

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Ovidiana

Arthur Palmer

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 03 / March 1891, pp 92 - 95

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00178540, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00178540

How to cite this article:

Arthur Palmer (1891). Ovidiana. The Classical Review, 5, pp 92-95 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00178540

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

OVIDIANA.

I. *Notes on the Heroides*. 1. NOTES ON THE CODEX PARISINUS (No. 8242: olim Puteaneus).—Happening to be in Paris in August 1889 I preferred the National Library to the attractions of the Eiffel Tower, and carefully inspected this famous MS. *En passant* I would recommend scholars who find time heavy on their hands in Paris, and value a fine cheerful room to work in, perfect civility from officials, and an excellent luncheon including wine at the cost of two francs, to frequent the National Library if they have not already learned to do so. The MS. P had been much used and partially collated by N. Heinsius, and by Jahn, first carefully collated by H. Keil for Merkel, by two friends for Sedlmayer, lastly by Ehwald, who seems to have used a more accurate collation of Keil's than Merkel did, or else to have used the same one which Merkel did but more accurately. At any rate I must warn students of the *Heroides* that Sedlmayer's and Ehwald's collations of P are the only collations to be trusted. For instance the well known lines VII. 45, 46—Non egosum tanti—quid non censeris inique?

Ut pereas, dum me per freta longa fugis—are so given, and rightly given by P. There is not a shadow of a doubt about P having *censeris*: the only letter that is at all obscure is the *n*. Yet Heinsius tells us P has *terreriis*: Merkel that P has *mereris* with the first syllable uncertain. Hence a host of conjectures have been built upon the sand, such as *quanti tu reris* of Heinsius, *quid nos metiris* of Madvig, *quid enim verearis* of Riese. There is not in my opinion a sounder reading in the *Heroides* than *quid non censeris*, which I am glad that I read in my edition of 1874 although then in ignorance that it had the support of P, as well as that of inferior MSS. Sedlmayer and Ehwald have recorded P rightly.

Again in III. 48:

Vidi consortes pariter generisque necisque
Tres cecidisse: tribus, quae mihi, mater
erat.

So P: and so vulgo. Merkel states that P has *quae mea*, leading me astray. Sedlmayer and Ehwald are right.

In II. 62:

Quaecumque e merito spes venit aequa
venit.

Here however Merkel is right. He says quite truly that P has *de merito*. Sedlmayer says that P has *est* ma. pr.: *ex* ma. 2. The latter statement is true: the former erroneous. P ma. pr. has *de*. Ehwald has no note.

III. 136:

Sic eat auspiciis Pyrrhus ad arma tuis. Merkel states that P has *tuis patris* for *tuis*. Sedlmayer that P has *tuis* with *patris* written over, and the second *u* in *tuis* corrected from another letter. I find *patris* certainly in the margin, but decidedly ma. rec.: and for *tuis* there is a corruption which I could not decipher, but it looked to me like *tu par* or *tu per*. Hence perhaps *puer* is the true reading. Ehwald has no note.

The usual number of lines in a page in P is 28, not 29 as stated by Merkel. Not only pp. 97 and 98 are blank, but also 55 and 56.

When Merkel (pref. p. ix.) states that there exists in P evidence of a gap at XVI. 38, where in later MSS. the spurious verses 39-142 are inserted, the student is likely to be led astray. There is no break whatever. Some reader, of uncertain date, has, as was natural, made a small mark in red ink where the spurious verses began in other MSS. i.e. after line 38: that is all.

I subjoin a few passages where P is either not reported, or reported incorrectly by Sedlmayer and Ehwald.

In IV. 138 P has *cognata* for *cognato*: not noticed by Sedlmayer or Ehwald. IV. 141 *reserenda manti* for *reseranda mariti* (not *reserenda amanti* as Sedlmayer has it: but *a* is written over *manti* ma. sec.). V. 3

Pegagis for *Pegasis*. V. 86 *qui* for *quas*. VI. 84 *face* pr. ma. for *falce*. VI. 83 *meritis* for *meritisque*, *ue* superscribed ma. rec. (not *meritisue* in one word, as Sedlm.). VI. 89

passi for *passis*. VI. 98 *fero sanguis* ma. pr. for *feros angues*.

VI. 118:

Me quoque dotalis inter habere potes.

The only letters of *dotalis* at all legible are *l* and *s*. There is not the smallest trace of *q* in the first letter as Merkel and Ehwald state. Sedlmayer states the whole word is illegible.

VII. 153, 4 :

Ilion in Tyriam transfer felicius urbem

Resque loco regis sacraque sceptrata tene.

So I now, after inspection of P, write the pentameter. In P there is some trace of the first letter which might have been R but could not have been either H or S or M : then an erasure in which however *loco* can be read.

VII. 179 :

Pro meritis et siqua tibi debebimus ultra

Pro spe coniugii tempora parva peto.

Ehwald correctly states that P has *ultra*, which is probably the right reading. Sedlmayer attributes *ultra* to inferior MSS. only.

VIII. 32 :

At pater Aeacio promiserat, inscius acti :

Plus quoque, qui prior est ordine, possit avus.

P omits *qui*, but supplies it ma. sec. above the line. The verse ran either :

Plus quo, quo prior est ordine, possit avus.

or

Plus quo, qui prior est ordine, possit avus.

Plus quoque is not correct here.

VIII. 65, is thus given in P :

N ^{hoc} *et* generis fato quod nostros ^t *eral-*
nannos.

The *t* is ma. 2, and the letter before *n* is too high for *i*, cannot be a *t*, is more like *l* than anything else but wants its curl.

IX. 40 *Omniaque* for *Omina que* P.

IX. 95 For *redundabat* P ma. 1 has a corruption which looked to me like *redulabat*, which Ehwald gives as *nudulabat*, Heinsius as...*elulabat*, and which Sedlmayer does not notice.

IX. 109 ^h *procedit* P : *h* ma. 1.

IX. 141 which generally appears thus—
Semivir occubuit in letifero Eveno—

P is not correctly reported by either Sedlmayer or Ehwald. P has : *Semivir occubuit in l* *et* (here the space of two, or at most

three, letters in ras.) : *fero* : *ueneno*, over the erasure *erni* ma. 2. Bentley's *lotifero* is probably right.

X. 106 :

Strataque Cretaeam belua stravit humum.
stravit P, not in rasura nor ma. 2 as Sedlmayer and Ehwald state. The letters *ui* may be a little 'inculcatae,' but *str* is clearly ma. pr. Of all the corrections proposed Bentley's *planxit* is the best. Cf. XVI. 334.

X. 126 :

Cum steteris urbis celsus in arce tuae.

P has *urbes* ma. pr. changed to *urbis* ma. 2, and *t* prefixed to it by a later hand, a half correction to *turbae*. For *arce* P has *aure* ma. pr.

XII. 3 :

Tunc quae dispensant mortalia fata sorores.

P has *facta*. XII. 17 thus appears in P : *Semina iecisset* (this word erased and *sensisset* in marg.) *totidemque & seminat &* (this erased) *hostes*. XIII. 133 : *Si* (rather than *Sed*) *quid ego reuoco ?* (the last four letters of this word 'inculcatae') : then an erasure and over it written *reuocantis et* ma. sec., then *omen abesto*. This line very much wants emendation. Bentley's *revocaminis* is only provisional. XIV. 46. For *reccidit* P pr. seemed to have *etendit*, not *ccendit* as Sedlmayer reports.

XVI. 200 :

Cum dis potando nectare miscet aquas.

P pr. had *disputando*.

XVI. 316 :

Uttere mandantis simplicitate viri.

P has *mandātis*. But I do not think *mandātis* here stands for *mandantis*. The mark over the *a* is in P often an indication of a marginal reading. And here ma. pr. in the margin is *l. non uafri*, which is probably the right reading.

XVI. 366 :

Instruere Atriden non potes arte mea.

non P, but *num* ma. 1 in marg. the right reading, as Merkel gave.

XVII. 234, *idia* P sub. ras., *ipsea* ma. 2.

XVII. 259 :

Aut ego deposito sapiam fortasse pudore.

For *sapiam* I read *faituam* in P, *faciam* P ap. Sedlmayer, *sautiam* in *faciam* ma. 2 mutatum ap. Ehwald. P has *pudorem*. Perhaps :

Aut ego deponam fatuum fortasse pudorem.

XIX. 53 : Ehwald is here right against Sedlmayer. P has *incertas* ma. 2 not *incertis*.

2. SOME CONJECTURES IN OVID.

Her. II. 100 :

Expectem qui me numquam visurus abisti !

Expectem pelago vela negata meo !

The pentameter is absurd, and P has *uela negatata meo* : but the third *a* seems corrected from *e* ; hence *negante* is an obvious correction : cf. XIII. 128 ; VII. 55. For the

last words I formerly gave *data* but *negante tamen* may be the true reading; *tamen* often ends a pentameter in Ovid. 'Expect your sails although the sea refuses them to my sight!'

III. 30-32.

Auxerunt blandas grandia dona preces,
Viginti fulvos operoso ex aere lebetas,
Et tripodas septem pondere et arte pares.

Blandas—*preces* has been changed to *blandae*—*preces* with a single inferior MS., to gain a construction, for *dona* must be in the same case as *lebetas* in 31. Yet *dona* ought surely be the nominative. Madvig seeing this went so far as to read *fulvi*—*lebetes* (keeping *blandas*—*preces*), regardless of the hiatus. I suggest:

Auxerunt blandas grandia dona preces,
Viginti *fulvi pretioso* ex aere lebetes.
or *fulvo pretiosi*. Cf. Met. I. 115: *fulvo pretiosior aere. tripodes*, of course, for *tripodas*.

VI. 3—5.

Gratulur incolumi quantum sinis: hoc tamen ipso

Debueram scripto certior esse tuo.

So (or *ipsum*) the MSS. without a legitimate construction, as far as I can see. I write:

hoc tamen *ipsum*
Debuerat scripto *certius* esse tuo.

The terminations of the comparative are confused in MSS.

VII. 77:

Quid puer Ascanius, quid di meruere Penates?

Ignibus ereptos auferet unda deos?

P omits *di*, and gives *ii* for it, but only ma. 2.: *di* the inferior MSS. But *deos* recurs at the end of the pentameter, and, if Lemaire's Index is to be trusted, *di* is not joined with *Penates* by Ovid. I write:

Quid puer Ascanius, quid *commeruere* Penates?

Cf. *Fast.* I. 362:

Quid bos, quid placidae commeruistis oves?

IX. 66:

Nec te Maeonia lascivae more puellae

Incingi zona dedecuisse pudet?

pudet has been commonly changed to *putas* or *putes* with Heinsius. I should prefer *patet*: cf. XVII. 32.

IX. 105:

I nunc tolle animos et fortia facta recense:

Quod tu non esses iure vir illa fuit.

quod G, quem P¹, quod P², quom Madvig.

Read: Quo tu non esses iure vir illa fuit.

'She was a man, with a title (quo iure) you could not claim' (because she conquered you). Heinsius had given *quo*, conjunction, with *foret* for *fuit*, a totally different conjecture.

XII. 80:

Per triplicis vultus arcanaque sacra Dianae

Et si forte aliquos gens habet ista deos.

I write *aequos* for *aliquos*: cf. *Fast.* VI. 766.

XIV. 103:

Quae tibi causa fugae? quid, Io, freta longa pererras?

Non poteris vultus effugere ipsa tuos.

I do not believe that Ovid shortened the first syllable of *Io*. P has *o* (*sic*). I am inclined to believe the line ran:

Quae tibi causa fugae? frustra freta longa pererras—

that *frustra* fell out before *freta*, and that the gap was supplied by *quid Io*.

XVI. 37:

Ante tuos animo vidi quam lumine vultus:

Prima fuit vultus nuntia fama tui.

So P. But V, a fragmentary MS. of no mean character, gives *prima mihi vultus*. I think that Ovid wrote:

Prima mihi *vulnus* nuntia fama tulit.

And this theory is borne out by the fact that the spurious verses which follow are:

Nec tamen est mirum si sicut toporteat arcu
Missilibus telis eminus ictus amo.

The interpolator chose a suitable place to insert these lines if Paris had just spoken of a wound inflicted on him by a report of Helen's beauty. Add the awkwardness of the repetition of *vultus*. Cf. XXI. 211, 2.

XVI. 111:

Addimus antennis et vela sequentia malos.

So the MSS.: *malis* Ehwald. Read: *malo*. Paris's ship had only one mast: cf. V. 53.

XVI. 320:

Tunc ego iurabo quaevis tibi numina meque

Adstringam verbis in sacra iura tuis.

So P: for *iura* I restore *vestra* 'the rites of your nation or family': *iura* and *vestra* are very like when *vestra* is written contractly.

XVII. 73:

Plus multo est quod amas quod sum tibi causa laboris.

la in *laboris* in P is *ma*. 2 and V and other MSS. have *doloris*. Read: *caloris*.

XVII. 114 :

Sed sine, quam tribuit sortem fortuna, tueri :
 Nec spoliū nostri turpe pudoris *habe*.
habe is awkward. The true reading is
 doubtless *ave* : written *have*, hence *habe* :
 'don't covet the spoil of my shame.'

XVIII. 121 :

Hoc quoque si *credis*, ad te via prona videtur,
 A te cum redeo clivus inertis aquae.
credis P, *credas* G ; read *credes*.

XVIII. 203 :

Desino ; parce queri. sed *ut et* mare finiat
 iram,
 Accedant, quaeso, fac tua vota meis.
ut et, as it seems, P : *ut hanc* V, *ut hoc* (?)
 G. Read : *uti* : the loss of *i* caused the
 variants.

XIX. 62 :

Nunc dare quae soleo madidis velamina
 membris,
 Pectora nunc iuncto nostra fovere sinu.
 So P : Merkel reads *nostro iuncta* and he is
 followed by Ehwald. But an epithet seems
 to lurk in *nostra* of P : the 'frozen bosom'
 of her Leander is what Hero thinks of
 warming : perhaps
 Pectora nunc iuncto *tosta* fovere sinu—
 scil. *frigore tosta*.

XX. 48.

Si non proficient artes veniemus ad arma
 Inque tui cupidos rapta ferere sinus.
 So Sedlmayer. P₁ has *tui cupidus—sinu*,
 P₂ has *meo cupido—sinu*. I write
Vique tui cupido rapta ferere sinu.
In is not wanted, cf. *Art.* 1. 128, and *vi* adds
 strength.

XX. 76.

Ante tuos liceat flentem consistere vultus,
 Et liceat lacrimis addere verba suis.

For *meis* P has *sui*, G *suis*, some inferior
 MSS. *tuis*. Read *sua*. Cf. XIV. 67 :
 'Haec ego : dumque queror lacrimae *sua*
 verba sequuntur.'

Rem. Am. 207-210 :

Lenius est studium, studium tamen, *alite*
capta,
 Aut lino aut calamis praemia parva sequi :
 Vel quae piscis edax avido male devoret ore
 Abdere *supremis* aera recurva cibis.

Ovid has been advising the lover to hunt—
 to hunt the hare, the deer, the boar—in
 verses 200-204. He here advises the quest
 of even small game : in the first couplet he
 prescribes fowling : in the latter angling.
 For *calamo* I take to mean the fowler's limed
 rod, *lino* snares of thread : fishing does not
 begin until verse 209. Now *alite capta* is
 very awkward, in fact untranslatable in the
 context : I wish to read *amite capta*. I am
 aware that it is generally supposed that the
a of *ames* is short : and Hor. *Epod.* II. 33
 'aut amite levi rara tendit retia' is sup-
 posed to prove that quantity. But Maguire
 (*Hermathena*, vol. V. p. 333) proposes to
 scan there *āmite lēvi*. The division of the
 tribrach would be allowable in Plautus and
 Terence : and it is not inconceivable in
 Horace. *Amentum*, supposed to be for *ap-*
mentum, has its first syllable long. How
 comes it that *ames*, supposed to be for *apmes*,
 has its first syllable short? Read *āmite*
 here and all is smooth : you have three
 recognised methods of fowling : *ames*, the
 pole for spreading nets : *lino* the snare :
calamus the limed rod.

For *supremis* in 210, it seems to me that
 the simplest correction is *suspensis* : bait
 hung on the hook, and dangled before the
 fish.

ARTHUR PALMER.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF *OSTERIA* AND SIMILAR WORDS.

I HAVE happened so frequently during the
 last few months upon what seems to me a
 false etymology for a rather large class of
 words, and have found this false etymology
 in such excellent authorities, that a state-
 ment of the real derivation of these words
 may not be out of place. The list of words
 in question includes *oste* It. (*landlord*), *hoste*
 old Fr., *hospede* Port., *gast* Ger., etc.

Now Cicero *de Off.* I. 12, 37 says : *hostis*
apud maiores nostros is dicebatur, quem nunc

peregrinum dicimus. This statement of Cicero
 in regard to the early meaning of *hostis* is
 confirmed by the use of the word in Plaut.
Trin. 102 *Hostisne an civis comedis, parvi*
pendere, and in Varro *L.L.* v. 3 *hostis, nam*
tum eo verbo dicebant peregrinum. Expres-
 sions in Plautus *Mil.* 450, *Curc.* 5 and in
 Horace *Epist.* I. 15, 29, suggest the same
 meaning for *hostis*, viz. *stranger*.

The similarity in the meaning and exter-
 nal form has given rise to the almost un-