

Pere Fàbregas Salis*

More Unpublished Conjectures by Nicolaus Heinsius on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Books 5–6

<https://doi.org/10.1515/phil-2024-0035>

Abstract: This paper publishes for the first time 85 conjectures by Nicolaus Heinsius on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 5–6. The value and possible motivations of each proposal are briefly assessed.

Keywords: Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, Nicolaus Heinsius, unpublished conjectures, textual criticism

As a sequel to my paper (2024) on books 1–4, in the following pages I will be disclosing Nicolaus Heinsius's unpublished conjectures on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* books 5–6. All conjectures come from the Berolinensis Diez. 4^o 1075 (= b3), but I provide occasional references to other Heinsian *libri impressi cum notis manuscriptis*. I append a cursory assessment to each proposal.¹

5.41 ardescit] ardescunt (136^v)

Coniciunt at 42 agrees *ad sensum* with *uulgus*. Could *ardescunt* have been assimilated to the immediately adjacent subject? This interpretation might be supported by *Ov. Her.* 14.27, where some mss. read *uulgus ... uocant*, which is then picked up by *uocantes*. Cf. Reeson (2001) 244–245; also Ramírez de Verger (2021) 209 on *Ov. Met.* 6.402. Cf. *Ov. Met.* 4.492–494; 12.53.

¹ I follow the same guidelines and abbreviations announced in my paper on books 1–4 (2024, 42–43), but it is probably not out of place to remind readers that the *lemmata* are taken from Tarrant (2004) and that for Ovidian mss. I use the sigla available at <http://www.uhu.es/proyectovidio/ing/index.html> and in Díez (2014), Suárez (2015), Rivero (2018), Ramírez de Verger (2021) or Fàbregas (2022). For book 6, several of Heinsius's previously unpublished conjectures were retrieved by Ramírez de Verger (2021).

***Corresponding author: Pere Fàbregas Salis**, Serra Húnter Fellow, Secció de Filologia Llatina i Lingüística Indoeuropea, Departament de Filologia Clàssica, Romànica i Semítica, Universitat de Barcelona, E-Mail: pfabregas@ub.edu

5.74 Suenites] Suenite *uel* Suenita (137^r)

The transmitted form seems authorised enough (cf., e.g., Ov. *Ib.* 319 *Atarnites*), as Heinsius himself recognises: “*Suenites bene habet.*”

5.113 *canendo*] Hymenaeon (138^r)

Canendo is to be understood absolutely, and *dapes festumque* as objects of *celebrare* (cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.682–684; 12.263–264; *Tr.* 4.1.17–18 *cum traheret siluas Orpheus et dura canendo / saxa*; Verg. *Ecl.* 2.31; 5.9; Prop. 2.10.19–20). But *celebrare canendo* is in fact rather pleonastic, especially after *citharam cum uoce moueres* in 112.² Heinsius’s emendation is perhaps too radical, but at least rightly flags the issue (cf. Lenz 1792, 316–317; Jahn 1821, 287).³ Cf. Ov. *Met.* 5.3 *coniugialia festa* (at the beginning of the episode); Claud. *carm. min. app.* 5.55 *festos celebrate hymenaeos*. Could *canendo* be a sort of gloss or correction inspired by the previous line (and perhaps by recollection of Ov. *Met.* 1.683)?⁴

5.114 *tenentem*] *terenti* (137^v)

Heinsius (1659) 113ⁿ read *cui ... a(d)stanti ... tenenti* with some mss. (e.g. Lr B2P2^{2c} Ld7), which is possible, if taken with *dixit*.⁵ He needlessly attempted *terenti*, which does not make much sense to me;⁶ *tenere* describes better the singer’s awe: he stands aside with the plectrum in his hand, an *imbellis* weapon, as his sole defence against the aggressor.

5.115 *inridens*] *arridens* (137^v)

Once a dative was admitted in the previous line (cf. n.), it was only natural to look for a substitute for *inrideo* that might smoothly govern one.⁷ Considering that prefixes are often confused in Ovid’s transmission, Heinsius’s *a(d)rridens* is not bad. Cf. Sil. *Pun.* 1.398–402. For *inridens*, cf. perhaps Ov. *Met.* 8.612–615.

2 The clearly incorrect reading *mouendo* instead of *moueres* should give one further pause, even if it could be admittedly a simple extension of *canendo*. On the other hand, the reading *canebas* of some mss. (among them N^c) might have originated once *festum* was taken with *canendo*, as an attempt to remove the harsh coordination of *celebrare dapes* and *festum canendo*.

3 Before Hartman (1905) 112, Lenz had already advocated for deletion. Cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.4–8.

4 If one wished to keep an infinitive here, I tentatively suggest *ciere*; I must concede that I do not know of any convincing parallels, but cf. perhaps Cic. *progn. frg.* 4.3 Soubiran *absurdoque sono fontis et stagna cietis*; Verg. *Aen.* 3.122 *tonitru caelum omne ciebo*.

5 It would be problematic to construe it with *inridens* (the first example with a dative is, according to *ThLL* VII.2 416.4–9, Serv. *Aen.* 10.20), as Heinsius knew: see on 5.115. On Heinsius’s penchant for the dative, see Fàbregas (2024) 50 n. 34; see also on 5.246; 5.384; 6.587.

6 In o4, 115 he suggested *terentem*.

7 Similarly, Heinsius (1659) 113ⁿ attempted ‘i,’ *ridens*.

5.131 *tollebat*] *cumulabat* (137^v)

Cumulabat enhances the idea of abundance (just like J. F. Gronovius's *cogebat*),⁸ but *tollebat* seems more subtle. There is indeed no need for the conjecture, as shown later by Heinsius (ap. Burman 1727, II, 325) and Burman (ibid.).

5.134 *animam*] *anima* (138^r)

Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9.333 *sanguine singultantem*. The transitive use of *singulto* appears first here, but later in *Tr.* 3.5.16; *Sil. Pun.* 2.361; 14.551; *Stat. Theb.* 5.261. See Bömer (1976 [IV–V]) 259. Therefore, *animam* needs not be an error of assimilation.

5.146 *Aethionque*] *Eetionque* (139^r)

The transmitted (*A*)*e(t/c)hion*⁹ is unattested in Greek (see Bömer 1976 [IV–V], 261). Heinsius's proposal, palaeographically excellent, transcribes Ἠτίων, a name of several (Homeric) characters.¹⁰ He referred to Gronovius's (1653) 409 note on *Stat. Theb.* 10.734, where he proposed *Eetiona*. The conjecture is certainly intriguing. But in *Stat. Theb.* 7.757 another *Aet(h)ion* is killed, precisely in a passage where several other names are taken from this Ovidian episode (cf. Smolenaars 1994, 359–360). Thus, we should probably read *Aetionque*.¹¹

5.171 *exactum*] *exsertum* (139^r)

Heinsius's proposal (on which see *ThL* V.2 1856.70–84) derives from *extractum* of *Ld*^{72v}, which could well be a gloss of *exactum*. For *exigere*, which seems to imply special impetus, see *OLD* s.v. 3a.

5.215 *confessasque*] *connexasque uel complexasque* (141^r)

Bach (1831) 225 rightly commented: “auf die Hände übertragen, was der Person zukömmt”, and compared *Prop.* 4.6.79 *confessum ... Parthum*. Cf. Fedeli/Dimundo/Cicarelli (2015) 893–894. Both proposals are therefore “faciliores”, and at least *complexasque* seems hardly compatible with *obliquaque brachia tendens*.

8 Cf. Gronovius ap. Burman (1727 [Syll.]) 487 and Heinsius (ibid.) 489–490.

9 *Ēchion* is, of course, impossible, as Fanensis (1508) ad loc. saw.

10 Ovid uses *Eetion* at *Met.* 12.110; *Fast.* 4.280; *Tr.* 5.5.44 referring to Andromache's father (as does *Sen. Tro.* 219), but nothing precludes an allusion to another Eetion. On the other hand, in all these places, the name is either not soundly transmitted or is conjectural (cf., respectively, Tarrant 2004, 487; Alton/Wormell/Courtney 1997, 92; Hall 1995, 188; Zwierlein 1986, 61).

11 Rosati (ap. Barchiesi 2024, I, 503) argues that *Aethion* might hint at the prophetic skills of the character through an allusion to ἀετός ‘eagle’. If this is so, we should write *Aetion* (cf. Housman 1933, 11–12).

5.215 obliquaque] adductaque (141^r)

Heinsius made his suggestion after *abductaque* of B4 and referred to *Ov. Met.* 8.28 *torserat adductis hastilia lenta lacertis*; 6.625 *paruis adduxit colla lacertis*. Add, e.g., *Her.* 10.104 *fila per adductas saepe recepta manus*. But *auertitur* of the previous line explains *obliquaque*: in addition to admitting defeat, Phineus tries not to lay eyes on Medusa's head. See Bach (1831) 225; Loers (1843) 150; Anderson (1997) 517.

5.228 domo] domu (141^r)

Since P4 has *domum* (an easy mistake after *in*), Heinsius suggested *domu*, a very rare form, unattested in Augustan literature.¹²

5.229 soletur] delectet (141^r)

This seems prompted by *laetetur*, which is intransitive, of four mss. (e.g. A6 Lr10 Lr19).¹³ The reading is probably a gloss of *soletur*, but the conjecture might have some diagnostic value. Perseus has arguably no cause to vex Andromeda,¹⁴ and, as far as we know, she has no reason to rue Phineus' demise. In fact, she should admire Perseus' feats instead: *delectet* goes in that direction.

5.235 summissaeque] commissaeque (140^v)

This looks analogous to *connexasque* at 5.215 (see n.). For *submissaeque*, see Bömer (1976 [IV–V]) 277–278.

5.244 mollierant] mollierunt (141^v)

An interesting suggestion, since *-ērunt* was often corrected in mss. into *-ērant* (see Fàbregas 2022, 134). According to Bömer (1976 [IV–V]) 280, the pluperfect indicates that the action is seen as the backdrop of the actual events of the episode (245–249).¹⁵ Could this mean that Perseus' exploits had reached Polydectes beforehand? The perfect, on the other hand, allows us to vividly imagine Perseus telling his vicissitudes to the very man who had sent him on the quest for Medusa's head.

¹² Before Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.6.5), it is only securely attested in some inscriptions (e.g. in the *Fasti Praenestini* Apr. 28 [*Inscr. Ital.* XIII.2 17]). In Plautus it appears only at *Mil.* 126 (cf. Hammond/Mack/Moskalew 1968, 86); in Cicero and Livius it is very dubiously transmitted. See Neue/Wagener 1902, 776; *ThLL* V.1 1950.38–1951.51.

¹³ Also as *uaria lectio* in one of the Argentinenses ("q" in o4, 118).

¹⁴ Schrader (1776) 206 considered the whole line spurious on grounds of Perseus' unseemly behaviour.

¹⁵ Ehwald (ap. Haupt/Korn/et alii 1903, 212 = 1966, 266) takes it to mean that Polydectes was punished before Perseus returned to Argos at 236–241.

5.246 laudem] laudi (141^v)

Detrectare with a dative is anomalous in classical Latin (cf. *ThLL* V.1 836.28–29). See also n. 5.

5.263 deduxit] seducit (143^r)

I think *seducit* is too strong a word, for it might suggest that only Minerva and Urania went to the fountain, leaving the rest of the Muses behind. But they all went along, it would seem (cf. 263–268). Read also Bömer (1976 [IV–V]) 287.

5.322 cunctosque] iunctosque (146^r)

Does Heinsius's alternative (“posset et ... legi”) to *uictosque* (“unus Basil. [Bs^{72c}] placet”)¹⁶ mean that the gods, under attack by Typhoeus, united only to flee? *Cunctosque* looks superior to me, almost as a response to Nicander (ap. Ant. Lib. *Met.* 28.2 [fr. 59 Schneider]), in whose version Zeus and Athena stay.¹⁷ Cf. also, e.g., *Ov. Tr.* 3.5.5 *cunctique metu fugere ruinam*; *Verg. Aen.* 12.251–252 *cunctaeque uolucres / conuertunt clamore fugam*; *Val. Fl.* 12.544. Heinsius (1742) 587 made the same conjecture at *Stat. Silv.* 5.3.85.

5.373–374 et tamen in caelo (quae iam patientia nostra est!) / spernimur] en tandem in coelo quoque iam patientia nostra / spernitur (148^r)¹⁸

En tandem is certainly clever (*tamen* and *tandem* are regularly confused, as are *et* and *en*).¹⁹ But, considering the change of subjects in 373, the transmitted *et tamen* is not out of place (see Bach 1831, 237; Bömer 1976 [IV–V], 321). On the other hand, the remainder of Heinsius's proposal must be rejected: it looks like *quae* (on which read Burman 1727, I, 11 and Barchiesi 1992, 90 on *Ov. Her.* 1.75; Kenney 1996, 128 on 17.29) was misunderstood and changed into *quoque* (this is the reading of most mss.). See also Anderson (1997) 537.

5.384 Ditem] Diti (148^r)

The proposal, which leaves the verb without an object, was made after *Ditis* of B4.²⁰

¹⁶ *Victos* is much weaker by sense. On the confusion, see Burman (1727, II) 340.

¹⁷ See Rosati ap. Barchiesi (2024, I) 539–540.

¹⁸ After *quo uisa* for *quae iam* of B2, Heinsius wrote: “f. *derisa spernitur*”, but I cannot tell how this might fit the metre. In his printed notes, he (1659) 121ⁿ recommended *et tamen in coelo quoque tanta potentia nostro / spernitur*.

¹⁹ Bothe (1818 [ed.]) 104 printed his own conjecture *En! tamen*. On Heinsius's fondness for *en*, cf. Fàbregas (2024) 50 (and n. 33) on *Ov. Met.* 2.458.

²⁰ See n. 5. More likely is Burman's (1727, II) 348 *inde ... Ditis* (cf. *Ov. Met.* 6.133), which removes the rare *in* (the best parallel for it is *Enn. Ann.* 564–565 Skutsch *me grauis impetus Orci / percutit in latus*

5.411 hic fuit] ~~hœ-subit~~ (147^v)

Cyane lived in the *stagnum* (cf. 413), so *hic fuit* must be right, as Heinsius himself apparently realised (he crossed the proposal out).

5.442 flammiferas pinus] flammī(f/g)era²¹ pinum (150^r)

Before propending for *flammifera* (1659, 125ⁿ) with O9¹ (also Go^{2v}; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 5.50; cf. also Ach. 1.490; *Theb.* 6.716 *uaporifera*), Heinsius seems to have also considered *flammigera*.²² In both cases, it is possible that the adjective was assimilated to *pinus*. Nevertheless, cf. *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 47–48 ἐννήμαρ μὲν ἔπειτα κατὰ χθόνα πότνια Δηῷ / στρωφᾶτ', αἰθομένης δαΐδας μετὰ χερσίν ἔχουσα. Less interesting is *pinum*, even if it might have been corrected into *pinus* because of *duabus manibus*. Cf. Ov. *Fast.* 4.493 [*Ceres*] *illic accendit geminas pro lampade pinus*; cf. also Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 3.370 *geminae ... cupressi*; 3.393.

5.450 dulce dedit, tosta quod texerat ante polenta] pulte dedit tosta [*uel* tostae] quod coxerat ante polentae [*uel* cocta quod torrerat] [*uel* tosta quas ... polentas]²³ (150^r)²⁴

The episode provides the aition for the κικεῶν ritually consumed during the Eleusinia, which was made of barley, water and pennyroyal.²⁵ *Polenta* could certainly designate barley, but *puls* was a typically Roman porridge made of emmer instead of barley (André 1961, 63–64), and is thus less pertinent (and it would be perhaps excessive to serve them both at the same time).²⁶ On the other hand, since the Eleusinian beverage apparently did not contain any sweetener (if we can trust *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 208–209 [the goddess rejects honeyed wine at 206–207] and Nicander ap. Ant. Lib. *Met.* 24.1 [fr. 56 Schneider]), one could argue that Heinsius was perhaps not altogether misguided when questioning *dulce*. But *dulce* is “difficilior” and, considering that we should not expect full ritual exactitude from Ovid, it could be de-

[although the verb has been doubted: see Skutsch 1985, 708]; there are otherwise no good classical parallels [*ThL* X.1 1241.4–25]; see also Bömer 1976 [IV–V] 325).

21 Heinsius wrote first *flammigera* and then, *supra lineam*, added an *f*.

22 The confusion is very common (e.g. 2.155; 14.796; 15.849 [cf. Tarrant 2004, 37; 443; 479]). But the evidence rather speaks for the compound in *-fer*, which was probably an Ennian coinage (*scaen.* 29 Vahlen = 25 Jocelyn), while the form in *-ger* is securely attested from Lucan onward (*ThL* VI.1 873.15).

23 Heinsius also wrote: “Fuit cum legendum putarem quod [...] *polentum* & mox [454] *Cum lympha mixto perfudit*) *Diva polento*. sed exemplum desidero ut *polentum* in neutro genere dicatur.” There are examples of *polentum*, but they are rather late (cf. *ThL* X.1 2526.46–53).

24 Additionally, in the lower-left part of the page Heinsius added: “*Pulte dat & tosta quas* [?] *coxerat*”; and then at the centre (although I am not sure it is Heinsius’s hand): “*Puls datur, et tostae quod coxerat ante polentę*”.

25 Cf. Richardson (1974) 344–348; Foley (1999) 47–48.

26 Even if there is no denial that Ovid was fond of introducing Roman details into Greek myth.

fended on Homer's authority (cf. Hom. *Il.* 11.631; *Od.* 10.233–235; even γληχῶνι τερ-εῖνῃ of Hom. *Hymn Dem.* 209 could account for *dulce*). Note also the alliterations *dulce dedit* and *tosta ... texerat*.²⁷

5.454 liquido] lympa (150^r)²⁸

Liquidum as a noun appears only here in Ovid (cf. Bömer 1976 [IV–V], 344) and is by all means rare in poetry (in addition to this line, *ThLL* VII.2 1484.51–62 [see also 1488.17–21] only quotes *Moret.* 45 and Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.54).²⁹ Could *lympa* have been glossed as *liquidum*? Against this interpretation, *lympa* is soundly transmitted at 5.437, 449 and 544.³⁰

5.462 et] per (151^r)

Heinsius's proposal features in Li3, a ms. he did not know. The asyndeton with repetition of *per* is possible and perhaps more emphatic than *et*. Bach (1831) 242 approvingly compared Ov. *Met.* 5.612 (*per tamen et campos, per* [cf. Tarrant 2004, 148: “per²] et *U BGP*”] *opertos arbore montes*) and 8.76–77 (where the same alteration also takes place: *ire per ignes, / per* [per² BLd3 Ds2L7 Lr15 : et Ω] *gladios ausim*). Read Burman (1727, I) 548 on Ov. *Ars* 1.96 and cf., e.g., *Her.* 7.88 *per mare, per terras septima iactat hiems*; 14.101; 2.35–44; 3.103–110; *Tr.* 2.53–54; 4.1.80; Hor. *Epist.* 1.1.46; Verg. *Aen.* 6.363–364; 6.458–459; 6.461–462. Cf. Wills (1996) 366.³¹ But, on the other hand, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.692–693 *quas ego te terras et quanta per aequora uectum / accipio, quantis iactatum, nate, periclis!*; Catull. 101.1.

5.494 ducimus] ducitur (152^r)

The shift from *mihi est* to *ducimus* is not rare (cf., e.g., 5.504–505; cf. Bach 1831, 244; Szantyr 1972, 20), but Heinsius's elegant emendation renders the line more coherent.³² Once *mihi* was understood exclusively with *est*, the obvious correction was *ducimus*.

²⁷ For *texerat*, cf. Ant. Lib. *Met.* 24.1 διδοῖ ποτὸν ὕδωρ ἐμβαλοῦσα γλήχωνα καὶ ἄλφιτον εἰς αὐτό; *coxerat* is “facilior”.

²⁸ I extract this from a more extensive proposal (see n. 23).

²⁹ Lucr. 2.451 and Ov. *Am.* 1.13.8 are not comparable.

³⁰ Note also the alliterative sequence *loquentem / cum liquido* (cf. *Fast.* 4.575–576 *liquidique immunia ponti / adloquitur*).

³¹ The repetition is also idiomatically Ovidian with other particles: cf., e.g., *Her.* 6.161 *cum mare, cum terras consumpserit*; 10.93 *si mare, si terras*.

³² For the construction, cf. Stat. *Theb.* 9.445 *tibi ductus ab aethere sanguis*.

5.532 *cautum*] *sanctum* (152^v)

Caueo in the legal sense does not usually apply to religious matters and is mostly a prosaic term (see Bömer 1976 [IV–V], 360). Maybe for this reason Heinsius thought of *sanctum*.³³ Cf., e.g., Verg. *Aen.* 12.200 *audiat haec genitor, qui foedera fulmine sancit*; Lucr. 1.587; Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 2.364 *omina perpetuo genialia foedere sancit*.

5.534 *ita*] *id* (152^v)

The confusion is not unheard of (*ThLL* VII.2 518.74). Cf. Ov. *Met.* 7.174 *nec sinat hoc Hecate*; 13.219; *Pont.* 4.1.19 *idque sinas oro*; cf. also Prop. 1.19.16 *Tellus hoc ita iusta sinat*. Despite these parallels (and the lack thereof for *ita sinere*), I would say that there is no true need to change anything (cf. 532).

5.550 *ignauus*] *feralis* (153^v)

Ignauus is a striking epithet for *bubo*.³⁴ See Bömer (1976 [IV–V]) 367. More traditional is Heinsius’s *feralis* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.462). But I do not know how *feralis* might have been substituted for *ignauus*, which is clearly “difficilior”.

5.562 *oris linguae deperderet*] *oris longaeuum perderet uel omnem* <*linguae deperderet*> (154^r)

Heinsius attempted to replace one of the genitives in 562 with an adjective agreeing with *usum*, perhaps because *oris* and *linguae* are synonyms and just one of them, taken ἀπό κοινοῦ, should be enough.³⁵ His first proposal could respond to a probable error in *scriptio continua* and account both for *deperderet*³⁶ and the clumsy reading *ne perderet*. However, I cannot see why the Sirens’ *usus oris* should be called *longaeuus*.³⁷ On the other hand, *omnem*³⁸ would be attractive if the Sirens did lose at

33 Bothe (1818 [Vin.]) 46 similarly conjectured *pactum*.

34 *Ignauus* is also backed up by Isid. *Etym.* 12.7.39, who quotes the line. It is elsewhere applied to animals, but the sense does not seem quite comparable (*ThLL* VII.1 279.57–59; 280.48–54; 281.19–25).

35 Furthermore, one might argue that at 561–562 *ille canor, dos oris* and *linguae usus* stand for the same thing, i.e. the Siren’s singing, making the sequence rather emphatic. Removing one genitive seems to smooth the tautology a bit. In any case, the juxtaposition of the two genitives is not *per se* unartful. On the other hand, one might try to set apart *canor* as ‘vocal singing’ in general (*OLD* s.v. 1a), *dos oris* as the ‘talent of singing’ (Anderson 1997, 556) and *linguae usus* as the physical capability of producing sound (*OLD* s.v. *usus* 3).

36 As Bömer (1976 [IV–V]) 371 states, Ovid uses *deperdere* only here; but cf. Lucr. 3.526–527.

37 The sense would rather require *blandum* (which would fit the metre keeping *deperderet*) or something of the like. Cf., also on the Sirens, Ov. *Ars* 3.315 *res est blanda canor*; Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 3.257.

38 It is unclear whether this is actually a conjecture or rather an attempt to retrieve the original reading of V5¹: “*oris*] *erasa vetus lectio in Vatic. pr. forte omnem*”. V5^{2r} wrote *oris*.

least some part of their human voice, which is not the case (cf. 563). In any case, the transmitted text does not seem intolerably emphatic to me (cf. *Ov. Met.* 3.359–361; 3.366–367; 2.657–658). One must also note that *oris* and *linguae* seem to be respectively picked up by *uultus* and *uox* in 563.

5.588 ad humum] imum (156^r)

Humus ‘de fundo aquae, alveo’ is a unicum (*ThL* VI.3 3122.30–31). *Ad humum* could be a gloss of *imus*,³⁹ which is often applied to liquids (*ThL* VII.1 1401.56–79) and outstandingly opposes the following *alte* (cf. n.). Heinsius (1659) 120 and 128ⁿ edited *imo* (cf., e.g., *Hal.* 90 *num uada subnatis imo* [‘from/at the bottom’] *uiridentur ab herbis*), but also suggested *imum*, staying closer to *ad imum* of some mss. (e.g. N^{nl} B4Hd^cV5 Lr8).⁴⁰ This could provide, I think, the sense ‘down to the bottom’.⁴¹ But an adverbial *imum* is unparalleled (and, therefore, linguistically suspicious). However, for similar adverbial forms, cf. *Ov. Fast.* 5.537 *creuerat immensum* (with Bömer 1958, 322–323); *Apul. Met.* 1.12.2 *infimum deiectus* (with Keulen 2007, 252).

5.588 alte] alto (156^r)

In addition to *imo* (or *imum*; cf. n.), Heinsius seems to have further suggested *alto* (which would usually refer to the sea). I see no reason to doubt *alte*, an extensively documented adverb.

5.590 cana] raua (156^r)

The conjecture was prompted by *parua* of Ld8.⁴² But willows or willow-groves are conventionally qualified with *glaucus* (*Verg. G.* 2.13; 4.182; Columella, *Rust.* 10.332), *canens* (*Verg. G.* 2.13) or *canus* (*Luc.* 4.131).⁴³

³⁹ The confusion is attested, e.g., at *Sen. QNat.* 3 *praef.* 8 (Oltromare 1961, 115; not in Hine 1996, 111); *Lact. Div. inst.* 3.12.34 (Heck/Wlosok 2007, 240).

⁴⁰ If we were to give any chance to *imum*, an *iter corruptionis* may be divined: *imum* being difficult, *ad* was added after 4.297–298 (*uidet hic stagnum lucentis ad imum / usque solum lymphae*) and the metre was restored by changing *imum* into *humum*. *Contra*, in a more straightforward process, Bach (1831) 251 (*praeunte* Bothe 1818 [Vin.], 46): “[*ad imum*] entstand [...] aus *umum*, wie in Ital. Codd. für *hum.* geschrieben zu werden pflegte.” Cf. *ad umum* Hd^c, *ad imum* Hd^{ac}.

⁴¹ For a similar description with analogous wording, cf. *Claud. rapt. Pros.* 2.114–117.

⁴² Heinsius (1658) 371–372ⁿ made the same proposal at *Ov. Ars* 2.659, where the mss. offer *flaua*, *fulua* and *parua*. Cf. Nikolaidis (2001).

⁴³ Also *densus* (or *rarus*) at *Ov. Met.* 11.363 (with Díez 2014, 260–261).

5.592 *primumque*] *primique* (156^r)⁴⁴

After *primaque* of “quart. Medic. & Genev.” (Lr4; Ge, f. 57^v, seems to read *primoque*) Heinsius reckoned *primique*.⁴⁵ Cf. *Ov. Am.* 3.2.64–65 *sed pendent tibi crura: potes, si forte iuuabit, / cancellis primos inseruisse pedes*. But so much precision is pointless; the subsequent *deinde* seems to confirm *primumque*.⁴⁶

5.595 *quas dum*] *dumque* has (156^r)

The conjecture, which is not impossible (cf. *Ov. Fast.* 1.545), was inspired by *dum quas* (P4). But a relative followed by *dum* appears in the same metrical position at *Ov. Met.* 5.391; 9.441; 11.489; 12.328; *Her.* 17.161. Cf. also *Met.* 6.324.

5.648 *super ... sublimis Asida terram*] ~~*supra ... supraque Asiatida terras*~~ (158^r)

Terras “ex optimo Thuaneo” (P28^{ac}; Heinsius 1659, 129ⁿ), which is not unattractive, should be taken as an apposition both to *Europen* and *Asiatida* (or *Asida*). But for *Āsis terra*, cf. 9.448.⁴⁷ For the phraseology of the sentence, cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.3.23 *super pontum simulato uecta iuueno*; Verg. *Aen.* 4.340–341 *quae [sc. talaria aurea] sublimem alis siue aequora supra / seu terram rapido pariter cum flamine portant*. Heinsius himself crossed the proposal out.

6.22 *uersabat*] *uerrebat* (160^r)

After *uergebat* of B2¹, Heinsius attempted *uerrebat* “ut verrere pollice chordas”. This is unparalleled. He himself referred to *Ov. Met.* 4.221 *leuia uersato ducentem stamina fuso*. Add 4.34 *stamina pollice uersant*.⁴⁸

6.37 *confecta*] *effeta* (160^r)⁴⁹

In addition to *defecta* (ap. Burman 1727, II, 381), Heinsius suggested *effeta*, which is more likely. He adduced *Ov. Met.* 7.312 *innumeris effetus laniger annis*; 252 *Aesonis effetum proferri corpus ad auras*. Add Verg. *Aen.* 7.440 *uerique effeta senectus*; 7.452; 8.508 *tarda gelu saeculisque effeta senectus*. However, *confecta* is great (cf., e.g., Catull.

⁴⁴ Also o4, 132.

⁴⁵ Reinforcing the *i*-assonance of the line.

⁴⁶ Ld Ld7 have *primoque*, which would more strictly conform to grammatical rule. See Bömer (1976 [IV–V]) 376.

⁴⁷ On the long *Ā*-, see Sommerstein (2019) 243 on Aischyl. *Suppl.* 547 *ἰάπτει δ' Ἀσίδοϛ δὶ' αἰάϛ*.

⁴⁸ If we were to suspect *uersabat* for some reason, one could perhaps think of *torquebat* (cf. *Ov. Met.* 12.475 *stamina pollice torque*; Catull. 64.313–314; *Eleg. in Maecen.* 1.73 *torsisti pollice fusos*).

⁴⁹ He spells it *effaeta*.

68.119 *confecto aetate parenti*; Verg. *Aen.* 4.599; 11.85; Lucr. 3.947; Cic. *Pis.* 83 *summa senectute confectum*).⁵⁰

6.39 si qua est tibi] est si tibi (160^v)⁵¹

The suggestion, probably inspired by *si est tibi* of “alius” (unidentified), provides an attractive *uariatio*.⁵² A geminated *est* might have dropped out and then *qua est* would have been interpolated to restore the metre. Cf., e.g., Ov. *Met.* 5.262 *uera tamen fama est: est Pegasus huius origo*.

6.51 enim] anus (161^v)

Lr26 has *anum*, whence Heinsius suggested *anus*. But Pallas has already revealed herself (43–44).

6.61 illic et] illic bis *uel* hic et bis (161^v)

The insertion of *bis* is attractive. The best purple cloths were usually dyed twice (cf. Plin. *HN* 9.137), and the description of the cloth’s variegated colours (62) seems to confirm that this is the kind of dyed wool we are dealing with here (Haupt/Korn/et alii 1903, 243–244 = 1966, 307). Heinsius referred to Ov. *Fast.* 2.107 (*induerat Tyrio bis tinctam murice pallam*) and *Ars* 3.170, where he read with Naugerius *nec quae bis Tyrio murice, lana, rubes*.⁵³ Cf., e.g., Hor. *Carm.* 2.16.35–37 *te bis Afro / murice tinctae / uestiunt lanae* (with Nisbet/Hubbard 1978, 269); *Epod.* 12.21 *muricibus Tyriis iteratae uellera lanae*; Tib. 3.8.16; *Cul.* 62; *Stat. Theb.* 9.690; *Mart.* 4.4.6. See also Heinsius (1661) 42–43ⁿ. Nevertheless, the anaphora *illic et* (68), framing the “colorful spectacle” of the tapestry (Anderson 1972, 158), should probably be retained.

6.71 pingit] fingit (163^v)

Anticipating Boissonade’s (1822) 227 *finxit* (after Planudes’ ἐπίξαιτο), Heinsius attempted *fingit* “ut infra v. 93 ex Ms.” But he remembered 6.23 *seu pingebat acu* and referred to Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 1.266. See Ramírez de Verger (2021) 103 on 6.93.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ For the homeoteleuton *-ecta -ecta* and the Ovidian transformation of the Virgilian model, see Rosati ap. Barchiesi (2024, I) 609.

⁵¹ Also o4, 136.

⁵² This is certainly better than *si quae tibi* which Heinsius (1652) 100 had printed, probably following some mss. that omit *est* (e.g. V3 Lr3Lr4 O18). *Quae* instead of *qua* is, to say the least, awkward if we keep the first hemistich unchanged.

⁵³ Cf. also Goold (1965) 80.

⁵⁴ The variation *pingit/fingit* is also documented at Manil. 1.455 (Goold 1998, 14).

6.80 simulat] similat (162^v)

Similat is also the reading of Dr, a less authoritative form (Ernout/Meillet 2001, 626) apparently preferred by Heinsius.⁵⁵

6.128 nexilibus] flexilibus (165^v)

The recollection of Ov. *Met.* 10.99 *flexipedes hederæ* inspired the proposal. *Nexilibus* is arguably pleonastic alongside *intertextos* and potentially could be an interpolation from 2.499. But Heinsius himself remarked: “nihil muta”. Indeed, there is no true need to alter the text.

6.150 admonita est] admonitæ (166^v)

Just like Heinsius read *paruae* instead of *parua est* at 142 (see Ramírez de Verger 2021, 117), here he attempted *admonitæ*. But I do not make sense of it.

6.201 infectis propere ite sacris] ita sacris, procul ite sacris (167^v) uel ite ratis propere sacris (168^r; o2, ad loc.) uel ite: sat est. properate sacris (o3, 155)⁵⁶

“Locus mendosissimus” (Heinsius 1659, 135ⁿ), which has given rise to a large number of conjectures. Read Ramírez de Verger (2021) 135–138. Three more can be added to the fold. The first one, rather inelegant, removes the initial *ite*, which should probably be retained, since it echoes Manto’s exhortation at 159–161 that Niobe is now countermanding. The second one, more interesting, seems to be an alternative to Heinsius’s (1652) 104 *ite statis properate sacris*.⁵⁷ On *ratus* (“according to the rules”) applied to religious matters, see *ThLL* XI.2 1131.71–1132.12.⁵⁸ The third one is palaeo-

55 In b2, 153^v, on 6.26 Heinsius also suggested *similat*, referring to 3.275 (cf. Suárez 2015, 234). Cf. also Fàbregas (2022) 373 on 10.596.

56 o2 = Oxoniensis Bodl. Auct. 2 R VI 25; o3 = Oxoniensis Bodl. Auct. S V 5. Magnus (1914) 211 says about Jahn’s (1832) 351 *ite sacris, propere ite sacris*: “post (cf. Mscr 1075) Heinsium”. The proposal does indeed feature in b3, 167^v and 168^r.

57 In b3, Heinsius wrote: “Leg. *ratis vel statis sacris*”. Since his reference text was *ite statis propere sacris*, his proposal was obviously *ite ratis (uel statis) propere sacris*. Heinsius also conjectured *ite ratis (uel statis) propere sacris* in o2, ad loc., and *ite statis propere sacris* again in o5 (= Oxoniensis Bodl. Auct. S V 11), 143, where he also recalled the juncture *stata* (‘celebrated in a fixed date’) *sacra* from Ov. *Fast.* (1.660; 2.528; cf. also Cato *orat.* 72 Manuwald [Fest. p. 466.22–26 Lindsay]; Cic. *Mil.* 45; *Tusc.* 1.113; Liv. 23.25.3; 23.35.12; 40.4.9; 42.32.2; Stat. *Theb.* 1.666). Therefore, it is unlikely that *statis* means ‘halted’, as Anderson (1972) 181 would take it. For the scansion *sācris*, Heinsius (b3, 168^r) referred to, I think, Ov. *Fast.* 1.333. As regards *statis*, he (b3, 167^v) also annotated “*statis videtur fuisse a manu prima in H [= N, f. 73^v, (s in ras.)atis]*”. See also n. 58.

58 *Ratis* seems more adequate by sense (cf. n. 57). I take *ratis ... sacris* as a bare separative ablative, on which cf. Bömer (1976 [VI–VII]) 65. On the other hand, *ratis* avoids the alleged violation of Ovidian prosody that probably implies *statis* (Anderson 1991, 130), namely placing a short vowel before *s impura* (cf. Platnauer 1951, 62–63). Indeed, I have not found examples in Ovid before *st-* (but cf., e.g., Lucr.

graphically clever (and resembles some proposals made later),⁵⁹ but there are no good parallels for *properare* with bare separative ablative (*ThLL* X.2 1983.61 quotes only Petron. 89 vers. 16).

6.210 hic] hinc (168^r)

This is not bad and certainly “difficilior”. Cf. Ov. *Fast.* 4.41 *Postumus hinc*; 4.393 *hinc Cereris ludi*; cf. also *Her.* 12.61. Translate: “and hence <does not come> my sole distress”. *Hinc* could have been assimilated to *dolor ... solus* (cf. *ThLL* VI.3 2791.77–2792.6).

6.211 uosque est] uosque et (168^r)

Et would correlate with *et* in 212. The intended polysyndeton *et uos ... et me* is interesting, but the postponement of the first *et* is not without complications (cf. Fàbregas 2022, 150). The structure would be further marred by the presence of *–que*.

6.219 turba] turbo (169^r)

This predates Cornelissen’s (1875) 80–81 proposal, on which see Ramírez de Verger (2021) 143. Heinsius quoted Prud. *psych.* 414 *uertigo rotarum*. Towards the margin and in a different ink, he added: “*turbo a manu prima unus meus*” (Gf⁷, 52^r; but I cannot be certain of the reading *ante corr.*).⁶⁰

6.261 non] nil (169^v)

Nil is a possibility (cf., e.g., Ov. *Met.* 12.84 *nil ... profecit [hasta]*; Catull. 42.21 *nil proficimus*; Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.150–151 *radice uel herba / proficiente nihil*; cf. *ThLL* X.2 1701.68–72), but with the future participle Ovid seems to prefer *non* (cf., e.g., *Met.* 13.411 *non profecturas tendebat ad aethera palmas* [with Bömer 1982, 303]; *Her.* 5.116; *Ib.* 520; cf. *ThLL* X.2 1699.55–60). The variation *non/nil* with the present participle is attested at *Tr.* 1.2.13; 1.4.13 (Hall 1995, 10 and 25).

6.293 duplicataque ... caeco est] duplicato ... caeco (170^v)

This would mean that the second daughter received two wounds. But why should it be so? In b3 Heinsius himself quotes some parallels for *duplicata* ‘bent over’, among which Val. Max. 5.1. ext. 1. Cf. Rosati ap. Barchiesi (2024, I) 648; Ramírez de Verger (2021) 172.

4.849), nor before *sq-* (but cf. *Lucr.* 1.372). The examples of Ov. *Her.* 5.24 before *sc-* and *Met.* 12.438 before *sp-* are probably spurious (but cf. *Verg.* *Aen.* 11.309 *ponite spes*). See also McKeown (1998) 121–122 on *Am.* 2.6.41.

⁵⁹ For instance, Bothe (1818 [*Vin.*]) 49–50 proposed *ite, sat est, propere ite, sacri!* See Ramírez de Verger (2021) 137.

⁶⁰ <http://diglib.hab.de/mss/159-gud-lat/start.htm?image=00109>.

6.312 manant] rorant (171^r)

After *narrant* of B4, probably interpolated from 316, Heinsius attempted *rorant*. He adduced *Ov. Met.* 13.622 *dat lacrimas et toto rorat in orbe*, which is not comparable, and on *rorare* with the accusative, he referred to his notes on Claud. 3.383 (1665, 83). See also *OLD* s.v. 3. But *manant* seems correct: cf. Ramírez de Verger (2021) 177–178.

6.352 quae] quas (173^r)

“Malim *quas tamen*. de aquis enim agitur.” Indeed, in Ovid Latona only wishes to quench her thirst.⁶¹ The relative might have been assimilated to *munera*.⁶² Cf. Fàbregas (2022) 391 on 10.645.

6.353 hic] his (173^r)

The ablative, more poetic and precise, is attractive. Cf., e.g., *Ov. Met.* 4.740 *manus hausta uictrices abluit unda*; 13.531–532 *crudelia uulnera lymphis / abluere*.

6.385 inquit] ipsi (173^v)

Heinsius probably thought that *clamabat* in 386 was all that was needed to introduce the direct speech (cf., e.g., *Ov. Met.* 3.477–478; 6.299–300; 8.433–434; 11.482–483; on the other hand, I have not found other examples in Ovid of *inquam* and *clamo* combined). On *mihi ipsi*, cf. Fàbregas (2022) 345–346.

6.406 nascendi tempore] ~~nascenti pectore~~ (175^r)

Nascenti appears in Lr12. This is about Pelops, so Heinsius rightly changed his mind and deleted his suggestion.

6.429 lecto] pacto (175^v)

See on *Ov. Met.* 2.693 (Fàbregas 2024, 53). The proposal derives from *facto* of Bo^{ac}. Heinsius referred to *Ov. Met.* 7.700 again. But poets often use *lecto* in the sense of ‘marriage’ (cf. *ThLL* VII.2 1097.42–45).

6.514 et uix animo sua] animis et uix sua (b2, 173^r) uel et uix iam nunc hic (180^r)

Many commentators consider strange the notion that Tereus ‘postpones his sexual pleasure’ *animo*. Cf. Ramírez de Verger (2021) 242–244. In his edition, Heinsius (1659) 137 bracketed the line, but he had also attempted some remedies. The first one seems an easy emendation of the unmetrical *animo et uix sua* (Ld2; cf. Ramírez de

61 Even if 6.352–353 *non ego ... parabam* allude to another version of the myth (cf. Ant. Lib. *Met.* 35.1) in which the goddess wanted to bathe her children in Melite’s waters.

62 For *aquam dare*, cf. *ThLL* V.1 1666.65–66.

Verger 2021, 341–342; also H3; on Ld2’s reading, in b3, Heinsius comments “proxime ad verum”; cf. 6.652 n.),⁶³ and anticipates many proposals put forward after him that construe *animo* with *exultat*. The second one (“posset & legi”) suppresses altogether *animo* and the expendable *sua*, but it seems unnecessarily emphatic to me.

6.538 hostis mihi debita poena] haecne est mihi debita poena? uel innoxia dedita poenae est (180^v)

“The hemistich has been one of the most mistreated passages of the *Metamorphoses*” (Ramírez de Verger 2021, 254: see 253–255). Heinsius (1659) 147ⁿ wanted to delete it altogether, but he made two proposals in b3. The first one provides an acceptable sense and is palaeographically easy, but not a great improvement as compared to the reading *non haec mihi debita poena*. The second one (“*dedita poenae* certe latet in his verbis”) is interesting, although, as far as *innoxia* is concerned, palaeographically less plausible.⁶⁴ Cf. Ov. Met. 13.663–664 *consortia corpora poenae / dedit* (cf. Lucr. 6.1255); Claud. 18.441–442 *natos hoc dedere poenae / profuit et misero ciuem praepone patri?*

6.541 habuissem] adiuissem (180^v)

No one seems to have doubted the expression *habere umbras*, which is a bit odd in this context: Philomela should rather wish to become an innocent shadow, not to ‘have’ one.⁶⁵ Heinsius’s suggestion is attractive: Philomela wishes she had gone to meet the crime-free souls, whereas she is now damned after death as well. For *adire* in a similar context, cf., e.g., Ov. Met. 10.15–16; 13.465–466 *uos modo, ne Stygios adeam non libera manes, / ite procul*. See ThLL I 622.65–71.

6.544 quandocumque] qualescumque (180^v)⁶⁶

The proposal, somewhat trivial, derives from *quacumque* of Lr^{92c}. *Quandocumque* belongs “zur altertümlichen und pathetischen Sprache” (Bömer 1976 [VI–VII], 149–150).

⁶³ He likewise approved (“bene”) of *exultatque animo uix et sua* (Bs2, f. 48^v).

⁶⁴ However, on account of the straightforward confusion of *d* and *b*, the oscillation between *debitus* and *deditus* is common enough (e.g. *Her.* 7.103 *uenio tibi debita coniunx* [with Heinsius ap. Burman 1727, I, 98–99]). See also Rivero (2018) 394–395 on 13.921.

⁶⁵ Significantly enough, Goold (1984) 327 translates “Then would my shade have been innocent and clean” and Chiarini (ap. Rosati 2009, 101) “Io sarei stata un’ombra senza peccato”. Cf., e.g. the more straightforward expression of 13.57 *letum sine crimine haberet* (although the line is problematic: cf. Rivero 2018, 76–77) or 11.688 *umbra fuit*. *Habere umbram* usually has a specific physical meaning.

⁶⁶ Also o4, 155.

6.552 flexis] plexis uel nexis (180^v)⁶⁷

Plexis, which seems to anticipate *uincla pati cogit*, is interesting. Heinsius made the same proposal at *Ov. Met.* 13.894 *incinctus iuuenis flexis noua cornua cannis*, where *nexis* is also attested (see Rivero 2018, 382).⁶⁸ *Plecto* and *flecto* are often confused (cf. *ThlL* X.1 2394.72–74), but I have not found parallels for *plexis lacertis* or similar (slightly metaphorical) junctures. Contrarywise, for *nexis*, cf. *Ov. Met.* 4.491 *nexaque uipereis distendens brachia nodis*; cf. also 8.747 *manibus nexis*; *Fast.* 6.329 *brachia nectit* (both on dancers); *Verg. Aen.* 4.694–695 *Irim demisit Olympo / quae luctantem animam nexosque resolveret artus*. But for the transmitted *flexis*, cf. *Ov. Met.* 2.196 *flexisque utrimque lacertis*; 3.575 *manibus post terga ligatis*; cf. also *Hor. Carm.* 3.5.22.

6.587 Bacchi] Baccho (182^r)

After *Bacch(a)e* of B7¹, Heinsius attempted *Baccho*: cf. *Verg. Aen.* 5.603 *hac celebrata tenus sancto certamina patri*. But the genitive looks fine: cf. *Ov. Met.* 10.431 *Festa piae Cereris celebrabant annua matres*; *Fast.* 1.393 *festas corymbiferi celebrabas, Graecia, Bacchi*. See n. 5.

6.591 accipit] induit uel arripit (182^r)

In addition to *corripit* (published by Burman 1727, I, 432), Heinsius made two supplementary proposals. The first one appears in Gf3 Ft (Ramírez de Verger 2021, 345); he seems to have drawn inspiration from *instruit* of P2¹ and *instpuit* of V2^{2s} (sic, ut uid.). *Arripit* was later suggested independently by Slater (1927, ad loc.): “*malle arripit*”.

6.611 ‘non est lacrimis hoc’ inquit] lacrimis non hic, non, inquit (182^v)⁶⁹

In his edition, Heinsius (1659) 150ⁿ preferred *hic* instead of *hoc* (cf. Ramírez de Verger 2021, 279), which is attractive (cf. Fàbregas 2022, 197–198 on 10.408). Additionally, he seems to have suspected *est*, which scribes could have interpolated from a gloss *est agendum*.⁷⁰ But, unless a word had been previously lost, the obvious place for the

⁶⁷ Goold (1984) 326 and Ramírez de Verger (2021) 258 read *fixis*, with no comment. As far as I know, the reading appears for the first time in Haupt’s (1853) 206 edition for Weidmann and subsisted up to the tenth edition (1966, 342). *Fixis* is, by the way, the reading of Bo3.

⁶⁸ *Flectit* and *nectit* are also confused at Petron. 18 vers. 3 (cf. Schmeling/Setaioli 2011, 55).

⁶⁹ In b3, he also suggested an emphatic *nil hic nil hic lacrimis, nil*, which implies the impossible scansion *nil! Quandoque bonus dormitat Heinsius*.

⁷⁰ He might have also drawn inspiration from some transposition in the mss., such as *lacrimis hoc non est* (P3 Bs7O12), *lacrimis non hoc est* (Ld), *lacrimis non est hoc* (A6), *lacrimis hiis hoc non est* (Bs3, *est* add. Bs3²), *non est hoc lacrimis* (Bs6).

insertion would have been after *agendum* (see Ramírez de Verger *ibid.*); so, I would tend to keep the text as transmitted. Cf. *Ov. Met.* 1.277–278; *Catull.* 42.15.

6.617–618 aut per uulnera mille / sontem animam expellam] per uulnera mille / sonti anima expulsa (182^v)

The proposal seems to derive from *expellens* of Ld8 and *expulsam* of O15 in combination with the omission of *aut* in “V. libri.” (e.g. O15). However, these words convey the final punishment that Procne devises for Tereus, not a consequence of a possible maiming or castration. See Luck (2009) 100.

6.619 quid sit] sed quid (182^v)⁷¹

“Lege, *Sed quid, adhuc* etc. ut & *sit* subintelligatur”. This is based on *et quid* of V8 Bs4 and constitutes a pragmatically adequate response, which could have been syntactically regularised, to *magnum quodcumque paravi* (618). On the omission of *esse* in indirect questions, cf. Kenney (ap. Barchiesi 2024, II, 101) on 7.566.

6.620 quid possit] quidnam sit (183^v)

This would cleverly pick up *quid sit* of the previous line (cf. n.). But, as far as I know, there are no examples of *quidnam* in Ovid, though parallels are available in other Augustan poets.

6.652 animi est] animis (184^r)

Heinsius liked *animo* of O¹ (“lego”; cf. 1659, 151ⁿ), and alternatively suggested *animis*, since B5 omits *est* (cf. 6.611 n.). But read Ramírez de Verger (2021) 293.

6.664 semesaque uiscera] semesaque fercula uel immersas uiscere (183^v)

The first conjecture is interesting: *ferculum* means ‘dish, course’ and more generally ‘stretcher’, which may be used in funeral rites (cf. *Suet. Cal.* 15.1). But the meanings of *uiscera* ‘flesh’ and ‘child’ are certainly at play here. See Fantham (1998) 132–133 on *Ov. Fast.* 4.200. As for the second proposal, Heinsius referred precisely to *Fast.* 4.199–200 [*Saturnus*] *ille suam metuens, ut quaeque erat edita, prolem / deuorat, immersam uisceribusque tenet*. The ablative *uiscere* should be taken only with *immersas* (cf., e.g., *Verg. Aen.* 3.605) to avoid an overlap with *inde* (and *reserato pectore*). On the other hand, the double epithet with *dapes* is not very elegant.⁷² Read Ramírez de Verger (2021) 298–302.

⁷¹ Also o4, 157.

⁷² Cf. *Serv. Aen.* 2.392; see Kenney (1996) 89 on *Her.* 16.45–46. I add that the omission of *-que* in a small number of mss. (Ramírez de Verger 2021, 349) seems a happenstance. For the coordination, cf. *Ov. Met.* 14.211–212 *eiectantemque cruentas / ore dapes et frusta mero glomerata uomentem*.

6.681 e quibus Aeolides] e quis Deionides (184^v)

Heinsius attempted to substitute the papponymic for the patronymic, referring to Meursius (1632) 135–136, who quotes: Callim. *Hymn* 3.209–210 καὶ Κεφάλου ξανθὴν ἄλοχον Δηϊονίδαο, / πότνια, σὴν ὁμόθηρον ἐθήκαιο; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.15.3 Πρόκριν δὲ Κέφαλος <ὁ> Δηϊόνος; Ant. Lib. *Met.* 41.1. His proposal could respond to a plausible error in *scriptio continua*,⁷³ but the result is unmetrical *ē quis Dēiōnīdēs*, unless we suppose an unlikely synzesis⁷⁴ (cf. 9.443; Callim. *Hymn* 3.209 [cit.]).⁷⁵ There is nothing wrong with the papponymic (see Bömer 1976 [VI–VII], 182); Cephalus is also *Aeolides* at 7.672.

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Álvaro Cancela, Juan Antonio Estévez and Luis Rivero for their helpful comments on a draft of my paper. Thanks are also due to Paloma Guijarro for answering my queries on Greek prosody. This paper was written while I was affiliated with the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Departamento de Filología Clásica); I am now a Serra Hünter Fellow at the Universitat de Barcelona.

Bibliography

Editiones operum Ovidii

Ovidii *Metamorphoseon libri quindecim*, Venetiis in aedibus Aldi mense Octobri MDII.

P. Ovidii Nasonis *Operum tomus II. qui XV Metamorphoseon sive Transformationum libros continet* [accurante Nic. Heinsio], Amstelodami 1652.

P. Ovidii Nasonis *Operum tomus I. Scripta Amatoria complexus*, Nic. Heinsius Dan. Fil. infinitis locis castigavit ad fidem scriptorum exemplarium, Amstelaedami 1658.

P. Ovidii Nasonis *Operum tomus II. qui Metamorphoses complectitur*, Nic. Heinsius Dan. Fil. locis infinitis ex fide scriptorum exemplarium castigavit et observationes adiecit, Amstelaedami 1659.

P. Ovidii Nasonis *Operum tomus III. In quo Fasti, Tristia, Ponticae Epistolae et Ibis*. Nic. Heinsius Dan. Fil. locis quamplurimis castigavit, et notas adjecit, Amstelaedami 1661.

Publii Ovidii Nasonis *Opera omnia*, IV, voluminibus comprehensa, cura et studio P. Burmanni, Amstelodami 1727.

⁷³ The editio Aldina (1502) ad loc. has *Eionides*.

⁷⁴ Or perhaps we should rather speak of ‘loss’ of *l*. See Bremmer (2006).

⁷⁵ Cf. also, e.g., Ov. *Met.* 1.670 *Plēiās* (6.174; 13.293); 4.1 *Mīnyēiās*; 4.632 *Īāpētīōnīdēs*; 6.114 *Dēōīda* (8.758); 7.759 *Lāiādes*; 9.9 *Dēiānīra* (9.138); 12.547 *Dēīphōbum*; Verg. *G.* 4.343 *Dēiōpēa*; *Aen.* 1.72. Additionally, if the text is correct, cf. Hes. *Cat.* 26.29 Merkelbach/West (17 Hirschberger) Δηῖων (Euryti f.). Both Merkelbach/West and Hirschberger print an unmetrical line: τοῦ δ’ υἱεὶς ἐγένοντο Δηῖων <τε> Κλυτίος τε; instead of Δηῖων one might wish to read Μολῖων (Hermann 1822, 60 [ad v. 265]) or Διδαίων (Rzach 1899, 214–215).

- P. Ovidii Nasonis *Metamorphoseon Libri XV*, collatis Academiae Berolin. codice ms. aliisque bonis libris curavit F. H. Bothe, Manhemii 1818.
- P. Ovidii *Metamorphoses*, recensuit varietate lectionis notisque instruxit G. E. Gierig. Editio tertia emendata et aucta cura Joannis Christiani Jahn. Tomus prior, Lipsiae 1821.
- Ὀβιδίου *Μεταμορφώσεως* / Ovidii Nasonis *Metamorphoseon libri XV* Graece versi a M. Planude et nunc primum editi a J. F. Boissonade, Parisiis 1822.
- P. Ovidii Nasonis *Metamorphoseon libri XV*, mit kritischen und erläuternden Anmerkungen von E. C. Chr. Bach, Erster Band I–VII, Hannover 1831.
- P. Ovidii Nasonis *quae supersunt Opera Omnia*, rec. J. Chr. Jahn, Volumen II. Tom. II *Metamorphoseon libr. VIII–XV continens*, Lipsiae 1832.
- P. Ovidii Nasonis *Metamorphoseon libri XV*, rec. V. Loers, Lipsiae 1843.
- Die Metamorphoses des P. Ovidius Naso*, Erster Band (*Buch I–VII*), ed. M. Haupt, Leipzig ¹1853.
- Die Metamorphoses des P. Ovidius Naso*, Erster Band (*Buch I–VII*), ed. M. Haupt/O. Korn/H. J. Müller/R. Ehwald, Berlin ⁸1903.
- P. Ovidii Nasonis *Metamorphoseon libri XV*, Lactanti Placidi qui dicitur *narrationes fabularum Ovidianarum*, ed. H. Magnus, Berolini 1914.
- Die Metamorphoses des P. Ovidius Naso*, Erster Band (*Buch I–VII*), ed. M. Haupt/O. Korn/H. J. Müller/R. Ehwald/M. von Albrecht, Zürich/Dublin ¹⁰1966.
- Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, with an English Translation by F. J. Miller, revised by G. P. Goold, 2 vols., London ³1984.
- P. Ovidius Naso, *Metamorphoses*, ed. W. S. Anderson, Stutgardiae/Lipsiae ⁵1991.
- P. Ovidi Nasonis *Tristia*, ed. J. B. Hall, Stutgardiae/Lipsiae 1995.
- P. Ovidi Nasonis *Fastorum Libri Sex*, rec. E. H. Alton/D. E. W. Wormell/E. Courtney, Stutgardiae/Lipsiae ⁴1997.
- P. Ovidi Nasonis *Metamorphoses*, rec. R. J. Tarrant, Oxonii 2004.
- Ovidio, *Metamorfosi*. Volume III (*Libri V–VI*), a cura di G. Rosati, trad. di G. Chiarini, Milano 2009.

Commentationes operum Ovidii ceterorumque auctorum editiones sive commentationes

- W. S. Anderson, *Ovid's Metamorphoses, Books 6–10*, Norman 1972.
- W. S. Anderson, *Ovid's Metamorphoses, Books 1–5*, Norman 1997.
- A. Barchiesi, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum 1–3*, Firenze 1992.
- A. Barchiesi (ed.), *A Commentary on Ovid's Metamorphoses*, 3 Vols., Cambridge 2024 (Milano ¹2005–2015).
- F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso*, Die Fasten, Band II: *Kommentar*, Heidelberg 1958.
- F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso*, Metamorphosen. *Kommentar, Buch IV–V*, Heidelberg 1976.
- F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso*, Metamorphosen. *Kommentar, Buch VI–VII*, Heidelberg 1976.
- F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso*, Metamorphosen. *Kommentar, Buch XII–XIII*, Heidelberg 1982.
- F. H. Bothe, *Vindiciae Ovidianae sive Annotationes in P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libros XV*, Gottingae 1818.
- S. Díez Rebozo, *Edición crítica y comentario textual del libro XI de las Metamorfosis de Ovidio*, Diss. Huelva 2014.
- P. Fàbregas Salis, *El libro X de las Metamorfosis de Ovidio: un comentario textual*, Huelva 2022.

- I. Constantius Fanensis, *Collectaneorum hecatostys prima Hadriano Cardinali dicata*. In Ibin Ouidii *Sarritiones annotationum ultra centum*. In eiusdem *metamorphoses assumpta: annotationum supra ter centum*. Impressa Fani a Hieronymo Soncino pridie festi Diui Paterniani. Sexto idus Iulias. MDVIII.
- E. Fantham, *Ovid, Fasti Book IV*, Cambridge 1998.
- P. Fedeli/R. Dimundo/I. Ciccarelli, *Properzio*. Elegie, *Libro IV*, Nordhausen 2015.
- H. P. Foley, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Princeton ³1999.
- G. P. Goold (ed.), *M. Manilii Astronomica*, Stutgardiae/Lipsiae 1998.
- I. F. Gronovius (ed.), *P. Papinii Statii Opera*, Amsterodami 1653.
- M. Hammond/A. M. Mack/W. Moskalew (eds.), *T. Macchi Plauti Miles Gloriosus*, Cambridge, MA 1968.
- E. Heck/A. Wlosok (eds.), *L. Caелиus Firmianus Lactantius*, Divinarum institutionum libri septem, libri III et IV, Berolini/Novi Eboraci 2007.
- N. Heinsius (ed.), *Cl. Claudiani quae exstant*, Amstelodami 1665.
- G. Hermann (ed.), *Sophoclis Trachiniae*, Lipsiae 1822.
- H. M. Hine (ed.), *L. Annaei Senecae Naturalium Quaestionum libros*, Stutgardiae/Lipsiae 1996.
- E. J. Kenney, *Ovid, Heroides XVI–XXI*, Cambridge 1996.
- W. H. Keulen, *Apuleius Madaurensis*, *Metamorphoses Book I: Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Groningen 2007.
- J. C. McKeown, *Ovid. Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary*. Volume III: *A Commentary on Book Two*, Leeds 1998.
- R. G. M. Nisbet/M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*, Oxford 1978.
- P. Ultramaré (ed.), *Sénèque*, Questions naturelles, *Livres I–III*, Paris ²1961.
- A. Ramírez de Verger, *Book VI of Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Textual Commentary*, Berlin/Boston 2021.
- J. Reeson, *Ovid. Heroides 11, 13 & 14. A Commentary*, Leiden/Boston/Köln 2001.
- N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford 1974.
- L. Rivero García, *Book XIII of Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Textual Commentary*, Berlin/Boston 2018.
- G. Schmeling/A. Setaioli, *A Commentary on the Satyrice of Petronius*, Oxford 2011.
- O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Oxford 1985.
- J. J. L. Smolenaars, *Statius, Thebaid VII: A Commentary*, Leiden/New York/Köln 1994.
- A. H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylus. Suppliants*, Cambridge 2019.
- A. Suárez del Río, *Edición crítica y comentario textual del libro III de las Metamorfosis de Ovidio*, Diss. Huelva 2015.
- O. Zwierlein (ed.), *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae, incertorum auctorum Hercules [Oetaeus]*, Octaúia, Oxonii 1986.

Opuscula virorum doctorum laudata

- J. André, *L'alimentation et la cuisine à Rome*, Paris ¹1961.
- J. N. Bremmer, "Rescuing Deio in Sophocles and Euripides", *ZPE* 158, 2006, 27.
- P. Burman, *Sylloges epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum tomi quinque*, collecti et digesti, Tomus III, Leidae 1727.
- J. J. Cornelissen, "Varia", *Mnemosyne* 3, 1875, 73–82.
- A. Ernout/A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*. Retirage de la 4^e édition augmentée d'additions et de corrections par J. André, Paris 2001.
- P. Fàbregas Salis, "Unpublished Conjectures by Nicolaus Heinsius on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1–4", *Philologus* 168.1, 2024, 42–69.

- G. P. Goold, “*Amatoria critica*”, *HSPH* 69, 1965, 1–107.
- J. J. Hartman, *De Ovidio poeta commentatio*, Lugduni Batavorum 1905.
- N. Heinsius, *Adversariorum Libri IV*, curante P. Burmanno Juniore, Harlingae 1742.
- A. E. Housman, “Notes on the *Thebais* of Statius”, *CQ* 27, 1933, 1–16 (= *Classical Papers*, III, Cambridge 1972, 1197–1222).
- C. G. Lenz, *Erklärende Anmerkungen zu Ovids Metamorphosen*, I, Braunschweig 1792.
- G. Luck, “More missing letters in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*”, *MH* 66, 2009, 88–119.
- I. Meursius, *Regnum Atticum sive, De Regibus Atheniensum, eorumque rebus gestis, libri III*, Amstelodami 1632.
- F. Neue/C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Erster Band: *Das Substantivum*, Leipzig³1902.
- A. G. Nikolaidis, “*Minerua raua an torua?*”, *AJPh* 122, 2001, 81–86.
- M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, Cambridge 1951.
- A. Rzach, “Zu den Nachklängen hesiodischer Poesie”, *WS* 21, 1899, 198–215.
- J. Schrader, *Liber emendationum*, Leovardiae 1776.
- D. A. Slater, *Towards a Text of the Metamorphosis of Ovid*, Oxford 1927.
- A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik*, Band II: *Syntax und Stilistik*, München 1972.
- J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion*, Oxford 1996.