

whose effect is blurred in the text as transmitted. The form of the couplet, typical of Ovid, dictates that what is wanted is a variation on *nil nisi lasciui*, e.g. *nec* or, better, *non proba*. The source of the intrusive *femina* is not far to seek, though how precisely it ousted the original reading I do not pretend to guess.

Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

TWO CONJECTURES IN OVID'S *METAMORPHOSES*¹

I

In 4.621–6, Ovid describes Perseus' flight over the known world:

inde per inmensum ventis discordibus actus
nunc huc, nunc illuc exemplo nubis aquosae
fertur et ex alto seductas aequare longe
despectat terras totumque supervolat orbem;
ter gelidas Arctos, ter Cancri brachia vidit:
saepe sub occasus, saepe est ablatus in ortus. 625

623 aequare βLM¹PUv aethere EM²N²We: *Perseus despectat terras Africae interioris, quae sunt a mari longe remotae*

The most obvious sign of difficulty in 623 is the fact that Anderson provides one of his infrequent exegetical notes. Nearly every other editor prefers *aethere*,² and *aequare* is clearly the *lectio difficilior*. I think that Anderson is quite right to reject *aethere*. The distribution of variants strongly suggests that it is not the reading of the paradosis: although the MSS. are fairly evenly divided between *aequare* and *aethere*, later MSS. and second hands prefer the latter. This fact, along with its difficulty, are themselves points in favour of *aequare*: *aethere* provides smoother sense, and so provides no clue as to why anyone would ever have altered it to *aequare*. On the other hand, Anderson's interpretation of *aequare* is unsatisfactory. Ovid provides no hint as to which land far from the sea he means: Anderson appears to have settled on Africa as the most plausible because parts of it are far from the sea and because Perseus' next stop is his visit with Atlas. But an allusion to Africa destroys the symmetry of the passage. With *nunc huc*, *nunc illuc* before, and *totum... orbem* and specific references to each of the four cardinal points after, what comes between should surely be similarly generalized: given Ovid's fondness for theme and variation, we would expect the phrase to be some equivalent of *totum... orbem*.

One final point against *aethere* is that it is otiose, since *ex alto* by itself can mean 'from on high', as in *A.A.* 1.633 (*Iuppiter ex alto periuria ridet amantum*). This fact is the key which solves the problem: in our passage *ex alto* is complete in itself, *aethere* is a banalizing interpolation, perhaps a reminiscence of 1.80–1, *aequare* is instrumental rather than ablative, and the participle is reciprocal. Perseus 'looks down from on high at lands far separated (from each other) by the sea', lands on all sides of the Mediterranean.

Although this meaning can be extracted from the text Anderson prints, I suggest that the participle should be *diductas* rather than *seductas*. In general, *seducere* is used

¹ Texts and pertinent selections of the apparatus are taken from W. S. Anderson's Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1977).

² H. Magnus (*P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon Libri XV* [Berlin, 1914]) prints *aethere*, but honours *aequare* with a *fortasse recte* and a cross-reference to 1.22 in his apparatus. While this was at the Press I learnt (what I should have known before) that *aequare* had been defended by C. Grilka in *Res Publica Litterarum* 6 (1983), 143–4; many of my particular points and emphases complement his.

for the separation of one thing from one or more others, *diducere* for the separation of two or more things from each other. That is, *diducere* is the reciprocal equivalent of *seducere*, and that is precisely what is needed in our passage. The rule is not absolute, and there are parallels, some of them Ovidian, for reciprocal *seducere*.³ However, it seems to me that *seductas* would be misleadingly ambiguous in our passage: we need a word that is definitely, not just possibly, reciprocal in meaning, to provide a hint to the reader on how to understand *ex alto* and *aequore*. As M. L. West puts it, 'the defender of the text... asks "could these words bear the required meaning?"' instead of "would the meaning have been expressed in these words?"'.⁴ If Ovid wrote *seductas*, he was asking to be misread in just the way he has been misread for centuries (assuming, for the moment, that my interpretation is correct).

The change proposed is palaeographically easy, and could be explained in either of two ways. Forms of *diducere* are corrupted more often than not to the equivalent forms of *deducere*: none of the five or six instances in Ovid lacks early variants.⁵ If that had happened here, the resulting nonsensical text would have invited correction to the commoner *seductas* rather than the rarer *diductas*. We might also attribute the error to the substitution of near-synonyms, since *seducere* approaches *diducere* in sense. Finally, any reader who is convinced that *seductas* can be used reciprocally in this context without undue confusion is welcome to accept my interpretation while rejecting my conjecture.

II

In 15.337–51, Pythagoras expounds the reciprocal transformations of the four elements. Although the difficulties I wish to examine are confined to 244–5, the context is important, and I will quote the whole passage:

haec quoque non perstant, quae nos elementa uocamus:
 quasque uices peragant, (animos adhibete) docebo.
 quattuor aeternus genitalia corpora mundus
 continet. ex illis duo sunt onerosa suoque
 pondere in inferius, tellus atque unda, feruntur,
 et totidem grauitate carent nulloque premente
 alta petunt, aer atque aere purior ignis.
 quae quamquam spatio distant, tamen omnia fiunt
 ex ipsis et in ipsa cadunt, resolutaque tellus
 in liquidas rarescit aquas, tenuatus in auras
 aeraque umor abit, dempto quoque pondere rursus
 in superos aer tenuissimus emicat ignes.
 inde retro redeunt, idemque retexitur ordo:
 ignis enim densum spissatus in aera transit,
 hic in aquas, tellus glomerata cogitur unda.

244 distant EFPWpr distent Uahnv

³ The *OLD* (s.v. *seduco* 4, 'To draw apart, divide, split') lists eight passages, though the earliest of them (Prop. 2.6.41) is conjectural, and *diducet* seems preferable there, as *diductas* does here. The other seven include *Met.* 13.611, *Fast.* 4.385, and *Her.* 18.142, of which the last is not certainly Ovidian.

⁴ M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart, 1973), p. 59.

⁵ R. J. Deferrari, Sister M. I. Barry and M. R. P. McGuire, in *A Concordance to Ovid* (Washington, 1939), list *Met.* 2.560, 6.405, and 8.588, *Tr.* 1.2.21, and *Ib.* 609, though Anderson prints *deduxit* in *Met.* 6.405. (For the variants in the last two passages, I have consulted J. André's *Budé Tristia* (Paris, 1968) and F. W. Lenz's *Paravia Ibis* (Torino, 1952), since S. G. Owen's Oxford text (1915) is unhelpful on this point.) There is another probable instance in *Am.* 1.7.47, where Kenney reads *diducere*, though the paradosis is unanimous for *deducere*.

There are two problems in 244–45a, the text of the first clause (*quae quamquam spatio distant*) and the meaning of the second (*tamen omnia fiunt / ex ipsis et in ipsa cadunt*). Although no firm conclusions are possible on the second point, it must be covered, and may as well be covered first. In the phrase *omnia fiunt / ex ipsis et in ipsa cadunt*, it is not clear whether *omnia* refers to the whole world or to the four elements. If we follow Bömer and most other commentators and translators, then ‘all *things* are made from *them* [= the elements] and turn back into them’.⁶ If we follow the recent English translators, then ‘all the *elements* are made from *each other* and turn back into each other’.⁷ The latter seems more natural in this context, which describes the elements turning into each other, rather than composite entities breaking down into their constituent elements and then being built up again differently. If *omnia* refers to the elements, we have another instance of Ovidian theme and variation, with 245b–51 spelling out the details implied in 244b–45a. The only problem with the second interpretation is that it involves taking *ex ipsis* and *in ipsa* as reciprocals, and there seems to be no parallel for this in verse. The oblique cases of *ipse* are of course used reflexively (*OLD* s.v. *ipse* 10), and the reflexive pronoun reciprocally (*OLD* s.v. *se*¹ 8), but the reciprocal use of *ipse*, which as it were combines the two, is found only in prose (*TLL* 7.3.306, 11–26), and only with *inter* (several instances), *ab* (once in the Elder Seneca), and *apud* (once in Tacitus). Our passage, with both *ex ipsis* and *in ipsa*, would be doubly unparalleled.

However we decide that question, there is a more serious problem in the previous clause, *quae quamquam spatio distant*. Specifically, I do not see any factual antithesis to justify the verbal one. There is no reason for Pythagoras’ listeners to be surprised (as *quamquam ... tamen* implies) that things in different locations should change into each other. The quoted context shows that change of nature precedes change of location: it could hardly be otherwise, since the elements would have no reason to move if they were already ‘at home’. If the entire universe is made from them, they can hardly all be lumped together in one place, in any case. How and why the elements change is a mystery, at least in Ovid’s version: apparently they do so spontaneously, in a kind of qualitative equivalent of Lucretius’ *clinamen*. The variant *distent* looks like an attempt to help the sense by taking *quamquam* as equivalent to *quamvis*: however far apart they may be, they can still change into each other. Again, since the change occurs spontaneously, and before the movement, there is nothing surprising about that.

It seems to me that it is rather the difference in appearance that makes the interchange of the elements seem unlikely: it is indeed odd that things which look so different and behave so variously as earth, water, air, and fire, should be interchangeable. Consequently, I suggest that *spatio* should be emended to *specie*. The error will have been facilitated by the similarity in many scripts of C to T and of E to O, and by the emphasis on the different places of the elements throughout the remainder of the passage quoted. The fact that *distant* in Ovid is more often local than qualitative,⁸ and that forms of *spatium* and *distare* are found together in five other

⁶ Cf. F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen. Kommentar* (7 vols., Heidelberg, 1969–86), *ad loc.*

⁷ F. J. Miller (Loeb, 1916) translates: ‘These elements, although far separate in position, nevertheless are all derived each from the other, and each into other falls back again.’ This is not changed in G. P. Goold’s revision (1977). A. D. Melville (*Ovid, Metamorphoses* [Oxford, 1986]) translates: ‘Though spaced apart, all issue from each other / And to each other fall.’

⁸ Examples of qualitative *distare* are *Met.* 8.438–9 *discite ... / facta minis quantum distent!*, *Tr.* 2.353 *crede mihi, distant mores a carmine nostro*, and *Tr.* 5.13.34 *meis ut distent tua fata!*

places in Ovid,⁹ will not have helped. The same error has occurred elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses*: *speciosam* has been corrupted to *spatiosam* in one MS. (Vat. lat. 5179) at *Met.* 3.20, and *speciosoque* altered (perhaps deliberately) to *spatiosoque* in another (Anderson's N, as corrected by N²) at *Met.* 11.133.¹⁰

Unfortunately, reading *specie* in line 244 provides no guidance on the meaning of *omnia*, which may still refer either to the whole world or to the four elements. No certainty is possible on this point, and the decision will depend, I imagine, on whether one is more distressed by unnatural interpretations or grammatical exceptions. Not being a lexicographer, I prefer the elements, with *ex ipsis* and *in ipsa* reciprocal, but doubt persists.¹¹

University of Alabama

MICHAEL HENDRY

⁹ These are listed by Bömer *ad loc.*: there is another in *Nux* 75, which, though inauthentic, may still be pertinent to the habits of Ovid's scribes.

¹⁰ Since Anderson reports the reading as 'sp (ati N²) osoque N', it may well be that N² was emending *suo Marte*. However, collation with a lost source cannot be excluded.

¹¹ It may be significant that one of the editors and the anonymous referee split on this point. I wish to thank both of them, and David Kovacs, for their help with this paper, which was not confined to the points on which they are specifically mentioned.

THE NAUTICAL IMAGERY IN *ANTHOLOGIA GRAECA* 10.23

Νικήτης ὀλίγος μὲν ἐπὶ προτόνοισιν ἀήτης
οἷά τε πρηγίης ἄρχεται ἐκ μελέτης,
ἀλλ' ὅταν ἐμπνεύσῃ, κατὰ δ' ἰστία πάντα φέρηται,
λαίφρα πακτώσας μέσσα θέει πελάγῃ
ναῦς ἄτε μυριόφορτος, ἕως ἐπὶ τέρματα μύθων
ἔλθῃ ἀκυμάντους †ἐμπροσθεν† εἰς λιμένας.

In this poem, ascribed to Automedon, Nicetes¹ way of orating is compared first to a light breeze that strikes upon the rigging of a sailing vessel and then, when the breeze has increased to a wind, to the vessel itself as it runs over open water under full sail.

Comparing oratory to a ship under way is a commonplace, as has frequently been pointed out.² But the very special quality of Automedon's nautical imagery, its preciseness and boldness, has escaped all commentators and translators.

Nicetes, says the poet, opens an address as gently as 'a light wind on the forestays'. The forestays are the lines that run from the top of the mast to the prow; ancient ships usually had two. Their function is to hold the mast firmly and so they are fixed permanently in place, are part of the 'standing rigging', to use the sailors' term.³ As the words 'all sail is lowered' in line 3 indicate, Automedon conceives of the ship at

¹ Two eminent rhetors by this name are known, one who lived under Augustus and another, more famous, who lived under Nero or Nerva; see *RE* s.v. Niketes, Nos. 5, 6 (1937). There is no consensus as to which is meant here. E.g. F. Jacobs (*Animadversiones in Epigrammata Anthologiae Graecae*, ii.2 [Leipzig, 1800], p. 137) opts for the later, P. Waltz (*REG* 59–60 [1946–7], 189) for the earlier, L. Radermacher (*RE*, no. 6 [1937]) inclines toward the later, L. Robert (*REG* 94 [1981], 338–9, esp. 339, n. 6) leaves it open between the two, as does E. Borthwick (*CQ* 21 [1971], 434), and Gow–Page (A. Gow and D. Page, *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams* [Cambridge, 1968], ii.187) throws the field wide open ('the name is common and any particular identification will remain speculative').

² E.g. Jacobs (n. 1, above), p. 137, Gow–Page (n. 1, above), ii.187.

³ L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*² (Princeton, 1986), pp. 230, 260.