

## NOTES ON THE TEXT OF OVID'S *REMEDIA AMORIS*<sup>1</sup>

Part I examines various readings about which there persists editorial or other disagreement, Part II argues that six couplets are not from Ovid's hand. The lemmata give the reading of the Oxford Classical Text (Kenney, 1961/5), followed by the rejected variants and any conjectures. 'Goold' = G. P. Goold, 'Amatoria Critica', *HSCP* 69 (1965), 1-107. 'Geisler' = H. J. Geisler, *P. Ovidius Naso Remedia Amoris mit Kommentar zu Vers 1-396* (Inaugural Dissertation, Berlin, 1969). Normally only the principal manuscripts are cited individually. The sigla are those of the Oxford Classical Text, with the addition of Y (Bero-linsensis Hamiltonensis 471 manus prima), y (eiusdem manus tertia) and Y<sup>2</sup> (eiusdem manus quarta [*sic*]).<sup>2</sup>

### I

65 redde Parin nobis, Helenen Menelaus habebit  
redde codd.: crede Heinsius, prob. Bentley, Goold

The objections to *redde* (Goold, 95) are empty. The imperative is co-ordinate with *da* (63 and 64) in anaphora, and must therefore be regarded as synonymous with *da*. Cf. 31-3 *effice . . . fac*, the reverse pattern, 175-9 *aspice . . . aspice . . . ecce*, and for more complex examples A.A. 1. 61-5, 159-61, 3. 145-7, 393-5.<sup>3</sup> For *reddere* = *dare*, 'evanida praepositionis vi', see Forcellini s.v. *reddo* II, and cf. (e.g.) Virg. *Aen.* 9. 253-5, Ovid, *Met.* 6.122, 11. 608, 13. 26 (*iura r.*), *Her.* 18. 10. Geisler's explanation, that *aliquem reddere* = *alicuius vitam reddere*, 'noch einmal leben lassen', creates difficulties with *nobis* and ignores the anaphora. The sense of 65 is not 'Restore Paris (to me) and Menelaus will not be cuckolded' but 'Suppose (one could put the clock back and) I could instruct Paris, then Menelaus would not be cuckolded'. The construction, imperative followed by future indicative in consequential asyndeton, is simply a humorous *variatio* of the prevailing past unreal conditional form of the catalogue.

88 nunc stat in immensum viribus aucta suis  
aucta yK<sup>2</sup> ζ: acta RYK<sup>1</sup> ζ

*acta* still has its adherents (e.g. Lenz 1960/9 (Berlin) and 1965 (Paravia, Turin)), despite Burman's note (1727). Were the point of Ovid's simile the *height* attained by the tree, then *acta* might conceivably pass muster; but the poet is speaking of its overall increase in *size* (primarily spread), for which *aucta* is essential. Note the exact chiasmic correspondence across the two couplets, 85 *latas umbras*>

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Professors P. G. Walsh, N. Rudd, and E. J. Kenney for their comments on the original version of these notes, which they saw *alia sub imagine*. It is hoped that their criticisms have been adequately taken into account here. I am indebted to Mr. Ian Du Quesnay for the loan of his copy of Geisler.

<sup>2</sup> See F. Munari, *Il Codice Hamilton 471 di Ovidio* (Rome, 1965), p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> On the picking up of the simple verb by the compound and vice versa (though without specific reference to anaphora), see L.-H.-S. ii, *Stilistik*, § 49.c.a. On the anaphora of synonyms (though without specific reference to 'simplex pro composito' or vice versa), see H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (Munich, 1960), §§ 629-30, 656.

<88 in immensum aucta; 86 virga fuit><87 poterat summa tellure revelli.

112 certa debuerat praeseuisse manu

certa debuerat K<sup>1</sup>, edd.: caetera debuerat RY: debuerat celeri y(cael-)Eω: celeri debuerat K<sup>2</sup>

The β-reading *debuerat celeri* commends itself for the following reasons: (a) The theme of this first section of the *tractatio* is the need for speedy action (see especially 80–1, 91, 95). In the immediate vicinity there occur *serior* (109), *post multos annos* (113), *tardam* and *lentus* (116), all desiderating an antithetic *celeri* rather than *certa*, which introduces the allied but unwanted (because already assumed) notion of resolve to act. For the phrase cf. A. A. 3. 576 'quae fugiunt, celeri carpite poma manu' (where again *certa* would give good, but not the best, sense). (b) Ovid repeatedly reverts to certain key words in order to hammer home his advice: 81 *mala (semina)*, 92 *mala* (subst.), 106 *mala (arbor)*; 83 *mora* (bis), 92 *moras*, 95 *morando*, 102 *morae*; 90 *laesuro*, 111 *laesus fuerat*; 91 *sero*, 109 *serior*; 93 *propera*, 115 *properabam*; 93 *differ*, 102 *dilatam*. At 89 we find *celeri mente*; the reappearance of *celer*, plainly a thematic word, would fit this pattern, especially as Ovid tends to pick up in an illustrative passage a word first used in an expository one, or vice versa, often with a slight shift of meaning (e.g. 83 *mora* = 'passage of time', 95 *morando* = 'delay(ing)'; 93 *differ* = 'put off' (with reflexive object, an Ovidian neologism), 102 *dilatam* = 'neglected', 'untreated'.)<sup>4</sup> (c) The order *certa debuerat* (spondee-word + choriamb-word) is not preferred by Ovid for the beginning of the line. In the pentameters of the *Remedia* (and probably elsewhere) the reverse order is the norm, unless there are overriding syntactical, prosodic, or euphonic grounds for abandoning it; cf. 58, 164, 272, 280, 374, 444, 456, 528, 576, 728, 812. *debuerat certa* would conform, but this order significantly lacks a witness. The reading of RY is unlikely to have arisen from a metathetic miscopying of the familiar *certa*. A spelling *caeleri* (preserved by y) would account for it, *caeleri* being misread as *caeteri*,<sup>5</sup> which was then altered to *caetera* and brought to the front of the line to mend the metre. K<sup>2</sup>'s unmetrical *celeri debuerat* may come from an exemplar in which *celeri* appeared as a supralinear correction of *caetera*. That the phrase *supremam manum* frames the pentameter at 114 does not seem sufficient to authenticate *certa manu* (likewise framing);<sup>6</sup> the epithets are not pointedly antithetic, whereas *supremam* and *celeri* might be considered so (cf. above).

135 ergo ubi visus eris nostrae medicabilis arti

nostrae . . arti RYKs: nostra . . arte yEω, prob. Goold

An instrumental dative with *medicabilis* is highly improbable; nor can *nostrae arti* = *mibi meaeque arti*, as Geisler opines, introducing a dative of agent which would bring this example into line with certain others in Ovid.<sup>7</sup> On the other

<sup>4</sup> It is possible that Ovid is seeking to reproduce a technique of Lucretian argumentation examined by David West in *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius* (Edinburgh, 1969), ch. 4, esp. pp. 43 ff. ('transfusion of terms'). The opening of the *tractatio* is heavily indebted for its matter to DRN 4. 1063 ff. and 1141 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the confusion between *l* and *t* at Ovid, *Fast.* 3. 726 (*vitis*-, *vilis*), on which see P. Maas, *Textual Criticism* (1958), Appendix II ad fin.

<sup>6</sup> As suggested to me by Professor Kenney.

<sup>7</sup> See Goold, 96, Geisler, ad loc. To Goold's comment on *Met.* 9.262 *populabile*

hand it is extremely awkward to construe *nostrae arti* with *visus eris*, meaning *mibi arte medendi perito* (Ovid never turns himself into an abstraction in this way), and deprive *medicabilis* of its expected qualification. The remedy lies to hand in the  $\beta$ -reading, an instrumental ablative. The copyist who felt the lack of a referent for *visus eris* and accordingly altered the ablative to the dative was however correct in thinking that it should be *mibi* (or *nobis*), not *tibi* (as Goold assumes; refuted by Geisler: 'der Arzt, nicht der Patient, muss über den richtigen Zeitpunkt entscheiden').

143 tam Venus otia amat: qui finem quaeris amoris  
 amoris RYEK $\omega$ [Plan.], edd.: amoris, Heinsius in adnot. ex codd.

The dative is supported by A. A. 1. 49 'tu quoque, materiam longo qui quaeris amoris', despite Prop. 2. 15. 29 'errat, qui finem vesani quaerit amoris', for Ovid's first concern is to avoid homoeoteleuton. Although he admits *reddis amoris* at the end of the line in 643, this particular terminal homoeoteleuton is rigorously avoided in his elegiac hexameters (elsewhere only *Fast.* 4. 223 *spectabilis Attis*, *Trist.* 1. 1. 113 *satis oris habebis*, 5. 1. 35 *carminis inquis*). Even in his pentameters there appear to be but seven instances, all of which involve a final *eris* (*Am.* 1. 3. 16, 1. 6. 70, A. A. 1. 728, *Her.* 7. 52, *Fast.* 3. 624, 6. 54, *Ex P.* 2. 6. 34). With *finem dare/facere/imponere*, etc., a dative is perhaps marginally commoner than a genitive in verse.<sup>8</sup>

161 quaeritis, Aegisthus quare sit factus adulter?  
 quaeritis RY $\varsigma$ , edd.: quaeritur yEK $\omega$ [Plan.], prob. Goold

See Goold, 97. Ovid consistently addresses a single reader/patient throughout the *tractatio*, except at 441 (*habeatis*), 709 (*conferte*), and 779 (*mibi credite*). Of these plural verbs the first is necessary to avoid ambiguity with the distributive *binas*, while the last is perhaps allowable as an aside of a formulaic character. Only *conferte* represents a genuine lapse (cf. 707 *confer*, 713 *confer* again; the paragraph patently lacks final revision — *quoque* in 709 is badly misplaced). At 433 the plural is generalizing ('luditis, o si quos potuerunt ista movere'). Ovid has the singular *quaeris* or *quaere* no fewer than seven times elsewhere in the *tractatio* (143, 221, 308, 487, 539, 544, 803); so *quaeritis* is anomalous. He could have chosen *quaeris* here, although the result (given the wording of this particular *exemplum*) would be intolerably spondaic: 'Aegisthus quare sit factus, quaeris, adulter.'<sup>9</sup> *quaeritur* has a considerable metrical advantage. If the impersonal usage strikes one as odd and without a close parallel in Ovid,<sup>10</sup> it may be suggested that *quaeritur quare* and the following *causa* (162), like *quale sit* earlier (89), are intended to remind the reader of *status*-doctrine,<sup>11</sup> for no better reason than that the notion of attempting to treat a broken heart by means akin to the cerebral procedures of the barrister is intrinsically funny.

*flammae* one might add that the epithet itself helps to 'personalize' the dative, since *populari* is essentially a human activity.

<sup>8</sup> TLL vi, s.v. *finis* sub *fin.* ('iuncturae').

<sup>9</sup> For the characteristic hyperbaton cf. 8, 641, *Trist.* 1.1.18.

<sup>10</sup> *Met.* 15.1 gives little support, as the context is so different (Geisler).

<sup>11</sup> Cf., e.g., Cic. *Top.* 82 (*status coniecturalis*: 'coniecturae ratio in quattuor partes distributa est, quarum . . . tertia [est cum quaeritur] quae id causa effecerit . . .'), 84 (s. *generalis*, 'cum . . . quaeritur quale quid sit'; cf. *Or.* 45, *Part.* 61 ff., etc.); Lausberg, op. cit., § § 123 ff.

184 quid, cum suppositos fugiunt examina fumos

suppositos ω: compositos RYEK<sup>2</sup> (corr. ex -as)

Whether or not *fumum supponere* (*alvo*) is intelligible (and one could not fumigate ancient beehives from beneath), there is no call to reject *compositos*. The defence of it offered by Lenz,<sup>12</sup> however, that it signifies *undique concretos* or *coortos*, i.e. *densos*, is both unconvincing and irrelevant.<sup>13</sup> *compositus* = *συνθετός*, 'compound'; i.e. the smoke is produced by the combustion of more than one ingredient. Cf. Columella 9. 15. 5 'fumum admovebimus factum galbano vel arido fimo; ea [*sic*] porro vase fictili prunis immixta conduntur', Pallad. 7. 7. 2 (galbanum *and* cow-dung). The adj. occurs in medical writings (e.g. Cels. 5. 28. 18, 6. 6. 28), as do the nouns *compositum* and *compositio* (Scrib. Larg. 38, Plin. *N. H.* 25. 175) for drugs made from two or more substances (opp. *medicamentum simplex*). At 350 below Ovid has *compositis venenis*, *φαρμάκοις συνθέτοις*, for the lotions and creams with which the lady plasters her face. As an epithet of *fumus* in a poem of this kind, *compositus* is certainly somewhat recherché. It must be recognized, however, that Ovid is always ready to introduce the 'right' technical term where he can for the sake of *fides* (credibility). Posing as an expert in one field, he seeks to augment his air of authority by a judicious use of jargon culled from others. From the vocabulary of the medical profession, for example, come *primum auxilium* (107), *advocor* (110), *opem admove* (116), *implere* (*vulnus*) (129), along with *contagia* (613) and the intriguing *transitio* (sc. *morbi*) (616).

221 nec quot transieris, sed quot tibi, quaere, supersint

sed codd., edd.: nec Damsté, prob. Goold

Damsté's correction (*Mnem.* 39 (1911), 446) is categorically necessary. The last thing the still-distraught lover would do is plan an itinerary before galloping off into the sunset and oblivion. See Goold, 98 f.

268 longus et invito pectore sedit Amor

et RYKω: in *Es*, prob. Goold: at [*Plan.*], Heinsius ex codd.

*in* preserves the pattern of adversative asyndeton in 265–8; the preposition was an easy victim of haplography before *invito* (see Goold, 61 f.). *amor*, not *Amor*, should be read here; cf. 108 'et vetus in capto pectore sedit amor', an identical type of metaphor, where *vetus Amor* is clearly grotesque.

351 tum quoque, compositis sua cum linit ora venenis

sua cum linit K<sup>2</sup> (sscr.) ε: sua cum linit EK<sup>2</sup> (*ut vid.*) ε: cum linit RY: sua collinet K<sup>1</sup>: cum collinet ε, prob. Goold

Read *cum collinet* (Goold, 100 f.). The future tense is essential, *sua* is wholly otiose, the compound verb is more vivid and continues the alliteration of *c*. The Plautine parallel mentioned by Goold is *Poen.* 826 'neque tam luteus neque tam caeno conlitus', the Horatian (*Od.* 1. 15. 20) 'serus adulteros/cultus pulvere collines.' In Horace, as in Ovid, *collinere* is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον.

<sup>12</sup> *SIFC* 29 (1957), 14. Cf. p. 66 of his Paravia text and p. 82 of his Berlin (1969) edition.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. E. J. Kenney, *SIFC* 30 (1968), 172 n. 2.

## 364 qui volet, impugnent unus et alter opus

qui volet  $\Upsilon^2 E\zeta$  [Plan.]: quod volet RYK $\varsigma$ : quamlibet Heinsius ex codd., prob. Bentley, Goold: quod solet S. Bailey

*qui volet* has been unjustifiably suspected. It forms a familiar enough *enallage numeri* or *synesis*,<sup>14</sup> cf., e.g., 711 'utraque formosae Paridi potuere videri.' Heinsius' *quamlibet* has its attractions, for the word is 'very Ovidian', as he says, but to read it here would spoil the development of the thought. Having stated in 361 that *quidam* have attacked the *Ars Amatoria* for its immorality, Ovid contemptuously extends an open invitation to anyone else who wishes to have a go at it — there will not be many (*unus et alter*).<sup>15</sup>

## 435 attrahet ille puer contentos fortius arcus

attrahet RYEK $\omega$ : attrahat  $\varsigma$  prob. Bentley, Goold

The subjunctive alone is capable of indicating the conditional relationship of the hexameter to the pentameter: 'Suppose he were to take a longer, stronger pull on his bow, you will (would in fact) all go running *en masse* for stronger medicines to soothe your wounds.' Such 'primitive' mixed-mood parataxis in lieu of a formal conditional sentence is not uncommon.<sup>16</sup>

## 446 laesaque diducto stipite flamma perit

laesaque K<sup>2</sup> (v.l.): haesaque RY: cassaque r: magnaue E: totaque K<sup>1</sup>: saevaue Merkel, prob. Goold: spissaque Luck, coll. Met. 15. 250 'ignis enim densum spissatus in aera transit', vix recte (vide Bühler, Gnom. 34 (1962), 787): densaque ego olim dubitanter (ined.): lataque P. G. Walsb (ined.), coll. Plin. Epist. 6. 16. 13 'latissimae flammae altaque incendia relucebant', unde et lataque duci poterat

Kenney, though admitting that '*laesa* is not what one expects after *grandia* in 445' nevertheless prints it in inference to *a*.<sup>17</sup> But it is not certain that *a* read *laesaque*. Goold (103) argues that *laesaque* is the reading of  $\beta$ , *haesaque* of  $\alpha$ , both coming from an archetypal *saelaque*, a simple corruption of *saevaue*. Ovid observes strict parallelism in paired illustrations, as a rule, and an epithet to balance *grandia* may be posited with some confidence. A simple quantitative adj. like E's *magna* would do, but that is too colourless, unmistakably a stopgap correction to give ready sense. But *grandia* carries more than a merely quantitative meaning. The theme of this section is *vires amoris altero amore subtrahere* (444); so *grandia* implies *violenta* or the like, to which *saeva* — of all the recorded variants and conjectures — answers best. In fact each epithet acts *metaleptically*<sup>18</sup> on the other, fusing quantitative and qualitative notions. Ovid's two comparisons recur at Quintil. 5. 13. 13 'urgent universa [sc. argumenta]; at si singula quaeque dissolveris, iam illa flamma, quae magna congerie convaluerat, diductis quibus alebatur concidit, ut, si vel maxima flumina in rivos diducantur, qualibet transitum praebent.' From *convaluerat* one might perhaps extract *valida*, which would underwrite Ovid's stronger *saeva*; but it proves nothing.

<sup>14</sup> L.-H.-S. ii. 438; K.-S. i. 24 f.

<sup>15</sup> See further Kenney, 'Notes on Ovid: II', CQ N.S. 9 (1959), 258.

<sup>16</sup> S. A. Handford, *The Latin Subjunctive* (London, 1947), pp. 117 ff.; L.-H.-S. ii. 657.

<sup>17</sup> Kenney, 'Notes on Ovid: II', 259. Cf. id., CQ N.S. 12 (1962), 27.

<sup>18</sup> See Servius on *Aen.* 1.165 *atrum nemus* for an explanation of this trope. A similar interaction between epithets can be seen at *Rem.* 251–2 'ista veneficii VETUS est via; noster Apollo/INNOCUAM sacro carmine monstrat opem', where *vetus* = '(harmful) old' and *innocuam* = 'harmless (new)'.

465 et, ne forte putes nova me tibi condere iura  
et ne *codd.*, *edd.*: ac ne Bentley, *prob.* Goold

In his note on Hor. *Od.* 1. 18. 7 *ac nequis* Bentley proposed to emend *et* here to *ac*: 'Sic editio prima & duo scripti, ut fatetur praestantissimus Heinsius. Vulgo ET. Ipse nullo praeunte codice reposuit AT. Non dubito, quin, si haec nostra vidisset [parallels for *ac ne* from Hor. *Ep.* 1. 1. 13, 1. 19. 26, 2. 1. 208], mutasset factum.' But *ac*, as distinct from *atque*, is absent from Ovid's *carmina amatoria*, and very rare indeed in his epistolary and narrative elegiacs. The combination *ac ne* is nowhere satisfactorily attested. For *et ne* cf. *A. A.* 2. 393, *Met.* 1. 159, 2. 402, 10. 583 (if an initial trochee is wanted, Ovid does not scruple to write *neve*). At *Am.* 3. 2. 75 *ac ne* is a correction by p of *agne* (PY), which remained unchanged in Y until Pontanus (Munari's 'Y<sup>4</sup>') wrote in *et ne*; the vulgate has *at ne*, adopted by most editors.

467 vidit id Atrides: quid enim non ille videret  
id *E5*: et *rs*, *prob.* Goold: ut RYK

Goold's advocacy (103 f.) of *et* does not convince, for two reasons: (a) A Latin reader would not in fact 'expect the construction to be *vidit haec iura Atrides*'; he or she would however expect an object to be expressed. *id* = *id ius*, viz. *omnem amorem successore novo vinci* (462). (b) The passage is not 'steeped in heavy sarcasm.' Agamemnon, for once, is not portrayed as 'an egregious blunderer in the amatory art (outdimmed by his brother alone)', but as an authority, in a quasi-legal sense, to whom Ovid can appeal when he runs the risk of appearing too advanced, too daring for his conservative Roman clientele. Naturally Ovid has his tongue in his cheek all the while, but his face is otherwise quite straight, with no sneer. Cf. 777 ff. (Agamemnon not so dumb after all).

477 hanc mihi, si sapiat, per se concedat Achilles  
concedat RYK5, *edd.*: concedet *E5*, *prob.* Goold

The mood and tense of the verbs of the parallel apodoses in 477 and 478 must correspond: *si sapiat, concedet* . . . ; *si minus (sapiat), sentiet*. The minatory nature of Agamemnon's remarks demands the vivid future indicative; the standard 'ideal' present subjunctive is retained in the protases.<sup>19</sup>

487 quaeris ubi invenias? artes tu perlege nostras  
*Artes scribendum, non artes*

Ovid plainly refers to the *Ars Amatoria* by name (so Bornecque and Lenz). It is in that work that the answer to the question 'quaeris ubi invenias [sc. novas flammas]?' is contained. Cf. *A. A.* 1. 151 'non ego quaerentem vento dare vela iubebo' (the nautical metaphor resurfaces here at 488 'plena puellarum iam tibi navis erit'). The poet uses the singular or the plural as metre dictates.<sup>20</sup>

492 frigidior dominae fac videre tuae  
dominae RYKω: glacie Itali, *prob.* Heinsius, Goold tuae *codd.*: nive Housman

<sup>19</sup> See H. C. Nutting, 'The form *si sit* . . . erit', *UCPCP* 8. 2 (1926), 187 ff.

the index of S. G. Owen's *O. C. T.* (1915) of the *Tristia* etc.

<sup>20</sup> As may conveniently be seen, e.g., in

*glacie* is desiderated both by the contrasted term *Aetna* (491) and by the comparative *frigidior* (see Goold, 104). *dominae* has displaced *glacie* either as a result of deliberate editing or through starting life as a supralinear or marginal gloss on *tuae*. In both cases we may blame failure to comprehend the shorthand erotic use of *meus*, *tuus*, etc. (usually feminine), for which cf. Hor. *Od.* 1. 15. 32, Prop. 1. 9. 22, 3. 8. 22, Ovid, *A. A.* 1. 322, 2. 557, etc.

512 (hoc etiam nostra munus ab arte feres)

*Arte scribendum, non arte*

The parenthesis is usually understood to say 'This is another benefit you will derive from my expert knowledge (*ars*).' But why should Ovid describe this particular observation (511) as a bonus (*etiam*)? It is integral to the argument that serves to 'prove' the precept 'quod non es, simula, positosque imitare furores:/sic facies vere, quod meditatus eris' (497-8). Ovid has already directed the reader once to his *Ars* (487); the present passage affords him the opportunity to advertise it again: 'She'll soon become less high-and-mighty when she sees you're losing interest. (This is a lesson you'll learn from my *Ars Amatoria* too.)' The reference is to *A. A.* 1. 715 ff. 'si tamen a pedibus tumidos accedere fastus/senseris, incepto parce referque pedem./quod refugit, multae cupiunt; odere, quod instat./lenius instando taedia tolle tui.'

632 et multam saliens incitat unda sitim

multam  $K^2$  (v.l.), *Itali, prob. Heinsius*: multum  $RYEK^1 \omega$  [*Plan.*]

The adverb *multum* (with *incitat*, not with *saliens*; for the hyperbaton cf. 791 *nimum*) is required to complete the parallelism of hexameter and pentameter. *unda saliens multum incitat sitim* = *unda saliente multum incitaber sitiens* = *sitiens non facile retinebere unda saliente* (*visa* vel sim.), so answering to 631 'non facile esuriens posita retinebere mensa.'

651 flumine perpetuo torrens solet altior ire

altior  $RE\zeta$  [*Plan.*]: altius  $K\omega$ : acrior  $y$ , *coniecerat Reise ex acrius, lectione in aliquot Heinsii codicibus adservata*

The contrast between the *flumen perpetuum* or *perenne* and the *torrens brevis* is not one of depth, but of speed and force. With *acrior* the aqueous illustration exactly matches in form the igneous one in the previous couplet, as expected, both being designed to prove that 'slow and certain' is better than 'impetuous and doubtful'.

658 aut amat aut aegre desinet esse miser

desinet  $RY\zeta$ : desinit  $E^2 K^2 \zeta$ : desinat  $E^1 K^1 \omega$

*desinit* is the logical tense, not *desinet* (the mood must be indicative). *aut amat aut aegre desinit* (*amare*) offers two mutually exclusive explanations: 'either he is in love < and not really capable of stopping >, or he is < trying to stop but > experiencing great difficulty in stopping.' *amat* contains the assumption *non desinit* and the inference *aegre desinet*; *amat* and *aegre desinet* therefore cannot be alternatives. One might write *et amat et aegre desinet*, but given the disjunctive form of the proposition, the tenses must be the same, i.e. present.

704 utque facis, coeptis, Phoebe saluber, ades

utque facis  $r(atque R)K^2(v.l.)\zeta$ : utque faves  $EK^1\zeta$ : ut faveas  $y(-eas\ ex\ corr.)\omega$ : tuque favens Parisinus lat. 7994, teste Lenz (tuque faveas apud Kenney): tuque fave Oxoniensis Bibl. Bodl. Canon. class. lat. 1

Goold (104 f.), believing that Parisinus latinus 7994 read *faveas*, conjectured *tuque favens* with its help and that of the Oxoniensis. This is apparently a transmitted reading anyway, and is clearly right. *favens adesse* has the weight of Virgil behind it (*Ge.* 1. 18 'adsis, o Tegeae, favens'). *utque facis* is illogical in conjunction with the imperative *ades*, while *utque faves* anticipates what Ovid asks for, Apollo's blessing on the last lap. The change of addressee from the readers (703 *parete*) to Phoebus probably demands the presence of *tu*.

713 nec solam faciem, mores quoque confer et artem  
artem  $RYK\zeta$ : artes  $yE\zeta$

The plural alone makes sense (see Goold, 106). There is nothing in the context to which a singular *artem* could refer (e.g. her singing or dancing, as in 333 ff.).

731 ut, paene extinctum cinerem si sulphure tangas  
vivit, et e minimo maximus ignis erit  
732 vivit  $rE\omega$ : vivit  $RYK\zeta$  [Plan.]

The present indicative is normal in the apodosis of generalizing conditions having a present subjunctive in the protasis.<sup>21</sup> Cf., e.g., A. A. 2. 180 'frangis [sc. ramum], si vires experire tuas.' That the sentence continues 'et e minimo maximus ignis erit' has no bearing on the tense of *vivere*, because although formally part of the apodosis, these words express the future *result* of the fulfilling of the condition: 'si tangas . . . vivit; ita maximus ignis erit (= fit).'

756 †quid caveas† actor, qua iuvat arte, nocet

quid . . . qua iuvat . . . docet  $RY$ : quid . . . qua iuvat . . . nocet  $E$ : quid . . . quid iuvat . . . nocet  $K$ : quod . . . quam iuvat . . . docet *Camps, prob. Goold*

Kenney proposed to doctor the text of E very slightly, to give 'id (or *tu*) caveas; actor, qua iuvat arte, nocet' (i.e. *ea arte, qua iuvat, nocet*).<sup>22</sup> The solution proposed by Camps and published by Goold (106 f.) involves altering the text of  $RY$  by an even smaller amount and produces subtler and better (i.e. apter) sense: 'quod caveas, actor, quam iuvat, arte docet', i.e. *actor arte docet quam iuvat (id) quod caveas*. *caveas* may be oblique<sup>23</sup> rather than jussive.

758 summoveo dotes ipsius ipse meas  
ipsius  $RY\zeta$ : impius  $yEK\omega$ , prob. Goold

Read *impius*: 'Here I am withdrawing my own gifts — it's sacrilege!' Ovid's veto on the reading of love poetry is an act of impiety, since he is the servant of Cupid, and an act of disloyalty to the *collegium poetarum tenerorum*, of which he is a member. *ipsius* represents a false expansion of *ipius* (see Goold, 97). Not only has

<sup>21</sup> Handford, op. cit., pp. 133 f. (§149).

<sup>22</sup> Op. cit. [n. 17], p. 260. The relationship of *id/tu caveas* to the rest of the couplet is not made wholly clear; presumably it is to stand as an independent prohibition

with reference back to 757.

<sup>23</sup> i.e. a reported form of *quid caveam*? See Handford, op. cit., §§ 72 f. and n. 1 on p. 65.



778 illam Plisthenio gaudia ferre viro  
viro *r(ex oiro R)YEKω*: toto *r(sscr.)*

II

(1) nam poteras uti nudis ad bella sagittis, 25  
sed tua mortifero sanguine tela carent.  
25 longis *Ec* 26 calēt *Palmer*: madent *Ehwald*

<sup>24</sup> H<sub>1</sub> in Lenz, 1965, H<sub>2</sub> in Lenz, 1969.  
<sup>25</sup> Deleted by Damsté, *Mnem.* 39 (1911),  
 445.  
<sup>26</sup> Deleted by Heinsius.  
<sup>27</sup> Deleted by L. Müller, *RbM* 17 (1862),  
 541.  
<sup>28</sup> Bracketed by Bornecque (1929)  
 without comment or explanation.  
<sup>29</sup> *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 3 (1978).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Lenz (1965), app. crit. ad loc.: 'distichon mihi quoque valde suspectum' see however his note in the 1969 edition (pp. 78 f.).

part of the speech will expose the flaw: 'You drive unhappy lovers to suicide – you've got yourself a bad name (17–20). Give them a break, and yourself (21–2). Play instead, as a little lad should; kindly rule is fitting for one of your age (23–4). *For you could use bare arrows for (your) wars, but your weapons are free from lethal blood* (or, *have no part in lethal bloodshed*) (25–6). Don't copy your stepfather and butcher people bloodthirstily (27–8), but be like your peaceable mother (29–30), limit your activities to what elegiac convention expects (31–6), and by so doing restore your reputation (37–8).' It is evident that a testimonial to Cupid's forbearance is quite out of place; Ovid is actually attempting to persuade him to hold his fire. It is possible to bring the couplet into a more satisfactory relationship with its context by emendation to reverse the sense of 26: *calent, madent*, or *tepent* for *carent*, but the paradox seems entirely trustworthy; new meanings have also then to be found for *nudis* and *mortifero*.<sup>33</sup> Korzeniewski argues that 25–6 are indispensable for the 'Harmonie' of the passage, pointing to the multiple correspondences between 25–6 and 27–8 (e.g. *sagittis* – *gladiis et hasta*; *sanguine* – *cruentus*). But some of these are illusory, others exactly what a competent imitator with his eye on 27–8 could hardly fail to bring out. In fact a far more artistic and Ovidian balance and pattern (chiastic antithesis) emerge if 25–6 are removed: 23–4 Cupid + 27–8 Mars > < 29–30 Venus + Cupid.<sup>34</sup> It is not difficult to perceive how the couplet came to be added. If one ignores the context, then the words 'decent annos mollia regna tuos' (24) can read like a flat statement approving Cupid's present conduct (as if Ovid had written *tua mollia regna annos tuos decent*). *ludere* in 23 and 24 possibly suggested *telis ludere*, to practise with weapons, not use them in earnest (cf. *Trist.* 4. 1. 72 'nec nisi lusura movimus arma manu', Cic. *De Or.* 2. 84, Hor. *A.P.* 379). A reference to Cupid's weapons would not indeed be inappropriate, in view of 27–8, though redundant, precisely because of 27–8. The hexameter, while original, lacks any semblance of poetic distinction; the pentameter has been put together from recollections of *Fast.* 1. 123 'sanguine letifero totus miscetur orbis', *Ex. P.* 3. 1. 26 'tinctaque mortifera tabe sagitta madet', and perhaps other verses.

(2) sed nimium properas; vivam modo, plura dolebis, 391  
et capiunt anni carmina multa mei.

391 capient *rEK*ω 392 animi *E<sup>1</sup>K<sup>2</sup>* (*v.l.*)ω

The centre of the poem (361–98) is given over to a vigorous defence of the *Ars* against its few reactionary critics. At 389 Ovid apostrophizes them, in the traditional manner of the love poet, as Envy ('rumpere, Livor edax'). He continues: 'I am famous already, and will be more famous still, provided I keep up my good start. . . . For I enjoy fame, and the more famous I am, the more ambitious I become; I haven't really got going yet (393–4).' Into this declaration 391–2 do not fit at all happily. The sequence of thought from 390 to 393 (*nam*) is dislocated by a return to the apostrophizing of Livor; and this renewed address itself is strangely incoherent. (a) After the gleeful command *rumpere*, 'sed

<sup>33</sup> For the morass into which this leads, see G. Luck, *Philol.* 106 (1962), 147 f. In his *Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte Ovids* (Heidelberg, 1969), pp. 45 f., Luck attributes the couplet to a Carolingian copy-

ist who found 25–6 illegible through wear and tear.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Geisler (p. 150): 'Die Harmonie des Aufbaus leidet unter der Athetese nicht.'

nimum properas' is tantamount to saying 'but don't burst yet.' (b) 'vivam modo' makes the reservation in 390 ('tantum, quo pede coepit, eat' [sc. nomen meum]) quite immaterial.<sup>35</sup> (c) The pentameter is a *non sequitur* after 'vivam modo.' The speaker's doubts in 391 about his survival have miraculously given way to the certainty that he is going to live to produce many works (*animi* may represent an attempt to improve the sense, though it is far more likely a mere blunder; *animus* and *annus* are constantly confused). *et* is extremely awkward; a *nam* would help to conceal the basic lack of logic, but there is no reason to suppose that the initial words of 392 and 393 have become transposed, although 'et iuvat et studium. . . .' (394) would give good sense (but 'nam iuvat . . .' follows on naturally from 390, as shown above). (d) *capiunt* = *continent* can be paralleled easily enough, but not with a subject like *anni*. The full meaning of the verb here is in fact rather *capiunt et mox proferent*.<sup>36</sup> In conclusion, it may be inferred that the author of the couplet had the reading *vester equus* before him in 394, which he (correctly) assumed referred to *Livor* (i.q. *invidiosi*), whom the poet was sneeringly promising more of the same on which to vent their critical spleen. He failed to observe the inconsistency in first telling one's adversaries that they have lost the fight (which *rumpere* surely connotes) and then asserting that the contest is just beginning. The half-line *sed nimum properas* recurs at *Her.* 17. 263; with *vivam modo* cf. *Her.* 1. 107 *vivat modo* and *Trist.* 4. 4. 71 (ditto). *properare* may have come into the writer's mind by association: cf. *Prop.* 1. 5. 1 ff. 'Invide . . . / . . . properas ultima nosse mala', with which *Prop.* 1. 8b. 1 ff. may have merged ('. . . rumpantur iniqui!/. . . (3) falsa licet cupidus deponat gaudia livor').

- (3) sustentata venus gratissima; frigore soles, 405  
sole iuvant umbrae, grata fit unda siti.

Do not (advises Ovid) go straight to see your girlfriend, but take the edge off desire first with a whore (401-2). The second time, with your mistress, will be less of a thrill (403-4). 'Love deferred is the most satisfying; in cold weather, sunshine (sunny days?) is a delight, in sunshine, shade; water becomes a treat for a thirst (thirsty man? in time of thirst?).' If we assume (as is reasonable) that *sustentare* is employed here as a synonym of *differre* or *prolatare*,<sup>37</sup> we may question the wisdom of extolling in such glowing terms the very thing which you are trying to make your patient forgo. If the pleasure is that great, the patient will counter, I *shall* wait. Ovid could hardly have made so elementary an error of judgment. Neither are the illustrations worthy of the poet. To substantiate the point of the *sententia*, these require to be expanded thus: 'in cold weather the prospect of hot sunshine is delightful, and vice versa; the thought of water is pleasant when one is thirsty.' This prospective idea we may allow to be carried, imperfectly, by *fit*; it is not implicit in *iuvant*. The discrepancy between *iuvant*

<sup>35</sup> One is reminded of the old joke 'If we had some bacon, we could have bacon-and-eggs - if we had some eggs.'

<sup>36</sup> Were it worth considering emendation, then perhaps *conciunt* or *conciunt* might be offered. But both 'my (remaining) years hold many poems' and 'my years (will) conceive many poems' seem foreign to

Ovid's idiom.

<sup>37</sup> Cf., e.g., *Cic. Cat.* 4.6, *Ad Fam.* 13.64.1. The word does not occur elsewhere in Ovid's works; he has *sustinere* in a similar context at *A. A.* 2.690, but meaning *producere* ('utque morer meme sustineamque, rogat').

and *grata fit* is itself troublesome on formal grounds; parallelism would demand *iuvant* and *grata est. fit* looks rather like a metrical filler. Furthermore, *grata* is weak after the superlative *gratissima*. Altogether the sequence *gratissima (est), iuvant, grata fit* has a most un-Ovidian ring. Another difficulty resides in *siti*, which has either to be locative (quasi-temporal), like *frigore* and *sole*, or to stand for *sitienti*. The former would be unique (*in siti*: Plin. *N. H.* 22. 111), the latter without parallel in Ovid (though not in Tibullus or Propertius).<sup>38</sup> With the removal of 405–6 the next precept, on alienation techniques, moves up to take its natural place immediately after 404 (407 ‘... venerem QUOQUE iunge figura . . .’).

(4) hic male dotata pauper cum coniuge vivit: 565  
uxorem fato credat obesse suo.

566 fato *Y* (corr. ex facto) *K*ω: facto *RE*ς obesse *ς*: adesse *REYK* *ς*

Lethaeon Love's advice is the old adage that a bigger worry will drive out a lesser (559 ‘ad mala quisque animum referat sua: ponet amorem’). Think of the sum you owe the HP company (561–2), think of the May sun shrivelling the grapes in your vineyard (567–8), think of your oil tanker hitting a reef on her homeward voyage (569–70) – ‘think of your wife and how she is ruining your life . . .’. As Gould notes (50), this last injunction will not wash. The more the deficiencies of one's wife are rehearsed, the greater the attractions of one's mistress will appear. As in the last case (405–6), the author of this couplet has not stopped to think; his response to the text is instantaneous and his understanding of it entirely superficial. Several linguistic features also raise suspicion. (a) Neither *fato adesse* nor *fato obesse* is known from elsewhere; both seem implausible phrases.<sup>39</sup> (b) *male dotata* should by rights = *paupere*; the husband will then be cursing his wife for having failed to bring a good dowry and so lift his *familia* out of the poverty trap. Yet it is very tempting to scent an allusion to that stock figure of fun of comedy and epigram, the poor man saddled with a rich and domineering shrew of a spouse.<sup>40</sup> This would require *male* to be taken with *vivit*, as Kenney proposes in his apparatus, but the hyperbaton is not typical. Other possibilities are to take *male* = *in malum suum*, as at 209 (‘quae piscis edax avido male devoret ore’), or as a pejorative intensifier of the epithet (‘damnable rich’). Neither of these commands unhesitating assent. (c) The substitution of *uxor* for *coniunx* in the pentameter points away from Ovid, who characteristically repeats a word in the figure of *traductio* (i.e. with a case-change).<sup>41</sup> Cf. (picked

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Prop. 4.9.62 and 70, Tib. 1.3.78. The poetic idiom exemplified by *sitis Hercules sitiens* is of course both ancient and universal, and may readily be found in Ovid (e.g. *Met.* 1.58 *cura dei = deus curans*, 1.74 *ira Iovis = Iuppiter iratus*), but he does not appear to employ it where physical *πάθος* like hunger, thirst, or pain are involved.

<sup>39</sup> With the former F. Vollmer (*Hermes* 52 (1917), 468) compared the Senecan *dolori adesse* (*De Cons.* 7.2.), which = *dolorem nutrire* (see further TLL ii. 925, s.v. *adsum* i.q. *faveo*). But what *fatum*

*nutrire* would mean is hard to guess; perhaps *mortem parare*, or (closer to the original dative) *exitio imminere* (cf. *Met.* 1.146). Reading *obesse*, Professor Kenney would translate (loosely) ‘is lousing up his entire life’, but without much conviction.

<sup>40</sup> Cf., e.g., Plaut. *Merc.* 702 ff., or Mart. 8.12 (Kenney). The previous couplet (563–4) introduces the Comic figures of the *durus pater* and (by implication) *adulescens flagitiosus*; 565–6 perhaps owe their genesis to that.

<sup>41</sup> Lausberg, op. cit., § §643 and 647.

at random from the surrounding text) 549 *templum*/550 *templo* (replace *templo* with *fano* to reproduce the effect of *uxorem* in 566), 567 *uvae*/568 *uva* (nom.), 579 *loca sola* (nom.)/*loca sola* (acc.), 581 *secretis*/582 *secreta*, 583 *tristis*/585 *tristior*. The objection that *coniugem* could not be used is empty, since the poet would of course have designed the pentameter so as to accommodate *coniunx* in the nominative, or more likely genitive, case.

- (5) *tutius est aptumque magis discedere pace* 669  
*nec petere a thalamis litigiosa fora.*  
 670 *quam* K<sup>1</sup> ω

See Goold, 50, where Heinsius' comment is quoted: 'Nemo mihi persuaserit hoc distichon Nasonianae venae foetum esse.' Some of Goold's points may be amplified or modified: (a) *pace* can be used adverbially, though not with the sense demanded here, i.e. *pacate*, 'peaceably'. 'In time of peace' (opp. *bello*), a standard meaning, will not do, and 'peace having been made' cannot be understood from *pace* unaccompanied by (e.g.) *composita*. (b) *tutius est aptumque magis* could conceivably be genuine, for cf. A. A. 3. 761 'aptius est decaetque magis'; on the other hand, that could as easily have inspired an imitator to produce the equivalent (but unparalleled) adjectival pairing. (c) *nec* is not necessarily 'for *quam*'; the writer might have intended *hoc* (abl., i.e. *quam uxorem ream facere*) *tutius est magisque aptum discedere pace facta, nec iudicium a thalamo petere*. Yet it is far more probable that the comparison was meant to be between *discedere pace* and *fora a thalamis petere*, and that *nec* is indeed a solecism (corrected in several manuscripts). (d) What Goold does not mention is that no other Ovidian pentameter exhibits this combination of word-shapes and homoeoteleuton in the second half of the line. Wherever possible, Ovid avoids ending his pentameters with a word ending in a short open *a*;<sup>42</sup> when such a word (noun) does constitute the final dissyllable, Ovid never places immediately before it another (adj.) in agreement and having a *fortiori* the same termination. The phrase *litigiosa fora* comes from *Fast.* 4. 188 'et fora Marte suo litigiosa vacent.'

- (6) *Cnosida fecisses inopem, sapienter amasset;* 745  
*divitiis alitur luxuriosus amor.*

The strongest argument against the authenticity of the couplet is that put by Goold (50). Noting that '*Cnosida* is ambiguous' he continues: 'the compelling reason for excision lies in the utter absurdity of the contrary-to-fact condition, which implies *Cnosida feceras opulentam*. Who, then, is *tu*? Not Neptune (743). Certainly not the reader. The author . . . was not Ovid (except that the pentameter is an insipid version of *Fast.* 1. 690).'<sup>43</sup> Long ago L. Müller pointed out<sup>44</sup> that the verses manifestly refer to Pasiphae, whom Ovid never calls *Cnosis*. This title is always reserved for Ariadne by the Latin poets. Müller's objection is dismissed as 'foolish' by D. Donnet,<sup>45</sup> undeservedly. *luxuriosus amor* cannot signify what Donnet claims, 'passionate love'; the adjective is condemnatory (literally 'rank', 'overblown', hence 'immoderate', 'wanton'). As a description of

<sup>42</sup> M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Hamden, Connecticut, 1971), pp. 64 ff.

<sup>43</sup> 'divitiis pereat luxuriosa suis.'

<sup>44</sup> *RbM* 17 (1862), 541.

<sup>45</sup> *LAC* 35 (1966), 581 ff.

Ariadne's love for Theseus it lacks all credibility, for she is universally depicted with sympathy as the victim of her scheming and unscrupulous lover. (Donnet rightly rejects Leo's opinion<sup>46</sup> that Ovid would have written *facias* . . . *amabit*, not *fecisses* . . . *amasset*, and that the epigram of 746 is un-Ovidian, but these are trivial side-issues.) We need look no further than the words *taurus avitus* in 744 for the origin of the couplet. Faced with these in an allusion to Phaedra, our imitator found the temptation to add the *exemplum* of her tauromaniac mother quite irresistible.<sup>47</sup> The structure *fecisses inopem* is copied straight from 744 (*faciet pavidos*) without regard either for sense (see above) or for style (the clauses are not parallel, which would permit the repetition-with-variation of the verb).

About the origins of the interpolations inherited by the archetype of the amatory poems, none but the most speculative conclusions can be drawn. Within sixty years of Ovid's death *Am.* 3. 11. 35-6 were circulating as authentic.<sup>48</sup> Whether any of the other spurious verses go back so far can only be guessed. From the first-hand acquaintance with the *Fasti* evinced by three of the *Remedia* couplets, and also perhaps by *Am.* 3. 8. 51-2,<sup>49</sup> it may be argued that these certainly predate the late fifth century, when the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* drop out of sight, and perhaps the late fourth century, by which time Virgil has quite eclipsed Ovid. On general grounds it may be proposed that additions to these three poems are likely to have been made earlier rather than later, and most likely in the first and early second centuries, while Ovid's erotica remained on the best-seller lists. Imitation, the sincerest form of flattery, is reserved for the fashionable, not the remaindered. As far as is known, the so-called *poetae Ovidiani* flourished only in this short period, there being obviously a great demand for work in Ovid's style.<sup>50</sup> Probably none of these interpolations was made with intent to deceive, however. They have the air of inspirations of the moment, set down by a reader or readers with some facility in elegiacs. All, or nearly all, reveal by their inappropriateness the same casual, opportunistic approach to the text. One should perhaps envisage an early codex containing the *carmina amatoria* (and the *Heroides* in all probability),<sup>51</sup> the favourite book of some keen student of Ovid, in which he (and maybe subsequent owners) penned these, and possibly other, couplets. When the codex came eventually to be copied, the scribe mistook all or some of the additions for genuine supplements; some may have been recognized as fakes and eliminated. Metrical

<sup>46</sup> *Senecae Tragoediae* i (1878), 174.

<sup>47</sup> Pasiphae precedes Phaedra in the catalogue of love's casualties at 63 f.

<sup>48</sup> The hexameter occurs on a wall at Pompeii (Bücheler, *CLE* 354.2); cf. *Am.* 1.8.77-8 (*CLE* 1785), *A.A.* 1.475-6 (*CLE* 936.1-2).

<sup>49</sup> Cf. *Fast.* 6.796 ff. (796 'cum data sunt trabeae templa, Quirine, tuae', 809 *Caesar*, 812 *Alcides*).

<sup>50</sup> See A. G. Lee, 'The Authorship of

the *Nux*', in *Ovidiana*, ed. N. I. Herescu (Paris, 1958), pp. 468 f. The *Halieutica* was accepted as by Ovid in Pliny's day (and afterwards).

<sup>51</sup> The archetype of our manuscripts contained all four works in the order *Ars*, *Remedia*, *Amores*, *Heroides*. See Goold, 3 f. (Luck, *Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte Ovids*, pp. 11 ff. and 45 f., argues otherwise, unconvincingly.)

embellishments in an ancient codex might easily have been deemed authentic by a later and intellectually distant age.<sup>52</sup>

*Glasgow University*

A. A. R. HENDERSON

<sup>52</sup> The positions of the interpolated verses are, with very few exceptions, consistent with their having been added at the foot of the page in a codex having 13 lines to the page (allowing appropriate space for titles etc.). This would be a great rarity, of course, though not an impossibility (cf.,

e.g., Lowe, *CLA* i. 23, Vat. Pal. Lat. 24 of Gellius; fourth century, *capitalis rustica*, 13 lines). We have nothing nearly as old as the second century to provide a control. But calculations of this kind in these circumstances are unprofitable, since too many unverifiable assumptions require to be made.