

Citation style

Heyworth, S. J.: Rezension über: Antonio Ramírez de Verger, Book VI of Ovid's Metamorphoses. A Textual Commentary, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2018, in: Exemplaria Classica, 27 (2023), S. 205-220, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33776/ec.v27.7979>, heruntergeladen über Website

exemplaria
C L A S S I C A
Journal of Classical Philology

copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

EDITING OVID'S *METAMORPHOSES*: A DISCURSIVE REVIEW OF RAMÍREZ DE VERGER ON BOOK 6*

Antonio Ramírez de Verger is a major figure, influential both as a university administrator (Rector of Huelva in a period of exciting growth between 1997 and 2005) and as a student of the ancient world, leading the revival of Latin philology in Spain. He has published voluminously, stimulated the researches of others, and built networks of scholarship within Spain and internationally. His work covers a range of major Latin poets, and includes editions, translations, introductions, as well as expansive reviews and exploration of the editions and scholarship of others, present and past.¹ From his own mentor Georg Luck² he derives a generosity and openness in his criticism. In particular he has contributed to the study of Ovid's texts, with an elegant Teubner edition of the love poetry, and by establishing his own university as a centre for the study of the *Metamorphoses* and its reception in medieval manuscripts and editions through the aptly named Research Group 'Nicolaus Heinsius' – I quote from the website:

Su propósito es, por una parte, publicar una nueva edición maior y el primer *commentarius criticus* de las *Metamorfosis* de Ovidio. La *editio maior* se propone la nueva colación exhaustiva de los manuscritos y ediciones existentes. El *commentarius criticus* es eminentemente textual: difiere por ello de otros enfoques previos (p.e., Bömer, 1969-1986) o de trabajos en curso de realización (p. e. Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 2005 & sqq.).

This volume is the third to appear of this grand project, after the slim, sadly posthumous, commentary of Luck on 15 (Huelva 2017), and the far more substantial volume of Luis Rivero dedicated to 13 (De Gruyter 2018). It conveys an enormous amount of information and learning, and argues, with extensive citation of evidence, for an intelligent and readable text of Ovid's most distressing book – the one that begins with the comparatively happy episode that sees Arachne transformed by the jealous

* ANTONIO RAMÍREZ DE VERGER, *Book VI of Ovid's Metamorphoses. A Textual Commentary*, Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2018, viii+415 pp., €149.95, ISBN 978-3-11-073082-1.

¹ The existence of *Exemplaria Classica* is itself an important symbol of his creativity and drive in encouraging detailed exchange of philological views.

² See the affectionate dedication ('optimo magistro et dulcissimo amico') and the acknowledgement on p. VIII. Luck's influence is visible in the thoughtfully eclectic approach to editorial problems as well as in the frequent citations of his views on the problems treated here, e.g. on 374. Below the dedication appears the text of *Tristia* 1.7.35-40, a noble vindication of Ovid's polite request that readers approach the work mindful of his sudden exile.

Minerva from consummate weaver to spider, passes through the killing of all Niobe's sons and daughters, fitting punishment for her hybristic arrogance, but wearingly un-forgiving as death follows death, and ends (save for the coda that links us on to the voyage of the Argonauts) with the poem's grimmest passage of all: Tereus' rape of his own wife's sister, his cutting out of Philomela's tongue, and the sisters' vengeance, wrought through the dismembering of Procne's son, the ever lamented Itys.

However, little is said here about the tone and structure of the book; the focus is narrowly textual. The introduction begins with a list of manuscripts, culminating in a brief statement of the prevalence of horizontal transmission and the impossibility of drawing a stemma. 'Editorial decisions must therefore be based on sense, style, grammar, diction, and metre' (20). A further 14 pages are dedicated to a history of the editing of the poem, from the 'Aetas Natalis' of the incunables, through eras dubbed 'Reggiana–Naugeriana', 'Heinsiana', 'Germanica', and (overlapping with the previous one) an 'Aetas Angloamericana', ending in 2017 – perhaps an invitation for a successor to see 2018 as the start of an 'Aetas Hispanica'. Over 25 pages of bibliography precede the textual commentary, the heart of the book, each section opened by a passage of text (between 2 and 9 lines) and a selective apparatus. Despite having spent some time with the book, it is still not clear to me whether RdV intends the passages to be the starting points for discussion or what he would print in a formal edition: I had thought the latter, but in 400 he argues for removing the comma after *habet*, and the closing portion of the note on 538 supposes the reading *hostis* (not *non haec*) *mihi debita poena*. Two appendices list readings of manuscripts, and then readings of editions (identified by date): again there is no clear statement of what these contain. The three indices cover 'textual problems', cited passages, and *nomina* (this being keyed to the Latin text).

The commentary reflects the admiration of Ramírez de Verger³ for the Variorum tradition, and many notes include the observations of early editors (Naugerius, Ciofanus, Heinsius, Burman, and others), often with full quotation of the parallels they cite. In a world where many of these commentaries are accessible online such extensive quotation is less valuable than it would have seemed 20 years ago. Still there may be a function in having the material brought together, and some notes tell an effective story (e.g. pages 95–8 on 77, 241 on 511). In others, however, the chronological treatment makes the presentation of evidence and the argumentation less orderly than might be hoped. There is some bias towards older material: it is hard to see what is gained by repeatedly citing the support of early modern scholars for forms like *Aragne*, 6.5; *Progne*, 6.428, 440, whereas views of recent critics such as Liberman and Reeve get presented curtly, often just before a final judgment that makes no attempt to respond (e.g. p. 187, where citation of Luck's reasons for preferring *errantem* in 334 is immediately followed by 'All in all *orantem* is more suitable', p. 208 on Reeve's *patulum* in 399). What follows will concentrate on weaknesses, so let me stress that there are many good and helpful notes here and offer a short selection, those e.g. on 53 *constituunt* (it is easy to see why this would have been corrupted to the shorter, commoner verb *consistunt*); 58 *pauuunt*; 223; 246; 333; 335; 375; 629; the arguments for *iterum*

³ Hereafter 'RdV'.

in 656 (the evocation of the name of Itys can be felt also I suggest, in 655 *i(n)tus habes quem poscis*); 660 *mentis*; 695 *intonet*. Moreover, using the foundations laid by great scholars of the past has led to a text that will rarely make the reader stumble; and even when I ended up disagreeing with the conclusions reached, the material or argumentation often proved stimulating (see on 15, 17-18, 398, among the additional notes with which I end).

It seems very mean to criticise the translation, when J.J. Zoltowski has laboured so hard to make the work accessible to anglophone readers. However, the English is not stylish, and an excess of conjunctions and adverbial phrases obscure, rather than enhancing, the flow of thought. ‘However’ at the start of the final paragraph of the note on 635 leads the reader to expect a correction of the argument for *Terei*; instead we find that the reading *Terei* was already in the Florilegium of Córdoba, and thus not simply a conjecture by Slater. Similarly there is no change of direction to the argument when ‘However’ opens a paragraph on p. 260. Word order can be misleading too: ‘They have all the appearance of glosses’ (p. 197, on 366) should presumably be ‘They all have’. Misuse of English diction is frequent, e.g. ‘the last-mentioned [Pl. *Mil.* 883] is cited differently in Lindsay 1905’ (68): rather ‘printed’ or ‘edited’, as the reference is to the OCT. ‘Alternate’ and its cognates are repeatedly used imprecisely: thus in the note on 641 *adhaeret/inhaeret* (p. 290), ‘alternation between the preverbs’ should be ‘interchange’ or the like; ‘alternation’ implies that in a sequence of MSS, if one has *ad-* the next has *in-*. ‘Read’ is used with the sense ‘found in a manuscript’ as opposed to ‘chose to print [*or* chosen for printing] in the text’; and words like ‘propose’ here apparently signify ‘accept’ (p. 85, on v. 50); a proposal cannot be ‘corroborated’ (p. 219, on 441) by its presence in a single codex; ‘Burman ... states, “nihil muta”’ (p. 234, on 490-1) – an imperative is not a statement. On p. 143, the adverb ‘tentatively’ is at odds with ‘must’ in the clause ‘Lieberman ... tentatively suggests that the term replaced must have been *massa*’; and on 307 the phrase ‘but unnecessarily so’ fits ill after ‘Heinsius ... attributes the variant *devexa* to a “Gronovianus”’. In cases like these the incoherence may be due to the author, of course, but it is disappointing that a translator has not spotted the problem. When the phrasing of *scires a Pallade doctum* at 23 is compared to the ‘same *iunctura*’ in 1.162 *scires a sanguine natos*, this seems to imply that *a* depends on *scires* not on the different participles in the accusative and infinitive construction that *scires* governs. This is perhaps just carelessness, whether on the part of author or translator, but the term *iunctura* is later applied to single words, e.g. *moenia* (‘The *iunctura* is Virgilian’, p. 276).

Another aspect of the book that I found frustrating comes in an area that ought to be a strength: access to clear and accurate information about the sources. There are two lists of MSS, both ordered in groups according to assigned date, on pages 1-18 with brief descriptions, on 61-5 with shelfmark and date. In the first list group 2 (*codices antiquiores*, ss. IX-XII¹) has 18 items; in the second only 17. When I checked to see which item was missing on page 61, I found that in fact there are three (T, T2, V46), and that Lo and T4, which appear there, are absent in the descriptive list. Some assistance is provided by the Huelva catalogue (<http://www.uhu.es/proyctovidio/pdf/descripcion.pdf>), where T4 is used for one of the many fragments that now make up T, the miscellaneous München BSB Clm 29208. However, München

BSB Clm 4610 (containing scholia that attest to a text through their lemmata), here T2, is Mo9 on the webpage (which uses T2 for another part of Clm 29208). Tarrant uses 'Mon' for this, and there is an obvious case for distinguishing from the main run of MS variants readings that have to be extracted in this way. From the book I have not been able to find any more information about 'Lo', the 'Loersii fragmenta', but the website offers this: 'Two parchment fragments containing: a) met. 7.292-448 (s. X); b) met. 5.574-675, 6.1-55, 6.131-44 (s. XII); Loers ed. met. 1843, p. XI.' It seems then that we are not dealing with a *codex antiquior*, but rather 19th-century collations: collations are not photographic copies, and should not be treated as if they were. V46⁴ is another unusual source: much of the first half of the *Met.* has been written in the margins of an 11th-century Vergil. A quick examination of the online copy⁵ seems to show that *Met.* 5.127-6.102 have been lost, along with *Aeneid* 1.320-2.145, between ff.49v and 50r; this aligns with the information (p. 4) that the text of book 6 begins at verse 103 on f.50r. Despite this claim readings from V46 are reported for the first 102 verses of book 6, and in fact *Met.* 5.667-6.102 are available from the two sides of f.48 (f.49, presumably a displaced half-sheet, contains *Aen.* 1.232-319 and *Met.* 5.24-126, missing between ff.42v and 43r). Another weakness in the handling of V46 is that, as far as I can see, only once (p. 323, on 6.189) is any distinction made between the manuscript's two copies of 6.167-299, written on ff.50v-51v, and again, by a different hand⁶, on f.64r-65r (of which f.64v has been erased): unfortunately the report is wrong: it is the copy on f.64r that has *mundi*, while f.50v has *mun-do*. Checking the readings in V46 has left me pessimistic about the accuracy of the collations in general.⁷ Further readings are missed or misreported as follows:⁸

6.167	decoro] decoros V46 (f.50v, f.64r)
6.172	auctor V46 (f.64r) [actor V46 (f.50v)] ⁹
6.180	[aduerti V46 (f.64r)] auerti V46 (f.50v)
6.182	[dea V46 (f.50v)] de(a)e V46 (f.64r) huc] hunc V46 (f.64r) [huic V46 (f.50v)]
6.184	laudem V46 (f.64r) [causam V46 (f.50v)]
6.187	negauit] negaris V46 (f.64r)
6.188	recepta] reperta V46 (f.50v; recepta m.2 s.l.)

⁴ Vat. Ott.lat.3313, Tarrant's v₂. A couple of slips need correcting in the description on p. 4: the text on f.64r begins at 6.167 not 177; and in the second paragraph removal of the brackets around 'now ... parchment' has turned the website's description into nonsense.

⁵ https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Ott.lat.3313.

⁶ An earlier one, 's. xii¹', Tarrant suggests (p. xix of the OCT). Both 12th-century hands use the Italian abbreviation for *qui* (with a bar through the tail of the *q*).

⁷ This is admittedly a rather special case, and I have not spotted any errors of commission in the citations of 200 lines of P2 that I read on gallica.bf.fr. On the other hand, the specific assertion (p. 200) that Tarrant was wrong to give *tendunt* as the reading of V2^{sc} (Tarrant's U^{sc}) is itself wrong, to judge from the digivatlib image, f.68r, where there are clear traces of an original *e* and *d* beneath the *a* and *g* of *tangunt*.

⁸ I omit those cases where both copies concur with the texts reported from V46, as well as items involving proper names, or where the digivatlib image is not clear or the text has been corrected.

⁹ I include but bracket this and other cases where the reading is cited for V46, but without indication of folio.

6.192	haec est V46 (f.64r) [est haec V46 (f.50v)]
6.255	afficit] efficit V46 (f.51r)
6.260	terebrata] tenebrata V46 (f.51r et f.65r)
6.268	certam] ceream V46 (f.51r et f.65r)
6.269	potuisse] posuisse V46 (f.51r; potuisse m.2 s.l.)
6.274	populum] populos V46 (f.51v)
6.280	dolore] cruore V46 (f.51v)
6.282	[sacia V46 (f.65r)] satura V46 (f.51v)
6.285	post] per V46 (f.51v)
6.286	contento neruus] contentus neruis V46 (f.65r)
6.293	[caeco V46 (f.51v, et f.65r m.2 s.l.)] tota V46 (f.65r)
6.294	[nisi V46 (f.51v)] et sibi V46 (f.65r)

Some of these variants may have been omitted as policy (e.g. 187, 188, 269, 274) on the basis that not every slip of every copy can be reported; but if that policy is explained anywhere, I have missed it; and it seems to run against the openness and inclusivity that the project has as its goal. In any case, some incidental errors do get reported, e.g. 171 *auras* in Es5 for *aras*, which is reported from nearly three whole lines of MSS; and other variants that might be found tempting are ignored, e.g. in Paris BN lat. 8001 (Tarrant's B, here P2):

6.153	magnique] nec magna P2 ¹⁰
6.165	comitum Niobe] niobe comitum P2
6.248	plangens] plaudens P2
6.251	ferro] telo P2

A large, collaborative research project needs stable ways of identifying the enormous number of sources (572 are listed on the website). The system used allocates a one- or two-letter for each city (thus L for London, O for Oxford, R for Rome, V for the Vatican, Vd for Vienna) or library (Lr for the Laurentian, M for San Marco, Rc for the Riccardiana); the oldest manuscript from each place is signified by the letter(s) alone, the rest by the addition of numbers, mainly in rough chronological order (though there are sources, such as V46, that break this norm). This is rational, but unfortunate for the composition of a legible apparatus, and it complicates discussion: older MSS do not stand out. In the OCT Tarrant lists twelve *codices antiquiores*, all identified with a single capital letter; of these three are maintained by the Huelva team, the others are changed, in all but one case (L) to capital + lower-case letter and/or number; and only one of those added by RdV for book 6 is allocated a single capital letter (A). I have a feel for M and N as old friends, and find it harder to get a sense of BFGL now they have become P2M2S2Lr. In the apparatus given for each brief passage in the commentary and again in the fuller listings of variants in the appendix these *antiquiores* are cited in alphabetical order (numbers before lower case),¹¹ and no attempt is made to group according to textual affiliation (no sign here of Tarrant's Δ

¹⁰ A very attractive variant.

¹¹ I have rarely noticed disorder, though one place things have gone astray is in the apparatus for verse 31 on p. 78.

and Σ). The effect of removing a sense of individual MSS and their associations may be intended: the focus turns to the variant and not the source.

The introduction (p. 18) is sensible about the use to be made of Planudes' Greek version: 'the translation can be given no greater weight than any of the Latin manuscripts of the same century' (i.e. the 13th). But I am not sure it is wise to report 'fingit *Planudes*' for verse 71, rather than the Greek ἐπήξατο: the translation may be inaccurate. Likewise at 654 it is not really true to find Heinsius' *caedis* 'in Plan.' – τοῦ φόβου ἄγγελος may be a translation of the implication of *nuntia cladis* rather than due to a correction or to reading *caedis* (whether accurately or not).

An area in which a lengthy textual commentary can contribute is through thoughtful explanation of errors. This is something to which RdV commits space, but not always persuasively. The starting point is regularly visual confusion: thus on p. 307 (*ad* 695 *intonet*) we are told 'The palaeographical difference between *s* and *t* is minimal.' In fact, *s* and *t* are rarely similar enough to be confused by the eye; what matters here is the similarity of *intonet* and *insonet* as words,¹² both in appearance and in sense — it is the brain that makes the mistake rather than the eye. We may compare 61, where the MSS are split between *sensit* and *sentit*, and the commentary refers to 'graphic proximity'; but if confusion happened at the level of the letter not the word, we would as often see errors like *tensit* and *sensis* – or *secrenit*, which the note on 55 postulates, quite unnecessarily, as an intervening lection between *secernit* and *secreuit*. It is in the middle that words are particularly vulnerable to corruption, hence misreadings such as *redit* for *ruit* in 51: scribes have in their mind a sense of the rhythm and the grammatical structure, and, at least in general terms, most replacements fit both – and perhaps the meaning too. I am thus dubious that abbreviations play as much part in corruption as he imagines: the standard abbreviation for *ipsa* is *iḗa*, not something that looks like any form of *usque*, despite the claim on p. 230; *i^l* and *u^l* are no closer than *ibi* and *ubi* (p. 177). Singulars become plurals (and *vice versa*) because they are related in the scribal mind, and not just because the suspended forms of the letters sometimes look alike (so e.g. p. 68, on 1 *atures*). Nor is the commentary sure-footed in suggesting that glosses may be the source of corruption: on p. 229, we are told that *demens* 'has every appearance of being a gloss on *Tereus*' in 473 – this seems unlikely, and misreading, e.g. of *t'eus*, may be a better explanation; and on p. 103 it is argued that *uirgo*, a variant for *Iuno* at the end of verse 94 'must have been incorporated from a gloss' — but why would *Iuno* be glossed with *uirgo*?¹³ False reminiscence is far more likely to be the cause: despite the assertion that Ovid never has the phrase *regia uirgo*, it appears at line-end four times in the poem (2.570, 2.868, 7.21, 13.523). In 377 the reading *uideres* for *tumescunt* is treated as a deliberate attempt at correction: it may be a careless replacement of one verb with another idiomatic form, the scribe having caught sight of *uidetur* in 379.

¹² The point has been grasped when the index was compiled: p. 375 lists '*insonet/intonet*' under 'Words confused', and '*sensit/sentit*' under 'Varietas temporum'; and *marito* is very plausible as a gloss on *tyranno* in 436 (p. 218).

¹³ Contrast 332, where the probability that *Iuno* would gloss *regia coniunx* makes the latter the right choice – it is not simply a case of following 'the best codices' (p. 185), though that is relevant too.

The terms *lectio difficilior* and *lectio facilior* appear frequently, but often seem to have little meaning beyond ‘true’ and ‘false reading’, without serious implications for the process of corruption: thus I fail to see how *prius* is *facilior* than *fuit* in 551 (p. 259); and on 81 (p. 100) the variant *candentis* (for *canentis*) is described as ‘a *lectio facilior*’, but when the words are so similar in form and meaning, the concept is irrelevant. Again in verse 208 *cunctis* is called ‘a “facilior” correction of *cultis* because of the similarity of their written forms’: similarity of form is the key point (once again two words that begin and end the same are interchanged), but we may add that both are adjectives and that meaning has played a part too, *cunctis* having been triggered by the presence of *omnia* earlier in the line. Nor would I describe *cupidine*, a variant for *libidine* in 562, as either ‘lectio facilior’ or ‘a prudish gloss’: such synonyms replace one another. In deciding between *solis ab ictu* and *solis ab ortu* at 49 neither reading is really easier or more difficult, but given the frequency of *solis ab ortu* as an Ovidian line-ending, in a case like this where either works, the question *utrum in alterum?* is the one that a critic should follow: reminiscence is more likely to have turned *ictu* to *ortu* than *vice versa*. The note quotes the parallel passages (p. 84), but recourse to the misguided rhetoric of *lectio difficilior* makes the argument less clear than it might be.¹⁴ It may be worth pointing out in addition that because RdV is an intelligent critic he regularly avoids what might be deemed the *lectio difficilior*, e.g. in 13, where he finds no interest in the variant *habitarat*, a slightly surprising assimilation of *habibat* to the pluperfect *quaesierat* in the main clause (12), and at 455, where *Tereus* is preferred to *Thracus*.

Metre is not a strength. Quite often when metrical considerations are decisive, they go unmentioned (e.g. 141 *et naris et aures*, where the variant *nares* does not scan, and likewise *ignotum* at 721, where it is presumably intended to replace *non notum*, if it is not a gloss). On 22 *siue lēui teretem uersabat pollice fusum* the note cites 4.221 *lēuia uersato ducentem stamina fuso*, without any attention being drawn to the quantity of the first syllable; nor is it pointed out that the variant *leni teretem* could only be accommodated if *seu* was read for *siue*. Verse 230 ends *per inane pharetrae*; yet the note on page 148 says ‘The penultimate syllable of *pharetra* is short before “muta cum liquida”;

cf. 2.419 *exiit hic umero pharetram lentosque retendit*.’ Even within the *Met.* there are five other places where the second syllable of the noun is light (2.421; 3.166; 9.113, 231; 13.680) – but also eleven of the parallel treatment of quantity when the word comes at line end (1.443, 468, 559; 2.439; 4.306, 308; 5.379, 620; 8.22; 10.518; 15.634). On p. 237 none of the possible parallels are given for the elision of ablative (or dative) in *-o* to bolster the case for retaining *ut* in 499 *patrio ut tuearis amore*: for instance, 9.675 *minimo ut releuere dolore*, a case well protected by its context. In the note on 622 (p. 283), we are told that ‘the *a* of *patri* is long’; this is not strictly true – the *a* remains short, but the syllabification comes between the *t* and *r* (*pat-ri*, as *pharet-rae*), so the syllable is heavy. On page 239 Catullus 34.22-3 is cited for hypermetric elision, as a parallel to 507 *nepotemqu(e)*; but the glyconic and

¹⁴ Also potentially confusing here is the account of *Met.* 3.183-4 *qui color infectis aduersi solis ab ictu | nubibus esse solet aut purpureae Aurorae*, where there is reference to dawn, but not necessarily to sunrise proper: the first comparison could equally well refer to sunset.

continuative effect of the final imperfect is visible again in *clamabat* in 6.386. Also to be distinguished from 6.281-2 are those places where *dixit* (or equivalent) introduces speech and *inquit* or *ait* follows amid (at *Aen.* 5.551, after) quoted words: this pattern is visible at Cat. 63.77-8, Verg. *Aen.* 3.474-81, 11.41-2 *lacrimis ita fatur obortis: | 'tene, 'inquit 'miserande puer, ...'*, Livy 7.16.5, Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.63-5, and *Met.* 14.716-21 (if we read the *ait* of GT rather than *enim*). I believe that Heinsius was on the right lines also in diagnosing the source of the interpolation: *per funera septem* started as a gloss on *efferror*, and led to the rather more inept 282a *dum pars nostra iacet et dum per funera septem*, found in a host of later MSS. *corque ferum satia* was introduced from the similar context at 9.176-8:

‘cladibus’ exclamat, ‘Saturnia, pascere nostris,
pascere et hanc pestem specta, crudelis, ab alto,
corque ferum satia. ...’

The tell-tale *dixit* was then added to make the line scan.

The book is not enhanced by the frequency of typos and other slips, as shown by the correcting marginalia that I have on most pages of the commentary. A sample to illustrate the problem (in addition to the corrections this review has made in passing): despite page 70’s assertion of the correctness of the Latin form *Arachne*, the name has lost its *h* on pages 68, and 315, as well as in the running heads from 69 to 117 and 317, 319. Another repeated Latin error is *i* for *y*, e.g. ‘Migdonides’ (p. 82), ‘Phrigiae’ (p. 83, ironically in the paragraph on the correct spelling of *Mygdonides*); anxiety over the letter has produced ‘*Ytli*’ on page 295.¹⁷ On p. 137 Greek τό has been printed as ‘to’ in the final line of the citation of Heinsius. In the apparatus for 252, ‘Magnus’ is apparently a mistake for ‘Gilbert’, to whom the conjecture *pars et* is attributed on p. 156; on p. 160, in the note on 272 *uita* has replaced *uox* (or *uoce*). The note on the difference between *lactare* and *lactere* (190, on verse 342)¹⁸ ends with a horribly confused sentence, printing *lactentantibus* in *Ars* 2.375, then commenting on it ‘the reading should be *lactentibus*, as in Enn. *Ann.* 448 Sk. *fici dulciferae lactantes*’. Items that I happen to have spotted as missing from the bibliography are ‘Goold 1965’ = G.P. Goold, “*Amatoria critica*”, *HSCPh* 69, 1965, 1-107, and ‘Heyduk 2012’. Heinsius’ edition was 1659, not ‘1959’ (p. 294), and Riese’s 1889 not ‘1989’ (p. 89). Mistakes involving numbers also appear in the note on 496-8 (p. 235), where the claims that ‘497 has been transmitted ... before 495 and after 498’ are at odds with the apparatus just above, which has 497 *after* 495 and after 499; in any case the focus of this opening sentence is strange, as 496 is the verse most frequently displaced in the tradition. If line 67 is an epiphonema, ‘line 66’ (and not ‘it’, p. 93) should end with a colon. There are irritating inconsistencies in spelling, e.g. *querelis* once, *querellis* twice in the same paragraph on p. 257. The text of 664 has the dittography ‘immersaqueque’ (p. 297), and that of 683 (p. 304) prints *Orithyia* as ‘Orithyia’, despite the following note correctly identifying the line as spondaic. Occasionally Spanish words have been

¹⁷ See S. Timpanaro, *Il lapsus freudiano*, Firenze 1974, 119 and n.13.

¹⁸ RdV opts for *lactantia* (‘giving suck’); I would follow Tarrant in thinking *lactentia* ‘milky’ more apt here.

retained ('en' on 243, 'y' on 297). Among inept quotations of Latin are the presence of 6.387 among the passages designed to illustrate 6.387 and of *Fasti* 2.742 *lanaque mollis erat* as a parallel for *lanae faciendae* in 31, the inclusion of *abstulerunt* before *ferro rapiam* in defence of 632 *rapta*, the omission of *palmasque* before the second *intendens* in 'changed *intendens palmas* to *intendens*' (p. 249, on 532) and of *socerque* before *non orandus erat sed ui faciendus* (p. 308, on 701).

I end with a miscellany of additional points, working in order through the text. Some of these observations are prompted by passages where I would have expected a textual commentary to provide explication or parallels for oddities, even when earlier commentators have not done so. The absence of a translation makes it hard to see how the editor is understanding some passages (e.g. 384, 600).

14-18	huius ut adspicerent opus admirabile, saepe deseruere sui nymphae dumeta Timoli, deseruere suas nymphae Pactolides undas. nec factas solum uestes, spectare iuuabat tum quoque cum fierent; tantus decor adfuit arti!	15
-------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

So Tarrant; RdV prefers the more common variant *uineta* in 15, and puts the comma in 17 after *iuuabat*. The line-ending *uineta Timoli* occurs also in 11.85-7 where Bacchus abandons Thrace after the killing of Orpheus by some Maenads and goes to Asia Minor (*ipsos quoque deserit agros | cumque choro meliore sui uineta Timoli | Pactolonque petit*); compare also *Fasti* 2.313 *iam Bacchi nemus et Tmoli uineta tenebat*, where Omphale and her court head for a Bacchic festival. The former is a possible source of corruption, but as RdV notes, citing the evidence, 'Tmolus was associated with wine in antiquity'. Still, the question remains what nymphs are doing in cultivated vineyards. I wonder whether *nymphae* has been introduced from 16, perhaps replacing *Bacchae*, an inversion of their movement in book 11.

The discussion about where to place the comma – which is not punctuation that Ovid will have expected – seems nugatory. I agree with RdV that a break in the middle of 17 feels illogical, but the need to introduce an adversative before *tum* makes the sequence awkward. Thus the note led me to have sympathy with Heinsius' transposition:

tum quoque cum fierent (tantus decor adfuit arti)	18
nec factas solum uestes spectare iuuabat,	17
sive rudem primos lanam glomerabat in orbes,	19
seu digitis subigebat opus ...	20

The grammatical incoherence of 18 reveals the parenthesis; and *nec* provides the expected sense of continuity and opposition between the clauses. *scires a Pallade doctam* in 23 then becomes a separate half-line sentence that sums up the whole paragraph.

26-7	Pallas anum simulat falsosque in tempora canos addit et infirmos baculo quoque sustinet artus.
------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Again a thoughtful note leads me to a different conclusion. RdV shows that *quoque* can come before the word it refers to (here *sustinet*), and argues against Riese's *quos*, claiming that it breaks 'the parallelism of the three copulative clauses with the ... introduction of a relative clause which would upset the balance that is represented by *simulat*, *addit* and *sustinet*'. However, one can argue that the phrasing is not balanced: the second clause is epexegetic, giving detailed illustration of the first. *infirmos ... artus* is parallel to *canos*, not actually true of Pallas, and balance thus suggests that the limbs too should be the object of *addit*. Moreover, haplography will lead to the corruption from *quos* to *quo*, and *quoque* is then the easy correction.

118-19 *et te* [Neptune] *flaua comas frugum mitissima mater | sensit equum*. The lack of balance in *flaua comas frugum mitissima mater* feels very awkward: *flaua comas* does not denote Ceres in itself (9.306-7 *una ministrarum, media de plebe, Galanthis | flaua comas*), and when a further adjectival phrase follows, the reader will expect to take them in parallel, but then discover this leads to nonsense ('golden in hair, ripest of fruits, mother') and realise that *frugum* goes with *mater*. But this means that *mater* has two descriptive adjectives not joined by a conjunction nor set in parallel. I suggest therefore that *comas* is an intrusive gloss (or a reminiscence of 9.307), and that it has replaced *Ceres* (cf. *Am.* 3.10.3 *flaua Ceres*).

178-9: *fidibusque mei commissa mariti | moenia*. The commentary provides no parallels for *commissa* here. The verb means 'to join together', but I have not found instances where it means 'to build by joining together' (no examples in *ThLL* s.v. 1902.70-1903.22). Did Ovid write *constructa*?

184-7	quaerite nunc, habeat quam nostra superbia laudem, nescioquoque audete satam Titanida Coeo Latonam praeferre mihi, cui maxima quondam exiguam sedem pariturae terra negauit.	185
-------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

As we reach the end of the closing relative clause, we find that we must connect *cui* not to the apparent antecedent *mihi* but to *Latonam*. This is difficult in itself, and especially unexpected because Latona has already been given a dismissive description (*nescioquo ... satam Titanida Coeo*). I suggest therefore that *quondam* might have replaced *numquam*: dare, she says, to prefer that nobody Latona to me, 'to whom the enormous earth has never refused a little place to settle when I was about to give birth. Your goddess was received neither in sky nor ground nor water, ...'. If the conjecture is right, a scribe will have been focusing on the Latona story, appropriately enough, and replaced the negative adverb of time with a positive one, a kind of polar error.

225-6	dum certum flectit in orbem quadripedis cursus spumantiaque ora coercet
-------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

Bersman's *cursum* is cited in the apparatus for 226; no comment appears in the notes, however. Corruption would be very easy before *spumantia*, and the si-

balance of *quadrupedis cursu spumantiaque* gave the poet a reason to prefer the straightforward singular.

286-93 dixerat, et sonuit contento neruus ab arcu,
 qui praeter Nioben unam conterrituit omnes;
 illa malo est audax. stabant cum uestibus atris
 ante toros fratrum demisso crine sorores,
 e quibus una trahens haerentia uiscere tela 290
 imposito fratri moribunda relanguit ore;
 altera solari miseram conata parentem
 conticuit subito duplicataque uulnere caeco est.

The note argues for *haerentia uiscere tela* in 290 over *uiscera telo* and other possibilities. This seems right; but I think the final section of the notes misunderstands the sequence: ‘one of the sisters was trying to extract the dart incrustated in the entrails of her brother’.¹⁹ Rather, it is the arrow shot in 286 that she tries to extract – from herself. The second sister to die succumbs to an unannounced arrow, hence *uulnere caeco* in 293, Ovid commenting on his own narrative.

316 utque fit, a facto propiore priora renarrant.

RdV regards the choice between *renarrant* and the variant *retractant* (found in just a couple of MSS) as ‘no easy matter’; I disagree. We may be choosing wrong in preferring *renarrant*, but no methodological process leads an editor to print *retractant* against the preponderance of the MSS. As is recorded here, Tarrant saw that the variant may derive from 4.569 *dum prima retractant*, whereas the verb *renarro* is rare but Ovidian, being used only once elsewhere (*Met.* 5.635). At most ‘*fort. recte*’ should be added to the report of *retractant* in the apparatus.

343 *forte lacum mediocris aquae prospexit*: Verheykius’ *Melitensis*, conceived by Burman (‘*Meliten fontem ... cuius nomen forte in melioris hic latet*’) and printed by Rosati, is very tempting, as RdV acknowledges, but the phrases *riuus aquae Lethes* (*Met* 11.603) and *in Tuscae gurgite mersus aquae* (*Fasti* 4.48), adduced by J.F. Gaertner, *RhM* 150, 2007, 95, and cited again here, are not really parallel, as in each case the genitive is partitive, whereas here it would be denotative.

345 *gratamque paludibus uluam* is cited at *ThLL* s.v. *gratus* 2262.32, along with e.g. *Fasti* 5.140 *compita grata deo, compita grata cani*; but the Lar and the dog choose to be at the crossroads, and enjoy that place. Closer to this instance might be Pliny, *Nat.* 15.127 *laurus ... gratissima domibus*, where the plant gives pleasure to the place where it grows; but houses, or at least those living in them, choose to have bay trees, and enjoy making use of the leaves. This instance seems to be beyond the normal boundaries of usage – and yet the commentary offers no observations. I

¹⁹ Similarly the Loeb translation; but not Chiarini, or A.D. Melville in *The World's Classics* version (Oxford 1991), 130.

wonder whether *gratam* might have replaced *laetam*; the adjective is commonly used of plants with the sense ‘thriving’ (*ThLL* 884.32-60, *OLD* 1); the ablative *paludibus* would here, I think, be locative (‘in marshes’), but the usage is eased by the frequency of causal ablative with *laetus*, both when it means ‘thriving’ (Verg. *Georg.* 1.101 *hiberno laetissima puluere farra*, 2.520 *glande sues laeti redeunt*), and when the sense is ‘(habitually) taking pleasure in’ (*Ars* 2.485 *tauro quoque laeta iuuenca est*, *Fast.* 4.744 *praecipue est hoc dea laeta cibo*, Hor. *Carm.* 1.21.5, of Diana, *laetam fluiuis et nemorum coma*, 3.4.34 *laetum equino sanguine Concanum*). For play between the two senses, cf. *Fasti* 4.407 *pace Ceres laeta est*. Comparable is the use of *laetari* and *gaudere* of plants, as at Columella 2.2.3-4 *plura pingui solo quam macro laetari. ... quae siccis quaeque umidis locis gaudent*, and Arb. 17.1 *olea maxime collibus siccis et argillosis gaudet*.

358-9 ‘... qui nostro bracchia tendunt
parva sinu,’ et casu tendebant bracchia nati.

RdV offers no comment on the text of 359. I once wondered whether *et* was an intrusion (cf. *Ep.* 12.149; but the homoeoteleuton²⁰ *sinu casu* would be surprising). In fact there are several parallels to the elision of ablative -u before *et*: 1.732 *et gemit(u) et lacrimis*, 9.299 *gen(u) et digitis*, 13.74 *pallentemque met(u) et trepidantem morte futura*. Moreover, Ovid elsewhere uses *et* or *que* in combination with repetition to mark breaking off from, or parenthesis within, direct speech: *Met.* 1.590-1 ‘... *pete*’ *dixerat ‘umbras | aliorum nemorum’ (et nemorum monstrauerat umbras)*, 10.556-7 ‘... *libet hac requiescere tecum*’ | (*et requieuit*) ‘*humo*’, *Fasti* 4.691 ‘*hoc*’ *ait ‘in campo’ (campumque ostendit)*. A similar instance of the phrase *et casu* occurs at 7.84.

384-5 *quem Tritoniaca Letous harundine uictum | affecit poena*. How is the ablative *harundine* to be understood here? Marsyas was beaten by the lyre rather than the pipe. Chiarini offers ‘vinto dal figlio di Latona in una gara col flauto di Atena’; this obviously supplies a lot to ease the boldness of the grammar. His skill on the pipe infects Marsyas with arrogance, and it is that that leads to his punishment (*Fasti* 6.706 *arte superbus erat*); as punishment of *hybris* is the connecting theme of this part of the text, I suspect that *uictum* has replaced an adjective (or participle) that expressed his pride, perhaps *magnum* (see *ThLL* *magnus* 135.74-84), or *grandem*; less likely seems *falsum* ‘mised’. Or perhaps *uictum* is right (cf. *Fasti* 6.707 *Phoebo superante pependit*) but there is a lacuna before it: *harundine* <*laetum* | *magnaque dicentem, sed mox certamine*> *uictum* (or <*sumpta* | *grandia* ...>).

Heinsius’ *afficit ut poena* is surely nothing to do with ‘the prosaic nature of *poena afficere*’ (202) – it does not change that phrase). Rather, it was designed to link this sentence to the next ‘*quid me mihi detrahis?*’ *inquit* – unwisely, I think, as the first

²⁰ A surprising absence from the bibliography is D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Homoeoteleuton in Latin dactylic verse*, Stuttgart 1994, which gathers the evidence demonstrating Ovid’s reluctance to have homoeoteleuton between adjacent words (save under limited circumstances): for example, this helps confirm that *ambo* is correct at 7.792 (cited on 631), even though it is present in only a small proportion of the tradition.

sentence is already complex enough. In 386 Heinsius is reported (202) as having conjectured '*a! piget, a! non est non es mihi tibia tanti*' (where *tibia* is presumably a vocative): that makes no sense – the whole line must be the words of Marsyas, and *non est* seems to have no function. I suspect that when Heinsius wrote *non es mihi tibia tanti* it was a slip through reminiscence or a garbled citation of *Ars* 3.505, and what he really wanted was '*non es, clamabat tibia, tanti*'. Something has gone wrong in the next note too (top of p. 203), as there is no 'genitive' if we read *clamanti*, which is I think best taken as dative of disadvantage with *est ... derepta*.

398 *uacuas emisit in auras*: the paragraph of parallels (drawn from Bömer) led me to become more sceptical of the phrase here: breath, words, smoke are rather different from a trickling spring, and it is hard to see why the fountain from which the river Marsyas flows should be made into a water-spout, or why so striking a phenomenon should be evoked so briefly. I would therefore follow the inclination of Heinsius and Burman and read *uacuos emisit in agros*.

416-17 *Orchomenosque ferax et nobilis aere Corinthos | Messeneque ferox*. Not surprisingly some MSS have *ferox* in 516, some *ferax* in 517. Even if we choose a different epithet in each line, the similarity looks suspicious, more likely to have arisen from a scribe than the poet. Heinsius' *Pheraeque* is thus tempting in 416, or we might think that corruption from the verse below has driven out a rather different word, e.g. *agnis*, balanced with *aere* (cf. *Stat. Theb.* 4.295 *diues et Orchomenos pecorum*).

449-50: *coeperat aduentus causam mandata referre | coniugis et celeres missae spondere recursus*: RdV favours *causam* over *causas*, also prominent in the tradition. I agree, and would add that the sibilance of the two lines might have given Ovid a reason for preferring the singular. It also opens up the possibility that originally an *et* linked the two objects and there was no need to choose between apposition (as in the Loeb) and asyndeton as an explanation for the juxtaposition of *causam* and *mandata*. For such elisions at this point in the line, cf. e.g. 2.422 *fessam et custode uacantem*, 4.412 *minimam et pro corpore uocem*, 7.748 *orabam ueniam et peccasse fatebar*, 15.454 *caelum et quodcumque sub illo est*; *causam et* occurs at the start of the third foot of 13.6.

455-7
 non secus exarsit conspecta uirgine Tereus,
 quam si quis canis ignem supponat aristis
 aut frondem positasque cremet faenilibus herbas.

Nothing reveals the leaves of 457 to be dry, and *positas* repeats the verb used in 456, as Heinsius observed in commending the variant *submittat*. As 457 adds nothing of value, I wonder whether it is a collaborative interpolation.

477: RdV opts for *usque*, as the *lectio difficilior* and because it fits with the persistence in Philomela's plea. However, *ipsa* is perhaps more likely to be the origin of *illa* and *ista*, also transmitted, and is idiomatic in emphasizing the reflexives in

similar to *praedator*. But the whole simile looks suspect to me: the ship is not like a nest, and this is not where the action ends; *Iouis ales* feels awkward in apposition to *praedator*. The lines were presumably composed to bulk out the voyage; but Ovid frequently uses *iamque* to move narrative on abruptly (e.g. 3.1, 6.339, 7.1, 7.404; *Fasti* 1.499, 3.203, 5.257, 6.706).

611-13 'non est lacrimis hoc' inquit 'agendum,
sed ferro, sed si quid habes, quod uincere ferrum
possit. ...'

The parallels cited for the repetition of *sed* to build up a list are not entirely persuasive: this list has only two members, and there is no clear parallelism in the words following the second *sed* in 612. The variant *uel*, which RdV reports from eleven sources, is an easy alternative, and may be right.

640-5	et 'mater, mater!' clamantem et colla petentem ense ferit Procne, lateri qua pectus adhaeret, nec uultum uertit; satis illi ad fata uel unum uulnus erat; iugulum ferro Philomela resoluit, uiuaque adhuc animaeque aliquid retinentia membra dilaniant.	640 645
-------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------

After Procne's temporary uncertainty (629-30) the narrative stresses the pathos and the horror of the murder. The notion that one stroke is sufficient to kill poor Itys fits this, but not the continuation, where first Philomela too strikes in a manner that seems designed to kill rather than to butcher, and then we are told that the body is still living as they tear it apart (644-5). I suggest that *uel* may have replaced *nec* (or *neque*): 'nor was one wound sufficient for his death'. If this is right, *nec*, though postponed, accompanies the word that it negates.

S.J. HEYWORTH
Wadham College, Oxford
stephen.heyworth@wadham.ox.ac.uk