

OVID, NAUGERIUS AND WE, OR: HOW TO CREATE A TEXT¹

GEORG LUCK

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

Andreas Naugerus (1483-1529), the distinguished Venetian ambassador, soldier, scholar and poet, produced in 1515 an edition of Ovid's complete works, known as the Second Aldina, which was by far the best among the early editions of the poet. It remained the authoritative text for the next two centuries or so, until N. Heinsius produced an even better one, based on many more manuscripts. Naugerus' notes on his text (his critical apparatus, so to speak) were published in the beautiful edition of his *Opera Omnia*, Padua, 1718. They contain readings that are forgotten today and many of his conjectures which are almost always valuable or at least point to a textual problem which was solved later by scholars like Gronovius or Heinsius. This paper, based on a lecture delivered at the University of Huelva, deals with the text of the *Carmina Amatoria*, including the *Heroidum Epistulae*.

Andreas Naugerus (1483-1529), ilustre embajador veneciano, soldado, humanista y poeta, publicó en 1515 una edición de las obras completas de Ovidio, conocida como la 'Segunda Aldina', que fue con diferencia la mejor de las primeras ediciones del poeta. Permaneció como texto de referencia durante los dos siglos siguientes, hasta que N. Heinsius publicó una todavía mejor, basada en muchos más manuscritos. Las anotaciones y el texto de Naugerus (es decir, su aparato crítico) fueron publicados en la magnífica edición de sus *Opera Omnia*, Padua, 1718, y contienen lecturas hoy día olvidadas y muchas conjeturas que casi siempre son valiosas o al menos hacen referencia a un problema textual resuelto después por humanistas como Gronovius y Heinsius. Este artículo, basado en una conferencia dictada en la Universidad de Huelva, se ocupa del texto de los *Carmina amatoria*, incluidas las *Heroidum Epistulae*.

¹ I am very grateful to Antonio Ramírez de Verger and to Guillermo Galán Vioque for their help and advice.



Who was Andreas Naugerus? He was born Andrea Navagero in 1483 of a noble Venetian family, studied in Padua and Venice with Sabellico and Marcus Musurus, among others. In Padua, the poet and physician Fracastoro, the author of a famous didactic poem on syphilis, *De Morbo Gallico*, became his friend and biographer. Naugerus joined Aldus Manutius' Academy and worked as an editor for his publishing firm. Over the years, he was responsible for editions of Virgil, Lucretius, Terence, Ovid, Horace and Quintilian as well as some works of Cicero. In 1516, the Venetian senate appointed him custodian of the Library of San Marco. For a while, he served in the Venetian army, but in 1525 he was posted as Venetian ambassador to the Spanish court of Charles V. During the four years he spent in Spain, he became acquainted with the poet Juan Boscán. Along with his friend, Baldassare Castiglione, the author of *Il Cortegiano*, he explored Sevilla, Toledo and Granada and wrote with great enthusiasm about Spanish architecture and Spanish gardens.

Soon after his return to Venice, he was sent as ambassador to the court of the French King Francis I at Blois, but a very short time after his arrival there, he was stricken by an illness and died in 1529, only forty-six years old.

Among his works there is a collection of playful poems in Latin, called *Lusus*. They are in the style of Virgil, Tibullus and Ovid, and were much admired by the French and Italian poets of the 16th century. There is a series of imitations entitled *Jeux rustiques* by Joachim Du Bellay.

Naugerus wrote a number of funeral orations in the style of Cicero. We also have letters and notes about his impressions of Spain. A *History of Venice* which was to become his *magnum opus*, was never finished. When he knew that the end of his life was near, he ordered that all of his manuscripts which were not ready for publication should be burned.

Yet, what we have, is substantial enough. The first edition was published in Venice in 1530. I have been using the magnificent Padua edition of 1718, edited by the brothers Gian Antonio and Cajetano Volpi and printed at their expense by Giuseppe Comino. It is very rare today. Thanks to a friend, I was able to use a microfilm of the copy that belongs to the University Library of Geneva, Switzerland. It contains several prefaces and a biography. It also contains Naugerus' critical notes on the text of Ovid.

Naugerus' edition of all of Ovid's works was published by Aldus Manutius in 1515. It is known as the Second Aldina, because there was

an earlier one, of 1502, not edited by him. His own edition represents a vast improvement over the earlier Aldina and all earlier editions and it is considered one of the best early editions of any Latin author. It has been said that Naugerus created the 'textus receptus' of Ovid, until Nicolaus Heinsius, on the basis of more manuscripts and thanks to his critical genius, established a better text. But for a century or more, all editions of Ovid (the Gryphiana of 1554, the Basel edition of 1568, the Wecheliana of 1601, the Bersmanniana of 1610 and 1621), depended on Naugerus.

After these general remarks I would like to give an idea of Naugerus' method as a textual critic and an editor. Perhaps "method" is not the right word. So much has been written about *il metodo di Lachmann*. Compared to Lachmann, Naugerus and even Heinsius did not have a "method". They knew Latin as if it had been their mother tongue, and they spoke and wrote it like an ancient Roman, in prose and in verse. They also had an extensive knowledge of Latin and Greek literature. At the same time, they respected certain principles. We will see that Naugerus often prefers a reading because it is "old". Of course he was not an expert palaeographer, and he may have been wrong in dating a manuscript, but he must have had a sense of its age in relation to other witnesses. He also used parallels to support a reading, just as a modern editor would. And there are a few other guidelines, resulting from his work rather than learned from a textbook.

Let us begin with his notes on the *Epistulae Heroidum*, a work which presents unusual problems, because of its textual tradition. These love-letters in verse are not easy to approach, because of these problems: but there are brilliant passages which can be enjoyed. I have been using Arthur Palmer's edition (Oxford 1898), completed by Louis C. Purser. In many ways, it is better than Heinrich Dörrie's more recent edition (Berlin 1971), although Dörrie used many more manuscripts and had access to scholarly work produced after Palmer. But Palmer was a textual critic and Dörrie was not. There are several excellent commentaries on parts of the work in the Cambridge series edited by Kenney and Easterling, one of them by Kenney himself. They deal with textual problems in an exemplary way.

2,45-6 At laceras etiam puppes furiosa refeci,
 ut, qua deserer, firma carina foret.

N. recommends *at* "ex veteribus exemplaribus", while G and some late Mss. have *ha* which may represent *a* (the *t* was lost before the *h*) or *ab* (Mz., D. Heinsius).

3,19-20 Si progressa forem, caperer ne nocte timebam.
Quamlibet ad Priami munus itura nurum.

N. seems to prefer *forte* for *nocte* "ex nonnullis", and Burman accepted this reading. N. may have found it in F, the Francofurtanus, which must have been in Italy at that time. It is also found in Bi and Gi. The repetition of *nocte* ... *noctibus* should not be a reason to change, and similar cases of hyperbaton have been collected by Housman (p. lviii of Palmer-Purser). Perhaps we should punctuate with Housman (following Madvig) *ne, nocte, timebam*.

3,30 Auxerunt blanda grandia dona prece

Palmer prints *blanda... prece* as Naugerus' conjecture, but N. actually found it as a "vetus lectio", probably in F (Bentley accepted the reading). The main Mss. are divided between *blandas ... preces* and *blande... preces*. Planudes' translation (which N. consulted, just as a modern editor would) supports *blanda... prece*.

(3,44 nec venit inceptis mollior hora malis

N. says nothing about this line, but I would like to note *en passant* that Housman's emendation *malis*, confirmed by Planudes, was anticipated by Lehrs; the Mss. have *meis*. Instead of *hora*, one should probably read *aura* with E and a number of late Mss.)

4,31-2 Si tamen ille prior, quo me sine crimine gessi,
candor ab insolita labe notandus erat

N. seems to have read *sed* (F alii) for *si* (late Mss.), but later he preferred *sic* (E alii). *Et* (G alii) represents *set* minus the first letter.

4,47 Nunc feror, ut Bacchi furiis Eleleides actae

N. found *Eleides* in all his Mss. and in Planudes, while P has *elelegides*. See Palmer's note. The correct form was established by an early editor.

4,57 f Pasiphae mater decepto subdita tauro,
enixa est utero crimen onusque suo

Here, N. considered at the end of the pentameter *suum*, an “old reading”, as he says, but he adds “sed et recta prior lectio”. He compares *Her.* 11,64 *et positum est uteri crimen onusque mei*.

This kind of compromise is not unusual for N. We could describe his attitude by the philosophical term *epoche*. Instead of making a decision, as we would, he keeps an open mind, hoping, perhaps, that he will find another parallel which will make up his mind for him, or a better manuscript. Dörrie says nothing.

4,103 f ipsa comes veniam, nec me latebrosa movebunt
 saxa neque obliquo dente timendus aper.

N. notes “legitur et *salebrosa* quae lectio fortasse verior”. Palmer found this reading in some late Mss. (perhaps the Palatinus of D. Heinsius and the Mediceus of N. Heinsius who accepted it; this is also what the editio Veneta of 1498 prints). In his note, Palmer adds “fortasse recte”, and he explains the vulgate as “full of dens of beasts”, *latebrae*, *latibula*. It seems to me that *latebrosa* reflects more the point of view of the animals, whereas the *salebritas* directly affects Phaedra.

4,157 f Quod mihi sit genitor qui possidet aequora, Minos,
 quod veniant proavi fulmina torta manu,
 quod sit avus radiis frontem vallatus acutis...

N. notes “recta profecto haec et vetus lectio, sed et recte in nonnullis *quid, mihi si genitor qui possidet aequora, Minos* et reliqua per interrogationem”. This reading is found in Y and other Mss., but N. does not actually adopt it, as Dörrie implies. Palmer explains *quod* as “touching the fact that” and supports it with *Met.* 7,704 ff.

5,15 f Saepe super stramen faenoque iacentibus alto
 defensa est humili cana pruina casa.

“*Depressa* cur legi non possit, nescio” is N.’ verdict. This is the reading of P E F and others, and this is what Planudes translates. According to Palmer’s apparatus, N. noted (but where?) “Quidam ex veteribus *defensa*, nusquam legi”. But this is Parrhasius’ correction, accepted by modern editors. In his commentary, Palmer illustrates the use of *defendere* = “to keep off cold or heat”.

5,45 f Et flesti et nostros vidisti flentis ocellos:
 miscuimus lacrimas maestus uterque suas.

Palmer, following Merkel, brackets 44 and 45. N. writes “nonnulli et fortasse rectius *madidos vidisti flentis ocellos*.” This reading is found in Bi and Bx. Did N. object to *nostros ... flentis*? But see Loers and Palmer *ad loc*.

5,119 ff Dum licet, obscenam ponto demergite puppim!
 Heu! quantum Phrygii sanguinis illa vehit!
 Dixerat, in cursu famulae rapuere furem...

In some Mss. N. found *di mergite*. This is the reading of E and (if *dimergite* results from misunderstood “scriptio continua”) a number of late Mss. Heinsius liked it, but Palmer may be right: “illud *dum licet* non nisi mortalibus convenit”. In v. 121 we should read, following Heinsius and Bentley, *vox erat in cursu: famulae rapuere furem*. Palmer translates *in cursu* as “in her wild career” which seems hardly possible. The two passages he quotes actually support Heinsius’ conjecture.

6,7 f Quamlibet adverso signetur epistula vento,
 Hypsipyle missa digna salute fui

For *quamlibet* N. found in some Mss. *quolibet*, and this is what Planudes translates.

6,29 f “Vivit” ait timidus: timidum iurare coegi.
 vix mihi teste deo credita vita tua est.

In the hexameter, Palmer prints Heinsius’ conjecture *timidus timidum* (the MSS vary wildly). Housman accepted the reading of E and some late Mss. *timidum quod amat*. N. notes ‘In pluribus antiquis libris *timidum quod ait iurare coegi* quod et Planudes agnoscit et ego rectius iudico’. This reading is attested in over twenty Mss. cited by Dörrie.

6,37 f Devictus serpens. iterum, si vivat Iason,
 quaerimus, alternant spesque timorque vicem.

Housman brackets the distich, while he defends vv. 31-36. Following Merkel, Palmer brackets vv. 31-38. In some witnesses N. found *devicto serpente* (T and two others in Dörrie have this reading) and added ‘sed et recte *devictus serpens*’. At the end of the pentameter, *vicem* is Bentley’s conjecture for ms. *fidem*; as Palmer observes, *vices* might be preferable (see his commentary where he compares *Met.* 15,409).

6,85 f Illa reluctantem curru deducere Lunam
nititur et tenebris abdere Solis equos.

Curru is N.' conjecture which Heinsius later found in a few Mss. He accepted it, but Dörrie prints *cursu*.

6,93 f Et quae nescierim melius: male quareritur herbis
moribus et forma conciliandus amor.

Melius: *male* is N.'conjecture. The Mss. are divided between *melius* *mage* and *magicis male*.

6,103 f Non haec Aesonides, sed Phasias Aetine
Aurea Phrixiae terga revellit ovis.

The two Greek names that form the end of the hexameter have been plausibly restored by Salmasius, Meziriac and Heinsius. There is a long note on this passage in N. who proposes doubtfully *Phasias Aeetae*, and this seems to be what Planudes who knows Greek mythology translates. Another possibility would be Kenney's *Phasias Aeetaea* (cf. Catullus 64,3). The vulgate offers *filia fasis etc*.

6,107 f Illa sibi a Tanai Scythiaeque paludibus udae
quaerat et a patria Phasidis usque virum

N. characterizes *a Tanai* as a 'vetus lectio'; most Mss., including P G E have *tanais*. Dörrie in his apparatus notes 'a Tanai Naugerius, Ciofanus' as if this were a conjecture. In the pentameter read probably *ripa* (Bentley, Housman) for *patria*.

6,117 f Dos tibi Lemnos erit, terra ingeniosa colenti;
me quoque dotales inter habere potes.

Dotales is Salmasius' brilliant conjecture (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4,104). N. was dissatisfied with *iam tales* or *quod tales* or *res tales* and added 'quoquo modo legatur, non satis quid sibi Ovidius velit, percipio'. This is typical of N.' approach: he senses that there is a crux in the text but finds no solution, so he leaves it for someone else to find. This has happened more than once, e. g. *Amores* 1,8,45 f (Burman).

6,137 f Quid refert, scelerata piam si vincit et ipso
crimine dotata est emeruitque virum?

The reading at the beginning of the hexamer is the one that N. prefers (it is found in E and others); but he also found *quid referam... vincat* in his Mss., and Planudes translates this. *Quid referat* or (mostly) *quid referam* the Mss.

(6,140 Quamlibet infirmis ipse dat arma dolor

N. says nothing about this line, but I would like to comment on it *en passant*. *Infirmis* is J. F. Heusinger's conjecture for *iratis*. The same idea occurred to Bentley who compared *Amores* 1,7,66 *quamlibet infirmas adiuuat ira manus*. C. Heusinger suggested *invitis*, Housman *ignavis* which is, perhaps, a little closer to the 'ductus litterarum' of *iratis*).

6,153 f Quod gemit Hypsipyle, lecti quoque subnuba nostri
maereat et leges sentiat ipsa suas.

According to N., *subnuba* is 'vetus lectio'. It is found only here, according to Palmer, while the variant *succuba* appears in Apul. *Met.* 5,28; 10,24. In Titinius, *Com.* 92 R., the editors now read *succubonem*, not *stucoboneam*, as Palmer did. D has *pronuba*.

7,33 f Aut ego quem coepi, neque enim dedignor, amare,
materiam curae praebeat ille meae...

Here, N. clearly indicates the parenthetic nature of *neque enim dedignor* by brackets, and later editors followed him. He also defends *quem* which is in F and other witnesses (*quae* PGE alii).

7,45 f Non ego sum tanti –quid non censeris inique?–
ut pereas, cum me per freta longa fugis.

N. hesitates between *meditaris* and *mediteris* for *censeris*, two readings that Dörrie has found in late Mss.

(7,85 Haec mihi narraras: at me movere merentem

N. does not comment on this line, but I would like to mention Housman's very neat proposal *sat me monuere merentem* (following Madvig). *Sat* is excellent, but there is no need to change *movere*).

7,113 Occidit internas coniunx mactatus ad aras.

Palmer adopts *internas* from late Mss. and early editions (Dörrie cites only a Dresdensis s. XIII and adds the names Merkel and Riese). But *internas* is N.' conjecture. The older Mss. have *in terras*.

8,1 f. The initial distich *Alloquor... tenet* which is not well attested (it appears in early editions and in the margins of some late Mss.) is relegated into the apparatus by Palmer and printed in small letters by Dörrie ('certe spurium'). N. observes 'non inveniuntur haec in antiquis exemplaribus carmina, sed omnino his ablatis nescioquid desideratur'. This is certainly true, and we must assume that the original beginning is lost and was replaced by an interpolation. Incidentally, N. uses *carmen* in the sense of *versus*; *duo carmina* = *duo versus*.

8,49 f Nec virtute cares; arma invidiosa tulisti:
 sed tu quid faceres? Induit illa pater.

At the end of the pentameter, *pater* is N.' conjecture. It is also the original reading in P, a manuscript that N. did not know. N. also, in a sense, anticipated Housman's *sed tibi (quid faceres?) induit illa pater* when he explained 'ut sit *pater induit tibi illa arma* (the second hand of P and all other witnesses, it seems, have *patrem*). Dörrie does not mention N.

8,103 f Pyrrhus habet captam reduce et victore parente:
 Hoc munus nobis diruta Troia dedit.

N. preferred *munus et hoc nobis* (F and a dozen others, Planudes) which he found in some Mss. This was the vulgate before Merkel, accepted by Dörrie.

(8,109 Pro somno lacrimis oculi funguntur obortis

Again, I am briefly commenting on a line that N. did not single out but needs to be restored. *Funguntur* makes very little sense. The OLD lists the passage under 'to go through with, experience, suffer, enjoy'. This seems absurd. Planudes translates *tinguntur* which may be right (see Palmer, pp. li; 541). Palmer also considered *funduntur* and compared Tibullus 1,7,59; *Corp. Tibull.* 3,2,29; one might add Ovid, *Met.* 11,672; *CIL* 1,1215b,3 *desinite... lacrimas fundere*. Both *tinguntur* and *funduntur* are much better than *funguntur* which owes its existence to scribal error. Dörrie does not deal with the problem.)

9,14 Se tibi pax terrae, tibi se tuta aequora debent

Se which N. introduced 'ex veteribus' seems pretty obvious, but he also knew a reading *si* (two Mss. in Dörrie's app. crit.) *Tuta* is Heinsius' emendation of *tota*.

9,53 Una, recens crimen, defertur adultera nobis

N. seems to like the 'vetus lectio' *referetur* (G alii) and compares v. 50; this is what Dörrie prints. But *defertur*, Egnatius' conjecture, accepted by Palmer, is the appropriate term.

9,73 f Inter Ioniacas calathum tenuisse puellas
diceris et dominae pertimuisse minas.

N. seems to feel comfortable with *Ioniacas* (cf. *Ars* 2,219), although he knew, like other editors, that the form is not found in Greek; hence *Maeonias* edd. vett. and *Ioniadas* Heinsius. Dörrie says nothing.

9,97 f Quique inter laevumque latus laevumque lacertum
praegrave compressa fauce pendit onus.

This is correctly interpreted as a reference to Antaeus by N.; hence there is no need for Bentley's *dextrumque* instead of the second *laevumque* (his conjecture is also found in I and other witnesses).

9,103 se quoque nympha tuis ornavit Iardanis armis

In his notes, N. says nothing about the reading *oneravit* (L alii) which he apparently once preferred. *Iardanis* is due to Volscus (the vulgate has *Dardanis*)

9,119 f Haec tamen audieram; licuit non credere famae

N. found *tantum* as a v. l. to *tandem*. It is not listed by Palmer who refers to *Ars* 2, 405 *haec tamen audierat; Priameida viderat ipsa*, but here we also have a v. l. *tantum* (A s. XI). Dörrie found *tantum* in two Mss. (Gu and H). N. adds diplomatically, as he often does, 'utrumque recte' but perhaps we should read *tantum* in both passages.

9,141 f Semivir occubuit in lotifero Eveno
Nessus, et infecit sanguis equinus aquas

The ending of the hexameter in Palmer's text (the Mss. offer a rich variety of readings) combines Heinsius' and Bentley's conjectures. N.

adopted a reading *vi letiferoque veneno* which seems to combine the text of G and others with that of early editions. It is attributed erroneously to Hornstein (*Wiener Studien* 67, 1954, pp. 71 f) by Dörrie.

9,165 f Iamque vale, seniorque pater germanaque Gorge,
 et patria et patriae frater adempte tuae

N. calls the reading *tuae* (six Mss. listed by Dörrie have *meae*) 'fortasse elegantius'.

10,9 f Incertum vigilans, a somno languida, movi
 Thesea prensuras semisupina manus.

N. has no objection to *semisopita*, the reading of all the Mss., including F, accepted by editors before Heinsius who made the correction. Curiously, N. refers to *Amores* 1, 14, 20 where all the Mss. have *semisupina* (cf. also *Ars* 3, 788).

10,111 f Crudeles somni, quid me tenuistis inertem?
 aut semel aeterna nocte premenda fui

N. adopted a reading *qui* (not found in Dörrie) and explained 'ut... exclamatio quaedam sit, veluti et ea, quae sequuntur'. For *aut* (P) Dörrie prints *at* (F G alii). The distich is not yet healed.

11,43 f A! nimium vivax admotis restitit infans
 artibus et tecto tutus ab hoste fuit.

Canace's unborn child survives the attempts made to abort its birth. N., considering the preceding lines, suggests *at* for ms. *a* or *ab* (see above on 2, 45f). This would make vv. 39 – 44 one period. Obviously, *t* could easily get lost before *n*. One MS has *ast* – it is the same idea, but the form is wrong.

11,127 f Tura rogo placitae nimium mandata sororis
 tu fer: mandatum persequar ipsa patris.

Palmer's text, based on three of his own conjectures, is hypothetical, but so is Dörrie's:

Tu, rogo, dilectae nimium mandata sororis
 perfer. Mandatum persequar ipsa patris.

N. found *prosequar* in some 'older witnesses' (not in the app. crit. of Palmer and Dörrie) and in Planudes (who may have translated *persequar*; the nuances are difficult to catch) and thought the reading attractive, but he also considered (*mandatis*) *perfruar* (G V Y alii, Heinsius). *Mandata persequi* seems to be idiomatic (cf. Cicero, *Ad Quint. Fratr.* 2,12,2). There is no easy solution.

12,1 f At tibi Colchorum, memini, regina vacavi,
ars mea cum peteres ut tibi ferret opem.

N. prefers *ut* for *at* (G V alii) a v. l. which he takes in the sense of *cum*. But for *at* expressing indignation see Palmer's commentary. There are similar cases (2,45 f; 11,43 f; 12,13 f below).

12,13 f Aut, semel in nostras quoniam nova puppis harenas
venerat audacis attuleratque viros

Here, N. considered the 'vetus lectio' *at* (G alii) but preferred *aut* (P alii) after all. See above on 12, 1f.

12,110 Munus, in exilio quod licet esse, tuli.

Quod licet, the reading of G and others, was found by N. in some witnesses (*quod libet* or *quodlibet* M and others). There seems to be a crux (see Palmer's app. and comm.).

12,135 f Ut subito nostras Hymen cantatus ad aures
venit et accenso lampades igne micant...

N. knew that the first syllable of *Hymen* can be long or short in Latin poetry (the *OLD* entry is misleading), and he seems to have considered briefly a v. l. not listed by Palmer and Dörrie, *at subito nostras ut Hymen*. This establishes a continuity within the vv. 133 ff. It would also make the first syllable of *Hymen* short, in accordance with *Hymen... Hymenae* below.

13,165 f Ultima mandato claudetur epistula parvo:
si tibi cura mei, sit tibi cura tui.

N. recommends *claudetur* as 'vetus lectio' (it is the reading of F G and others) There is no variant in Palmer's app., but Planudes must have read *claudatur* (B D alii) in his MS. In the pentameter, *si... sit* (W alii) appealed to N., as it later did to Heinsius (*sit... sit* G V plurr.) Palmer

wanted to eject the distich; he also bracketed 161f and would have been happy if the letter ended at v. 164.

14,17 f Cor pavet admonitu temeratae sanguine noctis
et subitus dextrae praepedit ossa tremor.

Orsa for *ossa* is not N.' conjecture, as Palmer and Dörrie say; he found it in Mss. unknown to more recent editors (F has *ora*) and simply said 'recte fortasse'. Bentley approved, Palmer did not.

14,41 f Aut sic, aut etiam tremui magis: ipse iacebas,
quaeque tibi dederam plena soporis erant.

Dederant (Ri alii) is a reading that was known to N. Burman accepted it, and it may be right. Palmer's conjecture *plena* for *vina* is based on his bizarre idea that it was making love with Hypermestra, not wine that made Lyenceus sleepy. This, of course, would require *dederam*. But *vina soporis*, "wines that were made of sleep", i. e. wines that were drugged, makes sense, I think, and it goes well with the servants (not the brides, as Palmer says) as subject. Dörrie prints *vina, soporis*. One wonders what is gained by this.

14,93 f Quid furis, infelix? quid te miraris in umbra?

In his edition, N. printed *fugis* (QY) for *furis*: in his notes he says nothing. Burman also printed *fugis*, and that may be right. The last word of the pentameter should be *unda* (G V alii), not *undis* (F alii) or *umbra* (P alii).

14,123 f At tu, siqua piaae, Lynceu, tibi cura sororis,
quaeque tibi tribui munera, dignus habes.

The name seems to have vanished from the ms. tradition, as we know it, but N. found it in 'nonnulli veteres' and Planudes translates it. Heinsius is credited with the emendation.

14,127 f Et sepeli lacrimis perfusa fidelibus ossa,
sculptaque sint titulo nostra sepulcra brevi.

In his edition, N. printed *scriptaque*: in his notes he is silent. No ms. witnesses for *scriptaque* are given by Palmer and Dörrie. Perhaps *scribere* (i.e. *inscribere*) *sepulcrum* is better Latin than *sculpere supulcrum* which could mean 'to create a funerary monument'.

15 (SAPPHO PHAONI)

N. has emended many passages in this letter which he found preserved in F.

15,7 f Flendus amor meus est: elegiae flebile carmen;
 non facit ad lacrimas barbitos ulla meas

Elegiae is Palmer's conjecture. Before him, editors printed *elegia* or *elegia* from 'recentiores'. N. recommends a 'vetus lectio' as 'multo elegantior': *elegi quoque* (F alii), and this is what Dörrie prints. On the following line, N. comments '*illa* in veteribus, sed et *ulla* recte'. *Illa* is not recorded by Palmer and Dörrie, in their app. crit., but it is possible in the sense of "that famous lyre", i. e. the lyric poetry that made Sappho famous, and it may well be right.

15,15-20 Nec me Pyrrhiades Methymniadesve puellae
 nec me Lesbiadum cetera turba iuvant;
 vilis Anactorie, vilis mihi candida Cydro.
 non oculis grata est Atthis, ut ante, meis,
 atque aliae centum quas non sine crimine amavi:
 improbe, multarum quod fuit, unus habes.

In v. 15, N. quotes *Pyrrhiades Methymniadesve* as a 'vetus lectio'; this is the text of F, and this is what Palmer and Dörrie print. F alone has the true reading. In v. 17, N. prefers *Anactorie* (F) to *Amynthone* which may have been the vulgate of his time, although it has left no trace in Palmer's app. crit (Dörrie has *amintorie* from some Mss., a combination of the two names). The next name, *Cydro*, is found in F and some late Mss.; a v. l. *Cydno* appears as *cidno* in late witnesses, and it seems to have been the vulgate in N.' time. Finally, in v. 19 the vulgate substituted *hic* to *non*, an attempt to absolve Sappho "from a common prejudice", but N. defended *non* (F alii), comparing 281 *Lesbides, infamem quae me fecistis amatae*.

15,33 f Sum brevis, at nomen quod terras impleat omnes
 est mihi: mensuram nominis ipsa fero.

This distichon has vanished from the broad tradition and has been replaced by another one (a Harleianus has both of them). It is found at this place in F (and a few Florilegia) and was recommended by N. as 'vetus lectio' from an 'exemplar castigatissimum'. Once more we see how much N. valued this codex.

(15,41 f At mea cum legeres, etiam formosa videbar

N. says noting on this line, but I would like to point out Housman's remarkable emendation *at mea cum legerem, sat iam formosa videbar*, especially since Dörrie does not mention it).

15,47 f Tunc te plus solito lascivia nostra iuvabat
crebraque mobilitas aptaque verba ioco,
et quod, ubi amborum fuerat confusa voluptas.
plurimus in lasso corpore languor erat

For *ioco* (v.48) some of N.' Mss. offered *loco* (cited by Dörrie from three witnesses) which is attractive. In v. 49 *et quod* is attributed to N. by Palmer and Dörrie, but N. could have found it in a MS. It was also adopted by Calderinus (between 1490 and 1502). F has *ecquid*.

15,57 f Tu quoque quae montes celebras, Erycina, Sicanos,
-nam tua sum- vati consule, diva, tuae.

Immities is a very common reading for *montes* (F); N. calls *montes* 'vetus lectio'.

15,75 f Vestе tegor vili, nullum est in crinibus aurum,
non Arabum noster dona capillus habet.

Palmer praises the 'nuda simplicitas' of F and prints it. Almost all other witnesses have *non Arabo noster ror capillus olet*. N. recommended the version of F but also liked *olet*.

15,84 ingenium nobis molle Thalia facit

Another example of a good reading that N. found in F. The vulgate offers *dedit* for *facit*.

15,99 f Si tam certus eras hinc ire, modestius isses,
si mihi dixisses 'Lesbi puella, vale.'

The witnesses vary between *si mihi* / *et mihi* and *si modo* / *et modo* in the pentameter. N. opted for *si modo* (F).

- 15,103 f Nil de te mecum est nisi tantum iniuria, nec tu
admoneat quod te, pignus amantis habes.

Palmer prints *nec tu... quod te*, Burman's correction of the vulgate *nec te.. quod tu*. N. suggests no changes but cites a v. l. *munus* for *pignus*. To mark the hyperbaton, we should, perhaps, print *pignus* (or *munus*) between commata.

- 15,157-60 Est nitidus vitroque magis perlucidus omni
fons sacer –hunc multi numen habere putant-
quem supra ramos expandit aquatica lotos.
una nemus; tenero caespite terra viret

N. suggested *vitroque... amnis* 'ex veteribus' (not as his own conjecture); what we need is Heinsius' emendation *vitroque ... omni*. In v. 159, N. lists two variants for *expandit*, viz. *extendit* and *expendit* adding 'recte omnia'. According to Palmer, *expandit* is found only here in Ovid and never elsewhere of a tree. Dörrie found *extendit* in a few witnesses, but *expendit* might be what Ovid wrote.

- 15,169 f Nec mora, versus amor fugit lentissima mersi
pectora: Deucalion igne levatus erat.

Again we see how highly N. estimated F, for he adopted *fugit* (*tetigit* or *figit* the other witnesses).

- 15,183 f 'Grata lyram posui tibi, Phoebe, poetria Sappho:
convenit illa mihi, convenit illa tibi.

N. did not object to *poetica*, the reading of F. but considered *poetria*, calling it a correction. It is actually Egnatius' emendation.

- 15,195 f Nunc vellem facunda forem: dolor artibus obstat
ingeniumque meis substitit omne malis

N. considered a variant *forent* (for *forem*) 'fortasse rectius'. Did he take it with *illa* (v. 193)?

- 15,211 f Sive redis, puppique tuae votiva parantur
munera, quid crucias pectora nostra mora?

N. acknowledges both *paramus* (F) and *parantur* (recc.) which he likes. In the pentameter, *crucias* is Sedlmayer's emendation (from the unmetrical *cruciatur* in F); all other witnesses have *laceras*.

16,23 f Illa dedit faciles auras ventosque secundos:
in mare nimirum ius habet orta mari.

N. records *nil mirum* (F alii) and says 'recte'.

16,39-142

These lines are preserved in the ed. Parmensis of 1477, the first Aldina of 1502, but also according to J. Chr. Jahn, in a Palatinus and in the 'fragmentum Paulinum'. The ed. Parmensis may be our oldest witness; late manuscripts were sometimes copied from printed books. N. deals with their authenticity and reaches no clear conclusion. On the one hand, he thinks that they are the work of Ovid and that the poet wished to delete them because they displayed too much *luxuria* and *loquacitas*. On the other hand, N. says that Ovid was not anxious to avoid these *vitia*. This is one of the few passages where N. speaks as a literary critic. In his own edition (second Aldina) he prints these lines, correcting the tradition, such as it is, in many places. This may be one of his greatest achievements as a textual critic (see, e. g. 52.53. 57. 143).

16,115 f Qua tamen ipse vehor, comitata Cupidine parvo
sponsor coniugii stat dea picta tui.

At the end of the pentameter, all Mss. seem to have *sui*. N. changed this to *tui*, and so did Bentley, perhaps independently (he knew N.'edition and mentions him on 14,18 with approval). Dörrie prints *sui* without any reference to N.

16,141 f Nec tibi par usquam Phrygia nec solis ab ortu
inter formosas altera nomen habet.

N. emended *per* to *par* and *Phrygia* to *Phrygiae*, explaining 'velut *usquam gentium*'. Palmer compared *usquam locorum*, and Purser added *uspiam ruris* from Apul. *Met.* 7,26,1. Palmer and Dörrie print *par* but not *Phrygiae*.

16,303 f Is 'sed et Idaei mando tibi' dixit iturus
'curam pro nobis hospitibus, uxor, agas.'

Palmer was not happy with his *is sed et* for *esset ut* or *ivit et* or *ipse abit* etc. of the Mss. N. felt comfortable with *exit et* (perhaps from a lost MS.) The solution may be Heinsius' *haesit et*.

- 17,17-22 Fama tamen clara est, et adhuc sine crimine vixi,
 et laudem de me nullus adulter habet.
 Quo magis admiror quae sit fiducia coepti,
 spemque tori dederit quae tibi causa mei.
 An, quia vim nobis Neptunius attulit heros,
 rapta semel, videor bis quoque digna rapi?

Bentley, according to Palmer, conjectured *forma* for *fama* in v. 17. but this change is not mentioned in the *Coniecturae Bentleianae* (p. 518 of Palmer's edition), nor is it confirmed by Planudes' translation, as Palmer (p. liii) claims, for the Greek text (p. 243) clearly has *pheme*, not *kallos*. What happened? Bentley conjectured *forma* for *fama* in v. 167, and here Planudes actually translates with *κάλλος*. Palmer must have confused the two passages. In v. 21 N. mentions *intulit* for *attulit* as a variant (Dörrie found it in G and others).

- 17,157 f Aut mihi sic visum est: ego, cum dubitaret, an iret,
 'quam primum' dixi 'fac rediturus eas.'

In the hexameter, N. proposes *at mihi sic iussum est*, as Helena's answer to 16, 30, an attractive suggestion (in 16,364, the Mss. are divided between *viso* and *iusso*).

- 17,171 f Nec quod abest hic me tecum mirare relictam:
 moribus et vitae credidit ille meae.

In his edition N. printed *relicta* (the reading of D and P), an ablative to go with *me*. Merkel approved of the change, the more recent editors stay with *relictam*.

- 17,259 f Aut ego deposito sapiam fortasse pudore
 et dabo cunctatas tempore victa manus.

Sapiam is Bentley's conjecture which then was found in Y and other Mss.; most witnesses have *faciam*. A problem remains, and *timore* which N. found in some Mss. does not solve it (the reading survives in Bi and T).

- 18,205 f Pace brevi nobis opus est, dum transferor isto;
 cum tua contigero litora, perstet hiems.

N. prefers *transferor* to a reading *transfretor* which is unknown to Palmer and Dörrie and looks like a humanist conjecture.

- 19,41-6 *Iamne putas exisse domo mea gaudia, nutrix,
 an vigilant omnes, et timet ille suos?*
*Iamne suas umeris illum deponere vestes,
 Pallade iam pingui tingere membra putas?*
*Adnuit illa fere, non nostra quod oscula curet,
 sed movet obrepens somnus anile caput.*

N. found the v. l. *patrem* for *suos* (v. 42). another forgotten reading but he did not reject *suos*. In v. 45, the variant *fere* (G) appealed to him, which means that, even then *fore* (F P W alii) was the vulgate. Planudes translates *fore*, but Palmer and Dörrie print *fere* which must be right: the nurse only seems to nod assent; in reality, she is overcome by sleep.

- 19,67 f *Firmius, o! Cupidi tandem coeamus amantes,
 Nec careant vera gaudia nostra fide.*

N. found *ne* for *nec* in some witnesses (Dörrie lists B H I K T U and a dozen others), adding 'utrumque recte'. The choice is difficult.

- 19,147 f *Nobilis ille quidem est et clarus origine, sed non
 a tibi suspecto ducit Ulixæ genus.*

N. did not approve of a v. l. *despecto* (not recorded by Palmer and Dörrie) and compared 20,173 *et sis suspecta Dianæ*. A lost reading, but perhaps no great loss.

- 19,191 f *Sed mihi, caeruleas quotiens obvertor ad undas,
 nescio quæ pavidum frigora pectus habent.*

In v. 192 Palmer prints *quid* (F P alii) instead of *quæ* (G W alii). N. suggests *nescio quod pavidum pectora frigus habet*, and this is actually supported by the parallels noted in Palmer's commentary, *Ars* 2,318 and *Fast.* 2,754 and seems, at any rate, superior to the attempts of Burman, Merkel and Sedlmayer. *Pavidum... frigus* is excellent.

- 20,41 f *Mille doli restant: clivo sudamus in imo;
 ardor inexpertum nil sinet esse meus.*

N. acknowledges a v. l. *modi* (I M N alii) for *doli*; he also found *isto* (Pm) for *imo*. Planudes translates *modi* and –I think *in unum* (ἐἰς ἓν); F and others have *in uno*.

20,113 f Inde fit, ut, quotiens existere perfida temptas,
peccatum totiens corrigat illa tuum.

N. found *obsistere* (Dp Pv) and *insistere* (U) in his manuscripts.

20,133 f Me miserum, quod non medicorum iussa ministro
effingoque manus insideoque toro

N. cites *effingoque* as an 'old reading' (it could be F, but it is actually broadly attested) and prefers it to *astringoque*, the vulgate of his time, comparing *Fasti* 5, 409. Palmer's suggestion *adsideoque* (in the apparatus crit.) for *insideoque* is excellent; it was already made by Bentley. Both verbs are repeated in v. 137.

20,143 f Quis tibi permisit nostras praecerpere messes?
Ad spes alterius quis tibi fecit iter?

N. knew a v. l. *decerpere* which Dörrie found in seven Mss. and which was accepted by Bentley. In the pentameter, Palmer ultimately preferred *spes* to Heinsius' *sepem* (see Corrigenda before p. 1 of his edition). *Spem* (Bn Dp) is probably a mistake for *sepem* and was changed to *spes* "metri causa".

21,13-248

In his notes, N. does not comment on the authenticity of these lines which are preserved in Gu, Sa and early editions; all other Mss. end with 21, 12. In his edition, N. accepted the opinion of Antonius Volscus (ed. Veneta of 1489) and doubted that the lines were genuine; at the same time, he edited them with the same care he devoted to the undisputed parts and emended a number of corruptions.

AMORES

We will now look at Naugerius' notes on Ovid's *Amores*. I am using the edition of E. J. Kenney (OCT 1961, second edition 1995).

Epigramma, v. 3 ut iam nulla tibi nos sit legisse voluptas

N. found a v. l. *ut non ulla*, 'fort. rectius'. Not in Kenney's apparatus.

1,5 Aestus erat mediamque dies exegerat horam

N. preferred the variant *excesserat* which is not in Kenney.

1,8,31 Prosit ut adveniens, en aspice: dives amator
te cupiit

The punctuation in the hexameter was suggested by N.

1, 8,37 Cum bene deiectis gremium spectabis ocellis

N. considers *spectaris* which is certainly a possibility. Not in Kenney.

1,8,45 f Has quoque quae frontis rugas in vertice portant,
excute, de rugis crimina multa cadent.

N. says 'nusquam aliter: ego aliud quid desidero'. He obviously saw a textual problem but could not solve it. Over two hundred years later, Burman solved it by proposing *quae... portant* for *quas... portas* which was what N. looked at. A similar case is *Her.* 6,117 f where N. questioned the vulgate *iam tales* without coming up with a solution; Salmasius found it: *dotales*.

1.8,65 Nec te decipiant veteres circum atria cerae

The Mss. have *quinquatria* which N. interprets as *quinque atria* and explains 'ut maxime nobilis significetur is cuius maiorum imagines vel quinque atria compleant'. This is ingenious but somehow hangs in the air. A preposition is missing. Moreover, I doubt whether even a very noble Roman had five *atria* in his house, especially if he was noble but poor. Heinsius' *circa atria* solves the problem.

1,8,712 Nec nocuit simulatus amor: sine credat amari

Here, N. found *se* for *sine* which is possible but no improvement.

1,8,87-90 Servus et ad partes sollers ancilla parentur,
qui doceant apte quid tibi possit emi,
et sibi pauca rogent: multos qui pauca rogabunt,
postmodo de stipula grandis acervus erit.

N. considered *multi* (recc.) for *multos* (P S alii) 'verior lectio', but the emphasis is not on the large number of servants in the household of the *domina*, but on the large number of lovers.

1,9,31 Ergo desidiam quicumque vocabat amorem
desinat

Vocabat is odd, and N. suggested a v. l. *vocavit*. Kenney does not have it, but he cites *vocabit* from S and others. Either *vocavit* or *vocabit* seems better than the imperfect. The perfect would imply a quotation.

1,12,19 f Illa dedit turpes raucis bobonibus umbras
vulturis in ramis et strigis ova tulit.

N. mentions a v. l. *ora* for *ova* which Kenney does not record, perhaps because he found it implausible.

1,15,25 Tityrus et fruges Aeneiaque arma legentur

For *fruges* (codd.) N. suggested *segetes* (after Verg. *Georg.* 1,1) and some later editors accepted his conjecture.

2,1,30 Quid pro me Atrides alter et alter agent?

N. found a v. l. *Aiaces* (recc. in Kenney's apparatus) and decided 'utrumque recte'. No need to change, I think.

2,5,41' his erat aut alicui color ille simillimus horum

Alicui (F alii) is for N. a 'vetus lectio' which appeals to him much more than *aliquis* (S alii). F seems to be for N. an 'old witness'.

2,5,61 illa nisi in lecto nusquam potuere doceri

Numquam (recc.) must have been the vulgate in N.' time, for he notes *nusquam* 'in nonnullis'. This is the reading of P S and other witnesses.

2,6,11 Omnes quae liquido libratis in aere cursus

N. found *vibratis* 'in veteribus' but this is what Kenney finds 'in recentioribus' whereas P (?) S and others have *libratis*. N. has no preference.

2,6,45 Septima lux venit non exhibitura sequentem

Some of N.' Mss. had *aderat* for *venit* (not in Kenney), perhaps a trivial change.

2,6,57 f Psittacus has inter nemorali sede receptus
convertit volucres in sua verba pias

Verba (P S alii) is, perhaps, a better reading than *vota*, says N. This must have been the vulgate of his time; no trace of it in Kenney.

2,7,19 f Di melius quam me, si sit peccasse libido,
 sordida contemptae sortis amica iuvet.

Si sit is the reading that N. selects from the Itali; P S and other witnesses have *sic sit* which makes little sense.

2,7,25 Scilicet ancillam quod erat tibi fida, rogarem?

Quod erat is Kenney's conjecture. P has *quierat*, S *quae erat*. N. prefers *quae tam* from recc.

2,8,1 Ponendis in mille modos perfecta capillis

N. found *praefecta* in some Mss. (not in Kenney) and explained 'ut significet ancillam quae A capillis esset, sed *perfecta* fortasse rectius'.

2,9,3 f quid me, qui miles numquam tua signa reliqui,
 laedis et in castris vulneror ipse tuis?

Cupido is addressed, as if he were the commander, and Ovid one of his soldiers. It would be logical to read *castris... tuis*, in analogy to *tua signa*, and this seems to have been N.' vulgate; he cites *meis* (P S alii) from 'quidam'.

2,9,37 f huc tamquam iussae veniunt iam sponte sagittae;
 vix illis prae me nota pharetra sua est.

Ullis (for *illis*) seems to have been the vulgate in N.' time; he mentions *illis* and adds 'utrumque recte'. *Ullis* which is a possibility, is not in Kenney's apparatus.

2,9,43 f me modo decipiant voces fallacis amicae
 (sperando certe gaudia magna feram)

For *gaudia* N. found *praemia* 'in antiquis'. Another reading that seems forgotten, and yet it deserves to be considered.

2,10,9 erro velut ventis discordibus acta phaselos

Erro velut is Camps' emendation, accepted by Kenney. N. found *errant ut* 'in veteribus', Kenney in P S and others. This reading has been

replaced in many Mss. by *errat* and *et ut* or *ut a* or *ut in* 'in veteribus' to establish the metre.

2,10,17 f hostibus eveniat viduo dormire cubili
 et medio laxe ponere membra toro.

Laxe is for N. 'vetus lectio' but *late* seems to have been the vulgate. Again, P and S seem to represent the 'veteres' of N. Perhaps he had access to a common ancestor of these important witnesses.

2,11,1 f Prima malas docuit mirantibus aequoris undis
 Peliaco pinus vertice caesa vias

Of the variant *undas* (P alii) N. says 'et vetus lectio restituetur et sensus carminis [=versus] erit rectior'.

2,11,15 Litora marmoreis pedibus signate, puellae

In Kenney's *adnotatio* we read 'signate *Naugeri*, F'; the other Mss. are divided between *signata* and *signanda*. It is not clear whether *signate* is N.'s conjecture or whether he took it from F, like so many other good readings.

2,11,27 Quod si concussas Triton exasperet undas

The subjunctive *-et* is a 'vetus lectio' for N. : Kenney cites it from P and others: the indicative *-at* is in S and others.

2,13,7 f Isi, Paraetionium genialiaque arva Canopi
 quae colis et Memphin palmiferamque Pharon

N. preferred *genialiaque* ('in nonnullis') to *genitaliaque*. Both readings are cited by Kenney from 'recentiores', while P and S have *gentiliaque*.

2,14,29 Colchida respersam puerorum sanguine culpant

Puerorum is better attested than *natorum* (recc.) which N. found in some Mss. It is difficult to decide between the synonyms; perhaps it is a question of the rhythm: *puerorum* has two short and two long syllables, *natorum* three long syllables.

2,16,41 ulmus amat vitem, vitis non deserit ulmun

N. finds *vitem* (P and others) 'elegantius' than *vites* (S and others). The sequence *vitem vitis* is perhaps more pleasing than *vites vitis*.

2,18,3 nos, Macer, ignava Veneris cessamus in umbra

Ignava (Itali, T) is what N. found in 'some'; the vulgate seems to have *ignavae* which is odd.

2,18,13 Sceptra tamen sumpsit curaue tragoedia nostra
 crevit

Curaue... nostra (P and others) was a reading known to N., but he also knew *versuque... nostro* (S and others). This could be an old variant.

2,18,19 Quod licet, aut artes teneri profiteamur Amoris

N. found *aut partes* (S F alii) for *aut artes* (P alii) in all of his Mss. and changed 'ope ingenii'. Perhaps *aut* was misread in an early manuscript (we find *ad*, *et* and *in*) and the *p* was inserted to establish the correct metre.

2,19,31 f Quod licet et facile est quisquis cupit, arbore frondes
 carpat et e magno flumine potet aquam

Magno is well attested (P S alii), while *medio* which N. considered occurs in late Mss. and Florilegia. It is tempting to read *medio*, but perhaps that would be correcting the author.

3,1,45 f Quam tu non poteris duro reserare cothurno,
 haec est blanditiis ianua laxa meis.

Here, N. firmly recommends *poteras* 'ex veteri' for *poteris*, and I agree with him. Another reading - a good one, at that - has vanished from Kenney's text.

3,2,83 f Risit et argutis quiddam promisit ocellis:
 'hoc satis hic; alio cetera redde loco.'

Hoc satis hic is, for N., a 'vetus lectio' and 'rectior': this is what S and others have, while P and others have *hoc satis est*. Kenney remarks 'aeque probabiliter, dummodo *hoc satis est*, *alio...* scribatur, ut *hoc*

cum *loco* coniungatur'. This is very ingenious, but the omission of *est* is more conversational and fits the allusive style of the *domina*.

3,6,25 f Inachus in Melie Bithynide pallidus isse
dicitur et gelidis incaluisse vadis

Most Mss. have *media* instead of the Greek name (*melie* P 'teste Heinsio': *melie* S) which led N. to suggest *Melia*, 'ut sit Nymphae nomen'. He found a similar name in Apollonius Rhod. 2,4.

3,6,45 f Nec te praetereo qui per cava saxa volutans
Tiburis Argei pomifer arva rigas

N. hesitates between *pomifer* (P S alii) and *spumifer* ('recc.'). He does not mention *pomifera* (Itali, Bentley) but quotes Hor. *Carm.* 1,7,13-4 *et praeceps Anio ac Tiburni lucus et uda / mobilibus pomaria rivis*.

3,6,71 f sera tamen scindens inimico pollice crinem
edidit indignos ore tremante sonos

For '*sera* N, preferred *saeva* which he found in 'a few'. Another forgotten reading.

3,6,85 Dum loquor, increvit latas spatiosus in undas
nec capit admissas alveus altus aquas

All Mss. have *spatiosus in*. N. suggested *spatiosius*, anticipating Bentley's *spatiosior*. *Increscere in...* seems an awkward construction in Latin. One hesitates between Naugerus and Bentley.

3,6,101 f Huic ego vae demens narrabam fluminum amores.
iactasse indigne nomina tanta pudet

Vae is the reading of P and others; Kenney lists *vel*, *ut*, *quos* and *cur* as variants: *nunc*, considered by N., is no longer mentioned.

3,7,1 f At non formosa est, at non bene culta puella,
at, puto, non votis saepe petita meis?

At... at... at... is 'vetus lectio', according to N., and 'multo rector' than *aut*, the vulgate.

3,7,3 f Hanc tamen in nullos tenui male languidus usus,
sed iacui pigro crimen onusque toro

For *sed* N. found *sic* and judged 'utrumque recte'.

3,7,37 Huc pudor accessit facti: pudor ipse nocebat

This punctuation was first suggested by N. and accepted by J. Chr. Jahn and Kenney.

3,7,61 Quid iuuet, ad surdas si cantet Phemius aures?

The name of the singer Phemios appears first in the *Editio Veneta* of 1489 which N. probably knew, but he says 'nos ex Homero': the Mss. have *phenius*, *phennius*, *phineus*, *tracius* etc.

3,7,79 Aut te traiectis Aeaea venefica lanis
devovet

Lanis (P X) probably refers to dolls made of wool that are pierced by the witch: *ramis* (P S alii) makes no sense. N. found *ranis* in a few witnesses (not in Kenney) 'i. e. rubetis', but he also approved of *lanis* because of Theocr., *Id.* 2.

3,9,23 f Et Linon in silvis idem pater 'aelinon' altis
dicitur invita concinuisse lyra.
Adice Maeoniden...

Aelinon (for *et Linon*) is due to Scaliger and Heinsius (ex codd.); it is also in P; *eunon* or *et linon* are the main variants, but N. found *edidit* (w) in most of his Mss.; he preferred *abditus*, a forgotten reading, perhaps bases on *edidit*. In the pentameter, *invicta* (P3 alii) is a variant that N. knew. In v. 25, N.' vulgate seems to have had *aspice* (no trace of this in Kenney).

3,9,33 Quid vos sacra iuvant? quid nunc Aegyptia prosunt
sistra?

N. acknowledges *nos* (ω) and *nunc* (recc.) for *vos* (P alii) without making a decision.

3,10,28 hinc pudor, ex illa parte trahebat amor.

Ex illa is in P and other Mss., *ex alia* in the 'recentiores', but N. calls it a 'vetus lectio'. The seeming contradiction could be solved by Pasquali's principle 'recentiores non deteriores'; after all, some good readings in late Mss. may be derived from older witnesses that we no longer have. *Ex illa parte* could be= *illinc*, corresponding to *hinc*.

3,11,17 f Quando ego non fixus lateri patienter adhaesi,
ipse tuus custos, ipse vir, ipse comes?

Patienter is the reading of P and others: *spatiantis* looks like the vulgate of N.' time (it could be a gloss); N. preferred *patienter*.

3,12,11 Me lenone placet, duce me perductus amator

Once more, N. accepts the reading of P and others, but he may have found it in one of the others, not in P.; the vulgate has *productus*, and *conductus* (recc.) may be an attempt to improve on it.

3,13,3 f Casta sacerdotes Iunoni festa parabant
et celebres ludos indigenamque bovem

This is an interesting case. Kenney prints the vulgate and mentions as variants *et celeres* (recc.), *per celebres* (due to an unknown typesetter whom most editors followed) and *percelebres* (N.' conjecture). In my opinion, there is no need for *per*. *Et* has been misunderstood: it corresponds to *-que*, and the sense is the same as if we had *et... et*, or *-que ... -que*. Here the vulgate is right, and the 'typotheta ignotus' no longer has any claim to immortality: the pentameter is in apposition to *festa*.

MEDICAMINA FACIEI FEMINEAE

Strictly speaking, this incomplete poem is not part of Ovid's *Carmina Amatoria*, but since N. commented on only two passages, we might fit them in here.

1 f Discite quae faciem commendet cura, puellae,
et quo sit vobis forma tuenda modo.

Forma (Itali) may be a humanist conjecture which N. found 'in nonnullis': the broad tradition has *cura* which would be a repetition of *cura* in v.1, hard to accept at the very beginning of a work. It must be an old scribal error.

61 iamque, ubi pulvereae fuerint confusa farinae

N.' vulgate seems to have had *namque* (not mentioned by Kenney), but he preferred *iamque* which is more natural in a recipe.

ARS AMATORIA

1,11 Phillyrides puerum cithara perfecit Achillem
atque animos placida contudit arte feros

On *perfecit* (R U alii) N. says 'sic legitur, ut sit *exacte erudivit*'. The vulgate had *prae-fecit* (O A alii). Cf. on *Amores* 2,8,1.

1,25 non ego, Phoebe, datas a te mihi mentiar artes

Mentiar is in R O A and others, while the 'recentiores' have *mentior* which N. prefers.

1,53 f Andromedan Perseus nigris portarit ab Indis
raptaque sit Phrygio Graia puella viro

Portarit ... sit, one of N.' brilliant emendations (for *portavit... sic*), has found its way into Kenney's text, even though N. did not reject the vulgate. He says of his own proposal that it is 'more elegant'.

1.125 f Ducuntur raptae, genialis praeda, puellae
et potuit multas ipse decere timor.

Timor is in R N U and others; N. preferred *pudor* (O A and others). Other variants, such as *color*, *rubor*, *decor* seem almost mechanical, but *pudor* would be appropriate. See below on 1,379 f.

1,281 parcior in nobis nec tam furiosa libido

Ovid compares the sexual urge of human beings with that of animals. *Parcior* (R A O plurimi) was found 'in veteribus' by N., but he thought that one could also read *fortior* and compared *Her.* 19,6 *fortius ingenium suspicor esse viris* and *Met.* 7,76. Not convincing.

1,367 f Hanc matutinos pectens ancilla capillos
incitet

N. considered *matutino* which he found 'in nonnullis'; and this is also in R, *ante corr.* Should one understand *matutino tempore*? Cf. *Met.* 13,581.

- 1,587 f Inde procurator nimium quoque multa procurat
et sibi mandatis plura videre putat.

The distich has been thrown out as an interpolation by Bentley and (along with 585 f by Weise). For *procurator* ... *procurat* (R O A alii) N. briefly considered *propinator* ... *propinet* (recc.) but then said of the vulgate 'nescio quo pacto subblanditur magis'. He added an explanatory note, but he was obviously not happy with the passage, even with *ut* for *et* in v. 588.

- 1,597 ff Ebrietas ut vera nocet, sic ficta iuvabit:
fac titubet blaeso subdola lingua sono,
ut, quicquid facias dicasve protervius aequo,
credatur nimium causa fuisse merum.

N. found a 'vetus lectio' *quicquid dicas faciasve* which he liked; the vulgate he knew seems to have been *dices faciesve*. These variants are not in Kenney.

- 1,643 f Ludite, si sapitis, solas impune puellas:
' thac magis est una fraude pudenda fides†

In order to make sense of the corrupt pentameter, N. tried *tuenda* from Mss., as he says, for *pudenda*. It seems that *tuenda* is better than *pudenda*, but it does not heal the verse. Burman proposed *hac minus est una fraude tuenda fides*, but that does not really work, either. Perhaps one should change *hac* to *hoc*, but the line still does not yield a satisfactory sense. *Iudicent peritiores*.

- 1,685 f iam nurus ad Priamum diverso venerat orbe,
Graiaque in Iliacis moenibus uxor erat

Graiaque is actually found in A and some 'recc.', but it is also N.' conjecture; most Mss. have *grataque*.

- 2,53 f Aera non potuit Minos, alia omnia clausit:
quem licet, inventis aera rumpe meis

Quem seems to the reading of all of Kenney's Mss., but N. also found *quam* or *qua* in his sources. Perhaps one should read *quod licet*.

- 2,81 f dextra Lebinthos erat silvisque umbrosa Calymne
cinctaque piscosis Astypalaea vadis

Another beautiful Greek name mistreated by the medieval tradition. N. proposed *Calymne* on the basis of *Met.* 8,222 and he should be given credit for this improvement, even if some 'recentiores' come close (*calimne* or *chalimne*).

2,93 f At pater infelix, nec iam pater, 'Icare' clamat,
 'Icare' clamat 'ubi es quoque sub axe volas?
 Icare' clamabat; pinnas aspexit in undis.

Here, *nec iam* is N.' conjecture (based on *Met.* 8,231), and Kenney puts it into his text, although the Mss. or most of them seem to have *non iam pater*.

2,177 f Si nec blanda satis nec erit tibi comis amanti,
 perfer et obdura: postmodo mitis erit

For the first *erit* N. found *sit* in some Mss., and this reading should be preserved; somehow, the repetition of *erit ...erit* does not sound Ovidian.

2,195 f pectora nec missis iubeo praebere sagittis;
 artis erunt cautae mollia iussa meae.

What exactly is *cauta ars* supposed to mean? N. found *certe* for *cautae* in some witnesses. Perhaps this is too trivial, and there is a special meaning of *cautus* that escapes me.

2,203 f Seu ludet numerosque manu iactabit eburnos,
 tu male iactato, tu male iacta dato

There must be a difference between *male iactare* and *male iacta dare*, but there is also a play on words or sounds. The vulgate that N. worked with seems to have had *bene iacta dato*.

2,209 f Ipse tene distenta suis umbracula virgis

N. found *distenta* in some witnesses, but his vulgate seems to have offered *distincta*. Neither this reading nor *bene* (above) have left a trace in Kenney's edition.

2,219 f inter Ioniacas calathum tenuisse puellas
 creditur et lanas excoluisse rudes.

Ovid refers to Hercules. N. hesitates between *inter Ionicas* ('veteres', but 'recentiores' in Kenney) and *Ionicas inter* (R A alii). He refers to *Her.* 9,73.

2,239 f Cynthus Admeti vaccas pavisse Pheraei
 fertur et in parva delituisse casa

Pheraei is the reading Kenney extracts from R D and the excerpta Put. et Scal., to go with *Admeti*. N. hesitates between *Pheraeas* (*fareas* 0_b¹) and *per herbas* (vulgo), but this looks like a trivial substitution for a Greek name.

2,243 Si tibi per tutum planumque negabitur ire

Before Heinsius (whose emendation *planumque* is also found in a Vaticanus, s. XV) editors read *placidumque*, a variant which N. adopted 'ex veteribus', but without strong conviction.

2,295 f Sed te, cuicumque est retinendae cura puellae,
 attonitum forma fac putet esse sua.

Te (R A alii) anticipates *attonitum* and it is probably better than *tu* (recc.); N. chose *te* from some of his sources.

2,331 f Omnibus his inerunt gratae vestigia curae;
 in tabulas multis haec via fecit iter.

N. found *in tabulas* 'in antiquis', and this is the reading of R and others; N. approves of it. *In tabulas iter facere* may be some sort of idiom taken from the language of commerce and business. When the idiom was no longer understood, the reading *in thalamos* (F² v. 1.) was substituted.

2,379 f in ferrum flammasque ruit positoque decore
 fertur, ut Aonii cornibus icta dei

Here, the witnesses vary between *decore*, *pudore* and *timore*, as in 1,125 f. N. hesitates between *decore* and *pudore*.

2,405 Haec tamen audierat; Priameida viderat ipsa

The Mss. are divided between *tamen* and *tantum*; N. mentions *tantum* without stating a preference. But it may be right, because there is a contrast between *audire* and *videre*.

2,413 Sed lateri ne parce tuo: pax omnis in uno est

Ne is in R and others, *nec* in A and others. N. is aware of both variants but indicates no preference.

2,421 f Candidus, Alcathoi qui mittitur urbe Pelasga,
bulbus et, ex horto quae venit, herba salax

Alcathoe seems to have been the vulgate in the Renaissance, and N. accepted it but preferred *Alcathoi*, as a correcture; he adds a note.

2,511 f Ad propiora vocor; quisquis sapienter amabit,
vincet et e nostra quod petet, arte feret.

N. knows a v. l. *patienter* (not in Kenney), 'fortasse recte'. Since *patientia* is part of *sapientia*, there is no great difference. On the other hand, if you have the *sapientia* that Ovid teaches you, you also have *patientia*.

2,557 f Quo magis, o iuvenes, deprendere parcite vestras;
peccent, peccantes verba dedisse putent

Peccent... putent seems to be the vulgate (A and others). N. prefers *peccant* 'ex antiquo'. This reading is unknown to Kenney, but he records *putant* (R alii) for *putent* which confirms a reading *peccant*. But is it right? *Deprendere* implies that they are actually unfaithful. On the other hand, the subjunctive expresses a possibility: "Let them..."

2,603 f Exigua est virtus praestare silentia rebus;
at contra gravis est culpa tacenda loqui

Exigua seems to be in most Mss. and editions, and N. found it in a few witnesses, but the vulgate in his time was *eximia*. As often, he hesitated. *Exigua* makes good sense and is the 'lectio difficilior'. The idea of a 'very small virtue' corresponds to the moral principle *vitium fugit, non laudem meruit*.

2,655 f ferre novae nares taurorum terga recusant;
adsiduo domitas tempore fallit odor

Adsiduo is the consensus of most of Kenney's Mss., and N. found it in some of his, but the vulgate in his time seems to have been *adsidue* (R W, acc. to Kenney).

2,661 f dic 'habilem' quaecumque brevis, quae turgida, 'plenam';
 et lateat vitium proximitate boni.

N. preserves a variant *agilem* for *habilem* (not in Kenney).

3,23 f Ipsa quoque et cultu est e nomine femina Virtus;
 non mirum, populo si placet illa suo

N. records a variant 'ex veteribus' *si favet ipsa suo* and adds 'de feminis intelligendum'. In other words, the women are the *populus Veneris*. This is excellent ('multo rectius' says N.) and should be recorded in *usum editorum*.

3,37 f Quaere, Novem cur una Viae dicatur, et audi
 depositis silvas Phyllida flesse comis

Heinsius understood the context and emended the text by introducing *viae* for *vices*, but N. found *viae* in some Mss., and he remembered a similar passage in Ovid, *Rem.* 56: *et per quod novies, saepius isset iter*.

3,149 f sed neque ramosa numerabis in ilice glandes,
 nec quod apes Hybla nec quot in Alpe ferae

The vulgate in N.' time offered *frondes*, and he found *glandes* only in a few witnesses (*grandes* in R seems to be a contamination of the two readings; hence probably an old crux).

3,187 f lana tot aut plures sucos bibit: elige certos,
 nam non conveniens omnibus omnis erit

Omnis is in R A (ut vid.) and others, whereas *unus* is in a and others. N. says 'utrumque recte'. *Omnibus omnis* sounds more Ovidian.

3,209 f Non tamen expositas mensa deprenat amator
 pyxidas: ars faciem dissimulata iuvat.

N.' note seems to indicate an earlier vulgate *iuvet*. It is often hard to weigh *iuvat* against *iuvet*.

3,215 f Nec coram mixtas cervae sumpsisse medullas
 nec coram dentes defricuisse probem

An earlier vulgate seems to have offered *perfricuisse* (not in Kenney). N. prefers *defricuisse* which is in all of Kenney's Mss. and compares Catullus 39,19.

3, 225 Tu quoque dum coleris, nos te dormire putemus

N. calls this reading (R A alii) 'vetus lectio' and he likes it; his vulgate was *tu faciem cura dum*, and he prefers the 'vetus lectio'. Another difficult decision.

3,269 pallida purpureis tangat sua corpora virgis

For *tangat* (R A alii) N. suggests *tingat* 'ex veteribus'; Kenney cites this reading from the 'recentiores'.

3,139 f Ennius emeruit, Calabris in montibus ortus,
 contiguus poni, Scipio magne, tibi.

This distich was brilliantly emended by Parrhasius; the 'better' Mss. have *hortos contiguos poenis* for *ortus contiguus poni*. N. accepts the emended version with the remark 'aliter in omnibus' but does not mention Parrhasius by name.

3,429 f Quid minus Andromedae fuerat sperare revinctae
 quam lacrimas ulli posse placere suas?

Andromedae... revinctae is the text of A and others; N. adopts it from the 'veteres'; the vulgate he knew seems to have offered *Andromede... revincta*.

3,577 f Omnia tradantur (portas reseravimus hosti)
 et sit in infida prodicione fides.

N. knows a v. l. *tradentur* (not in Kenney).

3,731 f surgit et oppositas agitato corpore frondes
 movit in amplexus uxor itura viri

A variant, *appositas* cited by N., might be an early conjecture.

- 3,739 f Ante diem morior, sed nulla paelice laesa:
 hoc faciet positae te mihi, terra, levem.

Positae is in N and others; N. adopts this reading but knows also *positam* (A and others). *Positae* stands for *sepultae*.

- 3,781 f Cui femur est iuvenale, carent quoque pectora menda,
 stet vir, in obliquo fusa sit ipsa toro.

Stet vir (R A alii) is essential, and N. adopted it 'ex veteribus' with some hesitation; *semper* (recc.) was the vulgate of his time.

REMEDIA AMORIS

- 87 f tum poterat manibus summa tellure revelli:
 nunc stat in immensum viribus aucta suis.

He is speaking of the growth of a tree. *Aucta* (K² alii) is in Kenney's text; N. calls *acta* (R K¹ alii) 'multo rectius' and refers to v. 106 *et mala radices altius arbor agit*.

- 137 Haec ut ames faciunt; haec, ut fecere, tuentur

Ut fecere is in R and others, *quod fecere* in E and others; N. seems to prefer *quod fecere*, but *ut* is probably temporal, as A. A. R. Henderson, in his commentary (Scottish Academic Press 1979) says *ad loc*.

- 163 f pugnabant alii tardis apud Ilion armis;
 transtulerat vires Graecia tota suas

N. wanted to read *quo tulerat* ('veteres') for *transtulerat*. This would make a period of the whole distich, while the modern editors accept an asyndeton and coordinate the two clauses.

- 253 f Me duce non tumulo prodire iubebitur umbra,
 non anus infami carmine rumpet humum

Ovid refers to magical operations. *Iubebitur* is in R E F L, *videbitur* in all other Mss., it seems. N. prefers this reading, but the poet is thinking of a necromantic ritual during which a ghost is summoned or conjured up by the sorcerer.

343 f Auferimur cultu: gemmis auroque teguntur
 omnia: pars minima este ipsa puella sui.

N. cites *crimina* ('nonnulli') for *omnia*, another forgotten reading but not, in my opinion, an improvement.

435 f Adtrahet ille puer contentos fortiter arcus,
 saucia maiorem turba petetis opem.

Adtrahet is in R E K and others, Bentley suggested *adtrahat* from a MS in Cambridge, while the 'recentiores' have *adtrahit*. N. suggests *at trahat*, an attractive conjecture, now forgotten. But Bentley may be right, and Henderson paraphrases 'let him but take a longer, stronger pull on his bow, (and)...' One might also think of an abridged conditional clause: *si Amor adtrahet arcus fortius*, etc.

453 Pasiphaes Minos in Procride perdidit ignes.

N. found *prognide* and *phronide* in his source (*Procride* is Heinsius' suggestion, based on *procride* K²), and adds 'ego nusquam de his Minois amoribus legi'. But there is, as Henderson notes, a minor tradition which makes Procris the mistress of Minos (see Apollodor. 3, 15, 1; Anton. Lib. 41).

455 f Amphiloichi frater ne Phegida semper amaret,
 Callirhoe fecit parte recepta tori

According to Kenney, *Phegida* is a conjecture by Antonious Volscus; N. had the same idea and supported it in a long note from Ovid, *Met.* 9,394 ff., and Pausanias. The Mss. offer a variety of bizarre names, such as *phetida* (R).

565 f hic male dotata pauper cum coniuge vivit:
 uxorem fato credat obesse suo.

The Mss. are divided between *obesse* and *adesse*; N. found the second reading 'in veteribus'. In his edition (Berlin 1960), F.W. Lenz accepts *adesse* and translates "daß seine Frau sein Schicksal besiegelt" which seems strange.

575 f plura loquebatur: placidum puerilis imago
 destituit somnum, si modo somnus erat.

N. found *somnum* in some Mss.; his vulgate apparently had *somnus*, perhaps in anticipation of the second *somnus*.

593 f Ibat, ut Edono referens trieterica Baccho
 ire solet fuis barbara turba comis

Edono is due to D. Heinsius; the Mss. are divided between *edonio* and *aonio*. N. realized that *Edonio* (accepted by Lenz) is unmetrical and preferred *Aonio*, but the reference is to the *Edoni* (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 2, 7. 26f).

663 f Forte aderam iuveni; dominam lectica tenebat

Aderam iuveni is the reading of R E K and others, and N. accepted it from 'veteres'; *aderat iuvenis* is the vulgate. But *adesse* is a legal term; it means to be someone's advocate (see Kiessling-Heinze on Hor. *Sat.* 1, 9, 38).

679 f Nec compone comas quia sis venturus ad illam,
 nec toga sit laxo conspicienda sinu

N. found *quia sis* (R E K alii) as a variant; the vulgate he knew had *cum sis* (recc.).

699 f Non ego Dulichio furari more sagittas
 nec raptas ausim tinguere in amne faces

Dulichio is attested by K² R and the exc. Scaligeri. N. found *Dulichias* (K¹ and others) in his Mss. and did not understand it. Instead of *furari more* (Housman, Palmer), his vulgate probably had *furiali more* which did not help.

737 praeterita cautus Niseide navita gaudet

Niseide is found in R E and others, *Ripheide* in W and others. N. found *Ripheide* 'in veteribus'. *Niseis* must be Scylla, the sea monster. The name may be incorrect (Henderson who tentatively suggests *Phorcynide*), but on the basis of the ms. tradition there is not much more that we can do.

773 f Quid, Menelae, doles? ibas sine coniuge Creten
 et poteras nupta lentus abesse tua

Lentus, Kenney's vulgate, was N.' 'vetus lectio'. R E K and others have *laetus*. Cf. v. 243 and Henderson *ad loc.*

CONCLUSIONS

Can we draw any conclusions from Naugerius' notes? I think we can. We are fortunate, in his case, to have the evidence of his edition and the evidence of his notes. This is unusual. We often have Renaissance editions of classical authors, without any notes. Or we have notes without any editions; I am thinking of the *excerpta Puccii* and other *Collectanea* in the case of the *Corpus Tibullianum*. Such notes represent a very sketchy *apparatus criticus* for a text which never appeared. In a sense, N.' notes are also a sketchy *apparatus criticus*. But he never names his manuscripts; he only says, e. g., that this or that reading was a 'vetus lectio' or that he found it in a good witness. He does not have the concept of the 'codex optimus atque praestantissimus' that the 19th c. editors have. He was an eclectic editor, like Bentley or Housman. When a reading appealed to him he considered it. And he was not impressed when a reading appeared in many witnesses. On the contrary, he seems to have been suspicious of the vulgate of his time, and he kept looking for more satisfactory readings. For him the job of editing an ancient text was never finished.

I just said that he never names his manuscripts. Heinsius, as is well known, gave names like Palatinus or Arundelianus to the Mss. he consulted, and many of the 'codices Heinsiani' have now been identified. Heinsius represents an intermediary stage between Renaissance editors like N. and more recent editors who assign letters and numbers and dates to their manuscripts. It is not clear whether N., like Heinsius, travelled widely to consult as many Mss. as possible. In his short and busy life he probably did not have the time. I would assume that he mostly relied on sources available in Venice, at the San Marco Library, but he may have known some manuscripts kept in Padua or Florence. Scholars sent each other codices they owned or had access to. N. almost certainly consulted one or several of the earlier editions, and it would only be logical to assume that the first Aldina served as a kind of basis for his own edition. He probably wrote corrections in the margins of the earlier Aldina.

What N. says about 'old Mss.' or an 'old reading' must be treated with caution. In his day and age, palaeography and codicology were not yet the disciplines they became two or three centuries later. He probably relied on impressions, not on a careful analysis. And he may

have been deceived by Renaissance Mss. that imitated Carolingian script.

Being a diplomat in life, he was also diplomatic as a textual critic. Very often he says 'fortasse rectius' or even 'utrumque recte' as if he wanted to keep an open mind, waiting for new evidence that would help him reach a decision. This attitude of 'wait and see' is, perhaps, typical for the early phase of editing. You had only a limited number of sources at your disposal, and you did the best you could, hoping for an opportunity to enlarge your horizon. Therefore you had to develop a sort of sense or instinct for the quality of any given manuscript that came your way. For N., that was quite often F, the *Francofurtanus*, but it is more or less by coincidence that we can identify this particular witness.

We have seen that many of N.' readings, including his own conjectures, are forgotten today and should be reconsidered.

Finally, it is interesting to look at the vulgate of his age. He knew it, of course, but was critical of it, especially where it made no sense to him, which he often admits.

This is really how every good editor should operate. I am sure *Antonio Ramírez de Verger* agrees with me. He is worldwide one of the prominent Ovidian scholars today, and he knows best how complex the business of editing a text will always be.