

IV

In his account of 194 B.C. Livy (34.44.6–8) returns to Pleminius and recounts the same story as Clodius Licinus, but without reference to book 29. Now 29.22.7–9 and 34.44.6–8 will continue to duplicate and contradict each other even if we remove 29.22.10, and such doublets and contradictions are found elsewhere in Livy's work;³³ but a telling point can still be made in favour of excision: one would have expected 34.44.6–8, like other such material relating to events at Rome, to come from one of Livy's normal annalistic sources (presumably either Claudius Quadrigarius or Valerius Antias).³⁴ If this supposition is correct, then this passage shows that when Livy came to describe the fate of Pleminius in book 29 he had no need to look beyond his usual sources of information.³⁵

Future editors would therefore be unwise to regard Livy as the author of 29.22.10.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge

S. P. OAKLEY

³³ See e.g. P. G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (1961), pp. 147–8.

³⁴ Briscoe *ad loc.* takes a different view: 'L. here follows the version of Clodius Licinus'; but he himself had thought it likely that the preceding passage (34.44.5) came from Antias. T. P. Wiseman, *Phoenix* 27 (1973), 195, optimistically held that Clodius Licinus was the source not just of 34.44.6–8 but also of Asc. *Corn.* pp. 55–6. We may suspect that Clodius Licinus and Livy both took their information from the annalistic tradition.

³⁵ Two further arguments of lesser force may be presented in a footnote. Luchs (*loc. cit.* [n. 3]; cf. also W. S. Teuffel, *A History of Roman Literature* [trans. W. Wagner, 1873], i.510, Holzapfel, *op. cit.* [n. 18], 62, and Cichorius, *op. cit.* [n. 18], 78) observed that the precision of the reference to Clodius Licinus is very uncharacteristic of Livy; but this cannot be used as a powerful argument for deletion in view of a parallel which he overlooked at 45.25.3: 'ipsius (sc. Catonis) oratio scripta exstat, Originum quinto libro inclusa'. Nevertheless, the case of Cato is perhaps somewhat different, since he is an author who features in Livy primarily as an historical character. Likewise the isolated reference to Clodius Licinus, though surprising, is not in itself a strong enough reason to justify excision, since there are unique references to Silenus (26.49.3) and Rutilius (39.52.1). Both these, however, were more considerable figures than Clodius Licinus.

CHASSEZ LA FEMME

Ipsa quoque et cultu est et nomine femina Virtus:
 non mirum, populo si placet illa suo.
 (nec tamen hae mentes nostra poscuntur ab arte; 25
 conueniunt cumbae uela minora meae.
 nil nisi lasciui per me discuntur amores:
 femina praecipiam quo sit amanda modo.)
 femina nec flammas nec saeuos discutit arcus;
 parcius haec uideo tela nocere uiris. 30

Ovid, *Ars amatoria* 3.23–30

Femina in line 28 has nagged me subconsciously for years. I have now belatedly realized that it sabotages the poet's prudent disclaimer: it is not women in general who are in question, but only those not ruled out of bounds by *stola* and *uittae*. The repetition of the word in the following verse, where it means, as the opposition to *uiri* indicates, 'the female sex', only serves to underline its inappropriateness here. Cristante's defence of the anaphora, that it 'ribadisce la necessità dell'insegnamento, introducendone la giustificazione' (*Ovidio, L'arte di amare*, ed. E. Pianezzola [1991], p. 352), sets up an unwanted connection: lines 25–8 are strictly parenthetical to the main argument, as indeed is signalled by the truly functional anaphora of *femina* in line 29,

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.