the present passage Orcus 'hears'—and so surely arrives—summoned or unsummoned to release the poor man from his toils. It is possible, then, that if Horace imagined Orcus carrying off his victims to the Underworld, he may have thought of Prometheus as scheming to be carried back from it, so that *revexit* would yield reasonable sense. On the whole, however, *revinxit* would seem to be the better choice.[11]

Brooklyn College, CUNY and Penn State University ARCHIBALD ALLEN
archibaldallen@msn.com

[11] Cf. D. West, *Horace. Odes II* (Oxford, 1998), 135 (reading *satelles Orci* = Mercury): '. . . did not unbind, *revinxit*, Prometheus—a typically dense and allusive Horatianism'.

VAIN REPETITIONS? NOTES ON THE TEXT OF OVID, *ARS AMATORIA* 2.593 AND *METAMORPHOSES* 14.240

The two conjectures offered here belong in the same category as one proposed by me many years ago in the text of Ausonius:[1] that of cases where the transmitted reading is not demonstrably faulty but may have ousted one more characteristic of the author.

I

Hoc uetiti uos este: uetat deprensa Dione
insidias illas, quas tulit ipsa, dare. (*Ars Am.* 2.593–4)

On *uetiti . . . uetat*, M. Janka in his commentary on Book 2 of the *Ars* (Heidelberg, 1997) observes; 'die stilistische Gestaltung des Verses mit Allitterationen und Verbalpolyptoton ist auffällig'. Polyptoton is indeed one of Ovid's favourite figures, but this example of it strikes me as being, by Ovidian standards, uncommonly feeble. It is also anomalous: in the standard type of reinforcing polyptoton to which at first sight it seems to belong,[2] a participle is picked up by a finite verb.[3] Here *uetiti . . . este* is imperatival, not participial. Moreover, even if the expression is allowed to pass as an example of the figure, the essential notion of reciprocity[4] is absent.

I am therefore—somewhat belatedly, it must be admitted—moved to wonder whether the general editorial acquiescence in the transmitted text is defensible, and whether what Ovid actually wrote was *hoc moniti uos este: uetat deprensa Dione* eqs.

Admonition is a recurrent feature of Ovid's didactic style: cf. *Ars Am.* 1.387 *hoc unum moneo*, 2.608 *admoneo, ueniat nequis ad illa loquax*, 3.353 *parua monere pudet.*

II

fugientibus instat et agmen
concitat Antiphanes: coeunt et saxa trabesque
coniciunt merguntque uiros merguntque carinas. (*Met.* 14.238–40)

[1] E. J. Kenney, *PCPhS* 22 (1976), 54.

[2] It is much rarer than the reverse type, of which J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion* (Oxford, 1996), 323–5 records over 125 examples.

[3] Ibid. 249.

[4] Cf. Austin on *Aen.* 2.160–1.

The Laestrygonians attack Odysseus' ships. On *mergunt . . . merguntque*, Bömer comments 'Geminatio intensiva', but none of the notes bearing on the subject scattered through his labyrinthine commentary (Heidelberg, 1969–86) offers anything like a real parallel to this instance. Here too the expression strikes me as feeble by Ovidian standards. It might nevertheless be suffered to pass were it not that a glance at his Homeric source[5] suggests otherwise:

οἱ δ' ἀΐοντες
φοίτων ἴφθιμοι Λαιστρυγόνες ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος,
μυρίοι, οὐκ ἄνδρεσσιν ἐοικότες, ἀλλὰ Γίγασιν.
οἵ ῥ' ἀπὸ πετράων ἀνδραχθέσι χερμαδίοισι
βάλλον· ἄφαρ δὲ κακὸς κόναβος κατὰ νῆας ὀρώρει
ἀνδρῶν ὀλλυμένων νηῶν θ' ἅμα ἀγνυμενάων. (Hom. *Od.* 10.118–23)

In the light of ἀγνυμενάων there we may deduce that what he originally wrote was *merguntque uiros franguntque carinas*. Ovid was not one to miss an intertextual trick if there was one to be taken.

The result of the change is to give us what commentators are wont to call *hysteron proteron*, a term that explains nothing. Poets exploited the flexibility of Latin in the matter of word-order: here perhaps a case in which 'the order of importance seems to prevail over that of time'.[6] The men drown as (ἅμα) their ships are shattered beneath them.

Cambridge E. J. KENNEY

[5] To which my attention was drawn by Professor K. Sara Myers's note ad loc. in her commentary on *Met.* 14, now in preparation.

[6] A. J. Bell, *The Latin Dual and Poetic Diction* (London and Toronto, 1923), 271.

BIRDS, FLAMES AND EPIC CLOSURE IN OVID, *METAMORPHOSES* 13.600–20 AND 14.568–80[1]

Perstat, habetque deos pars utraque, quodque deorum est
instar, habent animos; nec iam dotalia regna,
nec sceptrum soceri, nec te, Lavinia virgo,
sed vicisse petunt deponendique pudore
bella gerunt; tandemque Venus victricia nati
arma videt, Turnusque cadit: cadit Ardea, Turno
sospite dicta potens. quam postquam barbarus ensis
abstulit et tepida patuerunt tecta favilla,
congerie e media tum primum cognita praepes
subvolat et cineres plausis everberat alis.
et sonus et macies et pallor et omnia, captam
quae deceant urbem, nomen quoque mansit in illa
urbis, et ipsa suis deplangitur Ardea pennis. (*Met.* 14.568–80)

But the war went on and both sides had their gods to aid them, and, what is as good as gods, they had courage too. And now neither a kingdom given in dowry, nor the sceptre of a father-in-law, nor you, Lavinian maiden, did they seek, but only victory; they kept on warring for sheer shame of giving up. At length Venus saw her son's arms victorious and Turnus fell. Ardea, counted a powerful city while Turnus was alive, fell. But after the foreigner's sword

[1] The Latin text throughout is quoted from W. S. Anderson's Teubner edition, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses* (Leipzig, 1977); the translations are quoted from F. J. Miller (ed. and trans.), *Ovid IV, Metamorphoses IX–XV*, 2nd edn rev. G. P. Goold (Cambridge, MA and London, 1984) with a few changes.