ad esempio p. 18, dove, nella citazione di Ov. rem. 378, illa è da correggere in ille; p. 161, dove, nella citazione di Diomede, at è da correggere in et; inoltre p. 349 enjambment.

In conclusione, si può dire che quello di Morgan si imponga come un libro di raggarddevole rilevanza. Questo vale, in primo luogo, per i suoi contenuti: ricordiamo ancora una volta la lunga trattazione sull’endecasillabo (pp. 49–113), che merita di divenire un punto di riferimento, in particolare per gli studiosi di Stazio, Marziale e Catullo. Ma c’è da augurarsi, crediamo, che l’importanza del volume si possa presto giudicare anche per i suoi effetti: l’aver contribuito a stimolare, cioè, negli studi latini un più sistematico coinvolgimento dell’aspetto metrico.

Roma

Andrea Cucchiarelli


A key strength of this welcome new commentary on Tristia 2 is the enterprising way in which Jennifer Ingleheart combines philological rigor with an openness to interpretation of a more discursive kind: she explicitly states that she «offer[s] an interpretation» (p. 1), the outlines of which are sketched in her concise introduction (1–29), but which «will only become fully clear if the commentary is read in its entirety» (1). The politics of the poem, beginning from the familiar question of «To what extent is Tristia 2 to be read as a ‘pro-’ or ‘anti-’Augustan text?» (25), are predictably central to Ingleheart’s interpretative agenda. Her starting position, articulated with a refreshing directness on 26, is twofold: first, eschewing adherence to a flat neutrality («neutrality is not even desirable in this case»), she asserts that «readings of Tristia 2 which are receptive to the potential for subversion have proved the most rewarding in contemporary scholarship», and that «such an interpretation should…allow discussions of Tristia 2 to play a larger part in studies of Ovid and the interface between Augustan ideology and poetry». Secondly, however, this subversive element is set against the poem’s ability to be read «as the product of an ‘outraged loyalist’…, who is well informed about the evolving ideology of the Augustan regime, has supported it in the past, and is still capable of doing much for it in the future». On this dual approach, the subversive aspect belongs, we might say, to the outraged loyalist; to the outraged loyalist belongs the thought that all may not be lost, or that «Ovid can be brought within the Augustan fold if the emperor sees fit to effect this» (26).

By moving through the commentary in its entirety, as Ingleheart recommends, the reader gradually follows the storyline, instance by instance, of the subversive element in unremitting, teasing action. A favored technique is to appeal to the power of suggestion, often by concluding a given note (or part of a note) with an open-ended thought or question: so, e.g., 64 on 4 an semel est poenam commeruisse parum? («Does semel suggest that Ovid’s poetry alone deserved
punishment, in contrast to \textit{duo crimina, carmen et error, 207?}); 152 on 127 \textit{immite minaxque} («Cf. mitissime Caesar (27); how merciful is an emperor whose command is described by these adjectives?»); 210 on 216 \textit{non uacat} («...is it any wonder that Augustus has not read or misread the \textit{Ars?}»); 303 on 374 \textit{iratos...duces} («Might Ovid here evoke another \textit{iratus dux} (i.e. Augustus...?)»).

Interpretative nudges and guidelines are also beneficially encoded in Ingleheart’s summary introductions to sections of commentary: so, e.g., 215–16 on 225–30; 285–6 on 349–58; and especially 294–5 on 363–468, where she persuasively detects the privileging, in Ovid’s survey of the erotic component in earlier literature, of Latin love elegy, to the effect that he ultimately «asserts his confidence in his own poetry as the \textit{telos} of literary history» (294; in the introduction, cf. for this vision of an «elegiacized literary history» 21–4 on 'The literary past').

Yet while Ingleheart aggressively works an interpretative line into the commentary in these ways, she also fulfils the more traditional mandate of the commentator – a successful blending of objectives that distinguishes her project from those of S. G. Owen (Oxford, 1924) and Georg Luck (Heidelberg, 1967/1977). On the deficit side, however, many notes could have been curtailed through the more concise or discriminating compilation of fewer parallels, or through reference to an existing commentary that already lists the relevant material. So, e.g., 71 on \textit{11 curiae aigilatorumque laborum}, «poetry as the product of sleepless nights» is given unsparing treatment, but Ingleheart’s note scarcely supersedes (some updated bibliography aside) what is already amply recorded in (e.g.) Lyne on \textit{Ciris} 46. The same point applies to the Gigantomachy (104–5 on 71–2); to «metaphors involving comparison to stars» (177 on 167 \textit{sidus iuuenale}); to \textit{Victoria} (179–80 on 169); to \textit{lusibus} of «poetry that is generically or otherwise slight» (213 on 223); and many more examples of this tendency could be cited. Within many notes, moreover, multiple parallel or exemplary passages are cited fully in Greek or Latin when a simple reference to \textit{locus} alone could have sufficed for economy; so, e.g., 156–7 on 141 \textit{placabile numen}; 170 on 162 \textit{nisi te, nullo coninge digna fuit}; 192 on 190 \textit{premor}; 212 on 221 \textit{moles}; 222 on 232 \textit{corpor} (\textit{corpus} «used of many political units»); 263 on 309 \textit{supercilii...seueri}; 329 on 419–20 («For \textit{monumentum} with this literary sense cf. e.g. ...»). Despite these excesses, however, the store of factual information that Ingleheart provides, her attentiveness to Ovidian usage not just in \textit{Tristia 2} and the exilic corpus but across the larger oeuvre, her sensitivity to the nuances of Ovidian wordplay and tone – in combination, these strengths unquestionably give her commentary a utility and relevance that extend far beyond a narrow audience of specialists in the exile poetry.

In what follows, I offer a more detailed appraisal of (i) Ingleheart’s introduction; (ii) her text of \textit{Tristia 2}; (iii) her translation; and (iv) significant errata in the commentary and elsewhere in the book.

(i) The introduction concisely summarizes the state of opinion on issues well tilled in modern scholarship (\textit{carmen et error, 2–4}; chronology, 4–5; \textit{Tristia 2}'s
place within the exile poetry, 6–7), but in one key respect it also shows striking novelty.

Quite apart from the welcome methodological provocation that Ingleheart offers by sketching in the introduction the essentials of an interpretative line that she promises to pursue throughout the commentary, her coverage of ‘Models’ (7–21) moves beyond the familiar (she offers good coverage of Horace Epistles 2.1 on 8–10) to posit three important, and as yet unheralded, sources of influence: Epodes 17 (10–12), Cicero’s Pro Ligario (13–15) and Heroides 21 (21). She also usefully maps the poem’s ‘Rhetorical structure and argumentation’ (15–21) before moving efficiently to ‘The literary past’ (21–4) and her own special interest in Ovid’s construction in lines 363–468 of his custom-designed ‘elegiacaized literary history’ (24). The section on ‘Influence’ (27) is far too compressed to do more than merely advertize the interest of a subject that warrants much fuller treatment; equal brevity on ‘Manuscript tradition; text; translation’ (28) is at least offset by the weight of important scholarship to which she refers, while ‘Metre’ receives but fleeting mention (28): it is unfortunate that a major commentary on this scale lacks a better treatment of metrical usage.

(ii) Text:

Ingleheart prints her own text without an apparatus, and with no independent review of the MSS; while her text is (28) ‘much indebted to the text and apparatus’ of J. B. Hall’s 1995 Teubner edition, she nevertheless shows an admirable independence of mind in the extensive textual discussions incorporated within the commentary. In certain cases, those discussions are unnecessarily prolonged, reviewing proposals that could be dispensed with far more briskly, if mentioned at all: so, e.g., on line 79 (109) Ingleheart rightly rejects, but still discusses at over-generous length, Hall’s proposed *carmina ne nostros tecum uenerantia fastos* (fastos conjectured because, after Ovid’s recent allusion to the *Metamorphoses* in 63–4, for Hall LCM 16 (1991), 37, ‘another work must surely be alluded to here’); on 151 (162–3) Shackleton Bailey’s proposed lacuna of a couplet after 151 (CIQu 4 (1954), 169) is finally adjudged ‘not…necessary’ – a verdict which, if announced earlier, could have significantly guided and curtailed the note; on 211–12 (205–6) Ingleheart favors Hollis’ *altera pars superest* quae *turpi carmine facto* facto, but the case for that reading then gives way to a spacious review of several ‘other conjectures…worth considering’, only for Ingleheart to show in all but one case (Hall’s interesting *altera pars cause superest, qua carmine turpi*) that those conjectures are open to clear objection. There are many other instances where discussion of conjectures is perhaps more indulgent or dutiful than necessary, including, e.g., 213–14 on 223 *adsertere numerum/lumen*; 251 on *287–8 uter*… *si qua*; 269 on Heinsius’ *eversa est* at 318; 334 on 459 *cur*; and 388–9 on 542 *ireprehensum*.

Ingleheart generally defends her chosen readings with an impressive soundness of judgment and argument. In the following cases I register notable choices, with reservations where pertinent: *8 nam pridem emissa….ab Arte after Luck, with *nam demi iussa….ab Arte* (favored by most editors) convincingly rejected (68–9). 65 *ineuenies nostri praecomita numinis ilic* [sc. in the *Metamorphoses*]: retain *nominis* precisely because of *nominis…tui* in 62, then understanding the shift to *uestri* as connoting Housman’s *Caesarei nominus* (Class. Papers 792)? *111 ineuenies animi pignora mulia mei* (Ingleheart *sensa*) is then read in 66 with the majority of MSS, *mulia* miscievously belies the *infrrequency* with which Augustus and the imperial house actually appear in the *Metamorphoses*. *109 illa nemo* die (*nempe* conjectured by Hall in app. ad loc.): the vulgate’s *nostro* [sc. *domus*] is not necessarily *pointless* (129), but pointedly announces Ovid’s shift to our family origin/status in 109–16 as a whole? 111 *sic quoque para* etiam: *etiam* Hollis, but instead retain the vulgate’s *tamen*, to the effect that *parua quidem perit….domus* (110) receives two qualifications, the first in *sed sine labe*, the second in *sic quoque para* tamen? I.e. (cf. Ingleheart 112 ad loc.), ‘My house was admittedly *quidem*, 110 small, but (*sed* without reproach; yet *tamen* small also in such a way that…’). *165 sospite te sic sit natus quoque sospe*: retain the vulgate’s *sic te sit*, with *sic* more emphatically placed at the start of the
foot (so 161; cf. also 159, 169)? 175 praesens res vespicis urbevm: res is Heyworth’s near conjecture, plausibly read by Ingleheart (cf. 184). 191: for doubtful Matereaque turba Ingleheart tentatively proposes her own appealing Medeis turba in apposition to Colchii (197–8). 231 denique et is indeed tempting for MSS denique ut; but the excess of subordinations (221) claimed for 231–2 is no decisive argument against ut, which arguably does supply meaningful coordination between 231–2 and 233–4 if the sense is taken to be: «And finally, just as [due to your exhausting efforts] there is no part of the vast body of the empire which totters, the city too, and the protection of your laws, exhaust you.» 236 Bentley’s ingenious multus is printed by Ingleheart; but retain multus to the (more banal but still telling) effect that ‘the peace which you bestow upon nations (gentibus, ‘still telling) effect that ‘the peace which you bestow upon nations (gentibus, 229) stands as the lemma in the commentary (229); but is this colorlessness arguably an asset to Ovid’s sober, restrained case here, and therefore a point in favor of sunt ea 281 peecandi causam quam multus saepa dedurent: saepa is read by Ingleheart (after Hall) as an allusion to the voting enclosures in the Campus Martius, later reconstructed as the saepa Iulia conceived by Julius Caesar and dedicated by Agrippa in 26 BCE; there (248) «several Caesars, from Augustus… onwards, held gladiatorial contests». Or, better and less place-specific, multus quam saepe (multus quam Riese), with ludi/theatra retained from 279–80 as subject of dedurent, and with attractive stress on both the frequency of the corrupting influence and the number of the corrupted? 302 sunt tamen ipsa suis omnia tota locis: ipsa persuasively for illa after Diggle, CQu 30 (1980), 415–16. 323–4 denique cum meritis impleveris omnia, Caesar, pars mihi de meritis una camenda ful: Ingleheart prints (46) Hall’s meritis for the vulgate’s multus in the pentameter, presumably accepting his objection (Euphrosyne 20 (1992), 138, quoted on 272 ad loc.) that if Caesar has filled the whole world with his great achievements, those achievements are surely far more numerous than multa could suggest. Yet multus stands as the lemma in the commentary (272), with the following in its favor: «Alternatively, we can interpret the mismatch between multus and omnia as Ovidian subversion of his ostensibly panegyrical tone. In the inconsistency between her text and lemma, it is unclear which reading Ingleheart ultimately prefers. 331 et hoc dubito (not – em) persuasively after Diggle, CQu 30 (1980), 416. 337 Ovid on his claim to have attempted to sing of Augustus’ deeds et tamen ausus eram; sed detractare uidebar: Ingleheart asserts (279) that the variant uerebar «may be correct» as «fear is implicit in recuperationes;» but would an intolerable tension not then result between the daring and the fearful, ausus eram and uerebar? 343 haec [sc. littera] tibi me inuisum lasciuas fecit ob Artes; perhaps retain lasciusa with the majority of MSS, despite Ingleheart’s objection (283) that reading is «unfortunate: Ovid claims that, even if his work is decadent, he himself is not (347–56)?» If retained, lasciusa need betoken no more than ‘playfulness’ here (cf. OLD 2), taking up the Ovidian proclivity portrayed in 329–32 (cf. lude, 335; numeris lenioribus aptus, 332; ‘licentiousness’ (cf. OLD 3) is another matter, although Ovid may of course flirt with the ambiguity in 345. 357 honesta voluptas: voluptas is well defended (291) against the claims of voluptas. 371 Illas ipsa quid est, nisi turpis adultera: despite the seeming superfluity of adulter and the rare elision of t before short a (cf. Ingleheart 301–2), retain adulter nisi adultera with the majority of MSS for the playful, resonant effect of Illas…adulter 383 nisi saeuae flamma nonerae (of Phaedra): saeuae is eminently fitting as «the stereotypical adjective for a stepmother» (309). 495 nempe – nec invidio – tot de scribentibus unum: the vulgate’s denique nec video…unum (printed by, e.g., Owen, Luck) must be rejected at all costs; Ingleheart follows Diggle CQu 30 (1980), 418–19, his nempe modifying Bentley’s sumque (nec inuideo)…unum. 533–4: at the cost (or gain?) of repetition in coturnis…coturnus in the two lines, read et deismus tragicis sceptrum regale coturnis in 553 (coturnis MSS; tyrannis Ingleheart after Housman ad Manil. 5.458), thereby retaining
both sceptrum and coturnis in close combination as a familiar Ovidian generic marker (cf. Am. 3.1.13–14, 63)?

(iii) Translation:

Ingleheart modestly states (28) that her facing translation «is intended primarily as a basic tool to aid the reader’s understanding of the printed texts». Her rendition is admirably close to the text, and, while the effect can occasionally appear stilted (so, e.g., 10, 159–60, 267–8, 342, 437–8) or over-literary (e.g., 132 fuga «flight»: better ‘banishment’; 133 varianteque «vary»: better ‘fluctuate’), there are many fine turns, outstanding among them her rendering of 250 inaqua meo nullam carmine crimen erit: «and in what I sing there will be no sin». Some quibbles remain, e.g., on line 9 utae: dat. = «from my life», thereby yielding coordination between deme mihi and utae…dei?; 40 utere: render the imperative more directly than in «You too…should use…»; 68 render ut maior faet more explicitly?; 76 captur «a god is captivated»: better ‘won over’ (so OLD 19b)?; 124 enamoravertit of Caesar’s anger «growing more mature»: better ‘soften’, albeit the hint of «coming to maturity» remains valid (see 141 ad loc.); sic in resonant sequence at 159, 161, 165, 169, 177: render with emphatic «so»?; 241 «not written with a po-face» (frontis…seuerae): better ‘a stern brow’?; 285 patientur «cruise»: a little too casual, pace Green as cited on 250 ad loc.?; 354: bring out una ‘(but a single part’)”; 401 Lyaei: better ‘Loosener’ than «Loosers»?; 412 modus: better ‘measures’ than ‘metres’?; 514 lentus «laid-backs»: better ‘unconcerned’ (OLD 9), or, with uidisti, ‘you have gazed unfazed’?

(iv) Throughout the volume citations of the Greek are too often erroneous in accentuation and/or lettering (so, e.g., 61, 84, 87, 93, 125, 127; many more instances could be cited); it is disappointing, to say the least, that so many errors were not detected and removed in the production stages.

In the Abbreviations, under CIL read Latinarum; under Fr. Gr. Hist. read grecischen. In the introduction: 6 n. 37 for «see n. 38»; 9 n. 52 refers to Hor. Ep. 2.1.1 and quotes 2.1.2–3 just before 2.1.4 are quoted in their entirety in the main text; 9 n. 56: remove «Sicines»; 16 in citation of Rhet. Her. 1.6 for possumus read –imus; 19 n. 95 read (in citation of Cic. Inv. 1.30) magnum exceptum offendieronem; 19 in citation of Quint. Inst. 5.10.69 the subject of fit is potestas, not duius; 21 n. 111 read (in citation of Rhet. Her. 2.50) ostendemus for –imus; 23 n. 121 painting is far from the only art to which the citation from Cic. Bratus 71 applies; 28 read ‘…preserve the Tristia in its entirety’.

In the commentary: 63 on 2 miser read ‘exilic letters’; 64 on damnatas…Musas read (in citation of 3.1.7–8) id quoque; 68 on 6 notaret read ‘…may (undermining Ovid’s attempts to separate his life and poetry) allude…’; 94 on 57 (in citation of Met. 15.868–70) read faeatueae; 105 on 75–6 read ‘It is impossible…’; 119 on 97 extrema read (in citation of 3.3.1) populisque locoque; 131 on 109 error read (in citation of Met. 4.367–8) longaque erroribus actu…profuga cum conunge; 141 on 123 surge re read presumably (in citation of Prop. 2.10.11–12) surge, anime, ex humili iam carmine…; 148 on 133–8 (in citation of Met. 3.190) si poteris; 153 on 135 minax read (in citation of Hor. Carm. 4.9.7) Alcaei minaces…Camenaeae; 165 on 156 Romanum…nomen reed (in citation of Sall. Iug. 40.2) homines nominis Latin?; 166 on 156 si modo…amant reed (in citation of Liv. 36.17) ab Gadibus; 199 on 191 Materraque turba reed (in citation of Hor. 5.135–6) quaesierunt; 199 on 192 read ‘Sen. Nat. 1 pref. 9’; 210 on 217 read (in citation of Cic. Fam. 6.22.2) qui ex [de R.] te pendent; 199 on 217 orcepsplicae obscurum read (in citation of Fasti 1.85) orce unda; 215 on 224 ota nostra, the citation of Sen. Dial. 10.4.2 appears out of place in its immediate context (‘The pax Augusti brought oitum to Italy…’), but it is relevant on 224 on 235–6; 225 on 235 in boc…tantarae pendere reed (in citation of Mart. 6.64.14–15) non dedignatris bis terque revoluere [sc. nugas] Caesar; 234 on 252 stola…utaque sumpta read (in citation of Pont. 3.3.51–2, not 50–1) stola longa; 237 on 257 usitati read ‘Phaedr. 2.9.16’; 257 on 258 instret read (in citation of Hor. Epist. 2.1.120–1) orientem; 241 on 263 modo si licet ordine ferri, preferably read (in citation of Cic. Rep. 2.42) quod proprium si in nostra
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