

Conjectures in Ovid's *Heroides*

J. B. HALL

"Which text of the *Heroides* am I to use?" asks the student of Ovid, and "Which text of the *Heroides* am I to prescribe?" asks the teacher. These are very good questions, and ones which it was exceedingly difficult to answer before the year 1977; and even after that date there remains nowhere for the student or teacher to go who needs accurate information about what the manuscripts say. In 1971 appeared Heinrich Dörrie's elaborate edition with full apparatus criticus; but, lamentably, that apparatus is not critical nor is it to be trusted for what it says or implies, and the constitution of the text itself leaves everything to be desired. 1977 saw the very welcome arrival on the Ovidian scene of G. P. Goold's revision of Grant Showerman's Loeb edition of 1914; but, while Professor Goold has effected improvements at practically all points where he has deviated from Showerman, the limitations inevitably imposed on what in his words is "essentially a corrected reprint" mean that a lot remains in the Loeb which in any other circumstances would have been replaced by something quite new. And Loeb's of course have space only for a very small amount of critical information. While therefore we must all welcome what Professor Goold has been able to do for the *Heroides*, the need for a critical edition remains. For a number of years, I and others had been looking forward with the greatest anticipation to an OCT from Professor E. J. Kenney, but sadly, he has now abandoned that project. A new Teubner (Leipzig) edition being deemed desirable, I have found myself unable to resist the challenge presented by this formidably problematical collection of poems, and I have every intention of producing an edition (which I guarantee now will at all events have an accurate apparatus criticus, whatever people may think about my constitution of the text) within the next five or six years. The present paper will give those interested in Ovid a foretaste of the kind of text which I shall produce.

For the purposes of this paper I have regularly consulted the following editions: Burman (Amsterdam 1727); Palmer and Purser (Oxford 1898); Dörrie (Berlin and New York 1971); and Goold (Cambridge, MA and London 1977). As the reader will observe, I have been at pains to indicate where the new or revised Loeb edition differs from the old; hence the proliferation of phrases such as "the old Loeb edition," "the new Loeb

edition" (where the two editions go their separate ways), and "the Loeb translation" and "the Loeb edition" (where there are no differences between the new and the old). In the case of each passage discussed, I cite the text according to the revised Loeb edition, which is the best text currently available in print.

Finally, before coming to my notes on individual passages, I must say something on the question of authenticity in the *Heroides*. Much has been written on this subject over the years (see the bibliography provided by Dörrie in his edition), and much of what has been written has the validity of objective statement, with which no one can quarrel: it is, for example, fact that the double epistles contain locutions exemplified nowhere else in Ovid, and it is fact that the passages 16. 39–144 and 21. 145–248 are not found before the Parma edition of 1477. In the end of the day, however, the objective invariably gives way to the subjective, and final decisions about authenticity are based on nothing firmer than the instinct and intuition of each individual scholar. In *CQ* n.s. 29 (1979) 394–431, there appeared a splendid paper by E. J. Kenney entitled "Two Disputed Passages in the *Heroides*," and I am happy to say that I find myself in complete agreement with Kenney's main conclusion, which is that the two passages mentioned above, and indeed the double epistles as a whole, are the work of P. Ovidius Naso. I have myself read the disputed texts repeatedly with the question of authenticity in the forefront of my mind, and always have found myself ending with a reinforced conviction that this is the genuine article. Quite simply, I cannot believe in the existence of a second, unknown Ovid who was fully as consummate an artist as the first, known one. In the light of this conviction I approach the disputed texts with the same critical attitudes that I bring to bear on the undisputed, and apply the yardstick of Ovidian usage universally throughout the twenty-one epistles.

### 1. 3–4

Troia iacet certe, Danais inuisa puellis;  
uix Priamus tanti totaque Troia fuit.

Variation in the punctuation of the hexameter apart (Palmer, for instance, has no comma, while Dörrie places one after *iacet*, not after *certe*), this is how the couplet has stood for centuries, but not without some reservations on the part of critics. Burman, for example, had jibbed at *certe* (which, if right, would surely be less ambiguously placed at the start of the line?), for which he suggested *per te*, and before him Heinsius had written: "Ut tamdiu absis nimirum. Frustra igitur se exercent hoc in loco viri eruditi. Fuit cum et ego versum unum alterumque excidisse suspicarer, sed nullus excidit." The word *nimirum* in Heinsius' first sentence is to my mind rather nervously brusque, for there is in these verses no hint of *ut tamdiu absis*. What they appear to be saying is, "Troy has fallen: the whole of Troy was hardly worth it," and one is then entitled to ask, "Worth what?" Now

approach the verses from another angle, and consider the sentiment, "Troy has fallen: Priam was scarcely worth it." What kind of sense is this? Add then the adjective *tota*, attached as it is to the second occurrence of *Troia* but not the first, and enquire what may be its point. Unless I am very much mistaken, there is a deep corruption in the hexameter, and a lesser one in the pentameter, and the sense called for here may be expressed in the following words (for which various alternatives no doubt might be canvassed):

ut mora nectatur (or sic fieret) Danais inuisa puellis,  
uix Priamus tanti uictaque Troia fuit.

### 1. 13-14

in te fingebam uiolentos Troas ituros;  
nomine in Hectoreo pallida semper eram.

Another poet might operate differently, but I cannot believe that if Ovid had written *in te* and *nomine in Hectoreo* he would have intended *in* to have a different function in the two phrases; but so it must, for *te* is accusative in the hexameter, and *in* accordingly seems to be governing now the accusative, now the ablative. This is clumsy writing, I suggest, and the attractions of *et* for *in* in the pentameter I find compelling. Now back to the hexameter, which is, if anything, still more clumsy, with *uiolentos*, surely almost adequate in itself to explain *in te*, followed almost immediately by the almost superfluous *ituros*. Could even a juvenile Ovid ever have written so feeble a line? Unless something now very remote lies concealed here, there may be something to be said for:

in te fingebam uiolenter Troas ituros,

or, alternatively:

in te fingebam Troas uiolenter ituros.

It is pertinent to note that Planudes has βιαίως.

### 2. 9-10

spes quoque lenta fuit; tarde, quae credita laedunt,  
credimus. inuita nunc es amante nocens.

In the hexameter I would much prefer *fugit* for *fuit*, and then either *lenta . . . lente* or *tarda . . . tarde*. In the pentameter *es . . . nocens* is no doubt possible (for exemplification of the so-called periphrastic conjugation see K.-S. I 159, where *Lucr. 3. 396 est coercens* and *Ov. Her. 18. 55 nox erat incipiens* are cited), but *inuita* I should say was quite the wrong word for Phyllis to be made to use: of course she does not "will" Demophoon's ill-usage. Perhaps:

. . . inuicto nunc es amore nocens,

or, as I should myself prefer:

. . . inuicto nunc in amore noces.

2. 35–36

per mare, quod totum uentis agitur et undis,  
per quod nempe ieras, per quod iturus eras.

*Nempe* is Bentley's conjecture for the manuscripts' *saepe*, which is manifestly wrong since Demophoon had travelled that way but once before; but I have to say that I do not see the force here of *nempe*, which is only tolerable if toned down in translation to something like "over which you had indeed sailed" (so G. P. Goold in the revised Loeb ed.); but did the assertion that Demophoon had come from Troy to Thrace in fact need confirmation or strengthening? It is notorious that *nempe* is often corrupted to *saepe*, but this is not, I think, one of the cases where that corruption has happened. Let me propose, then, for consideration the form of words:

per quod ut ante ieras rursus iturus eras.

2. 61–62

sperauī melius, quia me meruisse putauī;  
quaecumque ex merito spes uenit, aequa uenit.

" . . . the hope—whatever it be—that is grounded in desert, is just" (so Showerman). Yes, that is doubtless a true sentiment, but is it Phyllis' sentiment? Is not the point here that her hope, while abundantly justified (as she sees it), was justifiably abundant? I fancy that Ovid here wrote, not *aequa*, but *ampla*.

2. 85–86

exitus acta probat." careat successibus, opto,  
quisquis ab euentu facta notanda putat.

I should like to think that Ovid wrote either *probat . . . probanda* or *notat . . . notanda*.

2. 91–92

illa meis oculis species abeuntis inhaeret,  
cum premeret portus classis itura meos.

And where, one may ask, was Demophoon's fleet in the period preceding its imminent departure if not (somewhere) in the area of Phyllis' harbour? There would be far more point in a pentameter which read:

cum fremeret portu classis itura meo.

## 2. 105–12

iamque tibi excidimus, nullam, puto, Phyllida nosti. 105  
 ei mihi! si, quae sim Phyllis et unde, rogas—  
 quae tibi, Demophoon, longis erroribus acto  
 Threicios portus hospitiumque dedi,  
 cuius opes auxere meae, cui diues egenti  
 munera multa dedi, multa datura fui; 110  
 quae tibi subieci latissima regna Lycurgi,  
 nomine femineo uix satis apta regi, . . .

It may be that there is no problem here, but it is noteworthy that as the lines stand at present, *quae* in 107 and 111 refers to Phyllis, but *cuius* and *cui* in 109 to Demophoon, and such an oscillation I should have said was clumsy (and, to the extent of the three words *cuius opes auxere*, misleading). I accordingly propose:

cuius opes auxere tuas, quae diues egenti . . . ,

a form of words which keeps the focus firmly on Phyllis.

## 2. 113–18

qua patet umbrosum Rhodope glacialis ad Haemum,  
 et sacer admissas exigit Hebrus aquas,  
 cui mea uirginitas auibus libata sinistris 115  
 castaque fallaci zona recincta manu!  
 pronuba Tisiphone thalamis ululauit in illis,  
 et cecinit maestum deuia carmen auis; . . .

Lines 113–14 were pronounced suspect by Sedlmayer, but in truth there is nothing un-Ovidian about them, nor are they in any way to blame except perhaps for their irrelevance; let them, therefore, be regarded, or even punctuated, as a parenthesis. With 115 I return to the previous note, and come to the main point of this one; for those who object to *tuas* and *quae* in 109 are sure to claim support in the *cui* of 115, which must refer to Demophoon. Must, that is, if it is right, for I fancy I discern a broken connexion between 115–16 and 117–18, and would suggest *cum* for *cui* in 115 to repair that break; but even if *cui* is right, it does not stand on a par with the pronouns of 109, being separated indeed from the previous sequence by the topographical parenthesis introduced by *qua*.

## 2. 145–46

inscribere meo causa inuidiosa sepulcro.  
 aut hoc aut simili carmine notus eris.

The parataxis of these clauses is arguably jagged, and the coupling of *aut . . . aut* ("either . . . or") a shade too emphatic. Perhaps *atque hoc*?

## 3. 1

Quam legis, a rapta Briseide littera uenit, . . .

*Rapta* is factually untrue, except with reference to Briseis' original capture at Lymesus, which is surely irrelevant here, where her present position in the Greek camp is what matters. The heralds came to Achilles and asked for her (7), and her complaint is that she was given up (7 *tradita*, 10 and 21 *data*) without a fuss. Although in 99 Briseis is made to say that she did not behave as Achilles' wife, there are a number of places in the poem (5–6, 37, 52, 101) where she views herself, or presents herself as viewed, as *coniunx* or *domina* to Achilles as *uir*. Much more apt than *rapta*, therefore, would be *pacta*, referring (it may be) as much to her quasi-matrimonial status as to the allocation of prisoners which had brought her to Achilles in the first place.

## 3. 3–4

quascumque adspicies, lacrimae fecere lituras;  
sed tamen et lacrimae pondera uocis habent.

*Sed tamen* is very heavy. Perhaps *sic tamen*?

## 3. 13–14

differri potui; poenae mora grata fuisset.  
ei mihi! discedens oscula nulla dedi.

If Briseis gave no kisses on her departure, that is her fault, and she has no one to blame but herself. *Ei mihi*, however, suggests rather that she was blameless in this respect, and so she would be if the original read, not *dedi*, but *tuli*.

## 3. 17–18

saepe ego decepto uolui custode reuerti,  
sed, me qui timidam prenderet, hostis erat.

Is there not something of a contradiction between the hexameter and the pentameter? If Briseis “wanted” to trick the guard and return, she was hardly “timid,” and I consequently find it impossible to believe that Ovid wrote *timidam*. What he did write, I know not, but it could have been *refugam*. *Timebam* in line 19 lends no support to *timidam*—though it may well explain its genesis—for capture by the Trojans outside the camp would be a quite different matter from being apprehended while sneaking from one Greek tent to another.

## 3. 29–33

Laertaque satus, per quos comitata redirem  
(auxerunt blandas grandia dona preces)  
uiginti fuluos operoso ex aere lebetas,

et tripodas septem pondere et arte pares;  
addita sunt illis auri bis quinque talenta, . . .

In 30 most of the manuscripts (including the Puteaneus) have *blandas* . . . *preces*, and that is what the sense calls for, since it is gifts that enhance entreaties rather than the other way around. The problem then presents itself in stark terms: on that interpretation of 30 the phrase *grandia dona* is in the nominative, but the particularised gifts of 31–32 are in the accusative. In the new Loeb I have to say that I find a breakdown of syntax between 29 and 31, which the parenthesising of 30 does nothing to remedy; nor indeed is this parenthesis to my mind at all credible. Various conjectures designed to deal with this problem may be found in Burman's edition and in that by Palmer, but the only one of these which I wish to explore is Madvig's:

auxerunt blandas grandia dona preces,  
uiginti fului operoso ex aere lebetes  
et tripodes . . .

*Lebetes* and *tripodes* are indeed found in manuscripts, as Heinsius had noted, and the new departure, unfortunately in the direction of a metrical solecism not to be attributed to Ovid, comes in the introduction of *fului* for *fuluos*. A brave attempt, and wrong, but suggestive of what may be right, and that is:

uiginti fuluo pretiosi ex aere lebetes.

This is, I must add, no more than a variation on an earlier idea by Palmer:

uiginti fului pretioso ex aere lebetes,

which I have no recollection of registering before I came to my own conclusion.

### 3. 93–94

res audita mihi, nota est tibi. fratribus orba  
deuouit nati spemque caputque parens.

Is this indeed the way of it, that Briseis had heard the story of Meleager—which Homer in *Iliad* 9 has Phoenix narrate to Achilles—while Achilles knows of it? Quite what the distinction is between *audita* and *nota* in this passage, I am not clear, but, whatever it is, I should have thought that the natural sequence was:

res audita tibi, nota est mihi,

the Asiatic Briseis' knowledge of a Peloponnesian tale presumably coming to her via Achilles.

## 3. 97–98

sola uirum coniunx flexit. felicior illa!  
at mea pro nullo pondere uerba cadunt.

Madvig's *pro!* (recorded by Goold), in which he had been preceded by Gruter, is best forgotten, but the diagnosis which led up to it should be remembered, and acted on. Daniel Heinsius' comment was: "Sane nec Latinum est, nec sensum explet," and while Nicolaus worked diligently to accumulate evidence against his father's contention, *pro* remains a problem. My suggestion is:

at mea non ullo pondere uerba cadunt,

in which case it may be that *pro* was interpolated to mend the metre after *non ullo* had been closed up to *nullo*. Not dissimilarly, perhaps, at *Tristia* 3. 2. 24 Ovid might, I think, have written *ianua non ullo tempore aperta fuit*, where the manuscripts have *sed nullo* or *sub nullo*, but Housman's learned defence of *sub* (*Classical Papers* [Cambridge 1972] III 1274) should act as a deterrent to conjectural intervention.

## 3. 103–04

per tamen ossa uiri subito male tecta sepulcro,  
semper iudiciis ossa uerenda meis; . . .

"Bones ever to be held sacred in my eyes" (so Showerman) is inoffensive enough, but Briseis is talking about the bones of her husband, slain in war, and *iudiciis . . . meis* properly means something like "in my opinion" (so Shuckburgh), a totally heartless expression in so poignant a remembrance. I do not know what Ovid wrote here, but two possibilities readily suggest themselves in the shape of:

semper ab (*or in*) officiis ossa uerenda meis,

and:

semper cum lacrimis ossa uerenda meis.

## 4. 7–8

ter tecum conata loqui ter inutilis haesit  
lingua, ter in primo restitit ore sonus.

The first two occurrences here of *ter* relate to *lingua*, but the third, according to the manuscripts, accompanies another noun altogether, and that, I submit, is not elegant. Perhaps the pentameter should read:

lingua, ter in primo restitit orsa sono.

## 4. 9-10

qua licet et sequitur, pudor est miscendus amor;  
dicere quae puduit, scribere iussit amor.

Nobody, I suspect, is entirely happy with *et sequitur*, and such a translation as "Wherever modesty may attend on love, love should not lack in it" (so Showerman), while it sounds very well, does not really meet the needs of this case: with Phaedra, *pudor* is opposed to *amor*, and while it must perforce be conjoined with love, it is not so obliging as to "follow" love. What Phaedra was ashamed to say, love has bidden her write, and, "as far as possible," shame must be made to come to terms with love. How is this possible? Lines 7 and 8 had told us that her tongue had ceased to function, and achievement of the fusion of *pudor* with *amor* is only possible without a tongue, without speech, on the silent page. No one word springs to mind as the mot juste, so let me simply suggest various possibilities: *elingui* (not otherwise found in Ovid, I know), *et mutae*, *et tacitae*, *hoc scripto*, or even *absque sono*.

## 4. 15-16

adsit et, ut nostras audivo fouet igne medullas,  
figat sic animos in mea uota tuos!

As the sequel shows, Phaedra has been burned and wounded by love, yet the action of *fouet*, I should have said, was a gentle one, and one, moreover, at variance with the adjective *audivo*. Better suited to conveying the sense required here would be *domat*.

## 4. 81-82

seu lentum ualido torques hastile lacerto,  
ora ferox in se uersa lacertus habet.

"*Ferox* applied to *lacertus* is in itself strange, and coming so soon after *ferocis* in ver. 79 is offensive. Heinsius proposes with inferior MSS. to read *fugacis* there. I should prefer to strike out ver. 81, 82, or 82, 83, for there is no real distinction between *hastilia* and *uenabula*." So Palmer, here, as often, both right and wrong: wrong about the need for deletion; right about the strangeness of the adjective *ferox*. Perhaps *sequax*, with something of the force of *lentus*, as Leander (19. 48) has *lenta brachia*; see also Purser's note on 19. 12.

## 4. 85-86

tu modo duritiam siluis depone iugosis;  
non sum militia digna perire tua.

*Militia* is Palmer's conjecture for the manuscripts' *materia*, which Heinsius ("Non sum digna, quae peream te praebente ac suppeditante caussam &

materiam mortis. eleganter & Latine dictum.”) and Burman (“Locus hic obscurior, & quidquid adferant interpretes, non efficient, ut *perire alicujus materia*, sit, caussa alicujus. *Materies* hominis vero eleganter dicitur, indoles, & ingenium ejus . . .”) were vainly at pains to vindicate. Tanaquil Faber had earlier hit on the expedient of writing *duritia* in the pentameter (for which he earned Heinsius’ incredulous censure), but he seems to have missed the opportunity of completing the emendation by, conversely, writing *materiam* in the hexameter. All that has happened here is that metrically equivalent words, set at the same point in consecutive lines, have exchanged places and terminations.

## 4. 87–88

quid iuvat incinctae studia exercere Dianae,  
et Veneri numeros eripuisse suos?

Not *numeros*, surely, but *neruos*?

## 4. 91–92

arcus—et arma tuae tibi sunt imitanda Dianae—  
si numquam cesses tendere, mollis erit.

It is all very well for modern editors to introduce marks of parenthesis, as is the case here, but I cannot bring myself to believe that in antiquity the sequence *arcus et arma* . . . would have been understood otherwise than as “the bow and weapons . . .,” in other words, as a double subject, when what follows shows clearly that while *arma* governs one verb, *arcus* governs another. Heinsius, not surprisingly, disliked *et*, and proposed replacing it with *ut*; but I am not sure that this expedient makes it clear that *arcus* and *arma* are shortly to move away from one another to different verbs. Perhaps *ita*?

## 4. 93–96

clarus erat siluis Cephalus, multaeque per herbas  
concliderant illo percutiente ferae;  
nec tamen Aurorae male se praebebat amandum.  
ibat ad hunc sapiens a sene diua uiro.

Cephalus (so the manuscripts here tell us) was a great hunter, but yet he did not do a bad thing in letting Aurora love him. That, perhaps, is one interpretation of the pentameter, and it holds out to Hippolytus an example of cynical self-interest. Surely that could not be what Ovid intended? Palmer, following a different approach, understood *male* to mean “reluctantly,” and that would give the sense: “but yet he did not reluctantly give himself to Aurora to love.” But Hippolytus has not given himself to Phaedra to love at all. And when all is said and done, these interpretations, and any variations on them that might be devised, lay an almost verbal force

on *male*, while leaving *praebebat* as a colourless irrelevance after the opening *nec tamen*. If *nec tamen* is to have any particular force in this line, what is needed, I suggest, is not *praebebat*, but *prohibebat*; and if that is right, *amandum* will have to be changed to *amari*.

## 5. 15–16

saepe super stramen faenoque iacentibus alto  
defensa est humili cana pruina casa.

Why the change of construction in the hexameter? Was there anything to be gained by not writing *faenumque . . . altum*?

## 5. 35–36

qua (*sc. die*) Venus et Iuno sumptisque decentior armis  
uenit in arbitrium nuda Minerua tuum.

These lines are translated as follows by Showerman: "when Venus and Juno, and unadorned Minerva, more comely had she borne her arms, appeared before you to be judged." If Minerva really was "more comely" in full armour, why was she such a fool as to appear in the nude before Paris? Or why did she not insist on appearing in full armour-plating, if that was what made her "more comely"? I find it hard to believe that *sumptis* is right, when *positis* would restore some common sense to these lines.

## 5. 109–12

tu leuior foliis, tum cum sine pondere suci  
mobilibus uentis arida facta uolant;  
et minus est in te quam summa pondus arista,  
quae leuis adsiduis solibus usta riget.

The ear of corn has already by implication in 111 been described as light-weight, and *quae leuis* in 112 accordingly seems pointless. Add also that *riget* is perhaps not the most appropriate verb to use of *arista*. I suspect that what Ovid wrote in the pentameter was:

cui leuis adsiduis solibus hasta riget.

## 6. 93–96

et quae nescierim melius. male quaeritur herbis  
moribus et forma conciliandus amor.  
hanc potes amplecti thalamoque relictus in uno  
inpauidus somno nocte silente frui?

In this conformation of the text, the first clause of 93 forms an appendix to the catalogue of Medea's fell deeds previously mentioned; then follows a generalised statement about winning love by herbs, not by character and by looks, which is only by implication to be referred to Medea. Somehow this is a rather uncoordinated couplet, in part retrospective, in part unrelated,

except by implication, to what follows. Making use of the variant *quod* for *quae* in 93, let me propose, at least as food for thought, this form of words:

huic, quod nescierim melius, male quaeritur herbis,  
moribus et forma conciliandus, amor.

The love of 93–94 now being clearly described as Medea's, the next couplet comes in much more smoothly, and proceeds unobjectionably as far as *somno*, which stands in jarring juxtaposition to *nocte*. Why not therefore *inpavidus somni*, a construction for which Silius (7. 128) provides exemplification?

6. 115–16

Bacchus auus; Bacchi coniunx redimita corona  
praeradiat stellis signa minora suis.

Perhaps *signis . . . suis*, or *signo . . . suo*?

7. 33–34

aut ego, quae coepi, (neque enim dedignor) amorem,  
materiam curae praebeat ille meae!

The trouble with this form of words (in which *amorem* is Madvig's conjecture for the manuscripts' *amare*) is that the couplet changes direction spectacularly in the pentameter, where a new subject, *ille*, takes over from *ego*, which no candid reader would say he did not expect to continue into the next line. Nor is this problem at all alleviated by punctuating after *aut* rather than after *ego*. The older editors opted for:

aut ego, quem coepi (neque enim dedignor) amare,

approved by Ciofanus and Heinsius, and retained, against his better judgement, it seems, by Burman ("Nondum tamen video sensum, cum suspensa sit oratio."), but this version is open to the same strictures as the other, punctuate the hexameter how you will. The difficulty, to be precise, consists primarily in the position of *ego*, and some means of indicating that it belongs firmly to a clause subordinate to that of the pentameter needs to be found. Would that means be found, I wonder, if we were to write:

aut, ut ego hunc coepi (neque enim dedignor) amorem?

*Hunc* for *aut* is given by the Eton MS Bk. 6, 18, and *ut* could obviously have dropped out after *aut*.

7. 75–76

haec minus ut cures, puero parcatur Iulo!  
te satis est titulum mortis habere meae.

*Haec minus ut cures* is Housman's conjectural restoration. Most manuscripts have *nec mihi tu curae*, while others weave variations with *tibi*, *tu*, *sum*, *non*, and *sim* in place of *mihi tu*, with *care*, *parcas*, and *parce* in place of *curae*, and with *parcatur* for *tu curae*. As so often in the *Heroides*, we are faced with a total mess in the transmission. From a Cambridge manuscript E. J. Kenney elicited *nec tibi sim curae*, which in point of sense is adequate, but lacks the emphasis which only *mihi* can give, as it is indeed given in the version preferred by the older editors, *nec mihi parcatur*; but here the repetition of *parcatur* is a little dull. Many manuscripts have *parcas* instead of *curae*, and *mihi non* is available (in the Eton manuscript cited in the previous note, and in Treuirensis bibl. ciu. 1088). Invert *tu*, therefore, let me suggest, and write:

ut mihi non parcas, puero parcatur Iulo.

For the pentameter to stand, *meae* would have, as Palmer spotted, to be emphatic ("not of the death of Iulus as well"), but alas! the emphasis has already been laid on *te*: it is enough that you (and no one else) should have the credit for my death. Perhaps it might be better to write:

sat tibi sit titulum mortis habere meae,

where *meae* can bear the emphasis that Palmer envisaged for it.

#### 7. 177-78

pro meritis et siqua tibi debemus ultra,  
pro spe coniugii tempora parua peto.

Dido has nearly done now, and hope of marriage is not compatible with learning "the strength to endure my sorrows bravely" (180). Not therefore *pro spe coniugii*, but *non spe coniugii*.

#### 8. 35-36

cum tibi nubebam, nulli mea taeda nocebat;  
si iungar Pyrrho, tu mihi laesus eris.

Showerman's translation makes my point for me: "When I was wed to you . . . if I wed with Pyrrhus . . ." *Cum tibi nubebam* calls for a corresponding *si nubam Pyrrho*.

#### 8. 89-92

parua mea sine matre fui, pater arma ferebat,  
et duo cum uiuant, orba duobus eram.  
non tibi blanditias primis, mea mater, in annis  
incerto dictas ore puella tuli.

89: Would anyone say that there was any point in *mea*, which bears no emphasis, nor adds a jot to the sentiment? Better by far would be *etiam*.

91: Precisely the same criticism may be levelled at *mea* in this line too. I should like to think that Ovid wrote either *male mater*, or *mala mater*.

92: *Dictas* strikes me as too articulate a verb for the blandishments which Hermione's "tripping tongue" endeavoured to utter. Perhaps *fictas*?

9. 19–20

quid nisi notitia est misero quaesita pudori,  
si cumulas turpi facta priora nota?

At *Tristia* 3. 13. 3 (on which see his note) Burman took the opportunity of correcting *miseros* to *seros*, and I can only express surprise that he did not propose the same expedient here, where *facta priora* would be neatly complemented by *serus pudor*.

9. 33–34

uir mihi semper abest, et coniuge notior hospes,  
monstraque terribiles persequiturque feras.

"My lord is ever absent from me—he is better known to me as guest than husband—ever pursuing monsters and dreadful beasts." So Showerman. If that is the sense of the couplet, as it surely is, *ut* would be better than *et*.

9. 41–42

aucupor infelix incertae murmura famae,  
speque timor dubia spesque timore cadit.

I do not believe that the pentameter, as the manuscripts give it, is logical: if hope is wavering, it will not bring down fear, nor will wavering fear bring down hope. Fear will only be brought down by hope if fear is wavering, and only if hope is wavering will it be brought down by fear. Logic will be restored if *dubius* is written for *dubia*.

10. 23–24

et quotiens ego te, totiens locus ipse uocabat.  
ipse locus miserae ferre uolebat opem.

With *locus ipse* first governing *uocabat*, and then, as it seems, on its return visit forming the subject of *uolebat*, this is not the most elegant of couplets. I wonder if *uocanti* would improve matters?

10. 37–38

haec ego; quod uoci deerat, plangore replebam;  
uerbera cum uerbis mixta fuere meis.

Thus punctuated, the hexameter presents no problem, for, as Palmer reminds us, "the verb is often omitted" after *haec ego*. Quite so, it is indeed omitted;

but not one of the cases he cites by way of illustration is at all ambiguous, whereas here, if there were inept punctuation (as e.g. in Weise's *haec ego, quod uoci deerat, plangore replebam*), or no punctuation at all (as in every ancient manuscript), the reader might well not understand. If, however, Ovid wrote, not *haec*, but *hic* or *hinc*, there would be no problem.

## 10. 67-70

non ego te, Crete centum digesta per urbes,  
adspiciam, puero cognita terra Ioui,  
ut pater et tellus iusto regnata parenti  
prodita sunt facto, nomina cara, meo.

*Terrae* has preceded in 61, *terra* in 64, and *tellus* is found in 69; a further occurrence in 68 is not needed, nor indeed does *terra* there add anything to the sense. What would add something to the sense, particularly in the light of *iusto* and *prodita*, would be *fida*: Jove experienced the fidelity of Crete, and Crete has experienced the infidelity of Ariadne.

## 10. 141-44

non te per meritum, quoniam male cessit, adoro;  
debita sit facto gratia nulla meo.  
sed ne poena quidem! si non ego causa salutis,  
non tamen est, cur sis tu mihi causa necis.

It may be that all is well here, but I find myself slightly disturbed by the lack of balance between the second halves of 143 and 144. Proper balance would, I suggest, be restored if 143 ended:

. . . tibi non sim ego causa salutis.

## 11. 1-2

Siqua tamen caecis errabunt scripta lituris,  
oblitus a dominae caede libellus erit.

*Tamen* is very abrupt, and has bothered editors since the time of Micyllus. If it is right, it must, as Palmer suggests, refer "to an implied thought that she was doing all in her power to avoid blots"; but the abruptness remains, and citation of Prop. 4. 3. 3-4, which is after all the second couplet of that poem, serves only to underline the present difficulty. Heinsius ventured a bold reconstruction in the shape of:

siqua latent caecis errantia scripta lituris,

but neither he nor Burman noticed that this is prosodically solecistic: if *latent* (but might not *manent* have been easier?) . . . *errantia* were right, *scripta* would also have to be changed, and that is going too far, I think. Showerman's translation begins: "If aught of what I write is yet blotted deep and escapes your eye . . .," and "escapes your eye," while not in the

Latin of the manuscripts, might yet have been in the Latin of the author, if *tamen* stood for an original *tibi*.

## 11. 107–08

quid puer admisit tam paucis editus horis?  
quo laesit facto uix bene natus auum?

The phrase *uix bene natus* is peculiar: the child was only a few hours old, and *uix natus*, it is true, but *bene* does not square with the fact of his being “completely” born. Well and truly born he indeed was, but not *uix bene notus*; and it was the fact of his “scarcely being fully known” to his grandfather that enabled Canace to ask these rhetorical questions.

## 12. 59–60

ante oculos taurique meos segetesque nefandae,  
ante meos oculos peruigil anguis erat.

*Meos* in 59 is indeed the reading of most manuscripts, but if it is right, it leaves *tauri* with no adjective, whereas the two other nominatives, *segetes* and *anguis*, are both qualified. This, Heinsius felt, was inelegant writing, and I am sure that he was right to accept *taurique truces* from two Medicean manuscripts. If he was right in so doing, he ought to have taken steps also to remove *meos* from 60. One way in which this may be done is to write:

ante oculos uigili peruigil anguis erat.

As the snake is sleepless, so is the distraught Medea.

## 12. 62–64

mane erat, et thalamo cara recepta soror  
disiectamque comas aduersaque in ora iacentem  
inuenit, et lacrimis omnia plena meis.

*Omnia* is an extravagant generalisation. Perhaps *stramina*?

## 12. 97–98

ipsa ego, quae dederam medicamina, pallida sedi,  
cum uidi subitos arma tenere uiros, . . .

Since *pallida* could refer to *medicamina*, there is, it seems to me, a manifest ambiguity here. Did Ovid, I wonder, write *medicamen*?

## 12. 111–14

uirginitas facta est peregrini praeda latronis;  
optima cum cara matre relicta soror.  
at non te fugiens sine me, germane, reliqui!  
deficit hoc uno littera nostra loco.

The verb forms *relicta* (112) and *reliqui* (113) are translated, respectively, as "I have left behind" and "I did . . . leave behind" in the Loeb edition, while Palmer, previously, had rendered *sine me* (113) as "behind me." Why, one may accordingly ask, does *sine me* appear in the one place but not in the other, and is it really necessary at all? Is it not, moreover, an odd way of expressing the idea "behind me"? "Suspectum hoc est & duriter dictum," said Burman of *sine me*; and he was right, I think, so to do. He was not, however, right, I think, in his solution, which was to write:

at cur non fugiens sic te germane reliqui?

since *sic* is not clear, and a question not necessary. A simpler way out of the difficulty might perhaps be to write:

at non te fugiens, miser a! germane, reliqui.

### 12. 143

turba ruunt et "Hymen," clamant, "Hymenae!" frequenter.

At *Tristia* 4. 7. 25 *frequenter* does indeed appear at the end of a line, but the tone there is almost colloquial. Here the tone is anything but colloquial, and *frequenter* at the end of this line has for me more than a touch of bathos. The older editors favoured *frequentant* (here in the sense of "ingeminare, repetere," as Burman suggests, and not, it must be added, otherwise attested with this force in Ovid), and if that is right, *clamant* must surely be wrong. Did the original conceivably read:

turba ruunt et "Hymen" clamore "Hymenae" frequentant? •

### 12. 155-58

ire animus mediae suadebat in agmina turbae  
sertaque compositis demere rapta comis;  
uix me continui, quin dilaniata capillos  
clamarem "meus est!" iniceremque manus.

*Demere* is slightly incongruous beside *rapta*, and one may well wonder why the poet did not write *deripuisse*, if that was all that he wished to say. I think that he wished to say more, and propose for consideration *scindere rapta*. It is not, I think, irrelevant that the participle of 157, *dilaniata*, like the participle of 156, *rapta*, is indicative of violent action on Medea's part.

### 12. 163-64

serpentis igitur potui taurosque furentes;  
unum non potui perdomuisse uirum.

At lines 62, 103 and 198 of this poem the serpent is singular; and it would be an absurdly exaggerated flourish for Medea here to be made to multiply

him. *Vnum* in 163 is not an objection, since the sense of that word is "alone." Perhaps one might contemplate:

ergo serpentem potui taurosque furentes.

12. 185–86

tam tibi sum supplex, quam tu mihi saepe fuisti,  
nec moror ante tuos procubuisse pedes.

Was Jason "often" a suppliant of Medea, and is she "often" a suppliant of him? Surely he was but once a suppliant, when Aeetes set him those dreadful tasks; and surely she is but once a suppliant, on this occasion, when she writes begging *redde torum* (193)? I cannot help feeling that *nempe* would be right here, as it is on other occasions where the manuscripts conspire in reading *saepe*.

12. 201–02

aureus ille aries uillo spectabilis alto  
dos mea, quam, dicam si tibi "redde!", neges.

*Alto* is the reading of a minority of manuscripts, including the Puteaneus, while the majority offers *aureo* or *auro*. It may be that the combination of *aureus* with *alto* is what Ovid intended, but I should have thought that what made the ram *spectabilis* was not the thickness of its fleece but the fact of the fleece being golden. If, therefore, *aureo* were right as the final word of the line, the first word as given by the manuscripts must be wrong; and for *aureus* the obvious word to restore is *Phrixus*.

12. 203–04

dos mea tu sospes; dos est mea Graia iuuentus!  
i nunc, Sisyphias, inprobe, confer opes!

"My dowry is yourself—saved; my dowry is the band of Grecian youth!" So the Loeb translation; but we are not told in what sense the "band of Grecian youth" is her dowry. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of *mea* and *Graia* is harsh: the last thing that Medea would want now is to be identified with Greeks! Both of these problems would disappear if the original read:

dos mea tu sospes, sospes tibi Graia iuuentus.

13. 9–10

raptus es hinc praeceps, et qui tua uela uocaret,  
quem cuperent nautae, non ego, uentus erat.

"*Vocaret* and *cuperent* in 10 are descriptive subjunctives," says Palmer, inviting us to compare 81 *deceat*; so how then is Showerman able to render 9–10 as: ". . . and the wind that invited forth your sails was one your seamen longed for, not I," where a clear enough distinction is drawn between

the type of the two verbs? Answer: the translator was aware what sense was required, but not aware that what was required in the Latin to convey that sense was one imperfect indicative, *uocabat*, to identify the wind, and one imperfect subjunctive, *cuperent*, to tell us what kind of a wind it was.

## 13. 37–40

scilicet ipsa geram saturatas murice lanas,  
bella sub Iliacis moenibus ille geret?  
ipsa comas pectar, galea caput ille premetur?  
ipsa nouas uestes, dura uir arma feret?

*Lanas* (37) is the reading of three manuscripts, according to Dörrie, the vast majority having *uestes*, an unwelcome repetition of line 40. Even with *lanas*, however, the contrast between the hexameter and pentameter is not at all exact: there is nothing in common between *geram . . . lanas* and *bella . . . geret* except the repetition of the verb, for the nouns conduct us to quite different types of action. As a mere shot in the dark, let me suggest that behind *lanas*, on which *uestes* is a gloss, stands a further word on which *lanas* is a gloss, namely *telas*, and that behind *bella* stands *tela*. I fancy it was a subconscious recollection of Claudian 18. 273–74 (of the eunuch consul Eutropius) *tu potes alterius studiis haerere Mineruae, / tu telas, non tela, pati*, which prompted this idea. If, as I hope, it is right, this passage will be yet another of many in Ovid which have given inspiration to Claudian.

In line 40 *nouas* is out of keeping with *dura*. Here I am rather inclined to think that the *uestes* were originally *leues*.

## 13. 71–72

si cadere Argolico fas est sub milite Troiam,  
te quoque non ullum uulnus habente cadet.

*Cadet* appears as a variant reading in Cantab. Trin. 598, and was also proposed conjecturally by Bentley and Madvig; but I see no merit in it. *Cadat*, the majority reading of the manuscripts, on the other hand, is absolutely apt to the required sense: if it is fated that Troy shall fall, let it fall without your being wounded. The new Loeb edition, however, favours *cadet*, and translates as follows: "If it be fated Troy shall fall before the Argive host, it will fall without your taking a single wound!" But where in this translation, I ask, is *quoque*? Palmer makes an attempt to do justice to it ("you, as well as others, being unwounded"), but the attempt is footling: Laodamia is not in the least concerned about others, only about Protesilaus. Of earlier critics, only Francius, so far as I can see, was aware of the problem, but I am not vastly attracted by his two alternative suggestions, *te uoueo nullum*, and *te modo non ullum*, although the first is on the right lines. In *quoque* I fancy I see one of the interpolator's favourite stopgaps, and suggest that the original form of words was:

te certe nullum uulnus habente cadat.

Compare the note above on 3. 97–98.

14. 31–33

in thalamos laeti—thalamos, sua busta!—feruntur  
strataque corporibus funere digna premunt.  
iamque cibo uinoque graues somnoque iacebant, . . .

To my mind the epanalepsis of 31 is rather overdoing things, and I would have expected a somewhat quieter form of words. It may be that nothing more is needed here than to replace the second *thalamos* with one or other of the variants *fratres* and *iuuenes*, but I find myself wondering whether the original might have read:

in thalamos laeti, iuuenalia busta, feruntur.

In 32 *corporibus* seems oddly otiose, and *strata . . . funere digna* is surely the last phrase to be put in the mouth of Hypermnestra.

strataque nequaquam funere digna premunt

is what she should be made to say.

14. 59–60

si manus haec aliquam posset committere caedem,  
morte foret dominae sanguinolenta suae.

*Caede for morte?*

15. 7–16

flendus amor meus est—elegiae flebile carmen;  
non facit ad lacrimas barbitos ulla meas.  
uror, ut indomitis ignem exercentibus Euris  
fertilis accensis messibus ardet ager. 10  
arua, Phaon, celebras diuersa Typhoidos Aetnae;  
me calor Aetnaeo non minor igne tenet.  
nec mihi, dispositis quae iungam carmina neruis,  
proueniunt; uacuae carmina mentis opus.  
nec me Pyrrhiades Methymniadesue puellae, 15  
nec me Lesbiadum cetera turba iuuant.

In lines 5–6 Phaon is represented as enquiring why Sappho, uncharacteristically, is writing in elegiacs, and the answer he receives is that her love is matter for tears, and for tears the appropriate verse form is the elegiac couplet (7–8). Would someone now explain to me why much the same point is made again five lines further on (13–14), in a context unrelated to the matter of the choice of metre? Not quite the same point, however, since 13–14 seem to be saying that Sappho cannot write lyrics (the formulaic *carmina neruis* refers to that kind of writing) because they

require an untroubled mind. This is a very pedestrian sentiment, and long-winded too, after the concise *flendus amor meus est* of line 7. I am strongly inclined to pronounce it a spurious insertion. If it is genuine, its appropriate place would be after line 8.

## 15. 21–22

est in te facies, sunt apti lusibus anni—  
o facies oculis insidiosa meis!

As it stands, 21 is identical with *Am.* 2. 3. 13, and that is unlike Ovid, whose normal practice is to incorporate variations, however slight they may be. But the 21 of our manuscripts is not, I suggest, the 21 that Ovid left behind him. To be sure, Phaon may well be endowed not only with looks but also youthful years, but line 22 dwells only on the looks, and the years are forgotten. Then there is the absence in the hexameter of anything corresponding to *oculis . . . meis*; and *oculis*, one notes, has appeared four lines earlier. All in all, there is a lack of balance between the hexameter and the pentameter which is somewhat jarring. Let me therefore suggest for consideration the wording:

est in te facies, in me apti lusibus anni.  
o facies annis insidiosa meis!

## 15. 35–38

candida si non sum, placuit Cepheia Perseo  
Andromede, patriae fusca colore suae.  
et uariis albae iunguntur saepe columbae,  
et niger a uiridi turtur amatur aue.

In 36 *fusca* completely gives the game away, leaving *patriae . . . colore suae* with very little to add to the sentiment. Rather than *fusca*, what is needed is *picta* or *tincta*, or at all events, a neutral adjective or participle.

In 37 there is no colour contrast with *albae* provided by *uariis*, and if anyone cared to argue that the line originally began *et fuscis albae*, the argument would surely find its supporters. There is more, however, I think, to be said for:

et ravis albae iunguntur saepe columbae.

## 15. 39–40

si, nisi quae facie poterit te digna uideri,  
nulla futura tua est, nulla futura tua est.

This may be right, but I find the presence of two ablatives, *facie* and *te*, in the hexameter slightly jarring. There is, however, a variant *facies*, from which may be elicited:

si, nisi cui facies poterit te digna uideri.

## 15. 45–48

haec quoque laudabas, omnique a parte placebam—  
 sed tum praecipue, cum fit amoris opus.  
 tunc te plus solito lasciuia nostra iuuabat,  
 crebraque mobilitas aptaque uerba ioco, . . .

Phaon praised Sappho's kisses, and she pleased him in every way, but above all when they made love. Then indeed her wantonness pleased him "more than usual"—what, pray, is the sense of "usual" in this context? And when else did her *lasciuia* please him? Is not what is required something like:

tunc te plus modico lasciuia nostra iuuabat?

## 15. 113–14

postquam se dolor inuenit, nec pectora plangi  
 nec puduit scissis exululare comis, . . .

On line 113 Palmer comments: "The bad caesura is decisive that the line is not Ovidian: no example exists of a hexameter with a caesura after the second and fourth arsis, and the first foot a spondaic word"; his own attempt at curing the line, however, is not attractive (*se dolor inuenit postquam*). Perhaps:

postquam sede dolor uenit, . . .

## 15. 201–02

Lesbides, infamem quae me fecistis amatae,  
 desinite ad citharas turba uenire mea.

*Mea* is Housman's conjecture for the manuscripts' *meas*, and for Purser "*mea* introduces real poetry into the line." That is as may be, but I am not happy with Housman's expedient, first because *citharas* seems to me to need the epithet *meas*, and second because of the position of *mea*, coming after, not before, the noun it qualifies. Let me therefore propose another solution, and that is to write:

Lesbides, infamem quae me fecistis, amata,  
 desinite ad citharas, turba, uenire meas.

## 16. 1–2

Hanc tibi Priamides mitto, Ledaean, salutem,  
 quae tribui sola te mihi dante potest.

*Tribuo for mitto?*

## 16. 21–22

hac duce Sigeo dubias a litore feci  
 longa Phereclea per freta puppe uias.

Theseus' path through the labyrinth was indeed "doubtful" (10. 128), and so was Leander's over the Hellespont (18. 154), but Paris has Venus for his guide, and, as he himself points out in 29, *neque tristis hiemps neque nos huc appulit error*, so how can he here be made to talk of *dubias . . . uias*? At 7. 116 Heinsius and Burman animadvert to the frequency of the confusion of *dubius* with *durus*, but *duras* here would hardly comport with *faciles auras uentosque secundos* of line 23. Did metre and Ovidian usage permit, one might have contemplated *indubias*; that word being impermissible, however, I am inclined to suspect that what Ovid wrote here was *certas*.

## 16. 31-32

nec me crede fretum merces portante carina  
findere—quas habeo, di tueantur opes!

If the newly landed Paris has wealth, as the pentameter says he has, he evidently must have arrived with it, and the contrast with the hexameter is greatly weakened. I suggest that what he originally said in the pentameter was:

. . . quas adeo, di tueantur opes!

with a graceful compliment to the wealth of beauty that he has arrived to find in his promised Helen.

## 16. 43-44

matris adhuc utero partu remorante tenebar;  
iam grauidus iusto pondere uenter erat.

Two nouns in the ablative juxtaposed in the hexameter is not at all elegant, and *partum* would, I suggest, be a distinct improvement.

## 16. 45-46

illa sibi ingentem uisa est sub imagine somni  
flammiferam pleno reddere uentre facem.

Two attributive adjectives, *ingentem* and *flammiferam*, attached to one noun, *facem*, is not in Ovid's manner, and Palmer's *urgentis*, for all that he did not regard the double epistles as Ovidian, reveals an appreciation of the problem. *Vrgentis* could well be right (as Palmer notes, Heinsius had made a similar correction, of *ingenti* to *urgenti*, in a fragment of Calvus), but I am not convinced that it is appreciably superior to *ingesti*, which I now propose for consideration.

## 16. 219-20

hostibus eueniant conuiuia talia nostris,  
experior posito qualia saepe mero.

No doubt *posito* is possible, but *posita . . . mensa* has occurred just three lines before (217), and Menelaus' boorish conduct is better explained if the company has already been drinking. *Poto* for *posito*, therefore?

## 16. 257-58

et modo cantabam ueteres resupinus amores,  
et modo per nutum signa legenda dabam.

I doubt if Helen would have been much pleased by Paris' singing of "old amours," since, as far as the Latin goes, those amours might have been his own! He would have been better advised—as Ovid, I am sure, advised him—to sing *ueterum . . . amores*.

In 258 *legenda*, which he attributes to the "excerpta Gallicana" and as a conjecture to Slichtenhorst, is scouted by Burman with a reference to 17. 82 *tecta signa*. The two cases, however, are only superficially comparable, since "covert signs" may be read, but "signs which should have been kept hidden" betoken at best a very timid passion—and was Helen expected to warm to that?!

## 16. 261-62

quae mihi non aliud, quam formidare, locutae  
orantis medias deseruere praeces.

*Mihi* does not sit comfortably in the proximity of *orantis*, and *formidare* could use a subject. *Se* for *mihi*, therefore?

## 16. 301-04

non habuit tempus, quo Cresia regna uideret,  
aptius—o mira calliditate uirum!  
"res, et ut Idaeï mando tibi," dixit iturus,  
"curam pro nobis hospitibus, uxor, agas."

If *calliditate* is right, it must be intended ironically, for, on an objectively factual assessment of Menelaus' conduct, the appropriate word (and form) would be *credulitate*, just as at 312 the word *commoditate* is used of the absent king, and then, in 316, *simplicitate*.

If, as I think possible, 302 has ironic intention, that may I think help us to determine what the original opening dactyl of 303 was. *Esset et, esset ut*, and *iuit et* say the manuscripts, and conjectures abound. The one here printed is by Madvig, and it requires us to believe, if we can, that *mando* has two direct objects, *res* and *ut Idaeï curam pro nobis hospitibus agas*. Did it never occur to Madvig to consider the demands of style in formulating his conjecture? *Haesit et, risit et, restat ut, cessit et*—the propounders of other conjectures seem determined to add a verb to *dixit iturus* (in the same way as

other scholars support *iuit et*). Let me propose a different solution. If *calliditate* is right, the next couplet might aptly begin:

scilicet "Idaei mando tibi" dixit iturus.

17. 195-98

tu quoque dilectam multos, infide, per annos  
diceris Oenonen destituisse tuam.  
nec tamen ipse negas; et nobis omnia de te  
quaerere, si nescis, maxima cura fuit.

All that Paris had said in his letter (16. 95 ff.) was that he had been sought after by many women, among whom he had admired Oenone the most; he was economical enough with the truth not to say that he had loved and left her. *Nec tamen ipse negas* thus seems to be at variance with what Paris himself has told Helen. Her enquiries in this respect, moreover, would appear to have been time wasted, if he had already confessed to her that he had betrayed Oenone. More apt to the sense required would be:

ne tamen ipse neges, et nobis omnia de te . . .

18. 3-5

si mihi di faciles, si sunt in amore secundi,  
inuitis oculis haec mea uerba leges.  
sed non sunt faciles . . .

With Palmer's *si* (in the second place, for the manuscripts' *et, ut, uel, qui, and tibi*), we are almost home and dry; but *sunt* is wrong, as line 5 makes clear, and it is necessary to adopt *sint* from a number of manuscripts.

19. 1-2

Quam mihi misisti uerbis, Leandre, salutem  
ut possim missam rebus habere, ueni!

*Missam* is no more than an empty verbal flourish, and it is unsurprising that Showerman's translation ignores it altogether. "That I may enjoy in very truth the greeting . . ." is how that translation runs, and for it to have a properly corresponding form of words in the Latin, *missam* should give place to *ueram* or *plenam*.

19. 115-16

o utinam uenias, aut ut uentusue paterue  
causaque sit certe femina nulla morae.

Purser and Palmer combine here to produce a lengthy note speculating on the possibility, or impossibility, of *ut* here having the sense of *utinam*; and the possibility is tacitly given reality by Showerman's translation (" . . . or did I only know that . . ."); the usage, however, remains dubious, and I for

one do not believe that Ovid would have contemplated it. What to do then? Dispose of *ut*, for a start, and after that do something about the ungainly sequence *-que . . . certe . . . nulla*. The required form of words might perhaps be this:

o utinam uenias, aut sit uentusue paterue  
causa, sed incertae femina nulla morae.

Since writing these words, I have seen a very recent paper by W. S. Watt entitled "Notes on Ovid, *Heroides*," which came out in *RIFC* 117 (1989) 62-68. On p. 67 of that paper Watt proposes to read *ferus aut* (that at all events is what his wording leads me to suppose, but did he not rather intend *ferus ut?*), but I am not taken with his suggestion that the hexameter has lost "an adjective ending in *-us*."

19. 121-22

me miseram! quanto planguntur litora fluctu,  
et latet obscura condita nube dies!

*Et* is a stylistic disaster, nor is Heinsius' tentative *ut* much better. Listen to Showerman's translation, and spot the difference between it and the Latin text as transmitted: "Ah, wretched me! with what great waves the shores are beaten, and what dark clouds envelop and hide the day!" Precisely; and what is needed in the pentameter here is:

quam latet obscura condita nube dies!

19. 197-98

stamina de digitis cecidere sopore remissis,  
collaque puluino nostra ferenda dedi.

*Nostra* is utterly pointless: of course it was her own head that Hero laid on the pillow. Far better would be *lassa* or *fessa*.

20. 15-18

quique fuit numquam paruus, nunc tempore longo,  
et spe, quam dederas tu mihi, creuit amor.  
spem mihi tu dederas, meus hic tibi credidit ardor.  
non potes hoc factum teste negare dea.

*Hic* (17) is left untranslated in the Loeb edition, nor do I see what particular point the pronominal adjective would have here (the adverb, I take it, would be no less pointless). Perhaps *hinc*, which would have some point: you gave me hope, and because of that "my ardent heart put trust in you."

## 20. 55–58

tu facis hoc oculique tui, quibus ignea cedunt  
 sidera, qui flammae causa fuere meae;  
 hoc faciunt flauī crines et eburnea ceruix,  
 quaeque, precor, ueniant in mea colla manus.

*Tu facis* does not seem in place in a context where Acontius' audacity (represented by the *hoc* of 55 and 57) is described as prompted by a variety of physical attributes possessed by Cydippe. Perhaps 55 originally began:

hoc facies oculique tui . . . ,

with *facies* picking up *facie* of 54, and *hoc* looking forward to *hoc faciunt* of 57.

## 20. 89–90

ipsa tibi dices, ubi uideris omnia ferri:  
 "tam bene qui seruit, seruiat iste mihi!"

Most manuscripts have *iste*; one or two have *ille* or *ipse*, with which *iste* is often enough confused; and all three pronouns alike are totally superfluous to the sense of the pentameter. Something would be added to the sense if what Ovid in fact wrote was *usque*.

## 20. 161–62

hic metuit mendax, haec et periura uocari;  
 an dubitas, hic sit maior an ille metus?

The only consideration which makes me wonder about the authenticity of this form of words, in which *metuit* is neatly complemented by *metus*, is the fact that in the context (160, 164) there is a pairing of *haec* (Cydippe) and *ille* (her father), whereas here we have *haec* and *hic*. It seems that the Puteaneus (before correction) had *ille timet*, and this opening is given also by a couple of later manuscripts, according to Dörrie. If *ille timet* is right at the start of the couplet, then *metus* at the end should be replaced by *timor*. Should anyone then be troubled by a further appearance of *timor* in 166, there is a variant, *metus*, available for adoption in that line.

## 20. 177–78

quem si reppuleris, nec, quem dea damnat, amaris,  
 tu tunc continuo, certe ego saluus ero.

The pentameter was thus translated by the old Loeb edition: "Then straightway you—and I assuredly—will be whole." The reader may well wonder what the force is of that "assuredly." The new Loeb edition, while retaining the Latin wording of the old, offers a different translation: "Then straightway, thanks to you my welfare will be secure." The reader may well wonder where "thanks to you" is in the Latin and what has become of *certe*,

now not translated at all. If *certe ego* is right, it surely implies a contrast with *tu*, and that contrast might perhaps best be represented by:

fors tu continuo, certe ego saluus ero.

Let it be noted that *fors* as an adverb is not found elsewhere in Ovid, and, while occurring a few times in epic, makes only one appearance in Propertius (2. 9. 1) but none in Tibullus.

20. 185–86

nil opus est istis; tantum periuria uita  
teque simul serua meque datamque fidem!

You need not have recourse to such treatments as steel and fire and bitter juices, Acontius assures Cydippe; “only shun false oaths, preserve the pledge you have given—and so yourself, and me!” (such is Showerman’s translation, retained by Goold). In the pentameter as transmitted, however, we have no less than three instances of *-que*, and the first of these has disappeared altogether from the translation, which also arranges the three objects in an order different from that of the Latin. What the Latin should, I suggest, be saying, but is not now saying, is: “simply avoid perjury, and you will save . . . ,” and that requires *seruabis*. What will Cydippe then save? Surely herself, in the first instance, and the pledge she gave. The Latin now reforms itself to read:

seruabisque simul teque datamque fidem.

I do not doubt that the devoted Acontius would be unconcerned at his not being mentioned in this line.

20. 189–92

admonita es modo uoce mea cum casibus istis,  
quos, quotiens temptas fallere, ferre soles.  
his quoque uitatis in partu nempe rogabis,  
ut tibi luciferas adferat illa manus?

*Cum* is Housman’s conjecture for *modo* of the manuscripts, but is there really anything amiss here with *modo . . . modo*? The admonition which Cydippe receives comes now from Acontius’ lips, now from the frequent setbacks to her health that beset her. In 191, however, I see no point whatsoever in *quoque*, and some form of contrast with *in partu* would be welcome. I suggest:

his nunc uitatis, in partu nempe rogabis, . . .

20. 197–201

non agitur de me; cura maiore laboro.  
anxia sunt causa pectora nostra tua.  
cur modo te dubiam pauidi fleuere parentes,

ignaros culpae quos facis esse tuae?  
et cur ignorent? . . .

*Cur* in 199 is just not credible. The answer to the question, "Why did your parents weep for you when you were poised between life and death?" is immediate, and obvious: because they were her parents, and concerned about her, and that makes the question a very silly one to ask. Sense will be restored to 199 if it begins: *quin modo* . . . , and the question mark is removed at the end of 200.

## 20. 235-36

quod si contigerit, cum iam data signa sonabunt,  
tinctaque uotiuo sanguine Delos erit, . . .

For the second half of 235 the Loeb translation offers "when the sounding signals will be given," which does not offend. Follow the Latin more closely, however, translating "when the given signals will sound," and offence will surely be taken at the purposeless "given." I think that the original had *rata signa*, a phrase for which Ovid had something of a liking, employing it also at *Met.* 14. 818 and *Ep.* 15. 90.

## 21. 7-8

omnia cum faciam, cum dem pia tura Dianae,  
illa tamen iusta plus tibi parte fauet.

"Though I do everything" (so Showerman) is a very flabby thing for Cydippe to be made to say; and when she is then made to add, "though I offer duteous incense to Diana," "everything" does not seem to amount to very much at all. She would be saying something entirely pertinent if her words originally ran:

uni cum faciam, cum dem pia tura Dianae, . . .

## 21. 33-34

haec nobis formae te laudatore superbae  
contingit merces? et placuisse nocet?

*Haec . . . formae te laudatore superbae . . . merces* is a strangely overladen subject phrase. Perhaps *superbis*?

## 21. 163-66

cum tetigit limen, lacrimas mortisque timorem  
cernit et a cultu multa remota suo,  
proicit ipse sua deductas fronte coronas,  
spissaque de nitidis terget amoma comis.

The main clause, so the Loeb translation assumes, begins with *proicit*, but this assumption involves supplying “and” between the first and the second clause of 163: “When he has touched the threshold, *and* (my italics) sees tears and dread of death . . .” The simplest way that I can see of confining 163–64 in subordination to 165–66 is to begin:

cum tetigit limen, lacrimasque necisque timorem . . .

*University of London*