

NOTES ON OVID'S POEMS FROM EXILE

I would refer to the introductory paragraphs of J. Diggle's 'Notes on Ovid's *Tristia*, Books I–II' (*CQ* n.s. 30 (1980), 401–19). His list of modern editions does not include F. Della Corte, *I Tristia* (Genoa, 1973), which I too have not seen. For Book IV we have an edition (not without merit) by T. J. de Jonge (Groningen, 1961).

For the *Epistulae ex Ponto* I have relied on J. André's apparatus (Budé, 1977).

I am much indebted to Professor E. J. Kenney (henceforth referred to as 'K.') for expert criticisms and suggestions.

Tristia

1. 1. 15–22

vade, liber, verbisque meis loca grata saluta:
contingam certe quo licet illa pede.
si quis, ut in populo, nostri non immemor illic,
si quis, qui quid agam forte requirat, erit,
vivere me dices, salvum tamen esse negabis;
id quoque quod vivam munus habere dei. 20
atque ita tu tacitus quaerenti plura legendum
et quae non opus est forte loquere cave.

21 atque ita tu *N pl.*: atque ita te *F¹ al.*: teque ita tu *P* 22 et *N al.*: ne *B_n KT pl.*

Among Luck's conjectures, some of which certainly have merit, Diggle awards the palm to his version of 21–2: *atque ita tu tacitus, quaerent si plura legentes*, | *ne, quae* sqq. But *quaerenti plura*, taking up *si quis...qui...requirat, erit*, ought not to be touched; and *legentes* is premature. Question time comes before the Book is handed over. Also, as K. observes, *tu* is otiose, or at least unnecessarily emphatic. All of the true readings are, I believe, to be found in the manuscripts, except for the transposition of two letters: *atque* (*adque*) becomes *daque* (the frequency of *atque ita* in Ovid would make the corruption almost predictable):

daque ita te tacitus quaerenti plura legendum,
et¹ quae non opus est forte loquere cave.

But there is a snag. The combination of *ita* with a connective, *atque* or (in prose) *et*, meaning 'and so', is common, especially in Ovid, but I am unable to find an example of *-que* thus used. That, however, may be simply because ninety-nine times out of a hundred *atque* is metrically more convenient. For *illic* in 17 see Diggle, loc. cit.

1. 1. 97

luce bona dominoque tuo felicior ipso
pervenias

tuo...ipso is an overload. For one or the other read *opto*, a favourite expression with Ovid?

1. 2. 101 f.

quod licet et minimis, domui si favimus illi,
si satis Augusti publica iussa mihi

si satis *N pl.*: sint satis *X (pl.)* iussa mihi *GKT pl.*: iussa tuli *R al.*: uisa mihi *AF*: cura fuit *Fragm. Boxhorn. ap. Heinsium*

¹ *neu* would be as good.

It should be observed that the proposed rewriting *si satis adiuvī publica vota meis* (Bentley, Mencken) derives from 2. 60 *ipse quoque adiuvī publica vota meis*. Luck's rendering of the vulgate, 'wenn für mich Augustus in seinen Anordnungen den ganzen Staat vertrat', conveniently ignores *satis*, which is functionless on this interpretation. Better to say with Heinsius: 'non me expedio ex hac Charybdi'. But I suspect that *satis* is a verse-filler, which has replaced a missing monosyllable:

si vox Augusti publica iussa mihi.

iubeo and *iussa* are the standard terms for ordinances of the People: e.g. Cic. Pis. 48 *iussa populi Romani*, Liv. 38. 51. 4 *pro decretis patrum, pro populi iussis*.

Luck rightly accepts from Kenney (originally Vogel) *ista* for *moris* etc. in 5. 5. 45.

1. 3. 5-8

iam prope lux aderat, qua me discedere Caesar
finibus extremae iusserat Ausoniae.
nec spatium nec mens fuerat satis apta parandi:
torpuerant longa pectora nostra mora.

What was the long delay which had numbed the poet's mind? It cannot have been, as Luck supposes, the interval between the issuing of the Emperor's sentence and the prescribed date by which he had to be out of Italy, for, as stated in the previous line, this scarcely left enough time to pack. So he must be referring to a period of suspense before the sentence struck. But if this had already numbed him, how should the sentence itself repeat the effect? *non aliter stupui quam qui Iovis ignibus ictus | vivit* (11 f.). As Luck says, there is little difference between *torpor* and *stupor*.

I suggest that *longa*, a cliché, has replaced *dempta* (cf. Pont. 3. 1. 149 *tum lacrimis demenda mora est*). Part of the shattering effect of the sentence was due to its typically tyrannical abruptness, admitting no delay. I would further accept K.'s tentative suggestion *torpuerunt* ('with departure hard on me, my mind immediately passed into numbness'), a very slight (after *fuerat*) and desirable, though not absolutely necessary, change.

1. 3. 83

et mihi facta via est, et me capit ultima tellus

Luck mentions my conjecture *lata* (for *facta*) in his apparatus (see *CQ* n.s. 4 (1954), 169), which I now withdraw. It was based on the notion that Ovid would travel to Tomis by sea ("Made" by the Argonauts?), as for the most part he did. But the first stage would be along the Appian Way to Brundisium. Luck's citation of Tib. 2. 6. 10 *et mihi sunt vires et mihi facta via est* in that form is, of course, a slip.

1. 3. 101 f.

vivat et absentem, quoniam sic fata tulerunt,
vivat et auxilio sublevet usque suo.

Not surprisingly, Luck remained dissatisfied with his chosen version of 102: *vivat ut* (Salmاسius), *auxilio sublevet usque suo*, which he renders 'da es das Schicksal so wollte, dass er lebt'. Why not an obelus? I think the second *vivat* has replaced a different verb:

vivat ut absentem, quoniam sic fata tulerunt,
ploret et auxilio sublevet usque suo.

2. 175 f.

dimidioque tui *praesens es* respicis urbem,
dimidio procul es saevaue bella geris.

es respicis *GV al.*: et resp- *MG² A al.*: hanc resp- *DL_n*: qui resp- *T*: es et asp- *F al.*

Luck reads his conjecture *praesens dum respicis*, on which see Diggle, loc. cit. Perhaps *praesenti respicis*?

2. 413 f., 443 f.

iunxit Aristides Milesia crimina secum, 413
pulsus Aristides nec tamen urbe sua est.

vertit Aristiden Sisenna, nec obfuit illi 443
historiae turpis inseruisse iocos.

Let us first dismiss the ridiculous, if widespread, notion that Sisenna enlivened his history of Rome with 'lewd jests'. As H. Peter pointed out (*Hist. Rom. rel. i. cccxli n. 2*), Ovid is here compiling two lists of erotic verse-makers, first Greek, then Latin. That Sisenna's translation of Aristides was in verse is further to be inferred from a (likewise misinterpreted) passage of Fronto, *Ad M. Caes. 4. 3. 2*: *nam praeter hos partim scriptorum animadvertas particulatim elegantis, Novium et Pomponium et id genus in verbis rusticanis et iocularibus ac ridiculariis, Attam in muliebribus, Sisennam in lasciviis* [read *lascivis* (Mai)], *Lucilium in cuiusque artis ac negotii propriis*.

We are left with another foolish notion, endorsed by Luck, that Sisenna expanded his translation of Aristides with 'derbe Schwänke' of his own – coals to Newcastle. So taken, however, *inseruisse iocos* would imply that there was nothing of that kind in the original. And it is perverse to understand *historiae* after Sisenna's name as anything but 'history'.

As anyone in the habit of reading Ovid might have been expected to realize, *historiae turpis inseruisse iocos* is merely another way of saying *Aristiden vertisse*. The 'lewd jests' are the Milesian tales. 'Put lewd jests into history' is only a way of saying that Sisenna's main literary occupation, historiography, was diversified by the composition of improper verse.

2. 433–40

quid referam Ticidae, quid Memmi carmen, apud quos
rebus adest nomen nominibusque pudor?
Cinna quoque his comes est, Cinnaque procacior Anser, 435
et leve Cornifici parque Catonis opus,
et quorum libris modo dissimulata Perillae
nomine nunc legitur dicta, *Metelle, tuo*;
is quoque, Phasiacas Argon qui duxit in undas,
non potuit Veneris furta tacere suae. 440

Which Metellus? Unless, like S. G. Owen, one has been brought up to believe that Roman wives took their husbands' names, the answer seems to be 'which indeed?'. *Metella suo* (Heinsius, read by Burman) is apparently judged unworthy of record in modern apparatuses.

Apuleius (*Apol. 10*) provides the information that 'Perilla' was Ticidas' pen-name for Metella. Others, as this passage shows, subsequently wrote of her under her real name. Lines 437 f. should be understood: *et ei quorum libris Metella, modo Perillae nomine* (sc. *a Ticida*) *dissimulata, nunc suo nomine legitur*. Luck hallucinates: 'Metella, die bisher unter einem Pseudonym in den Dichtungen ihrer Liebhaber erschien, tritt jetzt selbst als Dichterin auf'.

2. 557–60

atque utinam revoces animum paulisper ab ira
et vacuo iubeas hinc tibi pauca legi,
pauca, quibus prima surgens ab origine mundi
in tua deduxi tempora, Caesar, opus!

‘Wenige Worte, mit denen ich das Werk vom Urbeginn der Welt an bis in deine Zeit geführt habe, Caesar!’ For Luck, then, the few words are the entire fifteen Books of the *Metamorphoses*. Others have understood them to be the conclusion of the fifteenth Book, but nobody seems to realize that *surgens* is neuter, not masculine; this despite *Am.* 1. 1. 27 *sex mihi surget opus numeris* and *Fast.* 5. 111 *ab Iove surgat opus*, both cited by Owen.

3. 6. 5–8

isque erat usque adeo populo testatus, ut esset
paene magis quam tu quamque ego notus, amor,
quique est in caris animi tibi candor amicis,
cognitus est illi, quem colis ipse, viro.

7 quique est *MG² A pl.*: quique erat *P_a T*: qui fuit *K* 8 cognita sunt *M* illi *EO_oX (pl.)*: isti *F al.*: ipsi *MN pl.* viro] deo *Heinsius*: Iovi *Housman*

‘Subest etiamnum aliquid mendi his versibus’ (7–8). Modern editors are more easily satisfied than Heinsius but understand the Latin no better. Luck for example takes *candor* as the subject of *cognitus est*. The subject of *cognitus est* is *amor* and *qui est tibi candor* = *pro tuo candore*. For the idiom see Kühner–Stegmann, ii. 314, where the only verse example quoted is *Hor. Sat.* 1. 9. 54 f. *quae tua virtus, | expugnabis*. Ovid uses it freely (*Pont.* 1. 7. 59, 1. 9. 27, 2. 2. 21, 4. 9. 61; *K.* adds *Her.* 1. 75, 17. 29). The person whom Ovid is addressing was much too good a friend (for *candor* cf. *Pont.* 2. 5. 5) to have concealed his affection for Ovid from the Emperor.

3. 7. 27–30

forsitan exemplo, quia me laesere libelli,
tu quoque sis poenae *facta ruina* meae.
pone, Perilla, metum; tantummodo femina nulla
neve vir a scriptis discat amare tuis.

28 *facta N pl.*: fata *nonnulli codd.* *Heinsii* ruina *G² KT pl.*: secuta *NO*

Luck obelizes *sis...meae*. The fault clearly lies with *ruina* (*secuta*), presumably an interpolation. Sense seems to require something like *tu quoque sis poenae <pallida> facta meae*.

3. 12. 1 f.

Frigora iam Zephyri minuunt, annoque peracto
longior antiquis *visa Maeotis* hiems.

longior *G pl.*: tardior *PP_a X (pl.)* antiquis *G pl.*: antiqua *BPX (pl.)* Tomitis *Lachmann*

Luck obelizes *antiquis visa maeotis*, but I see nothing against *antiquis* = *prioribus*, as in 4. 10. 94 *antiquas miscueratque comas* et sim. *visa* is certainly wrong. The Pontic winter not only seemed longer, it actually was longer than the Italian. Perhaps *longior antiquis versa Tomitis hiems*. For *versa* (*est*) cf. *Virg. Aen.* 5. 626 *septima post Troiae excidium iam vertitur aestas*, *Stat. Theb.* 3. 33 *sub occiduas versae iam noctis habenas*. There was an old reading mentioned by Heinsius *longior a vobis versa Maeotis hiems*.

4. 3. 41

spiritus hic *per te* patrias exisset in aurasper te *MN pl.*: pro te *B,Q*

No more time should be wasted on *per te*. Luck's apparatus has room for *prope te* (Heinsius) but (like others) none for *certe* (Burman), which is obviously right ('*melius fortasse cum Burmanno: certe*' de Jonge). So Prop. 2. 26 B. 23 *certe isdem nudi pariter iactabimur oris*; and cf. 4. 2. 64 *sic certe in patria per breve tempus ero*, Met. 11. 441 *certe iactabimur una*.

4. 5. 31 f.

sic iuvenis similisque tibi sit natus, et illum
moribus agnoscat quilibet esse tuum.

The position of *iuvenis* and the presence of *-que* discountenance translations like 'dein jugendlicher Sohn soll dir ähnlich sein'; and if the son was already a young man, the wish should have been well on the way to fulfilment. He was probably a young child, and Ovid prays that he may grow to manhood (*iuvenescat*; cf. Met. 9. 431), as Heinsius (*sic superet*) saw.

4. 6. 45 f.

urbis abest facies, absunt, mea cura, sodales,
et, qua nulla mihi carior, uxor abest.

To tell his adored wife that he loves no woman better than her is a strangely conservative tribute. Hence Heinsius conjectured *nemo* for *nulla* (cf. Luck, 'die liebste von allen') or, alternatively, *et mihi qua nil est carius*. I suspect that Ovid meant *qua (cura) nulla (cura)*, but if so he was not writing at his best.

4. 7. 7 f.

cur, quotiens alicui chartae sua vincula dempsi,
illam speravi nomen habere tuum?

Again de Jonge manages to keep awake: 'Quae enim est vis vocabulorum *cur... speravi?* sunt qui rem expedire conati sunt interpretando: *speravi* = frustra *speravi*. sed ignoro hanc significationem verbi *sperare*.' But his own interpretation '*cur... etiam atque etiam (vel identidem) speravi illam tuum nomen habiturum (sic)*' hardly saves the day. Was not *frustra speravi* (or *speravi frustra* (K.)), what Ovid wrote (cf. Her. 11. 121 *o frustra miserae sperate sorori*)?

4. 8. 13 f.

haec mea sic quondam peragi speraverat aetas;
hos ego sic annos ponere dignus eram.

haec is ambiguous and variously understood. Read *hanc*? *hanc aetatem* (= *senectutem*) *sic peragi quondam speraverat mea aetas* (= *ego iuvenis*). For the construction cf. Met. 2. 294 f. *circumspice utrumque: fumat uterque polus*, 12. 154 *sacra tulere suam, pars est data cetera mensis* and the reading proposed in my note on Justin praef. 4 (Phoenix 34 (1980), 227) *simul ut otii mei, cuius et Cato reddendam [operam] putat, apud te ratio constaret*. Perhaps it is less unusual than I had thought.

5. 1. 19–24

atque utinam numero non nos essemus in isto!
 ei mihi, cur umquam Musa iocata mea est? 20
 sed dedimus poenas, Scythique in finibus Histri
 ille pharetrati lusor Amoris abest.
 quod superest, numeros ad publica carmina flexi,
 et memores iussi nominis esse sui.

23 numeros *Ehwald*: animos *GA*: socios *G² DKT pl.* 24 sui *GAP_u*: mei *G² DKT pl.* *distichon del. Bentley*

For some reason 23 f. has confounded interpreters. 'For the rest (i.e. following my love-poetry), I turned my numbers to public songs', namely the *Fasti*. Cf. 2. 547–50:

ne tamen omne meum credas opus esse remissum,
 saepe dedi nostrae grandia vela rati.
 sex ego Pastorum scripsi totidemque libellos,
 cumque suo finem mense volumen habet.

'I ordered them to be mindful of their name', that is to observe the dignity and propriety appropriate thereto. Ovid thinks, no doubt, of another sense of *Fasti*, 'register of higher magistrates'.

5. 2. 23–7

litora quot conchas, quot amoena rosaria flores,
 quotve soporiferum grana papaver habet,
 silva feras quot alit, quot piscibus unda natatur, 25
 quot tenerum pennis aera pulsat avis,
 tot premor adversis.

'Soviel... Vögel die weiche Luft mit ihrem Gefieder schlagen.' That is what was to have been expected, as in *Pont.* 2. 7. 27 *et quot aves motis nitantur in aere pennis*; but the text, which seems to be sound, provides something different. The presumably deliberate asymmetry is worth noting.

5. 7b. 65 f.

sic animum tempusque traho *mecumque* reduco
 a contemplatu summoveoque mali.

mecumque G² V al.: me sicque *AER al.*: sic meque *D*: meque ipse *KT pl.*: *memeque Housman*: *sensumque Luck*

Luck's proposal seems right in the main, but I doubt that *sensus* can be withdrawn from contemplation. Why not *mentemque*? Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 6. 2. 5 *vis adferenda est et ab ipsa veri contemplatione abducenda mens*, Cic. *Cat.* 4. 3 *neque meam mentem non domum saepe revocat exanimata uxor*.

5. 8. 9

exigit at dignas ultrix Rhamnusia poenas

at *AB_n DL_r T pl.*: ad *EKL_o*: a *GHPV al.*: ah *Heinsius*

So Luck. According to the *Thesaurus* postponed *at* is not found in Ovid.

5. 9. 33–6

ne tamen officio memoris laedaris amici,
 parebo iussis – parce timere – tuis.

at non parerem, si non meminisse putarer: 35
hoc quod non prohibet vox tua, gratus ero.

35 si non *AHPTV* pl.: nisi non *K al.*, *Broukhusius*: nisi me *DO_d* putarer *Landi*: putares *N pl.*: vetares *Broukhusius*

So Luck. But his translation, backed by a reference to *Pont.* 4. 6. 45 ff. in the commentary, implies something else: 'aber ich würde nicht gehorchen, verbötest du mir, daran zu denken'. No doubt this was what Ovid meant. He will have written *si me meminisse vetares* (or possibly *si non meminisse iuberet*).

5. 12. 55 f.

omnia barbariae loca sunt vocisque ferinae,
omnia quae possint plena timore soni.

55 barbariae *GHPV* pl.: barbaricae *AD²*, *Merkel* 56 omnia quae possint *GAB_n HL_r V al.*: omnia quae possunt *DL_n L_o al.*: omnia barbarici *E_t T al.*: omnia sunt getici *K al.*: omniaque hostilis *Merkel*

Luck obelizes the entire couplet, a needlessly Draconian measure. The fault lies in *quae possint*, for which *Merkel*'s conjecture gives excellent sense; but *infensi* sounds better to me. 'F' misread as 'P' may have started the corruption.

Epistulae ex Ponto

1. 9. 43–6

carmina iure damus raros testantia mores,
ut tua venturi nomina, Celse, legant.
hoc est quod possum Geticis tibi mittere ab arvis;
hoc solum est istic quod licet esse meum.

istic (46) is commonly (whether universally, I cannot be sure) taken to mean 'in Tomis'. It means 'in Rome', as in 2. 10. 52 (*hoc solum habeo quod Romae esse licet*). Némethy, followed by Luck in his Artemis Verlag edition of 1963, reads *mei*, which seems unnecessary.

2. 2. 89 f.

hanc colet ante diem qua, quae decreta merenti,
venit honoratis laurea digna comis.

qua, quae is Owen's correction of *quamque* or *quamquam*. No one seems to have corrected *ante*, which cannot mean *ante omnes* or *ante omnia*. Perhaps *ille*?

2. 3. 33–8

te nihil exacto nisi nos peccasse fatentem
sponte sua probitas officiumque iuvat.
iudice te mercede caret per seque petenda est 35
externis virtus incommitata bonis.
turpe putas abigi, quia sit miserandus, amicum,
quodque sit infelix, desinere esse tuum.

33 exacto *B²*: -tos *Ehwald* nos *AB¹ DT*: uos *C*: me *B²*: non *Burman* fatemur *B¹*: petentem *Faber*

33 is gibberish. I think Ovid says that all Cotta wants of his friends is that they should do nothing to make him feel that he had been mistaken in his choices: *te nihil ex iuncto nisi non peccasse petentem*. He does not cast them off because they are unfortunate.

For *iuncto* cf. 2. 5. 43 *tu comes antiquus, tu primis iunctus ab annis*, *ibid.* 59 *ingeniis aliqua est concordia iunctis*, 4. 3. 11 f. *vetusta | paene puer puero iunctus amicitia* et sim. For *peccasse* cf. *Liv.* 29. 37. 14 *neque infitiri possent aut iudicio semel aut comitiis bis ab se peccatum esse*.

2. 4. 15–18

quod tu laudaras, populo placuisse putabam.
hoc pretium curae dulce regentis erat.
utque meus lima rasmus liber esset amici,
non semel admonitu facta litura tuo est.

16 regentis *AD*: recentis *BC*: monentis *T*

Ovid's confidence in Atticus' good judgement can hardly be described as the latter's reward. Neither did Ovid emend what he had written for the sake of accepting his friend's criticisms.

quod tu laudaras, populo placuisse putabam, 15
nec semel admonitu facta litura tuo est; 18
utque meus lima rasmus liber esset amici, 17
hoc pretium curae dulce regentis erat. 16

The only reward Atticus wanted was the consciousness of having been of service to a friend. 18, by the way, is echoed in 4. 12. 26 *saepe tibi admonitu facta litura meo est*.

2. 7. 77 f.

sustineas ut onus, nitendum vertice pleno est;
aut, flecti nervos si patiere, cades.

pleno *AB*¹ *C*: recto *B*² *DT*

recto looks like an emendation by somebody who, unlike modern editors, found a difficulty in understanding *pleno* as 'stiff'. But a man with a load on his head (surely not the usual Roman way, though the women of Tomis carried water so: 3. 8. 12) is not likely to fall if he relaxes his muscles; the load will drop off. On the other hand, if he relaxes them while carrying a load on his back, *prono vertice*, fall he will.

2. 9. 43 f.

non tibi Cassandreu pater est gentisque Pheraeae,
quive repertorem torruit arte sua

gentisque *A*: gent || sue *B*¹: gentisque *C*: genitorue *B*² *T*: durusue *D* pheraeae *A*: caphareus *B*² in *ras.*, *CDT*

The two tyrants in the hexameter are Apollodorus of Cassandria and Alexander of Pherae, called *Pheraeus* in *Ibis* 321. As a periphrasis of *Pheraeus*, *gentisque Pheraeae* is acceptable, if not particularly elegant. But the manuscripts seem to favour *Pheraeus* (on the untrustworthiness of *A* see André, p. xl; *ca* in *caphareus* will come from *cass-*). If the original was *torvusue Pheraeus*, the reduction of *torvusue* to *torue* might set off a train of corruption (*dirusue* or *saevusue* are also possibilities, but note *genitorue* in *T*).

3. 1. 43–6

magna tibi imposita est nostris persona libellis:
coniugis exemplum diceris esse bonae.
hanc cave degeneres. ut sint praeconia nostra
vera, vide famae quod tuearis opus.

opus has been defended by false parallels: 3. 4. 5 f. *est opus exiguum vestrisque paratibus impar*: | *quale tamen cumque est, ut tueare rogo* and 4. 1. 28 *quod fecit, quisque tuetur opus*. Whereas Heinsius' certain and now commonly neglected correction *onus* (repeated by Némethy) is genuinely paralleled in *Tr.* 3. 4b. 16 *impositumque sibi firma tuetur onus*.

4. 1. 23–6

numquam pigra fuit nostris tua gratia rebus,
nec mihi munificas arca negavit opes.
nunc quoque nil subitis *clementia* territa fatis
auxilium vitae fertque feretque meae.

clementia ('ta bonté' André) is inept. Ovid had not injured Sex. Pompeius, so the latter's 'clemency' could not be intimidated by Ovid's downfall. The right word is *constantia*: cf. 2. 3. 69 *movit amicitiae tum te constantia longae*. In *Tr.* 4. 9. 3 *nostraque vincetur lacrimis clementia seris*, | *fac modo te pateat paenituisse tui* I think *constantia* would be a better answer than the nebulous *sententia* (Alton).

4. 6. 35–8

hostibus eveniat quam sis violentus in armis
sentire et linguae tela subire tuae,
quae tibi tam tenui cura limantur ut omnes
istius ingenium *corporis* esse negent.

Was Brutus then a *salaputium disertum*? Or a clumsy elephant of a man? Whatever the implication of *corporis*, it is in impossibly bad taste. Ovid wrote *nominis*. For the play on the name 'Brutus' cf. Cic. *Att.* 6. 1. 25, 14. 14. 2, also 4. 16. 17 *ingeniique sui dictus cognomine Largus*. On confusion of dactylic words see, as always, Housman on Manil. 1. 416, and now Diggle, loc. cit. pp. 404 f.

Harvard University

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY