

Cambridge University Press

0521606950 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman, Volume III - 1915-1936

Edited by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 108

*REVIEW: S. G. OWEN, P. OVIDI NASONIS  
TRISTIVM LIBRI QVINQVE\**

Little in this volume is new, for seven-eighths of it consist of the *ex Ponto*, which Mr Owen has edited once already, and the *Tristia*, which he has edited twice. His first edition of the *Tristia* had value, which it still retains, as furnishing full collations of the principal manuscripts; but its reader was repeatedly jolted out of his chair by collision with obstacles in the text. Picking himself up from the hearthrug, and feeling his neck to make sure it was not broken, he would find that what he had encountered was either a lection which no other editor had ever admitted or a conjecture which no other editor could easily have made. The disfigurement inflicted upon Ovid's text by Mr Owen's recension is not a matter of dispute, for it is tacitly acknowledged by its author, whose labours on the *Tristia* for the last quarter of a century have chiefly consisted in removing his own corruptions and reinstating the comparatively pure text of his predecessors. For example, of more than thirty original conjectures which he printed in 1889, only eight remain in 1915. That is six or seven too many; but Augeas failed to clean out his own stables, and it is no wonder if Mr Owen's similar task is even yet unfinished and will need a fourth edition to complete it. The notes are sometimes inaccurate and often defective. To take the first elegy only, they state that Bentley and Madvig read *hi quoque* at 112, which is not only untrue but incredible, and they omit to state that all or almost all good manuscripts have *carmina* for *crimina* at 23, *dictata* for *deducta* at 39, and *latori* for *laturo* at 126. The verses I. 2. 74, I. 10. 7, II. 542, IV. 4. 4, IV. 5. 29, V. 6. 35, V. 12. 23, are not printed as the Editor meant that they should be; and all seven miscarriages may be traced by the curious to a single cause.

In the *ex Ponto* Mr Owen had displayed less originality and consequently has less to repent of. Most of the changes in this edition are made in pursuance of orders issued by R. Ehwald in his *Kritische Beiträge* of 1896; but let it be counted to Mr Owen for righteousness that at III. 7. 37 and IV. 15. 42 he has refused to execute the sanguinary mandates of his superior officer.

To the *Tristia* and *ex Ponto* Mr Owen has added the 134 lines of the *Halieutica*.

\* [P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium libri quinque, ex Ponto libri quattuor, Halieutica, fragmenta. Recognovit breuique adnotatione critica instruxit S. G. Owen. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1915. *Cambridge Review*, 37 (1915), 60]

Cambridge University Press

0521606950 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman, Volume III - 1915-1936

Edited by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

904

S. G. OWEN, P. OVIDI NASONIS TRISTIA

[60

There has been some dispute in the past about the authorship of this fragment, but that is now happily set at rest, for Mr Owen assures us that the genuineness of the work is fully established by the testimony of Pliny. He says this once on p. iii and twice on p. xi, so that no further doubt is possible; for, in the words of another Student of Christ Church, 'What I tell you three times is true.'

Another poem, more than 600 lines long, was written by Ovid in his exile and has come down to our own times. Its name is not upon Mr Owen's title-page, but under cover of this silence it has been slipped into the middle of the book, – *medio tutissimus Ibis*, as its author himself observed, – apparently in the hope that it may escape notice. Well, so it shall.

Cambridge University Press

0521606950 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman, Volume III - 1915-1936

Edited by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 109

OVID, *IBIS* 512 AND *TRISTIA* III 6 8\*

*Ib.* 511 sq. lapsuramque domum subeas, ut sanguis Aleuae,  
stella Leoprepidae cum fuit aequa uiro.

‘May you perish by the fall of a house, as Scopas did, when Simonides escaped.’ The story is told in various places collected by Micyllus and subsequent editors, Suid. pp. 757–9 Bernh. [vol. IV p. 362 Adler] (= Callim. *fr.* 71 Schn. [64 7–14 Pfeiffer]), Cic. *de or.* II 352 sq., Val. Max. I 8 ext. 7, Phaedr. IV 23 [22], Quint. *inst.* XI 2 11–16: how Simonides, dining at the table of Scopas, was called to the door by two young men, who were none other than Castor and Polydeuces; how he went out and found no one there, and meanwhile the roof fell and all within doors were crushed.

In 1894, in a recension of the *Ibis* published in the *corpus poetarum Latinorum*, I changed the *uiro* of u. 512 to *Iouis*, citing Hor. *carm.* II 17 22–4 ‘te Iouis impio | tutela Saturno refulgens | eripuit’; and editors of Ovid cannot imagine why. Mr Ehwald in 1902 (Bursian’s *Jahresbericht* CIX p. 287) enquired ‘aber was hat Horat. II 17 22 mit unserer Stelle zu thun?’, and Mr Owen in 1914 (*C.Q.* VIII p. 258) ‘but what has the star of Jupiter to do with Simonides?’. When these scholars ask me these questions, they are not beseeching me to lighten their darkness; nothing is further from their desire. They hope and believe that they are asking me awkward questions, questions which I in my precipitancy have forgotten to ask myself; and accordingly, like Pilate of old, they do not stay for an answer. They assume without more ado that there is no answer, and that my conjecture is therefore wrong.

The first and indeed the only comment on this pentameter which bewrays any serious attention to its language and meaning is Merkel’s in his edition of 1889. Merkel, who had access to the manuscript notes of Schrader, writes as follows: ‘in librorum scriptura. . . *Leoprepidae uiro* iure displicebat Schradero, temptabat *dei*. . . maxime uero improbable illud, quod etiam Schraderus habet, “*stella* pro Tyndaridis”, quamquam adiecto “modo sit locus sanus”.’ There are two problems: what sense can be given to *stella*, and what excuse can be found for *uiro*?

‘The son of Leoprepes’ is *Leoprepides*, not *Leoprepides uir*. When Ellis

\* [CQ 9 (1915), 31–8]

Cambridge University Press

0521606950 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman, Volume III - 1915-1936

Edited by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

906

OVID, IBIS 512 AND TRISTIA III 6 8

[31-2

writes '*uiro cum Leoprepidae coniunctum patris laudem laudi filii adnectit*' he appears to mean, if anything, the opposite of what he says; but his translation || is '*Leoprepes*' famous son'. Hundreds and thousands of times are famous sons mentioned by patronymic in Ovid and other Latin poets, and where else is that notion conveyed by the bare addition of *uir*? I know but a single apparent instance; and that will vanish as soon as it is approached.

Of Lucr. III 370 sq. '*illud in his rebus nequaquam sumere possis, | Democriti quod sancta uiri sententia ponit*' I should not venture to say with Mr Heinze '*die Verbindung Democriti...uiri wäre ohne die prädicative Bestimmung sancta nicht möglich*': I agree rather with Lobeck at Soph. *Ai.* 817 that *uiri* is '*honoris causa additum*' with the pregnant force of '*worthy wight*' as a formal civility to a respected antagonist. But there is no similar reason why Simonides should be singled out from the multitude of his peers to be designated as Ovid never designates anyone else. The solitary parallel of which I spoke is to be found in Silius *Pun.* XIII 800. Scipio, having descended to the Elysian fields, sees the spirit of Homer pacing along: 781-3 '*dic, ait, hic quinam, uirgo? nam luce refulget | praecipua frons sacra uiro, multaeque secuntur | mirantes animae et laeto clamore frequentant.*' Autonoe\* answers his question, and his next question is about the admiring throng which follows at Homer's heels, 798-802:

sed, quae tanta adeo gratantum turba, requirens  
heroum effigies maiorisque accipit umbras.  
ire uiro stupet Aeacide, stupet Hectore magno  
Aiacisque gradum uenerandaque Nestoris ora  
miratur etc.

But this cannot be construed; and if the text is corrupt, *uiro* may be part of the corruption, as the latest editors assume when they write '*inuicto* stupet Aeacide' with Thilo. The text however is not corrupt, but only the punctuation.

heroum effigies maiorisque accipit umbras  
ire uiro. stupet Aeacide etc.

He learns (from Autonoe\*) that those approaching him (Homer) are the mighty shades of heroes. '*ire uiro*' for *ad uirum* is in Prop. I 15 8, and Silius himself has '*Daunius huic robur iuuenis iacit*' for *in hunc* at II 244 and '*huic procul ardentem iaculatus lampada Cimber | conicit*' at XIV 305 sq.

The *uiro* of *Ib.* 512 seems therefore to be an unexampled redundancy, and its presence is the more surprising because its place is wanted for something else.

*stella* means simply a star; and when the commentators explain it as *stella Dioscurorum* Merkel has every right to reject their gloss. But if we let them have their way it will help them nothing, for Simonides was not rescued by the *stella Dioscurorum*. That *stella*, mentioned by Horace *carm.* I 12 28 and described by

\* [[Corrected by Housman to 'the Sibyl' in *JPh* 35 (1920), 287 (this edition p. 1018)]]

Cambridge University Press

0521606950 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman, Volume III - 1915-1936

Edited by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

32-3]

OVID, IBIS 512 AND TRISTIA III 6 8

907

Pliny *n.h.* II 101 and Seneca *n.q.* I I 13, was a marine phenomenon promising fair weather to sailors, and never came anywhere near || Pharsalus or Crannon, in whichever of those two towns the house of Scopas stood. Interpreters who mistake *stella* for the constellation Gemini, the third sign of the zodiac, make the matter even worse. For, first, it was no sign of the zodiac that came to the door and called for Simonides, any more than it was a form of electricity; it was a pair of travel-stained young men on horseback. And, secondly, *stella* does not mean a constellation: the examples alleged in the dictionaries are all false. Verg. *georg.* I 222 ‘Cnosiaque ardentis decedat *stella* Coronae’ is not the constellation of the Crown but the bright star in its centre signalled by Manilius I 319–22 ‘at parte ex alia claro uolat orbe *Corona* | luce micans uaria; nam *stella* uincitur *una* | circulus, in media radiat quae maxima fronte | candidaque ardenti distinguit lumina flamma’, whose rising was separately noted in the calendars: Colum. XI 2 73 sq. ‘tertio Non. Octobris *Corona* incipit oriri. . . octauo Id. Octobris *Coronae clara stella* exoritur. . . tertio et pridie Id. Octobris *Corona tota*’, Plin. *n.h.* XVIII 313 ‘VIII Id. Oct. . . *fulgens in Corona stella* exoritur, . . . Idibus *Corona tota*’. Again, Hor. *carm.* III 29 19 ‘*stella* uesani *Leonis*’ is not the constellation Leo but ‘*stella regia* appellata Tuberoni *in pectore Leonis*’ (Plin. *n.h.* XVIII 235 and 271, schol. Germ. Breys. p. 132 14), the star we now call Regulus, the Βασιλίσκος or Καρδία Λέοντος of the Greeks. In Ovid himself, *amor.* II 16 4 ‘Icarii *stella* proterua *Canis*’ is not the constellation Canicula but the star Sirius; *fast.* V 112 ‘*stella*. . . in cunas officiosa Iouis’ is a perfectly correct description of Capella, which is a single star and not a constellation. As for *fast.* III 793 sq.,

*stella* Lycaoniam uergit declinis ad Arcton  
*Miluus*: haec illa nocte uidenda uenit,

the fact that Ovid called the *miluus* a *stella* shows that he believed it to be a star; and no writer mentions any constellation of that name. But in truth the *miluus* was neither a constellation nor a star but a bird of passage, the Greek ικτίνος, which made its appearance about the same time as the swallow; and Ovid or his informant, finding the words ικτίνος φαίνεται in a calendar (they occur for instance in Geminus ed. Manit. p. 228 1 and 11, Ptolemy ed. Heib. II p. 41 11, Clodius Tuscus ap. Lyd. *de ostent.* ed. Wachsm. p. 123 5), supposed them to signify the rising of a heavenly body.

That the Dioscuri might be called *stellae* I would not deny, for Callimachus plainly calls them ἀστέρες in *lau. Pall.* 23–5 δις ἐξήκοντα διαθρέσσα διαύλωσ, | οἶα παρ’ Εὐρώτῃ τοι Λακεδαιμόνιοι | ἀστέρες, and is imitated by Statius *Ach.* I 180 sq. ‘Eurotae qualis uada Castor anhelus | intrat equo fessumque sui iubar excitat astri’; but what we have here is the singular *stella*, and that question does not arise.

Cambridge University Press

0521606950 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman, Volume III - 1915-1936

Edited by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

It appears then that the star which rescued Simonides must be sought in the heaven not of mythology but of astrology. But there can be no allusion to that astrological entity which is called in English the natal star. 'Natal star' is a translation of *natale astrum* or *sidus natalicium*, and it means one of the || twelve signs of the zodiac. But *stella*, as I have said, does not mean a sign of the zodiac; and moreover the signs of the zodiac are neither *aequa* nor *iniqua* and do not rescue anybody from anything. A man's natal sign determines his character and pursuits, but for accidents or escape from accidents he must thank the planets, and to these are the epithets *aequus* and *iniquus* applicable: Sen. *dial.* VI 18 3 'uidebis *quinque sidera* diuersas agentia uias et in contrarium praecipiti mundo nitentia; ex horum leuissimis motibus fortunae populorum dependent, et maxima ac minima proinde formantur, prout *aequum iniquumue sidus* incessit.' And 'planet' is what *stella* most often means in astrology, and what it means in another astrological passage of the *Ibis*: 209-16 'natus es infelix, ita di uolueres, nec *ulla* | commoda nascenti *stella* leuisue fuit. | non *Venus* affulsit, non illa *Iuppiter* hora, | *Lunaque* non apto *Solque* fuere loco. | nec satis utiliter positos tibi praebuit ignes | *quem peperit* magno lucida *Maia* Ioui. | te fera nec quicquam placidum spondentia *Martis* | sidera presserunt *falciferique senis*.' It is therefore to be presumed that *stella* means a planet in verse 512.

But what planet of the seven? for Simonides (even if *stella* were *stella sua*) had no planet of his own. No planet was singly assigned to a man at his birth, to control his destiny: he was subject to the influences of all, according to their aspects. But if *stella* means simply 'a planet', some one or other of the choir, there was no cause or excuse for introducing astrology at all; it is as if he had said vaguely *deus* when he meant the Tyndarids. If he wished to profess ignorance of the planet's name, there were ways of professing it, as Persius V 51 says *nescioquod*. . . *astrum*, or as Hermione enquires 'quod. . . mihi miserae *sidus* obesse querat?' in *her.* VIII 88, or Ovid himself 'quod. . . putem *sidus* nostris occurrere fatis?' in *amor.* III 12 3: even *stellarum una* might have been sufficient. But he knew the planet's name well enough, and the wonder is that he should conceal his knowledge.

This verse therefore combines redundancy in phrase with deficiency in sense; and it needs no training in any art of criticism, it needs nothing but sincerity and mother-wit, to recognise that these two phenomena, found in conjunction, are not to be considered separately. It is not for us to set our teeth and accept *Leoprepidae uiro* for *Leoprepidae*, and then to take a breath, set them again, and accept *stella* for *stella Iouis*. The superfluity provides the material for repairing the defect, and *uiro* is a corruption of a word defining *stella*.

Two of the planets, Mars and Saturn, are specifically baneful, κακοποιοί, *maleuoli*, and two, Venus and Jupiter, are specifically benign, αγαθοποιοί, *beneuoli*; and it is the office of the two latter to contend against the two former

Cambridge University Press

0521606950 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman, Volume III - 1915-1936

Edited by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

34–5]

OVID, IBIS 512 AND TRISTIA III 6 8

909

in mankind's behalf: *C.C.A.G.* v iii p. 100 6 sq. οἱ ἀγαθοποιοὶ ὅτε ὀρῶσι τοὺς κακοποιοὺς ἐλαττοῦσι τὴν κακίαν αὐτῶν. Venus is naturally the special antagonist of Mars, and Jupiter of Saturn: *ibid.* p. 101 2–5 ὁ Ζεὺς ἀναλύει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κρόνου δεσμούμενα καὶ μεταβάλλει τὴν κακίαν αὐτοῦ, ὅτε συσχηματίζεται αὐτῷ· ἡ δὲ Ἄφροδίτη λύει τὴν κακίαν τοῦ Ἄρεως, Ouid. *amor.* 1 8 29 sq. ‘*stella tibi oppositi nocuit contraria Martis. | illa [[Mars]] abiit, signo nunc Venus apta || suo*’,<sup>1</sup> Pers. v 50 ‘*Saturnumque grauem nostro Ioue frangimus una*’, Hor. *carm.* II 17 22–5 ‘*te Iouis impio | tutela Saturno refulgens | eripuit uolucrisque fati | tardauit alas*’, where Porphyryon says ‘*aiunt Saturni stellam infestam esse hominibus, Iouis autem e contrario saluberrimam, Saturno pericula adferri eaque tamen euinci si perfulget Iouis stella.*’ But Jupiter, not Venus, is the saviour star κατ’ ἐξοχήν, the stronger and more active of the two: *C.C.A.G.* v iii p. 100 sq. ὁ Ζεὺς ἐὰν ὀρᾷ κακοποῖον ἀστέρᾳ μεταβάλλει τὴν κρᾶσιν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν· ἡ δὲ Ἄφροδίτη οὐ δύναται μεταβολεῖν τὴν κακίαν τοῦ κακοποιοῦ ὥσπερ ὁ Ζεὺς, εἰ μήπω ἐφορᾷ τὸν Δία. His pre-eminent goodwill and potency may be judged from what Firmicus says in *math.* II 13 6: ‘*unum tamen sciendum est, quod, licet beniuola sit Iouis stella, tamen contra impugnationem Martis et Saturni, si eam uiolenti radiatione constringant, resistere sola non possit; essent enim immortales homines, si numquam in genituris hominum Iouis benignitas uinceretur. sed quia sic artifex deus hominem fecit, ut substantia eius transacto certo uitae spatio solueretur, necesse fuit ut detento Ioue, per quem uitae confertur hominibus salutare praesidium, in extinguendo homine maliuolarum stellarum malitiosa uel perniciosa potestas cum augmento malitiae permaneret, ut maliuolis radiationibus impugnata compago corporis solueretur*’; and so Cicero calls him ‘*hominum generi prosperus et salutaris ille fulgor, qui dicitur Iouis*’ *de r. p.* VI 17, and Ausonius ‘*stella salutigeri Iouis*’ 332 26 (Peip. p. 25).

The malignant planets to some extent divide their provinces of evil: death by the sword and perils of warfare are naturally assigned to Mars, but some dangers to life and limb, including many maladies, are in the gift of Saturn. The peril incurred and escaped by Maecenas is not known and cannot be discovered from Horace; but Porphyryon says it was an illness, and his statement is generally and perhaps rightly accepted. Maecenas, as Pliny tells us in *n. h.* VII 172, suffered all his life long from fever, and if on this occasion his fever was an ague, ῥιγοπύρετος, it would fall within Saturn's department. Help, if it came, would come, as Horace says it did, from one of the benignant planets: Firm. *math.* III 2 26 ‘*in duodecimo loco Saturnus ab horoscopo constitutus... faciet... maximas aegritudines, sed et ualetudines non modicas, praesertim si... nulla beniuola stella in geniturae cardinibus fuerit collocata. nam si sic posito Saturno beniuola*

<sup>1</sup> Ovid knows too much astrology for his editors, and this phrase is misinterpreted by Heinsius and Némethy and not interpreted at all by any other commentator whom I have read. It means ‘Venus is now favourably situate in a sign of her own’, that is in one or other of the two signs Taurus and Libra, which are the houses (οἰκοί, *domus, domicilia*) of the planet Venus.

Cambridge University Press

0521606950 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman, Volume III - 1915-1936

Edited by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

910

OVID, IBIS 512 AND TRISTIA III 6 8

[35-6

stella in quocumque geniturae cardine fuerit inuenta, haec mala, quae diximus, ex parte aliqua mitigantur', IV 19 7-8 'facit (Saturnus) pleumonicos hydropicos podagricos caducos spasticos...quodsi eum beniuolae stellae habentem dominium sic, sicut diximus, positum bona radiatione conueniant, istas ualitudines *uel praesidium dei alicuius uel sollers medicina* curabit.' I have italicised these words with a purpose. For an astrologer the stars are supreme; || physicians and even gods are only their ministers. Maecenas may think that the doctors cured him, and Simonides may ascribe his rescue to the Heavenly Twins; but astrologers know that the true cause was higher and mightier than the sons of Aesculapius or of Leda.

But it is time to be telling Messrs Ehwald and Owen exactly how the planet Jupiter was concerned in the rescue of Simonides; and I begin with Firm. *math.* IV 20 5-6: 'si...in opportunis geniturae locis Iuppiter et Venus fuerint inuenti in horoscopo, ...minaces periculorum impetus salutari beniuolarum stellarum praesidio subleuantur et homines ex imminentibus periculis liberantur. periculorum autem non una substantia est; aut enim ex...aegritudinibus... aut *ex ruinis*...periculorum discrimen adfertur.' Falling houses are thus among the perils from which men are saved by benignant stars. And both in ancient and in medieval astrology the fall of houses is laid to the account of Saturn. Manetho VI 611 sq.

εἰ δέ τε καὶ Φαίνων ὀλοὴν ἀκτίνα βάλῃσιν  
ἄχθεσιν ἢ λάεσσι δόμων τ' ὀροφῆσιν ἔθλιψεν.

Chaucer *Knights Tale* 1605-8:

Myn is the ruine of the hye halles,  
The falling of the toures and of the walles  
Up-on the mynour or the carpenter.  
I slow Sampsoun in shaking the piler.

Jupiter, as Saturn's especial foe, is the planet to mitigate the calamity: *C.C.A.G.* II p. 123 12-16 ὀπηνίκα ὁ Κρόνος συνοδεύῃ μετὰ τοῦ Διός, δηλοῖ παντοίων οἰκοδομημάτων κατάλυσιν... εἰ δὲ συμβαίνει ἐν τῷ τοῦ Κρόνου οἴκῳ (Capricorn or Aquarius) τοῦτο γίνεσθαι, τότε ἔτι μᾶλλον τὰ τῆς κακίας αὔξει· εἰ δὲ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Διός (Sagittarius or Pisces), ἔλαττον ὑπάρχει τὸ κακὸν ὡς τούτου ὑπερνικῶντος. Sometimes Saturn is reinforced by Mars: Firm. *math.* VI 19 20 'si Saturnus in horoscopo partiliter fuerit constitutus et Martem habeat in occasu, id est in diametro, partiliter constitutum, ...ista coniunctio graue ac miserum mortis decernit exitium. aut enim ferarum morsu consumpti artus miseris lacerationibus dissipantur... aut *corpus cadentium culminum ruinis opprimitur*.' But Jupiter may yet be a match for the pair of them: *ibid.* VI 15 8-9 'si uero in quadrupedibus signis fuerint constituti (Mars et Saturnus) uel unus eorum in



Cambridge University Press

0521606950 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman, Volume III - 1915-1936

Edited by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

36-7]

OVID, IBIS 512 AND TRISTIA III 6 8

911

signo quadrupede inuentus alium diametra radiatione respexerit, . . . *graui ruinarum pondere oppressi* (homines) *et dissipati corporis laceratione confecti aut moriuntur aut uicina mortis coguntur subire discrimina*. sed haec omnia infortunia tunc forti calamitatis cumulo conualescunt, cum hos sic positos nullis *Iuppiter* radiationibus mitigarit.' That is, if Jupiter does not intervene, the threatened men *moriuntur*, like Scopas; if he intervenes, then, like Simonides, *uicina mortis coguntur subire discrimina*, and no more.

When a noun is distant from the word to which it is grammatically || related, and adjacent to a word possessing or governing a different case, its case is often altered by copyists who mistake its construction. Thus in *Ib.* 375 sq., 'ut quorum Aeacides misit uiolentus in altum | corpora cum senis altera sena *rogum*', more than half the MSS have *rogis* because of *cum senis*; and in the same way *Iouis*, because of *aequa*, might here be changed to *Ioui*. The letters *i* and *r* are sometimes mistaken for one another in minuscules (even as early as the MSS of *Lucr.* VI 210, *iubeant* for *rubeant*), and the word *Ioui*, which at *Ib.* 214 appears in the Vindobonensis as *roim*, might here by a slighter error become *roui*; while the transposition of syllables which converts the meaningless *ro-ui* into *ui-ro* is one which I have illustrated in my edition of *Manil.* I pp. lvii sq. and in the *Journal of Philology* xxx pp. 229 sq. [this edition pp. 711-12]: add here *Stat. silu.* I praef. l. 28 Klotz ed. 2 [l. 23 Phillimore] *bi-du-o du-bi-o*, *Seru. georg.* I 149 *br-um-as um-br-as*. But in the works of Ovid himself there is another verse in which I find, not a similar error, but the very same.

*trist.* III 6 1-8 foedus amicitiae nec uis, carissime, nostrae  
 nec, si forte uelis, dissimulare potes.  
 donec enim licuit nec te mihi carior alter  
 nec tibi me tota iunctor urbe fuit.  
 isque erat usque adeo populo testatus, ut esset  
 paene magis quam tu quamque ego notus, amor. 5  
 quique est in caris animi tibi candor amicis  
 cognita sunt ipsi, quem colis, ista uiro.

The last couplet means 'so generous a friend are you that you have not disguised our intimacy even from that man "quem colis"'. But 'ipsi uiro, quem colis' designates nobody, for there were dozens of men whom Ovid's friend 'colebat'. The relation between man and man described by the verb *colere*, with its synonyms *diligere* and *obseruare*, pervaded all society: 'utque ego maiores, sic me coluere minores' says Ovid in *trist.* IV 10 55, and again in *amor.* III 4 45, 'et cole, quos dederit (multos dabit) uxor, amicos'. The phrase does not even imply of necessity that *is qui colit* is inferior to *is qui colitur*: *Seru. Aen.* I 16 'ueteres *colere* dicebant etiam cum maior minorem diligeret', and such is its sense in *Ter. ad.* 925-7 'ego uero iubeo et hac re et aliis omnibus | quam maxime

Cambridge University Press

0521606950 - The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman, Volume III - 1915-1936

Edited by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear

Excerpt

[More information](#)

912

OVID, IBIS 512 AND TRISTIA III 6 8

[37-8]

unam facere nos hanc familiam, | *colere* adiuuare adiungere.’ But it is evident and admitted that the person here meant must be the emperor; and Heinsius accordingly says ‘puto *ipsi*. . . *deo*, hoc est Augusto’. For when a subject ‘colit Caesarem’, he ‘colit deum’ and not ‘uirum’. Let Ovid himself be witness: *ex Pont.* II 2 123-5 [[121-3]] ‘quoniam patria toto sumus orbe remoti | nec licet ante *ipsos* procubuisse *deos*, | quos *colis*, ad *superos* haec fer mandata sacerdos’, IV 8 22 sq. ‘*quos colis*, exora supplice uoce *deos*. | *di* tibi sunt *Caesar* iuuenis’, 15 23 sq. ‘quod quoniam in *dis* est, tempta lenire precando | *numina*, perpetua *quae* pietate *colis*’. And in the || only other verse of our poem where Augustus is signified he is called a god: 23 ‘*numinis*. . . *laesi*’. But the change of *deo* to *uiro*, though not impossible, is unlikely; and the same sense will be given by

cognita sunt ipsi, quem *colis*, ista Ioui.

In the *tristia* alone there are eight verses where oblique cases of *Iuppiter* denote Augustus: I 1 81, 4 26, 5 78, III 1 38, 5 7, II 62, IV 3 69, V 2 46: the nominative, for some reason or other, is not thus abused.

It may spare editors of Ovid some little trouble if I suggest to them how they had better defend the MS reading. The defence is one which would sooner or later occur to them spontaneously, even if I now said nothing; but I can save them time by foretelling it, as my acquaintance with their habits of thought enables me to do. I advise them then to ignore my objection and to set about proving what is not in dispute: that Augustus was a man and was so called by Ovid. I will even provide examples for them: *trist.* V 2 50 ‘o *uir* non ipso, quem regis, orbe minor’, *ex Pont.* I 2 89 [[87]] ‘ira *uir* mitis’, 120 [[118]] ‘aequandi *superis* pectora flecte *uir*’. This defence ought to satisfy quite a large number of their readers; for there are millions of mankind who can no more detect *ignoratio elenchi* than if they were editors of Ovid.