

Pere Fàbregas Salis

Unpublished Conjectures by Nicolaus Heinsius on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1–4

Abstract: This paper publishes for the first time 132 conjectures by Nicolaus Heinsius on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1–4. The value and possible motivations of each proposal are briefly assessed.

Keywords: Ovid; *Metamorphoses*; Nicolaus Heinsius; unpublished conjectures; textual criticism

Nicolaus Heinsius accompanied his colossal 1659 edition of Ovid's *Met.* with a bulk of more than 400 pages of critical notes,¹ which he, constricted by public duties, regretted having composed in a hurry.² Later, using Heinsius's manuscript drafts, Burman (1727) was able to supplement Heinsius's original notes and to produce his own. After that, Heinsius's rich preparatory materials, which included not only collations of many manuscripts, but also unpublished conjectures, fell into almost complete oblivion.³ The goal of this paper is to publish conjectures for books 1–4 present mostly in the Berolinensis Diez. 4° 1075 (= b3)⁴ which have never been printed by Heinsius himself (1659) nor Burman (1727), Magnus (1914) or Slater (1927),⁵ who made some use of Heinsian drafts.⁶ I comment briefly on each proposal.⁷

It is perhaps worth saying that I have decided to include every suggestion, not only the strongest ones, because I might have misjudged them and because, at this point, any exclusion would amount to a second *damnatio memoriae*. Furthermore, even what one might call *coniecturae nugatoriae*⁸ have something to teach us. On the one hand, they reveal extraordinary knowledge of the mechanisms of transmission, and some certainly have at least diagnostic value.⁹ Otherwise, by provoking refutation, they advance our

¹ This is his second edition. The first one of 1652 has no commentary.

² Heinsius (1658) 6^{r-v*} (*Nicolaus Heinsius Candido Lectori S.*). Heinsius was indeed heavily busy with diplomatic affairs up to 1671; similar regrets also appear in other editions of his up to that year. An excellent, though incomplete, account of Heinsius's career is still Blok (1949). For an updated critical and biographical profile of Heinsius, especially as regards his travels to Italy, see Celato (2023).

³ A brief account of the fate of these materials is to be found, e.g., in Fàbregas (2022) 35–37.

⁴ On the Berolinensis, see Boese (1962) 160–161 and 170; Reeve (1974) 136 n. 9 and 150–151; Winter (1986) 16–17; Fàbregas (2022) 36 n. 12.

⁵ Nor in Heinsius (1652, 1742, 1758) or by Suárez (2015) in the case of book 3. Additionally, since the proposal has been neglected, I point out that Heinsius's *ingentesque animo et* (b3, 25^r) at 1.166 was communicated *per litt.* to Gronovius (ap. Burman 1727 [Syll.], 293 [cf. 292]); however, he must have later realized that *concipit* is actually introduced by *et* in 164 (cf. Burman 1759, 126). Likewise, Ramírez de Verger (2022) 89–90 has recently attributed to Heinsius (b3, 58^r) 2.382 *quali, cum deficit, orbem* (Magnus 1914, 66 assigned it to Passerat), probably an attempt to make sense of the reading *orbe*.

⁶ Munari (1950) 164–165 published some conjectures on the *Amores* from the Oxonienses Bodl. Auct. S V 7 and Auct. S V 10. Despite these rather isolated efforts, a comprehensive exploration of Heinsian manuscript notes has not yet been undertaken. For my part, I intend to at least partially mend this state of affairs and gradually disclose all his unpublished conjectures on *Met.*

⁷ The lemmata are from Tarrant's OCT (2004). I indicate in brackets the exact folium of b3 in which they appear. Furthermore, the following sigla are also used for Heinsius's *libri impressi cum notis manuscriptis*: b2 = Berolinensis Diez. 4° 1072; o4 = Oxoniensis Bodl. Auct. S V 8. When Heinsius quotes ms. readings, I try to identify them to the best of my ability using the sigla available at <http://www.uhu.es/proyectovidio/ing/index.html> (a version of the website is stored for long-term preservation by the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: <https://opacplus.bsb-muenchen.de/search?oclcno=973043726&db=100&View=default>). The sigla are also available in Diez (2014); Suárez (2015); Rivero (2018); Ramírez de Verger (2021); Fàbregas (2022).

⁸ Heinsius himself defined so some of his proposals added in the margins of his collation of the *codex Etruscus* of Seneca's tragedies in a letter to Gronovius (ap. Burman 1727 [Syll.], 203).

⁹ Cf. Maas (1960) 32.

understanding of the passage at hand (Maas 1960, 13). In the worst-case scenario, they allow us glimpses into the *officina* of the *uerus sospitator Ouidii*.

1.15–16 utque erat et tellus ... / sic erat] quaque errat tellus (*uel* quaque haeret tellus) ... / siderat (17^v)

In addition to *quoque ierat tellus* (ap. Burman 1727, 13 = Heinsius 1758, 427),¹⁰ which makes good sense and avoids the repetition of *erat*, Heinsius made other conjectures, also implying the notion of movement: *quaque errat tellus*, drawing inspiration mostly from *quaque erat et tellus* of “optimus Cantabrigiensis [deperditus]¹¹ & primus Palatinus [sc. Gruteri = Hd; also V15 V26]” and *quaque erat tellus* of “2 Pall.” (V9 V17); and *quaque haeret tellus*. He even ventured *siderat* instead of *sic erat*, which, despite being palaeographically excellent, does not seem compelling to me. We should keep the combination *ut ... sic* (cf., e.g., 1.45–47; 1.370; 4.440–441). Read Burman ad loc. The reading *qua* instead of *ut* is probably a gloss.

1.92 turba] torua (21^v)¹²

The “Langermanni codex” (Gf4^{2m}(n.l.); also Bo) had *uerba*, which just probably slipped from the previous line. However, Heinsius, as reported by Burman (1727, 23 = Heinsius 1758, 430), took the chance to suggest *terra*, which seems flat to me (this could even be Burman’s mistake, since I cannot find the proposal among Heinsius’s drafts). Much more interesting is Heinsius’s autograph proposal *torua*, which is palaeographically easy and provides a more pointed sense than *turba*. Cf. Petron. *Sat.* 123 vers. 206 *toruo Iuppiter ore*; Sil. *Pun.* 12.551–552 *stat celsus et asper ab ira / ingentemque metum toruo domat ore senatus*; Stat. *Silv.* 5.2.179; *Achil.* 2.52–53.

1.155 subiectae Pelion Ossae] subuecto Pelio Ossae (23^v)

Jupiter knocks off the ladder to the heavens the Giants built piling up mounts Olympus, Ossa and Pelion. Since Homer (*Od.* 11.315–316), Pelion was often on the top, and Ovid kept that order in *Am.* 2.1.13–14 (with McKeown 1998, 13) and *Fast.* 1.307–308; 3.441–442; cf. also Prop. 2.1.19–20. Thus, *subiectus* must be probably referred to Ossa.¹³ Nevertheless, maybe because Virgil (*Georg.* 1.281–282) had reversed the Homeric order, Heinsius was also prepared to read *subiecto Pelio Ossam*, which he had found “in uno Ambrosiano pro diversa itidem lectione” (A2).¹⁴ But probably because there seems to be no reason why Ovid would resort to the Virgilian order here, in b3 he suggested *subuecto*, which would keep Pelion on top; but I cannot find fully comparable examples of this alleged used of *subueho*.

¹⁰ See also Burman (1727 [Syll.]) 395.

¹¹ Vid. Reeve (1974) 150 n. 67; Fàbregas (2019) 86.

¹² Also o4, 5.

¹³ Perhaps regarding the dative with *excitere* as objectionable (the construction is certainly not common [vid. *OLD* s.v.], and the thought seems a bit odd), Heinsius recommended (1659) 13–14ⁿ *subiectam Pelio Ossam*, which is excellent.

¹⁴ On f. 2^v, A2¹ reads *subiectum pelion oss(a)e*, A2^{2v} added *ossam* and A2^{3m} *pelio*, but, as far as I can tell, there is no correction on *subiectum*. A further argument for this interpretation is that the first mountain struck by lightning is Olympus, which we could assume to be placed on top. Nevertheless, *excitere* rather suggests that Jupiter struck the lowest mountain first and the others were “shaken off”.

1.173 hac parte] at fronte (24^v)

I am not very convinced by the reading of *Be hac parte*, which Bömer (1969) 79 rightly defines as colourless. The vulgate *a fronte* or *hac fronte* would place the godly halls in a clearly conspicuous place on both sides of the *Via Lactea* and close to the top, contrasting with the dispersion of the ‘plebeian’ houses. However, *a* or *hac* are still dull and somewhat prosaic. Heinsius thought of *at*, which is great. *At fronte* could have easily been corrupted to *hac fronte* (perhaps because of *hic* in 175) or to the more common expression *a fronte*. This conjecture deserves serious consideration.

1.175 uerbis] ueris (24^v)

Heinsius cleverly suggested *ueris*, which could have been replaced by an obvious gloss, palaeographically very close, such as *uerbis*. This variation is attested at 10.20 (vid. Fábregas 2022, 118). But cf., e.g., Cic. *De or.* 3.36 *alterum enim exultantem uerborum audacia reprimebat*; *Orat.* 81.28 *nec in faciundis uerbis erit audax*.

1.206 compressit] compescit (26^v)

Heinsius probably wanted to avoid the repetition *compressit* / *pressit* (207) in a rather tautological sequence. He quoted 14.629–630 *spatiantia passim / brachia compescit*; *Tr.* 1.2.87 *tantos compescite fluctus*; 5.6.45 *intempestiuos igitur compesce tumores*. To these, add Sen. *Herc. f.* 47.3 *uirga murmur omne compescitur*. Cf. also Claud. *rapt. Pros.* 1.84–88. *Compescit* is certainly attractive. However, cf. *Epiced. Drusi* 467 *iam comprime fletus*; Stat. *Theb.* 1.207 *compressa metu seruantes murmura Venti*; and perhaps also Lucr. 1.69 *murmure compressit caelum*.¹⁵ Vid. Bömer (1969) 90 ad loc.

1.280 immittite] admittite (26^v)

Permittite of “*unus meus* [P9], *quod magis placet*” (b3, 30^r) would be indeed possible (cf. *ThlL* VI.3 2394.57–58). Less likely is *dimittite* of “*tres alii*” (e.g. Hd Lr19P24 Lr26; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 9.233 *longum dimittere habenas*; August. *Conf.* 8.12.28) and even less so *emittite* of “*unus*” (Bo2; there seems to be no classical parallels for *habenae emittite*; one would expect *flumina* as object). Being aware that prefixes are often wrong in this paradox (cf. Luck 2008, 11–12), Heinsius added “*posset et admittite legi*”, which could certainly be right: cf. 11.512 *ubi se uentis admiserat unda coortis*; Val. Fl. 6.303 *opprimit admissis ferus hinc Gesander habenis*. Nonetheless, as recalled by Bömer 1969 (107), *immittere habenas* is a common poetical expression (cf. *ThlL* VI.3 2394.49–51; *OLD* s.v. *immittere* 9a).

1.298 uineta] pineta (26^v)

Heinsius commented: “*malim et pineta. pinus enim inter proceras arbores*”.¹⁶ This could certainly go well with the immediately preceding lines, which seem to imply fairly deep waters (295–297); but nothing rules out *uineta* (cf. 292–295).

¹⁵ In strictly physical sense, cf. Ov. *Met.* 6.556; also 6.294 (with Ramírez de Verger 2021, 170–174).

¹⁶ A similar confusion is attested at 11.87 (*uineta/pineta/spineta*: vid. Díez 2014, 69–71) and 6.15 (*uineta/dumeta*: vid. Ramírez de Verger 2021, 72).

1.406 non] nondum (33^r)

Heinsius suggested *nondum exacta satis*. *Nondum satis* is mainly prosaic, but not rare. The first poetic example I can find is Luc. 8.786–787 *semusta rapit resolutaque nondum / ossa satis neruis*. Cf. also Ov. *Her.* 17.177–178 *nec adhuc exacta uoluntas / est satis*. Since the sense would remain intact, *-dum* could have dropped in synaloepha. Cf. Fàbregas (2022) 438. For the synaloepha, cf., e.g., *Met.* 9.17. This is indeed an interesting proposal.

1.440 tantum spatii] totumque spati (34^r)

Heinsius attested: “*tantumque spatii* unus Med. ex melioribus [Lr7]”. Since the reading is unmetrical, he suggested *totumque spati*. This phrase explains why Python was so terrifying, which makes the asyndeton preferable. Furthermore, *totum* does not seem to admit the partitive construction (cf. Pinkster 2015, 991–992; cf. *OLD* s.v. 4b; one would rather expect *totumque spatium*). Likewise, the contracted form *spati* should be avoided (vid. Neue/Wagener 1902, 146; Bednara 1906, 340–341; Fàbregas 2022, 278–279 on 10.359).

1.533 ut] ceu (36^r)

The variation between *ut* and *ceu* is documented at 11.26 (vid. Díez 2014, 16–17).¹⁷ For *ceu ... sic*, cf., e.g., Verg. *Aen.* 10.723–729. Vid. *ThlL* III 982.5–9. But there is no need for the change; for *ut ... sic*, see on 1.15–16.¹⁸

1.542 sparsum] passum (36^v)

This is again a very interesting proposal. *Sparsum* could be an easy gloss of the much more difficult *passum*. The confusion between the two participles is almost systematic in the mss. (in similar syntagms, e.g., *Met.* 2.238 *passis ... comis*; *Tr.* 1.1.12 [Enn. *Ann.* 349 Skutsch]; *Met.* 4.521 *passis ... capillis*; 5.513; 6.531 [see Ramírez de Verger 2021, 249]; 7.257; 11.49; *Her.* 6.89; *Ars am.* 3.709; *Fast.* 2.813; *Tr.* 1.3.43; *Am.* 3.2.45 *passis ... pinnis* [with Heinsius 1658, 267ⁿ]). For *crinis passus*, cf., e.g., Verg. *Aen.* 1.480; 2.403–404;¹⁹ Ov. *Fast.* 1.645 (v.l. *sparsos*); *Tr.* 4.2.43 (v.l. *sparsis*). Vid. *ThlL* IV 1204.35–38; X.1 195.67–196.2. However, as far as I know, the juncture always appears in the plural. On the other hand, Ovid does not use *crinis sparsus* anywhere else (but cf., e.g., Sen. *Herc. f.* 473; *Oed.* 416; *Phaedr.* 393; Luc. 9.683; vid. *ThlL* IV 1204.53–58). See also on 4.261.

1.569 claudit silua] claudunt saxa (uel lustra) (37^v)

Heinsius attested: “*silva* [Lr9], vel, *littora* unus Mediceus [Lr9^{2m}]”. From this, he suggested “forte *claudunt saxa* vel, *lustra*” (in o4, 21, he added *ora*). Tempe is a defile between mounts Olympus and Ossa (*OCD* s.v. *Tempe*) which is often described as woody and shady. *Lustra* could certainly match this description, and the word could have been replaced by its gloss *silua* (could *littora* be a corruption of *lustra*?). *Saxa*

¹⁷ Heinsius also pointed out that at 1.555 one of his mss. (Gf7²) had *ceu* instead of *ut*.

¹⁸ The simile is modelled upon Verg. *Aen.* 12.749–757, where *ueluti* is used as introduction.

¹⁹ Some recc. of Virgil have *passis* (see Burman 1746, II, 132 and 264).

seems less likely, *ora* even less so. In any case, the transmitted *silua* looks fine: cf. Catull. 64.285–286 *confestim Penios adest uiridantia Tempe, / Tempe quae siluae cingunt super impendentes* (with Ellis 1889, 327); Plin. *NH* 4.31.

1.569–570 *ab imo ... Pindo] ad imum ... Pindum* (37^v)

Heinsius's suggestion cannot be right. The river Peneus flowed from mount Pindus into the sea through Tempe. Bömer (1969) 179 quotes Strabo 7 frg. 14 (ῥεῖ δ' ὁ Πηνειὸς ἐκ τοῦ Πίνδου ὄρους διὰ μέσης τῆς Θεσσαλίας πρὸς ἔω) and 15 (ὁ Πηνειὸς ποταμὸς, ῥέων διὰ τῶν Τεμπῶν, καὶ ἀρχόμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ Πίνδου ὄρους). See also Anderson (1997) 203–204. Therefore, *ab imo ... Pindo* is right.

1.591 *aliorum nemorum] dumorum aut nemorum uel horum altis nemorum* (39^r)

The transmission of this line is seriously troubled. Heinsius wanted to avoid the repetition of *altus* (592 *altissimus*). In addition to his printed suggestions (1659, 25ⁿ; cf. Burman 1727, 73), after *dū horum nemorum aut horum* of the “sec. Palat.” (Hd¹), he conjectured *dumorum aut nemorum*, which is palaeographically clever, but makes the repetition in parenthesis clumsy.²⁰ He also attempted *horum altis nemorum*, which is better, but does not remove the repetition.

1.737 *hoc audire] exaudire* (44^r)

Heinsius wrote: “*haec audire* Cantabr. [deperditus]²¹ VI. alii [e.g. Lr2 Lr3 Bs2 Gf8Lr14 Lr20]. forte, *exaudire*”. Just after the direct speech, *hoc* might seem a bit weak. *Exaudire* provides an apparently pointed sense: cf. *Am.* 2.9.51.²² But it often entails the notion of “heeding” (*OLD* s.v. 3b), whereas the Styx seems here a mere witness to Jupiter's tricky promise. Cf., e.g., 6.548; Verg. *Aen.* 12.200.

1.771 *ipse] ecce* (44^v)

Esse of “sec. Pal.” (Hd) prompted the conjecture. The confusion between *esse* and *ecce* is possible (cf. 2.78), but *ecce* is not very attractive here. The reading of Hd probably just tried to make clear that *uidendum* must be understood as *uidendum esse*. On the other hand, there is nothing wrong with *ipse* (cf., e.g., Lucr. 3.874–875 *quamuis neget ipse / credere se quemquam sibi sensum in morte futurum*; Ov. *Met.* 9.752 *non se negat ipsa roganti*), even if one might prefer the reading *ille*.

2.125 *repetens] promens* (50^r)

The conjecture seems to be inspired by *reprimens* of N⁴ (*repetens* N^{4v}), but it is unlikely that N⁴ is singling out a corruption, nor do I have reason to believe that the transmitted

²⁰ On the repetition in “demonstrative parenthesis”, see Wills (1996) 335–341, esp. 339.

²¹ See n. 11.

²² For a similar corruption, vid. Ramírez de Verger (2021) 172–173 on 6.294. The preceding *haec* might have encouraged the confusion.

repetens is an interpolation from 13.739 (with Rivero 2018, 331).²³ Furthermore, I have not found parallels for *promere suspiria*.

2.127 et fortius] at fortiter uel sed precor (50^r)

Burman (1727) 102 claimed credit for *at fortiter*, which is attractive, but it should be attributed to Heinsius.²⁴ As an alternative, he also suggested *sed precor*, which is dull and far too removed from the paradosis.

2.138 tortum ... Anguem] tortam ... Anguem (50^r)

As the “primus Moreti” (unidentified) read *inter utramque* in 140 (by assimilation with *pressam ... ad Aram?*), Heinsius suggested *tortam ... Anguem* here. It is true that scribes tended to restore the masculine with *anguis*,²⁵ but the constellation is regularly masculine (cf. *ThlL* II 55.46–55).

2.146 est] si (50^v)

Heinsius commented: “*sit unus Leid.* [Ld2¹] *Lego si non invenusta repetitione*”. But the repetition and resulting thought has no true rhetorical sharpness. The enjambement of *est tibi* looks far more acute. Cf. *Fast.* 4.600.

2.277 subsedit] subsidit (53^v)

Lines 275–279 are all in the perfect. Heinsius’s *subsidit* must be therefore wrong. Vid. Fàbregas (2022) 248 on 10.284.

2.316 illic ... illic] istic ... illic (54^v)

O4 reads *istinc ... illinc*, which prompted Heinsius’s *istic ... illic* (no examples in Ovid or in classical literature: cf. *ThlL* VII.1 373.52). See Bömer (1969) 321; Anderson (1997) 263.

2.399 dolens] premens (59^v)

Unless deeper corruption should be supposed, *dolens* was misunderstood once taken with *stimulo* and *uerbere*, giving way to glosses (*furens*) or corrections (*domans*). After the unlikely *fremens* of “*unus Leid.*” (Ld8, f. 16^r, reads *tremens*, on which Heinsius [b2, 50^v] commented “l(ege) *fremens*”), Heinsius conjectured *premens*, which is possible, but inferior to *dolens*: cf. 11.345.

2.400 enim] equis (60^r)

²³ For the *simplex* in a similar context, cf. 2.621–622. By the way, whether *repetens* means that Phoebus repeatedly sighs while he talks (cf. Lygd. 6.61) or whether this a case of “*vi praepositionis evanida*” (Bömer 1969, 272–273; cf. Bach 1831, 68), I cannot tell.

²⁴ Heinsius already observed that “*primus Med.* [Lr] *unus Bonon.* [Bo3]” had *et fortiter*. One of the anonymous reviewers points out that in his *Adversaria* Heinsius (1742) 160 quoted the line with the reading *et fortiter*. A similar oscillation between *utilius* and *utiliter* is attested at *Am.* 1.7.24.

²⁵ Cf. 4.495–496 (with Heinsius 1659, 95ⁿ; Burman 1727, 284); 4.594 (with Heinsius ap. Burman 1727, 293).

Heinsius (1659) 37ⁿ suspected lines 398–400 (400 *imprimis*, deleted by Tarrant 2004, 46). Probably for this reason, he suggested *equis* instead of *enim*, but the repetition of the word is not great (especially with its reprisal with *illis* at the end of the line). For the parenthesis with *enim*, cf., e.g., 15.566.

2.404–405 terras hominumque labores / perspicit] terrisque hominumque labori / prospicit (59^v)²⁶

Heinsius certainly found inspiration in *prospicit* of Lr P24 Lr20 (also Go2).²⁷ The confusion between the two verbs is common enough (*ThLL* X.2 2219.12–14). The enclitic after *terris* seems out of order (he excludes it in o4, 41), but, as Jupiter is restoring cosmic order after Phaethon’s race, *prospicit* with the dative could certainly be right. Available examples of this construction are mostly prosaic (vid. *OLD* s.v. 6; *ThLL* X.2 2222.15–60), but cf. 15.834–836 *inque futuri / temporis aetatem uenturorumque nepotum / prospiciens*. Despite this, *perspicio* seems faultless (vid. Bömer 1969, 269 on 2.112).²⁸

2.424 rescierit] rem scierit (61^r)

In addition to *rescieris* attested by Slater (1927) ad loc.,²⁹ maybe because *rescisco* is very rare in Augustan poetry (see Bömer 1969, 347–348: “bei Ovid nur hier”), Heinsius also suggested *rem scierit*, which is palaeographically obvious. In b3, Heinsius does not mention that this is the reading of Bo3 (also Li3). But cf., e.g., Plaut. *Asin.* 743 *ne uxor resciscat metuit*; Ter. *Phorm.* 585 *ueeorque ne uxor aliqua hoc resciscat mea*. Furthermore, the use of both compounds in close proximity (*nesciet/rescierit*) seems deliberate.

2.424 sunt o sunt] quin sunt haec (61^r)

Trying to make sense of *quia sunt haec* of “*alius*”,³⁰ Heinsius attempted *quin sunt haec*, which gives excellent sense. But for a similar pattern to *sunt o sunt*, cf. 4.583 *accede, o coniunx, accede*; *Pont.* 1.1.59–60 *paenitet, o ... / paenitet*; Verg. *Aen.* 8.579 *nunc, o nunc liceat crudelem abrumpere uitam* (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 3.360).

2.451 et] ac (61^r)

The “pr. Medic.” (Lr) reads *at*, which is wrong. Hence Heinsius suggested *ac*. But *et* and *at* are regularly confused.³¹

2.458 est] en (62^r)

Diana tells Callisto and her other companions that they are alone (so it is safe to take off their clothes and bathe). Heinsius’s *en* is attractive.³² Cf., e.g., 8.590–591 *ut tamen ipse*

²⁶ Also o4, 41 with *terris* instead of *terrisque*.

²⁷ Also Douza (teste Burmanno 1727, 124) by conjecture.

²⁸ Bach (1831) 86 observes that *perspicit* matches *explorat* (403).

²⁹ Reading *sunt o tua* with P2.

³⁰ The closest reading I have been able to trace is *quid sunt o* of Lr22.

³¹ On the variation, see Rivero (2018) 413; Fàbregas (2022) 277–278 and 431.

³² *En* calls attention to something perceptible, which can also be a situation (Pinkster 2021, 931). In any case, on Heinsius’s taste for *en*, see Rivero (2018) 164 on 13.262.

uides, procul, en procul una recessit / insula, grata mihi. The confusion between *en* and *est* is palaeographically easy.³³

2.473 *mei]* *mihi* (62^r)

The dative is probably more poignant than *mei*,³⁴ but cf. 475 *places nostro, importuna, marito; Fast. 6.52 hic teneam cum loue templa meo.*

2.482 *precantia]* *rogantia* (62^r)

Heinsius merely wrote: “l(ege) *rogan-*”. I had thought that Heinsius independently predated Schepper (ap. Faber 1665, 329), but his source was likely Gronovius, who communicated the proposal to him in a letter of the 14th January 1658.³⁵

2.494 *conspectos]* *consuetos* (63^r)

The conjecture is no improvement. In fact, *conspectos* is great: cf., e.g., *Her. 19.205–206 ut te conspecta subito ... / restiterim.*

2.518 †*est uero quisquam†]* *estne igitur* ~~est~~ *quis qui* (62^v), *est autem ut quisquam (uel est autem cur quis)* (63^r)

Instead of *ergo* in his *estne ergo quis qui* (1659, 39ⁿ), Heinsius also suggested *igitur*, which is possible, but palaeographically one step further away.³⁶ Additionally, he attempted *estne autem ut quisquam* or *est autem cur quis*. The latter is tolerable (cf. 13.114; *Her. 10.144; Pont. 1.7.54*), but I do not make much sense of the former.

2.559 *Pandrosos]* *Pandrasis* (65^r)

Heinsius attempted *Pandrasis*, probably after *Pandrasos* of most mss., and referred to 2.738 (where similar variants are recorded).³⁷ Perhaps *Pandrosis* would be feasible, yet this seems a second declension noun (cf., e.g., Paus. 1.27.2–3; read Bömer 1969, 375 and 376–377). Thus, *Pandrosos* must be right (vid. Sniehotta 1903, 5–6).³⁸

2.563 *dicar]* *cedar* (64^v)

³³ Vid. Heinsius (1659) 426ⁿ on 15.677.

³⁴ *Mei* might be taken as a sign of affection (cf. Anderson 1997, 288). Heinsius apparently had a certain penchant for the dative: see on 3.191; 3.456; 4.287; and cf. Fàbregas (2022) 338 and 390.

³⁵ Ap. Burman (1727 [Syll.]) 382. On the 24th December, Heinsius (ap. Burman 1727 [Syll.], 377) had confessed to Gronovius that he was struggling with the line and that he propended for *neue truces animos per uerba precantia flectat* (cf. 1659, 38ⁿ). I thank one of the anonymous readers for the precision.

³⁶ The confusion is rather common (*ThLL* VII.1 254.66–69; V.2 762.8–9): cf. Cic. *Div. Caec.* 19 *quis ergo [igitur v.l. teste Peterson] est qui neget; Planc.* 24 *quis est igitur [ergo dett. aliquot teste Olechowska], qui neget.* For *igitur*, cf. *Sull.* 52 *num quis est igitur, qui tum dicat; Orat.* 225 *quis est igitur qui non fateatur.*

³⁷ Cf. Tarrant (2004) 491.

³⁸ At 2.738 Heinsius (1659) 55 (also b3, 72^r) read *Pandroso* instead of *Pandrose*. But, as a second declension noun, the vocative in *-e* is certainly expected; if this was originally a noun in *-o*, *-ō* would be required in Latin (vid. Neue/Wagener 1902, 449; Sniehotta 1903, 15–16). Similarly, at 4.45 Heinsius (1659) 79ⁿ wrongly wanted to replace the vocative *Dercetī* for *Dercetō*. Cf. Bömer (1976) 29.

A “Gronovianus” (B2) had *credar*,³⁹ whence Heinsius suggested *cedar*,⁴⁰ anticipating Watt’s (1999) 167–168 *cedam*. The verb fits the context and balances well *ponar* in the next line. The passive (vid. *OLD* s.v. 13) is palaeographically more adequate and better demonstrates the crow’s reluctance at being replaced as Athena’s protégée. But for *dicar*, cf. Housman (1920) 40 on Manil. 4.314.

2.566 nec] uel (64^v)

The crow argues that he had not instigated Athena to seek him out. Heinsius’s *uel* is possible, but not really an improvement.

2.568 negabit] negarit (65^r)

Heinsius noted: “*negabat* unus [Bo3]. Lego *negarit*.” However, the future seems better after *quaeras* and *irata est*.

2.586 retinebat] retinebar (66^r)

I would happily endorse Heinsius’s suggestion, if only I had been able to locate parallels for *retineo* with the Greek accusative.⁴¹

2.589 prodest] refert (66^r)

Heinsius quoted 13.268 *Quid tamen hoc refert, si...*, where the gloss *prodest* has taken the place of *refert* in some recs. (vid. Rivero 2018, 167). Heinsius could well be right.

2.591 an] num (66^r)⁴²

Heinsius’s *num* is based on *nunc* of “duo libri” (Bo2, *an* Bo2^{2v}).⁴³ But *an* is said to imply a certain disbelief of the speaker, which fits the context best.

2.603 arma adsueta capit] armaque sueta rapit (67^r)

This proposal derives from *sueta* (“bene”) instead of *adsueta* of three mss. (L7 Lr14¹ O12).⁴⁴ However, *ad-* was probably just lost in synaloepha.⁴⁵ Furthermore, Ovid never uses *suetus*.

2.637 in rapidi] Aemathii (68^r)

³⁹ *Credar* is probably a gloss of *dicar*.

⁴⁰ Apparently, Heinsius also suggested replacing *at* for *ut* (a “Regius”, which I have been unable to trace, reportedly had *ad dicar*). We should then punctuate after *redditur*. But the change seems pointless.

⁴¹ Even if it is a different example, cf. 2.577.

⁴² Also o4, 47.

⁴³ In o4, 47, Heinsius assigns *nunc* to Lr10 and Bo2; Lr10 has *nunc* instead of *non* in 592. I suspect Heinsius inadvertently mixed collations.

⁴⁴ Heinsius (1659) 51 and 41ⁿ printed *rapit* of “Mediceus unus ex melioribus” (Lr22). Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 10.462.

⁴⁵ Unless one imagines that the scansion *sūētā* (Lucret. 2.903; Hor. *Sat.* 1.8.17) was rejected and *ad-* was interpolated so that the line scanned *ārma ādsuētā*. This seems less likely to me. Likewise, there is no need to add *-que*, as Heinsius suggests.

Sc. *Emathii*. Heinsius probably thought that the transmitted text was surprisingly unspecific and missed a reference to one of the rivers in Thessaly, where Chiron lived.⁴⁶ But Ocyr(rh)oë was named, so to speak, after the *flumen rapidum* (ὄκύρ- + ῥοή) in which she was born.

2.677 nam nec] nec enim (69^v)⁴⁷

Heinsius (1659) 54 and 43ⁿ edited *sed nec* with four mss.,⁴⁸ but he also conjectured *nec enim*, which is the reading of G,⁴⁹ a ms. he did not know. It is not easy to reach a decision, but *nam nec* is probably right.

2.687 notus] fatus (69^v)

Notus is perhaps a bit pleonastic, considering the parenthesis in 688. But *fatus* is no big improvement.⁵⁰

2.693 factu] pacto (70^r)

The confusion between *factum* and *pactum* is documented, for instance, at 11.135 or *Fast.* 4.817. *Facto* could certainly be a gloss for *pacto*. Heinsius referred to 6.429 (*non Hymenaeus adest, non illi Gratia lecto*), where he also proposed *pacto* (b3, 175^v), and to 7.700 *sacra iugalia*, where he read *pacta* (1659, 163). However, the possible ‘agreement’ is actually not suggested until the next line.

2.709 gratamque] sanctamque (70^v)

Heinsius made his suggestion after *anctamq.* (sic) of “pr. Gron.” [B4^{ac}, an *auctamque?*]. But I have been unable to find examples in Ovid of *sanctus* applied to places other than temples. For *gratus*, cf. 2.758 and see Bömer (1969) 405–406.

2.720 agilis] avidos (71^r)

Slater (1927) ad loc. already documented this conjecture. I add that in b3 Heinsius himself remarked: “male. nam *avidus* praecessit [719]”.

2.744 uerba] certa (71^r)

Lr26 has *uisa per auras* in 743, whence Heinsius suggested *certa* for *uerba* here. The change would ironically point out that Mercury is not actually acting as Jupiter’s envoy but following his own desire for Herse. But cf. *Am.* 2.5.20 *uerbaque pro certis iussa ualere notis*; *Fast.* 2.509–510 *iussit et in tenues oculis euanuit auras; / conuocat hic populos iussaue uerba refert*.

⁴⁶ Similarly, Heinsius (1659) 42ⁿ attempted *patrii*, making thus Chariclo daughter of the river.

⁴⁷ Also o4, 51.

⁴⁸ I have been unable to identify them.

⁴⁹ Bo3 has *neque enim*, but, as far as I can tell, Heinsius did not take notice of the reading in o4, where his collation is extant.

⁵⁰ What are we to make of *totus* of Li3 and *solus* of Go? Could they point to the palaeographically close *fatus*?

2.755 hanc] hinc (71^v)

But *hanc* is probably necessary, just to make clear that the subject of *detexisse* is Aglauros.

2.789 totum] s(a)eptum (73^r)

Considering readings such as *comptum* (“unus Med.” [Lr22]), *circum* (“Junian.” [Et]), *rectum* (“Sixi” [B7, f. 20^v (an *tectum*?)]), Heinsius suggested *s(a)eptum*, which is possible (vid. *OLD* s.v. 6) and enlivens the description of Invidia’s extraordinary attire. Cf., although it is a different example, *Ars am.* 3.662 *cingenda est altis saepibus ista seges*. But for *totum*, cf. *Fast.* 5.335 *tempora sutilibus cinguntur tota coronis* (where, nonetheless, *tota* has raised some doubts); cf. also *Met.* 5.388 *cingens latus omne*.

2.808 incerto] infesto (74^r)

Heinsius attempted *infesto*, which does not go too well with *lenta ... tabe*, but is still better than Merkel’s (1875) IX *inserto* (coll. *Lucr.* 2.115). For *incerto*, see Bömer (1969) 427.

3.75 quique] quaque (80^r)

Heinsius’s *quaque*, inspired by the reading *quoque* (vid. Suárez 2015, 523), is possible (cf., e.g., 1.241; 5.290 “*qua*”*que* “*uia est uobis, erit et mihi*” *dixit “eadem”*), but unnecessary (cf., e.g., 1.133–134 *quaeque diu steterant in montibus altis / fluctibus ignotis exsultauere carinae*).

3.84 figitque] triuitque (80^r)

Heinsius edited *frangitque* (vid. Suárez 2015, 82–83), but he had also suggested *triuitque* adducing 8.369 *dentibus ille ferox [sc. aper] in querno stipite tritis* (“ubi pro *dentibus tritis* forte *fractis* legendum”). It is an interesting halfway between *figit* and *frangit*.

3.97 quid] quod (81^r)

Quod should introduce a causal clause dependent of *et tu spectabere serpens*. But this seems inferior to the vulgate.

3.190 perfudit] perfundens (84^r)⁵¹

Heinsius’s *perfundens*, apparently inspired by *perfundit* (“tres libri [V8 Lr9^{ac}] ... cum pr. Regio [P4] & pr. Cantabr. [deperditus]”),⁵² could be right at first sight. But the series of enclitics of 189–190 coordinates finite verbs.

3.191 cladis] cladi (83^v)

⁵¹ Also o4, 64.

⁵² Vid. n. 11.

A dative could go well with *addidit*, while the genitive with *praenuntius* (vid. Bömer 1969, 500) is expendable (cf. 15.670). But Diana's words do indeed announce the *clades*; we must retain the genitive.⁵³

3.206 primique] primoque (84^r)

Heinsius suggested *primoque* as an alternative to *primumque*,⁵⁴ which he had found in M. But the predicative is clearly to be preferred.⁵⁵

3.242 hortatibus] ululatibus (84^v)

Heinsius adduced 15.797 *nocturnos ululasse canes* in support of his proposal, which is a different example. Here, Actaeon's former companions are urging the dogs. Cf., e.g., 10.537; *Her.* 4.42.

3.247 uidere] tueri (85^r)

Heinsius knew the erroneous reading *uideri* of some important mss. and cleverly conjectured *tueri*: “quae vox saepe corrupta apud nostrum et mutata in *uideri* lib. I. 85. ex Mss. [read Burman 1727, 21]”. Could *uidere* be an emendation of *uideri*, which in turn originated in *tueri*?⁵⁶

3.281 ut sit] absit (86^v)

Heinsius's *absit*, after *adsit* of “duo libri” (Lr21 Pt3?),⁵⁷ is not impossible. But Juno, disguised as Semele's wet nurse, encourages her to ask Jupiter for prove of his identity (cf. 281–283). Cf. also Hyg. *Fab.* 167.2.

3.355 tetigere] pepigere (90^r)

An allusion through *pepigere* to marital engagements would be enticing, but Narcissus can hardly be the object of the verb.

3.368 haec] hac (90^r)

This derives from *hoc* of P4¹. But *hac in fine* does not make sense. *Haec* is certainly required to signal the change of subject.

3.384 receptit] receptis (89^v)

After *recepto* of “unus Leid.” (Ld7¹) Heinsius thought of *receptis*, which precludes punctuating before *perstat*. This is appealing: the cause of Narcissus' astonishment in 385 is none other than his own repeated words. *Verba*, which must now be construed

⁵³ See also n. 34.

⁵⁴ For *primum* and *primo*, vid. Bömer (1976) 376 on 5.592.

⁵⁵ I do not fully share Suárez's (2015) 181 views. I think scribes must have assimilated *primi* to the closest noun or replaced it with an adverb. Cf. Fàbregas (2022) 233 on 10.240.

⁵⁶ For *tueri facta*, cf., e.g., Verg. *Aen.* 10.397–398. But see Suárez (2015) 214 for another, more straightforward, probably better, interpretation, of how *uideri* might have originated.

⁵⁷ In o4, 67, Heinsius assigns the reading to g (= Pt3). I believe that a folium, between ff. 31 and 32, once containing 3.232–295 is now missing; Heinsius certainly still saw it.

with *quot dixit*, could have been misunderstood and the participle altered into a personal form.⁵⁸ Cf. on 3.645.

3.410 turbarat] turbarant (92^r)

Turbarant actually appears in a couple of mss. unknown to Heinsius (vid. Suárez 2015, 591). Both forms are possible, but the postverbal position of one of the subjects and the emphatic coordination call for the singular, as transmitted (cf. Pinkster 2015, 152–153 [§13.6.v]).

3.456 est mea quam] sunt mihi quas (93^v)

Again, Heinsius wanted an agreement in the plural. But see on 3.410; also Suárez (2015) 332. On the other hand, the dative is attractive (cf., e.g., 1.192–195; 13.286; *Her.* 3.80; 3.146; 5.86; *Ars am.* 3.205–206; *Fast.* 6.219–220).⁵⁹

3.458 ultro] et tu (94^r)

Cf., e.g., Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.322 *quae si quis sanus fecit, sanus facis et tu*. Ovid has *et tu* at the end of the line at *Her.* 10.5. However, we are talking about Narcissus' image, so *ultro* (vid. *OLD* s.v. 5 “of one's own accord”) is certainly more pointed.

3.459 saepe] et ipse (94^r)

This proposal, which tries to adjust the unmetrical *ipse* of Lr instead of *saepe*, is really not bad (cf., e.g., Verg. *Aen.* 1.5 *multa quoque et bello passus*).

3.477 quo refugis? remane] quo fugis? ah remane (93^v)

As an alternative to his metrically objectionable *quo fugis? oro, mane* (see Suárez 2015, 342) and to the attractive *quo fugis? o remane* of Ld6,⁶⁰ Heinsius had also envisaged *quo fugis? ah remane*,⁶¹ which is very good. Cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 2.60 *quem fugis, a, demens?*; Prop. 2.30.1 *quo fugis a demens?*; cf. also Ov. *Am.* 1.13.3 *quo properas, Aurora? mane!* Ovid similarly combines *fugere* and *remanere* at *Pont.* 1.6.29–30 *haec dea [sc. Spes], cum fugerent sceleratas numina terras, / in dis inuisa sola remansit humo*.⁶²

3.478 quod] quem (93^v)

Heinsius wrote: “malo &, quem”. Cf., e.g., 10.387 (with Fàbregas 2022, 292). But the transmitted *quod* is probably right: cf. *Am.* 1.4.58; *Ars am.* 1.91–92; *Her.* 18.179.

⁵⁸ A delayed antecedent is certainly expected. On the one hand, this might explain the change in the transmission; on the other, it discredits the proposal.

⁵⁹ In his first edition Heinsius (1652) 58 printed *est mihi, quam*. See also n. 34.

⁶⁰ Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 10.369 *quo fugitis, socii?*; 10.649; Ov. *Her.* 7.41; 10.35; *Rem. am.* 580; *Met.* 8.108; 8.110 *quo fugis immitis ...?* (note *crudelis* at 3.477); cf. also *Ars am.* 1.124 *haec manet, illa fugit*. It is not unlikely that *o* fell out and the gap was filled back in with *re-fugis*, being *re-* readily available in *re-mane*.

⁶¹ One might wish to write *a*. See Ramírez de Verger (2021) 202 on 6.386; Fàbregas (2022) 383.

⁶² As for the transmitted text, Bach (1831) 144 objects to the “Missklang” *re-re-*. I would like to see a similar example of adjacent verbs with the same prefix and opposed meaning. I have not found good parallels for the combination of *refugere* and *remanere* either.

3.480 dumque dolet] dumque dolens *uel* dum dolet et (95^r)

Both proposals are palaeographically possible and extend the *dum* clause up to the end of line 481. But the text as transmitted is clearly more fluent.⁶³

3.518 ne] neu (95^v)

No doubt, the sense would admit a disjunctive within the *si*-clause.⁶⁴ But I have serious doubts that *neu(e)* is grammatically correct in this context.⁶⁵

3.523 tuam] tuo (96^r)

This is a significant improvement. It is of no great consequence whose blood defiles the woods, while it is all but trivial to insist that Pentheus' blood will sully his own aunts and mother. Of course, the delayed possessive might have been easily assimilated to *matrem*. For a similar hyperbaton (if indeed hyperbaton it is), cf. 5.281–282 “*nec dubitate, precor, tecto graue sidus et imbrem*” / (*imber erat*) “*uitare meo*. See also *Her.* 4.58; *Am.* 2.4.36; *Her.* 16.215–216; *Ib.* 360. Additionally, cf. *Octavia* 148–149 *Silanus et cruore foedauit suo / patrios penates*.

3.538 qui] quos *uel* quam (96^v)

Heinsius commented: “*Si miseri legamus [pro mirer], cum Lactantio et aliis [cf. Suárez 2015, 377], etiam quos longa vel quam erit legendum, ut ad Tyron aut ad penates referatur*”. This is not bad, even if we retain *mirer*. The relative might have been easily attracted to *qui*, being placed between *senes* and *uecti* (and *miseri*).

3.539 hac Tyron, hac profugos] a Tyria hac profugos *uel* hac Tyrios profugi (97^r)

Taking advantage of the reading *a Tyrio hac* of “*duo alii*” (H3 Lr9)⁶⁶ and *a Tyrio ac* of “*alius*” (Lr19), Heinsius attempted *a Tyria [sc. sede] hac [sc. sede]*.⁶⁷ But he right away stated, correctly: “*Sed Hac Tyron, hac vera lectio est*”. However, he also came up with another proposal (“*posset legi*”): *Hac Tyrios profugi*, which is interesting. Here the *senes*, not the *Penates*, are *profugi*, just like Aeneas (vid. Bömer 1969, 579). But the double epithet *uecti/profugi* is not very elegant.⁶⁸ Furthermore, cf. Prop. 4.1.39 *huc melius profugos misisti, Troia, Penatis* (with Fedeli/Dimundo/Ciccarelli 2015, 229).

3.554 iuuant] iuuent (96^v)

⁶³ One should also consider that the perfect is possible in *dum* clauses, but it often implies a “contrast between the events in the main and subordinate clauses” (Pinkster 2015, 615) which seems to be absent here.

⁶⁴ This would be better than the available options (i.e. a final/consecutive clause with *ne* or a negative copulative clause with *nec*).

⁶⁵ *Neu(e)* is mostly used in jussive contexts and is extremely rare with the imperfect subjunctive (vid. Lease 1913, 418; Szantyr 1972, 331).

⁶⁶ Another one was probably H (vid. Suárez 2015, 617).

⁶⁷ This proposal also features in o4, 76. For the alteration *a/hac*, cf. Rivero (2018) 53–54 on 13.8.

⁶⁸ The repetition *hac ... hac* seems also more expressive. Cf. Wills (1996) 76–79.

Although the subjunctive in the relative clause might further characterize Pentheus' contempt for the *puer inermis*, there is no real need for the change.

3.585 non ulla armenta] armentaue multa (97^v)⁶⁹

Heinsius's proposal derives from *armentaue nulla* of "unus Basil." (Bs3; also in some other mss.; see Suárez 2015, 405). One could perhaps approve of *-ue* (corresponding to *lanigerosue*),⁷⁰ but *multa* suggests that Acoetes inherited at least some livestock, which is impossible for a man *tam pauper ut cubili careat*.⁷¹ Cf. 3.590–591.

3.595 notai] notari (99^r)

Heinsius anticipated Watt's (1995) 98 very alluring *notare*. The passive infinitive⁷² seems unnatural after *flectere* (whose subject is inferred from *addidici*), but its intrinsic difficulty could more easily explain why it was substituted for a palaeographically close *notai*. Suárez (2015) 408 tried to defend the transmitted *notai* arguing, unconvincingly, that *sidera notare* requires less skill than *regimen flectere*.

3.600 nox ibi] noxque ibi (99^r)

Heinsius (1659) 76 kept the vulgate *nox ubi*, but he knew the alternative *nox ibi*, whence he proposed *noxque ibi*, continuing the double *-que* of 599 (the phrase is certainly linked to it). The subsequent *Aurora rubescere primo / coeperat* initiates a new period and a new stage of the tale. For the hypothetical loss of *-que* in synaloepha, vid. Fàbregas (2022) 112.

3.624 de] e (100^r)

This is not impossible (cf. 4.791; *Ars am.* 3.447), and is actually the reading of P5. But cf. 9.70–71 *nec ullum / de comitum numero caput est impune recisum*; *Fast.* 1.548; *Tr.* 5.3.44. See also on 4.516.

3.636 "Naxon" ait Liber] "Naxon" Liber ait (99^v)

Not a completely negligible suggestion, since Ovid usually places the subject of *ait* before the verb: cf., e.g., 3.10 *Phoebus ait* (6.215; 10.197); 3.532 *Pentheus ait*; 4.572 *Cadmus ait*; 12.201 *Caenis ait*; *Fast.* 2.759 *coniunx ait*; 2.796 *natus ait regis*; 6.444 *Metellus ait*. However, for the transmitted order: cf. *Met.* 4.639 *ait Perseus illi*; 8.350 *ait Ampycides*; 12.490 *ait Caeneus*; *Rem. am.* 475 *ait Atrides*.

3.644 "capiat"que "aliquis] "capias"que "alias (100^r)

⁶⁹ Also o4, 77.

⁷⁰ However, for the asyndeton, cf. 7.558 and Verg. *Aen.* 8.376 (adduced by Suárez 2015, 405); perhaps also *Met.* 1.512–514 (quoted by Bömer 1969, 591).

⁷¹ Burman (1727) 222 on 3.582 uses more or less these terms. Fishermen were proverbially very poor (cf., e.g., Verg. *Aen.* 12.517–520).

⁷² Cf., e.g., *Pont.* 2.10.22 *Trinacris est oculis te duce nota [uisa v.l.] meis*.

Heinsius's proposal probably tries to make sense of *capiasque aliquis* of the "Lovan." (*capiatque ás* Br2 (*alius* Br2^{2s}), f. 42^v; also B), but it is absurd for Acoetes to tell Opheltes that he may take the rudder *alias* and yield it in the very next line.

3.645 remoui] remoto (99^v)

Heinsius attempted *remoto*. This would more clearly state why Acoetes' companions "cried out upon him" (we should remove any punctuation after the participle). Cf. on 3.384.

3.650 tum deus inludens] tum deus, ille, deus (99^v)

The proposal is palaeographically great (cf. Lucr. 5.8 *deus ille fuit, deus*; Verg. *Ecl.* 5.64; Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.36), but I see no reason to suspect *i(n/l)ludens* (cf., e.g., 652 *fienti similis*; cf. also 9.66 *risit et inludens nostras Tiryntius artes*).

3.672 et expresso] de impresso (100^v)

Adopting the reading *pinnis* in the previous line, and probably combining readings such as *depresso* and *impresso*, Heinsius attempted *de impresso*, which is paleographically apt (and certainly better than a two-fold bare ablative). But, to avoid describing the same process twice (*corpore de impresso / curuamine flecti*), *et* is necessary (Suárez 2015, 457) and the participle must agree with *curuamine*.⁷³

3.708 monte fere medio est] monte viret (medium (101^v))

After *medium est* of "Thuan. opt." (P28), Heinsius suggested *monte viret* (*medium cingentibus ultima siluis*), which, despite being palaeographically clever, looks like an unnecessary, syntactically ambiguous alteration.⁷⁴ See also on 3.709.

3.709 purus ab arboribus] rura, sine arboribus, (101^v)

Perhaps Heinsius disliked the presence of two epithets with *campus*, as well as *purus* with *a(b)*, which is rare (Bömer 1969, 621).⁷⁵ Thus, he tried to introduce a noun that could be construed with *ultima* (on which see Bömer *ibid.*). But I believe that *rura* does not fit well into the description of the *campus*. See also on 3.708.

3.713 et 'o geminae'] 'io Ogygiae' (100^v)

Considering the reading *io* of some codices, Heinsius thought of *io Ogygiae*, as an alternative to his *et Ogygiae* (1659, 75ⁿ). This is very good, but one would rather expect a hiatus, as in 5.625.

⁷³ In that case, if Oellacher is right in his interpretation (*ThIL* V 1785.34–43 "ex corpore extrudere, emittere"), *expresso* suggests a sort of expansion of the spine, while perhaps *impresso* hints at a forced arching (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 5.403–409 *Iason ... / transtra per et remos impressaque terga uirorum / ... / uoce manique rogat*). However, I would not rule out a technical or artistic use of *exprimere* here (vid., e.g., *OLD* s.v. 6).

⁷⁴ For *fere*, see Bömer (1969) 620–621.

⁷⁵ A similar textual problem is to be found at 13.910–911 (see Rivero 2018, 387–389).

3.716 fremituque] unumque (101^v)

Heinsius independently suggested *unumque* (at least, he makes no reference whatsoever to Capoferreus 1659, ad loc.). See Suárez (2015) 485.

3.724 ostendens] obtendens (101^r)

The compound would pick up and pathetically intensify the previous *tendat*. See Wills (1996) 443–445. The confusion between *ostendo* and *obtendo* is, for obvious reasons, not uncommon (*ThlL* IX.2 273.68). However, the verb usually entails the notion of covering or protecting, which seems out of the question here. On the other hand, *ostendens* matches *aspice* and *uisis* of 725.

3.732 exemplis monitae] extemplo motae (103^r)

Burman (1727) 234 claims credit for this proposal, but it should be attributed to Heinsius.

4.61 patres] parens (105^v)

After *parens* of “m. pr. Urbin.” (V2¹), Heinsius attempted *parens* (coll. 4.155), which looks wrong with *uetuere*. For *patres*, see Bömer (1976) 39–40.

4.61 quod ... uetare] quae ... uetari (*uel* quas ... uetare) (105^v)

The former was later suggested by Bothe (1818) 32. *Quae*, referred to *taedae*, was probably misunderstood and substituted for *quod*. Or, as Bothe implies, the infinitive could have been assimilated to *uetuere* and *potuere*, and the syntax adjusted accordingly. Cf. 12.546 *quod mallet posse negare* (Tarrant 2004, 366: “negari *hp*₂ (Heinsius)”). Heinsius took inspiration from *qui* of “alius Medic.” (Lr12¹). His second alternative, less attractive, though involving a slighter change, derives from *quos* of “sec. Medic.” (Lr8).

4.150 est et ... hic] huic et ... haec (107^v)

Apparently, Heinsius drew inspiration from *hoc et ... haec* (“pr. Vatic. [V5, f. 33^v, reads *est et ... haec*] & Thysii [unidentified]”), *hoc et ... hoc* (“unus meus” [O4^{2v}]), and perhaps *huic et ... hic* of Lr12 (not quoted in b3). *Huic*, referring to *manus*, is not bad, but what are *haec uulnera*? Pyramus has just said that Thisbe was lost by her *manus amorque*; in turn he must rhetorically proclaim to have both as well. For the repetition of *est et*, see Bömer (1976) 61.

4.207 ipsoque] ipsasque (110^v)

“Locus mendi omnino suspectus” (Heinsius 1659, 83ⁿ), in part maybe because of the multiple variant readings. The expression *ipso illo tempore* is prosaic and “pedantisch”, as Bömer (1976) 82 calls it. Heinsius suggestion “per appositionem”, with great

palaeographical economy, clearly establishes Clytie's rivals as the cause of her *graue uulnus* and of her grief,⁷⁶ which will eventually lead to her transformation (4.256–273).

4.261 nudis] passis (112^v)⁷⁷

After the reading *sparsis* of some mss. (“IV nostri [Ld2 O12(teste Heinsio)⁷⁸Lr23]”), Heinsius put forward, again, *passis*. See on 1.542. But Heinsius himself compared 7.183 *nuda pedem, nudos umeris infusa capillos*. Cf. also *Her.* 14.100 *diues eras, nuda nuda recumbis humo*. In this case, it rather seems that *nudis* was lost after *nuda* and the gap filled with *sparsis* (which is a bit pleonastic with *incompta*).

4.269 tenetur] retenta (113^r)

Retenta, which implies the notion of stopping or refraining, seems to suggest that Clytie, now sunflower, would follow Helios, if she could. Cf., e.g., 2.348–349 *ad quam conata uenire / candida Lampetie subita radice retenta est*. For *quamuis* with a participle or adjective, cf. 4.206; 3.494; 4.232; 9.476. But for *teneo*, cf. 11.77–78 *at illam / lenta tenet radix*.

4.287 fontis] fonti (115^r)

The possessive dative is possible and could have been replaced by the genitive, a *lectio facilior*.⁷⁹ But, in truth, there is nothing wrong with the transmitted text (cf., e.g., 15.299; *Tr.* 3.10.17 *tantaque commoti uis est Aquilonis ut ...*).

4.288 diua Cythereide] diuaque Cytheride (114^v)

The attempt to correct *diuaque Cythereide* of “unus Leid.” (*diua(que) cithareia* Ld8, f. 35^r)⁸⁰ is futile. *Mercurio* is a dative, not an ablative (as whoever was responsible for the addition of *-que* surely thought): cf., e.g., *Caes. BGall.* 5.14.5; *Mart.* 6.39.13. The form *Cythereis* recurs at *Manil.* 2.33.⁸¹

4.328 seu] fac (115^v)

It seems that Heinsius wanted to avoid the repetition of *seu* (321; *sive* 322 and 327). *Fac* should mean “suppose” (*OLD* s.v. 20), but this requires a subjunctive or an infinitive. Should we understand *fac nullam esse*?

4.341 ut puer et uacuis ut] ilicet ut uacuis et (116^r)

Heinsius suggested this as an alternative (“vel”) to his excellent *ut puer et uacuis ut*, probably trying to stay closer to the text of most mss. (*scilicet ut uacuis et*).

⁷⁶ “*Vulnera sunt quoque amantium perfidiae et riuulium simultates*” (Pichon 1902, 302).

⁷⁷ Also o4, 91.

⁷⁸ o4, 91. 3.397–4.358 were lost after Heinsius collated O12 (Reeve 1974, 153 n. 78).

⁷⁹ See also n. 34.

⁸⁰ This is not Ld2 (f. 37^v) nor Ld7 (f. 36^r).

⁸¹ See Bömer (1976) 109. Cf. also *Pelopeis* (*Fast.* 4.285) and *Pelopeias* (*Fast.* 3.83). The form *Cytheris* lacks authority referring to Venus (*ThLL* O.2 811.75–812.28).

4.359 tangit] plangit (117^r)⁸²

The confusion between the two verbs is frequent (e.g. 2.584; 3.125 [with Suárez 2015, 116–117]; 11.81 [with Díez 2014, 62]), and *pectora plangere* is likewise a common expression (*ThLL* X.1 2310.66–2311.6), but it is usually a display of grief. For *tangere*, cf. 8.605–606 *ipse natantis / pectora tangebam trepido salientia motu*; *Fast.* 2.803–804 *positis urgentur pectora palmis, / tum primum externa pectora tacta manu*; 6.753.

4.371 et] ita (116^v)

The proposal was probably triggered by *ut* of P4 O4 P24. The repetition of *ita* is not unattractive. See *ThLL* VII.2 527.20–29. But apparently Ovid only admits synaloepha of *ita* over *est*.⁸³

4.373 nam] iam (116^v)

The confusion is common enough (see Suárez 2015, 1 on 4.1; Fàbregas 2022, 431), but *nam* is not wrong here: cf. 10.489.

4.375 conducat] conductos (117^r)

Heinsius (1659) 91 and 89ⁿ opted for *conducta*, but he had also suggested *conductos*, which seems also possible and perhaps even stylistically superior. The finite verb could have been easily introduced after *si quis*. But the change is not truly necessary. See Bömer (1976) 129.

4.463 undas] urnas (120^v)

Heinsius's proposal seems to derive from *umbras* of O4^{2v}. But *quas perdant* guarantees *undas*: cf. *Ib.* 177 *quaeque gerunt umeris perituras Belides undas*.

4.499 mens est, quae diros sentiat ictus] mens quae letalem sentiat ictum *uel* mens est, quam diro sauciat ictu (122^r)

Heinsius based his first proposal on *tales* instead of *diros* of Lr20. For *letalis ictus*, see *ThLL* VII.1 169.12. The conjecture is unnecessary: cf. *Her.* 21.135 *quae iurat, mens est*. The second conjecture derives from *sauciat* of “Sixi” (B7), but one would rather expect *sauciant*, which is unmetrical.

4.516 deque] eque (121^v)

On the usage of *de*, see Loewe (1889) 6–7. There is no need for the conjecture. See also on 3.624.

4.520 fecit] faciat (121^v)

⁸² See also Rivero (2018) 410–411 on 13.965, where Heinsius suggested *frangeris* instead of *tangeris*.

⁸³ *Pont.* 1.1.37; 4.4.3. But cf., e.g., *ita illum* (Plaut. *Men.* 41); *ita istaec* (Plaut. *Men.* 94); *ita ad* (Verg. *Aen.* 10.459); *ita ut* (Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.20).

Perhaps Heinsius wanted to avoid *uariatio temporum*, but Ovid, as is his wont, presents two possible causes of why Ino is *concita*. The indicative is grammatically correct with *seu*.

4.530 recanduit] ecanuit (123^r)

Recandesco (?) is an ‘Ovidian’ verb, which he uses in the sense of “to become white” only here and, perhaps, at 7.78⁸⁴ (later Claud. 15.211). Heinsius coined a different compound, *ecanuit*, for this line.⁸⁵ *E-* could have been lost in synaloepha, replaced with *re-* and *-d-* added (*percussa* *ēcānuit* > *percussă cānuit* > *percussă rēcanduit*). A pity that the verb is not otherwise attested!⁸⁷

4.620 infestaque] ~~infestis~~ (126^r)

Heinsius seems to have disliked for a moment the double epithet with *terra*. The ‘active’ sense of *infestus* is certainly possible. But, on second thought, Heinsius himself crossed the proposal out. See Bömer (1976) 191.

4.654 tibi gratia nostra est] uictoria constat (127^v)

Heinsius’s drastic emendation has at least some diagnostic value. Perseus’ utterance is certainly not as sharp as in 5.225: why on earth would he give a ‘boon’, even an ironical one, to Atlas for denying him the hospitality his *gratia* (*OLD* s.v. 5) as a hero deserves? However, reading *uictoria constat*, Atlas would receive a ‘prize’ for winning easily, and the sarcasm of Perseus’ utterance would be stronger. However, I cannot conceive a plausible *iter corruptionis*.

4.657 mons factus] mutatus (127^v)

This proposal derives from *mons tantus* of P2 and “*unus meus*” (*quantus Atlas o mons tantus erat* O12, f. 41^v).⁸⁸ *Mons factus* could be a gloss of *mutatus*, but I still see no cause for the emendation. *Tantus* certainly derives from *quantus*.

4.701 cunctis certe] numquid cunctis (129^v)

Heinsius suggested *praeferer numquid cunctis gener?*, reporting that Lr8 (f. 54^v) reads the text of most mss. “*cum interrogationis nota*”. The interrogative is attractive, but the negative answer usually implied by *numquid* is not adequate.

4.718 celeri missus praeceps] celer admisso praepes (131^r)

Magnus (1914) 160 attested Heinsius’s suggestion *celeri admissum praeceps* in b3,⁸⁹ but he failed to record this additional (“*posset et legi*”) and better option, which, beyond

⁸⁴ Holmes (*ThIL* XI.2 264.1) takes it so, but this is only a possibility; see Kenney’s note ad loc. (Barchiesi 2024, II, 44).

⁸⁵ For a similar compound, cf. *erubesco*, *excandesco*. For other Ovidian verbal compounds in *e-*, see Draeger (1888) 18 and Linse (1891) 53.

⁸⁷ One could perhaps think of *incanuit*, which is at least attested at Prisc. *Inst.* 2.438.5. However, both options sacrifice the anagram *recanduit unda*; see Rosati ad loc. (Barchiesi 2024, I, 429).

⁸⁸ O4^{2m} has *tantus*, but it is unclear what it refers to; P9^{3s} has *tantus* over *mons*.

the alternation *praepes/praeceps*,⁹⁰ anticipates Slater's (1927) ad loc. *celer admisso*. Slater compared 1.532 *admisso sequitur uestigia passu*. See Bömer (1969) 166.

4.757 tanti] sancti (132^r)

Andromeda's rescue was part of an agreement between her father and Perseus. In this sense, *sancti* is possible.⁹¹ But there is nothing wrong with *tanti ... facti*: cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.232 *tantique abolescet gratia facti*; Ov. *Tr.* 5.4.47 *tantis referetur gratia factis*.

4.761 tibiaque et cantus] tibiaque cantusque (132^r)

An interesting proposal, continuing the series of *-que* initiated in the previous line with *lyraeque*. Cf. 3.529–530; 4.9–10; 8.526–527. But perhaps *cantus* introduces a new category. See Fàbregas (2020); vid. also on 4.778.

4.767a unus] orsus (131^v)

The vulgate Heinsius received of the troubled lines 767–769 was:

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------|------|
| <i>cultusque genusque locorum</i> | 767 |
| <i>quaerit Abantiades; quaerenti protinus unus</i> | 767a |
| <i>narrat Lyncides, moresque, animosque uirorum.</i> | 768 |
| <i>quae simul edocuit ...</i> | 769 |

After *ursus* of four mss. (e.g. Lr14, *unus* Lr14^v), Heinsius attempted *orsus*, “si vulgata teneatur”. This removes the objectionable *unus*,⁹² but, if both *Abantiades* and *Lyncides* (cf. 5.99) allude to Perseus, the passage is still absurd. The solutions published by Heinsius (1659) 106–107ⁿ, involving some kind of deletion, are certainly better.⁹³

4.770 quibusque] quibusue (132^r)

Quibusue in a similar context and at the end of the line appears at Verg. *Aen.* 6.560. Cf. also Ov. *Tr.* 3.12.34. For the scribal tendency to substitute *-ue* for *-que*, see Rivero (2018) 414; Fàbregas (2022) 204–205.

4.771 artibus] astibus (132^r)

This is a very clever proposal. Of course, a rare term such as *astibus* could have been easily replaced by *artibus*, an obvious palaeographic rival. However, this dative-ablative plural does not seem to be attested anywhere in classical literature, although the singular *astu* was certainly in use. In fact, it appears in line 776. For *artibus*, cf., e.g., 9.62.

⁸⁹ Magnus does not say Heinsius adduced Verg. *Aen.* 11.272 *At socii admissis* [instead of *amissi*] *petierunt aethera pennis* (“sic enim cum vetustissimo libro legendum”, by which he does not refer to any of the late-antique mss.; cf. Heinsius ap. Burman 1746, III, 630).

⁹⁰ About it see Heinsius's note and Burman's (1727) 304–305 objections.

⁹¹ As reported by Burman (1727) 308, Heinsius also suggested *tanti ... pacti*. See also on 2.693.

⁹² The use of *unus* as *quidam* has some informal or late Latin aroma, even if Bach (1831) 210 compares Caes. *BGall.* 5.45.2 *erat unus intus Neruius nomine Vertico*. See also Oudendorp (1737) 266 ad loc. Read Szantyr (1972) 193. In Ovid, cf. *Her.* 15.162.

⁹³ Lines 767a and 768, missing in some mss., are now regarded as spurious, but I am not quite convinced this settles all the problems of the sequence. See also Anderson (1997) 493.

4.778 deuiaque et siluis] deuiaque siluisque (132^v)

This is much the same proposal as on 4.761. But here one would rather prefer that the double enclitic coordinated two exactly equivalent words.

4.786 matris de] materno (132^v)

This is the reading of Dr. Cf. 5.259 *uidi ipsum* [sc. *Pegasum*] *materno sanguine nasci*. Cf. also *Lucr.* 4.1214; *Tib.* 1.2.41. See *ThLL* IX.1 82.33–54. But maybe the *uariatio* of construction as regards 5.259 is correct. For *nasci* with *de*, cf., e.g., 2.469; 15.836. See *ThLL* IX.1 82.7–23.

4.796–797 illa, neque in tota conspectior ulla capillis / pars fuit] illa nec tortis conspectior ulla capillis / parue erat (*uel* claruit) *uel* illi nec toto conspectis orbe capillis / par fuit (133^r)

Introducing the adjective *par* instead of *pars* is certainly attractive (cf. *Her.* 16.143–144 *nec tibi par usquam Phrygia nec solis ab ortu / *** / inter formosas altera nomen habet*; *Fast.* 1.90).⁹⁴ For the postponement of *nec*, see Platnauer (1951) 93–96. The second conjecture tries to make sense, through extensive rewriting, of the reading *urbe capillis* of “*unus Medic. ex melioribus*” (Lr7) and *toto* of “*duo*” (Lr20O12^{ac}(*ut uid.*)). The former is perhaps more subtle, avoiding so many ablatives, but I must object to *tortis ... capillis*, because the transformation of Medea’s hair has not taken place yet.⁹⁵ Reading *totis* with some important mss. would be no great improvement.⁹⁶

Acknowledgement: I am grateful to Álvaro Cancela, Antonio Ramírez de Verger and Luis Rivero for having commented on a draft of this paper, and to Juan Antonio Estévez and Jaume Juan for valuable advice on specific points. Thanks are also due to the editors of *Philologus* and to the anonymous referees for saving me from some errors. This paper is part of the research project PID2019-106844GB-I00 financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation.

Bibliography

- Anthologia veterum latinorum epigrammatum et poematum ... cura Petri Burmanni Secundi*, I, Amstelaedami 1759.
- C. Iulii Caesaris *De Bellis Gallico et Civili Pompejano, nec non A. Hirtii, aliorumque De Bellis Alexandrino, Africano, et Hispaniensi Commentarii ... Cura et studio F. Oudendorpii*, Lugduni Batavorum et Rotterodami 1737.
- M. Manilii *Astronomicon liber quartus*, recensuit et enarrauit A. E. Housman, Londini 1920.
- P. Ovidii Nasonis *Operum tomus II qui XV. Metamorphoseon, sive Transformationum, libros continet*, Amstelodami 1652.
- P. Ovidii Nasonis *Operum tomus I scripta amatoria complexus*, Nicolaus Heinsius, Dan. Fil. infinitis locis castigavit ad fidem scriptorum exemplarium, Amstelaedami 1658.
- P. Ovidii Nasonis *Operum tomus II qui Metamorphoses complectitur*, Nicolaus Heinsius D. F. locis infinitis ex fide scriptorum exemplarium castigavit et observationes adiecit, Amstelaedami 1659.

⁹⁴ On the confusion, see *ThLL* X.1 261.36–37.

⁹⁵ Cf. *Hor. Carm.* 2.13.35–36 [*quid mirum, ubi*] *intorti capillis / Eumenidum recreantur angues?*

⁹⁶ On the other hand, the repetition *clarissima* (794)/*claruit* is not enticing.

- P. Ovidii Nasonis *Metamorphoseon libri xv* cum integris ... notis, quibus et suas adnotationes adiecit Petrus Burmannus, Amstelodami 1727.
- P. Ovidii Nasonis *Metamorphoseon libri XV*, mit kritischen und erläuternden Anmerkungen von E. C. Chr. Bach, Erster Band I–VII, Hannover 1831.
- P. Ovidius Naso *Metamorphoses* ex iterata R. Merkelii recognitione cum emendationis sumario, Lipsiae ²1875.
- P. Ovidii Nasonis *Metamorphoseon libri XV*, Lactanti Placidi qui dicitur *narrationes fabularum Ovidianarum*, ed. H. Magnus, Berolini 1914.
- P. Ovidii Nasonis *Metamorphoses*, rec. R. J. Tarrant, Oxonii 2004.
- P. Virgiliti Maronis *Opera*, cum integris et emendationibus commentariis Servii, Philargyrii, Pierii. Accedunt ... praecipue Nic. Heinsii notae nunc primae editae; quibus et suas in omne opus animadversiones et variantes in Servium lectiones addidit P. Burmannus, post cuius obitum interruptam editionis curam suscepit et adornavit P. Burmannus junior, Amstelaeami 1746.
- W. S. Anderson, *Ovid's Metamorphoses Books 1–5*, Norman 1997.
- A. Barchiesi (ed.), *A Commentary on Ovid's Metamorphoses*, 3 Vols., Cambridge 2024 (Milano ¹2005–2015).
- E. Bednara, “De sermone dactylicorum Latinorum quaestiones”, *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 14, 1906, 317–360; 532–604.
- F. F. Blok, *Nicolaas Heinsius in dienst van Christina von Zweden*, Delft 1949.
- H. Boese, “Zu den Ovidkollationen des N. Heinsius”, *Philologus* 106, 1962, 155–173.
- F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen. Kommentar, Buch I–III*, Heidelberg 1969.
- F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen. Kommentar, Buch IV–V*, Heidelberg 1976.
- F. H. Bothe, *Vindiciae Ovidianae sive Annotationes in P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libros XV*. Accedunt Joannis Henrici Vossii viri celeberrimi lectiones et notae, Gottingae 1818.
- P. Burman, *Sylloges epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum tomi quique*, collecti et digesti per Petrum Burmannum, Tomus III, Leidae 1727.
- J. G. Capoferreus, *Animadversionum in auctores classicos L. L. Liber I qui est in Ovidii Metamorphosin*, Lipsiae 1659.
- G. Celato, *Nasonis vincere decus. Da Ovidio a Claudiano: gli studi di Nicolaus Heinsius sugli auctores latini*, Pisa 2023.
- S. Díez Rebozo, *Edición crítica y comentario textual del libro XI de las Metamorfosis de Ovidio*, Diss. Huelva 2014.
- A. Draeger, *Ovid als Sprachbildner*, Aurich 1888.
- R. Ellis, *A Commentary on Catullus*, Oxford ²1889.
- T. Faber, *Epistolae*, Pars altera, Salmurii 1665.
- P. Fàbregas Salis, “Heinsius’s *Vnus meus* and *Oxoniensis* (or *Balliolensis*)”, *ExClass* 23, 2019, 65–108.
- P. Fàbregas Salis, “A note on Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 11, 17”, *MD* 84, 2020, 197–205.
- P. Fàbregas Salis, *El libro X de las Metamorfosis de Ovidio: un comentario textual*, Huelva 2022.
- P. Fedeli/R. Dimundo/I. Ciccarelli, *Properzio. Elegie, Libro IV*, Nordhausen 2015.
- N. Heinsius, *Adversariorum libri IV*, curante Petro Burmanno Juniore, Harlingae 1742.
- N. Heinsius, *Commentarius in P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera Omnia*, cur. I. F. Fischerus, Lipsiae 1758.
- E. B. Lease, “*Neve* and *Neque* with the Imperative and Subjunctive”, *AJPh* 34, 1913, 418–436.
- Ae. Linse, *De P. Ovidio Nasone vocabulorum inventore*, Lipsiae 1891.
- P. Loewe, *Über die Praepositionen A, DE, EX bei Ovid* (Beilage zum Programm des königl. Gymnasiums zu Strehlen 197), Strehlen 1889.
- G. Luck, “*Emendaturus, si licuisset, erat*”, *Euphrosyne* 36, 2008, 9–19.
- P. Maas, *Textkritik*, Leipzig ⁴1960.
- J. C. McKeown, *Ovid. Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary. Volume III: A Commentary on Book Two*, Leeds 1998.

- F. Munari, “Codici Heinsiani degli *Amores*”, *SIFC* 24, 1950, 161–165.
- F. Neue/C. Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Erster Band: *Das Substantivum*, Leipzig³1902.
- R. Pichon, *De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores*, Paris 1902.
- H. Pinkster, *The Oxford Latin Syntax*. Vol. 1: *The Simple Clause*, Oxford 2015.
- H. Pinkster, *The Oxford Latin Syntax*. Vol. 2: *The Complex Sentence and Discourse*, Oxford 2021.
- M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, Cambridge 1951.
- A. Ramírez de Verger, *Book VI of Ovid’s Metamorphoses: A Textual Commentary*, Berlin/Boston 2021.
- A. Ramírez de Verger, “Textual criticism”, in: L. Rivero (coord.), *The Metamorphoses of Ovid: 35 Years of Research 1980–2014*, Vol. I (*Lustrum* 62, 2020), Göttingen 2022, 58–215.
- M. D. Reeve, “Heinsius’s Manuscripts of Ovid”, *RhM* 117, 1974, 133–166.
- L. Rivero García, *Book XIII of Ovid’s Metamorphoses: A Textual Commentary*, Berlin/Boston 2018.
- D. A. Slater, *Towards a Text of the Metamorphosis of Ovid*, Oxford 1927.
- L. Sniehotta, *De vocum Graecarum apud poetas Latinos dactylicos ab Enni usque ad Ovidi tempora usu*, Vratislaviae 1903.
- A. Suárez del Río, *Edición crítica y comentario textual del libro III de las Metamorfosis de Ovidio*, Diss. Huelva 2015.
- A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik*. Band II: *Syntax und Stilistik*, München 1972 (≈ 1965).
- W. S. Watt, “Ovidiana”, *MH* 52, 1995, 90–107.
- W. S. Watt, “Notes on Ovid”, *C&M* 50, 1999, 167–178.
- J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry. Figures of Allusion*, Oxford 1996.
- U. Winter, *Die europäischen Handschriften der Bibliothek Diez*. Zweiter Teil: *Die Libri impressi cum notis manuscriptis der Bibliotheca Dieziana*, Leipzig 1986.

Pere Fàbregas Salis
 Departamento de Filología Clásica
 Universidad Complutense de Madrid
 Plaza Menéndez Pelayo s/n, 28040 Madrid, Spain
 E-Mail: pfabregasuni@gmail.com