

About three decades after the publication of *Odes* 1–3, Ovid will describe the end of Icarus using the same commonplace (*Met.* 8.229–30):

oraque caerulea patrium clamantia nomen
excipiuntur aqua, quae nomen traxit ab illo.

Not only is Gyges deafer than a rock, says Horace, he is deafer than the rocks that withstood the cries of dying Icarus. It is possible that the image of Icarus crying for help comes from the poetic accounts of his death by Ovid's lost Hellenistic sources, Philostephanus or Callimachus.⁶

University of Cincinnati

DANIEL MARKOVIĆ
daniel.markovic@uc.edu

doi:10.1017/S0009838810000285

⁶ Scholia on Hom. *Il.* 2.145 (1 p. 84 Dindorf; Van Thiel at <<http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/klassphil/vanthiel/index.html>>) give a brief outline of the story of Icarus' flight and refer to Philostephanus and Callimachus' *Aetia* as the main sources (*ἱστορεῖ Φιλοστέφανος καὶ Καλλίμαχος ἐν Αἰτίοις*). Incidentally, an extant fragment of the *Aetia* (23 Pfeiffer) mentions the Icarian Sea in the context of not hearing one's words: 'just as a Sellus in the mountain of Tmarus hears the sound of the Icarian Sea ... you (*sc.* Heracles) did not care at all ...' (... σὺ δ'ὥς ἄλδς ἤχον ἀκούει | Σ]ελλὸς ἐνὶ Τμαρίοις οὐρεσιν Ἰκαρίης, | ... οὐδὲν [ὀπι]ζόμε[εν]ος ...).

IN THE DARKNESS OF HELL: OVID *HEROIDES* 16.211–12

Paris, at *Heroides* 16.207–12, plays up for Helen his supposedly unimpeachable pedigree: his father is no Atreus, his grandfather no Pelops, nor has any ancestor of his merited the dismal fate of a Tantalus. At 211–12, Kenney,¹ with virtually all other editors,² prints *nec proauo Stygia nostro captantur in unda | poma nec in mediis quaeritur umor aquis*, and offers the following remarks in his commentary:

[211] **in unda**: he [*sc.* Tantalus] stood in a pool of water which sank whenever he tried to drink, under a tree which bent away whenever he tried to eat its fruits.

212 in mediis ... aquis virtually reduplicates *in unda*, which indeed is redundant; if the text is sound this is not O[vid] at his best. Contrast *Am.* 2.2.43–4 *quaerit aquas in aquis et poma fugacia captat | Tantalus*, 3.7.51–2, *A.A.* 2.605–6.

¹ E.J. Kenney (ed.), *Ovid: Heroides XVI–XXI* (Cambridge, 1996).

² The editions/commentaries of N. Heinsius, Riese, Sedlmayer, Palmer, Bornecque, Ehwald, Giomini, Dörrie, Kenney and Michalopoulos were consulted. All read *in unda*, only Kenney remarked upon it as a possible problem, and only Giomini offered any alternative manuscript readings in his apparatus (viz. 'in undas A [i.e. Antuerpiensis Plant. 68, *saec.* XII] ab unda Bodl. [i.e. Bodl. Can. lat. 1]', neither of which constitutes much of a variant). The case I am querying here is therefore a problem of sense rather than of the manuscript tradition, which on this point seems all but unanimous.

Kenney is perhaps not the first to oppugn this textual redundancy; yet neither is it difficult to see why it has been disregarded so regularly by editors of these epistles. By itself, *in Stygia unda* is a perfectly acceptable formulation: there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the expression, and it conforms to the general outline of the myth in question. Only the repetition from line to line of so similar a soggy sentiment vexes the attentive reader. If corruption this is, it is nevertheless easily understood: not only does a watery something seem an easy and natural accompaniment to the adjective 'Stygian', but *in Stygia unda* (vel sim.) is also a common expression in Ovid, the corpus furnishing numerous iterations of or slight variations on the theme.³ The scribe over-familiar with Ovid – or over-ready in his copying to fix upon the first easy word that fits a smudged line ending – would be readily excused for such a 'mistake'; it is simply a mistake which would have had to occur early in the paradosis.

To eliminate the echo – and so to exonerate Ovid of this charge of slack writing – at 211 I would suggest *nec proauo Stygia nostro captantur in umbra*, connoting 'in hellish darkness' or 'in the darkness of hell'. If we are willing to stretch our translation somewhat, this reading might also collaborate with *poma* of the next line to adumbrate (as it were) the myth's less waterlogged half, spelled out in Kenney's notes, above: Tantalus snatches at fruits 'in hellish darkness', but more specifically 'in hellish shade' – the shade, that is, of an understood tree.⁴ Where *unda* here blurs the distinction between the alimentary and aqueous torments of Tantalus, *umbra* grants them their time-honoured independence.⁵

Although the customary expression for such 'hellish darkness' seems to be *Stygiae ... umbrae* (pl.) – importantly, a form in fact corroborated in the Ovidian corpus at *Metamorphoses* 1.139–40 *quasque recondiderat Stygiisque admouerat umbris*, | *effodiuntur opes*⁶ – we find a corresponding use of the singular at Silius, *Punica* 13.784 *si Stygia non esset in umbra*, translated in J.D. Duff's Loeb as 'were he not in the darkness of Hades'. Silius offers two further examples at *Punica* 5.597 *Stygiae sub umbra* and 9.45 *perque has, nox Stygia quas iam circumuolat*

³ Cf. e.g. *Ars am.* 2.41 *Stygias transnabimus undas*; *Met.* 1.737 *et Stygias iubet hoc audire paludes*, 2.101, 3.272 *Stygias penetrabit in undas*, 3.505 *in Stygia spectabat aqua*, 5.504 *ergo dum Stygio sub terris gurgite labor*, 10.697 *an Stygia fontes dubitauit mergeret unda*, 11.500, 14.591 *Stygios semel isse per amnes*; *Fast.* 5.250 *et Stygiae numen testificatur aquae*; *Tr.* 1.2.65–6 *mittere me Stygias si iam uoluisset in undas* | *Caesar*, 4.5.22, 5.9.19 *seminecem Stygia reuocasti solus ab unda*; *Pont.* 1.3.20, 2.3.43, 4.9.74 *exeat e Stygiis ut mea nauis aquis*; [*Ov.*] *Epic. Drus.* 432 *nullaque per Stygias umbra renauit aquas* (a near miss).

⁴ With *umbra* = 'shade', reference to the tree or woodland that casts it is not strictly necessary where it can possibly be understood or inferred, as at e.g. *Cic. Balb.* 15 *ea quae nos libri docent in umbra atque otio*; *Cic. Leg.* 2.7 *considamus hic in umbra*; *Verg. Ecl.* 5.70 *ante focum, si frigus erit; si messis, in umbra*; or, in Ovid, *Met.* 10.533 *hunc tenet, huic comes est, aduetaque semper in umbra* or perhaps even *Am.* 2.18.3 *nos, Macer, ignaua Veneris cessamus in umbra*. In *Verg. Ecl.* 1.4–5 *tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra* | *formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas* and 7.10 *et, si quid cessare potes, requiesce sub umbra*, mention of the trees in question is made some lines prior to each of the quoted verses; the general principle holds, nevertheless.

⁵ As e.g. in the scene's archetype at *Hom. Od.* 11.582–92.

⁶ Further examples in extant Latin occur only after Ovid: cf. *Sen. Suas.* 6.26 *membra tamen Stygias tulit iniuiolata sub umbras*; *Luc.* 5.667, 6.569, 6.653, 7.612; *Sil. Pun.* 4.617–18 *atque umbras late Stygias immensa uorago* | *faucibus ostendit patulis*; *Stat. Achil.* 1.630 *Stygiasque procul iam raptus ad umbras*, *Silv.* 3.5.37, *Theb.* 11.85 *Stygiis certe manifestus in umbris*; *Mart.* 1.101.5 *ne tamen ad Stygias famulus descenderet umbras*, 1.114.5, 9.51.3–4, 11.84.1, 12.90.3; *Sen. Her. O.* 1983–4 *numquam Stygias fertur ad umbras* | *inclita uirtus*; [*Sen.*] *Oct.* 79 *qui me Stygias mittet ad umbras*.

umbra. The evidence seems to suggest, then, that the particular collocation *Stygia(e)* ... *umbra(e)* is a fairly late (and poetic) development – one which in fact locates its first extant instance in Ovid. This in turn may take its cue from the parallel use by Virgil and Propertius of the similar noun *tenebra(e)*⁷ and, with reference to Ovid's own parallel use of the similar adjective *Tartareus*,⁸ might also represent yet another demonstration of the plasticity of the Ovidian lexicon. This is all, moreover, to say nothing of the more elementary fact, in defence of the singular, that any competent composer of Latin elegiacs would wish to avoid *-iis* ... *-is* articulating both verses of the same couplet.⁹

The change here proposed is a small one. While not radically altering our understanding of the text, it does negate a somewhat troubling redundancy, it is sound Latin which finds firm support elsewhere, and it manages, I think, to supply a fuller and richer sense than the text as it stands.

St Hugh's College, Oxford

G.C. LACKI

glenn.lacki@classics.ox.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0009838810000273

⁷ Verg. *G.* 3.551–2 *saeuit et in lucem Stygiis emissa tenebris | pallida Tisiphone* (~ Stat. *Theb.* 8.376–7 *Stygiisque emissa tenebris | Mors fruitur caelo*) and Prop. 4.9.41 *Stygias ... tenebras*. After Ovid, cf. also Luc. 3.13, Sil. *Pun.* 13.625, 13.713, and Apul. *Met.* 4.33 *fluminaque horrescunt et Stygiae tenebrae*.

⁸ Ov. *Met.* 6.676 *Tartareas ... misit ad umbras* and 12.257 *Tartareas ... mittit ad umbras*. In extant Latin, this collocation *Tartarea(e)* ... *umbra(e)* is also found first – and until Horatius Romanus only – in Ovid. These two alternative word choices (i.e. *Tartareus* and *tenebra*) are found in combination at Sen. *Her. F.* 436 *tenebrae loquentem magna tartareae premunt*.

⁹ For this point I am obliged to the anonymous reviewer for *CQ*.

JEROME, *EPIST.* 147.11.2: *IN TUTO*¹

Jerome's letter to the deacon Sabinian² tells how after committing adultery with the wife of a barbarian general this bed-hopping cleric had then fled from Italy to Jerome's monastery in the Holy Land: *inde per quosdam cuniculos, dum illa tenetur, erumpis, Romam occultus ingrederis, latitas inter Samnitas latrones et ad primum mariti nuntium, quod novus tibi ex Alpibus Hannibal descendisset, navigio te credis in tuto. tanta fugae celeritas fuit, ut tempestatem terra duceres tutiorem. venis utcumque Syriam, inde te Hierosolymam velle transcendere et servituum domino polliceris*.³ The aim of the present note is to suggest that at the end of the first of these three sentences *in tuto* should be changed to *intuto*. Various arguments may be adduced in support of this view.

¹ Works are cited according to *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum* (Leipzig, 1990²).

² This celebrated document is given appropriately full treatment by both J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London, 1975), 275–7 and A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité 1: Le monachisme latin; De l'épître de S. Paule à la consécration de Démétride (404–14)* (Paris, 1998), 116–23.

³ *Epist.* 147.11.2. Text of I. Hilberg, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae* 3 (Vienna, 1996²). This is the only critical edition.