

NAUGERIUS' NOTES ON OVID'S *METAMORPHOSES*

As a sequel to my article on “Ovid, Naugerius and we, or: how to create a text” (*Exemplaria* 6, 2002, 1-40) I would like to offer comments on textual problems of the *Metamorphoses*. They seem to me no less remarkable than the others, and the more recent editors of the work should have paid more attention to them. True, they are not easily accessible today. One has to use the magnificent Padua edition of Naugerius' works, produced in 1718 by the brothers Gian Antonio and Cajetano Volpi and printed, at their expense, by Giuseppe Comino. The volume is quite rare today, but, thanks to Alain Berlincourt, I was able to obtain a microfilm of the copy owned by the University Library of Geneva, Switzerland.

The notes had been published before, but in an unreliable form, as the editors of the *Opera Omnia* inform us: *Variae lectiones in Opera omnia Ovidii exstant in editione Aldina. 1516.8 3 vol. Et in altera. 1533, 8, sed mutilae et passim interpolatae. Leguntur etiam in aliis editionibus quae ab Aldina ortum duxerunt. Ovidius de Tristibus, cum notis Andreae Naugerii. Londini 1583.*

For the convenience of the reader, I would like to repeat here some of the information given in the earlier article. Naugerius' edition of all of Ovid's works was published by Aldus Manutius in 1515. It is known as the “Second *Aldina*”, because there was an earlier one, in 1502, edited by someone else. It is generally acknowledged that his own edition represents a vast improvement over the first *Aldina* and all other early editions, and it is generally considered one of the best early editions of any Latin poet.

Incidentally, Naugerius also edited the third *Aldina* of Virgil's works which is still considered an outstanding scholarly achievement, but for reasons that are not clear, subsequent editors returned to the two earlier *Aldinae*. As he did in the text of Ovid, Naugerius introduced a number of corrections later made by Nicolaus Heinsius

(1664, reprinted many times) on the basis of better manuscripts. Pierius and other early critics had adopted some of Naugerius' improvements but also reinstated the text of the older *Aldinae* more than once. The reprints of 1555, 1558 and 1560 largely ignored Naugerius' valuable contributions and revived his predecessors' readings instead. This is also true — again, one wonders why — of the *Gryphiana* (1542), the edition of Robert Etienne (1531) and others.

Naugerius, one could say, created the 'textus receptus' of Ovid until Nicolaus Heinsius who, with the help of a large number of manuscripts and thanks to his critical genius, established a better text. But for a century or more, all editions of Ovid (notably the *Gryphiana* of 1554, the Basel edition of 1568, the *Wecheliana* of 1601, the *Bersmanniana* of 1610 and 1621) all depended on Naugerius.

What I have said before on Naugerius' 'critical method' (if the term is appropriate) also applies to his work on the text of the *Metamorphoses*. As I studied these notes, I noticed a few things I had not seen before. His command of Latin as well as Greek and his extensive knowledge of the classical authors are evident throughout. He himself wrote accomplished poems in Latin and his Latin orations were much admired by his contemporaries. His understanding of Ovid's style and his grasp of metrics enabled him to make a number of felicitous conjectures.

We will see again that he often prefers a reading because he found it in an "old manuscript". Of course he was not an expert palaeographer (the discipline did not yet exist) and he may have been wrong more than once in estimating the age of one of his sources. Most of the readings he reports have survived in one or more manuscripts known today, but some — not always the most important ones — would be lost, if it were not for him.

Since he does not identify his witnesses — not even in the casual way of the editors of later centuries — it is impossible to be sure which one of the manuscripts known today was known to him. For the text of the *Metamorphoses*, he seems to have had access to *F* (*Marcianus Florentinus* 223, s. XI/XII) and *U* (*Vaticanus Urbinas* 341, s. XI/XII). The case of *U* is particularly interesting, because some of his corrections are found as notes by the third or fourth hand of this manuscript. One of these hands

could be that of Constantius Fanensis to whom we owe several emendations in the *Metamorphoses*. It could also be the hand of a scholar who had read Constantius' book (Fani 1508).

Naugerius clearly knew most or all of the earlier editions of Ovid's works, notably the *Editio Princeps Bononiensis* of 1471 by Franciscus Puteolanus and the *Editio Princeps Romana*, also of 1471, by Ioannes Andreas, Bishop of Aleria. Naturally, he worked with the first *Aldina* of 1502 which he improved in so many ways. In fact, his notes may be understood, in part, at least, as attempts to justify his disagreements with this (and other) early editions. He never names other scholars, though he used the earlier editions and probably knew some of the conjectures made by Politian and Constantius. It will be seen that his emendations quite often agree with those published by Constantius in 1508, eight years before his own edition appeared.

Often, he spots a textual problem without being able to offer a solution, but he is usually right about the problem itself, and the solution was found by a later scholar, J. F. Gronovius or N. Heinsius, for example. In trying to establish a reading, he offers parallels, just as a modern editor would, and he often cites Greek authors. Planudes' Greek translation he must have read carefully, but he also knew Strabo and Stephanus of Byzantium, among others.

The format of his notes may be said to reflect the style of academic lectures of his time: The professor read aloud the portion of the text he was lecturing on and then discussed the variant readings, and if there was a problem, proposed his solution. This custom which must have its roots in antiquity is ultimately the origin of our apparatus criticus. Some thoroughly annotated manuscripts which have survived were probably used by their owners for teaching or for the preparation of a new text, or for both.

These general remarks must suffice. I now would like to discuss his notes one by one to show their value for the constitution and the understanding of the text. A few readings not recorded in N.'s notes but attributed to him by later editors are also included. As a rule, I first quote the lemma in the form he quotes it. The sigla are those of Tarrant's *Oxoniensis* (2004).

—BOOK 1—

1.244

dicta Iovis pars voce probant stimulosque *frementi*
adiciunt,

N. reports a variant *furenti* which is not recorded in Tarrant's *Oxoniensis* and in Anderson's *Teubneriana* (cf., however, Magnus and Slater ['quidam Naugerii'] ad loc.). In his German translation (Reclam 1994), Michael von Albrecht renders *fremens* as "der Wutschnaubende". It should be noted, however, that Ovid never uses the verb with an individual — a human being or a deity. He uses it of collectives (*met.* 3.528) or of animals (5.627) or of the sea (4.136 where we have *fremit* (Ω) vs. *tremit* (N^{ac}), preferred by A. and T. Achilles in battle is called *fremebundus* (12.128) which lends support to *frementi* in our passage. One could also cite *met.* 1.199 *confremuere* ($F^t \varphi$) *omnes*, apparently only here in Ovid. Most MSS. have *contremuere omnes*, but see also 15.606 *fremetis ... vulgi*, as N. reads against MS. *tremetis ... vulgi*, it seems). In 5.2 we have *fremida ... turba*. On the other hand, *furenti* would also be appropriate in this context; cf. *fast.* 2.177 *laesa furit Iuno*.

1.333

caeruleum Tritona vocat conchaeque *sonanti*
inspirare iubet

N. reports the reading *sonaci*, not found in A. and attributed to a generic *recc.* (ζ) group by T. It is actually Beroaldus' conjecture, adopted by Heinsius. There are several passages where we have to decide between forms in *—ans* and *—ax*. According to the *OLD*, *—ax* denotes 'wont or ability' (cf., e.g., *dicax*), but to make a distinction between, say, the potential of producing a sound and the actual sounding is not always easy. See, e.g., 1.91 *verba minantia* (most MSS.) vs. *verba minacia* (M^{ac}); 2.779 *vigilantibus ... curis* ($NU B^c F^c L$) vs. *vigilacibus ... curis* ($HM U^{2c} GP$); 5.669 *minacia verba* ($\Delta B^{ac} G^c$) vs. *minantia verba* (Σ); 13.442 *similisque minanti* (MSS.) vs. *similisque minaci* (Heins. ap. Burm. 'ex codd.', not quoted by T.). All MSS. have

minax (*sc.*, *monstrum*, as opposed to *laetum*) in 15.573, and no change has been suggested here. Apuleius, *met.* 4.31 (Triton) *concha sonaci leniter bucinat* suggests that he read *sonaci* in Ovid, *met.* 1.333. Similarly, 12.46 *ex aere sonanti* (most MSS.) was changed to *ex aere sonaci* 'ex Leidensi' by Heinsius (this is probably not Tarrant's 'o', i. e. *Leidensis Voss. Q.* 51, s. XII). Heinsius also preferred *minacia* (*FG*) to *minantia* (*U³BP*) in 15.793. See also Tarrant in: *ICS* 14, 1989, 103-17.

1.359-60

quo sola timorem
ferre modo posses? quo consolante *dolores*?

Dolores (*HM^{ac} B^{c2} GL[P^{ac}]*) seems to have been the vulgate before Naugerius, but he notes *doleres* (*M^{2c}M^{2v}NUB¹²P^c, Plan.*), which is preferred by the most recent editors. It is possible, however, to take *dolores* with *ferre*, parallel to *timorem*, as Ehwald did. In that case, the question mark after *posses* should be replaced by a comma.

1.521

inventum medicina meum est *opifexque* per orbem
dicor

N. says 'multo rectior vetus lectio *opiferque*'. This seems to be the reading of all MSS. known today, with the possible exception of *N* (according to A., nothing in T.). Cf. 15.653, where Aesculapius is called *opifer* in almost all MSS. (Slater records *opifex* from a Strozianus). In 15.744 he is called *salutifer Urbi*. There is, of course, a very real difference between the two words: For the meaning of *opifex* see 1.79; 8.201 (no variants).

1.580

Apidanosque senex lenisque Amphrysos et Aeas

N. writes: 'in veteribus omnibus *Eridanusque senex*.' All our MSS., as well as Planudes (which is remarkable) have the wrong river name. The correction is due to Raphael Regius (1493) who may have remembered Lucan 6.373 (duly noted by T.), but it

also occurred to Politian and Jacobus a Cruce. N., who saw that this was a list of Thessalian rivers, supported the emendation by passages from Pausanias and Strabo. Cf. 7.228 where all our MSS. have *Eridani*, while Planudes (as well as Heinsius' 'Noricus a prima manu') offer the correct name. In both passages, a *Basileensis* has a mixed form of the name, *Epidanus*. The paradosis preserves forms of *Eridanus* in 2.324 and 372. (T. prints —os in the text, but —us in the Appendix, p. 484, and the Index).

1.742

ungulaque in quinos *dilapsa* absumitur ungues

There is a variant *diducta*, known to N., but not recorded by A. and T. It is questionable whether *dilabi* can mean "sich spalten", as von Albrecht (1994) translates. There is certainly no exact parallel in Ovid, and the *OLD* lists our passage under the heading 'of liquids or sim.' which does not help. Could *diducta* be right? The verb means 'to branch out' (*vel sim.*); cf. *OLD* s. u. 2b; 4a. In 14.824–5 *corpus mortale per aura / dilapsum* one should probably read (with *M*, according to A.), *delapsum* (cf. 5.469). See also T., pp. 495, 497.

—BOOK 2—

2.189

et modo quos illi *fatum* contingere non est
prospicit occasus

For *fatum* Naugerius found a variant *fas tum* which A. reports from his *v* (= *Vaticanus lat. 1593*, s. XII/XIII), Heinsius' 'primus Vaticanus'. It was also conjectured by Constantius Fanensis. While N. preferred the vulgate, Heinsius favored *fato* (*B = Parisin. Lat. 8001*, s. XII), and Bömer followed him. It is possible to say *fata sinunt* or *fata negant*, but can *mihi fatum est, non* etc. mean "it is my destiny, not to..."? *Fas tum* may be an old correction, but, if so, *tum* seems otiose. Heinsius was right, I think, and *fato* could be supported by 2.305 *omnia fato / interitura gravi*. Nothing in T.

2.201

quae (sc. lora) postquam summum *tetigere* iacencia tergum,

On *tetigere* N. says 'recta lectio'. It is the reading of most MSS., except for *P* (and *h*?) which has *sensere*. This reading seems 'manufactured', so to speak, to fit *summo ... tergo* (most MSS., exc. *N U*). But there is another problem in this line. *Iacencia* can be supported by *am.* 3.4.16 *frenaque in effusa laxa iacere iuba* (Bömer *ad loc.*), but Polle's *cadentia* is very attractive, and this is what Planudes translates. Read probably: *quae postquam summum tetigere cadentia tergum*.

2.209

admiratur equos *ambustaque* nubila fumant

Combustaque, rather than *ambustaque*, seems to have been the accepted reading in N.'s time, but he found *ambustaque* in 'old manuscripts'. It is today's vulgate and has driven out the other reading, even from the *app. crit.* All MSS. seem to agree in 9.174 *ambustique sonant nervi*, translated by von Albrecht as "versengt knistern die Sehnen", a remarkable piece of Ovidian realism.

2.310

tunc habuit nec quos caelo *demitteret* imbres

N. does not discuss this passage in the notes, but *demitteret* (for *di-*) seems to be one of his emendations, at least according to A., while T. (p. 496) represents the paradosis as divided, without naming any witnesses. When the verb is together with *caelo*, we should probably always read *de-*, cf. 1.261; some other cases are doubtful; see E. J. Kenney (*CR* 22, 1972, 41, n. 2); 3.695 *Stygiae demittite nocti* was restored by Heinsius from MSS. Bömer's reasoning *ad loc.* seems bizarre: his parallels clearly support *de-*, but he prefers *di-* as 'lectio difficilior'.

2.314

consternuntur equi et saltu in contraria facto

This was the vulgate before N., and it is attested by *N U^{ac} P*. What N. found ‘in quibusdam antiquis’, *consternantur*, he liked much better. There is a clear difference in meaning. In support of *consternantur* we can quote 12.60 *consternatique Timores, fast. 5.310 cum consternatis diripereris equis; Stat. Theb. 7.130 metu consternat inani*.

2.326

corpora dant tumulo, signant quoque carmine *factum*

Factum, the vulgate before N., is attested by *N^{ac}* and *U*, but he also knew the readings *saxum* (*M^c BG^{3v} L*) and *fatum* (*HN^c B^{2v} FG¹ P*). *Saxum* is what the context requires, but there is another problem as well. *Quoque* seems weak. We should probably read *corpora dant tumulo signantque hoc carmine saxum* with Heinsius, who found *signantque hoc* in two *Leidenses* and a *Parisinus* (Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal 1045, a. 1472). This is what T. prints, while A. has no objection to *quoque*. It is easy to see how *QVEHOC* could be corrupted to *QVOQVE*. For *hoc carmen*, cf. *Her. 2.73 hoc tua post illos titulo signetur imago; fast. 3.547-8 tumulique in marmore carmen / hoc breve erat*. We can also compare 8.540 (of Meleager’s sisters), where we should probably read with Heinsius *signataque saxa / nomine complexae* (A. and T. print *saxo / nomina*).

2.382

expers

ipse sui decoris, *qualis* cum deficit *orbe*
esse solet

This, the reading of most MSS. (exc. *HM*), seems to have been the vulgate before N. He found *qualis ... orbi* in some witnesses and said about this reading ‘fortasse rectius’. Apparently he did not know *qualis ... orbem*, which T. prints, following *HM* and explaining *deficere* as *deserere*. He seems to take *orbem* as *orbem terrarum*, but the context suggests an eclipse, and *orbis* must be the disk of the sun. The two passages which T. cites for this specific meaning of *deficere*, 9.567 and 12.448, are different, and the first one is uncertain. If one reads *qualis ... orbem*, one

must take *orbem* as acc. of respect, as the *OLD* does (Bömer *ad loc.* offers no convincing explanation). On the other hand, Passerat's *quali, cum deficit, orbe*, printed by A., is certainly an elegant solution.

2.505

arcuit omnipotens pariterque ipsosque nefasque
sustulit

N. found *arguit* in one of his witnesses but preferred *arcuit* which survives in *U^{2c} BG*. Ciofani knew it from one of his *codd.*, and it was conjectured by Raphael Regius in his second edition (*s. l. et a.*; the first, Venice, 1493 had *arguit*). In 9.319, where the MSS. vary between *arcuit* and *arguit*, according to A. and T., *arcuit* must be right, too. The same is true for 12.427. In 15.73 we should probably read *primusque* (sc. Pythagoras) *animalia mensis / arcuit imponi*, with *B²*, the *Barberinianus*, Heinsius and Bentley). Ovid's Pythagoras does not only berate the meat-eaters; in his missionary zeal, he intervenes bodily (cf. v. 80 *eripitur*). Similarly, in *Pont.* 1.6.41-2 *me quoque conantem gladio finire dolorem / arcuit* (*COD*, Heinsius *ex codd.*) *iniecta continuitque manu*, we should keep *arcuit*, not *arguit* (*ABD, alii*). Here, the context clearly shows that Ovid's friend did not only try to persuade him not to commit suicide: he actually grabbed his arm or his sword. See my article in *Kontinuität und Wandel* (= *Festschrift Franco Munari*), 1986, 122 (= *Opera minora selecta*, Huelva 2003, 318-9). For the *met.*, T. presents the evidence conveniently on p. 495.

2.556

servandam dederat sic inconfessa quod esset

This interpolation (not identified as such by N.) appears after 554 or 555 in one form or another. N. cites it from 'old manuscripts' and mentions a variant *sed non confessa* but seems to prefer *sed enim inconfessa*. It is, perhaps, not entirely pointless to try to restore an interpolation (which is given away by the word *inconfessa*, only found in a sermon attributed to Augustine; cf. *ThLL* 7. 1.1003.22), because it may help us to understand the

textual tradition a little better. In v. 556 read probably *hanc legem dederat* for *et legem dederat*, following *U G^v*; cf. 10.50 *hanc ... legem Rhodopeius accipit Orpheus*.

2.560

timidas vocat una sorores
 Aglauros nodosque manu *diducit* et intus

N. does not discuss the line in his notes, but *diducit* is cited as one of his emendations by editors, though it is also found in *W^c e ζ*. Most MSS. have *deducit* (*deduxit P*, acc. to A.). Heinsius suggested *seducit*.

2.636—8

quam quondam nympa *Chariclo*
 fluminis in rapidi ripis enixa vocavit
Oxyrhoen

The name of the nymph, Chariclo, is N.'s emendation for MS. *Charicto* (*ferē Ω*). Politian had the same idea, and the correct form is now also known from *P²* (acc. to A.). Here, Planudes offers no help. The second name is given as *Ocyroë* by A. (in the text, *Ocyrhoë* in the Index) and T. (in the text and on p. 491). Both paradosis and etymology seem to favor *Ocyrhoë*. See also Bömer *ad loc.*

2.680-2

illud erat tempus, quo te pastoria pellis
 textit onusque fuit *baculus silvestris olivae*
alterius dispar e septem fistula cannis

N. found this particular version in 'several old manuscripts'. He adds 'ac, si hoc modo legunt, ob id quod dicit *alterius ... intelligendum est unius manus onus fuisse baculum, alterius fistulam. Sed in veteribus quibusdam onus dextrae baculus silvestris olivae, quae si probetur lectio, verbum fuit subintelligendum est quod saepius a poetis intermittitur. Nonnulli malunt legere: *alternis dispar e septem fistula cannis*, ut id dicat Ovidius: nunc baculum solitum ferre Apollinem, nunc fistulam'. As I understand the passage, Ovid says that, at one*

time, Apollo was a kind of minor deity, like Pan, holding in one hand, instead of the lyre, a shepherd's flute, and in the other, a rough stick. He also wore a cloak made of sheepskin. *Baculum silvestre* has a parallel in 15.655 *baculumque tenens agreste sinistra* (of Aesculapius, the son of Apollo). It seems fairly obvious that we should read *baculum*, not *baculus* in Ovid (as in Edwards' edition, p. 410); cf. also 2.789 *baculumque capit quod* (*H* [*M^{ac}?*]), not *quem* (Ω); cf. also *fast.* 1.177 where *quod*, suggested by Burman, has been found by Alton in *A* (= *Vat. Reg.* 1709, s. X, the oldest witness). For metrical reasons, *e septem* (for *septenis H BGL*) cited by N. and actually found in *M^cU FP*, is not possible in 2.682, and he knew that. What he did not know is the correct reading *silvestre sinistrae* (*HM^{ac}*), which was ousted from the broad textual tradition. Once *sinistrae* was lost, *alterius* had to be changed to *alternis* (not recorded by A. and T.). N. obviously understood the context, even if he did not have access to the best witnesses.

2.703

'sub illis

montibus' inquit 'eunt' (et erant sub montibus illis)

The variant *eunt* (for *erunt*) which N. found in some witnesses must be a mechanical error, and its disappearance from the *app. crit.* of recent editions is no great loss. *Eunt ... eunt*, a curious proliferation of errors, found its way into D. Heinsius' 1629 edition.

—BOOK 3—

3.37

urna dedit sonitum: *longo* caput extulit antro

'In nonnullis *longum*'. N. cites only this variant and does not prefer it to *longo*. Burman, who also found it in some of his witnesses, accepted it. But neither *longum caput* nor *longo ... antro* seems to be what Ovid wrote. Read probably *longe* (F. Vollmer); cf. 2.374 *capillos / dissimulant plumae collumque*

a pectore longe / porrigitur (where Burman also preferred *longum*) and 11.794 *longa manet cervix, caput est a corpore longe*. See also on 4.123 below.

3.52

tegumen *direpta leonis* pellis erat

‘Rectius in nonnullis *direpta leoni*’. The paradosis is divided between *leonis* (*HEM^{ac}N^{ac}B^{ac}FGI*) and *leoni* (*Bern. MN^{ac}U B^cL*), but there is also the problem of *derepta* (*Bern. N*) vs. *direpta* (Ω), which N. does not discuss. Here, as in 15.304 *derepta bicorni / terga capro*, we should probably read *derepta* which has good manuscript support in our passage and was introduced in the second passage by Heinsius ‘ex antiquis codicibus’; it is also what Planudes seems to translate. See also 3.724, 731; 6.387, 567; 9. 637; 10.475; 11.29; T., p. 496. If we read *derepta*, as we should, *leoni* becomes necessary (A. and T.).

3.132

exsilii felix

This variant for *exsilio felix*, found in some ‘old manuscripts’ by N., does not appear in the *app. crit.* of A. and T. For *felix* with the gen., cf. Verg. *georg.* 1.277; Hor. *serm.* 1.9.12 *o te, Bolane, cerebri / felicem*, in analogy to Greek $\mu\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ with genitive. Ovid seems to prefer the ablative; cf. 5.267 *felices ... studioque locoque* (*MNU al.*) vs. *felices ... studiique locique* (*BFGP*); 7.799 *coniuge eram felix, felix erat illa marito* (no variants recorded). Bömer *ad loc.* explains the form as an *abl. causae*.

3.216

et substricta gerens Sicyonius ilia *Ladon*

N. found *Lagon* in some of his witnesses, and Planudes has this name as well, a good name for a hunting dog which would deserve at least a place in the *app. crit.* Bömer *ad loc.* derives *Ladon* from a river.

3.271

fallat eam faxo, nec *sum* Saturnia, si non
ab Iove mersa suo Stygias penetrabit in undas

N. does not discuss this passage, but *sim* for *sum* is attributed to him by A. It is an attractive possibility; cf. 2.514 where *mentiar* (for *mentior*) was conjectured by Accursius and adopted by Heinsius from B.

3.302

qua tamen usque potest, vires sibi demere temptat

In some of his 'old manuscripts' N. found *quo tamen usque*. This is the reading of *W*, according to A., who was the first to collate this MS (on its qualities see his preface, pp. XV^s.); T. says nothing. Tmesis of *quousque* is not very likely, because that word is rare in poetry. Moreover, *qua potes* is well attested in *tristia* 1.9.65 vs. *quam potes* (see my commentary, Heidelberg 1968, with the references to 3.4.75 and 7.54 [here also with the variant *quam*]). Heinsius apparently could not make up his mind whether *qua potes* was more Ovidian than *quam potes* (see his notes on *Her.* 13.41 and *rem.* 325). The *OLD* s. u. *usque* 7c accepts *qua ... potest*.

3.480

dumque dolet, summa vestemque reduxit ab ora

N. read *summo ... ab ore* in all of his witnesses and accepted this reading. Among the more recent editors, A. also found *summo ... ore* in all MSS., but printed *summa ... ab ora*, following the excerpts of Matthaëus Herculanus (whom he also seems to quote in his note on v. 682). T. agrees but names as the source his 'χ' group, i. e. 'one or several 13th c. MSS.'. Does this mean that he found it in sources that are older than the *Excerpta*? Anyway, *summa ... ab ora* must be right; cf. 5.398 *ut summa vestem lanierat ab ora* where the reading is well attested (but *summo ... ab ore* also survives); *am.* 1.7.47 *aut tunicam a summa / diducere turpiter ora* (and the notes of A. Ramírez de Verger, in his *Teubneriana* 2003, *ad loc.*). This leaves the problem of

reduxit vs. *deduxit* and *diduxit*. In my opinion, Kenney (*CQ* n. s. 8, 1958, 56 and 12, 1962, 117) has made it clear that *diducere* is the appropriate verb in this type of context. Cf. 6.405 *suas a pectore postquam / diduxit vestes* (*U*³, Const. Fan. *ex coni.* but *de-Ω*); 13.264 *vestemque manu diduxit* (*BF al.*). Editors should be consistent and restore the required form of *diducere* in all passages. It is true, that the hands move from the area of the shoulders towards the center of the body, i. e. downward, as A. Ramírez points out to me, but at the same time they move sideways, I think, in the direction of the hips, in order to bare the breast. A. and T. (cf. T., pp. 495; 497) seem to be undecided. What we have is a rather dramatic gesture, intended to shock: the person, who felt provoked to perform it, grabbed the garment with both hands at the upper hem and tore it apart while pulling it down. This is the force of Greek διαρρήγνυμι which Planudes uses in 3.480 and 6.405 (διέρρηξε), because he understood the gesture.

3.531

‘quis furor, anguigenae, proles Mavortia, vestras
attollit mentes?’ Pentheus ait

For *attollit*, the reading of most MSS., N. found *attonuit* in some witnesses and recommended it strongly. Today, it survives in *N* and *U*⁴ (perhaps Constantius Fanensis, as Slater thought), but it is also preserved in the ‘Excerpta Calandrae’, a source of good readings and Lactantius Placidus (schol. on Stat. *Theb.* 7.164). It is what Planudes translates. Cf. Tib. 1.9.47 *quin etiam attonita laudes tibi mente canebam* and Bömer *ad loc.* *Attollit* must be an old corruption (*LL* for *NV*). *Attollo* never has *mentem* (*vel sim.*) as an object in Ovid, as far as I can see.

3.539

hac Tyron ac profugos posuistis sede Penates

N. notes ‘Sic legendum ex vetustissimis exemplaribus, quum prior lectio *A Tyro, hac profugos* repugnante syllaba claudicaret.’ He remembered the line in Virgil (*Aen.* 1.68) *Ilium in Italiam portans victosque Penates* that Ovid must have had in mind; he

also quotes *Her.* 7.151 *Ilion in Tyriam transfer felicius urbem*. But in our passage we should read *hac Tyron, hac*, as A. and T. do, following *HM N^{ac}(S)BGL^{ac}*. N.'s 'prior lectio' is found in *N^fL*, and Planudes translates it. The fact that, in the transmission of the text, *hac* could be reduced to *ac* and even to *a* makes one think of Moriz Haupt's dictum (according to oral tradition): 'If you have to change *o* to *Constantinopolitanus*, because the sense requires it, you must do so.'

3.640

dextera Naxos erat: dextra mihi lintea danti

N. writes: 'In nonnullis fortasse rectius *dextera Naxos erat*'. A. and T., following *M^fWh*, print *dextera ... dextra*, and perhaps the change within the line (instead of anaphora) is significant. But there is also a difference in meaning: *dextera* is 'situated on the right-hand side', whereas *dextra* ('abl. loci') can also mean *in dextram partem* (sc. *ire, ferri*). Cf. 7.386 *dextera* (*UBP: dextra Ω*) *Cyllene est*; 8.222 *dextra Lebinthos erat*; 11.197 *dextera Sigei, Rhoetei laeva profundum / ara ... est*; 5.167 *sic dubius Perseus, dextra laevane feratur*. See T., p. 497. Bömer on 3.640 prefers *dextera Naxos erat*, but leaves the question open.

3.644

obstipui 'capiat'que 'aliquis moderamina' dixi

N. does not discuss this passage in the notes but *alius*, a reading also found in the *Parisinus lat. 8000*, s. XI ex., is attributed to him. T. quotes it with qualified approval from his generic group φ , but leaves *aliquis* in the text. Heinsius, as A. Ramírez de Verger points out to me, printed *alius*.

3.689

corpore vixque meum firmat deus 'excute' dicens
'corde metum *Chiamque* tene'.

In some MSS. N. found *Diamque tene* and says 'fortasse rectius. Naxos enim quo iusserat Bacchus cursum nautas dirigere, *Dia* etiam, auctore Stephano, est dicta. Planudes tamen *Chiam*'.

The correct reading has survived in *U*^{4c}, a manuscript which N. probably knew; the change is attributed to Constantius Fanensis. All the other witnesses are divided between *Chiamque* and *Chionque*. Cf. 8.174 *protinus Aegides rapta Minoide Diam / vela dedit* where most MSS. have *Diam* (*Dian* Heinsius from three MSS., T.), though a few witnesses (*PW*^{1v} *ap.* Anderson) have *Chiam*. Cf. also ars 1.528 *qua brevis aequoreis Dia feritur aquis* where most MSS. have *india fertur*. Here, the necessary correction appears, according to A. Ramírez de Verger (*Carmina Amatoria*, Teubner 2003), in the *Parisin. Lat.* 7997, s. XV *ex.*, which is identical to Heinsius' 'Sarravianus', as A. Ramírez de Verger reminds me. It also occurred to I. Pontanus. A similar case is *met.* 3.597 *forte petens Delon Chiae telluris ad oras / adplicor*. Here, most MSS. offer *Chiae*, whereas a later hand of *U* again has *Diae*. But here one should probably read *Ceae* (*anonym. ap.* Micyll., Bothe); cf. 10.120 *sed tamen ante alios Ceae pulcherrime gentis, / gratus erat*.

3.723

non habet infelix quae matri bracchia tendat

N. remarks: 'Neque in veteribus libris invenitur id carmen quod ante hoc interponunt nonnulli: et si maxime inveniretur, expungendum esset, ita subsultat, ita nullius est sensus.' Here, N. condemns a spurious line (see T.'s *app. crit.*) which he may have read in *U*^{Am} where it is added in the margin by *man.* 4, the hand which often has good readings. The line is an adaptation of 1.636 and makes, indeed, no sense here. Perhaps it originated in a gloss intended to illustrate the phrase *bracchia tendere*. It must have found its way into other witnesses, because N. speaks of *nonnulli*, and T. quotes it from his χ group.

It may be worthwhile to stop here for a moment and look at the criteria N. applies to denounce an interpolation. (Incidentally, he uses the word *interponere*; hence he would have preferred the term *interpositio* to *interpolatio* which exists in classical Latin but with a different meaning). His first criterium: The line is not found in the 'old manuscripts'. If he knew *U* (s. XI) he may not have considered it old. Second criterium: Even if it existed in the oldest witnesses, it would have to be deleted, because (a) it

is jerky, jolting; (b) it makes no sense at all. N. may have found *subsultare* as a term of literary criticism in Quintilian (*inst.* 9.4.42; 11.3.43).

— BOOK 4 —

4.1

at non *Alcithoe* Minyeias orgia censet
accipienda dei

For *Alcithoe*, the daughter of Minyas, N. found *Arsinoe* in Planudes. This is, perhaps, worth recording (Ruiz de Elvira, I, 122 does record it, as A. Ramírez de Verger points out to me), since, in v. 274, Planudes has the correct form, but there Bentley proposed *Alcathoe*. Cf. also 7.443 (where the main paradosis has *Alcithoen*); 8.8 (where Heinsius introduced the form *Alcathoi* 'ex vetusto codice', while most MSS, have *Alcathoe*); see T., p. 484; R.O.A.M. Lyne on *Ciris* 105-6. Bömer on 4.1 claims that *Alcithoe* is the Latin form (only attested in Ovid) for Greek *Alkathoe*. Should one not distinguish between *Alcathoe* = Megara, daughter of Alcathous, and *Alcithoe*, daughter of Minyas?

4.53

haec placet: haec quoniam vulgaris fabula non est

N. found *hoc placet* as a variant. A. and T. list the variants *hoc ... haec, hoc ... hoc, hoc ... hanc, haec ... hanc* (Heinsius *ex codd.*), but not, as far as I can see, *hoc ... hinc* (*unus Vossii*). An anonymous proposal cited by Ehwald *hoc placet: hoc (quoniam vulgaris fabula non est)* is attractive (the parenthesis seems necessary; but then one should consider *hinc* from Vossius' MS.).

4.123

cruor emicat alte,
non aliter quam cum vitiato fistula plumbo
scinditur et tenui stridente foramine longas
eiaculatur aquas

N. records a variant version *et tenuis stridente foramine longe* but does not prefer it to *tenui ... longas*, while Heinsius put it into his text. A. does not mention it, but it must be right, as T. saw. If *tenues* (better *tenuis*, then *tenui* can be explained by haplography before *s*-) belongs to *aquas* (cf. *fast.* 2.250 *tenuem ... aquam*; Verg. *georg.* 3.335 *tenuis ... aquas*), the adjective *longas* is inappropriate, and what we need is *longe*. Cf. also *met.* 5.435; 6.351; 8.559. T. found *longe* in G and *tenues ... longe* in his generic χ group. See also on 3.37 above.

4.205

nec tenet *Aeaeae* genetrix pulcherrima Circes

N. does not deal with this line in the notes, but the form *Aeaeae* is attributed to him by A., while T. (p. 483) cites *eeae* from *P*.

4.279

nec *loquar*, ut quondam naturae iure novato

N. found *loquar* for *loquor* in some of his witnesses. A. and T. might have recorded this variant (which is cited from *Paris. lat.* 8000; it also survives in *f* and in Conradus de Mure; see Magnus in *app.*), though it is unlikely, coming after *taceo* (v. 276).

4.311

saepe *Cytoriaco* deducit pectine crines

'In omnibus *Cytheriaco*. Sed profecto *Cytoriaco* legendum'. N. seems to offer this as an emendation of his own, while A. and T. (on p. 486) cite it from *U* (*U³ vel U⁴*) and a *Parisinus* (A.) or a *Vaticanus* (T.). All their other MSS. have, indeed, *Cytheriaco*. Once more, we note the agreement between N. and one of the later hands of *U* (Constantius Fanensis?). Cf. 6.132 where *U* (*U³ vel U⁴*), along with others has the correct form. There is another problem: for *deducit* one should read *diducit* with Scaliger (mentioned but not accepted, by T., p. 495). See on 3.480 above; *ars* 3.303 *compositum discrimen erit*; Claud. 10.102 *haec morsu numerosi dentis eburno / multifidum discrimen arat*.

4.336

'desinis? aut fugio tecumque' ait 'ista relinquo?'

N. lists *desine, vel fugio* as a variant but adds 'mihi prior lectio magis placet.' Apparently he did not know the reading *desinis, an fugio* (*EM G^v*) which must be right; it may survive in disguise in *aufugio* (*N^{ac}U^{ac}*). Bömer seems to consider *aut fugio* (*Ω*), taking *aut* as "andernfalls" and comparing 7.699, where *aut* is not certain.

4.340

fruticumque recondita silva
delituit *flexumque* genu submitit. at ille,
ut puer et vacuis ut inobservatus in herbis

The passage is not discussed in his notes, but N. is credited with the reading *flexumque* which T. cites from *U* and accepts, while A., who cites it from *U* and *W*, prints *flexuque*, following Lachmann on Lucr. 4.952 (but see also T.'s *app. crit.* for MS. support). In the following line, T. adopts Heinsius' elegant restoration (based on Planudes, it seems), while A. prints *scilicet ut vacuis et*, the reading of most MSS., but *scilicet* is probably a gloss.

4.426

nil poterit Iuno nisi *multos* flere dolores

'Rectius in veteribus *nisi inultos*.' The trivial reading survives in *M^{2v} G. U* may be one of N.' 'veteres'.

4.475

mouit et obstantes reiecit ab ore *colubros*

'Rectius in nonnullis *colubras*.' There appears to be only one certain case of *coluber* in Ovid: *Met.* 11.774, perhaps for metrical reasons. As the *OLD* observes, the two words are not distinguishable in dat. and abl. plur. Similarly, Ovid seems to treat *serpens* sometimes as masc., sometimes as fem.; see *edd.* on l. 454; Bömer on 4.571.

4.498

inspirantque graves *animos*

N. notes a variant *animas* ($[S]G^{ac}L^{2c}PT$), which is probably better; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.351 *vipeream inspirans animam*. It has the meaning of *flatus*. Planudes seems to translate *animos* (*MN* with most MSS.). Bömer *ad loc.* and *ad* 2.800 defends *animas* (A. and T.), but some of his parallels actually support *animos*.

4.538

spuma fui *gratumque* manet mihi nomen ab illa

‘Rectius in nonnullis *Graiumque manet*’. The correct reading survives in $M^{2v}L^{ac}(T)$. See Bömer *ad loc.*, who refers to *Her.* 12.30; Prop. 3.8.29; Stat. *silv.* 3.5.94.

4.628

constitit Hesperio *regis* Atlantis in orbe

‘In quibusdam rectius *regnis Atlantis in orbe*’. The unmetrical *regis* survives in $EMU^c F^d L$. Planudes translates a completely different text (see Slater *ad loc.*).

4.725

quaque patent, nunc terga cavis super obsita conchis

N. knew *quaque patet*, which is preserved in *MN* and most MSS. as a variant. This is what we need; cf. 13.392 *in pectus ... / qua patuit ferro, letalem condidit ensem*. Polle tried to save *patent* ($U^{3c}L^{3c}\varphi$) by changing *quaque* to *quaeque*, but this seems unnecessary.

—BOOK 5—

5.3

nec coniugialia festa

Should we read *coniugalia* or *coniugialia*? N. compares 6.536 *nec mea virginitas nec coniugalia iura*, where the

second syllable of the adjective, he says, is long; he also refers to 11.743-4 *nec coniugale solutum est/ foedus in alitibus*. In our passage he does not reject *coniugalia* but declares that all of his 'old manuscripts' have *coniugialia*. Both forms exist in Latin, and the MSS. of the *Metamorphoses* vary in all three passages, though this is not quite clear from the *app. crit.* of A. and T.; A. is silent on 6.536 (but see Ehwald), and T. lists them on p. 495, preferring *coniugi-* in each case. From the *OLD* it looks as if *coniugalis* is more common in prose; the only poetic example cited is Sen. *Med.* 1. Therefore we should probably read forms of *coniugialis* in the *met.*, as T. does. See also Bömer on 6.536. The simplex *iugalis*, meaning 'matrimonial, nuptial', on the other hand, seems to be mainly poetical.

5.74

ecce *Syenites*, genitus Metione, Phorbas

In 'old manuscripts' N. read *Suenites*, and he assumed that *u* was written for *y* 'veterum more', because he found *Syenites* in Planudes, and he knew from Stephanus that the inhabitants of Syene in Upper Egypt were called *Syenites*. In *Pont.* 1.5.79 most editors read *calidae ... Syenae*. See Bömer *ad loc.* A. prints *Suenites* in the text and *Syenites* in the *Index Nominum*; T. also prints *Suenites*, *Suene*. The problem exists in other names: should we write *Myrrha* or *Murrha*? Both A. and T. prefer *Myrrha*.

5.85

inde Semiramio *Polydaemona* sanguine cretum

N. notes that Planudes has *Polydegmona*, not *Polydaemona*. Actually, the two Paris MSS. (2848, 2849), which Boissonade used, also have the form *Polydaemona*. There is no indication of a problem in A.'s *app. crit.*, but see Slater *ad loc.* and T., p. 492.

5.110

Amphycus albenti velatus tempora vitta

‘Rectius fortasse *Alphytus*’, says N. Both A. and T. print *Ampycus*, without *vv. ll.*, but some MSS. apparently have *Amphicus* (also in Planudes), and N. seems to have known *Amphitus* or *Alphitus*. Both are reported as conjectures by Constantius Fanensis. Bömer *ad loc.* only considers *Ampycus* (Heinsius’ conjecture) and this name could be supported by v. 184 *Ampyx* and 8.316 *Ampycides* (after Planudes); 350 *Ampycides* (also after Planudes); 12.450 *Ampyca* (after Planudes, but *Amphica* most MSS.); 456 *Ampyciden*; 524.

5.111

tu quoque, *Iapetide*, non hos adhibendus ad usus

In Planudes, N. read *Lampetide*, and this name also appears in some MSS., e.g. in *N* (a.c.); cf. T., p. 489. Many witnesses offer *Iampetide*, which may be a conflation. Cf. 2.349 where *Lampetie* as the name of Phaethon’s sister is given correctly by *N* (cf. Prop. 3.12.29-30), while most MSS. have *Iamp-* or *Iap -*.

5.127

sed retinente *manu* moriens e poste pependit

N. notes *manum* as a variant and comments: ‘utrumque recte’. It seems that *manum* was a reading he knew (Slater), and A.’s information ‘*manum edd. manu A*’ is not quite correct. Planudes translates *manu*, and that is what his editor, Boissonade, recommends. But *manum* is better (A. and T. print it), because *retinente* must go with *poste*: it is the gatepost that holds his hand. The final —*m* could get lost before *moriens* by haplography. Bömer’s comment: “Diese Situation ist physiologisch nicht zu realisieren” is baffling, and his description of Abas as “sozusagen ... Postifixus” seems to me in very bad taste.

5.135

Bactreus Alcioneus

N. writes: ‘*Barceus* Planudes. Mihi *Bactreus* placet’. The more

recent editors follow Heinsius (*ex codd.*) in printing *Bactrius*. The ending —*eus* was probably influenced by *Halcioneus*.

5.147

regisque *Thoastes* / armiger

Here is another problem involving a Greek name. N. notes 'Choristes Planudes, non *Thoastes*'. Planudes' editor, Boissonade, assumed a form *Corystes*, but the more recent editors print *Thoactes*, following Heinsius, who found this name in some of his MSS. (it survives in *BFG*, but the broad paradosis has *Thoastes*). According to Bömer *ad loc.*, this name is not found anywhere else — a good reason to reconsider *Corystes*.

5.237

intrat et *immeriti* vindex ultorque parentis

N. found *immeritae* in some witnesses (now lost?), and this is what Heinsius preferred, thinking of *Danae*. In the notes to his translation, von Albrecht explains "Acrisius hatte seine Tochter Danae, die Mutter des Perseus, grausam behandelt und verdiente daher nicht, dass sein Enkel sich für ihn einsetzte". Bömer, who also reads *immeriti*, explains 'qui non meretur malum' and takes *parentis* = *avi*. Considering these conflicting and not very plausible explanations, *immeritae* seems the best solution. 'Lactantius' V (ii) is unreliable (see Slater *ad loc.*).

5.252

inde cava circumdata nube Seriphon
deserit a dextris *Cythno* Gyaroque relictis

N. found *Cypro* for *Cythno* in all of his witnesses, and since, as a Venetian, he knew the geography of the Mediterranean, he wrote: 'Sed tam longe a *Seripho* et *Cycladibus* omnibus *Cypros*, ut nullum omnino in hoc versu locum habeat'. Therefore, he emended to *Cythno*, because this island is one of the Cyclades and is, in fact, not far from Seriphos. He cites Strabo, Stephanus and other authors and quotes from Planudes' translation. Constantius Fanensis proposed *Siphno*, but A. and T. follow N., who should

be given credit for this emendation. See Bömer *ad loc.* and on 7.464, where N. proposed *Cythnon* for *Cypron* (*Cynthon* in T.'s *app. crit.* is a misprint). *At* for *a* is well attested (*E^{ac}M^{ac}N^{ac}U F[P^{ac}?]*, according to T., nothing in A.) and should be considered; cf. 2.25.

5.286

fusca repurgato fugiebant nubila caelo

N. records a variant *fusa* with approval. It is mentioned by Slater, but not by A. and T. Cf. 3.273 *fusca* (*s. v. l.*) ... *nube* where the variants *fulva*, *furva* and *flava* are attested. Bömer *ad loc.* quotes *fusca nubes* from Claudius Donatus on Verg. *Aen.* 7.130 (*ThLL* VI 1653, 56-7). See below on v. 541.

5.363

depositoque metu videt hunc Erycina vagantem
monte suo residens

N. comments: 'Multo rectius quod et in nonnullis legitur et e Planude colligitur *deposuitque metum. videt hunc Erycina vagantem / monte suo residens natumque amplexa volucrem*'. This is the reading of the *Graecensis* (*s. XII/XIII*, probably written in Italy), according to Ehwald. A. records *deposuitque metus* (*e*) and *depositique metus* (*M* and *N* *ex corr.*) but prints *depositoque metu*, as does T. (with a reference to Housman on Lucan. 9.12). N. was right, I think, though one could consider *metus* for *metum*. Ovid uses both sg. and pl. with (*de*)ponere.; cf., e.g. 3.634 and 5.226 *pone metum* vs. 15.658 *pone metus* (but *metum recc.*). See Bömer *ad loc.* Sometimes, the metre seems to dictate the choice.

5.370

ipsumque regit qui *numina terrae*

'Fortasse rectius id quod nonnulli legunt, *ipsumque regit qui numina ponti*'. There seems to be an old variant *numina ponti* vs. *numina terrae* (most MSS.) which is attested in the 'Excerpta Calandrae', a source of good readings. If we accept *ponti* (as A. and

T. have done), we face the problem of two identical verse endings in vv. 369 and 370. Perhaps *terrae* represents a deliberate change to avoid the repetition. The *app. crit.* of the most recent editions show the omissions of words in several witnesses and how the missing portions were restored. T. suggests that some words were omitted in a common ancestor of *EMNU* and notes that in *U* a line has been erased between vv. 370 and 371.

5.445

solis ab occasu solis quaerebat ad ortus

N. points out a variant *solis ad occasus*. This, along with the unsuitable verse ending *ad ortus* is actually found in *NPp*. What we need is something else, probably *ad occasus... ab ortu*, and this, the reading of *M^{ss}U^{ac}BG* (according to T.) and the 'Excerpta Calandrae', was accepted by Heinsius. If this is, indeed, the true reading, the —s of *occasus* may have been omitted before the s- of *solis* and *ad* changed to *ab*. Cf. 1.354 *terrarum quascumque vident occasus et ortus*. In 14.386 we should probably read (with T.) *ad occasus* (-um *MN* and *Whp*, according to A.)... *ad ortus* (-um φ and *Wp* without *h*, according to A.). Cf. also *Pont.* 1.4.29 *Caesaris ira mihi nocuit quem solis ab ortu / solis ad occasus utraque terra tremit*. Here the change from sg. to pl. seems to be for the sake of metrical convenience. See also Bömer on 2.190.

5.459

mirantem flentemque et tangere monstra paventem

Here, N. notes '*parantem* in quibusdam, non *paventem*'. This verb (*parantem*), attested by *MN B (G^{ac})*, is what A. and T., following Ehwald, print. The fact that the lizard is afraid of the old woman seems to support this reading; 8.733 is different.

5.481

fertilitas terrae latum vulgata per orbem

N. notes a variant *totum* for *latum*. This may be an intrusion from Verg. *Aen.* 1.457 *fama totum vulgata per orbem*, as Slater

supposes. A.'s and T.'s *app. crit.* record neither *totum* nor *late* (*cod. Bersmanni*), an attractive possibility. Cf. 9.795 *latum patefecerat orbem; trist. 3.10.77 ergo tam late pateat cum maximus orbis*. There is nothing wrong with *latum*.

5.541

ex Acheronte suo *fulvis* peperisse sub *antris*

Where did Orphne give birth to Ascalaphus? A variant *silvis ... atris*, attested by Ω , is mentioned by N., and this is what A. and T. print. But is it right? *Furvis ... antris* is preserved by $U^{2c} G^c LP$. Planudes seems to translate *fulvis ... undis*, which led Boissonade to conjecture *fulvis ... undis*. All these variants survive by one hand or another in *U*, but also elsewhere. It is interesting that no form of *fuscus* seems to be preserved. Both *furvus* and *fuscus* occur in connection with the underworld; cf. Hor. *Carm. 2.13.21 furvae regna Proserpinae* and Prop. 4.11.5 *fuscae deus aulae*, where Heinsius (but see Burman's note) proposed *furvae*; cf. also Apul. *met. 6.13 fuscae Stygis undae*. Since Orphne is a nymph of Lake Avernus and her very name suggests darkness, it makes sense that she gave birth in a dark place, connected with the underworld. But was this the lake, or the woods around it or a cave in the underworld? I think we should eliminate the broadly attested *silvis ... atris* (A. and T.) as a corruption of *fulvis ... antris* (see Bömer *ad loc.*). But is this, in itself, the true reading? A very similar passage, 5.48, deals with another nymph whose name may be *Limnatis* (Heinsius) or *Limnaee* (Magnus), who was beloved by the Ganges river and gave birth to Athis, one of Phineus' companions, *vitreis ... sub undis* (Ω) or *vitreis ... sub antris* (*G*, Heinsius). Since she is a sea nymph, she gives birth in a bright environment. Here, *antris* may qualify as 'lectio difficilior'. For a different assessment see T. in *ICS* 14, 1989, 103-17. Incidentally, it becomes more and more probable that N. knew *U*. According to Roy E. Deferrari's *Concordance to Ovid* (1939), which is still useful, though not very reliable (see also CD-BTL 3 = CD *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina* 3-2004), *furvus* never occurs in Ovid. It certainly exists as a variant here and 5.546; see also above on v. 286.

5.598

territaque insisto propioris margine *fontis*

N. notes: '*Ripae* in quibusdam, non *fontis*'. This is the reading of *Urb*^{2v} *UGL*, and it seems better to me, though A. and T. print *propiori ... fontis* (Ω). T. wonders whether *margine ripae* is an intrusion from 1.729, as if Ovid could not have used the same phrase in two similar situations. It could be pointed out that *margo* and *ripa* are closely related in meaning, but *altera ... ripa* (vv. 601-2) clearly is the opposite of *propior ripa*. See Bömer, *ad loc.*, who points out the difficulty of the dat. *propiori*.

5.616

sed certe *sonituque pedum terrebat* et ingens

'In quibusdam *sonitusque pedum terrebat*, in aliis *sonituque pedum terrebar*; omnia recte'. Both A. and T. print *sonitusque ... terrebat*, following Ω . The second *s* of *sonitusque* was, perhaps, omitted in an early copy and *terrebat* was then changed to *terrebar* in one or several strands of the apodosis.

5.675

plangere dumque volunt

N. states a preference for *dumque volunt plangi*, and that is what A. and T., following Ω , print. According to Bömer *ad loc.*, *plangi* is "reflexiv-medial"; cf., perhaps, 11.75 *plangitur ac trepidans adstringit vincula motu*, where the passive form, as the *OLD* explains it, may be used in the middle sense.

—BOOK VI—

6.77

exsiluisse *fretum*: quo pignore *vendicet* urbem

'Sic in nonnullis, et recte legitur', says N. According to A., *vendicet* is found in all of his MSS. except *E*; according to T. (p. 499), in *MU BFG*. This seems to be a common mistake in the paradosis of the work; cf. 2.523; 10.312; 11.213. Looking at

T.'s note, it would appear that *L* and *P* consistently have the right form; A.'s reports do not support this. But N. was mainly interested in the variant *ferum* for *fretum* which T. reports from most witnesses, while he reports *fretum* from $E^{ac}(M^{ac})(N^{ac})U^{ac}$, a conjecture by Constantius Fanensis. 'Lactantius' recognizes it (*lacu salso in arce edito*). But is it right?

Ovid refers to the myth of the contest between Athena and Poseidon, each deity aspiring to become the patron of Attica. According to one version, Poseidon, by striking a rock, created "the sea" or "a sea"; according to another version, he created "a horse" or "the horse", and this, N. notes, could be the meaning of *ferum*. E^2 (according to Gierig-Jahn, 1804) actually has *equum* which must be a gloss, and this is what Planudes translates. *M* (*sscr.*), according to Magnus, offers *monstrum* which is almost certainly a gloss. N. points out that *ferus* can mean *equus* in Latin poetry and cites Verg. *Aen.* 2.51 *in latus inque feri curvam compagibus alvum*.

Perhaps we should look at the different versions of the myth more closely. According to Herodotus (8.55), Poseidon, with a blow of his trident, produced a ῥάλασσα, which is usually translated as a "saltpool" or a "well of sea-water" (see Pausanias 1.26.5). This pool or well or whatever it was ("ein Brunnenloch mit Meerwasser", says Bömer *ad loc.*) could be seen in ancient times within the sacred precinct of the Erectheum on the Acropolis. Apollodorus (3.177-8) reports that 'with a blow of his trident, he (Poseidon) produced a sea which we now call Erectheis' (see also Frazer's note, 1921, II, 79). This well-known version could support *fretum* in Ovid.

There is, however, the other version, according to which Poseidon, with his blow, produced a horse. This tale appears for the first time, it seems, in Verg. *georg.* 1.12-4 *tuque, o cui prima frementem / fudit equum magno tellus percussa tridenti / Neptune*. It is also known to Lactantius Placidus (on Stat., *Theb.* 7.185) and to late Latin mythographers (see G. H. Bode, ed., *Scriptores rerum mythicarum Latini tres Romae nuper reperti*, 1834, II, 1; 115). No trace of it has been found so far in any Greek author; it also seems to be unknown to Greek art. In the passage from the *georg.* quoted above, 'Servius Danielis' reports from 'libri antiquissimi plerique' a variant *aquam* for

equum which is rejected by all modern editors. It looks like an attempt to introduce the better-known Greek version into the Latin text.

There is yet another tale, also found in a Latin author. It connects the creation of “the horse” with Thessaly, not with Attica. Lucan, 6.396-9 writes *primus ab aequorea percussis cuspide saxi / Thessalicus sonipes, bellis feralibus omen, / exsiluit, primus chalybem frenosque momordit / spumavitque novis Lapithae domitoris habenis*. Like Ovid, Lucan uses the verb *exsilio*, which could mean that he had our passage in mind. That first horse incidentally had a name — Skyphios — and its creation added the epithet Περραιῶς to Poseidon.

Some scholars have suggested that, in Roman times, the original Attic legend was contaminated with a Thessalian myth that had no connection with the contest between Athena and Poseidon. We may assume that Ovid knew all the versions, and since he often follows Vergil in the *met.*, he might have remembered both *georg.* 1.12ff and *Aen.* 2.51, while Lucan most likely thought of Ovid. Therefore, *ferum*, as ‘lectio difficilior’ seems to be right, and that is what Heinsius, Gierig (2nd ed. 1804) and Merkel (2nd ed. 1875) put into their texts.

6.189

exsul erat mundi

N. writes: ‘In quibusdam *mundo*’. Today, this reading is known from the *Vat. Ottobon. Lat. 3313*, s. XI, according to A. (T. does not report it). *Exsul* can have the abl. (*Sall. Iug.* 14.17), but in poetry it usually has the gen.; cf. 9.409 *exsul mentisque domusque*; *Hor. carm.* 2.16.18-20 *quid terras alio calentis / sole mutamus? patriae quis exsul / se quoque fugit* (but here it is not quite clear whether *patriae* belongs to *exsul*); *Mart.* 10.5.3. The paradosis and the parallels in poetry are in favor of *mundi* (A. and T.). See Bömer *ad loc.*

6.203

quodque licet, tacito venerantur murmure numen
Latonae. turba quantum distabat ab orba
indignata dea est

N. quotes the lines in the order which the vast majority of the MSS. presents, i. e., 203, 200, 204 and realizes that there is a disturbance without finding a remedy. Gronovius was the first to give back its original place to v. 203, thus establishing the correct order. Four lines must have been omitted at an early stage of the textual tradition, probably because of the homoioteleuton *meorum ... duorum* in vv. 198-9; they were then inserted in the wrong sequence. The correct order, as conjectured by Gronovius, was found by Heinsius in *U*, the ‘codex Menardi’ and the ‘fragmentum Vossianum’. (T.’s note is too brief).

N. was also concerned with the variant *Latonae turbae* for *Latonae turbam*, a reading which survives in $E^{c?} \delta F^{2c} L^c bh^{ac}$, acc. to T. Ciofani knew it from one of his MSS. It is better, as N. saw, and Boissonade confirmed (he understood *turbae* as an apposition to *duorum*). A. and T. print *turbam*.

As I said, N. was the first critic, anticipating Gronovius and Heinsius, to realize that there was a major corruption in the whole passage. He wrote; ‘ego, quoquo modo legatur, aliud quid desidero.’ This is fairly typical: time and again, he puts his finger on a problem without being able to think of a solution right away. A later scholar — Gronovius, in this case — then found the answer, and sometimes, manuscript evidence was discovered even later — by Heinsius, in this case. N. also found in some MSS. an interpolation before v. 204, *tantum animosa sui furiis agitata doloris* of which he says ‘hoc rude et minime Ovidio dignum est, ita audacter excludi debet’. It seems fabricated on the basis of v. 595, and the most recent editors do not even record it; still, it remains interesting, because it shows what desperate efforts were sometimes made in order to restore a little sense to a passage that seemed beyond remedy.

Since there are other problems in the passage as well, and I do not agree with A. and T., I shall try to reconstruct what Ovid probably wrote:

non tamen ad numerum redigar spoliata duorum,	199
Latonae turbae, qua (Bentley) quantum distat ab orba?	200
ite, satis, propere ite, sacri est (Haupt) laurumque capillis ponite.’ deponunt et sacra infecta relinquunt,	

quodque licet, tacito venerantur murmure numen.
indignata dea est.

Niobe says (vv. 197-204): “Suppose that part of that multitude of my children could be taken away from me: though bereaved, I will not be reduced to a mere two, Latona’s ‘crowd’. How different is she from a childless woman by it? Go, go quickly; enough of this sacrifice. Take off the wreaths from your heads”. The narrative continues: “They take them off and leave their sacrifices unfinished. The only thing they were allowed was to worship the deity in silent prayers. The goddess was indignant...”

Turbae (v. 200) must be parallel to *populo* (v. 198), a hyperbole for the number of Niobe’s children, large as it is, and has ironic undertones (Bömer *ad loc.*). For a mother like Niobe, two is definitely not a crowd! She orders her children to break off their sacrifice before it is completed. This offends the deity even more, and now, even their silent prayers — a compromise — cannot save them. The children, though good and pious, torn between their obedience to the mother and their devotion to the goddess, are doomed because of Niobe’s hybris, and all must die. The whole passage is brilliant and deeply moving, at least to me, in this form; but how many steps were necessary to restore it! And the whole process was set in motion by Naugeriuss!

6.223

auro gravidis moderantur habenis

Ovid describes the luxurious equestrian equipment of Niobe’s sons. Most MSS. have the text that he quotes, except for *BG*, which have *auro gravidas ... habenas*. N. also cites a variant *gravidisque auro moderantur habenis*, though in the end he prefers *auroque graves moderantur habenas* “from some old manuscripts”. T. has found this in *W_χ et fere N³(auro)*, and prints it, as does A., following Heinsius and N. We need some connecting particles between *conscendunt ... premunt ... moderantur*. The main tradition preserves —*que* between *c.* and *p.*, but not between *p.* and *m.*, where we also need it. Once it got lost after *auro*, the following *graves* had to be changed to *gravidas* for metrical reasons. The other problem involves the two possible

constructions of *moderor*: it can have the dat. (Cic. *Inv.* 2.154) or the acc.; cf. *met.* 13.923 *moderabar harundine linum*. In a context like ours where “to control the reins” is required, it usually has the acc.; cf. *Pont.* 2.9.33 *Caesar et imperii moderetur frena precemur*; *Stat. Theb.* 4.129 (but the text is uncertain). *Gravis auro* can be supported by *ars* 3.131 *nec prodite graves insuto vestibus auro*, but *gravidus auro* could only be said of a gold mine vel sim. Here it must be an interpolation *metri causa*. Bömer comments: “Sachlich bedeuten die Lesarten keinen wesentlichen Unterschied”. But there is a difference. See also T., in *ICS* 14, 1989, 103-17.

6.332

illa suam vocat hanc, cui quondam regia *coniunx*
orbem interdixit

In some witnesses N. found *regia Iuno*, but he expressed no preference, while Heinsius, who read it in some of his MSS., adopted it. It may be an intrusion from 6.94 or 14.829; cf. also *Pont.* 1.4.39. It could also be a gloss. No mention in A. and T.

N. liked a variant *orbe* for *orbem* which likewise occurred in some of Heinsius' MSS. and appealed to him. *Interdicere* is transitive in 10.336 *spes interdictae*, as Bömer notes, but it can have (in prose mostly) the dat. of the person and the abl. of the object, as in the formula *alicui aqua et igni interdicare*. No mention in A. and T.

6.333

quam vix erratica Delos
orantem accepit

N. preferred *errantem*, attested by *U³ov*, according to A. (T. is silent) and accepted by Merkel. It might be said that *orantem* adds pathos: the goddess has to plead for mercy, as she does, indeed, in *Hymn. Hom.* 3.5-6 (cited by Bömer). On the other hand, there is the similarity between her fate and that of Delos. But *vix* gives more point to *orantem*, it seems to me.

6.341

sidereo siccata sitim *collegit* ab aestu

N. noticed a variant *concepit* for *collegit*; it survives in *BFGL*. We face a similar dilemma in 5.446 (*Ceres fessa labore sitim collegerat* (see *OLD*, 351, 7b), where most witnesses, including *BF*, have *conceperat* (see *OLD*, 388, 8a). *Sitim colligere* can be paralleled by Verg. *georg.* 3.327 (see Mynors, 1990 *ad loc.*, who translates 'to grow thirsty'). Perhaps one should be consistent and acknowledge only the phrase *sitim colligere*, or one should admit *sitim concipere* as well and follow the 'better tradition' in each case; but this is difficult considering the textual history of the work. So often, the truth has survived only in one or two witnesses or has to be restored by conjecture. The recent editors print *conceperat* and *collegit*. T. assumes that *collegerat* in 5.446 is an intruder from 6.341, but this hypothesis, applied throughout his edition, threatens to undermine the system of parallels on which textual criticism relies.

6.406

concolor *huic* humerus nascendi tempore dextro
corporeusque fuit

N. clearly prefers *hic* (*EM¹N^c BFG*) to *huic* (*Mⁿ[N^{ac}]U L*), and this is what A. and T. print. The contrast is between this (i.e. the left) and the other (i. e. the right one). Cf. 2.874 *dextra ... altera*.

6.489

ponitur; hinc placido *dantur* sua corpora somno

In some witnesses N. read *tradunt* for *dantur*, and this appealed to the editor of the *Gryphiana* (1563), among others. T. cites it from *c* and *o* (both late 12th c.). Planudes translates διδόασιν which could render both verbs. Cf. *fast.* 2.327 *sic epulis functi, sic dant sua corpora somno*; 4.332 *dantque levi somno corpora functa cibo*. Both parallels speak against Housman's proposal, *tempora* for *corpora* in our passage, though T., who found it in some witnesses, prints it. But *dantur* seems strange, since

Ovid elsewhere uses active forms, and *sua corpora* (“indirekte Reflexivität”, as Bömer notes — whatever that means) seems odd. *Tradunt* is supported by *Hom. Lat.* 634 *placido tradunt sua corpora somno* (cited by Bömer), perhaps a reminiscence of this passage, because the author is familiar with Ovid.

6.600

attonitamque trahens intra sua *moenia* ducit

N. mentions a variant *limina* for *moenia*. It is attested by $p^v \chi$ and by some of Heinsius’ MSS. (he accepted it). The same divergence appears in 14.456 *Euandri ad moenia* (Ω) vs. *E. ad limina* $N^{2v} \bar{U}P$. Here, *moenia* follows three lines later, whereas there is no such repetition in our passage. Burman has a useful note on 14.456. Bömer paraphrases *intra sua moenia* with ‘in aedes regias’.

6.617

abstulerant, ferro rapiam

‘Fortasse rectius sit *abstulerunt* ...’ writes N. and quotes two passages from Verg., *Aen.* 2.774 *steteruntque comae* and *georg.* 2.129 (283) *miscueruntque herbas et non innoxia verba*. The point is that the paenultima of this form of the perfect can be short in classical poetry, as N. knew, but the scribes who did not know this metrical licence, often substituted *—erant* (Ω) or *—erint* (φ). The more recent editors follow M^1NU^c . See Bömer on 6.585 where Heinsius restored *defuerunt* from a ‘Vossianus’ (T. attributes the reading to ‘three or more recentiores’).

6.677

sceptra loci rerumque capit moderamen Erechtheus

In some witnesses N. read *regnique* for *rerumque*. The variant is recorded by Ehwald as coming from a ‘codex vulgatae lectionis’. It is not mentioned by A. and T. It may be a gloss (Bömer comments “*sceptra fere id quod regnum*” and offers examples) which found its way into the text. On the spelling *Erechtheus* see Bömer *ad loc.*, T., p. 487.

6.707

Orithyiam adamans fulvis amplectitur alis

N. comments 'In veteribus prope omnibus, rectius *Orithyian amans fulvis amplectitur alis*'. According to A., *adamans* is found in *N*³, according to T., it is the reading of *BG*¹. We are facing another metrical problem: Unless we admit the Greek acc. ending (*Orithyian* in T. and A.), there is synaloepha. Cf. e.g. 7.357 *Aeoliam Pitanean a laeva parte reliquit*, and see Bömer's note on our passage with many examples. If one lets the Latin ending stand, the metre has to be repaired by various interpolations: an extra syllable could be added (*adamans* or *—que*) or *amans* could be changed to *clamans* (*G*^{2v} φ). This type of 'creative evolution', not unusual in the textual history of the *Met.*, is very instructive. See also T., p. 491.

—BOOK VII—

7.56

magna sequar: titulum servatae *pubis* Achivae

Here, N. considers the variant *puppis* (*M*^c *U*^l). It seems to appeal to him as much as the vulgate which, of course, is fine, though *pubes Achiva* is without parallel, according to Bömer *ad loc.* Verg. *Aen.* 7.794 writes *Argiva ... pubes*. For *puppis* cf. Cat. 64.4 *lecti iuvenes, Argivae robora puppis*.

7.115

diriguere metu Minyae, subit ille: nec *ignes*
sensit *anhelatos*

'Sic in veteribus, praeterquam quod non *ignes* sed *illos* aut *ullos* sensit *anhelatos* aut *anhelatus* aut *anhelantes*'. There is widespread corruption in the paradosis here, and N. was able to correct some of it, at least. First, we ought to read *deriguere* (*MNG*); cf. Lucan. 1.246 *deriguere metu*; T., p. 496; Bömer *ad loc.* Second, the order of the following words, *MINYAESVBITILLE* was disturbed and appears as *subito Minyae ille* in most MSS. This was corrected by N. 'ex veteribus'. The correct order is now

also known from $l^m \chi$. Third, *ignes* for *illos* or *ullos* seems to be N.'s own conjecture, based on *Her.* 12.15 *isset anhelatos non praemedicatus in ignes* and *fast.* 4.492 *cuius anhelatis ignibus ardet humus*. The same parallels also support *anhelatos* (Ω) vs. *anhelatus* ($M^c[S]N^{3c}U^{4s}B^{1s}G$) and *anhelantes* ($U^c \varphi$) which A. should not have printed. It is true that Verg. *Aen.* 8.421 wrote *fornacibus ignis anhelat*, but the context is different. *Ignes anhelatos* must mean *ignes quos tauri anhelant*; cf. 'Lact.', *Narr.* 7.1 *tauros spirantes ignem*. For *sensit* Heinsius proposed (*ex codd.*) *sentit*, because of *it* (v. 111), *subit* (v. 115), *mulcet* (v. 117). T. deserves praise for his restoration of the text (essentially the same as in Edwards' edition of 1893, in Postgate's *Corpus*, 437).

7.170

dissimilemque animum subiit *pater Aeta* relictus

This — or *pater Oeta* — seems to be the reading of almost all MSS., but *L* (s. XI/XII) and a few others have *Oeta* without the interpolation *pater*. It was Pierius who restored the correct form of the name and read *subiit Aeta relictus*. N. reports Pierius' emendation 'from some', without naming him, and it was found in $M^{ac}N^{ac}$, it seems. The line has been omitted in several witnesses, Planudes does not translate it, and Heinsius deleted it. In a slightly different form (*d. a. s. aetate relictus*) it appears in $M^{2m}N^2U$ *BFG*L after v. 293 in the text and in other witness in the margin; here, Planudes translates it. *Pater* seems to be a gloss or — more likely — an interpolation *metri causa*. Once the correct name has been restored (cf. *Her.* 12.29), the line is not only unobjectionable but necessary. T. prints the line as restored by Pierius, citing (M^{ac}) et fort. $N^{ac}M$ (*ante corr.*), without mentioning Pierius and N. He also put it into square brackets, following Heinsius.

7.177

non annis *renovare* tuis

The variant *renovare* which N. cites is attested in two 12th c. MSS., *e* and *v*, according to A. (nothing in T.) and appealed to Heinsius, but it is difficult to find a good parallel to *longum*

aevum revocare in the sense that is required. For *renovare* cf. v. 215 *renovata senectus* (*s.* being equivalent to *longum aevum*), where another 12th c. MS (*r*) also has *revocare*; cf. moreover 9.425 *Anchisae renovare ... annos* (no variant, it seems).

7.183

nuda pedem, *nudos* umeris infusa capillos

The variant *nudis umeris* which N. quotes is found in U^3W^3 and *h*, according to A. (nothing in T.). Merkel, in his 2nd edition of 1875, conjectured *nudis umeros ... capillis*, but a close parallel in Seneca, *Oed.* 499 *solemne Phoebus carmen / infusis umero capillis / cantat* seems to confirm *umeris*. Medea wears nothing on her feet, nothing on her head. See Bömer *ad loc.* If we look at this and the preceding line, *egreditur tectis vestes induta recinctas*, we can observe how consistently Ovid uses the 'Accusativus Graecus', twice with a verbal form in the middle sense, once with an adjective.

7.186

nullo cum murmure serpens
sopitae similis nullo cum murmure serpit
immotaeque silent frondes

N. finds no sense in this version and considers a different one which leaves out "the line in the middle", i. e. v. 186a of the modern editions. This version, *nullo cum murmure sepes / immotaeque silent frondes*, is attested in some 'recentiores', according to Ehwald. Heinsius deleted v. 186a. The word *s(a)epes* occurs in *B*. There is another version, also considered by N., *nullo cum murmure serpens* (Ω) which he explains 'ut sit *quies serpens cum nullo murmure*'. This is apparently how von Albrecht (Reclam 1994) understands it, for he translates "Schlummer, der ohne das leiseste Murmeln heranschleicht", which sounds a little strange. Finally, N. records the version of 'veteres quidam', *sopitis similes nullo cum murmure sepes / immotaeque silent frondes*. This is the reading of $M^c B^c P$, and Planudes translates it. It is a difficult problem. Perhaps v. 185 originally ended with *solverat alta quies*, and we have an

unfinished half-line like those in the *Aeneid*. What the paradosis offers are various attempts at completing it. A. thinks of a ‘double recensio’, and T. brackets v. 186a, following N. and Heinsius, which is a clean solution. See also Bömer *ad loc.* (pp. 249-50). A. Ramírez de Verger proposes *labens* for *saepes*, a very attractive conjecture. At present, he tells me, he is not sure and tends to prefer *serpens*, deleting v. 186a.

7.213

custodemque rudem *somno* sopistis et aurum

N. records a variant *somni*, perhaps from R. Regius’ edition, and Heinsius, who found it in the *Iunianus*, accepted it. The reference is to the sleepless dragon that guards the Golden Fleece; see 7.149-51 *pervigilem ... sopire draconem, / qui ... custos erat*. It is difficult to decide between *somno* (A.) and *somni* (T.). The gen. is supported by *fast.* 1.83 *colla rudes operum praebent*; the abl., it seems, by *trist.* 2.424 *Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis*; *Pont.* 3.3.38 *artibus ... non rudis ... meis*.

7.228

multa quoque *Apidani* placuerunt gramina ripis

Almost all MSS. known today seem to have *Eridani*, an error which also occurs at 1.580, where it was corrected by Iacobus a Cruce, Raphael Regius and Politianus (see on 1.580). In our passage, as N. observes, the poet lists place names in Thessaly, the classic country of witchcraft, and neither the Attic nor the Gallic Eridanus would be appropriate. N. therefore follows “those who made the correction”, without naming them (he never mentions any other scholars). Slater (1927) cites *Apidani* from the ‘Noricus’ (*man.* 1) and *Epidani*, a kind of conflation, from a *Basileensis*. On Planudes’ translation, which preserves the correct form, N. has this to say: “Planudes etiam, qui in *primo*, ubi idem error, cum ceteris erraverat, hic meliora videtur secutus exemplaria”.

7.259

multifidasque faces in fossa sanguinis *atra*
tingit

It is not clear whether *atri* is N.'s conjecture or an old variant. (This is another passage not discussed in his notes). T. cites it from *G* (s. XII), and it seems to have been the vulgate before Gierig — Jahn (3rd ed. 1821). The “black blood” may be an allusion to Hom. *Od.* 11.36.

7.293

ante quater denos *hunc se* reminiscitur annos

N., according to his notes, did not find the true reading *hunc se* (for *nunc se* of most MSS.) in ‘old MSS.’, as Slater and A. report; he corrected the vulgate *ope ingenii*, following Planudes’ translation τοιοῦτον. Later, Heinsius found *hunc se* in the ‘Zulichemianus’ and the *Basileensis BPU* F. II. 26. T. attributes the correct reading to unspecified 13th c. MSS. and to Planudes, without mentioning N. These details cannot, perhaps, be accommodated in a succinct apparatus, but they are not unimportant for the history of scholarship. One regrets that T. likes to cover a multitude of readings (variants, conjectures, the vulgate of a certain period) with his Greek symbols, leaving it to the reader to find out which is which.

7.343

ille cruore rubens *subito* tamen adlevat artus

‘*Cubito*, non *subito* ex veteribus legendum’, says N. After Ciofanus, Heinsius adopted this reading, which he found in the ‘Codex alter Moreti’ and other witnesses. It is also known today from the *Cod. Tortos. B. Cath. 134*, s. XIII *i. m.* This codex, not cited specifically by M., A. and T., may be one of the witnesses that N. and Ciofanus refer to. T. cites *cubito* from *a¹f^{2v}* χ (unspecified th c. MSS.). Any one of these could be among the ‘veteres’ of N. It is misleading to label them ‘codices vulgatae lectionis’, as Ehwald (1915) did. They are not very old, but that does not diminish their value for us.

7.366

quorum oculos ipso *vitiantes* omnia visu

Ovid speaks of the Evil Eye of the Telchines. The paradosis is divided between *vitiantes* (*N B^{2v}*, Naugerius), *vitantes* (*MB^{2c}FG^{ac}L*), *minitantes* (*P^l*, *ut vid.*) and *mutantes* (*U G^{3s}P*, *Plan.*). *Vitiare* is used in the sense of *fascinare*. N. does not discuss the passage in his notes, leaving it open whether he found the true reading in a MS. or made an emendation.

7.375

stricto toties iratus amore

In some witnesses N. found *spreto* for *stricto* but did not recommend it. Ciofanus also cites MS. support for *spreto* but rejects it. Constantius Fanensis, on the other hand, adopted the reading ‘ex archaeotypis’. Heinsius conjectured *tracto* (= *delato*). If *stringere* can mean ‘to wound slightly’ (cf., e.g. Quint. *Decl.* 342 [p. 352, l. 22]), it would be ‘lectio difficilior’. But is *spreto* too obvious to be right? Ovid always uses *stringere* in a concrete, physical sense, e.g. *ensem stringere*. Bömer tacitly adopts *spreto*, as does T., based on unspecified ‘recentiores’, while A. prints *stricto*.

7.464

florentemque *Tyron*, *Cyprum planamque* Seriphon

This is what N. read in all of his witnesses. He felt uncomfortable with the names, because both Tyrus and Cyprus are at some distance from the Cyclades (see above on 5.252), and he was almost certain that *Cypron* is a corruption of *Cythnon*, but he hesitated to put this into the text. He concluded that Ovid must have written *Cythnon planamque Seriphon* but left it to others to correct *Tyron*. Once more, a later critic found the solution: Heinsius’ *thymo* is in all the modern editions. A further improvement, I think, should be considered: *parvamque* for *planamque*, suggested by Constantius Fanensis; cf. 5.242 *parvae ... Seriphi*. A. prints *thymo Cythnon*, correctly, as I think, while T. prints *thymo Syron*. His *app. crit.* attributes both *Cythnon* (not *Cynthon*, a misprint) and *Syron* to N., and he does not mention *parvamque*.

7.509

ducite, et omnis eat, rerum status iste mearum

N. writes: 'In pluribus *dicite*, non *ducite*. Quin et melius fortasse dividatur carmen quo pacto Planudes: *Dicite, et omnis erat rerum status iste mearum*'. Planudes offers several clues, but the whole passage 508-11 is difficult. We find *ducite* in *U* (and in *e*², acc. to A.), *dicite* in all other MSS. (and Planudes translates it). Yet *ducite* is right, I think. Aeacus says: "You may confidently count all the forces of this island yours". For *omnia quae* (*M*^{ac}) the other MSS. have either *omnis ait* or *omnis eat*. Burman proposed *et ut rerum nunc est status iste mearum*, which deserves a mention. Riese assumed a lacuna after v. 509, and T. brackets vv. 508-9, an unnecessary measure, because the text can be salvaged with a few changes. But first, we may have to adopt the order of the lines preserved in *BFG* and attested by Planudes' translation, i. e. 509.511.510.512 (see below). Whatever solution one adopts, v. 510, as printed in A.'s *Teubneriana*, *robora non desunt: superat mihi miles et hostis* makes no sense. One should probably read *superest* (Heinsius *ex codd.*) *mihi miles in hostem* (Burman, following Planudes). On this meaning of *superesse* see my note (Heidelberg 1977) on *Tr.* 2.69 *fama Iovi superest*. Read, perhaps

508 nec dubie vires, quas haec habet insula, vestras
 509 ducite, ut omnis' ait 'rerum <est> status iste mearum
 511 (gratia dis) felix et inexcusabile tempus:
 510 robora non desunt: superest mihi miles in hostem.

T. proposes another solution which seems perfectly possible to me. He keeps the order of lines as attested in *MN U* and most MSS. but reads at the end of v. 510 *et hoc est*, following the 'Excerpta Calandrae'. But even so, there is no need to throw out 508-9; in fact, they are necessary. There are three reasons for Aeacus not to refuse the request of the Athenians: (1) he has enough soldiers; (2) his kingdom is in good shape; (3) he cannot use the present time as a pretext for refusing.

7.564

in partem leti citius venit *atque* salutis

In some witnesses N. read *utque salutis*, which seemed to him ‘perhaps better’; he also liked the new punctuation which now imposed itself. Weakly attested variants like *inque* and *hincque* show that *atque* (most MSS.) was felt to be wrong. As so often, Heinsius followed N. So does T., following A. and citing *utque* from *v*^{2c} and χ (unspecified 13th c. MSS.).

7.616

isse sub amplexus Asopidos *Aeginae*

This version which he found in some ‘veteres’ recommended itself to N., because he counted the first diphthong of *Aeginae* as bisyllabic, comparing Verg. *Aen.* 3.74 *Neptuno Aegaeo*. But for Ovid, *met.* 7.474 (where there does not seem to be a textual difficulty) *Aeginam* has three syllables, and in Verg. *Aen.* 12.366 *Aegaeo* is trisyllabic. Heinsius, at one time, accepted N.’s view, but the more recent editors, following *M* and *W*, print *dicta sub amplexus Aeginae Asopidos isse*. Is this what Ovid wrote? There is nothing wrong with *sub amplexus ... isse*; Ovid uses *sub* for *in*; cf. 11.228 *amplexus in virginis ire marinae* and Kenney on *Her.* 17.94. But it seems to me that, in our passage, Heinsius’ ‘Primus Moreti’ and his ‘Fragmentum Vossianum’ have preserved the truth, *isse sub amplexus Aeginae Asopidos ignem*, ‘as fire’; cf. 6.113. Mariangelus had found *ignem* in a ‘Vaticanus’, and T. reports *isse ... ignem* from the *Parisinus 8008* and the *Lausannensis*, but also from his non-specific χ class, though he prints the vulgate. Assuming that *isse ... ignem* is the authentic reading, *ignem* at the end of the line was misread as *isse* (or *olim* in T.’s φ class); then the same word at the beginning of the line had to be changed, which led to the awkward phrase *dicta loquuntur*.

7.636

ramos totidem

This is the reading that N. apparently found in some of his

MSS. (he says nothing in his notes). It is adopted by T., following Heinsius. The number of variants and their nature seem to indicate that this is an old corruption. A. prints *promittere idem*, following *L²M Bodl. F.4.31*. The correct reading is also cited from *e* (s. XII).

7.764

*cessit et exitio multis: pecorique sibi que
ruricolae pavere feram*

This reading N. found in 'many old' witnesses. Another version he knew, *cessit et exitio multis pecorumque suumque* he judged 'fortasse rectius'. He interpreted it as 'multis pecorum et suum' (gen. pl. of *sus*). This is what Planudes translates and what the gloss *porcorum* in *M* suggests. N. then mentions the *U^{3-4c} B^c L^{3c}P* variants *rurigenae* (and *indigenae v Plan.*) for *ruricolae*. Of *indigenae* he says 'fortasse rectius', because of *vicina iuventus* in v. 765. He does not object to *cessit*, which is in almost all MSS. and was emended to *pestis* by Gronovius, nor was he aware of the reading *multi*, known to Gronovius from two MSS. and to Heinsius from the 'Zulichemianus'. From these scattered readings and one brilliant emendation we can piece together what Ovid must have written: *immittitur altera Thebis / pestis et exitio multi pecorumque suoque / ruricolae pavere feram*. In prose this would be something like this: *altera pestis Thebis immittitur, et multi ruricolae exitio pecorum et suo feram pavere*. The reading *rurigenae* has broad support in the MS. tradition, and A. and T. print it, but it can hardly be right, in spite of the *OLD*, which allows the word a lemma with our passage as a lonely testimony. Cf. 11.91 *ruricolae cepere Phryges*, etc.

—BOOK VIII—

8.123

*generis falsa est ea fabula: verum
et ferus et captus nullius amore iuvencae*

This is from Scylla's speech of recrimination against Minos

(vv. 108-42). For *verum* N. found *verus* ($M^{ac}(S)(N^{ac})U G^{c2}$) but preferred *verum* ($M^c N^c B F^{ac} L P$). The contrast seems to be between the illusion of an animal (Zeus in the shape of a bull, see vv. 122-3) and a real animal; hence *verus*. But *generis* is in need of a qualification; hence *vestri*, which Heinsius found in one of his MSS., and that is what Capoferreus had proposed, understanding *generis falsa est ea fabula vestri* as a parenthesis. Burman adopted this, and it seems to be the solution. It is not necessary to delete v. 124 with Merkel, followed by T. A slight change — *verus* to *vestri* — is all we need (A. and T. are not aware of this possibility). In 6.104 *verus taurus* is different, as Bömer notes.

8.286

stantque velut vallum, velut alta hastilia setae

This is from the description of the Caledonian Boar (vv. 282-9). N. comments: ‘Legitur in nonnullis et alterum eiusdem sententiae carmen: *et setae rigidis similes hastilibus horrent*. Atque utrumque mea sententia Ovidii est. Quum tamen alterum repudiandum sit, proximum hemistichion *riget horrida cervix* in causa fuit, ut hoc excluderemus’. If I understand his note correctly, N. objects to the proximity of *horrida* and *horrent*, possibly also to the occurrence of *rigidis* shortly after *rigent*. In any case, he decided to keep v. 286 and delete v. 285. Heinsius also threw out v. 285. And Burman, followed by later editors, eliminated v. 286, which has a shaky tradition (*in textu BFL, in marg. M^{ac}(S^{ac})N^{ac}U^{ac}P^{ac}*). It is interesting to see that N. attributes two slightly different versions to Ovid, obviously assuming that the poet revised his work. He came to this conclusion long before the concepts of ‘author’s corrections’ or ‘double recensio’ were born. By deleting v. 285, N. is telling us that, in his opinion, Ovid would have preferred v. 286. He may be right, especially if we consider a very slight change proposed by Burman and accepted by Bömer, but ignored by A. and T., *vel ut alta hastilia* for *velut alta hastilia*. If v. 286 (probably in this form) resulted from a marginal note in the archetype, it could represent an improvement which occurred to the poet himself. Bömer has a long inconclusive note. The gist of it seems to be that the better

paradosis (v. 285) speaks against the better line (v. 286). See also A. S. Hollis (Oxford 1979) *ad loc.* T. brackets both lines, which seems too radical.

8.301

Tyndaridae gemini, *praestantes caestibus alter*

In some witnesses N. found *spectatus caestibus alter*. This is attested by $B^{ac} F^{ac}$, while *spectandus*, the true reading, in my opinion, is preserved by $N^1 U$; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 4.14.17 *spectandus in certamine Martio*. *Praestantes*, the reading of $M^{2v} B^c GLP$, may be a deliberate substitute for *spectantes* which is in $M^1 (S)$. Bömer's note is inconclusive, but he tends to accept *spectatus*, as does T. ('fort. recte'), who leaves *spectandus* in the text.

8.317

nemorisque decus Tegeaea Lycaei

In some MSS. N. read after this line the following verse: *venit Atalantis Schoenei pulcherrima virgo*. In one form or another, it is attested at this place in $M B$, in the margin by $N^3 F^2$, acc. to T. N. rejected for three reasons, all of them noteworthy: (1) it does not occur in any of the 'old MSS. '; (2) it is unmetrical (see Bömer's note); (3) it is 'rude ac nihili'. His first argument would be more valid, of course, if his 'old' MSS. were really older than M , for instance. The fact that Planudes translates the line (see Bömer *ad loc.*) would suggest an old interpolation. It may have been spun out of a marginal gloss ('notula, non versus', says Korn), explaining *Tegeaea*: '*Atalante, Schoenei filia*'. There may be a connection with 10.609, where S has *mollis Schoeneia virgo* for *molli Schoeneia vultu* (most MSS.).

8.339

fertur ut excussis *elisis nubibus ignis*

N. records without comment the variant *elisi nubibus ignes* and this is what A. and T., following Δ , print. Another group, Σ , offers *elisis nubibus ignis*, the sg. instead of the pl. Postgate suggested a major change, *elisis excussi nubibus ignes*. But in

6.696 Ovid writes *exsiliantque cavis elisi nubibus ignes*, which seems to make Postgate's change (also known from a *Berolinensis* cited by Magnus) unnecessary. Bömer *ad loc.* considers a 'double enallage', whatever this means. See also Slater and Hollis *ad loc.*

8.356

emicat ex oculis, spirat quoque pectore flammās

N. notes *flamma* as a variant. It is attested by *M*^{2ac} *F*^c; most MSS. have *flammās*. It is possible to understand *flamma emicat ex oculis, et ex pectore quoque spirat*, but it seems more natural to look for an object to *spirat*, i. e. either *flammam* or *flammās*; cf. Cic. *Arat.* 351 (110) *toto spirans de corpore flammam*; Lucr. 2.705 *flammam taetro spirantis ore Chimaerae*; 5.29 *et Diomedis equi spirantes naribus ignem*; 940-1 *prima leo, postrema draco, media ipsa Chimaera / ore foras acrem flaret de corpore flammam* (a passage emended by N.); Verg. *georg.* 2.140 *tauri spirantes naribus ignem*. There is, however, a problem at the beginning of the line. For *emicat* Schepper proposed *fax micat*, while Heinsius, along the same lines, adopted *lux micat* from one of his MSS. Burman adopted this with a further change and printed, in his edition, *lux micat ex oculis spiratque e pectore flamma*. Critics may hesitate to assume that *lux* could be corrupted to *e*— and —*que e* to *quoque*, but now the line makes sense, and it is not necessary to delete it with Capoferreus and Schrader. Both A. and T. print *emicat ... quoque*, and Bömer says nothing about the textual problems. *Quoque* occasionally serves as a convenient (but inappropriate) remedy to a textual problem.

8.371

Orithyiae magni rostro femur hausit adunco

Here, N. records the variants *Orichiae* (*P* has *Oriciae*) and *Orityae* (*Ω* have *Orithyiae*). Planudes offers the form *Orytyae*. Following these scattered clues, N., not unreasonably, proposed *Orytyae*, but this did not appeal to later editors. Heinsius, for instance, favored *Othriadae* from his 'Palatinus alter'. Gierig introduced *Actoridae* (cf. v. 308) from four of Heinsius' MSS.

Merkel suggested *Eurytidae*, the patronymic of Hippalmus (cf. v. 371) or Hippasus. At the same time he realized the problem he created by his conjecture: according to Riese's text (1st ed., 1872) of vv. 360-1, Hippalmus had already been wounded and was rescued by his companions. Therefore Merkel (2nd ed., 1875) had to change *Hippalmon*, Riese's conjecture in v. 360, to *Eupalamon* (from Planudes), which would leave Hippalmus still among the active hunters. A., who prints *Eurytidae* in v. 371, leaves *Hippalmon* in v. 360 unchanged. No matter what we decide, we cannot let this contradiction remain in the text. T. distinguishes two hunters, Hippalmus and Hippasus.

8.585

a silvis silvas et ab arvis arva *revulsi*

'*Revelli* in quibusdam, et recte', says N. *Revelli* is found in (M^{ac})(S)(N^{ac}) *BFL*, while M^cN^cUP have *revulsi*. A little later, in v. 588, the main paradosis preserves *revellit*, though *revulsit* appears in some 'recentiores', but here one should probably read *partesque resolvit* (Heinsius *ex codd.*, Hollis) for *pariterque revellit*, though Edwards, followed by Hall, preferred *partesque revellit*. Cf. 12.300 *sudem vix osse revellit* (Ω : *revulsit cod. Amplonianus*, acc. to Ehwald); *Her.* 6.104 *Phasias Aetine / aurea ... terga revellit*; *Sen. Oed.* 100 (of the Sphinx) *saxa ... / revulsit ungui*. *Revulsi* seems to be more common in prose (Bömer *ad loc.*).

8.621

medio circumdata muro

For *medio* there is, as N. notes, a variant *modico*. We find it in *e* and the *Harleianus* 2737. The sense, in my opinion, requires it. Planudes seems to translate *medio*, but Heinsius, Boissonade and J. B. Hall are in favor of *modico*. In his Latin text, von Albrecht keeps *medio* but translates "von einem bescheidenen Mäuerchen umgeben". The *OLD* acknowledges the meanings 'moderate', 'middling' and 'ordinary' and quotes e.g. *Cic. Orat.* 98, where *medius* is explained as *modicus*, but there is no exact parallel to our passage. Bömer refers to 7.779 *collis apex medii*, Livy

7.10.7 *media ... statura* and *ThlL VIII 589.24*. A. and T. keep *medio* in our passage, perhaps considering *modico* a gloss. One could compare 6.343 *lacum mediocris aquae*, where the *OLD* assumes the meaning ‘of medium size, fairly small’, while von Albrecht translates: “einen See mit niedriger Wasserfläche”; but here, one should probably read with Heinsius (‘ex uno Strozzae’) *lacum melioris aquae*.

8.635

nec refert dominos illic famulosne requiras

N. writes ‘*famulosve* in quibusdam’. This variant is reported by Ehwald, but not by Slater, A. and T. The first alternative after (*non*) *refert* is usually introduced by *an*, but the subjunctive alone is possible, as in Mart. 8.38.7 *refert sis bonus an velis videri*. For the second alternative —*ne* is normal.

8.670

pocula, quae cava sunt flaventibus illita ceris

N. notes *qua* as a variant for *quae*. It is attested by *M^c(S)N^{2c}PT* and must be right. Planudes is of no help, as he does not translate the clause *qua(e) cava sunt*. The distinction is between “inside” and “outside”, as von Albrecht’s translation clearly indicates: “Becher aus Buchenholz die innen mit Wachs ausgestrichen sind”.

8.854

*vultumque virilem
induit et vultus pisces capientibus aptos.*

N. comments ‘Legendum ex veteribus *cultus*, non *vultus*’. None of these ‘veteres’ seems to be known specifically. Ehwald cites the reading from ‘codd. vulgatae lectionis’, a vague designation which is, in this case, particularly inappropriate. T. ascribes it to his χ group (s. XIII). Cf. 2.425 *induitur faciem cultumque Dianae*, where *M* has *vultumque* and *L* *vultusque*.

—BOOK IX—

9.49

nescia quem maneat tanti victoria regni

N. records a variant *belli* for *regni*, without comment. *Regnum* seems odd in this context. In v. 18, it refers to Aetolia, the kingdom of Oeneus, in 14.512, *Venulus Calydonia regna ... relinquit*, to the kingdom of Diomedes. Can *victoria regni* mean “victory which brings a kingdom”? In his translation, von Albrecht seems to assume a kind of hendiadys, “der Sieg und die hohe Herrscherwürde”, but this reads something into the text. Ovid probably remembers a passage in Vergil’s *Georgics* (3.215–41; see Mynors *ad loc.*), where two bulls fight about a cow (cf. v. 224 *bellantis*, but see also v. 228 *regnis ... avitis*). *Bellum* can mean a single battle, as in Hor. *serm.* 1.7.16 *si disparibus bellum incidat, ut Diomedi / cum Lydio Glaucō*, or a fight in the animal kingdom, as in Manil. 2.43 *bella ferarum*. But there is also the idea that the victorious bull is king. Can this be expressed by *victoria regni*? Bömer *ad loc.* speaks of an unusual kind of genitive, something that is beyond explanation (A. Szantyr, *per litt.*) in terms of our grammar. *Belli* is actually found as a *v. l.* in the *Codex Tortos.*, *B. Cath.* 134, s. XIII (see on 7.343).

9.98

hunc tamen ablati doluit iactura decoris

‘In nonnullis *hunc tantum*, et fortasse rectius’, says N. This is the reading of *B*, according to *A.*, and from here it is only one more step to the reading proposed by Markland (*ad Stat. silv.* 2.5.23) and Bentley, *huic tantum ablati doluit iactura decoris*. Planudes probably found *huic tamen ablati doluit* in his Latin text. To me, Markland’s solution seems superior to all other attempts. We need *tantum*: of course Achelous is hurt by the loss of his beautiful horn (*decus = cornu decorum*; cf. vv. 96–7), but this is a minor loss, considering that he is otherwise undamaged and that cosmetic repairs are simple. How von Albrecht extracts “bei seiner Niederlage” out of *domuit* is a mystery. The text, as printed by Ehwald and *A.*, simply makes no sense, and Bömer’s

note is not helpful. T. adopts doubtfully part of Markland's emendation and cites *tantum* from his χ group (13th c.).

9.151

iugulata pellice *testor*

'Fortasse sit rectius *tester*; superius enim *memorem*. Sed et *testor* recte', says N. *Tester* seems to be his conjecture, based on *memorem esse* (Ω) in v. 149.

9.197

his elisa iacet moles Nemeaea lacertis

N. notes 'Quod post hoc legebatur carmen *hic Cacus horrendum Tyberino in litore monstrum*, quod et syllaba repugnat et in plurimis antiquis non invenitur; ideo nos repudiandum arbitrati sumus'. This line is found, in different versions, in the text in *B ϕ* , while *F^{2m}L^{3m}N^{3m}* have it in the margin; Heinsius read it in some of his MSS.; it is missing in *M(S)U P*. It should be mentioned that the line existed in the lost source of the *Monacensis lat. 4610*, a witness considered by T. of equal rank with *MNU* and other valuable witnesses (p. xiv). Planudes translated it, and the editors of the 'Bononiensis' (1480) and the 'Veneta' (1486) accepted it. In his note, N. also disagrees with those who wished to save the line in a metrically correct form, e.g. *his iacet horrendum* or *Cacus et horrendum*. What happened is that the faulty *Cacus* (with a short first syllable) was either omitted altogether or transposed in such a way that the syllable became long. For such manipulations see on 6.707 above.

9.347

Lotus in hanc Nymphæ fugiens obscœna Priapi

'*Lotis* fortasse legendum sit. *Lotis* enim, non *Lotos* dicta Nymphæ illa quæ in lotum versa est'. Thus N. Most MSS. have *Lotus* which is what Planudes translates. Only *M* and perhaps *S* anticipated N.'s emendation, which also occurred to Constantius Fanensis. Cf. *fast.* 1.416, 423.

9.493

hei mihi quae male sum, quos tu sortita, parentes

'Rectius in veteribus *et mihi*, non *hei mihi*', is N.'s comment. The reading *et mihi* which appealed to him, is known from *B^{ac}F^{ac}*, while (*h*)*ei mihi* is cited from *M^{2c}N^{2c}UB^cF^cL* by T. who, following A., prints *at mihi* from *M^lS*, which is probably the best solution.

9.578

'dum licet, o vetitae scelerate libidinis auctor,
effuge' ait '*qui* si nostrum tua fata pudorem
non traheret *secum*, poenas mihi morte dedisses'

The passage is not discussed in N.'s notes, but a variant, *quod* for *qui* which is also found in *NU^l* (acc. to A.) is ascribed to him. It is difficult to decide. If we keep *qui*, we should, perhaps, read *tecum* (Ω) in the following line ('fort. recte' T.).

9.691

sanctaque Bubastis variisque coloribus Apis

'In nonnullis *variusque coloribus Apis*', says N. *Variisque* is attested by *N^cUBL*, while most other witnesses, notably *MN^lFP*, have *variusue*, which A. and T. accept, probably treating it as an abl. resp.; cf. 14.267 *variasque coloribus herbas*.

9.749

spes est quae capiat, spes est quae pascat amorem

The variant *amantem* for *amorem* which N. found in 'some' is attested by *NUP*. While Heinsius deleted the whole line, there have been various attempts to save it: *captat ... pascit* (Korn), *faciat ... pascat* (Faber). Actually, adopting part of Korn's proposal and reading *amantem* would establish an acceptable meaning: Hope catches the lover (i. e. makes him believe that he has a fair chance) and feeds him (when he fails at first, in his pursuit). *Captat* could easily become *capiat*; subsequently, *pascit* was changed to *pascat*. Has it been noticed before that Ovid may

paraphrase a few lines from a comedy by Philemon (fr. 126 K.-A.): “First, they all look, then they look carefully, and then they begin to hope”? Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 6.23.4-5 who quotes the lines offers a paraphrase that may support *amorem* in Ovid. The anomaly of *capiat* followed by *pascit*, if one accepts the broad paradosis, cannot be explained in terms of Haupt-Ehwald and Bömer (potential versus reality). The easiest solution is, perhaps, Faber’s *faciat ... pascat*. T. cites *faciat* (‘fort. recte’) from his χ group and compares 1.469 *fugat hoc, facit illud amorem*.

9.755

nunc quoque votorum nulla est pars *vana* meorum

Another problem not dealt with in the notes. The broad MS. tradition offers *una* instead of *vana*. Slater and A. attribute *vana* to N., while T. cites it from his χ group. Apparently, it is also found in the *Codex Rhénovanus*. Burman ingeniously combined both readings in the following way: *nunc modo votorum pars una est vana meorum*. Heinsius deleted the line, along with the following one, and T. brackets both.

—BOOK X—

10.58

bracchiaque intendens prendique et prendere *certans*

N. omits this passage from his notes, but the reading *ceptans* for *certans* (*MB*) is attributed to some of his MSS. by A., while Slater quotes it from some of Ciofani’s witnesses; most MSS. (Ω) have *captans*. Slater points out that Planudes translate *temptans*, and this may be preferable to Merkel’s *certus*. Polle wanted to delete vv. 58-9 (‘haud scio an recte’ T.). See also Bömer *ad loc.* But *captans* in the sense of ‘trying to catch’ (though a kind of tautology) is possible; cf. 11.768.

10.215-6

ipse suos gemitus foliis inscribit *et ‘ai ai’*
flos habet inscriptum funestaque littera *ducta* est

‘In veteribus multis *et ya*, quam lectionem multi sunt qui

proben. Ego non video cur probare debeam, cum nullo pacto Aiakis nomen his litteris describi possit quod in eodem flore factum et hic'. N. then quotes 10.207-8 *tempus et illud erit, quo se fortissimus heros* (i. e. Ajax) / *addat in hunc florem folioque legatur eodem* and 13.397-8 *littera communis mediis pueroque viroque / inscripta est foliis, haec nominis, illa querelae*. Of the 'veteres multi' which, according to N., have *et ya*, none seems to have survived, and the 'multi' who approve of this reading probably include some of his friends, but not all the early editors of Ovid, for Raphael Regius (1493) apparently introduced *ai ai*, probably from Planudes. *Ya* or *hya* (disyllabic) was understood as the beginning of the name Hyacinthus, while N. correctly interprets *ai ai* as a lament, but also as an allusion to the name *Ai*ax. He then quotes Planudes who clearly renders the sound as *ai ai*. It might be possible, N. adds, to write only one syllable, *ai*, and treat it as a disyllable by 'dividing the diphthong', as he says (see his note on 7.616). T. cites *ai ai* from *SN^eU^{Ac}BP*, but adds 'fere'; how should one reconcile this with A.s app.? There is a similar problem in *am.* 3.9.23-4 *aelinon* (Heinsius for *et linon* or *eunon*; see A. Ramírez de Verger, Teubner 2003 *ad loc.*). In v. 216, the MSS. vary between *dicta* and *ducta*. A. and T. print *ducta*, but Bömer prefers *dicta* and interprets it with Breitenbach (Zürich 1958): "Man nennt das die Laute der Klage", whereas von Albrecht, who prints *ducta*, translates "es trauert der Schriftzug" which can hardly be right.

10.418

et officium commisso spondet amori

A variant *at* for *et*, known to N., is not mentioned by A., while T. ascribes it to unspecified 'recc.' and to Bothe, adding 'non male'. There is actually a transition here, a new step in the narrative: after having tried to discourage Myrrha, the nurse now promises to help her. In his translation, von Albrecht, while keeping *et*, renders *at*: "wenn sie sich aber ihr anvertraue..."

—BOOK XI—

11.37

quae postquam rapuere ferae cornuque *minaci*
divulsere boves

N. cites a variant *minaces* and comments ‘utrumque recte’. *Minaces* is found in *N*², acc. to A., and in a few ‘recentiores’. The whole line was inserted in *N* by the second hand after v. 35. Merkel printed *minaces*, while A. and T. prefer *minaci*. Bömer has this to say on *cornu ... minaci*: “Abl. qualitatis adnominal. . . , hier in ungewöhnlicher Weise vorausgestellt und durch Enjambement . . . getrennt. Diese ungewöhnliche Stellung hat sicher die lectio facilior *minaces* verschuldet”. For the adnominal function he refers to 10.91 where five examples are cited, and for the enjambement he points to 10.110-1 *late ... patentibus altis / ... praebebat cornibus umbras*. It may be possible to justify two unusual features individually, but their combination here and the ambiguity pointed out by Bömer (*cornu ... minaci* could be taken with *ferae*) surely make *minaces* the more natural — and in this sense the ‘easier’-reading.

11.317

carmine vocali clarus citharaque *Phylammon*

The form *Phylammon* is found in *M*, according to Ehwald, but the more recent editors print *Philammon*. N. found *Phil-* in a scholion on the epic of Apollonius Rhodius, 1.23, and in the Suda. According to an obscure myth cited by the scholiast, it was Philammon, not Orpheus, who accompanied the heroes, and he was the father of Thamyras or Thamyris and Eumolpus. According to Hygin. *Fab.* 161, Philammon himself was a son of Apollo. Constantius Fanensis suggested *Philoemon*, ‘nomen ex arte ductum’, an attractive change which seems all but forgotten today. Ignoring the fact that the text is uncertain, Bömer, following others, connects *Philammon* with the introduction of the cult of Ammon into Greek religion, surely an adventurous piece of speculation.

11.328

quam miser o pietas

For this, the reading of most MSS., N. suggested from Planudes *quam miser amplexans*. Later editors discovered that his conjecture had been anticipated by *M^{ac}* (with faulty word division, *MISERAMPLEXANS*), *N^{2c}* and *F^{2v}*. Siebelis' *quam miseram amplexans* is not necessary, I think, nor is Korn's *quo* for *quam* an improvement.

11.673

gestumque manus Ceycis habebat

N. noticed that Planudes translated a different text. He seems to have read *sceptrumque* for *gestumque*, and this absurd reading, perhaps influenced by 11.560-1, has survived in Heinsius' 'Primus Moreti'.

11.674

ingemit Halcyone: lacrimas movet atque lacertos

This is the text as N. cites it. I doubt that Ovid could have written this. Heinsius deleted vv. 674-6, but, perhaps, such a drastic remedy is not necessary. N. improved v. 674 by suggesting *lacrimans* for *lacrimas*, and this was later found in *e* (*Erfurtensis Amplonianus*, s. XII/XIII). Gronovius added a further improvement, reading *ingemit Alcyone lacrimans motatque lacertos*, and this is perfectly satisfactory, I think. Although rare in classical poetry, *motare* is attested in Verg. *ecl.* 5.5 and 6.28, and *motasse* was plausibly restored by Merkel in *met.* 4.46 for *mutasse* (or *celebrasse* or *coluisse*). *Lacrimas atque lacertos movere* is, indeed, as J. J. Hartman (*Mnemosyne* 46, 1918, 355) pointed out, a 'zeugma ingrattissimum atque adeo intolerabile', and *pace* Bömer, who ignores N. and Gronovius, the line needs to be emended. The corruption can be explained: once *MOTATQUE* was read as *MOVETATQUE*, a second object had to be created, and *LACRIMANS* became *LACRIMAS*. Here, as elsewhere (see note on 6.203) Gronovius found, as I think, the solution to a textual problem first recognized by N.

11.763

fertur *Alixirhoe*

N. found a different name in Planudes, *Alyxothoe*, but he transcribed it as *Alixithoe*. There are thirteen different variations in Magnus' *app. crit.* What the recent editors print, *Alexir(h)oe*, was proposed by Heinsius, who should be mentioned. The name is attested, e.g. Schol. Hom. *Il.* 24.497, as the mother of Aesacus, in accordance with Ovid, but as the daughter of Antandrus, not Granicus. This name has been restored by a brilliant conjecture attributed to Pierius Valerianus and Ioannes Commilius, *Graniconata bicorni* for *gracili conata bicorni*.

11.769

prospicit Hesperien patria Cebrenidos unda

In all of his MSS. and in Planudes N. found *eperien*. It looks as if the original name was lost in the whole direct paradosis of the work; *M* has a singular reading, *aspexit perien*. The correction *Hesperien*, accepted by modern editors (with the exception of Slater, who reads *Asteropen*, after Apollodor. 3.12.5) was made in the *editio princeps* of 1471 (Puteolanus, Bologna), probably on the basis of Lactantius, *Arg.* 11, *Fab.* 11; his MSS. offer *peries*, *peperies* and *epiripes*. Incidentally, N.'s *prospicit* is singular; all MSS. (except for *M*) seem to have *aspicit*. To me, *prospicit* looks like a superior reading, worthy of being considered by future editors. So many times, the first part of the first word of a line is misread in the paradosis. The verse ending which N. quotes, *Cebrenidos unda* may be an error for *Cebrenida ripa*, which is confirmed by Planudes. For *patria ... ripa* Bömer compares 9.450 *patriae curvamina ripae*.

—BOOK 12—

12.71

et iam *Sigea* rubebant

litora

Almost all MSS. have *signata*, and that is what Planudes

translated. Apparently, only *p* and some of Heinsius' MSS. offer forms like *sygea*. The emendation is attributed to N., who does not deal with the passage in his notes. The 'Iuntina' adopted it.

12.236

antiquus crater quem *vastum* vastior *ipso*
sustulit Aegides

'In nonnullis *ipse*,' says N. According to T., only *MN^{ac}U* have *ipso*, all the other witnesses have *ipse*. There are other variants (e.g. *surgens* for *vastum* in *MN^{ac}*). Editors ought to mention *quem vasto vastior ipse*, which is what Planudes seems to translate (see Boissonade's note).

12.302

fugit et Orneus *Lycabasque*

Most MSS. have *licidasque*, but this name occurs a little later, in v. 310; hence, we need another name. T. cites *licabasque* from *W* and *o*. The form *Lycabasque* is attributed to N. who omits the passage from his notes. Planudes has "Lykidas" twice (here and v. 310).

12.514

obrutus immani *cumulo* sub pondere Caeneus
aestuat arboreo

N. does not include this passage in his notes, but he is credited with introducing *cumulo* for *tumulo* (Ω), perhaps from Planudes who here uses $\sigma\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ while, in 4.240, he translates *tumulus* with $\chi\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$. It is difficult to decide (see Bömer *ad loc.*): A. prints *tumulo*, T. hesitates between the two forms but leaves *cumulo* in the text. He refers to 3.603, which is different. In our passage, Caeneus, although invulnerable, is overwhelmed by the sheer mass of trees which becomes his burial-mound. 4.240, where Leucothoe is buried by her father under a heap of sand, is a better parallel; and there, all MSS. seem to have *tumulum*.

12.526

quae mihi tunc primum, tunc est conspecta supremum

N. knew a variant *quae mihi tunc primum fuerat conspecta volucris*. It survives in *BFG*, according to T., also in *FPWe*, according to A. N. adds in his note: ‘Sed et prior recta. Ait enim inferius *avis nunc unica, Caeneu*’. The reference is to v. 531. One would hesitate to give up the correspondence of *primum ... supremum*, and *volucris* after *avem* seems a little trite. There is another problem: Should one print *tum ... tunc*, with A. and T.? The second *tunc* (attested by ΔP) is necessary before *est*, but should we give up the anaphora because *tum primum* is attested in *FMN¹PU*, while *tunc primum* is found in *EN²Wp*, according to A.? These configurations of witnesses carry, perhaps, not much authority, since many errors are common to different groups. T. has simplified the whole problem by printing *tunc* only where the metre requires it and *tum* everywhere else. I wonder whether this is a good decision. *Tunc*, originally *tum-ce*, is very often (not only in early Latin) more emphatic than *tum*. The *OLD* lists several examples for *tunc primum*, noting that it can alternate with *tum*, as in Verg. *georg.* 1.136-9 (but there, *tunc* is well attested in v. 139). A similar passage is *met.* 2.235-8 where T. prints *tum* three times in a row, even though *tunc* is well attested in v. 235. Perhaps here, as in Virgil, the more emphatic *tunc* introduces the first clause of the series and is followed (once or several times) by *tum*; hence it would be wrong, I think, to introduce the same form throughout. *Tum* and *tunc* do not completely overlap semantically, as a glance at the *OLD* confirms (12 basic meanings for *tum* vs. only 8 for *tunc*). To give just one example: *tum* can indicate, in dialogue, a change of speaker, while *tunc* cannot, as far as I know. The problem deserves an investigation, because here textual criticism, metrics, lexicology and stylistics intersect in many ways. To adopt metrics as the sole criterion oversimplifies the whole issue. A special case is *tunc* (or *tum*?) *quoque*: see 4.315 versus 14.369 in A.’s edition. See also, e.g. *met.* 1.119; 121; 11.743; 12.446-7 and Bömer on our passage.

12.592

quae tamen ille ferox

'In nonnullis *cur tamen*, in aliis *et tamen*', writes N. These variants are not recorded in Ehwald and A., but T. cites *cur ... Achilles?* from *mo* and his χ group. This is the reading — and the punctuation — which Constantius Fanensis found in his 'good' MSS. *Cum tamen*, the reading adopted by the most recent editors, is rare in poetry, according to Bömer *ad loc.* One might consider *dum tamen* (Boissonade from Planudes, without recommending it), an attractive solution, it seems to me.

12.622

non ea Tydides, non audet Oileus Aiax

'Si *Oileus* legatur, sumendum est pro *Oilejius*: quidam malunt *Oileos*, ut intellegatur *filius*'. N. seems to refer to earlier editions. The form *Oileos*, adopted by A. and T., is preserved in the 'Excerpta Calandrae' (see also *Hom. Lat.* 216, also at the end of a line), while practically all other witnesses have *Oileus*; Planudes offers *Oileides*. The Heroic Age knew the 'lesser Ajax', the son of Oileus, therefore known as *Oileos* (sc. *filius*, as N. says) or *Oiliades* (Prop. 4.1.117), and the 'great Ajax', the son of Telamon, hence known as *Telamonius* (13.194) or *Telamoniades* (12.231).

—BOOK 13—

13.19

iste tulit pretium

N. cites a variant *ipse* which is known to modern editors from *PWhp*. But see vv. 11-2 (and Bömer *ad loc.*) or v. 58, where Ajax refers to Ulysses contemptuously as *iste*.

13.51

heu pars una ducum

'Sic in omnibus. Sed fortasse sit rectius *et pars una ducum*'.

This is actually what Planudes translates, but N.'s suggestion has not found much favor, perhaps because of *et* in v. 50 (where one might consider *at* with Heinsius 'ex codd.'). But there is something else. In v. 51 *pars una ducum*, "one among the generals" seems weak, unless one were to take *unus* = *unicus*. Still, either Postgate's *spes una ducum* or Bothe's *pars magna ducum* would be an improvement, I think, and either one would justify *heu*. Korn's *pars illa d.* is less attractive but shows at least that he also felt uncomfortable with the *paradosis*. If *spes u. d.* is right, it means that Philoctetes is not counted as one of the 'generals', i. e. he is not an equal to Agamemnon or Menelaus or Odysseus. Reading *pars magna d.*, on the other hand, places him safely among the top commanders. Perhaps *spes m. d.* is preferable; cf. v. 375 *per spes nunc socias casuraque moenia Troum*. The *paradosis* can be defended by 2.426 where Jupiter, disguised as Diana, addresses the Nymph he intends to seduce as *comitum ... pars una mearum* which must mean something like "a very special companion of mine", in the light of vv. 415-6. Another passage, 10.318, cited by the *OLD* for *unus* = "one above all others", is not a good example.

13.53

velaturque aliturque avibus

'In quibusdam *venaturque aliturque*'. The variant noted by N. is found in *M^{ac}U^{2c}*, Planudes translates it, and Boissonade, his editor, prefers it to the vulgate. "He clothes and nourishes himself with birds" seems as strange a *zeugma* as *mouet lacrimas et lacertos* in 11.674 (see above). And can *velatur avibus* really mean 'he is clothed in birds' feathers'? I am unable to find any parallels, for in 8.253-4 *excepit Pallas avemque / reddidit et medio velavit in aere pennis* we have *pennis*, not *avibus*, and a bird, not a person, is covered by them (see also 2.376 and 4.45). Similarly, in 15.356-7 *esse viros fama est ... qui soleant velari corpora plumis*, we have *plumis*, not *avibus*. Instead of a *zeugma*, we may have to assume a kind of 'brachylogia': *venatur aves et avibus alitur*.

13.175

Scyron

Most MSS. seem to have *Scyrum*, and that is what Planudes translates. *Cyrum* (N) must be a mechanical error. N. suggested *Syron*, and that was found in the *Vallicell. F 25*, s. XII. R. Regius proposed *Seston*. Scyrus is mentioned in a different context in v. 156. N. does not include the problem in his notes, but in matters of geography he is usually right, and Gronovius (on Sen. *Tro.* 225) accepted his proposal. See also on 7.464.

13.368

tantum ego te supero

The variant *tanto*, noted by N., has survived in *U*, according to A., and Planudes seems to translate this form. In N.'s own diplomatic manner, one might say 'utrumque recte', although *quanto ... tanto* apparently occurs more often in prose and colloquial verse (e.g., Hor. *serm.* 2.4.85-6). We should probably keep *tantum* with A. and T.

13.491

lacrimas in vulnere fundit
osculaue ore *tegit*

For *tegit* N. found in some witnesses *legit*, which was accepted by Heinsius and may be right. Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.684-5 *extremus si quis super halitus errat, / ore legam*; Sen. *H. Oet.* 1342 *spiritus fugiens meo legatur ore*. Von Albrecht's translation shows how difficult it is to extract any sense from *tegit*: "Tränen lässt sie auf die Wunde fließen, drückt das Mündchen auf den Mund...". N. does not include this passage in his notes.

13.518

quo, dii crudeles, nisi *uti* nova funera cernam?

N. observes 'In quibusdam nisi *quo nova funera*'. The reading *quo* for *uti* is known from Ω and was accepted by Heinsius and Merkel. According to Bömer (*ad loc.*), 'final *uti*' is rare in Ovid. He

cites another example from *met.* 10.21, where *MN^{ac}S* have *veluti* for *nec uti*, but here, *uti* clearly corresponds to *ut* (v. 20).

13.562

expellitque genis oculos (facit ira nocentem)

‘In nonnullis *expilatque genis. Utrumque recte*’. Among the MSS. known to the more recent editors, *MB* offer *expellitque*, while *NUFPT* have *expilatque* and *B^{1v}G* agree on *exspoliatque*, followed by *genas oculis*, which Heinsius found in two other witnesses and adopted. Planudes’ translation καὶ ἐκκόπτει may render *effoditque*. Ovid does not seem to use *expilare* and *exspoliare*. The verb *expellere* which he does use does not really fit here, as Heinsius saw. There is no parallel in the Ovid Concordance for *effodire*, but see *OLD*, p. 592 ‘*effodio*’ 2a “to gouge out (usually the eye)”, citing, e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 3.663 *luminis effossi ... lavit inde cruorem*. T. records two variants or conjectures for *nocentem* both of which give us the meaning we need: *potentem* and *valentem*. Heinsius liked both of them, but he had a slight preference for *potentem*, perhaps because the ‘ductus litterarum’ is closer to the paradosis.

13.610

*terque rogom lustrant, et consonus exit in auras
ter plangor*

This is from the beautifully told story of the origin of the Memnonides, the birds that were originally ashes blown into the air from Memnon’s pyre. First they fly around the pyre, uttering mournful sounds, and then they divide into two hostile groups which massacre each other, as a funeral offering for the hero. N. notes a variant *tum consonus* for *et consonus*, not recorded in the recent editions, but that is, perhaps, no great loss. What Ovid may have written is *et ter sonus* (Ciofani from a MS.). *Consonus*, ‘in unison’ or ‘harmonious’ seems pointless or even contradictory in this context, but the ritual number three repeated three times makes good sense. This reading (which Magnus, p. 509 extracted from *N*, though *A*. and *T*. are silent) should definitely be remembered. ETTERTSONVS may have

lost *ter* because of the sequence of similar letters, and *con* was interpolated to save the metre. A second *ter* gives us an anaphora, *ter... ter... ter*, preparing *quarto ... volatu* (see Bömer *ad loc.*). In v. 611 we have to decide between *plangor* (Ω), *clangor* ($l_4p\chi$, Heinsius) and *clamor* (*W*, according to A.). The recent editors are probably right in printing *plangor*. This suits the context of a ritual lament. There could be a distinction between *sonus* (if we accept this reading) and *plangor*, the latter expressing the beating of their wings; cf. 4.554; 6.532; 11.709. We have a similar 'varietas lectionis' in 12.528.

13.707

ferre diu nequiere *luem*

N. reports a variant *Iovem* but quotes Virg. *Aen.* 3.139-40 in support of *luem* which is found in *MW*³, but *Iovem* (Ω) in the sense of *caelum*, i. e. 'climate' or 'weather' must be right; cf. Mart. 7.36.1 *madidum ... Iovem perferre* and the material collected by Bömer *ad loc.*

13.713

praetereunt vecti

'In quibusdam *praeter erant vecti*' says N. This is the reading of Ω . Today, *praetereunt* is known from *BF^cG*. The tmesis of *praetervehor* (apparently the only such case in Ovid) was not recognized. See Bömer *ad loc.*, who also deals with postposition.

13.956

hactenus acta tibi possum *memoranda* referre

'Legitur et *miranda*'. Like some other variants that N. knew of — not all of them important — this one has disappeared from the *app. crit.* of the two recent editions, though Magnus cites it from unspecified 'recentiores'. *Miranda* could be a deliberate change because of *memini* in v. 956. The two lines (956-7) seem to be repetitious to some extent, but *nec mens mea cetera sensit* adds something new. There is no need to delete the line.

—BOOK 14—

14.6

navifragumque fretum

‘In vetustis *naufragumque* fretum, ut tamen quadrisyllabum sit velut id Virgilianum *et naufragum Scyllaceum*’. The variant is attested in *MGT*, three witnesses that fairly often agree. But here, as in Verg. *Aen.* 3.553 *navifragum Scyllaceum* (the passage N. had in mind), editors prefer the form *navifragus*; see also Stat. *Theb.* 5.415 *navifragis ... concurrere saxis*. In *fast.* 4.500 Ovid treats *naufraga* as trisyllabic (see Bömer on 11.628). A stroke representing *i* could easily be omitted after *u*. Though N. wrote such accomplished Latin verse, his prosodic speculations are not always to the point.

14.87

Acheloidumque relinquit
Sirenum scopulos

Here N. is clearly right about metrics: ‘Profecto paenultima *Acheloidum* syllaba brevis est: ideo fortasse *Acheloiadumque* legendum’. Most MSS., including *M* and *N*, have the incorrect form. N.’s conjecture is confirmed by *W* and *U*³; it is also attributed to Constantius Fanensis, whose corrections are sometimes identical with one of the later hands of *U*, most likely the fourth hand. It was N. who emended 15.386 (*Cythereiadasque*), a similar case of corruption. See also on 15.500 below and Bömer *ad loc.* on the forms in *-is* and *-ias*.

14.169

hac mihi si potior domus est *Ithaceque* carina

The form *Ithaceque*, apparently proposed by N., but not discussed in his notes, was found by T. in the *Laurentianus* 36.14 (s. XII) and some ‘recentiores’. Most witnesses have *Ithacique* (but *P* offers *Ithaci atque*). Cf. 13.711 where T. writes *Ithacenque* for *Ithacamque*. But this was already Heinsius’ idea. See my note on *Tristia* 1.5.67.

14.324-5

nec adhuc spectasse *tot annos*
quinquennem poterat Graia quater *edere* pugna

Picus was handsome, brave and not yet twenty. How old was he? About nineteen, Bömer says. It is often impossible, in Latin verse, to indicate an exact number. Ovid, the master of paraphrase, has chosen a reference to the Olympic Games. The general sense is clear, but the text has been corrupted in the *paradosis*. N. is aware of the problem and has this to say: 'In nonnullis *Graiam ... pugnam*, sed licet aperte quid sibi hic Ovidius velit, intelligatur, confusus tamen verborum ordo et sibi non quadrans, aliquid facit ut desideremus'. As often, he puts the finger on a difficulty and leaves the solution for someone else to find. In this case, it was found by Heinsius in the 'Excerpta' of Mathaeus Herculanensis. One has to recognize *Elide* in the senseless *edere* and combine this with *Graia ... pugnam*. Statius, *silv.* 2.6.72-4 may have this Ovidian passage in mind: *vitae modo germen adultae / nectere temptabat iuvenum pulcherrimus ille, / cum tribus Eleis unam trieterida lustris* (where *germen* is Saenger's correction for MS. *carmen*). Other proposals, such as Farnaby's *Graios quater edere pugnam* are less attractive, I think. In v. 324 *per annos* (*Basileensis unus in marg., Aldina prima*, Heinsius) must be right, meaning "because of his youth" (cf. *Pont.* 2.2.71 *praeterit ipse suos animo Germanicus annos*). Picus was too young to have seen four Olympic Games. *Tot annos* (A., following Ω) makes no sense. Bömer also prefers *per* without giving any specific reasons. There is no need to delete vv. 324-5 with Zwierlein, once an acceptable sense has been established.

14.371

et abest custodia *regis*

N., who does not include the passage in his textual notes, seems to have suggested *regi*, which appealed to Heinsius and was found in *h = Hauniensis 2008*, s. XII vel XIII. For *abesse* c. dat. see Verg. *Aen.* 7.498.

14.612

clarus subit Alba Latino

‘In omnibus *Clarus subit ecce Latino* ... Alba Latino successit: ideo nos *Alba*, non *ecce* legendum putavimus’. N. realized that a name was lost in the paradosis as he knew it. Almost all MSS. known to the more recent editors have *ecce Latino*; *U*³ has *ecce Latinum*, and *M* has *ecce Latinus*. N.s conjecture, *Alba*, is found in the ‘Excerpta Calandrae’, and Heinsius, who adopted it, also knew it from the ‘Codd. Moreti’. The same idea seems to have occurred to Poliziano, probably because he remembered *fasti* 4.42-3 *subit Alba Latinum ... proximus est titulis Epytus, Alba, tuis*. He does not mention the emendation in his commentary (ed. by Fr. L. Monaco, Florence 1991). In the sense of “to succeed to”, *subire* can have the dat. or the acc., but editors after Heinsius, again following the ‘Excerpta Calandrae’ and the ‘Codd. Moreti’, prefer *Latinum*. There is no evidence in N.s notes that he wanted to change *clarus* to *clarum*, as A. reports. This change was suggested by Heinsius ‘ex codd.’, it seems.

14.622

iamque Palatinae summam Proca gentis habebat

In all of his witnesses N. read *Palatinus summae loca*, and this seems to be the consensus of all the surviving MSS., except for *M*^c, which has *Palatinae*. N. recognized the interpolation because he could not remember having read anywhere that someone called *Palatinus* had ruled Alba. It is not true, however, that he suggested *summam Proca* himself, as Slater, followed by A., claims. From his notes, at least, it is quite clear that the emendation had been made before: ‘Qui hoc carmen [he means ‘hunc versum’] ita castigarunt, recte mihi sensisse visi sunt’. He probably refers to Poliziano. Heinsius objected to *gentis* and proposed *collis* (cf. *met.* 15.560) or *montis* or *rupis*. *Summa* = *potestas*, *regnum* seems to be unusual in poetry (Bömer *ad loc.*).

14.724

non tamen ante mihi curam excessisse memento

N. reports a variant *tui* for *mihi* which T. reports from *Mon. GT*. It appealed to Heinsius, who also proposed *curam cessisse* and *curam fugisse* (*fuisse B*). It could be argued that *tui* is necessary; because *cura* by itself does not indicate the object of his love (Bömer *ad loc.* compares 9.511 *mei ... amore*, etc.). On the other hand, *tui* could be a gloss that found its way into the text. But the other problem, as Heinsius saw, is the need for a verb that goes with *cura* and with *vita*, and *excedere* does not really provide that (Bömer *ad loc.*). One can say *e vita excessi* (Curtius 4.10.28), but is it possible to say *vita mihi excessit*? Just as Heinsius' *fugisse* could hide in *fuisse*, *cessisse* could hide in *egisse* (*MF^{ac}*), which was then, perhaps, expanded to *excessisse*, to fit the metre. Read probably with Heinsius and Ehwald *non tamen ante tui curam cessisse*. For *amor cedit*, cf. *rem. 752 dum bene de vacuo pectore cedit amor*. For *amor fugit*, cf. Prop. 1.12.12 *quantus in exiguo tempore fugit amor!* I have not yet found a good parallel for *vita cedit*; hence Heinsius' *fugisse* may be preferable; cf. Lucr. 5.887 *membra ... deficiunt fugienti languida vita*.

14.773

Numitor ... senex amissa *nepotis*
munere regna capit

For *nepotis* N. suggested *nepotum*, because both Romulus and Remus played a role in restoring their grandfather to the throne. The plural is also found in the *Laurentianus 36.8*, and Heinsius accepted it. But according to *fasti 3.68* Romulus played the decisive role; hence there is no need to go against the main paradosis (and Planudes). The passage is not included in the notes.

14.777

dignam animam poena congestis *exuit* armis

Tarpeia meets her just punishment under the shields of the enemy. For *exuit*, N. found a variant, *edidit* which is also attested by *B^cF^{2v}G*. Another variant, *eruit* ($\Delta F^l P$) may be a scribal error for *exuit*. Heinsius proposed *obruit*, on the basis of *eruit*. But there is another difficulty, as he pointed out: the phrase *anima*

digna poena seems hardly possible, and can *animam exuere* mean “to die”? The *ThIL* (V 2.2114.26ff), cited by Bömer, adduces only Solinus 30.22 *vitam exuunt* (where the *v. l. exeunt* would require *vita*). On the other hand, *animam (vitam, spiritum, aetatem) edere* is well attested; cf. e.g. *Her.* 9.62 *nempe sub his animam pestis Nemeaea lacertis / edidit* (and see *OLD* s.u. ‘edo’ 1 c). What remains to be done is to sort out the syntax, and Heinsius did it for us: read probably *digna animam poena congestis edidit armis*. One might consider Poliziano’s *coniectis* for *congestis*, but see *OLD* s. u. ‘congero’ 8 a/b. *Digna* could become *dignam* by faulty attraction to *animam*.

14.813

(*nam memoro, memorique animo pia verba notavi*)

‘In quibusdam *tua verba*’, says N. It seems that this variant survives in *MU*³⁰. *Pia verba* is not found anywhere else in classical poetry, according to Bömer *ad loc.*, who thinks of the *pietas* of the gods. Even though T. (like A.) prints *pia v.*, he cites 9.778 in support of *tua v.*, and A. Ramírez de Verger adds *Her.* 20.19 *tua verba notavit*. Slater has a fairly long note on this ‘locus dubius’, and Ehwald lists various attempts to emend the beginning of the line (*nam refero*, Heinsius or *sum memor! o*, Withof). Actually, *memoro* seems to have given offence in an earlier phase of the textual transmission, as we can tell from *memini* in the ‘Excerpta Mureti’ and other witnesses. Read probably *refero* with Heinsius; cf. 15.451, 814–5.

—BOOK 15—

15.150

palantesque homines passim *rationis egentes*

N. notes ‘In nonnullis *ac rationis egentes*, in aliis *ac ratione carentes*. Mihi *ac videtur superfluere*’. T. reports *ac* from *P*, *et* from *FG* (*om. UB*). We do not have *MN* for Book 15. Ovid seems to have in mind two passages from Lucretius: 2.9–10 *despicere unde queas alios passimque videre / errare atque viam palantis quaerere vitae* and 3.44 *nec prorsum quicquam*

nostrae rationis egere. The variant *ratione carentes* may be influenced by *am.* 1.10.25 (cf. *fast.* 3.119).

15.274

alioque renascitur orbe

N. found *ore* in some witnesses. This is the reading of *F¹PT*, and it is supported by the indirect tradition (*Sen. nat.* 3.26.3-4). But *orbe* is also well attested: *UBF¹G*, thirteen *Ambrosiani*, most witnesses known to Constantius Fanensis and Planudes. It seems possible in the sense of "region, part of the world", but Ovid may have in mind another opening (Bömer translates as "Mündung", von Albrecht as "Schlund"); cf. *Lucr.* 6.702; *Lucan.* 3.263.

15.386

armigerumque Iovis *Cythereidasque* columbas

'Fortasse *Cythereiadas* rectius, ne claudicet paenultima' says N. The emendation is attributed to Constantius Fanensis by A. It is also found in Ω and some of Heinsius' MSS. See below on v. 500 and above on 14.87. According to Bömer, *Cythereias* is 'hapax legomenon' but admissible in Ovid (*ad loc.* and on 14.34). The third or fourth hand of *U* often preserves emendations of Constantius Fanensis, as we have seen.

15.420

 sic *tempora* verti
cernimus

Today, *tempora* is known primarily from Ω , but N. is said to have introduced it, probably from a MS. (He says nothing in the notes). *Omnia* (*UP*) seems to be a repetition of *omnia* in the preceding verse. We should probably read *tempore* with Heinsius (also found in T.'s *w*).

15.500

Pasiphaeia

To restore the metre, N. seems to have introduced this form for

Pasipheia of most MSS.; Magnus found it in some ‘recentiores’. Cf. above on v. 386; 14. 87. Not in his notes.

15.503

(*indiciine metu magis offensane repulsae?*)

Here, the older MSS. have —*ne* ... -*ve* or —*ve* ... -*ve* or —*que*... -*ve* or —*que* ... -*que*. A. attributes —*ne* ... -*ne* to the *Laurentianus Strozianus 120*, s. XII and N.; T. reports it from his generic χ group. The reading itself seems to have appealed to editors. Not in the notes.

15.606

per confusa *fremetis*
verba tamen populi vox eminet una

Fremetis is attributed to N.; all MSS. seem to have *tremetis*. Cf. 1.199; 244; Tac. *ann.* 6.9.3. Not in the notes.

15.824

Emathiique iterum madefient caede Philippi

Most MSS. have *Emathiaque* or —*aeque*. The correct form, attributed to N., is also found in an *Ambrosianus*, a *Guelferbytanus* (see A.), a *Harleianus* and a *Parisinus* (see Slater). T. reports it doubtfully from *F* and from his φ group. See Mynors on Verg. *georg.* 1.491. Not in the notes¹.

GEORG LUCK
The Johns Hopkins University
georgluck@comcast.net

¹I wish to thank my friend A. Ramírez de Verger for his invaluable help, his encouragement and for the opportunity to publish my ideas. He has corrected a number of errors, contributed new insights and given me the benefit of his erudition and his critical judgement. I am also grateful to my wife, Harriet R. G. Luck, for reading an earlier draft and suggesting changes. I am deeply indebted to Miryam Librán Moreno for the great care she has devoted to this article in preparing it for publication.