

Correcting Aeneas's Voyage: Ovid's Commentary on *Aeneid* 3*

SERGIO CASALI

University of Rome "Tor Vergata"

SUMMARY: This paper focuses on Ovid as an interpreter of Vergil's *Aeneid* in *Metamorphoses* 13. Ovid "corrects," or "comments on," Vergil's text in a way that sometimes presupposes an awareness of the presence of critical and exegetical *quaestiones* that we also find attested to in the ancient exegetical tradition as represented in the Servian commentary. The paper follows Aeneas's voyage in *Aen.* 3 and *Met.* 13 from Thrace to the Strophades, focusing especially on the death of Polydorus, the departure from Thrace, the Delos stopover, and the encounter with the Harpies.

IN THIS PAPER I WOULD LIKE TO FOCUS UPON OVID AS AN INTERPRETER OF VERGIL, a theme popular at least since the seminal article written by Rosa Lamacchia in 1960 entitled, "Ovidio critico di Virgilio."¹ Some years ago I published my own views about the ideological significances of Ovid's "re-writing" of Vergil's *Aeneid* in *Met.* 13.623–14.582, suggesting that Ovid's reading may be seen as an unsettling reading of the *Aeneid*, an anti-Augustan reading that

* Previous versions of this paper were read at the University of Palermo, at a conference organized by Professor Luciano Landolfi, and at the University of California at Los Angeles. I thank both audiences, and especially John Papadopoulos, Bob Gurval, Kathryn Morgan, and Sarah Morris, for their many useful comments and criticisms. A first version of this article was published in the proceedings of the Palermo conference (L. Landolfi and P. Monella, eds., *Ars adeo latet arte sua: riflessioni sull'intertestualità ovidiana*. Palermo: Flaccovio Editore, 2003), with the title "L'errore di Anchise e altre correzioni ovidiane all'*Eneide*." I also wish to thank Cynthia Damon, Stephen Heyworth, and Fabio Stok, as well as P. A. Miller and TAPA's anonymous reviewers, for their detailed and thoughtful comments on the paper.

¹ For an excellent sketch on the critical debate on Ovid's *Aeneid*, see Baldo 29–37, with full bibliography, to which add the classic treatment of Otis 278–305. Among the latest contributions, particularly interesting are Brugnoli and Stok (also on the *Fasti*); Tissol 177–91; Hinds 104–22; Thomas 78–84. Most recently, see Papaioannou.

aims at implicating Vergil himself in the charge of anti-Augustanism (Casali 1995).² In this paper I'll be less interested in ideological problems, and more in looking at Ovid as playing the part of the pedantic critic of Vergil—even if, as we shall see, it is not always easy to decide whether the Ovidian “correction” is just a pedantic joke, or whether the correction actually hides some more troubling implication for Vergil's text.

One theme in particular that will crop up many times in this paper is that of the intersections between the Ovidian “commentary” on the *Aeneid* and the actual exegetical tradition that we see coming together in Servius's commentary. I argue that when we talk about Ovid as an interpreter of Vergil, perhaps we should consider seriously the possibility of including him in the history of ancient Vergilian exegesis in quite a literal sense. Ovid did not work at his interpretation of the *Aeneid* in isolation; his “commentary” on Vergil was influenced, and probably in its turn exerted its influence on, the contemporary critical debate about the *Aeneid*.³

We will follow Aeneas's voyage from Thrace to the Strophades,⁴ and we will focus on some examples of Ovidian “corrections” to the *Aeneid* that presuppose an awareness of the presence of critical and exegetical *quaestiones* arising from Vergil's text. Let us begin from a *quaestio* concerning the story of Polydorus.

I. THE DEATH OF POLYDORUS

In the *Aeneid* of Ovid—which begins with Aeneas's escape from Troy in 13.623—there is only a very brief reference to Polydorus (Ov. *Met.* 13.628–30):⁵

²For a very similar point of view see Thomas 78–84, and, on *Heroides* 7, Knox 23–24. On the Ovidian treatment of Vergil's Dido in *Her.* 7, see also recently Miller and Casali 2004–5. In general on the intertextual relationship between Vergil and Ovid see Boyd.

³As it is well-known, in the Servian commentary we may sometimes find exegetical materials that can be traced back to the very earliest stages of the *Aeneid*'s ancient criticism. The name that most easily comes to mind is that of Hyginus, b. 64 B.C.E., a close friend of Ovid (Suet. *De gramm.* 20 *fuit familiarissimus Ouidio poetae*), and, already in the Augustan age, author of books on Vergil. On Ovid playing the “pedantic critic” about Caieta (*Aen.* 6.900–1 ~ *Met.* 14.156–57), and following, almost certainly, a criticism first advanced by Hyginus, see Casali 2004: 45–48. On Hyginus as a “pedantic critic” of Vergil, see Timpanaro 1986: 51–67; Görler 810–11; Timpanaro 2001: 13–23; cf. also Kaster 205–14.

⁴For a discussion from this point of view of the Trojans' stop at Actium, see Casali 2004, and (on Scylla) Casali 1995: 63–66.

⁵On the skein of myths about Polydorus, cf. the excellent sketch in Caviglia; for further suggestions about a possible “source” of Polydorus's bleeding bush, cf. Casali 2005. On Ovid's treatment of Polydorus, see also Stitz 28–30; Döpp 130–31; Galinsky 220; Baldo 46–48; Smith 104–15. I quote Ovid's text from Anderson, and Vergil's from Mynors.

...scelerataque limina Thracum
 et **Polydoreo manantem sanguine terram**
 linquit...

he leaves the sinful thresholds of Thrace, and the soil flowing with Polydorus's blood.

The phrasing of line 629 *Polydoreo manantem sanguine terram* (framed by Vergilian quotations)⁶ clearly alludes to the Vergilian version of the story of Polydorus: when Aeneas tears the first branch of the bush *huic atro liquuntur sanguine guttae / et terram tabo maculant* (Aen. 3.28–29, “drops of dark blood drip, and stain the earth with fluid”); and afterward Polydorus's voice says: *non me tibi Troia / externum tulit aut cruor hic de stipite manat*⁷ (Aen. 3.42–43, “I am no stranger to you, for Troy gave me birth; and this welling blood is not coming from wood” [Williams]).⁸

By beginning his *Aeneid* with this allusion to Polydorus as a bleeding bush, Ovid begins in a Vergilian way—namely, with an allusion to the version of the myth he has discarded from his own text, a quintessentially Vergilian technique. For the version of the bleeding bush is a version that Ovid does not follow in his *Metamorphoses*. Ovid allows himself this quick reference to Polydorus because he has already told his story in the preceding section of the poem, which was devoted to the story of Hecuba (*Met.* 13.429–575, cf.

⁶ *Met.* 13.628–30 *scelerata... limina Thracum / ... terram / linquit* ~ Aen. 3.60–61 *scelerata excedere terra, / linqui pollutum hospitium*. Ovid's association *scelerata limina Thracum / et... terram* repeats the Vergilian one between *terra* and *hospitium*, and this (in addition to the occurrence of the phrase *sceleratum... limen* in Aen. 6.563) supports the reading *limina* (instead of the *lectio facilior* *litora* preferred by Hopkinson *ad loc.*, who compares Aen. 3.16 *litore curuo*, 21 *mactabam in litore taurum*, 44 *fuge litus auarum*), to be understood as “dwellings” (for *limen* metonymic for “house, home” cf. OLD s.v. 2c), and not as “coasts” or “land” (the meaning of *limina* is discussed by Bömer, *ad loc.*, without consideration of the Vergilian model).

⁷ Ovid's recuperation of *manare* perhaps picks up a special point in Vergil's use of the word: if the blood does not gush out of a normal shrub but (in some unspecified way) from the dead “body” of Polydorus, then *manare* might suggest that it comes from his *Manes* (cf. 3.63 *stant Manibus arae...*): the word *manes* was pseudo-etymologically connected with *manare*: cf. Serv. *ad* 3.63 *alii manes a manando dictos intellegunt*; Fest. 114; Paul. Fest. 115. For a wordplay on such an etymology in Lucretius 1.122 (~ Enn. *Ann.* I fr. iv Sk.), cf. Skutsch 155.

⁸ A difficult sentence, which may be understood in two different ways: either supplying *externus* to *cruor* (“it is not foreign blood the one that flows from this wood”; so Conington *ad loc.*), or taking *non* as referring to *de stipite* only (“this blood flows not from wood,” but from my body; so Heyne, Williams).

esp. 429–38 and 533–44). There Ovid did not follow the Vergilian version according to which the spears that ran Polydorus through turned into myrtle branches; instead he followed the version of Euripides' *Hecuba* (718–20, 658 ff.): Polymestor cuts Polydorus's throat using a sword, and throws the dead body into the sea; then the corpse is found by Hecuba on the shore.

The elision of the Vergilian version of Polydorus's story is a very important move from a programmatic point of view. The voyage of Aeneas began with a metamorphosis—something apparently appropriate to Ovid's poem. But instead—we get silence. Stephen Hinds states that Ovid's principal aim in his "Aeneid" was that of "constructing Vergil as an hesitant precursor of the *Metamorphoses*": so he develops and organizes into a perfect system those myths of transformation that were already present in the *Aeneid*: "there is a *Metamorphoses* latent in the *Aeneid*, Ovid's treatment tells us: in Circe and in the biform Scylla, as also in the transformation of Aeneas' ships into nymphs and in the transformation of Diomedes' companions into birds" (Hinds 106). So it is all the more surprising that Ovid censors the very metamorphosis that could have provided an excellent "metamorphic" incipit to his own "Aeneid." If you recall that in Servius (*ad* 3.46) we find a harsh criticism of the implausibility and inconvenience of Polydorus's metamorphosis (*uituperabile... est, poetam aliquid fingere, quod penitus a ueritate discedat*, "it is blameworthy that the poet invents something so remote from the truth")⁹, we might think that Ovid, with his programmatic censorship, is the first testimony of this critical attitude.

But now let us consider more closely Ovid's narrative of Polydorus's death: it offers us an interesting example of Vergilian exegesis. In *Met.* 13.429–38 Ovid narrates how Polymestor killed Polydorus:

Est, *ubi Troia fuit*, Phrygiae contraria tellus
 Bistonii habitata uiris: Polymestoris illic
 regia diues erat, cui te *commisit alendum*
clam, Polydore, pater Phrygiisque remouit ab *armis*,
 consilium sapiens, sceleris nisi praemia magnas
 adiecisset opes, animi inritamen *auari*.
ut cecidit fortuna Phrygum, **capit inpius ensem**
rex Thracum iuguloque sui demisit alumni
 et, tamquam tolli cum corpore crimina possent,
 exanimem scopulo subiectas misit in undas.¹⁰

⁹ Here and elsewhere I quote Servius from the Thilo-Hagen edition.

¹⁰ Here and elsewhere I use italicization to highlight correspondences between Ovid's and Vergil's text, and boldface to emphasize the passages I discuss in the text.

There is a country opposite Phrygia, where Troy stood, that the Bistones inhabit: Polymestor's wealthy court was there, to whom Priam your father secretly sent you, Polydorus, to be reared away from the Phrygian war: a wise plan if he had not sent great riches with you, a reward for the criminal, a temptation to the greedy spirit. When Phrygia's fortunes waned, the impious king of Thrace took his sword and stabbed his young foster child in the throat, and threw the body from a cliff into the sea, as if murder could be eliminated with the corpse.

This passage recapitulates the prologue to Euripides' *Hecuba*, and it is full of allusions to Vergil's narrative of Polydorus.¹¹ Later on, Ovid comes back to Polydorus when his mother Hecuba finds Polydorus's dead body on the shore (Ov. *Met.* 13.533–38):

Dixit et ad litus passu processit anili,
albentes lacerata comas. "date, Troades, urnam"
dixerat infelix, liquidas hauriret ut undas:
adspicit eiectum Polydori in litore corpus
factaque Threiciis ingentia uulnera telis;
Troades exclamant, obmutuit illa dolore...

She spoke, and went to the shore, with the stumbling steps of an old woman, tearing at her white hair. "Give me an urn, women of Troy!" said the unhappy mother, wanting to draw water from the sea. There, she saw Polydorus's body, thrown on the beach, covered with open wounds made by Thracian spears. The Trojan women cried out, but she was dumb with grief.

Now, when Hecuba discovers her son's dead body, we discover together with her that Ovid, in spite of the profusion of Vergilian quotations in the preceding passage, does not follow Vergil's version. The fact that Polydorus's body is found on the beach obviously cannot match the story of the bleeding bush. But—and here is the point that interests us—it does not match Ovid's very own narrative well either. Let us see Bömer's note ad locum:

We have here a little problem: in Euripides, Polymestor had used a sword to kill Polydorus, σιδαρέω... φασγάνῳ, *Hec.* 719; in the other relevant passages he expresses himself in an indefinite way (25–26 κτείνω [781; 799]; 774 ὄλλομι); after all, the use of a sword is also the more practical procedure, *sit venia verbo*. But a problem arises from the fact that in Vergil we find the peculiar version according to which Polydorus was killed by a *ferrea telorum seges* (*Aen.* 3.45–46),

¹¹ Cf. *Aen.* 3.11 *et campos ubi Troia fuit*; 50 Priamus *furtim mandarat alendum*; 51–52 *cum iam diffideret armis* / *Dardaniae* (note *alendum* / *armis* at the end of two consecutive lines); 44 *fuge litus auarum*; 53 *ut opes* (cf. *opes* of the riches given to Polydorus in *Met.* 13.434) *fractae Teucrum et fortuna recessit*.

a *seges telorum* that was obviously meant, as *iacula acuta*, to grow as *arbores* on Polydorus' tomb, and then to change into bleeding branches. [...] It is interesting now to see how Ovid locates himself in this tradition. The plurals *uulnera* and *tela* at first sight might lead the reader to think that Ovid is following Vergil's version; but in 13.434 Ovid speaks of a *ensis* used by Polymestor. So, we must conclude that *uulnera* is a poetic plural, and that *tela* (poetic plural as well) means *ensis*, sword.

In 13.434–35 Polymestor cuts Polydorus's throat with a sword, as in Euripides (*capit inpius ensem / rex Thracum iuguloque sui demisit alumni*); but in 13.537 Polydorus's dead body shows "large wounds made by Thracian spears" (*factaque Threiciis ingentia uulnera telis*), as in Vergil he is killed by "a crop of iron spears" *ferrea... / telorum seges* (3.45–46). As a solution Bömer advances the idea that we should rectify the contradiction by taking *uulnera* as a poetic plural, "wound," singular, and *tela* as meaning "sword."

But contradictions are not always to be corrected. Ovid follows one version of the story (Polydorus slaughtered by sword), and later on he uses words referring to the version he has discarded, the Vergilian version (Polydorus killed by great number of spears). But the interesting point is that this Ovidian inconsistency is nothing but an allusion to, and a critical comment on, a parallel Vergilian inconsistency.

Let us see again how Polydorus's voice tells the story of his murder (Verg. *Aen.* 3.45–46):

"nam Polydorus ego. hic confixum **ferrea textit
telorum seges et iaculis increuit acutis.**"

For I am Polydorus. Here a crop of iron spears covered my transfixed corpse, and has grown into sharp spines

But afterwards it is the narrator himself who tells Polydorus's story in a more detailed way (Verg. *Aen.* 3.53–57):

ille, ut opes fractae Teucrum et Fortuna recessit,
res Agamemnonias uictriciaque arma secutus
fas omne abrumpit: **Polydorum obtruncat**, et auro
ui potitur. quid non mortalia pectora cogis,
auri sacra fames!

When the power of Troy was broken, and her fortunes ebbed, the Thracian breaks every divine law, to follow Agamemnon's cause, and his victorious army. He murders Polydorus, and takes the gold by force. Accursed hunger for gold, to what do you not drive human hearts!

Vergil at first talks about “a crop of iron spears” running through Polydorus, and destined to be changed into the branches of the miraculous bush; but then he says that it was Polymestor who killed Polydorus, apparently by himself, and specifically by cutting his head off: *Polydorum obtruncat*.

Williams *ad locum* comments: “*obtruncat*: ‘beheaded.’ This description of Polydorus’s death agrees with that in Euripides (*Hec.* 716 f., 781–2; cf. *Ov. Met.* 13.435–6), but it is inconsistent with 45–46. It seems to me to be an indication that Vergil is combining two different sources for the story” (Williams 65).¹² This is right, even if we could say more precisely that Vergil is exploiting his well-known technique of alluding to a version of the myth he has discarded from his own narrative.¹³

Vergil’s inconsistency between these two versions of Polydorus’s death was already noted by ancient Vergilian criticism (Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 3.46, Serv. *Aen.* 3.55):

TELORVM SEGES multitudo. [...] sane putatur non uerisimile iaculis coniectis puerum occisum, **nam repugnat cum illo “Polydorum obtruncat”**: nam et misisse radices iacula mirum est, nisi monstruosum sit.

“a crop of spears” a large number. [...] Actually scholars think it is unlikely that the boy is killed by a throwing of spears, since it contradicts *Polydorum obtruncat*: and the fact that spears take roots is strange, if not altogether monstrous.

OBTRVNCA**T occidit intellege**: nam obtruncare proprie est capite caedere.

obtruncat: understand “kills”: for *obtruncare* properly means “to behead.”

Servius Danielis refers to an exegetical tradition that criticized Vergil’s narrative of Polydorus killed by a large number of spears: one reason for this criticism was that it is unlikely that *telorum seges* is consistent with (*repugnat*) line 3.55 where the poet says that Polymestor *obtruncat* the boy.

In Servius’s note we see a clear influence of the discussions about this inconsistency. For Servius glosses *obtruncat* as “he kills”: we should not take the word in its proper sense of “beheading.” His aim is clearly that of correcting the inconsistency with *ferrea telorum seges*. Servius’s strategy then is surprisingly similar to Bömer’s faced with the Ovidian inconsistency: the expression that seems to allude to the discarded version of the myth is “neutralized” by

¹² Cf. also Paschalis 113: “In 55 Aeneas gives a description of Polydorus’s death (*Polydorum obtruncat*), which from a narrative viewpoint may appear inconsistent with the earlier version (45–46).”

¹³ From a realistic point of view, we could also imagine a beheading followed by target practice with spears so as to incriminate Thracians beyond Polymestor.

being interpreted in a generic way: Ovid's *tela* and *uulnera* as poetic plural, Vergil's *obtruncat* as simply "he kills."

Ovid is thus to be seen as the first surviving Vergilian critic to notice the contradiction between the two versions of Polydorus's death in the *Aeneid*. In a manner different from the subsequent exegetical tradition, mainly concerned with attacking or defending Vergil, Ovid, for once, by reproducing in his own text the same situation, also gives the correct interpretation of Vergil's "problem": Vergil follows (or maybe invents) a version of the myth (the metamorphosis of the spears) and evokes by allusion the discarded Euripidean version; Ovid does exactly the same thing—but in the opposite direction: he follows the Euripidean version, and evokes by allusion the Vergilian one.

II. THE (REALLY) USEFUL WINDS

At *Met.* 13.628–31 Aeneas leaves Thracia and gets to Delos *utilibus uentis aestuque secundo*, "thanks to the useful winds and the favourable currents" (630):

...*scelerataque* limina Thracum
et Polydoreo manantem sanguine *terram*
linquit et **utilibus uentis** aestuque secundo
intrat Apollineam *sociis* comitantibus urbem.

...he left the sinful thresholds of Thrace, and the soil drenched in Polydorus's blood, and riding the useful winds and the favorable tides, he came with his company of comrades to the city of Apollo.

The phrase *utilibus uentis* might seem innocuous; actually we lack not only "any other comparable *iunctura* in Verg. Hor. Tib. Prop." (Bömer *ad loc.*), but any other instance of this phrase in the whole of Latin literature—with one exception. The single exception is another Ovidian passage, where, again, the phrase is used with an emphatic meaning: Circe (obviously recalling the Vergilian Dido) attempts to persuade Ulysses not to sail in bad weather, and to wait for "a more useful wind" (*Rem.* 280 *utilior uelis postmodo uentus erit*).

In fact, the phrase *utilibus uentis* is here very pointed. Aeneas's departure from Thrace thanks to favourable winds corresponds to two passages in *Aeneid* 3, both of which are verbally recalled by Ovid (Verg. *Aen.* 3.60–61; 69–72):

omnibus idem animus, *scelerata* excedere *terra*,
linqui pollutum hospitium et **dare classibus Austros**.

All were of one mind, to leave this wicked land, and depart from a place of hospitality defiled, and give our fleet its winds.

Inde ubi prima fides pelago, placataque uenti
dant maria et **lenis crepitans uocat Auster in altum**,

deducunt *socii* nauis et litora complent;
prouehimur portu terraeque urbesque recedunt.

Then as soon as we have confidence in the waves, and the winds grant us calm seas, and the soft whispering breeze calls to the deep, my companions haul down the ships and crowd the shore. We set out from harbor, and lands and cities recede.

An inattentive reader might think that there is nothing strange about the mention of the *Austri* to which the Trojans give sails, and the *Auster* which calls the fleet towards the open sea. Nevertheless, there *is* something strange here, and this peculiarity did not escape ancient Vergilian criticism. The Auster is the South wind, and Aeneas from Thrace has to sail South to get to Delos (Serv. and Serv. Dan. [in italics] *Aen.* 3.70):

LENIS CREPITANS AUSTER: [...] “auster” autem quiuis uentus: *nam a Thracia*¹⁴ *aquilone nauigatur*. “*lenis*” autem ideo quia superius ait “*uix prima inceperat aestas*” [3.8], *et lenes uenti per aestatem sunt*.

“*auster*” is in the sense of whatever wind: for from Thracia one has to sail with the North wind. *lenis* is said because above he says *uix inceperat aestas* (3.8), and the winds are gentle during the summer.

This ancient *quaestio*¹⁵ still troubles modern interpreters, who generally follow Servius, and solve the problem by understanding *auster* as referring in a general way to whatever wind.¹⁶

Also in this case, the exegetic *quaestio* is clearly presupposed by Ovid: his Aeneas does not leave from Thracia thanks to the “absurd” Auster, but thanks to the (really) “useful winds.”

III. AT DELOS: A MORE PIOUS AENEAS

Both in Vergil and in Ovid, the Trojans, after landing at Delos, are hospitably received by king Anius, an old friend of Anchises. Vergil, however, only

¹⁴ The MSS. have the absurd *ad Thraciam*; Nager's emendation is obviously right. Cf. Georgii 156.

¹⁵ See also the annotation in Guelferbytanus I (quoted in Thilo's apparatus): “*quomodo auster ex Thracia, cum lenis sit? soluitur: ‘auster’ pro quolibet uento accipimus*” (“How ‘auster’ from Thracia, for all that is ‘gentle’? The solution is taking ‘auster’ for whatever wind”).

¹⁶ Cf. Conington 183: “*Auster*, as Heyne remarks, must be understood generally, as Aeneas would not want the south wind in setting sail from Thrace”; Williams 1962: 69: “*Auster*: cf. 61. As they wish to sail south, the emphasis should be taken to be on the gentle nature of the breeze, not on its direction. Servius firmly says ‘*auster autem quivis ventus*’”; Paratore 118; cf. also Cova LXXXIII.

briefly refers to the friendship between Anius and Anchises and to Anius's hospitality (*Aen.* 3.82–83). Immediately afterwards he focuses the attention on Aeneas's prayer to Apollo (3.84–89), the god's response (90–98), and Anchises' interpretation of the oracle (102–17), whereas in Ovid Anius first takes the Trojans for a sightseeing tour of Delos,¹⁷ and then, after entering Anius's home (*tecta*: *Met.* 13.638 ~ *Aen.* 3.83), they banquet, converse for a long time, and spend the whole night there (*Met.* 13.638–76). Their visit to the oracle of Apollo is put off until the following morning, and is knocked off in two lines (677–79).

This may be read as a witty debasement of Vergil's solemn narration.¹⁸ But things are actually a little more interesting. Here are the two passages:

huc feror, haec fessos tuto placidissima portu
accipit; egressi ueneramur Apollinis urbem.
rex *Anius*, rex *idem hominum Phoebique sacerdos*,
uittis et sacra redimitus tempora lauro
occurrit; ueterem Anchisen agnouit amicum.
iungimus hospitio dextras et *tecta* subimus.
Templa dei saxo uenerabar structa uetusto:
“da propriam, Thymbraee, domum; da moenia fessis
et genus et mansuram urbem...” (Verg. *Aen.* 3.78–86)

I sail there: it welcomes us peacefully, weary as we are, to its safe harbour. Landing, we pay homage to Apollo's city. King Anius, both king of the people and high-priest of Apollo, his forehead crowned with the sacred headband and holy laurel, meets us, and recognises an old friend in Anchises: we clasp hands in greeting and enter his house. I paid homage to the god's temple of ancient stone: “Grant us a true home, Apollo, grant a weary people walls, and a race, and a city that will endure...”

hunc *Anius*, quo rege homines, antistite *Phoebus*
rite colebatur, *temploque* domoque recepit
urbemque ostendit delubraque nota duasque
Latona quondam stirpes pariente retentas.
ture dato flammis uinoque in tura profuso
caesarumque boum fibris de more crematis
regia *tecta* petunt, positisque tapetibus altis

¹⁷ Cf. Solodow 144: “Instead of a seeker after oracles Aeneas is depicted practically as a tourist, visiting all the well-known sites and, we may imagine, hearing the traditional tour guides' stories”; Galinsky 220–21. On the Delos episode in Ovid, see also Stitz 32–46.

¹⁸ So e.g. Solodow 145: “The weight which this episode had in Vergil is shifted. A solemn seeking of divine guidance by the Romans-to-be has become a private sight-seeing tour, a domestic sacrifice, and a personal story.”

munera cum liquido capiunt Cerealia Baccho.

Tum pius Anchises...

(Ov. *Met.* 13.632-40)

Anius, who as king ruled the people, and as high priest worshipped Phoebus with the proper ritual, received him in temple and palace. He showed him the city, the famous sanctuary, and the two trees to which Latona clung when she gave birth. They gave incense to the flames, poured wine onto the incense, and, in accordance with custom, burned the entrails of slaughtered oxen, and then sought out the royal palace, where reclining on high couches, they ate the gifts of Ceres, and drank the wine of Bacchus. Then virtuous Anchises said: [...]

I have underlined Ovid's borrowings from the *Aeneid*. However, there is something in Ovid that is absent from Vergil, the detailed description of the ritual sacrifices carefully made by the Trojans after their landing at Delos and before they enter Anius's home (which is both his private house, and the temple of Apollo). The absence of this description from the *Aeneid* is unlikely to strike us as important, and in fact no modern commentator, apart from Cova (47), says anything on the matter. The absence of sacrifice on the Trojans' part when landing at Delos, however, did catch the attention of Vergil's ancient readers. Servius Danielis attests the existence of an exegetical *quaestio* (Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 3.85):

quaeritur etiam cur Aeneas cum Delum uenisset, nullis prius hostiis caesis statim a precibus coeperit: quia tradunt multi, inter quos et Varro, esse aras tam Apollinis, quam filii eius non tantum Deli, sed in plurimis locis, apud quas hostiae non caedantur, sed consuetudo sit deum solemnibus tantum prece uenerari. quod autem ait Neptuno et Apollini tauris postea sacrificatum (3.118–20), [et] apud alias aras hoc factum accipi oportet.

Scholars wonder why Aeneas, after his landing at Delos, immediately started praying without having offered any victims in sacrifice before. Many scholars, and Varro amongst them, say that at Delos, as well as in other places, there are altars both of Apollo and of his son, where no victims are sacrificed, but there is the custom of worshipping the god only with a solemn prayer. As to the fact that Vergil says that afterwards they did sacrifice bulls to Neptune and Apollo (3.118–20), we should understand that this sacrifice is made near other altars.

It is clear that some commentators find fault with Aeneas's conduct at his arrival at Delos, probably connecting his subsequent failure in understanding Apollo's oracle of the "ancient mother" with the lack of appropriate sacrifices before the consultation of the god (cf. Georgii 157–58). *Defensores Vergilii* tried hard to find an excuse for Aeneas's "fault," adducing as a justification for his conduct an alleged peculiarity of the cult of Delian Apollo (that no

sacrifices were needed at Delos), even if this detail stands in contradiction with the subsequent behavior of Anchises, who, *after* the oracle, does sacrifice bulls to Apollo (3.118–20). We find the same attempt at defending Aeneas from the accusation of *impietas* in Servius Danielis's note on 84 (*et quod 'uenerabar' ait, ostendit se precatum*, "and saying *uenerabar* Aeneas demonstrates that he did pray"), and also in Macrobius 3.6.1.

But once again our first testimony of the *quaestio* is Ovid. His Aeneas may be a tourist, but is also more pious than the Vergilian one.¹⁹

IV. THE MISTAKE OF ANCHISES

We know what happens at Delos: when Aeneas prays to Apollo for guidance, he receives an oracle bidding the Trojans to seek out their "ancient mother" (*Aen.* 3.89–98). At this point, Anchises intervenes to offer his help: he thinks he knows the solution to the riddle, but in fact he makes a terrible blunder. According to his explanation, the "ancient mother" is the island of Crete, the homeland of their ancestor Teucer (3.99–120). The Trojans follow Anchises' bad piece of advice, and go to Crete. There they are struck by a horrible pestilence (3.121–42). Anchises suggests that they go back to Delos in order to ask for more detailed information (3.143–46), but the Penates prevent him from causing further damage by appearing in a dream to Aeneas, and by revealing to him that the "ancient mother" is in fact Italy. The relevant ancestor is not Teucer but instead Dardanus, who originally came from the Etruscan town of Corythus (probably Cortona)—a mythical variant for which the *Aeneid* is our only testimony (3.147–71).²⁰

To judge, from a Georgii-inspired perspective²¹ on the Servian commentary, *ad loc.*, *obtretractores Vergilii* did not miss this occasion to attack the poet for having placed Aeneas's father in such an unfavorable light.²² In the Servian commentary, in fact, we see traces of both the aggressive and defensive attitudes towards Anchises' conduct in this episode. A series of comments remark on Anchises' interpretative faults. The oracle addresses the Trojans as *Dardanidae duri* (94). Servius comments that *dicendo 'Dardanidae' ostendit Italiam, unde Dardanus fuit. quod si Cretam significaret, Teucridae diceret* ("by

¹⁹ This is noticed also by Bömer 371.

²⁰ Maybe I have been a bit disrespectful towards old Anchises, but he does not cut a very fine figure.

²¹ Georgii has been rightly criticized for the excesses in his method, especially for his interpretation of all the passages in which Servius or others praise Vergil by saying *bene* as pointing to an implicit criticism of the poet (see Görler 812–13); nevertheless, much of his work is still worthwhile.

²² On Vergil's *obtretractores*, Görler is excellent.

saying *Dardanidae* he indicates Italy, whence Dardanus came. For if he had wanted to mean Crete, he would have said *Teucriadae*") (cf. Macrobius *Somn. Scip.* 1.7.7–8). On *duri* we find this interesting comment, unjustly forgotten by the subsequent commentators: *uel futurum ostendit laborem, uel eorum arguit insipientiam* ("he either points to their future toil, or blames their stupidity"), taking *duri* to mean "obtuse, dull."²³

On *maximus unde pater* (107), in Anchises' explanation, Servius comments: *fallitur; nam antiquior est Dardanus*; but Servius Danielis adds: *alii 'maximus' antiquissimus tradunt; per patris autem appellationem maiorum cognationem ostendit*. There was on the one hand an aggressive reaction to *maximus... pater*, according to which Anchises makes a mistake by saying that Teucer is "the oldest" of their ancestors (for Dardanus is older), and, on the other, there was a more defensive reaction, according to which *maximus* does not mean "the oldest father," but only "a very old father." But others also criticized this attempt to defend Anchises, for the fact that he says *pater* shows that he thinks of Teucer as the real progenitor of the Trojans (*per patris autem appellationem maiorum cognationem ostendit*).²⁴

On the other hand, in the parenthetical phrase *si rite audita recordor* (107) Servius sees a kind of extenuation of the gravity of Anchises' mistake on the part of the poet: *bene dubitatione excusat errorem* (cf. Georgii 158). By making Anchises express himself in a cautious way, Vergil intends to present him in a more positive light. Nevertheless, Anchises' mistake could be seen as an embarrassing moment in Aeneas's depiction of his family.²⁵

Ovid seems to emphasize his own embarrassment faced with this section of the *Aeneid*. He insinuates that Vergil went too far by presenting Anchises as not-quite-all-there, and the Trojans as a mass of dupes ready to follow his disastrous interpretation. Ovid censors everything—but of course one result

²³ For *durus* "dull, slow, obtuse" see *OLD* s.v. 4b.

²⁴ For remarks on Anchises' mistakes, cf. also Serv. on 104 *modo ergo errat Anchises, 106 VBERRIMA REGNA hic decipitur, quia audiit "ubere laeto."*

²⁵ It must be said, however, that the "arrogance" displayed by the ancient commentators is quite out of place: the story of Dardanus coming to Troy from Italy is a totally unattested variant of the legend. It is at least an extremely obscure mythical detail, and it may even be an invention of Vergil (cf. Buchheit 151–72). If the last hypothesis is true, and the story of the Italic descent from Dardanus is Vergil's invention, Anchises (on a metanarrative level) could not possibly be able to solve the riddle of the "ancient mother." (At most, Vergil uses a very recent and extremely marginal development of the saga: cf. Horsfall 1987, esp. 103–4; see also Horsfall 1973–74. Jocelyn's article is very useful, but fails to convince when he proposes that Dardanus-the-Italian was already present in the poems of Naevius and Ennius.)

of his censorship is that of giving even more prominence to Vergil's supposed lack of respect towards Augustus's venerable ancestor.

So, Ovid completely censors Anchises' mistake. The day after the symposium at Anius's home the Trojans go to consult Apollo's oracle, and the god orders them to look for the ancient mother (Ov. *Met.* 13.675–79):

Talibus atque aliis postquam conuiuia dictis
inplerunt, mensa somnum petiere remota
cumque die surgunt adeuntque oracula Phoebi,
qui petere antiquam matrem cognataque iussit
litora...

After they had filled the time with these and other matters, they left the table and retired to sleep, and rising with the dawn, they went to the oracle of Phoebus, who ordered them to seek their ancient mother, and their ancestral shores.

There is no exegesis on the part of anybody. Immediately afterwards there follows an elaborate digression about the gifts Anius gives the Trojans, especially a mixing bowl decorated with scenes from the story of the metamorphosis of Orion's daughters, which Ovid duly narrates (13.679–704). Then the whole story of Anchises' mistake, the deadly Cretan stop, and the prophecy of the Penates, is finished off in four lines, in which there is no hint either at Anchises and at any mistake he might have made, or at any plague striking the Trojans in Crete,²⁶ or even at any prophecy about Dardanus and Italy from the Penates or from anybody else (Ov. *Met.* 13.705–708):

Inde **recordati** Teucros a sanguine Teucri
ducere principium, Cretam tenuere locique
ferre diu nequiere Iouem *centumque* relictis
urbibus Ausonios optant contingere *portus*.

From there, remembering that they, the Teucrians, came originally from the blood of Teucer, they made for Crete. But they could not stand the weather for long, and they left Crete with its hundred cities, hoping to reach the harbors of Ausonian Italy.

The Trojans—but not particularly Anchises—“remember” Teucer and move on to Crete. The vague *recordati* maliciously refers the reader directly to An-

²⁶ The absence of any (explicit) reference to the plague at Crete is all the more striking since the story of Orion's daughters, which is depicted on the bowl Anius gives Aeneas, opens with a description of a plague striking Thebes (*Met.* 13.685–91; cf. *Ant. Lib. Met.* 25.2). A reader might think this an anticipation of the plague awaiting the Trojans at Crete.

chises' unfortunate misinterpretation, recalling Anchises' *si rite audita recordor* (Aen. 3.107), and censoring the fact that, actually, Anchises did not remember that very well. And notice also 13.707–708 *centum... / urbibus* echoing Aen. 3.106 *centum urbes* from the same context of Anchises' awkward hermeneutic enthusiasm (Verg. Aen. 3.102–109):

tum genitor ueterum uoluens monimenta uirorum
 “audite, o procures,” ait “et spes discite uestras.
 Creta louis magni medio iacet insula ponto,
 mons Idaeus ubi et gentis cunabula nostrae.
centum urbes habitant magnas, uberrima regna,
 maximus unde pater, **si rite audita recordor**,
 Teucrus Rhoeteas primum est aduectus in oras,
 optauitque locum regno.”

Then my father, thinking of the records of the ancients, said: “Listen, O princes, and learn what you may hope for. Crete lies in the midst of the sea, the island of mighty Jove, where Mount Ida is, the cradle of our race. They inhabit a hundred great cities, the richest of kingdoms, from which our earliest ancestor, Teucer, if I remember the tale rightly, first sailed to Trojan shores, and chose a site for his royal capital...”

In fact, Ovid does not restrict himself to censoring Anchises' mistake. He even censors the dramatic consequences of that mistake, by turning the plague by which the Trojans are struck on Crete into a mere weather problem: the Trojans *loci... / ferre diu nequiere Iouem* (707), “could not stand the weather for a long time.” The metonymy *Iuppiter* = climate, which gives the reader the impression that the Trojans found nasty weather on Crete, is pointed: it censors the plague, but at the same time it reminds the reader of it, since it alludes both to Vergil's description of the plague (3.138 *corrupto caeli tractu*; the most normal metonymic use of *Iuppiter* is for “sky”),²⁷ and to the final revelation of the Penates, when they explain the cause of the plague: 3.171 *Dictaea negat tibi Iuppiter arua*.

This censorship has been noticed by Ovidian interpreters.²⁸ But what has gone unnoticed is that this Ovidian ambiguity, for which the metonymy *Iuppiter* = “climate, weather” ironically suggests both *Iuppiter* in the sense of (infected) “sky,” and *Iuppiter* as the angry god who sends the plague, is actually picking up and developing a parallel ambiguity in Vergil. Anchises

²⁷ But no reader could understand *loci... / ferre diu nequiere Iouem* as a reference to a plague without knowledge of the Vergilian version of the story.

²⁸ See Galinsky 223; cf. also Solodow 145; Baldo 52n44; and Bömer, Galasso, and Hopkinson *ad loc*.

concludes his explanation of Apollo's oracle by urging the Trojans to leave for Crete (Verg. *Aen.* 3.114–17):

“ergo agite et diuum ducunt qua iussa sequamur:
placemus uentos et Cnosia regna petamus.
nec longo distant cursu: **modo Iuppiter adsit**,
tertia lux classem Cretaeis sistet in oris.”²⁹

“So come, and let us follow where the god's command may lead, let us placate the winds, and seek out the Cretan kingdom. It is no long journey away: if only Jupiter is with us, the third dawn will find our fleet on the Cretan shores.”

Modern commentators do not have much to say about *modo Iuppiter adsit*.³⁰ Ancient ones were more attentive to the polysemy of Vergil's phrase. Servius has this comment: *aut aër, ac si diceret: tantummodo sit serenum [...]: aut re uera Iuppiter, qui praeest insulae Cretae, quam petemus*. And Serv. Dan. adds a third explanation combining meteorological metonymy and literal meaning: *aut quia uentos prosperos Iuppiter praestat*. Anchises' polysemous phrase is however full of tragic irony: Jupiter as the sky will revolt against the Trojans (3.138 *corrupto caeli tractu*), and Jupiter as the god will not help them, but on the contrary will throw them off of his island (3.171 *Dictaea negat tibi Iuppiter arua*) (cf. Heyworth 257). When Ovid says that the Trojans at Crete “cannot stand the climate of the region,” he is certainly “debasing” Vergil's plague (so Stitz 48), or better, he is “censoring” it; but he is also picking up, and commenting on, a Vergilian point. The ambiguous Jupiter of Ovid develops and explains the equally ambiguous Jupiter of *Aeneid* 3.117: in Vergil the seemingly innocuous metonymy “Jupiter = weather” anticipates with tragic irony both the personal intervention of the god against the Trojans, and the plague the god sends against them through a corruption of the sky, his own element; in Ovid the metonymy “Jupiter = weather” alludes at the same time to the intervention of the god, to the corruption of the sky, and to Vergil's metonymic anticipation of those disasters (*modo Iuppiter adsit*).

We have seen that Ovid completely censors Anchises' mistake. Actually he does more than that: he self-reflexively comments on his own censorship. During the evening symposium at Anius's place, the conversation is started by Anchises, who asks Anius about his daughters and his son. Anius answers

²⁹ Vergil appropriately substitutes Cretan Jupiter for the Homeric model Poseidon; cf. Achilles menacing to return to Phthia in Hom. *Il.* 9.362–63 (363 is translated by Cic. *Diu.* 1.52 as *tertia te Phthiae tempesta laeta locabit*).

³⁰ But cf. Conington *ad loc.*: “Jupiter may be mentioned as the god of weather [...], Serv.”

by narrating the story of the metamorphosis of his daughters into doves. But this is how Anchises begins to speak, in Ovid:

tum pius Anchises: 'o Phoebi lecte sacerdos,
fallor, an et natum, cum primum haec moenia uidi,
 bisque duas natus, *quantum reminiscor*, habebas?
 huic Anius niueis circumdata tempora uittis
 concutiens et tristis ait: '**non falleris**, heros
 maxime; uidisti natorum quinque parentem,
 quem nunc (tanta homines rerum inconstantia uersat)
 paene uides orbum...' (Ov. *Met.* 13.640–47)

Then virtuous Anchises said: "O chosen priest of Phoebus, am I wrong, or do I not remember that you had a son and four daughters, when I first saw your city?" Shaking his head, bound with its white sacrificial fillets, Anius replied sadly: " Mightiest of heroes, you are not wrong: you saw me the father of five children, whom now you see almost bereft, such is the mutability of affairs that affects humankind..."

quantum reminiscor again recalls the crucial *si rite audita recordor* (3.107) from Anchises' wrong interpretation of Apollo's oracle,³¹ and Anius's address to Anchises as *heros / maxime* recalls the designation of Teucer as *maximus... pater* in that very verse (3.107)—an incorrect designation, of course, which is an integral part of Anchises' mistake, since Dardanus, and not Teucer, is the "oldest father" of the Trojans (cf. Serv. and Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 3.107, quoted above). But now, in Ovid's censored "Aeneid," there are *absolutely* no mistakes on the part of Anchises: "Am I wrong, or... as far as I remember...?" "No, you are *not* wrong, excellent hero..."

³¹ Insistence on "reminiscence" in the context of rewriting (and censoring) Vergil's *Aeneid* has a self-reflexive value: the reader of the *Metamorphoses* is also involved in the process of "remembering" the text of Vergil (cf. Hopkins 30), and Ovidian Anchises is "remembering" exactly his words about "remembering" in the *Aeneid*, but he is "remembering" them both precisely (*quantum reminiscor ~ si rite... recordor*), and incorrectly: by starting to speak at Anius's home, he is doing something that was totally absent from the *Aeneid*. Anius's comment on the mutability of human destiny in 13.646 (*tanta homines rerum inconstantia uersat*) can be read as a comment on the mutability of texts just at the point where Ovid is about to introduce Anius's daughters, who were completely absent from *Aeneid* 3. On the other hand, the fact that Anchises "sees Anius almost deprived of his daughters and his son" (*Met.* 13.645–46 *quem nunc... | paene uides orbis*) describes the narrative situation of the *Aeneid*, where no mention is made of any daughters nor son of Anius.

V. THE FOURTH DAUGHTER

Let us consider now Anius's tale about his daughters. Ovidian Anius has four daughters—their names are never mentioned—and one son, Andros, eponym of the island. Anius's daughters have received from Bacchus the gift of being able to transform all they touch into corn, wine, and oil. When Agamemnon hears of the girls' magical abilities, he plans to tear them, against their will, from their father's arms in order to oblige them to supply the Argive troops with food. But the girls escape, two to Euboea, and two to their brother in Andros. When the Greek army arrives there, Andros, frightened, delivers his sisters to the enemy. When the Greeks are about to put them in chains, they invoke Bacchus's help: the god intervenes and transforms them into doves (*Met.* 13.644–74).

The story of Anius's daughters was quite popular in classical literature. Callimachus told it in the *Aitia* (fr. 188 Pf. = 112 Massimilla), and Euphorion wrote an *Anius* about which we know very little (Euphor. fr. 2 Pow.).³² But the vulgate version of the myth differs from Ovid's. First of all, Anius and his daughters usually do not appear so hostile to the Greeks. Rather, in the original telling of the myth, it was Anius himself who sought to convince the Greeks to dally with him for nine years; in fact, thanks to his prophetic gifts, he knew that the Greeks would take Troy in the tenth year. In the meantime, the Greeks could be nourished by his daughters.³³

We find the most detailed version of the tale in the scholia to Lycophron 570 and 580, which refer to the versions in the *Kypria*, in Pherecydes, and in Callimachus:

Rhoio ("Pomegranate") was the daughter of Staphylos ("bunch of grapes"), son of Dionysus. Apollo lay with her in love. When Staphylos realized this, he locked her in a box and threw her into the ocean. She reached Euboea, and there, she bore a child in a cave, whom she called Anius because she had suffered (ἀνιηθήναι) because of him. Apollo took the child and brought him to Delos where he married Dorippe and fathered the Oinotrópoi ("women who transform (things) into wine"): Oinô ("wine girl"), Spermô ("seed girl"), and Elaís ("oil girl"): Dionysus gave them as a gift the ability to create seeds whenever they wished. Pherecydes (*FGrHist* 3 F 140) claims that Anius sought to convince the Greeks, who had arrived at Delos, to stay with him for nine years: in fact, it would be granted to them by the gods to seize Ilium in the tenth year, and he

³² Steph. Byz. 248.5 s.v. Δωδώνη + Iulian. *Or.* 4 p. 149 B. (= Eustath. *In Iliad.* p. 132.28 van der Valk). See Magnelli 95–96; van Groningen 21–23 (fr. 4).

³³ On the myth of Anius and his daughters see Càssola; Bruneau 1970: 413–30; Bruneau 1982; Bömer 370–73; Chirassi Colombo; Galasso 1476–78; Hopkinson 29–32.

promised that they would be nourished by his daughters. This episode is also found in the author of the *Kypria* (fr. 29 Bernabé, 19 Davies). Callimachus, too (fr. 188 Pf.), mentions the daughters of Anius in the *Aitia*.

Schol. Lycophr. 570 (Scheer 197–98)

The names of the Oinotrópoi were Oinô, Spermo, and Elaís. They had received from Dionysus the gift of being able to gather fruit whenever they wished, and Oinô made wine, Spermo, seed, and Elaís oil. They went to Troy and saved the lives of Greeks who were weak from hunger. Callimachus also attests this.

Schol. Lycophr. 580 (Scheer 200)

There is a version similar to this also in Eusthatus *ad Il.* 11.20 p. 827, 41–45: Anius invited the Greek army to spend ten years with him and then delivered his daughters to them so that they could nourish the Achaeans.³⁴

Thus, in the oldest version of the legend, Anius and his daughters did not harbor the slightest bit of hostility towards the Greeks; rather, they went out of their way to assist them.³⁵ One recurring theme is Anius's acknowledgment, thanks to his prophetic powers, that the war at Troy would last ten years, coupled with his offer to the Achaeans to stay with him as long as necessary: seeing that Troy would not fall for ten years, why shouldn't the Greeks stay with him on Delos until that time? His daughters would willingly provide for their nourishment.

In Vergil, however, Anius is an "old friend" of Anchises, and thus, presumably, pro-Trojan and not pro-Greek, as he is in Pherecydes, for example.³⁶ And

³⁴ Cf. also Diod. Sic. 5.61–62. The Oinotropoi nourish the Greek army also in Simonid. fr. 537 Page = schol. EPQ Hom. *Od.* 6.164. Cf. Dictys Cret. 1.23; Dares 19.

³⁵ Anius also advises the Greeks on a successful voyage, and gives them a black bull, suggesting they sacrifice it at the place where it goes ashore; the bull lands on the island of Andros, and its sacrifice is the occasion for the foundation of the temple of Athena Tauropolos: Phot. s.v.; Suda s.v. *Tauropolon*; schol. Aristoph. *Lys.* 447.

³⁶ There might be an earlier establishment of a relationship between Anius and Anchises, if the "Palaefatus" to whom Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 3.80 attributes the notion of a family tie between them is really the Peripatetic Palaephatus (IV–III century B.C.E.). We cannot be certain about this; Bömer 371 is skeptical. The story as expounded by Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 3.80 apparently presupposes the Ovidian version. The only points not attested in Ovid are that Anius's daughters have been "consecrated" to Dionysus by their father and the detail that their metamorphosis was the aition of the prohibition against harming doves in the temple of Apollo at Delos. On the "other" daughter of Anius, see below. The explanation of the origin of the friendship between Anchises and Anius given by Serv. Dan., according to whom *ad quem* (sc. Anium) *Anchises ante Troicum bellum consultum uenerat, an Salaminam peteret comes Priamo: unde et agnoscitur* ("Anchises had come to him before the Trojan war to ask for advice on whether he should have gone to Salamis as

in Ovid, Anius's daughters are even violently anti-Greek: they refuse to help the Greeks, and their hostility is such that they would rather be turned into doves than assist Agamemnon.

It is not clear exactly when or by whom a version of the story was created in which the daughters of Anius were forced unwillingly to help the Greeks. The mysterious φάβες ("doves") which Lycophron uses to refer to the Oinotrópoi in 580 is thought to be the first evidence of their metamorphosis: but even in Lycophron Anius's daughters help the Greeks, and are sympathetic to them (Lycophr. 569–83).³⁷

At a certain point, however, a positive connection between Anius and the Trojans was indeed created, when somebody invented the tradition of Aeneas's sojourn at Delos during his journey to Italy. We have no attestations of the sojourn prior to Vergil, but the episode is no doubt earlier, or at least independent of the Vergilian version, as it appears in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1.50.1, 1.59.3).³⁸ One must, however, note that Aeneas's stay with Anius was never connected to the story of the Oinotrópoi. In all of the versions of the myth known to us (and, of course, many others are lost to us forever), when the Oinotrópoi appear, they assist the Greeks.

It does not surprise us, then, that Vergil fails to make the slightest allusion to the daughters of Anius. We begin to see that developing the story of the Oinotrópoi by way of re-writing Vergil's *Aeneid* could present some degree of risk: Vergil carefully refrained from speaking of the daughters in *Aeneid* 3, and if one considers their staunch pro-Greek stance in an important branch of the literary tradition, Vergil's silence may seem like an act of censorship. The return of the daughters of Anius in the *Metamorphoses*, then, runs the risk of reading like a return of the repressed.

There is one particularly strange feature of Ovid's tale. The tradition as a whole attests three Oinotrópoi: Oinô ("wine girl"), Spermhô ("seed girl"), and Elaís ("oil girl"), each one having the power to transform whatever she touched into the substance from which she took her name. In the *Metamorphoses*, however, Anius clearly specifies, and reaffirms more than once, that

a companion of Priam; because of that now he is recognized by Anius"), is nothing but a scholiastic autoschediasm based on the similar scene in which Aeneas is recognized by Evander in *Aen.* 8.157–59; cf. Eden *ad loc.*

³⁷ A reference to the fact that the story of the metamorphosis of Anius's daughters is extremely rare is perhaps seen in 13.671–72 *nec qua ratione figuram / perdiderint, potui scire aut nunc dicere possum*. Even Anius cannot exactly tell the details of the metamorphosis of his daughters.

³⁸ Anius's new pro-Trojan attitude is possibly to be connected to the very good relationships between Delos and Rome from the II century B.C.E. onwards. Cf. Erskine.

he has *four* daughters: at the arrival of the Greeks, two flee to Euboea, and two to their brother at Andros.

Why does he include a fourth daughter of Anius, which has no parallel elsewhere (cf. e.g. Bömer 372; Galasso 1477)? In fact, some traditions of the tale of Anius recognize the existence of a fourth daughter—that is to say, that in certain versions of the myth, Anius does not appear as the father of three daughters, but rather as the father of a single girl. So, we have four daughters of Anius, if we add up the daughters who exist in the two differing versions of the myth. This “fourth” daughter is of particular interest from the standpoint of the *Aeneid*. In fact, Anius is father to exactly one girl in the version of the myth in which he hosts Aeneas during his journey. In Lutatius Catulus/Lutatius Daphnis (or Alexander of Ephesus) *ap. Origo gentis Romanae* 9.5 and in Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.59.3, Aeneas meets this “fourth” daughter of Anius during the stopover in Delos on his way to Italy, marries her, and brings her with him to Latium. The girl's name is Lavinia, and from her the city of Lavinium takes its name.³⁹

According to a note reported by Servius, however, the relationship between Aeneas and Anius's daughter was yet again different: Aeneas raped her in secret, and fathered a child by her, whose name is lost in the manuscript tradition.⁴⁰ The Ovidian move, which features *four* daughters of Anius, where Vergil cautiously avoided any allusion to a single one of them, is not innocent.⁴¹

In the first place, the intrusion of the Oinotrópoi into the travels of Aeneas recalls to the reader's mind the dominant mythological tradition in which they were undeniably pro-Greek, and in which their father Anius yearned to host the Greeks until that fatal tenth year of the war that he foresaw. This might even raise some malicious suspicions about the real authenticity of Anius's pro-Trojan loyalty in Vergil, and even about the real attitude of his Delian Apollo, to whom Anius is both son and priest (after all, it might not be so strange that the Apollo of Anius gives such an ambiguous response—a response that brings no advantage to the Trojans, but only misfortune). Second, the absolutely unexpected presence of *four* daughters awakens from its (opportune) slumber the phantasm of that “fourth” daughter, who could

³⁹ As for *OGR* 9.5, Vanotti 153 (on Dion. Hal. 1.50.1) attributes the story to Lutatius (Daphnis), but at 221–22 (on Dion. Hal. 1.59.3), on the contrary, to Alexander of Ephesus. In favor of Lutatius, e.g., Horsfall 1991: 51n131; of Alexander of Ephesus, doubtfully, D'Anna 87.

⁴⁰ Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 3, 80 *alii dicunt huius Anii filiam occulte ab Aenea stupratam edidisse filium nomine †an.*

⁴¹ Cf. Hopkinson 32: “This connection of a fourth daughter with Aeneas may be sufficient explanation for Ovid's treatment.”

be such a grievous embarrassment to the Vergilian version of Aeneas's adventures: at best, a rival of the "true" Lavinia; at worst, the victim of Aeneas's sexual abuse.

But Ovid, as is typical of him, attacks covertly. The four daughters of Anius are there in his "Aeneid." But of course they are fiercely opposed to the Greeks, or at least so Anius tells to the Trojans (perhaps sincerely, perhaps not). And there is no interaction or contact between any of the daughters and Aeneas. Literally no contact: when Aeneas reaches Delos, the daughters are no longer there. But Ovid feels the need to vouch also for the past. The two daughters who sought refuge with Andros were unable to get protection from their brother, who was too weak militarily. Confidently adapting a passage from the discussion of Vergil's Diomedes,⁴² Anius says,

**"Non hic Aeneas, non, qui defenderet Andron, Hector erat, per quem
decimum durastis in annum.**

iamque parabantur captiuis uincla lacertis..." (Met. 13.665–67)

Aeneas and Hector, thanks to whom you held out till the tenth year, were not here to defend Andros. Now they were readying the chains for the prisoners' arms...

There was no contact between Aeneas and Anius's daughters either in the present or in the past. But in light of the well-known version in which a meeting between Aeneas and one of Anius's daughters really occurred (with disastrous consequences for the Vergilian version of Aeneas's story) the specification according to which *non hic Aeneas...erat* sounds like an *excusatio non petita*. Especially so because, due to a curious coincidence, right at the point in which he denies any possibility for awkward interferences of the "prohibited" versions of the myth, Anius goes right on to remind the reader of his obsessive preoccupation with the exact length of the Trojan war, those ten years of siege during which he was famously willing to host and feed the Greek army.

VI. AELLO AND CELAENO:

OID ON VERGIL'S ETYMOLOGICAL PLAYS⁴³

In the *Aeneid*, after the departure from Crete (3.190–91), a violent storm sends the Trojans off course (192–208). The loss of track is a metanarrative

⁴² Cf. *Aen.* 11.288–90 *Hectoris Aeneaeque manu uictoria Graium / haesit et in decimum uestigia rettulit annum.*

⁴³ For other instances of Ovid's comments on Vergilian etymological wordplay, see O'Hara 1996b.

touch, since the Trojans are really veering "off course" (*Aen.* 3.200 *excutimur cursu*): in fact, they arrive at the Strophades islands, home of Celaeno and the other Harpies (209–18)—a stopover definitely not attested in the pre-Vergilian version of the tale.

Here Ovid's dependence upon the Vergilian model is unequivocal: Ovid takes from Vergil the nontraditional stopover on the Strophades, just as he uses the storm that hits the Trojans during their departure from Crete. Seventy-eight lines in Vergil (*Aen.* 3.192–269) become two in Ovid (*Met.* 13.709–10):

saeuit hiems iactatque uiros, Strophadumque receptos
portubus infidis exterruit ales Aello.

A tempest raged, and tossed the heroes on stormy seas, and taking refuge in the treacherous harbor of the Strophades, they were terrified by the harpy, Aello.

There is a point here which immediately grabs the attention of the reader, and requires comment: in Vergil, the leader of the Harpies, and the only one he names, is called *Celaeno* ("the Black" or "Dark One"); it is she who gives the Trojans the seemingly terrible prophecy of the eaten tables (*Aen.* 3.245–58), with which she frightens them and causes them to lose heart (*Aen.* 3.259–62; cf. *Ov. exterruit*). Ovid, on the other hand, at a very Vergilian point in his narrative, substitutes the name Aello for Celaeno. Why is this?

Let us begin with the most obvious point: Ovid elides an apparently Vergilian innovation in order to restore a traditional element. The name "Celaeno" for a Harpy is not attested before Vergil; "Aello," however, is attested as early as Hesiod, *Theog.* 267 (where she appears with "Okypete," "the Speedy"). Therefore, we could say that, while Ovid follows Vergil in his change of course, at the same time, he corrects an unnecessarily bold choice, by restoring to the head Harpy a name sanctioned by the tradition.

But this correction also has another goal, and here we will see how easy it is to pass from the correction of Vergil to its interpretation. Aello ("the stormy one") is from Hesiod on a "speaking name," since the Harpies were originally personifications of storm winds.⁴⁴ Ovid is obviously playing upon the etymology of Ἀελλώ from ἄελλα, "storm": *saeuit hiems iactatque uiros, Strophadumque receptos / portubus infidis exterruit ales Aello* (*Met.* 13.709–10).⁴⁵ The distich is introduced by *saeuit hiems*, "the storm rages," and closes with *Aello*, on which *hiems* is an etymological gloss.

⁴⁴ On the Harpies (literary sources and iconography), see esp. Kahil; also Fasce.

⁴⁵ This fact is noticed neither by Ovid's commentators nor by Michalopoulos, who does not say anything on *Aello* in 13.710, whereas on *Aello* (one of Actaeon's dogs) in

But the Ovidian concentration in a single distich of the storm plus the landing among the Harpies, with the etymological gloss *hiems* = *Aello*, forces us to realize something that otherwise could have escaped our notice, namely that the connection between storm and Harpies already exists in Vergil: in Vergil we must appreciate the fact that the Trojans arrive at the island of the “stormy” Harpies because they are driven there by a storm, unlike the *Argonautica* of Apollonius (2.164–530, a primary model for the Vergilian episode). What is more, the Ovidian sequence, “the Trojans were battered by a storm; they sought shelter in the harbors of the Strophades; they were terrified by *Aello*” (*Met.* 13.709–10), reproduces exactly the movement of *Aen.* 3.209–10: *seruatum ex undis Strophadum me litora primum / excipiunt* (“Free of the waves I am welcomed first by the shores of the Strophades”),⁴⁶ where Servius notes appropriately: *SERVATVM EX VNDIS ac si diceret, de periculis in grauiora se peruenisse discrimina* (“as if he were saying that, in escaping one danger, he found himself in dangers still more dire”). Ovid, then, repeats the effect of Vergil’s “out of the frying pan and into the fire,” and turns our attention to the storm-Strophades sequence from the *Aeneid*.⁴⁷

In other words, Ovid, by condensing the entire Vergilian episode of storm plus the run in with the Harpies into two verses, with the word “storm” at the beginning of the distich etymologically glossing the name of the Harpy at the end (*saeuit hiems-terrui...Aello*), makes us reflect upon the storm-Harpies connection in the *Aeneid*, and this allows us to catch a Vergilian point: Aeneas *seruatum ex undis* (3.210) is about to encounter another type of “storm,” the Harpies. He goes from storm to storm.

Now we can ask ourselves: if Ovid substantiates this effect etymologically (storm, and thus, *Aello*, “the stormy one”), could it not also be the case that

3.219 he says (Michalopoulos 16): “*Aello* recalls Greek [ἄελλα] “storm wind, whirlwind,” hence *cursu fortis*. Cf. Hes. *Theog.* 267–69.”

⁴⁶ *excipiunt*, *Aen.* 3.210 ~ *receptos*, *Met.* 13.709.

⁴⁷ Immediately after *excipiunt*, Vergil makes an explicit annotation on the name of the Strophades that attracts the reader’s attention on the well-known (Apollonian) issue of its etymology: *Aen.* 3.211 *Strophades Graio stant nomine dictae... Graio... nomine* refers the reader to the etymological explanation given by Apollonius: 2.295–97 (the Argonauts) “turned back (ὑπέστρεφον) quickly in order to come back to their ship; therefore they gave the name of Strophades (Στροφάδες), ‘Islands of the Turning,’ to those islands that before were called ‘the Wandering Islands (πλωταί).’” *stant* (210) means *sunt* (Serv. Dan.), but the collocation of this verb between *Graio* and *nomine* (referring to Apollonius’s etymology) activates an allusion to the fact that now they are called Strophades whereas before they were the Plotai, the Wandering ones: now, precisely, *stant*, “they are immobile.” Cf. O’Hara 1996a: 139; Paschalis 125–27 (with many other shrewd remarks).

Vergil included something similar in his text? Put another way, does Ovid, by creating an etymological connection between the storm which brings the Trojans to the Strophades and the leader of the Harpies who meets them there, correct only Vergil, or, in correcting him, give an interpretation?

Vergil's Harpy is not Aello, but rather Celaeno, that is, "the Dark," "the Black." I have said that an awareness of the narrative irony which brings the Trojans to pass from a real storm to a personified one (the Harpies) is already present in Vergil's text. I would like then to look again at how Vergil describes the real storm which precedes the storm of Celaeno, "the Dark," "the Black":⁴⁸

Postquam altum tenuere rates nec iam amplius ullae
 apparent terrae, caelum undique et undique pontus,
 tum mihi caeruleus supra caput astitit imber
noctem hiememque ferens, et inhorruit unda **tenebris**.
 continuo uenti uoluunt mare magnaue surgunt
 aequora, dispersi *iactamur* gurgite uasto;
 inuoluere diem nimbi et **nox umida caelum**
abstulit, ingeminant abruptis nubibus ignes,
 excutimur cursu et **caecis erramus in undis**.
ipse diem noctemque negat discernere caelo
 nec meminisse uiae media Palinurus in unda.
 tris adeo incertos **caeca caligine** soles
 erramus pelago, totidem sine sidere noctes.
 quarto terra die primum se attollere tandem
 uisa, aperire procul montis ac uoluere fumum.
 uela cadunt, remis insurgimus; haud mora, nautae
 adnixa torquent spumas et caerula uerrunt.
 seruatum ex undis *Strophadum* me litora primum
excipiunt...
 ...quas dira *Celaeno*...⁴⁹ (Aen. 3.192–211)

⁴⁸ The storm is very closely modeled on *Od.* 12.403–25 (~ 14.301–13), the storm following the killing of the cows of the Sun: in this storm all of Odysseus's comrades die, and Odysseus is tossed onto Calypso's island, where the Phaeacian narrative comes to an end. Here the storm introduces the Harpies episode, which has for its main model the Homeric episode of the cows of the Sun (already the model of the Harpies episode in Apollonius). Vergil's insistence on darkness here recalls also that surrounding the Argonauts at their departure from Crete (as the Trojans left Crete in the *Aeneid*) in *Arg.* 4.1689–701, a passage already inspired by Odysseus's departure from Crete in his (false) narrative in *Od.* 14.301–15. On this see Nelis 32–33.

⁴⁹ Here there is another etymological play: the epithet *dira Celaeno* is etymologically glossed in 3.214–15 *nec saeuior ulla / pestis et ira deum*; cf. e.g. Nonius p. 43 L. *dirum est triste, infestum, et quasi deorum ira missum*. Cf. Keith 71.

When the fleet had reached the high seas and the land was no longer seen, sky and ocean on all sides, then a dark-blue rain cloud settled overhead, bringing night and storm, and the waves bristled with shadows. Immediately the winds rolled over the water and great seas rose: we were scattered here and there in the vast abyss. Storm-clouds shrouded the day, and dank night hid the sky: lightning flashed again from the torn clouds. We were thrown off course, and wandered the blind waves. Palinurus himself was unable to tell night from day in the sky, and could not determine his path among the waves. So for three days, and as many starless nights, we wandered uncertainly, in a dark fog, over the sea. At last, on the fourth day, land was first seen to rise, revealing far off mountains and rolling smoke. The sails fell, we stood to the oars: without pause, the sailors, at full stretch, churned the foam, and swept the blue sea. Saved from the waves, I am first received by the shores of the Strophades... where dreadful Celaeno...

The description of the storm which brings the Trojans to the Strophades and to Celaeno, the Dark, the Black, is dominated by one element: the darkness, the shadowy night that envelops the fleet. We go from “dark” storm to “dark” Harpy.⁵⁰

The obvious etymological connection which Ovid creates between the storm, which drive the Trojans to the Strophades, and the name of the Harpy, Aello, is a footnote to the perhaps less-evident Vergilian etymological connection between the “darkness” of the same storm and the name of the Harpy Celaeno. Vergil’s etymologizing is perhaps even a bit more precise than this: he specifies that the sun was for three days hidden by a *caeca caligo* (*Aen.* 3.203). According to modern (if not ancient) etymologists, one possible etymology for the Latin word *caligo* finds a connection to the Greek *κελαινός*.⁵¹ The connection Celaeno-*κελαινός*-*κηλῖς* is likely also relevant to Vergil’s emphasis upon Celaeno’s filthiness and on the act of “contamination,” “dirtying” (*κηλιδόω*): *Aen.* 3.216–17 *foedissima uentris / proluuies*; 227 *contactuque omnia foedant / immundo*; 234 *polluit ore dapes*; 244 *uestigia foeda relinquunt*.⁵²

⁵⁰ A hint at this in Paschalis’s excellent discussion: “[Celaeno’s] name relates in first place to the ‘blind’ course that takes the Trojans to the Strophades” (Paschalis 128).

⁵¹ Cf. Walde-Hofmann 139–40, s.v. (2) *callidus*; Frisk 840–41, s.v. *κηλῖς* (“stain”).

⁵² Celaeno “the Obscure one” is at the same time to be connected to the fact that she is the one who delivers the prophecy of the “eaten tables” which terrifies the Trojans, and which Ovid singles out as the keyword of the whole episode (*exterruit*). The Trojans’ fear is wholly unwarranted, as Helenus will explain to them (*Aen.* 3.394–95), and as they will understand when they come to Latium (*Aen.* 7.107–47). The only justification for their fear is given, precisely, by the impenetrable “obscurity” of Celaeno’s prophecy.

There is an interpretation similar to that of Celaeno's name in the speech of Phineus to the Argonauts in Valerius Flaccus:

... ilicet omnes
deueniunt, **niger** intorto ceu turbine **nimbus**
iamque alis procul et sonitu mihi nota **Celaeno**.
diripiunt uerruntque *dapes* foedataque turbant
pocula, saeuit odor surgitque miserrima pugna
parque mihi monstريسque fames... (Val. Fl. 4.451–56)

Immediately they all gathered, like a black cloud in a wild storm; I already recognized Celaeno from afar by the sound of her beating wings. They stole and swept away our food; they fouled and overturned our cups. They have a fierce stench: there began a painful battle: the hunger of these monsters matched my own.

Here *niger*... *nimbus* is an etymological gloss on *Celaeno* (note the alignment of (*niger*) *nimbus* and *Celaeno* at the end of two consecutive lines, and *foedata* in 454 ~ *Aen.* 3.227 *foedant* ~ κηλιδόω); the reader's attention is drawn towards the Vergilian etymologies by the citation in 4.453 *diripiunt uerruntque dapes* of *Aen.* 3.226–27 *Harpyiae et magnis quatunt clangoribus alas, / diripiuntque dapes*, when *Harpyiae* is glossed by the word *diripiunt*, according to the etymology of *Harpyiae* from the Greek ἀρπάζω = *rapio*.⁵³

VII. CONCLUSION

To sum up, in this paper we have dealt with a series of parallel passages in which Ovid, once again, puts himself in the role of Vergil's interpreter—an interpreter especially interested in playing the part of the “pedantic critic.” He appears—often in coincidence with discussions of ancient *quaestiones* preserved in the Servian commentary—as variously interested in “finding fault” with sometimes very minor “mistakes” or “awkwardness” he discovers (or pretends to discover) in Vergil's text. His exegetical reactions are various: sometimes he reproduces in his own text a presumed contradiction in the *Aeneid* (section I); sometimes he pedantically corrects Vergil's “mistakes” (section II); sometimes his corrections suggest a “better way” to treat Vergil's heroes, Aeneas and Anchises (sections III and IV), so insinuating that Vergil after all has not always been so chary with his own heroes. Sometimes he maliciously points to silences and omissions in Vergil's text, suggesting that

⁵³ On *Aen.* 3.226–27 cf. O'Hara 1996a: 139. For a Homeric etymological gloss on the Harpies' name cf. Hom. *Od.* 1.241 Ἄρπυιαι ἀνηρείψαντο, where the verb is probably a compound of ἐρέπτομαι, “to devour,” but originally “to grip,” “to seize”: see West *ad loc.*

the reason for those omissions could have been Vergil's desire of covering up embarrassing traditions (section V). Finally, sometimes he just shrewdly discovers some "unnoticed" etymological plays, and develops those hints in a way that at the same time *signals* them to the *Aeneid* reader (section VI). In any case, I hope to have shown that casting a glance at Ovid's "commentary" on the *Aeneid* is something that can be useful for the reader of, and especially the commentator on, Vergil's text.

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, W. S., ed. 1996. *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphoses*. Stuttgartiae-Lipsiae.
- Bömer, F., ed. 1982. *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen: Buch XII–XIII*. Heidelberg.
- Boyd, B. W. 2002. "When Ovid Reads Vergil...": A Response and Some Observations," *Vergilius* 48: 123–30.
- Brugnoli, G. and F. Stok. 1992. *Ovidius παρῳδήσας*. Pisa.
- Bruneau, P. 1970. *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*. Paris.
- . 1982. "Anios," *LIMC* 1: 793–94.
- Buchheit, V. 1963. *Vergil über die Sendung Roms: Untersuchungen zum Bellum Poenicum und zur Aeneis*. Heidelberg.
- Casali, S. 1995. "Altre voci nell'Eneide di Ovidio," *MD* 35: 59–76. Repr. with corrections in P. E. Knox, ed., *Oxford Readings in Ovid*. Oxford. Forthcoming.
- . 2004. "Terre mobili: la topografia di Azio in Virgilio (*Aen.* 3.274–89), in Ovidio (*Met.* 13.713–15) e in Servio," in *Hinc Italae gentes. Geopolitica ed etnografia italica nel commento di Servio all'Eneide*, eds. F. Stok and C. Santini. Pisa. 45–74.
- . 2004–05. "Further Voices in Ovid *Heroides* 7," in *Aetas Ovidiana?*, ed. D. Nelis. = *Hermathena* 177–78: 141–58.
- . 2005. "La vite dietro il mirto: Lycurgus, Polydorus e la violazione delle piante in *Eneide* 3," *SIFC* 4th ser. 3: 233–50.
- Cassola, F. 1954. "La leggenda di Anio e la preistoria Delia," *PP* 9: 345–67.
- Caviglia, F. 1988. "Polidoro," *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 4: 162–64.
- Chirassi Colombo, I. 1984. "Anio," *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 1: 177–78.
- Conington, J., ed. 1884. *The Works of Vergil*. Vol. 2, rev. by H. Nettleship. 4th ed. London.
- Cova, P. V., ed. 1994. *Virgilio. Il libro terzo dell'Eneide*. Milan.
- D'Anna, G., ed. 1992. *Anonimo: Origine del popolo romano*. Milan.
- Döpp, S. 1969. *Virgilischer Einfluß im Werk Ovids*. Munich.
- Eden, P. T., ed. 1975. *A Commentary on Vergil: Aeneid VIII*. Leiden.
- Erskine, A. 1997. "Delos, Aeneas and IG XI.4.756," *ZPE* 117: 133–66.
- Fasce, S. 1984. "Arpie," *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 1: 334–37.
- Frisk, H. 1960. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Band I: A–Ko. Heidelberg.
- Galasso, L., ed. 2000. *Ovidio: Opere*. Vol. 2. *Le metamorfosi*, trans. G. Paduano. Turin.
- Galinsky, G. K. 1975. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: An Introduction to the Basic Aspects*. Oxford.

- Georgii, H. 1891. *Die antike Äneiskritik aus den Scholien und anderen Quellen Hergestellt*. Stuttgart.
- Görler, W. 1987. "Obtrectatores," *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 3: 807–13.
- Groningen, B. A. van, ed. 1977. *Euphorion*. Amsterdam.
- Heyne, C. G., ed. 1832. *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera*. Vol. 2. 4th ed. Leipzig and London.
- Heyworth, S. J. 1993. "Deceitful Crete: Aeneid 3.84 and the Hymns of Callimachus," *CQ* n.s. 43: 255–57.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Hopkinson, N., ed. 2000. *Ovid: Metamorphoses Book XIII*. Cambridge.
- Horsfall, N. M. 1973. "Corythus: The Return of Aeneas in Virgil and His Sources," *JRS* 43: 68–79.
- . 1987. "Corythus Re-Examined," in *Roman Myth and Mythography*, *BICS Suppl.* 52, eds. N. Bremmer and N. M. Horsfall. London. 89–104.
- . 1991. *Virgilio: l'epopea in alambicco*. Naples.
- Jocelyn, H. D. 1991. "Virgil and Aeneas' Supposed Italic Ancestry," *Sileno* 17: 77–100.
- Kahil, L. 1988. "Harpyiai," *LIMC* 4.1: 445–50.
- Keith, A. 2000. *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge.
- Knox, P. E., ed. 1995. *Ovid: Heroides. Select Epistles*. Cambridge.
- Lamacchia, R. 1960. "Ovidio interprete di Virgilio," *Maia* 12: 310–30.
- Magnelli, E. 2002. *Studi su Euforione*. Rome.
- Michalopoulos, A. 2001. *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Commented Lexicon*. Leeds.
- Miller, P. A. 2004. "The Parodic Sublime: Ovid's Reception of Virgil in *Heroides* 7," in *Re-Presenting Virgil: Special Issue in Honor of M. C. J. Putnam*, eds. G. W. Most and S. Spence. = *MD* 52: 57–72.
- Mynors, R. A. B., ed. 1969. *P. Vergili Maronis: Opera*. Oxford.
- Nelis, D. 2001. *The Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Leeds.
- O'Hara, J. J. 1996a. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor.
- . 1996b. "Vergil's Best Reader? Ovidian Commentary on Vergilian Etymological Wordplay," *CJ* 91: 255–76.
- Otis, B. 1970. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, 2nd ed. Cambridge.
- Papaioannou, S. 2005. *Epic Succession and Dissension: Ovid, Metamorphoses 13.623–14.582 and the Reinvention on the Aeneid*. Berlin and New York.
- Paratore, E., ed. 1978. *Virgilio: Eneide*, vol. 2 (*Aen.* 3–4). Milan.
- Paschalis, M. 1997. *Vergil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names*. Oxford.
- Skutsch, O., ed. 1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford.
- Smith, R. A. 1997. *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil*. Ann Arbor.
- Stitz, M. 1962. *Ovid und Vergils Aeneis. Interpretation Met. 13.623–14.608*. PhD Diss., University of Freiburg.
- Thomas, R. F. 2001. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge.
- Timpanaro, S. 1986. *Per la storia della filologia virgiliana antica*. Rome.
- . 2001. *Virgilianisti antichi e tradizione indiretta*. Florence.
- Tissol, G. 1997. *The Face of Nature: Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Princeton.

- Vanotti, G. 1995. *L'altro Enea. La testimonianza di Dionigi d'Alicarnasso*. Rome.
- Walde, A., and J. B. Hofmann. 1938. *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Vol. 1, A-L. Heidelberg.
- West, S., ed. 1996. *Omero: Odissea*, vol. 1. 4th ed. Milan.
- Williams, R. D., ed. 1962. *P. Vergilii Maronis Aeneidos Liber Tertius*. Oxford.