

8

The Text¹

The *Amores* have come down to us, complete or in substantial part, in more than eighty mss². Errors common to the whole tradition (e.g. 8.65 *quinquaria*, 2.5.27 *Phoebum...Dianae*, 3.6.31 *Xantho*) prove that they are all descended from the same archetype³. Despite this common ancestry, however, very little progress can be made in classifying them stemmatically. Only one small but very important group, the only mss which predate the 12th century⁴, can be distinguished from the bulk of the tradition. These mss are:

- R Paris Bibl. Nat. Lat. 7311, 9th cent., containing *Ars*, *Rem.*, *Am. Epigr.*, 1.1.3-1.2.19, 1.2.25-50
 P Paris Bibl. Nat. Lat. 8242, 9th cent., containing *Heroides* (incomplete), *Am.* 1.2.51-3.12.26, 3.14.3-3.15.8
 Y East Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibl. Hamilton 471, 11th cent.⁵, containing *Ars* (except 2.113-258), *Rem.*, *Am.*
 S St. Gall 864, 11th cent., containing, *inter alia*, *Am. Epigr.*-1.6.45, 1.8.75-3.9.10.

¹ I here give only a general outline of the tradition. For further information and discussion, see Munari *xixff.*, Kenney (1962), Goold (1965) 3ff., Munari (1965), Perl (1966), Oliver (1969), Tarrant (1983) 259ff., McKie (1986) 3.[5], the *Somnium*, has a somewhat different tradition from that of the rest of the collection and, partly for that reason, it is now generally regarded as spurious. For an account of its textual history and a discussion of its authenticity, see the introduction to that poem.

² Most are listed and briefly described by Munari *xxviff.*

³ I use the term loosely (see Housman [1931] *xl*, n. 1). It is quite possible that many readings drawn from other sources are preserved in all or part of the extant tradition. Xb, a miscellany containing 3.[5], the *Somnium*, was compiled early in the 9th century. Since, however, it clearly belongs in the line of tradition represented by the *recentiores* and offers no reading of particular note, I do not cite it systematically in reference to its age.

⁵ This dating is generally accepted and probably correct. Munari's caution should, however, be noted: 'nella datazione non si può scendere sotto il sec. XI' ([1965] 12).

These mss are all closely related to, but independent of, each other⁶. R, P and Y are our best witnesses to the text, of much more value individually than any other mss. S, however, has very little independent worth. It is our sole witness to the truth in only one passage (2.8.7 *num [prior]*) and very frequently agrees with the *recentiores* in transmitting readings which are inferior to those offered by other members of the group⁷.

The resurgence of scholastic and scholarly interest in Ovid from the late 11th century onwards not only produced a great number of mss, but also ensured that the relationship between them should be obscured⁸. They are heavily contaminated with readings from more than one source and with conjectures. It is, in fact, possible that there are among the *recentiores* mss which draw primarily on the stream of tradition represented by the *uetustiores*, but which are so influenced by other sources as to be indistinguishable from the rest of the *recentiores*⁹. All that is certain is that the *recentiores* show knowledge, most notably in their transmission of the genuine verses omitted by the *uetustiores* (see n. 6), of at least one independent line of descent from the archetype. Therefore, although none of the *recentiores* can be seen to have particular authority, as a class they have considerable importance and it is always possible that any individual member or group of members of this class of mss may alone preserve the truth.

⁶ That this group shares a common hyparchetype is established most clearly by the absence from P, Y and S of the genuine verses 1.13.11-14 and 2.2.18-22, 25-27, transmitted by the *recentiores* and added to P and Y by later hands. Since P begins where R breaks off and the two mss display very similar orthographical characteristics, Tafel (1910) 26ff. tentatively suggested that P may be a direct descendant of the now lost part of R. That hypothesis, forcefully restated by Goold (1965) 3f., has been convincingly refuted by McKie (1986) 219ff.

⁷ To account for the inferiority of S, Goold (1965) 6 suggests that it is descended from the now lost part of R, with the missing opening portion and many of its readings elsewhere drawn from other sources, antecedent to the *recentiores*.

⁸ Apart from Mk and its apographs (see below), the only *recentiores* which I cite which clearly have a close affinity are Jg and Me (both 15th century). They share eccentric readings at e.g. 1.3.24 *curua*, 1.8.47 *temporauit*, 53 *excultente*, 3.8.59 *lanienter*, 3.13.31 *arguta*. As Munari observes (p. xxxv), Vaticanus Palat. Lat. 910 (1467) is very similar to H, with which it shares eccentric readings at e.g. 2.8.7 *numero collapsus*, 3.1.15 *amator*, 3.13.27 *gratum*, 3.15.2 *nota*. Ferrariensis Bibl. Ciu. II 141 (15th cent.) is closely related not only to Ld (see Munari [1948] 148 and 151), but also to Pc, with which it shares eccentric readings at e.g. 3.4.29 *carie est*, 3.7.29 *saga ueneficia*, 3.13.11 *hac*, 3.14.37 *jugit et*; all three mss place the *Somnium* after 3.9.

⁹ C and D have the strongest claim to this distinction.

Heinsius' great edition (1661) showed clearly the value of an eclectic approach to the tradition. For centuries thereafter, however, apart from the modest contribution by Burman (1727), little progress was made. Editors were content to rely unduly on the authority of R, P and S, ignoring the need to draw on as large a number of mss as possible in such an open tradition. The first properly critical edition of the *Amores* was published by Munari in 1951 (5th ed., 1970). Munari based his text on R, P and S and (in Kenney's sigla) Ea, H, N, Ob, Va and Vb, with occasional citations from many other *recentiores*. In his Oxford Text (1961), Kenney increased to twenty-one the number of *recentiores* cited systematically. The present edition is based on the same mss as were used by Kenney, with the addition of Y and C. Errors in cataloguing prevented Munari and Kenney from making use of these important mss. When the Hamilton mss were sold in 1882, Y was wrongly listed as a 14th century ms and the error was first detected by Boese in 1963.¹⁰ C is Heinsius' *Arondeleanus*, but is not listed in any catalogue of Arundel mss, and was first identified as such by Reeve (1974) 138f.¹¹ I have also adopted Munari's practice of citing occasionally from other mss.¹² In a few cases, the source of these readings requires more explanation than could conveniently be given in the *siglorum conspectus*. Mk and Mm represent the collations of two now lost Florentine mss made by Politian in the copy of the 1477 Parma edition which is now in the Bodleian Library in Oxford.¹³ Since the collation of Mk is so sporadic, I have also cited readings from Lc and Ld, two of its apographs. Mn represents the collation by Heinsius of a still unidentified ms. That collation, which Heinsius denotes by the siglum C, is in one of the copies of his father's edition (1629) in the Bodleian Library (Auct. S 5 7)¹⁴. In reporting mss used by Kenney, I have retained his sigla. Y is heavily revised: Munari detects and

reports no fewer than six different hands.¹⁵ To simplify the *apparatus*, I have made no distinction between the original hand and that of the contemporary corrector, reporting both as Y, and I have reported all later hands as y, except in a few places where more than one later hand is at work; in those places, y denotes any later hand except that of Pontano, which, following Munari, I report as Y⁴. Since all the later hands seem to be drawing on sources comparable to the *recentiores*, little is lost by not distinguishing between them.

The closely related *excerpta Puteani* and *excerpta Scaligeri* derive most of their readings from a source or sources of comparable authority to the *recentiores*, with others taken from P¹⁶. I cite them only occasionally, when they offer a reading found in fewer than three of the *recentiores* and not taken from P¹⁷. I have not reported the readings of the *florilegia* cited by Kenney. e, p₁ and p₃ are all copies of the twelfth-century *florilegium Gallicum* (q) (see Hamacher [1975] 27ff., Burton [1983] 46ff.), of no particular value for the text of the *Amores*, since it clearly belongs with the *recentiores* (see Kenney [1962] 29f.). Its only reading of interest is *premsi* at 1.2.14, which it shares only with Band Me. The other *florilegium* cited by Kenney, p₆, contains only one couplet from the *Amores*, the suspected lines 3.11.35f.

I have preferred to standardise the orthography rather than to be guided by the testimony of the most authoritative mss in each passage individually.¹⁸ We do not know whether or not Ovid was consistent in such matters, but the authority of mss copied almost, or more than, a millennium after the autograph must be very slight. It

¹⁵ (1965) 19. The total is actually seven, if one includes the hand which, probably in the twelfth century, added 3.15.17-20 and the *explicit*. The distinction between the various hands is not always as clear as Munari's collation suggests; see Perl (1966) 268ff.

¹⁶ Kenney, regarding the source of these *excerpta* as uncertain, cites them 'fairly freely...as if they possessed independent authority' ([1962] 31). Their true worth is determined more closely by Reeve (1974) 162ff. and (1976) 73f.

¹⁷ Kenney cites one or both of these sets of *excerpta* fifteen times. At 2.5.29, 2.11.45, 3.6.65, 3.7.28 and 3.13.8, their reading agrees with that of q; at 3.2.41, 3.3.40, 3.4.24, 3.6.59 and 3.8.50, it is taken from P; to the five remaining passages, 1.4.23, 1.6.41, 2.2.25, 2.16.35 and 3.13.24, I add only 1.4.48, 1.6.6 and 3.13.27.

¹⁸ See Goold (1965) 9ff. and 95f. Greek proper names are a special case. I have despaired of attempting to present them in a consistent manner, and only occasionally attempt to justify my choice of a particular form: hence, for example, *Menandros* (1.15.18), but *Argus* (3.4.20), *Apollo* (1.14.31 etc.), but *Iason* (2.14.33 etc.), *Briseidos* (2.8.11), but *Memnonis* (1.8.4, 1.13.3, note *Memnona* at 3.9.1).

¹⁰ See Munari (1965) 9.

¹¹ For a description of the ms, see Cunningham (1973), esp. 67ff., and also (1976) 287.

¹² My information about the readings of Ja-Jf, Kf, Kg, Ld-Lh and Mg-Mj is derived almost entirely from Munari's articles and edition. For Jg, I draw mostly on Heinsius' collation, which is to be found, under the siglum G, along with that of Mn (see below).

¹³ See Reeve (1974) 142 n. 35.

¹⁴ The lost Glaserianus of unknown date was collated very sporadically as far as 1.12.13 by Gruterus in the Bodleian Library's copy of the 1578 Antwerp edition (Auct. S 5 13); see Reeve (1974) 143. It offers no reading of particular note.

seems an unnecessary distraction to print, for example, forms of *proximus* at 1.1.18 and 3.7.48, but of *proximus* at 3.2.70, of *uolgu* at 1.2.34 and 3.6.77, but of *uolgu* at 1.9.22 and 1.15.35, of *assiduu* at 1.2.36 and 2.7.16, but of *assiduu* at 2.2.27, of *lacrima* fourteen times, but of *lacruma* at 1.14.51. Nowhere in the *Amores* is there a strong case for supposing that Ovid sacrificed orthographical consistency in order to achieve a particular effect, such as euphony or archaic *color*. (One might, however, wish to think that he wrote either *grauús urbés* or *graués urbis* at 1.9.19; on *Aen.* 10.571 *quadriugís in equós*, Servius comments: *propter homoeoteleuton noluit dicere 'quadriugos'*¹⁹.) I generally follow the same policy of standardisation in the *apparatus*, except where particular spellings may affect the choice of reading.

I have not reported the various colophons and poem-titles found in some mss. There is no reason to suppose that any of them are original²⁰.

¹⁹ Cf. also Gell. 13.21. For an attempt to establish Ovid's use of such forms in *-is* and *-es* in the *Metamorphoses*, see Pulbrook (1973).

²⁰ The title *Amores*, however, is preserved in some *incipits* and *explicitis*; see p. 107, n. 11.

ARCA

Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs

20

OVID: AMORES
TEXT, PROLEGOMENA AND
COMMENTARY

in four volumes

J C McKEOWN

VOLUME I
TEXT AND PROLEGOMENA

General Editors: Francis Cairns and Robin Seager
Assistant Editors: Neil Adkin, Sandra Cairns, Frederick Williams

ISSN 0309-5541

X FRANCIS CAIRNS