CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

Two Disputed Passages in the Heroides
Author(s): E. J. Kenney
Reviewed work(s):
Source: *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 29, No. 2 (1979), pp. 394-431
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/638106
Accessed: 06/09/2012 20:37

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Cambridge University Press and *The Classical Association* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Quarterly*.

http://www.jstor.org

TWO DISPUTED PASSAGES IN THE *HEROIDES*

1. INTRODUCTORY

Heinrich Dörrie has demonstrated that the text of two long passages of Ovid's *Heroides* depends entirely on a single witness, the printed edition of the complete works published at Parma in 1477 by Stephanus Corallus (π). The passages in question are from the letters of Paris (16. 39–144) and Cydippe (21. 145–248).[1] In this paper I limit myself to a single question: whether these verses are by the same hand as the rest of the epistles of Paris and Cydippe. Since, however, I see no reason to doubt that all the double epistles are by Ovid, this means in effect that I shall be asking whether the disputed passages are his.

2. REMARKS ON METHOD

2.1 It is natural enough that the circumstances in which these verses have been transmitted should have given rise to suspicion of their authenticity. However, to begin with this aspect of the question is to stand the logic of such investigations on its head. For if the result of an examination of the internal criteria for authenticity is negative—if, that is to say, a disputed work or passage has so many apparently innate faults that to attribute it to its reputed author imposes an intolerable strain on our credulity—then there's an end of the real investigation. How the passage came to be where it is or how the work obtained entry to the canon, interesting as that may be, is of secondary importance. Only if the result of such an examination is positive—or, to speak more exactly, leads to a verdict

The following works are cited by author's name only:

Bömer = *P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphosen.* Kommentar von Franz Bömer. I. Buch I–III (1969); II. IV–V (1976); III. VI–VII (1976); IV. VIII–IX (1977), Heidelberg.

Bopp = Heike Bopp, *Inscia capta puella. Akontios und Kydippe bei Kallimachos und bei Ovid,* Diss. Münster, 1966.

Dörrie (1960) = H. Dörrie, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids Epistulae Heroidum* I, II, Nachr. d. Akad. Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1960, 5 (pp. 113–230), 7 (pp. 359–423).

Dörrie (1971) = *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum,* ed. H. Dörrie (Texte u. Kommentare 6), Berlin, 1971.

Fischer = Uta 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), Augsburg, 1969.

Fisher = Elizabeth Fisher, 'Two notes on the *Heroides*', *HSCP* 74 (1970), 193–205.

Jacobson = H. Jacobson, *Ovid's* Heroides, Princeton, 1974.

Kenney = E. J. Kenney, 'Notes on Ovid: III', *HSCP* 74 (1970), 169–85.

Kraus = W. Kraus, 'Die Briefpaare in Ovids Heroides', *WS* 65 (1950–51), 54–77.

Goold = G. P. Goold, Review of Dörrie (1971), *Gnomon* 46 (1974), 475–84.

Latta = B. Latta, *Die Stellung der Doppelbriefe (Heroides 16–21) im Gesamtwerk Ovids. Studien zur ovidischen Erzählkunst,* Diss. Marburg, 1963.

Palmer = *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides,* ed. A. Palmer, Oxford, 1898.

Reeve = M. D. Reeve, 'Notes on Ovid's *Heroides*', *CQ* N. S. 23 (1973), 324–38.

Showerman–Goold = *Ovid* I. *Heroides and Amores,* ed. and tr. G. Showerman, 2nd edn. rev. G. P. Goold (Loeb Classical Library), London, 1977.

[1] Dörrie (1960) ii. 377–9. References to the text of the *Heroides* in this paper follow the standard numeration as used by (e.g.) Showerman–Goold, and not that of Dörrie (1971).

of *nihil obstat* (see §2.2)—does it become relevant to the problem of authenticity to enquire into the problem of the transmission. Therefore I offer it as a general rule that in all such investigations examination of the internal evidence should precede that of the external, that is the circumstances of the textual transmission. In practice, as will be seen in what follows, the two things cannot be dichotomized quite so neatly as this formulation suggests; but that is true of pretty well any critical rule of thumb.

2.2. In questions of authenticity only negative proofs are as a rule convincing. It is often possible to show that a work or a passage displays so many incorrect, absurd, or anomalous features that, even when due allowance is made for textual corruption, it is unreasonable, on a balance of probabilities, to attribute it to its reputed author. It is rarely possible to prove authenticity with anything like even this limited degree of cogency. The most that it is usually realistic to expect is what I have called a verdict of *nihil obstat*: a conclusion that, on balance, a disputed work or passage contains nothing fundamentally inconsistent with its reputed authorship.

2.3. When attention has been closely focused on a work or a passage by the circumstances of its transmission, the critic has a special obligation to be on his guard against hypercriticism.[2] Of all the objections that critics have made against the two passages here in question, it is very doubtful whether most would have seemed significant, or would have been raised in the first place, if suspicion had not been awakened by their provenance.

2.4. Connected with the foregoing point is another. In examining the internal evidence—that is, the words of the disputed text—the weight to be assigned to particular anomalies must be assessed in the light of their frequency and the general quality of the writing. If a certain minimum level of competence and consistency with the indubitably authentic work of the reputed author or the rest of the text under discussion is for the most part maintained, the critic should be slow to damn the whole on the strength of sporadic blemishes, unless he can devise no plausible explanation of their presence and character except the hypothesis of forgery.

2.5. This last point is of particular importance as regards 16. 39–144, of which Reeve, who disbelieves in its authenticity, is ready to allow that 'There are sections in [it] that seem to me linguistically unexceptionable and in manner worthy of Ovid, notably 53–88, the account of the judgement.'[3] Clearly the critic who supports authenticity is not entitled to rewrite the transmitted text wholesale to suit his case; but the obduracy of some difficulties of reading and interpretation does not necessarily justify rejection of the whole. Everything depends on their character and number. I do not see how it can reasonably be maintained that 'Es hat wirklich wenig Sinn . . . einen interpolierten Text durch

[2] See Bömer on *Met.* 8.595 ff.

[3] Reeve, p. 337 n. 1; cf. Fischer, p. 74 and n. 1. On Reeve's expedient for reconciling this judgement with his condemnation of the passage see further below, p. 417 n. 73. I believe 21. 145–248 to be equally worthy of Ovid, but the state of the text towards the end of the epistle makes the point more difficult to sustain. Cf. also below, p. 428 n. 118.

Konjekturen heilen zu wollen.'[4] That is simply a flagrant *petitio principii.*

3. AN UNNOTICED ARGUMENT FOR AUTHENTICITY

3.1. In spite of what was said at § 2.2 above it seems worth while to draw attention to an argument for the authenticity of both our passages which appears to have received little or no notice. Both exemplify a curious construction of the word *nec,* to represent which the editor must resort to what Housman called 'a grotesque employment of inverted commas':

dulce Venus risit 'ne'c 'te, Pari, munera tangant . . .' (16.83)

negabis
'arte ne'c 'est' dices 'ista petita mea'. (21. 221–2)

The usage appears to be peculiar to Ovid; at least it does not seem that examples of it have been adduced from any other writer.[5] If these lines were the work of an interpolator, he was an artist of altogether exceptional technical skill—and perhaps possessed a sense of humour into the bargain. Be that as it may, if our passages are by the same hand as the rest of the double *Heroides,* and if that hand was, as I believe it to have been, Ovid's, then the evidence dovetails with curious neatness: for it will have been noticed (see n. 5 below) that this trick of usage, apart from its occurrence here, is exemplified only in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*—precisely those works on which, according to the usual chronology of his life, Ovid was engaged contemporaneously with the double *Heroides.*[6]

3.2. Such considerations cannot be decisive, for in spite of Ockham the simplest construction of the evidence in a given case is not necessarily the right one. But whether or not Ovid wrote *Heroides* 16–21, our postulated interpolator clearly seems to have thought that he did; for he took quite unexampled pains, as the trick with *nec* shows, to write like him. At the very least, since the two passages are classical in style and can hardly be dated much later than the rest of *Her.* 16–21 (cf. below, § 5.1.4), we have very early evidence for the attribution of the double epistles to Ovid. I mention this line of interpretation, not because I for one moment believe that it leads anywhere but into a mare's nest, but to indicate the sort of hypothetical maze into which the, to me, totally implausible figure of the interpolator (cf. below, §§ 7.1, 2) begins to beckon us as soon as we accept his existence.

4. THE CASE FOR THE PROSECUTION

4.1. This, so to call it, has been urged most recently and most effectively by

[4] G. Luck, *Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte Ovids* (Heidelberg, 1969), p. 21, cited with (qualified) approval by Reeve, p. 336 n. 7 (but cf. ibid., p. 337 n. 1). The dubious honour of coining this fallacious dictum appears to be ascribed to Rudolf Ehwald.

[5] See A. E. Housman, *CR* 11 (1897), 426–7 = *Classical Papers* pp. 413–14, citing in addition *Met.* 5. 414, 9. 131–2, 10. 568–70, 11. 134–7, 263, *F.* 4. 597–8.

[6] Cf. M. Pohlenz, 'Die Abfassungszeit von Ovids Metamorphosen', *Hermes* 48 (1913), 4–9; Latta, p. 119; Kraus, p. 56; Valerie A. Tracy, *CJ* 66 (1970–1), 330.

Dr. Fischer[7] and Mr. Reeve. It is therefore to their arguments that I chiefly address myself.

4.2. Three lines of attack may be distinguished:

(a) What I have called particular anomalies; that is, problems centred in single verses and couplets.
(b) The content of the passages and their place in the 'plot' of the correspondence.
(c) The points of juncture between the passages and the rest of their epistles.

I will take the two passages in turn and examine the problems which arise under these heads.

5. *16. 39–144*

5.1. PARTICULAR ANOMALIES

5.1.1. sic placuit fatis: quae ne conuellere temptes
accipe cum uera dicta relata fide.[8] (41–2)

42 cum *Itali*: dum π

Verglichen mit der Überleitung zur Schilderung des Gastmahles (213ff) oder den von der Gegenwart aus schrittweise zurückgehenden Hinführungen zu den Erzählungen der Vorgeschichte in her. 11, 12 und 14 erscheint auch die Hinführung zur der in 43 beginnenden Erzählung mit 'quae ne convellere temptes, / accipe cum vera dicta relata fide' gezwungen und hölzern. Der Ausdruck 'cum vera . . . fide' ist pleonastisch und erweckt den Anschein, also sollte er nun einen Vers füllen, der inhaltlich arm ist. Was mit 'dicta relata' gemeint ist, ist nicht recht einzusehen: bezieht es sich auf die Erzählung des Paris, so ist 'relata' uberflüssig, bezieht es sich auf das, was Paris selbst nur aus Erzählung wissen kann, ist 'dicta' nicht recht am Platz (Fischer, pp. 72–3).

I quote Fischer's remarks on this couplet *in extenso* because they seem to me to offer a good example of the kind of hypercriticism against which I have warned (above, §2.3). Of the context of which the couplet forms part more will be said presently (below, §5.3.8). What precisely Fischer finds 'forced and wooden' about the lines is not at all clear to me. In this non-literal sense *conuellere,* though rare in Ovid, is both apt and classical. Indeed, it is no accident that the other Ovidian occurrence is in Helen's answer:

desine molle precor uerbis conuellere pectus (17.111)–

which she must mean as a stroke of wit. Having been somewhat pompously warned by Paris 'ne fata conuellere temptet', she pertly retorts 'and don't *you* try to "dislodge" me'. Fischer's objection to 'uera . . . fide' is arbitrary; indeed it and her succeeding comment miss the point. Paris speaks in solemn and minatory tones to make it clear that Helen disregards his message at her peril. There is

[7] I am extremely grateful to Dr. Fischer for sending me a copy of her dissertation, and I only hope that my frank criticisms of what seem to me to be fundamental weaknesses in her case may not appear a churlish return for her courtesy. In view of the weight attached by Mr. Reeve and Professor Goold (cf. Goold, p. 483) to her arguments it seemed to me indispensable to examine them closely before they begin to be taken on trust and an orthodoxy is established by default. That is also why this paper is so long.

[8] In quoting from the disputed passages I give the text of π (ignoring trivial printer's errors) unless I indicate otherwise. Only the edition of Dörrie (1971) makes it clear that π is our sole authority for the transmitted text.

nothing pleonastic in any objectionable sense about the phrase; 'fide' would indeed be left uncomfortably in the air without its adjectival complement. For the language and emphasis we may compare 16.60 'uera loquar ueri uix habitura fidem' and 19.68 'nec careant uera gaudia nostra fide'.[9] Then 'accipe dicta' is an epicism (Virg. *Aen.* 3.250, 10.104; cf. Enn. *Ann.* 198 V.[2]), appropriate to the *color Ennianus* which, for some reason, distinguishes this pair of epistles.[10] The 'dicta' are what Paris is telling his correspondent, and 'relata' is not superfluous but emphatic = 'quae <tibi> refero'.[11] That the phrase does not conform exactly to any of the common formulae with *referre* (e.g. 16.63 'uisa referre') proves nothing; I mention this as an example of a type of argument that we shall encounter more than once, that cuts both ways. There is no law which lays it down that interpolators are more prone to *legitimate* linguistic innovation than real poets. Ovid was notoriously *imitator sui,* but the manner of the imitation is by no means invariably stereotyped and predictable.

5.1.2. Similarly captious, it seems to me, are the objections taken by Fischer to another couplet:

> arsurum Paridis uates canit Ilion igni:
> pectoris, ut nunc est, fax fuit illa mei. (49–50)

Fischer styles the conceit in line 50 'ziemlich künstlich' (p. 73) and 'gezwungen' (p. 136). Perhaps it is; but it is surprising to find this alleged as an objection to authenticity by a scholar who believes in the Ovidian authorship of the double letters. I wish I had a pound for every time that Ovid's critics have applied these and similar expressions to his undoubted work! Paris first reports the seer's oracular interpretation of the vision in which Hecuba was delivered of a firebrand; the word *ignis* is of course to be understood in two senses, the literal meaning of the flames in which Troy is to perish through Paris' fault and that, sufficiently familiar and needing no illustration, of the fire of love.[12] Paris in *his* interpretation chooses to see in all this only an innocuous reference to his passion; whereas Helen in her reply ignores his flippancy in her (justified) anxiety about the literal sense of the prophet's words. 'Vt nunc est', to which Fischer objects as 'nichtssagend' (p. 73), means 'as it now appears'; compare 17.169, where it means 'as things have turned out'.[13] At 19.127, where attempts have been made to emend these same words away, they appear to mean 'as may be seen', sc. in the light of Helle's unfortunate experience. That the phrase occurs three times in the double and not at all in the single *Heroides,*[14] if true, suggests perhaps that the poet for some reason had it on the brain at the time, but I do not know that it suggests anything else; it certainly authorizes no inference as to authenticity. Again, our putative interpolator must have had very finely tuned antennae to pick out this colourless phrase for imitation.

[9] Cf. also *ex P.* 3.7.24 '. . . seque semel uera scire perisse fide.'

[10] See H. Jacobson, 'Ennian influence in *Heroides* 16 and 17', *Phoenix* 22 (1968), 299–303; Diana G. White, 'Ovid, *Heroides* 16. 45–6', *HSCP* 74 (1970), 187–91.

[11] For this timeless sense of the perfect participle see E. Laughton, *The Participle in Cicero* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 2–3.

[12] Cf. Latta, pp. 87–8.

[13] Simple phrases, of which Fischer (p. 73 n. 2, p. 114) makes extraordinarily heavy weather.

[14] Cf. Palmer, pp. 436–7.

5.1.3. nec tantum regum natae petiere ducumque
sed nymphis etiam curaque amorque fui.
† quas super oenonem facies mutarer in orbem
nec Priamo est a te dignior ulla nurus.
sed mihi cunctarum subeunt fastidia postquam
coniugii spes est, Tyndari, facta tui. (95–100)

98 a *Heinsius*: ad π

Efforts to mend line 97 have failed to produce any wholly convincing solution, and for the purpose of the present discussion the textual problem had better be shelved.[15] The general drift of the argument seems clear. Among the nymphs who joined the throng of competitors for Paris' hand, Oenone was pre-eminent in beauty and eligibility, but even Oenone took a back seat when Helen came along—an adroit way of turning Paris' callous treatment of her to account in his suit to Helen.[16] I see no solid grounds for regarding lines 97–8 as an interpolation, and they cannot in fact be removed without damage, since without them 'sed' in line 99 can hardly be allowed to stand.[17] A *locus nondum sanatus,* if not necessarily *insanabilis*; but the persistence of a handful of cruces such as this does not entail the condemnation of the whole—especially if the circumstances of the textual transmission are taken into account (cf. below, §5.4.1).

5.1.4. te uigilans oculis, animo te nocte uidebam
lumina cum placido uicta sopore iacent. (101–2)

So π, contradicting the facts of the story and indeed the very next verse:

quid faceres[18] praesens, quae nondum uisa placebas?

This nonsense was simply and certainly emended by Bentley:

te uigilans oculis animi, te nocte uidebam . . .

The conceit in 'oculis animi' is Ovidian: *Met.* 15.64, *ex P.* 1.8.34.[19] The verse as emended takes up and varies what Paris has already said at line 37 'ante tuos animo uidi quam lumine uultus'; it is well rendered by Reeve, 'waking and sleeping I saw you in my mind's eye' (p. 336 n. 2). The tense of 'iacent' not only needs no defence (Reeve, ibid.), it is chosen for point: 'night, the time when the eyes

[15] See Dörrie (1971) ad loc.; J. Diggle, 'Notes on the text of Ovid, *Heroides*', *CQ* N. S. 17 (1967), 139; C. Austin–M. D. Reeve, Notes on Sophocles, Ovid, & Euripides', *Maia* 22 (1970), 6; Fischer, pp. 75–6.

[16] A point of some delicacy for the poet to negotiate. Cf. on Ovid's treatment of the Judgement from Oenone's point of view Jacobson, pp. 193–4.

[17] *at* Itali; cf. Fischer, pp. 76, 136; Reeve, p. 336 n. 1. The arguments of Asteroth (reported by Fischer, p. 76) and Latta (pp. 127–8, 160 n. 36) for deletion do not convince. Nor do I see any difficulty about taking 'subeunt' as historic present (Reeve, loc. cit.). On the relationship of this couplet with 17. 195–8 see below, §§5.2. 13–14.

[18] *facies* π, corr. Heinsius, prob. Bentley. The construction is equivalent to 'quid faceres si tum adesses?', and the correction is absolutely necessary; cf. Goold, p. 479. The conviction of Palmer (p. 441) and Fischer (pp. 77, 137) that it makes no difference to the sense is mystifying; cf. Reeve, p. 337 n. 1. Fischer's objection to *hic* (Itali: *hinc* π) in line 104 also falls to the ground if *faceres* is accepted.

[19] Cf. also *Tr.* 3.4. 55–6, 4.2. 57; A. Scholte, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis ex Ponto liber primus* (Amersfurt, 1933), p. 158 (ad 1.8.34); Cic. *Or.* 101 'eloquentia ipsa, quam nullis nisi mentis oculis uidere possumus'. Cf. also Plat. *Symp.* 219 a 2–3 ἢ . . . τῆς διανοίας ὄψις.

are fast closed in peaceful sleep, <but the mind is still active>'; not 'wenn ich schlafe' (Fischer, p. 135), which would indeed be 'nichtssagend'. Cf. *Met.* 8.83–4 'prima quies aderat, qua curis fessa diurnis/pectora somnus habet'.

The couplet as emended and correctly interpreted may now be compared with a poem in the *Anthologia Latina* with which it has obvious affinities:

te uigilans oculis, animo te nocte requiro,
uicta iacent solo cum mea membra toro.
uidi ego me tecum falsa sub imagine somni.
somnia tu uinces, si mihi uera uenis. (*AL* 702 R.[2])

One poet is pretty clearly echoing the other. Riese failed to notice, and the omission has not been repaired in the recent discussions, that the resemblances with the *Heroides* are not confined to the first couplet. The phrase 'falsa sub imagine somni' recalls both *Her.* 16.45 'sub imagine somni' and 17.45 'falsa sub imagine', looks indeed uncommonly like a conflation of both. That, taken with the fact that 'uicta' at *Her.* 16.102 has the adverbial complement ('sopore') which it lacks and seems to need in *AL*,[20] seems to point, on Axelsonian principles, to the priority of the *Heroides* poet; and also suggests that the *AL* poet had before him or recollected a text of the double epistles which contained our passage. That proves nothing about authenticity, but it may have a bearing on the date of composition (Fischer, p. 136). The *AL* poem belongs to a group of short pieces ascribed by modern editors, on no very solid grounds, to Petronius; if not by him, they are at any rate classical in language and versification. If therefore our passage of the *Heroides* antedates them, it must be of respectable antiquity. That I should have thought evident in any case,[21] but the corroboration, such as it is, is worth noting.

5.1.5. addimus antennas et uela sequentia malo,
accipit et pictos puppis adunca deos.
qua tamen ipse uehar, comitata Cupidine paruo
sponsor coniugii stat dea picta tui.
imposita est factae postquam manus ultima classi,
protinus Aegaeis ire iubetur aquis. (113–18)

113 malo *Palmer*: malos π: malis *Ehwald* 115 uehar *Bentley*: uehor π 116 ficta *Palmer* tui *Naugerius*: sui π 118 iubetur *uel* iubemus *Kenney*: iubebat π: lubebat *Heinsius*: iubebar *Itali.*

In line 113 'antennas et uela sequentia' is to my ear a curious way of saying 'the yards and the sails belonging/attached to them', and one is tempted to assail 'sequentia' (*ferentia*? *tumentia*?). However, in view of what has been said about hypercriticism the temptation probably ought to be resisted. The phrase hardly smacks (again, to my ear) of the interpolator.[22] Fischer's objection (p. 77, 137)

[20] Noticed by Dörrie (1960), ii. 360 n. 1.

[21] We need no longer take seriously the possibility of a Renaissance origin of the passages.

[22] There seems to be little to choose between 'malis' and 'malo'. If I incline to the latter it is less for the reason that Homeric ships had only one mast (Palmer, pp. 441–2) than because the variation 'antennas' (pl.) . . . 'malo' (sing.) is more elegant than two plurals; cf. Hor. *C.* 1.14. 5–6, cited by Palmer, p. 442.

to 'tamen' in line 115, that the sense does not require an adversative, is of no weight; in Ovidian usage *tamen* often = δέ.[23] At line 118, however, there is a real difficulty, not quite accurately represented by Fischer: the trouble is not so much that 'das überlieferte "iubebar"' is 'unklar' (p. 137)—for 'iubebar' is not the transmitted text—as that any reading in which the verb is in the imperfect tense (cf. Fischer, p. 77) is objectionable. I suggest 'iubetur', sc. *a me*, with *classis* understood as subject from the preceding verse. Another possibility is 'iubemus'; but *iubeo* with ellipse of the object is rare; however, the one Ovidian example cited by *TLL* s.v. 577. 76–83 is, as it happens, from the double *Heroides*, 20.80 'iamdudum dominae more uenire iube'.[24]

5.1.6. 'quo ruis?' exclamat [sc. Cassandra]; 'referes
incendia tecum.
quanta per has nescis flamma petatur aquas.'
uera fuit uates: dictos inuenimus ignes,
et ferus in molli pectore flagrat amor. (123–6)

Fischer (pp. 78, 138) detects a contradiction between 'dictos inuenimus ignes' and 'pectoris . . . fax' at line 50 on the one hand, and line 27 on the other. The latter verse must be quoted in its context:

perstet [sc. Venus] et ut pelagi sic pectoris adiuuet
aestum,
deferat in portus et mea uota suos.
attulimus flammas non hic inuenimus illas:
hae mihi tam longae causa fuere uiae. (25–8)

That Paris has fallen in love with Helen before ever setting eyes on her is a *datum* of the story, and this is what he says at line 27 (cf. 36–42). At lines 50 and 125 he makes a different point: that he now experiences the fire alluded to by both the unnamed seer and by Cassandra—that is, that he now understands what they were talking about. He did not 'find' love at Sparta, he was in love before he arrived; he has 'found' in the state of his own heart the true realization of the prophecies. The poet's offence, which so far as it goes is real enough, is not that he has contradicted himself, but that he did not take the trouble to vary the wording of these two distinct conceits; and it is compounded by the fact that the word 'inuenimus' occupies, almost of necessity, the same prominent place in the two hexameters. Had he thought to diversify his phraseology, no objection would or could have been made, but we are not entitled to diversify it for him.[25] The interval between the two verses is a longish one, and it seems to me arbitrary to identify negligence, especially of this order, as the hallmark of the incompetent forger rather than the insouciant poet. The argument, like others of the kind, proves nothing either way.

[23] Bömer on *Met.* 2.337, 5.262; on *nec tamen* = οὐδέ see below, p. 410 n. 48.

[24] 'iubemur' is the right tense but is open to the same objection as 'iubebar' on the score of vagueness: if it refers to Venus as the source of the sailing orders it is excessively elliptical, and it was not perhaps really for her to give them.

[25] As we might do by reading, for instance, 'concepimus' at line 125; cf. *Met.* 7.9, 17, 9.520, al.

5.2. THE PASSAGE IN RELATION TO THE 'PLOT' OF THE CORRESPONDENCE

5.2.1. The standard case for authenticity as argued by, for instance, Latta, rests in large part on the observation that certain portions of Helen's reply to Paris in *Her.* 17 appear to presuppose the existence of the disputed passage; and the simplest, though not of course the only possible, explanation of this fact is that the same poet wrote both passages. For the present purpose it seems to me that it will suffice to discuss the implications of what Latta (p. 132) rightly calls the 'Hauptstelle': 17. 115–36. In this passage Helen refers at some length and in some detail to an episode of which there is no *explicit* mention in Paris' letter outside the disputed passage: the Judgement. Two questions suggest themselves:

(i) Are the terms in which Helen refers to the Judgement only, or at all events most plausibly, explicable on the supposition that they refer to the relevant parts of 16. 39–144?

(ii) If the answer to that question is NO, can the reader be reasonably expected, in the absence of 16. 39–144, to make sense of what Helen says?

My answer to question (i) is YES; and if no suspicion attached to the disputed passage on other grounds I imagine that this, the simplest explanation, would not have been doubted. However, the question has been answered by more than one scholar, after a serious review of the evidence, with an emphatic NO; and it is therefore to question (ii) that we must turn.

5.2.2. There are in Paris' letter, apart from 16. 39–144, a number of references to the Judgement, all of a casual and allusive kind. To enable them to be evaluated they must be quoted *in extenso*:

(a) quae [sc. spes] rata sit nec te frustra promiserit opto
hoc mihi quae suasit mater Amoris iter. 16
namque ego diuino monitu, ne nescia pecces,
aduehor, et coepto non leue numen adest.
praemia magna quidem sed non indebita posco:
pollicita est thalamo te Cytherea meo. 20
hac duce Sigeo dubias a litore feci
longa Phereclea per freta puppe uias.
illa dedit faciles auras uentosque secundos;
in mare nimirum ius habet orta mari.
perstet et ut pelagi sic pectoris adiuuet aestum, 25
deferat in portus et mea uota suos.
attulimus flammas non hic inuenimus illas;
hae mihi tam longae causa fuere uiae.
nam neque tristis hiems neque nos huc appulit error;
Taenaris est classi terra petita meae. 30
nec me crede fretum merces portante carina
findere: quas habeo, di tueantur opes.
nec uenio Graias ueluti spectator ad urbes:
oppida sunt regni diuitiora mei.
te peto, quam pepigit lecto Venus aurea nostro, 35
te prius optaui quam mihi nota fores. (15–36)

This explains that Venus has promised him Helen as his bride (20, 35) and has ordered him to come to Sparta to seek her. The circumstances and occasion of

the promise are *not* explained; the words 'diuino monitu' (17) might refer to (e.g.) a dream or an oracle.

(b) praeposui regnis ego te, quae maxima quondam
pollicita est nobis nupta sororque Iouis,
dumque tuo possem circumdare bracchia collo,
contempta est uirtus Pallade dante mihi.
nec piget aut umquam stulte legisse uidebor;
permanet in uoto mens mea firma suo. (165–70)

Here we do find a reference to the Judgement: we are told that Juno offered him sovereignty, Minerva warlike prowess, but that he rejected their offers in favour of Helen's love. Nothing again is said as to circumstances or occasion, nothing as to how the goddesses came to be implicated, nothing of a competition, nothing of any *quid pro quo* on the part of Paris.

(c) nunc ea peccemus quae corriget hora iugalis,
si modo promisit non mihi uana Venus. (297–8)

This second reference to Venus' promise adds nothing to the first.

5.2.3. This then, if lines 39–144 are not an authentic part of his letter, is all that the poet has made Paris give Helen- and the reader—to go on. On that supposition, here is what Helen made of what she read:

at Venus hoc pacta est, et in altae uallibus Idae 115
tres tibi se nudas exhibuere deae,
unaque cum regnum, belli daret altera laudem,
'Tyndaridis coniunx' tertia dixit 'eris.'
credere uix equidem caelestia corpora possum
arbitrio formam supposuisse tuo; 120
utque sit hoc uerum, certe pars altera ficta est,
iudicii pretium qua data dicor ego.
non est tanta mihi fiducia corporis, ut me
maxima teste dea dona fuisse putem.
contenta est oculis hominum mea forma probari; 125
laudatrix Venus est inuidiosa mihi.
sed nihil infirmo, faueo quoque laudibus istis;
nam mea uox quare, quod cupit esse, neget?
nec tu succense nimium mihi creditus aegre:
tarda solet magnis rebus inesse fides. 130
prima mea est igitur Veneri placuisse uoluptas,
proxima me uisam praemia summa tibi;
nec te Palladios nec te Iunonis honores
auditis Helenae praeposuisse bonis.
ergo ego sum uirtus, ego sum tibi nobile regnum: 135
ferrea sim, si non hoc ego pectus amem. (17. 115–36)

Lines 115–18 sum up succinctly the scene and the essential features of the Judgement—that it was a beauty contest with Paris as sole judge—as it was known to Ovid's readers from other sources. But how, in this epistolary drama, is *Helen* supposed to know, for instance, that it took place 'in altae uallibus Idae' if she

had not read the words 'in mediae nemorosis uallibus Idae'[26] at 16.53? She appears, indeed, to know more than she has been explicitly told, for she adds a detail not in Paris' account, that the goddesses paraded before him naked. Proponents of the case for forgery have naturally enough made a good deal of what they see as a particularly revealing lapse on the part of an interpolator. Yet here again is an argument that proves nothing because it can equally well cut both ways. Would not an interpolator of the calibre we are obliged to postulate (cf. above, § 3.1) have been likely to notice the piquant detail in 'nudas' at 17.116 and retroject it into his own confection?[27] The proponent of authenticity is tempted on his part to subtlety: Helen, womanlike, leaps to conclusions where Paris had observed a decent reticence. The truth, in my view, is more prosaic and less flattering to the poet: another case of simple negligence. For once more we must ask: who has heard a voice from heaven telling us that interpolators are *necessarily* more careless than real poets?[28] (And after all the coarse voice of common sense asks: how else did Helen or anybody else in antiquity think beauty competitions could be effectively judged before the invention of the bikini?)[29]

5.2.4. On the hypothesis of interpolation Helen is represented by the poet as either clairvoyant (especially as regards the matter of the venue) or as amazingly sharp-witted, or a bit of both: certainly she can put two and two together with a vengeance. Nothing that can be gleaned from the passages cited in § 5.2.2 adds up to evidence of a competition, let alone a beauty competition; yet that this is what she instantly envisages is clear from the words 'arbitrio' at 17.120 and 'arbitrium' at 17.242. Once again both the circumstances and the word itself occur in the disputed passage:

> 'arbiter es formae: certamina siste dearum,
> uincere quae forma digna sit una duas.' (16. 69–70)

An attentive reader of *Her.* 16 and 17 whose text lacks 16. 39–144 ought to feel a sense of deficiency. That I do not postulate such a person merely to suit my argument is shown by the verses inserted in some late manuscripts, and universally acknowledged to be spurious, after 16. 168. These supply the missing fact that the occasion of the promise just mentioned was a contest with Paris as judge:

> cum Venus et Iuno Pallasque in uallibus Idae
> corpora iudicio supposuere meo.[30]

[26] This is the correct text, a change of one letter ('nemorosis' for '-us') from the reading of π. The vulgate 'in mediis nemorosae' is Francius's superfluous conjecture, on the model of *A. A.* 1.289 'forte sub umbrosis nemorosae uallibus Idae . . .'

[27] Cf. Latta, pp. 132–3.

[28] Negligence on *somebody's* part is all that 'nudas' can be made to prove; whoever wrote it did so for the same reason, that the familiar detail came so readily to mind that he quite forgot that there had been no previous allusion to it. Fischer's theory (p. 143) of two distinct versions of the story introduces quite unwarranted complications. If the double *Heroides* were written shortly before Ovid's departure into exile (cf. above, p. 396 n. 6), it is understandable that they were never carefully revised.

[29] Cf., for what they are worth, Alciphron 4.14 (1.39). 4–6, Rufinus, *A. P.* 5.35, 36 (XI, XII Page).

[30] This is what may be called the basic version: see Dörrie (1971) ad loc. The expression is modelled on 17. 119–20.

5.2.5. So we return to the question: if the poet did not mean us to suppose that Helen got these details from Paris' letter, whence did he mean us to think she got them—and, more important, *why* did he handle his material in this fashion? (It is this latter question which is largely ignored in Fischer's discussion.) From the beginning of *Her.* 16 it is clear that, though Paris is made to say that he fears he may already have given himself away (3–8), the poet's intention is that the real nature of his pretensions, what underlies them, and all that his suit implies, are to come to Helen as a complete revelation (cf. her reactions at 17. 1 ff. 'nunc oculos tua cum *uiolarit* epistula nostros' eqs.). This being so, it is both effective and logical that, after his exordium (1–40),[31] he should (if our passage is authentic) begin his speech proper—the main attempt to *convince* Helen—by a full retrospective statement of the background to his claims (41–130),[32] before proceeding to lay his heart at her feet—for what he felt before seeing her is nothing to what he feels now. In other words, whether or not 39–144 are strictly necessary—a question to which it is important to apply the appropriate standards of strictness, that is Ovidian standards—they do contribute something by no means superfluous to Paris' presentation of his case.

5.2.6. This position is not accepted by Fischer, who writes:

> Auch für den Aufbau des Parisbriefes sind die Verse wohl nicht nur nicht notwendig, sondern sogar störend. Wie wir gesehen hatten, nimmt Paris im ersten Teil seines Briefes keine Notiz davon, dass Helena schon verheiratet ist. Die Werbung, die er 171ff vorbringt, könnte an ein unverheiratetes Mädchen gerichtet sein, und selbst wenn er Menelaus darin nennt, so wie einen Mitbewerber (205ff). Erst v. 285 fasst er ins Auge, dass er Helena zum Ehebruch verleiten will, und nun fallen such die Worte 'maritus' (299) und 'vir' (316). In der Gastmahlsszene wird Menelaus dagegen nur als 'indignus ille' (215), 'rusticus' (222), 'ille' (242) bezeichnet und könnte genauso gut der Geliebte Helenas sein. Diese Linie würde durch v. 129 'vir tuus' durchbrochen (139).

This is an amazing example of the complete misreading of a text in the light of preconceived ideas. It is preposterous to suggest that the actions described in lines 205–18 of Paris' letter can be meant to refer to the behaviour of an engaged couple. Lines 215–16 'totis indignus noctibus ille/te tenet, amplexu perfruiturque tuc' are nothing to do with the banquet scene, which begins in the following verse. They refer to people going to bed together, and are not appropriate to the situation of a 'Mitbewerber', even in free-and-easy Sparta. However, even this point, though it totally disables Fischer's argument, is not the really important one. What was—to come to the second question posed above (§5.2.5)—the *literary* gain in a charade such as is here ascribed to the poet? Every schoolboy in Ovid's day knew that Menelaus and Helen were husband and wife; if the poet thought it necessary or effective for dramatic or rhetorical reasons to make Paris affect ignorance of the fact, he ought at least to have dropped a hint or two of what he was about. So far from doing that, he makes Paris, to any unprejudiced reader acquainted with the outline of the story—which means all the readers for whom he was writing—display from the very beginning an awareness, indicated allusively but unmistakably, of what might seem to be the fundamental obstacle of Helen's marital status. What else is one to make, what else could a Roman reader have been expected to make, of the expressions 'metus' (6), 'uultu . . .

[31] Not 1–38; see below, §§5.3.8, 5.4.3.

[32] Here too the rhetorical divisions of the speech do not coincide with the limits of the disputed passage; see preceding n.

duro' (11), and above all the carefully ambiguous 'pecces' (17)?[33] The matter is indeed broached with some delicacy; but well it might be. Paris could hardly appear totally oblivious of the existence of Helen's marriage, but it would have been a tactical mistake to make too much of it. By barely touching on it at the beginning of his pleading he implicitly minimizes its importance, as something which in the event he chooses to regard almost as a largely irrelevant technicality.

5.2.7. The line of argument espoused by Fischer has other awkward implications. Though on the one hand Helen, as has been said, is clearly supposed to be surprised at what Paris tells her, on the other hand she appears to be informed from some source ἔξω τοῦ δράματος about details of the Judgement which he has not seen fit to mention. These, it would seem, include everything pertinent to his mission, *except* the vital fact that it is she who is the promised prize. If that were not the case, Paris would have been declared a prohibited immigrant and refused permission to land.[34] This detail, we are asked to believe, the poet intends us to grasp that she acutely infers from his words at 16. 15–36, 165–70; and that she dovetails it without comment into her reply at 17. 118. But before receiving his letter she cannot have known it; therefore—this is what this line of argument must entail—the poet expected his readers (a) to be acquainted with a version of the story in which Helen was not named as the prize and (b) to grasp that it must have been this version which came to her ears and was all she knew until Paris revealed the one detail that implicated her.[35] Did such a version exist? If it did, what did the poet gain by exploiting it in the manner which we must attribute to him?

5.2.8. In the familiar version of the legend Helen was named as the prize.[36] There was, however, a variant in which Paris was simply promised a beautiful but unidentified bride: Apul. *Met.* 10.32.4 'nuptam . . . forma praecipuam suique consimilem'; *Scr. rer. myth.* i. 65–6 Bode 'qualemcumque uellet mulierem'. But even this variant seems to carry the implication that Paris chose Helen and that the expedition to Sparta was part of the divine plan (Bode i. 142–3; Tz. Σ Lyc. 93). The evidence, so far as it goes, does not suggest that this version would have been familiar in Ovid's time; but that is less important than the fact that the erudite reader who is supposed to be familiar with it still has to work out for himself how much even of this version had got abroad and reached Helen's ears before Paris arrived on the scene. Of course it can be countered that Helen heard some details before receiving Paris' letter and some more between reading it and writing her own. I leave such excursions into the realm of the remotely conceivable alternative to those who think them profitable; remarking merely that mystification for its own sake is entirely uncharacteristic of Ovid, in the *Heroides* or anywhere else. Ovid has his faults as a poet, but setting his readers pointless conundrums is not one of them. His manipulation of the *data* of the Acontius–Cydippe story is another matter entirely (below, §6.2).

[33] 'Ne nescia pecces' = (i) 'so that you may be under no misapprehension through ignorance'; (ii) 'so that when you sin <, as I shall now show you that you must>, you will know why.' Translators and commentators seem to have missed the play on the two senses of *pecco*: see *OLD* s.v. 1 and 3.

[34] Cf. Fischer, pp. 143–4.

[35] Fischer, p. 144.

[36] Hyginus 92; Apollod. *Epit.* 3.2; *Cypria* (Kinkel 17); Eur. *Tro.* 929–30, *Hel.* 27–9; Isoc. *Hel.* 41–2; Lucian, *Dial. deorum* 20.14; Colluthus 164–5.

5.2.9. The important question, once again, is what literary gain was to be expected from exploiting an unfamiliar variant of the story. The answer in this case can only be: What, indeed?—for if this is what the poet meant to do, one must be blunt and say that he bungled sadly. If his intention was to present Helen's reaction to Paris' (incompletely documented) advances as a brilliant feat of intuitive deduction, he has gone out of his way to make it as difficult as possible for his readers to follow and appreciate the process. In the first place lines 127 ff. of her letter certainly suggest, if they do not unequivocally prove, that her knowledge of what she is talking about derives exclusively from what Paris has written in his letter.[37] If the reader is supposed, from hints given elsewhere, to infer the contrary, he is not proffered much assistance towards that deduction. Next, on the 'Fischer' hypothesis we have a plot as follows. Helen has already heard, from unspecified sources, that Paris has been promised a beautiful bride/the most beautiful bride in the world by Venus; and she is in possession of all the essential facts of the case except one—the lucky girl's name. (In spite of this she and Menelaus have received him as a guest!)[38] Paris has now, in his letter, revealed everything that might allow her to appreciate the true state of affairs, *except* the fact (mentioned in so many words only at 16. 85–6) that *she* is the prize. This, however, Helen manages to work out for herself, and her reply takes it for granted; though she nowhere remarks that she has not been explicitly told what she is clearly prepared to accept, if not as proven fact (17. 119–22),[39] at least as the mainstay of Paris' case and the basis of a good deal of what she has to say herself in reply.

5.2.10. As *colores* go, this is pretty inept; but at least, so one would think, it offers an opportunity for some kind of *anagnorisis,* with scope for rhetorical exploitation, as with Cydippe's 'ergo te propter' eqs. (21.31). Of this, or of any similar opportunity, the poet has been curiously slow to take advantage. Preference for an obscure or sparsely attested variant of a legend is typically Alexandrian and Ovidian;[40] but it is pointless unless some sort of literary capital is made out of it. That is not the case here; if 16. 39–144 are not by the same hand as the rest of *Her.* 16 and 17, and if 16. 1–38, 145–378 represent the complete epistle as originally conceived and written, the poet has merely succeeded in mystifying and confusing his more attentive readers to no purpose.

5.2.11. Under the head of 'plot' one or two further passages deserve to be noticed. First, the words of Helen at 17. 237–40:

> fax quoque me terret, quam se peperisse cruentam
> ante diem partus est tua uisa parens;
> et uatum timeo monitus, quos igne Pelasgo
> Ilion arsurum praemonuisse ferunt.

Two objections have been made to this: (i) That what Helen says is inconsistent with what Paris has said at 16. 47–50; (ii) That 'ferunt' does not make sense.[41]

[37] Cf. Latta, pp. 134–5.

[38] On this theory the *naïveté* that the poet makes Paris attribute to Menelaus verges on idiocy. What on earth did they suppose he had come to Sparta for?

[39] Or not all at once; it is one of the delights of reading her letter to see how quickly (131 ff.) she acquiesces in what she has just affected to disbelieve.

[40] Fischer, pp. 62–3.

[41] Fischer, pp. 145–6, Reeve, p. 335.

As to (i), it is true that if Helen is supposed to refer only to 16. 47–50, the words 'uatum . . . monitus' are at least carelessly chosen, since Paris there mentions only a single *uates.* However, Paris in fact talks of prophecies in two places in his letter:

(a) territa consurgit metuendaque noctis opacae
uisa seni Priamo, uatibus ille refert.
arsurum Paridis uates canit Ilion igni:
pectoris, ut nunc est, fax fuit illa mei. (47–50)

(b) et soror effusis ut erat Cassandra capillis,
cum uellent nostrae iam dare uela rates,
'quo ruis?' exclamat; 'referes incendia tecum.
quanta per has nescis flamma petatur aquas.'
uera fuit uates: dictos inuenimus ignes,
et ferus in molli pectore flagrat amor. (121–6)

Helen in her reply telescopes both these utterances, that of the anonymous seer and of Cassandra, also called *uates,* recalling the substance of the second in words reminiscent of the first. So far from needing any special defence, this seems to me rather an elegant handling of the idea by the poet than otherwise, allowing Helen to misrepresent Paris when it suits her argument to do so.[42] That it is the poet's intention that she should be seen to be making a point, be it fair or unfair to Paris, is shown by the sharp rhetorical juxtaposition of 'Pelasgo/Ilion'.

5.2.12. As to (ii) and the question of 'ferunt', the point to be grasped is the one just made, that Helen is not *quoting* Paris but *interpreting* what he has said.[43] Paris has reported the utterances of two *uates.* The first said that Troy would burn 'Paridis . . . igni' (16. 49), the second that Paris would bring home 'incendia' (16. 123–4). Helen's words mean that she has heard people saying that what these prophecies really mean is that the Greeks will burn Troy. This Paris has not said or meant (cf. above, §5.1.6); but others have construed the words of the seers[44] in this way and are freely voicing their fears. What others? asks the sceptic. The prophecies were not uttered in secret—anybody in the fleet who was near enough could have heard Cassandra's—and were by this time common knowledge in Sparta; so much in the way of 'off-stage' assumptions we may reasonably accept, if indeed the point is worth making and answering at all. Be that as it may, Helen's words make perfect sense as a reference to the way in which people in general at Sparta were interpreting the words of the prophets. There was no occasion for

[42] Cf. T. Birt, *GGA* (1882), 839–40; Latta, pp. 130–1. Both, however, weaken their respective interpretations by taking Helen's words to refer only to one passage of Paris' letter, Birt to 121–6, Latta to 47–50.

[43] This point is clearly and persuasively made by Latta (p. 130), but apparently ignored by Fischer (p. 146).

[44] The antecedent of 'quos' at 17.239 is generally taken to be the *uates*; so, for instance, Showerman–Goold, Prévost, Ripert. *Contra* Riley: 'I fear, too, the presages of the prophets, which, they say, forewarns [*sic*] us that Ilion shall be burnt by Pelasgian flames.' 'Monitus' is next to 'quos', and it is more pointed, one would think, to say that the *words* of the seers, rather than the seers themselves, foretell. On the other hand 'monitus' as subject of 'praemonuisse' is perhaps odd writing. Did the poet write 'quibus'?: 'I fear the warnings of the seers, by which men say they have foretold . . .'

the poet to make her identify her sources more precisely; indeed the point is precisely the still vague and ill-defined nature of her apprehensions.

5.2.13. This is not the only passage in Helen's reply on which interpolationists have fastened. In this connection it is pertinent to remember that one of the faults for which Ovid is commonly, and often justifiably, criticized (and in this the author of the double *Heroides,* if it was not he, had clearly studied to improve on his model) is his habit of subordinating the interests of the artistic whole to the embellishment of its parts. That reflection is relevant to what he makes Helen say about Oenone at 17. 195–6:

> tu quoque dilectam multos, infide, per annos
> diceris Oenonen destituisse tuam.

That could not have been deduced from what Paris had seen fit to let drop at 16. 97–8. How then does she know it? Why, in this case, as she goes out of her way to reveal, she has been making enquiries:

> nec tamen ipse negas et nobis omnia de te
> quaerere, si nescis, maxima cura fuit. (197–8)

The authenticity of this couplet has been impugned,[45] and the grounds for suspicion are perhaps stronger than in the case of 16. 97–8 (above, §5.1.3); but they do not in truth seem very cogent. Let us make the assumption least favourable to the authenticity of 16. 39–144,[46] namely that both distichs are genuine. It is indeed true, as Fischer observes (p. 144), that Helen could not have gathered from Paris' actual words that Oenone had been more to him than one among the many pretenders to his hand. But the poet has attributed this natural and amusing reticence to him precisely so that he can allow Helen to pounce on it; for if there is one thing that no woman will suffer to pass at its face value it is such a casual or throwaway reference to an old flame—it is indeed the very way, as Paris ought to have known, to put any self-respecting member of the sex on her guard. The poet did not intend his readers to speculate about the source of Helen's information as to the real relationship of Oenone to Paris. What matters is that she had, somehow or other, ferreted it out; that is what shows her to be a very woman, and all the explanation we need is contained in 'diceris' at 17. 196. Footnotes are not required.

5.2.14. In that case, are not 17. 197–8 superfluous? Strictly speaking, perhaps yes; yet not entirely so, for they do add something. The words 'nec tamen ipse negas' can be read as a comment on 16. 97–8, meaning 'and you do (in fact) admit it', i.e. you admit that there was an Oenone in your life, even if you have not so far come clean about her. What follows is also not quite so pointless as some would have it. 'Et nobis' is not inappropriate after 'diceris'. Properly punctuated (as above) and read the meaning is: 'You admit it yourself and ("nec . . . et") <anyway> I have been taking some pains, you may like to know ("si nescis" = let me tell you),[47] to make enquiries about you off my own bat'. In the immediate context of Helen's feminine suspicions that is not ineffective,

[45] Fischer, pp. 116–17, repeating and amplifying the arguments of Asteroth.

[46] Fischer, p. 144.

[47] Another idiomatic phrase of which Fischer (p. 116 n. 4) makes very heavy weather. It gives pointed and perfect sense in the context.

even if it would not be missed if it had been lost. Of all the objections made by Asteroth and Fischer the only one meriting a moment's attention concerns 'tamen', characterized by Fischer, like 'tamen' at 16.39, as 'interpolatorisches Flickwerk' (p. 116). But here as elsewhere *tamen* does not have a strongly adversative force: 'nec tamen' = *οὐδέ*.[48] In sum there is nothing either in content or expression that may be seriously objected to.

5.2.15. In this part of the argument it has been my intention to show that Fischer and others who follow the same line of reasoning are going to the most extraordinary lengths[49] in order to avoid a simple supposition: that the poet followed the version of the story with which his readers were most familiar and did not expect them to perform complicated feats of interpretation based on assiduous reading between the lines. In this version Helen was named as the prize promised by Venus; of this fact and of the Judgement she must be supposed to be ignorant until the news was broken to her by Paris. Thus the content of the disputed passage is essential for the 'plot'. It has not been shown that the poet had anything to gain, in literary terms, by complicating things in the way demanded by Fischer's thesis. If on grounds other than those considered in this part of the paper 16. 39–144 are judged spurious, they must have supplanted a genuine passage in which the Judgement was described and the various circumstances with which Helen's reply shows her to be acquainted duly set forth.[50] This 'remotely conceivable alternative' I leave to others to pursue.

5.3. THE POINTS OF JUNCTURE

5.3.1. This aspect of the problem is especially teasing. It raises some questions which belong also under both the preceding heads (§§5.1, 5.2), but which may

[48] Cf. e.g. *Her.* 12.117, 16.373, 18.99; Bömer on *Met.* 6.329, 7.453; Shackleton Bailey on Cic. *Fam.* 4.12 (253).3; Roby, ii. 460, §2206, citing *inter al.* Cic. *Sen.* 13. For *ne tamen* cf. e.g. *Her.* 20.129, 213, 21.231. For *tamen* = *δέ* cf. above, p. 401 n. 23.

[49] One further point made by Fischer in this connection ought perhaps to be mentioned, since it is echoed by Reeve (p. 336 n. 5). She objects that 39–144 spoil a progression of emphasis in *Her.* 16 from past to future: 'Dieses Prinzip würde durch die Verse 43 ff und 121 ff durchbrochen, da sie schon im ersten Teil des Briefes einen Hinweis auf die Zukunft geben würden' (p. 140). In point of fact lines 149–62 (on Theseus) take the story back to a stage *before* the events hinted at in 15–36 (Venus' promise and the voyage to Sparta); then there follows another allusion to the Judgement (165–70), then reference to Helen's hoped-for reception in Troy (185–8), then events in the immediate past and the present (217–62), then Menelaus' absence (299–316), then again the anticipated triumphal reception at Troy (331–8); and these passages are interspersed with pleas, arguments, and *exempla*. It is true that the epistle ends (341 ff.), as Fischer notes (loc. cit.), with references to future events, chiefly by way of dramatic irony, but to call all this an 'illusion of a narrative progression' (Reeve, loc. cit.) seems to me greatly exaggerated. The excursus in 41 (see below, §§5.3.8, 5.4.3)–128 indeed 'puts the clock a long way back', but it is not equally true that 'the prophecies in 49 and 123–4 put [it] a long way forward' (Reeve, loc. cit.). They do admittedly in a sense carry the reader forward, but to the present; for the emphasis is less on the temporal implications of these vaticinations than on the actual state of Paris' feelings and his flippant interpretation of the apparently ominous words. It cannot be seriously maintained that they constitute a disruption of a carefully planned narrative structure. As to the digression in which they figure, I have already argued (above, §5.2.5) that towards the beginning of the epistle was the best—or at the very least a perfectly appropriate—place for it.

[50] Cf. Latta, pp. 123–4, 134–5.

most conveniently be discussed here as part of the 'juncture' problem. I do not pretend that I can answer all of them with quite the same degree of certainty and conviction that I feel elsewhere.

5.3.2. Let us first consider what happens if the passage is omitted. This is what the main tradition offers:

> ante tuos animo uidi quam lumine uultus;
> prima fuit uultus nuntia fama tui.
> credis et hoc nobis? minor est tua gloria uero,
> famaque de forma paene maligna fuit. (37–8, 145–6)

This, with the change to be discussed presently, of 'credis et' to 'crede sed', is found acceptable by Reeve: 'I am at a loss to understand what is wrong with this' (p. 335). However, it cannot be too strongly stated that the transmitted text of line 38 cannot possibly be right.[51] Reeve indeed allows that 'the juxtaposition of plural and singular *vultus* in 37–8', which lacks all rhetorical point, leaves something to be desired and considers Housman's correction 'tulit uulnus' for 'fuit uultus' 'if . . . legitimate . . . a great improvement' (p. 335 n. 1). That understates the case: either a convincing correction or (*pace* Professor Goold) the obelus is mandatory. Does Housman's correction convince? As to its legitimacy, Reeve rightly remarks that *uulnus ferre* commonly means *u. accipere*;[52] and 'tui' appears at best otiose.[53] The latter objection could be met by emending 'tui' to 'mihi' (cf. *Tr.* 2.20); so Palmer 'prima mihi uulnus nuntia fama tulit'. None of the expedients so far suggested seems to me really satisfactory, but I cannot cut the textual knot.

5.3.3. However, the textual problem cannot here be shelved, for it affects the sense of the couplet and the run of the argument. Reeve is, I think, mistaken in contending that Housman's correction 'makes no difference to the train of thought'. The transmitted text of line 38 offers a variation on the conceit in line 37: 'I knew your beauty before I ever saw it.' As a result of Housman's (or Palmer's) correction we have a new and rather more striking idea introduced by way of variation: 'I knew your beauty before I ever saw it and fell in love with the report of it.'[54] In this version of the text it is a fresh revelation of the power of Helen's beauty—it not only travels on the wings of fame, it actually enslaves men at a distance—that is followed by line 145, in which it is apparently acknowledged that she may find it difficult to credit what has just been said.

5.3.4. Accepting this text and interpretation of 37–8 as a *pis aller*, let us turn to line 145. That verse too has been under critical fire. Fischer and Reeve would both replace 'credis et' with 'crede sed'.[55] Against 'credis et hoc?' it is charged

[51] Fischer (pp. 71–2, 80 n. 2) seems not to have fully grasped this point. See Latta, p. 154 n. 16.

[52] *Rem.* 44 = *Tr.* 2.20 'uulnus opemque feret' cannot be allowed as a real instance to the contrary.

[53] Cf. Fischer, p. 72, who however exaggerates in terming 'nuntia fama tui' 'nichtssagend'.

[54] Fischer objects that 'durch die Änderung in v. 38 die Erklärung des "anté . . . animo vidi", die darin liegt, das die "fama" von Helenas Schönheit kündete, beseitigt wird und an ihre Stelle eine neue, grössere Unwahrscheinlichkeit tritt' (p. 72). This is, I think, mistaken. The correction still leaves *fama* as the agent responsible for both phenomena.

[55] 'Crede sed' was introduced into the text by Daniel Heinsius (to assist the connection of thought between 144 and 145, it should be noted: see below, §5.3.7) 'ex veteribus codicibus'; Dörrie (1971) reports it from Flor. Laur. 24, 8, a manuscript of the thirteenth century.

that the phrase 'lacks any parallel in Ovid' (Reeve, p. 334). That is true, but it is equally true, strictly speaking, of 'crede sed hoc';[56] and I do not see why it should be assumed that all uses of *credere* in Ovid must be formulaic. More important, at the risk of seeming obtuse where others detect a significant distinction, I must say that I can see no real difference in sense, emphasis, or rhetoric between the two formulations 'Do you also believe what I now tell you?' and 'But believe what I now tell you.' A question perhaps implies a slightly stronger expectation of an incredulous reaction, but the expectation itself is not removed by the change (palaeographically trivial, admittedly) of *et* to *sed*. To my ear both phrases carry the implication that it is not only what follows but also what has just preceded that is likely to occasion disbelief. That is to say (to vary slightly what was said above), there is no difference of any consequence between 'Will you believe this too?' and 'But [sc. whether or not you believe what I have just said] believe what now follows.' Fischer's contention, quoted with apparent approval by Reeve (p. 334 n. 5), that 'Liest man . . . das leicht herzustellende "crede sed", so hat man eine Beteuerungsformel, wie sie sich ähnlich bei Ovid immer wieder findet' (p. 79) would carry more weight if it had been supported by instances of such similar formulae elsewhere in Ovid.

5.3.5. What then is it that Helen is asked if she believes or, alternatively, is bidden to believe? (a) If the transmitted text of line 38 is kept (a difficult proceeding to defend): that Paris had heard of her beauty before he ever saw her. That is flattering, but not especially marvellous and totally credible. (b) If a correction on the lines of those of Housman and Palmer (and none better seems to have been suggested) be accepted: that he had fallen in love with her before he ever saw her. That is even more flattering and very remarkable; whether it is incredible admits of argument.[57] However, it can at least be said that the transition from (b) to the exaggeration which follows in 145–6 (this something that might well be thought to call for apology or extenuation) is slightly more satisfying than from (a). I should not rate it higher than that: as transitions, especially Ovidian transitions, go, neither alternative excites much admiration. In view of the uncertainty as to the correct text of line 38, judgement must be suspended; but when all possible reservations are made I cannot share the satisfaction of Fischer and Reeve with the connection of thought between 37–8 and 145–6.

5.3.6. Let us now see whether the insertion of lines 39–144 improves things. To take the second point of juncture first, we have there:

his similes uultus, quantum reminiscor, habebat
  uenit in arbitrium cum Cytherea meum.
si tu uenisses pariter certamen in illud,
  in dubio Veneris palma futura fuit. 140
magna quidem de te rumor praeconia fecit,
  nullaque de facie nescia terra tua est.

[56] *Pace* Reeve, p. 334 n. 5. His note appears to suggest that *crede sed* can be accommodated in the category ('syntactical form') *crede mihi*. The stumbling-block, however, as with *credis et*, is *hoc*; it is this which makes it difficult to classify either phrase as parenthetic-formulaic. There is 'hoc quoque si credis' at *Her.* 18.121; but see below, p. 420 n. 81.

[57] It is of course a familiar folk-tale motif: S. Thompson, *Motif-index of Folk Literature* v (Copenhagen, 1957), 333, T11, 11.1.

†nec tibi per usquam phrygia nec solis ab ortu
inter formosas altera nomen habet.
credis et hoc nobis? minor est tua gloria uero, 145
famaque de forma paene maligna tua est. (137–46)

140 dubio *Bersmann*: dubium π 143 par . . . Phrygiae *Naugerius*

At lines 135 ff. Paris records his emotions at the first sight of Helen: he can only compare her with Venus—indeed if she had entered the lists on Mount Ida it would have been touch and go! The reports of her beauty had represented her as without a peer in the whole wide world;[58] but they fell so far short of the reality that they libelled her. The hyperboles of 137–40 and 141–6 are closely connected. Helen was said by all to be the most beautiful woman in the world; if that commendation failed to do her justice it can only be because her beauty is divine. The development of the argument is in effect circular:

(A) Only a comparison with Venus is adequate to describe your beauty. (137–40).
(B) They said that you were the most beautiful woman in the world (141–4).
(A′) Fame maligned you, for the reality outdoes the report (145–8).

(A) and (A′), referring to the superhuman actuality of Helen's loveliness, frame (B), referring to the merely human standards applied to it by common fame. The transition from 144 to 145 is smooth, both logically (given the hyperbolical premisses) and rhetorically satisfying: 'minor . . . gloria' picks up the 'magna . . . praeconia' of 141 much more effectively and appropriately than it does the 'fama' (not 'magna fama') of 38.[59] There remains 'credis et hoc?' Of the two connected hyperboles (A) is a statement of opinion, (B) of (alleged) fact. It is perhaps (A) that might have caused Helen to murmur that, really, he was laying it on a bit thick;[60] but either is sufficiently exaggerated to provoke a reaction of (mock-)modesty masquerading as scepticism. Since the phrase occurs at the transition from (B) to (A′), it might be expected that its function is to assist that transition, so that it would seem that it is (B) to which an incredulous response is anticipated.

[58] That must be the gist of lines 141–4. I do not challenge Reeve's view (p. 336 n. 3) that my own attempt at emendation (Kenney, pp. 179–81) does not dispose of all the difficulties; but I cannot agree with him that 143–4 'could . . . be deleted without damage to the sense'. Lines 141–2 only state that the fame of her beauty was everywhere; 143–4 make the clinching point that it was unrivalled, which is not the same thing. Reeve also objects that my '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".' I should not go to the stake for my suggestion, but I do not think Reeve's argument invalidates it; for a parallel to the compendious phraseology 'nec *tibi* par <est>', sc. in the matter of fame, one need look no further afield than line 141 'magna quidem *de te* rumor praeconia fecit', sc. in the matter of beauty. In each case the pronominal reference is expanded and clarified in what follows.

[59] Cf. Birt, *GGA* (1882), 841.

[60] '. . . plump und übertrieben' comments Fischer (p. 80), comparing Prop. 2.2. 13–14; but that does not prove it to be spurious. Paris' 'quantum reminiscor' too she finds 'nicht eben geschmackvoll' (p.81). But good taste was never Ovid's strongest suit; and is not a stroke of wit intended? The recollection of Venus' beauty, overwhelming at the time, deserts him at the first sight of Helen: 135 'ut uidi, *obstipui*' eqs.

5.3.7. I see nothing wrong with that, but we must ask whether 'crede sed'—proposed originally to improve the connection of thought here and not between 38 and 145[61]—helps matters. Reeve, pointing to 'quidem . . . sed' at 131–4, ingeniously argued that 'the author of *quidem* in 141 read *crede sed hoc*' (334). Even if 39–144 are genuine, 'quidem' at 141 may still be legitimately invoked in support of 'sed' at 145;[62] and I think the case for a change rests primarily on this argument. For I do not believe that 'crede sed', whatever it may do for the rhetoric, really helps the connection of thought, any more than it did between 38 and 145. Again, it is prudent to suspend judgement on the textual questions; even so, the transition here seems to me quite perceptibly more satisfactory than it is with 39–144 omitted. From 144 to 145 there is a smooth connection, and there is in 137–44 a good deal more for Helen to be incredulous about than in what immediately precedes line 38.

5.3.8. Now for the first point of juncture:

ante tuos animo uidi quam lumine uultus;
  prima fuit uultus nuntia fama tui.
nec tamen est mirum †si sicut opporteat arcu
  missilibus telis eminus ictus amo.
sic placuit fatis, quae ne conuellere temptes,
  accipe cum uera dicta relata fide. (37–42)

39 *sic* π: oportet ab *Heinsius*: sic cum polleat arcus *Housman*

As in the passage just discussed, the question is bedevilled by the state of the text. Lines 39–40 present another apparently insoluble problem; at least I am not convinced by any correction hitherto proposed. However, I see no good reason to excise the lines, as suggested by Latta (p. 154 n. 17). When allowance is made for corruption, the general tenor of the couplet fits the context well enough as some sort of comment on what has just been said.[63] Whatever is done with 39–40, apart from deletion, hardly helps with the interpretation of 'sic placuit fatis' eqs. at 41–2. Fischer objects to this as 'ein recht floskelhafter Abbruch des Lobs von Helenas Schönheit; nach der Erwähnung einer Wunde, die allein die Kunde von ihrer Schönheit verursachte, erwartet man[64] irgendeine abschliessende Steigerung, eine Weiterführung des in "vulnus" anklingenden Bildes' (p. 72). That is more than a little arbitrary. The phrase makes admirable sense as a comment, not just on what has immediately preceded, but on the whole import of lines 15–38, on Venus' promise and Paris' infatuation with a woman he has never seen.[65] All this is part of the pattern decreed by the fates,

[61] Cf. above, p. 411 n. 55. Daniel Heinsius seems to have been in no doubt as to the authenticity of 39–144; his note on 'crede sed' reads merely 'magis arridet'.

[62] Fischer's argument here (p. 138) overlooks 'quidem . . . sed' at 131–4; as Reeve implies (p. 334 n. 4), it is difficult to see any difference. The sense is equivalent to a concessive clause: 'Though Menelaus showed me everything, yet what I really wanted to see . . .'; 'Great as was the fame of your beauty, yet it was outdone by the reality'. Cf. Bömer on *Met.* 6.679.

[63] Fischer, following Asteroth, objects to the connection given by 'nec tamen' as 'logisch schief' (p. 71). Cf. however above, p. 410 n. 48.

[64] On this kind of argument cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Erinnerungen 1848–1914* (Leipzig, 1928), p. 222: 'Aristoteles . . . dem das Buch [*Ath. Pol.*] abgesprochen war, nach der nicht selten befolgten Methode: "ich habe mir's anders gedacht, also ist es nicht das richtige".'

[65] Cf. Latta, p. 154 n. 17.

with which Helen is pompously warned not to try to interfere. On this interpretation the connection of thought between lines 38 and 39 (41) is quite satisfactory—appreciably more so than between 38 and 145.

5.3.9. To sum up this part of the discussion: under the head of points of juncture I do not think that any objection of real moment can be made against the authenticity of 16. 39–144. Indeed the balance of argument seems to me to incline the other way, in favour of the necessity of the passage for a satisfactory connection of thought. The unresolved textual cruces on either side of the points of juncture necessarily leave behind them a residuum of doubt, but I do not think they invalidate the other considerations developed in the preceding paragraphs.

5.4. THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE AND THE 'COINCIDENCE'

5.4.1. Having established that the internal evidence offered by the text itself affords no substantial grounds for doubting the authenticity of *Her.* 16. 39–144, we may turn to the external evidence: the circumstances, that is, under which the passage appears in the tradition of the *Heroides.* Here nearly all that needs to be said will be found in Dörrie's monograph,[66] supplemented by my comments and the outline stemma offered in my review (*Gnomon* 33 (1961), 483–4). Briefly: The ancestor of our existing manuscripts of the *Heroides* survived the Dark Ages complete. From it derived an early Carolingian copy, itself complete (Π); this survived, apparently unnoticed, down to the year 1477, when it was used (selectively, in the manner of the times) by Corallus as the source for 16. 39–144 and 21. 145–248. These passages were missing in the main tradition because they had disappeared not long after Π was copied, and the reason for their disappearance is not hard to conjecture.[67] 21. 145–248 stand at the very end of the text and were therefore especially vulnerable. 16. 39–144 (= 106 verses) represent the loss of a bifolium from a codex containing *c.* 26 verses to the page.[68]

5.4.2. This is all plain sailing. The real problem is that emphasized by Fischer and Reeve: the fact that (as they interpret the evidence) the portion of text

[66] Dörrie (1960), ii. 377–9.

[67] Fischer's scepticism on this head is unfounded and appears to rest in part on a misunderstanding of the historical facts. It is untrue that at the time of the presumed losses (and the loss of 21. 15–144 must have occurred not much later) the tradition of the *Heroides* was 'ziemlich breit' (Fischer, p. 133). It was only from the twelfth century onwards that Ovid's poems began to circulate widely: see S. Tafel, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids Carmina amatoria. Verfolgt bis zum 11. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 1910), pp. 66–72. To account for the state of affairs here outlined we are required to postulate the existence of no more than three Carolingian manuscripts of the *Heroides* apart from the surviving P (see my stemma, *Gnomon,* loc. cit.); and the interval between the re-emergence of the *Heroides* from oblivion and the genesis of the manuscript which, lacking 16. 39–144, 21. 145–248, and 15–144, was the source of the entire main tradition must have been quite short.

[68] It is unrealistic to attempt greater precision; cf. Reeve's justified scepticism (p. 335 n. 2) about Luck's reconstruction of the archetype. Fischer's objection (pp. 82, 133) that to calculate the lost verses as a multiple of a typical Carolingian page takes no account of a possible lacuna after line 50 (postulated, incidentally, by Scaliger, not Bentley) and perhaps also another after 88, carries no weight. A moment's thought suffices to show that those losses have no necessary connection with the loss of the passages discussed here and could have occurred at any time in the previous history of the text.

contained in the postulated lost bifolium should have been one which, when it disappeared, left no perceptible gap behind it; was, that is to say, self-contained in sense and neatly detachable from the rest.[69] In this connection two questions suggest themselves: (i) Is the coincidence quite so striking as is suggested? Are 39–144, that is to say, so completely self-contained as has been argued or assumed? (ii) Whatever the precise degree or dimension of the coincidence, does it outweigh the difficulties of the alternative hypothesis of falsification, notably that of the figure of the interpolator himself?

5.4.3. As to (i), I recur to a point touched on above (§5.3.8): that lines 39–40, allowing for textual corruption, make sense only as a comment on what has preceded. They do not pave the way for what follows, and indeed would not be missed if they were not there, though that in itself is not a reason for deleting them. In other words, the retrospective digression contained in our disputed passage begins at line 41 not 39; and 39–40 belong in sense to the generally transmitted part of the epistle and not to the argument developed by the postulated forger. Nor can they be explained by a desire on his part to provide a plausible transition from the genuine text to his own fabrication, for that they fail to do; as far as that goes they are something of an embarrassment, serving if anything to obscure the point of 'sic placuit fatis' eqs. at line 41. In other words, so far as the passage can be said to be detachable (a matter on which I have tried to cast doubt on other grounds: above, §5.3), it is 41–144 and not 39–144 of which this can be said. To this extent the enormity of the postulated coincidence may be regarded as diminished. As to (ii), consideration of this point is best deferred until the disputed passage of *Her.* 21 has also been discussed.

5.5. THE LENGTH OF *HEROIDES* 16

One substantial difficulty, of a literary order, remains to be faced. If we accept that 39–144 are genuinely part of Paris' epistle, its total length, making no allowance for possible lacunae after lines 50 and possibly 88,[70] is 378 verses. That would make it by far the longest of the double letters (17, 268; 18, 218; 19, 210; 20, 242; 21, 248); and the leisurely epic amplitude of the retrospective narrative in 39–144, even if its digressive function in the 'plot' of the correspondence can be defended (cf. above, §5.2.5), is at least very curious.[71] Impossible,[72] however,

[69] Fischer, pp. 81–2; 133 'Ein nur zufälliger, so verblüffend passender Textausfall ist kaum glaublich'; Reeve, p. 335, 'unless there is something wrong with [the connection of thought between 38 and 145], the accidental loss of 39–144 would be a coincidence so enormous as not to be worth contemplating.' The point had of course been taken before, e.g. by Kraus, pp. 63, 66.

[70] Scaliger was almost certainly right to suspect that something has been lost after 50. It is strange, in this so ample treatment of the story, to find no mention of Paris' exposure and nurture by shepherds; and as it stands line 51 is very abrupt. The lost portion need not have amounted to more than half a dozen verses. Cf. Latta, p. 157 n. 26. The case for a lacuna after line 88 is less clear; see Fischer, p. 75. Cf. above, p. 418 n. 68.

[71] Cf. Kraus, pp. 65–6. The comparison with the narrative insertions of the single letters, adduced by Kraus, *RE* 18 (1942), 1926, in support of authenticity and disallowed by Fischer (pp. 147–9), seems to me largely irrelevant; the double epistles must be judged in their own right. Much of Fischer's argument is disabled by what seems to me this fallacy.

[72] As argued by (e.g.) M. Pulbrook, *Hermath.* 122 (1977), 43 n. 9.

it can hardly be called. I do not see how it can be categorically asserted that Ovid, with the *Metamorphoses* currently in hand, might not have been tempted to indulge in 'eine Erzählung um der Erzählung willen' (Fischer, p. 149), when the material was so rich and attractive.[73] Ovid, after all, has gone down to posterity as the poet who did not know where to stop. But in any event 'Erzählung um der Erzählung willen' goes too far; Kraus, who characterizes the narrative as 'stilistisch den gelungsten Partien in Ovids erzählenden Dichtungen ebenbürtig', has rightly drawn attention to the 'tragic irony' of Paris' misinterpretation of the prophecies.[74] The general quality of the writing of 16. 39–144, rising at times to brilliance, suggests Ovid if it suggests anybody. Rand commented that, if *Heroides* 16–21 are not by Ovid, 'an *ignotus* has beaten him at his own game'.[75] If 39–144 are not by the poet of the rest of the epistle, we have a second unknown, *ignoto ignotior*; but further discussion of this enigmatic figure had better be postponed.

6. 21. 145–248

6.1. PARTICULAR ANOMALIES

6.1.1.

decipe sic alios: succedat epistula pomo;
si ualet hoc, magnas ditibus aufer opes.
fac iurent reges sua se tibi regna daturos,
sitque tuum toto quicquid in orbe placet.
maior es hoc ipsa multum, mihi crede, Diana,
si tua tam praesens littera numen habet. (145–50)

145 alias *edd.* 146 hoc *edd.*: hic π ditibus *Heinsius*: diuitis π 149 hoc *Francius*: ac π

In line 145 π's 'alios' should be kept: Cydippe, in her last desperate attempt to convince herself (cf. below, §6.3) that Acontius must be bluffing, puts the case generally. On 149–50 Fischer comments

[73] Evidently he used in the *Metamorphoses* material that could not conveniently be accommodated in the *Heroides* and that was too good to waste. Thus the storm which, as appears from the comparison of Musaeus with Virgil (*G.* 3. 259–62), must have been the centre-piece in his source for Hero and Leander, was transferred to the Ceyx and Alcyone episode in *Met.* 11 (see Pohlenz, *Hermes* 48 (1913), 7–8). Conversely it is equally plausible that good material which did not fit the final plan for the *Metamorphoses* might have been used in *Her.* 16–21. I should not rule out of court the idea that 16.39–144 represent an authorial *expansion* of an originally briefer treatment; cf. Kraus, p. 66. I am not, however, convinced by Reeve's variation on this idea: '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' (p. 337 n. 1). This argument depends on the premiss that *Her.* 16. 1–38, 145–378 can be described as a 'finished poem', which I deny.

[74] '. . . durch sie wird ganz in der Weise, die wir auch in den Einzelbriefen gefunden haben, eine Perspektive auf den Ausgang der Geschichte eröffnet; in ihrer Missdeutung durch Paris liegt eine tragische Ironie, durch die die Verblendung der Leidenschaft ins Licht gesetzt wird' (Kraus, p. 66; for reservations as to the relevance of the single epistles cf. above, p. 416 n. 71). On the immediately humorous effect of Paris' misinterpretation see above, §§5.1.2, 5.1.6.

[75] E. K. Rand, *Ovid and his influence* (London, 1926), p. 27.

Das Distichon . . . treibt die Ironie auf die Spitze: Wenn sein Brief so wirksam ist, ist Acontius mächtiger als Diana selbst. Dabei wird ignoriert, dass ja im Fall von Cydippes Schwur Diana der Eidesformel die Wirksamkeit verleiht, und einem eventuellen Brief des Acontius ein eigenes 'numen' zugeschrieben. Stillschweigend wird durch diese deductio ad absurdum auch die Behauptung, Diana setze sich für die Erfüllung von Cydippes Versprechen ein, in den Bereich des Unmöglichen gerückt (p. 188).

This is another example of hypercriticism, and misses the point. Cydippe indeed expresses herself hyperbolically, but what she says in quite logical. If Acontius can really get anybody to bind himself by an oath in this way, then he is indeed more powerful than Diana, or than any other deity,[76] for they become mere instruments in his hands. The premiss of Acontius' proceedings, of the whole story in fact, is that the goddess had no choice but to act as she did; she was not concerned with the merits of the case, only with the exact fulfilment of an oath. In that sense she is not a free agent, and Acontius is in truth 'greater' than she. Naturally Cydippe, arguing for *uoluntas* against *scriptum,*[77] denies the validity of the premiss, but her pleading on this point is fore-ordained to be fruitless.

6.1.2. cum tamen haec dixi, cum me tibi firma negaui,
cum bene promissi causa peracta mei est,
confiteor, timeo saeuae Letoidos iram
et corpus laedi suspicor inde meum. (151–4)

Fischer raises two difficulties (pp. 188–9): (i) The syntax; (ii) The sense of 'suspicor'. (i) The perfect indicatives 'dixi . . . negaui . . . peracta est' must be temporal, which will not do, since a concessive sense is required. As an example of a passage where 'eine zeitliche Sukzession sinvoll ist' she cites *Am.* 3.8. 5–8:

cum pulchre dominae nostri placuere libelli,
quo licuit libris, non licet ire mihi;
cum bene laudaui, laudato ianua clausa est:
turpiter huc illuc ingeniosus eo.

Unfortunately for Fischer's argument this is a perfect parallel to our construction. In both passages the 'adversatives Verhältnis', desiderated by her as essential to the sense here, is present: *though* the poet's work has pleased, *yet* he is not admitted; *though* Cydippe has pleaded her case so stoutly, *yet* she has not convinced herself. Context, not the 'rules' of school grammar, determines interpretation in such cases.[78] (ii) 'Suspicor' is seen as inconsistent with lines 7 ff., 43 ff. of her own letter and 109 ff. of Acontius', from which it is clear that she knows quite well why she is ill. But a careful reading shows that so far she has not committed herself to a complete and unqualified acceptance of Acontius'

[76] It would be of the essence of the strategy to ensure that the god or goddess chosen suited the circumstances and would be respected by the victim. Diana was appropriate in Cydippe's case because the trick was worked in her sanctuary and women used to swear by her.

[77] Kenney, *Philol.* 111 (1967), 225–6 = *Arion* 9 (1970), 400–2.

[78] The distinction between *cum* + indic. and *cum* + subj. is not always as rigid as some standard authorities (e.g. H.–S. pp. 624–5) would lead one to suppose: cf. Roby, p. 321, §§1731 (Plautus and Terence), 1735 (Cicero: esp. *Ad fam.* 6.14.1); K.–S. ii. 349. A possible alternative is to take the perfects as frequentative: 'As often as I say all this, as often as I reject your suit, as often as I plead my case to my own satisfaction, <yet each time I end up>, I must admit, fearing . . . and suspecting . . .'; but the close parallel with the *Amores* passage makes this interpretation less likely than the other.

explanation of her illness; reservation is always implied.[79] Lines 133–50 are a valiant, last-ditch attempt to prove not only that Acontius' reliance on her oath is unfounded but also that Diana herself cannot have regarded it as valid because of the circumstances in which it was taken. At 151–4 she then admits that, for all her confident language, this pleading in equity is of no avail and that she herself does not really believe what she is saying. The emphasis in line 154 is less on 'suspicor' than on 'inde', and the verb must be read as inceptive: 'I begin to believe that it is indeed Diana's anger that must be the source of my sickness'.

6.1.3. Fischer remarks of 157–72 that 'Das lebendige Bild, das hier gezeichnet wird, leidet unter sprachlichen Mängeln' (p. 189), and Reeve describes 159–70 as 'incoherent' (p. 336 and n. 6). I will try to deal with the several problems in turn.

uixque manu pigra totiens infusa resurgunt
lumina, uix moto corripit igne faces. (159–60)

160 porrigit *Diggle*

'For 'infusa . . . lumina' = 'poured over', i.e. 'filled', Diggle (*PCPS* 18 (1972), 38) cites only Greek analogies, which cannot entirely satisfy. This sense of *infundo* seems to be acceptable Latin, though unexpected for Ovid: the examples cited by *OLD* s.v. 2 are from technical writers, Vitruvius and Columella.[80] 'Infusa' must at least be registered as a stylistic curiosity. Diggle's 'porrigit', approved by Goold (p. 479), though not printed in Showerman–Goold, is elegant and may be right. But even if, which does not seem to be the case, the couplet were textually past praying for, it must be repeated that the odd persistent crux is not a compelling argument against the bona fides of the whole. (Cf. below, §§6.1. 10–14.)

6.1.4. saepe coronatis stillant unguenta capillis
et trahitur multo splendida palla croco. (161–2)

Reeve asks (p. 336 n. 6) how 'saepe' here is to be reconciled with 'ter' at line 157. A good question; but the real difficulty, I believe, goes deeper. The word might be emended, for instance to 'rite' or to an adjective agreeing with 'unguenta'. But do we want this couplet at all? The grammatical subject of 157–69, 163–6, is Hymenaeus; as Fischer notes (pp. 189–90), lines 161–2 interrupt this simple syntactical structure. That Hymenaeus wore a *palla* of the appropriate colour and that his head was garlanded and anointed is all but stated in 165–8; and 161–2, though undeniably decorative and good in themselves, are superfluous. They appear to have been fabricated, or more probably, given their quality, intruded from another poet, to provide a reference for 'cultus' in line 164 by somebody who did not see that it refers forward and is explained by what immediately

[79] At line 9 the words 'utque cupis credi' refer to and modify the sense of the whole passage; the verse only restates and varies what has just preceded. At 31 ff. the questions with which she begins her letter proper ('*ergo* te propter . . .' marking the start of the argument) colour what follows: her account of her attacks of illness is, so to say, apodotic to the unspoken protasis 'if it is as you say . . .'. The words of line 53 'causa latet' show that at this point of the letter she still does not accept implicitly what Acontius had told her at 20. 109 ff. Cf. Bopp, p. 100.

[80] *TLL* s.v. 1509. 31–6 also cites Phaedrus 3.13.9 (doubtful) and Martial 5.64.1 (irrelevant).

follows. Interpolated couplets in the *Heroides* are not so uncommon[81] that the critic need feel undue hesitation in invoking the remedy of limited deletion on occasion.

6.1.5. et pudet in tristi laetum consurgere turba,
quique erat in palla transit in ora rubor. (167–8)

This couplet was transposed to follow 163–4 by G. Meynck;[82] an attractive suggestion, for it is more natural for the god's reaction of shame to follow directly upon his entry and precede the gestures of renunciation into which it is translated. In line 167 'consurgere' is rightly challenged by Reeve (p. 336 n. 6);[83] Burman's 'consistere', 'hold his ground', gives adequate if unexciting sense. In any case the couplet seems to pose no insoluble problems.

6.1.6. numquid, in umbroso cum uelles fonte lauari,
imprudens uultus ad tua labra tuli
praeteriiue tuas de tot caelestibus aras
aue mea spreta est uestra parente parens? (177–80)

180 aue *Bentley*: atque π: aque *Bersmann* spreta est uestra *Kenney*:[84] est spreta nostra π

Fischer objects (p. 190) that the reference to Niobe, which takes up Acontius' words at 20. 105–6, 'hat wenig Sinn', since what Cydippe ought to be demonstrating is not that her mother does not belong in the catalogue of sinners but that she herself does not. This is captious and superficial. Cydippe is in the same position as Niobe's children, that of innocent victim, and that is the point of her reproachful question. Acontius has said (20. 99–100): 'nihil est uiolentius illa [Diana] /cum sua, quod nolim, numina laesa uidet'. Cydippe retorts that neither she nor anybody belonging to her 'numen laesit'. Acontius equates the non-observance of her involuntary oath with *laesum numen*; this view of the matter Cydippe—and it is the essence of what case she has—obstinately refuses to accept. For obvious reasons her reply is couched obliquely, but senseless it cannot possibly be called.

6.1.7. nil ego peccaui nisi quod periuria legi. (181)

Both Fischer (p. 190) and Reeve (p. 336 and n. 8) object to 'periuria legi'. It is indeed a striking brachylogy, but it does not seem to me to be either bad Latin or bad logic. Cydippe did not *utter* what Acontius is pleased to call her perjury, she *read* it: a condensed but in the context perfectly intelligible variation of line

[81] Not all the candidates for deletion listed by Goold, p. 479, deserve it, but others could be added, e.g. 4. 4–5 (Peters), 10. 85–6 (Bentley). A clear case in the double *Heroides* would seem to be 18. 119–21: see Housman, *CR* 11 (1897), 427–8 = *Classical Papers*, pp. 414–15.

[82] Not by Merkel (*sic* Showerman–Goold), who indeed omitted both our passages in his edition.

[83] Perhaps it is not totally indefensible: if Hymenaeus is figured, *more Ovidiano*, as both hymn and personified god, then it might be apt for him 'to rise joyfully'. However, the conceit, though not in itself too far-fetched for Ovid, would be abruptly introduced; and though Latin can say *clamor tollitur*, it does not appear that either *surgere* or *consurgere* is attested in such a sense. Perhaps there has been inopportune scribal reminiscence of Catull. 62.1.

[84] Kenney, pp. 182–3. I am flattered by Dörrie's ascription of this conjecture to Bentley. I owe it to myself to reclaim it, for it is printed by Showerman–Goold without any ascription at all.

143 'non ego iuraui, legi iurantia uerba'.[85] One may perhaps compare 135 'quae iurat mens est: nil coniurauimus illa', where emendations have been proposed;[86] but in a letter Dr. Timpanaro comments 'io sono convinto che *coniuravimus* e un uso linguistico ardito, sì, ma genuino. "Con là mente io non ho partecipato al giuramento".' Here I would paraphrase: 'If I have become forsworn, it is only by *reading* an oath'; she does not have to explain all over again that her words were spoken without intention, for she has said that at some length already (135–43). All she wishes to repeat now, as succinctly as possible, is that her offence against the goddess, if offence it be, is a purely technical one.

6.1.8. ingemit et tacito suspirat pectore meque
offensam, quamuis non mereatur, habet.
ei mihi, quod gaudes et te iuuat †ista uoluptas,
ei mihi, quod sensus sum tibi fassa meos.
†at mihi linga [*sic*] foret tu nostra iustius ira,
qui mihi tendebas retia, dignus eras. (201–6)

203–4 ei . . . ei *Gronouius*: si . . . si π 203 ista uoluntas *J. F. Heusinger*: ipsa uoluntas *Dilthey*: ista simultas *Heinsius* 205 at] tu *Diggle* linga] siqua *Bentley*

The joint version of line 205 by Bentley and Diggle ('tu mihi, siqua foret, tu . . .') satisfies Fischer (p. 191 'bestechend') but not Austin and Reeve (*Maia* 22 (1970), 8). They are in my view right to question the relevance of the distinction drawn by Diggle (*CQ* N.S. 17 (1967), 143–4) between Cydippe's feelings towards her official lover and towards Acontius. The rhetoric of her argument calls for her to say: 'I am angry with him, though he is blameless; it is *you* that I ought to be angry with'; and 'siqua', neat though it is,[87] spoils the point. It seems best to obelize the first part of the verse. Nor is the position much better in line 203. The transmitted text means 'alas . . . that you are pleased by that pleasure of yours', sc. that you feel on hearing about my sentiments towards the young man; but that is both elliptical[88] and tautologous. Of the suggested emendations only Heinsius's 'simultas' seems to me to give really good sense, but with it or, if that be preferred, with 'uoluntas', the further change of 'ista' to 'illa' is required.[89] Again the obelus seems safest. However, though the context here is corrupt, the corruptions are localized, the drift of the argument is clear, and the general quality of the writing not inferior to the rest.

6.1.9. scribis ut inualidum liceat tibi uisere corpus:
es procul a nobis, et tamen inde noces.
mirabar quare tibi nomen Acontius esset:
quod faciat longe uulnus acumen habes.
certe ego conualui nondum de uulnere tali,
ut iaculo scriptis eminus icta tuis. (207–12)

[85] Reeve (loc. cit.) also points to 110 'insidias legi, magne poeta, tuas', suggesting that 181 is 'an over-ambitious adaptation' of that verse.

[86] *nil tum iurauimus* Flor. Laur. 36, 2: *nil nos i.* Bentley: *sed nil i.* Palmer.

[87] It is printed by Showerman–Goold.

[88] Cf. Prévost's expanded version: 'que cette joie perverse te soit voluptueuse'.

[89] Cf. Fischer, p. 191, rightly insisting that 'ista' ought to mean 'this/that of yours'. Showerman–Goold's version of 'ista uoluntas' as 'that state of my will' is not very satisfactory; it entails accepting the explanation of van Lennep, approved by Palmer, that *uoluntas*, which generally bears a good sense when used absolutely = 'disposition', here takes its colour from 'offensam' in the preceding verse. That seems forced; and the difficulty of 'ista' remains.

Fischer takes exception to the quality of the word-play in this passage: 'Das Bild, Acontius habe Cydippe eine Wunde geschlagen, passt nicht recht auf ihre Krankheit, es wäre für eine Liebeswunde angebracht' (p. 192). Her objection, however, is based on a false premiss. It is true that in Callimachus the conceit appears to have been applied in the familiar way (fr. 70 Pf., Aristaen. 1.10. 14–17 Mazal). That is no reason why a later poet should not exploit it differently and less obviously, as Ovid in fact does in both epistles (cf. 20. 231–2 ~ Callim. loc. cit.). Indeed it would be absurd for Cydippe, who has not yet admitted, and never does in so many words admit, to being in love with Acontius,[90] to be allowed to apply it in the usual way. All she will admit to is that she is ill on his account, that she is injured by him, not that she is smitten with his charms. Nor can I agree with Fischer that the manner of the poet's variation is 'ungeschickt'. Far from it: he has introduced a new point (!) by a play, unavailable in Greek, on the literal and figurative senses of the word *acumen* (missed by the translators): 210 'acumen habes' = 'you are sharp by name and sharp by nature', alluding of course to the low cunning of his trick with the quince. Reeve finds fault (p. 336 and n. 9) with 'tali' in line 211, but I cannot see what is wrong with it. The argument runs as follows (pp. 209 ff.): 'I used to wonder why you were called Acontius. (Now I know:) you have about you a "sharpness" that can deal wounds at long range. Look at me, not yet recovered from just such a wound, smitten by your writing as if by a dart.' Where is the difficulty? Would any objection have been made to the phrase if it had occurred anywhere but in this passage?

6.1.10. From line 227 to the end of the epistle, the second passage labelled by Reeve (p. 336 and n. 7) as 'incoherent', we encounter a succession of serious difficulties of text and interpretation. Before discussing individual passages, two general points need to be made. (i) Some of the objections raised in particular by Fischer stem from a false premiss: that the poet must have followed Callimachus' version of the story in all or most of its details. That this is not the case I shall argue in the next section on the 'plot' of the correspondence (§6.2). (ii) The fact that the state of the text becomes palpably and progressively worse towards the end of the epistle is a consideration that, if anything, speaks for rather than against authenticity. At any rate it is consistent with the hypothesis that lines 227–48 were written on the last page(s) of a roll[91] or codex which was exposed to more than its fair share of physical abuse. The writing on this page may have been severely damaged by damp or abrasion at an early date, long before Π was copied from it. If so, it is small wonder that the copyist of Π produced, and the compositor of π reproduced, a small forest of cruces.

6.1.11. sed tamen aspiceres uellem prout ipse rogabas
et discas sponsae languida membra tuae. (227–8)

prout] uelut *Francius*: quod et *Bentley*

[90] Editors, including most recently and unfortunately Showerman–Goold, attribute such a feeling to her in the concluding couplet by printing the unnecessary correction 'coniungere' (Ald.[1]) for π's 'contingere'. See Kenney, pp. 183–4, Fischer, p. 196 (approving).

[91] The worst damage to the end of the epistle may have been done in antiquity. I do not think this very likely, but the possibility cannot be ruled out.

I do not report all the attempts to mend these and the following lines, which are conveniently assembled by Fisher (p. 198). It may well be the case that, as Goold suggests, only strong measures will serve. He proposes (p. 483) 'assideas utinam . . . et uideas', and prints this text, with Bentley's 'quod et',[92] in his revision of Showerman. Whether or not that is what the poet wrote, it is good crisp Latin and shows that the crux is not insoluble even if it cannot be called solved. As in other such cases the general sense of the couplet, in spite of the corruption, is clear and appropriate. The objection taken by Fischer (p. 193) and Reeve (p. 336 n. 7) to 'sponsae' seems to me—I am sorry to have to keep on using the word—captious. Of course she is not yet officially Acontius' betrothed, and that is just the point. The word is uttered in irony and resignation: 'Your "betrothed", as you call me and as I suppose I must now call myself.'[93] Ought the poet to have added a footnote?

6.1.12. ne tamen ignores, ope qua reualescere possim
quaeritur a Delphis fata canente deo.
et quoque nescio quantum nunc uaga fama susurat
neglectam queritur testis habere fidem. (231–4)

There is no difficulty about the general sense of the passage and its propriety to the argument once it is grasped that Ovid, for good reasons, has allowed himself some licence in adapting the story as he found it to the 'plot' of the correspondence. As Cydippe writes, the embassy to Delphi is still in progress (cf. below, §6.2). Objections to the sense of 'quaeritur' therefore fall to the ground and the text of lines 231–4 may be accepted as π gives it.[94] Punctuation is called for after 'ignores' to make the sense clear: 'And, to keep you fully informed, <let me tell you that> even now enquiries are being made as to how I may regain my health . . .'.[95] The difficulties of 233–4 are less tractable, but again the general sense, once Callimachus is left out of account as irrelevant, is clear. Cydippe's father has not yet returned, but rumour has outstripped him, bringing the vague but ominous report that the god is complaining of broken faith on somebody's part. The text is too corrupt for any but attempts *exempli gratia* at restoration. I offer two:

(a) is quoque nescioquem, quantum uaga fama susurrat,
neglectam queritur testis habere fidem.

233 is *Heinsius ex uno cod.* nescioquem *Fisher* nunc *del. Kenney*

'Apollo too, <himself> a witness, complains, so far as wandering rumour whispers, that somebody has omitted and is still omitting to keep faith.' *Pace* Fisher (p. 203), Apollo may quite properly be described as witness to a vow made to his sister on his own sacred island; and this solution has the double merit of

[92] It is not in fact clear to me that this is really preferable to Francius's 'uelut'.

[93] Cf. Bopp, p. 143.

[94] Fischer predictably calls 'tamen' 'sinnlos' (p. 194); cf. above, p. 401 n. 23, p. 410 n. 48.

[95] *Pace* Fischer (p. 194), this can be indicated by a comma just as well as by a colon (Dörrie), perhaps better. The fact that 'ope qua' eqs. looks forward and not back is clear from the syntax. Anxious punctuation may occasionally be needed to save an incoherent writer from himself, but this situation does not often arise with Ovid. True hyperbaton is another matter.

keeping the transmitted text of line 234 and imparting point to the poet's at first sight puzzling use of the periphrastic construction *neglectam habere* = *neglexisse* (cf. Fisher, p. 202 and nn. 30, 31). For the limiting sense of *quantum* we may compare in particular *Met.* 3. 460–2 'nutu quoque signa remittis / et, quantum motu formosi suspicor oris, / uerba refers aures non peruenientia nostras' (cf. also 13. 642, 15. 436, *Her.* 16. 137). Fisher's 'nescioquem', as Reeve remarks, is 'incompatible with her desire to bring the passage into line with Callimachus' (p. 336 n. 7); but once it is granted that Ovid's treatment should not be harmonized in this way and that it is a vague rumour of the oracle's answer, not the answer itself, that has come to Cydippe's ears,[96] it offers an attractive, economic, and consistent solution. The generalizing masculine, appropriate to the sense, was bound to be assimilated to the feminines in the next verse, and the first syllable of 'quantum' no doubt helped.

More drastically:

(b) is quoque nescioqua, quantum uaga fama susurrat,
neglectam queritur teste sorore fidem.

233 nescioqua *uel* nesciocui *Kenney* teste sorore *Ouwens*

'Apollo too complains, on his sister's evidence, so far as wandering rumour whispers, that somehow or other (*or* by somebody) there has been a breach of faith.' For this sense of *nescioqua* cf. *Her.* 20. 209,[97] *Ibis* 423 (Fisher, p. 203 n. 32). Palaeographically both these reconstructions are in one respect a little more economical than the standard version, which entails the transposition of 'nunc' and the 'ut' extracted from '(quan)tum'. *Nunc* is a handy monosyllabic stopgap for imposing a semblance of metre, and it is not all that drastic to delete it. Compare 21. 193, where π gives 'et quoque iam nescioquid desensisse uidetur'. The modern vulgate is 'iam quoque nescioquid . . .'; I should prefer the simpler 'et [at?] iam nescioquid . . .'[98]

6.1.13. †hoc deus & uates hoc & mea carmina dicunt. 235
at desunt uoto carmina nulla tuo.†
unde tibi fauor hic, nisi si noua forte reperta est
quae capiat magnos littera lecta deos?
teque tenente deos numen sequor ipsa deorum
doque libens uictas in tua uota manus. 240
fassaque sum matri deceptae foedera linguae
lumina fixa tenens plena pudoris humo.
cetera cura tua est . . . (235–43)

237 si *post* nisi *add. Palmer* 239 numen *edd.*: nomen π 242 tenens *Heinsius*: tenet π

[96] The objection of Fischer (p. 202) and Reeve (loc. cit.) to treating *Her.* 13.93 as a parallel is also disabled by this consideration.

[97] If the poet did indeed write 'nescioqua' at 21.233 he may have intended sarcasm: 'the god complains that faith has "somehow" been breached. "Somehow", indeed!'— Acontius, that is to say, knows very well about things of this kind that happen 'somehow'.

[98] For 'desensisse' Heinsius' 'de te sensisse' seems to me superior to 'de me sensisse' (Ald.[1]), which modern editors prefer.

These obvious and easy corrections having been made, further progress is not easy.[99] Lines 235–6 in particular cry out for the obelus. But down to line 239 I see no great difficulty in discerning a rational sequence of argument. It is begging the question to reject the transmitted 'at' at 236 on the grounds that there is no antithesis (Fischer, p. 195); in fact in the light of 237 ff. an antithesis lends point to the argument, which runs as follows:

235 Everything and everybody, then, combine against *me*;
236 whereas *you* lack no support.[100]
237–8 How do you manage it? Have you produced another of those 'letters' of yours, this time one which can entrap the very gods?

The last two verses are of course sarcastic, and it is excessively literal-minded to condemn the conceit as inconsistent with lines 145 ff., 'in denen es als unmöglich hingestellet wurde, dass das absichtslose Lesen von Schwurworten ein bindender Eid sei' (Fischer, p. 195). That poor Cydippe's feeble rhetoric is a prey to this kind of criticism may be seen as a tribute to the poet's art; for it is of the essence of the situation that she cannot be given a logically watertight case to argue. Her pleading excites the pity and sympathy of the reader, but he knows that she must finally concede the victory to the stronger party, who has got to have the best tunes.

6.1.14. In contrast, the difficulties of lines 239 ff. remarked by Reeve (p. 336 n. 7) are wholly real: (i) the word *-que* in 239 and 241; (ii) the sense of 241–2. But these are not such faults as can reasonably be ascribed to negligent composition; something has obviously gone badly wrong with the text. A lacuna must be postulated before line 239 in which the missing complement to the first *-que* occurred; and either 241–2 must be deleted (Palmer) or another lacuna must be postulated after 240. There is nothing wrong with 241–2 *per se,* and it seems to me clearly preferable to postulate the loss of some verses in which Cydippe said something like: 'So then, since I see that I cannot help myself, I finally abandon all thoughts of resistance, and I have just sent the nurse[101] to call my mother', or 'As I write these lines, my mother has appeared, and my faithful nurse cannot exclude *her*', or something of the sort. There is nothing at all improbable in postulating lacunae on this scale at the end of the epistle, for reasons already touched upon. The state of the writing hereabouts must have been such that a copyist could not read some lines at all and simply omitted them. If, as he should have done, he left blanks, they were unlikely to survive the next recopying.[102] On the poet's quasi-dramatic treatment of his material see below, §6.2.2.

6.2. THE PASSAGE IN RELATION TO THE 'PLOT' OF THE CORRESPONDENCE

6.2.1. Ovid's literary material for the *Heroides* was, generally speaking, available to him in the form of more or less continuous epic or dramatic narrative. Transposition into the epistolary mode posed a number of technical problems. Prominent among these was the choice of a particular point in the narrative continuum for

[99] '. . . the only remedy I can devise for 235–8 [233–6] is to scrap all four lines and start again' (Reeve, p. 336 n. 7).

[100] Reading (e.g.) 'numina' with Dilthey.

[101] Who is still on guard: 21. 17–24.

[102] C. H. Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930), pp. 21–2.

his protagonist to take up her pen.[103] In the double *Heroides* there were two protagonists and two points to be selected. These epistles presented Ovid with another challenge: that of the *creation* of character more or less *ex nihilo.* In two out of the three stories chosen for development in the double letters the heroine had, as Ovid found her, no character to speak of. She hardly existed in her own right, serving principally as a foil for the hero, whose masterful and enterprising behaviour dominated the action.[104] That this is true of Cydippe emerges with certainty from the extensive remains of Callimachus' treatment in the *Aetia*;[105] and that it was almost certainly true of Hero may be inferred from what we can piece together of the original Greek literary source of the story.[106] Of course Helen of Troy was by no means characterless in the literary tradition; here, however, the very richness and diversity of the interpretation of her career by Greek poets allowed Ovid considerable freedom to go his own way, and the Helen of *Heroides* 17 is a largely Ovidian, and brilliantly successful, invention. The last thing Ovid, being Ovid, ever contemplated was the slavish reproduction of his originals; and in Cydippe's case this would have been impossible, since there was little or nothing to reproduce. In Callimachus she is hardly a person at all, and no attempt is made to exploit the psychological interest of her predicament. It follows that Ovid not merely might but must manipulate the facts of the plot as he inherited it from Callimachus, and invent such new facts as his own treatment required.[107]

6.2.2. These general considerations are especially relevant to two features of the end of Cydippe's letter: (i) the treatment of the oracle; (ii) the mention of her mother. As to (i), it is essential to grasp (a) that Cydippe's father has not yet returned bearing the actual reply of the oracle; all that has reached her is a rumour (cf. above, §6.1.12);[108] and (b) that this is integral to the poet's manner of handling the story. The rumour, we must be meant to infer, has come to her ears during the composition of her letter.[109] That there have been intervals in which she has had to put it aside and receive visitors is not merely a reasonable assumption;[110] it is in the text:

[103] Jacobson, pp. 337–8.

[104] Not that Callimachus' Acontius is all that dynamic a figure; but such as he is he dominates the story, and the other characters exist chiefly as foils to him: Bopp, pp. 18–19, 26.

[105] Frr. 67–75 Pf.; Kenney, *Philol.* 111 (1967), 223 = *Arion* 9 (9170), 398–9; Bopp, pp. 9–11, 19, 96, 160–2.

[106] I hope to enlarge on this when opportunity permits. Meanwhile it is enough to point out that Musaeus' characterization of Hero is flagrantly inconsistent and therefore almost certainly his own invention. Behind his and Ovid's very different treatments there may perhaps be glimpsed a hint of the presentation of Hero in the Hellenistic original (whose existence, *pace* Gelzer, I see no reason to doubt) as a type of the frustrated housebound female familiar to us in Horace's Neobule: *Her.* 19. 5–16 ~ Mus. 187–93, Agathias, *A. P.* 5.297. This, however, is a far cry from Ovid's delicate and sympathetic portrait.

[107] On the implications of all this I may refer to the sensitive analysis of Bopp, pp. 45 ff., esp. 45–53, 96–101.

[108] This important distinction is overlooked by both Bopp (p. 144) and Fischer (pp. 199–200).

[109] An argument in favour of keeping 'nunc' at line 233; cf. above, §6.1.12.

[110] Fischer apparently fails to grasp this point and so oddly misinterprets Kraus, referring (p. 200 n. 2) to an 'Annnahme' on his part.

ante fores sedet haec [nutrix] quid agamque rogantibus intus,
ut possim tuto scribere, 'dormit' ait.
mox, ubi, secreti longi causa optima, somnus
credibilis tarda desinit esse mora,
iamque uenire uidet quos non admittere durum est,
excreat et ficta dat mihi signa nota.
sicut erant, properans uerba imperfecta relinquo
et tegitur trepido littera rapta[111] sinu. (19–26)

So the rumour of the oracle—couched in terms unintelligible to anybody else but crystal clear to her—comes to Cydippe as the final blow. This revelation, that in spite of her impassioned defence and her strong case in equity the gods are with Acontius and against her, this is what administers the *coup de grâce* to her wavering resolution.[112] For 200-odd verses Ovid has made her hold out, hoping against hope, grasping at argumentative straws, railing against Acontius' ruthless persistence. From line 247 a reader sensitive to nuance ought to sense that she really wants to give in but cannot bring herself to take the final step. Something is wanted to make her crack, and the advance warning of the oracle's attitude provides it. Fischer (p. 200) objects that only in the epistle of Deianira (*Her.* 9) is there a comparable intervention *ab extra* into the internal psychological drama, the struggle of the heroine with her own feelings. True; and the doubts that have been cast on the Ovidian authorship of that epistle[113] may seem to reinforce the objection. But two exceptions to the general rule may support each other. If the Deianira story was to be handled effectively in the form of a letter, some such device may have seemed to Ovid, for once, a technical necessity,[114] as it is here. It is also worth drawing attention to an analogy, if not a precise parallel, in the letters of both Helen and Hero, in both cases, as here, near the end. Helen, if the interpretation of 'ferunt' at 17. 240 offered above (§5.2.12) is correct, refers to something important that Paris has *not* said, conveyed to her, like Cydippe's news of the oracle, by rumour.[115] Hero (19. 193 ff.) refers to the dream which, as she fears and the reader knows, forebodes the death of her lover. Both are *ominous* hints breaking in from outside on the writer's train of thought; and in similar vein is Cydippe's reference to the oracle. The poet conveys it in the form of an unconfirmed rumour because to report the oracle itself would have wrecked the whole effect that he has built up. In Callimachus' version the god did not merely reveal the reason for Cydippe's indisposition; he told Ceyx, practically in so many

[111] *rapta* Kenney, pp. 181–2: *cauta* codd.: *coepta* Dilthey.

[112] 'Ky. subjektiviert die Orakelbefragung dadurch, dass sie deren günstigen Ausgang als weiteres günstiges Zeichen für A. bucht: sie wird für sie ein Moment mehr, sich von diesem jungen Mann, der es sogar versteht, die Götter auf seine Seite zu bringen, gewinnen zu lassen' (Bopp, p. 163). The 'downgrading' of the role of the oracle and the replacement of Cydippe's father by her mother were among the modifications which were in a manner forced on Ovid by his 'elegization' of the story as he found it in Callimachus: his transformation, that is, of the Callimachean relationship (if such it can be called) of the two lovers into a relationship, recognizably elegiac in spite of the bizarre features inherent in the original plot, of wooing and surrender. All this is admirably argued by Bopp; see esp. pp. 144, 162–3.

[113] See D. W. T. C. Vessey, 'Notes on Ovid, *Heroides* 9', *CQ* N.S. 19 (1969), 349–61; *contra* Jacobson, pp. 228–42.

[114] Cf. Jacobson, p. 229.

[115] The intervention does not, as with Cydippe, affect Helen's decision; its function is to contribute to the dramatic irony of 245–56.

words, that he would be a fool if he did not instantly clinch the alliance with so eminently suitable a son-in-law as Acontius (fr. 75. 28 ff. Pf.). For the poet of the *Aetia* that was peripety enough, but it is a very prosaic dénouement, and it would have been insufferably flat for Ovid's Cydippe, after working herself up to such a pitch of emotional confusion and exhaustion, to end with: 'Oh, here is my father, who says there is no help for it: I must marry you after all'! For Ovid's purpose it is essential that Cydippe herself should be seen to make the final decision, reluctantly and under great pressure, before the external logic of events forced her hand for her, and to communicate it herself, with mingled shame and relief, to her mother.

6.2.3. To her mother—not, as in Callimachus, to her father (fr. 75. 38–9 Pf.).[116] As just emphasized, her father is still on his way back from Delphi; and in whom should a girl confide but in her mother? This was what Acontius had advised (20. 201–2), and in the end she is driven to it. He had cheerfully told her that she had nothing to blush for; if now she cannot look her mother in the face it is because she must confess, not just the 'deceptae foedera linguae', which after all was not her fault, but her acquiescence (240 'libens') in her lot. If she had held out, as propriety dictated, declining to pay any attention to Acontius, until her father's return, then indeed she would have had no occasion to feel ashamed, but then there would have been nothing for the poet to write about. It is her consciousness, as he skilfully allows it to emerge, that in spite of herself she has been won over by this unscrupulous and unorthodox style of wooing that fills her with shame and confusion. This is clever and sensitive writing, deserving more thoughtful and perceptive criticism than it receives from Fischer: 'Dass Cydippe mit ihrer Mutter gesprochen hat, ist eine nebensächliche, unnötige Mitteilung, wohl nur in dem Bestreben gemacht, eine Entsprechung zum Acontiusbrief [sc. 20. 201–2] herzustellen, Cydippes Entgegenkommen vollständig zu machen' (p. 201). Moreover Fischer's argument is based on a false premiss that can be easily refuted from this very pair of epistles. She enunciates as a general rule: 'Dass ein Faktum der Vorlage geändert wird, entspricht . . . nicht der Technik Ovid. Er ändert den Stimmungsgehalt seiner Quelle, ohne ihre Fabel anzutasten' (ibid.). If that were literally true we should have no *Heroides,* for it is not one of the 'facts' of these stories that the protagonists corresponded with each other. But, quibbling apart, Fischer has overlooked the significance of *Her.* 20. 129–32, from which we learn that Acontius is in Naxos. That detail flatly contradicts Callimachus, in whose account Acontius returns from Delos to Keos and remains there until summoned to his wedding (fr. 75. 40–1 Pf.). If that is not alteration of a 'Faktum der Vorlage',[117] I do not know what is.[118]

[116] Cf. Bopp, p. 45.

[117] As Bopp (p. 80 n. 1) has duly remarked; cf. id., p. 79 n. 1, pp. 116–17. On Callimachus' indifference to the way in which Acontius is supposed to have heard of the outcome of the appeal to Delphi cf. Bopp, p. 18.

[118] This paper is quite long enough already, and I do not propose to consider here Fischer's criticisms of the disputed verses on artistic grounds. The *gravamen* of her objections consists in the two heads:

(a) that 'Sie bringen gedanklich nichts Neues; die Anordnung der einzelnen Punkte erscheint kunstlos, z.T. aus Gedankenverbindungen im Brief des Acontius und im ersten Teil des Cydippebriefes übernommen';

(b) that 'In dem uns vorliegenden zweiten Teil des Briefes tritt uns eine andere Cydippe entgegen als im ersten Teil. Es liegt ein Bruch in der Gestaltung vor' (pp. 221–2). In this admittedly subjective area I can only say that I find Bopp's interpretation of the epistle entirely persuasive, and I doubt if I could put the case better than she has done.

6.3. THE POINT OF JUNCTURE

Much less needs to be said here than was the case with 16. 39–144. The sense runs smoothly across the join, and there are no troublesome cruces. The main point to be established is that the division in the tradition does not coincide with a division in the argument. In Fischer's analysis line 144 represents, in a sense, the conclusion of Cydippe's 'Beweisführung' and 145 the beginning of a new sequence of thought (pp. 187–8). This is, I think, somewhat misleading. In so far as Cydippe develops a line of argument, it ends at 150 rather than 144. Lines 151–4 (cf. above, §6.1.2) represent the first really significant crack in the façade of her resistance. After describing the abortive weddings (155–68) she rallies and starts to fight back again, mingling pleas with reproaches; but the damage to her case has been done with the admission that *perhaps* (she knows full well but will not yet admit it to him) he is right, that Diana will hold her to her oath and that she must fulfil it or die. Line 151 is therefore a major turning-point in the argument of the letter.[119] Lines 145–50 round off what has preceded: logically considered they are a *reductio ad absurdum* of Acontius' position, and the effective place in an argumentative sequence for such a thing is at the end, where a sarcastic flourish of this kind provides a rhetorical climax—though its very exaggeration and lack of any real logical cogency betrays the weakness of her case as she, in her heart of hearts, knows it to be. After that, 'tamen' in 151 has, for once, real adversative force.[120] Whatever objections may be made to 21. 145–248 on other grounds, they certainly cannot be said to constitute an easily detachable and self-contained entity. If they are the work of a forger, he took quite exceptional pains and showed quite exceptional skill in marrying them to the text that he found to his hand.

6.4. THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

Here it will in the main be enough to refer to what was said above (§5.4). Of course the two passages do not necessarily stand or fall together; and whatever may be thought of the explanation offered for the disappearance of 16. 39–144, the loss of a portion of text at the end of the book is not difficult to account for.[121] Some sort of case, though not, as I hope to have shown, a strong one, can be made out for regarding 16. 39–144 as superfluous to the argument of Paris' epistle. No such view can possibly be entertained of the second half of Cydippe's letter; either the lines are genuine or they are a spurious replacement of a genuine ending of about the same extent (Acontius' letter = 242 verses). No third possibility exists.

7. THE POSTULATED INTERPOLATOR. CONCLUSION

7.1. Consideration of the external evidence does not much assist the investigation. The state of the manuscript tradition is consistent with either hypothesis: that

[119] Cf. Bopp, pp. 102, 133.

[120] It does not have to do all the work. The real force of the expression resides in the structure, a tricolon crescendo articulated by the thrice repeated 'cum' (cf. Bopp, p. 133). This is highly Ovidian writing: cf. (e.g.) *Am.* 3.9. 21–2, quoted by L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 203–4.

[121] As allowed by Fischer, p. 187. This obvious point receives further support, if support be needed, from the fate of 21. 15–144, attested only in a handful of witnesses, amounting perhaps, after Reeve's *eliminatio*, to no more than three: $G_{u}\rho\epsilon$.

the passages are genuine or that they are not. Dörrie's simple and plausible model of the textual history, which takes for granted the authenticity of the two passages and their presence in the archetype, might be amended without undue difficulty to accommodate their absence.[122] The problem at the centre of the enquiry is the figure of the postulated interpolator himself.[123] Is he, historically considered, a remotely plausible person? So far as I know, the annals of ancient (pagan) falsification offer no good analogy to him. In the first place, he was capable of *sustained* imitative effort at a *consistently* high level both of technical skill and of poetical invention. No other 'Ovidian' forgery contains so few truly suspicious features.[124] Indeed I should go so far as to say that, when due allowance is made for fair (towards the end of 21 unfair) wear and tear to the text, there is nothing of moment to be urged against the language and style of either passage. Secondly, he exemplifies a more specialized and perhaps rarer skill: for to manufacture a pair of very substantial passages for insertion into existing work is a different matter from the composition of a 'free-standing' forgery and, I should have thought, very difficult to do well.[125] He was particularly ingenious when it came to dovetailing his confection into the 'plot' of the Paris–Helen correspondence, retrojecting into it more than one reference to Helen's reply. The ABC of the interpolator's art, some would say; but how often does one find it done as well as here? He was so well acquainted, whatever his own date, with Ovid's style at (according to the generally received chronology) the relevant period of his poetic career, that he introduced into both his fabrications a rare and distinctive syntactical usage which appears altogether to have escaped the notice of scholars until the nineteenth century.

7.2. By the same token he gave full measure, pressed down and running over. His supplement to Paris' letter was conceived and executed on so ample a scale—far more ample than what was required merely for the reparation of a defective 'plot'—as seriously to unbalance the symmetry of the correspondence (cf. above,

[122] The simplest reconstruction along these lines, so far as I can see, involves postulating, what is not inherently improbable, the survival into Carolingian times of two ancient copies of the *Heroides,* one containing and one lacking the disputed passages.

[123] The possibility that the passages, if spurious, are by two different hands does not seem to me worth pursuing. In that case we should have to imagine two forgers of equal technical competence; and unless each hit independently on the idea of including one instance of the peculiar use of *nec* noticed above (§3.1) as an Ovidian hallmark, then one must have imitated, not only his model, but also the pseudo-model produced by his colleague. The point is worth making because it throws into relief the remarkable courage of the postulated single forger in essaying to complete two such very different epistles, in tone and feeling, as those of Paris and Cydippe.

[124] Relevant comparisons are with *Consolatio Liviae, Nux, Her.* 15 (*Ep. Sapphus*), and *Am.* 3.5 (*Somnium*), none of which is by Ovid. Possibly *Her.* 9 should be added to the list, but of that I am far less certain. The *Halieutica,* it should perhaps be expressly stated, is irrelevant. On the generally low technical standards in the field see W. Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung* (Munich, 1971), p. 113.

[125] Relevant comparisons here are more difficult to find. The 'Helen-episode' of *Aeneid* 2 comes immediately to mind; but it is very much shorter and offers a much higher concentration of features identifiable as anomalous: cf. C. E. Murgia, *Calif. Stud. Class. Ant.* 4 (1971), 213. On the general improbability of the idea that an interpolator, working back from *Her.* 17, could have produced 16.39–144 see Latta, pp. 132–6.

§5.5). Here he can be seen, apparently, out-Oviding Ovid; had he read his Seneca and determined that it should be said of him too 'nescit quod bene cessit relinquere'? One could go on; but enough has been said to indicate the great unlikeness of this figure to any other forger of Latin texts in classical antiquity whose activities we can document, and his very striking likeness to Ovid himself. The case against the authenticity of our two passages rests on a number of single arguments of varying strength, which I have tried to assess as fairly as I can. Some seem to me to emerge from careful scrutiny as valueless or nearly so; not quite all can be simply and cleanly disposed of. I do not attempt to deny that a residue of small uncertainties and difficulties persists. How much do they collectively amount to? And how heavily do they weigh against what I account the single enormous improbability of the postulated forger, whether we call him ps.-Ovid or ps.-[Ovid], considered, not as a critical abstraction but a flesh-and-blood human being, existing at some particular time and place in history? There is no critical formula to tell us how many minor improbabilities outweigh a single major one. Perhaps, however, a general principle, grounded on very respectable authority indeed, may be invoked *à la* Clericus to assist decision:

NE CRITICVS, CVLICEM EXCOLANS, GLVTITO CAMELVM.

Peterhouse, Cambridge E. J. KENNEY

ADDENDUM

p. 396 n. 6: I fail to see why *epistula* at *A. A.* 3. 345 should refer to a 'second edition' of the *Heroides* including the double letters (R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978), p. 13). Compare the equally arbitrary dictum of Jacobson, p. 302 n. 5.