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Abstract of Thesis

The primary purpose of this thesis is the establishing, in so far as that is possible, of the text of Book IV of Ovid's poem. For reasons explained more fully in Part I of the Introduction, the over-reliance of recent editors on the Lactantian MSS. has produced a text of a one-sided nature. The problem would have been more easily soluble if the manuscript-tradition itself of the poem had been stronger and less contaminated, if, to take an oversimplified hypothesis, an early Lactantian archetype could have been balanced against an early non-Lactantian archetype. As things are, however, contamination between MSS. is so widespread, and so unpredictable in its effects, that the truth may be preserved virtually anywhere, even in very few MSS. (see, for example, poma v.127, letabres v.407, and patriaeque vv.680 and 686, which I would regard, despite their slender attestation, as unquestionably correct): it therefore follows that much is to be gained from the use, in establishing the text, of as many manuscripts as possible: the thesis has as its backbone my own collation of 203 MSS. I have considered it wise to collate again for myself manuscripts used by previous editors because of the very widespread errors
of reporting which have, with time, crept in (see Appendix III).

In addition I have dealt, in Part II of the Introduction, and in some of the Appendices, with details of orthography, in order to establish, as nearly as one may from surviving evidence, Ovid's usage in matters of spelling.

The Commentary deals largely with textual questions, its main purpose being to justify the choice of text, although other subjects are occasionally touched on (e.g. the Pyramus and Thisbe myth). Appendices deal with some matters of kindred interest.
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INTRODUCTION

Part I The Text

It is to the work of Nicholas Heinsius that the modern reader of Ovid's Metamorphoses owes the greatest debt. That this is the case after 300 years is not only a reflection on the inadequacies of his successors to measure up to him, but a remarkable tribute to Heinsius' own scholarship. Where his predecessors, Raphael Regius and Hercules Ciofanus, in the dawn of the classical rediscovery, had been able to avail themselves of only a limited number of manuscripts (Loers, in the preface to his 1843 edition of the Metamorphoses, says that Ciofanus knew but 22 MSS.), Heinsius opened up a new world and used (again according to Loers) at least 88 more, and probably more than that.

While most critics today would share the view that Heinsius was too wide-ranging and unselective in his approbation of readings of uncertain merit, that his imagination was, if possible, too fertile, he thereby retained an open-mindedness, so essential in a manuscript tradition as weak and contaminated as that of the Metamorphoses, which enabled him to admit that the truth, if it could be found, might be found anywhere. Although he was perhaps without some of the advantages of more
modern scholarship, he was certainly without its prejugices. The edition of Burman (Amsterdam, 1727) was no significant improvement on that of Heinsius, its chief advantage being that it is often readily available today where Heinsius' own is scarce. Thereafter, with the notable exception of Jahn\(^1\) (although the names of Bach, Loers, Merkel and Riese deserve mention), the textual history of the *Metamorphoses* became constricted in ever-narrowing circles. \(M\), *San Marc. 226*, is a very good manuscript of the poem (Otis is gravely mistaken in suggesting otherwise\(^2\)), but the 19th-century belief in a *codex optimus* distorted more and more both the value of \(M\), and the distinctive feature of its family, the Lactantian *tituli* and *fabulae*; and the pejorative blanket-term for all MSS. not within the accepted circle, *codices vulgate lectionis* (a phrase which ought never to be used in relation to the *Metamorphoses*), is but the reverse side of this coin. This 19th- and early-20th-century German attention to \(M\) and the Lactantians, and the German reliance on a small group of well-known, but not necessarily invaluable, manuscripts, was a protracted obsession which culminated in the work of Magnus: his 1914 Berlin edition is a towering monument of application and skill, but of application and skill misdirected.

Edwards, in his text in Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum*
Latinorum (1894), and Slater, with his 1927 Apparatus Criticus, went some way towards redressing the balance: their open-mindedness is refreshing. But they came face to face with the problem which confronts all 20th-century editors, who have neither the opportunities nor the time for the travel which enabled Heinsius to do and to see so much. For this reason no praise can be too high for the task which Munari took upon himself in compiling his catalogue of manuscripts of the Metamorphoses. To date he has collected details of 405 manuscripts, and it seems certain that future generations will look to his catalogue as a decisive milestone in the history of the Metamorphoses in recent times.

Without doubt Munari's catalogue provides the where-withal from which future editions of Ovid's poem may be based on a fairer and more representative collection of manuscript evidence than has been used at any time since Heinsius. Belief in the inherent superiority of the Lactantian MSS. will die slowly (like all accepted theories, it is less challenging than its alternative), but die it must. The Lactantians are alone in many instances in preserving the truth; and in many instances they are palpably wrong: no benefit of the doubt should be given to them simply for being 'Lactantians': their evidence should be weighed objectively against that
of other manuscripts.

Munari's catalogue has also made obsolete another habit derived from the 19th-century Germans, that of describing together under the common symbols H or § a huge assortment of manuscript evidence collected together from widely disparate sources by Heinsius and other editors. The use of these symbols is convenient, as it is also sluggardly and misleading. So too, Heinsius' manuscripts have now, many of them, been identified, and references to obscure manuscript names used by him and by other editors are inexcusable except in those cases, now in a minority, where no firm identification has been established. More and more, editors who use without justification these Heinsian symbols and names will be laying themselves open to the charge that they are ignoring the clarity of definition which recent work has made possible. Use of the information of Heinsius and other editors is essential as a supplement to those sources of information suggested by Munari, but Munari's catalogue has rendered uncompetitive those editions based on earlier information alone.

It is with ideas of this sort in mind that I have assembled the ensuing text and apparatus of Book IV of the poem. Of Munari's 405 manuscripts, 4 at least may be discarded from the catalogue; and a further 42,
if not more, may be ignored for the purposes of Book IV either because of loss or damage, or through having been destroyed, or because they do not contain any of Book IV. Of the remaining 359 MSS., I have myself collated 200; for 3 further MSS. now lost (nos. 281, 295 and 313) I have used the collations of Heinsius and Magnus respectively; and for MS. 389, also lost, from Breslau, I have used the information available from Jahn's edition of 1832 and Loers' of 1843. In addition I have made use of my own collations of 3 manuscripts not enumerated by Munari, from Canberra, Ferro and Göttingen respectively. There follows a list of the 207 manuscripts consulted (they may be assumed to contain the whole of Book IV unless mention is made to the contrary):

Munari

1 Aberdeen University Library 165 S.XIII
2 Milan Biblioteca Ambrosiana R.22.sup. S.XII
3 " " " F.102.sup. S.XII/XIII
18 Rimini Biblioteca Civica Gambalunga 4.A.IV.18 S.XV/XVI
19 Arezzo Biblioteca S. Mariae 429 S.XIV
20 Assisi Biblioteca Civica 300 S.XV
21 Arras Bibliothèque Municipale 996 Caron S.XII, 407-803
22 St. Omer Bibliothèque Municipale 670 S.XIII
23 " " " 678 S.XII
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Callsign</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Baltimore Walters Art Gallery W.77</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>W.162</td>
<td>S.XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bamberg Staatsbibliothek Class.41</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bergamo Biblioteca Civica Γ.6.20</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Bern Bürgerbibliothek 345</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Berlin Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz lat.qu.270</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibliothek D.B.S.12</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>D.B.S.13</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Brescia Biblioteca Quiriniana lat.31</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Bruges Stadsbibliothek 545</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
<td>1-717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Brussels Bibliothèque Royale 2100</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>14620</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Cesena Biblioteca Malatestiana S.I.5</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>S.XXV.6</td>
<td>S.XIII/XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Cambridge Gonville and Caius College Library 202</td>
<td>S.XIII, 1-399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Sidney Sussex College Library 5</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Trinity College Library 606</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>University Library Ll.I.9</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Library/Institution</td>
<td>Shelf Mark</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Craców Biblioteka Jagiellońska</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Dijon Bibliothèque Publique</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Dresden Sächsische Landesbibliothek</td>
<td>Dc. 105</td>
<td>S.XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Edinburgh Scottish National Library</td>
<td>18.3.8</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Erfurt Wissenschaftliche Allgemeinbibliothek</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>II S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Erlangen Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>El Escorial Réal biblioteca</td>
<td>S.III.19</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Eton College Library</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Ferrara Biblioteca Civica</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S.XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; Antonell. I S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Frankfurt Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Barth.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97B</td>
<td>Giessen Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>? S.XIV, 482-793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Glasgow Hunter Museum</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>445 S.XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Gotha Forschungsbibliothek</td>
<td>I. 97</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>II.58 S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Graz Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek</td>
<td>2942</td>
<td>S.XI/XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>2952 S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3034 S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>3035 S.XIII/XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek</td>
<td>L4498</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek</td>
<td>Gl.kgl.S.2008</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Thott.1050</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Heidelberg Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>c.p.l.1661</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Holkham Hall Library</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Strozz.120</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Stockholm Kungliga Biblioteket</td>
<td>Va 23</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Florence Biblioteca Mediceo-Laurenziana</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Acq. e Doni</td>
<td>L.34</td>
<td>S.XII,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Holkham Hall Library</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>S.XV, 1-761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Strozz.120</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Leiden Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit</td>
<td>B.P.L.95</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>V.L.Q.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>V.L.Q.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Acq. e Doni</td>
<td>L.34</td>
<td>S.XII, 1-30,251-803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Leiden Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit</td>
<td>B.P.L.96</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>V.L.Q.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>V.L.Q.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Acq. e Doni</td>
<td>L.34</td>
<td>S.XII, 1-30,251-803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Leiden Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit</td>
<td>B.P.L.96</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>V.L.Q.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>V.L.Q.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Acq. e Doni</td>
<td>L.34</td>
<td>S.XII, 1-30,251-803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Leiden Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit</td>
<td>B.P.L.96</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>V.L.Q.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>V.L.Q.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek</td>
<td>Rep.I.7</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Rep.I.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 16 -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>London British Museum Add.11699</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11967</td>
<td>S.X/XI, 292-803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11968</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>15733</td>
<td>S.XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17405</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17416</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Burney 222</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Harley 2489</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2494</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2566</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2673</td>
<td>S.XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2737</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2742</td>
<td>S.XIV/XV, 1-102 S.XIII, 207-803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2769</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3754</td>
<td>S.XV, 1-194,415-636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>King's 26</td>
<td>S.XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Sloane 2489</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Lucca Biblioteca Publica 1417</td>
<td>S.XI/XII, 1-112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177A</td>
<td>Florence Biblioteca Mediceo-Laurenziana S.Marci 223</td>
<td>S.XI/XII, 40-260,702-803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177B</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Mediceo-Laurenziana S.Marci 223</td>
<td>S.XIV/XV, 1-39,261-701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Mediceo-Laurenziana S.Marci 225</td>
<td>S.XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Yale University Library Marston 16</td>
<td>S.XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
186 Madrid Biblioteca Nacional 10038 S.XIII/XIV
195 Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm.28504 S.XIII
197 Montpellier Bibliothèque de Médecine H.328 S.XIII
205 Naples Biblioteca Nazionale IV.F.2 S.XIII
206 " " " IV.F.3 S.XI/XII
208 " " " IV.F.5 S.XIII
209 " " " IV.F.6 S.XIII, 1-24
212 Nuremberg Stadtbibliothek Cent.V.56 S.XV
213 Novara Biblioteca Capitolare 111 S.XV
215 Oxford Bodleian Library Auct.F.1.17 S.XIV
216 " " " " F.2.3 S.XV, 359-803
217 " " " " F.2.4 S.XV, 1-396,454-803
218 " " " " F.4.22 S.XIII
219 " " " " F.4.30 S.XII, 101-803
220 " " " " F.4.31 S.XIII
221 " " " " Canon.class.lat.1 S.XIII
222 " " " " " " 2 S.XV
223 " " " " " " 3 S.XV
224 " " " " " " 6 S.XV
225 " " " " " " 7 S.XIV
226 " " " " " " 9 S.XIV
227 " " " " D'Orville 171 S.XIII
228 " " " " Rawl.G.103 S.XIV
229 " " " " Add.C.137 S.XV
230 " " " " C.138 S.XV
232 Paris Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 893 S.XIII
233 " " " " 1045 S.XV
234 " " " " 1046 S.XV
235 " " " " 1207 S.XIII
236 " Bibliothèque Nationale Baluze 822 S.XIII
237 " " " lat.7647 S.XIII, a manuscript of excerpts, containing all or part of the following lines: 115,428,432-45,472,481-85, 491-94,498-505,564-67,695-96,753-56,761-62
238 " Bibliothèque Nationale lat.7993 S.XII
239 " " " " 8000 S.XII/XIII
240 " " " " 8001 S.XII/XIII
241 " " " " 8002 S.XIII
242 " " " " 8003 S.XIII
243 " " " " 8004 S.XIV
244 " " " " 8005 S.XIV
245 " " " " 8006 S.XIII
246 " " " " 8007 S.XIV
247 " " " " 8008 S.XIV
248 " " " " 8009 S.XIV
249 " " " " 8010 S.XIV
250 " " " " 8011 S.XIII/XIV
251 " " " " 8012 S.XIII/XIV
252 " " " " 8013 S.XIV
1-131,212-293, 341-803
253 Paris Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 8014 S.XIV
254 " " " " 8015 S.XV
255 " " " " 8016 S.XV
256 " " " " 8017 S.XV
259 " " " " 8248 S.XIII
260 " " " " 8249 S.XIII
261 " " " " 8250 S.XIII/XIV
262 " " " " 8251 S.XIII
263 " " " " 8252 S.XIV
264 " " " " 8253 S.XIII/XIV
265 " " " " 8461 S.XIV
266 " " " " 10311 S.XV
267 " " " " 11314 S.XIII
268 " " " " 11315 S.XIII
269 " " " " 11316 S.XIII, 1-57
271 " " " " 14135 S.XIII
272 " " " " 15144 S.XIII
274 " " " " 17903 S.XIII, a manuscript of excerpts, containing all or part of
the following lines: 115, 432-45, 472, 481-85,
491-505, 564-67, 695-96, 753-56, 761-62
275 " Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 18546 S.XIII,
1-96, 193-803
276 " " " " nouv. acq. lat. 556 S.XIII
277 Parma Biblioteca Palatina 2930 S.XII/XIII
280 Padua Museo Civico C.M. 636 S.XIV
281 Padua Library of St. John's Monastery  S.XII
285 Phillipps Library 6642  S.XIII
287 Yale University Library Phillipps 9033  S.XII/XIII
291 Prague Státní Knihovna lat. 1631  S.XIV
292 " " 1638  S.XV
294 Le Fuy Bibliothèque du Séminaire  S.XIV
295 Khenana Fragmenta S.XII/XIII, 629-65,664-87,698-731, 735-65,777-800
300 Wardington Library  S.XV
306 Romorantin Bibliothèque Municipale I  S.XIII
307 Prague Biblioteka Roudnice Lobkoviciana R.VI.Ef,12  S.XIV
308 Savignano-sul-Rubicone Rubiconia Accademia 7  S.XII, 58-803
312 Siena Biblioteca Comunale 55  S.XV
313 Speyer S.XI: at least as far as v.797
321 Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm.29007  S.XII, 160-189,482-543
323 Toledo Biblioteca Capitular 102-6  S.XIII
325 Tournai Bibliothèque Municipale 99  S.XIII
327 Trento Biblioteca Comunale 1657  S.XV
329 Zürich Bibliothek Zentrale Rheinsau 46  S.XII
330 Tours Bibliothèque Municipale 879  S.XII/XIII
331 Uppsala Universitetsbibliothek C.903  S.XIII, 370-803
332 Warsaw Biblioteka Narodowa B.O.Z.50  S.XV
334 Vatican Library lat.1593  S.XIII
336 " " 1596  S.XII/XIII
345 " " 5859  S.XIII
Vatican Library Ottobon.lat.3313 S.XII
Urb.lat.341 S.XI/XII, 1-231, 284-542, 604-803
S.XIII, 232-283, 543-603
Vicenza Biblioteca Bertoliana 147 S.XV
Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 207 S.XII/XIII
Washington Library of Congress Ac.4189 S.XV, 416-441
Breslau Biblioteka Uniwersytecka Rehd.110 S.XIII/XIV
Zwickau Ratsschulbibliothek XIII.IV.3 S.XV
Austin (Texas) Humanities Research Center of the University Library S.XIII
Lausanne Bibliothèque Cantonale et Universitaire 403 S.XII
Naples Biblioteca Nazionale IV.P.62 S.XV
Prague Biblioteka Lobkoviciana 407 S.XV
Missouri Columbia Library of the Univerity S.XVI, 1-562, 616-803
Augsburg Staats- und Stadtbibliothek 124 S.XIV
Frankfurt Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Praed.101 S.XVI
Florence Biblioteca Mediceo-Laurenziana C.S.186 S.XIV
- Canberra National Library of Australia 1097-75 S.XIII, 794-803
- Fermo Biblioteca Comunale 92 S.XV/XVI
- Göttingen Niedersächsischen Staatsbibliothek Lün.I S.XV/XVI, 55-166
It is, I think, the near-impossible task of classifying Munari's huge list, and the sense of helplessness in the face of overwhelming odds, which have been responsible for the mystique which has grown up around the Lactantian family of manuscripts. (Of course Munari's list was not known to the 19th-century editors, but there was a general awareness that a large number of manuscripts of the poem had survived: Munari's catalogue is the definitive proof of that fact.) As a group the Lactantians are early in date (as far as surviving MSS. of the poem go), they have very considerable merits, and, most important of all to the editor, by being easy to distinguish, they offer a solution to the problem of which manuscripts to choose from the many available. (Besides the six known Lactantian MSS. available for Book IV, B J M N S and V, nos. 154, 281, 178, 206, 313 and 370A respectively, three other later MSS. among those I have examined contain either all, or some, of the tituli and fabulae of Lactantius, a Harley manuscript, no.167, a Paris manuscript, no.238, and one from the Vatican Library, no.345.)

Since the edition of Korn (Berlin, 1880), B and M have been very closely associated. They agree together in error in the following places: 298 nymphae, 320 dignissima, 328 sed, 346 placuit, 347 nymphis, 358 pug-
nantesque manus, 382 non iam, 386 ut tactis, 412 minimam et pro, 430 simuletur, 449 sacroque corpore, 514 dum, 517 uis terque, 552 saltemque, 553 hadusquam, 620 turba, 665 negat, 676 corruptus, 708 sic fert, 718 misso praeceps, 727 uenerat, 733 sinistro, 743 methusae, 751 tactu, 790 ante spectatum, 794 quaesitis, and 796 totis. Riese, in 1889, reintroduced \( N \), and Slater, in 1927, \( U \), both of them manuscripts which had been known to Heinsius, but progressively ignored since his time. Slater showed in his Apparatus (Prolegomena, 26-27) that there is a close affinity between \( N \) and \( U \) as a Lactantian sub-group distinct from \( BM \). \( N \) and \( U \) show agreement in error in the following instances in Book IV: 10 telas et calathosque, 132 erret, 145 a morte, 328 si, 336 aufugio, 420 thalamisque, 441 ipse, 692 iustior, 709-10 tortum ... plumbum, 710 medio, 712 at in, 733 sinistrae, 746 concepitque, 776 id se ex corr., and 783 percusso.

The loss of \( S \), and consequent reliance on Heinsius's none-too-full collation, has prevented editors from placing it with conviction in either the \( BM \) or the \( NU \) family. Bruère, in his attempt at a stemma of Metamorphoses' MSS., has the Copenhagen fragment \( \kappa \), from Books IX and X, firmly in the \( BM \) family. (Munari, in his catalogue, assumes that \( \kappa \), no.111, is a surviving quaternio of the lost Speyer manuscript (no.313), and Slater had written
'(K) cum Spirensi mirum in modum congruit, adeo ut...
communi siglo ... duos codices indicemus', op.cit., Proleg.,
17.) What evidence Bruère has for this decision he
nowhere makes explicit. I can find only one instance
in Book IV where S shares with BM a mistaken reading
not also found in N or U (628 regis BM3, regnis NU); in
the same way, at v.224, U, rather than sharing with
N the correct loquendi, has, with M, the mistaken loquenti.
But relationships cannot be proved by isolated examples,
and there are numerous instances where S shares its
errors not with BM, but with NU: 1 minyias NS, 15 eleus-
que NS, 131 uisam NSU, 206 tenebat SU, 328 si NSU, 564
laborum NS, 712 at in NSU, 727 uerberat NS, and 732 rapto NSU.
S seems rightly to belong in the family. But it
occupies a special place not only in the NU family, but
among the Lactantian MSS. as a whole: for on several
occasions it either preserves the truth where all the
other Lactantians are mistaken, or preserves vestiges of
the truth or of an earlier tradition than the other
Lactantians, or has readings which, though probably not
true, are unique in surviving Lactantian MSS. and deserve
the most careful consideration. Among the first group
I count hoc placet hanc 53, leuconoe 168, emetior 226,
pinna 408, sumptis 562, quondam 698, and arentia 778;
among the second leuis 413 and cipheaque 669; and among
the third proluit 310. The loss of S is a very serious
one.

Information about J is limited, for much of the time, by the nightmarish difficulty of being sure of what Heinsius has attributed to the manuscript in his collation at Oxford: so much information is gathered together on each small page that the result is often illegible (Slater noticed this also, op.cit., Proleg.,16). But available evidence suggests that J was one of the NSU family, and it is together with one or more of them in error at the following places: 45 di(y)erce JN, 251 perquestus JS, 562 distinguunt JU, 570 repetuntque JS, 591 exime JS, 607 natu JN, 676 eximiae JU, and 749 iterant JU. I can find no certain instance of its being mistaken together with BM but without N, S or U (at v.764, where B and N share with J the mistaken Cepheni, the reading of the first hand of N is uncertain). The relationship of the six major Lactantian MSS. is now established, in terms of time, as approximately the following:

(P. T. O.)
The classification of non-Lactantian MSS. remains a daunting task. For a time it did seem to me possible that, by classifying errors common to groups of MSS., one might eventually arrive at some sort of stemma, albeit a complex one. But contamination among non-Lactantian MSS. is so widespread that I now doubt whether the compilation of a stemma is either possible, or whether it would repay the enormous effort involved. The relationships between the manuscripts seem to be on a perpetually sliding scale, in which groups of MSS., rather than being sharply distinct, may merge or share common features with several others in turn, or at the same time.

Instead, I have adopted a system of evaluation based on independent merit alone. There are 95 places, according to the text which I print, where none of the six primary Lactantians is correct in the first hand, and where the true reading depends on what survives in non-Lactantian sources: 11 Lyaeumque, 21 quae, 22 Lycurgum, 25 secuntur, 26-27 sustinet artus ebrius, 41 auris (aures), 58 cincxisse, 91a, 92 surgit, 120 tracxit, 123(i) tenuis (tenues), 123(ii) longe, 127 poma, 136 tremit, 143 carissime, 145 iam, 156 iuncxit, 176 gracilis, 193 radiantia, 194 omnis, 200-201 transit mentis, 205 Aeaeae, 211 uincit, 225 paruerunt, 228 mundi oculo, mihi ..., 236 diffamatamque,
Magnus, in his 1914 edition, founded his main coverage of the non-Lactantians on five MSS., \( P(177A) \), \( L(131) \), \( e = A(81) \), \( g(102) \), \( h = C(112) \), and \( T = T(321) \); Slater and Lafaye, in 1927 and 1928 respectively, added \( P(240) \), and Slater also used \( E(365) \) and \( a = K(172) \). I have retained eight of these (i.e. all except the Graz manuscript, MS.102) as primary MSS. in the apparatus, as there seemed no point in change for the sake of change; and to them I have added six other manuscripts from those
I have collated (nos. 46, 80, 104, 148, 329, 379) which seemed particularly noteworthy as retaining the truth in a large number of the 95 instances noted above. These fourteen MSS. preserve the truth, or vestiges of it, as follows (out of a total of 95):

**MS. 104 (G)** 28 times (vv.11 25 41 92 127 136 145 156 193 250 260(ii) 328 346 367 388 413 489(ii) 495 546 553 570 577 623 676 680 696 713 767-768)

**81 (A)** 23 " (vv.11 41 92 136 145 205 211 260(ii) 299 328 367 371 389 459 488 489(ii) 495 553 567 623 647 676 713)

**329 (Z)** 22 " (vv.11 21 25 41 58 92 145 211 299 328 436 482 489(ii) 553 567 570 577 623 676 700 713)

**46 (D)** 21 " (vv.41 92 145 200-201 211 236 260(ii) 328 367 371 445 489(ii) 538 553 570 577 623 676 680 686 767-768)

**148 (O)** 21 " (vv.11 26-27 41 58 92 145 211 299 328 356 371 413 436 553 577 623 660 676 696 713 767-768)

**379 (W)** 19 " (vv.25 58 92 136 145 193 211 250 260(ii) 299 367 371 489(ii) 553 577 623 676 713 767-768)

**80 (Y)** 18 " (vv.11 41 92 193 250 260(ii) 299 328
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>240 (P)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25, 26-27, 92, 205, 328, 367, 408, 482, 488, 553, 570, 606, 630, 700, 713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 (K)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25, 92, 211, 250, 299, 328, 372, 436, 482, 489(ii), 495, 538, 567, 570, 713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365 (E)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11, 41, 205, 211, 278, 283, 299, 328, 488, 489(ii), 553, 567, 623, 676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 (C)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41, 92, 145, 193, 260(ii), 299, 328, 358, 436, 489(ii), 570, 577, 676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 (L)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25, 41, 194, 211, 225, 328, 371, 436, 482, 538, 577, 606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177A (F)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41, 143, 713, 767-768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 (T)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>482, 489(i)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be borne in mind that the figures for the manuscripts E, P, and T are not fully representative because these MSS. are in places defective.

While the grading suggested by this table is of great interest, it is also important to remember that the preservation of correct readings is not by any means confined to manuscripts at the top of the table: thus some correct readings are found exclusively in manuscripts in the lower half of the scale, v. 194 omnis L, v. 372 diducat K, v. 408 includit P, and v. 606 celebrat P.

Of the seven manuscripts at the top of the table
(nos. 104, 81, 329, 46, 148, 379 and 80), no. 81 (A) has been regularly used by editors since the time of Heinsius; no. 148 (Q) from Leiden was used by Heinsius himself under the name *Arondelianus*, although it has not been used systematically since then; and no. 329 (Z), the *Rhenouanus* from Zürich, first used by Bach, has been conspicuous in more recent editions primarily when it has been misreported. The other four manuscripts (nos. 104, 46, 379 and 80) have never been given full coverage before, and no. 104 (Q) in particular, from Wolfenbüttel, is, as is shown by its very large number of independent readings, a non-Lactantian manuscript of the very first rank.

Mention should be made of the often striking agreement, both in error and where the reading is correct, between the JNSU Lactantian family and non-Lactantian MSS.; but one should be aware also that many of the similarities are striking only because of the misplaced esteem in which B and M were held by the editors of the last century (see the Apparatus at, for example, vv. 186, 382 and 393: N sides with the non-Lactantians at places like these because EM (or M) are mistaken). While these agreements over correct readings between JNSU and non-Lactantians do not necessarily prove any connection between the two groups, their agreements in
error, which are more widespread, do suggest that there was some influence from a JNSU ancestor on non-Lactantian MSS, or vice versa. The following are line references to a selection of errors common to members of the JNSU family and to one or more of the non-Lactantian MSS. A(81), E(365), F(177A), G(104), and L(131): v.5 AGU, v.15 GNS, v.27 EGU, v.48 AEGLN, v.119 AFGLU, v.127 FJL, v.131 AFGLN, v.206 AEGLN, v.310 LS, v.408 AGU, v.437 AS, v.521 AEGL, v.562 AEJ, v.564 LNS, v.623 GN, v.620 AGJ, v.646 G3U, v.684 JL, v.712 AGJL, v.725 AU. Which way the influence took effect, whether from the non-Lactantians to JNSU, or vice versa, it would be hazardous to say for certain. It may however be the case that BM represent a purer Lactantian strain than JNSU, in which pure Lactantian readings were mixed with non-Lactantian influence from outside. But it is important, while bearing in mind the general idea of a link between JNSU and the non-Lactantians, not to apply it, in establishing the text, in any unconsidered or rigid fashion: above all open-mindedness is important, and the willingness to accept good readings from wherever they may be found. An approximate stemma appears on the following page.
Footnotes in Part I of the Introduction

1 cf. J. Postgate, JPh 22 (1894), 147.

2 HSpH 47 (1936), 131 et seq.

3 Catalogue: BICS, Suppl. 4 (1957).

4 This comment refers to the position in the Metamorphoses, where any attempt to place non-Lactantian MSS. in groupings under vague common sigla is ill-advised; the situation is naturally different in traditions such as that of Tacitus' Annales I-VI, where the codex Mediceus prior is the sole important primary source: in such a case a common siglum for the several lesser MSS. is both natural and sufficient.

5 cf. P. Munari's catalogue passim.


   F. W. Lenz 'Il primus Mediceus di Nicolao Heinsius', RIL 71.1 (1938), 133-144.

   F. Munari 'Manoscritti Ovidiani di Nicolao Heinsius', SIYC 29 (1957), 98-114 and 265.

   F. Munari 'Identificazioni di Codici Heinsiani delle Metamorfosi' (Ovidiana : Recherches


M. Reeve I am grateful to M. Reeve, of Exeter College, Oxford, who has allowed me to see an extensive article of his on this subject before publication (forthcoming in *CR*).

MS. 17 from Antwerp is not of Ovid's poem at all, but contains prose summaries and monochrome plates; MS. 50 from Berlin was removed from the catalogue by Munari himself in the first supplement; MS. 116 from Seville is a Spanish prose translation of the poem; and I am assured by A. N. L. Munby, of King's College, Cambridge, that MS. 282 from the Phillipps Collection is in all probability the same as MS. 283, and was given duplicate Phillipps numbers.

MSS. 37  65  70  71  76  77  78  83  111  120  145  151  152  162  166  174  193  196  198  211  214  231  257  258  270  273  283  284  288  293  296  301  309  319  320  326  371  386  388  400  and 405: for further details see catalogue. Wherever the catalogue expresses uncertainty about MSS., I have myself confirmed from the relevant library that the manuscript is not available.

For MS. 281 from Padua (J) and MS. 313 from Speyer
I have used Heinsius's collations at the Bodleian Library, in *Auct. S. V. 8* and *Auct. 2. R. VI. 23* respectively. For MS. 295 (*Rhenana Fragmenta*) I have used Magnus's collation in *Philol. 79* (1923), 161.

The librarian of the Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, Breslau, informs me that both Breslau MSS., 388 and 389, are still lost. Jahn and Loers used one of these two MSS. frequently in their editions, and I have assumed, as did Munari in his catalogue, that this was no. 389, the earlier of the two: I have therefore included no. 388 in the list of MSS. from which no information is available, in footnote 7.

And Konrato Ziegler (*Catalogus Codicum Latinorum Classicorum qui in Bibliotheca Wratislauensi Adseruantur*, Breslau, 1915) suggests that Jahn (1832) used MS. 389, not 388, which was first inspected fully by Kampmann in 1843.

I have distinguished the two halves of this manuscript by the letters A and B for ease of identification (as also later with MS. 177 from Florence and MS. 370 from The Vatican). Munari wrongly reports MS. 97 (as do the Giessen catalogues) as containing, in two hands, vv. 1-3, 25-61, 79-117, 428-688 and 638-746.

Munari follows a mistake in the library catalogue
at Heidelberg by saying that, from Book IV, vv. 362-667 are missing.

12 Munari reports that this manuscript goes from III. 75 to the end of the poem with lacunae in Books VII, VIII, IX and XV; but III. 183 - IV. 100 are also missing.

13 According to Slater (Apparatus Criticus, Sigla Codicum, 11) the Speyer manuscript contained, of Book IV, vv. 1-786; but Heinsius mentions several readings after v. 786 in his collation, the last being at v. 797.

14 That Bach's codex Rhenouanus and the Zurich manuscript no. 329 (Rheinau 46) are one and the same should not be doubted: Munari associated the two in his catalogue, and they preserve together some very unusual mistaken readings, sometimes in the second hand, not found in other MSS.: uluam v. 340, amorant v. 455, fluido v. 674, summum v. 718, assumit-que v. 746, and alternum v. 792. But after its use by Bach, the codex Rhenouanus was subject to an extraordinary piece of misreporting ex silentio, having attributed to it many readings which, while not found in MS. 329, are either correct or had been adopted or suggested by Heinsius or other early scholars (see Appendix B for details).

15 See footnote 9: if (which seems unlikely) I have
used MS.388, then it is Rehô.109, S.XV.

To the list of manuscripts used I should perhaps add three points: first, I have not referred to the Greek version of the poem by Planudes because I have found nothing of importance there which was not available from manuscripts which I have used. Secondly, I have been unable to trace the manuscript Petropolitanus (not listed by Munari, but mentioned by Jahn and Loers): the librarian of the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library, Leningrad, informs me that the manuscript was transferred to Poland in 1923, but as it cannot be traced there, it seems likely to have been destroyed in the war together with some of the other contents of Warsaw's Biblioteka Narodowa. Thirdly, the Musei Civici of Pavia, now housed in the Castello Visconteo, the former residence of the Sforza family, have unfortunately been unable to furnish me with any details of three manuscripts of the Metamorphoses formerly in the Libreria Visconteo-Sforzesca. These three MSS., not listed, it seems, by Munari, must be presumed lost: they were numbered 24, 195 and 627 respectively in the catalogue by G.D'Adda (Paris, 1875) of the Sforza Library.

That they are a family is shown, apart from the

18 See the introductions to the editions of Jahn (1832) and Loers (1843). Loers lists in all 145 MSS.

19 HSPh 50 (1939), 95 et seq.

20 For example, the five manuscripts 84 164 165 183 and 390 are shown to be a group by their inclusion of an extra line between vv.91 and 92, and by their readings noua monstra at v.500, uiuos at
v.619, and *indo*ataque at v.758; a few manuscripts share with the Lactantians the omission or displacement of v.113; others show common treatment of the difficulties in v.446; nos.34, 59 and 159 include a patchwork line after v.783; and so on.

I exclude the later Lactantians H, R and V, which are sometimes right in these places (see vv.136, 145, 228, 407, 696 and elsewhere), because it is not possible to know how much these correct readings may have been influenced by contamination.
The number of interpolated glosses found in manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses* is a very large one: see the *Apparatus* at vv.1, 26, 42, 45, 46, 57, 58, 64, 68, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 100, 113, 117, 127, 156, 181, 186, 199, 204, 206, 215, 228, 261, 271, 273, 295, 296, 310, 325, 330, 331, 340, 341, 346, 347, 353, 360, 365, 372, 375, 393, 399, 400, 410, 412, 415, 421, 435, 448, 458, 460, 482, 487, 494, 513, 517, 524, 550, 562, 567, 568, 570, 574, 577, 580, 582, 587, 607, 616, 619, 635, 638, 644, 651, 671, 680, 682, 696, 697, 691, 699, 701, 710, 714, 720, 761, 762, 765, 767, 768, 772, 775, 791 and 798. It seems not unlikely that there are other places also in Book IV where Ovid's original is masked by an unsuspected interpolation; but unless other compelling variants are discovered in MSS., the problem remains an insoluble one.
Introduction, Part 11.11: Parablepsy in Metamorphoses

A manuscript tradition as weak as that of the Metamorphoses is full of textual problems: interpolations are one, and parablepsy another. The simplest form of parablepsy, which could also be called assimilation, occurs when the termination of one word has an influence on that of another, so that the two become identical, thus *et colus et fues* for *et colus et fusi* v.229, *natis thalamisque* for *natis thalamoque* v.420, and *in totis conspectior ulla capillis* for *in tota ...* v.796. This is a very common kind of error, and examples of it will be found repeatedly throughout the apparatus. A variant on this type is where confusion takes place not between two words in the same line, but between two words in consecutive lines. Thus at vv.89-90 the majority of manuscripts read:

```
arboris arbor ibi niueis uberrima pomis
ardua morus erat gelido contermina fonti
```

The manuscript G, by a parableptic error, has *arbor erat* in v.89 and *morus ibi* in v.90; a different stage of this fault is shown by F, which has both *arbor erat* v.89 and *morus erat* v.90. When all MSS. have, in a particular passage, the kind of error exemplified by F in vv.89-90, then the truth may be irrecoverably lost.
An example of this sort of difficulty is found at vv.782-783, where the accepted text has been:

se tamen horrendae dipei, quem laeua gerebat,

sere repercusso formam aspexisse Medusae

However, some manuscripts preserve in v.782 the reading horrendo, which gives a chance of recovering the truth, and the first hand, subsequently erased, of the Naples manuscript no.208 preserves the truth itself, horrendo in v.782 and repercussae in v.783, a confirmation of Slater's conjecture. The fault in this instance developed because repercussae was assimilated in sense to its nearest word sere, becoming repercusso, which is found in all manuscripts except no.208. In time this caused the displacement from v.782 of the true horrendo, which none-theless survived in a few manuscripts; the Graz manuscript too (no.102), and other MSS., with their reading horrendam, bear testimony to a tradition other than that of the generally inherited horrendae.

In the same way the truth has disappeared from most MSS. at vv.560-562:

quo quaeque in gestu deprensa est, haesit in illo.

pars uolucris factae, quae nunc quoque gurgite in illo

sequors destringunt sumptis Ianenides alis.

The majority of editors have printed without demur the consecutive appearances of in illo in vv.560 and 561; but this is exactly the sort of parableptic error against
which the editor should be most on his guard in the *Metamorphoses*. And it must not be confused with Ovid's common habit of repeating ideas in parallel language in consecutive lines for rhetorical effect (for examples of this, see *Met.* I.325-26, IV.152-53, 575-76, V.341-43, VI.430-31, IX.114 and 118, and XII.553-54); in vv.560 and 561 *in illo* does not refer to the same object or idea in both lines, as happens in the other passages: one of the appearances of *in illo* is spurious, copied parableptically from the other, and masking Ovid's original, in exactly the same way as happened in F at vv.89-90. Heinsius alone of earlier editors appreciated the full significance of this when he conjectured *purgite in alto* in v.561 ('natus error ex ultima uoce praecedentis versus perperam alieno loco repetita', ed.1659).

The same sort of parableptic corruption occurs in vv.609-611, which most editors during the last 200 years have printed:

```plaintext
... contraque deum ferat arma : genusque
     non putat esse deum (neque enim Iouis esse putabat
     Persea ...)
```

Heinsius however, sensing the repetition of *deum* in v.610 (which cannot properly initiate the idea *neque enim Iouis* ..., which depends on some previous mention of Jupiter), printed *arma genusque non putet esse Iouis*,

```plaintext
   Heinsius however, sensing the repetition of deum in
   v.610 (which cannot properly initiate the idea neque
   enim Iouis ..., which depends on some previous mention
   of Jupiter), printed arma genusque non putet esse Iouis,
```
a reading which is now shown to have considerable MSS. authority. This is a good example of how a blind adherence to belief in the infallibility of the Lactantian MSS. has led editors to reject a reading of perfect sense and impeccable style in favour of one which, with its unnatural stop after arma, borders on the abstruse and the absurd.

Parablepsy becomes a more serious problem when it involves not single words, but whole lines. Again the cause is the presence of similar words in adjacent lines: the eye of the scribe travels from one word to the similar one in the following line, and a line may thereby be omitted. Thus the similarity of vv.152 and 153, both ending with morte reuelli, causes the omission of v.153 in some MSS.; the same kind of thing happens in other MSS. at v.576, which closely resembles v.575. At vv.306-309 there are two pairs of lines which form a pattern a,b,a,b; the manuscripts GU omit the second and third of the four, and B the third and fourth.

In another form, the problem can affect half-lines or part-lines. At vv.358-359 most MSS. read:

\[
pugnantemque\ tenet\ luctantiaque\ oscula\ carpit \]
\[
subiectatque\ manus\ inuitaque\ pectora\ tangit\ ...
\]

But certain Lactantian MSS. have, in error, for v.358:

\[
pugnantesague\ manus\ inuitaque\ oscula\ carpit
\]
This is followed by v.359 correctly. Again, at vv.553-554, the reading of the majority of MSS. is:

\[ \text{haud usquam potuit scopuloge affixa cohaesit;} \]
\[ \text{alteru, dum solito temptat plangore ferire...} \]

But, by a parableptic error, some of the Lactantian MSS. placed the phrase solito ... ferire in v.553, and potuit ... cohaesit in v.554.

This is not the place for a full discussion of the difficulty known as 'Double Recension'\(^1\), which for long has tormented editors, although it is worthy of mention that Heinsius in general printed the longer versions. All I need say in brief is that I believe that the spectre of 'Double Recension' will one day haunt us no more. It is a theory which has grown and taken root from belief in the over-riding superiority of the Lactantian MSS. because the Lactantians did not have these lines, then the lines had to be condemned. I cannot speak for Metamorphoses Book VIII, where the problem is at its worst, as I have not examined a wide range of manuscripts for that book, but I suspect that a thorough examination from an unprejudiced viewpoint would solve the question conclusively in favour of the longer versions.

In the passage which is thought to represent 'Double Recension' in Book IV, I have adhered to the
longer, non-Lactantian text. In v.767 (quærít Abantiades, or Lyncides, which was a gloss for Abantiades

Perseus asks one of the assembly for details of the country to which he has come. v.769 shows us that Perseus' questions have been answered, and he is in turn asked by his answerer for a story: what we should expect to come in between (in v.768) is a description of the fact that someone does reply to Perseus' question. That is precisely what is found in the longer, non-Lactantian version; but the 19th-century German editors and Magnus could not accept it as the truth: the Lactantian MSS. did not support it, and the Lactantians were always right in matters of this kind. Thus the extraordinary situation developed where the truth, though available (albeit in fragmented, rather than perfect, form), was brushed aside because it could not coexist with the theory of a codex optimus. Jahn diagnosed the problem of vv.767-768 correctly when, considering their abbreviation into one line in the Lactantian MSS., he observed in his 1832 edition (p.274): 'librarii oculis aberrarunt ideoque media uerba omiserunt'.

There is one other important passage in Book IV where I believe that the omission of a line by parablepsy has caused a difficulty inherent in the inherited
text. At vv.455-457 the three sisters of the underworld rise to greet Juno:

quam simul agnorunt inter caliginis umbras,
surrexere deae; Sedes Scelerata uocatur:
viscera praebebat Tityos . . .

Thus the MSS. and printed editions. At v.453 the sisters had been sitting in front of fores clauses adamantice. And yet between vv.455 and 457 they rise and show Juno the underworld without having to open these gates. Vergil had taken considerable care to describe the gates' massive size, and the consequent effort involved in opening them, by the heavily spondaic phrasing at Aen.VI.573-574:

tum demum horrisono stridentes cardine sacrae
panduntur portae . . .

The words Sedes Scelerata uocatur are properly an amplifying idea, giving further detail about something which has been described already: Sedes Scelerata is a rhetorical climax to a simpler, preceding reference to the same object. The same sort of sentence structure is found in the following passages:

est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt
Aen.III.163

naias una fuit, nymphae Syrinsae uocabant
Met.I.691
est locus Arcadise, Pheneon dixere priores

Met. XV. 332

And it is found in twofold form at Met. XIV. 292; vV. 291-292 read:

pacifer huic dederat florem Cyllenius album:
moly uocant superi; nigra radice tenetur.

But at Met. IV. 456, the earlier reference to the underworld, to which Sedes Scelerata uocatur is an accessory, has disappeared; what survives as v. 456 is a combination of the first and second halves of two consecutive lines. The loss of the line has been caused, perhaps, by the -eae termination of deae; and there is one word, Tartareae, which may share with deae an -eae ending, and with Sedes Scelerata uocatur the necessary sense; there may be others also: but without any manuscript authority the line as a whole must remain a matter for conjecture (for a hypothetical reconstruction, see the apparatus). The passage is illustrative of the way in which parablepsy can cause the simple disappearance of a line, as also was the case in some MSS. at vV. 153 and 576.
Mistaken word-order in manuscripts may be ascribed to one of two reasons. Often the error is a parableptic one: the similarity between two words causes confusion. Thus at v.166 the correct *urna ... in una* is found in some MSS. as *una ... in urna*, and at v.12 the manuscript G has *iterumque satum* for *satumque iterum*. The presence of the word praepes in v.714 before the caesura causes *missus praeceps* in v.718 to become *praeceps missus* so that *praeeceps* occupies the same position in the line as *praeepe* in the earlier verse. And elsewhere parableptic confusion between words of similar length produces *dominas famulasque* for *famulas dominasque* (v.5), *bromiumque uocant bac(c)humque* for *bacchumque uocant bromiumque* (v.11), and *seruata mea uirtute* for *uirtute mea seruata* (v.703).

Confused word-order is also liable to occur where two words which agree in case or sense are separated by an intermediate word or phrase. Scribes, in order to show that the two words should be taken together, tended to write one over the other as a gloss, so that the line came to contain one of the words duplicated: and the duplicated word was then omitted in its proper place. Errors of this kind in Book IV in-
clude ebrius artus sustinet for sustinet artus ebrius (vv.26-27), nos toto for toto nos (v.74), nequiquam di-
uerse for diverse nequiquam (v.78), nox inquit for inquit nox (v.108), mentis transit for transit mentis (vv.200-
201), fatum tantis for tantis fatum (v.249), colubras re-
jectit ab ore for reiectit ab ore colubras (v.475), opus est longis for longis opus est (v.476), and terras despectat 
longe for longe despectat terras (vv.623-624). The common-
ness of this fault makes it not unreasonable to sup-
pose that there may be instances in Book IV where the text is mistaken because no manuscript has preserved 
the correct word-order.
Introduction, Part II.iv: Third Declension Accusative

Plurals in -is and -es

Throughout the text I have adopted -es or -is spellings on the whole according to the findings of my article on the subject, which is attached as Appendix I. In that article I suggested that there were 48 instances in book IV where an -is spelling should be adopted; of those 48 instances, 9 were said to be on manuscript authority (according to the information of Magnus' 1914 apparatus), 2 were accepted from the edition Romana of 1471, and 37 were suggested by me. Investigation of MSS. has shown that one of the -is forms adopted from the edition Romana, tenuis v.104, is confirmed by N and by a manuscript from Prague (no.291), and of the remaining 37 spellings, 15, or about two-fifths of them, can now be supported by manuscript authority. One other of the 37 examples, omnis v.464, is found also in the edition Romana (not reported by Magnus), and a second, greuis v.498, had been suggested already by Conington.

There are three other places (vv.425, 495 and 675) where conservatism of approach prompted me, in the article, to retain an -es ending; but as the spellings triplicis, anguis, and ignis are now found to exist in MSS., and are compatible with the findings of the
article, I have used these -is terminations in the text.

In addition, there are two places, not mentioned in the article, where consideration of the -is/-es problem is helpful to an appreciation of the textual difficulty. But first it is important to note the tendency of MSS., where one word ends in 's' and the next begins with 's' or 'f', to confuse the two letters; thus we find uoci fecistis for uocis fecistis v.69, suo sermone for suos sermone v.570, and par fuit for pars fuit v.797; conversely 's' is sometimes added, as at v.310 suos formosos for suo formosos, v.424 lacerandae suee for laceranda suee, and v.577 cutis squamas for cuti squamas. The ability of final 's' to change word, and be added to the beginning of the next, is illustrated by v.97 spumanti feruida for spumantis oblita, v.389 dicti eed for dictis et, and v.800 ioui stetit for iouis textit.

We can now turn to the two passages. At v.413 I have adopted the reading perguntque leui stridore querellas (not unlike Lucretius' liquidam tollunt lugubre uoce querellam at D.R.N.IV.548); nearly all modern editors have accepted the reading leues stridore; and S and a Dresden manuscript preserve leuis stridore. This is a simple case of 's' having been duplicated: leui stridore became leuis stridore, and the majority of MSS.
simply eliminated the -is form and wrote leues.

At vv.123-124 Heinsius accepted the reading tenuis stridente foramine longe eisculatur aquas; all editors in recent times have preferred tenuis stridente foramine longas. The difference between longe and longas is not a material consideration; granted that aquas was without its adjective tenuis, the change from longe to longas was in time almost inevitable; and yet certain MSS. (see the Apparatus for details) do preserve both tenui and longe, the coexistence of which is a pointer to the truth. As may be seen from the examples above, tenuis stridente was an easy corruption of tenuis stridente; besides, tenuis was an -is word (v.104), and a few unidentified MSS. of Heinsius and Ciofanus are reported to have had the spelling tenuis; the reading tenuis ... longe should be accepted without reservation.

In general, it is important to bear in mind two statements which I made in the article (Appendix I): a) 'restitution of -is for transmitted -es accusative readings remains a hazardous task', and b) 'in the absence of Ovid's own spelling, no distribution of -is to -es can claim authenticity'. I am not confident that my choice of spellings has always been correct; but if, as I hope, it comes nearer to Ovid's usage than does the overwhelming preponderance of -es forms found in previous editions, then the investigation will not
have been in vain. It is at least in favour of a fairly extensive use of the -is form by Ovid that survivals of the form are found not exclusively in one or another manuscript time after time (which would suggest mediæval reinstatement of -is in a narrow range of MSS.), but in many different manuscripts in the various places concerned.
Introduction, Part II.v : Second Declension Proper Nouns

A full coverage of this subject is attached as Appendix II. I explain there why I favour the form *orchamos* at v. 212.

Introduction, Part II.vi : Word-forms with epic or archaic colouring

Throughout the underworld passage of *Metamorphoses* Book IV (vv. 432-511), Ovid draws copiously on Book VI of the *Aeneid* and on the Allecto scene in *Aeneid* Book VII. I have therefore printed in the text three word-forms favoured by Vergil (*hiemps* 436, *arbos* 459, *urpues* 460); though all of them have minority MSS. support in these places in the *Metamorphoses*, they are accepted on the basis of 'difficilior lectio potior'. 
Introduction, part II.vii: Perfect Tenses in -ex-

Housman's comments on this subject 8 deserve the widest study, and application. Editors are shy of introducing any spelling which offends against the norms of standardisation, but it should be remembered that, even as recently as the year 1700, spelling was often a largely fluid matter. Slater (op. cit., Introd., 27) lists some places where -ex- spellings have been preserved in the Metamorphoses. The Wolfenbüttel manuscript G has -ex- spellings in three places in Book IV (iuncxít v.156, tinctxít v.388, and deplencxere v.546); the first of these three, iuncxít, is found also in several other manuscripts, and the second, tinctxít, in the Copenhagen manuscript G and in the Escorial manuscript no. 88; and at v.156 a British Museum manuscript, no. 156, has the reading iuncxít. I have printed -ex- spellings in all of these three places.

Twice elsewhere (vv.58 and 120) vestiges of these perfect forms survive in varying degrees in different MSS.: I have used the spellings cincxisse and træcxít in the text.

At vv.506-507 the manuscripts read:

\[ \text{dumque pauent illi, uestit furiale uenenum} \]
\[ \text{pectus in amborum praecordiague intima mouit} \ldots \]

Editors have sensed the difficulty of uestit, and
Grævius suggested the reading uerxit, which met with the approval of Gronovius, Heinsius and Bentley. There is a similar problem at Ep.Pont.I.9.52; vv.51-54 read:

ille tibi exequiæs et magni funus honoris
fecit et in pelidos uertit amosa sinus
diluit et lacrimis maerens unquenta profusis
ossaque uicina condita texit humo...

Here again Gronovius proposed uerxit, but Heinsius suggested uersit; Heinsius's instinct was right, and the past tense is indeed very necessary in both passages, so as to balance mouit (v.507) on the one hand, and fecit, diluit, and texit (vv.52, 53, 54) on the other.

Although the past tense of uergo is unattested in Latin literature, the grammarian Charisius mentions what the form should be (Art.Gramm.III.244-245): in tertio ordine formæ sunt nouem: ... quarta forma est qua perfectum in 'xi' litteræ cadit, uelut 'dico dicis dixi ... uergo uercia uerxi'. What Ovid wrote in both passages was uerxit; but he spelt it uercxit. In the same way as cincissæ (v.58) became cincisse, and træcæt (v.120) træcit, uercxit was written uercit, which, as near as makes no difference, is the same as uertit of the MSS.
Introduction, Part II, viii: Assimilation

I have throughout the text based spellings on the manuscript consensus BFGMN; and in addition I have taken account of the spelling of the Harley manuscript δ (no.166), which survives in Books I–III, wherever it uses the relevant words. Where there is not unanimity between the manuscripts, then I have as a general rule adopted unassimilated rather than assimilated spellings into the text. The spellings chosen are as follows (with manuscript evidence):

4 inpietatis G (imp- MN, δ I.200)
5 inmunes G, δ I.101, I.111 (imp- MN)
29 inpulsaeque G, δ I.529, I.521 (imp- N)
102 conpescuit P : òpescuit δ II.313 (comp- GMN)
157 conponi FG (comp- MN)
252 inbutum FG (imp- MN)
318 composuit see FG at 157 (comp- BGMN)
340 submisit BGM : sumisit δ III.23,502 (summ- N)
342 alludentibus BGMN, δ II.864
352 adplauso N : aplauso G (app- BM)
357 inmittitur δ I.280 : òmittitur G (imp- BMN, δ III.599)
362 inplicat G, δ III.343 : òplicat δ I.762 (imp- BMN)
364 alligat BGMN, δ II.670
364 inplicat see Gδ at 362 : òplicat G (imp- BMN)
inprobus: inprobus G; improbus BMN
complexus ε Ι.734: complexus III.48,286,390 (comp- BMN)
adcommodat G (sec- BMN)
inmergere BMN: inmergere G
inplacabile &: inplacabile G (imp- MN)
inportuna BMN, ε ΙΙ.475
inmiser ΜΝ, and see ε at 357: inmiser G (imm- Β)
inminet ΜΝ: inminet G (imm- BMN, ε Ι.52,146,542)
inmeritae Μ: inmeritae G (imm- ΒΝ)
inmense ΜΝ, ε Ι.309,728,ΙΙ.35,157: inmense G (imm- ΒΝ,
ε Ι.38,ΙΙ.220,ΙΙΙ.42)
annuit BMN, ε Ι.567 (sdn- ε ΙΙ.531)
imposuit G, ε Ι.67,230,ΙΙ.17,124,507,522 (imp- BMN,
ε ΙΙ.875)
adpositi: adpositi BMN
inpositus see G at 541: inpositus G (imp- BMN)
inmense BMN, and see ε at 535: inmense G
admonitor GN, ε ΙΙΙ.566 (amm- ΒΜ)
inmeritam Μ: inmeritam G (imm- ΒΝ)
inpleuit ε Ι.723,ΙΙ.155,344,372,799,ΙΙΙ.180: inpleuit G
(imp- BMN, ε Ι.245)
inmense BMN, and see ε at 535: inmense G
inminet G, and see ε at 525 (imm- BMN)
inpleuit see ε at 684: inpleuit G (imp- BMN)
impulsu ΕΡ, ε ΙΙΙ.61: impulsu G (imp- ΜΝ)
722  stollit BFNN, ε II.448,822 : stollit G
736  ingleuere FG, and see G at 684 (imp- BN
743  iponit see G at 541 : Iponit G (imp- BNN)
777  subposita G, ε II.8.0,III.102 (supp- BNN, ε II.712)
800  ipune F, ε II.474 : Ipune G (imp- BNN)
802  attonitos BFGGN, ε I.202,II.463 : attonitos ε III.40
Introduction, Part II.ix: Miscellaneous Spellings

The following spellings, all of them based on manuscript evidence, are adopted in the text: tinguo not tingo vv.127 and 343, iuuenalis 9 not iuuenilis vv.28 and 50, pinna 10 not penna vv.47,408,665,677,729, 785 and 789, extinctum not extinctum v.151, monimenta not monumenta vv.161 and 550, penetrix 11 not genitrix vv.205,219 and 384, quadrupedes 12 not quadrupedes v.217, harena not arena vv.240,617 and 741, exanguis not exsanguis vv.244,267 and 443, adamanis not adamas v.281, Kares not Caras v.297, myrrhaseque 13 not murraseque v.393, Athamans not Athamas v.489, solacia not solatia v.604, Atlans 14 not Atlas vv.632,646 and 657, Hammun not Ammon v.671, extat not exstat v.732, curaliis not coraliis v.750, and expectatum not exspectatum v.790.
Footnotes in Part II of the Introduction

1 cf. H. Magnus 'Ovids Metamorphosen in Doppelter Fassung?', Hermes 40 (1905), 191 et seq., 60 (1925), 113 et seq.
R. Helm Festschrift Johannes Vahlen (Berlin, 1900), 337-365.
T. Kleberg Gnomon 18 (1942), 58.

2 Abantiades was the original, Lyncides the gloss, because we may be sure that Ovid chose the dactylic, rather than the spondaic, form. For other examples of Abantiades in this position of the line, see Met.V.138 and 236.

3 vv.6, 7, 26, 77, 97, 144, 180, 199, 271; brumalis (v.199) is also, as Magnus noted, the spelling of the editio Romana.

4 vv.104 and 212.
This was reported by Slater in his *Apparatus*, but not by Magnus.

*Adversaria Orthographica I, CR 5 (1891), 293-294 (Classical Papers I, 175-176).*

juvenalis was Vergil's spelling, and besides being generally retained by F and M in the *Metamorphoses*, is the spelling of the early Harley and Paris fragments, ε and π, at *Met.*II.150.

Ovid uses the word *pinna* or *penne* on seven occasions in Book IV (vv.47, 408, 665, 677, 729, 785 and 789). On three of these seven occasions, the manuscripts S or U have the form *pinne* (vv.408, 729 and 789); and as it does not seem likely that Ovid varied his usage, and as *pinne* is the better form, used throughout Vergil, for example, by Ribbeck (ed.1894-95), I have used *pinna* on the other four occasions also.

Although *genitrix* is found in all the major MSS., Lachmann, at Lucretius I.1, shows the form to be a mediaeval mis-spelling for *genetrix.*
12 *quadripedes* is also retained by the Harley and Paris fragments at II.84 and 121.

13 Vergil, at *Aen.* XII.100, writes *murra*, but the Ovid MSS. preserve the Greek form *myrrhae* here (some of them with *ι* for *υ*, or without the *h*), and, in view of Ovid's penchant for Greek forms, it would be perverse not to accept it. Heinsius had it, although recent editors have not followed him.

14 *Atlans* is found in one manuscript or another at all three places, and as Ribbeck prints it *passim* in his *Vergil* (ed. 1894-95), and as it was more likely to be corrupted to *Atlas* than vice versa, I have kept it.
Manuscripts are designated in the Apparatus by four types of sigla, capital letters, small letters, name-abbreviations, and numbers. Capital letters are used for certain selected manuscripts of special merit (see Sigla Codicum for details). I have assigned capitals to some of the non-Lactantian manuscripts which were given small letters in the editions of Merkel-Ehwald, Magnus and others: the MSS. from Erfurt (Amplonianus), Copenhagen, Florence (Laurentianus), and London (King's), hitherto generally known by the sigla e h l and g, I have called A C L and K (Slater already had L, not l, in his 1927 Apparatus). Although one hesitates before changing an existing system, the prejudice implied by the general rule of capital letters for Lactantians and small letters for non-Lactantians is neither beneficial nor tolerable.

I do not always quote all the selected manuscripts in the Apparatus. H R and V, which often duplicate information available in the other selected MSS., are only mentioned from time to time, when their readings are of interest; and J and S, because of their loss, can be cited only intermittently, and should never be presumed
to offer any reading other than where they are specifically mentioned. All the other selected manuscripts I use all the time when they are available (see end of Sigla Codicum, and between the text and apparatus, for details).

Small letters are used exclusively to designate manuscripts used by earlier scholars and editors, when those manuscripts are not firmly identifiable with any listed by Munari in his catalogue. Future investigations will, it is to be hoped, gradually eliminate manuscripts from this category: for example, a comprehensive collation of all the Berlin manuscripts enumerated by Munari would almost certainly obviate the need for the siglum b for Bach's Berlin manuscript.

Name-abbreviations are given only for manuscripts which I have used which are not enumerated by Munari in his catalogue to date: e.g. the Fermo manuscript is designated by the abbreviation Ferm. Again, as Munari extends his catalogue with further supplements, it will become possible to replace these name-abbreviations with numbers.

All other manuscripts are cited by their numbers in Munari's catalogue; the manuscripts which I have collated are listed, with their numbers, in the Introduction, Part I. Occasionally I give in the Apparatus the number
of a manuscript not among those I have collated: these are manuscripts used by Heinsius which have since been identified, and details of them are to be found towards the end of the *Sigla Codicum*.

A word of warning needs to be said about certain manuscripts, at present lost or unidentified, used by early 19th-century editors. I have dealt elsewhere with the widespread misreporting of the *codex Rhenouanus* (= Z, no.329): in time this manuscript, through assumptions *ex silentio*, had attributed to it many readings of special significance or unique value which had been adopted or suggested by early scholars such as Regius, Scaliger and Heinsius (see Appendix III). The same problem arises in the case of three other manuscripts, b from Berlin (still unidentified), d from Dresden (still unidentified, and perhaps destroyed in World War II), and 339 from Breslau (lost). Although with these manuscripts counter-checking has not yet been possible, as with the *Rhenouanus* and Z, one must treat some of their readings with scepticism. I have omitted from the *Apparatus incompatibilities* of the most obvious kind (e.g. Magnus (after Jahn) at IV.282: Celmi Berol.,Rhenou.,Scaliger: but Z does not have Celmi, and I doubt very much whether berol. (b) had it either); one should bear in mind that, especially where these MSS. are in limited
company in supporting readings approved by Heinsius or other early scholars, no real reliance should be had in their readings. Elsewhere they may be treated normally.

I have used the symbol X in the Apparatus to denote manuscripts other than those already cited for a reading: but X has a variable range, depending on which other manuscripts have been cited. X automatically includes the full complement of selected manuscripts in use at the time (see end of Sigla Codicum for details of lines), but excludes, for reasons mentioned earlier, H J R S and V. Thus at v.320 the primary manuscripts in use are ABCDGKLMNOPUWYZ, and NFU are cited in opposition to EX: X therefore on this occasion is equivalent to ABCDGKLMNOWYZ. Unidentified manuscripts (small letters) should never be assumed to be included in X, and are therefore treated in the same way as H J R S and V. Where selected and numbered manuscripts are quoted together for a reading, and X stands in opposition to them (e.g. v.48 albis M 205 361: altis X), then X denotes all or the overwhelming majority of all the other manuscripts which I have collated. Where the first hand only of a manuscript is quoted, and X follows in opposition, then X includes the second hand, unless there is any indication to the contrary: and vice versa.

Where a variant reading is given by itself in the
Apparatus, attested by a primary manuscript or manuscripts, then the remainder of the unmentioned selected MSS. in use at the time always have the reading which appears in the text. When a variant reading is given by itself in the Apparatus, attested by a numbered manuscript or manuscripts, then it may usually be assumed that the great majority of all other manuscripts have the reading which appears in the text. The important distinction is that, whereas I have tried to give a full coverage of the primary MSS. (so that their readings are never in doubt), the same comprehensiveness is neither possible nor always desirable for all other MSS. For the sake of convenience, X sometimes comes in the middle of a grouping of variant readings, with other manuscripts' readings (which must therefore be excluded from X) coming afterwards, as in the Apparatus at vv. 487 and 553.

The symbol X has two other functions, both slightly different extensions of the uses already described. Where a conjecture is adopted into the text, and X stands in opposition to it (e.g. v.33 turpantes Heinsius : turbantes X), then X comprises all available manuscript evidence; and X has the same meaning again where questions of orthography are concerned (e.g. v.16 gentis : gentes X ; v.665 pinnis : pennis X). Questions of this kind about
Orthography are dealt with in more detail elsewhere, and reasons are given for the choice of spelling.

Where I have met with faults in the collations of previous editors, I have corrected these tacitly in the apparatus; but full details of the more important instances will be found in Appendix IV. Most usually these mistakes take the form noted above with Rhen., b, d, and 389, of the wrong attribution ex silentio of correct readings.

In matters of spelling, I do not necessarily note minor inconsistencies between manuscripts, such as the inclusion or omission of \( \hat{a} \), the differences between \( i \) and \( y \), \( e \) and \( ae \), and \( o \) and \( u \); and I have not always mentioned wrong word-divisions, when they were of no consequence, or self-corrections by the first hand at the first copying. When I cite a variant reading for one purpose (e.g. v.5 inmunes AEGKU 176, to show the omission of -que), I spell the rest of the word in the apparatus as it appears in the text (e.g. I write inmunes in the note although in some of the manuscripts the word appears as immunes).
## SIGLA CODICUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Munari</th>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Codic</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 81</td>
<td>Erfurtanus I, olim Amplonianus</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 154</td>
<td>Londiniensis 11967</td>
<td>S.X/XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 112</td>
<td>Hauniensis 2008</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 46</td>
<td>Berolinensis D.B.S.12</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 365</td>
<td>Vaticanus Palatinus 1669</td>
<td>S.XI/XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 177A</td>
<td>Marcianus Florentinus 223</td>
<td>S.XI/XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 104</td>
<td>Guelferbytanus 2942</td>
<td>S.XI/XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 167</td>
<td>Londiniensis Harleianus 2737</td>
<td>S.XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 281</td>
<td>Patavinus Sancti Iohannis</td>
<td>?S.XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 172</td>
<td>Londiniensis Regius 26</td>
<td>S.XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 131</td>
<td>Laurentianus 36.12</td>
<td>S.XI/XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 178</td>
<td>Marcianus Florentinus 225</td>
<td>S.XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 206</td>
<td>Napolitanus IV.F.3</td>
<td>S.XI/XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O 148</td>
<td>Leidensis Vossianus 0.51, olim Arondelianus</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 240</td>
<td>Parisinus 8001, olim Berneggerianus</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 238</td>
<td>Parisinus 7993</td>
<td>S.XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 313</td>
<td>Spirensis</td>
<td>?S.XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 321</td>
<td>Monacensis 29007, olim Tegernseensis</td>
<td>S.XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 370A</td>
<td>Vaticanus Urbinas 341</td>
<td>S.XI/XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V 345</td>
<td>Vaticanus 5859</td>
<td>S.XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 379</td>
<td>Vindobonensis 207</td>
<td>S.XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Edinburgensis 18.3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Turicensis 413, olim Rhenouanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Codices Incerti Veterum Editorum:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>codex Abbatorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Berolinensis Bachii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>unus uel plures Ciofani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Dresdensis Bachii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>fragmentum Amstelodamense Heinsii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>codex Constantis Fanensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Gryphianus Heinsii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>unus uel plures Heinsii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Argentinensis Heinsii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Boschianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Mediceus Heinsii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Ambrosianus Heinsii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>excerpta Langermanni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Leidensis Heinsii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>codex Gronouii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>unus uel ambo Sulmonensium Ciofani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>fragmentum Theatinorum Heinsii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>codex Ursini</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vaticanus, siue Clofani siue Heinsii
Moretanus
excerpta Calandrae
codex Thysii
codex Zulichemii
editio Romana princeps, anno 1471

Codices Heinsiani:

42 Berolinensis D.B.S.5, S.XIII
olim Sixianus
108 Guelferbytanus 4427, S.XIV
olim Rottendorphianus
214 Oxoniensis Balliolensis 142 setatis incertae
349 Vaticanus Barberinianus 70 S.XIII

Extant codices ABCDEFGKLMNOPTUWYZ ita ut X (= ABCDEFGKLMNOPTUWYZ, praeter eos qui separatim nominantur) uersibus uariis varios codices contineat:

uu. 1-39 : ACDEGKLMNOPUWYZ
40-101 : ACDEFGKLMNOPUWYZ
102-159 : ACDFGKLMNOPUWYZ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Alphabet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160-189</td>
<td>ACDFGKLMNPTUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190-197</td>
<td>ACDFGKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198-231</td>
<td>ACDEFGKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232-260</td>
<td>ACDEFGKLMNOPWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261-283</td>
<td>ACDEGKLMNOPWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284-291</td>
<td>ACDEGKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292-309</td>
<td>ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-397</td>
<td>ABCDGEKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398-440</td>
<td>ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441-448</td>
<td>ABCDGEKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449-481</td>
<td>ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482-503</td>
<td>ABCDEGKLMNPTUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504-542</td>
<td>ABCDGEKLMNPTUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543-548</td>
<td>ABCDGEKLMNOPWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549-553</td>
<td>ABCDEGKLMNOPWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554-598</td>
<td>ABCDGEKLMNOPWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599-603</td>
<td>ABCDEGKLMNOPWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604-695</td>
<td>ABCDGEKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696-701</td>
<td>ABCDGEKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702-793</td>
<td>ABCDFGKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794-803</td>
<td>ABCDEFGKLMNOPUWYZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At non Alcithoe Minyeias orgia censet
tacipienda dei, sed adhuc temeraria Bacchum
progeniem negat esse Iouis sociasque sorores
inpietatis habet. festum celebrare sacerdos
inmunesque operum famulas dominasque suorum
pectora pelle tegi, crinalis soluere uittas,
serta coma, manibus frondentis sumere thyrsos
iusserat et sæuam laesi fore numinis iram
uaticinatus erat. parent matresque nurusque
telasque calathosque infectaque pensa reponunt

1-10 : ACDEGKLMNPWYZ

1 alcione 102 : arsinoe v

mineias \textsuperscript{AELU} \textsuperscript{1} 133 150 269 : mineelias \textsuperscript{K} \textsuperscript{marg.} : minyoias b : mineias \textsuperscript{Z} : mineias \textsuperscript{vel siaa}
X 5 post u.6 cod.84 inmunesque inmunesque

AEKU 176 dominas famulasque \textsuperscript{G} 6 crinalis

N \textsuperscript{1} m 225 : crinale X 7 \textsuperscript{comas} \textsuperscript{comis CDGopWY}

frondentis \textsuperscript{N} : frondentes X 10 telasque calathosque

EJWS : telas et calathosque \textsuperscript{361} : telas et calathosque \textsuperscript{N1U} :
telas \textsuperscript{ACKLYZ} et calathos \textsuperscript{DGAW 176} 105
turaque dant Bacchumque uocant Bromiumque Lyaeumque
ignigenamque satumque iterum solumque bimatrem.
additur his Nyseus indetonusque Thyoneus
et cum Lenaeo genialis consitor uae,
Nycteliusque Eleleusque parens et Iscchus et Euhan 15
et quae praeterea per Graias plurima gentis
nomina, Liber, habes; tibi enim inconsumpta iuuentus,
tu puer æternus, tu formosissimus alto
conspiceris caelo; tibi cum sine cornibus adstas
virgineum caput est; oriens tibi uictus aüaque 20

11-20: ACDE<GLMNOPUWYZ

11 bromiumque uocant bachumque 9.176
AEGL2OP2RU2YZ: ly(a)emque
CDK1LMNP1U1W 12 indigenamque
L 276

15 nycteliusque AEMLP2UZ: nyctelius DP1: nictileusque uel
nicteleusque uel alia X

256 396 399: elileusque 25: elileisque AE 135 268: eleusque X
16 gentis ] gentes X

17 iuuentus DONOPWZ 176:
iuventas S: iuuentus est 23 36 39 72 110 141 155 186 232 275
291: iuventas est CML: iuuenta ABLU 1
19 sine
cornibus adstas ] confinibus astris EKL1S2U 176

in
marg. N
(?)abusque M1
decolor extremo quae cingitur India Gange. Penthea tu, uenerande, bipenniferumque Lycurgum sacrilegos mactas Tyrrenaque mittis in aequor corpora; tu biiugum pictis insignia frenis colla premis lyncum: Bacchae Satyrique secuntur 25 quique senex ferula titubantis sustinet artus ebrius et pando non fortiter haeret asello, quacumque ingredieris, clamor iuuenalis et una feminineae uoces inpulsaque tympana palmis concavaque aera sonant longoque foramina buxus. 30

21-30: ACDEGLMNPWYZ

21 discolor 105 110 155 241 292 quae Z 292 Heinsius: qua X tingitur b 114 146 147 217 221 223: iungitur D
26 baculo W titubantis N¹: titubantes X
26-27 sustinet artus ebrius CP: ebrius artus sustinet X
27 et] aut EGUZ¹ 28 iuuenalis M¹(S)Z¹ 177B¹: iuuenilis X 30 longoque ] largoque 349: uncoque Heinsius longaque foramina M¹
'pacatus mitisque' rogant Ismenides 'adsis'
iussaque sacra colunt. solae Minyeides intus
intempestiua turpantes festa Minerua
aut ducent lanas aut stamina pollice uersant
aut haerent telae famulasque laboribus urgent. 35
e quibus una leui deducens pollice filum
'dum cessant aliae commentaque sacra frequentant,
nos quoque quas Pallas melior dea detinet' inquit
'utile opus manuum uario sermone leuemus
perque uices aliquid, quod tempora longa uideri 40

31-39 : ACDEGKLMNOPUWXYZ
40 : ACDEFGKLMNOPUWXYZ

31 pacatus m. prob. Heinsius 32 Minyeides E 129^1
Heinsius : minicides L : mynyenides U^1 : meinaiedes 157^1 :
mineiades 157^2 : mineides uel alia X 33 intempestiua/
... minerua/ M turpantes Heinsius : turbantes X
34 aut ducent J adducunt MN^1Y^1 : aqutducunt 156 36 ex
quibus h 91 102 115 157, fort. recte filum J fusum DO
37 ministrant A 40 uidere MN^1N^1
non sinat, in medium usus usque referamus ad auris'.
dicta probant primamque iubent narrare sorores.
illa quid e multis referat (nam plurima norat)
cogitat et dubis est de te, Babylonia, narret,
Derceti, quam uersa squamis velabantis artus
stagna Falaestini credunt celebrasse figura,
an magis ut sumptis illius filia pinnis
extremos albis in turribus egerit annos,
mais an ut cantu nimiumque potentibus herbis
uerterit in tacitos iuuenaliam corpore pisces

41-50: ACDEFGKLMNOPWYZ

41 sinet M  auries 396¹  :  aures X  :  auras K⁻M⁻N⁻S⁻U⁻
42 iubent J  uocant G  43 quidem multis M⁻¹
norat J  noscit O 176  45 derceti ENU 92 97A 129¹ 236
396 399  :  decerti F  :  di(y)rc(h)eti AL₂OYZ¹  :  directi 19  :
discreti 102¹  :  dirces S  :  dircē G  :  dirce X  :  uersam
CM⁻¹U  :  mersantibus 171  46 credunt J  memorant 3
celebrasse CJ(IN¹)P⁻²S⁻Z² 176  :  (???)asse F¹  :  habitasse 0  :
coluisse DP⁻¹N⁻²WY  :  mutasse ACEKL⁻²MP¹UZ¹  :  inbitasse L¹
figuram CM⁻¹U  47 sumptis 48 subitis U  :  pinnis J
pennis X  :  48 albis K 205 361  :  altis X
50 iuuenalis EFM⁻¹Sa 95 300  :  iuuenilis X
donec idem passa est, an quae poma alba ferebat
ut nunc nigra feras contactu sanguinis arbor.
hoc placet; hanc, quoniam vulgaris fabula non est,
talibus orsa modis lana sus fils sequente:
'Pyramus et Thisbe, iuuenum pulcherrimus alter,
altera quas oriens habuit praelata puellis,
continuas tenuere domos, ubi dicitur altam
coctilibus muris cincisse Semiramis urbem.
notitiam primosque gradus uiceria fecit,
tempore creuit amor; taedae quoque iure coissent,

51-60 : ACDEFGKLMNOPWYZ

51 aut quae A 52 arbos 34 106 327 53 hanc S : haec X : hoc AELOUY 54 sequente est d 56 om. N1
57 continuas A1ENPSUV : contiguas X : contiguas 97A
tenuere J habuere DEGUWY post u.57 habet hunc versum
cod.197 : Sennarar in campis babilon q dicitur olim
58 cincisse 110 205 : cincisses 22 : cincisse 168 : cincisse
OWZ 23 63 : cincixe 392 : cinxisse X : struxisse J
sed uetuere patres, quod non potuere uetare,  
ex se quo captis ardebant mentibus ambo.  
conscius omnis abest, nutu signisque locuntur,  
quoque magis tegitur, tectus magis aestuat ignis.  
fissus erat tenui rima, quam duxerat olim  
cum fieret, paries domui communis utrique.  
id uitium nulli per saecula longa notatum  
(quid non sentit amor?) primi uidistis amantes  
et uocis fecistis iter: tutaeque per illud  
murmure blanditiae minimo transire solebant.

61-70 : ACDEFGKLMNOPUWYZ

61-62 primi sic distinxerunt I.H.Voss et Gierig
63 locuntur DGLMW : loquuntur X 64 tectus ] tanto H
67 notatum est ACL 68 uidistis ] sensistis t 91 106
147 149 394 69 uoci GU² 70 nimio A
sepe, ubi constiterant, hinc Thisbe, Pyramus illinc, inque uices fuerat captatus anhelitus oris, 'inuide' dicebant 'paries, quid amantibus obstas? quantum erat ut sineres toto nos corpore iungii aut, hoc si nimium est, uel ad oscula danda pateres! 75 nec sumus ingrati: tibi nos debere fatemur quod datus est uerbis ad amicas transitus auris.' talia diversa nequiquam sede locuti sub noctem dixere 'uale' partique dedere oscula quisque suae non peruenientia contra. 80

71-80: ACGDFGKLMOUFUWYZ

71 ubi ] ibi W : ut ADEGUZ : hic F² 72 uicem GW
74 toto nos ] nos toto AGLOVWY, prob. Heinsius 75 est om. DY danda ] blanda G : sola FU 77 auris N¹:
sares X 78 nequiquam diversa ADEGPY2 176
80 quiue N¹
postera nocturnos aurora remouerat ignis
solque pruinosis radiis siccauerat herbas:
ad solitum coiere locum. tum murmure paruo,
multa prius questi, statuunt ut nocte silenti
fallere custodes foribusque excedere temptent,
cumque domo exierint, urbis quoque tecta relinquant;
neue sit errandum lato spatiantibus aruo,
conueniant ad busta Nini latesantque sub umbra
arboris (arbor ibi nuiueis uberrima pomis,
erdua morus, erat, gelido contermina fonti).
pacta placent, et lux tarde discedere uisa est; Phoebus in Oceani non cursu fessus inani praecipitatur aquas, et aquis nox surgit ab isdem. callida per tenebras uersato cardine Thisbe egreditur fallitque suos adopertaque uultum peruenit ad tumulum dictaque sub arbore sedit. audacem faciebat amor; uenit ecce recenti caede lesena boum spumantis oblita rictus depositura sitim uicina fontis in unda. quam procul ad lunae radios Babylonis Thisbe uidit et obscurum timido pede fugit in antrum,

91-100 : ACDEFGKLMNCPUWYZ

91 decedere 129 uisa est DMOWNYZ : uisa X
91a non extat hic versus nisi in codd. 84 164 165 183 390
92 aquas conieci : aquis X surgit ACDKOPWYZ₁, prob.
Heinsius : surget ᵃ : exit EFLMNUZ² 93 callida)
candida p 228¹, fort. recte 97 spumantis N¹r 225 300 : spumantes X spumanti feruida rictu U 280 oblita ] albida 221 394 98 uicina 101
100 timido ] trepido A
dumque fugit, tergo uelamina lapsa relinquuit.
ut lea saeua sitim multa conpescuit unda,
dum redit in siluas, inuentos forte sine ipsa
ore cruentato tenuis laniauit amictus.
serius egressus uestigia uidit in alto
pulvere certa ferae totoque expalluit ore
Pyramus; ut uero uestem quoque sanguine tinctam
repperit, 'una duos' inquit 'nox perdet amantis,
e quibus illa fuit longe dignissima uita.
ostra nocens anima est, ego te, miseranda, peremi

101 : ACDEFGKLMNOPUWYZ
102-110 : ACDEFGKLMNOPUWYZ

101 relinquit DJNOSW : relinquit X
104 tenuis N1r : tenuies 291 : tenues X
108 una dies inquit nos 91 97A 105 150 205
nox inquit
3 23 61 66 106 176 197 208 224 228 229 245 247 332
nex 168, fort. recte
amantes λ
109 ex quibus L, fort. recte
109-110 primus sic distinxi
in loca plena metus qui iussi nocte uenires
nec prior huc ueni. nostrum diuellite corpus
et scelerata fero consumite uiscera morsu,
o quicumque sub hac habitatis rupe leones;
sed timidi est optare necem.' uelamina Thisbes
115
tollit et ad pactae secum fert arboris umbram,
utque dedit notae lacrimas dedit oscula uesti,
' accipe nunc' inquit 'noster quoque sanguinis haustus'.
quoque erat accinctus demisit in illis ferrum.
nec mora, feruenti moriens e uulnere tracxit
120

111-120 : ACDBGKLMNOPUWYZ
111 metu DGKONY  
habent post u.114 DU  
confert S  
notae X  
notae Y  
Heinsius : dimittit w
111 metu DGKONY  
habent post u.114 DU  
confert S  
notae X  
notae Y  
Heinsius : dimittit w
111 metu DGKONY  
habent post u.114 DU  
confert S  
notae X  
notae Y  
Heinsius : dimittit w
111 metu DGKONY  
habent post u.114 DU  
confert S  
notae X  
notae Y  
Heinsius : dimittit w
111 metu DGKONY  
habent post u.114 DU  
confert S  
notae X  
notae Y  
113 om. M^1 N^1 S^1 V^1,  
morsu] dente L  
116 se  
madidae conici lacrimas
lacrimas puer oscula G : lacrimas atque os-
cula W  
119 demisit MNZ^1 : dimisit X : demittit
120 tracxit ] tracxit 168 :
tracit 88 : tracit X
et iucuit resupinus humo : cruor emicat alte non aliter quam cum uitiato fistula plumbo scinditur et tenuis stridente foramine longe eiaculatur aquas atque ictibus sera rumpit. arborei fetus aspergine caedis in atram uertuntur faciem madefactaque sanguine radix purpureo tinguit pendentia poma colore.

Ecce, metu nondum posito, ne fallat amantem illa redit iuuenemque oculis animoque requirit quantaque uitarit narrare pericula gestit ;

121-130 : ACDPGKLMNOPUWYZ

121 et ] ut A, prob. Heinsius humi N(2) 105
123 tenuis hs, prob. Heinsius : tenues c 396 : tenui X
127 purpureo ] puniceo s tinguit ] tinguet N(1) :
tinxit CFJKLP poma G 19 66 74 92 98 146 160 292 396 394 : mors X colore ] rubore CD
utque locum et uissa cognoscit in arbore formam,
sic facit incertam pomi color: haeret, an haec sit.
dum dubitat, tremebunda uidet pulsare cruentum membra solum retroque pedem tulit oraque buxo pallidiora gerens exhorruit aequoris instar, 135
gaud tremit exigua cum summum stringitum aura.
seō postquam remorata suos cognouit amores percutit indignos clēro plangore laceratos et laniata comas amplexaque corpus amatum uulners suppleuit lacrimis fletumque cruori 140

131-140 : ACDFGKLMNOPUWXYZ

131 uissa M 92 : uisam SX : uersam 0 20 67 69 91 143 1862 224
135 in ras. M2 gerens ] rigens Heinsius
136 tremit GN2WN : fremit EX 137 memorata U1
138 percutit ] perculit 1 34 239 : pertulit G1
139 complexaque 23 66 107 217 222 amantis DS
140 cruore F1LFS
miscuit et gelidis in uultibus ocula figens
'Pyrame' clamauit 'quis te mihi casus ademit?
Pyrame, responde; tua te, carissime, Thisbe
nominat: exsudi uultusque attolle iscentis.'
ad nomen Thisbes oculos iam morte grauatos
Pyramus erexit uisaque recondidit illa.
quae postquam uestemque suam cognouit et ense
uidit ebur vacuum, 'tua te manus' inquit 'amore
perdidit, infelix; est et mihi fortis in unum
hoc manus, est et amor: debit hic in uulnera uires.

141-150: ACDFGKLMNCFWYZ

141 fingens D4Z  142 in marg. N, om. S
143 carissime FR 205 214 334, prob. Heinsius: carissima X
144 iscentis N1: iscentes X  145 iam ACDHORYWZ: a NU:
in PKLMP 149 est et EX: etiam S 146 215 277: uulnus
DO 1 220 263: similis 35 unum EX: iotum K2 74 221:
unam C: una E2 149-150 in unum hoc manus] in unam me
manus Heinsius: in usum hunc manus Francius: in usus hos manus
Schepper 150 hoc 243 260 2652 323: haec X
uulnere 60 61 220
persequar extinctum letique miserrima dicar
causa comesque tui; quique a me morte reuelli
heu sola poteras, poteris nec morte reuelli.
hoc tamen amborum uerbis estote rogati,
o multum miseri, meus illiusque, parentes,
155
ut quos certus amor, quos hora nouissima iuncxit,
conponi tumulo non inuidiestis eodem.
at tu quae ramis arbor miserabile corpus
nunc tegis unius, mox es tectura duorum,
signa tene caedis pullosque et luctibus aptos
160

151-159 : ACDFGKLMNOPUWYZ
160 : ACDFGKLMNOPTUWYZ

151 prosequar 42 223 229 153 om.FN. add. in summa pag.
F2, in marg. N poterisne in morte S 154 hoc]
haec A : hic C1F2 : his C2LMW 155 miseri meus EJSX :
miseri mei K2k2y2 : miseri meique W : miserique mei CDN2O :
miseri nostri L 156 certus ] iustus G : carus Y :
ersus w iuncxit G 140 205 212 225 230 : iuncsit 156 :
iuncit X 158 arbos 18 113 251 160 caedis et
pullos luctibus N : caedis et pullosque et luctibus L
semper habe fetus, gemini monimenta cruris.'
dixit et aptato pectus mucrone sub imum
incubuit ferro, quod adhuc a caede tepebat.
uota tamen tetigere deos, tetigere parentis:
nam color in pomo est, ubi permaturuit, ater, 165
quodque rogis superest urna requiescit in una.'

Desierat mediumque fuit breue tempus, et orsa est
dicere Leuconoe: uocem tenuere sorores.

'Hunc quoque siderea qui temperat omnia luce
cepit amor, Solem: Solis referemus amores. 170

161-170: ACDFGKLMNOPTUWYZ

162 imum ipsum G 164 parentis parentes X
166 urna ... in una GNPR: una ... in urna EX
requieuit N² 168 leuconoe K₁₀₂PST: leuc(h)ot(h)oe X:
leucotee 59 390: leucatoe 153 157 223: Leucippe Riese
uoces U 170 referamus ODFGKLOPSWY
primus adulterium Veneris cum Marte putatur
hic uidisse deus: uidet hic deus omnia primus.
indoluit facto Iunonigenaeque marito
furta tori furtique locum monstruit; at illi
et mens et quod opus fabrilis dextra tenebat 175
excidit: extemplo gracilis ex aere catenas
retiaque et laqueos, quae lumina fallere possent,
elimat (non illud opus tenuissima uincant
stamina, non summo quae pendet aranea tigno),
utque leuis tactus momentaque parua sequantur 180

171-180 : ACDFGKLMNCPTUWYZ

172 deus hic uidet 22  176 extemplo ADFLN²CPTUVY
gracilis 47 : gracialis 20 : graciles X  179 non ] nec
AZ  180 leuis N¹ m 247 : leues X
efficit et lecto circumdata collocat spte.

ut venere torum coniunx et adulter in unum,

arte uiri uinolisque noua ratione paratis

in mediis ambo depresemi amplexibus haerent.

Lemnius ex templo usuas patefecit aenas 185

admisitque deos: illi iacuere ligati

turpiter, atque aliquis de dis non tristibus optat

sic fieri turpis: superi risere diuque

haec fuit in toto notissima fabula caelo.

Exigit indicii memorem Cythereia poenam 190

181-190 : ACDFGKLMOQFTUWYZ

181 efficit fecit S: fecerat 67 collocat ] colligat

G 205 spte ADGHKM ORWYZ : arte L1N1 ex spte L1N1 :

arte SX : alte 147 : alto Heinsius : abscissum in T

185 ex templo ACDFK1L1UNY aenas conieci (χαλκοβάτες,

Hom. Od. VIII.321) : eburnas EX 186 admissitque adducit-

que 242 : immisitque M1 92 101 197 187 optet w 2 389

188 turpis tristis w
ingue uices illum, tectos qui laesit amores, laedit amore pari. quid nunc, Hyperione nate, forma colorque tibi, radiantia lumine prosunt? nempe tuis omnis qui terras ignibus uiris ueris igne nouo, quique omnia cernere debes. Leucothoen spectas, et uirginem figis in una quos mundo debes oculos. modo surgis Eco temperius caelo, modo serius incidis undis spectandique mora brumalis porrigis horas. deficit interdum uitiumque in lumina transit

190-197: ACDFGKLWNOFUVWXYZ
198-200: ACDFGKLWNOFUVWXYZ

191 qui J quia A 192 laedit] lesit DFG
193 calorque L 2121, prob. Heinsius : decorque 401
radiantia CGM 2WY : et radiantia 391 : radiantiaque 60 2292 :
radiataque ADFKL1OFUZ : radiata 881 260 399 : laudataque N
194 omnis L 1 101 140 213 : omnes X
196 leucothoen h Heinsius : leucattoen 157 : leucotaen 153 una ]
illa GJ 198 serius ] segnius 245
199 brumalis N 1 m 164 223 300 : brumales X
horas ]
umbras N 2 200-201 transit mentis D Ferm. : mentis transit X
mentis et obscurus mortalitatem pectora terres.

nec tibi quod lunae terris propriis imago

obstiterit palles: facit hunc amor iste colorem.

diligis hanc unam, nec te Clymeneque Rhodosque

genetrix pulcherrima Circes, nec tenet Aeneae

quaeque tuos Clytie quamuis despecta petebat

tempore. Leucothoe multarum obliuia fecit,
gentis odoriferarum quam formosissima partu

eaudit Eurynome; sed postquam filia creuit,

201-210: ACDEFGKLMNQPWYZ

201 pectora corpora AGY

204 unam solam AZ

205 aeaeae AEFY : ethe Fd 64 : enene 2231

300 (= ?N1) : eene in ras, N2 : et ceae M : eoe vel oee X

207 cardisque connecti : ipsoque X : ipsosque AEL1U1 : ipsos P1

210 eurinome EX2WNOV : erinome AZ : eurinone D : erimone Y :
eurimone X
quam mater cunctas, tam matrem filia uincit.

rexit Achaemeniss urbis pater Orchamos isque
septimus a prisco numeratur origine Belo.

axe sub Hesperio sunt pascua Solis equorum;

ambrosiam pro gramine habent; ea fessa diurnis

membra ministeriis nutrit, reparatque labori.

dunque ibi quadrupedes caelestia fabula carpunt

noxque uicem peragit, thalamos deus intrat amatos

versus in Eurynomes faciem genetricis et inter

bis sex Leucothoen femulas ad lumina cernit

211-220: ACDFGKLMNQFUWYZ

211 uincit A¹DEKLOW: uicit X  212 urbis X: urbes X

Orchamos } Orchamus X  213 prisa ... beli K

numeratus N²  215 habent ea } habentia E 113

ea } haec G : quae Y  217 quadrupedes MN¹ : quadrupedes X

219 eurinomes MNUV : eynomes A : eronimes Z : ermiones Y :
e(u)rimonex X  220 leucotheen h Heinsius : leuchotee

173 : leucatoen 157
leuia uereato ducentem stamina fusio.

ergo ubi ceu mater carae dedit oscula natae,
'res' sit 'arcana est : famulae, discedite neue
cripite arbitrium matri secreta loquendi'.
paruerunt thalsmoque deus sine teste relicito
'ille ego sum' dixit 'qui longum emetior annum,
omnia qui uideo, per quem uidet omnia tellus :
mundi oculo, mihi crede, places'. pauet illa metuque
et colus et fusi digitis cecidere remissis.
ipse timor decuit, nec longius ille moratus

221-230 : ACDEFGKLMNCPUWYZ

221 leuia ] leis CDEN2OUWE : tenes h. unde tenuia Heinsius
224 cripite ] abripite CE : sripite AFKLOY2Z loquenti
CMU matre in secreta loquente Heinsius
225 paruerunt L 212, prob. Heinsius : paruerant X : annuerant 23
relictus FGKL2M1 226 dixit 117, hau scio en recte
emetior FL5 : metior X longum qui metior 66 164 183 308
390 227 om. M1N1S 228 oculo 60 Bentley :
oculos N 67 74 : oculis N1 84 156 Heinsius : oculus X
crede ] sola 330 pauet om. M1, pauet illa metuque om. N1
229 fusi E1GNFU1 : fusus X 230 ipse ] ille D
ille ] ipse DEG
in uerum redit faciem solitumque nitorem;
at uirgo quamuis inopino territa uisu
uicta nitore dei posita uim passa querella est.

Inuidit Clytie (neque enim moderatus in illa
Solis amor fuerat) stimulataque paelicis ira
uulgat adulterium diffamatemque parenti
indicat: ille ferox inmensuetusque precentem
tendentemque manus ad lumina solis et 'ille
uim tulit inuitae' dicentem defodit alta
crudus humo tumulumque super grauis addit harenæ. 240

231 : ACDEFGKLMNOPWYZ
232-240 : ACDEFGKLMNOPWYZ

231 faciem AFNP : speciem X nitorem ] netorem N¹ :
decorem A 149 233 dei est posita AL : dei et posita
Goodyear querella est ] est om. L 234 illa]
illem ACE 236 diffamatemque D 158 280 Heinsius : dif-
famatemque X 240 in marg. N¹, et iterum in ima pag. N²
homo ] homo N¹ grauis super DFCK
dissipat hunc radiis Hyperione naturus iterque
dat tibi qua possis defossos promere uultus,
nec tu iam poteras enectum pondere terrae
tollere, nymphæ, caput, corpusque exangue iacebas.
nil illo fertur volucrum moderator equorum
post Phaethonteos uidisse dolentius ignis.
ille quidem gelidos radiorum uiribus artus
si quest in uium temptat reuocare calorèm,
sed quoniam tantis fatum constibus obstat,
nectare odorato spargit corpusque locumque

241-250 : ACDEFGKLMNOPWYZ

242 qua $F^1G^1M^1$ : quo X  243 enectum $|$ erectum $A^2M^2$ :
eiectum H : deiectum AEO : deiectum D  245 nil $|$ non G
246 phentontiados L, unde Phaethontiacos Heinsius
ignis 110 : ignes X  249 tantis $|$ uanis Heinsius
fatum tantis ACDEKOWYZ  250 spargit $GK^1WYZ$ : sparsit X
multaque praequestus 'tanges tamen sethera' dixit.
protinus inbutum caelestri nectar corpus
delicuit terramque suo madefecit odore,
uirgaque per glaebas sensim radicibus actis
tures surrexit tumulumque cacumine rupit. 255

At Clytien,quamuis amor excusare dolorem
indiciumque dolor poterat, non amplius auctor
lucis adit Venerisque modum sibi fecit in illa.
tebuit ex illo dementer amoribus usa,
siluarum inpatiens, et sub Ioue nocte dieque 260

251-260 : ACDEFGKLIMNPWYZ

251 perquestus AC2JS : post questus (?C1)FL : conquestus 3 222
67 98 133 135 140 195 222 280 325 255 tures ] surea M1
258 illa ] illam AW 259 dementer ] clementer E 18 105
247 394 : vehementer 373 usa ] usta 23 35 63 91 221 259
260 siluarum 239 247 261 276 325 : nympharum X : linpharum 19 :
nimborum z. prob. Heinsius et Bentley inpatiens
patisens EF1KLM1N1O1PSZZ nympha operum inpatiens
Madvig, lorum inpatiens Schenkl, sui inpatiens Tournier
sedit humo nuda nudis incompta capillis
perque nouem luces expers undaeque cibique
lore mero lacrimisque suis ieiunia pauit
nec se mouit humo: tantum spectabat euntis
ora dei uultusque suos flectebat ad illum. 265
membra ferunt hæsisse solo, partemque coloris
luridus exanguis pællor convertit in herbas;
est in parte rubor uiolaeque simillimus ora
flos tegit. illæ suum, quamuis radice tenetur,
uertitur ad solem mutataque seruat amorem.'  270

261-270 : ACDEGKLMNOPWYZ

261 nuda] gelida D nudis] madidis 396
263 pascit A 264 spectauit L 265 in marg. N
266 partemque] partesque 61 : pariterque 115
267 exanguis N¹ 261 47¹ 217 229 280¹ : exangues X
269 suum] sus N
Dixerat, et factum mirabile ceperat auris; pars fieri potuisse negant, pars omnia ueros posse deos memorant, sed non et Iacchon in illis.

Foscitur Alcithoe postquam siluere sorores. quae radio stantis percurrens stamina telse 275 'uulgetos taceo' dixit 'pastoris amores

Daphnidis Idaei, quem nympha paelicis ira contulit in saxum (tactus dolor urit amantis); nec loquor ut quondam naturae iure nouato ambiguus fuerit modo uir modo femina Sithon;

271-280: ACDEGKLMNCPWYZ

271 miserabile Y auris N₁: aures X: omnes GL₂N₂S²
273 et Iacchon Slater: et becchus SX: est becchus CLN²OYW
274 Alcathoe Bentley: alcinoe 158 277 Idaeae ...
paelicis Heinsius 278 amantis D₁₂30₁: amantes X
279 loquar D 280 fuerat GL: fieret cu
Sithon ] syt(h)on ADRY Bentley: cithon O: scyt(h)on 18 118
255 396 399 Micyllus: fiton 62: phiton GZ: chiron 173
te quoque, nunc adamsns, quondam fidissime paruo,
Cem1, Ioui largoque satos Curetas ab imbri
et Crocon in paruos uersum cum Smilage flores
praetero dulcique animos nouisate tenebo.

Vnde sit infamis, quere male fortibus undis
Salmacis eneruet tactoque remollit artus
discite: causa latet, uis est notissima fontis.

Mercurio puerum diua Cythereide natum
naides Idaes enutriuere sub antris;
cuius erat facies in qua materque paterque

281-283 : ACDEGKLNMOPFWYZ
284-291 : ACDEGKLNPOUWYZ

281 adamsns EM\(^1\), 150, 334 : adams X
ceime X

282 Cem1 Scaliger:
imbri ACERLANYZ : imbre X

283 uersos

284 dulcique ] duplicique 247

288 puerum et diua V\(^2\) diua et 72
cognosci possent; nomen quoque traxit sa illis. is, tris cum primum fecit quinquennis, montis deseruit patrios Idaque altrice relicta ignotis errare locis, ignota uidere flumina gaudebat studio minuente laborem. 295
ille etiam Lycias urbis Lyciasque propinquos Karas adit: uidet hic stagnum lucentis ad imum usque solum lymphae, non illic canna palustris, non steriles uluae, nec acuta cuspide iunci; perspicuus liquor est; stagni tamen ultima uiuo 300

292-300: ABCDEGKLMNOPUNVYZ

292 montis 36:\ montes X 295 minuente 34\ 59 155 159: remouente a 277 296 ille etiam 34\ illustrat G, unde lustravit coniici urbis 34\ urbes X propinquus ACDNY 297 Karas 261: Karras 252 272 277: Carras BEK 2 MNP 59 92 100 101 118 205 215 223 396 399: Carras X 298 nymphae 2BE 1 KMZ 299 non steriles ACEGWYZ: nec steriles X nec 34\ neque G
caespite cinguntur semperque uirentibus herbis. 
nympha colit, sed nec uenatibus apta nec arcos 
sectere qua se solest nec qua se contendere cursu, 
solaque naidum celeri non note Dianae: 
saepe suas illi fuma est dixisse sorores
'Salmae, uel isculum uel pictas sume pharetras 
et tua cum duris uenatibus otia misce'.
 nec isculum sumit nec pictas illa pharetras
 nec sua cum duris uenatibus otia miscet,
 sed modo fonte suo formosos perluit artus,

301-309 : ABCDEGKLMNPQRSTUVWXYZ
310 : ABCDEGKLMNPQRSTUVWXYZ

304 celebri e 213 307 miscet B₁ 307-308 om. c₁,
in marg. U. post v. 309 habet Y 308 non isculum A₀²ECZ 
non pictas E 308-309 om. B₁ 310 suos A
proluit Lp₁S, fort. recte : abluit 61 147 241 259
saepe Cytoriaco deducit pectine crinis
et quid se decent spectatas consultit undas;
nunc perlucenti circundat corpus amictu
mollibus aut foliis aut mollibus incubat herbis;
saepe legit flores, et tunc quoque forte legebat 315
cum puerum uidituisumque optauit habere.
nec tamen ante adit, et si properabat adire,
quam se conposuit, quam circumspexit amictus
et finxit uultum et meruit formosa uideri.
tum sic orsa loqui: 'puer o dignissime credi 320

311-320: ABCDKLMNOPUWYZ

311 cytoriaco U3g 1492 323 3272 396 Regius: cytheriaco M1N:
cy(i)thareaco CY: citharaico L: cytheriaco uel citheresco uel
alia X diducit Scaliger: deduxit G crinis] crines X 316 optabat N 317 non tamen E
319 uideri ] uocari 214 320 tum NFU: tunc EX
dignissima EM1
esse deus, seu tu deus es, potes esse Cupido,
siue es mortalis, qui te genuere beati
et frater felix et fortunata profecto
si qua tibi soror est, et quae dedit ubera nutrix;
sed longe cunctis longeque bestior ills
si qua tibi sponsa est, si quam dignabere taeda.
haec tibi siue aliqua est, mea sit furtius uoluptas,
seu nulla est, ego sim thalamumque ineamus eundem'.
nais ab his tacuit. pueri rubor ora notauit
(nescit quid sit amor), sed et erubuisse decest. 330

321-330 : ABCDKLMPQFUVYZ
323 frater L3 2082 2122 255 256 : mater EX
325 beatior ] potentior A1a1C1Y1Z : usalentior 161
illa est ACDGLOP 328 seu nulla ] siue nulla Y : si
nulla K2NSU : sed nulla B1k1 : si ea nulla B3
330 nescit quid sit amor ACDGLOPSU2VYZ : nescia quid sit amor
X : nescit amor quid sit 160 : nescit quid amor 1601 : nescit
enim quid amor EMNU1 : nescit adhuc quid amor 308
hic color aprica pendentibus arbores pomin
ut ebori tincto est aut sub candore rubenti,
cum frustra resonant sero auxiliaria, lunae,
poscenti nympheae sine fine sororia saltem
oscula iamque manus ad eburnea colla ferenti 335
'desinist an fugio tecumque' ait 'ista relinquo?'
Salmacis extimuit 'loca' que 'haec tibi libera trado,
hospes' ait simulatque gradu discedere uerso,
tum quoque respiciens; fruticumque recondita silus
delituit flexumque genu submisit. at ille, 340

331-340 : ABCDGKLMNPQWYZ

331 pomis ] malis ACD'KWY'Z 336 an fugio BMhv 18 62
92 118 222 255, prob. Heinsius : aufugio N'Y' 361 : aut fugio X
339 tum ] tunc CDNOW siluis b 340 flexumque
DGHOU : flexoque ACK'LMNPYZ : flexaque PK' : flexuque Lachmann
at ille ] at illa S : in uluam Z' : in ulua b 392
scilicet ut uacuis et inobserustus in herbis, 
huc it et hinc illuc et in alludentibus undis 
summa pedum taloque tenus uestigia tinguit; 
 nec mora, temperie blenderum captus aquarum 
mollia de tenero uelamina corpore ponit. 345
 tum uero obstipuit nudaeque cupidine formae 
Salmacis exarsit: flagrant quoque lumina nymphes 
non aliter quam cum puro nitidissimus orbe 
opposita speculi referitur imagine Phoebus, 
uique moram patitur, uix iam sua gaudia differt, 350

341-350 : ABCDGKLMNOPWYZ

341 scilicet et puer SZ : ut puer KL 
  uacuis BKMN3SV
  Z : uacuis X 
  346 obstipuit 229 312 3312 : stipuit 115
  129 : obstupuit G(KN1)RY : ostupuit 66 114 177B : stupuit ACDJK
  LN2OPWYZ : placuit BM3 : nudaeque ] uisaeque 22 62 101
  105 197 347 nymphes ADLPSV : nymphis BM1 : nymphae X
iam cupit amplecti, iam se male continet amens.
ille causa velox adplauso corpore palmis
desilit in latices alternaque braccia ducens
in liquidis translucet aquis, ut eburnea si quis
signa tegat claro uel candida lilia uitro.

'uicimus : en meus est!' exclamat nais et omni
ueste procul iacta mediis inmittitur undis
pugnamentque tenet luctantiaque oscula carpit
subiectatque manus inuitaque pectora tangit
et nunc hac iuueni, nunc circumflectitur illac.

351-360 : ABCDKLMNQPUWYZ

353 ducens ] iactans AEGOUWYZ 355 claro ] puro AD\textdegree{}E
356 uincimus D en 0 143 Ferm., prob. Heinsius : et EX
358 pugnacemque z 93, prob. Heinsius
358 pugnamentque tenet ] pugnantesque manus BM luctantia-
que ] inuitaque BMN1S 360 circumflectitur P 155 2212

230 287
denique nitentem contra elabique volentem
implicat ut serpens quam regis sustinet ales
sublimemque rapit (pendens esput illa pedesque
alligat et cauda spatiensis implicat ales),
utque solent hederae longos intexere trunci,
365
utque sub æquoribus depresum polypus hostem
continent ex omni dimissis parte flagellis.
perstat Atlantisæ sperataque gaudia nymphae
denegat; illa premit commissaque corpore toto
sicut inhaerebat 'pugnes licet, inprobe,' dixit
370
361-370 : ABCDKLMLFCWYZ

362 quem DEG
363 sublimenque NV
364 spatiensis

spatientes X

implicat } impedit Heinsius
365 post u. 366 A
utque ADGOWZ

innectere G

366 polipes U : pulypus Const. Panensis
367 dimissis

ADGPW : demissis X

369 commissaque S2 j 19 59 102 155,
prob. Heinsius : demissaque EDKNPS1U : demissaque X
'non tamen effugies: ita di iubestis ut istum nulls dies a me nec me duiduc ab isto!' uote suos habuere deos; nam mixta duorum corpora iunguntur faciesque inducit illos unas; uelut, si quis conducat cortice ramos, crescendo iungi pariterque adolescere cernit, sic, ubi complexu coierant membra tenaci, nec duo sunt et forma duplex, nec femina dici nec puer ut possit: nec utrumque et utrumque uidentur. ergo ubi se liquidas, quo ur ir descendet, undas

371-380 : ABCDGKLMNOPUWYZ


semimarem fecisse uidet mollitasque in illis
membra, manus tendens sed iam non uoce uirili
Hermaphroditus ast : 'nato date munera uestro,
et pater et genetrix, amborum nomen habenti :
quisis in hos fontis uir uenerit exeat inde 385
semuir et tectis subito mollescat in undis'.
motus uterque parens nati rata uerba biiformis
fecit et incesto fontem medicamine tincxit.'

Finis erat dictis, et adhuc Mynyeia proles
urget opus spernitque deum festumque profanat, 390

381-390 : ABCDGKLMNPGUWYZ

381 illis ] undis W_100 382 non iam BMY : nondum 105
384 et pater ] o pater HK^2 : di, pater tempt. Iasm
habenti ] adendi M^1 385 post u. 386 BMN^1 fontis]
fontes X inde ] idem L 386 et ] ut BMF
387 data BM^1N^1 uerba ] uota h 101 143 260, prob.
Heinsius 388 incesto BM^1M^1N^2S 158 : incerto N^1N^3X :
ingesto Riese tincxit CG 88 : tinxit EX 389 dictis et ] dicti sed BKM^1 : dictis sed K^3
my(i)niey(i)a AU^2 129 280^2 : menieia 392 : mineneia 66 :
emineia 334 : mi(y)neia uel meneia uel alia X
tympana cum subito non apparentia raucis
obstrepuere sonis et adunco tibia cornu
tinnulique sera sonant; redolent myrrhaeque crocique,
resque fide maior, coepere uirescere telae
inque hedarse faciem pendens frondescere uestis. 395
pars abit in uitis et quae modo fila fuerunt
palmite mutantur; de stamine pampinus exit;
purpura fulgorem pictis adcommodat uuis.
ianque dies exactus erat tempusque subibat
quod tu nec tenebras nec posses dicere lucem 400

391-397 : ABCDKLMNOPUWYZ
398-400 : ABCDEGKLMMOPUWYZ

393 redolent ANU² : et dolent b : redolentque 150 : et olent
BCDKLMNOPU¹WYZ  396 uitis 82¹ : uites X : frondes
ACGLY  399 exsuctus 262 : ex(h)austus Gd 267 336
400 possis ACDKOYZ  lucem J lumen GZ
sed cum luce tamen dubiae confinia noctis:
tecta repente quati pinguesque arder e uidentur
lampades et rutilis collucere ignibus sedes
falsaque saeuarum simulacra ululare ferarum.
fumida ismdudum latitant per tecta sorores
diversaeque locis ignis ac lumina uitant,
dumque petunt latebras, paruos membrana per artus
porrigitur tenuique includit bracchia pinna;
 nec qua perdiderint ueterem ratione figuram
scire sinunt tenebrae. non illas pluma leuauit,

401-410 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ

403 et ] ut (collucent) P² Magnus

404 ululasse 36 113

406 ignis 157¹

407 latebras V o 239 277, prob. Heinsius

tenebras X

408 tenuique B M N P S : tenuis 21 : tensus X

includit P 392 : includunt X

410 pluma ] penna G
sustinuere tamen se perlucentibus alis
conataeque loqui minimam pro corpore uocem
emittunt peraguntque leui stridore querellas
tectaque non siluas celebrant lucemque perosae
nocte ulant seroque tenent a uesper e nomen. 415

Tum uero totis Bacchi memorabile Thebis
numen erat, magnasque noui matertera uires
narrat ubique dei, de totque sororibus expers
una doloris erat, nisi quem fecere sorores.
aspicit hanc natis thalamoque Athamantis habentem 420

411–420 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ

412 minimam ] paruam 331 minimam pro ] minimam et pro
B1KV : minimamque pro 149 : minimam cum W1 : minimam de 98 107
147 208 413 leui GHN20 : leuis S751 : leues X
Heinsius 416 tum ] cum M2 : tunc DGOW
420 thalamisque NU
sublimis animos et alumni numine Iuno
nec tuliit et secum: 'potuit de paellce natus
uerere Maeonios pelagoque inmergere nautas
et laceranda suae nati dare uiscera matri
et triplicis operire nousis Mynieidas alis? 425
nil poterit Iuno nisi inultos flere dolores?
idque mihi satis est? haec una potentia nostra est?
ipse docet quid agam; fas est et ab hoste doceri;
quidque furor ualeat Penthea caede satisque
ac super ostendit. cur non stimuletur et atque 430

421-430: ABCDEGKLMPNPUWYZ
per cognata suis exempla furoribus Inc?

Est uia declius, funesta nubila taxo:
ducit ad infernas per muta silentia sedes.
Styx nebulas exhalat iners, umbraeque recentes
descentunt illae simulacraque functa sepulcris. 435
pallor hiempsque tenet late loca senta, nouique,
qua sit iter, manes, Stygiam quod ducat ad urbem,
ignorant, ubi sit nigri fera regia Ditis.
mille capax aditus et apertas undique portas
urbs habet, utque fretum de tota flumina terra, 440

431–440: ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ

431 sororibus NU^WY 432 funesta ] funestaque A^D
nebula 23.195.236 433 multa D^KO 434 recentes]
iacentes G : nocentes O 435 illuc CKN^ : illic d^389
sepulchro 213.227 436 hiemps ANOZ : hiems X
 tenet A^CEKL^2OZ : tenent X 437 quod HRVX, prob.
Heinsius : qua B^1C^1LMN^1S : qui O
 urbes urbem ] umbram N^1Z
sic omnis animas locus accipit ille nec ulli
exiguus populo est turbamue accedere sentit.
errant exangues sine corpore et ossibus umbrae,
parque forum celebrant, pars imi testa tyranni,
pars alias artis, antiquae imitamina uitae,

445
exercet † aliam †, partem sua poena coercet.

441-446 : ABCDGLMNOUWYZ

441 omnis 212 : omnes X ille ] ipse NU
442 turbamue ] turbasue 235 : turbam nec D 236 : nec turbam
239 : turbamque LM W Y : turbasque G accedere ] acc-
cendere 215 : ascendere 36 : accrescere Dziatzko
445 alias D Y, prob. Heinsius : aliquid X antiquas
artes tempt. Slater artis ] artes X : arces D 91 153
213 k 237 : partes Y : 446 in ima pag. G N : om. EHJRS
Y X et, ut uid., F (uid. ea quae in commentario dixi) : post
u, 443 cod. 39 : post u, 444 codd. 62 163 173 223 : post u, 447
codd. 123 160 241 294 : uersum del. Heinsius et editores fere
omnes : post u, 445 plura deesse Bentley ratus est
exercet aliam partem N, aliam obelis inclusi :
aliamque partem 276 : aliquam partem 72 98 Ferm. : partemque
alia W 25 213 : partemque aliquam G : illic alios 253
sua ] fera 232
Sustinet ire illuc cælesti sede relicta
(tantum odiis iraeque dabat) Saturnia Iuno;
quo simul intrauit sacroque a corpore pressum
intremuit limen, tria Cerberus extulit ora
et tris latratus semel edidit. illa sorores
nocte uocat genitas, graue et inplacabile numen.
carceris ante fores clausas adamanter sedebant
deque suis atros pectebant crinibus angues.
quam simul agnorunt inter caliginis umbras,

447-448 : ABCDKLMNOPUWYZ
449-455 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ

448 dabat ] uacat G, fort. recte 449 a om. BM
450 intremuit AB^2CDEKOP^2UW^2YZ: illa tremit W : contremuit G:
ingemuit B^1LMNP^1 451 tris ] tres X simul
DL^3OW 454 atris GY^1 pectabant KW : pendebant
Y^1 146 268 277 : spectabant N^1F^1: pexabant tempt. Heinsius
455 simulac norunt N^2 agnoscent O : agnorant Z
surrexere deae ........................................

.............. : Sedes Scelerata vocatur.

 uiscera praebebat Tityos lanianda nouemque

 iugeribus distinctus erat ; tibi, Tantale, nullae

 deprenduntur aquae quaeque inminet effugit arbos;

 aut petis aut urges ruiturum Sisyphe, saxum ;

 uoluitur Ixion et se sequiturque fugitque,

 molique suis letum patruelibus ausae

 assiduae repetunt, quae perdant, Belides undas.

456-463 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ

456 lacunam posui, aliquid huiusmodi Ouidium hoc loco

 scripsisse suspicetus :

 surrexere deae, regionis et atra recludunt

 limina Tartareae : Sedes Scelerata vocatur

457 tityos AB^LMP 74 150 215 312 361 : ttitus X

 laniata I : laceranda 21 62 217 220

458 districtus

 coniaceram, coll. Aen, VI.617 ; confirmant codd. 157 217 399 :

 distentus GLO, prob. Heinsius : distinctus 22 307 312 : dis-

 tractus X

459 arbos AH 106 161 223 287 292 373 : arbor

 X : arbor S

460 urges LNU : urges X

 ruiterum

 EKL^M^OUZ, prob. Heinsius : reditum X

463 perdunt

 B^CKLPU^W
Quos omnis acie postquam Saturnia torua
uidit et ante omnis Ixions, rursus ab illo
Sisyphon aspiciens 'cur hic e fratribus' inquit
'perpetuas patitur poenas, Athamanta superbum
regia diues habet, qui me cum coniuge semper
spreuit?' et exposuit causas odique uiaeque
quidque uelit; quod uellet erat ne regia Cadmi
staret et in facinus traherent Athamanta furores.
imperium promissa preces confundit in unum
solicitatque deas, sic haec Iunone locuta

464-473 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWXYZ

464 omnis r : omnes X facie LM² postquam
facie CDEKYZ 465 omnis ] omnes X 466 Sisiphona
aspiciens DG 469 spernit AKW exposuit 183 331
470 erant N¹ 471 furores ABCDE²KL²MOP¹SUWYZ¹:
sorores X, prob. Heinsius 472 confudit GKY
Tisiphone, canos ut erat turbata capillos,
mouit et obstantis reiecit ab ore colubras

atque ita 'non longis opus est ambagibus' inquit;
'facta puta quaecumque iubes; inamabile regnum

desere teque refer caeli melioris ad auras'.
laeta reit Iuno, quam caelum intrare parantem

roratis lustrauit aquis Thaumantias Iris.
Nec mora, Tisiphone madefactam sanguine sumit

inportuna facem fluuidoque cruore rubentem

474-481 : ABCDEKLMNCOPUWYZ
482 : ABCDEKLMNOPTUWYZ

474 ti(y)siphone BEKMU : t(h)esiphone X  canos ut erat
ACDEGKOWYZ : ut erat (errat B) canos BLMNPU 72 75 95
475 obstantis ] obstantes X  colubras reiecit ab ore
G t 161  deiecit 395  colubros 1591 164 167 327
390 476 opus est longis ] inquit ] inquit 115,
prob. Heinsius : uti D 481 ti(y)siphone BLMNZ :
482 fluidoque C2KLETYZ :
tisophone EK : t(h)esiphone X
fluidoque X : fuluoque d 63
rubentem ] madentem N2
rubore d
induitur pallam tortoque incingitur angue
egrediturque domo (Luctus comitatur euntem
et Pauor et Terror trepidoque Insania uultu). 485
limine constiterat: postes tremuisse feruntur
Aeolii pallorque fores infecit aenas
solque locum fugit. monstris est territa coniunx,
territus est Athamans, tectoque exire parabant:
obstitit infelix aditumque obsedit Erinys 490

483-490: ABCDEGLMNOPTUWYZ

483 recingitur L: accingitur D 484 comitantur 74 98
129 485 et terror J atque tremor Y 218 226 308
486 constiterant D 1 101 110 115 169 262 277
487 om. B 1 , inter lin. et iterum in marg. add. B 3

aenas conieci: Auernus Merkel: acernas X: eburnas D 3 107 147
252, prob. Burman, sed uid. u. 185 'eburnas' pro 'κυλκοβατές'
(= aenas) Homer 488 monstrisque O 63 389
est territa AP 1 72 113 139 291: et territa B 205: exterrita X
489 athamans T 247: athamas X: athemas B parabant
ACDEGKN 2 R 2 WYZ: parabat X
nexaque ulpereis distendens brachia nodis
caesariem excussit: motae sonuere colubrae,
parsque iscent humeris, pars circum pectora lapsae
sibila dant saniemque uomunt linguasque coruscant.
inde duos mediis abrupit crinibus anguis
pestiferaque manu raptos inmisit; at illi
Inoosque sinus Athamanteosque pererrant
inspirantque grauis animas. nec uulnera membris
ulla ferunt: mens est, quae diros sentiat ictus.
attulerat secum liquidi quoque monstra ueneni,

491-500: ABCDEGKLMNOPTUWYZ

491 necxaque 88. haud scio an recte ostendens C
492 motu T 389. fort. recte 493 pectora ] tempora N 2 m:
tempora L 494 linguasque EL 2 STY 2 Z, prob. Heinsius:
linguasque BDL 2 MN 2 V 69 164 165 390 1 : linguaque om. 183 361:
linguasque X : linguasque 105 107 110 218 224
495 ab-
ruptit AK : arruptit Od : abrupmit X anguis 101 1 : angues
X
498 aspirantque A grauis Conington ad Aen.
VII.351: graues X animas DGL 1 M 1 OPST 1 UWZ, prob.
Heinsius: animos X 499 diros om. M 1 , tales uel totos
in marg. M 2 : duros ADWKLOYZ, sed uid. Halietut.116, ubi 'diro' pro 'duro' recte coniecit Birt
500 quoque ] noua IV
84 164 165 183 390
oris Cerberei spumas et uirus Echidnae
erroresque uagos caecaeque obliuia mentis
et scelus et lacrimas rabiemque et caedis amorem,
omnia trita simul, quae sanguine mixta recenti
coxerat aere cauo uiridi uersata cicuta;
dumque pauent illi, uercxit furiale uenenum
pectus in amborum preecordiaque intima mouit.
tum face iactata per eundem saepius orbem
consequitur motis uelociter ignibus ignis.
sic uictrix iussique potens ad inania magni

501-503 : ABCDEGKLMNOPTUWXYZ
504-510 : ABCDGKLMNOPTUWXYZ

504 mixta] tri(c)ta K1Y : tincta ADEKLN2O1PTUW
recenti] rigenti S102 505 aere nouo 61 : igne nouo h
506 uercxit conieci (iam 'uersit' pro 'uertit' coniecerat
Heinsius ad Ep. Pont. I.9,52) : uergit Graevius : uertit EX
ferrale 312 508 tunc DGOW 509 motis ABCJLMNOS2 :
motos EHRX, prob. Heinsius et Bentley
ignis 227 291
306 : ignes X
regna redit Ditis sumptumque recingitur anguem.

Protinus Aeolides media furibundus in aula clamat 'io, comites, his retia tendite siluis:
hic modo cum gemina uisa est mihi prole leaena'
utque ferae sequitur uestigia coniugis amens

deque sinu matris ridentem et parua Learchum
brachia tendentem rapit et bis terque per auras
more rotat fundae rigidoque infantia saxo
discuit ora ferox; tum denique concita mater,
seu dolor hoc fecit seu sparsi causa ueneni,

511-520 : ABCDKLMNOPTUWYZ

511 sumptoque ... angue N¹ sumptumque septumque K :
tortumque W : tumidumque Böttiger 513 pandite L
514 dum BM¹ 517 bis terque quaterque 107 147 218¹
519 ossa 150, prob. Heinsius tuno DGOW : cum ET
exululat passisque fugit male sana capillis
tequa ferens paruum nudis, Melicerta, lacertis 'euhoe Bacche' sonat: Bacchi sub nomine Iuno
risit et 'hos usus praestet tibi' dixit 'alumnus'.

Inminet aequoribus scopulus: pars ima cauatur fluctibus et tectas defendit ab imbrisbus undas;
summa riget frontemque in apertum porrigit aequor.
occupat hunc (uiris insania fecerat) Ino
seque super pontum nullo tardata timore
mittit onusque suum: percussa recanduit unda.

521-530: ABCDGKLMNOPTUWYZ

521 passis BMN: sparsis EX
524 usus fructus 164 165 208 : lusus Heinsius
527 rigent GNOW: uiret Heinsius
528 uiris uires X
dolore 0 133
at Venus inmeritae neptis miserata labores
sic patruo blandita suo est: 'o numen aquarum,
proxima cui caelo cessit, Neptune, potestas,
magna quidem posco, sed tu miserere meorum
iactari quos cernis in Ionio inmenso
et dis adde tuis: aliqua et mihi gratia ponto est
si tamen in medio quondam concreta profundo
spuma fui Graiumque manet mihi nomen ab illa'.
anruit oranti Neptunus et abstulit illis
quod mortale fuit maiestatemque uerendam

531-540 : ABCDGKLMNOPTUWXYZ

531 inmersae 19: dolores G., fort. recte, uid.
IX. 142-143: duorum
331 : nepotum PU^2 242
534 pasco M^1 tuorum C^1 98
336 mihi ] mea KM^2Z est
mihi (mea W) gratia ponto GW 537 om. M^1 si]
sed T : set W
538 graiumque D^1 marg., KLM^2 N^2 U^2 fgh 12 2
113 129 197 213 215 219 389 : graiumque (= graiumque) 115 :
graumque U^1 : gratumque X
inposuit nomenque simul faciemque nouauit
Leucotheaque deum cum matre Palaemonae dixit.

Sidoniae comites, quantum ualuer, secutae
signa pedum primo uidere nouissima saxo;
nec dubium de morte ratae Cadmeida palmis
deplancxere domum scissae cum ueste capillos
utque parum iustae nimiumque in paelice saeuae
inuidiam fecere deae. conuicia Iuno
non tulit et 'faciam uos ipsas maxima' dixit
'saeuitiae monimenta meae'. res dicta secuta est:

541-542: ABCDGKLMNOPUWYZ
543-548: ABCDGKLMNOPUWYZ
549-550: ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ

542 Leucotheaque 396 399: Leucathoeque 74: Leucotheaque 84 171
287^2 390, prob, Heinsius: Leucoteque 100: Leucotheaque 164:
Leucothoeque X: Leucotoque T
546 deplancxere G: de-
planxere X domus N^1
scissae ... capillos
BEMN^1SV 92 361: scissis (scisis D, cisis Y) ... capillis X
550 nequitiae 23
nam quae praecipue fuerat pia 'persequar' inquit
'in freta reginam' saltumque datura mouerit
haut usquam potuit scapuloque affixa cohaesit;
altera, dum solito temptat plangore ferire
pectora, temptatos sensit riguisses lacertos;
illa, manus ut forte tetenderat in maris undas,
saxea facta manus in easdem porrigit undas;
huius ut arreptum laniabat uertice crinem
duratos subito digitos in crine uideres:
quo quaeque in gestu deprensa est, haesit in illo.

551-553 : ABCDEGKLMNOPWYZ
554-560 : ABCDGLKMNOPWYZ
551 prosequar Kd 100 102 177B 323 : praesequar 118
552 saltemque B¹M¹ saltuque dato remoueri B²ELM²
553 haut usquam ADEGOPWYZ : aut nusquam d : haud usquam X :
hadusquam B¹M¹ infixa D 553-554 potuit ...
cohaesit et solito ... ferire inter se mutata in cod. B¹MN¹
555 temptantes 150 : temptanti Heinsius sentit ACELYZ,
prob. Heinsius 556 in maris illa manus ... Heinsius
557 om. B¹L¹ porrigitur n. unde porgitur Heinsius
558 arrectum BM¹N¹S : apprensum M² laniabant d. prob.
Heinsius 560 deprenditur q. prob. Heinsius
in illo eodem 394
pars uolucres factae, quae nunc quoque gurgite in alto
aequora destringunt sumptis Ismenides alis.
Nescit Agenorides natam paruumque nepotem
aequoris esse deos; luctu serieque malorum
uictus et ostentis, quae plurima uiderat, exit
conditor urbe sua, tanquam fortuna locorum,
non sua, se premeret, longisque erratibus actus
contigit Illyricos profuga cum consuige finis.
iamque mali annisque graues, dum prima retractant
fata domus releguntque suos sermones laborum,

561-570 : ABCDGKLMNOPWYZ

561 alto Heinsius : illo EX : ipso b 91
562 de-
stri(y)ngunt BKN : distinguunt GLP : distinguunt JX
sumptis Shz, prob. Heinsius : summis EX
I(y)smenides
217 Heinsius : menides h : niseides 69 : inmeides 0 1 :
cadmeides N H : mineides B 97B 394 : minenides 370B 1 :
mineides uel meneides uel alia EX
564 luctu usu
Heinsius laborum LNPS
566 tanquam AKM :
tamquam
567 erratibus A 2K distrust 36 100 110 129 153 157
164 165 183 186 1 212 224 236 323 390, prob. Heinsius : erroribus
X
568 profugus 2 250 2 252 finis ] : fines X :
muros 23
570 facta ABLM 1 NOSWy
repetuntque
A 2DKM 2N 2SWY
570 suo L
'num sacer ille mea traiectus cuspide serpens'

Cadmus ait 'fuerat tum cum Sidone profectus
uipereos sparsi per humum, noua semina, dentis?
quem si cura deum tam certa uindicat ira,
ipse, precor, serpens in longam porrigar aluum.'

dixit et ut serpens in longam tenditur aluum
durataeque cuti squamas increscere sentit
nigraque caeruleis variari corpora guttis,
in pectusque cadit pronus commissaque in unum
paulatim tereti tenuantur acumine crura.

571-580: ABCDGKLMNOPWYZ

571 num ] non A^DWY  572 fuerit 129, prob. Heinsius
tunc DLW  573 dentis ] dentes X  574 certa]
saeua N^2  576 extenditur Francius : porgitur Heinsius,
uid. u.557  577 cutis BC^KMNPS  nigrescere 339
114 171 186: duescere 197 268  578 uitiari D^d
579 commissaque BGMN^P : commistaque Z : commixtaque X
580 sinuantur DN^2OPY, prob. Heinsius : curuantur 63
bracchia iam restant quae restant bracchia tendit et lacrimis per adhuc humana fluentibus ora 'accede, o coniunx, accede, miserrima', dixit 'dumque aliquid superest de me, me tange manumque accipe, dum manus est, dum non totum occupat anguis'. 585 ille quidem uult plura loqui sed lingua repente in partis est fissa duas, nec uerba loquenti sufficiunt quotiensque aliquos parat edere questus sibilat; hanc illi uocem natura reliquit. nuda manu feriens exclamat pectora coniunx 590

581-590 : ABCDGKLMNOPWYZ

582 cadentibus ora 119 584 de me me tange ) de me mihi tange Gronouius manuque B 585 non totam Heinsius : me nondum Z 587 partis ] partes X loquenti ] uolenti DKMN2WZ, prob. Heinsius 588 alios D 183 589 relinquat A1W, prob. Heinsius
'Cadme, mane teque, infelix, his exue monstris;
Cadme, quid hoc? ubi pes? ubi sunt umerique manusque
et color et facies et, dum loquor, omnia? cur non
me quoque, caelestes, in eundem uertitis anguem?'
dixerat : ille suae lammbebat coniugis ora
inque sinus caros, ueluti cognosceret, ibat
et dabat amplexus assuetaque colla petebat.
quisquis adest (aderant comites) terrentur; at ille
lubrica permulcet cristati colla dracoenis,
et subito duo sunt iunctoque uolumine serpunt,

591-598: ABCDKLMNPY

599-600: ABCDEGKLMNPY

591 infelix his ] his infelix N2 22 118 197 331, prob. Heinsius:
his om. W1 3 62 107 146 147 168 177B 222 267 327 exime
KN2S 592 quid hoc ] ubi uox Heinsius 594 eundem ADKN2PWYZ
597 tenebat Y: terebat tempt. Heinsius
598 terrentur DLN1 m 47 62 74 100 197 224 245 2512 255 280 291
300: tenentur 312 : terretur X  illa ] illis A2(?E)OW1Y
598-599 at illos ... permulcent ... dracones uel at illi ... perlucent ... dracones h Heinsius 599 perlucent A2EOW1Y
donec in adpositi memoria subiere latebras.
nunc quoque nec fugiunt hominem nec uulnere laedunt,
quidque prius fuerint placidi meminere dracones.
Sed tamen ambobus uersae solacia formae
magna nepos dederat, quem debellata celebat
India, quem positis celebrarat Achaia templis.
solus Abantides ab origine cretus eadem
Acrisius superest, qui moenibus arceat urbis
Argolicæ contraque deum ferat arma genusque
non putet esse Iouis (neque enim Iouis esse putabat

601-603 : ABCDEGKLMNOPWYZ
604-610 : ABCDEGKLMNOPWYZ
601 opposti E2DG02P2W subiere ] repserre Heinsius
603 quiue A¹ : quodque N placidi fuerint D
fuerant GNW 605 dejobellata G : decollata 135 : de-
colorata P 114¹ 606 celebrarat P 150 223 228 : celebrat
Y¹ 143 249¹ 225 300 399 : celebravit Lb 216 392 : celebrabat X
607 cre tus J n¹P 610 putet ADEGJKN²UWy : putat X
esse Iouis J¹Os 2 23 36 97B 100 107¹ 113 143 171 244 259¹ 263
331, prob. Heinsius : esse deum Iouis 101 : esse deum X
nec enim 2 36 88 129 165 208 336, fort. recte, uid. II.301,
III.658
Persea quem pluuo Danae conceperat auro).
mox tamen Acrisium (tanta est praesentia ueri)
tam uliolasse deum quam non agnosse nepotem
paenitet: inpositus iam caelo est alter, et alter
uipeiei referens spolium memorabile monstri
aera carpebat tenerum stridentibus alis
cumque super Libycas uictor penderet harenas,
Gorgonei capitis guttae cecidere cruentae
quas humus exceptas uarios animauit in angues,
unde frequens illa est infestaque terra colubris.

611-620 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWXYZ

613 agnouisse DG : nouisse h 614 et : at BMNUZ
615 mirabile 149 616 tenerum ] tenuem 959 159 :
liquidum 34 208 619 acceptas DGPY^Z : erectas Y^1
uarios ] uinos 84 164 165 183 390^1 620 infectaque
AGJL^2S^2, (que om.) Y : etiamnum tempt, Slater
turba
BK^1M^1 : membra Y colubrum S
Inde per immensum uentis discordibus actus
nunc huc nunc illuc exemplo nubis aquosae
fertur et ex alto seductas aethere longe
despectat terras totumque superuolat orbem.
ter gelidas arctos, ter cancri brachia uidit,
saepe sub occasus, saepe est ablatus in ortus.
iamque cadente die ueritus se credere nocti
constitit Hesperio, regnls Atlantis, in orbe
exiguamque petit requiem dum Lucifer ignis
euocet Aurorae, currus Aurora diurnos.
Hic hominum cunctos ingenti corpore praestans
Iapetionides Atlans fuit. ultima tellus
rege sub hoc et pontus erat, qui Solis anhelis
sequora subdit equis et fessos excipit axes.
mille greges illi totidemque armenta per herbas
errabant et humum viciniae nulla premebant.
arboreae frondes auro radiante nitentes
ex auro ramos, ex auro poma tegebant.
hospes,' ait Perseus illi 'seu gloria tangit
te generis magni, generis mihi Iuppiter auctor,
siue es mirator rerum, mirabere nostras.
hospitium requiemque peto'. memor ille uetustae
sortis erat (Themis hanc dederat Parnassia sortem):
'tempus, Atla, ueniet, tua quo spoliabitur auro
arbor, et hunc praedae titulum Ioue natus habebit';
id metuens solidis pomaria clauserat Atlans
moenibus et uasto dederat seruanda draconi
arcebätque suis externos finibus omnis.
huic quoque 'uade procul, ne longe gloria rerum
quam mentiris,' ait 'longe tibi Iuppiter absit';

641-650 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ

644 at(h)la ADEKLO1PUNYZ : at(h)las CG02M : athlans B : ait N :
adhuc R 150
At(h)las X : pomaria GNPU : Atlans U2 :
647 moenibus AC2 ems 68 74 82 102 129 142
149 163 224, prob. Heinsius : montibus X : molibus Schepper
648 omnis 691 217 : omnes X : quam BCHLM1UV : quas
JX, prob. Heinsius : longe tibi ] ne longe L
uimque minis addit manibusque expellere temptat

cunctantem et placidis miscetem fortis dictis.

uiribus inferior (quid enim par esset Atlanti

uiribus?) 'at quoniam parui tibi gratia nostra est,

accipe munus' ait laeuaeque a parte Medusae

ipse retro uersus squalentia protulit ora.

quantus erat, mons factus Atlans: nam barba comaque

in siluas abeunt, iuga sunt umerique manusque,

quod caput ante fuit summo est in monte cacumen,

ossa lapis flunt; tum partis auctus in omnis

651-660 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ

651 uimque animis firmat 291 foribusque t, prob.

Heinsius repellere 72 107 213 276 : euellere Y

653 Atlanti b 107 218 229, prob. Heinsius : Atlantis X

654 gloria U 656 prodict e, prob. Heinsius

657 factus ] tantus P At(h)lans NU 67 392 : At(h)lans X

nam ] iam 331, uid. Heinsium ed u, 373 660 partis U 2241:

partes X auctus 0 1 36 60 63 98 113 212 218 259 330

3312, prob. Heinsius : actus 2 61 67 101 105 107 133 218 241

creuit inmensum (sic di statuistis), et omne
cum tot sideribus caelum requieuit in illo.
Clauserat Hippotades †aeterno† carcere uentos
admonitorque operum caelo clarissimus alto
Lucifer ortus erat: pinnis ligat ille resumptis 665
parte ab utraque pedes teloque accingitur unco
et liquidum motis talaribus aera findit.
genibus innumeris circumque infraque relictis
Aethiopum populos Cepheaque conspicit arua.
illic inmeritam maternae pendere linguae 670

661-670 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ

662 requiescit P 663 (h)ypodates AOP
aeterno X, obelis inclusi : eceterno 156 : eternos 91 : terreno
vel Tyrrheno Heinsius : aerato Bentley : Aetnaeo Housman :
IV.6.28 et Petr. Sat.104 665 pinnis ] pennis X
667 scindit 213 668 circaque infraque 107.147, unde
citraque ultraque Heinsius 669 cepheaque ADG 19.102 :
ci(y)pheaque S 91 : cepheia W 97.99.226.331, prob. Heinsius :
cepheiaque CEKLOPU.Z : ci(y)pheiaque BMNU aspicit 19
Andromedan poenas in iustus iusserat Hammon.
quam simul ad duras religatam bracchia cautes
uidit Abantiades (nisi quod leuis aura capillos
mouerat et trepido manabant lumina fletu,
marmoreum ratus esset opus), tranhit inscius ignis 675
et stupet et uisae corruptus imagine formae
psene suas quater est oblitus in aere pinnas.
ut stetit 'o' dixit 'non istis digna catenis
sed quibus inter se cupidi iunguntur amantes,
pande requirenti nomen patrisaeque tuumque 680

671-680 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWYZ

671 Andromedan BKNU, prob. Heinsius : -dā ACDELMYZ : -dam O :
den P, fort. recte : -dē GW : -dem 2 in iustus]
immitis bh (h)amon CDGLOWYZ 674 trepido AGN,
prob. Heinsius : tepido X : eras, in Z 675 ignis 47 :
ignes X 676 et uisae A, (et om.*)C DEGKM2OY, (uisse)
WZ : exiguae BM1N1S : eximiae JLN2PUbdb corruptus BM1 :
remoratus Heinsius 677 quater est X : in ras, N1 :
corrupt, in codd, BM pinnas] pennas X
678 o dixit a dixit D1S, fort, recte, uid X 632 : heu dixit
Y1 679 iungantur Heinsius 680 patrisaeque DG
61 139 227 : terraeque X
et cur uincla geras'. primo silet illa nec sudet appellare uirum uirgo manibusque modestos celasset uultus, si non religata fuisse; lumina, quod potuit, lacrimis inpleuit abortis. saepius instanti, sua ne delicta fateri nolle uidetur, nomen patriaeque suumque quantaque maternae fuerit fiducia formae indicat, et nondum memoratis omnibus unda insonuit ueniensque inmenso belua ponto inminet et latum sub pectore possidet aquor.

681-690 : ABCDEKLMNOPUWYZ

681 silet ] stupet DEKOWYZ  
682 com(n)pellare G 26 259 : adspectare Heinsius  
683 uelasset W 23 60 631 161 223 : uelaret k 1681  
684 abortis CEJLY  
686 patriae-que D 139 : terraeque X  
687 linguae 3 164 390  
688 at .. uel en nondum Heinsius numeratis L  
690 eminet A2DEKOWZ possidet ] personat N2 : proscidit Heinsius
conclamat virgo; genitor lugubris et una
mater adest, ambo miseris, sed iustius illa;
nece secum auxilium sed dignos tempore fletus
plangoremque ferunt uinctoque in corpore adhaerent
cum sic hospes ait: 'lacrimarum longa manere
tempora uos poterunt, ad opem breuis hora ferendam est.
hanc ego si peterem Perseus Ioue natus et illa
quam quondam inpleuit fecundo Iuppiter auro,
Gorgonis anguicomaet Perseus superator et alis
aerias ausus iactatis ire per auras,

691-695 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWXYZ
696-700 : ABCDEGKLMNOPUWXYZ

691 una J amens 91 142 249 280, prob. Heinsius
692 iustior N^1 U^1 694 iunctique M^1 : iunctoque A^1 E^2 M^2
695 tum D^2 N^2 U^2 Z 696 nos G ferendam est GOV
22 105 107 114 146 169 205 230 251 253 263 331 399 : ferendam ?J
(difficillima lectu Heinsii scriptura est), 93 106 : ferenda
est X 698 quondam PS 146 228 : quondam clausam Ferm.:
clausam EX : lusam Heinsius 699 ales S
700 aerias PRZ^1 : uetheri(e)as ESX
praeferrer cunctis certe gener; addere tantis
dotibus et meritor, faeuent modo numina, tempto:
ut mea sit uirtute mea servata paciscor'.
acciunt legem (quis enim dubitaret?) ouantes
promittuntque super regnum dotale parentes.

Ecce uelut nauis praefixo concita rostro
sulcat aquas iuvenum sudentibus acta lacertis,
sic fera dimotis impulsu pectoris undis
tantum aberat scopulis quantum Balearica torto
funda potest plombo medi transmittere caeli

praeficere 701: ABCGKLMNOPUWYZ
702-710: ABCDFGKLMNOPUWYZ

praeficere 701: 0
uirtute 703: R 22 61 69
servata 139 168 213 260 392: prob. Bentley: servata uirtute EX
conici 704: et orant X: et orant 01: et ornat 215:
et oram 217

balearia 709: Y

plumbum N2UZ: plumbum tortum D
transcurre A2R 97A 217 caelo Z
709-710 tortum D
710 medio N2UZ
cum subito iuuenis pedibus tellure repulsa
arduus in nubes abiiit. ut in sequore summo
umbra uiri uisa est, uisam fera seuit in umbram,
utque Iouis praepes uscuo cum uidit in aruo
praebentem Phoebu liuentia terga draconem
occupat suersum, neu saeua retorquest ors,
squamigeris suis pos fijit cerucibus unguis,
sic celeri missus praepes per insae uolatru

711-718 : ABCDFGKLMNOPWYZ

712 ut BHMV 19 72 84 100 267 : at NSU 95 : et JX
713 uisam ... umbram ACFGMK2OPWYZ : uisa ... umbra SX
714 aruo ] agro 39 88 97A 101 159 259 356
715 lucentia MY 88 99 156 157 148 : lucentia tempt. Housman
draconem ] leonem A
716 aduersum AGDGKN2OVYZ
ne saeua S : sua neue 213
717 squamiferis DO
unguis ] unguex X
718 missus praepes DK1LM2NOPUY :
praepes missus W : missus praepes BCK2M1 : praepes misso AG :
missus praepes F2 ex missus praepes F1 : praepes fissum
Heinsius : summum praepes Z2 ex summum praepes Z
terga ferae pressit dextraque frementis in armo
Inschides ferrum curuo tenus addidit haemo. 720
uulnere laesa graui modo se sublimis in auras
atollit, modo subdit aquis, modo more ferocis
uersat apri quem turba canum circumsona terret.
ille suidos morsus uslocibus effugit alis
quaque patet, nunc terga cauis super obsita conchis,
nunc laterum costas, nunc qua tenuissima cauda
desinit in piscem, falcato uulnerat ense.
belus puniceo mixtos cum sanguine fluctus
ore vomit: maduere graues aspergine pinnae.
nec bibulis ultra Perseus talaribus ausus 730
719-730 : ABCDFGKLMNOPUWXYZ
719 prementis 63 720 addidit $A^{1}_{N^{1}}OU^{1}Z^{2}$
725 quaque patent $ADL^{2}_{O^{2}UWXYZ}$ : quaque patent $O^{1}$ : quaque ualeit
158 lateris A 727 piscem } pristin Gronovius :
pristem Heinsius et Bentley uulnerat $A^{2}B^{2}CDFGKLM^{2}_{N^{2}}$
OPUWXYZ : uerberat $A^{1}N^{1}S19 95^{1} 106 161 229 300 389 395^{1}$, prob.
Heinsius : uenerat $B^{1}M^{1}$ 729 graues } leues G
pinnae $SU^{1}$ : pennae X
credere conspexit scopulum qui uertice summo
stantibus extat aquis, operitur ab sequore moto.
nixus eo rupisque tenens iuga prima sinistra
ter quater exegit repetita per ilia ferrum.
litora cum plausu clamor supersaque deorum
inpleuere domos: gaudent generumque salutant
auxiliumque domus seruatoremque fatentur
Cassiope Cepheusque pater; resoluta catenis
incedit uirgo, pretiumque et causa laboris.
ipse manus hausta uictrices ablut unda,

731-740 : ABCDFGLMNOPUNYZ

732 moto ] rapto FGNPSU : summo D 733 sinistra
AB\textsuperscript{2}CDFGJKLM\textsuperscript{2}OPVWXYZ : sinistrae NU : sinistro \textsuperscript{3}M\textsuperscript{1}
737 salvatoremque DW 738 casiaphe L : causopie G :
cauliope W cephusque G : celeusque Z : cephesusque D
anguiferumque caput nuda ne laedat harena,
mollit humum foliis natasque sub sequore uirgas
sternit et inponit Phorcynidos ora Medusae.
uirga recens bibulaque etiamnunc uiua medulla
uirg a rapuit monstri tactuque induruit huius
percepitque nouum remis et fronde rigorem.
at pelagi nymphae factum mirabile temptant
pluribus in uirgis et idem contingere gaudent,
seminaque ex illis †iterant iactata† per undas.
nunc quoque curaliis eadem natura remansit

741-750 : ABCDFGKLMNOPUWYZ

741 anguigerumque Y : anguicolumqu e 242 : igniferumque 267 268
nuda GJKN 2 : dura SX  neu caput anguiferum nuda laedatur
harena tempt. Heinsius 743 fornicidos O : phorcynidos
FL : foronidos D1Y1 : phoroeudos A1 744 etiamnum Hein-
sius 745 monstro F1 : 746 praecipitque M1 312 :
concepitque N1U : assumsitque Z2 : uigorem N2
749 iterant iactata ACDGJ202P2UWYZ, obelis inclusi : ut erant
(e rerant B) iactata BFK1LM1NP1S : intrant iactata Q1 : iterant
iactanda 147, unde iactant iteranda conieci
750 curaliis B1F1MNU1 205 : curalis Z : caraliis 63 :
caraliis 165 390 : caraliis uel alia X
duritiem tacto capiant ut ab aere, quodque uimen in sequore erat fiat super sequors saxum.

Dis tribus ille focos totidem de caespite ponit, laeuum Mercurio, dextrum tibi, bellica uirgo; ares Iouis media est: mactatur uacca Mineruse, slipedi uitulus, taurus tibi, summe deorum.

protinus Andromedan et tanti praemia facti indotata capit; taedas Hymeneus Amorque

751-758 : ABCDFGKLNPWYZ

751 duritiem 26 123 224 267 307 327 396 399, prob. Heinsius:
duritiem X tacto ] tactu BM\(^1\) capiant JX : rapiunt Z : captant BM\(^1\)N\(^1\)SU ab aere \(A^2\)GM\(^2\)N\(^2\)U : ab ethere OWY : ab aequore A\(^1\)CDFKLPZ : ad aera BM\(^1\)N\(^1\)
tactum ... ad aera tempt. Slater 757 Andromedan
BCF\(^1\)LM(?\(^1\))SUWYZ, uid. u.671 : Andromaden P : Andromaden
AF\(^2\)KN\(^2\)O, -dé D : Andromedon C : Andromedamque 221 : Andromeda Slater et ] ut Heinsius : te Slater

758 indotataque 84 164 165 183 30 : indorata 141 242 : Indonata Slater capix Y q 149 349 : rapit X

himineus FG
praecutiunt, largis satiantur odoribus ignes, sertaque dependent tectis et ubique lyraeque, tibiaque et cantus, animi feliciis laeti argumenta, sonant; reseratiss sures ualuis atria tota patent pulchroque instructa paratu Cephenum proceres ineunt conuiuiis regis.

Postquam epulis functi generosi munere Bacchi diffudere animos, cultusque genusque locorum

759-766 : ABCDFGKLMNOPUWYZ

759 praecutiunt $B^1M^1N^1U^1$ : percutiunt $q$ : praeципиunt $X$
760 sociantur $LY$ tectis citharaeque $72\ 252\ 331\ 394$ : tectis lotique Gronouiuis : tectisque tubaeque $D\ 268$
762 instrumenta $69$ ualuis $J$ portis $G$ ualuis $J$
764 Cephenum $FSU^1WZ$ : Cepheum $Y$ : Cepheni $A^2BCDGJLMOP$ Cephenes $Heinsius$ : Cephe(ii$^2$) $N$ : Cephei $A^1$
765 functos tempt. $Heinsius$ : functi et $J^2N^2$ : uicti $D^1OZ$
766 uicti et $101$ generosi et $L$ : generosi in $75$
generoso $216\ 245^1\ 268$, haud male : generoso et $R$
querit Abantiades; quarenti protinus \textit{illi}
narrat Sirites moresque habitumque uirorum \textit{illi};
qua simul edocuit 'nunc, o fortissime,' dixit
'fare, precor, Perseu, quanta uirtute quibusque

767-770 : ABCDFGKLMNOPUWYZ

767-768 duos uersus habent DFGHORW, quos in textu serusui,
obelis tamen s\textit{apositis} : u.768 om. \textit{Y} \textsuperscript{1} : unum uersum ex duobus
confictum (\textit{i.e.} queren abantiades u.767 + mores(que) habitumque (animumque) uirorum u.768, uel quaerit u.767 + lincides
mores(que) habitumque (animumque) uirorum u.768, uel similis)
habent ABC\textit{EJ}KL\textit{MNPSUZ} 767 illi 6\textsuperscript{2} 3 36\textsuperscript{2} 216\textsuperscript{2}, 331 sup.
lin., 391\textsuperscript{1} : nullum uerbum habet cod.153 : unus cett.
768 Sirites coniici ex codd. \textit{G} Siricidas et 119 Siricides :
lancides 19 : lanciades 234 : lincides H 133 217 : nancides
277 : elinades 373 : limphides 292 : listides 23 : lyncides
\textit{cett.} moresque HJRSX : mores DGN\textsuperscript{2}Y\textsuperscript{2}
habutumque A\textsuperscript{2}DKLRUWY\textsuperscript{2}Z : habitusque GOVs : cultumque 267 :
animumque BFCHMN\textsuperscript{2}p 72 95 : animosque A\textsuperscript{1} 3 67 102 197
769 qua \textit{e} qui M\textsuperscript{2} 119 : quem H : quod 101 : tum 173
edocuit \textit{e} ut docuit S 770 qua tu uirtute Heinsius
artibus abstuleris crinita draconibus ora'.

Narrat Agenorides gelido sub Atlante iacentem esse locum solidae tutum munimine molis; cuius in introitu geminas habitasse sorores Phorcidas unius partitas luminis usum; id se sollerti furtim, dum traditur, aitu subposita cepisse manu perque addita longe deuiaque et siluis arentia sexa fragosis Gorgoneas tetigisse domos passimque per agros perque uias uidisse hominum simulacra ferarumque in silicem ex ipsis uisa conuerse Medusa; se tamen horrendo clipei, quem laeua gerebat,

771-782: ABCDFGKLMNOPUWYZ

771 actibus L 772 Agenorides } abantisades A²CW:
athlanciades Y : acriadiades 155¹ 775 partitas
A²BC¹F¹KLW¹NP¹S : sortitas X 777 accepisse 195 251 : sumpsisse d 778 arentia A¹OPSZ, prob. Heinsius:
herentia 102 114 230 331 : horrentia X : horrendaque 19 195
226 251 395 780 ferarumque EN¹, F¹ marg., SU²W²Z : ferarum X 782 se ACDEGM²OP²UWYZ : set KP¹ : sed X
horrendo BM¹N¹ 208¹ 295 : horrenda 147 : horrendam 92 102
Ferm : horrendae X clipeo U quem GJL²NUWY :
quod X
aere repercussae formam aspexisse Medusae,
dumque grauis somnus colubrasque ipsamque tenebat,
eripuisse ceput collo, pinnisque fugacem
Pegason et fratrem matris de sanguine natos.
addidit et longi non falsa pericula cursus,
quaer freta, quas terras sub se uidisset ab alto
et quae lactatis tigitisset sidera pinnis.
ante expectatum tacuit tamen; excipit unus
ex numero procerum quaerens cur sola sororum
gesserit alternis inmixtos crinibus angues.

783-792 : ABCDFGKLMNOPUWXYZ
hospes ait 'quoniam scitaris digna relatu, accipe quaesiti causam. clarissima forma multorumque fuit spes inuidiosa procorum illa, nec in tota conspector ulla capillis pars fuit; inueni qui se uidiisse referret. henc pelagi rector templo uitiasse Minerue dicitur; auersa est et castos aegide uultus nata Iouis texit, neue hoc inpune fuisset, Gorgoneum crinem turpis mutauit in hydros.
nunc quoque, ut attonitos formidine terreat hostis, pectore in aduerso quos fecit sustinet angues.

793 : ABCDFGKLNMOPUWXYZ
794-803 : ABCDEFGKLNMOPUWXYZ

793 scrutaris N¹  q 61 147 168 262 794 quesitis B¹M¹ :
quaesita K¹  795 insidiosa h  796 nec ADM¹N²
OYZ : neque JX  toto C : totis BLM¹  797 pars
par BHM¹N¹U¹  referret BH¹MNSU : referrent JX
798 uiolasse DFW  799 auersa DLW  800 texit
nata iouis D : nata ioui stetit M¹  fuisset ] tulisset
Heinsius  801 crimen M¹  turpes crinem Heinsius
  turpis ] turpes X : om. Z  mutavis B¹  hydros ]
angues A¹DY  802 admonitos Bentley  hostis ]
hostes X : hospes F¹
The names of the three daughters of Minyas. There exists no extant version of the myth of the Minyeides dating from before the time of Ovid; however it is known from Antoninus Liberalis' treatment of the theme (Metamorphoses Συναγωγή 10, Introduction) that both Corinna, and Nicander, in his Επειδή Βολαία, had dealt with the subject: for Antoninus tells us οτάρει, Νικάνδρος Επειδή Βολαίαν καὶ Κόριννα. Otherwise, apart from Antoninus' version, there are later accounts of the myth in Plutarch (Ελληνικά 38) and Aelian (Ποικ. Ιστ. ΙΙΙ.42). Plutarch, Antoninus and Aelian all begin by naming the three sisters; Ovid does not, but mentions two of them during the course of the stories which they tell (vv.168 and 274), referring to the other one only by the indecisive una (v.36). There is some conflict about the names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Second Name</th>
<th>Third Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ovid</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Leuconoe</td>
<td>Alcithoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plutarch</td>
<td>Arsinoe</td>
<td>Leucippe</td>
<td>Alcathoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelian</td>
<td>Arsippe</td>
<td>Leucippe</td>
<td>Alcithoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoninus</td>
<td>Arsippe</td>
<td>Leucippe</td>
<td>Alcathoe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems that the endings Arsinoe/Arsippe and Leuconoe/Leucippe were at some stage muddled, and that Aelian and Antoninus have preserved a state of affairs where one variant ending has been lost; however, the fact that Ovid, as the earliest source for the names, preserves Leuconoe suggests that he might have thought the other sister's name to be Arsippe.

The reading of the manuscript no.102 (from Graz), alcione, looks like a mis-spelling for alcione, in itself not a difficult miscopying of alcitoe, as the name is spelt in many manuscripts. Arsinoe, from a Vatican manuscript as yet unidentified, is a more subtle error, and seems to represent a conscious attempt on the part of one scribe to introduce the name of the third sister. However, the fact that Ovid refers to the third sister by the word una (v.36) means that the name in v.1 need not be hers any more than that of either of the other two sisters. If there were no mention of the third sister in v.36, or if there were a clear link, making the subjects of vv.1 and 36 one and the same person, then Arsinoe (or perhaps Arsippe: see above) would have to be seriously considered in v.1; but as things stand, there is no good reason for doubting the reading Alcit(h)oe of nearly all MSS.

Minyeias: -eias (or -eias XIV.87), in this case a metrically convenient substitute for the more usual -eis (see vv.32 and 425), is a rare termination, found in only seven
other places in the Metempsychoses, I.670 Pleis, V.487 Alpheis, VI.174 Pleiadum, VI.414 Pelopeides, XIII.293 Pleiades, XIV.87 Acheloiadum, and XV.386 Cythereiadus.

6 pelle: 'scilicet ceruina, quae nebris dicebatur' (Gronovius).

...crinalis soluite uittas: the language here is reminiscent of Aen.VII.403 solute crinalis uittas, capite orgia mecum. Ovid returns to the phrase, but without the Vergilian overtones, on two later occasions in the poem, at V.617 and IX.771.

7 A line from the Tristia suggests that the serte were ivy-shoots: Tr.I.7.2 deme meis hederae, Bacchica serta, comis.

A corruption similar to the comis for comae of some manuscripts is found in M at II.124, where the second hand has substituted comis for the correct comae.

11-30 Similar invocations, and passages listing the multiple names of Dionysus-Bacchus are found in other authors:

κισσοφόρε βάκχεις
δέρποτ'...
εὔιον ζ. Δίονυς
βρόμις καὶ Ἑσελάς παλ...
εὔιον εὔιον εὔιοι
Aristoph. Thesm. 988-991, 993b

Δίονυσον καὶ Ζαγρέα καὶ Νυκτέλιον καὶ Ἡροδάκτην αὐτὸν ἐνομάζουσιν
Plut. Moral. 389A

his erat in ore Bromius, his Bacchus pater,
illis Lyceus uitis inuentor seceres.
tum pariter euen euhium
ignotus iuenenum coetus altera uice
inibat aiacris Bacchico insultans modo.
Ennius Athenas (Jocelyn LII.120-124)

... ὅτι τὸ πολυκρατεὶν ὁ ἄρεξκοι ἐνόμαζον φλέυν
ἐντεῦθεν τὸν Δίονυσον φλέων ἐνάλουν καὶ
Προτρόγιλον καὶ Ἑσαύλιτην καὶ Ὀμφακίτην καὶ
ἔτερως τοὺς διαφέρουσιν
Aelian Poic. Intro. III.41

But it is characteristic of Ovid that he does not rely on repetition of single words (Aristophanes, v.993b), or on single phrases repeated alternately (Ennius, vv.120 and 121), or on a generalised phrase, such as Aelian's, which avoids the necessity for a full list. Ovid makes a stylistic virtue of using as many different names and attributes
of Bacchus as possible. His description takes twenty verses (vv.11-30; iussaque sacra colunt of v.32 picks up where parent matresque nuruesque of v.9 had left off), and consists first of fifteen different names or attributes associated with Bacchus (vv.11-17), then of some of his special qualities and achievements (vv.17-25), and lastly of a list of his various followers and supporters (vv.25-30). Ovid's sense of transition is shown in the way he leaves Bacchus' female attendants to the end of the list in vv.25-30; femineae uoces (v.29) leads back naturally and unobtrusively to Ismenides in v.31.

Besides the passages already quoted where lists of the names of Dionysus-Bacchus are found, Ovid was also influenced, in the second section (vv.17-25), by some not dissimilar lines about Hercules in Aeneid Book VIII:

'tu nubigenas, inuictae, bimembris, Hyleeumque Pholhumque, manu, tu Cresia mactas prodigis et vastum Nemeae sub rupe leonem. te Stygii tremuerre lacus, te ianitor Orct ossa super recubans antro semese cruento; nec te utilae facies, non terruit ipse Typhoeus arduus arma tenens; non te rationis egentem Lernaeus turba cepitum circumstetit antruis. salve, uera louis proles, decus addite diuis; et nos et tua dexter adi pede sacra secundo.'

It is of interest to note some of the features common to both Vergil's and Ovid's treatment: tibi uictus (Ovid v.20) and inuictae (Vergil v.293), mactas (Ovid v.23 and Vergil v.294), biiugum (Ovid v.24) and bimembris (Vergil v.293), suggesting a conquest which, because it was of something twofold, was a special achievement, Tyrrhena ... corpora (Ovid vv.23-24) and Cresia ... prodigis (Vergil vv.294-295), where the neuter-plural noun, in both cases separated from its epithet, follows at the beginning of the next line, and lynceum (Ovid v.25) and leonem (Vergil v.295), large animals usually difficult to tame.

11 Lyaeumque: supernumerary -que was always liable to be omitted by scribes; see v.780 where ferarumque has become ferarum in the majority of extant manuscripts.

12 immigenemque satumque iterum: see Met. III.308-312.

17 iuuentus has never found favour with editors; yet it can be shown to be unquestionably correct. One fact alone has stood against it, that M has iuventa est; and because of the uncritical veneration in which M was held, iuventa est is the reading which will be found in most editions. But three reasons, in their different ways, each point towards iuventus. First,
the discovery in some MSS. of the impossible iuuentus est (i.e. the superlinear scribal addition est was incorporated by a subsequent copyist into the text), shows that iuuenta est arose as a means of incorporating est metrically into the line. Secondly, the use of iuuenta with an adjective in -a preceding it in the fifth foot is not uncommon in Ovid, being found on nine other occasions (Met.III.124, VII.765, XII.553, XIV.637, Fast.I.397, A.A.I.459, II.733, Her.XII.203, and Tr.V.3(4).37). Such a usage is never found with iuuenta, partly no doubt for reasons of assonance. Thirdly, there survives in Juvenal, at II.155, the phrase consumpta iuuenta: while we cannot be sure here that Juvenal is echoing Ovid, either consciously or subconsciously, and while this phrase of Juvenal's would not, of itself, be sufficient warranty for iuuenta in v.17, it may nonetheless, in view of the two other reasons already given, be adduced as a subsidiary pointer in the direction of iuuenta.

20-21 adusque ... Gange: the implication is that the worship of Bacchus stretches to the very limits of the known world. India was commonly thought, among the Greeks and Romans, to represent the farthest boundary in an eastern direction:

(ο Ερατοσθένης) ἐν δὲ τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν γεωγραφικῶν καθιστάμενος τῶν τῆς έικονεικής πίνακας γεγραμμένης τινὶ διαφερέσθαι ἀπὸ δυσίες ἑπάναστας παραπληθής τῇ ἐξερευνήθη χρονικῇ. πέρατα δὲ αὐτῆς τῆς πρὸς δύσεις μέν τις ἔρεισσος ὀστήρας, ἑπάναστάς ἐκ τῆς ἀκραίας ἑπάναστας ὀρέων τὴν πρὸς ἀκραίας τῆς Ίνδικῆς πλέγμας.

Strabo II.1

siue in extremos penetretabit Indos
Catullus XI.2

sunt quos Oceano proprior gerit India lucos,
extremi sinus orbis
Verg. Georg.II.122-123

More specifically, the River Ganges was held to mark the dividing line between the known world and the uncivilised wilderness beyond:

quae pars (Indiae) orienti est adverse ... se flexit in meridiem ..., ut Eratosthenes tradit, usque ad Indum emnem, qui est ab occidente finis Indiæ ... finisque tractus eius Ganges.

Flin. N.H.VI.17.21

decolor: used of the parching effect of the Eastern sun; see also Sen. Phaedr. 344-345 aigretas India tigres decolor horret.
For a discussion of why decolor, and not discolor, is correct here and elsewhere, see F.J. Enk on Propertius IV.3,10 (Ad Propertii Carmina Commentarius Criticus, Zutphen, 1911).

I have followed Heinsius in accepting the reading quae, found in the Zürich manuscript Z, rather than qua of the other manuscripts. adusque ... quae cingitur India Gange is equivalent, for metrical convenience, to adusque Indiam, quae cingitur Gange.

cingitur; see also, for similar uses of this word, Caes.B.G. I.38.4 ... flumen Dubis ut circino circumductum peene totum oppidum cingit and Verg.Aen. IX.468-469 Aeneaeae duri murorum in parte sinistra opposuere aciem (nam dextera cingitur amni).

26 ferula; Pliny explains (N.H.XIII.22.42) why fennel was used for walking sticks: ferula calidis nascitur locis etque trans maris, geniculatis nodata scapis. ... nulli fruticum leuitas maior; ob id gestatu facilia heculorum usum senectuti praebet. And there is a subsidiary reason for the use of ferula in this passage, for it was one of Silenus’ special attributes:

ebrius ecce senex: pandro Silenus asello
uix sedet et pressas continet arte iubas; ...
quadrupedum ferula dum malus urget eques,
in caput aurito cecidit delapsus asello.
Ov.A.A. I.543-544, 546-547

baculo, the reading of the Vienna manuscript W, has made its way into the text as a gloss for ferula, or perhaps from comparison of this passage with VI.27, where very similar wording is found: infirmos baculo quoque sustinet artus.

26-27 Between sustinet artus ebrius and ebrius artus sustinet certainty is not possible; but two reasons perhaps suggest that the former is correct. ebrius and titubantia are the important words of this clause, and the effect of ebrius in v.26 is to bring on the climax too early, so that sustinet is anticlimactic in v.27; by contrast, if ebrius is kept until v.27, it is more effective, being the main word of its clause both coming at the end of its clause and with the emphasis of being the first word in the line (see Pyreus v.107, montibus v.647, and uiribus v.654). Secondly, if sustinet artus ebrius was what Ovid wrote, the change to ebrius artus sustinet is explicable as it is not if the reverse was the case. A scribe or reader, seeing the word ebrius in v.27 isolated from the rest of its phrase in v.26, and wishing to show where it belonged in sense, glossed v.26 as follows:

EBRIUS

quiique senex ferula titubantia sustinet artus

A subsequent copyist incorporated ebrius into v.26, and placed sustinet at the beginning of the next line.
placatus mitisque: the same combination of words is found again in an invocation at Fast.III.789: mite caput, pater, huc placataque cornua uertas.

Heinsius's emendation turbantes, for turbantes of the manuscripts, is to be accepted. In reply to the command of the priest, the other women of Thebes were celebrating the festival (vv.4,8-11): festum celebrare sacerdos ... iussurat ... parent metresque nurusque telsaque calathosque infectaque pensa reponunt turague dant. The phrase turbantes festa would suggest that the Minyeides physically interrupted the other Theban women, preventing them from continuing their celebration, in the same way as the feast is brought to a halt at Met.XII.222 (protinus eversae turbent conuia meneae). The part played by the Minyeides is not active (interruption of the other celebrants), but passive (refusal to participate themselves). turbantes festa is re-echoed towards the close of the same story in the words festumque profanat (v.390). The idea implicit in the words intempestiua turpantes, that there is something out of place about irreverent actions, is found again in Ovid (inportuna profanat) at Am.III.3.19: scilicet omne sacrum inportuna profanat. Although this metaphorical use of turpare is rare, it is not a difficult extension of ideas such as Ennius' luces aram sanguine turpari (Andromache. Jocelyn XXVII.94). And for a similar confusion between turpare and turbare, see Stat.Theb.III.680, where P retains the correct turpeta, but where the manuscripts BDNQS have turbata.

For other four-word lines in this book, see vv.173, 236, 497 and 737.

ex quibus may very possibly be correct (see Neue-Wagener Lateinische Formenlehre II.889-893), and was perhaps more likely to be altered into e quibus than vice versa. I have however retained e quibus in the text, at least for the time being, because an examination of all other places in the poem where Ovid uses this wording (III.647, IV.109, VI.224, 290, 317 and 681, VIII.432, XI.6, XII.56 and 291, XIII.725, XIV.546 and XV.414) shows that, according to the apparatus of Magnus's edition (Berlin, 1914), e is transmitted in all cases except IV.109, where the manuscript L has ex. But if, in the future, collations of other manuscripts in other books of the poem should show a more widespread survival of ex, then it may become evident that ex and not e is the correct reading, both here and elsewhere.

filum: fusum of D and G may have arisen partly through visual error, and partly through mental association of this phrase with phrases such as that at Met.VI.22 siue leui teretum uersabat pollice fusum.
celebrasse: see also Met. II.252-253 et quae Meonias celebrarent carmine ripas fluminumae uolucres and Tr.V.6(7).37-38 quam multa medidae celebrantur harundine fossae, florida quam multas Hybla tueatur apes ... .

This is a passage where the true reading has been ignored in recent generations for no other cause than that the Lactantian manuscript M has lost it. The exact development from celebrasse of M's mutasse, found also in numerous other MSS., is hard to explain: it is not, as are habitate and coluisse, an obvious simplifying gloss for celebrasse. Perhaps the reason is to be found in the verse ... figurem of M and other MSS., which could not coexist with celebrasse, needing an active verb to govern them. It may be mentioned in passing that Merkel's conjecture motasse, ascribed by Ehwald (ed. Teubner, 1915) to the manuscript N, is not found in N at all. This is a good example of scrip­tion to manuscripts, ex silentio, of readings believed to be correct (and, more generally, on the mis-reporting of MSS., see Appendix IV). The first hand of N is almost impossible to read, being obscured by the corrector's coluisse, but the manuscript seems likely to have shared with its fellow-Lactantians J and S the correct celebrasse.

Derceto's daughter was Semiramis, a name used by the Phoenicians and derived either from the Arabic words for 'mountain' and 'dove' (T.G.L.VII.154A) or, according to Diodorus Siculus, from the Syrian word meaning 'doves'. Diodorus gives an account of how Semiramis came to receive her name (II.4.3-4):

Τὴν δὲ Δερκετὸν μικρὰν τῷ Σύρῳ γεννησαί μὲν θυμίατρα, κατασχομένης δὲ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀρχαίος τῶν μὲν νεόνισκον ἄμβασις, τοὶ δὲ παιδίων ἐς τινὰς ἄρθραμα καὶ πτεράδες τότες ἔκρεβαν ... πέρι δὲ τῶν τότων ὅπου τὸ ἔφεσιν ἐστερέω τις πάλαις περιστερῶν ἐνεστώτως ἐκθησάμενοι καὶ δαμιόνων, ὅποι τοῦτων τὸ παιδίον διατερέφανοι ... καὶ [Σήμαντος] ἀπεκονισνέον ὡς τῶν παιδίων, ἐπεὶ πάτρος οὗ ἦν ἦπερ ἀμφοτερὸν ἕβεβην ἔμπροσθεν Σεμιράμις, ἐπεὶ ἐπὶ κατὰ τῶν εὐρὺς διάλεκτον παρουσιασάμενον ἀπὸ τῶν περιστέρων.

At the end of her life, at the age of sixty-two (Diod.Sic. II.20.2), Semiramis was turned into a dove; τὸ Σεμιράμις τέλος ἐς περιστερὰν ἀπίκετο (Lucian Peri Tῆς Συρίας Θεὸς , 14).

turris regularly bears the meaning 'dovecot': Varr.R.R.III. 3.6 erant columbœ in turribus aut summa uilla, III.7.1 duo enim genera eorum in peristerotrophio esse solent, unum agresti ... quod habetur in turribus ac columinibus uillee, a quo appellatae columbœ ... , Ov.A.A.II.150 queaque colat turres, Caenal.s alae habet, Font.I.6.51 nam prius incipient turris utare columbœ, Mart.III.58.18 sonantque turres plausibus colubrarum, and Columella VIII.8.1 quoniam uel summis turribus uel editissimis...
sedificiis assignatas sedes frequentant. And passages in Martial, Columella and Ovid suggest that dovecots were of a white colour, not darkened or dirty: Mart.XIII.31.6 quaseque gerit similis candida turris sues, Columella VIII.8.3 totus autem locus et ipsae columberum cellae poliri debent albo tectorio, quoniam eo colore praecipue delectatur hoc genus avium, and Ov.Tr.I.9.7-8 espicles ut uenient ad candida tecta columbæ? accipiat nullas sordida turris sues.

The reading albis therefore seems likely to be correct in v.48. Elsewhere, using turris in its more usual sense of 'tower', Ovid links it with the words alta (Her.V.61 and Tr.III.10(11).17-18), celsa (Met.II.61), and ardua (Met.XI.392). Even at Met.IV.43, altis might be correct, and would not be completely out of place, as is shown by Verro's use of the words sublimis, summa and columinibus in the passage quoted, and Columella's summis turribus vel ditis similis aedificiis.

53 hoc placet: see also Met.II.279-280 si placet hoc, meruique, quid o tua fulmina cessant, summe deum? and Met.IX.517 hoc placet, haec dubiam uicit sententia mentem.

The third word of v.53 appeared as hanc in the edition of Heinsius (1659); and more recently (1927) Slater gave hanc his support. Otherwise, the vast majority of editors have printed haec from the other MSS. (the reading hoc from the manuscripts AELOUY may be dismissed as a subconscious repetition of the first word of the line). Heinsius and Slater were not mistaken. If haec is accepted, then it becomes an integral part within the quoniam clause. But other examples of Ovid's use of quoniam throughout the poem show that he commonly left a single word outside the quoniam clause, as with hanc in this passage, to be picked up by what followed in the next line: Met.I.194-195 quos, quoniam caeli nondum dignamur honore, quas dedimus certe terras habitare sinemus, V.101-102 qui, quoniam prohibent anni bellare, logendo pugnat et incessit scelerataque deuouet arma, and VII.299-300 illam, quoniam grauis ipse senecta est, excipiunt natae. haec in v.153 is an unnecessary rationalisation of this idiomatic use of hanc.

55-166 Pyramus and Thisbe. No version of the myth, as told by Ovid, is extant in classical literature written before Ovid's time (see G.Hart Ursprung und Verbreitung der Pyramus- und Thisbe-sage, Passau, 1889). Ovid's exact use of his sources, therefore, is shrouded in uncertainty. A slightly different version of the story, however, is told in the Appendix Narrationum to the Scriptores Rerum Mirabilium Graeci (ed. Westermann, Brunswick and London, 1839), a version which, being of unknown authorship, is also of uncertain date (Otto Immisch, in his article 'Pyramos und Thisbe' in Roscher's Mythological Lexicon, col.3337, ascribes the passage to Nikolaos of Myra, of the fifth century A.D.; if he is correct, then it is noteworthy that such a simple version
of the myth should be written so long after Ovid's more complex treatment):

\[\text{...}\]

Whether or not this version of the story precedes in date that of Ovid, it is of interest in that it preserves a version which is simpler, and therefore perhaps nearer to the origin of the myth, than Ovid's story. The common features of the two versions are (a) that Pyramus and Thisbe fall equally in love with each other (tempore creuit amor ... ex aequo captis ardebat mentibus ambo, Ovid vv. 60, 62; Θισβή καὶ Πύραμος τὸν ἄλλον πρὸς ἐκέκτυτο πόθον, ἔρωτες δὲ ἐπιληψίαν). (b) that Pyramus kills himself on discovering (or so he believes, in Ovid) of Thisbe's death ('accipe nunc ... nostri quoque sanguinis haustus', quoque erat accinctus demisit in illa terram, Ovid vv. 119-120; η πάντως θανάτως καὶ ἑαυτῆς καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου. Appendix), (c) that the gods have pity on them (unctatem tetigere deos, Ovid v. 164; καὶ θεὸς τοὺς ἐλεήσατο Appendix), and (d) that they achieve a unity in death which had escaped them in life (quodque regis superest, urna requiescit in una, Ovid v. 166; η Θισβή ... παρὰ τὸν κλώμαν Appendix). Without more source-material, opinions about passages such as Ovid's lion-episode (vv. 96-104, and resulting in Thisbe's actual, rather than apparent, death after, and not before, that of Pyramus) must remain speculative: it is not possible to know either at what stage in the development of the myth the lion-motivation replaced the simpler reason that Thisbe was expecting a child (Θισβή καὶ Πύραμος ... ἐρωτεῖς ... ἐπιληψίαν, καὶ τοῦ καὶ τοῦ γέγονές περὶ καὶ λαβάνη ... θανάτως καὶ τῆς ἑαυτῆς. Appendix), or how much of the detail in Ovid's telling of the story may be his own even if he inherited from Alexandrian predecessors the version incorporating the lion. In one respect, however, the romanticism of Ovid's story, as compared with the simplicity of that in the Appendix, is demonstrable. Thisbe's twin death-wish in Ovid (on behalf of both herself and Pyramus) is (a) that they should be buried in the same tomb (vv. 156-157), and (b) that the fruits of the mulberry-tree should henceforth be not white, but dark red (vv. 158-161). Both of these wishes eventually become reality (vv. 164-166). But the story of the Appendix, that Pyramus becomes a river, and Thisbe a well nearby (καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ μὲν γεγονός δ
TooTov T T ot^ T clv T K $  ex^oA,^^ ) fin d s confirmation in the writings of, among others, Pomponius Mela, the mythographer Apollodorus, and Nonnus; Pomp.Mel,1,13*70 procul inde Hammodes promimturlum inter Pyramum Cydnunque fluuios iacet. Pyramus Isso propior Mallon praeterfluit, Apollod. III.i,1 and Ptolemy in fo estuto kemungen xweren totemai xeneuus Pyrami kikiai analeste, Nonn. Dionys.VI,344-345,347,350-352,354:

Either continues or continuas could be correct in this line. Previous editors have opted universally for continuas; for that is the reading found in the Florentine manuscript M. Yet if we try to rid ourselves of prejudices, and consider both readings on their objective merits, I believe the balance tilts towards continuas. While continuas is the obvious word for describing the proximity of the houses in a general sense, continues is the 'not just' in a more specific way, looking forward to vv.65-66, and especially to the phrase peries domui communis utrique. Preference for continuas therefore is based on the fact that it might easily have been altered to continuas, but that the reverse, though possible, is less likely. For similar uses of continuus, see Plin.Epist.II.17.27 litus ornant varietate gratissima nunc continua nunc intermissa tecta uillarum, Ov.Met.XV.289-290 Leucada continuam ueteres hebuerse colonii: nunc freta circumeunt, and Plin.N.H.XI.61.160 dentium tria genera, serrati aut continuai aut exerti serrati: ... continui, ut homini, equo.

Supernumerary line found in the Montpellier manuscript. Although this line must be rejected as a gloss, it serves as a useful indication of the confusion and uncertainty which bedevil the manuscript tradition of the poem. For although the Montpellier manuscript (dating from the thirteenth century) is the only manuscript, of the 200+ which I have used, which contains the line, the line itself was already known to Hieronymus when he wrote his commentary to the Book of Hosea in, or shortly after, the autumn of A.D.406 (see Corpus Christianorum LXVI.1, praeef.v) for at Comm.ad Hos.I.2.16-17 Hieronymus quotes the words quam dicitur olim coctilibus murie cinixisse Semiramis urbem. Later, perhaps in the eighth or ninth centuries (see G.Highet Juvenal the Satirist, p.194), the scholiast on Juvenal ('Cornutus') quoted the line fully, in his note on Juvenal II.108: Senae in campis Babylonia dicitur olim coctilibus murie cinixisse Semiramis urbem. This version of 'Cornutus' retains the correct Senaer (a Greek mis-spelling of the Babylonian word for Babylon, Shumer: see Encyclopaedia Britannica, ed.1911, XXVI.75, SUMER and SUMERIAN)
for the mistaken Sensarar of the Montpellier manuscript; but in turn both Hieronymus' quam dicitur olim and the scholiast's Babylonis dicitur olim are at fault where the Montpellier manuscript's Babylon quae dicitur olim makes good sense. The line should therefore read Sensar in campis Babylon quae dicitur olim. Although this is not completely impossible in the context (if Sensar, as an indeclinable form, is accusative, to be taken with altem, to which urbem is attached in apposition), it nonetheless represents an unnecessary attempt to clarify the apparently inconclusive words altem ... urbem. Ovid has already made clear with Babylonia (v.44) that the various stories enumerated in vv.44-53 are set in that part of the world, and he uses Babylonia again at v.99. His readers would not have needed the stimulus to memory which a later glossator thought necessary. A more serious objection to the acceptance of the supernumerary line immediately after v.57 is the consecutive appearance of dicitur in the fifth foot of both lines. If the extra line were to be accepted, it would have to be on the condition that one of the two appearances of dicitur were removed as being a mistaken paraleptic repetition of the other (see the Introduction, Part II.ii). But when dicitur in v.57 gives perfect sense, and when the information contained in the extra line is superfluous to vv.57-58, it is reasonable to presume that the line is an addition; it contains dicitur only because the glossator lacked the literary perception to avoid duplicating a word just used by Ovid.

But though this supernumerary line is rejected as a gloss, an important principle becomes evident. Information which was available in texts of the late fourth or early fifth centuries bypasses Lactantian manuscripts such as B M or N of the tenth and eleventh centuries, and is found in a thirteenth-century manuscript which, in other respects, in Book IV, is not specially remarkable in any way. In this instance the piece of information preserved is of negative value. But the reverse is not impossible elsewhere: what is important is that a thirteenth-century manuscript is alone in preserving fourth/fifth century material. It becomes obligatory to acknowledge the important part which twelfth or thirteenth (or even fourteenth and fifteenth) century manuscripts may have to play in the recension of the poem.

It should be borne in mind that some MSS. at Juvenal II.108 have the spelling Sameremis for Semiramis (Sameremis ..., ut ferre solent optimi codices Latini, nescio quam recte, Housman loc. cit.), and that the spelling semiramis survives in the manuscript P at Ov. Am. I.5.11; Sameramis is therefore not impossible here at Met. IV.58. But when all MSS., as well as the fifth-century citation by Hieronymus, have the spelling Semiramis, there are no adequate reasons for not printing the word spelt that way.

tentu is an unnecessary rationalisation of the more idiomatic
teutus. Other examples in the poem show that, although Ovid sometimes picks up the first quo megis with a following ablative (e.g. XI.722-723 quo megis illa tuetur, hoc minus et minus ... and XIV.302-303 quo megis illa cenit, magis hoc tellure leuati ergimur), there are other occasions when he does not: X.460 quoque suo proprior sceleri est, magis horret and XIII.37-38 quo megis hos noxi ... magis hos reor esse timendos. The fact that Servius, writing in the early fifth century, cites the reading tanto (at Aen.IV.2) is an indication, in the same way as the spurious 'Montpellier' line between vv.57 and 58, that many corruptions which seem, through lack of early evidence, to be mediaeval may date back to much earlier times.

68 quid non sentit amor? A modification of Ovid's part of Vergil's phrase at Aen.IV.296-297: et regina dolos (quis fellere possit amantem?) praesensit. See also Cv.AA.II.573 quis Solem fellere possit? and 647-648 multa uetustas lenit, at incipient omnia sentit amor.

74 toto nos corpore iungi: for an example of similar word-order in Ovid, see nullo mihi foedere iuncti (Tr.I.8.27). On the word-order nos toto corpore of some MSS., see the Introduction, Part III.ii.

78 diuersa nequiquam has in some manuscripts become nequi(c)quam diuerea because an early reader or copyist wrote diuersa above the line over sede in order to show that the two words should be taken together. A scribe subsequently copied the words in the wrong order.

86 nocte silenti; 'cum esse tnox intempesta quia tum omnia animalia silent; vid. Verg.Ecl.IX.44' (Gronovius). See also Alcman Freg. 60 (Bergk), and Verg.Aen.IV.522-527.

86 Heinsius's objection to the paradigm tecta was not unjustified; and the same suspicion lurked in the mind of the scribe of the Dresden manuscript when he wrote claustra for tecta. The three words urbis ... tecta reliquant are a strange and incongruous mixture; for, as Heinsius realised, urbis ... reliquant has as its focus not the city as a unity made up of many houses, as tecta implies, but some more specific part or characteristic of the city which Pyramus and Thisbe will be leaving behind at their departure. Both claustra and Heinsius's saepta emphasize this idea well in a purely physical sense. My conjecture tuta (see Met.X.744-745 trepidumque et tuta petentem trux apser insequitur) has in its favour that it is an easier word to be corrupted into tecta than are either saepta or claustra. This kind of accusative plural with a defining genitive is poetic or post-Augustan; for a similar example, see intuta moenium (Tac.Hist.III.76.2).

91a For a full discussion of this line, and of its relationship with vv.91-92, see Appendix III. For parallels in Ovid to in Oceani
... praeclpretatur aquas, see Fast.IV.164 Scorpios in uiridis praeclpretatur aquas, Ibis 326 uinus in occultes praeclpretiter aquas, and Ibis 464 clausus in sequores praeclpretiter aquas.

92 I have, for various reasons, preferred surgit to exit in this line. exit itself is a colourless word: surgit, while not particularly strong (as is Vergil's renit Oceano nox, for example, at Aen.II.250), is more purposeful than exit, and offers a better contrast with praeclpretatur earlier in the line. exit may be accounted for in either of several ways. It may be a simple gloss for surgit; it may owe its presence to reminiscence of exierint in v.86; or it may represent a more subtle kind of error. The present tense was always liable to be changed into the past (see reliqut v.101, tinxit v.127 etc.), and surgit might therefore have become surrexit; and nox surrexit ab isdem would then have been changed, in metrical reasons, into nox exit ab isdem.

candida, found in an as yet unidentified Leiden manuscript of Heinsius and also in a manuscript at Oxford, may possibly be correct. The antithesis candida per tenebras is in its way an effective one. However, callida also has a specific purpose, in picking up faele (v.85), and, pending further examination of the Leiden manuscripts, and perhaps the discovery of wider manuscript support for candida, there are no adequate grounds for displacing callida from the text.

96 audacem faciebat amor: see also Tib.I.2.16 audendum est: fortes adiuuat ipsa Venus.

97 albida, found in MSS. from Oxford and Naples, is a reminiscence of Met.III.74 spumaeque pestiferos circumfluit albida rictus.

100 timido pede fugit: see also Met.I.525-526 plura locuturum timido Fenea cura fugit. There is no sufficient reason for reading, with Surman, trepido from the Erfurt manuscript A, which seems to be a reminiscence of phrases such as Vergil's at Aen.IV.672 trepido ... exterrita cursu.

101 relinquuit: a check throughout the whole of the Metamorphoses of those places where the present and perfect tenses of relinquere are metrically interchangeable reveals several important facts. According to the apparatus of Magnus's edition (Berlin, 1914), one or more of the manuscripts, on all occasions when the present tense is correct, has the perfect (I.538, II.771, VI.34, VII.357, X.459 and 670, XII.251, XIV.87, 303, 363, 377 and 543, and XV.526); and of seven other instances where both forms survive and Magnus accepts the perfect tense (III.39, IV.589, IX.564, X.478, XIII.428, XIV.100 and XV.539), Heinsius approved the present in no less than five (i.e. except at IX.564 and XV.539). On all other occasions in the poem where the perfect tense occurs, none of the manuscripts, according to Magnus, has the present. The
explanation is clear: because relinquit was often written reliquit, it was easier for the bar above the i to be ignored, and for relinquit to become reliquit, than for the reverse to happen and reliquit become relinquit.

Wherever, therefore, relinquit and reliquit occur as alternatives, as at IV.101, the former is more likely, if it makes sense, to be correct. Heinsius accepted the present tense in v.101. For another similar confusion, see Verg. Georg. I.35.

in alto puluere: it seems likely that puluis here bears the meaning 'sand': for this was a country where sol ... radiis siccauerat herbes (v.82). For a similar use of puluis, see Juvenal VII.48-49 tenui ... in puluere sulcos ducimus. Because there was a considerable depth of sand, the foot-prints showed up more clearly for Pyramus to see.

totoque expalluit ore: see also Met. VI.602 horruit infelix totoque expalluit ore.

The variant nex, from the twelfth/thirteenth century London manuscript 168, may perhaps be correct; and although there is some antithesis between nox in v.108 and uita in v.109, the antithesis between nex and uita would be clearer still. And Pyramus does indeed go on (vv.112-114) to ask for the same death as he believes has befallen Thisbe: nostrum diuelli corpus et acelerate fero consumite uiscera morsu. o quicumque sub hac habitatis rupe leones. However, a line from Book VIII of the poem (v.709), in which Philemon asks for death at the same time as Baucis (auferet hora duos eadem), offers a parallel for nox rather than nex. And when the evidence for nex is confined to one manuscript, and the corruption between the two words is such an easy one, and nox itself offers good sense, there are no adequate grounds for displacing nox from its position in the text.

ex quibus from the manuscript L may possibly be correct. See the note on v.36.

There is a degree of difficulty in note, for in the context it seems to mean not that Pyramus recognises the shawl (having seen it before) but that he recognises it as belonging to Thisbe. However, as Thisbe was the only person with a shawl in the vicinity at the time, the word may be taken in a general sense implying that Pyramus, on seeing the shawl, knew whose it was and what had happened. Although the word does not withstand any very exact scrutiny or interpretation, there is not any sufficient reason for removing it from the text: it should be borne in mind that the Metamorphoses lack the uniformly perfect finish which distinguishes works such as, for example, the Eclogues or the Georgics.
If notae were a corruption, then it is possible that it hides a word such as medidae: there would be logic in Pyramus' picking up of medidae ... uesti with nostri quoque senquinis haustus in the following line, medidae might have lost its central syllable and become medae (see medium for medium at II.198 in the Paris manuscript); and a subsequent scribe, perplexed with the incomprehensible medae, might have altered the word to notae.

119 See also Met.XII.440-441 gladium spolientis in ima illia demisi and Met.XIII.435-436 caput inditus ense rex Thracum jugulque sui demisit alumni.

121 The confusion of et and ut is a frequent one in MSS.: see vv.371, 386, 678 and 712 for some other examples in this book. et is the correct reading here in v.121: Ovid describes in the past tense Pyramus' own actions at this point (dedit v.117, demisit v.119, traxit v.120, and iacuit v.121), and iacuit is a natural member of this grouping. In the ornate simile which follows, Ovid changes, for dramatic effect, to the present tense (emicat v.121, etc.), which tends to confirm that the phrase-division comes between humo and cruor, rather than at the beginning of the line.

123 For a full orthographical discussion of why Heinsius was correct to adopt the readings tenuis and longe in this line, see the Introduction, Part II.iv. And there are, besides, stylistic reasons for preferring tenui stridente foramine longe eiaculatur aquas. While stridente foramine longe eiaculatur is a balanced phrase where every word plays its distinct part, the consecutive adjective and participle, both agreeing with the same noun, of tenui stridente foramine, though not impossible in sense (see tenui foremine at Plin.N.H.XVI.36,66 and longo foraminate at Ov.Met.IV.30), is less elegant in style; and longe ... aquas, though again not completely impossible, is a peculiarly clumsy and inapproachable alternative to the naturalness and clarity of tenuis ... aquas (see tenuis ... aquas at Verg.Georg. III.335 and tenuem ... aquem at Ov.Fast.II.250).

125-126 in atram uertuntur faciem; see also Met.XIV.505-506 et dum mirantur, eandem accipient faciem.

Confusion between faciem and speciem is found elsewhere in the poem at I.602 and IV.291.

127 Ovid uses the adjective purpureus with color on three other occasions in the poem: III.484-485 aut ut usuris solet uua recemis ducere purpureum nondum matura colorem, X.212-213 flos oritur foramnique cepit, quem illi, si non purpureus color his, argenteus esset in illis, and XIV.393 purpureum chlamydis pennae traxere colorem. puniceo (by no means impossible in sense), the reading of one of the Sulmona manuscripts, may have been suggested by comparison with V.536 puniceum curua decerpserat arbo re pomum.
The change of *tinguit* to *tinxit* in some MSS. is in line with the tendency discernible elsewhere (e.g. *reliquit* for *relinquit* v.101, *cognouit* for *cognoscit* v.131, *percuit* for *percussit* v.138, and *requieuit* for *requiescit* v.166) for the historic present, a device of which Ovid makes constant use, to be altered into the more obvious past tense.

*pome* is found in only a few of the MSS. which I have inspected, and in two of those (from Leiden and Romorantin) only as a correction; however it is the reading of the Wolfenbüttel manuscript G (see the Introduction, Part I), and thus, although it has never been printed, or even mentioned, in any previous edition, its manuscript authority is of the very highest. More, the reading of the majority of MSS., is a 'specifying' gloss for the vaguer *pome*; in the same way, at v.331, *mals* has made its way into the text in some MSS. in place of the correct *pomis*.

131 *cognoscit* is followed by the historic presents *facit* and *hearet* (v.132) and *uidet* (v.133). See the note on *tinxit* at v.127 for the variant *cognouit*.

135 Heinsius's emendation *rigens* is unnecessary. Many parallels can be found for *gerens* of the MSS., of which the following are only a few: Verg.Aen.II.277-278 *squalentem barbam et concretos sanguine crinis* ... *gerens*, Ov.Met.V.161 *tuta* ... *terga gerena* and 552-553 *uvibus, Achelooides, unde pluma pedesque aurum, cum virginis ora geratis?*. Luc.X.129 *flauos ... serit crinis*, and Mart.III.93.4 *rugosiorem cum geres stola frontem*.

136 *tremit*; the choice here between *tremit* and *fremit* offers a good example of the way in which many editors of the last century became conditioned into accepting the impossible simply because the impossible was found in the manuscript M. *fremit*, descriptive of the roar of an ocean-storm, is quite out of place when Ovid is speaking here of a light wind (*exigua aura*) which passes with a shiver over the wave-crests, barely ruffling the surface. Conclusive proof of the rightness of *tremit* is found at Heroides XI.75 *ut mare fit tremulum, tenui cum stringitur aura*. The reverse idea is found in Callimachus (Pfeiffer, Frag.713): *θ' άνέρ άνερ άνερ άνερ άνερ κύ η η διαλόγιον*.

138 *percuit indignos* ... : for the notion that the part of the body being punished did not deserve its harsh treatment, see also Met. X.273 *indignis percussit pectora palmis*, and, if Wakefield's emendation is correct, Ciris 284 *insontes multo deturpat puluere crinis*.

140 *uulnera suppleuit lacrimis*; see also Met.XIII.490 *lacrimas in uulnera fundit*. 
141 oscula figens; see also Lucr. IV. 1179 foribus miser oscula figit, Verg. Aen. II. 490 amplexasque tenent postes atque oscula figunt, Ov. Met. III. 25 Cadmus egit grates peregrinaeque oscula terrae figit, and Ciris 253 dulcis deinde genis rorentibus oscula figens.

142 The omission of this verse in the manuscripts N and S (because of the similar beginning Pyramus of vv. 142 and 143) is a good example of interlinear parablepsy (see the Introduction, Part II. i i ).

143 carissime, despite the fact that it has much slighter manuscript attestation than carissima, may be preferred for two reasons. First, because Thisbe is the word following, carissima is a natural assimilative corruption of carissime, while the reverse fault, if Ovid had written carissima, would not have developed as easily. Secondly, if Ovid wrote carissime, then Thisbe uses the word of her own feelings for Pyramus; but with carissima she would be making the presumption on her own behalf of what Pyramus feels for her; although she is of course carissima to Pyramus, the comparative modesty of carissime is preferable as being the more natural method of expression. See, similarly, v. 320, where B and M have dignissima for the correct dignissime.

144-146 Ovid no doubt had in mind here Dido's last moments at Aen. IV. 688-692.

145 oculos iam morte grauatos: this is yet another instance of how the German editors of the late nineteenth century failed to choose the correct manuscript reading where the Lactantians, and especially M, are mistaken. It is very much to Edwards' credit (ed. 1894) that he brought back into the text non-Lactantian readings, such as iam in this line (and see also vv. 136, 510, 647 etc.), which had been present in the edition of Heinsius (1659), but are ignored by many subsequent editors even up to the present day.

151 prosequar of the Berlin manuscript 42 (Heinsius's codex Sixianus) may possibly be correct. This kind of confusion between per and pro or prae in MSS. is not infrequent: see v. 251 preequestus/persequus, v. 551 persequar/prosequar, and v. 759 praecutiunt/percutiunt.

155 miser meus illiusque parentes: the confusion of the text in this line, with meus becoming mei or nostri, is the result of misunderstanding, on the part of a post-Roman annotator, of the pre-eminence, in the Roman family-structure, of the paterfamilias. Ovid refers in this line to the two fathers of Pyramus and Thisbe, not to all four of their parents, as the corrections to meus try to suggest.

166 una ... in urna has found general favour with editors (rather
then urna ... in una) for no better reason than that it is the reading of M. But una is the punch-word of the line, and urna ... in una is stylistically preferable. For the same word-pattern, see Thisbe's request at v.157, tumulo ... eodem.

requiescit: for the variant requiesit, see the note on tinctuit and tinct at v.127.

168 For the reasons which prompted Riese to make the emendation Leucippe, see the note on v.1. The emendation is an unnecessary rationalisation, and is not supported by the evidence of the parallel variation in the third sister's name, Arsinoe/Arshippe.

169 sidera qui temperat omnia luce: see also Met.1.770-771 hoc te, quem spectas, hoc te, qui temperat orbem, sole satum, II.32 Sol oculis iuuenem, quibus expicit omnia, uidit, and XIV.375-376 socerum, qui peruidet omnia, Solem accipe.

170 referamus: the subjunctive referamus might possibly be correct here, in which case it is taken in the same way as leuemus (v.39) and referamus (v.41). However, at vv.39 and 41 the suggestion that the three sisters should each tell a story is being mooted for the first time, and the subjunctive is appropriate in those circumstances. Elsewhere, when the sisters have decided on the stories they are going to tell (or not tell), the indicative is used (hoc placet v.53, taceo v.276, nec loquor v.279, praetereo v.284, discite v.287); and similar instances at VII.797 (illa prius referam) and IX.5 (referam tamem ordine ...) are to be taken as future rather than subjunctive. If Leuconoe uses the subjunctive (referamus) in v.168, she means 'let all of us tell stories about Phoebus'; but as Alcithoe, in vv.274-287, shows no inclination of doing so, it is more likely that Leuconoe is using the plural for herself alone, meaning 'I shall tell you a story about Phoebus'.

171-189 Venus and Mars. Ovid had himself told this story on a previous occasion, at A.A.II.561-562, and there are instances where he makes use, in Metamorphoses IV, of words or phrases from his earlier version: (1) A.A.II.577-578 obscuros ... disponit laqueos: lumina fallit opus = Met.IV.177 retiaque et laqueos, quae lumina fellere possent; (2) A.A.II.585 aliquis ridens = Met.IV.187 aliquis de dis non tristibus, (3) A.A.II.561 fabula narratur toto notissime caelo = Met.IV.189 haec sult in toto
In the *Ars Amatoria* version, there are numerous small details which are suppressed or condensed in the passage in *Metamorphoses* IV (see vv.563-572, 575-576, 579, 582-584, 587-592); one of the reasons for this is that the story in *Metamorphoses* IV is no more than a diversion, a passing link in the main theme of *Solis amores*, mentioned by Leuconoe at vv.170 and subsequently told in more detail in vv.190-270. Thus Venus and Mars are of interest only in so far as they establish the background for the stories about Phoebus; the full details of their own story are unimportant in the context.

For other and more comprehensive versions of the Venus-Mars story, see Horner*.Od.*VIII.266-369, Hyginus *Fab.*CXLVII.1-2, Appendix Narrationum (*Script.Rei.Mirab.Graec.* XIX.2, and Lucian *Dial.* Deor.XXI.17. On the testimony of the mythographer Palaephatus, Homer was regarded as the authoritative source for the myth: ιστορία ποιητικός ὑμέρος ὁ ποιητής μέλις ἡ Ἑλίκιος, φρονίμῳ, ιερείτε κτίσειν *τῶν Ἀφροδίτης* συμμετέχουσιν νωκτίς ᾗ Ἅρης ... (*Palaeph., de Incredib.,53). None of the other versions contains information independent of the story as told by Homer.

174 *furta t ori*: see also Prop.II.23.22 *nobil furta pudica tori.*

174-178 *et illi ... quod opus ... dextra tenebat exicit: graciliis ... cestaes ... elimet.* The idea of these lines was perhaps derived from Callimachus (*Aetia*, Pfeiffer, *Frag.*177-15-17): ἦς ἐν τῶν τὸ μέγεν ἔδωκεν, ἄβρακον τὸ *κατά τὸν διπλασίαν* ἐκτείνον ἐν κτίσειν *τοιαύτης* βαλει κτίσις. It is not unlikely that Ovid intended a diminution of the ectorites of Mars and Venus by using for them an idea which had been applied previously to mice.

176 *retiaque et laqueos; see also Met.XV.473-474 retia cum pedicis laqueosque dolosque tollit.*

179 The confusion of *non* and *nec* was a very common one in the copying of MSS. For a similar rationalisation of a second *non* into the easier *nec*, see *v.299*. For examples of the reverse fault, see vv.308, 378 end 422.

181 The reading *fecit* of the manuscript 3 is an unhappy example of the tendency of scribes to alter the historic present into the past tense (see the note at *v.127* on *tinguit* and *tinxit*). *efficit* became *fecit*, which was changed, *metri gratia*, into *fecit*, which still does not scan.

*collocat*: see *disponit laqueos* at *A.A.*II.578.
The choice between *apte* and *arte* is an extremely difficult one: either could be correct, and both make good sense (for a defence of *arte*, see H. Magnus Studien zu Ovids Metamorphosen, Progr. Berlin 1887, p. 6). I have chosen *apte* for two reasons. First, it is the less obvious word, and thus its replacement by *arte* was perhaps more likely than the reverse. For other examples of this use of *apte*, see Non. Marc. IV, 234, 37 *aptes*; *conexum et conligatum* significat, Amm. Marc. XXIII, 4, 2 *eique cochleae duse lignere coniunguntur aptissime*, and Aug. de Civ. Dei IV, 32 *hoc modo eos ciuili societati uelut aptius alligantes*, quo similiter subditos possiderent. Mommsen's emendation of *aptissime* to *artissime* in the passage of Ammianus is an unnecessary rationalisation. It was the very common linking of the adverb *arte* with verbs of joining (*e.g.* Neev. Com. 8, Warrington, nimio *arte* conligor. Plaut. Epid. 694 *atque arte conliga*, Cato de Agr. Cult. XXXIII, 5 *salictum suo tempore cedito, glubito arteque alligat*) which may be the reason why *apte* was changed into *arte*. And secondly (although this is not such a serious consideration), the close proximity of the adverb *arte* (*v. 181*) and the ablative of *ars* (*v. 183*) is perhaps less agreeable stylistically than the variation of *apte* (*v. 181*) and *arte* (*v. 183*); it is even possible that the presence of *arte* in *v. 183* was responsible for a subconscious paraleptic error by which *arte* replaced *apte* in *v. 181*.

I propose to deal together with the problems in this line (Lemnius... *valuas patefacta eburnas*) and at *v. 487* (*pallorque fores infecta acernas*, or... *infecta eburnas*). The difficulty is a common one, distinguished only by the fact that *v. 185* represents a more advanced stage of corruption than *v. 487*: *eburnas* survives alone in the one case, and is found in a few MSS. in the second, where *acernas* is the reading of the majority of MSS.

No explanation of why doors should be made of maple-wood (*v. 487*) is given by any ancient authority, and nowhere else in extant classical literature are doors of this material found. Suspicion of the word is therefore justifiable: while on the one hand one may claim that there is no reason why doors should not be made of maple-wood, one may legitimately say on the other that there is no ready explanation for the use by Ovid of such an unusual idea. I have printed in both lines, for five reasons, my emendation *acernas*. First, the difference between 'e' and 'o' is orthographically negligible: *acernas* could with the greatest of ease have become *acenas*; and from there *acenas* (= *acernas*) is no distance away. At a relatively early stage, therefore, in the transmission of the text, *acernas* would already have been found in both verses, the latter no doubt influenced by the former. Secondly, because *acernas* was a somewhat rare and unusual word, not known to a subsequent scribe, he tried to simplify the phraseology by substituting *eburnas*, which he understood. The same mistake is found again at Fast. III, 359, where *eburnas* has, in a few MSS., replaced *acerno* (and the correctness of *soleo*...
acerno at Fast.III.359 is corroborated by the parallel phrase, on which Ovid drew, at Aen.VIII.178. Thirdly (excluding such special doors as are found at Verg.Georg.III.26-27, Aen.VI.895 and Hor.Carm.III.27.41), there is remarkable unanimity in the Latin poets about brass, or other metal, rather than wood, being the distinguishing feature of doors. Thus porta has the epithets aerata (Ov.Met.VIII.41, Fast.II.785), aena (Stat.Theb.X.263), and ferrata (Stat.Theb.X.570); foris is found with sena (Verg. Aen.I.295 and 449) and aerate (Prop.III.7.2); and postis is used with aeratus (Verg.Aen.II.480-481; Ov.Met.XV.621, Am.II.8.32), aenus (Claud.D.R.P.1.73) and ferratus (Verg.Aen.VII.622; Claud. D.R.P.I.239). To these examples may be added two others which tend in the same direction, Plaut.Asin.426 iussin in splendorem dari bullas has foribus nostris? and Lucr.I.316-318 tum portas propter aena signe ostendunt attenuatur eaepe solutentum tectu preterque meantum. Fourthly, Ovid, in the Mars-Venus story, had as a primary model Homer's version of the story in Book VIII of the Odyssey; and in v.321 of that book, at the same stage of the story as vv.185-186 in Metamorphoses IV, Homer uses the word χαλκοβάτης.

Each of these four reasons, in different ways, casts some doubt on eburnas and acernas, and together their cumulative weight is heavy. But it is the fifth reason which I regard as decisive in the case of v.487; and if aenas is accepted there, then its acceptance at v.185 is made easier, particularly in view of Homer's χαλκοβάτης.
pellorque fores infectit acernas (v.487) is explained by Haupt 'die hellpolierten Türrflügel verlieren ihren Glanz'. Some such explanation is essential. But wood (and least of all maple-wood, which is itself pale in colour) does not properly reflect light, even if highly polished; what does reflect light is brass or bronze (see, for example, Verg.Aen.VII.526-527 and Ov.Met.IV. 782-783). Tisiphone was standing in front of the door (limine constiterat, v.486), and her deathly-white pallor, that of the underworld, was reflected in the bronze or brass before her.

immisit, rather than admisit, has been accepted by the majority of editors (a) because it is the reading of the manuscript M, and (b) for the same reason as led the scribe of M to substitute immisit for admisit of nearly all other MSS., both Lactantian and non-Lactantian. Because Vulcan was not inside the room, letting in the other gods who were outside, but was himself outside also, immittere was a more obvious word for the necessary sense than admittere. Gronovius explains admisit 'intrare, accedere permitisse'.

The indeterminate alicuius, found also in the Ars Amatoria version at v.585, may be a conscious means, on Ovid's part, of bypassing an ambiguity in the tradition as to which god it was who made the quip, or, in the words of Brandt (A.A., ed.Leipzig 1902, 111), 'Das unbestimmte alicuius ist pikant'. We know from other versions...
...either Phoebus or Mercury was the god in question. In Homer (Od. VIII. 334-342) it is Phoebus who makes the suggestion to Mercury in the first instance, but Mercury who actually expresses the wish (though it is impossible to resist the suspicion that Phoebus' question to Mercury is only a way of expressing the wish himself more modestly); in Lucian (D.D. XXI. 17.2) it is again Mercury who makes the wish, and he is also the first to raise the subject, as he is describing the incident to Phoebus, who was absent when it happened. It is also possible that aliquis was suggested to Ovid by Homer's πρῶτον, at Od. VIII. 328:

193 **forma colorque;** see also et color et facies (v. 593).

Either radiantia or radiatague could be correct in this line: the choice between them is a difficult one. Previous editors' preference for radiatague has been based on the fact that radiantia was found only in non-Lactantian MSS., and was therefore considered an intrinsically weaker reading. I have accepted radiantia for two reasons. First, the present participle, with its subjective emphasis, is better suited than the past to Phoebus' personal involvement with Leucothoe at this point (the phrase radiantia lumina solis is also found elsewhere in Ovid, at Tr. II. 325); and, secondly, the asyndeton forma colorque tibi, radiantia lumina was more likely to be removed by the inclusion of a second -que (the unmetrical radiantiaque became radiatague) than vice versa. See, similarly, horrendaque for horrrentia at v. 773.

The exact reason why Heinsius preferred the form Leucothee in this line (and also at vv. 208 and 220) remains uncertain; for it is important not to confuse the person named here with the goddess mentioned in v. 542. Leucothoe is the correct form for the daughter of Orchamos and Eurynome (see Roscher Lexicon der Mythologie, col. 2017).

Leucothoe. Besides Ovid's treatment of the Leucothoe myth, one other version survives, that of an Greek mythographical writer collected in Scriptores Rerum Mirabilium Graeci (Brunswick and London, 1859): Ἡλίος Λευκόθοι τοῖς Θεομένων μιγώνι καθότις ἐστὶν μεταφόρῳ τοῖς προερχόμενοις μετεπορφώθη. τούτων δὲ πατήρ ζωὸς κατὰ ἄραν, Ἡλίος δὲ εἰς δέντρον λυμανθόφορον μετεπορφώθη, ποίησα
Ovid's version adheres to the facts of this tradition in every detail. The lack of other extant treatments of the myth must make uncertain the extent to which Ovid's considerably longer, and more detailed, treatment is his own: small touches here and there may have been gleaned from other sources, but what is noteworthy about Ovid's telling of the myth is that it is longer not because of a greater amount of factual detail, but because of its emphasis on characterization. In this sense, the passage describing Phoebus's feelings for Leucothoe (vv. 192-203), for example, is entirely Ovidian: it begins with a rhetorical question (quid nunc, Hyperione nate, forma colorque tibi. radiantia lumina orosunt?), and abounds in rhetorical antitheses, tuis ignibus uris/urcis igne nouo, omnis/Leucothoen, urginem in una/mundo, surgis Eoo/templeu caelo/seris incidis undis, obscurue (of the suit), and hunc amor iste colorem. Similarly the characterizations of Phoebus pretending to be Leucothoe's mother (vv. 218-228), or of his attempt to bring Leucothoe back to life (vv. 241-251), are typical of Ovid's concentration, in the Metamorphoses, on individuals in relation to situations and events, and seem likely to owe more to Ovid's own imagination than to reliance on any earlier model.

I presume the inversion in the word-order at the end of v. 200 and beginning of v. 201 to have arisen in the same way as the similar confusion in the phrase sustinet artus ebrius at vv. 26-27. If we accept, as I believe we must, the word-order of the Berlin and Ferro manuscripts (the harshness of the separation of uitium and mentis by lumine, with which mentis would more naturally, be taken, is unacceptable), then the word-order of the other MSS. may be explained by the supposition that mentis was written over uitium in v. 200, to show where it belonged, and that a subsequent scribe rearranged the words into the order in which they now appear in all MSS. other than those from Berlin and Ferro.

The confusion between dactyls such as pectora and corpora is a very frequent error in MSS. (see J. Willis Latin Textual Criticism, 74-77).

The reverse confusion (una for sola) is found in some MSS. at v. 797.

Clymene, Rhodos, Aseaua genetrix . . . Circe, Clytie. Clymene and Phoebus were the parents of Phaethon, whose story Ovid has told already in the poem (I. 750-II. 339). But neither Rhodos nor Perse, the mother of Circe, has been mentioned previously. Their stories are found in Pindar and Homer respectively:

```
... Βάλτε μὲν ἔς ἡλιὸς ἄγρα
νάος, ἔχει τε τινι δεινὸν καὶ γενέλαιον ἐκτίνην πατέρα,
πύρ πνεοντων ἄρχος ῥημαν· ἐνθα, ῥοήν ποτὲ μικρούς τέκεν
```
My emendation cordisque (to be taken as dependent on uulnus) is based on three passages in Ovid where the thought and wording are similar, Met.IX.540 quamuis animl graue uulnus habebam, Ep. Pont.I.3.21-22 edferat ipse licet sacras Epidaurus herbas, sanabit nulla uulnera corde opé, and Tr.IV.1.97 corque uetustae mens tamquam nos uulnera nouit. animi at Met.IX.540 (the other variants, among them animo, are mistaken; animo owes its place in editions to the fact that it is the Lactantian reading) effectively disproves the possibility that Ovid could have written the tautological ipsoque illo ... tempore at vv.207-208; and the other two passages show the use of cor with uulnus.

I presume òdisque (= cordisque) to have lost its bar, and to have become odisque; and because of the similarity of 'o' and 'o', the word was next copied as odisque. A subsequent scribe, trying to make sense of the difficulty, substituted ipsoque which (in a different order) shares all letters except one with odisque.

gentis odoriferae: 'h.e. Arabium, ubi nascuntur odoramenta' (Gronovius).

vincit: see the note on tincuit and tinxit at v.127. Similar confusion between the present and past tenses of uincere is
found also at Verg. Ecl. X.69, Juv. IV.136 and Luc. IV.164.

215-216 See also XI.623-625 Somne ... qui corpora duris fessa ministeriis mulces reparasque labori.

220 See also Verg. Aen. VIII.411-412 (femina) noctem addens operi, famulasque ad lumina longo exercet penso ... .

221 For a similar confusion of lenia for leuia, see Tib. I.8.31; for the reverse fault (leuia for lenia), Tib. I.8.2 and 57.

225 peruerunt: on the rightness of the perfect, and not the pluperfect, in cases such as this, see Housman The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism, PCA 18 (1922), 83 & Classical Papers III.1068-1069).

thalamo ... sine teste relictus: see also VII.277-278 solas sine ture relictas ... esse.

226 I have preferred emetior of FLS to metior of the other MSS. because the elision was more likely to be obliterated by a corrector than willfully imported. The same fault is found in the codex Matritensis of Manilius, which has, at II.674, the reading mensis for the correct emensis.

longum qui, found in some MSS. for qui longum, looks like a deliberate correction to avoid correspondence of end of word and end of foot; it was perhaps influenced by tecta qui leesit amores (v.191). But Ovid does not seem to have minded a monosyllable followed by a disyllable in this position of the line: see II.849, III.544 and 624, and VI.224.

227 omnia qui uideo; see also Hom. Od. XII.323 Ηελίου... ὁ πάντι ἐφορεῖ καὶ ἄκοιμη τειχακότεν, Soph. O. K.869 ὁ πάντι λέοντος Ἡλίου, Verg. Aen. IV.607 sol, qui terrarum flammis operis omnia lustras, and Ov. Met. II.32 sol oculis luuenem, quibus expicit omnia, uident.

228 I have adopted Bentley's certain emendation oculo in this line, together with the punctuation of Bentley himself and Heinsius (oculo is found in one manuscript, from Bruges); other editors, taking mundi ocul(us) with the previous line, punctuate between oculus and mihi. But although mundi ocul(us) itself forms a not unpleasant climax to the idea of v.227, severe difficulties then arise with the three words, in isolation, mihi crede places. Is mihi to be taken with the first or the second? Assuredly it cannot do service for both; neither may places reasonably stand alone, without a dative; and mihi crede (like ἔσκαψεν) is a unity whose splitting, though advocated in the majority of editions, is intolerable and unnatural. When Bentley made his emendation, the manuscript readings oculis and oculus only were known, and Heinsius had thrown his weight behind the latter. The
Bruges reading oculo and the presence in some MSS. of oculae (neither reported in editions before) confirm the rightness of Bentley's correction.

mihi sola places, the reading of the Turin manuscript, may have been influenced by Ov. A.A. I.42 elige, cui dices 'tu mihi sola places', Tib. III.19.3 tu mihi sola places, or Prop. II.7.19 tu mihi sola places: pleceam tibi, Cynthia, solus.

See the Introduction, Part II.11, for the kind of assimilation of word-endings which caused et colus et fusus to replace et colus et fusus.

See the note at v.126 for the confusion of speciem and faciem.

For an expansion of the idea of this line, see XIV.766-769: in iuuenem reedit et anilia demit instrumenta sibi talesque apperuit illi, qualis ubi oppositas nitidissima solis imago euicit nubes nullaque obstente reluit.

Clytie. In the anonymous Greek excerpt (see note on Leucothoe, vv.196-255), Clytie was the sister of Leucothoe. But Ovid seems not to follow this particular detail: Clytie is mentioned in v.206 as one of several who have been discarded in favour of Leucothoe, and the lengthy exposition of Leucothoe's parentage and background (vv.208-213) tends to suggest that she is someone new and unrelated to those who have gone before. At least part of the reason for this may be Ovid's full treatment of Phoebus's appearance to Leucothoe as her mother: if Ovid had made a special reference to Clytie as Leucothoe's sister, the reader might wonder why Clytie was not also present weaving with Leucothoe and the twelve servant-girls in vv.220-221.

Apart from Ovid's version and the one sentence from the Anonymi Miscella, no.6 - τὴν δὲ ἀξελαφὴν ἄριστήν ἐξ θάν ἄμωτον γινομένον διὰ τὸ κατὰ γοργασία αὐτής - there is no surviving example of the Clytie story in classical literature. However, a passage of Hyginus indicates that, although sources for the Clytie story before the time of Ovid are no longer extant, the story itself would have been well-known when the Metamorphoses were written: Mercurii filium ex Clytie natum, nomine Myrtilum ... cuius post notem omnibus mortem corpus in mundo constituisse existimatur (Hyg. Astr. II. 13).

Various authors of the first centuries B.C. and A.D. speak of the strange properties of heliotrope, but none of them couples the name of Clytie to what he says about the plant: Varro R.R. 1.46 nec minus admirandum quod fit in florisbus quos uocant heliotropia ab eo quod ad solis ortum mane spectant et eius iter its secuntur ad occasum, ut ad eum semper spectent, Plin. N.H.
II.41.41 herbam unum, qua erectur heliotropium, abuentem solem intueri semper omnibusque horis seu uerit, vel nubilo obvamente, Fil. H. X. X. 2. 29 heliotropi miraculum seseque diximus cum sole se circumgentis etiam nubilo die, tantus sideris amor est. Noctu uelut desiderio contulit crelulem florem, and Dioscorides IV.190 ἀλαστρὸπιον ... ἐκ τοῦ σμπεριπρέπειοι τὰ φύλλα τοῦ ἑλεοῦ κλήσει.

235 peculiarly: the same phrase recurs later in the book, at v.277.

236 Only Hartman (ed.,Leiden, 1823) and Edwards of more recent editors have accepted Heinsius's emendation differentamque for the differentatamque of nearly all manuscripts. But the emendation is now found to be the reading of the Berlin manuscript D, a non-Lactantian of very considerable importance. In a graphic and entirely Ovidian way differentamque parenti leads on to the action of the next lines. First Clytie spreads the news generally of Leucothoe's misdemeanour (uulgat adulterium), and then she takes Leucothoe's father to where Leucothoe is and points her out to him (differentatem...indicat); Orchemus is therefore in situ for the harsh treatment which he metes out to his daughter in vv.237-240.

I do not propose to try to prove differentatumque wrong, because it is in its own way defensible, and offers tolerable sense ('Clytie broadcasts Leucothoe's adultery, and informs her father that the bad news has been spread about'). The fact that parenti indicat (with differentatum, but not differentatem) properly suggests that Clytie informs her own father, and not Leucothoe's, is not a primary reason against differentatum; for, in the version of the Greek mythographer (Anonymous Miscellanea, no.6), Leucothoe and Clytie were sisters; and although Ovid has not adhered to this detail so far, it is the sort of minor inconsistency which would not be out of place in the Metamorphoses. The basic arguments against differentatum and in favour of differentatem are two: first, as has been noticed already, differentatem leads on more directly to the action of vv.237-240, and, secondly, the presence of the -um termination of adulterium made it likely that the third word of the line would have its ending attracted to -um also. While differentatum alone was known in M.S., Heinsius's emendation remained an observation of acute intelligence, but one which it was difficult to substantiate, although it seemed likely to be correct. The discovery of differentatem in so important a manuscript as D brings certainty as near as we have a right to ask.

242 The fact that quae, and not quo, is found as the reading of the first hand in manuscripts as far removed from each other as G and K (see Stemma Codicum, Introduction, Part I) is a very strong indication of its rightness, when quo was so likely to creep in as a normalising correction. For similar uses of quae, see Verg. Georg. I.89-90 seu plures color ille uias et caecas relaxat spiramenta.
nouas uenist qua sucus in herbas. Aen. V. 588-591 ut quondam Creta
fertur labyrinthus in alta partibus textum caecis iter anoipi-
temque milie uis nebuisse dolum, qua sigia sequendi frengeret
indeprensus et inremissibilis error, end Cic. pro Csec. VIII ad
ommnes introitus, qua adiri poterat, ... armatos homines opponit.

243-244 For a more prolonged description of the same kind, see le-
the poem, at XII. 514-518:
obrutus inmanu tumulo sub pondere Caeneus
aestuet arboreo congestaque robora duris
fert uemeris, sed enim postquam super oras ceputque
creuit onus neque habet, quas ducat, spiritus artus,
deficit ...

244 Ovid also uses the phrase corpus exangue at Met. II. 647 and V.

246 Heiniius's Pheathontiacos, though by no means impossible, tends
to rely over-heavily on a variant of one manuscript, for which
there is perhaps an easier explanation. Of adjectival forms
based on Phaethon, there existed Pheathontiue (see Mart. VI. 15. 1
and X. 12. 2; Stat. Theb. I. 221; Claud. de Cons. Prob. et Clyt. 258,
de Tert. Cons. Honor. 124, de Phoenix. 107) and Pheathontius (see Stat.
Silv. II. 4; Silv. VII. 149, X. 110, XVII. 497). The 'i' of L's
phontiados suggests that the correct pheathonteus may in error
have been replaced, in the first instance, with the form phe-
thontios, which would not scan; and then a subsequent copyist
corrected the fault not by restoring the 'e' but by adding
another syllable, in which he included a 'd' because he confused
the adjective with the -iis/-iatis and -is/-idis forms used for
Phaethon's sisters.

249 For the reasons which prompted the re-arrangement of order
fatum tantis constibus for the correct tantis fatum constibus,
see the Introduction, Part II. iii.

250 Heiniius correctly Preferred spargit to sparsit (see the note
on tinguit and tinctat at v. 127); subsequent editors have, on the
whole, ignored the wisdom of his judgment; their decision has
been based not on any rational or logical preference, but on the
supposition that sparsit was Lactantian and right, spargit non-
Lactantian and wrong. Ovid uses the phrase nectaris odorato
spargere again later in the poem, at X. 732.

251 praequestus; a unique appearance of this word in Latin, which
may account for its replacement in a few MSS. with the more
usual conquestus (see XIV. 243 multaque conquestus). But Ovid
had a predilection for coining new words in this way (e.g. de-
frenato I. 282, indeuitato II. 605, praeelasset XI. 730), and
there is no adequate reason for doubting the authenticity of
praequestus here. For the confusion between prea and pro (of
the manuscripts AJS), see the note at v.151.

259 dementer emoribus usa: 'indulging her love in a mad way'. See also Plaut. Curc. 204-205 quo usque, quaero, ad hunc modum inter nos amore utemur semper subrepticio? For a similar use in Ovid of utor with an ablative and an adverb, see Tr. II.117 quo uidear quemuis nimium iuuenaliter usus.

260 siluarum inpatients; various observations may be made about the four manuscript readings of the first word of this line. First, both lympharum and nimborum are, in different ways, not difficult corruptions of nympharum, which suggests that nympharum lies at the root of both readings. For similar confusion between nympha and lymphe, see vv. 298 and 347: lympharum may therefore be ruled out in this line. For a similar use in Ovid of utor with an ablative and an adverb, see Tr. II.117 quo uidear quemuis nimium iuuenaliter usus.

It is natural, therefore, that Clytie should leave the woods, her usual haunts, and pine away in the bare, open countryside. The idea is found in various forms in the earlier books of the Metamorphoses, which is the part of the poem to which are mostly confined the amours of the gods and nymphs: I.479 inpatients expersue uiri nemora sua laustrat, I.700-701 restabat uerba referre et precibus spretus fugisse per sua nympham, II.437-438 superum petit aethere uictor lupiter, huic odio nemus est et conscia silua. There is an intended and logical progression in vv. 260-261 from siluarum inpatients to humo nuda: nudus is used to describe the exposed openness of the waste-land to which Clytie goes to pine away.

For a similar confusion of the words silua and nympha in Ovid MSS., see Fest. I.512.

261 nudis ... cepillis: the phrase is found again, with the same
repetition of nudus for pathetic effect, at VII.183: nudae pedem, nudos umbris infuse capillos.

265 The omission of this verse in the text of the manuscript K was probably due to a parableptic error by which spectabat (v.264) and flectebat (v.265) were confused because of their similar endings (see the Introduction, Part II.i).  

266 pertemque coloris is contrasted with est in parte rubor (v.268); a part of Clytie loses its colour and becomes as bloodless grass (v.267), while the other part, the flower, retains the rubor of her face.  

267 exanguis ... herbes: see χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας ἐγγύν (Sappho Od. 2, 14-15).  

271 factum mirabile: this phrase is used elsewhere in the poem at IV.747, V.258, VIII.611 and IX.394.  

272 pars and pars in this line refer each to only one sister, Arisippe and Alcithoe respectively. For similar examples of this unusual use of pars, see Met.VII.582-583 quid mihi tunc animi fuit? an quod debuit esse ut uitem odissem et cuperem pars esse meorum?, Met.IX.20 sed populeris ero et rerum pars una tuaem, and Juvenal I.26 pars Niliaeae plebis.  

273 I have accepted Slater's emendation Iacchon for Bacchus of the manuscripts. The same mistake is found again in a Wolfenbüttel manuscript (no.105) at v.15 (bacchus instead of iacchus). In both cases the more unusual form was glossed Bacchus, and subsequently the gloss was incorporated by a scribe into the text.  

Heinssius demonstrates by many examples (among them Met.XV.74, Fast.IV.307, Ep.Pont. I.8.48, and Aen.VI.86, VII.736, X.343 and 584) the specific meaning of the words sed non et ..., which pick up an earlier idea and yet, in spite of that idea's expected universality, show an exception to it. est, found in this line (in some manuscripts) for et, may be rejected as an unnecessary rationalisation, but a rationalisation which developed because of the difficulty of Bacchus in the nominative, isolated grammatically from deos in the accusative earlier in the line. Slater's Iacchon is an acutely perceptive solution to the difficulty of the line.  

274 Alcithoe: for a discussion on Alcathoe (Bentley's emendation)
Stories avoided by Ovid. Ovid mentions briefly in these lines five stories which he does not treat in detail, those of (1) Daphnis, (2) Sithon, (3) Celmis, (4) The Curetes, and (5) Crocos and Smilax. Quite apart from whatever special meaning the word nouitata (v. 284) may have in relation to the Salmacis and Hermaphroditus legend (see the note on vv. 285-288), it also suggests that Ovid avoided these five stories because they were already well-known in versions by earlier authors. Much of Ovid's source-material is likely to have been lost; but references to the myths are found in, among others, the following authors: Daphnis, Diodorus Siculus (IV. 84), Melesag (Anth. Pal. Graec. VII. 555), Theocritus (I. 66 and the scholia thereon), Parthenius (Ner. Am. XXIX), and Vergil (Serv. V. 20, with Servius's note); and Parthenius informs us besides (loc. cit.) that Timaeus had dealt with the subject in his poem Σικελικόν: Sithon; all trace of the myth is now lost (see the note on v. 280); Celmis, Strabo (X. 3. 22), and Sophocles (Trag. Fragm. 365, Pearson); The Curetes, Strabo (X. 3), Diodorus Siculus (III. 6). 2), Diomedes (Art. Gramm. III. p. 480, Keil), Lucretius (II. 633-643), and Vergil (Georg. IV. 150-152); Crocos and Smilax, Pliny (N. H. XVI. 35, 63); Ovid himself passed over this myth elsewhere (Fast. V. 227).

277 (tantus dolor urit amantis): Ovid particularly liked this kind of parenthesis. For a similar example, see Met. III. 447, and the discussion by E. J. Kenney (In Parenthesis, CR n. s. 20. 3, 1970, 291).

280 Micyllus, who accepted from one or more MSS. the reading Scython, wrote the following note to the word: 'in aliis editionibus Sithon, absque c scriptum, legitur, utrum rectius, affirmare non possim; quando ipse fabula elisas, quod sciam, nusquam extat' (see Burman's 1727 edition, vol. II, 263). The position is still the same now. However, it is possible to make various comments on the different manuscript readings. Phiton, from G and Z, is a re-spelling of fiton, in its turn mis-spelt from sit(h)on. The common confusion between 's' and 'c' accounts for the variants sithon and sython; and it seems likely, as scython has been found only in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscripts, that it represents an attempt to combine these two apparently contradictory spellings. There are two further reasons why Scython should be rejected: the 's' of feminia would properly be lengthened before 'c', which perhaps tells against this particular form, especially if it is late; and, secondly, the various Greek words for Scythia and its inhabitants have a short first syllable; Scython would seem by nature to be an iambic word. The important alternatives, therefore, are sithon and sython. Bentley favoured Sython, although one may suspect that, like Scython, it would have been scanned as an iambus. I have printed Sithon for two reasons: first, the presence of an 'i' in three different
strands of the transmission (sithon, cithon, phiton) must be considered to give Sithon the stronger manuscript authority; and secondly, the name Sithon, although of a different person, is recorded elsewhere (see Parthenius Narr.Amat.VI).

281 I have written adamans, not adamas, in this line, Athamans, not Athemans, at vv.489, and Atlans, not Atlas, at vv.632, 646 and 657. See Neue-Wagener Formenlehre der Lateinische Spreche, I.234.

282 largo ... ab imbr; see also Met.XI.516 ecce cadunt largi resolutis nubibus imbres.

283 The miscopying of the name Smilax as Milax is found often in Greek authors (see T.G.L.VII.491); if the mistake in this line is not the result of an unconscious reminiscence on the part of a scribe of this common Greek fault, then it seems likely that the manuscript Z provides the reason for it: if Smilace was miscopied as Similace (the reading of Z) in some MSS., the word was restored to metrical length by the omission either of the first syllable (= milace, the reading of most MSS.) or of the second syllable (= silace, whence comes cillace, the reading of G).

284 duplicique, the reading of a fourteenth-century manuscript at Paris, is, in the context of the Hermaphroditus story, a variant of more than passing interest. For a similar confusion between the two words, see Verg.Aen.II.138.

285-388 Hermaphroditus and Salmacis. The origin of the Hermaphroditus and Salmacis myth is twofold. On the one hand Hermaphroditus existed in his own right as a bi-sexual person: he inherited his nature from those of his two parents combined, as his twin name testifies. As his physical characteristics were inborn in him, there was no logical need for Salmacis to be part of the myth as an explanation of how he came to be what he was. Many classical authors, both before Ovid's time and afterwards, wrote of Hermaphroditus in terms which, showing the origin of his nature, had nothing to do with Salmacis:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ιστάτατο} & \quad \text{Ερμαφρόδιτος} \quad \text{Ερμαφρόδιτος} \quad \text{οὐθέ} \quad \\text{οἷς} \quad \text{ἀνήρ} \\
\text{οὐδὲ} & \quad \text{γυνὴ} \quad \text{μικτὸν} \quad \text{γαρ} \quad \text{ἐν} \quad \text{βρέτας} \quad \text{ἡ} \\
\text{κύπριος} & \quad \text{αὐκόλπιο} \quad \text{καὶ} \quad \text{Ερμαφρόδιτος} \quad \text{εὐφρείς} \\
\text{ματος} & \quad \text{κεφαλῆς} \quad \text{νοσημνη} \quad \text{οἰκεί} \quad \text{κεκυκτη} \\
\text{εύρηκα} & \quad \text{δὲ} \quad \text{παθι} \quad \text{φαίνει} \quad \text{μετατηρεῖον} \quad \text{ἀρσενος} \quad \text{αἰδέως} \\
\text{κυνής} & \quad \text{ἀγαλῆς} \quad \text{κεκεφαλητρία} \quad \text{προχρήσεως} \quad \text{οἰκεί} \\
\text{Ἀντ.Παλ.Γραικ.} & \quad \text{II.102-107}
\end{align*}
\]

ανδράκων Ἑρμης ἐμφατος εἰς ὑμαλεῖς δὲ κύριος δεινομος
ἀμφωτερός δὲ φερώ συμβολα μοι τοκέων
τούνεκαν, οὐκ ἀλόγως μὲτ τὸν Ἑρμαφρόδιτον ἐθέντο
ἀνδρογυνοῦς λούτροιν
Ἀντ.Παλ.Γραικ. IX.783

παραπλησίας δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ τινὸς μυθολογοῦσι
γεγενήθαι τὸν ἔννομομον Ἑρμαφρόδιτον, ὦν

285-388 Hermaphroditus and Salmacis. The origin of the Hermaphroditus and Salmacis myth is twofold. On the one hand Hermaphroditus existed in his own right as a bi-sexual person: he inherited his nature from those of his two parents combined, as his twin name testifies. As his physical characteristics were inborn in him, there was no logical need for Salmacis to be part of the myth as an explanation of how he came to be what he was. Many classical authors, both before Ovid's time and afterwards, wrote of Hermaphroditus in terms which, showing the origin of his nature, had nothing to do with Salmacis:
Diodorus Siculus IV.6.5-7

...utriusque sexus quos hermaphroditos vocamus, olim androgynos vocatos ...

Plin. N.H. VII.33.34

... et utrique, abut in probris maxime in promptu est si quid tale dicat potest: uos enim iuuenes animum peritis muliebrem, illa uirgo uirum; et si quid eiusmodi: 'Salmacida spolia sine sudore et sanguine'.

Austen, Epigr. 102

Similarly, the legend of the pool of Salmacis, whose waters had strange powers, existed quite independently of the myth of Hermaphroditus:

... itaque in probris maxime in promptu est si quid tale dicat potest: 'uos enim iuuenes animum peritis muliebrem, illa uirgo uirum'; et si quid eiusmodi: 'Salmacida spolia sine sudore et sanguine'.


... et Salmacis cognita, Salmacis, cujus culpa deus infamasti eque rum sollicitare iuvat: procul hinc et fonte doloso Salmacis ...

Stat. Silv. I.5.19-21

Salmacis nomine nymphæ, Caeli et Terræ filia, fertur causa fontis Halicarnasii aquæ appellandæ fuisset Salmacidis; quem qui bibisset utio inuditias mollesceret, ob eam rem quæ idem editus, augustatus parentibus, occisionem largitur iuvantium petulantibus antecedentium puerorum puellarumque uiolendarum quæ non poterit effugium.

Festus de Verb. Sign. 484, Lindsey
Ovid himself, despite his mixed account of the two myths, retains in places clear evidence of their original separateness (see Met.IV.285-287, 288-291, 383-384, and Met.XV.319); and Vitruvius, writing about the area of Halicarnassus, gives a convincing account of the legend associated with the pool of Salmacis: Hermaphroditus is not involved at all (see Vitruv.II.8.50). There is no literary evidence before Ovid that the two myths were ever connected, and we may perhaps assume that it was Ovid himself who had the idea of linking them for dramatic effect. This may be the purpose behind Alcithoe's remark to her sisters dulciique animos nouitate tenebo (v.284); Ovid is perhaps subtly claiming the story that follows as his own idea.

286 Although emollia
t. the reading of the Vienna manuscript, is apt in sense, remollia may be preferred for two reasons, besides its stronger manuscript attestation: first, it is the rarer word, and may thus be accepted on the basis of difficilior lectio potior; and secondly, all else being equal, the elision and spondee que emollia is better avoided in favour of an unelided dactyl.

288 Mercurio is to be taken as a dative ('a son born to Mercury from the goddess Venus'): the correction of the Vatican manuscript, and the et of the Cracow manuscript, were the result of a misreading of Mercurio as ablative. For a similar phrase, see Tac. Ann.XV.23.1 metam sibi ex Poppaeas filiam Nero ultra mortale gaudium acceptit.


297 The testimony of four manuscripts dating from the late-twelfth to the fourteenth century is but slight justification, of itself, for preferring Karas to Garas. However, the form Karas survives on ninth-century manuscript authority in the geographer Vibius Sequester (Gentes 336, ed. R.Gelsomino), and in view of the overall weakness of the manuscript tradition of the Metamorphoses, and the survival of forms such as Kalendas in the Fasti and Karthago in the Aeneid, it is not unreasonable to accept Karas in this line. (For further details, and references, see W.M. Lindsay The Latin Language, 6-7).

299 On the confusion of non and nec, see the note at v.179. For other examples of the type non ... non ... nec (vv.298-299), see VII.558-560 non stratum, non uilla peti ulealma possunt ... nec fit corpus humo gelidum and X.90-92 non Chaonis abfuit arbor, non nemus Heliodum, non frondibus aesculus altis, nec tiliae molles, nec fagus et innuba laurus.
See Callimachus Hymn III.1-3: Άρτεμιν... εἰμινέομεν, τή τούτων λαγόθραμμα τέ μέλονται καὶ χορὸς ἥμφι λαβῆται καὶ ἐν οὐρασίν ἐφάκασθαι.

sole... celeri non nota Dianae: because Salmacis had never been hunting (see vv. 302-303 and 308-309), she had never met Diana. celeri lays emphasis on the same effortful aspect of hunting as contendere (v. 303) and duris (vv. 307 and 309).

Whether perluere or prolueri is here correct is very hard to say with any degree of certainty. The sense of both words is good and the confusion between 'p' (per) and 'q' (pro) a very common one (see the note at v. 151). While I have retained perluere on the inconclusive grounds of wider manuscript attestation, the three manuscripts L, P and S, which have prolueri, are from time to time alone, or in company with very few MSS., in preserving a true reading (see the Introduction, Part I), and prolueri could be correct. The same confusion between perluere and prolueri is found again at Met. III.173, Fast. IV.778, and Fast. V.435: the fact that the majority of the important MSS. give, as at IV.310, per- rather than pro- in each of these three places is perhaps a pointer towards prolueri in v. 310. See also Petr. Sat. 120.97, nec mee Tisiphone sitientes perluere artus, where the manuscript reading is prolueri, for which Colladonius conjectured prolueri.

Cytoriaeco: the very real weakness of the manuscript transmission of the Metamorphoses is shown well by the fate of Cytoriaeco in this line. The correct reading survives in very few manuscripts, and Raphael Regius was the first to restore Cytoriaeco into the text. Instead the MSS. give a variety of readings, of which citheriaco and citheriaco are typical examples; the same fault is discernible elsewhere where the true reading also survives. Thus at Met. VI.132 M's cytoriaco has been altered by a corrector to citheriaco; and other MSS. have citheriaco or citheriaco. At Catullus IV.11 η's cytorio becomes citorio in V and citherio in 7; and two lines later, at IV.13, η's cytore is found as citheri in V.

deducit pectine crinum; see also Met. XV.656 caesarium longae dextra deductere barbse, Mart. Cap. IV.328 crines... deducti per quosdam consequentes gradus... formam totius capitis circubabant, and Stat. Silv. I.2.111 pingui crinem deductum amomo.

The scribe of N seems to have been prone to interlinear para­blepsy: his mistaken optabat (for optauit) crept in because of propersbat in the next line. See also the note at v. 265.

The first word of this line illustrates well the madness in method inherent in reliance on a codex optimus, as propounded and followed by many nineteenth-century editors and their suc­cessors. Ovid uses the phrase tum/tunc sic orsa loqui on two occasions in the poem, here and at VI.28; and it is almost
inconceivable that he should have used *tunc* on one occasion and *tum* on the other; but this is what is preserved by M (tune IV. 320, tum VI.28), and therefore what Magnus (1914) and, more recently, von Albrecht (1966) ask us to believe that Ovid wrote. *Tum* was very often miscopied as *tunc*; apart from its appearance in this line, *tum* is found on eight occasions elsewhere in Book IV (vv.83, 339, 346, 416, 508, 519, 572 and 660), and on no less than six of them (vv.83, 339, 416, 508, 519 and 572) *tunc* has been substituted for it in one or more of the primary MSS. M, though a very good and important manuscript, is not infallible; and it, together with other MSS., has replaced *tum* with *tunc* in v.320. Bothe and Ehwald deserve credit for accepting *tum* both at IV.320 and VI.28.

323 To account for the presence of *mater* in the first hand of nearly all MSS. is difficult, unless the confusion between it and *frater* be a purely visual one. Certainly *mater* is impossible in sense after *qui te genuere beeti* of the previous line, and Heinsius very rightly brought back *frater* into the text. A similar corruption is found again in some MSS. later in the poem, at XI.542, *mater parensque* for *frater parensque*.

325 The choice between *beatior* and *potentior* is a difficult one, and it may be that Heinsius was correct to prefer *potentior* on the grounds of *difficillior lectio potentior*; there is no ready explanation of how *potentior* may have developed, unless it is an optical fault derived from *postes* in v.321 and the termination of *beatior, beati* (v.322), *felix* (v.323), and *fortunata* (v.323) all point towards *beatior* in v.325 rather than to *potentior*, and it is possible that the author of the *Ciris* was influenced by this passage (with *beatior*) at v.445 of that poem, *coniugis atque tuse, quaecumque erit illa, beatae*.

328 *seu nulla*: the progression of the corruption of this phrase was as follows; *seu nulla* was glossed *siue*, and the gloss subsequently, in some MSS., incorporated into the text (= the reading of Y). As *siue nulla* would not scan, some Lactantian MSS. abbreviated *siue* to *si* (NSU); others replaced it with *sed* (BM).

330 Editors for too long have accepted the reading of the three Lactantian manuscripts B M and N (*nescit enim quid amor*), with its difficult and un-Ovidian ellipse of *sit*; but the congruence of S, a very important Lactantian, and nearly all other MSS. in favour of *nescit quid sit amor* gives that reading the greater authority. Although the reading *nescit amor quid sit* of a Burney manuscript (no.160) is in some ways attractive, as preserving a dactyl at the beginning of the line, there is insufficient reason for trusting one single thirteenth-century manuscript against the body of other manuscript evidence. Besides, it is arguable that a dactyl in the second foot of this parenthesis is even more important than one in the first, so as to prevent the jerky, 'end-stopped' feeling within the parenthesis which results from
the word-order of the Burney manuscript.

331 pomis/malis: for the same kind of mistake (i.e. replacement of the general, by the specific, term), see the note at v.127 on pomis and malis.

332-333 Ovid's description in these lines may have grown out of Callimachus' simpler idea at Hymn V.27-28 ... τὸ Σ' ἐν θόρος ἀνέθρατε, πρώτον οὐκ ἦ δόλον ἦ σίθις κόκκος ἐκτὸ χρόων.

rubenti: 'von dem dunkelen Erglühlen des Mondes bei der Verfinsterung' (Haupt). At an eclipse, the moon is tinged with red below its white surface (sub candore): the antithesis of candor and redness is common elsewhere in Ovid; for a particularly striking example, see Am. III.3-5 candida candorem roseo suffusa rubore ante fuit; niveo lucet in ore rubor.

334-335 sororia seltem oscula: Ovid defines, with the precision of an expert, exact grades of oscula. See also IV.222 ergo ubi ceu mater cerca dedit oscula natee, IX.456 non soror ut fratrem, nec qua debebat, amebat, and IX.498-499 et crebri amplexus, et que, si forte notasti, oscula sentiri non esse sororia possent.

336 The choice between an and aut is a difficult one, and either might be correct. I have, for three reasons, accepted an with Heinzius (see the parallels which he gives, reported in Burman's edition, vol.II, 270). First, au fungo, the reading of N and U, was a more natural miscopying of an fungo than of aut fungo, and yet at the same time points to how aut might have developed. Secondly, if an were attested only by Lactantian MSS., one might legitimately be suspicious of it; the fact that it occurs also in other manuscripts tells in its favour. Thirdly, in more general terms, aut is the more obvious word for the context, and it was thus perhaps more likely to replace an than vice versa (for similar examples of an becoming aut, see G at v.47 and A at v.51).

337 The strange isolation of que by itself outside reported speech is a trick of which Ovid is especially fond in the poem. Other examples are found at I.456, II.642, III.644, V.195, VIII.203, IX.109, XI.323 and XIV.657 (see Housman CR 11, 1897, 426 = Classical Papers I.443).

340 flexumque genu: this phrase serves as a good indication of the constricting effect which increasing reliance on the Lactantian MSS. had on nineteenth-century editors. The Lactantians, with many other MSS., are conspicuously at fault in their reading flexoque (or flexaque, BK): for then submisit has no object. Heinzius and Burman appreciated the difficulty and printed the alternative manuscript reading flexumque, whose sense is impeccable. For nineteenth-century editors, non-Lactantian readings of this kind tended to become classified under some such vague
siglum as ζ or vulg. (see the Introduction, Part I), and were then assumed to be of dubious authority, and so were removed from the text. Editors returned to the Lactantians, and where, as here, these were indubitably mistaken, emendation, rather than reference to ζ or vulg. readings, became the only way of restoring sense: thus Lachmann's flexu is what will be found now in most editions. But when flexum gives perfect sense, flexu is gratuitous.

See also Fast.IV.317 submisso ... genu and Tr.IV.2.2 victa potest flexo subcubuisse genu.

341 uecuis/uecus: a good example of assimilation (see the Introduction, Part II.ii). uecuis became uecus because of the influence of inobseruatus almost immediately following.

346 obstiuit: the vicissitudes of this word show yet again the way in which over-reliance on the Lactantian MSS. was detrimental to the editors of the nineteenth century, and to their successors. placuit, appearing in two Lactantian MSS. in the first hand and in another as a correction, was considered a reading of importance, certainly as important as stupuit, for which, by self-inflicted limitation, editors showed no wider manuscript attestation than for placuit. But the very wide support now shown for stupuit in the generality of MSS. indicates that it is placuit which is the upstart reading: it is confined entirely to Lactantian MSS., and thus its range, rather than being wide, as nineteenth-century editors supposed, is limited. How it developed is difficult to judge, but that is another matter. However, the development from obstiuit of stupuit is straightforward, and Heinsius's judgment in accepting obstiuit absolutely sound: obstiuit became ostiuit, found in some MSS., which coming after uero, lost its initial 'o'. I have preferred the form obstiuit, found in Oxford and Siena MSS., to obstiuit; see, for example, I.384, where the 'i' form of the word is preserved in M and in the important Harley fragment; and obstiuit is corroborated by the survival, in MSS. from Heidelberg and Florence, of the strange form stipuit.

uisaeque, found for nudaeque in a few MSS., appears to be a reminiscence of the phrase at III.416 (found also later at IV. 676).

347 If the only variants for the last word of this line were nymphes and nymphae, the choice would be difficult, although nymphes would probably have to be chosen on the basis of difficilior lectio potior. The presence in B and M of nymphes, a mis-copying of the Greek form by someone who, not understanding it, tried to latinize it, makes nymphes certain beyond peradventure.

348-349 See Callimachus Hecale frag.238(Pfeiffer), 15-18:
Ophiom μὲν οὖν ἐνδόις ἐρν ἐπὶ, ἔφεζεν ἔ τε ἡθῶν,
τέφερα δὲ εἷς σάλοιο φαντατεος ὑμαντις ἧνος
οὔσα τοῦτο κυκλίς ὑπεφαίνετο, πέντατος δ᾽ ἄθιρρο
ἀνάφεσα...

353  iste ne at the end of this line may possibly be correct (see
Met.V.596, end Her.XIV.69 and XVII.56). I have preferred ducens
because it seems, if only marginally, the lectio difficilior.
See also Gv.Am.II.4.29 ille placet gestu numeroseque brachia
ducit.

355  puro, found in some MSS. in this line, appears to be a remini-
scence from v.348.

356  uincimus of the Berlin manuscript Β would not be im-
possible here: see the note at v.214. But the perfect tense seems on the whole
express better the finality of the achievement which Salmacis
claims for herself. See also Met.VI.513 'uicimus' exclaimet.

With Heinsius I have accepted en as the second word of the
line from the Leiden manuscript O (codex Arondelianus): granted
the variants en and et, the former was more likely to become the
latter than vice versa (see Met.XIII.756 and XV.677, and, ed.
Ribbeck, Culex 220 and Verg.Eol.IX.42, for the same fault). en
has gradually disappeared from recent editions because, like
flexumque (v.340), non-Lactantian readings of this kind became
classified under vagus sigla such as γ, and were subsequently
ignored as unimportant.

358 The difference between pugnantem and pugnacem is minimal
(pugnatem, pugnacem), amounting to no more than the addition or
omission of a bar, and to the common confusion of 't' and 'c':
Heinsius may possibly have been correct in his preference for
pugnacem. I have preferred pugnantem for three reasons: first,
for what it is worth, the weight of manuscript authority lies
with pugnantem; secondly, the bar was more likely to be omitted
from pugnatem than added to pugnacem (see the note at v.104 on
relinquit and reliquit; and, thirdly, a similar phrase is found
at Fast.III.307-308: somnus ut abscessit, pugnando uincula
temptent rumpere; pugnantes fortius ille tenet.

For the interlineal parablepsy of the Lactantian manuscripts
BMNS in this line, see the Introduction, Part II.ii.

360 There is no very obvious explanation for the variant circum-
fectitur of the Paris manuscript P, unless it comes into the
category of word-confusions arising from overall similar appear-
ance (see Willis Latin Textual Criticism, 74-77). circumfunditur
is particularly apt of Salmacis at this point because, as a
water-nymph, she is here thought of as consisting of actual
water, which hugs the contours of Hermaphroditus's body in the
pool. See also Met. XIV.353-354 ne posset adire cursus equi fecit circumfususque satelles.

363-365 See also Verg. Aen. XI. 751-756:
   utque uolens alte repturn cum fulua draconem
efort aquila implicitique pedes atque ungubus haesit,
   saucius at serpens sinuosa volumina uerset
   arrectisque horret squamis et sibila ore
   arduus insurgens, ills haud minus urget obunco
   luctantem rostro, simul aethera uerberat alis.

363 For uses of the adverbial sublimen in Plautus (Men. 995 and Asin. 868) see F. Ritschl Opusc. II. 462 sq.; and for the same usage in Vergil (Aen. I. 259, X. 144 and XI. 67) see O. Ribbeck, Prolegomena to Vergil, 1866, 446. The manuscripts M and W have sublimenque here at v. 363, and it is not utterly impossible as a reading although, if correct, it is a striking archaism on Ovid's part. I have printed sublimemque for three reasons. First, the abbreviation of sublimem, sublimē, is the same as that for sublimen; secondly, as sub and limen are themselves two Latin words, an ignorant scribe could have copied sublimen without being aware that anything was amiss, or of the resulting archaism; and, thirdly, the adjectival sublimem seems corroborated by phrases such as precipitem, famuli, rapite hunc (Met. III. 694) and sub-
   limis rapitur (Met. VII. 222).

364 While there are no adequate grounds for going so far as to print Heinsius's impedit, it is nonetheless a conjecture of acute per­ception: implicat of this line might easily owe its origin to a reminiscence of v. 362. The nearness of impedit to the train of thought in this passage is shown by a comparison of v. 365 and Met. III. 664-665, impediunt hederae remos nexuque recuro serpunt
   et greuidis distinguunt uels corymbis.

365 remos of some MSS. is perhaps derived from the similar phrases at II. 352, VIII. 760 and XIV. 392; but for a parallel to longos ... truncos, see X. 491 redix, longi firmamina trunci.

365-366 utue ... utque: the supposition that Ovid wrote these lines at considerable speed may account for the slightly strange phrase­ology of ut serpens (v. 362) followed by utue and then utque; or it is possible that utue (v. 365) suggests a first alternative to the egle-snake simile which would be too inconclusive an ending to the sentence; and that a greater finality is gained by the use of utue for the last of the triplet clauses. For an exactly similar grouping, see Met. IX. 659-662 (where some MSS., in error, have replaced utque of v. 661 with the simpler utue):
   ... ut secto piceae de cortice guttee
   utue tenex greuidis manet tellure bitumen,
   utque sub aedentu spirantis lene faunoi
   sole remollescit, quae frigore constitit, unda.
366 sub sequoribus; see Plin. N.H. IX. 29. 46 usque (polypi) non adprehendunt.

366-367 For a description of some of the characteristics and habits of octopodes, see Pliny N.H. IX. 29. 46: omnibus bracchiis ut pedibus ac manibus utuntur ... et polypis fistula in dorso, quae transmittunt mare, craqe modo in dexteram partem, modo in sinistram transferunt. natunt obliqui in caput ...; cetero per brachia velut acetabulis dispersis haustu quodam adhaerescunt; tenet supini, ut suelli non quest.

I have preferred dimissis to demissis in v. 367 for three reasons. First, the attached words ex omni ... parte suggest strangulation from pressure applied horizontally rather than from above (see on demissis below), and therefore blend better with dimissis; secondly, demissis may owe its origin, by parableptic miscopying, to the appearance, immediately above it in the preceding line, of deprensum (demissis, however, is not completely without merit in relation to the octopus itself: as Pliny's tenent supini suggests, it is possible that demissis describes the octopus seizing its prey from above and from behind - i.e. in a vertical relationship - , rather than with the horizontal pressure from all sides, ex omni ... parte, implied by dimissis). A third reason in favour of dimissis is that, however apt demissis may be in relation to the octopus, dimissis offers a better parallel for the way in which, as water (see note on v. 360), Salmacis engirdles Hermaphroditus on all sides, not just from above (nunc hac ... nunc circumfunditur illos, v. 360).

369 Heinsius properly restored commissaque to the text in this line. dimissaque and demissaque, the readings of most MSS., developed through parableptic confusion with dimissis/demissis two lines above, in v. 367.

371 ut, rather than et, is very necessary in this line: without ut, one has to take ita as being retrospective, and to imagine from non tenem effugies some such wish as ne effugiat; such a formula is unnatural when the simple basis of Salmacis' wish, that she and Hermaphroditus should be for ever indivisible, follows in the next line. et owes its popularity to no logical reason other than its being the Lactantian reading.

372 I have, with Jahn, accepted diducat in this line, because that seems the variant which best explains both deducet and seducat. The reasons which led Riese, in 1889, to restore deducet to the text remain uncertain (other than that it is the Lactantian reading). Ciofanus cited two examples in support of deducat in this line (see Burman's 1727 edition, vol. II, 273): Prop. II. 25. 9-10 et me ab amore tuo deducet nullo senectus, siue ego Tithonus, siue ego Nestor ergo, and Cic. de inv. I. 55. 109 cum deducaris ab eo, quocum libenteriam uixeris. W.A. Camps, in his
1967 commentary on the passage of Propertius, gave the following useful definition of _deducet; 'said regularly of inducing someone to depart from an allegiance, conviction, duty, etc.' What is important is that _deducere_ in this sense is a philosophical word, used of abstract emotions or ideals (see T.L.L.V.1.276-277). The passages of Cicero and Ovid, where _deducere_ would be used of separation from people, not ideals, would be unique examples of such a use of the word. And since the time of Cicero, _diducaris_ has been accepted, in all modern editions, as the correct word for the context in the passage of Cicero.

When the confusion between _di- _and _de_- was so common among scribes (see vv.367 and 369), then we may ignore _deducat_; sense demands either _diducat_ (Jahn) or _seducat_ (Heinsius). While either may be correct, I have printed _diducat_ in the text on the supposition that, if Ovid had written _seducat_, _deducat_ (a misspelling of _diducat_) would not be found, as it is, in the vast majority of MSS.; and _seducat_ is to be explained as a gloss for _diducat._

373 _uota suos habuere deos_; for a further use of this phrase, see the story of Kyrrha, at X.489. _tetigere_ of some MSS. appears to be a reminiscence from IV.164. In both these passages (IV.165 and X.489) the answering of the _uota_ is explained by a following _nem- _clause, as also here in v.373 in the MSS.: Heinsius's _iam_ is therefore unnecessary.

375 _conducet corrice ramos_ refers to the grafting of branches by the bark: as the sap flows between the bark and the wood within, an incision is made downwards into the bark, which is then bound back over the shoot which has been inserted there.

378 _et forma duplex_; _et_, found in _B_ and _P_ and a Leipzig manuscript, was rightly brought back from obscurity into the text by Edwards in 1894; Heinsius had accepted it. For similar examples, see II.42-43 'nec tu meus esse negari dignus es, et Clymene ueros' _ait 'edidit ortus_, II.811 _quae neque dant flammas lenique tepore crementur_, and IV.602-603 _nec fugiunt hominem nec uulnere laedunt, quidque prius fuerint, placidi meminere dracones_. The correctness of _et_ in this line may account for the appearance in _N_ of _set_, a compromise between _et _and _sed._

379 Heinsius (ed.1659) printed in this line both _possint _and _uidentur_; Magnus (ed.min.,1908) had _possit _and _uidentur_, but returned to _possit_ and _uidentur_ of most editors in his _editio maior_ of 1914. The difficulty of vv.378-379 lies in whether the words _nec femina dici nec puer ut possit _are to be taken with what precedes or with what follows. Heinsius, Magnus (1908) and also Lefaye (1928) took them with the earlier part of v.378, and I have followed them, as the subjunctive _possit_ then has more purpose. While I have accepted _uidentur _from _M_, I have retained
possit of the manuscripts, rather than Heinsius's possint, as referring to *forme* rather than to *duo*.

I have printed *nec utrumque* in the text, as that was more likely to become *neutrumque* than the reverse to happen.

381 *undis*, found in some MSS., is a paraleptic fault which owes its origin to the last word of v.380 (see the Introduction, Part II. ii).

382 I have preferred *iam non* of nearly all MSS. to *non iam* of B M and X; for a parallel, see III.677-678 (*Libye*) ... *uidit et illas iam non esse manus, iam pinnas posse uoceri*.

385-386 The transposition of these lines in Lactantian MSS. has perhaps arisen as a result of the similarity of their last words, *inde* and *undis*.

386 *ut* owes its presence, in the editions of the nineteenth-century German tradition, to its appearance in the text of the Lactantian manuscripts B and M; Heinsius (1659) rightly preferred *et*, as did also Edwards (1894) and Slater (1927).

387 *uota*, the reading of a few manuscripts, perhaps springs from recollection of *rata uota* at Am.III.2.80 or *Ibis* 97; but *rata uerba* has good parallels in *rata dicta* (*Fast.II.488*) and *uox rata* (*Fast.III.77*).

388 *incedo* ... *medicamine*: see also *Met.XV.319 cui non audita est obscene Selmacis undae?*, Liv.XXVII.37.5-6 *incertus, mas in femina esset, natus* ...; *id uero haruspices ex Etruria saciti foedum sterpe prodigium dicer*; *extorrem ego Romano, procul terre con-tactu, alto mercurium, uium in arcem condidero, proiectumque in mare p roiecerunt.* and Liv.XXXI.12.6,8 *iam animalium obsceni fetus pluribus locis nuntiabantur* ...; *in Sabiniis incertus infans natus, masculus an femina esset ...; foeda omnis et deformia ... uies, ante omnia abominati seminates insiique in mare extemplo deporterint.*

389 The development of the corruption in this line may be traced through the stages *dictis et* : *dicti set* ; *dicti sed* ; *dictis sed*.

390 Merkel's and, more recently, von Albrecht's, acceptance of *sed* in this line springs from a readiness to believe whatever *M* may tell us, however illogical that may be.

391 The threefold pattern of this line is a special characteristic of Ovid; see also v.494: *sibilla dant seniemque uomunt linguasse coruscant*.

393 The readings *et dolent* and *redolentque* of the Berlin and Leipzig manuscripts show in different ways how the *et olent* of the majority of MSS. came into being. The asyndetic bluntness of
redolent after sonant was modified by the addition of et (see redolentia/radiatque, v.193), so that the middle words of the line now read sonant et redolent; but that would not scan; one scribe restored metre with et dolent, two others have left us proof that et dolent is wrong by their unmetrical corrections et dolent and redolentque. (It is also possible that redolentque, rather than being an attempted correction of et redolent, itself developed independently; but even so it illustrates the tendency among scribes towards eliminating asyndeton.) See also Met.VIII. 674-676 hic nux, hic mixta est rugosis caris palmis prunaeque et in patulis redolentias male senetiae et de purpureis confluenta ultibus usque et XV.79-80 nec uobis lacteus humor eripitur nec mella thymi redolentis flora.

396 frondes of some MSS. is a reminiscence of the fifth word of the previous line.

400 See also Met.XI.570-572 Lucifer obscurus nec quem cognoscere posses illis luce fuit, quoniamque excedere caelo non licuit, densis exit sue nubibus ore.

402-403 pingues ... ardere uidentur lampades: a sign of approaching stormy weather. See Callimachus Hecale frag.269(Pfeiffer):

The difference between collucē (= collucere) and collucēt (= collucent) is so small that confusion was easy (see Willis Latin Textual Criticism, 68 sq.). For other instances of the rather rare elision between the fourth and fifth feet (collucere ignibus; apart from in this line, there are but 22 other examples of it in Books I-V), see V.150 coniurata undique and V.166 et rue re ard et.

407 Heinsius rightly accepted latebras in this line. For other uses of petere latebras in Ovid, see Met.V.460 fugit anum latebrasque petit and Fast.V.177 dumque petit latebras fata catulosque leasene, tenebras of most MSS. is probably either a reminiscence of v.400, or a parableptic error from v.410; but in any case the confusion between the two words is not uncommon: see tenebrosa/latebrosa at Her. IV. 103.

408 Merkel was correct to accept includit, from the Paris and Lausanne manuscripts, in this line. Ovid uses the same phrase again at Met.XV.475: nec ... cervos includite pinnis. The corruption of the line was as follows: a scribe, not realising that membrana was the subject of includit, and not knowing what the subject might be, assumed that it must be bracchia, just nearby; and on that account changed includit to includunt (and perhaps tenuique ... pinne to tenuis(que) ... pinnes; see the reading of the Arras manuscript, no.24). Then someone else, at pains to explain includunt, and with wits enough to realise that bracchia
was its object, not its subject, substituted *tenuesque* ... *pinnae* for *tenui(s)que* ... *pinna(s)*.

410 *penna* (for *pluma*) of G is a reminiscence of the last word of v.408.

412 Between *minimam pro corpore* and *minimam et pro corpore* choice is extremely hard, and certainty not possible. Heinsius printed the former, while the editors of the late-nineteenth century German school preferred the inclusion of *et* (partly no doubt because they found it in B and M). *minimam et pro corpore* has in its favour that the elision *minimam et* was perhaps more likely to be suppressed by the removal of *et* than voluntarily imported; while *minimam pro corpore*, as the blunter phrase, was likely to be softened by the addition of *et* before *pro corpore*, which is in effect a second adjective. For *minimamque* of one of the Leipzig manuscripts, see the notes at vv.193 and 393.

413 For a discussion of the variant readings *leui*, *leuis* and *leues*, see the Introduction, Part II.iv.

414 *tectaque non siluas celebrant*; for the reverse idea, see X.703, *pro thalamis celebrant siluas*.

415 Heinsius accepted *trahunt* (found in the Eton and Montpellier manuscripts) in this line; but *tenere nomen* is an equally valid expression (see *Met.* XIV.626, and *Fast.* II.476, III.402, IV.160 and 872, V.240, and VI.578), and there is no adequate reason for over-riding the superior manuscript authority of *tenent* trahunt is perhaps repeated subconsciously from v.291.

416 With this verse we are back to where Book III ended, before the start of the episode of the Minyeides in v.1 of Book IV.

420 For a fuller treatment of the assimilation of endings in consecutive words (*natis thalamisque, NU*), see the Introduction, Part II.i, at the beginning.

421 I have accepted *alumni* with Jahn rather than *alumno* with Heinsius. The fact that *alumno* is confined to B and M, being found in no other manuscript, suggests that *alumni* has the greater manuscript authority; and *alumno numine*, besides, looks like an example of assimilation of word-endings (see previous note, on v.420, and also at v.783). If the genitive is accepted, there is a chiastic balance between *natis thalamisque Athamantis* (v.420) and *alumni numine*. For other examples of *numen* with a genitive, see I.411-412 *inque breui spatium superorum numine sua missa uiri manibus faciem traxere uirorum* and IV.416-417 *tum uero totis Bacchi memorabile Thebis numen erat*.

421-422 For another occasion which angered Juno similarly, see II.468-469: *et iam puer Arcas (id ipsum indoluit Juno) fuerat de paellice natus*. 
multos flere per annos, the reading of G, serves as a useful indication that the manuscript contains serious errors and interpolations at the same time as its many readings of real merit. It is always important to balance these two considerations against one another.

penthes/penthei/pentheia: the variant manuscript readings may be accounted for as follows: penthes was glossed penthei to show the origin of the adjective; and a subsequent scribe, unable to choose between the two, combined in one word the characteristics of both.

sororibus of some MSS. may be rejected for two reasons: first, it is doubtful whether cognate suis exempla sororibus could in any circumstances be the Latin for cognate exempla suorum sororum exemplis; and, secondly, furoribus is very necessary to the sense of the line, and develops the idea of furor in v.429. The same confusion between the words is found at v.471.

See also Met.I.168-169 est uia sublimis, caelo manifesta sereno: lacte nomen habet, cendore notabilis ipso and VII.410,413 est uis decluia, per quem Titynthius heros ... Cerberon attraxit.

For funestaque of some MSS., see the notes at vv.193 and 393.

Ovid uses the phrase mute silentie again later in the poem at VII.184 and X.53.

umbre ... recentes: see also X.48-49 Eurydiceque vocant; umbras erat illa recentes inter et incessit passu de uulnere tardo.

simulecraque functa sepulcris: sepulchro of the Novara manuscript looks like a Christian gloss, referring not to individual graves but to 'The Grave'. See Fast.II.565 corpora functa sepulcris; and at Met.X.14, where many recent editors print simulecraque functa sepulcro from the Lactantian manuscripts, Heinsius preferred sepulcris which he found in other MSS..

I have accepted tenet into the text because the singular was likely, preceded by the two nouns pallor and hiemps, to become the plural. For other similar passages in this book, see vv.484-485 Luctus comitetur euntem et Pauor et Terror tremidoque Insania uultu and vv.632-633 ultima tellus rege sub hoc et pontus erat. The readings comitantur and erant are found in some MSS. in both places.

que of the Lactantian manuscripts RMNS, which replaces the quod of other MSS., is an inapposite repetition of the first word of the line (an error helped perhaps by the fact that the following word ducet/ducit begins with a 'd'), and should not be confused...
with the *qua* of v.242; *qua* is inappropriate in v.437 because *iter*, on which it would depend, is itself the subject of *ducat*/
*ducit*. Heinsius correctly preferred *quod*.

The choice between *ducat* and *ducit* is considerably more dif­
ficult: *ducit*, which won Heinsius' approval, may well be right, and has strong manuscript authority, S, an important Lectantian,
and A Q and Y, each in different ways distinguished non-
Lectantians. I have preferred *ducat* because of the greater
vagueness implied by the subjunctive. As Ovid explains in v.439
(*mille cepex aditus et apertas undique portas* ...), there was no
single path to the realms of Pluto; and I therefore take v.437
to mean not that the simulacra are unaware of something which
was definite and could be known (i.e. *ducit*), but that the ap­
proaches were deliberately confusing, and not susceptible of
being followed rationally by any of them.

The difficulties of this passage are threefold. First, the
omission, for whatever reason, of v.446 in a great proportion
of extant MSS., and notably in B and M, has made editors sus­
picious of the line. Secondly, that suspicion is augmented by
the appearance, in MSS. which do contain v.446, of superfluities
such as *aliem partem* or *aliquam partem*. And, thirdly, the sense
of the passage as a whole suffers from the imprecision of the
reading generally accepted in v.445, *pars aliquas artes*.

445-446

Heinsius urged the deletion of v.446 (and the majority of
editors since his time have followed his example); and yet the
ideas, if not the transmitted form, of the line are very neces­
sary both to what follows and to what has gone before (as Bentley
realised in suggesting a lacuna, rather than the omission of the
verse). Juno visits that part of the underworld where criminals
are undergoing their various punishments, and as these criminals
fit into none of the three categories of underworld inhabitants
in v.444-445, there is a real need for a mention of them in
some form in v.446. If v.446 is omitted, then *artes* of v.445 is
dependent on *celebrant* (v.444); but while *celebrare forum* or
*celebret res* have many parallels in Latin literature, *cele­
brare artem* is an unusual idea (see T.L.L. III.745-746), not as
natural as *exercere artem* (see Hor. Epist. I.14.44, Ov. Met. II.618
and XV.360, and Stat. Silv. II.2.112); besides, with the verb in
v.444, v.445, if v.446 is omitted, hangs unpleasantly incomplete
and unresolved. For two reasons, therefore, I consider that there
is no case to be made out for the deletion of v.446: first, its
ideas, though not necessarily its expression, are important for
the context; and secondly, its presence in the first hand of the
two manuscripts G and N gives it very high manuscript authority.

The difficulty in v.446 can be isolated to the single word
*aliem*/*aliquam*; the phrase *partem sua poena coercet* is impeccable
in formation and style, and this use of *partem* picking up an
earlier *pars* is found again at Met.XIII.829-830 *pars inde bibena*.
seruatūr, partem liquefacta coagula durant. No word is necessary before partem sua poena coercet in v. 446 as part of that phrase, and therefore it seems likely that aliam/aliquam has been assimilated to partem but hides a word in Ovid's original which belonged to the expression of the previous phrase.

446 The old hand of F, containing vv. 40-260 and 702-803, has exactly 55 lines to every column; when 55 is divided into vv. 261-701, one line is left over, and thus it seems likely that F omitted v. 446.

448 tantum odii iraeque debet: 'tantum obsequatur ira et odio; tantum faciebat propter iram et odia. sic dare famae est aliquid facere propter famam' (Gronovius).

450 ingemuit owes its place in many editions to the fact that it is the Lactantian reading; but intremuit is correct: see Met. IV. 486-487 postes tremuisse feruntur Aeolii and IX. 783 et templi tremuere fores.

451 tris ... semel: see also Ov. Incert. Sed. Vers. bis rapitur uixitque semel.

452 graue et inplacabile numen: a modification of Vergil's phrase magnum et memorabile numen (Aen. IV. 94). Ribbeck wrongly prints magnum et memorabile nomen at Aen. IV. 94, citing Met. X. 608. But Ovid's purpose, both at IV. 452 and X. 608, is to modify Vergil's phrase in subtle, yet different, ways: at IV. 452 he changes the adjectives, at X. 608, an even more subtle change, the noun. The presence of numen at Met. IV. 452 is an indication that Vergil wrote numen at Aen. IV. 94; otherwise there is no basis for the reminiscence.

456 For my reasons for assuming a lacuna in v. 456, see the Introduction, Part II. 11, at the end.

458 If the choice in this verse lay between districtus and distentus alone, then one might, with Heinsius, choose distentus on the grounds that districtus was a gloss derived from Vergilian reminiscence. But I have accepted districtus into the text because it seems to explain better than distentus the other variants distractus and distinctus. distractus of most MSS. looks like a simpler word substituted, by the change of one letter, for the unusual districtus, and distentus, if itself not correct, may be explained as a gloss for districtus, a gloss which retained the same meaning, but replaced the difficult with the easier word.

459-460 On the spellings erboe and urgues, see the Introduction, Part II. vi.

460 The choice between rediturum and ruiturum is exceptionally hard, and I can see no definite explanation of how either was derived from the other: it seems a case of confusion between words simi-
I have preferred ruiturum because rediturum seems rather flat in the context, ruiturum more graphic and more what we should expect of Ovid stylistically. See also Lucretius V.313 nec ruere auolsos silices a montibus altis.

I have retained furores of the majority of MSS. because that seems the more subtle word. For the same confusion between furores and sorores, see v.431; and for a further linking of furo and facinus, see Met.V.13-14 quae te, germane, furentem mens agit in facinus?

I have accepted the rarer fluido for fluido of most MSS. in this line. The scansion fluidus and not fluidus is an uncommon one (see T.L.L.VI.1.952); but another example is found in Lucretius: II.451-452 illa guidem debebat e leibus atque rutundis esse magis, fluuido quae corpore liquide constant. Here too the manuscripts ABFQ have fluido.

I have accepted, with Bentley, the reading est territa of A and P and a few other manuscripts in this line. If exterrita of most MSS. is read, the anticlimax of the simple territus in v.489 is intolerable. The chiastic pattern of est territa ... territus est is preferable, if unremarkable.

For the spelling Athamens in this line, see the note at v.281 on ademens.

parabat may have been corrupted to parabat because it was thought to refer only to Athamas. But the confusion was a very
simple one; see Met. I.183, where both parabat and parabent survive in MSS.

492 motae sonuere colubree: an extension of the idea at v. 475, mouit ... colubras. See also Met. I.707-708 dumque ibi suspense, motos in herudine ventos effecisse sonum teneam, Met. XI. 600-601 non fere, non pecudes, non moti flamme remi humanaeque sonum reddunt conuicia linguae, Met. XIII. 418-419 ismeque visum suadet Boreas, fluidaque secundo carbasa mota sonant, and Ibis 159 nurbera saeue dabunt sonum nesque colubree.

494 I have accepted linguaque with Heinsius in this line for two reasons. First it is the manuscript reading which best explains the other variants. The final 's' of a word was often written slightly above the line in MSS., and thus linguaque became linguaeque; but the singular was felt by scribes to be inadequate for many snakes' tongues, and linguisque and linguaeque replaced linguaque. For similar examples of coruscare, see Verg. Aen. V. 641-643 sublataque procul dextra conixa coruscet et isic et Aen. XII. 919 telum Aeneas fatale coruscet. Secondly, linguaque is necessary on stylistic grounds, to balance the other accusatives sibia and seniem in the triplet-phrase. Ovid's parallelism of construction in these triplet-phrases enables us to be certain that linguaque is here correct. See also I. 398-399 discendent velantque caput tunicasque recingunt et iussos lanides sum post vestigis mittunt, I. 599-600 deus ... terras occultuit tenuitque fugam repuitque pudorem. III. 68-69 ille ... caput in sue terga retorsit uulherque aspexit fixumque hostile momordit, III. 350 rescue probat letique genus nouitasque furoris, and IV. 390 urget opus spernitque deum festumgue profanat.

495 Whether abrumpit or abrupit is here correct is very hard to determine, and certainty is not possible. This kind of confusion between present and past tenses is a common one; see Juvenal X. 153, for example, where the alternatives rumpit and rupit are found in the manuscripts. I have preferred abrupit because of the following immisit (v. 496), but abrumpit is equally possible.

498 insipirentque grauis animas: see Verg. Aen. VII. 354 uipeream insiprans animam.

499 mens est, quae diros sentist ictus; an elliptic phrase: 'empfinden soll' was Haupt's explanation of sentist. The full idea compressed into what Ovid says appears to be 'but it is Athamass's and Ino's minds which the snakes attack, in order that they (the minds) may feel the deadly pangs'. The standard explanation of the passage, 'it is their mind which feels the deadly pangs', by taking the quae-clause as a simple relative clause, fails to explain or justify the subjunctive sentist. Alternatively, it is not impossible that the phrase quae diros sentist ictus is generic rather than final.
noua (for guoque) of some manuscripts may be dismissed as a reminiscence of I.437.

The reading tri(c)te of K and Y points to the origin of tincta of many MSS.: the second word of the line was responsible for an optical error by which the end of the line was copied trite recenti; and a subsequent scribe, realising the impossibility of the repeated trite, thought of the nearest suitable word, and wrote tincta. But mixta, found on the one hand in the manuscripts B and M, and on the other in G and Z, has a very wide conspectus of authority behind it (see the stemma in the Introduction, Part I).

rigenti of the Speyer and Graz manuscripts is an example of mindless miscopying. The blood was recens because it came from a freshly-killed animal, probably a sheep. See Met.VII.244-245 cultrosque in guttura uelleris atri conicit et patulas perfundit sanguine fossas.

coxerat aere cauo; see also Met.VI.645 pars inde ceuis exultat eenis et VII.262-263 interea ualidum posito medicamen sene feruet et exultat spumisque tumentibus albet.

For a discussion of my conjecture uercxit for uertit of the MSS., see the Introduction, Part II.vii.

Although the combined opinion of Heinsius and Bentley should not lightly be cast aside, I have preferred motis to motos in this line for three reasons. First, the pattern of words, if motis is read, has parallels elsewhere in the poem: II.311-313 intonat et dextra libraturn fulmen ab aure misit in aurigam pariterque animae rotisque expulit et saeuis conpescuit ignibus ignis and XI.522-523 praebentque micantia lumen fulmina: fulmineis ardescent ignibus ignes. Secondly, while motis velociter ignibus forms a phrase of symmetrical ABA design, the adverb, with motos, is separated from its verb, in that case consequitur. Although this is not an absolute bar to motos, it tends nonetheless in favour of motis. Thirdly, the common balancing of adjective and noun at the ends of the two halves of the line meant that motis was more likely to be attracted to the same case as ignis than motos to that of ignibus. The same fault is discernible in the passage quoted above from Book II, where some MSS. have replaced saeuis with saeuos (also accepted by Bentley).

An alternative solution to the problem of this line is suggested by Fast.VI.439, flegrebant senoti sceleratis ignibus ignes. It is possible, if motos is correct in Met.IV.509, that Ovid wrote originally consequitur motos uelocibus ignibus ignis.
But there are no adequate grounds, as motie has good manuscript authority, and in view of the examples from Books II and XI, for not putting motie velociter ignibus in the text.

511 It is important not to confuse the single snake mentioned in vv.483 and 511 (tortoque incingitur angue v.483, sumptumque recingitur anguem v.511) with the two snakes which Tisiphone hurls at Athamas and Ino in vv.495-496. These latter two snakes are taken from her hair (duos mediis ... crinibus anguis, v.495), while the single snake represents her stole. For a fuller reference to this kind of garment, see Aeschylus Coephoroi 1048-1050:

\[ \text{δαμαλί γυναίκες, φωλοκτόνος και πεπλεκτάνημενι πυκνοὶ δράκοις.} \]

519 discutit ore ferox: see also Met. II.625 tempore discussit clero causa melleus iictu and V.292-293 st cedit in uiltus discussisque ossibus oris tundit humum moriens scelerato sanguine tinctum.

521 passis ... capillis: for other similar uses of pandere in the poem, see II.238-239, V.513, VI.531, VII.257, VIII.107, IX.772 and XI.49. The confusion between passus and sparsi, not a difficult one, is found in some MSS. in all cases. It is rendered more likely here by sparsi in v.520.

524 hos usus: a difficult phrase, if the text is sound. usus seems here to be used in its sense of 'familiarity' (see also Tr. III. 5.9 nec longo cognitus usu). Ino has shown her attachment to Bacchus by the words 'euhoe Bacche', and Juno sarcastically hopes that Bacchus will acknowledge her familiarity and reciprocate it; like Pentheus (see III. 537 inemia tympana), Juno does not acknowledge the powers of Bacchus, and so does not believe that he can offer any help.

529 nullo tardata timore: see also Met. XIII.282-283 nec me lacrimae luctuque timorque tarderunt.

537 si temen: for this unusual explanatory use of temen after si, see also Tr. III.14.23-24 nunc incorrectum populi peruenit in ora, in populi quicquam si temen ore meum est.

It almost surpasses belief that this verse should still begin, in von Albrecht's edition (1966), with the words si temen in dio. If one example, and one example only, had to be chosen in this book to illustrate the fallacy inherent in the theory of a codex optimus, no better than this could be found. All manuscripts (including B, very closely allied to M) have the reading in medio in the original hand, and the sense of that is faultless; and the line is omitted by the first hand of the manuscript M. But because a later reader of M added the line in the margin, with in dio for in medio (a fault corrected in turn by a further reader), and because of the veneration in which M was held, in
dio found its way into the text, something for which, since 1832, when Jahn passed judgment in favour of in medio, there has been no logical justification.

538 The orthographical difference between graium and graum is trifling. *espus = spuma, hence graium ... nomem.

542 For a discussion on the rightness of the form Leucothea, here and elsewhere, and on its corruption in less good MSS., see Housman JPh 35 (1920), 303-304 (Classical Papers III.1031).

546 scissis ... capillis, if not a simple rationalisation of the more difficult scissee ... capillos, may have arisen through a parableptic confusion with palmis in the previous line; scissee ... capillos: scissee ... capillis: scissis ... capillis.

551 perseguar/prosequar: perseguar has to be accepted on grounds of greater manuscript authority, but prosequar might possibly be correct: see the note at v.151.

553-560 For another similar passage, see V.182-186: ... utque manu iaculum fatalem parabat mittere, in hoc haesit signum de marmore gestu. proximus huius Ampyx animi plenissima magnipectora Lyndeae gladio petit, inque petendo dextra diriguit nec citra mota nec ultra est.

555 Although Heinsius may have been correct to prefer sentit (of the manuscripts ACLYZ) in this line, I have printed sensit because there is, it seems, a contrast between the vividness of the attempted action (historic present), and the pinpointing of the very moment when the change takes place: thus, in the same way, in the passage quoted above from Book V, petit is followed by diriguit (vv.185-186).

556 Heinsius's rearrangement of the word-order of this line, though not without its attractions, may be discounted for two reasons. First, as Slater showed with parallels (Ov.Fast.III.863 and Verg. Aen.XII.270; and see besides Ov.Met.I.254 and VII.694, Prop.II. 9.47 and II.26.7, and Stat.Ach.I.514), a forte-phrase is not uncommon in this position of the line. Secondly, Heinsius's rearrangement seems to be motivated by the wish (a) to restore a caesura to the line, and (b) to avoid a break in words after the first syllable of the fifth foot: but see v.10 of this book for a similar line with no caesura, and I.757, II.521 and III.266 for a break after a monosyllabic first syllable of the fifth foot.

557 porrigitur for porrigit of an unidentified Ambrosian manuscript was a very easy corruption: see Willis, Latin Textual Criticism, p.69, and v.408, where the London manuscript A has includuntur for includunt. In the circumstances, the acceptance of porrigitur
into the text does not seem justified.

558 lenisbant of the Dresden manuscript might possibly be correct, but I have retained lenisbat because that continues more logically the personal emphasis of perseguar, temptab and tetenderat (vv. 551, 554 and 556).

561 I have accepted Heinsius's alto at the end of this line; for similar phrases see Verg. Ecl. VI. 76 and Aen. VI. 310 and VII. 704, and Ov. Met. IX. 226-227. For reasons explained in the Introduction (Part II. ii), either in illo at the end of v. 560 or in illo at the end of v. 561 should be considered mistaken. While the readings of one Naples manuscript (no. 394) are not impossible (eodem v. 560, in illo v. 561), in illo seems preferable in v. 560, and Heinsius's conjecture as good a reconstruction as can be found for the end of v. 561.

561-562 Ovid does not tell us what kind of birds the Ismenides were turned into, but perhaps they became gulls; see Callimachus Epigram LIX. 3-4: οὕτως ἄπνων, ἁθοῦσα ἵσα ἔφλεξα. For further uses of sumptis ... alis (or sumptis ... pinnis), see Met. IV. 47, V. 288 and VI. 96, and Fast. IV. 605; and for the reverse (positis ... alis), Met. VIII. 627.

Heinsius observes acutely in his edition that the corruption of Ismenides in MSS. is due to the repeated syllable -is at the end of sumptis and at the beginning of Ismenides (see M. L. West, Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique, 24).

564 laborum of the manuscripts LNFPS appears to be a visual error from labores in v. 570; but see also 1. 733, where laborum is found in some MSS. for malorum.

567 I have, with Heinsius, accepted erratibus and not erroribus in this line. erratus is unique to Ovid in Latin of this era, being found elsewhere only in the writings of Pope Gregory the Great in the 6th century (Moral. V. 82). See the note on prequestus at v. 254 for other words coined by Ovid himself in the Metamorphoses.

The special purpose of the use of erratus for error in this line appears to be a reminiscence, with modification (see the note on graue et inplacabile numen at v. 452), of Vergil's phraseology at Aen. VI. 532-533, pelagine uenis erroribus actus an monitu diuom? The presence of erroribus in many Ovid MSS. at v. 567 may be the result of recollection by scribes of the passage of Vergil.

Ovid uses the phrase longis (que) erratibus/erroribus act(us)
on four occasions in his works, in the passage under discussion, and at Met.XV.771, Her.II.107 and Trist.IV.10.109; and it is overwhelmingly likely that, whichever word he used, erratus or error, he used on all four occasions. Investigation of MSS. has revealed that eratibus has good authority at Met.IV.567; and Burman (ed.1727) reports that the codex Moretanus had eratibus at Met.XV.771, and the codex Junianus (= Eton MS., no.91) erratibus at Her.II.107: I suspect that the collection of a greater number of MSS. at Met.XV.771, Her.II.107 and Trist.IV.10.109 would reveal wider support for eratibus in all three places. We have seen that eratibus was likely to become erroribus because of reminiscence of Verg.Aen.VI.532; but there is no adequate explanation of why erroribus should become eratibus. The presence of eratibus in no less than three of the four examples is a coincidence which points very strongly to its being correct. We may assume that the word erratus was an Ovidian coinage.

profugus of a few MSS. is by no means impossible, but there is no sufficient reason for changing the reading profuga found in most manuscripts. For similar uses of this adjective, see also Met.XIII.627-628 (Aeneas) ... profuga ... per sequum classe fertur and XV.506 Pittheam profugo curru Troezena petebam.

On the confusion of fatum and factum, and similar errors, see Housman, CR 17(1903), 310 = Classical Papers II.595.

For a similar confusion between increscere and nigrescere, see Trist.I.4.5.

Heinsius may possibly have been correct to prefer sinuantur of some MSS.; however, the word adds a subsidiary idea which may have been gleaned from other passages of Vergil and Ovid: Aen.II.207-208 (anguium) pars cetera pontum pone legit sinuatque inmensa volumine terga. Sinuantur has excellent manuscript authority (G and 4 on the one hand, B and M on the other), and there is no compelling reason which justifies the change to sinuantur.

nec uerba loquenti sufficient; volenti (for loquenti) of some MSS. is in many ways very attractive as a reading: it may be argued convincingly from uult plura loqui in v.586 that Cadmus was not speaking in v.587, but only wishing to speak. Thus Ovid writes in two other places in the poem sed et os et linguæ uolenti dicere non aderet (V.466-467) and cui respondere uolenti uox pariter uocisque uia est tenuta (XIV.497-498). And on another occasion, when Ovid uses loquor, he adds frustra, so as to show the impossibility of speech: exululat frustraque loqui conetur (I.233). However, what is important at IV.587-588 is that Cadmus is not deprived of the means of making some sound:
he can still hiss (v.589). It is in this wider sense of 'uttering a sound' that loquor is used in v.587: when he tries to utter a sound, human words (verba) will not come. Ovid uses loquor in this sense elsewhere: metuitque loquere moreiuence mugist (I.745-746). volenti shows signs of being a gloss which simplifies this less obvious use of loquor, and which seems, at first, to fit better with uult plura loqui; but loquenti makes perfect sense, and has the stronger manuscript authority: it should be retained.

589 Heinsius may have been correct to prefer the reading relinquuit in this line: see the note on the similar problem at v.101. I have however retained relinquuit because the phrase hanc illi uocem natura relinququit is not an integral part of the narrative in the same way as v.101; it is an interjection by the poet, and has a finality which is best expressed by the past tense.

591 Although his infelix, approved by Heinsius from a few manuscripts, is preferable rhythmically to infelix his, its inclusion in the text is hard to justify, on the simple grounds that there is nothing actually wrong with infelix his; and infelix his has in its favour besides that the vocative adjective comes next to teque, which, matters of rhythm apart, is the more natural speaking order: see tu uenerande (v.22), te Babylonia (v.44), and te carissime (v.143).

598 quisquis adest ... terrentur; for a parallel, see XV.680 quisquis adest, uisum uenerantur numen.

598-599 The variant readings illis (or illi or illis) and perlucent seem likely to have originated from the confusion of illa at the end of v.598 with the 'comites' earlier in the line; when the proper subject of permulcet had been lost, a new verb was necessary in order to try to restore sense in v.599.

600 Loers correctly explained, in his 1843 edition, the words iuncto ... volumine serpunt: the coils of the snakes rise and fall together as they move along side by side. Two other passages from Vergil and Ovid express the same idea: eace autem gemini ... immensis orbibus angues incumbunt pelago pariterque ad litora tendunt (Aen.II.203-205), (Orpheus) quaerens ... per arus piorum inuenit Eurydican cupidisque emplecitur ulnis, hic modo coniunctis spatientur passibus ambo ... (Met.XI.62-64).

605 The variant decolorata of P is perhaps to be explained by the supposition that debellata, followed by colebat, became, as a result of optical confusion, decollata (reading of manuscript no.135). The scribe of G realised the mistake before completing the word, and corrected it; but the scribe of P remembered v.21 (decolor extremo quae cingitur India Gange) and modified decollata accordingly.
I have printed *celebrarat* of the Paris and Leipzig manuscripts in this line. Similar errors are found elsewhere in the poem at II.252 (where *celebrabent* has displaced *celebrarat*) and at X.431 (*celebrabent* again for *celebrarat*). While *celebrarat*, the reading of most MSS., is the easiest rationalisation of *celebrarat* (as at II.252 and X.431), the other variants *celebrat* and *celebrareit* are also of considerable interest and importance: the haplography *celebrarat*/*celebrat* is simpler than that *celebrabat*/*celebrat*, and the perfect *celebrareit* may be a contraction of a stage now lost, *celebrauerat*, in its turn expanded from *celebrat*.

A further reason in favour of *celebrarat* is that *celebrabat* appears to be assimilated to the tense of *celebat* in v.605; but the words *positis ... templis* suggest that the *celebratio* itself consisted in the actual building of the temples: this meaning is properly conveyed by the pluperfect tense. *celebrarat* does not necessarily imply that Achaia has now given up the cult of Bacchus; the temples, once built, are there to be used when needed. The emphasis on the building of the temples, rather than on the worship which takes place within them, is a typical example of Ovidian *aeriatric*, and rationalisation of *celebrarat* to *celebrabat* is unnecessary.

For a note on the correctness of *putet* and *Iouis* in this line, see the Introduction, Part II.ii. The change of the first *Iouis* of the line to *deum* may have been influenced either by *deum* in v.609 or by *deum* in v.613.

I have preferred *et* of nearly all MSS. to *at* of the Lactantians BMNU and of Z: while either reading might be correct, and the confusion is of the simplest, *et* looks like a correction introduced to point a stronger contrast.

*aerea carpebat tenerum*: see also *Trist*.V.2.26 *quot tenerum pinnis aerea pulsat suis*.

The variant *liquidum* of the Bergamo and Naples manuscripts may have arisen as a gloss (it is found also in some MSS. in the line quoted above from the *Tristia*); but it occurs in its own right slightly later, at v.667 (*liquidum motis talaribus aera findit*).

*uarios ... in angues*: see also *tellus ... edidit innumeræ species* (I.434, 435).

For a similar idea, see *Manilius IV*.664-666: (*Libya*) *horrendos angues habitatque membra uenumo et mortis pastu uiuentia, crimina terræ, ... habet*.

*seductas aethere longe despectat terras*: see also *Verg.Aen.VII.*
288-289 (Iuno) Aenean classemque ex aethere longe Dardaniam
Siculo prospexit ab usque Fachyno.

On the changed word-order of the manuscript O (codex
Arondelianus), see the Introduction, Part II.iii. terras was
written over seductas in v.623, then incorporated into v.623
and omitted from v.624: seductas terras aethere longe despectat
was subsequently re-arranged, for the sake of metre, into the
word-order of O.

625 gelidas arctos: geminas arctos of the Paris manuscript may, as
Heinsius and Slater observed, be a reminiscence of the same
words at Met.III.45. gelidas arctos has a parallel at Verg.Aen.
VI.16: insuetum per iter gelidas enuit ad arctos.

629-630 ignis ... Aurorae: the first light of dawn, Homer's ἀρκτοῖς ἀρκτοῖς
'Heo'. See also Ἐρυμήνη; & '136 (Archilochus Frag.160, Edmonds),
κρᾶς ἐκ ξώλα λόγῳ φάραγω (Callimachus Hecele 260.65,
Pfeiffer), Φιλοτήτος 77 λος ἀνθρώπως (Callimachus Incert.Sed.
Frag.539, Pfeiffer), Aurorae lumina (Ov.Met.VII.835), and prima
nouo sparagebat lumine terras ... Aurora (Verg.Aen.IV.584-585).

630 On the removal of asyndeton by the addition of -que (curruseque,
Y), see the notes at vv.193 and 393.

631 The fact that cunctos is found in the first hands of manuscripts
as far removed from each other as the Lactantians BMN on the one
hand and the Berlin manuscript D on the other gives it very
strong authority. That, coupled with the comparative rareness of
praestare with an accusative rather than a dative, reinforces
Heinsius' preference for cunctos rather than cunctis or custos.
Heinsius refers to Stat.Theb.IV.207 Argolicasque habitu praestabo
merites and to Servius's note on Aen.XI.438 (magnum praestat
Achilles): 'et praesto illum, id est melior illo sum, et praesto
illi dicimus: Cicero in Caesarinas tanto ille superiores uicerat
gloria, quanto tu omnibus praestitisti'.

632 For a note on the spelling Atlans in this line and at vv.646 and
657, see on v.281 (ademans). The form Atlans survives elsewhere
in Ovid at Her.IX.18.

633 solus of the manuscripts BMN is a good example of assimilation
of the ending of one word to the word which has gone before
(qui): see the Introduction, Part II.ii, at the beginning.

636 For other examples of uiciania with a plural verb in Ovid, see
Fast.II.657-658 conuenienti celebrantque dapes uiciania simplex
et cantant laudes. Termine sancte, tuas end Fast.III.189
spernebent generos inopes uiciania diues.

637-638 auro ... ex auro ... ex auro: for similar repetitions of ideas
involving gold, see also:

\[ \text{cui pharetra ex auro, crines nodantur in aurum}
\]

\[ \text{surea purpuream subnectit fibula vestem.}
\]

\[ \text{Vergil Aen. IV.138-139}
\]

\[ \ldots \text{nunc auro phaleras auroque sagittas}
\]

\[ \text{cingulaque et manicas, ne coniuge uilium iret,}
\]

\[ \text{presserat et mixtum cono crispauerat aurum.}
\]

\[ \text{Statius Theb. VIII.566-568}
\]

644 Atla: for this kind of vocative, see Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre
der Lateinischen Sprache, I.446-447.

647 Heinsius correctly accepted moenibus (for montibus of most MSS.)
in this line. For a further use of the epithet solidus of walls,
see Met.VI.573 structa rigent solido stabulorum moenia saxo. For
the opposite idea, see Trist.V.10.17-18 tumulus defenditur ipse
moenibus exiguis ingenique loci.

650 I have preferred quam to quas on the simple grounds that if
Ovid had written the three words gloria rerum quas, there was no
immediate reason why quas should become quam; by contrast, the
interposition of the plural rerum was very likely to turn quam
into quas, the reading of the majority of MSS..

L's ne longe, repeated from v.649, is a good example of
interlineal paralepsy: see the Introduction, Part II.ii.

651 There are no adequate grounds for accepting from one manuscript,
with Heinsius, foribus for manibus. The error may be one arising
from the general similarity of the words (see Willis, Latin
Textual Criticism, 74-77), or alternatively it may spring from a
reminiscence of the last half of v.85, foribusque exceedere
temptent.

653 Heinsius was undoubtedly correct to prefer Atlanti to Atlantis.
The error may have been caused by either of two reasons: first,
the -is termination of dictis at the end of v.652 may have
brought about Atlantis by optical confusion, and, secondly,
uiribus at the beginning of v.654 may have been taken as the
dative dependent on per, and Atlanti modified accordingly: but
uiribus in v.654 is ablative, to be taken with per in the same
way asuiribus with inferior in v.653. For a similar confusion
between the dative and the genitive, see the variants fortitudini
and fortitudinis at Phaedr.IV.15.6.
squalentia protulit ore: see also Trist.III.10.9 at cum tristis
Hiemps squalentia protulit ore.

partis euctus in omnis: 'having increased in size in every
direction'. Heinsius rightly preferred euctus to the other
variants: it is picked up by creuit in the next line. The
Latinity of partes altus in omnes, which appears in the
majority of editions, is dubious: for it is difficult to see
how partes ... in omnes can properly depend on a simple
adjective rather than on a participle.

I have obelized the reading aeterno of most MS3., which was shown
to be impossible by Housman (TCPHs 3, 1890, 144 = Classical
Papers I.165). I have left the word obelized rather than substi-
tuting one of the various conjectures, because no one con-
jecture commends itself as unquestionably correct over and
above some of the others: this is a place where the original
text is perhaps beyond certain recovery.

Cepheaque: see the note at v.429 on the variant pentheia (for
penthea) for a possible explanation of cepheaque here;
alternatively Cepheius, as an adjectival form in its own right,
may have been more familiar to a scribe than Cepheus, and may
therefore have been substituted for it. It is possible that
Heinsius was correct to prefer the asyndeton of cepheia without
the -que (see the notes at vv.193 and 393), but when both non-
Lactantian (ADG) and Lactantian (S) manuscripts have -que,
then it is there that the stronger manuscript authority lies.
See also Prop.IV.6.78 Cepheam hic Meroen fuscaque regna cenat.

The orthographical difference between tepido and trepido (pido)
is so trifling that the latter might easily be mistaken for the
former. Heinsius correctly preferred trepido, which emphasizes
the idea of movement, and continues the imagery of leuis aura
and moverat. It was Andromeda's slight movement which enabled
Perseus to know that she was not a marmoreum opus; there is
something grotesque and far-fetched about the supposition that
Perseus knew this because he could see that Andromeda's tears
were warm. For a similar confusion between trepido and tepido,
see III.125.

ulsa correptus imagine formae: see also III.416, where Ovid
used the same phrase. The double appearance of the phrase with
the participle correptus disproves Heinsius's conjecture
remoratus.

patrisque: this is a good example of how Ovid's original has
very nearly become lost to us. Nothing is intrinsically wrong
with terraseaque, but it is likely that Ovid preferred the ana-
apastic patrise to terrese, which would have crept in, in the
first instance, as a gloss. The same mistake is found again a
few lines later, at v.686. For similar uses of patriae by Ovid in the poem, see also III.580-581 ede tuum nomen nomenque parentum et patriam morisque noui cur sacra frequentes and V.651-653 quae ueniat, causamque uiae nomenque rogatus et patriam. 'patriae est clarse mihi' dixit 'Athenae, Triptolemus nomen'.

681 silet is to be preferred to stupet, and leads more naturally into the following phrase nec audet appellare uirum. stupet appears to be a reminiscence of the second word of v.676.

682 compellare seems likely to owe its presence in some MSS. to Vergilian reminiscence: Aen.II.279-280 ultro flens ipse uidebar compellare uirum et maestas exprimere uoces, Aen.III.298-299 opstipui, miroque incensum pectus amore compellare uirum et causam cognoscere tantos, Aen.VIII.163-164 mihi mens iuuenali erdebat amore compellare uirum et dextrae coniungere dextram.

682-683 menibusque modestos celasset uultus; for the same association of ideas in Ovid, see also Met.XI.180-181 ille quidem celare cupit turpique pudore tempora tempertat uelutem taliis, Fast.II.819-820 ille diu reticet pudibundaque celat amictu ora; fluent lecrimae more pertainis squee, and Fast.VI.579 nunc uoluit, et uoluit uelume celat amat. In the passage from Book II of the Fasti the same progression of thought is found as at this point in Metamorphoses IV, silence, hiding of the face in modesty, and tears.

684 obortis/abortis: a very common confusion: see, for example, Met.I.350.

685-686 sua ne delicta fateri nolle uideretur: Andromeda considered that if she remained silent, her silence would suggest that she had some personal misdemeanour to hide (sua ... delicta): she speaks to establish her own innocence, and to show that the fault is not hers but her mother's (maternae, v.687).

686 For a note on the correctness of patriaeque, not terraeque, see at v.680.

687 maternae ... fiducia formae: 'Cassiope's over-confidence in her own (Cassiope's) beauty'. Andromeda's punishment was, for her, a very unfair one, because she was to suffer for someone else's mistake; thus there is a logical justice in her rescue by Perseus. fiducia formae is used also by Ovid at Met.II.731, III.270, VIII.434 and XIV.32, and at A.A.I.707.

689 inmenso and ponto are to be taken with inminet rather than with ueniens: 'the approaching monster rears itself up over a huge area of sea'. The idea is the same as that of the words latum subsectum possidet sequor in v.690. This is a good example of Ovid's use of the device of variatio, when he describes in two...
different ways what is essentially a single idea.

eminet of some MSS. is not unattractive as a reading ('the monster emerges high out of a vast expanse of sea'), but, for reasons described above, its sense is not as suitable to the context as that of inminet. Besides, when in(m)minet is found in G and A on the one hand, and in B and M on the other (see Stemma Codicum, Introduction Part I), that is where the manuscript authority lies.

amens, found at the end of this line in a few MSS., appears to be a reminiscence of II.334.

justior of N and U is perhaps assimilated to the ending of genitor in the previous line.

ferenda, found for the correct ferendam in the majority of MSS., has been assimilated to the ending of the preceding word hora.

quondam of the manuscripts P and S is the 'mot juste' in this line in a sense in which clausum is not. The word is used often by Ovid when he refers to the birth or procreation of heroes and deities in the distant past: II.636-638 quam quondam nymphe Chariclo fluminis in rapidi ripis saixa uocuit Ocyroen, III.342-344 quam quondam flumine curuo implicuit clausaeque suis Cephisos in undis uim tulit, IV.537-538 in medio quondam concreta profunde spuma fui Graiumque manet mihi nomen sa ilia, VI.224-225 e quibus Ismenus, qui matre panicula quondam prima suae fuerat, XIV.332-334 spreitas tamen omnibus unam ille colit nymphen, quam quondam in colle Palati dicitur Ionio peperisse Venilia Iano. Clausam of most MSS. may be accounted for by the supposition that a scribe who realised that Danae was locked in a tower when Jupiter visited her wrote clausam over the beginning of the verse; and the gloss was subsequently interpolated into the text. Heinsius had justifiable doubts about clausam when he observed: 'clausam absoltue postum nescio an sit Latinum' (ed.1659).

serias ... per auras: see also Met.IX.219 ille per serias pendens induruit auras, Met.X.178-179 quem prius serias libratum Phoebus in auras misit et oppositas disiectit pondere nubes, and Met.XIV.127-128 pro quibus serias uiueni euctus ed auras templa tibi statuam. serius is correct rather than aetherius; for aer was the lower air of the atmosphere, aether the celestial air of heaven. The confusion between the two words was a common one; see, for example, v.677, where the Bern manuscript (no.36) has aether for aer, and v.751, where aether is found in many MSS. for aer.

There is very little to choose between uirtute mea servata, the word-order approved by Bentley, and servata mea uirtute, the reading of the majority of MSS., and found in all editions: the
transposition could have developed at a very early stage in the transmission of the text, and the confusion is an easy one. I have preferred Bentley's word-order for two slight, though inconclusive, reasons: first, it is more natural for the verb to come at the end of the three-word phrase (uirtute mea seruata), and, secondly, the juxtaposition of sit and seruata when, unlike their occurrence at Met.V.24 for example, they belong to different clauses, is perhaps stylistically better avoided. But the matter remains an open one, not susceptible of certainty.

704 et orant, the manuscript reading, is a phrase of very considerable difficulty. It cannot reasonably be taken with the following line, for then it would share with promittunt the object regnum: and the Latinity of orant regnum = orant regnum accipiat is not admissible. Neither may orant properly share with accipiant the object legem: on the one hand it is divided off from accipiant legem by the interjection quis enim dubitaret?, and on the other it is out of place where it is: accipere legem implies that the time for orare legem is already past. The only logical explanation of vv.704-705 as they stand is that adopted by, for example, Henry Riley of Clare Hall, Cambridge, in his 1871 translation: 'Her parents embrace the condition (for who could hesitate?) and they entreat his aid, and promise, as well, the kingdom as a dowry'. Some such supplement as 'his aid', difficult though it is, seems the only way of bringing sense to the passage as it stands.

My conjecture ouantes is based on the supposition that ouantes became orantes (not a difficult change), which, as it would not scan, was altered to et orant. While the sense of et orant is difficult, there is logic in Andromeda's parents' being overjoyed at Perseus' offer. Similar uses of ouans/ouantes are found at Liv.I.25.13 Romani ouantes . . . Horatium accipiunt, Verg.Aen.IV.577 imperioque iterum paremus ouantes, and Stat.Theb. III.260 gaudet ouans iussis.

709-710 tortum and plumbum of some MSS. have been assimilated to the ending of quantum, and medio and caelo to that of plumbo.

714 eruo/agro: for the same confusion, see v.87.

715 Housman's luventia for the lucentia of some MSS. (see TPhS 3, 1894, 141 = Classical Papers I.162) is rendered superfluous by caeruleum ... draconem (Met.XII.13). Both lucentia and caeruleum refer to the lead-like blue-grey colour of reptiles.

praebentem Phoebò ... terga draconem; see also Verg.Aen.II. 473-475 (coluber) ... nitidus ... iuentia lubrica consoluit sublato pectore terga, arduos ad solem.

718 missus preceps per inane: see also Verg.Aen.IV.574 deus aethere missus ab alce.
The confusion in some MSS. over the words *missus praeceps* springs in part from the assimilation of *missus* to the ablative *uolatru* at the end of the line, and in part from the parableptic association of *praeciceps* with *preepes* (v.714).

*quaque patet; see the parallel at Met.XIII.391-392 dixit et in pectus tum demum uulnera passum, qua patuit ferro, letsem condidit ensem.*

*qua tenuissima cauda desinit in piscem; 'where the monster's very narrow tail ends in the shape of a fish'. Gronovius's emendation is unnecessary: for this kind of pleonasm in the Latin poets, see Housman's note on Manilius 1.539 (ed.1903, p.51).*

The acceptance of *uulnerat* into the text seems justified by the very close parallel at Met.I.717-718: *nec mora. falcato nutantem uulnerat ense qua collo est confine caput.* The presence of the variants *uenerat* and *uerberat* in the Lactantian MSS. *B M N* and *S* suggests that the loss of the true reading became localised in the Lactantians (although it also affected non-Lactantian manuscripts, e.g. A).

*greues; for the mistaken leues of Q, see Willis, Latin Textual Criticism, 74-77.*

Gronovius refers to Verg.Ecl.II.26 (*cum placidum uentis staret mare*) as a parallel for Ovid's *stantibus ... aquis* here.

*sequore moto; see also V.6-7 (fretum) ... quod seua quietum uentorum rabies motis exasperat undis and XI.600 moti flamine rami.*

*sinistra; the mistake here is shown to be confined entirely to Lactantian MSS., and sinistra therefore established as unquestionably correct.*

*It was Heinsius who shrewdly observed that *dura* has made its way into the text as a contrast for *mollit* in the next line. Pliny describes sand as *aspera* (*N.H.XXXVI.23.52*), and it was for this reason that Perseus did not wish to put down the head on bare sand (*nuda harena*), but strewed the ground with leaves (v.742).*

*praecipitque and concepitque of *M N* and *U* reveal that the true reading at some stage became lost to some MSS. of the Lactantian tradition. *assumisitque* of *Z* is a simple gloss for *percepitque.*

The exact text of this line must remain uncertain, but various comments may be made about the line's content, and its relationship with the surrounding lines. There are at least six other examples in Ovid's works alone of *iactare* with *semen* or *semina* (*Met.V.485 and XV.347*; *Fast.* I.662, and *Her.* VI.11 and 33, and XII.17), and the idea is relevant, in some form, to this line.
The majority of manuscripts present a choice, in the middle of the line, between the readings iterant and uterant. If iterant is read, then it is necessary to punctuate with a comma after v.748, and a full-stop after v.749: nunc quoque of v.750 begins a new sentence and a new train of thought. With uterant, the break in continuity comes after v.748, and v.749 is taken with v.750. While this latter is not completely impossible, other examples of nunc quoque in Book IV (vv.561, 602 and 802) confirm that this phrase is properly used to initiate a new idea; if, therefore, v.750 is to be taken separately from vv.748 and 749, iterant seems to lie closer to the truth than the ut-phrase.

ex ilis: it was essential for the future propagation of coral that the sea-nymphs should sow seeds from the sea-weed which had turned hard under the Gorgon's head. If they had sown seeds from ordinary sea-weed, it would have remained soft, rather than turning hard, when drawn out of the water and brought into contact with air.

Heinsius correctly preferred the less common form durities: see also I.401 and III.64, where durities is the correct form, and has been replaced in some, or many, MSS. by duritias.

As the reading tactu (for tacto) is confined to the Lactantian manuscripts B and M, and as B and M (as well as the Lactantian N) also have ad aera (for ab aere), it is reasonable to suspect corruption of the whole phrase within the Lactantian tradition, especially when aera tacto occurs later in the poem in a passage where coral is mentioned: XV.415-417 ertitur in lapides et congelat aera tacto. sic et curialium, quo primum contigit aures tempore, durescit; mollis fuit herba sub undis. It is possible that tactu in v.751 is a reminiscence of the same word in v.745. For a phrase similar to duritiem tacto capiant ... ab aere, see Met.XIII.605-606 faciemque capitis sumitque calorem atque animam ex igni.

Andromeda was of course herself the praemia, but there is no strict need for Heinsius's ut: Andromedan et ... praemia is a perfectly defensible hendiadys. Because Andromeda herself was the praemia indotata, indotata is to be taken as referring to Andromeda herself (= ἀρχοντίος).

capit is infinitely preferable to rapit, which suggests a forced abduction. The confusion between the two words was not a difficult one: see, for example, only seven lines above, at v.751, where, for capiant of most MSS., the Zürich manuscript has rapiant and a Sulmona manuscript rapient; and in v.759, a Copenhagen manuscript (no.113) has praeripiunt for preципiant of most MSS..

For a fuller description of this kind of marriage-celebration, see Xenophanes Eleg.I.1-12 (Bergk).
praecutiunt: probably a word coined by Ovid himself (see v.251 praequentus and v.567 erratibus), if we accept, as is likely, that percuitit, rather than Guyet's praecuit, is correct at Prop.III.10.16. But Ovid's coining of the word may have been prompted by the combination of Propertius's percuitit with the following ante (ipse Amor eccenas percuitit ante faces), in itself a combination which tells against Guyet's praecuitit in the passage.

The survival of -cutiunt in a Gronovian manuscript, and of prae- in MSS. generally, serves as an indication that, as with praequestus at v.251, scribes tended to normalise the unusual (and perhaps unique) by altering a part of the word they saw before them, so as to make a familiar word.

Gronovius's conjecture lotique for et ubique, though not unpleasant in some ways, is rendered superfluous by tibia at the beginning of the next line.

Editors who print Cephei as the first word of this line have accepted (on the grounds that it is the reading of the Lactantian manuscripts B and M) an adjective not otherwise known to exist, when it (the word Cephei) may be explained very simply as a mistaken assimilation of the correct Cepheum to the case of the following proceres. Even granted that Cephei were a legitimate form, it would have to be rejected (as would A's Cephei) for reasons of style: for the ambiguity as to whether the word were nominative (with proceres) or genitive (with regis) would be intolerable. By contrast Cepheum is unambiguous and stylistically impeccable: only the Lactantian fetish has stood between it and wider acceptance.

Heinsius, perhaps not unreasonably, objected to the repeated -i endings of this line, especially the consecutive functioni and generosi, as being unworthy of Ovid; but the word-endings of both halves of the line have parallels elsewhere in Ovid's works (Fast.II.327 sic epulis functioni and A.A.I.565 ergo ubi contigerint positis tibi munera Baccii), and there is no adequate reason either for presuming that Ovid was always perfect in matters of this kind or for altering the text as it stands.

quaerenti protinus illi: see also Ep.Pont.II.3.85 tibi quaerenti, num uerus nuntius esset.

For a discussion on these two lines, and for comments on the problems of interlineal parablepsy and 'Double Recension', see the Introduction, Part II.ii.

I have printed Sirites as the second word of this line, the name of the person who answers Perseus' question. We would expect Perseus' informant to be one of King Cepheus' noblemen,
a local Ethiopian; and we know from Priscian's poem *Periegiesis* that there was a river *Siris* in Ethiopia; *partibus a Libycis qui currens solis ed ortus Siris ab Aethiopum populis cognomine fertur* (*Perieg.* 211-212). More specifically, Eustathius tells us that *Siris* was the name given to the Nile as far as the city of Syene (*Eust.* 222):  ὁ δὲ Νέλος Ἀιγύπτιον ἐπ' ἀνατολήν πολὺς ἐτῶν ἐν καὶ ἐκ τὴν καλουμένην πόλιν Συνίην Σιρίς ὑπὸ Ἀιθιόπων κικλήσκεται, ἀφ' ἢν καὶ ἢπείρῳ ἐκεῖνον.

When *G* is the important manuscript we know it to be (see the *Introduction, Part I*), and when, together with the Stockholm manuscript, it has the reading *Siricides*, and when no other manuscript provides at this point a reading which offers any suggestion of sense, it is reasonable to suspect that the truth lies hidden somewhere behind *Siricides*. The problem hinges on deriving from the simple noun *Siris* the correct toponymic for a person who came from that area; that is as near as it is possible to come to what Ovid was likely to have written.

The toponymic of the noun 'Siris' (though of a different place, in Lucania, not the river in Egypt) is found in the writings of Athenaeus (*Deipn.* 523d): Ἄρχιλόχος δ' ἐν Ποντίης ἐπερθαύμαζε τὸν χώραν τῶν Σίριτῶν διὰ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν. The genitive Σιρίτων points to a nominative form Σιρίτης.

Sirites, or *Sirices* (through the constant interchange of 't' and 'c'), found itself directly below v.767's *Lyncides* (a gloss for *Abantiades*: see the *Introduction, Part II.ii*), and ocular confusion between the two names caused the assimilation of *Sirices* to the ending of *Lyncides* above; hence the *Siricides* of the Stockholm manuscript, found also as a correction by the first hand in *G*. But before correcting himself and preserving the wrong reading, the scribe of *G* had all but provided us with *Sirices* itself: *G* reads *Siricides*, and both the dot and the superscript 'i' are in the writing of the first hand. I take it that the scribe of *G* was copying from a source which suggested both *Sirices* and *Siricides*; and he was as far as *Sirice* intending to write *Sirices*, when he changed his mind and substituted the alternative.

moresque seems preferable to mores because there is no good reason why the phrase of v.768 should not balance, with double *que*, that of v.766. Such omissions of first -que are not uncommon: see inmunes ... *famulas dominesque* (v.5) for inmunesque ... *famulas dominesque*, and *colubras ipsumque* (v.786) for *colubrasque ipsumque*.

I have printed *habitusque* rather than *animumque*, which appears to be a reminiscence of v.766 (*animos*). But either *habitusque* or *animumque* is preferable to the plural forms found
in some MSS., which seem to be assimilated to the preceding plural moreisque. Ovid's pair of -que ... -que phrases in vv.766 and 768 appears to be a conscious eristic of Vergil's cultusque habituque locorum at Georg.1.52. In turn Statius modified Ovid's phrase when he wrote moreisque habituque decoros (Silv. II.6.104).

769-770 o fortissime ... Perseu: for this kind of phrase, see Soph. O.T. 1469 ὡ ... γεννάξε, Hor. Set.II.112 pater optime, Verg. Aen. XI. 294 rex optime, and Verg. Aen. XI. 344 o bone rex.

775 sortitas, like compellare at v.682, might possibly be correct, but seems more likely to owe its presence to Vergilian reminiscence: Aen.III.633-635 nos magna precati numina sortitique uices una undique circum fundimur, Aen.VIII.444-445 octius incubuere omnes periterque laborem sortit, Aen.IX.174-175 omnis per muros legito sortita periclum excubat. Aeschylus mentions the Phorcides in fuller detail:

From Vinct. 794-797

778 srentia should be accepted in this line for horrentia of most MSS.: see Met.XIII.691 for a further use by Ovid of the phrase srentia saxa. The reading herentia of the Graz manuscript (no. 102) shows a mid-way point between srentia and horrentia; and a similar fault (but in the reverse direction) is diagnosed at Met.X.190 by Arthur Platt, who substitutes horrentia for the difficult heerentia of the MSS. (G Smith, 1911, 53). The ablative siluis ... fragosis amplifies the way in which the saxa were srentia; not only was the land rocky and desolate, but it had brittle (i.e. sapless, and therefore dead) trees standing upon it: see, similarly, tepidis ... srentia uenis ora at Met.VII. 556-557, used of those who have a high fever and parched mouth. Alternatively it is possible that Gronovius was correct to paraphrase fragosis 'inaequalibus', and that Ovid here has in mind the idea of rough, broken woodland.

780 ferarumque/ferarum: for a further example in this book of the omission of supernumerary -que, see Lyaeum for Lyaeumque at v.11.

782 sed, the reading of many manuscripts, developed via set (which survives in K and P): it was added to the original se because of the following temen.

782-783 For a discussion of the readings horrendo and repercussae, and of the rightness of Slater's conjecture (before repercussae was found in Naples MS. no.208), see the Introduction, Part II.ii.
A parallel for repercussae form(a) Medusae is found at Her. XVIII.77, repercussae ... imag(o) lunae.

horrendo clipei ... aere: it was not of course the shield itself which was frightening, but what Perseus saw reflected in it.

786 Pegasus' twin-brother was Chrysaor. fratres (for fratrem), found in most MSS., has been assimilated to natos at the end of the line. The assimilation recurred the other way round at the end of the line where, because of fratrem (or fontem), natos became, in some MSS., natum.


791 una of some MSS. is perhaps an interpolated gloss, or perhaps a reminiscence of the last word of v.790.

796 I have preferred nec to neque, as the latter was always liable to be substituted before a vowel; see vv.299 and 441 for other instances of the fault in this book.

798 The variant uiolasse may have arisen through interlinear confusion between uidisse and uitasse, exactly below and above each other respectively in vv.797 and 798: the 'd' of uidisse may have been misread as 'ol', and miscopied into the word in v.798; or, more simply, uiolasse may be no more than a gloss for uitasse.

802 attonitos formidine ... hostis: see also Met.XV.153 o genus attonitum gelidae formidine mortis.
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The Third Declension Accusative Plural in -is and -es in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*

According to the information provided in the *apparatus criticus* of Magnus’ edition of the *Metamorphoses* (Berlin, 1914), the third declension accusative plural in -is is attested, on manuscript authority, in 113 instances in the whole poem.\(^1\) The distribution, according to books, is as follows:


The average in Books I - III is 13 instances per book; in the other books it is 6 if Books VII and XV are included, 4 if they are not. The high proportion of instances in Books I, II and III is due, in large measure, to the evidence of two 9th and one 10th century manuscripts, the *codex Bernensis* (a), the *codex Lipsiensis* (X), and the *codex Londiniensis* (e), all of which exist in fragments from the first three books only. They are alone in preserving an -is reading at I. 153 (a), 228 (e), 304 (a), 305 (a), 389 (s), 685 (e), 773 (e), II. 179 (c), 229 (e) 229 (e), 271 (e), 729 (e), III. 22 (a), 41 (c), 43 (e), 182 (l), 319 (c), and 369 (e).

Without the evidence of the early fragments, the figures for survival of the -is form in Books I, II and III would be 4, 10 and 8 respectively, nearer to those for the rest of the poem.

The high figure for Book VII, 16 survivals of the -is form, does not seem to be justified by any internal evidence: the subject matter of the book, Jason and Medea, Aeson, The Plague at Aegina or Cephalus and Procris, no more lends itself to whatever special flavour of style was felt to be inherent in -is than do The Greeks at Aulis, Achilles and Caeneus, The Battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs or The Death of Achilles in Book XII, where there is only one example of the -is spelling. It is more likely that a sport of fate has preserved for us, in Book VII, a proportion of -is to -es nearer than elsewhere to that which Ovid himself intended.

A check in Books I and VII has shown that Ovid’s total use of accusatives in -is and -es combined is 75 in Book I and 79 in Book VII. The figures therefore of 11 -is forms in Book I and 16 in Book VII represent at most one example of -is to every four of -es.

The table below shows, by books, the distribution of -is spellings in adjectives, participles and nouns respectively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI</th>
<th>XII</th>
<th>XIII</th>
<th>XIV</th>
<th>XV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>3-2-63-2-3-6-0-4-3-0-0-3-8</td>
<td>3-6-64-0-1-6-1-0-2-2-0-0-3-2</td>
<td>5-6-2-2-1-2-4-1-4-0-1-1-2-0-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participles</td>
<td>3-6-64-0-1-6-1-0-2-2-0-0-3-2</td>
<td>5-6-2-2-1-2-4-1-4-0-1-1-2-0-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>3-6-64-0-1-6-1-0-2-2-0-0-3-2</td>
<td>5-6-2-2-1-2-4-1-4-0-1-1-2-0-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are not wide-ranging enough, on the basis of individual books, to give statistics for each book, but it is of interest to note that, taken all together, they show 34 instances of -is in nouns and 79 instances in adjectives and participles combined.

Other passages throughout the *Metamorphoses* show that an -es termination was sometimes substituted for -is endings other than accusative plurals, as at
III. 581, VIII. 296 and 522, X. 243, XI. 79, XII. 7 and XV. 871. And -es sometimes replaced the Greek accusative plural in -as, as at I. 152 and 778, IV. 425, V. 319 and X. 150. Although these instances serve as corroboration that a significant proportion of what would have been accusative plurals in -is is likely to have been altered into -es, restitution of -is for transmitted -es accusative readings remains a hazardous task: nonetheless it is of interest that in Book IV, for example, the 9 surviving instances of -is occur between lines 6 and 271, roughly the first third of the book. Thus, if the spread of -is to -es were even, any other words which were written with the -is form would be more likely to have been present in the latter part of Book IV, and statistics suggest that an adjective-participle was at least twice as likely as a noun to be written with -is.

The figure of 13 -is forms in Book XV, above the normal average, is due to the evidence of various 'second-string' manuscripts which have been consulted in that book alone where M and N are not extant: these manuscripts, by themselves, preserve -is readings at XV. 232, 248, 412, 512, 657 and 806, and it is likely that collations of them and of other manuscripts for the remainder of the Metamorphoses will result, even if only sparingly, in further attestations of -is forms. In several other cases, such as at I. 483, V. 358 and XI. 477, the editio princeps Romana of the Metamorphoses, dating from 1471, prints an -is rather than -es accusative termination, though there exists no manuscript corroboration of an -is form from manuscripts known today; elsewhere the editio Romana gives the -is form where we have manuscript backing, as at III. 22 (a), III. 601 (eN) and V. 421 (M); it is therefore possible that, wherever the editio Romana gives -is rather than -es, there is a certain truth of manuscript tradition in the -is reading, but that the relevant manuscript, available to editors 500 years ago, is lost today.

There follow two lists, one of places where an -is accusative survives on ms. authority, the other of the manuscripts which preserve these readings.

**Surviving -is forms**

| I.  | 117 aN, 149 eN, 153 a, 228 e, 304 a, 305 a, 370 s, 389 e, 685 e, 692 N, 773 a |
| II. | 12 N, 119 eN, 128 s, 179 e, 215 N, 229 e, 231 h, 271 e, 375 N, 464 N, 479 N, 535 N, 729 e, 738 eF |
| III. | 22 a, 41 a, 43 s, 80 Ne, 182 λ, 319 e, 363 N, 369 e, 376 eN, 381 N, 587 N, 599 N, 601 N, 676 N |
| IV. | 6 N, 7 N, 25 N, 77 N, 97 N, 144 N, 180 N, 199 N, 271 N |
| V. | 421 M, 617 u, 642 N |
| VI. | 231 h, 302 h, 348 N, 405 N, 450 s, 454 MN |
| IX. | 96 M, 202 Senat., 304 N, 381 M, 442 N, 516 F, 655 K, 796 N |
| X. | 59 Fr1, 483 K, 510 NH, 518 KN, 602 M |
| XI. | 112 M, Vratislav., 475 Vratislav., 682 h |
| XII. | 551 M |
| XIII. | 91 N, 121 M |
| XIV. | 87 Mnμ, 199 N, 473 N, 501 μ, 685 N, 734 F |
| XV. | 151 F, 232 a5, 248 a8, 270 F, 316 Fa5, 406 F, 412 a8, 512 a5, 630 A, 657 a5, 741 F, 784 F, 806 v |

**Codices which preserve -is readings:** a Bernensis (Munari 37), N Neapolitanus (M 206), π Parisinus (M 270), e Harleianus (M 166), s Bruxellensis (M 61),
It is worthwhile, after looking at the survival of -is forms in Ovid, where, at best, there is a ratio of one -is to four -es, to turn to Vergil, where the position is strongly contrasted, with -is in the predominant: this state of affairs in Vergil is owed to the much older manuscript authority. For statistical examination I took at random Books II, IV and VIII of the Aeneid: in Book II there are 44 cases of -is and 34 of -es; in Book IV 44 -is and 40 -es: and in Book VIII 43 of -is and 36 of -es: the ratio is almost constant in favour of -is.

What is interesting in the pattern which emerges of Vergil's usage is that the choice of -is or -es is governed only very rarely by the position of the word in the line, its connection with other words (i.e. adjective or participle with noun) or general principles of euphony: in an overwhelming proportion of cases words fall into categories for which -is or -es is the uniform spelling: thus -is is the standard form for accusative plural participles. A table is given below of how -is and -es forms are distributed in Aeneid II, IV and VIII respectively.

### -is forms

- opes II. 4, 603; IV. 75; VIII. 317, 364; inopes VIII. 100; voces II. 98, 280, 768; IV. 439, 460, 463; VIII. 70; comites II. 181, 744; nepotes II. 194; clamores II. 222; sedes II. 232, 437, 642, 760, 785; VIII. 244, 362, 667; pedes II. 273, 673; labores II. 284, 306, 362; IV. 78; VIII. 291, 378, 439; vices II. 433; trabes II. 448; fores II. 450; VIII. 130; postes II. 490; moles II. 497, 608; penates II. 514; IV. 21, 598; grates II. 537; cineres II. 587; IV. 427; arces II. 615; IV. 234, 260; VIII. 375; vires II. 617; IV. 175; VIII. 687; ignes II. 686; matres II. 797; patres IV. 682; montes II. 804; IV. 155; degeneres IV. 13; amores IV. 28, 292; urbes IV. 173, 187, 225, 609; VIII. 290, 434; memores IV. 539; immemores IV. 194; leges IV. 213, 231, 618; VIII. 322; manes IV. 427; latices IV. 454, 512; mentes IV. 487; furores IV. 501; priores IV. 534; classes IV. 537; faces IV. 567, 604; rates IV. 593; VIII. 107; preces IV. 612; VIII. 60, 574; pecudes IV. 636; vestes IV. 648; cruores IV. 687; colores IV. 701; frondes VIII. 32; duces VIII. 120, 503; orbes VIII. 137, 448; daptes VIII. 186; honores VIII. 189; boves VIII. 213; coles VIII. 216; laudes VIII. 287; angues VIII. 289; caedes VIII. 483, 709; oratores VIII. 505; equites VIII. 555; vetere VIII. 600; apices VIII. 664.

### -es forms

- ingentis II. 20; VIII. 204, 475; omnis II. 40, 66, 102, 266, 498, 598, 750; IV. 59, 141, 496, 581, 630; VIII. 26, 566; hostis II. 43, 358, 377, 511, 527, 632; ferentis II. 49; IV. 430; auris II. 81, 119; IV. 428, 440; VIII. 582; euntis II. 111; dulcis II. 138; IV. 33, 281, 342; ardentia II. 210, 734; qualis II. 223; talis IV. 551; fatalis II. 237; timentis II. 273; ignis II. 276, 502, 624, 664; VIII. 199, 267, 410, 590; crinis II. 277; IV. 509, 559; VIII. 34; penatis II. 293, 717, 747; VIII. 11, 543; navis II. 399; IV. 398; VIII. 546; ruitus II. 440; IV. 401; postis II. 442, 480; VIII. 227; turris II. 445; labantis II. 463; stantis II. 485; merentis II. 585; mortalis II. 605; montis II. 636; IV. 151; VIII. 692; mollis II. 683; IV. 66, 423; tenuis II. 791; pallentis IV. 26, 243; manis IV. 34, 387, 490; bidentis IV. 57; VIII. 544; biremis VIII. 79; binembris VIII. 293; pinguis IV. 62; dotus IV. 104; patentis IV. 153; amantis IV. 221, 520; celeris IV. 226, 270, 357; partis
Each word, or type of word, belongs predominantly to the -is group or to the -es group: it is comparatively rare for a word to switch from one group to the other, and instances of this within Books II, IV and VIII are limited.

Participles, we have seen, belong almost exclusively to the -is group: there is only one -es accusative participle in the Aeneid, tondentes (III. 538). The -es group consists, in the main, of what might be called 'ordinary' nouns and a handful of adjectives which tend towards the prosaic (inopes, veteres, degeneres, priores). The -is group, besides participles, contains the majority of adjectives, and 'special' nouns which tend to have epic or heroic associations (hostis, ignis, crinis, funis, navis, manis, turris): there seems to be no particular explanation of what puts a noun in the 'special' -is class (e.g. why rates, trabes, vestes, arces or colles are -es forms, and auris, partis, gentis and finis -is forms): all that seems possible is some sort of placing of words based on the principle of observation and likelihood, that if a word appears in one form in one place, it is more likely than not to occur thus everywhere. It is worth noticing, in passing, that groups of words, or opposites, fall within the same spelling: thus memores-immemores, opes-inopes, comites-nepotes-matres-patres-duces-oratores-equites, pecudes-boves, but qualis-talis, difficilis-facilis, gravis-levis, dulcis-mollis-tenuis.

Some idea and comparison of Ovid's usage of -is can now be gained by turning to the 113 instances where -is is suggested on manuscript authority in the Metamorphoses, and seeing where Ovid departs from Vergil's practice. The list which follows is largely self-explanatory: a letter Y signifies a usage in accordance with Vergil, with references to Aeneid II, IV and VIII, or if necessary elsewhere in the Aeneid, in brackets: all other references are specified: NV signifies that the accusative of the word in question is not found in Vergil, and X that the usage is contrary to Vergil's.

**Met. I.**

117 inaequalis NV (but cf. X. 194 and Met. XV. 741) Y; 149 madentis Y (XII. 100); 153 montis Y (II. 636; IV. 151; VIII. 692); 228 seminecis Y (IX. 455); 304 leonis X (leones Eel. IV. 22; Ecl. V. 27; Aen. X 157); 305 tigris Y (VI. 805); 370 secantis NV participle Y; 389 sortis X (sortes VI. 72); 685 mollis Y (II. 683; IV. 66, 423); 692 sequentis Y (Georg. I. 33); 773 penatis Y (II. 293, 717, 747; VIII. 11, 543).

**Met. II.**

12 viridis Y (VIII. 96); 119 vomentis NV participle Y; 128 volentis Y (Georg. IV. 561); 179 patentis Y (IV. 153); 215 gentis Y (VIII. 13); 229 ferventis Y (XI. 195); 231 cineris X (cineres II. 587; IV. 427); 271 ignis Y (II. 276, 502, 624, 664; VIII. 199, 267, 410, 590); 375 rubentis Y (Georg. IV. 47); 464 fontis Y (Georg. II. 175); 479 unguis NV (cf. ungues, Ciris 507) X; 535 nigrantis Y (V. 97); 729 ignis Y (cf. Met. II. 271); 738 tris Y (VIII. 429 (bis), 430, 564); 22 sequentis Y (cf. Met. I. 692); 41 orbis Y (Georg. II. 153); 43 levis Y (VIII. 624); 80 obstantis NV participle Y; 182 omnis Y (II. 40, passim); 319 gravis Y (IV. 688); 363 iacentis Y (IX. 329); 369 vocis X (voces 11.98, 280, 768; IV. 439, 460, 463; VIII. 60).
376 mollis Y (cf. Met. I. 685); 381 omnis Y (cf. Met. III. 182); 587 salientis NV participle Y; 599 levis Y (cf. Met. III. 43); 601 recentis Y (Georg. III. 301); 676 obstantis Y (cf. Met. III. 80).

Met. IV 6 crinalis Y (VII. 403); 7 frondentis Y (IV. 399); 26 titubantis NV participle Y; 77 auris Y (II. 81, 119; IV. 428, 440; VIII. 582); 97 spumantis Y (IX. 456); 144 iacentis Y (cf. Met. III. 363); 180 levis Y (cf. Met. III. 43); 199 brumalis NV (but cf. Lucretius V. 616) Y; 271 auris Y (cf. Met. IV. 77).

Met. V 421 terribilis Y (VIII. 266); 617 crinalis Y (cf. Met. IV. 6); 642 anguis Y (VIII. 433, 697).

Met. VI 231 imbris Y (Georg. IV. 115); 302 exanimis NV (but cf. Ovid Aru. I. 7.53) probably Y; 348 vetantis NV participle Y; 405 vestis X (vestes IV. 2); 450 celeris Y (IV. 226, 270, 357); 454 similis NV (but cf. dissimilis, Lucretius VI. 775 and Met. XV. 316) Y.

Met. VII 132 parantis NV participle Y; 171 talis Y (IV. 551); 205 montis Y (cf. Met. I. 153); 221 levis Y (cf. Met. III. 43); 258 flagrantis Y (XII. 65); 269 infamis NV (but cf. Horace Carm. I. 3.20) Y; 366 vitiantis NV participle Y; 373 voluerit Y (VIII. 433); 533 fontis Y (cf. Met. II. 464); 579 versantis NV participle Y; 613 ignis Y (cf. Met. II. 271); 625 generntis NV participle Y; 649 qualis Y (II. 223); 709 recentis Y (cf. Met. III. 601); 752 dulcis Y (II. 138; IV. 33, 281, 342); 769 sequentis Y (cf. Met. I. 692).

Met. VIII 88 hostis Y (II. 43, 358, 377, 511, 527, 632); 609 natantis NV participle Y.

Met. IX 96 aegre Y (VIII. 349); 202 omnis Y (cf. Met. III. 182); 304 silicis NV (cf. silices, Moretum 23) Y; 381 omnis Y (cf. Met. III. 182); 442 gentis Y (cf. Met. II. 215); 516 ignis Y (cf. Met. II. 271); 655 viridis Y (cf. Met. II. 12); 796 ignis Y (cf. Met. II. 271).

Met. X 59 cedentis NV participle Y; 483 talis Y (cf. Met. VII. 171); 510 dolentis NV participle Y; 518 levis Y (cf. Met. III. 43); 602 inertis Y (Ecl. VIII. 24).

Met. XI 112 arenstis Y (Georg. IV. 268); 475 pendentis Y (VIII. 632); 682 crinis Y (II. 277; IV. 509, 559; VIII. 34).


Met. XIII 91 ignis Y (cf. Met. II. 271); 121 hostis Y (cf. Met. VIII. 88).

Met. XIV 87 fumantus Y (XI. 908); 199 madentis Y (cf. Met. I. 149); 473 tristis Y (Georg. IV. 531); 501 levis Y (cf. Met. III. 43); 685 omnis Y (cf. Met. III. 182); 734 uenatis NV participle Y.

Met. XV 151 timentis NV participle Y; 232 anitis Y (VII. 416); 248 ignis Y (cf. Met. II. 271); 270 fontis Y (cf. Met. II. 464); 316 similis Y (cf. Met. VI. 454); 406 levis Y (cf. Met. III. 43); 412 coloris X (colores IV. 701); 512 mollis Y (cf. Met. I. 685); 630 tenentis NV participle Y; 657 talis Y (cf. Met. VII. 171); 741 aequalis Y (X. 194); 784 terribilis Y (cf. Met. V. 421); 806 ensis X (enses III. 237).

In the main, Ovid's usage follows that of Vergil with remarkable unanimity; the important divergence, only one, is shown in nine places of difference: leonis (Met. I. 384), sortis (I. 389), cineris (II. 231), anguis (II. 479), vocis (III. 369), vestis (IV. 405), silicis (IX. 304), coloris (XV. 412), and enis (XV. 806). It seems that Ovid accepted Vergil's basic pattern, but was willing, on occasion, to modify it by bringing into the -is group some of the 'ordinary' nouns which had, with Vergil, been in the -es group. No post-Augustan or Silver Age poet
has a manuscript tradition as reliable as Vergil’s, and therefore nowhere have -is spellings been preserved as thoroughly as in Vergil’s text: but it would seem that there was a general tendency for post-Augustan writers to introduce -is forms, as did Ovid, into words which had been used with -es in Vergil: thus we find *ratis* for *rates* (Lucan II. 676), *arcis* for *arces* (Lucan VI. 14), *ratis* again for *rates* (Statius Silv. III. 2. 73), and *urbis* for *urbes* (Statius Theb. III. 221).

The evidence, therefore, may be summarised thus: Vergil is the only author whose textual tradition is such that we can be sure that most genuine -is spellings have been preserved in his poems. And on Vergil’s evidence words preserve, except in certain rare instances, the same termination, whether -es or -is, throughout. The evidence as far as Ovid is concerned is that surviving examples of the -is form suggest that he closely followed Vergil’s pattern except where he may have been willing to write with an -is termination a few ‘ordinary’ nouns which had ended in -es in Vergil. And although the higher proportion of -is forms in Books I, II, III and VII of the *Metamorphoses* accounts for a definite, though small, loss in the other books, far stronger evidence to support more widespread loss is provided by the uneven distribution of surviving -is forms, nine between Book IV. 6-271, six between Book VI. 231-454, and two at Book XIII. 91 and 121, when the remainder of these books have no -is forms at all, and when Book V III has only two examples and Book XII only one. This uneven distribution runs quite counter to the evidence of Vergil, and for no sound reason: it stems solely from the poor manuscript authority for the *Metamorphoses*. To take but one example, Vergil, as we have seen, used the accusative *ignis*; the form *ignes* as an accusative is exceptional in his poetry. In the *Metamorphoses*, *ignis* as an accusative is attested seven times (II. 271, 729; VII. 619; IX. 516, 796; X. 248): on the occasion in Book XIII, Ajax is talking of the Trojans who, under Hector’s leadership, have been burning the Greek ships (*Met.* XIII. 91-92):

> ecce ferunt Troes ferrumque ignisque lovemque in Danaas classes . . .

Here the form *ignis* is preserved and read; but later, when Ovid reverts with the same words to the theme of Hector, *ignis* has not survived: so we are asked to believe that Ovid wrote (*Met.* XIII. 384-6):

> Hectora qui solus, qui ferrum ignisque Iovemque/sustinuit tothens, unam non sustinet iram, invictumque virum vicit dolor . . .

Examples could be multiplied. Just as *solvite crinalis vittas* (*Aen.* VII. 403) influenced Ovid at *Met.* IV. 6 when he wrote *crinalis solvere vittas . . . iusset*, so too Ovid was influenced by phrases like Vergil’s *terribilis oculos* (*Aen.* VIII. 266): -is forms are preserved similarly at *Met.* V. 241 *terribilisque horatius eques* and at *Met.* XV. 784 *terribilisque tubas*; it is all the harder therefore to believe at *Met.* VII. 112, simply because no -is form is attested, that Ovid wrote *terribiles vultus* and not *terribilis vultus*. Similarly *Aen.* X. 194 *filius aequalis comitatus classe catervas* finds parallels at *Met.* I. 117 *perque hiemes aestusque et inaequalis autumnos* and *Met.* XV. 741 *porrigit aequalis media tellure lacertos*. Can we then reasonably claim at *Met.* V. 408, where there is no surviving -is termination, that Ovid wrote _inter inaequales pouverunt moenia portus?_ If we are able to replace -is in these passages, it is because the words and the language are distinctive enough to make the task easy. Equally, we may wonder, if it is possible for such conspicuous words to have been corrupted with time from -is to -es, how much more likely is it that ordinary, inconspicuous words will have undergone a degree of alteration at least as great, if not greater!

7
I propose to take one book of the *Metamorphoses*, Book IV, to show the application to Ovid of the likelihoods which have emerged. Although, in the absence of Ovid's own spelling, no distribution of *-is* to *-es* can claim authenticity, it is at least possible to suggest a rationalisation of spellings on this basis. There are, in all, 90 third declension accusative plurals in *Metamorphoses* Book IV. Nine of these are where *-is* has survived on manuscript authority (6, 7, 26, 77, 97, 144, 180, 199, 271); then the *editio princeps Romana* gives two further *-is* forms, which should be accepted as stemming in all probability from manuscript sources now lost: *tenus* (104) is an *-is* word in Vergil and never occurs as an *-es* word in his poetry, and *urbs* (212), an unusual form in Vergil, and one not found in the *Aeneid* is one of the nouns which later poets used in the *-is* range (cf. Statius Theb. II. 221). *Urbis* is also preserved at two other places (III. 339 and III. 511) by the *editio Romana*.

It is not unreasonable to presume that Ovid, like Vergil, maintained, in general, the clearly-defined boundaries between *-es* and *-is* words: the evidence tends towards that conclusion. On this basis it is possible, where an *-is* form survives for a word somewhere in the *Metamorphoses*, to reinstate *-is* in general for that word. This affects 21 places in *Metamorphoses* IV: 16 gentis cf. *Met. II. 215; IX. 442; 41 auris cf. *Met. IV. 77, 271; 81 ignis cf. *Met. II. 271, 729; VII. 613; IX. 516, 796; XIII. 91; XV 248; 194 omnis cf. *Met. III. 182, 381; IX. 202, 381; XIV 685; 246 ignis as 81; 292 montis cf. *Met. I. 153; VII. 205; 311 crinis cf. *Met. XI. 682; 385 fontis cf. *Met. II. 464; VII. 533; XV. 270; 406 ignis as 81; 441 omnis as 194; 451 iris cf. *Met. II. 738; 464 omnis as 194; 465 omnis as 194; 475 obstantis cf. *Met. III. 80, 676; 498 gravis cf. *Met. III. 319; 509 ignis as 81; 629 ignis as 81; 648 omnis as 194; 660 omnis as 194; 717 unguis cf. *Met. II. 479; 802 hastis cf. *Met. VIII. 88; XIII. 121.

Of these words *obstantis* and *unguis* do not occur in the accusative plural in Vergil: all the others are without exception *-is* words in the *Aeneid*, save in special circumstances (i.e. *ignes* II. 686, *montes* without adjective IV. 155, and *tres* X. 350). I would however keep *ignis* not *ignis* at 675 on the evidence of *Ecl.* V. 10. And in view of the uncertainty between the forms *angues* and *anguis*, it would be wiser to retain *angues* at 454, 495, 619, 792 and 803.

Then there are 29 instances involving words which, without exception, are always *-es* words in Vergil: there seems no good reason why they should not be kept as *-es* words in *Metamorphoses* IV: *sorores* (3, 305, 451, 774), *vices* (40, 72, 191), *pisces* (50), *amores* (137, 170, 191, 276), *flores* (283, 315), *latices* (353), *pedes* (363, 666), *dolores* (426), *sedes* (433), *fores* (453, 487), *preces* (472), *errores* (502), *labores* (531, 570), *cautes* (672), *nubes* (712), *victrices* (712), and *iores* (768).

Conversely there are eleven instances involving words which, though not surviving with the *-is* spelling in the *Metamorphoses*, are used with *-is* by Vergil, and seem more likely to have been *-is* than *-es* words in Ovid: *amantis* (108, 278), *parenatis* (164), *exsanguis* (267), *spatiantis* (364), *vitis* (396), *sublimis* (421), *finis* (568), *parsis* (587 and 660), and *turpis* (801). These words are spelt with *-is* wherever they occur in the *Aeneid*. For the accusative of *vis* Vergil's usual spelling was *vires*, and this should be kept at 150 and 417. But examples at *Georg.* III. 209 and 215, and *Aen.* VI. 114 and X. 786 show that *viris* may be preferred before a caesura, especially if a vowel follows, and *viris* may therefore be accepted at 528. *Arpis* is less common than *artes*, and tends to be suggestive, at *Aen.* IV. 493 of magic and at *Aen.* XI 716 of fraud. But as *artis* is the
reading at Aen. VI. 663, which was an influence on Ovid, we may accept it at 445.

There remain eight words whose spelling is less certain, either because they are not used by Vergil in the accusative plural, or for other reasons: *immunes* (5), *custodes* (85), *graciles* (176), *luces* (262), *urbes* (296), *triplices* (425), *dentes* (573), and *axes* (634).

*Denis* (573) was used by Vergil as an -es word (Georg. III. 255); it was also, if the manuscripts may be trusted, an -es word in Lucan (IX. 806; X. 446); but Statius spelt the word with the -is ending (Theb. II. 514; IX. 48; Ach. I. 749). Although there is no firm proof that Ovid wrote *dentes*, the editio Romana preserves the form at III. 103, when, as at IV. 573, the accompanying adjective is *vipereos*: it seems quite likely therefore that Ovid wrote *dentis* at IV. 573, even if he did not use the -is form of the word everywhere. Similarly *urbis* may be accepted at 296: it too was one of the words which was used increasingly in the -is class, and the editio Romana preserves examples of *urbis* at III. 339 and 511, and at IV. 212.

Neither *custos* nor *lux* (85 and 262) appears in the accusative plural in Vergil: but both are nouns of the -es category, and are found thus at Lucan V. 198 (*custodes*) and Lucretius V. 681 (*luces*). Lucan I. 101 corroborates the form *gracilis* (176), not *graciles*. *Triplices* (425) is difficult: Statius at Theb. II. 454 writes *triplices*, but the evidence of Vergil, who writes *duplicis* (Aen. IV. 470; X. 667), points in the opposite direction. It would be safer to retain the given text *triplices*.

The accusative plural of *axis* does not occur in Lucretius or Vergil. Although Statius writes *axis* as the plural in his epic (Theb. VIII. 83; X. 479, 828; XII. 650), the form *axes* occurs at Silvae IV. 3.136, Lucan II. 237 and Juvenal IV. 117, as well as at Ovid Am. I. 6.65: *axes* should therefore be retained at Met. IV. 634.

The accusative form *immunis* is not attested in poetry: *immunes* does not occur often either, and the word seems to have been used sparingly by the poets. However *immunes* is the manuscript reading at Ovid Am. II. 14.1, Ep. XIV. 8, E.P. IV. 9.102, and Trist. IV. 2.62, as well as at Lucan VIII. 704, and should therefore be read at Met. IV. 5.

Of necessity the information which appears above is in no way comprehensive. It stems in the main from work on a particular book, *Metamorphoses* IV, and I am conscious that much which deserves attention remains unsaid, especially regarding the use of the -is form in the poets of the Silver Age, a large subject which deserves treatment in its own right. But I hope at least that the foregoing presentation of certain simple facts concerning -is, especially in Vergil, will combat a tendency among some to deduce from instances of -is and -es theories of sound-relationships and euphony which are largely illusory.

MARTIN PULBROOK
Bedford College, University of London

NOTES
1: There are certain other cases, such as where an -is ending is suggested by the editio princeps Romana of 1471 alone. For these, see later.
3: Cf. *penates, postes, montes, maris, orbes, angues, ignes*. The ending -is seems more likely with an adjacent adjective (Aen. II. 636, 717, 747; IV. 9.
151; VIII. 11, 437, 543, 675), -es without any adjective (Aen. II. 490, 514, 804; IV. 155); but each word has its own range for -is and -es. Ignes (II. 686) and manes (IV. 427) are exceptional cases in the Aeneid, the one representing the unusual nature of fire as a kindly substance, the other a rare example of euphony after cineres.

4: Cf. Georg. I. 25, which is remarked upon specially by Valerius Probus (Gellius XIII. 21).

*** A general word must be said about my indebtedness to Ribbeck (Prolegomena, 1866, pp. 405-413, and Second Edition, 1894-5). Although I occasionally disagree with his conclusions (cf. II. 598; III. 180; VIII. 410; IX. 129 and 456), the sheer comprehensiveness of his work remains unsurpassed. And I would like also to thank Dr. J. B. Hall, of Bedford College, who read a draft of this paper and made several invaluable suggestions.
Note on Appendix I

This appendix, though not published until 1973, was originally written in the earlier half of 1972. For further information about -ie endings, and for details discovered since 1972, see the Introduction, Part II.iv.
Second Declension Proper Nouns in -os and -us: A Study on their Use in the Nominative in the Aeneid and in the Metamorphoses

(with special reference to Metamorphoses Book IV)

In the whole of the Aeneid, Vergil uses second-declension -os/-us proper nouns in the nominative on 395 occasions. 208 of these 395 instances (approx. 52%) are of proper nouns of non-Greek origin, in other words of nouns for which the Latin -us termination was the natural one. There are 180 instances (approx. 45%) of words which are spelt by Vergil with the -us termination, but which originated as Greek words ending in -os. Only rarely does Vergil preserve in the Aeneid an actual -os spelling: of the total of 395 usages only 7 (just under 2%) are of -os forms. The table below shows, by books, distribution of words in these three categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pure Latin 1 -us forms</th>
<th>5- 1- 1- 0- 9- 9-35-21-28-40-22-37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original -os forms used with -us ending</td>
<td>14-27-15- 3-33-15-10- 7-29-15- 6- 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained -os forms</td>
<td>0- 2- 2- 1- 1- 0- 0- 0- 0- 0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern which emerges is consistent with the move from a Graeco-Trojan world towards Italian influence as the poem progresses. Latin -us forms, rare in the first six books, and outnumbered by Greek -os words spelt with the -us termination, are used in greater proportion in Books VII-XII, where Greek -os words spelt with -us tend to be fewer; and it is no coincidence that words spelt with a retained Greek -os ending are confined entirely to the first half of the poem. It is a sign of Vergil's wish that things Greek should be forgotten as Aeneas and his followers move onwards to Italy.

Where Vergil's use of -os/-us nominatives is evidence of a growing striving for Roman-Italian influence as the poem proceeds, Ovid's style and purpose in the Metamorphoses is altogether different: he uses nominative proper names in -os/-us
with less frequency than Vergil (only 286 instances in 15 books as against Vergil's 395 in 12 books), thereby lessening in the Metamorphoses a certain amount of the aura of formality which pervades the Aeneid. And Ovid's subject matter, more Greek-based than Vergil's, not surprisingly has a greater proportion of Greek -os words used with -us (181, approx. 64%) than of pure Latin -us forms (37, approx. 13%). Vergil used actual -os spellings only very rarely (approx. 2%); but Ovid resorts with much greater freedom to this form: the manuscripts (as reported by Magnus in the apparatus criticus of his Berlin edition, 1914) preserve 68 instances of it (approx. 23%). The table below shows, by books, the distribution for the Metamorphoses of the same three categories as in the earlier table for the Aeneid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Latin -us</th>
<th>-os as -us</th>
<th>retained -os</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-18</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>10-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>10-2</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is of interest that Roman influence reaches its peak in Met.XIV, and that that book alone of the books of the poem has, as was the case in Aen.VII-XII, no examples of retained -os forms.

Vergil's seven uses in the Aeneid of the -os form are Tenedos (II.21), Epeos (II.264), Zacynthos (III.270), Neritos (III.271), Tyros (IV.670), Demoleos (V.265) and Cocytos (VI.132). Tenedos, Zacynthos and Neritos are the only three -os islands mentioned in the nominative in the Aeneid, and the unanimous -os spelling suggests that the Greek islands as a group of words retained their Greek spelling in Latin. This fact is corroborated, as will be shown later, by the evidence of Ovid. Two of Vergil's other uses of -os are to a certain extent psychological, suggesting the specially Greek qualities and character of the person concerned: the -os of Epeos (II.264) emphasizes the Greek origin of the one thing most responsible for the fall of Troy, the wooden horse, and the effect of Demoleos (V.265) is almost nostalgic, looking back to the past at Troy, and to things which are no more. antiqua Tyros (IV.670) suggests a mighty city influenial in earlier times. About Cocytos (VI.132) there is room for doubt: although the codex Mediceus preserves Cocytos as against Cocytos of the other manuscripts, Ribbeck (ed.1894-95) does not accept the -os termination into his text. However, if it were to be accepted, the effect would be primarily sural, emphasizing, as for instance Letumque Labosque (VI.277), the oppressive gloom of the underworld.

While, therefore, the retention of the -os spelling is rare
enough in the Aeneid for each example of the form to have its own individual effect, the effect in the Metamorphoses is not so much individual as cumulative. There are occasions when Ovid's spelling conflicts with that of Vergil: at Met.XV.438 Ovid writes Helenos, while on four occasions in Aeneid III Vergil's spelling is Helenus (346, 369, 559 and 712). Where the alternatives Paphos and Paphus exist, Vergil chooses Paphus at Aen.X.86, and also probably at X.51 (R gives Paphos here, but M and P Paphus as at 86); Ovid, with a predilection for place-names in -os (Claro I.516, Orchomenos VI.416, Corinthos VI.416, Pylos VI.418, Epiros VIII.283 and XIII.720, Olenos X.69 and Buthrotos XIII.721, the last being chosen in preference to the more common Buthrotum) would in all likelihood have chosen the form Paphos if he had used the word. However, the difference in extent of the use of the retained -os form between Vergil and Ovid is not due alone to different spellings, one with -us, and one with -os, of the same word. As the lack of any -os spellings in Aeneid VII-XII suggests, Vergil made a positive effort in the Aeneid to avoid words for which -os was the natural spelling: it is significant that in the 3,037 lines of the Eclogues and Georgics combined, there is only one less proper name ending in -os than in the 9,896 lines of the whole of the Aeneid (cf. Ecl. VI.13 and VIII.44, and Georg.II.90 and 487, III.6 and IV.210).

Of the 180 instances in the Aeneid of words which originated with a Greek -os termination, but are spelt with -us, the great majority are words which the Romans assimilated into their own language and culture: thus -us is the standard Latin spelling for some of the gods inherited from the Greek tradition (Aeolus, Bacchus, Phoebus), for winds, stars and places (Eurus, Notus, Zephyrus, Sirius, Caucasus), for legendary figures and mythical places (Polyphemus, Deedalus, Minotaurus, Cephalus, Tartarus), and for names which, though Greek in origin, had a specially Roman significance (Ascanius, Priamus, Iulus, Euryalus, Niscus, Eueandros). Other words in this category are of less obviously Latin importance, and their -us terminations may be ascribed generally to Vergil's wish to see people and events from a Roman viewpoint.

Although Ovid accepted, like Vergil, -us terminations for gods, winds and mythological figures inherited from Greece, his subject matter meant that more Greek -os forms were retained. As in Vergil, the Greek islands are always spelt with -os in the Metamorphoses: Tenedos I.516 (cf. Tenedos, Aen.II.21), Naxos III.640 (cf. Naxos, Aen.III.125), Delos VI.191 and 333, and VIII.224 (cf. Delos, Georg.III.6), Oliaros VII.469 (cf. Olearon, Aen.III.126), Tenos VII.469, Andros VII.469, XIII.649 and 661, Gyros VII.470, Pepearethos VII.470, Samos VIII.224, Paros VIII.224 (cf. Paros, Aen.III.126), Lebinths VIII.222, Lemnos XIII.46 and 313, and Pharos XV.287. Ovid uses -os often also for other geographical names, and occasionally these have parallels in
Vergil: Parnasos I.317 and II.221, Claros I.516, Sperchios I.579 (cf. Georg.II.487), Amphrysos I.580, Peneos II.213, Iasemos II.244 and VI.224, Alpheos II.250, Cephisos III.343, Caystros V.386, Orchomenos VI.416, Corinthis VI.416, Pylos VI.418, Epiros VIII.283 and XIII.720 (cf. Georg.I.59), Olenos X.69, Buthrotos XIII.721, Peychynos XIII.725, Peloros XIII.727, Anigros XV.282, and Tyros XV.288 (cf. Aen.IV.573). To a greater extent than Vergil, Ovid used the -os termination for the names of people and animals: we have seen that Ovid wrote Helenos where Vergil had Helenus, while elsewhere Ovid's Tityos (Met.IV.457) is matched by Vergil's Tityon (Aen.VI.595). Otherwise Ovid uses -os for people or animals on 25 occasions (cf. Met.II.559, 560, 739, 749 and 785, III.210, 211, 220, 222, 224 and 233, V.302, VIII.299, 385 and 515, IX.356, XI.642 and 791, XII.305, 307, 308 and 310, and XV.20). A notable feature here is for a cluster of -os forms to develop for a particular scene; this occurs in the Battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs (XII.305, 307, 308 and 310) and, more strikingly, in the story of Actaeon (III.210-233). More will be said about these clusters later.

Retained -os forms were by nature liable to be corrupted into the more usual -us; even 5th-century manuscripts of Vergil are not immune from this fault. In seven of the total of thirteen cases of retained -os in the Eclogues, the Georgics, and the Aeneid, one or other of the 5th-century manuscripts has a reading in -us, R(EcI.VI.13), V(EcI.VIII.44), PR(Georg.II.487), R(Georg.IV.210), R(Aen.II.21), M(Aen.V.265) and PR(Aen.VI.132). It follows that the extent of corruption is likely to be appreciably greater in the Metamorphoses, where the earliest manuscript sources are of the 9th century (fragments only), and where, more generally, the text of the poem depends on late 10th or 11th century manuscripts. In the first three books of the poem, two of the earliest manuscripts, the Harley fragment (ε) and the Leipzig fragment (λ), are alone in preserving five -os readings otherwise lost: Parnasos I.317 (ε), Oribasios III.210 (λ), Nebrophonos III.210 (λ), Asbolos III.218 (λ), and Theocritus II.220 (λ). These five examples represent roughly 20% (5/24) of all surviving -os forms in Books I-III, which serves as an indication of what may be lost elsewhere. In ten other cases, the Leipzig and Harley fragments, as well as κ, a surviving part of the lost codex Spirensis, preserve an -os reading which also survives in only one or two other important manuscripts: Parnasos II.224 (ε F), Peneos II.243 (ε F), Iasemos II.244 (ε MN), Alpheos II.250 (ε FN), Aglauros II.560 (ε F), Nebrophonos III.214 (λ N), Harpalos III.222 (ε MN), Orisasitrophos II.233 (λ, Berol, Rhen.4), Cephisos III.343 (ε Al), and Amphissos IX.356 (κ N).

Mention was made above of clusters of -os forms, as at III.240-233, where ε and to an even greater extent λ played a considerable part in supporting -os spellings. Two other such
clusters occur at VIII.298-317 and at XII.302-311:

VIII.298 diffugient populi nec se nisi moenibus urbis esse putant tutos, donec Meleagros et una
300 lecta manus iuvenum colere cupidine laudis:
Tyndaridae gemini, spectandus caestibus alter,
alter eque, primaque ratis molitor Iason
et cum Pirithoo, felix concordia. Theseus
et duo Theseiadeae et proles Aphaeris, Lyaneus
305 et uelox Idae, et iam non feminae Caeneus
Leucippusque ferox iaculloque insignis Acetas
Hippothoosque Dryasque et cretus Amyntore Phoenix
Actorieaeque pares et missus ab Elide Phyleus,
nec Telamon aberat magnique creator Achillis
310 omque Pheretinde et Hyanteo Tolao
impiger Eurytion et cursu iniquus Ecthon
Nercedesque Lelex Panopeque Hyleaque feroxque
Hippneus et primis etiamum Nestor in ennis,
et quos Hippocoon antiquis misit Amycles,
315 Penelopeaque socer cum Parrhasio Ancie,
Ampycesque sagax et adhuc a coniuge tutus
317 Cecides nemorisque deus Teseoa Lycae.

XII.302 fugit et Orneus Lycaesque et saucius armo
dexteriore Medon et cum Piseneor Theumas,
quique pedum nuper certamine uicerat omnis,
305 Memereros (accepte tum uilnere tardius ibat),
et Pholus et Melaneus et Abas praedator eorum,
quique suis frustra bellum dissuaserat, sugur
Astylus: ille etiam metuenti uulnera Nessos
'ne fugas': ed Herculeos' inguit 'seruabris arcus'.
310 at non Euynomus Lycaesque at Areos et Imbreus
311 effugere necem.

In both these passages some -os forms survive, as they did at
III.210-233 without the evidence of $\lambda$. But as neither Book VIII
nor Book XII has any manuscript source as authoritative as
$\epsilon$ and $\lambda$ for Books I-III, it is likely that some -os forms
have been lost in both these passages.

It is worth, at this point, remarking upon the fact that
although Vergil from time to time preserves the nominative -os
termination in proper nouns, this never happens with Greek-
derived descriptive and personal adjectives, where -ios, -aioi,
-eioi terminations invariably occur as the Latinized -ius, -aeus
or -eus forms. Ovid's usage appears to conform exactly with
Vergil's, as there are no examples in the Metamorphoses of -os
being preserved with a personal adjective. It is for this reason
that Hyleaque (213), alone of the -os/us words in the cluster-
passage of Met.III, does not survive with an -os termination.
Similarly, in the passage from Book VIII, it is possible to be
sure that Narycius (312), as an adjective, should be spelt with the -us termination, and not Nerycius.

In three instances in the passage from Met.VIII (Leucippos 306, Acastus 306 and Hippeus 313), and in three more instances in Book XII (Orneus 302, Pholus 306 and Euryonymus 310) -us terminations have survived rather than those in -os. But the evidence of the Leipzig fragment in Book III, as a result of which all -os/-us words within the cluster which could have had the -os spelling appeared in that form, makes it seem likely that each of these six words in Books VIII and XII should be spelt with the -os termination. And there is perhaps support for the form Hippesos (VIII.313) at Met.XII.352, where Ovid writes Hippeason. This does not make Hippasus impossible, for we find Pegasos at Met.IV.786 and Pegasos at Met.V.262; but Pegasus was one of those mythical figures whom the Romans adopted into their own heritage, and Latinized with an -us termination. The name Hippasus, or Hippasos, is more obscure, and an -os termination therefore correspondingly more likely, quite apart from the presence of the -os cluster.

In Metamorphoses IV there are 17 words which have -os/-us nominative spellings. Two of these, Rhodos (204) and Titys (457) survive on manuscript authority as -os words. Another, Neptunus (539), is a Latin -us word. There are two adjectives, Nyctellius (15) and Lemnius (185) which, on the basis of what was said earlier about Greek -ios adjectives, should retain their Latin -ius terminations. Five names of Greek origin, Iacchus (15), Phoebus (349), Hermaphroditus (383), Cadmus (572), and Acrisius (608), were sufficiently Romanised for -us to be their natural termination in Latin. The form Cerberus (450), and not Cerberos, is justified by Vergil (Aen.VI.417), whose underworld scene Ovid follows closely in this part of Book IV. No sign of any -os termination survives on manuscript authority for Pyramus on any of the four occasions where the name occurs (55, 70, 107 and 146), and on the supposition that if Ovid had written Pyramos, traces of the -os spelling would have been evident in some manuscripts in one at least of the four places, it is safe to prefer Pyramus to Pyramos. Hymenaeus, not Hymeneos, is Magnus's reading at 758 (as also at VI.429, IX.796 and X.2); none of the manuscripts which he uses gives the reading Hymeneos. Slater, however, in his apparatus criticus (Oxford, 1927), suggests that Hymeneos may have been the reading, subsequently obscured by overwriting, of the first hand of the codex Palatinus 1669. (After inspecting the manuscript on film, I would think it rash to assume that the -us ending hides an -os form: the mistake could have been anything, and certainly no clearer indication of any 'o' is visible.) As no further indication of Ovid's use of Hymeneos occurs, according to Slater, in the codex Palatinus or any other manuscript at VI.429, IX.796
or X.2, we may take Hymenaeus to be the correct form. A second reason in support of the -us termination is that Hymenaeus is a word made up from the simple noun Hymen and the adjectival suffix -aioς (the form Hymenaeus reveals its adjectival properties in the refrain of Catullus LXI). The accusative Hymenaeon (Met.XII.215) does not contradict this interpretation, but exists as a metrically convenient alternative for the difficult Hymenaeum.

Orchamus makes its only appearance in recorded Latin literature at Met.IV.212; this fact alone means that it would not have been among those words which, like Phoebus or Bacchus or Eurus, became naturally assimilated, through constant use, into the Latin language with an -us termination. Further, there is at this point in Book IV a cluster of Greek word-forms, not exclusively of the -os kind mentioned earlier, but still wholly Greek in feeling: Clymene (204), Rhodos (204), Circes (205), Clytie (206), Leucothoe (207), and Eurynome (210). In these circumstances the reading Orchamos at 212 would be entirely in keeping with the Greek feeling of these lines, and I have printed it in the text for Orchamus of the manuscripts.

Footnotes:

1 including Umbrian, Sabine, Etruscan words etc.

2 Magnus's information that Planudes also retains an -os reading can be ignored as -os was the inevitable Greek transcription of the Latin -us.

3 also conjectured by Heinsius before the -os of the MSS. was known

4 but beware readings of this kind attested by Berol and Rhen; see Introduction, pp.71-72.

5 Hippothoosque is from Heinsius's codex Sixianus. The reading is not accepted into the text by Magnus, Merkel or, more recently, Hollis, although λ's Theos (III.220) has proved Heinsius's Hippothoe here beyond contention.

6 Astilus is the reading of M, and the -us ending was accepted by Merkel in the days of belief in the absolute supremacy of M. Magnus rightly accepts the -os of F and N.

7 It is no.365 (Ε) in Munari's catalogue.
The Supernumerary Line found between vv. 91 and 92

Before the discovery of v. 91a in MSS., Merkel had already suggested, by the deletion of v. 92, that the latter part of v. 91 belonged not with what followed but with the preceding words pacta placet. There is inherent logic in this interpretation: Pyramus and Thisbe meet at dawn to agree on their plans for escape (vv. 81-83), and we may assume that pacta placet too (v. 91) is set in the early morning: that being so, it is natural to take lux tarde discedere uisa est as referring to the slowness with which the rest of the day appears to pass for Pyramus and Thisbe, who are waiting eagerly for the evening (v. 84). If we accept this interpretation of v. 91 (with uisa est, from the manuscripts DNOWYZ, at the end of the line), then v. 92 cannot be correct as it stands: either we must delete it with Merkel, or consider it together with the extra line found in MSS. 84, 164, 165, 183 and 390.

The authority of these five manuscripts, and therefore of the supernumerary line itself, is not ostensibly convincing. Three of the MSS. (nos. 84, 165 and 390) cannot be dated more precisely than to the 15th century, and, of the other two, MS. 164 was written in 1456 and MS. 183 in 1459. Against this, however, must be set the fact that these five MSS., either singly or as a group, do occasionally preserve correct readings which have been lost in many earlier manuscripts or in the majority of manuscripts of the poem: thus we find in them celebresse v. 46, relinquit v. 104, longe v. 123, radientia v. 193, brumalis v. 199, spargit v. 250, obstupuit v. 346, erratibus v. 567, abit ut v. 712, ferarumque v. 780, and referret v. 797; and in addition they have the readings seducat v. 372, Leucothoeque v. 542, and carallis v. 750, which, though not correct, are examples of variants from the truth not found widely, if at all, in other MSS., and which therefore suggest a considerable degree of independence. None of these examples is as striking as the presence of v. 91a (if that is correct, and Ovidian in origin), but they do at least suggest that the survival, in MSS. 84, 164, 165, 183 and 390 alone, of v. 91a is not intrinsically impossible.

Stronger support for the genuineness of the line comes from a consideration of its structure and of its relationship with the surrounding ideas, particularly those of v. 92. There are three reasons which point to its being correct.
In the phrase non cursu fessus inani, non is to be taken with inani: for this splitting of non and the word with which it is to be taken, see Housman, C. 28 (1934), 130-131 (Classical Papers III.1227-1228); but while this usage is not unacceptable in Ovid, it is not the sort of stylistic nicety which would be likely to be reproduced by a humanist annotator; besides, the mildly depreciatory attitude to the gods implied by the suggestion that Phoebus is tired by his day's work, as any human being might be, is entirely Ovidian: for the same idea applied to Phoebus later in the book, see fessus ... axes at v.634.

Secondly, it is important to consider two distinct uses of praeclarae. With the dative (praeclatur aquis) it suggests a degree of force, as one object collides or merges with the other: see Met.XV.518 quadripedes ... praeclant currum scopus and Val.Plaeoc. IV.52-53 praeclata profundo siderem pars uise poli. The idea of force is less prevalent when praeclata is used with in and the accusative, which suggests a more gradual merging or joining of the two substances: see Fast. IV.164 (quoted in the Commentary) for praeclatae in and the accusative in a description of the sinking of a star gradually into the sea; and similar examples involving water are found in Ovid at Heroides X.13, and Tib. 326 and 464. Two observations may therefore be made, (a) that praeclatur aquis of the MSS. in v.92 is not in keeping with Ovid's usage elsewhere, notably at Fast. IV.164, and (b) that in Ocean ... praeclatur aquis (if vv.91a and 92 are taken together) is unparalleled as a construction: on the analogy of the other examples we should expect in Ocean ... aquis. There is good reason why, if Ovid had written aquis, it was likely to become aquis: for aquis follows later in the line, and the assimilative confusion is not a difficult one. Alternatively, if v.91a become lost, praeclatur aquis, meaningless by itself, could have been modified so as to restore sense. The repetition of the same word in a different case (aquis ... aquis) is a common feature of variatio in Ovid: see, for example, for other instances in Book IV, nuda nudis v.264, pars ... partem vv.445-446, Bacche ... Bacchi v.523, memus ... manus vv.584-585, and sequore ... sequora v.752.

The third reason in favour of v.91a is that its loss is explicable as a parebliche error (see the Introduction, Part II.,iv). All three lines 91, 91a and 92 begin with the letter 'P'; and it would not have been difficult for the eye of a scribe to pass in error from the first to the third 'P'.

The sense of the line is good, and the line itself is in keeping with Merkel's perceptive interpretation of v.91. It should be included in the text.
APPENDIX IV

A List of Places where there is Serious Misreporting of MSS

This list does not claim to be exhaustive, but gives details of the more important misreportings. Line-numbers are followed by the correct reading and manuscript concerned, with the misreported reading appended in brackets. Manuscripts are designated as follows (Munari numbers): Goth. I = 100, Goth. II = 101, Rhen. = 329, L = 131, N = 206, M = 178, F = 177A, h = 112, P = 240, Earl. 2742 = 169, g = 102, S = 313, and £ = 177B.

v. 1 mineias 100 101 (minyeias)
5 femules dominasque 329 (dominas famulasque)
10 telasque et calathos 329 (teласque calathosque)
31 placetus 329 (pactatus)
32 minicides 131 (minioides)
46 ?celebras 206 (motasse)
53 hoc placet haec 329 (haec placet hanc)
75 nimum est 329 (nimium)
91 discedere 329 (decedere)
uisa est 178 (uisa)
108 inquit nox 329 (nox inquit)
131 uisam 329 (eursam)
143 carissima 329 (carissime)
150 haec manus 177A 329 (hoc manus)
203 ipse 329 (iste)
204 climeneque rodosque 329 (Clymeneque Rhodosque)
211 uicit 329 (uincit)
242 quo 112 (qua)
282 Celme 329 (Celmi)
311 citheriac 329 (Cytoriaco)
cytheriac 240 (Cytoriaco)
341 uacuis 112 (uacuis)
347 nymphae 329 (nymphaes)
356 et meus es 169 (en meus es)
367 dimissis 329 (dimissis)
389 dicti sed 154 (dictis sed)
407 tenebras 102 (astebras)
421 alumn 329 (alumno)
446 extat uersus in 206 1 (om. 206 1 , habet 206 2 )
457 ticius 329 (Tityos)
521 sparsisque 329 (passisque)
546 scissae ... capillos 313 (scissos ... capillos)
589 reliquid 329 (relinquit)
591 teque infelix exue 1778 (teque his infelix exue)
       infelix his 329 (his infelix)
610 esse deum 329 (esse Iouis)
630 currus 112 (currus)
647 montibus 329 (moenibus)
671 in justus 329 (immitis)
718 missus praeceps 112 (missus praeceps)
769 quae 178 (qui)
786 fratres 329 (fratrem)
APPENDIX V

A List of the Differences (excluding those of an orthographical nature, and excluding the spelling of proper names) between my text and the printed texts of Regius (1513), Heinsius (1659), Jahn (1832), Magnus (1914), Slater (1927: text ex silentio from the Apparatus), Lafaye (1928), and von Albrecht (1966).

In the following list, the various editors' names are indicated by the respective names' initial letters, viz. R H J M S L V and P; in addition readings or conjectures advocated by Heinsius in his notes, but not printed by him in his 1659 text, are indicated by the sign h. It would have been desirable, perhaps, to include also details of the readings of Burman (1727) and Edwards (1894); I have omitted them because the texts of Heinsius and Burman, and of Edwards and Slater, respectively, are in many ways similar, and it seemed sufficient to quote one editor from each pair.

v.5 in(m)unesque HMLVP : immunes RJ
7 coma HMLVP : ccmis R
10 telasque calathosque HMLVP : telasque et calathos R
17 iuuentus F : iuuentas HJ : iuuenta R : iuuenta est MSLV
21 quae HP : qua RJMLV
cingtut RHMVP : ting(u)itur JSV
26-27 sustinet artus ebrius F : ebrius artus sustinet RHMMLVP
31 placatus RHMMLVP : pecatus H
33 turpantes HP : turbantes RHMMLVP
46 celebresse HJP : coluisse R : motasse MSLV
48 albis HMMLVP : altis RJ
53 hoc placet hanc SP : haec placet hanc HJ : hoc placet haec MLY : haec placet haec R
57 continuas P : contiguas RHMMLVP
64 tectus RHMMLVP : tento R
68 uidistis RHMMLVP : sensistis H
71 ubi RMLVP : ut HW
74 toto nos RMLVP : nos toto HJ
75 nimium est RMLVP : nimium HJ
86 tecta RMLVP : clausura J : saepta h
91 uisa est P : uisa RHMMLVP
91a habet P : om. RHMMLVP
92 aquas et aquis F : aquis et aquis RHMMLVP
surgit HJP : exit RMLVP
101 relinquuit IP; relinquit RJMSLV
108 inquit nox RJMSLV; nox inquit H
109 demisit RJMSLV; demittit H
112 et iacuit RJMSLV; ut iacuit H
123 tenuis (-es) ... longe HP; tenui ... longes RJMSLV
127 purpureo RMSLV; puniceo H
129 ting(u)it RMSLV; tinxit R
131 poma P; more RJMSLV
131 et uissa MLVP; et uisam RJ; et uersam H; uidet et 3
136 tremit MLSVP; fremit RJ
143 carissima HMP; carissima RJSLV
145 iam RJSP; a MLV
154 hoc tamen HJMSLV; his tamen R
155 miser meus HJMSLV; miserique mei R
166 urna ... in una P; una ... in urna RJHMSLV
170 referamus HJMSLV; referamus R
171 apte RJJSLP; arte MV
185 aenas P; eburnas RJMSLV
192 colorque RJLVP; calorque HS
200-201 transit mentis P; mentis transit RJMSLV
207 cordisque P; ipsoque RJJMSLV
224 eripit ... loquendi RJMSLV; erripit ... loquenti H
225 peruerunt HP; peruerant RJMSLV
226 relictus HJMSLV; relictus R
228 oculo P; oculus RJJMSLV
231 fuci RMVP; fusus RJSV
236 diffamatumque HSP; diffamatumque RJMVL
242 qua MLVP; quo RJJS
243 spargit HP; sparsit RJMSLV
260 siluarum JP; nympherum RJMSLV
273 et Bacchus HMLV; est Bacchus RJ
279 loquer RJMSLV; loquer R
288 puerum diua RJMSLV; puerum et diua R
297 non steriles P; nec steriles RJHMSLV
311 deducit RJMSLV; deducit R
320 tum JP; tunc RJHMSLV
323 frater RJMSLV; mater R
325 longeque bestior illa RMSLP; longeque potentior illa J; longeque potentior illis H
330 nescit quid sit amor RP; nescia quid sit amor H; nescit enim quid amor JMSLV
336 en RHMSLP; aut JV
340 flexumque HJLP; flexuque MSV; flexoque R
341 scilicet RMSLV : ut puer HJ
   ut uasius et NLSLV : ut uasius et RJ : et uasius ut H
346 obstu(1)putit HJP : stupuit RS : placuit MLV
347 nymphae HJP : nymphae RMSLV
353 ducens HJMSLV : iactans R
356 en meus est HP : et meus est RJMSLV
358 pugnamentaque RJMSLV : pugnacemque H
365-366 utue ... utque HJMSLV : utue ... utue R
367 dimissis HJMSLV : demissis R
369 commissaque HJMSLV : demissaque R
371 ut HP : et RJHJMSLV
372 diducat RJSP : seducat H : deducat MLV
375-376 conducta ... cernit RJMSLV : conducta ... cernat H
378 et forma HP : sed forma RJMSLV
379 possit RJMSLV : possint H
    necutrumque SP : neutrumque RHJMLV
    uidetur HSP ; uidetur RJMLV
382 iam non RJHMSLP : non iam V
386 et RHJSLP : ut MV
387 uerba RJESLV : uete H
388 incesto MLVP : incerto RHJS
389 et adhuc RHJMSLP : sed adhuc V
393 redolent HJSP : et olent RMLV
400 posses RHMSLV : possis J
403 collucere HJMSLV : collucent R
407 latebras HP : tenebras RJMSLV
408 tenuique includit ... pe(i)nae SP : tenuique inducit ...
    penna H : tenuique includunt ... penna MLV : tenuesque
    includunt ... pennae RJ
412 minimam pro RHJP : minimam et pro MSLV
413 leui P : leues RHJMSLV
415 tenent RJMSLV : trahunt H
421 alumn(i) RP : alumno HMSLV
426 inultos HJMSLV : multos R
433 mutes HJMSLV : multa R
436 tenet P : tenent RHJMSLV
437 qua sit RJMSLV : qua fit H
    quod ducat HP : quod ducit HJ : qua ducat MSLV
445 alias HJP : aliquae RMSLV
446 habent RSLVP : om. HJM
450 intremuit RP : ingemuit HJMSLV
451 semel MLP : simul RHJ3V
456 lacunam habet P
458 districtus P : distantus HS : distractus RJMLV
460 ruitorum RHJP : rediturum MSLV
464 acie HJMSLV : facie R
471 furores RMLVP : sorores HJS
473 sic RHJMLVP : uix S
475 colubras HJMSLV : colubros R
476 inquit RJMSLV : infit H
484 comitatur RJMSLV : comitatur H
senss $ P $ : acernas $ R H J M S L V $ 

est territa $ P $ : exterrita $ R H J M S L V $ 

incens $ J M S L V $ : incens $ R H $ 

linguasque $ H J P $ : linguasque $ R M S L V $ 

ebruptit $ R F $ : ebrumpit $ B H J M S L V $ 

uercxit $ P $ : uerigt $ H S V $ : uerit $ R F J M L $ 

motis $ M S L V P $ : motos $ R H J $ 

tendite $ R J M S L V P $ : pandite $ H $ 

ossa $ R J M S L V P $ : ossa $ H $ 

passisque $ H J M S L V P $ : spersisque $ R $ 

in medio $ R J M L P $ : in dio $ H S V $ 

graiumque $ H J M S L V P $ : gratumque $ R $ 

scissae ... capillos $ H J M S L V P $ : scissis ... capillis $ R $ 

sensit $ J M S L V P $ : sentit $ R H $ 

depressa est $ R J M S L V P $ : depredittur $ H $ 

gurgite in alto $ H P $ : gurgite in illo $ R H J K S L V $ 

sum$ (p)$tis $ H P $ : summis $ R J M S L V $ 

Ismenides $ J M S L V P $ : Cadmides $ R J $ 

erratibus $ H J P $ : erroribus $ R M S L V $ 

tum cum $ R H J M S L V P $ : tunc cum $ J $ 

comissaque $ H J M S L V P $ : commixtague $ R $ 

tenantur $ R M S L V P $ : sinuantur $ H J $ 

loquenti $ R M L V P $ : ulcenti $ H J S $ 

reliquit $ R J M S L V P $ : relinquuit $ H $ 

infelix his $ J M S L V P $ : his infelix $ R H $ 

sando $ M S L V P $ : eundem $ R H J $ 

terrentur $ M V P $ : terretur $ R H J S L $ 

at illa ... permulcat $ J M S L V P $ : at illos ... permulcent $ H $ : 

at illis ... perlucent $ R $ 

draconis $ R J M S L V P $ : dracones $ H $ 

celebravit $ P $ : celebrabat $ R H J M S L V $ 

putat $ H J S L V P $ : putat $ R M $ 

Iouis $ H S P $ : deum $ R J M L V $ 

et alter $ R P $ : at alter $ H J M S L V $ 

currus $ H M S L V P $ : cursus $ R J $ 

cunctos $ B H J M S L V P $ : cunctis $ R S $ 

premebent $ H J M S L V P $ : premebat $ R $ 

tegebant $ H J M S L V P $ : ferebant $ R $ 

Themis hanc dederat $ H J M S L V P $ : dederat Themis hanc $ R $ 

Atla $ R H J S L V P $ : Atlans $ M $ 

moenibus $ H J S P $ : montibus $ R M L V $ 

quam $ J M S L V P $ : quas $ R H $ 

manibusque $ R J M S L V P $ : foribusque $ H $ 

Atlanti $ H J P $ : Atlantis $ R M S L V $ 

protulit $ R J M S L V P $ : prodidit $ H $ 

suotos $ H J S P $ : altius $ R M L V $ 

tepes que conspicit $ J M S V P $ : cepheia conspicit $ R H J M S L V P $ : cepheia conspicit $ R L $ 

trepido $ H J P $ : tepido $ R M S L V $ 

et uisse $ R H J M S V P $ : eximiae $ L $
680/686 patrisaeque P : terraeque RHJMSLV
690 in(m)inet MSLVP : eminet RHJ
691 et una RHJMSLV : et amens H
698 quondam P : clausem RHJMSLV
700 series VP : aetheri(e)as RHJMSLV
703 uirtute mea seruata P : seruata mea uirtute RHJMSLV
704 ouentes P : et orant RHJMSLV
712 ut in sequore HJMSLV : et in sequore R
713 uisam ... in umbrem RHJSP : uissa ... in umbra MLV
718 celeri missus JMSLV : celeri misso R : fissum præpes H
725 quaque patet MSLVP : quaque patent RHJ
727 uulnerat RHJMLP : uerberat hJSV
733 sinistra RHJMSLP : sinistrae V
741 nuda HJP : dura RMSLV
744 etiamnumo RHJMSLV : etiamnumo hJ
751 duritiem HJP : duritiam RMSLV
tact RHJSLVP : tactu M
757 Andromeda(e)n et RHJSLVP : Andromeda te S
758 capi hP : rapit RHJMSLV
759 praecluent RHJMSLV : præcipiant R
760 et ubique RHJMSLV : loquē H
764 Cephenum HJP : Cepheni RMSLV
767-768 duos uersus habent RJP ; unum uersum habent HMLV
767+ fillif P : unus RJ
768 †Sirites † P : Lyncides RJ
769 quae RHJSP : qui MLV
775 partitas HJMSLV : sortitas R
778 arenia hP : horrentia RHJMSLV
780 fererumque HJMSLV : fererum R
782 horrendo SP : horrendae RHJMLV
quem RMVP : quod HJSL
783 repercussae SP : repercusso RHJMLV
784 colubrasque HJMSLV : colubras R
791 ex numero RHJMSVP : e numero H
796 nec RHJVP : neques MSL
797 referret MSLVP : referrent RHJ
801 crinem turpes RMMSLVP : turpes crinem H
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