

propr XIX, 38 [Kühn] and Harig, *op cit* 45 with n 20) Therefore Galen may well have referred to Asclepiades' corpuscles as 'atoms' in *De exp med* (as does Caelius Aurelianus in *De morb acut* I, 105, cf Vallance, 24-25) On the other hand, the clause 'these are parts which cannot be divided further' is most likely a gloss, more probably of a scribe than of Hunain; cf the note at *De exper med* XXX, 7 (Walzer, *op cit* 152), in which the name Asclepiades mistakenly appears for Asclepius, most probably by scribal error (cf Walzer's note *ad loc* , 164)

A NOTE ON OVID, *ARS AMATORIA* 1 553*

Horruit, ut steriles, agitat quas ventus, aristae,
ut levis in madida canna palude tremit

553 steriles *codd* : teretes *dub Heinsius* : graciles *Goold* : fragiles *Hollis* *
aristae ω *def Heinsius Goold Hollis* : -as *RYAç prob Ehwald Bornecque Kenney*
Lenz : -us *O* *

This is the text of the still extremely useful edition of N Heinsius¹), which we shall use for the following observations

First, the nominative *aristae*²), instead of the accusative *aristas*, is supported by *Ep* XIV 39: *ut leni Zephyro graciles vibrantur aristae*

Secondly, we do not believe it necessary to adopt, in substitution for the adjective *steriles*, readings such as *teretes* (Heinsius), *graciles* (Goold) or *fragiles* (Hollis) At first sight, the combination *steriles aristae* may well appear somewhat unsatisfactory In fact, Heinsius himself³), in his note on *Ep* XIV 39, quoted above, already questioned it: "sed cur *steriles aristae* ibi dicat, haud video Quare *teretes* existimo reponendum" However, Heinsius was not absolutely convinced that *steriles* was not, in fact, the correct reading Thus, referring to the line which concerns us here, he eventually favoured⁴) *steriles aristae* as the definitive reading: "Putabam aliquando legendum *steriles avenae*⁵), quod sic Vergilium [*G* I 154] quoque locutum meminisssem Nunc nihil mutandum censeo Intellegit *aristas* sole adustas ac proinde *steriles*", a decision which he was to support with the passage from *Ep* V 111-2 (*arista, / quae levis assiduis solibus usta riget*) recently recalled by Pianezzola⁶)

In our view, Heinsius was right when he referred to dried ears of corn, an interpretation which fits perfectly with the definition Varro⁷) gives of *arista arista dicta, quod arescit prima* However, what appears to us to be of real significance is that these ears of corn have not been dried, as Heinsius would have it, by the action of the sun, but, as the text itself indicates, by that of the wind That is to say, *agitat quas ventus* is not a simple poetic expansion aimed at picturing the action of the wind on the sun-dried corn, but refers explicitly to the agent behind this effect It is therefore the wind, and not the sun, that is the reason for the corn drying

Mnemosyne, Vol XLVII, Fasc 2 (1994), © E J Brill, Leiden

The explanation of this phenomenon dates back to Theophrastus (*HP* VIII 10, 3):

ἀπόλλυται δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πυρὸς καὶ κριθῆ, ὅταν ἢ ἀνθοῦντα ληφθῆ ἢ ἄρτι ἀπηνθηκότα καὶ ἀσθενῆ μᾶλλον δὲ κριθῆ, πολλάκις δ' ἤδη ἐν τῷ ἀδρύνεσθαι οὔσα, ἐὰν μεγάλα καὶ πλείω χρόνον ἐπιγένηται ξηραίνει γὰρ καὶ ἀφραυαίνει, ὃ καλοῦσιν τινες ἐξανεμοῦσθαι διαπόλλυσι δὲ καὶ ἥλιος ὁ ἐκνέφελος ἄμφω καὶ μᾶλλον πυρὸν ἢ κριθήν, ὥστε μηδ' ἐπίδηλον τὸν στάχυν τῆ ὄψει ὄντα κενόν

Or to the short Latin version given by Pliny the Elder (*Nat* XVIII 151):
 Venti autem tribus temporibus nocent frumento et hordeo: in flore aut protinus cum defloruere vel maturescere incipientibus *Tum enim exinaniunt grana*, prioribus causis nasci prohibent Nocet et sol creber ex nube

11080-CÁDIZ, Universidad de Cádiz
 Facultad de Filosofía y Letras

A RAMÍREZ DE VERGER
 A GARCÍA HERRERA

* We are very grateful to Professor G Luck for his criticism in reading an earlier draft of this note Thanks are also due to J J Zoltowski for his help with the English translation and to DGICYT (PS89-0114) of Spain

1) *Operum P Ovidii Nasonis editio nova* Nic Heinsius Dan F recensuit ac notas addidit, I (Amstelodami 1661), 210

2) The nominative is rightly defended by G P Goold (*Amatoria critica*, HSCPh 69 [1965], 66), who is followed by A S Hollis, (*Ovid, Ars amatoria, Book I* [Oxford 1977], 124) Others, such as R Ehwald, (*P Ovidius Naso* [Lipsiae 1916 = 1888], 198), H Bornecque (*Ovide, L'Art d'aimer* [Paris 1980 = 1924], 23), E J Kenney (*P Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina faciei femineae, Ars amatoria, Remedia amoris* [Oxonii² 1965], 133), F W Lenz (*P Ovidi Nasonis Ars amatoria cum appendice ad Remedia pertinente* [Torino: CSLP 1969], 31) and E Pianezzola (*Ovidio, L'arte di amare* [Milano 1991], 48) opt to keep *aristas*

3) Followed by E J Kenney with his observation on *steriles* (“vix satis explicatum”) in the apparatus of his Oxford edition cited above

4) Heinsius questioned practically all the possibilities; a) Doubting the reading *steriles aristae*, he decides to change *steriles* to *teretes*; b) Doubting the combination of *steriles* and *aristae*, he decides to change the latter to *avenae*; c) He finally keeps the text as it stands (*steriles aristae*) and offers an explanation in the right direction, but one which, in our view, does not go far enough

5) There is no reason to change *aristae* to *avenae*, since the comparison between hair and the beard of corn was a traditional one, as can be deduced from the text of Varro, *L* VI 45: *Tremo dictum a similitudine vocis quae tunc cum valde tremunt apparet, cum etiam in corpore pili, ut arista in spica hordei, horrent*

6) E Pianezzola, *Ovidio, L'arte di amare* (Milano 1991), 124

7) *R* I 48, 2; cf Fest 289, Serv *A* VII 720 (*aristas ab ariditate dictas esse constat*) and 809 (*aristae sunt primae spicae partes, ab eo quod primae arescant dictae*), Isid *Orig* XVII 3, 16 (*arista appellata quod prius ipsa arescat*) See *ThLL* I 579, 60-62