

## THREE NOTES ON OVID, METAMORPHOSES 15\*)

15.214 *nostra quoque ipsorum semper requieque sine ulla  
corpora uertuntur, nec quod fuimusue sumusue  
cras erimus. fuit illa dies, qua semina tantum  
spesque hominum primae matris habitauimus aluo.*

217 *matris* EUnr: *matrisque* FPahv: *materna* Wp

---

\*) Text and manuscript readings are cited from W. S. Anderson's edition (Leipzig 1977).

The metrical anomaly of 217 is at home in most modern editions, with the sanction of Vergil invoked by Haupt-Ehwald for irrational lengthening in the fourth foot arsis. But the two examples cited occur in the fifth foot and are explained by imitation of a Greek rhythm: Ecl. 6.53 *fulvus hyacinthos*, Aen. 7.398 *canit hymenaeos*<sup>1</sup>). Ovid is much more strict about admitting this license, as Haupt-Ehwald admit, and the instance alleged here, which does not meet this condition, cannot count as an exception to his usual practice<sup>2</sup>). Metrical considerations also eliminate *materna*, offered by two of Anderson's manuscripts and accepted by Heinsius and Burman. Ovid elides a long vowel or diphthong at this point in the hexameter three times, only in the *Metamorphoses*: 4.445 *antiquae imitamina*; 6.656 *quaerenti iterumque*; 12.407 *amando et*<sup>3</sup>). Furthermore, elision of long *a* before a short vowel is generally avoided in Latin verse. Ovid has only one example, *contra ego*, Met. 9.16, in the first foot; Vergil, in the *Aeneid*, only four, none in the fourth foot: 6.145 *uestiga oculis*; 11.160 *contra ego*; 11.862 *laena aciem*; 12.839 *supra homines*<sup>4</sup>). The solution was offered by Riese's *latitauimus*, which has been accepted only by G. M. Edwards (1905) and G. P. Goold in his recent revision of F. J. Miller's Loeb edition (1984)<sup>5</sup>). In its support note now the parallel, not cited by commentators, at Hor. Carm. 4.6.19–20 *etiam latentem / matris in aluo*.

- 15.361 *siqua fides rebus tamen est addenda probatis,  
nonne uides, quaecumque mora fluidoque calore  
corpora tabescunt, in parua animalia uerti?*  
i quoque, delectos mactatos obrue tauros  
365 (cognita res usu): *de putri uiscere passim  
florilegae nascuntur apes, quae more parentum  
rura colunt operique fauent in spemque laborant.*

362 *fluuidoque* Fnv 363 *tabescunt* FPU<sup>2</sup>Wahv: *tabuerint* EU<sup>n</sup>pr 364 *i quoque* in *quoque* n<sup>2</sup>pv<sup>1</sup>: *his quoque* Fa: *hos quoque* P: *i tamen* U<sup>2</sup>: *i uide* W<sup>2</sup> *delectos* UWs<sub>v</sub>: *dilectos* FPhps<sub>1</sub>: *dilectus* a: *dilecto* E

In 362 read *-ue* and in 363 *tabuerint*. Pythagoras is making the point that the result of this experiment is the same whether the decay is gradual or speeded by the heat. In 364 the juxtaposition of *delectos mactatos* is awkwardness of a type unknown in Ovid, but *delectos* is irrelevant as well as inelegant. Pythagoras has no need of choice cattle to test his hypothesis; any sort will do<sup>6</sup>). And *quoque* is

1) On such lengthenings in Vergil, cf. E. Norden, P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI, ed. 4 (Leipzig 1957) 450–52, and H. Nettleship's "Excursus to Book XII", in Conington-Nettleship, The Works of Virgil<sup>3</sup>, Vol. 3 (London 1883) 486–91.

2) Cf. Norden (above, n. 1) 452. Haupt-Ehwald's other argument here is irrelevant on a point of Ovidian metrics: "In der Metrik der Späteren bildet *b* sehr häufig Position oder verhindert den Hiatus."

3) Cf. A. Siedow, De elisionis aphaeresis hiatus usu in hexametris Latinis ab Ennii usque ad Ouidii tempora (Diss. Greifswald 1911) 85.

4) See J. Soubiran, L'élision dans la poésie latine (Paris 1966) 310–15.

5) Riese followed a suggestion by Schepper, who proposed *latitamus in aluo*. Riese is supported by L. Müller, Kritische Beiträge zu einigen römischen Autoren, RhM 17 (1862) 188, whose suggestion of a similar change to *latitabat* at Manil. 1.75 was rightly rejected by Housman.

6) Planudes accordingly omits *delectos*: ἴθι γοῦν, καὶ σφαττομένους τοὺς ταύρους κάλυπτε. Bentley athetized the line, which is now defended by F. Bömer, P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen. Buch XIV–V (Heidelberg 1986) 349, who com-

without point: Pythagoras is asking his listener to put his preceding proposition to the test, he is not adding new information. *Quoque* was recognized as a filler, so the correctors of U and W attempted to find a better. Most attempts to heal the fault begin with Heinsius' *i scrobe delecta*, which suggests a choice of available pits, while Madvig's *i scrobe delecto* offers an otherwise unparalleled use of the verb<sup>7</sup>). Read *i grege de laeto*, and compare Verg. Aen. 6.38–39 *nunc grege de intacto septem mactare iuuenos / praestiterit*, a passage evidently on Ovid's mind here<sup>8</sup>). This wording constitutes a suitably Ovidian "correction" of the metrical irregularity in Vergil, one of only two instances of elided *de* in classical verse<sup>9</sup>).

15.575                    *mactatarumque bidentum,*  
*quid sibi significant, trepidantia consulit exta.*  
*quae simul adspexit Tyrrhenae gentis haruspex,*  
*magna quidem rerum molimina uidit in illis.*

577 *inspexit* W et e duobus codd. Heinsius

Anderson's apparatus is inaccurate: Heinsius found the reading in Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 2278, his "primus Bononiensis" (= Munari 54). And he does not include the reading of Planudes, ἐπεσκέψατο. Heinsius' advocacy of the variant *inspicere* deserves a new hearing. The second half of 579 is borrowed from Cicero, De consul. fr. 2.34 *Lydius ediderat Tyrrhenae gentis haruspex*, perhaps an indication of an earlier common source. In this context, Ovid's word choice is likely to be particularly careful. *Adspicere* and *inspicere* are often confused in manuscripts: cf. TLL 7.1.1951.24–32. But, as Heinsius noted, comparing Met. 15.136–37 *ereptas . . . fibras / inspicunt, inspicere* is the mot juste for the activity of the haruspices<sup>10</sup>).

Columbia University

Peter E. Knox

---

pares Verg. Georg. 4.538–40 *quattuor eximios praestanti corpore tauros / . . . delige*. But there, as in the similar scene at Aen. 6.38–39, the religious context explains the requirement of choice victims. Compare Ov. Fast. 1.377 *obrue mactati corpus tellure iuueni*.

7) Hence Merkel's *in scrobe*, retaining *delectos*.

8) Note the conjecture by Capoferreus based on this parallel, *e grege dilectos*. For *laetus* as an epithet of herds, cf. TLL 7.2.884.69–79. *Grege* might have been corrected to *quoque* after losing a syllable by haplography, a suggestion I owe to the editor. For confusion between *laetus* and *lectus*, see Tib. 2.4.41, Plin. Epist. 5.6.39.

9) The other is at Lucr. 3.853; cf. Soubiran (above, n. 4) 404.

10) He cites Serv. Aen. 4.64, Juv. 3.44, Sen. Thy. 757. To these add the examples given at TLL 7.1.1953.59–65.