

NOTES ON OVID, *HEROIDES* 20 AND 21¹

20.25–6

fraus mea quid petiit, nisi uti tibi iungerer uni?
id me, quod quereris, conciliare potest.²

Acontius argues that there was nothing wrong with the trick he played on Cydippe – the end justifies the means.

Heinsius and Dilthey doubted the authenticity of this couplet, whilst Bornecque bracketed line 26 alone. Line 25, however, contains a familiar elegiac theme, and line 26, with one small emendation, is rhetorically sharp.

All the MSS have *uni* in line 25, but many editors have found this unsatisfactory, preferring to read *unum* and punctuating the line in various ways: Burman prints ‘iungerer? unum’, Showerman, Goold and Palmer ‘iungerer, unum?’ Of these, the latter is the more attractive (Acontius wants one thing and one thing only – union with Cydippe; he is not interested in trying to cheat her financially, which is what *fraus* would most immediately suggest). ‘iungerer uni’, however, is perfectly good, and should be retained: *uni* means not ‘you alone (as opposed to several girls)’, but ‘you alone (as opposed to any other girl)’, cf. *OLD* s.v. *unus* 8 ‘one in particular, one above all others’. Acontius is paying Cydippe a compliment – she is the only girl for him, and nobody else will do. This is a common theme in Latin love elegy, cf. Prop. 2.7.19, [Tib.] 3.19.3–6, Ovid, *Ars Am.* 1.42: ‘elige cui dicas “tu mihi sola places”’.³

me, which is found in almost all the MSS is a very weak and has satisfied few scholars apart from Fischer,⁴ who attempts unconvincingly to defend *me* by interpreting *conciliare* as meaning *empfehlen*, citing as a parallel *Tristia* 3.11.41–2 (‘qui ... fertur ... / et dictis artes conciliasse suas’). The line is much improved if we change *me* to *te*, suggested first by Bentley, and interpret *conciliare* as meaning ‘to win over’, as it is (likewise, of winning over a female) in Lucr. 5.963 ‘conciliabat enim vel mutua quamque cupido’.⁵ Translate: ‘That very thing which you complain of [i.e. the implied complaint of *fraus* in line 23] has the power to win you over’. The paradox is witty and Ovidian.

20.179–80

quem si reppuleris nec, quem dea damnat, amaris,
et tu continuo, certe ego salvus ero.

The text and interpretation of this couplet have caused scholars some difficulty, and it is regrettable that the text of the best manuscript, P, ends at line 177.⁶ The attention

¹ The material in this article is taken from my Oxford D. Phil. thesis, which was submitted in 1989. I am indebted to my supervisor, Mr A. S. Hollis, and to Dr G. O. Hutchinson and Professor E. J. Kenney for their criticisms and suggestions.

² Unless otherwise stated, the text printed is that of H. Dörrie’s 1971 Berlin edition.

³ ‘tu mihi sola places’ is found in all three passages cited: Hollis (*Ars Am.* loc. cit.) styles it ‘the typical declaration of the elegiac lover’.

⁴ U. Fischer, ‘Ignotum Hoc Aliis Ille Novavit Opus. Beobachtungen zur Darstellungskunst Ovids in den *Heroides* unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Briefpaare her. 16 und 17 (Paris und Helena) und her. 20 und 21 (Acontius und Cydippe)’ (Diss., Berlin, 1969), p. 158.

⁵ See Costa, ad loc.

⁶ On the manuscript tradition of the *Heroides*, see R. J. Tarrant in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 268–73.

of scholars has understandably focused on the pentameter, which is most unsatisfactory, both on grounds of sense (the emphasis should be on the fact that Cydippe, not Acontius, will be well if she rejects his rival) and for metrical reasons, elision in the pentameter at a place corresponding to 'cert(e) ego' being very rare in Ovid.⁷ Emendation is clearly necessary.

Merkel and Ehwald both wished to emend 'et tu' to 'tu tunc', but this is needless tinkering and does not tackle the real difficulties posed by the line. *terque* for *certe* (adopted by Gilbert and Sedlmayer) is meaningless.

Housman⁸ suggested that we read 'continuo per te <tunc> ego salvus ero', arguing that 'per te' is similar to *certe*, *tc* could drop out after *te*, and 'et tu' be added to complete the line. These alterations make the thought consistent with statements elsewhere in *Heroides* 20 (e.g. 20.235, 'iuncta salus nostra est, miserere meique tuique'), but the emphasis is still firmly on Acontius' welfare. Housman's decision to put the line in parenthesis does have a softening effect, but this requires that 'stabili potiere salute' be taken as the apodosis to line 179, which I think unlikely. Finally, as Housman himself admits, the parenthesis would anticipate the content of the apodosis, which 'is not at all to be admired'.

More recently, W. S. Watt⁹ has conjectured 'tecum continuo sospite salvus ero', but this is a considerable departure from the readings of the MSS, and does not produce the appropriate sense.

A more attractive solution to the problems of line 180 is suggested by Palmer,¹⁰ who used Planudes' translation¹¹ as a starting point: *σὺ παραχρῆμα τῆς σωτηρίας σου τῆς ἐπιλήψῃ*. Palmer conjectured 'certa salutis eris' in place of 'certe ego salvus ero', citing in support both Planudes and 21.31 ('incerta salutis'). This conjecture makes good sense, and removes the problematic 'cert(e) ego' and the stylistically unattractive rhyme 'continuo...ero'. Admittedly the conjecture is a considerable departure from the vulgate, and one would have to suppose that the archetype suffered considerable damage at some point, and that the vulgate is an attempt to piece together the remains of the damaged text.

If 'certa salutis eris' is adopted, doubt is cast over *tu*, which in the transmitted text complements *ego*, but is now robbed of its function and might be thought unduly emphatic. Perhaps a better alternative is to emend *tu* to *tunc*, with *tunc* meaning 'in that event' (*OLD* s.v. 5).¹²

Difficulties remain with the text of line 179 and the interpretation of the couplet. The repeated 'quem...quem' is undesirable, as it suggests that we should look for a

⁷ M. Platnauer (*Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 88) notes only five other instances, in none of which is a long open vowel elided.

⁸ CR 11 (1897), 429–30 = J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (eds.), *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1973), pp. 418–19. ⁹ *Mus. Helv.* 42 (1985), 57.

¹⁰ A note on the chronology of the conjectures of Palmer and Housman is perhaps in order. Palmer first published his conjecture in 1893 (*CR* 7 (1893), 101), Housman his in 1897, although Palmer was familiar with it some time before 1894, as he refers to it in the apparatus to *Heroides* 20 in Postgate's *Corpus*, published in that year. Housman presumably knew of Palmer's conjecture when he published his own, although he makes no reference to it. In his review of Palmer's edition (*CR* 12 (1898), 175 = *Classical Papers*, p. 475), he quotes lines 179–80 in a list of what he terms 'conjectures intrinsically bad', although his chief dispute is with Palmer's interpretation of 'si...nec.../et', and of Palmer's 'certa salutis eris' he says simply 'So Palmer writes and so Planudes seems to read'. Housman's failure to discuss Palmer's conjecture more fully is both surprising and disappointing.

¹¹ In the absence of P, the fourteenth-century Greek translation of Planudes is an important witness. Palmer includes Planudes' translation in his edition of the *Heroides* and discusses its merits in his introduction.

¹² I am grateful to Professor E. J. Kenney for this suggestion.

parallel structure or rhetorical point which is not to be found. Emendation of the first *quem* to *hunc* makes the structure less ambiguous and continues the emphatic series 'hic... / hunc... / hoc' (lines 175–7).¹³ There remains the problem of the interpretation of the couplet. As the text stands in the vulgate, it is unclear whether line 179 contains a double protasis ('si reppuleris... nec... amaris'), with line 180 forming the apodosis, or whether 'si reppuleris' alone constitutes the protasis, with 'nec... amaris' and line 180 forming a double apodosis. Whichever interpretation is adopted (the parallel tenses of *reppuleris* and *amaris* would suggest that they form a double protasis), the tense of *amaris* is awkward. The adoption of *amabis* (the reading of one MS, H) in place of *amaris* would render the structure of the couplet less ambiguous, 'nec... amabis' and line 180 clearly forming a double apodosis. Translate: 'If you repel this man, you will both avoid loving one whom the goddess damns, and you will then straightaway be assured of safety.' 'nec... amabis' makes good sense as an apodosis: being friends with someone hated by the gods was both undesirable and dangerous, cf. Callimachus, *Hymns* 6.116–17 Δάματερ, μὴ τήνος ἐμὶν φίλος, ὅς τοι ἀπεχθήσ, / εἰή μῃδ' ὁμότοιχος. I therefore suggest that the couplet should be printed as follows:

hunc si reppuleris nec, quem dea damnat, amabis,
et tunc continuo certa salutis eris.

20.221–2

sed tamen et quaerat quis sim qualisque. videto:
inveniet vobis consuluisse deam.

Acontius urges Cydippe to induce her mother to find out about him, and thereby learn of his good breeding and character.

Almost all the MSS have *et*, but one (Ab) has *ut*, which is the reading adopted by Palmer, Showerman and Goold. *ut* is grammatically necessary if one reads *videto* and takes *quaerat* as a subjunctive after the imperative ('see to it that she makes enquiries...'), since *videto* with a straight subjunctive is an archaic construction and is not found in Augustan literature. *ut*, however, has no purpose beyond its grammatical function, and is otherwise much poorer than *et*, which has more point and which looks back to line 219 ('quisquis is est, placeat, quoniam placet ante Dianae'): it is important not only that the mother accepts the goddess' choice but *also* (*et*) that Cydippe induces her to check up on the origins and character of her daughter's suitor. *et*, therefore, is preferable and may be retained if *iubeto* (found in three MSS) is read instead of *videto*. *iubeto* with a direct subjunctive is a regular classical construction, cf. *Amores* 1.4.29 'quod tibi miscuerit, sapias, bibat ipse iubeto'.¹⁴ Translate: 'But tell her also to make enquiries as to who and what sort of man I am'.

'quis sim' is the reading of most MSS, but 'qui sim' (found in Gu and D) is preferable on grounds of euphony, and there is clear evidence that Ovid, along with other Latin poets, disliked the excessive sigmatism of 'quis sim [sit etc.]'.¹⁵

My preferred text for line 221 would, therefore, be as follows:

sed tamen et quaerat qui sim qualisque iubeto:

¹³ I am indebted to Mr A. S. Hollis for this suggestion.

¹⁴ Cf. also *Rem.* 671, *Amores* 1.11.19; see further Kühner-Stegmann, vol. 2.2, 228–9.

¹⁵ For instances in Ovid where the MSS support *qui* against *quis*, cf. *Fasti* 3.791, *Heroides* 1.105, *Met.* 11.279 (there are six others). Only in *Met.* 1.248 does the manuscript evidence appear to favour *quis*, and perhaps here *qui*, the reading of the *recentiores*, should be preferred.

20.229–30

appeteres talem vel non iurata maritum;
iuratae vel non talis habendus erat!

Acontius asserts the desirability of marriage to someone such as he.

In line 230 most of the MSS have *erat* and a few *erit*, but Bentley conjectured *eram*,¹⁶ which is adopted by many editors, including Goold. Certainly *eram* would be indicative of Acontius' arrogance, but *erat* is none the less attractive, the third person suggesting that Acontius pretends to take a step back and to view Cydippe's situation in a detached manner, advising her regarding the sort of husband she should have sought or accepted.

21.21–2

ante fores sedet haec, quid agamque rogantibus intus,
ut possim tuto scribere 'dormit' ait.

The nurse, Cydippe's only confidante, sits at the door of the sick girl, keeping people out while Cydippe writes her letter to Acontius.

All editors punctuate with a comma after *intus*, thus taking it with 'quid agamque'. This makes good sense if 'quid agam' means 'what I am doing', and there is a close parallel in Columella, *R.R.* 1 praef. 9: 'neque enim roganti quid agatur intus, respondere servi dignantur'. It seems more likely, however, that in the present passage 'quid agam' means 'how I am' (cf. Plautus, *Curc.* 235; Horace, *Sat.* 1.9.4–5, *Heroides* 20.131), in which case it makes better sense to take *intus* with 'tuto scribere': 'to those who ask how I am, so that I am able to write inside in safety, she says "she is sleeping".' I would therefore punctuate the couplet as follows:

ante fores sedet haec, quid agamque rogantibus (intus
ut possim tuto scribere) 'dormit' ait.

21.28

et tegitur trepido littera coepta sinu.

Whenever anyone is about to enter the bedroom, her nurse signals with a cough, and Cydippe conceals the letter to Acontius in the fold of her dress.

The MSS and early editions¹⁷ all have *cauta*, which is weak whether it is taken as meaning that the letter is being written cautiously or (with a touch of personification) that the letter takes cover in a cautious manner. Dilthey's *coepta* has been adopted by many editors, but Kenney¹⁸ has rightly objected to the conjecture on the grounds that the sense needed is 'unfinished' rather than 'begun'. He makes no further progress in this direction, and the conjecture he offers, *rapta* (i.e. the snatched-up letter), is unconvincing. Appropriate sense could be yielded by reading *rupta*, taking it as

¹⁶ We are faced with a similar dilemma regarding readings in *Heroides* 19.205–6:

'si tibi non parcis, dilectae parce puellae,
quae numquam nisi te sospite sospes ero.'

Most MSS have *erit*, but editors prefer *ero*; I wonder whether *erit* might not be better.

¹⁷ The text of *Heroides* 21.15–146 is dependent on two fifteenth-century MSS. and three early printed editions. Our sole authority for lines 147–250 is the 1477 Parma edition, π: see H. Dörrie, 'Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungs-geschichte von Ovids *Epistulae Heroidum*', *Nachr. d. Akad. Göttingen, Phil. Hist. Kl.* (1960), 365ff., 377ff.

¹⁸ *HSCP* 74 (1970), 181–2.

equivalent to *interrupta. rumpere* is used elsewhere of interrupting speech and poetry recitations (cf. Tib. 2.3.20: 'rumpere mugitu carmina docta boves', *Ars Am.* 1.539), and in the *Tristia* Ovid uses the word of interrupting poetic composition, cf. *Tristia* 1.7.13–14: 'carmina mutatas hominum dicentia formas, / infelix domini quod fuga rupit opus'; 2.552: 'tibi sacratum sors mea rupit opus'.

21.65–6

elige, quid fingas, – non vis placare Dianam.
inmemor es nostri; non potes, – illa tui est.

Dörrie's punctuation is most unsatisfactory and suggests that he misinterpreted the couplet, erroneously making lines 65 and 66 into two independent and unconnected statements. In this couplet, Cydippe offers Acontius two alternative standpoints to choose from (*elige*), and then exposes the weakness of his position in each case, ridiculing the idea that he has a special relationship with Diana, the witness to her oath. Goold's punctuation brings out the balance between the clauses well: 'elige, quid fingas: non vis placare Dianam – / inmemor es nostri; non potes – illa tui est!' Whilst this punctuation is perfectly acceptable,¹⁹ a more colourful alternative is to interpret 'non vis placare Dianam' and 'non potes' as questions:

elige quid fingas: non vis placare Dianam?
inmemor es nostri; non potes? illa tui est.

This type of rhetorical device (known as *hypophora*), whereby a rhetorical question is posed and then immediately answered, is much used in Greek and Roman forensic oratory, cf. Demosthenes, *Corona* 24: τί γὰρ καὶ βουλόμενοι μετεπέμπεσθ' ἂν αὐτοὺς ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ; ἐπὶ τὴν εἰρήνην; ἀλλ' ὑπήρχεν ἅπασιν. ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον; ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ περὶ εἰρήνης ἐβουλεύεσθε; Cic. *Mil.* 54: 'devertit in villam Pompeii: Pompeium ut videret? sciebat in Alsiensi esse. villam ut perspiceret? miliens in ea fuerat'; *Amores* 2.2.17–18 'conscius esse velis? domina est obnoxia servo; / conscius esse times? dissimulare licet', *Tristia* 4.3.33–4 'tristis es? indignor quod sim tibi causa doloris: / non es? at amisso coniuge digna fores.'

21.91

ipsa dedit gemmas digitis et cruribus aurum
et vestes umeris induit ipsa meis.

As Cydippe recalls the events leading up to the trick Acontius plays on her, she draws a touching picture of her proud mother preparing her for her visit to shrines on Delos.

The text in the MSS is that printed above, and has been retained by Heinsius, Bentley and Dörrie. Most other editors, however, prefer to read *crinibus* for *cruribus*.²⁰ *crinibus* makes perfectly good sense: hair ornaments were a regular part of Greek and Roman jewellery, and 'dedit...crinibus aurum' is not a repetition of 'comuntur...comae', but constitutes an activity clearly distinct from it (hair jewellery and hair arrangement respectively: but do we want this emphasis on the hair?). Is emendation really necessary, however? *cruribus* should most probably be taken as a

¹⁹ The usage of parallel indicative clauses in place of alternative conditional clauses is perfectly regular in poetry, cf. *Amores* 2.2.19–22, 'scripta leget secum; matrem misisse putato; / venerit ignotus: postmodo notus erit; / ibit ad affectam, quae non languebit, amicam: / visat, iudiciis aegra sit illa tuis.'

²⁰ For the easy confusion of *crinibus* and *cruribus* in MSS, cf. *Fasti* 5.37.

reference to anklets (*periscelides*), an item of jewellery worn both by Greek and Roman women, and the reading could only be objected to if anklets were found to be an inappropriate item of jewellery for a respectable young Greek noblewoman such as Cydippe. The surviving evidence, however, suggests that there was nothing intrinsically improper about anklets, and in the Greek world at least they appear to have been worn by women of the highest rank and stature. Inventories from the Delian Artemision record the dedication of anklets to Artemis in the third century B.C. by Stratonice, a member of the royal house of the Antigonids (Insc. de Delos (Durrbach, 1929), no. 442 B199).²¹ Clearly, for anklets to be dedicated by a member of a royal family to a virgin goddess, they cannot have had vulgar or disreputable associations. In *Mor.* 142c (= *Coniug. Praec.* 30) Plutarch, writing of women in general, states that τῶν δε πλείστων γυναικῶν ἂν ὑποδήματα διάχρυσα περιέλῃς καὶ ψέλλια καὶ περισκελίδας καὶ πορφύραν καὶ μαργαρίτας, ἔνδον μένουσιν.²² There is clearly no suggestion in Plutarch's statement that anklets are the mark of a disreputable woman. Finally, the mention of anklets by Longus (1.5) in a beautiful and tasteful description of the baby Chloe clearly precludes the idea that they are in any way vulgar. Mention is made of anklets elsewhere in more vulgar contexts in Greek literature (e.g. Alciphron fr. 4 (Schepers)), but the evidence cited above argues against the view that the Greeks regarded them as intrinsically tasteless or improper. Evidence from Roman sources is patchy and inconclusive, but given that our poem has a Greek setting, *cruribus* is an appropriate and acceptable reading.²³

21.197–8

et minus audacter blanditur et oscula rara
accipit et timido me vocat ore suam.

Cydippe describes to Acontius the ever more feeble attempts of his rival to court her at her bedside.

accipit is the reading of our sole witness for the text here, the 1477 Parma edition, and is clearly inappropriate: it is not Cydippe but the rival who is making the advances (cf. *blanditur*, *vocat*), and it would be improper and out of character for Cydippe to take the initiative. Emendation is necessary, and various conjectures have

²¹ See also the references in Ph. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique* (Paris, 1970), p. 547.

²² Although it is not known for certain what audience Plutarch is addressing, it is possible, given his connections with Rome, that he is writing for an educated Roman, as well as Greek, audience.

²³ Evidence regarding Roman attitudes to anklets is more limited, although some scholars believe that they were seen as vulgar and tasteless, e.g. J. P. V. D. Balsdon (*Roman Women*, p. 263): 'Jewels were worn...in the hair and – though not of course by respectable married matrons – in anklets'; cf. also W. D. Lowe on Longus 1.5, C. Barini, *Ornatus Muliebris* (Turin, 1958), pp. 105–6. These views reflect modern rather than ancient prejudices, I think. The evidence cited in support of this view consists of two passages, Hor. *Epist.* 1.17.55–6 ('nota refert meretricis acumina, saepe catellam / saepe periscelidem raptam sibi flentis') and Petr. 67: 'venit ergo galbino succincta cingillo, ita ut infra cerasina appareret tunica et periscelides tortae phaeasidaeque inauratae...eo deinde perventum est, ut Fortunata armillas suas crassissimis detraheret lacertis...ultimo etiam periscelides resolvit et reticulum aureum, quem ex obrussa esse dicebat.' The value of this evidence is dubious: if one is to condemn anklets on the basis of the passage from Petronius, then one must likewise condemn hair-nets and bracelets, which is obviously ridiculous. It is not anklets *per se* that are vulgar, but rather it is that Fortunata's own particular anklets (like all her jewellery) are vulgar, and the fact that she takes them off in public. We simply lack the evidence to make conclusive statements about the attitude of Romans to anklets.

been offered: *admoveo* (Dilthey),²⁴ *appetit* (Palmer), *applicat*²⁵ (Housman)²⁶ and *arripit* (H. Erbse).²⁷ Housman's *applicat* (adopted by Goold) makes adequate sense but is rather colourless. *admoveo* is a long way from *accipit*; furthermore, when used in the context of kissing, it normally has the lips or mouth as its object rather than, as here, the kisses themselves. *appeto* is quite attractive, suggesting that the rival is trying to get a kiss out of Cydippe; the word is frequently used of seizing the hand to kiss it (e.g. Pliny, *N.H.* 11.250), although not otherwise directly of kissing. Erbse's *arripit* is very close to *accipit*, and would be consistent with *oscula* meaning 'kisses' rather than 'lips'. There are no close parallels, however,²⁸ and the word is too violent, and inappropriate to the actions of the timid rival. Another alternative would be to read *eripit*, which is less violent, and possibly suggests a peck on the cheek rather than an erotic or passionate kiss, cf. Tib. 2.5.91–2 'natusque parenti / oscula comprensis auribus eripiet'. *eripit* has the advantage of being close to *accipit*, and may suggest that the rival feels that he is taking what he feels does not rightfully belong to him (a nuance often present in *eripio*).

21.203–4

ingemit et tacito suspirat pectore, meque
offensam, quamvis non mereatur, habet.

Cydippe describes the dismal reaction of Acontius' diffident rival when she rejects his tentative advances.

In Palmer's edition, Purser takes 'me... / offensam... habet' as meaning 'I am offended by him', and compares the construction in Cic. *Fam.* 2.18.2: 'tres fratres... te nolo te habere iratos', *Att.* 14.19.4: 'nolo te illum iratum habere'.²⁹ Perhaps, however, the sense is slightly different here, and we should take *habet* as meaning here 'he holds that', 'he believes': for *habeo* used in this sense and constructed with a double accusative, cf. Plaut. *As.* 80–1 'is me dignum... / habuit'; Ovid, *Tristia* 4.1.1–2 'siqua meis fuerint, ut erunt, vitiosa libellis, / excusata suo tempore, lector, habe'.³⁰ *offensam* here is adjectival (*esse*, as usual with *habere*, is not expressed). Translate: 'He groans and sighs to himself, and believes that I am displeased, although he does not deserve my displeasure.' Often when *habeo* is used in this sense (particularly in the passive), it contains a hint, as here, that the opinion held may not be justified, cf. *Met.* 9.333 'habetur coniuge felix'. 'quamvis non mereatur' may be interpreted as representing either Cydippe's view of the situation, or what she thinks are the feelings of the rival. The latter is more pointed: the rival thinks that Cydippe is unjustly angry with him.³¹

²⁴ Cf. *Met.* 10.344: 'osculaue admoveam', where see Bömer.

²⁵ Cf. *Fasti* 4.851: 'osculaue applicuit posito suprema feretro'.

²⁶ *applicat* is ascribed to Housman in Palmer's edition, although Housman does not appear to have published it in his own right; possibly he suggested it to Palmer in private correspondence.

²⁷ *Wurzbürger Jahrbucher für die Altertums-wissenschaft* N.F. II (1976), 234–5.

²⁸ Erbse quotes Tib. 1.4.53–4; Ovid, *Heroides* 15.44, and *Ars Am.* 1.667, none of which provides a very good parallel.

²⁹ Cf. also Ter. *Eun.* 383–4: 'quae nos nostramque adulescentiam / habent despiciatam.'

³⁰ Cf. also *Amores* 2.3.15, *Met.* 8.262; see further TLL 6.3.2444.19ff.

³¹ The interpretation of 'offensam habet' offered here removes the clear statement that Cydippe is actually angry with the rival, and thereby eliminates the objection which has been made on grounds of sense to Diggle's conjecture (based on Bentley) in line 207: 'tu mihi siqua foret, tu nostra iustius ira'. Cydippe is not actually angry with the rival, he only thinks she is – if she were really angry, then Acontius would be the more deserving focus of her anger.

21.205–6

ei mihi quod gaudes et te iuvat ista voluptas!
ei mihi quod sensus sim tibi fassa meos!

As it stands, line 205 is tautologous and emendation is necessary. Heusinger's *voluntas* is unconvincing: as Kenney observes,³² *voluntas* is normally used in a positive sense, and so is inappropriate here; Van Lennep's suggestion that it gets its colouring here from *offensam* is implausible. Heinsius' *simultas* ('animosity') is better, but further removed from *voluptas*, and both *simultas* and *voluntas* require the further change of *ista* to *illa*, as *ista* meaning 'this / that of yours' would clearly be inappropriate with either conjecture. A much simpler alternative is to emend *te* to *me*, which produces plausible sense with little violence to the text: 'Alas, that you rejoice, and that I am pleased by that joy of yours.' This eliminates the tautology and is both paradoxical (in typical Ovidian manner) and psychologically fine: Cydippe is painfully aware of the embarrassing fact that, despite her better judgement, she cannot help having feelings for this unscrupulous youth who has caused her so much anguish. *me* also gives a more specific point of reference for the statement in the following line ('ei mihi quod sensus sum tibi fassa meos!'): she betrays her true feelings in line 205, and then promptly declares her regret that she has done so.

21.245–6

cetera cura tua est: plus hoc quoque virgine factum
non timuit tecum quod mea charta loqui.

After hinting to Acontius that she is attracted to him, Cydippe puts the ball firmly in Acontius' court, stating (with a possible allusion to Callimachus' version of the story)³³ that she has done more than is proper for a girl to do, and that the rest is up to him.

Kenney³⁴ interprets 'plus hoc quoque virgine factum' as being a condensed way of saying 'plus factum est quam virginis', and compares *Amores* 2.6.62 ('ora fuere mihi plus ave docta loqui') and *Met.* 11.336–7 ('iam tum mihi currere visus / plus homine est'). He dislikes *hoc*, however ('appears intrusive: at all events I cannot construe it myself'), and suggests as possible alternatives *huc*, *hic* and *iam*. J. M. Hunt³⁵ argues in favour of the retention of *hoc*, taking it as subject and interpreting the line as meaning 'etiam hoc feci ultra id quod virginem decet'. I agree with Hunt regarding the retention of *hoc*, which provides an attractive contrast with 'cetera cura tua est', but suggest another possible interpretation: *hoc* may be taken as ablative, and anticipatory, picked up by *quod* in the following line: 'I have done more than ought to be done by a girl, even in the following respect [*hoc*], that my page ...'.³⁶

Manchester Grammar School

P. A. M. THOMPSON

³² *CQ* 29 (1979), 421.

³³ 'cetera cura tua est', cf. Call. fr. 75.40–1: λοιπόν, Ἀκοντίε, σείο μετελθεῖν / ... ηνιδιην ἐς Διονυσιάδα.

³⁴ *HSCP* 74 (1970), 183.

³⁵ *CP* 70 (1975), 224.

³⁶ The one objection to this interpretation is that the ablative *hoc* is juxtaposed with the comparative *plus* but not construed with it, and this is rather awkward writing for Ovid.