

means that Aeneas is now based firmly in his *mater antiqua* (cf. 3.96). He is linked to a people, the Etruscans, who, because of the ancestral connection, are his natural allies. The journey of the Trojans to Italy in the *Aeneid* is as much a return, a *nostos*, as it is a new journey. They are Dardanians, and Aeneas is the new Dardanus.<sup>27</sup>

Thus, Vergil's version of events in Italy amplifies the stature and prominence of Turnus. At the same time it stresses Turnus' hostility to the Etruscans, and Aeneas' ancestral links with them. Turnus' Argive ancestry and Aeneas' Etruscan are different sides of the same coin. There is a natural enmity between them in the old world (i.e. Argive [or Danaan] v. Trojan) just as there is in the new world (i.e. Argive/Italian v. Trojan/Etruscan). Vergil establishes a historical continuum in which a new conflict arises almost naturally (with Juno's help) from an old one. Given the different ancestries emphasised within the poem, the 'other Achilles' (6.89) is clearly Turnus, whose Greek connections make the reference all the more pertinent. In the Iliadic context Turnus ends his life like Hector, slain by an Achillean Aeneas; but in the context of the web of racial links which extend throughout the poem itself, Turnus is the new Achilles.

A final and important reference. Aeneas is of course the major figure in Italy who experiences the earlier war at Troy. But another hero in the vicinity endured the Trojan war, and is not keen to go through it all again. This is Diomede, a Greek champion at Troy now dwelling in Argyripa in Daunia. Diomede, an Argive, might have been expected to assist the Rutuli against an old enemy as requested (8.9–10); but he rejects the appeal out of hand (11.252–95). He curses the war at Troy and its aftermath, and praises Aeneas' strength in war. If there were two warriors like Aeneas, says Diomede, the Trojans would have attacked the cities of Inachus, not vice versa:

si duo praeterea talis Idaea tulisset  
terra uiros, ultro Inachias uenisset ad urbes  
Dardanus, et uersis lugeret Graecia fatis.

(11.285–7)

There is an irony in Diomede's reply; for this is in fact the story of what is happening in Italy. The descendants of Dardanus now come and, in a reversal of their fate at Troy, threaten the descendants of Inachus. Aeneas, the new Dardanus, 'returns' to Corythus (7.205–11; 9.10–11) leading the charge against Turnus, the proud descendant of Inachus.<sup>28</sup>

University of Melbourne

C. J. MACKIE

<sup>27</sup> See 3.94–8; 3.167ff.; 7.205ff.; 9.10: on the Etruscans and the *Aeneid*, see J. N. Bremmer and N. Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography*, B.I.C.S. Supplement 52 (London, 1987), 89ff.

<sup>28</sup> I should like to thank the anonymous *CQ* referee for helpful criticisms.

OVID, *ARS AMATORIA* 3.653–6<sup>1</sup>

munera, crede mihi, capiunt hominesque deosque:  
placatur donis Iuppiter ipse datis.  
quid sapiens faciet? stultus quoque munere gaudet:  
ipse quoque accepto munere mutus erit.

The aim of these lines seems to be to demonstrate that everyone has his price. Even Jupiter can be bribed. According to the text as printed above (= O.C.T.), the sequence would then continue: 'What can a wise man do (*sc.* but submit to bribery) when even foolish ones willingly contract to keep quiet?'

<sup>1</sup> In preparing this note I have benefited a very great deal from the suggestions made by the referees appointed by *CQ*.

The logic of this sequence is clearly unsatisfactory: surely it is the foolish who have no choice but to submit to bribery if the wise, including Jupiter, presumably no fool, succumb. What we have is the opposite.

Various attempts have been made to deal with the question.<sup>2</sup> Lenz places 'stultus... gaudet' in parentheses. This helps the overall logical sequence:

653–4 Gifts corrupt gods and men. Jupiter himself can be bought.

655 That being the case, what can the wise man do (Incidentally, the foolish man also delights in bribes)?

656 Once bribed, he too will keep quiet.

This parenthesis seems rather pointless, however. (*Ars* 1.357 which contains another apparently pointless parenthesis with *quoque* does at least anticipate the section beginning 399f. while reminding the reader that medicine, like hunting and fishing, was a common didactic theme – see Hollis *ad loc.*) Generally greater pith is to be looked for in Ovidian asides.

The text favoured by Ehwald, Brandt and Bornecque – 'quod sapiens, faciet stultus quoque: munere gaudens | ipse quoque...' again restores a logical sequence:

653–4 Gifts corrupt gods and men. Jupiter himself can be bought.

655 As the wise man (like Jupiter), so does the foolish.

655–6 Rejoicing in gifts, he too, once bribed, will keep quiet.

Logical though this may be, however, it makes for an unsatisfactorily weak final line (as in fact is also the case with Lenz's text).

Although a definite solution to the puzzle has still to be found, certain observations which might prove eventually helpful can be made.

Lines 653–4 present no difficulty and can therefore be left.

In line 656, it is possible to read *ipse vir* (see Kenney's appendix) as did Burman, dispensing with the clumsy and repetitive *quoque*. This introduces a nice touch of absurd and ironical humour: the *vir* who employs a *custos* to ensure his lady's fidelity is himself open to bribery by those wanting her favours.<sup>3</sup>

Further it introduces a certain edge: one would expect *mutus erit* to apply to the *custos* (cf. *Am.* 2.2.28; 44; 60). Referring to the *vir* it might seem provocative in view of Augustus' moral legislation against adultery: 'mutus erit' would mean 'He will not lodge an official complaint with the authorities'.<sup>4</sup>

Given, then, that reading *ipse vir* makes the pentameter a self-contained and attractive whole, the difficulty in this couplet might be, if not solved, at least confined to the hexameter.

Alternatively, the rather drastic step of deleting lines 655–6 might be considered.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The East Berlin Hamilton MS. Y is of no help in this matter: 655 = Kenney (*munerae*); 656 'quoque... mutis (*sic*)' Y, *mitis* y. See Franco Munari, *Il Codice Hamilton 471 di Ovidio* (Rome, 1965), p. 30.

<sup>3</sup> Compare perhaps *Am.* 3.4.48 where the *vir* is urged not to insist on his rights, but to profit from the presents given to his wife at no expense to himself.

<sup>4</sup> Note Paulus (third century), *Opinions* 2.26.1–17 'It has been decided that a husband who does not at once dismiss his wife whom he has taken in adultery can be prosecuted as a pander'; cf. Justinian, *Digest* 48.5.1 pr. 'This law was introduced by the divine Augustus... The crime of pandering is included in the Julian law of adultery, as a penalty has been prescribed against a husband who profits pecuniarily by the adultery of his wife; as well as one who retains his wife after she has been taken in adultery' – taken from Lefkowitz and Fant, *Women's Life in Greece and Rome* (Baltimore, 1985), p. 182.

<sup>5</sup> Deletion is, for instance, suggested at *Ars* 3.433–8 by R. J. Tarrant, *PCPhS* 206 (1980), 85–8. I would, as it happens, oppose this deletion, although tentatively accepting Kenney's transposition of 435–6 to follow 454 (Tarrant, *op. cit.*, p. 88 n. 8). My arguments, too lengthy

Such a deletion would provocatively juxtapose Jupiter and the *custos*, while giving greater point to *sed semel* in 657 'sed semel est custos longum redimendus in aevum': Jupiter receives frequent and repeated offerings, but the way to deal with a *custos* is to buy him once and for all. Further, after *homines deosque* in 653, there is no need to sub-divide humanity into 'sapientes' and 'stulti'. Then too, the force of *Iuppiter ipse* (654) is somewhat weakened by a second *ipse* in line 656. And finally, 655 appears to me the sort of line that an interpolator might write, as indeed is 656 with *ipse quoque*.

Hampton School, Middlesex

T. J. LEARY

to reproduce here, can be found *ad loc.* in 'Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 3.101–498: an Introduction and Commentary' (unpublished Oxford M.Litt. dissertation, Trinity 1989). Tarrant cites as other instances of interpolation in the *Ars* 1.585–8 and 2.669–74.

The omission of 656 in two MSS. should probably not be allowed to influence arguments for deletion here.

## NOTES ON SENECA TRAGICUS

### *Agamemnon* 545

tandem occupata rupe furibundum intonat  
superasse nunc se pelagus atque ignes iuuat  
uicisse caelum Palladem fulmen mare. 545

545 nunc se *A*, nunc *E*

Ajax is the subject of *intonat*, but little else is certain. Various punctuations are on offer, and even the authenticity of lines 545 and 546 is questioned; the difficulties are set out in Professor Tarrant's commentary (Cambridge, 1976). My concern is focused solely on 545 and the word *nunc*, printed in the text of the recent Oxford Classical Text and obelized by Professor Zwierlein. I suggest that the original word in this part of the line was *saeuum*, a standing epithet of the sea. Written *seuum*, its initial syllable might have disappeared through haplography; that would have left *uum* to be transformed into something else. *E* came up with a word close to the *ductus*, *nunc*; the *A*-tradition added *se* either to mend the metre or perhaps to indicate (by superscription?) the omitted syllable. If *saeuum* is a plausible emendation, we might at least keep 545 as a piece of direct speech introduced by *intonat*, exactly as at *Phaed.* 1065 *magnum intonat*.

### *Troades* 584

Propone flammas, uulnera et diras mali  
doloris artes et famem et saeuam sitim  
uariasque pestes undique et ferrum inditum  
uisceribus ipsis, carceris caeci luem... 584

585 ipsis *Wertis*: istis *E*, ustis *A*, his et *Williams apud Fantham*

Andromache defies Ulysses. But what does she mean by *ferrum*? Two interpretations are currently available, to which I shall add a third.

The common view appears to be that *ferrum* refers to a sword (so in addition to Zwierlein, M. Billerbeck, *Senecas Tragödien. Sprachliche und stilistische Untersuchungen* [*Mnemosyne* supplement 105, 1988], 30–1). It must be an objection to this that a sword thrust up into the guts is not a form of torture. Indeed, it would produce