Marginalia Critica to Ovid, *Am.* 2.15.19-24[*]

Among the many textual problems still presented by elegy **2.15** of Ovid's *Amores*, I am here going to examine those affecting lines **19-24**. For the remaining problems the reader is referred to another study[1], which also contains an overall interpretation of the poem and its less obvious key elements.

L. 19:

The text *si dabor ut condar loculis* has been emended by some editors and simply obelized by others. In my view, such problems seem to arise from a general misunderstanding of the poem rather than from the intrinsic difficulties of the transmission of the manuscripts. In fact, I am fully convinced that, as G. P. Goold points out, "The text is perfectly sound"[2], even if I differ from his interpretation of *loculis* as a dative depending on *dabor*[3], which

    [1] L. Rivero García, "A Reading of Ovid, Amores II 15", *Hermes* 132, 2004, 186-210.
    [2] G. P. Goold, "*Amatoria Critica*", *HSCPh* 69, 1965, 1-107 (39).
    [3] And see the translation by Showerman-Goold (G. Showerman, *Ovid I: Heroides and Amores*, with an English Translation by..., London-Cambridge, Mass. 1914 [second edition revised by G. P. Goold, 1977]): "If you wish me given over to the casket's keeping...". This same interpretation is expressly accepted by O. Hiltbrunner ("Ovids Gedicht vom Siegelring und ein anonymes Epigram aus Pompei", *Gymnasium* 77, 1970, 283-99 [294-5]), J. Booth (*Ovid. The Second Book of «Amores»*. Edited with translation and commentary by..., Warminster 1991, 171 *ad loc.*, although it is not reflected as such in her translation: "If I am going to be handed over to be put away in your jewel

leads him to argue at length on the rarity of the construction
with *ut* in place of the expected gerundive. In my opinion,
loculis is not necessarily a dative but can rather be considered an
ablative depending on *condar* (*cf.*, for example, Ov. *Pont.* 1.5.34
c. semen humo)[4]. As for the verb, Heinsius took it as representing
the beloved's handing over of the ring to a serving girl (*i.e. 'si
puellae dabor a te'*)[5]. This interpretation is irreproachable not
only from a linguistic point of view but because it fits in with the
dramatic situation and maintains the elegiac scenario. However,
I am inclined to think that *dabor* is used here in the sense of

case...") and B. Weinlich *(Ovids Amores. Gedichtfolge und Handlungsablauf*,
Stuttgart-Leipzig 1999, 152). The same sense seems to be implied by the
punctuation *si dabor, ut condar, loculis* in the edition by A. Riese (*P. Ovidii
Nasonis Carmina*, edidit... I: *Heroides. Amores. Med. Formae. Ars Amatoria.
Remedia Amoris. Poetae Ovidiani*, ed. stereotypa, Leipzig 1871), and
compare *si dabor, ut condar loculis*, followed *e.g.* by N. Heinsius (*P. Ovidii
Nasonis Opera Omnia in tres tomos divisa cum integris Nicolai Heinsii, D.f.,
lectissimisque variorum notis, quibus non pauca, ad suos quaeque antiquitatis
fontes diligenti comparatione reducta, accesserunt, studio Borchardi
Cnippingii*, Amstelodami 1683, I, 427-9) and R. Merkel (*P. Ovidius Naso*, ex
recognitione..., tom. I: *Amores, Epistulae, De medic. fac., Ars amat., Remedia
amoris*, Leipzig 1852 [ed. stereot. 1881]).

[4] *Cf. e.g.* the translation by F. Bertini (*Publio Ovidio Nasone, Amori*, a
cura di..., Milano 1983): "Se vorrai sfilarmi per ripormi in uno scrigno",
the one by F. Socas (*Ovidio. Obra Amatoria I: Amores*. Introducción, texto
latino e índices de A. Ramírez de Verger, introd., traducción y notas de F.
Socas, Madrid 1991): "Si me das para que me pongan en cajones", or that
of J. A. González Iglesias (*Ovidio. Amores, Arte de Amar*, trad. de..., Madrid
1993): "Si vas a darme para que me guarden / dentro de tu joyero".

[5] *P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera Omnia*, 428 *ad loc.*, followed by D. Crispinus
(*Pub. Ovidii Nasonis Opera quatuor tomis comprehensa. Interpretatione et
notis illustrauit Daniel Crispinus, Heluetius, jussu Christianissimi Regis ad
usum serenissimi Delphini*, Lugduni, apud Anissonios, 1689, I, 330-2 [331
ad loc.]), R. P. Oliver ("Ovid in his Ring (*Amores* 2.15.9-26)", *CPh* 53, 1958,
103-6 [104]), F. W. Lenz (*Ovid. Die Liebeselegien*, lateinisch und deutsch
von..., Berlin 1965, 202), A. della Casa (*Opere di Publio Ovidio Nasone.
Volume primo: Amores, Heroides, Medicamina faciei, Ars amatoria, Remedia
amoris*, a cura di..., Torino 1982, 139) and J. C. McKeown (*Ovid: Amores.
Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes*, III: *A Commentary on
Book Two*, Leeds 1998, 324 *ad loc.*).

"give as a present", a sense which scarcely requires justification on the linguistic level (*(munera) dare: cf.*, for example, Ov. *am.* 2.5.6 **data**... *munera; ars* 3.531 *Munera* **det** *diues; am.* 1.8.61–2 *Qui* **dabit**, *ille tibi magno sit maior Homero; / crede mihi, res est ingeniosa dare;* 2.6.19 *ut* **datus** *es [sc. psittacus]; ars* 1.447-54; *et passim*). Moreover, I believe that this interpretation is closer to the poetic context of this elegy. It should be recalled that our poem basically consists in the poet's handing over of the *munus amoris* to his *puella* (a gift-poem, variant of the ἀναθεματικόν), and this handing over is expressed at the beginning and the end of the composition precisely by the use of the verb *dare*[6]: l. 2 *in quo censendum nil nisi* **dantis** *amor;* l. 28 *illa* **datam tecum** *sentiat esse fidem*. Thus the sense would be: "If I am given [*i.e.* as a gift] to be kept in a coffer, I will refuse to come out", which could be glossed as: "If my fate as a gift is to be put away...". This, incidentally, would rule out any strong punctuation after *loculis*, since *exire negabo* is simply the apodosis of this conditional sentence[7]. To conclude on this point, I think it

---

[6] See P. Murgatroyd, "Genres and Themes in Ovid Amores 2.15", *ÉMC* 28, 1984, 51-5 (53, n. 8).

[7] On this point, note that the colon used by R. Ehwald (*P. Ovidius Naso. I: Amores. Epistulae. Medic. Fac. Fem. Ars Amat. Remedia Amoris. Ex Rudolphii Merkelii recognitione edidit...*, Leipzig 1888 [editio stereotypa 1916] and, after him, P. Brandt, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amorum libri tres*, erklärt von..., erste Abteilung: Text und Kommentar, Leipzig 1911 [ed. stereot. Hildesheim 1963]) does make sense, but only within the reading he proposed (*uid.* p. X of his edition): *sit labor, ut*... On the other hand, this punctuation is not acceptable in a reading such as that of G. Némethy (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Amores edidit, adnotationibus exegeticis et criticis instruxit...*, Budapest 1907): *Si trahar, ut condar loculis:*, which is structurally the same as the one we propose here (his explanation is: "*si me digito detrahere volet amica*"). This was the view of H. Bornecque (*Ovide: les Amours. Texte établi et traduit par...*, Paris 1930 [= 1989⁵, revu et corrigé par H. le Bonniec] and, after him, J. Pérez & M. Dolç, *P. Ovidi Nasó, Amors*, text revisat i traducció de..., Barcelona 1971), F. Munari (*P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores. Testo, introduzione, traduzione e note di...*, Firenze 1970⁵) and, more recently, M. von Albrecht (*P. Ovidius Naso, Amores/Liebesgedichte*, Lateinisch/ Deutsch, übersetzt und herausgegeben von..., Stuttgart 1997), all of whom,

opportune to note that the lack of definition in the Latin expression *si dabor* makes it unreasonable to come down firmly in favour of one interpretation or the other (that is, Ovid himself was not aiming to be explicit on this point), so I believe that the translator should reflect this nuance in his version.

L. 21:

As for the textual problem presented by *sim/sum*, it seems to me that the subjunctive, although transmitted in the best codices and accepted by many of the editors, could have come about, not only from an obvious paleographic confusion with SVM (a confusion equally possible in the opposite direction), but by association –in my view, an erroneous one– with the previous verbs in this part of the poem, understood per force as subjunctives and not as futures. I must admit that there are arguments in defence of both interpretations (as far as l. 18, of course) and even to make us think that Ovid consciously used these forms, which were ambiguous for the Roman listener-spectator[8]. The question, in principle, is of no great importance for the understanding of the text, but I am inclined to think (together with Oliver, "Ovid in his Ring...", 104) that here the notion of the future prevails over that of eventuality (as in any case becomes evident precisely from l. 19: 'si dabor... negabo'), and for this reason the form *sum... futurus* is preferable[9]. But I am

---

while accepting (with reservations in the case of Munari) the conjecture *trahar*, replaced the colon with a simple comma. For the same reason, the punctuation of Heinsius (followed by Crispinus and P. Burmann [*Publii Ovidii Nasonis Opera Omnia IV. voluminibus comprehensa, cum integris Jacobi Micylli, Herculis Ciofani, Danielis et Nicolai Heinsiorum et excerptis aliorum notis, quibus suas adiecit Petrus Burmannus,* Amstelodami 1727, I, 446-8]) is not valid either: *Si dabor, ut condar loculis; exire negabo...*

[8] As pointed out by McKeown, *Ovid: Amores*, 321-2 *ad loc.*, although he argues that these forms are, strictly speaking, subjunctive.

[9] I believe that the parallel, cited by editors and commentators, of Claud. 40 (*ep. ad Olyb.*) 24 is not proof in itself (the contexts being different) of the mood of the verb here (though it is valid for the expression), and,

going to allow myself one final consideration on this question. The formula *irrita quid uoueo?* (l. 27) with which the poet is to precipitate the end of the elegy has not, I believe, been fully understood. Regarding *irrita*, McKeown (*Ovid: Amores*, 327 *ad loc.*) correctly points out: "not 'things which have not been realised' [...] but rather 'things incapable of realisation'". More problems are raised by the verb *uoueo*, and I believe that it was its relative obscurity which led quite a few editors, some perfectly sound and reliable, to adopt the reading *foueo*[10], found only in S and with all the appearance of being a mere trivialization. Other no-less competent authorities such as McKeown (*Ovid: Amores*, 327 *ad loc.*), while accepting *uoueo*, indicate that the verb "here bears the rare sense 'pray for'" (consider, too, most of the translations). It seems to me that this is not exactly the case. The verb *uoueo* is used here in the sense of "to wish - desire"[11], which is perfectly explicable in terms of the basic meaning of "to promise (to a god) in return for a favour, vow" (*OLD s.u.,* 1, 2104). We should bear in mind that Ovid-*poeta/amator* has formulated a real wish in ll. 9-10: *o utinam fieri... possem.* Then

---

moreover, there are numerous textual problems affecting it, as can be seen in the *apparatus criticus* of the Teubner edition by J. B. Hall. See also the defence of *sum... futurus*, although with different arguments, by Goold, "*Amatoria Critica*", 39 (*cl.* Ov. *epist.* 17.68), Hiltbrunner, ("Ovids Gedicht", 295, Booth, *Ovid,* 171 *ad loc.* and McKeown, *Ovid: Amores*, 324-5 *ad loc.* (*cl.* Ov. *am.* 2.17.25 [*non tibi crimen ero, nec quo laetere remoto*]; Verg. *Aen.* 7.231).

[10] Thus, for example, Bornecque, Munari, Lenz, Pérez-Dolç and Bertini. In his review of Kenney's first edition (1961) G. Luck ("Ovid Liebesgedichte, ed. Kenney", *Gnomon* 35, 1963, 256-62 [259]) also seems to show some sympathy for this reading.

[11] *Cf.* Burmann, *Opera Omnia, ad loc.*: "*Voveo*, id est cupio. nam quae magnopere cupimus, ea à diis immortalibus solemus votis petere. Hinc quandoque *vovere* significat desiderare, & votum desiderium. Marius". *Cf.* Ov. *ars* 1.671 *quantum defuerat pleno post oscula uoto?*, and *De pulice* (text available at F.W. Lenz, "De Pulice libellus", *Maia* n.s. 14, 1962, 299-333 [313]) l. 16 *promptior ut fieret ad mea vota via*, l. 20 *carminibus fierem* † *ad mea vota pulex* and l. 36 *afferrem cunctos in mea vota deos.* See also González Iglesias, *Ovidio*: "¿Mas para qué deseo algo irrealizable?".

comes the fantasy (*tunc*), a scene which, from the perspective of religious parody[12], serves in turn to formulate the *uotum*, that is, what Ovid-*poeta/amator* undertakes to do if his wish is granted. This undertaking is formulated in the future, as is only logical (*cupiam*... etc.). Once the fantasy/*uotum* has vanished, the poet comes back to reality and asks himself: *irrita quid uoueo*?, "Why make a vow that cannot be carried out?".

Ll. 23-4:

There are three textual questions to be resolved by the editors in this distich, although none of them is a serious hindrance to a perfect understanding of the text[13]: *perfundes, gemmam* and *perfer euntis.*

For the first case the manuscripts are divided between the participle *perfundens* (*profundens* in some codices), the present *perfundis* and the future *perfundes*, with the latter followed by most editors. Heinsius proposed the emendation *perfunderis*[14],

---

[12] It should be stressed that I am in no way arguing that there is any intention on Ovid's part to deliberately parody any type of religious ceremony: I am simply observing that Ovid may here be making use, for his own poetic-amatory ends, of a mould (that of the *uotum*) whose natural –though not exclusive- ambit is the religious sphere. For another example of an amatory *uotum* in *Amores* 3.2, *uid.* the remarks by J.T. Davis, "Dramatic and Comic Devices in Amores 3,2", *Hermes* 107, 1979, 51-69 (67-8).

[13] For the interpretation of them, *uid.* the notes in McKeown, *Ovid: Amores*, 325-6 *ad loc.*

[14] See Heinsius, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera Omnia,* 428 *ad loc.* This reading has won over editors such as Crispinus, Burmann, Merkel, L. Müller (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Carmina Amatoria*, ed..., Berlin 1861), Ehwald, Némethy, Brandt, Bornecque, Pérez-Dolç and A. Ramírez de Verger (*Ouidius. Carmina amatoria*, ed...., München-Leipzig 2003). It is also accepted by W. Gebhardi ("Zu Ovidius *Amores*", *Jahrbücher für Class. Philol.* 21 [= *Der Jahnschen Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* 111], 1875, 122-4). G. M. Edwards (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Amores* edidit..., *apud* J. P. Postgate, ed., *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, I fasc. II, London, 1894) keeps *perfundes*, but in his *apparatus criticus* he opens the lemma with the proposal by Heinsius,

adducing the parallel of *met.* 1.484 *pulchra uerecundo suffunditur ora rubore*, but the fact is that this reading has usually been rejected in favour of ... *suffuderat ora rubore* (though not in the recent Oxford edition by R.J. Tarrant, who keeps *suffunditur*). Leaving to one side *perfundens*, since it requires no great attention, and concentrating on the forms *perfundis-perfundes-perfunderis,* the future is clearly preferable to the present in the context of our elegy, and Ovid's works offer several examples of the imperative + future *cum*-clause construction (*uid.* Oliver, "Ovid in his Ring", 105; Goold, "*Amatoria Critica*", 99-101; McKeown, *Ovid: Amores*, 325-6 *ad loc.*). As regards voice, I am also fully convinced by the parallel adduced by Oliver ("Ovid in his Ring", 105): *met.* 3.163-4 *Hic dea siluarum... solebat / uirgineos artus liquido perfundere rore*, a scene which Ovid describes again (*met.* 3.173) using the middle voice but with no accusative of respect (*artus* in Heinsius' proposal): .... *perluitur solita Titonia lympha.* Also relevant is his mention of *epist.* 2.90 *membra lauabis*, analogous to *perfundes... artus* and both equivalent to a middle voice used in an absolute construction.

The expression *sub gemmam* appears in two *antiquiores*, as against the common reading of the rest (*i.e. sub gemma*), was defended by L. Müller[15], Oliver ("*Ovid in his Ring*", 104-5) and Luck ("*Ovid Liebesgedichte*", 261), and adopted by numerous major editors. In my opinion, it is much more in accordance with the lexeme *(per-)euntis* (*cf.* Ov. *fast.* 2.403; 5.470; 6.554; epist. 6.10; 6.42; 17.94, as pointed out by Goold, "*Amatoria Critica*", 40) and I believe that paleographically it requires no further justification[16].

---

relegating *perfundes* to the end of the list. This makes me think that either some mistake has been made in the text, and that it was this editor's intention to put *-eris*, or else he had it this way for some time before changing his mind, forgetting, however, to modify the apparatus.

[15] See "*De Ovidii Amorum libris*", *Philologus* 11, 1856, 60-91, 192 (192) and "Zur Kritik des ersten Theils der Ovidischen Dichtungen (II)", *RhM* 18, 1863, 71-90 (78).

[16] Moreover, I find no sense in the defence of *sub gemma* put forward by Brandt, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amorum libri tres, ad loc.* (although the reasoning was previously presented by Burmann): "*sub gemma* d.h. *gemmata*, also den

As regards *(per-)fer (per-)euntis*, although we should not openly rule out the tradition of the mss., *perfer euntis*, which is, after all, valid[17], I must admit that I find quite convincing the arguments presented by Goold ("*Amatoria Critica*", 40-1) to defend (and subsequently incorporate into his edition), along with editors such as Ehwald and Brandt (and recently also Ramírez de Verger in his Teubner edition), the old conjecture of J. Douza: *fer pereuntis,* these arguments being reproduced in what follows together with some fresh considerations of my own. The paleographical interpretation is valid: *fer per- > perfer* by assimilation to *perfund-*, situated just above. The phraseological arguments are also valid: Ovid shows a great fondness for the expression *damna* (always in the plural) *ferre*[18], but in addition –and this is quite significant- he *never* uses the expression *damna perferre*. As for *pereuntis aquae*, the expression is supported by the parallels of Mart. 12.50.6 (in an analogical metrical position), Front. *aqu.* 88 (*pereuntes aquae*) and Hor. *carm.* 3.11.26-7 (*lymphae /... pereuntis*). The verb here (as in the passages just mentioned) refers to the loss and disappearance (in the sense of its not being fully used) of the shower water (*cf. fast.* 3.236 *et pereunt lapsae sole tepente niues; trist.* 3.7.16 *ne male fecundae uena periret aquae;* Lucan. 5.428-9 *summaque pandens / sipara uelorum perituras colligit auras*: *uid. ThlL* X,1 1326, 56-58; 1327,2; 1338,44; 1340,10). There is one final argument: McKeown, who, while not going so far as to introduce this reading into his edition, does show some sympathy towards it[19], believes that *fer pereuntis* would confer on the pentameter

---

Ring am Finger, wie man *sub armis* für *armatus* sagt". To whom, then, are we to take *gemmata* to refer?

[17] See the defence put forward by Booth (*Ovid,* 171 *ad loc.*). In contrast, the old conjecture defended by Gebhardi ("Zu Ovidius *Amores*"): *damna neque in gemma fers subeuntis aquae*, seems preposterous, and in fact it was rejected by K. Frey in the very same issue of the journal in which it was presented (634).

[18] *Vid. am.* 1.13.20; 2.2.50; 3.3.16; 3.7.72; *epist.* 15.64; *ars* 1.186; 3.280; *rem.* 102; *fast.* 1.60; 2.522; *trist.* 3.8.34; *ib.* 220.

[19] See his note on the passage (*Ovid: Amores*, 326): "he [i.e. Goold] may also be right to argue for Dousa's *fer pereuntis*".

an "unusual rhythm", although at the same time he sees in this possible reading the closest parallel for *am.* 2.12.18 (*Tyndaris, Europae pax Asiaeque foret*). In his commentary on this other passage (273) he cites several lines with an identical rhythm. To these should be added, from the work of Ovid itself and precisely with the verb *pereo*, the following passages: *fast.* 1.368 (*quoque modo repares, quae periere, dabit*); *trist.* 1.3.100 (*respectuque tamen non periisse mei*); 1.4.28 (*si modo, qui periit, non periisse potest*); 4.10.82 (*ante diem poenae quod periere meae!*); 5.5(6).34 (*fratribus, alterna qui periere manu*).

This, then, is the text proposed for these lines:

> Si dabor ut condar loculis, exire negabo
>   adstringens digitos orbe minore tuos.   20
> Non ego dedecori tibi sum, mea uita, futurus,
>   quodue tener digitus ferre recuset onus.
> Me gere, cum calidis perfundes imbribus artus,
>   damnaque sub gemmam fer pereuntis aquae.

Luis Rivero García
Universidad de Huelva
lrivero@uhu.es