The Soldier in the Garden and Other Intruders in Ovid's "Metamorphoses"

R. J. Tarrant

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. 100. (2000), pp. 425-438.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0073-0688%282000%29100%3C425%3ATSITGA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-1

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology is currently published by Department of the Classics, Harvard University.

THE SOLDIER IN THE GARDEN AND OTHER INTRUDERS IN OVID'S *METAMORPHOSES*

R. J. TARRANT

THE last full-scale love story in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* relates the passion of Vertumnus, a minor divinity and shape-shifter, for the virginal gardener Pomona (*Met.* 14.622–771). Pomona strictly regulates entry to her farm-garden from fear of male violence, and Vertumnus can only catch a glimpse of his beloved by assuming the appearance of various members of her work crew:

> o quotiens habitu duri messoris aristas
> corbe tulit uerique fuit messoris imago!
> tempora saepe gerens faeno religata recenti
> desectum poterat gramen uersasse uideri;
> saepe manu stimulos rigida portabat, ut illum
> iurares fessos modo disiunxisse iuuencos;
> falce data frondator erat uitisque putator;
> induerat scalas, lecturum poma putares.
> miles erat gladio, piscator harundine sumpta.
> denique per multas aditum sibi saepe figuras
> repperit, ut caperet spectatae gaudia formae.

Problems arise with the occupations mentioned in line 651. Fishermen are not usually found in an orchard, but that difficulty pales beside the unlikelihood that Pomona would let troops from the local barracks conduct maneuvers in her garden. The two guises referred to also appear in Vertumnus' self-description in Propertius 4.2 (soldier 27–28, fisherman 37), as does the line-end *harundine sumpta* (33), which there refers to birdcatching. In Propertius the roles of soldier and fisherman are appropriate to Vertumnus' boast that he can assume any shape (21 *opportuna mea est cunctis natura figuris*); in the more restricted setting of Ovid's story, however, they are jarringly out of place. At the verbal level, while

the verse in question is elegantly constructed, the pattern of abl. abs. + *erat* repeats that of 649, which itself raises doubts in a passage so clearly marked by variation of syntax. Furthermore, *piscator* appears only here in Ovid, who elsewhere denotes fisherman with participial phrases such as *piscem capientes Met.* 8.854 or droll periphrases, e.g., *moderator harundinis Met.* 8.856; the word is not otherwise found in poetry between Plautus and Juvenal, probably because it was felt to be too "low" for respectable genres. By contrast, the other *nomina agentis* in the passage, *messor* and *putator*, had been dignified by appearances in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*.[1]

One might argue in support of the line that it portrays Vertumnus as so besotted that he will adopt any shape, however unsuitable, to get near Pomona; but since the following lines clearly state that the transformations achieved that end (*per multas aditum sibi saepe figuras / repperit*), we come back to the initial improbability of Pomona's admitting a soldier or a fisherman to her demesne.

On contextual and verbal grounds a serious case can be made out, I believe, for regarding *Met.* 14.651 as an interpolation, presumably by a reader familiar with the treatment of Vertumnus in Propertius. To be convincing, however, this assertion also needs to answer a larger question: how well established is the presence of interpolation, and specifically interpolation of the kind alleged here, in the poem as a whole? Modern editors of the *Metamorphoses* have generally limited interpolations to cases of apparent doublets and to lines with dubious manuscript authority, but in previous studies I have argued, reviving a view held by earlier critics such as Heinsius and Bentley, that a significant number of interpolated lines are transmitted by all extant manuscripts.[2] The majority of these additions are instances of what I term "collaborative interpolation," places where "the reader seems to take on the role of a co-author who revises, expands, or varies the text, not because it appears defective or obscure but simply because it allows for further elaboration."[3] In place of the rhetoric of forgery and deception often invoked in the study of interpolation, I have stressed the elements of

[1] For *messor* cf. *Ecl.* 2.10, 3.42, *G.* 1.316; *putator*, cf. *G.* 2.28.

[2] A list of the lines I regard as interpolated appears in the Appendix.

[3] "The Reader As Author: Collaborative Interpolation in Latin Poetry," in J. N. Grant ed., *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York 1989) 137. See also "Editing Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Problems and Possibilities," *CP* 77 (1982) 342–360; "Toward a Typology of Interpolation in Latin Poetry," *TAPA* 117 (1987) 281–298.

imitation and emulation involved in responding to a text in this way, elements basic to the literary and rhetorical formation of both Ovid and his ancient readers.[4]

The addition of line 651 in the Vertumnus passage illustrates one form of collaborative interpolation, the extension of a catalogue or series. Ovid's fondness for lists of various kinds contributed to the early stereotype of a clever poet unable to let well enough alone,[5] and also provided a natural opportunity for readers to display their own fertility of invention. In the following pages I consider several passages in the *Metamorphoses* where I believe this has happened. In some cases the line between genuine Ovidian *copia* and interpolation is admittedly hard to draw, and the difficulty is compounded by the fact that interpolation of this kind is almost certainly ancient, and so not likely to reveal its non-Ovidian character by unclassical wording or syntax. I am therefore under no illusion that my arguments on the following passages will appear uniformly persuasive, but I hope that the discussion as a whole will succeed in demonstrating the existence of this subtype of interpolation.

2.216–226 (the disastrous effects of Phaethon's ride in the chariot of the Sun)

siluae cum montibus ardent,
ardet Athos Taurusque Cilix et Tmolus et Oete
et tum sicca, prius creberrima fontibus, Ide
uirgineusque Helicon et nondum Oeagrius Haemus;
ardet in immensum geminatis ignibus Aetne
Parnasosque biceps et Eryx et Cynthus et Othrys
et tandem niuibus Rhodope caritura Mimasque
Dindymaque et Mycale natusque ad sacra Cithaeron.

[4] Otto Zwierlein has recently advanced a far more radical hypothesis involving interpolation of this kind, arguing that our texts of Virgil and Ovid descend from a thoroughgoing revision by the Tiberian poet-rhetorician Julius Montanus: *Die Ovid- und Vergil-Revision in Tiberischer Zeit* (Berlin-New York 1999). Zwierlein's case is still being presented and so a verdict would be premature, but even if his claims for large-scale rewriting by Montanus should prove unconvincing, his acute discussions of individual passages of the *Metamorphoses* have already added to the number of justly bracketed or suspected lines.

[5] Sen. Rhet. *Contr.* 9.5.17 (citing Mamercus Aemilius Scaurus): *Ouidius nescit quod bene cessit relinquere.*

nec prosunt Scythiae sua frigora; Caucasus ardet
Ossaque cum Pindo maiorque ambobus Olympus, 225
aeriaeque Alpes et nubifer Appenninus.

The list of mountains reaches a climax in line 225: any reference to Olympus is implicitly closural, and here its final position is heightened by the arrangement of the line and the build-up phrase *maiorque ambobus*. The sudden shift to Italy in 226 and the absence of rhetorical emphasis in the line undercut this carefully planned effect. The anticlimactic abruptness of 226 can also be gauged by contrast with the globally conceived catalogue of rivers that follows (242–259), where the transition to western rivers is explicitly marked (258 *Hesperiosque amnes*) and the Tiber occupies an emphatic final position (259 *cuique fuit rerum promissa potentia, Thybrim*).[6] In its wording the line looks unobjectionable, although Ovid has no other example of *aerius* used of a mountain (a favorite expression of Virgil), and the aptness of *nubifer* under the circumstances might be questioned: compare the negation of usual descriptions elsewhere in the passage, 218 *tum sicca, prius creberrima fontibus*, 222 *tandem niuibus . . . caritura*, 224 *nec prosunt . . . sua frigora*.

9.450–456 (the opening of the episode of Byblis)

Hic tibi, dum sequitur patriae curuamina ripae, 450
filia Maeandri totiens redeuntis eodem
cognita Cyanee praestanti corpora forma,
Byblida cum Cauno, prolem est enixa gemellam.
Byblis in exemplo est ut ament concessa puellae,
Byblis Apollinei correpta cupidine fratris. 455
non soror ut fratrem nec qua debebat amabat.

Line 455 forms so ringing a conclusion to its paragraph that any continuation of the thought is likely to seem anticlimactic, but 456 is particularly lame. *Non soror ut fratrem* and *nec qua debebat* are equivalent expressions; neither is required to explain *correpta cupidine fratris*, and the first is both clearer and stronger than the second, which makes the doubling of the idea even more obviously inept. What the line lacks in

[6] R. F. Thomas on Virgil *G.* 4.363–373 plausibly relates both Ovid's and Virgil's catalogues of rivers to Callimachus' treatise "On the Rivers of the Known World."

cohesion and point is evident by comparison with its almost certain source, *Ars* 1.283–286 *Byblida quid referam, uetito quae fratris amore / arsit et est laqueo fortiter ulta nefas? / Myrrha patrem, sed non qua filia debet, amauit / et nunc obducto cortice pressa latet.* It would admittedly be typical of Ovid to transfer to Byblis in the *Metamorphoses* a phrase he had applied to Myrrha in the *Ars* (especially in light of the close parallels between the two episodes in the *Metamorphoses*), and such a transfer on the level of plot is in fact present here: in the *Metamorphoses* it is Myrrha, not Byblis, who tries unsuccessfully to hang herself in horror at her incestuous passion (10.378–387). But I can think of no genuine instance of Ovidian self-variation that produces a revision as feeble as 456, and the coupling of Byblis and Myrrha in the *Ars* passage could itself have suggested the transfer of motif to an alert reader.[7]

11.592–602 (the cave of Sleep)

Est prope Cimmerios longo spelunca recessu,
mons cauus, ignaui domus et penetralia Somni,
quo numquam radiis oriens mediusue cadensue
Phoebus adire potest; nebulae caligine mixtae
exhalantur humo dubiaeque crepuscula lucis.
non uigil ales ibi cristati cantibus oris
euocat Auroram, nec uoce silentia rumpunt
sollicitiue canes canibusue sagacior anser;
non fera, non pecudes, non moti flamine rami
humanaeue sonum reddunt conuicia linguae;
muta quies habitat.

Several features of lines 600–601 generate strong suspicion: (a) after 598–599, which name three animals known for (indeed, almost synonymous with) their noisemaking habits, the vagueness of *fera* is blatantly anticlimactic; (b) given the stress in 592–596 on the other-worldly remoteness and perpetual darkness of the place, the notion that the silence might be broken by the sound of people arguing (*humanae . . . conuicia linguae*) borders on the ludicrous; (c) both lines are almost entirely made up of elements used more effectively and appropriately

[7] For another example of a line in the *Ars* interpolated (in this case without alteration) into the *Metamorphoses*, see *Ars* 2.73 (= *Met.* 8.216).

elsewhere in the poem: cf. 3.408–410 [*fons*] *quem neque pastores neque pastae monte capellae / contigerant aliudue pecus, quem nulla uolucris / nec fera turbarat nec lapsus ab arbore ramus*;[8] 3.498 *haec* [sc. Echo] *quoque reddebat sonitum plangoris eundem*;[9] 7.629–630 *intremuit ramisque sonum sine flamine motis / alta dedit quercus*; 13.306–307 *neue in me stolidae conuicia fundere linguae / admiremur eum.*

13.375–381 (the peroration of Ulysses' speech in the *Armorum Iudicium*)

'per spes nunc socias casuraque moenia Troum
perque deos oro, quos hosti nuper ademi,
per si quid superest, quod sit sapienter agendum,
si quid adhuc audax ex praecipitique petendum est,
si Troiae fatis aliquid restare putatis,
este mei memores! aut si mihi non datis arma,
huic date!' et ostendit signum fatale Mineruae.

378–379 *suspectos Heinsio del. Bentley*

Heinsius' suspicions about 378 and 379 were expressed in general terms ("agnosco alienam denuo manum in hoc versu. . . . Praecedens etiam versus est suspectus"), but the lines offer no shortage of reasons for doubt.[10] Line 378 seems to present a more aggressive counterpart to the prudent action spoken of in 377, but the coherence of the wording unravels on closer inspection. The apparent parallelism of *audax* and *ex*

[8] As a totalizing formula like "birds and beasts," the combination *fera-uolucris* is found also at 1.75; 7.185; 11.21 (plus *angues*), 44, 639 (plus *serpens*); *F.* 3.193; *Ars* 2.271.

[9] In *Met.* 11.601 *sonum reddere* means simply "to emit a sound," while in Ovid *reddere* usually describes words or other forms of sound that "return" (by echoing, answering, or otherwise responding to) a previous statement or action. Bömer cites as instances of *reddere* = *edere Met.* 8.770 (where *editus* is to be preferred to *redditus*) and, only a few lines after the line in question, 608 *ianua ne uerso stridorem cardine reddat*; here *reddat* qualifies the sound as the result of the turning door-hinge (for this cause-and-effect use compare *F.* 2.108 *reddidit icta suos pollice chorda sonos*), and thus shows *sonum reddit* in 601 to be even more obviously anomalous.

[10] My treatment of lines 378–379 has benefited greatly from the discussion by Jefferds Huyck in his 1991 Harvard dissertation; Dr. Huyck is not responsible for the doubts expressed about line 377.

praecipiti creates a syntactical Hobson's choice: either both are to be taken as adverbs (which would be unparalleled and unlikely for *audax*)[11] or both as adjectives (which would be unparalleled and unlikely for *ex praecipiti*). The only other option is to take *ex praecipiti petendum* together as parallel to *audax* ("if there is anything bold and needing to be snatched from the edge of disaster"), and this mars what must be an intentional symmetry of *agendum* and *petendum*. In 379 attention has been focused on the near-rhyme *fatis . . . putatis*; while several of the parallels cited by Bömer in its defense are illusory,[12] the effect does not seem fundamentally different from 3.251 *finita . . . uita*. More significant is the unclarity of *Troiae fata*, which should probably be taken to mean "the destruction of Troy" ("if you think something is still wanting to bring about" etc.), but which could as readily be interpreted "if you think something still remains of the protective destiny of Troy" or more generally "if you think the destiny of Troy is not yet complete." Ambiguity of this sort, though hardly fatal, suggests lack of skill in manipulating words, a frequent characteristic of Ovid's interpolators but hardly ever of the poet himself; it is certainly absent in the probable model for the phrase, *Met.* 2.655 *restabat fatis aliquid*, where the meaning is "something of the fates [sc. of Chiron] remained to be told."

Although doubt has so far been confined to 378 and 379, the phrasing of 377 makes that line open to question as well. In his elegiac writing Ovid several times couples *sapienter* with forms of *amare* for ironic effect (*Her.* 2.27, *Ars* 2.501, 511); the only other use of the adverb in the *Metamorphoses* is not so pointed (2.102 [the Sun-god to Phaethon] *sed tu sapientius opta*), but it is still far livelier than the clunky *sapienter agendum*; one expects something snappier from Ulysses as a curtain line. The sequence *per . . . perque . . . per si quid* (375–377) is also stylistically anomalous: Ovid's penchant for such sequences is a feature of his elegiac verse, and the only clear instance in the *Metamorphoses* is Procris' dying appeal to Cephalus (7.853–855 *per nostri foedera lecti / perque deos . . . / per si quid merui de te bene, perque manentem / . . . amorem*), a passage heavily elegiac in tone that also recalls Dido's plea

[11] Bömer states that *ex praecipiti* is also unparalleled in an adverbial sense, but in *Cons. Liu.* 399–400 *non ex praecipiti dolor . . . uenit / sed . . . per gradus* the meaning of *ex praecipiti* must be "in a rush, suddenly."

[12] E.g., 12.614 *armarat . . . cremabat*, 13.224 *dares . . . parares*, 390 *Aiacem . . . Aiax*, 736 *nymphas . . . nymphis*.

to Aeneas, *per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos, / si bene quid de te merui* (*Aen.* 4.315–316).[13] Elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses* appeals and oaths are regularly expressed by a twofold *per*, cf. 6.498–499 *perque fidem cognataque pectora supplex, / per superos oro*, 7.94–97 *per sacra triformis / ille deae . . . / perque patrem soceri . . . / iurat*, 14.372–373 *per, o, tua lumina . . . / perque hanc, pulcherrime, formam.*

Excising 377–379 gives a new and clearer focus to Ulysses' closing argument, which now turns on his crowning achievement, the theft of the Palladium, and the certainty it brings of the imminent fall of Troy.

13.789–797 (Polyphemus' courting song to Galatea)

'Candidior folio niuei, Galatea, ligustri,
floridior pratis, longa procerior alno, 790
splendidior uitro, tenero lasciuior haedo,
leuior adsiduo detritis aequore conchis,
solibus hibernis, aestiua gratior umbra,
nobilior pomis, platano conspectior alta,
lucidior glacie, matura dulcior uua, 795
mollior et cycni plumis et lacte coacto,
et, si non fugias, riguo formosior horto'

794 nobilior pomis (n. forma MN^{ac}) *saepe temptatum*: n. palma *Siebelis* (palmis *iam* ς): mobilior damma *Madvig* (*sed quis amator mobilitatem puellae fugientis umquam laudauit?*)

The text of the first half of 794 is uncertain (Siebelis' *nobilior palma* is the most attractive conjecture), but textual corruption is not in itself grounds for suspecting interpolation. More serious is the fact that *platano conspectior alta* replicates *longa procerior alno* in 790 in less choice and appropriate language, plane trees not being exceptional for their height. Bömer moots the possibility that the language of 794 is deliberately "off" to mock Polyphemus, but Ovid elsewhere uses more overt ways to depict his ineptness, as in the juxtaposition of *cycni plumis* and *lacte coacto* in 796. It is also worth noting that with 794

[13] On the elegiac-erotic character of sequences of line-initial *per* in Ovid see J. Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry* (Oxford 1996) 409; Wills mentions the passage under discussion as an exception, "also Met. 13.375–7."

removed each half of Polyphemus' litany (789–797, 799–807) contains seven lines of asyndetic epithets rounded off by a more elaborate final phrase beginning with *et, si* or *et, quod*; the second appearance of this coda-structure (805–807) is fittingly more ample than the first (three lines to one). It would be typical of Ovid's wit to give this uncouth rustic's song such a neatly symmetrical structure.[14]

15.420–435 (Pythagoras on the rise and fall of nations)

sic tempora uerti
cernimus atque illas adsumere robora gentes,
concidere has; sic magna fuit censuque uirisque
perque decem potuit tantum dare sanguinis annos,
nunc humilis ueteres tantummodo Troia ruinas
et pro diuitiis tumulos ostendit auorum.
clara fuit Sparte, magnae uiguere Mycenae,
nec non et Cecropis, nec non Amphionis arces;
uile solum Sparte est, altae cecidere Mycenae.
Oedipodioniae quid sunt, nisi nomina, Thebae?
quid Pandioniae restant, nisi nomen, Athenae?
nunc quoque Dardaniam fama est consurgere Romam,
Appenninigenae quae proxima Thybridis undis
mole sub ingenti rerum fundamina ponit.
haec igitur formam crescendo mutat et olim
immensi caput orbis erit.

Lines 426–430 were first suspected by Heinsius, who gave an unusually detailed set of reasons for their deletion.[15] The principal stumbling

[14] In an early paper of 1887 Magnus doubted the genuineness of 797, but in his edition he accepted Hartman's interpretation of the line as a contrary-to-fact condition ("I would go on to praise you as *riguo formosior horto* if you were not running away from me and not listening"). I agree that the line should not be suspected, but this reading will not do. Galatea is not like Daphne in Book 1, who runs away from Apollo as he speaks; we know that she is hiding behind a rock with Acis (786–788), and Polyphemus does not catch sight of her until his monologue is over (873). Furthermore, if Ovid intended the sense Hartman suggested, why did he not use the syntactically regular and metrically equivalent *fugeres*? (To be fair, Hartman thought the final books of the poem were left in an unrevised state and was thus ready to tolerate a high degree of verbal imprecision.) It seems simpler to take *si non fugias* as equivalent to *dummodo non fugias*, "provided you are not running away from me."

[15] Heinsius more often deleted lines on unspecified aesthetic grounds such as "frigidity" or lack of elegance; cf. R. J. Tarrant, "Nicolas Heinsius and the Rhetoric of Textual

block was the patent anachronism of Pythagoras' referring to Athens, Thebes, and Sparta as "mere names." It has been argued that the force of this objection is diluted by the anachronism of the entire episode, a meeting between Numa and Pythagoras that Livy recognized as chronologically impossible.[16] But the issue is not so easily skirted, since even if the perspective adopted is that of Ovid's own time, it would still have been patently false to call the Athens of that day a "mere name." At the verbal level, Heinsius was aware that the scansion of *Cecropis* with a short first syllable is unparalleled in Ovid's approximately twenty instances of the name in its various forms and by-forms. To remove the anomaly he accepted the variant *Cecropiae* from a thirteenth-century manuscript, but there is no apparent reason for the smooth *Cecropiae* to have been altered to the more awkward *et Cecropis*, and the variant is more likely to be an attempt at emendation. On a related point it may be significant that the adjectival forms *Oedipodionius* and *Pandionius* are, with one exception, not otherwise attested before the latter part of the first century A.D. (for the former cf. Lucan 8.407, Statius *Th.* 2.505, 10.801; for the latter Prop. 1.20.31, ps.-Sen. *Octauia* 8, *Culex* 251, Statius *Th.* 8.616). One might also wonder if these grandiloquent adjectives do not blunt the effect of *Apenninigenae* in 432.

Finally and to my mind most tellingly, Heinsius noted that the reference to Thebes, Mycenae, Sparta, and Athens obscures the rhetorical focus of the passage, the link Pythagoras draws between the collapse of Troy and the rise of Rome.[17] This connection is verbally underscored by the parallelism of *nunc* in 424 and *nunc quoque* in 431, and by the roughly equal space allotted to Troy (422–425) and Rome (431–435).

Criticism," in P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. Hinds eds., *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's* Metamorphoses *and its Reception* (Cambridge 1999 [Cambridge Philological Society Supplementary Volume 23]) 291, and see above on 13.378–379. The lines in question are defended by I. Marahrens, *Angefochtene Verse und Versgruppen in den Metamorphosen* (Ph.D. diss., Heidelberg 1971) 265–270, but several of Heinsius' arguments still carry weight.

[16] Livy 40.29.8. Bömer on *Met.* 15.7 notes that Ovid never explicitly speaks of a personal meeting, but the natural understanding of 15.479 is that Numa heard the lengthy discourse of Pythagoras at first hand.

[17] "In eo enim artificium Poetae imprimis consistit, ut perpetuo orationis filo mutationem rerum omnium tanquam concatenatam pertexat; nunc in eo occupatur, ut ex ruinis Trojae Romam prodisse demonstret. Inopportuna igitur, ut quae maxime, Spartes, Mycenarum Athenarumque ac Thebes hic inculcatur mentio."

In this context the baldness of *clara fuit Sparte, magnae uiguere Mycenae* is clearly out of place.

Even if the wording of lines 426–430 is not Ovid's, the impulse that led to their insertion arose from a sensitive reading of his text. The logic of Pythagoras' argument can be applied to any great power, and since Ovid himself organized Books 3 to 6 of his narrative around Thebes and Athens in the heroic age, a reference to their former glory would find confirmation within the poem. Sympathetic expansion of this kind defines the essence of collaborative interpolation.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX

Interpolated or Suspect Verses

The first of the following lists contains the lines that I currently intend to bracket in my forthcoming edition of the poem, the second the lines about whose genuineness doubt is expressed in the *apparatus criticus*. Where applicable I give the name of the scholar who first deleted or suspected the lines; I am responsible for deletions not otherwise attributed.

I. Lines bracketed

1.344 (Riese)
1.477 (missing in some older MSS)
1.544–545 (Magnus)
1.638
2.147 (missing in some MSS, del. Hartman)
2.226
2.384
2.400 (398–400 suspected by Heinsius)
2.520
2.611 (Gierig)
3.200 (omitted in some late MSS, del. Heinsius)
3.230 (Heinsius)
3.400–401 (Heinsius)
3.415 (Merkel)

3.417 (Merkel)
3.576 (Heinsius)
4.446 (missing in most older MSS, del. Heinsius)
4.768 (missing in older MSS, dell. edd.)
6.282 (Heinsius)
6.294 (Heinsius)
6.514 (suspected by Heinsius)
6.532 (Heinsius)
6.537–538 (in part suspected by Heinsius, 537 paelex—539 poena del. Merkel)
6.674 (Riese)
7.146–145 (145 del. Heinsius)
7.170 (missing in several older MSS, del. Heinsius)
7.186a (Naugerius)
7.508–509
7.522
7.525–527
7.569 (Merkel)
7.576 (suspected by Heinsius, del. Merkel)
7.580–581 (Heinsius)
7.687–688 (suspected in part by Bentley)
7.762 (missing in most older MSS, dell. edd.)
7.831 (Polle)
8.87 (missing in some older MSS, del. Heinsius)
8.124 (Merkel)
8.190 (Merkel)
8.216 (= *Ars* 2.73)
8.285–286 (285 Naugerius, 286 Burman)
8.597–600b, 603–608 (missing in some older MSS, del. Magnus; Heinsius bracketed 600b and suspected 605–608)
8.655–656 (missing in some older MSS, dell. edd.)
8.693a-b (missing in some older MSS, del. Heinsius)
9.111 (Heinsius)
9.147–148
9.179 (Korn)
9.415 (Heinsius)
9.456
9.520
9.728 parcere—729 et (729 missing in some older MSS, del. Heinsius)

9.755–756 (Heinsius)
9.777 (Merkel)
10.200–201 (Merkel)
10.205–208 (Merkel)
10.256
10.549
11.59 (Riese)
11.108 (Merkel)
11.180
11.351(Heinsius)
11.510–513 (Merkel)
11.600–601
12.230–231 (missing in some older MSS, del. Merkel)
12.434–438 (missing in older MSS, del. Bothe)
13.57 (missing in some older MSS, del. Merkel)
13.295 (Bentley)
13.332 (suspected by Heinsius, del. Merkel)
13.377–379 (378–379 suspected by Heinsius, del. Bentley)
13.404–407 (Bentley)
13.461
13.794
14.152–153
14.202
14.385 (Korn)
14.651
15.426–430 (Heinsius)

II. Suspicions mentioned in apparatus

1.207 (207–208 del. Merkel)
2.191–192 (192 misplaced in several older MSS, del. Zwierlein)
3.34 (missing in one ninth-century fragment, del. Zwierlein)
5.612–613
6.654 (del. Merkel)
7.135–136
7.154
7.195
7.335 (del. Heinsius)

7.657
8.525 (missing in some older MSS, del. Heinsius)
8.652–655a (missing in some older MSS, del. Magnus); cf. 8.655–656 above
8.778–779
9.524
9.563 (del. Heinsius)
11.518 (missing in some older MSS)
13.230 (del. Haupt)
13.333
13.374
13.849–850 (849 missing in some older MSS, del. Merkel)
14.201
14.324–325 (del. Zwierlein)
14.705–706 (missing or misplaced in several MSS, del. Zwierlein)
15.652 (del. Heinsius)