

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.<sup>8</sup>

Penn State University

ALLAN KERSHAW

<sup>8</sup> 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

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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:<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> 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*.

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

<sup>3</sup> cf. Roscher 1.2.2770.31ff., *RE* 9.1.48.34ff.

<sup>4</sup> 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.