

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF OVID'S *METAMORPHOSES*<sup>1</sup>

In my review of R. J. Tarrant's edition (*OCT* 2004) of Ovid's masterpiece (*Exemplaria Classica* 9, 2005, 249-71) and in a few pieces published elsewhere, I have tried to show that the corruption of the text is deeper and more extensive than the more recent editors seem to realize. They thought it feasible to build the text on a seemingly solid foundation provided by a few *codices optimi et antiquissimi*, looking for additional help only when their trusted witnesses were obviously wrong. They do cite selected *deteriores et recentiores*, and they adopt conjectures, but not often enough, in my opinion. Their position is essentially that of the German editors of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and they do not pay enough attention to the invaluable legacy left to us by Heinsius and Burman, to mention only those two. Even though it is very important to collate witnesses that have been neglected so far, including the *editiones veteres*, no way leads around those heavy, ornate 18th century volumes.

The following notes should be considered as *specimina* intended to show how much more work remains to be done<sup>2</sup>.

1.190-1

cuncta prius *temptanda*, sed immedicabile *corpus*  
ense recidendum est, ne pars sincera trahatur.

First, we ought to read *temptata* (Bern., N<sup>ac</sup>, L<sup>ac</sup>, Plan., edd. multi). A. G. Lee (1953, 149-50) defended *temptanda*, but Jupiter

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Gauthier Liberman, Paris, and Antonio Ramírez de Verger, Huelva, for a critical reading of this article. Their advice has been invaluable to me. I am also grateful to three anonymous readers for their very perceptive comments.

<sup>2</sup> The sigla for the manuscripts are those used by Tarrant.

actually *has* tried everything, even walking among mortals. The ending was, perhaps, assimilated to *perdendum* (188) or *recidendum* (191). Second, *corpus* cannot be right, because the body as a whole is not incurable, and T.'s (= Tarrant's) explanation ('*sc. caro*') seems far-fetched. *Vulnus*, the reading of most manuscripts is probably right. It could be = *pars uulnerata*, as G. Liberman points out to me. The concept is the same as in 2.285-6 *utque malum late solet immedicabile cancer / serpere et inlaesas uitiatis addere partes* where *immedicabile* belongs to *malum*. *Corpore* and *uulnere* are variant readings in 2.606.

4.669

Aethiopum populos *Cepheaque* conspicit arua

Read *Cepheia* (Heins. ex v aliisque), without *-que*. Aethiopia is the kingdom of Cepheus. The apposition was misunderstood<sup>3</sup>, an

<sup>3</sup> One of the anonymous readers of *ExClass* writes that a brief explanation of this type of apposition would be useful. Originally, I just referred to Burman's note on *am.* 3. 10. 20, but I agree that this stylistic device deserves a comment. Let me begin with a type that is easy to spot, the 'parenthetical apposition', e. g. *met.* 5. 74 *ecce Syenites, genitus Metione, Phorbas*. In this case, editors regularly place commas before and after the apposition (T. omits them). A well-known example is Verg. *ecl.* 1. 57 *raucae, tua cura, palumbes* (s. W. V. Clausen's commentary, Oxford 1994, *ad loc.*; O. Skutsch named this type 'schema Cornelianum', after Cornelius Gallus). A less obvious type is the 'mannered apposition', e. g. Verg. *ecl.* 2. 11 *alia serpyllumque herbas contundit olentis* (see Clausen *ad loc.*). In this case, a comma (after *serpyllumque*) is more or less an editorial decision. Other examples are Verg. *Aen.* 6. 7-8 *densa ferarum / tecta ... silvas* (with Norden's note) or Hor. *Carm.* 1. 3. 20 *infamis scopulos Acroceraunia* (see Nisbet-Hubbard *ad loc.*). Here, a comma after *scopulos* would be optional. The point is that the *infames scopuli* are the *Acroceraunia*. Following Heinsius, I believe that this is the type of apposition we have in our passage, *met.* 4. 669, a type that is sometimes misunderstood in the paradox of the *met.*, especially when names are involved, because the scribes were not sure whether the poet was speaking of the same place or person or of two different ones. Assuming that it was another one (because, in a way, the *perpetuum carmen* in itself is a sequence of events, episodes, people, places)

–*i*– disappeared from the name, and –*que* was added to restore the metre, a type of interpolation which is not uncommon in the *Met.* According to Ehwald (1915, 114), E M N have *ci(y)pheiaque*. This information is lacking in A. (= Anderson) and T. who print, like Ehwald, *Cepheaque*. We should write *Cepheius* etc. everywhere, e. g. *am.* 3.3.17 (see the Teubner edition of A. Ramírez de Verger), in analogy to *Cythereia* (*Met.* 4.190).

## 4.760-2

sertaque dependent tectis et *ubique* lyraeque  
tibiaque et cantus, animi felicia laeti  
argumenta, sonant.

*Et ubique* is meaningless; read *lotique* (Gronovius, *Obs.* 4.15; Heinsius [I 477-8 Notae] on *Rem.* 753). The emendation occurred to both scholars independently, it seems (to Heinsius when he was still *adulescens*). Cf. *Rem.* 753 *citharaeque lotosque lyraeque*, where the emendation is due to Scaliger and Salmasius.

## 5.440-1

illam non *udis* ueniens Aurora capillis  
cessantem uidit, non Hesperus

G. Liberman (“Observations sur le texte des *Métamorphoses* d’Ovide”, *RPh* 78, 2004, 70) accepted *udis*, but the variant readings *nitidis* and *rutilis* reported by T. seem to be early conjectures to replace a word that was felt to be wrong. For a while, I thought of *croceis* (cf. *am.* 2.4.43; *ars* 1.530), but Liberman now finds *nitidis* attractive. He points out to me that *nudus* is a frequent mistake for *nitidus*, and this might also apply to *udus*. The proper word could have been contracted into a shorter one that made sense.

---

they tend to introduce a connection, such as *et* or –*que*. Sometimes, they try to fit the apposition syntactically into the period, as in *met.* 15. 802-10 *cernes illic molimine vasto/ ex aere et solido rerum tabularia ferro*, where we should read with G. Liberman (*RPhil* 78, 2004, 88-9) *molimina vasta*. This kind of misunderstanding is the cause of quite a few textual corruptions and would be worth a study.

After having read an anonymous reader's report, I must retract this note, but I will let it stand as a warning example and because the reader admirably illustrates the transmitted text. He (she) feels strongly that *udis* is fine and that *nitidis* would be a trivialization. The paradox is practically guaranteed by Stat. *Theb.* 2.135-6 *impulerat caelo gelidas Aurora tenebras/ rorantes excussa comas*. Her hair is wet because of her son, Memnon, *cuius mortem mater Aurora hodieque matutino rore flere dicitur* (Serv. on *Aen.* 1.489). Ovid himself explains the dew of the early morning as the tears of Aurora in *met.* 13.621-2 *luctibus est Aurora suis intenta piasque/ nunc quoque dat lacrimas et toto rorat in orbe*.

5.524-6

sed si modo nomina rebus  
addere uera placet, non hoc iniuria factum,  
uerum *amor* est.

Read *honor* (Schepper, ap. Burm. II 363-4). We need a contrast to *iniuria*, and *amor* does not provide it. Proserpina did not fall in love with Dis; he fell in love with her, because this suited Venus. We have here a typical case of an arranged marriage, a 'dynastic alliance' in the very highest circles. Love is not important; it is the honor that counts, though this could also be a burden or a pain (2.98; 634; Casali on *her.* 9.31). *Amor* and (*h*)*onor* look very much alike in certain scripts. In Prop. 1.7.26 *saepe uenit magno fenore tardus amor* we should read *honor* (Rossberg) or *Honos* (Heyworth [*honos* in his recent Oxonian edition], accepted by Giardina, in his edition, 2005); cf. 3.1.22.

Lieberman remarks (*per litt.*): "The confusion AMOR/HONOR is very frequent, but I don't agree as far as Propertius is concerned. See my note :

25-26 transposés après le v. 14 par Fischer 1863 et Otto 1885. Ainsi *hic* (v. 15) a son indispensable référent, *Amor* v. 26. La fonction de ce distique est d'assurer la transition entre a) la profession de foi du locuteur, ses vœux pour le succès et l'utilité de son œuvre destinée aux amants malheureux et b) la vengeance d'Amour méprisé qui transformera Ponticus en amant et poète érotique (amour et poésie érotique sont pratiquement confondus).

Placé à la fin du poème, notre distique est si peu adéquat après la prophétie du locuteur sur sa gloire future que certains érudits (Rossberg 1877, Heyworth cité et suivi par Giardina 2005) y substituent *Honor/Honos* d'après 3,1,22. Remarquer les séries antithétiques *Hic mihi... Me laudent... Me legat* (v. 9-14)/ *Tu caue... Te quoque... Longe castra tibi* (v. 25-26-15 ss.). Burman 1780 critique la répétition *nostro* v. 23/*nostrum* v. 24/*nostra* v. 25, que ne justifie pas l'expressivité manifeste dans les répétitions qui viennent d'être évoquées : *talem certe stribliginem nemo ferret in artis poeticae tyrone*. Observer que le v. 24 fait une fin excellente. Un copiste sera, par parablepsie, passé de *Tu* à *Te* (homéoarchon), omettant ainsi les v. 25-26 qui, écrits à la fin, ne furent pas remis à leur place. C'est, je crois, une erreur de transposer après le v. 14 les v. 23-24 devant 25-26 (ainsi Baehrens 1880) et c'est une erreur aussi de transposer les v. 23-24 après le v. 10 (Housman). Goold 1999 attribue à tort à Fischer la transposition des v. 23-24 après le v. 14, laquelle, soit dit en passant, amène une répétition affreuse de *noster* (4x en l'espace de cinq vers) ; cf. *infra* note au v. 23."

6.237-8

ille ut erat pronus per *crura* admissa iubasque  
uoluitur

*Crura* is in most MSS, but Heinsius (II 137 Notae) adopted *colla* from the 'primus Gronovianus' and other witnesses, referring to 5.403-4 *exhortatur equos, quorum per colla iubasque / excutit ... habenas* and his note on Verg. *Aen.* 11.171. See also Burman on *am.* 2.16.49. T. tentatively considers *colla*. But could *crura* not be a corruption of *lora*? The passage cited above (*met.* 5.403-4) can be used to support *lora*; see also Verg. *Aen.* 5.146-7 *nec sic immisissis aurigae undantia lora / concussere iugis pronique in uerbera pendent* and McKeown on *am.* 2.16.49-50. I believe that Ovid wrote *lora*.

6.663-4

et modo, si posset, reserato pectore diras  
egerere inde dapes *semasaque* uiscera gestit,

Tereus has just eaten his son, Itys, and now wants to regurgitate him. *Semesaque*, cited by T. only from one of his groups is also the reading of N<sup>2</sup> vel <sup>3</sup>, of h<sup>2</sup> and others (Plan. translates it) and was accepted by Heinsius (II 152 Notae), but not by Burman (II 348) who defends *demersa*. It may be an old conjecture, based on 2. 771. The broad tradition has *emersaque*, an unsatisfactory reading which was also changed to *immersaque* (N G) and *immensaque* (d). The true reading, *demersaque*, in my opinion, was found by R. Regius (ap. Burm. II 437). This is a case of the missing letter and the wrong prefix. Cf. 15.105 *corporeas ... dapes auidam demersit in aluum*. Ovid uses the 'simplex' in 14.203-4 *mea uiscera rebar / in sua mersurum*, but that would not work here metrically. See also Sen. *Thy.* 1041 *uoluuntur intus uiscera*.

7.203

*uipereas rumpo uerbis et carmine fauces,*

In magical rituals *uerba* and *carmen* are practically synonymous; hence *uerbis et carmine* is a pointless repetition. Heinsius (II 165 Notae) found *herbis* in two witnesses, but since this would not work metrically, he had to rearrange the line: *uipereasque herbis et rumpo carmine fauces*. Another solution occurred to me: Read *gramine* for *carmine*. The two words occur as variants more than once, e. g. 152; 2.841; 14.34 *carmine cum tantum, tantum quoque gramine possim*; 44; see *TLL* 6.2.2168.56ff. Add to these passages *med.* 35-7 *sic potius uos urget amor quam fortibus herbis, / quas maga terribili subsecat arte manus. / nec uos graminibus nec mixto credite suco*.

7.488

*dixit et utilius bellum putat esse minari  
quam gerere*

Read probably *at* for *et*. There are several errors in the text of the *met.* involving these two words, sometimes after endings like *-at* or *-it*. In v. 375 T. was right to change *et* to *at* after *uicerat*. In our passage, Minos has just threatened the Athenians but then

decides to postpone any military actions. There has to be some sort of contrast. See 8.60 below. Von Albrecht translates as “doch” but leaves *et* in the text, as do all recent editors.

## 7.554-7

uiscera torrentur primo flammaeque latentis  
indicium rubor est et ductus anhelitus *aegre*;  
aspera lingua tumet *tepidisque* arentia *uentis*  
ora patent

This is from the clinical description of the plague which was sent by Juno to the people of Aegina. T. reports *aegre* from one of his groups and as a conjecture of Heinsius (II 181 Notae ‘legendum arbitror *et ductus anhelitus aegre*’. He compares Lucil. 105 *pulmonibus aeger agebat* and Verg. *Aen.* 9.814 *quatit aeger anhelitus artus*). Heinsius did not prefer *aegro*, as Burman writes in II 516. This must be a typographical error, as Antonio Ramírez de Verger points out to me. In v. 556 we ought to read with Heins. *trepidis* (N h teste A.) ... *uenis* (B G<sup>ac</sup> L); cf. 6.389-90 *trepidae ... / ... micant uenae*; Sen. *nat.* 6.14.2 *dum bona ualetudo est, uenarum ... imperturbata mobilitas modum seruat; ubi aliquid aduersi est, mica<n>t crebrius et suspiria atque anhelitus laborantis ac fessi signa sunt*. Seneca must have Ovid in mind, as he often does.

## 8.58-62

iusta gerit certe pro nato bella perempto  
*et causaque* ualet causamque *tenentibus* armis  
*et*, puto, uincemur. *qui si* manet exitus urbem,  
cur suus haec illi *reseret mea* moenia Mauors  
et non noster amor?

Scylla, in love with Minos, is trying to justify her treason. Her soliloquy is marred by a number of corruptions which have been passed on by the more recent editors, although some of them were detected long ago. In v. 59 read probably *in causaque* (F L N<sup>3</sup> P U<sup>3</sup>, Constantius Fanensis ex coni., Heinsius ‘ex multis veterum’)... *tuentibus* (Urb<sup>2</sup>. M<sup>2</sup> N<sup>3</sup> U G P alii, Heinsius). True, *in* is not absolutely necessary, but see, e. g. 13.12 *inque acie ualeo*. For *causam tueri* cf. *Her.* 20.92 *mea, cum sit/ optima, non ullo*

*causa tuente perit*; Cic. *de or.* 1.169 *ut amicorum controuersias causasque tueatur*. The beginning of v. 60 was emended by Markland: *at, puto, uincemur?* This is a very common idiom, anticipating an objection in the form of a question. Cf. 2.566-7; 3.266-7; 11.425-6; 13.523-4; *am.* 3.7.2; *Pont.* 1.2.41-2; 2.5.26; Luck, *Opusc. Min. Sel.* 317-8. *Scilicet* can have the same function; cf. *Pont.* 1.5.19. Kenney (*per litt.*) defends *et*: “= ‘and in any case’ (OLD 2a); she is piling up the justifications for her treason”. Yes, but *at, puto*, is such a striking idiom, and *et* is written instead of *at* so many times in this tradition (see, e. g., 10.724) that we should consider it here. After *armis* we probably need a full stop (comma in A., nothing in T.). *Qui si* (*quis enim, quod si* are variants) is right, but *haec ... mea moenia* seems odd, and we should consider *reserabit* (Heinsius, II 199 Notae, ex Gronoviano primo et Plan.) or *reserarit* (Heinsius dub. ex coni.).

8.279-80

tangit et ira deos; ‘at non impune *feremus*,  
 quaeque inhonoratae, non et dicemur inultae’

*Feremus* is impossible, as M. Possanza, in his eulogistic appraisal of T.’s edition (*BMCR* 2005.06.27) points out. *Impune ferre* means ‘to get away with (a crime)’, the opposite of what Diana has in mind for the mortals who have not honored her; cf. 2.474; 8.494; 11.207; 12.265; 14.383; *fast.* 4.494; Getty on Lucan 1.289. This is usually a threat addressed to another person, sometimes, like similar threats, introduced by *at*. Cf. 10.724; 12.367; Heinsius (I 97 on *Her.* 12.1). Possanza proposes *sinemus*, but that normally requires an obj. with an inf., as his examples show. Read: *non impune feretis* (Bentley in *Studia Bentleiana*, 30, Hartman ap. Magnum). There seems to be a disturbance at the end of v. 279, and the false ending was probably added under the influence of *dicemur* (280).

8.821-2

fecundum deserit orbem  
 inque domos inopes *adsueta* reuertitur *arua*.

The asyndeton is difficult, I think, and Shackleton Bailey’s (ap. Tarrant) *et sueta* for *adsueta* may be the solution. If we



substitute *ac sueta* for *adsueta*, we stay a little closer to the 'ductus litterarum'. Some 'editiones veteres' print *adsuetaque uertitur antra*, obviously a conjecture to remove the asyndeton, but *uerti* = *reueriti* is questionable. On the other hand, *adsueta ... arua* could be in apposition to *domos inopes* = *in domos inopes*, *adsueta arua*, *revertitur*. Should we read *antra*, following Δ (cf. 13.777)? But does *Fames* live in a cave, like *Somnus*? We first encountered her on a *lapidosus ager* (v. 799), and, like this, *arua* is a suitable contrast to *fecundus orbis* (v. 821). G. Liberman points out to me that *antra* could also mean *conualles*.

9.98-9

huic *tamen* ablati doluit iactura decoris,  
cetera sospes *habet*.

I think we need *tantum* (Paris. lat. 8001, Markland 1827, 241, 'fort. recte' T.) for *tamen*; see *Exempl. Class.* 9, 2005, 203-4; 262-3. The attempts of Delz and McKeown (ap. Tarrant) to restore the passage are not convincing; see Casali on *Her.* 9.134-40. Let me add that *habet* (99) cannot be right. At one time, Heinsius liked *erat* (alter Regius), but the true reading, I think, is found in one of Heinsius' manuscripts. Read *abit*, 'eleganti Graecismo', as Heinsius, II 236 Notae, says. This is the technical term in the language of sports and warfare; cf. 13.279 *Hector abit violatus uulnere nullo*; Lucan 2.714; *OLD*, p. 5, 7a. *Abit* was read as *abet* and taken for a form of (*h*)*abere*.

10.143-4

tale nemus uates attraxerat inque ferarum  
concilio medius *turba* uolucrumque sedebat.

Ovid says two things at the same time, I believe: (1) Orpheus was sitting in the assembly of the beasts and the birds: *in ferarum et uolucrum concilio sedebat*; (2) he was sitting in the middle of the whole crowd, *medius turba<e> sedebat*. We need the genitive (Vat. lat. 5179, Basil. primus, Bentley in *Studia Bentleyana*, 31, ex con.). Read and punctuate: *inque ferarum concilio, medius turbae, uolucrumque sedebat*. For *medius* c. gen. cf. 2.31 *loci* (Heinsius : loco Ω) *medius*; 8.182 *medius Nixique genu est*

*Anguemque tenentis*; 13.780-1 *Cyclops medius ... resedit/lanigerae pecudis* (Turonensis, Luck ex con. : *pecudes* Ω). Antonio Ramírez de Verger tells me that the Turonensis, recently collated by one of his associates, Gabriel Martel, has *pecudis*. In 10.144 the broad tradition lost a letter, I think.

## 10.238-40

sunt tamen obscaenae Venerem Propoetides ausae  
esse negare deam; pro *quo sua* numinis ira  
corpora cum *forma* primae uulgasse feruntur.

Prostitution came into the world as a curse of Venus. Slater recognized that *pro quaestu* is hiding behind the unintelligible *pro quo sua*, a plausible error in 'scriptio continua'. But we should also read *fama* for *forma* (cod. unus, ut vid., Burman, II 706, ex con.), as T. doubtfully considers. *Famam uulgare* is close to *famam prostituere* (see *OLD*, p. 674, 6a). Cf. *Narr. Fab.* 10.7 *Propoetides ... primae in triuio uulgauere corpora*; cf. *Her.* 7.5; *Pont* 2.3.20 *prostat et in quaestu pro meretrice sedet*; L. Håkanson, in: *Class. et Med. Dissertationes* 9, 1973, 322 = *Festschrift F. Blatt*, 322.

## 10.384-7

surgit anus reseratque fores mortisque *paratae*  
instrumenta uidens spatio conclamat eodem  
seque ferit scinditque sinus ereptaque colla  
uincula dilaniat.

Myrrha's nurse prevents her at the last moment from committing suicide by hanging herself. In v. 384 read probably *parata*; cf. 3.697-8 *crudelia iussae/ instrumenta necis, ferrumque ignesque, parantur* (sic dist., ut opinor); *Carmen de Bello Actiaco*, col. v, v. 41 (p. 338 Courtney) *instrumenta necis uario congesta paratu*; *Apul. Met.* 10.10.4 *nec rota vel eculeus more Graecorum tormentis eius apparatus iam deerant* (with the note of Pricaeus). In our passage, a letter was added to the last word of the line by mistake, I think. Or, as G. Liberman suggests, *parata* was assimilated to *mortis*.

11.47-9

lacrimis quoque flumina dicunt  
 increuisse suis, *obstrusaque* carbasa *pullo*  
*Naides* et *Dryades* passosque habuisse capillos.

Since I published my note on this passage (in: *Exemplaria Class.* 9, 2005, 264-5), I read G. Liberman's comments (*op. cit.*, 80-1). He deems *obstrusaque* corrupt and considers readings like *imbutaque*, *infectaque*, *saturataque*. Edwards and Hall accepted *obscuraque* (N<sup>c</sup> U B G P N). I still like Polle's *obsutaque*, though I can find no compelling arguments for it. In v. 48 my suggestion *pullis* (sc. *carbasis*) still seems a possibility to me (M, not reported by T., is said to have *pullos*), because the plural is idiomatic, at least for female mourners; see 669 *da lacrimas lugubriaque indue* and other references in Blümner, *Privataltertümer* (Munich 1911), 497. In 49, T.'s text is impossible Latin. You can either say (*dicunt*) *Naidas et Dryadas ... habuisse* (Heinsius ex uno Moreti) or *Naides et Dryades ... habuere* (Ω), but you cannot combine both readings in this way.

11.351

[pendet et ipse metu *trepidi* Trachinius *oris*]

This line can probably be saved from deletion (Heinsius, T.). Burman (II 774) proposed *heros* for *oris* which seems excellent to me. His *trepidus* is not as good, I think; read probably *trepido* (Polle who preferred *hospes* at the end). Ovid likes *heros*, preceded by an adjective, at the end of a line: see, e. g. 3.198 *Autonoeius heros*; 8.324; 10.50 *Rhodopeius ... heros*; 10.730; 11.106; 13.625; 14.461, etc. These men are not always 'heroes' in the strictest sense, but simply characters of the heroic age. At the end of the line, (*h*)*eros* may have become *oris*. For *trepido ... metu* cf. *trist.* 3.154 *quatitur trepido littera nostra metu*; Val. Fl. 3.93 (cited by Burman) *pendent mortalia longo/ corda metu*. I do not think that *trepidi ... oris* can be defended as a gen. of description; but see McKeown on *am.* 1.15.19-20.

11.361-2

Nereus Nereidesque tenent (hos navita *templi*  
 edidit esse deos, dum retia litore siccant).

*Templi* is the reading of N<sup>2</sup> U G<sup>2</sup> P v, but most other MSS have *ponti*, printed by Ehwald and A. The information that Nereus and the Nereids are deities of the sea would be a little too trivial, especially coming from a sailor. Heinsius conjectured *templo*; in fact, we need the plural (see 359). Read *templis*. The last word of the line seems to have lost its last letter and was then replaced by an interpolation (I think) in part of the paradosis.

## 11.590-1

Iris et arcuato caelum curuamine signans  
tecta petit iussi sub *nube* latentia regis.

Here, one is tempted for a moment to read *spissa* (Bentley, in *Studia Bentleiana*, 31, Bothe), but that would be a mistake. *Iussi* refers back to the order given to Iris by Juno (vv. 584-8) to go to *Somnus*, the King of Sleep. It is *nube* that ought to be changed, as Heinsius (II 300 Notae; cf. Burman II 793) realized when he found *rupe* in some MSS. (Sl. cites the reading from the Bodl. F 1.17). The King of Sleep lives, indeed, in a deep cave on the Island of Dreams (vv. 592-6). See Stat. *Theb.* 10.86-7 *subter ... cauis graue rupibus antrum / it uacuum in montem*, an echo of our passage, as Heinsius saw. It seems to me that the reader has a right to find this kind of information, at least in the apparatus.

## 11.696-8

at certe uellem, quoniam periturus abibas,  
me quoque *duxisses tecum!* fuit utile tecum  
ire mihi;

Here, the more recent editors list a variety of readings, and T. declares ‘*uerum adhuc latere reor.*’ The text seems fine, but it needs a slightly different punctuation:

me quoque duxisses! tecum fuit utile, tecum  
ire mihi.

This was the punctuation adopted by Heinsius-Burman (II 799), and it is a pity that it has disappeared without a trace from our modern texts.

12.316-7

in tanto *fremitu cunctis* sine fine iacebat  
 sopitus *uenis* et inexperrectus Aphidas  
 languentique manu carchesia mixta tenebat,

Aphidas is a Centaur who has had a great deal of wine to drink and is totally incapable of taking part in the big fight (see 320-6). In v. 316 read probably *strepitu* (F, Conradus de Mure) for *fremitu*. A letter may have been lost. But I will not insist on this point. The anonymous reader who corrected me on 4.669 finds a parallel to *fremitu* in 5.2 *fremida ... turba*. The context is not quite the same: In 12.210-458 we have a real battle scene, whereas 5.1-29 is more like the prelude to a fight. Still, the parallel should not be ignored. The main problem is *cunctis ... / sopitus uenis*. Can this really mean “bis in die letzte Ader betäubt”, as M. von Albrecht translates? We have a choice between *iunctis ... uinis* (Gronovius ap. Heins.), *ductis ... uinis* (Heinsius II 319 Notae) and *cunctis ... uinis* (Burm.), all listed by Ehwald (1915, 367), all absent from A. and T. Surely, *uinis* instead of *uenis* is an easy change in this context; see Heinsius II 318, Burman II 832 and the note of Antonio Ramírez de Verger on *ars* 1.244. But what about the epithet? *Cunctis* seems weak. *Ductis* can easily be paralleled (9.358; *trist.* 1.8.43; Heinsius and Burman *ad loc.*; *OLD*, p. 577, 25b), but lacks color. *Iunctis*, on the other hand, goes well with *sine fine*, requires the change of only one letter, and for this meaning of *iungere* see Stat. *silu.* 1.5.10 *iunge, puer, cyathos, sed ne numerare labora* which Shackleton Bailey (LCC 2003) translates as “Boy, pour cup on cup (but take no care to count them)”. The expressions *cyathos iungere* and *uina iungere* obviously mean the same thing: ‘to drink non-stop’, and here we have the result!

13.442-3

temporis illius uultum referebat Achilles,  
 quo ferus *iniusto* petiit Agamemnona ferro,

Here, *iniustum ferrum* is singular. The *OLD* (p. 915.1) acknowledges a poetic use ‘of inanimate objects’ and cites *am.* 2.11.12 *iniusti ... forma maris*, but here Heinsius was probably

right in reading *infesti* (cf. *trist.* 1.11.26, etc.), the same type of corruption. T. cites *iniustum* (Magnus in app. crit.) which misses the point and *infesto* (Slater) which I find very attractive; cf. *Her.* 11.19; Catull. 64.355 (of Achilles) *Troiugenum infesto prosternet corpora ferro*. On *petiit* (*petit* N U P<sup>c</sup>, by haplography) see Reeson on *Her.* 13.29.

## 13.840-1

certe ego me noui liquidaeque in *imagine* uidi  
nuper aquae, placuitque mihi mea forma uidenti.

The Cyclops has seen his own reflection in the water and found himself not at all bad-looking. But is *me in imagine liquidae aquae uidi* supposed to mean *meam imaginem in liquida aqua uidi*? This is how Mary M. Innes (Penguin 1955) translates it: “I saw my reflection in the clear water,” but this meaning cannot possibly be extracted from the Latin. The true reading, *in margine*, is found in N<sup>ac</sup> as a variant, according to Ehwald who notes (p. 414) ‘*suprascr.*’ Heinsius (II 353) had reported ‘*in margine* Neapol. Arondel. pri. Hamburg. et alii complures. unus Voss. *e margine*’, while Burman found *in margine* in thirteen witnesses. Cf. Verg. *ecl.* 2.25–*nec sum adeo informis: nuper me in litore uidi, / cum placidum uentis staret mare*. Clausen (1994) points out (*ad loc.*) that *in litore* means the shallows along the shore. In other words, it corresponds exactly to *in margine* (see also *met.* 1.729). *INMARGINE* may have lost the *R*, and *INM-* was read as *INIM-*.

## 14.23-4

nec medeare mihi sanesque haec uulnera mando  
(*fine nihil opus est!*); partem ferat illa caloris.’

The bizarre phrase *fine nihil opus est* was translated by F. J. Miller (LCC 1916) with “nor end my love”, and this must be the meaning. The variants listed by the recent editors are essentially attempts to adjust a corrupt word to the metre. But where is the corruption? It was located long ago by Capoferreus, and his solution, *frigore nil opus est*, was accepted by Burman (in his Appendix *Joannis Gulielmi Capoferrei animadversiones*

in *Ovidii Metamorphosin*, II 1100), Leo (*Plautinische Forschungen*, 1912<sup>2</sup>, 150) and Ehwald (1915, 420). Then it disappeared from the editions. Glaucus does not want Circe to transform his love for Scylla into cold indifference – which magic, as love-magic in reverse, could do – but he wants Scylla to feel the flames of love that he feels. A passage of the *Rem.* (which, as a whole, deals with that kind of problem) uses (491-4) the very same imagery: *quamuis infelix media torreberis Aetna, / frigidior glacie fac uideare tuae; / et sanum simula, ne, siquid forte dolebis, / sentiat*. Here, the unhappy lover is told to simulate the coldness that he does not feel. *Frigidior* corresponds to *frigore* and *sanes* to *sanum*. As often, the first word of the line was corrupted – in this case contracted or compacted into a shorter word. In such a phrase, *nil*, not *nihil* is idiomatic; cf. 10.564-5 *coniuge... / nil opus est, Atalanta, tibi*; T.'s reference to Housman does not help.

14.218

*hanc* procul aspexi longo post tempore navem

Read perhaps *haud* for *hanc*. No ship has been mentioned before, and this one is obviously not far from the coast. For *haud procul* at the beginning of a line see, e. g., 5.385. Missing negations are not – as far as I can tell – a major issue in the *met.*, but there are a few remarkable cases in the New Testament (see Jan Krans, *Beyond What is Written: Erasmus and Beza as Conjectural Critics of the New Testament (= NT Tools and Studies, vol. 35, 2006, 50, n. 50)*. One example may serve as a parallel. In *Matth.* 8:30 Jesus comes to a region near Gadara and encounters two men who are possessed. They reproach him for torturing them by exorcizing their daemons. The narrative continues: “There was far from them a large herd of pigs on a pasture.” What would be the point of mentioning a location that is far away, especially since the pigs are needed at once as receptacles of the daemons? Beza (Théodore de Bèze) saw that the negation *ou* was missing, and his conjecture was anticipated by some MSS of the Vulgate, as acknowledged by Erasmus in a note, although he did not change his text, saying that it mattered very little. But it does matter, in the New Testament as well as in Ovid.

14.404-5

et Noctem Noctisque deos *Ereboque Chaoque*  
*convocat* et longis Hecaten ululatus orat.

*Ereboque Chaoque* have to be understood as ablatives of separation, “from Erebus and Chaos”, i. e. from the underworld. But Erebus and Chaos could also be personified. According to the *OLD*, Erebus is the ‘god of darkness ... brother and husband or ... father of Nox’. Similarly, Chaos is not only a place or a condition, but a supernatural power. Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.510-1 *ter centum tonat ore deos, Erebumque Chaosque/ tergeminamque Hecaten, tria virginis ora Dianae*. The priestess/witch summoned by Dido “utters thunderously” the names of deities of the underworld. It would make sense to read, in our passage, *Erebumque Chaosque*, as suggested by Lindemann (ap. Magn., 548). Some edd. vett. have *Erebonque Chaonque* which is on the same track. In religion and magic it often matters to invoke as many deities as possible.

In v. 405 *convocat* is not the proper term. Read either *evocat* (Leidensis unus); cf. *am.* 1.8.17; *OLD*, 627.1c, or, perhaps, *invocat*; cf. *OLD*, 962.b. This looks like a case of the wrong prefix at the beginning of a line.

15.169

utque nouis *facilis* signatur cera figuris,

In an article forthcoming in *Athenaeum* (2008), Antonio Ramírez de Verger justly claims that Bömer’s explanation of *facilis* as ‘tractabilis’ cannot be supported by any parallels and that we should revive Heinsius’ choice *fragilis* from several MSS. There is an evident parallel in Juvenal 12.88, *fragili simulacra nitentia cera*, but Burman (II 1021 in his notes while keeping *fragilis* in the text) rejected Heinsius’ view, referring to his own note on Val. Fl. 3.6. Ironically, as Ramírez de Verger shows, the reference should be to 6.147 where Burman actually defends the reading *fragilemque* found in most MSS. Ramírez de Verger carefully explains the technical process that Ovid and Juvenal must have had in mind. There can be very little doubt that *fragilis* is right. *R* was probably lost after *F*, and *G* was read as *C*.



15.407

ante fores sacras Hyperionis *aede* reponit.

*Aede* cannot be right, as T. indicates. It repeats *fores sacras* which is a paraphrase of *aedes*. Moreover, whatever the Phoenix does, he does it in front of the temple of the Sun in Heliopolis, not inside. *Urbe* (Basil. 3 teste Bach, Schepper ap Burm. II 1047 ex con.) is possible but not very likely. The solution was found by Bach (1836, II 472) and then forgotten, I think. He suggested *igne* for *aede*, and he must be right, for all the testimonies agree that the bird deposits the nest with his dead father on the altar of the Sun where it is burned with fragrant spices. The whole ritual was almost certainly performed outside of the temple where a large crowd of worshippers was able to watch and breathe in the aromatic essences. Cf. *infra* 685-6; 9.297-8 *in illa/ ante fores ara*; Sil. It. 1.617 *in foribus sacris primoque in limine templi*. The best confirmation of *igne* is found in Stat. *silv.* 2.4.35-6 *senio nec fessus inerti/ scandet odoratos Phoenix felicior i g n e s* and Claudian, *carm.* 27(45).92-6 *illic, ut perhibent, patriam de more reponit/ congeriem uultumque dei ueneratus erilem/ iam fl a m m a e commendat onus, iam destinat aris/ semina reliquiasque sui: myrrhata relucent/ limina: diuino spirant altaria fumo*. It can be taken for granted that Claudian knew our passage and embellished it in his manner, but he may also have witnessed such rituals.

15.426-30

[clara fuit Sparte, magnae uiguere Mycenae,  
nec non et Cecropis, nec non Amphionis arces;  
uile solum Sparte est, altae cecidere Mycenae.  
Oedipodioniae quid sunt, nisi nomina, Thebae?  
quid Pandioniae restant, nisi nomen, Athenae?]

These five lines are bracketed by T. Apparently they are the only interpolation he found in all of Book 15. The lines were deleted by Heinsius (who also, at one time, tried to save them by making a few changes; see II 415 Notae), Schrader (1776), Canter (1783), Meineke (1825), and others. Lachmann (on Lucr. 6.1138) only deleted vv. 428-30 and saw nothing wrong with 426-7.

It is true that all of them are only sporadically attested in the older MSS, but the Tegernseensis (s. XI) has them between 451 and 452. That probably means that they had lost their original place because of the four identical verse endings in *-ae* and were inserted twenty lines later. Other objections have been made, e. g. the anachronism implied in 430. There are certainly some doubtful readings in the version printed by T. On the other hand, it seems that Lucan 8.407 *damnat apud gentes sceleris non sponte peracti/ Oedipodionias infelix fabula Thebas* knew the passage. It has been declared genuine by Jahn (1832, II 1004–5), Bach (1836, II 475), A. and Bömer.

Perhaps it can be saved. It seems to me that vv. 426 and 428 belong together and that 428 may have lost its place because of the ‘homoeoteleuton’ *Mycenae ... Mycenae* and the ‘homoeomeson’ *Sparte ... Sparte*. If so, a simple transposition, 428 before 427, might solve part of the problem. This has probably been suggested before. In 427 *nec non et Cecropis* is impossible, because Ovid, following Homer, counts *Cecr-* as a long syllable (cf. 2.555; 6.70; 446; 7.502; 671; 11.93). Here we could consider one of the many variants. *Nec non Cecropiae* (sc. *arces*), cited by Heinsius from one of his Vaticanani, may be an old conjecture, and it would work, if we supply a suitable verb. There is nothing wrong with v. 428, except that it should come after v. 426, in my opinion. In v. 429 *nomina* must be wrong. Perhaps a scribe anticipated the word from *nomen* in the following line. B and many other witnesses offer *fabula* instead of *nomina*. The reading was accepted by Heinsius (*fort. recte* T.) and it gives us the meaning we want. V. 430, as printed by T., is difficult, but it was plausibly restored by Heinsius from MSS: *quid Pandioniis restat, nisi nomen, Athenis?* We may need another transposition, 430 before 420, and then the passage reads as follows:

clara fuit Sparte, magnae uiguere Mycenae:	426
uile solum Sparte est, altae cecidere Mycenae	428
nec non Cecropiae, nec non Amphionis arces.	427
quid Pandioniis restat, nisi nomen, Athenis?	430
Oedipodioniae quid sunt nisi fabula Thebae? <sup>4</sup>	429

<sup>4</sup> One of the anonymous readers refers me to Ch. Segal, “Myth and

In conclusion, I hope that I have been able to show that many problems in the text of the *Metamorphoses* remain open. Even if my own solutions are tentative, certain areas where errors are likely to occur in this particular paradosis have emerged.

I. Word endings: 1.190; 11.48; 361; 14.384; 404.

II. Endings of lines: 1.190; 8.279; 11.48; 351.

III. Prefixes: 6.664; 14.405; 15.650.

IV. Beginnings of lines: 14.24; 218.

V. Omission of a letter: 4.669; 6.664; 7.556; 10.144; 12.316; 13.840; 15.169.

This last category, in my opinion, deserves special attention. In addition to the cases I have presented here and in *Myrtia* 21, 2006, 113-21, I would like to recommend the following passages for further study: 1.71; 739; 2.96-7; 3.125; 506; 693; 6.259; 325; 327; 334; 393; 7.161; 240; 430; 504; 681; 9.344; 12.538; 13.866; 14.87; 206; 390; 15.149; 169; 351; 386; 642; 685; 723; 742.

GEORG LUCK  
Johns Hopkins University  
georgluck@comcast.net

---

Philosophy in the *Metamorphoses*”, *AJP* 90, 1969, 257ff where this passage is cited as a testimony of Ovid’s own view of Rome (288).

