

seems to qualify as the stuff of anyone's favourite anecdote, nor does it show any appreciation of the dramatic impact of the climactic 'Bigob, I t'ought he waz a priest.'

Although he does not actually refer to the term *pius*, which is applied to Aeneas eighteen times in the epic, Clausen seems to have it in mind when he describes the hero as becoming more and more one 'who acts in some other higher interest'.

In considering the anecdote afresh, however, perhaps we should bear in mind another epithet that runs *pius* close: *pater Aeneas* occurs in the epic seventeen times.² I would suggest, then, that as the mythical Irish sailor struggled manfully to translate passages of the *Aeneid* (with presumably generous assistance from his equally mythical tutor) the recurring sound of 'Father Aeneas' would bring back to him memories of a certain Father Geoghegan (or perhaps a Father Malone) he knew in earlier days, not to mention some Father Mulvaney who figured in later years, when retirement left time for those Latin tutorials ashore. For Yeats's 'plain sailor man', then, Vergil's hero would naturally become just an additional name in a familiar sequence—'Father Aeneas'. And Clausen's suspicions regarding the man's alleged lack of sophistication were misplaced: he was not really a Vergilian critic in the making after all.

The University of Leeds

E. L. HARRISON

eharrison3@cwctv.net

doi:10.1017/S0009838806000693

² Cf. R. G. Austin (ed.), *Vergil: Aeneid I* (Oxford, 1971), ad l. 580: 'The term marks Aeneas as responsible leader.'

OVID *TRISTIA* 2.549: HOW MANY BOOKS OF FASTI DID OVID WRITE?

In his apologia in *Tristia* 2, Ovid shows that he has produced serious poetry by referring to *Fasti*, *Medea* and *Metamorphoses*; of the first he supposedly writes at 549ff.:

sex ego Fastorum scripsi totidemque libellos,
cumque suo finem mense libellus¹ habet,
idque tuo nuper scriptum sub nomine, Caesar,
et tibi sacratum sors mea rupit opus;

It is certain that *sex . . . totidemque libellos* in the passage as we have it, would mean twelve books;² cf. *Fasti* 6.725, *iam sex et totidem luces de mense supersunt*, which

¹ The citation is from J. B. Hall's Teubner text (Stuttgart & Leipzig, 1995); he prints *libellus* with a minority of his primary MSS rather than the majority's *volumen*. Ovid loves to repeat words wherever possible, and he would have no motive to change from *libellos* to *volumen* here; besides he is quoting *Fast.* 1.724, which has *libellus*; *volumen* is easily explicable as a gloss designed to make it clear that the reference is to each individual papyrus roll rather than to the *Fasti* as a whole.

² It is hardly necessary to remark that if Ovid had had occasion to mention twelve books, he could have employed other expressions, e.g. *bis sena volumina*.

certainly means twelve days. There is however a notorious incompatibility³ between the apparent assertion that Ovid wrote twelve books of *Fasti* and the conclusion to which all the other evidence points. We may begin by briefly reviewing what we would know if the *Tristia* passage had never been written. We have six books of *Fasti*, one for each of the first six months of the Roman year. The work was originally dedicated to Augustus, but after Augustus' death the exiled Ovid adapted Book 1 in honour of Germanicus; there are minor adaptations elsewhere (e.g. 4.81–2); it is this 'second edition' that has come down to us. Ovid tells us (3.57–8, 199–200, 5.147–8), what we would anyhow have guessed, that he intended to complete the work and to express the praise of Augustus in the month named after him. However, no text of the last six months was known in antiquity,⁴ from which it is clear that no such text was published. From this we may deduce that no such text was ever written; for if it had been written, Ovid would have had every motive to publish it, in general because a patriotic work on a religious theme would have been welcome to Augustus, and in particular because July and August would have given valuable opportunities for flattery. Finally, *tempus Iuleis cras est natale Kalendis: / Pierides coeptis addite summa meis* (6.797–8) is at least consistent with the *coepta* in question being completed with the publication of the first six books.⁵ To return to the *Tristia*, if we were to take into account only the second of the two couplets above, we would take it as confirmation of the conclusions to which common sense has already led us, that is, that before his exile Ovid dedicated *Fasti* 1–6 to Augustus as a complete work, but that his exile interrupted the task and that the other six books⁶ remained unwritten.

Not only does the first couplet involve us in historical difficulty, but it also seems to fall short of Ovid's usual standards of verbal dexterity: the pentameter appears to convey what in the context is no more than uncalled-for bibliographical information, while in the hexameter (by way of contrast with *Fasti* 6.725, quoted above) the position of *Fastorum* gives the initial impression that *totidemque* will be followed by some other book title as a balancing item, and that this is accordingly no mere

³ Cf. F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso: die Fasten* (Heidelberg, 1957), 1.20, 'Die Schwierigkeit dieser viel interpretierten Verse liegt darin, dass einerseits Ovid tatsächlich nicht XII, sondern nur VI Bücher geschrieben hat und dass andererseits *scripsi* normalerweise die Vollendung der Niederschrift bedeutet.'

⁴ Cf. F. Peeters, *Les Fastes d'Ovide: Histoire du Texte* (Brussels, 1939), 72, 'Que l'antiquité n'ait jamais connu des *Fastes* que la première moitié, cela ressort de l'examen de la tradition indirecte. Lactance et les chrétiens ou les grammairiens qui citent cette oeuvre ne se réfèrent jamais qu'aux six premiers chants.' He points out that *sic Ovidius in Fastis* at Serv. ad *Georg.* 1.43 must be a mistake of the commentator or, more probably, of one of his readers (Peeters, 73).

⁵ It may also be significant that the last words of the poem, *adnuat Alcides increpuitque lyram*, seem to quote Horace's last Ode (4.15, 2); cf. B. Nemeth, 'Horace and the problem of the authentic final of the Ovidian *Fasti*', *ACD* 28 (1992), 79–81. The way in which the ending of the *Fasti* is appropriate to the ending of a completed work is well brought out by A. Barchiesi, *The Poet and the Prince* (Berkeley, 1997), 259–71, and 'Endgames: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 15 and *Fasti* 6', in D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn and D. Fowler (edd.), *Classical Closure* (Princeton, 1997), 181–208. I am indebted to CQ's anonymous referee for, among other things, these latter references.

⁶ Ovid uses *fuga rupit opus* of the *Metamorphoses* at *Trist.* 1.7, 14, but their incompleteness lay in the lack of the *ultima lima* as he explains shortly afterwards. R. Schilling, *Ovide: les Fastes* (Paris, 1992) 1.viii, argues as follows: 'comme nous possédons l'ensemble des quinze livres des *Métamorphoses*, l'interruption signalée doit porter dans les deux cas sur la finition et non sur le nombre des chants'. This is a *non sequitur*; *rupit* means 'interrupted'; how much is lost as a result of any given interruption can only be determined by examining the evidence for that particular case.

addition sum. For it should be noted that on other occasions where *totidem* follows a number, there is almost always some distinction between what the number refers to and what *totidem* refers to; cf. *OLD* s.v. 1, and, to take a couple of the many examples in Ovid, *signaque sex foribus dextris totidemque sinistris* (*Met.* 2.18), where the two sets of *signa* are at any rate distinguished by position; and *mille greges illi totidemque armenta per herbas / errabant* (*Met.* 4.635), where *greges* and *armenta* are similar but not identical. If there were something of that sort here, we might be able to obtain the six books that we need. We know that Ovid wrote six books of *Fasti*, and we also know that he wrote about six Roman months. If *menses* could be inserted in the hexameter, it might be possible to restore both style and sense; to make room for *menses*, *scripsi* would have to be moved to the first half of the line and lengthened by a syllable to *conscripsi*, which is appropriate as *conscribo* can be used both of a book and of its theme; cf. *OLD* s.v. 2 and 3. Therefore it is at least worth suggesting that what Ovid wrote ran as follows:

sex ego conscripsi menses totidemque libellos,
cumque suo finem mense libellus habet,

The hexameter, as emended, would employ *totidem* in the usual way; even more importantly it would agree with the known facts without any need for distortion or misinterpretation;⁷ finally the zeugma consequent on the two different senses of *conscripsi* is a favourite Ovidian device.⁸ The pentameter now has typically Ovidian point and smartness in the way in which it takes up and explains the hexameter's reference to the numerical equality of books and months.⁹ To claim demonstrative certainty for such a conjecture might be unduly rash, but the postulated corruption is easy enough. *Fastorum* is a natural gloss on *libellos*, and if it invaded the text, it would only leave room for the two indispensable syllables of *scripsi*. A close parallel would be the well-known case of *Trist.* 1.11, 12, where all the MSS offer the unsatisfactory but not quite intolerable *omnis ab hac cura mens relevata mea est*; without the external evidence of *CIL* 6.2, 9632, the true reading (*cura levata mea est*) might never have been recovered. In our passage too the tradition is uninspiring, but it is the external evidence which surely demonstrates that Ovid could not have written it.

Bury St Edmunds

JOHN TRAPPES-LOMAX

trappeslomax@aol.com

doi:10.1017/S000983880600070X

⁷ Nobody now holds to the view that *Fasti* can have the unexampled sense of 'calendar for a single month'; cf. S. G. Owen, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Liber Secundus* (Oxford, 1924), ad loc. Interpreters are thus driven back on the theory that the last six books existed only in rough draft, i.e. that *scripsi* means *scripturus eram*. Thus, to take one example from many, L. P. Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled* (Cambridge, 1955), 252, writes, 'presumably *scripsi* indicates that the last six books were indeed to some extent drafted'. The truth is that *scripsi* indicates that they were written—but they were not written. Hence the need for emendation. The only alternative would be to suppose that Ovid is making a claim that Augustus and all literary Rome would have known to be a lie, and that would not have been a good way to secure Augustus' favour.

⁸ Cf. S. Mack, 'Some observations on zeugma with particular reference to Virgil', *Ramus* 9 (1980), 101–11. It should suffice to quote three of her examples: *demisere metu vultumque animumque Pelasgi* (*Met.* 7.133); *actaque magni / Herculis implerant terras odiumque novercae* (*Met.* 9.134–5); *inlato lumine vidit / et scelus et natam* (*Met.* 10. 473–4).

⁹ J. C. McKeown, *Ovid Amores: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary* (Liverpool, 1987) 1.109, observes how Ovid's use of the elegiac couplet commonly 'gives the pentameter the function of supporting the point made in the hexameter, either by expanding it, or by restating it in a different way, or by making a further point which draws its impetus from the hexameter'.