, 2.489.

¹⁷ *pararis* is accepted by W. S. Anderson (Teubner, 1977).

οὐδὲν ἄπτεται νεκροῦ, Soph. *El.* 1170 τοὺς γὰρ θανόντας οὐχ ὁρῶ λυπούμενους, *Tr.* 1173 τοῖς γὰρ θανοῦσι μόχθος οὐ προσγίγνεται, *OC* 955 θανόντων δ' οὐδὲν ἄλγος ἄπτεται. Closest in diction is Eur. *Tr.* 642 τέθηκε κοῦδὲν οἶδε τῶν αὐτῆς κακῶν. Note also *Hcl.* 595-6, *Or.* 1522, fr. 833.3-4.

1.5.7

scis bene cui dicam, positis pro nomine signis . . .

Lines 1-6 of this poem are an apostrophe to a loyal friend, whom Ovid tactfully does not name. After this apostrophe I should expect not 'you know to whom I am speaking' (*cui dicam*) but 'you know whom I mean' (*quem dicam*).

Tr. 4.4 is addressed to the same friend and begins in the same way with six lines of apostrophe, and in the seventh line it continues *quod minime uolui, positis pro nomine signis, / dictus es*. The passive *dictus es* implies, in the active, *te dixi*, not *tibi dixi*. Note also *Met.* 15.595 *is qui sit, signo non nomine dicam*. Further support for the accusative is afforded by the similar context of *Tr.* 3.4.63-4 *amici, / dicere quos cupio nomine quemque suo*. Other parallels for *dico* with the accusative may be found in *TLL* s.u. 980.23 ff. Rather a close parallel to the whole expression *scis bene quem dicam* is Dem. 21.71 εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι γιγνώσκουσι τινας ὁμῶν ὃν λέγω.

1.7.5-6

hoc tibi dissimula, senti tamen, optime, dici,
in digito qui me fersque refersque tuo.

Ovid addresses a friend who carries his likeness on a ring. *fersque refersque* is taken to mean 'carried about, i.e. hither and thither' (Owen), 'perpetuo fers' (Némethy),¹⁸ 'you carry about' (Wheeler), 'portes partout' (André), 'immer wieder tragen' (Luck). But when the verbs *fero* and *refero* are combined in verse, they appear to convey something more than that.

At Verg. *Aen.* 4.437-8 *talisque miserrima fletus / fertque refertque soror* ('she takes and takes again') and 12.865-6 *se pestis ob ora / fertque refertque* ('the fiend flies and flies again before his face') there is a clear notion of persistency or of a redoubling of effort. The compound verb added to the simple verb shows that the activity described in the simple verb is incomplete or unsuccessful and is therefore repeated. At *Am.* 2.19.41 *quas ferat et referat sollers ancilla tabellas* the meaning may be 'bring and take back' ('bring repeatedly' is equally possible), and at *Tr.* 5.13.29 *sic ferat et referat tacitas nunc littera uoces* the meaning is 'take and bring back', as the context shows. At *Fast.* 6.334 *errantes fertque refertque pedes* the implication is not quite clear. The line describes the drunken Priapus in his attempt to capture a nymph. The verbs may indicate the persistency of his unsuccessful efforts; but it is more likely that they indicate his retracing of his drunken steps back and forth. From authors later than Ovid I have found three instances of these verbs combined: Val. Fl. 7.111-12 *extremas lo uaga sentit barenas / fertque refertque pedem* (she keeps putting her foot into the water and taking it out again), Sil. 3.59-60 *Luna . . . fertque refertque fretum sequiturque reciproca Tethys* (the moon constantly draws the sea this way and then the other), and Luc. 2.12-13 *fors incerta uagatur / fertque*

¹⁸ *Commentarius exegeticus ad Ovidii Tristia* (1913).

refertque uices et habet mortalia casus (here *fertque refertque uices* means the same as *alternat uices*: cf. *Met.* 15.409, *Sil.* 9.355).

It seems reasonable to say that in these passages the combination of the two verbs conveys one or other of these notions: (i) persistency or redoubling of effort (the Vergilian passages); (ii) backward and forward movement of a repeated or persistent kind (*Tr.* 5.13.29, Lucan, Valerius, and Silius). Whether *Am.* 2.19.41 and *Fast.* 6.334 should be classed as instances of (i) or (ii) is uncertain. Neither notion suits our passage: 'carry repeatedly' is all that we want.

It may be that the evidence available is not extensive enough to justify a dogmatic statement that Ovid would not have used the verbs in this weakened sense. Though I concede that, I contend that Heinsius's *fersque ferasque* will still deserve the most serious consideration on its own merits, as conveying a point which is missing in the transmitted reading: 'who carry me—and I hope that you will continue to carry me—on your finger'. For the combination of indicative and subjunctive see 1.10.1 *est mihi sitque, precor*, 2.155–6 *per superos igitur, qui dent* (GB), Heinsius: *dant cett.*) *tibi longa dabuntque / tempora* (with which Heinsius compared *St. Silu.* 4.4.56–7 *at tu, si longi cursum dabit Atropos aevi, / detque precor*), *Ex P.* 4.12.38 *absit abestque* (cf. *Verg. Aen.* 10.85 'Aeneas ignarus abest': *ignarus et absit*). For the subjunctive in a relative clause, expressing a wish, see *Her.* 15.107 *per tibi, qui numquam longe discedat* (-et pars codd.), *amorem*.¹⁹ For the corruption Heinsius compared *Ex P.* 4.1.26 *auxilium uitae fertque feretque* (O, Heinsius e coni.: *refertque cett.*) *meae*; see also *Tr.* 3.8.12 *fertque feretque* (*refertque* § teste Owen), 4.1.80 *fertque trahitque* (*refertque* § teste Owen), and 2.358 discussed below. For Ovid's fondness for playing with different parts of the verb *fero* in close proximity see Luck, *HSCP* 65 (1961), 248.

Luck claims that *refersque* is confirmed by *C.L.E.* 1988.40 *auro tuum nomen fert ille refertque lacerto*. The author of this halting and (by Classical norms) unmetrical poem has several reminiscences of the *Tristia*. If he read *fersque refersque* in his text of *Tr.* 1.7.6, we shall have to assume that the corruption was in the text by the third or fourth century, when the poem was written. There is no reason why we should not make such an assumption.²⁰

1.7.33–4

hos quoque sex uersus, in prima fronte libelli
si praeponendos esse putabis, habe.

Will editors ever stop believing that Ovid could describe the *Metamorphoses* as a *libellus*? Or will those editors who do not believe that ever stop believing that *in prima fronte libelli* is acceptable Ovidian Latin for 'at the head of the first book'?

First attend to Heinsius: 'inepte enim *Metamorphoses libellus* uocentur, quas ipse lib. II 63 *maius opus* sit appellaturus; sic alibi [2.549] *sex ego Fastorum scripsi totidemque libellos*, & [*Am.* 1 epigr.] *qui modo Nasonis fueramus quinque libelli, tres sumus*.' Ovid uses *libellus* to designate a single book from a larger

¹⁹ *discedat* is wrongly rejected by H. Dörrie, *P. Ovidius Naso: Der Brief an Phaon* (1975), p. 136.

²⁰ In the following pentameter (1.7.8)

editors continue to print *quae* instead of *qua* (M^o, Heinsius), oblivious of Housman's discussion in *CQ* 10 (1916), 130 = *Classical Papers*, 917–18.

work at *Ars* 3.47, *Fast.* 1.724, *Tr.* 1.11.1, 2.245-6,²¹ 3.14.51, 5.1.1, 5.7.59, and to designate a single work of the same compass but in only one book at *Ars* 3.206, *Rem.* 1, *Ib.* 49, 637; and he uses the plural *libelli* to designate the *Metamorphoses* only a few lines earlier in this poem: 19-20 *sic ego non meritos mecum peritura libellos / imposui rapidis uiscera nostra rogis*. To set against this evidence of Ovidian usage there is only *Tr.* 2.545, invoked by Owen (1915 edn.), where the *Ars Amatoria* is described as *uetus libellus*. But a work in three books is not the same as a work in fifteen books, and it suits Ovid's apologetic purpose to pretend that the *Ars* is a book of no great substance.²²

The belief that *in prima fronte libelli* may mean 'at the head of the first book' begins with Burman ('libellum uocat primum uolumen') and is endorsed by Luck, by *TLL* s.u. 1269.41, and by André ('*libellus* y désigne évidemment un des 15 livres des *Métamorphoses* et par conséquent le premier'). The Latin for 'at the head of the first book' is *in primi fronte libelli*, the conjecture of Heinsius, which should be in the text.²³ For the ordinal with *libellus* see *TLL* s.u. 1269.42 ff. (see also s.u. *liber* 1275.14 ff.). Burman's *libellis*, for which T. Birt (*Das antike Buchwesen* (1882), 30) and Luck have a good word, is much less stylish.

1.11.15

fuscabatque diem custos Atlantidos Vrsae

Atlantidos $L_d P_u$: Adlantidos $T_p M^2$: Arimantidos GHV: Erymanthidos uel sim. cett.

Erymanthidos Vrsae recurs as a verse-ending at 1.4.1 and 3.4.47. Our oldest manuscript (T_p , saec. x) has *Adlantidos*, and it is upon this, or upon *Atlantidos*, that explanation or emendation must be based, for the familiar *Erymanthidos* would never have given rise to those readings. At 5.3.7 the unfamiliar *Cynosuridos Vrsae* led again to the substitution of *Erymanthidos* in several manuscripts.

Owen (*CR* 2 (1888), 180-1) refers to Apoll. 3.8.2, who records that, according to Asius, Callisto was the daughter of Nykteus, who was the great-grandson of Atlas. In the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, and in the common account, Callisto (The Great Bear) was the daughter of Lycaon and so did not trace her descent from Atlas.²⁴ 'This poet', adds Owen, 'is prone to the luxury of inconsistency in such matters.' No doubt; but unease remains.

At *Fast.* 3.659-60 editors used to read *inuenies qui te nymphen Atlantida dicant, / teque Ioui primos, Anna, dedisse cibos*. According to Alton-Wormell-Courtney AU have *alanida*, G *azamnida*, M *azamida*, the other manuscripts *at(ba)-lantida*. Ovid is identifying Anna Perenna with one of the Arcadian nymphs,

²¹ *neue quibus scribam possis dubitare, libellus* (ς: -οσω: -ισς) / *quattuor hos uersus e tribus unus habet*. If one wanted a simple test of an editor's feeling for Ovidian style, one could hardly do better than note the choice which he makes here between *libellus* and *libellos*. The test is passed by Heinsius and Luck, failed by nearly everyone else.

²² Compare his own bowdlerization of *Ars* 1.33 in his quotation of the line at *Tr.* 2.249. One might, alternatively, argue that

the expression *uetus libellus* does not have to be taken as referring to all three books of the *Ars*.

²³ It was accepted by Ehwald-Levy (see Ehwald in *Bursian*, 21 (1882), 160) and by Owen (in deference to Ehwald) in 1889 and 1894. Owen had printed *prima* in 1885 and he returned to this in 1915 in deference to the futile objections of K. P. Schulze (*Woch. f. kl. Phil.* 7 (1890), 577).

²⁴ For details see Bömer on *Fast.* 2.156.

possibly Hagno, who first fed the infant Jupiter. None of the nymphs in question is elsewhere said to be descended from Atlas. E. H. Alton (*Hermathena* 20 (1926), 113–14) made the brilliant proposal *Azanida*, which Bömer has accepted. Azan was son of Arcas and founder of the Arcadian tribe of Azanes. The name Azan appears to be found only once in Latin poetry, at St. *Theb.* 4.292; this is the only instance of the masculine name which Alton quotes, and he quotes no instance of the feminine name. The name is well attested in Greek: e.g. Hdt. 6.127.3 Ἀζήν, Eur. *Or.* 1647 Ἀζᾶσω Ἀρκάσω τε. It is possible, but far from certain, that Ἀζανίδα (Martin) or Ἀζηνίδα (Gemoll) should replace Ἀζαντίδα (Ἀτλαντίδα M) κούρην at *Hom. h. Ap.* 209.²⁵ The first certain, or at least highly probable, appearance of the feminine form is at Call. *b.* 1.20, where Pfeiffer has recovered Ἀζηνίς from the scholia to Dionys. *Perieg.* (Callimachus' manuscripts have Ἀρκαδίη, 'i.e. glossa quae in textum irrepsit', Pfeiffer). Note also Call. *b.* 3.235 οὔρεα . . . Ἀζήνια (Holstenius: ἀξένια codd.).

Alton proposed *Azanidos* in our passage too, and this must be right. Callisto's homeland was Arcadia. We may admire the ingenuity with which Ovid found so many epithets, all meaning 'Arcadian', to apply to her: not only *Azanis* and *Erymanthis* but also *Maenalis* (*Tr.* 3.11.8), *Maenalia* (*Fast.* 2.192), *Nonacrina* (*Met.* 2.409), *Parrhasis* (*Met.* 2.460, *Tr.* 1.3.48), *Parrhasia* (*Tr.* 2.190), *Tegeaea* (*Ars* 2.55, *Fast.* 2.167).²⁶

2.63–4

inspice maius opus, quod adhuc sine fine tenetur,
in non credendos corpora uersa modos.

tenetur M: reliqui M³ cett.

tenetur is printed by all modern editors. Owen translates 'is arrested still unfinished', Wheeler, 'is still kept unfinished'. For this alleged sense of *tenere* ('arrest, check') Owen compares *Met.* 9.301 *inceptos tenuerunt carmina partus*, 8.463 *coepta quater tenuit*, *Her.* 2.14 *nec tenuit cursus forsitan ille tuos*. In these passages *tenere* is combined with a word which helps to define its meaning: what is 'checked' has either 'begun' (*inceptos*, *coepta*) or is in motion (*cursus*). Nothing in our passage helps *tenetur* to have the sense which Owen and Wheeler assign to it. Luck translates 'das man noch in unvollendeter Form besitzt' and takes *tenetur* to mean 'is in the hands of the public', comparing 3.1.82 *sumite plebeiae carmina nostra manus*. It is conceivable that *adhuc sine fine tenetur* could mean 'is in my hands, still unfinished', which would be at variance with the facts; I do not believe that it can mean 'is in other people's hands, still unfinished'. Note, for what it is worth, the similar verse-ending at *Met.* 2.502 *immosque oculos in se sine fine tenentem*.

We must accept *reliqui*. For the use of the verb in similar connections (of something left incomplete) see *Met.* 1.526 *uerba imperfecta reliquit*, *Ars* 2.78 *inceptum dextra reliquit opus*; for the addition of *sine fine* compare *Met.* 8.277–8

²⁵ See, in addition to the commentaries ad loc., Bömer on *Fast.* 3. 659–60 and the *Lexicon der frühgriechischen Epos* s.u. Ἀζανίς.

²⁶ For Ovid's fondness for *recherche*

proper names in *-is* see E. Linse, *De P. Ouidio Nasone vocabulorum inventore* (1891), pp. 19–22, E. J. Kenney in *Ovid* (ed. J. W. Binns, 1973), p. 126.

sine ture relictas . . . aras. M is prone to idiosyncratic blunders, and *tenetur* for *reliqui* is fit to keep company with *sisui* for *et opis* at 1.5.15, *pati* for *loqui* at 1.8.20,²⁷ *mibi* for *pede* at 1.8.38 and 1.10.23, and many another such aberration. Housman's warning (Manilius i, p. xxxviii) against the 'tactless preference' of his contemporaries for M has not been fully heeded by later editors.

2.173-6

per quem bella geris, cuius nunc corpore pugnas,
auspiciu cui das grande deosque tuos,
175 dimidioque tui praesens tet respicis urbem,
dimidio procul es saeuoque bella geris.

175 et respicis MG² Aς: es r- G¹ Vς: hanc r- DL_n: qui r- T: es et aspiciς Fς

Ovid prays that victory may attend Augustus' vice-gerent, Tiberius, who is fighting wars abroad. In 175-6 he says that Augustus is both at home, taking care of the city, and abroad (in the person of Tiberius), fighting Rome's enemies. Luck's view that 'The half of him that is absent is his "gods and great auspices" (174)' (*HSCP* 65 (1961), 255) is wrong. The city needs Augustus' *auspiciu* as much as the army in Germany. The half of him that is absent is Tiberius, in whose person he fights (173 *cuius nunc corpore pugnas*). We have here an echo of the familiar conceit *animae dimidium meae* (Hor. *carm.* 1.3.8), which is found again at *Tr.* 1.2.43-4 *at nunc, ut peream, quoniam caret illa periclo, / dimidia certe parte superstes ero*. And for the idea of Tiberius as the *alter ego* of Augustus see 229 below *nunc te prole tua iuuenem Germania sentit*.²⁸

Heinsius, Bentley, and, of modern editors, Owen (in all but his last edition) and Wheeler were content with *es et aspiciς*. But others have preferred to found conjectures on the better attested *respicis*. There is little attraction in these conjectures: *praesentis* r- (Heinsius), <es> *praesens et* r- (Goldbacher and Némethy,²⁹ accepted by Owen in 1924, creating a very unpleasant elision), *en* r- (Schenkl,³⁰ much too dramatic). Luck proposes *dum respicis*, comparing 217 *de te pendentem sic dum circumspiciς orbem*. But the sentence then runs very awkwardly: the reader's impulse is to take *dimidioque* as the beginning of a main clause, and I experience an uncomfortable jolt when I encounter *dum* and find that I am in a subordinate clause. If the reader will begin at 155, which is the start of a very long sentence (155-80) of which lines 173-6 form only a small part, and will attend to the connection of the clauses, I think that he will better appreciate the awkwardness of the connection afforded by *-que . . . dum*.

If I were determined to keep *respicis*, I should consider writing *sic respicis*: 'and thus (because your vice-gerent is abroad) you keep watch over the city in person with one half of yourself, while with the other half you are far away waging

²⁷ Such is their devotion to M that Owen is able to translate *pauca . . . uerba . . . pati* as 'bear with (uttering) a few words', Wheeler 'suffer a few words . . . to escape you'.

²⁸ At first sight Burman's *te <in> prole tua* is appealing. For this use of *in* see OLD s.u. § 43 ('in the person or shape of'). But here is a parallel for the bare

ablative: *Met.* 13.503-4 *cinis ipse sepulti / in genus hoc saeuit: tumulo quoque sensimus hostem*, where *tumulo* means (so I should assume) not 'in his tomb' but, as Loers paraphrases it, 'per tumulum'.

²⁹ Goldbacher, *WS* 26 (1904), 271; for Némethy see above, n. 18.

³⁰ In the edition of O. Güthling (1884).

wars.' For *sic* compare 217, cited in the preceding paragraph.³¹ But how keenly need we cling to this verb? As Owen shows, *respicere* is regularly used 'of the thought for the interests of an inferior taken by a superior, whether (a) a god . . . or (b) a more powerful human being'. He quotes numerous instances of this use, to which Luck (*Philologus*, loc. cit.) adds Hor. *carm.* 1.2.36. But *aspicere* is equally, though less commonly, used in this sense: see *TLL* s.u. 836. 72 ff. ('de dis, plerumque curandi, fauendi uel animaduertendi causa'), where there are quoted among other passages Cat. 76.19, Verg. *Aen.* 2.690, 4.208. Conjecture, therefore, seems needless.

2.279-83

280 ut tamen hoc fatear, ludi quoque semina praebent
nequitiae: tolli tota theatra iube.
peccandi causam multis quam saepe dederunt,
Martia cum durum sternit harena solum.
tollatur Circus . . .

281 multis quam *Riese*: multi quam *M*: quam multis *Nw*: multis quoque *E*

The theatre (279-80), the amphitheatre (281-2), and the Circus (283-4) all afford the spectators an opportunity for immoral behaviour. In 281 I have reproduced what is the modern vulgate, *Riese*'s *multis quam*. The subject of *dederunt*, so editors allege, is *ludi* in 279. It is something to Owen's credit that having thrice acquiesced in this he finally abandoned it in 1924 with the observation that 'the interposition of *theatra*, which should grammatically be the subject, makes this impossible.' To this must be added a further objection, that *quam multis saepe* gives an intolerable tautology.

Ehwald's *mimi quam* and Rappold's *nudi quam* are dismissed for good reasons by Owen. Heinsius's and Vogel's *quam munera saepe* gives impossible word-order. Phillimore's *spectacula* (for *quam saepe*) is an improbable change in itself and introduces a form not elsewhere used by Ovid. Owen reverts to *M*'s *multi quam*, in which 'multi' are the 'numerous persons' who put on the games. The sense is feeble, and the tautology remains.

P. H. Damsté, *Mnemosyne* 46 (1918), 6, proposed *saepta* for *saepe*. This conjecture, which Owen regards as 'violent' and does not discuss, is palmary. Since Damsté does not elucidate his conjecture and rather damages it by perverse punctuation, I must explain.

The *saepta* in the Campus Martius were, from early times, the voting precinct for the *comitia tributa*: *Fast.* 1.53 *est quoque quo populum ius est includere saeptis*. Julius Caesar planned to replace them with an elaborate marble structure (*Cic. ad Att.* 4.16.8). His building was continued by Lepidus and completed and dedicated in 26 by Agrippa (*Dio* 53.23.1). Gladiatorial contests were exhibited in the *saepta* by Augustus (*Suet. Aug.* 43, *Dio* 55.8.5, 55.10.7), Caligula (*Suet. Cal.* 18), and Claudius (*Suet. Claud.* 21). See further *R-E* 1A, 1724-7, L. R. Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies* (1960), pp. 47-58, E. Nash, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (1962), p. 291.

³¹ Wheeler actually translates the text as if it had *sic*: 'and thus art half present . . .'. *ita* would be closer than *sic* to what is

transmitted, but such an *ita* would not conform with Ovidian usage.

Damsté proposed to punctuate *quam multis saepta dederunt / Martia, cum . . .* He explains why: 'soluta est copulatio illa molestissima *Martia harena*, quam vix neque vix quidem ferendam semper duxi, nam "harena" h.l. non tropice dictum est ut Martial. 2.75.8 "*Martia non uidit maius harena nefas*", sed propria significatione sabulum denotat et epitheton "*Martia*" non admittit.' This cannot be right. The *saepta* were officially designated by Agrippa as *saepta Iulia*. They are never called *saepta Martia*. In fact the place 'seems to have been called saepta only' (S. B. Platner-T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (1929), p. 460). Suetonius, in the passages cited above, speaks simply of the *saepta*, while Dio, cited above, speaks of the *σέπτα*. As Owen says, 'The epithet *Martia*, applied to *harena*, means appropriated to Mars, the god of battle, "the sand of conflict". So "*Martia bella*" F.III.232' (he adds similar expressions). But the epithet may now be seen to have a further point: the sand belongs to Mars not only because he is the god of fighting but also because the fighting takes place in his own Campus. I do not know whether Friedlaender was right to explain *Martia* as equivalent to *Romana* at Mart. 2.75.8 (he compared 1.3.4 *Martia turba* and 5.19.5 *Martia Roma*);³² but the likelihood is that Martial took the epithet from this line of Ovid and assumed that Ovid intended that it should be taken with *harena*. Perhaps we should admire Ovid's cunning in choosing to locate his gladiators in a place which was so clearly associated with the imperial family.

2.301-2

omnia peruersas possunt corrumpere mentes:
stant tamen illa suis omnia tuta locis.

If a woman is disposed to be immoral, says Ovid in 279 ff., many places in Rome will encourage her: the theatre, the amphitheatre, the circus, colonnades, temples. Lines 301-2 round off the passage: 'all things can corrupt perverted minds; yet all *those* things stand safe in their places.' According to Owen *illa* refers to 'all those temples'; according to Luck *illa* 'faßt Theater, Zirkus, Säulenhallen und Tempeln zusammen'. This will not do. If *illa* refers back to the places on the preceding list, it should appear in the hexameter. When Owen translates 'Though all those temples may tempt depraved hearts inclined to sin, yet they all stand secure each in its several place', he is translating *omnia illa . . . omnia* rather than *omnia . . . illa omnia*. If anyone should claim that the reason why *illa* does not appear in the hexameter is that the hexameter is a generalization, I reply that to change the general to the specific by writing *omnia* ('all things in general') . . . *illa omnia* ('all those things') is banal. In any case, what is the point of saying 'all those things stand safe in their places'? That, in spite of the encouragement which they give to the immoral, they have not been blasted from the earth by a bolt from heaven? Or that nobody has proposed their demolition?³³ The point (whatever it may be) is less than felicitously expressed.

Read *ipsa* for *illa*. The whole couplet is a generalization: 'all things can corrupt perverted minds; but all things stand safe in their own proper places.' The point is followed up in the next two couplets, which show how unsafe it is to step

³² Ovid has *Martia Roma* at 3.7.52, Ex P. 1.8.24, 4.9.64; cf. Bömer on *Fast.* 3.79.

³³ 'tuta: undemolished' (Owen); 'et tamen nemo ullum istius generis simulacrum loco mouendum censet' (Pontanus).

beyond prescribed boundaries: a respectable woman who reads the *Ars*, from which she has been warned to stand aloof, is likened to a woman who enters a holy place to which a priest has forbidden her access.³⁴

Numerous instances of the collocation *ipsa suis* and the like are quoted by Owen on 2.86. The confusion of *ipse* and *ille* is common: e.g. 1.1.31, 1.2.95, 1.7.37, 2.106, 3.6.8, 5.4.8. The proximity of *suus* is no insurance against this corruption: 4.4.70 *ipse* (*ille* ς teste Owen) *suis*, 5.4.45 *ipse* (*ille* ς teste Owen) *suum*, *Met.* 3.229 *ipse* (*ille* ς) *suos*, 3.440 *ipse* (*ille* ς) *suos*, *Her.* 1.86 *ipse* (*ille* half the MSS) *suas*, 9.96 *ipsa* (*illa* G) *suis*, *Ib.* 398 *ipse* (*ille* ς) *suis*.

2.331–2

forsan (et hoc dubitem) numeris leuioribus aptus
sim satis . . .

One reads the parenthesis with disbelief,³⁵ and then conjectures *dubito*, with the confident expectation of finding that the conjecture has been anticipated. There is no record of *dubito* in Luck, Wheeler, Landi, or three out of Owen's four editions. But according to Owen's 1889 edition it is the reading of DEKT ν , a respectable quintet (ν is Luck's O δ); and Ehwald-Levy and André, although they do not give full details, at least record the existence of this reading. Surely, one thinks, Heinsius must have preferred it, if he knew of it, or conjectured it, if he did not. But even Heinsius nods, for, having reported that his manuscripts were divided between *forsan et hoc* and *forsitan hoc*, he conjectured *forsitan et dubitem*.

I had better quote, lest they should be thought relevant to the defence of the subjunctive, two passages in which the subjunctive is correctly used in a parenthetical question: *Met.* 4.704 *accipiunt legem (quis enim dubitaret?) et orant*, 6.193–4 *sum felix (quis enim neget hoc?) felixque manebo / (hoc quoque quis dubitet?): tutam me copia fecit*. For the indicative (though not in a parenthesis) see *Her.* 17.37 *hoc quoque enim dubito*. For *et* introducing a parenthesis see *Am.* 2.5.45 *sicut erant (et erant culti) . . .*, *Ars* 3.673 *efficite (et facile est) . . .*, *Met.* 9.782 *uisa dea est mouisse suas (et mouerat) aras*, *Her.* 4.91 *arcus (et arma tuae tibi sunt imitanda Dianae) . . .*; cf. TLL s.u. *et* 891.80 ff., and M. von Albrecht, *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion* (1964), pp. 55–6.

Parentheses are particularly vulnerable to corruption; with *forsan* preceding, *dubito* was a sitting duck. For other corrupted parentheses see the note on 2.495–6 below, John Jackson, *Marginalia scaenica* (1955), p. 128, E. J. Kenney, 'In parenthesis', *CR* N.S. 20 (1970), 291 (on *Met.* 3.447), and my *Studies on the Text of Euripides* (1980), pp. 115–16.

³⁴ Luck's transposition of 303–4 to follow 305–6 is very attractive. The objection of M. von Albrecht, *Gnomon* 37 (1965), 493, that 'Die Argumentation aus den "Sakralrecht" gewinnt erst ihre Pointe, wenn der Hinweis auf die Warnung in der *Ars* vorausgegangen ist' is not convincing. If my interpretation of 302 is accepted, it loses all validity. But in 305 read *quaecumque irrumpit* (L δ , Luck: *irrumpit* ς : *erupit* uel

erumpit cett.) *quo* (ς : *qua* ω , Luck) *non sinit ire sacerdos*. For *quo* see 5.1.78 *quae tamen irrumpunt quoque uetantur eunt*, *Ex P.* 1.7.23 *nec tamen irrumpo quo non licet ire*, *Ars* 3.636 *quoque sui comites ire uetantur eunt*. The two last passages tell against Kenney's hesitant *quaque* which is proposed in Luck's apparatus criticus at 5.1.78.

³⁵ The early editors print no parenthesis, nor does André. The result is hopeless.

2.357-8

nec liber indicium est animi sed honesta uoluntas
plurima mulcendis auribus apta feret.

357 uoluptas *EV et cod. Barberin.* 358 feret *G¹ AK⁵; ferens L_OQ⁵; ferens MG² HV; refert G³ T⁵*

Nearly all editors accept *uoluntas*, but they are not agreed on the meaning of *honesta uoluntas* or on the reading at the end of the pentameter or on how to punctuate the couplet. Owen in the first three of his editions printed *uoluntas*: . . . *feres*, as did Landi and Ehwald-Levy; Wheeler and André print *uoluntas* . . . *ferens*, Luck (1967) prints *uoluntas* . . . *feret*. Wheeler translates 'A book is not an evidence of one's soul, but an honourable impulse that presents . . .'; Owen (*CR* 2 (1888), 181) translates 'It is not the book that is the index of the mind, but the honest wish to please (on the part of the writer).' The sense is absurd in each case. André's translation 'mon livre . . . a l'innocent désir de présenter . . .' cannot be extracted from the Latin. Luck translates 'Ein Buch ist kein Spiegel der Gesinnung, aber der ehrliche Wille wird vieles davontragen, was den Ohren schmeicheln kann', which transfers the 'honourable impulse' from book (or writer) to reader, which is not a happy idea.

uoluptas, which Heinsius preferred, is right: 'A book is not evidence of the writer's mind but is a respectable source of pleasure, an innocent entertainment.' Of modern editors only Owen (1924) and Luck (1963) accept *uoluptas*. Owen rightly observes that 'the sense in which the *Ars* is termed an object of pleasure is defined by the pentameter'. In the pentameter Heinsius preferred (as did Luck in 1963) *ferens*, which Owen rejects for the right reason, that 'Ovid never places the present participle at the end of a pentameter when it is strictly participial in meaning': on this see M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse* (1951), pp. 45-7.³⁶ But I doubt if Owen is right to prefer *feres*, 'you will gain'. A second-person verb will have to be addressed to Augustus (cf. *tibi* 345), and an address to Augustus, in this context, is unwelcome. Better is *feret*: 'a book . . . is an innocent entertainment: it will offer many things suited to charm the ears.'³⁷

The aptness of *uoluptas* would be even greater if, as Dr McKeown suggests to me, we were to see in *honesta uoluptas* an allusion, by way of a clever oxymoron, to the controversy respecting the purposes of poetry, as reflected by Hor. *Ars Poet.* 333 ff. *aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poetae . . . ficta uoluptatis causa sint proxima ueris . . . omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci*. In this controversy the recurrent contrast is between *uoluptas* and *utilitas*; and, since there is a close relationship, for example in rhetoric and philosophy, between the concepts of *honestum* and *utile* (see *TLL* s.u. *honestus* 2912.7 ff.),

³⁶ A 'gross violation of Ovidian usage', says E. J. Kenney (*CR* N.S. 20 (1970), 342) of *ferens* in André's text. The same must be said of *habens* at *Her.* 12.96, which is commended by G. P. Goold, *Gnomon* 46 (1974), 477.

³⁷ A. Palmer, *Hermathena* 7 (1890), 268, proposed the atrocious conjecture *carmina* (for *plurima*) . . . *fere*. But I should like to commend his conjecture *in electu* (for

euentu) *poenae* at 2.125 (cf. *Her.* 2.144 *in necis electu*). I commend it the more keenly because editors are unaware of it and because it was suggested to me independently by Mr W. A. Camps. Owen's parallel for a defining genitive with *euentu* is not good enough: at *Ex P.* 2.2.32 *nam timor euentu deterioris abest*, read *euentus* with the majority of manuscripts.

the expression *honesta uoluptas* might be taken as being tantamount to *utilis uoluptas*. For a paradoxical exploitation earlier in this poem of the concept of *utilitas* see 265 ff. (note especially, in the light of the quotation from Horace given above, 266 *prodest*, 267 *utilius*).

2.493-6

his ego deceptus non tristia carmina feci,
sed tristis nostros poena secuta iocos.
495 denique nec uideo tot de scribentibus unum,
quem sua perdiderit Musa; repertus ego.

495 nec MNS: non DE ς de tot ς unus M¹ (*testibus Owen, Ehwald-Levy*)

So lines 495-6 are printed by everyone, though some prefer to punctuate with a colon instead of a semi-colon in 496, while Owen in two of his editions prefers to puzzle the reader with a comma. Each of the first three words in 495 is faulty. (i) *denique* is not a suitable word to connect this couplet with what precedes. (ii) sense demands not *nec* but *non*. Editors suppose that *nec* means *ne . . . quidem*, 'not even one', and Luck and Owen offer illustration. But then *nec* should stand next to *unum*. '*unum* am Versende ist betont': this is wishful thinking. (iii) *uideo* is not in itself a very suitable verb for the role which it has to play in its clause; and it is a thoroughly unsuitable verb to be balanced against *repertus* in the clause which follows. These are not the only faults of the couplet. With *repertus ego* tagged on as an independent clause, the lines are preposterously ill balanced. 'Finally I see not even one out of so many writers whom his own Muse has destroyed; I have been found (sc. to be the only example of such mischance).' Ovid does not write so jerkily.

Bentley conjectured *sumque (nec inuideo) de tot scribentibus unus, / quem sua perdiderit Musa, repertus ego*. So far as concerns sense and structure, this is excellent. For the structure compare 567-8 *inter tot populi, tot scriptis* (M: -ti cett.), *milia nostri, / quem mea Calliope laeserit, unus ego*, where *ego* (B₁Q, Heinsius) is rightly preferred by Luck to the vulgate *ero*. For the parenthetical *nec inuideo* compare 1.1.1 *parue (nec inuideo) sine me liber ibis in urbem*, *Ex P.* 1.8.7-8 *deque tot expulsis sum miles in exule solus: / tuta (neque inuideo) cetera turba latet*, *Her.* 2.79 *illa (nec inuideo) fruitur meliore marito*, *Strato, A.P.* 12.208.1 *εὐτυχές, οὐ φθονέω, βιβλιδίον*. Both *nec inuideo* and *unus* (which, if one may believe Owen and Ehwald-Levy, was the original reading of M) have every chance of being right.³⁸ But *sumque* is too remote from the transmitted text to be convincing.

Housman conjectured *deque (nec inuideo) tot idem scribentibus unus. . .*³⁹ For palaeographical neatness this is admirable (*deque nec INuideo* might easily become *deNIque nec uideo*); and for the initial *deque* compare *Ex P.* 1.8.7 quoted above. But this conjecture labours under a grave drawback: the word

³⁸ For the corruption of the parenthesis see my note on 2.331-2 above.

³⁹ The conjecture was published in the apparatus criticus of Owen's text in the *Corpus poetarum Latinorum* and was reported again by Owen in his Oxford Text. So far as I am aware it has not been reported

elsewhere and has never received a word of comment. It is interesting that Housman himself nowhere refers to it, although it offers such a good example of the kind of trajection of letters which he was fond of illustrating. Perhaps he later saw the weakness which I have tried to expose.

idem. Ovid has just finished a catalogue of didactic poets, composers of hand-books on indoor and outdoor games, the arts of make-up and pottery, and the like. 'Beguiled by them', he continues at 493, 'I wrote verse lacking seriousness, but a serious penalty has attended my jests.' Then, with Housman's conjecture, he proceeds 'And out of so many poets writing the same thing I alone have been destroyed by my Muse.' The poets were not writing the same thing as Ovid, for his subject was different from theirs, and they were not writing the same thing as each other, for their subjects were various. They were all writing in the same didactic genre; but *idem scribere* cannot mean 'write in the same genre'.

I suggest *nempe (nec inuideo) tot de scribentibus unus*, etc.

Queens' College, Cambridge

JAMES DIGGLE