

EVPHROSYNE

EVPHROSYNE

Director

Maria Cristina Pimentel

Editorial Board

Aires A. Nascimento, Universidade de Lisboa

Ana Maria Lóio, Universidade de Lisboa

Ana María Sánchez Tarrío, Universidade de Lisboa

Arnaldo do Espírito Santo, Universidade de Lisboa

Bernardo Machado Mota, Universidade de Lisboa

Carmen Codoñer, Universidad de Salamanca

Emílio Suárez de la Torre, Universitat Pompeu Fabra

José Manuel Díaz de Bustamante, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela

José Pedro Silva Santos Serra, Universidade de Lisboa

Manuel Alexandre Júnior, Universidade de Lisboa

Paolo Chiesa, Università degli Studi di Milano

Paolo Fedeli, Università degli Studi di Bari 'Aldo Moro'

Paulo Farmhouse Alberto, Universidade de Lisboa

Rodrigo Correia Furtado, Universidade de Lisboa

Rosalba Dimundo, Università degli Studi di Bari 'Aldo Moro'

Thomas Earle, University of Oxford

Vanda Anastácio, Universidade de Lisboa

Victoria Emma Pagán, University of Florida

Editorial Assistants

Vanessa Fernandes

David Mesquita

Joana Veiga

Ana Matafome

EVPHROSYNE

51 (2023)

*CENTRO DE ESTUDOS CLÁSSICOS
FACULDADE DE LETRAS DA
UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA*

*JOURNAL FOR CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY
NEW SERIES – VOLUME 51*

BREPOLS

This work is financed with National Funds through FCT (Foundation for Science and Technology), through the project UIDB/00019/2020 (<https://doi.org/10.54499/UIDB/00019/2020>).

© 2024, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium.

This is an open access publication made available under a
CC BY-NC 4.0 International License:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>.

D/2024/0095/346
ISBN 978-2-503-60365-0
DOI 10.1484/J.EUPHR.5.137208
ISSN 0870-0133
eISSN 2736-3082

Printed in the EU on acid-free paper.

Contents

List of Illustrations	15
------------------------------	----

I. Commentationes

Le récit des Thermopyles dans l'Enquête d'Hérodote. Un exemple des relations intertextuelles complexes avec le modèle épique Arnaud AMILIEN	19
Le ironie di Enea. (<i>Aen.</i> 10.510-605 e 769-908; 12.887-952) Paola GAGLIARDI	33
Il tema del pianto nella tragedia senecana di <i>Medea</i>. Confronti con il modello euripideo e ovidiano Francesca D'ANGELO	49
Du "Je narrateur" à la représentation de l'espace. Lecture narratologique des <i>Métamorphoses</i> d'Apulée José MAMBWINI KIVUULA-KIAKU	85
Amor filial y honor familiar en <i>Colosenses</i> 3.2.1. Anotaciones desde la antropología cultural Virginia ALFARO BECH	131
Adverbios de modo de la letra épsilon en el <i>Nuevo Testamento</i>. Una aportación al <i>DGENT</i> Alberto ROMERO CRIADO	151
<i>CIL</i> XII, 5750 (= <i>CLE</i> 770) o el epitafio del niño que no pudo ser bautizado Alicia ORTIZ GÓMEZ	169
Los Sermones de clade de las <i>Homiliae Toletanae</i> (<i>CPL</i> 1997). Fuentes, datación y autoría M. ^a Eugenia PÉREZ GORDILLO	185

Las fuentes del <i>Apologeticum aduersus Elipandum</i> de Beato de Liébana y Eterio de Osma José Carlos MARTÍN-IGLESIAS	209
Dall' <i>Eneide</i> all' <i>Eneas</i>. Didone e Lavinia Sabina TUZZO	247
La <i>Coronica</i> de Pulgar, ¿única fuente de las <i>Decades</i> de Nebrija? El reinado de Enrique IV y el conflicto con el infante Alfonso Alicia MARTÍNEZ RODRÍGUEZ	285
Conocimiento lingüístico en Pedro Simón Abril José Antonio BELTRÁN CEBOLLADA	299
Housman on Tibullus Maxwell HARDY	321
II. <u>Studia breviora</u>	
Some Points of Precision on the Grammatical Gender of <i>cupido</i>, -inis in Ovid Luis RIVERO GARCÍA	343
<i>Annum agens</i> vs. <i>annum gerens</i>. Un problema di critica testuale (Svetonio, <i>De uita Caesarum</i>, Vespasiano, 24) Iván LÓPEZ MARTÍN	357
<i>De honoribus eius qui flaminica fuerit</i>. A note to AE 1982, 521 = CILA 3, 358 Manuel Alejandro GONZÁLEZ-MUÑOZ	369
Dos versiones del <i>Commentum Brunsonianum</i> a Terencio Enara SAN JUAN MANSO	375
¿A quién dedicó Janus Pannonius su <i>Ep.</i> 413? Alfonso LOMBANA SÁNCHEZ	391
El proemio de la versión manuscrita de la <i>repetitio septima</i> de Nebrija del códice Bolonia Biblioteca del Real Colegio de España, ms. 132. Edición y estudio David PANIAGUA	405

Ciris 524. An Observation Włodzimierz OLSZANIEC	421
Inácio Monteiro as an Eyewitness and Testimony of the Mathematical Libraries in Coimbra Noël GOLVERS	423
Muñecas animadas o sobre un mito clásico como estructura narrativa del filme <i>Love Object</i> (2003) María de la Luz GARCÍA FLEITAS	437

III. Disputationes

Nuovi contributi al testo di Eschilo in un volume miscellaneo Valentina CARUSO	449
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

IV. Libri recensiti

a) Text Editions. Commentaries. Translations.	461
SANTO AGOSTINHO, <i>Confissões</i>, tradução e notas de Arnaldo do Espírito Santo, João Beato e Maria Cristina de Castro-Maia de Sousa Pimentel, Lisboa, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 2021. 777 pp. ISBN 978-972-27-2511-8 PAULO RAMOS	461
IRENE VILLARROEL FERNÁNDEZ, <i>Flores Philosophorum et poetarum: tras la huella del Speculum Doctrinale de Vicente de Beauvais</i>, Basel, Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, 2020. XI + 754 pp. ISBN 978-2-503-59067-7 PAULO RAMOS	463
JAVIER SOAGE (ed.), <i>Anecdota rustica. Textus minores ad aedificationem pertinentes prout in codicibus saec. VIII-X asseruati sunt</i>, Turnhout, Brepols, 2022. XXIV + 28 pp. ISBN 978-2-503-59912-0 CARLOS PRIETO ESPINOSA	465

- PANAGIOTIS A. AGAPITOS** (trans.), *The Tale of Livistros and Rodamne: A Byzantine Love Romance of the 13th Century*. Translated with an introduction, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, 2021. X + 194 pp. ISBN 978-1-80085-603-5
RUI CARLOS FONSECA 468
- MARÍA DOLORES GARCÍA DE PASO CARRASCO, TRINIDAD ARCOS PEREIRA, MARÍA ELISA CUYÁS DE TORRES, GREGORIO RODRÍGUEZ HERRERA** (edd., trans.), *Los Principios de Retórica de Aftonio con anotaciones de Juan de Mal Lara*. Introducción, edición, traducción y notas, Madrid, Ediciones Clásicas, 2021. 363 pp. ISBN 978-84-7882-876-0
RUI CARLOS FONSECA 471
- PAOLO GATTI**, *Introduzione alla lessicografia latina da Festo al XII secolo*, Firenze, SISMEL - Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2021. XVIII + 58 pp. ISBN 978-88-9290-086-8
GIORGIA ASUNI 474
- EVERT VAN EMDE BOAS, ALBERT RIJKSBARON, LUUK HUITINK, MATHIEU BAKKER**, *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2019. XLII + 811 pp. ISBN 978-0-521-19860-8 (hardback); 978-0-521-12729-5 (paperback)
ANA ALEXANDRA ALVES DE SOUSA 476
- JAMES DIGGLE** (ed.), **BRUCE FRAZER, PATRICK JAMES, OLIVER SIMKIN, ANNE THOMPSON, SIMON WESTRIPP**, *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*, 2 vols, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2021. XXIII + 1529 pp. ISBN 978-1-108-83698-2
ANA ALEXANDRA ALVES DE SOUSA 480
- b) Literature. Culture. History.** 484
- FRANCK COLLIN**, *L'invention de l'Arcadie. Virgile et la naissance d'un mythe*, Paris, Honoré Champion, 2021. 852 pp. ISBN 978-2-7453-5732-8
GABRIEL A. F. SILVA 484
- DANIEL VALLAT** (ed.), *Vergilius orator, Lire et commenter les discours de l'Énéide dans l'antiquité tardive*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2022. 388 pp. ISBN 978-2-503-59583-2
DAVID PANIAGUA 486

- FRANCA ELA CONSOLINO (ed.), *After Ovid. Aspects of the Reception of Ovid in Literature and Iconography*, Turnhout, Brepols 2022. 374 pp. ISBN 978-2-503-59250-3** 491
LUCIANA FURBETTA
- TIMOTHY A. JOSEPH, *Thunder and lament. Lucan on the beginnings and ends of epic*, New York, Oxford University Press. 2022. 299 pp. ISBN 978-0-19-758214-5** 495
LUÍS MANUEL GASPAR CERQUEIRA
- ANA LÓIO (ed.), *Editing and Commenting on Statius's Silvae*, Leiden, Brill, 2023. XIV + 257 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-52906-9** 498
NEIL W. BERNSTEIN
- SOPHIA PAPAIOANNOU, AGIS MARINIS (edd.), *Elements of Tragedy in Flavian Epic*, Berlin / Boston, De Gruyter, 2021. VII + 210 pp. ISBN 978-3-11-070952-0** 500
FRANCESCO CANNIZZARRO
- SILVIO BÄR, EMMA GREENSMITH, LEYLA OZBEK (edd.), *Quintus of Smyrna's Posthomerica: Writing Homer under Rome*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2021. 448 pp. ISBN 978-1-4744-9358-1** 504
FOTINI HADJITTOFI
- NICOLE HECQUET-NOTI, *Épopée et Prédication – La poétique d'Avit de Vienne dans le 'De Spiritalis Historiae Gestis'*, Paris, Brepols, 2022. 322 pp. ISBN 978-2-85121-318-1** 508
PAULO RAMOS
- ZACHARY GUILIANO, *The Homiliary of Paul the Deacon: Religious and Cultural Reform in Carolingian Europe*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2021. 341 pp. ISBN 978-2-503-57791-3** 511
DAVID MESQUITA
- CHRISTHINE BÉNÉVENT, ROMAIN MININI, LUIGI-ALBERTO SANCHI (edd.), *Les Noces de Philologie et de Guillaume Budé. Un humaniste et son oeuvre à la Renaissance*, Paris, École des Chartes, 2021. 592 pp. ISBN 978-2-35723-160-3** 514
LUÍS MANUEL GASPAR CERQUEIRA

- FLORENCE GOYET**, *Penser sans concepts: fonction de l'épopée guerrière. Iliade, Chanson de Roland, Hôgen et Heiji monogatari*, Paris, Honoré Champion, 2021. 557 pp. ISBN 978-2-7453-5599-7; ISSN 1262-2850; e-ISBN 978-2-7453-5600-0
ANA RITA FIGUEIRA 518
- PIETER D'HOINE, GEERT ROSKAM, STEFAN SCHORN, JOSEPH VERHEYDEN** (edd.), *Polemics and Networking in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2021. 528 pp. ISBN 978-2-503-59688-4
DUARTE JOÃO VENÂNCIO DOS ANJOS 525
- ANDREA ERCOLANI**, *La letteratura sommersa nella Grecia antica. Nuove prospettive storico-letterarie*, Roma, Carocci editore, 2021. 180 pp. ISBN 978-88-2901-171-1
ANDRÉ BAPTISTA 527
- ROSARIO LÓPEZ GREGORIS** (ed.), *Mujer y violencia en el teatro antiguo*, Madrid, Catarata, 2021. 142 pp. ISBN 978-84-1352-152-7
SOFIA FRADE 530
- JONATHAN P. YATES, ANTHONY DUPONT** (edd.), *The Bible in the Christian North Africa – Part 1: Commencement to the “Confessiones” of Augustine (ca. 180 to 400 CE)*, Berlin / Boston, De Gruyter, 2020. 396 pp. ISBN 978-1-61451-756-6
PAULO RAMOS 532
- MONIQUE GOULLET**, *L'hagiographie est un genre introuvable – Études d'hagiographie latine réunies par Fernand Peloux avec la collaboration de Michèle Gaillard*, Paris, Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2022. 286 pp. ISBN 979-10-351-0790-1
PAULO RAMOS 535
- PAUL-AUGUSTIN DEPROOST**, *In Melius, Études sur la poésie latine chrétienne*, Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, Paris, 2022. 504 pp. ISBN 978-2-85121-322-8
PAULO RAMOS 538
- CARMEN CODOÑER, MARÍA ADELAI DA ANDRÉS SANZ, JOSÉ CARLOS MARTÍN-IGLESIAS, DAVID PANIAGUA** (edd.), *Nuevos estudios de latín medieval hispánico*, Firenze, SISMEL – Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2021. XII + 630 pp. ISBN 978-88-8450-972-7
CARLOS PRIETO ESPINOSA 540

- IMMACOLATA AULISA, LUCA AVELLIS, ADA CAMPIONE, LAURA CARNEVALE, ANGELA LAGHEZZA (edd.),** *Esegesi, Vissuto Cristiano, Culto dei Santi e Santuari – Studi do storia del cristianesimo per Giorgio Otranto*, Bari, Edipuglia, 2020. 634 pp. ISBN 978-88-7228-935-8
PAULO RAMOS 543
- NICOLAS DETERING, CLEMENTINA MARSICO, ISABELLA WALSER-BURGLER (edd.),** *Contesting Europe. Comparative Perspectives on Early Modern Discourses on Europe 1400-1800*, Leiden / Boston, Brill, 2020. 386 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-41471-6
ANA MARIA S. TARRÍO 546
- ANA ISABEL MONIZ, JOAQUIM PINHEIRO, LEONOR MARTINS COELHO, ALCINA SOUSA, CRISTINA SANTOS PINHEIRO (coord.),** *Viagem e Cosmopolitismo: Da Ilha ao Mundo*, Vila Nova de Famalicão, Húmus, 2021. 557 pp. ISBN 978-989-755-610-4
CATARINA GASPAR 551
- LOWELL EDMUNDS,** *Greek Myth*, Berlin / Boston, De Gruyter, 2021. 213 pp. ISBN 978-3-11-068233-5
NEREIDA VILLAGRA 554
- DAVID SOLÉ GIMENO, CARLOS PRIETO ESPINOSA, ANAHÍ ÁLVAREZ AGUADO, ALBA DOMÍNGUEZ CARCELLER (edd.),** “*Ardua Quae Pulchra. Contribucions d’Estudis Clàssics Presentades al VII Congrés Nacional Ganimedes*”, *Anuari de Filologia. Antiqua et Mediaevalia*, 11.2, 2021. 158 pp. ISSN 2014-1386
BRUNO MARQUES DOS SANTOS 556
- ROSSELLA SAETTA COTTONE (dir.),** *Penser les dieux avec les présocratiques*, Paris, Éditions Rue d’Ulm, 2021. 249 pp. ISBN 978-2-7288-0747-5
TOMÁS N. CASTRO 558
- MARCO ANTONIO CORONEL RAMOS (ed.),** *Overarching Greek Trends in European Philosophy*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2021. X + 270 pp. ISBN 978-90-272-0929-0 (hardback) 978-90-272-5914-1 (e-book)
TOMÁS N. CASTRO 561

- MARCO ALVIZ FERNÁNDEZ, DAVID HERNÁNDEZ DE LA FUENTE** 564
(edd.) *Shaping the 'Divine Man': Holiness, Charisma and Leadership in the Graeco-Roman World*, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag, 2023.
378 pp. ISBN 978-3-515-13398-2
DUARTE JOÃO VENÂNCIO DOS ANJOS
- LAUTARO ROIG LANZILLOTTA, JOSÉ LUÍS BRANDÃO, CLÁUDIA** 568
TEIXEIRA, ÁLIA RODRIGUES (edd.), *Roman Identity. Between Ideal and Performance*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2023.
401 pp. ISBN 978-2-503-59922-9
JOAQUIM PINHEIRO
- CELIA E. SCHULTZ, Fulvia. Playing for Power at the End of the Roman** 572
Republic, New York, Oxford University Press, 2021. 130 pp.
ISBN 978-0-19-760183-9
MARIA CRISTINA PIMENTEL
- SABINO PEREA YÉBENES** (coord.), *La devoción del soldado romano. Cultos públicos y cultos privados*, Madrid, Universidad Nacional de 575
Educación a Distancia, 2020. 263 pp. ISBN 978-84-362-7590-2
NUNO SIMÕES RODRIGUES
- OLIVIER PONCET, SYLVIE DESACHY, OLIVIER GUYOTJEANNIN** 578
(edd.), *Figures du Notaire dans la France méridionale: Institutions, clientèles et actes: XIIe-XVIe siècle*, Paris, École des Chartes, 2022.
334 pp. ISBN 978-2-35723-167-2; ISSN 1289-7566
CARLOS GUARDADO DA SILVA
- VALÉRIE NEVEU, La Bibliothèque de Thou et ses catalogues: ordonner** 582
les savoirs au XVIIe siècle, Paris, École des Chartes, 2022. 395 pp.
ISBN 978-2-35723-170-2
JORGE REVEZ
- BERNARD BARBICHE, Le roi et l'État. Regards sur quelques institutions** 586
de la France moderne (XVIe-XVIIIe siècle), Paris, École des Chartes,
2021. 392 pp. ISBN 978-2-35723-165-8
JOSÉ DAMIÃO RODRIGUES
- c) Instrumenta. Textual Transmission. Codicology. Linguistic Studies.** 588
- MARIA CRISTINA ROSSI, Gli autografi di Tommaso d'Aquino,** 588
Turnhout, Brepols, 2021. XX + 156 pp. ISBN 978-2-503-59789-8
BERNARDO SÁ NOGUEIRA

POSITIONS DES THÈSES: Soutenues par les élèves de la promotion de 2022, pour obtenir le diplôme d'Archiviste Paléographe, Paris, École Nationale des Chartes, 2022. 204 pp. ISBN 978-2-35723-168-9; ISSN 0755-2976 591
CARLOS GUARDADO DA SILVA

POSITIONS DES THÈSES: Soutenues par les élèves de la promotion de 2023, pour obtenir le diplôme d'Archiviste Paléographe, Paris: École Nationale des Chartes, 2023. 271 pp. ISBN 978-2-35723-183-2, ISSN 0755-2976 595
CARLOS GUARDADO DA SILVA

List of Illustrations

Alicia Ortiz Gómez

- Fig. 1. Dibujo de Le Blant (LE BLANT op. cit., 1892, p. 381). 171
- Fig. 2. Fotografía de Zoé Lemonnier, facilitada por la responsable de las colecciones del Musée des Comtes de Provence. 171

Manuel Alejandro González-Muñoz

- Fig. 1. Vibia Modesta's inscription (Museo Arqueológico de Sevilla). 370

Alfonso Lombana Sánchez

- Fig. 1. detalle del f. 12v del ms. Sevilla, Biblioteca Capitular y Colombina, mss. 56-4-57 (= S). 399

Some Points of Precision on the Grammatical Gender of *cupido*, *-inis* in Ovid*

▼ **ABSTRACT** the masculine use of *cupido*, *-inis* as an abstract common noun is analysed. Some caveats to the *communis opinio* are proposed, especially to the alleged first occurrence of this usage in Plautus. Especial attention is then paid to Ovid's usage.

▼ **KEYWORDS** Grammatical gender; Cupid; Ovid; Plautus; Horace.

As is well known, Latin nouns ending in *-ēdo* and *-īdo* that derive from physical or psychical *uerba sentiendi* are in the feminine gender. This is the case with *cupido*, *-inis* (or, for that matter, *cup(p)edo*, *-inis*), yet this noun can also be “mask. bei Dichtern für gr. Ἔρως”¹. E. Forcellini (*Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, Bologna, 1965 [= Prato, 1858-1875], s.u., p. 915) asserts: “*CŪPIDO*, *īnis*, f. 3. *De*

* Recebido em 20/04/2022; aceite para publicação em 30/05/2023. – This article was started in the hard months of confinement. The friends and colleagues who helped me in different ways are too numerous to name here, but I want to express my deepest gratitude and indebtedness to each of them. This work also benefited from the help of the Research Project PGC2018-098024-B-I00, financed by the Spanish Government and FEDER funds, and of the Centro de Investigación en Patrimonio Histórico, Cultural y Natural at the Universidad de Huelva (Spain).

¹ M. LEUMANN, *Laut- und Formenlehre*, vol. I of M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik*, München, 1972, 3 vols., p. 367³; cf. *ThLL* 4.1421.32-38; A. ERNOUT, A. MEILLET, *Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Latine. Histoire des Mots*, Paris, 1951³, s.u., p. 283: “*cupīdō*, *-inis* f. qui, personnifié, change de genre et traduit le gr. Ἔρως. *Cupīdō*, formé comme *libīdō*, *formīdō*, semble évité par les classiques qui lui préfèrent *cupīditās*”. See also

Luis Rivero García • Departamento de Filología, Facultad de Humanidades, Universidad de Huelva, lrivero@uhu.es

alia forma CUPEDO, V. loco suo. – **Cupido** mascul. *quoque genere occurrit apud* Plaut. *Amph.* 2.2.210.; Hor. 3. *Od.* 16.39.3. *ibid.* 24.51.2. *ibid.* 16.15.1. *Sat.* 1.61. et 1. *Ep.* 1.33; Ov. 9. *Met.* 734 et 8. *ibid.* 74; Sen. *Hippol.* 533; et Sil. 4.99 et 6.615. In his *tamen locis, praeter traditum Cupidinem, pulchrum amoris antistitem, poetae feliciter audaces alios Cupidines (ut sordidum, pravum, falsum* etc. apud Hor. *ll. citt.*) *ex sua fabrica nobis praeberunt*". The *ThLL* (4.1421.38-40) expands the list of occurrences of this masculine use of *cupido* as a common noun (not a proper name), quoting 14 instances in all. Four of these are from Ovid: *Altera iam dudum succensa cupidine tanto* (*Met.* 8.74); *femina femineo correpta cupidine nulla est* (*Met.* 9.734); *utque rudis primoque cupidine tacta* (*Met.* 10.636); *arsit enim magno correpta cupidine regis* (*Fast.* 6.575). To these passages, I will add *Pont.* 2.8.71: *Aut ego me fallo nimioque cupidine ludor* (which I will address in due course). The aim of this paper is to consider the origin and basis of this masculine usage in general and, through an analysis of the occurrences in Ovid's work, to offer some points of precision regarding the extent of this alleged practice. Here are the other passages quoted in *ThLL*², with the corresponding notes in the commentaries:

— One in Plautus:

(*Amph.* 839-840) *Non ego illam mihi dotem duco esse, quae dos dicitur, / sed pudicitiam et pudorem et sedatum cupidinem*: A. Palmer (*T. Macci Plauti Amphitruo. The Amphitruo of Plautus*, London, 1890, p. 216), inaccurately says: "*cupidinem*: mas. as often, Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.61"; W. B. Sedgwick (*Plautus. Amphitruo*, Manchester, 1967 [1960¹], p. 116), also inaccurately: "*cupidinem*: masc. as often, e.g. H. *Sat.* 1.1.61: hence the god Cupido". No comment or reference whatsoever in F. W. Holtze (*T. Macci Plauti Amphitruo*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 109), or D. M. Christenson (*Plautus. Amphitruo*, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 274, 337). For the variant *sedatum et cupidinem*, see F. Lindemann (*M. A. Plauti Amphitruo*, Leipzig, 1834, p. 80).

— Five in Horace:

(*Serm.* 1.1.61-62) *At bona pars hominum decepta cupidine falso / "nil satis est" inquit "quia tanti tantum habebas sim"*³: A. Kiessling (*Q. Horatius Flaccus*.

E. SPANGENBERG YANES (ed.), *De nominibus dubiis cuius generis sint*, Hildesheim / Zürich / New York, 2020, pp. 111-112.

2 CH. T. LEWIS, CH. SHORT (*A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1879 [repr. 1984], s.u., p. 498) record only nine occurrences (from the list in *ThLL*, these five additional passages do not appear in this dictionary: Ov. *Met.* 10.636, *Fast.* 6.575; Sen. *Phaedr.* 528; Sil. 6.615, 14.495). A straightforward – if unsatisfactory – solution was adopted in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1982², s.u., p. 472), where the noun *cupido*¹ (i.e. as differentiated from *Cupido*², openly discarding any possibility of personification in the first case) is assigned the gender "f. or m.", with no further clarification or precision.

3 If *falso* is not to be taken as an adverb referring to *inquit* (or at least as both an adverb and an adjective). This adverb is certainly used most commonly in prose texts, but it is not unknown

Satiren. Sechste Auflage, erneuert von R. Heinze, Berlin, 1957, p. 13) simply states: “stets Maskul. bei H.” (see next passage). P. Fedeli (*Q. Orazio Flacco. Le Opere. II: Le Satire*, tomo secondo, Roma, 1994, p. 308) offers more detailed information: “*Cupido* è sempre maschile in Orazio [...], sc. Horace’s other passages and a reference to Plautus’ and to *ThLL*] e ha sempre il senso di ‘bramosia di denaro’: l’alternanza di genere è spiegata in modo non corrispondente alla realtà da Nonio (681, 21-24 *L. cupidinem cum feminino genere dicimus, cupiditatem significamus ... cum masculino, deum ipsum*): proprio il nostro passo lo contraddice in pieno”.

(*Carm.* 2.16.15-16) *nec leuis somnos timor aut cupido / sordidus aufert*: A. Kiessling (*Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden*. Achte Auflage, besorgt von R. Heinze, Berlin, 1955, p. 226): “*cupido* ist bei H. stets, auch als Abstraktum, Mask.; das ist, wie die alte Personifizierung (und Plaut. Amph. 840) zeigt, das ursprüngliche; seit Sallust und Lucrez wird es, nach Analogie von *libido* u. a., sonst meist als Femin. gebraucht”; F. Plessis and P. Lejay (*Oeuvres d’Horace*, Paris, 1909³, p. 99): “Horace n’emploie *cupido* qu’au masculin” (with a reference to the other passages in Hor.); in F. Plessis, P. Lejay and E. Galletier (*Oeuvres d’Horace*, Paris, 1924), a reference is added to *Ov. Met.* 8.74, 9.734; R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard (*A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*, Oxford, 1978, pp. 261-262): “Porphyrio regards the masculine gender as strange, but this is the older usage (cf. the sex of the god), and invariable in Horace”; E. Romano (*Q. Orazio Flacco. Le Opere. I: Le Odi, Il Carme Secolare, Gli Epodi*, tomo secondo, Roma, 1991, p. 698): “*Cupido* è sempre maschile in Orazio”. Remember that Servius tried to explain this particular passage as an attempt at avoiding hiatus (*Aen.* 5.122): *CENTAVRO MAGNA: sed sciendum genera plerumque confundi aut metri ratione, aut hiatus causa: sic Horatius nec cupido sordidus aufert, cum significantes cupiditatem feminino genere dicamus*.

(*Carm.* 3.16.39-40) *contracto melius parua cupidine / uectigalia porrigam*: R. G. M. Nisbet and N. Rudd (*A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book III*, Oxford, 2004, p. 210): “*cupidine* is ‘avarice’ (for the metrically impossible *cupiditate*); the word is always masculine in H.” No comment in A. Kiessling (op. cit., 1955, p. 330).

in verse, sometimes appearing in colloquial genres such as comedy (Naeu. *Com.* 3; Pl. *Amph.* 859, *Bacch.* 474, 572, *Most.* 177-178; Ter. *Andr.* 505, *Hec.* 777), or in satire itself (Enn. *Sat.* 8 V). It also recurs in first century poetry: *Catul.* 114.1; *Lygd.* 3.20 (with F. NAVARRO (ed.), *Corpus Tibullianum III.1-6. Lygdami elegiarum liber*, Leiden / New York / Köln, 1996, p. 227); *Ov. Am.* 3.12.43, *Epist.* 7.35, 17.149, 20.195, *Met.* 11.662 (with S. DíEZ, *Edición crítica y comentario textual del libro XI de las Metamorfosis de Ovidio*, Tesis Doctoral Universidad de Huelva, 2014, p. 454 for the variant *false*), *Fast.* 5.683, *Trist.* 5.13.18, and also in [Sen.] *Oct.* 274. See *ThLL* 6.1.199.13-200.4.

(*Carm.* 3.24-51-52) *eradenda cupidinis / pravi sunt elementa*: R. G. M. Nisbet and N. Rudd (op. cit., p. 292): “*cupidinis* (masculine in H as in early Latin)”. No comment in A. Kiessling (op. cit. 1955, p. 357).

(*Epist.* 1.1.33) *feruet auaritia miseroque cupidine pectus*: I. Cruquius (*Q. Horatius Flaccus*, Antverpiae, 1578, p. 515): ***miseroque cupidine. sic habent*** 4. Bland. Tons. Sil. Bust. *reliquit misera, non apte. posterior autem huius carminis pars est prioris descriptio, auaritia namque est ingens habendi cupido, qui miserum facit hominem*. See also M. A. Muretus (*M. A. Mureti Variarum lectionum libri XV*, Parisiis, 1586, p. 1.4). S. Borzsák (*Q. Horati Flacci Opera*, Leipzig, 1984, p. 231): “33 *misera* v² *dett.*, edd. ***aliquot prisici***”. Misleading information in the apparatus criticus of D. Bo (*Q. Horati Flacci Opera*, vol. II: *Sermonum libri II, Epistularum libri II, De arte poetica liber*, Aug. Taurinorum, 1959 [repr. 1971], p. 166). No comment in A. Kiessling (*Q. Horatius Flaccus. Briefe*. Fünfte Auflage, bearbeitet von R. Heinze, Berlin, 1957, pp. 9-10), or in R. Mayer (*Epistles. Book I*, Cambridge, 1994, p. 95).

— One in Seneca:

(*Phaedr.* 527-528) *nullus his auri fuit / caecus cupido*: P. Grimal (*L. Annaei Senecae Phaedra. Sénèque Phèdre*, Paris, 1965 [1979²], p. 95): “*cupido* au masculin est une «licence poétique», qui n’a pas été comprise par A, d’où les corrections inutiles: *nulla et caeca*, qui créent de graves difficultés métriques”. C. De Meo (*Phaedra*, Bologna, 1990, pp. 169-170): “*caecus cupido*: la bramosia che acceca (sul genere maschile, poetico, ha influito la personificazione del dio *Cupido*)”. No comment whatsoever in I. F. Gronovius (*L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*, Lugduni Batavorum, 1661, pp. 242-243), in O. Zwierlein (*Kritischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien Senecas*, Stuttgart, 1986, pp. 196-197), in A. J. Boyle (*Seneca’s Phaedra*, Liverpool, 1987 [repr. Leeds, 1992], p. 168), and in M. Coffey and R. Mayer (*Seneca: Phaedra*, Cambridge, 1990, p. 139, even if they duly recall – p. 201 – the borrowing from *Ov. Met.* 3.620 *caeca cupido*, to which *Lucr.* 3.59 could be added).

— Three in Silius:

(4.99-100) *Ambobus uelox uirtus geminusque cupido / laudis*; (6.615) *non astus fallax, non praeda aliusue cupido*; (14.495) *nec sat maturus laudum bellique cupido*: As far as I can understand, no comment in P. P. K. Roosjen (*Silius Italicus. Punica Liber XIV. Een commentaar*, Ph. D. thesis Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, 1996, pp. 228-229), although he pays attention to the expression of 14.495 and its parallels. No comment in F. Spaltenstein on these passages (*Commentaire des Punica des Silius Italicus, livres 1 à 8*, Genève, 1986, pp. 271, 434; *Commentaire des Punica des Silius Italicus, livres 9 à 17*, Genève, 1990, pp. 323-324). For *geminus cupido*, cf. *Sen. Oed.* 499, *Phaedr.* 275; for *alius cupido*, cf. *Afran. Tog.* 24.

Before turning to Ovid's usage, the previous list should be considered with the following caveats in mind:

1. The range of this grammatical use of *cupido* depends on its being used with an adjective of the 1st-2nd declensions: all authors use the abstract with no adjective (e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 1.19.1, 2.5.9; *Serm.* 1.2.111, 2.7.85; Ov. *Ars* 3.373; *Met.* 1.234; 2.104; 3.225; 4.346; 5.218; 6.50, 671; 7.19; 8.224, 300; 9.445; 10.182, 666; 11.338; 13.762, 906; 14.229; 15.173; *Fast.* 6.119; *Tr.* 4.5.11; *Pont.* 4.15.31; *Ib.* 517), or else with 3rd declension adjectives, as e.g. Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.98 *num te semper inops agitet uexetque cupido*; Ov. *Met.* 8.143 *faciente cupidine uires*; 14.29 *parilique cupidine*. Out of these cases, we are supposed to accept that those from Horace are in the masculine gender, being his regular use, while in Ovid, they are feminine, as is the normal use of this poet (but note that we should take *cupido* as masculine in *Tr.* 2.1.385 *agitante Cupidine currus*). Furthermore, the presence – or absence – of these adjectives has strongly determined whether they are considered personifications or abstract concepts. As suggested by E. Forcellini (above), why cannot *Cupido* be *sordidus*⁴, *caecus*, *sedatus* or *prauus*? If we take the word as a personification, not only of sexual desire but also of a strong, irresistible wish of any kind, could it also be accompanied by any adjective appropriate for such a character?
2. Considering that Plautus' passage is alluded to as the "source" of this use, it is surprising that nobody has pointed out that, in this scene, Alcmena is defending her own *pudicitia* from the accusations of her husband, Amphitruo. Alcmena considers that her sexual virtue is her most authentic and valuable dowry, including, as is only to be expected, a *sedatum Cupidinem*. Thus, Plautus' model is just a false one⁵.
3. The number of cases of this masculine use depends thus on our identification of *cupido* as an abstract noun, or as a personification, i.e. how it has been spelled – *cupido/Cupido* – by editors (and hence probably the omission of at least some passages in Forcellini and Lewis & Short, as we have seen). Most of the cases above could be – and some indeed have been – considered as personifications. If we take the parallel case of *uenus/Venus*, editors tend to feel at liberty to make the decision about which option to choose: e.g. *parabilem amo uenerem* or *Venerem* (Hor. *Serm.* 1.2.119), since the two options do not seem to present insurmountable semantic implications. Did the ancient writers genuinely note these connotations

4 Note that in CH. T. LEWIS & CH. SHORT (op. cit.) this passage (Hor. *Carm.* 2.16.15-16) is still located – with good reason, in my view – as a personification of the third definition of the word in his second meaning: "Avarice, covetousness" (s.u. I.I.C.2, p. 498). Cf. also the words in E. FORCELLINI, *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, Bologna, 1965 [= Prato, 1858-1875]), where these uses are considered as style figures.

5 E. SPANGENBERG YANES (op. cit., p. 112) timidly points to the possibility of *sedatum* being a corruption of *sedatam*. This is a much more improbable explanation, in my view.

in the distinction between *cupido* and *Cupido*, a graphic differentiation that they never made? Nonius' classification (681, 21-24 L., quoted above *ad Hor. Serm.* 1.1.61-62) might be the result of a grammarian's excess of zeal for clear-cut taxonomies, yet it could also indicate how the ancients understood these literary uses: when the masculine is utilised, it indicates a fervent, spirited and passionate wish, hence the different intensity ascribed to *cupido* and *cupiditas* by Nonius himself (703, 1 L. *cupiditas et cupido diuersa sunt, nam cupiditas leuior est*) in his comment on Lucil. (806-807M.) *cupiditas ex homine [...], cupido ex stulto numquam tollitur*⁶. Further research should probably be developed in this direction, but it should also be explained why this differentiation does not apply to the great majority of authors, specifically all those who do not use the masc. *cupido*, yet use the noun with different levels of intensity.

4. As the apparatuses in the critical editions show, in almost every occurrence of this masculine use, we find feminine variants in the mss., specifically in those cases where the metre is not an obstacle⁷. Of course, they may be considered banal corrections, yet nonetheless, we should take into account the authority of the manuscripts and the literary context of each and every passage⁸.
5. It is unlikely that the masc. use was "das ursprüngliche", or "the older usage", as Kiessling, Nisbet-Hubbard, and Nisbet-Rudd assume, since these scholars rely on the authority of Plautus' sole – and, as already stated, only apparent – usage: Palmer's note (and hence Sedgwick's) is an unfortunate example of inaccuracy. Scholars cited in note 1 are right in defending an original feminine gender and a contextual, derivative masculine usage.

6 See M. PUELMA PIWONKA, *Lucilius und Kallimachos*, New York / London, 1978 (repr. of Frankfurt am Main, 1949), p. 52 n. 2. Probably a similar nuance should be ascribed to the use of *Venus* as opposed to *coitus*, *concupitus* etc.: see R. MORENO, in R. MORENO (ed.), *Diccionario de motivos amorios en la literatura latina (ss. III a.C. – II d.C.)*, Huelva, Universidad de Huelva, 2011, pp. 95-101, and J. A. BELLIDO, *ibid.*, pp. 447-449.

7 Sometimes not even in such cases: in the above-mentioned passage of Sen. *Phaedr.* 528, the family of mss. called A transmit the variant *caeca*, which causes R. GIOMINI (*L. Annaei Senecae Phaedram*, Roma, 1955 [1968²], p. 87) to make this harsh statement: "l'unica originalità, che è poi un preziosismo poetico, è *cupido* maschile (*caecus*; preziosismo che A corresse, arbitrariamente, con una falsità che non lascia adito a dubbi sulla ottusità del copista)".

8 There is even the odd reverse case, as in the majority reading *solitaeque cupidine caedis* (*Ov. Met.* 1.234), for which N. HEINSIUS (*Nic. Heinsii Commentarius in P. Ouidii Nasonis Opera omnia*. Tomus II, Lipsiae, 1758, p. 590 [or in P. BURMAN, *Opera omnia, IV uoluminibus comprehensa*, Amstelodami, 1727, II, p. 551]) attests "ex MS Florentino lib. I *Met.* 234 *solitoeque cupidine caedis*", a variant not recorded by H. MAGNUS (*P. Ouidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV*, Berolini, 1914, p. 18), W. S. ANDERSON (*P. Ouidius Naso. Metamorphoses*, Monachii et Lipsiae, 1982 [1977¹], p. 8), or R. J. TARRANT (*P. Ouidii Nasonis Metamorphoses*, Oxford, 2004, p. 10). This is certainly not the reading of mss. Marcianus Flor. 225, or Laurentianus plut. 36.12, 36.1, Stroz. 120 or 121, to quote just a few important Florentine manuscripts of the poem known to Heinsius.

6. Be that as it may, it is beyond doubt that Horace avoids using this word with a feminine 1st decl. adjective (which does not necessarily mean that all his uses are in the masculine), and that this is perceived as a style feature that may have influenced later writers. But perhaps we miss the point, in that Horace was not trying to create a grammatical innovation, but to widen the features of the personification (and as such, always masculine) to non-sexual nuances of wish or desire⁹.

Let us now focus on Ovid's usage, which seems more problematic. He always uses this abstract (non-personified) noun in the feminine where it is accompanied by a 1st-2nd decl. adj.: *Ars* 3.397 *nulla cupido* (*Met.* 14.634); *Met.* 3.620 *caeca cupido*; 5.529 *tanta cupido*; 10.689 *intempestiua cupido*; *Fast.* 1.211 *furiosa cupido*¹⁰. I will now examine the five allegedly masculine examples:

— *Met.* 8.74: *Altera iam dudum succensa cupidine tanto*: Most editors and translators take *cupidine tanto* as a noun phrase ("such love as mine", transl. A. D. Melville, *Ovid. Metamorphoses*, with an Introd. and Notes by E. J. Kenney, Oxford, 1986 [repr. 1998], p. 173, *infra*), and commentators observe – if at all – the masc. use of the noun¹¹. Some editors spell *Cupidine tanto*, like e.g. R. Regius (*P. Ovidii metamorphosis*, Venetiis 1493 [prima editio licita], *ad loc.*), N. Heinsius (*Operum P. Ovidii Nas. editio noua. Tomus II: P. Ovidii Nasonis operum tomus II qui METAMORPHOSES complectitur*, Amstelaedami, 1659, p. 171), P. Burman (*op. cit.*, II, p. 551), Th. E. Gierig (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses*, I: *Met.* 1-8, Leipzig, 1784, p. 342), and E. C. Ch. Bach (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV*, II: *Met.* 8-15, Hannover, 1836, p. 7), though some of their notes seem to indicate that they take it rather as a common noun¹². However, I think that in order

9 Cf. D. LAMBINUS, *Q. Horatius Flaccus*, Lugduni, 1561, p. 200 *ad Carm.* 2.16.15-16, who defends "hic Cupidinem esse Dei nomen. Cupido enim omnium rerum amoris & cupiditatis auctor est" (similar comment *ad Carm.* 3.16.39-40 at p. 290). For Horace's usage as a style mark, see R. RENEHAN, "On gender switching as a literary device in Latin poetry", in P. Knox, C. Foss (edd.), *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*, Stuttgart / Leipzig, De Gruyter, 1998, pp. 212-229, pp. 223-224.

10 At *Met.* 13.762 I do not think *ualidaque cupidine* to be the genuine reading, and I accept instead *nostrique cupidine*, as defended in L. RIVERO, *Book XIII of Ovid's Metamorphoses. A Textual Commentary*, Berlin, 2018, pp. 337-339.

11 F. BÖMER, *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen*. Buch VIII-IX, Heidelberg, 1977, p. 36: "*cupido*, abstr., masc. (vulg.: fem.): IX 734". No comment in E. J. KENNEY (comm.), G. Chiarini (trans.), *Ovidio Metamorfosi. Volume IV. Libri VII-IX*. Roma-Milano, 2011, p. 314. Significantly enough, no ms. prior to 1150 transmits the expectable variant *tanta*, as Filomena Bernardo kindly points out to me. Nor has she found the fem. variant in any of the *recentiores* that she has collated hitherto.

12 See R. REGIUS (*op. cit.*, *ad loc.*): "*Tanto cupidine. tam magno amore*"; E. C. CH. BACH (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV*, II: *Met.* 8-15, Hannover, 1836, p. 7): "*tanto*, also *cupid.* als mascul., wie IX, 734, X, 636, auch meistens bei Horaz". Cf. also N. HEINSIUS ("*Nic. Heinsii Commentarius in P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera omnia...*", *op. cit.*, p. 590): "*Cupidine tanto*] **Tanta**

to understand the text properly, we must read ll. 74-75 together (Scylla speaking): *Altera iam dudum succensa cupidine tanto / perdere gauderet quodcumque obstaret amori* (“Fired with such love as mine / Another girl would blithely have destroyed, / Oh! long ago, whatever crossed her love”, transl. A. D. Melville, op. cit., p. 173). But in this passage the adj. *tanto* only appears (maybe that was Ovid’s purpose) to accompany *cupidine*, because, instead, it determines *amori* (i.e., “fired with passion, [...] whatever crossed such a strong love [as mine]”) through the habitual hyperbaton in Ovid¹³: cf. e.g. 13.552-553 [...] *nam se monstrare relictum / uelle latens illi, quod nato redderet, aurum*; 15.9-10 *Graia quis Italicis auctor posuisset in oris / moenia, quaerenti sic e senioribus unus*¹⁴. This is, in fact, how Maximus Planudes understood and translated Ovid’s text (as noted at least as early as by J. Ch. Jahn, *P. Ouidii Nasonis quae supersunt Opera Omnia*, II: *Met.* 8-15, Lipsiae, 1832, p. 483): Ἀλλῆ μὲν οὖν ἂν τις ἤδη πάλαι, φλεγόμενη τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ, ἔχαιρε πᾶν ὄτιοῦν ἀπολλύσα τὸ τῷ τοσοῦτῳ ἔρωτι ἀντιπρᾶττον¹⁵.

Finally, although the argument has no actual probatory force, it is perhaps appropriate to point out that in the previous lines (72-73 *di facerent, sine patre forem! sibi quisque profecto / est deus: ignavis precibus Fortuna repugnant*), Ovid is reworking¹⁶ a famous passage by Virgil where *cupido* is used – as is always the case in Virgil – in the feminine (*Aen.* 9.184-185): *Nisus ait: ‘dine hunc ardorem mentibus addunt, / Euryale, an sua cuique deus fit dira cupido?’*.

In conclusion, this passage cannot be used to ascertain the grammatical gender of *cupido* in Ovid.

Let us now consider two dubious cases:

etiam in Thuani codice. sed masculino genere etiam Plautus Amphit. II. 2. 210. et Noster infr. lib. VIII 733. X. 636. VI *Fast.* 575. Sil. III. 99 et VI. 614”.

- 13 For the expectable variant *tanta*, see P. BURMAN (op. cit., II, p. 551); for the variant *amanti*, F. BERNARDO, *Ovidio, Metamorfosi 8.1-154: edizione critica, traduzione e commento*, tesi di laurea Univ. di Napoli ‘Federico II’, 2019, pp. 128-129.
- 14 See F. BÖMER, *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen*. Buch XII-XIII, Heidelberg, 1982, p. 165 ad 12.506, and J. P. POSTGATE, “On Trajection of Words or Hyperbaton”, *CR*, 30, 1916, 142-146, esp. pp. 145-146. Cf. also e.g. *Met.* 7.180-181; 10.1-2, 423-424 (*gelidos* u.l.: see P. FÁBREGAS, *El libro X de las Metamorfosis de Ovidio: un comentario textual*, Huelva, 2022, p. 302); 13.165-166, 232-233 (*proteruius* u.l.: see L. RIVERO, op. cit., p. 150), 425-426.
- 15 I follow the edition of M. ΠΑΡΑΘΗΜΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, I. ΤΣΑΒΑΡΕ, ΟΒΙΔΙΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΜΕΤΑΜΟΡΦΩΣΕΩΝ ὁ μετήνεγκεν ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων φωνῆς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ΜΑΞΙΜΟΣ ΜΟΝΑΧΟΣ Ο ΠΛΑΝΟΥΔΗΣ, Athens 2002.
- 16 See N. HEINSIUS, *Operum P. Ovidii Nas. editio noua*. Tomus II: *P. Ovidii Nasonis operum tomus II qui METAMORPHOSES complectitur*, Amstelaedami, 1659, p. 200; F. BÖMER, “P. Ovidius Naso. *Metamorphosen*. Buch VIII-IX...”, op. cit., pp. 35-36; E. J. KENNEY, “Ovidio *Metamorfosi*...”, op. cit., p. 314.

- *Met.* 10.636: *Dixerat, utque rudis primoque cupidine tacta* (lit. “She had said, and, as artless and touched by first desire [...]”). H. Glareanus and G. Longolius (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera*, Basileae, 1538, p. 315) were the first to capitalise *Cupidine*, and this spelling has been rightly followed by a good number of editors up until G. Lafaye (*Ovide, Les Métamorphoses*, II: VI-X, Paris, 1928)¹⁷. Once more, we must consider that “the ancients treated as personifications concepts that we would consider abstract today. There should therefore be no hesitation about introducing capital letters whenever they are called for”, as is the case here (A. Ramírez de Verger, “A New Edition of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*”, in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XIII*, Bruxelles, 2006, 315-334, p. 334). *Contra*, Vossius (ap. F. H. Bothe, *Vindiciae Ouidianae*, Gottingae, 1818, p. 174): “cupidine, non Cupidine”, with no further argument.

The person(-ified) agent without a preposition is mainly – but not only – a poetic usage, developed among Augustan and post-Augustan writers (J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Syntax und Stilistik*, vol. II of M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik*, München, 1972, 3 vols., p. 122¹⁻²; H. Pinkster, *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, vol. I: *The Simple Clause*, Oxford, 2015, p. 249). As is to be expected, the usage recurs frequently in Ovid¹⁸: *Epist.* 5.75 [sic] *Helene doleat defectaque [desertaque u.l.] coniuge ploret*; 12.161-162 *Deseror amissis regno patriaque domoque / coniuge, qui nobis omina solus erat!*; 16.115 *comitata Cupidine paruo* (*Fast.* 2.463)¹⁹; *Am.* 2.4.35 *haec habilis breuitate sua est: corrumpor utraque*²⁰; 2.5.35 *coloratum Tithoni coniuge caelum*; *Ars* 1.54 *raptaque sit Phrygio Graia puella uiro*; *Met.* 9.308-309 *ea sensit iniqua / nescio quid Iunone geri*²¹; *Fast.* 5.561-562

- 17 See P. FÀBREGAS, op. cit., pp. 384-385, and 554. As Prof. Estévez rightly suggests to me, we cannot rule out the possibility of understanding *primo* as an adverb: cf. e.g. 10.527-528 *altius actum / uulnus erat specie primoque fefellerat ipsam*, or 15.106-107 *primoque e caede ferarum / incaluisse potest maculatum sanguine ferrum*, where we need not consider a masc. use of *caedes*. Planudes, though, takes it as an adjective: *πρώτῳ ἀλοῦσα ἔρωτι*, with good reason in my opinion: cf. *Am.* 2.1.6 *et rudis ignoto tactus amore puer*.
- 18 More sceptical, E. J. KENNEY (“Notes on Ovid”, *CQ* 8, 1958, 54-66, p. 59). For this usage in Propertius, see P. FEDELI (*Sesto Properzio. Il primo libro delle Elegie*, Firenze, 1980, p. 65) on 1.1.2.
- 19 Cf. also *Fast.* 6.119 *uiderat hanc Ianus, uisaeque c/Cupidine captus*. The prepositional phrase *a Cupidine* never appears in Ovid’s works. For this use of *comitari* in Ovid, see J. C. MCKEOWN (*Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes. Vol. II: A Commentary on Book One*, Leeds, 1989, p. 141) on *Am.* 1.3.33-34, and cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.6.33 *Non ego militibus uenio comitatus et armis*; *Met.* 3.215 *natis comitata ... duobus*; *Fast.* 4.425 *ut erat comitata puellis*.
- 20 J. C. MCKEOWN (*Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes. Vol. III: A Commentary on Book Two*, Leeds, 1998, p. 80) points out the possibility that here the omission of the preposition perhaps “suggests Ovid’s detached and impersonal attitude”.
- 21 E. J. KENNEY (“*Ovidio Metamorfosi...*”, op. cit., p. 429) takes – mistakenly, in my view – *iniqua ... Iunone* as an absolute ablative. See also F. BÖMER, “*P. Ouidius Naso. Metamorphosen. Buch VIII-IX...*”, op. cit., p. 372.

perspicit in foribus diuersae tela figurae / armaque terrarum milite uicta suo. For the particular expression of this passage, cf. Prop. 1.1.2 *contactum nullis ante Cupidinibus*, where K. Lachmann and most editors subsequent to him prefer to print *cupidinibus*. But P. Fedeli (op. cit. 1980, pp. 64-65), starting from Propertius' model in Meleag. *Anth. Pal.* 12.101.1-4 and especially from the expression Πόθοις ἄρωτων, convincingly claims that here we are dealing with the "Amorini": "Né si può ammettere che in Meleagro si debba scrivere πόθοις: τιτρώσκω ed ἄρωτων sono normalmente usati in connessione con i dardi e per di più Meleagro usa Πόθοι in altre occasioni, sempre alludendo chiaramente agli Ἐρωτες". G. Liberman (*Cynthia. Monobiblos de Sextus Propertius*, Huelva, 2020, p. 67), for his part, argues that, since the distinction between majuscule and minuscule does not apply to ancient times, "ΠΟΘΟΙΣ et CVPIDINIBVS peuvent en eux-mêmes se prêter aux deux interprétations".

— *Met.* 9.734 *femina femineo correpta cupidine nulla est*²² ("A female never fires a female's love", transl. A. D. Melville, op. cit., p. 222). The amatory use of the verb "corripio" (*Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.u., esp. 5, pp. 449-450), related to the *topoi* of *morbis amoris*, *flamma amoris*, and *tormenta amoris*²³, appears timidly in Propertius (3.24.13): *correptus saeuo Veneris torrearbar aëno*²⁴, and then in Ovid: *Met.* 3.416 *uisae correptus imagine formae* (4.676); 9.455 *Byblis Apollinei correpta cupidine fratris*; *Fast.* 3.681 *correptus amore Mineruae*; 6.575 (*infra*). See also Sen. *Phaedr.* 115-117 *infando malo / correpta [...] ducem / audax amasti* (and cf., in a non-amatory context, *Dial.* 2.2.1 *caeca cupiditate correpti*). Obviously, as a verb of action *corripio* is perfectly suited to an animated subject such as *Cupidine*.

Here too a small group of mss. offer the variant *feminea*²⁵, which might be an attempt at grammatical regularisation, or else a recollection of *Ars* 1.341 *omnia feminea sunt ista libidine mota*. But it could also be an attempt to avoid the odd association *femineo [...] Cupidine*. In fact, this is how I understand this text:

22 In F. BÖMER ("P. Ovidius Naso. *Metamorphosen*. Buch VIII-IX...", op. cit., p. 495) we find a comment similar to that on *Met.* 8.74 (two more passages in Ovid added, and a reference to Plautus and Horace). No comment in E. J. KENNEY ("*Ovidio Metamorfofi...*", op. cit., pp. 477-478). The expression *correpta cupidine*, in the same metrical position, recurs only in Ovid: *Met.* 9.455 (*Byblis Apollinei correpta cupidine fratris*), and *Fast.* 6.575 (below). Cf., halfway between personification and a common concept (i.e. *uento*), *Am.* 2.6.44 *uota procelloso per mare rapta Noto*. Cf. also *Ars* 1.54 (above).

23 For the *morbis amoris*, see R. MORENO in R. MORENO, op. cit., pp. 144-146, esp. p. 146 s.u. *cupido*; for the *flamma amoris*, see R. MORENO, *ibid.*, pp. 232-240; for the *tormenta amoris*, see J. A. ESTÉVEZ, *ibid.*, pp. 418-419.

24 And see R. MORENO, op. cit., p. 234.

25 In fact, only seven out of the 72 extant mss. prior to 1250, as V. Pérez Gil has kindly told me *per litteras*. Four other mss. give the reading *feminea ... libidine* (P. BURMAN, op. cit., II, p. 679, quotes "*feminea libidine quinque [sc. mss.]*" for this passage), and three mss. transmit *feminea cupidine* as a *uaria lectio*.

femineo [...] *Cupidine*, again personified. From a semantic point of view, there is no obstacle to a “feminine Love/Desire”, that is, “Love/Desire for a woman”²⁶: cf. *Am.* 3.2.40 *captaque femineus pectora torret amor*; *Met.* 10.80 *finierat Titan, omnemque refugerat Orpheus / femineam Venerem*; *Tac. Ann.* 4.39.1 *Seianus [...] muliebri [...] cupidine incensus*. Nor does the fact that the masculine (and manly) *Cupido* is called *femineus* present any problem, as is proved by *Met.* 12.610: *at si femineo fuerat tibi Marte cadendum*. Furthermore, the epithet becomes particularly expressive when applied to a “person” in a context of ambiguous sexuality, such as the Iphis episode.

Thus, none of these passages can be presented as a clear instance of the masc. use of *cupido* as a common noun. Yet, the two remaining passages seem less clear to me, but it is due to their respective textual transmission in both cases, or rather to the relative lack of textual information at our disposal²⁷:

- *Fast.* 6.575: *arsit enim magno correpta cupidine regis / caecaque in hoc uno non fuit illa uiro*²⁸. These lines, again containing the expression *correpta cupidine* (cf. *Met.* 9.734 above), are a parenthetical reference to *Fortuna*’s love/desire for King Servius Tullius, but in this case, the sequence adj. (*magno*) + *cupidine* + genitival determination seemingly points to its being a common noun. As such, a feminine *magna* (*cupidine*) would be expected in Ovid, or, even more likely, a genitive *magni* (*regis*), according to the pattern found e.g. in *Met.* 9.455: *Byblis Apollinei correpta cupidine fratris*, or 13.906: *uisaeque cupidine uirginis haeret* (for this use of the adj. as applied to a king or sim., cf. also *Met.* 1.170 *ad magni tecta Tonantis*; 2.844 *ubi magni filia regis*; 4.510-511 *ad inania magni / regna redit Ditis*; 6.94 *cum magni consorte Iouis*; *Pont.* 4.2.1 *uates magnorum maxime regum*).

Both variants have been transmitted, but the meagre information provided by the available editions does not permit us to evaluate their respective weights²⁹.

26 F. BÖMER (“*P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen. Buch VIII-IX...*”, op. cit., p. 495): “*femineo cupidine* i.q. ‘*cupidine feminae*’, Adj. statt Gen. obiect.”

27 Significantly enough, in both of them we lack the richness of textual information available for the passages of *Met.* 8, 9 and 10, where, thanks to the research developed at the Universidad de Huelva in recent years, we have access to the collations of all the mss. prior to 1150 and a significant number of *recentiores*, always more than 100 mss. altogether.

28 N. HEINSIUS (*Operum P. Ouidii Nas. editio noua. Tomus II: P. Ouidii Nasonis operum tomus tertius, in quo Fasti, Tristia, Ponticae Epistolae, et Ibis...*, Amstelaedami, 1661, p. 136) printed *magno correpta cupidine Regis* (with no comment at p. 209), but P. BURMAN (op. cit., III, p. 415) preferred *magnâ correpta cupidine Regis*, yet with this note: “*Lib. Urs. Arsit enim magno*, generis masculini, placet. Duo alia loca in lib. Variarum Lectionum notavit & animadvertit Muretus. Ciofan. [...] *Magna plurimi. magni* quatuor.”

29 R. MERKEL (*P. Ovidius Naso, Faistorum libri sex*, Berolini, 1841 [repr. Hildesheim / New York, 1971], p. 289) and F. BÖMER (*P. Ovidius Naso. Die Fasten, Band I: Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung*, Heidelberg, 1957, p. 285) limit themselves to quoting the variants *magna* and (only Merkel) *magni* with very few witnesses. E. H. ALTON, D. E. W. WORMELL, E. COURTNEY

However, I would like to express my profound gratitude to Prof. S. Heyworth for having shared with me information from his personal collations: he has recorded *magno* as the first reading of one ms. from the eleventh century plus another one where it is the reading *post correctionem*. This is also the first reading of eight twelfth/early thirteenth century mss. and the reading *p. c.* of another one from the same period, and the first reading of two fifteenth/early sixteenth century mss. *Magna* is the reading of only three twelfth/early thirteenth century mss.; *magni*, finally, is the reading of just one twelfth/early thirteenth century ms. Based on this information, the reading *magno* should clearly be preferred. If so, we would have here the first clear masculine use of *cupido* as a common noun in Ovid.

- *Pont.* 2.8.71-72: *Aut ego me fallo nimioque cupidine ludor, / aut spes exilii commodioris adest.* The widespread paradosis of the mss. is *nimioque cupidine*, and this was the text accepted by editors until the second half of the nineteenth century.³⁰ Yet mss. A (Hamburg. scrin. 52 F, s. IX) and B (Monac. lat. 384, s. XII) transmit *nimioque cupidine*³¹, leading some editors to accept the masc. variant. The first edition where I have found it is that of A. Riese (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Carmina*, vol. III, Lipsiae, 1874, p. 247), where these two codices have a preferential position (p. xxix): “*Optimus codex est Hamburgensis A, qui III 2,67 desinit, quemque β Bavaricus proxime sequitur*” (see also p. vii). However, Riese does not mention this new reading in his *adnotatio critica* (p. xxx). The next edition where I have found this masc. variant is that of O. Güthling (H. St. Sedlmayer, A. Zingerle, O. Güthling (edd.), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Carmina*, vol. III, O. GÜTHLING (ed.), Pragae, 1884, p. 268), and he explicitly gives the same priority to these mss. (p. VIII: “*In epistulis ex Ponto O. Kornii editione usus librum Hamburgensem potissimum respexi. quae autem hoc libro non continentur carmina, ad Monacenses lat. 384 et 19476 [...] exegi quam accuratissime*”). Similarly, Güthling says nothing about this passage in the

(*P. Ovidius Naso. Fastorum libri sex*, ed. stereot. editionis quartae, Monachii et Lipsiae, 2005, p. 156) do not even record this reading in the app. crit., nor do F. BÖMER (*P. Ovidius Naso. Die Fasten*, Band II: Kommentar, Heidelberg, 1958, p. 377) or R. JOY LITTLEWOOD (*A Commentary on Ovid: Fasti, Book VI*, Oxford, 2006, p. 175) make any comment on this grammatical usage.

³⁰ Remember that this passage is still absent from the list in *ThLL*.

³¹ The feminine is still in S. G. OWEN (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Tristium libri quinque, Ibis, Ex Ponto libri quattuor, Halieutica, fragmenta*, Oxonii, 1915), who records “*nimioque AB*” in the app. crit. The reading *nimioque cupidine* appears, with no note whatsoever, in N. HEINSIUS (“*Operum P. Ovidii Nas. editio noua...*”, op. cit., pp. 292 and 379; “*Nic. Heinsii Commentarius in P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera omnia*”, op. cit., p. 1072), P. BURMAN (op. cit., III, p. 790), or R. MERKEL (*P. Ovidius Naso*, vol. III: *Tristia, Ibis, Ex Ponto libri, Fasti*, Lipsiae, 1889, p. 160), even if both Heinsius and Merkel had collated ms. A (see J. A. RICHMOND (ed.), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Ex Ponto libri quattuor*, Leipzig, 1990, p. VII). There is no comment in G. NÉMETHY, *Commentarius exegeticus ad Ovidii Epistulas ex Ponto*, Budapestini, 1915, p. 41, or in ID., *Supplementum commentariorum ad Ovidii Amores, Tristia et Epistulas ex Ponto*, Budapest, 1922, p. 22.

adnotatio critica (p. L)³². More information, however, is to be found in the edition by F. W. Lenz (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae ex Ponto*, Augusta Taurinorum, 1938, p. 102). He justifies his decision with the four alleged parallels of masc. use in Ovid, that is, with a circular reasoning³³.

This choice was followed – as far as I know – by G. Luck (*P. Ovidius Naso. Briefe aus der Verbannung*, Stuttgartardiae, 1963, p. 400), J. André (*Ovide, Pontiques*, Paris, 1977, p. 68), A. Pérez (*Ovidio. Cartas desde el Ponto, libro II*, Sevilla, 1989, p. 104; no comment in p. 212), J. A. Richmond (op. cit., p. 49), N. Holzberg (*P. Ovidius Naso. Briefe aus der Verbannung. Tristia. Epistulae ex Ponto*, Zürich, 1995, p. 400), and A. Pérez and F. Socas (*Publio Ovidio Nasón. Cartas desde el Ponto*, Madrid, 2000, p. 92). For his part, L. Galasso (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto Liber II*, Firenze, 1995, p. 376) defends the masculine “in quanto *lectio difficilior*”, quoting the passages gathered in *ThLL*, while M. Helzle (*Ovids Epistulae ex Ponto*, Buch I-II, Heidelberg, 2003, p. 373) limits himself to citing the phrases that feature this masculine use in Plautus, Horace and Ovid.

The phrase *nimia cupiditas* is – logically – not infrequent in Latin texts³⁴; nor is the expression *nimia cupido* unparalleled. We find it in Seneca (*Dial.* 9.9.7) *Ignoscerem plane, si studiorum nimia cupidine erraretur*, and Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.63) *ob nimiam uiuendi cupidinem*; (*Ann.* 14.22) *nimia luxus cupido*. But Virgil was the first to use it: (*Aen.* 9.354) [sc. *Nisus*] *sensit enim nimia caede atque cupidine ferri*. An echo of this memorable passage appears in Lucan, but note that it seems as if Lucan were passing the Virgilian phrase through the metrical filter of Ovid: (1.87) *o male concordēs nimiaque cupidine caeci*³⁵.

32 Although O. GÜTHLING (in H. St. Sedlmayer, A. Zingerle, O. Güthling (edd.), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Carmina*, vol. III, Prague, 1884) explicitly says he is following O. KORN's edition, this scholar (*P. Ovidius Naso. Ex Ponto Libri Quattuor*, Lipsiae, 1868, p. 65) printed *nimiaeque cupidine* and recorded “nimioque Aß” in the apparatus criticus. He did not mention our passage either in O. KORN, *De codicibus duobus Carminum Ouidianorum ex Ponto datorum Monacensibus*, Vratislaviae, 1874.

33 In his *praefatio* (p. xxv), however, he does not cite this passage as an instance of places where “AB recte congruunt contra C (et ceteros)”.

34 Cic. *Sest.* 134 *nimia gloriae cupiditate*; *Pis.* 79 *propter nimiam fortasse constantiae cupiditatem*; *Phil.* 3.29.8 *uiuendi nimia cupiditate*; *Off.* 1.64.3 *nimia cupiditas*; *Liu.* 27.33.10 *nimia cupiditate conserendi cum hoste manum*; *Val. Max.* 8.7.7 *propter nimiam cupiditatem inuestigandi*; 9.2.2 *nimia cupiditate persequendi*; 9.6.3 *nimia gloriae cupiditas*; *Col.* 6.27.4 *nimia cupiditate*; *Curt.* 4.1.19 *ob nimiam regni cupiditatem*; *Quint. Inst.* 9.1.18 *nimia profecto nouitatis cupiditate ductus*; 10.3.12 *nimia bene dicendi cupiditate*; *Decl. Min.* 321.12 *uitium est humanae mentis nimia cupiditas*; [*Quint.*] *Decl. Mai.* 12.14 *ex nimia cupiditate*; *Fest.* 165.16 *nimia cupiditate*; *Porph. Serm.* 2.2.67 *ob cupiditatem nimiam habendi*; *Seru. Aen.* 2.238 ‘*faucibus expectant siccis*’, *id est nimia cupiditate aperiantur*; *Georg.* 3.268 *effrenatis nimia cupiditate equabus*.

35 For Virgil's echo in Lucan, see P. ROCHE (ed.), *Lucan: De Bello Ciuili Book 1*, Oxford, 2009, p. 161, who however fails to record Ovid's passage.

Ovid seems not to be referring to the god, who is always related to the amatory sphere in his work³⁶. As far as the transmission of the text is concerned, one would be prone to accept *nimioque* as the *lectio difficilior* because of the authority of mss. AB³⁷, where the reading presents neither difficulty nor *uariae lectiones*. Yet we cannot forget that, as against the transmission of *Fast.* 6.575, this is an almost unique variant³⁸. The only reason to adopt it, in contrary to the massive witness of the mss. and to Ovid's habitual *usus scribendi*, is precisely the possible – and provisional – backing of the previous passage.

These two cases, in turn, open the way to a third 'if'; that is, if the masculine is really to be accepted at *Fast.* 6.575, and if, on these grounds, we should accept the masculine at *Pont.* 2.8.71, then we might possibly reconsider the interpretation of *Met.* 9.734 and 10.636. Be that as it may, scholars will have to account for such instances of 'Horatianisms' in Ovid, for which I cannot find any plausible stylistic purpose. For my part, I really suspect that a richer and more in-depth knowledge of the ms. transmission of *Fast.* 6.575³⁹ will prove that Ovid, as e.g. Virgil, always used *cupido* in the feminine. In turn, that will be a proper starting point to reconsidering the stylistic usage of Horace and the imitations by Seneca and Silius.

36 Yet the noun phrase would not be unparalleled: cf. *Tr.* 3.10.51-52 *siue igitur nimii Boreae uis saeua marinas, / siue redundatas flumine cogit aquas*.

37 But cf. readings such as 1.1.38 (*lactantem*) or 1.9.44 (*celsa*), which F. W. LENZ himself quotes (*P. Ouidii Nasonis Epistulae ex Ponto*, Augusta Taurinorum, 1938, p. XXV) as instances where "AB falso contra C (et ceteros) inter se congruunt".

38 Remember and compare (n. 8 above) the case of the variant *solitoque cupidine caedis* for the accepted *solitaeque c. c.* in *Ov. Met.* 1.234.

39 This necessarily implies a thorough research to identify all the extant mss. of *Fasti*, such as that made by J. A. ESTÉVEZ ("New manuscript witnesses of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *ExClass*, 16, 2013, 191-208; "Nuevos fragmentos de las *Metamorphosis* de Ovidio en Trento", *Emerita*, 85, 2017, 161-167) for the *Metamorphoses*. For his part, J. A. Estévez had the privilege of starting from the meritorious catalogues already published by F. MUNARI (*Catalogue of the MSS. of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, London 1957; "Supplemento al catalogo dei manoscritti delle *Metamorfosi* ovidiane", *RIFC* 93, 1965, 288-297; "Secondo supplemento al catalogo dei manoscritti delle *Metamorfosi* ovidiane", in *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi sexagenario oblata*, Roma 1970, 275-280) and F. T. COULSON ("An Update to Munari's Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *Scriptorium* 42, 1988, 111-112; "Newly Discovered Manuscripts of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in the Libraries of Florence and Milan", *Scriptorium* 46, 1992, 285-288; "A Bibliographical Update and *corrigenda minora* to Munari's Catalogues of the Manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses*", *Manuscripta* 38, 1994, 3-22; "Addenda to Munari's Catalogues of the Manuscripts of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *RHT* 25, 1995, 91-127; "Addenda to Munari's Catalogues of the Manuscripts of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (II)", *Manuscripta* 40, 1996, 115-118).