

a much bolder rhetorical strategy. Now he asks Venus to give up *two* things and in return offers her the shrine and—nothing! Why? The poet, I suggest, is implying that Glycera is herself special enough to compensate for the loss of temple and worshippers on Cyprus. Horace is magnifying Glycera by implication. In the *Iliad* Helen's beauty is never described but indicated only by the effect it has on the Trojan elders. Here Glycera's remarkable qualities are not described but only hinted at by what he is asking Venus to do on no other grounds than herself.<sup>10</sup>

This remarkable hyperbole, implicit only, is reinforced by two explicit cases of hyperbole: in line 2 Horace says *sperne* 'reject with scorn' rather than simply 'leave behind' (for example *linque*);<sup>11</sup> and in line 4 *transfer* suggests 'move lock, stock, and barrel', which is explicated by lines 5–8, the request to bring her entire retinue. The poem is thus an extravagant compliment to Glycera, all the more extravagant for the absence of any hint that Horace desires her for himself.<sup>12</sup>

The poem as restored is a breath-taking display by Horace of good will toward a woman he is inviting his audience to admire. The new text, differing from the old only by the addition of a single *ac*, not only rids us of the sole case in the *Odes* where Horace misleads a first-time reader but also brings the text closer to Greek descriptions of shrines such as Venus' and removes unhelpful distractions from the poet's chosen topic.

University of Virginia

DAVID KOVACS

[kovacs@virginia.edu](mailto:kovacs@virginia.edu)

doi:10.1017/S000983882200012X

### ARS ADEO LATET (OVID, *METAMORPHOSES* 10.252)

#### ABSTRACT

*The problems recently detected in the famous words ars adeo latet arte sua (Ov. Met. 10.252) can be resolved if the line is repunctuated on the basis of an unjustly neglected interpretation put forward by Byzantine and Renaissance scholars.*

**Keywords:** Ovid; *Metamorphoses*; textual criticism; ancient scholarship; Graeco-Latin bilingualism; editing

<sup>10</sup> E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), 198 says that 'Glycera remains completely in the background; it does not matter who she is or what the poet may feel for her'. Horace's *erōs* for her is in the background, but I would argue that the lady herself is very much to the fore.

<sup>11</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard say that *sperne* 'need not imply contempt', and they cite *Carm.* 3.2.24 *spernit humum*. But when in that passage Virtus leaves the earth behind, it is in a spirit of rejection, as would have been apparent in a fuller quotation: *coetusque vulgaris et udam | spernit humum fugiente penna*. Nisbet and Rudd ad loc. say, correctly, that the word expresses 'disdain'.

<sup>12</sup> There may be a still more startling compliment in the phrase *Glyceræ ... aedem*. Some scholars (Page, Moore, West, Mayer) interpret this to mean that she has a shrine to Venus in her house, while Garrison thinks that a *hetaira*'s house would naturally be considered a shrine of Venus. Kiessling and Heinze say that the house becomes Venus' shrine on the goddess' arrival. In a phrase such as 'the temple of X', however, X is normally a divinity. Perhaps the compliment is more daring still and Glycera is the goddess to whom the *aedes* is consecrated. Horace would be asking Venus to visit someone as potent in the field of love as herself.

'Textual difficulties as well as problems of content are sometimes prone to being overlooked in famous passages, because their very familiarity tends to stifle reflection on their actual meaning.' Setting out from these words, Martin Korenjak has proposed that the famous phrase *ars adeo latet arte sua* (Ov. *Met.* 10.252) presents difficulties, and that emendation may be called for.<sup>1</sup> Korenjak offers a few suggestions for correction, but concludes that 'the true solution presumably still remains to be found'.<sup>2</sup>

The object of this contribution is to put forward what seems a likely textual elucidation of the problem. It was not considered by Korenjak, but it does have support from the Byzantine indirect tradition.

Here is the relevant passage in full (Ov. *Met.* 10.247–53), where Pygmalion begins to fall in love with the statue of a woman he has sculpted:

interea niueum mira feliciter arte  
 sculpsit ebur formamque dedit, qua femina nasci  
 250 nulla potest, operisque sui concepit amorem.  
 uirginis est uerae facies, quam uiuere credas  
 et, si non obstet reuerentia, uelle moueri;  
 ars adeo latet arte sua. miratur et haurit  
 pectore Pygmalion simulati corporis ignes.

Although the known Latin manuscripts are, according to modern editions, unanimous in reading *ars adeo latet arte sua*, it is certain that not all readers of editions of the text circulating in the Byzantine period had this version of *Met.* 10.252 before their eyes.

Maximus Planudes (1255–1305) made a Greek prose translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the autograph copy of which still survives (Vatican City, Reg. gr. 132, dated to around 1294). His translation is generally thought to be fairly faithful to Ovid's text, and was based on the collation of various Latin manuscripts, some of which are probably now lost.<sup>3</sup> In Planudes's work, the final four lines of the above passage are translated in this way: παρθένου γὰρ ἦν ὄντως τὸ εἶδος, ἦν ἐμπνεῖν ἂν πιστεύσαις, κἄν, εἰ μὴ ἀνθίστατο ἡ αἰδώς, καὶ κινεῖσθαι δὴ βούλεσθαι. διὰ δὴ ταῦτα καὶ ἡ τέχνη λανθάνει. ὁ δὲ Πυγμαλίων τὴν τε ἑαυτοῦ τέχνην θαυμάζει, κἄν τῇ ψυχῇ τὸν τοῦ πεπλασμένου σώματος εἰσδέχεται ἔρωτα.<sup>4</sup> This naturally suggests either that Planudes did not understand and so reworked line 10.252, or that he had before him a different Latin text. Neither possibility can be ruled out. Whatever the reason, Planudes's version is different in that it has no reference at all to art hiding in its own art: *ars adeo latet arte sua. miratur et haurit* | *pectore Pygmalion simulati corporis ignes* has been turned into διὰ δὴ ταῦτα καὶ ἡ τέχνη λανθάνει. ὁ δὲ Πυγμαλίων τὴν τε ἑαυτοῦ τέχνην θαυμάζει ('on account, indeed, of these even the art escapes notice; and Pygmalion admires his own art').

<sup>1</sup> M. Korenjak, 'Ars adeo latet arte sua: what is art's art?', *CQ* 70 (2020), 443–6.

<sup>2</sup> Korenjak (n. 1), 445.

<sup>3</sup> On the character of the work and the autograph manuscript, see V. Kōpanos, 'Παρατακτικὰ ζεύγη στίχ μεταφράσεις τοῦ Μᾶξιμου Πλανουδῆ', *EEThess* 13 (1974), 21–34; I. Tsavari, 'Deux nouveaux autographes de Maxime Planude', *Dodone* 16 (1987), 225–9; E.A. Fisher, *Planudes' Greek Translation of Ovid's Metamorphoses* (New York and London, 1990); E.A. Fisher, 'Planudes' technique and competence as a translator of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *ByzSlav* 62 (2004), 143–60; E.A. Fisher, 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, sailing to Byzantium', *CML* 27 (2007), 45–67.

<sup>4</sup> M. Papathomopoulos and I. Tsavari, 'Ὄβιδίου Περὶ Μεταμορφώσεων, ὁ μετήνεγκεν ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων φωνῆς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα Μᾶξιμος μοναχὸς ὁ Πλανουδῆς (Athens, 2002), on *Met.* 10.247–53.

This gives rise to a new interpretation of the line. There is no available evidence for the original ancient punctuation of the *Metamorphoses*, if any ever existed, and in this particular instance one can see that Planudes has interpreted the punctuation of the line in a way that differs from modern scholars. He must have read *ars adeo latet. arte sua miratur*, from which one could translate ‘the *ars* is truly hidden; Pygmalion is amazed at his own *ars*’.<sup>5</sup> In other words, the sculpture has been so well crafted that one can hardly tell that it is not real but rather the product of *ars*; indeed, it is more perfect even than any living woman (cf. 10.248–9). Even Pygmalion is surprised by the product of his own skill in crafting the sculpture.

At a grammatical level, this needs some explanation. It is extremely rare for *miror* to take an object in the ablative case, and alleged examples of this usage listed in dictionaries are not encouraging.<sup>6</sup> There is one important exception. At Verg. *Aen.* 11.126 *iustitiaene prius mirer belline laborum*, Priscian offers ablative *iustitiane* as an alternative to the genitive *iustitiaene* (*Inst.* 17 = *GL* 3.163.1–4 Hertz). The testimony of Priscian suggests that an ablative object for *miror* can be taken as poetic usage.<sup>7</sup> A less attractive alternative might be to interpret *arte sua* instead as an ablative of cause (‘he is amazed because of his own *ars*’), with *miror* intransitive; this would be subtly different from Pygmalion being amazed at his own *ars*, for which one might expect the normal accusative construction *artem suam*. As far as the metre is concerned, diaeresis at the end of the second foot is sometimes used in hexameter poetry, though rarely (in Ovid compare, for example, *Met.* 10.590 *miratur magis: et cursus facit ipse decorem*).<sup>8</sup>

Since this reading works both grammatically and metrically, it deserves attention. Planudes’s version has value in so far as it represents the interpretation of a learned scholar from the distant past, who may have had access to knowledge that has not survived to our day. Even so, Planudes’s interpretation has no ancient authority and must be judged on its own merits. In the notes to his *editio princeps* of Planudes’s Greek translation, J.F. Boissonade seems to have been the first to have recognized that Planudes had a different reading for line 10.252, but he thought that it was a bad reading on the part of the Byzantine scholar: ‘Ovidius: *Ars adeo latet arte sua; miratur*—male lecta uerba male uertit. Legisse enim uidetur, *Ars ab eo latet; artem suam miratur*’.<sup>9</sup> Boissonade did not take into account the possibility that the ablatives *arte sua* might be kept as a feature of poetic language with *miror*, and his back-translation is unmetrical.

<sup>5</sup> So as not to prejudice the matter, *ars* is here left untranslated: see Korenjak (n. 1), 444. Perhaps *ars* in this line means first ‘craft’ (i.e. there is no evidence of the arduous process of crafting, so perfect is the sculpture) and then ‘skill’ (Pygmalion is surprised by the quality of his own work when he looks at the result).

<sup>6</sup> See *ThLL* 8.2.1065.75–82.

<sup>7</sup> For ablative *iustitia* with *miror*, a usage also mentioned elsewhere in Priscian (*Inst.* 16 = *GL* 3.101.14 Hertz; 17 = 3.172.24 Hertz; 18 = *GL* 3.316.14 Hertz; 18 = *GL* 3.319.12 Hertz; 18 = *GL* 3.325.13 Hertz), see e.g. E. Spangenberg Yanes, *Prisciani Caesariensis Ars liber XVIII. Pars altera 2. Comento* (Hildesheim, 2017), 216, J. Conington and H. Nettleship, *The Works of Virgil. Vol. III* (London, 1875), 319: ‘the construction of *miror* with an abl. seems quite unexampled, in spite of Priscian’s authority’.

<sup>8</sup> Some examples are collected and discussed in H.J. Edmiston, ‘Diaeresis after the second foot of the hexameter in Lucretius’, *TAPhA* 34 (1903), lx–lxi, H.H. Huxley, ‘Significant diaeresis in Vergil and other hexameter poets’, *Vergilius* 33 (1987), 23–8, at 25.

<sup>9</sup> J.F. Boissonade, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphosen libri XV Graece uersi a Maximo Planude* (Paris, 1822), 435 n. 1.

To finish, it is interesting to note that the same punctuation is also found in the learned, old edition of Regius.<sup>10</sup> According to Regius, the words *ars adeo latet* can be explained as referring to the living quality of the statue (*'ars adeo latet: ut uiua uideretur, non ex ebore confecta'*), and the words *arte sua* can signify the statue itself (*'arte sua miratur: statuam subaudiamus'*).

This repunctuation—it is not an emendation—gets rid of an Ovidian phrase famous in modern scholarship; but it is worth remembering that *ars adeo latet arte sua* is not cited by any indirect Latin or Greek witnesses, and its obscurantist character may well be out of place in anything other than modern scholarly imagination. If this solution is right, then what Ovid wrote was rather plain.

Trinity College, Oxford

KONSTANTINE PANEGYRES  
[konstantine.panegyres@trinity.ox.ac.uk](mailto:konstantine.panegyres@trinity.ox.ac.uk)  
 doi:10.1017/S0009838822000076

## LACTANTIUS BEFORE LACTANTIUS? A HEXAMETER FROM THE *CARMINA XII SAPIENTVM* IN AN INSCRIPTION ON SAMIAN WARE FROM BELSINON (HISPANIA TARRACONENSIS)

### ABSTRACT

*This paper presents a graffito written after firing on a Samian-ware bowl dated to the turn of the first and second centuries C.E., which seems to contain part of a hexameter included in the well-known anthology Carmina XII sapientum, the composition of which has recently been attributed to the Christian author Lactantius.*

**Keywords:** Latin epigraphy; graffiti; Samian ware; *Carmina XII sapientum*

The review of an interesting group of inscriptions on Samian ware<sup>1</sup> from the ancient *mansio* of Belsinon (Mallén, Zaragoza), situated in the Middle Ebro Valley, in the interior of Hispania Tarraconensis,<sup>2</sup> has made it possible to document a sequence that seems to belong to one of the monostichs included in the *Carmina XII sapientum*, a collection of ludic poems perhaps assembled during the fourth century C.E. or a little earlier and included in modern times in the so-called *Anthologia Latina*.<sup>3</sup> It has recently

<sup>10</sup> R. Regius, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon libri XV* (Venice, 1586 [first published in 1493]), 204; on this work, see the introduction to M. Benedetti (ed.), *Raffaele Regio, In Ovidii Metamorphosin enarrationes, I (libri I–IV)* (Florence, 2008).

<sup>1</sup> I. Aguilera Aragón and B. Díaz Ariño, 'Escritura cotidiana en el ámbito rural de la Hispania tarraconense. Grafitos sobre cerámica de época alto-imperial procedentes del Campo de Borja (Zaragoza)' (forthcoming). This study is part of the Project 'Everyday Writing. Literacy, Cultural Contact and Social Change in Hispania Citerior between the Roman Conquest and Late Antiquity', financed by the Ministry of Science and Innovation of Spain.

<sup>2</sup> Ptol. *Geog.* 2.6.57; cf. F. Beltrán Lloris, 'An irrigation decree from Roman Spain: the *lex riuvi Hiberiensis*', *JRS* 96 (2006), 147–97, especially 161–2.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. R.J. Tarrant, 'Anthologia Latina', in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1986), 9–13.