

A final thought. If *io* is correct in this passage it may be another example of Ovidian playfulness; it would provide a verbal link between two myths whose protagonists have entirely opposing lots: Narcissus, utterly in love with his appearance, tries to embrace it, Io, utterly terrified by her appearance, tries to escape it.⁸

Penn State University

ALLAN KERSHAW

⁸ I thank my colleagues Archibald Allen and Stephen Wheeler for helpful discussion.

LA FEMME RETROUVÉE?

nil nisi lasciui per me discutunt amores:
femina praecipiam quo sit amanda modo.
femina nec flammas nec saeuos discutit arcus.

Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 3.27–9

In *C.Q.* 42 (1992) 551–2 E. J. Kenney impugned the appropriateness of *femina* in 28 on the grounds that it sabotages the poet's disclaimer to be treating not of women generally, but only of women not ruled out of bounds by the *stola* and *uittae*. Hesitantly he proposed to read in its place *non* or *nec proba*. It should be borne in mind that when a word has intruded itself from a nearby line and expelled the authentic reading, the *ductus litterarum* is no guide to emendation. The door stands open to bold measures. I propose to read *Thais*. The name of the famous courtesan well serves as the type with which Ovid proposes to deal. But what advantage has she over, say, Lais or even Phryne, whose names would fit here as well as hers? The answer comes from *Remedia Amoris* 385–6 *Thais in arte mea est: lasciuia libera nostra est; | nil mihi cum uitta; Thais in arte mea est*. Indeed, this distich might have been taken before now to suggest the presence of her name somewhere in the *Ars*, for it looks like the sort of self-reference that Ovid is especially fond of (we recall how he speaks at *A.A.* 2.169–72 of tearing his girlfriend's hair and perhaps her dress, a reference back to *Amores* 1.7, except that there he did not rip her dress; it is a cheat of clever Corinna's to secure a present!). *Thais* does appear at *A.A.* 3.604 *ut sis liberior Thaide, finge metus*, but the line is not as programmatic as the *Remedia* passage suggests its cross-reference is. The earlier part of the third book now in question is programmatic, and we find its language resumed in the *Remedia*. The restoration of *Thais* to 3.28 sharpens the point.

Mr Hollis points out that a word-order more in line with Ovidian practice for the pentameter would be *praecipiam Thais*; the evidence is assembled by M. Platnauer, *Latin elegiac verse* (Cambridge, 1951) 37–8. Nonetheless, the proper name at the head of the line strikes me as more emphatic.

King's College London

ROLAND MAYER

ON MARTIAL 3.44.15

In thermas fugio: sonas ad aurem.
Piscinam peto: non licet natare.
Ad cenam propero: tenes euntem.
Ad cenam uenio: fugas edentem.

15

So far as I can tell from the editions of Friedländer, Gilbert, Izaak, and Shackleton Bailey, no one has questioned or defended the pointless repetition of *cenam* in 15. It is, however, to the credit of the Loeb translator, Walter C. A. Ker, that he could not