

TOWARD A TYPOLOGY OF INTERPOLATION IN LATIN POETRY

R. J. TARRANT
Harvard University

Cuncta prius temptanda, sed immedicabile corpus
ense recidendum est, ne pars sincera trahatur. (Ovid *Met.* 1.190–91)

The pursuit of interpolation¹ is as old as classical scholarship itself—and so are the passions it has provoked. From Zenodotus' treatment of Homer to Bentley's mutilation of *Paradise Lost* to the policy of freewheeling excision which passed for enlightened criticism in the two generations after Lachmann, the dealings of interpolationist critics have often struck other classicists—even other textual critics—as the epitome of arrogance and insensitivity.² One reason for this impression is that athetesis, even when not practiced in an extreme form, can seem to be a game without rules, or at best one in which the rules are known only to the critic. To some extent the appearance of arbitrariness is well founded, since the study of interpolation, like textual criticism in general, proceeds not by the application of rules but by the exercise of individual judgment. When carried out with knowledge and tact it

This article is the revised and annotated version of a paper given at the 1985 Annual Meeting of the APA in Washington, D.C., as part of a panel session entitled "The Future of Textual Criticism." I am grateful to Professor David Kovacs for inviting me to participate in the session, to members of the panel and audience for several useful suggestions, and to Lyn Straka for commenting on an earlier draft of the paper.

¹ In textual critics' parlance "interpolation" has two meanings: in its broad sense, which corresponds to the classical meaning of *interpolare*, it denotes any conscious alteration in the wording of a text (including, for example, replacement of an obscure or difficult word by a simpler synonym); in its narrower use, it denotes one kind of such alteration, the insertion of unoriginal matter into the body of a text. In this discussion I am concerned only with the latter sense.

² On Zenodotus' Homeric scholarship cf. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968) 108–14, who shows that much of his later reputation for highhandedness rests on dubious evidence; on Bentley's Milton see most recently C. O. Brink, *English Classical Scholarship: Historical Reflections on Bentley, Porson, and Housman* (Cambridge/New York 1985) 80–83; the excesses of nineteenth-century criticism and the conservative reaction they provoked have been chronicled with inimitable wit in the preface to the first volume of Housman's *Manilius* (xl–liii).

can resemble connoisseurship, as in Cicero's vignette of the eminent critic Ser. Clodius, who could pronounce on the authenticity of a disputed line of Plautus merely by hearing it read;³ without those qualifications it amounts to little more than imposing the critic's prejudices on the unresisting text. Cicero may have been only half serious in saying that Aristarchus obelized any line of Homer that failed to please him,⁴ but this would not be a grossly unfair description of the Virgilian criticism of Aristarchus' most famous Latin descendant, M. Valerius Probus, at least as it is preserved in Servius Auctus. Of *Aeneid* 4.418 (*puppibus et laeti nautae imposuere coronas*) Probus wrote *si hunc uersum omitteret, melius fecisset*, a judgment as uncomprehending as it is confidently expressed.⁵ Unfortunately, the Proban manner has had a powerful influence on the style of later ages of criticism. "Hi duo immundi et impudici uersus Iuuenalis non sunt" (Giorgio Valla on Juv. 9.43–44); "non est Manilii. est ineptissimus" (Scaliger on Man. 4.576); "hunc uersum me auctore deleto, ut spurium. quem qui dicunt esse elegantissimum, ipsi sunt omnis elegantiae expertes, et imperiti; et caeci iudicant de coloribus" (Lambinus on Lucr. 3.498).⁶ Pronouncements of this kind, which could easily be illustrated in the criticism of more recent times, have done much to foster the suspicion that among skeptical⁷ critics apodictic assertion often takes the place of reasoned argument.

In this article I propose to treat interpolation from a different perspective, as a historical phenomenon with clearly defined causes and workings. Little in what follows will be unknown to experienced critics, but the material presented here may provide some of the general understanding of interpolation that practicing critics have usually taken for granted.⁸ My own stand-

³ Fam. 9.16.4 *ut Seruius, frater tuus, . . . facile diceret 'hic uersus Plauti non est, hic est,' quod tritas auris haberet notandis generibus poetarum et consuetudine legendi.*

⁴ Fam. 3.11.5 *ut enim Aristarchus Homeri uersum negat quem non probat.*

⁵ Other opinions of a similar nature on *Aen.* 1.21–22, 8.731 (if, as seems likely, Probus is meant by the plural *critici*); see J. E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (New York 1981) 48–49.

⁶ The stylistic link between Probus and later critics was noted by Zetzel (above, note 5, 266 n. 68), citing Lachmann on Lucr. 3.362 "haec si omittantur, planiorem sententiam fore Lambinus recte dicit"; as it happens the Proban coloring is here due to Lachmann rather than Lambinus, who justified this deletion with detailed arguments from style and content ("hunc uersum delendum censeo. nam primum supervacaneus est, eoque deleto de sententia nihil deperit. immo planior atque illustrior est, ut statim ostendam: deinde falsum est, quod per eum significatur, et ab Epicureis decretis abhorret: postremo loquendi genus inelegans atque adeo inquinatum est" etc.).

⁷ While "conservative" is now well established as a description of critics who adhere closely to the transmitted form of a text, no equally neat epithet has yet been devised for critics of an opposite tendency. "Radical" carries unwelcome overtones of extremism, while the names that the critics in question might choose for themselves—"rational," for example, or "perceptive"—are not likely to win general acceptance. "Interventionist" is accurate but probably too cumbersome for frequent use. *Faute de mieux* I have settled on "skeptical."

⁸ Housman is an honorable exception: the pages of his preface to Juvenal dealing with interpolation (xxxii–xxxvi) are the best treatment of the subject known to me. There is also a

point is that of a moderate skeptic—moderate in my own eyes, at least,—but my aim is less to defend any particular set of views than to provide a framework for future discussion.⁹

Every time a critic alleges corruption in the transmitted form of a text, a historical statement is implied: the suspected change must have been made by some person, at some time, and for some reason. A conjecture need not account for all of these circumstances to be worth proposing or even, if it is compelling on internal grounds, worth adopting, but conjectures which presuppose a kind of scribal behavior well documented from other sources will obviously be more persuasive than those which postulate a rare or unique set of conditions. These considerations apply with special force to suggestions of interpolation: the act of inserting a line or lines into a text is, or at least appears to be, a far more drastic alteration than misreading an unfamiliar abbreviation or confusing two words of similar shape or meaning, and the critic who wishes others to believe that it has taken place should feel some obligation to explain the occurrence in historically believable terms. As E. J. Kenney has put it, “the critic would do well to recite to himself the old verse *quis? quando? quibus auxiliis? cur? quomodo? quare?* Suspension of judgment is not enough; there is an absolute duty to disbelieve such hypotheses when they are not supported by reliable parallels and conflict with what we know (little though it may be) about what happened or can reasonably be thought to have happened in scriptoria and places where they copied texts.”¹⁰ Kenney’s strictures were directed at an unusually bold appeal to interpolation, the view that our text of Propertius has undergone extensive rearrangement at the hands of a reviser;¹¹ but the kind of plausibility he speaks of may properly be asked for in all attempts to identify transmitted matter as interpolated. It must be said that in this respect interpolationist critics have not always met their responsibilities. All too often they—I should say we—have invoked the figure of an interpolator who floats in a temporal and spatial vacuum, without dimension or feature—except, of course, for a mischievous or malevolent urge to deceive. The language of interpolationist criticism

judicious survey of the question of interpolation in Juvenal by E. Courtney, *BICS* 22 (1975) 147–62.

⁹ I had originally planned to include here a short history of the place of interpolation in Latin textual criticism since the Renaissance, but it quickly became clear that this would require more space and knowledge than is presently available to me. I hope to return to the subject in a different context.

¹⁰ *The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Berkeley 1974) 146.

¹¹ The notion goes back to Scaliger: “qui autem illud [i.e., the Propertian archetype] descripsit primus, nae ille audax aut negligens homo fuit, quisquis ille fuit. nam praeter innumera menda, quibus totum librum praestantissimi poetae aspersit, magni sceleris se obligavit, quum in secundo et tertio libro integras paginas et magnum uersuum suo loco luxauerit, et infinitis locis tenebras offuderit.” (*Castigationes* 168, cited by Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship. i Textual Criticism and Exegesis* [Oxford 1983] 315 n. 80.)

habitually employs the idiom of criminality, with the critic cast now as acute investigator, now as prosecuting attorney, now as sentencing judge. Spurious verses are “detected” like counterfeit bills or forged Vermeers, or “uncovered” like conspiracies. Interpolators often “betray” themselves by a solecism or anachronistic usage, like undercover agents whose identity is revealed by a fatal blunder. “Rarely is the forger so plainly caught in the act,” writes Housman on Manilius 2.518 (“ut raro manifestius . . . falsarius deprehendatur”). Such imagery may be harmless if it is merely intended to enliven an otherwise austere subject, but if it be taken as an attempt to explain the workings of interpolation, its implications are seriously misleading. It would obviously be impossible to maintain that a conscious desire to falsify a text has *never* played a part in generating an interpolation, but I *would* maintain that the overwhelming majority of evident and probable interpolations in Latin poetry can be accounted for without recourse to fraudulent motives. Scholars have tended to approximate interpolation to forgery because that is a form of behavior familiar in the modern world; I would suggest, however, that we cannot properly understand interpolation unless we see it as arising from a relationship between readers and texts that is substantially different from anything in our own experience.

In the following pages I shall identify some aspects of an ancient reader’s experience which favored or prompted what we encounter as interpolation; with this as a basis I shall offer a tentative typology of interpolation as it is found in the texts of several Latin poets. My classification consists of three broad categories, corresponding to the motives which account for the bulk of interpolations: I shall call them *emendation*, *annotation*, and *imitation* or *collaboration*.¹² My primary focus is on readers rather than copyists; few full-time scribes, whether lay or monastic, possessed the interest or independence to intervene actively in the form of the texts they copied.¹³ I emphasize Antiquity because I believe that almost all the interpolations which have established themselves in the transmitted texts of classical Latin poetry are of ancient origin; most of the conditioning factors I shall invoke, however, were also present in the Middle Ages, and so I shall not exclude instances which are more likely to be medieval than ancient. One more preliminary remark. Since interpolated lines hardly ever have the decency to identify themselves as

¹² These categories do not conflict with already current formal descriptions such as “Zusatz-” and “Ersatzinterpolation,” “Binneninterpolation,” and “Kleininterpolation”; cf., e.g., G. Jachmann, *NGG* 1943, 187–266, S. Mendner, *Der Text der Metamorphosen Ovids* (diss. Cologne 1939).

¹³ The importance of readers is similarly stressed by Zetzel (above, note 5) 238–39: “there is no escaping the disturbing fact that, in antiquity, the preservation and the quality of a text were the results of the interests of its successive owners or readers, not of a scholarly editor. Whether . . . we have . . . an interpolated version or an accurate representation of the author’s original work, depends entirely on the individuals whose copies have survived.

such, adducing examples to illustrate a typology will always entail some risk of circular argument. To minimize the danger I shall give prominence to lines which come as close as possible to being certified interpolations, that is, lines with dubious or slight manuscript attestation which have been regarded as inauthentic even by conservative editors.

A. Emendation

When any of us opens a new scholarly edition of a classical author, we expect that the text will have been carefully established by a competent expert and printed in scrupulous conformity with the editor's typescript (or diskette). If a passage as printed offends against the rules of Latin syntax or violates our notions of the author's style, our first recourse will be to consult another edition of the same work; only if all editions agree might we be tempted to remove the difficulty by conjecture. Ancient and medieval readers were not so well placed. Books were notoriously inaccurate, and reliable texts against which they could be corrected were rare or unobtainable.¹⁴ Hence the lively interest shown by imperial *littérateurs* in manuscripts with claims (not always beyond reproach) to descent from authors' originals or early copies.¹⁵ Many ancient readers, however, were thrown back on their own resources in correcting their books, as is evident from several extant *subscriptiones* which speak of emending *sine codice* or *sine exemplari*.¹⁶ In these circumstances it seems highly probable that readers on occasion attempted to repair lacunae in their texts by conjecture—which is to say, from our perspective, by interpolation.¹⁷

¹⁴ Cf. Cicero's often quoted complaint in *Q. fr.* 3.5.6 *de Latinis uero quo me uertam nescio; ita mendose et scribuntur et ueneunt*. Few readers indeed were so fortunate as to possess copies with corrections in the author's own hand, cf. Mart. 7.11, 17.

¹⁵ On which cf. J. E. G. Zetzel, "Emendavi ad Tironem," *HSCP* 77 (1973) 225–43.

¹⁶ Cf. Zetzel (above, note 5) 211–31, especially 227–28; also "The Subscriptions in the Manuscripts of Livy and Fronto and the Meaning of *Emendatio*," *CP* 75 (1980) 38–59. We perform a similar kind of *emendatio* when we correct printer's errors in newspapers or popular novels, though in most cases these emendations remain unrecorded.

¹⁷ The effects of unskilled correction were often lamented, cf. Quint. 9.4.39 (on archaic forms and spellings) *quae in ueteribus libris reperta mutare imperiti solent, et dum librorum insectari uolunt inscientiam, suam confitentur* (a complaint echoed by Jerome, *Epist.* 71.5 and thence often restated in the Middle Ages). Medieval practice has not yet been systematically surveyed. Monastic guidelines stressed fidelity to exemplars and discouraged freehand correction by scribes. Some ninth-century copyists even left blank spaces rather than transcribe or alter apparently corrupt readings: e.g., Lupus of Ferrières in his copy of Cicero's *De oratore*, BL Harley 2736 (cf. C. H. Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic* [Cambridge, Mass. 1930] 21–27) and the Irish monk Dicuil in his transcription of Pliny's *Natural History* (note the full statement of his procedure in the prologue to his *De mensura orbis*, ed. L. Bieler, *Scriptores latini Hiberniae* [Dublin 1967] 44); other examples of such omission in L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris 1911) sections 848–49, below, items 1 and 20. Scrupulousness of this kind, however, became increasingly rare after the Carolingian period and can never have been universal; there is evidence that correction of clear scribal errors (including omissions) was

To begin with a straightforward example. Propertius 3.1.25–28, a list of memorable episodes from the *Iliad*, appears thus (disregarding minor variants) in all manuscripts but one:

- (1) nam quis equo pulsas abiegnō nosceret arces,
 fluminaque Haemonio comminus isse uiro,
 Idaeum Simoenta, Iouis cunabula parui,
 Hectora per campos ter maculasse rotas?

In line 27 the words *Iouis cunabula parui* were accurately termed by Lachmann “ab omni huius loci sensu aliena ac prorsus diuersa”; soon afterwards the young Gustav Wolff brilliantly emended them to *Iouis cum prole Scamandro* (i.e., the Xanthus), a correction adopted by all modern editors. The original reading is therefore not in doubt; what concerns us here is the manner of its loss. As mentioned earlier, one manuscript does not agree with the vulgate: N, the former Neapolitanus (now Wolfenbüttel Gud. 224, s. XII ex.), the oldest and best witness, reads in 27 *ideum simoenta iouis*, with the remainder of the line omitted. It seems very likely that at some point in the transmission the words *cum prole Scamandro* had been either severely corrupted, illegibly copied, or torn away, with only the first letters *cu-* still to be read:¹⁸ in the tradition represented by N, following good Carolingian practice, the problematical words were not copied or the lacuna left unfilled, whereas in an ancestor of the other manuscripts a learned and resourceful reader¹⁹ conjectured *cunabula parui*, in the process furnishing a splendid instance of interpolation prompted by the desire to emend.

The same impulse, applied to cases where entire verses had been omitted, can be seen to generate interpolations on a larger scale. Among the texts where interpolation of this kind has occurred are Ovid’s *Epistulae ex Ponto*, a text for which the main witnesses are a single Carolingian manuscript (= A) on the one hand and a cluster of later manuscripts on the other, among which

at all times practiced and even on occasion encouraged, cf. (e.g.) the colophon in St. Gall 28 (s. ix): *prudens quisquis lector uolumen cum legeris istud, | scriptori imperito ueniam concede deposco, | et eradere quod superest, et non pigriteris aptare quae desunt*. (Cited in W. Wattenbach, *Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*³ [Leipzig 1896] 340; the entire section on “kritische Behandlung,” 317–44, is relevant.)

¹⁸ Physical damage was postulated by Housman (*JPhil* 21 [1893] 126–27 = *Classical Papers* 251), but it is hard to see how the end of line 27 could have been torn away with no visible effect on the surrounding lines.

¹⁹ Hardly an ordinary scribe, since the supplement shows awareness of the fairly obscure mythical variant which places Zeus’ birth on the Phrygian rather than the Cretan Ida; for numismatic evidence see A. B. Cook, *Zeus* 1 (Cambridge 1914) 151–52; a possible allusion in the phrasing of Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus* 6 (see McLennan *ad loc.*). The wording recalls Virg. *Aen.* 3.104–5 *Creta Iouis . . . | mons Idaeus ubi et gentis cunabula nostrae* and perhaps Ovid *Met.* 8.99 *Iouis incunabula Creten*.

(2) (a) 1.2.9–12	Videris! audeo tibi me scripsisse fateri qui, cum me poena dignum grauiore fuisse confteor, possum uix grauiora pati. 10 <i>om. AC</i> : audeo propriis ingemuisse malis	<i>BDT</i>
(b) 1.8.17–20	Ille memor magni generis uirtute quod auget protinus innumero milite cinctus adest, nec prius abscessit merita quam caede nocentum 20 <i>om. A</i> : audaces animos contuderit populi se nimis ulciscens extitit ipse nocens	<i>BC cett.</i>
(c) 2.2.31–34	Tuta petant alii; fortuna miserrima tuta est, nam timor euentu deterioris abest. qui rapitur porrigit et spinas duraque saxa ... 33–34 <i>sic A</i> :	
	qui rapitur spumante salo sua brachia tendens freto cauti porrigit et spinas duraque saxa manus ad capit	<i>DFL</i>
	qui rapitur fatis quid praeter fata requirit porrigit ad spinas duraque saxa manus	<i>MNb</i>
	qui rapitur fatis quid praeter fata requirit saepe creat molles aspera spina rosas	<i>cett.</i>
(d) 3.1.143–44	Omnia per rerum turbam tu quoque oportet eas. omnia . . . eas <i>uno uersu A</i> : lacunam indicauit Ehwald: omnia per rerum turbam fastidia perfer quolibet illa meat tu quoque oportet eas	<i>BC</i>
	curia cum patribus fuerit stipata uerendis, per patrum turbam tu quoque oportet eas rerum	<i>cett.</i>

Now *some* of these lines are almost certainly interpolations; the only way of saving all of them is to suppose that the later tradition at 1.8.20, 2.2.33–34, and 3.1.143–44 has preserved Ovid's own alternative versions or rejected first

drafts—an argument made impossible to sustain by the incoherence and poor latinity of several of the lines in question. (Specifically, at 1.8.20 the line *se nimis ulciscens* etc. contradicts the eulogistic tenor of the passage; at 2.2.33–34 the couplet found in most later manuscripts contains a complete *non sequitur* between hexameter and pentameter; at 3.1.143–44 the most widely attested version has Livia attending meetings of the Senate.) It is far more plausible to conclude, as does the most recent editor, Jacques André, that the ninth-century witness in each instance faithfully reflects the defective state of the archetype and that all the lines found in the *recentiores* are conjectural supplements.²⁰

The effects of this kind of readers' emendation can be illustrated even more clearly when the supposed lacuna is in fact nonexistent, as in the following lines of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (11. 56–57).²¹

- (3) hic ferus expositum peregrinis anguis harenis
os petit et sparsos stillanti rore capillos.

56 expositum *We*: -tus *MN*^{1v}: -tis *P*: -to *cett*.

57 os petit *Wev*^c: obstitit *cett*.

post 57 (a) lambit et hymniferos inhiat diuellere uultus *NSUW*³ (*mg.*)

(b) extemplo morsu coepit laniare ferino *Voss. lat. Q. 61*

(c) absorbere parat diroque recondere uentri *Lucensis B. mun.*

1415.

Ovid is describing the severed head of Orpheus, which has drifted onto the shore of Lesbos and is in danger of being savaged by a snake when Apollo intervenes. As lines 56–57 are printed in all modern editions, the syntax is complete, with *os* and *capillos* objects of *petit*. In most manuscripts, however, *os petit* has been corrupted to *obstitit*, touching off adjustments to *expositum* and leaving *capillos* seemingly ungoverned. The apparent lacuna was filled in at least three ways (other versions probably remain so far unrecorded), of which the most widely attested, *lambit et hymniferos inhiat diuellere uultus*, may well have a late antique origin—its phrasing would not seem out of place in Sidonius Apollinaris or Venantius Fortunatus. I append additional examples of interpolation of this kind from Ovid, Juvenal, and Manilius; in each case a mistaken impression of syntactical incompleteness has prompted an unnecessary attempt at restoration.²²

²⁰ The same phenomenon is visible in Tibullus (single lines omitted after 1.2.25, 2.3.14a and 74); here, though, the supplements are later in origin and have been attributed to specific humanists (Pontano, Aurispa, Filelfo).

²¹ In citations from the *Metamorphoses* I use the *sigla* of W. S. Anderson's Teubner text (Leipzig 1977, second edition 1982), occasionally correcting the reports of manuscript readings from my own collations.

²² For Greek examples of the same process cf. Eur. *Or.* 1024 and *Ba.* 1028, both added by readers or copyists who did not grasp the elliptical force of ἀλλ' ὅμως (cited by R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader* [Cambridge, Mass. 1969] 28–29).

- (4) Ovid *Met.* 2.552–56 nam tempore quodam
 Pallas Ericthonium, prolem sine matre creatam,
 clauserat Actaeo texta de uimine cista
 uirginibusque tribus gemino de Cecrope natis
 et legem dederat, sua ne secreta uiderent.
inter 554 et 555 seruandumque dedit sic inconfessa quid esset
N²U; post 555 seruandum (uel -dam) dederat s. i. q. e. aut in
textu aut in margine codd. plerique (line added to give *Eric-*
thonium its “missing” form of *dare*)
- (5) Juvenal 13.86–91
 sunt in fortunae qui casibus omnia ponant
 et nullo credant mundum rectore moueri
 natura uolente uices et lucis et anni,
 atque ideo intrepidi quaecumque altaria tangunt.
 90 [est alius metuens ne crimen poena sequatur.]
 hic putat esse deos et peierat *eqs.*
- 90 *del. Jahn* (“Some bad men . . . are atheists, and therefore
 commit perjury without a qualm. Another type of man (*hic*)
 . . . believes in God yet commits perjury all the same. . . . A
 reader who did not see the sense of *hic*, and thought to pro-
 vide it with a reference, has inserted u. 90. . . .” Housman,
 preface xxxiv.)
- (6) Manilius 1.703–7
 namque in caeruleo candens nitet orbita mundo
 ceu missura diem subito caelumque recludens,
 ac ueluti uirides discernit semita campos
 707 [inter diuisas aequabilis est uia partis.]
 707 *del. Bentley* (“uersum . . . additum ab aliquo cui
 apodosis deesse uidebatur” Housman *ad loc.*)

This kind of emendation is, to be sure, not the most common or the most bothersome type of interpolation in Latin poetry. It may, however, assume less obvious forms than those used here to demonstrate its existence: for example, lines which appear in corrupt or variously transmitted forms may not be garbled renditions of an archetypal text but instead failed attempts to reconstruct a line or lines missing in the archetype. (A possible, but controversial, instance appears below as item 20.) There is also a way in which attempts to repair damage to a text can produce the appearance of interpolation, i.e., when lines that have been dislodged from their proper context are mistakenly relocated.²³ Some of these misplacements are easily undone, but when the original place of such a passage is not obvious it may be hard to distinguish it from an intruded parallel (for which see below, section B [2]).

²³ For other passages where the choice between bracketing and relocating has not been clear, see Housman on Man. 2.232, 5.30–31, Shackleton Bailey on Hor. S. 2.2.38, my note on Sen. Ag. 471.

B. Annotation

Ancient readers were not only compelled to act as their own editors; for the most part they were also left to their own devices in interpreting the texts they read. Few poets were provided with full commentaries as were Virgil and Terence, and even when sets of scholia were available (as with Juvenal, for example), there is no reason to think that all or even most readers will have had these aids at hand. The majority of private copies probably therefore contained a certain amount of annotation designed to elucidate obscurities or make reference to a specific passage easier. (There are obvious parallels with the kinds of marginalia we enter in our own texts, with the crucial difference that in Antiquity and the Middle Ages the distinction between text and annotation was much more likely to be blurred in subsequent copies.) The notes made by ancient readers were conceivably as varied as our own; for the sake of simplicity I propose to divide them into three categories: gloss, commentary, and citation or parallel.

(i) Gloss

- (7) Juvenal 7.50–52 *nam si discedas laqueo tenet ambitiosi
consuetudo mali tenet insanabile multos
scribendi cacoethes et aegro in corde senescit.*
51 *del. Jahn* (*ambitiosi in ambitiosum mutato*): 50–51
laqueo . . . mali *del. Housman*
- (8) Ovid *Met.* 8.317 . . . *nemorisque decus Tegeaea Lycae.*
post 317 aut in textu aut in margine addunt codd.
aliquot uenit At(a)lantis (uel -te) Schoenei pulcherrima
uirgo
- (9) Germanicus *Aratea* 564ff.
 tunc iterum praedictus nascitur ordo.
[Lanigeri et Tauri, Geminorum, postea Cancrī,
tunc Leo, tunc Virgo, tunc Scorpīos, Arcitenensque
et gelidus Capricornus et imbrifer et duo Pisces.]
565–67 *del. Grotius*

In its simplest form a gloss explains the meaning of an unfamiliar term; so, in Juvenal 7.50 (7), the rare *cacoethes* was glossed by *consuetudo mali*, which was later elaborated into a metrically appropriate insertion.²⁴ Similarly, at *Met.* 8.317 (8), Ovid's allusive reference to Atalanta as *nemoris decus Tegeaea Lycae* prompted a more explicit (though unmetrical and inaccurate) supplement. Intruded glosses of this kind are rarely difficult to spot, and can at times be almost comically blatant: in the Latin translation of Aratus

²⁴ Cf. most recently S. H. Braund, *Phoenix* 36 (1982) 162–66, who argues for deletion of 51 and alteration of *ambitiosi* to *ambitiosus* in agreement with *laqueo*.

attributed to Germanicus Caesar, after a full enumeration and description of the twelve signs of the zodiac comes the concluding phrase “and then the sequence that has been spoken of starts anew” (*tunc iterum praedictus nascitur ordo* 564)—followed in the manuscripts by three metrically and syntactically crude lines which duly list the signs all over again (9).

(ii) Comment

- (10) Juvenal
8.254–58 plebeiae Deciorum animae, plebeia fuerunt
nomina; pro totis legionibus hi tamen et pro
omnibus auxiliis atque omni pube Latina
sufficiunt dis infernis Terraeque parenti.
[pluris enim Decii quam quae seruantur ab illis.]
258 *del. Markland et Dobree*
- (11) Ovid *Met.*
7.759–64 Carmina Laiades non intellecta priorum
soluerat ingeniis, et praecipitata iacebat
immemor ambagum uates obscura suarum;
[scilicet alma Themis nec talia linquit inulta]
protinus Aoniis immittitur altera Thebis
pestis . . .
762 *in textu codd. aliquot: aut omittunt aut postea
additum exhibent cett.: del. edd.*

The line dividing the gloss from my next category, the comment, is at times thin or even arbitrary. By a “comment” I mean a note which either reduces a passage to its essentials (a kind of capsule summary) or else supplies information felt necessary or helpful for understanding the passage. An instance of the first kind might be Juvenal 8.258 (10), which blandly digests the vigorous rhetoric of the previous four lines; for the latter type consider Ovid *Met.* 7.762 (11), which attempts to explain why Thebes suffered a new affliction after Oedipus had killed the Sphinx. Not all kinds of poetry afford equal scope for comment of this sort: it is most at home in densely factual texts such as Juvenal and in technical writing; several interpolations in Manilius, for example, are the work of a reader obviously familiar with other astrological treatises.²⁵ Before leaving this kind of interpolation I should like to suggest that it may help to account for one of the most serious textual problems in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.

- (12) *Met.* 7.685ff. Tum uero iuuenis Nereius omnia quaerit,
cur sit et unde datum, quis tanti muneris auctor;
687a quae petit ille refert et cetera nota pudori (*uel -e*)
687b quae patitur pudor ille refert; et cetera narrat

²⁵ E.g., 1.171–72, 394, 2.968–70 (and cf. Housman *ad locc.*).

687c quae petit ille refert; ceterum narrare pudori
 qua tulerit mercede silet tactusque dolore
 coniugis amissae lacrimis ita fatur obortis *eqs.*
 687a *codd. plerique*: 687b *N¹S²e^vPar. 8008*: 687c *M¹*:
 quae petit ille refert, sed quae narrare pudori est
 Heinsius

Cephalus has been asked the origin of the magic spear he carries with him; as he begins his story, the text of 687–88 appears to say that he will suppress a significant detail, the price at which he obtained the spear. I say the text “appears” to say this because, as the apparatus shows, 687 is transmitted in three forms, none of which can possibly be original; even Nicolaus Heinsius has not succeeded in knitting these phrases into a credible semblance of Ovidian Latin. If we add that what Cephalus is said to suppress corresponds to a version of the story found in Nicander but deliberately *not* used by Ovid, it begins to seem that the disorder of the manuscripts may signal not corruption but interpolation, a succession of attempts to hammer into metrical form an original comment to the effect that Ovid’s Cephalus does not tell the story as it was known to readers of Nicander and Hyginus.²⁶

(iii) Citation

(13) Ovid *Amores* 3.15.19–20

Imbelles elegi, genialis Musa, ualete,
 post mea mansurum fata superstes opus.
post 20 sequuntur sine interuallo in Vat. Pal. lat. 1655
 Hic ego qui iaceo tenerorum lusor amorum
 ingenio perii Naso poeta meo (= *Trist.* 3.3.73–74)

(14) Propertius 4.5.53–58

Aurum spectato, non quae manus afferat aurum;
 uersibus auditis quid nisi uerba feres?
 [quid iuuat ornato procedere, uita, capillo
 et tenuis Coa ueste mouere sinus?]
 qui uersus, Coae dederit nec munera uestis,
 istius tibi sit surda sine arte lyra.
 55–56 (= 1.2.1–2) *del. Itali*

(15) Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 2.667ff.

Vtilis, o iuuenes, aut haec aut senior aetas;
 iste feret segetes, iste serendus ager.
 [dum uires annique sinunt, tolerate labores;

²⁶ I hope to offer a full discussion of this vexed passage in another place. The wish to note a mythological variant may also lie behind the textual disturbance at *Met.* 1.544ff. (but for a different view cf. C. E. Murgia, *CA* 3 (1984) 207–35.

- 670 iam ueniet tacito curua senecta pede.
aut mare remigiis aut uomere findite terras
aut fera belligeras addite in arma manus,
aut latus et uires operamque adferre puellis;
hoc quoque militia est, hoc quoque quaerit opes.]
675 adde, quod est illis operum prudentia maior,
solus, et, artifices qui facit, usus adest.
“669–74 *hic uix ferendi* (*quod tamen* 669–72 *in inter* iii
10 et 59 *leguntur, id ex materiae similitudine tantum*
accidisse puto): post 702 L. Müller, *uix recte: haereo*”
(E. J. Kenney): post 732 A. M. Dabrowski (*prob.*
G. P. Goold, *HSCP* 69 [1965] 92–93), *sed cf. PCPS*
n.s. 26 (1980) 88.

- (16) Juvenal 6.612ff. quod desipis, inde est,
inde animi caligo et magna obliuio rerum
quas modo gessisti. tamen hoc tolerabile, si non
614a [semper aquam portes rimosa ad dolia, semper
614b istud onus subeas ipsis manantibus urnis,
614c quod rabidus nostro Phalarim de rege dedisti.]
et furere incipias ut auunculus ille Neronis,
cui totam tremuli frontem Caesonia pulli
infudit. quae non faciet quod principis uxor?
614a–c post 614 *ponunt U Vallia Lond BL Add. 12002*
(mg): post 601 K Vat. Reg. 2029 (m² mg.): om. P:
post 617 G. Luck HSCP 76 (1972) 229–30

The third form of reader's note which can give rise to interpolation is the illustrative citation or parallel. Here at least we may feel on familiar ground; we all know what parallels are, and we can all recognize one when we see it. So indeed we can, as long as its source is a text which we happen to possess, as with the citation of two lines from Ovid's *Tristia* at the end of at least one manuscript of the *Amores* (13) or the appearance of a couplet of the *Monobiblos* in a poem of Propertius' fourth book (14, though this is arguably a wry self-citation rather than an intruded parallel).²⁷ But for ancient readers to have recorded only parallels from texts which were destined to remain extant would, to paraphrase Housman, require not simply good luck but the intervention of providence—and providence has more pressing things on its mind. We should therefore reckon with the likelihood that our texts of the Latin poets contain at least some illustrative citations from works now lost which have been mistaken by scribes or readers for omitted portions of the work at hand. By definition insertions of this kind will be especially hard to

²⁷ M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart 1973) 142–43, suggests (following Schrader) that in *Am.* 3.15 the unanimously transmitted 5–6 are an interpolation arising from citation of *Tr.* 4.10.7–8; in *CP* 77 (1982) 360, I tried to show that the repetition of *Ars* 2.73 at *Met.* 8.216 is not authentic.

identify; perhaps the only criteria that can be formulated are that the lines will not cohere with their context, but will seem undoubtedly ancient in origin, and that there will be no obvious reason for their having been interpolated. Some potential candidates might include a set of lines in the second book of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* hesitantly bracketed by E. J. Kenney, which perhaps come from a poem similar to the *Ars* and inspired by it (15)²⁸; also the three lines transmitted by some manuscripts of Juvenal after 6.614 (16), probably the work of a less skillful satirist writing about the reign of "Caligula." (This latter is, however, a controversial example, and several critics have argued for Juvenal's authorship of the lines.) More speculatively, I might suggest that some lines in the manuscripts of Propertius which seem impossible to integrate with their transmitted context may have originated as citations from other elegists.²⁹

C. Imitation/Collaboration

(17) Ovid *Met.* 11.109ff.

uixque sibi credens, non alta fronde uirentem
 ilice detraxit uirgam: uirga aurea facta est;
 tollit humo saxum: saxum quoque palluit auro;
 contigit et glaebam: contactu glaeba potenti
 massa fit; arentes Cereris decerpsit aristas:
 aurea messis erat; demptum tenet arbore pomum:
 Hesperidas donasse putes; si postibus altis
 admouit digitos, postes radiare uidentur;
 ille etiam liquidis palmas ubi lauerat undis,
 117 unda fluens palmis Danaen eludere posset.
post 117 corporis et membris resplenduit aurea uestis
addunt codd. aliquot

(18) Ovid *Met.* 11.598–601

non uigil ales ibi cristati cantibus oris
 euocat Auroram, nec uoce silentia rumpunt
 sollicitiue canes canibusue sagacior anser.
 600 non fera, non pecudes, non moti flamine rami
 humanaeue sonum reddunt conuicia linguae.
post 599 garrula nec Procne stertentia pectora mulcet
addunt codd. aliquot

(19) Ovid *Met.* 14.383–85

'non impune feres neque' ait 'reddere Canenti,
 laesaque quid faciat, quid amans, quid femina, disces.'
 [rebus' ait 'sed amans et laesa et femina Circe.']
 385 *del. Merkel*

²⁸ *Ars* 1.585–88 is a similar case; so too, I argued in *PCPS* n.s. 26 (1980) 85–88, may be *Ars* 3.433–38.

²⁹ E.g., 3.7.21–24, 3.18.29–30, 4.8.19–20.

All the factors I have spoken of so far are directly related to the circumstances in which ancient readers found themselves; even if some of the examples used are open to question, the types of activity involved (glossing, citation, etc.) are not in themselves difficult for us to comprehend. There is another form of interpolation, however, which poses a much more serious challenge to our historical imagination, because it reflects a way of responding to literature that is no longer natural to us. My name for it is *imitation* or *collaboration*, and its distinctive mark is a desire to prolong, to elaborate, or even to surpass the text which inspires it.³⁰ I look first at some poorly attested lines in the *Metamorphoses* whose non-Ovidian origin is hardly open to doubt. In 17 Ovid is enumerating the effects of Midas' new-found ability to transform whatever he touches into gold. The list reaches a high point of wit and verbal neatness in lines 116–17 *ille etiam liquidis palmas ubi lauerat undis, / unda fluens palmis Danaen eludere posset*. Then in a few manuscripts of note comes the verse *corporis et membris resplenduit aurea uestis*. Too obviously an anticlimax to have been meant by Ovid for this position, too poorly written (especially *corporis membris*) to be by Ovid at all. Is it a line from another poet's treatment of Midas, or simply a description of a gold garment which struck a reader as apposite? Either is possible, but I wonder if it is not rather an attempt to extend or "cap" Ovid's series of vignettes. This motive can also be seen at work in 18, from the description of the cave of Sleep: the line *garrula nec Procne stertentia pectora mulcet*, found in the margins of some older manuscripts, is evidently unoriginal (*mulcet* is precisely the wrong word for the context and *Procne* in the sense of "nightingale" is not likely to be found before late antiquity); its purpose seems equally clear, to continue the theme of the preceding lines by introducing another well-known source of nocturnal sound, the nightingale. These examples are especially useful because of their dubious transmission, but some lines which enjoy unanimous manuscript support may have similar origins. When Circe (in 19) fails to persuade Glaucus to return her love, she warns him that he will learn "what an injured person, a lover, and a woman can do" (*laesaque quid faciat, quid amans, quid femina, disces*). This splendid line is then immediately lamed by an unsuccessful attempt to surpass it; although line 385 was not bracketed until Merkel, it is one of the most blatant interpolations in the whole poem. The same factor may have played a part in a passage from *Metamorphoses* 13 to which I alluded earlier (above, p. 289):

(20) Ovid *Met.* 13.328–35

sis licet infestus sociis regique mihique,
dure Philoctete, licet exsecrere meumque
deuoeas sine fine caput cupiasque dolenti
me tibi forte dari nostrumque haurire cruorem—

³⁰ The term "cumulierende Interpolation" was used by U. Knoche (*DLZ* 62 [1940] 53).

- 332 [utque tui mihi, sic fiat tibi copia nostri]
 te tamen adgrediar { *mecumque reducere nitar*
nec inultus, spero, relinquer
capto bene tempore tecum
longe formidine pulsa }
 tamque tuis potiar, faueat Fortuna, sagittis
 quam sum Dardanio, quem cepi, uate potitus *eqs.*
332 del. Heinsius 333 om. FP¹ N^m U¹ W¹ e¹ h¹ (276–343
desunt in MN¹, add. N^{2m}); te tamen aggrediar tantum
E: mecumque r. n. N⁴ h² et fere P^{1m}; nec inultus s. r.
U^{2m} W^c; capto b. t. c. v³; longe f. p. d² e^{3m} “equidem
totum uersum uelut inutilem libenter secluserim” W.
S. Anderson (in app.)

Here too there is a clear progression to a climax (*nostrumque haurire cruorem*) followed by a line both anticlimactic and syntactically problematical (332 *utque tui mihi, sic fiat tibi copia nostri*). If this is Ovid, it can only be meant as a jarring deflation of Ulysses' rhetoric, an effect Ovid achieves elsewhere by subtler means. I find it more plausible to see here another attempt by a reader to extend a rhetorical progression beyond its intended limit. Recognizing 332 as interpolated may in turn clarify the status of 333. The line is omitted in several of the oldest manuscripts; one, Vat. Pal. lat. 1661, gives only the first three words (*te tamen aggrediar*); the second half is transmitted in at least four versions, none of them fully satisfactory. Heinsius thought the line was left incomplete by Ovid, but there is no clear example of unfinished verses elsewhere in the poem. W. S. Anderson, usually a conservative editor, considered bracketing the line “uelut inutilem,” but excising 333 would leave *sis licet . . . cruorem* without an adversative counterpart and *-que* in 334 without a referent. The simplest, though not the happiest, explanation is that the insertion of 332 caused the loss of a genuine line, and that 333 represents the efforts of successive readers to recover its sense.³¹

In speaking of collaborative interpolation I may seem merely to have bestowed a more respectable-sounding title on the *falsarius* of earlier writers; the change of name may be useful, however, in directing attention away from inappropriate thoughts of fraud and deception. We should consider instead the large role played in the ancient world by imitation of specific styles and authors, both as a method of instruction³² and as a form of elegant diversion. Imitative interpolations may be best seen as akin on a smaller scale to such productions as the *Somnium* transmitted among Ovid's *Amores*, several poems of the *Corpus Tibullianum*, and the *Culex*, the authors of which

³¹ For other cases (admittedly debatable) of interpolation ousting part of the genuine text cf. Leo on Pl. *Capit.* 237 and my discussion of Ovid *Am.* 2.18.26 and 34 in *HSCP* 85 (1981) 149–53. *Met.* 7.687f. (item 12) may be another instance.

³² I was reminded of this important point by Professor J. W. Halporn.

probably had no intention of passing off their work as that of the more famous writers they echoed or impersonated.³³

Understanding this kind of interpolation calls for a special effort of imagination on our part. Dealing with it also requires unusual tact in the critic. The texts which inspire these efforts of collaboration tend to be highly rhetorical, exuberant, and loosely textured: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and *Heroides*, Seneca's tragedies, Lucan, Juvenal. But these are also texts whose authors are themselves inclined to elaborate themes beyond what a more tightly disciplined taste would regard as sufficient. I do not mean to be merely paradoxical when I say that the first reader of the *Metamorphoses* to introduce a "collaborative" interpolation in it may have been Ovid himself.³⁴

This completes my survey of the varieties of interpolation most often found in our texts of the Latin poets. As happens with any attempt to classify a complex set of phenomena, there will be many instances which seem not to fit neatly into a single category.³⁵ For example, the writer of the "Helen episode" in *Aeneid* 2 (567–88) may have been motivated by a desire to fill (if only *exempli gratia*) a lacuna in Virgil's draft of the poem, but the resulting passage is also a sustained and at least partially successful emulation of Virgil's epic manner.³⁶ Some interpolations which extend or elaborate an idea may at the same time incorporate phrases cited from other contexts, such as, perhaps, *spoliatis arma supersunt* in Juvenal 8.124 or that even more famous piece of pseudo-Juvenal, *orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano* (10.356), whose exposure by Michael Reeve in 1970 is one of the most brilliant episodes in recent interpolationist criticism.³⁷

Textual criticism is ultimately the study of individual cases, and as such it stubbornly resists systematization. The typology I have proposed will not in itself prove or disprove any single alleged instance of interpolation; that requires a combination of linguistic and literary considerations subtly adjusted

³³ On the *Somnium* cf. E. J. Kenney in *Agon* 3 (1969) 1–14; for the *Culex* cf. E. Fraenkel, *JRS* 42 (1952) 1–9 = *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* (Rome 1964) 2.181–97 (though Fraenkel treats the work as a deliberate forgery).

³⁴ I am thinking of lines such as 7.135–36 and 11.600–1 (above, item 18), which show some of the usual signs of interpolation—they are not organically linked to their contexts and draw on phrases used more successfully elsewhere—but which are not clearly inauthentic.

³⁵ I have not attempted to deal with more unusual sets of circumstances which could produce the appearance of interpolation, e.g., the insertion of matter from a now lost prior or subsequent edition of a work (as was formerly thought to have happened with Juvenal) or, in the case of poems left unfinished by their authors, the inclusion by a redactor of passages which had not been given a definitive form or place. (The latter situation has been plausibly postulated for Lucan by E. Fraenkel, *Gnomon* 2 [1926] 520–27 = *Kleine Beiträge* [above, note 33] 2.295–303, even if many of Fraenkel's detailed arguments and reconstructions are open to question.)

³⁶ The most important studies are those of G. P. Goold, *HSCP* 74 (1970) 101–68 and C. E. Murgia, *CSCA* 4 (1971) 203–17; for a recent attempt to reclaim the passage as an authentic first draft cf. G. B. Conte, *The Rhetoric of Imitation*, ed. C. Segal (Ithaca 1986) 196–207.

³⁷ *CR* n.s. 20 (1970) 135–36.

to the needs of the particular passage. It is only reasonable to suppose, however, that the more we learn of the workings of interpolation in Latin poetry as a whole, the more informed will be our analysis of single cases. This paper comprises the merest skimming of the evidence; a study of all the several hundred interpolated lines in our texts of the Latin poets could take us much further. We might, for example, be better able to explain why some texts, and even some portions of texts, have attracted much more interpolation than others; we could surely present a far more refined account of the motives for interpolation than I have sketched here; we might even be in a position to embark on a stylistics of interpolation, and to specify the details in the handling of Latin which separate the gifted professional from the poetaster and the amateur. These discoveries, of course, lie far in the future, but mention of them may remind us that the study of interpolation, despite its long and contentious history, is in some respects only now beginning.