

599b2–3); and ‘most of them [*sc.* fish] hide in winter’ (τὰ μὲν οὖν πλεῖστα φολεῖ τοῦ χειμῶνος, 599b27–8). Note too that this is an ancient variant of the title of the *Historia animalium* not mentioned by Schnieder in his discussion of titles attributed to the work in antiquity (n. 2), 99–102: Περὶ ζώων φύσεως.

\*\*\*

My aim in this note was not to level a criticism against Schnieder for a serious omission but to supplement and support his excellent discussion by adding these two obscure texts to the evidence he presents.

Seton Hall University

ROBERT MAYHEW

[robert.mayhew@shu.edu](mailto:robert.mayhew@shu.edu)

doi:10.1017/S0009838821000549

### THREE GREEK PROPER NAMES IN OVID, *METAMORPHOSES* BOOK 10\*

#### ABSTRACT

*This paper discusses the transcription of three Greek proper names in Ovid, Metamorphoses Book 10. It argues that we should read Haemon (10.77), Amycliade (10.162) and Panchaica (10.309) rather than Haemum, Amyclide and Panchaia.*

**Keywords:** Ovid; *Metamorphoses*; textual criticism; *Graeca Latine*; missing letters

Proper names, especially Greek ones, are more subject to corruption in Latin manuscripts than other words. The restoration of the correct forms is not always easy. When metre provides no guidance, it is often unclear to what extent they retained Greek morphology or were adapted to Latin inflection. It can also occur that a place or a character is only known from a single Latin source. Likewise, derivative adjectives or patronymics used by Latin poets might not be documented in extant Greek texts. Since all these problems are recurrent in Ovid, it is often possible to call into question the transcription of Greek words.

I shall try to exemplify this with the help of three passages of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* Book 10. I take Tarrant’s OCT text<sup>1</sup> as a starting point, but I add my own critical apparatus, in which I provide more readings from the *recentiores*.<sup>2</sup>

\* I wish to thank Drs Juan Antonio Estévez, Dániel Kiss, Bartomeu Obrador, Antonio Ramírez de Verger and Luis Rivero for their useful suggestions. I am also very grateful to *CQ*’s anonymous referee and to Professor Bruce Gibson for their valuable advice. This paper is based on my doctoral dissertation, which I am now revising for publication: P. Fàbregas Salis, ‘Edición crítica y comentario textual del libro X de las *Metamorfosis* de Ovidio’ (Diss., University of Barcelona, 2016).

<sup>1</sup> R.J. Tarrant (ed.), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses* (Oxford, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> I use the *sigla* available at <http://www.uhu.es/proyectovidio/esp/index.html>. I omit most variants that are merely orthographical.

## (1) 10.76–7

[Orpheus] in altam | se recipit Rhodopen pulsumque aquilonibus<sup>3</sup> Haemum

77 (h)(a)emum Ω, *edd. plerique*: (h)(a)emon B3DrEsV6 A7Ld7(*ut uid.*) Es2 Bs7Lr26Nr3<sup>3s</sup>V44, Heinsius, *rectius*

Almost all manuscripts read (H)(a)emum, but a group of *recentiores* from the twelfth century onwards has (H)(a)emon. Heinsius printed it with the following comment: ‘Haemon pro Haemum tres scripti [for example Ld7 Bs7Lr26Nr3<sup>3s</sup>]. sic & alibi non semel’.<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Met.* 2.219,<sup>5</sup> 6.87,<sup>6</sup> *Pont.* 4.5.5.<sup>7</sup> However, Heinsius<sup>8</sup> kept *Haemum* at *Her.* 2.113. Tarrant says nothing about this in his appendix.<sup>9</sup> Unfortunately, in all the examples cited the word appears at the end of the line, so metre does not reveal whether Ovid used one form or the other.<sup>10</sup> None the less, there is no denial that he was especially fond of Greek forms.<sup>11</sup>

To give a couple of examples, Virgil undoubtedly wrote *Cyprum*, *Polyphemum* and *Menelaum*, as the subsequent elisions show:

*Aen.* 1.622 uastabat *Cyprum* et uictor dicione tenebat  
*Aen.* 3.657 pastorem *Polyphemum* et litora nota petentem  
*Aen.* 6.525 intra tecta uocat *Menelaum* et limina pandit

But Ovid opted for the Greek endings without elision:<sup>12</sup>

*Met.* 10.718 *Cypron olorinis* nondum peruenerat alis  
*Met.* 13.772 terribilem *Polyphemon* adit ‘lumen’que, ‘quod unum  
*Met.* 14.167 fatur Achaemenides: ‘iterum *Polyphemon* et illos  
*Her.* 5.105 ardet amore tui? sic et *Menelaon* amauit  
*Her.* 17.249 tu fore tam iusta lentum *Menelaon* in ira

Let me list further examples of accusatives in *-on* guaranteed by the metre in the *Metamorphoses*: 2.83 *Scorpion* (cf. *Fast.* 5.541); 2.415 *Maenalon* (2.442); 3.539 *Tyron*; 3.636 *Naxon*; 4.283 *Crocon* (cf. *Fast.* 5.227); 4.466 *Sisyphon* (13.26); 4.786

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps we should capitalize this word here and in some other places, as Heinsius did: N. Heinsius (ed.), *P. Ovidii Nasonis operum tomus II* (Amsterdam, 1659), 219. Cf. e.g. *Ov. Met.* 1.262, 7.3, 13.726.

<sup>4</sup> Heinsius (n. 3), 260n.

<sup>5</sup> Heinsius (n. 3), 33n.: ‘Haemos Barberinus [V10], ut alibi’.

<sup>6</sup> Heinsius (n. 3), 133n.: ‘Haemon decem veteres’.

<sup>7</sup> N. Heinsius (ed.), *P. Ovidii Nasonis operum tomus III* (Amsterdam, 1661), 406n.: ‘Haemon Fragmentum Vatic. et Gryphii editio. sic & et in *Metamorph.*’.

<sup>8</sup> N. Heinsius (ed.), *P. Ovidii Nasonis operum tomus I* (Amsterdam, 1658), 11.

<sup>9</sup> Tarrant (n. 1), 488.

<sup>10</sup> We do have, in another position, the vocative *Haeme* (*Fast.* 1.390), but this is not helpful either. Nor could I find any examples of *Haemum* or *Haemon* confirmed by the metre in any other Latin poet (again, the word usually appears at the end of the line).

<sup>11</sup> See, for instance, M. Pulbrook, ‘Ovid, *Metamorphoses* Book IV’ (Diss., University of London, 1973), 236–42, who has shown, according to the evidence available to him, that Ovid had much more frequent recourse to nominatives in *-os* than Virgil.

<sup>12</sup> Likewise, Virgil always used the neuter *Ilium* (e.g. *Aen.* 1.68 *Ilium in*; 6.64 *Ilium et*), whereas Ovid wrote *Ilion* (*Her.* 7.151 *Ilion in*; 13.53 *Ilion et*; 16.49 *Ilion igni*; 16.181 *Ilion aspiciens*; 17.240 *Ilion arsurum*; *Rem. am.* 163 *Ilion armis*; *Met.* 6.95 *Ilion illi*; 13.408 *Ilion ardebat*; 13.505 *Ilion ingens*; 14.467 *Ilion et*—it is irrelevant whether some of these examples could actually belong to the feminine *Ilios*).

*Pegason*; 7.365 *Rhodon*; 7.413 *Cerberon*; 7.466 *Siphnon*; 7.500 *Clyton*; 8.261 *Daedalon*; 8.270 *Meleagron*; 8.798 *Caucason*; 9.435 *Aeacon* (9.440, 13.27); 9.440 *Rhadamanthon*; <sup>13</sup> 9.646 *Cragon*; 10.217 *Hyacinthon*; 10.530 *Paphon* (cf. *Am.* 2.17.4; cf. also *Ars am.* 2.588, *Met.* 10.297); 11.762 *Aesacon* (12.1); 12.215 *Hymenaeon* (cf. *Pont.* 1.2.131); 12.262 *Orion*; 12.352 *Hippason*; 12.378 *Phlegraeon*; 12.408 *Cyllaron*; 12.433 *Tectaphon* (dubium); 13.171 *Telephon*; 13.257 *Coeranon*; 13.260 *Ennomon*; 13.726 *Lilybaeon*; 14.223–4 *Aeolon*; 15.61 *Samon*.

It is noteworthy that none of these forms coexists with a metrically guaranteed form in *-um* in Ovid's corpus. It is also important to note that at 9.440 the metre demands *Rhadamanthon*, but that did not prevent the scribe of M from writing *R(h)adaman-t(h)um*. Likewise, at 13.27 and 13.772 some manuscripts, including some *antiquiores*, wrongly give the form in *-um*.<sup>14</sup> This strongly suggests that Greek endings are likely to be substituted for Latin ones, as Housman proved for accusatives in *-an* or *-en*.<sup>15</sup> From this, I infer that, whenever there is some evidence for the Greek form in Ovid, we should adopt it.

## (2) 10.162

'te quoque, Amyclide, posuisset in aethere Phoebus

162 amyclide Ω, *edd.*: am(y/i)cliade *Dr Es5, e coni. Unger*: amycliades *Gf6<sup>ac</sup>*: amyclaide *etiam Unger, Merkel, prob. Luck*: amiclides *Cs BoLr14*: amiclede *A<sup>ac</sup>*: amiclate *Lr7*: amiclade *So Bo2To2*

The patronymic *Amyclides* is attested only here. It alludes to Hyacinthus, whom elsewhere Ovid calls *Taenarides* (*Met.* 10.183), *Oebalides* (10.196, *Ib.* 588) or *Oebalius* (*Met.* 13.396). According to Bömer,<sup>16</sup> *Amyclides* is probably the true patronymic for Hyacinthus.<sup>17</sup> At the very least, the use of *Amyclides* shows that Ovid was aware of a tradition in which Amyclas was Hyacinthus' father (Simmias, fr. 8 Powell; Paus. 3.1.3; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.116; Schol. Nic. *Ther.* 902–3a; Tzetz. *Chil.* 244–5).

The scansion *Amyclīdes* would be formed upon an irregular Ἄμυκλειδῆς created *metri gratia*, probably by analogy with patronymics in *-ειδης* of *-ευ-* stems (for example *Met.* 1.390 *Promethides*). This is not impossible: cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.82 *Belīdae* (Cinna, fr. 1.3 Blänsdorf; Ov. *Her.* 14.73); 7.484 *Tyrrhīdae*;<sup>18</sup> Ov. *Met.* 12.433 *Olenīden*; 15.624 *Coronīden*; Prisc. *Inst.* 2.67.9–13 Hertz.<sup>19</sup> However, Unger<sup>20</sup> conjectured *Amycliade*

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Tarrant (n. 1), 493: 'r(h)adamant(h)on *SNU FLP* : -um *M* : -en *B<sup>c</sup>* (*ut uid.*)'.

<sup>14</sup> See L. Rivero García, *Book XIII of Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Textual Commentary* (Berlin and Boston, 2018), 419 and 509.

<sup>15</sup> A.E. Housman, 'Greek nouns in Latin poetry. From Lucretius to Juvenal', *JPh* 31 (1910), 236–66 (= *Classical Papers* [Cambridge, 1972], 2.817–39). I am aware that in some special cases the Greek inflection could be imposed upon Latin words (e.g. *Achillen* or *Vlixen*), but this does not invalidate the whole point.

<sup>16</sup> F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen: Kommentar: Buch X–XI* (Heidelberg, 1980), 73.

<sup>17</sup> Although Bömer admits it could simply mean 'Spartan'. Cf. e.g. Verg. *G.* 3.89, 3.345.

<sup>18</sup> See N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 7. A Commentary* (Leiden, 2000), 326.

<sup>19</sup> See e.g. V. Loers, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides et A. Sabini Epistolae* (Cologne, 1829), 334–5 (on *Her.* 14.73); R. Unger, *Analecta Propertiana scripsit; quaestiones Philetaeae atque emendationes Arnobianas interposuit* (Halle, 1850), 7; C.T. Angermann, *De patronymicorum Graecorum formatione* (Leipzig, 1868), 15–16, 31 n. 1 and 32–4; A.E. Housman, 'Palmer's *Heroides of Ovid*', *CR* 13 (1899), 172–8, at 177 (on 14.73) (= *Classical Papers* [Cambridge, 1972], 2.479).

<sup>20</sup> Unger (n. 19), 7.

and *Amyclaide*. The former would be derived from Ἀμύκλας; the latter from the homonymous city Ἀμύκλαι and would mean ‘Spartan’.<sup>21</sup> Merkel<sup>22</sup> printed *Amyclaide* in his second edition, but he was not followed by subsequent editors. Only Luck<sup>23</sup> favoured *Amyclaide*, pointing out the similarity with 4.1 *Minyeias* (‘M man. 2, Scaliger, Heinsius: *minyas* vel *mineias* vel similia Ω’);<sup>24</sup> 14.87 *Acheloidumque* (‘U ex corr. W, Constant. Fanensis et Naugerius ex coni.: *Acheloidumque* Ω’);<sup>25</sup> 15.386 *Cythereiadasque* (‘b man. 2 k man. 2, Constant. Fanensis et Naugerius ex coni.’).<sup>26</sup> We could add, among other examples, *Met.* 6.414 *Pelopeiadesque Mycenae*; *Fast.* 2.43 *Amphiareides*;<sup>27</sup> *Ib.* 295 *Amyntiaden*; *Ib.* 345 *Dryantiadae*;<sup>28</sup> *Ib.* 503 *Lycurgiaden*;<sup>29</sup> *Ib.* 631 *Cliniadaeue*.<sup>30</sup> The examples just quoted rather stand for *Amycliade*, which is actually the reading of Dr Es5, while Gf6<sup>ac</sup> reads *Amycliades*.<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, these examples show that omission of letters, often that of *-a-*, is usual in this kind of words.<sup>32</sup> *Amycliades* is indeed a possible patronymic of Ἀμύκλας,<sup>33</sup> just like we have *Amyntiades* from *Amyntas* (*Ib.* 295), *Anchisiades* from *Anchises* (*Verg. Aen.* 5.407 and elsewhere) or *Thyestiades* from *Thyestes* (*Ov. Ars am.* 2.407). Furthermore, Ovid’s liking for alluding to mythographical variants is well known. To my mind, an allusion to a tradition that made Hyacinthus the son of Amyclas makes much more sense than a dull reference to a city or a geographic area.<sup>34</sup> I think we ought to read *Amycliade*.

## (3) 10.309

tura ferat floresque alios Panchaia tellus

309 panc(h)aiia GfHLr2M, *recc.*, *edd. plerique*: panc(h)aica AL3LrLuNTV3, *recc.*, *edd. ueteres aliquot*, *prob. Luck: alii aliter*

<sup>21</sup> See n. 17. A possible patronymic in *-αιδης* from Ἀμύκλας seems unparalleled (cf. Angermann [n. 19], 11 and 26–7).

<sup>22</sup> R. Merkel (ed.), *P. Ovidius Naso ex iterata R. Merckelii recognitione. Vol. II Metamorphoses cum emendationis sumario* (Leipzig, 1875<sup>2</sup>), 200.

<sup>23</sup> G. Luck, ‘More missing letters in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*’, *MH* 66 (2009), 88–119, at 107.

<sup>24</sup> Luck (n. 23), 107; cf. Tarrant (n. 1), 490.

<sup>25</sup> Luck (n. 23), 107; cf. Tarrant (n. 1), 483.

<sup>26</sup> Luck (n. 23), 107; cf. Tarrant (n. 1), 486; G. Luck, *A Textual Commentary on Ovid, Metamorphoses, Book XV* (Huelva, 2017), 73.

<sup>27</sup> E.H. Alton, D.E.W. Wormell and E. Courtney (edd.), *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum libri sex* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997<sup>4</sup>), 26: ‘*nomina varie corrupta, velut amphiaraides (sic ε ...)*’.

<sup>28</sup> A. La Penna (ed.), *Publi Ovidi Nasonis Ibis* (Florence, 1957), 85: ‘*driantiade G<sup>2</sup> dryantide oP<sub>2</sub> driantides P driant(th)ide cett. Corr.*’.

<sup>29</sup> La Penna (n. 28), 130: ‘*ligurgidē GPP<sub>1</sub>TFVHAZ ligurgidem xy Corr. ligurgeiden V<sub>1</sub> ligurgitē o (c supra prior. g) lygurgiaden P<sub>2</sub> ligurgiadē E liguriges Schol. Bern. licoriden in ligoriden corr. cod. Bobiensis Eutyichis*’.

<sup>30</sup> La Penna (n. 28), 170: ‘*Cliniadeve ex manu rec. in x Cliniadeque P<sub>1</sub> Clitiadeve m<sub>2</sub><sup>2</sup> Clitiadeque l<sub>2</sub>m<sub>5</sub><sup>2</sup>*’.

<sup>31</sup> Other variant readings might also point in that direction: *Amiclate* (Lr7) and *Amiclade* (So Bo2To2).

<sup>32</sup> Therefore, it seems unlikely that scribes could actually recognize *Amycliade* as metrically defective. In consequence, the readings of Dr Gf6<sup>ac</sup> Es5 can hardly be attempts at prosodic correction. On a general basis, single letters were often omitted in this paradosis, especially in Greek words: cf. Luck (n. 23), 103.

<sup>33</sup> Angermann (n. 19), 25–8.

<sup>34</sup> In spite of Claud. *Raptu Pros.* 2.133 *tu natus Amyclis [sc. Hyacinthus]*.

The manuscripts are split, offering *Panchaia* and *Panchaica*.<sup>35</sup> Heinsius commented: ‘*Panchaia meliores* [for example HM EHdLr3P2 P24 Bo3<sup>ac</sup>]. bene’.<sup>36</sup> He compared it to Verg. *G.* 2.139 (*totaque turiferis Panchaia pinguis harenis*), but there *Panchaia* is a noun (as in Lygd. 2.23; Val. Fl. 6.119; Claud. *III Cons. Hon.* 211, *Raptu Pros.* 2.81; Plin. *HN* 7.197, 10.4). He also mentioned *App. Verg. Culex* 87 *Panchaia tura*, where *Panchaia* is an adjective, but the reading is not quite certain, because the best manuscripts offer *Pancheia* (Γ) or *Panchasia* (V), while *Panchaia* is attested in CL,<sup>37</sup> ‘the least estimable MSS of the poem’.<sup>38</sup> The only well-attested example of *Panchaius* seems to be Mela 3.81, who calls the inhabitants of the island *Panchai*. On the other hand, I have found only one example of *Panchaius*: Arn. *Adu. nat.* 7.27.

Since the evidence for *Panchaius/Panchaius* is clearly poor, I suggest that we examine a parallel and well-documented doublet: *Achaius/Achaicus*. The alternation occurs at Verg. *Aen.* 2.462, where MPωγ read *Achaica castra* and Fcy read *Achaia castra*.<sup>39</sup> The variation could be explained by the scribal distaste for the cacophonous syllabic combination *-ca ca-*.<sup>40</sup> None the less, the same variation also occurs in other contexts where there is no *cacemphaton*.<sup>41</sup> In general, adjectives in *-icus* often lose the letter *-c-* in manuscripts. For instance, in Ov. *Met.* 2.727 some manuscripts read *Balearia* instead of *Balearica*.<sup>42</sup> In Ov. *Met.* 3.518 the adjective *Bacchica* (Βακχικός, which coexists with *Baccheus*, Βακχεῖος, and *Baccheius*, Βακχῆϊος) is altered to *Bacchia* in some manuscripts.<sup>43</sup>

On the other hand, the adjective *Achaeus*, which is the right transcription of Ἀχαιός, is extensively documented in Latin (cf. *TLL* 1.384.67–385.60). I doubt that Ἀχαιός could be transcribed both as *Achaeus* and *Achaius*, with a different scansion. Furthermore, apart from *Achaius* (and *Panchaius*), I can find no other example of any Greek adjective in *-αίος* (or in *-αίφος*)<sup>44</sup> being transcribed into Latin as *-aius*. Therefore, I believe that Diehl (*TLL* 1.284.8–11) is right when he points out that *Achaius* is only a scribal misspelling of *Achaicus*.<sup>45</sup> The analogy with adjectives in *-ius* and the noun *Achaia*, in combination with the scholastic doctrine against *cacemphaton*, probably smoothed the way for *Achaius* to substitute *Achaicus*.

<sup>35</sup> As an alternative, Latin language had the adjective *Panchaeus*, which is the right transcription of Πανχαῖος. This is used by Ovid at *Met.* 10.478. *Panchaeaque* is rightly edited at Claud. *Carm. mai.* 10.94 instead of *Panchaiaque*.

<sup>36</sup> Heinsius (n. 3), 267n.

<sup>37</sup> W.V. Clausen et al. (edd.), *Appendix Vergiliana* (Oxford, 1966), 22.

<sup>38</sup> W.V. Clausen, ‘The textual tradition of the *Culex*’, *HSPH* 68 (1964), 119–38, at 124. Could the obvious errors in Γ and V suggest that the archetype was subject to some corruption?

<sup>39</sup> G.B. Conte (ed.), *P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis* (Berlin and Boston, 2019<sup>2</sup>), 45.

<sup>40</sup> At *Aen.* 2.27 and 6.88 Servius wanted to read *Doria castra* instead of *Dorica castra* to avoid the *cacemphaton*. See also P. Burman (ed.), *P. Virgilio Maronis opera* (Amsterdam, 1746), 2.273–4 (on 2.462); but cf. N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 2. A Commentary* (Leiden, 2008), 356–7 (on 2.462).

<sup>41</sup> e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 5.623; Ov. *Met.* 12.70; *App. Verg. Catal.* 5.2; Manil. 4.614; Sil. *Pun.* 14.5, 15.306; *Ilias Latina* 790. Cf. *TLL* 1.384.15 ‘*Achaius, quod haud raro eodem loco atque Achaicus traditur*’.

<sup>42</sup> W.S. Anderson (ed.), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses* (Munich and Leipzig, 1982<sup>2</sup>), 49.

<sup>43</sup> Heinsius (n. 3), 69n. See also A. Suárez del Río, ‘Edición crítica y comentario textual del libro III de las *Metamorfosis* de Ovidio’ (Diss., University of Huelva, 2015), 363–4.

<sup>44</sup> P. Chantraine, *La formation des mots en grec ancien* (Paris, 1933), 46; E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (Berlin and New York, 1974<sup>2</sup>), 126–7.

<sup>45</sup> See also *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (Rome, 1984), 1.21–2.

Let me address one final question about the adjectives from *Achaia*. As often, Ovid also used derivatives in *-is* (*Met.* 3.511, 5.306, 15.293; 5.577, 7.504 [nouns]) and in *-ias* (*Her.* 3.71). In the *Metamorphoses*, Tarrant<sup>46</sup> accepted the transmitted form *Achais*, even if Ovid clearly kept the Homeric form *Achaeias* at *Her.* 3.71 (*Achaeiadas ... matres*).<sup>47</sup> Kenney<sup>48</sup> suggested that it was very likely that Ovid had also retained the transcription *Achaeis* in the *Metamorphoses* (it appears in some old editions). Indeed, *Achaeis* and *Achaeias* are the expected transcriptions of Ἀχαιῖς (for example *Hom. Il.* 1.254) and Ἀχαιῖας (for example *Hom. Il.* 5.422).<sup>49</sup>

As for *Achaicus*, Kenney recalled that since Homer the regular Greek form was Ἀχαιῖκός (for example *Il.* 9.141), and we could expect that Latin poets transcribed *Achaeicus* rather than *Achaicus*. But Keeney also knew that this was a complicated issue, since *Achaicus* relies on the authority of the ancient Virgilian manuscripts (see above; this form is also attested in *Hor. Carm.* 1.15.35; cf. *TLL* 1.384.14–42). Perhaps we should consider the possibility that the Latin adaptation had been filtered through the prosaic alternative Ἀχῶϊκός (and palaeographic rival of Ἀχαιῖκός; cf., for example, *Eur. Hec.* 521).

All these observations apply, I think, to *Panchaius* and *Panchaicus*. If we accept the illegitimacy of *Achaius*, we must conclude that *Panchaius* is simply a form attested in manuscripts instead of the true *Panchaicus*, the transcription of a postulated Παγχῶϊκός. Thus *Panchaeus* and *Panchaicus* would stem from *Panchaia*, just like *Achaeus* and *Achaeicus* stem from *Achaia*.<sup>50</sup> Other parallels are available: *Phocaea* produces *Phocaeus* (\*Φωκαῖος; *Hor. Epod.* 16.17) and *Phocāicus* (Φωκαῖικός; *Ov. Met.* 6.9; *Luc.* 3.172) but not *Phocaius*; *Thebae* produces *Thebanus*, *Thebaeus* (Θηβαῖος; *Claud. Carm. min.* 27.91) and *Thebāicus* (Θηβαῖικός; *Stat. Silu.* 4.9.26) but not *Thebais*.<sup>51</sup> For all these reasons, I think we should restore *Panchaica*.<sup>52</sup> This had been printed by some editors up to Heinsius and was recently favoured by Luck ('read probably').<sup>53</sup>

Universitat de Barcelona

PERE FÀBREGAS SALIS  
 pfabregasuni@gmail.com  
 doi:10.1017/S0009838821000380

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Tarrant (n. 1), 483.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. H. Dörrie (ed.), *Publi Ovidi Epistulae Heroidum* (Berlin, 1971), 67. See also A. Barchiesi, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum 1–3* (Florence, 1992), 224.

<sup>48</sup> E.J. Kenney, 'Textual notes on Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 7–9', *CQ* 51 (2001), 545–50, at 546.

<sup>49</sup> Luck (n. 23), 103 also wanted to restore these forms in Ovid.

<sup>50</sup> As stated earlier, *-aeus* (not *-āius*) is the legitimate transcription of adjectives in *-aios*.

<sup>51</sup> The alternation between adjectives in *-aios/-eios* and in *-ikos* goes back to Homer. Cf. Chantraine (n. 44), 385–6; id., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots* (Paris, 1968), 149 s.v. Ἀχαιῖος; Risch (n. 44), 163–4.

<sup>52</sup> This might even be the right reading for *App. Verg. Cul.* 87, while for *Mela* 3.81 I would suggest *Panchaei*. On the contrary, I do not think we should write *Panchaica*.

<sup>53</sup> Luck (n. 23), 107.