

bring himself to render the word twice and in 15 he translates with 'table'. *Mensam* would in fact not be a bad conjecture, especially since it has a number of letters in common with the jarring *cenam*, and might in fairness be attributed to Ker. Nevertheless, I propose *lectum* instead. It seems to me superior in that the table might have had up to seven more guests around it. But if the pest pursues Martial to the same couch and reclines beside him, there is truly no relief except escape (whether Martial describes himself as *edentem* or *sedentem* makes no difference). At any rate, editors who print *cenam* a second time ought to say how it pulls its weight.

King's College London

ROLAND MAYER

HYDRA REDUNDANS (OVID, *HEROIDES* 9.95)

Deianira complains that Hercules, as a slave of Omphale, did not refrain from telling to the Lydian queen his famous labours; among them, the Hydra:

quaeque redundabat fecundo vulnere serpens
fertilis et damnis dives ab ipsa suis (Ov. *Her.* 9.95f.)

'It will be admitted that *redundabat*, which usually means to "overflow"' can only be applied to the Hydra by a very strong metaphor; but it is not only a strong one, it is quite unexampled': so A. Palmer in *The Academy* 49 (1896), 160. But his own emendation *rebellabat* has not convinced anybody – rightly, as I think.¹ Still, his remark was not otiose: *redundabat* refers to the 'growing again' of Hydra's heads, that seem to 'spring' from the wounds like water's spurts; it is not impossible, but nevertheless it *is* strange.² Why does Ovid use this metaphor 'a fluctibus desumpta' (Burman) here? I suggest that there is a precise reason: Ovid does not mention the name of the *serpens*, but of course his reader knows it and also knows why the Hydra is so called: ἀπὸ τῶν ὑδάτων. If the verb *redundare* refers only by force to the monstrous snake, it is on the contrary very suitable for the rationalistic interpretation of that snake: the Hydra was regarded as the personification of the Lernaean marsh and its heads symbolized the numerous springs of the marsh:³ cf. especially Servius ad *Aen.* 6.287 'sed constat hydram locum fuisse evomentem aquas, vastantes vicinam civitatem, in qua uno meatu clauso multi erumpebant: quod Hercules videns loca ipsa exussit et sic aquae clausit meatus; nam hydra ab aqua dicta est'; schol. ad Stat. *Theb.* 1.384 'si veram quaeramus historiam, Lerna palus fuit, quae cum frequenter siccaretur ac denuo impleretur aquis, Hercules deprehendit venas terrae incendio posse praecludi atque ideo, postquam exhaustit eam, ignem adhibuit, et si qua unda prorumpibat, obstruxit'. The ambiguity between the realistic and the allegorical side of the story is well preserved by *serpens*: the verb *serpere* is frequently applied to streams of water.⁴ Furthermore, this distich offers the first example of a kind of paradoxical expression that will have a great fortune in Latin poetry: the joke on the

¹ Palmer adduced Ov. *Met.* 9.81 'tauro mutatus membra rebello' (not really pertinent), and he attributed great importance to the reading of cod. P, *redulabat* (according to him: H. Dörrie [Berlin/New York 1971] does not notice anything in his app.; Heinsius read ... *elulabat*, 'forte pro *resultabat*'; H. Keil, ap. R. Ehwald [Leipzig 1888], praef. xix, *nudulabat*); but cf. Housman, *CR* 13 (1899), 175 = *CP* 2.475. In the same number of *The Academy*, p. 180, R. J. Walker suggested *repullabat*.

² *OLD* s.v. 8 does not provide any relevant parallel for this absolute use of *redundo*.

³ cf. Roscher 1.2.2770.31ff., *RE* 9.1.48.34ff.

⁴ cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.598, *Trist.* 3.10.30, Tib. 1.7.14, Luc. 1.215, 9.974, Stat. *Silv.* 4.3.91; for ἔρπω, cf. Call. fr. 43.42 Pf., Dion. Per. 222, 496, *AP* 9.362.2, Nonn. *Dion.* 6.341, 23.165.

'fertility' of Hydra (cf. *fecundo vulnere, fertilis*).⁵ Now, this joke sounds much more interesting and paradoxical, if *redundabat* has just reminded us that the *serpens...fertilis* can actually be regarded as nothing but the *sterile* Lernaean marsh.

St John's College, Oxford/Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa SERGIO CASALI

⁵ cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.70 'vulneribus fecunda suis', Germ. 543 'fecundam...hydram', Sen. *H.F.* 529 'colla feracia', 781 'fecunda...capita', *H.O.* 258, 1292, *Ag.* 835 'morte fecundo...dracone', Mart. 9.101.9.

OCTAVIAN AND ORESTES IN PAUSANIAS

M. J. Dewar¹ argues that in Georg. 1.511–4 Virgil may have been drawing a disquieting parallel between Orestes, evoked through an imitation of Aeschylus ('Choeph.' 1021–5), and Octavian, present a few lines above (498ff.).

Pausanias probably supports this suggestion; he shows that the link Octavian–Orestes existed quite early and in a sense favourable to Octavian, even though it may soon have been used in a negative sense by anti-Caesarian propaganda on account of the dark side of the myth. In front of the temple of Hera in Argos there was still visible in the second century a statue representing Orestes, but identified by the inscription as Augustus.² Certainly this parallel Augustus–Orestes was not proposed – and preserved – with polemical purpose in a famous sanctuary and in the Augustan age. Given the resemblance between history and myth and the moral weight of the famous myth itself, it is unlikely that we have to do with the mere re-use of any old statue.

The inscription was most probably engraved during the life of Augustus, probably soon after the vengeance taken at Philippi against the murderers of his 'father' Julius Caesar (42 B.C.). Actually Pausanias says 'the emperor Augustus' (name after 27 B.C.), but he probably wants to be understood readily, and does not quote from the inscription itself.

Rome

NATALE CECIONI

¹ 'Octavian and Orestes in the Finale of the First Georgic', *CQ* 38 (1988), 563–5; 'Octavian and Orestes again', *CQ* 40 (1990), 580–82.

² Paus. 2, 17, 3; see Frazer's commentary (1898) *ad loc.* and 1, 18, 3 about reconversions of ancient statues in favour of living personalities.

A TEXTUAL NOTE ON GALEN, *ON THE POWERS OF FOODSTUFFS* I 1.3 (P. 202.17 HELMREICH)

In *De alimentorum facultatibus*, Book I, Ch. 1, Galen begins his discussion of the powers of foodstuffs by a rough sketch of the opinions of earlier physicians on this subject. He says that according to some of them these powers are only known (*ἐγνώσθαι*) on the basis of experience (*πειρα*), according to others on the basis of a combination of experience and reasoning (*λογισμός*), whereas a third group gave priority of importance to reasoning (202.4–6 Helmreich). Galen proceeds to say that there is considerable disagreement between these physicians on the topic in question and that, consequently, an unbiased testing of their opinions is necessary; this testing should operate by means of argumentation (*ἀπόδειξις*). Now there are two different starting-points for argumentation, i.e. perception and 'distinct thinking' (*ἡ γὰρ ἐξ αἰσθήσεως ἢ ἐκ νοήσεως ἐναργούς*). Then the text printed by Helmreich runs as