counterpart'. To those who object that *ille*, *ego*, and *qui* are not sufficiently allusive terms of the same rank as *arma*, *uiri* (if that is the true reading), and *cano*, I would reply that such is the nature of pronouns like *ille*, *ego*, and *qui*; and to those who would ask whether the allusion be too far buried in an improbable place, I would ask whether an allusion to the beginning of a great poem such as the *Aeneid* would be more likely found in the first poem of Propertius' first book, or the fourth poem of his third book. And finally, to those who say that the eleven lines in Propertius separating *ille* from *ego* constitute too much of a stretch, I would point out that *arma* is nine lines distant from *cano*; and only two verses apiece separate *ego . . . qui* and *arma . . . uiri*, respectively.

I draw no firm conclusions from either allusion, if they are not illusions, to the *Aeneid*. At a minimum, however, I would insist that we would be rash to assume that the *ille ego qui . . .* lines are spurious because of what Propertius says in the fourth poem of his third book. More adventurously, I would argue that if we permit the allusion in 3.4, we ought to permit it in 1.1; and if we do that, we may be constrained to believe that Propertius considered the *ille ego qui . . .* lines authentic.[2]

Cornell University MICHAEL FONTAINE
mf268@cornell.edu
doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh074

[2] The best article dealing with the lines is that of L. Gamberale, 'Il cosidetto *preproemio* dell'*Eneide*', in Antonio Butteto and Michael von Albrecht (edd.), *Studi di filologia classica in onore di Giusto Monaco* (Palermo 1991), 963–80, which reviews and supersedes most earlier treatments. The still-prevalent arguments of R. G. Austin ('*Ille ego qui quondam*', *CQ* n.s. 18 [1968] 107–15) are, to say the least, subjective, and are disposed of by P. A. Hansen in '*Ille ego qui quondam . . .* once again', *CQ* n.s. 22 (1972), 139–49.

OVID, *HEROIDES* 7.113[1]

occidit *internas* coniunx mactatus ad aras
et sceleris tanti praemia frater habet.

113 internas *Dp, Naugerius, Heinsius, quem secuti sunt edd. plerique*: in terras *P, recc. plerique*: ad terras *P3, recc. aliquot*: in terra *R:* in terris *T, recc. aliquot:* internis *E2:* (occiderat) tirias *cod. Turonensis Bibl. Comm. 881 (teste Dörrie):* Herculeas *Micyllus:* infernas *D. Heinsius*: Herceas *Heinsius in notis, Sedlmayer, Bornecque:* ut Tyrias *Dörrie*

This is the text of Heinsius' edition of 1661 (with my own apparatus),[2] and the one followed by almost all the editors.[3] The reading *internas* is a conjecture by Andreas Naugerius (1483–1529),[4] brilliantly correcting the unintelligible *in terras* of the older manuscripts. But Andrea Navagero's conjecture, though closer to the *ductus litter-*

[1] The line numbering is from Ovid's editors, except Dörrie (line 15 in his edition), since I also assume that the introductory couple (*accipe . . . legis*) is spurious; read P. Knox, *Ovid, Heroides: Select Epistles* (Cambridge, 1995), 36.

[2] Dp: Dresdensis, Landesbibl. Dc 142, saec. XIII (ex Dörrie's edition); P: Parisinus, Bibl. Nat. lat. 8242, Puteaneus, saec. IX 3/4; P3: Parisinus, Bibl. Nat. lat. 7993, saec. XII–XIII; T: Turonensis, Bibl. Munic., 879, *c.* 1200; E2: Etonensis 91 (Bk. 6.18), saec. XIII; R: Pragensis Bibl. Univ. 1630 sive VIII H 12, saec. XII ex. (ex Dörrie's edition).

[3] Dörrie asigns *internas* to the Dresdensis, Landesbibl. Dc 142, saec. XIII (Dp) and to Merkel and Riese.

[4] Read G. Luck, 'Ovid, Naugerius and we, or: how to create a text', *Exemplaria* 6 (2002), 8–9.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh075 Published online by Cambridge University Press

arum, is probably not what Ovid would have written. In such a case, one probably should not worry too much about the *ductus litterarum*, as G. Luck said to me *per litteras*. On the other hand, Knox admits in his commentary[5] that

> *internas* is unparalleled in the sense of 'within a house'; this is the only occurrence of the word in poetry until Neronian verse, which led Heinsius[6] to conjecture *Herceas*, a title of Zeus as household god, comparing Luc. 9.979 *Herceas . . . non respicis aras*.

The Ovidian adjective which best goes with *aras* is *antiquas*, as in *Met.* 7.74 (*ibat ad antiquas Hecates Perseidos aras*) and 15.686 (*flectit et antiquas abiturus respicit aras*) in the same position and with a similar rhythm.[7] When and how *antiquas* was corrupted into *ad terras/in terras* is a question on which I would rather not speculate.

Universidad de Huelva A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER
ramirezdeverger@uhu.es
doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh075

[5] Knox (n. 1), 221; read also A. Palmer, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides* (Oxford, 1898), 346.
[6] 'Forte rescribendum *Herceas ad aras*', he wrote in his notes on the text.
[7] Cf. also *Am.* 3.13.10: *ara per antiquas facta sine arte manus*. In the singular Ovid uses the expression *vetus ara*, as in *Met.* 12.12 (*ut vetus accensis incanduit ignibus ara*) with Bömer's commentary. This paper forms part of a research project (BFF2002-02113) financed by the DGICYT of Spain.

MAKING WATER NOT LOVE: APULEIUS, *METAMORPHOSES* 1.13–14

In Apul. *Met*. 1.11–14, the aptly named[1] witches Meroe and Panthia burst into the room of an inn where Aristomenes and his old friend Socrates are lodged for the night. In revenge for Socrates' planned flight from the bed of Meroe, they plunge a sword into his neck, catch in a leather bottle the eruption of blood from the wound and finally, using the same mode of ingress, rummage around in Socrates' innards before removing his heart. At this point Socrates not unsurprisingly expires. The two women then turn their retributive attentions to the ironically named Aristomenes,[2] the moving spirit behind Socrates' flight;[3] after removing the bed under which Aristomenes is cowering, *super faciem meam* <sc. *Aristomenis*> *residentes vesicam exonerant, quoad me urinae spurcissimae madore perluerent*.

The implications of the witches' emptying their bladders over Aristomenes are various. At the most basic level, their act represents a gesture of contempt.[4] Suet. *Ner*. 56 *religionum usque quaque contemptor, praeter unius deae Syriae, hanc mox ita sprevit, ut urina contaminaret* will serve as illustration.[5] The degradation to which the witches thus subject Aristomenes anticipates at a thematic level the humiliation, in the shape of the Festival of Laughter (3.1–13), to which Lucius, the ego-narrator of the novel, will shortly be subjected at the hands of other female practitioners of *Schadenzauber*. As in

[1] *Meroe* suggests the lady's profession of *caupona*, innkeeper (1.7: cf. *merum*) and the island of that name in the Nile, Egypt being notoriously a locus of magic. Panthia, 'all goddess', sets up the bearer of the name as a malign counterpart to the syncretic goddess Isis, with her universal beneficence, at the conclusion of the novel.
[2] 'Best Counsellor'.
[3] *Qui fugae huius auctor fuit* 1.12.
[4] Rather than 'exhibitionism and obscenity' (Wytse H. Keulen, 'Comic invention and superstitious frenzy in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* ', *AJPh* 124 [2003], 107–35, at 116).
[5] Cf. Hor. *Ars P*. 471, Pers. 1.113, Juv. *Sat*. 1.130–1 *nescio quis . . . Aegyptius atque Arabarches, | cuius ad effigiem non tantum meiere fas est*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh075 Published online by Cambridge University Press