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Abstract

The *Ibis* of Ovid, an enigmatic poem written during the poet's exile at Tomis, contains a series of violent and allusive imprecations drawn from history and mythology. The purpose of this dissertation is to provide a detailed study of the poem, to aid readers in their understanding and appreciation of the *historiae caecae* and *ambages* in which Ovid takes such delight; accordingly, an introductory chapter attempts to outline the historical and literary background to the poem, with particular attention devoted to placing the poem more firmly within the sphere of imprecatory writing in the ancient world. Following this is an explanatory commentary which covers models, parallels for topoi, and explanations of references, meanings, and allusions in the *Ibis*. Inevitably, this commentary is indebted to the efforts of previous commentators; however, I have endeavoured throughout to suggest additional lines of enquiry and to provide a fresh perspective on a challenging work.
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SIGLA

\[ F = \text{Francofurtanus, saec. xii} \]
\[ G = \text{Galeanus 213, saec. xii} \]
\[ H = \text{Holkhamicus, saec. xiii} \]
\[ P = \text{Philippicus nunc Berolinensis, saec. xiii} \]
\[ T = \text{Turonensis 879, saec. xiii ineuntis} \]
\[ V = \text{Vindobonensis 885, saec. xii} \]
\[ X = \text{Parisinus 7994, saec. xiii} \]
\[ B = \text{Canonicianus Lat. 20, saec. xv} \]
\[ \omega = \text{Codices omnes aut fere omnes} \]
\[ \varsigma = \text{Codices aliqui recentiores} \]

*deft.* = *deflorationes Ellisii*

Atregatensis 65
Parisina 17903
Musei Britannici 18459
bodleiana Canon. patr. Lat. 43
TEMPVS ad hoc lustris bis iam mihi quinque peractis
omne fuit Musae carmen inerme meae;
nullaque, quae possit, scriptis tot milibus, extat
littera Nasonis sanguinolenta legi;
nec quemquam nostri, nisi me, laesere libelli,
artificis perit cum caput Arte sua.

unus, et hoc ipsum est iniuria magna, perennem
candoris titulum non sinit esse mei.
quisquis is est, nam nomen adhuc utcumque tacebo,
cogit inassuetas sumere tela manus.
ille relegatum gelidos Aquilonis ad ortus
non sinit exilio delituisse meo,
vulneraque inmitis requiem quaerentia vexat,
iactat et in toto nomina nostra foro,
perpetuoque mihi sociatum foedere lecti
non patitur miseris funera flere viri;
cumque ego quassa meae complectar membra carinæ,
naufragii tabulas pugnat habere mei,
et, qui debuerat subitas exanguibus flammis,
hic praedam medio raptor ab igne petít.
nititur ut profugae desint alimenta senectae.

heu quanto est nostris dignior ipse malis!
di melius, quorum Longe mihi maximus ille est,
qui nostras inopés noluit esse viás.

huic igitur meritas gratias, ubicumque licebit,
pro tam mansuetò pectore semper agam.
audiet hoc Pontus. faciet quoque forsitan idem

heu quanto est nostris dignior ipse malis!
di melius, quorum Longe mihi maximus ille est,
qui nostras inopés noluit esse viás.

huic igitur meritas gratias, ubicumque licebit,
pro tam mansuetò pectore semper agam.
audiet hoc Pontus. faciet quoque forsitan idem

heu quanto est nostris dignior ipse malis!
di melius, quorum Longe mihi maximus ille est,
qui nostras inopés noluit esse viás.

huic igitur meritas gratias, ubicumque licebit,
pro tam mansuetò pectore semper agam.
audiet hoc Pontus. faciet quoque forsitan idem

heu quanto est nostris dignior ipse malis!
di melius, quorum Longe mihi maximus ille est,
qui nostras inopés noluit esse viás.

huic igitur meritas gratias, ubicumque licebit,
pro tam mansuetò pectore semper agam.
audiet hoc Pontus. faciet quoque forsitan idem

heu quanto est nostris dignior ipse malis!
di melius, quorum Longe mihi maximus ille est,
qui nostras inopés noluit esse viás.

huic igitur meritas gratias, ubicumque licebit,
pro tam mansuetò pectore semper agam.
audiet hoc Pontus. faciet quoque forsitan idem

heu quanto est nostris dignior ipse malis!
di melius, quorum Longe mihi maximus ille est,
qui nostras inopés noluit esse viás.
et ver autumno, brumae miscebitur aestas,
atque eadem regio vesper et ortus erit,
quam mihi sit tecum positis, quae sumpsimus, armis
gratia, commissis, improbe, rupta tuis.
pax erit haec nobis, donec mihi vita manebit,
cum pecore infirmo quae solet esse lupis.
prima quidem coepto committam proelia versu,
non soleant quamvis hoc pede bella geri.
utque petit primo plenum flaventis harenae
nondum calfacti militis hasta solum,
sic ego te nondum ferro iaculabor acuto,
protinus invisum nec petet hasta caput,
et neque nomen in hoc nec dicam facta libello,
tequi brevi qui sis dissimulare sinam.
postmodo, si perges, in te mihi liber iambus
tincta Lycambeo sanguine tela dabit.
nunc, quo Battiaedes inimicum devovet Ibin,
hoc ego devoveo teque tuosque modo.
utque ille, historiis involvam carmina caecis,
non soleam quamvis hoc genus ipse sequi.
ilius ambages imitatus in Ibide dicar
oblitus moris judiciique mei.
et, quoniam qui sis nondum quaerentibus edo,
Ibidis interea tu quoque nomen habe.
utque mei versus aliquantum noctis habeunt,
sic vitae series tota sit atra tuae.
haec tibi natali facito Ianique kalendis
non mentituro quilibet ore legat.
di maris et terrae, quique his meliora tenetis
inter diversos cum love regna polos,
huc, precor, huc vestras omnes advertite mentes,
et sinite optatis pondus inesse meis.
ipsaque tu tellus, ipsum cum fluctibus aequor,
ipse meaet aether accipe summe preces,
sideraque et radiis circumdata solis imago,
lunaque, quae numquam quo prius orbe micas,
noxque tenebrarum specie reverenda tuarum,
quaeque ratum triplici police netis opus,
rique per infernas horrendo murmure valles
inperiuatae laberis annis aquae,
quasque ferunt torto vittatis angue capillis
carceris obscuras ante sedere fores,
vos quoque, plebs superum, Fauni Satyrique Laresque
Fluminaque et Nymphae semideumque genus,
denique ab antiquo divi veteresque novique
in nostrum cuncti tempus adeste Chao,
carmina dum capit male fido dira canuntur,
et peragunt partes ira dolorque suas.
annute optatis omnes ex ordine nostris,
et sit pars voti nulla caduca mei.
quaeque precor fiant, ut non mea dicta, sed illa
Pasiphaes generi verba fuisse putet.
quasque ego transiero poenas, patiatur et illas:
plenius ingenio sit miser ille meo.
neve minus noceant factum execrantium nomen
vota, minus magnos commoveant deos,
illum ego devoveo, quem mens intellegit, Ibin,
qui se scit factis has meruisse preces.
nulla mora est in me: peragam rata vota sacerdos.
quisquis ades sacris, ore favete, meis.
quisquis ades sacris, lugubria dicit verba,
et fletu madidis Ibin adite genis:
ominiusque malis pedibusque occurrite laevis,
et nigrae vestae corpora vestra tegant,
tu quoque, quid dubitas ferales sumere vittas?
iam stat, ut ipse vides, funeris ara tui.
pompa parata tibi est: votis mora tristibus absit:
da iugulum cultris hostia dira mei.
terra tibi fruges, amnis tibi deneget undas,
deneget afflatus ventus et aura suos.
nec tibi Sol calidus nec sit tibi lucida Phoebe,
destituant oculos sidera claros.
nec se Vulcanus nec se tibi praebat aer,
nec tibi det tellus nec tibi pontus iter.
exul inops erres alienaque limina lustres,
exiguumque petas ore tremente cibum.
ec corpus querulo nec mens vacet aegra dolore,
noxque die gravior sit tibi, nocte dies.
Sisque miser semper nec sis miserabilis uli:
gaudeat adversis femina virque tuis.
accedat lacrimis odium, dignusque puteris
qui, mala cum tuleris plurima, plura feras.
sitque, quod est rarum, solito defecta favore
fortunae facies invidiosa tuae.
causa non desit, desit tibi copia mortis:
optatam fugiat vita coacta necem.
luctatusque diu cruciatus deserat artus
spiritus et longa torqueat ante mora.
evenient. dedit ipse mihi modo signa futuri
Phoebus, et a laeva maesta volavit avis.
certe ego, quae voveo, superos motura putabo
speque tuae mortis, perfide, semper alar.
et prius hanc animam, niumim tibi saepe petitam,
aiferet illa dies quae mihi sera venit,
quam dolor hic umquam spatio evanesceque possit,
leniat aut odium tempus et hora meum.
pugnabunt arcu dum Thraces, Iazyges hasta,
dum tepidus Ganges, frigidus Hister erit,
robora dum montes, dum mollia pabula campi,
dum Tiberis liquidus Tuscus habebit aquas,
tecum bella geram; nec mors mihi finiet iras,
saeva sed in Manis Manibus arma dabat.
tum quoque, cum fuero vacuas dilapsus in auras,
exanguis mores oderit umbra tuos.
tum quoque factorum veniam memor umbra tuorum,
insequar et vultus ossea forma tuos.
sive ego, quod nolim, longis consumptus ab annis,
sive manu facta morte solutus ero,
sive per inmensas iactabor naufragus undas,
nostraque longinquus viscera piscis edet,
sive peregrinae carpent mea membra volucres,
sive meo tinguent sanguine rostra lupi,
sive aliquis dignatus erit supponere terrae
et dare plebeio corpus inane rogo,
quicquid ero, Stygiis erumpere nitar ab oris,
et tendam gelidas ultor in ora manus.
me vigilans cernes, tacitis ego noctis in umbris
excutiam somnos visus adesse tuos.
denique quicquid ages, ante os oculosque volabo
et querar, et nulla sede quietus eris.
verbæ saeva dabant sonitum nexæque colubrae:
conscia fumabant semper ad ora faces.
his vivus Furiis agitabere, mortuus isdem:
et brevis poena vita futura tua est.
nec tibi continget funus lacrimæque tuorum;
indeploratum proiciere caput,
carnificisque manu populo plaudente traheris,
infelixusque tuis ossibus uncus erit.
ipsae te fugient, quae carpunt omnia, flamæae:
respuet invisum iusta cadaver humus
unguibus et rostro tardus trahet ilia vultur,
et scindent avidi perfida corda canes.
deque tuo fiest (licet hac sis laude superbæ)
insatiabilibus corpore rixa lupis.
in loca ab Elysiis diversa fugabere campis,
quaæ tenet sedes noxia turba, coæes.
Sisyphus est illic saxum volvensque petensque,
quia agitur rapidæae vinctus ab orbe rotae,
quaæque gerunt umeris perituras Belides undas,
exulis Aegypti, turba cruenta, nurus;
poma pater Pelopis praesentia quaeærit et idem
semper eget liquidis semper abundat aquis;
iugeribusque novem summis qui distat ab imo
visceræque assiduæ deîta praebet avi.
hic tibi de Furiis scindet latus una flagello,
ut sceleris numeros confiteare tui,
altera Tartareis sectos dabæi anguibus artus,
tertia fumantes incóquet igne genas.
noxia mille modis lacerabitur umbra, tuaæque
Aeacæ in poenas ingenious erit.
in te transcribet veterum tormenta vironum:
omnibus antiquis causa quietis eris.
Sisyphæ, cui tradas revoluæile pondus habæbis:
versabæt celeræ nunc nova membra rotae.
hic et erit ramos frustra qui captæt et undas:
hic inconsæmptæ viscere pascæt avis.
nec mortis poenas mors altera finiet huius,
    horaque erit tantis ultima nulla malis.
inde ego paucam frondes ut siquis ab Ida
    aut summam Libycop de mare carpat aquam.
nam neque, quot flores Sicala nascantur in Hybla,
    quotve ferat, dicam, terra Cilissa crocos,
nec, cum tristis hiems Aquilonis inhorruit alis,
    quam multa fiat grandine canus Athos.
nec mala voce mea poterunt tua cuncta referri,
    ora licet tribuas multiplicata mihi.
tot tibi vae misero venient talesque ruinae,
    ut cogi in lacrimas me quoque posse putem.
illae me lacrimae facient sine fine beatum:
    dulcia hic risu tum mihi fletus erit.
 natus es infelix, ita di voluere, nec ulla
    commoda nascenti stella levisve fuit.
non Venus adfulsit, non illa Iuppiter hora,
    Lunaque non apto Solque fuere loco.
nec satis utiliter postos tibi praebuit ignes
    quem peperit magno lucida Maia Iovi.
te fera nec quicquam placidum spontentia Martis
    sidera presserunt falciferique sensis.
lux quoque natalis, nequid nisi triste videres,
    turpis et inductis nubibus atra fuit.
haec est, in fastis cui dat gravis Allia nomen;
    quaeque dies Ibin, publica damna tulit.
qui simul inpura matris prolapsus ab alvo
    Cinyphiam foedo corpore pressit humum,
sedit in adverso nocturnus culmine bubo,
    funereaque graves edidit ore sonos.
protinus Eumenides lavere palustribus undis,
    qua cava de Stygiis fluxerat unda vadis,
    pectoraque unerunt Erebeae felle colubrae
    terque cruentatas increpuere manus,
gutturaque inbuerunt infantia lacte canino:
    hic primus pueri venit in ora cibus.
perhibit inde suae rabiem nutricis alumnus,
    latrat et in toto verba canina foro.

195 abj in BFHPX 197 nascantur BV: nascuntur ω 198 cilissa BH: cilisca ω 206
tunc GHTV 208 leuisue BG: leuisque ω 209 illuxit G: effulisit T 218 interpunxit
Housman: cf. Ellis, Journ. Phil. xxiv. 180 219 impurae GHc aluo BTX: aluo est
cest. codd. 223 paludibus udis Saluagnius 227 imbuerunt Harleianus 2538: imbuerant
membraque vinxerunt tinctis ferrugine pannis,
a male deserto quos rapuere rogo,
et, ne non fultum nuda tellure iaceret,
molle super silices inposuere caput.
iamque recessurae viridi de stipite factas
admorunt oculis usque sub ora faces.
flebat ut est fumis infans contactus amaris:
de tribus est cum sic una locuta soror:
'tempus in inmensum lacrimas tibi movimus istas,
quae semper causa sufficiente cadent.'
dixerat: at Clotho iussit promissa valere,
nevit et infesta stamina pulla manu,
et, ne longa suo praesagia diceret ore,
'fata canet vates qui tua,' dixit 'erit.'
ille ego sum vates: ex me tua vulnera disces,
dent modo di vires in mea verba suas;
carminibusque meis accedent pondera rerum,
quae rata per luctus experiere tuos.
neve sine exemplis aevi cruciere prioris,
sint tua Troianis non leviora malis.
quantaque clavigeri Poantius Herculis heres,
tanta venenato vulnera crure geras.
nec levius doleas quam qui bibit ubera cervae
armatique tulit vulnus; inermis opem,
qui quae ab equo praeceps in Aleia decidit arva,
exitio facies cui sua paene fuit.
id quod Amyntorides videas trepidumque ministro
praetemptes baculo luminis orbis iter.
nec plus aspicias quam quem sua filia rexit,
expertus scelus est cuius uterque parens;
qualis erat, postquam est iudex de lite iocosa
sumptus, Apollinea clarus in arte senex,
qualis et ille fuit, quo praecipiente columba
est data Palladiae praevia dux et rati,
qui qui oculis caruit, per quos male viderat aurum,
inferias nato quo dedit orba parens;
pastor ut Aetnaeus, cui casus ante futuros
Telemus Eurymides vaticinatus erat;

231 uinxerunt T: uixerunt BFGP: uixerunt X: tinxerunt V 237 infans fumis BHP
ut duo Phinidae, quibus idem lumen ademit
qui dedit; ut Thamyrae Demodocique caput.
sic aliquis tua membra secet, Saturnus ut illas
subsecuit partes unde creatus erat.
nec tibi sit tumidis melior Neptunus in undis,
quam cui sunt subitae frater et uxor aves,
sollertique viro, lacerae quem fracta tenantem;
membra ratis Semeles est miserata soror.
vel tua, ne poenae genus hoc cognoverit unus,
viscera diversis scissa ferantur equis.
vel, quae qui redimi Romano turpe putavit
a duce Punico pertulit, ipse feras.
nec tibi subsidio praesens sit numen, ut illi,
cui nihil Hercei profuit ara lovis.
utque dedit saltus de summa Thessalus Ossa,
tu quoque saxoso praeeipitere iugo.
aut velut Eurylochi, qui sceptrum cepit ab illo,
sint artus avidis anguibus esca tui.
vel tua maturet, sicut Minoa fata,
per caput infusae fervidus umor aquae.
utque parum inmitis, sed non inpune, Prometheus
aerias volucres sanguine tixus alas.
vel tua quam Pyrrhi felicius ossa quiescant,
sparsa per Ambracias quae iacuere vias.
nataque ut Aeacidae iaculis moriatis adactis:
non licet hoc Cereri dissimulare sacrum.

269 et GPT  270 ut FÇ: et w  Demodocique BÇ: demophoique similis Ô 273 melior
tumidis FH: tumidis t. s. melior T  278 secta BH cinyphio ç: cf. Met. xv 755: cinyphis B
mitis Ô: parum ignis Nettleship  290 corporæ BFHV (t. a.) pace tuo FGHV: pascit aves B
291 Erecithides Ellis: ethrecides G: ecrecrates T Plantinianus: ecrecrates X alia alii
cond. ictus T Conradas de Mure: quintus Ô  294 uerberet G (corr. G)  299
Achillidae Saluagnius  304 sacrum] nefas BFH
utque nepos dicti nostro modo carmine regis
cantharidum sucos dante parente bibas.
aut pia te caeso dicatur adultera, sicut
qua cecidit Leucon vindice dicta pia est.
inque pyram tecum carissima corpora mittas,
quam finem vitae Sardanapallus habet.
utque Iovis Libyci templum violare parantes,
acta Noto vultus condat harena tuos.
utque necatorum Darei fraude secundi,
sic tua subsidens devoret ora cinis.
aut, ut olivifera quondam Sicyone profecto,
sit frigus mortis causa famesque tuae.
aut, ut Atarnites, insutus pelle juvenci
turpiter ad dominum praeda ferare tuum.
inque tuo thalamo ritu iugulere Pheraei,
qui datus est leto coniugis ense suae.
quosque putas fidos, ut Larisaenus Aleuas,
venire non fidos experiere tuo.
utque Milo, sub quo cruciata est Pisa tyranno,
vivus in occultas praecipiteris aquas.
quaeque in Aphidantum Phylacesia regna tenentem
a love venerunt, te quoque tela petant.
aut ut Amastriacias quondam Lenaeus ab oris,
nudus Achillea destituaris humo.
utque vel Eurydamas ter circum busta Thrasylli
est Larisaenus raptus ab hoste rotis,
vel qui quae fuerat tutatus moenia saepe
corpore lustravit non diuturna suo,
utque novum passa genus Hippomeneide poenae
tractus in Actaea fertur adulter humo,
sic, ubi vita tuos invisa reliquerit artus,
ultores rapiant turpe cadaver equi.
viscera sic aliquis scopulus tua figat, ut olim
fixa sub Euboico Graia fuere sinu.
utque ferox perit et fulmine et aequore raptor,
sic te mersuras adiuvet ignis aquas.
mens quoque sic Furiis vecors agitetur, ut illi
unum qui toto corpore vulnus habet,
utque Dryantiadae Rhodopeia regna tenenti,
in gemino dispar cui pede cultus erat;
Tisamenique patri Callirhoeisque viro.
nec tibi contingat matrona pudicior illa,
qua potuit Tydeus erubuisse nuru,
quaque sui venerem iunxit cum fratre mariti
Locris in ancillae dissimulata nece.
tam quoque di faciant possis gaudere fideli
coniuge quam Talai Tyndareique gener,
quaque parare suis letum patruelibus ausae
Belides assidua colla premuntur aqua
Byblidos et Canaces, sicut facit, ardeat igne,
nec nisi per crimen sit tibi fida soror.
filia si fuerit, sit quod Pelopea Thyestae,
Myrrha suo patri Nyctimeneque suo.
neve magis pia sit capitiisque parentis amica
quam sua vel Pterelae, vel tibi, Nise, fuit,
infamemque locum sceleris quae nomine fecit,
pressit et inductis membra paterna rotis.
ut iuvenes pereas quorum fastigia vultus
membraque Pisaeae sustinuere foris,
ut qui perfusam miserorum saepe procorum
ipse suo melius sanguine tinxit humum;
prodiotor ut saevi periti auriga tyranni
qui nova Myrtoae nomina fecit aquae,
ut qui velocem frustra petiere puellam
dum facta est pomis tardior illa tribus,
ut qui tecta novi formam celantia monstri
intrarunt caecae non redeunda domus,
ut quorum Aeacides misit violentus in altum
corpora cum senis altera sena rogum,
ut quos obscuri victos ambagibus oris
legimus infandae Sphingae dedisse neci,
ut qui Bistoniae templo cecidere Minervae,
propter quos facies nunc quoque tecta deae est,
ut qui Threicii quondam præsepie regis
fecerunt dapibus sanguinolenta suis,
Therodamanteos ut qui sensere leones
quique Thoantei Taurica sacra deae,
380
ut quos Scylla vorax Scyllaeque adversa Charybdis
Dulichiae pavidos eripuere rati,
385
ut quos demisit vastam Polyphemus in alvum,
ut Laestrygonias qui subiere manus,
390
ut quos dux Poenus mersit putealibus undis,
et iacto canas pulvere fecit aquas;
sex bis ut lcaridos famulae periere procique,
inque caput domini qui dabat arma procis;
395
ut iacet Aonio luctator ab hospite fusus
qui, mirum, victor, cum cecidisset, erat,
ut quos Antaei fortes pressere lacerti
quosque ferae morti Lemnia turba dedit,
ut qui post longum, sacri monstrator iniqui,
elicuit pluvias victima caesas aquas;
frater ut Antaei, quo sanguine debuit, aras
tinxit et exemplis occidit ipse sui;
ut qui terribiles pro gramen habentibus herbis
impius humano viscere pavit equos,
ut duo diversis sub eodem vindice caesi
temporibus Nessus Dexamenique gener,
ut pronepos, Saturne, tuus, quem reddere vitam
urbe Coronides vidit ab ipse sua,
ut Sinis et Sciron et cum Polypemone natus
quique homo parte sui parte iuvencus erat,
quique trabes pressas ab humo mittebat in auras
eaequoris aspiciens huius et huius aquas,
quaque Ceres laeto vidit pereuntia vultu
corpora Thesea Cercyonea manu.
400
haec tibi, quem meritis precibus mea devovet ira,
evenient aut his non leviora malis.
405
qualis Achaemenidae, Sicula desertus in Aetna
Troica cum vidit vela venire, fuit,
qualis erat nec non fortuna binominis Iri,
quique tenent pontem, vae tibi talis erit.
410
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filius et Cereris frustra tibi semper ametur
destitutaque tuas usque petitus opes.
utque per alternos unda labente recursus
subtrahitur presso mollis harena pedi,
sic tua nescioqua semper fortuna liqueat,
lapsaque per medias effluat usque manus.
utque pater solitae varias mutare figuras
plenus inextincta conficiare fame.
nec dapis humanae tibi erunt fastidia, quaque
parte potes, Tydeus temporis huius eris.
atque aliquis facies, a vespere rursus ad ortus
cur externati Solis agantur equi.
foeda Lycaoniae repetes convivio mensae
temptabisque cibi fallere fraudem.
teque aliquis posito temptet vim numinis opto:
Tantalides tu sis Tereidesque puer.
et tua sic latos spargantur membra per agros,
tamquam quae patrias detinuere vias.
aere Perilleos veros imitare iuvencos
ad formam tauri conveniente sono.
utque ferox Phalaris, lingua prius ense resecta,
more bovis Paphio clausus in aere gemas.
dumque redire voles aevi melioris in annos,
ut vetus Admeti decipiare socer.
aut eques in medii mergare voragine caeni,
dum modo sint fata nomina nulla tui.
atque utinam pereas, veluti de dentibus orti
Sidonia iactis Graia per arva manu.
et quae Pitthides fecit fraterque Medusae
eveniant capiti vota sinistra tuo,
et quibus exiguo volucris devota libello est,
corpora projecta quae sua purgat aqua.
vulnera totque feras, quot dicitur ille tulisse
cuius ab inferiis culter abesse solet.
attonitusque secess, ut quos Cybeleia mater
incipiat, ad Phrygios vilia membra modos.
deque viro fias nec femina nec vir, ut Attis,
et quas molles tympana raucu manu.

ique pecus subito Magnae vertare Parentis,
    victor ut est celeri victaque versa pede.
solaque Limone poenam ne senserit illam,
    et tua dente fero viscera carpat equus.
aut ut Cassandreus, domino non mitior illo,
    saucius ingesta contumulerris humo.
aut ut Abantiades, aut ut Cycneius heros,
    clausus in aequorea praecipiteris aquas.
victima vel Phoebus sacras macteris ad aras,
    quam tulit a saevo Theudotus hoste necem.
aut te devoveat certis Abdera diebus,
    saxaque devotum grandine plura petant.
aut Iovis infesti telo feriare trisulco,
    ut satus Hipponoo Dexionesque pater,
    ut soror Autonoeus, ut cui matertera Maia,
    ut temere optatos qui male rexit equos,
    ut ferus Aeolides, ut sanguine natus eodem,
    quo genita est liquidis quae caret Arctos aquis.
ut Macedo rapidis ictus cum coniuge flammis,
    sic precor aetherii vindicis igne cadas.
predaque sis illis, quibus est Latonia Delos
    ante diem rapto non adeunda Thaso,
quique verecundae speculantem labra Dianae.
quique Crotopiaden diripuere Linum.
neve venenato levius feriarios ab angue,
    quam senis Oeagri Calliopesque nurus,
quam puer Hypsipyles, quam qui cava primus acuta
    cupidse suspecti roborae fixit equi.
neve gradus adeas Elpenore cautius altos,
    vimque feras vini quo tulit ille modo.
tamque cadas domitis, quam quisquis ad arma vocantem
    luvit inhumanum Thiodamanta Dryops,
quam ferus ipse suo periti mactatus in antro
    prodictus inclusae Cacus ab ore bovis,
quam qui dona tulit Nesseo tincta veneno,
Euboicasse suo sanguine tinxit aquas.
vel de praecipiti venias in Tartara saxo,
ut qui Socraticum de nece legit opus,
ut qui Theseae fallacia vela carinae
vidit, ut Iliaca missus ab arce puer,
ut teneri nutrix eadem et matertera Bacchi,
ut cui causa necis serra reperta fuit,
livida se scopulis ut virgo misit ab altis,
dixerat inviso quae mala verba deo.
feta tibi occurrat patrio popularis in arvo
sitque Phalaecae causa leaena necis.
quique Lycurgiden letavit et arbore natum
Idmonaque audacem, te quoque rumpat aper.
isque vel examinis faciat tibi vulnus, ut illi,
ora super fixi quem cecidere suis.
sive idem, simili pinus quem morte peremit,
Phryx et venator sis Berecyniades.
si tua contigerit Minoas puppis harenas,
te Coryraeum Cresia turba putet.
lapsuramque domum subeas, ut sanguis Aleuæ,
stella Leoprepidae cum fuit aqua viro.
utque vel Euenus, torrenti flumine mersus
nomina des rapidae, vel Tiberinus, aquæ.
Astacidaeque modo decisa cadavere trunco,
digna feris, hominis sit caput esca tuum.
quoque ferunt Brotean fecisse cupidine mortis,
des tua succensæ membra cremanda pyrae
inclususque necem cavea patiaris, ut ille
non prefecturae conditor historiae.
uque repertori nocuit pugnacis iambi,
sic sit in exitium lingua proterva tuum.
utque parum stabilii qui carmine laesit Athenas,
invisus pereas deficiente cibo.

utque lyrae vates fertur perisse severae,
causa sit exitii dextera laesa tui.

utque Agamemnonio vultus dedit anguis Orestae,
tu quoque de morsu virus habente cadas.
sit tibi coniugii nox prima novissima vitae:
Eupolis hoc perit et nova nupta modo.

utque coturnatum perisset Lycophrona narrant,
haeret in fibris fixa sagitta tuis.
aut lacer in silva manibus spargare tuorum,
sparsus ut est Thebis angue creatus avo.
perque feros montes tauro rapiente traharis,
ut tracta est coniunx inperiosa Lyci.

quodque suae passa est paelix invita sororis,
excidat ante pedes lingua resecta tuos.
conditor ut tardae, laesus cognomine, Myrrhae,
urbis in innumeris inveniare locis.
inque tuis opifex, vati quod fecit Achaeo,
noxia luminumibus spicula condat apis.
fixus et in duris carparis viscera saxis,
ut qui Pyrrha sui filia fratris erat.

ut puer Harpagides referas exempla Thyestae
inque tui caesus viscera patris eas.
trunca geras saevo mutilatis partibus ense,
qualia Mamerci membra fuisse ferunt.

utve Syracosio praestricta fauce poetae,
sic animae laqueo sit via clausa tuae.
nudave derepta pateant tua viscera pelle,
ut Phrygium cuius nomina flumen habet.
saxificae videas infelix ora Medusae,
Cepheum multos quae dedit una neci.

Potniadum morsus subeas, ut Glaucus, equarum,
inque maris salias, Glaucus ut alter, aquas.
utque duobus idem dictis modo nomen habenti, praefocent animae Gnosis mella viam.
sollicitoque bibas, Anyti doctissimus olim inperturbato quod bibit ore reus.
nec tibi, siquid amas, felicius Haemone cedat,
vel videas quod iam cum flammae cuncta tenerent
Hectoreus patria vidit ab arce pufer.
sanguine protra luas, ut avo genitore creatus,
per facinus soror est cui sua facta parens.
ossibus inque tuis telis genus haeret illud,
tradi tradit Icarii quo Cecidisse gener.
aut, ut Anaxarchus, pila minuaris in alta,
ictaque pro solitis frugibus ossa sonent.
utque patrem Psamathes, condat te Phoebus in ima Tartara, quod natae fcerat ille suae.
inde teos ea pestis eat quam dextra Coroebi vicit opem miseris Argolisinque tulit.
utque nepos Aethrae Veneris moriturus ob iram,
exul ab attonitis excutiaris equis.
propter opes magnas ut perdidit hospes alnumum,
perdat ob exiguas te tus hospes opes.
utque ferunt caesos sex cum Damasichthone frates,
interet tecum sic genus onne tuum.
addidit ut fidicen miseris sua funera natis,
sic tibi sint vitae taedia iusta tuae.
utve soror Pelopis, saxo dureris oborto,
ut laesus lingua Battus ab ipse sua.
aera si missio vacuum iaculabere disco,
quo pufer Oebalides ictus ab orbe cadas.
siqua per alternos pulsabitur unda Iacetos,
oannis Abydena sit tibi peior aqua.
comicus ut liquidis perit dum nabit in undis,
et tua sic Stygius strangulet ora liquor.
aut, ubi ventosum superaris naufragus aequor,
contacta pereas, ut Palinus, humo.
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utque coturnatum vatem, tutela Dianae,
dilaniet vigillum te quoque turba canum.
aut, ut Trinacrius, salias super ora Gigantis,
plurima qua flammis Sicanis Aetna vomit.
diripiantque tuos insanis unguibus artus
Strymoniae matres Orpheos esse ratae.
natus ut Althaeae flammis absentibus arsit,
sic tuus ardescat stipitis igne rogus.
ut nova Phasiaca comprensa est nupta corona,
utque pater nuptae, cumque parente domus,
ut cruror Herculeos abiit diffusus in artus,
corpora pestiferum sic tua virus edat.
qua sua Prataliden proles est ulta Lycastum,
haec maneant teli te quoque plaga novi.
utque Milo, robur diducere fissile temptes
 nec possis captas inde referre manus.
muneribusque tuis laedaris, ut Icarus, in quem
intult armatas ebria turba manus.
quodque dolore necis patriae pia filia fecit,
vincula per laquei fac tibi guttur eat.
obstructoque famem patiaris limine tecti,
ut legem poenae cui dedit ipsa parens.
ilius exemplo violes simulacra Minervae,
Aulidis a portu qui leve vertit iter.
Naupliadeae modo poenas pro crimen facto
morte lusas, nec te non meruisse iuvet.
Aethalon ut vita spoliavit Isindius hospes,
quem memor a sacris nunc quoque pellit Ion,
utque Melanthea tenebris a caede latentem
prodidit officio luminis ipsa parens,
sic tua coniectis fodiantur viscera telis,
sic precor auxiliis impediare tuis.
qualis equos pacto, quos fortis agebat Achilles,
acta Phrygi timido est, nox tibi talis eat.
nec tu quam Rhesus somno meliori quiescas,
quam comites Rhesi tum necis, ante viae,
quam quos cum Rutulo morti Rhamnete dederunt
impiger Hyrtacides Hyrtacidaeque comes.
Cliniadaeve modo circumdatus ignibus atris
membra feras Stygiae semicremata neci.
utque Remo muros auso transire recentes
noxia sint capiti rustica tela tuo.
denique Sarmaticas inter Geticasque sagittas
his precor ut vivas et moriare locis.
haec tibi tantispe subito sint missa libello,
inmemores ne nos esse querare tui:
pauca quidem, fateor; sed di dent plura rogatis
multiplicentque suo vota favore mea.
postmodo plura leges et nomen habentia verum,
et pede quo debent acria bella geri.
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Introduction

I. The Exile of Ovid

In A.D. 8, at the age of 50, while visiting the island of Elba, Ovid learned that he had been banished by imperial edict to Tomis (modern Constantza) on the very edge of the Roman Empire. Although Ovid asserts that the cause of his ruin was well-known to all (Tr. 4.10.99), it is not until the 5th century A.D. that we find any discussion of his fate,\(^1\) apart from his own numerous, albeit oblique, references in the exilic poetry. Therefore, what we know of the circumstances surrounding his exile, we know primarily from the poet himself and from his scattered allusions the following points emerge: there were two causes of his downfall, a poem, the notorious *Ars Amatoria*, and an *error*, the exact nature of which is never disclosed: *perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen et error, alterius facti culpa silenda mihi: nam non sum tanti, renovem ut tua vulnera, Caesar, quem nimio plus est indoluisse semel. altera pars superest, qua turpi carmine factus/ arguor obsceni doctor adulterii* (Tr 2.207-12).\(^2\) He does, however, give some tantalizing hints about the fact that it hurt Augustus himself (Tr. 2.209, 2.134, 3.8.39, 5.7.8)., and implies that the *error* was more injurious to

\(^{1}\)The evidence from both Ovid and later writers regarding his banishment is gathered together by John Thibault, *The Mystery of Ovid's Exile* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964), pp. 24-31. The earliest comment is by the writer of the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, c. A.D. 400, who wrote: *Nam poetam Ovidium, qui et Naso, pro eo quod tres libellos amatoriae aris conscripsit, exsilio damnavit*. The Roman poet Statius alludes to Ovid's exile, but not the cause, in his passing comment *Nec tristis in ipsis/Naso Tomis* (Silv. 1.2.254). For the disingenuous theory that Ovid simply invented his banishment as a poetic conceit, see A.D. Fitton Brown, "The Unreality of Ovid's Tomitian Exile", *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 10 (1985) 19-22.

\(^{2}\)For the *Ars* as a cause of disgrace cf. *Ibis* 5, *Tr.* 1.1.67, *Ex P.* 2.10.15; for the *error* cf. *Ex P.* 1.6.21, 2.9.73, *Tr.* 1.2.99, 1.3.37, 3.1.51, 3.5.51, 3.11.33, 4.1.23 etc.
Augustus than the *Ars* was (*Ex P.* 3.3.72). Moreover, he asserts that he broke no law (*Ex P.* 2.9.67ff.), committed no crime (*Ex P.* 1.6.25); more specifically, he was guilty neither of murder, poison or forgery (*Ex P.* 2.9.67ff.), nor of taking up arms nor conspiring against Augustus (*Tr.* 2.51, 3.5.45), nor of careless talk (*Tr.* 3.5.47f.). Rather, his *error* was a fault (*Tr.* 2.109), unpremeditated (*Tr.* 4.4.43f.), which brought him no advantage (*Tr.* 3.6.34). He inadvertently witnessed a crime (*Ex P.* 3.5.49, 2.103f., 3.6.27) and in this was hurt by his timidity (*Tr.* 4.4.39, *Ex P.* 2.2.17) and his stupidity (*Ex P.* 2.2.17), while his words at *Tr.* 4.4.38 - . . . *tanti series* . . . *mali* - suggest that it was something which developed over time. When word of his involvement reached Augustus, he was judged by Augustus himself (*Tr.* 2.131ff.), who punished him with *relegatio*3 to Tomis and banned his poems from the libraries of Rome (*Tr.* 3.1.59-82; 3.14.5-8).

Although numerous theories have been posited concerning Ovid's *error*, nothing definitive can be said. Among the hypotheses which have been advanced are that Ovid was involved in an affair with Augustus' daughter, Julia, or granddaughter, Julia the younger, or even with Livia, Augustus' wife; that he witnessed Augustus performing an immoral act (ranging from pederasty to incest); that he saw Livia naked; that he was involved in a conspiracy centered around Augustus' grandson, Agrippa Postumus; or that he in some way aided the adultery of Julia the younger, who coincidently was banished by Augustus on this charge in the same year that Ovid was sent into exile.4

This last theory is perhaps the most plausible; as Goold remarks, "it is not likely that the two counts on which Ovid was condemned were unrelated . . . if the earlier (i.e. the poem) was the real charge, Augustus would have acted earlier; if it was irrelevant and hence powerless to sustain the *crimen erroris*, Ovid would have contrived

---

3For discussion of the punishment of *relegatio* which allowed Ovid to retain his property and Roman citizenship, see commentary on verses 5-6 *perit* . . . *caput*.

4Fuller discussion of the various theories and their proponents may be found in Thibault, pp. 38-114; see also S.G. Owen *Tristium Liber Secundus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924), 8ff.
to apprise us of the fact."⁵ In the final analysis, we must fall back once again on the words of Ovid himself, and accept that: *scire meos casus siquis desiderat omnes,/ plus, quam quod fieri res sinit, ille petit.* (Tr. 1.5.45f.)

Whatever Augustus' motive in banishing Ovid, he did not seek to prohibit Ovid from corresponding with friends in Rome, as Ovid notes in *Ex P.* 3.6.11f., *non vetat ille sui quemquam meminisse sodalis,/ nec prohibet tibi me scribere teque mihi.* And so, Ovid continued to write; while in Tomis he wrote five books of elegiac Epistles known as the *Tristia,* another four books of epistles known as the *Epistulae ex Ponto,* and the *Ibis,* a poem of violent imprecations directed against an enemy identified only by this pseudonym "Ibis". In so concealing the identity of his foe, Ovid was imitating the Hellenistic poet Callimachus, who likewise had written a vitriolic poem against an enemy, traditionally assumed to have been Apollonius Rhodius,⁶ but masked in the poem by the pseudonym *Iβις* (cf. Ovid *Ibis* 55-62), an Egyptian bird notorious for its eating of refuse, and its habit of purging itself with water from its beak.⁷ Who the Ovidian Ibis was, or whether he was indeed an historical figure, has not been resolved; all that we learn from the poem is that Ibis adds to Ovid's misfortunes by drawing attention to Ovid's name in the forum (*Ibis* 11-14), by not allowing Ovid's wife to mourn for her husband (15-16), by trying to profit at Ovid's expense (20), and by trying to make Ovid's lot in exile even worse (17-18, 21). His actions are all the more base, since he was evidently once on close terms with the poet (19, 39-40, 83). Although Ovid would appear to imply that there is a connection between Ibis' persecution and the offense for


⁶See the commentary on verses 53-54 *inimicum Ibin* for fuller discussion of the alleged quarrel between Callimachus and Apollonius.

⁷For the bird's eating habits, cf. Aelian *NA* 10.29, ἰβις, πολυβορότατον γοῦν ὅν καὶ κακοβορότατον . . . πανταχοῦ δὲ καθείσα . . . τὸ ρόμπος τῶν ρύπαρων καταφρονοῦσα καὶ ἐμβαίνουσα αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ τοῦ καὶ ἐκεῖθε πετρενθείαν, and Strabo 17.823; for its purging itself cf. Pliny *Nat.* 8.97; Plutarch *Is. et Osir.* 381C; Isidorus *Etym.* 12.7.33. A full assemblage of the ancient testimonia concerning the Ibis may be found in La Penna's introduction to the *Ibis* XXXVI-XXXVII. La Penna makes the observation that Callimachus would be well aware of the bird's dirty habits, since he had written a work 'On Birds' (fr.414ff.Pf.).
which he was banished, *qui debuerat subitas extinguer<flammas* (19) suggests that Ibis was not, at any event, responsible for bringing Ovid's offense to Augustus' attention.\(^8\)

The only other clues that we are given to his identity are that he was born in Africa (221f.) and is an habitué of the forum, where he hones his oratorical skills (14,231f.). There are, in addition, a number of poems in the *Tristia* which have thematic and/or verbal links with the *Ibis*, and which are generally believed to refer to the same foe;\(^9\) thus in *Tr.*3.11.19f., written against an unnamed detractor, *et tamen est aliquis, qui vulnera cruda retractet, / solvat et in mores ora diserta meos* recalls *Ibis* 13f., *vulneraque inmitis requiem quaerentia vexat, / iactat et in toto nomina nostra foro*; further the *exempla* of Busiris and Phalaris appear in both poems (*Ibis* 397f., 437f. and *Tr.* 3.11.39ff.), and both conclude with a wish that Ovid's punishment be visited upon his foe (*Ibis* 635f., *Tr.* 3.11.73f.). A similar wish is expressed at the end of *Tr.* 5.8 (35ff.), although here the measure of his enemy's offence is only alluded to in very general terms, with the phrases *casibus insultas* (*Tr.* 5.8.4) and *nostra laetere ruina* (*Tr.* 5.8.33). Very similar to the prologue of the *Ibis* is *Tr.* 4.9, which, in the words of Owen, "looks as if it were an announcement of the near publication of the *Ibis*".\(^10\)

For in this poem Ovid promises that he will not reveal his enemy's identity or his offence, if his foe, in turn, will cease his hostilities (1-6). If he persists, however, Ovid will be compelled to take up the arms of the Muses in his defense (7-12). Although he has the power through his poetry to consign his foe to eternal infamy, he will retreat and allow him one more opportunity to come to terms (25-32).

Interesting though these parallels with the *Ibis* are, they bring us no closer to the identity of the enemy assailed under this pseudonym. Any attempts at

\(^8\) It is, however, tempting to equate Ibis with the enemy Ovid denounces in *Tr.* 2.77ff. for reading offending passages of the *Ars* to Augustus, and thereby adding to the emperor's wrath at the poet: *a! ferus et nobis crudelior omnibus hostis,/ delicias legit qui tibi cumque meas,/ carmina ne nostris quae te venerantia libris/ iudicio possint candidiore legi.*

\(^9\) Cf. especially *Tr.* 1.6.7-16, 3.11, 4.9, 5.8.

identification must be very tenuous indeed, for clues within the poem to either Ibis' identity or to the offence which has provoked Ovid's attack, are, as we have seen, extremely vague. Nonetheless, this has not prevented scholars from proposing various candidates, briefly summarized below.

One of the earliest suggestions was made by an Italian humanist, Caelius Rhodiginus, who, basing his argument on spurious fragments of Caecilius Minutianus Apuleius,\(^1\) asserted that Ibis was Corvinus, whom he identified with Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus, the patron of Tibullus, or his son, Messalinus Aurelius Cotta. However, Ovid's warm words concerning the deceased Corvinus in *Ex P.* 1.7.27ff., and 2.2.97ff., and his request that Messalinus use his influence with Augustus to change Ovid's place of exile (2.2.95ff.) would argue against the association. More popular has been the suggestion of Salvagnius, that 'Ibis' represented C. Julius Hyginus, the Palatine librarian, who was, according to Suetonius, a native either of Alexandria or Spain, and an intimate friend of Ovid's.\(^2\) It is a tempting proposal, since an Alexandrian might be considered 'African' by Romans (although 'Egyptian' is a more likely designation), and it fits the implication that Ibis was once on close terms with Ovid; further, it is under Hyginus' name that we have the *Fabulae*, an abridged handbook of mythology, and thus he would be an apt recipient of the myriad of mythological curses Ovid invokes upon his

\(^1\)Caelius Rhodiginus Antiq. lect. 13.1: *In Caecilii Minutiani Apuleii fragmentis observatum, annis septem in exilio consumptis, functum esse fato Ovidium calendis ianuariis: qua die Titus quoque Livius decesserit: structum item illi a barbaris per multas lacrymas tymbon ante ianuam. Auctor idem Minutianus est, Corvinum ab Ovidio appellatumuisse ibin ex avis foeditate, cui ventrem rostro purgare insitum sit; et hoc ex Callimachi imitattione: pulsam quoque in exilium, quod Augusti incestum vidisset. Although he admits that the fragment in question is a humanistic forgery, L. Braccesi ("Ibis - Corvinus: Divagazioni Ovidiane" *A & R* 19 1974, 151-9) argues that there might nonetheless be merit in the identification of Ibis with Corvinus.

\(^2\)Suetonius *de Gramm.* 20: *C. Iulius Hyginus, Augusti libertus, natione Hispanus (nonnulli Alexandrinum putant et a Caesare puerum Romam adductum Alexandria capta) . . . praefuit Palatinae bibliothecae, nec eo secius plurimos docuit; fuitque familiarissimus Ovidio poetae et Clodio Licinio consulari, historico, qui eum admodum pauperem decessisse tradit et liberalitate sua, quoad vixerit, sustentatum.*
enemy! However, the stress on Ibis as an orator does not seem pertinent to Hyginus, and if Van de Woestyne is correct in suggesting that Hyginus is the intended recipient of *Tr.* 3.14, Hyginus and Ovid would appear to have remained friends. Ellis added three candidates to the list: the orators Cassius Severus and Titus Labienus, because he saw similarities in descriptions of their oratorical practises to the description of Ibis barking out his attacks in the forum, and the astrologer of Tiberius, Thrasyllus, essentially because of Ovid’s designation of Ibis’ birth to Cinyphian (i.e. African) soil. More recently, Janssens has used acrostics in the *Ibis* and *Tr.* 5.11 to affirm that Ibis was C. Ateius Capito, while Le Bourdelles develops the theory of Hermann that the repetition of *fidus* in the poem (cf. 85, 297, 323, 324, 358) is intended as a clue to the identity of Ibis as Ovid’s son-in-law, Cornelius Fidus.

Alternatively, it has been suggested that Ibis is a purely fictional character, whose birth in deepest Africa, on the very anniversary of the Romans’ defeat by the Gauls at Allia, is simply too convenient to be true. Thus Housman sees Ibis as a composite of the characters persecuting the poet in the *Tristia*; the ensuing poem offered him a way of varying the theme of the exilic poetry, often criticized for its monotony, and a means of showing off his learning, but was not intended as a serious piece of invective, directed at a ‘flesh and blood’ enemy. In support of this, Housman notes

---

13Worth noting in this regard is the similarity of the accounts of Ovid (*Ibis* 304) and Hyginus *Fab.* 123 concerning the fate of Neoptolemus; see commentary on 304 for the more traditional accounts of Neoptolemus’ end.


20Housman, "The Ibis of Ovid," 316-17. For Ovid’s recognition that his poems from exile are monotonous, see, for example, *Ex P.* 3.9.1f. and 33ff., 3.7.1-8, 4.15.29ff.
Ovid's assertion in *Ex P.* 4.14.44, generally presumed to post-date the *Ibis,* "*extat adhuc nemo saucius ore meo*," and to this I would add *Tr.* 2.355f., which, although written in justification of the *Ars Amatoria,* nevertheless has bearing on Ovid's poetic process: "*magnaque pars mendax operum est et ficta meorum:/ plus sibi permisit compositore suo.*"

In summary, there is little to be gained from attempting to guess whom Ovid might be assailing under the cover of Ibis; as Watson emphasizes, "Ovid is, proportionately speaking, far less interested in 'Ibis', than in the curses which he pours upon his head." Therefore, let us turn our attention away from the identity of Ibis, and attempt to place the poem more firmly within the context of cursing in the Greco-Roman world.

II. The *Ibis* and traditions of cursing in the Ancient World

Cursing was an integral part of ancient society, playing an important role even in the earliest mythology and heroic legends of the Greeks: the curse of the priest Chryses on Agamemnon and the Greek army begins the action of the *Iliad* (1.37ff.), while in book 9 Phoenix relates how, at his mother's urging, he dallied with his father's mistress, and thereby incurred the wrath of his father, who cursed him with childlessness (453ff.); other instances of cursing in the Homeric poems include that of Althaea on her son Meleager (9.566ff.), and the curse of the Cyclops, Polyphemus, upon Odysseus (*Od.* 9.528ff.). Similarly, curses were a recurring feature of Greek tragedy. Their almost commonplace nature is suggested by the comment of Diogenes the Cynic that he "endured and fulfilled in his own person the curses from tragedy, for he was 'without city, without a home, deprived of his native land, a wandering beggar, having provisions sufficient only for the day'". A well-known example of a tragic curse is that of

---


22 As quoted by Aelian, *Varia Historia* 3.29.
Oedipus upon his son Polyneices (Sophocles, OC 1383ff.), wherein deities of the underworld, including the Erinyes, are invoked to fulfill a father’s angry curses, which this time seek the son’s death, slain by his own brother’s hand:

"oú δ’ ἐρρ’ ἀπότπυστός τε κάπατωρ ἐμοῦ, κακῶν κάκιστη, τάσσει συλλαβῶν ἀράς, ὡς σοι καλούμαι, μήτε γῆς ἐμφυλίον δόρει κρατήσαι μήτε νοστήσαι τοτε τὸ κοίλον Ἀργος, ἀλλὰ αὐγγενεὶ χερὶ θανεῖν κτανεῖν θ’ ὑφ’ οὕτε ἕξελῆλασαι. τοιαῦτ’ ἀρώμαι καὶ καλῶ τὸ Ταρτάρου στυγνὸν πατρίδον ἐρεθος, ὡς σ’ ἀποκύσῃ καλῶ δὲ τάσσει δαίμονας, καλῶ δ’ ἂρη τὸν σφῶν τὸ δεινὸν μίσος ἐμβεβηληκότα. καὶ ταῦτ’ ἀκούσας στείχε, καξάγγελλ’ ἱων καὶ πάσι Καδμείοις τοῖς σαυτοῦ θ’ ἄμα πιστοίσι συμμάχουσιν, οὖνε’ Οἰδίπους τοιαῦτ’ ἐνεμε παιί τοὺς αὐτοῦ γέρα."  

The word which Oedipus uses for "curse" in his solemn denunciation of his son is ἀράι, a word capable of two-fold meaning: ἀραὶ, like the Latin preces and vota, covers a semantic area for which English uses two words, curse and prayer. In fact, in such contexts as the passage cited above, the curse is merely a prayer that something bad happen to someone else, a prayer that some evil, rather than blessing, be bestowed. This concept is well illustrated by Electra’s statement in Aeschylus’ Libation Bearers, 145f., that she is interrupting her prayer for good (τὴν καλῆς ἀράς), by uttering a prayer for evil, or curse (τὴν κακῆν ἀράν), against the murderers of her father.  

In the instances discussed above, the curse is invoked against someone who

---

23For the special potency of a parent’s curse, cf. Plato Leges 931 B-C, Aeschylus Ch. 912, Th. 70.

24For preces used for curses, cf. OLD s.v. 2b, and parallels noted in the commentary on preces at verse 94. For vota so used, cf. OLD s.v. and Seneca Thy 1110-1, vindices aderunt dei, his puniendum vota te tradunt mea.

25Watson, p.4, notes some interesting distinctions made between curses and prayers, including that made by the priestess Theano when asked to curse Alcibiades: she refused, on the grounds that “she had been made a priestess of prayer not of cursing” (ἐνυχής οὖ κατάρασις ἱέρεια γεγονέναι, cited by Plutarch Q. Rom. 275d.)
is perceived as having committed an offence against the existing world order. It is not surprising, therefore, that the curse was early used to uphold the laws of a state. ἀραί and δίκη were complementary concepts, with the curse acting as a means of ensuring that justice was served. Thus Plato speaks of ἡ τοῦ νόμου ἀραί (Leges 871b), and, in like manner, Demosthenes considers ὁ δήμος . . . καὶ ἀραί καὶ νόμοι (20.107) the safeguards of democracy, while the Diræ Teiorum, which cursed both those guilty of actions against the state and magistrates who failed to protect the state by invoking the curse against transgressors, provide fascinating insight into the early application of such legal sanction of curses. Similarly at Rome, we find that the fledgling republic was protected in 509 B.C. by a law which cursed (sacer esto) the life and property of anyone who plotted to make himself king (Livy 2.8). Much later, in 55 B.C., curses were resorted to by the tribune Ateius Capito in a last-ditch effort to protect the state by preventing Crassus from setting off for his command in Syria. Plutarch reports how Ateius

. . . προδραμὼν ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην ἐθηκεν ἐσχαρίδα καιρομένην, καὶ τοῦ Κράσσου γενομένου κατ’ αὐτὴν ἐπιθυμοῦν καὶ κατασφένδων ἀράς ἐπηράτο δεινὰς μὲν αὐτὰς καὶ φρικόδεις, δεινοὺς δὲ τινὰς θεοὺς καὶ ἀλλοκότους ἐπ’ αὐτὰς καλῶν καὶ ὀνομάζων. ταύτας φοβή Ὀμαίοι τὰς ἀράς ἀποθέτοιν καὶ παλαιὰς τοιαύτην ἔχειν δύναμιν ὡς περιφύγειν μηδένα τῶν ἐνσηχεθέντων αὐτάς, κακῶς δὲ πράσσειν καὶ τὸν χρησάμενον, οὔτε ὃν ἔπι τοῖς τυχόντιν αὐτάς οὔδ’ ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἀράσθαι. 29

Crassus disregarded this dire event and continued on his way, but paid the price for his folly, when he and his army were subsequently ambushed and destroyed by the Parthians.

26 Watson, p.21, provides further examples of curses attached to laws, such as οἱ νόμοι οἱ ἐπαρχοί, and ἀραὶ ἐκ τῶν νόμων.

27 See the discussion of E. Ziebarth, "Der Fluch im griechischen Recht", Hermes 30 (1985), 57-70. Also of interest are the very ancient Βουργυγοὶ ἀραὶ, used by the priestly family at Eleusis against those who refused to others the necessities of life, such as fire and water, or denied burial to a corpse, etc., discussed by Watson, p.17.

28 See also the archaic laws preserved in Festus 368 M Numa Pompilius statuit, eum, qui terminum exarasset, et ipsum et boves sacros esse, and 232 M patronus si clienti fraudem faxit, sacer esto.

29 Plutarch, Crassus 16.
We find what appears to be a specifically Roman application of the curse for the welfare of the republic in the rite of *devotio*, a concept exemplified for the Romans by the self-sacrifice of the Decii, father and son, who, on separate occasions devoted themselves and the enemy forces to destruction, when the tide of battle had turned against them. Livy's description of the *devotio* of Publius Decius the elder, when his army was unable to withstand the attack of the Latins, reveals many of the features associated with the ritual, as Decius, with the aid of the *pontifex*, recited the following:

*Iane, Iuppiter, Mars pater, Quirine, Bellona, Lares, Divi Novensiles, Di Indigetes, Divi quorum est potestas nostrorum hostiumque Dique Manes, vos precor, veneror, veniam peto, oroque uti populo Romano Quiritium vim victorian prosperetis, hostesque populi Romani Quiritium terrore, formidime, morteqe adficiatis. Sicut verbis nuncupavi, ita pro republica populi Romani Quiritium, exercitu legionibus auxiliis populi Romani Quiritium, legiones auxiliaque hostium mecum Deis Manibus Tellurique devoveo."

(Livy 8.9)

He then rode into the midst of the enemy forces, *sic ut caelo missus piaculum omnis deorum irae, qui pestem ab suis aversam in hostes ferret*. With the death of Decius, it was believed that the gods had entered into a pact with him, and were in turn obligated to assist in the vanquishing of the foe.

In 295 B.C., Publius Decius the younger is said to have followed his father's example and devoted himself *Telluri ac dis Manibus* during a battle against the Gauls (Livy 10.28). Like his father, he bade the pontifex to lead him in the *devotio* formula, with which he *se legionesque hostium pro exercitu populi Romani Quiritium devoveret*. Both men were consuls, facing certain defeat from enemy forces, who, by their act of self-sacrifice, assured the defeat and destruction of their enemy.

A related rite, which also bore the title of *devotio*, concerned the cursing of an enemy city, its inhabitants, and army, and was usually preceded by an *evocatio* of the city's tutelary deities. The ritual *carmen*, preserved by Macrobius, is as follows:

*Dis pater, Veiovis, Manes, sive quo alio nomine fas est nominare, ut omnes illam urbem Carthaginem exercitumque quem ego me sentio dicere fuga, formidime, terrore compleatis, quique adversum legiones*
exercitumque nostrum arma telaque ferunt, uti vos eum exercitum, eos hostes eosque homines, urbes agrosque eorum, et qui in his locis regionibusque, exercitumque hostium, urbes agrosque eorum quos me sentio dicere, uti vos eae urbes agrosque, capita aetatessque eorum devotas consecratasque habeatis ollis legibus quibus quandoque sunt maxime hostes devoti. Eosque ego vicarios pro me, fide, magistatuque meo, pro populo Romano, exercitibus legionibusque nostris do, devoveo, ut me meamque fidem imperiumque, legiones exercitumque nostrum, qui in his rebus gerundis sunt, bene salvos siritis esse. Si haec ita faxitis ut ego sciam intellegamque, tunc quisque hoc votum faxit, ubi faxit, recte factum esto ovibus artis tribus. Tellus mater, teque Juppiter, obtestor. 30

Like the devotio associated with the Decii, this was a public vow to the gods of the underworld on the country’s behalf, and was similarly intended to cause confusion and destruction among the enemy. Publius Decius had prayed that the enemy be afflicted with terrore, formidine, morteque, and likewise in this carmen devotionis desire is expressed that the enemy be filled with fuga, formidine, terrore. 31

However, in both Greece and Rome, the use of curses was by no means limited to official and public acts on behalf of the state; even when laws and legal institutions were highly developed, the protecting role of the curse did not disappear, but continued to enjoy great popularity in private use by individuals seeking to safeguard their own rights and interests. For many of the poorer members of society in particular, who lacked the resources for other forms of legal remedy, the curse provided a valuable means of ‘self help’. Accordingly, in Greece from the 4th century B.C. on and later also in the Roman world, the practice arose of inscribing lead tablets with curses, and sending them to the gods of the underworld, by burying them in a tomb, or casting them into a

30Macrobius 3.9.

31H. Versnel, "Two Types of Roman Devotio", Mnem. 29 (1976), 408, has made a careful study of the devotio ducis and the carmen devotionis preserved by Macrobius, presents a strong case for the argument that the latter rite was a very ancient one, on to which was grafted the devotio ducis. Thus he suggests that the devotio ducis is a "combination of two rites differing in origin: I. a devotio of the enemy army, and II. a self consecration of the Roman general." Therefore, the devotio ducis, which occurred only in exceptional circumstances, and always in connection with a devotio hostium, was added on to the formula for devoting the enemy to death. Since the desire was to link the fates of the general and enemy forces as closely as possible, he postulates a progression from consecro me, devoveo hostes to consecro me et mecum devoveo hostes, to mecum devoveo hostes.
river, well, or other spot where the deities would be able to find them and assist in carrying out the curse.\textsuperscript{32} The Greeks referred to this type of curse as a Καταδέσως or "binding down", the Romans as a "defixio" or "nailing", represented in their simplest and most literal forms by tablets containing merely the name of the intended victim, perforated by a nail, or rolled up and tied with wire.\textsuperscript{33} Others state the relationship more explicitly, as in the Greek tablet which states "I bind the name and the man himself" (δύομαι καταδόω καὶ αὐτὸν).\textsuperscript{34} Just as in sympathetic acts of magic an image of one's victim is perforated with a nail, or in some other way damaged, in the belief that the image is not merely like, but in some way identical with, the intended victim, so too the performers of these acts of defixio, by puncturing or binding the name of the victim, sought to reproduce that effect on their victim and thereby render him immobile. Moreover, there are some curse tablets which try to reproduce in writing the effects achieved from puncturing an image, by listing the various parts of the body which they wish to be afflicted, as the following example reveals:

Malcio Nicones oculos, dicitos, bracias, uncis, capilo, caput, pedes, femus, venter, natis, umlicus, pectus, mamilas, collus, os, bucas, dentes, labias, mentus, oclus, fronte, supercilia, scaplas, umerum, nervias, ossu, medulas, venter, mentual, crus, quastu, lucru, valetudines, defico in as tabelas.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{32}La Penna notes that lead was not only easy to attain and write on, but its coldness and pallor was suggestive of death, and it was sacred to the maleficent deity Saturn. For the casting of the tablets into graves, wells, etc., see the discussion of W. Sherwood Fox, "An Infernal Postal Service", \textit{Art \& Archaeology} 1 (1914-1915), 205ff.

\textsuperscript{33}See, for example, Audollent tablet 58 and 132, wherein only the victims' names were inscribed, and the tablets were perforated by a nail. Tablet 72 is somewhat more detailed:


\textsuperscript{34}CIA Appendix continens defixionum Tabellas 57.20.

\textsuperscript{35}Audollent, Tablet 135.
In many of the tablets, such as the ones cited above, the magical element is clearly predominant, with no reference being made to the gods at all. Through the *defixio* spell itself, results are expected. In other instances, however, magical and religious elements are mingled together, as magical formulae and rituals are buttressed by an invocation of the underworld deities and spirits to assist in the curse. Thus a long and repetitious curse from Cyprus exclaims in part:

```
. . . 'Ορχίσι'ω ύμα δεμονες πολυάνδρου κε βιοθάνατοι κε ἄωροι κε ἀποροὶ
taφής κατὰ τὴς ρη[σ]ιχθόνης τῆς κατενεκάσης μελιοῦχον τὰ μέλη κε
αὐτὸν μελιοῦχον. [Ἐν]ορχίσι'ω ύμας <ο> κατὰ τοῦ Ἀχαλεμορφωθ
δόστις ἐστίν μόνος ἐπίγι[ς θεός Οὐσος οἰσωροφρίς οὐσατιοὺς ποιήσατε
τὰ ἐγγεγραμ[ένα:] . . . χθόνοι θεοὶ κῇ 'Εκάτη χθονία κῇ 'Ερμῆ
χ[θόνια]ὲ Πλοῦτων κῇ 'Ερμῖνες ὑποθόνου κῇ ύμες οἱ ὤδ κατω κύμ[ενοι
ἄ]νοροι κῇ ἀνόνυμοι Εὐμάξων, παραλάβετε τὰς φωνὰς το 'Αρίστωνος
tοῦ προς ἐμὲ τὸν Σωτηριανὸν τὸν κῇ Λίμβαρον Μασσ[ο]ς· . . . .36
```

and so it continues. Mysterious deities such as Achelomorphoth and magical gibberish such as we find in this tablet were not uncommon. We also find tablets whose authors strove for greater obscurity and mysteriousness by writing Greek words in Latin and vice-versa, mixing Greek and Latin, and even confusing the order of lines and words.37

Another interesting tablet, this time from Carthage, which is in many ways typical of *defixiones*, states the following:

```
. . . [occus]ite exterminate vulnerate Gallicu que [n] peperit Prima in ista
ora in [amin] piteatri corona . . . oblaga Gallicu quen peperit Prima ut neque
ursu neque tauru singulis plagis occida[t n]eque binis plagis occida[et]
neque ternis plagis oc[ci]dat tauru ursu; per nomen dei vivi omnipotentis
ut perficacatis; iam iam cito allidat illu ursus et vulneret illu.38
```

Note the repetitious nature of the curse, the specificity of afflictions to be visited upon the victim, and the stipulation of *when* the punishment is to occur, all of

---

37 Cf., for example, Audollent, Tablets 271, 253, 249 and 82.
38 Audollent, Tablet 247.
which are typical features of the *Tabellae*. In general, four main types of situations wherein *defixiones* were employed may be distinguished: 1) for love purposes, to secure a beloved’s affection or punish him/her for their lack of reciprocal feelings, or to harm a rival lover; 2) against competitors at the Games; 3) against adversaries at law; and 4) against unknown thieves. However, by no means do all *defixiones* fall within these four categories, for much of their appeal lay in their ability to be used for almost any purpose, by all members of society. Thus Tacitus relates that curses and spells were used against the imperial prince Germanicus, who fell ill and died under mysterious circumstances in Syria:

> et reperiebantur solo ac parietibus erutae humanorum corporum reliquiae, carmina et devotiones, et nomen Germanici plumbeis tabulis insculptum, semusti cineres, ac tabe obliti, aliaque malefica, quis creditur animas numinibus infernis sacrari.

(*Ann. 2.63*).

Indeed, Pliny attests to the widespread use of such practices in the Roman world when he claims *defigi quidem diris deprecationibus nemo non metuit.*

Also worthy of consideration among these rites and rituals of cursing are the sepulchral curses against would-be grave violators, which are analogous in many respects to the *Tabellae Defixionum*. As Richmond Lattimore points out in *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, the curses served far more than a purely decorative function; they were designed to preserve the grave and the peace of the dead from intruders. One of the earliest examples occurs in a 7th century epigram from Rhodes,

> Σέρμοι τάς’ Ἰδομενεὺς ποίησα, ἵνα κλέος εἴη.
> Ζεὺ δέ νυν ὅστις πημαίνω, λείδηλη θείη.

Standard formulae tend to recur again and again, the most common of which contain curses directed against the culprit’s family as well as himself, the threat of injury.

---


40 R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, 109 (*J.G. 12.1.737*).
and deprivation on both land and sea. These themes are combined in some particularly exhaustive curses, such as the following example from Chalcis:

\[
\text{προογορεώ} \text{ κατά τοῦ χώρου τόν. ἐπικατάρατος ὡσις μὴ φείδουτο κατά τόνδε τόν χώρου τοῦδε τοῦ ἑργοῦ καὶ τῆς εἰκόνας τῆς εἴδρυμενης, ἀλλὰ ἀτειμάσει ἢ μεταθήσει ὅρονς ἢ βρώσαι μίανας ἢ αἰκάσει ἢ θραύσει ἢ τοῦ μέρος ἢ σύμπαν ἢ εἰς γῆν ἀνατρέψει καὶ κατασκεύάςει καὶ ἀμαυρώσει.}
\]

toútn te ἰθέος πατάξαι ἀπορία καὶ πυρετῷ καὶ ῥέγει καὶ ἐρεθίση καὶ ἀνεμοφθορία καὶ παρτληξία καὶ ἀφαία καὶ ἐκατάσει διανοίας, καὶ εἰς ἀφαίη τὰ κτήματα αὐτοῦ μὴ γῆ βατή μὴ βάλατα πλωτή, μὴ παιδῶν γονῆ. μὴδὲ οἰκος αὐξήτου μηδὲ καρπῶν ἀπολαναί. μὴδὲ οἰκον, μὴ φωτός μὴ χρήσεως μηδὲ κτήσεως. ἐπισκόπους δὲ εἴχω ἸΕρευνάς.

Although in general Roman sepulchral inscriptions tended to be less abusive, and preferred simply to request passersby not to violate the tomb, there is an interesting exception in a curse from Rome written against the deceased’s murderer:

\[
\text{Hoc opto: Moriare malis exemplis cruciatus et ipse,}
\]
\[
\text{ne te nunc liceat quo me privasti lumen videre,}
\]
\[
\text{et tu des poenas quas meruit[i] defensus inique.}
\]

Such a malediction recalls the literary sepulchral epigrams found in the Greek Anthology, which often curse their murderer with a like fate, as in the following example:

\[
\text{Εἰ μὲ νέκων κατέθαπτες ἱδὼν οἰκτίρμον θυμῷ,}
\]
\[
\text{εἴχες ἐν ἐκ μακάρων μισθὸν ἐπ’ ἐνοεῖα.}
\]
\[
\text{νῦν δ’ ἄν δὴ τῷμῷ με κατακρύπτες ὁ φονεύσας,}
\]
\[
\text{τῶν αὐτῶν μετέχους ὧνπερ ἐμοὶ παρέχεις.}
\]

\[
\text{(AP 7.359)}
\]

In the Hellenistic age, the interest in curses exemplified in the \textit{Tabellae Defixionum} and the sepulchral curses was complemented by literary works in which curse poetry, or \textit{ἀραὶ}, developed into a minor genre of its own. Unfortunately, little of it

---

41See examples in Lattimore, 108ff.
42Ibid. 116 (I.G. 12.9.1179).
43Ibid. 120-1.
44Ibid. 125 (C.E. 1948, 5-7)
survives, and thus it is difficult to make firm conclusions regarding its nature. Nevertheless, poets such as Callimachus, Euphorion and Moero contributed to the genre, a characteristic feature of which seems to have been to curse one's enemy by invoking upon him a whole string of unpleasant fates culled from mythology, or to use the myths to point the moral that the culprit would eventually receive his due punishment. In addition to sharing this catalogue format, evidence suggests that the Hellenistic curse poetry was characterized also by an extreme conciseness of allusion, and a concomitant penchant for obscurity. Thus Ovid proposes in the *Ibis* to imitate the *ambages* and *caecae historiae* of Callimachus' poem of the same name, wherein *ambages* would appear to refer to the manner of presentation, and *caecae historiae* to the obscure nature of the stories:

> Nunc quo Battiades inimicum devovet Ibin, 
> hoc ego devoveo teque tuosque modo, 
> utque ille, historiis involvam carmina caecis, 
> non soleam quamvis hoc genus ipse sequi. 
> Illius ambages imitatus in Ibide dicar 
> oblitus moris iudiciique mei.

(*Ibis* 53ff.)

Suidas also comments on the obscurity of the Callimachean *Ibis*, terming it a ποιήμα ἐπιτετηθεμένον εἰς ἀσάφειαν καὶ λαοδορίαν.45

The accumulation of recondite mythological stories which thus appears to have been a prominent feature of Callimachus' curse poem also characterizes the curse poetry of Euphorion of Chalcis, who flourished in the last half of the 3rd century B.C. Again, although we are hampered by the fragmentary remains of his works, three of his poems, 

> 'Αραὶ ἡ ποτηριοκλέπτης, Χιλιάδες and Θραξ seem to fall into the category of maledictory poetry. 
> 'Αραὶ ἡ ποτηριοκλέπτης, as its title suggests, offered a series of curses directed against someone who had stolen a cup, curses which were once again drawn from obscure stories. Thus one fragment of the poem invokes upon the thief the fate given:

---

45See commentary on verses 53ff. for fuller discussion.
We may note here the concise presentation of the stories, and the indirect naming of Theseus as the son of Aethra, two traits which recur in Ovid’s *Ibis*.

In a similar vein, *θραξ*, directed against a guest-murderer, appears to have covered a variety of mythological *exempla*, many of the themes of which also appear in Ovid’s poem, such as ill-fated marriages, incest, shipwreck, and the serving of human flesh to unsuspecting diners; further, a number of the same mythological figures appear as *exempla* in both poems, including Comaetho, the daughters of Pelias, and Tereus. The *χιλιάδες*, which detailed the eventual punishment to be suffered by those who had cheated Euphorion of money, likewise seems to have employed a catalogue form of *exempla* to underscore its point, as Suidas’ summary suggests:

χιλιάδες. ἔχει δ’ ὑπόθεσιν ἐς τοὺς ἀποστερησαντας ἀυτὸν χρήματα & παρέθετο, ὡς δίκην δοῦν κἀν εἰς μακράν. εἶτα συλλέγει διὰ χιλιῶν ἔτων χρησμῶν ἀποτελεσθέντας.⁴⁷

We know even less about the curse poetry of the Byzantine poetess Moero, who wrote in the early third century B.C. Our only evidence appears in Parthenius’ collection of obscure love stories, *Ερωτικὰ παθήματα*, where the heading of Tale 27, which tells the story of the sorry end of the lady Alcinoe after unjustly depriving her

---

⁴⁶See the analysis of Watson, 100-103.

⁴⁷Suidas s.v. Εὐφορίων, χιλιάδες.
spinning woman of wages, states: 'Ιστορεῖ Μοιρῶ ἐν ταῖς Ἀράκεις. Quite possibly, the story of Alcinoe was one in a series of mythological curses, like those of Callimachus and Euphorion.

We come now to the Ovidian Ibis and its relationship to the maledictions previously discussed. Much of the scholarship on the Ibis has focused on the extent to which the poem was influenced by the Tabellae Defixionum, or whether it should more properly be considered a devotio. Carl Zipfel undertook a detailed study of the relationship between defixiones and the Ibis, and concluded that the Ibis did indeed owe much of its inspiration to the defixiones. In coming to this conclusion, he notes that many of the themes found in the Ovidian poem, especially in lines 104-250, find counterparts in the Tabellae Defixionum, and La Penna also cites many parallels from defixiones. The following serve as some of the many correspondences which could be recounted: Ovid’s wish that Ibis suffer deprivation on both land and sea,

Terra tibi fruges, amnis tibi deneget undas,
deneget afflatus ventus et aura suos.
- - - - - - - - - -
nec tibi det tellus nec tibi pontus iter

(Ibis 105-110)

is paralleled by tablets such as number 84 in Audollent, Ζωπυρω μη γη καρπων μη θῦνω μη θαλασσα μονω ουυτω ιγγνα, while the wish that Ibis be an exul is to be equated with the curse οξετε αυτην . . . εκπησησι εκ θαντὸς τόπου και πάσης οἰκιάς, (PSI 1.28, 1.16ff.). Audollent tablets 72, 73, 92 and 193.8 contain curses similar in thought to Ovid’s desire that Ibis wander inops, haunting the threshold of others, while curses such as καταδησατε τα νευρα και τα μελη και την ἐνθύμησαν και των νον και την διάνουμ, find their counterpart in Ovid’s desire that Ibis’ corpus querulo nec mens vacet aegra dolore (113). Moreover, there are tablets which ask that the victim find no

---

48 C. Zipfel, Quatenus Ovidius in Iride Callimachum aliquosque fontes inprimis defixiones secutus sit (Diss. Leipzig, 1910.)

respite, awake or sleeping, from their afflictions,\textsuperscript{50} and others which ask that the victim be an object of hatred to all,\textsuperscript{51} thus corresponding to lines 114 and 116 respectively of the \textit{Ibis}.

Zipfel also notes that parallels can be adduced for nearly all of the gods who are invoked by Ovid to attend his pleas\textsuperscript{52} and suggests that the obscurity and mysteriousness after which many authors of the \textit{defixiones} strove by enveloping their curses in magical gibberish, writing Greek words in Latin and vice-versa, mixing Greek and Latin, and confusing the order of lines and words, is followed by Ovid when he cloaks his curses in \textit{ambages} and \textit{historiae caecae}.\textsuperscript{53} Further, he equates Ovid's role as \textit{sacerdos} (97ff.) with the role played in some \textit{defixiones} by \textit{magi}, who composed the \textit{defixiones} and ensured that the victim was properly dedicated to the gods of the underworld,\textsuperscript{54} and he also stresses Ovid's preoccupation with the \textit{nomen} of Ibis; we have already noted the importance which was attached to stating the name of the victim in the \textit{Tabellae Defixionum}, since knowledge of a person's name was believed to give one power over that person. Therefore, it was of the utmost importance to identify the victim clearly if the curse was to have the desired effect. Consequently, in addition to giving the victim's name or names, many of the tablets also gave the parentage (usually maternal) or marital relationship of the victim, in order to ensure that there might be no case of mistaken identity. Some examples of the most common formulae are: \textit{Κάρδηλος δὲ ἔτεκεν μὴτρο Φωλγεντία, Ἀδενδάτος ὁ νίος Κησκωνίας, Saturninus quem pepercit Aquilia Saturnina, Atta Marii uxor}, etc.\textsuperscript{55} It is within this context of the importance and power of names, Zipfel reasons,\textsuperscript{56} that we must consider Ovid's repeated allusions

\textsuperscript{50}Thus Audollent, Tablet 266; see also 267, 270 and 250.

\textsuperscript{51}Audollent, Tablet 139, also 198, 208.

\textsuperscript{52}Zipfel, 12-14.

\textsuperscript{53}Ibid., 23ff.

\textsuperscript{54}Ibid., 15-16.

\textsuperscript{55}See the excellent indices in Audollent, 440ff.

\textsuperscript{56}Zipfel, 10-12.
to the true *nomen* of Ibis, even though he does not publicly reveal it. For, no fewer than four times within the first one hundred lines, Ovid refers to Ibis' *nomen*, most notably when he exclaims:

\[
\text{Neve minus noceant fictum execrantia nomen} \\
\text{Vota, minus magnos commoveantve deos:} \\
\text{Illum ego devoveo, quem mens intellegit, Ibin,} \\
\text{qui scit se factis has meruisse preces.} \\
\]

(*Ibis* 91-94)

Since Ibis' true identity is masked, the phrase *quem mens intellegit* is of crucial importance, if the curse is to find its mark. Similarly, Zipfel argues that the emphasis placed on Ibis' birth parallels the emphasis in the *defixiones* on the maternal parentage of the victim, as noted above.\(^{57}\) Moreover, Ovid's curses stem from *ira dolorque*, the same motivation which prompted the *defixiones*, and they share the same desire for the destruction of a personal enemy.

However, granted that the *Ibis* has many points of comparison with the *Tabellae Defixionum*, as La Penna and most recently Watson have argued,\(^{58}\) it is neither necessary nor viable to view the *Ibis* solely in the light of a *defixio*. Most significantly, the themes discussed above which the *Ibis* shares with the *defixiones* are common also to other curses, particularly to the sepulchral curses. Thus Ovid's wish that Ibis suffer deprivation on land and sea also has parallels with the earth/sea motif frequently found in sepulchral maledictions, such as:

\[
\text{δς δν σκυλη, μ[η]τε αντω θαλασσα} \\
\text{πλωτη μητε γη βατη.} \\
\]

(*TAM* 2,488)

Furthermore, the desire that Ibis be an exile, reduced to begging, with neither body nor mind free from pain (*Ibis* 113ff.), is reminiscent of the lengthy curse quoted above from Chalcis, with its list of afflictions to be visited upon the transgressor. Just as Ovid

\(^{57}\text{Ibid., 21-2.}\)

\(^{58}\text{La Penna, *Ibis* XX-XXIX, Watson 202ff.}\)
envisioned his curse extending beyond Ibis himself, so that it embraced his children and household as well (*ego devoveo teque tuosque*, 54), so too do the authors of the sepulchral curses, as the following example illustrates:59

\[ \epsilon οται δὲ ἐπικατάρατος ὁ τῶτος, καὶ δωσι ἄρα \]
\[ ἐν τῷ Δευτερονομίῳ ἐσὼν γεγραμμέναι αὐτῷ \]
\[ καὶ τέκνοις καὶ ἐγγόνοις καὶ παντὶ τῷ γένει \]
\[ αὐτοῦ γένοιτο. \]

Finally, Ovid stresses that his foe has merited his curses (*qui scit se factis has meruisse preces*, *Ibis* 94), a formula which recalls that of the young man's curse against his murderer, *tu des poenas quas meruist[i]*. To Ovid, as he reiterates time and again in the works which he composed during his exile, banishment to the remote outpost of Tomis was in fact a living death, and thus there is a certain degree of irony in the similarities which his poem bears to the sepulchral maledictions.

Concerning Zipfel's assertion that the gods invoked by Ovid to aid in the fulfillment of his curses could nearly all be paralleled by gods appealed to in the *defixiones*, La Penna points out that there is a curious lack of reference in Ovid's invocation to the underworld deities, who are typically invoked in the *defixiones*, nor are the central elements of the *defixio*, such as the tablets, nails, or the 'binding' of the victim alluded to in any way in the poem.60 Watson adds that the obscuritY of the *defixiones* is really not comparable to that of the *Ibis*, for "in the first, one finds arcane symbols and deities intended to reinforce the efficacy of the magical utterances, in the second, mythological brain-teasers designed to test the reader's learning and capacity for riddle solving". In terms of style, moreover, there is a great difference between the direct, precise, and repetitious *defixiones*, and the "taut and convoluted style of the Hellenistic 'Ἀπατ'".61

In dismissing the idea that the *defixiones* were the major source of inspiration

---

59Lattimore, 114 (*MAMA* 6, 335).

60La Penna, *Ibis* XXVI.

61Watson, 206.
for the *Ibis*, La Penna posits instead that the poem should be viewed as a *devotio*; in this, he expands upon the earlier comment of Audollent, who wrote of Ovid’s dramatic vision of priest, spectators and victim gathered at the sacrificial altar (97-106): *tibi audire videaris Romanorum imperatorem Karthagini diras minantem*. We are here far-removed from the furtive, nocturnal world of the *defixiones*. Rather, we are onlookers at a public ceremony in which Ovid, in the role of a *sacerdos*, prepares to offer up his sacrificial victim, the unfortunate *Ibis*, to the gods, paralleling the human sacrifice inherent in the rite of *devotio*. Although Ovid does not offer to sacrifice himself with *Ibis*, he does closely link their fate, as did the general who devoted himself along with the enemy forces. In the opening lines of the poem, Ovid exclaims of *Ibis*:

Heu! quanto est nostris dignior ipse malis! (22)

and he brings his long list of desired tortures and destruction to a close with the prayer that *Ibis* might live and die in the desolate frontier that he himself must endure:

Denique Sarmaticas inter Geticasque sagittas  
his precor ut vivas et moriare locis.

(*Ibis* 635-636)

Thus he is in effect asking the gods to make *Ibis* their substitute victim, and to turn the evils intended for himself against *Ibis* instead. Livy records a similar sentiment on the part of the Romans when they were being threatened by the people of Veii:

obsecrationes in templis factae precibusque ab dis petimum ut exitium ab urbis tectis templisque ac moenibus Romanis arcerent Veiosque eum averterent terrorem si sacra renovata rite, si procurata prodigia essent.

(Livy 5.18.12)

In like manner, the devoted general (and the enemy forces) was a substitute offering for the Roman people, *qui pestem ab suis aversam in hostes ferret*. As there was special emphasis placed on the ceremonial clothing worn by the generals who devoted themselves

---

63La Penna, *Ibis* XXVII-XXIX.

64A. Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae*, XL.

in battle, so here the onlookers are clad in black, and Ibis himself is to wear the *ferales vitae* of the *hostia*. Moreover, Ovid warns the spectators *ore fauetis*, to "speak no word inappropriate to the rite in progress"; only *lugubria verba* may be uttered at this ritual of execration and doom.\(^{65}\)

Given the elements suggestive of the rite of *devotio*, and indeed the presence of the verb *devovere* immediately before the sacrificial scene (93), it is difficult to believe that Ovid did not intend his audience to make the association.\(^{66}\) It is thus interesting to note that in the poem's introduction there is a recurring emphasis on military metaphors and images. In line 10, for example, Ovid states that a certain unnamed foe has compelled his unaccustomed hands to take up weapons (*sumere tela*), a theme he returns to in line 39 (*positis, quae sumpsimus, armis*), while in 43 he speaks of undertaking battle (*committam proelia*), in 44 of waging war (*bella gen*) and in 46-8 he develops the image of a soldier's spear seeking the head of a foe.

*Ira dolorque* (*Ibis* 84) at the actions of a former friend purportedly drive Ovid to compose his poem of malediction, but in his indignation he proclaims:

> Haec est, in fastis cui dat gravis Allia nomen,
> quaeque dies Ibin, publica damna tuit.

(*Ibis* 217-18)

He thus implies that Ibis is much more than his own personal enemy: he is a menace to the entire state. For the sake of Rome, not merely for Ovid, this man must be destroyed. By opening his curses in the style of a formal act of *devotio*, therefore, Ovid puts his poem of malediction on a higher plane than simply that of petty revenge; he aligns himself with the pontifices and magistrates of Rome's past, who invoked solemn curses upon deserving foes.

---

\(^{65}\)See commentary on verses 95-104 for further discussion.

\(^{66}\)Ovid uses forms of *devovere* three times in the poem (53, 93, 447), but he never uses *defigere*. 
III. Mythological Exempla and the Ibis

The first 250 lines of the Ibis, climaxing with the dramatic picture of priest, victim and bystanders gathered at the sacrificial altar were praised by Housman as a "masterpiece: Ovid has written no passage of equal length which has equal merit". However, it is generally agreed that this vigour is hardly sustained in the second half of the poem, 251-642, with its obscure, sometimes tedious allusions to the sufferings of historical and mythological figures. In this section, Ovid has gathered together a large number of diverse stories, presented allusively, and in varying degrees of detail and complexities. Through the use of favourite conjunctions such as ut, utque, et and aut, misfortune after misfortune is wished upon Ibis. Some exempla, which occur within a mini-catalogue of like afflictions, receive but half a line, and it is rare for any to be drawn out beyond a couplet. The range of material presented to the reader is remarkable, and even on the odd occasions where characters recur, they invariably return with a different affliction emphasized. Thus, for example, Hercules appears once as a victim of madness sent by Hera (347), and again when he puts on the robe poisoned by Centaur's blood (605). Similarly, Odysseus is presented first as a victim of shipwreck (277) and later the victim of a sting ray at the hands of his son Telegonus (567). This pattern of introducing different elements of stories told earlier is interesting, and may be a deliberate attempt on the poet's part to give an 'aide de mémoire' to the solution of puzzles over which readers may have pondered. Indeed, I find the long catalogue


68 Watson (134) notes the preponderance of et and its cognates as the poem progresses, and the repetition of ut without any linking term thereby furthering the impression of the sheer volume of curses which are to be hurled at Ibis en masse, not as alternatives.

69 Other "doublets" include Adonis killed by a boar (503) and expiating his incestuous origin (565); Astyanax hurled from the Trojan ramparts (496), and witnessing the fall of the city (563); Lycaon serving human flesh to Jupiter (431) and being struck by lightning (473); Macareus having an incestuous affair with his sister (357), and as an exemplum of one bereft of his love (562); Orestes afflicted with madness (348) and dying from a fatal snake bite (527); and Thyestes, having an affair with his daughter (359), and his notorious banquet (429).
difficult to take seriously as a sustained expression of violent anger, and find myself in complete agreement with G.P. Goold, who comments that the poem seems to have been "designed less as an invective to wound the victim, than as a kind of mythological cross word puzzle for solvers to enjoy". This raises the question of how the *Ibis* would have been received by Ovid's readers, and whether they would have had sufficient knowledge of mythology to solve the riddles and complexities of the poem. Clearly, the poem assumes a highly literate audience, which would be capable of solving and appreciating its elaborate word games.

The 2nd and 1st centuries B.C. had witnessed a great interest and immersion in Greek culture on the part of the Romans, and Greek mythology was no exception. Wandering scholars and Greeks captured in wars helped cater to the demand for this learning, and the artwork brought back as spoil in Roman conquests gave visual expression to the myths. It is interesting too that it is during the 1st century B.C. that handbooks of mythology seem to proliferate as aids to those aspiring to the literary culture of the Greeks. But by far the most important source for Roman knowledge of mythology was the educational process, based on careful and thorough study of Homer, Hesiod, the tragic poets, lyric poetry, and comedy under the tutelage of the *grammaticus*. In addition to overseeing students' reading and their committing to memory the texts, the *grammaticus* also had to be prepared to interpret the poems and to explain references made within them to people, places and events. Given the nature of the poetry studied, a very large proportion of the *historiae*, or interpretation of subject matter, was devoted to mythological allusions, including genealogy, epithets and aetiological explanations. Various catechisms have been found, which illustrate the

---


72Quintilian 1.8.5.

73Bonner, 237-8.
attention paid to these details, and the grammarian Quintilian voiced his disapproval of
the extremes in which some teachers of his day indulged:

His accedet enarratio historiarum, diligens quidem illa non tamen usque
ad supervacuum laborem occupata. Nam receptas aut certe claris
auctoribus memoratas exposuisse satis est. Persequi quidem, quid quis
unquam vel contemptissimorum hominum dixerit, aut nimiae miserieae aut
inanis iactantiae est et detinet atque obruit ingenia melius alii vacatura.
. . Ex quo mihi inter virtutes grammatici habebitur aliqua nescire. 75

Although much of the evidence is post-Ovidian, there is little doubt that the educational
process was similar in Ovid's day. Ovid could thus assume that his audience carried a
good deal of mythological knowledge in their heads. It is worth pointing out also that,
for many of his exempla in the Ibis, the difficulty does not lie in the obscurity of the tale
itself - many were very well-known, almost hackneyed subjects 76 - but in the concise,
riddling method of presentation. Thus Orestes and Alcmaeon, stock examples of
matricide and madness, are alluded to only as the father of Tisamenus, and the husband
of Callirhoe respectively (346). Similarly, to identify Hippolytus in verse 575, Ovid
avoids any direct mention of the involvement of Theseus, by terming Hippolytus "the

74See examples in H. Marrou; A History of Education in Antiquity (NY: New York American Library,
1956), 232; narratives also served as a means of reinforcing mythical subjects - see the discussion of S.
Bonner, Education in Ancient Rome, p.260, who notes that many models given by Libanius deal with myths
such as those of Marsyas, Procne and Philomela, Atalanta and the golden apple, Pasiphae and the bull, the
Danaids, and others which figure in the Ibis.

75Quintilian 1.8.18ff. Compare also Seneca 88.6-8: hoc quidem me quaerere uter maior aetate fuerit,
Homerus an Hesiodus, non magis ad rem pertinet quam scire, cum minor Hecuba fuerit quam Helena,
quare tam male tulerit aetatem. Quid? Inquam, annos Patroclii et Achilli inquirere ad rem existimas
pertinere? Quaeris, Ulixes ubi erraverit, potius quam efficias, ne nos semper erremus? . . . Quid inquiris,
an Penelope pudica fuerit, an verba saeculo suo dederit? An Ulixem illum esse, quem videbat, antequam
sciret, suspicata sit?

76For poets decrying the hackneyed themes of myth, see, for example, Vergil Georgics 3.4-6, Tibullus
1.4.63ff., Anth. Gr. 12.2, Martial 10.4.1ff., Juvenal 1., Statius Silvae 5.3.80ff. Among the myths so
categorized, we find many which occur in the Ibis, including Priam by the altar, the woes of Medea and
Niobe, Nisus, Pelops, Busiris, Oedipus, Thyestes, Attis, Telephus, Orestes, the labours of Hercules,
Philomela and Procne, Phaethon and Marsyas.
grandson of Aethra." In some instances, a clue to these elaborate word games is to be found in Ovid's other writings. For example, Ovid uses a form of the patronymic Naupliades at verse 616 as a riddling allusion to Palamedes, who was stoned to death on a false charge by the Greek forces at Troy; this form does not occur in other Latin poets of the time, but is found in Ovid's expanded version of the myth in *Metamorphoses* 13.39, and 310, where the allusion is much clearer, since more details of the story are given, and Palamedes is called by his own name (308) as well as by the patronymic. Granted not all the exempla are as riddling as those discussed above, but the overall emphasis on geographical and genealogical hints, and the very concise allusions to the victims' sufferings are very reminiscent of the quaestiones on trivial or obscure points of learning posed to the grammatici to try to stump them. Suetonius records how Tiberius used to amuse himself by testing the knowledge of scholars with such questions as: "Who was Hecuba's mother; what was the name of Achilles among the maidens; what were the Sirens in the habit of singing?" while Juvenal wraps up his advice to parents on the qualities to be sought for in a teacher by saying:

```
... ut forte rogatus
dum petit aut thermas aut Phoebi balnea, dicat
nutricem Anchisae, nomen patriamque novercae
Anchemoli, dicat quot Acestes vixerit annis,
quot Siculi Phrygibus vini donaverit urnas.
```

Ovid is in a similar way challenging his readers and at the same time showing off his own learning, a feat all the more impressive when it is remembered that he was cut off from the critical audience and books which he deemed necessary for poetic composition. If, however, the Ibis was a game in which Ovid was indulging with his

---

77 In so doing, he goes one better than Euphorion, who had referred to Theseus as Αἰθρῆς ... ποιζ (fr. 9.8 Powell)! Other instances in the Ibis of grandparents' being used as the clue to an individual's identity are found in 305f., 531f., 563f.

78 Suetonius *Tib.* 70.3

79 Juvenal *Sat.* 7.230f.

readers, it was a game which has not appealed greatly to modern sensibilities. Antonio La Penna, whose commentary to the poem has done much to further our understanding of it, nevertheless castigates the poem, and voices the sentiment of many when he claims "del valore poetico dell' Ibis non vale neppure la pena di discutere". 81

IV. The Ibis as an Inverse Genethliakon

There is, I believe, one very significant and novel aspect of Ovid’s poem which has been consistently overlooked, and that is the emphasis which Ovid places on the birthday of Ibis. Ovid ends his programmatic introduction at lines 63f., by expressing the wish that the poem be read to Ibis on the Kalends of January, and on his birthday, *haec tibi natali facito Ianique kalendis/ non mentituro quilibet ore legat*, and he returns again to the theme of Ibis’ birth in a lengthy section preceding the catalogue of literary curses (207-250). Here, in a digression central to our understanding of the poem, Ovid details the dire events surrounding Ibis’ birth: no planets were favourably positioned (207-214), gloomy clouds cast a pall over all (215-216), and an owl screeched from a nearby tree (221-222). Moreover, the day on which Ibis was born was one of the blackest days in the Roman calendar, the *dies Allia* (217-218), the anniversary of the Romans’ catastrophic defeat at the hands of the Gauls in 390 B.C. As for Ibis’ early nurture, he was born on Cinyphian ground from an impure womb (219-220), washed by the Furies with swampy water drawn from the Styx (223-224), anointed with snake’s venom (225), given dog’s milk for sustenance (227-228), and clothed in dusky colored clothing snatched from an accursed pyre (231-232). The only support for his tender head was a rock (233-234), while a smoking torch thrust before his face caused tears to stream from his eyes as a grim prophecy was recorded. With this, we may contrast the birth of Apollo as described in the Homeric *Hymn* in his honour, 3.114ff.: for at the god’s birth, he leapt forth to light, and was received with a cry of gladness. No Furies were

---

81La Penna, *Ibis* LXXIV.
his birth attendants, but rather the Olympian goddesses, who washed him purely and cleanly with sweet water (θεοὶ λῶν ὕδατι καλὰ/ ἀγνὸς καὶ καθαρὸς) and dressed him in a white garment of newly-woven, fine texture, fastened with a gold band (στάρξειν δ’ ἐν φάρει λευκῷ/ λεπτῷ, νηγατέω. περὶ δὲ χρύσου στρόφουν ἥκαιν). Finally, the new-born babe was fed with nectar and ambrosia, and he himself pronounced his glorious future. This has clear similarities with the γενεθλιακὸς λόγος, or birthday speech, among the standard elements of which were: 1) to praise the day on which the subject was born, particularly if it occurred during a holy month or festival etc; 2) to record any divine signs on the land or in the heavens which accompanied the birth; 3) to describe the nurture of the new born babe; and 4) to pray for the person’s future, and for their long life.82

Clearly, it is not simply coincidence that all these elements occur, but in an inverted fashion, in Ovid’s description of Ibis’ birth, nor does it suffice to explain this lengthy section solely as part of the stock themes of invective, although such themes are certainly relevant. I believe that the key may well lie in the poet’s wish that the poem be read to Ibis on his birthday. We send cards and/or a gift to our friends on their birthdays, to let them know that they are in our thoughts, and to express our best wishes; in the Greco-Roman world, it was also customary to give gifts, or, if you were poetically inclined, to send a gift of poetry. Thus there are numerous Greek epigrams in the Palatine Anthology which were sent to a birthday celebrant along with a gift,83 or in place of a gift,84 while the Roman poet Martial (Ep. 10.23) urges everyone to send the

---

82 See especially Menander Rhetor, ΠΕΡΙ ΓΕΝΕΘΛΙΑΚΟΥ, and ΠΕΡΙ ΕΠΙΔΕΙΚΤΙΚΩΝ 371.

83 Examples include AP 6.227, 261, 345; 9.353, 355.

84 Thus AP 6.325, "One sends you, Eupolis, birthday gifts from the hunting net, another from the air, a third from the sea. From me accept a line of my Muse which will survive forever, a token of friendship and learned skill"; 6.329. Also common was the practice of dedicating a book to a friend on his birthday. Examples include Antipater in AP 9.93, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who states in his preface to On Literary Composition: Δώρον τοις εγώ τέκνοις φίλε τυχόν δίδωμι, καθέπερ ἡ παρ’ ὁμήρῳ ψήφῳ ’Ελεος ξενιδώτα τίνι Τηλέλοχοι τρῶτιν ἡμέρων ἐγὼν ταυτήν γενέθλιον, ἀν’ ὅ παραγήγορας ἕως άνδρος ἡλικίας, ἡδίστην γοῖς ομοστότην ἱστότων ἡμοί. Compare also Phrynichus’ comment to Aristokles (Photius cod. 158) that the author of Makrobioi gave the book to Quintillus on his birthday.
best that they have to offer to his friend Restitutus on his birthday and concludes by saying, *si mittat sua quisque, quid poetam/ missurum tibi, Restitute, credis?* Indeed, by the time of Augustus the birthday poem or genethliakon as a poetic theme had become a minor genre, exemplified in works such as Propertius 3.10, Horace *Od.* 4.11, Ovid himself in *Tr.* 3.13 and 5.5, and numerous others. I wonder, therefore, if the *Ibis* is not Ovid's tongue-in-cheek effort at what might be labelled an "inverse genethliakon", that is, instead of a birthday poem expressing the customary good wishes, Ovid sends the opposite, one which wishes countless misfortunes upon Ibis.

An examination of two other poems composed by Ovid during his time at Tomis, *Tr.* 3.13 and 5.5, reveals many characteristic features of the birthday celebration: the donning of fine white clothing (3.13.14, 5.5.7-8), an altar garlanded with chaplets (3.13.15), incense (3.13.16, 5.5.11), wine (5.5.12), birthday cakes (3.13.16), and words of good omen (3.13.17, 5.5.5f.). Other elements include the presence of the Genius Natalis (3.13.1ff.), games (cf. *Ex P.* 4.9.115f., Tibullus 1.7.49f.), dances (cf. Propertius 3.10.23), and the wish for a long and happy life for the celebrant (cf. *Tr.* 5.5.19ff. Tibullus 1.7.55ff., and the comment of Fronto *ep. ad Caes.* 3.95 *Scio natali die quoiusque pro eo, quoius is dies natalis est, amicos vota suscipere . . . Igitur iam primum pergami arcem ascendo et Aesculapio supplico, uii valetudinem magistri mei bene temperet vehementerque tueatur . . .*). Interestingly, *Tr.* 3.13 shows Ovid experimenting with the genethliakon genre, for it also can be seen as an inversion of the genre, in that the poet refuses to take part in the customary celebrations in honour of his

---

*Other examples include Tibullus 1.7, 2.2, 4.5, 4.6, Persius 2, Martial 4.1, 7.21, 22, 23, 7.86, 12.60 a & b, 12.67, Statius 2.7. As Helen Bowerman remarks in "The Birthday as a Commonplace of Roman Elegy", *CJ* 12 (1916-1917) p.311, the "poems are as varied as the authors and the circumstances under which they were written, having hardly a common element beyond the mere fact that they are occasional poems." On the genre, see Murgatroyd's introduction to Tibullus 1.7.

*F. Cairns Generic Composition* (Edinburgh) 129f. says of inversion that "every genre has a function, which is often to convey a communication of a certain character . . . inversion takes place when, in an example of a genre, the normal function of the genre is replaced by a diametrically opposite function, while at the same time the generic identity of that example remains clear. This clarity is achieved by the continued presence of some of the primary elements (for example speaker, addressee, and generic situation in normal form), and of at least some altered but recognizable secondary elements".
birthday, since he is forced to spend it in Tomis. He therefore inverts the celebrations by introducing ill-omened counterparts, for example, a funeral pyre garlanded with cypress (3.13.21), a torch to light it with (3.13.22), and the refusal to speak words of good omen (3.13.24). His one apparent concession, to make a birthday wish, is also an inversion, for in asking that his Genius visit him no more in Tomis, he is, in effect, asking for his death (3.13.25ff.).

I believe that Ovid is once again inverting many of these topoi in the Ibis. For the sacrificial ceremony which Ovid performs at lines 95ff., the natal horoscope at 209ff., and the string of curses which he calls down upon Ibis, take on very ironic overtones if considered within the context of the genethliakon, and give the poem new unity. At the sacrifice he describes, onlookers are to be clad in black, the antithesis of the fine white clothing traditionally put on for birthdays, and words and signs of ill-omen are expressly requested: *quisque ades sacris, lugubris dicite verba,/ et fletu madidis Ibin adite genis./ ominibusque malis pedibusque occurrite laevis/ et nigrae vestes corpora vestra tegant.* (99ff.) With this we may contrast Tibullus 2.2, wherein the poet, in celebration of the birthday of Cornutus, also takes on the role of master of ceremonies as he offers sacrifice to the Genius and calls for words of good omen: *dicamus bona verba; venit Natalis ad aras:/ quisque ades, lingua, vir mulierque, fave.*

Tibullus' offerings are the customary ones of wine, incense and honeycake in keeping with the precept that birthdays, as celebrations of life, should have nothing to do with death and thus the sacrifice of animals. At the ceremony at which Ovid officiates, however, the sacrifice is that of a living being, featuring the addressee, Ibis, as the victim! Moreover,

---

87Tibullus 2.2.1f. This was a common ritual at the birthday gathering; cf. Ovid *Tr.* 5.5.5, *lingua favens adsit;* 3.13.18, *concipiamque bonas ore favente preces;* Martial 10.87.2, *linguis omnibus et favete votis;/ natalem colimus, tacete lites;* Statius Silv.2.7.19, *Lucanum canimus, favete linguis.*

88Tibullus 2.2.3-8; cf. Ovid *Tr.* 3.13.13ff., wherein he gives, only to reject, some of the traditional rites performed in honour of the Genius Natalis. For the avoidance of any blood sacrifice, see the comment of Varro, as quoted by Censorinus *De Die Nat.* 2.2: *hic forsitan quis quaerat quid causae sit ut merum fundendum genio, non hostia faciendum putaverit. quod scilicet, ut Varro testatur in eo libro cui titulus est Articus et de numeris, id moris institutique maiores nostri tenuerunt, ut, cum die natali munus annale genio solverent, manum a caede ad sanguine abstinerent, ne die qua ipsi lucam accepissent alii demerent.*
the altar at which the rites are undertaken is called by Ovid a *funeris ara* (102), the same phrase, interestingly enough, which he uses in *Tr*. 3.13.21 to describe his own birthday altar as he deplores the paradox of celebrating a birthday in the desolation of Tomis. Given that the death of Ibis is being sought, it is entirely appropriate that the Genius Natalis does not feature in the poem, while the games which were a common feature of the celebration may find their counterpart here in the literary game of mythological riddles. One final element remains, the wishes for health, happiness and preservation from danger traditionally bestowed upon the celebrant. In place of these customary expressions of best wishes, Ovid calls for every possible form of injury and death to be inflicted upon Ibis. These curses, he concludes, are to be sent to Ibis, lest he feel that Ovid has forgotten him (638). In other words, Ovid, with characteristic audacity and ingenuity, has delighted in combining two incongruous genres, the curse and the birthday poem, into a witty and original whole. 89 He demonstrates thereby, that, although relegated to the farthest outposts of the Empire, a victim of cultural and spiritual isolation, he was still a creative force worthy of recognition.

---

89 For combination of the birthday poem and another genre, cf. Tibullus 1.7, while a sepulchral imprecation from Salamis includes among its curses: "for him may birthdays be a matter for grief" (*SEG* 6 1932 no. 802).
COMMENTARY

The first thirty lines, which form an introduction to the poem, are subdivided into three sections, the first and last of which are each eight lines long, and frame a middle section of fourteen lines; 1-8 focus on the poet, while 9-22 put emphasis on his unnamed enemy, who, the poet feels, is contributing to the hardships that he suffers in exile. The introduction concludes, 23-30, with an encomium of the Emperor Augustus, and a further denunciation of his foe.

1 Tempus . . . peractis: noteworthy is the presence of all five vowels in the opening line (and in the next four lines), an artistry which Ovid frequently displayed, as McKeown notes on Am. 1.1.1. Further examples include the opening verse of the Fasti, Remedia and Metamorphoses. Note also the pronounced sibilation of this opening verse. Ovid was born March 20, 43 B.C. (cf. Tr. 4.10.13; Fast. 3.813), and in the autobiographical sketch given in Tr. 4.10.95f., Ovid states that he was in his fiftieth year when he was exiled (A.D. 8). However, the expression lustris bis iam quinque peractis is somewhat ambiguous, and defies an exact date. The Ibis was certainly written after the poet’s exile in A.D. 8, and before the death of Augustus in A.D. 14, but the precise date of its composition remains problematic. It is generally dated to A.D. 11 on the basis of its presumed relationship with Tr. 4.9 and 1.6, for a fuller discussion of which see La Penna p.viiff. and p.3. For Ovid’s use of similar expressions to calculate age, cf. Tr. 4.8.33, iamque decem lustris omni sine labe peractis, and 4.10.77f., et iam complerat genitor sua fata novemque/ addiderat lustris altera lustra novem.

2 carmen inerme: cf. Propertius 4.6.31f., where he writes of Apollo, non ille attulerat crines in colla solutas/ aut testudineae carmen inerme lyrae. Inermis is the first of many expressions with military overtones used by the poet in this programatic
introduction to, and justification for, his literary attack. For the equation of poetry with weapons of war, compare also Tr. 5.12.52, carminis arma; Horace Ars 79 Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambó, and see further discussion at verses 43ff. of this commentary.

meae: by delaying meae to the end of the line, Ovid makes the adjective strongly emphatic, as is omne by its positioning at the beginning of the line.

3-4 nullaque . . . legi: this couplet continues the sentiment expressed by carmen inerme, that hitherto his poetry has harmed no one. Cf. the very similar thought expressed in Tr. 2.563ff., wherein Ovid, after briefly summarizing his past works, pleads for a mitigation of Augustus' anger, and says: non ego mordaci destrinxí carmine quemquam/ nec meus ullius crimina versus habet./ candidus a salibus suffusís felle refugi:/ nulla venenato littera mixta ioco est./ inter tot populi, tot scriptís, milia nostri,/ quem mea Calliope laeserit, unus ero. Moreover, in Ex P. 4.14.44, Ovid claims exstat adhuc nemo saucius ore meo. Since Ex P. 4.14 is generally assumed to have been written after the Ibis, this statement in the Ex P. has caused scholars considerable difficulty. H. Fraenkel, A Poet between Two Worlds (Berkeley, 1956), p.247, states, "This can be explained in three ways. Either the Ibis was not yet written at that time (which is unlikely); or it was as yet unpublished; or Ovid ignores the existence of the Ibis." Similarly La Penna (p.xii) suggests that the Ibis was never published, and John Thibault, The Mystery of Ovid's Exile (Berkeley, 1964), p.140, adds that since Ovid never reveals the true identity of Ibis, and therefore does not harm him, he may truthfully say nemo saucius ore meo. (This latter interpretation, however, ignores 91f., neve minus noceant fictum exequantia nomen/ vota, or assumes that Ovid's prayers went unanswered and Ibis remained unharmed.) Another explanation would be that Ovid never intended the Ibis to be a serious piece of invective, directed against a real foe, as Housman (Journal of Philol. 35, 1920 p.316) argues. See further the discussion in the Introduction, p.6f.

littera: usually understood as 'a short or minimal piece of writing; a line' (OLD s.v. littera 4a), as in Tr. 2.566, nulla venenato littera mixta ioco est; Cicero Fam. 2.17.6;
however, it could be intended also in its literal sense of a letter of the alphabet, as an ironic exaggeration on Ovid's part.

**Nasonis:** Ovid always refers to himself thus by his *cognomen*, never by his *nomen*, *Ovidius*. Other instances of Ovid's referring to himself by name in the opening lines of his work are noted by McKeown on *Am.* 1.1.1, and include *Am.* 2.1.2, *Ex P.* 1.1.1, and 3.1.3.

**sanguinolenta:** a word well-suited to battles, which provides a striking effect by its delayed position, and its long separation from *nulla*. Its bulkiness and rarity also contribute to the effect.

5-6 **laesere:** *laedere* is commonly used by Ovid in similar contexts; cf. *Tr.* 2.568; 3.7.27, *quia me laesere libelli.*

**libelli:** as McKeown notes on *Am.* 1. Epigram, the poet often used the diminutive as the virtual equivalent of *liber*; cf. *Am.* 2.17.33 *Amores libelli*, but *libri* in *Ars* 3.343. Occasionally it can signify a whole work, as in *Tr.* 1.7.33 of the *Metamorphoses*, and *Tr.* 2.545 referring to the *Ars Amatoria*; sometimes it appears to signify single books of an entire work, as in *Tr.* 1.11.1, 2.549, 3.14.51, 5.1.1, 5.7.59, *Ars* 3.47, or books in a more general sense, as in *Tr.* 2.1, 3.1.71, 3.14.25, 4.1.35, 5.1.65, 5.9.3, 5.14.1, and this seems to be the force of the noun here. Cf. the discussions of *libellus* in S.G. Owen, *Tristium Liber Secundus*, p. 121-2, and A.S.F. Gow, "Diminutives in Augustan Poetry", *CQ* 29 1935, p.150ff. Forms of *libellus* occur three more times in the *Ibis*, at 49, and 637 to denote the Ovidian *Ibis*, and at 447 to refer to Callimachus' *Ibis*.

**artificis . . . Arte sua:** note the careful balance of syllables here, as we have *art-* followed by three syllables at both ends of the line, a type of word play in which Ovid frequently indulged. A similar play on the nouns *artifex* and *ars* occurs in *Tr.* 3.14.5ff., *suscipis exceptis ecquid mea carmina solis/ Artibus, artifici quae nocere suo?,* and *Ars.* 1.656, *artifices arte perire sua*. *Arte* in our passage refers to the *Ars Amatoria* (the line may well be an intentional reminiscence of *Ars* 1.656 *quam necis artifices arte perire sua*), which along with an undisclosed *error* was the apparent
reason for Ovid's banishment to Tomis in A.D. 8. For further citations of the *Ars* as the cause of his disgrace, cf. *Tr.* 1.1.67f., "Inspice" dic "titulum. non sum praeceptor amoris;/ quas meruit, poenas iam dedit illud opus"; *Ex P.* 2.10.15, *Naso parum prudens, artem dum tradit amandi,/ doctrinae pretium triste magister habet.* So too *Ex P.* 3.23-70, and *Tr.* 1.9.58ff. A comprehensive examination of the evidence for, and theories of, Ovid's exile may be found in John Thibault, *The Mystery of Ovid's Exile* (Berkeley, 1964).

**periit . . . caput:** the term *caput* designated a Roman citizen's civil status, which included the rights of *libertas, civitas,* and *familia.* Loss of one or more of these elements of status was called *deminutio capitatis,* which could occur in varying degrees of severity, termed *maxima, media,* and *minima deminutio.* *Maxima deminutio* entailed complete loss of citizenship and of freedom, wherein the offender was condemned to death, or enslaved. *Media deminutio,* on the other hand, entailed loss of citizenship, but not of *libertas.* In this situation, the offender became an outlaw (*aquae et ignis interdictio*), avoiding the penalty of death by relinquishing his civic rights. It was, in effect, civic death. The third form of *deminutio, deminutio minima,* involved merely a change in one's *familia,* through marriage, adoption, or by becoming the head of a new family. Cf. *Inst.* 1.16, *Dig.* 48.22. For concise definitions of the various legal terms, and for additional bibliography, consult Adolf Berger, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law,* Philadelphia, 1953. In actual fact, Ovid did not suffer *deminutio capitatis* when he was banished to Tomis. As he himself makes clear on several occasions in his exilic poetry (eg. *Tr.* 2.128ff., especially 137-8, *quippe relegatus, non exul, dicor in illo/ pravaque fortunae sunt ibi verba meae;* 4.4.5f; 4.9.11ff.; 5.2.57ff.; 5.4.21ff., 5.11.9ff.) the technical term for Ovid's sentence was *relegatio* rather than *exsilium.* *Relegatio* was a less severe form of banishment than *exsilium,* since it allowed one to retain the rights of citizenship and property, although additional penalties could be added to the *relegatio,* including loss of citizenship and/or property, and banishment to a specified place. Cf. *Modestinus* fr.2, *inter eum qui in insulam relegatur et eum qui deportatur, magna est differentia,
ut ait Herennius: primo quia relegatum, bona sequuntur, nisi fuerint sententia adempta, deportatum non sequuntur, nisi palam ei fuerint concessa: ita fit ut relegato mentionem bonorum in sententia non haberi prosit, deportato noceat. In Ovid's case, he retained all of his civic rights and his property, but was required to remain at Tomis; nonetheless, he speaks here as though he were an exul who has lost his civic rights. Similarly in Tr. 1.2.71f. he says, *nee tamen, ut cuncti miserum servare velitis/ quod perit, salvum iam caput esse potest.* Indeed, Ovid frequently uses the word *perire* with regard to his exile, and in the words of B.R. Nagle, *Poetics of Exile* (Brussels, 1980), p.29, "equates his death as a citizen with his death as a poet". See also the discussion of Ovid's exile in Owen, *Tristium Liber Secundus* (Oxford, 1923), p.40ff.

7-8 This couplet provides a transition to the second section of the introduction, dealing with Ovid's foe, Ibis.

*unus*: emphatically disparaging, although this does not become clear until the pentameter is read.

*hoc ipsum*: the phrase has, I believe, both a general reference to the rest of the sentence which it precedes, and to the *unus*, i.e. that anyone should be so persecuting him.

*titulum*: generally understood as 'claim to glory or fame' *OLD* s.v.7 (cf. La Penna ad loc.), but the primary force of *titulus* was 'inscription', particularly with reference to recording one's exploits on tombstones. Consequently, given *perit* (6), and the funeral imagery of 15-16, as well as Ovid's frequent equation of his banishment with death, the funerary aspect of the word is very appropriate. Moreover, in *Tr.* 3.3.71ff., Ovid wrote *quosque legat versus oculo properante viator,/ grandibus in tituli marmore caede notis:/ hic ego qui iaceo tenerorum lusor amorum/ ingenio perit/ Naso poeta meo./ at tibi qui transis ne sit grave quisquis amasti/ dicere Nasonis molliter ossa cubent./ hoc satis in titulo est.* Given the consistent imagery used by Ovid throughout the *Tristia, Ex Ponto* and *Ibis*, he may well have expected his readers to recall *Tr.* 3.3, and to understand the full significance of *titulum* here.
9-10 quisquis is est, nam nomen adhuc utcumque tacebo: Ovid makes a similar claim in the opening line of Tr. 4.9, *si licet et pateris, nomen facinusque tacebo*, and it is generally assumed that the recipient of that elegy is the same as the enemy assailed in this poem under the pseudonym of Ibis. For further remarks on the relationship of the *Ibis* to certain poems of the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*, see the Introduction, p.4. This is the first of several instances in the *Ibis* in which Ovid emphasizes his foe's *nomen*, although he does not reveal it.

cogit *inadsuetas* . . . *manus*: again, emphasis is placed on the novelty of this type of poetry for Ovid, as the second line of this section (9-22) repeats the idea expressed in the second line of the first section (1-8). *Inadsueta* is also found linked with *manus* in *Ars* 1.300, *fertur inadsueta subsecuisse manu*.

cogit: further justification for the poet's literary attack, as he seeks to emphasize that he is attacking not of his own volition, but out of self-defense.

tela: the military imagery is continued. Once again Tr. 4.9 provides a parallel, wherein Ovid threatens a foe by means of his poetry, *Pierides vires et sua tela dabitur* (4.9.16). See also Catullus 116.7-8, *contra nos tela ista tua evitamus amictu*: *at fixus nostris tu dabis supplicium*.

11-12 relegatum: See the commentary above, on 6.

exilio: although, as was pointed out above, Ovid takes pains on several occasions to emphasize that he is not in legal terms an exile, but has been relegated to Tomis, he does nevertheless frequently refer to himself in a general sense as an *exul* (Tr. 1.1.3; 1.2.37,74; 4.1.3; 4.3.49; 5.9.6; 5.11.2; *Ex P*. 1.1.22, 65; 2.6.3), and to his banishment as *exilium* (*Ex P*. 1.3.43; 1.5.4; 2.5.8; 3.1.38; 3.23.39; 3.7.34; 4.4.50). See the discussion of Owen, *Tristium* II, p.44.


13-14 vulneraque: cf. the similar statement in *Tr*. 3.11.63ff., *ergo quicumque es, rescindere crimina noli,/ deque gravi duras vulnere tolle manus;/ utque meae famam*
tenent oblivia culpae,/ facta cicatricem ducere nostra sine.

iactat . . . nomina nostra: in this context, the phrase should be understood in the sense of slandering Ovid’s good name or reputation; it need not imply a professional delator bringing renewed proceedings against Ovid before a court, but simply someone who refuses to let the matter quietly be forgotten.

15-16 perpetuoque . . . viri: in Tr. 1.6.1ff., Ovid commends his wife for repulsing the efforts of an unnamed foe who has tried to take advantage of Ovid’s situation and steal his property. Here, Ovid implies that Ibis, through his scheming, does not allow Ovid’s wife the peace to grieve for her banished husband. Perpetuus is perhaps intended by Ovid to distinguish this marriage from his two previous marriages. For sociatus in the sense of an alliance in marriage, cf. OLD s.v. 1b.

funera: Ovid draws upon a conventional topos in ancient literature, which equated exile with death. Thus Cicero wrote to his brother from exile that he was nothing more than a quandam effigiem spirantis mortui (Q.Fr. 1.3.1), while Leonidas of Tarentum referred to separation from his native land as ἀβιος βιος (AP 7.7.15). Horace cleverly reversed the image in Od. 2.3.27f., when he likened death to an eternal exile; cf. the note of Nisbet & Hubbard on Horace, which cites the Christian expansion of this, whereby exclusion from heaven was likened to exile (cf. Augustine c.Jul. 3.39, Dante Inf. 32.126, Purg. 21.8). Compare also Seneca Epigram 1.7, parce relegatis, hoc est, iam parce sepultis: vivorum cineri sit tua terra levis; Phoen. 94ff. Ovid was very fond of this conceit in his exilic poetry and used it most effectively in Tr. 1.3, wherein his departure from Rome on the eve of his exile was described as follows: quocumque aspiceres, luctus gemitusque sonabant,/ formaque non taciti funeris intus erat./ femina virque meo, pueri quoque funere maerent (21-3).

All the conventional details are present: the hearth fire is out (44); Ovid’s wife mourns her lamented husband with loosened hair (43), while his friends moan and beat their breasts (78); and Ovid’s departure is compared to being borne off for a funeral: egredior, sive illud erat sine funere ferri (89). Similarly, in Tr. 1.8, he bitterly reproaches a friend for not coming to pay his last respects to him, while in
Tr. 3.3.52ff., from his sickbed in Tomis he asks his wife not to mourn his death excessively, but to consider that he died when he left Rome: *cum patriam amisi, tunc me perisse putato:/ et prior et gravior mors fuit illa mihi*. Cf. also Ex P. 1.9.17f., 55f. For a very good discussion of Ovid’s use of this imagery, see B.R. Nagle, *Poetics of Exile* (Brussels, 1980), pp.22-30.

17-18 Cf. the similar lines in *Tr*. 1.6.7f., *tu facis, ut spolium non sim, nec nuder ab illis,/ naufragii tabulas qui petiere mei*. Storms and shipwrecks were a standard literary motif, especially in epic poetry (consult M.P.O. Morford, "Literary Background to Lucan’s Storms" in *The Poet Lucan* (Oxford, 1967), p.20ff.; W.H. Friedrich, "Episches Unwetter", *Festschrift Bruno Snell zum 60. Geburtstag* (Munich, 1956), pp.77-87; I. Herescu, "Un Theme traditionnel de la poesie latine: le naufrage", *Rivista Classica* 4, 1932-3, pp.119-137); Ovid in his poetry written in exile consistently uses the imagery of a shipwreck to refer to his own shattered fortunes. Thus for example, *Tr*. 1.2.1f., 52; 1.5.35ff.; 2.99ff.; 3.4.11ff.; 5.5.17f.; 5.7.34ff.; 5.9.15ff.; 5.12.49ff.; Ex P. 1.2.59ff.; 2.2.30, 126; 2.3.25ff.; 2.6.11ff.; 2.9.9ff.; 3.2.5ff.; 4.4.8. Cf. V. Max. 8.1.12, *inter maximos et gravissimos infamiae fluctus emersit*.

*tabulas*: planks or boards of a ship. Cf. *OLD* s.v. 1b.

*pugnat habere*: for *pugno* plus an infinitive meaning to struggle to do something, cf. *OLD* s.v. 5. Not content with the poet’s life being irrevocably shattered, Ibis would try to wrest away the very planks keeping Ovid afloat.

19-20 *qui debuerat*: the phrase presumably implies that Ibis was once on close terms with Ovid, and could therefore have been expected to work on his behalf to soothe the Emperor’s ire. However, as the following line reveals, Ibis instead took full advantage of Ovid’s predicament. The imagery suggests a fireman or *vigil*, who, instead of putting out the flames and preventing plunderers from taking advantage of the fire (cf. Dig. 1.15.3, *cognoscit praefectus vigilum de incendiariis effractoribus furibus raptoribus receptatoribus*), used the opportunity to plunder for his own benefit. Thus Ibis is portrayed as a robber (*raptor*), in search of booty (*praedam*). However,
raptor and praeda can also be used in the sense of a bird and its prey - a possible play on the Ibis? Cf. Ovid Met. 6.518, nulla fuga est capto, spectat sua praemia raptor, of Jupiter in the form of an eagle; Bömer notes adloc. that praemia equals praedam. Compare also Tr. 1.6.11ff., aut ut edax vultur corpus circumspicit ecquod/ sub nulla positum cernere possit humo,/ sic mea nescio quis, rebus male fidus acerbis/ in bona venturus, si paterere, fuit.

21-22 alimenta: used in the plural to mean sustenance or means of livelihood (OLD s.v. 2). Cf. Fast. 5.473.

quanto est . . . dignior ipse: here, as in 635-6, Ovid wishes that the evils intended for himself might be turned instead against his enemy Ibis. Further examples of such prayers in antiquity can be found in Livy 5.18.12; Horace Od. 1.21.13ff.; Catullus 63.91ff.; Vergil Georg. 3.513; Prop. 3.8.20; Ovid Her. 16.219; and Fast. 3.494.

23-30 The third section of the introduction, a panegyric of the Emperor Augustus, contrasts sharply with the base actions of Ibis.

23 di melius: there has been some question as to whether the verb ellipsed in this proverbial formulaic expression should be faciant or fecerunt; in either instance, the reference most obviously is to verse 21. Ellis and La Penna both opt for fecerunt, i.e. 'the gods willed better' and cite in their support Valerius Maximus 6.1.ext.3, di melius quod hunc animum viris earum in acie non dederunt, and Seneca, Ep. 98.5. However, in my opinion, the present subjunctive is entirely appropriate, i.e. 'may Ibis not succeed', as the present tense of nititur in 21 shows that the threat from Ibis was not yet over, and parallels for an implicit optative subjunctive can be found elsewhere in Ovid (cf. e.g. Her. 3.125, Am. 2.7.19, Ars 2.399, Met. 9.496 etc.).

ille: Augustus. At the conclusion of Met. 14.858, Ovid likened Augustus to Jupiter, and he continued to equate the two in his exilic poetry. Compare Tr. 2.54, where Augustus is a praesentem conspicuumque deum; 1.5.77ff.; 2.141f.; 3.11.61f.; 5.2.45; and Ex P. 4.8.55ff., wherein Ovid asserts that his poetry played a role in the deification of Augustus.

24 qui: for qui in a causal sense, but still retaining an indicative verb, see E.C.
Woodcock, *A New Latin Syntax* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), p.119, "... the subjunctive becomes more and more frequent, until, by Cicero's time, it is the rule. Nevertheless the indicative remained possible whenever it was desired to emphasize the fact, rather than the causal connexion." Thus Plautus *Men.* 309, *insanit hic quidem, qui ipse male dicit sibi*, Cicero *Sen.* 46, *habeo senectuti gratiam, quae mihi sermonis aviditatem auxit, potionis et cibi sustulit*.

**Inopes noluit esse vias:** in contrast to his denunciation of Ibis' attempts to deprive him of *alimenta*, Ovid lauds Augustus' generosity in not depriving him of his *opes*. Cf. *Tr.* 2.129f.; 4.4.46; 4.5.8; 5.2.57; 5.11.15; *Ex P.* 1.7.47; 4.5.37ff. For the poet's retention of his civic rights, see the discussion above on verse 11, and cf. *Tr.* 4.9.11; 5.11.15.

**26 tam mansueto pectore:** Ovid never lost hope that Augustus would relent, and recall the poet, or at least change his place of *relegatio*, and thus Augustus' clemency is frequently lauded. As H. Evans, *Publica Carmina* (North Carolina, 1973), p.23, rightly notes, "by repeatedly emphasizing his unhappiness, with constant references to Augustus' *clementia*, Ovid in effect challenges the Emperor to demonstrate his *clementia*. If Augustus is to be celebrated for his mercy, he should prove it to Ovid's readers now and in the future by pardoning the poet." For further instances of Ovid's emphasis on Augustus' clemency, cf. *Tr.* 1.2.61; 2.41ff., 125ff., 147; 4.4.53; 5.2.35ff.; 5.4.19ff.; 5.8.26ff.; 5.11.15ff.; *Ex P.* 1.2.59; 2.2.115ff.; 3.6.7f. Augustus himself was very proud of his reputation for clemency, stating in his *Res Gestae* 3, *bella terra et mari civilia externaque toto in orbe terrarum saepe gessi, victorque omnibus veniam petentibus civibus peperci. Externas gentes, quibus tuto ignosci potuit, conservare quam excidere malui*. See also 34.2 where he describes the golden shield given to him by the Senate and Roman people *virtutis clementiaeque et iustitiae et pietatis causa*. Compare Suetonius *Aug.* 51; Horace *Saec.* 51, and Propertius 2.16.41ff. For a less favourable view, see Seneca's appraisal in *Cl.* 1.11.2, *clementiam non voco lassam crudelitatem*. *Mansueto* contrasts effectively with the description of Ibis as *inmitis*.
27 *audiet hoc Pontus*: in an example of pathetic fallacy, the land of Pontus, rather than its inhabitants, will hear Ovid's expressions of gratitude to Augustus. MS G, supported by Housman (Journal of Philol. 35, 1920 p.305), preserves an alternate reading, *audiat*, but as La Penna notes *ad loc.* the presence of *faciet* in the same line lends support to *audiet*.

*faciet . . . forsitan*: for the use of *forsitan* with the future indicative, cf. *Tr.* 1.1.35 (forsan); 3.1.75; 3.8.20; *Ex P.* 1.1.78, and the note of Owen *Tristia* II 20.

28 *terra . . . propior*: Ovid complained often of the remoteness of Tomis. Cf. the similar pleas for a change of locale to one nearer to Rome in *Tr.* 2.185f., *mitius exilium si das propriusque rogant/ pars erit ex poena magna levata mea*; 4.4.51, *mitius exilium pauloque propinquius opto*; *Ex P.* 1.2.128, *ut propior patriae sit fuga nostra roga*; 1.8.73f., *terra velim propior . . . / detur*; 3.9.3, *nil nisi me terra fruar ut propiore rogare*; 4.8.85f., *ut ponar in ullo,/ qui minus Ausonia distet ab urbe, loco.*

*sit . . . testificanda mihi*: i.e. if his request for a change in locale from the Pontus is granted, a nearer land must then be the witness of his thanks to the Emperor. Cf. *Ex P.* 4.9.97f., *hoc facit ut misero faveant . . . Tomitae:/ haec quoniam tellus testificanda mihi est.* For geographical entities being invoked as witnesses in Latin poetry, compare Catullus 64.357 (with Fordyce's note), *testis erit magnis virtutibus unda Scamandri*; Horace *Od.* 4.4.37, *quid debeas, O Roma, Neronibus,/ testis Metaurum flumen*; Tibullus 1.7.11 (with Murgatroyd's note), *testis Arar Rhodanusque celer magnusque Garunna*; and *Ex P.* 4.9.114, *officii testis Pontica terra mihi.*

29 *calcasti qui me . . . iacentem*: *calcare* presents a vivid image of bodies trampled under foot in battle; cf. the similar reproaches against unfaithful friends in *Tr.* 1.8.15f., *illud amicitiae sanctum et venerabile nomen/ re tibi pro vili sub pedibusque iacet?*; 5.8.10, *inposito calcas quid mea fata pede?*; 2.571; *Ex P.* 4.3.27.

30 Ovid concludes the introduction by returning his attention to Ibis, and reiterating his treachery.

*quod licet et misero*: an example of hyperbaton. *Et* is best rendered here as 'even'.

31-40 A series of adunata, or impossible conditions, are introduced, which Ovid says will come true sooner than the hostility between himself and his foe come to an end. Adunata tended to be of a proverbial character, and most frequently focused on reversal of the laws of nature, and unnatural union (see Nisbet & Hubbard on Horace *Od.* 1.29.10 for examples). H.V. Canter, "The figure ΔΥΝΑΤΟΝ in Greek and Latin Poetry" *AJPh* 51 (1930), p.40, notes that Ovid was particularly fond of this device, and that more examples of it survive in his poetry (37 in all), than in that of any other Greek or Latin poet. The adunaton figures most prominently in Ovid's exilic poems, an analysis of which has persuaded M.H.T. Davison (*Omnia naturae praepostera legibus ibunt.* 'Αδύνατα in Ovid's Exile Poems" *CJ* 58 1981/2, pp.124ff.) that it was not simply lack of new subject matter which caused Ovid to use this device so often, but that the adunaton played an important role in effecting a reconsideration of what constitutes an impossibility, and with particular regard to Ovid's own situation, emphasized the "unprecedented nature of his sufferings." Further discussion of the adunaton can be found in G.O. Rowe, "The Adunaton as a Stylistic Device" *AJPh* 86 (1965), 387-396, and Ernest Dutoit, *L' Adynaton dans la Poésie latine* (Paris, 1936).

31 desinet . . . contrarius ignibus umor: similarly in *Tr.* 1.8., Ovid envisioned a complete reversal of the laws of nature because of the base actions of a friend, and among the series of impossibilities given there we find, *unda dabit flammas, et dabit ignis aquas* (1.8.4). See too Cicero *Phil.* 13.49, "prius undis flamma" ut ait poeta nescio quis, prius denique omnia quam aut Antonii res publica aut cum re publica Antonii redeat in gratiam; and Augustus in Cassius Dio 55.13.1, θάσον τῷ ὄσατε μικρόσεσθαι ἦ . . . For the proverbial opposition of fire and water in the context of friendship, see, for example, Theognis 2.1245f., οὗ ποθ' ὄσατο καὶ τῷ συμμείζεσται, οὔδέ ποθ' ἡμεῖς/ πιστοὶ ἐπ' ἀλλήλως καὶ φίλοι ἔσσόμεθαι; Seneca *Thy.* 480. See further Otto, s.v. *aqua*, Luck on *Tr.* 1.8.4.
32 cum luna lumina solis: Ellis cites Herodotus 8.143, νῦν τε ἀπάγγελλε τῷ Μαρτινῷ ὡς 'Ἀθηναῖοι λέγουσι, ἔστ' ἐν ὦ ἡλιός τὴν αὐτὴν ὀδὸν ἤ τῇ περ καὶ νῦν ἔρχεται, μέποτε ὁμολογήσων ἡμέας Ἰέρεμί, and Dutoit (L'adynaton dans la Poésie Latine, p.111) adds I.G.4,1372, ὃσον ἕπ' ἀέλιος τε μέγας μάνα δὲ τ' ἀμβέβησει αἰνετον Ἑλλάνων ἀγγελεό πρῶταν. Closer parallels might be found in Senecan tragedy: cf. the adunaton spoken by Thyestes concerning his brother's regard for him, (prius) lucem dabit/ nox atra terris (Seneca Thy. 479f.); Med. 757f., . . . mundus lege confusa aetheris/ et solem et astra vidit; Ag. 34ff.

33-34 The series of unnatural phenomena continues with opposing winds coming from the same parts of the heavens. Thus Zephyrus, a west wind, and Eurus, an east wind, will arise from the same origin (pars eadem caeli), and Notus, a south wind, will come from the cold North pole.

tepidus: 'warm', an apt epithet for a mild wind first so used in Catullus 64.282 (see the note of Fordyce ad loc.); cf. Am. 1.4.12, nec Euris da mea nec tepidis verba ferenda Notis. Note the juxtaposition of antonyms with tepidus gelido. Winds also figure in an adunaton in Ex P. 4.12.35ff., (prius) et tepidus Boreas et sit praefrigidus Auster,/ et possit fatum mollius esse meum,/ quam tua sint lapso praecordia dura sodali.

axe: the North Pole. Cf. OLD s.v. axis 4. Although Ovid does not make specific mention of it here, these fraternal winds were conventional rivals (cf. Homer Od. 5.331f.; Met.1.61f. with Bömer's note, Nisbet & Hubbard on Horace Od. 1.3.13 etc.), and thus they provide a subtle link to another instance of brotherly discord, that of the sons of Oedipus, Polyneices and Eteocles.

35-36 fraterno . . . fumo: the enmity of Polyneices and Eteocles, who slew each other in battle at Thebes, was so great that it persisted even in death, as the flames of their joint funeral pyre divided, and thereby symbolized their eternal hatred. This tradition of the divided flame was attributed to Callimachus by Ovid in Tr. 5.5.33ff.: consilio commune sacrum cum fiat in ara/ fratribus, alterna qui periere manu,/ ipsa sibi discors, tamquam mandetur ab illis,/ scinditur in partes atra favilla duas./ hoc
memini, quondam fieri non posse loquebar, et me Battides iudice falsus erat: omnia nunc credo...


See also the note of Luck on Tr. 5.5.33, Pfeiffer on Aet. 4.fr.105.

37 et ver autumno: for a similar confusion of the seasons, compare Propertius 1.15.29ff., nulla prius.../ annus et inversus duxerit ante vices; Ovid Ex P. 2.4.25ff., longa dies citius brumali sidere, noxque/ tardior hiberna solstitialis erit/... quam tibi nostrarum veniant oblivia rerum; Tibullus 1.2.50, (with Murgatroyd’s note) aestivo convocat orbe nives; Seneca Med. 759ff.,... temporum flexi vices/ aestiva tellus floruit cantu meo,/ coacta messem vidit hibernam Ceres.

38 eadem regio: a continuation of the idea expressed at verse 32 concludes this series of adunata. Cf. Seneca Thy. 786ff., tenebrisque facinus obruat taetrum novis,/ nox missa ab ortu tempore alieno gravis,/ tamen videndum est....

39-40 Military imagery is revived with armis (cf. 10, 43ff.).

gratia: ‘friendship’ or ‘goodwill’; cf. Ovid Met. 1.145 (with Bömer’s note); Seneca Thy. 1024, hoc foedus? haec est gratia, haec fratris fides?

41-42 An unnatural accord between wolves and livestock was a stock theme in adunata; cf. Horace Od. 1.33.7 (with the note of Nisbet & Hubbard), Epod. 15.7ff., Vergil Ecl. 8.52, Dirae 4. Here, however, Ovid does not use an adunaton, but varies the image by comparing the relationship between Ibis and himself to the ‘peace’ which exists between wolf and flocks, a conceit which can be found as early as Homer Il. 22.262ff., ὡς οὐκ ἔστι λέοντα καὶ ἀνδράσιν ὅρκα πιστά,/ οὐδὲ λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες ὄμοφρονα θυμὸν ἔχουσιν,/ ἀλλὰ κακὰ φρονέουσι διαμπερές ἅλληλοισιν,/ ὡς οὐκ ἔστι ἐμὲ καὶ σὲ φιλήμεναι... Compare also the similar sentiment expressed by Horace in Epod. 4.1f., lupus et agnis quanta sortito obtigit/ tecum mihi discordia est. After this couplet, Housman (Journal of Philol. 35, 1920), is inclined to transpose verses 133-138, a series of expressions of perpetuity. Thus the text would read: (41) pax erit haec nobis, donec mihi vita manebit,/ (42) cum pecore inermo quae solet esse lupis./ (133) pugnabunt arcu dum Thraces, Iazyges hasta,/ (134) dum tepidus Ganges,
frigidus Hister erit,/ (135) robora dum montes, dum mollia pabula campi,/ (136) dum Tiberis liquidas Tuscus habebit aquas,/ (137) tecum bella geram; nec mors mihi finiet iras,/ (138) saeva sed in Manis Manibus arma dabit./ (43) pr"{a}ima quidem coepto committam proelia versu,/ (447) non soleant quamvis hoc pede bella geri./ Such a transposition has much to recommend it; in their new location, these verses have a close correspondence with the verses immediately preceding and following them, as donec mihi vita manebit (41) is balanced by nec mors mihi finiet iras (137), and bella geri (46) by bella geram (138). Moreover, the expressions of perpetuity provide an effective contrast with the adunata of 31ff., while their removal from their location after 132 allows a closer correspondence between odium at 132 and oderit at 140, and provides a natural progression in thought from the intensity of Ovid's hatred during his lifetime to the continuation of his hatred when he is a shade in the underworld. Perhaps the chief argument in favour of this transposition is its removal of an inconsistency first noted by Karl Schenkl in 1883, "v.142 (138) saeva sed in Manis Manibus arma dabo ist in manis auff"{a}llig; denn dies setzt voraus, dass der Gegner des Ovid auch als bereits gestorben gedacht wird, was aber nach den folgenden Versen nicht anzunehmen ist" (Zeitschr. fur d.oest. Gymn. 1883, p.264). The logical implication of in Manis Manibus is that, when both Ibis and Ovid are dead, the battle will go on, yet in 139ff. the phraseology used suggests that while Ovid remains a shade, Ibis is very much alive, for Ovid portrays himself as a shade returning to haunt Ibis, with phrases that only make sense when understood as a shade haunting a living man, in particular 151ff., where Ovid vows to burst forth from the Stygian realm, and haunt Ibis day and night. However, with 133-138 removed, events fall neatly into place: Ovid declares the intensity of his hatred during his lifetime (129-132), vows to continue hating him even when he, Ovid, is but a shade (139-157), tells of Ibis' death and funerary rites, or lack thereof (159-170), and foretells the fate of Ibis in the underworld (171-194). In their new location, 133-138 continue the theme of combat, while the emphatic pr"{a}ima of 43 serves to recall Ovid to the present from his musing over his continued hatred in death. Furthermore, there is considerable confusion in
the manuscript tradition in this section of the poem, which perhaps lends support to Housman. For, after 40, the majority of the manuscripts insert 131-2, *quam dolor hic umquam spatio evanescere possit/ leniat aut odium tempus et hora meum* (thus HTX before 43, and before 133; by F before 133 and before 39; by V only before 43; and by GP only before 133). Although the couplet's proper location is no doubt after 133, it is noteworthy that it immediately precedes the passage in question and shows that there was scribal uncertainty and dislocation. Overall, I think that Housman's proposed transposition enhances the poem and should be accepted.

43-52 Ten lines in which imagery with military overtones is heavily emphasized, with *committam proelia* (43), *bella geri* (44), *militis hasta* (46), *ferro...acuto* (47), *hasta* (48), and *tela* (52), as Ovid outlines his preliminary attack. Cato the elder provides the first extant example in Latin of the imagery of warfare transferred to the pen (*ORF* 19.3): *Antiochus epistulis bellum gerit, calamo et atramento militat.* Further instances of this conceit are collected by A.D. Booth, in "The Savage Style" *EMC* 23 (1979), 36-7.

43 prima: Ovid's 'opening tactic' in the upcoming battle (and contrasting with *postmodo* in 51), not, as Martini thinks (*Philol. Wochenschrift* 25 1932, p.1104), an assertion by Ovid that he is the first to use elegiac metre for invective. As an example of earlier elegiac invective, we might note the abusive banter at feasts, attested to in *Theognidea* 453.6. See also commentary on verse 44, below.

coepto...versu: i.e. elegiac, which Ovid used not only for the *Ibis*, but for all his extant works except for the *Metamorphoses*. Cf. the note on *hoc pede* below.

44 hoc pede: although the elegiac metre could encompass a wide variety of uses - from sympotic songs to epitaphs and laments, to military and historical pieces, epigrams, and poems of love - iambics, hendecasyllables, and hexameters were the metres more commonly used when writing invective. Thus Archilochus and Hipponax wrote scathing vitrioles in the iambic metre, Catullus used hendecasyllables for several of his abusive poems, while Euphorion and the author of the *Dirae* wrote their *apoloi* in hexameters. The metre of Callimachus' *Ibis* has been the subject of much debate (see
below, commentary on verse 54), but according to the Patavian scholia, it was written in iambics. For Ovidian comments on suiting subject matter to metre, cf. e.g., Am. 1.1.2 (with McKeown’s note), 1.1.19, 3.1.42, Rem. 381ff., Fast. 2. 119ff., Tr. 2.331ff., 5.1.5f., Ex P. 3.4.85f.

45-48 A metaphor drawn from the training of professional soldiers and fighters is fitting for one about to embark upon a battle of words. Just as fighters must practise their skills for battle, so Ovid envisions this first literary attack as a preliminary warm-up; afterwards if there is still need, a sharp weapon (i.e. pointed iambics) will be cast without mercy at the head of his foe. Ellis, following Salvagnius, aptly cited the comments of Cicero concerning speech-making, in Orat. 2.78: in quo admirari soleo non equidem istos qui nullam huic rei operam dederunt, sed hominem in primis disertum atque eruditum, Philippum, qui ita solet surgere ad dicendum ut quod primum verbum habiturus sit nesciat; et ait idem, cum brachium concalefecerit, tum se solere pugnare, neque attentit eos ipfos unde hoc simile ducat primas illas hastas ita iactare leniter ut et venustati vel maxime serviant et reliquis viribus suis consulant. Neque est dubium quin exordium dicendi vehemens et pugnax non saepé esse debeat, sed si in ipso illo gladiatorio vitae certamine quo ferro decernitur tamen ante congressum multa fiunt quae non ad vulnus sed ad speciem valere videantur, quanto hoc magis in oratione est spectandum . . .


49 neque nomen . . . nec dicam facta: Ovid keeps his word, and as a result we learn very little about Ibis from this poem. The precise nature of his offence against Ovid is never specified, but is concealed in generalities; although Ovid makes repeated allusions to the true nomen of Ibis (cf. 9, 59f., 91, 641), he refrains from revealing it.

50 brevi: ‘for a short time’; cf. OLD s.v.6. Ironically, Ovid will permit his foe the obscurity which he earlier (cf. 11ff.) accused Ibis of not granting him.

qui sis: the nominative masculine singular form of qui for the interrogative pronoun quis is not uncommon. See, for example, Plautus Am. 844, delanitus sum . . . ita ut
me qui sim nesquiam; Hyginus Fab. 164.1, cum esset certatio qui primus oppidum in terra Attica conderet . . .; Plautus Capt. 833; Terence Ph. 990 etc.
dissimulare: cf. Tr. 4.9.33, dum licet huic nomen dissimulare suum.

51 postmodo: similarly used in a threat in Catullus 30.11f., Si tu oblitus es, at di meminerunt, meminit Fides/ quae te ut paeniteat postmodo facti faciet tui; Horace Od. 1.28.31.

liber: ‘unrestrained’, ‘outspoken’, (OLD s.v. llc), as in Rem. 377, liber in adversos hostes stringatur iambus, but possibly with the additional implication of freedom from some of the restraint imposed by the elegiac metre (thus Persius 1.13, scribimus inclusi, numeros ille, hic pede liber).

iambus: The word ιαμμος was first used by the poet Archilochus (c.700 B.C.), referring to his satirical invective, and it was he who was primarily responsible for developing the iambic metre into a vehicle for personal abuse and vituperation. According to Aristotle (Poetics 4.1449a26) it was the similarity of the metre to ordinary speech which facilitated its development in this regard. For discussion of the ιαμμος and invective, consult M.L. West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus (Berlin and New York, 1974), p.22, 37f.; C. Miralles and J. Portulas, Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry (Rome, 1983).

52 Lycambeo sanguine: according to literary tradition (cf. M.L. West, Iambi et Elegi Graeci, (Oxford 1971-2) pp. 15 and 63f. for the testimonia) Lycambe was a Theban who promised his daughter Neobule in marriage to the poet Archilochus, but later changed his mind and refused to give her up. Thereupon Archilochus is said to have launched such a bitter attack upon him in his poetry that Lycambe and his daughter hanged themselves. Although little survives of Archilochus’ poetry which affirms his reputation for bitter invective, his vitriolic attack on Lycambe was a commonplace of ancient literary criticism. Cf. Horace Epod. 6.11ff., cave, cave: namque in malos asperrimus/ parata tollo cornua,/ qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener . . . , with scholia ad loc.; Epist. 1.19.23ff., . . . Parios ego primus iambos/ ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus/ Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben/ . . .
temperat Archilochi Musam pede mascula Sappho/ temperat Alcaeus, sed rebus et ordine dispar/ nec socerum quaerit, quem versibus oblinat atris,/ nec sponsae laqueum famoso carmine nectit; AP 7.69ff. Clearly iambics, Archilochus, and Lycambes were closely associated in ancient thought, and were considered a very dangerous combination.

53-60 These eight programmatic lines are vital to our understanding of the poem and its relationship to the Ibis of Callimachus. Up to this point, the poem has not been very different from poems in the Tristia and Ex Ponto; these lines thus represent a major transition in the poem from the introduction to the rest of the poem and make clear Ovid's literary debt to Callimachus.

53 nunc: contrasting with postmodo above.

Battiades: the Hellenistic poet Callimachus (c. 310-240 B.C.), whose father was Battus (Suidas). The patronymic also had associations with the founder of Callimachus' native city of Cyrene, King Battus, from whom Callimachus traced his descent (cf. Strabo 17.3.21, λέγεται δ' ἡ Κυρήνη κτίσμα Βάττου. πρόγονον δὲ τούτον ἐαυτοῦ φάσκει Καλλίμαχος; Herodot. 4.155ff.). In Epigram 35, Callimachus uses the patronymic of himself: Βαττιάδεω παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις τόδος εὗ μὲν ἀοιδὴγειδότος, εὗ δ' οἶνῳ καἰρία συγγελάσαι; cf. Call. Hymn 2.65.96, Catullus 65.16, 116.2. Ovid frequently referred to Callimachus by means of the patronymic, as in Am. 1.15.13, Tr. 2.367, 5.38, but as McKeown notes (Amores I p.32), Ovid made specific mention of his literary debt to Callimachus only here, in Am. 2.4.19f., and in Rem. 381f.

53-54 quo . . . modo: the precise meaning which Ovid wished to convey with modo has been the subject of some dispute. Are we to take it in the general sense of 'manner' or 'mode' of writing (so E. Martini, Philol. Woch. 1932, pp.1104-5, G. Perrotta, Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica 4 1925, pp.146ff., A. La Penna Ibis, pp.14f), or is it intended more specifically, to mean 'metre' (so Kolar, Philol. Woch. 1933, pp. 1104f., Rostagni, Ibis, Storia di un poemetto greco, 1920, p.8). Although it is more frequently used in the plural by Latin poets in general, and Ovid in particular (Tr. 2.220, 332, 412, 432, 538, 4. 10.24, Ex P. 4.13.20, 4.16.36, Am. 2.1.4, Fast. 6.22)
when signifying metre or verse, it can also be used in the singular in this sense (cf. Cicero *Orat.* 193, *Esse autem tertium ac medium inter illos et ita factos eos pedes esse, ut in eis singulis modus insit aut sesquiplex aut duplex aut par; Orat.* 1.151, *tum ipsa collocatio confirmatioque verborum perfectit in scribendo, non poetico, sed quodam oratorio numero et modo;* and Ovid *Am.* 2.17.21, *carminis hoc ipsum genus impar; sed tamen apte iungitur herous cum breviore modo*). However, it is worth pointing out that, in each of these instances, the meaning of *modus* is clarified by the context. If *modo* is indeed to be understood in a metrical sense here, it follows that Callimachus’ *Ibis* was also written in elegiacs and not in hexameters or iambics; this assumption, however, runs counter to the Patavian scholia on the Ovidian *Ibis*, which state explicitly that Callimachus wrote *iambico cannine* (quoted below, on *inimicum Ibin*). Also of interest is scholium C, which interpreted *modo* as follows: *Quasi diceret: et quomodo Callimachus filius Batti male dixit aemulum suum cui hoc nomen imposuit, hoc modo et tam execrabilis maledictione maledicam tibi ut ita dicar a te illum esse imitatus imponens tibi hoc idem nomen quod eius aemulus habuit.* Certainly *quo modo* in the sense of ‘manner’ is not an unusual turn of phrase in Ovid, and I think that this is how it should be understood in this context, looking ahead to the allusive curses which occupy the second part of the poem.

**inimicum . . . Ibin:** Callimachus, imitated by Ovid, chose to veil the name of his adversary under the pseudonymn Ἱβις, a bird which was held sacred by the Egyptians, but was notorious for its filthy habits. For ancient testimonia concerning the Ibis, and further discussion of the bird, see the introduction, p.3. It is traditionally assumed that Callimachus’ adversary in his *Ibis* was Apollonius Rhodius, a μαθητής of Callimachus (*Vit.* A8, B5 Wendel), and author of the epic *Argonautica*. The conflict, whether actual or not, has been seen as the archetypal literary dispute, a veritable ‘battle of the books’ between the advocate of short, carefully polished poems, and that of the epic. Certainly Callimachus’ well-known renunciation of the long, continuous poem in the prologue to the *Aetia* could refer to the type of work produced by Apollonius, but it is noteworthy that Apollonius is not to be found among
the names given to the Telchines by the scholia to the prologue (1 p.3 Pf.), nor is there any direct evidence of the quarrel in either poet’s extant works. There is one abusive epigram against Callimachus which is attributed to Apollonius because of belief in a quarrel, in AP 11.275, Καλλιμάχος τὸ κάθαρμα, τὸ παιγμον, ὁ ἐλυμος νοῦς, ἀνίκω, ὁ γράφας Αἰτία Καλλιμάχος, but apart from this, evidence for the supposed quarrel is based largely on interpretation of passages of Callimachus’ poetry (most notably the Prologue to the Aitia, and the end of the Hymn to Apollo), and the ancient biographies. According to Suidas, 'Ἰβυς ἔστι δὲ ποίημα ἐπιτεθειμένον εἰς ἀφάφειαν καὶ λοιδορίαν, εἰς τυχα Ἰβυν, γενόμενον ἐχθρὸν τοῦ Καλλιμάχου. ἦν δὲ οὗτος Ἀπολλάνιος, ὁ γράφας τὰ Ἀργοναυτικά. Likewise, the Patavian scholia on Ovid’s Ibis comment at 55, in hoc tamen librum Ovidius de Callimacho intellexit, qui contra Cyrenaicum Apollonium qui deinde Rhodius a Rhodo civitate ubi praefuit appellatus est, iambico carmine scripsit et eum Ibidem appellavit, and again at 447, Callimachus, Batti filius, in Apollonium discipulum <invectus> est, quem Ibidem appellavit. For a concise account of the evidence and problems concerning the alleged dispute, see Mary Lefkowitz, Lives of the Greek Poets (London, 1981), pp. 117ff, and L. Watson Arae, 121ff.

54 teque tuosque: for vengeance affecting one’s family as well as oneself, see, for example, Homer ll. 4.160ff., εἰ περ γὰρ τε καὶ ἀντίκ’ Ὀλύμπιος οὐκ ἔτελεσσον, ἐκ τε καὶ οὐκ ἔστειλε, σὺν τε μεγάλῳ ἀπετίσαν, σὺν σφήσις κεφαλῆς γυναιξί τε καὶ τεκέσσαν; Solon 13.31f., . . . οἱ δὲ φώνωσιν αὐτοὶ μὴθεὶν μοῦρ ἐπιδιόρισα κίχη, ἤλθεν πάντως αὐτις. ἀναίτιοι ἔργα πιέσαν ἡ παιδες τούτων ἡ γένος ἐξοπλώσων, and Cicero N.D. 3.90, quem vos praeclare defenditis, cum dicitis eam vim deorum esse, ut etiamsi quis morte poenas sceleris effugerit expetantur eae poenae a liberis, a nepotibus, a posteris. Moreover, in the curses found in Greek inscriptions against those harming the state, the customary formula was ‘let him be utterly ruined, himself and all his race’ (cf. E. Ziebarth, "Der Fluch im griechischen Recht" Hermes 30, 1895, pp. 37ff.). Compare also the curses against would-be grave-violators, such as the following: ἦν γὰρ θείᾳ τις ἐως ἔνοιξιν τὴν ἐμῆν, μὴ γείον ἐλπίδων ὀναιτο, μὴ
τέκνων σποράς, / ἄλλας εὐγένειας δόλω τάνυρειζ' γένος (E.G.502,26-8), and: ο θεὸς 
αὐτῷ προκόψας ὀρᾶσε τέκνωσ βίω καὶ προίδοιτο τέκνα! λάποιτο χήρον βίων, οίκον 
ἐρνυτον (MAMA 1.437). The enclitic -que -que is found as early as Ennius, and is 
analogous to the Greek τε . . . τε.

55 utque: as was noted by Martini (Philol. Woch., 1932, pp.1105-6.) this word appears 
to distinguish two distinct parts of the poem, the devotiones and the historia caeca. 
Thus ‘as Callimachus did his foe, I curse you (the fairly straightforward curses, 
105-206) and, as he did, I shall veil my curses in obscure stories’ (250-636).

ille: i.e. Callimachus.

4.668, (Numa) et secum ambages caecaque iussa referet; Cicero Agr.2.36. Suidas 
describes the Callimachean Ibis as ποίημα ἑπιτετηδειμένων εἰς ἀσάφειαν καὶ 
λοιποῖαν, wherein ἀσάφεια seems the Greek equivalent of caecus. A late Greek 
poem which describes Callimachus’ works (Pf. p.xcix) alludes in its conclusion to the 
riddling style of the Greek Ibis as follows: Σκώπτω δ' ἑπαραίς Αἰβίν Ἀπολλώνιον/ 
καὶ τῇν Ἀθηνάν μέλπω πάλιν/ γρίφω βαθίστω καὶ δυσειρέτως λόγους.

carmina: the plural here may be no more than a poetic plural, or the plural may be 
to signify his curses, as in 83, carmina dum capiti male fido dira canuntur, and 247, 
carminibusque meis accedent pondera rerum.

56 Despite this apparent renunciation of the Hellenistic poets’ love of recondite allusions 
to mythological lore, Ovid showed his own considerable learning in such ambitious 
works as the Fasti and the Metamorphoses. See the useful discussion of Ovid’s 
doctrina in McKeown, Amores I, pp. 32ff.

57 ambages: usually taken as a general allusion to the riddling style of Callimachus’ 
poetry, and thus the equivalent of the historiae caecae, but Perotta (p.149) makes the 
intriguing suggestion that ambages should be taken very closely with in Ibide, as a 
reference to the concealment of the true identity of Ibis. For ambages in this sense 
of concealing the truth, he cites Ovid Met. 10.19f., si licet et falsi positis ambagibus 
oris/ vera loqui sinitis . . . , and Fast. 3.337f., verum ambage remota/ abdidit.
**in Ibide:** if Perotta is right concerning the interpretation of *ambages*, ‘in’ here must mean ‘in the case of’; cf. Cicero *Ver.* 2.3.3.#6, *in hoc homine saepe a me quaeris*. . . . *OLD* s.v. 42.

58 *oblitus moris iudiciique:* a reiteration of his earlier claim (cf. 1ff.), that it was not in character for Ovid to indulge in abuse.

*mei:* the adjective emphatically concludes the line and provides an effective contrast with *illius* which begins the preceding line.

59 *qui sis:* see commentary on 50.

60 *Ibidis . . . nomen habe:* the first explicit statement that Ovid too will use the pseudonym Ibis for his foes.

61 *aliquantum noctis:* in addition to lending a rather sinister tone to the poem, the phrase reinforces the idea of obscurity expressed above. For a similar metaphorical use of *nox* cf. Cicero *N.D.* 1.3.6, *multis etiam sensi mirabile videri eam nobis potissimum probatam esse philosophiam quae lucem eriperet et quasi noctem quandam rebus offunderet,* while Quintilian (8.2.23) writes, *non semper tam esse acrem iudicis intentionem, ut obscuritatem apud se ipse discutiat et tenebris orationis inferat quoddam intelligentiae suae lumen.*


*atra:* Ovid wishes that all stages of Ibis’ life be ‘black’, or unlucky. This is connected with the Roman practice of distinguishing ‘black’ from ‘white’ days in the calendar. The Kalends, Nones, and Ides of every month were very important days in the Roman religious calendar, and the day after each of these days was considered *ater* and *religiosus,* on which no public business was to be undertaken (cf. Varro, 6.29; Livy 6.1.11). According to Aulus Gellius (5.17.1-2) and Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.15.22, 1.16.21-5), the ‘black days’ came into being in 389 B.C., when the soothsayer L. Aquinius explained to the Senate that the cause of the disaster at Allia and elsewhere was on each occasion due to omens having been taken on the day following the Ides. Upon deliberation, the Senate recalled similar disasters when
omens had been taken after the Nones and Kalends, and hence the pontiffs passed a new decree which termed these days 'black days' and forbade the undertaking of any battle, sacrifice, or public assembly. Consult Frazer's commentary on the _Fasti_, pp.79-81. The connection of Ibis with black days is particularly apt, since Ovid later states (217f.) that the _dies Alliensis_ was the day of Ibis' birth. More generally, Horace _Od._ 1.36.10, and Catullus 107.6, 68. attest to the custom of putting white marks on their calendar to denote a happy day, and black marks for an unlucky day, while Trimalchio had a diary of sorts above his door, on which he could mark lucky and unlucky days (_Sat._ 30). According to Pliny the Elder (_Nat._ 7.131), the Romans traced this custom to the Thracians, who daily put a white pebble in an urn if they had been happy, a black if not, and thereby could assess the happiness of their life.

63-4 haec tibi . . . legat: instead of the gifts and words of good omen which were customarily received both on one's birthday and on the first day of the New Year, the Kalends of January, Ovid wants Ibis to hear only curses. Although originally the calendar began with the month of March, when it was reorganized the first month of the year was named in honour of Janus, the Roman god of beginnings. On this day, the Romans exchanged good wishes and small gifts, generally sweets such as gilded dates, and small coins, in order to sweeten the whole year, and to ensure a sufficient supply of money (cf. Ovid _Fast._ 1.166ff., Pliny _Nat._ 28.22, Suet. _Cal._ 42, _Aug._ 57, Martial 8.33.11, etc.). Frazer, in his comment on the above-cited passage of the _Fasti_ remarks, "As omens are commonly drawn from the beginnings of anything, New Year's day is naturally regarded as the most ominous day of the year; whatever happens on it may be taken to portend, or even to cause, a series of like happenings in the twelve months that follow; in short the course of a whole year is supposed to be coloured, or even determined, by the course of the first day in it." It was thus very important that good wishes be exchanged, since the first words spoken could affect the entire year. By wishing that his curses be read to Ibis on this day, Ovid sets the tone for the year and thereby reinforces his wish of the preceding couplet, that the whole series of his life be black. Likewise on one's birthday it was considered
very important to avoid ill-omened words and events, and thus in the genethliaka we find many allusions to *bona dicta*, and holy silences (cf. Tib. 2.2.1f.; Ovid *Tr.* 3.13, 5.5.5; Martial 10. 87.2).

This couplet provides the transition to the ceremonial *devotio*, in which Ovid delivers his first set of curses; the birthday allusion, which is picked up again at 207ff., may be the key to understanding the poem: see the introduction, pp.29ff., in which the poem is discussed as an inverse genethliakon.

**haec**: the pronoun looks back to *versus* in 61, and forward to the curses which follow.

**facito**: the so-called future or legal imperative addressed to Ibis lends a note of solemnity via archaism in preparation for the ceremony which follows.

**non mentituro . . . ore**: perhaps an ironic barb against Ibis, implying that his mouth was *mentiturum*. For the phrase compare *Tr.* 4.3.16, *non mentitura tu tibi voce refer*, and *Fast.* 6.426, *hos non mentito reddidit ore sonos.*

65-84 Ovid invokes the gods to hear and aid his prayers with a comprehensive formula which encompasses the entire cosmos. Cf. the invocation of the deities Zeus, Helios, Earth, rivers, and the Furies of the underworld in *Il.* 3.276ff., and similar formulae found in the near Eastern tradition cited by W. Burkert *Greek Religion* (Harvard, 1985), pp.251f. It is possible also to draw many parallels with the invocations found in the popular *Defixiones Tabellae*; see especially the work of C. Zipfel, *Quatenuus Ovidius in Ibide Callimachum aliosque fontes imprimis defixiones secutus sit* (Leipzig, 1910). The alliteration and assonance found throughout the invocation give it a solemn, liturgical tone.

65-66 The gods of the earth, sea, and heavens are called upon by the poet, a traditional tripartite division of the cosmos (cf. Ovid *Met.* 1.5 with Bömer’s note), which not infrequently had associations with utter catastrophe; thus Vergil *Aen.* 6.724, Ovid *Met.* 2.298.

**meliora**: an unusual way of denoting heaven, presumably because it included Zeus, as better than the sea and earth.
inter diversos • • • polos: between the opposite poles of the heavens, the north, 
polus Boreus, and the south, polus Australis, are the realms of the heavenly deities.
quique • • • cum love: i.e. the rest of the Olympians.

67-68 huc . . . huc: Ariadne implores the Eumenides with the same words in Catullus 64.195: huc, huc adventate, meas audite querellas, and for other instances of huc huc in prayer cf., for example, Catullus 61.9, Seneca Med. 69. For the phrase huc adverite mentes, cf. Vergil Aen. 8.440.

pondus: for pondus in this sense of ‘weight’ or ‘consequence’, cf. OLD s.v. 6; Prop. 3.7.44; verbaque duxisset pondus habere mea; Ovid Met. 9.496, an habet et somnia pondus?; Fast. 1.182; Her. 7.65.

69-70 tellus . . . aequor . . . aether: from the gods of the land, sea, and heavens, Ovid turns to the elements themselves as divine forces, and then further particularizes.
aether . . . summe: the uppermost regions of heaven were often qualified by an adjective such as summus or altus, to emphasize their lofty position; cf. Vergil Aen. 4.574, deus aethere missus ab alto; Seneca Her. F. 3, templa summi aetheris; Cicero N.D. 2.40.101, ultimus et a domiciliis nostris altissimus omnia cingens et coercens caeli complexus, qui idem aether vocatur.

71-73 The same deities here invoked play a prominent role in the magical invocation of Medea in Met. 7.192ff.

71 radiis circumdata solis imago: a periphrastic expression for the sun. For this use of imago cf. Met. 14. 768 nitidissima solis imago; 15. 785; OLD s.v. 12.

72 luna . . . micas: because of its ever-changing shape, the moon often serves as a symbol of human vicissitudes. Ellis aptly cites Ovid Met. 15.196ff., nec par aut eadem nocturnae forma Dianae/ esse potest umquam, semperque hodierna sequente,/ si crescit, minor est, maior si contrahit orbem. Compare also Sophocles Fr. 871P. orbe: commonly used of the moon. Cf. Met. 7.531, 10.296, 15.198; TLL 9.2,913,68ff.

73 nox . . . reverenda: reverendus, ‘inspiring awe’, is an uncommon word, which occurs only here in Ovid’s works, and occasionally in later poets.

74 quaeque... opus: an allusion to the three Parcae or Fates, identified with the Greek Moirai, who spun their threads as a measurement of one’s lifespan. See also commentary at 241f.

ratum: the destiny measured out by the Parcae at one’s birth was irrevocable, and even Jupiter could not breach it. Cf. Tib. 1.7.1f., hunc cecinere diem Parcae fatalia nentes/ stamina, non ulli dissoluenda deo (with Murgatroyd’s note); Cons. ad Liv. 443f., sed rigidum ius est et inevitabile Mortis/ stant rata, non uilla fila tenenda manu.

triplici pollice netis: from Homer on, spinning was the traditional occupation of the Parcae (so, for example, II. 20.127f., 24.209f., Catullus 64.311ff., Tibullus 1.7.1f., Ovid Met. 8.452f., triplices... sorores/ staminaque impresso fatalia pollice nentes, Tr. 5.3.25f., Ex P. 1.8.63f.); the thumb played a key role in the spinning process, turning the threaded spindle, as Catullus describes in 64.311ff. (with Fordyce’s note): laeva colum molli lana retinebat amictum,/ dextera tum leviter deducens fila supinis/ formabat digitis, tum prono in pollice torquens/ libratum tereti versabat turbine fusum. For more on spinning in antiquity and the role of the thumb therein, consult the notes of Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.6.77-80, and Bömer on Met. 4.34. In the Metamorphoses, Ovid refers to the Parcae as triplices deae (2.654), and triplices... sorores (8.452); triplici pollice is thus an ingenious way of making their identity clear here, as their number and occupation were their primary attributes. For the poetical use of tripexus, first found in Propertius (3.17.24), see Bömer on Met. 4.425.

75-76 quique... inperiuatae laberis amnis aquae: the river Styx, which flowed through the underworld, and by whose waters the gods swore their most formidable oaths (Homer Il. 15.37f.). According to Servius on Aen. 6.323, any deity who made a false vow faced dire penalties, including being unable to consume ambrosia and nectar for one year. Cf. Ovid Met. 3.290f. (with Bömer’s note); Vergil Aen. 6.323. The adjectives infernas and horrendo contribute here to the eerie, fearful atmosphere of the underworld.
inperiuratae: 'that is never sworn falsely by', a rare epithet of the Styx, first attested in Ovid.

77-78 quasque . . . / carceris obscuras ante sedere fores: the Eumenides, or Furies, who from Homer on (II. 19.259f.) were envisioned as dwelling beneath the earth in the underworld, where they punished sinners. Cf. Aeschylus Eu. 267ff.; Vergil Aen. 6.552ff., 570ff.; Tib. 1.3.69f.; Ovid Met. 4.451ff.

torto vittatis angue capillis: snakes in the hair of the Furies, and in place of their hair were traditional and originated with Aeschylus, according to Pausanias (1.28.6); cf. Aesch. Ch. 1049f.; Vergil Georg. 4.482f.; Ovid Met. 4.454; Statius Theb. 11.65f.; Murgatroyd’s note on Tib. 1.3.69-70. However, the notion of wreathing here seems most unusual, as the snakes take the place of traditional vitta.

vittatis: Ovid’s penchant for forming adjectives from nouns, as here, is noted by McKeown on Am. 1.7.17-18. The adjective is subsequently found in the Silver Latin poets Lucan, Martial, Juvenal and Statius.

angue: singular for plural, as in Ex P. 3.1.124, nexaque nodosas angue Medusa comas. For the use of anguis in poetry see Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.4.35-6.

carceris: used of Tartarus also by Seneca Her.F. 1221f., . . . Dira Furiarum loca/et inferorum carcer; Lucan 6.797. In Met. 4.451ff., Ovid has a very similar vision of the Furies acting as wardens before the doors of Tartarus: . . . illa sorores/ nocte vocat genitas, grave et implacibile numen:/ carceris ante fores clausas adamante sedebant.

obscuras . . . fores: the underworld was traditionally dark (thus Homer Il. 8.13; Hesiod Th. 49, 721, 726f., 807; Aeschylus Pr. 221f., 1050f.; Ovid Met. 1.113; further citations by Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.3.67-8); here the epithet obscurus may have the additional connotation of ‘hard to find’.

79-80 plebs superum . . . semideumque genus: the lesser gods, including the Fauns, Satyrs, Lares, river gods, and Nymphs, are summoned by the poet. For plebs referring to the common multitude of gods cf. OLD s.v.3, Met. 1.73 (with Bömer’s note), 595, Fast. 5.20 de media plebe . . . deus, and Martial 8.50.3f., qua bonus
accubuit genitor cum plebe deorum/ et licuit Faunis poscere vina Iovem.

-que . . . -que/ -que . . . et . . . que: for similar constructions, cf. Vergil Aen. 11.675, Tereaque Harpalycumque et Demophoonta Chromimque; Ovid Am. 1.8.113-14; TLL 5,2,888,14ff.

Fauni: the Fauni were equated with the Panes, rustic gods of woods and fields, with the horns and hooves of goats. They were frequent companions of the Satyri, who were also sylvan deities with goat-like features, and notorious for their drinking and cavorting in the countryside. Cf. Ovid Met. 1.192f., 6.392; Horace Ep. 1.19.4; Lucretius 4.580ff.

Lares: the Lares were Roman gods, who presided over crossroads and household property. Cf. Tib. 1.1.19f. (with Murgatroyd’s note).

Flumina: cf. their inclusion in the invocation of Agamemnon in II. 3.278 κοι ποταμοὶ καὶ γαῖας, and that of Aeneas in Aen. 12.181, fontisque fluviosque voco.

Nymphae: nature spirits, who inhabited the rivers, fountains, woods, trees, and mountains, and who were regularly grouped with the Satyrs and other woodland deities. Cf. Vergil Georg. 2.493ff., fortunatus et ille, deos qui novit agrestis;/ Panaque Silvanumque semem Nymphasque sorores.

semideumque genus: a vague phrase, which Ovid does not elaborate upon further. In Met. 1.192f., it is the minor rustic deities invoked above whom Ovid terms semidei: sed mihi semidei sunt, rustica numina, Nymphae Faunique Satryique et monticolae Silvani; in Her. 4.49, the Dryades. Presumably the poet’s vagueness here is meant to be comprehensive.

81-2 denique ab antiquo . . . Chao: the notion of a dark, ‘yawning’ space termed Chaos, from which the gods and universe were born, goes back to Hesiod Th. 116ff. Cf. Ovid Met. 2.299 in chaos antiquum (with Bömer’s note), 1.7ff.; Vergil Georg. 4.347, Aen. 4.510; Lucan 1.74 antiquum repetens iterum chaos.

divi veteresque novique: at the end of his invocation of major and minor deities, Ovid adds this blanket clause covering all gods, old and new, lest any deity be passed over. Cf. Vergil Georg. 1.21, where, after directly addressing several deities, the
poet adds *dique deaeque omnes*, and the explanation of Servius *ad loc.*: *post specialem invocationem transit ad generalitatem*, *ne quod numen preatereat*, *more pontificum*; *(per)* *quos ritu veteri in omnibus sacris post specialis deos*, *quos ad ipsum sacrum*, *quod fiebat*, *necesse erat invocari generaliter omnia numina invocabantur*; Cicero *Rab.* 2.5.


capiti: dative with *canuntur*. Just as one swore by one’s head (cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.8.5, wherein Barine binds her head by vows (*devotio capitis*) and promises it ‘as a forfeit if speaking false’; Verg. *Aen.* 4.357; Cic. *de domo sua* 145), so curses were frequently aimed at the head of one’s foe as is the case here. Cf. Livy 39.10.2, *et in caput eorum detestari minas periculasque*, 39.51.12 *exsecratus in caput*; Ovid *Met.* 13.329f., . . . *licet exsecrare meumque/ devoveas sine fine caput . . .*, 15.504f., . . . *meritumque nihil pater eicit urbe/ hostilique caput prece detestatur euntis*, Her. 3.94; Pliny *Ep.* 2.20.6, . . . *iram deorum . . . in caput infelicis pueri detestatur*.

**male fido**: cf. *Tr.* 1.6.13, which is perhaps directed against the same enemy as the *Ibis*; Luck comments *ad loc.* that this use of *male* was introduced into Roman high poetry by Vergil (cf. *Aen.* 2.23), and is analogous to the Greek use of *κακώς* in, for example, Xenophon *Cyropaedia* 2.3.13, where *κακώς εἴδοτες* is the equivalent of *ἁγνοῦντες*.

canuntur: ‘chanted’, particularly of religious or magical incantations (*OLD* s.v. 1b).

**84 peragunt partes . . . suas**: ‘play their parts’, which suggests a theatrical metaphor (*OLD* s.v. 8); the expression also serves to distance the poet himself from the proceedings.

**ira dolorque**: the two play a similar role against a faithless friend (perhaps also *Ibis*) in *Tr.* 4.9.8ff., . . . *induet infelix arma coacta dolor/ . . . / nostra suas istuc porrigit ira manus*. Anger is also the motivation given for the curses the poet hurls
against his writing tablets in Am. 1.12.29-30.

85 **annuite:** for *adnuo* of the gods granting their favour or support, cf. Fast. 1.15 (with Bömer’s note), 2.489, 6.547, Met. 4.539, Am. 3.2.56, Ex P. 2.8.51.

**omnes ex ordine:** ‘one after another’, OLD s.v.8b. Cf. Nux 35.


88 **Pasiphaes generi:** Theseus, who was married to Phaedra, the daughter of Pasiphae and Minos, and sister of Ariadne. In Met. 15.500, Theseus’ son Hippolytus speaks of Phaedra, the stepmother who wrought his ruin, as *Pasiphaeia.*

**verba:** i.e. the curses which Theseus uttered against Hippolytus, when he read his wife Phaedra’s accusations of rape against Hippolytus. Despite his son’s protestations of his innocence, Theseus banished him and cursed him, calling upon Poseidon to bring his curse to fulfilment. Cf. e.g. Euripides *Hipp.* 88ff.; Ovid Met. 15.497ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 47; Cic. *Off.* 1.10, 3.25. For Hippolytus’ death as a result of Theseus’ curse, see 575f. and commentary *ad loc.*

89-90 **quasque ego transiero poenas . . . :** even if Ibis should undergo all the torments specified by Ovid, this proviso ensures that Ibis’ punishment will not come to an end. For *transiero* in the sense of ‘pass over’ or ‘omit’, cf. OLD s.v. 12c, Vergil *Georg.* 2.102.

91-94 **fictum . . . nomen:** earlier (59-60) Ovid implied that he gave his enemy the name Ibis in order to conceal his true identity (see also 49-50), and still earlier (47ff.) stated that this was but a preliminary skirmish, not a full-scale attack. At this point, however, the gloves come off, and Ovid prays that although he is not using his foe’s true *nomen*, his curses still will find their mark. In the *defixio* tablets which have been found (see the Introduction, pp.12ff.) great importance was attached to stating the name of the victim, since knowledge of a person’s name was believed to give one power over that person. It is within this context of the importance and power of names that we must consider Ovid’s repeated allusions to the true *nomen* of Ibis,
which he refers to no fewer than four times within the first hundred lines of the poem (9, 49, 60, 91) even though he does not publicly reveal it. Since Ibis' true identity is masked, the phrase *quem mens intellegit* is of crucial importance, if the curse is to find its mark.

**magnos . . . deos:** Ovid was fond of referring to the gods in this solemn manner. Cf. e.g. *Tr.* 2.22, *exorant magnos carmina saepe deos*; *Ex P.* 1.5.70, *sic merui, magni sic voluere dei*, *Met.* 5.320, *et extenuat magnorum facta deorum*; 9.555, *et sequimur magnorum exempla deorum.*

**quem mens intellegit:** cf. the formulaic *quos me sentio dicere* preserved by Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.9) in a ritual *carmen* for cursing enemy forces, inhabitants, cities and fields.

**se scit . . . has meruisse:** cf. the curse found upon a gravestone in Rome (*CE* 1948 5-7) against the deceased's murderer, which wishes unpleasant afflictions and death on the murderer, and concludes *tu des poenas quas meruisti.*

**factis:** again Ovid makes it clear that it was the actions of Ibis which prompted this literary attack.

**preces:** the Latin *preces,* like the Greek ἀραῖ, was capable of two-fold meaning, as both curse and prayer. In fact, the curse was a sort of backwards prayer, a prayer that some evil, rather than blessing be bestowed. For *preces* used of curses, cf. *OLD* s.v. 2b; Caesar *Gal.* 6.31.5, (Catuvolcus) *omnibus precibus detestatus Ambiorigem*; Horace *Epod.* 5.86, *Thyestae preces*; *S.* 2.6.30, *iratis precibus*; Ovid *Met.* 15.505, *hostilique caput prece detestatur*; Tacitus *Ann.* 14.30.1, *Druidae . . . preces diras . . . fundentes.*

95-104 The introduction is brought to a dramatic conclusion providing a transition to the curses which follow, as we become onlookers at a public ceremony in which Ovid, in the role of a priest, prepares to offer up Ibis as a sacrificial victim. For the creation of ceremony in poetry, cf. Callimachus *Hymn* 2; Tibullus 2.1; Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry,* 211-12.

**95 nulla mora est:** cf. *Met.* 11.160f., . . . "in iudice" *dixit/ "nulla mora est," with
Bömer’s note.

rata: ‘granted fulfilment’; cf. OLD s.v.2b, Ovid Met. 9.703, Cressa manus tollens, rata sint sua visa, precatur, Fast. 1.696, ratae . . . preces.

96 quisquis ades: part of a traditional formula, intended to encompass all those present at the rite. Cf. Tib. 2.2.1f., dicamus bona verba . . . / quisquis ades, lingua, vir mulierque, fave; 2.1.1; Appel De Romanorum Preca titionibus, RVV 7,2,78f.

ore favete: a variation on the traditional religious formula favete linguis, meaning ‘be favourable with your tongue’, that is, ‘to speak no word of ill-omen’, and then by extension, ‘to be silent’, analogous to the Greek εὐφημεῖν (Homer Il. 9.171; Callimachus Hymn 2.17 εὐφημεῖτ’ αἰώντες, ἐπ’ Ἀπόλλωνος ἀουδή). Cf. the explanations of Cicero Div. 1.45.102, Festus s.v. "Faventia", Servius on Aen. 5.71, and Seneca de vita beata 26.7, Favete linguis: hoc verbum non, ut plerique existimant, a favore trahitur, sed imperat silentium, ut rite peragi possit sacrum nulla voce mala obstrepente. For its use in Roman ceremony cf. Tib. 2.2.1f. quoted above; Horace Od. 3.1.2; Virgil Aen. 5.71; Prop. 4(5).6.1; Ovid Fast. 1.71 (with Bömer’s note); further citations in Appel, 187ff. However, in this instance words of good omen are to be avoided, so that only lugubria verba are heard. Ore favete thus becomes the equivalent of ‘say nothing inappropriate to the rite in progress’ (Mosley, Ovid, The Art of Love and Other Poems, p.258), or even ‘use your mouths so as to further what I am about’ (Henry, Aen. vol. 3 p.22ff.).

97 lugubria . . . verba: ‘gloomy, sinister’, (OLD s.v.2b) a very ironic expansion of ore favete, as it is, of course, precisely words of ill-omen which Ovid wishes at this sacrifice.

98 fletu madidis: another sinister omen. This is a common phrase in Ovid, imitated by Seneca Phaedra 1121, madent fletu genae.

99 pedibus . . . laevis: it was traditionally unlucky to begin a venture with left foot foremost; thus Vitruvius (3.4.4) urges architects to construct the stairways of temples with an odd number of steps, to facilitate starting the stairs and entering the temple on the right foot, while Petronius’ Trimalchio is so concerned with this superstition
that he has a servant call out *dextro pede* when guests enter the dining room (Sat. 30). See also Euripides *Ba.* 943f., ἐν δεξιᾷ χρή χαμα δεξιῷ ποδὶ/ αἵρεν νυν; Sil. 7.171f., *attulit hospitio pergentem ad litora Calpes/ extremumque diem pes dexter et hora Lyaeum*; Apuleius *Met.* 1.5, *sed ut fieri assolet, sinistro pede proiectum me spes compendii frustrata est.* Presumably, Ovid means simply that those present at this ceremony are to run to Ibis with their left feet first, otherwise it is difficult to envision!

100 nigrae vestes: the Romans considered white clothes a symbol of joy and good luck, appropriate attire for birthdays and other holiday occasions (cf. e.g. Ovid *Fast.* 4.619, 906; *Tr.* 5.5.7ff.; Horace *Sat.* 2.2.60; Persius 3.40). Conversely, black clothes were symbolic of gloom and unfavourable omen; Cicero (*In Vatiniun* 13.31) provides a good indication of the outrage caused by a man who wore black attire in inappropriate circumstances.

101 tu quoque: Ovid addresses Ibis directly for the first time in the ceremony of execration, as he prepares to offer him as a sacrificial victim. *vittas:* the *vitta* was a woollen band worn by the sacrificial victim (*OLD* s.v. 2b; Austin on *Aen.* 2.133). For its use in human sacrifice, cf. Seneca *Thy.* 686f., of Atreus murdering his nephews, *post terga . . . religat manus/ et maesta vitta capita purpurea ligat;* Lucretius 1.87 and Juvenal 12. 117ff. of Iphigenia; Ovid *Ex P.* 3.273ff. of Pylades and Orestes.


103 votis mora tristibus absit: the ceremony is framed by the repetition of key words, as *votis* and *mora* reaffirm the assertion of 95, *nulla mora est in me: peragam rata vota sacerdos,* while *tristibus* reinforces the atmosphere of sinister gloom which has been created.

104 da iugulum: the phrase is suggestive of the sacrifice of animals. Cf. *OLD* s.v. *iugulum* 2b; Seneca *Ag.* 43 (of Agamemnon), *daturus coniugi iugulum suae.* For the imagery cf. Juvenal 10.268 (of Priam), *ut vetulus bos,/ qui domini cultris tenue et miserabile collum/ praebet;* Homer *Od.* 11.411, wherein Agamemnon compares his
slaughter by Aegisthus and Clytemnestra to that of an ox (ὡς τίς τε κατέκτανε βοών ἐπὶ φάτνη).

**hostia**: Murgatroyd notes on *Tib*. 1.2.61-62 that *hostia* usually referred to small sacrificial animals such as sheep, while *victima* was used of larger victims, such as cattle (see Char. Gramm. 403.28B *victima maior est, hostia minor*). For *hostia* used by Ovid of human sacrifice, cf. *Ars* 1.334.

105-124 Ovid proceeds to pronounce a short series of curses upon Ibis, according to which he is to be deprived of all essentials, to wander as an exile and a beggar, to be pitied by no one, and to desire death but lack the means of attaining it. In contrast to the second, longer series of curses (249-642) which consist of a literary catalogue of afflictions culled from mythology and history, the curses expressed here have a more realistic quality and correspond to sentiments expressed in the *Tabellae Defixionum* and sepulcral maledictions (for a fuller discussion of which, see the Introduction, pp.12ff.). Worthy of note is the poet’s careful balancing of motifs in 105-110, as the land/sea motif of 105 is picked up again in 110 to round off the section, while the wind and breeze of 106 are balanced by *aer* in 109, and the middle couplet plays *sol candidus* and *lucida Phoebe* against the *sidera clara*.


106 **ventus et aura**: for the life-giving property of breezes see, for example, Plato *Lg*. 845d, ὁυτε γὰρ γῆν ὁυτε ἡλιον ὁυτε πνεύματα τοῖς ὕδασι ξύντροφα τῶν ἐκ γῆς ἀναβλαστανόντων ῥόδιον φθείρειν, Horace *Od*. 1.22.17, with the note of Nisbet & Hubbard. The obverse of Ovid’s curse upon Ibis is found in a wish expressed on a Latin tombstone that those who show proper respect to the tomb be rewarded: *Tu*
quoque praeteriens tumulum qui perlegis istum,/ parce meos cineres pedibus calcare protervis:/ sic tibi ab aethereas lux multa superfluat auras. (CE 1943, 7-9.)

107 Sol calidus: most manuscripts read clarus here instead of calidus, but calidus, which is found in some of the minor manuscripts or deflorationes seems to me the better reading. It seems contrary to Ovid's customary artistry to have a pointless repetition of the adjective clarus in the couplet with both sol and sidera, and calidus is surely a more fitting epithet for the sun. The proximity of clara in the following line could easily have resulted in scribal error and duplication of the adjective.

Phoebe: 'Bright One', a name which was often used to refer to the moon (cf. Vergil Georg. 1.431, Aen. 3.371, Statius Theb. 1.105 etc.).

108 sidera: the last of the three celestial elements to deny their advantages to Ibis are the stars. La Penna, who favours retaining clarus with sol, remarks that it then becomes a descending climax of withdrawn light, from the sun to the moon, to the stars.

109 Vulcanus: metonymy for fire.

110 nec . . . tellus . . . iter: a variant on the earth/sea imprecatory formula discussed above at 105. Ellis (Journal of Philol. 24, 179) and La Penna cite the malediction found in Muratori III 1298, Ei τις ἀποκοσμήσει τότε τὸ ἡρῶν ἣ ἀναστομώσει τι τι καὶ ἔτερον μετακυψῆσαι ἠ αὐτῶς ἢ διὰ ἄλλου, μὴ γῇ βατῆ μὴ βάλασσα πλωτῆ, ἄλλα ἐκριζωθήσεται; very similar is the following sepulcral inscription: δς δ’ ἄν σκυλη μηὖ γῇ βατῆ μὴ βάλασσα πλωτῆ. Very similar is the following sepulcral inscription: δς δ’ ἄν σκυλη μηὖ γῇ βατῆ μὴ βάλασσα πλωτῆ. Very similar is the following sepulcral inscription: δς δ’ ἄν σκυλη μηὖ γῇ βατῆ μὴ βάλασσα πλωτῆ μὴ γῇ βατῆ (IG 14,1901). Further examples include TAM 2,451, 524; IG 12, 5, 22; CIG 4302b.

111 exul inops erres: La Penna notes several Tabellae Defixionum which parallel Ovid's wish that Ibis wander in destitution, haunting the threshold of others; see, for example, Audollent 72, 73, 92. Noteworthy also are the many literary curses in this vein; thus Seneca Med. 20ff., vivat; per urbes erret ignotas egens/ exul pavens invisus incerti laris./ Iam notus hospes limen alienum expetat; Martial 10.5.3ff., erret per urbem pontis exul et clivi,/ interque raucos ultimus rogatores/ oret caninas panis inprobi buccas; Tibullus 1.5.53ff.; Ovid Am. 1.8.113ff. For the phrase exul inops,
113-114 Again, La Penna adduces many parallels in the *Tabellae Defixionum* for the mental and physical anguish wished upon Ibis, such as the following, which contains within it many of the sentiments expressed in Ovid’s series of curses: τούτων τε θεῶν παντάξει ἀπορία καὶ πυρετῷ καὶ ρήγει καὶ ἐρεθίσμῳ καὶ ἀνεμοθυρία καὶ παραπληξίᾳ καὶ ἀφοσίᾳ καὶ ἐκστάσει διανοίᾳ καὶ εἰς ἁφανῆ τις κτήματα αὐτοῦ, μὴ γῇ βατῇ μὴ θάλαττα πλωτῇ μὴ παίδων γονῆ · μηδὲ ὁικὸς αὐξοντο μηδὲ καρπῶν ἀπολαυον μηδὲ οἶκον, μὴ φωτὸς μὴ χρήσεως μηδὲ κτήσεως . . . (IG 12, 9, 1179).

The couplet takes on added point when read in conjunction with Ovid’s description of his own sufferings in the *Tristia* for the torments he wishes upon Ibis correspond closely to the reality of the poet’s distress. Cf. especially Tr. 3.8.31ff., . . . nec viribus adlevor ullis, / et numquam queruli causa doloris abest. / nec melius valeo, quam corpore, mente, sed aegra est/ utraque pars aeque binaque damna fero; Tr. 4.6.43, corpore sed mens est aegro magis aegra.

nox . . . die . . . nocte dies: note the careful arrangement of the two nouns, with the alternation of nominative - ablative, ablative - nominative. For the sentiment, compare Audollent 266, and also 267, 270 and 250. See too Sophocles Tr. 27ff., where Deianira exclaims . . . λέχος γὰρ Ἰῃκλεὶ κριτῶν/ ἕιστάσο ἀεὶ τιν’ ἐκ φόβου φόβον τρέφω,/ κεῖνον προκηραίουσα. νῦξ γὰρ εἰσάγει καὶ νῦξ ἄπωθει διαδεδεμένη τόνον.

115 i.e. ‘May you always be pitiable, without being pitied by anyone’; that is, although Ibis’ wretched condition should arouse pity, even that consolation is to be denied to him. The hissing alliteration provided by the ss effectively conveys the poet’s wrath.

For similar plays on miser - miserabilis, particularly by Christian writers, see the citations of Salvagnio as collected by La Penna in his commentary. Ellis (*Journal of Philol.* 14 1885, pp.93f.) notes the close imitation of the Ovidian line by the Christian poet Orientius in his *Elegiacs* 2.315, *ille miser vere nec erit miserabilis ulli.*

116 femina virque: i.e. ‘everyone’, although Stevens (CW 1947-8 p.41) notes that the inclusion of femina might have the additional implication that even women, who might
be thought more prone to feelings of compassion, will take pleasure in Ibis’ sufferings. The phrase *femina virque* appears in the same position in *Ars* 2.478, 682, 3.799f., *Rem.* 814, *Tr.* 2.6, and *Am.* 1.35f., in which McKeown notes that Ovid never uses *vir mulierque* as an alternative phrase, despite its equivalent scansion.

117-118 **accedat lacrimis odium**: a strengthening of the previous curse, as hatred, as well as lack of pity, is invoked against Ibis; cf. Aristotle *Rh.* 1382a 14.

**dignusque puteris**: heavily ironic, as the concluding pentameter reveals.

**tuleris plurima, plura feras**: note the chiastic arrangement.

119-120 A difficult couplet, which seems, like the preceding one, to be an amplification of the curse expressed in 115f., namely that even in reduced circumstances, Ibis will continue to be subject to ill-feeling.

**solito defecta favore**: referring to the pity which would usually be given to the wretched. Cf. Quintilian *Inst.* 4.1.9, *est enim naturalis favor pro laborantibus*. For acknowledgement that even one’s enemy could be moved to pity, cf. Sophocles *Ajax* 924f., *OT* 1295f., and further citations in Tarrant on Seneca *Ag.* 521f.

**invidiosa**: here predicative. For the relative scarcity of the adjective in the sense of 'arousing ill-feeling’, see the note of McKeown on *Am.* 1.1.9. The sense of the couplet would thus be: 'May the aspect of your fortune, having lost, as rarely happens, the sympathy customarily given to the wretched, still be hateful’, or, as paraphrased by Stevens (CW. 1947-8, p.43), "May that law of divine and human psychology, whereby envy disappears with its object’s ruin, fail to operate in your case. May every stage of your fortune be subject to envy".

121-122: La Penna aptly cites Sophocles *Electra* 1007f., οὐ γὰρ θανεῖν ἔκθιστον, ἀλλὰ δὲν θανεῖν/ χρήζων τις εἶτα μηδὲ τοῦτ’ ἔχῃ λαβεῖν, and Suetonius *Tib.* 61, *mori volentibus vis adhibita vivendi*.

123-124: A long, agonizing death is envisioned as part of Ovid’s revenge. Compare the following sepulchral curse from Rome (*CIL* 6,36467), *opto ei ut cum dolore corporis longo tempore vivat* . . . , Lucian *Luc.* 25, ἀλλὰ μὴ ὀστὶν ῥαῖδις ἀποθνησκέτω πεσοῦσα ἐκ τοῦ λιθου, θάνατον δὲ αὐτὴ τὸν ἀλγεινότατον καὶ μακρότατον ἐξεύρωμεν καὶ ὅστις αὐτὴν χρόνω καὶ βασάνω φυλαξας ὕστερον ἀπολεί.
diu: placed so that it may be taken with both luctatus and cruciatos.

spiritus: 'the non-corporeal part of a person', 'spirit'; OLD 4.

125-126 evenient: this couplet appears to be modelled upon Tibullus 1.5.57, wherein Tibullus, after pronouncing curses upon the lena whom he blames for turning Delia against him, proclaims: eveniet, dat signa deus. Indeed, eveniet would seem to be part of the stock language of prophecy; one may compare Met. 3. 524, with Bömer’s note, when the seer Tiresias utters dire prophecies to Pentheus concerning Dionysus, and concludes, eveniet!, and Tib. 1.7.5; 2.1.25. As in the above instances, the short and emphatic evenient here serves as a transition from the opening series of curses uttered against Ibis. Cf. also Ex P. 2.1.55f., quod precor, eveniet: sunt quiddam oracula vatum:/ nam deus optanti prospera signa dedit; Fast. 4.775, quae precor, eveniant!

a laeva maesta volavit avis: perhaps an imitation or reminiscence of Ennius Ann. 22.V, laeva volavit avis, as La Penna suggests. Among the Greeks, the right side was considered favourable in omens, the left unfavourable, but in Roman divination it was the left side which was considered propitious (cf. Cicero Div. 2.82, haud ignoro quae bona sint sinistra nos dicere, etiam si dextra sint, with the note of Pease ad loc.). However, the Romans were also influenced by Greek practices, with the result that there was some confusion in usage: depending upon the context, laeva and sinister might signify bad or good luck. See further Fordyce on Catullus. 45.8f. In our passage, the addition of the adjective maesta with avis suggests ill-omened or sinister (cf. Heroides 2.118 cecinit maestum devia carmen avis, and Seneca Med. 733 maestique cor bubonis), but I think it quite possible that Ovid was playing on the ambiguity; that is, while it was unlucky for Ibis, for Ovid it was a sign of good omen, since it signalled that his curses against Ibis would be fulfilled.

129 nimium . . . saepe: in support of this reading, Ellis cites Cicero Fin. 2.13.41, quod vos interdum vel potius nimium saepe dicitis, and Leg. 2.17.43, nimis saepe. Housman, however, (Journal of Philol. 35, 1920, p.306) like Heinsius before him, argued for the vocative saeve in place of saepe, on the analogy of violente (29),
inprobe (40), and perfide (128); nimium would then be taken closely with petitam. Although the conjecture is attractive, Housman's objection to nimium saepe on the grounds that "Ibis had shown him no enmity before his banishment, and since his banishment he can hardly have found opportunity for frequent attacks", perhaps takes Ovid too literally. Ovid was fond of exaggeration, and, to him, any attack made upon him must have seemed excessive. (Cf. the poems in the Tristia on a similar theme, e.g. 3.11.1f., si quis es, insultes qui casibus, improbe, nostris, meque reum dempto fine cruentus agas . . . , 5.8.1ff., and Ex P. 4.3.27ff.) In this context, the attested reading of nimium saepe is viable, and should probably be retained.

130 illa dies . . . sera: i.e. the day of his own death. The wish for death as an escape from the miseries of exile is an oft-recurring theme in Ovid's exilic poetry. Thus, for example, Tr. 4.1.86, heu nimium fati tempora longa mei!; 4.3.39f., atque utinam lugenda tibi non vita, sed esset/ mors mea, morte fores sola relicta mea!; 4.6.49f., una tamen spes est quae me soletur in isitis,/ haec fore morte mea non diuturna mala; 5.9.37, dumque -quod o breve sit!- lumen vitale videbo; 3.229f.; 5.10.45; and Ex P. 1.2.57f., saepe precor mortem, mortem quoque deprecor idem,/ nec mea Sarmaticum conegat ossa solum.

131 spatio: 'with the lapse of time' - cf. Ars 2.113f., Forma bonum fragilis, quantumque accedit ad annos,/ fit minor et spatio carpitur ipsa suo; Ars 2.651.

133-138 A second series of conditions designed to illustrate the hostility between Ovid and Ibis. On this occasion however, they are not adunata as at 31ff. but rather expressions of perpetuity introduced by the conjunction dum. Like the adunata, these expressions were of proverbial nature, and were extensively developed and used by Roman poets and rhetoricians. For further examples of expressions of perpetuity introducing a strong assertion, cf. Vergil Ecl. 5.76-78, Aen. 1.607-610; Horace Epod. 15.7; Ovid Am. 1.15.9 (with McKeown's note); Seneca Oed. 504ff., Her.O. 1576f., Med. 401ff.; Statius Silv. 1.1.93f.; Sil. 7.476; and Claudian Ruf. 2.526. Further examples may be found in Smith's note on Tib. 1.4.65. For the possible dislocation of this passage from its proper place in the text, cf. the commentary on
verse 42.

133 arcu . . . Thraces, Iazyges hasta: two stock examples of war-like peoples, with particular relevance for Ovid, since the Getae tribes in the area of Tomis were considered Thracian in origin, and the Sarmatians were Iazygian. Cf. Ex P. 1.2.77, 4.7.9, and Strabo 7.3.17.

134 dum tepidus Ganges, frigidus Hister erit: the apposition of the warm Indian Ganges with the cold Hister (Danube) recalls the adunaton in Vergil Ecl. 1.61f., ante pererratis amborum finibus exul/ aut Ararim Parthus bibet aut Germania Tigrim. . . There is a similar contrast of hot and cold in the adunaton in Ex P. 2.4.27, nec Babylon aestum, nec frigora Pontus habebit . . .

135 robora dum montes: a conventional sentiment, with which compare Tibullus 1.4.65f., (with Murgatroyd’s note) quem referent Musae vivet, dum robora tellus,/ dum caelum stellas, dum vehet amnis aquas; AP 7.153.2, ἐστὶν ὑδωρ ἡ νάη, καὶ δὲνδρα καὶ μακρὰ τεθῆλη. For plants in general as symbols of perpetuity, cf. McKeown on Am. 1.15.11-12.

mollia pabula: cf. Met. 7.284, where the same phrase occurs, at the same position in the verse.

136 dum Tiberis . . . Tuscus: Roman writers quite frequently referred to the Tiber as Tuscan, since it flowed from Etruria. Cf. Vergil Georg. 1.499, Tuscum Tiberim, Aen. 8.473. Note the sigmatism of this verse and its rhythm, which helps to convey the impression of flowing water.

137 mors: to whose death is Ovid referring? His own, Ibis’, or both? I believe that he means the death of both, particularly in view of the next line, in Manis Manibus. Thus he must mean that neither his own death nor the death of Ibis will deter him from his anger, and quest for vengeance.

138 Manis Manibus: Ovid achieves a striking effect here by the juxtaposition of different cases of the noun Manes. Manes originally seems to have referred to the spirits of the dead in a collective sense, but later, still retaining the plural form, came to be used with reference to the spirit of one particular dead person. Cf. Cicero In
Pisonem 16 and the note of Nisbet ad loc. for the earliest known instance of Manes referring to an individual. It has been suggested that the Manes, like the Eumenides, were euphemistically named (from manus = good), in order to placate the potentially vengeful spirits. Here Ovid envisions the spirits of himself and his foe continuing their conflict in the underworld.

139ff. If we disregard 133-138 (see commentary on 42), Ovid moves from the thought that his hatred will not fade in intensity with the passing of time (131-132), to the assertion that even as a shade he will persevere in his pursuit of Ibis, a point emphasized by the repetition of tum quoque in the opening of successive couplets.

139 vacuas dilapsus in auras: for the phrase, which Ovid employed frequently, compare Tr. 1.5.11f., spiritus et vacuas prius hic tenuandus in auras/ ibit; 3.3.61, nam si morte carens vacua volat altus in aura/ spiritus; Ex P. 2.11.7, et prius hanc animam vacuas reddemus in auras; Met. 6.398, ... vacuas emisit in auras with Bömer’s note.

140 exanguis . . . umbra: a common way of describing the dead in Latin poetry. Cf. Met. 4.443, errant exangues sine corpore et ossibus umbrae; 10.41, exangues animae; Vergil Aen. 6.401, (Cerberus) exangues terreat umbras; Seneca Oed. 598, (Ditis) exsangue vulgus; Statius Theb. 4.519. While it was conventional to describe the dead as bloodless in Latin, interestingly enough they were not so described in Greek works, although there were references to their being pale or ωχρός (cf. Philostr. Imag. 2.10.3; Lucian Menip. 21).

141ff. For the power of the spirits of the dead to return to the world of the living and seek revenge against those who wronged them, see especially: Horace Epod. 5.92ff., quin, ubi perire iussus exspiravero/ nocturnus occurram furor/ petamque vultus umbra curvis unguibus,/ quae vis deorum est Manium./ et inquietis adsidens praecordiis/ pavore somnos auferam; Livy 3.58.11, Manesque Verginiae, mortuae quam vivae feliciores, per tot domos ad petendas poenas vagati nullo relicto sonle tandem quieverunt; Vergil Aen. 4.385, (Dido speaking) et cum frigida mors anima seduxerit artus,/ omnibus umbra locisadero,/ dabis, inprobe, poenas;/ audiam et haec
manis veniet mihi fama sub imos/, with comment of Pease ad loc.; Suetonius Otho 7; V. Fl. 3.383ff.; ps. Quint. Decl. mai.10.19, Decl. min. 314; Suet. Nero 34.4; Statius Theb. 3.74f.; Ammian. Marcell. 14.11.17. The portrait which Ovid draws of himself as an *umbra* shares common elements with those passages cited above: Ovid too seeks to return to gain revenge and punish his foe and intends to afford no respite to Ibis from his vengeful presence.

**141-142 ossea forma:** Ovid, who in 140 described himself as an "*umbra*" after death, (described in *Met. 4.443* cited above as *sine corporibus et ossibus*) now envisions himself as an "*ossea forma*," that is a skeleton, more commonly expressed in Latin by the nouns *larva* or *larvalis* (thus Seneca *Ep.* 24.18, *Nemo tam puer est, ut Cerberum timeat et tenebras et larvalem habitum nudis ossibus cohaerentium*; Apuleius *Met.* 1.6; Petronius 34.8; *TLL 7,2,977/8*). The Homeric conception of the afterlife, which had a very pervasive influence on subsequent generations, portrayed the dead as insubstantial forms of their former selves, or *ειδωλα*, which flit about like shadows (*Od.* 11.207ff.) and this coincides with artistic depictions of the dead: in her article on skeletons in Greco-Roman art, "*Sic Erimus Cuncti*, Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, 1986, p.185f., K.M.D. Dunbabin notes that "the normal representation . . . of the dead has nothing skeletal about it. In scenes of the Underworld, for instance, or in representations of the dead at their tombs, they usually appear as fully normal human beings, or as small winged (or occasionally wingless) figures of the type conventionally known as *ειδωλα*; later, they sometimes appear enveloped in grave-clothes, their heads covered and their limbs invisible, in a way which distinguishes them from living figures." With Ovid's depiction of himself as a withered figure of bones returning to seek vengeance against his enemy, one may compare *Priap.* 32, *aridior . . . pallidior . . . pro sanguine pulverem . . . ad me nocte solet venire et affert pallorem maciemque larvalem*, and Apuleius *Met.* 9.29-30, wherein a pale and emaciated figure (*lurore buxeo macieque foedata*), the *umbra* of a woman who came to a violent end, is summoned by a witch to kill a man. For more on the portrayal of ghosts in antiquity, see Jack Winkler, "Lollianos and the

143-150 Various ways by means of which he might become a shade are enumerated by Ovid, each introduced by *sive*.

143-144 A natural death from old age is contrasted with one which is induced.

*quod nolim*: most of the MSS have the imperfect subjunctive *nollem*, but that implies that his wish was in the past and is no longer capable of being fulfilled, whereas the present *nolim* does not rule out the possibility that it may yet take place, and this makes much more sense in the context.

*manu facta morte solutus*: i.e. an unnatural death. Ellis cites examples from Seneca, including *Ep.* 58.32, *finem non opperiri, sed manu facere*; 41.3, *specus non manu factus, sed naturalibus causis excavatus*, and *de brev. vit.* 3.2, *morbos quos manu fecimus*.

145-146 *naupagus*: death at sea was particularly abhorrent to the ancients because it denied the victim proper burial. Cf. Nisbet & Hubbard on Hor. *Od.* 1.28.23, who note the curses of Archilochus (79a), Thyestes (Enn. *scaen.* 362ff.), and Horace (*Epod.* 10) which invoke drowning upon their victims, while Cicero used the case of a man who *periit in mari* (*Pis.* 44), as an *exemplum* of fate’s unfairness.

*longinquus . . . piscis edet*: compare Propertius 3.7.8, *et nova longinquus piscibus esca natat*. *Longinquus* here means ‘far off’, or ‘remote’, and is perhaps intended to emphasize Ovid’s feeling of desolation in Tomis, far from Rome, a point reiterated in the following line by the description of the birds as *peregrinae*. A piteous end as prey of fish befell the nurse of Eumaeus in Homer *Od.* 15.480f. Compare also *AP* 7.273.5f., *κάγω μέν πόντῳ διεύμενος ἱερός κῦρμα/ οἰχημαι . . .*, and *Tr.* 1.2.53ff., *est aliquid, fatove suo ferro cadentem/ in solida moriens ponere corpus humo,/et mandare suis aliqua et sperare sepulcrum/ et non aequoreis piscibus esse cibum*.

147-148 In similar fashion, to lie unburied as prey for birds or wild beasts was a commonly expressed fear. Cf. Homer *Il.* 1.4f., . . . *ἐλάρια . . . κώνεσσαν/ οἰνονοία τε τάσι*; Ovid *Her.* 10.121,123f., *spiritus infelix peregrinas ibit in auras?/ ossa superstabunt volucres inhumata marinae?*; Horace *Epod.* 5.99f., *post insepulta
membra different lupi/ et Esquilinae alites; Catullus 64.152f., pro quo dilaceranda
feris dabor alitibusque/ praeda, neque inianta tumulavor mortua terra.

149-150 The desire for some form of burial is expressed in Tr. 1.2.55 quoted above,
with Luck’s note. Also noteworthy is the curse recorded in Cicero Tusc. 1.67, neque
sepulcrum quo recipiat habeat partum corporis/ ubi remissa humana vita corpus
requiescat malis.
terrae: dative after supponere.

plebeio . . . rogo: commentators compare Horace Sat. 1.8.10, hoc miserae plebi
statab commune sepulcram, as opposed to the magna sepulcra of the upper classes,
but the point here seems to be that any kind of burial, even the most lowly, would
be gratefully received by the poet. Cf. Sophocles Ant. 256, λεξ τη δ' ἁγος φεύγοντος
δος ἐπήνο κόνις and Horace Od. 1.28.23f., where, in both instances, a few handfuls of
dust suffice.
corpus inane: for the phrase used to signify a lifeless corpse, compare Ovid Am.
3.9.6, ardet in exstructo, corpus inane, rogo; Met. 2.611, 13.488; Propertius 3.18.32,
and Cicero, Leg. 2.18. Cf. also Bömer on Fast. 2.554.

151 quicquid ero: as his earlier shift from viewing himself as an umbra to an ossea
forma suggests, Ovid is not sure what he will be after death.

Stygis erumpere nitar ab oris: for the image of shades bursting out from the lower
realms in pursuit of revenge cf. Seneca Thy. 87, Tro. 179ff.

152 gelidas . . . manus: death, and limbs affected by death, are conventionally cold,
and thus are frequently qualified by the adjectives gelidus and frigidus. Cf. Lucretius
3.401, gelidos artus in leit frigore linquit; 3.529f., post inde per artus/ ire alios
tractim gelidi vestigia leit; 4.927, aeterno corpus perfusum frigore leit; Vergil Aen.
4.385 (with the note of Pease for further examples.) For coldness as an attribute of
umbrae cf. Met. 8.496, gelidae umbrae, and Statius Theb. 2.1, Interea gelidas Maia
satus aliger umbras/ iussa gerens magni remeat Iovis . . .

153-154 Night-time was the most common time for shades to return to the upper world,
as the ghost of Cynthia informs Propertius (4.7.89f.): nocte vagae ferimur, nox
clausas liberat umbras,/ errat et abiecta Cerberus ipse sera, and revenge was the most common reason for their return. Cf. especially Horace Epod. 5.95-96, et inquietis assidens praecordiis/ pavore somnos auferam, Sen. Ag. 2 with the note of Tarrant.

155-156 ante os oculosque: a common turn of phrase in Latin. Thus Cicero Phil. 8.7.20 ante os oculosque legatorum; Vergil Aen. 2.; 8.152; Catullus 9.8, with note of Fordyce.

volabo et querar: volare and querere, or synonyms, are frequently found in descriptions of the actions of spectres. Compare Tibullus 1.5.51ff., hanc volitent animae circum sua fata querentes/ semper.

157-158 Harsh lashings, serpents, and smoking torches were all associated with the Furies, who punished the shades of men for their sins. La Penna records Salvagnius’ comparison of Pacatus, Paneg. Theodosii 42, nisi vero tu tuum, venerabilis Gratiane, carnificem Furiis comitatus ultricibus obsidebas et irata ac minax umbra ob os eius oculosque fumantes infernis ignibus taedas et crepitantia torto angue flagra quatiebas . . . Cf. also Seneca Ag. 760, Her.F. 88, Med. 961f., Thy. 96f., and see my commentary on verses 77-78, and 181-184.

conscia . . . ad ora: ad is here the equivalent of circa as in Sen. Ag. 770.

159 agitabere: a verb often found in conjunction with the Furies; thus Cicero S. Rosc. 24.67, agitari et perterreri Furiarum taedis ardentibus, 24.66 (of Orestes and Alcmaeon) ut eos agitent Furiæ neque consistere umquam patiantur; Vergil Aen. 3.331; Ovid Met. 9.410; Fast. 4.73; Suetonius Nero 34.4. etc. For Furiis as an abl. of instrument with ago, cf. Ovid Fast. 6.489, hinc agitur furiis Athamas; Seneca Thy. 24.

vivus . . . mortuus: cf. Cicero Catil. 1.33.35 (of Jupiter), supplicis vivos mortuosque mactabis. The notion of Ibis’ punishment continuing in death is amplified in the pentameter.

161-162 cf. Tr. 3.3.45f., sed sine funeribus caput hoc, sine honore sepulcri,/ indeploratum barbar a terra teget? with the note of Luck. Further examples of the
commonplace of being unburied and unmourned include Homer Od. 11.54 (of Elpenor) σῶμα . . . κατελείπομεν . . . ἀκλαυτον καὶ ἀθαπτον; Sophocles Ant. 29, ἀκλαυτον, ἀταφον; Euripides Hec. 30; AP 7.247.1f. ἀκλαυτον καὶ/ ἀθαπτον . . . / κείμεθα; Vergil Aen. 11.372f.; and Lucan 9.62f.

indeploratum: cf. Met. 7.611f., and Tr. 3.3.46 (cited above on 161-162).

proiciere: this verb is often found with regard to corpses that have been refused burial (OLD s.v.7a). Cf. Ovid Met 7.602 with Bömer’s note, Cicero Tusc. 1.104 proici se iussit (Diogenes) inhumatum; Lucretius 6.1155, rancida quo perolent proiecta cadavera ritu; Livy 29.9.10, nec satiatus vivorum poena insepultos proiecit; Lucan 6.626, corpora caesorum tumulis proiecta negatis.

164-165 uncus: this was a hook which was fastened underneath the chin of convicted criminals after they had been executed, and by this means they were dragged from the prison to the Scalae Gemoniae. The technical term for such a dispatch was trahitur unco. See the note of Mayer on Juvenal 10.66, and cf. Lucan 6.637, Seneca de Ira 3.36; Suetonius Tib. 61; and Festus, who comments on the executioners’ nickname ‘Hamotrahones’, and says that they are those qui unco cadavera trahunt. Also of interest is the curious litany recorded by Lampridius (Comm. 18-19), which he states was chanted by the Senate at the death of Commodus in AD 192: Qui senatum occidit, unco trahatur. Qui innocentes occidit, unco trahatur . . . qui sanguini suo non pepercit, unco trahatur. Qui te occisurus fuit, unco trahatur. Carnifex unco trahatur. Carnifex senatus more maiorum unco trahatur . . . omnes censemus unco trahendum.

populo plaudente: for the approval of the people, see omnes censemus . . . quoted above, and compare Catullus 108.1f., Si, Comini, populi arbitrio tua cana senectus/ spurcata imputis moribus intereat. The phrase appears in the same place in the line in Am. 3.13.13.

166 A vivid image of the earth spewing out the rejected body of Ibis. It is noteworthy that the personified earth is described as iusta, because, although she generally treats all alike, she will not take in Ibis. For the sentiment of the natural elements denying

167-170 The resemblance of these lines to Catullus 108.3ff., *non equidem dubito quin primum inimica bonorum/ lingua exsecta avido sit data vulturio,/ effossos oculos voret atro gullete corvus,/ intestina canes, cetera membra lupi*, has often been commented upon. Fordyce notes that "the resemblance has suggested that Catullus was drawing on reminiscences of the *Ibis* of Callimachus", but he rightly qualifies this by stressing the commonplace nature of the abuse. Cf. Martial 10.5.10ff., *at cum supremae fila venerint horae/ diesque tardus, sentiat canum litem/ abigatque moto noxias aves panno*. Indeed, they are variations on the same gruesome ends that Ovid envisioned for himself at 146ff. above.

169 *licet hac sis laude superbus*: Ibis will have the dubious distinction of having rival wolves contend for his corpse, and this will be his sole source of pride.

171ff. Lists of the great sinners who occupied Tartarus, and their punishments, were a traditional theme in ancient literature from the time of Homer (*Od.* 11.576ff.) on. Other examples include Plato *Ax.* 371E; Lucretius 3.978ff.; Vergil *Aen.* 6.580ff.; Culex 231ff.; Tibullus 1.3.73ff.; and Seneca *Ag.* 15ff., *Her.* 750ff. For variations on the sinners enumerated, cf. the discussion of Roscher 5.1039f.

171 *in loca ab Elysiis diversa . . . campis*: although he does not directly name the place of punishment, Ovid clearly is referring to Tartarus, the dark prison located deep within the bowels of the earth, where sinners underwent eternal punishment (cf. Homer *Il.* 8.13ff.; Vergil *Aen.* 6.563ff.; Tibullus 1.3.67ff. with Murgatroyd's note.) *Diversa* conveys the idea of being both far-removed in distance (*OLD* 4), and differing greatly in characteristics (*OLD* 5) from Elysium. Cf. especially Culex 258f., as the gnat is borne from Tartarus to Elysium, . . . *auferor ultra/ in diversa magis, distantia nomina cerno,/ Elysiam tranandus agor delatus ad undam;* Sallust *Cat.* 52, *diverso itinere malos a bonis loca taetra inculta foeda atque formidolosa habere*.

Elysiis . . . campis: the Elysian fields were synonymous with the Isles of the Blest (so Servius on *Aen.* 5.735). Originally a paradise in the far distant corner of the earth
which was reserved for a few special favourites of the gods, who were granted the gift of immortality (Homer *Od.* 4.560ff., Hesiod *Op.* 167ff.), Elysium was transferred to the Underworld when it was conceived rather as a reward for the virtuous dead. Cf. Plato *Ax.* 371C; Vergil *Aen.* 6.660ff.; V.Fl. 1.843, 851; Murgatroyd on *Tib.* 1.3.57-8.

172 *noxia turba*: ‘guilty crowd’. In Tibullus 1.3.70 the notorious denizens of Tartarus are termed an *impia turba*. The same group of sinners whom Ovid now describes, Sisyphus, Ixion, the Danaides, Tantalus, and Tityos, are also highlighted in *Met.* 4.457ff. (and cf. Bömer’s notes *ad loc.*).

173 *Sisyphus*: the classical symbol of craftiness and deceit; it is perhaps not fortuitous that Ovid begins with this shifty and unscrupulous character, for he exemplifies the very qualities which Ovid ascribes to Ibis (cf. 13-21, 29, 40).

*saxum volvens petensque*: there were several legends centered upon this son of Aeolus, all of which involved his trickery and cunning, but concerning his eternal torment in the Underworld there was unanimous agreement: he was sentenced to roll a large rock up a hill, from which it always rolled down again when near the top. Cf. Homer *Od.* 11.595ff., ἢ τοι δὲ μὲν σκηνυπτόμενος χερσίν τε ποσίν τε/ λάων ἀνω ὀθεσκε ποτὶ λόφου· ἀλλ’ ὅτε μέλλου/ ἄκρον ὑπερβαλέειν, τότ’ ἀποστρέψας κραταίς; αὐτὸς ἐπείτα πέδωνε κυλίνδετο λάως ἀναιδής; αὐτὰρ δ’ ἄψ ὅσαςκε τυταινόμενος, κατὰ δ’ ἱδρῶ/ ἐρρεεν ἐκ μελέων, κοινὴ δ’ ἐκ κρατός ὅρωρε; Plato *Ax.* 371E; Apollod. *Bib.* 1.9.3; Ovid *Met.* 4.460, aut petis aut urges reditum, Sisyphe, *saxum*; Hyginus 60.201; *Culex* 243f. Although Homer did not record the reason for Sisyphus’ punishment, a common explanation was that he aroused the anger of Zeus by revealing to the river god Asopus that it was Zeus who had carried off Asopus’ daughter Aegina (thus Paus. 2.5.1; Apollod. 1.9.3; scholia on Homer *Il.* 1.180). Alternatively, he was punished for outwitting Thanatos whom he caught and bound, thereby giving mortals a brief period of immortality. After Thanatos was freed by the gods, he again came for Sisyphus, but again Sisyphus had a clever ruse: he bid his wife Merope not bury his body or make any offerings in his honour, and then complained bitterly to Hades of his wife’s conduct. Hades accordingly allowed
Sisyphus to return to the upper world in order to punish his wife, but Sisyphus, of course, had no intention of so doing, and, once he regained the upper world, resumed his life and lived to a great old age. Cf. Phercydes fr. 119; scholia on Homer Il. 6.153; Pearson, Fragments of Sophocles vol.2,p.184f. Engaged perpetually in his futile labour with the rock, Sisyphus was thereby denied any further chance of escape. Variant versions of the legends associated with Sisyphus, and a discussion of them, may be found in Roscher 4, s.v. Sisyphos, 958-972.

174 quique agitur: an allusion to another of the great sinners of antiquity, Ixion, who was fastened to an ever-revolving wheel by Zeus, because Ixion had tried to rape Hera. Ixion does not figure in the Homeric Tartarus, but first receives this aerial punishment in Pindar P. 2.21ff., θέων δ' ἐφετμαίζει Ἰξίωνα φαντὰ ταύτα βροτοῖς/ λέγειν ἐν προὔεντι τροχῷ/ ταντῇ κυλινδομένον. See also Apollonius Rhodius 3.62; Hyginus 62; Tibullus 1.3.73-74 with references of Smith ad loc.; Met. 4.461; Vergil Aen. 6.601f.; Seneca Ag. 15f. with Tarrant’s note. Ixion’s punishment was sometimes further embellished by portraying him as bound to a burning wheel (thus scholia ad Euripides Ph. 1185), or by having snakes rather than chains tie him to the wheel (Vergil Georg. 3.38 and Servius ad loc.). Murgatroyd notes at Tibullus 1.3.73-74 that Tibullus emphasizes the speed with which the wheel revolves, (cf. Pindar P. 2.22, προὔεντι; Sophocles Ph. 676, δρομάδα; Sen. Ag. 15 celeri, Thy. 8) in order to bring out the full force of Ixion’s punishment, and Ovid in similar fashion highlights this aspect of the punishment with rapidae rotae, while the placement of rapidae between agitur and vinctus stresses Ixion’s helplessness and passivity as he flies through the air. See further Roscher 2.1, s.v. Ixion, 766-772.

175-176 Belides: although Ovid does not name them directly, the patronymic Belides identifies these transgressors as the Danaids, the fifty daughters of Danaus, son of Belus and twin brother of Aegyptus. Ovid would seem to have been the first in Latin literature to denote the Danaides by Belides, which he does not only here, but in Met. 4.463, 10.44, Ars 1.73f., and Tr. 3.1.62. (See further the note of Bömer at Met. 4.463.) After Ovid, the title was used by Juvenal (6.655); cf. also Seneca Her.O.
960, *cruenta Belias.*

gerunt umeris perituras . . . undas: for the murder of their cousin-husbands (see below, note on *exulis Aegypti . . . nurus*), the Danaids were compelled to spend all eternity carrying water in leaky vessels, a punishment first assigned to them by Plato *Ax.* 371E.1 The story was a favourite among Augustan writers (cf. Horace *Od* 3.2.25ff.; Tibullus 1.3.79f.; Propertius 2.1.4; 4.11.27f., Ovid *Met.* 4.462f.; *Am.* 2.2.4; *Her.* 14; *Ars* 1.73f.; *Tr.* 3.1.59ff. with Luck's note etc.), and was portrayed in the portico of Augustus' Palatine temple to Apollo. (Cf. Horace *Od.* 2.1.5f. and Nisbet & Hubbard *ad loc.*) For their punishment cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.12ff., with Frazer's note; Pausanias 2.16.1ff., 19.3-7, 25.4, 37.1-2; Hyginus *Fab.* 168; Lucretius 3.1008ff.; *Culex* 245ff. See further Roscher 1, s.v. Danaiden, 949-952; *LIMC* 3, s.v. Danaides.

*exulis Aegypti . . . nurus:* after Danaus and Aegyptus quarrelled, Aegyptus suggested that peace should be restored by marrying his fifty sons to Danaus' fifty daughters. Danaus instead fled with his daughters from Egypt to Argos, but when followed there by the sons, finally agreed to the marriages. However, he secretly ordered his daughters to murder their husbands on their wedding night, which all but the eldest, Hypermestra, did. The significance of *exulis Aegypti* is passed over in silence by La Penna and Ellis; the point of it may lie in the tradition recorded by Pausanias (7.21.6) that Aegyptus, fearing his brother, fled to Aroe after the murder of his sons. (Cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.1.4ff., Hyginus *Fab.* 162, Horace *Od.* 3.11.25ff.).

turba cruenta: a concise reminder both of the magnitude and horror of the infamous slaughter of their husbands. Tarrant remarks of *turba* at Seneca *Thy.* 19 that it conveys the sense of "members of a family seen as a closely linked group", and this is appropriate for the Danaids, who, apart from Hypermestra, were rarely accorded any individual treatment. For listings of their names, compare Apollodorus *Bib.*

---

1The Homeric poems make no mention at all of the Danaids, while Pindar tells of the remarriage of 48 of the daughters in *P.* 9.111-116.
2.1.5, and Hyginus *Fab.* 170.

177-178 *pater Pelopis*: Tantalus. The periphrastic expression serves as a reminder of one of Tantalus’ most notorious crimes (Nisbet & Hubbard on Hor. *Od.* 2.13.37), the dismemberment of his son Pelops, whom he served to the gods in order to ascertain if they could differentiate human from animal flesh (cf. Pindar *O.* 1.46ff.; Servius on *Aen.* 6.603). All the gods except Demeter saw through the deception, but she, preoccupied by the loss of Persephone, ate one of Pelops’ shoulders. The gods, however, restored Pelops to life, and replaced the lost shoulder with an ivory one (Hyginus *Fab.* 83). Other crimes which were attributed to Tantalus included divulging Zeus’ plans to mortals (Hyg. *Fab.* 82; Ovid *Met.* 6.213), stealing the nectar and ambrosia of the gods (Pindar *O.* 1.36-64), and perjuring himself when he swore that he had not seen Zeus’ dog, which had been stolen by Pandareus and given to him (Eustath. ad *Od.* 19.518).

Tantalus’ punishment for these crimes was very well known and often described: he was continually hungry and thirsty, and forced to stand in water that reached to his chin, while trees abounding in fruit hung just over his head. However, if he tried to drink, the water withdrew, and if he tried to eat the fruit, the wind blew the branches out of his reach. (Thus English ‘tantalize’.) Cf. Homer *Od.* 11.582ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 82; Tibullus 1.3.77f.; Ovid *Met.* 4.458f; *Am.* 2.2.43; and Seneca *Thy.* 152ff.; *Her.F.* 752; *Her.O.* 1075. Both elements of this punishment are concisely alluded to here.

*poma . . . praesentia*: the alliterative p’s are striking. Note the word order here, with *poma . . . praesentia* surrounding *pater Pelopis*, as if to emphasize the fruit’s proximity, and thereby taunt Tantalus. The thwarting of Tantalus’ wants is continued with the antithetical *semper eget . . . semper abundat aquis*.

According to an alternate tradition, a large rock loomed over his head, ever ready to fall on him, and crush him (Pindar *O.* 1.57ff.; Archilochus fr.55; Pausanias 10.31.12; Hyginus *Fab.* 82; Cicero *Fin.* 1.18.60, *Tusc* 4.35; Lucretius 3.981 etc.) See further Roscher 5, s.v. Tantalos, 75-85.
179-180 iugeribusque novem . . . qui distat: the giant Tityos, son of Zeus, who was goaded by a jealous Hera into trying to rape Leto, mother of Apollo and Artemis. However, he was killed in the attempt, either by Zeus (Hyginus 55), Apollo (Apollonius Rhodius 1.759ff.), or both Apollo and Artemis (Apollod. Bib. 1.23, Pindar P. 4.90ff.). After his death, Tityos lay stretched out in the Underworld, and covered nine acres with his body, a traditional detail found first in Homer Od. 11.576ff.; cf. Tibullus 1.3.75-76; Lucretius 3.988f.; Propertius 3.5.44; Vergil Aen. 6.596; Ovid Met. 4.457ff., Tityos . . . novemque/ iugeribus distentus erat; Hyginus 55.

summus . . . ab imo: cf. Horace Sat. 2.3.308f., longos imitaris, ab imo/ ad summum totus moduli bipedalis.

visceraque assiduae . . . avi: avi here is presumably singular for plural. Cf. verse 192 and commentary ad loc. The epithet assiduus emphasizes the continuous torment of Tityos, and is an oblique way of referring to the continual replenishment of Tityos' liver. Cf. Tibullus 1.3.75f., porrectusque novem Tityos per iugera terrae/ adsiduas atro viscere pascit aves; Ovid Ex P. 1.2.39f.; Vergil Aen. 6.597ff.; Seneca Thy. 9ff., Ag. 18. The punishment reflects the ancients' view that the liver was the seat of sexual appetite, as noted by Servius ad Aen. 6.596. For more on Tityus, see Roscher 5, s.v. Tityos, 1033-1055.

181-185 Punishment by the Furies (Erinyes), traditionally thought of as three in number, the sisters Tisiphone, Alecto, and Megaera. Here, each in turn inflicts punishment upon Ibis. The Furies first make their appearance in the Underworld to punish sinners in Homer Il. 19.259f., . . . Ἐρυνύς, αἰ θ' ἰπὸ γοῖαν/ ἄνθρωπος τίνως τοι θυγατρία; 9.571, and Od. 20.77, and are likewise κατὰ γῆς in Aeschylus (Eu. 1007, 115). For their appearance in Tartarus as the chief tormentors of the dead in Latin literature, cf. Tibullus 1.3.69f. with the notes of Smith and Murgatroyd ad loc., Vergil Aen. 6.570ff., and Ovid Met. 4.455f. They were invariably portrayed with snaky locks, and brandishing whips and torches.

181-182 flagello: for the Furies lashing their victims with a whip compare Vergil Aen.
6.570; Seneca Med. 962; V. Fl. 8.20.

**numeros:** ‘sum’ or ‘total’; cf. *OLD* s.v. 1.

**confiteare:** compare Martial 10.5.18, *et cum fateri Furia iussisset verum/ prodente clamat conscientia: "Scripsi!”*

183-184 In *Met.* 4.495ff., Ovid depicts the Fury Tisiphone tormenting transgressors with snakes, *inde duos mediis abrumpit crinibus angues/ pestiferaque manu raptos inmisit . . .*, and she finishes off the task with her torch (508f.): *tum face iactata per eundem saepius orbe/ consequitur motis velociter ignibus ignes,* but the punishment seems less vivid and unpleasant than the one outlined here.

186 **Aeacus:** a son of Zeus who was renowned for his piety and thus after his death became a judge of the dead in the Underworld. In Homer, Rhadamanthus appears to be the sole judge, but from Plato on Aeacus is assigned a role (see Bömer on *Met.* 7.475ff., p.320f.). Cf. Plato *Ap.* 41a, *Gorgias* 523e; Ovid *Met.* 13.25f., *Aeacus huic pater est, qui iura silentibus illic/ reddet;* Propertius 4.11.19, *aut si quis posita iudex sedet Aeacus urna,/ in mea sortita vindicet ossa pila,* Martial 10.5.13f., *nec finiantur morte supplicis poenae/ sed modo severi sectus Aeaci loris;* and Juvenal 1.9f., *quas torqueat umbras/ Aeacus. in poenas ingeniosus:* an Ovidian phrase, found also in *Tr.* 2.342, *inque meas poenas ingeniosus eram.*

187-192 In the same sequence as they appeared above (but with the omission of the Danaids), the punishments of the sinners of old are once again briefly highlighted, but now all their torments are to be transferred to Ibis. Tarrant on Seneca *Ag.* 15, notes that Agrippina invokes the punishments of traditional sinners on Nero in *Oct.* 619ff., and compares Claudian *Ruf.* 2.506ff. As he points out, this may have a proverbial origin: cf. *Paroem. Gr.* II. 680.10. Leutsch, *Τιτὶ σε περιμένει καὶ Ἦξιόνος κολαστήρια;* Martial 10.5.17, *delasset omnes fabulas poetarum.*

**transcribet:** ‘reassign’. Cf Seneca *Thy.* 13, wherein Tantalus asks *in quod malum transcribor? Transcribere* was a legal term for the transference or reassignment of property, as in *Dig.* 19.5.17, *convenisse . . . ut eos fundos . . . mulier transcriberet.*
viro (Fordyce on Aen. 7.422). Tarrant (on Thy. 13) notes that "the verb is first attested in this sense in Augustan poetry (cf. Vergil Aen. 5.750, 7.422, Ovid Met. 7.173), and appears in the prose of the next generation (cf. V. Max. 2.7.9.15; Seneca Ep. 4.2, etc.)."

causa quietis eris: no longer will the sinners of the Underworld undergo their endless torment, as all their punishments are to be visited upon Ibis instead.

189 revolubile: 'rolling backwards’, also used of Sisyphus’ punishment in Silius Italicus 11.476, revolubile saxum. Before Ovid, the adjective is found only in Propertius (4.7.51). As was the case above, Sisyphus remains the only sinner directly named.

190 celeres . . . rotae: again, as in 174 (rapidae) the swiftness of the wheel’s revolution is stressed.

191 The futility of efforts made to snare the elusive rami and undae are summed up by frustra . . . capet.

192 inconsumpto viscere: the continual replenishment of Tityos’ liver, which was only obliquely referred to earlier with assiduae . . . avi is now specified. Note the change from the singular avi in 180, to the plural avis here; this is most likely simply a poetic device on Ovid’s part, but there was some discrepancy in antiquity concerning the number of birds. (Cf. Roscher 1073f.) The traditional account, beginning with Homer Od. 11.579 (cf. Prop. 2.20.31; Tib. 1.3.76; Ovid Met. 10.43) had two vultures (or an unspecified plural) feeding on Tityos’ liver, while Vergil (Aen.6.596), followed by Horace Od. 3.4.47, and Claudian de Rapt. Pros. 2.341, had but one. Seneca, like Ovid, is inconsistent, having the singular on some occasions (Her.F. 756, Ag. 18, with Tarrant’s note, Phaed. 1233, Oct. 622), and on others the plural (so Her.O. 1071, Thy. 10), but nowhere within so few lines.

193-194 A curious statement, intended to emphasize the eternity of Ibis’ punishment. Cf. Martial 10.5.13, nec finiantur morte supplicis poenae.

195 paucă: understand mala. Ovid now goes on to give vivid and solemn expression to the innumerable woes that are to fall upon Ibis, by comparing them to different aspects of nature.
frondes ab Ida: E.S. McCartney in "Vivid Ways of Indicating Uncountable Numbers", Classical Philology 55 (1960), p.79, notes that "throughout the ages leaves seem to have been used more frequently than any other aspect of nature to signify great multitudes"; the earliest examples of this occur in the poetry of Homer, wherein the comparison of leaves is used on more than one occasion to suggest the great size of martial forces. Cf. Il. 2.467-8, 786-801, and Od. 9.51. Ida was the name of two different mountains, one in Crete, the other in Southern Phrygia, but it was the latter, from the summit of which Zeus watched the Trojan War, which was called by Homer "Ιδας... ἰλισσης (Il. 21.449). The same leafy mountain was employed by Bacchylides (5.63-7) to good effect, when he commented that the souls of mortals seen by Hercules in the underworld were "countless as the leaves quivering in the wind, where flocks graze on the gleaming headlands of Ida". Also noteworthy is the example found within a series of adunata in Met. 13.324, sine frondibus Ide stabit; see further Bömer on Met. 7.359, Fast. 4.182.

196 Libyco de mare: Libycum mare refers to the southern part of the Mediterranean Sea, off the coast of North Africa. Cf. Pliny Nat. 5.1.1. It is employed here in a variation of another common topos, namely the countless number of waves in the sea (cf. Homer Il. 11.307ff.; A.R. 4.214-215; Theoc. Id. 16.60-61 and Gow's note ad loc.; Vergil Georg. 2.103-108; Martial 6.34; Claudian In Eutrop. 18.32-33 etc.) Ellis points to this poetical ablative form of mare in other works of Ovid, notably Ars 3.94, Tr. 5.2.20, and Ex P. 4.6.46.

197 quot flores Sicula nascantur in Hybla: Hybla, located in the vicinity of Mt. Aetna in Sicily, was renowned for its honey (Strabo 6.2.2, Pliny Nat. 11.13), and abounded in bees and flowers. Cf. Tr. 5.6.38 florida ... Hybla, Seneca Oed. 601, nec vere flores Hybla tot medio creat.

198 ferat ... terra Cilissa crocos: the province of Cilicia in south-east Asia Minor, which lay between Pamphylia and Syria, was particularly famed for its saffron. Compare Lucretius 2.416, et cum scena croco Cilici perfusa recens est; Culex 401, Cilici crocus editus arvo; Prop. 4.6.74; Horace Sat. 2.4.68 etc.
199 **heiems Aquilonis . . . alis:** with this winged representation of Aquilo, La Penna compares *Tr.* 3.10.45, *et quamvis Boreas lactatis insonet alis.*

200 **grandine:** the use of hail in a comparison is found in Ovid’s *Ex P.* 4.7.34 to describe the countless number of stones thrown in battle. Compare also Vergil *Georg.* 4.80, and additional examples collected by McCartney, p.87.

**Athos:** (modern Agion Oros/ Monte Santo) a mountain on the peninsula of Acte in Chalcidice, Athos does not have the distinction of being the highest mountain in Northern Greece (that belongs to Olympus at 2,917 meters), but its pyramid-shaped peak rises in spectacular fashion straight up from the sea to a height of 1,935 meters, and it would certainly take a vast quantity of hail to cover the mountain in white. Athos and Hybla are found together in a comparison in *Ars* 2.517; *quot lepores in Atho, quot apes pascuntur in Hybla.*

201-202 **nee mala . . . referri:** profession of one’s inadequacy for the task at hand began with the Homeric πληθών δ' οὐκ ἤν ἐγὼ μνῆσομαι οὐδ' ὑμηνώ,/ οὐδ' εἰ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἰς,/ φωνή δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δὲ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη (*Il.* 2.488-90), and became a conventional motif in epic poetry. Examples include Ennius *Ann.* 547-8W; Vergil *Georgics* 2.43-4, *Aen.* 6.625-6, with Austin’s note; Ovid *Met.* 8.533ff. (additional examples cited by Bömer *ad loc.*); cf. the mocking comment of Persius 5.1f.: *vatibus hic mos est, centum sibi poscere voces, centum ora et linguas optare in carmina centum.* Such formulae lent themselves particularly well to encomia (cf. Claudian *Prob.* 55ff., *non mihi centenis pateant si vocibus ora/ multiforme ruat centum per pectora Phoebus,/ acta Probi narrare queam . . . *), and conversely, to vituperation such as this.

**ora . . . multiplicata:** the number of tongues involved increased from the Homeric 10, to 100 (cf. Vergil *Georg.* 2.43ff.), and then to 1000 (Ovid *Fasti* 2.119, V. Fl. 640).

The lack of an adequate reference for *inde* in 195 led Housman (*Journal of Philol.* 34, 1918 p.235f.) to argue that this couplet should in fact be transposed, so as to follow after 194. His rationale for this was that in the traditional order *inde*
... *canam* should refer to the punishments to be endured by Ibis after death, a few of which Ovid has already enumerated; however, when Ovid resumes his catalogue of afflictions, they consist instead of afflictions to be visited upon Ibis when alive. To remove this inconsistency, Housman suggested the transposition, whereupon *inde* would then look back to *mala tua*, and could conceivably be applied to all of the *exempla* which follow. As always, Housman was sensitive to the text, and his arguments are persuasive. However, there is no evidence for dislocation in the manuscripts.

203-206 cogi in lacrimas: Ovid’s apparent sympathy for his enemy’s sufferings (for which compare Sophocles *Ajax* 924, ὡς καὶ παρ’ ἐχθροῖς ἔξιος θρήνων τυχεῖν; Ennius *Ann.* 5.vii.162, cogeabant hostes lacrimantes ut misererent; Ovid *Tr.* 3.11.59f., (with Luck’s note) tot mala sum . . . passus/ te quoque ut auditis posse dolore putem) is ironically undercut by his admission that he will delight in his tears.

207-214 natus es infelix: Ibis’ day of birth is recalled, and the astrological signs which presaged his character. For the popularity of astrology in Augustan Rome, see Nisbet & Hubbard on Horace *Od.* 1.11.2. The position of the planets at an individual’s birth was considered of great importance by many in determining character and destiny: at Ibis’ birth no favourable stars were present; Venus and Jupiter were absent, the Moon and the Sun were not in a fitting locale, nor was Mercury. Only the baneful stars of Mars and Saturn watched over him.


209 Non Venus adfusit, non . . . Juppiter: it was a commonplace of astrological lore that Venus and Jupiter were benign and beneficial influences, while Saturn and Mars were evil and harmful. The antagonism between Saturn and Jupiter in astrological matters reflects their antagonism in myth (cf. English ‘saturnine’ and ‘jovial’), and likewise the opposites Venus and Mars squared off against one another. Thus *C.C.A.G.* ν iii p.101 2-5, ὃ Ζεὺς ἀναλύει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κρόνου δεσμούμενα καὶ μεταβάλλει τὴν κακίαν αὐτοῦ, ὃτε συσχηματίζεται αὐτῷ. ἢ δὲ Ἀφροδίτη λύει τὴν
κακίων τοῦ "Ἀρεως; Cicero Div. 1.85, quid astrologus cur stella Iovis aut Veneris coniuncta cum luna ad orus puerorum salutaris sit, Saturni Martiisve contraria?

Lucan 1.660ff. and scholia ad loc.; Macrobius De Som. 1.19.23; Firmicus Maternus 4.20.5. For the opposition of Mars and Venus see especially Amores 1.8.29f., stella tibi oppitii nocuit contraria Martis;/ Mars abiiit; signo nunc Venus apta suo, with the comments of McKeown ad loc.

ADFULSIT: Ellis follows the reading of G, illuxit, but admits that adfulsit, which La Penna opts for, and which seems the more likely, is not without merit, and cites in its favour Seneca Suas. 4.2, Natales inquirunt et primam aevi horam omnium annorum habent nuntiam, quo ierint motu sidera, in quas discurrerint partes, contrane deus steterit an placidus adfulserit sol; Sil. Ital. 7.467.

210 Lunaque . . . Solque: cf. Macrobius 1.19.23, vitam nostram praecipue moderantur, cum οἰωθητικῶν, id est sentiendi natura, de sole, φυτικῶν autem, id est crescendi natura, de lunari ad nos globositate perveniant.

APTO . . . LOC: ‘favourably situated’. McKeown notes on Am. 1.8.29-30 that aptus was considered the equivalent of ἀπερεσθεα, as Servius remarks on Aen. 4.482.

211-212 UTILITER POSITOS . . . IGNES: cf. Manilius 4.470 nec quarta (scil. pars Erigones) nec octava utilis umquam. The use of positus as a technical term in astrological references in Manilius 2.166, Gellius 14.1.1, and Maternus is noted by La Penna.

QUEM PEPERIT . . . MAIA IOVI: an allusion to the god Mercury, son of Maia and Jupiter. Compare Vergil Aen. 1.297 Maia genitum; Horace Od. 1.2.43 filius Maiae; and Ovid Met. 11.303. For Mercury’s influence at birth, see Maternus 4.19.24ff. Ellis makes the interesting point that Mercury should in fact aid Ibis, since the bird Ibis was favoured by him. Cf. Aelian NA 10.29 τῷ Ἑρμῆ γοασι τῷ πατρὶ τῶν λόγων φιλετον (Ἰῆρι βιν).

213-214 FERA . . . MARTIS/SIDERA . . . FALCIFERIQUE SENIS: appropriately, the two malefic influences, Mars and Saturn, attended the birth. Ovid appears to have been the first to describe Saturn with the epithet falcifer (Fast. 1.234, and see the note of Bömer on 5.627; imitated by Martial 11.6.1), a reminder of the god’s use of the sickle to
castrate his father Uranus (Hesiod Th. 175 etc; cf. 271-272 of the Ibis and commentary ad loc.). For the baneful effect of Mars, compare Cicero De Rep. 6.17.17, tum rutilus horribilisque terris quem Martium dicitis; Macrobius 1.19.19, plerunque de Martis stella terribilia, de Iovis salutaria manare definiunt. Likewise Saturn's harmful character was a commonplace. Thus Propertius 4.1.84, felicesque Iovis stellas Martisque rapaces/ et grave Saturni sidus in omne caput; Lucan 1.651f. frigida . . . stella nocens . . . Saturni; Persius 5.50; Macrobius 1.19.20; and Servius ad Aen. 4.92, who explains Juno's epithet Saturnia because scit . . . Saturni stellam nocendi facultatem habere. The combined influence of Mars and Saturn was particularly unfortunate, as Maternus notes (4.29.10; 15.8f.). For a full discussion of the role of the planets at birth, see Bouche-Leclercq, L’Astrologie grecque (1899), pp.405-457.

216 inductis nubibus: this phrase appears to have been a favourite of Ovid's, and variations on it are particularly common in the Metamorphoses. Thus Met. 1.263 inductas . . . nubes, 2.307 nubes inducere, 309 inducere nubes, etc. Prior to Ovid, similar formulae are found in Lucretius 4.140 [nubes videntur] alios trahere atque inducere . . . nimbos, and in Horace Sat. 1.5.9f., iam nox inducere terris umbras ... parabat. See further Bömer on Met. 2.307. For clouds as symbols of gloom in Ovid's poetry, cf. Tr. 5.5.22, pars vitae tristi cetera nube vacet, Ex P. 2.1.5f., tandem aliquid pulsa curarum nube serenum/ vidi. Since Ibis' life begins with such gloom, the implication is that his entire life will be spent 'under a cloud'.

217 [dies] in fastis cui dat gravis Allia nomen: Ibis' birthday is reputed by Ovid to fall on the dies Allia, the 18th of July, which was marked as a black day in the religious calendar (cf. Gellius 5.17.2, Macrobius 1.16.23), in memory of the terrible defeat suffered by the Romans at the hands of the Gauls in 390 B.C., at the spot where the Allia joined the Tiber. Compare Ovid Ars 1.413f. . . . qua flebilis Allia luce/ vulneribus Latiis sanguinolenta fluit; Vergil Aen. 7.717; Cicero Att. 9.5.2, etc.

218 publica damna: Ellis, "New Remarks on the Ibis of Ovid", Journal of Philol. 24 1895-6, p.180, notes that this combination is also found in Epiced. Drusi 200,
consulis erepti publica damna refert, and Rutilius Namatianus 1.24, Privatam repetunt publica damna fidem. The punctuation followed is that of Housman, who removed the comma after damna. (Cf. Ellis "New remarks . . . " p.180.)

220 Cinyphiam . . . humum: the adjective Cinyphius is first found in Latin poetry in Vergil's Georgics 3.312, and was used frequently thereafter as the poetic equivalent of 'Libyan'. It is derived from the river Cinyps, which flows into the Mediterranean about 18 kilometres from Leptis Magna.

221-222 bubo: yet another bad omen for Ibis, the screeching owl which heralds his birth. The owl was a frequent portender of ill omen and misfortune to the Romans. Because of its dark colouring, nocturnal habits, and eerie cry (cf. graves . . . sonos), it was commonly associated with the underworld, and considered an omen of death (Pliny Nat. 10.34) or great calamity. Thus in Ovid Met. 5.550 we find ignavus bubo, dirum mortalibus omen; 6.431-2, tectoque profanus/ incubuit bubo thalamique in culmine sedit (at the wedding of Tereus and Procne); 10.452f., ter omen/ funereus bubo letali carmine fecit (when Myrrha was about to make advances upon her father); 15.791, tristia mille locis Stygius dedit omina bubo (before the death of Caesar). Among the many other examples which might be cited are Vergil Aen. 4.462; Seneca Her.F. 687; Lucan 5.396 etc. See further the copious note of A. Pease in his commentary on Aeneid 4.462, Bömer on Met. 5.550, 7.269 and Wellman, RE 6 (1909), pp.1064-71.

223 Eumenides: the same spirits of divine vengeance whom Ovid envisioned punishing Ibis after death in the Underworld at 181ff. - but there referred to as the Furies - are attendant at his birth.

lavare palustribus undis: compare Met. 14.103f., loca feta palustribus undis,/ litora Cumarum, while Gratius Faliscus Cyn. 34 refers to the Cynphias . . . paludes. For attempts to identify the location of Ibis' bath, see the lengthy note by La Penna, p.45. Water was considered ἀμύηνος, 'undefiled' (Thgn. 447; Aeschylus Pers. 578), and hence was used for ceremonial purifications (cf. Macrobius 1.16.36; Empedocles fr. 143). However, the water with which the Furies washed Ibis was drawn from Stygian
pools, and was therefore associated with death.

224 **cava . . . unda:** cavis in this context seems to mean 'surrounding' or "engulfing". Cf. Catullus 17.4 and *Met.* 6.371, *cava palude.*

225 **Erebeae felle colubrae:** the potent effects of serpents’ venom are illustrated in Horace *Epod.* 3.6ff., and Seneca *Medea* 684-90, 731f. The adjective *Erebea* appears to have been an invention of Ovid’s, derived from Erebus, the abode of the dead. The Eumenides were traditionally represented with snaky locks (cf. Aeschylus *Ch.* 1049f.; Catullus 64.193; Tib. 1.3.69f., Vergil *Georg.* 4.482 etc.), and thus I presume that the nether snakes here described are those which resided in the Eumenides’ hair, which could be brought into contact with the baby as the Eumenides bent over him, or which they could draw out from their hair and use to assail their victim, as Tisiphone did to Athamas in *Met.* 4.495ff., or Allecto to Amata in Vergil *Aen.* 7.346ff.

226 **terque . . . increpuere manus:** the number three was frequently found in magical formulae and charms (cf. for example, Vergil *Ecl.* 8.75 and Servius *ad loc.*), and here presumably gives added potency to the rituals being carried out by the Eumenides.

**cruentatas:** not necessarily with the blood of the unwashed baby, as Ellis explained, since by this point the baby has in fact been washed; the hands of the Eumenides remain bloody even after washing Ibis, another sinister omen. This accords with other references to their bloody appearance: cf. *Met.* 4.481ff., . . . *Tisiphone* *madefactam sanguine sumit/ inportuna facem fluidoque cruore rubentem/ induitur pallam; Statius *Theb.* 11.197f., *cruenta Eumenis* etc.

227-228 **gutturaque . . . infantia:** this adjectival use of *infans* in place of the genitive form is found only in Ovid’s poetry. Compare *Fast.* 6.145, *infantia pectora*, and *Met.* 4.518f., *rigidoque infantia saxo/ discutit ora ferox*, with Bömer’s note.

**lacte canino:** there is an old saying, ‘you are what you eat’, and the canine milk which Ibis first drinks portends his character and later activities of ‘barking out’ his attacks in the Forum. The barking of a dog was a common metaphor in Latin
rhetoric, particularly with regard to denouncing an opponent. Thus Cicero *S. Roscio* 57, *Alii* (accusatores) *canes qui et latrare et mordere possunt*; Sallust *Hist.* 4.54 *canina facundia exercebatur*; Quintilian 12.9 *canina eloquentia*; Vell. 2.62 *tribunes Cannutius canina rabie lacerabat Antonium*, and a possible imitation of *Ibis* 230 in Prudentius Hamartig 401, *Inde canina foro latret facundia toto*. See further Otto, p. 69, nr. 316.

229 *perbibit*: 'drank deeply'. A rare verb; the only other instance where it is found in Ovid's poetry occurs in *Met.* 6.397, *venis perbibimus*.

230 Early in the poem (14), Ovid had complained that Ibis *iactat et in toto nomina nostra foro*.

231-232 The emphasis on the ill omens that accompanied Ibis' birth is resumed with a description of Ibis' first clothes, which were not only of a gloomy colour associated with the underworld, but taken from an accursed funeral pyre!

233-234: having clothed the child, the Furies now provide a rock to support his *molle... caput*, and in so doing underscore the adult Ibis' unfeeling hardness, for it was a common-place that the hard of heart were born of rocks. Cf. Homer *Il.* 16.33ff., *νηλεές, οίκ ἄρα σοι γε πατήρ ἵν αἰπτότα Πηλεύς, οἷδε Θέτις μήτηρ; γλαυκή δὲ σε τίκτε βάλασσα/ πέτραι τ' ἡλίσβατοι, δότι τοι νόος ἐστιν ἀκπηνής*; Cicero *Tusc.* 3.6.12, *non silice nati sumus*; Ovid *Tr.* 3.11.3ff., *natus es e scopulis et pastus lacte ferino,*
et dicam silices pectus habere tuum; Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.1.63-64.

235-236 viridi de stipite . . . faces: as their final preparation on Ibis' behalf, the Furies place a burning, green branch before his face, causing tears to stream from his eyes. For a similar reaction to green wood, compare Horace Sat.1.5.79ff., nisi nos . . ./ villa recepisset, lacrimoso non sine fumo,/ udos cum foliis ramos urente camino. As the Furies are his tormentors at birth, so they return with their snakes and smoky torches to plague Ibis again after his death. Cf. 181-185 and commentary ad loc.

238 de tribus . . . una soror: the question must be asked, which sisters does Ovid have in mind here, the Furies or the Parcae? For Clotho, one of the three Parcae (see commentary below) suddenly appears on the scene at 241, and this, coupled with the fact that the Furies have been described at 235 as recessurae, has led editors to assume without hesitation that the phrase de tribus . . . una soror refers to the Parcae. Certainly this phrase is often found in formulaic descriptions of the Parcae (thus Prop. 2.13.44 de tribus una soror; Martial 4.54.10 semper de tribus una negat; Epiced. Drusi 243), but the parallel cited by Ellis and La Penna from Met. 10.313, Stipite te Stygio umidisque adflavit echidnis/ de tribus una soror, actually concerns the Furies, not the Parcae. Given that Ovid has just been speaking of three sisters (i.e. the Furies) it seems natural to assume that de tribus . . . una soror is still referring to them; the Fates have played no part in Ibis' birth thus far, and to suddenly move on to them in this manner would be needlessly confusing. Moreover, the assertion of the sisters at 239, tempus in immensum lacrimas tibi movimus istas, is best attributed to the Furies, who first caused Ibis' tears. Such an interpretation would also give added point, I feel, to 241, dixerat: at Clotho iussit promissa valere; i.e. the Furies have delivered the prophetic utterance traditionally given by the Parcae at birth, but Clotho gives assent to their dire words.

241-242 Clotho: the Parcae, sometimes called the daughters of Necessity, were identified with the Greek Moirai, or Fates, known as Clotho 'the spinner', Lachesis 'the dispenser of lots', and Atropos 'the inflexible' (Hesiod Th. 217; Plato R. 617c). Tarrant (on Thy. 616) notes that these Greek names make their first appearance in
Latin poetry in Ovid's later works (cf. Fast. 6.757, Tr. 5.10.45), and thereafter are found in Cons. Liv. 239; Seneca Apoc. 4.1, Thy. 616; and Flavian writers. For more on their functions and mythology consult Roscher 2.3095, 3099.

nevit: the Parcae's spinning of one's destiny at birth occurs as early as Homer, Il. 20.127f. (of Achilles), ὥστερον αὖτε τὰ πείστειν ἄσσα οἱ Αἰδαὶ γνωμένος ἐπένεισε λίνῳ, δεὶ μν Τίκε μήτηρ; cf. Od. 7.196f., where the Fates collectively are called Κλώθες or 'spinners'.

stamina pulla: threads of dark hue were symbolic of a black fate. Thus Ovid in Tr. 4.1.63f. (with Luck's note), hic quoque cognosco natalis stamina nostris,/ stamina de nigro vellere facta mihi; 5.13.24 non ita sunt fati stamina nigra mei, again with a useful comment by Luck ad loc.; Ex P. 1.8.63f.; Martial 6.58.7f., si mihi lanificae ducunt non pulla sorores stamina.

243-244 Ovid gives a novel twist to the traditional prophetic song of the Parcae (for which compare, among others, Tib. 1.7.1f., hunc cecinere diem Parcae fatalia nentes/ stamina, non ulli dissoluenda deo . . . ; Ovid Met. 8.451f., stipes erat, quem, cum partus enixa iaceret/ Theslias, in flammam triplices posuere sorores;/ staminaque impresso fatalia pollice nentes/ "tempora " dixerunt "eadem lignoque tibique/ o modo nate, damus."; Hyginus Fab. 171), by having Clotho assign the song to a vates who is none other than Ovid himself.

245 ille ego sum: an emphatic formula which Ovid employed on several occasions - cf. Met. 1.757, 4.226, 15.500, Tr. 4.5.12 etc. It was otherwise sparingly used by the poets, exceptions being Tib. 1.6.31, Prop. 4.9.38, Ciris 409.

vulnera: as Ellis notes, vulnera is here used metaphorically for dolores; similarly in Tr. 4.1.97, we find corque vetusta meum, tamquam nova, vulnera novit.

246 dent . . . di vires in mea verba: for this thought, see especially Fast. 1.17, dederis in carmina vires; Met. 4.150, . . . dabit hic in vulnera vires; Prop. 3.9.27; Lucan 1.66; TLL 7.1,765,29.

247 pondera rerum: 'weight of circumstances' Cf. Tr. 2.237, Ex P. 3.4.98, in hoc . . . tantarum pondere rerum; Martial 6.64.13f., ipse etiam tanto dominus sub pondere
rerum/ non dedignatur bis terque revolvere Caesar.


exemplis aevi . . . prioris: cf. especially Tr. 1.5.31f., where Ovid states atque haec, exemplis quondam collecta priorum,/ nunc mihi sunt propriis cognita vera malis, and Ex P. 1.3.61f., nunc et veterum nobis exempla virorum/ . . . refer, where veterum is the equivalent of priorum. As Luck notes in his commentary to the above cited passage of the Tristia, "da die Grenze zwischen Mythos und Geschichte fließend ist, können exemplis priorum sowohl mythische als historische Beispiele sein."

Accordingly, the historiae caecae to which Ovid here makes the transition are drawn from both mythology and history, although the majority are mythological.

251-252 quantaque . . . Poeantius geras: Ovid's wish that Ibis suffer ills no less grave than those suffered by the Trojans rather surprisingly does not lead immediately to a catalogue of afflictions suffered by the Trojans; instead, with a lively touch characteristic of Ovid, he moves by association to the man whose weapons were destined to end the Trojan war (and therefore by extension the supreme ill for Troy), the Greek Philoctetes.

Philoctetes was the son of Poeas, a Thessalian king (cf. Homer Od. 3.190, ἐν δὲ Φιλοκήτην Ποιάντιον ἀγλαῖον νίόν; Pindar P. 1.53; and Sophocles' Ph., wherein he is addressed as Poeas' son on eight occasions). For Ovid's use of this patronymic to refer to Philoctetes in his other works, cf. Met. 13.45 Poeantia proles; Rem. 111 Poeantius heros; Tr. 5.1.61 and 5.2.13 Poeantius; and Ex P. 1.3.5 Poeantius heros.

clavigeri . . . Herculis heres: Hercules, in gratitude for Philoctetes' services in lighting his funeral pyre on Mt. Oeta, gave to Philoctetes his famed bow and arrows (cf. Sophocles Ph. 801ff.; Ovid Met. 9.229-234; Hyginus 36; 102; Diodorus Siculus 4.38.4). Hercules had once conquered Troy with these weapons (Homer Il. 5.640ff.), and it was fated that only by their new possessor, Philoctetes, would Troy again be taken (cf. Homer Il. 2.724f.; Sophocles Ph. 604-613; Hyg. 102; Apollodorus Epit.
5.8). It is interesting that, although *Herculis heres* is intended to remind readers of Hercules' bow and arrows, Ovid uses the epithet *clavigerus* to describe Hercules, also used in connection with Hercules at *Met.* 15.22, 284; *Fast.* 1.544, 4.68.

**venenato . . . crure:** on his way to the Trojan war, Philoctetes was bitten on his foot by a snake (on the island of Chryse according to Sophocles, *Ph.*; on Tenedos in Hyginus' version). Because of the overpowering smell from the wound, which refused to heal, and because Philoctetes was unable to restrain himself from crying out in agony during sacrifices, the Greek leaders agreed among themselves to leave him behind on the uninhabited island of Lemnos. For ten long years (*Ph.* 310ff.; *Tr.* 5.2.13f., *paene decem totis aluit Poeantius annis/ pestiferum tumido vulnus ab angue datum*), Philoctetes endured agonizing pain, before the Greeks returned for him, in order to fulfil the prophecy that Troy would fall only to an enemy armed with the weapons of Hercules. For the running, ulcerated sore which kept Philoctetes in agony, cf. Soph. *Ph.* 7, νόσψ καταστάξοντα διαβόρφ πόδα, 696ff., δε ταν, θερμοστάταν αἰμάδα κηκομέναν ἐλκέων/ ἐνθήρου ποδος; ἥπιοις/ φύλλοις κατευνάσεων . . . and Cicero *Fin.* 2.94, who cites Philoctetes' excruciating ordeal in refutation of the maxim of Epicurus that severe pain is short-lived: *Huic Epicurus praecentet, si potest, cui/ "E viperino morsu venae viscerum/ veneno imbutae taetros cruciatus cien."* Elsewhere (5.32) Cicero says of Philoctetes *cruciaretur non ferendis doloribus.* Philoctetes appears in Ovid's other poetry from exile as an *exemplum* of heroic suffering for the poet, which he equates to his own suffering in exile. Cf. *Ex P.* 1.3.5; *Tr.* 5.1.61f.; 5.2.13f.; 5.4.12.

**vulnera:** poetic plural. For more on the Philoctetes myth see Roscher 3,2311-2343.

253-254 From Hercules' heir, to Hercules' son, and again, an allusion to a figure from the time of the Trojan war, Telephus, the son of Hercules and Auge, the daughter of the Arcadian king Aleos. In his customarily allusive manner, Ovid highlights the two most important aspects of the Telephus myth, in order to make clear his identity. These are that he was nourished by a deer, and was healed by the same man who wounded him. It is noteworthy that Philoctetes and Telephus appear in close
proximity not only here in the *Ibis*, but also in *Tr.* 5.2.13ff., and Propertius 2.1.59ff., while their myths are side by side in Hyginus 101, and 102, and both seem to have figured in the *Cypria*, judging by the brief summary of Proclus. There are correspondences in their myths: both received wounds before the start of the Trojan War, and both were necessary for the Greek victory - Telephus to guide them to Troy, and Philoctetes to capture it - and only by so aiding the Greeks were they cured of their wounds.

*bibit ubera cervae*: Telephus was exposed after his birth by his grandfather Aleos, but survived because he was suckled by a hind, and thereafter taken in by shepherds, who named him Τῆλεφος, as though from θηλάν 'to suckle', and ἐλαφος 'deer' (Hyginus 99; Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.7.4 and Frazer's note *ad loc.*)

*armatique tulit vulnus, inermis opem*: Telephus grew up to become the king of the Teuthranians in Asia Minor, and according to the *Cypria*, was there wounded by Achilles, when the Greeks engaged the Teuthranians in battle, thinking that they had reached Troy. Telephus took his stand against the Greeks, but frightened by Achilles, turned to flee, tripped, and was wounded in the thigh by Achilles' spear (cf. Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.17). Like Philoctetes, Telephus suffered great pain from a wound which refused to heal; after eight years of agony (Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.18-19), his wound still festering, Telephus consulted the Delphic oracle, which revealed that he could only be healed by the one who had wounded him. Reduced to the life of a ragged beggar, he made his way to the Greek camp, and sought Achilles' aid in return for guiding the Greeks to Troy, which they had still not reached. Achilles scraped some of the rust from his spear into the wound, which thereupon healed (Apollodorus; Hyginus 101). Telephus was the subject of a famous play by Euripides (Nauck *TGF* 2nd ed. fr. 696-727) and was featured in a Sophoclean drama (Pearson *Sophocles Frags.* 2.220). His wounding and healing became a favoured literary topos; see for example, *AP* 2.763ff., ὁ τρώσας ἱαστᾶτο; 5.291.5, Τῆλεφος ὁ τρώσας καὶ ἄκεσσατο; Propertius 2.1.63f., *Mysus et Haemonii iuvenis qua cuspidé vulnus/ senserat hac ipsa cuspidé sensit opem*. In the *Metamorphoses* Achilles twice speaks of his role in curing
Telephus: . . . opusque meae bis sensit Telephus hastae (12.112), and . . . ego Telephon haste/ pugnaniem domui, victum orantemque refeci (13.171f.).

armati . . . inermis: an allusive way of conveying the point that the armed and unarmed man were one and the same. For other plays on armatus/inermis in Ovid, see, for example, Am. 1.9.22, traditur armata vulgus inerme manu; Ars 3.46, armatis vulgus inerme viris. As was the case with the myth of Philoctetes, Ovid used the Telephus myth paradigmatically in Tr. 1.1.100, 2.20, 5.2.15ff., and Ex P. 2.2.26 and applied it to his own situation - only Augustus, who was responsible for the edict which banished him, could change it and recall him. For a fuller discussion of the myth, consult Roscher 5, 274-308; LICM 3 s.v. Auge.

tulit: the Propertian rendering of the myth cited above, with its word-play senserat . . . sensit, may have prompted Ovid’s dual use of tulit here. Vulnera tulit is certainly an appropriate phrase for receiving or enduring a wound (OLD s.v. fero 20b), and opem tulit is a common phrase for bringing aid or assistance to someone (hence in Tr. 2.20, also with regard to Telephus, res eadem vulnus opemque ferat), but I can find no adequate parallel for its use here in the sense of receiving aid. (Cf. OLD s.v. fero 36a.)

255-256 Temporally, the connection of this couplet to the preceding two is strained, since it concerns the hero Bellerophon, who was not himself involved in the Trojan War, but was the famed ancestor of the combatant Glaucus (cf. Homer II. 6.144-211). Perhaps Ovid intended his readers to make a connection between Aleos, the maternal grandfather of Telephus, and the Aleian plain where Bellerophon was thrown. The two lines in this couplet refer to two distinct exploits of the young Corinthian prince: his attempt to ride his winged horse Pegasus up to the heavens, and the tribulations which he underwent earlier because of a scorned woman.

quique ab equo praeceps . . . decidunt: although part of the same grammatical structure as the preceding couplet (nec levius doleas quam), the suffering of Bellerophon is only obliquely referred to. When Bellerophon, a victim of his own hybris, tried to scale the heavens on Pegasus, and join the gods, he was thrown by the
steed to the ground. See especially the account of Pindar I. 7.60ff.: ... τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐὰν παττάτω, βραχὺς ἐξικέθαι χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἔδραν. ὁτι πτερόεις ἐρρυψε Πάγασος/ δεσπότας ἔθελοντ' ἐς οὐρανοῦ σταθμοὺς/ ἐλθεῖν μεθ' ὁμάγων Βελλεροφόνταν/ Ζηνός.

in Aleia ... arva: it is not easy to ascertain Bellerophon's fate after his fall, for there were many versions of his story. Homer (II. 6.200-202) makes no mention of his fall from Pegasus, but does say that "hated by the gods, he wandered over the Alean plain alone, eating out his heart and avoiding the paths of men." Pindar, on the other hand, stops his account with Pegasus hurling off his rider; Bellerophon's fate is passed over in silence. Euripides, in a lost tragedy entitled Bellerophon, appears to have depicted him as surviving the fall, but severely crippled, and spurned by all (Nauck T.G.F. 2nd ed., p.443; cf. Aristophanes' parody in Peace 75-172), while Hyginus states merely that he dislocated his hip (Fab. 57, decidisse dicitur in campos Aleios, unde etiam coxas eiecisse dicitur).

exitio facies ... paene fuit: Bellerophon's beauty (for which see especially Homer II. 6.156f., τῶ δὲ θεοὶ κάλλος τὸ καὶ ἡμορην ἐρασευνή/ ὥπασαν) was to cause him considerable anguish: as a young man, Bellerophon accidently murdered someone (his name is explained as 'killer of Bellers'), and fled to the court of king Proteus of Tyrins. There, the king's wife (Anteia in Homer II. 6.155ff., Stheneboea in Apollodorus Bib. 2.3.1; Euripides T.G.F. 2nd ed., p.567ff. etc.) fell in love with the handsome Bellerophon, and tried to seduce him. When he rejected her advances, she took her revenge by telling her husband that Bellerophon had tried to take advantage of her. Proteus was unwilling to kill a guest of his home and so sent the unsuspecting Bellerophon to Anteia's father Iobates, the king of Lycia, with a letter stating that Bellerophon should be put to death. This is what lies behind Ovid's cryptic reference to Bellerophon's appearance nearly causing his destruction, for Iobates, in response to his son-in-law's request, sent the young man first against the fire-breathing Chimaera, then a neighbouring army, the Solymes, then the Amazons, and finally, the best soldiers of Lycia, all of whom Bellerophon defeated with the help of Pegasus. Cf.
Homer *II. 6.178ff; Apollodorus *Bib. 2.3.1; Hyginus *Fab. 57. One could say that indirectly at least, Bellerophon’s beauty, and Anteia’s consequent infatuation with him, did in fact lead to his destruction, for it was because he was swollen with pride at his success in the trials given to him by Iobates, that he later tried to ascend to the heavens. See further Roscher 1,757-774.

**257-270** The Bellerophon myth is followed by ten *exempla* of men afflicted with blindness, introduced by the ironic *id . . . videas.* Although there might not seem an obvious connection with the preceding couplet, according to one version of the myth Bellerophon was not only crippled after his fall from Pegasus, but was blinded as well (cf. schol. *II. 6.155*), and Ovid may well have expected his readers to make the association. Furthermore, there is a link between Bellerophon and the first victim of blindness, Phoenix, in that their troubles center around charges of seduction.

**257-258 Amyntorides:** Amyntor was the king of Ormenion at the foot of Mount Pelion, and his son, here designated by the patronymic *Amyntorides,* was Phoenix, who was blinded by his own father. For the patronymic cf. Ovid *Ars 1.337,* *flevit Amyntorides per inania lumina Phoenix.* (In both passages, the patronymic is perhaps intended to highlight Amyntor’s responsibility for the blinding.) According to the Homeric narrative (*II. 9.437-484*), Phoenix seduced one of his father’s concubines at the instigation of his mother, and when his father found out, he cursed Phoenix, and prayed to the Erinyes that Phoenix be childless. Nowhere in the Homeric tale is Phoenix portrayed as blind. However, in an alternate account preserved by Apollodorus (*Bib. 3.13.8*), it was the concubine who took the initiative, and tried to seduce Phoenix, who rejected her. The concubine thereupon denounced Phoenix with a false charge of seduction to his father, and in his wrath, Amyntor blinded Phoenix. After his blinding, Phoenix fled from his father’s court to Phthia, where Peleus gave him refuge, and had the centaur Chiron restore his sight. Phoenix later became the tutor of Peleus’ son Achilles, and accompanied him to Troy. Sophocles and Euripides both wrote plays entitled *Phoenix* (cf. Nauck *T.G.F. 2nd ed.,* pp.286, 621ff., Pearson *Frags. of Sophocles* vol.2, pp.320ff.), and it is clear from Aristophanes’ allusion in
the *Acharnians* 421 (τὰ τοῦ τυφλοῦ Φοίνικος) that Euripides depicted Phoenix as blind. This tradition is also recorded by Tzetzes on Lyc. *Alex.* 421, and by a poet of the *Palatine Anthology* (3.3). See further Roscher 3,2403-2409.

**ministro . . . baculo:** ‘with the aid of a stick’. For this adjectival use of *minister*, cf. *OLD* s.v. *minister* 2.


**luminis orbus:** cf. *Met.* 14.189 cited above with note of Bömer; Seneca *Oed.* 995, *luminis orbus/ molitur iter.* *Lumen* means both sight and light, as often.

**259-260 quem sua filia rexit:** one of the most famous legends of Greek literature was the self-blinding of Oedipus, king of Thebes, after he learned that he had killed his father, and married his mother. Blind, and an outcast from Thebes, Oedipus wandered for years as an exile (cf. *OC* 7f., *χρόνος . . . μακρός*), guided by his daughter Antigone, until they finally arrived at Colonus, where they were kindly received by Theseus, and where shortly thereafter Oedipus died. Sophocles’ *Oedipus Coloneus* opens with Oedipus, a blind old beggar, being supported by Antigone, and the many tribulations which she endured on her father’s behalf are recounted by Oedipus at 345ff.: . . . ἡ μὲν ἐξ ὅσιον νέας/ τροφῆς ἐληξε καὶ κατίσχυσεν δέμας,/ ἀεὶ μεθ’ ἡμῶν δύσμορος πλαισμένη/ γερονταγωγεῖ πολλὰ μὲν κατ’ ἀγρίαν/ ἔλην ἀσίτος νηλίπους τ’ ἀλώμενη,/ πολλοῖσι δ’ ὄμβρους ἡλίου τε καύμασι/ μοχθοῦσα τλῆμον δεύτερ’ ἥγειται τὰ τῆς/ οίκων διαίτης, εἰ πατήρ τροφὴν ἔχου; see also *Hyginus* 67.8, *Oedipus re audita postquam vidit se tot scelera nefaria fecisse, ex veste matris fibulas detraxit et se luminibus privavit, regnumque filiis suis alternis annis tradidit, et a Thebis Antigona filia duce profugit.*

**expertus scelus est cuius uterque parens:** i.e. his father, King Laius, was murdered by Oedipus at a cross-road not far from Delphi; his mother, Jocasta, married the young man and bore his children, after he freed the city of Thebes from the sphinx.
The myth's most famous treatment was by Sophocles in OT. Cf. Euripides Ph.; Apollodorus Bib. 3.5.7-9; Hyginus 66-67. See further Roscher 3,700-746.

**expertus est**: 'learned by experience'.

**uterque**: a favorite phrase of Ovid's. See McKeown on Am. 1.3.9-10.

261-262 **qualis erat**: here, and at the beginning of the next couplet, one should supply *talis sis*. Ovid follows the *exemplum* of Oedipus with the most famous prophet of ancient literature, the blind seer of Thebes, Tiresias. Indeed, it was Tiresias who predicted Oedipus' blindness (OT 419, 454ff.), after Oedipus taunted him concerning his own lack of sight. Ovid gives three hints in the couplet to Tiresias' identity: 1) he had taken some part in a playful dispute (*lite iocosa*), 2) he was an old man (*senex*), and 3) he was famous for his prophetic skill (*Apollinea clarus in arte*). Although there were variant accounts (cf., for example, Callimachus Hymn 5.57ff.; Propertius 4.9.57ff.), Ovid alludes here to the most well known legend associated with Tiresias' blindness (cf. Apollodorus Bib. 3.6.7, and the informative note of Frazer ad loc. who says that Hesiod treated the tale; Ovid Met. 3.316ff. with Bömer's notes; Hyginus 75): as a young man Tiresias happened upon two snakes mating on Mount Cithaeron (Schol. on Homer Od. 10.494) or Mount Cyllene (Apollodorus and Hyginus cited above), and struck them with his staff, whereupon he was instantly transformed into a woman. Seven years later, Tiresias again came upon a pair of copulating snakes, struck them with his/her stick, and was changed back into a man. Consequently, when Zeus and Hera disagreed over whether a man or a woman experienced greater pleasure when making love, Tiresias was consulted as a fitting arbitrator, since he had experience from both perspectives. After his pronouncement that women experienced the greater pleasure, Hera in anger blinded him, but Zeus compensated for this by giving to Tiresias exceptional prophetic skill, and a long life.

**de lite iocosa**: Ovid tells the story of Tiresias' metamorphosis, and his role in the quarrel between Zeus and Hera, in greater detail in Met. 3.316-338, with *de lite iocosa* (332) appearing in the same position of the line as it does here. Hyginus, Fab. 75, calls it a *iocosa altercatio*. Certainly what is for the gods merely a trifle, a
playful dispute, can nevertheless have serious repercussions for mortals who get involved, as *postquam* emphasizes.

**Apollinea clarus in arte:** from Homer on, Tiresias was renowned for his skill in prophecy, and even in the gloomy Homeric Underworld was given the unique privilege of retaining his *φολεπεν*, and the ability to foresee the future (cf. Homer *Od.* 10.493-495, 11.90-151; Pausanias 9.33.2). For *Apollinea . . . arte*, cf. *Tr.* 3.3.10. See further Roscher 5, 178-207.

**senex:** Tiresias was always depicted as grey-haired, blind, and having already seen many generations of men (for example, his portrayal by Sophocles in the plays of the Theban cycle, and Euripides in the *Bacchae*). The tradition that he was granted a life seven generations long is found in Phlegon *Mir.* 4; Hyginus 75; and the scholia on Lycophron *Alex* 682f., while Apollodorus 3.6.7, Callimachus *Hymn* 5.128, Theocritus *Id.* 24.101, and Statius *Theb.* 2.98 all mention that he had an extremely long life.

**263-264** Another blind seer, the Thracian Phineus. I find it interesting, and perhaps not coincidental, that Phineus, who occupies the central position in this mini-catalogue of victims of blindness, has connecting links with both the *exemplum* which opens the series (257-258, Phoenix), and with the concluding couplet of the series (269-270, the Phinidae); for although Phineus was usually said to be the son of Agenor (A.R. 2.237; Apollodorus *Bib.* 1.9.21; Hyginus 19), there was a tradition (scholia *ad* A.R. 2.178) that Phineus was the son of Phoenix, and we thus have an interwoven structure of Phoenix being blinded by his father, for allegedly seducing his father's concubine, Phineus, the son of Phoenix, and Phineus' sons, blinded by their father on a charge remarkably similar to that brought against Phoenix. The *exemplum* of Phineus also has connecting links with the couplet which precedes it, since like Tiresias he had prophetic skills and lived to a very old age, and with the couplet which follows it, since he, like Polymestor, was a Thracian monarch. Concerning Phineus' blindness, there were many variant legends. One tradition attributed his blindness to Zeus, who was angry with him for revealing the gods' plans to men (thus A.R. 2.179ff.; Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.15.3; Hyginus 19), while others related that he was once given a
choice between long life or his vision, and when he opted for longevity, was blinded by the Sun (scholia ad A.R. 2.179-182). Yet another tradition (Servius ad Aen. 3.209) records that Phineus was blinded either by the god of the North wind, Boreas, who lived in Thrace, or by his sons, Calais and Zetes, because Phineus had blinded his own sons, who were the Boreades' nephews (see below, 269-270). In addition to being blinded, Phineus was plagued by the Harpies, who snatched away or spoiled any food which the old man tried to eat. See especially A.R. 2.179ff., who tells of the miseries that Phineus underwent, Roscher 3, 2357-2375.

columba/... Palladiae praevia duxque rati: the clue for identifying Phineus as this victim of blindness is the allusion to his role in guiding the Palladian ship by means of a dove. Palladiae... rati refers to the Argo, which was built under the guidance of Athena (cf. the scholia on the Ibis, quia consilio Palladis... facta est; V. Fl. 5.206, Palladium... ratem); when the Argonauts sailed for Colchis, they asked Phineus for advice in navigating the ship through the Clashing Rocks or Symplegades, huge rocks which dashed together, and closed the passage at the entrance to the Pontus. Phineus advised them to release a dove between the rocks, and if it made it safely through, to quickly follow it through the treacherous passage. Cf. A.R. 2.328ff.; Apollodorus Bib. 1.9.22; Hyginus 19; Propertius 3.22.13f.

265-266 Another Thracian, Polymestor, king of the Bistonians, who was married to Iliona, the daughter of Priam. According to the standard version of the myth, canonized by Euripides in his tragedy Hecuba, when Priam and Hecuba feared for the safety of their young son Polydorus during the Trojan War, they sent the boy and a store of treasures to Polymestor for safe-keeping. As the war turned against the Trojans, Polymestor, desiring the rich treasure for himself, slew Polydorus, and threw the corpse into the sea. After the fall of Troy, Hecuba went to Thrace as Odysseus' slave, and while drawing water discovered the body of her son. Concealing her knowledge of his murderous deed, Hecuba played on Polymestor's greed, and lured him to her tent with word of a further treasure that she had kept for her son. Once inside the tent, he was surrounded by Hecuba and the other captive women, and his
eyes were gouged out. Ovid delights in describing the gory scene in *Met.* 13.560ff.: *atque ita correpto captivarum agmina matrum/ invocat et digitiis in perfida lumina condit/ expellitque genus oculos (facit ira potentem)/ immergitque manus foedataque sanguine sonit/ non lumen (neque enim superest), loca luminis haurit./*


**inferias nato:** Ovid asserts that Hecuba gave the eyes of Polymestor as offerings to her dead son, an assertion for which I can find no parallel. Perhaps Ovid intended an association with his own passage in *Met.* 13.556ff., in which he portrayed Polymestor seeking the treasure promised to him by Hecuba, and saying, "*da munera nato!/ omne fore illius, quod das, quod et ante dedisti,/ per superos iuro*," whereupon Hecuba responds by attacking him and digging out his eyes. For more on the myth, consult Roscher 3,2656f., 2644f.

**267-268 pastor . . . Aetnaeus:** the cyclops Polyphemus, whose blinding by Odysseus was a well-known tale. The son of Poseidon, Polyphemus lived a savage and solitary life as a shepherd, in a rude cave on Sicilian Aetna. For the use of the adjective *Aetnaeus* to refer to the Cyclops, cf. Char. *gramm.* 1.13.22, *Cyclopos, Aetnaeus cultor, Neptunia proles;* Vergil *Aen.* 8.440, *Aetnaei Cyclopes; Culex 332;* and Ovid *Ex P.* 2.2113, *Aetnaeus Polyphemus.* As Polymestor had broken the laws of hospitality when he murdered his ward Polydorus (cf. Euripides *Hec.* 715f., 790f., 803f; Vergil *Aen.* 3.55), so too did Polyphemus, when he held Odysseus and his men captive on their way home from Troy, and began eating them (cf. Homer *Od.* 9.477ff.). Odysseus' stratagem of getting the Cyclops drunk, then blinding him with
a huge stake, and escaping with his men by clinging under the bellies of the Cyclop's sheep is well known. Cf. Homer *Od.* 1.68-75, 9. 105-566; Euripides *Cyclops*; Ovid *Met.* 13.738-897, 14.167ff.; Hyginus 125.

**Telemus Eurymides:** in the *Odyssey* (9.507ff.), the seer Telemus, son of Eurymus, who dwelt in the land of the Cyclopes, predicted to Polyphemus that he would one day be blinded by a man named Odysseus (cf. Ovid *Met.* 13. 770-775; Hyginus 125).

*Telemus Eurymides* occurs in the same position of the line in *Met.* 13. 771, wherein the seer predicts to Polyphemus his blinding by Odysseus, but he was not named by other Latin poets. The Cyclops' subsequent prayer to his father Poseidon for revenge was to result in many trials for the Greek captain (see below, 275-276).

**vaticinatus erat:** a rather prosaic word, which is not found at all in Vergil, Horace, or Propertius, and but once in Tibullus (1.6.44); Ovid, however, used it no fewer than twelve times.

**269-270 duo Phinidae:** the two sons of Phineus (see above 263-264), from Phineus' marriage to Cleopatra, the daughter of Boreas. When the two sons were grown to manhood, Phineus got married again, to Idaea, the daughter of king Dardanus of Scythia. She, jealous of her stepsons, accused them of having raped her. Phineus believed her, and blinded his sons as punishment. There were many variations to the tale, concerning the sons' names (Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.15.3: Plexippus and Pandion; Schol. *ad* A.R. 2.178: Parthenios and Kambiris), the stepmother (Apollodorus, Hyginus *Fab.* 19: Idaea; Sophocles *Ant.* 966ff.: Eidothea), and who actually blinded the sons - according to Sophocles it was the stepmother herself who deprived them of their sight.

**idem lumen ademit/ qui dedit:** ie. their father, Phineus, who was responsible for bringing them into the world, and hence into the light, and was also the one who blinded them, and thereby deprived them of the light. Note the word play on the double meaning of *lumen*, as it here means both the light of life (cf. Ovid *Tr.* 4.4.45; Lucr. 3.1033), and sight (cf. Vergil *Aen.* 3.658 of the blinding of the Cyclopes). With *idem* Ovid thus indicates that he is following the tradition (cf. Apollodorus *Bib.*
3.15.3, with the note of Frazer) that Phineus was responsible for the act, as he does in *Ars* 1.339, *quid fodiis inmeritis, Phineu, sua lumina natis?*

**Thamyrae Demodocique caput:** the two legendary musicians Thamyras and Demodocus bring to an end the catalogue of men afflicted with blindness. Thamyras, like the Phinidae, was Thracian, the son of the musician Philammon and the nymph Argiope. Famed for his beauty and skill in minstrelsy, Thamyras entered into a musical contest with the Muses, stipulating that if he should win, he should sleep in turn with them all, but if they won, they should take whatever they so willed from him (Apollodorus *Bib.* 1.3.3; scholia *ad* Homer *Il.* 2.509). The Muses were victorious, and as the price of their victory took from him his sight and skill in music (cf. Homer *Il.* 2.594-600; Euripides *Rh.* 915ff.). Demodocus appears in the Homeric *Odyssey* (8. 44-45, 62-64, 266ff., 474ff., and 521ff., 13.27) as the talented bard who sings of the Trojan War at the Phaeacian court, and moves Odysseus to tears. In contrast to Thamyras, Demodocus was a favourite of the Muse, who gave him exceptional musical skill as compensation for blinding him (Homer *Od.* 8.62ff., . . .)

*ἐρήπην ἀοιδόν, τὸν πέρι μοῦσα ἐφίλησε, διδόν δ᾽ ἀγαθῶν τε κακῶν τε, ὑφαλμῶν μὲν ἀμερσε, διδόν δ᾽ ἡδείαν ἀοιδήν). Why she blinded him is not revealed. The periphrasis *Thamyrae Demodocique caput,* 'as the head of Thamyras and Demodocus', seems an awkward way of referring to the two musicians, however, it does serve to focus attention on the part of the body where the blind eyes are located. cf. *OLD* s.v. 7c, Sophocles *Ant.* 1.

271-272 Linked to the preceding couplet by an inversion of emphasis - in 269f., a father blinded his progeny (*quibus . . . lumen . . . dedit*), here the progeny castrates its father (*partes unde creatus est*). Although it may seem odd to have a single *exemplum* of castration inserted here, G. Devereux (*JHS* 1973, pp.36-49) makes an interesting argument that the punishment of blinding for sexual offenses (cf. Phoenix, the sons of Phineus, even Tiresias) represents a symbolic castration; hence blinding and castration are mutually exclusive punishments, and indeed Devereux notes some variants of myths, according to which the victim is sometimes blinded, other times
made impotent, but never both (cf. Phoenix in II. 9.453ff., where Phoenix is cursed by his father with impotence, but not blinded, and the alternate tradition which depicts him as blinded only; Anchises, who is crippled in Vergil Aen. 2.647ff. (perhaps a euphemism for castrated) for boasting of his affair with Venus, but blinded according to another version preserved by Servius ad Aen. 1.617, 2.35, 687; and Tiresias, who is first unmanned by being changed into a woman, and then blinded after his manhood has been restored). Although this Ovidian passage is not mentioned by Devereux, the proximity of the two punishments would seem to accord with his theory that blindness and castration were, in effect, equivalent punishments for sexual misbehaviour.

Saturnus: Saturn, the Roman equivalent of the Greek god Cronos, was one of many children born to Uranus and Gaia. When Gaia complained to her children of Uranus, who was imprisoning their offspring within her, only the youngest, Saturn, agreed to help her, and when Uranus next slept with Gaia, Saturn took a sickle given to him by his mother, and castrated his father, throwing the testicles into the sea (Hesiod Th. 178ff.; cf. Callimachus fr. 43.68-71; Apollodorus Bib. 1.1).

273-274 Ovid here makes a rather forced association, as he turns from Saturn, to the myth of Ceyx, in which Saturn’s son, Neptune, plays a role.

cui . . . frater et uxor aves: Ceyx, the king of Trachis, had a brother named Daedalion, and was married to Alycone, the daughter of the king of winds, Aeolus. The legend commonly associated with Ceyx and Alcyone portrays them as a devoted couple, who were changed into birds as punishment for their presumption in calling themselves Zeus and Hera (thus Apollodorus Bib. 1.7.4; scholia ad Homer II. 9.562). In the Metamorphoses, however, Ovid gives a different account of the cause of their transformation (11.410ff.): Ceyx set off on a sea voyage to consult the Clarion oracle, but during the night his ship was destroyed in a terrible storm, and Ceyx was drowned. Here compressed into a very allusive reference (tumidis . . . Neptunus in undis), the raging storm and Ceyx’s drowning are elaborated for some 89 lines in the Metamorphoses (11.480-569 with the note of Bömer ad loc.). Ceyx’s body was eventually washed ashore and found by Alycone, who, leaping into the sea, was
changed into a sorrowing bird, (the halycon) and the gods, pitying the couple, similarly transformed Ceyx. Cf. Hyginus 65, *Ceyx Hesperi sive Luciferi et Philonidis filius cum in naufragio perisset, Aleycone Aeoli et Aegiales filia uxor eius propter amorem ipsa se in mare praecipitavit; qui deorum misericordia ambo in aves sunt mutati quae alcyones dicuntur* . . . . The story of Ceyx’s brother Daedalion and his transformation into a bird, appears only in Hyginus 200, and Ovid *Met.* 11.291-345. In the latter, Ovid tells of the fierce Daedalion’s great love for his daughter Chirione, a young woman of exceptional beauty, who had the distinction of being loved by Mercury and Apollo on the same day, and who subsequently bore them each a son. However, when she later claimed that she surpassed even the goddess Diana in beauty, the goddess killed her with an arrow. Chirione’s father was so bereaved by her death that he threw himself from Mount Parnassus, and was transformed by Apollo into a falcon.

*subitae:* often used by Ovid when describing a metamorphosis. So, for example, *Tr.* 2.389 of the transformation of Tereus and his wife into birds, *Met.* 7.732 of Cycnus into a swan, *Met.* 11.341 of Daedalion’s transformation, *Met.* 13.617 of the birds which were formed from the ashes of Memnon, *Fast.* 3.723 of sailors changed into dolphins, and *Her.* 12.98 and *Met.* 3.123 of the warriors who sprang from the dragon’s teeth.

275-276 Following the drowning of Ceyx, we have the near-drowning of Odysseus.

*sollertique viro:* the emphatic position of *sollerti* immediately draws one’s attention to the first clue given to Odysseus’ identity, for it is a translation of the Homeric epithet for Odysseus, πολύμην. Ovid applies the epithet to Odysseus again in *Ex P.* 4.14.35, *quis patriam sollerte magis dilexit Ulixe?*; see also Statius *Ach.* 1.784, *dixerat, et sollers arrepto tempore Ulixes* . . .


*Semeles est miserata soror:* the sister of Semele was Ino, daughter of Cadmus, who raised Semele’s son Dionysus along with her own, after Semele’s death. This angered
Hera, and so she drove Ino and her husband Athamas mad; Ino threw her young son into boiling water, and then jumped into the sea with his body, whereupon the sea gods took pity upon her, and transformed her into a sea-goddess, Leucothea, who lived with the Nereids, and gave aid to sailors in storms (cf. Ovid Met. 4.512ff.). It is in this role that she appeared to Odysseus, who, having set sail on his raft from the island of Calypso, was shipwrecked by Poseidon to avenge his son the Cyclops (see above, 267-268). Leucothea saved him from certain death in the stormy waters by telling him to abandon his shattered boat and to trust in the magical veil which she gave to him, which kept him afloat. After two days in the water, he finally arrived on the Phaeacian shore and threw the magical veil back into the sea, as the goddess had asked. (Homer Od. 5.333-353; cf. Hyginus 125 . . . ratim Neptunus fluctibus disiecit, quod Cyclopem filium eius lumine privaverat. ibi cum fluctibus iactaretur, Leucothoe, quam nos Matrem Matutam dicimus, quae in mari exigit aevum, balteum ei dedit quo sibi pectus suum vinciret, ne pessum abiret. quod cum fecisset, enatavit.)

Ovid also referred to the myth in Ex P. 3.6.19f. (nec, quia Neptunus navem lacerarat Ulixis, Leucothea nanti ferre negavit opem), as a reproach to a friend who was fearful of being associated with the poet.

277-280 A change of tack, introduced by vel . . . vel, as Ovid proceeds with two exempla drawn from Roman history, the agonizing end of a traitor, Mettius Fufetius, and of a hero, Regulus. The scholia consistently report that 277-278 refer to the death of Hippolytus, when his horses were frightened by the strange sea-monster which Neptune sent in response to Theseus’ prayer. The horses took flight and dragged Hippolytus, who had become entangled in the reins, with them (cf. above, 89-90, and relevant citations there). Although Neptune would then provide a connecting link with the preceding couplet, diversis . . . equis is not strictly appropriate for the Hippolytus myth, and furthermore, the punishment of Hippolytus is unmistakably alluded to later in the Ibis (575-576), and a duplication would seem both unwarranted, and uncharacteristic. However, a feasible alternative is suggested
by scholium C: vel hoc dicitur de Mettio, rege Albanorum, qui saepe cum Romanis confoederatus, rupit foedus unde tandem a Romanis iudicatus est hostis. Postea eum captum equis indomitis alligatum Romani distrahendo interfecerunt. It is certainly a very plausible conjecture, which well befits the allusion in the Ibis. Mettius Fufetius was the last king of the Albans, and although under treaty with Rome, plotted against her in the war against Veii, and worked for her defeat. After the battle, where his treachery was plainly revealed, he was delivered into the hands of the Roman, Tullus Hostilius, who commanded that as his loyalties had been divided so too should his body. Accordingly, Mettius was fastened to two quadrigae, and the horses then sent in opposite directions, tearing his body apart.

ne poenae genus hoc cognoverit unus: Ovid’s emphasis on the singularity of the punishment is paralleled by Livy’s comment on it (1.28) as primum ultimumque illud supplicium apud Romanos exempli parum memoris legum humanorum fuit. Cf. Ogilvie ad loc.

poenae genus: compare Met. 8.782, Ibis 335.

viscera diversis scissa ferantur equis: compare Livy’s description of Mettius’ punishment (1.28): duabus admotis quadrigis in currus earum distentus illigatus est; deinde in diversum iter equi concitati, lacerum in utroque curru corpus, qua inhaesperant vinculis membra, portantes; Vergil Aen. 8.642f., haud procul inde citae Mettum in diversa quadrigae/ distulerant - at tu dictis, Albane, maneres!; Dionys. 3.23.2-30; V. Max. 7.41; etc. If the textual tradition were not very suspect, Tr. 1.3.75f., sic doluit Mettus tunc cum in contraria versos/ uliores habuit proditionis equos, (see the note of Luck ad loc.) would give strong support to the identification.

279-280 An allusion to the legendary Roman hero, Marcus Atilius Regulus, a consul and general in the war against Carthage. In 255 B.C., he and five hundred of his men were captured by the Carthaginians (cf. Polybius 1.34), and ca. 250 B.C. he reputedly was sent to Rome by the Carthaginians to negotiate a prisoner-exchange, or perhaps a peace treaty. Before leaving the Carthaginians, he swore an oath that he would return to Carthage, if he failed in his mission. When he arrived in Rome, he told the
Senate not to accept the Carthaginians' terms, and then returned to Carthage, where he died, according to the tradition, from torture (but cf. the analysis of Klebbs, *RE* sv. Atilius (51) cols 2088-92). Polybius makes no mention of Regulus' death by torture, but it becomes prominent in later accounts. Thus Cicero reports that he died from lack of sleep and food (*Off.* 1.13.39, 3.26.99; *Fin.* 2.65, 5.82; *Pis.* 19.43, (with the note of Nisbet) *quem Karthaginenses resectis palpebris inligatum in machina vigilando necaverunt*), and a similar account of forced wakefulness is given by Valerius Maximus 9.2. ext.1, and by Gellius (7.4) on the authority of Tuditianus. Gellius also records the account of Tubero concerning the novel tortures to which Regulus was subjected, including being confined for a long period of time in a dark dungeon, and then, when the sun was at its brightest, being brought out and forced to stare at the sky, with his eyelids sewn back to prevent him from closing his eyes. For a poetic account of Regulus' heroic departure from Rome, see Horace *Od.* 3.5.13-56.


a duce Puniceo: the punishment of Regulus is not associated with any one Carthaginian. Cicero speaks generally of *Carthagienses* in *Pis.* 19, and of *Poenis* in *Off.* 1.13.39, and likewise Valerius Maximus alludes only to *Karthaginienses* (9.2. ext.1). The adjective Puniceus, greek φοινικώς, is commonly found in the sense of 'red' in Ovid and other Latin authors (Bömer on *Met.* 2.607) but not in the sense of 'Carthaginian'; cf. *OLD* sv. Puniceus, Housman "The Ibis of Ovid" *Journal of Philol.* 35 (1920), p.309.

281-282 The death of Priam at the altar of Jupiter Herceus.

praesens sit numen: *praesens* when applied to deities often has the connotation of being present in order to help - cf. Vergil *Ecl.* 1.41, *nec tam praesentes alibi cognoscere divos*.

ut illi: a very compressed expression, which equals *ut non subsidio fuit illi*.

nihil Hercei profuit ara Iovis: *Hercei* is the key to the riddle of this couplet; Jupiter Herceus was the protector of the domestic hearth, to whom Priam, son of Laomedon,
and king of Troy during the Trojan War, is pictured making a libation in the final book of the *Iliad*; στᾶς μὲν ἑρέμος ἑρκεῖ (24.306). Priam was noted among men and gods for his piety (see, for example, *Il.* 3.105ff, 20.183), but his piety was of no avail in the final sack of Troy: his murder within his own palace at the altar of Zeus Herceus by Achilles' son Neoptolemus was a well-known theme in classical literature and art. As the enemy swarmed over Troy, and into the palace itself, the feeble old man tried to take up arms against them, but was dissuaded by his wife Hecuba, who led him to the protective sanctity of Jupiter's altar. From his position there, Priam saw his son Polites also try to gain the altar's sanctuary, but be ruthlessly struck down by Neoptolemus. When Priam cursed the Greek, and in vain tried to prevent his son's murder, he was seized by Neoptolemus and slain at the very altar (Vergil *Aen.* 2.499ff.; Ovid *Met.* 13.409f., *exiguumque senis Priami Iovis ara cruorem/conbiberat*; Euripides *Troades* 16f., 481-3, *Hec.* 22-24 etc. He thus became proverbial for having experienced extremes of fortune (cf. Aristotle *EN* 11018a; Juv. 10.258ff.).

**Hercei:** the epithet derives from the custom of placing an altar dedicated to Zeus in the ἐρκοτ, or forecourt, of a house, and was not common as an epithet of the god in Latin. See, however, Hyginus 91; Seneca *Ag.* 448, (of the death of Priam) *sparsum cruorem regis Herceum Iovis*, Servius on *Aen.* 2.469. That Priam took refuge at the altar of Zeus Herceus is recorded as early as the *Iliupersis*, but there were variants to the tale, which had Neoptolemus drag Priam from the altar to avoid polluting it, and killing Priam elsewhere (cf. Paus. 10.27.2; Servius on *Aen.* 2.506, *alii dicunt quod a Pyrro in domo quidem sua captus est, sed ad tumulum Achillis tractus occisusque est iuxta Sigeum promunturium; nam in Rhoeteo Aiax sepultus est*; hence La Penna and Ellis speculate that *Rhoetei* might be the true reading of the variant *rhetei* found in many of the MSS.)

283-286 Two obscure allusions from the legendary history of Thessaly. The scholia explain the first allusion as a reference to a king of Thessaly, Ionus, son of Perpeti, who cast himself from Mt. Ossa while under the influence of wine. If this identification is accepted, *Thessalus* would equal 'the Thessalian'; some support for
this conjecture of Ionus and the Thessalian kingship is perhaps provided by Lucan 4.402f., *Primus Thessaliae rector telluris Ionus/ in formam calidae percussit pondera massae*, although some editors read *Ionus* for Ionus, and no mention is recorded of his death. Another possibility is to understand *Thessalus* as a proper name; evidence for various figures by the name of Thessalus is collected by La Penna, including one *katà τούτους τόν χρόνους πρώτος ἐβασίλευε θεσσαλίας ὁ Γραικοῖ ταῖς θέσσαλος* (Eusebius *Chron.* ad ann. Abraham 224), but none of the figures bearing this name seem to be associated with a plunge from Mt. Ossa. In the absence of a more plausible candidate, I would tentatively accept the scholia’s identification.

283 *dedit saltus*: i.e. ‘to leap’; *dare* in such a phrase is virtually the equivalent of *facere*. Cf. *Met.* 2.165, with Bömer’s note for further examples, *TLL* 5.1, 1686, 33f.

*Ossa*: a Thessalian mountain, referred to by Ovid also in *Met.* 1.155, *Am.* 2.1.14.


285 *Eurylochi, qui sceptrum cepit ab illo*: the scholia identify this successor of ‘Thessalus’ with the son of Ionus above, and relate that he was killed by snakes as punishment for wishing to sleep with his daughter. Ellis, *Excursus*, p.171, notes two figures by the name of Eurylochus, one of whom Strabo calls *Εὐρυλόχοι τοῦ Θεσσαλοῦ*, and who was involved in the war against Crisa (Strabo 9.3.4); however, beyond the common name, neither figure appears to have any connection with the Ovidian allusion. However, Ellis makes an interesting analogy with the account found in Hyginus *Astr.* 2.14, concerning a Thessalian king named Triopas, and following a convoluted genealogical trail (Triopas is the son of Phorbas according to Diodorus Siculus 4.58, while Phorbas is the grandson of Eurynomus in Diodorus 4.69), notes that Triopas is a descendent of Eurynomus, and thus theorizes that the reading of MS T, *Yrioni*, might be a corruption of Eurynomi. He also notes in his commentary *ad loc.* a variant account of this story attached to another Thessalian king, Cenobates (alternatively Corobates, or Carnabotes). Certainly Thessalians and punishment with snakes seem to be associated.
287-288 vel . . . Minoia fata: the allusion is to Minos, the son of Zeus and Europa, who ruled as king of Crete three generations before the Trojan War. Minos came to an unfortunate end when he went in pursuit of the famous Athenian architect and inventor, Daedalus (cf. below, 496 and commentary ad loc.), who had once sought refuge at Minos' court. When Daedalus and his son Icarus escaped from Crete by using wings of wax fashioned by Daedalus, Minos trailed the crafty inventor to the court of king Cocalus, in Camicos, Sicily.

tua: supply fata.
maturet: 'accelerate', or as Ellis translates, 'bring on before its time'. Cf. Horace Od. 3.7.14-16, nimis/ Casto Bellerophon/ maturare necem; Cic. Clu. 171, huic mortem maturabat inimicus; Nepos Cha. 4.2, quae res ei maturavit mortem; and Cels. 7.7.7, eos qui carcinoma habent curare periculosum est: nam mortem quoque ea res maturat.

per caput infusae fervidus umor aquae: Cocalus, compelled to admit that Daedalus had sought refuge within, promised to return him to Minos, and entertained the Cretan king at his court. As Minos was having a bath in the royal palace, however, Cocalus' daughters scalded him to death by pouring boiling water over his head. Cf. Scholia on Il. 2.145, who say that the story was told by Callimachus in the Aetia (fr.43 Pf., 46ff.), Apollod. Epit. 1.13ff., and the scholia on Pindar N. 4.59, who add that the water came from a pipe in the roof, devised by Daedalus. Zenobius Cent. 4.92 gives a variant detail that boiling pitch was the agent of destruction, while Diodorus 4.79.2 says that Minos died from being kept too long in the bath. Pausanias 7.4.6, Conon Narrat. 25, and Hyginus 44 all mention Minos' murder by Cocalus' daughters, without specifying the means, and Herodotus 7.169ff. tells of Minos going in search of Daedalus, and in so doing coming to a violent end in Camicos. See also the remarks of Pearson Frags. of Sophocles vol.2, 3, concerning Sophocles' lost play The Camicans, which told of Daedalus' stay at Cocalus' court; Bömer at Met. 8.173; Roscher 2, 2993-2999.

289-290 Uncharacteristically, the victim is directly named, and this, coupled with the fact
that the fate of Prometheus is again invoked upon Ibis at 541f., led Housman (Journal of Philol. 35, 1920, 298) to speculate that this couplet is spurious, added by someone who failed to recognize the later allusion to Prometheus as Pyrrha's fraternal uncle. For Prometheus' deception of Zeus, theft of fire, and subsequent punishment by Zeus of being chained to a rock on the Caucasus, where his liver was daily eaten by an eagle, cf. Hesiod Th. 507ff., Apollodorus Bib. 1.7.1f., 2.5.11, Hyginus Fab. 54, 144 etc. Hyginus (Astr. 2.15) citing Aeschylus as his authority, states that Prometheus underwent this punishment for 30,000 years, although in the Fabulae (54, 144) 30 years is given as the limit of his suffering.

_parum inmitis:_ this is the conjecture of Owen, CQ 8 (1914), p.255 to convey the notion of φιλάνθρωπος (Aeschylus Pr. 11). Most of the manuscripts read _parum mitis_; Ellis sees in this a play on μῆτρις, i.e. Πόρος, son of Μῆτρις, while Perrotta, pp.172-3, interprets it in the sense of audax, asper, analogous to the Hesiodic epithets ἀγκυλομῆτρης (Th. 546) and αἰολόμητρης Th. 511; cf. Aeschylus Pr. 436).

291-292 Textual uncertainty regarding the proper form of this victim's name complicates interpretation: the manuscripts record several variants, including Ececratides, Echecratides, and Ethreclides. The scholia also show considerable confusion, naming the victim as Encredies, Ethcratides, Eacrides, Echecratides and variations thereof. The Oxford text followed here prints Ellis' conjecture of Erechhides, and the reading of codex T, which has _victus_ in place of _quintus_. With this, Ellis posits an allusion to Eryx, the son of Poseidon Ἐρεξθεὺς and Aphrodite (cf. Servius ad Aen. 5.24, who notes an alternate tradition that Eryx is the son of the Argonaut Butes and Aphrodite), and king of Western Sicily, who challenged Hercules to a wrestling bout when the latter was driving the cattle of Geryon back to Greece. Hercules defeated Eryx three times, killed him, and then continued on his way to the Ionian Sea with the cattle. Cf. Apollodorus Bib. 2.5.10, Tzetzes ad Lyc. Alex. 866. However, there is no indication that he was thrown into the sea by Hercules; rather, he seems to have been buried on the mountain in Sicily which bears his name. (Cf. Servius ad Aen. 1.570, Apollodorus Bib. 2.5.10, Diodorus Siculus 4.23.2, Pausanias 3.16.4, 4.36.4
and Vergil *Aen.* 5.410f.) The association seems forced to me; I prefer to follow La Penna, who retains the readings *Echecratides* and *quintus*, whence the allusion is to the 15th descendant of Hercules, Echecratides. For the Echecratides of Thessaly who traced their descent from Hercules, cf. scholia on Theocritus *Id.* 16.35, scholia on Pindar *P.* 10.3, Rostagni *Ibis*, pp.102f. A possible candidate is the 7th century Echecratides of Larissa, mentioned in Pausanias 10.16.8, although nothing is known of his death. Nonetheless, it seems preferable to retain the reading of the MSS, given that the Echecratides were a prominent Thessalian family and to assume that a member of this family was killed and hurled into the sea. See further the discussion of La Penna *ad loc.*


**ter . . . victus:** if we accept Ellis’ proposal, this alludes to the three times Eryx was defeated in wrestling by Hercules; if we follow La Penna, *ter . . . quintus* refers to the line of descent from Hercules, i.e. 15th. Cf. *Her.* 8.48, *a love quintus eris*, and *Fast.* 6.768, *quintus ab extremo mense bis ille dies.*

293-330 A series of largely historical *exempla* begins, which raises interesting, albeit unanswerable questions about the way in which Ovid worked. Did he ransack historical works for suitable examples of unpleasant ends, or perhaps more likely, was there a handbook of rhetorical *exempla*, containing both historical and mythological deaths? See the discussions of La Penna, lxiiiff., Watson, *Arae*, pp.104f.

293 *Amyntiaden:* the son of Amyntas was Philip, the king of Macedon from 359-336 B.C. Cf. Diodorus Siculus 15.60.3, Ἅμυντας μὲν ὁ Ἀρριδαίον βασιλεύων τῆς Μακεδονίας ἐτελεύτησεν ἄρξας ἐτή εἴκοσι καὶ τέταρα, νίοις ἀπολιπῶν τρεῖς, Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ Περδίκκαν καὶ Φίλιππον; Strabo 9.3.8 (421). Philip was murdered at the wedding of his daughter Cleopatra in the fall of 336, by a young officer and favourite of his, Pausanias.

**turpi dilectus amore:** according to Diodorus (16.91-4), when Pausanias’ position as favourite of Philip was threatened by Philip’s attraction to another youth of the same
name, Pausanias abused and goaded his rival to such an extent that the second Pausanias deliberately sought death in battle. Another officer of the court, Attalos, who knew of the abuse that Pausanias had inflicted upon his rival, determined to avenge the dead youth. Accordingly, he invited Pausanias to a banquet, got him extremely drunk, and then gave him to his stable-help to abuse. When Pausanias returned to his senses and realized the disgrace which had been inflicted upon him, he went to Philip and complained of his treatment by Attalos. Philip, who needed Attalos' military skills for a forthcoming campaign, was loath to take action against him, and instead tried to pacify Pausanias through gifts and promotions. Pausanias' resentment grew, however, and he resolved to kill Philip for not avenging him. After killing Philip with his sword at the wedding feast, he was himself killed by Attalos and others while trying to make his escape. Cf. the accounts of Aristotle Pol. 5.8.10, Plutarch Alex. 10.4, Justin 9.6. Arrian, on the other hand, (An. 3.7.1) implies that the conspiracy against Philip was quite widespread, and not motivated solely by Pausanias' personal grievance. With the phrase turpi dilectus amore La Penna compares Aen. 1.344, magno miserae dilectus amore.

puer: Pausanias. For puer in a sexual connotation, like the Greek παυδικά, cf. OLD s.v. 3.

295-296 Another Macedonian exemplum, as we move from Philip to his son, Alexander the Great, who died in 323 B.C., according to one tradition as a result of poison which had been put into his drink.

fida . . . pocula: Ellis aptly compares Juvenal 6.630, with its warning, nulli credite mensae. Alexander was struck with a fever and debilitating weakness from which he did not recover; the rumours of poison are discussed by Arrian (7.27), but he rejects the story's validity, as does Plutarch, Alex. 77. In popular tradition, the poison was reputed to have been so strong that no ordinary vessel could contain it, and thus it was finally stored in the hoof of a mule (Justin 11.11).

cornigero . . . Iove: an allusion to the Egyptian god Ammon, who was identified with Zeus by the Greeks (Pindar fr. 36 Ἄμων, Ὁλυμπος δέσποτα), and who had
a renowned oracle in a temple at Siwa. He was usually portrayed as having the head of Zeus, but with the curling horns of a ram (cf. Roscher 1 s.v. Ammon). Alexander the Great visited Ammon's oracle at the Oasis of Siwa in 332-1 B.C. and subsequently it was announced that he had been acknowledged by the god as his son; hence the point of *qui cornigerō de iove natus erat*. Cf. Valerius Maximus 9.5.1, *fastidio enim Philippi, Jovem Hammonem patrem ascivit*; Justin 11.1. For the adjective *corniger* referring to Jupiter Ammon cf. Ovid *Met.* 5.17, with Bömer's note; 15.309 *corniger Ammon*; *Ars* 3.788; Lucan 3.292; 9.545; 297-8; V. Fl. 2.482; Statius *Theb.* 8.201, etc. A useful discussion of the oracle of Ammon may be found in H.W. Parke, *The Oracles of Zeus* (Oxford, 1967), pp.194ff.

297-298 more . . . capti . . . Achaei:  Achaeus, a relative of Antiochus III, set himself up as king of Phrygia in 220 B.C., while Antiochus was engaged with Artabazanes. Antiochus eventually took action against his kinsman, but was unable to penetrate his fortress in Sardis. Finally, after a two-year siege, Achaeus was betrayed and delivered into the hands of Antiochus in 214 B.C. Polybius (8.17-23) reports the betrayal and notes that after Achaeus' capture there were many suggestions as to the proper punishment he should receive. The outcome was that his extremities (ears, nose, tongue and hands) were cut off, his head sewn up in an ass's skin, and his body impaled on a stake along the shores of the river Pactolus. The custom of cutting off the extremities of victims seems to have originated in a wish to weaken the ghost of the slain person; cf. Frazer on Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.5.1. Achaeus' death is well-treated in B.A. Van Proosdij's article, "De Morte Achaei", *Hermes* 69 (1934), pp. 347-50.

aurifera . . . teste aqua: an allusion to the Pactolus, whose golden waters were proverbial. Cf. for example, Sophocles *Philoctetes* 392, τὸν μέγαν Πακτολόν εὐχρυσὸν νέμεις; Varro *Sat.* 234, *non hos Pactolus aureas undas agens eripiet unquam e miseriis*; Horace *Ep.* 15.19f.; *Vergil* *Aen.* 10.142; Propertius 1.6.32, 1.14.11, 3.18.28; and Ovid *Met.* 11.87f., *Pactoloneque petit, quamvis non aureus illo/ tempore nec caris erat invidiosus harenis*; Seneca *Phoen.* 604, *Oed.* 467; Juvenal 14.298. For geographical features as testes, cf. commentary on 28.
299-300 Achilliden: the genealogical clue *Achilliden cognato nomine clarum* and the cause of the victim's undoing being a tile cast by an enemy hand both accord with the king of Epirus, Pyrrhus (319-272 B.C.), a man whom the Romans might be expected to have a special interest in, because of his famed invasion of Italy in 280-279 B.C. Pyrrhus claimed to be descended from Achilles, and bore the same name as Achilles' son. (Cf. commentary at 301-2 for the dual names of Achilles' son, Pyrrhus/Neoptolemus and his legendary association with the kingdom of Epirus.) For the patronymic *Achillides* compare *Heroides* 8.3, wherein Ovid refers to Achilles' son Pyrrhus, as *Pyrrhus Achillides, animosus imagine patris*. Pyrrhus waged a constant struggle against Macedonia to preserve Epirus' freedom, and lost his life in an encounter with the Macedonian king Antigonus Gonatas, in a battle at Argos.

**opprimat hostili tegula iacta manu:** caught up in the narrow streets and confusion of the city, Pyrrhus was killed by a blow from a woman who hit him on the head with a tile (Pausanias, 1.13.7; cf. Livy 29.8.9, 18.3ff.; Justin 25.5). Pausanias goes on to note that according to the Argives, Pyrrhus' assailant was the goddess Demeter disguised as a mortal woman. Plutarch, *Pyrrhus* 34, records that Pyrrhus was only dazed by the blow, but before he could regain his wits, was slain by a mercenary of Antigonus who recognized him, and his head was borne to the king.

301-302 Pyrrhi . . . ossa: the Pyrrhus here referred to is a mythological figure, the son born to Achilles and Deidamia, the daughter of Lycomedes, when Achilles was hidden at Lycomedes' court disguised as a girl. In Homer, the son of Achilles is known only as Neoptolemus, but his alternate name of Pyrrhus occurs as early as the *Cypria* (Pausanius 10.26.4; cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.13.8). Ovid refers to him in his works more often as Pyrrhus (9 times) than as Neoptolemus (3) and in this series of *exempla*, of course, Ovid plays upon the connexion between the mythical Pyrrhus, and the Pyrrhian dynasty in Epirus.\(^1\) According to the canonical version of the myth

---

1Pausanias 1.13.9 links three Aeacidae - Achilles, his son Pyrrhus, and Pyrrhus the Great - as victims of divine vengeance. As the traditional ancestor of the Pyrrhi, Pyrrhus was said by Pindar (*N.* 4.51ff.; 7.38f.) to have received the kingship of Molossia. A somewhat different account is given by Strabo
associated with Pyrrhus (see esp. Euripides Andr. passim), Menelaus promised his daughter Hermione to Pyrrhus, if he would aid the Greeks in their fight against the Trojans. Unfortunately, she had also been promised to her cousin Orestes (cf. the "explanation" of this double arrangement offered by Eustathius Od. p.1479.10, namely that Hermione was promised to Orestes by her grandfather Tyndareus while Menelaus was away at Troy; not knowing of his father-in-law's arrangements, Menelaus in turn betrothed the girl to Pyrrhus). When Pyrrhus came to Sparta after the war, and demanded his bride, the rights of Orestes were ignored and Hermione was married to Pyrrhus. Later, when Pyrrhus went to Delphi to consult the oracle and to dedicate some of the booty from Troy, Orestes instigated a riot, in the course of which Pyrrhus was slain at Apollo's altar. Pyrrhus' death at Delphi is not in the Homeric tradition; it is first found in Pindar Pae. 6.105ff., wherein Apollo kills Pyrrhus in retribution for his murder of Priam. The poetic justice of Pyrrhus' death in light of his similar slaying of Priam at the altar of Zeus (cf. 280-1 and commentary ad loc.) led to the proverbial expression 'the punishment of Neoptolemus' (Paus. 4.17.4 καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου τὸ παθεῖν ὅποιόν τις καὶ ἔδρασε Νεοπτολέμειον τίσιν ἄνομάξουσι).

sparsa per Ambracias...vias: Pyrrhus is traditionally said to have been buried in the precinct of the Delphian temple (cf. Euripides Androm. 1240 ff., Pausanias 10.24.6), but Hyginus Fab. 123 agrees closely with Ovid's account: Orestes iniuria accepta Neoptolemum Delphis sacrificantem occidit, et Hermionen recuperavit; cuius ossa per fines Ambraciae sparsa sunt, quae est in Epiri regionibus. It is, in my opinion, unnecessarily confusing, and grammatically strained, to understand this line as a reference to the death of Pyrrhus the Great, as do Rostagni, Ibis pp.44ff., and N. Hammond, Epirus (Oxford 1967) p.592. Furthermore, their assertion that Pyrrhus' tomb was opened and his ashes scattered by the Ambracians, is not supported by the ancient sources of the period.

(7.7.8), who makes Pyrrhus' son the one who became ruler of the Molossians.
303-304 nata ... Aeacidae: as was noted above, Pyrrhus the Great was proud of his alleged descent from Achilles (cf. 299f. and commentary ad loc.) and, he was, like Achilles, sometimes designated by the patronymic Aeacides, since Aeacus was Achilles’ grandfather. See Ennius’ description of him as such in Ann. 179 (6.167 Skutsch) and in Cicero Div. 2.5.6, and Cicero Off. 1.12. His daughter Deidamia (cf. Polyenuen Strategemata 8.52), or grand-daughter Laodamia (Justin 28), was forced to flee from Epirus after the short reigns of Pyrrhus the younger and his brother Ptolemaus came to a violent end. She reached Ambracia and took refuge in a temple, but was there viciously murdered by the Epirean Milon. Particularly valuable is the account of Polyenuen Strat 8.52: Δηιδάμεια Πύρρου θυγάτηρ Αμβροσίαν καταλαμβανετη τιμωρήσαι Πτολεμαίω διδοθηνυμένη προελμένη, προσβεςαμένων Ἡπειρωτῶν τὸν πόλεμον κατέβηκα ἐπὶ τῷ τῶν κληρον καὶ τὰς τιμὰς τῶν προγόνων ἔχειν. καὶ λαβούσα πίστεις ἐξηπατηθή. συντάξαμενοι γὰρ τῶν Ἡπειρωτῶν τινες Νέστορα τῶν ᾿Αλεξάνδρου σωματοφυλάκων ἀναιρήσουτα ἀντίν εἰσέπεμψαν. ὁ δὲ κάτω νεύσασαν αἰδεθείς καὶ καταπλαγείς ἀνέστρεψεν. ἡ δὲ κατέφυγεν ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς ᾿Ηγεμόνης ᾿Αρτέμιδος. Μῶλον δὲ αὐτίναν ἔχειν ὡς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μητέρα φιλωτέραν ἀποκτείνας ὄρμησεν ἐπ’ αὐτὴν ὀπλισμένας. ἡ δὲ ἀνέβοθησεν; "ὁ μητροφόντης ἐπὶ φόνῳ πράσσει φόνον." τούτο μόνον αὐτὴν ἐκβοσάσαν ὁ Μῶλον ἀπέκτεινεν ἐν τῷ τεμένει τῆς θεοῦ.

iaculis . . . adactis: cf. Justin’s description (28.3) of Deidamia’s murder as concursu populi interficitur.

non licet hoc Cereri dissimulare sacrum: Ovid is the only extant source for the murder taking place in the temple of Ceres: according to Polyenuen (supra) and Justin (28.3), it occurred in the temple of Artemis. Therefore I would concur with Ellis’ suspicion that the shift in locale may perhaps be accounted for by a desire on Ovid’s part to draw a connexion between Ceres’ role in Pyrrhus the Great’s death, and Deidamia’s death in her temple - that is, the goddess continues her hostility to Pyrrhus and his family, first shown by the active role which she played in Pyrrhus’ death, by concealing the murder of his granddaughter within her temple. The connexion is
further strengthened by Ellis' citation of Dionysus *Ant. Rom. Ex.* 20.9, wherein Dionysus connects Pyrrhus' death with the wrath of Ceres' daughter, Persephone, because Pyrrhus had pilfered her temple for funds. La Penna and Ellis rightly note the grim irony of *sacrum* and with it compare *Met* 13.461, concerning the sacrifice of Polyxena: *haud per tale sacrum numen placabitis ullam*, where *sacrum* is the virtual equivalent of *nefas*.

**305-306 nepos dicti nostro modo carmine regis:** another historical *exemplum* from Epirote history, this time describing the fate of Pyrrhus' grandson and namesake. This Pyrrhus, who lived c. 255-237 B.C., was the son of Alexander II of Epirus, and Olympias; Olympias reigned for a short time as Pyrrhus' guardian (cf. Polyaeus 8.52), but then quarrelled with her son, and gave up the throne to him. Pyrrhus ruled for only a very brief period, before he died at a young age, and was succeeded by his brother Ptolemaus. Ovid appears to be the only source for the tradition that Pyrrhus was poisoned by Olympias; Athenaeus 13.56 attests that Pyrrhus' mistress Tigris was poisoned by Olympias, Πύρρον δὲ τοῦ Ἡπειρωτῶν βασιλέως, ὡς ἦν τρίτος ἀπὸ Πύρρου τοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰταλίαν στρατέυσαντος, ἐρωμένη ἦν Τίγρις ἡ Δευκαδία. ἦν ὁ Ὀλυμπιάς ἦ τοῦ νεκρῶσκου μήτηρ φαρμάκος ἀπέκτεινεν, while Helladius (Photius, *Bibl.* 530a27) turns things completely around and reports that Pyrrhus poisoned his mother with the help of a slave.


**307-308** According to the scholia, a Pontic king by the name of Leucon murdered his brother Spartacus, either because Spartacus had seduced his wife, (G,C) or because he loved Spartacus’ wife (P, Bern.). In either case, the wife then murdered Leucon. Credence is given to the scholia’s assertions by other sources which attest to two
Pontic kings by the name of Leucon: the first was a son of Satyrus and ruled for 40 years, from 393 - 353 B.C. (cf. Diodorus Siculus 14.933, 16.31), while the second, a descendant of his, also named Leucon, had a brother named Spartacus (see Latyschen, Inscr. ant. orae sept. Ponti Euxini 2.15, 2.18; 308, RE s.v. Leukon). The coincidence of names is intriguing and certainly a historical exemplum from the Pontic area would accord well with the Epirean exempla which precede it.

**pia . . . adultera:** particularly ironic and appropriate if applied to the version of the story given by scholia G and C; Leucon's wife, the *adultera*, would be *pia* for avenging the death of her lover, Spartacus. Ellis (see his commentary *ad loc.*) posits a very different interpretation of the couplet, as an allusion to the mythical Leucon, son of Themisto and Athamas. According to one version of the myth, which appears to have originated with Euripides' *Ino*, and which is summarized by Hyginus, *Fab.* 4, Athamas married Themisto in the belief that his previous wife, Ino, was dead, although in fact she was still living. When Athamas discovered this, he brought her secretly into his household as a servant. Meanwhile, word had reached Themisto that her husband's former wife was alive, and she determined to kill her rival's children. To do this, she took the new servant into her confidence and asked her to dress her own children in white clothing, Ino's in black, so that she could distinguish them in the night. In fact the servant, Ino, did the opposite, and Themisto unwittingly slew her own children. Themisto was inadvertently an *adultera*, and Ellis sees in *pia* a play on her name, "*nam ea fecit quidem Æôμιστον facinus, dum filios suos occidit, et tamen oîk Æôμιστις ἕδη quae imprudens occideret*". Although there is ancient testimony that Athamas and Themisto had a son named Leucon (cf., for example, Apollodorus *Bib.*1.9.2, scholia *ad* A.R. 2.1144, Tzetzes *ad* Lyc. *Alex.* 21), and his name 'Whitey' is appropriate to the tale, he is not associated in extant sources with the myth of Themisto murdering her children: Hyginus (*Fab.* 239) calls the murdered children Sphincius and Orchomenus, a difficulty which Ellis glosses over.

309-310 The death of Sardanapallus (also known as Ashurbanipal), the last of the Assyrian kings, who lived from 668-626 B.C., is here chronicled. According to
Diodorus Siculus (2.23) Sardanapallus was notorious for his love of luxury and his effeminacy. One of his generals, the Mede Arbaces, led a revolt against the king. When thwarted twice by the king’s forces, he attacked again unexpectedly during the night, while Sardanapallus and his men were celebrating their victories. Taken by surprise, the king was easily defeated and he withdrew into his palace. There, trusting in an oracle which had said that the city would never be taken unless the river Euphrates should first become the city’s enemy, the king withstood the rebels’ siege for two years. However, it happened that after two years the Euphrates became swollen from heavy rains, and overflowing its banks, broke down some of the city’s hitherto impregnable walls. The king took this as evidence of the oracle’s fulfillment and resolved to die: he built a huge pyre, 400 feet high, in a fortified chamber within the palace and onto this he piled all his gold and silver, clothes, and one hundred fifty gold couches and tables. Having shut himself, his concubines and his wife within it, he gave orders for the pyre to be lit, and it burned for fifteen days. Cf. the account of Diodorus Siculus 2.26ff.; Athenaeus 12.528cff.; Justin 1.3.5; and the scholia on Aristophanes’ *Aves* 1021; RE s.v. “Sardanapal” col. 2439ff., and Streck, *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Konige*, vol.I. pp.ccc1XXXVI-cdv, vol.II. p.37.

*tectum carissima corpora*: according to Diodorus, Sardanapallus entombed his concubines and eunuchs with himself in the fiery pyre (2.27.2), while Athenaeus states it was his wife and concubines (αὐτὸς τε μετὰ καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ παλαικίδες ἐν τοῖς ἄλλαις κλίναις). He had already sent his children to Cotta, the governor of Paphlagonia.

311-312 *Iovis Libyci templum violare parantes*: an allusion to the soldiers sent by the Persian king Cambyses, the son of Cyrus the Great, who were to enslave the Ammonians, and burn the oracle of Zeus Ammon (cf. 295 and commentary *ad loc.*), while Cambyses continued on his way to Ethiopia with the rest of his army. The army, estimated at 50,000 men by Herodotus (3.25), never reached its goal, but disappeared after setting out from the Great Oasis.
Io vis Libyci templum: the temple of Zeus Ammon was located in the Libyan desert, in the oasis of Siwa. For the use of Libycus as an epithet for Ammon, cf. Phaistos FGrHist. 893, Ze ν Λιβύς "Αμμών κερατόφορος κέκλυθι, μάντι; Prop. 4.1.103, harenosum Libyae Iovis . . . antrum, and the note of Bömer on Met. 5.17.

acta Noto vultus condat harena tuos: Herodotus (3.26) notes the Ammonians’ explanation for the Persians’ disappearance, namely that they were overwhelmed and buried by a sand-storm: λέγεται . . . ὃτ᾽ αὐτῶν Ἀμμώνιων ἐπειδὴ ἐκ τῆς Ὑσίου ταύτης ἰέναι διὰ τῆς ψάμμου ἐπὶ σφέας, γενέσθαι τε αὐτοῦς μεταξὺ κοι μάλιστα αὐτῶν τε καὶ τῆς Ὑσίους, ἄριστον αἰρεμένουσι αὐτοῖς ἐπιπενδύσαι νότον μέγαν τε καὶ ἔξωσιν, φορέωντα δὲ θώνας τῆς ψάμμου καταχώσαι σφέας, καὶ τρόπῳ τοιοῦτῳ ἀφανισθῆναι. See too Justin. 1.9.3.

313-314 Darei . . . secundi: Darius II, or Ochus, King of Persia from 424-404, devised a stratagem to punish those who had formed a conspiracy against him; since he had sworn an oath not to kill them, and did not wish to perjure himself, he had a hidden pit full of ashes constructed, into which the unsuspecting men fell. Cf. Valerius Maximus 9.2.6, Ochus autem, qui postea Darius appellatus est, sanctissimo Persis iureiurando obstrictus, ne quem ex coniuratione, quae septem Magos cum eo oppresserat, aut veneno aut ferro aut ulla vi aut inopia alimentorum necaret, crudeliorem mortis rationem excogitavit, qua hostes visos sibi non perrupto religionis vinculo tolleret. Saeptum enim altis parietibus locum cinere complevit, superpositque tigno prominente, benigne cibo et potionem exceptos in eo collocabat, e quo somno sopiti in illam insidiosam congeriem decidebant. The scholia on the Ibis claim that Callimachus also used the exemplum of Darius in his Ibis.

subsident . . . cinis: as La Penna notes, the phrase probably refers to the ash settling under the weight of the bodies. Cf. Fast. 3.330, terraque subsedit pondere pressa Iovis. Ellis notes that Maccabees (2.13.5) records the punishment of Menelaus, who was thrown into a tower full of ashes, where he met his end; yet another death from ashes was met by Nitocris, Queen of Egypt, who avenged the murder of her brother by building an underground banquet chamber to which she invited the murderers, and
then flooded it by letting in the river from a secret channel. She then cast herself into a room full of ashes to escape reprisal (Herodotus 2.100.16).

315-316 There are no names to help identify this victim, only that he died of cold and hunger after leaving Sicyon; the most plausible candidate is Nicocles, tyrant of Sicyon in 251-250 B.C., whose rule and expulsion from the city are attested to by Pausanias 2.8.3, Polybius 2.43.3, and Plutarch Arat. 4ff., 9. Although they make no mention of his death, anyone thrown out of a city without means of support could conceivably die of cold and hunger. The scholia would appear to support this identification, although they call the tyrant Neocles (as La Penna points out, the names are similarly confused in Suidas, s.v. Φιλανκρέας). Ellis proposed a number of other candidates who had connections with Sicyon, including the tragic poet Neofron, Adrastus, Demetrius Poliorcetes and Lysippsus, but none of them appear to have suffered a death similar to that described. See Ellis' arguments in his commentary ad loc. and in the Journal of Philol. 14 (1885), pp.94f., for further discussion of the relative merits and shortcomings of these candidates.

olivifera . . . Sicyone: Sicyon was renowned for its olives; cf. Vergil Georg. 2.519, Ovid Ex P. 4.15.9f. The same phrase reappears in Statius Theb. 4.50, oliviferae Sicyonis.

317-318 Atarnites: as was first noted by the scholia, Atarnites would appear to refer to Hermias, the philosopher, eunuch, and former slave of Eubulus, who reputedly murdered his master, and became the tyrant of Atarneus, a city on the Asiatic coast opposite Mitylene (cf. Diodorus Siculus 16.52.5ff., Diogenes Laertes 5.3ff.). He successfully revolted from the king of Persia, Artaxerxes, and controlled many cities, in addition to having a not inconsiderable fleet and army. In 342-1 B.C., however, he was betrayed at a conference by the satrap of the Asiatic coast, Mentor, who had been put in charge of quelling the rebels in Asia Minor by the king. This man promised Hermias that he would try to persuade the king to drop the charges against him, as he had done for others at Mentor's request, but in fact, once he had won Hermias' trust, he arrested him. Cf. Diodorus Siculus 16.52.5ff.
insutus pelle iuvenci: the scholia on the Ibis are the only other extant authorities for Hermias being sewn up in a hide, but for this form of punishment cf. Valerius Maximus 9.2.11: Sicut illi barbari, quos ferunt mactatarum pecudum intestinis et visceribus egestis homines inserere, ita ut capitibus tantummodo emineant, quoque diutius poenae sufficiant, cibo et potione infelicem spiritum prorogare, donec intus putrefacti laniatur sint animalibus, quae tabidis in corporibus nasci solent, and also Lucian Lucius 25, Apuleius Met. 6.31-2, wherein a girl was to be put inside the carcass of an ass, with only her head protruding, and thrown to the vultures. The heat, lack of food, smell, and maggots guaranteed a horrendous death. Hermias was perhaps only conveyed to the king in this manner, and then released from the hide, for Strabo (13.1.57) states merely that Hermias perished after being hung (κρεμασθέως ἀντὸς).

319-320 Again, the scholia first provided identification of this victim, Alexander, the Thessalian tyrant of Pheres from 369-357 B.C. He was slain in bed, either by his wife Thebe alone (so Cicero Off. 2.7; Valerius Maximus 9.13.3), or by her brothers at her instigation (Xenophon HG 6.4.35ff.), or by both his wife and her brothers (Diodorus Siculus 16.14.). See the vivid account of Cicero (Off. 2.7): quid Alexandrum Pheraeum quo animo vixisse arbitramur? qui, ut scriptum legimus, cum uxorem Theben admodum diligebat, tamen ad eam ex epulis in cubiculum veniens barbarum, et eum quidem ut scriptum est, compunctum notis Thraecis, destriecto gladio iubebat anteire praemittebatque de stipatoribus suis, qui scrutarentur arculas muliebres et, ne quod in vestimentis telum occultaretur, exquirerent. O miserum, qui fidelissime et barbarum et stigmatiam putaret quam coniugem! Nec eum fefellit: ab ea est enim ipsa propter pellicatus suspicacionem interfectus.

ritu: cf. OLD s.v. 2, ‘in the manner of’, ‘like’. Thus Cicero Phil. 2.62 erat vivendum latronum ritu; Horace Sat. 2.1.28f., me pedibus delectat claudere verba/Lucili ritu.

iugulere: a forceful verb, especially common when used to refer to a sacrificial victim having its throat cut. Cf. TLL. 7.2.635.23.
**datus est leto:** cf. Phaedrus 1.22.9, *atque ita improbam leto dedit.*

321-322 Larisaëus Aleuas: the Aleuades were prominent citizens of Larissa (for their dynasty cf. Pindar *P.* 10.5, Herodotus 7.130, 9.58 etc.), who appealed to Alexander II of Macedon to bring to an end the occupation of their city by Alexander, tyrant of Pheres (for whom, see above, 319-320). When Alexander of Pheres fled at the advent of the Macedonian king’s forces, the latter garrisoned the city and took control of it himself, instead of giving it the freedom which he had promised (Diodorus Siculus 15.61.2-5; *R.E.* 1,1373). The Ovidian couplet may be an allusion to this event, referring in a general sense to the betrayal of the Aleuades by the Macedonians, or perhaps to a specific, albeit unknown, incident, in which one of the Aleuades was harmed. Certainly an allusion to this historical event accords well with the preceding and following exempla. Individuals named Aleuas are noted by La Penna *ad loc.*, but there is no evidence to connect them with the Ovidian allusion.

323-324 As the text stands, Ibis is wished a fate similar to that of Milo, tyrant of Pisa, who was hurled alive into hidden waters. However, nothing is known of a Milo who fits this description; although there was a historical figure of this name, who was a friend of Pyrrhus of Epirus (cf. Justin 25.3.4, 25.3.6), there is little beyond the common name to support the connexion. Merkel suggested reading *ut Patalon*, as an allusion to Pantaleon, a tyrant of Pisa (cf. Strabo 8.4.10, Pausanias 6.21.1, 22.2), however he did not perish in this manner (cf. Athenaeus 616). Ellis in turn proposed two possibilities: 1) to read *utque Anio*, thereby referring to Annius the Etruscan (for whom cf. Plutarch *Parall.* 40; discussed by Ellis in his "Excursus") and 2) to read *Milioniaco* for *milo sub quo* and *Roma*, the reading of G, for *Pisa*, whereby the couplet would mean "As Rome was tortured by Milo’s so-called tyrant, Clodius, so may you be thrown into the public sewers" (*Journal of Philol.* 26, 1895-6, p.182). Justification for calling Clodius a tyrant is found in Cicero *Mil.* 35, 43 and *Att.* 6.4, but Ellis’ conjecture concerning the corruption of *milioniaco* to *milon aquo*, to *Milo(n) sub quo* seems forced and his interpretation of the pentameter, based on Sestus 35.77 (Cicero speaking) *meministi tum, iudices, corporibus (tum) civium Tiberim compleri,*
cloacas refarciri, e foro spongiis effingi sanguinem, highly improbable.

occultas . . . aquas: possibly an allusion to the Alpheus river which flowed in Pisa's immediate vicinity and which at some points disappeared underground. Cf. Pausanias 8.54.2, Strabo 342.

325-326 Another unknown allusion, concerning a victim of Jupiter's thunderbolt. Ellis proposed the reading followed by the Oxford text, Aphidantum Phylacesia regna, and understood thereby a reference to the well-known blasting of Lycaon's palace by Zeus. Cf. 429-430 and commentary ad loc. For support of Aphidantum and Phylacesia, Ellis cites Pausanias 8.45.1. Rostagni, p.106, retained the manuscript reading of Adimantum, but emended Phylesia to Phylacesia, as an allusion to Philacos, eponymous hero of Phylace, while Zipfel, p.52, advocated Phialesia, the name of an Arcadian town. In the absence of more cogent suggestions, I think it best to follow the manuscript and the scholia and to accept the couplet as an allusion to Adimantus, king of Phialesia; if the victim's identity is uncertain, his punishment is not, for a love . . . tela clearly refer to the god's thunderbolts. Cf., for example, Met. 1.259, Fast. 3.343, 6.735.

327-328 Amastriacis . . . ab orbis: Amastris was a city of Pontus, standing here for the Pontic kingdom; cf. Strabo 12.3.10.

Lenaeus: the Pontic king Mithridates VI Eupater (120 - 63 B.C.). The identification is based on the use of Lenaeus, an established epithet of Dionysus (see Bömer on Met. 4.14 for citations in Latin literature), to refer to Mithridates' surname, Dionysus, which he was said to have been given as a baby, when struck by lightning, since Dionysus' mother Semele had been struck by Zeus' thunderbolt when pregnant. Cf. Plutarch Mor. 624 b, Quaest. conv. 1.6.2; Appian Mith. 10.113, Cicero Flac. 60.

nudus . . . destituaris humo: humo is best taken as a locative here, rather than an ablative of separation. For a similar construction with nudus, compare Vergil Ecl. 1.61, freta destituant nudos in litore pisces. After his defeat by the Romans in 63 B.C., Mithridates faced a revolt led by his own son, Pharnaces, who proclaimed himself king. Mithridates, fearing that he would be handed over to the Romans,
attempted to commit suicide by drinking poison. When that failed, he was killed by one of his Gallic bodyguards at his own request (so Appian Mith. 12.110-111), or his men turned against him and killed him (cf. Cassius Dio 37.11-14).

**Achillea . . . humo:** this could refer to the so-called 'Αχιλλέας δρόμος, a flat penninsula about 1000 stades long on the north coast of the Black Sea (for which see Strabo 7.3.19, Pliny Nat. 4.83), or the 'Αχιλλείαν, a village in the Bosphorus (cf. Strabo 7.4.5). Since Mithridates was in Panticapaeum, which was not far from Achilleium (cf. Strabo 11.2.6ff.), when forced to take his life, the latter location would seem to be the point of Ovid's allusion. See Ellis *ad loc.* for a different explanation of the couplet, as a reference to the sufferings of Philoctetes, by reading *Lemnæus* for *Lenæus*, and *Echidnea* for *Achillea*.

**329-330** *Eurydamas ter circum busta Thrasylli:* the precise circumstances surrounding the deaths of Eurydamas and Thrasyllus are unclear. However, according to the scholia, who cite Callimachus as their source, after Eurydamas had killed Thrasyllus, he was in turn killed by Thrasyllus' brother or friend, Simon of Larissa, and his body dragged three times around Thrasyllus' grave. This accords with the comment of scholium A on *Il.* 22.396ff., concerning Achilles' treatment of Hector: ὁ δὲ Καλλιμαχός φησὶν ὅτι πατριόν ἐστι θεσαλοὶς τοὺς τῶν φιλτάτων φονέας σώρειν περὶ τοὺς τῶν φονευθέντων τάφοις. Σίμωνα γὰρ φησι, θεσαλὸν τὸ γένος, Εὐφρυδάμαντα τὸν Μεδίου ἀποκτείναντα Θράσυλλον τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἀρξάσθαι τοῦ νόμου πρῶτον. τούτῳ γὰρ ἔξαψαι τοῦ δίφρου τῶν φονέα καὶ περὶ τῶν τοῦ τετελευτηκότος τάφων ἔλκειν. θεῖν καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα ως θεσαλὸν πατρίω ἔθει τούτῳ ποιήσαι καὶ δῆσαι τὸν Ἐκτορα. See also Callimachus fr. 588 and Pfeiffer *ad loc.*

The Thessalian origin of the custom is mentioned also by Aristotle in Porph. on *Il.* 24. The dragging of the corpse around the tomb was both a final tribute to the man buried there and a degradation of his murderer.

**331-332** For the similar maltreatment of Hector's body by Achilles, cf. Homer *Il.* 22.395-404, 23.13-14 etc. Achilles did not stop at merely dragging Hector's corpse three times around Patroclus' grave, but dragged it right around the city walls which
Hector had so often defended.

tutatus: the origin of Hector’s name was ‘keeper’ and thus there were frequent wordplays on his name and role as the principle defender of Troy, as, for instance, Andromache’s lament in II. 24.730f., . . . ἔχεις δ’ ἀλόχους κεδνάς καὶ νήπια τέκνα,/ αὖ δὴ τοι τάχα νυνῖν δρήσονται γλαυφρῆι.

lustraunt: this final degradation of Hector’s body is a parody of a lustral ceremony performed around the walls of the city. Cf. especially Culex 324 Hectoreo victor lustravit corpore Troiam, and Lucan 8.437, quae moenia trunci lustrarunt cervice duceo.


Hippomeneide: Limone, the daughter of the Athenian Hippomenes; when her father discovered that she had been seduced, she was shut up with a horse which had been deprived of food for days and was killed by the frenzied animal. Cf. 457f. and my commentary ad loc.

tractus . . . fertur adulter: Hippomenes punished Limone’s lover by having him dragged to his death by horses. Cf. Heraclides Pol. fr.3, Ἰππομένης εἰς τῶν Κοριδίων λαβὼν ἐπὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ μοιχῷ, ἐκεῖνον μὲν ἀνείλεν ὕποζεύξις τῷ ἀρματί, τὴν δὲ ἱππο συνέκλεεσαν, ἵνα ἀπόληται; Callimachus fr.94 and 95 Pf.

Actaea humo: i.e. Athenian. According to Diodorus Siculus 8.22, Hippomenes was an Athenian archon. Here, as elsewhere in the poem, Housman proved himself a sensitive critic and proposed transposing 457f., which allude to Limone’s fate, so that they follow after 336. As he notes, poenam . . . illam of 457 would then naturally refer to the novum . . . genus . . . poenae here mentioned, as Ovid first invokes the fate of Limone’s lover on Ibis, and then that of Limone herself. Moreover, an allusion to Limone in two different ways in successive couplets (i.e. by the patronymic Hippomeneide and then by her own name), is consistent with his allusion to Antaeus at 391ff. and elsewhere. See further Housman, Journal of Philol. 34 (1918), pp.227-228.

337-340 The shipwreck of the Greek fleet as they returned home from Troy, and the
death of Ajax, son of Oileus, form a unit, in which the death of Ajax helps to make clear the reference to shipwreck in the preceding couplet. As early as Homer (Od. 4.499ff.) mention is made of the storm which overwhelmed Ajax and part of the Greek fleet, but there is only a passing allusion (502) to Athene’s anger. Later writers, beginning with the author of the Illiupersis, attributed the storm to Athene’s anger at the rape of her priestess Cassandra by Ajax. Cf. Callimachus fr.35Pf.; Vergil Aen. 1.39ff.; Ovid Met. 14.466ff.; Hyginus Fab. 116; and Seneca Ag. 532-66. According to an alternate tradition, the wreck was caused by the Greek Nauplius, who sought to avenge the death of his son Palamedes (cf.617f. and commentary ad loc.); he therefore lit huge fires on the reef, which the Greeks mistook for the lights of a harbour, and were thereby lured to their destruction on the rocks. Cf. Apollodorus Epit. 6.7, Propertius 4.1.113ff., Hyginus Fab. 116 etc. Curses which invoked shipwreck upon one’s enemy were a familiar theme in ancient poetry. Cf. Polyphemus’ curse upon Odysseus (Od. 9.528ff.), the Danaides upon their cousins (Aeschylus Supp. 29ff.), Thyestes upon Atreus (Cicero Tusc. 1.44.107, exsecratur luculentis sane versibus apud Ennium Thyestes, primum ut naufragio pereat Atreus; durum hoc sane; talis enim interitus non est sine gravi sensu; illa inania ‘ipse summis saxis fixus asperis, eviscерatus,/ latere pendens, saxa spargens tabo sanie et sanguine atro’), and Horace’s employment of the exemplum of Ajax and the Greek fleet in his curse upon Maevius (Epod. 10.11ff., quietiore nec feratur aequore/ quam Graia victoriam manus/ cum Pallas usto vertit iram ab Ilio/ in impiam Aiacis ratem). In the Ibis the curse of shipwreck occurs also at 273f., 275f., and 592f.

338 sub Euboico . . . sinu: the rocks of Cape Caphereus, off the coast of South Euboea were the traditional site of the wreck. La Penna notes the prophecy of Poseidon in Euripides Troades 90f., οἱ Καφήρειοι τ’ ἄκραυ τολλῶν θανότων σώματ’ ἐξουσι νεκρων, and Tr. 5.7.35f., quaeque modo Euboicis lacerata est fluctibus, audet Graia Capherea currere puppis aqua.

Graia: understand viscera.

339-340 From the shipwreck of the Greek fleet in general, to the man whose act of
sacrilege at Troy led to the fleet's destruction, Ajax.

339 ferox . . . raptor: during the sack of Troy Ajax raped Cassandra, either tearing her from a statue of Athene in the goddess' temple where she had sought refuge (so Proclus *Chrestom* EGF p.49; cf. Euripides *Troades* 69ff.) or raping her within the temple itself (Callimachus fr.35Pf., Lycophron *Alex.* 357ff., Propertius 4.1.117ff.).

periit et fulmine et aequor: Ajax survived the initial break-up of the boat, but was then blasted by Athene with Zeus' thunderbolt. For Ajax's death, cf. the account in Vergil *Aen.* 1.42ff., *ipsa lovis rapidum iaculata e nubibus ignem/ disiecitque rates evertitque aequora ventis;/ illum exspirantem transfixo pectore flammis/ turbine corripuit scopuloque infixit acuto;* Seneca *Med.* 661, *fulmine et ponto moriens Oileus;* Ag. 556, *igne victus et pelago iacet.*

340 adiuvet ignis aquas: that two such discordant elements (cf. *Fast.* 4.788, *discordes, ignes et unda, dei;* Theogn. 1245 *οὐ ποθ' ἕδωρ καὶ πῦρ οὐμιξτοι*) should unite in a common purpose is an indication of the loathing felt for Ajax and by extension, Ibis.

341-342 The first of six *exempla* of men driven mad by the gods. No patronymic or other genealogical or geographical clue is provided for the victim's identification: it rests on his madness and the phrase *unum qui toto corpore vulnus habet.* The scholia, followed by La Penna, would identify the victim with Marsyas, the satyr who was flayed alive by Apollo. In support of this, La Penna cites the similarity of *Met.* 6.387f., *clamanti . . . / nec quicquam nisi vulnus erat,* which does in fact describe the fate of Marsyas. Marsyas was certainly rash and foolhardy in challenging Apollo to a musical contest, but to my knowledge he was never characterized as mad, the point of this *exemplum,* and in the passage of the *Metamorphoses* treating his plight madness is nowhere mentioned. Furthermore, the flaying of Marsyas is unmistakeably alluded to later in the *Ibis* (549ff.) and although characters do occasionally make repeat appearances in the poem, they generally do so with a different misfortune emphasized (see further discussion of this on p.24 of the Introduction). A more plausible candidate, in my view, would be Ajax, the son of Telamon, or Greater Ajax, as was first suggested by Parrhasius *Epist.* 44 and subsequently adopted by Ellis. This
identification provides a logical progression in thought from the preceding couplet, which concerned the Lesser Ajax and accords much better with the victims of madness with which it is linked, since the legend of Ajax’s madness after his loss to Odysseus in the contest for Achilles’ arms was very well-known. Cf. Sophocles Ajax passim, Apollodorus Epit. 5.6f. If this is the intended reference, the phrase *unum qui toto corpore vulnus habet* would be an obscure, but entirely feasible allusion to the myth that Ajax was visited at his birth by Hercules, who wrapped the baby in his own lion’s skin, and prayed to Zeus that the baby be made invulnerable. The prayer was granted, except for the shoulder, armpit and side of Ajax, since they were covered by the section of lion’s hide which normally came over Hercules’ quiver and which, not being in direct contact with Hercules’ body, could not convey his invulnerability to the baby. Cf. Pindar I. 6.35-54, and Lykophron Alex. 454ff., τοῦ λόσσαν ἐν πούμαισιν αἰχμητηρίαν/ ξεάντος, δὲν χάρωνος ὑμηστοῦ δορᾶ/ χαλκῷ τορπῦν οὐκ ἔτευξεν ἐν μάχῃ,/ μίαν πρὸς “Αιδήν/ καὶ θειτὸς πεπαμένοι/ κέλευθον, ἦν γωρυτος ἐκρυφῃ Σκύθης/, ἡμος καταιθών θυσθλα Κωμῦρμ λέων/ σφῷ πατρί λάσκε τὰς ἐπικόσους λιτάς/, σκυμνὸν παρ’ ἀγκάλαισιν αἰτα βράσας. *Vulnus* would thus be used in the sense of ‘vulnerable’ or ‘vulnerable place’.

**343-344 Dryantiadæ Rhodopeia regna tenenti:** the patronymic *Dryantiadæ* identifies this madman, the Thracian king Lycurgus, son of Dryas (cf. Homer Il. 6.129ff., Sophocles Ant. 955, Servius ad Aen. 3.14 etc.). According to the Homeric tradition, (Il. 6.129ff.) Lycurgus so frightened the child-god Dionysus when he arrived with his nurses in Thrace, that Dionysus jumped into the sea, and was there rescued by Thetis. Zeus, angered at Lycurgus’ actions, deprived him of his sight, but apparently not of his senses. Later versions of the myth however, depicted Dionysus as an adult, who, in revenge for being driven out of Thrace, afflicted the king with madness.

**Rhodopeia:** cf. Hyginus Fab. 132 . . . *in Rhodope, qui mons est Thraciae, cuius imperium <Lycurgus> habuit*. The adjective *Rhodopeius* was often used as a poetical equivalent of Thracian; cf. Vergil *Georg.* 4.461 *Rhodopeiae arces*; Ovid *Ars*
3.321, *Rhodopeius Orpheus*.

in *gemino dispar cui pede cultus erat*: Ovid here follows the tradition that in his madness Lycurgus determined to chop down all the vines sacred to Dionysus and while attempting to do so, cut off one of his own feet; hence the allusion to the dissimilarity of his foot apparel. A similar account is found in Hyginus *Fab.* 132, and Servius *ad Aen.* 3.14: *Lycurgus autem hic filius Dryantis, rex gentis Bistonum Thraciae fuit, qui ut habet fabula, dum contemnens Liberum eius amputat vites, crura sibi incidit*. . . . Cf. also *AP* 16.127.1, τὸν δὲ μονοκρήτιδα Δυκούργον χείλκεον, and *Fast.* 3.721f. . . . *tacebere . . . inque tuum furiis acte, Lycurge, genu.* Other variants of the tale have Lycurgus chop up his son Dryas, or his wife (cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.5.1, with the note of Frazer). A useful synopsis of the differing accounts of the punishment inflicted upon Lycurgus may be found in *RE* 13.2433ff., while Frazer has an interesting note on the widespread belief that whoever attempts to cut down a sacred tree will injure himself in the process.

345-346 The catalogue of victims of madness continues, with four very brief, allusive references, each one being alluded to by a single geographical, genealogical, or matrimonial clue: *Oetaeus* is a reference to Hercules, whose funeral pyre was on Mt. Oeta, the *gener draconum* was Athamas, who by his marriage to Ino became the son-in-law of Cadmus and Harmonia, who were changed into snakes, the father of Tisamenus was Orestes, and the husband of Callirhoe was Alcmeon.

*Oetaeo*: the epithet was a nickname of Hercules, derived from his fiery death on Mt. Oeta, when he was driven mad from the excruciating pain caused by the cloak steeped in poison, which ate away his flesh (cf. 603f. and commentary *ad loc.*). La Penna accepts this as the point of the allusion here and dismisses Ellis' suggestion that the madness of Hercules should refer instead to the bout afflicted upon him by Juno, under the influence of which he threw his children into the fire, and killed them, a legend made famous by the dramatic presentation of Euripides (*HF*, esp. 930ff.; cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.4.12, Μετὰ δὲ τὴν πρὸς Μινύας μάχην συνέβη αὐτῷ κατὰ γῆλον Ἡρας μανήνα, καὶ τοὺς τε ἰδίους παῖδας, οὕς ἐκ Μεγάρας εἶχεν, εἰς τὴν ἐμβαλεῖν *Heraς μανήνα, καὶ τοὺς τε ἰδίους παῖδας, οὕς ἐκ Μεγάρας εἶχεν, εἰς τὴν ἐμβαλεῖν
καὶ τῶν Ἰφικλέους δυν; Diodorus Siculus 4.11; Moschus Megara 13ff.; Hyginus Fab. 32). However, I believe that a strong case can be made in support of this being the true point of the Ovidian allusion. From a structural standpoint, we would expect the two exempla paired in the line, Hercules and Athamas, to correspond closely to one another, as do the two in the pentameter, the two classic examples of matricide, Orestes and Alcmeon, yet the legend of Hercules’ death has little in common with Athamas. The epithet Oetaeus, moreover, need not be used solely in connection with Hercules’ death; indeed, it would be a characteristically Ovidian touch to use Oetaeus as the clue to Hercules’ identity, but have an entirely different myth in mind than that which is associated with the epithet. Ovid himself (in Fast. 6.519, cf. Bömer’s note) uses Oetaeus to designate Hercules without reference to his death, and indeed, to describe the hero meeting none other than Athamas’ wife Ino, after her husband’s attack of madness! Further, Athamas, according to the version of his myth followed by Ovid in Met. 4.416ff. (and cf. Fast. 6.489f., Hyginus Fab. 2; Apollodorus Bib. 3.4) was afflicted by the same goddess who drove Hercules to madness, Juno, because she was angry that he and his wife Ino had agreed to take in and raise the young Dionysius. In his mad frenzy, Athamas murdered his young son Learchus. Explained in this way, the couplet neatly balances two examples of fathers who murdered their sons while in a mad frenzy, with two examples of sons who murdered their mothers, and were subsequently driven mad.

generoque draconum: Athamas, the son-in-law of Cadmus. The earliest extant account of the transformation of Cadmus and his wife Harmonia into snakes is found in Euripides Ba. 1330ff. See also Ovid Met. 4.563-603, Hyginus Fab. 6, Apollodorus Bib. 3.5.4 (with Frazer’s note).

Tisamenique patri: a riddling means of referring to Orestes, who had a son, Tisamenus, by Hermione, the daughter of Menelaus and Helen (see commentary to 301-2 above; for Tisamenus being Orestes’ son, cf. Apollodorus Bib. 2.8.2-3, Pausanias 2.18.6). After his mother Clytemnestra and her lover Aigisthus had killed Agamemnon, (for which see below, commentary to 351-2), Orestes was brought up
at the court of Strophius. When he reached manhood, he was charged by the oracle of Apollo with the task of avenging his father's death. He thus returned to Mycenae, slew his mother and Aigisthus and was afterwards driven mad by the Erinyes. The legend was treated by Aeschylus in the Oresteia, Sophocles in Electra, and Euripides in Orestes and Electra, and was a favourite among the Romans (cf. Cicero de Fin. 5.63). As well as being a well-known literary theme, it was also popular in art; Pliny (Nat. 35.144) describes a painting of 'Orestis insania' by a 4th century painter, Theon of Samos, and one of Orestes killing his mother. Indeed, Orestes' madness became proverbial; Gellius states (13.4.1.) that a treatise was written by Varro entitled Orestes, vel de Insania, and numerous references to Orestes as an exemplum of madness are collected by Otto, pp.258-9, nr.1308 and Pease on Aen 4.471.

Callirhoesque viro: like Orestes, Alcmeon, the husband of Callirhoe, avenged the death of his father by murdering his mother and was then driven mad by the Erinyes. His father, the seer Amphiaraurus, was compelled by his wife Eriphyle to take part in the expedition of the Seven against Thebes, although he knew from his prophetic powers that he would die in the battle. (See below, commentary to 351-2.) Accordingly, before he left, he asked his son Alcmeon to avenge his death by taking part in a second expedition against Thebes, and by killing Eriphyle. When he had done so, however, Alcmeon was driven mad by the Furies, and eventually wandered to the court of King Phegeus in Arcadia, who purified him of his matricide, and married him to his daughter Arsinoe (Prop. 1.15.15, Paus. 8.24.8) or Alphesiboea (Apollodorus Bib. 3.). Later, still suffering from madness, he went in accordance with another oracle to the river god Achelous, and took Achelous' daughter Callihroe as his second wife, although she is not named in extant accounts prior to Ovid (cf. Bömer on Met. 9.414). When Alcmeon later returned to Phegeus' court in order to retrieve the necklace of Harmonia which he had given to Arsinoe, he was killed by her brothers. Cf. Ovid Met. 9.407ff.; Hyginus Fab. 73; Pausanias 8.24.8-10; Apollodorus Bib. 3.7.5; Diod. Sic. 4.65.7. Sophocles and Euripides both wrote plays entitled Alcmeon, which have not survived (cf. Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta ed.
A. Nauck 2 p.153ff., 379ff., and Fragments of Sophocles, ed. A.C. Pearson, vol.1. p 68ff.) In Timocrates fr. 6.8, Alcmeon is represented as a stock madman: τοὺς γὰρ τροχωδοὺς πρῶτον, εἰ βόλει, σκότει/ ὡς ὠφελοῦσι πάντας . . . ὁ νόσων δὲ μανικῶς Ἀλκμέων ἐκέψαιτο. Orestes and Alcmeon are linked, along with Nero, in the alleged Pythian oracle, Νέρων Ὁρέστης Ἀλκμέων μητροκτόνοι, in Philostr. vit. Soph. 1.481, while Lycurgus, Orestes, and Alcmeon are found together as well-known 'types' of madmen in Plautus Captivi 562ff.

347-354 Orestes and Alcmeon were driven mad as a consequence of their mothers' betrayal of their husbands and so Ovid proceeds with five examples of treacherous wives, including Clytemnestra and Eriphyle, who, like their sons, are paired together.

347-348 matrona: a wife, with the implied idea of chastity and virtue.

illa/qua potuit Tydeus erubuisse nuru: the daughter-in-law of Tydeus was Aegiale, Diomedes’ wife (cf. Homer Il.5.412) whose licentious behaviour while her husband was away fighting at Troy was said to have been caused by the goddess Aphrodite: the latter had been wounded by Diomedes at Troy while she sought to protect Aeneas (cf. Il. 5.330-362) and thus she took her revenge upon Diomedes by inflicting Aegiale with uncontrollable passions, and urging her into adultery with various men, including Cometes, the son of Diomedes’ friend Sthenelos. When Diomedes at last returned home from Troy, he narrowly escaped being assassinated by his wife and her lover, by taking sanctuary at Hera’s altar and then fleeing to Italy. Cf. Ovid Met. 14.476ff. with Bömer’s note, p.148; Lycophron Alex. 610ff. with Tzetzes ad loc.; and Servius ad Aen 8.9,11.269. In an alternate version given by Apollodorus Epit. 6.9 and Lycophron 1093 with scholia, Aegiale’s infidelity was the result of the scheming of Nauplius seeking to avenge his son Palamedes’ death (see commentary to 617f.). Nauplius thus went throughout the cities of Greece telling the Greek wives that their husbands were bringing back concubines from Troy who would usurp their rightful place, and urged them to take lovers of their own.

349-350 There is still no consensus on the identity of this Locrian woman who slept with her husband’s brother, and who disguised herself through the murder of a maid. The
scholia state that the couplet refers to a woman called Hypermestra, who, caught in an act of adultery with her husband's brother, fled, and then killed her maid Locris and said that she had caught her in an adulterous act. (Cf. scholium B, which cites Callimachus as the source for the story.) Apart from the scholia, however, nothing is known of Hypermestra, or her supposed affair with her husband's brother, although Rostagni, pp. 113ff., followed by Andre, would identify her with the Hypermestra who was the daughter of the Aetolian king Théstios and the mother of Amphíraous, thereby tying in with the exemplum of Eriphyle and Amphíraous, which follows (cf. Diodorus Siculus 4.68, Pausanias 2.21.2, Apollodorus 1.62). Ellis put forward a different and ingenious explanation: he theorized a reference to Arsínoe II, who was born in 316 B.C. In 281 B.C., Seleucus of Syria attacked her husband Lysimachos' Thracian kingdom and murdered Lysimachos. Arsínoe was trapped in Ephesus, her dramatic escape from which is told by Polyænus 8.57:

'Αρσινόη Ανθιμάχου τοῦ ἄνδρος τελευτήσαντος μεγάλης ταραχῆς οὖσης ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ τῶν Σελευκιζόντων τὰ τείχη καταβαλλόντων καὶ τὰς τύλας ἀνοιγόντων εἰς μὲν τὸ φορεῖον τὸ βασιλικὸν κατέκλυσε βεράπαιναν στολὴν περιβείσα βασιλικὴν καὶ περιέστησε πολλὰς τῶν ὑπασπιστῶν. αὐτὴ δὲ περιβαλομένη βάκια καὶ προσφεσοῦ ἐρυθμένον, καθ᾽ ἐτέρων βύρων ἐξῆλθε μόνη, καὶ δραμόναι ἐπὶ τὰς νοῦς ἀπέπλευσε; Μενεκράτης, ἐς τῶν ἡγεμόνων, τῷ φορείῳ προσπεσέων κατεκέντησε τὴν βεράπαιναν οἰόμενος 'Αρσινόην φοινεὺειν. This would thus neatly fit Ovid's clue in ancillae dissimulata nece. After her escape, she married her brother Ptolemy Ceraunos, who, however, shortly thereafter murdered two of her sons and once again Arsínoe barely escaped with her life (cf. Justin. 17.2.24.2-3). This time she fled to Egypt and there lived with and eventually married Ptolemy Philadelphus, Ceraunos' brother, as well as her own, thereby fulfilling the first clue, quæque sui venerem iunxit cum fratre mariti. Finally, Locris as an epithet for Arsínoe, although not satisfactorily explained, is attested in both Catullus 66.54 Arsínoes Locridos ales equos (see Fordyce's note ad loc.), and in the Callimachean original (Fr. 110 Pf. with Pfeiffer's comments). For the typically Ovidian technique of highlighting two important events in reverse chronological order, compare, for example 255-6, of Bellerophon.
351-352 Talai... gener: Amphiaraus, the Argive seer who was married to Eriphyle, the daughter of Talaus (cf. Apollodorus Bib. 1.9.13). Amphiaraus, who had received the gift of prophecy from Zeus, killed his uncle Talaus, and drove his cousin Adrastus from the Argive throne. The two cousins later resolved their differences however, and Amphiaraus married Adrastus’ sister Eriphyle, with the agreement that if the cousins should quarrel again in the future, Eriphyle would settle the dispute. When Adrastus subsequently decided to attack Thebes and asked Amphiaraus to join him, the seer, warned by his powers of prophecy that he would die if he went, did not wish to take part. Eriphyle was then called upon to act as arbitrator and she, bribed by the necklace of Harmonia, decided in favour of the campaign, and thus compelled Amphiaraus to go to his death. Before leaving, Amphiaraus asked his son Alcmaeon to avenge his death by murdering Eriphyle (see above, commentary to 346). For the legend cf. Pindar N. 9.13-27; Apollodorus Bib. 3.6.2, 3.7.2.7; Diodorus Siculus 4.65.5ff.; Pausanias 5.17.7ff.; 9.41.2; Propertius 2.16.29; 3.13.57; and Ovid Amores 1.10.51-2, with the note of McKeown ad loc., citing instances of Eriphyle as an exemplum of treacherous greed.

352 Tyndareique gener: the son-in-law of Tyndareus was Agamemnon, through his marriage to Clytemnestra (cf. Hyginus Fab. 117 Clytaemnestra Tyndarei filia Agamemonis uxor...), the unfaithful wife par excellence in antiquity, who appears in a similar catalogue of wicked women in Ex P. 3.1.121. While Agamemnon was away fighting at Troy, Clytemnestra became involved with Aigisthus, the son of Thyestes and Pelopea (cf. 357 and commentary ad loc.). Clytemnestra’s betrayal of her husband was said to be because of her anger and horror at the sacrifice of their daughter Iphigenia (cf. Aeschylus A. 1431ff., 1521-1529). When Agamemnon returned home, he was welcomed by his wife and then murdered by her and her lover while he bathed; a netlike robe was thrown over him to render him defenceless, and he was struck down with an axe. Cf. Aeschylus A.; Apollodorus Epit. 6.23, Hyginus Fab. 117; Seneca Ag. etc. Interestingly, in the Homeric legend, Clytemnestra is not so heinously portrayed; it is Aigisthus who plans and executes the murder, at a feast
to which he had invited the unsuspecting Agamemnon (Od. 4.519-37), while Clytemnestra appears only in a passive role, as Aigisthus' mistress.

353-354 An allusion to the Belides, the fifty daughters of Danaus, so named after their grandfather Belus, who, with the exception of Hypermestra, all slew their cousin-husbands on their wedding night. See above, 175f. and commentary ad loc. for their punishment in Hades, where they continually filled leaky jars with water. Compare Ovid's similar description of them in Ars. 1.73f., *quaque parare necem miseris patruelibus ausae* / *Belides*, and Met. 4.462f., *molirique suis letum patruelibus ausae* / *adsiduae repetunt, quas perdant, Belides undas*, with the note of Börner ad loc.

**assidua:** as in Met. 4.463, the adjective is used instead of the adverb.

La Penna transposes this couplet so that it follows immediately after 350. This has the advantage of making the treachery of Clytemnestra and Eriphyle the concluding *exempla* of the series, as their sons concluded the series of madmen. A further result is two consecutive couplets introduced by *quaque*, one singular, one plural, analogous to Ovid's use of the same introductory formula in 369 and 371, 383, 385 and 386 etc. However, such a transposition lacks authority in the manuscripts and one could argue that by their sheer number and the fact that their treachery was on the very night of their wedding, the Belides are deliberately placed as the culminating *exempla*. Further, *fideli* seems a more appropriate point of comparison than *pudicior*; thus, in a very concise structure Ovid states 'May you enjoy as faithful a wife as the wife whom the son-in-law of Talaus or the son-in-law of Tyndareus enjoyed, and a wife as faithful as were the Belides'. The text would be improved by a full stop after *aqua* in 354.

355-358 As Ovid attacked Ibis' wife through the *exempla* of unfaithful wives in the preceding couplets, he now casts aspersions on Ibis' sister and daughter(s), through a series of incestuous relationships, the first two examples concerning the love of a sister for her brother, and then three of a father and daughter. Uncharacteristically, all five are directly named.

355-356 Byblidos et Canaces . . . igne: according to the detailed narrative of Ovid in
Met 9.447-665, Byblis was the daughter of Miletus and Cyane and the great-grandchild of Minos. She had a twin brother, Caunus, with whom she fell deeply in love. When she told her brother of her feelings, however, he was shocked and fled from her advances. Indeed, he left their home and founded a new city in southern Caria named after himself. Byblis became mad in her grief and went searching for her brother. When she had no success in finding him, she resolved to put an end to her life, but the nymphs took pity upon her, and transformed her into a spring, a symbol of her inconsolable grief. Ovid also alludes to Byblis' incestuous passion in Ars.1. 283-4, when he asks: *Byblida quid referam, vetito quae fratris amore arsit et est laqueo foriiter ulta nefas?* Cf. Hyginus Fab. 243.6; Nonn. 13.548-561. The scholia on Theoc. Id. 7.115, and Parthenius Erotica 11.2 give a variant tradition, according to which Caunus fell in love with Byblis and fled in shame from his home. *Καῦνος ἐρως* thus became a proverbial expression for an incestuous love (cf. Aristotle Rh. 2.25; Suidas and Hesychius s.v.). See further Bömer's introduction to Met 9.450-665, p.411ff.; B.Otis, Ovid as an Epic Poet, pp.386-388. *igne*: for the conventional topos of the ‘fire of love’, see Gow on Theoc. Id. 7.55, and Pease on Vergil Aen. 4.2.

*sicut facit*: this is the reading adopted by Owen for the Oxford text. Alternatively, La Penna reads *facis* as the genitive singular of *fax*, although the resulting phrase seems rather feeble. If *facit* is retained, the subject is presumably *soror*.

Like Byblis, Canace, the daughter of the wind god Aeolus and of Aenarate, developed a great passion for her brother Marceus, and bore him a son. When their relationship became known, the child was thrown to the dogs by Aeolus and Canace killed herself with a sword sent to her by her father. Euripides wrote a play, *Aeolus*, no longer extant (cf. Nauck TGF ed.2 p.366) concerning the story, and the dramatic role of Canace was said to be a favourite of the Emperor Nero's (cf. Suetonius Nero 21 cantauit Canacem parturientem, and Dio Cassius 58.10.22). For the legend of Canace, cf. Ovid Her. 11; Tr. 2.384; Hyginus 238.3, 242.2, 243.6; Anth.Lat.
1.273.8; Aristophanes *Nu.* 1371 and scholia *ad loc.* The point of the pentameter is thus ‘May you not have a faithful sister, except through crime’, i.e. because she has an incestuous relationship with Ibis.

357 *filia si fuerit:* understand *tibi.*

sit quod Pelopea Thyestae: Thyestes, the son of Pelops and Hippodamia (cf. below, commentary to 363ff.) was told by an oracle that the only way he could secure revenge on his twin brother Atreus for the so-called Thyestean banquet (see below, commentary to 427-8) would be through a son born to him from his daughter Pelopea (cf. Apollodorus *Epit.* 2.14; scholia *ad* Euripides *Orestes* 15; Servius *ad Aen* 11.262; Seneca *Ag.* 29ff. for the oracle). It is generally agreed that Thyestes journeyed to Sicyon and there raped Pelopea, without realizing the identity of his victim. Pelopea apparently did not recognize her father either, but took away with her his sword, which she hid in Athena’s temple. Shortly thereafter, Thyestes’ brother Atreus met Pelopea and married her without realizing her identity. She gave birth to a son from her union with Thyestes and exposed the child, but he was taken in by shepherds and nourished on their goats (hence his name Aigisthus, from *Ait*). When the boy came to Atreus’ attention, he took him in and reared him as his own son. Some years later, the young man was sent by Atreus to kill Thyestes, but Thyestes recognized the sword carried by Aigisthus, which had been given to him by Pelopea and the truth of Aigisthus’ parentage was revealed. Pelopea stabbed herself with the sword when she heard the tale and Aigisthus, instead of killing Thyestes, slew Atreus, and so avenged his father. Cf. Hyginus *Fab.* 87,88; Apollodorus *Epit.* 2.14; Scholia on Plato *Leges* 8.839C; and Claudian *in Eutrop.* 1.289ff. This *exemplum* differs from the tales of Myrrha and Nyctimene which follow, in that Pelopea was an unknowing victim of incest.

358 *Myrrha:* also known as Smyrna; cf. Bömer’s introduction to *Met.* 10 298ff. for a full account of the variant traditions associated with the myth, pp.110-116, and B. Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet,* pp. 391-392. She was generally said to be the daughter of the king of Cyprus, Cinyras (see, however, Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.14.4, Tzetzes on
Lyc. 829, 831, for the view that she was the daughter of Theias, king of Syria). Because Cinyras' wife Cenchreis had boasted that Myrrha was more lovely than Aphrodite herself, the offended goddess afflicted Myrrha with an overwhelming passion for her father. Aided by her nurse, the girl slept for twelve nights with her father, who thought her one of his concubines. On the twelfth night, however, he recognized her, and when she fled from his bed he followed, armed with his sword. As he was about to overtake her, she prayed to the gods for help, and was transformed by them into a myrrh tree, from which a child, Adonis, was born nine months later. Cinyras, ashamed of his illicit union, killed himself. Cf. especially Ovid's account in Met. 10.298-518; Ars 1.285f., Myrrha patrem, sed non qua filia debet, amavit, et nunc obducto cortice pressa laet; Apollodorus Bib. 3. 14.4; Hyginus Fab. 58, 164, and Servius ad Ecl. 10.18, ad Aen. 5.72.

Nyctimene: Nyctimene was the daughter of the king of Lesbos, Epopeus, according to Hyginus Fab. 204,253, or the king of Ethiopia, Nycteus (Lactantius Placidus on Stat. Theb. 3.507). Hyginus records that her father forced her into the incestuous union, but other accounts, including Ovid in Met. 2.589-93, imply that she was at fault. Ashamed of what had taken place, Nyctimene took refuge in the woods and was changed by Athena into an owl, which thereafter shunned the light, and came out only at night when no one could see it (hence νυκτικόραξ). Cf. Servius ad Georg. 1.403; Callim. fr. 326, 519, 608 and 803 Pf., with Pfeiffer's notes. For the myth consult Roscher 3,498; Bömer on Met. 2.589-595.

359-362 Three famous instances of fathers betrayed by their daughters; Pterelas by Comaetho, Nisus by Scylla, and Servius Tullius by Tullia. Again, aspersions are cast by association upon Ibis' daughter or daughters.

359-360 neve magis pia sit capitique parentis amica: noting the parallel with Ciris 386 (ergo iterum capiti Scylla est inimica paterno) R.O.A.M. Lyne, in his commentary to the Ciris, states of the Ovidian line, "here pia, capiti and amica are all contrived (cleverly) to fit both the situation of the invective and the myths. Pia and amica are cleverly pointed in an invective motivated, it seems, by the violation of amicitia and
pietas (cf. 40 gratia, commissis, improbe, rupta tuis); and amica (as well as pia) is a striking enough description of the mythical heroine’s actions, since it effectively makes a litotes with neve, contributing therefore grim irony. As for capiti, its ambiguity ‘head’ and ‘life’ is the pivotal point. It is hard to imagine that all this was not specifically arranged for the particular context.” Filia, from 357, remains the subject.

The myths of Pterelas and Nisus, each of whom had a lock of hair with magical protective qualities, parallel one another very closely.

**Pterelae:** Pterelas, the king of the island of Paphos, had a single golden hair on his head, which his grandfather Poseidon had planted there, and with which his life was closely linked, for the god had said that as long as the golden lock remained on his head, Pterelas and his realm would be invincible. However, when Amphityron undertook an expedition against Pterelas, in order to avenge the deaths of the sons of Electryon (cf. Apollodorus Bib. 2.4.6.), Pterelas’ daughter Comaetho fell in love with the enemy commander, and cut off her father’s protective lock. Forthwith Pterelas died, Amphityron seized control of the island, and Comaetho was put to death for her treachery. The tale was apparently told by Euphorion (cf. D.L. Page Gr. Lit. Papyri Loeb 1 498), and is also found in Apollodorus Bib. 2.4.5, 1.4.7, Tzetes ad Lyc. Alex. 932, and Eustathius on Il.1.197.

**Nise:** In the very similar legend concerning Nisus, king of Megara, and his daughter Scylla, Nisus was endowed with a purple lock of hair, which rendered him invincible. When the kingdom was besieged by Minos, Scylla fell in love with him, and so cut off her father’s purple lock while he slept, thereby enabling Minos to take Megara. Scylla then went to Minos, hoping for gratitude for her betrayal of her father, but instead was attached by him to the prow of his ship and dragged through the water until either she drowned (Apollodorus Bib. 3.15.8), or was transformed by the gods into a ciris (Vergil Georg. 1.404ff., Ovid Met. 8.1ff.; cf. Hyginus Fab. 198 who alone says that the ciris was a fish), forever chased by her father who became a sea-eagle. The myth of Scylla is first referred to in Aeschylus’ Ch. 613ff., where,
however, she betrays her father because of a bribe, rather than from love. See also the detailed account in Ovid *Met* 8.1-151, with the commentary of Bömer *ad loc.*; the pseudo-Vergilian Ciris; *Georg* 1. 404ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 198; Propertius 19.21; Tzetzes *ad Lyc.* *Alex.* 650, 932ff.; Callimachus *Hec.* fr.288 Pf. and *Aitia* fr. 113 Pf. Tzetzes draws the analogy of Samson with Nisus and Pterelas in *Chil.* 2.541ff., and there is also an interesting similarity with the rite undertaken by Thanatos in Euripides’ *Alcestis* 74ff., wherein he cuts off a lock of hair from his victims’ heads, in order to consecrate them to the underworld. Similar customs are noted by Grant on Hyginus *Fab.* 198, including the goddess Iris releasing Dido from her death struggle by cutting a lock of her hair (*Aen.* 4.693ff.) and Achilles and his men leaving locks of their hair with the body of Patroclus (*Il.* 23.135ff.). For detailed studies of the development of the Scylla myth see especially Bömer’s introduction to *Met.* 8.1ff., Hollis on *Met.* 8.1ff., and Lyne’s introduction to the *Ciris*. Also useful is B. Otis’ analysis in *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, pp.62-65.

361-362 The concluding example of a daughter’s treachery is drawn from Rome’s legendary history, and concerns Servius Tullius, king of Rome, and his daughter Tullia. In the couplet, Ovid highlights the two most sensational details of the story, Tullia driving a cart over the fallen body of her father and the renaming of the street where this occurred, in order to commemorate her notorious action. Tullia and her husband Lucius Tarquinius were both ruthless and ambitious, and hence schemed to overthrow Tullia’s father, and establish Tarquinius as king. To this end, Tarquinius convoked the senate one day and usurped his father-in-law’s position on the throne. When the latter entered and saw what was happening, he protested, and was finally thrown out and down the steps by the younger man. Tullius then tried to retreat to his house, but was murdered on the way by some followers of Tarquinius and his body was left lying on the street. Tullia meanwhile had gone to the senate meeting to urge on her husband and, as she headed home, her driver noticed the body of her father lying on the road and stopped in horror. Tullia, however, immediately ordered her cart to be driven over the body. Henceforth the street (the modern Via di S.
Pietro in Vincoli - cf. Platner-Ashby s.v.) was known as *Vicus Sceleratus*. Compare the accounts of Livy 1.48, with Ogilvie’s note; Dionysius Halicarnassus 4.28-39; Hyginus *Fab* 255.2; Valerius Maximus 9.11.1; Varro *L.* 5.159; and Ovid’s in *Fast.* 6.587ff., especially 608ff., "duc, inquam, invitás ipsa per orá rotás". / certa fides facti: *dictus Sceleratus ab illa /vicus, et aeterna res ea pressa nota*, with the note of Bömer *ad loc.*

**363-368** In three successive couplets Ovid highlights the three key details in the myth concerning Hippodamia, the daughter of King Oenomaus of Pisa: the unsuccessful suitors who were killed by Oenomaus, Oenomaus’ own death, and the death of Oenomaus’ charioteer Myrtilus, who had betrayed his master. There is a continuation of the general theme of betrayal found in the preceding *exempla*, since Hippodamia fell in love with Pelops and therefore determined to help him defeat her father (Apollodorus *Epit* 2.6). The deaths of the suitors also begin a lengthy series of *exempla* (363-410) in which human sacrifice predominates.

**363 ut iuvenes pereas:** Oenomaus was reluctant to give his daughter Hippodamia away in marriage, either because an oracle had warned him that he would die at the hands of his son-in-law (Hyginus *Fab.* 84; Apollodorus *Epit* 2.4.), or because he was himself in love with his daughter (Apollodorus *Epit* 2.4; Scholiast on Pindar 0.1.71; Scholiast on Euripides *Or.* 990; Tzetzes on Lyc. *Alex.* 156). Consequently, the king devised a stratagem to ensure that there would be no successful suitor: only the man who could defeat him in a chariot race (from Elis to the Altar of Poseidon in Corinth, according to Diodorus Siculus 4.73; alternatively the goal of the race was said to be across the Isthmus of Corinth) could marry his daughter, while those whom he defeated forfeited their life. Because his horses were the gift of Ares and swifter than any mortal horses (cf. Apollodorus *Epit* 2.5; Hyginus *Fab.* 84; Lycophron *Alex.* 166 and Tzetzes *ad loc.*), Oenomaus always prevailed.

**364 fastigia vultus/ membraque Pisaeae sustinuere foris:** the unsuccessful suitors were killed and their heads nailed to the palace doors (cf. Apollodorus *Epit* 2.4, and Hyginus *Fab.* 84, who adds that Pelops lost his courage when he saw the row of
heads and so enlisted the help of Myrtilus). According to Apollodorus supra and Tzetzes (ad Lyc. Alex. 156), twelve suitors had been killed by the time Pelops arrived to challenge for Hippodamia’s hand; Pindar (0. 1.79ff.) and the scholia ad loc. list thirteen. An even longer list may be found in Pausanias 6.21.7.

365-366 qui . . . ipse: Oenomaus himself died in the race against Pelops, for Myrtilus, Oenomaus’ charioteer, was bribed either by Hippodamia (Apollodorus Epit 2.6) or Pelops (Hyginus Fab. 84) to tamper with the king’s chariot. Accordingly, Myrtilus either left out the bronze lynch pins in the wheels of Oenomaus’ chariot (so Apollodorus and Tzetzes supra), or replaced them with pins of wax (schol. on A.R. 1.752). The result was that the wheels came off during the race, Oenomaus became entangled in the reins and was dragged by his horses to his death.

perfusam: cf. Met. 1.157, perfusam mulio natorum sanguine Terram.

melius: i.e. better that Oenomaus’ blood should be spilled, than the blood of the innocent suitors.

sanguine tinxit: a favourite expression of Ovid’s. Cf. Met. 4.107, 5.293 and 14.237 where, as here, the phrase conveys the two-fold image of moistening and of colouring the ground with blood.

367-368 proditor . . . auriga tyranni: Myrtilus, Oenomaus’ charioteer, who had sabotaged his master’s chariot for Pelops, was slain by the latter as they journeyed with Hippodamia across the sea at Cape Geraestus, south of Euboea (Euripides Or. 989ff.; Apollodorus Epit 2.8 etc.). According to Apollodorus, the reason for the murder was that Myrtilus tried to rape Hippodamia (cf. Tzetzes on Lyc. Alex. 156; scholiast on Homer Il. 2.104) while Hyginus (Fab. 84) says that it was because Pelops did not wish to give Myrtilus the reward which he had promised him for betraying Oenomaus. Be that as it may, Pelops cast Myrtilus into the sea, who, as he fell, cursed the house of Pelops.

nova Myrtoae nomina fecit aquae: the sea into which Pelops cast Myrtilus was thereafter known as the Myrtoan Sea. Nomina is a poetic plural. For the phrase nomina facere in etymological contexts, cf. Ovid Met. 14.616 (of the Tiber) nomina
fecit aquae; Fast. 3.870; 4.284 Icarus et vastae nomina fecit aquae; and Tr. 1.1.90, with Luck's note.

369-370 . . . qui velocem frustra petiere puellam: another contest of suitors, here a reference to the suitors of the beautiful maiden Atalanta. Atalanta had no desire to marry (because of a terrifying oracle according to Ovid Met. 10.564ff.; according to Hyginus Fab. 185, Apollodorus Bib. 3.9.2 because she wished to remain a virgin), but nonetheless she was often sought after, and so she devised a contest: every prospective suitor had to enter a foot-race against her, with Atalanta as the prize for anyone who could beat her. Those whom she defeated, she killed. According to the accounts of Hyginus, and Apollodorus, (see above) the suitor set off unarmed, and Atalanta followed, weighed down by her armour and spear, with which she killed the unsuccessful man when she overtook him. Hyginus gives the interesting additional detail that like the suitors of Hippodamia, the heads of the unfortunate victims were displayed in the stadium.

velocem . . . puellam: Atalanta's swiftness of foot was legendary, hence her appellation here, and her easy victory over her opponents. Compare Hesiod Cat. fr. 76.5 (Merkelbach and West) ποδώκης δι 'Αταλάντη.

dum facta est pomis tardior illa tribus: the only time that Atalanta was defeated was through the stratagem of the suitor Hippomenes (or Milanion/Melanion in Apollodorus Bib. 3.9.2, Propertius 1.1.9, Ovid Ars 2.188). Hippomenes prayed to Aphrodite for her favour in winning Atalanta and in response the goddess gave to him golden apples from her garden in the Hesperides (Servius ad Aen. 3.113) or her sacred field in Tamasus (Ovid Met. 10.644ff.). Hippomenes threw these one by one behind him whenever the swift girl was about to catch up with him; she stopped each time to gather them up and thus Hippomenes was able to defeat her. For the confusion and conflation of the myth of the Boeotian Atalanta with the Arcadian, cf. RE 2. 1890, 8.1887, Roscher 1.2688, and Bömer on Met. 10.560ff., pp.188-190. For the couple's short-lived happiness, cf. 455f. and commentary ad loc.

pomis . . . tribus: three appears to be a canonical number in the myth: cf., for
example, Hesiod *Cat.* fr. 76.21 (Merkelbach and West); Ovid *Met.* 10. 649f.; Hyginus *Fab.* 185. For apples as a token of love in antiquity, cf. Theoc. *Id.* 5.88 and Gow's note *ad loc.*

371-372 An allusion to the Labyrinth in Knossos, which housed the half human, half bull Minotaur (see 406 and commentary). It was a vast maze of corridors and rooms constructed by the architect Daedalus, within which the fourteen Athenian youths and girls sent as a tribute every nine years were enclosed. Unable to find their way through the intricate passageways, they made easy prey for the Minotaur. See especially the description in *Met.* 8.157ff., with Bömer's note *ad loc.* and for a discussion of the myth of the Labyrinth, see A.B. Cook *Zeus* vol.1, pp.473ff.

*novi formam ... monstri:* ‘novel’, ‘unheard of’. Cf. Ovid's description of the Minotaur in *Met.* 8.156 as *monstri novitate biformis,* and 8.96 *monstri novi.* For this use of *novus* see also *Met.* 4.195, 7.758, 9.727. *Monstrum* is first used by Catullus to describe the Minotaur (64.101); further parallels are cited by Bömer on *Met.* 8.156.

*caecae ... domus:* for the Labyrinth as *caecus,* cf. the description in *Met.* 8.158, *multiplicique domo caecisque ... tectis,* and Vergil *Aen.* 5.588ff., *ut quondam Creta fertur labynthus in alta/ parietibus textum caecis iter ancipitemque/ mille viis habuisse dolum, qua signa sequendi/ frangeret indeprensus et inremeabilis error.* *Caecus* surely refers not simply to its lack of windows (as Ellis suggests) but to the darkness of its path.


*violentus:* a fitting epithet for the warrior described by Homer *Il.* 20.467f. as ὁ γάρ τι γυναῖκιμος ἀνηρ ἢν ὄνει ἀγανάφωρον, ἀλλὰ μαλί ἐμμεμαίως. Ellis notes also Horace's depiction of Achilles as *iracundus inesorabilis acer* (*Ars* 120f.).

375-376 quos . . . Sphingá dedisse neci: the sphinx was a monster with the face of a woman, the breast, feet and tail of a lion, and the wings of a bird, which was sent by Hera to prey upon the Theban citizens (see Apollodorus Bib. 3.5.7ff.). Perched on the city walls, the sphinx would pose riddles for the Thebans and when they were unable to give a correct answer, would kill another victim, until Oedipus finally gave the correct answer to the riddle. Thwarted, the sphinx plunged from the wall to its death. For the myth of the sphinx and its riddle, cf. Hesiod Th. 326ff.; Sophocles OT 391ff.; Euripides Ph. 45ff.; Diodorus Siculus 4.64.3ff.; Hyginus Fab. 67; Seneca Oed. 92ff., etc.


377-378 qui Bistoniae templo cecidere Minervae: this would appear to be an allusion to the slaughter of Trojan suppliants in Siris, who had taken refuge at Athena's altar after the city had been captured by the Ionians. (Strabo 6.1.14, Justin 20.2). According to Lycophron (Alex 984-992), however, it was the Ionians, not the Trojans, who were slaughtered at Siris.

Bistoniae: the Siritans were considered Thracian in origin, hence the adjective Bistoniae, which Ovid uses elsewhere as the equivalent of Thracian (thus Tr. 1.10.23, nam mihi Bistonios placuit pede carpere campos, with Owen's note, who remarks that the Bistones were a Thracian tribe from the area of Abdera; Ex P. 1.3.59, 2.9.54, 4.5.35).

propter quod facies . . . tecta deae est: other ancient accounts of the story (e.g. Lycophron 988 and scholia ad loc., Strabo 6.1.14), emphasize the goddess' closing her eyes at the ensuing sacrilege; in our text, as it stands, Ovid says that her face is covered, which is not quite the same thing. Housman, however, (Journal of Philol.
proposed a very attractive and viable emendation which would overcome the apparent discrepancy: noting MS T’s reading of *quos*, he theorized that the final ‘s’, written as ‘ق’, became confused with an ‘f’; as a result, *quos acies*, written as *quōcacies* might easily give rise to the *quod facies* and *quos facies* of the manuscript tradition. Housman also gives convincing evidence of similar confusions, and as he notes, the comment of scholium P, *quos ne Minerva videret, fecit sua lumina operiri*, would seem to be based on the reading *quos acies*. Acies which is commonly used by the poets in the sense of ‘eyes’ (cf. *OLD* s.v. 4b), thus accords well with other accounts of the myth and it is my opinion that Housman’s emendation should be accepted.

**Threicii . . . regis:** in the preceding couplet Ovid used the adjective *Bistonius* in the general sense of ‘Thracian’, here he uses *Threicius* to refer to Diomedes, said by Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.5.8, to be the king of the Bistones (however, the exact location of Diomedes’ Thracian kingdom varies - cf. *RE* Suppl. 3, 1053, 66ff. He is referred to simply as Thracian by Ovid in *Met.* 9.194, Hyginus *Fab.* 30, and Diodorus 4.15.3). *Threicius* as a variant of *Thracius* is first found in the Augustan poets; see McKeown on Ovid *Am.* 1.9.23-4. Diomedes, son of Ares and Pyrene, possessed four man-eating mares (cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.5.8), to which he sacrificed all strangers. Hercules’ eighth labour was to bring the mares alive to Eurystheus, in the course of which he killed Diomedes (according to Diodorus Siculus 4.15.3f. by feeding him to his own mares); cf. 399 and commentary *ad loc.* Pindar treated the story (fr. 169.20ff.) as did Euripides (*Herc.* 380ff., *Alc.* 481-506). Cf. also Ovid’s allusions to the myth in *Heroides* 9.67ff., and *Ex P.* 1.2.122. Noteworthy also are the vases by Psiax and Oltos depicting the man-eating horses, for discussion see D.C. Kurtz, *JHS* 95 (1975), p.172.

*praesepia . . . dapibus sanguinolenta:* cf. the concise account of Diomedes and his mares in *Met.* 9.194f., *quid, cum Thracis equos humano sanguine pingues/ plenaque corporibus laceris praesepia vidi?*

**Therodamanteos . . . leones:** as Diomedes gave his victims to his man-eating
horses, so this monarch Therodamas, a Libyan (or Scythian - see Scholium b below), kept lions to which he fed human victims. The scholia state that one of his victims was a woman named Melontea (alternatively Menalia or Menelea), whom he sacrificed in order to sleep with her daughter Messagete (or Megisea, Mesagea), but was himself killed by the girl. See the report of scholium b: Therodamas Scythiae rex fuit, qui timens ne per insidias occideretur, leones hominum sanguine alebat quo magis saevirent, ut, si casus postularer, ad crudelitatem paratos haberet. Alii dicunt Therodamantem Libycum fuisse, qui Menaleam nobili genere matronam leonibus suis obiecerit, quod eius filiam adulterari vellet, a qua occisus est. Although little is known about the ruler apart from what is found here and in the scholia, he appears to be the figure referred to in Ex P. 1.2.119, again paired with Diomedes: non tibi Theromedon crudusque rogabitur Atreus/ quique suis homines pabulafecit equis. See the discussion of La Penna in his commentary to Ibis 383.

382 The victims of Thoas, king of the Taurians, who sacrificed strangers to the goddess Artemis; the earliest extant source for this king (sometimes identified with the Lemnian Thoas: cf. A.R. I; Hyginus Fab. 120,15) and his savage rites is Euripides’ Iphigeneia in Tauris, wherein Orestes and Pylades are captured by the king’s men and nearly slain by Orestes’ sister Iphigenia, who served as the goddess’ priestess. See also Hyginus’ summary in Fab. 120. The myth had special point for Ovid, because it was set so near to his own place of exile, as he notes in Tr. 4.4.61ff., illi, quos audis hominum gaudere cruore, / paene sub eiusdem sideris axe iacent, / nec procul a nobis locus est, ubi Taurica dira / caede pharetratae spargitur ara deae./ haec prius, ut memorant, non invidiosa nefandis / nec cupienda bonis regna Thoantis erant. Noteworthy also is the narrative of the rites offered to Artemis in Ex P. 3.2.43ff., esp. 57ff.

Thoantae . . . deae: for the adjective cf. especially Sil. 4.771f., urna reducebat miserandos annua casus/ sacra Thoantae ritusque imitata Dianae, 14.260, and V. Fl. 8.208.

383-386 The misfortunes that Odysseus and his men suffered from the sea-monsters
Scylla and Charybdis, the Cyclops Polyphemus, and the Laestrygonians are catalogued here. The pictorial aspect conveyed by *pavidos* matches the dramatic sculptures found at Sperlonga, for a good discussion of which, see J.J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, 1986), 122-6. Cf. also *LIMC* s.v. Charybdis and Cyclopes.

383-384 Scylla: Ovid recounts in *Met.* 14.8ff. how Scylla was once a beautiful young maiden loved by Glaucus. The goddess Circe, consumed by jealousy, mixed potent herbs in the waters wherein Scylla bathed and thereby transformed the lower part of the girl’s body into a belt of barking dogs. As revenge against Circe, she and the dogs appended to her attacked the ships of Odysseus. Cf. Homer *Od.* 12.234ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 199 etc. The Augustan poets, and Ovid in particular, often conflated the myth of this Scylla with Scylla the daughter of Nisus (cf. 360). Thus, for example, Vergil *Ecl.* 6.74ff.; Prop. 4.4.39f.; Ovid *Am.* 3.12.21f., *Ars* 1.331f., *Rem.* 737, *Her.* 12.123f., *Fast.* 4.500 (with the note of Bömer).

*vorax*: *vorax*, ‘devouring’, more commonly describes Charybdis and her drinking in of water. Cf. *Met.* 13.730f.; Cicero *Phil.* 2.67 *qua Charybdis tam vorax?* The only other instance I can find for *vorax* being applied to Scylla or her canine parts occurs in *Ciris* 57, *Scyllaeum monstrum . . . voraci.*


Dulichiae: according to Homer *Il.* 2.625, Dulichia was an island in the area of Echinadin; the adjective *Dulichius* became a favourite synonym for *Ithacensis* among the Roman poets. Cf. Vergil *Ecl.* 6.76, *Dulichias vexasse rates*, and Servius *ad loc.* who explains: *Ithacenses, vel urbe Dulichia in regno Ulixis.* Ovid made frequent use of the adjective - thus *Met.* 13.107 *Dulichius . . . vertex* with the note of Bömer; 425
Dulichiae . . . manus; 711 Dulichios portus; 14.226 Dulichium . . . ducem; Tr. 1.5.60 Dulichias . . . domos; 4.1.31 etc.

385 Polyphemus: the giant Cyclops, son of Poseidon (cf. *Ibis* 267-68, and commentary *ad loc.*). For his devouring of Odysseus’ men, see especially Homer *Od.* 9.231ff.

386 Laestrygonias: when Odysseus and his men came to the island of the Laestrygonians, Odysseus sent three of his men ashore to learn about the place at which they had landed, and the nature of its inhabitants. After they had been directed to the king, Antiphates, he promptly ate one of the men, while the other two ran in terror back to the ships. The Laestrygonians stood on the shore and pelted Odysseus’ ships with rocks, destroying all but the ship of Odysseus. The shipwrecked men floating among the debris were speared like fish by the Laestrygonians, and eaten. Cf. Homer *Od.* 10.80-134, 23.318ff.; Lyc. *Alex.* 622 and Tzetzes *ad loc.*; Hyginus *Fab.* 125; also noteworthy is the representation of the Laestrygonians in the Odyssey Landscape painting (see plates and discussion in Roger Ling’s *Roman Painting* (Cambridge, 1991), pp.107ff.). The Romans identified the country of this savage people with Formiae in southern Latium - see Cicero *Att.* 2.13.2, Horace *Od.* 3.16.34, 3.17.1ff. The same four opponents of Odysseus catalogued here are also found together in *Ex P.* 4.10.21ff., as *exempla* of horrors which fall short of those encountered by Ovid in his exile, and in Horace *Ars* 145 we find *Antiphaten Scyllamque et cum Cyclope Charybdin.*


387-388 quos dux Poenus mersit: an historical reference to the action of Hannibal in 216 B.C., when he plundered and burned the town of Acerra, about 8 miles NE of Naples, and then reportedly threw its senators into a well, interrupts seven references to the *Odyssey.* Livy (23.17.4-8) relates the town’s siege and plundering, but does not say anything about the incident here referred to. Instead he says that the Acerrians escaped during the night before the blockade was fully established, and took
refuge in other Campanian towns. However, Appian, *Pun.* 8.63 records a speech of P. Cornelius which enumerated the crimes of the Carthaginians, among which we find: Ἄχερρανῶν δὲ τὴν βουλὴν ἐν στονδαῖς ἐς τὰ φρεάτα ἐνέβαλον, καὶ τὰ φρεάτα ἐπέχωσαν. Note too Valerius Maximus’ account, 9.6 ext. 2, *Hannibal... Acerranorum Senatum, eadem ratione extra moenia evocatum, in profundum putearum abjiciendo...*

canas pulvere fecit aquas: i.e. instead of the water running red with the blood of the slaughtered Acerrians, it turns white from the dust which has been cast into the well, perhaps as a mocking performance of the burial rite. Hannibal’s cruelty was proverbial, and Ellis aptly quotes Seneca, *de Ira* 2.5 when he relates the delight Hannibal took in seeing his enemies killed: *Hannibalem aitn dixisse cum fossam sanguine humano plenam vidisset: O formosum spectaculum!*

389-390 A threefold allusion to the vengeance wreaked by Odysseus upon his return to Ithaca - the slaughter of the shameless hand-maidens, the suitors, and the goatherd Melanthius.

sex bis... *Icaridos famulae:* for the formula cf. *Met.* 4.220 (with Bömer’s note) *bis sex Leucothoen famulas.* The reference here is to the twelve maids who slept with the suitors. Cf. especially Homer *Od.* 22.421ff., wherein Eurycleia tells her master that of the fifty handmaids in the palace, Δώδεκα πᾶσαι ἀνοιδείς ἐπέβησαν ὦν... ἐμὲ τίόνσαι οὕτοι αὐτὴν Πηνελόπειαν. Odysseus thus orders them to be put to death at 437ff., after they have disposed of the slaughtered suitors and cleaned up the hall. Telemachus takes them out and hangs them, with their final agony vividly depicted by their writhing feet: ἡσπαρον δὲ πόδεσι μῦννιθά περ, οὗ τι μάλα δὴν (22.473). The maids’ behaviour contrasts sharply with that of Penelope, their mistress, who was renowned for her virtue.

*Icaridos:* Penelope, the daughter of Icarius. I have not been able to find any other examples of this form of the patronymic in Latin literature, the closest being *Culex 265, ecce Ithaci coniunx semper decus, Icariotis.*

.procique:* the suitors for Penelope’s hand, who moved into Odysseus’ home, and
feasted extravagantly at the absent lord’s expense (cf. *Od.* 14.80-109). According to Homer their number totalled 108 plus servants and attendants (*Od.* 16.245ff.), while Apollodorus counts 136 in all (*Epit.* 7.27f.). When Odysseus returned to his palace, still disguised as an old beggar, Penelope announced that she would marry the man who could bend Odysseus’ bow. None of the suitors were successful, but Odysseus took it, bent it, and then proceeded to slay the suitors. See especially *Od.* 21.140-434, 22.1ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 126; and Apollodorus *Epit.* 7.33.

**inque caput domini:** the periphrasis *caput domini* is virtually the equivalent of *dominum ipsum*. *Caput* is used in the sense of ‘life’ - cf. *OLD* s.v. 4.

**qui dabat arma procis:** the goatherd Melanthius, son of Dolius, who betrayed his master by supplying shields, spears and helmets to the suitors from the storeroom. After Melanthius’ treachery had been discovered, Odysseus ordered him to be tied with legs and arms twisted back, and hung from the pillar. When all the suitors had been slain, and the handmaidens hung (among them Melanthius’ sister Melantho), Melanthius was brought out and his nose, ears, arms and feet were cut off. Cf. *Od.* 22.139ff., 173ff., 474ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 126.9.

391-392 **iacet . . . luctator:** an allusion to the giant Antaeus, king of Libya, and son of Poseidon and Gaia who forced all strangers who came through his land to wrestle with him, and killed them in the bout (cf. Pindar *I.* 4.52ff. with scholia; Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.5.11; Hyginus *Bib.* 31; Diodorus Sic. 4.17.4; Lucan 4.598ff.).

**Aonio . . . ab hospite fusus:** i.e. Hercules, who was on his way through Libya in quest of the golden apples of the Hesperides when he was challenged by Antaeus. *Aonius* is a poetic adjective for *Boeotius*, or *Boeoticus*, first found in Latin in Catullus (61.28), and thereafter in Vergil (*Ecl.* 6.65, 10.12, *Georg.* 3.11), Propertius (1.2.28) etc., but is used only by Ovid as an epithet for Hercules, who was born in Thebes. Cf. *Met.* 9.112, *tradidit Aonius pavidam Calydonida Nesso*, with the note of Bömer and possibly (the text is problematic) *Her.* 9.133 *atque Aonii Alcidae*. For Thebes as Hercules’ place of birth see Homer *Il.* 19.99, Hesiod *Th.* 530 etc.

**mirum:** for Ovid’s use of this as a parenthetical interjection cf. *Met.* 7.790, 11.50f.,
Fast. 2.413, Hal. 99.

victor cum cecidisset: Antaeus seemed invincible, because he became stronger through contact with his mother, the earth. Hence when he fell and touched the earth with more of his body, he arose with renewed strength. Cf. especially Lucan 4.598ff., hoc quoque tam vastas cumulavit munere vires/ terra sui fetus, quod, cum tetigere parentem,/ iam defecta vigent renovato robore membra; and Apollodorus Bib. 2.5.11. When Hercules realized that Antaeus was invigorated through contact with the earth, he lifted Antaeus up from the ground and choked him to death while holding him aloft (cf. Apollodorus Bib. 2.5.11, τούτω χαλαίνειν ἀναγκαξόμενος Ἡρακλῆς ἀράμενος ἄμμασι μετέωρον κλάσας ἀπέκτεινε; the incident is very allusively mentioned in Met. 9.183f.).

393 quos Antaei . . . pressere lacerti: from Antaeus as the victim of Hercules, to the victims of Antaeus himself, those whom he had defeated in the wrestling matches. Pindar notes that the giant wrestler used to decorate the temple of his father Poseidon with the heads of his opponents (I. 4.54ff.): καίτοι ποτ' Ἀνταῖον δόμους/ θηβάν ἀπὸ Καλλιμείαν μορφὰν βραχὺς ψυχὰν δ' ἄκαμπτος, προσπαλαίσων, ἦλθ' ἀνήρ/ τὰν πυροφόραν Διβάναν, κρανίως δόφρα ξένων ναὸν Ποσειδάνων ἐφεφοντα σχέδου,/ ἵνα 'Ἀλκμήνας. Antaeus is first named in Latin poetry by Plautus (Persa 4), but among Augustan poets only by Ovid (Met. 9.184, Her. 9.71, Ibis 393, 397) and Propertius (3.22.10). See further Bömer on Met. 9.184.

394 quosque ferae morti Lemnia turba dedit: if we accept the manuscript tradition, the reference here is to the women of Lemnos, who killed all but one of their men one night (the exception being King Thoas who was secretly rescued by his daughter Hypsipyle). Because the women had neglected her worship, Aphrodite afflicted them with a foul odour, which repelled their husbands and caused them to bring home Thracian women as their mistresses. In revenge, the Lemnian women massacred the men. Cf. Aeschylus Ch. 631ff., κακῶν δὲ πρεσβεύεται τὸ Δήμιον/ λογφ, γοαταὶ δὲ δημόθεν κατάπτυστον, ἦκασεν δὲ τις/ τὸ δεινὸν ἄν Δημίωιοι πήμασιν; Apollonius Rhod. 1.609ff. and scholia ad loc.; Apollodorus Bib. 1.9.17; Valerius Flaccus 2.113-
427; Statius *Theb. 5.49*ff.; and the brief treatments by Ovid of the tale in *Ars* 3.671ff., *Her. 6.53,139, Met. 13.399*ff. (with the note of Bömer). For the notoriety of the deed cf. the comments of Hesychius, *Λήμνον κακόν*, Suidas, *Λημνία δίκη*. ἡ κακίστη, and Herodotus 6.138. But although *Lemnia turba* is the attested reading of the manuscripts, a reference to the Lemnian women, sandwiched as it is among the violent tyrants encountered by Hercules, has seemed incongruous to modern commentators (cf., for example, Ellis *ad loc.*, *unde hic Lemniades*?). The apparent discrepancy caused Housman (*Journal of Philol. 35, 1920, pp.311f.*) to propose the emendation *clava* for *turba* and hence to explain the epithet *Lemnia* in this context as the equivalent of *Vulcania*; thus the line would be an allusion to the victims of the robber Periphetes, son of Vulcan/Hephaestus (for whom cf. 403f. and commentary *ad loc.*). In support of this he notes "that his (i.e. Periphetes') victims should be first mentioned in 396 (394), and then he himself in 405 sq. (403f.) is like the mention of Diomed's [sic] victims in 381 sq. (371f.) and the minotaur in 408 (406)". However, *clava* for *turba* seems quite a violent correction and the insertion of one of Theseus' opponents into a catalogue seemingly devoted to the feats of Hercules is no less intrusive than that of the Lemnian women. Indeed, the Lemnian women can at least claim a tenuous connection with Hercules, since he was aboard the Argo when it stopped at Lemnos shortly after the massacre. One could argue that the intrusion makes for interest and variety, just as the Minotaur in 406 interrupts the sequence of brigands met by Theseus on the road to Athens, or Hannibal interrupts a series of allusions to the *Odyssey* at 387f. The unifying factor of this section may be no more than the plurality of victims (*ut qui, ut quos* etc.).

395-396 An allusion to the Cyprian seer Phrasius (Thrasius in *Hyginus Fab. 56; Ovid. Ars* 1.649) who prophesied to the Egyptian king Busiris (see below, 397f.) that the long drought afflicting Egypt would end if Busiris were to sacrifice a stranger annually to Zeus. Busiris accordingly began with the sacrifice of Phrasius.

**post longum:** Ovid relates the story in *Ars* 1.645ff., and says there that the drought was in its ninth year: *dicitur Aegyptos caruisse iuvantibus arva/ imbribus atque annos*
sicca fuisse novem, / cum Thrasius Busirin adit monstratque piari / hospitis adfuso sanguine posse Iovem./ illi Busiris "fies Iovis hostia primus"/ inquit "et Aegypto tu dabis hospes aquam". Similarly in Callimachus Aet. fr. 44 Pf. we find Αἰγυπτος προσάροδθεν Ἐξ' ἐννέα κάρφετο ποίαις; cf. Hyginus Fab. 56 annis novem, while in Eutrop. 1.159ff., Claudian speaks generally of multos . . . per annos.


elicuit: the ritualistic connotations of the verb are entirely appropriate to the context, for Elicius was a cult title of Jupiter when invoked to call down rain. Cf. Varro L. 6.95, Elicii Iovis [visa] ara in Aventino ab elicendo; Paulus Festus p.2, cum aqua pluvialis remediis quibusdam elicitur.

397-398 frater ut Antaei: Busiris, who like Antaeus was the son of Poseidon (Apollodorus Bib. 2.5.11). See 395f. and commentary ad loc. for his cruelty to strangers.

quo sanguine debuit: as at 366, it is fitting that the one responsible for the deaths of many innocent men should in turn lose his life.

exemplis occidit ipse suis: cf. Fast 3.272, perit exemplo . . . quisque suo. When Hercules was travelling through Egypt, he was seized by Busiris’ men and brought to Zeus’ altar as the next sacrificial victim, but he shrugged off his bonds and killed Busiris instead. Cf. Hyginus Fab. 31.2; Apollodorus Bib. 2.5.11; Servius ad Aen. 8.300, ad Georg. 3.5; Diod. Sic. 4.27.2ff. See also the brief allusions to the myth by Ovid in Met. 9.182f, Her. 9.69f., Fast. 3.272, Tr. 3.11.39, and Ex P. 3.6.41. The myth of Busiris and his savage rites appears first in extant literature in Pherecydes, FGrH. 3 f17, while Vergil bears witness to the tale’s notoriety in Georg. 3.5f., . . . quis . . . inlaudati nescit Busiridis aras?

399-400 At 379-380 we had the victims of king Diomedes (see commentary ad loc.); here we have an allusion to the death of Diomedes himself. According to Diodorus he was killed by Hercules in the same manner as he had killed so many others, i.e. by feeding him to his man-eating horses (4.15.3f.). Others (Apollodorus Bib. 2.5.8
etc.) say merely that Hercules killed him while taking the horses. Diomedes and Busiris are found together also in Ovid *Her.* 9.67ff.

pro *gramen* habentibus herbis: an odd and seemingly otiose phrase - *gramen habentibus* equals 'grassy' as in *Met.* 1.633, . . . *terrae non semper gramen habenti*.

equos: Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.5.8, Euripides *HF* 381, *Alc.* 483 and Ovid himself in *Her.* 9.68 give the feminine form, while Hyginus *Fab.* 30 makes the horses masculine.

401-402 Two more of Hercules' victims, the centaurs Nessus and Eurytion.

diversis . . . temporibus: Hercules' fight with Eurytion occurred shortly after the hero had completed his fifth labour, the cleaning of Augeas' stables, while his encounter with Nessus is usually said to have occurred after all twelve labours had been completed. There is more point to *temporibus* than *vulneribus*, which is the reading of MSS FHV.

Nessus: according to Jebb on Sophocles *Tr.* 557f., p.87, "the name Νεσσος symbolizes the roar of the angry torrent: the sanskrit is nad - loud sound, whence nadá-s - bellower (bull) or river: nad-ί - flood: Curtius *Etyml.* 287b". It was thus an appropriate name for the centaur, who acted as a ferry-man across the Evenus river. When Hercules arrived at the river with his bride Deianira, he himself swam over, but gave Deianira to the centaur to be carried across. In the midst of the river Nessus tried to rape Deianira, but was fatally wounded by Hercules' poisoned arrow (cf. 489 and commentary *ad loc.* for the centaur's revenge). For the encounter between Hercules and Nessus, cf. Sophocles *Tr.* 555ff.; Ovid *Met.* 9.98ff. with Bömer's note, *Her.* 9.141; Hyginus *Fab.* 31, 34, 36.

Dexamenique gener: the centaur Eurytion, who had compelled Dexamenus, the King of Olenus, to promise to him his daughter Mnesimache (Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.5.5; Deianira in Hyginus *Fab.* 31 and 33). However, when the centaur arrived on the appointed day to claim his bride, he was slain by Hercules, the guest of Dexamenus. See Apollodorus *Bib.* 2.5.5, 'Ἡρακλῆς δὲ εἰς Ὀλευον πρὸς Δεξαμενῶν ἥκε, καὶ κατέλαβε τοῦτον μέλλοντα δι' ἀνάγκην μνηστεύων 'Ευρυτίων Κενταῦρῳ Μησιμάχην τὴν θυγατέραν: ὃς ἄρα παρακληθείς βοηθεῖν ἔλθων ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην'.
'Ευρυτίωνα ἀπέκτεινεν; the scholiast on *Od.* 11.295, according to whom Βακχυλίδης δὲ διάφορον οίται τὸν 'Ευρυτίωνα. ἕφη γὰρ ἐπιξενῳδεύοντα Δεξαμενῷ ἐν Ἡλιδι ὑβριστικῷ ἐπιχειρήσει τῇ τοῦ ξενοδοχείου θυγατρὶ, καὶ διὰ τούτῳ ὑπὸ Ἡρακλεὸς ἀναφεβήσαν καιρίως τοῖς ὁίκοις ἐπιστάντος; Hyginus *Fab.* 31 and 33.

Diodorus Siculus (4.33.1) records a variant of the legend, according to which Dexamenes’ daughter, there called Hippolyte, was attacked by Eurytion during a feast celebrating her wedding to Azan, and the centaur was then killed by Heracles, while in Sophocles’ *Tr.* 429ff., Hercules battled the river god Achelous for Deianira.

403–410 From the violators of the laws of hospitality who were vanquished by Hercules, to a similar catalogue of those whom Theseus slew. Cf. the narration of Theseus’ exploits in *Met.* 7.433ff. (with Bömer’s notes); Bacchylides 17(18).16ff.; Diodorus Siculus 4.59; Plutarch *Thes.* 8ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 38 etc.

403–404 pronepos, Saturne, tuus: Theseus’ first victim on the road from Troezen to Athens was Periphetes, the son of Vulcan, and thus through him a descendant of Saturn (cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.16; Ovid *Met.* 7.437; Pausanias 2.1.4 etc.). Periphetes was nicknamed Κορύνητις, or the ‘Club-man’, because of the heavy bronze club that he wielded, and with which he beat to death those travelling through Epidaurus (Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.16.1, Περιφήτην . . . δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς κορύνης ἦν ἐφορει Κορυνήτης ἐπεκαλεῖτο . . . Plutarch *Thes.* 8.1; Paus. 2.1.4). Theseus killed Periphetes when the latter attacked him, and kept the club for himself.


urbe Coronides vidit: *Coronides* refers to Aesculapius, the son of Apollo and Coronis, who lived in Epidaurus. Aesculapius does not figure in the myth of Periphetes, but is used to refer obliquely to Epidaurus. So far as I have been able to determine, Ovid was the first and only writer to call Aesculapius by his matronymic, which he does not only here, but in *Met.* 15.624, and *Fast.* 6.746. Like Ellis, I cannot help but think that its use here is intended by Ovid to remind his readers of Periphetes’ nickname Κορυνήτης (discussed *supra*).

It is interesting to note that Periphetes does not occur in Bacchylides’ account of
Theseus’ journey, nor does he appear on vase paintings illustrating Theseus’ adventures until about 450-440 B.C., thus suggesting that he was a later addition to the Theseus legend (discussed by C. Roberts *Hermes* 33, (1898), p.149ff.).

405 The catalogue of brigands continues with Sinis, Sciron, Polypemon, and Polypemon’s son.

**Sinis:** Sinis, whose name was popularly derived from σίνομα, ‘to rob’, dwelt on the Isthmus of Corinth, and earned the nickname of Πυνοκάμπης, or ‘Pine-Bender’ (cf. Strabo 9.1.4; Plutarch *Thes.* 8.3; Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.16.2) from his method of torturing passersby: according to Diodorus 4.59.3, and Pausanias 2.1.4, Sinis would bend two pines to the ground, tie the limbs of his victim to both trees and then release the trees, so that they would spring up, and in so doing, tear apart the man tied to them. Alternatively, Hyginus *Fab.* (38) and Apollodorus (*Bib.* 3.16.2) say that Sinis forced wayfarers to help him bend a pine tree and as they struggled to hold the tree down, Sinis would suddenly let go, and send his victims catapulting into the air, to crash to death on the ground (cf. *Met.* 7.441ff., (Sinis) *qui poterat curvare trabes et agebat ab alto/ ad terram late sparsuras corpora pinus*). Whichever method Sinis used, it proved to be his own undoing when he attempted to make Theseus his victim: Theseus instead made Sinis the victim of the pine trees (cf. Paus. 2.1.4; Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.16.2).

**Sciron:** this bandit forced travellers through Megara to wash his feet and while they were so engaged, would kick them into the sea. Theseus, however, seized Sciron by the feet and threw him into the sea; from his bones the Scironian rocks were formed. Cf. Ovid *Met.* 7.443ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 38.4; Apollodorus *Epit* 1.2; Plutarch *Thes.* 10; Diodorus 4.59.4 etc.

**cum Polypemone natus:** this allusion to Polypemon and his son is fraught with confusion. Polypemon, a son of Poseidon, like the others in this mini-catalogue was a brigand in the area of Megara; Apollodorus *Epit.* 1.4 mentions that he was also known as Damastes, and Pausanias (1.38.5) adds that he had the nickname Procrustes. The son of Polypemon was Sinis according to Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.16.2, and the
scholiast on Euripides *Hipp.* 977, but in *Met.* 7.401 (see Bömer *ad loc.*) the implication is that Sciron is Polypemon’s son. Obviously, neither can be intended here, since they have already been mentioned. It is generally assumed that Ovid had Procrustes in mind as the son of Polypemon; Procrustes is linked with the brigands Periphates, Cercyon, Sinis and Sciron in *Met.* 7.436ff., and with Sciron, Sinis and the Minotaur in *Her.* 2.69f. Procrustes was notorious for the two beds he had for wayfarers, a long one for short people who were stretched to fit it, and a short one for tall people whose limbs were cut to fit (cf. Hyginus *Fab.* 38.3, Apollodorus *Epit.* 1.3; Diodorus 4.59.5 and the schol. on Euripides *Hipp.* 977 say there was one bed for all, and that Procrustes adjusted his victims to fit it with a hammer or a saw). It would be surprising if he were omitted from this catalogue and although the legend that he was the son of Polypemon is unparalleled in Latin literature, Housman (*Journal of Philol.* 35, 1920 p.313,) aptly noted Bacchylides 18.27ff., . . . Πολυπήμενος τε κατέραυν/ σφυραν ἔξεβαλεν Προκόπτας, ἀρείονος τυχών/ Φωτός, wherein Προκόπτας may be an early form of Procrustes and thus would imply that Procrustes is at least Polypemon’s successor, if not his son. Presumably, both Polypemon and his son were killed by Theseus in the same way they had dispatched others.

406 *qui que homo parte sui, parte iuvenus erat:* the Minotaur, slain by Theseus in the Cretan labyrinth. See also 374-5 and commentary *ad loc.* Cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.1.4 οὕτως εἶχε ταύρον πρόσωπον, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἀνδρῶς, and Ovid’s many allusions to him as tauri mixtæque forma uiri (Her. 2.70), parte virum . . . parte bovem (Her. 10.102), taurique virique (10.127) and the notorious semibovemque virum semivirumque bovem (Ars 2.24 and the comment of Seneca the Elder, *Con.* 2.2.12).

407-408 The pine-bender Pityocampites, usually equated with Sinis. Ellis, however, rightly points out that Eustathius 158 seems to make a distinction between the two: ὡς δὲ καὶ Σίνις . . . αἱ ἱστορίαι δηλοῦσι περιφέρουσαι καὶ ἀντίκα, καθὼς καὶ τὸν Σκέιρωνα καὶ τὸν Πιτυκάμπτην καὶ τὸν Κάκον καὶ τὸν Διβυν Ἀνταίον καὶ τῶν τοιούτων. Moreover the couplet in Propertius 3.22.73f., *arboreasque cruces Sinis*
et non hospita Grais/ saxa, et curvatas in sua fata trabes, which has caused great difficulties for commentators, would be entirely explicable if it referred to two separate pinebenders, Sinis and Pityocamptes, with Sciron being the middle allusion.

eaequoris . . . huius et huius aquas: i.e. the Bay of Corinth and the Saronicus, separated by the Isthmus of Corinth. Cf. Seneca Thy. 111, qua fluctibus illinc propinquus Isthmos atque illinc fremit; Met. 7.405 bimarem Isthmon; and Prop. 3(4)21.22.

409-410 quaeque . . . corpora . . . Cercyonea: a poetic plural referring to Cercyon, who lived in the area of Eleusis and challenged all travellers to fight with him. Theseus lifted him off the ground and crushed him when he threw him down. Cf. Bacchylides 17.26; Paus. 1.39.3; Diod. 4.59.3; Apollodorus Epit 1.3 etc. The adjective Cercyonea appears only here in Ovid’s works, nor can I find any evidence of it elsewhere in Latin poetry.

Ceres: the goddess Ceres had very close ties to the city of Eleusis, where her mysteries were celebrated, and thus she is used here as an oblique way of referring to the brigand’s place of residence as Met. 7.439, Cercyonis letum vidit Cerealis Eleusin, makes clear (cf. the similar use of Aesculapius in 404). Note the chiastic word order of the pentameter and the neat balance achieved by the two nouns enclosing the adjectival names. Cercyon preyed upon travellers entering Eleusis, many of whom, presumably, were on their way to attend the mysteries of the goddess, hence her joy at the brigand’s dispatch.

411-412 haec: a summation of all the curses uttered thus far, from 249 on, with an insurance stipulation that if these ill fortunes should not befall Ibis, others no less grievous shall.

quem meritis precibus mea devovet ira: cf. 95f., illum ego devoveo, quem mens intellegit, Ibin,/ qui se scit factis has meruisse preces, and commentary ad loc.; for ira as the poet’s motivation, cf. 84 and commentary.

evenient: an emphatic future indicative after a series of optative subjunctives. Compare 125 and commentary ad loc., where evenient was also used to sum up a
series of maledictions.

haec . . . aut his non leviora: a similar formula is found in Met. 6.702, haec . . . aut his non inferiora. Cf. curse formulae such as τὰσι τοῖς κακοῖς πείραιν δώσει, discussed by Watson, Arae, p.36.

413-424 Utter destitution is the common theme of these lines.

413-414 qualis Achaemenidae: an allusion to the plight of Achaemenides, who was left behind at Aetna by Odysseus in his haste to escape from the Cyclops (cf. 385 and commentary ad loc.) In rags, close to starvation and in constant fear of being discovered by the Cyclops, Achaemenides threw himself at the mercy of Aeneas and his Trojan companions when they arrived at the island. As a curse, this exemplum is not very effective, since the Trojan ships were Achaemenides' means of salvation. The story of Achaemenides is not known before Vergil's treatment of it in Aen. 3.588ff. and may well have been invented by him. Ovid himself tells the story at length in Met. 14.158-222 (with Bömer's note) and refers to it again in Ex P. 2.2.25, as a paradigmatic appeal for clemency. For the Persian overtones of the name Achaemenides, which resembles that of the founder of Persian royalty, Achaemenes, consult A.G. McKay, Vergilius 12 (1966), p.31ff., and for a good discussion of the Achaemenes myth see T.E. Kinsey, "The Achaemenides Episode in Aeneid III" Latomus 38 1979, p.510ff.; B. Otis, Ovid as an Epic Poet pp.73-6. The manuscripts have a nominative form, Achaemenides, or Achimenides, but what is required is a genitive dependent on fortuna of verse 415, on the analogy of the destitution of Irus and the beggars on the bridge; therefore Achaemenidae, or possibly Achaemenidis. See Housman's note in "The Ibis of Ovid" Journal of Philol. 35 (1920), p.313ff. Note the striking alliteration in the pentameter, vidit vela venire.

415 binominis Iri: the beggar in Homer Od. 18.1-107, who mocked and abused Odysseus when the latter returned to Ithaca disguised as a vagrant. The suitors heard the exchange of words and set up a boxing match, in which Odysseus roundly defeated his opponent. Cf. Apollodorus Epit. 7.32, and Hyginus Fab. 126. The name Irus became proverbial for poverty; cf. Tr. 3.7.42, Irus et est subito, qui modo
Croesus erat, Rem. 747, and Otto, p.177, nr.875. For Irus’ double set of names, see Homer Od. 18.5ff., Ἀρναίος δ’ ὄνομα ἔσκε: τὸ γὰρ θέτο τῶν αἱ μήτηρ/ ἐκ γενεῆς· Ἰρον δὲ νέοι κύκλησκον ἀπαντεῖς,/ οὐκετ’ ἀπαγγέλλεσκε κιών, δότε πού τις ἀνώγοι. Binomen is a rare word, which makes its first certain appearance in Met. 14.609, binominis Alba, although, as Bömer discusses ad loc., it may occur in Plautus Bacch. 39.

416 quique tenent pontem: i.e. beggars, since bridges were a notorious gathering point for them in antiquity (see the note of Courtney on Juvenal Sat. 4.116). Cf. the curse of Martial 10.5.1ff., quisque stolaevae purpuraeae contemptor/ quos colere debet laesit impio versu,/ erret per urbem pontis exul et clivi, and Seneca Vit. Beat. 25.1, in sublicium pontem me transfer et inter egentes abice. So common was the association of bridges and beggary that Juvenal could use simply the phrase aliquid de ponte as a synonym for a beggar in Sat. 14.134. Nonetheless, the use of such a vague curse is unusual in the Ibis.

vae tibi talis erit: the second half of the pentameter is clearly corrupt. The predominant manuscript reading is que tibi maior erit, although B has qua for que, and G qui. If a relative pronoun were intended, the antecedent should be fortuna, and hence we would expect quae tibi maior erit, i.e. ‘bad fortune will be worse for you than for Achaemenides, Irus, and beggars on the bridge’. This is the reading adapted by La Penna, since it accords most closely with the MSS, while Owen proposed the reading in our text, vae tibi talis erit. However, vae is usually considered a cry of pain or misery (cf. OLD s.v. 1), whereas Ovid’s cry ought to be triumphant. Two other possibilities were suggested by Housman ("The Ibis of Ovid," Journal of Philol. 35, 315f.): 1) nec tibi maior erit (i.e. talis nec maior, tibi erit fortuna) or 2), his preferred reading, spe tibi maior erit, i.e. "such beggary as that of Achaemenides, of Irus, of mendicants on the bridge, shall be more wealth than you can hope for", on the analogy of Ovid’s use of res fide maior (Met. 3.106, 660, 4.394, etc.) to mean maior quam ut ei fidem habeas. This seems to me the most attractive solution, although it is also the one furthest from the readings of the MSS.
417-418 *filius* . . . *Cereris*: Plutus, the god of riches and son of Demeter and Iasion.

Cf. Hesiod *Th.* 969ff., Δημήτριος μὲν Πλοῦτον ἐγείνατο διὰ θέανον, 'Ἰασώφ ἡρώι
μυγεῖον ἐρατὴν φιλότητι/ νεώ τιν ἐπὶ πρᾶπαλώ χρήσης ἐν πίον δήμῳ,/ ἐσθλον, ὁς ἐν ἐπὶ ἐν
γῆν τε καὶ εὐρεά νύστα θαλάσσης/ πάσαιν· τῷ δὲ τυχόντι καὶ οὔ κ' ἐς χείρας
ικηταί, τὸν δ' ἀφείον ἥθηκε, πολών δὲ οἱ ὀπασαν ὀλβον. In Aristophanes' *Plutus*,
the god is represented as blind, since he gives wealth not only to the wise and
the virtuous, but to all, without distinction. See also Diod. Sic. 5.77.1f., Lucian *Tim.* 26.

*destitut . . . opes*: rendered by Ellis as 'leave your fortune in the lurch', a theme
which is amplified in the following verses.

*usque petitus*: 'although continually begged'.

419-422 A vivid and effective metaphor of the ebbing and flowing of fortune. For
similar imagery cf. Seneca *Thy.* 536f., *Quis influentis dona fortunae abnuit?/ Expertus
est quicumque quam facile effluant*. Note also Shakespeare's use of the ‘tide of
fortune’ in *Julius Caesar* 4.3.217: "there is a tide in the affairs of men which taken
at the flood leads on to fortune; omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in
shallows and in miseries."

*per alternos . . . recursus*: cf. Seneca *Dial.* 12.20.2, *cursus . . . eius (maris)
alternos et recursus*; Mela 3.55, *ab alternos accessus recursusque plagi*.

423-424 *pater solitae . . . mutare figuras*: the *pater* here referred to as the concluding
*exemplum* of utter destitution is Erysichthon, the son of the Thessalian king Triopas.

After the impious Erysichthon cut down a grove sacred to Demeter, the goddess
punished him by afflicting him with an insatiable hunger. When he had eaten up all
his stores of food and had nothing left to sell in order to try to satisfy his hunger, he
sold his daughter Mnestra as a slave. However Poseidon responded to her pleas and
aided her by giving her the gift of metamorphosis. Thus as soon as she was sold, she
changed her form and returned home to be sold again and in this way she managed
to support her father for some time. The earliest extant reference to the myth is in
Hesiod’s *Catalogue of Women* fr. 43a. (Merkelbach and West), wherein Erysichthon
suffers perpetual hunger and uses the profits from selling his daughter to finance his

**solitae varias mutare figuras:** cf. Nicander *Met.* 2 *apud* Anton Lib. 17.5, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἡ Υπερμῆστραν πιπρακομένην ἐπὶ γυναικὶ μὲν αἰρεθαὶ τίμον, ἀνδραὶ δὲ γυνομένη Αἰθών τροφὴν ἀποφέρειν τῷ πατρὶ.

**plenus inextincta conficiare fame:** plenus is concessive in force - ‘although full’.


Although Callimachus makes no mention of Erysichthon’s ultimate fate, in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid concludes his account with Erysichthon in desperation eating himself. With this self-cannibalization in mind, the story here provides a clever transition to the next series of curses, which centre upon cannibalism (425-432).

**425-426 Tydeus:** Tydeus was one of the commanders in the Expedition against Thebes, where he was fatally wounded in the campaign by Melanippus. As Tydeus lay dying, the goddess Athena came to make her favourite immortal, but the seer Amphiaraus, who realized her intention and wished to forestall it, quickly killed Tydeus’ adversary Melanippus and cut off his head, which he then presented to Tydeus. Tydeus split open the head and ate the brains, an act which so disgusted Athena that she departed without conferring immortality upon him. Cf. Euripides *Meleag.* fr. 541 Nauck *TGF* εἰς ἀνδροβρῶτας ἡδονὰς ἀφίεσαι/ κάρημα πυρσαίς γένυι Μελανίππον σπάσας; the scholiast on Homer *Il.* 5.126, who cites Pherecydes as his source: φασὶν ἐν τῷ
Tydeus temporis huius eris: cf. Martial 12.32.9, Irus tuorum temporum. Ibis can be the equal of Tydeus in one respect only: with his mouth. The Ibis was notorious for its filthy habit of eating refuse (cf. 448 and commentary ad loc.) and this perhaps gives added point to the comparison. Note the alliteration of ps and ts in this pentameter.

427-428 An allusion to the infamous 'Thyestean banquet', prepared by Atreus for revenge against his brother Thyestes, who had seduced Atreus' wife Aerope and stolen a golden lamb from Atreus' flock. Atreus staged a reconciliation and invited his brother to a feast at his palace, at which he served Thyestes' own sons to his unsuspecting guest and then afterwards revealed their identity. The sun was so repelled that he reversed his course and set in the east that evening. Ibis is to perform a deed of similar atrocity and provoke a like reaction from the sun. For the banquet cf. Aeschylus A. 1590ff., Seneca Thy. 682ff.; Apollodorus Epit. 2.13, Servius ad Aen.1.568 etc. A favourite subject for the tragedians, plays entitled Thyestes were written by Sophocles (cf. Pearson, Sophocles Frags. vol.1,91ff. Nauck TGF p.480ff.), Ennius and Seneca.

a vespere rursus ad ortus: the alteration of the course of the sun was not always linked with the Thyestean banquet: according to an alternate, predominantly Greek tradition, the cosmic disruption was a sign from Zeus that Atreus' claim to the kingdom took precedence over that of Thyestes. Cf. Apollodorus Epit. 2.12, and Euripides fr. 861. However the epigram composed by Statyllius Flaccus in Sophocles' honour (AP 9.98) would seem to imply that Sophocles associated the changed course of the sun with the banquet; it is this tradition which prevailed in
Latin poetry and the next couplet, which continues the theme of cannibalism, makes clear that this was in Ovid's mind here. It was a theme which Ovid employed frequently in his poetry: cf. Ars 1.327, Cressa Thyesteo si se abstinuisset amore.../non medium rupisset iter curruque retorto/Auroram versis Phoebus adisset equis; Ex P 4.6.47, Utque Thyesteae redeant si tempora mensae, solis ad Eoas currus agetur aquas; Am.3.12.39, aversumque diem mensis furialibus Atrei; Tr. 2.391f. (with the note of Owen), si non Aeropen frater sceleratus amasset,/aversos solis non legeremus equos. Elsewhere compare Lucan 1.543; Statius Theb. 4.307; Seneca Thy. 776ff., 990ff., with Tarrant's notes); and Aetna 20.

externati: a very uncommon word which is found only twice before Ovid, both times in Catullus 64 (71 and 165). Ovid himself uses it but three times (Met. 1.641, 11.77, and here), and it does not appear again until Apuleius Apol. 43. Quinn (Catullus, at 64.71) terms externare "an uncommon, frequentative form of sternere; originally 'flatten', then by association with externus, something like 'craze', 'dement'." Externati can be taken in agreement with solis or equi, or (a characteristically Ovidian play) with both nouns.

429-430 According to Ovid's account in the Metamorphoses (1.209ff.), the impiety of king Lycaon of Arcadia and his fifty sons occasioned a visit from Zeus, disguised as a peasant. The king decided to put the stranger to a test, in order to determine whether he was god or mortal, and accordingly served to the god a banquet of human flesh. Zeus in anger upset the table, and killed Lycaon's sons with his thunderbolt, while Lycaon himself was transformed into a wolf. Other accounts, however, make Lycaon a just and wise ruler and blame his sons for the outrage. (Cf. Hyginus Fab. 176; Apollodorus Bib. 3.8.1.)

foeda Lycaoniae repetes convivia mensae: an imitation of Met. 1.165, foeda Lycaoniae referens convivia mensae. Other than in these two instances, Ovid uses the adjective Lycaonius only with reference to Callisto.

repetes: Ibis is to repeat the banquet and presumably provoke a similar reaction from Jupiter.
cibi . . . fraude: accounts vary as to who the slaughtered victim was. Hyginus (Astr. 2.4.) states that it was Lycaon's grandson, Arcas; Nonnus Dionys. 18.20ff. that it was his son, Nyctimus; Ovid in Met. 1.218ff. that it was a Molossian hostage, and Apollodorus Bib. 3.8.1, that it was a child of the local people.

431-432 The exempla of Pelops and Itys conclude this series featuring cannibalism.

teque . . . posito: i.e. as a meal for a god. Cf. Fast. 2.566 cibo posito; OLD s.v. pono 5.

Tantalides: Pelops, the son of Tantalus; the patronymic is found also in Tr.2.385. Pelops was cut into pieces by his father and served at a banquet to the gods, in order to test their omniscience. Cf. Servius ad Georg. 3.7, Tantalus, pater Pelopis, volens deorum temptare divinitatem, invitatis filium suum epulandum adposuit, a quo omnes di abstinerunt, excepta Cerere, quae bracchium eius consumpsit. Postea dixi, punito Tantalo, cum voluissent eius filium revocare ab inferis, Ceres ei eburneum bracchium restituit; Hyginus Fab. 83; Ovid Met. 6.401-11 etc. The myth of Pelops is an old one, appearing first in extant literature in Pindar, O. 1.37ff., and is alluded to by both Vergil (Georg. 3.7) and Lucian (Salt. 54) as a well-known story. For Tantalus' punishment cf. 177f. and commentary ad loc.

Tereidesque: patronymic for Itys, son of Tereus, king of Thrace, and Procne, the daughter of King Pandion of Athens. When Procne asked her sister Philomela to come for a visit, Tereus went to Athens to fetch her. However, when he saw her he was overcome with desire, and hence imprisoned her, raped her, and then cut out her tongue to prevent her from telling Procne what had happened. The resourceful Philomela nevertheless revealed her plight to Procne by weaving a tapestry of her story. Procne, who had believed her husband's tale that Philomela was dead, immediately began plotting her revenge against Tereus. After freeing Philomela, Procne seized her son Itys, and together the sisters slew him and served him as a meal to Tereus. After Tereus had eaten his fill, Philomela revealed the head of Itys to Tereus, and the sisters fled, pursued by the frenzied Tereus. Procne was thereupon changed into a nightingale, Philomela into a swallow, and Tereus into a hoopoe (cf.
535f. and commentary ad loc.). For the myth see especially Ovid Met. 6.433ff. Traces of the story can be seen in Homer Od. 19.518ff., wherein the nightingale, daughter of Pandareos, mourns her son Itylus, whom she killed δι’ ἄφροδιας, while Hesiod Erg. 568f. refers to the swallow as the daughter of Pandion. The first clear allusion, however, is in Aeschylus Supp. 60ff., in which the nightingale, wife of Tereus, laments the son whom she herself slew. Ellis condemns Tereidesque puer as ‘et a grammatica abhorret et a MSS’ and reads Teleique puer, as does La Penna. Tereidesque is the reading of late manuscripts, B and S, while the majority, FGPTV and X read tereique, which does not scan, while only one, G, preserves teleique. In fact it was not the son of Teleus who was killed and served as food, as Teleique puer would suggest, but his grandson, the son of Harpalyce and her father, Clymenus. For the myth see Hyginus Fab. 206,238,242,246,253,255; and Parthenius Erotica 13. I presume Ellis’ objections on grammatical grounds centre on the use of the patronymic with puer, but cf. 510 Leoprepidae viro; and 586 puer Oebalides. See further the note of La Penna ad loc.

433-434 The pentameter makes clear the general allusion of the hexameter, as a reference to the death of Absyrtus at the hands of his sister Medea, as she and Jason fled with the golden fleece from the pursuit of her father Aeetes. To prevent her father from overtaking them, she slew her young brother and scattered his limbs along their path, thereby causing Aeetes to give up the chase, and concentrate instead on picking up the pieces of his son. There were a good many variants concerning Absyrtus’ death: according to Euripides (Medea 1334f.), he was killed by Medea before she fled from Aeetes’ palace, and this seems to have been the version followed by Sophocles in Colchian Women (Scholiast on A.R. Argo. 4.228). In Apollonius Rhodius by contrast (4.305ff.), Absyrtus was a young adult who led the pursuit of Medea, and was slain by Jason. For more details on the variant traditions see RE 2.285-6.

latores spatantur membra per agros: although Apollodorus implies (1.9.24) that the murder took place on the Argo, and the limbs were scattered on the sea (so too
Pherecydes FGrH. 1.3 F 32), Ovid here and on two other occasions, stresses that the limbs were dispersed *per agros*, in the area of the future Tomis, site of the poet’s exile. Thus *Her.* 6.129f., *spargere qua fratris potuit lacerta per agros/ corpora*; and *Tr.* 3.9.27f., *atque ita divellit divulsaque membra per agros/ dissipat in multis invenienda locis*. In this detail, Ovid appears to be following a well-known passage of a Medea tragedy, possibly by Ennius or Accius, and quoted by Cicero in *N.D.* 2.67: . . . *postquam pater/adpropinquat iamque paene ut comprehendatur parat/ puerum interea obtuncat membraque articulatim dividit/ perque agros passim dispersit corpus, id ea gratia/ ut dum nati dissipatos artus captaret pares/ ipsa interea effugeret, illum ut maeror tardaret sequi/ sibi salutem ut familiari pareret parricide*. The line is also perhaps reminiscent of Vergil *Georg.* 4.522 (of Orpheus), *discerptum latos iuvenem sparsere per agros*.

435–436 *aere Perilleo*: Perillus was an inventor who devised a brazen bull for Phalaris, the tyrant of Acragas in Sicily (see below), in which men could be imprisoned and slowly tortured to death over fire. The cries of the victim were transformed by the device into the sounds of a bellowing bull. Phalaris’ reward to Perillus was to make the inventor the bull’s first victim. Ovid refers often in his exilic poetry to the story, for example in *Tr.* 5.1.53, 5.12.47f., *Ex P.* 2.9.44, but especially in *Tr.* 3.11.39-54: *saevior es . . . illo/ qui falsum lento torruit igne bovem,/ quique bovem Siculo ferrur donasse tyranno,/ et dictis artes conciliasse suas:/ "munere in hoc, rex, est usus, sed imagine maior,/ nee sola est operis forma probanda mei./ aspicis a dextra latus hoc adapertile tauri?/ hac tibi, quem perdes, coniciendus erit./ protinus inclusum lentis carbonibus ure:/ mugiet, et veri vox erit illa bovis./ pro quibus inventis, ut munus munere penses,/ da, precor, ingenio praemia digna meo."/ dixerat, at Phalaris "poenae mirande repertor,/ ipse tuum praesens imbue" dixit "opus"./ nec mora, monstratis crudeliter ignibus ustus/ exhibuit geminos ore gemente sonos*. For the sentiment that it was a fitting punishment for the deviser of such a cruel punishment, cf. *Epistles of Phalaris* 122.3, cited by Hollis, *Ars* 1.653, wherein Phalaris says, "I am convinced that no one among you or the rest of the Greeks will think it unjust that
an inventor of an outrage for others should have his fill of it himself"; Ovid Ars 1.653ff., et Phalaris tauro violenti membra Perilli/ torruit; infelix inbuit auctor opus./ iustus uerque fuit, neque enim lex aequier ulla est, quam necis artifices arte perire sua; Tr. 5.12.47; Claudian in Eutr. 1.163ff., etc. For aere Perilleo compare Tr.5.1.53, ipse Perilleo Phalaris permisit in aere.

veros imitere iuvencos: cf. Tr. 3.11.48 cited above, mugiet, et veri vox erit illa bovis; Ps. Plutarch Parall.min. 39a.315c, ἐδόκει δὲ μυκηθιὰν ἀναβιάναι ἡ δέμαλις.

The bull of Phalaris was mentioned by Timaeus (fr.118 FGH), but the fate of Perillus is first found in Callimachus' Aetia 2. fr. 46 and 47 (Pf.).

437-438 From the inventor of the bull we pass next to the cruel tyrant for whom it was invented, Phalaris, who ruled Acragas 570-554 B.C. Notorious for his cruelty, Phalaris quickly became an exemplum of the savage tyrant. Thus Pindar in P. 1.95-6 proclaimed: τὸν δὲ ταύρῳ χαλκῷ κατήρα νῆλεα νοῦν/ ἐχθρὰ Φάλαρων κατέχει παντὶ φάτις, and Phalaris often appeared as the 'type' of the cruel despot in conjunction with the equally cruel Busiris (397f.). Thus for example Callimachus fr. 44-45 (Pf.), Ovid Ars 1.647ff.; Tr. 3.11.39ff., Ex P. 3.6.42f.; Claudian in Eutr. 1.163ff. Ovid here implies that Phalaris also became a victim of the brazen bull. It is possible that Callimachus dealt with the manner of Phalaris' death in the Aetia, but I can find no extant source for this prior to Ovid. Ellis notes a possible, but very tenuous support for such a tradition, in a fragment of Heraclides Ponticus (FHG Muller ii p.223). After Phalaris' death, the bull was said to have been thrown into the sea, but the scholiast on Pindar P. 1.185 dismisses the alleged bull of Phalaris shown to tourists as in fact the bull-headed river god Gela! (Hollis on Ars 1.653-4).

more bovis . . . gemas: cf. Met. 1.745 (of Io), ne more iuvenae/ mugiat.

Paphio in aere: Cyprian bronze was renowned in antiquity. Cf. Pliny Nat. 34.2, in Cypro, ubi prima aeris inventio, and Festus p.18 (Lindsay), aerosam appellaverunt antiqui insulam Cyprum, quod in ea plurimum aeris nascatur. The manuscripts are divided on the question of where the Phalaris couplet belongs: G P and X place it here, H T and V following 335f. Housman ("Transpositions in the Ibis of Ovid,
Journal of Philol. 34 (1918) p.224f.) argues in favour of its transposition to follow the couplets concerning Limone and her lover (hence 333-336, 457f., and then 437f.), based on the superiority of manuscript T, and on the repetition of aere . . . Perilleo, Papho in aere; imitere iuvencos . . . sono, more bovis . . . gemas, if the couplet is left in its present site. I do not find it out of place here; it follows the same pattern seen in 395ff., where an adviser to a cruel despot becomes the first victim, and then the despot’s death is narrated.

439-440 vetus Admeti . . . socer: Pelias, king of Iolchus, whose daughter Alcestis was married to Admetus. After Pelias had sent his nephew Jason on his quest for the Golden Fleece, he put to death Jason’s father Aeson and his younger brother, Promachus. When Jason returned with Medea and learned of Pelias’ actions, Medea plotted revenge for her husband: according to the canonized version of the myth (so Ovid Met. 7.297ff., Apollodorus Bib. 1.9.27, Hyginus Fab. 24 etc.) Medea persuaded Pelias’ daughters that she could rejuvenate the old king and demonstrated her skill by cutting up and boiling an old ram, which emerged from the cauldron restored to a young lamb by her potent herbs. The daughters were convinced of her skills, and thus while Pelias was sleeping they entered his chamber and killed him. However, when they had carved up his body and thrown it into the boiling cauldron, there was no miraculous rejuvenation; too late the daughters realized the fraudulent trick which had been played upon them.


decipiare: more that simply to cheat or dupe, the verb decipio is often found on funeral inscriptions in the sense of ‘cheating one’s relatives of their hopes or expectations by one’s death, or to be so cheated by one’s own death’ (OLD s.v. 3). cf. CIL 5.1705, 5.7917, 5.7962, 12.18 etc. Here the verb perhaps implies that Pelias himself, not merely his daughters, was taken in by Medea’s promises. Although the predominant tradition, as cited above, was that Pelias knew nothing of the planned
rejuvenation, there is at least one vase painting which depicts Pelias with his daughters, watching the young lamb emerge from Medea’s cauldron (See J.E. Harrison *Greek Vase Paintings*. London, 1894, plate ii). Furthermore, Ellis aptly points to a passage in Diodorus Siculus 4.51 wherein Medea comes to Pelias himself.

441-442 A reference to a youth of the early Republic, Marcus Curtius, who, in 362 B.C., is said to have ridden his horse into an enormous chasm which appeared in the middle of the Roman forum. An oracle had declared that the chasm could only be filled if the Romans were to cast the most prized of their possessions into it; Curtius interpreted that as meaning Rome’s youth, and thus devoted himself to the gods of the underworld and was then swallowed up in the ground. Where the cavern had been, there remained only a small lake, which was called the *lacus Curtius* in his honour. See especially Livy 7.6.3-5, Paulus Festus 42L; V.Max. 5.6.2; August. C.D. 5.18 etc. An alternative version of the story claims that the lake received its name from a Sabine, Mettius Curtius, who engaged in hand to hand combat with Romulus in order to give his men a chance to withdraw and then plunged into the marshes with his horse and rode to the other shore (Livy 1.12, Plutarch *Rom.* 50).

*in medi ... voragine caeni:* cf. Livy 1.13.5, *monumentum eius pugnae, ubi primum ex profunda emersus palude equus Curtium in vado statuit, Curtium lacum appellarunt.*

dummodo sint fati nomina nulla tui: ‘provided your fate shall have no renown.’

For the renown which Curtius gained for his deed, cf. Statius *Silv.* 1.1.66f., *sacra vorago/ famosique lacus nomen memorabile servant;* Prop. 3.11.61; V. Max. 5.6.2.; Ovid *Fast.* 6.403.

443-444 *de dentibus orti:* the Sparti, fully armed men who rose up from the ground in which Cadmus planted the teeth from the dragon he had slain. Cf. *Met.* 3.101ff. Cadmus, who was the son of Agenor, had been commanded by the Delphic oracle to follow a cow and found a city at the spot where the cow stopped. He therefore followed the cow from Phocis to southern Boeotia, where it finally collapsed at the site of the future Thebes. Cadmus then sent some of his men to a nearby spring to
fetch water for a sacrifice, but they were attacked by a huge dragon which guarded
the spring. Cadmus slew the dragon and was told by Athena to sow the dragon’s
teeth in the earth. Once this was done, the Sparti sprang forth and immediately began
fighting among themselves. Only five of them survived the battle and with Cadmus
they founded Thebes. See esp. Euripides Ph. 641ff.; Apollodorus Bib. 3.4.1; Ovid
Met. 3.1-130; and Hyginus Fab. 178.

**Sidonia . . . manu:** Cadmus was from Sidon in Phoenicia; cf. Met. 2.840, where
Jupiter describes Agenor’s kingdom to Mercury, and says *indigenae Sidonida nomine
dicunt.* For the adjective *Sidonius* referring to Cadmus compare Met. 3.129 *Sidonius
hospes,* and the same phrase, also with reference to Cadmus, is found in Seneca Oed.
713 and Statius Theb. 3.180ff., while in Theb. 3.300 we find *Sidonii . . . Cadmi.*

**445-446** Not without reason La Penna says of this couplet "forse il distico piu spinosa
dell’Ibis." (p.113). There are considerable textual difficulties: the subject of the
allusion is variously given by the manuscripts as Penthides (FV), Pentides (GHPX)
and Pentelides (T) and they are almost equally divided on the readings *de fratre*
(FHTV) and *fraterque* (GPX). Salvagnius proposed the emendation *Pitthides,* which
has been generally adopted by subsequent editors. If this is correct, then *et quae
Pitthides fecit* is a reference to the curses uttered by Theseus, grandson of Pittheus
(for which cf. Hyginus Fab 14.5 *Theseus Aegei et Aethrae Pitthei filiae filius*) against
Hippolytus (cf. commentary at 87f.). Salvagnius also had an explanation for *fraterque
Medusae,* which he understood to be a reference to Eurystheus, *qui multa vota in
Herculis exitium nuncupavit* (a theory supported by Owen in CQ 8,1914 p.256).
However the proposal was scorned by Housman, *(Journal of Philol. 35, 1920, p.299)*
who called it "an impudent and comical fiction", unknown to antiquity. He in turn
adopted the reading *de fratre* on the following grounds: " . . . Hippolytus by one
account was the frater Medusae. Medusa was the daughter of Phorcus, and Phorcus
according to Servius at Verg. Aen. 5. 824 was *Thoosae nymphae et Neptuni filius;*
Neptune therefore was the common grandfather of Medusa and Hippolytus, and
Hippolytus was her *frater patruelis*, in which sense the simple *frater* is used at *Met.* 13.31 and *Her.* 8.28. The far fetched description is quite in the manner of this poem, and it has its purpose, since the curse of Theseus on Hippolytus was fulfilled by Neptune, the ancestor whom he shared with Medusa, and Theseus, in keeping with the allusion, is called Pitthides, not Aegides*. Cf. Gaius *Inst.* 111.10 *fratres patruelis*. . . . *id est qui ex duobus fratribus progenerati sunt.* It is a viable interpretation of the couplet, but if we can give any credence to the scholia, yet another possibility comes to mind. For there is widespread agreement among the scholia that one of the protagonists in the verse is a certain Hipponax, the son of Abacius/Ebalus, and a poet according to some of the accounts. Although there is a great deal of confusion and error in their stories, it is noteworthy that the poet Hipponax, who flourished around 540 B.C., is said by Suidas to have been νιωζ Πώθεω. Interestingly, Hipponax was notorious for his scathing iambics and in particular for his attacks upon the sculptor Bupalus (cf. Callimachus fr.191 Pf. μόχη Βούπάλεος; Horace *Epod.* 6.11-14; Pliny *Nat.* 36.11; Suidas etc.). Tradition records (Pliny *Nat.* 36.11, Ps. Acr. *ad Hor. Epod.* 6.14) that Bupalus and his brother Athenis made an unflattering statue of the poet, which so infuriated him that he attacked them in his poetry and by this means drove them to suicide. La Penna, therefore, read *Pytheides* as signifying Hipponax, and *de fratre Medusae* as Bupalus. However he made no attempt to explain the significance of the latter phrases. Like Degani, *RFIC* 109 (1981), pp.389-92, I am tempted to see this as a disparaging comment on Bupalus and his profession, i.e. like Medusa he turns people to stone. Alternatively, Watson (*Arae*, p.62) suggests that "Hipponax will have defused the accusation of ugliness by turning it back on its author, claming that his features rivalled those of the Gorgon herself". See also the discussion of Rosen, *CQ* 38 (1988), pp.291-6. An allusion to Hipponax and his abusive poetry is certainly very fitting in this context, particularly since the next allusion is to the Callimachean curse poem. For *vota facere* in Ovid, cf. *Ex P.* 1.6.38 *aliquis pendens in cruce vota facit*; 2.5.6 (candor) *exigit ut faciam talia vota tuus.*
447-448 quibus: supply ea vota.

exiguo volucris devota libello est: a reference to the Ibis of Callimachus. Cf. the commentary to 53. Since et implies that the curses found in Callimachus' poem are not the same as those already recited by Ovid against his foe, the couplet is a strong argument against the poem being merely a translation of the Callimachean work. The view of A. Rostagni (Ibis: storia di un poema greco, 1920, 10ff., 34ff.), who argues unconvincingly and without foundation that the Ovidian poem is little more than a translation of the Greek Ibis (and that not by Callimachus but a later author), and that it therefore follows 447-8 are interpolated, may be dismissed.
corpora: poetic plural for singular.
proiecta . . . purgat aqua: for this characteristic of the Ibis, see p.3 of the introduction.

449-450 The subject of this allusion is open to dispute. According to one of the scholia (C) it is a reference to Osiris, who was murdered by his brother Typhon and the pieces of his corpse scattered throughout Egypt. As a result, says the scholium, knives were banned from the god's rituals and it cites Plutarch's de Isid. as its authority. However, I can find no evidence in Plutarch or elsewhere that knives were in fact prohibited at Osiris' rites. The remaining scholia explain the couplet as concerning a certain Menedemus, a Greek hero who fought at Troy and perished there from the many wounds he received. Cf. Scholium B: Callimachus dicit in Creta Menedemo sacra fieri, et non ferro, quia in Troiano bello plurimis vulneribus cultorum interiit. Although nothing remains in Callimachus' works which treats of this hero, a passage from Clemens of Alexandria's Protrept. (2.40.2) lends support to the scholium's statements, in so far as it mentions a Menedemus accorded honours after his death (although in Kythnos rather than Crete): ἄοτι μὲν ἐφευρεῖν καὶ ἀναφανδὸν ὅντω κατά πόλεις δαίμονας ἐπιχωρίους τιμὴν ἐπιδρεπομένους. παρὰ κυθνίως Μενέδημον, παρὰ Τηνίως Καλλισταγόραν, παρὰ Δηλίως "Ἀμόν, παρὰ Λακων' Ἀστραβακον. Furthermore, if Menedemus was indeed mentioned by Callimachus, he might have been suggested to Ovid by the mention of Callimachus' Ibis in the preceding couplet.
451-452 attonitus: 'smitten with divine frenzy'. Cf. Ovid Ars 1.538; ... attonita tympana pulsa manu; Valerius Flaccus 7.635f.

seces ... membra: a reference to the Galli, priests of the Phrygian goddess Cybele, who castrated themselves and slashed their persons generally (cf. Lucretius 2.629ff.) as part of their devotion to the goddess. Cybele's official title in Rome was Magna Mater Deum Idaea; her worship was one of the first of the Oriental cults to appear in Rome (204 B.C.), but it was strictly supervised and no Roman was allowed to serve as her priest until the time of Claudius (Dion. Hal. 2.19.3-5). The priests' self-mutilation was linked to the story of the castration of Attis and was re-enacted at celebrations of the goddess' rites. Note the description of Cybele's procession in Lucretius 2.620f., et Phrygio stimulat numero cava tibia mentis/ telaque praeportant, violenti signa furoris; and Ovid Fast. 4.221-244, but especially 242-4, nullaque sunt subito signa relictæ viri/ venit in exemplum furor hic mollesque ministril caedunt iactatis vilia membra comis. Cf. Prop. 2.22.14f.; Juvenal 2.115f.; Martial 9.2.13f. etc. for their self-mutilation.

Cybeleia mater: the poetic adjective Cybeleius appears first in Ovid. Cf. in particular Ars 1.507f., Cybeleia mater/ concinitur Phrygiis exululata modis; Met. 10.104 with Bömer's note.

ad Phrygios vilia membra modos: the rhythmic strains of the Phrygian music were reputed to be wildly exciting and were particularly linked with the ecstatic dances of the goddess' cult. Quintilian (1.10.33) cites a law case in which the music played by a flutist in 'Phrygian mode' caused the man performing the sacrifice to die from the excitement. With the Ovidian phrase compare Tibullus 1.4.70, which served as Ovid's model, et secat ad Phrygios vilia membra modos; Propertius 2.22.16, et Phrygis insanos caeditur ad numeros; and Martial 11.84.4, cum furit ad Phrygios enthea turba modos. In his commentary to Tibullus 1.4.70, Murgatroyd suggests that ad Phrygios ... modos could be a reminiscence of Callimachus, Iamb. 3. fr. 193.36 (Pf.), φρόγες[α] πρόφης[ζ] ἀγάλματος. Like Tibullus, Ovid invokes the fate of being a priest of Cybele as a curse, and Murgatroyd gives related examples from Athen. 541e, wherein Clearchus describes the tyrant Dionysus the Younger's 'bad end' as a priest
of Cybele, and Callimachus, *Iamb.* 3 fr. 193.34ff., who complains that since the Muses are no longer honoured in his day, he might as well become a devotee of Cybele or Adonis. This belief in the worthlessness of such worshippers is also found in the derogatory remarks of Juvenal 8.171ff., and Martial 14.204. See also Pease on *Aen* 4.215.

vilia: 'worthless', i.e. unusable and therefore ready to be cut off. Cf. the Tibullan phrase cited above, and *Fast.* 4.244, also cited above.

453-454 Attis, originally perhaps a vegetation deity, and a companion of the goddess Cybele, castrated himself after he had been smitten with madness by the jealous deity. His castration, death and resurrection were all dramatically re-enacted in cultic rituals. For Attis and his legends, cf. Ovid, *Fast.* 4.223-44; Catullus 63; Pausanias 7.17; Diodorus 3.58 etc. A useful collection of passages on the Cybele-Attis cult may be found in Hugo Hepding's *Attis, seine Mythen und seine Kult,* Geiszen, 1903, 5ff.

dequo viro: there is a similar construction with de rather than ex, in *Met.* 9.743f. *puerum de virgine...efficiet*; cf. *Ars* 2.504, *de duce terribili factus amator erat.*

fias nec femina nec vir: compare the Catullan description of Attis in 63.27 as *notha mulier,* and Attis' own words at 63.69, *ego mei pars, ego vir sterilis ero.* Also relevant is Valerius Maximus' record (7.7.6) of the statement of the consul Mamercus regarding a castrated priest, *Genucium amputatis sui ipsius sponte genitalibus corporis partibus neque virorum neque mulierum numero haberi debere,* while Martial (3.91.2) scornfully speaks of Cybele and her followers as *semiviro Cybeles cum grege.*

molli...manu: *mollis* here has the sense of being both soft in touch (and thereby contrasting with the loud noise which it creates from the tympana), and of being effeminate or unmanly - thus the priests of Cybele are described in *Fast.* 4.243 as *mollesque...ministri.* For the feminine characteristics of the *Galli,* see Bömer on *Fast.* 4.182; for the phrase *mollis...manus* cf. *Am.* 1.4.23-4, with McKeown's note *ad loc.; Fast.* 4.342.

tympana: the Greek τῷμπανον was a type of hoop with a piece of hide stretched over it. For its close association with the cult of Cybele cf. Euripides *Hel.* 1346; Catullus
63.8 with Fordyce's note; Lucr. 2.618 etc.

rauca: 'harsh-sounding'; for parallels for this application of raucus, cf. Lucretius 2.619; Catullus 64.264; Propertius 3.10.23; Seneca Ag. 689; and OLD s.v. 3.

455-456 After Hippomenes' successful courtship of Atalanta (for which see 369-370 and commentary ad loc.), the youth forgot to give his thanks to Aphrodite for her aid. Affronted, the goddess afflicted him with an overpowering desire for his new bride and thus caused him to profane a temple of Cybele by sleeping with Atalanta within the sacred precinct. As punishment, they were transformed by Cybele into lions. See especially Ovid's account in Met. 10.681-707. Servius on Aen. 3.113, and Probus on Ecl. 6.61, agree that the lovers profaned an area sacred to Cybele, but Apollodorus Bib. 3.9.2, and Hyginus Fab. 185 say that it was the temple of Zeus.

pecus . . . Magnae . . . Parentis: i.e. the lion. Cybele was commonly portrayed in both literature and art in a chariot pulled by lions. Cf. Lucretius 2.600f.; Vergil Aen. 3.113, 10.253; Ovid Fast. 4.215ff.; Varro ap. August. C.D. 7.24; Sophocles Ph. 394 etc. Hyginus Fab. (185) explained the couple's transformation into lions because it was lions quibus di concubitum veneris denegant. See also Pliny Nat. 8.42f., Servius ad Aen. 3.113. The use of pecus to refer to animals individually is very uncommon; cf. Seneca Thy. 225 and the note of Tarrant ad loc.

subito: see commentary on 274.

Magnae . . . Parentis: Cybele's full title was Magna Deorum Mater Idaea; Vergil refers to her in Aen. 10.252 as alma parens Idaea deum.

victor . . . victaque: Hippomenes and Atalanta respectively. Ovid was inordinately fond of rhetorical word play of this sort and repetitions of forms of vincere are particularly frequent in his works. Note, for example Met. 3.95, victor victi; 8.56f.,vinci/victoris; 12.608f. victor . . . /victus; Her. 9.2, victorem victae; 9.70, victor victo; Fast. 2.811, and 3.101, victas victoribus.

celeri . . . pede: cf. 369, where Atalanta is described as velocem . . . puellam, and commentary ad loc.

457-458 The punishment of Limone probably belongs after 335f. (cf. commentary ad
The transposition to its present place could perhaps have arisen from a false identification of the Hippomenes in the preceding couplet with the Athenian father of Limone, also named Hippomenes. For the story compare Callimachus fr. 94-95 (Pf.), and the Diegesis 3.25ff., which reports that Hippomenes "shut up his daughter Limone, who had been secretly seduced, in a chamber with a horse, and by this means killed her. Whence there is a place in Athens called 'the horse and the girl.' And he struck the one who had seduced her with his spear and tied the body to a horse, so as to drag it through the city."


Apollodorus ruled over Cassandreia from 279 to 276 B.C., when he was overcome by Antigonus Gonatas after a ten month siege. For his notorious cruelty cf. Polyænus 6.7; Dio Chrysostom 2.76; Cicero N.D. 3.33.82; Seneca de ira 2.5.2, de benef. 7.19.5 etc.

domino non mitior illo: if the couplet is retained in its present position, the comparison here made is troublesome: to whom does domino . . . illo refer?

Housman (Journal of Philol. 34, 1918, p.226) notes that Merkel referred non mitior to Ibis, the subject of contumuleris, and domino . . . illo to Apollodorus, a comparison unparalleled elsewhere in the Ibis, while Salvagnius understood mitior to refer to Apollodorus, and illo to the implied reference to Hippomenes, father of Limone, in the preceding couplet. However, as Housman points out, dominus is not an apt epithet for Hippomenes, who was not a tyrant, but king or archon, nor is the comparison non mitior Hippomene a credible way of highlighting the cruelty of Apollodorus. Ellis' solution was to understand Cassandreus as an allusion not to Apollodorus, but to Ptolemy Ceraunus (cf. Justin 24.3-5 for his cruelty and death), with domino . . . illo referring to Apollodorus. Housman in turn proposed retaining Apollodorus as the Cassandreian, and transposing the couplet so that it would follow the couplet describing another notoriously cruel tyrant, Phalaris, who would then be
the point of comparison in domino . . . illo, a transposition supported by MSS BHTV. This is attractive not only because of manuscript authority, but because it brings together two tyrants, Apollodorus and Phalaris, who were often paired together in antiquity as types of the cruel tyrant - cf. Dio Chrys. 2.76; Plutarch cum princ. phil 3.5 778E; Seneca de ira 2.5.1, de benef. 7.19.7; and Ovid himself, in Ex P 2.9.43f., non tibi Cassandreus pater est gentisve Pheraeae/ quive reperetorem torruit arte sua. I would therefore support Housman's transposition of this couplet to follow 437f., but would not support his further relocation of 437f. and 459f. to follow 336, 457f., concerning Limone and her lover. See my discussion at 435-6.

461-462 Two examples of young children locked in a chest and thrown into the sea.

Abantiades: Perseus, the great grandson of Abas, and the child of Danae and Zeus. For the patronymic Abantiades used to refer to Perseus cf. Met. 4.673, 5.138, and 5.236. Ovid appears to have been the only Latin writer to use this form, as Bömer notes in his commentary to Met. 4.607. Danae's father Acrisius had been warned by an oracle that a son of Danae's would kill him, so he locked her in a bronze chamber to prevent her from becoming pregnant. Zeus, however, was able to filter through the roof in a golden rain, and from their union Perseus was born. When Acrisius discovered that Danae had given birth to a son he had both mother and child put in a chest and cast into the Aegean sea, until they eventually landed on the coast of Seriphos, and were found by the fisherman Dictys. See Hyginus Fab. 63, Apollodorus Bib. 2.3.4; and for Danae's lament in the chest, Simonides fr.37 Bergh.

Cycneius heros: Tenes, the son of King Cycnus of Colonae, and Procleia. After the death of Procleia, Cycnus married Philonome, who falsely charged Tenes with attempting to rape her. Cycnus believed her, and put Tenes and his sister Hemithea into a chest, which was then thrown into the sea. After some time the chest came ashore on the island of Leucophrys, which afterwards was called Tenedos, and over which Tenes ruled. See the accounts of Apollodorus Epit. 3.24-5; Pausanias 10.14.1-4; scholia ad Iliad 1.38; Tzetzes ad Lyc. Alex. 232. For the combination of a Greek patronymic with heros at a line's conclusion in Ovid's poetry cf. Met. 3.198
Autonoeius heros; 2.676 Philyreius heros; 5.1. Danaeius heros; 7.410 Tirynthius heros etc.

463-464 Theudotus: the name Theudotus is conjectural; the MSS read theodotus, theodus or variations on these. Ellis proposed that the couplet alluded to a victim of Apollodorus of Cassandrea, who, when attempting to gain the tyranny of the city, slew a youth and served his flesh and blood to those conspiring with him, in order to ensure their loyalty. The youth's name, however, is given by the sources (Diodorus 22.5, Polyaenus 6.7.2) as Callimeles, a difficulty which Ellis would explain as confusion from the fact that it was a man named Theudotus who suggested the sacrificial murder of Callimeles to Apollodorus. However, scholia C and D on the Ibis offer an intriguing alternative, which Pfeiffer identifies with fragments of Callimachus' Aetia (4.fr.93 Pf.): during a war between the inhabitants of Lipara, an island near north-east Sicily, and the Tyrrhenians, the latter vowed to sacrifice the bravest of the Liparians to Apollo, if the god should secure their victory. When they were indeed victorious, they discharged their vow by slaying a certain Theudotus. Although we know nothing of the Tyrrhenian vow or Theudotus' death from other sources, Diodorus (5.9.4), Pausanias (10.11.3, 10.16.7), and Strabo (6.275), all attest to conflict between the two nations, and Strabo mentions the special honour in which Apollo was held among the Liparians.

quam . . . necem: accusative virtually in apposition to the preceding line.

465-466 Ovid here refers to a scapegoat ritual which took place in Abdera, in the process of which a poor man was given a lavish meal, led in ceremony around the walls of the city, and then driven out of the city by the people, who threw stones at him, with the hope that he took with him all the misfortunes of the city. The ritual was described by Callimachus in the Aetia (fr.90 Pf.), and of great value is the accompanying Diegesis, which records that "in Abdera, a slave bought in the market is used to purify the city. Standing on a block of grey stone, he enjoys a rich banquet, and so, fed to the full, he is led to the gates called Prurides. Then he goes round the walls in a circle, purifying in his own person the city, and then the basileus
and others throw stones at him until he is driven beyond the boundaries". The scholia on the *Ibis* note that Callimachus told of the rite, but according to their account, the victim was stoned to death, rather than simply being driven beyond the city's boundaries. Similar practices were undertaken by the Massilians (cf. Servius *ad Aen.* 3.57; Petronius fr.1; Lactantius on Statius *Theb.* 10.793), Athenians (cf. Suidas, and Hesychius, s.v. φαρμακός), and other communities. A good discussion of these may be found in Jan Bremmer's article "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece", *HSCP* 87 (1983), pp.299-320. See also L. Deubner, "Der Pharmakos von Abdera", *Studi ital. di fil. class.* XI (1934), pp.185-192.

**Abdera:** Abdera was a Thracian city, located near the mouth of the Nestos River and was often disparaged by Roman writers for the stupidity of its inhabitants. Cf. Cicero *Att.* 4.16.6, 7.7.4; Juv. 10.48 and scholia *ad loc.*; further citations may be found in Otto, p.1, nr.1.

*saxaque . . . grandine plura petunt:* similar imagery occurs in *Nux* 132, *saxa novos fructus grandine plura petunt*; *Ex P.* 4.7.34, *saxaque brumali grandine plura subis*; *Met.* 5.158, *tela volant hiberna grandine plura*, with further parallels collected by Bömer *ad loc.*

**devotum:** supply *te.*

467-474 Eight examples of people blasted by the thunderbolt of Zeus: Capaneus, the father of Dexitheia, Semele, Iasion, Phaethon, Salmoineus, Lycaon and Macela and her husband.

**467 telo . . . trisulco:** i.e. the three-pronged thunderbolt of Jupiter. *Trisulcum* is used first in Varro *Men.* 54 to describe the weapon of Jupiter (*et pater divum trisulcum fulmen igni fervido actum mittat*) and it is also so used by Ovid in *Am.* 2.5.52 . . . *oscula . . . qualia possent excutere irato tela trisulca lovi*, and *Met.* 2.848f. (with the note of Bömer), *ille pater rectorque deum, cui dextra trisulcis/ignibus armata est.* Cf. also Seneca *Thy.* 1089, *Pha.* 681.

**468 satus Hipponoo:** Capaneus, son of Hipponous (cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.6.3 *Καπανεύς Ἐπινόου*, Hyginus *Fab.* 70.1 etc.), who took part in the expedition of
the Seven against Thebes. A violent and overbearing man, Capaneus was scaling the walls of Thebes with fire in his hand when he was struck down by the thunderbolt of Zeus. His fall from the ladder when smitten by Zeus' weapon was a familiar scene in art, and Servius records that it was portrayed in the temple of Castor and Pollux: *Ardeae in templo Castoris et Pollucis in laeva intrantibus post fortem Capaneos pictus est fulmen per utraque tempora traiectus* (ad. *Aen.* 1.44). For the myth cf. Aeschylus *Th.* 423ff.; Sophocles *Ant.* 134ff.; Euripides *Supp.* 496ff.; *Ph.* 1172-86; Apollodorus 3.73; Hyg. *Fab.* 68; Statius *Theb.* 10.897-939 etc. Ovid alludes briefly to Capaneus and his fate in *Met.* 9.404ff., and *Ex P.* 3.1.51, while in *Tr.* 4.3.63ff. he appears along with Phaethon and Semele in a short, paradigmatic catalogue of those who have felt Jove's weapons.

**Dexionesque pater:** *Dexiones*, the reading of G, was adopted by Ellis, and also by Owen in the Oxford text. The variant readings given by Owen are: *Dexithoes* HT, *Dexitoes* P, *Desithoes* X, *Dexithoos* F and *Desithoos* V. Ellis proposed that the phrase concerned Aesculapius, a well-known victim of Zeus' thunderbolt, and whom one would accordingly expect to find in a catalogue of such fiery deaths. In support of this conjecture, he cited *Etym. magn.* 434.15f., in which there appears to be a reference to a daughter of Aesculapius, whose name begins with Δεκ-: Aesculapius' wife was Ηπιόη, εξης αυτώ γενέσθαι Ίάσωνα, Πανάκειαν. Δεκτίων ἐν ὑπομηματι Δυκόφρωνος. However, subsequent finds of Callimachean fragments have suggested a more viable interpretation. In fr. 75.66ff. (Pf.) we find the Telchines and their king Demonax blasted by Zeus for their hybris. Only aged Macelo and her daughter Dexithea are spared: εὖ δ' ὑβριν θανατόν τε κεράννυον, ἐν δὲ γοήτας/ Τελχίνας μακάρων τ' οῖκ ἀλέγοντα θεών/ ἠλεα Δημώνακτα γέρων ἐνεθύκατο δελτοῖς/ καὶ γηνὰς Μακελὼ μητέρα Δεξιθέης, ἀς μοῦνας, ὅτε νῆσον ἀνέτρεπον ἐπίτις ὑβριος, ἀσκηθεὶς ἔλλιτον ἀθάνατον. Furthermore, in Pindar's *Pae.* 4.37ff., a hymn to Keos, the same incident is recalled by Euxantios, the son of Minos and Dexithea (for which cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.1.1; Bacchylides I. 3-17): τρέω τοι/ πόλεμον Διός/ Εὐνοοίδαν τε βαρύκτυπον/ χθόνα τοί ποτε καὶ στρατὸν ἄθρόνων/
Moreover, two scholia of the *Ibis* furnish similar details; thus P: *Telchinum princeps fulmine perit cum tota sua doma excepta filia, cuius erat Jupiter usus hospitio*, and Conr. de mure: *Telchinon princeps perit cum tota familia eius fulminatus excepta Dexithoe, a qua Jupiter quadam vice fuerat hospitatus*. There are consequently good grounds for assuming that the myth of the kings of the Telchines, whose daughter’s name was Dexithoe (from ἰ δεξιαμένη θεόν) lies behind the Ovidian allusion. The true reading, suggested by Pfeiffer, should probably be *Dexitheae*, which could easily have become *Dexithoes* (cf. the history of Leucothea in Latin MSS, cited by Housman in *Journal of Philol.* 35, 1920 p.303).

469 soror Autones: Semele. Thus Hyginus *Fab.* 179 notes: *Cadmus Agenoris et Argiopes filius ex Harmonia Martis et Veneris filia procreavit filias quattuor; Semelen, Ino, Agaven, Autonen et Polydorum filium*. The goddess Hera was jealous of Semele, who had become Zeus’ mistress, and was pregnant by him with Dionysus and so she went to Semele in disguise and persuaded her to ask Zeus to appear to her in all his glory, as he appeared to Hera. Zeus, who had sworn to grant Semele whatever favour she wished for, was compelled to keep his word and come to her with his thunderbolts, as a consequence of which she perished. Cf. Euripides *Bacchae* 84ff.; *Hipp.* 555ff.; Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.26ff.; and Hyginus *Fab.* 167, and 179. Ovid tells the story in detail in *Met.* 3.253-315, and mentions it briefly in *Am.* 3.3.37f., *Fast.* 3.715f., 6.485ff., and *Tr.* 4.3.67f.

cui matertera Maia: Iasion, son of Zeus and Electra; Electra’s sister was Maia, and thus Iasion’s aunt. Cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.10.1, "Ἀτλαντος δὲ καὶ τῆς Ὀκεανοῦ Πληκτὸς ἑγένοντο θυγατέρες ἑπτὰ ἐν Κυλλῆνῃ τῆς Ἀρκαδίας, αἱ Πληκτοὶ προσαγορευθέσαν, Ἀλκυόνῃ, Μερόπῃ, Κελαινῇ, Ἡλέκτρᾳ, Στερόπῃ, Ταυγέτῃ, Μαίᾳ . . . (3.12.1) Ἡλέκτρᾳ δὲ τῆς Ἀτλαντος καὶ Διος Ἱασών καὶ Δάρδανος ἑγένοντο. Ἱασών μὲν οὖν ἑρασθεὶς Δήμητρος καὶ θέλων κατασχῦναι τὴν θεόν, κεραυνουταί. According to Homer *Od.* 5.125ff., Demeter and Iasion were lovers and Iasion was smitten by Zeus after he had slept with Demeter. See also Hesiod *Th.*
970, and Hyginus *Fab.* 270. Iasion was not prominent in Latin poetry, but he is a recurring figure in Ovid’s poems. Cf. *Met.* 9.423 (with the note of Bömer *ad loc.*), *Am.* 3.10.25, and *Tr.* 2.300.

470 **temere optatos qui male rexit equos:** Phaethon, the son of Helios and Clymene.

When the boy was mocked by a friend concerning his parentage, he asked his mother for some proof of his origin, and she in turn sent him to Helios. When he had there repeated his request, Helios affirmed that he was indeed his father and promised him anything that he should ask for. Phaethon immediately asked to be allowed to drive his father’s chariot across the sky for one day. With grave misgivings, and having warned his son of the difficulties of the course, Helios reluctantly gave way and Phaethon set off. However, once under way, he became frightened and soon lost control of the horses, who left their customary route and set the earth aflame. Finally, lest everything be destroyed by the flames, Zeus smote Phaethon with his thunderbolt, whereupon he fell into the river Eridanus. Cf. Plato *Ti.* 22, Ὄς ποτε Φαέθων ἦλθεν πάις τὸ τοῦ πατρός ἀρμα ζεύξας διὰ τὸ μὴ δυνατός εἶναι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρός ὀδὸν ἑλαύνειν τὰ τ’ ἐπὶ γῆς ξυνέκαυσε καὶ αὐτὸς κεραυνωθεὶς διεφθάρη; Diodorus Siculus 5.23.2-3; Hyginus *Fab.* 152 etc. Ovid recounted the story at length in *Met.* 1.750ff. and it assumed a new importance for him in the exilic works, in which he identified himself with the blasted Phaethon (cf. *Tr.* 1.1.79, 3.4.30, 4.3.65f.). A concise history of the myth may be found in Bömer’s introduction to *Met.* 1.747-2.400, p.220ff.

**optatos . . . equos:** cf. *Met.* 2.104, wherein Phaethon *flagrat . . . cupidine currus,* and 148, where his father speaks of the *male optatos . . . axes.*

**qui male rexit equos:** cf. the final words of Phoebus in *Met.* 2.392f., as he mourns Phaethon’s death, and exclaims: . . . *sciet . . . non meruisse necem, qui non bene rexerit illos.*

471 **ferus Aeolides:** Salmoneus, the son of Aeolus and Aenarete, who boasted that he himself was Zeus. He imitated the god by dragging bronze kettles behind his chariot to represent thunder and threw burning torches into the air to imitate lightning. Zeus,
angered at Salmoneus’ impiety, struck and killed him with his thunderbolt, and also
destroyed the town which Salmoneus had founded in Elis. Cf. Hyginus Fab. 61,
Salmoneus Aeoli filius, Sisyphi frater, cum tonitura et fulmine imitaretur Iovis, sedens
quadrigam faces ardentes in populum t mitteret et cives,/ ob t id a love fulmine est
ictus; Vergil Aen. 6.58ff., and Servius ad loc; Apollodorus Bib. 1.9.7; Diodorus
Siculus 4.68.1; and Valerius Flaccus 1.662-5. The legend was apparently known to
Hesiod, who called Salmoneus ἀδικοῦς, but Eustathius on Od. p.1681,63 claims that
the story of Salmoneus’ impiety was the invention of oi νεώτεροι, and unfamiliar to
Homer.
sanguine natus eodem: an obscure way of referring to Lycaon, the Arcadian king,
who, like Salmoneus, was descended from Zeus (Zeus - Pelasgus - Lycaon; Zeus -
Hellen - Aeolus - Salmoneus). For Lycaon’s impiety and the consequent blasting of
his household by Zeus, cf. above 429-30 and commentary ad loc. That the reference
here is indeed to Lycaon is made clear by the concluding line of the couplet, quo
genita est liquidis quae caret Arctos aquis, for the constellation Arctos (also known
as Ursa Maior, and among the Romans as Septem Triones) was once the maiden
Callisto, Lycaon’s daughter and companion of Artemis. Once while resting after a
hunt, she was spotted by Zeus, who fell in love with her and under the disguise of
either Artemis or Apollo came to her and slept with her. Cast out from Artemis’
band after her pregnant state was revealed, Callisto was transformed into a she-bear
and finally into the constellation of the great bear by Zeus. For the myth of Callisto,
cf. Met. 2.409ff. (with Bomer’s notes); Fast. 2.155ff.; Hyginus Fab. 177; Astr. 2.1;
Apollodorus Bib. 3.8.2; Servius ad Georg. 1.138 etc.
liquidis quae caret . . . aquis: the ancients often noted that the constellation of the
Bear appeared to circle unceasingly around the Pole Star, staying above the horizon
all year, and never setting. Cf. Homer ll. 18.487ff. (Od. 5.273-5) "Ἀρκτος θ’ . . ./ἡ
τ’ αὐτὸν στρέφεται καὶ τ’ Ὑρώνα δοκεῖ,/ αὖ ῥ’ ἀμμορός ἐστι λοετρὼν Ὁκευνοίο; Aratus Phaen. 47ff.; Vergil Georg. 1.246 Arctos Oceani metuentes
aequore tingui; Ovid Met. 13.726ff. . . . ad Arctos/ aequoris expertes spectat... etc.
The reason for this was said to be that Hera was angered that her rival for Zeus' love had been given immortality in this fashion and thus went to the sea goddess Tethys and her husband Oceanus, and received their promise that Callisto should not be able to sink in the ocean like the other stars when they set. Cf. Fast. 2.188ff., signa propinqua micant: prior est, quam dicimus Arcton,/ Arctophylax formam terga sequentis habet. / saevit adhuc canamque rogat Saturnia Tethyn,/ Maenaliam tactis ne lavet Arcton aquis; Met. 2.409ff.; Hyginus Astr. 2.1; Fab. 177 etc.

473-474 Macedo: Macedo should almost certainly be emended to the Macelo of FG and T, a further reference to the Telchines myth alluded to at 468. In the Callimachean passage discussed above, Macelo appears as the wife of Demonax and mother of Dextihea, who with her daughter escapes the lightning blast. Similarly Nonnus Dionys. 18.35-8 speaks of a Macello who hospitably entertained Zeus and Apollo, and was therefore spared. However the Ibis scholia (cf. B) cite Nicander for a variant version of the myth, in which Macelo is a daughter of the Telchines' king, and who perishes in the lightning attack because of her husband's impiety: Nicander dicit Macelon filiam Damonis cum sororibus fuisse. Harum hospitio Juppiter susceptus, cum Telchinas, quorum hic Damon princeps erat, corrumpentes venenis successus omnium fructuum, fulmine interficeret, servavit eas, sed Macelo cum uiro propter viri nequitiam perit. Sed ad alias servatas cum venisset Minos, cum Dexitioe concubuit, ex qua creavit Euxantium, unde Euxantidae fuerunt. See the discussion of Housman, Journal of Philol. 35 (1920): pp.300ff., La Penna p.121f.

ictus: should be replaced by icta est, the reading of Ζ.

475-482 Three instances of youths being torn to pieces by dogs, followed by three exempla of fatal snakebites.

475-476 Although there is some confusion in the MSS regarding the name of this victim (Thaso is found only in V, the others having either Thraso or Traso), he seems to be
the same figure found in Hyginus Fab. 247 under the heading "qui a canibus consumpti sunt", where we find Thasius Delo, Ani sacerdotis Apollinis filius; ex eo Delo nullus canis est. The scholia on the Ibis (B, cf. G, C.) give a very similar account, and cite Callimachus as their authority: Sacerdos Apollinis Delii Anius fuit, ad quem cum venisset per noctem filius eius Thasus a canibus laniatus est, unde Delon nullus canis accedit, auctore Callimacho. Cf. Callimachus fr. 664 Pf., and also 188 Pf., wherein Anus is mentioned.

illis: i.e. dogs.

quibus... Delos/... non adeunda: for the prohibition of dogs at Delos cf. Strabo 10.486, οὐκ ἐξεστὶ δὲ ὠδὲ κῦνα ἐν θηλῷ τρέφειν; Plutarch act. Rom. III.

Latonia Delos: the epithet Latonia refers to the legend that Delos, then a moving island, afforded a place of shelter for Latona (the Greek goddess Leto), when she gave birth to the twins Apollo and Diana. Cf. Callimachus Hymn. 4; Vergil Aen. 3.75f.; Servius ad Aen. 3.73 etc. For Latonia Delos cf. Vergil Georg. 3.6.

ante diem: i.e. 'prematurely', 'before the due time'. Cf. Dido's prayer in Aen 4.620 that Aeneas cadat ante diem mediaque inhumatus harena, and her own death at 697: quia nec fato merita nec morte peribat, sed misera ante diem subitoque accensa furore; Porphyr. ad Hor. Ep. 2.2.209, umbras vagantes hominum ante diem mortuorum; Sophocles Ant. 896, πρὶν μοι μοίραν ἐξῆκεν βίον. The per noctem of the scholia is perhaps a misunderstanding of this phrase.

477 quique verecundae speculantem labra Dianae: Actaeon, the son of Antonoe and Aristeus, who was changed into a stag by the goddess Artemis and then torn to pieces by his own hunting dogs, because he had inadvertently seen the goddess bathing in a pool on Mt. Cithaeron. For variants of the myth, see Bömer's introduction to the Actaeon episode in Met. 3.138-252, p.487-488. Note especially Callimachus Hymn 5.111ff., ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄντων δ' ὁ τε δρόμος α' τ' ἐν δρεσσῇ ῥυοῦνται εὐνοί τάμος ἐκαθολία, ἐκ ποτὲ ἄν οὐκ ἔθελον πέρ ἣδ χαρίεται λοετράδι δείσετε. ἀλλ' αὐτῶν τῶν πρὶν ἄνακτα κύνες συντάκτης ὁ τεύτων δεινιοθεύτης; Ovid Met. 3.108-252; Hyginus Fab. 180-181; Apollodorus Bib. 3.4.4. In Tr. 2.105f., Ovid equates his own punishment
for seeing something that he should not have, with that of Actaeon.


478 Crotopiaden... Linum: Linus was the son of Apollo and Psamathe, the daughter of the Argive king Crotopus. Psamathe, fearing the wrath of her father, exposed the baby at its birth and it was subsequently taken in by shepherds. While still a child however, he was killed by dogs, and Crotopus, learning of the story, had his daughter put to death. Apollo in turn sent a plague upon the city of Argos, which was only assuaged after the Delphic oracle advised that Linus and Psamathe be propitiated by singing a dirge in their honour and by killing any dogs found in the square during the ceremony. Cf. Pausanias 1.43.7; Statius *Theb.* 1.570ff.; and Callimachus *Aetia* 1. fr. 26-31 (Pf.). In fr. 28 Callimachus refers to Linus as τὸν... Κροτωπιάδην which Ovid imitates here. The patronymic does not occur elsewhere in extant Latin verse.

479-480 Ovid here refers to the death of Eurydice, wife of the legendary musician Orpheus, after she was bitten by a snake in a Thracian meadow. Orpheus followed her to the underworld and almost succeeded in bringing her back to the upper world, but broke his promise not to look behind him until out of the underworld, and so lost her once again.

venenato... ab angue: Vergil, in *Georg.* 4.454ff., was the first to tell of Eurydice's fatal snakebite, and claimed that it occurred while she was trying to flee from the advances of Aristaeus, a detail not found elsewhere. According to Ovid *Met.* 10.8-10, and Hyginus *Fab.* 14, the incident occurred as she strolled through the meadow with the Naiads. Cf. also Apollodorus *Bib.* 1.3.2, δηχθείσης ἐπὶ δὲ φεσὶ.

senis Oeagri Calliopesque nurus: Eurydice. Cf. Apollodorus 1.3.2, Καλλιόπης μὲν οὖν καὶ Οἰάγρου... Ὀρφεὺς ὁ ἀσκήσας κιβαρφίαν, δὲ ἄδων ἐκίνει λίθους τε καὶ δένδρα. ἀποθανὼν δὲ Εὐρυδίκης, τῆς γυναικὸς ἄντοι... levius: 'more tolerably'; cf. *OLD.* s.v. levis 10.

481-482 puer Hypsipyles: Hypsipyle was the daughter of King Thoas of Lemnos, who secretly saved her father from the massacre committed by the Lemnian women (cf.
Although in Apollonius Rhodius' account she continued to reign after the massacre, a variant tradition (for which cf. Pindar Nem. 8.51ff.; Paus. 8.48.2; Apollodorus Bib. 3.6.4; Hyginus Fab. 74; Statius Theb. 4.739ff.) had her driven off the island by the other women and subsequently sold to the Spartan Lycurgus, king of Nemea. *Puer Hypsipyles* is a misleading expression, which initially appears to refer to a son of Hypsipyle, but in fact refers to the young son of Lycurgus, Opheltes, who became Hypsipyle's charge. One day while she was out with the child, she met the members of the expedition against Thebes, who asked her where they might find some water. She set the child down in order to show them the way and the child was fatally attacked by a serpent. There is a relief of the scene in the Palazzo Spada at Rome; this and other artistic renderings of the myth are collected in Roscher 1.473.

*qui . . . / cuspide suspecti robora fixit equi:* the Trojan priest of Apollo, Laocoon, who tried to warn his fellow Trojans not to take the wooden horse of the Greeks within the city walls, and who, to prove his point, threw a spear at its side. When he later performed a sacrifice to Poseidon, two serpents rose from the sea and attacked his sons. Laocoon tried to save the boys, but was himself fatally overcome by the serpents. The Trojans interpreted the event as a sign of the gods' displeasure at the priest's opposition to the horse and forthwith decided to draw it within the walls. The story of Laocoon is not treated in the Homeric poems; it makes its first appearance in the *Iliupersis* of Arctinus (EGF p.49), where, although he takes no part in the debate concerning the horse, he and one of his sons are killed by serpents at a feast celebrating the apparent withdrawal of the Greek forces. The first extant source to depict him throwing his spear at the horse is Vergil (cf. *Aen.* 2.229 . . . *Laocoontia ferunt, sacrum qui cuspide robur/ laeserit.*) His death was a popular theme in art, the most well-known representation of which is the marble sculpture in the Vatican, found near the Bath of Titus; see Roscher 2,1833ff. For the myth cf. especially Vergil *Aen.* 2.40ff., 199-231; Servius *ad Aen.* 2.201; Hyginus *Fab.* 135; Dion. Hal. 1.48.2.

*483-484 Elpenore:* one of Odysseus' men, who fell headlong to his death from the roof
of Circe's palace, after a surfeit of drink. See especially the account of Odysseus in 
Od. 10.552ff., Ἤλπίνωρ.../ ὃς μοι ἀνεύθ ἐτάρων ἱεροῖς ἐν δόμασι Κίρκης,/
ψύχεος ἰμείρων, κατελέξατο οἶνοβαρείων./ κινυμένων δ’ ἐτάρων ὃμοδον καὶ δούσον
ἀκούσας, ἕξατίνης ἀνόρους καὶ ἐκλάθετο φρεσίν ἤσιν/ ἄψυρον καταβήναι ἰον ἐς
κλίμακα μακρὴν, ἀλλὰ καταντικρὺ τέγεος τέσσεν. ἐκ δὲ οἱ αἰχήη/ ἀστραγάλων
ἐάγη, ψυχή δ’ Ἁιδοσίδε κατῆλθεν; ἤτρ. 3.4.19f. ... miser Elpenor tecto delapsus ab
alto/ occurrit regi debilis umbra suo; Martial 10.82.3f.

vimque...vini: when Odysseus met Elpenor's shade in Hades, the latter confessed
that ἄθεσφατος ὄνος was the cause of his undoing (Od. 11.51ff.). See too Ovid's
description of Elpenor in Met. 14.252, as nimiique Elpenora uini (with Bömer's note).

485-490 Ovid here begins a mini series featuring three exploits of Hercules: the
vanquishing of Thiodamas and the Dryopians, of Cacus, and of Lichas.

485-486 cadas: the verb takes on a different meaning (i.e. 'to perish') from its literal
meaning of 'fall' implicit in the Elpenor couplet.

quisquis.../iuvit inhumanum Thiodamanta Dryops: Thiodamas was the king of
the Dryopes, whom Hercules encountered as he and his son Hyllus passed through the
Dryopian land. Thiodamas was working a plough with a pair of oxen when Hercules
approached and asked him for food for the young Hyllus. Thiodamas refused, and
so Hercules unyoked one of the oxen, killed it, and he and his son ate it. Thiodamas
then collected a band of supporters and attacked Hercules, but was defeated, and his
son, Hylas, was taken by Hercules as a hostage. The scholia on A.R. 1.12.12 state
that the myth was told by Pherecydes, and it is also found in Apollodorus 2,77, and
Callimachus fr.24-5 (Pf.). Note also the latter's Hymn to Diana 160f., wherein he
says of Hercules δὲ οἱ πάρα νηδὺς ἐκεῖνη/ τῇ ποτ’ ἀροτρίωντι σωμήντεο
Θειοδάμαντι. The myth bears some resemblance to that of the Lindian peasant who
cursed Hercules while the hero ate, and indeed Philostratus when recounting the
Lindian myth in Imagines 2.24 calls the ploughman Thiodamas. Cf. the versions of
Apollodorus Bib. 2.5.11 (with Frazer's note); Tzetzes Chil. 2.385ff.

inhumanum: 'heartless'. La Penna aptly cites Cicero Ver. 7.46, Quis tam fuit durus
et ferreus, quis tam inhumanus, qui non illorum miseria commoveretur?

487-488 ferus . . . Cacus: Cacus, a son of Vulcan, was a figure in Roman myth who dwelt in a cave in the area of the Palatine hill, and was said to have stolen some of the cattle of Geryon which Hercules was driving through Italy. When Hercules stopped near the Tiber to rest, Cacus hid some of the grazing cattle in his cave, dragging them backwards by their tails so that Hercules could not follow their tracks. The deception might have worked, had not the cattle lowed when Hercules began to drive off the remaining animals and thus revealed where they were hidden. Hercules then went in pursuit of the animals and slew Cacus in his cave. It would seem that Cacus was originally a benevolent rustic deity of the Palatine of Etruscan origin, whose own cattle were stolen by a guest named Geranes or Recoranus; Cacus became the villain of the story, aided by the false etymology Cacus = Κακός, when the local myth was fused with the Greek myth of the theft of Geryon’s cattle and thereby provided an aetiology for the cult of Hercules at the Ara Maxima. This version of the myth was standard from the time of Ennius on. See Ogilvie on Livy 1.7, Fordyce on Aen. 8.184ff., Williams on Aen. 8.184ff., and J. Fontenrose Python (Berkeley, 1959), pp.339ff. The Scalae Caci from the Palatine to the Circus Maximus, and the Atrium Caci are the legacy of this local hero.

ferus: Vergil describes Cacus as semihominis (Aen. 8.194), and semiferi (8.267), Ovid in Fast. 1.554 as monstrum.

mactatus: Cacus sought in vain to hide within his cave, but was bludgeoned to death by Hercules. Thus Fast. 1.575ff., occupat Alcides, adductaque clava trinodis/ ter quater adverso sedit in ore viri./ ille cadit mixtosque vomit cum sanguine fumos / et lato moriens pectore plangit humum; Livy 1.7.7. In Vergil Aen. 8.224f., however, he is strangled by Hercules.

antro: for descriptions of his cave, adorned with parts of men whom he had slain, cf. Aen. 8.193ff., and Fast. 1.555f.

proditus inclusae . . . ab ore bovis: cf. Aen. 8.215ff., discessu mugire boves atque omne querellis / inpleri nemus et colles clamore relinqui / reddidit una bovum vocem
vastoque sub antro / mugit, et Caci spem custodita fefellit; Fast. 1.560, mugitum rauco furta dedere sono; Livy 1.7.7.

489-490 qui dona tulit Nesseo tincta veneno: Lichas, the servant of Hercules, who was sent by his master to Deianira to fetch a sacrificial tunic in which Hercules could dedicate an altar of thanksgiving to Zeus for his victory over Eurytus. Deianira, fearing that she was losing her husband to the younger Ioile, daughter of Eurytus, dipped the tunic in the poisonous venom given to her by the centaur Nessus as a love philtre (cf. 402 and commentary ad loc.). The unsuspecting Lichas gave the tunic to Hercules and then watched in horror as the tunic began to attack and burn the hero’s body. In his agony Hercules turned on Lichas and hurled him into the Euboean sea. From the myth arose an aetiology for the Lichadian islands near Cenaeum (Strabo 9.426, Ovid Met. 9.226ff.). For Lichas’ role in bringing about Hercules’ death and his own see especially Sophocles Tr. 756ff.; Hyginus Fab. 36; Apollodorus Bib. 2.7.7; Diod. Sic. 4.38.1; and Ovid Met. 9.134ff., with Bomer’s note, which provides a concise history of the events surrounding the death of Hercules. Lichas begins a series of exempla (491-500) of those who either jumped or were pushed to their death.


491-492 An allusion to an Ambracian named Cleombrotus, who was reputed to have leapt to his death from a wall after reading the Phaedo of Plato. Cf. Callimachus Epigram 23 (AP 7.471): εἶτας "ἡλικε, χαίρε" Κλεόμβροτος ὄμβρουκιώτης/ ἦλετ’ ἀφ’ ύψιλου τείχεος εἰς ἁίδην,/ ἄξιον οὔδεν ἱδών θανάτον κακόν, ἀλλὰ Πλάτωνος/ ἐν τῷ περὶ ψυχῆς γράμμ’ ἀναλεξάμενος; Cicero Tusc. 1.84, Callimachi quidem epigramma in Ambriotam Cleombrotum est, quem ait, cum ei nihil accidisset adversi, e muro se in mare abieciesse lecto Platonis libro; Scaur. 4; Nonnus ad Gregorii Nazianzeni stelit. 1. Hist.16; August. C.D. 1.22.
de praecipiti . . . saxo: the sources cited above maintain that Cleombrotus cast himself from a wall, but Ovid's choice of words suggests that Ovid knew a version in which he jumped from a high rock or cliff. Or, is praecipiti . . . saxo metonymy for a high wall?

Tartara: plural, as always in Ovid. Cf. Met. 1.113, 5.371, 10.21, Tr. 1.2.22 etc.

Socraticum de nece . . . opus: a rather curious way of describing the Phaedo (cf. however Cic. Scaur. 4, who calls it librum de morte). It is interesting to note that Plutarch records (Cato. 68) that Cato the Younger read the Phaedo before his suicide.

493-494 ut qui Theseae fallacia vela carinae/vidit: King Aegeus of Athens, Theseus' father, had given instructions that a white sail should be flown on Theseus' ship if he should return home safely from Crete and the Minotaur (cf. 371f., 406, and commentary ad loc.), but a black sail if Theseus were dead. Theseus prevailed over the Minotaur, but forgot to change the colour of the sail, and so Aegeus, when he saw the black sail on the incoming ship, killed himself, in the belief that Theseus was dead. According to Catullus 64.241ff., Apollodorus Epit 1.90, Diodorus 4.66.6f., and Plutarch Thes. 22, Aegeus threw himself from the Acropolis, but Hyginus Fab. 43, and Servius ad Aen. 3.74 say that he threw himself into the sea, which afterwards was called the Aegean in his memory.

Iliaca missus ab arce puer: Astyanax, the son of Hector and Andromache, who was hurled to his death from the Trojan walls by the Greeks, after the capture of Troy. Cf. Ibis 561f. and commentary ad loc., and Met. 13.415ff. (with the comments of Bömer ad loc.), mittitur Astyanax illis de turribus, unde/ pugnantem pro se proavitaque regna tuentem/ saepe videre patrem monstratum a matre soZebat. His death in this fashion was foreshadowed in ll. 24.732-37, when Andromache lamented σὲ θ’ ἀν τέκος ἡ ἔμοι ἑντῆ/ ἔφεσα . . . / . . . ἤ τις Ἀχαιῶν/ ἑψεῖ χειρὸς ἐλών ἄπο τύργου λυγρὸν δλέθρον. The Iliupersis (fr.2 Kinkel) states that it was Odysseus, the Ilias Parva (fr.18 Kinkel) Neoptolemus, who threw him from the battlements, and the disagreement continued among later writers. See H. Kern "Der antike Astyanax Mythus und seine späteren Auswuchse," Philol. 75 (1918), pp.183-201, for the
various traditions concerning the young boy’s death.

**495 nutrix eadem et matertera Bacchi:** Ino, daughter of Cadmus and sister of Semele, who took in and raised the young child Dionysus after Semele’s fiery death (see 469 and commentary *ad loc*). For Ino as Dionysus’ *matertera* cf. *Met.* 3.313ff., *furtim illum* [scil. Bacchum] *primis Ino matertera cunis educat*; *Fast.* 6.523; Seneca *Oed.* 445. Hera in revenge afflicted both Ino and her husband Athamas (cf. 345 and commentary) with madness. In her derangement, Ino plunged her son Melicertes into a cauldron of boiling water, and then leapt with his body into the sea. Forthwith she and her young son were transformed by the gods into divinities of the sea, who guided sailors in storms. Cf. *Met.* 4.416-31, 522-30; *Fast.* 6.485ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 179; and Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.4.2.

**496 cui causa necis serra reperta fuit:** Perdix, the nephew and apprentice of Daedalus, whom Daedalus is said to have thrown from the Acropolis, because he was jealous of his nephew’s invention of the saw, which he constructed either from observation of a snake’s jawbone (so Diodorus Siculus 4.76.4ff., Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.15.8), or from the backbone of a fish (Hyginus *Fab.* 274.14, Ovid *Met.* 8.244ff.). Pliny *Nat.* 7.198 falsely credits Daedalus with the invention. Cf. Hyginus *Fab.* 39, *Daedalus* . . . *Perdicem sororis suae filium propter artificii invidiam, quod is primum serram invenerat, summo tecto deicit*; and Ovid *Met.* 8.236-59.

*serra:* an unpoetical word, found in classical Latin poetry only here, in *Met.* 8.246 (also in connection with Perdix), and in Vergil *Georg.* 1.143.

For a concise summary of the background to the myth, consult Bömer’s introduction to the Perdix episode in *Met.* 8. 236-259, pp.82-84.

**497-498 Once again textual uncertainties render a difficult allusion even more obscure.**

Most of the manuscripts read *lindia*, T and V *lidia*, and Parrhasius *Epist.* 49 suggested *livida*. The most plausible explanation is to retain *lindia* and to infer that the couplet has something to do with the Lindian custom of sacrificing to Hercules with blasphemous words (cf. Callimachus fr. 20f. Pf. The myth was conflated with that of Thiodamas the Dryopian, who likewise refused food to Hercules - cf. *Ibis*
485f. and commentary ad loc.) This would explain *lindia, mala verba*, and, following GÇ, *invicto . . . deo*, since *invictus* was an epithet often applied to Hercules (see below). Thus scholium P makes the connection with the Lindian peasant who cursed Hercules for killing and eating one of the peasant’s oxen when the peasant refused to give him food (cf. Callimachus 22-23 Pf.), and adds that thereafter there was a custom of paying homage to Hercules with curses; when these rites were neglected one year, young women of Lindos threw themselves into the sea. Other scholia, however, (cf. B,C,D) identify the *invictus deus* with Bacchus, and say that the young women cast themselves off the mountain while under the influence of wine: *Lindiae (Lind[di]ae B: Lidie CD) virgines convicia Baccho inferentes nimum potae de monte praecipitae sunt*; Pfeiffer accepts this version, and connects it with Callimachus fr. 778, κούραι πετράων ἱπτον ἐὰν ἱπταν. For titles analogous to *invictus deus* applied to Bacchus, cf. Euripides *Ba.* 1001 ἄνικατον, Vergil *Aen.* 6.804; and Ovid *Ex P.* 4.8.61, *victor*. Parrhasius, in suggesting *livida*, referred the allusion to the myth of the sisters Aglaurus, Herse and Pandrosus, who were given custody of the chest containing Erichthonius by Athena. The myth has many variants, but one recurring version has Herse and Aglaurus (Pausanias 1.18.2, Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.14.6) or all three sisters (Euripides *Ion* 273, Hyginus *Fab.* 166) open the chest, whereupon they are driven mad, and cast themselves from the Acropolis. It is difficult to see an allusion to this myth in Ovid’s pentameter, however, in *Met.* 2.822ff., Ovid presents yet another version of it, according to which Aglaurus alone peeks into the forbidden chest, and in return Athena sends Invidia to torment the girl. Hence Aglaurus is consumed with envy for her sister Herse’s happiness, and her affair with Mercury. When the god appeals to her for her aid in seeing Herse, she tries to thwart him by refusing to move from the threshold, and is thereupon turned into a lifeless statue by the god. It is possible, although still not entirely a satisfactory explanation, that Ovid conflated his version of Aglaurus and her fate, with the tradition cited above of the sisters leaping to their death. For *lividus* used in the sense of envious, cf. Cicero *Tusc.* 4.12.28, *invidi et malevoli et lividi*; Horace *Epod* 2.1.89, *Sat.* 1.4.93; Martial
1.40.2 etc.

inviso . . . deo: if this reading is retained, the god must be *invisus* in the eyes of the *livida* or *lindia puella*. Preferable, in my opinion, is the reading *invictus*, as an epithet of Hercules, analogous to the Greek *καλλινικος*. For *invictus* so used, see Bömer on *Fast.* 1.562, and G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, Monaco 1912, pp.272ff.

499-500 The couplet refers to the death of Phalaecus (conjectured from the muddled readings of the MSS), an Ambracian tyrant who was torn to pieces by a lioness when he captured its cub. It is worth noting how Ovid maintains suspense in this *exemplum*, for no clue is given to the identity of the victim until *Phalaecaeae*, and not until *causa leaena necis* is the manner of his death revealed.

**patrio popularis in arvo**: initially the phrase seems mere padding, but it perhaps also serves as a subtle reminder of the reaction of the Ambracians to his death; they rejoiced at their unexpected liberation and erected a statue in honour of Artemis, whom they credited with their release. See the account of Antoninus Liberalis in *Met.* 4.5: ὁτε Φάλαικος ἐτυράννευε τῆς πόλεως, οὐδὲνδός αὐτῶν δυναμένου κατὰ δέος ἀναλεῖν, αὐτῇ [scil. Ἀρτεμίς] κυνηγετοῦντι τῷ Φαλαίκῳ προφῆναι σκύμνον λεόντος, ἀναλαβόντος δὲ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας ἐκδραμεῖν ἐκ τῆς ὕλης τὴν μητέρα καὶ προσπέσσαν ἀναρρήξκε τὰ στέρνα τοῦ Φαλαίκου, τοὺς δ’ Ἀμβρακίωτας ἐκφυγόντας τὴν δουλείαν Ἀρτεμίν Ἡγεμόνην ἱλάσασθαι καὶ ποιησομένους Ἀγροτέρης εἰκάσμα παραστήσασθαι χάλκεον ἀντὶ θῆρα.

501-502 Three instances of men killed by a wild boar.

**Lycurgiden**: the patronymic here designates Ancaeus, the son of Lycurgos (cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.9.2, Pausanias 8.4.10), an Argonaut who was killed in the Calydonian Boar hunt, when he rashly attacked the boar. Cf. Ovid *Met.* 8.315-407; Hyginus *Fab.* 173; Apollodorus *Bib.* 1.8.2. etc.


**arbore naturae**: Adonis, born from a myrrh tree into which his mother had been
transformed after an incestuous affair with her father. Cf. Hyginus *Fab.* 58.3, *cui Venus postea miserata est et in speciem arboris eam commutavit, unde myrrha fluit, ex qua natus est Adonis.* . . . (for Myrrha cf. 360 and commentary *ad loc.*). Adonis, the beloved of Aphrodite, was killed by a boar while out hunting. See Ovid's account in *Met.* 10.503ff., and the brief allusion in *Am.* 3.9.15f.; Bion *Id.* 1; Hyginus *Fab.* 58.248; Propertius 3.4.53ff.; and Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.14.4.

**Idmonaque audacem:** Idmon, as his name implies, was a seer, the son of Apollo and Astaria (or Cyrene), who sailed with the Argonauts. When they arrived in the land of the Mariandynians, he was attacked and killed by a boar lurking by the water. Cf. Apollonius Rhodius 1.139ff., 2.815-850; Apollodorus *Bib.* 1.9.23; Hyginus *Fab.* 18; V. Fl. 5.1.ff. *Audacem* is perhaps a tribute to his bravery for sailing with the Argonauts, when he knew by his gift of prophecy that he would die on the trip (Hyginus *Fab.* 14.26, Apollonius Rhodius 1.139ff.).

**503-504 examinis faciat . . . vulnus:** this mini-series featuring people dispatched by boars culminates with an *exemplum* of a man killed not by a live boar, but by a dead, and therefore seemingly harmless, one. The couplet refers to a hunter who offended Artemis by dedicating the head of the boar he had killed to himself, not to the goddess. He hung the head on a tree and went to sleep underneath it; as he slept, the head fell and killed him. Callimachus told the story in *Aetia* fr. 96Pf. and it is commented upon by the Callimachean *Diegesis* 3.34ff.: *θεοί πάντες κομποίς νεμεσήμονες, ἐκ δὲ τε πάντων Κυνηγός ἀλώος ἐλών κάπρον ἐπεῖπεν ὅδεν Ἀρτεμίδι ἀνατιθέναι τοὺς ἡγομένους ἐκείνης καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἀνήρτησε τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ ὤς ἐὰς αἰγείρου, ὡς ἡ καθυπνώσας ἐπιπεσοῦσας ἀντῶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀπέθανεν.* See too the account of Diodorus Siculus 4.22.

**ora:** plural for singular. For *os* in the extended sense of 'head', cf. *OLD.* s.v. 7. *fixi . . . suis:* i.e. hanging from the tree.

**505-506** Although there is general consensus among scholiasts and later scholars alike that Attis (whose emasculation was described at 455) is the subject of this couplet, the precise point of the *exemplum* remains difficult to explain satisfactorily; corruption is
certainly a possibility. Attis was indeed generally acknowledged to be Phrygian (see, for example Ovid himself, *Fast.* 4.223, Statius *Theb.* 10.170, Martial 8.46 etc), and 'Berecyntian' was an epithet closely associated with Cybele and her rites, from Mount Berecyntus in Phrygia (cf. Vergil *Aen.* 6.784 *Berecynthia mater,* 9.82 *ipsa deum genetrix Berecynthia,* 9.619f., *Fast.* 4.181, and note also the mocking comment of Persius 1.93, *cludere sic versum didicit: Berecyntius Attis*). A major stumbling block, however, is the apparent clue, *simili pinus quem morte peremit.* Attis was known to have castrated himself under a pine tree, and according to some reports, to have died there as a result of the castration (cf. Servius *ad Aen.* 9.114; Arnobus *adv. nat* 5.7). Furthermore, in the *Metamorphoses* 10.103-5, Attis is transformed into a pine tree, while the importance of the pine in Attis' cult is demonstrated by the annual ceremony on the 22nd of March, *Arbor intrat,* in the course of which a pine was taken in procession to the temple of Cybele on the Palatine. But one would expect *simili morte* to refer to the manner of death in the previous couplet, wherein a hunter was killed by a boar's head falling upon him from a pine tree. Hence the implication is that this victim perished either from something hanging from the tree which fell upon him, or from the actual tree falling. Scholium b suggests that it was the fall of a pine cone which caused Attis' death (although it seems unlikely that a pine cone could strike a fatal blow!), and in connexion with this, scholium Vc cites Martial 13.25, *poma sumus Cybeles; procul hinc discede viator,/ ne cadat in miserum nostra ruina caput.* La Penna thus suggests that Martial might be alluding to an alternate tradition regarding Attis' fate, with which Ovid was familiar and according to which Attis perished because of the pine tree. It is certainly a more attractive solution than Ellis' proposal that two different people are being alluded to in the couplet, the Phrygian Marsyas, who was flayed alive on a pine tree (and whose death is chronicled at *Ibis* 549f.) and Attis, who castrated himself under the pine. However, if we are to understand the point of *pinus* as being simply the locale where the incident took place, the couplet could be taken more generally with the context of the preceding three couplets, and mean that a boar, alive or dead, was the cause of death. There were
certainly variants of the Attis legends which told of Zeus' anger at Attis' association with Cybele and his consequent dispatch of a boar which killed Attis (cf. Pausanias 7.17, Scholia ad Nic. Alex. 8), while Herodotus (1.34-5) told of Atys, son of Croesus, who was killed during a boar hunt by a missed throw. There are obvious associations with both boars and pine trees in the Attis legends, but their exact implications for this couplet remain unclear.

**Berecynthiades:** a form which occurs only here, and is remarkable for being a very rare six syllable pentameter ending. D.S. Raven, *Roman Metre*, p.107 comments that "by the time of Ovid the disyllabic pentameter ending was established, and this poet observed it with depressing rigidity . . . nearly all the 'irregular' closes are found in Ovid's later poems (Tristia and Ex Ponto): the Ars Amatoria shows no exception to the disyllable rule in 1165 pentametres, and the Fasti only two exceptions in nearly 2500 pentametres". Other examples of a six-syllable close are to be found in Martial 5.50.2, *inimicitiae*, and Ausonius 19.43.8, *Lacedemonius*.

507-508 According to the scholia, after Minos' death in Sicily (for which see *Ibis* 287f. and commentary ad loc.) the Cretans tried to return home with his remains, but when they landed at Corcyra they were attacked by the Corcyreans, who took the remains of Minos. In retaliation the Cretans henceforth killed any Corcyreans who landed on their island. Thus scholium Z (cf. B,G,C) states *Perempto rege Minoe a Cecalo, Cretenses, asportantes cineres eius, per Corcyram venerunt; ubi ab incolis vexati sunt et omnes <cineres> dispersi. Unde statuum est quod, siquis de Corcyra veniret in Cretam, suspenderetur*. Unfortunately, there is no other extant account of this incident; see further the note of La Penna ad loc., p.133.

**Minoas:** cf. *Her.* 6.114 *Minoo nata thoante feror*; *Fast* 3.81. As Ellis points out, the adjective is very appropriate here, since it means both 'belonging to Minos', and 'Cretan.' (Cf. *OLD* s.v.)

509-510 Although there are some as yet unresolved difficulties, the couplet clearly alludes to the famous story concerning the poet Simonides and the collapse of the house in which he was dining. During the meal, Simonides was called out of the
house by two young men who were asking for him; when he went out, Simonides saw no one there, but at that moment the house collapsed, killing all those inside. The two youths credited with saving the poet's life were the divine twins, Castor and Pollux, whom he had honoured in song. Cf. Cicero Orat. 2.86: *Dicunt enim cum cenaret Crannone in Thessalia Simonides apud Scopam fortunatum hominem et nobilem cenisse quem id carmen quod in eum scripsisset, in quo multa ornandi causa poetarum more in Castorem scripta et Pollucemuisse, nimirum ueste Simonidi dixisse se dimidium eius ei quod pactus fuerit pro illo carmine daturum: reliquum a suis Tyndaridis quos aeque laudasset peteret si ei videretur. Paulo post esse ferunt nuntiatun Simonidi ut prodiret: iuvenes stare ad ianuam duos quosdam qui eum magnopere evocarent; surrexisse illum, prodisse, vidisse neminem; hoc interim spatio conclave illud ubi pularetur Scopas concidisse; ea ruina ipsum cum cognatis oppressum suis interiisse . . .*; V. Max. 1.8.ext.7; Quintilian Inst. 11.2; and Phaedrus 4.25. Cf also Callimachus Aetia fr.64 11.ff. (Pf.), ovd’ υμέας, Πολύδευκες, υπέτρεσσην, ου με μελάθρου/ μέλλοντος πάπτειν  ἐκτὸς ἑβεσθε κοτε/ δαυτύμων ακτο/ μοῦνον, δε Κρασάνοις αἰσι/ ὠλισθεν μεγάλους ὁκιος ἐπι Σκοπάδας.

*sanguis Aleuae:* an allusion to Scopas is commonly understood here, although the Scopadae were said to be from Crannon, the rival Aleuadae from Larissa. (Cf. the discussion in *RE* s.v. 'Scopadai', Perrotta, p.190). Scopas is indeed the one figure consistently mentioned as being killed at the dinner, but Quintilian (Inst. 11.2.14) gives a valuable indication of the fluidity of the story: *Est autem magna inter auctores dissensio, Glaucone Carystio an Leocrati an Agatharche an Scopae scriptum sit id carmen, et Pharsali fuerit haec domus, ut ipse quodam loco significare Simonides videtur urque Apollodorus et Eratosthenes et Euphorion et Larissaeus Eurypyle tradiderunt, an Crannone, ut Apollas † Callimachus †, quem secutus Cicero hanc famam latius fudit.* It is possible, therefore, that Ovid was here following a tradition in which a member of the Aleuadae figured, in which case part of the riddle would lie in Scopas not being the banqueter mentioned.

*stella . . . aequa:* a bone of contention. Ellis understood *stella* as an allusion to the
stella Dioscurorum, for the twins were frequently associated with stars in antiquity, in which form they were widely believed to aid men in the perils of war, and at sea (cf. Bömer on *Fast.* 5.694, Nisbet & Hubbard on Horace *Od.* 1.12.28). A reference to the Dioscuri is not essential however, nor is it easy to see in the lone *stella.* Housman, moreover, (CQ 9 1915, pp.32f.) objected that a star associated with saving seamen, and which had never come anywhere near Crannon or Pharsalus, had no place in this couplet. He therefore proposed emending *viro,* which he found unsatisfactory, to *lovis,* and thereby understood an allusion to the *Stella lovis,* a benevolent and protecting constellation (cf. Horace *Od.* 2.17.22ff., Cicero *Rep.* 6.17.17; further citations in La Penna *ad loc.*). Owen (CQ 8 1914, p.257), while retaining the reading of the MSS, likewise objected to the star being that of the Dioscuri, and proposed instead that it was Simonides' natal star, "the star of his good fortune which rose above the horizon at his birth". In support of this interpretation, La Penna adduces the parallels of *Tr.* 5.10.45ff., *O durum Lachesin, quae tam grave sidus habentii/ fila dedit vitae non breviora meae!;* Her. 8.88; Propertius 1.5.36 etc. Yet another possibility might be to understand *stella . . . aequa* as an astrological reference (cf. Am. 1.8.29f.), meaning simply 'when Simonides was lucky'.

**Leoprepidae . . . viro:** for the patronymic referring to Simonides cf. Simonides himself, fr. 77.6 D, παιδί Λεωπρεπες, Herodotus 7.228, and Callimachus fr. 64.8 (Pf.). Housman (cited *supra*) disapproved of *viro* in conjunction with the patronymic, but Owen notes (also cited *supra*) a similarly emphatic use of *vir* in Lucretius 3.371, *Democriti quod sancta viri sententia ponit,* while in the *Ibis* itself, at 543, we find a patronymic with a noun in opposition, *puer Harpagides.*

511-512 Two kings, Evenus of Aetolia, and Tiberinus of Alba Longa, who drowned in rivers which afterwards bore their name.

**Evenus:** usually said to be the son of Ares, Evenus threw himself into the river then called the Lycormas, after his daughter Marpessa was carried off by Idas, a cousin of the Dioscuri, and described by Homer as the 'mightiest of men then on earth' (*Il.* 9.557ff.). Evenus tried to catch up with Idas, but finding the pursuit futile, he
drowned himself in grief. For the myth cf. the account of the scholiast on Il. 9.557, "Ἰδας ὁ Ἀφαρέως μὲν παῖς κατ' ἐπίκλησιν, γονὸς δὲ Ποσειδώνος, Λακεδαιμόνιος δὲ τὸ γένος, ἐπιθυμήσας γάμον παραγίνεται εἰς’ Ὀρτυγίαν τὴν ἐν τῇ Χαλκίδῃ καὶ ἐντεύθεν ἀρπάξει τὴν Εὐνύῳ θυγατέρα Μάρτησσαν. Ἔχων δὲ ἵππους Ποσειδώνος ἠπείγετο. ὁ δὲ Εὐνύος εἰς ἐπιζήτησιν ἔξηλθε τῆς θυγατρὸς, ἔλθὼν δὲ κατὰ τὸν Δυκόριαν ποταμὸν τῆς Αἰτωλίας, μὴ καταλαβὼν, ἕαυτὸν εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν καθήκεν. ὅτεν ὁ Δυκόριας Ἑυνύος μετωνομάσθη . . . οὕτως δὴ Σιμωνίδης τὴν ἱστορίαν περιείρασσαν; Apollodorus Bib. 1.7.7; Plutarch Parall. 40a (who cites Dositheus’ Aetolian History as his source); Pseud. Plutarch de Fluv. 8.1; Hyginus Fab. 242.1.

rapidae . . . aquae: the phrase applies equally to the Evenus and the Tiber; it is similarly applied to the Evenus in Met. 9.104.

Tiberinus: according to the most well-known version of the myths associated with the Tiber river, and the one followed by Ovid, the river’s early name of Albula was replaced by Tiberinus after an Alban king of that name was drowned in its waters (so Ovid Fast. 2.389ff., 4.47-8, Met. 14.614-16; Livy 1.3.8; Dionysus Halicarnassus 1.71.2). For variants on the myth see especially Varro L. 5.30, Servius ad Aen. 8.72,330; Ogilvie on Livy 1.3.8, Bömer on Fast. 2.389,4.47, and RE s.v. 6. 787, 51ff.

513-514 Astacidae: with this patronymic, Ovid refers to Melanippus, the son of Astacus (cf. Apollodorus 3.6. Μελάνιππος δὲ ὁ λοιπὸς τῶν Ἀστακοῦ παῖδων), who fought with the Thebans against the expedition of the Seven. After he had fatally wounded Tydeus, Melanippus was himself slain by Amphiaraurus, and his head was presented to Tydeus (cf. Ibis 425f. and commentary ad loc.). The only other Latin poet to use the patronymic Astacides for Melanippus was Statius, when referring to the same gruesome incident: cf. Theb. 8.718 Astacides Melanippus erat, 8.725, 8.746. The myth served as a model for Dante’s portrayal of Count Ugolino eating his foe’s head (Infern. 32.125ff.).

decisa cadavere trunco: cf. Sil. 13.486 suffixa cadavera truncis. It is noteworthy that Ovid here uses cadaver, a relatively rare word in Latin high poetry, which
Tarrant in his commentary to *Thyestes* 724 notes "is a more highly charged word than *corpus*, carrying a stronger sense of the physical realities of death". Ovid himself uses *cadaver* a total of only four times in his poetry, three of which occur in the *Ibis* (166,336,513, and in *Met.* 7.602), while Vergil uses it but twice (*Georg.* 3.557, *Aen.* 8.264), and Tibullus and Propertius not at all. See the comments of B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter* (Lund 1945), p.49: "So hatte in klassischer Zeit das wort *cadaver*, das gern von der Leiche eines gemeinen oder verachteten Menschen gebraucht wurde, einen üblen Nebenklang, der es für die hohe Dichtung ungeeignet machte; statt dessen gebrauchte man *corpus* (Norden zu *Aen.* 6.149), daneben auch *mors, funus* u.A. (Rothstein zu Prop. 1.17.8). Untersuchen wir das Vorkommen des fraglichen Ausdrucks bei Ovid, so finden wir, dass von den nur vier Belegen die drei auf das Schmahgedicht *Ibis* entfallen, was gar kein Zufall ist: in seinen drastischen Verwünschungen des Todfeindes wählt der Dichter mit Vorbedacht ein wegwerfendes Wort, das er in seiner ganzen sonstigen Dichtung nur einmal benutzte . . .".

**decisa:** transferred from *caput* to *esca*. The alternate readings of the MSS., *defixa* and *cadavera*, are retained by La Penna and Ellis, who envision the headless body fixed to the ground with a spear. See further the note of Ellis *ad loc.*, p.149, and of La Penna, p.135-6.

**digna feris . . . esca:** i.e. such as wild beasts might eat; it is not surprising that beasts would eat human remains, but it is unthinkable that a fellow human-being should do so.

**515-516 Brotean:** numerous candidates have been proposed to explain this allusion. Ellis, following the interpretation of Leopardus *Emendat.* 1.10, explained *Brotean* as a Cyprian corruption of *Biothean*, and hence understood the couplet as an allusion to the death of Biothea, wife of Nicocles or Nicocreon, a Cyprian king; after Ptolemy I had compelled Nicocreon to commit suicide, Biothea and other members of Nicocreon's family shut themselves up in their home, and started a fire, onto which they threw themselves. Cf. Diodorus Siculus 20.21; Polyaenus 8.48. Other possibilities discussed by Ellis (see *Excursus*, pp.183-185) include: reading *Prothean*
instead of *Brotean*, and thus understanding a reference to Peregrinus Proteus, a cynic philosopher who burned himself to death (cf. Lucian *de Peregrini morte*); Timanthes Cleonaeus who threw himself onto a burning pyre; or Hercules Brutius, who is sometimes represented holding a thunderbolt, and hence might be called βροταίος. The scholia on the *Ibis* explain that Brotea was a poet who flung himself on a fire (cf. scholium B), or a son of Jupiter (or, according to the *Calderini Commentarius*, of Vulcan), who threw himself onto the flames either because of his wickedness, or his ugliness. The most plausible candidate, in my view, is that advanced by Frazer in his note on *Apollodorus* *Epit.* 2.2, and subsequently adopted by La Penna and André, namely an allusion to the Brotean mentioned by Apollodorus, *Epit.* 2.2, a hunter who was driven mad by the goddess Artemis when he failed to honour her, and in his madness threw himself onto a fire.

**517-518** With this couplet, Ovid begins a short catalogue (517-524, 527-530) of Greek authors who met an unfortunate end. He opens with an allusion to the historian Callisthenes, born c. 360 B.C., who, in addition to his *Hellenica* and *History of the Sacred War*, wrote an unfinished *History of Alexander the Great*. He was a relative and former pupil of Aristotle, who is said to have praised his rhetorical ability, but bemoaned his lack of common sense (Plut. *Alex.* 54, Diogenes Laertes 5.5). As a member of Alexander's retinue, Callisthenes fell out of favour with Alexander when he refused to perform proskynesis (cf. Arrian 4.10.5-12; Plut. *Alex* 54.3-6; Justin 12.7.1-3; V.Max. 7.2. ext 11 etc.). When the conspiracy of pages against Alexander was discovered shortly thereafter, Alexander was quite ready to believe that Callisthenes was involved in the plot. Thus Arrian (4.14.1) reported that while Aristobulus and Ptolemy said that the pages named Callisthenes in the plot when they were interrogated, he added that "most authorities do not say so; but only that by reason of Alexander's dislike for Callisthenes . . . he easily believed the worst about him."

**inclususque necem cavea patiaris:** guilty or not, Callisthenes was put to death in 328/7 B.C., although there are great variations regarding the nature of his
punishment. Ovid here shows his familiarity with the tradition that Callisthenes was shut up in a cage, a punishment which is given in gruesome detail by Justin 15. 3.3-6: *Quippe cum Alexander Magnus Callisthenen philosophum propter salutationis Persicae interpellatum morem insidiarum, quae sibi paratae fuerant, conscium fuisse iratus finxisset eumque truncatis crudeler omnibus membris abscessisque auribus ac naso labiisque deforme ac miserandum spectaculum reddidisset, insuper in cavea cum cane clausum ad metum ceterorum circumferretr: tunc Lysimachus, audire Callisthenen et praecepta ab eo virtutis accipere solitus, miseratus tanti viri non culpae, sed libertatis poenas pendentis, venenum ei in remedia calamitatum dedit.* Diogenes Laertes also reported that Callisthenes was confined to a cage, but adds that after he was infested with vermin he was thrown to a lion and so met his end (5.5). A different story is told by Plutarch (*Alex* 55.9) and Arrian (4.13.3), who say that Callisthenes was either hung immediately, or carried in fetters with the army for seven months, until he died of disease. For useful studies of Callisthenes and his downfall consult L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*, Stamford, 1960; J.R. Hamilton *Plutarch’s Alexander, A Commentary*, p.147ff., and *RE* 10.2 pp.1674-1702.

**non profecturae conditor historiae:** the phrase presumably refers to Callisthenes’ unfinished (and perhaps by implication adulatory) *History of Alexander.* With this pentameter consisting of only four words and ending in a rare four syllable close, compare Tr.2.415f., *Eubius impurae conditor historiae,* and the epigram quoted by Quintilian (*Inst.Or.* 8.3.29) about Sallust, *et verba antiqui multum furate Catonis/ Crispe, Iugurthinae conditor historiae.* Ovid was fond of the phrase *non profectura:* cf. *Met.* 6.261f., *ultimus Ilioneus non profectura precando/ bracchia sustulerat.* . . ; *Met* 13.411, *non profecturas tendebat ad aethera palmas; Nux* 158 etc.

**519-520 repertori . . . pugnacis iambi:** the word ἱαμβος first appears in the poetry of Archilochus of Paros (cf. fr.215 West) and although he may not have been the first to write satirical verse in iambic metre (see Aristotle *Poet.* 4), he was recognized as the one who moulded the verse form into his own distinctive weapon of abuse. Cf. Horace *Ars* 79 *Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo,* and Acron *ad loc.*
Archilochus iambicum metrum primus invenit; Epod 6.11ff.; Epist. 1.19.30-1; and commentary to Ibis 51f. Ovid here implies that Archilochus' wayward tongue (lingua proterva) led to his death, while the scholia on the Ibis report variously that he was exiled for his wayward speech (so B,C,b), killed by enemies whom he had attacked in his verse (G1), or committed suicide (G). No mention is made of the traditional story that Archilochus was killed in battle in approximately 640 B.C. by the Naxian Calondas (for which, see the ancient testimonia collected in F. Lasserre and A. Bonnard, Archiloque Fragments Paris, 1958, CVII Nr.14a,b).

Pugnacis: for pugnax used to describe an aggressive style of writing cf. Pliny Ep. 7.9.7 pugnacem et quasi bellatorium stilum, and further citations are to be found in OLD s.v. 'pugnax'.

Sit in exitium: for the final construction of in exitium, cf. Tibullus 1.5.48; Ovid, Am. 1.1.22 with McKeown's note; and Met. 7.406 with Bömer's note. As in the latter, exitium is the virtual equivalent of mors. The ability of exitium to mean both a 'departure', and 'death' may account for the divergent explanations of the scholia.

Lingua proterva: cf. the parallel cited by La Penna in CLE 883.2. cedat et in nostris lingua proterva locis. See further RE s.v. (2,495) and Suppl. XI, and Müller "Die Archilochoslegende" Rh. Mus. 128 (1985) pp.99-151, esp. 141f., for the variant traditions surrounding Archilochus.

521-522 Parum stabili . . . carmine: almost certainly an allusion to Hipponax (cf. also 445f. and commentary ad loc.); as Archilochus was heralded in the preceding couplet as the inventor of iambic poetry, there is a logical progression to the man who made the 'limping' (scazon or coliams) iambic his trademark, so-called because, since it ends with a spondee, "the three long final syllables produce a dragging, breaking effect" (M. West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus, New York 1974, pp.28-31). For the pairing of Archilochus and Hipponax in ancient references, cf. Cicero, N.D. 3.91, Horace Epod. 6.11ff., Lucian Pseud. 2 etc. For the close association of Hipponax and the scazon, cf., for example, Callimachus Iamb. fr.203.13f., AP 7.405.6; further citations may be found in La Penna ad loc.
Athenas: more appropriate is the reading Athenin, which the humanist scholars Alciatus (παρ. iur 5.18) and Turnebus (Adv. 9.25) proposed, and which has been adapted by La Penna, for the sculptors Athenis and Bupalus were well-known victims of Hipponax’s vitriol (see commentary on 445f., and R. Rosen, "Hipponax and his Enemies in Ovid’s Ibis," CQ 38 1988: 291-6). Athenis is mentioned in fr.70.11 of Hipponax, and possibly fr.1. Ellis, in his commentary ad loc., rejected the identification with Hipponax, on the grounds that the manuscripts read Athenas, and because there was no ancient evidence that Hipponax died of hunger, which is the point of the pentameter (although noting that Hipponax did complain frequently of poverty - cf. fr.17 and 19). Instead, he suggested three candidates who might be said to have harmed Athens with their verse: 1) Eubius Parius, who wrote four books of parodies (cf. the comment of Athenaeus 698, οὐτός ἡστιν ὁ καὶ Ἡθοναίως λοιδορησάμενος, καὶ σώζεται αὐτοῦ τῶν ποιημάτων βιβλία τέσσαρα), but about whose death we know nothing; 2 Menippus, who, according to Diogenes Laertes 6.8.100, hung himself because of his poverty; 3) Diagorus Melius, a philosopher and poet (cf. Suidas s.v., Diodorus 13.6.7, further citations in La Penna), who denounced the Eleusinian mysteries and went into exile, although again nothing is recorded about his dying from starvation.

523-524 lyrae vates . . . severae: yet another uncertain allusion. La Penna argues convincingly that, as Archilochus and Hipponax were closely associated with the invention of a particular genre or style of poetry in the preceding two exempla, this couplet should likewise concern a historical figure responsible for the development of lyric poetry in an elevated, serious style. He thus proposes Stesichorus as the lyrae vates . . . severae, noting, among others, Horace’s depiction of Stesichorus’ style as Stesichorique graves Camenae (Od. 4.9.8); Pliny Nat. 2.12, Stesichori et Pindari vatum sublimia ora; and the judgement of Quintilian Inst. 10.1.62, Stesichorum, quam sit ingenio validus, materiae quoque ostendent, maxima bella et clarissimos canentem duces et epici carmen onera lyra sustinentem. However, as West discusses (CQ 21 (1971), p.305), Cicero was familiar with a tradition that Stesichorus died an old man
(Sen. 23; cf. Ver. 2.2.87); while this need not exclude the possibility that he died in a manner consonant with the breaking of faith in the Ovidian couplet, there is no extant tradition to support it. The poet Hesiod, on the other hand, did have associations with such an end, and thus has been broached as a possible candidate by André; he was said to have been murdered by his hosts at Locris because they suspected he had seduced their sister (cf. AP 7.55, Certamen 13-14). According to one version of the story (cf. Aristotle fr. 565), the child born from the union was Stesichorus. Less plausible are a number of other candidates who have been put forward. Ellis suggested that the couplet was an allusion to the lyric poet Timocreon, who accused his friend Themistocles of being bribed to thwart his return to his home in Rhodes (cf. Plutarch Them. 21.3ff.; Suidas s.v. Timocreon); alternatively, in his Excursus Ellis suggested the mythical poet Linus as a candidate, who was killed by Hercules, while tutoring him in music (cf. Diodorus 3.67). Scholium G, interpreting dextera laesa in its literal sense, explained the allusion of Orpheus, whose hand was cut off by the priests of Bacchus; enraged because he could thus no longer play the cithera, Orpheus attacked the priests, and was killed by them. (Cf. Rostagni, p.118, for his support of this identification.)

dextera laesa: for the right hand as a pledge of good faith, cf. Cicero Phil. 2.5, dextraeque fidei testes esse solebant; Vergil Aen. 4.597; Livy 1.58.7; Ovid Met. 14.297, with Bömer’s note ad loc.

525-526 For the legend that Orestes died from a snake bite in Arcadia, cf. Apollodorus Epit 6.28, δηχθεὶς ὑπὸ δέφως ἐν ὶ Ὄρεστεῖῳ τῆς Ἀρκαδίας βυῆσει; the scholiast on Euripides Or. 1645, who cites Asclepiades as his authority; and Tzetzes ad Lyc. Alex. 1374.

Agamemnonio . . . Orestae: for the use of the possessive adjective Agamemnonius instead of the patronymic compare Vergil Aen. 4.471, Agamemnonius . . . Orestes, and the further examples collected by Pease ad loc., including τὸν ρ' ᾿Αγαμεμνονίδης τηλεκλυτός ἐκταν' ᾿Ορέστης (Homer Od. 1.30); ᾿Αγαμεμνόνιος κέλωρ (Eurip. Andr. 1034), and ᾿Αγαμεμνόνιος παῖς (Euripid Or. 838). The form
Orestae is found only in manuscripts B and ζ; the predominant reading is Oresti. Both forms are found elsewhere in Ovid's poetry - in Ex P. 2.3.45 we find insano . . . Orestae, in Her. 8.59 Oresti.

de morsu virus habente: cf. Tr. 4.1.84 telo virus habente perit; Ex P. 4.6.34 verba velut tinctu singula virus habent.

527-528 The story of Eupolis and his bride Lycainion, who perished on their wedding night when the ceiling fell upon them, is briefly told in AP 7.298, Αἰαῖ, τούτο κάκιστον δὲαν κλαίσω τανόντα/ νυμφίον ἦ νυμφήν/ ἡνίκα δ' ἀμφοτέρους,/ Εὔπολιν ὡς ἀγαθήν τε Δυκαίνου, ἣν ὑμέναιον/ ἔσβεσθαν ἐν πρώτῃ νυκτὶ πεισῶν θαλαμος; a similar incident is recounted in AP 9.422. In this mini-catalogue of literary figures and figures like Orestes who frequently are found in literature, Ovid may have been thinking of a link with the playwright Eupolis (who perished by drowning; cf. 589f. and commentary ad loc.), or the fact that this Eupolis and his wife appeared in epigram, and presumably elsewhere in literature too, may have prompted their inclusion here.

novissima: 'the last'; cf. OLD s.v. novissimus 3; Ovid Met. 4.156, 11.757.

529-530 coturnatum . . . Lycophrona: the Hellenistic tragedian Lycophron from Chalcis in Euboea, who was born in approximately 330-325 B.C., was a prolific writer and member of Ptolemy Philadelphus' 'Tragic Pleiad.' According to the Byzantine scholar Tzetzes, Lycophron wrote 46 or 64 tragedies, twenty titles of which are listed by Suidas, but only fragments have survived, apart from his Alexandra. Ovid here suggests a tradition (narrant) that Lycophron was killed by an arrow, although no other ancient writer refers to the tragedian's death. See, however, the comment of scholium S3: Lycophron tragicus poeta, licet eius tragoediae non extant, scripsit etiam de oraculis versu opus a paucissimis intellectum. Hic, quom in tragoediis multos lacerasset nominatim, per urbem eundo sagittae exceptus est, quae ad intima usque praecordia penetravit fiditque medium cor. For coturnatum cf. Ovid Am. 2.18.18, 1.15.15 (Sophocleo . . . cothurno) with the note of McKeown, and Ibis 595, where the adjective is applied to Euripides. For further information on
Lycophron, see RE 2316ff., esp. 2319.

fibris: ‘entrails’.

531-532 aut lacer in Silva manibus spargere tuorum;/ sparsus ut est Thebis angue creatus avo: an allusion to one of the most famous myths of the Theban cycle, the tearing apart of Pentheus by his mother Agave and the other Bacchantes, after Pentheus had tried to prevent the worship of his cousin, Dionysus. The Theban women were celebrating the god’s mysteries on the mountainside when they saw Pentheus spying on them from the heights of a tree; afflicted with madness by Dionysus, the women toppled the tree, and tore Pentheus to pieces with their hands. See especially the account of Euripides in Bacchae 1125ff.; Pausanias 2.2.7; Apollodorus Bib. 3.4.1, 3.5.2; Hyginus Fab. 184; and Ovid Met. 3.511ff. with Bömer’s note. Ovid also makes a passing reference to the myth in Fast. 3.721, and Tr. 5.3.40. For representations of the myth in art, including the well-known scene in the house of the Vettii at Pompeii, consult Roscher 3.2, 1931ff.

lacer in Silva ... spargere: cf. the prophecy of Tiresias to Pentheus in Met. 3.521ff., (Liber) quem nisi templorum fueris dignatus honore, /mille lacer spargere locis et sanguine silvas / foedabis matremque tuam matrisque sorores. Ovid uses the adjective lacer frequently, a total of 19 times in his poems, as compared to Vergil’s 3, and no occurrences of it in Horace, Tibullus or Propertius (cf. Bömer, on Met. 3.522).

angue creatus avo: Pentheus’ grandfather was Cadmus, who was transformed into a snake, but not until after Pentheus’ death. Cf. commentary on 345, Met. 4.571ff., and Euripides Ba. 1330ff.

533-534 Ovid follows the death of Pentheus with another violent death from Theban myth, that of Dirce, the wife of the Theban king Lycus, for her cruel treatment of Lycus’ niece Antiope. Antiope, who was the daughter of Nycteus, Lycus’ brother, incurred her father’s wrath when she became pregnant by Zeus. Shortly thereafter, as he lay on his deathbed, Nycteus bade his brother punish Antiope, and thus Lycus had her put in chains and exposed the twin sons whom she bore, Amphion and
Zethus. The children were taken in and raised by a shepherd, but Antiope was kept in bondage by Lycus and Dirce, and dreadfully maltreated, until one day her chains fell off, and she fled to her sons' cottage. When they realized who she was, they killed Lycus, and tied Dirce while still living to a wild bull, which dragged her to her death on Mt. Cithaeron (therefore sometimes called Dircean), and her body was then thrown into a stream. (Apollodorus Bib. 3.5.5., Hyginus 7). Dirce's punishment figured prominently in ancient art; it was the subject of many Pompeian wall paintings, and of the famous statuary group from the Baths of Caracalla, the Farnese Bull. Consult LIMC s.v. 'Dirke' for portrayal of the myth in art. According to Clemens Romanus, epist. ad Cor. 1.6.2, a version of this punishment was meted out to Christian women in the amphitheatres: speaking of Christians who underwent torture, he writes of "persecuted Danaids and Dircae who suffered frightful and abominable outrages."

feros montes: 'wild', or 'savage'; the mountains reflect the nature of the bull, as it drags Dirce to her death. For the adjective applied to mountains, compare Vergil Ecl. 5.28, montesque feri silvaeque, and Ovid Tr. 1.8.40 feris . . . iugis.

inperiosa: for Dirce's treatment of Antiope see especially Propertius' account in 3.15.11ff.; testis erit Dirce tam vero crimine saeva,/ Nycteos Antiopen accubuisse Lyco./ a quotiens pulchros uisset regina capillos,/ mollique inmites fixit in ora manus!/ a quotiens famulam pensis oneravit iniquis,/ et caput in dura ponere iussit humo!/ saepe illam immundis passa est habitare tenebris,/ vilem ieiunae saepe negavit aquam. See also Pausanias 9.25.3, and Hyginus' summary of the Euripidean Antiope in Fab. 7.

535-536 Paelex invita sororis, and lingua resecta provide the needed clues for solving this riddle: Philomela, the sister of Procnæ, was abducted and raped by Procnæ's husband Tereus, the king of Thrace, and then had her tongue cut out by the barbaric king, so that she could not tell of the outrage which had been done to her. Ovid went to great lengths to detail this gruesome incident in Met. 6.553ff., . . . iugulum Philomela parabat/ spemque suæ mortis viso conceperat ense: / ille indignantem et
nomen patris usque vocantem/ luctantemque loqui comprensam forcipe linguam/
abstulit ense fero. radix micat ultima linguae,/ ipsa tacet terraeque tremens
inmurmurat atrae,/ utque salire solet mutilatae cauda colubrae,/ palpitat et moriens
dominae vestigia quaerit.

Philomela, despite her severed tongue, eventually managed
to convey her story to Procne through an embroidery which she made, and together
the two of them took their revenge on Tereus by killing Procne’s son Itys, and serving
him to his father (see Ibis 432 and commentary ad loc.). The chief sources for the
myth are Ovid Met. 6.519ff.; Hyginus Fab. 45; Pausanias 1.418ff.; Apollodorus Bib.
3.148. Bömer gives an account of the history of the myth in his introduction to the
episode in Met. 6.412ff., p.115ff.
paelex ... sororis: ‘rival of her sister’. Compare Met. 6.537f., where Philomela
herself declares, "omnia turbasti; paelex ego facta sororis,/ tu geminus coniunx . . .
The phrase is also used of Philomela in Tr. 2.389 (with Owen’s note), Martial 10.514,
and Seneca Her. F. 149.

ante pedes . . . tuos: a grimly vivid detail. The severing of his tongue would seem
a particularly appropriate punishment for Ibis, whose bitter tongue-lashings of the poet
in the forum (14) helped prompt Ovid’s maledictions.

537-538 The scholia, reading cognitor, understood this couplet as a reference to
Cinyras, the father of Myrrha (cf. 358 and 563f.), whom they report was killed and
torn to pieces, either by his own citizens (so scholium C), or by unnamed enemies
(scholium G). Tardae would then refer to the fact that Cinyras realized too late that
he had been sleeping with his own daughter (cf. Apollodorus Bib. 3.14), and laesus
cognomine would be an allusion to the deception practised by the nurse regarding
Myrrha’s identity - cf. Met. 10.438f., nacta gravem vino Cinyran male sedula nutrix,/
nomine mentito veros exponit amores. Ellis accepted the identification, but explained
the pentameter (in Journal of Philol. 7 (1877), p.253) as meaning Cinyras was
reduced to a life of exile and mendicancy for his crime of incest; this does not accord
with the account of Hyginus Fab. 242, however, who says that Cinyras committed
suicide, or with the scholiast on ll. 11.20, who records that he was flayed and killed
by the gods. In his commentary, Ellis subsequently took a quite different tack in explaining the couplet, and followed the proposal of Leopardus that Blaesus should be substituted for laesus, and Cyrae for Myrrhae, whence it became an allusion to the wanderings of Battus the stammerer before he finally founded Cyrene (for Cyra as the equivalent of Cyrene see the explanation of Ellis ad loc.). Housman in turn objected to the ‘tameness’ of such a curse, and returned to the reading of the manuscripts offering the following plausible interpretation, which has won wide acceptance (cf., for example, La Penna and André ad loc., and Perrotta, pp.173ff.): "May you be torn in pieces like the author of the Zmyrna that was nine years in writing, brought to grief by his cognomen of Cinna" (Journal of Philol. 12 (1883), p.167). The couplet would thus allude to the death of C. Helvius Cinna, the poet and friend of Julius Caesar, who was killed at the funeral of Caesar by the mob, who mistook him for the anti-Caesarian and conspirator, L. Cornelius Cinna.

conditor...tardae...Myrrhae: Cinna was the author of a very learned poem which took nine years to complete, on the incestuous affair of Myrrha (or Zmyrna as she was also called) and Cinyras. Cf. Catullus 95, Zmyrna mei Cinnae nonam post denique messem/ quam coepst nonamque edita post hiemem; Quintilian Inst. 10.4.4.

laesus cognomine: Cinna was mistaken for the praetor L. Cornelius Cinna. For debate over whether the Cinna killed was Cinna the poet, or Cinna the tribune of the plebs, or whether they were one and the same man, see T. P. Wiseman, Cinna the Poet and Other Roman Essays, Leicester 1974, pp. 45-6; R. Schwabe, "Der Tod des Dichters Helvius Cinna," Philol. 47 (1889):169; M. Deutsch, "The Murder of Cinna the Poet," CJ 20 (1924-25), pp.326ff. Ancient accounts of the murder can be found in Valerius Maximus 9.91, Suetonius Jul. 85, Appian BC 2.147, Dio Cassius 44.50.4, and Plutarch Brutus 20, the only ancient source to mention that Cinna was a poet.

urbis: i.e. Rome. André retains the alternate reading of orbis, arguing that it is hyperbole.

in innumeris...loca: for the mob’s brutal treatment of Cinna’s body, cf. Valerius Maximus 9.9.1, populi manibus discerptus est; Appian BC 2.147, (ὁ δῆμος) οὔτω δῆ
The identity of the Achaean bard whose eyes were stung by a bee is not known. In his commentary *ad loc.*, Ellis suggests Aristaeus as a viable candidate, on the grounds that as a Thessalian (cf. scholia on A.R. 1.77, 284, 3.775, 4.1329), he could be called *Achaeus* in a general sense, he was called a *χυμησμόλογος* by Clementus *Strom.* 1.21.132, and he invented a remedy for bee stings (cf. Nonnus *Dion.* 5.243f., 247ff.), which Ellis postulates he would not have done had he not been a victim of stings himself. In a later discussion of the couplet in the *American Journal of Philol.* 20 (1899), pp. 75-77, Ellis identified the bard with Rhoecus, who saved a Hamadryad and her tree, and in exchange she became his lover, with a bee acting as their messenger. One day, however, he impatiently brushed aside the bee when it came and offended the Dryad, who punished him with blindness (scholia on A.R. 2.471, scholia on Theocritus 3.73); Plutarch (*Quaest. nat.* 36; surviving only in the Latin translation of Gybertus Longolius, c.1542) hints at another version of the story, however, which he attributes to Pindar, and which implies that Rhoecus was stung by the bee to punish him for unfaithfulness to the Dryad: *Et Pindarus:* "Parvula favorum fabricatrix, quae Rhoecum pupugisti aculeo, domans illius perfidiam." It seems conceivable, therefore, that Rhoecus could be the victim alluded to here. Another possibility, discussed by André and La Penna *ad loc.*, would be to understand *Achaeus* as a proper name, as do the scholia; there were two poets that we know of who were named Achaeus (cf. *RE* 1.1.207), but there is no evidence to associate them with bee stings.


A reference to the punishment of Prometheus by Zeus for giving fire to mankind, contrary to Zeus’ will. In revenge Zeus had Prometheus bound to a rock in the Caucasus, where every day an eagle came and ate his liver. Cf. *Ibis* 289f. and
carparis viscera: viscera is a retained accusative after the passive verb.
cui Pyrrha sui filia fratris erat: as part of the same punishment, Zeus sent Pandora, the first woman and one who was designed to be responsible for all the troubles of mankind, to Prometheus' brother Epimetheus. Pyrrha was their daughter. Cf. Hyginus Fab. 142, Prometheus Iapeti filius primus homines ex luto finxit. Postea Vulcanus Iovis iussu ex luto mulieris effigiem fecit, cui Minerva animam dedit, ceterique dixi alius alium donum dederunt; ob id Pandoram nominarunt. Ea data in coniugium Epimetheo fratri; inde nata est Pyrrha, quae mortalis dicitur prima esse creata; Apollodorus Bib. 1.7.2.

543-544 puer Harpagides: the son of Harpagus was the victim in an act of revenge on the part of Astyages, king of the Medes: frightened by a dream in which he was usurped by his daughter's child, Astyages gave the new-born baby (Cyrus) to one of his advisers, Harpagus, to kill. Harpagus however was loath to carry out the deed himself, and thus gave the infant to a goatherd, with orders to expose it. Since the herdsman and his wife had just lost their own baby, the couple decided to switch the babies, exposing their dead child and raising the royal prince as their own son. Eventually, however, a chance incident exposed the truth of the boy's parentage, and Astyages took his revenge upon Harpagus for not following orders by killing Harpagus' son, and serving his flesh to him. Cf. Herodotus 1.119; Justin 1.5; Seneca de Ira 3.15.1.

exempla Thyestae: an allusion to the so-called 'Thyestean banquet', at which the Mycenaean king Atreus killed the sons of his brother Thyestes and served them to their unsuspecting father. Cf. 427 and commentary ad loc.

545-546 trunca: supply membra.

Mamerci: the MSS show evident confusion regarding the correct form of the victim's name: Mamerte, Mammerte, Mimeri, Manmerini, Minermi and variations on these are all found. Ellis adopted the reading Mamertae, and identified it with Mamercus, the 4th century B.C. tyrant of Catana in Sicily; subsequently Owen printed Mamerci
in his text, and there has been general acceptance (cf. La Penna and André ad loc.) that the allusion is indeed to Mamercus. Regarding the confusion of names, La Penna aptly cites Festus 98.1, *Mamercus praenomen Oscum est ab eo quod hi Martem Mamertum vocant.* Mamercus presented himself as an ally to Timoleon when the latter was dispatched to Syracuse to overthrow the tyrant Dionysius, but subsequently formed an alliance with the Carthaginians against Timoleon. Timoleon pursued and captured Mamercus, and put him on trial at Syracuse. According to Plutarch (*Tim.* 34), Mamercus tried to commit suicide by dashing his head against the stone steps of the theatre where the trial was taking place, but thwarted in his attempt, ἐτὶ ξῶν ἀποτεθεὶς ἠντερ ὁ λαστᾶι δίκην ἔδωκε. As La Penna notes, the punishment meted out to Mamercus seems similar to that of Achaeus (for which see 297f. and commentary ad loc.). Ellis points to *AP* 11.280, which contains an interesting allusion to Hegemon, ‘slayer of pirates’ (ληστοκτόνου), although precise details of the method of punishment used are not given. Mamercus is mentioned briefly in C. Nepos *Timol.* 2.4, Polyaeus 5.12, and Diodorus Siculus 16.69.4, but his death is not elaborated upon.

547-548 Syracosio . . . poetae: the identity of this Syracusan poet who was the victim of strangulation is unclear. Most of the scholia state that the couplet refers to the bucolic poet Theocritus, who was certainly well-known as a Syracusan (cf. *AP* 9.434; Vergil *Ecl.* 6.1 with Servius ad loc.); according to scholium b the poet was strangled or beheaded at the command of the tyrant Hieron. There is no evidence to support this assertion, but given the propensity of biographers to derive their material from the poetry of their subjects (as discussed by Mary Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, London, 1981 passim), it is noteworthy that one of Theocritus’ characters hangs himself because of love (ld. 23.49-52), and this might have given rise to a tradition that Theocritus himself died in such a manner. This is the most satisfactory explanation to date, although numerous other candidates have been proposed, including: 1) Antiphon the tragedian, who was said to have been flogged or tortured to death by the tyrant Dionysius, (cf. Plutarch *de stoic. repugn.* 37, Aristotle *Rh.*
2.6); 2) Empedocles, based on Diogenes Laertes' recounting of differing versions of Empedocles' death, including one tradition that he hung himself (8.2.74). (However, the more common tradition, that he flung himself into the mouth of Aetna, is alluded to at Ibis 595f.) 3) Philemon, sometimes said to be Syracusan (cf. Hesychius s.v.), who suffocated from excessive laughter (Valerius Maximus 9.12.6, Lucian Macr. 25), although this entails understanding lagueo with the pentameter only. See further the discussions of La Penna ad loc., Ellis ad loc., and for Philemon, Ellis, Journal of Philol. 24 (1895-6), 186.


animae . . . via: cf. the similar expressions at 556,568.

549-550 The clues that he was flayed alive, and that a Phrygian river was named after him, identify this victim as the mythical musician and satyr Marsyas. After Marsyas had found and mastered the flute discarded by Athena, he rashly entered into a musical contest with Apollo: unable to follow suit when Apollo played his lyre upside down, Marsyas lost the contest, and was then punished by Apollo by being bound to a tree and flayed. The punishment was vividly detailed by Ovid in Met. 6.387ff., clamanti cutis est summos direpta per artus,/ nec quicquam nisi vulnus erat; cruor undique manat,/ detectique patent nervi, trepidaeque sine ullalpelle micant venae; salientia viscera possis/ et perlucentes numerare in pectore fibras. Both Herodotus (7.26), and Xenophon (Anabasis 1.2.8) claimed that Marsyas' flayed skin was still to be seen in their day at Celaenae.

Phrygium cuius nomina flumen habet: from Marsyas' tears (Met. 6.396ff.) (or alternatively his blood, Hyg. Fab. 165), a river was said to have formed. For Ovid's use of nomen habere in etymological contexts, cf. for example, Met. 1.169, with Bömer's note, Met. 4.384, Am. 1.8.3-4, with McKeown's note; Tr. 3.1.28; Met. 6.399f. . . . aequor/ Marsya nomen habet, Phrygiae liquidissimus amnis. For the myth consult Ovid Met. 6.382ff. with Bömer's commentary; Fast. 6.703ff.; Hyginus
Artistic renderings of the myth are detailed by Roscher, s.v. "Marsyas" 2,2450ff., and are also to be found in LIMC, s.v. "Apollo".

551-552 saxificae . . . ora Medusae: Medusa was one of three Gorgons, all of whom had the power of turning to stone anyone upon whom they gazed. In contrast to her two sisters, however, Medusa was mortal, and was killed by the hero Perseus, with Athena’s aid. The Gorgon and her hideous head were known to Homer (cf. Il. 5.741, 8.349, Od. 11.634), and Hesiod speaks of Perseus’ conquest of Medusa (Theog. 270ff.), but the first explicit mention of her ability to petrify beholders is in Pindar P. 10.46.

saxificae: ‘that turns to stone’ - compare Ovid Met. 5.217, saxificos vultus, quaecumque est, tolle Medusae. Formed from saxum and ficus, the compound appears to have been the invention of Ovid. It reappears in the Silver-age poets Seneca (Her. F. 902), Lucan (9.670), and Statius (Silv. 10.177), but always in connection with Medusa.

Cephenum multos quae dedit una neci: as he was returning home with the Gorgon’s head, Perseus saw the young maiden Andromeda chained to a rock, whom the Ethiopians were offering as a sacrificial victim to a sea monster sent by Poseidon. Perseus fell in love with the girl, and promised her father, king Cepheus, that he would free her if he could marry her. Cepheus agreed, and Perseus slew the monster. Andromeda, however, had previously been betrothed to her uncle, Phineus, and he, enraged at having lost his bride, instigated an uprising at the wedding banquet. Perseus, although sorely outnumbered, easily prevailed by bringing out the head of Medusa, and turning all his rivals to stone. Cf. Ovid Met. 4. 468ff., 5.1-209; Hyginus Fab. 64; and Apollodorus Bib. 2.4.3. The story is first found in Pherecydes FGrH 3F12, and Herodotus 7.61.2f. It was also the subject of a tragedy by Sophocles (Pearson, vol.1.p.78) and Euripides (Nauk TGF 726) as well as by the Latin playwrights Livius Andronicus, Ennius and Accius (Ribbeck, TRF. 3;27;148).

Cephenum: the Cephenes were a mythical people who came to be associated with the Ethiopian king Cepheus, because of the similarity of name (cf. RE 11,222,35ff.).
multos: according to Ovid’s description in the *Metamorphoses* (5.208f.), 200 Cephenians were turned to stone: ... *bis centum restabant corpora pugnae/Gorgone bis centum riguerunt corpora visa.*

553-556 Three victims linked together not only by their common name of Glaucus, but also by the role played by a magical herb in their myths.

553 *Potniadum morsus subeas, ut Glaucus, equarum:* this Glaucus was the son of Sisyphus (Homer *Il.* 6.154, Paus. 6.20.19 etc.), and father of Bellerophon; he was devoured by his mares during funeral games given in honour of the father of Acastus. In what appears to be a doublet of the myth of Diomedes’ flesh-eating horses, Probus (*ad Georg.* 3.266) states that Glaucus was accustomed to feed the mares on human flesh, but other writers stress the effects of a spring of water at Potniae which produced madness in horses (Paus. 9.8.2, Servius *ad Georg.* 3.266), or of the grasses in the Potnian meadow (Pliny *Nat.* 25.56, Aelian *NA* 15.25). Vergil assigns responsibility for the horses’ actions to Venus (*Georg.* 3.266f.), because Glaucus did not allow them to breed (in order to keep them in top form for racing. Cf. Servius *ad loc.*).

*Potniadum:* the town of Potniae, where Glaucus kept his mares, about 10 stades from Thebes, and the adjective *Potnias* were closely associated with the myth of Glaucus and his mares. Cf. Vergil *Georg.* 3.267f., ... *quo tempore Glauci/Potniades malis membra absumpserae quadrigae;* Euripides *Ph.* 1124f., ποτνιάδες ... πῶλοι δρομάδες, while Aeschylus wrote a play entitled Γλαῦκος Ποτνιάες.

554 *inque maris salias, Glaucus ut alter, aquas:* the Glaucus here referred to was a fisherman of Anthedon in Boeotia; born a mortal, he happened to place a dead fish one day on grass that had been planted by Saturn. The grass had a special life-giving quality, and revived the fish. Intrigued, Glaucus tried the grass himself, whereupon a great longing for the sea came over him, and he dived into the sea, where he became a deity. Nicander (*History of Aetolia*, cited by Athenaeus 7.48.296Ff.) and Claudian both remark on the special qualities of the grass near Anthedon, while the myth of Glaucus is recounted by Paus. 9.22.7, Ovid *Met.* 13. 908ff., 14.1-70 (cf. the

555-556 **utque duobus idem dictis modo nomen habenti:** i.e. Glaucus. This Glaucus was a child, son of King Minos and Pasiphae, who fell into a jar of honey while playing, and drowned. However, an oracle revealed that the child could be restored to life by whoever could furnish the most fitting description of a certain cow in Minos’ herd, which changed its colour three times a day, from white to red to black. The seer Polyidus compared it to the mulberry, and was thereupon enclosed in the tomb with Glaucus, and charged by Minos with the task of reviving the child. As Polyidus was despairing over the seemingly impossible task, a snake approached the body, and Polyidus killed it. Within a short period of time, however, a second snake appeared, and touched the dead snake with a blade of grass, whereupon the dead snake was revived. Polyidus accordingly applied the grass to Glaucus, and the child was brought back to life. The myth does not appear in extant literature before Sophocles, who appears to have treated it in the lost play *Mánvteis* (See Pearson vol. 2. p.60). For details of the myth, see Hyginus *Fab* 49,136; Ovid *Fast.* 6.749ff.; Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.3.1; and scholia ad Lyc. *Alex.* 811. The myth gave rise to a proverbial saying for those who had been given up for dead, but subsequently recovered - Γλαύκος πών μελι ἀνέστη (Apostol. *Cent.* 5.48; Palaephat. c.27). See further Frazer, Appendix VII in Apollodorus vol. 2. For similarly complicated expressions with *idem* and the dative, cf. *Met.* 13.50, *et nunc ille, eadem nobis iuratus in arma*, with Bömer’s note *ad loc.*; and *Am.* 1.4.1 with McKeown’s note, *vir tuus est epulas nobis aditurus easdem.*

**nomen habenti:** see commentary on 550, *nomina habet.*

**praefocent:** ‘choke’, a rare word in poetry.

**animae . . . viam:** i.e. the windpipe. Cf. 548, *animae . . . via*, 568, *vocis iter.*

**Gnosia:** a poetic adjective for Cretan/Cnossian, since Gnosus was the principle city of Crete, and residence of Minos.

557-558 **Anyti doctissimus . . . reus:** Socrates, who was brought to trial by Anytus, Lycon and Meletus (Plato *Ap.* 10), and sentenced to death by drinking hemlock, in
399 B.C. For the phrase *Anyti . . . reus* referring to Socrates, compare *Tr. 5.12.12, fana refer* *Anyii quale fuisse reo*, and Horace *Sat. 2.4.3, Anytique reum doctumque Platon*. Anytus appears also in the *Meno* of Plato (90b 5ff) in a discussion with Socrates, wherein he protests against Socrates' criticism of the political leaders.

**imperturbato . . . ore:** for Socrates' calm acceptance of his fate, see Seneca *Prov. 3.13 venenum laetus et libens hauriet*, while Ellis aptly cites Seneca's remarks on *imperturbatus* in *Ep. 85.2, qui constans est, imperturbatus est. qui imperturbatus est, sine tristia est*. For Socrates' final hours, see especially Plato's *Phaedo*, and Diog. Laert. 2.18, while Cicero (cf. *Orat. 1.231, Tusc. 1.71.*) noted Socrates' control and calmness throughout his trial. Socrates' demeanour provides an ironic contrast to the behaviour expected from Ibis, emphasized by the contrasting adjectives *imperturbato* and *sollicito*. Supply *ore* with *sollicito*.

**quod:** i.e. the hemlock drink. The effects of hemlock poisoning form part of an interesting discussion in C. Gill's "Death of Socrates", *CQ* 22 (1973), pp.25-28.

559-560 Two examples of ill-fated lovers, Haemon and Macareus.

**nec tibi . . . cedat:** 'nor, should you fall in love, may the affair turn out more fortunately for you than for Haemon.' For this use of *cedo*, compare *Met. 10.79ff., . . . omnem refugerat Orpheus/femineam Venerem, seu quod male cesserat illi,/ sive fidem dederat.*

**siquid amas:** i.e. 'if you love at all'; for a similar use of *quid* compare Cicero *Att. 3.15.4, Si quid in te peccavi, ignosce.*

**felicius Haemone:** the fate of Haemon was best known from Sophocles' rendering of the myth in the *Antigone* 122ff., wherein Haemon, grieving over the dead body of his beloved Antigone, tried in vain to kill his father Creon, and then plunged the sword into his own side. Cf. Propertius 2.8.21, *quid? non Antigonae tumulo Boeotius Haemon/ corruit ipse suo saucius ense latus?*

**felicius:** compare *Ant. 1225*, where Haemon is described as bewailing τὸ δύστηρον λέξιος.

According to the scholia on the passage, however, the allusion is not to
Haemon, but to Haemus, who was turned into a mountain along with his sister Rhodope, for their effrontery in calling themselves the lovers Jupiter and Hera. (Cf. Ovid *Met.* 6.87ff. with Bömer *ad loc.*; Plutarch *de Fluv.* 11.3; Lucian *Salt.* 51). As Ellis has remarked, this story of incestuous love would accord more closely to that of Macareus, with which it is coupled, but the form Haemone, which is the uncontested reading of the MSS, argues in favour of Haemon as the intended victim. (Although see Ellis' addendum in the *Journal of Philol.* 24, 1895-6 p.187, in which he cites Mela p.37.1 Parthey, *montes interior* (Thracia) *adtollit Haemona et Rhodopem et Orbelon.*)

**sua:** supply *amica* or an equivalent with *sua* and *tua*, both of which are in the ablative, dependant on *potiare*. For *potiare* in this sense of ‘win sexually’, cf. *Ars.* 1.711; *Eleg.* *Maec.* 93 and further citations in *OLD* s.v. 2c.

**Macareus:** Macareus had a love affair with his sister Canace, and committed suicide when the affair became known. Cf. 355 and commentary *ad loc.*

561-562 *vides . . . ab arce:* the thrust of the curse is not merely that Ibis is to look upon a scene of destruction similar to that of burning Troy, but ‘may you see the ground (i.e. death) rushing to meet you, as you plunge from a great height.’

**Hectoreus . . . puer:** Astyanax, who was thrown from the Trojan ramparts by the Greeks, after they had captured Troy (cf. 496 and commentary *ad loc.*).

563-564 Adonis, born from the incestuous union of Cinyras with his daughter Myrrha. Cf. 360 and commentary *ad loc.* for the affair of Myrrha and Cinyras, and 503f. with commentary for Adonis' death as a result of a boar's attack.

**sanguine:** note its emphatic position here; the blood of Adonis played an important part in the myth, from which Aphrodite caused anemones or roses to spring forth. Cf. Bion *Epit. Adon.* 1.64ff.; *Met.* 10.725ff., and the note of Bömer on *Met.* 10.735.

**proba luas:** the implication seems to be that Adonis' death was in some way an atonement for the alliance of his parents, a unique interpretation of his death as far as I know.

**avo genitore creatus/ per facinus soror est cui sua facta parens:** Adonis was the
son of his sister, Myrrha; they had the same father, Cinyras, and since Cinyras was Myrrha’s father, he was also Adonis’ grandfather. Cf. Met. 10.520f., . . . ille sorore/ natus avoque suo, and 10.348, (of Myrrha) tune soror nati generixque vocabere fratris?

565-566 teli genus . . . illud: i.e. the long spine on the tail of the sting-ray. Cf. Aelian NA 1.56; Oppian Hal. 2.470ff.; and Pliny Nat. 9.155 for the fatal effects of a wound caused by a sting ray.

Icarii . . . gener: the son-in-law of Icarius was Odysseus, through his marriage to Penelope; in later epic poetry Odysseus was said to have been killed by his son born from the goddess Circe, Telegonus (whose name is suggested here by teli genus). Although the Homeric poems made no mention of any offspring born to Odysseus from Circe, the prophecy of the seer Teiresias that death would come to Odysseus from the sea - θάνατος δὲ τοι ἕξ ἀλὸς αὐτῷ/ ἁβληχρὸς μᾶλα τοῖς ἐλεύσεται, δὲ κέ σε πεφυγί γήραι ὡπο λιπαρό ἄρημένου (Od. 11.134ff.) - led to the development of a tradition that Odysseus was killed by Telegonus’ spear, which was tipped with the bone of a sting ray. Stanford notes at Od. 11.134 that ἕξ ἀλὸς is best taken as ‘away from’, ‘out of range of the sea’, but readers as early as Sophocles (in the lost play 'Οδυσσείς ἀκανθοπλήξ fr.453-4) and Aeschylus (Ψυχωγωγαῖ) read it as ‘death coming from the sea’, making Odysseus die as the result of a wound by a fish-bone. The involvement of Telegonus is first found in the epic poem Telegonia, by Eugamon of Cyrene (c.568 BC), according to which Telegonus had learned from his mother that Odysseus was his father, and set out to find him. When he landed at Ithaca, he was caught plundering the herds by Odysseus, and in the ensuing fight Telegonus, not realizing Odysseus’ identity, killed him. Cf. also Hyginus Fab. 127; Parthenius Erotica 3; Apollodorus Epit. 7.36, with the note of Frazer; Scholia ad Od. 11.134 etc.

567-568 loquax . . . guttur: Ovid here alludes to the story of Anticlus, shut up with the other Greeks inside the Trojan horse, who sought to answer Helen when she stood near the horse and imitated the voices of the Greeks’ wives. The swift reaction of
Odysseus, who silenced Anticlus by clapping his hands over his mouth, saved the Greeks from detection, as Homer details in the *Odyssey* (4.285ff.): ἐνθ' ἄλλου μὲν πάντες ἄκην ἔσαν ὑπὲρ Ἀχαιῶν, ὁτι “Ἀντικλὸς δὲ σὲ γ’ οἷς ἀμείβονθαί ἐπείειν ἥθελεν. ἄλλ’ ὁ Ὀδυσσεύς ἐπὶ μάστακα χερῶ πιέζειν νωλεμέως κρατηρῆσιν, σάωσε δὲ πάντας Ἀχαιῶν. τὸ φόρα δ᾽ ἔχει φόρα σὲ νόσφιν ἀπήγαγε Παλλᾶς Ἀθήνη. The story, which seems to have appeared in the *Ilias Parva* (schol. ad Od. 4.285), was subsequently given further elaboration by Tryphiodorus in the *Excidium Illi* (476ff.) who added that Anticlus died from the strong pressure of Odysseus’ hands: ἂντικλὸς δὲ ὅτε κέντρον ἐδέξατο λαεδαμείης, μοῦνος ἀμοιβαίνην ἀνεβάλλετο γῆρων ἀνοίξας. ἄλλ’ ὁ Ὀδυσσεύς κατέσκαλτο καὶ ἀμφοτερος παλάμμησιν ἀμφιπεσὼν ἐπίεσεν ἐπεγόμενον στόμα λύσας; μάστακα δ’ ἀρρήκτους ἀλκυτόπεδος μεμαρσῶς, εἶχεν ἐπικρατέως, ὁ δέ ἐπάλλετο χερῶν πιεσθεῖς, φεῦγον ἀνθρωφόνον πελώρια δεσμὰ σωπῆς, καὶ τὸν μὲν λύσει ἀσθμα φερέσθαι. See also Apollodorus Epit. 5.19, Quint. Sm. 12.317.

*vocis iter*: cf. Ovid *Met.* 2.829f., *nec conata loqui est nec, si conata fuisset,* / *vocis habebat iter,* with further parallels cited by Bömer *ad loc.; Ibis* 548 and 556.

569-570 Anaxarchus: Anaxarchus, a philosopher from Abdera, was a follower of Democritus, and was part of the retinue that accompanied Alexander the Great on his Asiatic campaigns (cf. Plutarch *Alex.* 8.4, 28.2-3, 52.2). After Alexander’s death, Anaxarchus was captured by the Cyprian tyrant Nicocreon (alternatively Timocreon: cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 2.52), with whom he had previously quarrelled, and was thereupon pounded to death in a mortar. The endurance with which he bore this cruel torment was often noted. Cf. Cicero *Tusc.* 2.52, *de Anaxarcho Democritio cogitetur, qui cum Cypri in manus Timocreatonis regis incidisset, nullum genus supplicii deprecatus est neque recusauit;* Diogenes Laert. 9.10. (Νικοκρεον) . . . εἰς δῆμον βαλὼν ἐκέλευσε τύπτεσθαι σιδήροις ὑπέρως, τὸν δ’ οὗ φροντίζαντα τῆς τιμωρίας εἰπεν ἐκεῖν αὕτη τὸ περιφερόμενον, "πτίσα τὸν Ἀναξάρχον θύλακν, Ἀναξάρχον δὲ οὗ πτίσεις, ἐκέλευσαι δὲ τοῦ Νικοκρεοῦτος καὶ τὴν γλώτταν αὐτοῦ ἐκτυμηθῆναι, λόγος ἀποτράγοντα προσπτύσαι αὐτῷ;* Valerius Maximus 3.3. ext.4; Tertullian *Apology*
pro solitis frugibus: 'in place of the customary grains'; solitis helps to emphasize the novelty of this punishment.

571-574 Two related exempla, concerning Apollo's retribution for the death of his beloved, Psamathe, and their son Linus.

patrem Psamathes: Crotopus, king of Argos. Psamathe had exposed Linus at his birth, because she feared her father's wrath. The baby was taken in by shepherds, but was subsequently attacked and killed by dogs, and when Crotopus learned all the details, he put his daughter to death (cf. 477 and commentary ad loc.).

quod natae fecerit ille suae: i.e. condiderat natam in ima Tartara. This detail, and the subsequent punishment of Crotopus by Apollo of being consigned to the depths of Tartarus, appear to be unique to Ovid. Pausanias (2.33.7) notes the grave of Crotopus in Argos, and other references to the myth may be found in Pausanias 1.43.7, Statius Theb. 1.570ff., AP 7.154, and Callimachus fr. 26-31 (Pf.)

ea pestis . . . quam dextra Coroebi/vicit: as retribution for the deaths of his child and lover, Apollo sent a monster to Argos, which carried off the children of the inhabitants. It was eventually slain by the young Argive Coroebus. Cf. Callimachus fr. 26 Pf., and Pausanias (1.43.7), who records that the story of Psamathe and Coroebus was inscribed in elegiac verse on Coroebus' grave, in the market place of the Megarians, along with a relief of Coroebus killing the monster, the oldest stone image Pausanias had seen among the Greeks.

pestis: 'destructive creature' (OLD s.v. 3), the τουρή of Pausanias. Cf. Statius Theb. 1.597ff., . . . monstrum infandis Acheronte sub ima/ conceptum Eumenidum thalamis, cui virginis ora/ pectoraque; aeternum stridens a vertice surgit/ et ferrugineam frontem discriminae anguis./ haec tum dira lues nocturno squalida passu/ inlabi thalamis, animasque a stirpe recentes/ abripere altricum gremiti morsuque cruento/ devesci et multum patrio pinguescere lucto.

575-576 nepos Aethrae: i.e. Hippolytus, the grandson of Aethra who was Aegeus' wife and Theseus' mother. For the curse uttered by Theseus upon his son, because he
believed his wife Phaedra's charge that Hippolytus had raped her, see 87f. and commentary *ad loc.* In response to Theseus' curse, Poseidon sent a great monster-bull from the sea, which terrified Hippolytus' horses, and caused them to bolt. Hippolytus was thrown from the chariot, but became entangled in the reins, and was dragged to his death. (Cf. Euripides *Hipp.* 1216 ff.; Ovid *Met.* 15. 492ff., with the commentary of Bömer; *Fast.* 6.739ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 47 etc.)

**Veneris moriturus ob iram:** cf. especially the opening speech of Aphrodite in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, 1-50, in which she outlines her forthcoming revenge on Hippolytus for scorning her worship.

**exul:** cf. the decree of Theseus in Euripides' *Hipp.* 1048ff., ἀλλ' ἐκ πατρῷας φυγὰς ἀλητεύων χθονός/ ἕτην ἐπ' αἰαν λυπῶν ἀντλήσεις βίον.

**attonitus ... equis:** in the *Ars* (1.338) Ovid describes the horses as *rabidi*; in the *Fasti* (5.310), they are *consternati*. *Attonitus*, literally 'thunderstruck', gives vivid expression to the horses' panic at the sight of the bull.


**577-578 hospes:** Polymestor, the Thracian king and son-in-law of Priam.

**alumnum:** Polydorus, the young son of Priam and Hecuba.

Earlier in the *Ibis* (265f.) the blinding of Polymestor by Hecuba in revenge for Polydorus' murder was highlighted; here it is Polydorus' death at the hands of his greedy guardian. Cf. Euripides *Hecuba*, passim; Vergil *Aen.* 3.19ff.; Ovid *Met.* 13. 429-38, 532-75; Hyginus *Fab.* 109 etc.

**opes:** contrast is created by Ovid between the *opes magnas* of Polydorus, and Ibis' *exiguas opes*. *Opes magnas* is also used to describe Polydorus' treasure in *Met.* 13.433f. Note the interesting word-order of the couplet.

**579-583** The deaths of the sons of Niobe, her husband Amphion, and Niobe herself are
here catalogued, all of which occurred as a consequence of Niobe’s denigration of the
goddess Leto, because she had fewer children than Niobe herself. Leto was so
angered by Niobe’s braggadocio that she asked her children Apollo and Artemis to
punish Niobe; Apollo accordingly slew the boys, Artemis the girls, although Ovid
here alludes only to the boys’ murder.

579 utque ferunt caesos sex cum Damasichthon e fratres: in Met. 6.218ff., Ovid gives
a fuller treatment of the boys’ deaths, and names all seven: Ismenus, Sipylus,
Phaedimus, Tantalus, Alphenor, Damasichthon, and Ilioneus. Damasichthon is also
named as one of the slain youths in Apollodorus 3.45, Tzetzes Chil. 4.424, and is
probably the true reading in Hyginus 11. Other names for Niobe’s sons are given by
Phercydes FGrH 3 F126, and Hellanikos FGrH 4F21. There was considerable
disagreement in antiquity over the number of Niobe’s children. Although she was
always represented as having an equal number of girls and boys, the count ranged
from six children, to as many as twenty. Thus the comment of Gellius, Attic Nights
20.7: Mira et prope adeo ridicula diversitas fabulae apud Graecos poetas deprenditur
super numero Niobae filiorum. Nam Homerus pueros puellasque eius bis senos dicit
fuisse (II.24.602), Euripides bis septenos (fr. 455 N2), Sappho bis novenos (fr. 143
Bergk.), Bacchylides (fr. 46 Blass2) et Pindarus (fr. 65 Bergk.) bis denos, quidam alii
scriptores tres fuisse solos dixerunt. Ovid in Met. 6.183f. puts the number at
tfourteen: ... huc natas adice septem/ et totidem iuvenes. According to Homer, the
slain children lay unburied for nine days, but on the tenth day the gods took pity on
them, and buried them (II.24.603ff.).

580 intereat tecum ... genus omne tuum: as La Penna notes, this corresponds to the
formula of the Dirae Teiororum, ἀπὸ λοιποῦ αὐτός καὶ τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ, for more on
which consult E. Ziebarth’s "Der Fluch in Griechischen Recht" Hermes 30, 1895
p.57ff. It is a sentiment which also appears on numerous sepulchral curses, and
earlier in the poem Ovid himself declared (54) ego devoveo teque tuosque.

581-582 The death of Amphion, son of Zeus and Antiope, and twin brother of Zethus
(see 535f., and commentary ad loc.) follows upon those of his children. There were
various traditions concerning the manner of Amphion’s death: Ovid here, and in Met. 6.271f. *(nam pater Amphion ferro per pectus adacto/finierat mortiens pariter cum luce dolorem)* implies that Amphion killed himself because of his grief for his children’s fate. Alternatively, Pausanias (9.5.8f.) relates that Amphion was afflicted with a fatal plague for taking part in the mockery of Leto, while Hyginus *Fab.* 9 states that Amphion was shot by Apollo when, demented by his loss, Amphion tried to attack Apollo’s temple. His insanity is also alluded to by Lucian *Salt* 41. Cf. *RE* 1. 1946, 49ff.

**fidicen:** Amphiom had been given the lyre by Hermes, and was renowned for his musical skill (cf. Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.5.5; Pausanias 9.5.7ff.; Bömer on *Met.* 6.152).

**taedia:** poetic plural. As here, it occurs in combination with *iusta* in *Ex P.* 4.15.29f., *et pudet et metuo semperque eademque precari/ ne subeant animo taedia iusta tuo.*

583 The misfortunes which Niobe brought upon her family culminate in her petrification, which is vividly depicted in *Met.* 6.301ff.

**soror Pelopis:** Niobe, like Pelops, (cf. *Ibis* 177 and commentary *ad loc.*) was fathered by Tantalus; for her parentage, first attested in Pherecydes *FGR Hist.* 3 F 38, cf. *Met.* 6.172, *mihi Tantalus auctor.* After the deaths of her children and husband, Niobe was inconsolable, and wept continuously until she was turned into a rock by the gods, from which water issued as a sign of her perpetual grief. Many ancients identified the rock of Niobe with a stony formation on Mt. Sipylus in Lydia (cf. the descriptions of Pausanias 1.21.3, 5.13.7; Quintus Smyrnaeus 1.293-306; and the comment of Jebb at Sophocles *Ant.* 831). The story of Niobe and her children first appears in Homer *Il.* 24.599ff., and was used by Ovid in his poetry of exile as an *exemplum* for his own sorrows. Thus, for example, *Tr.* 5.1.57f., 5.12.8, and *Ex P.* 1.2.29f., *felicem Nioben, quamvis tot funera vidit/ quae posuit sensum saxea facta malis.* Apost. *Cent.* 12.11 records the popular saying *Nioβης πάθη.* For studies on the myth of Niobe consult O. Altenburg, "Niobe bei Ovid" *Philologus* 64 1905, p.284-96, Roscher "Niobe und Niobiden" 3,372ff., and *RE"* *Niobe* p.644.

**saxo ... oberto:** for *obortior* in the sense of springing up to cover the surface of

584 laesus lingua Battus: the petrification of Niobe leads Ovid by association to the petrification of the old man Battus, for deceiving the god Mercury. Mercury had stolen some of Apollo's cattle, and driven them into the Peloponnese, where he encountered Battus. Having attained Battus' promise of silence in exchange for a heifer, Mercury continued on his way and hid the cattle. However Mercury was still distrustful of Battus, and hence, assuming a new shape, the god returned to Battus and asked his help in locating the stolen cattle. Overcome by the thought of yet another reward, Battus broke his earlier promise of silence, and disclosed where the cattle were hidden. As punishment he was then turned into a stone by the angry god.

Battus: the myth of the theft of Apollo's cattle by Mercury was a familiar theme (cf. Homeric *Hymn* 4 74ff.; Pausanias 7.20.4; Horace *Od.* 1.10.9ff. with Nisbet & Hubbard *ad loc.*). However the role of Battus was not always a prominent feature of the myth: in the Homeric hymn, the theft is witnessed by an unnamed old man, to whom Mercury makes the request that he keep silent and forget all that he saw or heard (91ff.). The old man, however, tells Apollo what he saw, and thereafter plays no further part in the story, nor does he suffer any punishment for having revealed Mercury's secret. The role of Battus was probably elaborated upon by Nicander (whom Antoninus Liberalis lists as one of his sources, in *Met.* 23), and it was subsequently taken up by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses* (2.676-707 - note especially the ironic avowal of Battus to Mercury 696ff., "tutus eas! lapis iste prius tua furtar loquetur"/ et lapidem ostendit). From Battus' name (which occurs in Latin poetry only in Ovid, here and in *Met.* 2.688) was derived βαττολογία, which Hesychius glosses as ἀκαυρολογία (Bömer, on *Met.* 2.688). For the myth, consult R. Holland "Battus" in *Rh.Mus.* 75 (1926), pp.156-184; V. Castellani "Two Divine Scandals: Ovid *Met.* 2.680ff. and 4.171ff., and his Sources", *TAPA* 110 (1980), pp.37-50; *RE*
8 755,65ff.; Roscher s.v. 1,752.

ab ipse sua: cf. 404.

585-586 The couplet refers to the young prince of Sparta, Hyacinthus, who was killed when throwing the discus with Apollo. A gust of wind caught a discus thrown by Apollo and caused it to swerve suddenly, so that it struck Hyacinthus on the head with a fatal blow. As a reminder of his friend, Apollo is said to have created the hyacinth flower from the bloody wound. Although Pausanias noted (3.19.3) that the myth was depicted on the throne of Bathykles, the first extant literary treatment of it is not found until Euripides' *Hel.* 1472 ff., while Ovid appears to have been the first Roman poet to treat the myth (*Met.* 10.162-95, *Fast.* 5.223f.). Cf. the accounts of Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.10.3, and Hyginus *Fab.* 271.

aera si . . . iaculabere disco: ‘if you strike the air with a discus’, a rather unusual phrase.

aera . . . vacuum: five of the MSS have *liquidum* rather than *vacuum*; parallels for both with reference to *aēr* or *aura* can be found in Ovid. Thus for *vacuus* we may compare *Met.* 6.398, 12.469, 15.220, *ExP.* 2.11.7, *Tr.* 1.5.11, 3.3.61, and *Ibis* 141, for *liquidus*, *Met.* 2.532, 4.667, 11.194, 12.525, *Am.* 2.6.11, and *Rem.* 6. However, given the proximity of *liquidis* at 589, I am inclined to suspect that the copyist’s eye was attracted to *liquidis*, and consequently *liquidum* found its way into the MSS at 585, in place of the correct reading, *vacuum*.

puer Oebalides: there is some confusion regarding Hyacinthus’ paternity. He is generally said to be the son of the Spartan king Amyclas (for which cf. Apollodorus 3.1.3; Pausanias 3.1.3; Tzetzes *ad* Lycoph. *Alex.* 511 etc); however some accounts call him the son of Oebalus, a Spartan king, and father of Tyndareus (thus Lucian *dia* deor. 14.1; Hyginus 27.1; Servius *ad Aen.* 11.68). Ovid opens his account of the myth in *Met.* 10.162 by calling Hyacinthus *Amyclide*, but at 10.196 Phoebus addresses him as *Oebalide*. The apparent ambiguity can perhaps best be resolved by noting that *Oebalides* and *Oebalus* occur elsewhere in Ovid’s works as poetical equivalents of ‘Laconian’ (cf. *Fast.* 1.260, *Rem* 458, and Bömer’s note on *Met.* 10.162), and that
is probably how *Oebalides* should be understood here.

**orbe:** the use of *orbis* to refer to a discus occurs first in *Met.* 10.183, and was subsequently taken up by Statius *Theb.* 6.656, 7.20f. *Cf TLL* 9.2, 987, 71f.

587-592 A mini-catalogue of water-related deaths.

**587-588 per alternos pulsabitur unda lacertos:** for similar descriptions of swimming compare *Met.* 4.353, . . . *alternaque bracchia ducens; Prop.* 1.11.12, . . . *alternae faciles cedere Lympha manu; and Lygd. 5.30, facilis lenta pellitur unda manu.*

**Abydena . . . aqua:** the phrase provides the needed clue for identifying this couplet as an allusion to the tragic story of Leander and Hero. The two lived on opposite sides of the Hellespont, Leander in Abydos, Hero in Sestos, but during the night Leander, guided by Hero's lamp, would swim the Hellespont (a distance of about 7 stades according to Luck on *Tr.* 3.10.41f.) to be with his beloved Hero. One stormy night, however, Hero's lamp was put out by the winds, and Leander was drowned. When Hero saw his battered body lying on the shore the following morning, she threw herself to her death from the watch-tower. The story does not appear in extant literature prior to Vergil's citation in *Georgics* 3.258ff., *quid iuvenis, magnum cui versat in ossibus ignem/ durus amor? nempe abruptis turbata procellis/ nocte natat caeca serus freta, quem super ingens/ parta tonat caeli, et scopulis inlisa reclamant/ aequora; nee miseri possunt revocare parentes,/ nee moritura super crudeli funere virgo.* However, the absence of names in Vergil's account (in this regard see also Horace *Epist.* 1.3.3ff. and Strabo, 13.591, who mentions Hero's tower, but not the myth associated with it) would seem to suggest that the story was already a familiar one. Note too Servius' comment *ad Georg.* 3.258, *quia cognita est fabula.* Ovid gives a detailed account of the tale in *Her.* 18 and 19, and brief references in *Am.* 2.16.31, *Ars* 2.249f., and *Tr.* 3.10.41f. It was also the theme of numerous epigrams in the *Palatine Anthology* (most notably *AP* 7.666, and 9.215 by Antipater of Thessalonica), and a long poem in hexameters, called *Hero and Leander,* by the Greek poet Musaeus of the late 5th century A.D. Indeed, the similarities between Musaeus' and Ovid's treatment of the tale in the *Heroides* have led some scholars to
posit an Alexandrian poet as a common source (thus for example, the dissertation of Joannes Klemm, \textit{De Fabulae quae est de Herus et Leandri amoribus fonte et auctore}, Lips. 1889), but it remains a matter of speculation. The story appears quite frequently on later Imperial coins of the two cities of Abydos and Sestos, and was also depicted in wall paintings found in the House of the Vettii, and House of Hero and Leander. See further Roscher, 2.1919f., and RE 'Hero' p.912ff.

\textbf{Abydena:} the adjective \textit{Abydenus} is also used in connection with the story of Leander crossing the Hellespont in Ovid \textit{Tr.} 1.10.28, \textit{Her.} 18.100, and Statius \textit{Ach.} 1.204, 1.451, \textit{Silv.} 1.2.87.

\textbf{589-590 comicus:} death from drowning was attributed to three comic poets, Eupolis, Terence and Menander. Eupolis, a 5th century Athenian poet, was traditionally reported to have drowned in a sea-battle in the Hellespont during the Peloponnesian war (Suidas s.v. Eupolis), or, according to popular anecdote, to have been drowned by Alcibiades on a voyage to Sicily, as fitting retribution for the playwright's attack on Alcibiades in the \textit{Baptae} (for which cf. Kaibel \textit{CGF}, p.27-8, and the epitaph recorded in Cram. \textit{Anec. Par.} 1.540, "Drown me on stage, and I'll drown you in the waves of the sea in bitter streams of water"). Cicero refutes the latter story's authenticity in \textit{Att.} 6.1.18, but at the same time points out the popularity of the tradition: \textit{quis enim non dixit Eιπολυτ \tauον \της ἄρχαιας αβ Αλκιβίαδε ναυηγός de Sicilia diecit esse in mare? redarguit Eratosthenes; adfert enim quas ille post id tempus fabulas docuerit.} As K.J. Maidment notes in "The Later Comic Chorus" \textit{CQ} 29 (1935), p.10 n.3, "Eupolis is continually turning up as a corpus vile in the Grammarians and the sole consistent piece of information about him which emerges is the fact that he was drowned . . ."

Likewise the Roman poet Terence was reputed to have drowned, while on his way back to Italy from Greece in 159 B.C. Thus Suetonius in the \textit{Vita Terenti} 4f. remarks: \textit{de morte eius Vulcaciis sic tradidit: "Sed ut Afer populo sex dedit comoedias/ iter hinc in Asiam fecit, et navem ut semel/ conscendit, visus numquam est; sic vita vacat." Q. Cosconius redeuntem a Graecia perisse in mari dicit cum C}
et VIII fabulis conversis a Menandro.

Lastly, the scholia on the Ibis claim the couplet is an allusion to the death of Menander (in approximately 290/280 B.C.), who, they say, drowned while swimming in the Piraeus: Menander comicus Atheniensis dum in Piraeco portu nataret, submersus est, de quo nobilissimae a Graecis editae traduntur Elegiae et a Callimacho Epigramma (in Cod. Salvagnii). Pausanias (1.2.2) records that he saw Menander’s tomb by the street leading from the Piraeus to Athens, but there is no ancient evidence concerning Menander’s death to confirm or refute the Scholia’s assertion that he drowned.

dum nabat: no can refer to sailing as well as swimming - cf. OLD s.v.2b.

Stygius . . . liquor: for this metaphorical use of Stygius in the sense of ‘deadly’, cf. Met. 3.76, 15.791; Vergil Aen. 5.855, 7.476.

591-592 ut Palinurus: we expect this to be another in the short series of those who meet their end by drowning. However, with a characteristic twist Ovid concludes the series with Palinurus, the helmsman of the Trojans, who survived falling overboard and swimming for three days, only to be attacked and killed on the Italian shore by the ruthless inhabitants of the area - in many ways a more unpleasant death than being shipwrecked and drowned. The myth of the death of Palinurus was an aetiological story for the foundation of Capo di Palinuro on the Lucanian coast, between the gulfs of Salerno and Policastro, and the most well-known account of his death is found in Vergil’s Aen. 5.843-71, and 6.337-62, esp. 355ff. where Aeneas meets Palinurus in the underworld, and learns of his sorry fate: (Palinurus speaking) tres Notus hibernas immensa per aequora noctes/ vexit me violentus aqua: vix lumine quarto/ prospexi Italian summa sublimis ab unda./ paulatim adnabam terrae; iam tuta tenebam,/ ni gens crudelis madida cum veste gravatum,/ prensantemque uncis manibus aspera montis,/ ferro invasisset praedamque ignara putasset. R. Williams, in his commentary to Aen. 5.827f. thinks it “likely that the Palinurus legend can be traced back to Timaeus in the third century, and probably came to Vergil through Varro. Certainly by Varro’s time, if not before, Palinurus had become associated with Aeneas
and the Trojans."

593-594 cothurnatum vatem: the playwright Euripides was reputed to have been torn to bits in 407/6 B.C. by the Molossian hounds of the Macedonian king, Archelaus; the *Vita Euripidi* (1.55ff.) gives the following account: ἐτελεύτησε δὲ τῶν τρόπων τούτων. ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ κάμη ἐστι καλομιένη θρακῶν διὰ τὸ ποτε κατφηκέναι ἐνταῦθα θράκες. ἐν ταύτῃ ποτέ τοῦ Ἀρχελάου Μολοσσή κών ἦλθεν ἀποπλανηθείσα. ταῦτην Θράκες, ὡς ἠθος, θύσαντες ἐφαγον. καὶ δὴ ὁ Ἀρχελάος ἐξημίωσεν αὐτοὺς ταλάντῳ. ἐπεὶ δὲν οὐκ ἔιχον, Εὐριπίδου ἐδείήθησαν ἀπολύσεως τυχεῖν δεθέντος τοῦ βασιλέως. χρόνῳ δὲ ὡστερον Εὐριπίδης ἐν ἄλσει τοῦ ἀπ' τῆς πόλεως ἁρέμει, ὁ Ἀρχελάος δὲ ἔπι κυνηγέσιον ἕξελθόντος, τῶν σκυλάκων ἀπολυθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν κυνηγῶν καὶ περιπτυχόντων Εὐριπίδη, διεσπαράξθη καταβρωθείς ὁ ποιητής. ὡσαν δὲ ἐκγονοὶ οἱ σκυλάκες τῆς ὑπὸ Θρακῶν ἀναφεβείσης κυνός, ὅθεν καὶ ἡ παρουμία ἐστὶ παρά τοῖς Μακεδοῖο "κυνὸς δίκη". Compare also Suidas s.v. Euripides (wherein the dogs were released on Euripides as a result of a plot by two jealous poets), Valerius Maximus 9.12.ext.4; Hyginus *Fab.* 247; A. Gellius 15.20.9; Diodorus Siculus 13.103.5 etc. Ancient *vitae* of poets were often distorted, and Euripides’ was no exception. Much of the supposedly biographical material in his *vita* appears to have been drawn from his poetry rather than his life; consequently the tale of his death may owe much to his poetic treatment of the death of Actaeon and the tearing apart of Pentheus by the Bacchantes (consult further M. Lefkowitz "The Euripides Vita" *GRBS* 20, 1979, (pp.188-210). It is perhaps significant that Aristophanes in the *Frogs* makes no mention of such an end befalling Euripides. The story’s authenticity may be open to doubt, but nevertheless it seems to have prevailed.


*vigilum*: Euripides was apparently taken off guard, but Ovid curses Ibis with a similar fate, regardless of his vigilance.

595-596 ut Trinacrius: Trinacris or Trinacria, often explained as ‘of three points’ (i.e.
τριάντα ἀκρα - cf. Fordyce on Catullus 68.53) was an ancient name for Sicily, and the corresponding adjective *Trinacrius* is here used to refer to the Sicilian philosopher Empedocles who lived from about 494-434 B.C. Although various traditions regarding his death are given by Diogenes Laertes (8.69ff.), the most popular version was that he flung himself into the mouth of Aetna, hoping for immortality. See especially Horace *Ars* 464-66 and Porph. *ad loc.; AP* 7.123, 7.124.3f.; Strabo 6.274; and Diogenes Laertes 8.69ff.

**ora Gigantis:** cf. Ex P. 2.10.23f. *vidimus Aetnaea caelum splendescere flamma/ subpositus monti quam vomit ore Gigans.* The giant imprisoned under Mt. Aetna was usually said to be Typhaeus (Typhon), punished so for his assault on Zeus and the other gods; his violent efforts to free himself became the aition for the mountain’s volcanic activity. Cf. Pindar *P.* 1.15-28; Aeschylus *Pr.* 354ff.; V. Fl. 2.24; and Ovid *Met.* 5.346ff.: *vasta giganteis ingesta est insula membris/ Trinacris et magnis subiectum molibus urguet/ aetherias ausum sperare Typhoea sedes./ nittitur ille quidem pugnatque resurgere saepe,/ dextra sed Ausonio manus est subiecta Peloro,/ laeua, Pachyne, tibi, Lilybaeo crura premuntur,/ degravat Aetna caput, sub qua resupinus harenas/ eiectat flammanque ferox vomit ore Typhoeus. Ora here refers to the giant’s mouth but it was also a technical Latin term for describing the volcanic crater; cf. Lucr. 6.701ff., *in summo sunt vertice enim ‘ crateres’, ut ipsi/ nominant, nos quod ‘ fauces ’ perhibemus et ‘ ora’.*

**qua flammatas Sicanis Aetna vomit:** cf. the descriptions of Aetna’s eruptions in Lucr. 1.722ff., . . . *et hic Aetnaea minantur,/ murmura flammarum rursum se colligere iras/ faucibus eruptos iterum vis ut vomat ignis,* and in Vergil *Aen.* 3.570-7. See further *RE* "Empedokles", p.2506ff.

597-598 An allusion to the murder of the legendary musician Orpheus, who was torn to pieces by the women of Thrace. There were various explanations given for the women’s conduct, the most common being that Orpheus had scorned them because of his devotion to his dead wife Eurydice (Conon *FGrH.* 26F 1,45,4; Vergil *Georg.* 4.520ff.; Pausanias 9.30.5), or because he favoured young boys instead (Phanocles


*Strymoniae:* 'of or dwelling by the river Strymon', which was on the Thracian-Macedonian border. The adjective was used as a poetic equivalent of 'Thracian'. Cf. Vergil *Aen.* 10.265, 11.580. In his account of the Orpheus myth in the *Georgics*, Vergil calls the women *Ciconum matres*, *Ciconum* being another synonym for 'Thracian', and he was imitated in this by Ovid in *Met.* 11.3.

*Orpheos:* a Greek genitive singular; cf. Statius *Silv.* 2.7.99, *non mutum caput Orpheos.*

599-604 A brief catalogue of mythological figures who were consumed by flames: Meleager, Jason's bride and her father Creon, and Hercules.

599 *natus ut Althaeae . . . arsit:* Meleager, son of Althaea and Oeneus of Calydonia.

Ovid (here and at *Met.* 8.446) and Seneca were the only classical Latin poets to name Althaea.

*flammis absentibus arsit:* Meleager's lifespan was tied to that of a log which was burning on the hearth when he was born; his mother, having been told of its significance by the Fates, snatched the log from the fire, and hid it in a chest. However, when Meleager had grown to manhood, and organized the famous Calydonian boar hunt, he quarrelled with his uncles, Althaea's brothers, over the proper division of the spoils, and slew them. When Althaea learned of her son's actions, she avenged her brothers by throwing the log which was bound up with Meleager's life onto the fire. Meleager, still far away at the scene of the hunt, was thereupon consumed from within by an unseen fire, and perished, unaware of his mother's role in his death. Homer (*II.*9.524 ff.) told of the boar-hunt, and Althaea's curses on her son when he killed her brothers, but made no mention of the firebrand; according to Pausanias (10.31.4) the story first appeared in drama in the *Pleuronian*
Women of Phrynichus. "However," Pausanias noted, "it appears that Phrynichus did not elaborate the story as a man would his own invention, but only touched on it, as one already in the mouths of everybody in Greece," while Aeschylus, in Ch. 602ff., contented himself with the following summary of the myth: ἵστι χ' ὀστὶς οὐχ ὑπόπτερος/φροντίαν, δαεῖς/τὰν ἀ πανδολυμάς τάλανα θεστίὰς μήποτε/πυρδαήτων πρόνοιαν,/ καταίθουσα παις δαφωνίδ/ δαλὸν ἥλικ', ἐπεὶ μολὼν/ ματρόθεν κελάδησε/ ξύμμετρόν τε διαὶ βίον/ μοιρόκραντον ἐς ἀμαρ. Cf. also Ovid Met. 8.445-525; Hyginus 171, 174; Apollod. Bib. 1.8.2 etc. For the history of the legend, see the concise account of Hollis Met. 8, pp. 66-68, and Bömer's introduction to the Meleager episode, pp. 94-100. The concept of the absens flamma burning Meleager was a favorite of Ovid's; cf. Fast. 5.305f., respice Thestiaden: flammis absentibus arsit; Rem. 721; and Met. 8.515f.

sic tuus ardescat . . . : the pentameter seems a woefully limp conclusion to the couplet; presumably the suddenness of Meleager's death, and his lack of awareness as to its cause, are to be wished also upon Ibis.

601-602 Ovid here refers to the terrible revenge wrought by Medea upon the household of Creon, king of Corinth, when Creon betrothed his daughter to Jason. Pretending to be reconciled to her fate, Medea steeped a robe and crown in one of her potent poisons, and sent them to the new bride. The unsuspecting girl immediately tried on the new adornments, and was consumed instantly by flames. Her horrified father suffered the same fate, when he tried to embrace her. Euripides' Medea 982ff. was the best known treatment of the myth, and Ovid remarks on the tale's familiarity in Ars 1.335f., cui non defleta est Ephryaeae flamma Creusae/ et nece natorum sanguinolenta parens? Ovid himself treated the myth in a tragedy on Medea, which unfortunately has not survived, but which was highly acclaimed in antiquity (cf. Quint.10.1.98; Tacitus Dial. 12); see also Seneca's Medea, and Hyginus Fab. 25. For a fuller discussion of the myth, see Ibis 402 and 489f. and commentary ad loc. nova . . . nupta: in Euripides Medea, the name of Creon's daughter was not specified; she is called Glauce by Apollodorus (Bib. 1.9.28) and Anaxicrates (FGrH.
307.F2, Creusa by Propertius (2.16.30) and Ovid (Ars. 1.335). Horace (Epod. 5.65f.) refers to her simply as a *nova nupta* - *cum palla tabo munus imbutum novam/ incendio nuptam abstulit* - and she is likewise described in Met. 7.394: . . . Colchis arsit nova nupta venenis.

**Phasiaca:** i.e. *Colchia*. For the poetic practice of equating a region with its main river, cf. Vergil Aen. 6.800; Tibullus 1.7.4. The adjective *Phasiacus* is also used by Ovid in Tr. 2.439, and Her. 12.10.

**compressa est:** For *comprehendo* in the sense of catching fire compare Livy 26.27; Ovid Met. 9.234, *avidus comprehenditur ignibus agger*; TLL 3.2152.56 ff.; OLD s.v.3b. Most of the MSS read *compressa*, i.e. *was crushed*, in support of which Ellis cites Euripides Med. 1190ff., *φεύγει δ' ἄναστάσ' ἐκ θρόνων πυρομένη/ σείσονα χαίτην κράτά τ' ἄλλοτ', ἄλλοσε/ ῥίψαι θέλουσα στέφανον. ἄλλ' ἀραφότως/ σύνδεσμαι χρυσός εἰχε, τῶρ δ' ἐπεί κόμην/ ἔσεσε, μᾶλλον δίς τόσως τ' ἐλάμπετο*. However, it is the fire imagery which ties this *exemplum* to the preceding and following couplets.

**corona:** In Euripides’ Medea, both a poisoned robe and crown are mentioned, while Hyginus Fab. 25 mentions only a crown.

**pater nuptae:** Creon.

**cumque parente domus:** Medea considered burning the palace in Euripides’ play (378), but did not in fact do so. In later accounts, however, the burning of the palace is frequently noted. Cf. Ovid Met. 7.395, *flagrantemque domum regis mare vidit utrumque . . . ;* Hyginus Fab. 25; Seneca Med. 885ff.; V.Fl. 1.226; Apuleius Met. 1.10 etc.

603-604 The final exemplum in this series is that of Hercules, whose flesh was eaten away by the poisoned robe sent to him by Deianira, until he finally consigned himself to a fiery pyre on Mt. Oeta. For the terrible effects of the potion on Hercules’ body, see especially Sophocles Tr. 1053ff.: *πλευράσι νὰρ προσμαχθὲν ἐκ μὲν ἔσχάτας/ βέβρικε σάρκας, πλεύμονος τ᾿ ἀρτηρίας/ ῥοφεὶ ἔννοικοῦν,* and Ovid Met. 9.166ff.: *nec mora, letiferam conatur scindere vestem:/ qua trahitur, trahit illa cutem,*
foedunque relatu,/ aut haeret membris frustra temptata revelli,/ aut laceros artus et
grandia detegit ossa./ ipse cruor, gelido ceu quondam lammina candens/ tincta lacu,
stridit coquiturque ardente veneno./ nec modus est, sorbent avidae praecordia
flammane,/ caeruleusque fluid toto de corpore sudor,/ ambustique sonant nervi. . . .
cruor Herculeos abit diffusus in artus: compare the very similar phraseology at
Met. 9.162, Herculeos abit late dilapsa per artus. The adjective Herculeus makes
its first appearance in Latin poetry in Vergil; Ovid showed his fondness for it by using
it a total of 18 times in his works.
cruor: i.e. of Nessus.
abiit: for abire in similar contexts cf. Met. 9.162 cited above, Lucan 6.96f.; further
citations may be found in Bömer’s discussion of Met. 8.255.
virus edat: compare Fast. 5.403, wherein a virus edax attacks Chiron when mortally
wounded by one of Hercules’ poisoned arrows, and in Met. 9.201f., the ignis edax
plagues Hercules.

The Hercules couplet thus shares with the preceding couplet the common
feature of raiment poisoned by a jealous rival, but unlike the preceding example, the
sender, Deianira, is unaware of the terrible properties of her gift. Moreover, in
addition to the couplet’s obvious link with the Meleager exemplum as an example of
a hero being consumed by hidden flames, there is a more subtle connection, for
Deianira was Meleager’s sister, and indeed in Met. 9.149f. she invokes him as she
ponders what course of action to take to win back her husband: “quid si me,
Meleagre, tuam memor esse sororem/ forte paro facinus, quantumque iniuria possit/
femineusque dolor, iugulata paelice testor?”

No satisfactory explanation has been posited for this victim who was punished,
or less probably avenged, by his offspring with a novel form of weapon. Prataliden
. . . Lycastum is the emendation of Ellis (American Journal of Philology 23 (1902),
pp.204ff., in place of the variations on Pentheliden and Lycurgum found in the
manuscripts. Ellis makes a forced and unconvincing connection with Parthenius 35
concerning a Cretan named Lycastus, and his illicit union with the king’s daughter.
When the girl was slain in accordance with an oracle, and it was discovered that she was pregnant, the king had Lycastus killed. With this story in mind, Ellis would translate the Ovidian couplet, "May the stroke that is in store for you be dealt by the same unlooked for weapon by means of which Lycastus' unborn child punished its father". Not only is his interpretation of novi strained, as he admits, but his explanation requires that both proper names in the couplet, Lycastum and Pratiliden, undergo considerable corruption; further, while he notes a Lycastius called πραταλίδας Λυκάστιος in AP 7.449, there is no evidence to associate that Lycastius with the Lycastus of Parthenius' story. Indeed, the entire notion that the unborn child was punishing its father seems very far-fetched, and I see no reason to support his emendation of the text. If we retain the reading of the MSS, Pentheliden and its variants would suggest a descendent of Penthilos, son of Orestes, and tyrant of Lesbos (cf. Strabo 9.2.3; Pausanias 3.2.1.; Tzetzes on Lyc. Alex. 1374). Although nothing is known about any such descendent named Lycurgus, La Penna's suggestion that the victim might have been featured in a local history detailing the deaths of tyrants is attractive. See his discussion ad loc.

607-608 Milo: Milo, who lived in the second half of the 6th century B.C., and was a native of Croton in Southern Italy, was the most famous athlete of antiquity (cf. Strabo 6.1.12 ἐπίφανεστατος μὲν τῶν ἀθλητῶν γεγονός). He was awarded numerous championships in wrestling at both the Olympian and Pythian games, but it was his pride in his brute strength which was said to have led to his death: chancing upon an oak tree one day which had been partially split and blocked with wedges, Milo tried to pull the tree apart with his hands. In so doing, however, he dislodged the wedges and when he relaxed his hold, the wood snapped back and pinned his hands. Unable to free himself, he was eaten by wolves. Cf. the account of Valerius Maximus 9.12. ext. 9, Milo Crotoniates cum iter faciens quercum in agro cuneis adactis fissam vidisset, fretus viribus accessit ad eam insertisque manibus divellere conatus est. Quas arbor excussis cuneis in suam naturam revocata compressit eumque cum tot gymnicens palmis lacerandum feris praebuit; Juvenal Sat 10.10; Gellius 15.16; Paus.
6.14.3; and Strabo 6.1.12. Ovid is the only Augustan poet who mentions Milo (also in *Met.* 15.229-31), although his prowess in athletics was referred to on more than one occasion by Cicero (cf. e.g. *Cato* 27.33). For more on Milo and his career consult *RE* 15, 1672, 62ff.

609-612 The murder of the countryman Icarus (or Icarius), and the subsequent suicide of his daughter Erigone are highlighted here.

609-610 munera: when Icarus welcomed the god Dionysus into his home, the god in turn gave to him the vine and the art of making wine. Icarus proceeded to share his new gift with his neighbours, but they, being unused to the wine’s intoxicating effects, thought that they had been poisoned, and therefore attacked and killed Icarus. The myth is said to have received its literary form from Eratosthenes in the 3rd century B.C., in his *Erigone* (for the remaining fragments of which, see Powell, *Coll. Alex.* fr.22-27, p.64-5); brief references to the tale may be found in Propertius 2.33.27-30 (with Camp *ad loc.*), Ovid *Met.* 10.450f. (with Bömer’s note), Hyginus *Fab.* 130, *Astr.* 2.4, Apollodorus *Bib.* 3.14.7, Statius *Theb.* 11.644-7, and Servius *ad Georg.* 2.389. The most detailed account is found in the *Dionysiaca* (47.34-245) of the late Greek poet Nonnus. For artistic representations of the myth consult *LIMC* s.v. Erigone.

Icarus: the Greek form of the name is usually rendered as 'Ικαρίος, but Ovid here and in *Met.* 10.450 uses the form *Icarus*, as does Propertius at 2.33.29.


armatas ••• manus: for the weaponry of Icarus’ assailants, see the account of Nonnus, *Dionys.* 47.116 ff.: καὶ χορὸς ἄγρονμον φοιώ δεδουημένος οἰστρῳ/ τλήμωνος ’Ικαρίου κατέτρεξε θυίαδι λύσθη/ οἷα τε φαρμακόντα κερασομένου δόλου οίνου, / δς μὲν ἔχων βουλήγα σιδήρεον, δς δὲ μακέλλη/ θωρήξας έο χείρας, / ο δ’ ἵστατοτόμῳ ἀρση/ κοψίζων, ἔτερος δὲ λίθον περιμετρον ἁείρων, / ἀλλος ἀνεπτύγχα καλαύφορα χειρί τιταίνων, / γηραλεδί πλήσοντες. ἐλῶν δὲ τις ἐγγύς ἰμάσθηνι/ ’Ικαρίου τέτρην δέμας ταμεσίχροι κέντρῳ.
Icarus’ daughter Erigone was eventually led by her dog to the spot where her father’s unburied body lay beneath a tree. The girl, overwhelmed with grief, hung herself from the tree. Dionysus was so incensed at the deaths of Icarus and Erigone that he afflicted young Athenian girls with madness and caused them to hang themselves in imitation of Erigone. To propitiate the god and honour the shepherd and his daughter, the Athenians instituted the festival of Aiora in Erigone’s honour, during which girls swung from trees. Later, masks designed as oscilla replaced the girls. Cf. Servius ad Georg. 2.389; Athenaeus 14.10; Call. fr.178 (Pf.)


vincula per laquei: with the phrase compare Met. 14.735, cum foribus laquei religaret vincula summis. For Erigone’s death, see the description of Nonnus, Dionys. 47.221 ff.,... μανωμένη δὲ (Ἡργόνη) / εἰς φυτὸν υψικάρηνον ἀνέδραμεν. ἀμφὶ δὲ δενδρῷ ἀγχονίῳ σφίγξασα περίπλοκον ἀνχένα δεσμῷ/ αὐτόφωνῳ στροφάλιγγι μετάρσους ἄλετο κοῦρην/ ἀμφοτέρους δονεόνσα ποδας βητάρμουν παλμῷ.

Ovid here alludes to the death of the Spartan, Pausanias, the son of Cleambrotus I, and nephew of Leonidas, who was suspected of intrigue with Persia. After the Ephors had determined his guilt and were on their way to arrest him, he fled to the temple of Athene Chalcioecus and there took refuge. The building was then completely sealed up by the Ephors, and Pausanias was left to starve to death within the enclosure. When he was on the verge of expiring, he was removed from the temple, lest it be profaned by his death.

legem poenae: poenae defines, in a very general way, the subject of the law. Cf. OLD s.v. ‘lex’ 2b.

ipsa parens: cf. the accounts of C. Nepos Paus. 5 (Dicitur eo tempore matrem Pausaniae vixisse eamque iam magno natu, postquam de scelere filii comperit, in primis ad filium claudendum lapidem ad introitum aedis attulisse); Diodorus Siculus 11.45.6; Polyaeenus 8.51; and the scholiast on Thucydides, who all relate that Pausanias’ mother helped to seal up the temple. Thucydides, however, (1.134) makes
no mention of this in his account of Pausanias’ death.

615-616 The clues given to this victim’s identity, 1) that he violated an image of Minerva, and 2) that he turned his course from the haven of Aulis, suggest a member of the Greek force assembled for the Trojan War, but there is no consensus as to whom the couplet refers. The two principle candidates are Odysseus and Ajax Oileus: the scholia, followed by Ellis and André in their commentaries *ad loc.*, explained the couplet as an allusion to Odysseus, who, with Diomedes, stole the Palladium, the sacred idol of Troy (cf. especially *Met.* 13.337ff., with Bömer’s notes *ad loc.*, where Ulysses refers to the Palladium as *signum . . . Minervae* (337, 381) and tells how he stole it from its shrine (341ff.). The point of the pentameter, according to Ellis, would lie in Odysseus’ role in persuading Agamemnon to sacrifice his daughter Iphigenia, to secure favourable winds for the departure of the fleet from Aulis (cf. Hyginus *Fab.* 98, *Met.* 13.181ff.). An allusion to Odysseus would tie in neatly with the following couplet, which refers to the stoning of Palamedes, instigated by none other than Odysseus, and, as André remarks, it does not invoke Olysseus’ death upon Ibis (already alluded to at 565f.), but the many years of suffering he had to endure before finally returning home. However La Penna, noting that the implication of the couplet is that the goddess punished the one responsible for the violation of her image, objected that Minerva was always the protectress of Odysseus, and hence he, like Housman (see *Journal of Philol.* 35 (1920) p.299), espoused Ajax Oileus as a more suitable candidate, since he incurred the wrath of Minerva when he tore Cassandra from the goddess’ statue (cf. 339f. and commentary *ad loc.*). La Penna theorizes that the pentameter might well allude to a tradition, lost to us, that Ajax disregarded a sinister omen before departing from Aulis, while Housman equates the phrase *leve iter* with the Homeric description of Ajax as lightly-armed (*λιοντόρηξ*, *Il.* 9.529). However, a reference to Ajax here would seem an uncharacteristic repetition of the imprecation of 339f., since the shipwreck and drowning of Ajax were his punishment for the violation of Athene’s temple.

For the suggestion that the couplet may instead refer to Acamas, son of
Theseus, see Ellis *ad loc.*; for the alternate reading of *Diana* for *Minerva*, and the couplet as an allusion to Agamemnon, see the discussion of La Penna *ad loc.*

**simulacra:** it is not necessary to assume, as André does, that the plural *simulacra* signifies the two images of the Palladium, the true image, kept hidden away, and a false one kept in the shrine (cf. Vergil *Aen.* 2.172ff.; Dion Hal. 1.69) - Ovid elsewhere uses *simulacra* simply as a poetic plural; cf. *Met.* 7.358; 10.280, with Bömer’s note *ad loc.*

617-618 **Naupliadaeve modo:** the patronymic occurs twice in the *Metamorphoses* (13.39, 310), and in this passage, all in reference to Nauplius’ son Palamedes, but it is not found elsewhere in Augustan poetry. According to Pausanias (2.38.2; 4.35.2), Nauplius was the son of Poseidon and Amymone, and founder of Nauplia; his son Palamedes incurred the wrath of Odysseus when he placed the life of Odysseus’ young son Telemachus in danger, in order to prove that Odysseus’ supposed madness was merely a pretext for not joining the expedition to Troy. The ploy on Palamedes’ part was successful, but Odysseus subsequently got his revenge, when he hid a pile of gold in Palamedes’ tent at Troy and forged a letter from Priam which compromised the young Greek. Palamedes was accused of treachery at Odysseus’ instigation and stoned to death by the Greek forces. Neither Palamedes nor Odysseus’ feigned madness are mentioned by Homer (cf. Cicero *Off.* 3.97, *apud Homerus... talis de Ulixe nulla suspicio est*). According to the author of the *Cypria* (see Paus. 10.31.2), Palamedes was drowned by Diomedes and Odysseus while fishing, and Dictys (2.15) related that Palamedes was lured by Diomedes and Odysseus into a well in search of a treasure and then stoned. The most popular version of Palamedes’ death, however, the one which was adopted by the tragedians (Polyaen. 1. *prooem*.), was the stoning on the charge of treason. Cf. Ovid *Met.* 13.56-62, 308ff.; Vergil *Aen.* 2.81 ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 105; Apollodorus *Epit.* 6.8, 3.7-8; and scholia on Euripides *Orestes* 432.

**ficto:** the manuscripts are divided between *ficto* and *falso*, both of which occur in conjunction with Palamedes’ death in Ovid’s account in *Met.* 13: cf. 13.59f., *fictumque probavit/ crimine et ostendit, quod iam praefoderat, aurum*, and 13.308f.,
... an falsa Palameden crimine turpe/ accusasse mihi, vobis damnasse decorum est?
Either adjective is plausible here; we can only note that falsum crimen is the more common turn of phrase in Ovid. Cf. Am. 2.2.37f., 3.9.63, Her. 6.22, Fast. 4.308.

non meruisse: as Austin notes in his commentary on Aen. 2.82f., "Palamedes' condemnation and death was a by-word for an unjust judgement," and was used by Socrates as an exemplum for himself in the Apology of Plato (41b: ἐπεὶ ἔμωγε καὶ αὐτῷ θαναμαστῇ ἣν ἐν ἡ διατριβῇ αὐτῶθι, ὅποτε ἐντύχομι Παλαμήδει καὶ . . . εἰ τις ἄλλος τῶν παλαιῶν διὰ κρίσιν ἄλκον τέθηκεν, ἀντιπαραβάλλοντι τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ πάθη πρὸς τὰ ἐκεῖνων...), and that of Xenophon (Apol. 26).

619-624 Two exempla tenuously identified with fragmentary episodes from Callimachus' Aetia.

619-620 This couplet appears to allude to the prohibition of the Isindians of Asia Minor from the Pan-Ionian festival, because of the actions of an unknown Isindian who killed his guest Aethalos. Thus scholium G explains: Isidius, a loco sic dictus Talon [i.e. Aethalon?], hospitem suum, occidit; quare lo omnes homines illius regionis a sacrificio suo repellit. Zipfel, p.39f., and Perrotta, p.197, first posited a connection with Callimachus, and it was subsequently identified with the fragmentary remains of Callimachus' treatment of a myth dealing with the Isindians in Book 3 of the Aetia (cf. fr.78 Pf., with his commentary and the accompanying Diegesis).


Isindius: a possible reference to the Callimachean treatment of the story may be found in Stephen of Byzantine, s.v. Ἡσύνδος, under which heading he states: πόλεσ Ἡσύνδος ὁ πολίτης Ἡσύνδος ζήτησεν νόμον ἀνετιτάς. For the obviously corrupt ἀνετιτάς, Pfeiffer conjectures ἐν Ἡσύνδων τρίτης.

nunc quoque: suggestive of an aition; cf. the aetiological story at 376f. where nunc quoque is also used.

Ion: singular for plural.

621-622 The scholia on the Ibis explain this couplet as follows (BCD,cf.G): Melantheus homicidium fecit et in domum matris suae fugit ibique se abscondit; quem sequentes
inimici eius quaeiverunt a mater. Mater accenso lumine - putabat enim illum non posse inveniri - cum ipsis coepit quasi inquirens ire per domum, et sic filius interfectus est. Ellis dismissed this as nothing more than a tale concocted to explain the Ovidian verses, and in the absence of any other evidence or explanation, proposed that the couplet referred to Odysseus after he had returned to Ithaca disguised as a beggar, when he tried to avoid being recognized by the old serving woman, Eurycleia (Od. 19.386). The interpretation was not without problems, for the old nurse (for whom the term parens is not strictly appropriate) knew Odysseus by touching his scar, not through the agency of light, nor did she betray him. In addition, Odysseus at that point had not yet taken his revenge on the herdsman Melantheus (cf. Od. 19.474, Ibis 390 and commentary ad loc). The subsequent discovery of the Callimachean Diegesis, however, has provided an entirely different and plausible explanation for the couplet. For, according to this, Callimachus told the story of a certain Pasikles, archon of Ephesus, who "was attacked when leaving a banquet. The assailants were in difficulty on account of the darkness, but when they approached the temple of Hera, Pasikles' mother, who was a priestess there, heard the noise of the pursuit, and ordered a lamp to be brought out. And in this way they got a light, and killed her son." (Dieg. ad fr.102 Pf., Loeb trans.) Johannes Stroux, "Erzählungen aus Kallimachos", Philol. 89 (1934), p.310 ff., first connected the remarks of the Diegesis with this passage of the Ibis, and noted the contrast between the tenebris and officio luminis was a neat parallel of the ὑπὸ τοῦ σκότους καὶ λύχνον ἐκελεύειν προσευγκεῖν found in the Diegesis.

Melanthea . . . a caede: the Diegesis gives no clue to the assailants' identity, merely calling them τυφές, but Stroux connects this story of Pasicles with an episode related by Aelian (V.H. 3.26), in which Pindaros, tyrant of Ephesus, was forced to leave the city, but left behind his son and many of his goods in the guardianship of one of his followers, Pasicles. Stroux then conjectures that Pasicles, in his official capacity as archon, became an obstacle to the reinstatement of the tyranny of Pindaros, and was slain by Pindaros' son. According to Aelian, Pindaros was ὁ Μέλανος νιὼς, and thus
Stroux argues that the adjective *melanthea* in the Ovidian couplet designates Pindarus’ son, the descendant of Melas, as the murderer of Pasicles. It is indeed a remarkable coincidence of names, if the two stories are not related, and Stroux’s conjecture is attractive. However even without it, the *Diegesis* alone sheds considerable light on the *Ibis* couplet.

623-624 The hexameter refers back to the death of Aethalos, the pentameter to the murder of Pasicles.

*auxilliis . . . tuis:* in an extended sense of ‘those coming to your aid’ (*OLD* s.v.3); i.e. may they be of as much avail to you as the mother of Pasicles was to her son, when she revealed his hiding place with her lamp.

625-630 Three *exempla* culled from epic mythology: the first two are derived from related incidents in the *Iliad* involving the nocturnal raid of Odysseus and Diomedes on the Trojan camp, while the third *exemplum*, from the *Aeneid*, alludes to the the exploits of the Trojans Nisus and Euryalus in the Rutulian camp.

625-626 When Hector asked for a volunteer to scout the Greek camp in the tenth year of the war, in order to see whether the Greeks were planning to flee or to stay and fight, Dolon, the son of the herald Eumedes, volunteered for the mission on the condition that he should receive Achilles’ horses and chariot in return. He set forth under cover of darkness, but was caught on the way by Odysseus and Diomedes, who were out on a scouting mission of their own. In his fear, Dolon confessed his mission, and told the two Greeks how the Trojan army and allies were positioned, and of the late arrival of the Thracians with their king Rhesus. After he had told them all that he knew, in the hope that his life would be spared, Dolon was slain by Diomedes. Compare the accounts of Homer *Il.* 10.314ff.; Hyginus *Fab.* 113; Ovid *Met.* 13.243ff. Dolon’s capture and murder is featured on a number of late Archaic Attic vases and southern Italian vases, as well as on gems and miniatures. Consult *LIMC* s.v. ‘Dolon’, figs. 17-24.

*equos pacto:* for the promise of Achilles’ horses and chariot, cf. Homer *Il.* 10.322; Vergil *Aen.* 10.581; *Georg.* 3.91; and Ovid *Met.* 13.253f. Note the word play which
Ovid indulges here with *pacto* and *acta*, to emphasize the great gulf between Dolon’s expectations and the actual consequences of his mission, and the contrast between *fortis* . . . *Achilles*, and *Phrygi timido*.

**Phrygi timido**: Dolon’s fright when captured is described in *Il. 10.374ff.*, . . . ὃ δ’ ἄρ ἐστὶν τάρβησεν τελ βαμβαίνων, ἀράβος δὲ διὰ στόμα γίγνετ’ ὄδοντων/ χλωρὸς ὑπαί δείονς. In *Met. 13.244* Ovid mentions Dolon by name as *Phrygia de gente Dolona*.

627-628 **Rhesus**: acting on the information that they had extracted from Dolon, Odysseus and Diomedes continued on to the Trojan camp, in search of the Thracian king Rhesus, who had arrived only that day with his forces. The fame of Rhesus’ horses, which were white as snow, and as fast as the wind (*Il. 10.437*) led them on, and when they discovered that the Thracians had fallen asleep without setting any guard, Diomedes went on a rampage, slaying Rhesus and twelve of his men, while Odysseus led away the horses. Cf. Homer *Il. 10.434ff.*; Euripides *Rhesus*, esp. 756 ff.; Apollodorus *Epit. 4.4*; Vergil *Aen.* 1.469ff.; Hyginus *Fab* 113; Ovid *Met.* 13.249ff., etc. Southern Italian vases depict the attack on Rhesus, and the theft of the horses - cf. *LIMC* s.v. ‘Diomedes’.

**somno meliore quiescas**: a witty double entendre referring not only to the deep sleep of exhaustion into which Rhesus and his men had fallen, but also to the ‘eternal sleep’ of death.

**comites . . . tum necis, ante viae**: i.e. first in their march to Troy from Thrace, and then in their slaughter. For *comites* with a dependent genitive, cf. Cicero *Amic.* 11.37.

629-630 In an expedition patterned after that of Diomedes and Odysseus in the *Iliad*, Vergil portrayed the young Trojan friends Nisus and Euryalus stealing into the Rutulian camp during the night, and slaying the augur Ramnes along with many of his companions (*Aen.* 9.176 ff.); unlike Odysseus and Diomedes in the preceding couplet, however, Nisus and Euryalus did not make it back to the safety of their own camp.

**Hyrtacides**: Nisus, the son of Hyrtacus. Cf. Vergil’s use of the patronymic at *Aen.*
9.177,234, and 319 to refer to Nisus, and Ovid Tr. 1.5.12, Hyrtacidae Nisi.

**Hyrtacidaeque comes:** the loyalty and devotion shown by the two friends to each other in the *Aeneid* resulted in their becoming an *exemplum* of true friendship, analogous to that of Orestes and Pylades. Cf. Tr. 1.5.24; Hyginus *Fab.* 257.

631-632 Cliniadaeve modo: the son of Clinias was a historical figure, the Athenian Alcibiades, who was murdered in 404 B.C. in Phrygia, at the instigation of Lysander and the thirty tyrants. According to Plutarch (*Alc.* 39) those who had been given the task of killing Alcibiades did not dare to slay him openly, and so set fire to the house in which he was sleeping. When he emerged from the flames within, he was shot with javelins and arrows. Cf. the accounts of Cornelius Nepos *Alc.* 10; Diod. Sic. 14.11; and Justin 5.8.13-14.

**Stygiae ... neci:** a typically Ovidian touch, which produces a more vivid image than would be achieved by having either *neci* or *Stygi* alone. Cf. *Met.* 3.694f., *Stygia mors*.

**semicremata:** the equivalent of the Greek ἡμίφλεκτα, the adjective is found for the first time in Latin poetry here, and it recurs again only in Martial 11.54.2, *turaque de medio semicremata rogo*. McKeown (on *Am.* 1.6.3f.) notes Ovid's fondness for the prefix *semi-*, particularly in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.

633-634 Remo: the final mythological *exemplum* is drawn from the legend of Rome's founding, wherein Remus mocked the efforts of his brother Romulus, who was marking out the boundary for his settlement on the Palatine hill, by jumping over the fledgling wall. According to traditional accounts, Romulus thereupon slew Remus for his act of sacrilege. Thus Livy 1.7.2: *Vulgatior fama est ludibrio fratris Remum novos transiluisse muros; inde ab irato Romulo, cum verbis quoque increpitans adieisset, 'sic deinde, quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea', interfectum.* In the *Fasti* (4.843), Ovid departs from this tradition, and says that a man named Celer killed Remus, rather than Romulus. Aurelius Victor, *De viribus illust.* 1.4, also makes Celer the killer, and this variant tradition is noted by both Dionysus Hal. (1.87), and Plutarch (*Rom.* 10.1).
rustica tela: specified in the *Fasti* (4.843) as a *rutrum*, or shovel.

635-636 *denique*: the final curse which Ovid wishes upon his enemy is that he may suffer the agony of exile in Tomis, as Ovid has. The very compression of the couplet, and its climactic position, is the key to its effectiveness: after such a long series of mythological and literary afflictions, the personal nature of this curse and the economically menacing *sagittas* strike the reader with a jolt and remind him of the bleak reality of Ovid’s life in exile. Similarly in *Tr.* 3.11, and 5.8, both letters to an unnamed detractor, Ovid concludes with the wish that they too might suffer the penalty with which he is afflicted.

*Sarmaticas inter Geticasque sagittas*: the poisoned arrows of the inhabitants, symbolic of the barbarian land in which he is compelled to dwell, are frequently mentioned by Ovid in the epistles of his exile. Cf., for example, *Tr.* 4.1.65ff., esp. 77f.; 4.4.55ff.; 5.7.43ff.; 5.10.15ff. etc.

**his . . . vivas et moriare locis**: i.e. ‘may you be kept here in exile without recall for the rest of your life’.

637-642 A short epilogue brings the poem to its conclusion.

637 *haec*: referring to the *vota* of 640.

**tantisper**: ‘for the moment’. *Tantisper* is rarely found in poetry after Plautus; cf. Seneca *Thy.* 280, *hic placet poenae modus/ tantisper*, with Tarrant’s note.

**subito**: rendered by Ellis as ‘hasty’, ‘extemporized’; the mocking disparagement of his own work heightens the irony of the concluding line of the couplet, *inmemores ne nos esse querare tibi*.

639 *pauca*: supply *vota* from the following line. It is, in fact, the longest of the poems composed during his exile.

641 *postmodo . . .*: the final couplet reinforces the threat made at 49ff., to send more curses against Ibis if he persists in troubling Ovid: *et neque nomen in hoc nec dicam facta libello,/ teque brevi qui sis dissimulare sinam./ Postmodo, si perges, in te mihi liber iambus/ tincta Lycambeo sanguine tela dabit.*

642 *pede*: i.e. iambic metre, the traditional metre of invective. Cf. 44, *non soleant quamvis hoc pede bella geri*, and commentary *ad loc.*
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