

3 steht das Wort *igni*, am Anfang von Vers 8 steht das als Metonymie gleichbedeutende Wort *Vulcanus*; dabei verlässt im zweiten Distichon der Landmann (*arator*) das wärmende Herdfeuer, um den nun nicht mehr gefrorenen Boden (*nec prata canis albicant pruinis*) zu pflügen, während in einer gewissen Umkehrung im vierten Distichon Vulcan seine olympische Behausung verlässt, um die Feuerherde der Zyklopen aufzusuchen (*visit*). Die Distichen 2, 4, 7, 9 sind also offenbar durch teils wiederholte, teils gegensätzliche Bewegungen zu einem sorgfältig geknüpften Beziehungsnetz zusammengefasst; würde in Vers 8 *visit* durch *versat* ersetzt, so hätte dieses Netz einen Riss.

CH-8052 ZÜRICH, Höhenring 30
lbernays@bluewin.ch

LUDWIG BERNAYS

1) Entgegen Kiessling-Heinze dürfte *gravis* zu *Vulcanus*, nicht zu *officinas* zu ziehen sein.

2) Die beiden Texthälften sind dann aber doch wieder zu einer Einheit zusammengefasst, indem das Gedicht mit dem 'Tod' der Natur (*acris hiems*) beginnt und mit dem Ausblick in die Zukunft einer lebensvollen Jugend schließt. Dabei erinnert das Endwort *tepebunt* an die lauen Lüfte des in Vers 1 genannten *Favonius*. Es ist wohl auch kein Zufall, dass die beiden Hälften des Gedichts mit zwei klangähnlichen typischen Frühlingsboten (*Favonius/Faunus*) beginnen: das erste Wehen des Zephyr (Favonius) erfolgt laut Ovid nahezu gleichzeitig mit dem kalendarischen Frühlingsbeginn und den vorgeschriebenen Faunusopfern (Ov. *Fast.* 2.148, 150 und 193).

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. ⁴2001. *Horatius Opera* (München/Leipzig)

FURTHER EVIDENCE OF THE ORIGINAL OUTLINE OF OVID'S *ARS AMATORIA* (1.771-2)

In the introduction to his commentary on Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* 1, A.S. Hollis summarizes the major arguments which suggest that the tripartite *Ars* was originally planned in two books.¹⁾ His remarks at 1.771-2 on the book's final distich further sustain the thesis. His claim, however, that in the last line Ovid changed the chariot image (as found in the corresponding place in Verg. *G.* 2.541-2)²⁾ to that of a ship is only partially correct. It is true with regard to the *Georgics*, but it overlooks the evidence from the *Aeneid*. The metaphor and diction with which Ovid indicates that the first part of his work has come to its end unmistakably echoes the ending of the arithmetically first half of the *Aeneid*:³⁾

Pars superat coepti, pars est exhausta, laboris;
hic tenet nostras *ancora iacta* rates. (*Ars* 1.771-2)

'Part of my enterprise remains, part is now finished; here let the anchor be thrown, and hold my bark secure.'

Tum se ad Caietae recto fert limite portum.

ancora de prora *iacitur*; stant litore puppes. (*A.* 6.900-1)*

'Then he sailed on a direct route to Caieta's port. The anchor is thrown from the prow; the sterns rest on the shore.'

While in the final line of Book 6 the anchor is set down as Aeneas (and the Trojans) reach the port of Caieta, the *praeceptor amoris* ends his work metaphorically through the dropping of an anchor that is to hold his poetical ship tight.⁵⁾ Although the metaphor of literary activity imagined as a nautical voyage is conventional,⁶⁾ Ovid's employment of the *topos*, in essence, appears to make more sense (and thus fully exploit the allusiveness)⁷⁾ through his having accomplished precisely the first *half* of the opus and not simply any first *part*.⁸⁾ The final line of *Ars* 1 therefore provides further evidence of the presumed original plan, because it implies that the first half of the *two*-book project has been completed.⁹⁾

Historisches Institut, Universität BERN
mehran.nickbakht@hist.unibe.ch

MEHRAN A. NICKBAKHT

1) Hollis (1977, xii-xiii): "To mention some of them: the table of proposed contents at i. 35-40, a pause at i. 771-2 ('half is finished, half remains'), the invocation of Erato at ii. 16 (at the beginning of the second half of his work, as in Apollonius Rhodius and Vergil's *Aeneid*), and the personal seal ending book ii as well as book iii." *Contra* Janka (1997, 55), who curiously dismisses Hollis' arguments as "zu schematisch". Janka's referring to the re-emergence of Erato in 2.425, however, does not refute the former view.

2) *Sed nos immensum spatium confecimus aequor, / et iam tempus equum fumantia solvere colla.* See also Thomas 1988, 264 at 2.541 on the ambiguity of *aequor*.

3) To be sure, the palpable similarity of *Ars* 1.772 with Prop. 3.24.15-6 (*ecce coronatae portum tetigere carinae, / traiectae Syrtes, ancora iacta mihi est*) is by far closer in terms of wording, juxtaposition, and position within the pentameter. Propertius, however, employs the nautical metaphor for matters of love, not literature.

4) The quotation is taken from R.A.B. Mynors's *OCT* (1969). The much debated authenticity of line 901 has been recently called into question again by Zwierlein (1999, 166 n. 2, and 2000, 65 n. 126). See, however, the arguments put forth by Wills (1997) in favor of the line's authenticity.

5) Note also that the composition of the *Ars* is called *labor* (1.771), a key word in the *Aeneid* that denotes what the characteristically heroic Aeneas is known to have undergone, e.g. *A.* 1.10: *tot adire labores*. Cf. also diction and metaphor in Verg. *G.* 4.116-7.

6) Seafaring is a well-paralleled image of (ambitious) literary activity, at least in Latin literature: e.g. Verg. *G.* 2.41; Prop. 3.3.22-4; Hor. *Carm.* 4.15.3-4; Manil. 2.59; see further Bömer on Ovid *Met.* 15.176.

7) There is strong reason to believe that *A.* 6.900-1 carried metapoetical overtones in the first place, cf. Nickbakht forthcoming.

8) By what R.F. Thomas has coined a 'window reference', Ovid might also be seen as referring via Vergil to the end of the first *half* of Apollonius Rhodius where the Argo is anchored at Colchis (*A.R.* 2.1281).

9) In a similar fashion *arma* marks the beginning of the *Amores* by harking back

to the first word of the *Aeneid*. More importantly, *Ars* 3 likewise begins with *arma*, again indicating an entirely new beginning as it were. See also Gibson 2000.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gibson, R.K. 2000. *Book Endings in Greek Poetry and Ars Amatoria 2 and 3*, *Mnemosyne* 53, 588-91
- Hollis, A.S. (ed.) 1977. *Ovid, Ars amatoria, Book 1* (Oxford)
- Janka, M. 1997. *Ovid: Ars Amatoria Buch 2: Kommentar* (Heidelberg)
- Nickbakht, M.A. forthcoming. *Closure and Continuation: the Poetics of Aeneid 6.900-1*
- Thomas, R.F. (ed.) 1988. *Virgil, Georgics*, vol. 1: *Books I-II* (Cambridge)
- Wills, J. 1997. *Homeric and Virgilian Doublets: the Case of Aeneid 6.901*, *MD* 38, 185-202
- Zwierlein, O. 1999. *Die Ovid- und Vergil-Revision in tiberischer Zeit* (Berlin)
- . 2000. *Antike Revisionen des Vergil und Ovid* (Wiesbaden)

“QUANTUM CONIECTARE (NON) LICET.”

MENODOTUS BETWEEN SEXTUS EMPIRICUS (P. 1.222)
AND DIOGENES LAERTIUS (9.116)

Τούτου (sc. Τίμωνος) διάδοχος, ὡς μὲν Μηνόδοτος φησι (*FGH* 541 F 4), γέγονεν οὐδεὶς, ἀλλὰ διέλιπεν ἡ ἀγωγή ἕως αὐτὴν Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Κυρηναῖος ἀνεκτίησάτο. ὡς δ' Ἰππόβοτος φησι καὶ Σωτίων, διήκουσαν αὐτοῦ Διοσκουρίδης Κύπριος καὶ Νικόλοχος Ῥόδιος καὶ Εὐφράνωρ Σελευκεὺς Πραύλους τ' ἀπὸ Τρωάδος . . . (116.1) Εὐφράνωρος δὲ διήκουσεν Εὐβουλος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, οὐ Πτολεμαῖος, οὐ Σαρπηδὼν καὶ Ἡρακλείδης, Ἡρακλείδου δ' Αἰνεσίδημος Κνώσιος, ὃς καὶ Πυρρωνεῖων λόγων ὀκτῶ συνέγραψε βιβλία· οὐ Ζεύξιππος ὁ πολίτης, οὐ Ζεύξις ὁ Γωνίπου, οὐ Ἀντίοχος Λαοδικεὺς ἀπὸ Λύκου· τούτου δὲ Μηνόδοτος ὁ Νικομηδεὺς, ἰατρὸς ἐμπειρικός, καὶ Θειωδᾶς Λαοδικεὺς· Μηνόδοτου δὲ Ἡρόδοτος Ἀριεὺς Ταρσεύς· Ἡρόδοτου δὲ διήκουσε Σέξτος ὁ ἐμπειρικός, οὐ καὶ τὰ δέκα τῶν Σκεπτικῶν καὶ ἄλλα κάλλιστα· Σέξτου δὲ διήκουσε Σατορνίνος ὁ Κυθηναῖς, ἐμπειρικός καὶ αὐτός. (D.L. 9.115.6-116.9)

The sequence of leading figures of the Sceptical school which Diogenes Laertius proposes in the ninth book of his *Lives* has appeared problematic to many. The passage (and the whole book) has been repeatedly investigated, and it is unnecessary to reopen here the related issues, concerning Diogenes' sources and the overall trustworthiness of his account.¹⁾ Diogenes associates Sceptical philosophers particularly with Empiricist physicians, tries to assign a specific role to each, makes out of the Empiricists an underpinning axis of the school. Among others, he explicitly sets Menodotus of Nicomedia, an Empiricist doctor whose *floruit* was around 125 AD, in the frame of scepticism: together with Menodotus, leading empirical representatives of Sceptical philosophy would have been at least Heraclides of Tarentum (I BC) and Theodas of Laodicea (II AD), then Sextus Empiricus. Taken for granted the conceptual kinship between Empiricism and Scepticism, as well as the cues that empirical science will have taken, mostly at the outset, from sceptical elaborations (and *vice versa*), the attempt to incorpo-