

NOTES ON OVID'S *HEROIDES*

THERE are still many passages in *Heroides* where editors prefer a poor variant or cling to an indefensible text. Some of these I touched on in reviewing Dörrie's new edition (Berlin, 1971),¹ but shortage of space made it necessary to reserve others for discussion elsewhere. As Dörrie goes astray more often than most of his predecessors, this article may be regarded as a continuation of the review;² but I do not discuss any passage where he is alone in his misjudgement.

My text follows Dörrie's in all points relevant to the discussion. In the apparatus criticus, however, I adopt the notation used by Kenney in his O.C.T. of *Amores* (1961), and much of Dörrie's detail is omitted. The only commentaries that I cite are those of Heinsius-Burman (Amsterdam, 1727) and Palmer-Purser (Oxford, 1898). Dörrie's edition has a full bibliography at the end of each epistle.

1. 73 quaecumque aequor habet, quaecumque pericula tellus,
 tam longae causas suspicor esse morae.
 haec ego dum stulte meditor, quae vestra libido est,
 esse peregrino captus amore potes

75 meditor Ew: metuo Gs, Sedlmayer, Palmer

Dörrie reverts to *meditor*, which in Ovid nowhere means 'contemplate' in the sense of contemplating something that already exists to be contemplated. Moreover, if it is not too fine a point, *stultitia* for Penelope lies not so much in contemplating the previous explanation as in accepting it, which she does momentarily if she gives way to fear.

2. 10 spes quoque lenta fuit. tarde quae credita laedunt
 credimus. invita nunc et amante nocent

11 sic ω: nocens E, es amante nocens F² (*coniecerat Housman*), invito nunc et amore nocens G

The third statement as it stands, *et* meaning 'even', contradicts the second by implying that a lover is the first person to think ill of his beloved (by no means an impossible notion in itself: cf. 6. 21). Furthermore, though it is a particular

¹ C.R. lxxxvii (1973).

² Having looked at some of Heinsius's collations (Bodl. Auct. S V, 7 and 10) and ten manuscripts in the Bodleian, I can now amplify my charge of inaccuracy in Dörrie's apparatus criticus: 2. 135 *portent* cited by Dörrie from only five minor manuscripts, but it is in nine of the manuscripts that I inspected in the Bodleian, including Ob, and Heinsius gives no indication that he found anything else in his manuscripts; 6. 162 *exspes* in Vb as well as G; 7. 100 not *quem* but *quas* P (checked in the original); 8. 41 *egerat* also in Gi, Vb, Ob, Of; 11. 129 *te* Ob; 12. 8 *vitam* also in Mi; 13. 133 *omen revocantis* Vb; 16. 323 *nostri* K and Pb¹ (both by implication); 19. 171 *clam* also in Mi and Pb; 20. 6 *dolere* also in Gi, K, Pb, Vb

(all by implication); 232 *vigilem* v.l. in Gi. These are only a selection of the discrepancies I have noticed. Heinsius's collation of Sp, the lost Argentinensis, is either more full or more accurate than Loers's, which I have not seen; the manuscript broke off in *Ep.* 20 not after 239 but after 233 or 234, and it read e.g. 4. 93 *herbam*, 5. 128 *ante*, 6. 89 *sparsis*, 93 *male*, 111 *vir non*, 7. 175 v.l. *certius*, 8. 104 v.l. *munus et hoc*, 10. 96 *rabidis*, 11. 113 *rabidarum*, 13. 13 *mandantis*, 16. 323 *nostri*, 17. 173 *relicta*, 188 *fuit*, 212 *Asiae*, 20. 191 *cum*, 203 *ignorant*. Other mistakes of Dörrie's, mostly connected with manuscripts used by Heinsius, are pointed out in my forthcoming article 'Heinsius's Manuscripts of Ovid'.

statement (*nunc*), it has a general subject, *quae credita laedunt*. Neither fault attaches to *invita nunc es amante nocens*, which appears in F by a later hand¹ and is only one letter distant from the reading of E. Corruption of *es* to *et* or *est* is exceedingly common (to *et* at e.g. 11. 64 and the following places in Owen's ed. maior of *Tristia*: 4. 1. 164, 4. 3. 33, 5. 14. 15). G might be thought to offer an alternative along the same lines, *invito nunc es amore nocens* (Merkel); but the meaning of this is much less perspicuous, and in any case G is alone in reading *invito . . . amore*.

2. 87 at si nostra tuo spumescant aequora remo,
iam mihi, iam dicar consuluisse meis.
sed neque consului nec te mea regia tanget
fessaque Bistonia membra lavabis aqua

89 tanget PG: tangit Eω

Dörrie refers in his apparatus to 5. 81, where P again has (or once had) *tanget*. In both places the future prompts the unanswerable question 'when?'. The reverse corruption is no doubt commoner (e.g. 3. 61 *relinques* G_S, *relinquis* PEω).

3. 58 quin etiam fama est, cum crastina fulserit Eos,
te dare nubiferis lintea plena Notis

59 lintea plena s: lintea vela Gω, linea vela Es

Palmer gives no reason for printing Micyllus's conjecture *lintea velle*, and from his apparatus it might seem that he had none, since he countenances *lintea plena*. A sufficient reason is that *dare* must be converted into a future.² Planudes has δῶκειν, but perhaps from common sense rather than because he is rendering *dare . . . velle*.

3. 111 si tibi nunc dicam, fortissime, 'tu quoque iura
nulla tibi sine me gaudia facta', neges.
at Danai maerere putant—tibi plectra moventur,
te tenet in tepido mollis amica sinu

I do not know what tone of voice to read into *at Danai maerere putant*, and the dash that Dörrie and other editors put after it suggests that they do not know either. Had Ovid written (metre allowing) *at maeres*, Briseis would be inventing a rejoinder for Achilles and then answering it in *tibi . . . sinu*; but in view of *putant*, the transmitted words cannot be a rejoinder. In the hope that someone will be provoked into explaining them or offering a better emendation, I suggest *dum* for *at*. The couplet then gives the reason for *neges*, and the force of *dum* is exactly what it is in 1. 75.

4. 7 ter tecum conata loqui ter inutilis haesit
lingua, ter in primo restitit ore sonus.
qua licet et sequitur, pudor est miscendus amor;
dicere quae puduit scribere iussit amor.
quicquid amor iussit non est contemnere tutum:
regnat et in dominos ius habet ille deos

¹ I owe this information to Mr. Kenney. Dörrie gives '*es a. nocent* F (?)'.

² Sedlmayer in his apparatus maintains that Ovid is translating *Il.* 9. 682–3 ἡπείλησεν . . . ἐλκέμεν . . ., but he is manifestly not; and

why should he have thought that ἡπείλησεν ἐλκέμεν in Greek justified *fama est dare* in Latin? Sedlmayer's other parallel, *Met.* 7. 739, is vitiated by an uncertain text.

For once I agree with Dörrie, who obelizes *sequitur*. The only possible rendering, 'where it naturally follows it' (Palmer), rescues the verb at the cost of the clause, for all the parallels suggest that the two verbs should be on the same footing: 16. 237 *qua licet et possum*, *Am.* 2. 19. 31 *quod licet et facile est*, *A.A.* 3. 387 *at licet et prodest*, *Fasti* 1. 25 *si licet et fas est*, 6. 325 *nec licet et longum est*, *Trist.* 4. 5. 17 *quod licet et tutum est*, 4. 9. 1 *si licet et pateris*. I hope it is not just the lure of a palaeographical explanation and a verbal parallel that makes me wonder whether Ovid wrote *qua licet et prodest, pudor est miscendus amori*;¹ the verbal parallel is *A.A.* 3. 387, just cited, and the palaeographical explanation is that *prodest* was omitted by reason of its similarity to *pudor est* and *sequitur* inserted to mend the syntax and the metre (cf. *Trist.* 1. 11. 12, where all the manuscripts have *omnis ab hac cura mens relevata mea est* for *omnis ab hac cura cura levata mea est*). If *prodest* is right, its meaning is determined by the antithesis it forms with *non est tutum*. My reason for hesitating is that it does not make very good sense outside the context of the antithesis; Phaedra may have thought *praestat pudorem amori miscere* but scarcely *prodest mihi pudorem amori miscere*. Better in this respect would be an adaptation of *Trist.* 4. 5. 17, *qua licet et tutum est*; but I cannot invent a plausible process by which *tutum est* might have turned into *sequitur*.

5. 3 Pedasis Oenone, Phrygiis celeberrima silvis,
 laesa queror de te, si sinis, ipsa meo

4 ipsa P₅: ipse EG_ω

All the implications that can be read into *ipsa* are absurd, such as that someone else would more naturally do the complaining on her behalf; and *te meo* is no more Latin than 'my you' is English. The other reading, with a comma after it, provides both *ips-* and *meo* with a function: *qui meus es, si sinis ipse*.

7. 45 non ego sum tanti, quod non cessaris, inique,
 ut pereas, dum me per freta longa fugis

45 quod non cessaris s: quid non ce is P, quid non cen ri G, quam tu dimittis E, quamvis merearis s, varie delirant ω

The reading printed by Dörrie is quite meaningless but no worse than most of the others offered by his minor manuscripts, of which only *quamvis merearis* both makes sense in the context and complies with Ovidian usage.² I have no solution to offer, but I wish to protest against a conjecture mentioned by Dörrie that is already finding unmerited favour: *numquid censeris inique?* Shackleton Bailey ('Dido . . . asks in bitter parenthesis whether Aeneas is satisfied with this estimate of his importance'), which according to Kenney, *Gnomon* xxxiii (1961), 481, is 'brilliant' and 'gives perfect and pointed sense'. On the contrary, Dido is saying 'don't go and get killed on my account: I'm not worth it', and even the most devious Aeneas can hardly be expected to interpret this self-appraisal, however insincere, as a hostile appraisal of himself.

¹ For *est* at successive stresses cf. 20. 111, suspected by Dilthey but unemendable.

² Palmer's note on his text *quid non censeris inique?* tells the reader everything but what it means. In his earlier edition of *Epp.* 1-14

(London, 1874), he renders it 'what do you not rate unfairly?', which in the context is obscure to say the least; and his parallels are far from proving that *censeris* can mean *aestimas*.

was ousted by a repetition of *tutus*.¹ There is no denying that *quovis* gives acceptable sense, and it is not impossible that it was ousted by a variant (rather than a repetition) of *tutus*; but a word is available that gives equally acceptable sense and is not far removed from *tecto*: *caeco*, 'unseen'.² For similar uses of *caecus* in a passive sense cf. 4. 20 *caecum pectora vulnus habent*, *Am.* 2. 14. 4 *caecas armant in sua fata manus*; and for an active use in a similar context, *Fasti* 1. 623 *ictu temeraria caeco visceribus crescens excutiebat onus*.³

The fatal objection to *denaque* was pointed out by Heinsius: 'quemadmodum *quini et deni calculi* pro decem et quinque calculis recte dicuntur, ita *Lunam denam* pro decima posse dici erat ostendendum'. He also rejected *nonaque*, which makes the pentameter a pointless repetition of the hexameter. The only conjecture that editors record is *plenaque*, which they attribute to Bentley; but he did not make it. It is cited by Heinsius, apparently with favour, from Gronovius, *Observationes*, iv. 15, where a parallel is adduced from *Metamorphoses*:

iamque coactis
cornibus in plenum noviens lunaribus orbem
illa Paphon genuit (10. 295-7).

For a long time I believed that Gronovius was right; but *plenaque luciferos luna movebat equos* is a mixture of literal and figurative language for which I have not found and no longer expect to find a parallel. When Ovid speaks literally of a 'full' moon, he invariably elaborates the description in terms no less literal: 2. 3 *cornua cum lunae pleno semel orbe coissent*, *Met.* 2. 344 *luna quater iunctis implerat cornibus orbem*, 7. 530-1 *quater iunctis explevit cornibus orbem luna*, 11. 453 *luna bis impleat orbem*, *Fasti* 2. 175 *luna novum decies implerat cornibus orbem*. Terms that describe the appearance of the moon are inappropriate when it is treated figuratively as a charioteer.⁴ Now what Bentley actually conjectured was *pronaque*,⁵ which suits equally the downhill motion of a chariot and the setting of a heavenly body: cf. *Met.* 5. 424 *pronus currus*, 11. 257-8 *pronus erat Titan*

¹ *Mnem.* xxxiii (1905), 34-5. Though Dörrie includes a great quantity of rubbish in his apparatus, he mentions not a single conjecture of Damsté's. No doubt he was scared off by Housman's assertion in *C.R.* xliii (1929), 196 that 'among all that has been written on the *heroides* Mr. Damsté's paper in *Mnem.* 1905 pp. 1-56 is conspicuous for shallowness and futility'; but someone who so often sets Housman's scholarship aside has no reason to heed his strictures on other people's. At the risk of being condemned for Damsté's vices, I should like to record the opinion that amongst much triviality and error he says something worth saying on at least 1. 1 *hanc*, 44 *at*, 2. 126 *illa*, 5. 74 *has*, 8. 81 *nam coniunx aberat*, 14. 42 *vina*, 121 *et*, 15. 178 *et* (his conjecture *habe* is ingenious), 18. 141 *et*.

² When I say that *caeco* is not far removed from *tecto*, I mean not that *c* and *t* were frequently confused, which I have no reason to believe they were at the time when this corruption must have taken place, but that

the *es* and *ts* in *et caeco tutus* could easily have become muddled in a scribe's mind.

³ A parallel for *caecus hostis* would be welcome, since it might be taken in the obvious sense 'blind enemy'; but the context and the commonness of expressions like *caecum vulnus* greatly reduce the risk.

⁴ 'Phoebus has a chariot, the moon has not' Goold, *H.S.C.P.* lxix (1965), 46; but *currus* cannot be right at *Met.* 15. 790 *sparsi lunares sanguine currus*, and she must do something with her horses in the present passage and at *Am.* 2. 5. 38, *Rem.* 258, *Med.* 42, *Met.* 2. 208-9, *Fasti* 3. 110, 4. 374, 5. 16, *Trist.* 1. 3. 28.

⁵ See my review of Dörrie's edition (cf. above, p. 324 n. 1). Housman mentions this conjecture on Manilius 4. 451 (I owe the reference to Professor R. Kassel) together with a palaeographical experiment of his own, *et nova*, which fails to state the essential fact that nine months were complete, and thereby leaves itself ambiguous: would *nova* mean the ninth, just mentioned, or the tenth?

12. 8

9 vitae ω : vitam PGs, *Sedlmayer*

12. 177

in faciem moresque meos nova crimina fingas

17. 17

et laudem de me nullus adulter habet

19 lusi P₅: vixi Gw

ludunt formosae: casta est quam nemo rogavit.

Moreover, a Helen who can say *lusi* is hardly entitled to declare in 143-4:

(di mihi sunt testes) lusimus arte virum.

17. 99

disce meo exemplo formosis posse carere

meo PG_ω: modo V (*coniecerat* Owen)

¹ Owen is so often lacking in judgement that it is a pleasure to find him arguing sensibly in favour of two other variants in *Heroides* not printed by Dörrie, 14. 11 *ense*

(ibid. p. 166) and 17. 261 *faciam* (C.Q. xxxi [1937], 14-15).

² On *Am.* 2. 19. 20 see Gould, op. cit. (above, p. 328 n. 4) p. 44.

meo.¹ Palmer has been commended by at least one discriminating judge² for suggesting *ex*, but *ex exemplo* is cacophonous and unparalleled in Ovid against twenty or so instances of the plain ablative. Though *modo* is unobjectionable, the three instances of unqualified *exemplo* in Ovid (*Rem.* 52, *Met.* 10. 685, *Trist.* 3. 7. 27) are all clearer in their reference. Unless *modo* is right, *hoc* might be considered; it could have been glossed *meo*.

17. 101 quam multos credis iuvenes optare quod optas?
 qui sapiant oculos an Paris unus habes?
 non tu plus cernis sed plus temerarius audes,
 nec tibi plus cordis sed magis oris adest

104 magis s : minus PGω

'If *magis* is read, it must of course mean *potius*, as *magis oris* is not Latin' Palmer, correctly. At *Trist.* 4. 3. 71 *sed magis* means *sed potius*, but who will believe after *non plus* that it means it here? In any case, not *magis* but *minus* is the reading of P and the majority. Palmer's defence of *minus*³ is subverted by Purser, who remarks in passing that 'Riese reads *nimis*, "excess of assurance": for gen. cf. *Fast.* 6. 115'. It is hard to understand the preference of recent editors for *minus* or *magis* when this simple and satisfactory correction has once been made. The conjecture *nec minus*, wrongly ascribed by Dörrie to Bentley, spoils Helen's point by imputing brazenness to her other admirers as well.

17. 115 sed sine quam tribuit sortem fortuna tueri
 nec spoliū nostri turpe pudoris habere

As Palmer says, 'do not have the spoils' is an odd imperative. Unless the text can mean 'do not have the shame of stealing my honour', there is something to be said for changing *nec* to *et*: 'and consider it shameful to rob me of my honour'. For *turpe habere* cf. *Met.* 10. 325, for the imperative of *habere* in this sense, *A.A.* 2. 144.

17. 173 nec quod abest hic me tecum mirare relictam

relictam Gω : relictā Ps

The accusative gives the sense 'and do not be surprised that I am left here with you because he has gone away'; the ablative, 'and do not be surprised that he has gone away leaving me here with you'. The choice between these alternatives, one utterly impenetrable and the other a model of lucidity, is an excellent test of fitness for editing the text, except that *relicta* runs the risk of being preferred because it is in P.

¹ Alternatively, *Epp.* 16–21 may be assigned to some other poet than Ovid. Two of Lachmann's reasons for taking this step, the polysyllabic endings and the metre of 19. 29, have been repeated by Courtney, *B.I.C.S.* xii (1965), 63–4, who points out that parallels can be found only in the poems from exile; but why should Ovid not have composed *Epp.* 16–21 in exile? One of the other things that Lachmann objected to is worth recalling, 17. 215 *qui*. It is offered by the oldest manuscript at *Trist.* 3. 4. 21, where Courtney, *Gnomon* xlv (1972), 80, will not allow Luck to accept it; but if the

genuineness of *Ep.* 17 is granted, the two instances support each other, the more so because they both occur in late works (another archaism, *haud*, makes its one appearance outside *Met.* at *Trist.* 1. 3. 73). On the whole, Lachmann's observations seem to me much too weak to establish the existence of a second poet as talented as Ovid, or more talented, it might be thought, than the Ovid of *Epp.* 1–15.

² Goold, *op. cit.* (above, p. 328 n. 4) p. 44.

³ It has a long history: in Bodl. Auct. F 2 17 (15th cent.), *oris* is glossed *verecundie*.

19. 63 multaque praeterea lingua reticenda modesta
 lingua . . . modesta P ω : linguae . . . modestae s

The ablative, besides rhyming with *praeterea*, is inferior in sense. Whereas the dative implies that Hero's tongue is *modesta*, the ablative only fulfils the function of an adverb.

19. 192 nescioquid pavidum frigore pectus habet
 nescioquid (-quod P) . . . frigore . . . habet P ω : nescioquae . . . frigora . . . habent s

The text printed by Heinsius from s, *nescioquae pavidum frigora pectus habent*, gives satisfactory sense, but it does not account for the reading of P ω , and the plural *frigora* is not usual in expressions of this kind: cf. 9. 135 *frigusque perambulat artus*, 12. 144 *in toto pectore frigus erat*, 15. 112 *adstrictum gelido frigore pectus erat*, *Fasti* 1. 98 *gelidum subito frigore pectus erat*, 2. 754 *gelidum pectora frigus habet*, *Met.* 2. 611, 823, 9. 582, 11. 416. 'Putabam aliquando hebet' Heinsius, and indeed *nescioquo pavidum frigore pectus hebet* disposes of both difficulties; for the association of *hebere* with cold cf. *Aen.* 5. 395 *gelidus tardante senecta sanguis hebet*. Once *hebet* became *habet*, the other corruptions were inevitable. The verb *hebere* does not occur elsewhere in Ovid except as a variant at *Trist.* 4. 1. 48 (where it may be right: cf. *Pont.* 4. 1. 17) and *Am.* 3. 14. 37 (where it is supported by Lenz: cf. Kenney, *C.R.* lxxvii [1966], 270), but it is rare enough for that not to matter. Ovid was under no more of an obligation to write *hebescit* than to write *canescit* and *umescit* at 5. 54-6.

19. 205 si tibi non parcis, dilectae parce puellae,
 quae numquam nisi te sospite sospes ero.
 spes tamen est fractis vicinae pacis in undis:
 tum placidas tuto pectore finde vias

208 tuto G s : toto P ω , Palmer

He must not swim when the sea is rough; when it calms, he can—swim safely? swim his heart out? The proximity of *sospite* and *placidas* lends a certain speciousness to *tuto*, and there appears to be a parallel for it at 92 *facias placidum per mare tutus iter*; but the appearance is illusory, because she is there saying that she does not mind if he insists on safety. From the pen of an impatient lover *toto* is immeasurably superior.

Next, some passages where a remedy more radical than emendation seems to be called for.¹

1. 27 grata ferunt nymphae pro salvis dona maritis;
 illi victa suis Troia fata canunt

28 fata EG s : facta ω

This couplet should be deleted. Heinsius emended *nymphae* to *nuptae*, but nothing can be done with *canunt*, which Ovid elsewhere confines not surprisingly to singing or prophecy. Actual singing would be ludicrous enough in the heroic age, let alone among the Ovidian rank and file, who have more modern ways of reliving their campaigns (31-6). In such circles I also find the pentameter

¹ Most of the spurious couplets in *Heroides* have already been suspected by someone other than Lehrs, and where I cannot bring

forward new reasons I have no wish to repeat old ones until they are ignored in a better edition than Dörrie's.

unsuitably metaphysical; and if with *fata* it is unsuitable, with *facta* it is just drab.

10. 81 occurrunt animo pereundi mille figurae,
 morsque minus poenae quam mora mortis habet.
 iam iam venturos aut hac aut suspicor illac
 qui lanient avido viscera dente lupos.
 forsitan et fulvos tellus alat ista leones;
 quis scit an haec saevas tigridas insula habet? 86
 et freta dicuntur magnas expellere phocas;
 quis vetat et gladios per latus ire meum?
 tantum ne religer dura captiva catena 89
 neve traham serva grandia pensa manu,
 cui pater est Minos, cui mater filia Phoebi,
 quodque magis memini, quae tibi pacta fui.
 si mare, si terras porrectaque litora vidi,
 multa mihi terrae, multa minantur aquae.
 caelum restabat: timeo simulacra deorum. 95
 destituor rabidis praeda cibusque feris.
 sive colunt habitantque viri, diffidimus illis:
 externos didici laesa timere viros

Next to 1. 97–116, this passage is a bigger mess than any other of comparable length in *Heroides*. (1) 86, if not spurious, is incurably corrupt: *quis scit an . . . habet?* is ungrammatical, the elision in *insula habet* is indefensible, and all emendations that remove these faults import others, such as a lone tiger. (2) Whose are the swords in 88? or are they swordfish? (3) When she is terrified by every prospect, how can she say ‘anything so long as I am not haled off into slavery’ (89–92)? (4) What are *simulacra deorum* (95)? (5) There is no connection between 95 and 96 unless in 95 she is saying that *simulacra deorum* deterred her from flying away.¹ (6) *sive* in 97 ought to be one of a pair.² (7) *colunt habitantque* in 97 needs an object, and there is none in sight. Jachmann solved all but two of these difficulties by deleting 85–96, his pupil Schmitz-Cronenbroeck all but one by deleting 86–95. Burman may have been on the right lines (cf. *Trist.* 5. 7. 43–6) in suggesting that 96 was originally preceded by a verse ‘qui sequenti pentametro aptius cohaereat. continuisse vero hunc sensum puto: sive deserta est et incolis vacua, . . .’. There is much to be said for deleting 86–95 and marking a lacuna in their place.³

¹ When Daedalus at *A.A.* 2. 37 considers escaping by air, he is disastrously sane. Hypsipyle’s injunction *aera temptet* at 6. 161 is a deft touch of Ovidian irony: in the context it is triumphantly sarcastic, but anyone who knows Euripides has seen it fulfilled.

² Exceptions in Ovid: 15. 211, 217 (problematical: see Burman), *Trist.* 1. 3. 89 *egredior, sive illud erat sine funere ferri. Fasti* 4. 749 *sive . . . ve . . . si . . . ve . . . si . . .* hardly counts as an exception.

³ The probability that another couplet beginning with *sive* preceded 97–8 makes it tempting to suppose that a scribe omitted it by jumping from one *sive* to the other;

85–96 would then be an attempt to fill the gap and at the same time to supply enough illustrations of *pereundi mille figurae* in 81. I have three reasons for resisting this temptation: (1) the gap before *sive* in 97 would not have been much more evident if it followed 84 than in its present position; (2) as the hypothetical interpolator felt, one illustration of *pereundi mille figurae* is not enough; (3) it is extremely hard to think up a couplet beginning with *sive* that would provide a smooth transition from 83–4 to 97–8. Anyone who accepts these reasons but finds the temptation irresistible will be driven to deleting 83–4 as well.

11. 123 tu tamen, o frustra miserae sperate sorori,
 sparsa precor nati collige membra tui
 et refer ad matrem socioque impone sepulchro
 urnaque nos habeat quamlibet arta duos.
 vive memor nostri lacrimasque in funere funde 127
 neve reformida corpus amantis amans.
 tu rogo dilectae nimium mandata sororis
 perfice; mandatis obsequar ipsa patris

127 funere s; vulnera Ps, fulnere G*, vulnere s 129 tu Gw: te vel et s (P* non legitur)
 130 perfice K², Housman: perfer PGw mandatis obsequar Housman: mandatis persequar
 Ps, mandatis perfruar Gw, mandatum persequar s

In 130 I have given not what Dörrie gives, but what I believe the author wrote. Heinsius found *perfice* as a variant in his Gortorpius (Dörrie's K), and if Housman's *obsequar* had occurred to him I doubt whether he would have condemned 129–30, which in their emended form have only one thing against them: the repeated *tu* at the beginning (cf. 123). Since *tu* is not secure, substitution of *haec* might be considered.

If any couplet in this passage was not written by Ovid, it is surely 127–8 (*del.* Bornecque). Even if 124–6 are left out of account, the order of events in 127–8 is quite bewildering enough in itself. It seems to suit only a context in which the lover proposes to mummify the corpse of his beloved and keep it in his house; she can then say 'remember me as long as you live, and shed a tear on the anniversary of my death (or: on the parts of my body where I wounded myself), and do not recoil from the mummy of your beloved'.¹

16. 207 non dabimus certe socerum tibi clara fugantem
 lumina, qui trepidos a dape vertit equos;
 nec Priamo pater est soceri de caede cruentus
 et qui Myrtoas crimine signat aquas;
 nec proavo Stygia nostro captantur in unda
 poma nec in mediis quaeritur umor aquis.
 quid tamen hoc refert si te tenet ortus ab illis 213
 cogitur huic domui Iuppiter esse socer
 heu facinus! totis indignus noctibus ille
 te tenet amplexu perfruiturque tuo

Commentators have been suspiciously silent about 213–14, and editors have put the question mark in three different places: after *refert* (cf. *Fasti* 3. 495), after *illis* (cf. *Met.* 13. 268), and after *socer* (which is surely asking too much of the ancient reader). Before the couplet can be considered proof against deletion, four questions must be answered, and the answers must account for the

¹ Bearing in mind how Professor Douglas Young has recently opened our eyes to certain refinements of thought and expression in Longus (*Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* cxciv [1968], 65–74, cxvii [1971], 99–107), I feel it would be rash to exclude this interpretation, supported as it is by the parallel of Xen. Eph. 5. 1. 9–11. Indeed, one might go further with Professor Young and regard *funere* and *vulnera* as author's variants; Ovid first wrote *vulnera*, but then he realized that it would be difficult for Macareus to shed a tear on the

wounds of a mummified corpse, and so he altered *vulnera* to *funere* (*funus* does not seem to occur elsewhere in the sense 'anniversary of death', but Romans knew from childhood the word *natalis*, 'anniversary of birth'). Pedants will object that in 126 Canace has asked for her remains to be put in an urn; but Ovid well understood the psychology of his heroines, and he would have expected Canace to be somewhat confused on the brink of suicide.

whole of its content : (1) what does not matter ? (2) to whom does it not matter ? (3) in what sense does it not matter ? (is it irrelevant, unimportant, or unprofitable ?) (4) why does it not matter ? I can provide answers to all four questions (the villainy of Menelaus' ancestors is no use to Paris if Helen is actually married to Menelaus), but they do not account for the pentameter. Another reason for disquiet is the recurrence of *te tenet* in 216 in a different sense. If the couplet were deleted, *indignus* in 215 would be explained by 207-12.

Finally a few words about some of the ill-attested lines, namely the two long passages 16. 39-144 and 21. 147-end and the introductory couplets.¹ About the genuineness of the two long passages, preserved only by the ed. Parmensis of 1477, Dörrie seems to be in no doubt, and he could invoke the support of several scholars who have recently made their views known either explicitly or by implication.² Most of the arguments that lead me to the opposite opinion have already been used,³ but they obviously bear repeating. I begin with 16. 39-144.

- (1) 37 ante tuos animo vidi quam lumine vultus ;
 prima fuit vultus nuntia fama tui.
 141 magna quidem de te rumor praeconia fecit
 nullaue de facie nescia terra tua est,
 nec tibi par usquam Phrygia nec solis ab ortu
 inter formosas altera nomen habet ;
 145 credis et hoc nobis ? minor est tua gloria vero,
 famaue de forma paene maligna tua est

145 credis et hoc PG ω : crede sed hoc s, D. Heinsius, N. Heinsius, Bentley, Sedlmayer, Housman

The main question at issue here is whether the last couplet can follow the first without leaving a gap in the train of thought ; but before it can be answered, the correct reading in 145 has to be decided. The decision is perfectly straightforward : the author of *quidem* in 141 read *crede sed hoc*,⁴ and furthermore *credis et hoc* ? lacks any parallel in Ovid.⁵ Back therefore to the main question.

ante tuos animo vidi quam lumine vultus ;
 prima fuit vultus nuntia fama tui.
 crede sed hoc nobis : minor est tua gloria vero,
 famaue de forma paene maligna tua est

¹ On the other ill-attested couplets, e.g. 7. 98-9, I have nothing to add to Housman, *C.R.* xi (1897), 200-2, and Sicherl, *Hermes* xci (1963), 190-212.

² Kraus, *Wien. Stud.* lxxv (1950-1), 66 ; B. Latta, *Die Stellung der Doppelbriefe im Gesamtwerk Ovids* (Marburg 1963), 120-38 ; Goold, *op. cit.* (above, p. 328 n. 4) p. 3 ; Kenney, *Philologus* cxi (1967), 212-32 and *H.S.C.P.* lxxiv (1970), 179-85 ; Luck, *Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte Ovids* (Heidelberg 1969), 12.

³ See especially Uta Fischer, *Ignotum hoc aliis ille novavit opus* (Berlin diss., Augsburg, 1969), 132-52, 196-222.

⁴ If this use of *quidem* . . . *sed* is 'ganz unpassend' (Fischer p. 138), so is the one just before (131-4).

⁵ The parenthetic uses of *credo* to be found in Ovid can all be reduced to four syntactical forms : *crede mihi, si credis, quis credere possit?*, and *vix equidem credo*. Cf. also Fischer p. 79 : 'Versteht man es [*credis et hoc*] als Frage, so kennzeichnet er seine Komplimente als incredibilia, von denen er nicht sicher ist, ob Helena sie ihm glaubt. Wie muss aber ein Kompliment wirken, das von seinem Urheber selbst in Frage gestellt wird ! Liest man dagegen das leicht herzustellende "*crede sed hoc*", so hat man eine Beteuerungsformel, wie sie sich ähnlich bei Ovid immer wieder findet. Paris fordert Helena damit auf, etwas zu glauben, was sicher wahr ist, was sie aber vielleicht aus Bescheidenheit nicht ohne weiteres annimmt.'

'It was your reputation that first attracted me to you; but believe me, it does not do you justice.' I am at a loss to understand what is wrong with this;¹ and unless there is something wrong with it, the accidental loss of 39-144 would be a coincidence so enormous as not to be worth contemplating.²

(2) *Ep.* 16 is longer than *Ep.* 17 by roughly the length of the doubtful passage. *Ep.* 18 is 8 lines longer than *Ep.* 19, *Ep.* 21, if the end were genuine, 6 lines longer than *Ep.* 20.

(3) *ferunt* at 17. 242 is inappropriate if Paris has just told the story (16. 49),³ and the same applies to *si tua gloria vera est* at 17. 245 (cf. 16. 53-88).

¹ 'Lesen wir einmal mit *s* crede sed hoc in v. 145. "Glaube mir aber dieses. Dein Ruhm (sc. von deiner Schönheit) ist kleiner als die Wirklichkeit." Der erste Gedanke verlangt einen Gegensatz als vorausgehend, der zweite lässt darauf schliessen, dass dessen Inhalt war "der Ruhm deiner Schönheit ist gross". Das steht aber nicht in v. 38...; beide Gedanken stellen auch in keiner Weise einen Gegensatz dar' Latta p. 121. The piece of literalism italicized is satisfactorily answered by Fischer p. 80: 'Wenn Paris von der "fama vultus Helenae" spricht, so kann man nur an die Schönheit ihrer Züge denken, in der ihr Ruhm allein bestehen kann'.

If anything is wrong, it is the juxtaposition of plural and singular *vultus* in 37-8, which Housman did away with by modifying a conjecture of Palmer's and suggesting *prima tulit vulnus nuntia fama tui*. The legitimacy of this slight alteration is not obvious, since *vulnera ferre* commonly means *vulnera accipere* (the exceptions in Ovid are *Rem.* 44 and *Trist.* 2. 20 *vulnus opemque feret*, which could be a mildzeugma); but perhaps *nuntia* helps. If it is legitimate, it is a great improvement (cf. 12. 33-4 for a similar progression from the hexameter to the pentameter). Legitimate or not, however, it makes no difference to the train of thought.

² Cf. Riese, *Bursian* x (1877), 22. In spite of this, it is one of the three props on which Luck, op. cit. (above, p. 334 n. 2), pp. 11-12, supports his theory that the archetype of *Heroides* had 13 lines to the page; the others are the loss of 21. 15-146 and the appearance of 14. 114 in some manuscripts as 14. 62. I cannot take any of them seriously. Both 16. 39-144 and 21. 15-146 must be reduced by a couplet before they will fit into pages of 13 lines, and I see no reason for supposing that any couplet in either, albeit spurious, was absent from the archetype (or that Luck has more right to delete 16. 97-8 than other scholars have to postulate a lacuna after 50); as for the disturbance in *Ep.* 14, something can perhaps be made of it, but the knots that Luck ties himself into (p. 34) might rather suggest that he had an awkward fact to explain away.

When Luck begins to elaborate his theory, the loss of 16. 39-144 is matched by another coincidence: *Ep.* 15 fell out in its entirety, and nothing of *Ep.* 14 or *Ep.* 16 went with it. Unfortunately 220 (or 221 if you count the title) is not divisible by 26; but presumably the front of the first leaf that fell out was blank (though the scribe of P, it seems, was so inattentive to such gaps that he actually ran some epistles together).

Finally, when he has to decide what lines were in the archetype, Luck employs three assumptions: (1) where P has fewer lines than the archetype requires, some lines were undecipherable and the scribe simply ignored them; (2) where P has more lines than the archetype requires, there are interpolations; (3) where the archetype requires lines that Ovid did not write, the wording is corrupt. (1) is applied in the most shameless manner: as the line with which P ends, for instance, would not have been the last of a leaf in the archetype, the remaining lines were no longer legible (p. 16); and P omitted 5. 25-6 because 25 stood at the damaged foot of one leaf and 26 at the damaged head of the next (pp. 19-20). (2), as I have already pointed out, arbitrarily identifies accretions to the original with accretions to the archetype. (3) is superfluous and betrays an irrational dread of ascribing interpolations to the archetype; it is also in some cases highly improbable, because the wording is free from objection (e.g. 1. 37-8, 13. 63-4, 17. 248).

In short, I can only agree with Luck himself: 'dies alles hat zuweilen eine spielesche Note' (p. 7). Dr. M. Winterbottom in *C.R.* lxxxv (1971), 208-9 takes the same view and shows that weaknesses in Luck's method are not confined to *Heroides*.

³ Cf. Fischer p. 146; the whole section pp. 140-7, 'Die Verse als notwendige Voraussetzung für Helenas Brief?', is worth reading.

Fischer borrows from Asteroth an argument of the same kind that would be even more elegant if it were valid: that *quondam* in 16. 165 is impossible after the detailed narrative in 53-88. 20. 216 seems to show that it is not, unless Asteroth's formulation of the argument, which differs rather from

(4) No-one has yet succeeded in turning parts of the doubtful passage into coherent and Ovidian Latin, e.g. 39-40, 97,¹ 101-2,² 143-4.³

(1) to (3) do not rule out the possibility that Ovid himself added the doubtful passage later,⁴ but apart from the unlikelihood of his inserting 106 lines of narrative into a *suasoria* already complete and balanced by a reply,⁵ (4) is a serious enough obstacle.

Once this passage is rejected, less of a welcome will be accorded to the other offered by the same source. It deserves no welcome anyway. I single out two incoherent sections, 159-70⁶ and 229-44,⁷ and two linguistic licences, 183 *periuria legi*⁸ and 213 *tali*.⁹

Fischer's, can be sustained: 'so spricht man im Hinblick auf ein dem Gesprächspartner bekanntes Moment, welches, bereits lange vertraut, in die Erinnerung zurückgerufen werden soll' (p. 33).

¹ Cf. *Maia* xxii (1970), 6. The couplet cannot be deleted without a further change (99 *at* for *sed* Itali). Another difficulty in the vicinity is *subeunt* in 99, which at first seems to be a genuine present but turns out to be a historic present.

² The present *iacent* is defensible (cf. 15. 46), but *te vigilans oculis videbam* is not. Bentley's conjecture *oculis animi* improves the sense but leaves the second half of the antithesis without an instrumental ablative to match *oculis animi* (or perhaps it cancels the antithesis altogether: 'waking and sleeping, I saw you in my mind's eye').

³ Only rewriting will achieve results, as Kenney is forced to admit (*H.S.C.P.* lxxiv [1970], 179-81). His idea of separating *nec tibi par usquam Phrygiae* from *nomen habet* is an unhappy one: the sense required by the antithesis of which it forms part is not 'you have no equal in Phrygia' but 'your fame has no equal in Phrygia'. The couplet could admittedly be deleted without damage to the sense.

⁴ Kraus, *op. cit.* (above, p. 334 n. 2) 66.

⁵ The unlikelihood is increased by Fischer's observation, pp. 99-100, 140, that in 1-38+145-end, though Paris is writing at a particular time and is not telling a story, the illusion of a narrative progression is created. The main story in 39-144 puts the clock a long way back, the prophecies in 49 and 123-4 a long way forward.

⁶ The first problem in these lines is the meaning of 161-2. The second is how *ter* in 159 and *saepe* in 163 are to be reconciled. The third is the point of *consurgere* in 169.

⁷ Most of the problems here have been adequately ventilated: see e.g. Palmer and Fischer pp. 193-5. Elizabeth Fisher, *H.S.C.P.* lxxiv (1970), 198-205, tries to solve them, but without success. Her arguments rest largely on false parallels: for her conjecture *legeres*

in 230, *Trist.* 3. 8. 36 *legenda* (corrupt); for *quaeritur* in 234, *Met.* 15. 1 (unambiguously a historic present); for her conjecture *nescioquem* in 235, 13. 91 (cf. Fischer); for *deus et vates* in 237, *Fasti* 5. 97 *et matri et vati* ('Apollo says this both as a god and as a prophet' is absurd); for *mea carmina* in 237, *A.A.* 2. 3 and 3. 792 (Cydippe is not a poet). She says nothing about the propriety of *sponsae* in 230 (cf. Fischer), the meaning of 238, or the point of *nunc ut vaga fama susurrat* in 235 (did *vaga fama* make the inquiry?). Her conjecture *nescioquem* in 235 has the further drawback of being incompatible with her desire to bring the passage into line with Callimachus by supplying a suitable couplet before 237 (cf. Call. fr. 75. 22-7; as Pfeiffer says, 'dei responsum minime obscurum est').

My inclination is to agree with the view expressed by Ehwald in another connection and applauded by Luck, *op. cit.* (above, p. 334 n. 2) p. 21: 'Es hat wirklich wenig Sinn, einen interpolierten Text durch Konjekturen heilen zu wollen'. It is a premature answer, however, to anyone who thinks that emendation can save a passage from condemnation. In 229-38, one reasonable emendation is to delete 229-30 and alter *petas* in 232 to *petes*; but I have yet to see any others, and the only remedy I can devise for 235-8 is to scrap all four lines and start again.

After 238 there are three more difficulties: *que* in 241 and again in 243, and the content of 243-4 (cf. 19-20). The threefold *que* in 241-3, which Fischer finds 'unschön', has parallels at 14. 32-4, 90-2, 16. 334-6, 19. 47-9.

⁸ It seems to be an overambitious adaptation of *insidias legi* in 112.

⁹ If it is a fancy way of saying *tuo* or *illo*, where are the parallels? Perhaps the author thought he had found one in 109:

mittitur ante pedes malum cum carmine
tali—
ei mihi! iuravi nunc quoque paene tibi.

Here, of course, *tali* means 'like the following', but as the *carmen* does not actually follow, it could have been misunderstood.

In short, these two passages, old as they may be, have no place in the text of Ovid's *Heroides*. An appendix is where they belong.¹

The most thorough and balanced treatment of the introductory couplets is now Kirfel's *Untersuchungen zur Briefform der Heroides Ovids* (Stuttgart, 1969), reviewed by Kenney in *C.R.* lxxxiv (1970), 195–7. About the couplets unevenly attested I find myself in general agreement with Kirfel. In *Ep.* 12, however, *at tibi* can hardly begin the letter: Kirfel's parallels are all different, and without some preceding couplet it is impossible to tell whether the contrast implied is *nunc tibi non vaco* or *tu mihi non vacas*. The couplet offered by three late witnesses clears up this last point, but its formulation is slipshod: *exul* is ambiguous (voluntarily from Colchis, as in 112, or by order from Corinth, as in Euripides?), *novo marito* would most naturally mean 'to her new husband', and *dicit* ought to be either *quaerit*, if the object is *an . . . vacant?*, or *scribit*, if no object is intended (Kirfel's case against the couplet rests entirely on the impossible assumption that the object is the whole letter). In *Ep.* 11 Kirfel rightly rejects 1–2, which anticipate 5–6 and are also too confused to be genuine (cf. 2 with 5); but when he puts 3–4 between 6 and 7, he makes nonsense of *tamen* (*igitur* would be less inappropriate)² and robs *haec* in 7 of its proper function. 5–8 form so magnificent an opening that deleting 3–4 is preferable to postulating a lost version of 1–2. In *Ep.* 18 he should have condemned not only Oa–b but also 23–4 (*om. P*Gu, post 2 habent DF, post Oa–b Excerpta Douzae, post 20 Mz; del. Sedlmayer*), which were almost certainly written to follow them (cf. Vahlen). 25–6 explain 21–2; Kirfel says that 23–4 follow well on 21–2 but is silent about the connection forwards. Of the couplets unanimously attested Kirfel rejects those in *Epp.* 2, 13, and 19, all for inadequate reasons.³ The old argument about the word order of 13. 1–2 is groundless, and the only question worth discussing is whether 1 is ambiguous; *Haemonis* in 2 is no more suspicious than 12. 11 *Magnetida* and 15. 217 *Pelasgida*.³ At 19. 2 *rebus* goes not with *habere* but with *missam*; as for the greeting of Leander's referred to, Kirfel never considers the possibility that a genuine version of it is lost (if he is right about the version offered by all the manuscripts except P*W); moreover, 3 surely cannot begin the letter.

¹ There are sections in 16. 39–144 that seem to me linguistically unexceptionable and in manner worthy of Ovid, notably 53–88, the account of the judgement; and I dare say a zealous executor may have found this fragment among Ovid's papers and with additions of his own incorporated it into the only possible context. Such speculation I do not find congenial, and it would never persuade me to leave the whole of 39–144 in the text for fear of sacrificing a fragment that Ovid might have written. Not interfering with finished poems is surely more important than not sacrificing fragments, and I do not believe that *Ep.* 16, when Ovid finished it, included any part of 39–144.

Even if I were relegating the two passages to an appendix and ascribing them to a forger, I should make some emendations that

are not made by most editors who retain them and ascribe them to Ovid. My text of 16. 39–144 would differ from Dörrie's in at least the following places: 60 *veri* (Heinsius), 91 *laeta domus nato post tempora longa recepto est* (so Palmer; *post Bentley*), 103 *faceres* (Heinsius; this 'beseitigt den Anstoss nicht' according to Fischer p. 77, but I have no idea why not), 98 *a te* (Heinsius), 140 *in dubio* (Micyllus; Heinsius's defence of *in dubium* finds no support in *T.L.L.* D 2120. 5–2121. 80).

² Cf. Kenney 196.

³ Cf. Kenney p. 196 n. 1. In assailing *Haemonis* Kirfel may be following the example of his supervisor Luck, who suspects the wording of 8. 19 because *repetitor* is a ἀπαξ λεγόμενον (op. cit. [p. 11 n. 2], p. 25).

So far as the manuscripts are concerned, future editors, thanks to Dörrie, will have a less daunting task: to select from the mass of Dörrie's material enough manuscripts to represent the tradition. Dörrie's inaccuracy has made this task much harder than it need have been, but not so hard that they will have the same excuse as Dörrie for spending all their time on manuscripts and none on determining what Ovid wrote. As Dörrie's results have shown, the nature of the latter task has not changed since the days of Heinsius. As I hope to have shown in this article, much of it is still unaccomplished.

Exeter College, Oxford

M. D. REEVE