

**Ovid's *Heroides* 4 and 8. A commentary with
introduction**

Charilaos Michalopoulos

**Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

**The University of Leeds
School of Classics**

October, 2006

**The candidate confirms that the work submitted is his own and that
appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the
work of others.**

**This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright
material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without
proper acknowledgement.**

For my parents

20 του Ιούνη 1990. Φύγαμε από το Ντουμπάι για Γαλλία. Δυο λάμδα θέλει τώρα η Γαλλία ή ένα; Από σωστογραφία άστα. Αμέ τις ψιλές και τις δασείες δεν τις αποχωρίζομαι με τίποτε. Μια νύχτα τις είδα στον ύπνο μου σα γυφτάκια ξυπόλητα με λαδωμένα μαλλιά και τρόμαξα. Και μια υπογεγραμμένη, από τότες τη μνημονεύω κι αυτή. Όσο για τις περισπωμένες άμα ταιριάζει κάνω το χρέος μου.

Στο σαλόνι μας έχουμε τρεις μύγες: τη Μυρτώ, τη Ζανέτ και τον Κορνήλιο. Τρώνε ζάχαρη και γάλα. Καμιά φορά τις συναντώ στο διάδρομο και κάνω πως δεν τις βλέπω. Τώρα θα πάω στο ψυγείο να πάρω ακάματα φρούτα να τα βάλω στο φινιστρίνι να γίνουν. Χωρίς τα φρούτα και τα βιβλία δε θα είχα κανένα πάθος εδώ.

Τώρα θα ήθελα να είμαι στην Ομόνοια, να 'χει πολύ καυσαέριο, πολλή ζέστη και πολύ κόσμο στη στάση και το λεωφορείο να μη φαίνεται. Κι όταν κάποτε θα έφτανα στους Αμπελοκήπους, θα αγόραζα ψάρια, χόρτα και σιταρένιο ψωμί κι άγιος ο Θεός. Ήθελα να 'ξερα δεν είστε ευτυχισμένοι;

Πήρα ένα γράμμα από τη μάνα μου και όλο τα ίδια μου γράφει, το διάβασα πολλές φορές. Κι ένας νέος ναύτης με πλησίασε.

«Καπετάν Μανόλη, από τη μάνα σου είναι το γράμμα;»

«Ναι, από τη μάνα μου.»

«Δώσε να το διαβάσω.»

(Λουδοβίκος των Ανωγείων, *Το γράμμα του ναύτη*)

June 20th 1990. Leaving Dubai behind we are now sailing for Marseille. How do you spell Marseille? One "l" or two? My spelling is terrible. But, I cannot do without smooth and rough breathings. I dreamt of them one night; they looked like barefoot gypsy kids, with greasy hair. I was scared. I also dreamt of a subscript. Since then, I use it too. If you ask for circumflex, if it seems right, I pay my debt.

In the common room we have three flies: Myrto, Janet and Cornelius. They feed on sugar and milk. Sometimes I come across them in the corridor, but I pretend I don't see them. I'm going to the fridge now to get some unripe fruits. I will put them at the window screen to mellow. Without fruits and books I would have no passion here.

I wish I were on Omonoia Square now, in the smog and the heat, waiting at the crowded bus-stop. And no sign of the bus coming. And when I would finally get at Ampelokipoi, I would buy fish, greens and wheat bread. And God bless. I wish I knew: aren't you happy?

I got a letter from my mother, the same things again and again. I read it many times. A young sailor came close:

"Captain Manolis, is this letter from your mother?"

"Yes, it's from my mother."

"Give it to me to read."

(Ludwig of Anogea, *The sailor's letter*)

Acknowledgements

In the course of writing this thesis I have incurred a number of debts, which is a great pleasure for me to acknowledge here. First of all, I would like to thank Professor Robert Maltby, the supervisor of my work, who has always been an unfailing source of inspiration, criticism and encouragement. Words fail me as I express my gratitude to him, whose example of generous, fair-minded, and dedicated scholarship I have tried to keep before me. I consider myself extremely fortunate to have studied under his supervision and I will always be indebted to him for his help, patience and moral support so generously given to me during the preparation of my thesis. My deepest gratitude also goes to Dr. Ken Belcher for putting his trust in me and my work from the early days of my postgraduate studies as an MA student. I am obliged to him for being most generous and helpful throughout my stay at Leeds and for offering me his incisive comments, his moral support and above all his friendship. He has been a constant source of encouragement in difficult times and a calm mediator of grace and rare intellectual wit. I will always be indebted to both of them for their hospitality, which I know that I will never manage to reciprocate fully. I am also indebted to Professor Barry Hall, who generously shared with me his prodigious knowledge and offered me his learned advice and valuable guidance on issues of textual criticism. I also thank him for letting me consult his own copy of the Burman (1727) edition of the *Heroides*. I would also like to thank the members of staff of the Classics Department in Leeds University for making Leeds such a pleasant and enjoyable place to work in. Thanks also go to the members of staff at the University Library of Leeds with whom I had the pleasure to work for a whole year and who made every possible effort to satisfy my bibliographical needs. I would also like to thank my friend and colleague Mr. Marios Skempis who, while preparing his thesis on Callimachus' *Hecale*, never failed to provide his *ταπεινή φιλοξενία* to my bibliographical requests and to my queries on issues of modern literary theory. Special thanks are owed to my colleague Miss Maria Georganta for her love, care and untiring emotional and moral support, which lightened the burden of my work and provided me with much needed encouragement.

My warmest thanks go to my brother, Dr. Andreas N. Michalopoulos, who has been a model of industrious devotion for me and whose constant moral encouragement, untiring support and unfailing academic guidance helped me surpass several hardships in times of troubled anxiety. I have benefited greatly from his stimulating comments and thought-provoking observations, which have saved me from many infelicities. My commentary owes much to his most recent work on Ovid's *Heroides* 16 and 17 (*Ovid Heroides 16 and 17. Introduction, Text and Commentary* (2006)). Above all, I am grateful to him for his belief in my work, which always kept me going.

My heartfelt debt is to my parents and my aunt Domna, whose unfailing love and faith supported me and made all this possible for me. I would like to express in print what words can hardly describe, even though I know that this lame expression of gratitude could not ever match their magnanimity and the sacrifices that they have gone through all these years. I will always cherish their broad and deep understanding, their patience and their warmest support throughout these years. The dedication of my thesis to them for everything they have done for me is a totally insufficient way of acknowledging their contribution.

Obviously, for remaining errors and inadequacies I alone am responsible.

Leeds 08.10.06

Charilaos Michalopoulos

Abstract

Ovid's *Heroides* in the form they have come down to us are a diverse group comprising fourteen verse letters supposedly addressed by heroines of Greek mythology to their absent loved ones (*Her.* 1-14), one further similar letter by the Greek poet Sappho (*Her.* 15), and the so-called "double letters" (*Her.* 16-21), which consist of three pairs of letters exchanged between famous couples of myth and literature. Despite the recent revival in the study of this Ovidian work, this thesis is the first full-length comprehensive commentary on Phaedra's letter to Hippolytus (*Her.* 4) and Hermione's letter to Orestes (*Her.* 8) since 1898. In the main commentary my investigation treats issues of language, style, versification and structure in the light of possible intertextual exchanges with prior works of Greek and Roman literature (esp. Greek epic, Euripidean tragedy and Roman elegy). A wide range of literary, inscriptional and archaeological material is used to illuminate and contextualize this many-sided poetry. The introduction concentrates primarily on issues of characterization mainly from a post-feminist and intertextual perspective with emphasis on the representation of (fe)male voice and desire, and the mechanics of the generic assimilation of prior literary material to the elegiac context. In addition, the introduction also provides a detailed examination of the (mis)application of mythological *exempla* in terms of rhetorical effectiveness and relevance to the overall structure of both letters. The aim of this explorative study, besides including a detailed stylistic and linguistic analysis, is to offer an in-depth and multi-faceted critical examination of the poetic quality of these two poems and with the help of modern, up-to-date literary theories on genre, gender and writing to contribute further to the critical reassessment of the *Heroides* as a whole.

Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iv
Introduction.....	3
1. Content of <i>Her.</i> 4 and 8.....	3
2. Characterization.....	4
2.1. Phaedra.....	6
2.2. Hippolytus.....	32
2.3. Hermione	49
3. The (mis)application of mythological <i>exempla</i> in <i>Heroides</i> 4 and 8.....	60
3.1.1 <i>Her.</i> 4.53-66.....	61
3.1.2. <i>Her.</i> 4.93-104	77
3.2. <i>Her.</i> 8.65-82.....	98
4. Text and Transmission.....	112
5. Table of comparative readings.....	114
Text.....	118
Commentary.....	128
<i>Heroides</i> 4.....	129
<i>Heroides</i> 8.....	220
Appendix	276
Bibliography and Abbreviations.....	289



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby
West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ
www.bl.uk

**PAGE NUMBERING AS
ORIGINAL**

Introduction

1. Content of *Her.* 4 and 8

A tabular analysis of *Her.* 4 and 8 is as follows:

Her. 4

1-7: letter opening, Phaedra is urging Hippolytus to read the letter

8-16: Phaedra's earlier failed attempts, divine inspiration

17-37: inexperience in love, struggle for *fama*, claim to "virginity"

38-52: Phaedra in the woods

53-66: first mythological list on hereditary sexual perversion (Europa, Pasiphae, Ariadne)

67-84: description of Hippolytus' physical appearance and of his excellence in sports and hunting

85-104: second mythological list on "amatory hunt" (Cephalus, Adonis, Meleager)

105-28: Theseus' multiple injustices against Phaedra and Hippolytus

129-46: Phaedra's "new morality", explicit call to adultery

147-76: supplication

For literary sources and synopses of the myth see Shuckburgh (1885) 113, Palmer (1898) 305, Collins and Hayes (1910) 95f., Eitrem *RE* 8 (1913) s.v. *Hippolytos* 1870-72., Barrett (1964) 1f., Jacobson (1974) 142-6, Fontenrose (1981) 160 n.1, Coffey-Mayer (1990) 5, Spentzou (2003) xvii-xviii, Fulkerson (2005) 123-6.

Her. 8

[1]-14: Hermione's abduction by Neoptolemus

15-26: appeal to Orestes to imitate Menelaus and take up action

27-36: double relationship, descent from Pelops house, Hermione's betrothal to Orestes by Tyndareus

37-42: Orestes paralleled to Menelaus

43-56: Orestes compared with Neoptolemus, Orestes' bloody past

57-64: Hermione's powerless defence of Orestes

65-82: mythological list on hereditary abduction (Leda, Hippodamia, Helen)

83-88: Achilles' imaginary condemnation of Neoptolemus' actions

89-100: Hermione's deprivation of her mother

101-16: Hermione's nights with Neoptolemus

117-22: final appeal to Orestes

For literary sources and synopses of the myth see Schuckburgh (1885) 156, Palmer (1898) 350f., Collins and Hayes (1910) 138f., Stein *RE* 8.1 (1912) s.v. *Hermione* 841-3, Jacobson (1974) 43-6, Williams, Allan (2000) 8-18, Spentzou (2003) 14, Fulkerson (2005) 88-90.

2. Characterization

Despite pseudo-Demetrius' claims that a letter is a straightforward, unmediated reflection of reality, in which the writer can unveil his true soul, a letter is in fact the product of a process of construction.¹ Writing a letter actually means constructing a self, choosing a certain perspective of truth. Far from being a reflection of reality the letter is in fact a fashioned narrative adapted each time to the circumstances at hand.² In the case of the *Heroides*, in particular, the already complicated issue of representation is further problematized by the reversal of elegy's traditional gender hierarchy. The substitution of the female perspective for the predominant male one,³ what Rosati has called "l'elegia al femminile,"⁴ has significant consequences for the status of both the sender and the addressee of each letter. The speaking "I" of the elegiac male poet is now completely usurped by the "I" of the elegiac *puella*, and the impression is given that we are at last in position to listen to elegy's otherwise silenced (with the possible exception of Sulpicia) female voice. There is, however, an important *caveat*, which should not be discarded. The sex-reversal of the gender-specific role of the male narrator is crucial, but it does not necessarily cause a radical turn-about of elegy's generic principles. The question at stake here is not so much the narrator's shift *per se*, but rather the extent to which this alternative perspective gives voice to a genuine female experience. In the course of the 1970s and 1980s the spectacular boom in the study of women's social reality and the feminist

¹ [Demetrius] *On Style* 227 (probably late Hellenistic or early Roman times) Πλείστον ἐχέτω τὸ ἠθικὸν ἢ ἐπιστολή, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ διάλογος· σχεδὸν γὰρ εἰκόνα ἕκαστος τῆς ἐαυτοῦ ψυχῆς γράφει τὴν ἐπιστολήν. καὶ ἔστι μὲν καὶ ἐξ ἄλλου λόγου παντὸς ἰδεῖν τὸ ἦθος τοῦ γράφοντος, ἐξ οὐδενὸς δὲ οὕτως, ὡς ἐπιστολῆς, 223 Ἀρτέμων μὲν οὖν ὁ τὰς Ἀριστοτέλους ἀναγράψας ἐπιστολάς φησιν, ὅτ' δεῖ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ διάλογόν τε γράφειν καὶ ἐπιστολάς· εἶναι γὰρ τὴν ἐπιστολήν οἷον τὸ ἕτερον μέρος τοῦ διαλόγου. Cf. also Sen. *Epist.* 40.1 *Quod frequenter mihi scribis gratias ago; nam quo uno modo potes te mihi ostendis. Numquam epistulam tuam accipio ut non protinus una simus. Si imagines nobis amicorum absentium iucundae sunt, quae memoriam renouant et desiderium [absentiae] falso atque inani solacio leuant, quanto iucundiores sunt litterae, quae uera amici absentis uestigia, ueras notas adferunt? Nam quod in conspectu dulcissimum est, id amici manus epistulae inpressa praestat, agnoscere.*

² Rosenmeyer (2001) 5, 10f., Trapp (2003) 4, Lindheim (2003) 23f. For theoretical approaches to the epistolary genre in general see Altman (1982), Malherbe (1988) 12ff and Rosenmeyer (2001) 1-16 and *passim*. Specifically on the epistolary aspects of the *Heroides* see Rahn (1958), Kirfel (1969) 11-36, esp. Kauffman (1986) 17-61, Hintermeier (1993) 152-89 on the double letters, Lindheim (2003) 13-77.

³ On female perspective and sexual reversal as a result of the female speaking voice in the *Heroides* see Jacobson (1974) 349-62 and 371-6, Seeck (1975), Henderson (1986) 7, Rosati (1989b) 5-46, esp. 5-9, 30-6, *idem* (1992) 90ff., Maurer (1990) esp. 95ff., Spoth (1992) 157-70, Smith (1994), esp. 257, 266-8, Farrell (1998) *passim*, esp. 315ff., Lindheim (2003) 13-37, Spentzou (2003) 24ff., Volk (2005), also Curley (1999) 20. For a broader discussion of the first-person narrative and its subjective reproduction of the (inter-)textual reality see Barchiesi (1987) esp. 68-71 (=now in Barchiesi (2001) esp. 32-4), *idem* (1992) 19-23.

⁴ Rosati (1992), esp. 90ff.

reconsideration of the wider question of female experience and ideology in Greece and Rome⁵ has fruitfully renewed the interest in Roman female sexuality and its representation in Latin literature. The last decade, in particular, has seen an increasingly growing number of (post-feminist) interpretations focusing on the question of female representation and female ideology in general within the elegiac erotic discourse.⁶ Despite the different methodological origin and orientation of these approaches, there seems to be a wide agreement on the importance of the male-prejudiced representation-mechanisms in the construction of female experience in Roman elegy.

It is very unfortunate that the Roman female voice is lost for us today almost in its entirety. The surviving evidence from ancient sources is too scarce and fragmentary to allow us to reconstruct the whole picture. All that we read and hear about women is filtered through the dominant male perspective. “Female” ideology and “female” voice are but constructions of the contemporary male, upper-class Romans and of their prejudices. As a consequence, in the *Heroides* the assumption of the role of the elegiac poet by the heroines inevitably means their adherence to the poetic principles of the genre, and more importantly to its phallogentric ideology. The heroines, bound as they are within the constraints of elegy, are unable to articulate their own voice and ultimately succumb to the norms of the predominant male perspective; hence, the poetic restraints set upon them ultimately turn into sexual constraints. A fundamental convention in the collection is that men re-assert their virile status and by behaving according to the Roman social tenets they break free from elegy’s *seruitium amoris* and claim their manhood back. The heroines faced with such “reality” become frustrated, as they continue to fantasize and portray their loved ones in terms of their “traditional” generic role as subservient of female love.⁷ Hence, it is only occasionally that they manage to undo these

⁵ This is only a selection of the most important bibliographical items on women and gender in antiquity: Arthur (1973) and (1977), Gould (1980), Foley (1981)a, Lefkowitz and Fant (1982), Hallett (1984), Peradotto and Sullivan (1984), Skinner (1987), Halperin, Winkler and Zeitlin (1990), Patterson (1991), Pomeroy (1991) and (1995)a, b, Dixon (1988), (1992) and (2001), Treggiari (1991) and (2005), Rousselle (1992), Schmitt Pantel (1992), Thomas (1992), Rabinowitz and Richlin (1993), Clark (1996), Cohen (1996), McAuslan and Walcot (1996), Hallett and Skinner (1997), Hawley and Levick (1997), Larmour, Miller and Platter (1998), McGinn (1998), Dixon (2001), O’Higgins (2003). Further bibliography see in Pomeroy (1973), Greene (1998) 115 n.1. Joshel and Murnaghan (1998). On Roman sexuality in particular see the bibliography cited in Wyke (2002) 166 n.35. Also see the special issues of *Arethusa* 6 (1973), *Helios* 25 (1998), *CW* 92.5 (1999), *Arethusa* 22 (2000).

⁶ Cf. e.g. Haley (1924-25), Lilja (1965), Hallett (1973), Gilleland (1980), Lyne (1980), Adams (1984), Culham (1990), Nugent (1990), Skinner (1993)a, Janan (1994) and (2001), Keith (1994), (1997) and (2000), Greene (1995) and (1998), Habinek (1997), Oliensis (1997), Flaschenriem (1998), Gamel (1998), James (1998), *idem* (2003)a and b, Rosenmeyer (2000), Sharrock (1991)a and b, (1994)a, (2002), McCoskey (1999), Wyke (2002), Miller (2003). Especially for female representation in the *Heroides* see Jacobson (1974) 371-6, Rosati (1985), (1989)a and (1992), Kauffman (1986), Barchiesi (1987) (=2001) 29-47, Gamel (1989), Desmond (1993), Gold (1993), Gordon (1997), McCarthy (1998), Armstrong (2001), Lindheim (2003), Spentzou (2003), Fulkerson (2005), Volk (2005), Michalopoulos (2006) 8-20. For critical reviews of the state of scholarship on Roman elegy see Janan (2001) 175-77 n.58, Wyke (2002) 11-9, James (2003) 28f., on the *Heroides* see Lindheim (2003) 5-7 n.12, Spentzou (2003) 13-42 and Fulkerson (2005) 1-16.

⁷ Cf. Greene (1998) xii-xiii on the conventional enslavement of the elegiac lover to his emotions and the servitude of his mistress. Further on the motif of the so-called *seruitium amoris* see my bibliography in n. on *Her.* 4.22.

restrictions and give voice to their intimate, female thoughts; despite appearances, the instances where the heroines manage to articulate their female desire through the use of elegy's phallogocentric rhetoric are limited; for most part, these female characters simply ventriloquize the male elegiac poet by giving voice to elegy's male-prescribed obsessions.

My investigation of characterization derives primarily from a perception of character as a process of literary construction and representation, and less (if at all) as a static reflection of social reality.⁸ It is the premise of my argument that, especially in the case of the *Heroides*, characterization is caught up in the problematic of both sexuality and (inter)textuality. In my exploration of the contribution of (inter)textuality in the heroines' self-portrayal I am greatly indebted to Kauffman's instructive discussion of the inter-dependence between (inter)textuality and self-representation in the epistolary genre,⁹ while my emphasis on the intricacies of the representation of female sexuality and female voice has benefited immensely from recent works on gender-construction in elegy, such as Sharrock (1991)a, (2002)a and b, Greene (1998), Janan (2001) and Wyke (2002).¹⁰

2.1. Phaedra

A letter written by Phaedra is surely not an Ovidian innovation. Her letter to Theseus in Euripides' *Hippolytus* with its disastrous consequences constitutes a landmark in her literary career as "letter writer". However, composing a poetic letter in elegiac couplets has significant effects on Phaedra's literary status. A letter in Latin written by a Greek mythological heroine sounds at least unconventional. But which world does Phaedra really belong to? Being on the verge of two literary genres, namely Greek tragedy and Roman elegy, how does she define herself?

⁸ The question of characterization in Greek tragedy remains a vexed one. In my discussion of tragic characters I subscribe to Gill's critical inquiry of characterization, what he calls the "personality-viewpoint" approach and the intricacies of the articulation of selfhood (Gill (1986), (1990)a,b and (1995)). Further on characterization in Greek tragedy see Garton (1957), Easterling (1973), (1977), (1987) and (1990), Gould (1978), Goldhill (1990), Griffin (1990). For the representation of female characters in Greek tragedy, in particular, see Shaw (1975), Foley (1981)b and (2001), Zeitlin (1985)b and (1996), Goldhill (1986) 107-37, Easterling (1987), Powell (1990), Rabinowitz (1993)b, Seidensticker (1995), Hall (1997), Zelenak, (1998), Blondell, Gamel, Rabinowitz and Zweig (1999), McClure (1999) and (2000).

⁹ Kauffman (1986) 17-27 and 30-61 (on the *Heroides*).

¹⁰ In terms of a psychoanalytical approach I have been very sceptical and extremely selective in my use of such readings following duBois' (1991) 7-36 critique of the ahistorical claims of psychoanalytic theory and its application in classics. Also cf. Gould's (1978) 48 discussion of tragic characters in text(ure): "in order to seize the essence of a particular human figure in the dramatic whole, we have to attend primarily to the tenor of the poetry and the texture of the language *through the play*, not to separate off an independent rounded personality who can then be examined, 'in terms of common realism', in isolation from the ordered imaginative structure of which his human existence is part, the character, like the plot, being 'an extension of the poetry'...in effect an expanded image'." *mutatis mutandis* my discussion of characterization focuses strictly on textual characters, characters within the texture of the poem's language.

i) Opening address (*Her.* 4.1f.)

An ordinary opening of a Roman letter comprises the name of the sender, the name of the addressee and a short, often abbreviated, phrase of salutation.¹¹ At first sight Phaedra seems to comply with the Roman conventions of letter writing, as she opens her letter with a poetic adaptation of the common letter formula *s(i) u(ales) b(ene) e(st) e(go) q(uidem) u(aleo)*. A closer examination, however, reveals the complexity and subtlety of this opening couplet, which ultimately undermine its conventionality. In fact, Phaedra's salutation fails to fulfil its main purpose, which is the identification of the sender and the addressee; neither Phaedra nor Hippolytus are mentioned by name. The concealment of the correspondents' names is not unusual, especially in the case of incest letters. Byblis' love letter to her brother Caunus in *Ov. Met.* 9.523ff. offers an interesting parallel, since Byblis, like Phaedra, carefully conceals her name in the opening of her letter. Byblis avoids writing not only her name, but her title as well.¹² In the *Heroides*, Canace, who is involved in an incestuous affair with her brother Macareus, also tries to conceal her name by postponing her reference to the names of the correspondents until the third couplet in her letter.¹³

What we read in Phaedra's case is that this letter is sent by a Cretan girl (*Cressa puella*) to the man or husband of an Amazon (*Amazonio...uiro*). The ambiguity of *uiro*, which can denote either "a man" in general,¹⁴ or more specifically "a husband",¹⁵ is intentional and it further confuses rather than clarifies the situation. Had it not been for the superscription of the letter,¹⁶ the reader might have thought for a moment that he was about to read Phaedra's disastrous suicide note to Theseus (the husband of the Amazon).

Phaedra's use of the adjective *Cressa* calls for further scrutiny. The possibility of a verbal echo from *Eur. Hipp.* 372, where the Chorus calls Phaedra "a wretched Cretan child" (*ὠ τάλαινα παῖ Κρησία*), is tempting, but the specific form *Cressa* seems to have been dictated by reasons of metrical convenience.¹⁷ However, the fact that *Cressa* is a favourite Ovidian *antonomasia* for Ariadne¹⁸ also contributes to the concealment of Phaedra's identity by giving the false impression that this letter is a letter addressed by Ariadne to Theseus.¹⁹ Even in the

¹¹ On epistolary formulas see n. on *Her.* 4.1f.

¹² Cf. *Ov. Met.* 9.528-34). Further on the relationship between the *Heroides* and Byblis' letter in *Ov. Met.* 9.523ff. see Bömer's notes ad loc., Tränkle (1963) 460-5, Kirfel (1969) 19f., 114, Paratore (1970), Rosati (1985) 121, esp. Verducci (1985) 191-7, Davis (1994) 322-24, De Vito (1994) 322-4, Farrell (1998) 318ff.

¹³ *Ov. Her.* 11.5 *haec est Aeolidos fratri sribentis imago*.

¹⁴ *OLD* s.v. *uir* 1.

¹⁵ *OLD* s.v. *uir* 2a. a husband, b. a lover.

¹⁶ For the genuineness of the letter's superscription see pp.277f.

¹⁷ All alternative forms (*Cretaea*, *Cressia*, *Cretensis*, *Cretica*) would have been unmetrical. Further on *Cressa* see n. on *Her.* 4.2.

¹⁸ Cf. e.g. *Ov. Am.* 1.7.16, *Ars* 1.327ff. See Barchiesi on *Her.* 2.76.

¹⁹ Phaedra's references to her sister, Ariadne, (cf. lines 63-6, 116) play a crucial role in her argumentation. For a detailed examination of Phaedra's attempt to become a second Ariadne in her letter see Fulkerson (2005) 122-35, 137-42.

unfortunate event of an interception, if someone slightly unfolded the letter scroll, the opening salutation would hardly have revealed the true identity of both the sender and the recipient. Phaedra's play with the reader's expectation is indicative of her Hellenistic learning, since this deception technique at the opening of the poem was amply attested in Hellenistic poetry (possibly originating in early Greek poetry) and is also present in Roman elegy (cf. e.g. Tib. 1.5).²⁰

Phaedra's self-identification as *puella* (a distinctive elegiac signal)²¹ placed at the very opening of her letter is undoubtedly programmatic. *puella* is not only "the standard term for a woman viewed as a potential object of love,"²² but also a term suggesting the *pathos* and the erotic suffering of the girl. Above all, Phaedra's self-identification as *puella* practically signals her transposition from the world of Greek tragedy to that of Roman elegy; what we are about to read is the versified letter of an elegiac mistress and not the soliloquy of a tragic heroine.²³ In addition, the term's association with young age plays down her real age and makes Phaedra a suitable match for young Hippolytus. Phaedra's self-identification as *puella* is picked up again near the end of her letter at lines 173f. (*quamuis odisse puellas / diceris*), where she concludes her letter with a ring-composition through the mention of Hippolytus' alleged hatred for girls

Some critics²⁴ have found the attribution of *puella* to Phaedra, a married woman, a rather incongruous choice given that *puella* -in the majority of cases- is used for unmarried, young maidens (often a synonym for "virgin").²⁵ What makes the term inappropriate, however, is not its attribution to a married wife (a use well attested in elegy),²⁶ but the fact that, when the term is attributed to wives, it is strictly reserved for those with lascivious behaviour (in this sense the term is often used for *meretrices*).²⁷ It goes without saying that such connotations of impropriety lie beyond Phaedra's intentions; however, they are a first indication of the dangers inherent to her (mis)application of elegiac language.

Phaedra's concealment of her identity also helps to avoid the risk of any implications of incest.²⁸ Phaedra is well aware of the illicit nature of her proposal and takes all necessary precautions. A reference to Phaedra and Hippolytus by name would automatically put both of them in the context of a (step)mother – (step)son relationship; hence, it is avoided.²⁹ Instead, the

²⁰ For more see Cairns (1979) 166ff. and Maltby's introduction to Tib. 1.5.

²¹ Further on *puella* as an elegiac signal see n. on *Her.* 4.2. *puella* is the generic term widely used by the elegists with regard to their beloved.

²² Watson (1983) 135.

²³ *pace* Volk's (2005) 88 suggestion that there is "a secret communication between author and reader over which the *persona* has no control and of which he or she is unaware," I believe that the *persona* working hand in hand with the poet is fully aware of its literary status and the implications of her words.

²⁴ Cf. Jacobson (1974) 147 n.13, Casali (1995)b 2.

²⁵ See Pichon (1966) s.v. *puella* and Watson (1983). See also De Vito (1994) 313.

²⁶ See Pichon (1966) s.v. *puella*, Kirfel (1969) 93, Booth (1981) 2689 n.21, Watson (1983) 135.

²⁷ Kirfel (1969) 93, esp. Watson (1983) 135.

²⁸ Rosati (1985) 115, Jacobson (1974) 147, Casali (1995)b 2.

²⁹ Cf. De Vito (1994) 313. In a strikingly similar way, Byblis in her love letter to Caunus (*Ov. Met.* 10.523ff.) tries to play down their "brother-sister" relationship. Not only does she postpone the names of the correspondents in the opening of her letter (*Met.* 10.530-4), but more importantly she decides to physically remove the term "sister" by scratching it out from the salutation of her letter (*Met.* 10.523-9).

mother-son relationship is effectively replaced by the elegiac love affair between a *puella* and a *uir*.³⁰

Phaedra's reference to her Cretan origin is also very important, especially when examined in conjunction with the presence of the "motif of Crete" in Euripides' *Hippolytus*. In the play, all references to Crete occur at critical moments of the action³¹ and carry connotations of suffering and doom, since the heroine's departure from the paternal house prefigures death and disaster.³² In particular, Phaedra's own references to her origin constitute a reminder of the sexual perversion of her Cretan family and a reminder of her tragic sexual heredity;³³ Crete in effect "comes to stand metaphorically for evil itself,"³⁴ a representation of the inevitability of moral failure. In this light, Phaedra's reference to her Cretan origin is ill-omened, as it is bound to bring to the attentive reader's mind connotations of doom and disaster from tragedy.

Phaedra mentions her Cretan origin repeatedly throughout her letter.³⁵ Nevertheless, her emphasis on her Cretan descent proves to be rather controversial. On the one hand, it facilitates her inclusion in her family, but at the same time it marks her alienation from Theseus. Right from the very beginning Phaedra depicts herself as a foreigner, an outcast, who finds it difficult to adjust and incorporate herself to her new environment. Given the years of marriage with Theseus, away from her homeland,³⁶ this can be seen as a hint at an unhappy married life. Her emphatic association with her homeland is meant to challenge her husband's power over her and effectively undervalues her status as Theseus' wife.³⁷ In addition, it also helps to further associate herself with Hippolytus, whose descent from the Amazon also makes him a foreigner. In this light, the juxtaposition of the two adjectives *Amazonio Cressa* further stresses her detachment from Theseus as opposed to her proximity to Hippolytus.³⁸

The ominous connotations behind Phaedra's emphatic association with her Cretan line are far from over. The fact that the Cretans were traditionally considered to be liars³⁹ makes Phaedra's identification as *Cressa* an unfortunate and rather self-contradictory choice, as it undermines her credibility. The connection with her previous literary career as letter-writer in

³⁰ On this see p.33.

³¹ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 371f. (after the revelation of Phaedra's love for Hippolytus), 719-21 (Phaedra's last words on stage), 752-63 (in the so-called "escape ode", following Phaedra's last entrance to the house), also 155-60. On the importance of Phaedra's Cretan origin in Eur. *Hipp.* see Norwood (1953) 79, Winnington-Ingram (1960) 169-91, esp. 175f., Reckford (1974) 319, esp. 322ff., Mills (1997) 199 n. 51.

³² Goff (1990) 64.

³³ Winnington-Ingram (1960) 176.

³⁴ Reckford (1974) 327.

³⁵ Cf. *Her.* 4.61 *en ego nunc, ne forte parum Minoa credar*, 68 *Cnosia me uellem detinuiset humus*, 157 *quod mihi sit genitor...Minos*, 163 *mihi dotalis tellus...Crete*.

³⁶ Jacobson (1974) 143f. following Barrett (1964) 32 n.4 places the scene of Phaedra's letter in Athens (cf. also Ov. *Met.* 15.506 with Bömer and Ov. *Fast.* 6.739).

³⁷ Cf. also her wish for the death of her children with Theseus at lines 125f.

³⁸ Jacobson (1974) 147.

³⁹ For the Cretans' association with lying see n. on *Her.* 4.2.

tragedy is inevitable.⁴⁰ In the Euripidean play, it was Phaedra's disastrous letter, which full of lies and false accusations caused Hippolytus' death.⁴¹ In the following line, Phaedra prompts Hippolytus to have no fear and read her letter thoroughly (3 *perlege, quodcumque est*). Her additional suggestion that there can be no harm at all from reading a letter (*quid epistula lecta nocebit?*) is meant to recall to the attentive reader's mind the disastrous outcome of the reading of that lethal letter. From a metaliterary perspective, Phaedra seems to suggest that her new, elegiac letter is harmless compared with its lethal tragic precedent. Her emphasis, however, on her Cretan origin undermines considerably the sincerity of her letter. Hence, the iunctura *Cressa puella* is a telling manifestation of the incongruity that lies at the very heart of Phaedra's new elegiac status, as she finds herself trapped between tragedy and elegy. She strives to become an elegiac *puella*, however she fails to overcome her tragic legacy, which haunts her and ultimately cancels all her attempts to break free from the prescribed doom of her tragic past. In this respect, *Cressa puella* signals both her departure from her tragic past, and the unfortunate failure of her new elegiac existence.

Phaedra's use of *salutem mittit* as an epistolary salutation is remarkable, mainly because of its rareness in classical Latin poetry, where this particular letter greeting is attested only in the Ovidian verse letters.⁴² Once again, the possibility of a Euripidean influence offers an interesting explanation for this strange choice. *Salus*, apart from greeting,⁴³ also means good health.⁴⁴ In this second meaning, Phaedra's wish for good health becomes extremely important in connection with the heroine's love-diseased image in the play, the so-called "nosos imagery".⁴⁵ The "nosos imagery" is one of the most prominent metaphors in the play, whose presence dominates the first half of the action entirely.⁴⁶ Initially, *nosos* coincides with "desire" and becomes synonymous with her erotic passion for Hippolytus. In the course of the play, Phaedra's *nosos* gradually spreads beyond control and it soon contaminates even Hippolytus by inflicting upon him physical and mental torment, which ultimately causes his death.⁴⁷ From physical illness to mental affliction and eventually to death the "nosos imagery" -through its manifold transformations- plays a crucial role in the workings of the impending disaster. Hence,

⁴⁰ For a detailed discussion of this allusion to the Euripidean *Hippolytus* see Barchiesi (1993) 337f. (=2001) 108f.), and Casali (1995)b 5. Also see n. on *Her.* 4.3.

⁴¹ Casali (1995)b 3. Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1288 *ψευδέσι μύθοις ἀλόχου*, 1311 *ψευδεῖς γραφάς ἔγραψε*. For a detailed discussion of Phaedra's Euripidean letter see Goff (1990) 37f., Segal (1992) 431f., esp. Rosenmeyer (2001) 88-94.

⁴² Ovid is the only classical poet to use *salutem mittit* (or *mitto*) as an epistolary salutation (so Lanham (1975) 31f. with n.61 for references in other Ovidian works). In the *Heroides*, the salutation appears again at: 13.1, 16.1, 18.1, 19.1.

⁴³ *OLD* s.v. *salus* 8.

⁴⁴ *OLD* s.v. *salus* 2. A similar *double entendre* on *salus* may be also at work at *Her.* 11.[1f.], 13.1f. Further on this play see n. on *Her.* 4.1.

⁴⁵ Cf. also her reference to love as wound at line 20 *...et caecum pectra uulnus habent* with n. ad loc.

⁴⁶ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 40, 179f., 186, 205, 269, 279, 283, 293, 294, 394, 398, 405, 463, 477, 479, 512, 597, 698, 730, 766. The "nosos imagery" must have been present even in Euripides' first *Hippolytus* (see fr. F Barrett (= fr. 428 N) *οἱ γὰρ Κύπριν φεύγοντες ἀνθρώπων ἄγαν / νοσοῦσ' ὁμοίως τοῖς ἄγαν θηρωμένοις*).

⁴⁷ On the importance of Phaedra's disease image in Eur. *Hipp.* see Segal (1965) 138 and n. 39, Gill (1990) 87 with n.41 and 90 with n.60, Goff (1990) 50, esp. 68.

the *double entendre* of *salus* in Phaedra's letter is cutting. The love-diseased Phaedra sends to Hippolytus "wishes for good health", which in effect are an invitation to join her in ill-health, to share her love-disease and ultimately to give in to her *nosos*.⁴⁸ The ominous nature of this witty ambiguity is further enhanced by Phaedra's last words on stage. Moments before leaving the stage to enter the palace and kill herself, Phaedra concludes her last public speech with her decision to take revenge by making Hippolytus "share this disease in common with [her]."⁴⁹ Moreover, Hippolytus himself later in the play uses the "*nosos* metaphor" to describe the forthcoming disaster.⁵⁰ In this light, Phaedra seems to be left once again in the middle, lingering between tragedy and elegy. Her reminiscence of her very last words in the Euripidean play and her decision to take revenge now become the opening words in her elegiac letter, thus transforming an otherwise conventional epistolary wish for good health into an ominous invitation to Hippolytus' death.

ii) Phaedra the elegiac poet (*Her.* 4.7-16)

In Euripides' *Hippolytus*, Phaedra's public confession of her love for her stepson is followed by a long speech in which she tries to justify her actions (*Eur. Hipp.* 373-430).⁵¹ Phaedra finds herself caught between speech and silence⁵² and her initial response is to look for remedy in the concealment of her love with silence.⁵³ And when silence fails her, in a very aristocratic way she opts for the only remaining alternative, death.⁵⁴

The Ovidian Phaedra initially gives the impression of having similar concerns about the revelation of her illicit love. Her decision to write this letter, she claims, was not taken on the spur of the moment. On the very contrary, her letter is the outcome of her inner struggle and moral inhibition (a claim she repeats near the end of the letter).⁵⁵ There is, however, a crucial distinction. In complete contrast with her tragic counterpart, the Ovidian Phaedra does not retreat into silence; instead, following an aggressive tactic she communicates her love to Hippolytus. Phaedra's initial justification is based on her rather paradoxical assumption that

⁴⁸ Casali (1995)b 2.

⁴⁹ *Eur. Hipp.* 730f. *τῆς νόσου δὲ τῆσδέ μοι / κοινῇ μετασχὼν σωφρονεῖν μαθήσεται.*

⁵⁰ *Eur. Hipp.* 933 (...) *νοσοῦμεν δ' οὐδέν ὄντες αἴτιοι;*

⁵¹ On the scholarly controversy about the interpretation of Phaedra's speech see Halleran on *Eur. Hipp.* 373-420 with bibliography ad loc., also see Knox (1952) 8-10, Rabinowitz (1987) 131f. For a totally different approach, according to which Phaedra manipulates her speech in order to propitiate the Chorus and secure the Nurse's help, see Roisman (1999) 77f.

⁵² On Phaedra's entrapment between speech and silence in *Eur. Hipp.* see Goff's comprehensive discussion (1990) 30-32 and Longo (1985), esp. 79-81, 86-90. Further on polarities in the play and their relationship to the "silence-speech" opposition see Goff (1990) 1-26. For the choice between silence and speech as a unifying element of the play see Knox (1952) 3, 12f., 14f. Also consult McClure's (1999) 112-35 excellent discussion of Phaedra's speech in view of the wider issue of female speech in Greek tragedy and its connotations of promiscuity and deceit.

⁵³ *Eur. Hipp.* 38-40 *ἐνταῦθα δὴ στένουσα κάκπεπληγμένη / κέντροις ἔρωτος ἢ τάλαιν' ἀπόλλυται / σιγῇ ξύνοιδε δ' οὐτις οἰκετῶν νόσον.* Cf. Roisman (1999) 6f.

⁵⁴ *Eur. Hipp.* 392-402. For Phaedra and Hippolytus as two typical examples of aristocrats with aristocratic ideals see Knox (1952) 17f. and 21f., Norwood (1953) 75, Zeitlin (1985) 70.

⁵⁵ *Her.* 4.151f. *et pugnare diu nec me summittere culpaē / certa fui –certi siquid haberet amor* with my note ad loc.

pudor (chastity, shame)⁵⁶ has its share in *amor* (love),⁵⁷ which in fact constitutes a reversal of the conventional incompatibility between *pudor* and *amor* (a *topos* for both Greek and Latin love poetry).⁵⁸ The reversal is suggestive of the heroine's elegiac mindset and her new erotic priorities, which stand far apart from the standards set by her tragic counterpart. The Ovidian Phaedra lingering between speech and silence eventually opts for confession over concealment. Casali's suggestion that Phaedra's failed triple attempt to communicate with Hippolytus (lines 7f.) is meant to pick up her failed triple attempt not to communicate with Hippolytus in Eur. *Hipp.* further enhances the intertextual association on grounds of the binary opposition "communication (elegy) / concealment (tragedy)".⁵⁹ Casali moves one step further and argues that these attempts can be read as an allusion to her failed communication with Hippolytus in her previous literary career (namely Sophocles' *Phaedra*, Euripides' first and second *Hippolytus*).⁶⁰ His suggestion is intriguing; however, I am rather reluctant to accept his exclusive emphasis on Greek tragedy, since one runs the risk of totally discarding the story's other literary treatments either from the Greek post-classical period (e.g. Lycophron's *Hippolytus*) or from earlier Latin dramatic production.

Phaedra's emphasis on number three (**three attempts, triple anaphora of *ter***)⁶¹ provides a further link with Euripides' *Hippolytus*, which seems so far to have gone unnoticed. Phaedra proves to be a well-informed reader of the play, where number three has a prominent role: a) the play takes place on the third day of Phaedra's fasting,⁶² ii) Phaedra's resolution to die is the third plan she considers in her attempt to control her unnatural love for Hippolytus,⁶³ iii) Theseus is granted by Poseidon three wishes,⁶⁴ iv) Aphrodite's victims are in triads.⁶⁵

Further ominous implications are introduced through the wider intertextual association of Phaedra's triple attempt with similar cases from earlier literature,⁶⁶ in particular the failed attempts of Ulysses or Aeneas to embrace the ghosts of their loved ones during their visit in the Underworld.⁶⁷ The association with Lucretia's triple attempt to reveal to her father her rape by Sextus Tarquinius as narrated by Ovid in his *Fasti* (2.283 *ter conata loqui ter destitit, ausaque*

⁵⁶ OLD s.v. *pudor* 1. 2.

⁵⁷ *Her.* 4.9 *qua licet et prodest, pudor est miscendus amori*. For the text of this line see pp.278f.

⁵⁸ Further on the poetic *topos* of the incompatibility between *pudor* and *amor* see n. on *Her.* 4.9 with parallels. Phaedra's only other reference to her *pudor* is found at line 155, where *pudor* has already left her (*depuduit, profugusque pudor sua signa reliquit*).

⁵⁹ Casali (1995)b 4.

⁶⁰ Casali (1995)b 4.

⁶¹ On the triple anaphora of *ter*, a frequent Ovidian feature, see n. on *Her.* 4.7f.

⁶² Eur. *Hipp.* 275 *πῶς δ' οὐ, τριταίαν γ' οὐδ' ἄσιτος ἡμέραι;*

⁶³ Eur. *Hipp.* 400-2 *τρίτον δ', ἐπειδὴ τοισὶδ' οὐκ ἐξήνυτον Κύπριν κρατῆσαι, καταναεῖν ἔδοξέ μοι, / κράτιστον - οὐδεὶς ἀντερεῖ-βουλευμάτων.*

⁶⁴ Eur. *Hipp.* 44-6 *κτενεῖ πατήρ ἀραίσιν, ἃς ὁ πόντιος / ἄναξ Ποσειδῶν ὤπασεν Θησεῖ γέρας, / μηδὲν μάταιον ἐς τρίς εὐξασθαι θεῶ, 887-8 ἀλλ', ὦ πάτερ Πόσειδον, ἃς ἐμοί ποτε / ἀράς ὑπέσχου τρεῖς (...).*

⁶⁵ Eur. *Hipp.* 361 *ἢ τήνδε κάμει καὶ δόμους ἀπόλεσεν, 1403-4 [Hipp.] τρεῖς ὄντας ἡμᾶς ὄλεσ', ἥσθημαι, Κύπρις. / [Art.] πατέρα γε καὶ σέ καὶ τρίτην ξυνάρορον.*

⁶⁶ Jacobson (1974) 148, Armstrong (2001) 86 n.88.

⁶⁷ Ulysses: Hom. *Od.* 11.206f. *τρὶς μὲν ἐφωρμήθη, ἔλεειν τέ με θυμὸς ἀνώγει, / τρὶς δέ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν σκιῇ εἴκελον ἦ καὶ ὄνειρον / ἔπατ', Aeneas: Verg. *Aen.* 6.700f. *ter conatus ibi colo dare braccia circum; / ter frustra comprehensa manus effugit imago*, also 2.792f.*

quarto / non oculo ideo sustulit illa suos) is also relevant, since the parallel with Lucretia, the Roman chaste matron *par excellence*, fits in well with Phaedra's self-portrayal as a chaste and loyal wife. Finally, Phaedra's reference to her failing tongue at the edge of her mouth is reminiscent of Medea's hesitant attempts to reveal to her sister Chalciope her love for Jason.⁶⁸ All these intertextual echoes infuse Phaedra's narrative with rather sinister implications, which prefigure the failure of communication with Hippolytus, despite her hard attempts for the contrary.

No matter how tempting the association between Phaedra's concern for *pudor* in her letter and her similar concern for shame in tragedy can be,⁶⁹ a further crucial distinction needs to be made. For tragic Phaedra *αἰδώς*, intrinsically linked with her *εὐκλεία*,⁷⁰ is what keeps her from giving voice to her love for Hippolytus; her *αἰδώς* is incompatible with Eros and remains such until the end of the play. Phaedra in her justification speech to the Chorus (lines 385-7) offers an insight into how she perceives the term through a special reference to the dual nature of *αἰδώς*. There, she distinguishes between an inward *αἰδώς* (meaning "modesty, shame, chastity") and an external social *αἰδώς* of "reputation, good name," a respect for the opinion of others and an awareness of conformity with the social norms.⁷¹ It is precisely her *εὐκλεία*, which causes *αἰδώς* and ultimately results in death. In complete contrast, the Ovidian Phaedra's *pudor* seems to be devoid of such moral connotations; hence, the reminiscence of the tragic *αἰδώς* seems to be restricted only to the level of verbal correspondence.⁷² Her *pudor* is merely a device to justify her use of the letter; more importantly, in a perverse way, the compatibility of *pudor* with *amor* cause no problems whatsoever.⁷³

In an attempt to provide further justification Phaedra complements her reference to her initial hesitation with the manipulation of a poet's divine inspiration scene (lines 10-4). In doing so, Phaedra ingeniously equates her love for Hippolytus with the commands of *Amor* and thus shakes-off responsibility, since she has no other choice but to succumb to god's will and write her letter. Far more importantly, Phaedra's reference to *Amor*'s divine inspiration constitutes a bold acknowledgment of her new status as an elegiac poet. What initially seemed to be a struggle between speech and silence now becomes a struggle between tragedy and elegy in

⁶⁸ Ap. Rhod. 3.683-6 *μῦθος δ' ἄλλοτε μὲν οἱ ἐπ' ἀκροτάτης ἀνέτελλεν / γλώσσης, ἄλλοτ' ἔνερθε κατὰ στήθος πεπότητο / πολλάκι δ' ἡμέροεν μὲν ἀνά στόμα θυῖεν ἐνισπεῖν, / φθογγή δ' οὐ πρόβαινε παροϊτέρω.* *pace* Jacobson (1974) 148 n.16, who fails to read Ovid's use of the "thrice" motif in combination with that of the tongue-tied girl; instead, he considers it strictly in terms of epic parody.

⁶⁹ Verducci (1985) 192, Curley (1999) 170.

⁷⁰ Segal (1970) 284, Winnington-Ingram (1960) 177f.

⁷¹ For a detailed examination of Phaedra's dual meaning of *αἰδώς* see Segal (1970). On the various interpretations of Phaedra's vague use of *αἰδώς* see Winnington – Ingram (1960) 177-9, Barrett (1964) on 385f., Willink (1968) 15f., Segal (1970) 283-8, Pigeaud (1974) 18-21, Kovacs (1980), Cairns (1993) 314-40, Craik (1993), Halleran on Eur. *Hipp.* 385-6a with bibliography, McClure (1999) 130f., Roisman (1999) 79-81, Patrikiou (2004) 297 n.54. For the centrality of *αἰδώς* in the value system of both Greeks and Romans see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 17.13 with bibliography ad loc. On Hippolytus' *αἰδώς* in the play see Segal (1970) 292f, Halleran (2000) 44, Turato (1974) 145-49, Craik (1993) 45-59.

⁷² Curley (1999) 171 draws attention to the inherent lack of the Latin term *pudor* to express the ambivalence of the Greek *αἰδώς* (good and bad).

⁷³ Paratore (1952) 224.

terms of poetics. Her self-consciousness as a letter writer develops in her assumption of her new elegiac *persona*; Phaedra has become an elegiac poet.⁷⁴ The image of Love dictating to Phaedra is inevitably associated with similar scenes in Roman elegy, where Love chides the poet for his attempt to compose in a genre other than love poetry (esp. epic), and calls him back to elegy. This poetic conceit, common among the Augustan poets (possibly under the influence of Callimachean literary principles),⁷⁵ was very popular with the Roman elegists.⁷⁶ Phaedra's implicit allusion to her elegiac status through her self-identification as *puella* in the opening couplet has now given place to a more explicit statement. To sum up, Phaedra by following *Amor*'s poetic instructions effectively identifies herself with the elegiac poet.⁷⁷

A comparative reading with the opening poem of Ovid's *Amores*, given their close thematic affinity and their programmatic character, has much to offer in terms of Phaedra's literary status.⁷⁸ The fact that in both passages *Amor* delivers a laconic order which extends over one line⁷⁹ combined with the divine command which is immediately followed by the imagery of love as fire⁸⁰ further support the association. McKeown is partly right in arguing that *Amor* in the opening poem of the *Amores* is portrayed more as an interfering god and less as "a deity who inspires poetry",⁸¹ in his view the god's laconic response to the poet's long protest is rather insufficient to justify a case of divine inspiration.⁸² Nevertheless, one of the fundamental principles of Roman elegy involves the identification of loving with writing and love often becomes synonymous of the poem itself.⁸³ On the face of this elegiac identification of sexuality with textuality, *Amor*'s shooting of his arrows against the poet is practically an act of poetic

⁷⁴ It is very unfortunate that Volk (2005) 90-2 in her most recent discussion of the poetic *persona* in the *Heroides* failed to take notice of Phaedra's identification with the elegiac poet and expressed the misguided assumption that "the *Heroides*, with its obvious lack of poetic self-consciousness and the subsequent "weakness" of its persona, is in its own category" among the rest of Ovid's elegiac work (91).

⁷⁵ Further on this issue, particularly on the differentiation between Callimachus and the Augustans in terms of aesthetic and social standards see McKeown's discussion in his introduction to *Am.* 1.1, esp. 10f., also Papanghelis (1994) 95-106 and Keith (1994) 27 n.1 with bibliography ad loc.

⁷⁶ Cf. Prop. 1.1.1-8, 2.10.25f., 2.13A.1-4, Ov. *Am.* 1.1, 2.1.3f. and 38 with McKeown, *Her.* 20.230, *Ars* 3.43f. with Gibson. Cf. also Prop. 3.3 (Apollo and Muse Calliope substitute for Love), Ov. *Am.* 3.1 (a dispute between Tragedy and Elegy). Cf. also Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3-5, Hor. *Carmin.* 4.15.1-4.

⁷⁷ On Phaedra as an elegiac figure see Jacobson (1974) 148f., Kenney (1992) 423f., Smith (1992) 264ff., Spoth (1992) 111-17, Casali (1995)b 5, Armstrong (2001) 158f. Further on the close generic relationship of the *Heroides* with Roman elegy see Jacobson (1974) 338ff., Barchiesi (1987) 67-71 (=2001) 31-4), Rosati (1992), esp. 71-89, Spoth (1992), Knox (2002) 126. Corinna in Ovid's *Amores* also shows signs of poetic self-consciousness, when through her use of *blanditias* and *dulcia uerba* she assumes the posture of an elegiac poet in *Am.* 2.19.9-18 (see Keith (1994-5) 32).

⁷⁸ Smith (1994) 265-68, Curley (1999) 164, Armstrong (2001) 158f.

⁷⁹ Cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.1.24 "quod"que "canas, uates, accipe" dixit "opus". In both cases, the line is a pentameter, which underlines the elegiac character of the god's orders (Armstrong (2001) 159 n. 6).

⁸⁰ Cf. Ov. *Her.* 4.15f. *adsit et, ut nostras audio uorat igne medullas, fingat sic animos in mea uota tuos* ~ Ov. *Am.* 1.1.25f. *me miserum! certas habuit puer ille sagittas. I uror, et in uacuo pectore regnat Amor.* For more on the combination of love's arrows with love's fire (two widespread *topoi* in elegy) see note on *Her.* 4.15f.

⁸¹ McKeown's introductory note to *Am.* 1.1, p.8, and *idem* on 1.1.23f.

⁸² McKeown on *Am.* 1.1.23f.

⁸³ See Wyke (2002) 159f., esp. 160 n.14 with bibliography, and 164 on Sulpicia's identification of her love with her poetry. A consequence of this elegiac trope is the conflation of the personal style with principles of elegiac writing in the construction of the elegiac *puella*. Further on the elegiac mistress as a *scripta puella* see Keith (1994-5), Skinner (1998) 22, Wyke (2002) 11-191. For this principle in the *Heroides* see bibliography in n.118.

inspiration; hence, *Amor* becomes an inspiring god both in terms of erotics and poetics. Besides, the god's active involvement in the poetic process in the very beginning of the poem, where he steals away the last metric foot from the poet's hexameter (lines 4f.) further adds to his inspiring role.

Close thematic and verbal similarities also argue in favour of a possible association with *Ov. Am.* 2.1, where the lover-poet composes his work in accordance with the commands of *Amor*.⁸⁴ The presence of love's imagery as fire following immediately after the divine command is a further indication,⁸⁵ while the employment of *ausus eram* at line 11 denoting the undertaking of an ambitious literary project is echoed by Phaedra's *conata loqui* at line 7. Within the *Heroides*, Acontius' letter to Cydippe (*Her.* 20) also offers an interesting parallel with Phaedra's case, since Acontius is strikingly reminiscent of Phaedra, when he makes a similar claim that his letter is dictated by *Amor* himself.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ *Am.* 2.1.3 *hoc quoque iussit Amor* with McKeown, 38 ...*purpureus quae mihi dictat Amor*. Cf. also Prop. 2.13A.4 (sc. Amor) *iussit et Ascraeum sic habitare nemus*, *Ov. Ars* 3.43 *me Cytherea docere / iussit*. For further intertextual associations with the *Ars* see Spoth (1992) 114, Landolfi (2000) 13-8, also Kenney (1992) 424, Farrell (1998) 319 n.21. In view of Phaedra's erotodidaxis, the presence of *Amor* at the prologue of Phaedra's letter could be a remote echo of divine epiphanies at the prologue of didactic poems (further on divine epiphanies in didactic poetry see Gibson on *Ov. Ars* 3.43-56).

⁸⁵ *Am.* 2.1.7f. *atque aliquis iuenum, quo nunc ego, saucius arcu / agnoscat flammae conscia signa suae*. Cf. also Prop. 2.13A.1-7, esp. *specula quot nostro pectore fixit Amor*, and Byblis' incest letter to Caunus (*Met.* 9.514-6 *ipsa petam! poterisne loqui? poterisne fateri? / coget amor, potero! uel, si pudor ora tenebit, / littera celatos arcana fatebitur ignes*), where Byblis' initial fight between *amor* and *pudor* ultimately gives way to her confession under love's commands.

⁸⁶ *Her.* 20.230 *haec tibi me uigilem scribere iussit Amor*. Further on the correspondence between *Her.* 4 and *Her.* 20-21 see Fulkerson (2005) 135-7.

A reference to Love as an inspiring god may be absent from Euripides' second *Hippolytus*, but is very close to a surviving fragment from Euripides' first *Hippolytus*.⁸⁷ Unfortunately, the fragmentary nature of the surviving evidence permits us to draw only tentative conclusions about the plot of the play. However, following the generally accepted assumption,⁸⁸ Phaedra, instead of concealing her passion, makes a direct sexual approach to Hippolytus in an attempt to seduce him. The reference to Eros as "instructor in boldness and daring" (τόλμης καὶ θράσους διδάσκαλον) must have appeared within the context of her attempt at seduction.⁸⁹ In both passages, the love god inspires the revelation of the forbidden passion. The fact that the Euripidean fragment is the first surviving evidence (and it is very likely that it belongs to the earliest ones), where Eros receives the title διδάσκαλος, adds further significance to the allusion.⁹⁰

iii) Phaedra between *fama* and εὐκλεία

Phaedra's unfailing concern for her reputation (*fama*) throughout her letter⁹¹ recalls her similar concern for εὐκλεία in the Euripidean *Hippolytus*, where she is completely usurped by her struggle to maintain the integrity of her public image at any cost. The thickly sown references to her εὐκλεία⁹² together with her long justification speech to the Chorus (Eur. *Hipp.* 373-430) provide sufficient evidence for her view of life and her moral principles.⁹³ At the very heart of her *Weltanschauung* lies the struggle between her inner self and her public image. Phaedra's view of the world is in accordance with the prevailing Athenian male ideology about female silence and female sexual control within the constraints imposed by female gossip and public criticism.⁹⁴ She sounds like "a woman who wants to fulfil her role in a world whose order is established by male authority."⁹⁵ Either out of conformity to the norms of female behaviour⁹⁶ or as expression of her aristocratic code of ethics⁹⁷ Phaedra assumes εὐκλεία as

⁸⁷ Jacobson (1974) 149, Knox (2002) 131.

⁸⁸ Cf. Barrett (1964) 11f, Halleran (2000) 25-7, Reckford (1974) 309-17, Curley (1999) 155, Mills (1999) 195-207. For a different opinion see Roisman (1999) 9-17.

⁸⁹ fr. 430 Nauck² (= Eur. first *Hipp.* fr. C Barrett, *ap.* Stob. 4.20.25): ἔχω δὲ τόλμης καὶ θράσους διδάσκαλον ἐν τοῖς ἀμηχάνοισιν εὐπορώτατον; Ἐρωτα, πάντων δυσμαχώτατον θεόν.

⁹⁰ Zeitlin (1987) 55 with n. 9. The idea must have been earlier than Euripides, but it is here that Eros receives the exact title. This particular portrayal of Eros by Euripides is later found in Nicias of Miletus (*SH* 566), and it seems that the idea of love (Eros / Aphrodite) being a "διδάσκαλος of poetry" must have been popular in Hellenistic poetry (cf. Bion fr. 9 and 10, *Anacreontea* fr. 1.9f.). Further on the Hellenistic popularity of the motif see McKeown's introductory note to *Am.* 1.1., pp. 8f. and Procopius (1939) cited by Jacobson (1974) 149 n.17.

⁹¹ Cf. *Her.* 4.17f., 27f., 51, 129f., 139f.

⁹² Phaedra on her εὐκλεία: Eur. *Hipp.* 329, 401-5, 423, 489, 687, 717, others on Phaedra's εὐκλεία: 47, 502f., 719, 773f.

⁹³ A wide range of different, often conflicting, interpretations has been put forward in respect of the function of Phaedra's speech varying from a speech of moral self-justification to a rhetorical manipulation aiming at winning the Chorus' favour and the Nurse's help. Cf. Halleran on Eur. *Hipp.* 373-430 with bibliography, also see Reckford (1974) 315, Roisman (1999) 77-86.

⁹⁴ McClure (1999) 19-24, 112-15. For female speech and the detrimental results of female gossip in the example of Euripides' *Andromache* see McClure (1999) 158-83, 193-97.

⁹⁵ Gill (1990) 89 with n.57 and bibliography ad loc.

⁹⁶ Goldhill (1986) 126f., McClure (1999) 117f. On the abnormality of Phaedra's claim for public glory (lines 403f.) with regard to the social standards of Athens see Goff (1980) 15 with n.20 with bibliography.

the governing principle of her life with utmost importance.⁹⁸ However, her struggle for reputation becomes something of a paradox in that the circumscription of her life between *εὐκλεία* and *δύσκεια* reaches such levels of self-containment that Phaedra ultimately fails to maintain the crucial distinction between appearance and reality.⁹⁹ Her external image to the eyes of the public becomes an end in itself, as she becomes all the more estranged from morality, which ultimately causes both hers and Hippolytus' death.¹⁰⁰

Phaedra's preoccupation with her good name in the letter is but a remote echo of Phaedra's *εὐκλεία* in the play. Her *fama* is perceived and should be understood purely in Roman terms.¹⁰¹ Actually, Phaedra's repeated references to *fama* seems to be a means of the heroine's Romanization within the generic context of Roman elegy, since such concern was considered to be a desirable, a typical virtue of a Roman matron.¹⁰² A respectable *matrona* was expected to conduct her life (private or public) with moral integrity in order to preserve her *fama* and the honour of her family.¹⁰³

Phaedra's proud declarations of a spotless married life with Theseus¹⁰⁴ stand very close to Helen's similar claims for a morally unmarred life with Menelaus in her reply letter to Paris.¹⁰⁵ Helen in a striking anachronism presents herself in terms of a *uniuira*, that is a woman married and devoted to only one man, the embodiment of the ideal role of a Roman matron.¹⁰⁶ Both passages ultimately recall Dido and her archetypal concern for her good name in Vergil's *Aeneid* 4.¹⁰⁷ Actually, Phaedra and Dido have much more in common than their steadfast

⁹⁷ Knox (1952) 17, Winnington-Ingram (1960), Reckford (1974) 315, Kovacs (1987), McClure (1999) 117.

⁹⁸ Segal (1970) 288f., Zeitlin (1985) 100, Gill (1990) 88f., McClure (1999) 116-19, Patrikiou (2004) 297.

⁹⁹ On the intricacies of Phaedra's *εὐκλεία* and the justification (moral, dramatic) of her actions as a result of her struggle for reputation see Knox (1952) 12, 17f., Winnington-Ingram (1960) 179f., 185, Conacher (1967) 41, Willink (1968) 20, Fitzgerald (1973) 22-6, Claus (1972) 230, Reckford (1974) 314f., Loraux (1978) and (1987) 29f., Goff (1980) 15, Gilula (1981), Longo (1985) 88, 93f., Zeitlin (1985) 100, Rabinowitz (1987) 131, Gill (1990) 86f., 89, McClure (1999) 116-19, Roisman (1999) 6f., 84, Patrikiou (2004) 297f.

¹⁰⁰ For a detailed discussion of the role of public criticism and the manipulation of seeing and being seen in the play see Goff (1990) 20-6, Reckford (1974) 314f. and Zeitlin (1985) 100, Segal (1992) 428 respectively.

¹⁰¹ On Roman honour and shame see McGinn (1998) 10-4.

¹⁰² Cf. e.g. Treggiari (1991) 311-13, 232-37, 464. Men, on the other hand, were allowed to maintain extramarital relationships, see Dixon (1992) 88, Edwards (1993) 49-53, Williams (1999) 47-56. For a concise overview of the Romans' mechanisms of female construction and their perception of female sexuality see Skinner (1998) 3-25.

¹⁰³ In view of Phaedra's assumption of the role of the "elegiac poet" Phaedra's concern could also be associated with the lover-poet's frequent claim for eternal loyalty to his mistress, though in reversed gender order. For further discussion on this elegiac *topos* with examples see Lilja (1965) 172-8 and Lyne (1980) 65-7.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. *Her.* 4.18 *fama –uelim quaeras– crimine nostra uacat, 31f. si tamen ille prior, quo me sine crimine gessi, candor ab insolita labe notandus erat.*

¹⁰⁵ Cf. *Her.* 17.17f. *fama tamen clara est, et adhuc since crimine uixi, et laudem de me nullus adulter habet, 69 aut ego perpetuo famam sine labe tenebo.*

¹⁰⁶ Further on this see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 17.17f. with parallels and bibliography ad loc. Also see Williams (1958) 23ff., Treggiari (1991) 233f., Dixon (1992) 89f.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.27, 55, 322, 665f.

commitment to their marital relationships.¹⁰⁸ First, they both perceive their erotic infatuation in terms of the conventional erotic combination of love as fire and as wound.¹⁰⁹ Second, Phaedra's affiliation of *pudor* with *fama* reiterates that of the Vergilian Dido. Phaedra is striving to control her passion within the constraints imposed by *pudor*.¹¹⁰ It is her *pudor* that prevents her from revealing her illicit passion and maintain her good name. But when this inhibition fails under the pressure of Love's divine intervention, Phaedra's primary concern becomes the preservation of her *fama*. The Vergilian Dido shows a similar concern for the balance between *pudor* and *fama*, when in accordance with the precepts of *pudor* she struggles to maintain her reputation against her feelings for Aeneas.¹¹¹ What generates her ill repute is her surrender to her erotic feelings for Aeneas. Dido's complaint to Aeneas at lines 322f., where the loss of her shame inevitably results in the loss of her good name, articulates most effectively the interdependence between *pudor* and *fama*.¹¹² The correspondence between Dido and Phaedra is further sustained by their use of *sine crimine*,¹¹³ however in contrasting contexts. While Phaedra uses the phrase in her claims to a morally spotless life with Theseus,¹¹⁴ Dido, on the other hand, moments before killing herself, contemplates on her failure to live a respectable married life *sine crimine*.¹¹⁵ The contrast between Dido's failure and Phaedra's (alleged) success makes the association to stand out. Phaedra also resembles Dido, in her mistaken interpretation of her relationship with Hippolytus. Trapped as she is between truth and her erotic infatuation she will fall prey to her own misguided expectations, like Dido did in falsely considering her erotic union with Aeneas as marriage.

The interconnection of *pudor* with *fama* also brings Phaedra close to what appears to be the only case of "female" voice within the territory of the male-prescribed Roman elegy, namely Sulpicia.¹¹⁶ The similarities (verbal, thematic) in particular with Sulpicia's poem [Tib.] 3.13 offer strong evidence for the association of the two texts.¹¹⁷ Sulpicia, like Phaedra, is striving to

¹⁰⁸ For Dido's devotion to the love of the dead Sychaeus in particular cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.344 with Austin, 4.28f., 550-2.

¹⁰⁹ *Her.* 4.15f., 19f. with n. ad loc. ~ Verg. *Aen.* 4.1f., 66-8.

¹¹⁰ *Her.* 4.7-10.

¹¹¹ Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.170f., 221, 322f. Dido's concern for *fama* is echoed in the opening of her elegiac letter to Aeneas in *Her.* 7.5f. *sed merita et famam corpusque animumque pudicum / cum male perdiderim, perdere uerba leue est.*

¹¹² Verg. *Aen.* 4.321-3...*te propter eundem / extinctus pudor et, qua sola sidera adibam, / fama prior.*

¹¹³ On the ominous connotations of *sine crimine* and its association with the epitaph language see my note on *Her.* 4.31.

¹¹⁴ *Her.* 4.18 and 30.

¹¹⁵ Verg. *Aen.* 4.550-2 *non licuit thalami expertem sine crimine uitam / degere more ferae talis nec tangere curas; / non seruata fides cineri promissa Sychaeo.*

¹¹⁶ The text of Sulpicia's six *elegidia* is preserved in the third book of the *Corpus Tibullianum* (3.13-18 (= 4.7-12)). Sulpicia's elegies are preceded by the so-called "*amicus Sulpiciae*" group of five longer poems, which are also concerned with the Sulpicia-Cerinthus affair (3.8-12). The identification of Sulpicia, the authorship and the dating still remain a matter of scholarly dispute (cf. Currie (1983) 1751-55, Hinds (1987) 29f., 46, Lowe (1988) 194, Keith (1997) 295f., Holzberg (1999), Hallett (2002) 47). For extensive bibliography on Sulpicia see Wyke (2002) 163 n.27; to her list add Bréguet (1946), Fredericks (1976), Currie (1983), Hallett (2002). In my discussion I consider Sulpicia to have come later than Ovid.

¹¹⁷ For a detailed discussion of the intertextual correspondence between the Ovidian Phaedra and Sulpicia see Michalopoulos (forthcoming) "Ovid's Phaedra, Sulpicia and the politics of *fama*." On the intertextual connection between Sulpicia's *persona* in [Tib.] 3.13 and Dido's Vergilian portrait see Keith's (1997)

comply with her prescribed female virtues of silence and sexual constraint under the pressure of her good reputation.¹¹⁸ Hence, her *pudor* becomes intrinsically linked with her *fama*. Both Phaedra and Sulpicia give the impression of being preoccupied with their public image, nevertheless they also show signs of ironic detachment. Phaedra, on the one hand, as we have seen above, is not immensely troubled with people's gossip *per se*, but only to the extent that this gossip affects Hippolytus' erotic response to her approach.¹¹⁹ Sulpicia, on the other hand, is much more outspoken, since she proves to be practically indifferent to her reputation. She even challenges the regulation of female sexuality by rumour by inviting those who lack their own erotic experiences to circulate her erotic affair.¹²⁰

One could explain these similarities on grounds of a common -more or less- ideology of Roman female respectability. But, the association between the two poets proves to be much deeper judging from their ingenious employment of *pudor* in terms of poetic creativity. Sulpicia's reference to her dilemma between speech and silence in the opening couplet of her poem is clearly programmatic. Her employment of a sexually charged vocabulary (*texisse, nudasse*)¹²¹ intertwines loving with writing. *pudor* becomes "a central force that dictates poetic behaviour", since the revelation of her passion coincides with the publication of her erotic poem and the display of her own body becomes a metaphor for the poetic display of her love, thus making her *tabellae*¹²² become synonymous of her love.¹²³ This poeticization of *pudor* has immediate consequences on her *fama*. Since *pudor* is associated with poetic creativity, Sulpicia's *fama* –besides its implications of moral reputation- stands for her poetic fame as well.¹²⁴ In this light, Sulpicia's struggle between concealment and revelation should be understood not solely within the context of Roman phallogentric ideology, but more importantly within the context of "the interpretative problem created by the assumption of the female author into elegiac discourse."¹²⁵ As Lowe nicely puts it: "the final theme of the poem, then, is not reputation *per se*, but the wider irony of writing public poetry on private experience."¹²⁶

Phaedra in her letter also follows the elegiac trope of identifying love and poetry. The somewhat ambiguous use of *ars* in her claim to her alleged erotic inexperience (lines 23-7) deserves special attention. Given the programmatic character of the divine inspiration scene only a few lines above (10-14), I am more than inclined to read *ars* as a clever *double entendre*

instructive discussion. For a close stylistic analysis of this elegy consult Lowe (1988) 202-5, also see Smith (1913) 504-8, Santirocco (1979) 234f., Hinds (1987) 42f., Milnor (2002).

¹¹⁸ For Propertian echoes in Sulpicia's struggle between *pudor* and *amor* see Flaschenriem (1999) 39f.

¹¹⁹ *Her.* 4.139f., 145f. Nevertheless, her use of verbs in passive, like *uidear* 120, *laudabimur* 139, *dicar* 140, is indicative of her awareness of public criticism and gossip.

¹²⁰ Sulp. [Tib.] 3.13.5f. On the key role of the reputation theme in the poem see Santirocco (1979)234f. As he characteristically notes: "The poem is not about love but also about reputation" 234.

¹²¹ Hinds (1987) 43f., Keith (1997) 301, Milnor (2002) 260.

¹²² Flaschenriem (1999) 37f., Milnor (2002) *passim*, esp. 260.

¹²³ Wyke (2002) 164.

¹²⁴ Santirocco (1979) 234, Wyke (2002) 165.

¹²⁵ Milnor (2002) 263.

¹²⁶ Lowe (1988) 204.

both for the “art of love” and for the “art of writing.”¹²⁷ Her simulated renunciation of love becomes a simulated renunciation of her poetry and in doing so Phaedra ultimately manages to intertwine sexuality with textuality.¹²⁸ If such connotations are perceptible here, then her use of *fama* at line 18 in respect of her unspotted marital life also carries further implications of poetic reputation. However, this renunciation of *ars* has much more serious implications. Phaedra throughout her letter pays heed to the advice of the *praeceptor amoris*, who “recognizes how large a role artifice plays in arousing and sustaining desire.”¹²⁹ In her attempt to downplay the artifice of her erotic approach she runs the risk of almost negating the principal erotic norm of the collaboration of art with love, which so often resounds in the teaching of the *praeceptor*.¹³⁰ Thus she damages considerably the inherently erotic character of her writing, and finds herself stumbling on the verge of self-denial.

Phaedra associates her erotic inexperience with the elegiac motif of love’s belated arrival,¹³¹ which is somewhat of a paradox coming from the mouth of a married woman. Judging from her reference to their children with Theseus (123-6) the couple must have spent a long time together, hence love’s late arrival can be seen as an implicit hint at Phaedra’s disappointment and the betrayal of her hopes for a blissful married life.¹³² In fact, her frustration is discernible throughout her letter in her references to Theseus, which are all made in derogatory tone and primarily concern his unfaithfulness to her and his injustices against Hippolytus.¹³³ The complete absence of a second-person address to him is noteworthy. Theseus’ depiction in the letter does not differ greatly from his representation in the Euripidean play, where he shows also elements of being an emotionally detached and uncaring husband.¹³⁴ However, the implications of a less blissful married life is not inappropriate within the Roman context, since the marital life of the Roman élite was frequently characterised by some sort of estrangement and laxity of the emotional bond between the two consorts.¹³⁵

A further point of contact between Phaedra and Sulpicia is provided by this rare sense of mutuality, which pervades the descriptions of their love affairs. Both refer to their loved ones in terms of “an equal other half”, “a perfect match.”¹³⁶ The presence of the adjective *dignus* in both passages is supportive of my suggestion, which in my view goes deeper than the linguistic

¹²⁷ Also see n. on *Her.* 4.25.

¹²⁸ Further on the heroines’ association of erotic art with the art of writing as a fundamental principle of their epistolary poetics see Kauffman (1986) 36-7 with n.37 with bibliography, Spentzou (2003) 53-60, Milnor (2002) 261 n.6 with bibliography.

¹²⁹ Kauffman (1986) 52.

¹³⁰ Cf. *Ov. Ars* 1.1-4 with Hollis, 2.11-4 and 2.313f. with Janka, 3.41f. with Gibson.

¹³¹ *Her.* 4.19 *uenit amor grauius, quo senior, 26 cui uenit (sc. amor) exacto tempore*. See my note on *Her.* 4.19.

¹³² So also Jacobson (1974) 148.

¹³³ Cf. *Her.* 4.65f., 109-28.

¹³⁴ Cf. Roisman (1999) 126-33. For a detailed discussion of Phaedra’s portrayal of Theseus in her letter and its intertextual association with Euripides’ *Hippolytus* see Michalopoulos (forthcoming) “Theseus in Ovid’s *Heroides* (*Her.* 2, 4 and 10).”

¹³⁵ Hallett (1984) 219-43.

¹³⁶ Cf. *Her.* 4.28n. *et pariter nostrum fiet uterque nocens* and 33n. *at bene successit, digno quod adurimur igni. ~ Sulp. [Tib.] 3.13.10 cum digno digna fuisse ferar.*

level. Both Phaedra and Sulpicia give voice to the erotic motif of *mutuus amor* (ἴσος ἔρωος), which is well attested in Roman elegy as a witty poetic reversal of the predominant Roman phallogocentric view of love in terms of male penetration and domination.¹³⁷ This alternative perception of love as a relationship between equals ultimately draws on Sappho's erotic lyrics with her similar claims for reciprocity in love, as well as the dissolution of the boundaries separating the self and the other.¹³⁸

A final link between Phaedra and Sulpicia is provided through their awareness of their wrongdoing. Sulpicia is less concerned with a public acknowledgment of this fact.¹³⁹ Phaedra, on the other hand, is very conscious of the inappropriateness of her proposal; despite her allegations for the contrary, her use of a language with clear undertones of guilt gives away her resolution to overcome any moral constraints and pursue her erotic passion.¹⁴⁰

Phaedra in an attempt to further strengthen her association with Hippolytus intertwines her concern for *fama* with his own concern for reputation. The preservation (or loss) of her good name inevitably results in the preservation (or loss) of the good name of her beloved. In fact, she proves to be more preoccupied with Hippolytus¹⁴¹ rather than herself, since both her references to her *fama* are made in connection with him either anticipating his anxieties and fears or simply offering reassuring answers to her beloved's possible objections.¹⁴² In complete contrast with the Euripidean *Hippolytus*, where Phaedra's struggle for *εὐκλεία* offered the necessary moral grounds for self-justification, her perverse elegiac rhetoric has now transformed her *fama* from a power of self-restraint into a motive in favour of adultery.

Phaedra's disregard for her children's reputation in her elegiac letter signals a further departure from the Euripidean play, where her tragic counterpart, in accordance with the Athenian politics of reputation, sees in her imminent death, apart from self-justification, the potential of securing for her children a noble reputation.¹⁴³ Phaedra practically becomes a mouthpiece for the Athenian male anxieties about the political legitimacy of their male

¹³⁷ Kauffman (1986) 55, Hallett (2002) 50. *pace* Keith's (1997) 302 misguided suggestion that Phaedra's claim to erotic mutuality constitutes actually the missing "elegiac parallel for Sulpicia's evocation of the mutual worthiness of poet-lover and beloved" the theme of *mutuus amor* is already attested in Roman elegy as early as Tib. 1.5.65f. For more see Maltby on Tib. 1.5.65f. with bibliography. Also see Keith's (1997) 302f. valid suggestion for the possibility of a Gallan intertext, through the intervention of the Vergilian equality between Aeneas and Dido in the *Aeneid*. Lowe (1988) 204f. associates Sulp. [Tib.] 3.13 with Catullan epigram on grounds of formal structure and narrative technique (on possible Catullan echoes in [Tib.] 3.8-12 see Hallett (2002) 48-51, esp. 48 on the adjective *digna* (3.8.15)).

¹³⁸ Kauffman (1986) with n. 49, Greene (1996)b, Skinner (1996) 186f., Stehle [Stigers] (1996), Wilson (1996) 68-86. Further on the intertextual exchange with Sappho's lyrics see Michalopoulos (forthcoming) "Ovid's Phaedra, Sulpicia and the politics of *fama*."

¹³⁹ Sulp. [Tib.] 3.13.10f. *sed pecasse iuuat, uultus componere famae / taedet*.

¹⁴⁰ For Phaedra's use of a guilt-vocabulary see n. on *Her.* 4.18. The Euripidean Phaedra was also conscious of her adultery (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 28, 312, 34), see Turato (1974) 148f., Roisman (1999) 32f., Halleran on Eur. *Hipp.* 10-2 with bibliography ad loc.

¹⁴¹ On the very contrary, there are only two references to Hippolytus' reputation (*κλέος*) in Eur. *Hipp.* (lines 1028, 1299). On Hippolytus' *κλέος* (in death) in Eur. *Hipp.* see Longo (1985) 94f., Rabinowitz (1986) 178f.

¹⁴² *Her.* 4.18 *fama –uelim quaeras– crimine nostra uacat, 27 tu noua seruatae capies libamina famae*, cf. also 129f. *nec, quia priuigno uidear coitura nouerca, / terruerint animos nomina uana tuos, 139f. uiderit amplexos aliquis, laudabimur ambo ; / dicar priuigno fida nouerca meo*.

¹⁴³ Eur. *Hipp.* 420-5 and again at 717f., also 305f. (the Nurse's reference to Phaedra's children).

offspring,¹⁴⁴ since after Pericles' reforms in 451/50 the political legitimacy of a male Athenian had to be derived from both his parents. Phaedra associates her struggle for *εὐκλεία* with her children's *εὐκλεία*, since her morally unblemished life will guarantee for her children the fundamental political right of *παρρησία* (freedom of speech).¹⁴⁵ In the end, Phaedra will achieve her goal, but it is rather ironic that her children will enjoy the *εὐκλεία*, which she herself will lose. In striking contrast, the elegiac Phaedra does not show the slightest concern for her children's reputation. In fact, she does not even care about their very existence, since her only reference to them is nothing more than a wish that they had died in birth, so that they would not become a nuisance for her beloved.¹⁴⁶ Phaedra does not treat her children as a bond between herself and her husband, but rather as one of Theseus' many injustices against herself and Hippolytus (Eur. *Hipp.* 113-26).¹⁴⁷ This is the portrayal of a degenerated Roman mother on the verge of self-denial. Phaedra is moving to extremes, since she is willing to even disassociate herself from her children in favour of her illicit passion for Hippolytus. The reference is by no means insignificant. Given the Amazons' hostility towards reproduction and motherhood,¹⁴⁸ Phaedra's rejection of motherhood is a well-calculated choice, which is meant to portray her as an Amazon-like figure and thus make her even more desirable in Hippolytus' eyes.

iv) Phaedra's "virginity"

Phaedra complements her claim to her erotic inexperience with an equally paradoxical claim to "virginity" (*Her.* 4.27-34). The choice of the flower imagery is a calculated one, which contributes further to the enhancement of the virginal undertones, especially through its affinities with the hymeneal tradition (Sappho, Catullus).¹⁴⁹ Phaedra's claim to her chastity is beyond doubt controversial. The reference cannot and should not be taken literally, especially in view of her many years of married life with Theseus. Rosati's suggestion for "una verginità 'sociale'"¹⁵⁰ understood within the context of Phaedra's unconventional reassessment of adultery according to the adulterer's merits (lines 33f.) seems to offer a plausible solution to the apparent contradiction.

Critics so far have focused their attention only on the incongruity of Phaedra's virginal imagery,¹⁵¹ which is treated as part of the poet's "attempt at representing Phaedra's confused

¹⁴⁴ So Segal (1988) 275, McClure (1999) 134 n.80, against Goff (1990) 7. For a more detailed discussion on the significance of public speech in the construction of civic identity in classical Athens see McClure (1999) 8-15.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 423 *κλεινῶν Ἀθηνῶν, μητρὸς οὐνεκ' εὐκλειῆς*, 717 *ὥστ' εὐκλεᾶ μὲν παισὶ προσθεῖναι βίον*.

¹⁴⁶ *Her.* 4.125f. with n. on *Her.* 4.126 on the use of *uiscera*.

¹⁴⁷ Further see De Vito (1994) 317f., also Patrikiou (2004) 295 with n.50.

¹⁴⁸ On the Amazons' hostility towards marriage and reproduction see p. 32 n.228.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. in particular *Her.* 4.30 *et tenui primam delegere ungue rosam* ~ Catul. 62.43 *idem cum tenui carptus defloruit ungui*. For more on the sexual / virginal imagery see n. on *Her.* 4.29f. Also see Jacobson (1974) 148, Pearson (1980) 113-5 and Armstrong (2001) 55, 163f.

¹⁵⁰ Rosati (1985) 116f.

¹⁵¹ Jacobson (1974) 148, Pearson (1980) 113.

vision of the situation.”¹⁵² In this light, Phaedra’s claim to her “virginity” is seen as another example of her misinterpretation of reality as a result of her erotic infatuation. It is my contention that Phaedra’s “virginity” -far more than an unfortunate contradiction- is an intentional choice, which is better understood within the context of a carefully drawn self-portrayal aiming primarily at Hippolytus’ erotic persuasion.

Despite her proud declaration against the craftiness of her writings at lines 25f., Phaedra throughout her letter is struggling to depict herself as most appealing to Hippolytus. A way to achieve that is by portraying herself as Hippolytus’ perfect match through the appropriation of his chastity. In doing so, Phaedra turns into a reflection of her beloved; she practically becomes a female Hippolytus whose “virginity” “mirrors Hippolytus’ real and jealously guarded virginity.”¹⁵³ An element in Phaedra’s virginal representation, which is aimed specifically at arousing Hippolytus’ male desire, is the combination of purity with sexuality, since this combination of female virtue and licentiousness constitutes primarily a male erotic fascination.¹⁵⁴ An interesting parallel is offered by Ovid’s *Amores* 1.5, where the poet voices in the depiction of his beloved the same male version of desire. In the poem, Corinna is portrayed in binary terms and thus simultaneously affirms her sexuality together with her moral restraint.¹⁵⁵ Her sexually charged representation reaches its climax in her comparison with the self-contradictory image of Semiramis, a female figure notorious for her sexual lechery, entering her bridal chambers.¹⁵⁶ The paradoxical combination of female virtue with depravity is exploited by the poet as “the ultimate sexual turn-on for the male lover in the poem”.¹⁵⁷ The same applies to Phaedra and her binary self-depiction, in which she actually suppresses her own voice and desire in favour of Hippolytus’ male desire. Instead of articulating her personal female speech, Phaedra becomes a mouthpiece of male erotic fascinations in order to fulfil Hippolytus’ expectations. But even so, her attempts are bound to fail, since she fails to take into consideration Hippolytus’ ambiguous sexuality.¹⁵⁸ Hippolytus is not a typical male. In fact, he stands far apart from any sexual ideology. His seclusion in the untouched meadow and his devotion to Artemis is a telling reflection of his rejection of conventional sexuality. Hippolytus lives his life irrespectively of any social norms and practices, in a world where nobody and nothing matters more than his virginity, which ultimately becomes an end on its own. Hence Phaedra’s offering of her virginity hits deaf ears and all her attempts at Hippolytus’ sexual persuasion end in failure.

¹⁵² Jacobson (1974) 148.

¹⁵³ Armstrong (2001) 163. Cf. the extremity of a similar claim made by the Senecan Phaedra: Sen. *Phaedr.* 668f. *respersa nulla labe et intacta, innocens / tibi mutor uni.*

¹⁵⁴ Further on the male fascination of a woman as “virgin and whore” see Mulvey’s (1989) critical model which discusses male representation strategies against the Freudian (/Lacanian) sexual instincts of “fetishistic scopophilia” and “sadistic voyeurism.” Also see Wyke (2002) 140 n.54 with bibliography

¹⁵⁵ For a detailed examination of the poem in terms of gender and the construction of desire see Greene (1998) 77-84.

¹⁵⁶ Ov. *Am.* 1.5.9-11 *ecce, Corinna uenit tunica uelata recincta, / candida diuidua colla tegente coma, / qualiter in thalamus Formosa Semiramis isse / dicitur et multis Lais amata uiris.*

¹⁵⁷ Greene (1998) 80.

¹⁵⁸ Further on this see pp. 33ad 45ff.

v) Phaedra as *lena*

Another role put on by Phaedra in her letter is that of the elegiac *lena*. Instead of making a reference to her Nurse,¹⁵⁹ Phaedra moves a step further and appropriates her role. However, the process of such appropriation does not derive directly from tragedy, but through the assimilation of the Nurse's role in the Hellenistic, and most importantly, in the elegiac literary tradition.¹⁶⁰ Hence, Phaedra's suggestion to Hippolytus to abandon his fatherly devotion, because this kind of respect (*pietas*) has been regarded as "unsophisticated" (*rustica*) and was abandoned ever since the time of Saturn's reign, is strikingly reminiscent of the rejection of old moral standards in favour of modern practices by the elegiac *lena*.¹⁶¹ Especially, her rejection of the past on grounds of *rusticitas* ("lack of sophistication in love") brings Phaedra very close to the propositions advanced by the *praeceptor* in the *Ars amatoria* (3.107-28) who has also usurped the role of the *lena*.¹⁶² In both occasions, the *lena*-like narrator dismisses the somewhat primitive quality of the old days for the sophistication and refinement of modern Rome. There is, however, a distinction to be made; in the case of the *praeceptor*, the opposition between the unrefined past of outmoded *rusticitas* and the sophistication of contemporary Rome involves bodily *cultus*, and not so much the standards of contemporary morality.¹⁶³

Phaedra's reference to the reign of Saturn, instead of the usual reference to the reign of Tatius, the ancient king of the Sabines, is a rather peculiar choice. The integrity shown by the Sabine women was the typical Roman paradigm for the ancestors' simple morality¹⁶⁴ and Tatius' reign became synonymous of the traditional Roman virtues of frugality and propriety; hence, the example of the Sabine women as a discarded model of old-time morality appeared in all similar comparisons made by the *lena* (or other *lena*-like narrators).¹⁶⁵ Phaedra's departure from such practice could be seen as an act of resistance towards the Romanization of her writing. Her use of the Latin name of the god (*Saturnus*), instead of the Greek one (*Cronus*),¹⁶⁶ combined with *pietas* -a typically Roman virtue- sounds already very strange in the mouth of a Greek heroine. Given the Greek background of the story, a reference to an event of the early origins of Roman history would be completely inappropriate, and consequently rhetorically

¹⁵⁹ Cf. e.g. Canace's reference to her Nurse's active involvement in her erotic affair (*Her.* 11.33-44).

¹⁶⁰ Further on this see Rosati (1985) 124ff, Casali (1995)b 4 and Landolfi (2000) 17f.

¹⁶¹ Cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.8.38ff., *Ars* 3.107ff., also *Am.* 3.4.37f. Phaedra is also critical towards Hippolytus' *rusticitas* at lines 101f., where she claims that his countryside without the presence of Venus is nothing but a rustic place.

¹⁶² Cf. esp. *Ov. Ars* 3. 113 *simplicitas rudis ante fuit* with Gibson, 127f. ...*nec nostros mansit in annos / rusticitas priscis illa superstes auis*. Further on the *praeceptor* as *lena* in *Ov. Ars* 3 see Gibson's (2003) 19-21 detailed discussion. On the association of the *lena* with the elegiac poet see esp. Myers (1996), also see Morgan (1977) 59-68 for the *lena* in Prop. 4.5 and *Ov. Am.* 1.8.

¹⁶³ See Gibson on *Ars* 3.107ff. and on 113ff.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.8.39f., 2.4.15f., 3.8.61f., *Medic.* 11f. See also Otto (1890) s.v. *Sabina* with Nachträge (1968) p.208.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Prop. 2.32.52, *Ov. Am.* 1.8.39f., *Medic.* 11f., *Ars* 3.117f.

¹⁶⁶ For the identification of the Roman *Saturnus* with the Greek *Cronus* see n. on *Her.* 4.132.

ineffective. In any case, a reference to Tatius' reign in the letter is impossible also on grounds of relative chronology, since Phaedra's story antedates the rape of the Sabine women.¹⁶⁷

Phaedra's reference to Saturn's reign briefly touches upon a very popular idiom of Augustan poetry, the Golden Age,¹⁶⁸ with the addition of a small twist, that of sexual licence.¹⁶⁹ The surviving literary evidence remains unclear over the issue of sexual liberation during the Golden Age, since most references to the Golden Age are often mixed up with similar accounts of the Old Times in general. What can be said with some certainty is that *licentia amoris* constituted a *topos* of the Old Times (*Zeitalter*), especially in elegy.¹⁷⁰ This specific association of the Golden Age with sexual license is a first in Roman elegy.¹⁷¹ Perhaps Phaedra is further developing here the idea of the compatibility of shame and sexual freedom during the Old Times.¹⁷²

From an intertextual viewpoint, Phaedra's particular predilection for the Golden Age could be read as a response to Hippolytus' fantasies of a Golden Age in Euripides' *Hippolytus*. Twice in the play¹⁷³ Hippolytus sounds "as the nostalgic standard-bearer of the Golden Age".¹⁷⁴ Either in his present (remote in his un-touched meadow) or in his wishes (vehemently denouncing the female race on the whole) he longs for a world, which displays the qualities of the Golden Age.¹⁷⁵ However, in complete contrast with the Ovidian Phaedra, Hippolytus' version of the Golden Age is completely a-sexual. His moral standards are not dependent on differentiated patterns of sexual behaviour. On the very contrary, his morality is defined by being totally averse to any sort of sexuality. His world is a world devoid of female sexuality and matrimonial reciprocity.

Phaedra without further delay complements her rejection of old morality with a reference to modern moral practices (lines 133f.). The structure of the couplet is telling: the general exposition of the new, sophisticated morality in the hexameter is narrowed down to the example of the Jupiter-Juno family incest in the pentameter. Phaedra has no intention to theorize; her rejection of old times' morality is made to support her proposed incest, and Jupiter's incestuous relationship with Juno, his sister, provides the perfect example. A first subtle allusion to this

¹⁶⁷ On the relative chronology of the Sabines see *OCD* s.v. *Sabini*. Theseus antedates the Trojan War, in which his two children, Demophoon and Acamas, took part (cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.265, *Od.* 11.321-4). Further on this chronology see Herter *RE* Suppl. 13 (1973) s.v. *Theseus* 1050.49ff., Mills (1997) 5 with n.13, also Walker (1995) 10-5.

¹⁶⁸ For more on the Golden Age motif see n. on *Her.* 4.132.

¹⁶⁹ For a detailed examination of the heroines' employment of the Golden Age motif in the collection see Spentzou (2003) 43-83 (with some reservations); in particular for Phaedra's use of the motif see Landolfi (2000) 37-42.

¹⁷⁰ See Gatz (1967) 132 with references.

¹⁷¹ Cf. Tib. 1.3.35-48, 1.10.1f., 2.3.69-74, Prop. 2.32.49-52, 3.13.25-46, Ov. *Am.* 3.8.35-6. As far as Tib. 2.3.69-74 is concerned, following Maltby ad loc. (cf. Bailey on Lucr. 5.925-1010) I take the reference in connection with the pre-agricultural phase of mankind (according to the Epicurean tradition, cf. Emped. fr. 128 Diels (= 118 Wright = 122 Inwood)), and with the Golden Age. For an opposite view see Newman (1998) 236.

¹⁷² Cf. Prop. 3.13.38.

¹⁷³ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 74-87 and 616-24.

¹⁷⁴ Zeitlin (1985) 71.

¹⁷⁵ Turato (1974), Zeitlin (1985) 71 and 88f., Segal (1992) 443, Fabre-Serris (1998)a 27-38.

incestuous relationship was already made earlier at line 35 through Phaedra's metonymic reference to Jupiter as Juno's *fratremque uirumque*. There the incestuous couple was used for a comparison in terms of physical appearance; here, the reference serves as divine justification for Phaedra's proposals.¹⁷⁶ Phaedra's reference to Juno through the telling combination *marita soror* (an exact equivalent in female terms of Jupiter's *fratremque uirumque*), instead of her conventional title of Juno as Jupiter's *coniunx et soror*,¹⁷⁷ is suggestive of her emphasis on incest.

A further identification of the Ovidian Phaedra with the Euripidean Nurse also operates behind Phaedra's image as a suppliant near the end of her letter (lines 153-6). Phaedra's appeals to Hippolytus bring to mind the Nurse's two supplication scenes in the play: first, in front of Phaedra in order to force her confess her hidden passion,¹⁷⁸ and second, during her confrontation with Hippolytus where she uses her supplication as a means to keep Hippolytus silent.¹⁷⁹ Besides, one should not exclude the possibility of a more straightforward allusion to a (now lost) scene of Phaedra's erotic supplication to Hippolytus.¹⁸⁰

In any case, Phaedra's assumption of the role of the elegiac *lena* remains a rather controversial choice. The combination of the role of the *lena* with that of the *praeceptor amoris* facilitates her exit from elegy's narrow focused elegiac code,¹⁸¹ but at the same time it is also indicative of the contradictions and incompatibilities involved in her inner struggle to articulate her own voice and desire under the pressure of elegy's generic restraints.

vi) Phaedra in the woods (*Her.* 4.37-52)

In Eur. *Hipp.* Phaedra during her first appearance on stage, despite the Nurse's advice against the public disclosure of her secret suffering,¹⁸² opts for a gradual revelation through the ambiguities and impossibilities of her hunting fantasies (Eur. *Hipp.* 208-238). The close intertextual association between lines 37-50 of Phaedra's letter and Phaedra's so-called "delirium scene" in Euripides' *Hippolytus* has now become more than a commonplace. However, the correspondence is not as direct as generally considered and we should allow also for the possible influence (stylistic, syntactic) of Vergilian pastoral and Propertian elegy.¹⁸³ Moreover, despite the obvious verbal and thematic similarities, from a narratological perspective there is a crucial differentiating factor, namely the change of the narrator's

¹⁷⁶ Cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 3.4.37f., *Ars* 3.121f., against Prop. 2.25.37. The Jupiter-Juno incestuous relationship also features among the *exempla deorum* employed by Byblis in support of her proposed incest at Ov. *Met.* 9.497-501. Cf. Davisson (1993) 223, Feeney (1991) 195-7.

¹⁷⁷ Further on the widespread motif of Juno as Jupiter's sister and wife in both Greek and Latin literature see my note on *Her.* 4.133f.

¹⁷⁸ Eur. *Hipp.* 324-6.

¹⁷⁹ Eur. *Hipp.* 605-7. For further connections between the Ovidian Phaedra and the Euripidean Nurse see Armstrong (2001) 165f.

¹⁸⁰ Possibly in Euripides' first *Hippolytus*? (so Barrett (1964) 11, against Roisman (1999) 9f.).

¹⁸¹ See Conte (1989) esp. 448, 450, Spentzou (2003) 20.

¹⁸² Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 213f. οὐ μὴ παρ' ὄχλω τάδε γηρύση / μανίας ἔποχον ρίπτουσα λόγον.

¹⁸³ Rosati (1985) 128-30.

viewpoint. In tragedy, Phaedra's erotic confession unfolds gradually along her quasi-lyric utterances,¹⁸⁴ which generate the Nurse's puzzled and rather slow-minded replies. Hence, the reader approaches the revelation of Phaedra's desire through the alternation of the (often contrasting) perspectives of the two women. In the case of Phaedra's letter, we are moving from public revelation to private confession, since we are now entering the private and intimate sphere of a woman confessing her erotic passion in writing. The dual perspective of tragedy is now condensed to the letter-writer's only viewpoint, which is the only governing perspective of the narrative. The reader of her letter can see and hear only through Phaedra's eyes and ears.

A far more significant discrepancy between the two texts involves the different state of mind of the two Phaedras. In the play, Phaedra is overwhelmed completely by her passion and seems to have lost contact with reality.¹⁸⁵ Driven by her erotic infatuation and close to erotic frenzy, she is balancing precariously on the verge of a delirium.¹⁸⁶ What she delivers is nothing more than wishful thinking, an erotic hallucination, and her hunting fantasy ultimately becomes a figure of metaphor for her suppressed desire to be with Hippolytus.¹⁸⁷ The Ovidian Phaedra, on the contrary, seems to be much more in control of her passion. What she describes in her letter is no longer a fantasy. Her hunting pursuit is not a wish, but a reality. Phaedra has actually managed to fulfill in her narrative present (letter) the wishful thinking of her literary past (tragedy). This crucial change reflects on the grammar of the two texts, where her extensive use of optative or equivalent verbal constructions in tragedy¹⁸⁸ has now given place to the much more assertive indicative.¹⁸⁹ In addition, pathetic interjections, like *πρὸς θεῶν* 219, *εἶθε* 230, *φεῦ φεῦ* 242, which raise the emotional pitch by underlining Phaedra's excitement, are now replaced by temporal adverbs, like *iam...iam* 38f., *saepe* 45, *nunc* 47, which rather suggest the sense of "here and now".

Phaedra calls at line 37 her new hunting pursuits *ignotas artes*. The ambiguity of the term, which -in addition to its meaning as "pursuit, activity"- can also denote "art, artistic skills"¹⁹⁰ is not coincidental, especially in view of the prepositional construction with *mittor*.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁴ See Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 208ff.: "Here Ph. continues to use ordinary non-lyric anapaests, but her excitement is marked by her use of lyric *â* in place of Attic secondary *η* (does this point to some kind of quasi-lyric delivery? one can only guess): the Nurse of course sticks to *η*." Also Halleran on Eur. *Hipp.* 198-266.

¹⁸⁵ The loss of contact with the surroundings as a technique to highlight the change of the character's troubled or changed state of mind seems to have been something of a convention in tragedy: see Halleran (2000) on Eur. *Hipp.* 198-266 with bibliography. For a similar example of this technique see Roisman's (1999) 70 n.14 discussion of Alcestis' vision at Eur. *Alc.* 252-63.

¹⁸⁶ So Knox (1952) 6, Barrett (1964) on Eur. *Hipp.* 208ff., Segal (1965) 141, Zeitlin (1985) 110, Goldhill (1986) 124f., Rabinowitz (1987) 132, Goff (1990) 7, 32-34. For an opposite opinion see Roisman (1999) 50-6 who argues for Phaedra being in full control of her passion.

¹⁸⁷ For hunting as freedom from restraints on sexuality see Detienne (1979) 25, Goff (1990) 33 with n.9, Cairns (1997) 67.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 209f. *πῶς ἄν ἄρυσσάιμαν*, 211 *ἀναπαυσάιμαν*; 230 *εἶθε γεινοίμαν*; also 215 *πέμπετε μ'*, 215 *εἶμι πρὸς ὕλαν*, 219f. *πρὸς θεῶν, ἔραμαι κυσὶ θωύξαι / καὶ παρὰ χαίταν ξανθὰν ῥίψαι*.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. *Her.* 4. 37 *mittor in artes*, 38 *est mihi*, 39 *mihi...est*, 40 *subsequor*, 41 *ire libet*, 45 *iuvat uersare*, 46 *feror*, 51 *referent*, 51 *remisit*, 52 *urit*.

¹⁹⁰ See *OLD* s.v. *ars* 7 and 8 respectively.

It is my contention that Phaedra's relocation to the woodland is not only spatial, but more importantly generic.¹⁹² As she runs for the woodland, Phaedra leaves behind not only her palace, but also her literary past, thus signalling her assimilation into the world of elegy. Hence, her frantic roving in Hippolytus' woods ultimately becomes a metaphor for her venture in these *ignotas...artes*, which become synonymous with her new literary attempts in elegiac poetry.¹⁹³

In tragedy, Phaedra's reference to the wild opens with a deliberate echo of the innocence of Hippolytus' untouched meadow; her yearning for the pure water of a spring and for some repose in a grassy meadow recalls his exclusive and pure meadow, which is watered by the rivers of *Αιδῶς*.¹⁹⁴ But soon she transforms Hippolytus' untainted woodland into a projection of her suppressed erotic desire through her emphatic use of the verb *ἔραμαι* (219, again at 215 *ἔρασαι*) and through her reference to hunting and riding, whose sexual connotations invest her account with a distinctively erotic colour.¹⁹⁵ The Ovidian Phaedra proves to be a well informed reader by picking up the sexual overtones of the Euripidean passage, but she moves one step further, as she tries to assimilate these overtones in the new elegiac context. Phaedra restricts her reference to the countryside only to a passing reference (line 44), while she puts much more emphasis on her hunting and riding pursuits (lines 37-44). The employment of the hunting imagery, apart from its obvious links with Hippolytus,¹⁹⁶ is also associated with the poetic motif of "amatory hunt", which has high frequency in elegy.¹⁹⁷ In addition, Phaedra's hunting desire makes much better sense if seen within the context of erotic *obsequium*.¹⁹⁸ The idea of accompanying your beloved in his hunting pursuits as a proof of erotic devotion¹⁹⁹ is a typically elegiac concept, which is more than likely to have originated in the elegiac work of Cornelius Gallus.²⁰⁰ Hence, Phaedra through the elegization of her

¹⁹¹ For the text in this line see p. 280.

¹⁹² On the self-reflexivity of the passage also see Spentzou (2003) 113. I do not agree with Jacobson (1974) 149 who interprets Phaedra's exaggerated claims "as an element of parody."

¹⁹³ *OLD* s.v. *ars* 8 "artistry, person's art."

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 73f. σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἔξ ἀκηράτου λειμῶνος, ᾧ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω ~ 210f. ὑπὸ τ' αἰγείροις ἐν τε κομήτη / λειμῶνι κλιθεῖσ' ἀναπανσαιίμαν;, 78 Αἰδῶς δὲ ποταμίαισι κηπέυει δρόσοις ~ 208f. πῶς ἂν δροσερᾶς ἀπὸ κρηνίδος / καθαρῶν ὑδάτων πᾶμ' ἀρυσαιίμαν. Further on the sexual / a-sexual connotations of Hippolytus' meadow see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 79-81, Segal (1965) 122, Rankin (1974) 83-5, Turato (1974), Bremer (1975) 276-9, Pigeaud (1976) 3-7, Longo (1985) 81f., Zeitlin (1985) 64, Goff (1990) 58-65 and Halleran on Eur. *Hipp.* 73-87 with bibliography ad loc., Cairns (1997), Roisman (1999) 27-30, Armstrong (2001) 55, Patrikiou (2004) n.51 with bibliography.

¹⁹⁵ For the sexual connotations of Phaedra's delirium speech see Knox (1952) 6 with n.8, Segal (1965) 124f., 130, 144-7, Bremer (1975) 278f., Glenn (1976), Corelis (1978) 44-48, Devereux (1985) 10-2, Rabinowitz (1987) 132, McClure (1999) 126, Roisman (1999) 51-6.

¹⁹⁶ On the importance of Hippolytus' hunting see pp. 45 with n.312, and 47f.

¹⁹⁷ Further on the "amatory hunt" motif see n. on *Her.* 4.37-52.

¹⁹⁸ For more on the erotic *obsequium* see p.97 and n. on *Her.* 4.103.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Tib. 1.4.49-52, Prop. 1.1.9-16, 2.26.29ff., Ov. *Am.* 1.9.9-14, 2.11.49ff., 2.16.19-32. For the dependence of this motif on Euripides' *Hippolytus* see Fedeli (1980) on Prop. 1.1.9 and Willamowitz-Moellendorff (1924) 2.59 n.2., 2.19.17-26, Ov. *Her.* 5. 17-20 with Knox.

²⁰⁰ So Skutsch (1901) 15, Ross (1975) 89-91, DuQuesnay (1979) 62 n.214. See also Maltby on Tib. 1.4.47f. and Armstrong (2001) 160 n.10.

Euripidean reminiscence manages to convert the hunting motif into the typically elegiac *obsequium*,²⁰¹ and thus further reinforce her new literary status as an elegiac *puella*.²⁰²

Phaedra's hunting *obsequium* offers further links with Sulpicia and her concerns in Sulp. [Tib.] 3.9, where she complains about her beloved, Cerinthus, who has abandoned her for hunting.²⁰³ Like Phaedra, Sulpicia is more than willing to join her beloved in his hunting pursuits by carrying the hunting nets and by guiding the hounds.²⁰⁴ Far more importantly, in both texts the association of hunting with loving is so close as to cause in the end "the collapse of hunter into lover."²⁰⁵ As mentioned above, Phaedra's reference to her hunting pursuits resounds with sexual connotations. Likewise, Sulpicia's employment of a similar sexually charged imagery causes the initial opposition between Venus and Diana to break down and infuse the narrative with erotic colour. In the end, her infatuation for her beloved transforms the woodland from a place of hunting to a place of loving; Cerinthus from hunter becomes a lover. However, a crucial discrepancy still remains: in comparison with the Ovidian Phaedra, Sulpicia's reference to her hunting pursuits is only a fantasy, no more than wishful thinking. Sulpicia is fantasizing what the Ovidian Phaedra has already realized. In this respect, Sulpicia stands closer to the Euripidean Phaedra and her erotic day-dreaming. Furthermore, Sulpicia faced with the harsh reality of Cerinthus' erotic indifference ultimately returns to the initial opposition between hunting and loving, as she concludes her poem by urging her beloved to completely give up his hunting pursuits and run back to her erotic embrace.²⁰⁶ This is a clear departure from Phaedra's tactics, who only goes as far as to suggest to Hippolytus just an occasional pause from his hunting practices.²⁰⁷

Phaedra's reference to goddess Diana in her letter also deserves attention, especially in view of a similar reference in Euripides' *Hippolytus*. In tragedy, Phaedra concludes the so-called "delirium scene" with a wish to be transposed to the precinct of Artemis of the Limne, where Hippolytus and his comrades are exercising their horses.²⁰⁸ Artemis is evoked in

²⁰¹ Kenney (1982) 423.

²⁰² Phaedra later in her letter will make a second extensive use of both the "amatory hunt" and the erotic *obsequium* motifs in her list of mythological *exempla* at lines 93-104. See also p. 97.

²⁰³ Further on the intertextual exchange between the two texts see Michalopoulos (forthcoming) "Phaedra, Sulpicia and the politics of *fama*."

²⁰⁴ Sulp. [Tib.] 3.9.12-4 *ipsa ego per montes retia torta feram / ipsa ego uelocis quaeram uestigia cerui / et demam celeri ferrea uincla cani*, also 20 *caste puer, casta retia tange manu* ~ *Her.* 4.41f. *in nemus ire libet pressisque in retia ceruis / hortari celeres per iuga summa canes*.

²⁰⁵ Further on this see Hinds (1987) 34f.

²⁰⁶ Sulp. [Tib.] 3.9.23f. *at tu uenandi studium concede parenti / et celer in nostros ipse recurre sinus*.

²⁰⁷ *Ov. Her.* 4.89f. *quod caret alterna requie, durabile non est ; / haec reparat uires fessaque membra nouat*.

²⁰⁸ Cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 228-32 with Barrett. Phaedra's reference to her chariot-driving skills in her letter at lines 45f. (which also concludes her reference to her hunting pursuits) is perhaps an echo of the riding-reference in tragedy. Further on the sexual implications of Phaedra's horse-riding see Glenn (1976) 228-31, Brenk (1986), Armour (1988) and Roisman (1999) 53-5, Patrikiou (2004) 296 n.5 with bibliography. The specific reference to Artemis of the Limne by the Euripidean Phaedra has also certain ominous connotations, since Artemis of Limne was involved in the drowning of one of her followers (Saron), who was also a hunter (further on this see n. on *Her.* 4.46 with bibliography ad loc.). For the role of Artemis in the Euripidean *Hippolytus* in general see Knox (1952) 25-31 (esp. for the close correspondence and the

connection with the taming of horses in an attempt to further highlight the erotic undertones in Phaedra's longing for the remote Artemisian spaces. The Ovidian Phaedra refers to Diana in terms of her traditional association with her bow,²⁰⁹ but she manages to manipulate her reference and thus transform this conventional association into a multi-purposed reference. The implications of chastity are seriously undermined by the emphasis on the bow, which is commonly used as a *double entendre* for male genitalia.²¹⁰ Moreover, through the bow Phaedra also manages to associate two very different divinities with opposing attitudes to love, Diana and Amor, thus proving that "her adherence to Diana is but a thinly veiled manifestation of her devotion to that other archer-god, Cupid."²¹¹ Besides, the bow imagery offers a link with Hippolytus himself, since his excellence in archery is mentioned later in the letter in connection with Diana's bow within a similar context of sexual implications.²¹²

An echo from Vergil's *Aeneid* is perhaps perceptible in Phaedra's connection of Diana with Amor, since Venus in her first appearance to Aeneas is also depicted in terms particularly fitting to Diana.²¹³ In addition, Dido in the hunting company of Aeneas is also portrayed as a Diana-like figure (Verg. *Aen.* 4.136-39),²¹⁴ and the presence of the "amatory hunt" motif further supports the association. The Vergilian Dido, trapped as she is between her promise for eternal chastity and her passion for Aeneas, "combines features both of Hippolytus (...) and of Phaedra."²¹⁵

The Ovidian Phaedra concludes her section on her "amatory hunt" with a reference to her erotic passion through a simile, where she likens the rage of her erotic roving in the wild to the frenzy of a god-stricken Bacchant.²¹⁶ The image of a distraught woman likened to a Bacchant is a poetic commonplace, very frequent in Roman elegy.²¹⁷ In Phaedra's letter, it becomes particularly fitting in that it further facilitates the smooth transition to the following section, the list of mythological *exempla* at lines 53-66.²¹⁸ To be more precise the bacchic imagery helps Phaedra's association with Pasiphae and Ariadne, who are often described in

interchange of roles between Artemis and Aphrodite), Segal (1965) 154, 158f., *idem* (1992) 426, Rabinowitz (1986) 175, Roisman (1999) 28f., 52-4, 147-51.

²⁰⁹ Cf. Ov. *Her.* 4.39f. *iam mihi prima dea est arcu praesignis adunco / Delia*. Further on Diana's conventional association with her bow and its long literary history in both Greek and Latin literature see nn. on *Her.* 4. 39 and 92. On Phaedra's connection with Delia see Armstrong (2001) 54-7.

²¹⁰ See Adams (1982) 21f.

²¹¹ Armstrong (2001) 160. Further on this see n. on *Her.* 4.39. For the correspondence between Artemis and Aphrodite in Eur. *Hipp.* see Knox (1952) 27ff., Segal (1965) 158f., Luschnig (1980) 92, Rabinowitz (1986) 175 n.7 with bibliography, Roisman (1999) 52-4, 147-51. For Phaedra's combined reference to both Venus and Diana as a sign of her "double-mindedness and confusion" see Spentzou (2003) 80 with n.64.

²¹² Ov. *Her.* 91f. *arcus -et arma tuae tibi sunt imitanda Dianae- / si numquam cesses tendere, mollis erit.*

²¹³ Verg. *Aen.* 1.314-20, 326-9.

²¹⁴ Armstrong (2001) 57. Dido in her first appearance in the poem is also likened to Diana (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.498-502).

²¹⁵ Further on this see Hardie (1997) 322, also see Armstrong (2001) 57.

²¹⁶ *Her.* 4. 47-50. See Jacobson (1974) 149 for the possibility of a Euripidean influence and n. on *Her.* 4. 49.

²¹⁷ For more details on the motif and Phaedra's "dionysiac wildness" see Armstrong (2001) 52-4 and nn. on *Her.* 4.47, 48.

²¹⁸ For more details on this section see p. 61ff.

Latin poetry as love-lorn Bacchant, because of their erotic infatuation for their loved ones.²¹⁹ Perhaps it is not by chance that Dido is also paralleled to a Bacchant, when she rages in anger and despair through the city at the news of Aeneas' imminent departure.²²⁰

A final remark: in Eur. *Hipp.* Phaedra through her hunting fantasies portrays herself as the perfect match for Hippolytus; she almost becomes a reflection of her beloved, as she imagines herself roaming in the very same places frequented by him, she becomes involved in the same practices and shares the same interests with him. In the end, Phaedra "longs not only to be with Hippolytus but even more to *be* him."²²¹ Phaedra's self-portrayal in her letter is along the same lines, but she adds a further twist through her ingenious arrangement of the material in the letter. Placing her reference to Hippolytus' hunting skills after the account of her own hunting pursuits is an intentional choice with significant consequences. Through this *προθύστερον*-like arrangement Phaedra manipulates the correspondence between herself and Hippolytus to her own advantage. Now that Phaedra's hunting pursuits come first in the letter, Hippolytus gives the false impression of being a reflection of Phaedra; it is him who offers a complementary portrayal, and not the other way round.²²² This false impression complicates the situation and has further implications on Phaedra's representation. If Hippolytus has become a reflection of Phaedra, who in turn was already a reflection of Hippolytus, then Hippolytus ultimately becomes a reflection of himself. Hence, Hippolytus actually looks at himself through Phaedra. The highly complicated character of Phaedra's representation tactics now becomes evident. Her game is one of distorting mirrors and deceptive reflections, a game of constructed realities, in which Phaedra has reserved for herself the role of the mirror. Phaedra has become the mirror in which Hippolytus can see himself, and as a mirror, her interests, desires, her very existence depends exclusively on the image she reflects, which is none other than Hippolytus himself.²²³

²¹⁹ Pasiphae: Ov. *Ars* 1.311f. *in nemus et saltus thalamo regina relicto fertur, ut Aonio concita Baccha deo*. Ariadne: Ov. *Her.* 10. 48. also cf. *Catul.* 64.60f., 251-64 saved and married to Bacchus after her abandonment by Theseus. Nonn. *Dion.* 47.419ff. Also see my note on *Her.* 4.47.

²²⁰ Verg. *Aen.* 4.300-3. On the morbid implications of the bacchic imagery see my note on *Her.* 4.47.

²²¹ Goff (1990) 34 (her emphasis). Phaedra's struggle to become Hippolytus was first noted by Zeitlin (1985) 110: "In desiring and desiring to be desired in turn, and also desiring not to desire, she plays all the roles—herself (now woman, once virgin), Aphrodite, Hippolytus, and Artemis, the eternal *parthenos*." See also Segal (1965) 141. Gill (1990) 87 with n. 44 and bibliography ad loc.

²²² Further on the multiple similarities (verbal, thematic) between Phaedra's self-portrayal and Phaedra's description of Hippolytus see n. on *Her.* 4.93f.

²²³ For the great importance of the symbolism of mirror and reflection play in Eur. *Hipp.* (cf. esp. 428-30), see Zeitlin (1985) 99-106, Goff (1990) 23-6, 72, Segal (1992) 428, Luschig (1988) 3-15.

2.2. Hippolytus

The generically inherent to the *Heroides* substitution of the “female” voice for the conventionally dominant male perspective combined with Phaedra’s programmatic self-identification with the elegiac poet at lines 11-4²²⁴ has a huge impact on Hippolytus’ status in the letter. Phaedra’s elegicization inevitably inscribes Hippolytus in the realm of elegy as “the object of her desire,” which was a role conventionally reserved for the female. In addition, the process of Hippolytus’ accommodation to the new elegiac context is double-edged in that it operates both under the mechanics of intertextuality (mostly in connection with Greek tragedy and the earlier Roman elegiac production) and under the procedures of gender construction.

i) Hippolytus the son of the Amazon (*Her.* 4.1f.)

In the opening couplet of her letter Phaedra establishes Hippolytus as the recipient of her letter; however, she avoids calling him by name. Instead, she refers to him as “the son of the Amazon.”²²⁵ Hippolytus’ identification through his relationship with his mother, and not through his name, is a well-planned choice with multiple repercussions. An intertextual reminiscence from Euripides’ *Hippolytus* is possible, since Hippolytus is mentioned (by Aphrodite) for the first time in the play as “the son of the Amazon.”²²⁶ In addition, both Euripides and Phaedra maintain the same degree of vagueness about the exact name of the Amazon.²²⁷

Phaedra through Hippolytus’ association with his mother manages not only to conceal his name, but more importantly to suppress their “(step)mother- (step)son” relationship, and thus downplay any implications of the proposed incest. Hippolytus is not her (step)son, but the son of the Amazon. However, being the son of an Amazon is somewhat of a paradox given the Amazons’ proverbial hostility towards marriage and reproduction in general.²²⁸ According to the main mythological tradition, the Amazons lived in a liminal place forming a community, where anything male was excluded. In this light, Phaedra’s reference to Hippolytus’ mother works as an implicit allusion to the hero’s problematic sexuality. His a-sexual behaviour, his rejection of Phaedra’s advances and his fixation to his liminal stage between puberty and maturity should be understood as parts of his Amazonian inheritance. Hence, the reference to

²²⁴ See pp.11ff.

²²⁵ *Her.* 4.1f. *Quam nisi tu dederis, caritura est ipsa, salutem / mittit Amazonio Cressa puella uiro.*

²²⁶ *Eur. Hipp.* 10 *Ἀμαζόνως τόκος*, also 307-10, 351, 581f. See Casali (1996)b 2. Further on the Amazon see n. on *Her.* 4.2.

²²⁷ On Euripides’ avoidance in naming Hippolytus’ mother see Barrett (1964) on 10f., Halleran (1995) 10-12. Phaedra avoids mentioning the Amazon’s name in her letter again at lines 117f. *prima securigeras inter uirtute puellas / te peperit*, 120 *tanto mater pignore tuta fuit*, 165f. *potuit corrumpere taurum / mater.*

²²⁸ On the Amazons’ hostility towards marriage see Rankin (1974) 77, duBois (1982) 34, 40-2, Blake-Tyrell (1984) 76-85, esp. 84f., 88-112, Devereux (1985) 26-8, Longo (1991) 22ff.

the Amazon effectively prefigures the failure of Phaedra's erotic advance. As Casali nicely puts it: "in the word *Amazonio* is already written Hippolytus' refusal."²²⁹

Interestingly enough the Ovidian Phaedra's reference to Hippolytus' unresolved sexuality through his association with his mother seems to echo a similar, less implicit, reference made by her Euripidean counterpart.²³⁰ In the play, Phaedra's very first, and rather cryptic reference, to Hippolytus involves a clear hint at his ambiguous sexuality, which is intrinsically linked with his Amazonian descent.²³¹ Even more appropriate proves to be Hippolytus' one and only recollection of his mother near the end of the play, where he perceives his forthcoming doom as a consequence of his unfortunate birth by the Amazon.²³²

The fact that Hippolytus is introduced as "the son of the Amazon" complicates the situation further, since the association with his mother, instead of his father, can also be seen as an implicit allusion to Hippolytus' illegitimacy: he is after all the child of Theseus' illicit liaison with the Amazon.²³³ The nameless mother underlines his low and shameful origin. Phaedra later in her letter (lines 117-24) will mention again Theseus' illicit affair in another reference to Hippolytus' illegitimacy.

Phaedra lays the generic foundations of her letter right from the very beginning. Her emphatic juxtaposition of *puella uiro* at line two is clearly programmatic and sets the pace for the whole letter. This letter has nothing to do with her other letter in tragedy; this is a love letter sent by an elegiac *puella* to her elegiac *uir*. Hence, Hippolytus' identification with the elegiac lover (*uir*)²³⁴ is the inevitable consequence of Phaedra's self-identification as an elegiac *puella*. In respect of Hippolytus' age the application of *uir* for Hippolytus is rather problematic, in that the term is mostly applied to male adults as opposed to those still in puberty.²³⁵ And Hippolytus is far from being a male adult; to be more precise, Hippolytus refuses to assert his virile status and start behaving as a sexually mature grown-up. Instead, he remains a stubborn devotee of Diana and of her virginal universe, thus entrapping himself in a transitive phase between adolescence and adulthood.²³⁶ Phaedra's predilection for the rather generic *uestis* with regard to Hippolytus' garment, instead of a more specific type of clothing (like *toga* or *palla*), is another indication of her reluctance to mention the exact age of her beloved.²³⁷ In my view, what seems to be a "misunderstanding" is actually a reflection of Phaedra's inner desire. Her deliberate

²²⁹ Casali (1996)b 2.

²³⁰ Casali (1996)b 2.

²³¹ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 351 *δοτις ποθ' οὐτός ἐσθ', ὁ τῆς Ἀμαζόνος* . . . On Hippolytus' ambiguous sexuality as a result of his Amazonian descent in Eur. *Hipp.* see Winnington-Ingram (1958) 176, Frischer (1970) 91, Rankin (1974) esp. 77f., Devereux (1986) 28f., Longo (1992) 28.

²³² Eur. *Hipp.* 1082f. *ὦ δυστάλαινα μήτηρ, ὦ πικραὶ γοναί / μηδεὶς ποτ' εἶη τῶν ἐμῶν φίλων νόθος*.

²³³ For a detailed discussion of Hippolytus' illegitimacy and its importance for both the Euripidean play and Phaedra's elegiac letter see the relevant section below.

²³⁴ For *uir* as a generic term for the elegiac lover see Pichon (1966) s.v. and *OLD* s.v. *uir* 2b.

²³⁵ Pichon (1966) s.v., *OLD* s.v. 1b.

²³⁶ For Athenian ephebes and the Athenian rites of passage see Jeanmaire (1939) 258, Vidal-Naquet (1981) 147f., 190, Garland (1990) 163-98, Mitchell-Boyask (1999).

²³⁷ For more see n. on *Her.* 4.71. For the importance of the deployment of gender stereotypes in Roman epic through the description of clothing see Keith (2000) 19-22. On Hippolytus' effeminization through his dress in Eur. *Hipp.* see Craik (1998) 35f.

distortion of factual reality is part of her wider strategy to make Hippolytus realize his new role as an adult and thus urge him succumb to her love. Once again the Ovidian Phaedra follows in the steps of her Euripidean counterpart, since in the play Phaedra always refers to Hippolytus as an adult.²³⁸

ii) Hippolytus, the son of Theseus

Phaedra refers to Hippolytus in connection with his father twice in her letter. The first time, the reference appears in the list of mythological *exempla* at lines 53-66,²³⁹ where father and son are mentioned together with regard to their erotic involvement with Ariadne and Phaedra respectively. Phaedra's attempt to build a parallel between Theseus-Ariadne and Hippolytus-herself results in the close association of Hippolytus with Theseus on grounds of common sexuality. The grammar in these four lines supports the association. Not only Hippolytus and Theseus appear together at the beginning of line 65, but more importantly Hippolytus is mentioned by his patronymic (*Thesides*).²⁴⁰ Furthermore, the repetitive succession of two forms of the same verb (*capit* (Hippolytus) *capta* (by Theseus)) at line 64 implies an additional sense of continuity between father and son.²⁴¹ In any case, the attentive reader does not fail to take into consideration the fact that Phaedra's comparison rests on the condition that both father and son have been erotically involved with the two sisters. But this is true only for Theseus, while for Hippolytus is more like wishful thinking. As a result, the close association between father and son ultimately collapses into pieces.

The father-son relationship appears again in the section about Theseus' multiple injustices against Phaedra and Hippolytus at lines 109-26. In comparison with the first reference the tone has completely changed. Hippolytus and Theseus have no longer anything in common and the father-son connection now turns into a relationship of hatred and antagonism. Hippolytus is portrayed as a victim of Theseus' brutality, since Theseus constantly tries to inflict upon his son as much pain as possible; first, through the killing of his mother (lines 117-20), and second through his exclusion from any claim to the throne (lines 121-6). This is an account of a deeply problematic father-son relationship, in which even the slightest hint of fatherly concern and affection seems to be missing; the traditional family values of affection and reciprocity disappear under the pressure of personal antagonisms for political power and control.²⁴²

The list of Theseus' injustices reaches its climax with the reference to Hippolytus' illegitimacy (lines 121-6), which occupies equal number of lines with Phaedra's reference to the

²³⁸ In the Euripidean play a big variety of terms is applied to Hippolytus in respect of his age. Phaedra calls him *ánhr̄p* (Eur. *Hipp.* 311 *τοῦδ' άνδρός*), a term also used by Hippolytus for himself (Eur. *Hipp.* 944, 1031). Aphrodite calls him *νεανίας* (Eur. *Hipp.* 43) and his servant says he is *νέος* (Eur. *Hipp.* 114, also 1098). There are also references to him as *παῖς* (603, 609, 613) (see Cairns (1997) 58f.). Despite the wide range of these terms, Hippolytus should be understood as an adult (so Cairns (1997) 58f.).

²³⁹ For more on Phaedra's list of mythological *exempla* see pp. 61 ff.

²⁴⁰ *Her.* 4.65 *Thesides Theseusque duas rapuere sorores* with n. ad loc.

²⁴¹ Note also the metonymic reference of *domus una* (line 63) for both of them.

²⁴² Further on the problematic father-son relationship see Devereux (1985) 68f., Roisman (1999) 133ff.

killing of Hippolytus' mother (117-20). Her specific choice of the rare (poetic) Grecism *nothus* is telling,²⁴³ since the Greek origin of the term offers valid reason to suspect an intertextual allusion to the Euripidean text. Perhaps the Ovidian Phaedra is echoing here the Euripidean Nurse, who also calls Hippolytus a *νόθος* in her first reference to him in the play.²⁴⁴ But the reference to Hippolytus' illegitimacy in the letter is much more than a verbal echo from tragedy. Phaedra proves to be an attentive and well-informed reader of the Euripidean play, where Hippolytus' illegitimacy plays a prominent role. Throughout the play the references to Hippolytus as "the illegitimate son of Theseus" are constant²⁴⁵ and become an essential part of the father-son relationship.²⁴⁶ Moreover, Phaedra moves a step forward and invests her reference to Hippolytus' illegitimacy with political implications, since she interprets his personal misfortunes within the wider context of strife for political power.²⁴⁷ She holds that behind Theseus' failure as a father hides his ambition to maintain political power and his will to transfer this power only to his legitimate heirs. In this light, the killing of Hippolytus' mother and his bastardy turn from personal issues into matters of public concern.

Phaedra's emphasis on the political aspects of Hippolytus' illegitimacy can also be associated with a similar claim made by Hippolytus himself during the *agon* scene with his father (Eur. *Hipp.* 902-1101).²⁴⁸ In his reply to Theseus at lines 1009-11²⁴⁹ Hippolytus tries to refute both the possibility of his erotic seduction by Phaedra, and the alleged conspiracy to inherit Theseus' wealth and his political power through his marriage to Phaedra.²⁵⁰ The fact that Theseus did not put these two political charges forward in his earlier accusations has raised a considerable amount of suspicion. It has been suggested that Hippolytus' defence against any political implications of his illegitimacy is actually reminiscent of an attempt made by Phaedra in the first *Hippolytus* to tempt him through the offer of Theseus' throne.²⁵¹ From this perspective, Phaedra's emphatic reference to the political implications of Hippolytus' illegitimacy could well be a remote intertextual echo of the first *Hippolytus*.

²⁴³ For more on *nothus* see n. on *Her.* 4.122.

²⁴⁴ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 309f. *νόθον φρονούντα γνήσι', οἰσθά νιν καλῶς, / Ἰππόλυτον.*

²⁴⁵ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 309, 943f, 962f., 1082, 1455.

²⁴⁶ On the importance of Hippolytus' bastardy in Eur. *Hipp.* see Luschnig (1980) 98, Devereux (1985) 33-43, 145, Goldhill (1986) 127, Segal (1992) 444 with n. 84, Casali (1995)b 2, Roisman (1999) 38f., 143, 152f., 177-180. For an opposite view see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1082-3: "the *νοθεία* is wholly irrelevant to the action of the play."

Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 309, 943f, 1082, 1455. For more see Roisman (1999) 38f., (on Theseus' bastardy) 151-4. For an opposite view see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1082-3: *the is wholly irrelevant to the action of the play and passim.*

²⁴⁷ The concentration of political language in this section can hardly be missed, cf. e.g. *praeposuit* 111, *iniuria* 113, *magnis...rebus* 114, *uirtute* 117, *digna* 118, *regna paterna* 122, *tollendi causa* 124). For more on this see my notes ad loc.

²⁴⁸ For a detailed examination of the *agon* scene see Lloyd (1992) 43-54.

²⁴⁹ Eur. *Hipp.* 1009-11 *πότερα τὸ τῆσδε σώμ' ἐκαλλιστεύετο / πασῶν γυναικῶν; ἢ σὸν οἰκήσειν δόμον / ἔγκληρον εὐνήν προσλαβῶν ἐπήλιπια;*

²⁵⁰ Cf. Phaedra's offer to Hippolytus of her father's kingdom later in her letter (lines 162f. *est mihi dotalis tellus Iouis insula, Crete- / seruiat Hippolyto regia tota meo!*).

²⁵¹ See Barrett (1964) 37 n.3 and on lines 1007-20, Webster (1967) 67, Reckford (1974) 312 with n.7. For a detailed discussion see Roisman (1999) 12-5.

Given the close correspondence between father and son on grounds of sexuality at lines 63-6, the emphasis on Hippolytus' disputed descent inevitably implicates Theseus' legitimacy as well. Theseus had double parentage, since he had Neptune as his divine father and king Aegeus, as his mortal one.²⁵² Phaedra is aware of his double paternity judging from her combined reference to him both as *Aegides* (line 59) and as *Neptunius heros* (line 109).²⁵³

iii) Elegiac Hippolytus

Phaedra's earliest allusion to Hippolytus' elegiac status appears as early as the opening couplet of her letter, where she refers to him as *uir* (*Amazonio...uiro* 2), a typical elegiac signal. Only a few lines below, Hippolytus' characterization as *ferreus* (iron-hearted) combined with the imagery of erotic subjugation (*dabit uictas ferreus ille manus* 14) further enhances his elegiac status, since both features constitute typical figurative tropes of elegy's erotic language.²⁵⁴ Phaedra emphatically returns to Hippolytus' hard-heartedness near the end of her letter (lines 147-76); there, in a scene which has all the characteristics of a conventional elegiac supplication (however in reverse sex-order), Hippolytus' apathy is given in terms appropriate to the cruelty of the elegiac *puella*.²⁵⁵

Hippolytus' erotic indifference in Phaedra's letter has obvious similarities with his a-sexual behaviour in the Euripidean play. However, one should be extremely vigilant not to be taken in by these superficial similarities. It is true that Hippolytus, self-consumed as he is by his obsession for chastity, is averse even to the slightest hint, which could potentially mar his morally spotless life. The refutation of (his) sexuality reaches its climax in his vehement tirade against women (lines 616-68).²⁵⁶ Moments after the revelation of Phaedra's passion for him by the Nurse Hippolytus in disgust and anger delivers a stream of abuse and accusations against women. His refutation of the female race ranges from his absurd suggestion for an a-sexual, feminine-less procreation to the ultimate extinction of women from the face of the earth. Nevertheless, the violence of Hippolytus' misogynistic speech in tragedy has nothing in common with the resistance he shows in elegy. In the letter, Hippolytus' attitude towards Phaedra's approach has a distinctively elegiac undertone; he is no longer a self-obsessed, fervent misogynist, but an "elegiac object of desire," whose hard-heartedness is to a certain extent justified by his elegiac status. While in tragedy Hippolytus "expresse(d) more starkly the cultural beliefs that define the ways in which the female threatens the social structures,"²⁵⁷ in the

²⁵² On Theseus' double parentage see n. on *Her.* 4.59 with bibliography ad loc.

²⁵³ For both *Aegides* and *Neptunius heros* see nn. ad locc.

²⁵⁴ For more on the long literary history of *ferreus* and of the imagery of erotic subjugation in Greek and Latin literature, and in particular in Roman elegy, see n. on *Her.* 4.14.

²⁵⁵ Cf. *duritia* 86, *tutus* 145, *tolle moras* 147, *amans* 154, *duraque corda* 156, *flecte...animos* 165, *ferox* 165, *parcas* 167. For the elegiac undertones of the vocabulary see nn. ad locc.

²⁵⁶ For detailed analyses of Hippolytus' tirade see Rankin (1974) 87-90, Devereux (1985) 33-43, Zeitlin (1985) 71, esp. 88f., Rabinowitz (1987) 128-30, Goff (1990) 10f., 45f., Lusching (1998) 21-3, Longo (1991) 13f., Craik (1998) 34f., Roisman (1999) 109-13.

²⁵⁷ Rabinowitz (1987) 128.

letter Hippolytus' reaction -far from echoing social anxieties- is in accordance with the rules and conventions of the elegiac genre. In my view, Phaedra's only obvious allusion to Hippolytus' misogyny is her reference to his hatred for the girls in the penultimate couplet of her letter (lines 173f.), where the presence of *diceris* (an "Alexandrian footnote") signals the intertextual allusion.²⁵⁸

Phaedra's comparison of Hippolytus with Jupiter at lines 35f.²⁵⁹ in terms of physical appearance offers another example of his elegicization. The comparison follows the established elegiac *topos* of the poet's comparison of his beloved with a goddess,²⁶⁰ but in reverse sex-order. Perhaps a hint at Hippolytus' effeminization is perceptible here.

Hippolytus' association with the interior of Phaedra's *domus* at lines 137-46 is much more significant. Phaedra takes advantage of Theseus' long absence (109f.) and urges Hippolytus to succumb to her proposition and join her erotically, even in the very same palace, where she dwells with his father. There is no need for the two lovers to take any precautions to conceal their love affair, since this can be easily masked under their "(step-)mother - (step-)son" relationship (lines 139f., 143-46). Phaedra's reference to her *domus* deserves special attention, especially when examined in conjunction with the role of *οἶκος* in Euripides' *Hippolytus*. In the play, Phaedra's *οἶκος* maintains and simultaneously challenges its traditional fifth-century Athenian ideological association with female seclusion and patriarchal continuity.²⁶¹ The interior of the house is always mentioned in terms of female confinement and silence. It is not by chance that the Chorus in its very first reference to Phaedra associates her with the interior.²⁶² Phaedra belongs to the interior sphere of her *οἶκος*, as long as she is a chaste and faithful wife. It is the realization of her illicit passion for Hippolytus, which cuts off her lore with her prescribed attachment to the interior and its silence, and turns her into a potential threat against the very existence of her house. Moreover, Phaedra herself in her first long speech to the Chorus (Eur. *Hipp.* 373-430) identifies *οἶκος* as the female place *par excellence*. It is interesting that she complements her curse against the first adulteress with a description of the house as the dark theatre of female lust and mischievousness (Eur. *Hipp.* 408-418). In this light, the *οἶκος* poses a potential threat against Phaedra. Overcome by desire Phaedra loses her self-control and fails to comply any longer with her role as a faithful wife. Instead, she exits the oppressive (socially and psychologically) environment of her *οἶκος* and exchanges the suppression of her erotic desire with an open revelation in public. Her exit from the *οἶκος* is not only a striking transgression of the "inside / outside" dichotomy; more importantly it signals the beginning of

²⁵⁸ *Her.* 4.173f. *sic tibi dent Nymphae, quamuis odisse puellas / diceris, arentem quae leuet unda sitim!* with n. ad loc.

²⁵⁹ *Her.* 4.35f. *si mihi concedat Iuno fratremque uirumque, / Hippolytum uideor praepositura Ioui !*

²⁶⁰ Further see n. on *Her.* 4.35f.

²⁶¹ For the gender prescribed dialectic of interior and exterior in fifth century Athens both in social and dramatic terms see Shaw (1975), Gould (1980) 46-52, Foley (1982), *idem* (1992) 129-32, *idem* (2001) 76-9, Easterling (1987) 15, McClure (1999) 24. Especially, for the "inside - outside" dichotomy with reference to the *οἶκος* in Eur. *Hippolytus* see Zeitlin (1985) 74-6, 81f. and Goff (1990) 2-12.

²⁶² Eur. *Hipp.* 131-3 *τειρομένην νοσερᾶ κοίτα δέμας ἐντὸς ἔχειν / οἴκων.*

her end. When all her attempts to break free from the social and moral constraints imposed upon her fail, Phaedra returns to the interior of her *οἶκος*, but this time only to find death by her own hand in her marital chamber. She commits suicide and the house ultimately triumphs in imposing to the female its confinement and concealment.

The association of Hippolytus with his *οἶκος* in the play is equally important. In view of the significance of *οἶκος* as one of the most fundamental formations of the ancient *πόλις*, it is not difficult to read Hippolytus' detachment from his house as a reflection of his ambiguous pre-social (and pre-sexual) status.²⁶³ His predilection for the untouched meadow practically means the rejection of his *οἶκος*. Even his tirade against female race is thickly sown with domestic terms (Eur. *Hipp.* 616- 67).²⁶⁴ In the end, however, despite his arduous struggle to disassociate himself from his *οἶκος*, the house becomes the purveyor of death, like it was for Phaedra.²⁶⁵ Hippolytus leaves the meadow and follows the Nurse into the house, where he falls prey to her female deviousness. It is inside the *οἶκος*, where Hippolytus binds himself with the fatal oath which ultimately costs him his life.²⁶⁶ When he returns on stage, he is banished not only from his house, but (even worse) from his native homeland, while later -near the end of the play- Hippolytus appeals to the house to speak the truth – in vain.²⁶⁷

The Ovidian Phaedra's reference to her *domus* has nothing in common with the *οἶκος* in the Euripidean play as “the site of the transgression and punishment of its female members and the betrayal of its male”²⁶⁸ Her *domus* is not a space of female confinement and of suppression of female desire, but rather a house of love, where she can enjoy her passion with her beloved. The gloomy references to the darkness of the interior and the timbers of the roof (where she will hang herself from) in tragedy²⁶⁹ have given place now to her bed as the place of erotic pleasure.²⁷⁰ This is no longer the Euripidean chamber of death and suicide, but the chamber of a Roman mistress. In striking contrast to the tragic *οἶκος*, which posed a potential lethal threat for both lovers, Phaedra's *domus* functions as a guarantor of both lovers' safety.²⁷¹

²⁶³ On Hippolytus' isolation as a reflection of his antisocial behaviour see Turato (1974)136-42, Luschning (1980) 94-6, Longo (1985) 79-82, Segal (1992) 44. For an opposite opinion see Winnington – Ingram (1958) 184.

²⁶⁴ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 617 *κατάκισσας*, 623 *ἐν... δάμασιν*, [625] *δόμους*, [626] *δωμάτων*, 629 *ἀπόκισ' (ε)*, 630 *δόμους*, 639 *κατ' οἶκον*, 640 *δόμοις*, 646 *συγκατοικίζειν*, 649 *ἔνδον*, 659 *δόμων*.

²⁶⁵ Zeitlin (1985) 75.

²⁶⁶ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 611, 1033, 1036f., 1062f.

²⁶⁷ Eur. *Hipp.* 1074-5 *ὦ δάματ', εἴθε φθέγμα γηρόσαισθέ μοι / καὶ μαρτυρήσαιτ' εἰ κακὸς πέφυκ' ἀνὴρ*).

²⁶⁸ Goff (1990) 11.

²⁶⁹ Eur. *Hipp.* 417f. *οὐδὲ σκότον φρίσσουνι τὸν ξυνεργάτην / τέραμνά τ' οἴκων μὴ ποτε φθογῆν ἀφῆ;*; cf. also 769-72 *χαλεπᾶ δ' ὑπέραντιλος οὐσα συμφορᾶ τεράμων / ἀπὸ νυμφιδίων κρεμαστὸν ἄνεται ἀμφὶ βρόχον / λευκᾶ καθαρμοζουσα δεῖ- Ιρα*.

²⁷⁰ Cf. *Her.* 4.146 *tu licet in lecto conspiciare meo*, also 143f. *ut tenuit domus una duos, domus una tenebit; / oscula aperta dabas, oscula aperta dabis*.

²⁷¹ Cf. *Her.* 4.145 *tutus eris mecum laudem merebere culpa*. For the love of the heroine offering protection to her man as a recurring motif in the *Heroides* see n. on *Her.* 4.145.

Phaedra's specific reference to the door (*ianua*) at lines 141f.²⁷² is also intrinsically related with the issue of Hippolytus' elegiacization, since it portrays Hippolytus in the role of the elegiac *exclusus amator*.²⁷³ Through the recapitulation of the most typical clichés of the *komos* (*παρακλανσίθυρον*)-tradition, such as the promised night, the unlocking of the door, the cruel husband, the *custos*, Phaedra manages to further enhance the elegiac undertones of the reference. Once again the intertextual reading of the reference to the door in the letter with similar references in the Euripidean play has much to offer. In the play, the door serves as the boundary between private and public sphere, between female and male, concealment and revelation, shame and promiscuity.²⁷⁴ It is Phaedra's crossing of the threshold, which sets the play in motion, but at the same time it is this very movement, which signifies the beginning of her downfall. When Phaedra crosses the threshold for the second time, she is determined to kill herself. With regard to Hippolytus, his crossing of the threshold proves to be equally lethal, since, as we have discussed above, inside the house he binds himself with a fatal oath. From this perspective, the dramatic irony of Phaedra's erotic reference to the door in her letter is cutting. The door identified by Phaedra with the elegiac door²⁷⁵ is exactly the same door, through which both herself and Hippolytus enter the house to meet death. More importantly, this elegiac door is the same door, which Theseus in the play orders the slaves to open, so he can see with his own eyes the dead body of his wife.²⁷⁶ The Ovidian Phaedra manages to transform the threshold of death into a threshold of love; nevertheless, for the attentive reader the ominous connotations of the reference still lurk at the background.

iv) Hippolytus at Eleusis (*Her.* 4. 67-84)

The heart of Phaedra's letter is taken up by her description of Hippolytus' beauty, or to be more precise, by her recollection of Hippolytus' physical appearance during their meeting at the Eleusinian mysteries (lines 67-84). The Ovidian Phaedra seems to be reminiscent of a similar reference made by Aphrodite in her prologue speech in Euripides' *Hippolytus* (lines 24-8). However, Aphrodite's short and third-person summary of pre-dramatic events has nothing in common with Phaedra's personal account of her erotic past. In the play, the reference to the mysteries is all too important not only because this was Phaedra's first meeting with Hippolytus, but more significantly because this was the very first time, when Phaedra fell in love with her stepson.²⁷⁷ On the contrary, the Ovidian Phaedra employs her reference to this meeting (almost entirely) with respect to Hippolytus, and less to herself. Furthermore, she downplays the

²⁷² Cf. *Her.* 4.141f. *non tibi per tenebras duri reseranda mariti / ianua, non custos decipiendus erit.*

²⁷³ For bibliography on *exclusus amator* see n. on *Her.* 4.141.

²⁷⁴ For the possible implications of promiscuity (even prostitution) of Phaedra standing at the palace door see Cohen (1991) 148 and McClure (1999) 126 n.48.

²⁷⁵ For the house door as poetic property of the elegiac production (as opposed to the palace, which belongs to tragedy) see Wyke (2002) 126f.

²⁷⁶ Eur. *Hipp.* 808-10 *χαλάτε κλήθρα, πρόσπολοι, πυλωμάτων, / έκλύεθ' άρμούς, ώς ίδω πικράν θέαν / γυναικός, ή με κατθανούσ' άπόλεσεν.*

²⁷⁷ For the poetic *topos* of "love at first sight" see n. on *Her.* 4.69f.

significance of the meeting, which seems to serve more as an excuse to proceed to the description of Hippolytus' exquisite physical beauty rather than as a justification of her feelings for him. The parenthetical reference to her long standing desire for Hippolytus at line 69 (*nec non tamen ante placebas*) undercuts the uniqueness of this meeting, since this is clearly neither their first meeting²⁷⁸ nor the time when Phaedra fell in love with her stepson. In addition, the element of divine intervention is totally removed from Phaedra's letter. Whereas in the prologue of the Euripidean play Aphrodite accepts full responsibility for causing Phaedra to fall in love with Hippolytus,²⁷⁹ in the letter Phaedra falls in love with Hippolytus not through the divine intervention of Venus, but as a result of Hippolytus' exquisite beauty. Phaedra's combined use of the "love as disease" motif²⁸⁰ with the lack of any reference to Venus is indicative of her emphasis on the physical aspects of love, as opposed to love as a god-inspired irrational passion in tragedy. The Ovidian Phaedra is not the victim of divine vengeance, but an elegiac *puella* fully responsible for her actions.

Moreover, in the play Aphrodite is rather vague about the exact nature of the mysteries and avoids mentioning them by name. The setting of Attica and more importantly her use of *ὄψις...μυστηρίων* (Eur. *Hipp.* 25) are thought to allude to the Eleusinian mysteries,²⁸¹ where the fully initiated in the highest of the ceremonies were involved in some sort of secret *ὄψις* (a "viewing", whose exact nature still remains uncertain).²⁸² Whatever the case may be, the Ovidian Phaedra does not seem to be much troubled about the exact nature of the mysteries. Instead, her reference to the mysteries makes better sense if seen within the context of the erotic motif of a young man meeting his beloved during a religious festival.²⁸³ Through the association with this well-established literary *topos* Phaedra manages to eroticize an otherwise insignificant reference from tragedy and further exploit it to her own advantage.

Judging from her Romanised reference to Eleusis (*Cerealis Eleusin* 67) the Ovidian Phaedra seems to have picked up the Euripidean allusion to the Eleusinian mysteries. Her emphasis on Eleusis, far from being a mere intertextual reminiscence, offers Phaedra great potential for drawing further connections with Hippolytus. First of all, Hippolytus' participation in the Eleusinian mysteries is indicative of his spiritual and rather mystic idiosyncrasy. The young man's piety and his close association with the divine are constantly mentioned (or

²⁷⁸ *pace* Shuckburgh on *Her.* 4.67.

²⁷⁹ Eur. *Hipp.* 27f. *ἰδοῦσα Φαίδρα καρδίαν κατέσχετο / ἔρωτι δεινῶ τοῖς ἑμοῖς βουλευμάσιν.*

²⁸⁰ *Her.* 4.79 *acer in extremis ossibus haesit amor.* Further on the erotic *topos* of "the bones as the seat of love" see n. on *Her.* 4.15f.

²⁸¹ So Barrett and (more emphatically) Halleran on Eur. *Hipp.* 25.

²⁸² The metonymic reference to Athens as "the land of Pandion" (Eur. *Hipp.* 26) offers perhaps a further implicit and learned hint at the identification of these mysteries with the Eleusinian rites, since Demeter came to Athens during the reign of Pandion (see Ferguson (1984) *ad loc.*). Also, we should not be dismissive of the possibility of an Ovidian allusion to an explicit reference to the Eleusinian mysteries appearing in plays which have not survived. For evidence of lost plays see Barrett (1964) 10-45, esp. 18-26.

²⁸³ See n. on *Her.* 4.67.

alluded to) throughout the Euripidean play.²⁸⁴ Moreover, Phaedra's specific mention of Ceres proves to be a fitting choice, since the strong associations of the goddess with chastity further underline Hippolytus' moral purity.²⁸⁵ Also, the Eleusinian mysteries commemorated the events of an erotic abduction, namely the abduction of virgin Persephone by Hades, Demeter's subsequent grief and the ultimate recovery of her daughter. Hence, Persephone's rape could be seen as an implicit incitement to Hippolytus to play a more energetic role and imitate the example set by Hades by abducting "virginal" Phaedra.²⁸⁶ A further similarity between Hippolytus and the rape of Persephone comes from Hippolytus' attachment with goddess Diana, whose role in the story of Persephone's rape is not insignificant. According to the main mythological strand, Persephone, moments before her abduction by Hades, was gathering flowers accompanied by Artemis and Athena,²⁸⁷ who were the first to run in rescue of the ravished maiden.²⁸⁸ Servius' comment on Verg. *Aen.* 6.118 offers a good explanation for the presence of Diana in the story, since Diana together with Proserpina are the two other faces of Hecate, the triple deity.²⁸⁹

Given that Ceres was considered by the Romans the goddess of legitimate marriage, to whom they used to sacrifice during the wedding ceremony,²⁹⁰ Phaedra's reference to her subtly suggests perhaps her wishful thinking about the outcome of her relationship with Hippolytus. More importantly, the erotic involvement of Ceres with Iasius - a story, which was treated at length by Ovid in his *Amores* 3.10- offers the perfect parallel for Phaedra. The similarities (both thematic and verbal) between the two love affairs are close. First, both Ceres and Phaedra fall in love with a hunter²⁹¹ and vision, in both cases, is the catalyst in stirring up the female erotic passion.²⁹² In addition, a struggle between *pudor* and *amor* precedes their surrender to desire,²⁹³ while both heroines describe *amor* in terms of similar psychosomatic symptomatology (the fire

²⁸⁴ Cf. Eur. *Hipp* 15f., 24f., 84-6, 656f., 948-54, 994-6, 1060-3, 1080f., 1092-4, 1309, 1364-9, 1391-4, 1416-22, 1440f., 1454. See Knox (1952) 21-3, Devereux (1985) 20f., 125-8, Roisman (1999) 168f.

²⁸⁵ On Hippolytus' purity (*ἀγνός*) see Segal (1970) 278-80, 292, Devereux (1985) 93f., 115-9, 123, 128.

²⁸⁶ For Phaedra's paradoxical claim to "virginity" see pp. 22ff.

²⁸⁷ Cf. *Hom. Hymn. Dem.* 424f. *Παλλάς τ' ἐγρεμάχη καὶ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα / παίζομεν ἠδ' ἄνθεα δρέπομεν χεῖρεσσ' ἐρόεντα* with Richardson on the artistic representation of the scene on Roman sarcophagi. So also at Claud. *DRP* 2.204-7, 3.198, Hyg. *Fab.* 146.2.

²⁸⁸ Cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1315-16^a with Dale *ἃ μὲν τόξοις Ἄρτεμις, ἃ δ' / ἔγχει Γοργῶπις πάνοπλος, / <συνείποντο. (...)>*

²⁸⁹ Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 6.118 *Hecate trium potestatum numen est: ipsa enim est Luna, Diana, Proserpina.* For more on Hecate's triple identification see Fontenrose (1981) 210f. n.27.

²⁹⁰ Treggiari (1991) 164.

²⁹¹ Cf. *Her.* 4.83-92, 104f. ~ *Am.* 3.10.25f. (...) *Iasium Cretaeta diua sub Ida / figentem certa terga ferina manu.*

²⁹² Cf. Phaedra's description of Hippolytus at lines 67-84 as "the object of her desire" (on this see below) ~ *Am.* 3.10.25 *uiderat Iasium, 27 uidit et.*

²⁹³ Cf. *Her.* 4.9f. *qua licet et prodest, pudor est miscendus amori; / dicere quae puduit, scribere iussit amor, 155 depuduit, profugusque pudor sua signa reliquit* ~ *Am.* 3.10.28 *hinc pudor, ex illa parte trahebat amor. / uictus amore pudor..*

of love devouring the marrow of their bones).²⁹⁴ A final link between the two stories is offered by the Cretan background²⁹⁵ of Ceres-Iasion affair.²⁹⁶

In the Euripidean play, Hippolytus in order to participate in the Eleusinian mysteries leaves Troezen and goes to Athens (lines 24-6),²⁹⁷ where Phaedra already dwells as the loyal wife of Theseus. Phaedra's elegiac account of this meeting in her letter is slightly – but crucially – differentiated in that she puts her emphasis once again on the foreign origin of both herself and Hippolytus.²⁹⁸ Phaedra moves in exactly the same direction with Hippolytus, from “outside to inside.” Both are foreigners and they visit Eleusis as guests.²⁹⁹ In her letter Phaedra appropriates not only the direction of Hippolytus' visit to Eleusis, but more importantly the purpose of this visit, which is the viewing of the mystery rites (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 25 *ἐς ὄψιν...μυστηρίων*). Hippolytus goes to Eleusis to *see* the mysteries, but instead he *is being seen* by Phaedra. Hence, he is being transformed from the subject of his *ὄψις...μυστηρίων* to the object of Phaedra's erotic *ὄψις*. The reversal is crucial, since it is intrinsically linked with Phaedra's elegiac appreciation of reality. Vision is one of the most important functions operating in the Euripides' *Hippolytus*³⁰⁰ and Phaedra's play on vision in this section lies at the heart of her representation of Hippolytus.

We have seen above how Phaedra's concern for *fama* reflects the anxieties of a shame culture, where women operate under the restraint and suffocating control of the male eye (public or private) and of female slander. In such a male-made and male-orientated society the representation of the world is nothing more than a male construction. The gaze is male, since the predominant ideology and language are male.³⁰¹ From this perspective, Phaedra's appropriation

²⁹⁴ Cf. *Her.* 4.15f. *adsit et, ut nostras auido fouet igne medullas, / figat sic animos in mea uota tuos !, 19f. ...urimur intus ; / urimur, et caecum pectora uulnus habent ~ Am.* 3.10.27 *ut tenerae flammam rapuere medullae.*

²⁹⁵ There is a plentiful of references to Crete in *Am.* 3.10: Iasion is a Cretan hunter hunting at the mountain of Ida (line 25), Ceres being in love with Iasion spends the whole time on Crete (lines 37, 39), references to Minos (line 41f.) and the conventional literary *topos* of the Cretans as liars (lines 19f.).

²⁹⁶ A possible further link between Phaedra and Persephone may be provided through the god Sun, since from what we learn from the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (lines 25f.) Persephone's cries were heard only by Hecate and Sun, who was the head of Phaedra's family (cf. her allusion at line 53f. with n. ad loc.). Also, Phaedra's starvation, which is mentioned in the Euripidean text (lines 136-8), but not in her letter, offers another interesting parallel with Demeter's fasting as a sign of grief for the loss of Persephone. The use of the “rather unlikely periphrasis” *Δάματρος ἀκτᾶς δέμας ἀγνόν ἴσχειν* 138 for the grain (see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 135-8) further adds to the association.

²⁹⁷ Eur. *Hipp.* 24-6 *ἐλθόντα γάρ νιν Πιτθέως ποτ' ἐκ δόμων / σεμῶν ἐς ὄψιν καὶ τέλη μυστηρίων / Πανδίωνος γῆν*. For the importance of Hippolytus' visit to Athens in the play see Barrett (1964) 33f. Whether Athens or Troezen provides the setting for the play or the letter see n. on *Her.* 4.107.

²⁹⁸ Cf. e.g. her juxtaposition of *Amazonio Cressa* in the very opening address of her letter, which serves exactly the same purpose.

²⁹⁹ *Her.* 4.67f. *tempore quo nobis inita est Cerealis Eleusin, / Cnosia me uellem detinisset humus!*

³⁰⁰ On the importance of vision in Eur. *Hipp.* see Zeitlin (1985) 90-3, Luschnig (1988) 3-15, esp. 4f., Goff (1990) 20, Segal (1992) 428, Roisman (1998) 28, McClure (1999) 120.

³⁰¹ On the gaze as a male strategy of sexual domination, which is traditionally associated with patriarchal power, see Kaplan (1983), De Lauretis (1987), Benjamin (1988), Gammand and Marshment (1988), Irigaray (1991), Mulvey's (1991 (=1975)) discussion of Freudian/Lacanian psychoanalysis and the role of vision in narrative cinema, Fredrick's (1997) 173-9 application of Mulvey's theory in elegy, Foxhall (1998)a 2, Barton (2002), Sharrock (2002)b, Lindheim (2003) 164ff. on the Ovidian Sappho's construction of her self as object of her lover's overpowering gaze. Snyder's (1997) 35 stimulating examination of Sapph. fr. 31 draws attention to the fact that in this poem Sappho “has for the first time in

of the male gaze is problematic and the situation becomes more complicated in view of her self-identification as an elegiac poet in the opening of her letter. Actually, Phaedra's appropriation of the male gaze comes as a consequence of her new poetic status. The description of the beauty of the beloved is not uncommon in the elegiac genre. What makes this description extraordinary is the inversion of sex-order in the subject-object relationship, since it is now the male that is being described by the female.

Beyond any doubt, the fact that Phaedra places the description of her beloved's physical appearance at the very heart of her letter (lines 67-84) indicates its special significance. Phaedra lavishes great detail in the description and pays great attention to the symmetrical development of the description. The section is split into two halves with equal number of lines: the first (lines 71-8) refers to Hippolytus' physical beauty, while the second (lines 79-89) treats Hippolytus' sporting activities. The second half is also divided in two equal halves: lines 79-82 are about athletics and lines 83-6 are devoted to hunting. Nevertheless, despite appearances, Phaedra's description of Hippolytus is a far cry from being a romantic description of an idealised beloved.³⁰² Hippolytus is not described as a "whole", as an "entity", where physical appearance matches his competence in sports and hunting. Instead, his image emerges "as a fetishized object of the narrator's gaze."³⁰³ Phaedra's view of Hippolytus is the view of a fragmented "reality", a fragmented description of various body parts (hair, face, feet, arms) and of various athletic and hunting activities (chariot racing, javelin, hunting).³⁰⁴ By fragmenting his body into pieces Phaedra manages to put Hippolytus, the owner of this disparaged body, under her control. She chooses and emphasizes those aspects of her beloved, which best serve her argument; hence, her gaze does not reflect reality, but rather constructs it. Hippolytus is lacking unity and coherence; he is simply a composite of some random and rather unconnected details. Ultimately, Hippolytus is turned into an "icon", an image to be looked at rather than a personality of autonomous existence. A reference to Hippolytus' voice is nowhere to be found; he is transformed into a mute object of Phaedra's desire. On the very contrary, Phaedra's emphasis on her eyes (or more generally to her judgment)³⁰⁵ underlies the controlling role of her gaze as opposed to Hippolytus' degradation to being merely an object of her gaze.

Western literature articulated the female gaze" (further on Sappho's female gaze see also Stehle (1996) esp. 219ff., Wilson (1996) 14f., 100ff.). Further on (fe)male gaze in the Greek novels in particular see Egger (1994) and Frontisi-Ducroux (1996).

³⁰² My discussion of Phaedra's representation strategies is greatly indebted to Greene's (1998) thorough and stimulating discussion of the narrator's similar techniques of manipulation in the representation of Cynthia in Prop. 1.3 and especially of Corinna in Ov. *Am.* 1.5 (pp. 51-9 and 77-84 respectively).

³⁰³ Greene (1998) 77.

³⁰⁴ For a similar list of characteristics of female beauty in Roman elegy cf. e.g. Prop. 1.3.21ff. (hair, face, eyes), Ov. *Am.* 1.5.19-22 with McKeown (white neck, long hair, arms, shoulder, bosom, breasts, waist, thigh), 2.2.5, 2.4.33ff. (hands, height, hair colour), 2.5.45f. (eyes, hair, face), Prop. 1.3.9ff. For features of female beauty see Richlin (1992) 32-3, 44-56, Quinn (1963) 66-73, Lilja (1978) 123-4, 128-9.

³⁰⁵ 69 *mih...*placebas, 74 *Phaedra iudice*, 82 *ora... in se uersa*, 84 *nostra... lumina*.

One might have expected that the shift of perspective would also bring along a shift in the construction of desire; that Phaedra's appropriation of the male gaze would actually bring as a consequence an attempt to deconstruct male desire and replace it with her female voice. But is that so? How "female" Phaedra's gaze really is? Is she actually replacing the dominant male view with her own female experience? A closer reading of Hippolytus' description reveals that Phaedra's appropriation of the strategies of the male gaze essentially means her appropriation of the male desire as well. Other than the reversal in sex-order, Phaedra has fully subscribed to the practices employed by a male narrator. Her emphasis on the narrator's vision, the fragmentation and silencing of the beloved as means of (rhetorical and physical) control over him show Phaedra's adherence to the strategies of the male gaze. Her version of Hippolytus is no different from Corinna's depiction in *Ov. Am.* 1.5, since both Hippolytus and Corinna are portrayed as fragmented totals of some erotically charged, but loosely inter-related details; both are statue-like figures circumscribed by silence.³⁰⁶ In this light, Phaedra's offer to Hippolytus of her royal riches near the end of her letter (lines 163f.) could perhaps be seen within the context of venerating offerings to a statue of mortals or gods.³⁰⁷

Nevertheless, there are certain elements in Phaedra's description of Hippolytus, which seem to suggest some kind of resistance against the complete appropriation of the male gaze. Despite the fact that she is -to a great extent- a mouthpiece of the dominant male ideology, Phaedra shows some signs of resistance by giving voice to an alternative female sensitivity. A close examination of Hippolytus against Corinna's portrayal by Ovid in *Am.* 1.5 proves to be instructive. Following Greene's acute remark: "nowhere in his (Ovid's) description of her (Corinna) does the narrator mention Corinna's head, face, or eyes -parts of the body which are most associated with a person's humanity."³⁰⁸ This rather strange case of "decapitation" further enhances the dismemberment and dehumanization of the beloved. Hence, "head-less" Corinna not only lacks unity, but more importantly she is doomed to silence, since she has no mouth, and has to depend on the intervention of the narrator to bring her back to the speaking world. Phaedra, on the contrary, diverts from such strategy. Her dismemberment of Hippolytus aims more at the arousal of erotic desire rather than at the hero's dehumanization, since she makes two crucial references to Hippolytus' face,³⁰⁹ which offer her the opportunity to unify his scattered body parts into a whole. In my view this diversion indicates a "female" gaze, which seems to suggest a more unified version of desire as opposed to male strategies of "fetishistic scopophilia."

³⁰⁶ Greene (1998) 81f. Cf. Propertius' statue-like description of Cynthia in *Prop.* 1.3. For more see Greene (1998) 51-9 with 121 n.22 with bibliography on the poem. On the function of vision in Propertius see Maltby (2006) 164-8.

³⁰⁷ Curran (1966) 194f. Cf. Hippolytus' description of woman in terms of a (Pandora-like) statue in his tirade against female race (631-3) with Zeitlin (1985) 88f.

³⁰⁸ Greene (1998) 83.

³⁰⁹ *Her.* 4.72 *ora*, 78 *in ore*.

The grammar in the passage offers further evidence for Phaedra's differentiated construction of desire. The fact that all references to Hippolytus are given in nominative undercuts effectively his objectification, since (at least) on a grammatical level he retains some kind of subjectivity. The only case of accusative used for Hippolytus is the emphatic accumulation of adjectives at line 73 (*quemque uocant aliae uultum rigidumque trucemque*).

Another critical feature of Phaedra's elegiac representation of Hippolytus is the ambiguity of his sexual status. Hippolytus in the letter is a strange mixture of both masculinity and effeminacy; his sexual identity is as ambivalent as his unresolved age between adolescence and adulthood. In view of the reversal of sex-order, which constitutes an inherent principle in the *Heroides*, it goes without saying that his substitution for the elegiac *puella* further complicates the issue of his sexual identity.

The Ovidian Phaedra does her best in order to portray Hippolytus as a typical example of Roman manliness.³¹⁰ Her description of Hippolytus is striking for its distinctively Roman character. The austerity and rigour of her beloved³¹¹ joined by his excellence in athletic and hunting pursuits³¹² are suggestive of his manhood. The undeniable proof for his virile status, however, is offered by his rejection of excessive personal care³¹³ and the meaningful application of the adjective *uirilis* with reference to his beauty.³¹⁴ Hippolytus' portrayal conforms to all dictates of contemporary morality reflecting conventional prejudices about male / female attractiveness.³¹⁵ Judging from the surviving evidence, appearance in public for the Romans must have been dictated by an extremely firm and exclusive set of gender-prescribed moral and social conventions. Men, as opposed to women, abstained from excessive personal care; however, a certain degree of neatness must have been permissible, so long as they stayed away from effeminacy.³¹⁶ Hence, Phaedra voices here the Roman male anxieties about effeminacy as a potential threat against masculinity. Furthermore, Hippolytus' rejection of effeminacy associates him with the advice offered by the *praeceptor* in the *Ars amatoria* to his male pupils to avoid excessive personal care.³¹⁷ Hippolytus is in complete agreement with the *praeceptor*, since he voices exactly the same moral standards; the fact that Hippolytus is actually named by

³¹⁰ For Roman masculinity in general see Fox (1998), Foxhall's introduction in Foxhall and Salmon (1998), Gardner (1998), Greene (1998) xi-xvi and *passim*, McDonnell (2003), Gibson on *Ars*. 3.422-66, (pp.275f.) with bibliography ad loc.

³¹¹ *Her.* 4.73f., 77f., 82, 86.

³¹² *Her.* 4.79-86. On the importance of Hippolytus' hunting in Eur. *Hipp.* see Devereux (1985) 21-4, Zeitlin (1985) 56 with n. 11, Burnett (1986), Roisman (1999) 137. Cf. Σ on Eur. *Hipp.* 1016 about Hippolytus' preoccupation with hunting.

³¹³ *Her.* 4.75f. *sint procul a nobis iuuenes ut femina compti! - / sine coli modico forma uirilis amat.*

³¹⁴ For the masculine connotations of the adjective *uirilis* and its occurrence in Roman legal writing see Gardner (1998) 146f.

³¹⁵ Cf. e.g. Cic. *Off.* 1.130, also Quint. *Inst. Or.* 11.3.137.

³¹⁶ For more on the fragility of Roman masculinity and the potential threat of effeminacy see Wyke (2002) 173f. with n.61 with bibliography ad loc.

³¹⁷ Cf. *Ov. Ars.* 1. 505-25 with Hollis and 3.434f. with Gibson.

the *praeceptor* as an example of a man renowned for “rustic” beauty further supports the association.³¹⁸

Hippolytus’ restraint and rigour reflects the standard conceptions of Roman manliness; a closer examination, however, of the vocabulary and imagery applied reveals his complex and ambiguous nature. As it turns out, Hippolytus’ manly portrayal is seriously undermined by the duplicity of Phaedra’s rhetoric. The first hint at Hippolytus’ less manly side is offered through the specific reference to the Eleusinian mysteries, since Hippolytus’ seclusion to his virginal meadow (cf. *Her* 4.85-92 echoing Eur. *Hipp.* 73-80) offers a close parallel with Persephone. In particular, the image of Hippolytus plucking flowers in his untouched meadow in Euripides’ *Hippolytus* (lines 73-80) recalls Persephone’s gathering of flowers in a meadow moments before being abducted by Hades.³¹⁹

Phaedra’s misinterpretation of Hippolytus’ flower crown at line 71 (*praecincti flore capilli*) plays a programmatic role in this section and it is a first clear indication of her infatuation.³²⁰ Driven by her passion for her beloved Phaedra fails to understand the actual symbolic use of Hippolytus’ wreath. While in the Euripidean play Hippolytus’ crown “is a symbolic offering of his sexuality to the virgin goddess, a concrete embodiment of the offer which he makes every day of his life”,³²¹ Phaedra treats the crown merely as an adornment for Hippolytus’ hair, similar to those adorning the heads of the elegiac *puellae*.³²²

Phaedra’s main strategy towards Hippolytus’ effeminization is realized through the manipulation of language. Despite her proclamation for the rejection of the *pueri delicati*, her description of Hippolytus resounds with elements which ultimately subvert his heroic status. Her reference to Hippolytus’ garment is not surprising, since a reference to cloths is often associated with physical beauty in erotic descriptions.³²³ As far as the colour of the garment is concerned, white (*candida uestis* 71), in addition to its connotations of good luck, could also be seen as a manifestation of Hippolytus’ morally unblemished life.³²⁴ After all, in the context of the Eleusinian mysteries, a white garment is particularly appropriate, since white was the conventional colour of garments in most religious festivals.³²⁵ What is remarkable, however, is Phaedra’s emphatic opening of the hexameter with the adjective *candidus*. *candidus* is an adjective traditionally associated with the elegiac *puella* with reference to the paleness of her complexion, which was considered to be particularly attractive.³²⁶ In addition, the grammatical

³¹⁸ Ov. *Ars* 1.511 *Hippolytum Phaedra, nec erat bene cultus, amavit*.

³¹⁹ For the gathering of flowers as the archetypical pursuit of the chaste / innocent female see parallels in Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.345f. On the association between Hippolytus and the Kore in terms of virginity see Zeitlin (1985) 66f.. Also see Cairns (1997) 62f.

³²⁰ On the metaliterary implication of this reference see n. on *Her.* 4.71.

³²¹ Segal (1965) 122. Further on the crown-motif see Herter (1940) 285f.

³²² Cf. e.g. Prop. 1.3.21f., Ov. *Am.* 1.6.37, 68, 3.10.36.

³²³ Cf. e.g. Ap. Rhod. 3.454 (Medea’s reference to Jason’s outfit), Prop. 1.2.3f., 2.3.15, Ov. *Am.* 1.5.10 with McKeown, 1.8.24, 3.1.11, Sulp. [Tib.] 3.8.11f.

³²⁴ On the implications of *candida uestis* see n. on *Her.* 4.71.

³²⁵ See n. on *Her.* 4.71.

³²⁶ See especially Nikolaidis (1994) 28 n.26, 31 n.36. Also Lilja (1965) 132, Pichon (1966) s.v. *candidus*. Cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.5.9f., 1.7.40 with McKeown, 3.3.5, 3.7.8.

gender of the adjective (*candida* - female) combined with its emphatic placement add to the implications of effeminacy. This indirect hint is further reinforced by Phaedra's reference to Hippolytus' blush of modesty in the pentameter (line 73 *flaua uerecundus tinxerat ora rubor*). The combination of pale complexion with the light blush of shame as a conventional feature of female beauty, particularly popular in the virginal idiom of brides,³²⁷ constitutes the climax of Phaedra's effeminization strategy of Hippolytus, since the young man is portrayed in terms suitable for an elegiac *puella*.³²⁸ Far from simply assimilating Hippolytus in his new elegiac environment, Phaedra's rhetorical duplicity severely damages his heroic status.

Phaedra's reference to Hippolytus at lines 73-6 on grounds of his austerity and his rejection of excessive personal care is another ingenious example of her manipulation of language. Her use of the adjective *rigidus* in reference to Hippolytus' sternness is somewhat controversial, since *rigidus* is often used with regard to male erection.³²⁹ The sexual undertones of the adjective undermine its effectiveness in establishing Hippolytus' morality. Phaedra's description of Hippolytus' excellence in physical activities at lines 79-86 is also very suggestive, since, apart from the obvious sexual implications of horse-riding and hunting,³³⁰ the whole section is thickly sown with a sexually charged vocabulary, which eroticizes further Hippolytus' heroic valour.³³¹

Phaedra's reference to Hippolytus' hair deserves special attention. It is true that Phaedra shows the same degree of ambiguity about the exact length of Hippolytus' hair, as in her vague reference to Hippolytus' garment at line 71. Instead, she puts all her emphasis on Hippolytus' lack of excessive care for his personal appearance. However, given that long hair was often associated with the *pueri delicati*, Phaedra's silence is meaningful.³³² In any case, her reference to his hair can be considered as another sign of effeminacy in that it recalls the widespread elegiac *topos* of the reference to the beauty of the *puella*'s hair.³³³

Phaedra concludes her portrayal of a sexually ambiguous Hippolytus with an equally ambiguous combined reference to his excellence in horse-riding and hunting. Both physical activities were part of the educational agenda of both Greeks and Romans,³³⁴ since they were considered to contribute the most to the young man's assertion of his virile status.³³⁵ Hunting in particular constituted an initiatory rite for the Athenian youth marking the passage from

³²⁷ Cf. Catul. 61.191-5.

³²⁸ Further on the literary history of blushing and its elegiac implications see n. on *Her.* 4.72.

³²⁹ See Adams (1982) 103. Also cf. Catul. 56.7, Hor. *Epod.* 1.1.17, Ov. *Rem.* 762.

³³⁰ For the sexual connotations of horse-riding see nn. on *Her.* 4.21-4 and 22. For the motif of "amatory hunt" see pp. 77ff. and n. on *Her.* 4.41.

³³¹ Cf. *lentum* 81, *hastile* 81, *lacerto* 81, *lacertus* 82, *cornea* 83, *duritia* 86. For the sexual implications of the terms see nn. ad locc.

³³² On the sexual (and heroic) implications of men's long hair see n. on *Her.* 4.76.

³³³ Phaedra's use of *flaua* at line 72 with reference to *ora* echoes perhaps Hippolytus' blond hair (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1343 *ξανθὸν τε κάρα*). Blond hair as a feature of male heroic beauty dates back to Homer; however, fair hair was later established as a conventional attribute of female beauty. Further on this see Craik (1998) 35. On *flaua* and its association with Ceres see n. on *Her.* 4.72.

³³⁴ See n. on *Her.* 4.79-82.

³³⁵ For Hippolytus' interest in horse-riding in view of his political ambition to obtain nobility among Theseus' genuine heirs see Roisman (1999) 137.

adolescence to adulthood.³³⁶ Without a shadow of doubt, Phaedra's reference to Hippolytus as hunter is bound to recall his similar portrayal in Euripides' *Hippolytus* (esp. his self-portrayal at lines 73-87).³³⁷ Hippolytus' association with hunting is an indisputable evidence of the hero's masculinity;³³⁸ secluded in his untouched meadow he enjoys hunting and the company of his devoted friends, who will remain his only company until his very last moment. At first sight, there seems to be nothing suspicious in Hippolytus' close association with his comrades. However, as Craik has recently argued,³³⁹ a close and detailed examination of the vocabulary applied by Hippolytus with reference to his comrades reveals the homosexual nature of this relationship. It is true that hunting carries connotations of both sexual indulgence and sexless life,³⁴⁰ since the liminal space of the forest lies between license and innocence and the hunter consequently balances between savage and civilized man.³⁴¹ If such connotations are perceptible in Phaedra's reference to Hippolytus' hunting, her reference to hunting, in addition to its association with the erotic motif of "amatory hunt", can also be seen as an implicit allusion to Hippolytus' effeminacy through his homosexual attachment to his comrades.

A final remark: Phaedra's representation of an effeminate Hippolytus should not be seen exclusively in view of her rhetorical strategy to assimilate Hippolytus in his new elegiac context. In my view, Phaedra once again proves to be a well-informed and attentive reader of the Euripidean text, where Hippolytus' ambiguous sexuality constitutes part of a wider investigation of the exchange and inversion of the socially prescribed gender roles.³⁴² Phaedra picks up and further develops hints, which are already present in the play, and accommodates them to her poetic program. Throughout the play, from Phaedra's ambiguous first reference to him at line 351³⁴³ until the very end Hippolytus remains an ambiguous figure in many respects. The uncertainty of his age is intrinsically related with the uncertainty of his social role and of his sexual identity. Now a *ἀνὴρ*,³⁴⁴ then a young *νεανίας*,³⁴⁵ Hippolytus oscillates between male and female. Either through the female overtones of his defence against his father in the *agon* scene³⁴⁶ or through the effeminate characteristics of his physical appearance³⁴⁷ the rigidity

³³⁶ Vidal-Naquet (1981) 151ff., Burkert (1983) 19ff., Detienne (1979) 20-52. On the connection of hunting with chastity see Burkert (1979) 11f., *idem* (1983). 81f.

³³⁷ For the centrality of Hippolytus' hunting in Eur. *Hipp.* and the ambiguity in terms of sexuality around hunting see pp. 45 n.312 and 47f.

³³⁸ Devereux (1985) 19-28.

³³⁹ Craik (1998) 36-8. So also Devereux (1964), *idem* (1985) 67f., 74f. For an opposite view see Poole (1990) 134 according to whom the relationship between Hippolytus and his comrades constitutes an obvious example of how "Euripides put a high value on male friendship which lacked a homosexual dimension." For the homosexual implications of hunting in general see Detienne (1979) 26, also Sargent (1987) 121-4.

³⁴⁰ Fontenrose (1981) 253.

³⁴¹ Fontenrose (1981) 253.

³⁴² Knox (1952) 12, 25, Zeitlin (1985) 65f., 70f., Segal (1965) on the compatibility and exchange of the roles between Phaedra-Hippolytus, Aphrodite-Diana.

³⁴³ Eur. *Hipp.* 351 *ὅστις ποθ' οὐτός ἐσθ', ὁ τῆς Ἀμαζόνος . . .*

³⁴⁴ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 994, 1031.

³⁴⁵ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 43, cf. also 114, 798, 967, 1098.

³⁴⁶ Goff (1990) 65f.

of the male / female dichotomy in the play collapses and consequently problematizes Hippolytus' sexual ambiguity even further.³⁴⁸ From this perspective, Phaedra's strategy of Hippolytus' effeminization in her elegiac letter makes better sense if seen within the context of an elegiac transformation of a similar tragic technique.³⁴⁹

2.3. Hermione

Palmer's view of Hermione's letter as the "feeblest and least poetical"³⁵⁰ of the *Heroides* or Jacobson's remarks on the letter's "rather boring, not to say sometimes silly and annoying"³⁵¹ structure is but a mundane commonplace in the scholarly appreciation of the letter. Until very recently, the letter was severely criticized almost exclusively on grounds of certain linguistic and metrical shortcomings,³⁵² its rigidity of expression and the excessiveness of its overall rhetorical character, while the issue of Hermione's characterization was either ignored as a whole or only superficially touched upon. The first to diverge from such interpretation and focus his attention on the question of Hermione's self-representation was Williams (1997), later followed by Fulkerson (2005). Both scholars' inter- and intra-textual readings of Hermione's portrayal yielded a fruitful re-assessment of the letter by disclosing its high degree of complexity and sophistication. My discussion of Hermione's self-representation lies to a great extent within the same context of interpretation, as I also make extensive use of both inter- and intra- textuality as components of textual characterization. Indeed, Hermione in her letter is constructing a self through a complex web of multiple textual references to prior works of literature, as well as to letters within the collection.³⁵³ However, my own investigation moves a step further, as I examine Hermione's self-portrayal in conjunction with her struggle to assert her right both as a woman and as a letter writer. Her self-definition is intrinsically related with her struggle to find her own voice and articulate her "female" desire under the constraints and erotic expectations imposed on her by the two rivaling lovers. In this light, her self-representation is transformed from a static conflation of textual exchanges into a dynamic

³⁴⁷ For a thorough discussion of the effeminate details in Hippolytus' physical appearance in the play see Craik (1998) 35f.

³⁴⁸ Further on the "feminization" of men in tragedy as a repeated and persistent poetic strategy see Zeitlin (1985)b 80; in particular on Hippolytus' feminization see Zeitlin (1985)a 65-7.

³⁴⁹ On the description of young men and effeminate beauty in general in Euripides see Poole (1990) 120-8.

³⁵⁰ Palmer (1898) 98.

³⁵¹ Jacobson (1974) 55.

³⁵² Cf. Knox' (1995) 8f. doubts against the Ovidian authorship of *Her.* 8.65-74.

³⁵³ It is rather unfortunate that the paucity of the relevant surviving evidence allows us only tentative speculations about the nature of these intertextual exchanges. For an extensive collection and discussion of the earlier literature (both Greek and Roman) see Jacobson (1974) 43-6, La Penna (1979), Allan (2000) 16-8, Fulkerson (2005) 89f.

process, where textuality merges with sexuality and writing ultimately stands for an alternative way of desiring.

i) Living the absence

Hermione opens her letter rather abruptly, without a formal salutation.³⁵⁴ Instead, she plunges into it by crudely stating the facts of her current misfortune: Pyrrhus, the son of Achilles, holds her against her will confined in his palace (lines 3f.). Given the particular circumstances of the letter (Hermione is a captive secretly sending away her letter) the lack of an opening salutation³⁵⁵ can be explained as an attempt to suppress the identity of both the sender and the receiver, in case the letter gets intercepted on its way. Moreover, the abruptness of the opening can also be seen as the result of Hermione's turbulent state of mind and the urgency of the situation. Under the pressure of her current distress Hermione seems to care more about the safe sending of her letter and less about abiding by epistolary conventions, such as the letter's *salutatio*. She does not want to waste any time. Even if she was prevented from writing the rest of her letter, the initial couplet alone (lines 3f.) would suffice to get the message across (in the form of a short note).

Nevertheless, the somewhat unconventional character of the letter's opening does not necessarily remove any of its rhetorical complexity. On the very contrary, these lines communicate much more information than they may initially seem to. Despite Hermione's attempt to conceal the name of the addressee and keep her own identification as subtle as possible, her reference to her abduction by Neoptolemus gets straight to the point and puts the reader immediately at the very heart of the story. Hence, lines 3f. introduce issues of key importance to Hermione's argumentation; above all, her abduction by Neoptolemus. The early reference to this event (at the very opening couplet of the letter) which is clearly programmatic also suggests its great importance, since it becomes intrinsically related with her dual status as daughter (of Helen) and wife (of Neoptolemus). Hermione at two pivotal moments of her life becomes –directly or indirectly– involved with abduction: either as the prey of Neoptolemus' rape or as the innocent victim of Helen's abduction by Paris. Her entire life revolves around abduction and Hermione throughout her letter defines herself in terms of the absence of her husband and/or her mother. It is surely not by chance that the only instances in her letter where she recalls her exact words from the past concern her violent separation from her husband and her mother (lines 7f. and 80 respectively).

Hermione throughout her letter tries to construct a self and define her presence through the interpretation of the absence of her loved ones. She is the daughter of an absent mother and the wife of an absent husband. This sense of absence and emptiness reflects on the syntax of the

³⁵⁴ For the spurious character of the letter's opening salutation (lines 1f.) transmitted in some manuscripts see pp. 283f.

³⁵⁵ The lack of an opening salutation is not uncommon in the *Heroides*; letters 5-12, and (from the double) letters 17, 18, 20, 21 also open without a formal salutation.

opening couplet (3f.). Instead of providing a direct object for the verb (*tenet*), Hermione opts for the emphatic use of the participle *inclusam* alone, thus maintaining an effect of a certain vagueness and uncertainty in the sentence.³⁵⁶ Hermione translates bodily absence into grammatical uncertainty. By doing so, she moves from defining herself through the absence of her loved ones into actually effacing herself even from the grammatical level of her letter. Her desire for her absent loved ones ultimately becomes a desire for absence itself.

The so-called “heredity theme” is also introduced in the opening couplet.³⁵⁷ Hermione’s allusion to Neoptolemus’ valour through the use of the epic patronymic (*Achillides*)³⁵⁸ and the elevated apposition *animosus imagine patris* captures the reader’s attention. Neoptolemus is introduced in view of his family’s great past and of his proud parentage. His past, and more precisely his association with his father, Achilles, is called upon to give an explanation for his present behaviour. Neoptolemus is seen as a mere projection of his father (*Achillides*) and later he is judged and condemned by Hermione exactly on these grounds (line 84). Actually, one of Hermione’s rhetorical strategies in the letter is to evoke, even to re-create if necessary, the past, in order to provide a valid interpretation of the present. For her, past and present form an undivided entity, a circle of events, where from there seems to be no escape. Throughout the letter Hermione plays with time scales by constantly moving from present to past and back to present again. Deprived of Orestes and helpless as she is in the possession of Neoptolemus, her belief in a hereditary continuity seems to be the only logical explanation of this current misfortune. It is exactly this sense of absence in her personal life, which makes her project her personal misery on to the canvas of a common family fate merging in this way her personal history with the history of her family.³⁵⁹

Trying to counterbalance the sense of absence in her personal life, Hermione takes up action and plays multiple roles by imitating the lives of others.³⁶⁰ The first obvious candidate is Helen, her mother. Throughout her letter Hermione brings up the similarities between herself and Helen, whose abduction by Paris sets the pattern for her current misfortune. Her proud declaration at lines 40f. (*proderit exemplo mater amata suo. / tu mihi quod matri pater est*) that Orestes is to her, what Menelaus was for Helen, attests to the fact that she lives in the shadow of her mother and that she actually aspires to become a “second Helen” herself. In Hermione’s eyes everything is filtered through her association with her mother’s turbulent past; her ambiguous reference to her Helen-like abduction (lines 5f.), her constant references to her mother (19f., 40f., 73-80, 91-100), her appeals to Orestes to imitate the paradigm of Menelaus

³⁵⁶ The same elliptical usage occurs also at lines 9f. and 103. Further on this see Jacobson (1974) 52f.

³⁵⁷ For the motif of “worthy ancestors” in the *Heroides* see Jacobson (1974) 47 n.9, Sabot (1976) 233 and Bettini (1990) 422 n. 2.

³⁵⁸ Further on the use of *Achillides* see n. on *Her.* 8.3.

³⁵⁹ Jacobson (1974) 54.

³⁶⁰ It is true that the reading of Hermione’s letter is enriched immensely by the comparative reading of both Briseis’ letter to Achilles (*Her.* 3, see Jacobson (1974) 47, 379, Williams (1997) 125, Fulkerson (2005) 90- 102), and that of Helen’s response to Paris (*Her.* 17, see Williams (1997) 122-4). The circle of possible intratextual readings has opened up lately also to include Hypermestra’s letter to Lynceus (*Her.* 14) (see Fulkerson (2005) 102-5).

in claiming his wife back (19-26, 37-42) and her concern for her physical appearance (10, 79f., 95-100) are all suggestive of Helen's deep impact on Hermione's life. Her present becomes a mere repetition of her mother's past. The multiple similarities (verbal, thematic, rhetorical) between Hermione and Helen have long now been thoroughly discussed.³⁶¹ For my part I would only add the following: in her re-enactment of Helen, Hermione passes the erotic element in their abduction in silence. Both women are portrayed almost exclusively as the innocent victims of male violence. Through this subtle shift of emphasis from erotic desire to erotic suffering Hermione manages to transform Helen's abduction from a paradigm of erotic lust to a reminder of the reconstitution of an injustice.

Hermione's reference to Helen's abduction by Paris also provides her with the opportunity to widen the heredity theme so as to include Orestes as well. The close parallel between Hermione and Helen inevitably brings to the fore the association of Orestes with Menelaus. On the face of it, Helen's abduction becomes the connecting link not only between Hermione and her family, but more importantly between Hermione and her absent husband. Like Hermione, Orestes' present is also projected against the past of his family, entangling his personal history with the history of the male members of the house of Tantalus. His introduction to the letter is realized through Hermione's appeal to claim her back from Neoptolemus by imitating Menelaus' example (19-22), while his association with the Tantalids is constant throughout the letter (44-8, 122). Later in the letter Hermione will repeat the same call through her acknowledgement of the paradigmatic role of her parents' relationship for her life (39-42). Orestes is urged to live in the shadow of Menelaus, in the same way in which Hermione imitates the life of her mother. Williams³⁶² convincing arguments that Hermione's emotional reactions in the letter are aimed to echo Orestes' distress and his frenetic crises after his matricide further enhance the similarities between the two. From this new perspective, Hermione seems to push the game of multiple role-playing to an extreme, as she includes Orestes among the people, whose lives she tries to imitate in her letter. In her desperate attempt to re-establish the connection with her absent husband Hermione goes as far as to subtly identify herself with him, and become a "second Orestes".

Hermione's response to her husband's inertness is drastic. Given Neoptolemus' initial connection with Achilles (line 3) her association of Orestes with Menelaus transforms the issue of Helen's recovery from a feud between two lovers to a conflict between two families. This is no longer a private matter, but a matter of family pride and hereditary honour. Hermione's extensive use of patronymics in her letter, especially in connection with the two rivals, further reinforces this sense of continuity.³⁶³ This leaves Orestes with no other option but to succumb to the fate of his family and follow the steps of Menelaus who had deemed it was worthy to endure

³⁶¹ Jacobson (1974) 48, Williams (1997) 120-22, Fulkerson (2005) 97-9.

³⁶² Williams (1997) 127-9.

³⁶³ Neoptolemus: *Achillides* 3, *Aeacide* 7, *Aeacidiae* 33, *Aeacides* 55, Orestes: *Tantalidae* 122. Also *Pelopeius* 27, *Dardanius* 42, *Tantalides* 45, *Tantalides* 66, *Pelopeia* 81, *Pelides* 83.

fierce war for the love of his wife (25f. *sic quoque eram repetenda tamen, nec turpe marito / aspera pro caro bella tulisse toro*).

In Hermione's letter there is no single evidence for her emotional independence and self-sufficiency. Her reliance on others is constant throughout and she fails to reach any kind of self-definition on her own, as she always perceives herself in relation to others.³⁶⁴ Hence, her introduction to the letter is made through her association with Neoptolemus (3f.), while soon after that, Hermione associates herself with Orestes by subscribing to his conjugal protection (8 "*haec tibi sub domino est, Pyrrhe, puella suo!*", also lines 31ff.). Later on, Hermione decides to transfer her emphasis from Orestes to her own family and more precisely to her mother (40f. *proderit exemplo mater amata suo. / tu mihi, quod matri pater est*), but when she feels in need of wider validation, she does not hesitate to take refuge to the realm of myth and incorporate herself to the wider context of her family fate (65-74, 81f. *ne non Pelopeia credar, / ecce, Neoptolemo praeda parata fui!, 122 aut ego Tantalidae Tantalus uxor ero!*).³⁶⁵ Hermione's transposition to the realm of myth has further repercussions. By merging her personal experience with the mythical past of her family, Hermione retreats even further from her narrative present; she seems to have abolished her individuality as a whole, as she seeks validation not through herself but through the collective memory of her family. Even at the very end of her letter, Hermione fails to assert herself on her own right and to take control of the situation. Instead, she rounds off her letter in ring-composition by concluding her plea with another reference to Neoptolemus, her new master, and the frustration she experiences during the nights she has to spend with him.

Hermione's dependence on others develops in the letter according to the following pattern: Neoptolemus (– Orestes) – Helen – Tantalid women – Helen – Neoptolemus, which (if one removes Orestes) is symmetrically organized around her association with the women of her family. Hermione finds herself framed (or better, entrapped) by the presence of an enemy (Neoptolemus- Neoptolemus, outer pair) and the absence of her mother (Helen – Helen, inner pair). In this sense, Orestes (who is conspicuously absent) becomes almost a parenthesis in her life. I am more than inclined to believe that this intricate pattern is meant to be read as a subtle hint at Orestes' marginal involvement in her life. Hermione intentionally exaggerates her self-portrayal of helplessness and despair in order to arouse Orestes' sympathy for her and achieve his return. Instead of asserting her own place in her relationship and giving voice to her own desire, she manipulates her "female" voice in order to construct a passive and helpless self which will be most appealing to the male expectations of her lover. Hence, Hermione maintains

³⁶⁴ According to Lindheim's (2003), esp. 78-135 Lacanian reading of the *Heroides*, the heroines' multiple role-playing belongs to a rhetorical strategy of self-diffusion and self-depreciation which ultimately aims at the affirmation of the male self and the satisfaction of the male desire. In her own words: "Desiring to be the cause of the hero's desire, the heroine begins a performance that leads her to play out various roles in relation to him. Each guise she assumes is a calculated one; she seeks through each role she acts out to manipulate the hero and his desire as if she were a puppeteer pulling the strings."

³⁶⁵ For an extensive discussion of Hermione's (mis)application of mythological *exempla* in her letter see pp. 60ff.

the gender-prescribed role of female passivity, while she preserves for Orestes the role of the rescuer. Orestes is the only one who can guarantee her happiness by interrupting the circle of heredity doom.

ii) Married to a name

The nature of Hermione's relationship with Orestes is also very important in terms of characterization. Hermione's self-identification as *puella* through the recollection of her exact words during her abduction by Neoptolemus is clearly programmatic and does more than to simply imply the elegiac context of the affair (8 "*haec tibi sub domino est, Pyrrhe, puella suo!*"). Her reference to Orestes as *dominus*, despite the term's erotic connotations,³⁶⁶ is a rather strange choice, in that it goes against one fundamental generic convention of Roman elegy, that of *seruitium amoris*.³⁶⁷ Instead of the man being enslaved to the woman, Hermione reserves for herself the role of the submissive one. However, Hermione's choice is not so much a departure from elegiac conventions, but rather a case of a gender-reversed *seruitium amoris* (the woman enslaved to the man), which is equally frequent in Roman elegy.³⁶⁸ The fact that this female form of erotic servitude is present in Greek erotic poetry could perhaps be associated with Hermione's Greek descent. Moreover, while *dominus* can be seen within the wider context of Hermione's use of legal terminology in the letter (especially in view of her reference to the *manus iniectio* procedure at line 16),³⁶⁹ I am inclined to read behind its use Hermione's implicit allusion to the harshness of her affair with Orestes. The fact that she is actually reporting her own words in direct speech invests her words with certain genuineness and the pretence of personal experience.³⁷⁰ Hence, her use of *dominus* becomes a subconscious choice dictated by the problematic nature of her relationship with Orestes, which ultimately prevents her from subverting the hard conditions of her reality within the literary conventions of elegy. Hence, her recollection of the past becomes like a crack on the solid surface of the poem, which offers an insight into her personal, more intimate thoughts.

Hermione does not give the impression that she knows a great deal about Orestes on a more personal level, as her husband. In fact, her references to him are restricted only to the first half of the letter (lines 1-61), while in the second half he disappears almost completely, as Hermione retreats to her own self-obsessed, self-pitying world of absence and rejection. One might argue that she seems to know a lot more about Orestes in connection with his family and his turbulent past.³⁷¹ But this is but a false impression. Hermione tactfully avoids getting into

³⁶⁶ Cf. *Ov. Am.* 3.7.11, *Ars* 1.314, also *Cat.* 45.14. Further on Hermione's use of *dominus* see n. on *Her.* 8.8.

³⁶⁷ For bibliography on *seruitium amoris* see n. on *Her.* 4.22.

³⁶⁸ Further on female erotic servitude in Greek and Latin poetry see Murgatroyd (1981) 592, 594, esp. 597 nn. 35 and 25 for elegiac occurrences, also Copley (1947) 289.

³⁶⁹ For a detailed discussion of Hermione's use of legal terminology see below.

³⁷⁰ The insertion of direct speech as a means to raise the emotional pitch is frequent in the *Heroides* (cf. e.g. 3.102, 111-2, 6.25-28, 14.53-66, 17.86, 157-8, 162).

³⁷¹ Cf. Jacobson (1974) 50.

much detail; instead, she concentrates only on some widely known events from his family life. Hermione's reference to Orestes is far from being a mere retrospective investigation of the hero's past. Instead, it becomes more of an insight into the future in an attempt to remind Orestes of his conjugal obligations. From this perspective, lines 49-54, despite claims for the contrary,³⁷² become extremely relevant to Hermione's argumentation. Hermione's recollection of the past, which is but a meticulous selection of events, proves to be extremely manipulative. Through her highly subjective perspective the past is re-shaped and re-interpreted in the way which suits her argumentation the best. Orestes' bloody past is recalled only as proof for his heroic valour and the rest of the ominous events are suppressed. Hence, his disgraceful matricide, which Hermione passes twice in silence (both at lines 49-54 and 119f.)³⁷³ becomes conspicuous through its absence.³⁷⁴ Instead, all emphasis is put on Orestes' sense of his family duties and obligations. Above all, Orestes is portrayed as a man of action, someone who has the will and physical power (*nec uirtute cares* 49, *materia uellem fortis meliore fuisses* 51) for great deeds, no matter how (self-) destructive these deeds can be. Through her ingenious manipulation of language and of factual reality Hermione tries her best to play down his responsibility for the killing of his mother. The horrible act comes second in importance to the execution of his family duties, the responsibility is transferred to Agamemnon (50), while Orestes is left with no other choice but to succumb to his obligation to avenge his fathers' death (52). Hermione carefully avoids even the slightest allusion to Orestes' post-matricidal mental and emotional instability, which constituted an indispensable feature in the hero's long literary career.³⁷⁵

Furthermore, Hermione's use of terms showing affection and intimacy with reference to Orestes is rather limited; she addresses him using his name only once throughout the entire letter (15 *Oreste*). The feeling of her husband's absence now translates into an absence of feeling. The reader cannot find anywhere Hermione's recollection of, or even the slightest allusion to, any blissful moments of their life together. There seems to be no emotional bond between the two and Hermione, indeed, gives the impression that she knows very little about Orestes as her husband. In fact, Hermione, together with Penelope and Deianira, are the only heroines in the entire collection whose letters do not contain a nostalgic reminiscence of a happy past shared with their loved ones.³⁷⁶ This lack of shared memories becomes all the more evident in Hermione's two emotional recollections from the past. Her selection is surely not

³⁷² *pace* Jacobson (1974) 50: "a full six lines [49-54] recount an event in the hero's life *which has no direct bearing on the heroine*" (my emphasis).

³⁷³ Cf. Jacobson (1974) 49f. and Williams (1997) 130.

³⁷⁴ For the possibility, however, of a covered allusion to Clytemnestra's killing through Hermione's reference to Aegisthus' throat see n. on *Her.* 8.53.

³⁷⁵ Cf. e.g. Aesch. *Cho.* 1021ff., *Eu.* 329-32, *Eur. El.* 1252f., *Or.* 255-76, *IT* 281-308, *Ar. Ach.* 1167f., Scholion *Ar. Av.* 712, Paus. 3.22.1, 7.25.7, 8.34 (further on Oreste's madness in Greek tragedy see Gregory (1974), Hartigan (1987) esp. 129ff., Theodorou (1993)). Nevertheless, Williams (1997) 127-9 offers valid justification for his claim that Hermione's distress in the letter echoes Orestes' mental disarray after the killing of his mother. Cf. also Jacobson (1974) 50.

³⁷⁶ Fulkerson (2005) 94.

coincidental, as she chooses two instances from her personal history, where Orestes is conspicuously absent (abduction by Neoptolemus (5-10) and separation from Helen (75-80)).

Hermione's use of the conditional clause *cura mei si te pia tangit* at line 15 is equally suggestive of the problematic nature of her relationship with Orestes. Hermione expresses her doubts about Orestes' intentions in the very couplet, which actually introduces her passionate appeals to him to imitate Menelaus' example and rescue her from Neptolemus. Such concerns are indicative of a conjugal relationship which lacks the affection and mutual trust of a married couple. The same kind of emotional detachment can also be discerned behind Hermione's frequent use of legal terminology.³⁷⁷ Her written appeal to Orestes is replete with legal terms to the extent that her love-letter ultimately transforms into a legal challenge.³⁷⁸ In my view, Hermione's refuge to the realm of law indicates her acknowledgement of the emotional distance between herself and Orestes. Knowing that her sentimental pleas to Orestes are most likely to fail, she seeks further justification and support on legal grounds; in this light, her constant appeals to him to assert his legal rights and defend his wife (7f., 15f., 19f., 25f.) seem to counter-balance her husband's emotional alienation. Law is evoked to make up for any losses in love.

Hermione's reference to her beloved through the third-person periphrasis *nomen Orestae* at line 9, instead of a second-person one, is suggestive of her emotional detachment and it helps to maintain the impression that she is addressing her abduction by Neoptolemus to nobody in particular.³⁷⁹ This periphrasis together with her choice for *dominus* at line 8 make Orestes "no more than another third-person outsider."³⁸⁰ To move one step further, Hermione now treats Orestes' physical absence as a complete absence. Hence, Orestes-the person ultimately becomes Orestes-the name; her beloved is nothing more than a *nomen*. Hermione uses again the same periphrasis *nomen Orestae* with an equally alienating effect near the end of her letter where she mentions the nights spent by Neoptolemus' side (lines 115f.).³⁸¹ The sarcasm behind her allegedly mistaken choice of the name of Orestes instead of that of Neoptolemus is cutting. More importantly, Hermione by interpreting her hardship purely in linguistic terms, manages at the same time to turn the game around to her own advantage. She is no longer the helpless victim of violence and sexual desire of two rivalling lovers; instead, she seems to hold herself the key to her own happiness, which is nothing more than a question of right choice between two names.

Orestes becomes not only a name, but a title as well, since Hermione throughout her letter attributes to him a series of titles. The distribution of these titles is well calculated and

³⁷⁷ For detailed discussion of Hermione's use of legal terminology in her letter see Palmer (1898) on *Her.* 7 and 8, Jacobson (1974) 56f. n.22, Williams (1997) 122 with notes, Fulkerson (2001) 101, and nn. on *Her.* 8. 7, 8, 16, 31-4, 36, 44, 51, 55, 59, 70, 88, 95, 110, 113.

³⁷⁸ Cf. Sabot (1981) 2607: "Cette lettre, construite très logiquement, est un bon plaidoyer. Hermione utilise des arguments juridiques et manie habilement le langage du barreau."

³⁷⁹ Jacobson (1974) 51.

³⁸⁰ Jacobson (1974) 51.

³⁸¹ For the sexual undertones of Hermione's vocabulary in this section see n. on *Her.* 8.11-16.

they seem to develop from the harsh and distant to the more intimate ones. Thus, Orestes makes his first appearance in the letter as a powerful *dominus* in possession of his *puella* (8 *sub domino est...puella suo*); then the tone gradually softens, when Orestes is portrayed in terms of an injured *maritus / uir*, who is prompted to fight for the recovery of his abducted wife (25f. *nec turpe marito / aspera pro caro bella tulisse toro*, 29 *uir, precor, uxori...succurre*). Later, when the reference to the relationship becomes more intimate, Hermione reminds Orestes of his double status as “husband and cousin” and calls him to avenge the insult made to his family (29 *frater succurre sorori*). Her emphatic juxtaposition of the two patronymics *Tantalidae Tantalidis* at the final line is along the same lines of intimacy³⁸² underlining the close ties between two members of the same family.

Hermione’s emphatic employment of the “double relationship” theme at lines 27-30 is also part of the same strategy. Faced with Orestes’ failure as husband Hermione resorts to her ultimate argument of defence by reminding her beloved of his double status as her cousin.³⁸³ Orestes is related to Hermione not only by marriage (husband) but also by blood (cousin) through their common descent from *Pelopeius Atreus* (27).³⁸⁴ It seems that Hermione’s employment of the “double relationship” theme is not only an attempt to re-establish a closer connection with him, but rather a means of making Orestes finally realize the size of his responsibility. Where he fails as a husband, his sense of duty as a cousin should never fail to call him to action, and vice versa.

iii) Becoming an object

Hermione’s self-portrayal as a helpless, abandoned woman, of no –or little–significance, marginalizes herself and leaves the centre of the story, indeed the centre of her whole life, to Orestes. Her strategy of self-degradation and de-humanization is consistent throughout her letter.³⁸⁵ At the very heart of this self-effacing process lies the negation of her self as a person and her consequent objectification.³⁸⁶ Hermione seems to translate the absence and the rejection she has received from her loved ones into a self-destructive obsession, which, nevertheless, should not be understood as a case of psychotic self-degradation, but rather within the context of a strategy to satisfy Orestes’ erotic fantasy.

A first indication of her “transformation into an object” is offered by the grammar of the letter; in most sentences Hermione appears as the syntactical object.³⁸⁷ This combined with her

³⁸² Jacobson (1974) 52

³⁸³ Hypermetra (*Her.* 14) is also writing a letter to her cousin, Lynceus. Further on the intra-textual exchange between Hermione and Hypermetra see Fulkerson (2005) 102-5. Also see n. on *Her.* 8.27-9.

³⁸⁴ Orestes: 47 *tu quoque habes proauum Pelopem Pelopisque parentem*, Hermione: 81 *ne non Pelopeia credar*.

³⁸⁵ For a more detailed discussion of this technique see Lindheim (2003) *passim*, esp. 13-77.

³⁸⁶ Hermione’s self-degradation echoes to a certain extent the contemporary male Roman attitude towards women as property, see Treggiari (1982)b.

³⁸⁷ Fulkerson (2005) 91 with n.11

use of passive voice³⁸⁸ implies her submissive role. Hermione is introduced to the poem as a prisoner, a victim of abduction (3f.), and she is eager to sustain this image primarily through her parallel with her mother, but also through the application of a carefully chosen vocabulary.³⁸⁹ More importantly, Hermione as a prisoner in Neoptolemus' hands gives the impression of having resigned from any claim to her freedom; instead of fighting for her own self-assertion and her right to independence, her only concern is how to achieve her transference from the possession of Neoptolemus to that of Orestes. Her vague use of *inclusam*³⁹⁰ at line 4 which turns her "into a spectator of her own life"³⁹¹ paired with the third person reference to herself at line 8 ("*haec tibi sub domino est, Pyrrhe, puella suo!*") stress the sense of detachment from her own self. Her self-objectification becomes more obvious in her appeal to Orestes to claim her back at line 16 by means of the *manus iniectio* procedure (*legis actio per manus iniectioem*). Hermione's wording is actually a close poetic adaptation of the legal formula (*eam ob rem tibi manum inicio*) used in this legal procedure, during which one could claim back his stolen property.³⁹² Hermione's relegation to *res*, a property object needs no further exemplification. Instead of voicing her own will and desire, Hermione becomes a mouthpiece of male sexual fantasy. Her voice is silenced and her degradation to the state of an object, upon which the male lover exerts his right of possession and control, is actually expressing the male attitude to love by confirming the erotic supremacy of the male over the female.

Hermione becomes an object of exchange, a commodity between the people who supposedly should have cared for her. What her female hands fail to do (6 *cetera femineae non ualuere manus*), she asks the fearless hands of her husband to do for her (16 *inice non timidus in tua iura manus!*). Being no longer a person, she is likened to a cattle herd (*armenta* 17), a war-booty (*praeda* 82) and, even worse, a mere bundle (*sarcina* 94). As Fulkerson nicely puts it: "Hermione is an object to be traded, stolen, or sold."³⁹³ Now her only value is her exchangeability. Even her betrothal by Tyndareus to Orestes, the most important event of her adult life, is given in terms of a commercial transaction (31f. *me tibi Tyndareus, uita grauis auctor et annis, / tradidit*),³⁹⁴ while her father, Menelaus, treats her merely as a means of strengthening his alliances and complementing his political ambitions (33f.).

When Hermione contemplates the controversy of her "double marriage",³⁹⁵ she examines the situation strictly in terms of the possible harm she may inflict on the two rivals (35f.). Once again she silences her own desire. It is my contention, however, that, despite appearances, Hermione manages to preserve her own voice through the application of a

³⁸⁸ Fulkerson (2005) 90f. with n. 10.

³⁸⁹ *capta* 11, *raperet* 12, *rapiat* 17, *rapta coniuge* 18, *nuptae...ademptae* 19, *repetenda* 25, *apta rapina* 66, *uecta* 70, *rapta* 73, *aberat* 81, *praeda* 82, *abducta...coniuge* 86, *ademptus* 102, *captam* 103, *condidit* 108.

³⁹⁰ For more on this see above.

³⁹¹ Jacobson (1974) 53.

³⁹² Further on the *manus iniectio* procedure see n. on *Her.* 8.16.

³⁹³ Fulkerson (2005) 100. For more details and bibliography see n. on *Her.* 8.32.

³⁹⁴ For the commercial character of *tradidit* see n. on *Her.* 8.32.

³⁹⁵ Further on this see n. on *Her.* 8.31-4.

carefully chosen vocabulary and the highly skilled structure of the couplet. Her union with Orestes by being put in the hexameter receives more attention compared with her reference to Neoptolemus, who is mentioned in the subordinate pentameter. In addition, her application of *nubebam*, a verb often applied to women in marriage context,³⁹⁶ is in complete contrast with the passive *iungar* (a sexually charged verb),³⁹⁷ which often bears negative connotations of subjugation.³⁹⁸ Besides, the active voice of *nubebam* suggests willing co-operation in the wedding, while the passive voice of *iungar* highlights once again Hermione's victimization.³⁹⁹

Hermione's concern for her physical appearance (9f., 79f., 95f.) constitutes a similar lapse of her female tongue, which cracks the solid surface of her calculated and highly rhetorical letter. The reference to her beauty in her recollection of the two most tragic events of her life (her abduction by Neoptolemus and her separation from her mother) is meant to be taken as a touch of "childlike feminine vanity."⁴⁰⁰ Moreover, I suspect that Hermione's obsession with her physical appearance subconsciously serves as a constant reminder of the feminine care she has been missing. In this light, her concern for beauty makes better sense if seen not so much as an expression of female vanity but rather as Hermione's attempt to bring herself closer to Helen, as an alternative way to fill up her need for motherly care.

iv) Reading and being read

A final remark: The metaliterary implications of Hermione's inter- and intra- textual self-construction have a huge impact on her literary status. Hermione, a chameleon-like figure, through her multiple transformations and the re-enactment of the thought and manners of other letter-writing heroines oscillates between her role as a textual character within a poem and that of an external reader of the rest of poems within the collection.⁴⁰¹ From being read (an object of reading) she ultimately becomes a reader herself (a reading subject), participating thus in the poetic process of her characterization from both inside and outside the text. From this perspective, Hermione's multiple role-playing invites a reading of the letter as a work within a community of poetic texts and less as an emotional outburst of the heroine; hence, the letter's literariness is disclosed, which causes as a result the "genuineness" and "sincerity" of Hermione's writing to be severely damaged.

³⁹⁶ OLD s.v. 1

³⁹⁷ TLL 7.658.60ff.

³⁹⁸ TLL 7.53.80ff., OLD s.v. *iungo* 1.

³⁹⁹ Note also how the dative *tibi* – referring to Orestes – by being emphatically placed at the beginning of the hexameter carries much more weight compared with the bare dative *Pyrrho*, which simply follows the verb. Further on the structure of the couplet see n. on *Her.* 8.35f.

⁴⁰⁰ Jacobson (1974) 53.

⁴⁰¹ For the idea of the Ovidian heroine not only as writer and reader see Jacobson (1974) 47f., Kauffman (1986) 44, Lindheim (2003) 92, Fulkerson (2005), Michalopoulos (2006) 18 on Helen as reader of Paris' letter. Williams (1997) 122 and 125 on the other hand shows some scepticism.

3. The (mis)application of mythological *exempla* in *Heroides* 4 and 8

Ovid's innovative and playful use of mythological *exempla*, especially in his elegiac production, has long now been noticed.⁴⁰² Either to support a claim with universal validity or to raise the poet's private experience to the level of shared human experience or purely as means of embellishment and poetic expansion, mythological *exempla* lie at the forefront of Ovid's artistic arsenal. Through the employment of mythological *exempla* the poet manages to liven up his narrative and keep the reader constantly unsettled by broadening the textual horizon through witty comparisons and unexpected reversals. For Ovid, myths are primarily tales, belonging to a long literary tradition, devoid of any exalted religious or symbolic connotations. Above all, myth is a rhetorical device, a component of poetic creation, which can be shaped, altered, used or disposed of each time according to the rhetorical and literary needs at hand. Its validity or falsehood depends almost entirely on rhetorical appropriateness and the need for persuasion, or as Davis nicely puts it: "when it is convenient for myth to be treated as true, it is; when it is not convenient, it is admitted to be false."⁴⁰³

It is very unfortunate that the use of mythological *exempla* in the *Heroides* has received little attention so far. It is only until very recently that scholars have started to include the use of myth in their critical assessment of these letters.⁴⁰⁴ In this chapter, I will investigate the heroines' (mis)application of mythological *exempla* as they appear in the three short mythological lists in *Her.* 4 (lines 53-66 and 93-104) and 8 (lines 65-81). My interest lies primarily on issues of content and rhetorical function both within the narrative framework of each letter and with regard to any possible intertextual influences from earlier Greek and Roman literature (with an emphasis on Roman elegy).

Before I begin my discussion a crucial distinction needs to be made with regard to the use of the term "myth" and "history." The *Heroides* constitute a unique case in the Roman elegiac corpus not only for allowing the (otherwise almost silenced) "female" voice to be heard, but also for its idiosyncratic use of intertextuality in the construction of textual characters. Despite the fact that they have assumed the role of the elegiac poet, both Phaedra and Hermione actually belong to the world of Greek myth. The elegiac status of these two mythological heroines does not annul their fictitiousness, which still has a huge impact on their appreciation of reality. Unlike the external readers of their letters, both heroines fail to make the essential

⁴⁰² Canter (1933), Renz (1935), Wilkinson (1955) 360, Webster (1966), Andrews (1969), Otis (1970) 373-7, Segal (1971), Stirrup (1973), Krill (1976), Williams (1976), Davis (1980), Davisson (1983), Gold (1983), Weber (1983), Whitaker (1983), Schubert (1992), Fabre-Serris (1998), Arkins (1994), Smith (1994), Graf (2002) esp. 111-5, Gibson (2003) 359f.

⁴⁰³ Davis (1980) 415.

⁴⁰⁴ E.g. Jacobson (1974) 6, 371-80, Davisson (1993) 221-2, Smith (1994), Davis (1995) 50f., Curley (1999) 166-70, Michalopoulos (2004)b, *idem* (2006) 5-8.

discrimination between “myth” and “history”. As a consequence, what the external reader of these letters considers to be “myth”, for the heroines it is “history”; what he perceives as “fiction”, for them it is a “fact”, a “reality”. In this light, both Phaedra and Hermione treat the mythological *exempla* employed in the mythological lists under examination not as a literary poetic device, a group of mythical tales of abstract and symbolic value, but rather as chapters of their personal history, fragments of their shared family heritage. Living their lives and their stories from the inside, they ultimately manage to infuse the text of their letters “with a completely new dynamic through the synthesis of intertextualized myth and psychological fantasy.”⁴⁰⁵

3.1.1. *Her.* 4.53-66

There are two short mythological lists in Phaedra’s letter (lines 53-66 and 93-104), of similar layout and almost similar length. The first one (lines 53-66) comprises an introductory couplet (53f.) followed by three mythological *exempla*, which demonstrate the proposition put forward in the introductory couplet. The *exempla* are placed in chronological order, each one extending over a couplet. The three mythical female figures are brought together on grounds of common Cretan descent⁴⁰⁶ and of their involvement in illicit⁴⁰⁷ or unnatural⁴⁰⁸ love affairs. The list is rounded off with a “concluding” couplet (61f.) corresponding in language and theme to the introductory one, where Phaedra underlines again her subscription to the long line of her female ancestors. Lines 63-6 form an expansion on the Theseus-Ariadne *exemplum*, which for reasons I will discuss in detail below constitutes an integral part of the short mythological list and not a superfluous addition.

A few lines before offering a detailed description of Hippolytus’ exquisite physical appearance during their meeting at the Eleusinian mysteries (*lines* 67-84), Phaedra makes a flashback, in which she relates her present misfortune with the long series of unfortunate erotic affairs of her female ancestors. The close connection between these lines and Eur. *Hipp.* 337-43 has long now been noticed⁴⁰⁹ and it is true that both passages have much in common in terms of content and structure. However, the fact that Euripides’ *Hippolytus* is the only surviving literary source does not necessarily argue for its exclusivity. Ovidian erudition and the complex character of the poet’s intertextual practices undermine considerably any suggestion of a straightforward, linear correspondence between the two texts. The unfortunate loss of the earlier

⁴⁰⁵ Smith (1994) 270.

⁴⁰⁶ For Europa’s differentiation from the rest in terms of blood ties see p.66.

⁴⁰⁷ With the exception of Europa.

⁴⁰⁸ With the exception of Ariadne.

⁴⁰⁹ So Palmer on *Her.* 4.53, Jacobson (1974) 149, Reckford (1974) 323, Spoth (1992) 116, Davis (1995) 50f., Armstrong (2001) 166.

relevant material, like Euripides' first *Hippolytus* (*Hippolytus Kalyptomenos*),⁴¹⁰ Sophocles' *Phaedra*, and Hellenistic works (e.g. Lycophron's *Hippolytus*)⁴¹¹ or later Roman dramas⁴¹² leaves us for most part in the realm of speculation.⁴¹³ Nevertheless, even though this is not the case of a straightforward association, the intertextual exchanges between Phaedra's elegiac letter and the Euripidean *Hippolytus* are of such high quality and density that cannot be dismissed.

In the Euripidean play, Phaedra's recollection of her family's unfortunate past occurs at a critical moment of the action, just before the revelation of her love for Hippolytus. Being unable or in fear of bringing herself to tell the truth to the Nurse, Phaedra opts for a gradual revelation by taking refuge in her family's past (Eur. *Hipp.* 337-43).⁴¹⁴ The illicit erotic affairs of both her mother and sister offer a strong case for self-justification. Phaedra presents herself as having no other option but to succumb to the hereditary lust of her ancestry, since her present (so she argues) is dictated by the fervent amorous past of her generation. In her struggle to make the Nurse realize that she is in love, Phaedra's use of mythology aims primarily at underlining the erotic aspect of these stories. In the words of Winnington-Ingram: "It is not a question of inherited *guilt*, but of inherited *sexuality*" (my emphasis).⁴¹⁵ Her emphasis on love in her enigmatic replies to the Nurse is noteworthy (cf. οἶον... ἠράσθης ἔρον 337, δν (sc. ἔρον) ἔσχε ταύρου 338, σύ τ', ὦ τάλαιν' ὄμαιμε, Διονύσου δάμαρ (sc. οἶον ἔσχες ἔρον) 339, ὡς ἀπόλλυμαι 341, τί τοῦθ', ὃ δὴ λέγουσιν ἀνθρώπους ἐράν; 347).⁴¹⁶ Phaedra is drawing

⁴¹⁰ For the tilte *Kalyptomenos* see Pollux 9.50 (for a variant *Katakalyptomenos* see Σ on Theocr. 2.10). For the name of the second Hippolytus *Stephanias* see Arist. Byz. 28, and for *Stephanephoros* see Stob. 4.44.34 and Hesych. s.v. ἀνασειράζει.

⁴¹¹ TrGF 1 100F 1g. ΠΠΠΟΥΤΟΣ.

⁴¹² Unfortunately, nothing survives from Republican tragedy about a Hippolytus-play.

⁴¹³ Further on lost Greek tragedies see Barrett (1964) 10-45, Coffey-Mayer (1990) 5-10, Mills (1999) 195-207 and Halleran (2000) 25-37. Friedrich (1953) 110-49 (followed by Zintzen (1960), Snell (1964) 23-46, Webster (1967) 64-71) suggests that Seneca's *Phaedra* can often be used as a "safe" guide towards the reconstruction of Euripides' first *Hippolytus* in terms of plot and characterization. However, I find that this view is very speculative and that it needs sounder justification, especially since the loss of earlier literature makes it impossible to track down Seneca's sources for the play.

⁴¹⁴ Contrary to the widely held assumption about Phaedra's gradual revelation, Roisman (1999) 61-3 offers an interesting alternative reading, according to which Phaedra actually manipulates her "unwilling" confession in order to shake off responsibility from herself and gain the Nurse's pity and co-operation. In the end, it is the Nurse, not Phaedra, who mentions Hippolytus by name.

⁴¹⁵ Winnington-Ingram (1958) 175. Cf. Σ on Eur. *Hipp.* 337 ὦ τλήμων. αἰνιγματικῶς θέλει φράσαι τὸν ἔρωτα. πιθανώτατα δὲ ἅμα τῷ αἰνιγμῷ καὶ τὴν συγγνώμην ἠτήσατο ὡς προγονικὸν κεκτημένη τὸ πάθος καὶ οὐκ ἰδίας φύσεως ἀμάρτημα, Reckford (1974) 323: "the reticence with which she treats **sexual passion**, whether her relatives' or her own ... making only brief, allusive mention of her mother's love and her sister's", Coffey and Mayer on Sen. *Phaedr.* 113 "that Phaedra's blood is somehow tainted with unnatural desires is hinted at by Eur. *Hipp.* 343 and Ov. *Her.* 4.55", Halleran on Eur. *Hipp.* 337-43: "While she (sc. Phaedra) places herself in the context of her family's unfortunate **sexual passions**...", Craik (1998) 31 "Unusual **sexual activity** is a brooding background to *Hippolytos*", Roisman (1999) 61 "The scene that follows, in which Phaedra refers to her mother's and sister's illicit loves... further clearing herself of responsibility for what she presents as her hereditary **passion** ... that the source of her misery is **love**." (all emphases are mine)

⁴¹⁶ Following Barrett on line 342 I take ἐκεῖθεν in its temporal meaning (see LSJ s.v. ἐκεῖθεν III. "of Time, thenceforward"). Barrett ad loc. translates: "it was then, not of late, that my misfortune began."

Hippolytus' attention to the "how" (*ὡς ἀπόλλυμαι* 341) and not to the "why" of her hereditary doom.⁴¹⁷

An obvious discrepancy with the Euripidean text is Phaedra's reference to the role of Venus in her letter. In Euripides, the mythological allusions are introduced *ex abrupto* and develop along the exchange between Phaedra and her Nurse.⁴¹⁸ The Ovidian Phaedra, on the contrary, introduces her mythological *exempla* with a couplet, where she expresses her fears lest her forbidden love for Hippolytus is another tribute owed by her family to Venus (lines 53f). Europa, Pasiphae and Ariadne are all employed as examples of Venus' vengeance against Phaedra's generation, and hereditary sexuality is not mentioned in general, but rather in connection with a very specific cause. It is the critics' unanimous conviction that the allusion here is made to the well-known story of Sun's revelation of the illicit affair between Venus and Mars.⁴¹⁹ According to the myth, Venus directed her revenge against all Sun's female progeny, because the latter had disclosed to Hephaestus her adulterous relationship with Mars. Hephaestus caught Venus and Mars in the act and ridiculed them in front of the Olympian gods.⁴²⁰ Hence, the Ovidian Phaedra by putting her emphasis on the *why* and less on the *how* of her downfall stands far apart from her tragic counterpart. This shift from inherited *sexuality* to inherited *guilt* is significant, as it makes Phaedra's inherited sexuality merely the outcome of her inherited guilt. By holding Venus responsible, Phaedra manages to downplay her guilt, if not to dismiss it all together. She is not the one to blame; this is the fate of her family. Through the integration of her personal story to her family's long line of hereditary guilt she is hoping to acquit herself from the charge of adultery, since she gives the impression of being trapped in a situation, from where there is no escape but to surrender to Venus' divine will. Her fate is one of prescribed doom.⁴²¹

Phaedra's inclusion of Venus' wrath calls for further scrutiny. Apart from introducing the short mythological list, lines 53f. in effect illuminate Phaedra's state of mind. A closer reading against the Euripidean text proves to be instructive. Compared with Aphrodite's early appearance in the play, Venus makes a rather belated appearance in Phaedra's letter (as opposed to the early appearance of *Amor* (lines 11-16)). Furthermore, Phaedra's appropriation of Venus' wrath is in complete contrast with what Aphrodite argues in her prologue speech in the play

⁴¹⁷ Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 342-4 "no-one here will wonder *why* the women have this taint" (his emphasis).

⁴¹⁸ Reckford's suggestion that Venus' hatred against Sun might have appeared in Euripides' first *Hippolytus* (Reckford (1974) 311 with n. 6) or in his *Cretans* (*idem* 321 with n.17) is interesting. However, Reckford fails to provide any substantial evidence for his claim; as a result, his overall argumentation remains extremely speculative. Cf. also the reservations expressed by Collard-Cropp-Lee against Reckford's assumptions.

⁴¹⁹ So Palmer on Ov. *Her.* 4.53, Rosati (1985) 116 n. 9, Armstrong (2001) 166 n.29.

⁴²⁰ Further on the myth and its popularity see n. on *Her.* 4.54.

⁴²¹ Phaedra's allusion to Sun is an appropriate choice not only for herself and her family, but also for Hippolytus, since following a rather obscure tradition preserved by Servius on Verg. *Aen.* 7.776 Hippolytus was closely related with Sun (*nam et Virbius inter deos colitur. Virbium autem quidam Solem putant esse, cuius simulachrum non est fas attingere, propterea quia nec sol tangitur*). Within the same context of interpretation, I also note the identification of Phaedra with Venus (see Sauer in *Roscher* 1.2.2684 s.v. *Hippolytos*, Ilberg in *Roscher* 3.2.2224 s.v. *Phaidra* (*in der Kunst*)).

(Eur. *Hipp.* 1-57). Phaedra is right in holding Venus responsible for the imminent disaster, but she is seriously mistaken about the true cause of Venus' anger. Aphrodite throughout her opening speech (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 5f., 11-16, 21-3, 48-50) mentions repeatedly that the true cause of her anger is Hippolytus' lack of respect and his refusal to pay his debts to her divinity, and not the revelation of her adulterous relationship by Sun. She holds nothing against Phaedra. But it is exactly this misunderstanding that brings the Ovidian Phaedra closer to her tragic counterpart. In Eur. *Hipp.* Phaedra shows the same degree of misinterpretation of Aphrodite's role in her life and of her own responsibility. Moments after announcing to the chorus her resolution to die, Phaedra rightly holds Aphrodite responsible for her death (Eur. *Hipp.* 725-7 *ἐγὼ δὲ Κύπριν, ἥπερ ἐξόλλυσί με, / ψυχῆς ἀπαλλαχθεῖσα τῆδ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ / τέρψω*); however, she fails to realise that she "is only a means to another end" in the unfolding tragedy and not the goddess' ultimate objective.⁴²² Phaedra is ignorant of Aphrodite's open statement in her prologue speech, where she is mentioned as the "innocent" victim of divine revenge (47-50).⁴²³ Instead, she considers herself to be a helpless victim unable to escape Aphrodite's relentless power. In this light, Phaedra the letter-writer with her restricted view of reality is strikingly reminiscent of her tragic counterpart.

Europa (lines 55f.)

The inclusion of Europa in the list constitutes a peculiar choice both because it departs from the Euripidean subtext and, more importantly, because Europa does not actually belong to Sun's family. Phaedra's emphatic reference to her (the daughter of Agenor and Telephassa)⁴²⁴ as 'the very origin of the family' (55 *prima...gentis origo*) surely sounds strange. Armstrong contends that the inclusion takes place "perhaps a little facetiously" as it further obscures the reason behind Venus' revenge.⁴²⁵ But is that so? Is Phaedra's recollection of Europa actually that accidental and unintentional?

A closer examination of the wording of the couplet has much to offer. The integration of Europa is first attempted through a verbal link between the *exemplum* and the introductory couplet, since *prima...gentis origo* (line 55) corresponds to *ex tota gente* (line 54) in an attempt to establish Europa as the very beginning of Phaedra's line. But holding Europa, a woman, as the head of a whole generation undoubtedly comes as a shocking surprise for the Roman reader. In fact, Phaedra's emphasis on the female origin of her generation runs against the Roman

⁴²² Zeitlin (1985) 56.

⁴²³ On the highly disputed issue of Aphrodite's absolute power and Phaedra's responsibility in the play see Knox (1952) 4, Winnington-Ingram (1958) 182-3, Segal (1965) 118-9, Luschnig (1980) 89-92, Zeitlin (1985) 56.

⁴²⁴ Cf. Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.1.1 *Ἀγῆνωρ δὲ παραγεγόμενος εἰς τὴν Φοινίκην γαμῆ Τηλέφασσαν καὶ τεκνοῖ θυγατέρα μὲν Εὐρώπην, παῖδας δὲ Κάδμον καὶ Φοίνικα καὶ Κίλικα*. There seems to have been a general disagreement on Europa's ancestry. Alternative parentage includes Phoenix (or Tityus) as her father, and Argiope (Hyg. *Fab.* 178.1), Cassiopeia or Perimede as her mother (for sources see Ha in Brill's *New Pauly* s.v. *Europa/Europa* 2.210). Further on this issue with references see Frazer (1921) 296 n.2, 298 n.1. Campbell on Mosch. *Europa* 7 for Europa, daughter of Phoenix.

⁴²⁵ Armstrong (2001) 166 n.29.

patriarchal hierarchy, since the male-prescribed title of the *auctor gentis* was strictly preserved for the first male ancestor in chronological order.⁴²⁶ Phaedra's shift from male to female is indeed strange, but it can be justified on grounds of rhetorical persuasion. Her desperation and fervent desire to convince Hippolytus lies behind her unconventional rhetoric. For reasons I will discuss in detail below Phaedra needs to include Europa in her family flashback and she is willing to do that at any cost, even through this blatant reversal of social conventions. In any case, the role of the *auctor gentis* is not new for Europa. The idea is also present at *Ov. Met.* 2.833-3.6, where Europa's abduction by Jupiter appears at the opening of a lengthy section about Thebes and its turbulent past. Europa's connection with the remote beginning of Thebes is echoed again in the *proemium* of Statius' *Thebaid*, where her abduction by Jupiter is also mentioned among the remote beginnings of the Cadmean generation.⁴²⁷

Europa's close association with Cretan women, and Pasiphae in particular, is not new in Roman elegy. In Propertius⁴²⁸ Europa features among a multitude of women renowned for their beauty, who are now in the Underworld. The reference to her as *auctor gentis* is not explicit; however, the fact that she is being evoked first is suggestive of her prominence. Her close association with Pasiphae is highlighted by the fact that they both share the same pentameter, while each one is placed at the second foot of each hemistich. Perhaps it is not by chance that their pentameter is immediately followed by a hexameter containing a general reference to Cretan women.

Europa's Cretan origin is more emphatically manifested at *Ov. Ars* 1.283-342, where Pasiphae's story receives a lengthy and detailed treatment by the *praeceptor amoris* as an exemplification of unbridled female lust.⁴²⁹ Near the end of the story Pasiphae infatuated by her unnatural love for the bull wishes to become another "Europa" and, like her, to be carried-off by a bull.⁴³⁰ Pasiphae's wish leaves no doubts about the paradigmatic role of Europa in the sexual history of the Cretan family. Emerging as Pasiphae's *alter ego* Europa becomes an indispensable member of the Cretan line in that she sets a behavioural pattern for the rest of the women of Sun's family. It is worth noting that the reference to Europa appears in a list of mythological *exempla*, which resounds with Euripidean overtones. Pasiphae's story is followed by the unfortunate love affairs of Aerope, Cleopatra and Phaedra, which were all treated by Euripides (*The Cretans*, *The Cretan Women*, first and second *Hippolytus* respectively);⁴³¹ hence

⁴²⁶ See Treggiari (1991) 15f., *ThLL* s.v. *origo* I.B.b.a.IV. *auctor gentis, stirpis* 9.2.987.57ff.

⁴²⁷ Stat. *Theb.* 1.4-6 (...) *gentisne canam primordia dirae, / Sidonios raptus et inexorable pactum / legis Agenoreae scrutantemque aequora Cadmum?*

⁴²⁸ Prop. 2.28.49-56 *sunt apud infernos tot milia formosarum: / pulchra sit in superis, si licet, una locis! / uobiscum Antiopae, uobiscum candida Tyro, / uobiscum Europa nec proba Pasiphae, / et quot Creta tulit uetus et quot Achaia formas, / et Thebae et Priami diruta regna senis: / et quaecumque erat in numero Romana puella, / occidit: has omnis ignis auarus habet.*

⁴²⁹ On the Hellenistic (neoteric) character of the list see Hollis on *Ov. Ars* 1.283-342.

⁴³⁰ *Ov. Ars* 1.323f. *et modo se European fieri, modo postulat Io, / altera quod bos est, altera uecta boue!*

⁴³¹ See Hollis on *Ov. Ars* 1.327ff. Notice also that the reference to Aerope is followed by Scylla's unlucky love with Minos, Europa's son (lines 331f.).

it is tempting to suspect a possible Euripidean influence behind the idea of Europa being the head of the Cretan female progeny. However, this assumption needs further evidence.

Anyhow, the awkwardness of Europa's inclusion in the mythological list remains unresolved mainly due to the lack of any family ties between herself and Sun. It is true that there are no direct blood-ties between Europa and Sun. However, Europa is associated with Sun through the marriage of her son, Minos, with Pasiphae, Sun's daughter.⁴³² The association with the Cretan family is not totally ungrounded, but still it is rather weak for the justification of her title as "the head of Sun's female progeny."

The rather dubious inclusion of Europa in the list provides Phaedra with further rhetorical potential. Phaedra compiled this short mythological list in order to exemplify the uncontrollable lust of the female members of her family. At first sight, all these women are put together on grounds of common origin and of perverse sexual behaviour. A scrupulous examination, however, reveals that -in a very strict sense- both criteria do not apply simultaneously to all three *exempla*; instead, each criterion applies to only one pair at a time. So, common origin is appropriate for Pasiphae and Ariadne, but not for Europa, while monstrous sexual behaviour applies to Europa and Pasiphae, but not to Ariadne.⁴³³ Minos, on the other hand, provides a common link with all three *exempla*, as he is related to all three women: he is the son of Europa, the husband of Pasiphae, and the father of Ariadne (and of Phaedra). What is more, Pasiphae gives birth to the *Mino-taur*.⁴³⁴ It is surely very ironic that a list of women is kept together by the implicit presence of a man. Phaedra's shift from female to male has a huge impact on her argumentation; through her emphasis on Minos Phaedra manages to transform the hereditary guilt of Sun's progeny into a Minoan family affair. Phaedra once again underlines the inescapability of her predicament, since her self-identification as the daughter of Minos (*Minoia credar*) inevitably generates the family curse upon her.⁴³⁵

Jupiter's disguise as a bull also helps her introduce the first subtle hint at the "bull motif," which offers multiple links both within the list and between the list and the rest of the poem. But it is not only through Jupiter's disguise that the "bull motif" is introduced. Europa's descent from Agenor offers an interesting parallel, since one of Agenor's remote ancestors was Io, the unlucky maiden who was transformed into a cow by Juno as a punishment for her affair with Jupiter.⁴³⁶ In fact, Phaedra places her emphasis more on Jupiter and less on Europa. Even though Europa's overwhelming presence in the hexameter limits Jupiter to a space no bigger

⁴³² According to Diod. Sic. 4.60.2.4ff. Minos, who was married with Pasiphae, was not the son, but the grandson of Europa (the son of Minos, Europa's son).

⁴³³ Notice how Pasiphae, placed at the centre of the three *exempla*, meets both criteria.

⁴³⁴ Andrews (1969) 60. However, I find his astronomical interpretation of the Europa-Minos myth overall highly arbitrary and poorly justified.

⁴³⁵ Ov. Her. 4.61f. *en ego nunc, ne forte parum Minoia credar, / in socias leges ultima gentis eo* with n. ad loc. Phaedra identifies herself as *Minoia* again near the end of her letter at line 157 *quod mihi sit genitor, qui possidet aequora, Minos*.

⁴³⁶ In Ovid, Europa and Io very often appear together in mythological references, cf. Ov. Am. 1.3.23-6 *carmine nomen habent exterrita cornibus Io / et quam fluminea lusit adulter aue, / quaeque super pontum*

than his name, the whole couplet is effectively framed by *Iuppiter* and *deum*, with *Iuppiter* emphatically placed first in the hexameter and followed by *Europen*. Jupiter's importance is also reflected on the grammar of the couplet, since Jupiter is the subject of *dilexit*, as opposed to Europa, who is the object of that verb. But it is exactly this explicit reference to Jupiter's feelings (*dilexit*), which differentiates him greatly from Europa; the emphatic placement of the verb at the opening of the pentameter comes exactly under the name of Jupiter in the previous line, and despite their spatial separation in the couplet points to their association.⁴³⁷ Jupiter's disguise as a bull is withheld until the end of the couplet (the second half of the pentameter) in an attempt to depict Europa's abduction as a case of divine love, and less as another example of divine trickery.⁴³⁸ In striking contrast, we hardly hear anything about Europa's feelings, since her own desire is completely silenced and she is transformed into the voiceless victim of Jupiter's desire. The only reference to her is an appositional clause (*prima est ea gentis origo* 55), whereas she completely disappears from the pentameter.⁴³⁹

But how does the reference to Europa contribute to Phaedra's argumentation? Her primary goal in this section is to avoid responsibility by justifying her love for Hippolytus on grounds of heredity. By stretching her past back as far as Europa Phaedra manages to establish a long line of sexual notoriety starting from its remote beginnings and thus implicitly to suggest the power of nature over her moral principles. In addition, her emphasis on Jupiter glorifies her ancestry and at the same time helps her establish her divine descent. Her royal status (she is after all a Cretan princess and a queen of Athens) is further enhanced by her divine origin. Phaedra later in her letter will return to her association with Jupiter through her reference to Crete as the island of Jupiter (163 *est mihi dotalis tellus, Iouis insula, Crete*).

The Europa-*exemplum* plays an additional role by pointing also to Hippolytus, who should pick up behind Phaedra's emphasis on Jupiter her subtle invitation to him to take up a more energetic part in their relationship. Hippolytus should imitate Jupiter's example and actively pursue his feelings for Phaedra. After all, the parallel between Jupiter and Hippolytus is not new in the letter, since a few lines above (lines 35f.) Phaedra had openly expressed her preference for Hippolytus over Jupiter.

A comparative reading of the presence and function of Europa's abduction by Jupiter in Roman elegy and in the Ovidian corpus, in particular, with its presence here will provide us with a useful intertextual framework about the rhetorical purpose of this myth in Phaedra's

simulato uecta iuueno / uirginea tenuit cornua uara manu, Ars 1.323f. *et modo se Europam fieri, modo postulat Io, / altera quod bos est, altera uecta boue.*

⁴³⁷ The same also applies to *Pasiphae* and *enixa est* in the following mythological *exemplum* (lines 57f.)

⁴³⁸ References to Jupiter's erotic feelings for Europa are not rare in Ovid, cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.10.7f. *aquilamque in te taurumque timebam, / et quidquid magno de Ioue fecit Amor, Met.* 2.836 *causam amoris, 847 maiestas et amor, 862f. gaudet amans et, dum ueniat sperata uoluptas / oscula dat minibus.* Also cf. *Sen. Phaedr.* 294ff., esp. 299ff.

⁴³⁹ For a deceiving Jupiter in connection with Europa see *Ov. Am.* 1.3.2.22 *lusit, 23 simulato...iuueno, Met.* 2.847-51, esp. 850 *induitur faciem tauri, 6.103-4 elusam...imagine tauri / Europam, Fast.* 5.606 *falsa cornua fronte tulit.* Also [*Sen.*] *Octau.* 201.

letter.⁴⁴⁰ Phaedra is very selective in her employment of the myth, but since her reference is restricted to only one couplet, this brevity can be understood as a result of limited space. However, her suppression of certain details and her emphasis on others is not perhaps so coincidental. Hence, for reasons of rhetorical relevance nothing is said about either her transportation from Sidon to Crete⁴⁴¹ or her precarious plucking of flowers in the company of her maids.⁴⁴² Similarly, even the slightest hint at her virginity is carefully avoided.

In the Ovidian corpus, Jupiter's liaison with Europa is very often employed as a typical example of Jupiter's extramarital affairs, with Europa frequently appearing in many Ovidian catalogues of the god's adulterous conquests.⁴⁴³ In this light, Phaedra's choice for the specific myth is rather unfortunate and her careful attempt to conceal her adultery ultimately fails, as the true nature of her incestuous plan finds its way through her words.

A final remark concerns the validity of the story *per se*. *Am.* 3.12.19-42 is one of these instances in the Ovidian work, where the poet proudly dismisses myth as being merely a fiction, nothing more than poetic lies (41 *fecunda licentia uatum*), devoid of any historical validity (19 *nec...ut testes*, 42 *obligat historica nec...fide*).⁴⁴⁴ One of the stories appearing in this list of questionable mythological *exempla* is Jupiter's affair with Europa (*Am.* 3.12.33f. *Iuppiter aut in aues aut se transformat in aurum / aut secat inposita uirgine Taurus aquas*); the same story is also dismissed as being nothing more than poetic lies in Scylla's indignant reproach to Minos at *Ov. Met.* 8.120-5.⁴⁴⁵ From this intertextual perspective, Phaedra's use of a story with somewhat limited validity in a list of mythological *exempla*, whose main aim is to persuade, seriously undermines her credibility and weakens her argumentative power. No matter how hard she tries, her doom lurks in the shadows and occasionally finds its way between the lines. Despite her desperate effort to exploit the inclusion of Europa in the most efficient way, the remaining incongruities ultimately fight against her, causing her attempts to fail.

Pasiphae (lines 57f.)

The position of Pasiphae's story at the very heart of the mythological list suggests its importance, which is further enhanced by the fact that Pasiphae is the only female figure in the list to open a couplet. Being placed in the middle, the *exemplum* looks simultaneously at both

⁴⁴⁰ My emphasis on elegy and Ovid in particular is not intended to be exclusive. Where appropriate other works of Latin literature are included.

⁴⁴¹ Cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.3.23-4, 3.12.33-4, *Ars* 1.323-4, *Met.* 2. 868-3.2, 6.103-7, 8.120, *Fast.* 5.605-18.

⁴⁴² Cf. e.g. Mosch. *Eur.* 28-36, 63-71, 89f., 102f. *et al.*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.27.29f., *Ov. Met.* 2.844f., 861, 6.106, Sen. *Phaedr.* 304.

⁴⁴³ Cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.10.1-8 (Helen, Leda, Anymone, Ganymede, Europa), 3.12.21ff., esp.33f. (Ganymede, Danae, Europa), *Ars* 3.251-8 (Semele, Leda, Europa, Helen), *Met.* 6.103-22 (Jupiter: Europa, Asterie, Leda, Antiope, Danae, Aegina, Mnemosyne, Persephone, Neptune: Canace, Aloidae, Theophane, Ceres, Medusa). Cf. also *AP* Bassus 5.125.1-2 (Danae, Europa, Leda), *AP* Palladas 5.257.3f. (Europa, Danae, Leda), and Sen. *Phaedr.* 299-308 (Leda, Europa).

⁴⁴⁴ Further on the passage see Davis (1980) 413-5, Davisson (1993) 217-8, Graf (2002) 111. For similar instances of Ovidian "dismissal" of myth. cf. e.g. *Am.* 3.6.13-8, *Her.* 18.49-52, *Rem.* 161f., *Met.* 3.732, *Fast.* 1.353f., *Tr.* 1.5.79f., 1.9.33f., 3.8.11f.

⁴⁴⁵ Esp. line 123 (...) *generis falsa est ea fabula!*

directions in the list: in terms of the bull-imagery and the theme of deception the hexameter looks *backwards* to the Europa–Jupiter love affair, while the pentameter through the reference to the Minotaur and the theme of infidelity looks *forward* to the Ariadne–Theseus affair. In Ovid, Pasiphae often appears in connection with Europa and Ariadne as a female member of the Cretan family.⁴⁴⁶

Pasiphae's story picks up and further expands the bull-imagery put forward in the previous *exemplum*. Phaedra's reference to Pasiphae seems to have a direct bearing on her exchange with the Nurse at Eur. *Hipp.* 337f.⁴⁴⁷ This time, however, the story serves a totally different purpose. Phaedra's omission of any explicit reference to Pasiphae's erotic feelings for the bull brings a new twist to her Euripidean reminiscence. Nothing is said about Pasiphae's erotic infatuation with the bull. Instead, Phaedra glosses over the unnatural affair by focusing almost entirely on the monstrous fruit of Pasiphae's birth. But still, the emphatic placement of *tauro* last in the hexameter calls for further attention. Near the end of her letter, Phaedra picks up again the reference to her mother's unnatural love affair by portraying Hippolytus as "a doublet of Pasiphae's bull" (lines 165f.).⁴⁴⁸ Hippolytus will ultimately have to succumb to Phaedra, just like the bull did to Pasiphae's love.⁴⁴⁹ Through this parallel, Phaedra manages to further expand her Euripidean reminiscence by complementing the mother-daughter analogy with the association between the lovers of the mother and daughter (bull–Hippolytus).

With respect to the "bull motif" there is an additional aspect, which seems to have gone so far unnoticed. According to Apollodorus⁴⁵⁰ the bull, which Pasiphae (maddened by Poseidon) fell in love with, was the same bull which king Minos had failed to sacrifice to Poseidon, despite his initial promises.⁴⁵¹ There is a crucial detail, which deserves special attention, since it helps to draw a close parallel between Pasiphae and Hippolytus. Pasiphae's bull appeared from the bottom of the sea at Poseidon's command,⁴⁵² just like the fatal bull, which killed Hippolytus,

⁴⁴⁶ Cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.323f. *et modo se (sc.Pasiphae) Europam fieri, modo postulat Io, / altera quod bos est, altera uecta boue, Rem. 63f. da mihi Pasiphaen, iam tauri ponet amorem; / da Phaedram, Phaedrae turpis abibit amor.* Also cf. Prop. 2.28.52f. *uobiscum Europa nec proba Pasiphae, / et quot Creta tulit uetus et quot Achaia formas.*

⁴⁴⁷ Phaedr. *ὦ τλήμον, οἶον, μήτηρ, ἠράσθης ἔρον, / Nurs. ὄν ἔσχε ταύρου, τέκνον, ἦ τί φῆς τόδε;*

⁴⁴⁸ Davis (1995) 50. See also Spoth (1992) 116 n.28.

⁴⁴⁹ In both cases *taurus* is placed emphatically at the end of the hexameter, cf. 57 *Pasiphae mater, decepto subdita tauro* ~ 165 *Flecte, ferox, animos! potuit corrumpere taurum.*

⁴⁵⁰ Apollod. 3.1.4ff.: *καὶ Ποσειδῶνι θύων ἠῤῥατο [Μίνως] ταῦρον ἀναφανῆναι ἐκ τῶν βυθῶν, καταθύσειν ὑποσχόμενος τὸν φανέντα. τοῦ δὲ Ποσειδῶνος ταῦρον ἀνέντος αὐτῷ διαπρεπῆ τὴν βασιλείαν παρέλαβε, τὸν δὲ ταῦρον εἰς τὰ βουκόλια πέμψας ἔθυσεν ἕτερον. θαλασσοκρατήσας δὲ πρῶτος πασῶν τῶν νήσων σχεδὸν ἐπῆρξεν. ὀργισθεὶς δὲ αὐτῷ Ποσειδῶν ὅτι μὴ κατέθυσε τὸν ταῦρον, τοῦτον μὲν ἐξηγρίωσε, Πασιφάνην δὲ ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν αὐτοῦ παρεσκεύασεν. ἡ δὲ ἐρασθεῖσα τοῦ ταύρου συνεργὸν λαμβάνει Δαίδαλον, ὃς ἦν ἀρχιτέκτων, πεφευγῶς ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν ἐπὶ φόνῳ. οὗτος ξυλίην βοῦν ἐπὶ τροχῶν κατασκευάσας, καὶ ταύτην βαλὼν κοιλάνας ἐνδοθεν, ἐκδείρας τε βοῦν τὴν δορὰν περιέρραψε, καὶ θεὸς ἐν ᾧπερ εἶθιστο ὁ ταῦρος λειμῶνι βόσκεισθαι, τὴν Πασιφάνην ἐνεβίβασεν. ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ ταῦρος ὡς ἀληθινῆ βοῦ συνῆλθεν. ἡ δὲ Ἀστέριον ἐγέννησε τὸν κληθέντα Μινώταυρον. οὗτος εἶχε ταύρου πρόσωπον, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἀνδρός.* Also see Eur. *Cretans* fr. 72e 21–34, Diod. Sic. 4.7.2 and 13.4 and Paus. 1.27.9.

⁴⁵¹ The Euripidean echoes are further enhanced by the fact that the attribution of Pasiphae's love for the bull to Poseidon's revenge for Minos' irreverence must have originated in Euripides (so Cantarella (1976) 48).

⁴⁵² Apollod. 3.8.4–7 *ταῦρον ἀναφανῆναι ἐκ τῶν βυθῶν ... τοῦ δὲ Ποσειδῶνος ταῦρον ἀνέντος.*

was spewed by a sea wave, according to the messenger's report at Eur. *Hipp.* 1205-14.⁴⁵³ Moreover, in both cases Poseidon plays the role of the avenger god, since Hippolytus' punishment was also carried out by Poseidon as a fulfillment of Theseus' last of three wishes.⁴⁵⁴

One could argue that Pasiphae, like Europa, is portrayed as a victim of male sexual violence judging from the use of the passive past participle *subdita*. However, the close juxtaposition of the two passive participles (*decepto subdita*) makes Pasiphae's erotic submission to a deluded bull sound somewhat bizarre, if not ridiculous, while the passiveness of *subdita* is effectively played down by its framing by *decepto* and *tauro*.⁴⁵⁵ There is surely a comic undertone in this unusual union. The theme of erotic deceit constitutes an obvious link with the first *exemplum*, but in a reversed sex-order, since in the second *exemplum* male and female have exchanged roles and the female from victim of male deception has taken up the role of the deceiver. Pasiphae becomes more of a Jupiter-like figure as she mates with the bull after hiding herself into the wooden effigy of a cow.

It is true that Phaedra's depiction of Pasiphae as a deceiver is not breaking any new ground, since there are plenty of references to Pasiphae's deception of the bull in elegy, and in the Ovidian corpus in particular.⁴⁵⁶ Such emphasis, however, becomes particularly significant for Phaedra's argumentation, so far as we can judge from its central position in the list. Framed by two mythological *exempla* about female victims of male deception (Europa, Ariadne) the reference to Pasiphae serves as Phaedra's subtle warning to Hippolytus. Phaedra through this *exemplum* adds a further crucial touch to her family's long-standing erotic legacy, the art of erotic deception. Pasiphae stands out from the rest for her unique self-consciousness and her determination to fulfil her erotic infatuation at any cost. Instead of remaining a passive spectator of her life, she takes her fate in her own hands and pursues her erotic desire to the extreme; this is why Phaedra has reserved for her the central and most prominent place in her mythological flashback. Hippolytus should read between the lines the subtle warning of Phaedra's rigid determination to imitate her mother's example and overcome her beloved's resistance.

In Roman elegy Pasiphae features as the archetype of unrestrained female lust. For the first time she is depicted like that at Prop. 3.19.11f., where her story comes first in a catalogue of family affairs, which all (with the exception of Tyro) end up in disaster as a result of

⁴⁵³ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1205-14, esp. 1213f. *ἀντῶ δὲ σὺν κλύδωνι καὶ τρικυμῖα / κῶμ' ἐξέθηκε ταύρον, ἄγριον τέρας*. Also cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.508-11. On the ominous connotations of the "bull motif" in the letter, esp. in view of Eur. *Hipp.*, see n. *Her.* 4.21.

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 43-6, 887-90, 1169f., 1315-19, 1411f.

⁴⁵⁵ In the hexameter Pasiphae's predominance also translates in numbers, since three terms in the line refer to her compared with the two referring to the bull.

⁴⁵⁶ Cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.325 *hanc tamen impleuit uacca deceptus acerna / dux gregis, et partu proditus auctor erat*, (for Euripidean echoes in the Ovidian version of the story in the *Ars* see Cantarella (1976) 48-50), *Met.* 8.132-3 *quae toruum ligno deceptit adultera taurum discordemque utero fetum tulit*, 9.739-40 *tamen illa dolis et imagine uaccae passa bouem est, et erat, qui deciperetur, adulter*. An interesting exception is Prop. 2.32.57f. *uxorem quondam magni Minois, ut aiunt, / corrupti torui candida forma bouis*, where Pasiphae's liaison with the bull is treated as an extreme case of seducing a faithful wife.

unbridled female sexuality.⁴⁵⁷ Pasiphae's uncontrolled libido is later picked up and further expanded by Ovid in his *Ars Amatoria* (1.281-342),⁴⁵⁸ where Pasiphae also features in a catalogue of mythological *exempla* illustrating women's excessive lust over men's.⁴⁵⁹ Pasiphae's story receives the bulk of the *praeceptor's* interest outdoing the rest of the *exempla*, which are restricted to only one couplet (or two couplets maximum) each. All but one of the female figures, which appeared at Prop. 3.19.11-21,⁴⁶⁰ are also present in the Ovidian passage, thus further underlining the link between the two texts, while the additional *exempla* include - among others- also members of the Cretan family, like Europa (323f.), Aerope (327f.), Scylla (331f.) and Phaedra (through the reference to Hippolytus' death (338)).⁴⁶¹ Pasiphae reappears in Ovid's *Remedia amoris*⁴⁶² in a context very similar to that of the *Ars amatoria*, since she is mentioned in a mythological list illustrating cases of extreme erotic passion.⁴⁶³ It is very interesting that the rest of the female characters mentioned in the list (Phyllis, Dido, Phaedra, Helen)⁴⁶⁴ appear as letter writers in the *Heroides*.⁴⁶⁵

Pasiphae is also the unfaithful wife *par excellence*. In the vast majority of references to her, her perverse feelings for the bull are linked with marital infidelity and the annulment of her marital oath.⁴⁶⁶ Likewise, her reference to the Minotaur as *crimen* in the pentameter (58) gives away Phaedra's self-consciousness and her preoccupation with the adulterous nature of her love affair.⁴⁶⁷ Actually, the reference to Pasiphae's love affair through *crimen* combined with a reference to the Minotaur as proof of her adultery is common in Ovid.⁴⁶⁸ However, given

⁴⁵⁷ Prop. 3.19.11-22. The list comprises Pasiphae, Tyro, Myrrha, Medea, Clytemnestra and Scylla. The list is organized in two groups: a) first three *exempla* (Pasiphae, Tyro and Myrrha) as exemplifications of erotic illicit affairs, b) the last three *exempla* (Medea, Clytemnestra, Scylla) forming a group of erotic affairs with murderous consequences (I follow Fedeli on Prop. 3.19.15-6, who (like Baehrens) argues against the transposition of lines 15f. after line 20 (suggested by Postgate (1881), repeated by Richardson (1977) 396-7).

⁴⁵⁸ Hollis on Ov. *Ars* 1.281-2 and 283-342: "In fact *Eclogue* 6 seems to have been in Ovid's mind here no less than Propertius iii.19."

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.281f. *parcior in nobis nec tam furiosa libido; / legitimum finem flamma uirilis habet* and 341f. *omnia feminea sunt ista libide mota; / acrior est nostra plusque furoris habet*.

⁴⁶⁰ Tyro is the only exception.

⁴⁶¹ For a detailed examination of Ovid's treatment of the story in the *Ars*, especially in terms of structure, see Weber (1983) 17-38.

⁴⁶² Ov. *Rem.* 63f. *da mihi Pasiphaen, iam tauri ponet amorem; / da Phaedram, Phaedrae turpis abibiit amor*.

⁴⁶³ Ov. *Rem.* 53-4 *utile propositum est saeuae extinguere flammam / nec serum uitii pectus habere sui*.

⁴⁶⁴ With the exception of Philomela and Scylla.

⁴⁶⁵ Henderson on Ov. *Rem.* 55-68.

⁴⁶⁶ Cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6.49f. *turpis... / concubitus*, *Aen.* 6.24-5 *hic crudelis amor tauri suppositaque furto / Pasiphae, 26 Veneris monimenta nefandae*, Prop. 2.28.52 *...proba Pasiphae*, Ov. *Ars* 1. 295 *Pasiphae fieri gaudebat adultera tauri*, 304 *ille tuus nullas sentit adulter opes*, 309 *siue placet Minos, nullus quaeratur adulter*, *Met.* 8.131f. *... te uere coniuge digna est, / quae toruum ligno decepit adultera taurum*, 9.739f. *... tamen illa dolis et imagine uaccae / passa bouem est, et erat, qui deciperetur, adulter*, *Fast.* 3.499f. *ceperunt matrem formosi cornua tauri, / me tua: at hic laudi est, ille pudendus amor*.

⁴⁶⁷ *crimen* is a legal term, which is widely used in elegy with reference to adultery. Further see nn. on *Her.* 4.18, 31 and 58. Despite her initial claims for the contrary, Phaedra throughout her letter proves to be very conscious of her adultery, cf. *crimen* 25, *nocens* 28, *crimine* 31, *adulterio...adulter* 34, *culpa* 138, 145, *culpa* 151. For more see n. on *Her.* 4.31.

⁴⁶⁸ Cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.23f. *Daedalus, ut clausit conceptum crimine matris / semibouemque uirum semiuirumque bouem*, *Met.* 8.131-3 *te uere coniuge digna est, / quae toruum ligno decepit adultera*

Phaedra's consistent attempts throughout the letter to conceal her proposed adultery, such reference becomes totally inappropriate. Perhaps, it could be seen as another unfortunate slip of tongue, offering insight to the heroine's innermost thoughts and fears; another failure to suppress the true character of her proposal. In any case, the inverted correspondence between Pasiphae's double delivery (*crimen onusque* 58) and Phaedra's concern on how to avoid even the slightest blemish on her marital life (cf. lines 4.18 *fama ... crimine nostra uacat*, 31 *me sine crimine gessi*) further adds to the overall awkwardness of the *exemplum*.

The reference to the Minotaur also proves very useful and rhetorically effective for Phaedra, first for offering a smooth transition to the following *exemplum* (Ariadne – Theseus) and second, for offering a further link between the mythological list and the rest of the letter, since Phaedra later in her letter (lines 115f.) picks up the reference to the Minotaur through a reference to his killing by Theseus.

Ariadne (lines 59f.)

It becomes evident right from the very start that Phaedra's reference to her sister, Ariadne, further develops the theme of erotic infidelity, introduced in Pasiphae's *exemplum*. The emphatic placement of *perfidus* -a forceful adjective-⁴⁶⁹ first in the hexameter receives further prominence by the fact that this is the only couplet in the list which does not open with a proper name. The substitution of Theseus' patronymic (*Aegides*) for his name is an intentional choice, which goes beyond metrical intractability in a dactylic line of the alternative *Atheniensis*.⁴⁷⁰ *Aegides* combined with the use of *perfidus* can be seen as a subtle allusion to Aegeus' death, which was caused by Theseus' frivolous character.⁴⁷¹ The patronymic works as a reminder of the potential dangers posed by Theseus, who has been the source of multiple disasters in the past, as Phaedra will show in much more detail later in her letter (lines 109-26).

In terms of gender hierarchy, Ariadne's *exemplum* comes in complete contrast with Pasiphae's story. The power game is reversed once again and the male (Theseus) re-asserts its authority over the female (Ariadne), which is consequently reduced to being the victim of male power. However, Phaedra in her usual way hides a further surprise. Her portrayal of Theseus is not restricted only to his unfaithfulness, but is complemented by a reference to the "winding house." Actually, in terms of structure the central part of the *exemplum* is taken up by the

taurum / discordemque utero fetum tulit, 155f. creuerat obprobrium generis, foedumque patebat / matris adulterium monstri nouitate biformis.

⁴⁶⁹ Theseus was notorious for his erotic unfaithfulness (cf. Catul. 58f., 132ff., Bömer on *Fast.* 3.437). *perfidus* (in Greek *ὀρκαπάτης*, cf. Nonn. *Dion.* 47.389, 48.544) is a typical adjective for unfaithful lovers and a stock adjective for Theseus, ever since its use by Ariadne at Catul. 64. 132f. ("*sicine me patriis auectam, perfide, ab aris, / perfide, deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu?*"), also 174. Further on the adjective see n. on *Her.* 4.59.

⁴⁷⁰ Further see n. on *Her.* 4.59.

⁴⁷¹ According to the main mythological version, when Theseus was returning to Athens, after his victory against the Minotaur, either himself or the captain of his ship failed to hoist white sails (the agreed sign for his survival). At the sight of the black sails, Aegeus believed his son was dead and found tragic death by throwing himself off Acropolis (or into the sea). Cf. Plut. *Thes.* 22, Paus. 1.22.5, Apollod. *Epit.* 1.10ff., Diod. Sic. 4.61.6ff, Hyg. *Fab.* 43.2.1, Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 3.74.

labyrinth (*curua...tecta*) around which the two lovers are placed and frame the whole couplet (*perfidus Aegides.../ ... sororis ope*). The reference to the labyrinth is significant as it helps to undermine Theseus' heroic reputation. In fact, there is nothing grand in this reference as far as Theseus is concerned. By putting her emphasis on Ariadne and her thread, Phaedra manages to manipulate her reference to Theseus' safe return in order to give a serious blow to his virile status. In her hands, the labyrinth, traditionally one of the greatest landmarks in Theseus' life, turns into the hero's biggest detriment. His safe return from the labyrinth is no longer his own achievement; instead it is attributed entirely to Ariadne's assistance.⁴⁷² Theseus is a hero only because of the help of a woman. The balance between male and female becomes extremely fragile. It is surely not by chance that Ariadne is not mentioned by name but through the periphrasis *sororis ope* (60) as this further stresses her contribution.

Phaedra in her reference to the labyrinth remains conspicuously silent over the killing of the Minotaur by Theseus. The omission is even more striking in view of the reference to Pasiphae's "guilty burden" (*crimen onusque suo* 58) in the previous *exemplum*. This is another fine example of Phaedra's selective memory, which is dictated by her rhetorical needs at hand. A reference to the killing of the Minotaur is totally inappropriate here, as this would automatically betray Ariadne's cooperation to the killing of her brother; however, the killing of the Minotaur is particularly appropriate to appear among Theseus' many injustices against Phaedra's family later in the letter (*Her.* 4.109-28, esp. 115-6 *ossa mei fratris claua perfracta trinodi / sparsit humi*).

A reference to Ariadne also appears in Phaedra's mythological flashback at Eur. *Hipp.* 339 (*σὺ τ', ᾧ τάλαιν' ὄμαιμε, Διονύσου δάμαρ*); however, the reference there is made in connection with Ariadne's unlucky love affair with Dionysus. According to this strand of myth, by the time Theseus arrived at Crete, Ariadne was already the bride of Dionysus.⁴⁷³ Ariadne fell in love with Theseus, helped him escape the labyrinth and ran away with him, abandoning Dionysus.⁴⁷⁴ Whether or not the Ovidian Phaedra is aware of this version cannot be deciphered. If so, Ariadne's abandonment by Theseus becomes even more ironic, as Dionysus' runaway bride in a reversal of fate becomes herself a victim of abandonment by her new lover.

Her. 4.61-6

Lines 61-6 intervene between the short mythological list and the description of Phaedra's meeting with Hippolytus at Eleusis. At first sight, these lines seem to be merely a

⁴⁷² The attempt to underestimate the beloved's heroic valour through the exaggeration of the heroines' contribution to the deed is a common strategy in the *Heroides* (cf. e.g. both Hypsipyle's (*Her.* 6.12) and Medea's (*Her.* 12.163-74) remarks about Jason's heroic deeds at Colchis).

⁴⁷³ Halleran (2000) 23 places the marriage between Dionysus and Ariadne after the killing of the Minotaur.

⁴⁷⁴ Further on this version see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 339. The story might have appeared as early as in the *Cypria* (Webster (1966) 23f.).

narrative filler, a link-passage between two sections. A closer examination, however, proves that lines 61-6 constitute a vital part of the list, whose integration is supported by a number of intricate verbal and thematic similarities.

A first obvious link between lines 61-6 and the mythological list is Phaedra's reference to her family's destiny at line 63 (*hoc quoque fatale est*), which picks up both verbally and thematically a similar reference made in the introductory couplet (*forsitan hunc generis fato reddamus amorem* 53). In this light, the reference to her house at line 66 (*de nostra...domo*) does not simply frame the pentameter, but it effectively rounds-off with ring composition the whole mythological section, which is devoted to Phaedra's house and the perverse sexual heredity. Phaedra's emphasis on her Cretan descent offers a further connection, since one of Phaedra's principal concerns in the list is to establish her place in the long line of her Cretan family past.

The expansion on Ariadne's *exemplum* is not a superfluous addition for the purposes of rhetorical elaboration; in these lines Phaedra's past meets up with her present and through the close parallel between Phaedra and Ariadne, Phaedra becomes "worthy" of her family. Her unfortunate love affair with Hippolytus effectively legitimizes her Cretan descent (cf. lines 61f. *en, ego nunc, ne forte parum Minoia credar, / in socias leges ultima gentis eo!*), since it is through her victimization that Phaedra "officially" joins the rest of the female members of her family. The framing of line 64 by the two sisters (*me...soror*) paired by the repetition of *...soror /...sorores* at the end of two consecutive lines (64-5)⁴⁷⁵ underlines the close sisterly relationship.⁴⁷⁶ The victimization of both Phaedra and Ariadne is also reflected on the fact that they are both mentioned as syntactical objects.⁴⁷⁷

The close association between the two sisters inevitably results in the close parallel between their lovers. The syntax at lines 64f. supports this idea of continuity and interconnection in a most expressive way; both the succession of *capit* by *capta* at line 64 and the emphatic juxtaposition of *Thesides Theseus* at the opening of line 65 convey this sense of continuity and analogy between the two couples.⁴⁷⁸ Hippolytus becomes a "second Theseus", in the same way in which Phaedra re-iterates the life of Ariadne. In this ingenious way, Phaedra manages to inscribe her family history in a circle of hereditary unrestrained sexuality, which is dictated by continuous analogy and repetition and from which nobody seems to be able to break free.

Her. 4.53-66: Overall rhetorical function and structure

Given the reference to Venus' wrath in the introductory couplet (lines 53f.), one might have expected from the following mythological list to throw further light into the cause of this

⁴⁷⁵ Further on this see n. on *Her.* 4.65.

⁴⁷⁶ On the close relationship between Phaedra and Ariadne see n. on *Her.* 4.64.

⁴⁷⁷ Cf. 64 *me...capit capta...soror*, 65 *duas rapuere sorores*, 66 *ponite...bina tropaea*.

⁴⁷⁸ For more details see nn. ad locc.

anger. Indeed, the mythological *exempla* are closely related to Venus' wrath; however, instead of looking back at its cause, they look forward to its consequences. The reference to the past is intended to clarify the present (and future) of the letter.

Phaedra's success through the employment of this list is twofold: first, she manages to establish the idea of her family's hereditary sexuality, and second she integrates herself with the rest of the female members of her Cretan family. Her emphasis, however, on her Cretan descent⁴⁷⁹ undercuts the effectiveness of her argumentation, since it is bound to recall the ominous connotation of the "Crete motif" in Eur. *Hipp.*, where Crete ultimately becomes a symbol of moral failure and potential destruction.

In the Euripidean play Phaedra's reference to the unfortunate love affairs of her family constitutes "a device which has the effect of minimizing the shockingness of her own case and her own unique responsibility for it".⁴⁸⁰ The Ovidian Phaedra picks up the rhetorical effectiveness of her Euripidean counterpart, but she further manipulates the reference by accommodating it to the popular in Latin poetry *topos* of "hereditary guilt".⁴⁸¹ Phaedra's inclusion to her Cretan family is not a goal in itself, but an essential prerequisite for her further argumentation. Her reference to her past is intrinsically linked with the idea of fate's inescapability. Her ultimate goal is to shake off responsibility both from herself and from Hippolytus. Her family's past is a long line of hereditary disaster. She is surely not the one to blame, as this is the fate of her family. Her fate is one of prescribed doom and there is nothing she can do to prevent the imminent disaster from happening.

With respect to Hippolytus and his share of responsibility, there is nothing much we can really say, as we hardly hear anything about him. Phaedra saves no room for him in this section, apart from a reference at lines 63-6; but there again he is nothing more than a shadowy reflection of his father. Hippolytus' "disappearance" is far from accidental. Given that Phaedra is trying here to justify her actions, a more extended reference to her beloved would inevitably get him involved in the proposed adultery. By having him removed from the picture at this crucial stage she manages to play down his responsibility and secure for both of them a place away from reproach- at least for now.

In terms of structure, Phaedra takes great pains to give unity and coherence to the mythological list and she manages to do so through a web of multiple links between the three mythological *exempla*. In terms of gender, Phaedra's arrangement of the *exempla* is remarkable, as she organizes her list in a male-female alternation pattern, of the type A-B-A-B. Her initial emphasis on Jupiter (male) is followed by Pasiphae's energetic role in the bull's deception (female), which in turn gives place to Theseus' injustice against Ariadne (male). The whole section is rounded off by her emphatic self-portrayal as Ariadne's doublet (female). The

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. *Cressa puella* 2, *generis fato* 53, *ex tota gente* 54, *prima...gentis origo* 55, *Pasiphae mater* 57, *ne...parum Minoia credar* 61, *domus* 63, *de nostra...domo* 66, *genitor...Minos* 157, *mihi dotalis...Creta* 163.

⁴⁸⁰ Griffin (1990) 134 with n.12.

⁴⁸¹ See Tarrant on Sen. *Ag.* 906f.

common theme of deceit offers a further link between all three *exempla* in the list, since each story is a variation of erotic deceit (Europa: abduction, Pasiphae: adultery, Ariadne: abandonment).⁴⁸² Placed in the centre of the list, Pasiphae's active role in the bull's deception becomes all the more prominent, thus adding further emphasis to her erotic cunningness. A final link is provided, as shown above, by Minos and the bull-motif.

There is, however, an additional link, whose subtle presence permeates the whole section together and which has remained so far uncovered: the function of vision. The importance of vision becomes apparent right from the very beginning through the allusion to Venus' wrath, since the actual cause of Venus' indignation was the revelation of her adulterous relationship with Mars by Sun. More importantly, Sun is the god who brings the light and sees everything over the entire world (both human and divine).⁴⁸³ Vision is present in the first *exemplum* also through the (possible) etymological association of *Εὐρώπη* (the Greek form for Europa) with the adjective *εὐρύοπα / εὐρύοψ* ("the wide-eyed").⁴⁸⁴ The presence of two typical etymological markers (*prima* and *origo*)⁴⁸⁵ in the hexameter further supports my suggestion. The irony involved in the big-eyed Europa, who fails to see through Jupiter's disguise (*tauro dissimulante deum* 56) is cutting. The combined play on vision and deception also continues in the second *exemplum* initially through the etymological derivation of Pasiphae from the Greek adjective *πασιφα(ν)ής* ("all shining");⁴⁸⁶ then through the implicit emphasis on deception, since the "all shining" Pasiphae conceals her true identity by hiding herself in the dark interior of the wooden cow-effigy constructed by Daedalus.⁴⁸⁷ In the third *exemplum*, the connection with vision does not derive from etymology, but through Theseus' deadly wanderings in the dark winding halls of the labyrinth. It is only through Ariadne's help that the hero leaves the darkness of death behind and following the maiden's thread (or her "shining

⁴⁸² So Jacobson (1974) 156.

⁴⁸³ Cf. Ovid's reference to Sun as "the god who first sees everything" with reference to his role in the revelation of the Venus-Mars adultery at *Ov. Met.* 4.172 *uidet hic deus omnia primus* with Bömer. The idea of Sun as an all-seeing god is a widespread motif in use ever since the Homeric epics (cf. *Hom. Il.* 3.277 *Ἡέλιός θ', ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾶς καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούεις*, cf. *Od.* 11.109, 12.323), for parallels (both Greek and Latin) see Pease on *Verg. Aen.* 4.607 and Bömer on *Ov. Met.* 1.769 with bibliography.

⁴⁸⁴ See Aly (1914) 63ff., Frisk (1960) s.v. *Εὐρώπη*, Chantraine (1968) s.v. *εὐρύς*. Also cf. *TLG* s.v. *Εὐρώπη*. "Hoc certe constat, ueteres magnam uel potius maximam pulcritudinis partem in oculis stauisse; eosque aliquando a colore laudasse, aliquando a magnitudine, et quidem in feminis praesertim." *εὐρύοψ* is also attributed to Sun (cf. *Orph. Lith.* 701 *Ἥλιον εὐρύοπα*). Further see *LSJ* s.v. *εὐρύοπα*.

⁴⁸⁵ For *origo* and *primus* as etymological markers see Michalopoulos (2001) 4 with n.15 (with bibliography ad loc.).

⁴⁸⁶ See Maltby (1991) s.v. *Pasiphae*: *Fulg. Myth.* 2.7. p.47.18 *Pasiphaen... id est quasi pasifanon, quod nos Latine innibus apparentem dicimus*, and Paschalis (1997) 88. Camilloni (1986) 56 suggests an alternative etymological derivation of Pasiphae from *πάσις* (= *κτῆσις*) and *φάος*, thus meaning "signora della luce." It is interesting that *πασιφα(ν)ής* is also attributed to Sun (*Orph. Hymn.* 36.3). For more details on Pasiphae's legend and its association with Sun (being the daughter of the wife of Sun) see Camilloni (1986) *passim*.

⁴⁸⁷ For Daedalus constructing the wooden cow-effigy see *Ov. Ars* 1.325 *hanc tamen impleuit uacca deceptus acerna / dux gregis, et partu proditus auctor erat, Met.* 8.132-3 *quae toruum ligno deceptit adultera taurum discordemque utero fetum tulit, 9.739-40 tamen illa dolis et imagine uaccae passa bouem est, et erat, qui deciperetur, adultery*, *Apollod.* 3.1.4, *Hyg. Fab.* 40.2.2-4 *exsul cum uenisset, petiit ab ea auxilium. is ei uaccam ligneam fecit et uerae uaccae corium induxit, in qua illa cum tauro concubuit* (on the possibility of Hyginus' account being spurious see Cantarella (1976) 50).

crown”)⁴⁸⁸ reaches the light of life safe and sound. Ariadne, even though she is not mentioned by name, or perhaps exactly because of this, also provides a further allusion to vision, since her name seems to have been associated with “light” and “brightness.”⁴⁸⁹

Running the risk of over-interpretation, I would also draw attention to the possible presence of an acrostic in the mythological list. Ovid’s resourcefulness extends the play on vision beyond the content of the text, as he challenges the reader’s eye to distinguish the acrostic formed by the initial letter of the four hexameters at lines 55-62, which reads: *I-P-P-E*, the singular vocative of the Greek *ἵππος*.⁴⁹⁰ If such connotations are perceptible here,⁴⁹¹ then the acrostic is clearly alluding to Hippolytus by picking up the etymological derivation of his name from *ἵππος* (Hippo-lytus).⁴⁹² In terms of gender this adds a further twist to the list, which, despite the fact that it is supposed to be about the female members of Phaedra’s family, it is ultimately held together by the implicit presence of two male figures: Minos and Hippolytus. Furthermore, given the ominous character of the horse imagery in the letter Phaedra’s cryptic reference to Hippolytus through the acrostic *IPPE* ultimately becomes an implicit hint at his tragic death.⁴⁹³ In close connection, I would simply add that in the great majority of funerary epigrams with acrostics, the name of the deceased was spelled out in the acrostic.⁴⁹⁴ Phaedra, once again seems to lose the battle against her Euripidean reminiscence, which finds its way through her words investing her letter with such ill-omened connotations of death.

3.1.2 *Her.* 4.93-104

Phaedra resorts to the use of mythological *exempla* for a second time at lines 93-104, where she argues for the compatibility of love with hunting. In terms of structure Phaedra’s mythological list comprises three mythological *exempla*, which are held together by the

⁴⁸⁸ In other mythological versions Ariadne guides Theseus by offering him a “shining crown”, further see n. on *Her.* 4.59.

⁴⁸⁹ Cf. Ap. Rhod. 3.1074-6 *ἦε καὶ Αἰαίης νήσου πέλας; εἰπέ δὲ κόρυνην / ἦντινα τήνδ’ ὀνόμηνας ἀριγνώτην γεγαυῖαν / Πασιφάης, ἣ πατρὸς ὀμόγνιός ἐστιν ἐμεῖο* and 1096-100 *ἀλλὰ τίη τάδε τοι μεταμῶνια πάντ’ ἀγορεύω, / ἡμετέρους τε δόμους τηλεκλείτην τ’ Ἀριάδην, / κόρυνην Μίνωος, τόπερ ἀγλαδὸν οὖνομα κείνην / παρθερικὴν καλέεσκον ἐπήρατον ἦν μ’ ἐρεεῖνεις; / αἶθε γάρ, ὡς Θησῆι τότε ξυναρέσσατο Μίνωος* with O’Hara (1996) 29 and Hunter on Ap. Rhod. 3.1075. For Phaedra’s possible identification with Aphrodite in the sense of the adjective *φαιδρὰ* (“shining”) see Fontenrose (1981) 162 with n.6.

⁴⁹⁰ The acrostic lacks the initial heavy breathing (*H-*); however, cf. Nicand. *Alexipharm.* 266-74 and *Ilias Latina* 1-8 and 1063-70, where “we must face the possibility that Nicander and Italicus were satisfied with acrostics of their names defective in one letter” (Courtney (1990) 13). The use of acrostics in order to highlight the meaning of a word by drawing attention to its form is attested ever since Homer. However, it was developed as a conscious poetic technique during the Hellenistic times (cf. e.g. Nicand. *Theor.* 345-53 and *Alex.* 266-74. Arat. *Phaen.* 783-7 (with Kidd on 783) and became popular with Latin poets, cf. Ennius *Epicharmus* (?) *ap. Cic. de div.* 2.111 with Pease. Verg. *Georg.* 1.428-33, *Aen.* 7.601-4, *Ilias Latina*. Further on acrostics (both Greek and Latin) see Graf in *RE* (1894) I s.v. *Akrostichis*, Hilberg (1899), *idem* (1900), Vogt (1967) with bibliography cited in p.80 n.1, Fowler (1983), Courtney (1990) esp. 5f. with bibliography.

⁴⁹¹ If so, then the acrostic offers an additional argument for my inclusion of lines 61-6 to the mythological list.

⁴⁹² On this etymology see n. on *Her.* 4.21 with bibliography.

⁴⁹³ See n. on *Her.* 4.21.

⁴⁹⁴ Courtney (1990) 6f.

common theme of “amatory hunt”. The first *exemplum* (Cephalus-Aurora) extends over two couplets (93-6), while the following two (Adonis-Venus, Meleager-Atalanta) occupy one couplet each (97f., 99f.). The mythological reference is rounded off by four lines serving as a conclusion, where Phaedra recapitulates her argument through the suggestion that both herself and Hippolytus should be included in the crowd of lovers appearing in the mythological *exempla* above.

This is not Phaedra’s first reference to the compatibility of love with hunting in her letter. Much earlier at lines 37-44 Phaedra had implied the eroticization of the wild through her attempts to imitate Hippolytus’ hunting pursuits.⁴⁹⁵ This time, however, the link between love and the wild is provided through the world of myth. Moreover, the emphasis now shifts from Phaedra to Hippolytus, since the application of the mythological *exempla* is intended to strengthen primarily the parallel between Hippolytus and the mythical hunters, and less the connection between Hippolytus and Phaedra.

Three very well known mythical hunters, namely Cephalus, Adonis and Meleager by not failing to combine their hunting pursuits with love have set out the pattern, which Hippolytus should follow. At first Phaedra’s choice of the particular *exempla* seems all too appropriate, not only because of the common link of hunting, but also due to the fact that all three stories concern problematic family affairs: Cephalus’ involvement with Aurora is an extramarital relationship, Adonis is the illicit fruit of Myrrha’s incestuous union with her father, and Meleager meets death by his mother.

Nevertheless, all three stories end in death and destruction: Cephalus kills his wife (Procris),⁴⁹⁶ Adonis is killed while hunting, and Meleager is killed because of his hunting association with Atalanta. It is exactly these morbid connotations, which seriously undermine the appropriateness of the *exempla* and undercut the overall effectiveness of Phaedra’s argumentation. The impression is given that Phaedra in a rather self-contradicting way ultimately fights against her own case. The irony involved in Phaedra’s specific choice of myths has not gone unnoticed by scholars.⁴⁹⁷ It is my contention, however, that a closer and in-depth examination of each mythological *exemplum per se* as well as in connection with the rest of the *exempla* in the list will throw further light on Phaedra’s somewhat controversial use of myth.

Cephalus-Aurora (lines 93-96)

Cephalus’ erotic involvement with Aurora is emphatic both by position and extent. The story comes first in the list and occupies double the space (two couplets) compared with the other two *exempla* (one couplet each). The *exemplum* is perfectly balanced with the two lovers (Cephalus and Aurora) being appointed one couplet each. However, a closer reading reveals

⁴⁹⁵ Further on the erotic implications of Phaedra’s reference to her hunting pursuits see p.29 n.208.

⁴⁹⁶ On the implicit reference to the killing of Procris at lines 93f. see Jacobson (1974) 153; Jacobson’s remark was later picked up and further discussed by Casali (1995)b 6f.

⁴⁹⁷ Jacobson (1974) 154, Casali (1995)b 6f., Curley (1999) 166-170, Armstrong (2001) 160 n.11.

Phaedra's subtle preference for Cephalus. First, her reference to Aurora (95f.) follows that to Cephalus (93f.). Second, Cephalus holds a prominent place in the hexameter by being emphatically placed at the very centre of the line (after the penthemimeral caesura), with three words on each side (93). Last, the application of *clarus*, a high-register epithet, which is extremely rare in Roman elegy,⁴⁹⁸ is no doubt emphatic.

The priority of the Cephalus-Aurora story in the list could be justified on grounds of intertextuality, given its presence in the Euripidean *Hippolytus*.⁴⁹⁹ In the play, the Nurse employs the story of Cephalus' erotic abduction by Eos in her double attempt to illustrate the inevitability of love and to convince Phaedra that there is nothing shameful in her love for Hippolytus. The story, coupled with Zeus' affair with Semele, is used as evidence for the omnipotence of Eros, even over the gods.⁵⁰⁰ Phaedra through her re-employment of Cephalus' story effectively takes up the role of the elegiac *lena*;⁵⁰¹ however, she makes all necessary changes in order to serve her rhetorical needs. In the Euripidean text much emphasis is laid on the literary descent of the stories.⁵⁰² The Nurse through the employment of mythological *exempla* is struggling to validate action. But her emphasis on the literariness of the stories has a counter effect, since Phaedra is prompted to imitate examples of divine lust, which are considered to be nothing more than poetic products. The poetic origin and the fictitious character of the stories ultimately fight against their validity, thus weakening considerably the Nurse's argumentative power.⁵⁰³ In stark contrast, the Ovidian Phaedra carefully avoids any hint at the fictitious character of the stories. Her *exempla* are evoked without the slightest reference to their poetic origin. For Phaedra myth is history, without the slightest shadow of doubt regarding its validity. These are not tales composed by poets, but actual love affairs, whose true character should be taken at face value. Thus, Phaedra manages to successfully interweave myth with the reality of her letter.⁵⁰⁴

Another crucial discrepancy between the Euripidean Nurse and the Ovidian Phaedra in the application of Cephalus' story is the purpose for which it is employed. In Eur. *Hipp.* the story is employed to exemplify Love's omnipotence. Cephalus and Semele are employed as two victims of divine erotic desire (of Eos and Zeus respectively). For Phaedra, this is no longer the

⁴⁹⁸ Further see n. on *Her.* 4.93.

⁴⁹⁹ See Palmer on *Her.* 4.93. Jacobson (1974) 153. Casali (1995)b 6. Curley (1999) 166-70. Armstrong (2001) unfortunately misses the intertextual allusion.

⁵⁰⁰ Eur. *Hipp.* 451-58: ὅσοι μὲν οὖν γραφάς τε τῶν παλαιτέρων ἔχουσιν αὐτοὶ τ' εἰσὶν ἐν μούσαις ἀεὶ. ἴσασι μὲν Ζεὺς ὡς ποτ' ἠράσθη γάμων Σμελέης. ἴσασι δ' ὡς ἀνήρπασέν ποτε ἡ καλλιφεγγής Κέφαλον ἐς θεοῦς Ἔως / ἔρωτος εἵνεκ'· ἀλλ' ὁμως ἐν οὐρανῷ / ναίουσι κοῦ φεύγουσιν ἐκποδῶν θεοῦς, / στέργουσι δ' οἴμαι, ξυμφορᾷ νικώμενοι with Halleran.

⁵⁰¹ For Phaedra as *lena* see pp. 23ff.

⁵⁰² Eur. *Hipp.* 451-2 ὅσοι μὲν οὖν γραφάς τε τῶν παλαιτέρων / ἔχουσιν αὐτοὶ τ' εἰσὶν ἐν μούσαις ἀεὶ. On the ambiguity of *γραφάς* either as "writings" or as "paintings" see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 451f., who opts for "writings", and Halleran (2000) ad loc.

⁵⁰³ The Nurse's dismissive attitude towards *μῦθοι* at line 197 is irrelevant to my discussion, since the term there is more likely to be used in the sense of "popular wisdom tales about afterlife." On the disputed interpretation of these lines see Knox (1952) 27, Barrett (1964) and Halleran (2000) on Eur. *Hipp.* 191-7.

⁵⁰⁴ For Ovid's playful attitude towards myth see the bibliography cited in p.60 n.402.

case. Cephalus is evoked mainly, because of his multiple correspondences with Hippolytus: both are young and share a common interest in hunting. Moreover, both youths appear together in the opening of Xenophon's *Cynegeticus* in a long list of renowned hunters, who had been pupils of Centaur Chiron.⁵⁰⁵ In addition, Cephalus and Hippolytus have a common descent from Poseidon. Theseus' divine father was Poseidon, which makes Hippolytus Poseidon's grandson.⁵⁰⁶ Cephalus, on the other hand, was third in descent from Poseidon: Cephalus' father, Deion or Deioneus,⁵⁰⁷ was the son of Aeolus, whose father was Poseidon (or Hippotes Poseidon).⁵⁰⁸ The final connection between the two young men concerns their physical appearance. Phaedra throughout her letter constantly refers to Hippolytus' exceptional beauty;⁵⁰⁹ to use her words, Hippolytus was *pulcherrimus rerum*.⁵¹⁰ So too was Cephalus, whose handsomeness aroused Aurora's divine desire and made her abduct him. The vast majority of the surviving sources do not fail to mention his extraordinary beauty,⁵¹¹ which judging from Pherecydes' account⁵¹² must have been an original feature of the story.

However, Phaedra brings further modifications to the story. In the Euripidean text, Cephalus is portrayed as the victim of Aurora's abduction.⁵¹³ Aurora's rape of Cephalus was a very-well known story ever since the Epic Cycle⁵¹⁴ and it is first recorded in Hesiod's *Theogony*.⁵¹⁵ In Roman elegy the story appears only once, at *Ov. Am.* 1.13.39f.,⁵¹⁶ where the early coming of Dawn (Aurora) is explained as a result of her flight from her aged husband (Tithonus).⁵¹⁷ The poet complements his suggestion with the hypothetical claim that this would not be the case if Aurora was holding in her arms young Cephalus, instead of Tithonus (*Am.*

⁵⁰⁵ Xen. *Cyneg.* 1.2-3.1: *καὶ ἐγένοντο αὐτῷ μαθηταὶ κυνηγεσίῳ τε καὶ ἐτέρων καλῶν Κέφαλος, Ἀσκληπίος, Μειλανίων, Μέστωρ, Ἀμφιάραος, Πηλεὺς, Τελαμών, Μελέαγρος, Θησεύς, Ἰππόλυτος, Παλαμῆδης, Μενεσθεύς, Ὀδυσσεύς, Διομήδης, Κάστωρ, Πολυδεύκης, Μαχάων, Ποδαλείριος, Ἀντίλοχος, Αἰνείας, Ἀχιλλεύς, ὧν κατὰ χρόνον ἕκαστος ὑπὸ θεῶν ἐτιμήθη.*

⁵⁰⁶ On Theseus' double paternity see n. on *Her.* 4.59.

⁵⁰⁷ Cf. *Ant. Lib.* 41.1, *Hyg. Fab.* 189.1-2, 273.11.5, Eustath. on *Hom. Od.* 11.320 vol.1 p. 420 line 29.

⁵⁰⁸ There seems to have been an alternative version of Cephalus' parentage arguing for his Athenian origin. In this version Cephalus was the son of Hermes either with Herse, daughter of Cecrops (*Apollod.* 3.14.3) or with Creusa, daughter of Erectheus (*Hyg. Fab.* 160). Further on Cephalus' parentage see Gibson on *Ov. Ars* 3.725 with bibliography ad loc.

⁵⁰⁹ Cf. *Her.* 4.30, 35f., 64, 71-84, 125.

⁵¹⁰ *Her.* 4.125 ο *utinam nocitura tibi, pulcherrime rerum.*

⁵¹¹ *Paus.* 1.3.1.7-9, 3.18.12.3f., *Ant. Lib.* 41.1.2-4, *Athen.* 13.20.36 Kaibel, *Ov. Met.* 7.496-7, *Hyg. Fab.* 270.2.3, *Astr.* 2.42.4.5f. For a comprehensive list of both Greek and Roman versions of the myth see Gibson (2003) 357f.

⁵¹² *FGrH* 3 F34 Jacoby (= Σ *Hom. Od.* 11.321).

⁵¹³ *Eur. Hipp.* 454-6 *ἴσασι δ' ὡς ἀνήρπασέν ποτε / ἢ καλλιπεργῆς Κέφαλον ἐς θεοῦς Ἔως / ἔρωτος εἶνεκ'...*, 458 *ξυμφορᾷ νικώμενοι.*

⁵¹⁴ *Erigoni* F4, incert. loc. I Davies.

⁵¹⁵ *Hes. Theog.* 986f.: *αὐτὰρ τοὶ Κεφάλῳ φητύσατο φαίδιμον υἱόν, / ἴφθιμον Φαέθοντα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελον ἄνδρα.* Also cf. *Xen. Cyneg.* 1.6, *Paus.* 1.3.1, 3.18.12, *Apollod.* 3.14.3, 3.15.1, *Ant. Lib.* 41.1, *Athen.* 13.566d, *Ov. Am.* 1.13.[33-34], 39-40, *Her.* 15.87f., *Ars* 3.84, *Met.* 7.700-713, *Hyg. Fab.* 198. Further on Aurora's abduction of Cephalus see Rapp in Roscher s.v. *Eos* 1268-9, 1273-4, Bömer on *Met.* 7.490-865 (pp.324f.).

⁵¹⁶ Following Kenney (1994) *app. cr.* and McKeown ad loc. I consider lines 33f. as spurious. Aurora is also mentioned at *Ov. Am.* 2.4.43, however, the reference there is made in connection with her golden hair (cf. *Am.* 2.4.43 *seu flauent, placuit croceis Aurora capillis*).

⁵¹⁷ For the coming of dawn described in terms of Aurora's marital relationship see Green on *Ov. Fast.* 1.461.

1.13.39f.).⁵¹⁸ In fact, Cephalus' rape by Aurora proves to be particularly popular with Ovid, since the story appears again: a) in Sappho's letter to Phaon (*Her.* 15.87-92, esp. 87f.),⁵¹⁹ b) as part of the narration of Cephalus' and Procris' unhappy marriage in the *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 7.672-862, esp. 700ff.), and c) in the advice given by the *praeceptor* in the third book of the *Ars amatoria* (*Ars* 3.83-8, esp. 83f.). The similarity between the *Ars* and Phaedra's letter is striking, since the *praeceptor*, like Phaedra, employs the story as reinforcement to his suggestion that there is nothing immoral in love.⁵²⁰

There seems to be a certain degree of sentiment and reciprocity in Phaedra's reference to the Cephalus-Aurora love affair, which implies the intimacy of a relationship. Moreover, Phaedra departs from Cephalus' conventional portrayal as the innocent victim of abduction,⁵²¹ emphasizing instead his active co-operation.⁵²² This is no longer a story of erotic rape, but rather the romantic love affair between a goddess and a mortal. Her own version of Cephalus is what Hippolytus should aspire to become by giving in to her love. Phaedra will not imitate Aurora in forcing her will upon her beloved; on the other hand, however, it is high time Hippolytus took a more energetic role and responded to her erotic call.

In all cases mentioned above, Aurora's liaison with Cephalus appears in connection with the erotic adventures of Venus with Adonis and Luna with Endymion. The association of the three female figures in terms of their erotic affairs is common in both Greek and Latin poetry, where the goddesses appear either in combination of twos⁵²³ or all three together.⁵²⁴ However, the Ovidian Phaedra slightly varies the usual combination by substituting Meleager-Atalanta for Endymion-Luna, mainly because of the appropriateness of the hunting context provided by the former.

Another reason behind Phaedra's avoidance to mention Cephalus' abduction by Aurora is the marriage between Cephalus and Procris, which is passed over in silence both by the Euripidean Nurse and the Ovidian Phaedra. The Cephalus-Aurora love affair may be an appropriate *exemplum* in many respects, as we have seen above; however, it is essentially an extramarital relationship, since, according to the main mythological strand, the abduction of the

⁵¹⁸ Cf. *Am.* 1.13.39 *at si quem manibus Cephalum complexa teneres*. The emphasis on Aurora's erotic embrace of Cephalus is perhaps suggestive of her abduction.

⁵¹⁹ Sappho expresses her fears lest Aurora abduct Phaon, because of his exquisite beauty, and replace Cephalus with him, cf. *Her.* 15.87f. *hunc ne pro Cephalo raperes, Aurora, timebam- / et faceres, sed te prima rapina tenet!*

⁵²⁰ For a detailed examination of the story at *Ov. Ars* 3.683-746 see Gibson on *Ov. Ars* 3.683-746 and Weber (1983) 127-52.

⁵²¹ Cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.13.39 *at si, quem mauiis, Cephalum complexa teneres, Her.* 15.87f.: *hunc ne pro Cephalo raperes, Aurora, timebam- / et faceres, sed te prima rapina tenet!*, *Ars* 3.84: *nec Cephalus roseae praeda pudenda deae.*

⁵²² *Ov. Her.* 4.95 *nec...Aurorae male se praebebat amandum.*

⁵²³ Aurora-Venus: Hes. *Theog.* 984-91, Theocr. 3.46-50, *Ov. Her.* 4. 93-98, Aurora-Luna: *Ov. Am.* 1.13.39-44, Venus-Luna: [Theocr.] 20.34-39, *Ov. Tr.* 2.299.

⁵²⁴ Cf. *Ov. Ars* 3.83-6 with Gibson ad loc, *Ov. Her.* 15.87-92. The tripartite *exemplum* also echoes the advice given by the elegiac *lena* to her pupil so as to earn many lovers. For more see Gibson (2003) on *Ars* 83-98.

young Cephalus took place only a month or two after his marriage to Procris.⁵²⁵ The story centres on marital infidelity, deceit and destruction and it is treated as such by Ovid in his *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 7.672-862),⁵²⁶ where “the failure of trust in a violent and possessive love”⁵²⁷ lies at the heart of the narration. Phaedra proves to be well aware of these ominous connotations; hence, she does her best to downplay the illicit nature of this affair by suppressing Cephalus’ marriage to Procris. The -somewhat unusual- attribution of *sapiens* to Aurora at line 96, apart from denoting erotic skill, could also be seen as an allusion to Aurora’s consciousness of her adultery.⁵²⁸ In this light, *sapiens* seems to pick up Phaedra’s earlier use of *consciis*,⁵²⁹ which also suggests awareness of the illicit propositions, and further suggests the close association between Aurora and Phaedra.⁵³⁰

Aurora’s involvement in the Cephalus-Procris affair must have been present in the story from the very beginning, at least as early as Pherecydes (*FGrH* 3 F34 Jacoby).⁵³¹ Aurora’s abduction (or seduction) of Cephalus, in particular, seems to have been established as an integral and indispensable part of the myth during the Hellenistic period. It is very likely that the story originated with Nicander’s *Heteroiumena*.⁵³² If this assumption is right, then the presence of the adjective *clarus* at line 93 becomes meaningful, especially in view of its transference from Eos in the Euripidean play (*Eur. Hipp.* 455 ἡ καλλιφεγγής ... Ἐως) to Cephalus in the Ovidian letter (*Her.* 4.93 *clarus...Cephalus*).⁵³³ In my view, *clarus* has an additional meta-literary role and serves as an “Alexandrian footnote”; after all, its emphatic position first in the hexameter and its rarity in elegy betray its importance.⁵³⁴ To be more precise, I am inclined to read behind the application of *clarus* an allusion to the work of the Hellenistic poet Nicander, whose version of the story in his *Heteroiumena* included (so far as we can tell) for the first time Cephalus’ erotic seduction by Aurora.⁵³⁵ *Clarus* sounds like the Greek Κλάρος, an oracle and grove of Apollo, near Colophon,⁵³⁶ and Nicander was from Clarus.⁵³⁷ In this ingenious way

⁵²⁵ Cf. Apollod. 1.9.4. Athen. 13.566d. Ov. *Met.* 7.690ff., Hyg. *Fab.* 189. *Astr.* 2.42.4. Ant. Lib. 41.1. Nonn. *Dion.* 48.679-81. Schol. SG on Germ. *Arat.* pp.186, 229. Servius on Verg. *Aen.* 6.445. Further see Green (1979) 19-20. For Cephalus’ abduction by Aurora as an incident separate from his wedding with Procris see Rapp in Roscher s.v. *Kephalos* 1090.

⁵²⁶ Further on Ovid’s treatment of Cephalus’ rape by Aurora in relation to the Cephalus-Aurora marriage in the *Met.* see below.

⁵²⁷ Segal (1978) 176. On the centrality of marital “faith” and “belief”, trust / distrust in the story in the *Met.* see Segal (1978) 194-6.

⁵²⁸ Further on *sapiens* see n. on *Her.* 4.95.

⁵²⁹ Ov. *Her.* 4.52 *me tacitam consciis urit amor*.

⁵³⁰ For Phaedra’s awareness of the illicit character of her erotic approach see nn. on *Her.* 4.18, 25, 26, 34 and 52.

⁵³¹ So Pölsch (1959) 330 n.2. Green (1979) 18f., Fontenrose (1981) 94. Davidson (1997) 172 n. 29.

⁵³² Pölsch (1959) 330 n.2. Otis (1966) 411-2. Papathomopoulos (1968) 165 n.1. Segal (1978) 175. Green (1979) 19 with n.18. Fontenrose (1979-80) 290 n.6. *idem* (1981) 94.

⁵³³ Casali (1995) b 7.

⁵³⁴ Further on the adjective see n. on *Her.* 4.93.

⁵³⁵ *pace* Green (1979) 19 who holds that Nicander “may have (only) modified or romanticized” the seduction of Cephalus by Aurora. Further on this controversial issue see Davidson (1997) 170ff.

⁵³⁶ Cf. e.g. *Hom. Hymn.* 3.40, 9.5. *Call. Hymn.* 2.70. *AP* 9.525.11. *Nicand. Ther.* fr.31.2. *Strab.* 14.2.1.27. *Paus.* 2.2.8. *Aelius Aristides* p.294 line 33 *Jebb.* *Iambli. Myst.* 3.11.5. *John Chrysostom De laudibus Sancti Pauli Apostoli* 4.8.11. *Eusebius Praeparatio evangelica* 4.2.8.2, 5.21.6.6, 10.4.7.3. *Porphyry Epistula ad Anebonem* 2.2d.3. *Origenes Contra Celsum* 7.3.2, 7.6.45. *Theodoretus Graecarum*

Phaedra with admirable Hellenistic allusiveness pays her literary debt to Nicander and at the same time proves to be an erudite reader with rich literary background. Nevertheless, her acknowledgment of the literary descent of the myth proves to be rather controversial in that it contradicts her initial reluctance to diverge from the Nurse's similar acknowledgement of the fictitious character of her stories in the Euripidean text.⁵³⁸ Phaedra's literary self-consciousness ultimately aligns her with the Euripidean Nurse in terms of their use of myth strictly as devices of poetic composition, as products of a long standing literary tradition.

Despite Phaedra's careful efforts to conceal Cephalus' marriage, she ultimately fails to do it. Procris is present in the *exemplum* through the conspicuous absence of any explicit reference to her. Hence, Phaedra's reference to Cephalus' exceptional hunting skills and especially the emphasis on the great number of his many preys (line 93f. *multaeque.../ferae*) are bound to recall Procris who tragically lost her life through Cephalus' hunting spear.⁵³⁹ It goes without saying that these morbid connotations ultimately undercut the effectiveness of the *exemplum*. Procris, even at the backdrop of the story, proves to be an extremely interesting figure, especially in view of her association with Phaedra. According to one strand of the myth, Cephalus (after his abduction and) following Aurora's advice disguised himself and put his wife's marital fidelity to the test.⁵⁴⁰ After the exposure of her unfaithfulness, Procris fled in shame to Crete.⁵⁴¹ There, she cured king Minos from his inability to procreate, which was afflicted upon him by his wife Pasiphae as punishment for his marital infidelities.⁵⁴² The surviving sources disagree on whether or not Procris had sexual intercourse with Minos. In any case, Procris' adulterous liaison with Minos seems to be in accordance with her morally frail behavior. In Ovid's *Remedia amoris*⁵⁴³ Minos' passionate love for Procris, despite his marriage to Pasiphae, comes first in a list of mythological *exempla* employed by the *praeceptor* to support his advice not to be content with only one love. Apollodorus' account of the story also

affectionum curatio 10.3.8, 10.46.7, Schol. on Nicandr. *Ther. vita* line 7-9, *ibid* 958 lines 5-7, Plut. *Pomp.* 24.5.3, Clemens *Protrepticus* 2.11.2.2, Hesychius s.v. κλάριον. On Apollo's oracle in Clarus see Haussoullier (1898).

⁵³⁷ Cf. Nicander *Ther.* 957f. *Καί κεν Ὀμηρείοιο καὶ εἰσέτι Νικάνδροιο / μνήστιν ἔχοις, τὸν ἔθρεψε Κλάρου νιφόεσσα πολίχνη, Alex.* 9-11 *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τόθι παῖδες ἐυζήλοιο Κρεούσης / πιωτάτην ἐδάσαντο γεωμορίην ἠπείρου / ἐζόμενοι τριπόδεσσι πάρα Κλαρίοις Ἐκάτοιο.* For the identification of Nicander from Clarus with Nicander from Colophon see Gow-Schofield (1953) 4f.

⁵³⁸ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 451f. *ὄσοι μὲν οὖν γραφάς τε τῶν παλαιτέρων / ἔχουσιν αὐτοὶ τ' εἰσὶν ἐν μούσαις αἰεὶ.*

⁵³⁹ Jacobson (1974) 153 was the first to detect the allusion, which was later developed by Casali (1995)b 6f.

⁵⁴⁰ Cf. Ov. *Met.* 7.700ff., esp. 721ff., Ant. Lib. 41.5, Hyg. *Fab.* 189.1-3, also, Apollod. 3.15.1 offers another variant according to which Cephalus found Procris in bed with a certain Pteleon, who had bribed her with a golden crown.

⁵⁴¹ Further on Procris' escape from Cephalus in shame see Fontenrose (1981) 89-91.

⁵⁴² Pasiphae had put on Minos a horrible spell to discharge snakes and scorpions in his partners' bodies every time he tried to copulate. Cf. Apollod. 3.15.1, Ant. Lib. 41.4.3.

⁵⁴³ Ov. *Rem.* 453 *Pasiphaes Minos in Procride perdidit ignes* with Henderson and Pinotti ad loc.

contains an explicit reference to this adulterous relationship.⁵⁴⁴ From this perspective, the implicit allusion to Procris offers a link with the first mythological list in the letter (lines 53-66) through king Minos.

The association between Phaedra and Procris is as old as the Homeric epics judging from a reference in the *Odyssey*, where Procris, Phaedra and Ariadne are mentioned together among the multitude of dead heroines that Odysseus met during his visit in the Underworld. The fact that all three of them share the same line is indicative of their close association.⁵⁴⁵ Ovid's treatment of the story in his *Metamorphoses* (7.700ff, esp. 743ff.) offers an interesting variant, which further supports the association between the *exemplum* and Phaedra's love affair. Following the account of the story given by Cephalus, Procris, after the exposure of her marital infidelity, did not flee to Minos, but went off to the mountains and devoted herself to hunting full of hate for the opposite sex.⁵⁴⁶ Procris thus becomes a female mirror-image of Hippolytus, since her life in the wild and her devotion to Diana bear a striking resemblance with the principles and the way of life of the young hunter. Hence, Procris, present in her absence, has a twofold role by offering with her paradigm a parallel both for Phaedra and Hippolytus.

The possibility of an allusion to Procris' escape to Crete becomes even more intriguing in view of the meta-literary implications of *clarus* at line 93, since Procris' stay with Minos was mentioned in Nicander's work.⁵⁴⁷ An additional link with Nicander is also provided through the gifts, which Procris received in Crete. According to Pollux (*Onom.* 5.38f.), who cites Nicander from Colophon as his authority (fr. 97 Schneider), Minos offered Procris as a reward for the cure she provided him (or alternatively as enticement for her seduction)⁵⁴⁸ a hound, which outran all others and a javelin, which never missed its target.⁵⁴⁹ The hound provides a link with

⁵⁴⁴ Apollod. 3.15.1 *Πρόκριν δὲ Κέφαλος <ὁ> Διήνορος. ἡ δὲ λαβοῦσα χρυσοῦν στέφανον Πτελέοντι συνεννάζεται, καὶ φαραθεισα ὑπὸ Κεφάλου πρὸς Μίνωα φεύγει. ὁ δὲ αὐτῆς ἐρᾶ καὶ πείθει συνελθεῖν.* There was, however, an alternative mythological tradition, where the relationship between Procris and Minos was devoid of any moral blemish: Ant. Lib. 41.4f. *Πρόκρις δὲ καταλιπούσα τὸν Κέφαλον ὑπ' αἰσχύνῃς ἄχετο φεύγουσα παρὰ Μίνωα τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Κρητῶν. καταλαβοῦσα δ' αὐτὸν ἐχόμενον ὑπ' ἀτεκνίας, ὑπισχνεῖτο καὶ ἐδίδασκε τὸν τρόπον αὐτῷ, εἰ γένοιτο παῖδες. ὁ γὰρ Μίνως οὖρεσκεν ὄφεις καὶ σκορπίους καὶ σκολοπένδρας καὶ ἀπέθησκον αἱ γυναῖκες ὅσας ἐμίγνυτο,* Hyg. *Astr.* 2.35 *Quem* (sc. Minos) *Procris Cephalii uxor laborantem dicitur sanasse.*

⁵⁴⁵ Hom. *Od.* 11.321 *Φαίδρην τε Πρόκριν τε ἴδον καλήν τ' Ἀριάδην.*

⁵⁴⁶ According to Hyg. *Fab.* 189.4ff. Procris fled to Crete, where she joined Diana and her company in their hunting pursuits.

⁵⁴⁷ Otis (1966) 177.

⁵⁴⁸ Cf. Apollod. 3.15.1 *ὁ δὲ* (sc. Minos) *αὐτῆς* (sc. Procris) *ἐρᾶ καὶ πείθει συνελθεῖν (...)* *ἐχοντος οὖν αὐτοῦ κύνα ταχὺν <καὶ> ἀκόντιον ἰθυβόλον, ἐπὶ τούτοις Πρόκρις, δοῦσα τὴν Κιρκαίαν πειεῖν ῥίζαν πρὸς τὸ μηδὲν βλάσαι, συνεννάζεται.* According to Ovid (*Met.* 7.754ff.) the hound and the javelin were offered to Procris by Diana as a gift. This version was later followed by Hyginus (*Fab.* 189.5.2-4 *Diana misericordia tacta dat ei iaculum quod nemo euitare posset et canem Laelapem quem nulla fera effugere posset, et iubet eam ire et cum Cephalo con<ten>dere.*). Servius on Verg. *Aen.* 6.445 informs us that a dog and two javelins were offered by Aurora to Cephalus in erotic exchange (*amorem in se mouit Aurorae, quae ei* (sc. Cephalus) *canem uelocissimam, Laelapam nomine, donauit et duo hastilia ineuitabilia et reciproca, eumque in amplexus rogauit.*)

⁵⁴⁹ Cf. Ant. Lib. 41.5.4-7: *ὁ Μίνως διδοῖ τῇ Πρόκριδι τὸν ἄκοντα καὶ τὸν κύνα τούτους δὲ οὐδὲν ἐξέφυγε θηρίον, ἀλλὰ πάντα ἐχειροῦντο,* Hyg. *Astr.* 2.35.1-7: *Canis. Hic dicitur ab Ioue custos Europae adpositus esse et ad Minoa peruenisse. Quem Procris Cephalii uxor laborantem dicitur sanasse et pro eo beneficio canem munere accepisse, quod illa studiosa fuerit uenationis et quod cani fuerat datum ne ulla fera praeterire eum posset,* also [Eratosth.] *Cat.* 33. Both the javelin and the hound were

the first mythological section at lines 53-66 through its association with Europa. According to the myth, this hound was fabricated by Hephaestus and was offered to Jupiter as a gift. Jupiter then gave it to Europa as guardian dog.⁵⁵⁰ From Europa the dog passed on to Minos, who in turn offered it as a gift to Procris. Europa thus becomes a connecting link between the two mythological examples. Europa is not the only member in Phaedra's family that serves as a link between the Cephalus *exemplum* and lines 53-66. The implicit allusion to Procris' sexual remedies to Minos also implicates Pasiphae, who had inflicted the terrible curse upon her husband. To move a step further, Procris as a healer of Minos could even be a remote echo of Daedalus' role in accommodating Pasiphae's monstrous sexual desire for the bull implied at lines 57f.⁵⁵¹

Phaedra tries her best to provide her short mythological list with cohesion through a well-planned web of multiple, often subtle, links between the *exempla*. Her choice to follow up the Cephalus *exemplum* with the story of Adonis, apart from the obvious common theme of "amatory hunt", can also be explained on grounds of a "father-son" relationship. From Hesiod (*Theog.* 986-91) we learn that Aurora bore to Cephalus a son, named Tithonus (or Phaethon),⁵⁵² whose exquisite beauty was the reason for being carried-off by Aphrodite. Alternative names for this child were: Esperos or Heosphoros,⁵⁵³ Phosphoros, Arcesius⁵⁵⁴ or Aeos. The last alternative (Aeos) is important for my discussion, since according to the entry in the *Etymologicum Magnum*, Aeos (possibly a Cyprian dialectic form for *Éōios* or *Heōios*) was the name of Adonis.⁵⁵⁵ Apollodorus offers further evidence in support of the family ties between Cephalus

unsurpassable, cf. Apollod. 3.15.1 *ἔχοντος οὖν αὐτοῦ κύνα ταχὺν <καί> ἀκόντιον ἰθυβόλον*, Ant. Lib. 41.5.6-7 *ὁ Μίνως διδοῖ τῇ Πρόκριδι τὸν ἄκοντα καὶ τὸν κύνα τούτους δὲ οὐδὲν ἐξέφυγε θηρίον, ἀλλὰ πάντα ἐχειροῦντο*, Ov. *Met.* 7.754f. *dona, canem munus; quem cum sua traderet illi / Cynthia, "currendo superabit" dixerat "omnes."*, Hyg. *Fab.* 189.5.2-4: *Diana misericordia tacta dat ei iaculum quod nemo euitare posset et canem Laelapem quem nulla fera effugere posset, et iubet eam ire et cum Cephalo con<ien>dere*, 273.11 [ludis funebribus Peliae uicit] *Cephalus Deionis filius funda*, Astr. 2.35.1-6: *pro eo beneficio canem munere accepisse, quod illa studiosa fuerit uenationis et quod cani fuerat datum ne ulla fera praeterire eum posset*. That the javelin was impossible to miss the target became proverbial (Diogenian. *Paroem.* 7.55= Apostol. 14.84, Eustath. on Hom. *Od.* 11.320 pp. 440, 29). Perhaps the attribution of the adjective *multae* to *ferae* at lines 93f. also hints at Cephalus' success in hunting with the help of his unsurpassable javelin.

⁵⁵⁰ Hyg. *Astr.* 2.35.1f.: *Canis. Hic dicitur ab Ioue custos Europae adpositus esse et ad Minoa peruenisse*.

⁵⁵¹ Davidson (1997) 177.

⁵⁵² Also Paus. 1.3.1.7-2.1: (...) *καὶ φέρουσα Ἡμέρα Κέφαλον, ὃν κάλλιστον γενόμενόν φασιν ὑπὸ Ἡμέρας ἐρασθείσης ἀρπασθῆναι καὶ οἱ παῖδα γενέσθαι Φαέθοντα, <ὃν ὕστερον ἢ Ἀφροδίτη ἤρπασε> *** καὶ φύλακα ἐποίησε τοῦ ναοῦ. ταῦτα ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ἡσίοδος εἶρηκεν ἐν ἔπεισι τοῖς ἐς τὰς γυναῖκας. According to Apollodorus, Phaethon was Tithonus' child (Apollod. 3.14.3 "Ἐρσης δὲ καὶ Ἑρμοῦ Κέφαλος, οὗ ἐρασθείσα Ἥως ἤρπασε καὶ μιγεῖσα ἐν Συρίᾳ παῖδα ἐγέννησε Τιθωνόν, οὗ παῖς ἐγένετο Φαέθων). On the vexed issue of the identification of this Phaethon with the famous charioteer, the son of Helios and Clymene, see Fontenrose (1981) 102f. with notes (and bibliography ad loc.).*

⁵⁵³ Hyg. *Astr.* 2.42.4ff. (quoting Eratosthenes).

⁵⁵⁴ Hyg. *Fab.* 189.

⁵⁵⁵ Phileas *ap. EM* 117.33-38 *Ἀῶος: Ποταμὸς τῆς Κύπρου. Ἀῶ γὰρ ὁ Ἄδωνις ὀνομάζετο· καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ οἱ Κύπριοι βασιλεῖς Ζωῖλος δὲ ὁ Κεδρασεὺς καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐαυτοῦ μητρὸς κληθῆναι τὴν γὰρ Θεῖαντος μητέρα οὐ Σμύρναν, ἀλλ' Ἀῶν καλοῦσι. Φιλέας δὲ πρῶτον βασιλέα Ἀῶν, Ἡοῦς ὄντα καὶ Κεφάλου, Hesychius A 8987 Ἄωοι: θεοὶ οἱ ἐκ Ἀρόμου μετακομισθέντες εἰς*

and Adonis. In his account of the genealogy of Cecrops' family, Adonis, who is identified with the Adonis loved by Venus,⁵⁵⁶ comes sixth in descent from Cephalus.⁵⁵⁷ An additional link between Adonis and Cephalus is provided through Procris on grounds of incest. Adonis was the fruit of the incestuous affair between Myrrha (or Zmyrna)⁵⁵⁸ and her father (Theias, Cinyras).⁵⁵⁹ Following a minor branch of mythological tradition Procris had also committed adultery with her father, Erectheus.⁵⁶⁰

Links are also provided between the two framing *exempla* of the list. In this case, the association involves the female characters of the stories, and more specifically the fact that both Procris and Atalanta were two very well known and highly competent huntresses. Xenophon's treatise on hunting concludes with a passing reference to women renowned for their hunting skills, in which Procris and Atalanta are the only paradigms mentioned by name.⁵⁶¹ Moreover, both huntresses also feature together in Eustathius' note on Hom. *Od.* 11.320, where they are associated on grounds of "manliness."⁵⁶²

Adonis – Venus (lines 97f.)

The erotic affair of Venus and Adonis comes second in this short mythological list. Given the intertextual character of the section, this is a significant departure from the Euripidean subtext. In Eur. *Hipp.* (451-58) the Nurse complemented her reference to Cephalus with the story of Zeus and Semele, which is of little use -if any at all- to Phaedra. Hence, she replaces it with the Adonis-Venus love affair, which offers her great potential for further exploitation. Even so, her departure is not entirely alien to the Euripidean context, since the reference to the Adonis-Venus love affair could be picking up a (possible) allusion to Adonis near the end of the play (Eur. *Hipp.* 1420-22),⁵⁶³ where Artemis in her final address to Hippolytus promises to

Σαμοθράκην νήσον. και Κίλικες από 'Αώου του Κεφάλου < η > του παραρέοντος ποταμού Also see Fontenrose (1981) 103f. with notes.

⁵⁵⁶ Apollod. 3.14.3. According to Apollodorus the male line of Cephalus' house is as follows: Hermes (+Herse) > Cephalus (+Eos) > Tithonus > Phaethon > Astynoos > Sandocos (+Pharnace) > Cinyras (+Metharme) > Adonis. For Hesiod, Adonis was the son of Phoenix and Alpheisiboia, while for Panyassis he was the son of Theias+ Smyrna.

⁵⁵⁷ According to Apollodorus the male line of Cephalus' house is the following: Hermes (+Herse) > Cephalus (+Eos) > Tithonus > Phaethon > Astynoos > Sandocos (+Pharnace) > Cinyras (+Metharme). For Hesiod Adonis was the son of Phoenix+Alpheisiboia, while for Panyassis the son of Theias+ Smyrna.

⁵⁵⁸ Further on Myrrha's (or Smyrna) genealogy see Frazer (1921) 2.86 n.1.

⁵⁵⁹ On the many variations of Adonis' origin see Fontenrose's (1981) 168 comprehensive discussion with notes and bibliography ad loc.

⁵⁶⁰ Hyg. *Fab.* 253 with Davidson (1997) 181.

⁵⁶¹ Xen. *Cyneg.* 13.18: οὐ μόνον δὲ ὄσοι ἄνδρες κυνηγεσίῳ ἠράσθησαν ἐγένοντο ἀγαθοί, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αἷς ἔδωκεν ἡ θεὸς ταῦτα [᾽Αρτεμις], Ἀταλάντη καὶ Πρόκρις καὶ ἦτις ἄλλη.

⁵⁶² Eustath.on Hom. *Od.* 11.320: Ἰστέον δὲ διὰ τε περιάδεται ἐπ' ἀνδρῖα καὶ ἡ Πρόκρις αὐτὴ καθὰ καὶ τις Ἀργαθῶνη καὶ ἐτέρα Ῥοδογού, ἢ καὶ ἄλλη Ἀταλάντη.

⁵⁶³ So Jacobson (1974) 153, Casali (1995)b 7.

avenge his death by killing Aphrodite's dearest mortal.⁵⁶⁴ Despite the reservations of the Scholiast on line 1421,⁵⁶⁵ it is generally assumed that the person hiding behind the rather vague phrasing is Adonis.⁵⁶⁶

There seems to be a certain degree of irony with regard to the temporal sequence of the stories in the list, since Phaedra tries to persuade Hippolytus to succumb to her love by offering as an example the Adonis-Venus affair. But her suggestion is somewhat of a paradox in that, as one reads in the Euripidean play, the Adonis-Venus story chronologically follows that of Phaedra-Hippolytus.⁵⁶⁷ The killing of Adonis was the outcome of Artemis' revenge for the death of Hippolytus. This is an interesting case of *προθύστερον*, which has an obvious counter effect to Phaedra's argumentation, since the disorder of temporal sequence further complicates rather than enhances the inclusion of the *exemplum* in the list.⁵⁶⁸ At the same time, this lapse of logic reveals Phaedra's highly textual character, since the intertextual sequence of events proves much stronger than their temporal succession. Furthermore, the allusion to the death of Adonis inevitably recalls the tragic outcome of Phaedra's erotic involvement with Hippolytus, whose death antedates the killing of Adonis. Once again Phaedra's reminiscence of her tragic past comes back to haunt her elegiac present and undercuts the argumentative coherence of her letter.

Phaedra's reference to the danger posed by the blow of a wild boar at the concluding line of the mythological section further supports the allusion to Adonis' death,⁵⁶⁹ since following the most popular mythological version Adonis was killed by a wild boar while hunting.⁵⁷⁰ It is my contention, however, that Phaedra's particular reference to the boar is not restricted exclusively to the Adonis-Venus *exemplum*; it also provides an interesting, though subtle, link with the mythological list at lines 53-66 with particular reference to the Venus-Mars relationship. As we have seen above, the boar that killed Adonis was stirred by Diana. However,

⁵⁶⁴ Eur. *Hipp.* 1420-2 *ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτῆς ἄλλον ἐξ ἐμῆς χειρὸς / ὅς ἂν μάλιστα φίλτατος κυρῆ βροτῶν / τόξοις ἀφύκτοις τοῖσδε τιμωρήσομαι.*

⁵⁶⁵ Σ on Eur. *Hipp.* 1421 *εἰς τὸν Ἄδωνιν δὲ αἰνίττεται, ὡς τινες, λῆρος δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτον. οὐ γὰρ τόξοις Ἀρτέμιδος ἀπόλετο Ἄδωνις, ἀλλ' ὑπ' Ἄρεως. ἄδηλον οὖν τίνα φησί.* The Σ rejects the identification following that version of the story, according to which Adonis was not killed by Artemis' arrows, but by Ares (for literary evidence for this version see Fontenrose (1981) 201 n.25). Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1416-22, on the other hand, reads the reference to the arrows of Artemis as an attempt to disguise the identity of her victim, while Fontenrose (1981) 168 takes it as "a metaphor for the swift death that Artemis will bring." According to Apollodorus (3.14.3 Ἄδωνις δὲ ἔτι παῖς ὢν Ἀρτέμιδος χόλω πληγείσιν ἐν θήρᾳ ὑπὸ σοῦς ἀπέθανεν) Adonis in a very young age lost his life while hunting; he got killed by a boar sent by angry Artemis. Apollodorus, however, provides no further information about the cause of Artemis' wrath.

⁵⁶⁶ So Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1416-22, Halleran on Eur. *Hipp.* 1420-2, Fontenrose (1981) 167f.

⁵⁶⁷ Casali (1995)b 7.

⁵⁶⁸ Cf. Phaedra's substitution of a reference to the reign of Saturn for the conventional reference to the reign of Tatiüs in order to avoid an uncomfortable case of *προθύστερον* at lines 131f. For more see n. ad loc.

⁵⁶⁹ *Her.* 4.104 (...) *neque obliquo dente timendus aper.*

⁵⁷⁰ Cf. Apollod. 3.14.4, Ov. *Met.* 10.715f. In Roman elegy all references to Adonis are associated with his death by the boar and Venus' lament (cf. Prop. 2.13.53-6, Ov. *Am.* 3.9.15f.). The story is likely to have been treated by Gallus (through Euphorion (and Hermesianax)) see Papanghelis (1987) 68 n.46. Further on Adonis' death see Frazer (1914) 11 n.2, Atallah (1966) 53-91, esp. 54-62, Detienne (1977)a 66-68, esp. nn. 41f., Ribichini (1981) 108-123.

a handful of surviving sources offer an alternative version of the story, according to which Mars out of jealousy for Venus' affection for Adonis transformed himself into a boar and killed the young man.⁵⁷¹ In this light, the reference to the boar provides an additional link between the two mythological lists on grounds of the disastrous outcome of both extramarital relationships.

Adonis' devotion to hunting, even above his reverence for Venus, bears a striking resemblance with Hippolytus. The resemblance is further reinforced by Venus' erotic infatuation, which caused her to join Adonis in the woods and become his closest companion. As we hear from Ovid in his *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 10.519ff., esp. 533-41) not only did Venus take up Diana's dress, but she effectively imitated her role as huntress. Venus' erotic hunt with Adonis recalls Phaedra's similar attempts to imitate Hippolytus' way of life at lines 37-44. The verbal similarities with Phaedra's similar reaction in the letter deserve special notice in that they establish a valid link between the two passages.⁵⁷² In both passages, the detailed reference to the erotic embraces of the two lovers clearly implies the erotic character of their repose on the grass.⁵⁷³

Adonis and Hippolytus do not only have a similar death, but a similar afterlife as well. Servius' note on Verg. *Ecl.* 10.18 is enlightening in this respect. Erinoma, a Cyprian maiden, enrages Venus with her chastity. Venus plots against her by making Jupiter fall in love with her. At Juno's request Venus also makes Adonis fall in love with Erinoma. Jupiter out of jealousy strikes Adonis with his fatal thunderbolt. Venus' complaints for the injustice and her lament over dead Adonis results in the restoration of Adonis back to life, since Jupiter allowed him to spend the rest of his life with Erinoma.⁵⁷⁴ Like Adonis, Hippolytus was also granted a second chance after his death and was restored to life as Virbius⁵⁷⁵ with the help of Aesculapius.⁵⁷⁶

⁵⁷¹ Cf. Σ on Hom. *Il.* 5.385, Σ on Theocr. 3.47, Nonn. Dion. 41.209-11, Serv. on Verg. *Ecl.* 10.18.11f., *idem* on Verg. *Aen.* 5.72.10f. For more sources see Fontenrose (1981) 170f. with notes.

⁵⁷² Cf. Ov. *Met.* 10.533 *hunc tenet, huic comes est* ~ *Her.* 4.103 *ipsa comes ueniam* (cf. also 40 *iudicium subsequor ipsa tuum*), *Met.* 10.533f. *adsuetaque semper in umbra / indulgere sibi* ~ *Her.* 4. 44 *in graminea ponere corpus humo*, 98 *sustinuit positos quaelibet herba duos*, *Met.* 10.535 *per iuga, per siluas...uagatur* ~ *Her.* 4.41 *in nemus ire libet*, 42 *per iuga*, *Met.* 10.535 *dumosaque saxa uagatur* ~ *Her.* 4.103f. *nec me latebroso mouebunt / saxa*, *Met.* 10.536 *fine genus uestem ritu succincta Dianae* ~ *Her.* 4.87 *incinctae studia exercere Dianae* *Met.* 10.537 *hortaturque canes* ~ *Her.* 4.42 *hortari celeres...canes*, *Met.* 10.538 *celsum in cornua ceruum* ~ *Her.* 4.41 *pressisque in retia ceruis*, *Met.* 10.539 *a fortibus abstinet apris* ~ *Her.* 4.104 *neque oblique dente timendus aper*.

⁵⁷³ Cf. line 98 *sustinuit positos quaelibet herba duos* ~ 44 *in graminea ponere corpus humo*.

⁵⁷⁴ Fontenrose (1981) 172.

⁵⁷⁵ Cf. Call. *Aet.* fr. 190 Pf., Ov. *Met.* 15.492-546 with Bömer's instructive discussion *ad loc.* (pp. 384f.), *Fast.* 3.265f. with Bömer, Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 7.778. For a detailed discussion of the multiple versions of Virbius' story (from Greek tragedy to Latin epic, and Ov. *Met.* 15 and *Her.* 4 in particular) see Curley (1999) 145-72.

⁵⁷⁶ Judging from Apollodorus (3.10.3) the story goes back as far as the Greek epic of *Naupactia* (cf. *Naupactia* fr. 10^{A-C} Davies). The oldest surviving reference to the story in Augustan poetry is Verg. *Aen.* 7.761-82 with Servius and Fordyce (1977) *ad loc.* (which is the only surviving version, where Virbius is the son of Hippolytus), also Hor. *Carm.* 4.7.25f. The story of Virbius was popular with Ovid (cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.497-546, *Fast.* 3.263ff., 6.737-62 with Frazer (1929) *ad loc.*). Further see Hyg. *Fab.* 48, 251.3.2f. According to Pausanias (2.32.4.1-6) a statue of Asclepius was erected very close to Hippolytus' grave in Troezen.

According to Ptolemy Hephaestion I,⁵⁷⁷ Cocytus, the man who healed Adonis' wound by the boar, was also a pupil of Chiron, like Hippolytus (and Cephalus).

The association of Adonis with the Underworld seems to be an original feature of his myth. Adonis as a child became the object of dispute between Venus and Persephone. Jupiter ruled over the divine strife by dividing the year into three equal parts and granting an equal share to each of the three persons involved.⁵⁷⁸ From this perspective, the Adonis-Venus *exemplum* offers a potential link with Phaedra's earlier reference to the Eleusinian mysteries (lines 67ff.), which Phaedra complements with a detailed description of Hippolytus' physical appearance (lines 71-84). In addition, Phaedra's erotic infatuation at the sight of her beloved also must have been a popular feature of the story.⁵⁷⁹ Pausanias offers an interesting account of Phaedra's erotic burning at the sight of Hippolytus (2.32.3.1ff.). In his description of the city of Troezen he mentions a place, where from Phaedra used to gaze upon Hippolytus whenever he was practicing his athletics. Inflamed with passion and unable to find relief, Phaedra used to shrub off with her hands the leaves of a myrtle tree, which grew there.⁵⁸⁰ The myrtle tree could potentially offer a subtle link between Hippolytus and Adonis. As mentioned above, the dispute between Venus and Persephone over Adonis was settled by having each goddess enjoy the company of Adonis for an equal period of time. Adonis, however, offered his share of time to Venus.⁵⁸¹ a fact that infuriated Persephone. According to Ausonius. Persephone punished Adonis by tying him up and tormenting him on the bark of a myrtle tree.⁵⁸² Phaedra's reference to roses near the beginning of her letter, in addition to its obvious sexual implications,⁵⁸³ might also provide a further link with Adonis' *exemplum*, since the dying Adonis (or his blood)⁵⁸⁴ was transformed into a rose.^{585, 586}

⁵⁷⁷ Cited in Fontenrose (1981) 172.

⁵⁷⁸ Cf. Panyassis (quoted in Apollod. 3.14.4). According to Hyginus (*Astr.* 2.7.3.3-8) Jupiter charged Muse Calliope with the ruling and she allocated to Venus and Persephone an equal share by splitting the year in two equal halves. So also in Σ. on Theocr. 3.48. For further sources see the comprehensive list in Fontenrose (1981) 172 with n.26.

⁵⁷⁹ Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 24-28 ἐλθόντα γάρ νιν Πιθέως ποτ' ἐκ δόμων / σεμνῶν ἐς ὄψιν καὶ τέλη μυστηρίων / Πανδίωνος γῆν, πατρός εὐγενῆς δάμαρ / ἰδοῦσα Φαίδρα καρδίαν κατέσχετο / ἔρωτι δεινῶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς βουλευμάσιιν.

⁵⁸⁰ Paus. 2.32.3.1-8: κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἕτερον τοῦ περιβόλου μέρος στάδιόν ἐστιν Ἴππολύτου καλούμενον καὶ ναὸς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ Ἀφροδίτης Κατασκοπίας αὐτόθεν γάρ, ὅποτε γυμνάζοιτο ὁ Ἴππόλυτος, ἀπέβλεπεν ἐς αὐτὸν ἐρώσα ἢ Φαίδρα. ἐνταῦθα ἔτι πεφύκει ἢ μυρσίνη, τὰ φύλλα ὡς καὶ πρότερον ἔγραψα ἔχουσα τετρυπημένα καὶ ἡνίκα ἠπορεῖτο ἢ Φαίδρα καὶ ραστώνην τῷ ἔρωτι οὐδεμίαν εὑρίσκειν, ἐς ταύτης τὰ φύλλα ἐσιναμῶρει τῆς μυρσίνης.

⁵⁸¹ Apollod. 3.14.4.

⁵⁸² Aus. *Cup. Cruc.* (19) 56-61: *eligitur maesto myrtus notissima luco, / inuidiosa deum poenis. cruciauera illic / spreta olim memorem Veneris Proserpina Adonin. / huius in excelso suspensum stipite Amorem / deuinctum post terga manus substrictaque plantis / uincola maerentem nullo moderamine poenae / afficiunt.*

⁵⁸³ For more on this see n. *Her.* 4.30.

⁵⁸⁴ Serv. on Verg. *Ecl.* 10.18.14f.

⁵⁸⁵ According to Bion 1.64ff. from Adonis' blood sprang a rose and from his tears an anemone. For Nicander (Nicander fr. 65 Schneider = *ap.* Σ. on Theocr. 5.92e), later followed by Ovid (*Met.* 10.735), an anemone sprang from Adonis' blood. For the multitude of the mythological versions concerning Adonis' associations with either roses and/or anemones see Bömer on *Met.* 10. 735 and *idem* on *Fast.* 5.225.

⁵⁸⁶ Hippolytus and Adonis are also closely associated at Ov. *Ars* 1.509-12 (*forma uiros neglecta decet; Minoida Theseus / abstulit, a nulla tempora comptus acu. / Hippolytum Phaedra, nec erat bene cultus,*

A final parallel between this *exemplum* and Phaedra's relationship with Hippolytus is provided through Myrrha, Adonis' mother. The allusion to her through the high style, epic periphrasis *Cinyra...creatum* at line 97 can hardly go unnoticed. It is exactly the suppression of her name, as opposed to the elevated reference to Cinyras, which generates the allusion to Myrrha's incestuous affair with her father.⁵⁸⁷ Myrrha, just like Procris in the Cephalus-Aurora *exemplum*, is present through her conspicuous absence. Despite the inappropriateness of the implications of incest, the similarities with Phaedra's case are hard to ignore. Both stories are about incest and in both the Nurse plays a prominent role by taking the development of the plot in her hands. In fact, in both cases the disastrous outcome comes as a result of the Nurse's devious initiatives.⁵⁸⁸ Finally, both stories are stories of divine wrath, in which Venus plays the role of the avenging goddess. At lines 53-66 Phaedra interpreted her current misfortune as a result of a divine curse inflicted upon her family by Venus. Myrrha's illicit passion for her father was the result of Venus' revenge against Cenchreis, Myrrha's mother, who had claimed that her daughter exceeded in beauty even Venus herself.

Meleager-Atalanta (lines 99f.)

With the Meleager *exemplum* Phaedra "moves on from boar-slain to boar-slayer".⁵⁸⁹ This story, which was extremely popular in both Greek and Latin literature,⁵⁹⁰ is a fitting choice, since it is a story of "amatory hunt". According to myth,⁵⁹¹ Oeneus, Meleager's father, provoked Diana's anger by failing to offer her the sacrifices she deserved. As a result, Diana sent the Calydonian boar to ravage Oeneus' land. Atalanta, a virgin huntress, joined Meleager and many others in the hunt of the Calydonian boar and thanks to her hunting competence she managed to be the first one to strike the boar. Meleager fell in love with Atalanta and offered her the head and skin of the boar as prize for her prowess in hunting and as a token of his love.⁵⁹²

amauit; / cura deae siluis aptus Adonis erat), where the *praeceptor* mentions them both (together with Theseus) as examples of supreme manly, unadorned beauty. Note that Hippolytus and Adonis share the same couplet.

⁵⁸⁷ Casali (1995)b 7.

⁵⁸⁸ Similarly to Phaedra's case, the Nurse also convinces Myrrha to overcome her initial moral reservations and commit incest by sharing the bed with her father. Cf. Apollod. 3.14.4, Anton. Lib. 34, Ov. *Met.* 10.382ff., Hyg. *Fab.* 58, Serv. on Verg. *Ecl.* 10.18.5f. For further sources and bibliography see Fontenrose (1981) 200 n.22.

⁵⁸⁹ Curley (1999) 168. For the close association between the myth of Adonis and that of Atalanta see Detienne (1977)a *passim*.

⁵⁹⁰ See Geffcken in *RE* (1931) s.v. *Kephalos* 15.1.455ff., Grossart (2001), Tsitsiou-Chelidoni (2003) 182 n.457.

⁵⁹¹ Cf. Paus. 8.45.2ff., Diod. Sic. 4.34.2.1ff., Apollod. 1.8.2, Ov. *Met.* 8.317ff., Hyg. *Fab.* 173.3, 174.5f. Further on the myth see Geffcken in *RE* 15.1 (1931) s.v. *Kephalos* 447ff., Papatthopoulos (1968) 73 n.1, Fontenrose (1981) 180f..

⁵⁹² Atalanta is completely absent from the Iliadic version of the story, where Meleager is married to Cleopatra (Hom. *Il.* 9.529ff.). In this version, Diana out of her anger for Oeneus stirred up a strife between the Aetolians and the Curetes over the skin and head of the Calydonian boar. The Aetolians benefited immensely so long as Meleager was fighting at their side. But the hero withdrew embittered with his mother, who cursed him for having killed one of her brothers. Despite the numerous entreaties and gift offerings Meleager succumbed only to the pleas of his wife, Cleopatra, and returned to the battle (although Ovid in the *Met.* is not following the Iliadic version, he mentions Cleopatra's name).

So far, the correspondence between the *exempla* and Phaedra's case is established primarily in terms of gender; Hippolytus shares similarities with the male mythical figures, and Phaedra with the female ones.⁵⁹³ Atalanta, however, constitutes a close parallel for both Phaedra and Hippolytus, thus turning the gender-based dyadic comparison (male-male, female-female) into a cross-over between couples (female-male and female-female). Atalanta's sexual notoriety⁵⁹⁴ makes her an appropriate parallel for Phaedra, but at the same time she seems to have more in common with Hippolytus. Apart from the obvious fact that they are both hunters, Atalanta and Hippolytus show an almost identical attitude towards marriage. A reference to Atalanta in Theognis' elegiac work throws further light to this close similarity.⁵⁹⁵ Atalanta is portrayed in terms that suit Hippolytus; Atalanta effectively becomes a female Hippolytus. Like him, she is virgin (1288 *παρθένον*), with physical beauty (1289 *ώραίην περ έοῦσαν*), she is averse to love (1289 *άναινομένην γάμον άνδρῶν / φεύγειν ζωσαμένην*, 1292 *φεύγουσ' ίμερόεντα γάμον*, 1294 *μάλ' άναινομένη*) and in order to maintain her virginity she leaves her father's house and goes off to live and hunt in the woods (1291-3 *πατρός νοσφισθεΐσα δόμων ξανθή Άταλάντη / ὤχετο δ' ύψηλάς εις κορυφάς ὀρέων / φεύγουσ' ίμερόεντα γάμον*).⁵⁹⁶

With regard to the story of Meleager and Atalanta *per se*, Phaedra's account diverges significantly from the two most popular versions, at least in the form in which they appear in Roman elegy (and in the Ovidian corpus in particular).⁵⁹⁷ There seems to have been two main mythological traditions (possibly two variations of the same myth).⁵⁹⁸ In the Boetian version, Atalanta, a fast runner, was the daughter of Schoeneus. She was loved by Hippomenes, who defeated her in a race by using a trick with golden apples. In the Arcadian version, Atalanta, the daughter of Ias(i)us (or Iasion), was a huntress. Milanion, also a hunter, fell in love with her and eventually won her after a series of hardships and entreaties. These two versions, which in time became indiscriminately conflated, formed the -more or less- standardised version of the myth.⁵⁹⁹ Phaedra, however, deviates from both versions opting for an alternative one, in which

⁵⁹³ For the correspondence between Hippolytus and Procris in reverse sex-order see p.84 above.

⁵⁹⁴ See Gibson on *Ov. Ars* 3.775f.

⁵⁹⁵ Theogn. 1287-94 *άλλά σ' έγῶ τρώσω φεύγοντά με, ὡς ποτέ φασιν / Ιασίου κούρην, παρθένον Ιασίην, / ώραίην περ έοῦσαν άναινομένην γάμον άνδρῶν / φεύγειν ζωσαμένην. έργ' άτέλεστα τέλει / πατρός νοσφισθεΐσα δόμων ξανθή Άταλάντη / ὤχετο δ' ύψηλάς εις κορυφάς ὀρέων / φεύγουσ' ίμερόεντα γάμον, χρυσῆς Άφροδίτης / δῶρα τέλος δ' έγνω και μάλ' άναινομένη*. The similarity in context with Phaedra's letter is striking. Atalanta is employed as a warning against the boy who flees from the poet's love. There is, however, a crucial difference: the reference in Theognis is made in connection with Atalanta's race and her lover's trick with the apples, and not in terms of her prowess in hunting.

⁵⁹⁶ Cf. also Apollod. 3.9.2, Hyg. *Fab.* 185. Also see the list of sources with bibliography in Fontenrose (1981) 203 n.34, and Whitaker (1983) 16.

⁵⁹⁷ Cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.7.13-4, 3.2.29-32, *Her.* 9.151f. and 165f., 16.265f., 21.123-4, *Ars* 2.185-92, 3. 775, *Met.* 10.560-707, *Rem.* 721f., *Ib.* 601, *Tr.* 1.7.17. Cf. also Verg. *Ecl.* 6.61 and Prop. 1.1.9-16.

⁵⁹⁸ Fontenrose (1981) 176.

⁵⁹⁹ For a comprehensive list of literary evidence for both versions see Fontenrose (1981) 202f. nn. 32f. and Bömer on *Ov. Met.* 10. 560-707 (p.188f.). Further on the contamination of the two versions see Bömer on *Met.* 8.273ff. (pp. 98f.), Janka on *Ov. Ars* 2.185f. For an opposite view see Luck on *Ov. Tr.* 2.399ff., Stroth (1971) 49 with n.10.

Atalanta becomes erotically involved with Meleager during the Calydonian hunt.⁶⁰⁰ The common theme of “amatory hunt” offers an obvious explanation for the deviation. Phaedra’s emphasis on Meleager, however, and his erotic feelings for Atalanta turn out to be a rather ominous choice, since Meleager’s story is one of death and family disaster.⁶⁰¹ Meleager’s decision to offer the skin and head of the Calydonian boar to Atalanta and not to his maternal uncles caused a broil during which he killed his uncles; as a result, Althea, his mother, caused Meleager’s death.⁶⁰² On the face of it, the elevated reference to Meleager through the emphatic use of the patronymic *Oenides* combined with the careful position of the verb *arsit* at the opening of the hexameter and the postposition of *et* (line 99 *arsit et Oenides*) can hardly be accidental. As it has been rightly suggested, Meleager’s erotic flame clearly prefigures the flames of his tragic death.⁶⁰³ In a wider context Meleager’s family history as a whole prefigures that of Hippolytus; the similarity between the two becomes evident: Meleager was killed by his mother, and so was Hippolytus, who was killed by his (step)mother. The similarity also involves Althea and Phaedra not only for causing the death of their (step)sons, but also for terminating their disgraceful lives in the very same way (by hanging themselves in remorse for the killing of their sons).⁶⁰⁴

The emphatic framing of the pentameter, which is devoted to Atalanta, by the subject (*illa*, i.e. Atalanta) and the verb (*habet*) balances Meleager’s prominent presence in the hexameter. In my view, *ferae spoliium* in the pentameter is much more than merely a reference to the skin of the boar. This reference actually adds further to the morbid connotations of the *exemplum*. Given the implicit allusion to Meleager’s death in the hexameter, the only reference to the hero is actually through the mention of the skin of the boar. All that Atalanta is left with is the skin of the dead boar, the token of his love, which eventually becomes the substitute for Meleager’s physical presence. It sounds very ironic that Atalanta, instead of the actual company of her beloved, can only enjoy the inanimate pledge of a dead love (100 *spoliium amoris*). To make matters worse, it was this very skin, which caused the killing of her beloved. A final link between Meleager and Hippolytus is offered through Meleager’s double paternity (human and

⁶⁰⁰ For a full discussion of the Calydonian hunt (and Atalanta’s role in particular) see Grossardt (2001) 270-5 and Tsitsiou-Chelidoni (2003) 218ff. In *Ov. Met.* 8.317-23 Atalanta’s character is modeled on Vergil’s Camilla (bks 7, 11), a rather problematic figure in terms of her compliance with the conventional epic gender discrimination. For more see Keith (2000) 27-31.

⁶⁰¹ Cf. e.g. *Ov. Met.* 8.425ff., Apollod. 1.8.2f., Diod. Sic. 4.34.4ff., Hyg. *Fab.* 174.

⁶⁰² On Althaea’s dilemma at *Ov. Met.* 8.414ff. see Tsitsiou-Chelidoni (2003) 259ff. Also cf. *Ov. Rem.* 721f., *Ib.* 601f., *Tr.* 1.7.17f.

⁶⁰³ Casali (1995)b 7.

⁶⁰⁴ For Althaea hanging herself in remorse see Apollod. 1.8.3, Diod. Sic. 4.34.7.3ff.

divine),⁶⁰⁵ which could be picking up Theseus' double paternity.⁶⁰⁶ Perhaps it is not by chance that Theseus (together with Pirithous)⁶⁰⁷ had also participated in the Calydonian hunt.⁶⁰⁸

It is tempting to read behind Phaedra's choice of this particular version of the story a possible influence from drama (Greek and Roman).⁶⁰⁹ The lack of adequate evidence is disheartening. However, it seems very likely that Meleager's erotic involvement with Atalanta during the Calydonian hunt was a development introduced to the myth by the Athenian dramatists,⁶¹⁰ possibly a Euripidean innovation.⁶¹¹ It has been suggested that a surviving fragment⁶¹² from Euripides' *Meleager*⁶¹³ (fr. 530 Nauck²) might be suggestive of an erotic affair between Meleager and Atalanta. The story about the affair must have been a popular one and it was later picked up by Roman dramatists. Fragments from both Accius' *Meleager*⁶¹⁴ and Pacuvius' *Atalanta*⁶¹⁵ survive, but hardly anything can be deduced about the details of their dramatic treatments.

Phaedra's attribution of the adjective *Maenalia* to Atalanta at line 99 is worth mentioning not only because of its rarity.⁶¹⁶ The ambiguity of whether *Maenalia* refers to *Maenalus* the Arcadian mountain or to *Maenalus* the Arcadian hero, Atalanta's father, makes its application even more interesting. In my view, the ambiguity is intended to pick up the controversy surrounding the name of Atalanta's father. If the reference here is made to Maenalus the person, *Maenalia* is used as a patronymic; hence the possibility of a Euripidean reminiscence becomes all the more likely, since, as we learn from Apollodorus, Maenalus was the name of Atalanta's father used by Euripides.⁶¹⁷

⁶⁰⁵ Meleager was the son of Oeneus, king of Aetolia; however, Ares was considered to be his divine father, cf. Hes. fr. 25.4 M-W, Hom. *Il.* 9.550, Ov. *Met.* 8.437, Apollod. 1.8.2, Hyg. *Fab.* 171, Ant. Lib. 2.1. Further on his double paternity see Geffcken in *RE* (1931) s.v. *Kephalos* 15.1.446, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 8.437 with parallels and bibliography.

⁶⁰⁶ On Theseus' double paternity see n. on *Her.* 4.59.

⁶⁰⁷ Cf. *Her.* 4.109-12.

⁶⁰⁸ Cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.303, 403-10, Hyg. *Fab.* 173.1, Apollod. 1.8.2, Paus. 8.45.6.1ff. Further on this catalogue of hunters in Ov. *Met.* see Tsitsiou-Chelidoni (2003) 198ff.

⁶⁰⁹ All three *exempla* mentioned in the list had been dramatized before Ovid's time. Further on the tragic character of the stories and their recodification in elegy by Phaedra see Curley (1999) 168 with n.46.

⁶¹⁰ Grossardt (2001) 76-112 offers a detailed analysis of the treatment of Meleager's story in Attic drama (tragedy and comedy). See also Radt (1999) on Soph. *Meleagrus* p.345.

⁶¹¹ Geffcken in *RE* 15.1 (1931) s.v. *Kephalos* 453f.

⁶¹² Eur. *Meleagrus* fr. 530 Nauck²: Τελαμών δὲ χρυσοῦν αἰετὸν πέλτης ἐπι / πρόβλημα θηρός, βότρυσι δ' ἔστεπεν κᾶρα, / Σαλαμίνα κοσμῶν πατρίδα τὴν εὐάμπελον. / Κύπριδος δὲ μίσημ', Ἄρκας Ἀταλάντη, κύνας / καὶ τόξ' ἔχουσα, πελέκεως δὲ δίστομον / γένυν ἔπαλλ' Ἀγκαῖος οἱ δὲ Θεστίου / παῖδες τὸ λαιὸν ἴχνος ἀνάβρυλοι ποδός, / τὸ δ' ἐν πεδίλοις, ὡς ἐλαφρίζον γόνυ / ἔχοιεν, ὅς δὴ πᾶσιν Αἰτωλοῖς νόμος.

⁶¹³ Cf. Eur. *Meleager* fr. 515-39 Nauck². On Euripides' *Meleager* see Grossardt (2001) 88-95, also Wilamowitz cited in Bömer on *Met.* 8.273-546 pp. 98f. and Geffcken 15.1 (1931) in *RE* s.v. *Kephalos* 452ff.

⁶¹⁴ Fr. 428-50 Warmington.

⁶¹⁵ Fr. 49-78 Warmington. See Grossardt (2001) 144-8.

⁶¹⁶ Further on *Maenalia* see n. on *Her.* 4.99.

⁶¹⁷ Cf. Apollod. 3.9.2 (= Hes. fr. 72 M-W) Ἡσίοδος δὲ καὶ τινες ἕτεροι τὴν Ἀταλάντην οὐκ ἴασου ἀλλὰ Σχοινέως εἶπον, Εὐριπίδης δὲ Μαινάλου. The only surviving evidence from Euripidean tragedy to support Apollodorus' claim is line 1162 from the *Phoenissae* (τῇ καλλιτόξῳ μητρὶ Μαινάλου κόρη). Even so, the ambiguity around the interpretation of the genitive *Μαινάλου* remains. According to the ancient Scholion ad loc. (followed by Craik (1988) and Mastronarde (1998) ad loc. -the latter with some

Phaedra's choice for the Meleager-Atalanta love affair is rather unusual. With the only other exception of the *Metamorphoses*, where the love affair of Meleager with Atalanta appears imbedded within the narrative of the Calydonian hunt (*Met.* 8.260-546), Ovid in his work, especially in his elegiac production, follows the two most popular versions of Atalanta's erotic involvement with either Hippomenes⁶¹⁸ or Milanion.⁶¹⁹ Especially, in the single *Heroides*, this is the only reference to the Meleager-Atalanta love affair,⁶²⁰ while in the double letters, Atalanta is mentioned twice (*Her.* 16.265f.⁶²¹ and 21.123f.) in connection with Hippomenes and his trick with the apples.⁶²²

Given the popularity of the Milanion-Atalanta story the substitution of Meleager for Milanion is peculiar, but Meleager, as we have seen above, offers much greater potential for comparison with Hippolytus. In any case, however, I believe that Milanion is not totally removed from the picture. In a similar way to Procris and Myrrha in the two preceding *exempla*, Milanion remains present at the background of the story through his absence. His suppressed presence is bound to recall the paradigmatic use of his story by Propertius in the opening poem of his *Monobiblos* (Prop. 1.1.9-16), where the poet employs the Milanion-Atalanta story in order to mark the contrast between his erotic suffering and Milanion's success in winning over Atalanta's love through his persistent endurance. The programmatic character of the *exemplum* has long now been noticed.⁶²³ A close examination of the intertextual character of the *exemplum* proves to be instructive for my discussion. While Milanion's erotic suffering is likely to have been modelled on a Hellenistic source,⁶²⁴ the archaic style of the reference - compared with the similar treatment of Milanion by Ovid and Gallus in Verg. *Ecl.* 10.56ff. - most likely suggests the poetry of Gallus as a common source.⁶²⁵ Yet, the underlying common theme of "amatory hunt" as a cure for love ultimately looks back to the Euripidean *Hippolytus*.

reservation) *Μαινάλου* is more likely to refer to the Arcadian mountain, where Atalanta lived as a huntress, and not to Atalanta's father. If this is the case, then Apollodorus' claim is based on a misreading of the Euripidean text. Whether or not Apollodorus had this line in mind cannot be determined, since he must have had a much wider range of sources at his disposal. In any case, Apollodorus (3.8.1) also mentions a certain Maenalus, son of the Arcadian king Lycaon, who gave his name to the homonymous Arcadian mountain (cf. Hellenic. fr. 162 Jacoby, Paus. 8.3.4f., Steph. Byz. *Ethnica* (*Epit.*) p.426 lines 6-10, Σ on Pind. *Ol.* 9.88c.1f., Σ on Theocr. 1.124a.1ff., Σ on Ap. Rhod. 1.168, 769, Hdn. *De prosodia catholica* vol. 3.1, p.159 line 10). In this light, all references to Maenalus ultimately look back to Maenalus, the Arcadian hero. Further support for the association of *Maenalius* with *Maenalus*-the person is provided by Stephanus Byzantius, who derives the adjective *Μαινάλιος* /-ια from *Μαίναλος* the Arcas, and not the mountain.

⁶¹⁸ Cf. Ov. *Her.* 16.265f., 21.123f., *Met.* 10.560-707.

⁶¹⁹ Cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.2.29-32, *Ars* 2.185-92, 3.775f. Also cf. *Am.* 1.7.13f., where the reference is made to Atalanta alone in terms of her unique physical beauty.

⁶²⁰ There are actually two more references to Meleager in the single letters: a) *Her.* 3.92, where Briseis makes an erudite allusion to the epic version of Meleager's myth (see Barchiesi on 91-8) and, b) *Her.* 9.151, where Deianira suggests a parallel between her "heroic" suicide and her brother's (i.e. Meleager) heroism (for more on the complex character of this allusion see Casali ad loc).

⁶²¹ See Michalopoulos on *Her* 16.265.

⁶²² References to Meleager (however, in connection with his death by Althea) appear at Ov. *Rem.* 721f., *Ib.* 601f. and *Tr.* 1.7.17.

⁶²³ For bibliography on Prop. 1.1 see Whitaker (1983) 111 n.61. Also see Ross (1975) 59ff., Fedeli (1986) ad loc., Hodge and Buttimore (1977) and Baker (2000).

⁶²⁴ So Fedeli on Prop. 1.1.9 (p.72).

⁶²⁵ See Skutsch (1901) 15f., Ross (1975) 63f., Fedeli on Prop. 1.1.9, Janka on Ov. *Ars* 2.187f.

Milanion's erotic suffering as a hunter in the woods, by Atalanta's side, is reminiscent of Phaedra's hunting fantasies in the company of Hippolytus as described at Eur. *Hipp.* 215ff.⁶²⁶ Milanion in his desire to bend Atalanta's resistance effectively becomes a "male Phaedra". From this perspective, the Meleager-Atalanta *exemplum* (through Milanion's suppressed "presence") through this dense web of implicitness and erudition offers an additional intertextual link between Phaedra's letter and the Euripidean play.

Milanion offers a multiplicity of connections with Hippolytus. First, through hunting: Milanion also features -together with Hippolytus, Theseus and Cephalus- in Xenophon's list of renowned hunters who had been pupils of Centaur Chiron.⁶²⁷ A second connection is provided on grounds of incest. Following Apollodorus,⁶²⁸ Milanion was the son of Amphidamas, the brother of Iasus. According to the Arcadian mythological version, Atalanta was the daughter of Iasus, which makes her and Milanion first cousins; hence, their love affair was another case of family incest.⁶²⁹ A final link between the two stories is provided through the wrath of Venus, since Venus directed her wrath also against Atalanta, because the young huntress so obstinately rejected Milanion's love.⁶³⁰

Her. 4.101-4

Lines 101-4 are not merely a transitional section between the mythological list (93-100) and Phaedra's criticism of Theseus (109-28). Both couplets constitute an indispensable part of the mythological section and Phaedra is working hard to establish a solid connection. Line 101 is a concise recapitulation, or better an emphatic statement, of the rhetorical purpose of the list, while the careful placement of *nos* first in the hexameter, enhanced by the emphatic accumulation of *quoque iam primum*, infuses to Phaedra's request a certain sense of urgency. Phaedra is desperate to include both Hippolytus and herself in the company of the lovers mentioned above.

Phaedra's remark in the pentameter (line 102) that Hippolytus' woods without love are but a rustic place is much more than a complement to the hexameter. This opposition reflects the conflict between two incompatible visions of life: on the one hand, there is Hippolytus with his virginal life in the countryside, away from love and art, while, on the other, Phaedra proposes the fusion of the countryside with love, the combination of nature with art. Phaedra's suggestion for the compatibility of love with the countryside springs from her failure to read properly into Hippolytus' seclusion in the countryside. At Eur. *Hipp.* 73-87 Hippolytus

⁶²⁶ Skutsch (1901) 15f., Snell (1953) 298, Clausen on Verg. *Ecl.* 10.55. Cf. also Aristophanes' account of Milanion in *Lysistrata* (*Lys.* 781-96) (further on this see Janka on *Ox. Ars* 2.187f.).

⁶²⁷ Xen. *Cyneg.* 1.2.

⁶²⁸ Apollod. 3.9.1.

⁶²⁹ Fontenrose (1981) 180.

⁶³⁰ Cf. Musae. *Hero and Leander* 153-6, Eur. *Meleagrus* fr. 530.4f. Nauck². Following another mythological branch, Atalanta also insulted Venus, when she and Hippomenes made love in the goddess' temple (cf. *Ox. Met.* 10.686ff., Apoll. 3.9.2, Hyg. *Fab.* 6).

considers his seclusion in the “untouched meadow” as totally a-sexual and strongly denies any erotic element to it. The meadow for him is the only place, where chastity and virginity can be secured.⁶³¹ Phaedra, on the other hand, by focusing on all those elements, which Hippolytus tried to discard, interprets his preoccupation with hunting not as a symbolic act of celibacy, but rather in the context of “amatory hunt”. Her version of the woods is purely erotic.⁶³²

It is my view that Phaedra’s eroticized appreciation of Hippolytus’ (otherwise plain) woods is more than an invitation to him to join her in love; her comment looks far beyond the context of this specific reference. Phaedra’s suggestion for the combination of love with the countryside can be read as a metaliterary comment on the long standing (and much disputed) issue of the intersection between the bucolic / pastoral and elegiac ideal. As early as Theocritus, the tension between erotic suffering and the peacefulness of bucolic love lies at the heart of pastoral poetry. From exclusive opposition to mutual compatibility love remains central to the bucolic / pastoral discourse throughout the evolution of the genre.⁶³³ Phaedra through her employment of the three erotic mythological *exempla* is trying to infuse the woods with love and thus emphatically restate the intersection between the two discourses. Her combination between love and nature keeps up with the long-standing literary tradition of the eroticized pastoral countryside. From this perspective, the proposed combination of love with the countryside works as a metaliterary postscript to the preceding short mythological section. Her incitement to Hippolytus to take up a more energetic role effectively becomes a meta-literary guide on how she expects him to read and understand the mythological *exempla* mentioned above.

Phaedra’s rejection of *rusticitas* at line 102 proves to be a rather self-contradictory choice in view of her poetological claims near the beginning of her letter,⁶³⁴ where she argues that she comes to love inexperienced and totally unprepared (lines 25f.).⁶³⁵ The use of *rusticus* is an interesting case of *double entendre*, since the adjective, apart from its “rural”, “rustic”, connotations⁶³⁶ is also used to denote the “opposite of *urban*” and the “lack of urban sophistication”.⁶³⁷ Especially in erotic contexts, *rusticus* implies lack of sophistication and experience in sexual matters.⁶³⁸ In this light, Phaedra’s suggestion to Hippolytus to abandon the unsophisticated, love-less woods and give in to her erotic proposals essentially equates love

⁶³¹ See Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 79-81, Segal (1965) 122, Bremer (1975) 268-80, Pigeaud (1976) 3-7, Zeitlin (1985) 64, Roisman (1999) 27-30. Further on Hippolytus’ seclusion in the “untouched” meadow see p.28 n.194.

⁶³² Spentzou (2003) 72-4.

⁶³³ Further on the (in)compatibility between love and nature within the bucolic / pastoral genre see Curtius (1953) 187ff., 195ff., Fantazzi (1966) 176ff., Segal (1969) 74f., Papanghelis (1995) 43ff., Fantuzzi (2003) 3ff.

⁶³⁴ Cf. *Her.* 4.20, 25-7, 37.

⁶³⁵ Further on this see pp.19ff.

⁶³⁶ *OLD* s.v. 2a.

⁶³⁷ *OLD* 7b. Further on this meaning see Scivoletto (1976) 71 and Labate (1984) 41 n.44.

⁶³⁸ See also Pichon (1966) s.v. *rusticus*, Booth (1981) 2692. *rusticus* in the sense of “inexperienced in love” is very common in the *Heroides* (cf. 1.77, 16.222, 287, 17.12, 13, 186, 20.59).

with art.⁶³⁹ Phaedra is actually asking from Hippolytus to substitute her art of love for his virginal art of hunting, since it is the generic artlessness of the natural world, which accounts for his sexual inexperience. But in doing so, Phaedra contradicts her initial claims in erotic / artistic inexperience.

Phaedra rounds-off her mythological list with her reference to the well-established elegiac motif of *obsequium amoris* (lines 103f.).⁶⁴⁰ The image of the lover hunting with his beloved seems to have been generically inherent to elegy, possibly originating with Gallus.⁶⁴¹ An instance from Oenone's letter to Paris (*Her.* 5), where she describes her "amatory hunt" in the company of her beloved⁶⁴² and the advice given by the *praeceptor amoris* at Tib. 1.4.41⁶⁴³ offers sufficient evidence for the adaptation of the *obsequium* motif within the context of "amatory hunt".⁶⁴⁴ Moreover, the attribution of *comes* to Phaedra proves to be a fitting choice, since the term was commonly used for wives within the context of Roman coniugal *obsequium*.⁶⁴⁵ On the face of it, this can be seen as another instance, where Phaedra perceives her erotic affair with Hippolytus in terms of a marital relationship.⁶⁴⁶ The term, however, also carries certain ominous connotations, since it is attested in sepulchral epitaphs for those (wives in particular) who follow their beloveds or friends to death.⁶⁴⁷ Once again, the multi-layeredness of Phaedra's language and the complexity of her rhetoric ultimately outdo her attempts to fight against her prescribed literary destiny, since these dark shadows of doom hint at the tragic outcome of the story and seal the mythological section with death.⁶⁴⁸

To sum up, Phaedra's application of mythology in her letter to Hippolytus is a far cry from a short list of *exempla* strictly used for purposes of rhetorical ornamentation. In her hands myth raises above the level of a static "treasury of pictures";⁶⁴⁹ instead, it becomes, a powerful rhetorical tool, whose (mis)application manages to infuse her text with elements of intellectual wit, irony, and even self-contradiction. Both mythological lists are effectively integrated to the body of the letter in terms of content and rhetorical function. The selection of the mythological *exempla* is carefully calculated, while the overall structure of each section follows a complex, though clear layout, which proves to be perfectly balanced in every single detail. Nothing is left at random; everything is put at the right place serving a wide range of rhetorical purposes. Both

⁶³⁹ Spentzou (2003) 73.

⁶⁴⁰ Cf. e.g. Prop. 2.26.29ff., Ov. *Am.* 1.9.9-14, 2.11.49ff., 2.16.19-32. For a comprehensive list of parallels see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.9.9-14 and Yardley (1981) 64 with n.6.

⁶⁴¹ It has been suggested that the similarities between Verg. *Ecl.* 10.55-60, Tib. 1.4.47-50 and Prop. 1.1.9-16 are indicative of a Gallan origin (so Skutsch (1901) 15, Ross (1975) 89-91, DuQuesnay (1979) 62 n.214, see also Maltby on Tib. 1.4.47f. and Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.4.39f.).

⁶⁴² Ov. *Her.* 5.19f. *retia saepe comes maculis distincta tetendi; / saepe citos egi per iuga longa canes.*

⁶⁴³ Tib. 1.4.41 *neu comes ire neges.*

⁶⁴⁴ The fact that in all three passages *comes* appears in the same metrical *sedes* further supports my suggestion.

⁶⁴⁵ *ThLL* 3.1774.70-72. On coniugal *obsequium* see Treggiari (1991) 238-41.

⁶⁴⁶ Cf. *Her.* 4.17 with n., 62, 147.

⁶⁴⁷ Cf. *CLE* 439.2, 516.2, 1187.10, 1148.8, 1432.11, *ThLL* 3.1774.57-70, e.g. Verg *Aen.* 4.667, Hor. *Carm.* 2.17.12, Ov. *Am.* 3.9.65, *Tr.* 1.6.20. Also see Gibson on Ov. *Ars* 3.17f.

⁶⁴⁸ For the sinister import of the *exempla* in the list see Jacobson (1974) 153f. and Pearson (1980) 118 n.23.

⁶⁴⁹ von Albrecht (1996) 646.

mythological lists resound with intertextual exchanges, in particular from the Euripidean tragedy. Phaedra's choice and her employment of the specific mythological *exempla* betrays her new elegiac authority, as she tries to accommodate some well-known stories from Greek tragedy⁶⁵⁰ in the elegiac code.⁶⁵¹ Nevertheless, Phaedra through her ingenious manipulation and her creative re-working manages to overcome the danger of slavish imitation. In the end, she offers an unmistakably fresh use of myth, distinctive for its appropriateness and effectiveness for her rhetorical needs of persuasion. As Spoth nicely puts it: "Phaedras skrupellose Rhetorik isoliert Fragmente mythographischen Materials und ordnet sie kaleidoskopisch um, zu verblüffend neuen, elegischen Mustern."⁶⁵²

3.2 Ov. *Her.* 8.65-82

Hermione resorts to the use of mythological *exempla* only once in her letter (lines 65-82). Myth is employed primarily to facilitate her integration to her family, since Hermione sees her current misfortune within the wider context of an inescapable fate, which runs through the female members of the house of Tantalus. Her abduction by Neoptolemus is the latest addition to a long series of female rapes, and as such it guarantees her entry to the family of Tantalus. With regard to the letter's structure, this short mythological list balances Hermione's earlier digression on Orestes' descent from the house of Pelops (lines 47-56) and offers Hermione at the same time the opportunity to associate herself with Orestes on grounds of common descent.

Lines 65-82 (in parts or as a whole) have caused considerable uneasiness among scholars in terms of authenticity⁶⁵³ with the main argument against Ovidian authorship concerning primarily certain so-called "un-Ovidian" features of diction and metre.⁶⁵⁴ Peter Knox in his most recent discussion of the passage further advances Palmer's suggestion⁶⁵⁵ by considering lines 71f. and 75-82 as scribal interpolations.⁶⁵⁶ In his view, the text as it stands poses certain difficulties which are unsurpassable both in terms of diction and content; hence, he concludes, lines 65-82 more than likely betray a hand other than Ovid's. Against such reservations, it is the premise of my argument that the short mythological list at lines 65-82, with the exception of lines 71f., constitutes an indispensable part of the letter.⁶⁵⁷ All linguistic and metrical rarities (not an uncommon feature in Ovid's *Heroides*) and the possibility of minor interpolation should not necessarily invalidate the section as a whole. In my view,

⁶⁵⁰ For information on the dramatization of these stories see Curley (1999) 168 n.46.

⁶⁵¹ Cf. Curley (1999) 168: "Phaedra's paradigms activate tragedy by blending the very codes of elegy and epic".

⁶⁵² Spoth (1992) 116 n.28.

⁶⁵³ See Palmer on Ov. *Her.* 8.71 and 75, Courtney (1965) 65, Sabot (1981) 2556f., Knox (1995) 8-11, Williams (1997) 113-19.

⁶⁵⁴ For a full bibliographical list on the linguistic and metrical abnormalities in this section see Williams (1997) 133 n.6.

⁶⁵⁵ Palmer on *Her.* 8.71.

⁶⁵⁶ Knox (1998) 8-11.

⁶⁵⁷ My discussion is in line with Williams (1997), esp. 113-9.

appropriateness of content and rhetorical efficiency constitute a much sounder platform for critical evaluation. Hence, the combined examination of rhetorical effectiveness with close stylistic and metrical analysis has much more to offer towards a better understanding of the issues involved.

Critics who reject the incorporation of the mythological list into the main body of the letter also argue against Hermione's inclusion in her family, which they find precariously founded on factual inaccuracies. These so-called "factual inaccuracies", however, turn out to be nothing more than a misguided reading, which results from the disregard of a vital poetic principle, namely the differentiation between the poet and his *persona* in the poem. Williams is right in underlining the importance of maintaining this crucial distinction between Ovid and his heroine at all times.⁶⁵⁸ Ovid is not Hermione.⁶⁵⁹ In the case of the *Heroides*, in particular, the concept of the literary *persona* offers a sound methodological tool, which contributes to a better understanding of the poems by sustaining the literariness and the highly intertextual character of the work.⁶⁶⁰

Hermione, deprived of both her parents from an early age,⁶⁶¹ is struggling to restore her connection with her mother through the existence of a common family past. In this attempt, her fragmentary memory,⁶⁶² her fantasy, her romantic idealism,⁶⁶³ and above all her need for erotic persuasion often fight against factual accuracy. In her desperation, Hermione does not hesitate even to (re)invent, if necessary, possible connections between herself and the other members of her family. Hence, all these (minor or major) "factual inaccuracies" should be seen as reflections of her turbulent psychological condition. Hermione's view of reality is one of extreme relativity, where nothing is fixed and stable. Past and present are constantly under her creative adaptation, each time according to the rhetorical needs at hand. In Williams' words "strict factual accuracy may matter less than tactical need".⁶⁶⁴ From this viewpoint, the so-called "genealogical distortions" or the "tenuous" links between family members should be treated strictly on grounds of rhetorical effectiveness and psychological appropriateness.

In terms of structure this short mythological list comprises an introductory couplet (65f.), which contains the main proposition,⁶⁶⁵ three mythological *exempla* (67-74),⁶⁶⁶ a digression on Hermione's separation from her mother (75-80) and a concluding couplet (81f.). Each *exemplum* is allocated a couplet, and the concluding couplet (81f.) through its close

⁶⁵⁸ Williams (1997) 117.

⁶⁵⁹ Cf. Knox (1995) 10: "O[vid] could not have blundered so: genealogical relationships were the sort of material he took great care with."

⁶⁶⁰ On the concept of the literary *persona* see the bibliography cited in Volk (2005) 85 n.12 and Davis (1989). Especially on the role of the heroines' personal perspective in the collection see pp. 4f.

⁶⁶¹ Cf. *Her.* 8.89f. *parua mea sine matre fui; pater arma ferebat; / et duo cum uiuant, orba duobus eram.*

⁶⁶² Cf. *Her.* 8.75 *uix equidem memini, memini tamen.*

⁶⁶³ On Hermione's romantic approach to reality see Williams (1997) 120f.

⁶⁶⁴ Williams (1997) 119.

⁶⁶⁵ The introduction of a mythological list with a rhetorical question is not uncommon in Ovid, cf. e.g. *Ov. Ars* 1.475, 2.185.

⁶⁶⁶ For the excision of lines 71f. see below with details.

correspondence (verbal and thematic) with the introductory one rounds-off the list effectively with ring-composition.

Hermione's reference to the female members of her family through the iunctura *Tantalides matres* has caused much controversy. Palmer translated *matres* as "matrons" and argued for the inappropriate application of the term, since both Hermione and Hippodamia at the time of their abduction were not *matres*, but *puellae*.⁶⁶⁷ Palmer may be right for Hippodamia (for more on this see below), but clearly this was not the case for Hermione, who mentions her betrothal to Orestes (either explicitly or implicitly) constantly throughout her letter.⁶⁶⁸ Faced with the uncertainty about her status (virginal or marital) at the time of her seduction by Jupiter Palmer carefully avoids any reference to Leda,⁶⁶⁹ while his comment about Helen is of no interest, since lines 71f. are spurious. In my view, there seems to be nothing wrong in the application of *matres*, given that the term is used here generically in the sense "ladies", "respected women." This rather rare and formal use of the term,⁶⁷⁰ is, nevertheless, in accordance with the elevated context of Hermione's reference to her family's past.

But it was Hermione's employment of *Tantalides*, which caused even more suspicion. Her use of the patronymic, which has been criticized as "inexact"⁶⁷¹ and "odd(ly),"⁶⁷² is a striking choice, but surely not a mistaken one. This is not the case of a genealogical blunder, since *Tantalides* is used in prolepsis. None of the women named in the list was a Tantalid, because of her descent from Tantalus; instead, Leda, Hippodamia and Helen received this title through their marriage to a member of Tantalus' family (Jupiter, Pelops and Menelaus respectively). Hermione follows in the same steps through her engagement with Orestes. Hence, taking *Tantalides* as *ἐκ τοῦ ἀποτελέσματος* removes any possible incongruities, and at the same time it underlines Hermione's inclusion to Tantalus' family.⁶⁷³

Another thorny issue is the authenticity of the reference to Helen's abduction by Theseus at lines 71f. Most modern editors rightly bracket the couplet as an interpolation, since a number of verbal and primarily metrical irregularities offer valid ground against its Ovidian authorship.⁶⁷⁴ Goold's⁶⁷⁵ brief remark that the reference to Helen at lines 71f. brings an irrelevant interruption to the letter's argumentation points to the right direction, but it needs further justification. Beyond any doubt her abduction by Theseus secures Helen a place in a list

⁶⁶⁷ Palmer on *Her.* 8.66: "Hermione and Hippodamia were not *matres*, "matrons", when carried off, but *puellae*; the same remark applies to Helen when carried off by Theseus."

⁶⁶⁸ Cf. *Her.* 8.8, 15f., 18, 25f., esp. 29-36, 41, 95f.

⁶⁶⁹ There seems to have been a certain ambiguity concerning the exact sequence of Leda's love affair with Jupiter and her marriage to Tynareus. In most versions of the story her seduction by the god precedes her marriage. For a list of literary sources see Frazer (1921) 2.23f. n.7.

⁶⁷⁰ For more details see n. on *Her.* 8.66.

⁶⁷¹ Jacobson (1978) 54 n.18.

⁶⁷² Knox (1995) 10.

⁶⁷³ My reading makes Delz's (1986) 83 emendation of *Tantalides matres* to *Tantalidum matres* also unnecessary.

⁶⁷⁴ The awkward metrics in the hexameter has been first pointed out by Palmer (1898) ad loc. For further discussion see bibliography in Williams (1997) 133 n. 6, to his list add Sedlmayer (1881) 32f. on lines 69f.

⁶⁷⁵ Goold (1974) 479.

of rapes. However, this is where similarity ends, since in the rest of the mythological *exempla* erotic abduction is intrinsically linked with guile and deception: Jupiter is transformed into a swan, Pelops beats Oenomaus in the chariot race with the help of Myrtilus, Paris conceals his erotic passion for Helen under his role as a guest. Helen's abduction by Theseus, on the very contrary, is a clear-cut case of male violence over female frailty and involves no trail of deception.⁶⁷⁶ Furthermore, given the great importance of Helen's abduction by Paris in the letter, a reference to her earlier abduction by Theseus would undercut its impact and it would weaken significantly Hermione's implied parallel with her mother. Besides, within the context of my interpretation of the use of *Tantalides* at line 66 Theseus does not fulfill the conditions of entry, since (contrary to Jupiter, Pelops and Menelaus) he does not belong to the house of Tantalus. Finally, the clumsiness of the repetition of *Taenaris* in two consecutive lines (72f.) is a further indication of a possible interpolation.⁶⁷⁷

A possible explanation for the insertion of the couplet, apart from the popularity of the story of Helen's rape by Theseus, could be found on grounds of structural balance within the mythological list. All *exempla* in the list involve rape, but it is only the third, and last one (Helen's abduction by Paris), which also entails a reference to the recovery of the victim. Hence, the introduction of Helen's rape by Theseus could be seen as an attempt to restore the balance in the list, since with the insertion of the Helen-Theseus story the list now comprises four *exempla*, which can be organized in pairs (in ascending order): the first two (Leda and Hippodamia, lines 67-70) on the abduction of Tantalid women, and the last two (Helen-Theseus, Helen-Paris, lines 71-4) on the recovery of the female victims. The close intertextual association of Hermione's letter with *Her.* 16, where Paris reminds Helen of her abduction by Theseus,⁶⁷⁸ offers perhaps a further explanation for the inclusion of lines 71f. It is possible that the interpolator had in mind Paris' determination to imitate Theseus' example, through which he could include himself, along with the Dioscuri and Theseus, in a mythological list about erotic abduction.⁶⁷⁹

Leda – Jupiter (lines 67f.)

For Hermione to open her short mythological list with Leda seems to be an obvious choice, since Leda stands first in the long line of her female ancestors. Her choice becomes all the more appropriate in view of her attempt to underscore the divine origin of her family, since Leda's seduction by Jupiter practically establishes Jupiter as the head of the family. It becomes clear right from the very beginning that Hermione's reference to her family counter-balances

⁶⁷⁶ Cf. e.g. Apollod. 3.10.7, Plut. *Thes.* 31-2, Hyg. *Fab.* 79. See also the list of sources cited in Frazer (1921) 2.25 n.2.

⁶⁷⁷ Knox (1995) 10.

⁶⁷⁸ *Her.* 16.149-54 with Michalopoulos on 149.

⁶⁷⁹ *Her.* 16.327-30: *nam sequar Aegidae factum fratrumque tuorum. / exemplo tangi non propiore potes. / te rapuit Theseus, geminas Leucippidas illi; / quartus in exemplis adnumerabor ego* with Michalopoulos ad loc.

her reference to Orestes' divine origin earlier in the letter (lines 47f.). Hermione is no inferior to her loved one. Orestes can boast for having Jupiter as the founder of his family, and so can she. In fact, Hermione compared to Orestes proves to be in a much more privileged position, since she comes second from Jupiter (Jupiter is her grandfather), while Orestes is much further down the line of genealogical succession (fifth from Jupiter). Hermione's striking avoidance to mention Leda by name further underlines her close association with Jupiter. In a very Hellenistic manner, Leda is not identified by name but through her erotic involvement with Jupiter; hence, all emphasis shifts from her to Jupiter and his deception (66 *mendacia cycni*, 67 *in plumis delituisse Iouem*).

Throughout her letter Hermione is striving to establish herself as a "second Helen," leading a life, which effectively repeats her mother's life. Leda's emphatic placement as first in the mythological list helps to establish the association not only between Hermione and Leda, but also with Helen. A comparative reading with the exchange of letters between Paris and Helen throws further light into this matter.⁶⁸⁰ In fact, Hermione's association with Leda dates back to Vergil's *Aeneid*, where Hermione is called *Ledaea*.⁶⁸¹ This is exactly how Paris addresses Helen at the opening of his letter,⁶⁸² while in two further instances in the letter Helen is called *filia Ledae*.⁶⁸³ In this light, Leda becomes the meeting point of both daughter and grand-daughter, thus strengthening their association.

A further similarity is provided through Helen's reference to Leda with regard to her divine ancestry. Like Hermione, who tries to balance her reference to Orestes' high birth with a similar reference to her own family, in her reply to Paris (*Her.* 17.51-65) Helen also tries to outdo Paris' boastful claim about his high birth (*Her.* 16.175-204)⁶⁸⁴ with a reference to the divine origin of her family.⁶⁸⁵ The similarities between the two letters are noteworthy. Both Helen and Hermione establish Jupiter as the head of their family through his erotic involvement with Leda, while both portray Leda as the innocent and credulous victim of Jupiter's trickery.⁶⁸⁶ Furthermore, Helen also refers to Paris as fifth to Jupiter;⁶⁸⁷ however, in her case the reference is made only to emphasize by contrast her closer descent from Jupiter, as opposed to Hermione's positive reference to Orestes' high birth (*Her.* 8.48).

⁶⁸⁰ See especially Williams' (1997) 121f. intra-textual reading of *Her.* 8 in connection with *Her.* 16. Nevertheless, Williams does not consider intra-textuality as part of Ovid's poetic agenda in the collection. For an opposite view, which sees the heroines as members of a writing and reading community within the collection and consequently values intra-textuality as a fundamental poetic principle in the composition of the letters see now Fulkerson (2005) 1-18.

⁶⁸¹ Cf. Virg. *Aen.* 3.327 *Ledaeam Hermionen*.

⁶⁸² *Ov. Her.* 16.1f.: *Hanc tibi Priamides mitto, Ledaea, salutem, / quae tribui sola te mihi dante potest* with Michalopoulos on line 1.

⁶⁸³ *Ov. Her.* 16.85 *pulchrae filia Ledae*, 294f. *uix fieri, si sunt uires in semine morum, / et Iouis et Ledae filia casta potest*.

⁶⁸⁴ Cf. esp. *Her.* 16.175f. *Pliada, si quaeres, in nostra gente Iouemque / inuenies, medios ut taceamus auos*.

⁶⁸⁵ For the heroines' concern about their ancestry in the collection see Jacobson (1974) 399.

⁶⁸⁶ Cf. *Her.* 17.55 *Leda... cycno decepta, 56 falsam gremio credula fouit auem* with Michalopoulos ad loc.

⁶⁸⁷ Cf. *Her.* 17.59f. (...) *sed qui tibi Gloria magna est / quintus, is a nostro nomine primus erit*.

A close examination of the references to Leda's affair with Jupiter in Roman elegy (and Ovid in particular) throws further light to the appropriateness of the *exemplum* in Hermione's list. In the majority of cases, Leda (often in the company of Helen)⁶⁸⁸ is employed as an example of rare female beauty.⁶⁸⁹ I believe that Hermione in her reference to Leda is well aware of this association. Physical appearance becomes a further link which, in addition to genealogy and erotic abduction, holds the three female figures (Leda, Helen, Hermione) together in the list. Female beauty, passed on from mother to daughter and from daughter to grand-daughter, guarantees continuity between the female members of the family. Hermione,⁶⁹⁰ just like Leda⁶⁹¹ and Helen,⁶⁹² was renowned for her beauty, ever since the Homeric epics; her allegations for the contrary later in her letter are nothing but mere flattery to Helen.⁶⁹³

Almost all references to Leda's exquisite beauty in elegy appear in connection with her abduction by Jupiter.⁶⁹⁴ Leda often features in lists of Jupiter's erotic infidelities.⁶⁹⁵ Hermione's emphasis on Jupiter's deceptive transformation into a swan is in accordance with the vast majority of the relevant mythological references in elegy,⁶⁹⁶ where erotic guile is associated with male deception and female victimization.⁶⁹⁷ In doing so, Hermione manages to emphasize those aspects of the myth's conventional application in elegy, which mostly befit her argument.

⁶⁸⁸ Ov. *Am.* 1.10.1-4 *Qualis ab Eurota Phrygiis auecta carinis / coniugibus belli causa duobus erat, / qualis erat Lede, quam plumis abditus albis / callidus in falsa lusit adulter aue*, and *Ars* 3.251-4 *non mihi uenistis, Semele Ledeue, docendae, / perque fretum falso, Sidoni, uecta bovue, / aut Helene, quam non stulte, Menelae, reposcis, / tu quoque non stulte, Troice raptor, habes*.

⁶⁸⁹ Cf. Prop. 1.13.29f. with Camps and Fedeli, Ov. *Am.* 1.10.3f., 2.4.41f. with McKeown, *Her.* 16.85.

⁶⁹⁰ Cf. e.g. Hom. *Od.* 4.13-4 *ἐπεὶ δὴ τὸ πρῶτον ἐγείνατο παῖδ' ἐρατεινήν, / Ἑρμιόνην, ἣ εἶδος ἔχε χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης*, Hes. fr. 204.94 West *ἢ τέκεν Ἑρμιόνην καλλίσφυρ[ο]ν ἐν μεγάροισιν / ἀελπτον*, Sapph. fr. 197 Page *ὡς γὰρ ἀντίον εἰσίδω σ[ε], / φαίνεται μ' οὐδ'] Ἑρμιόνα τεαύ[ε]τα / [ἔμμεναι.] ξάνθαι δ' Ἑλένας σ' εἰσ[κ]ῆν / [οὐδ' ἐν ἄει]κες*, Prop. 1.4.6-7 *Spartanae referas* (sc. formam) *laudibus Hermionae / et quascumque tulit formosi temporis aetas*, 1.13.29f. (in connection with Helen) *nec mirum, cum sit Ioue dignae proxima Ledaee / et Ledaee partu gratior, una tribus*.

⁶⁹¹ Cf. *Her.* 16. 85 *pulchrae filia Ledaee*.

⁶⁹² Both Greek and Latin literature are replete with references to "beautiful Helen" as the female beauty *par excellence* (cf. e.g. Eur. *Hec.* 269: *ἡ Τυνδαρίς γὰρ εἶδος ἐκπρεπεστάτη*, 635f *Ἑλένας ἐπὶ λέκτρα, τὰν / καλλίσταν ὁ χρυσοφαῆς / Ἄλιος ἀγάξει*, Gorg. *Hel.* 4 (*ισόθεον κάλλος*), Isoc. 10.14, Theoc. 18.20-31, Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.7 *κάλλει διαπρεπῆς*). Homer, in particular, mentions Helen's sublime and incomparable beauty in several instances (*Il.* 3.228, 423, *Od.* 4.305, 15.106 *διὰ γυναικῶν, Il.* 9.139f. *Τρωϊάδας δὲ γυναικάς ἐείκοσιν αὐτὸς ἐλέσθω / αἶ κε μετ' Ἀργεῖην Ἑλένην κάλλισται ἔωσιν*, also Sapph. fr. 195 Page *ἄ γὰρ πόλυ περσκέθοισα / κάλλος [ἀνθρώπων Ἑλένα*, Theocr. 18.20 *οἷα Ἀχαιιάδων γαῖαν πατεῖ οὐδεμὶ' ἄλλα*). Helen is also renowned for her beauty in Latin literature (cf. e.g. Prop. 2.3.32, 3.14.19, Ov. *Met.* 8.99, Hyg. *Fab.* 78.1.3, 92.3.5). In the *Heroides*, even Oenone, Helen's rival, cannot help acknowledging Helen's physical supremacy (*Her.* 5.125 *sit facie quamuis insignis*).

⁶⁹³ *Her.* 8.99f. *te tamen esse Helenen, quod eras pulcherrima, sensi; / ipsa requirebas, quae tua nata foret!*

⁶⁹⁴ The only exception is Ov. *Am.* 2.4.41f., where the reference to Leda is made with regard to her long, black hair.

⁶⁹⁵ Further on Ovid's use of Jupiter's multiple erotic transformations as paradigm for the successful philanderer see Davis (1989) 72-86. For a list of such catalogues see McKeown on *Am.* 1.3.21-4.

⁶⁹⁶ Cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.3.22 *et quam* (sc. Leda) *fluminea lusit adulter aue*, 1.10.3f. *qualis erat Lede, quam plumis abditus albis / callidus in falsa lusit adulter aue*, 3.12.33 *Iuppiter aut in aues aut se transformat in aurum*, *Her.* 17.56 *dat mihi Leda Iouem cygno decepta parentem, / quae falsam gremio credula fouit auem*

⁶⁹⁷ Cf. e.g. Greene's (1998) 74ff. excellent discussion of Ov. *Am.* 1.3 in terms of the poem's gendered rhetoric and the poet's deceptive use of myth.

Leda is not only a victim of rape, but also a victim of male deception. More importantly, her abduction comes as a result of both male violence and deception. Hence, she offers the perfect example for both Hermione (and Helen).

Despite Hermione's attempts to make the most out of her reference to Leda, her choice of the specific myth is somewhat problematic. There is no doubt that Leda's abduction by Jupiter sets the archetypal pattern for the rest of the Tantalid women. Nevertheless, the story *per se* proves to be a rather unsuitable choice, especially in respect of its validity. Ovid in his *Amores* 3.12 complains about his mistress' popularity with men; a popularity gained, as he claims, through the publication of her beauty in his poetry. His poetic work is the cause of his suffering. In an attempt to overturn his current misfortune by attacking the idealised portrayal of his mistress he argues that his poetic account of Corinna is pure poetic fiction, the product of his imagination. Myth is the material appropriate to poetry as opposed to the truthfulness of history. The poets' creative imagination knows no boundaries; there are no limits to poetic license. The poet cites in support of his claim a long catalogue of some well-known myths, which are considered to be the fruit of poetic imagination, without the slightest relevance to reality.⁶⁹⁸ Jupiter's erotic transformations appear in the list, with his seduction of Leda mentioned first.⁶⁹⁹ But if the stories told by the poets are treated strictly in terms of poetic creativity, then myth becomes just a literary device. Hence, the fictitious character of the reference to Leda's rape by Jupiter seriously undermines the validity of the story, which in turn is degraded to being merely a literary falsehood.

Ovid is not alone in considering the Leda-Jupiter affair as nothing more than a poetic lie. In fact, the Ovidian reference belongs to a long-standing tradition of disbelief in this myth. The Euripidean treatment of the story, in particular, is very useful for my discussion. In Euripides, in the majority of cases,⁷⁰⁰ the story of Leda's intercourse with Jupiter, disguised as a swan, is either denied or severely questioned, because of its extraordinary character.⁷⁰¹ In my view, Hermione's employment of Leda's myth is not devoid of such connotations of disbelief. Either because of a misunderstanding or because she is consciously picking up the allusions present in the Euripidean text, Hermione employs Leda's myth with a certain degree of disbelief. Moreover, the use of *mendacia* also carries implications of poetic falsehood. Even if

⁶⁹⁸ In his employment of the long mythological catalogue Ovid was undoubtedly influenced by rhetorical exercises and mythological sourcebooks. The attack against a story in terms of being a poetic fiction draws heavily on the rhetorical exercise of *anaskeue*, practiced in the rhetorical schools. Further on the possible rhetorical influence on *Am.* 3.12 and Ovid's own arrangement of the mythological catalogue see McKeown (1979).

⁶⁹⁹ *Ov. Am.* 3.12.33f. *Iuppiter aut in aues aut se transformat in aurum / aut secat imposta uirgine taurus aquas.*

⁷⁰⁰ Cf. e.g. *Eur. Hel.* 256-61, 1145f., *IA* 793-800.

⁷⁰¹ Stinton (1976) 75-9 argues that any disbelief expressed in the Euripidean text does not concern the validity of Leda's story as a whole, but rather its bizarre details. See also Jacob (1998) 50-5. The Ovidian Hermione misreads the Euripidean text. She fails to see the irony and the correspondence of the mythological reference to the specific context each time; hence, she takes Euripides' disbelief for granted. For more on Helen's birth see Bethe *RE* 7 (1912) s.v. *Helene* 2.2826f.

she knows that a reference to Leda might weaken her argumentation, Hermione is determined to inscribe herself to the long line of her family history properly, starting with Leda.

Hippodamia – Pelops (lines 69f.)

With the story of Hippodamia's abduction by Pelops Hermione turns to her father's side of the family. The reference to Pelops is not unexpected; Hermione in many occasions throughout her letter identifies herself and Orestes as members of the house of Pelops.⁷⁰² Furthermore, Pelops' erotic affair with Hippodamia fits perfectly well in the list by being a rape story. Nevertheless, objections have been raised concerning its appropriateness. Fairly recently Knox has athetized the couplet, primarily on grounds of contextual irrelevance arguing for the inappropriateness of Pelops' presence in the list; to use his own words: "the entire couplet is out of place in this context."⁷⁰³ His main argument is that Pelops -contrary to the rest of the *exempla*- is not involved into a story of rape. Hippodamia was not the victim of Pelops' abduction; she was given, instead, to him as a prize for his victory in a chariot race against Oenomaus, Hippodamia's father. The case is not as clear-cut as it may initially seem. The fact that Hippodamia was offered to Pelops as a prize does not necessarily exclude abduction. Apollodorus' account of the story, the fullest surviving version, preserves a detailed account of the chariot race.⁷⁰⁴ Oenomaus, indeed, offered his daughter to the winner of the race; there is, however, a crucial detail, which should be taken into account. Hippodamia was not offered as prize to the victorious suitor after the end of the race.⁷⁰⁵ Instead, each potential suitor would take Hippodamia before the race and with her on his chariot he would race against Oenomaus covering the distance from Elis to the Corinthian Isthmus.⁷⁰⁶ Oenomaus would then pursue them in full armour and claim his daughter back by killing defeated suitors. From this perspective, the chariot race was effectively a reiteration each time of Oenomaus' attempt to recuperate his ravished daughter. Initially Hippodamia became the suitor's prey, a victim of abduction and then the prize in a chariot competition. The suitors were asked to maintain their possession against Oenomaus, who played the role of the avenger. In this light, Hippodamia's erotic affair with Pelops becomes essentially a story of erotic abduction, and there seems to be nothing objectionable to its integration in the list.⁷⁰⁷

⁷⁰² Cf. *Her.* 8.27 *quod auus nobis idem Pelopeius Atreus, 47 tu quoque habes proauum Pelopem Pelopisque parentem, 81 ne non Pelopeia credar.*

⁷⁰³ Knox (1995) 10. He rejects the couplet also on grounds of its metrical peculiarities.

⁷⁰⁴ Apollod. *Epit.* 2.4-6. For a full list of literary sources see Frazer (1921) 2.157. n.4 and Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.209f.

⁷⁰⁵ For the literary motif of games with a woman as prize see Michalopoulos on *Ov. Her.* 16.263f.

⁷⁰⁶ Cf. Diod. Sic. 4.73.3.5, Σ on Eur. *Or.* 990, Σ on Ap. Rhod. 1.752.

⁷⁰⁷ The fact that at *Ov. Ars* 2.5-8 the emphasis is put again on the heroine's abduction by Pelops is not coincidental (cf. also Prop. 1.2.19f.). The only two exceptions are *Ov. Am.* 3.2.15f., where the reference is made solely to Hippodamia's beauty, and *Her.* 16.266, where Paris refers to Hippodamia as the prize of a contest.

Hermione exploits every single detail, which can contribute to the unity and cohesion of the list. Pelops' presence in the list provides an interesting intratextual link with the Paris-Helen *exemplum* in the following lines. The connection between Pelops and Paris is provided primarily through their foreign origin. Pelops was Phrygian;⁷⁰⁸ and so was Paris.⁷⁰⁹ The reference to *peregrinis...rotis* at line 70 clearly alludes to his foreign descent. The association between Pelops and Paris is further exemplified by the structure of the mythological list. A more careful examination reveals how the list can be organized in pairs of twos in terms of gender:⁷¹⁰ Leda and Hippodamia (the female characters) are portrayed as abduction victims, while Pelops and Paris (the male characters) are associated through their Phrygian origin.

The association of Pelops with Paris is not new. An intratextual, comparative reading with Paris' letter to Helen (*Her.* 16) throws further light on Hermione's rhetorical strategy. Paris throughout his letter depicts himself as a fearless young man who would go to any lengths in order to be together with his beloved. No hardships, not even a war, can shake his determination.⁷¹¹ Paris expresses the wish to fight for Helen and win her as a prize of a competition, just like Pelops won Hippodamia.⁷¹² His metonymic reference to Pelops through *Phrygios...sinus* is clearly meant to stress their common origin, and thus further emphasize their close association. Hermione, like Paris, refers to Pelops using a similar metonymy (69 *peregrinis...rotis*), which calls for our close attention.⁷¹³ Hermione both succeeds and fails in her application of *peregrinus*. Her choice is successful in that it helps the allusion to Pelops' Phrygian origin without mentioning it openly; thus, she manages to avoid the adjective's usual implications of effeminacy and contempt.⁷¹⁴ On the other hand, however, *peregrinus* is an adjective with negative connotations in two respects. First, the adjective often appears in the context of erotic infidelity to denote an extramarital love affair.⁷¹⁵ Second, *peregrinus* is known for its legalistic undertones. The term was applied to foreigners whose marriage with Roman (and non-Roman) citizens with regard to the civil status of the offspring was in the middle of huge legal controversy during the Principate.⁷¹⁶ From this perspective, despite Hermione's attempt to gloss over Pelops' Phrygian identity, her use of *peregrinus* fails to remove completely any possible negative implication.

⁷⁰⁸ Cf. e.g. Pind. *Ol.* 1.23f., Soph. *Aj.* 1292, Pherec. *FGrH* 3F 37f. Jacoby, Prop. 1.2.19 *Phrygium*. Luc. *Menipp.* 14.19 (Tantalus). With the only exception of Ov. *Am.* 3.2.15-8, Pelops' foreign origin is mentioned in all references to him in elegy and in Ovid (cf. Prop. 1.2.19f., Ov. *Her.* 16.266, *Ars* 2. 5-8).

⁷⁰⁹ Cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.10.1f., *Ars* 1.53f.

⁷¹⁰ This offers another argument for the excision of couplet [71f.] from the list.

⁷¹¹ Cf. *Her.* 16.341-764.

⁷¹² Ov. *Her.* 16.265-8. The mythological *exempla* also comprise Hippomenes (and Atalanta) and Hercules (and Deianira). For more details see Michalopoulos ad loc.

⁷¹³ The pentameter *uecta peregrinis Hippodamia rotis* is an Ovidian adaptation of Prop. 1.2.20 *auecta externis Hippodamia rotis*. For Ovid's adaptation of the Propertian line see Knox (1995) 10, Janka on Ov. *Ars* 2.7f. For more see n. on *Her.* 8.70.

⁷¹⁴ See Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.103.

⁷¹⁵ Cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.18, Prop. 3.20.6, Ov. *Her.* 1.76 *peregrino captus amore*, 9.47 *peregrinos addis amores* with Casali, 12.111 *uirginitas facta est peregrine praeda latronis* with Bessone). In this sense, the use of *peregrinus amor* becomes almost synonymous to *externus amor*, which is conventionally used as a by-word for extramarital love (see Barchiesi on *Her.* 1.76).

⁷¹⁶ Treggiari (1991) 45-48.

Moreover, Oenomaus' failed attempt to claim his ravished daughter back and his murder by Pelops make Hermione's choice perhaps less effective in view of her attempt to be successfully restored back to her husband. This is surely not the message she is trying to get across. A further ominous aspect of the story concerns the final outcome of the Pelops-Hippodamia affair. According to the main mythological strand, Pelops and Hippodamia lived together in happiness and prosperity and had three (or six) sons. However, Hyginus preserves an alternative version, according to which the couple's common life ended in tragedy, since Hippodamia incited Atreus and Thyestes, her two children from Pelops, to kill Chrysippus, their step-brother. As a result, Pelops avenged Chrysippus' murder and killed Hippodamia.⁷¹⁷

In Roman elegy Hippodamia is not used exclusively as an example of rape, since all references to her abduction by Pelops are made in connection with her extraordinary physical appearance.⁷¹⁸ Propertius in his attack against the excessive use of cosmetics mentions Hippodamia among other mythical heroines as an example of unadorned beauty.⁷¹⁹ Ovid's reference to Hippodamia in his *Amores* is in a very similar context,⁷²⁰ as the poet likens himself to Pelops, who stood speechless at the sight of Hippodamia's stunning beauty. Such combination of exceptional physical appearance and erotic rape earn Hippodamia a place in the mythological list and make her a perfect parallel for Hermione.

Helen – Paris (lines 73f.)

Hermione's short mythological list reaches its climax with her reference to Paris' abduction of her mother. Not only is this the most recent case of rape in the family, but more importantly Hermione's current misfortune is the immediate aftermath of this incident. Hermione gives a significant twist to her application of myth. While in the previous two *exempla* she portrayed her female ancestors as victims of rape, now she moves from rape to the recuperation of the abducted. Helen is not mentioned as the victim of Paris' violence, but rather as the cause of the Trojan War. The shift of emphasis is effectively reflected on the grammar of the couplet. Phaedra's choice to convey the temporal sequence of events through the "past participle - verb" structure is significant, in that Helen's abduction is given through the past participle (*rapta*), while all weight is put on the verb. Helen's prominence is also reflected on the emphatic use of the prepositional clause *pro se* and on the fact that it is her, and not Menelaus, the subject of the verb governing the whole couplet (*Argolicas...uertit in arma manus* 74). The emphasis on Helen is convenient for Hermione's argumentation in two respects.

⁷¹⁷ Hyg. *Fab.* 85.4 *hunc* (sc. Chrysippum) *Atreus et Thyestes matris Hippodamiae nimpulsu interfecerunt; Pelops cum Hippodamiam argueret, ipsa se interfecit.* Also cf. Thuc. 1.9, Eur. *Chrysippus* (=TrGF Eur. fr. 838-44 Kannicht), Paus. 6.20.7, Tzetz. *Chil.* 1.415ff., Σ on Hom. *Il.* 2.105.

⁷¹⁸ For Hippodamia's exemplary beauty see also Diod. Sic. 4.73.5.2. Pelops also matched Hippodamia in beauty (see Apollod. *Epit.* 2.6, Σ on Eur. *Or.* 999.9f.).

⁷¹⁹ Prop. 1.2.19f. *nec Phrygium falso traxit candore maritum / aucta externis Hippodamia rotis* with Whitaker (1983) 114-5.

⁷²⁰ *Am.* 3.2.13-18, esp. 15f. *a, quam paene Pelops Pisaea concidit hasta, / dum spectat uultus, Hippodamia, tuos!*

First, Helen is the necessary link through which the hereditary theme of rape is reiterated and is passed on from the family's remote beginnings to the present. Second, and more importantly, Menelaus through his recuperation of Helen sets the perfect example for Orestes, who should imitate his father-in-law and claim Hermione back from Neoptolemus. Repeatedly throughout her letter Hermione urges Orestes to imitate Menelaus in the victorious return of his wife.⁷²¹ Her application of the Helen-Paris story with special emphasis on the restoration of the abducted wife is not uncommon in Roman elegy. Both Propertius⁷²² and Ovid⁷²³ complement their references to Helen's abduction with a reference to the Trojan War, which is treated in terms of Menelaus' attempt to take his wife back.⁷²⁴

The juxtaposition at the beginning of the hexameter of Spartan Helen with Trojan Paris through the careful placement of the adjectives of origin (73 *Taenaris Idaeo*) is remarkable. Hermione's metonymic use of *Taenaris* for Helen is interesting, since the adjective is extremely rare in Augustan poetry, but frequent in the *Heroides* in connection with Helen.⁷²⁵ Nevertheless, Hermione's particular choice for *Taenaris* also seems to carry with it certain ominous connotations, because of its associations with cape Taenarum, the southernmost point of Laconia, which was considered to be an entrance to the Underworld.⁷²⁶ The reading *Tyndaris*,⁷²⁷ instead of *Taenaris*, perhaps removes any difficulties caused by the gloomy connotations of *Taenaris*.⁷²⁸ At the same time, the patronymic picks up a reference made to Tyndareus earlier in her letter (lines 31f.), where Hermione refers to her betrothal (or marriage) to Orestes by her grandfather Tyndareus, during Menelaus' absence at Troy.⁷²⁹ Moreover, the association with Tyndareus is also very appropriate in terms of Helen's recuperation by Menelaus, since, according to the main mythological strand, it was Tyndareus who had enforced upon the suitors the pledge to protect Helen and her husband from any injury.⁷³⁰

Her. 8.75-82

Hermione complements her short mythological list with a digression on the last *exemplum*. This is not uncommon, since, as we have seen above, Phaedra in her letter to Hippolytus also concluded both mythological lists with complementary sections.⁷³¹ In like

⁷²¹ *Her.* 8.19-24, 41-2.

⁷²² Prop. 2.32.31f. with Whitaker (1983) 133.

⁷²³ Ov. *Am.* 1.10.1f. (echoing Prop. 1.2.19f., 1.3.1ff.), 2.12.17f.. Also cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.685-8, 3.253f.

⁷²⁴ For women as the cause of wars, and Helen in particular as the cause of the Trojan War see McKeown on *Am.* 2.12.17-26, *idem* on 2.12.17f.

⁷²⁵ For more on *Taenaris* see n. on *Her.* 8.73.

⁷²⁶ Further on this see n. on *Her.* 8.73.

⁷²⁷ For *Tyndaris* used for Helen, cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.12.17, *Her.* 5.91, 16.100 with Michalopoulos, 308, 17.120, *Ars* 1.746. Also see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 8.301.

⁷²⁸ Despite the plausibility of *Tyndaris*, I print *Taenaris*.

⁷²⁹ On the controversial issue of Hermione's betrothal (or marriage) to Orestes see nn. on *Her.* 8.9f. and 31-4.

⁷³⁰ Cf. Hes. fr. 204.78-92 M-W, Isoc. *Hel.* 40, Paus. 3.20.9, Apollod. 3.10.9, Ov. *Ars* 1.687f. See Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 12.6f.

⁷³¹ *Her.* 4.61-6 and 101-4.

manner, lines 75-82 constitute an integral part of the mythological list and in addition facilitate the transition from the mythological section to the rest of the poem. Palmer⁷³² was the first to express serious doubts about the Ovidian authenticity of lines 75-80 suggesting their excision (together with lines 71f.) as an interpolation. His principal objection concerned problems of content. In his view, Hermione's detailed account of her separation from her mother contradicts her claim to her fragmented memory. Palmer became even more suspicious in his examination of certain instances in the text (see below), where -in his opinion- the meaning is vague and inconsistent within the specific context. I find his approach completely misguided, primarily because he fails to take into consideration Hermione's state of mind and more importantly the very nature of her rhetoric. In his search for square logic Palmer completely disregards the intimate character of Hermione's memories.

Hermione complements her reference to Paris' abduction of Helen with a much more personal account of the story. Despite Palmer's claim to the contrary, there is actually no discontinuity between Hermione's reference to the arming of Greece and her account of her parting from her mother. In fact, it is the very same story, seen, however, from a different angle. What we have here is a shift of perspective rather than a change of subject matter. Myth is appropriated in terms of family affairs, as Hermione offers a personal insight into a major mythological ("historical" for her) event, the Trojan War, and its impact on her life. This is the personal account of the first victim of this war. For Hermione, Helen's abduction is not just the cause of a conflict, but above all the cause of family disaster. Hermione is the first victim of this disaster and she is now given the chance to speak. Through this highly emotional flashback Hermione merges myth with personal history, thus accomplishing a twofold goal: first, to inscribe herself in the history of her family; second, to raise the emotional tension in her letter.

Hermione's reference to her torn hair at her mother's departure reveals her understanding of the separation in terms of a definite separation imposed by death, since, according to Greek and Roman customs, the violent tearing of a woman's hair was a common practice and an essential part of the ritual lament.⁷³³ Despite the ominous connotations, however, Hermione's preoccupation with her physical appearance, even at the moment of her parting from her mother, could be seen as an expression of her female vanity.⁷³⁴ From this perspective, Hermione's ritual manifestation of wild grief and lament could be associated with the established elegiac *topos* of the enhancement of the *puella's* beauty through her disarranged hair. Dishevelled hair is a clear sign of a woman's abandonment by her beloved,⁷³⁵ but at the

⁷³² See Palmer on *Her.* 8.75, followed by Knox (1995) 10f. who extends the interpolation at least as far back as line 65.

⁷³³ See Alexiou (1974) 6 with nn. 22,23, to her list of literary parallels (n.27) add Aesch. *Pers.* 1056 (plucking out hair from beard), 1062, Soph. *Aj.* 634, Eur. *Alc.* 101-2, *Andr.* 826-7, 1209, *Supp.* 973-4, *El.* 150, *Hec.* 652-5, *Tro.* 279, *Hel.* 372-4. Also see Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 22-83 with bibliography. *pace* Knox on *Her.* 11.116 according to Roman rituals of lament the female members of the family were also expected to shear off their hair and leave them on the body of the deceased (cf. e.g. Cic. *Leg.* 2.64, Livy 1.13.1, Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.51, *Cons. ad Liv.* 98, 318, Luc. 2.36ff., Apul. *Met.* 5.11).

⁷³⁴ Williams (1997) 117f., also see Jacobson (1974) 53.

⁷³⁵ Fedeli on Prop. 3.6.9-10.

same time the disarray of hair is often a feature which adds further to the beauty of the beloved⁷³⁶ by offering “a sensual foretaste of the dishevelled pleasures of the night”.⁷³⁷ Besides, Hermione’s preoccupation with beauty became evident in the short mythological list through the implicit allusions to the exquisite beauty of her female ancestors (Leda, Hippodamia, Helen).

In terms of structure the mention of Leda by name and her prayers to “*her Jupiter*” (78 *suumque Iouem*) offer a strong link between the complementary section and the mythological list. The same purpose is served by the accumulation of Hermione’s family members at line 77 (*flebat auus Phoebique soror fratresque gemelli*).

With regard to the repetitions *equidem memini, memini tamen* (line 75) and “*sine me, me sine*” (line 80) Palmer treats them as nothing more than jingle,⁷³⁸ and also fails to understand the relevance of the genitive *timoris* (line 76). Once again he fails to take into consideration any sentimental value in Hermione’s recollection of the past. It is true that clarity of meaning becomes at times obscured by certain stylistic and metrical irregularities. These obscurities, however, should not be seen as the result of Hermione’s artistic deficiency, but rather as the reflection of her psychological turmoil. Hermione’s flashback to Helen’s departure paired by her acknowledgement of the lack of both parents in early childhood (lines 89-100) constitutes the emotional peak of her letter.⁷³⁹ In this light, *timoris* at line 76 is totally understandable within the context of fear, panic and distress experienced by Hermione at her abandonment by her mother. Fear fills the gap left behind by Helen. This sense of fear clearly reflects on the grammar and diction of the lines under examination. The section is thickly sown with repetitions (*omnia... / omnia* 75-6, “*sine me, me sine*” 80, *abis /...aberat* 80-1) which give away Hermione’s upset state of mind, while her carefully chosen vocabulary (*omnia luctus* 75, *plena timoris* 76, *flebat* 77, *orabat* 78, *scissa* 79, *clamabam* 80) is indicative of the sorrow and horror felt by Hermione at Helen’s departure. Far from being an awkward repetition or just a jingle, the repetition of “*sine me, me sine*” (80) underscores Hermione’s distress and further “suggests the disruption of domestic harmony when Helen leaves”.⁷⁴⁰ The chiasmic arrangement picks up the equally emphatic repetition of *equidem memini, memini tamen* (75). Moreover, the double repetition of *memini* (emphatic by position over the third foot strong caesura) offers to Hermione’s account a sense of autopsy, of first-hand knowledge of the events.⁷⁴¹ In re-telling these horrible events Hermione is actually experiencing again the fear and anguish of the past.

⁷³⁶ Further on the disarray of hair as an enhancement of the *puella*’s beauty see Greene (1998) 86 citing Curran (1984) 84, McKeown on *Am.* 1.7.11f.

⁷³⁷ Verducci (1985) 250.

⁷³⁸ Palmer on *Her.* 8.75.

⁷³⁹ Cf. Jacobson (1974) 55f.: “But undoubtedly the high point of the poem is the sympathetic and effective account by Hermione of her life without parents, a brilliantly evocative delineation of a young woman mourning her lost childhood.”

⁷⁴⁰ Williams (1997) 118.

⁷⁴¹ For *memini* as an “Alexandrian footnote” and the possibility of an allusion to a well-known scene from Greek or Latin literature see n. on *Her.* 8.75.

Given Hermione's fragmented memory, the reference to her desperate appeal to Helen at line 80 (*clamabam: "sine me, me sine, mater, abis?"*) is noteworthy.⁷⁴² Through the quotation of her exact words Hermione manages not only to establish her authority by validating the truthfulness of her claim, but also to infuse her text with sentiment and pathos. The reader gets the impression, at least for a moment, that he travels back in time; the illusion is sustained by the disruption of the letter's linearity and the reader moves from the letter's present to the letter's past, since the insertion of Hermione's exact words unsettle the temporal progression of the narrative. By entangling him in her memory Hermione manages to manipulate the reader of her letter, who is left with no other option than to adopt her own version of truth and see reality through her own perspective.

The concluding couplet (lines 81f.) by recapitulating in the most emphatic and assertive way the purpose of Hermione's list of mythological *exempla* rounds-off the mythological section with ring-composition. Hermione comes at the end of a long line of hereditary fate, which is common for all Tantalid women. Her current misfortune (i.e. her abduction by Neoptolemus) is part of a family legacy, where the association with the house of Pelops comes through rape.⁷⁴³

To sum up, lines 65-82, with the exception of lines 71f., whose authenticity is rightly disputed both in terms of language and content, can stand as they are in the manuscript tradition. Hermione's list of mythological *exempla* is surely not an interpolation, but an integral part of her overall argumentation. The heroine tries to establish a place among the female ancestors of her family in terms of erotic abduction. Her short list of mythological *exempla* is a far cry from being a random accumulation of stories; instead, Hermione takes great pain in offering cohesion and unity to the list. The combination of male guile and female victimization together with the foreign origin of the abductors are the two main common themes, which run throughout the whole list. Furthermore, there seems to be a certain structural pattern, since the *exempla* in terms of the outcome of the erotic abduction could be organised in pairs, as follows: Leda and Hippodamia become Tantalids through rape, while Helen and Hermione risk losing their status as Tantalid women. A final remark concerns a certain sense of inner movement in the list, since the *exempla* are employed in gradual progression from guile (Leda) to abduction (Hippodamia) and finally to the recuperation of the abducted wife (Helen).

⁷⁴² The use of reported speech is a technique much favoured by Ovid in the *Heroides* (twenty six instances in total), which adds further to the dramatization of the letters.

⁷⁴³ The similarity (both in wording and content) with Phaedra's claim at *Her.* 4.61f. (*en, ego nunc, ne forte parum Minoia credar, / in socias leges ultima gentis eo!*) is striking. *pace* Palmer on *Her.* 8.75 there is no need to rewrite line 81 on the model of *Her.* 4.61. Further on the theme of hereditary guilt in Ovid see Jacobson (1974) 374 with n.9.

4. Text and Transmission⁷⁴⁴

The *Heroides* of all the surviving Ovidian works has the poorest manuscript transmission. The text for letters 1-14 (and 16-21)⁷⁴⁵ depends for the most part on a codex of early Carolingian date (around 800), probably written in France. The oldest surviving codex is Paris lat. 8242, also known as the *Puteaneus* (*P*), which dates to the Carolingian age (s. IX^{2,3}, France, Corbie).⁷⁴⁶ The second oldest manuscript which preserves the *Heroides* is Eton 150 (*E*, s. XI^{ex}).⁷⁴⁷ These two manuscripts together with the almost two hundred later manuscripts represent the text's tradition, which unfortunately has suffered extensive contamination, scribal interpolation and great physical damage. The already precarious textual transmission of the text becomes further complicated by the presence of additional verses (titular salutations, "introductory distichs", distichs found in the body of the poems), which are attested only in a minority of witnesses.⁷⁴⁸ Some of these additional passages are clearly interpolations, while others may possibly belong to a stand-alone branch of tradition, independent of the mainstream one (Dörrie (1971) 7 refers to it as "apocryphal").⁷⁴⁹ As a result, to construct a stemma is almost impossible;⁷⁵⁰ so is an *eliminatio codicum*, while there is almost no room at all for *recensio*.⁷⁵¹ In such a corrupted manuscript tradition there is "no monopoly of truth";⁷⁵² an old reading is not necessarily a better reading and, in the majority of cases, manuscript tradition cannot settle the matter; hence, lines must be judged on their own merit. Tarrant's precautionary remark that "all inherently plausible readings, whatever their source, must be taken seriously, and sense and usage are the only sure criteria for deciding among them"⁷⁵³ still proves to be the golden rule, which I adopt as my main principle in my discussion of textual criticism of *Heroides* 4 and 8.

⁷⁴⁴ Here I will restrict myself only to a general and brief outline of the history of the text's manuscript tradition. For a detailed discussion and extensive information about the textual tradition of the *Heroides* the reader should first consult the fundamental studies by Dörrie (1960), (1971), (1975). Also see Palmer (1898) xxxiii-xlv with Leeper's (1899) and Housman's (1899) 172-8 (= (1972) 470-80) reviews, Giomini (1957) xvi-xxx, Kenney's (1961)b review of Dörrie (1960), *idem* (1996) 26f., Tarrant (1983) 268-73, Rosati (1989) 49-51, Knox (1995) 34-7, Kenney (1996) 26f., Reeson (2001) 8-10, Richmond (2002) esp. 462-9.

⁷⁴⁵ *Her.*15, Sappho's letter to Phaon, has a separate transmission, independent of that of the rest of *Heroides*. The poem appears as fifteenth in the collection for the first time in Daniel Heinsius' edition of 1629. Further on the poem's textual history see Tarrant (1983) 272f., Knox (1995) 36f., Dörrie (1971) 287-96, *idem* (1975), Richmond (2002) 467-9.

⁷⁴⁶ Richmond (2002) 459, Tarrant (1983) 268 dates *P* to s. IX^{3/4}. See also Dörrie (1971) 15 with bibliography ad loc., Bischoff (1961) 53.

⁷⁴⁷ Richmond (2002) 459f., Dörrie (1971) 13f., Tarrant (1983) 270.

⁷⁴⁸ Further on these issues see my comments ad loc.

⁷⁴⁹ Dörrie (1971) 7, Tarrant (1983) 270f. with n. 10, Rosati (1989) 49-51, Richmond (2002) 465.

⁷⁵⁰ Cf. Kenney's (1961)b stemma and now Richmond's (2002) 466 illustration "in rough outline" of the textual transmission on the text.

⁷⁵¹ So Tarrant (1983) 270, also Kenney (1961)b 480.

⁷⁵² Reeve (1974) 58.

⁷⁵³ Tarrant (1983) 270. Cf. also Kenney (1961)b 480: "the mechanical application of critical 'methods' is impossible; Ovidian usage and 'ratio et res ipsa' are the only guides" and Goold (1974) 476: "what is important is readings, not manuscripts."

For the needs of this commentary I have not embarked on any systematic reading of the manuscripts. I have myself consulted a copy of the Burman edition (1727),⁷⁵⁴ which Professor J. B. Hall kindly put at my disposal, Shuckburgh (1885), Palmer (1898), Giomini (1957), Dörrie (1971), Showerman-Goold (1977) and Rosati (1989).⁷⁵⁵ It is very unfortunate that Dörrie's (1971) ambitious and elaborate edition of the *Heroides* ultimately failed to deliver a reliable critical edition of the text. In spite of the full *apparatus criticus* provided, his examination of the manuscripts in many respects is lacking, and he is rarely critical in the constitution of the text.⁷⁵⁶ The Showerman-Goold (1977) edition, on the other hand, may not offer exhaustive annotation of textual criticism (mainly due to the nature of the series), nevertheless it provides a sound text, which overall presents the best readings and it is beyond any doubt the product of serious critical examination of the manuscript tradition. In any case, the *Heroides* constitutes a special case in terms of textual criticism, where no edition can claim to be definitive. In my discussions in the commentary I have restricted myself exclusively to places in the text where issues of textual criticism affect directly my interpretation.⁷⁵⁷ Manuscript evidence and conjectures are mentioned only where they are discussed in the commentary, while trivial spelling mistakes or variants have not been recorded. The text of *Heroides* 4 and 8 printed below is a slightly revised version of the text offered by G. P. Goold's (1977) second and revised edition of G. Showerman's edition (1914) in the Loeb Classical Library series. I follow the Showerman-Goold (1977) text even in its punctuation, except line *Her.* 4.140. Also, apart from all proper names, I capitalize only the first word of each epistle. A table of comparative readings between my text and the editions since Shuckburgh (1885) are given in the following pages:

⁷⁵⁴ Burman (1727) incorporates a great number of N. Heinsius' readings and emendations of the text.

⁷⁵⁵ For a list of the most important editions of the *Heroides* see Dörrie (1971) 19-21. A new edition of the *Heroides* is eagerly awaited from Prof. J. B. Hall.

⁷⁵⁶ For scholar's skepticism and the overall bad reception of Dörrie's edition see the reviews by Goold (1974) and Reeve (1974). Also see Hall (1990) 263 and Bessone (1997) 43.

⁷⁵⁷ For critical discussions of issues of textual criticism in *Her.* 4 and 8 see Sedlmayer (1881), Palmer (1891) and (1898), Housman (1897)b (= (1972) 388-95), Damsté (1905), Ker (1958), Kenney (1961)b, *idem* (1970)a,b, *idem* (1993), Sicherl (1963), Courtney (1965), Goold (1965) and (1974), Diggle (1967), Kirfel (1969), Reeve (1973), Hunt (1975), Tarrant (1983), Delz (1986), Watt (1989), Roncaioli Lamberti (1989-90), Bettini (1990), Hall (1990), Rosati (1990), Knox (1995), Ramírez de Verger (2005).

Line number	Shuckburgh (1885)	Palmer (1898)	Collins-Hayes (1910)	Giomini (1957)	Dörrie (1971)	Showerman-Gould (1977)	Rosati (1989)	This edition
4.1	Qua	Qua	Qua	Qua	Qua	Quam	Qua	Quam
4.8	destitit	destitit	destitit	destitit	destitit	restitit	destitit	destitit
4.9	sequitur	sequitur	sequitur	sequitur	†sequitur	sequitur	sequitur	prodest
4.15	fouet	fouet	fouet	fouet	fouet	fouet	fouet	uorat
4.16	figat	figat	figat	figat	figat	figat	figat	fingat
4.19	serius	serius	serius	serius	serior	serius	serior	serior
4.21	laedunt	laedunt	laedunt	laedunt	laedunt	laedunt	laedunt	urunt
68	Gnosia	Gnosia	Gnosia	Gnosia	Gnosia	Gnosia	Gnosia	Cnosia
4.85	duritiam	duritiam	duritiam	duritiam	duritiam	duritiam	duritiam	materiam
4.86	materia	militia	militia	materia	materia	militia	materia	duritia
4.133f	Iuppiter esse pium statuit quod- cumque iuuaret, / et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.	Iuppiter esse pium statuit quod-cumque iuuaret, / et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.	Iuppiter esse pium statuit quod- cumque iuuaret, / et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.	Iuppiter esse pium statuit quod- cumque iuuaret, / et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.	Iuppiter esse pium statuit, quod- cumque iuuaret, / et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.	Iuppiter esse pium statuit, quod- cumque iuuaret, / et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.	Iuppiter esse pium statuit, quod- cumque iuuaret, / et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.	[Iuppiter esse pium statuit, quodcumque iuuaret, / et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.]

Line number	Shuckburgh (1885)	Palmer (1898)	Collins-Hayes (1910)	Giomini (1957)	Dörrie (1971)	Showerman-Gould (1977)	Rosati (1989)	This edition
4.137	nec labor est. celare licet. pete munus ab illa.	nec labor est celare, licet peccemus, amorem:	nec labor est, celare licet : pete munus ab illa :	nec labor est: celare licet; pete munus ab illa:	nec labor est celare, licet! pete munus, ab illa	nec labor est celare, licet peccemus, amorem.	nec labor est celare licet †pete munus ab illa†	nec labor est celare licet †pete munus ab illa†
4.176	perlegis	perlegis	perlegis	perlegis	qui legis	qui legis	qui legis	iam legis
8.1f.					*Alloquor Hermione nuper fratremque uirumque / nunc fratrem. nomen coniugis alter habet*		Adloquor Hermione nuper fratrem-que uirumque, / nunc fratrem: nomen coniugis alter habet	[Alloquor Hermione nuper fratremque uirumque / nunc fratrem. nomen coniugis alter habet.]
8.9	Orestis	Orestis	Orestis	(7) Orestis	Orestis	Orestae	Orestis	Orestae

Line number	Shuckburgh (1885)	Palmer (1898)	Collins-Hayes (1910)	Giomini (1957)	Dörrie (1971)	Showerman -Goold (1977)	Rosati (1989)	This edition
8.18	feras	feres	feras	(16) feras	feres	feras	feras	feras
8.21				(19) [socer... stertisset]	pater... plorasset	socer... stertisset	pater... iacuisset	pater... stertisset
8.22	ut ante fuit	[ut ante fuit]	ut ante fuit	(20) ut ante fuit	†ante fuit.†	ut ante fuit	ut ante fuit	ut ante fuit
8.34	plus quoque , qui prior est ordine, possit auus.	plus quo, quo prior est ordine, possit auus	plus quoque, qui prior est ordine, possit auus	(32) plus quoque, qui prior est ordine, posset auus	plus quoque qui prior est ordine, posset auus	plus patre, quo prior est ordine, pollet auus	plus quoque, qui prior est ordine, posset auus	plus quoque, qui prior est ordine, posset auus
8.47	habes	habes	habes	(45) habes	habes	per	habes	habes
8.48	melius	medios	melius	(46) melius	melius	medios	medios	melius
8.59	Oresti	Oresti	Oresti	(57) Oresti	Oresti	Orestae	Orestae	Orestae

Line number	Shuckburgh (1885)	Palmer (1898)	Collins-Hayes (1910)	Giomini (1957)	Dörrie (1971)	Showerman -Goold (1977)	Rosati (1989)	This edition
8.63	has solas habeo semper	solas habeo semper semperque	has solas habeo semper	(61) semper solas habeo solasque	semper solas habeo semperque	solas habeo semper semperque	solas habeo semper semperque	solas habeo semper semperque
8.67	cygni	cygni	cygni	cygni	cygni	cygni	cygni	cycni
8.71f.	Castori Amyclaeo et Amyclaeo Polluci / reddita Mopsopia Taenaris urbe soror	[Castori Amyclaeo et Amyclaeo Polluci / reddita Mopsopia Taenaris urbe soror;]	Castori Amyclaeo et Amyclaeo Polluci / reddita Mopsopia Taenaris urbe soror	(69f.) Castori Amyclaeo et Amyclaeo Polluci / reddita Mopsopia Taenaris urbe soror	Castori Amyclaeo et Amyclaeo Polluci / reddita Mopsopia Taenaris urbe soror;		Castori Amyclaeo et Amyclaeo Polluci / reddita Mopsopia Taenaris urbe soror;	[Castori Amyclaeo et Amyclaeo Polluci / reddita Mopsopia Taenaris urbe soror;]
8.88	quodue mihi miserae	quodue mihi miserae	quod mihi -uae miserae!-	(86) quodue mihi miserae	quodue mihi miserae	quod mihi -uae miserae!-	quod mihi, uae miserae!	quod mihi - uae miserae!-
8.110	uiro	uiro	uiro	(108) uiro	uiro	uirum	uiro	uirum
8.115	Orestis	Orestis	Orestis	(113) Orestis	Orestis	Orestae	Orestis	Orestae

Text

Heroides 4

PHAEDRA HIPPOLYTO

Quam nisi tu dederis, caritura est ipsa, salutem
 mittit Amazonio Cressa puella uiro.
 perlege, quodcumque est –quid epistula lecta nocebit?
 te quoque in hac aliquid quod iuuet esse potest;
 his arcana notis terra pelagoque feruntur. 5
 inspicit acceptas hostis ab hoste notas.
 ter tecum conata loqui ter inutilis haesit
 lingua, ter in primo destitit ore sonus.
 qua licet et prodest, pudor est miscendus amori;
 dicere quae puduit, scribere iussit amor. 10
 quidquid Amor iussit, non est contemnere tutum;
 regnat et in dominos ius habet ille deos.
 ille mihi primo dubitanti scribere dixit:
 “scribe! dabit uictas ferreus ille manus.”
 adsit et, ut nostras auideo uorat igne medullas, 15
 fingat sic animos in mea uota tuos!
 non ego nequitia socialia foedera rumpam;
 fama –uelim quaeras– crimine nostra uacat.
 uenit amor grauius, quo serior –urimur intus;
 urimur, et caecum pectora uulnus habent. 20
 scilicet ut teneros urunt iuga prima iuuenos,
 frenaque uix patitur de grege captus equus,
 sic male uixque subit primos rude pectus amores,
 sarcinaque haec animo non sedet apta meo.
 ars fit, ubi a teneris crimen condiscitur annis; 25
 cui uenit exacto tempore, peius amat.
 tu noua seruatae capies libamina famae,
 et pariter nostrum fiet uterque nocens.
 est aliquid, plenis pomaria carpere ramis,
 et tenui primam delegere ungue rosam. 30
 si tamen ille prior, quo me sine crimine gessi,
 candor ab insolita labe notandus erat,

at bene successit, digno quod adurimur igni;
 peius adulterio turpis adulter obest.
 si mihi concedat Iuno fratremque uirumque, 35
 Hippolytum uideor praepositura Ioui!
 iam quoque –uix credes– ignotas mittor in artes;
 est mihi per saeuas impetus ire feras.
 iam mihi prima dea est arcu praesignis adunco
 Delia; iudicium subsequor ipsa tuum. 40
 in nemus ire libet pressisque in retia ceruis
 hortari celeris per iuga summa canes,
 aut tremulum excusso iaculum uibrare lacerto,
 aut in graminea ponere corpus humo.
 saepe iuuat uersare leues in puluere currus 45
 torquentem frenis ora fugacis equi;
 nunc feror, ut Bacchi furiis Eleleides actae,
 quaeque sub Idaeo tympana colle mouent,
 aut quas semideae Dryades Faunisque bicornes
 numine contactas attonuere suo 50
 namque mihi referunt, cum se furor ille remisit,
 omnia; me tacitam conscius urit amor.
 forsitan hunc generis fato reddamus amorem,
 et Venus ex tota gente tributa petat.
 Iuppiter Europen –prima est ea gentis origo– 55
 dilexit, tauro dissimulante deum.
 Pasiphae mater, decepto subdita tauro,
 enixa est utero crimen onusque suo.
 perfidus Aegides, ducentia fila secutus,
 curua meae fugit tecta sororis ope. 60
 en, ego nunc, ne forte parum Minoia credar,
 in socias leges ultima gentis eo!
 hoc quoque fatale est: placuit domus una duabus;
 me tua forma capit, capta parente soror.
 Thesides Theseusque duas rapuere sorores– 65
 ponite de nostra bina tropaea domo!
 Tempore quo nobis inita est Cerealis Eleusin,
 Cnosia me uellem detinisset humus!
 tunc mihi praecipue (nec non tamen ante placebas)
 acer in extremis ossibus haesit amor. 70

tempore abest aberitque diu Neptunius heros;
 illum Pirithoi detinet ora sui. 110
 praeposuit Theseus –nisi si manifesta negamus–
 Pirithoum Phaedrae Pirithoumque tibi.
 sola nec haec ad nos iniuria uenit ab illo;
 in magnis laesi rebus uterque sumus.
 ossa mei fratris claua perfracta trinodi 115
 sparsit humi; soror est praeda relicta feris.
 prima securigeras inter uirtute puellas
 te peperit, nati digna uigore parens;
 si quaeras, ubi sit –Theseus latus ense peregit,
 nec tanto mater pignore tuta fuit. 120
 at ne nupta quidem taedaque accepta iugali–
 cur, nisi ne caperes regna paterna nothus?
 addidit et fratres ex me tibi, quos tamen omnis
 non ego tollendi causa, sed ille fuit.
 o utinam nocitura tibi, pulcherrime rerum, 125
 in medio nisu uiscera rupta forent!
 i nunc, sic meriti lectum reuerere parentis–
 quem fugit et factis abdicat ipse suis!
 nec, quia priuigno uidear coitura nouerca,
 terruerint animos nomina uana tuos. 130
 ista uetus pietas, aeuo moritura futuro,
 rustica Saturno regna tenente fuit.
 [Iuppiter esse pium statuit, quodcumque iuuaret,
 et fas omne facit fratre marita soror.]
 illa coit firma generis iunctura catena, 135
 inposuit nodos cui Venus ipsa suos.
 nec labor est celare licet †pete munus ab illa†
 cognato poterit nomine culpa tegi.
 uiderit amplexos aliquis, laudabimur ambo;
 dicar priuigno fida nouerca meo. 140
 non tibi per tenebras duri reseranda mariti
 ianua, non custos decipiendus erit;
 ut tenuit domus una duos, domus una tenebit;
 oscula aperta dabas, oscula aperta dabis;
 tutus eris mecum laudemque merebere culpa, 145
 tu licet in lecto conspiciare meo.

tolle moras tantum properataque foedera iunge—
 qui mihi nunc saeuit, sic tibi parcat Amor!
 non ego dedignor supplex humilisque precari.
 heu! ubi nunc fastus altaque uerba? iacent. 150
 et pugnare diu nec me submittere culpae
 certa fui —certi siquid haberet amor;
 uicta precor genibusque tuis regalia tendo
 brachia! quid deceat, non uidet ullus amans.
 depudui, profugusque pudor sua signa reliquit. 155
 Da ueniam fassae duraque corda doma!
 quod mihi sit genitor, qui possidet aequora, Minos,
 quod ueniant proaui fulmina torta manu,
 quod sit auus radiis frontem uallatus acutis,
 purpureo tepidum qui mouet axe diem— 160
 nobilitas sub amore iacet! miserere priorum
 et, mihi si non uis parcere, parce meis!
 est mihi dotalis tellus Iouis insula, Crete—
 seruiat Hippolyto regia tota meo!
 Flecte, ferox, animos! potuit corrumpere taurum 165
 mater; eris tauro saeuior ipse truci?
 per Venerem, parcas, oro, quae plurima mecum est!
 sic numquam, quae te spernere possit, ames;
 sic tibi secretis agilis dea saltibus adsit,
 siluaque perdendas praebat alta feras; 170
 sic faeant Satyri montanaque numina Panes,
 et cadat aduersa cuspide fossus aper;
 sic tibi dent Nymphae, quamuis odisse puellas
 diceris, arentem quae leuet unda sitim!
 addimus his precibus lacrimas quoque; uerba precantis 175
 iam legis, et lacrimas finge uidere meas!

Heroides 8

HERMIONE ORESTAE

[Alloquor Hermione nuper fratremque uirumque
nunc fratrem. nomen coniugis alter habet.]
Pyrrhus Achillides, animosus imagine patris,
inclusam contra iusque piūque tenet.
quod potui renui, ne non inuita tenerer; 5
cetera femineae non ualuere manus.
“quid facis, Aeacide? non sum sine uindice,” dixi :
“haec tibi sub domino est, Pyrrhe, puella suo!”
surdior ille freto clamantem nomen Orestae
traxit inornatis in sua tecta comis. 10
quid grauius capta Lacedaemone serua tulissem,
si raperet Graias barbara turba nurus ?
parcius Andromachen uexauit Achaia uictrix,
cum Danaus Phrygias ureret ignis opes.
at tu, cura mei si te pia tangit, Oreste, 15
inice non timidas in tua iura manus!
an siquis rapiat stabulis armenta reclusis,
arma feras, rapta coniuge lentus eris ?
†sit socer exemplo nuptae repetitor ademptae,
cui pia militiae causa puella fuit! 20
si pater ignauus uidua stertisset in aula,
nupta foret Paridi mater, ut ante fuit. †
nec tu mille rates sinuosaque uela pararis
nec numeros Danaī militis –ipse ueni!
sic quoque eram repetenda tamen, nec turpe marito 25
aspera pro caro bella tulisse toro.
quid, quod auus nobis idem Pelopeius Atreus,
et, si non esses uir mihi, frater eras.
uir, precor, uxori, frater succurre sorori!
instant officio nomina bina tuo. 30
me tibi Tyndareus, uita grauis auctor et annis,
tradidit; arbitrium neptis habebat auus.

at pater Aeacidae promiserat inscius acti;
 plus quoque, qui prior est ordine, posset auus.
 cum tibi nubebam, nulli mea taeda nocebat; 35
 si iungar Pyrrho, tu mihi laesus eris.
 et pater ignoscet nostro Menelaus amori –
 succubuit telis praepetis ipse dei.
 quem sibi permisit, genero concedet amorem;
 proderit exemplo mater amata suo. 40
 tu mihi, quod matri pater est; quas egerat olim
 Dardanius partis aduena, Pyrrhus agit.
 ille licet patriis sine fine superbiat actis;
 et tu, quae referas facta parentis, habes.
 Tantalides omnes ipsumque regebat Achillem. 45
 hic pars militiae; dux erat ille ducum.
 tu quoque habes proauum Pelopem Pelopisque parentem,
 si melius numeres, a Ioue quintus eris.
 nec uirtute cares. arma inuidiosa tulisti,
 sed tibi – quid faceres? – induit illa pater. 50
 materia uellem fortis meliore fuisses;
 non lecta est operi, sed data causa tuo.
 hanc tamen implesti; iuguloque Aegisthus aperto
 tecta cruentauit, quae pater ante tuus.
 increpat Aeacides laudemque in crimina uertit – 55
 et tamen adspectus sustinet ille meos.
 rumpor, et ora mihi pariter cum mente tumescunt,
 pectoraque inclusis ignibus usta dolent.
 Hermione coram quisquamne obiecit Oresti,
 nec mihi sunt uires, nec ferus ensis adest ? 60
 flere licet certe; flendo defundimus iram,
 perque sinum lacrimae fluminis instar eunt.
 has solas habeo semper semperque profundo;
 ument incultae fonte perenne genae.
 num generis fato, quod nostros errat in annos, 65
 Tantalides matres apta rapina sumus ?
 non ego fluminei referam mendacia cycni
 nec querar in plumis delituisse Iouem.
 qua duo porrectus longe freta distinet Isthmos,
 uecta peregrinis Hippodamia rotis; 70

[Castori Amyclaeo et Amyclaeo Polluci
reddita Mopsopia Taenaris urbe soror;]
Taenaris Idaeus trans aequora ab hospite rapta
Argolicas pro se uertit in arma manus.
uix equidem memini, memini tamen. omnia luctus, 75
omnia solliciti plena timoris erant;
flebat auus Phoebeque soror fratresque gemelli,
orabat superos Leda suumque Iouem.
ipsa ego, non longos etiam tunc scissa capillos,
clamabam : “sine me, me sine, mater abis ? ” 80
nam coniunx aberat! ne non Pelopeia credar,
ecce, Neoptolemo praeda parata fui!
Pelides utinam uitasset Apollinis arcus!
damnaret nati facta proterua pater;
nec quondam placuit nec nunc placuisset Achilli 85
abducta uiduum coniuge flere uirum.
quae mea caelestes iniuria fecit iniquos,
quodue mihi –uae miserae! – sidus obesse querar ?
parua mea sine matre fui, pater arma ferebat,
et duo cum uiuant, orba duobus eram. 90
non tibi blanditias primis, mea mater, in annis
incerto dictas ore puella tuli;
non ego captaui breuibus tua colla lacertis
nec gremio sedi sarcina grata tuo.
non cultus tibi cura mei, nec pacta marito 95
intraui thalamos matre parante nouos.
obuia prodieram reduci tibi –uera fatebor–
nec facies nobis nota parentis erat!
te tamen esse Helenen, quod eras pulcherrima, sensi;
ipsa requirebas, quae tua nata foret! 100
pars haec una mihi, coniunx bene cessit Orestes;
is quoque, ni pro se pugnat, ademptus erit.
Pyrrhus habet captam reduce et uictore parente –
hoc munus nobis diruta Troia dedit!
cum tamen altus equis Titan radiantibus instant, 105
perfruor infelix liberiore malo;
nox ubi me thalamis ululantem et acerba gementem
condidit in maesto procubuique toro,

pro somno lacrimis oculi funguntur obortis,
 quaque licet, fugio sicut ab hoste uirum. 110
saepe malis stupeo rerumque oblita locique
 ignara tetigi Scyria membra manu,
utque nefas sensi, male corpora tacta relinquo
 et mihi pollutas credor habere manus.
saepe Neoptolemi pro nomine nomen Orestae 115
 exit, et errorem uocis ut omen amo.
per genus infelix iuro generisque parentem,
 qui freta, qui terras et sua regna quatit;
per patris ossa tui, patru mihi, quae tibi debent,
 quod se sub tumulo fortiter ultra iacent— 120
aut ego praemoriar primoque exstinguar in aeuo,
 aut ego Tantalidae Tantalidis uxor ero!

Commentary

Heroides 4

1f. Phaedra opens her letter with a poetic adaptation of the conventional letter-opening formula *s(i) u(ales) b(ene) e(st) e(go) q(uidem) u(aleo)*, which according to Seneca was an old practice surviving until his own days (*Epist.* 15.1 *mos antiquis fuit, usque ad meam seruat aetatem, primis epistulae uerbis adicere “si uales bene est, ego ualeo”*, cf. Cugusi (1983) 47f., *idem* (1989) 386). The poetic adaptation of conventional letter-opening formulas is one of the most important epistolary features of the *Heroides* (cf. *Her.* 13.1f., 14.1f., 16.1f., 18.1f., 19.1f.). Further on epistolary formulas see Merklin (1968) 472f., Kirfel (1969) 11ff., Lanham (1975) 15-22, 31ff., Trapp (2003) 34-38, Cugusi (1983) 28f. and 47f., *idem* (1989) 385f., Görgemanns (2004) 1138f., also *TLL* 5.1.1672.37ff and 1687.57f., 8.1179.20ff.). Phaedra’s letter opening bears a striking similarity with two other Ovidian letters of seduction: Byblis’ letter to Caunus at Ovid’s *Met.* 9.530f. (*quam, nisi tu dederis, non est habitura salutem, / hanc tibi mittit amans*, further on this see p. 7 with n.12 (with bibliography) and Curley (1999) 177) and Paris’ letter to Helen (*Her.* 16.1f. *Hanc tibi Priamides mitto, Ledaeva, salutem, / quae tribui sola te mihi dante potest*, see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.1f. with bibliography ad loc., also Pohlenz (1913) 5-7 on the correspondence between Paris’ letter and Byblis’ letter to Caunus at *Ov. Met.* 9.530ff.). Undermining the function of an actual letter *salutatio* Phaedra manages to conceal the identity of both herself and Hippolytus; a technique which occurs throughout the collection, with the exception of *Her.* 1.1f., 2.1f., 5.1f.

On the authenticity of the superscription (PHAEDRA HIPPOLYTO) and the opening couplet see 277f.

1. caritura: Phaedra’s reference to her lack of *salus* (“good health”) has additional metaliterary connotations, since the sense of lacking, above all the absence of the recipient’s presence, constitutes an essential pre-requisite of epistolography in general (Altman (1982) 13-5, 127f., 186, Kauffman (1986) 24-26, Lindheim (2003) 19-22, Barthes (1978) 157-9, esp. 13-7 on absence as a fundamental principle or erotic discourse). It is exactly this sense of longing, her need for what is missing (or better, her need for whom she is missing) that instigates Phaedra to write her letter. In this light, her struggle for *salus* ultimately coincides with her desire for Hippolytus, which makes her wish for physical well-being a mere metaphor for her erotic longing.

salutem: Ovid is the only classical author who uses *salutem mittere* as a letter greeting, which in most cases obeys the third-person convention of letter greetings, like here (Lanham (1975) 31-3). In the *Heroides* again in 13.1f., 16.1f., 18.1f., 19.1f., cf. also *Tr.* 5.13.1f. *Hanc tuus e Getico mittit tibi Naso salutem, / mittere si quisquam, quo caret ipse, potest, Pont.* 1.10.1f. *Naso suo profugus mittit tibi, Flacce, salutem, / mittere rem siquis, qua caret ipse, potest* (for an extensive list of Ovidian examples see Bömer on *Ov. Met.* 9.530). *salus* is an interesting case of *double entendre*: the term apart from “greeting” (esp. in epistolary formulas, see *TLL*

5.1.1672.37ff. and 1687.57f., 8.1179.20ff., *OLD* s.v. *salus* 8) also means “good health” (*OLD* s.v. *salus* 2); hence, its use could be seen as Phaedra’s very first hint at the *nosos* theme in the letter. Love as *nosos* is a widespread *topos* in Roman poetry (possibly under Greek influence (tragedy, Hellenistic love poetry, novel) see La Penna (1951) 206-8). The imagery is significant, especially in view of the centrality of the *nosos* imagery in Euripides’ *Hippolytus*, where Phaedra’s physical illness reflects her erotic suffering (for more on this see pp. 10f. and n. on *Her.* 4.20). This play on the double meaning of *salus* (“greeting” and “good health”), already present in Cato (*Agr.* 141.3), is a favourite play with Ovid, especially in letter openings (cf. *Her.* 13.1f., 16.1f., also *Tr.* 3.3.87f., 5.13.1, *Pont.* 1.10.1f., 3.2.1., also see Kirfel (1969) 94f., Williams (1994) 124f.). Phaedra’s reference to her adultery in terms of liberation from her conjugal bonds at line 17 (*socialia foedera rumpam*) invests *salus* with an additional meaning, that of “freedom” (*OLD* s.v. *salus* 4).

2. Amazonio ... uiro: Phaedra in an attempt to suppress her close association with Hippolytus carefully avoids mentioning him by name; instead, she opts for a periphrastic reference which puts all emphasis on Hippolytus’ association with his mother. Further on the multiple consequences of such choice for both Phaedra and Hippolytus see pp.32f. In fact, Phaedra calls Hippolytus by his name only twice in her letter (lines 36 and 164). In complete contrast, Hippolytus is the most named (or referred to) character in Eur. *Hipp.* (cf. lines 11, 53, 310, 352, 513, 581, 689, 728, 885, 900, 1162, 1436). Nevertheless, in the Euripidean play Hippolytus is also mentioned for the first time as “the son of the Amazon” (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* Ἀμαζόνος τόκος 10, also 307-10, 351, 581f.).

The Ovidian Phaedra, like her tragic counterpart, also avoids any reference to the name of Hippolytus’ mother. The avoidance of the Amazon’s name in the Euripidean play could have been dictated by reasons of metrical convenience (see Barrett (1964) on 10f., Halleran (1995) 10-12). I am inclined to detect behind the special reference to the Amazon’s association with horses at lines 307 (μὰ τὴν ἄνασσαν ἰππίαν Ἀμαζόνα) and 581 (ὁ τῆς φιλίππου παῖς Ἀμαζόνοσ) a possible etymological allusion to the name *Hippolyte* (Ἴππο - λύτη) (cf. Paschalis (1997) 368f.). The Amazon must have been an Attic importation into Hippolytus’ ancestry (see Barrett (1964) 8 n.3. Herter *RE* Suppl. 13 (1973) s.v. *Theseus* 1153.22ff.). Her name was either *Antiope* (cf. Schol. on Eur. *Hipp.* 10, Plut. *Thes.* 26, 28.2, Apoll. *Epit.* 1.16, *Diod. Sic.* 4.28, *Paus.* 1.2.1, 1.41.7, *Sen. Ph.* 927, *Hyg. Fab.* 30.20) or *Hippolyte* (Isocr. 12.193, Plut. *Thes.* 27, Simonides fr. 551A Campbell quoted in Apoll. *Epit.* 1.16, *Serv. Verg. Aen.* 11.661). Further on the name of Hippolytus’ mother see Eitrem *RE* 8 (1913) s.v. *Hippolytos* 1865.37ff., Frazer (1921) 2.143 n.2. and Casali (1996) n.8.). Phaedra’s chiasmic arrangement of both herself and Hippolytus in the line (abBA) is noteworthy in that *Cressa puella* becomes effectively framed by *Amazonio... uiro*; in this way Phaedra’s desire to be in Hippolytus’ arms is reflected on a visual and syntactical level. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of the geographical adjectives (*Amazonia Cressa*) offers an additional contact point between the two unnamed

lovers, that of their foreign origin (on this see p.9). *Amāzonius* is a rare poetic adjective, appearing before Ovid only at Verg. *Aen.* 5.311 and Hor. *Carm.* 4.4.20. In Ovid again at *Her.* 21.119 and *Pont.* 3.1.95).

Cressa: Phaedra's constant references to her Cretan origin throughout her letter (cf. lines 55-66, esp. 61 *ne forte parum Minoia credar*, 115f., 163f.) receive further significance in view of the ominous character of similar references in the Euripidean play, where Crete stands for evil, death and sexual perversion (for more details on the multiple implications of Phaedra's employment of *Cressa* see p.7f.). In addition, her emphasis on Crete, given the traditional association of the Cretans with lying, undermines her credibility as letter-writer (further on this also see pp.9f.). The Cretans' inclination to lies was proverbial and constituted a widespread *topos* of both Greek and Roman literature, ever since Homer (cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.568, 13.256 with Heubeck and Hoekstra, 14.199, 19.179, Hes. fr. 11, 144 M-W, Hom. *Hymn. Dem.* 123 with Richardson, also 223-5, Epimenides fr. 1.3 *Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί* (ap. Paul ad Tit.1.12), Call. *Hymn.* 1.8 "*Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται*", Arat. *Phaen.* 30 *εἰ ἐπέδον δῆ* (sc. a Cretan story), Ov. *Am.* 3.10.19 *Cretes erunt testes; nec fingunt omnia Cretes*, *Ars* 1.299 *quamuis sit mendax, Creta negare potest* with Hollis for a list of parallels, also see Otto (1962) s.v. *Creta* and Vertoudakis (2000) 106ff., esp. 106 nn. 24f. for Greek sources dating back to Homer. On the intertextual importance and the self-reflexivity especially of the Callimachean excerpt above see Barchiesi (1993) 351f.).

Cressa is a high-register poetic adjective, rare in Roman elegy (6 occurrences in Ovid, 2 in the *Her.* (here and 2.76), 2 in Propertius (2.1.61, 4.7.57 referring to Pasiphae), 0 in Tibullus, see also *TLL Onom.* 4.710.21ff.).

puella: Phaedra's self-identification as *puella* in the very opening couplet of her letter is undoubtedly programmatic, given the elegiac connotations of the term (cf. Pichon (1966) s.v., Barchiesi on *Her.* 1.3). Through her use of this distinctive elegiac signpost Phaedra asserts her new literary status and at the same time establishes the elegiac character of her letter. This is the versified letter of an elegiac woman and not the soliloquy of a tragic heroine. Phaedra will implicitly identify herself as *puella* again near the end of her letter (line 173 *puellas*) (further on Phaedra's self-identification as *puella* see p. 8).

uiro: Phaedra's self-identification as *puella* has an immediate effect on Hippolytus' literary status. Her reference to him in terms of an elegiac *uir* is a clear indication of his own elegicization as well; in her eyes Hippolytus plays the role of an elegiac lover (for more on this see pp.36ff.).

3. perlege: "read thoroughly, read to the end". The emphatic use of the prefix *per-* (it denotes completion, see *OLD* s.v. *per-*, *prefix* and Booth (1981) 2697 on the precision of prepositional prefixes, Cooper (1895) 254 on their possible colloquial character) is indicative of the urgency of Phaedra's appeal. *perlegere* is very rare in Augustan poetry with the exception of Ovid's epistolary works (see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.11.19, for the restricted poetic use of adjectives

and adverbs compounded with *per-* see Axelson (1945) 37f.). In this particular form of imperative the verb occurs for the first time in Ovid (cf. also *Her.* 5.1, 16.12, 21.109, *Rem.* 487, *Fast.* 1.591, *Pont.* 2.27) and later in Juvenal (14.192) and Martial (14.183.1). In the double *Heroides* the verb occurs again within the same context at the opening of Acontius' letter to Cydippe (*Her.* 20.3 *perlege! discedat sic corpore languor ab isto*), as well as in Cydippe's recollection of her Nurse's instigation to read the inscription on Acontius' fallacious apple (*Her.* 21.109 *sustulit hoc nutrix mirataque "perlege!" dixit*).

The similarity with the opening of Oenone's letter is striking, as she uses the same verb (in double repetition) to make a similar invitation to Paris to read her letter to the end (*Her.* 5.1 *Perlegis? an coniunx prohibet noua? perlege*). It is perhaps ironic that Paris (later in his life) echoing Oenone through the use of the same imperative will also urge Helen to read his letter to the end (*Her.* 16.12 *perlege sed formae conueniente tuae* with Michalopoulos ad loc.).

Phaedra's invitation to Hippolytus to read her letter to the end calls for further investigation in view of the great number of Roman artistic representations, which depict Hippolytus holding or throwing away a letter delivered to him by the Nurse (cf. *LIMC* s.v. *Hippolytos I* 5.1.449ff (nos. 35, 37-9, 48-9, also Casali (1995)b 13 n.12 with bibliography). Whether or not these representations can be associated with an earlier Greek version (even with Euripides' first *Hipp.*, so Leo (1878) 178f., against Halleran (2000) 26), in which Phaedra wrote a seduction letter to Hippolytus still remains a much vexed question (see Jacobson (1974) 146 n. 11 with bibliography). In any case, her appeal to Hippolytus can be read as an intertextual reminiscence from her earlier literary life, or better as an implicit attempt to fight against her prescribed fate. This time Hippolytus is warned not to reject her approach before reading the whole of her letter first. Curley's (1999) 161f. suggestion for a possible allusion to Sophocles' *Phaedra* is highly speculative and lacks substantial evidence. Furthermore, especially in view of Hippolytus' refusal, the imperative *perlege* can be seen as an invitation not only to Hippolytus, but to the external reader of the letter as well (see Casali (1995)b 3, Barchiesi (1993) 337 =(2001) 108)). Further on the act of reading as a pervasive part of the narrative see Kauffman (1986) 36. Perhaps, it is not by chance that Caunus has a Hippolytus-like reaction as he reads only half-way through Byblis' incestuous love letter, cf. *Ov. Met.* 9.574f. *attonitus subita iuuenis Maeandrius ira / proicit acceptas lecta sibi parte tabellas*.

quodcumque est: the aphaeresis of *est* and the strong punctuation (full stop) mark the coincidence of metrical pause with sense-pause in the line.

quid...nocebit?: Phaedra draws attention to the potentially dangerous and deceitful character of female writing (see Fulkerson (2005) 140f. with nn. 59f., on the association of letters with deceit see Rosenmeyer (2001) 25-8, 43-60; 110-30; also see Landolfi (2000) 17 on dangerous poetic letters). The irony of the question is cutting. Despite Phaedra's assurances about the harmless character of her writing, such reference is bound to recall to the reader's mind the disastrous consequences of her lethal letter in Eur. *Hipp.* (so Jacobson (1974) 146, Casali

(1995)b 5). For a detailed discussion of Phaedra's Euripidean letter see Rosenmeyer (2001) 88-94).

4. te quoque: a common combination in apostrophe (often in lists or catalogues), very frequent in Hellenistic poetry *καὶ σὺ* (for bibliography see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.349). Its association with the Roman funerary (epigram) tradition (Merkelbach (1971)) is very appropriate in that it helps to maintain the ominous connotations of the opening couplet (on the ominous implications of the opening of the letter see pp. 9 and 11).

iuuet: Phaedra is conscious of the illicit nature of her proposition; hence, right from the very beginning she is careful to appeal to his emotion (delight, pleasure) rather than his logic.

5. arcana: a rare noun in elegy (0 Tibullus, 2 Propertius, 6 Ovid, in the *Her.* again only at 17.265). For the adjective *arcanus* used in the same context, cf. *Her.* 17.265 *hactenus; arcanum furtivae conscia mentis*, *Ars* 1.137 *nil opus est digitis, per quos arcana loquaris*, *Ars* 2.596; in connection with secret love-letters, cf. *Ov. Am.* 2.15.15 *arcanas...tabellas*, *Met.* 9.516 *littera...arcano*, *Sen. Phaedr.* 875 *fido pectore arcana occulam*.

notis: "letters, written characters" (*OLD* s.v. 6a and b, cf. e.g. *Ov. Am.* 1.12.8, *Ars* 630, in the *Her.* cf. 1.62 *digitis charta notata meis*, 3.2 *notata...manu*, 5.22 *legor Oenone falce notata tua*, 20.212 *uerba ferens doctis inuidiosa notis*, the use of *notare* for "writing" seems to be a poeticism (Barchiesi on *Her.* 1.62)). Given the letter's cryptic character (*arcana*) *notis* seems to carry also connotations of "signs of an (erotic) cipher" (*OLD* s.v. 6b, Pichon (1966) s.v. *nota*, cf. *Prop.* 3.8.26, *Ov. Am.* 1.4.20, 2.5.20 with Booth for parallels. *Ars* 1.489f.). For non-verbal signs and nods exchanged between lovers, particularly in drinking parties, see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.258.

terra pelagoque feruntur: a poetic variation of the political formula (both in poetry and prose) *terra marique* (in Greek *κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν*). Further on the history of the formula see Momigliano (1942) 62ff. Phaedra's substitution of the Greek *pelagus* for the Latin *mare* is perhaps reminiscent of a reference made by the Chorus to Eros' similar flight over land and sea at *Eur. Hipp.* 1272-80 (*ποτάται δὲ γαῖαν εὐάχητόν θ' / ἀλμυρόν ἐπὶ πόντον / θέλγει δ' Ἐρως, ᾧ μαινομένα κρᾶδιά / πτανὸς ἐφορμάσῃ χρυσοφαῆς, / φύσιν ὄρεσκόων σκυλάκων πελαγίων θ' / ὄσα τε γὰ τρέφει / τὰ τ' ἄελιος αἰθόμενα δέρκεται, / ἄνδρας τε συμπάντων βασιλῆϊδα τιμάν, also Soph. Phaedra fr. B Barrett Ἐρως γὰρ ἄνδρας οὐ μόνους ἐπέρχεται / οὐδ' αὖ γυναῖκας, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεῶν ἄνω / ψυχὰς χαράσσει κάπι πόντον ἔρχεται*). On the face of it, Phaedra hints at the erotic nature of her writing, even before the reference to her inspiration by Cupid. The above mentioned intertextual association helps to identify the secrets borne over land and sea with erotic secrets. Furthermore, this flight over sea can also be seen as a remote echo of Phaedra's sea journey from Crete to Athens. However, in the Euripidean play Phaedra's transposition from her birth place is seen as the beginning of her doom (cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 752-63, also 155-61). Phaedra's wish at line 68 never to have left Crete most eloquently shows her awareness of this fact. In this light, Phaedra's reference to the

crossing of the sea becomes potentially dangerous. On the symbolism of the sea and the employment of sea imagery in the play see Segal (1965) *passim*, esp. 119-21; for the significance of sea in Greek tragedy in general see Lesky (1947) esp. 215ff.. The special reference to the sea is perhaps explained by the fact that the Cretan sea was considered to be stormy (cf. Soph. *Tr.* 118f. *πολύπονρον ὄσπερ πέλαγος / Κρήσιον* with Σ ad loc.)

The high frequency of *terra marique* in epitaphs further enhances its ominous connotations (cf. e.g. *CLE* 1185.10 *per mare, per terras subsequitur dominum*, 1845.3 *per freta per terr[as sedula] dum sequ[itur]*). Phaedra's slip of tongue is meaningful and lies at the very heart of her generic conflict. Having experienced death and disaster in the Euripidean tragedy, Phaedra carries her "tragic legacy" into her new elegiac life. As a result, her elegiac appeal to Hippolytus is often undercut by such ominous Euripidean reminiscences, which foreshadow failure and death in the letter (cf. also her use of *sine crimine* at line 31 with n.). For ironic prefiguration and foreshadowing in the *Heroides* see Michalopoulos (2006) 33 n.69 with bibliography ad loc.

I am also tempted to read the reference to the journey over the sea in light of the poetic *topos* of the wind blowing a lover's perjured words or oaths over the sea (see Maltby on Tib. 1.4.21 with bibliography ad loc., Otto (1962) s.v. *ventus* 2), which in connection with *Cressa* at line 2 it further undermines Phaedra's credibility as letter writer.

pelagus (a transliteration of the Greek *πέλαγος*) is a poetic Graecism.

6. A *sententia*. Ovid was particularly fond of using *sententiae* in his work, possibly under the influence of the rhetorical school of his time (for more see Michalopoulos (2006) 63f). For a collection of such *sententiae* in the *Her.* see Carbonero (1993). See also lines 9, 11f., 25f., 29f., 34, 75f., 89f., 135f.

hostis ab hoste: perhaps an allusion to the *militia amoris*, since *hostis* is often used to describe an angry opponent in a lovers' quarrel (cf. e.g. Ov. *Ars* 2.461 with Janka, 3.667, *Rem.* 659, also *Her.* 7.62). On the motif see La Penna (1951) 193, Murgatroyd (1975), *idem* on Tib. 1.10.53-6, Booth (1981) 2695 n.63 with bibliography, Wyke (2002) 34 n.56 with bibliography, Maltby (2006) 158-60 with n.12. Moreover, the relationship between (step)mother and (step)son was traditionally notorious for its hostile character (for more see n. on *Her.* 4.129f.). The polyptoton (*hostis...hoste*) is further emphasized by the repetition *notis 5 / notas 6*.

7f. ter...ter / ...ter: the triple anaphora of *ter* is a poetic commonplace to describe –in most cases– a repeated attempt followed by failure, like here; it dates back to Homer (where it is generally followed by *τὸ τέταρτον* or failure, see Hopkinson on Call. *Hymn.* 6.13-15) and it is very frequent in Vergil (for a list see Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.690) and Ovid (cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.7.61f., 3.6.69, 3.7.23f., *Her.* 14.45, 18.35f., *Met.* 2.270f. with Bömer on the function of the double anaphora of *ter*, 7.189f., 7.261, esp. *Fast.* 2. 823 *ter conata loqui ter destitit*). The enjambment further adds to the triple repetition.

It was a common belief that single numbers, especially number three, enclose mystic power, possibly because of the traditional three-partite cosmic structure (air, earth, sea), cf. Theocr. 2.43 with Gow, Verg. *Ecl.* 8.73-5, *Georg.* 1.345, 4.384f., *Aen.* 6.229, 6.506, 11.188f., Tib. 1.2.56 with Murgatroyd and Maltby, Ov. *Met.* 7.153, 7.189-91, 14.387, *Fast.* 4.551 with Fantham. For the special meaning of number three (3) in magic and rituals see Gow on Theocr. 2.43, Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 1.267, Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.510, Norden (1923) 348-54, Tupet (1976) 47, Faraone (1991) 41f. For the power of numbers in general see Ifrah (1985).

inutilis haesit / lingua: *inutilis...lingua* is unique in Latin poetry, but the personification of *lingua* combined with *haereo* is common (cf. e.g. Ter. *Eun.* 977 *lingua haeret metu*, Verg. *Aen.* 2.774, 7.250, Ov. *Met.* 1.551, 4.266, 9.351. For further examples see *TLL* 6.2499.45ff.). Cf. also *Her.* 5.52, 11.82, 12.56, 13.13 for similar cases of personification of *lingua*. Phaedra's reference to her failed attempts to communicate with Hippolytus is noteworthy for its sexual undertones. Through the careful application of a sexually charged vocabulary (*haereo* has a wide range of sexual uses (Adams (1982) 181f.)), especially the attribution of *inutilis* which is used in descriptions of impotence (Adams (1982) 46), Phaedra manages to describe her failure in communication in terms of sexual malfunction. For Ovid's predilection for compounds (mostly adjectives and participles) with the *in-* privative see Booth (1981) 2698, also Cooper (1895) 250-2. Again at lines 10, 32, 33, 65, 87, 92, 106, 113, 117.

in primo destitit ore sonus: the verbal similarity with Apollonius' account of Medea's failed attempts to communicate to Chalciope her feelings for Jason is striking, cf. Ap. Rhod. 3.683-6 *μῦθος δ' ἄλλοτε μὲν οἱ ἐπ' ἀκροτάτης ἀνέτελλεν / γλώσσης, ἄλλοτ' ἔνερθε κατὰ στήθος πεπόνητο / πολλάκι δ' ἰμερόεν μὲν ἀνά στόμα θυῖεν ἐνισπεῖν, / φθογγή δ' οὐ προύβαινε παροιτέρω.*

in primo...ore: a common *iunctura* in the *Her.*, cf. 2.32 *in falso...ore*, 4.78 *in ore*, 16.228 *inuito...in ore*, 17.17 *ficto...in ore*, 17.36 *in ore*, 19.40 *in ore meo*, 20.122 *niueo...in ore*. The combination of *os* with a suitable adjective to identify a poetic style is a common Ovidian idiom, cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.15.19 *animosi...oris* and 2.1.11 with McKeown, 3.1.63f. *contacto...ore* (further see Thomas (1978) 448f.).

destitit: on the text see p.278.

9. prodest: on the text see p.278f.

pudor est miscendus amori: Phaedra's first attempt to portray herself as a virtuous woman and offer moral justification to her illicit plans actually constitutes a reversal of the traditional *topos* of the incompatibility between *pudor* and *amor* (cf. e.g. *AP* 12.117.3 Meleager ... *ποιῖ, θυμέ, τρέπη; – Τί δ' ἔρωτι λογισμός;* with Gow- Page ad loc., *AP* 12.120.4 Posidippus τὸν παραταξάμενον πρὸς σὲ λογισμόν ἔχω, *AP* 5.93.1 Rufinus Ὠπλισμαὶ πρὸς Ἔρωτα περὶ στέρνοισι λογισμόν, *AP* 16.198.3 Maecus, Verg. *Aen.* 4.55, Prop. 2.24A.4 *aut pudor ingenuis aut reticendus amor*, Ov. *Am.* 1.2.32 with McKeown, 1.6.59f., 1.8.35f., 3.1.22, 3.10.29 *uictus amore pudor*, esp. *Her.* 15.121 *non ueniunt in idem pudor atque amor*, 17.96 *quam cadat*

externo noster amore pudor, *Met.* 1.618f. *Pudor est, qui suadet illinc, / hinc dissuadet Amor*). Such contrasting pairs seem to have been popular in Roman poetry (cf. e.g. *Enn. scaen.* 278 *amor – honor*, *Plaut. Pseud.* 292-3 *pietas – amor*, *Ov. Met.* 2.847 *maiestas – amor*, 3.205 *pudor – timor*, for an extensive list of parallels see Bömer on *Ov. Met.* 1.618). However, nowhere in elegy does *pudor* appear in a programmatic context (see Keith (1997) 309 n.22). Phaedra mentions her *pudor* once again, near the end of her letter, where she contradicts herself by admitting to the flight of her *pudor* away from her (see line 155 with n.). For a detailed discussion of the intertextual implications behind Phaedra's combined use of *pudor* with *fama* see pp.16ff.

The combination of the double caesurae ("strong caesura" and hepthemimeral) builds the line in a slow pace.

10f. iussit amor / ... Amor iussit: cf. Medea's similar inner conflict at *Ap. Rhod.* 3.653f. ἤτοι δ' ἰθύσειεν, ἔρυκέ μιν ἔνδοθεν αἰδώς / αἰδοῖ δ' ἐργομένην θρασὺς ἴμερος ὀτρύνεσκεν with Curley (1999) 171. The triple repetition of *amor* at lines 9-11 is remarkable: first, through a line-final repetition between lines 9 and 10 (...*amori* / *amor*), and then through the repetition of the end of line 10 at the beginning of line 11 (*iussit amor* / ... *Amor iussit*). The repetition also helps to highlight both the prominent presence of Love and the urgency of his commands.

10. dicere...scribere: the close metrical association of the two infinitives (both placed at the beginning of each hemistich in the pentameter) through the swift transition from *dicere* to *scribere* gives the impression of an immediate realization of *Amor*'s command.

11-4. Phaedra's careful arrangement of two well-known elegiac *topoi* is remarkable: a) *Amor* instructing on a poem in progress (lines 11, 13), b) *Amor*'s omnipotence over gods and mortals (lines 12, 14).

11. quidquid Amor iussit: the idea of a divinity ordering the content of a poem goes back to *Hes. Theog.* 33 καὶ μ' ἐκέλονθ' ὕμνεῖν μακάρων γένος αἰὲν ἔόντων, cf. also *Call. fr.* 1.25f., *fr.* 67.1f. *Pf., Tib.* 1.6.30, *Prop.* 2.13.4, 16.40, *Ov. Am.* 2.1.3 with McKeown, *Ars* 3.43f. with Gibson, *Met.* 9.515. The phrase (*amor iussit*) appears again at *Tib.* 1.6.30, *Ov. Am.* 2.1.3, *Her.* 20.230, *Sen. Phaedr.* 354 and *CLE* 83.90.

Amor's divine apparition at the very opening of the letter and his instructions regarding the content of the poem are clearly programmatic. Phaedra through a dense web of intertextual allusions to similar instances of divine inspiration in elegiac poetry manages to assume the role of the elegiac poet and thus further establish her elegiac status (further on Phaedra's role in the letter as an elegiac poet see pp.11ff.).

Amor: modern conventions demand *Amor* (the love-god) to distinguish from *amor* (the erotic feeling) in the previous line; however, the conflation of the two should not be excluded (cf. Booth on *Ov. Am.* 2.1.3 and 18.15, Kenney (1958) 61).

11. non est contemnere: the idea of the mortals' futile fighting against the will of gods was known even since Homer (cf. e.g. *Il.* 6.129, 141, 17.489f., 20.367f.) and became proverbial (see Murgatroyd (1980) and Maltby (2002) on *Tib.* 1.6.29f.).

tutum: here in the sense of “free from risk, safe” (*OLD* s.v. 5b), the adjective appears again at lines 120 and 145 with reference to the Amazon and Hippolytus respectively meaning “unharméd, secure” (*OLD* s.v. 1, see n. on *Her.* 4.145).

12. regnat et in dominos ius habet...deos: cf. Sen. *Phaedr.* 218 *amoris in me maximum regnum reor*, the omnipotence of Love has a long history in both Greek and Latin poetry, cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 2.669 ...ὄς τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀνάσσει, Hes. *Theog.* 120-2 ἦδ' Ἔρος, ὃς κάλλιτος ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι, / λυσιμελής, πάντων τε θεῶν πάντων τ' ἀνθρώπων / δάμναται ἐν στήθεσσι νόον καὶ ἐπίφρονα βουλήν, Soph. *Phaedra* fr. B Barrett (= Eur. fr. 431 Nauck) Ἔρος γὰρ ἀνδρας οὐ μόνους ἐπέρχεται / οὐδ' αὖ γυναῖκας, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεῶν ἄνω / ψυχὰς χαράσσει κάπι πόντον ἔρχεται / καὶ τόνδ' ἀπείργειν οὐδ' ὁ παγκρατῆς σθένει / Ζεὺς, ἀλλ' ὑπέκει καὶ θέλων ἐγκλίνεται, Eur. *Hipp.* 538 Ἔρωτα δέ, τὸν τύραννον ἀνδρῶν (with Segal's (1965) 130f. remarks on the vocabulary of violence and conquest employed in this lyric representation of Eros), Verg. *Aen.* 1.229f. ...*o qui res hominumque deumque / aeternis regis imperiis et fulmine terres*, Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.14-6 ... *qui res hominum ac deorum, // temperat* (for further parallels see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.1.13f. and 2.37-38).

regnat et in...ius habet...deos: both terms belong to the legal technical language (La Penna (1951) 192, Kenney (1969) 253), which is used extensively by Ovid in this letter, cf. e.g. *socialia foedera* 17, *crimine* 18, *crimen* 25, *sine crimine* 31, *iudicium* 40, *iudice* 74, *iniuria* 113, *tollendi causa* 124, *nobilitas* 161 (further on Ovid's predilection for legal terminology in general see Kenney (1969) and Booth (1981) 2694 n.58 with bibliography). Together with Ov. *Am.* 1.1.5 (*hoc in carmina iuris*) this is the earliest occurrence of *ius* denoting “a god's power” (McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.1.5, cf. also *TLL* 7.2.690.68ff.).

et: the postponement of *et* by analogy with the postponement of *καὶ* in Hellenistic poetry was a neoteric mannerism, see Papanghelis (1994) 156f., Maltby (1999) 384f. with n.16 with bibliography, *idem* (2002) 71f. with n.122 with bibliography, McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 2.10.36 with bibliography and on 1.9.22, Michalopoulos (2006) 60f. Again at lines 15, 99 and 123.

13f. Cf. the Nurse's interpretation of Phaedra's erotic feelings in terms of the god's will at Eur. *Hipp.* 476 τόλμα δ' ἐρώσα θεὸς ἐβουλήθη τάδε.

13. dixit: the intensity of the command implied through the double repetition of *iussit* at lines 10f. is further enhanced by the emphatic placement of *dixit* last in the hexameter (immediately followed by the imperative *scribe!* 16). The verb *dicere* often introduces *Amor*'s divine utterances (cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.1.24, 2.1.9, *Rem.* 40). For a list of parallels of Love's commands to the poet see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.6.12 and 2.1.38.

14. Amor's laconic instructions to Phaedra are restricted only to the pentameter, stressing thus further the elegiac character of her writing (cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.1.24, see also pp.14f.).

dabit uictas...manus: *manus dare* is a common metaphor for erotic subjection, originating in the technical vocabulary of war (La Penna (1951) 194 with references) and of gladiators (for

more see Otto (1962) s.v. *manus* 211); it is very popular with Ovid, cf. *Her.* 17.262 *cunctatas tempore uicta manus* with Michalopoulos, 21.240 *do...uictas in tua uota manus*, *Am.* 1.2.20 *porrigimus uictas tua iura manus* with McKeown, 1.7.1 *Adde manus in uincla meas*, 28 *uincla subite manus*, *Met.* 5.351 *dextra sed Ausonio manus est subiecta Peloro*, 5.236 *submissaeque manus*, *Petron.* 111.10 *porrexit ad humanitatem uictam manum*. For similar combinations of amatory and military expressions cf. e.g. *Prop.* 4.3.12, *Ov. Her.* 2.117ff., 7.95ff., *Met.* 6.428ff.

ferreus: a typical elegiac signal denoting hard-heartedness, common in Ovid's elegiac verse, where the metaphorical use of *ferrum* in erotic contexts is very frequent (cf. Pichon (1966) s.v., for a list of parallels see McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.6.27 and 1.11.9). A heart made of iron or rock is a widespread literary convention for both Greek and Latin literature going back to Homer (cf. *Hom. Od.* 23.103, 23.172, *Hes. Op.* 147, *Theog.* 239, *Aesch. Prom.* 242, *Aristoph. Acharn.* 491 *σιδηροῦς ἔ ἀνήρ*, *Cic. Amic.* 87, *Tusc.* 3.12, *Tib.* 1.1.64 with Maltby, 1.10.2, *Prop.* 1.9.31, 1.16.29ff., *Ov. Am.* 1.6.27, 1.7.50, 1.11.9, 1.14.28, 2.5.11, 2.19.4, 3.6.59, *Her.* 2.137, 10.107-110, 12.138, *Met.* 9.614, 14.712, *Tr.* 1.8.41ff., *Juv.* 1.31). In Tibullus the adjective is applied to the man of the Iron Age twice (cf. 1.2.67 and 1.10.2 with Maltby), which in view of Phaedra's reference to Saturn's Golden Reign at lines 131f. (see n.) could perhaps invest the attribution of *ferreus* to Hippolytus with further connotations of old-fashioned morality.

Adjectives in *-eus*, with the exception of those who denote material (cf. line 83 *cornea*), are stylistically elevated (Ross (1960) 60ff.) (cf. lines 49 *semideae*, 160 *purpureo*) and are metrically convenient in hexameters (see Norden (1927) 218 and Bömer on *Met.* 15.296 and 12.417).

15. adsit: the verb has sacral connotations (*OLD* s.v. *adsum* 13b), as it appears often in ritual requests of divine epiphany, cf. *Catul.* 62.5, *Verg. Georg.* 1.18 (with Thomas (1988) 71f., *Aen.* 1.734, 3.116, *Hor. Carm.* 3.21.21, 27.66, *Tib.* 1.1.37 and 1.7.49 with Maltby, *Lygd.* [Tib.] 3.3.33, 3.6.1, 3.101.1, *Ov. Am.* 2.13.21, 3.2.51, *Met.* 3.613, 4.31, *Rem.* 75, *Ib.* 83, *Fast.* 3.834, 5.109, *Sen. Phaedr.* 54, especially *Ov. Met.* 10.640f. ("*Cytherea.../ adsit*", *ait*" *nostris et quos dedit, adiuuet ignes*"), where the invocation of Venus is combined with the motif of love as fire, just like here. Further see Appel (1909) 115f. and N-A on *Lygd.* [Tib.] 3.6.1.

ut nostras audio uorat igne medullas: the chiasmic arrangement of the terms in the line (ab V BA) puts all emphasis on the verb around which they are centred. Phaedra here introduces the erotic motif of "love as fire" (further on this see n. on *Her.* 4.19f. below).

nostras...medullas: *nostras* is a case of poetic plural. The substitution of *nos / noster* for *ego / meus* is frequent both in prose and verse (often for reasons of metrical convenience, like here), possibly originating in colloquial register as a result of rhetorical influence (hence its high frequency in elegy), see K-S 1.2. 87f., Löfstedt (1928) 1.27-8, LHS 2.16-8. For more see N-A on *Lygd.* [Tib] 3.2.5. Again at lines 18 *fama...nostra* and 84 *nostra lumina*.

medullas: cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 255 *χρῆν γὰρ μετρίας εἰς ἀλλήλους / φιλίας θνητοῦς ἀνακίρνασθαι / καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἄκρον μυελὸν ψυχῆς*. The bones as the seat of love's attack (or

love's malady) is a widespread erotic *topos* of Hellenistic literature (for parallels see Theocr. 3.17 with Gow and Hunter ad loc., Fordyce on Catul. 45.16, Prop. 1.9.29 with Fedeli, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 14.351).

aido...igne: the *iunctura* originates with Ovid (cf. *Met.* 9.172 *flammae* with Bömer, 9.234, 12.280, 15.530 *faces*, Sen. *Med.* 885f., [Verg.] *Aetn.* 640), perhaps a Vergilian influence (cf. Verg. *Georg.* 3.271f. (*continuoque aidis ubi subdita flamma medullis / uere magis , quia uere calor redit ossibus (...)*) and *Aen.* 4.66 *est mollis flamma medullas*, also Ov. *Am.* 3.10.27f. *uidit et, ut tenerae flammam rapuere medullae, / hinc pudor, ex illa parte trahebat amor*).

uorat: on the text see p.279. *uorat* is a strong verb. For love as a cruel and destructive force see Grassmann (1966) 139 131n., Fedeli on Prop. 1.1.6 and McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.1.5.

16. fingat...animos: on the text see p.279.

animos in mea uota tuos: *animos* is another case of poetic plural. The imagery of moulding Hippolytus' mind complements nicely that of the melting of Phaedra's bone marrow. The use of *in* + accusative to denote manner ("according to") is common (see *OLD* s.v. *in* 18, *TLL* 7.1.754.31ff. Further parallels see McKeown on *Am.* 1.13.46).

17. nequitia: "wantonness, baseness", a typical term for the morally lax elegiac way of living, cf. Prop. 1.6.26, 2.24A.6, Ov. *Am.* 1.13.32, 2.1.2, 3.1.17, Pichon (1966) s.v.). Ovid at *Am.* 2.1.2 uses the term to refer to his poetry (on its metaliterary connotations see Landolfi (2000) 21 and Michalopoulos on *Her.* 17.29).

socialia foedera rumpam: "marriage- bond", the metaphor of marriage as *foedus* is common in Roman elegy (cf. Reitzenstein (1912) 9-36, Pichon (1966) s.v. *foedera*). The idea of "love as contract" (*foedus amoris*), despite its (plausible) Greek background, seems to have been largely imported from Roman legal terminology (further see La Penna (1951) 190-2, Freyburger (1980), Maltby on Tib. 1.5.7). Phaedra, although a Greek heroine, voices the idea of partnership (*societas*), which best characterizes the relationship between husband and wife in Roman marriage. The Romans showed a particular preoccupation for partnership in life and community of property between the spouses. Wife and husband were joined by *socialia foedera* and enjoyed *socialia iura* and *socialis amor* (see Treggiari (1991) 208, esp. 249f.).

The *iunctura* appears only twice in Ovid (again at Ov. *Met.* 14.380 *socialia foedera laedam* also with reference to marital relationship) and in Livy (34.57.9.2, 45.25.9.2). For similar formations in Ovid see e.g. *Her.* 5.101, *Met.* 6.536 *coniugalia iura*, 7.710 *foedera lecti*, 715 *iura iugalia*, 852 *foedera lecti*, 11.743f. *coniugale / foedus*, 11.743-4 with Bömer, *Ponto* 3.1.73.

Phaedra later in her letter (line 147) refers again to her proposed relationship with Hippolytus in terms of *foedus amoris* (see n. ad loc.).

rumpam: Phaedra's use of *rumpere* (*OLD* s.v. *rumpo* 3a "to burst (barrier, bonds) so as to escape, break out of or through") is linked with the popular elegiac idea of liberty and escape from the (often chained) erotic servitude (see Murgatroyd (1981) 597f.); at the same time this particular choice implicitly suggests Phaedra's view of her marriage to Theseus in terms of

imprisonment. Perhaps it is not by chance that the Euripidean Phaedra during her first appearance on stage also makes use of a vocabulary, which implied a similar longing for freedom (Eur. *Hipp.* 199 loosening of the yoke of her limbs, 202 removal of the head-dress and release of her hair) (Rabinowitz (1987) 132). For a similar phrasing see Ov. *Fast.* 4.602 *statque semel iuncti rumpere uincla tori* with Fantham.

18. fama: Phaedra's concern for *fama* ("good reputation") is a typical virtue of a respectable Roman matron. Through her proud declaration of a spotless life (repeated at lines 31f.) Phaedra embodies the Roman ideal of the *uniuira*, a woman married and devoted to only one man (see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 17.17f.). From an intertextual perspective, her emphasis on *fama* echoes her similar concern for *εὐκλεία* in Eur. *Hipp.* For a detailed discussion of Phaedra's preoccupation with her good name (*fama*) and its multiple intertextual implications see pp.16ff. Her concern for good reputation goes back to Homeric quotations of future speeches (cf. *Od.* 6.276-84 (Nausicaa), *Il.* 6.459-62, 7.87-91, 16.838-42, 22.106-8 (Hector)), while the struggle for good name often appears among the pursuits of a mistress in elegy (cf. Pichon (1966) s.v. *fama*).

crimine: Despite her claims for the contrary, Phaedra proves to be conscious of the illicit character of her proposition. *crimen* is a legal term, widely applied in elegy with reference to adultery (cf. Pichon (1966) s.v. *crimen*, further on the term see n. on *Her.* 4.31). Cf. *crimen* 25, *nocens* 28, *crimine* 31, *adulterio...adulter* 34, *culpa* 138, 145, *culpae* 151, which contribute to the formation of a context of guilt.

-uelim quaeras-: Phaedra's use of parenthesis gives to her letter a certain degree of spontaneity and immediacy by creating the illusion of Hippolytus' actual presence. She is addressing him as if he was standing close to her. The use of parenthesis, which was inherited principally from Hellenistic poetry, is a popular narrative device in Ovid. Further see Lapp (1965) 52f., von Albrecht (1964), Lyne (1978) 30f., Galimberti Biffino (1988), Solodow (1988) 54f., Clausen on Verg. *Ecl.* 1.31 with bibliography, Tarrant (1998), Wills (1996) 337-41, Wheeler (1999) 102. A similar conditional clause is also found at line 119 (*si quaeras, ubi sit*). Further on the so-called *quaeris*-formula see Heinze on *Her.* 12.199 with bibliography.

19-26. Rosati (1985) 115 finds these lines "particolarmente interessante per capire il codice etico cui la lettera si ispira." Phaedra's initial claim to *fama* receives further justification through her self-portrayal as a virtuous and loyal wife. Her portrayal is twofold: lines 19-26 deal with her inexperience in love, while at lines 27-36 she puts forward her claims to her (alleged) virginity.

19. uenit amor grauius, quo serior: cf. Prop. 1.7.26 *saepe uenit magno faenore tardus amor*, esp. Sulp. [Tib.] 3.13.1f. *Tandem uenit amor qualem texisse pudore / quam nudasse alicui sit mihi fama magis* (further on the intertextual link between *Her.* 4.19 and Sulp. [Tib.] 3.13.1 see pp. 18ff.), also Prop. 1.9.1, 2.3B.46. Ov. 1.6.13 *uenit amor*. For the motif of love's late arrival and its consequent harshness see Fedeli on Prop. 1.7.26.

gravius...serior: on the text see 279.

19f. urimur intus; / urimur, et...: the repetition of *urimur* is emphatic (cf. Tib. 2.4.5f ...*urit / uror*...). Similar repetitions of verbs (or equivalent verbal structures) in significant places in the verse are broadly used by Ovid in his *Her.* (in the majority of cases adding further emphasis), cf. 5.145f., 10.33, 11.59f., 19.151f., 15.162f. For more see Wills (1996) 174-178. The metaphoric use of fire and heat for love constitutes a widespread *topos* in ancient poetry (for a list of parallels see Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.1f., Maltby on Tib. 1.1.6 and 1.8.7, Gibson on *Ars* 3. 597f.). Love as fire is particularly frequent in Roman elegy (cf. McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.1.26 with bibliography, also Booth (1981) 2695 n.63).

It is tempting to detect behind the image of Phaedra on erotic fire a possible influence from visual arts. Two surviving works, however of a much later age, might be echoing an iconographic tradition of “Phaedra on fire.” In a mosaic from New Paphos (from the “House of Dionysus,” 250-300 AD) a little Eros is targeting Phaedra with an inflamed torch (see *LIMC* V2 s.v. *Hippolytus* I 35); similarly on the face of a Roman sarcophagus from Tyrus (?) a little Eros is sculpted raising a flamed torch on Phaedra’s chest (cf. *LIMC* V2 s.v. *Hippolytus* I 32). Further on Ovid’s influence from visual arts in his work see Bartholomé (1935), Wilkinson (1955) 172ff., Benediktson (1985)b, McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.1.21-24 with bibliography.

urimur, et...uulnus habent: the combination of love as wound and as fire is reminiscent of Verg. *Aen.* 4.1f. *At regina graui iam dudum saucia cura / uulnus alit uenis et caeco carpitur igni* with Pease, 66-8 (... *est mollis flamma medullas / interea et tacitum uiuit sub pectore uulnus. / uritur infelix Dido* (...). Cf. also Ov. *Met.* 8.516f. *uritur et caecis torreri uiscera sensit / ignibus*, *Met.* 10.525-28, *Rem.* 105 ...*tacitae serpent in uiscera flammae* with Henderson and Pinotti.

caecum...uulnus: love as wound is another widespread *topos* in Latin poetry (originating in Lucr. 4.1120, also see Verg. *Aen.* 4.67, 683, 689, 10.732, Ov. *Met.* 6.293, 7.342, Stat. *Silv.* 5.5.82), and elegy in particular, cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.2.7, 2.9A.3-4, *Her.* 6.82, 7.191f., 16.38, 210, 244, 278 (see Pichon (1966) s.v. *uulnus*, *saucius*). For further parallels in both Greek and Latin poetry see Jocelyn on Ennius’ *Medea*. 216, Gow on [Theocr]. 11.15, 30.10, *AP.* 5.225. On the *iunctura* see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 7.342 (and *TLL* 3.45.53ff.). Phaedra’s use of the wound imagery inevitably evokes the imagery of Cupid as an archer, especially in view of Phaedra’s sole reference in the Euripidean *Hippolytus* of love as wound caused by Cupid (Eur. *Hipp.* 392 *ἐπεὶ μ’ ἔρωσ ἔτρωσεν*, in all other references she mentions love as a disease. Love as disease (physical or mental) is a frequent metaphor in Roman elegy, possibly under Greek influence (tragedy, Hellenistic love poetry, novel) see La Penna (1951) 206-8, Booth (1981) 2695 n.63 with bibliography, Maltby (2006) 153. Further on Phaedra’s use of the *nosos*- imagery in her letter see pp. 10f.). The fact that the image of Eros as archer first originates in Eur. *Hipp.* 530-33 (*οὔτε γὰρ πυρὸς οὔτ’ ἄστρων ὑπέρτερον βέλος, / οἷον τὸ τὰς Ἀφροδίτας / ἴησιν ἐκ χερῶν / Ἔρωσ, ὁ Διὸς παῖς*) further supports the intertextual link. For the bow as Cupid’s attribute

and the god's skills in archery see Ap. Rhod. 3.278f. with Campbell, Tib. 2.5.105f. and 2.6.15 with Maltby, Prop. 1.7.15, 1.10.21, Ov. *Am.* 1.1.21-24 with McKeown, *Am.* 2.5.1, also Ov. *Am.* 2.5.1, 3.9.7f., *Met.* 1.461 and 10.34 with Bömer, and Apul. *Met.* 4.30.4 with Kenney, also Pichon (1966) s.v. *arcus*, Maltby (2004) 264f. If such connotations are perceptible here, then Phaedra manages to produce a striking image of suffering from a wound caused by Eros' fiery arrows. Actually, the combination of torch, bow and arrows as *Amor's* arms was conventional, since the Hellenistic times, cf. Ap. Rhod. 3.286f. with Campbell, *AP.* 5.181 (Meleager), 5.189 (Asclepiades), Tib. 2.6.15f. with Maltby, Prop. 2.12.1-12, 3.16.16 with Fedeli, Ov. *Am.* 1.1.25f., 1.2.45f. with McKeown, 1.15.27, 2.9.5 with McKeown with bibliography, *Her.* 2.39f. (Venus), *Ars* 1.21-24 with Hollis, Sen. *Phaedr.* 276, Repos. *Carm. de aegr. Perd.* 7-8, also Wyke (2002) 63 n. 19 with bibliography. On Eros' fiery missiles see the literature assembled by Williams on Call. *Hymn.* 2.49, Kost on Mus. 19, esp. Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.1f..

pectora: a common poetic plural for metrical reasons. The breast as the seat of love is a commonplace in erotic poetry, cf. McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.1.25f., Pichon (1966) s.v. *pectus*, Bömer on *Met.* 7.55. Also see line 4.23 *sic male uixque subit primos rude pectus amores* (in the *Heroides* again at 1.22, 3.60, 7.189, 8.58 (in connection with fire), 12.142, 213, 13.30, 15.112, 207, 212, 16. 25, 50, 126, 17.138, 18.65, 92, 19.192, 21.231). The close similarity with Ariadne's and Helen's similar references to love as wound in the chest is noteworthy (cf. *Her.* 7.191-2 *nec mea nunc primum feriuntur pectora telo: / ille locus saeui uulnus amoris habet*, 16. 277-8 *non mea sunt summa leuiter dstricta sagitta / pectora; descendit uulnus ad ossa meum*.

21-4. The taming of oxen and horses in erotic context is a commonplace in erotic poetry, particularly favoured by Ovid (cf. *Am.* 1.2.13-6 with McKeown, 3.4.13-16, *Her.* 9.27f. with Casali and Lindheim (2003) 67, *Ars* 1.471f., 3.555f., *Rem.* 89f. and 235f. with Pinotti, also see N-H on Hor. *Carm.* 2.5.1f., Tib. 1.3.41f. and 1.4.16 with Murgatroyd and Maltby, La Penna (1951) 206, Buchheit (1962) 104 n.6 with bibliography, Pichon (1966) s.v. *domare*). After all, Eros, as a rustic fertility god, was born among the herds in the countryside, cf. Tib. 2.1.67f. *ipse quoque inter agros interque armenta Cupido / natus et indomitas dicitur inter equas* with Maltby citing Eur. *Hipp.* 1274-7 *θέλγει δ' Ἔρως, ᾧ μαινομένα κρᾶδιά / πτανός ἐφορμάση χρυσοφαής, / φύσιν ὄρεσκόων σκυλάκων πελαγίων θ' / ὄσα τε γὰ τρέφει*). An epigram from Moschus (*AP A.Pl.* 200) offers an interesting portrayal of Eros as plougher (where the combination of Eros' torch and bow also appears). Here Phaedra manipulates the conventional erotic simile in order to provide further links between herself and her beloved. Her specific choice of animals becomes very appropriate in the letter's context, since both the bull and the horse play a prominent role in the life of the two lovers. Hence, the erotic implications of the animal imagery are further enhanced by its symbolic significance for the two main protagonists of the story (Phaedra and Hippolytus) and by the multiplicity of its intertextual associations. For a detailed examination of the simile see Pearson (1980) 112-20, Armstrong (2001) 159 and nn. below.

21. ut teneros urunt iuga prima iuencos: the transition from adolescence to adulthood in terms of taming through the metaphor of the girl as filly or heifer is a commonplace in both Greek and Roman poetry (for parallels in Greek literature see Calame (2001) 238-44 with nn.119-23, also Call. *Epigr.* 45.3 Pf., Plaut. *Curc.* 50ff., Catul. 63.33, 68. 118, Verg. *Ecl.* 6.50, Hor. *Carm.* 2.5.1f. with N-H, 3.11.9, Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.164f.). Phaedra's substitution of *iuencos* for *boues*, which is the normal use for oxen used for ploughing (so Mynors on Verg. *Georg.* 1.45f.), is worth mentioning. Her emphasis on their young age subtly plays down the age gap between herself and her young stepson. The association between the two is supported by the careful placement of *iuencos* and *equus* at the very end of two consecutive lines. In addition, the use of *tener* (a frequent attribute to elegiac mistresses, cf. Pichon (1966) s.v. *tener*) further underscores the youth and the vulnerability of the yoked animals.

More importantly, her particular choice for the "young bulls" must have been dictated by the overwhelming presence of the bull imagery in her family: Europa's love for Jupiter disguised as bull (*tauro dissimulante deum* 56), Pasiphae's unnatural love for the bull (*decepto subdita tauro* 57, *corrumpere taurum / mater* 165f.), Theseus' killing of the Minotaur (115f.) (see Pearson (1980) 115f.). Furthermore, from an intertextual perspective Phaedra's choice of the bull imagery is fitting for Hippolytus. Her reference to the young bulls works here as an ominous allusion to Hippolytus' tragic death, which was caused by the lethal combination of a monstrous bull, miraculously spewed by a sea wave, and Hippolytus' panic-stricken horses, according to the messenger's speech at Eur. *Hipp.* 1213ff. (cf. also Ov. *Met.* 15.508-11 with Curley (1999) 200f., *Rem.* 743f. *perdat opes Phaedra, parces, Neptune, nepoti, / nec faciet pauidos taurus auitus equos*). Further on the symbolism of the bull imagery in the play see Segal (1992) 433f. with n. 47 with bibliography and Detienne and Vernant (1978) 190-206. For a similar interplay between the two imageries in Seneca's *Phaedra* see Paschalis (1994) 121-6).
urunt: on the text see p.279f.

iuga prima: an Ovidian *iunctura*, cf. *Am.* 1.2.14 *detractant prensi dum iuga prima boues*, 1.13.16, *Rem.* 235 *aspicis ut prensos urant iuga prima iuencos*, *Met.* 4.733. Ovid seems to have been very fond of the association of *iugum* with marriage (so Pearson (1980) 114 n.16 with bibliography). Phaedra's use of the yoke imagery is indicative of her confusion, since the yoke is appropriate with regard to her marital relationship with Theseus, but totally inappropriate in respect of her proposed adulterous relationship with Hippolytus (cf. her equally confused application of *foedera* at line 147).

The yoke imagery is one of the most prominent motifs in Eur. *Hipp.* (see Reckford (1972) esp. 419-21, Fowler (1978) 18, Zeitlin (1985) 58ff., Goff (1990) 63). In addition, the pun on yoking plays a central role in Hippolytus' life, since Hippolytus in the Euripidean play is transformed from the one who unyokes his horses (a symbolic manifestation of his opposition to any sexual union promoted by Aphrodite) into a victim of the *συσύγλαι Χάριτες* (1148 "yoked

Graces”) when he ultimately succumbs to his horrible misfortune (1389 οἶα συμφορᾶ συνεζύγης) (further see Calame (2001) 241).

22. frenaque uix patitur de grege captus equus: the horse imagery is particularly appropriate especially in view of the ominous etymological derivation of Hippolytus from ἵππος and λύω (Ἰππόλυτος = “furiis direptus equorum” Ov. *Fast.* 3.265). On the etymology see Paschalis (1994) 119f., *idem* (1997) 271f. and Michalopoulos (2001), esp. Segal (1965) 147 n. 48 with bibliography on the connections made in antiquity between his name and his fate (cf. also the similar etymology of the name of Hippolytus’ mother (*Hippolyte*), see note on *Her.* 4.2). Moreover, Hippolytus was highly skilled in horsemanship judging from the great number of relevant references throughout the play (for the (homo)sexual connotations of the imagery see Devereux (1964), *idem* (1985) 24-32, Segal (1965) 125f., 130, esp. 144-7, Bushala (1969), Zeitlin (1985) 56, 79, Craik (1998) 36-42, also see p.48. For the sexual implications of Phaedra’s horse-riding see Glenn (1976) 228-31, Brenk (1986), Armour (1988) and Roisman (1999) 53-5).

The morbid allusions to the death of Hippolytus already present in the etymology of his name are further enhanced in view of the combined presence of both the bull and the horses in Hippolytus’ death (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1174ff.) in the Athenian version of the myth (as opposed to the Troezinian version, where Hippolytus’ death comes solely from the sea (see Pausan. 2.32.10)).

Phaedra’s specific reference to a horse “taken from / cut off from the herd,” (*de grege captus*) constitutes a further hint at the symbolic identification of the horse with Hippolytus, since the reference does not concern any horse in general, but more specifically horse which has been separated from its herd. It is exactly this separation which brings to the attentive reader’s mind Hippolytus’ separation from society and his seclusion to his “untouched meadow”, a theme which is repeatedly touched upon in the play (cf. e.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 12 μόνος πολιτῶν, 75-77 ἔνθ’ οὔτε ποιμὴν ἀξιοὶ φέρβειν βοτὰ / οὐτ’ ἠλθέ πω σίδαρος, ἀλλ’ ἀκήρατον / μέλισσα λειμῶν ἠρινὴ διέρχεται, 84 μόνω γὰρ ἔστι τοῦτ’ ἐμοὶ γέρας βροτῶν, 986 ἐγὼ δ’ ἄκομπος εἰς ὄχλον δοῦναι λόγον).

frenaque uix patitur: the reference to the reins -emphatically placed at the beginning of the line- supports further the dark allusion to Hippolytus’ tragic death, since the hero is dragged to death entangled to the leather reins of his horses (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1236-39, 1244-46, Ov. *Met.* 15.518-20). The verbal similarity with Eur. *Hipp.* 1223f. is noteworthy (αἶ δ’ ἐνδακοῦσαι στόμια πυριγενῆ γναθμοῖς / βία φέρουσιν). Cf. also Phaedra’s similar reference at line 46 *torquentem frenis ora fugacis equi* with n. ad loc. In artistic representations, whenever Hippolytus is depicted with a horse, he is always holding the reins of his horses (see *LIMC* V2 s.v. *Hippolytus* I, e.g. 32, 49, 52, 54, 68-70, 86). For Hippolytus’ death in Ov. *Met.* 15 see Curley (1999) 199ff.

captus: a hint at the elegiac motif of the *seruitium amoris* (on the motif see Copley (1947), Lilja (1965) 86f., 94, Lyne (1979), Pichon (1966) s.v. *capere*, N-H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.33.14,

Murgatroyd (1981), Davis (1989) 38 n. 3, McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.3.5f., McCarthy (1998), Wyke (2002) 33f. with n.53, Maltby (2006) 156-8 with n.10).

equus: the horse and bull imagery can also be seen as a double entendre for (male and female) genitalia, possibly under the influence of the similar metaphorical use of the terms by the Greeks (for horse: see Adams (1982) 30, 165, Henderson (1991) 126f., 165, 177, for bull: Henderson (1991) 133, 202f.). Cf. also the sexual innuendos behind the use of *frenum* (Adams (1982) 74). Further on the sexual (and phallic) implication of the bull and Hippolytus' horses see Knox (1952) 6 n.8, Segal (1965) 125, 144-48, (1978) 136, also Zeitlin (1985) 193 n.32.

23. uixque subit primos rude pectus amores: the close association with the simile is further supported by the use of *subit*, the repetition of *uix* and by the presence of *primos...amores* which picks up the *prima iuga* at line 21. Helen in her letter to Paris makes a similar claim to her alleged erotic inexperience (cf. *Her.* 17.141-6, esp. 141f. *sum rudis ad Veneris furtum, nullaque fidelem— / di mihi sunt testes— lusimus arte uirum*). Like Briseis (*Her.* 3.17f.) and Phyllis (*Her.* 2.63f.), Phaedra proudly pronounces her timidity and inexperience in love while rejecting at the same time love as a technique (more on this see Spentzou (2003) 55).

pectus: for *pectus* as the seat of love see n. on *Her.* 4.20 above.

rude: *rudis* is a typical adjective to denote unsophistication and inexperience in love, see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 17. 141f. with bibliography.

amores: the use of the plural *amores*, instead of the singular *amor*, to suggest affection and intensity of feeling is an old, familiar practice in Roman poetry, see Pease on *Verg. Aen.* 4.28, La Penna (1951) 195-201.

24. sarcinaque haec animo non sedet apta mea: this idea of endurance in erotic context and of Love punishing the unwilling originates at Eur. *Hipp.* 443-6 *Κύπρις γὰρ οὐ φορητός, ἦν πολλὴ ῥυτῆ / ἢ τὸν μὲν εἶκονθ' ἡσυχῆ μετέρχεται, / ὄν δ' ἂν περισσὸν καὶ φρονοῦνθ' εὕρη μέγα*), cf. also Tib. 1.8.7f., Prop. 2.5.16, *Ov. Am.* 1.2.10. The possibility of a sexual innuendo behind the use of *sedeo* (see Adams (1982) 165) should not be excluded.

sarcina is mostly prosaic, but it is popular with Ovid (often in metaphorical use), cf. *Tr.* 1.1.126, 3.84, 3.14.16, 5.6.5, *Pont.* 1.2.45, 3.7.14, again in the *Her.* 3.84, 4.24, 7.107, 9.58, also Plaut. *Most.* 430, *Trin.* 596, 719, Prop. 4.3.46, Hor. *Epist.* 1.13.6, Juv. 2.103, [*Verg.*] *Catal.* 10.16.

25f. Phaedra's pretentious claims to her erotic inexperience are contradicted later in her letter by her direct references to her new pursuit of erotic arts (37 *ignotas mittor in artes*) and to her conscious love for Hippolytus (52 *consciis amor*). In fact, the letter itself is a manifestation of the art she denounces.

25. ars fit: Phaedra vigorously starts the verse with the emphatic use of the double-edged *ars*, meaning "wile, stratagem" (*OLD* s.v. 3, *TLL* 2.658.46ff., cf. in the *Her.* 12.50, 17.142, 20.47, 21.222) and "art" (*OLD* s.v. 8). In the latter sense, the term becomes extremely significant, since Phaedra's "erotic art" actually coincides with her "art of writing." (further on the poetological

implications of *ars* here see Spentzou (2003) 55ff. and my discussion at pp. 19ff.). Cf. also Ov. *Ars* 1.4 *arte gerendus Amor*, 2.313 with Janka on *dissimulatio artis* and 3.41 *arte perennat Amor* with Gibson's note that "it is characteristic of Ovid to emphasise *ars* at critical moments in his prologues." Prop. 1.1.17 (*in me tardus Amor non ullas cogitat artes*) offers an interesting parallel; however, the reference there is made to Love's slow pace, and not to his late arrival.

teneris...annis: *tener* picks up *teneros...iuuencos* (20) and suggests once more Phaedra's "virginity".

crimen: Despite her allegations for the contrary, Phaedra's use of *crimen* betrays her self-consciousness (see n. on *Her.* 4.18).

condiscitur: the intensive prefix *con-* in compounds is a colloquial feature, with high frequency in early Latin and Roman comedy (see Cooper (1895) 262-74). For Ovid's fondness of verbs prefixed by *con-* (or *com-*) see McKeown on Ov. Am. 2.4.3 and Wills (1996) 441-3 (cf. line 165 *corrumpere*).

26. exacto tempore: a slip of tongue which undermines Phaedra's attempts to portray herself as a young maiden. The *iunctura* appears again in Latin poetry at *Hor. Sat.* 1.1.18.

peius amat: in addition to marking the intensity of the feeling, *peius* has further ethical implications, especially in terms of personal integrity and propriety (see *TLL* 8.237.6ff.). Phaedra is constantly preoccupied with the moral implications of her actions.

27. libamina: a religious term, *libamen* is a Vergilian innovation for *libamentum* (Austin on *Verg. Aen.* 6.246). Further on nouns in *-amen* and their increasing popularity in poetry, esp. in Ovid, see Norden (1965) 27ff. and Hollis on *Met.* 8.729. Phaedra effectively introduces her claim to "virginity" (lines 27-30) through this imagery of the first offering of the fruits. The sacral connotations of *libamina* together with the somewhat elevated opening of the hexameter through the emphatic use of the second-person pronoun (*tu*) (a hymnic feature) is a subtle parodic hint at the elegiac *topos* of comparing one's beloved with a god (for more on the *topos* see n. on *Her.* 4.35f.).

28. nocens: a legal term, which combined with *crimen* (25), further contributes to Phaedra's sense of guilt (see n. on *Her.* 4.18 above). Ending a pentameter with a participle (with the exception of *nocens* and *amans*) is uncommon, so Palmer (1897) ad loc.

pariter nostrum...uterque: Phaedra's suggestion for Hippolytus' equal share in her proposed injustice is indicative of her appreciation of love in terms of reciprocity and equality. For a detailed discussion of Phaedra's use of the elegiac motif of *mutuus amor* see pp. 20f., also see n. on *Her.* 4.33.

29f. Phaedra complements her animal simile with the equally incongruous erotic imagery of picking up fruits and flowers in a garden. The floral metaphor resounding with Catullan (61.21-5, 87-9, esp. 62.39-47 with Godwin) and Sapphean (fr. 105a, 105c) echoes is meant to reinforce the virginal aspects of her self-portrayal (further on the overall function and the incongruity of

this metaphor see Pearson (1980) 113f., Armstrong (2001) 163f., De Vito (1994) 314-6, Fulkerson (2005) 131, also see pp.20f.). The hymenaeal implications create “a precarious mixture of purity and sexuality.” (Armstrong (2001) 163). At the same time Phaedra’s seclusion in this garden is bound to recall Hippolytus’ similar seclusion in his virginal “untouched” meadow, which makes Phaedra almost a reflection of her beloved (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 73-87, further on Hippolytus’ virginal meadow see p.28 n.194). In this light, Phaedra’s concern for her virginity could be seen as an appropriation of Hippolytus’ concern with his virginity in Eur. *Hipp.* (cf. Segal (1975) 162 n.14).

29. est aliqid: a colloquial expression (see Barchiesi on *Her.* 3.131), first found in Ovid (see Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.484. For further parallels see Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* 6.27).

pomaria: *pomum* is a generic term for any orchard fruit (so Kenney on *Her.* 20.9, *OLD* s.v. *pomum* 2b), but given the erotic context of the passage I think it is safe to assume that the reference here is made to apples. Apples were considered to be symbols of love; hence, the apple imagery is very frequent in ancient erotic poetry (see Clausen and Coleman on Verg. *Ecl.* 3.64, Fedeli on Prop. 1.3.24, Kenney on *Her.* 20.9 and intro p.15 n.60, 19. n.74, Littlewood (1967), Harmon (1974) 160, Brazda (1977), Rosenmeyer (2001) 109 with n.23, Petropoulos (2003) 64-9 and 69-73). Apples are often offered as gifts (as means of seduction) to win over girls (cf. Theocr. 3.10, *AP* 5.79, 80, Verg. *Ecl.* 3.70f., Prop. 2.34.69,71, *Her.* 20.9f., 209-12, 21. 107, 215-7). For apples as gifts of the traditional lover see Enk (1946) on Prop. 1.3.24, Wlosok (1967) 345 n.1, Lyne (1970) 72 n.3, Cairns (1977) 327 n.3, Hodge and Buttimore (1977) 93 n.23, Maltby (1980) 69. For artistic representations of Venus with apples see *LIMC* s.v. *Venus* 8.1.176-181, and 23a, 26, 28.

pomaria carpere ramis: in the sense of plucking a fruit (Pichon (1966) s.v. *c. est proprie libare fructum*, *OLD* s.v. 1a,c, TLL 3.491.80ff.), for the phrasing cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.576 *celeri carpente poma manu*. Despite its virginal connotations, the imagery of plucking fruits from trees also carries certain ominous allusions, since it often appears in protests against premature death, cf. Cic. *Senect.* 71 *quasi poma ex arboribus, cruda si sunt, uix euelluntur, si matura et cocta, decidunt, sic uitam adolescentibus uis aufert, senibus maturitas*, Ov. *Am.* 2.14.23f. *quid plenam fraudas uitem crescentibus uuis, / pomaque crudeli uellis acerba manu?*, later imitated by Lygd. [Tib.] 3.5.19f. *quid fraudare iuuat uitem crescentibus uuis / et modo nata mala uellere poma manu?* with N-A.

ramis: for *ramus* as a botanical metaphor for “penis” see Adams (1982) 28.

30. et tenui primam deligere ungue rosam: the flower imagery is a well-known *topos* of ancient erotic poetry, present already in Sappho’s lyrics (cf. fr. 105a, 105c). Further on the sexual symbolism of flowers in Sappho see Stehle [Stigers] (1977) 92f., Snyder (1997) 51f., 59, 82, 146, 228 n.11, also 105f. on the “deflowering” imagery. The association of roses with Aphrodite, in particular, dates back to the Homeric epics (cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.186f., Anacr. 55.30ff, Eur. *Med.* 835ff., further on this association see Bömer on *Fast.* 4.138) and the rose imagery

was very popular in the Hellenistic Epigrams (cf. e.g. *AP* 5.74, 79f., 143). Further on the rose imagery see N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.4.31f., Thomson (1997) on Catul. 62.39ff. with bibliography, also Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 10.735 with bibliography ad loc, and *idem* on *Fast.* 5.336). In Greek comedy *ρόδον* and *κῆπος* are used as metaphors for female genitalia (Henderson (1991) 135, cf. also Ovid's reference to penis as a drooping rose (*languidiora rosa*) at *Am.* 3.7.66). Nevertheless, roses are also associated with death (cf. Bion *Epitaph. Adon.* 64ff. *δάκρυον ἂ Παφία τόσσον χέει ὅσσον Ἄδωνις / αἷμα χέει, τὰ δὲ πάντα ποτὶ χθονὶ γίνεται ἄνθη / αἷμα ῥόδον τίκτει, τὰ δὲ δάκρυα τὰν ἀνεμώναν*, [Mosch.] *Epitaph. Bion.* 5 *νῦν ῥόδα φοινίσσεσθε τὰ πένθιμα, νῦν ἀνεμώναι*, Prop. 4.7.60 *mulcet ubi Elysias aura beata rosas*). In particular for Ovid's symbolic use of the "flower motif" in the *Met.* see Segal (1969) 33-38.

tenui... ungue: a common formation, often in connection with the metaphorical use of plucking a flower for erotic desire, cf. Catul. 62.43 *idem cum tenui carptus defloruit ungui, / nulli illum pueri, nullae optauere puellae*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.23f. (...) *et incestos amores / de tenero meditatur ungui* with Williams (1965) 66f. and West (2002) 68, Prop. 1.20.39 *decerpens tenero pueriliter ungui*, Ov. *Ars* 3.79f. (...) *carpite florem, / qui, nisi carptus erit, turpiter ipse cadet*, cf. also *AP* 5.157 (Meleager) (= G-P XLIX) *Τρηχὺς ὄνυξ ὑπ' Ἔρωτος ἀνέτραφες Ἥλιοδώρας / ταύτης γὰρ δύνει κνίσμα καὶ ἐς κραδίην*. Despite the close verbal similarity with Catullus' epithalamium (Catul. 62.43), Phaedra stands closer to the *praeceptor* of the *Ars*, as she shares with him the same "male" sexual desire in plucking the flower, instead of preserving its beauty (Hinds' suggestion cited by Gibson on *Ars* 3.79f.). From an intertextual perspective, Phaedra's reference to the gathering of flowers seems to pick up Hippolytus' garland to Artemis as a symbolic offering of his purity (Eur. *Hipp.* 73-8). Baker on Prop. 1.20.39 traces the motif of the "delicate fingernail" back to a Greek proverb, cf. Cic. *Fam.* 1.6.2.6f. *sed praesta te eum qui mihi a teneris, ut Graeci dicunt, unguiculis es cognitus* (generally for scratching in erotic context, cf. e.g. *AP* 7.219.5f. (Pompeius the Younger) ... *καὶ τὰ ποθεύτων / κνίσματα*, 12.209.3f. (Strato) *ἔστω που προὔνεικα θιγῆματα καὶ τὰ πρό ἔργων / παίγνια, πληκτισμοί, κνίσμα, φίλημα, λόγος*. Also Theocr. 5.49 with Gow (1952).

tenui: *tenuis* is a significant term in elegy associated with the Callimachean stylistic principle of *λεπτότης* (for the programmatic role of *tenuis* in neoteric poetry and its echoes of Callimachean aesthetics of *λεπτότης* see Papanghelis (1994) 177f. and 220ff., Kyriakidis (1998) 97ff. and Papaioannou (2005) 154 n.28 with bibliography; for elegy in particular see Wyke (2002) 123 n.19 with bibliography, also Commager (1974) 8 n.12 and 46 nn.20-2 with bibliography).

31f. si ... / notandus erat, / ... successit: cf. 18 *fama -uelim quaeras- crimine nostra uacat*, a "past general supposition" to imply something certain, not an unfulfilled wish (note the detachment of the conditional *si* from the verb). For Phaedra, her relationship with Hippolytus is not something hypothetical, but something plausible.

si tamen: *tamen* in the sense of “however, nevertheless” (*OLD* s.v. *si* 8b) always accompanies *si* in such antithetical uses.

sine crimine: *crimen* here in the sense “reproach, accusation” (*OLD* s.v. 2), a judicial term (Cicerale (1978) 32 n. 27). *sine crimine* appears for the first time at Verg. *Aen.* 4.550 (with Pease) and is very frequent in Ovid in this metrical position (see Casali on *Her.* 9.137 with parallels). Its frequent attestation in epitaphs (cf. *CLE* 1203.3 and Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.550, Lattimore (1942) 279 n. 108, 295f., cf. Prop. 4.11.35-54.) makes its presence rather inauspicious (cf. the other epitaph-like phrase *terra pelagoque* at line 5 with n.).

ab insolita labe: Helen twice in her letter to Paris makes a similar claim, cf. *Her.* 17.13f. *rustica sim sane, dum non oblita pudoris, / dumque tenor uite sit sine labe meae* and 69f. *aut ego perpetuo famam sine labe tenebo, / aut ego te potius quam tua dona sequar* with Michalopoulos. *labes* in the metaphorical sense of “moral stain”, “disgrace”, “dishonour” (*OLD* s.v. 5) is not frequent in poetry, but is common in Ovid (for parallels see Casali on *Her.* 9.8). Also cf. Senecan Phaedra’s similar claim (Sen. *Phaedr.* 668f. *respersa nulla labe et intacta, innocens / tibi mutor*).

For parallels of Ovidian use of *ab* with instrumental ablatives see Shuckburgh (1885) ad loc.

33. at: like the Greek $\delta\epsilon$. For *at* introducing the apodosis to a conditional clause see McKeown on Ov. *Epigr.* 3 and Ov. *Am.* 1.3.11f.

digno quod adurimur igni: cf. Ov. *Her.* 19.5 *urimur igne pari*, Sulp. [Tib.] 3.13.10 (...) *cum digno digna fuisse ferar. adurimur* picks up the double repetition of *urimur* at lines 19f. thus maintaining the imagery of love as fire (see n. on *Her.* 4.19f.). The first person plural combined with the *digno...igni* suggests her elegiac approach to love in mutuality (also see n. on *Her.* 4.28). Also note the postponement of *quod* for metrical reasons and the jingle *digno...igni*.

34. peius adulterio turpis adulter: *peius* picks up *peius* at line 26. The accumulation of negative terms and the emphatic polyptoton *adulterio...adulter* are indicative of the fact that Phaedra is very conscious of the immorality of her proposal.

35f. Phaedra’s comparison of Hippolytus with Jupiter constitutes a witty reversal in terms of gender of the established elegiac *topos* of the poet’s comparison of his beloved with a goddess (see Lieberg (1962), McKeown on *Am.* 1.10.1-8 with parallels in the *Amores*, also cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 167, *Andr.* 959ff., *Heaut.* 693, Catul. 68.70, 70.1f., 72.1f, Tib. 1.10.59f. and 2.4.59f. with Murgatroyd ad loc.). The reversal is the inevitable result of Phaedra’s assumption of the role of the elegiac lover, since it is no longer the male poet, but the mistress who compares her beloved to a god.

fratremque uirumque: Phaedra’s depiction of Jupiter as “brother and husband” is suggestive of her mental and psychological turmoil. Instead of the traditional reference to him as “the father of the gods and (king of) the humans” (cf. Enn. *Ann.* 6.203 Sk. *diuom pater atque hominum rex* which ultimately goes back to the Homeric formula $\text{πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε}$

(cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.544 with Kirk), also cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.65 *diuum pater atque hominum rex* with Austin and Ov. *Met.* 14.807 *diuum hominumque parentem* with Bömer), Phaedra focuses on Jupiter's family relationships and identifies him as "the brother and husband" of Juno. Phaedra finds herself on the brink of incest and in need of justification, and Jupiter's incest offers the perfect example (for a similar allusion to incest through the use of the Homeric formula *κασίγνητόν τε πόσιν τε* see Gow on Theocr. 17.130). Phaedra later in her letter (lines 133f.) will re-use the example set by Jupiter in a more open way.

The formation *-que...-que* is stylistically elevated, modelled on the Homeric *τε... τε*, and very common in epic (further see McKeown on 1.6.57f. with bibliography, Maltby on Tib. 1.1.33, also Bömer on *Met.* 12.156 with bibliography).

Hippolytum uideor praepositura Ioui: the similarity with Lesbia's claims to Catullus is noteworthy, cf. Catul. 72.1f. *Dicebas quondam solum te nosse Catullum, / Lesbia, nec prae me uelle tenere Iouem* and 70. 1f. *Nulli se dicit mulier mea nubere malle / quam mihi, non si se Iuppiter ipse petat*. Also cf. Ov. *Fast.* 2.676 *ne uideare hominem praeposuisse Ioui*. Nevertheless, in view of Catul. 70 Phaedra's claim sounds like nothing more than a deceitful exaggeration of a woman in love, cf. Catul. 70.1-4 *Nulli se dicit mulier mea nubere malle / quam mihi, non si se Iuppiter ipse petat. / dicit: sed mulier cupido quod dicit amanti, / in uento et rapida scribere oportet aqua*.

uideor: Phaedra throughout her letter makes extensive use of similar verbs in passive which, despite her claim for the contrary, gives away her awareness of the social repercussions of her actions and her concern for public criticism (cf. *credar* 61, *numeremur* 101, *uidear* 129, *laudabimur* 139).

Hippolytum...Ioui: the position of the two in the pentameter visualizes their juxtaposition; furthermore, the placement of Hippolytus at the beginning and Jupiter at the end suggests Phaedra's preference for the former.

37-52. Phaedra's new hunting pursuits have a striking resemblance with a similar account of her hunting ravings at Eur. *Hipp.* 207-49 (cf. also the Senecan Phaedra's similar fantasies (Sen. *Phaedr.* 387-403). For a detailed discussion of lines 37-52 and their multiple implications for Phaedra's character in the letter see pp. 26ff. Apart from the obvious intertextual associations with tragedy, Phaedra is also playing here with the erotic motif of "amatory hunt", which employs hunting imagery with regard to erotic pursuit (cf. e.g. Call. *Epigr.* 31Pf, *AP.* 5.16.5-6, 100.1f., 193.1, 12.92, 102, 146, Plaut. *Epid.* 215f., Prop. 1.1.1f, Tib. 1.6.1-6 with Murgatroyd and Maltby, Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.105-8, *Carm.* 3.12.10-2, Ov. *Am.* 2.9.9, *Ars* 1.45-8 with Hollis, 89, Ov. *Medic.* 27). Further on the motif see Kenney (1970)c 386-8, Davies (1980), Murgatroyd (1984), Hintermeier (1993) 111 n.20, also N-H in the introduction to Hor. *Carm.* 1.33). In general, Ovid seems to have been fond of the hunting theme in his work (see Tsitsiou-Chelidoni (2003) 218 n.610 with bibliography). Given Hippolytus' association with the Amazons,

Phaedra's self-portrayal as a huntress can be seen as another attempt to become more desirable to her beloved, this time by evoking the archetypal image of an Amazon.

37. iam quoque: combined with the repetition *iam mihi* at line 39 it echoes similar formations at Verg. *Ecl.* 10.58f. *iam mihi...uideor.../ ire* and Prop. 2.19.17f. *iam nunc me... / iuuat* (Rosati (1985) 130. On the emotional repetition of *iam* see Maltby on Tib. 1.1.25 with bibliography ad loc.

-uix credes-: "hardly", "scarcely", this usage of *uix* is frequent in Ovid, see Bömer on *Met.* 4.350f., *TLL* 8.243.18ff. On Ovid's use of parenthesis see n. on *Her.* 4.18.

ignotas mittor in artes: in view of her subtle self-identification as an elegiac poet near the beginning of her letter (lines 10-14) this reference to her hunting pursuits could well be read as a covert meta-poetical comment on Phaedra's new literary venture at hand. Her reference to hunting is meant to recall the relevant Euripidean passage, even though the correspondence is not a direct one. As Rosati (1985) 129f. convincingly argues, Phaedra's reminiscence of her "delirium scene" from Euripidean tragedy reaches her letter through the filter of the "amatory hunt" motif as it appears in earlier Latin poetry (esp. under the influence of Verg. *Ecl.* 10 and Prop. 2.19). Phaedra is not simply taking up hunting: more importantly, she is embarking on a new (meta)literary quest to re-codify her tragic past into her elegiac present. She carries forward her fantasy from tragedy, which is adapted to her new textual environment, according to the needs of the elegiac motif of "amatory hunt" (on the self-reflexivity of the passage in terms of poetics and gender see Spentzou (2003) 113). Her detailed account in the following lines (39-46) follows almost to the word the precepts offered by the *praeceptor* in Tib. 1.4.40ff.

mittor: on the text see 280.

in artes: For the final construction of *in* + accusative see McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.1.21-2. *artes* picks up *ars* at line 25 underlying once again Phaedra's literary consciousness.

38. est mihi...impetus ire: for the construction, cf. *Ov. Am.* 2.5.46 *fuit in teneras impetus ire genas* with McKeown, *Her.* 5.64 *et mihi per fluctus impetus ire fuit* with Knox, *TLL* 7.1.610.5ff. For Shuckburgh (ad loc. and on *Her.* 5.64) *ire per* implies "a notion of desperate courage or wild despair."

per saeuas...feras: again at *Her.* 7.38, the *iunctura* appears for the first time at Tib. 1.10.6, again at Lygd. [Tib.] 3.9.22, *Ov. Met.* 4.404, 7.387, Sen. *HO* 1327, [Sen.] *Octau.* 637. Cf. also Prop. 1.1.12 *rursus in hirsutas ibat et ille feras*.

39. iam: emphatic anaphora stressing the immediacy, the "here and now" of her hunting pursuits.

arcu praesignis adunco: cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 167f. *τόξων μεδέουσαν άύτευν / Άρτεμιν* and 1451 *την τοξόδαμνον Άρτεμιν*. Phaedra's Cretan origin may account for her emphasis on Diana's bow, since the Cretans, ever since Homer, were renowned for their skill in archery (see N-H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.5-17, also cf. Caes. *Gal.* 2.7.1.2. *Numidas et Cretas saggitarios*, Apul. *Met.* 11.5.12 *Cretes sagittiferi Dictynnam Dianam*, *Ov. Met.* 7.777 with Bömer); hence, the bow

ultimately became a typical Cretan weapon (cf. Call. *Hymn* 3.81 *Κυδώνιον...τόξον*, fr. 560 Pf. *τόξου ... Κυδωνίου*, Verg. *Ecl.* 10.59, Hor. *Carm.* 4.9.17, also Vertoudakis (2000) 29-35 for references in Hellenistic epigrams). For Diana's conventional association with her bow, cf. Call. *Hymn. Artem.* 2, 8-10, Verg. *Aen.* 1.499, 11. 11.536-8, Ov. *Met.* 1.697f, 5.619f., *Fast.* 2.157f., Sen. *Phaedr.* 72, Grat. *Cyneg.* 124-6, 252, 497. For artistic representations of Diana with her bow cf. *LIMC* s.v. *Artemis / Diana* 27, 35a, 73, 91f. Furthermore, the special association of Diana with her bow can be seen as Phaedra's subtle attempt to eroticize goddess Diana through her weapon, since the bow is the most characteristic attribute of Cupid (and Venus, cf. *Her.* 2.40f.). A similar suggestion is to be found at Ov. *Am.* 1.1.10 through the unexpected application of one of Cupid's typical adjectives (*pharetratus*) to Diana (*lege pharetratae uirginis arua coli*, further see McKeown ad loc.). Phaedra's second reference to Diana's weapons at line 92 takes place in a clearly erotic context. For the bow as a frequent metaphor for male genitalia see Adams (1982) 21f. For a detailed discussion of Phaedra's association of *Diana* with *Amor* see pp.29f.

adunco: a rare adjective (in prose and poetry) before Ovid, who uses it frequently (*Enn. Ann.* 517 Skutsch, Ter. *Heauton* 1062, ap. Cic. *Tusc.* 2.24.2, Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.5, Prop. 3.14.6).

40. Delia: Diana, born on the island of Delos, is emphasized by the placement first in the line and by the enjambement. *Delia* as a name for Diana was in use since Verg. *Ecl.* 7.29, cf. *Met.* 5.639, *Her.* 19.95, *Fast.* 5.537 (see *TLL onom.* D 90.10). Further on Phaedra's association with Diana (both virginal and erotic) see Armstrong (2001) 54-7.

40. iudicium...tuum: *iudicium* is a legal term with high frequency in Ovid (Kenney (1969) 253). The framing of *subsequor* by *iudicium...tuum* is emphatic.

41. in nemus ire libet: cf. Phaedra's similar utterance in Eur. *Hipp.* (215f. *πέμπετέ μ' εἰς ὄρος εἶμι πρὸς ὕλαν / καὶ παρὰ πεύκας*, 233f. *τί τόδ' αὖ παράφρων ἔρριψας ἔπος; / νῦν δὴ μὲν ὄρος βᾶσ' ἐπὶ θήρας*). The image of a distressed lover wandering around is a symptom of passion in Hellenistic and Latin poetry (Clausen on Verg. *Ecl.* 6.52, see also *idem* on 10.55-6n). The reference here is intended specifically to the elegiac motif of accompanying one's beloved in hunting (a motif originating in all probability in Gallus' elegiac work (Ross (1975) 61-5)). Phaedra's account is strikingly reminiscent of Oenone's (*Her.* 5.17-20 with Knox and Spentzou (2003) 50) and Sappho's (*Her.* 15.137-52) recollection of their blissful time in the hunting company of their loved ones.

pressisque in retia ceruis: cf. *Her.* 5.19 *retia saepe comes maculis distincta tetendi*. Nets often appear in the context of the "amatory hunt". The idea is first found at Verg. *Ecl.* 3.75 (and later at Tib. 1.4.49f., Ov. *Ars* 1.2692.189 with Janka, *Met.* 10.171- 3, 529ff.) and it is very likely to have originated with Gallus (for more see Maltby on Tib. 1.4.47-8 and 49-50). Carrying the hunting nets was a duty usually reserved for slaves (cf. Xen. *Cyneg.* 2.2, esp.6.5-10); hence, the image can be associated with the *seruitium amoris*. For more on hunting nets see Xen. *Cyneg.*

2.2-9 (on nets for hare hunting) and 10.2 (for nets on boar hunting), Kenney (1970)c 386-8, Hollis on Ov. *Ars* 1.263, Phillips and Willcock (1999) 5f. and Maltby on Tib.1.6.5f.

42. hortari...canes: cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 219 *ἔραμαι κυσὶ θωύξαι*, 216f. *ἵνα θηροφόνοι / στείβουσι κύνες*, also *Her.* 5. 20 *saepe citos egi per iuga longa canes*. Inciting the hounds with loud cries was a common hunting practice according to Xenophon (cf. Xen. *Cyneg.* 6.17, 19-20, on the variety of hound species see Xen. *Cyneg.* 3-4 *passim*, 10.8, also Phillips and Willcock (1999) 6-8, esp. 12-18.). In the majority of the surviving artistic representations Hippolytus is depicted in the company of dogs (cf. *LIMC* V2 s.v. *Hippolytus* I 5, 9b, 10,11,15, 31, 32, 39, 49, cf. also Eur. *Hipp.* 17f. *χλωρὰν δ' ἀν' ὕλην παρθένω ξυνὼν ἀεὶ / κυσὶν ταχείαις θήρας ἐξαιρεῖ χθονός*). The reference to the hounds can perhaps be associated with the barking of the dogs, which was a common hazard for the elegiac lover (cf. e.g. (Tib. 1.6.31f., 2.4.32, 34, Prop. 4.5.73f., Ov. *Am.* 2.19.40, also Hor. *Epod.* 5.57f., *Sat.* 1.2.128, *Carm.* 3.16.2f.). In Greek hounds were often used as metaphors for the phallus (cf. Arist. *Lys.* 158, *AP* Argentarius 5.105.4, *AP* Strato 12.225.2) (Adams (1982)).

per iuga summa: for Hippolytus' preference for remote places cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 73 -81, 1137f., also Sen. *Phaedr.* 235 *sequi* (sc. Hippolytum) *per alta nemora, per montes placet*. Dido and Aeneas also hunt at the top of the mountains (Verg. *Aen.* 4.151 *postquam altos uentum in montes atque inuia lustra*).

43. tremulum excusso iaculum uibrare lacerto: cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 220f. *καὶ παρὰ χαίταν ξανθὰν ῥῆψαι / Θεσσαλὸν ὄρπακ', ἐπίλογγον ἔχουσ'(α)*. Phaedra's brandishing of the spear with its phallic connotations (Adams (1982) 19f., 46) further contributes to the sexual undertones of her reference to hunting. Through her careful selection of vocabulary Phaedra manages to portray herself as the perfect complement to Hippolytus' depiction at line 81 (*seu lentum ualido torques hastile lacerto*). On the use of *lacertus* see n. on *Her.* 4.81 below.

44. aut in graminea...humo: the Ovidian Phaedra has realized the wish made by her Euripidean counterpart (Eur. *Hipp.* 201f. *ὑπὸ τ' αἰγείροις ἔν τε κομήτη / λειμῶνι κλιθεῖσ' ἀναπανσαίμαν*); cf. also Sappho's similar claim at *Her.* 15.147-9 *cognoui pressas noti mihi caespitis herbas; / de nostro curuum pondere gramen erat. / incubui tetigique locum, qua parte fuisti*. Phaedra's reference to lying on the grass with its erotic connotations constitutes an allusion to her eroticized version of Hippolytus' virginal meadow in the Euripidean play (further on Hippolytus' "untouched meadow" see p. 28 n.194). Her hunting is one of love. Phaedra will re-employ this erotic imagery later in her letter, in connection with the Venus-Anchises love affair (97f. *saepe sub ilicibus Venerem Cinyraque creatum / sustinuit positos quaelibet herba duos*). This eroticized reference to the countryside could also be seen as a compressed and remote echo of the *locus amoenus*. If such connotations are perceptible here, then her innocent hunting setting for her erotic adventures with Hippolytus could potentially transform into a place of sexual violence and destruction for both herself and her beloved, like most of the landscapes of this category (on the potentially destructive character of *locus amoenus*-like

landscapes, see Parry (1957), *idem* (1964), Segal (1969), Verducci (1985) 170-73, Richlin (1992) 172, Keith (2000) 42ff., Spentzou (2003) 80 n.63 with bibliography, Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.423f.).

graminea: for adjective in *-eus* see n. on *Her.* 4.14.

45f. Phaedra's reference to chariot racing echoes her similar wishes at Eur. *Hipp.* 228-31 *δέσποιν' ἄλίας Ἄρτεμι Λίμνας / καὶ γυμνασίων τῶν ἵπποκρότων, / εἴθε γενοίμαν ἐν σοῖς δαπέδοις, / πόλους Ἐνέτας δαμαλιζόμενα* and 234f. *πόθον ἐστέλλου, νῦν δ' αὖ ψαμάθοις / ἐπ' ἀκυμάντοις πόλων ἔρασαι*, and complements Hippolytus' competence in chariot driving later in the letter (79f.). In the Euripidean play, the reference to Artemis of the Limne is ominous, since, according to a Troezenian legend, Artemis of the Limne was involved in the death of one of her followers, Saron, who was also a hunter (see Segal (1965) 159 with n.70). In any case, a reference to the chariot inevitably recalls Hippolytus' tragic death. Further on Phaedra's interest in horsemanship see Brenk (1986) and Armour (1988).

46. torquentem frenis ora equi: the spondaic opening suggests the stopping of the horse with the reins as opposed to the short dactyls at the end (Pearson (1980) 116). Phaedra as charioteer further supports the imagery of erotic subjugation suggested by the taming of the horses at line 22 (*frenis ~ frena* at line 22).

leues in puluere currus: later picked up by *leuis egregio puluis in ore* at line 78.

47. nunc feror, ut Bacchi furiis Eleleides actae: the image of a distraught woman likened to a Bacchant is a poetic commonplace dating back to Andromaches' response to the news of Hector's death in the *Iliad* 22.460-3, cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 55f., Verg. *Aen.* 4.301f. *bacchatur, qualis commotis excita sacris / Thyias*, 374, 7. 385-91, Catul. 64.61, Prop. 2.3.18, 4.7.71, Nonnus *Dion.* 47, also see Warden (1978) 181, Hardie (1986) 267-85, Janan (2001) 77, Fantuzzi (2003) 7f. For the presence of the image in Ovid, cf. e.g. *Med. fr.* 2 *feror huc illuc ut plena deo*, *Ars* 1.311f. (Pasiphae) *in nemus et saltus thalamo regina relicto / fertur ut Aonio concita Baccha deo* with Hollis, 2.380 *fertur ut Aonii cornibus icta dei*, 3.709f. *nec mora, per medias passis furibunda capillis / euolat, ut thyrso concita Baccho, uia* with Gibson, *Her.* 10.47f. *aut ego diffusis erravi sola capillis, / qualis ab Ogygio concita Baccha deo*, 15.139f. *illuc mentis inops, ut quam furialis Enyo / attigit, in collo crine iacente feror*, *Tr.* 4.1.41f. For more parallels see Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.301 and 374. Byblis also rages like a Bacchant maddened by her passion for Caunus (*Met.* 9.641-4 *utque tuo motae, proles Semeleia, thyrso / Ismariae celebrant repetita triennia bacchae, / Byblida non aliter latos ululasse per agros / Bubasides uidere nurus. quibus illa relictis*). In view of Phaedra's connection with Ariadne and Pasiphae in the list of mythological *exempla* below the maenad imagery seems very appropriate given the association of both her sister and her mother with Bacchus.

feror: for *feror* as a technical term of literary criticism (a designator of an "Alexandrian footnote") see Papaioannou (2005) 67 n.48 with bibliography.

Faunique bicornes, 171 *sic faeant Satyri montanaque numina Panes*, and the theme of divine “madness,” cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 141-4 *ἦ σὺ γ' ἔνθεος, ᾧ κούρα, / εἴτ' ἐκ Πανὸς εἶθ' Ἐκάτας / ἡ σεμνῶν Κορυβάντων φοι- / τᾶς ἡ ματρὸς ὀρείας*, ~ Her. 4.47 *ut Bacchi furiis Eleleides actae*, 49f. *quas semideae Dryades Faunique bicornes / numine contactas attonuere suo*).

Idaeo: for the epithet stereotypically attributed to Paris see Michalopoulos on Her. 16.303.

49. semideae Dryades Faunique bicornes: cf. Ov. *Ib.* 81f. *uos quoque, plebs superum, Fauni Satyrique Laresque / Fluminaque et nymphae semideumque genus*. Phyllis also places *Faunus* on Mt. Ida (Her. 5.137f. *cornigerumque caput pinu praecinctus acuta / Faunus in immensis, qua tumet Ida, iugis*). *Faunus* was an Italian rural deity (“a descendant of Saturn,” so Collins and Hays (191) ad loc.) identified with Pan (cf. N-H on Hor. *Carm.* 3.18.1, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 1.193 and *idem* on *Fast.* 2.271, Fantham on Ov. *Fast.* 4.650); possibly under Greek mythological influence he became “pluralized” and was associated with local deities (Nymphs, Satyrs, cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 7.47f., 8.134) see Bömer on *Met.* 14.637-41, Clausen on Verg. *Ecl.* 6.27, Fordyce on Verg. *Aen.* 7.47ff., also Parker (1997) 73-100. Following Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.397 “the multiplication of singular deities appears to have been a very common exercise in literature.” Further on the presence of *Fauni* in Latin poetry see Ross (1975) 25.

semideae: compounds in *ἡμι-* are very common in Greek; compounds in *semi-* are frequent in epic, but generally avoided by Tibullus and Propertius. Ovid, on the contrary, is very fond of the prefix *semi-* and of compounds in *-deus* (for more see Linse (1891) 47,51, Ross (1969) 22, esp. n.25, McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.6.3-4).

bicornes: often attributed to *Faunus*, Pan and Satyrs since Ovid (cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.304, Calp.Sic. *Ecl.* 2.13), a similar stock adjective for these deities is *corniger* (cf. e.g. Her. 2.84, 5.137, *Fast.* 3.647 (Pan), for more examples see *TLL* 4.959.83ff.). For Ovid’s predilection for compounds in general see Glenn (1936), Kenney (1973) 121ff., Booth (1981) 2696-9, cf. also Quint *Inst.* 1.5.65-70).

50. numine contactas attonuere: cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.312 *ut Aonio concita Baccha deo*, 2.380 *ut Aonii cornibus icta dei* with Janka on the image of horned Bacchus (here the horns are transferred to *Faunus*).

51. mihi referunt: possibly a case of a so-called “Alexandrian footnote” (so named by Ross (1975) 78), which was a popular poetic method of alluding to prior works of literature (see Miller (1993) 157 n.10. For more on the “Alexandrian footnote” see Michalopoulos (2006) 34f. and *ibid* on Her. 16.137f. with bibliography ad loc.). Perhaps Ovid here has in mind earlier literary treatments of Phaedra’s erotic frenzy.

referent...remisit: for verbs compounded with *re-* in Ovid see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.8.76 (cf. also *reddamus* 54, *recuruas* 79, *reparat* 90, *reuerere* 127, *reseranda* 141, *reliquit* 155).

furor: it picks up the frenzy of the Bacchantes at line 47 (*furiis*) which is now transferred to Phaedra as “erotic madness” (*furor*). Love (*amor*) as madness (*furor*) is a well-established *topos* in both Greek and Roman erotic poetry, originating as early as in Greek lyric poetry (cf. e.g.

Sapph. fr. 204 Page, Theogn. 1271, 1338). For more on the motif of *amor* as *furor* (*μανία* / *ἔρωμανία*) see Preston (1916) 5ff., Pichon (1966) svv. *furor*, *insanus*, *morbus*, Giangrande (1974) 6, N-H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.4-8, Fedeli on Prop. 3.24.17-18, Thomas on Verg. *Georg.* 4.488, Maltby on Tib. 2.6.17-18, also see Gill (1997) for passion as madness in general. The motif is very frequent in the *Her.* (cf. 2.45, 5.69, 121, 9.133, 145, 13.34, 14.93, 16.237, 20.207). Phaedra in the Eur. *Hipp.* also perceives her erotic passion as madness (241 *ἐμάνην, ἔπεσον δαίμονος ἄτη*), while frequent mention of erotic madness (*μανία*) is made throughout the play (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 214, 232, 236-8, 241, 398, also 1146). There is, however, a crucial distinction. While in tragedy *μανία* carries with it connotations of divine intervention (see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 241, Knox (1952) 6), Phaedra's *furor* in her letter is perceived strictly in elegiac terms as a manifestation of her erotic infatuation, without any supernatural implications.

52. omnia: emphatic by position (note the enjambement), punctuation and metre (the coincidence of the *ictus* with the *accentus* at the end of the first foot of the pentameter contributes to the isolation of the term).

tacitam: yet another reference to Phaedra's initial decision to keep her passion secret (cf. line 7f. and 151f.), just like her tragic counterpart in Eur. *Hipp.* (cf. 38-41 *ἐνταῦθα δὴ στένουσα κάκπεπληγμένη / κέντροις ἔρωτος ἢ τάλαιν' ἀπόλλυται / σιγῆ*, 393-4 *κάλλιστ' ἐνέγκαιμ' αὐτόν. ἠρξάμην μὲν οὖν / ἐκ τοῦδε, σιγᾶν τήνδε καὶ κρύπτειν νόσον*).

conscius...amor: despite her previous mention of erotic frenzy, Phaedra once again proves to be fully aware of her actions (cf. 18n, 25n, 26n, 34n), cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.2.17 *conscius esse uelis – domina est obnoxia seruo* with McKeown, 2.7.11 *atque ego peccati uellem mihi conscius essem!*, *Her.* 21.49 *quamuis mihi conscia non sim*, *Tr.* 3.6.9. The *iunctura* appears only here in elegy (cf. *TLL* 4.371.25ff.); *conscius*, however, is often used in erotic contexts to denote a secret knowledge of love (for parallels see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 2.1.7-10, Luck (1970) 472 n.15).

53-66. This is the first of the two short lists of mythological *exempla* employed by Phaedra in her letter. For a detailed examination of its structure and function and an in depth analysis of each *exemplum* see pp. 61ff.

53. forsitan: *forsitan* is the poetic alternative to the prosaic *fortasse* (Axelson (1945) 31f.), very frequent in Ovid; for its construction with the indicative see Ov. *Am.* 1.6.45-6, 2.6.28 with McKeown and bibliography ad loc. Further on its use see *LHS* 2.334f., Bömer on *Met.* 5.333, Fedeli on Prop. 3.20.6, *TLL* 6.1138.32ff.

generis fato: I take *generis* with *fato* ("due to the fate of my generation"), not with *amorem*. *fatum* is an interesting case of double entendre, since it can mean "fate, destiny" (*OLD* s.v.3), as well as "death, doom, ruin" (*OLD* s.v.6); in the latter sense, it prefigures the mythological list with hints of disaster. For the importance of hereditary backgrounds in the Eur. *Hipp.* see Winnington-Ingram (1960) 169-91, esp. 175f.

reddamus amorem: *reddere* with an abstract object in the sense of “paying something as a debt, compensation” is a common idiom (*OLD* s.v. 9). However, the *iunctura reddere amorem* appears in Augustan poetry only here, and later at Sen. *Phoen.* 401 *redde amorem fratribus*.

54. et Venus ex tota gente tributa petat: In complete contrast with her Euripidean counterpart, the Ovidian Phaedra attributes her family’s turbulent erotic past to Venus’ wrath against the Sun, who revealed the adulterous relationship of Venus with Mars to her husband, Vulcanus. This was a well-known story ever since Homer (cf. *Od.* 8.266-369, esp. 335-342). As we learn from Σ on Eur. *Hipp.* 47 (ἀπολείται καίπερ οὔσα εὐκλεῆς. τὸ δὲ αἴτιον ὅτι πάσαις ταῖς ἀφ’ Ἡλίου γενομέναις ἐμήνιεν Ἀφροδίτη, διὰ τὴν μηνυθεῖσαν ὑφ’ Ἡλίου μοιχείαν. τὴν γοῦν Πασιφάην οὐ μόνον τοῦ ταύρου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ** Μίνωος ἐρασθῆναί φασιν, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Σωσικράτης) the revenge of Venus against the Sun’s female progeny was also treated by the Attidographer Sosicrates (*FrGrH* 461 F 6). So far as we can judge from Hyginus’ mythological account (*Hyg. Fab.* 148, esp. 148.3 *Soli autem Venus ob indicium ad progeniem eius semper fuit inimica*) and from Servius’ comments on Virg. *Ecl.* 6.47.5-14 (*quidam ‘uirgo’ non quod uirum illo tempore non haberet, sed quia talis ei poena iam uirgini destinata sit, intellegunt, ob iram scilicet Veneris, quae irata Soli, quod se, ut quidam uolunt, Anchisae, ut alii, Marti coniunctam prodidisset, subolem eius inhonestis amoribus subiecit, ut Circen, Medeam, Pasiphaen. et hoc dicit, in illa commiserabili dementia feliciores fuisse, quae se animalia credebant, quam Pasiphaen, quae cum sciret se hominem, taurum sectabatur*) and on *Aen.* 6.14.2-12 (*sane fabula de hoc talis est: indicato a Sole adulterio Martis et Veneris Vulcanus minutissimis catenis lectulum cinxit, quibus Mars et Venus ignorantes implicati sunt et cum ingenti turpitudine resoluti sub testimonio cunctorum deorum. quod factum Venus uehementer dolens stirpem omnem Solis persequi infandis amoribus coepit. igitur Pasiphae, Solis filia, Minois regis Cretae uxor, tauri amore flagrauit et arte Daedali inclusa intra uaccam ligneam, saeptam corio iuuencae pulcherrimae, cum tauro concubuit, unde natus est Minotaurus, qui intra labyrinthum inclusus humanis carnibus uescebatur*) the story must have been very popular with the Romans as well. In Ovid, it appears again at *Am.* 1.9.40, *Ars* 2.561ff. with Janka and *Ov. Met.* 4.169ff. with Bömer. For further evidence see Bömer on *Ov. Met.* 4.167-89, pp. 67-9, Rudd (1976) 25f., cf. also Sen. *Phaedr.* 124-8. For a detailed examination of the multiple (inter)textual implications of Venus’ involvement in Phaedra’s family history see pp. 63f.

ex tota: for the Ovidian use of *ex* before substantive adjectives starting with a consonant see Ross (1969) 48, cf. also line 123 *ex me*.

tributa: an *hapax* in Roman elegy, very rare in Augustan poetry (again only at *Ov. Met.* 8.263 and [*Ov.*] *Nux* 88), the plural is used primarily for reasons of metrical convenience, but it also prepares the ground for the following list of *exempla*. *tributum* is a financial term, which during the Augustan period referred to direct taxes raised in the provinces (for more see Nicolet (1976)). For a similar association of Venus with financial imagery (land taxation) at Plaut. *Truc.*

141f. see Maltby (2004) 259. For love in terms of commercial transaction see n. on *Her.* 8.32 below.

55. Iuppiter Europen: *Iuppiter* placed first in the line draws attention to Phaedra's divine origin, while the penthemimeral caesura associates the two lovers even further. Europa's abduction by Jupiter is an addition made by the Ovidian Phaedra to the list of her family's erotic stories given by her tragic counterpart in Eur. *Hipp.* 337-43. The story also appears among the mythological *exempla* used by the Chorus to exemplify Love's omnipotence in Seneca's *Phaedra* (303-8, later echoed in [Sen.] *Oct.* 203-6). For more on the literary and artistic representation of the myth see Bühler (1968).

Europen: in an attempt to underscore the Greek setting of the story Ovid preserves the Greek accusative in *-en* (instead of *Europam*), which is in use since Ennius *Ann.* 9.302 Skutsch. In Ovid the Greek accusative *Europen* appears again at *Ars* 1.323 and *Met.* 5.648 (with Bömer). It is tempting to see behind Phaedra's use of the Greek declension an allusion to her Greek origin, and on a metaliterary level, a reminiscence of her previous life in Greek literature. In the collection, both Briseis (*Her.* 3.1f.) and Oenone (*Her.* 5.1-4) open their letters by drawing attention to the fact that, despite their foreign origin, they both write in Greek. In fact, the motif of the heroines' linguistic foreignness is frequent in the collection, as the pretence that these Latin letters are letters actually written in Greek constitutes a fundamental convention of the *Heroides* (see Farrell (1988) 313f., 334f. with n.54). For Ovidian preference for the accusative of Greek names see Michalopoulos (2006) 65 and on *Her.* 16.259f. (for examples see Knox on *Her.* 1.5 and Bömer on *Met.* 4.115 and 13.877 with bibliography). On Greek accusatives in *-en* of proper names in Latin poetry see Housman (1910) 245-7 (= (1972) 823-5). In any case, it is almost impossible to discern with certainty between the alternative endings, since the scribal evidence is in the majority of cases contradictory and untrustworthy, see Housman (1910) 248, 252 (= (1972) 826, 828).

-prima est ea gentis origo-: The strong hyperbaton puts further emphasis on Phaedra's origin. Phaedra starts from the very beginnings of her remote past with *prima...gentis origo* corresponding to the *ex tota gente* at line 54. Her choice, however, of Europa, a woman, for the male-prescribed role of the *auctor gentis* is remarkable in terms of conventional gender hierarchy. Further on the implications of such reversal see p.65. The presence of *origo*, a typical etymological marker (see Michalopoulos (2001) 4 with n.15 and bibliography ad loc.) in connection with Europa's etymological association with eye-sight and Jupiter's bull-disguise possibly suggest to me a play on vision (further see pp.76f.). On parenthesis as a Callimachean stylistic feature see n. on *Her.* 4.18

56. dilexit: the careful placement of *Iuppiter* and *dilexit* at the beginning of two consecutive lines is noteworthy. The emphasis is laid more on Jupiter than Europe, possibly in an attempt to urge Hippolytus imitate the divine example and play a more active role. On the very contrary, we hear nothing of her feelings. For the high frequency of *diligo* as a synonym for *amo* in the

Ovidian corpus (in contrast with its scarce use by Tibullus and Propertius) see *TLL* 5.1.1176.61ff.

tauro dissimulante deum: cf. Moschus' *Europa* 279 *κρύψε θεὸν καὶ τρέψε δέμας καὶ γείνετο ταύρος*, *Met.* 2.850 *induitur faciem tauri* with Bömer for Ovid's dependence on the treatment of the story by Moschus. The postponement of *dissimulante* after *dilexit* plays down Jupiter's deceit. *tauro* (repeated in the following line) is another hint at the bull motif and possibly to its morbid connotations (on the bull motif see n. on *Her.* 4.21 and pp.66ff.). The framing of the couple between *Iuppiter* and *deum* (56) makes the god's presence even more dominant.

57. Pasiphae...tauro: cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 337f. *ὦ τλήμων, οἶον, μητέρα, ἠράσθης ἔρον / ὄν ἔσχε Ταύρου, τέκνον, ἢ τί φῆς τόδε;* (also see Sen. *Phaedr.* 113-9). Phaedra's emphatic placement of Pasiphae first in the line is further enhanced by the fact that Pasiphae is the only female figure in the list to open a mythological *exemplum*. Phaedra shifts her emphasis from male (Jupiter) to female (Pasiphae). Pasiphae's importance is also reflected on the grammar, since she and Phaedra are used as subjects, while Europa and Ariadne are used as objects. Moreover, Phaedra's emphasis on Pasiphae's deception of the bull conveys a covered message to Hippolytus about her determination to overcome his resistance. Judging from her second reference to this story near the end of her letter (lines 165f.) Hippolytus in her eyes becomes "a doublet of Pasiphae's bull" (see Spoth (1992) 116 n.28, Davis (1995) 50).

decepto subdita tauro: *decepto* picks up *dissimulante*; the change from active (*dissimulante*) to passive (*decepto*) marks the transformation of the male from deceiver of the female to a victim of female deception. The telling juxtaposition of the two past participles (*decepto subdita*) depicts the mutual erotic submission of both lovers (the bull's to Pasiphae's deception, Pasiphae's to the power of the bull). In this light, the second participle, through its implications of sexual subjugation, lessens somehow the strong effect of female deception. For the literary history of the liaison between Pasiphae and the bull see Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 337-8.

58. enixa est utero crimen onusque suo: another instance of Phaedra's feeling of guilt (cf. *Her.* 4.18n, and 31n above). For similar references to the Minotaur as evidence for the unnatural sleeping of Pasiphae with the bull, cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.326 (...) *et partu proditus auctor erat*, 2.23f. *Daedalus, ut clausit conceptum crimine matris / semibouemque uirum semiuirumque bouem*, *Met.* 8.132f. *quae toruum ligno decepit adultera taurum / discordemque utero fetum tulit* (...), 155-6 *creuerat opprobrium generis, foedumque patebat / matri adulterium monstri nouitate biformis*. For *crimen* in the sense of "accusa' nei confronti del sesso femminile" see Fedeli on Prop. 3.19.15f. In the *Heroides*, Canace also refers to her child, the fruit of her incestuous union with her brother, as crime (*Her.* 11.66 *crimina sunt oculis subripienda patris*, pace Reeson (2001) ad loc.)

59. perfidus: the adjective is emphatic not only by position, but also by the fact that this is the only *exemplum* in the list, which does not open with a proper name. *perfidus* is a typical adjective for unfaithful lovers (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.305 with Pease, 366, 421 (Dido for Aeneas), *Her.* 2.78 with Knox, *Her.* 12.19 with Bessone, Ov. *Rem.* 597 with Pinotti (with bibliography) and Lucke, [Verg.] *Culex* 133, also Pichon (1966) s.v. and Landolfi (2000) 99 n.50) with a long history in Latin poetry (Fedeli on Prop. 1.11.16 stresses its Catullan origins in the sense of the violator of a *foedus amicitiae* (mostly in erotic context)). Theseus is *ὄρκαπάτης* (Nonn. *Dion.* 47.389, 48.544) and notorious for his erotic unfaithfulness (cf. Catul. 58f., 132ff., Bömer on *Fast.* 3.437). *perfidus* is a stock adjective for Theseus, cf. Catul. 64. 132, 133, 174, Ov. *Ars* 1.536, *Fast.* 3.464, 473, *Epist. ex Ponto* 4.3.17, [Verg.] *Aetna* 583. In the *Heroides*, cf. *Her.* 2.78 (through Demophoon's imitation of his father), 10.58, 78, 116f. For the high concentration of the “*perfidus* motif” in the *Heroides* see Bessone on *Her.* 12.19 and Michalopoulos on *Her.* 17.191-6 with bibliography ad loc., also see Della Corte (1969). For male faithfulness in elegy see Lilja (1965) 172-86, Lyne (1980) 65-7, while for the Romans' application of double standards to husbands and wives with respect to marital fidelity see Wyke (2002) 33 n.51.

Aegides: Theseus had double paternity: his mortal father was Aegeus (Athenian tradition), the king of Athens, and his divine father was considered to be Neptune (Troezenian tradition). Phaedra is aware of this, since later in her letter she refers to Theseus through the periphrasis *Neptunius heros* (line 109, see n. ad loc.). For more details on Theseus' double paternity see Bacchylides fr. 17.81-129 (esp. 17, 33-36 with Jebb's exhaustive discussion, 57-60, 77-80), Isocr. *Helen* 18.1-2, Eur. *Thes.* fr. 386b 10f. Kannicht, Call. *Hec.* fr. 4f. Hollis, Plut. *Thes.* 6.1, also see Calame (2003) 2f., Barrett (1964) 2f., Herter *RE Suppl.* 13 (1973) s.v. *Theseus* 1052.36ff., Bömer on *Met.* 9.1, Fontenrose (1981) 165 n.12, Goldhill (1986) 127f., Casali (1995) 221f., Halleran (1995) 23-4, Mills (1997) 37 n.161, Roisman (1999) 38, 123f., Bessone (2003) 159 with n.31. Michalopoulos on *Her.* 17.21f. with bibliography. For Ovid's special interest in matters of double paternity (mortal and divine) see Casali (1995)a *Her.* 9.43.

There is definitely more to the employment of *Aegides* than merely the intractability of *Atheniensis* or *Athenaeus* in dactylic poetry (cf. Norden on Verg. *Aen.* 6.21). Through Theseus' association with his father Phaedra manages to include also Theseus (and through him Hippolytus) in the “hereditary guilt” motif, which is the underlying idea of the mythological list. Both Theseus and Hippolytus are now seen in the perspective of a common family fate. In addition, the use of *Aegides* could be seen as an implicit allusion to Aegeus' death caused by Theseus' forgetfulness (see also p. 72). The patronymic *Aegides* (a Greek formation, cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.265 *Θησέα τ' Αιγείδην*, Theogn. 1233 *Αιγείδης Θησεύς*, Plut. *Thes.* 24.5.1 *Αιγείδη Θησεῦ*) seems to have been an Ovidian introduction to Latin poetry (cf. *Her.* 2.67, 10.131, 16.327 with reference to Theseus, *Met.* 8.174, 405, 560, 12.237, again only at Stat. *Theb.* 12.546, 769, *Achil.* 1.192). The use of patronymic instead of proper name is a neoteric “learned” mannerism (see

Ross (1975) 62). In the Euripidean play, Theseus is mentioned as “the son of Aegeus” only twice (1282-3 τὸν εὐπατρίδην Αἰγέως ... / παῖδ' and 1431 ὦ γεραίου τέκνον Αἰγέως). In all other occasions, he is called “the son of Poseidon”.

With respect to Phaedra's recollection of her family's erotic past in Eur. *Hipp.*, the reference there to Ariadne takes place in connection with her marriage with Dionysus, and not through her relationship with Theseus (for more on this see p.73).

59. ducentia fila: for similar expressions for Ariadne's thread, cf. *Her.* 10.72 ...*pro duce fila dedi*, 103f. *nec tibi, quae reditus monstrarent, fila dedissem, / fila per adductas saepe recepta manus*. Also cf. *Catul.* 64.112-115, esp. 113 *errabunda regens tenui uestigia filo / ne labyrinthis e flexibus*. On Ariadne's thread cf. Σ on Hom. *Od.* 11.322, Eustath. on Hom. *Od.* 11.320 p.1688, *Diod. Sic.* 4.61.4f., *Plut. Thes.* 19.1, *Hyg. Fab.* 42, *Serv. on Verg. Aen.* 6.14.22-24 and on *Verg. Georg.* 1.222.1-16. In what became the canonical version of the myth Ariadne offers Theseus a ball of thread (for the symbolic value of Ariadne's thread in terms of poetics see J. Miller (1976), N. Miller (1986) esp. 281-6 and Kaufmann (1986) 57). However, there seems to have been an alternative tradition, according to which Ariadne provided Theseus not with a thread, but with a luminous wreath, whose light guided the hero safely in the dark labyrinth. The wreath which was either a marriage gift to Ariadne from Bacchus (Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 339) or from Theseus became superfluous in the canonical version and was later catasterized by Bacchus after Ariadne's death (cf. *Arat. Phaen.* 1.71f. *Αὐτοῦ κάκεινος Στέφανος, τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἔθηκεν / σῆμ' ἔμειναι Διόνυσος ἀποιομένης Ἀριάδνης*, *Hyg. Astr.* 2.5.1.9-12 *dicitur etiam a Vulcano facta (sc. corona) ex auro et Indicis gemmis, per quas Theseus existimatur de tenebris labyrinthi ad lucem uenisse, quod aurum et gemmae in obscuro fulgorem luminis efficiebant*. Further on Ariadne's wreath see Webster (1966) 25f. Note the arrangement of the terms in the line (of the type ABab).

60. curua....tecta: for the concept of the labyrinth as a round architectural construction, cf. *Call. Hymn.* 4.311 *γναπτὸν ἔδος σκολιοῦ λαβυρίνθου*, *Apollod. Bibl.* 3.1.4 (= *TrGF* II adesp. [34] *ἦν δὲ ὁ λαβύρινθος, ὃν Δαίδαλος κατασκεύασεν, οἴκημα καμπαῖς πολυπλόκοις πλανῶν τὴν ἔξοδον* (possibly a Sophoclean fragment (so Austin on *Verg. Aen.* 6.27, Hill on *Ov. Met.* 8.152-82)), *Verg. Aen.* 5.588-91 *ut quondam Creta fertur Labyrinthus in alta / parietibus textum caecis iter ancipitemque / mille uiis habuisse dolum, qua signa sequendi / frangeret indeprentus et inremeabilis error, 6.27-30 hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error; / magnum reginae sed enim miseratus amorem / Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resoluit, / caeca regens filo uestigia*. Both passages look back at *Catul.* 64.114f. *ne labyrinthis e flexibus egredientem / tecti frustraretur inobseruabilis error*" (so Austin on *Verg. Aen.* 6.27), *Ov. Her.* 10.71 *tecto...recuruo*, 10.128 *saxea tecta*, *Met.* 8.157ff., esp. 157f. *thalamo... / multiplici que domo caecisque includere tectis, 172-4 utque ope uirginea nullis iterata priorum / ianua difficilis filo est inuenta relecto, / protinus Aegides*, also *Plin. NH* 36.85.

sororis ope: There is no doubt that the reference to Ariadne's help is aimed at undermining Theseus' heroic valour (on this see p.73). Ariadne claims to have saved Theseus from certain death at Catul. 64.149-51 (*certe ego te in medio uersantem turbine leti / eripui, et potius germanium amittere creui, / quam tibi fallaci supremo in tempore dessem*); a claim, which she repeats in her letter to Theseus, cf. *Her.* 10.71f. *cum tibi, ne uictor tecto morerere recuruo, / quae regerent passus, pro duce fila dedi* and 103f. *nec tibi, quae reditus monstrarent, fila dedissem, / fila per adductas saepe recepta manus*). Also Eur. fr. 1001 N². . λίνου κλωστήρα περιφέρει λαβών, Ap. Rhod. 3.997f. *δή ποτε καὶ Θησῆα κακῶν ὑπελύσατ' ἀέθλων / παρθενικὴ Μινωῖς ἐυφρονέουσ' Ἀριάδνη*, Catul. 64.112f. *inde pedem sospes multa cum laude reflexit / errabunda regens tenui uestigia filo*, Prop. 2.14.7f. *nec sic, cum incolumem Minois Thesea uidit, / Daedaliu lino cui duce rexit iter*, 4.4.41f. *prodita quid mirum fraterni cornua monstri, / cum patuit lecto stamine torta uia?*, Ov. *Met.* 8.172f. *utque ope uirginea nullis iterata priorum / ianua difficilis filo est inuenta relecto*, *Fast.* 3.462 *quae dedit ingrata fila legenda uiro*. Further see Whitaker (1983) 42ff. Nevertheless, Vergil offers an alternative version, according to which it was not Ariadne, but Daedalus who provided the assistance out of sympathy for Ariadne's unlucky love affair (*Aen.* 6.28-30 *magnum reginae sed enim miseratus amorem / Daedalus ipse dolos tecti ambagesque resoluit, / caeca regens filo uestigia*).

Like line 57, the couplet is also framed by the names of the two lovers (*perfidus Aegides...sororis ope*).

fugit: here in the sense of "escaping the danger, escaping death" (*OLD* s.v. *fugere* 6, *TLL* 6.1.1488.26ff.), but the verb often appears in the context of erotic abandonment (*TLL* 6.1.1481.1ff., Pichon (1966) s.v. *fugere*), cf. e.g. with reference to Theseus: Catul. 64.58 *inmemor at iuuenis fugiens*, 183 *quine fugit lentos incuruans gurgite remos?*, *Her.* 10.34 "quo fugis?" *exclamo; "scelerate reuertere Theseu!"*, also see Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.314.

61. en ego nunc: *en ego* is a favourite Ovidian exclamation (cf. *Am.* 1.2.19, *Ars* 3.598, see Bömer on *Met.* 6.206). The application of *nunc* underlines once again the urgency, the "here and now" of her appeal (cf. *iam* 37, *iam* 39, *saepe* 45, *nunc* 47).

ne forte parum Minoia credar: an outspoken claim to her inclusion to her Cretan family. Phaedra's preoccupation with her Cretan origin is constant throughout the letter (cf. *Cressa puella* 2, *generis fato* 53, *ex tota gente* 54, *prima...gentis origo* 55, *Pasiphae mater* 57, *ne...parum Minoia credar* 61, *domus* 63, *de nostra...domo* 66, *mihi sit genitor...Minos* 157, *mihi dotalis...Creta* 163). *Minoia* is an elevated patronymic, modelled on the Greek epic adjective *Μινώϊος*, which first occurs at Hom. *Hymn. Apoll.* 393 (referring to Cnossus). The adjective is used widely by Apollonius Rhodius either with reference to Crete (*Argon.* 2.299, 516, 4.1456, 1691) or as a patronymic for Ariadne (*Argon.* 3.998, 4.433, also 3.1998 *κούρην Μίνωος*). *Minois* in Latin poetry occurs only at Verg. *Aen.* 6.14 (*Minoia regna*), Ov. *Her.* 17.193 (for Ariadne), *Fast.* 3.81 (for Crete), *Ib.* 289, and is later picked up by Lucan (3.163, 5.406) and Statius (*Ach.* 1.192). For the formation of patronymics in *-ius* under Greek influence

see Harrison on Verg. *Aen.* 10.123. On the contrary, *Minois*, a similar formation (also under Greek influence, cf. Call. fr. 110.59 Pf. *νύμφης Μινωίδος*, Nonn. *Dion.* 47.424, 48.548) is much more popular with regard to Ariadne (cf. Catul. 64.60, 247, Prop. 2.14.7, 2.24b.43, 2.32.57, 4.11.21, Sen. *Phaedr.* 127, *Her.* 16.349, *Ars* 1.509, *Met.* 8.174 with Bömer, [Verg.] *Lydia* 152, *Aetna* 22, *Ciris* 31). A similar claim to family integration is also made by Hermione, cf. *Her.* 8. 81f. *ne non Pelopeia credar, / ecce, Neoptolemo praeda parata fui!* with n. ad loc. and p.53. The Senecan *Phaedra* concludes her reference to the guilty past of her family with a similar assertion, cf. Sen. *Phaedr.* 127f. (...) *nulla Minois leui / defuncta amore est, iungitur semper nefas*. For further examples of the linguistic similarities between the Ovidian and the Senecan *Phaedra* see Tarrant (1978) 262 n.208

credar: *Phaedra*'s use of passive verbs like this one (cf. also *uidear* 120, *laudabimur* 139, *dicar* 140) is indicative of her awareness of public criticism and its potential effects on her relationship with Hippolytus (cf. lines 139f. and 145f.) (on this see pp. 16ff. and esp. 18 n.119).

62. in socias leges: Palmer ad loc. translates: "I am now the last to come under the laws of marriage of my race." (cf. *OLD* s.v. *socius*¹ 4b). *Phaedra* later in her letter makes a similar reference to marital bonds with respect to her liaison with Hippolytus (line 147 *properataque foedera iunge*, also 17 *socialia...foedera*). Cf. Dido's reference to her "marital" bonds with Aeneas (Verg. *Aen.* 4.213 *cuique loci leges dedimus, conubia nostra*). For the final construction of *in* + accusative as an Ovidian feature see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.1.21f.

ultima gentis eo: cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 341 *τρίτη δ' ἐγὼ δύστηνος ὡς ἀπόλλυμαι*. *ire* in the sense of "walking to meet death (or fate)" is perhaps under a Greek influence, since such use is very common in tragedy (cf. e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 807f., 867f., 877, 892, Eur. *Alc.* 163).

63-6. In a further attempt to shake off responsibility from both herself and her beloved *Phaedra* applies the motif of hereditary guilt also to Hippolytus and his father. Her depiction of Hippolytus as a "second Theseus" in terms of sexual behaviour is strikingly reminiscent of Phyllis' similar association of Demophoon with Theseus on grounds of hereditary unfaithfulness (cf. *Her.* 2.67-78).

63. fatale est: the double entendre of *fatalis* –similar to that of *fato* at line 53 (see n. ad loc.)– offers an interesting fusion of "fated" (*OLD* s.v. 2) with "fatal" (*OLD* s.v. 4b), see Boyle on Sen. *Phaedr.* 113. Cf. also Sen. *Phaedr.* 698 *et ipsa nostrae fata cognosco domus*.

domus una duabus: the claim is later echoed by the Senecan *Phaedra*, cf. Sen. *Phaedr.* 665f. *domus sorores una corripuit duas, / te genitor, at me gnatus*. The juxtaposition of *una duabus* at the end of the line is emphatic. A similar wordplay on *unus*, *duo* and *domus* also occurs later in the letter (line 143 *ut tenuit domus una duos, domus una tenebit*), but the reference there is made in connection with the protection offered by the house to *Phaedra* and Hippolytus.

64. me...soror: father and son are framed by the two sisters. The close association between the two sisters is as early as Hom. *Od.* 11.321 *Φαίδρην τε Πρόκριν τε ἶδον καλήν τ' Ἀριάδην*.

Cf. Jacobson's (1974) 149 remark that Phaedra in comparison with Ariadne is "fulfilling her fate more than suffering it."

capit capta parente: another allusion to the *seruitium amoris* (on the metaphor see n. on *Her.* 4.22). The succession of the verb in the present tense (*capit*) by its past participle (*capta*) further enhances the sense of continuity between the two sisters. Phaedra carefully avoids any mention of the fact that Theseus is her husband (De Vito (1994) 316).

65. Thesides Theseusque: Hippolytus, like Theseus a few lines above, is called by his patronymic; the repetition of the initial sound *Thes-* in both names underscores the father-son relationship. For similar repetitions cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.10.19 *nec Venus apta feris Veneris nec filius armis*, 2.11.36 *Nereidesque deae Nereidumque pater*, 2.18.24 *Hippolytique parens Hippolytusque legant*, *Met.* 2.268f., 11.361, 12.94, further parallels see McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.10.19. For repetitions denoting "father-son" relationship see Wills (1996) 257ff.

duas rapuere sorores: *rapere* is a strong verb, loosely related to Phaedra's reality, since Ariadne was not abducted by Theseus; instead, she followed him with her own will. Once again Phaedra constructs reality through the projection of her innermost wishes and desires. Nonetheless, Theseus had a very bad reputation for abducting women (cf. *Athen.* 13.557a *Ἴστρος γοῦν ἐν τῇ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ τῶν Ἀττικῶν καταλέγων τὰς τοῦ Θησέως γενομένας γυναῖκας φησιν τὰς μὲν αὐτῶν ἐξ ἔρωτος γεγενῆσθαι, τὰς δ' ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς, ἄλλας δ' ἐκ νομίμων γάμων ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς μὲν Ἑλένην, Ἀριάδην, Ἴπολύτην καὶ τὰς Κερκύονος καὶ Σίνιδος θυγατέρας, νομίμως δ' αὐτὸν γῆμαι Μελίβοιαν τὴν Αἴαντος μητέρα. Ἡσίοδος δὲ φησιν καὶ Ἴππην καὶ Αἰγλήν, δι' ἣν καὶ τοὺς πρὸς Ἀριάδην ὄρκους παρέβη, ὡς φησι Κέρκωψ. Φερεκύδης δὲ προστίθησι καὶ Φερέβοιαν. πρὸ δὲ τῆς Ἑλένης καὶ ἐκ Τροιζήνος ἤρπασεν Ἀναξά. μετὰ δὲ τὴν Ἴπολύτην Φαίδραν ἔσχευ.). His abduction of young Helen, in particular, is often mentioned in the *Heroides* (cf. *Her.* 5.127-9, 16.149-54, 327-9, 17.21-34. For a detailed discussion of Helen's abduction by Theseus see Michalopoulos (2006) 5f., 39f., esp. on *Her.* 16.149. Phaedra through her allusion to Theseus' role as abductor of women is urging Hippolytus to imitate his father's example.*

rapuere: Ovid prefers for the third person plural of the perfect indicative the less frequent -but more elevated- ending in *-ere*, instead of the more popular ending in *-erunt* (further on this see Michalopoulos (2006) 65).

sorores: *soror* carefully placed at the end of two consecutive lines (*...soror / ...sorores*) forms what Wills calls a "line-final repetition"; the figure is common in the *Heroides* (for examples see Wills (1996) 422).

66. Phaedra's claim is closely reminiscent of both Phyllis' and Ariadne's similar ironic statements in their letter to their loved ones (Demophoon and Theseus respectively), cf. *Her.* 2.65f. *di faciant, laudis summa sit ista tuae!* and *Her.* 10.130 *non ego sum titulis subripienda tuis*.

ponite...bina tropaea domo: for double success (*bina tropaea*), cf. *Ov. Her.* 17.241f. *ut quae fauet Cytherea tibi, quia uicit habetque / parta per arbitrium bina tropaea tuum* with

Michalopoulos, *Rem.* 157f. *uince Cupidineas pariter Parthasque sagittas / et refer ad patrios bina tropaea deos* with Pinotti. Phaedra's anachronistic reference to erotic success in terms of a Roman triumph adds an interesting touch of Romanization to the Greek background of the story. *tropaea* belongs to military vocabulary. The concept of erotic subjection as a triumph appears very often in elegy (cf. Prop. 2.8.40, Ov. *Am.* 1.2.23-48, 2.9.15f., *Her.* 9.104 *et tulit a capto nota tropaea uiro* with Casali, 21.214 *ingenii uideas magna tropaea tui!*, further see McKeown's introduction to *Am.* 1.2). For the idea of erecting trophies against the opposite sex see Ov. *Ars* 2.744 with Janka and 3.812 with Gibson.

Phaedra echoes here Phyllis' complaint to Demophoon (*Her.* 2.63f. *fallere credentem non est operosa puellam / gloria simplicitas digna fauore fuit*) which according to Barchiesi ad loc. it can be seen as a parodic reminiscence of Juno's complaint to Venus at Verg. *Aen.* 4.93-5 (*"egregiam uero laudem et spolia ampla refertis / tuque puerque tuus magnum et memorabile numen, / una dolo diuum si femina uicta duorum est."*).

bina...domo picks up (in reversed order) *domus...duabus* (63). *domo* by being placed last in the line concludes not only the line, but more importantly the whole section of Phaedra's reference to the hereditary guilt of her house!

67-84. The heart of Phaedra's letter to Hippolytus is occupied by her description of his physical appearance through a flashback to their meeting during the Eleusinian mysteries. For a detailed examination of this section in terms of narratology, rhetorical function and its intertextual relation to Eur. *Hipp.* (with special emphasis on Hippolytus' elegicization) see pp. 39ff.

67. tempore quo: a temporal *iunctura* (either *tempore quo* or *quo tempore*) introducing a reference to past events widely used both in poetry and in prose (cf. e.g. Cic. *Quint.* 16.3, 46.7, 60.10, *Rosc.* 2.14, Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.34, *Epist.* 1.2.66, Verg. *Georg.* 1.61, 3.267, Ov. *Rem* 86). In the *Heroides* flashbacks to a happily shared past with their loved ones constitute a common technique. For an in depth examination see Spentzou (2003) 43-83.

Cerealis Eleusin: the attribution of the Roman adjective *Cerealis* to *Eleusin*, which preserves its Greek declension is an interesting combination. The nominative *Eleusin* is Greek, cf. Palmer (1898) ad loc., Bömer on *Met.* 7.439 and *TLG* 3.725c 10-16. The *iunctura* is found only in Ovid and then in Seneca (who preserves the nominative in *-in* both in his poetry and his prose, cf. Sen. *HF* 302 with Billerbeck, 843, *HO* 599, *Ph.* 838, *Tro.* 843, *Nat. Qu.* 7.30.6.2, also see Serv on Verg. *Georg.* 1.162.4-7 *talis est et in graecis ratio; nam 'actin' et 'actis' dicunt, 'delphin' et 'delphis', 'Eleusin' et 'Eleusis': sed uerius in 'n' desinunt, quod in obliquis habent, ut 'actinos, Eleusinos, delphinos'*). For the same line ending in Ovid cf. *Met.* 7.439, *Fast.* 4.507.

On the disputed identification of the Roman goddess Ceres with the Greek Demeter see Le Bonniec (1958) 213-53, Spaeth (1996), Graf in *Brill's New Pauly* 3 (2003) s.v. *Ceres* 158. Further on the nature and secret character of the Eleusinian mysteries see Magnien (1938), Mylonas (1961), Richardson (1974) 12-30, Brumfield (1981) 182-92, Burkert (1972) 274-327, Foley (1993) 65-75.

Specifically for the Roman mysteries of the goddess Ceres see le Bonniec (1958) 108ff., Wagenvoort (1980) 114-46.

On the multiple implications of Phaedra's specific reference to the Eleusinian mysteries see pp.40ff. Phaedra's recollection of their meeting in the mysteries is reminiscent of the motif of the first encounter between the lovers during a religious festival, which was popular both in Greek New Comedy (see Halleran on Eur. *Hipp.* 24-8 with parallels) and in Roman Comedy (cf. Plaut. *Aul.* 794ff., *Cist.* 156ff., Ter. *Ad.* 470, further see Stockert on Plaut. *Aul.* 36 with bibliography). The love affair between Acontius and Cydippe also originates in a festival on the island of Delos (cf. Call. *Aetia* 3 fr. 67-75 Pf. and *Her.* 21.77-104). For bibliography on the motif see Rosati (1985) 126 n.24. It is very interesting that the festival of *Ceres (Initia Cereris)* also provides the setting for Myrrha's incestuous union with her father (cf. Ov. *Met.* 10.430 with Bömer on 431-45), as well as for an erotic seduction in Plautus' *Aulularia* (Plaut. *Aul.* 794ff.).

68. Cnosia me uellem detinuisset humus!: another instance where Phaedra proves to be a well-learned reader of the Euripidean tragedy, since her transposition from Crete to Athens in the play is considered to be the beginning of her doom. For more details see n. on *Her.* 4.5 above. The substitution of *humus* for *terra* (or *tellus*) is an Ovidian variation (Knox on *Her.* 7.140), frequent in the *Her.*, cf. 7.140 *Punica...humus*, 10.106 *Craeteam...humum*, 13.94 *Troada...humum*, 16.276 *Taenaria...humo*, 20.106 *Mygdonia...humo*. For further instances in the Ovidian corpus see *Fast.* 1.490, 2.444, 4.362.5.658, 6.82, 462, *Tr.* 1.404, *Pont.* 1.2.108.1.3.74, 3.1.6, 3.2.46, 3.5.56, *Ib.* 222,336.

The framing of the pentameter (*Gnosia...humus*) was a popular neoteric feature, see Conrad (1965) 226ff., Pearce (1966).

Cnosia: this is another reminder of Phaedra's Cretan origin. *Cnosius* is often used as a synonym to "Cretan" (cf. e.g. Catul. 64.172, Verg. *Aen.* 3.115, 6.23, 566, Prop.2.12.10, Ov. *Met.* 3.208). For the form *Cnosia* instead of *Gnosia* see p.280.

69f. Phaedra is playing with the poetic *topos* of "love at first sight." The motif originating as early as in Homer (cf. Hom. *Il.* 14.293) received special attention during the Hellenistic period (cf. Theocr. 2.66 with Gow, 2.82, 3.42, Ap. Rhod. 3.287-8 with Campbell and bibliography ad loc.). In the *Her.*, cf. 12.33 *et uidi et perii* with Bessone and Heinze, 20.205ff. with Kenney, 21.103f., also see McKeown on *Am.* 1.8.24f., Hinds (1993) 21-7. Phaedra's reference is meant to recall specifically the Catullan description of Ariadne falling in love with Theseus (Catul. 64.84-93, esp. 91-3), which is archetypal for Roman elegy, as well as Medea's similar reaction at the sight of Jason (Ap. Rhod. 3.445ff., esp. 453). In view of the reference to the Eleusinian mysteries, the hint at the "love at first sight" motif is very appropriate, in that god Dis, before abducting Proserpina, also fell in love with her at first sight (cf. Ov. *Met.* 5.395 *χαινε simul uisa est dilectaque raptaque Din*).

69. (nec non tamen ante placebas): the intertextual association with Eur. *Hipp.* 24-8 (*ἐλθόντα γάρ νιν Πιτθέως ποτ' ἐκ δόμων / σεμνῶν ἐς ὄψιν καὶ τέλη μυστηρίων / Πανδίοιος γῆν, πατρός εὐγενῆς δάμαρ / ἰδοῦσα Φαίδρα καρδίαν κατέσχετο / ἔρωτι δεινῷ τοῖς ἐμοῖς βουλευμάσιν*), where Phaedra falls in love with Hippolytus during their first meeting at Eleusis

is tempting (so Palmer (1898) ad loc.). Nevertheless, the parenthetic acknowledgement of her long standing desire for Hippolytus, even before their meeting at Eleusis, clearly marks the differentiation. In contrast with the Euripidean text, for the Ovidian Phaedra this is neither her first meeting with Hippolytus nor is it the first time when she falls in love with him (further see pp. 39f.). The *litotes* (*nec non*) combined with the sequence of the two monosyllables by the two two-syllables (*tamen ante*) draws attention to her claim. The figure of *litotes*, which has its roots to *sermo communis*, is frequently applied in Augustan poetry, often for reasons of metrical convenience. On parenthesis as a Callimachean feature see n. on *Her.* 4. 18.

nec non: following the practice set by Propertius and Tibullus Ovid uses *nec* before consonants (cf. lines 69, 95, 103, 113, 120, 129, 137, 151), but he uses *nec* even before vowels (see n. on *Her.* 4.103). See also n. on *Her.* 4.103f.

70. haesit: cf. Ariadne's similar reaction at the first sight of Theseus (Catul. 64. 91-3 *non prius ex illo flagrantia declinauit / lumina, quam cuncto concepit corpore flammam / funditus atque imis exarsit tota medullis*) and Dido's infatuation when staring at Cupid in the human shape of Ascanius (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.717-9 (...) *haec oculis, haec pectore toto / haeret et interdum gremio fouet inscia Dido / insidat quantus miserae deus* (...). *haesit* picks up *haesit* at line 7 (see n. ad loc.)

70. acer...amor: the pentameter is framed between *acer...amor*. The attribution of *acer* to *amor* to denote love's cruelty is frequent in elegy, see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.2.17 and Maltby on Tib. 1.2.15. Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 27f. *ἰδοῦσα Φαίδρα καρδίαν κατέσχετο / ἔρωτι δεινῷ*.

in extremis ossibus: for the bones as the seat of love see n. on *Her.* 4.15.

70-84. Phaedra organizes her description of Hippolytus' beauty in three sections: a) 71-78: on clothing and personal grooming, b) 79-82: on his excellence in athletic exercises, c) 83f.: on his hunting pursuit. For a detailed investigation of Phaedra's appropriation of the male gaze and its multiple consequences on Hippolytus' status (both in terms of genre and gender) see pp.43ff.

71. candida uestis: a reference to the garments worn by the beloved often complements the description of his/her beauty (cf. e.g. Ap. Rhod. 3.454, Prop. 1.2.3f., 2.3.15, Ov. *Am.* 1.5.10 with McKeown, 1.8.24, 3.1.11, Sulp. [Tib.] 3.8.11f.). The choice of white colour is in accordance with the Roman practice of the worshippers wearing white in most religious festivals (cf. Tib. 2.1.16 with Maltby, Ov. *Am.* 1.5.10, 2.13.23f. with McKeown, *Fast.* 1.70 with Bömer, 2.654, 4.906, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 10.431-45 (pp.149), Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.79), especially in the *Cerialia* festival (cf. Ov. *Fast.* 4.619f. *uestes Cerialibus albas / sumite; nunc pulli uelleris usus abest, 906, 5.355 ut dantur uestes Cerialibus albae*). Further see Radke (1936), esp. 61ff. The specific choice of *candida* is far from coincidental, since *candidus* is a typical elegiac signal which is very often attributed either to the elegiac *puellae* in general or to elements of their physical beauty (e.g. Prop. 2.28.51, Ov. *Am.* 1.4.7, 2.18.29, 3.3.5, 3.7.8, Pichon (1966) s.v.). Whiteness or paleness of skin was considered as a desirable feature of female beauty (see N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.4.29). The epithet is also often ascribed to deities (cf.

TLL 3.241.36ff.) or to elegiac mistresses appearing as deities (see *Ov. Am.* 1.5.10 with McKeown); in the latter sense Hippolytus' description could also be seen within the context of a divine epiphany (cf. his comparison to Jupiter in terms of his beauty at line 35f. above). In any case, its application with reference to Hippolytus is a first clear hint at the hero's elegization (on this see pp.46f.). In view of the story's tragic aftermath, it is rather ironic that the white colour of the garment carries implications of good luck and fortune (*OLD* s.v. *candidus* 7, also see *Tib.* 1.3.94 and 1.10.45f. with Maltby, also *Prop.* 1.17.26, *Catul.* 64.235). By Ovid's time white was considered to be a propitious colour, as opposed to the gloomy connotations of the black, dark or grey clothing, appropriate for funerals. However, during the Imperial times white became the colour of mourning (further see N-A on *Lygd.* [Tib.] 3.2.18). Phaedra's specific preference for *candidus* ("bright white") instead of *albus* ("matt white") proves to be a well-planned choice in another respect as well (for more on the chromatic opposition *albus* / *candidus* see N-A on *Lygd.* [Tib.] 3.2.10 with bibliography), since the moral connotations of the adjective (*OLD* s.v. 8b) makes its attribution to Hippolytus as a reflection of his unmarred morality (in particular for the use of *candidus* and its multiple connotations in the elegies of Tibullus see Booth-Maltby (2005)). Last, Hippolytus' *candida uestis* picks up Phaedra's claim to her alleged pure and unspoiled erotic life at line 31 *candor ab insolita labe*.

uestis: Phaedra's use of the generic *uestis* (*OLD* s.v. *uestis* 1,2) instead of a more specific term, such as *toga* or *palla*, is part of her strategy to avoid any reference to Hippolytus' exact age in an attempt to play down their age difference (also see p.33). For the Romans the passage from adolescence to adulthood was symbolically marked by the assumption of the *toga uirilis* (the exact age remains uncertain, most likely around the age of 14-16), see Stone (1994), Gardner (1998) 142f., Godwin (1997) and Thomson (1997) on *Catul.* 68.15). For more on Roman clothing see Stone (1994), Vout (1996). Judging from Roman legal writings on clothing the Romans seem to have been particularly preoccupied with public decency in terms of clothing for both sexes, cf. *Ulp. Dig.* 34.2.32.2, *Paulus Sent.* 3.6.80. The wearing of loose togas characterised Roman dandies (cf. e.g. *Cic. Catul.* 2.2, *Ov. Rem.* 679f., for bibliography see Maltby on *Tib.* 1.6.39f.), while the elegists are adamant in their condemnation of expensive and extravagant garments (see Gibson (2003) on 169-192).

In view of the *praeceptor's* remark at *Ov. Ars* 3.191 that "white cloths suit the dark-skinned" (*alba decent fuscas*) we might infer from Hippolytus' white his dusky skin, which is in accordance with his training in the countryside at lines 79-84 (cf. *Cic. Off.* 1.130.9-11 *sunt recta et simplicia laudantur. Formae autem dignitas coloris bonitate tuenda est, color exercitationibus corporis*, *Ov. Ars* 1.513, *Hor. Carm.* 1.8.4 with N-H ad loc. (For the need of those having dark skin to apologize for it, see *Verg Ecl.* 10.38f. *seu quicumque furor quid tum, si fuscus Amyntas? / et nigrae uiolae sunt et uaccinia nigra* with Clausen ad loc. and N-H on *Hor. Carm.* 2.4.3).

praecincti flore capilli: The reference to the crown is important in that it picks up its symbolic use in Eur. *Hipp*, where the crown helps to bring together all three main protagonists: Hippolytus and the offering of his garland to Artemis (Eur. *Hipp*. 73f.) and Theseus' removal of his crown from his head (Eur. *Hipp*. 806f.), which visually recalls Phaedra's removal of her veil at the beginning of the play (201f.) (see Luschnig (1980) 96f., Goff (1990) 61f.). Phaedra's misinterpretation of Hippolytus' symbolic offering of a wreath to Artemis is intentional (cf. Eur. *Hipp*. 74f. σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκηράτου / λειμῶνος, ὧ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω). Hence, from proof of his chastity the crown becomes in Phaedra's eyes a feature which adds further to the elegiac beauty of her beloved (see also see p.46). Moreover, I am tempted to read the reference to Hippolytus' crown as a metaliterary allusion to the title of the surviving Euripidean tragedy (*Ἰππόλυτος Στεφανίας* (or *Στεφανηφόρος*) to differentiate it from Euripides' first *Hippolytus* (*Ἰππόλυτος Καλυπτόμενος*), on the titles see Barrett (1966) 10 n.1 and 37 n.1).

flore: the collective singular is poetic, see Green on Ov. *Fast*. 1.345.

capilli: *capillus* is prosaic. It is frequent in satire and elegy (always restricted to the line end, cf. also line 77) and eminently absent from elevated poetry (*TLL* 3.314.24-48). The most frequent word for hair in elegy is *coma*; *crinis* is widely used in epic. Further (with statistics) see N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.1.10, Bessone on *Her*. 12.11f., Maltby on Tib. 1.1.67f. with bibliography. *capillus* is a diminutive; diminutives were often employed to infuse sentiment in the narrative, and strike a more personal, emotional tone, see Fordyce on Catul. 3.18 (cf. also on 64.60); however, their presence in elegy is somewhat restricted (on the use of diminutives in poetry see Axelson (1945) 38-45, Ross (1969) 22-6, Gow (1932), also Cooper (1895) 164ff.).

72. The symmetrical arrangement of two adjectives and nouns around a central verb in the pattern *A-B-verb-a-b* constitutes the so-called "golden line" (the term was introduced by Dryden). The figure, which was not unknown to Ennius, but sparsely used by Lucretius, became more frequent with Catullus and was particularly favoured by Ovid. Further on "golden line" see Michalopoulos on *Her*. 16.109 with bibliography.

uerecundus...rubor: a rare *iunctura* in elegy, in Ovid again at *Met*. 1.484 with Bömer. For similar combinations, cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.572 (*uerecudi...pudoris*) and *Tr*. 4.4.50 (*uerecundo...pudore*). The combination of a pale complexion with a light blush of modesty constituted a desirable feature of female beauty, in particular (see Nikolaidis (1994) 27f., 38). The contrast between a red flush of modesty and paleness was very popular in Hellenistic poetry (cf. e.g. Ap. Rhod. 3.298, 963, 681, for more parallels see Enk on Prop. 2.3.11f.) and it was then passed on to Latin literature (cf. e.g. Verg. *Georg*. 1.430, *Aen*. 12.67-9, Prop. 2.3.10, Ov. *Am*. 1.4.22, 1.8.35 with McKeown (1989) ad loc., *Am*. 3.3.5f., *Ars* 1.729 with Hollis, *Her*. 20.120 with Kenney, 21.217, *Met*. 3.423 with Bömer, Lygd. [Tib.] 3.4.30 with N-A, Sen. *Phaedr*. 376, *Benef*. 4.36.2, also André (1949) 324-6, Pichon (1966) s.v. *rubere*, Lyne (1983) 63 n.7). The juxtaposition of colour terms was a standard poetic technique, see André (1949) 345ff.

Hippolytus' blush of modesty through the association with the blush of the snow-white face of the newly-wed bride (a popular convention of ancient epithalamia, cf. Sapph. fr. 112 L-P, also Catul. 61.191-5. Further see Fordyce on Catul. 61.252 and N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.4.31-4) contributes further to the effeminization of Hippolytus. For Cicero's close connection between *rubor* and *pudor* cf. Cic. *de Orat.* 2.242.14, *Orat.* 79.1, *Tusc.* 4.19.2, *Nat. Deor.* 1.75.6. Like Hippolytus, Hermaphroditus also blushes at Salmacis' approach (cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.329 with Bömer). Cf. also Plaut. *Captiu.* 962. Ov. *Met.* 8.388 *erubere uiri*.

flaua ora: in Eur. *Hipp.* Hippolytus is blond (Eur. *Hipp.* 1343 *ξανθὸν τε κάρα*); blond was the colour of heroes (so Fordyce on Catul. 64.62f., Coffey and Mayer on Sen. *Phaedr.* 652, André (1994) 326f. and Nikolaidis (1994) 71, Tromaras on Catul. 64.63-5, cf. e.g. *Her.* 12.11 Jason's blond hair). The epithet was common for deities (see *TLL* 6.1.888.48ff.), heroes and elegiac mistresses with reference to hair-colour (for parallels see Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.5.43f., also see Leary (1990) 153, Lilja (1965) 123-4, 128-9). Perhaps this is the missing evidence for the use of the adjective not for hair-colour, but for complexion (so McKeown on *Am.* 2.4.39f. and Booth on *Am.* 2.4.39-44). In addition, the nuptial associations of bright yellow or saffron (cf. Catul. 61.8-10, 134, Tib. 2.2.18 with Murgatroyd and Maltby) complement nicely the image of Hippolytus' bridal-like blush of modesty. The attribution of *flauus* to Hippolytus offers perhaps a subtle link with the *Cerialia*, since *flaua* was conventionally used for Ceres as well (cf. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.500 *ξανθή Δημήτηρ*, Hom. *Hymn. Dem.* 302 *ξανθή Δημήτηρ*), first attested in Verg. *Georg.* 1.96, Tib. 1.1.15, *Am.* 1.1.7, 1.1.8, 3.10.3,43, *Fast.* 4.424, Lucan 4.412, *CLE* 570.2. For an extensive list of parallels see Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.590. In view of a possible implicit reference to Hippolytus' dark complexion through the white colour of his garment, *flauus* seems very appropriate for sun-burnt complexion (André (1994) 128ff.), as opposed to the paleness of the *pueri delicati*.

73. quemque aliae uocant: another case of a so-called "Alexandrian footnote" (see n. on *Her.* 4.51).

uultum rigidumque trucemque: the face is one of the most prominent features of physical beauty ever since Homer (cf. e.g. *Il.* 19.285 (Briseis), *Od.* 18.192 (Penelope)); so, in Roman elegy, cf. e.g. Tib. 1.8.46, 1.9.15,69, Prop. 2.3.9f, 3.8.27, 3.22.36 with Fedeli on the synecdochic use of *facies* for beauty (also see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.8.33f.), Ov. *Am.* 2.1.5, *Her.* 16.236, Pichon (1966) s.v. *uultus*). Cf. also the reference to the beauty of Aeneas' face at Verg. *Aen.* 4.150 (*tantum egregio decus enitet ore*).

rigidum: in elegy the adjective appears only in Ovid often in the sense of "austere, rigid" (*OLD* s.v. 4), cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.6.73, 2.4.15, 3.4.44, *Rem.* 35, 762; however, *rigidus* has further sexual connotations (Adams (1982) 46 and 103) associated with male erection. The repetition in the following line (*pro rigido* 74) is emphatic.

trucem: the epithet was frequently used in elegy for those opposed to love, cf. e.g. Prop. 2.34.50, 3.15.38, Ov. *Ars* 2.186, 477, also Hor. *Epod.* 5.4, *truces...animos*, *Met.* 7.111, 8.297,

9.81, also Calp. Sic. *Ecl.* 4.60, Mart. 3.58.10, 7.58.7f., Billerbeck on Sen. *HF* 371, Keulen on Sen. *Tro.* 220. *trux* is later repeated at line 166 with reference to Pasiphae's bull (*eris tauro saeuior ipse truci?*).

74. Phaedra iudice: the mistress as *iudex* is a legal metaphor (see Kenney (1969) 253), widely used in elegy, cf. Prop. 2.13.14 ... *nam domina iudice tutus ero*, Ov. *Am.* 2.2.56 with McKeown, 2.17.2 *conuicar iudice turpis ego*, also *Ars* 3.491, *Rem.* 428, *Met.* 2.428, 8.24, 10.613, *Fast.* 3.488 *iudicio peccas turpius ipe tuo*. In the *Her.*, cf. 16.206 *iudice te nobis antefendus erit*, 17.244 *iudice te causam non tenere duae*. Phaedra is extremely cautious in concealing her identity; we are 74 lines in the letter and this is the first reference to her name (again only at line 112).

75f. Hippolytus' rejection of excessive personal care is in complete accordance with the principles of Roman manliness. Through this reference the hero's Romanization reaches its climax in the letter. Phaedra judges Hippolytus in terms of the prevailing attitude towards male appearance in Ovid's time. Further on this see pp.45ff.

75. sint procul iuuenes ut femina compti: Phaedra gives voice to contemporary Roman anxieties of personal grooming as a potential threat against masculinity, cf. Cicero *Off.* 1.130 *cum autem pulchritudinis duo genera sint, quorum in altero uenustas sit, in altero dignitas, uenustatem muliebrem ducere debemus, dignitatem uirilem. Ergo et a forma remoueat omnis uiro non dignus ornatus, et huic simile uitium in gestu motuque caueatur. Nam et palaestrici motus sunt saepe odiosiores et histrionum nonnulli gestus ineptiis non uacant, et in utroque genere quae sunt recta et simplicia laudantur. Formae autem dignitas coloris bonitate tuenda est, color exercitationibus corporis. Adhibenda praeterea munditia est non odiosa neque exquisita nimis, tantum quae fugiat agrestem et inhumanam negligentiam. Eadem ratio est habenda uestitus, in quo, sicut in plerisque rebus, mediocritas optima est* (and Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.137ff.), Ov. *Ars* 3.433f. *sed uitate uiros cultum formamque professos / quique suas ponunt in statione comas*. It is surely not by chance that Hippolytus is employed by the *praeceptor* as the embodiment of his advice on male public appearance at Ov. *Ars* 1.511 *Hippolytum Phaedra, nec erat bene cultus, amauit*. In this light, closely related is the chorus' comment on the potential danger posed by extraordinary male beauty in Seneca's *Phaedra* (Sen. *Phaedr.* 820f. *raris forma uiris saecula perspice / impunita fuit*). Further on excessive care for personal appearance as sign of a man's effeminacy see Gibson on Ov. *Ars* 3.101-34 and on 3.434, Scivoletto (1976) 85 n.45 and Myerowitz (1985) 198f. n.2, Williams (1999) 127-32. Hippolytus' beauty must have been extraordinary, see Fontenrose (1981) 165 n.13.

procul: a solemn, high style, sacral proclamation; a ritual cry, possibly originating in the Eleusinian mysteries (if so, this is a further link with *Cerealis Eleusin*). Further on *procul* see Maltby on Tib. 1.1.76 with bibliography, also Bömer on *Met.* 2.464, Pinotti on Ov. *Rem.* 14, Booth (1981) 2699. On the very contrary, for the praise of the effeminate beauty of young men see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.8.33 with bibliography.

femina: *femina*, a neutral term for “woman,” is preferred to *mulier* in poetry, possibly due to its connotations of respect in the Republican period (so Adams (1972) 239, see also Axelson (1945) 55f.). In prose, *femina* as an emphatic term for “female” (as opposed to *uir*) gradually replaced *mulier* from the Augustan period onwards (see Adams (1972) 242-9). Cf. also *Her.* 14.55 *femina sum et uirgo*.

76. fine coli modico forma uirilil amat: a certain neatness (*munditia*) seems to have been permitted to a certain extent to young men as long as it did not lead to effeminacy.

forma uirilil: again only at *Ov. Fast.* 6.631. Hippolytus is mentioned by Phaedra as *uir* (line 2 *Amazonio...uero*).

77. iste: an unpoetic pronoun with colloquial colour, see Axelson (1945) 71f., LHS 2.184, Tränkle (1960) 162, Bömer on *Met.* 1.488, Casali on *Her.* 9.69 (for a different view see Kenney (1986a) 56f.).

rigor: it picks up the sexual implications of *rigidus* (73) and *rigido* (74), see Adams (1982) 46 n.1, and 59.

positique sine arte capilli : the beauty of the hair as a feature of female beauty is another erotic *topos* of elegy (cf. Lilja (1965) 120, 123, 128f., Pichon (1966) s.v. *capillos*, on Roman female hairstyles see Gibson (2003) 151, 159, 277, 280f.). The reference here is made with respect to Hippolytus’ lack of concern for hair-dressing as a sign of the rustic ways of the *mos maiorum* (for the association of long hair with archaic virtue see N-H on *Hor. Carm.* 1.12.41). Untied hair (often perfumed) were considered as a trademark of the *pueri delicati* (further see N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.4.27 with bibliography). Cf. a similar reference to Hippolytus’ hair at *Sen. Phaedr.* 757 (*rigidas Hippolyti comas*, a possible imitation of *Ov. Met.* 3.100 *gelidoque comae terrore rigeabant*, 13.765 *iam rigidos pactis rastris, Polypheme, capillos*). Further on the heroic implications of long hair see Jeanmaire (1939) 257f., 379f., Miller (1998) 41, Calame (2001) 106 n.51 with bibliography.

Phaedra, similarly to her use of *uestis*, remains equally vague about the exact length of Hippolytus’ hair. For the Romans, the ritual practice of cutting a man’s hair signified the passage from adolescence to adulthood (see Tromaras on *Catul.* 81.139), while long, uncut hair carried associations of eternal youth (see N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.4.27, cf. also the practice of cutting a boy’s hair of childhood, when he became an ephebe, see Fitch on *Sen. HF.* 853 and Steininger *RE* 7 (1912) s.v. *Haartracht und Haarschmuck* 2118.43ff.). For the sexual implications of men’s long hair for both Greek and Romans see Blümner (1911) 271, 396 n.10, Dover (1978) 78, also Watson on *Hor. Epod.* 11.28, Fitch on *Sen. Ag.* 853, Vollmer on *Stat. Silv.* 3.4, Greg. Naz. *Or.* 14.17. Phaedra’s emphasis on Hippolytus’ lack of (erotic) art, corresponds to her own lack of erotic art (cf. line 25). Thus, her beloved’s uncultivated beauty matches the artlessness of her letter.

78. leuis puluis in ore: Palmer ad loc. interprets *puluis* as a reference to Hippolytus’ first beard (cf. *Sen. Phaedr.* 648 *cum prima puras barba signarat genas*), but such use of *puluis* is

unattested. More importantly, the reference to the dust from the arena on Hippolytus' face offers a smooth transition to the following section about his excellence in horse-racing in the circus (lines 79f.). For *puluis* in the strict sense of dust from race-course of the arena see *OLD* s.v. 2a. Further support is provided by the fact that the *iunctura leuis...puluis* appears again in a similar context in Ovid's *Amores*, where the poet complains about the light dust, which sits on the white garment of his mistress (3.2.41f. *dum loquor, alba leui sparsa est tibi puluere uestis. / sordide de niueo corpore puluis abi!*).

More importantly, Hermione's reference to *leuis...puluis* ("light dust") casts a dark shadow on Hippolytus' beauty and offers an implicit hint at his death by evoking the Roman funerary formula of *s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(euis)* (see Lattimore (1942) 65-74, *OLD* s.v. *leuis*¹ 1d).

79-83. For such activities as manifestations of Roman virility, cf. Plaut. *Bac.* 412ff., esp. 428-31, Hor. *Carm.* 1.8.3-12 with N-H, 3.7.25ff., Ov. *Ars* 3.383-6. The combined reference to horse riding, hurling the javelin and the hunting spear at lines 79-83 suggests the typical Roman attitude of hunting on horseback (cf. Gratt. *Cyneg.* 497-538, Arr. *Cyneg.* 16.5, 18, 23, esp. 24, Opp. *Cyneg.* 1.82-85, 95f.), as opposed to the Greek practice of hunting on foot (cf. Pl. *Leg.* 822d, Xen. *Cyneg.* 1.12f., 18), which provided a good training for the Greek hoplite. Further on Greek and Roman hunting techniques see Anderson (1961) 100-2, *idem* (1985) 30-56 and 83-100 respectively, Aymard (1951).

79f. Phaedra's reference to Hippolytus' expertise as a chariot driver foreshadows the tragic outcome of the story in view of the hero's death in the Euripidean tragedy (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1188f., 1194f., 1219f., also Ov. *Met.* 15.518-20 (...) *ego ducere uana / frena manu spumis albensibus oblita luctor / et retro lentas tendo resupinus habenas*). Further on the combination of sexual and morbid implications of the horse imagery in the letter see n. on *Her.* 4.22.

siue...seu...siue: this combination of disjunctive conditional conjunctions, however infrequent in the archaic period, was popular in classical times (see N-A on [Tib.] 3.4.11f. with bibliography).

ferocis equi: Hippolytus' (Virbius') in his own account of his death in Ov. *Met.* also calls his horses fearless (cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.515-8 *cum colla feroces / ad freta conuertunt adirectisque auribus horrent / quadripedes monstrique metu turbantur et altis / praecipitant currum scopulis...*, 521 *nec tamen uires has tamen rabies superasset equorum*). Nevertheless, following the Euripidean messenger's report, Hippolytus' tragic death was caused by the frenzied reaction of his fearful horses (Eur. *Hipp.* 1218 *εὐθὺς δὲ πάλοις δεινὸς ἐμπίπτει φόβος*, so also at Sen. *Phaedr.* 1055f. *equos / pauidos*). For the *iunctura*, cf. Plaut. *Men.* 863, Verg. *Aen.* 7.724. The word-order in the line (of the type A-a-B-b) is worth mentioning (cf. Bömer on *Met.* 2.163).

80. exiguo...in orbe pedes: it echoes Phaedra's skills in charioteering at lines 45f. (*saepe iuuat uersare leues in puluere currus / torquentem frenis ora fugacis equi*) assimilated, however, to the context of the Roman *gyrus* (cf. also Eur. *Hipp.* 228-31 and 1131). On the equine exercise (*gyrus*) see Gibson on Ov. *Ars* 3.383f. Given Ovid's favourite pun on *pes* meaning "bodily foot"

and “metrical foot” (cf. *Ov. Am.* 3.1.8, see Keith (1994) 37), Phaedra’s admiration for Hippolytus’ excellence in steering the racing chariot could also be seen as an implicit admiration of his attempt to find his course by controlling the swift metrical feet in his new elegiac context.

81. lentum...hastile: *lentus* is often attributed to arms, cf. e.g. *Verg. Aen.* 7.162-164 *lenta...spicula*, 7.731 *lento...flagello*, 12.489 *lenta...hastilia*. In Ovid, the combination appears again only at *Met.* 8.28. *lentus* is an elegiac signal, often used to denote an unwilling lover or his reluctant behaviour (see Pichon (1966) s.v., Fedeli on *Prop.* 1.15.4, Maltby on *Tib.* 2.6.36), whose frequency in the *Heroides* is very high (10 times). The verbal similarity with Scylla’s description of Minos at *Ov. Met.* 8.28 *torserat adductis hastilia lenta lacertis* is noteworthy. For an extensive discussion of the close relationship between Phaedra and Scylla see Curley (1999) 186ff., also Tsitsiou-Chelidoni (2003) 50-3.

ualido...lacerto: *lacertus* is rare in prose, “ein Lieblingwort Ovids” (for statistics see Bömer on *Met.* 8.28). The combination is very frequent in Ovid, cf. *Her.* 3.125f. *ualidoque...uibrata lacerto / ...hasta*, *Lucr.* 4.829 *bracchia...ualidis ex apta lacertis* (it is absent from Vergil, Horace, Tibullus and Propertius). Vergil seems to distinguish between *lacertus* (“parte superiore del braccio”) and *bracchium* (“l’ avambraccio”) (so Boscherini in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (1984) 1 s.v. *corpo umano* 901); here the reference is made with reference to muscular strength. Cf. also the Nurse’s reference to Hippolytus’ strong right arm at *Eur. Hipp.* 605 (*αὶ πρὸς σὲ τῆς σῆς δεξιᾶς εὐωλένου*). In elegy, the admiration of the arms is conventionally more fitting with reference to a woman rather than a man; hence, the reference to Hippolytus’ fair arm also hints at his effeminization (see Craik (1998) 35). On the attractiveness of women’s arms cf. e.g. *Tib.* 1.5.43-6, *Prop.* 3.6.13, 4.3.23, *Tib.* 1.2.75, *Ov. Am.* 1.13.5, *Ars* 1.231, *Her.* 18.213, *Stat. Silu.* 5.2.66.

hastile: in poetry it is first attested at *Enn. Ann.* 392 Skutsch (*configunt parmam, tinnit hastilibus umbo*), and it is frequent thereafter in Vergil and Ovid, while its first attestation in prose is rather late (*Sen. Epist.* 36.7). The term means primarily the shaft or handle of the spear, its synecdochic use for spear is poetic (see *OLD* s.v. *hastile*).

lentum ualido...hastile lacerto: a “golden line” (see n. on *Her.* 4.72).

82. Hippolytus’ description echoes Phaedra’s similar account of her hunting pursuits at line 43 (*aut tremulum excusso iaculum uibrare lacerto*).

ferox: Hippolytus shares the same qualities (*ferox*) with his horses (*ferocis*), the adjective is often used with reference to mortals or divinities showing defiance and harshness (*OLD* s.v. 3a). In elegy, in particular, the adjective denotes the arrogant and scornful in love (see Pichon (1966) s.v.).

lacertus: this is one of the two instances in classical Latin dactylic poetry, where *lacertus* is not placed last in the hexameter (again at *Her.* 13.104 *quarum suppositus colla lacertus habet*, also at *Prud. Psych.* 594-5 *compressa ligantur / uinclu lacertorum sub mente*).

83-86. In this section Phaedra picks up the theme of amatory hunt. Her portrayal of Hippolytus as a hunter and her detailed mention of his hunting equipment are meant to complement her own self-portrayal as huntress at lines 37-46. At the same time the section also functions as an introduction to her second list of mythological *exempla* (lines 93-104).

lato...ferro: a high-style, epic *iunctura* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.313, 4.131, 12.165, Ov. *Met.* 8.342 *tela tenent dextra lato uibrantia ferro*, also Sen. *Phaedr.* 50 *robur lato derige ferro*), possibly modeled on the Homeric formula *δοῦρε δῶω κεκορυθμένα χαλκῶ* (cf. Hom. *Il.* 3.18, *Od.* 22.125). Hunting spears had broad-pointed spearheads, cf. Xen. *Cyneg.* 10.3 *τὰ δ' ἀκόντια ἔστω παντοδαπά, ἔχοντα τὰς λόγχας εὐπλατεῖς*, Gratt. *Cyneg.* 108-9 *ille etiam ualido primus uenabula dente / induit* with Formicola (1988). The image of Hippolytus holding a hunting spear of broad-pointed steel (*lato uenabula ferro* 83) and riding a fiery horse (*ferocis equi* 79) echoes the preparation made by the young companion of Dido in Verg. *Aen.* 4 (cf. *lato uenabula ferro* 131, *frena ferox spumantia mandit* 135).

cornea: the adjective derives from *cornus* (the cornel cherry) and not from *cornu* (horn), see Palmer ad loc. For adjectives in *-eus* denoting material see n. on *Her.* 4.44. Cf. Xen. *Cyneg.* 10.3 *τὰ δὲ προβόλια πρῶτον μὲν λόγχας ἔχοντα τὸ μὲν μέγεθος πεντεπαλάστους, κατὰ δὲ μέσον τὸν αὐλὸν κνώδοντας ἀπολεχαλκευμένους, στιφρούς, καὶ τὰς ῥάβδους κραινείας δορατοπαχεῖς.*

uenabula: the *terminus technicus* for hunting spear. The poetic plural is for metrical convenience (cf. Ov. *Met.* e.g. 8.404, 9.205, 10.173, 12.453).

ferro: the iron spearhead is very appropriate for an iron-hearted hunter (cf. line 14 *dabit uictas ferreus ille manus*).

84. nostra...lumina: Phaedra's explicit reference to her erotic gaze. *lumina* is another case of poetic plural (see n. on *Her.* 4.15). The metonymic use of *lumina*, a short form of *lumina oculorum*, is poetic; in Latin poetry it occurs ever since Lucretius and it is particularly favoured by Ovid. For more see Maltby on Tib. 1.1.65-6, N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.4.22, also Axelson (1945) 41f.

iuuat: again at line 87 and 45 with reference to Phaedra's horsemanship (an attempt to further associate the two lovers not simply in terms of the same practices but also through the application of the same verb). For its high frequency in Roman elegy see Pichon (1966) s.v. *iuuare*.

85f. An ominous phrase foreshadowing the tragic outcome of the story. On the text see p.281.

85. materiam: in the sense of "material or object upon which an art is exercised" (see *TLL* 8.461.39ff., *OLD* s.v. *materia* 6). Despite its high frequency in Ovid (47 times), the term is rare in Augustan poetry (so Knox on *Her.* 7.34). *materia* here echoes the Ovidian metaphor of the elegiac *puella* as the *materia* for the poet's work, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.1.19 *nec mihi materia est numeris leuioribus apta* with Wyke (2002) 146, 1.3.19 *te mihi materiem felicem in carmina*

praebe, 3.1.25 *non sum materia fortior ipsa mea* with Wyke (2002) 128. Also see Greene (1998) 37f., 67f., 70.

siluis... iugosis: cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 17f. *χλωρὰν δ' ἀν' ὕλην παρθένω ξυνὼν ἀεὶ / κυσὶν ταχείαις θήρας ἐξαιρεῖ χθονός*. *iugosus* appears again only at Ov. *Am.* 1.1.9 *quis probet in siluis Cererem regnare iugosis*. The introduction of a great number of adjectives in *-osus* in Latin poetry seems to have been an Ovidian innovation, cf. Knox (1986)b 99-101. For more on adjectives in *-osus* and the nuance of such formations in Latin diction see Cooper (1895) 22-32, Ernout (1947) 64, *idem* (1949), Ross (1969) 53-60, esp. 58ff., Fedeli on Prop. 1.2.9, Knox (1986)b 97-101, McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.1.9, Maltby on Tib. 1.1.17 with bibliography.

86. duritia: the Ovidian Phaedra accommodates Hippolytus' moral rigidity in tragedy to the widespread elegiac *topos* of the lover's hard-heartedness (cf. Pichon (1966) s.v. *durum*, James (2003)b 105 n.23). The alliteration of “*d*” adds further to the effect of “harshness.”

87f. In imitation of Prop. 2.19.17f. *ipse ego uenabor: iam nunc me sacra Dianae / suscipere et Veneris ponere uota iuuat*. The combined presence of the two goddesses suggests Phaedra's interpretation of Hippolytus' hunting pursuits both in terms of chastity and of sexual freedom. The presence of Venus in the subordinate pentameter, however, is indicative of Hippolytus' preference for Diana.

87. incinctae...Dianae: Phaedra's emphasis on Delia at line 40 now becomes understandable, as she uses the goddess as a further link between herself and Hippolytus. The specific *iunctura* appears only here, see *TLL onom.* 133.53f.; for similar combinations, cf. Verg. *Georg.* 4.342f. ...*Oceantides ambae, / ambae auro, pictis incinctae pellibus ambae*, Ov. *Am.* 3.2.41 *succinctae crura Dianae*, *Ars* 3.143 *succinctae ...Dianae*, *Met.* 3.156 *succinctae sacra Dianae*, 9.89 *nymphē ritu succincta Dianae*, 10.536 *fine genu uestem ritu succinctae Dianae*, Ov. *Fast.* 2.635 *incinctos...Lares*, 5.217 *pictis incinctae uestibus Horae* (the frequent application of the participle *succinctus* in epic warfare context hints at its high-style origin, cf. Enn. *Ann.* 16.426 *succincti gladii, sub scutis, sed. inc.* 519 *succincti...machaeris*, 527 *succincti gladiis*, Veg. *Aen.* 1.323 *succinctam pharetra*). On hunter's clothing, cf. Gratt. *Cyneg.* 340 <*mantica curta chlamys*>, Opp. *Cyneg.* 1.97f. *εὐσταλέως δὲ χιτῶνα καὶ εἰς ἐπιγουνίδα πήξας / ἐλκέσθω, σφίγγοιτο δ' ἐπημοιβοῖς τελαμῶσιν*. For the conventional imagery of girdled Diana see Bornmann on Call. *Hymn Dian.* 11f. ... *ἔς γόνυ μέχρι χιτῶνα / ζώννυσθαι λεγνοτόν, ἴν' ἄγρια θηρία καίνω*. on artistic representations of girdled Diana while hunting see *LIMC* s.v. *Artemis / Diana* e.g.18, 19a, 17a, 91,95, 151.

studia exercere Dianae: cf. Ov. *Met.* 7.746 *montibus errabat studiis operata Dianae*.

Dianae: *Dīana*, originally with *i* long (Enn. *Ann.* 7.240 Skutsch, *Scaen* 33, Plaut. *Bacch.* 312), which was shortened later (first in Lucilius 104 at the end of the hexameter). However, *Dīana* did not entirely disappear (e.g. Prop. 2.28.60, Ov. *Met.* 5.619, 8.353, Grat. *Cyneg.* 2, 13, 99,124). For more see *TLL onom.* 127.27-55.

88. et Veneri numeros eripuisse suos: *numerus* is used here in the sense of “office, duty” (Lewis-Short (1879) s.v. *numerus* D). Palmer and Shuckburgh ad loc. translate “to rob Venus of her duties.” For the syntax of *eripuerē* with abstract objects meaning “take away suddenly” see Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.621.

89f. A *sententia*. On Ovidian predilection for *sententiae* see n. on *Her.* 4.6.

89. requie: *requie* together with *membra* (see below) support the sexual undertones of the couplet. On the erotic associations of *requiescere*, cf. Tib. 1.2.4, [Tib.] 3.19.11, Prop. 2.25.7 (metaphorical use), Ov. *Am.* 1.5.25, 1.6.45, *Her.* 5.13, *Ars* 2.351, 3.695, *Met.* 10.556f., *Fast.* 1.667f. Further see Maltby on Tib. 1.1.43 with bibliography.

90. fessaque membra: *fessus* is extremely rare in Roman elegy and it is sparingly used by Ovid (appearing only once in the *Amores* (2.9.19) and five times in the *Her.* (2.90, 4.90, 18.162, 19.56, 21.14)), because of its “epic”, elevated origin (cf. Axelson (1945) 29f. -30). For a full list of its frequency and its interchangeability with the metrically equivalent *lassus* see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.2.3-4. *membra* is a popular euphemism for male genitalia, see Adams (1982) 46,69, 224, Booth on Ov. *Am.* 2.3.3, also see *TLL* 6.1814.9ff., 8.636.65ff.

91. arcus –et arma...Dianae–: cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11.652 *aureus ex umero sonat arcus et arma Dianae*. The stretching of the bow reflects on the strong hyperbaton, since the main clause (*arcus mollis erit*), interrupted by a parenthesis and an hypothetical clause, stretches over the couplet. Phaedra eroticizes her reference to Diana’s bow and through her carefully chosen vocabulary (*arma, tendere*) further sustains the erotic implications in this section. On *arcus* and *arma* as metaphors for male genitals and the employment of *tendere* and its derivatives in contexts of male erection see Adams (1986) 21f. Hippolytus’ association with his bow could have been inherited from his mother, since the Amazons were notorious for their excellence in archery (cf. Paus. 4.13.1, Otto (1984) 106).

92. mollis: (sc. *arcus*) the *iunctura* appears only here. *mollis* is often used with reference to effeminate and emasculated males (Wyke (2002) 174). On *mollis* as *terminus technicus* of elegy and as a signifier for the genre itself see Wyke (2002) 168f. and Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.125f. with bibliography.

93-104. This is Phaedra’s second list of mythological *exempla* in the letter and it comprises three sets of love affairs (the first extending over four couplets, the last two occupying one couplet each) and four complementary lines. Phaedra picks up the theme of “amatory hunt”, however, she manipulates the conventional opposition between Venus and Diana through the collapse of the hunter into a lover. For a detailed examination of the list as a whole and of each *exemplum* individually see 77ff.

93f. The story is also mentioned by the Nurse at Eur. *Hipp.* 454-6 to support her claim for the omnipotence of love. Cephalus’ abduction by Aurora was a well-known story ever since the Epic Cycle (*Epigoni* F4, incert. loc. 1 Davies). Also cf. Xen. *Cyneg.* 1.6, Apollod. 1.4.3f., Athen. 13.566d, Ov. *Am.* 1.13.[33f.], 39f., *Her.* 15.87f., *Ars* 3.684, *Met.* 7.700-713. Further on

the myth see Bömer on *Met.* 7.490- 865 at p.324 (on his abduction by Aurora), Fontenrose (1981) 86ff., Kearns (1989) 177, Miller (1993) 157 n. 9, Gibson on *Ov. Ars* 3.683-74 (pp.356-9). For artistic representations of Aurora abducting Cephalus see *LIMC* s.v. *Eos / Aurora* e.g. 50, 69, 74, 77,80, *Eos / Thesan* e.g. 30, 32 and Caskey-Beazley (1954) 37f.

The setting of the story is strikingly reminiscent of the references to the countryside as the setting for both Phaedra's and Hippolytus' hunting pursuits above (cf. *siluis* 93 ~ *in nemus ire libet* 41, *per herbam* ~ *in graminea...humo* 44, *multae.../ferae* 93f. ~ *saeuas...feras* 38, also *illo percutiente* 94 ~ *tremulum excusso iaculum uibrare lacerto* 43, *lentum ualido torques hastile lacerto* 81).

93. clarus...Cephalus: "famous, celebrated", *clarus* is a high style epithet, extremely rare in Roman elegy, it appears only once in Propertius (2.31.9) and in Ovid's *Amores* (2.1.35) (seven occurrences in the *Heroides*); it is absent from Tibullus. Cephalus was a famous mythical hunter. *clarus* is also a honorific adjective attributed to those of senatorial rank (*TLL* 3.1275.8ff., *OLD* s.v. 7b), but also attributed to gods (*TLL* 3.1273.79ff.); in particular, *Κλάριος* (*Clar(i)us*) was a conventional honorific epithet of Apollo (cf. e.g. *Call. Hymn. Apoll.* 70, Bömer on *Met.* 1.368 with bibliography, *idem* and Green on *Fast.* 1.20, see *TLL* 2.245.39ff.). Cephalus appears together with Theseus, Hippolytus and Milanion in a long list of renowned hunters at *Xen. Cyneg.* 1.2 (*καὶ ἐγένοντο αὐτῶ μαθηταὶ κυνηγεσίων τε καὶ ἐτέρων καλῶν Κέφαλος, Ἀσκληπιός, Μειλανίων, Μέστωρ, Ἀμφιάραος, Πηλεὺς, Τελαμών, Μελέαγρος, Θησεύς, Ἰππόλυτος, Παλαμήδης, Μενεσθεύς, Ὀδυσσεύς, Διομήδης, Κάστωρ, Πολυδεύκης, Μαχάων, Ποδαλείριος, Ἀντίλοχος, Αἰνεΐας, Ἀχιλλεύς, ὧν κατὰ χρόνον ἕκαστος ὑπὸ θεῶν ἐτιμήθη*). More importantly Cephalus constitutes the perfect example for Hippolytus through his combination of heroic origin (*clarus*), excellence in hunting (*siluis...per herbam*) and love (*se praebebat amandum*). For *clarus* as an "Alexandrian footnote" (more specifically as an allusion to the work of Nicander from Colophon) see pp.82f.

Cephalus: emphatic by position, since it is placed at the very heart of the hexameter framed by three words on each side.

94. percutiente illo: echoing Phaedra's similar reference to Hippolytus at line 81 *seu lentum ualido torques hastile lacerto* with note ad loc.

multae...ferae: for the possibility of a subtle allusion to Cephalus' killing of his wife (Procris) see Casali (1995)b 6f. (also cf. *Ov. Ars* 3.733 *ille* (sc. Cephalus) *feram uidisse*). If such connotations are perceptible here, the reference may entail a dark, subtle allusion to Phaedra's death. Like Procris, Phaedra will also meet death as a result of her beloved's misinterpretation of reality.

95. Aurorae: Aurora is the personified goddess of dawn (in Greek *Ἑώς* or *Ἔως*, in Etruscan *Thesan*), daughter of Theia and Hyperion (Hes. *Theog.* 372-4). Aurora was notorious for her innumerable love affairs (Cephalus: Hes. *Theog.* 986-91, Eur. *Hipp.* 454f., *Ov. Am.* 1.13.39f., *Her.* 4.93-6, 15.87f., *Ars* 3.84, *Met.* 7.700-13 with Bömer (1976) 324, Orion: Hom. *Od.* 5.121-4,

Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.4.3, Cleitus: Hom. *Od.* 15.250f.). Further on Aurora's promiscuity see McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.13.35f.

nec...male se praebebat amandum: Cephalus is the exact opposite of Hippolytus. Diverting from the established version of the story Phaedra (in the steps of the Nurse at Eur. *Hipp.* 454-6 *ἴσασι δ' ὡς ἀνήρπασέν ποτε / ἢ καλλιφεγγῆς Κέφαλον ἐς θεοῦς Ἔως / ἔρωτος εἵνεκ'*) adds a new twist to it by presenting Cephalus not as a victim of Aurora's abduction but rather as willingly yielding to her love. The litotes (*nec...male*) underlines Hippolytus' active co-operation.

sapiens: it picks up Phaedra's *conscius...amor* (line 52). Aurora resembles Phaedra in that she is equally aware of the illicit nature of her love affair with young Cephalus (cf. *OLD* s.v. *sapiens* 2a "understanding, having sound judgment", s.v. *sapio* 4 "to have consciousness"). The adjective is attributed to Aurora only here (cf. e.g. Aurora's Homeric epithets: *καλή, εὐθρονος, ροδοδάκτυλος, δία, κροκόπεπλος, φαεσίμβροτος, ἠριγένεια, εὐπλόκαμος, χρυσόθρονος, δυσώνυμος*). *sapiens, sapere, sapientia* were avoided by poets before Ovid (with the exception of Horace, where it occurs 57 times), as their use must have been rather colloquial (see Bömer on *Ov. Met.* 10.622 *optari potes a sapiente puella* (with bibliography)). The *iunctura* to denote "a clever girl" in erotic context is rare.

96. ibat a sene...uiro: cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.13.1 *Iam super uenit a seniore marito*, which is modeled on the epic descriptions of dawn, cf. Hom. *Il.* 11.1f. *Ἥως δ' ἐκ λεχέων παρ' ἀγανοῦ Τιθωνοῖο / ὄρνυτο* (for more parallels in Latin literature see McKeown ad loc.). The periphrasis *sene...uiro* brings an erotic twist to the conventional description, since Aurora prefers Cephalus to Tithonus, because of the latter's unsatisfactory sexual performance as a result of his old age. Even though the story of Tithonus' eternal old age does not occur in Homer, old age became Tithonus' main feature and the reason for being avoided by his wife Aurora. (cf. Mimnermus fr. 4 West *Τιθωνῶ μὲν ἔδωκεν ἔχειν κακὸν ἄφθιτον < > / γῆρας, ὃ καὶ θανάτου ρίγιον ἀργαλέου, AP* (Antipater of Thessalonica) 5.3.5f. *γηράσκεις, Τιθωνέ. τί γὰρ σὴν εὐνέτιν Ἥῶ / οὕτως ὀρθριδίην ἤλασας ἐκ λεχέων,*; *Ov. Am.* 1.13.1, 37f.). Propertius offers a more sympathetic portrayal of a loving Aurora towards her old husband (*Prop.* 2.18B.7-18, esp. *non Tithoni spernens...senectam, 15 cum maiora senis Tithoni gaudia uiui, 17 cum sene non puduit dormire*). Further on the story see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.201f.

97f. The Venus-Adonis story does not appear in the list of mythological *exempla* employed by the Nurse in the Euripidean play (Eur. *Hipp.* 451-7). However, this reference might be picking up an allusion to Adonis near the end of the play (Eur. *Hipp.* 1420-22). Further on this see pp.86f.

sub ilicibus: picking up and eroticizing Phaedra's repose on the grass during her hunt at line 44 *in graminea ponere corpus humo*. The *illex* (see André (1985) s.v.) was sacred to Pan (cf. Tib. 2.5.26); hence, it is very appropriate in view of Phaedra's reference to *Dryades Faunique* at line 49 (see n. ad loc. on the identification of Faunus with Pan).

Cyniraque creatum: the combination of the father's name with the participle *creatum* is a high-style, epic periphrasis, frequently applied as hexameter ending in Ovid (cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.760, 5.145, 7.3, *Fast.* 5.227). Following Casali (1995)b 7 the elevated periphrasis is meant to recall Adonis' incestuous origin; Adonis was the fruit of Myrrha's illicit affair with her father, Cinyras (first attested in the comic poet Plato fr. 3.1-3 ὦ Κινύρα, βασιλεῦ Κυπρίων ἀνδρῶν δασυπρώκτων / παῖς σοι κάλλιστος μὲν ἔφου θαυμαστότατός τε / πάντων ἀνθρώπων). For a list of sources see Fontenrose (1981) 200 n.23 and Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* 5.227.

99f. There seems to have been two main mythological traditions concerning Atalanta's liaison with either Hippomenes (through a race, Boetian version) or with Milanion (through hardships, Arcadian version). On the conflation of the two versions see pp.91f. In Roman elegy, Atalanta is always (except for Ov. *Am.* 1.7.13f. where she appears alone) mentioned in connection with Milanion (cf. Prop. 1.1.9f., Ov. *Am.* 3.2.29, *Ars* 2.185-194, also cf. Hes. fr. 72-6 M-W, Theocr. *Id.* 3.64, Philet. fr. 18 Powell, Apollod. 3.9.2, Hyg. *Fab.* 185.2). Hence, Phaedra's reference to Atalanta's erotic involvement with Meleager constitutes the only case of deviation in elegy. For Phaedra's specific rhetorical intentions here see p.92.

99. arsit et: the "love as fire" motif (see n. on *Her.* 4.19). The postponement of *et* at the second place in the line further underscores *arsit*, which is emphatic by position. The combination of *ardere* with *et* as line-opening is popular with Ovid (cf. e.g. *Ars* 1.284, 2.378, *Met.* 2.248, 10.156, *Fast.* 3.442, 6.438); so is the construction of *in* with the object of love, see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.9.33.

Oenides: the patronymic is used again by Ovid with reference to Meleager only at *Her.* 3.92, *Met.* 8.414, *Fast.* 4.76 with Bömer. In all other instances *Oenides* is attributed to Diomedes (the grandson of Oeneus). Besides Ovid, *Oenides* appears only in Statius (13 times), [Verg.] *Catal.* 9.6, *Epiced. Drus.* 110, *Ilias Lat.* 466. The use of the patronymic is perhaps intended to remind Hippolytus of Diana's wrath against Oeneus (cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.279, also 6.415), thus warning Hippolytus about the fierceness of his patron goddess. The accumulation of the three Greek names (*Oenides...Maenalia Atalanta*) in the line is noteworthy.

Maenalia: Phaedra opts for the Arcadian origin of Atalanta, cf. Call. *Hymn.* 3. 224, Ap. Rhod. 1.769f. δεξιτερῇ δ' ἔλεν ἔγχος ἐκηβόλον, ὃ ρ' Ἀταλάντη / Μαινάλῳ ἔν ποτέ οἱ ξεινήιον ἐγγυάλιξε, AP (Antipater of Sidon) 7.413.7f. ἀμι δὲ Μαιναλίας κάρρων ἰάμιντ' Ἀταλάντας / τόσσον, ὅσον σοφία κρέσσον ὀρειδρομίας, Σ on Ap. Rhod. 1.769 Ἀταλάντη] Ἰασίωνος θυγάτηρ, ἣν ἔγνημεν Μιλανίων. ἐτέρα γάρ ἐστιν ἡ Ἀργεῖα ἡ Σχοινέως, ἣν ἔγνημεν Ἰππομέδων. Μαινάλος δὲ ὄρος Ἀρκαδίας, ἐν ᾧ ἡ Ἀταλάντη διῆγεν, ἀπὸ Μαινάλου τοῦ Ἀρκάδος, ὡς φησιν Ἑλλάνικος, Stat. *Theb.* 6.653-5 (...) *quis Maenaliae Atalantes / nesciat egregium decus et uestigia cunctis / indeprenta procis? onerat celeberrima natum.*

Maenalia means "Arcadian" by synecdoche, since Maenalus is a mountain in Arcadia (see Bömer on Ov. *Fast.* 5.89, Clausen on Verg. *Ecl.* 8.22). The fact that Mt. Maenalus was

considered sacred to Pan (cf. Call. *Hymn.* 3.88f., Theocr. *Id.* 1.124, Paus. 8.36.8) offers an interesting link with Phaedra's orgiastic frenzy at lines 47-50 (see n. *Her.* 4.49 *Faunique bicornes*). The adjective appears in Latin for the first time in Augustan poetry (for statistics see McKeown on *Am.* 1.7.13f.). In addition to Maenalia, *Nonacrina* (*Ars* 2.185f., *Met.* 8.426) and *Tegaea* (*Met.* 8.317, 380) are also used for Atalanta. Further see Bömer on *Met.* 8.317 and Janka on *Ars* 2.185.

Maenalia could also be a patronymic, hinting at the much disputed issue of Atalanta's father. His name was either *Ias(i)us* / *Iasion* (Arcadian version) or *Schoeneus* (Boetian version, so *Ov. Am.* 1.7.13, *Tr.* 2.399). For more on this see Frazer's (1921) 1.398 n.2 extensive note. Apollodorus informs us that according to Euripides the father's name was *Maenalus*. Atalanta is named *Μαινάλου κόρη* at Eur. *Phoen.* 1162 (with Σ, Craik (1988) and Mastronarde (1998) ad loc.), where the ambiguity between Maenalus the mountain and Maenalus the father is similar to the one found here. There can be no proof that Apollodorus had this specific Euripidean passage in mind. However, it is tempting to suspect an allusion to the above mentioned Euripidean passage behind Ovid's ambiguity in the use of *Maenalus*.

For patronymics in *-ius* see n. on *Her.* 4. 61.

100. ferae spoliū: *spoliū* seems to echo the elegiac idea of erotic success as trophy (see La Penna (1951) 194f. and n. on *Her.* 4.66). For more see pp.92f.

pignus amoris: meaning "token", "symbol" (*OLD* s.v. *pignus* 3b). *pignus* is a legal term, the *iunctura* is frequent in Ovid (cf. *Her.* 11.113, *Met.* 3.283 with Bömer, 8.92, possibly introduced through imitation of Vergil (cf. *Aen.* 5.538, 575).

101-4. For more details on the complementary function of these lines to the list of the mythological *exempla* see pp.95ff.

101. nos quoque iam primum turba numeremur in ista!: an echo of Prop. 1.6.27f. *multi longinquo periere in amore libenter, / in quorum numero me quoque terra tegat.*

quoque iam primum: the emphatic accumulation underscores the immediacy and urgency of Phaedra's claim.

turba: used with reference to a "throng" (*OLD* s.v. 2), often in amatory context, the term is popular with Augustan poets, and Ovid in particular (for its frequency see Casali on *Her.* 9.51). Its use in apposition to a plural (a frequent feature in the *Her.*, cf. 1.88, 136, 9.51, 15.202) is stylistically elegant. Given Ovid's fondness of applying *turba* to members of a family (see Winnington-Ingram (1955) 140f., who fails to include *Her.* 4.101, 8.12, also see *OLD* s.v. 5b) implications of incest could perhaps be detected here.

numeremur: the association with *Veneri numeros* at line 88 further underlines the erotic character of the mythological *exempla*.

102. rustica silua: "if you exclude Venus, your forests are but a rustic place," cf. *Lucr.* 5.962 *et Venus in siluis iungebat corpora amanti*, *Ov. Am.* 3.1.43 *rustica sit sine me lasciui mater Amoris. rusticus* is an interesting case of double entendre offering to Phaedra great potential,

which she exploits to the full. The adjective primarily means “rural, rustic, in connection with the country” (*OLD* s.v. 2a); however, it is also used (esp. in erotic context) to denote “lack of urban sophistication,” crudeness and artlessness, erotic inexperience, in a word the “opposite of *urban*” (*OLD* s.v. 7b, Scivoletto (1976) 71, Booth (1981) 2692 nn.34f., Labate (1984) 41 n.44, Hollis on *Ov. Ars* 1.672, Gibson on *Ov. Ars* 3.127f.). The latter use of the term is very frequent in the *Heroides*, cf. 1.77, 16.222, 287, 17. 12, 13, 186, 20.59. For extensive bibliography on the term see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.221f. and on *Her.* 17.185f. (with bibliography for *rusticitas*). Phaedra’s rejection of Hippolytus’ morality, repeated more emphatically at lines 131f., aligns her with the elegiac *Iena*. Further on the multiple sexual and generic implications of Phaedra’s use of *rusticus* see pp.96f.

tua est: aphaeresis at the last foot of the pentameter.

103. ipse comes ueniam: an allusion to the elegiac motif of *obsequium amoris* (for more details on the motif and the multiple connotations of *comes* see p.97). Cf. the similar wish of the Senecan Phaedra (Sen. *Phaedr.* 613-16, esp.700-3).

ueniam: *ueniam* following immediately after *Venerem* in the previous line and in combination with two clear etymological markers (*primum* (101) and *rustica* (102), see Cairns (1996) 33-40, 44-46) picks up the well-known etymological derivation of Venus from *uenire* (see Maltby (1991) s.v. *Venus*, Paschalis (1997) 44 and Michalopoulos (2001) s.v. *Venus* (a)).

103f. nec me latebrosa... / neque obliquo: following the practice set by Propertius and Tibullus Ovid uses *nec* before consonants, but he extends the use of *nec* even before vowels. This is one of the few exceptions in the Ovidian corpus where *neque* appears before a vowel (in the *Her.* only here, no more than 20 times in his entire elegiac production). For more on the use of *nec* / *neque* see Axelson (1945) 115-118 and Ross (1969) 39-46.

latebrosa saxa: the *iunctura* appears only here, for adjectives in *-osus* see n. on *Her.* 4.85n.

104. obliquo dente ...aper: a phrase of epic colour, modeled on the widespread epic simile of a boar attacking slantwise (cf. Hom. *Il.* 12.146-50, esp. 148 *δοχμῶ τ' αἰῖσοντε* – *pace* Hainsworth (1993) *ad loc.*). An interesting case of hypallage, since instead of the expected attribution of *obliquus* to *ictus* (cf. Hom. *Od.* 19.450 *ὀδόντι / λικριφίς αἰῖξας*, *Il.* 14.462f. *Πουλυδάμας δ' αὐτὸς μὲν ἀλεύατο κῆρα μέλαιναν / λικριφίς αἰῖξας*, [Hes.] *Aspis* 388f. *θήγει δέ τε λευκὸν ὀδόντα / δοχμωθεῖς*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.22.7 *uerris obliquom meditantis ictum*, *Met.* 8.757 *obliquos in ictos*, 8.344 *obliquo latrantes dissipat ictu* with Bömer, 10.715f. *aper insequitur totosque sub unguine dentes / abdidit* (the death of Adonis), Stat. *Theb.* 11.451 *obliquis...ictibus hastae*) the adjective is attributed to *dens*. Ovid here fuses two widespread poetic (primarily epic) motifs: the boar’s slantwise attack (for *ictus obliquus* as “eine Poetische Formel” see Bömer on *Met.* 5.132 and 10.712) and the image of a boar sharpening its teeth (cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.780ff, 12.41-8, 146-50, 13.471-5, 17.281ff, 17.725-9, also Eur. *Phoen.* 1380, Ar. *Lys.* 1255f., *Ran.* 815 with Σ. and Dover (1993), Ap. *Rhod.* 3.1351-3, Verg *Georg.* 3.255, [Tib.]

3.9.3, Sen. *Phaedr.* 346f., Apul. *Met.* 8.4, Aelian *NA* 6.1). The *iunctura obliquo dente* appears only here.

aper: an attack by a boar figures among the potential dangers during the lover's hunting (cf. e.g. Ov. *Her.* 9.37, 20.101, *Ars* 2. 386-8, 2.190, 373, *Rem.* 204,422, Sulp. [Tib.] 3.9.16). Ovid's specific choice for *aper* is not that haphazard, since *aper* can be seen as an implicit allusion to Adonis' tragic death see p.86f. An *aper* also appears in the amatory hunt of Dido and Aeneas (Verg. *Aen.* 4.158f.). From Ovid onwards there is no difference in the use of either *aper* or *sus* to refer to a boar (Mynors on Verg. *Georg.* 3.255).

105. aequora bina...Isthmon: cf. Gallus fr. 1 *uno tellure diuidit amne duas*. This is a conventional description of the Corinthian Isthmus, cf. *Her.* 12.104 *quique maris gemini distinet Isthmos aquas*, *Fast.* 6.495f. *est spatio contracta breui, freta bina repellit, / unique pulsatur terra duabus aquis*, Sen. *HF* 336 *et bina findens Isthmos exilis freta*, 1164f. *Actaea quisquis arua, qui gemino mari / pulsata Pelopis regna Dardanii colis* with Billerbeck and Fitch, Prop. 3.21.22 *Isthmos qua terris arcet utrumque mare*. For more on such descriptions, which were extremely popular in Latin poetry, especially after Ovid, see Tarrant on Sen. *Ag.* 563. *aequora bina* seems to be an equivalent in periphrasis for *bimaris*, Ovid's almost stereotypical adjective for Corinth or Isthmus, cf. *Her.* 12.27 *hic Ephyren bimarem*, *Met.* 6.418f. *Pittheia Troezen, / quaeque urbes aliae bimari clauduntur ab Isthmo*, also *Met.* 7.405 *bimarem... Isthmon*, *Tr.* 1.11.5 *bimarem ... Isthmon* with Luck (the adjective *bimaris* was a Horatian neologism, cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.7.2. *bimarisue Corinthi* with N-H, possibly a translation of the Greek *δίπορος*, cf. Eur. *Tro.* 1097f. *ἡ δίπορον κορυφὰν / Ἴσθμιον*).

suis oppugnant fluctibus: for similar descriptions of the raging sea-waves breaking on the coastal rocks (common in epic similes), cf. *Her.* 19.121 *quanto planguntur litora fluctu*, *Met.* 9.40f. *magno murmure fluctus / oppugnant* with Bömer, Sen. *Thy.* 111f. *et qui fluctibus / illinc propinquis Isthmos atque illinc fremit*, Stat. *Theb.* 1.120 *et geminis uix fluctibus obstitit Isthmos*. Phaedra transfers her emphasis from the steadfast rock (as at Hom. *Il.* 4.422-6, 2.209f., 294-7, Verg *Georg.* 3.237-41, *Aen.* 7.528-30) to the storming sea, because of its association with the "sea of love" motif in both Greek and Latin love poetry. For more on the motif of the "sea of love" and its long literary history see Murgatroyd (1995), esp.10, 14, 17, 18f., 23 and La Penna (1951) 202-5 and Ieranò (2003). From an intertextual perspective, however, Phaedra's employment of the erotic sea-waves becomes an ill-fated choice, as it foreshadows Hippolytus' death caused by the lethal bull, which was spewed by a sea wave (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1213f. *ἀὐτῷ δὲ σὸν κλύδωνι καὶ τρικυμῖα / κῦμ' ἐξέθηκε ταύρον, ἄγριον τέρας*).

oppugnant fluctibus is an interesting combination of war (La Penna (1951, for *oppugno* as "besieging one's heart" in amatory context cf. [Verg] *Ciris* 272 with Lyne, Ov. *Rem.* 691 with Pinotti) and sea-navigation vocabulary. The verb *fluctuo* is often used to denote a state of turmoil, especially in relation to violent emotion (*ira*, *curae*, anger, worries, see *OLD* s.v.

fluctuare 3, also Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.532), but also in connection with love and feelings of affection (cf. *TLL* 6.1.941.53-56).

Isthmon: another instance of Greek accusative in the letter (see n. on *Her.* 4.55). *Isthmon* in Latin poetry appears in Ovid (3 times), at Sen. *Ag.* 564 and at Val. Fl. *Argon.* 8.23 always (with the only exception of Seneca) concluding the hexameter. Phaedra's specific reference to (the Corinthian) Isthmus is another instance of a sinister foreboding, since Isthmus is the place, where, according to Euripides, Hippolytus meets death (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1205-1209 ... *ἐς δ' ἀλιρρόθους / ἀκτὰς ἀποβλέψαντες ἱερὸν εἶδομεν / κῆμ' οὐρανῶ στήριζον, ὥστ' ἀφηρέθη / Σκίρωνος ἀκτὰς ὄμμα τοῦμόν εισορᾶν / ἔκρυπτε δ' Ἴσθμόν καὶ πέτραν Ἀσκληπιοῦ*, so also at Ov. *Met.* 15.507 *iamque Corinthiaci carpebam litora ponti*). On Troezenian topography and Euripides' acquaintance with it see Barrett's detailed discussion on Eur. *Hipp.* 1198-1200 and 121f., also Σ on 1209. Furthermore, the specificity of the reference to Isthmus is also aimed at Theseus, since according to Plutarch (*Thes.* 8.2) Isthmus is the setting of Theseus' first love affair (with Perigune, the daughter of Sinis, who gave birth to Melanippus). Besides any intertextual association, Phaedra's reference to Isthmus has further implications on a more abstract and symbolic level, since the image of Isthmus is often evoked to denote the transition and instability between two situations in a person's life (cf. e.f. Soph. fr. 145 N (=568 R) *λάθα Πιρίσιν στυγερὰ / κνήρατος· ᾧ δύνασις / θνατοῖς εὐποτμοτάτα μελέων, / ἀνέχουσα βίου βραχὺν ἰσθμόν*. For the metaphorical use of *ισθμός* in Greek for both male and female genitalia see Henderson (1991) 131 n. 143.

106. et tenuis tellus: cf. line 30 *et tenui...*, the repetition of the sounds *e-t* at the beginning of three consecutive words should be mentioned (*et tenuis tellus*). The *iunctura* ("narrow (strip of) land") (*OLD* s.v. 4a,b) appears only here in Latin poetry.

audit utrumque mare: cf. Prop. 3.21.22 *Isthmos qua terris arcet utrumque mare*.

107. hic tecum Troezena colam: whether Athens or Troezen provides the setting for Phaedra's letter remains a much disputed issue (see the list in Jacobson (1974) 144 n.5, Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 15.506 with bibliography, Curley (1999) 161). Jacobson (1974) 143f, following Barrett (1964) 32 n.4, argues for Athens, which was possibly the setting of Euripides' first *Hipp.* (or Sophocle's *Phaidra*), so also Ov. *Met.* 15.506, *Fast.* 6.739, Sen. *Phaedra*). I am more inclined towards Troezen in view of the letter's strong intertextual associations with Euripides' second *Hippolytus*, the absence of any reference (or even allusion) to Athens and Phaedra's mention of their common visit to Eleusis at lines 67f. In any case, no definite conclusions can be drawn. For a detailed discussion on the scene of Euripides' surviving *Hipp.* see Barrett (1964) 32-4, Halleran (1995) 26, 144, Curley (1999) 154 n.20 with bibliography).

Troezena: a Greek accusative.

Pittheia regna: cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 24 *ἐλθόντα γάρ νιν* (sc. Hipp.) *Πιτθέως ποτ' ἐκ δόμων*. The mention of Pittheus' name disassociates Hippolytus from his father by recalling Aphrodite's reference to Hippolytus being reared by Pittheus in the prologue of the play (Eur. *Hipp.* 11

Ἰππόλυτος, ἀγνοῦ Πιθέως παιδεύματα). For the conventional attribution of *Pithe(i)us* to Troezen, cf. *Met.* 6.418 *Pitheia Troezen, quaeque urbes aliae bimari clauduntur ab Isthmo*, 15.296 *Pitheam ...Troezena* with Bömer, 15.506 *Pitheam profugo curru Troezena petebam*. For adjectives in – *e(i)us* see n. on *Her.* 4.14.

regna: the poetic plural *regna*, instead of *regnum*, is dominant in Latin poetry, ever since Ennius (see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.324 with bibliography ad loc.).

109-28. In this section Phaedra enumerates Theseus' many injustices against Phaedra and Hippolytus, but also against the members of their individual families. The carefully structured list is organized as follows: a) Theseus' combined harm against Phaedra and Hippolytus (109-14), b) Theseus and the Minotaur (115f.), c) Theseus and Ariadne (116), d) Theseus and the Amazon (117-20), e) final reference to the problematic father-son relationship (121-8).

109-12. Judging from indirect evidence, namely Plutarch's reference to Phaedra's accusations against Theseus' sexual misdemeanours (see Barrett B (= *Plut. Mor.* 27f.-28a with Barrett (1964) 18 n.3, *Sen. Phaedr.* 96-9), and from implicit hints in the surviving *Hippolytus* (cf. *Hipp.* 152-54. and 320) it seems very likely that such accusations may have appeared in the first *Hippolytus* (see also Rosati (1985) 119f. n.10, Roisman (1999) 9ff., esp. 13 nn.41f.). Theseus was notorious for his uncontrolled sexuality cf. e.g. Istros *FGrHist.* 334 F.10, *Plut. Thes.* 29.1f.). Phaedra's account of Theseus' uncontrolled sexuality is in accordance with the hero's portrayal in *Eur. Hipp.*, where he embodies the exact opposite of his son. Theseus stands in striking contrast to Hippolytus in relation to sexual behaviour and voices the conventional "double standard" of male sexuality (cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 320, 967-70).

The importance of Theseus' attachment to Pirithous is reflected on its position in the list (it comes first) and on the fact that the reference stretches over four lines in contrast with the other references which vary from less than one line to one couplet at the most (with the only exception of Hippolytus' bastardy which also occupies four lines (121-4)).

109. abest...aberitque: the complaint for the absence of the beloved is very frequent in the collection, cf. *Her.* 1.50, 57, 2.23, 16.299f., 17.153f., 179 (in all cases *abesse* is the verb used to denote the absence). Such repetition of present and future tenses was idiomatic, almost conversational in Latin, and it was very frequent in letters (see Wills (1996) 302). Theseus' prolonged absence is underscored both by the elision in the first foot (*tempor(e) abest*) and by the combined presence of the temporal ablative (*tempore*) and the temporal adverb *diu*. Phaedra's complaint about Theseus absence is almost a reversal of the popular erotic idea that the absence of the loved one arouses feelings of true love and longing to the one left behind (cf. *Plaut. Amph.* 542, *Ter. Eun.* 192-6, *Prop.* 1.6, 8, 11, 19, *Ov. Am.* 2.16.11, *Her.* 1.50, 9.43, 16.104). This reversal can perhaps be associated with the so-called *loci mutatio* suggested by the *praeceptor* at *Ov. Rem.* 213-248 (see Pinotti ad loc.) as means of getting over a relationship. Also see Fedeli on *Prop.* 3.21.1f.

More importantly, Phaedra manages to manipulate her complaint against Theseus' absence and transform it into a valid justification for her adultery. Phaedra is echoing a similar reference at *Ov. Ars* 2.357ff., where the *praeceptor* argues against the prolonged absence of the husband which gives valid reason for the wife's infidelity (Rosati (1985) 119f.). Phaedra's reference echoes contemporary social and legal practices, since "long physical separation might (also) seem to imply a divorce" (Treggiari (1991) 451). For the Romans prolonged absence of a husband or wife justified remarriage (see Corbett (1930) 215f.). Phaedra rounds off the list by making a similar reference to Theseus' abandonment of their common bed at lines 127f.

Neptunius heros: on Theseus' double parentage see n. on *Her.* 4.59. *Neptunius* is a common patronymic of Theseus in Latin poetry (cf. *Her.* 17.21 *Neptunius...heros*, *Met.* 9.1 *Neptunius heros*, *Stat. Theb.* 12.588 *Neptunius heros*, for patronymics in *-ius* see note on *Her.* 4.61). Its employment, however, is rather ominous, because of Neptune's involvement in Hippolytus' death through the three wishes he granted to his son Theseus (see Barrett (1964) 39-42 and *idem* on *Eur. Hipp.* 887-9, Halleran on *Eur. Hipp.* 887-90). In the play, Theseus is called "the son of Poseidon" in connection with his fatal curse (cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 43-46, 886-90, 895f., 1169f., 1315-21, 1411, see Barrett (1964) on 878). Moreover, the reference to Theseus' descent from Neptune is perhaps also intended as an implicit allusion to the hero's ferocious character, since, according to Aulus Gellius *poetae... ferocissimos et inmanes et alienos ab omni humanitate tamquam e mari genitos Neptuni filios dixerunt* (*ap. Noct. Att.* 15.21).

110. illum Pirithoi detinet ora sui: while in *Eur. Hipp.* Theseus is away on a visit to an oracle (cf. lines 281, 790 with Barrett), in Phaedra's letter Theseus is away accompanying his friend Pirithous (so in *Soph. Phaedr.* fr. G and H Barrett, also at *Sen. Phaedr.* 91, 244, 627, 835-41, where Theseus spends four years in the Underworld as a punishment for helping Pirithous ravish Persephone. For more on Theseus' absence in the relevant plays see Barrett (1964) 31f.). The pair of friends in the Underworld was extremely popular in artistic representations (see Brommer (1982) 97-103, *LIMC* s.v. *Peirithoos* esp.89, 90, s.v. *Theseus* XIII.291-297. According to Pausanias (10.29.9f.) Theseus' descent to the Underworld was depicted in the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi. For more on Theseus' *katabasis*, which was known ever since Hesiod (fr. 280 M-W), see Herter *RE* Suppl. 13 (1973) s.v. *Theseus* 1161.36ff. The relationship between Theseus and Pirithous was considered to be archetypical of true friendship already in Homer (*Od.* 11.631). In Latin it became proverbial (see Otto (1968) s.v. *Theseus* 347§ 1779). For more on Theseus' connection with Pirithous see Mills (1996) 10-13. On the high frequency of the pair in Ovid see Herter *RE* Suppl. 13 (1973) s.v. *Theseus* 1158.9ff.; to his list add *Hor. Carm.* 4.7.27f., *Prop.* 2.1.37f, *Ov. Ars* 1.744, *Tr.* 1.3.66, 1.9.31f., *Pont.* 2.3.43, 2.6.26, *Stat. Silv.* 4.4.104. Also see Bömer on *Ov. Met.* 8.303 and esp. Galán Vioque (2002) on *Mart.* 7.24.3-6 with parallels and bibliography. For references to Greek literature see Galasso (1995) on *Pont.* 2.3.41-6.4.10.78, *Stat. Silv.* 2.6.54-5 with van Dam. An interesting link between Hippolytus,

Theseus and Pirithous can be found at Hor. *Carm.* 4.7.25-8 *infernīs neque enim tenebris Diana pudicum / liberat Hippolytum, / nec Lethaea ualet Theseus abrumpere caro / uincola Perithoo.*

Phaedra's emphasis on Pirithous combined with her reference to the Amazon (below) might also allude to a rather obscure strand of the myth, according to which both Theseus and Pirithous raped Antiope, Hippolytus' mother (cf. Pindar fr. 174f. Snell (= 157f. B), Paus. 1.2.1). **detinet:** the verb often occurs in amatory contexts to denote erotic attachment (cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.17.16, *Ars* 2. 98, *Rem.* 272, *Curt.* 5.5.20, *Met.* 13.301, Serv. on Verg *Aen.* 4.348, see *TLL* 5.1.815.38ff.), always with animate subject (except Vergil).

sui: the use of the possessive pronoun for somebody particularly dear is a feature of the *sermo communis* (LHS 179, 772-6, *OLD* s.v. *suus* 7, also cf. e.g. Prop. 1.1.1, 2.27, 4.23, 5.25) and adds to the overall intimacy of the reference. For more on the use of personal pronominal adjective to express affection in erotic context see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.15.30.

111. praeposuit: the verb is rare in Roman elegy, it appears only in Ovid (for Ovid's predilection for compounds see n. on *Her.* 4.49). The motif of preferring one's beloved to other rivals (or riches) is common in the *Her.*, cf. 2.82, 5.97, 6.132, 7.124, 16.165, 17.134). Phaedra through her careful choice of an elegiac vocabulary infuses her narrative with erotic implications which are imed perhaps at the supposedly homosexual attachment of Theseus to Pirithous (Plut. *Thes.* 30.2 *ὡς δ' εἶδεν ἄτερος τὸν ἕτερον καὶ τὸ κάλλος ἐθαύμασε καὶ τὴν τόλμαν ἠγάσθη, μάχης μὲν ἔσχοντο*, Xen. *Symp.* 8.31 *καὶ Ὀρέστης δὲ καὶ Πυλάδης καὶ Θησεύς καὶ Πειρίθους καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ πολλοὶ τῶν ἡμιθέων οἱ ἄριστοι ὑμνοῦνται οὐ διὰ τὸ συγκαθεύδειν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἄγασθαι ἀλλήλους τὰ μέγιστα καὶ κάλλιστα κοινῇ διαπεπράχθαι*, Sen. *Phaedr.* 97f. *stupra et illicitos toros / Acheronte in imo quaerit Hippolytus pater*, Mart. 7.24.3-6 *te fingente nefas Pyladen odisset Orestes, / Thesea Pirithoi destituisset amor*, also see Mayer (1883) 67f. and Herter *RE* Suppl. 13 (1973) s.v. *Theseus* 1192.25-9, Tarrant on *Ag.* 1009, Grimal (1951) s.v. *Pirithoos* 377, Jacobson (1974) 155, De Vito (1994) 317 with n.12 (for an opposite view see Coffey and Mayer on Sen. *Phaedr.* 97 and 244, and Poole (1990) 135).

nisi si: *nisi si* is a colloquial pleonasm, frequent in archaic Latin (see H-S 668, also cf. e.g. Pacuv. *Antiopa* 8 Warmington (= D' Anna 1.4)) and Roman comedy (e.g. Plaut. *Capt.* 530, *Curc.* 51, *Most.* 769, *Trucu.* 670, 782, 927, Ter. *Ad.* 594, *Eun.* 160, 524, 902), but rare in the rest of Latin poetry. On the frequent use of *nisi si* in the place of *nisi* see K-S 2.417. For a list of parallels in Ovid see Reeson on *Her.* 13.55 (to his list also add Ov. *Met.* 14.561, *Pont.* 3.1.21).

112. Pirithoum Phaedrae Pirithoumque tibi: a "uersus echoicus," remarkable for consisting of only four words. The accumulation of the Greek sounds (*th, ph, ae, ou*) offers a distinctive Greek colour, emphasizing the Greek origin of the technique (Maltby (1999) 383). This kind of repetitions (what Wills (1996) 415 calls "parallel half-lines") is very frequent in the *Her.* (cf. 2.40, 7.14, 10.94, 11.70, 114, 13.104) and it appears always in the pentameter.

113. sola non haec ad nos iniuria uenit: cf. *Ov. Fast.* 6.737 *notus amor Phaedrae, nota est iniuria Thesei*. *sola* emphatic by position is further stressed by the strong *litotes*. *iniuria* is widely used in elegy to denote the violation of the *foedus amoris* (cf. Pichon (1966) s.v. *iniuria*). For love as *foedus* see n. on *Her.* 4.17.

114. laesi: a popular term with the elegists used for those wronged in love (in the sense “to hurt your lover” see *OLD* s.vv. *laedo* 3b and *amor* 1c, also see Janka on *Ov. Ars* 2.447f. with bibliography), especially with reference to amatory infidelity (cf. Pichon (1966) s.v. *laedere*, in the *Her.*: 5.4,102, 7.59, 8.36, 10.98). *laedere* is a legal term used to denote damage done to the interest of another (see Berger (1953) s.v.).

115f. Phaedra complements her mythological list at lines 53-64 with this second reference to her family’s tragic past. But her emphasis now shifts from the long series of female victims to Theseus and his many injuries against her family. The reference to the Minotaur, who was conspicuously absent from the mythological list above, receives special importance by being placed first in the couplet and by extending over one line and a half. Ariadne appears again; however, this time the reference to her is limited only to less than one pentameter.

115. fratris: Phaedra’s choice of *frater*, which is rather colloquial and less elevated compared to *germanus*, raises the emotional pitch of the reference to her brother. Ariadne also refers to the Minotaur as *frater* in her letter to Theseus (*Her.* 10.77 *me quoque, qua fratrem, mactasses, improbe, claua*), cf. also *Catul.* 64.180 *quemne ipsa reliqui / respersum iuuenem fraterna caede secuta*, but 64.150 *et potius germanum amittere creui*). Her emphasis on the brother-sister relationship further enhances the emotional repercussions of Theseus’ cruelty on her. Even though Ovid’s use of the *germanus / frater* distinction seems to be based primarily on stylistic criteria (further on this see Reeson’s extensive note on *Her.* 11.89), there is an explanation for the specific choice here. *germanus*, unlike *frater*, is used exclusively for siblings born from the same parents (*OLD* s.v. *germanus*, *TLL* 6.1914.40-49 and 6.2.1914.40-73, cf. *Char. Gramm.* 389.15ff. Barwick *frater aut ex alia matre aut ex aio patre potest esse, germanus ex isdem parentibus sit necesse est*. Further see Del Rio (1939)); hence Phaedra’s preference for *frater* makes better sense if understood as an attempt to play down the brother-sister relationship. In this light, her application of *frater* is twofold: first, it invests her narrative with emotional undertones, and second it helps Phaedra to dissassociate herself from her monstrous brother (cf. Ariadne’s many references to the Minotaur as a “monster”, a “semi-bull – semi-man” creature in her letter to Theseus, cf. *Ov. Her.* 10.102, 106, 127, also *Catul.* 64. 101, 110, *Prop.* 4.4.41, *Ov. Met.* 8.169). The repetition of the combinations *fr* and *tr* brings the words in which they appear even closer (*fratris...perfracta trinodi*); the sound effect perhaps mimicks the sound of broken bones.

ossa.../ sparsit humi: the image of bones scattered on the ground is common in Latin for scenes of killing. For close verbal parallels, cf. *Her.* 10.106 *stratamque Cretaeam belua planxit humum*, *Fast.* 3.708 *sparsis ossibus albet humus* (echoed in *Sen. Oed.* 94 *albent ossibus*

sparsis solum, Stat. *Theb.* 2.29 *sparsa solo...ossa*. The phrasing has a distinct epic quality, since the locative *humi* echoes the Homeric adverb *χαμαί*, which also appears in contexts of warfare killing (cf. Hom. *Il.* 13.616-8, 16.741, also 4.526, 5.583, 588, 14.418). For *humi* echoing the Greek structure *βάλλειν / πίπτειν / φέρεσθαι χαμαί* see K-S 1.2.485 and K-G 2.1.444. LHS 2.145 consider the substitution of *humo* for *humi* (an old dative?) as a late Latin phenomenon. However, it is found already in classical Roman poetry, often in Ovid (cf. e.g. *Her.* 21.242, *Met.* 1.424, 9.84, also see TLL 6.3124.24ff., OLD s.v. *humus* 1b and Harrison on Verg *Aen.* 10.557f.). Very similar in use and meaning is the phrase *sternere caede uiros*, another poetic euphemism for “killing”, particularly favoured by Vergil. For more see Axelson (1945) 65-8, esp. 67, Austin on Verg *Aen.* 2.398.

sparsit: the use of active voice (*sparsit*) highlights Theseus’ role in the killing of the Minotaur. On the contrary, with regard to Ariadne Phaedra opts for the passive *relicta est*, which is a much more appropriate choice in that it puts all emphasis on the act of abandonment and Ariadne’s consequent victimization.

claua...trinodi: an Ovidian *iunctura* appearing only here and at *Fast.* 1.575f. (in connection with Hercules) *occupat Alcides, adductaque claua trinodis / ter quater aduerso sedit in ore uiri* with Bömer and Green. For similar formations, cf. Verg *Aen.* 7.507 *stipitis...nodis*, Ov. *Her.* 10.101 *nodoso stipite* (Ariadne’s reference to Theseus’ club), Ov. *Met.* 6.691 *nodosa robora* with Bömer, 11.83 *nodosa robora*, 12.349 *nodose robore*. Phaedra’s account of Theseus’ fight against the Minotaur is stripped of any quality of altruistic heroism, which was predominant in the hero’s fifth century public representations (see Mills (1997) 16). What we have here is the appropriation of a myth with wider, public significance into a personal story. For Phaedra Theseus is not a civilizer and a liberator of his people, but the merciless killer of her brother. For more details on Theseus’ fight against the Minotaur see Mills (1997) 10-13.

The use of a club strikes a rather Roman, or in any case a post-fifth century BC, note. Theseus in early Greek art is depicted as killing the Minotaur with a sword. It is near the late fifth century when Theseus begins to be depicted with a club, possibly as a result of the conflation of his myth with the myth of Hercules (cf. LIMC s.v. *Theseus* 5.2.329, 6.1.48). During the Hellenistic period the club became Theseus’ standard weapon (see Shefton (1962) 368 n.137, cf. LIMC 6.2.71, 7.2.241,242 (= 6.2.24), 257, 259 (=63), 260 (=62)), while in the Roman period a *pedum* appears very often (also very frequent in the Etruscan art, cf. LIMC e.g. 7.2.250, 251, 256,258 (=6.2.64), 6.2.58, 59,61,68). On the conflation (mythological, artistic) between Theseus and Hercules see Isocr. *Helen* 23 – 28, Shefton (1962) 344-353, Boardman (1982), esp. 2-5, Woodford (1994) LIMC s.v. *Theseus* 7.1.942f. and s.v. *Minotauros* 6.1.580f., Mills (1997) 27-29, esp. 27 n.113, 136, Walker (1995) 51-3, Mills (1997) 129ff. The substitution of the club for the sword could also be the result of an influence from Theseus’ use of a club during an earlier circle of labours, namely the chase of the Marathonian bull.

According to a surviving fragment from Callimachus' *Hecale* (Call. *Hec.* fr. 69.1 οἰόκρωσ ἔτερον γὰρ ἀπηλόιησε κορύνη with Hollis) Theseus using his club broke one horn of the Marathon bull (cf. *LIMC* e.g. 7.2. 185,188,189,201). A handful of literary sources identify the Cretan bull with that from Marathon (cf. Mills (1997) 23 n.90 and Bromer (1982) 27-34, esp. 27f.). Ariadne in her letter to Theseus also refers to Theseus' killing of her brother with the use of a club, cf. *Her.* 10.77-8 *me quoque, qua fratrem mactasses, inprobe, claua; / esset, quam dederas, morte soluta fides*).

trinodi: this is an Ovidian adjective (again only at *Fast.* 1.575). Given the legal connotations of *nodus* (cf. *Juv.* 8.50 with Courtney) I am tempted to read behind Theseus' *tri-nodus* club a hint at his triple injustice against the Minotaur, Ariadne and the Amazon.

116. praeda relicta feris: Ariadne's abandonment by Theseus complements and re-affirms Phaedra's accusation against the hero's infidelity at line 59 above (*perfidus Aegides* with n. ad loc.). Ariadne's conventional depiction as prey for wild animals goes back to *Catul.* 64.152f. *dilarecanda feris dabor alitibusque / praeda*, again at *Her.* 10.96 *praeda cibusque feris* (with Knox (1995) ad loc. for the Homeric model of such formulations), also see *Her.* 11.111 *nate, dolor matris, rabidarum praeda ferarum*. *praeda* picks up the hunting imagery, and it is also associated with the widespread *topos* in Latin erotic poetry of the lover as Cupid's booty (cf. Pichon (1966) s.v. *praeda*, McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.2.19).

While in the mythological list above Phaedra made a special note of Ariadne's help to Theseus (cf. 60 *sororis ope*), here she deliberately suppresses the actual details of the story in order to play down her sister's participation to the killing of their brother, and thus transfer all responsibility to Theseus. But she remains equally vague in respect of Ariadne's fate after her abandonment by Theseus (rescued by Bacchus? self-hanged in despair? further on the multiple versions of the story see Herter *RE Suppl.* 13 (1973) s.v. *Theseus* 11.36.40ff.). Perhaps her silence is a metaliterary comment on the multitude of the relevant mythological versions, whose number was huge in antiquity already (cf. *Plut. Thes.* 20.1).

117-20. The reference to the Amazon receives special attention by extending over two couplets. In doing so, Phaedra is aiming once again at transferring the "hereditary motif" from her family to Theseus himself. In this light, Theseus' injustice against Phaedra seems to reiterate the hero's previous injustice towards the Amazon in the past.

prima...inter uirtute puellas: *uirtute puellas* is a paradoxical juxtaposition hinting at the Amazons' unsettled gender, more specifically to their androgyny (on the Amazons' unique sexual nature see Blake Tyrrell (1984) 76-85, 88-112). The paradox of the "virile woman" is further supported by the allusion to the etymological association of *uirtus* with virility (cf. 117f. *uirtute paellas / ...uigore parens* with Casali (1996) 2 with n. 2). On the ethical implications of *uirtus* (in the sense of "moral excellence") under the influence of the Greek ἀρετή see McDonnell (2003) 247-51.

securigeras...puellas: a striking oxymoron. *securiger* is a poetic adjective, an *hapax* both in Ovid and in Augustan poetry, it occurs again later at *Sen. Oed.* 471, *Ag.* 217 (Amazon), *V. Fl.*

Argon. 137, 191, *Sil.* 16.48. Compounds in *-fer* or *-ger* are archaic, epic and are found only in poetry, whereas Greek epithets in *-φόρος* are distributed to prose as well (their number increased considerably with Vergil and Ovid). For Vergil's rather restricted use of compounds in *-fer* or *-ger* see Norden on *Verg. Aen.* 6.141. For more see Bömer on *Fast.* 1.125 with bibliography. For adjectives in *-fer* attested for the first time in Ovid see Linse (1891) 42-44, Arens (1950), Ross (1969) 20 n. 14 with bibliography. For Ovid's predilection for compounds see n. *Her.* 4.49. A very similar compound (also an *hapax* in Latin poetry) is *securifer* (*Ov. Met.* 12.460 with Bömer).

The Amazons' association with weapons, esp. with the axe, is a stock feature in Latin poetry, cf. *Hor. Carm.* 4.4.19 *Amazonia securi*, *Ov. Her.* 21.119f. *sumpta peltata securi / qualis in Iliaco Penthesilea solo*, 21.173, *Pont.* 3.1.95 *Amazonia...securis*, *Sen. Oed.* 471 *securigeri...Lycurgi*, *Ag.* 217 *securigera manu / peltata Amazon* with Tarrant, V. FL. *Argon.* 5.137 *securigeras...cateruas*, *Sil.* 16.48 *securigera miscebat proelia dextra*, with arms in general: cf. *Verg Aen.* 5.311 *Amazoniam pharetram plenamque sagittis*, 11.660 *pictis bellantur Amazones armis*, *Ag.* 736 *ferrum Amazonium*, *Stat. Theb.* 4.394 *Amazoniis...armis*, *Silv.* 5.1.131 *Amazonia...pelta*, *Achil.* 1.760 *sepositis...Amazones armis*. For more on the Amazons' weaponry (esp. the axe) as a reversal of the Greek use of arms see Blake Tyrell (1984): 49-52, esp. 51.

118. te peperit: Phaedra picks up once again her initial reference to Hippolytus' descent from an Amazon (*Amazonio...uiro* 2, on the multiple implications of Hippolytus' Amazonian decent see pp.32ff.).

nati digna uigore parens: another allusion to the unsettled sexual status of both the Amazon and Hippolytus. The mother is worthy of her son not only because of her physical strength, but also because of their common denial of their sexuality. In fact, this is a remarkable claim in that it constitutes a reversal of Ovid's contemporary Augustan ideal of raising the Roman youth (in particular the young Roman aristocracy, namely that children should stand up to the legacy inherited by their parents, cf. *Sallust Catil.* 51.6, 55.6, *Jug.* 31.18, 33.3, 63.8, La Penna (1963) 117); this idea permeates thoroughly the Ovidian exile corpus (cf. *Met.* 8.847 *non illo digna parente*, *Tr.* 4.2.40 *digna parente*, *Pont.* 2.2.82 with Galasso, 2.8.33, 2.9.38). This shrewd reversal is another indication of Phaedra's infatuation with Hippolytus who becomes the centre of her personal universe, the metre of comparison for everything and everyone. For a similar inversion in Ovid, where Livia Dusilla is considered worthy of her son or husband see *Ov. Pont.* 4.13.30 *esse udicarum te Vestam, Liuiam, matrum, / ambiguum nato dignior anne uiro, / esse duos iuuenes, firma adiumenta patris*.

119f. Phaedra has read her mythology well, since the killing of the Amazon by Theseus belongs to a rather obscure branch of the mythological tradition (cf. *Hyg.* 241 *Theseus Aegei filius* (sc. occidit) *Antiopam Amazonam Martis filiam ex responso Apollinis*, *Sen. Phaedr.* 226f., 578, 927-9, 1166f.). For the possibility of an allusion to Euripides' first *Hippolytus*, where a mention of this killing might have appeared see Zintzen (1960) 31. According to the myth, the killing of the

Amazon took place during the invasion of the Amazons in Attica as a response to Theseus' abduction of one of them, or as a response to Theseus's marriage with Ariadne, while he was already married to Antiope. However, there seems to have been an alternative version, in which the Amazon was slain fighting on Theseus' side (cf. Plut. *Thes.* 27.4 ἔνιοι δέ φασι μετὰ τοῦ Θησέως μαχομένην πεσεῖν τὴν ἄνθρωπον ὑπὸ Μολπαδίας ἀκοντισθεῖσαν, καὶ τὴν στήλην τὴν παρὰ τὸ τῆς Γῆς τῆς Ὀλυμπίας ἱερὸν ἐπὶ ταύτῃ κεῖσθαι, see duBois (1982) 33 with n.33 for further parallels. For a detailed discussion of Theseus' fight against the Amazons see Mills (1997) 30-33. Theseus' killing of the Amazon might have been the product of conflation with Hercules' similar adventure (see Boardman (1982) 5-16, Halliday (1928) 210, Mills (1997) 31 n.132).

The Amazonomachy was a particularly popular theme for artistic representation, esp. for the Athenians. The most renowned artistic treatment of the Amazonomachy must have been the one painted by Polygnotos in the Stoa Poikile (Athens) (cf. Paus. 1.15.1-4, Blake Tyrell (1984) 11-13, Mills (1997) 40-1 with notes) and the one in the Athenian Treasury at Delphi (cf. Pausanias 10.11.4, de la Coste-Messelière (1957) 70-81, Boardman (1982) esp. 9f.). For a comprehensive discussion of public artistic depiction of Amazonomachy in classical Athens (Theseion, Stoa Poikile, Parthenon, Shield of Athena Parthenos) see Boardman (1982) 16-20, also duBois (1982) 57-61 on the Athenian Treasury at Delphi, 61f. on Theseion, 62-4 on the Parthenon, 64-6 on the temple of Apollo at Bassae).

119. si quaeras: the second person address to Hippolytus helps to create the illusion of his actual presence (cf. also line 18 *uelim quaeras* with n. ad loc.)

latus ense peregit: The wounding of the ribs is of epic origin (cf. Verg. *Aen.* e.g. 2.393, 11.648, 12.304, 389, 508f., *Met.* 12.370 with Bömer), but it also appears in elegy very often, cf. e.g. Prop. 2.8.2, Ov. *Am.* 3.8.14, *Her.* 10.88, *Tr.* 3.9.26 (also Sen. *Phaedr.* 548, 714, *Ag.* 200, *HO* 1166, [Sen.] *Oct.* 122). Phaedra's description of the killing has very interesting sexual connotations. *latus* is a sexually charged term in Latin poetry (see Pichon (1966) s.v., Vessey (1976), Galán Vioque on Mart. 7.58.3-6 with bibliography) often used for female genitalia (Adams (1982) 90,108), and it frequently alludes to sexual intercourse (cf. Ov. *Her.* 2.58, 19.138, also *Ars* 1.140, 496, Adams (1982) 49 n.2, 180, Maltby (2002) on 1.8.25f. For more examples see Traina-Bini (1990) 30). In addition, the possibility of a sexual double entendre behind the use of *ense* is strong, since the application of weaponry (esp. knife and sword) as sexual symbols for penis is well attested (see Adams (1982) 19-21). A further indication is offered by the presence of *peregit*, a verb often used with reference to sexual intercourse (see *TLL* 10.1.8.1177.46ff, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.4.48.). For a multitude of artistic representations of Theseus' piercing with his sword an Amazon's flank see *LIMC* s.v. *Amazones* 230-47, 295-303, and *Peirithoos* 59-67, 22-31.

ensis: an elevated term, Ovid follows the Augustan predilection for the elevated *ensis*, instead of the rather prosaic *gladius*. For more see Axelson (1945) 51, Watson (1985) 441-3, Lyne (1989) 103f., Oakley on Liv. 7.10.9, *TLL* 5.2.608.40ff.

120. pignore: it picks up *pignus amoris* at line 100. *pignus* is a common legal term applied to persons standing as a guarantee of a relationship, esp. to children in respect of a marriage (*OLD* s.v. *pignus* 4). For Ovid's penchant for legalistic terminology see n. on *Her.* 4.12. For a child as *pignus* in the *Her.*, cf. 6.122 *pignora Lucina bina fauente dedi*, 11.113 *nate, parum fauti miserabile pignus amoris*, also Prop. 4.11.73 *nunc tibi commendo communia pignora, natos*.

121-126. Phaedra rounds off her list of Theseus' injustices against his family-members with a reference to the problematic relationship of Theseus and Hippolytus. Her focus is now put on Hippolytus' illegitimacy, which is very interesting in view of its great importance in the Euripidean play (*pace* Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 1082f.: "the *νοθεία* is wholly irrelevant to the action of the play"). However, the Ovidian Phaedra moving away from her Euripidean counterpart manages to keep the political implications behind Hippolytus' illegitimacy to a minimum by restricting the reference to only one couplet. Instead, she puts all her emphasis on her feelings towards her children with Theseus as a family issue. For a detailed examination of Hippolytus' illegitimacy in the Ovidian letter see pp.34f. For a selection of bibliography on Roman family see Williams (1958), McCormack (1978), Hallett (1984), Veyne (1985) 23-59, Gardner (1986), and Wiedemann (1991), *idem* (1998)a, Rawson (1986), *idem* (1996), Saller (1986), *idem* (1991), *idem* (1994), Dixon (1988), *idem* (1992), Pomeroy (1995)b, Thomas (1996), Rawson and Weaver (1997), Gardner (1998) 47-55, Frier and McGinn (2004).

121. taeda...iugali: the *iunctura* originates in Catul. 64.302. Also cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.18, Ov. *Met.* 1.483, *Tr.* 4.5.33, *Pont.* 3.2.55, Sen. *HO* 339, [Sen.] *Octav.* 570, 694f., V. Fl. *Argon.* 5.443, Sil. *Pun.* 17.73, also Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.70. (see also *TLL* 7.2.624.18ff.). The metonymic use of *taeda* for "wedding" is common (cf. e.g. Catul. 64.25, 302, 66.79, Verg. *Aen.* 4.339-40, Ov. *Am.* 3.6.75, *Her.* 14.10). *taeda* (as opposed to *fax*, which is used for both marriage and death) appears mostly in marital context (*OLD* s.v. 2b, so in the *Her.* 6.134, 8.35), however cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.322 *funestae taedae*. On the association of the two kinds of torches (wedding, death) see Shackleton Bailey (1967) 315-6 on Prop. 4.11.46. For the use of torches in marriage, death and other religious ceremonies see Bömer on *Fast.* 4.727.

iugalis: in the sense "nuptial", "matrimonial" is a poetic adjective in use since Catullus; it is also employed by Dido in similar context at Verg. *Aen.* 4.16, 496. For more see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 3.309.

122. Cf. the Senecan Phaedra's similar suggestion to Hippolytus (Sen. *Phaedr.* 617-9 *mandata recipe sceptrā, me famulam accipe: / [te imperia regere, me decet iussa exequi] / muliebre non est regna tutari urbium*). For the possibility of an allusion to Euripides' first *Hippolytus* see p.35. **regna paterna:** it echoes *Pittheia regna* at line 108. The combination is frequent in Latin poetry (cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 3.121, Prop. 3.19.22, Sen. *HF* 255, *Med.* 620, *Oed.* 22, 793, 794, V. Fl. *Argon.* 5.240), but it appears only here in Ovid. The use of an adjective (*paterna*) in the place of a genitive (*patris*), perhaps under the influence of the same practice in Greek ever since Homer,

is a Latin idiom (see LHS §55ba and Hofmann (1926) §146) equally frequent both in prose and poetry. For more see Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 2.543, Fordyce on Catul. 44.10 and Bömer on *Met.* 1.779.

paterna nothus: the juxtaposition *paterna nothus* through the close association of the two terms in the line is meant as an implicit hint at Theseus' own illegitimacy (on this see Patterson (1990) esp. 65, Roisman (1999) 38f., cf. also Plut. *Thes.* 17.1 ἀλλ' ἐπὶ νόθῳ καὶ ξένῳ παιδί). For such contrasting juxtapositions of terms denoting relationship as a common feature in Seneca see Fitch on Sen. *HF* 51f.

nothus: a rare poetic Grecism (7 times in poetry: Catul. 34.15, 63.27, Lucr. 5.575, Verg. *Aen.* 7.283, 9.697, only once in prose: Cic. *Quint.* 2.12.4.3), it is an *hapax* in Ovid (and in elegy). The rarity of Phaedra's choice possibly hints at the Euripidean text, where the Nurse uses exactly the same term to refer to Hippolytus at line 309 (νόθον φρονοῦντα γνήσια, again at lines 962 and 1082). Further on Roman father-son relationships and Roman heirship see Kaser (1965) 278ff., Eyben (1992), Saller (1991), *idem* (1994) 161ff., also Harrison (1968) 1.13 on Greek practices.

123. addidit et fratres: Acamas and Demophoon (cf. Σ on Eur. *Hipp.* 314 Ἀκάμας καὶ Δημοφῶν παῖδε Φαίδρας καὶ Θησέως, Σ on Eur. *Hec.* 123 οἱ δὲ τοῦ Θησέως παῖδες, Ἀκάμας καὶ Δημοφῶν οἱ ἦσαν κλάδοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων and [Apollod.] *Epit.* 1.18). According to Σ on Eur. *Hec.* 123 Acamas and Demophoon were the children of Theseus with Aithra, while Stesichorus calls Acamas the son of Iope (Stes. fr. 16.22-26 (...) γενέσθαι] δὲ Θη [σεῦ] Δημοφῶ [ντα μ] ἐν ἐξ Ἴο [πης / τῆς Ἰφικ [λέους, Ἀ]κάμαν [τα δὲ /]. [] ἐκ δὲ τῆς αμ [/ []. τη []. λη []). Cf. also Hippolytus' affectionate reference to his (nameless) brothers in Seneca's *Phaedra*, cf. 434 *sospesque Phaedra stirpis et geminae iugum?*, 631 *pietate caros debita fratres colam*. Further on Theseus' children see Herter *RE Suppl.* 13 (1973) s.v. *Theseus* 1183.35ff., 1211.21-27 and Mills (1997) 190 n.11. Phaedra in her application of *fratres* proves once again how conscious she is of the crucial difference in the meaning of the two terms (see n. on *Her.* 4.115). Also note the postponement of *et* (see n. on *Her.* 4.99).

124. tollendi causa: Phaedra's reference to the Roman ritual of *tollere liberos* is another instance of her Romanization. A Roman father was expected to raise his new born child in the air in order to acknowledge its legitimacy and take it into his power and protection. This practice registered the child to the inheritance networks and rights. Further on this practice see Shuckburgh (1885) ad loc., Watson (1967) 77-81 with notes, Veyne (1985) 23f., Harlow (1998) 161 with n.7 and bibliography.

125f. In complete contrast with Phaedra's genuine concern for her children and their right to self-government and freedom of speech in Eur. *Hipp.* (Eur. *Hipp.* 420-5, also 313f.), the Ovidian Phaedra puts her love for Hippolytus even above her feelings and her maternal obligations towards her physical children. On this crucial discrepancy with the Euripidean text see pp. 21ff. A similar complaint about motherhood as burden is made by Sappho in her letter to Phaon (*Her.* 15.69-70 *et tamquam desint, quae me sine fine fatigent, / accumulatur curas filia*

parua meas). On Roman motherhood and the nature of mother-daughter relationship see Dixon (1988) 104ff.

125. o utinam: a poetic combination for introducing an unrealistic wish. In the *Her.* the interjection occurs again in three other instances (cf. 1.5, 11.21, 19.115); it is very common in elegy (cf. Tib. 1.3.2 with Murgatroyd, *Ov. Am.* 2.5.7 with McKeown, also 2.11.5, 15.9, 3.6.73, also see Ross (1969) 49-53), as opposed to epic poetry (absent from Vergil, see *Met.* 3.467 with Bömer, also see [Verg.] *Ciris* 287 with Lyne). The tolerance of hiatus after *o* and other interjections is a common elegiac feature (see Platnauer (1951) 57, also cf. Prop. 1.3.39, 8.9, 16.27).

125. pulcherrime rerum: the construction – modeled on Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.4 *dulcissime rerum* – became very popular in Latin poetry (cf. Verg. *Georg.* 2.534 *rerum facta est pulcherrima Roma*, *Aen.* 7.602, also Cic. *Catil.* 4.11, *Rosc.* 50, *A.* 7.602, *Verr.* 1.55.7, *Ars* 1.213 *pulcherrime rerum*, *Ars* 1.359, *Met.* 8.49, 12.502, 13.508, 14.489). On its long literary history see Bömer's analytical note on *Met.* 12.502. *pace* Bömer who finds Phaedra's words "ironisch-gehässig" there seems to be nothing ironic in Phaedra's rejection of her children as a result of her erotic infatuation for Hippolytus (see Di Vito (1994) 317f.). On the potential dangers posed by Hippolytus' exquisite beauty, cf. Sen. *Phaedr.* 820f. (for the text see n. on *Her.* 4.75).

Phaedra's choice for the more elevated *pulcher* (instead of the colloquial *formosus*) further underscores Hippolytus' beauty. For extensive bibliography on the stylistic differentiation between *pulcher* / *formosus* see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.85f. Moreover, given Phaedra's attempt to offer Hippolytus a moral justification for her proposition, its implications with the moral, ethical aspect of beauty make *pulcher* a very appropriate choice (*OLD* s.v.3). *formosus*, on the other hand, refers almost exclusively (with the exception of Claud. 10.324) to physical appearance, with an emphasis on sexual attraction. For a similar differentiation in the combined use of *pulcher* with *formosus* see *Ov. Ars* 3.255-58 (*turba docenda uenit, pulchrae turpesque puellae, / pluraque sunt semper deteriora bonis. / formosae non artis opem praeceptaque quaerunt; / est illis sua dos, forma sine arte poten.*) with Gibson ad loc., also (possibly) at Prop. 2.28.49f. *sunt apud infernos tot milia formosarum: / pulchra sit in superis, si licet, una locis!* Besides, there seems to have been some sort of gender-based differentiation with respect to the use of the two terms (and their derivatives) between (would-be) lovers: *pulcher* is used solely by women, while *formosus* is used only by men (Dickey (2002) 143 nn. 17, 18). For similar line-endings, cf. *Ov. Ars* 1.213 *pulcherrime rerum*, *Met.* 9.9 *pulcherrima uirgo*, also Verg. *Aen.* 1.72 *forma pulcherrima Deiopea*, 1.496 *forma pulcherrima Dido* (again at 4.60), 7.761-2 *Hippolyti proles pulcherrima bello / Virbius*).

126. uiscera rupta forent!: a similar wish is made by Althaea at *Ov. Met.* 8.501f. (*o utinam primis arsisses ignibus infans, / idque ego passa forem!*), by Agripinna at [Sen.] *Oct.* 636-8 (*utinam, antequam te paruulum in lucem edidi / aluique, saeuae nostra lacerassent ferae / uiscera !*) and by Alcmena at [Sen.] *HO* 1805f. (*utinam meis uisceribus Alcides foret / exsectus*

infans!). For a similar wording see *Her.* 11.118 *diripiunt auidae uiscera nostra ferae*. *uiscera* is an interesting double entendre. *uiscera* is used primarily for the internal organs of the body (*OLD* s.v. 3), the womb in particular (see *OLD* 3b, McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 2.14.27). In the latter sense, Phaedra's reference to her womb is balancing the reference to Amazon's death at line 119 (*Theseus latus ense peregit*), since *latera* (in Greek *πλευρά*) is often used with reference to a specific part of the womb (see Adams (1982) 108)). Moreover, the reference to the womb is perhaps echoing the chorus' reference to female melancholy and helplessness caused by labour at *Eur. Hipp.* 160-9. For the womb as a potential threat through its associations with female instability and insanity see Goff (1990) 6 n.6 with bibliography.

uiscera is also used for children, in the sense "my own flesh-and-blood" (see McKeown on *Am.* 2.14.27f. with bibliography, cf. *Ov. Met.* 5.18, 6.651, 664, 8.478, 10.465, *Her.* 11.118), which seems to have been an idiomatic use of Ovidian coinage (see Bömer *Ov. Met.* 6.651 and Pinotti on *Rem.* 59, Ortega (1970) 221 n.14 argues for the colloquial origin of the usage). Phaedra's wish for the death of her children could be seen as another hint at her unhappy marriage with Theseus. Also note the sexual implications of *uiscera* (see Adams (1982) 224).

forent: the substitution of the archaic *forent* for *essent* is dictated by metrical reasons to avoid elision in the final foot; the substitution of *foret* for *sis* is particularly frequent in Augustan poetry (see LHS 2.394f.).

127. i nunc: a popular construction in Ovid (but not in the *Met.* and the *Fast.*), usually implying sarcasm or irony (often combined with another imperative, like here. For the ironic use of *ire* see *OLD* s.v. 10b.). For more see Gagliandi (1978), Fordyce on *Verg. Aen.* 7.425, McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.7.35f, Casali on *Her.* 9.105 with bibliography, Bessone on *Her.* 12.204 with bibliography and Michalopoulos on *Her.* 17.57f. with bibliography.

sic meriti lectum reuerere parentis: Phaedra echoes here Theseus' accusations against Hippolytus in the Euripidean play (cf. *Eur. Hipp.* 651f. *ὡς καὶ σὺ γ' ἡμῖν πατρός, ὦ κακὸν κάρα, / λέκτρων ἀθίκτων ἦλθες ἐς συναλλαγάς*, esp. 885f. *Ἴππόλυτος εὐνήσ τῆς ἐμῆς ἔτλη θιγεῖν / βία, τὸ σεμνὸν Ζηνὸς ὄμμ' ἀτιμάσας*, also cf. lines 408, 1003, 1011). The association with lines 885f., in particular, is significant in that Theseus in the play curses Hippolytus immediately after the reference to Hippolytus' alleged insult to his bed. From this perspective, Phaedra's reference to the bed could be another ominous allusion to Hippolytus' death. The accumulation of terms from legal language, like *reuerere*, *fugit*, *factis abdicat*, offers further support by echoing the legal character of Theseus' confrontation with his son in the play (on Theseus- Hippolytus *agon* scene, see Goff (1990) 41-4, Segal (1992) 426, Roisman (1999) 134-47, Lloyd (1992) 43-51). Phaedra's second reference to the bed at line 146 is in a totally different light, since in these lines the bed no longer belongs to Theseus (*parentis*), but to herself (146 *lecto...meo* with n. ad loc).

The metonymic use of bed for "wife", present already in the Euripidean text (see Barrett on *Eur. Hipp.* 651f.) is also widely attested in Latin elegy, see cf. Pichon (1966) s.v. *lectus*, *TLL*

7.2.1097.42ff., also cf. Prop. 2.2.1, 6.23, 18C.35 with Camps. *lectus* is extremely rare in epic (in Vergil only at *Aen.* 4.496 *lectumque iugalem*), while in Ovid it is slightly less frequent than *torus* (see Bessone on *Her.* 12.57). The heroines' reference to their empty bed as testimony of their abandonment is a common motif in the *Her.*, cf. 1.7, 6.39f., 164, 10.13-4, 51-8, 12.193, 19.65-6. The etymological association of *lectus* with the Greek *λέκτρον* (so Varro *Ling.* 5.166, see Maltby (1991) s.v. *lectus* (3)) further supports the intertextual connection with Eur. *Hipp.*

Furthermore, I am inclined to read Phaedra's suggestion that Hippolytus should give up his respect for his father's marital bed as an attempt to fight against her literary past (what Barchiesi (1987) 70 (=2001) 33) calls "tagli 'elegiaci' sul materiale narrativo della tragedia"). Phaedra once again manipulates her Euripidean reminiscence in order to serve her own rhetorical goal in the best possible way. Hippolytus' devotion to his father, apart from the father-son *agon* scene, seems also to anticipate the revalidation of the father-son relationship (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1325f., 1431-6, 1449-51) over her dead body at the end of *Hipp.* (Segal (1992) 443, for an opposite view see Roisman (1999) 147-53). Hence, Phaedra's suggestion to Hippolytus is meant to shake Hippolytus' devotion to his father and ultimately tear down to pieces the essentially male father-son relationship. Hippolytus has no obligation whatsoever to pay respect to his father's marriage, since the latter has dishonored it many times in the past with his infidelities. As if she knew the outcome of their story, Phaedra is fighting against the (re-) validation of male relationships at the cost of her female desire; she is trying to convince Hippolytus to succumb to her love, but more importantly she does all that is possible to disassociate her beloved from his father.

128. fugit...abdicat: both terms belong to the legal vocabulary; *abdicat*, in particular, refers to the *abdicatio fili*, a procedure through which a father could renounce his son (*TLL* 1.1.53.83ff.). For more see Palmer ad loc., Kaser (1965) 264, Saller (1994) 118f.

129. nec: for the use of *nec* before consonants see n. on *Her.* 4.103f.

quia uidear: in classical Latin *quia* (stylistically less elevated than *quod*) was considered prosaic and archaic (*LHS* 2.585). *uidear* picks up *uideor* at line 36 (see n. ad loc. on Phaedra's use of verbs in passive as an indication of her concern for reputation). Here the choice is dictated by reasons of metrical convenience.

nouerca: again at line 140 *fida nouerca*. The term has strong negative connotations. Stepmothers were conventionally notorious for their unjust and cruel behaviour towards their stepchildren (cf. Hes. *Op.* 825 with West, Verg. *Ecl.* 3.33, Hor. *Carm.* 3.24.17f., *Epod.* 5.9, Jerome *Ep.* 54.15). The image of the poisoning stepmother (the so-called "stepmother *topos*") became a stock figure in verse and rhetoric and their spitefulness was proverbial, see Otto s.v. *nouerca* with *Nachträge* 113, 193, 241, 282, Schmieg (1937) *passim*, Opelt (1965) 199, 202, Fiorencis - Gianotti (1990) 85 n.36. In the *Her.* all references made to stepmothers have negative implications (cf. *Her.* 6.126f., 9.8,54, 12.188, 19.126). *nouerca* is often found in connection with Phaedra in Latin poetry, esp. in Ovid (cf. *Am.* 2.18.30 *legit ab Hippolyto*

scripta nouerca suo, *Met.* 15.498 *sceleratae fraude nouercae*, *Tr.* 2.383, also *Prop.* 2.1.51 *nouercae...Phaedrae*). The application of *nouerca* also offers a link with Juno, who is the archetypal stepmother in Roman literature (see Watson (1995) 113-28, Bömer on *Met.* 1.147).

130. nec...terruerint: for the use of *nec* with (present) subjunctive see Lease (1913) 268ff.

animos: a poetic plural. *animus* here is better understood in the sense of “instrument of judgment” (*TLL* 2.91.48ff.) rather than as “the seat of feelings and desire” (*TLL* 2.95.74ff., cf. lines 16 and 165), since in the following lines Phaedra’s argumentation on the moral implications of her proposition is appealing primarily to Hippolytus’ judgment and less to his emotions.

nomina uana: “false accusations”, “ungrounded charges” (for *nomen* as “counterfeit accusation” see *OLD* s.v. *nomen* 25). The combination is rather unusual both in poetry (again at *Met.* 15.154 and *Mart.* 4.11.1) and in prose (only at *Sen. Epist.* 80.5.2). *uanus* is often attributed by Ovid to speech (or words) with negative connotations (cf. e.g. *Am.* 3.11.21, *Met.* 13.263).

131-4. Phaedra’s claims echo conventional rejection of old moral standards in favour of modern practices by the elegiac *lena*. In particular, her rejection of the past on grounds of *rusticitas* brings her very close to the propositions of the *praeceptor* in Ovid’s *Ars amatoria* 3.107-28. For a detailed discussion on Phaedra’s appropriation of the role of the elegiac *lena* see pp. 23ff.

131. uetus pietas aeuo moritura futuro: cf. Horace’s pessimistic view on moral decline (*Hor. Carm.* 3.6.46-8 *aetas parentum peior auis tulit / nos nequiores, mox daturos / progeniem uitiosorem*). This is another instance where Phaedra, a Greek heroine, strikes a typically Roman tone. *pietas*, was one of the most fundamental values of the Romans throughout their history and it involved respect for both the gods and the fellow human beings (cf. *Cic. Nat. Deor.* 1.2, also *De Fin.* 3.73, *Nat. Deor.* 1.116, 2.66, *ibid* 2.161, *Rep.* 6.16). On the gradual differentiation in the meaning of *pietas* from the Republic to the Principate see Wagenvoort’s (1980) excellent discussion. Byblis’ reference to people of old age as guarantors of the interpretation and enforcement of the laws (cf. *Ov. Met.* 10.551 *iura senes norint et (...) / (...) inquirant legumque examina seruent*) offers an interesting parallel for *Aen.* 8.627, *Lygd.* [Tib.] 3.4.47, *Tert. Pud.* 13.

132. rustica: in the sense of “erotic inexperience” and “crudeness in love” it picks up the *rusticitas* theme from line 102 (*rustica silua*). Further on the term see n. on *Her.* 4.102.

Saturno regna tenente: an imitation of *Prop.* 2.32.52 *hic mos Saturno regna tenente fuit*. For similar suggestions, cf. *Ov. Am.* 3.4.37f. *rusticus est nimium, quem laedit adultera coniunx, / et notos mores non satis Urbis habet* and Juvenal’s discussion of adultery (*Sat.* 6.1-24).

Phaedra briefly touches upon the theme of the Golden Age, which was a popular idiom in Augustan literature (cf. e.g. *Verg. Ecl.* 4 *passim*, *Georg.* 1.125f., 2.536f., *Ov. Am.* 3.8.35f., *Met.* 1.89f., 15.96f.). The Golden Age motif, known ever since Hesiod (*Op.* 42,46, 90-2, esp. 109-20), was present throughout Greek (cf. in particular Plato’s account at *Rep.* 2.372a, *Plt.* 272a-b, *Leg.* 3.680 b and 4.713 b-714 b with Vidal-Naquet (1978)) and Latin literature.

However, while the Greeks referred to a *Golden Race*, the Romans replaced the *Golden Race* with the *Golden Age* (see Baldry 87-90). The Golden Age was considered to be a period of blissful and carefree, though primitive, existence under the power of Saturn. Jupiter terminated this period of primitive happiness by overthrowing his father, Saturn, see Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.236. Further on the Golden Age see Gatz (1967). Further on the Golden Age theme in Augustan poetry see Ryberg (1958), Fantazzi (1974), Galinsky (1981), *idem* (1996) 90-121, Wallace-Hadrill (1982), Whitaker (1983) 66-71, 83-6, Barker (1996), Parker (1997) 19-35, Morrison (1999), Perkell (2002), Campbell (2003) 336-53: *Appendix B Table of Themes in Prehistories and Accounts of the Golden Age (including Isles of the Blessed, ideal States, Noble Savages, etc.)*. Especially on the precariousness of the Golden Age as a motif of alleged purity and erotic fulfillment in the *Heroides* see Spentzou (2003) 43-53 (with some reservation).

Phaedra throughout the letter is consistent in using the Roman names of the gods (cf. *Amor* 11, *Iuno* 35, *Ioui* 36, *Bacchi* 47, *Fauni* 49, *Venus* 54, *Iuppiter* 55, *Dianae* 87, *Veneri* 88, *Aurora* 95, *Venerem* 97, *Venerem* 102, *Venus* 136, *Amor* 152, *Iouis* 163, also *Neptunius* 109) with the only exception of *Satyri...Panis* at line 171. The Roman god Saturnus was identified with the Greek Kronos at a very early stage, cf. Andr. *Od.* fr. 2 Warmington (=Prisc. in *G.L.* 2.305.27 K) *Pater nostri, Saturni filie* translating *Od.* 1.45 (al.) "ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη, *ibid* fr. 16 Warmington (=Prisc. in *G.L.* 2.231.13K) *sancta puer Saturni...regina*, Enn. *Ann.* 53 Skutsch *Respondit Iuno Saturnia, sancta dearum*, 444 *O genitor noster, Saturnie, maxime diuom* and 445 *Optima caelicolum, Saturnia, magna dearum*, Accius *Annales* fr.3 Courtney (=Macr. 1.7.36) and Cic. *Carm.* 23.18 *genitor Saturnius*. Cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 8.319ff., Ov. *Fast.* 1.235, Dion. Hal. 1.34. As a result of this identification, the Golden Age for the Romans coincides with Saturn's reign. For more on the Hellenization of the Roman Saturnus and his identification with the Greek Kronos see Roscher s.v. *Saturnus* 432.5ff. and Thulin in *RE*² (1921) s.v. *Saturnus* 219.62ff. The etymology of the god's name is much disputed. Some derive his name from *sātus*, thus making him a god of sowing, or of seed-corn, others from the Etruscan *Sartre*, while most modern historians consider him as an Italo-Roman deity (for more on this see Bömer on *Fast.* 1.234, Roscher s.v. *Saturnus* 436.7ff., Maltby (1991) s.v. *Saturnus*). His festival, celebrated on the 17 December, was among the most popular festive days of the Roman calendar (cf. Livy 2.21ff.).

The phrase *regna tenente(m)* appears frequently in hexameters and in elegy (cf. e.g. Prop. 2.32.52, Ov. *Fast.* 2.384, 432, 4.594); Ovid combines here two stock phrases: *Saturno rege* (Verg. *Aen.* 8.324, Tib. 1.3.35, 2.5.9, Mart. 12.62.1ff, [Sen.] *Oct.* 396, Juv. 6.1) and *Saturnia regna* (Verg. *Ecl.* 4.6, 6.41, *G.* 2.538, *Aen.* 6.792-4, Ov. *Am.* 3.8.35). On the high frequency of *rex* (or adjectives from the same root) as attributes to gods in Augustan poetry see Murgatroyd on Tib. 2.5.9.

133f. On the text see p.281. The couplet is framed by the two lovers who are mentioned either by name (*Iuppiter*) or by their title of kinship (*soror*).

Phaedra's substitution of Saturn for Tatius in the previous couplet (on this see p.24) offers a smooth transition to the Jupiter-Juno *exemplum*, since it was Jupiter who put an end to the Golden Age by overthrowing Saturn, his father. This is the second appearance of the royal couple in Phaedra's letter, since at lines 35f. Phaedra drew an analogy between herself and Juno through her comparison of Hippolytus' exquisite beauty to that of Jupiter (see n. ad loc.). Now, the king and queen of gods and mortals through their incestuous affair offer the perfect example for Phaedra's argumentation. Perhaps it is not by chance that Byblis in her love-letter to her brother, Caunus, also makes use of the Jupiter-Juno relationship as a paradigm of incest (cf. *Met.* 9. 497-9 *di melius! – di nempe suas habuere sorores. / sic Saturnus Opem iunctam sibi sanguine duxit, / Oceanus Tethyn, Iunonem rector Olympi*). On the use of this *exemplum* see Davisson (1993) 223, Feeney (1991) 195-7. Comparing the ruling couple to Zeus and Hera was a panegyric *topos* established during the Hellenistic period, which survived until the Imperial period. The identification of Augustus with Jupiter became a popular flattery to Augustus and his successors. Further on this matter with parallels and bibliography see Green on *Ov. Fast.* 1.608 and 650. Cassius Diodorus (*Hist. Rom.* 59.26.5), for example, informs us that the emperor Gaius ('Caligula') called himself equal to Jupiter in order to justify his incestuous relationship with his sisters (cf. also *Aur. Vict. Epit. de Caes.* 3.5 *Iouem ob incestum...se asserebat*). Further on this see Ferri on [Sen.] *Octav.* 220 with bibliography.

Endogamy with a kin, especially for economic reasons, was not strange to the Romans, since the Republic and throughout the Imperial times. Nevertheless, the union of near relatives was generally considered as incestuous and scandalous. A woman's extra-marital incest, like in Phaedra's case, would have been judged on grounds of adultery and would have fallen under the directives of the *lex Iulia de adulteriis* (see Treggiari (1991)104-19, esp. 281 and McGinn (1998) 140-7. On the restrictions concerning marriage between relatives in Rome see Rossbach (1853) 442.

133. Iuppiter...iuuaret: Phaedra alludes to the etymological derivation of *Iuppiter* from the verb *iuuare*, cf. *Enn. ap. Varro Ling.* 5.65 (= *Trag.* 359f. Jocelyn), *Cic. Nat. Deor.* 2.64 *Iuppiter, id est iuuans pater, quem, conussris casibus, appellamus a iuuando Iouem*, *Gell.* 5.12.4. Further see Maltby (1991) s.v. *Iuppiter*. For other instances in Ovid see McKeown (1987) 49, Michalopoulos (2001) s.v. *Iuppiter*.

marita soror: the juxtaposition is emphatic, it picks up – though in reverse gender order – the *fratremque uirumque* at line 35. The use of the poetic *marita*, instead of *uxor*, which is the popular elegiac term for “wife” (on the term see n. *Her.* 8.29) adds further to the grandeur and importance of the reference. As an adjective *marita* in classical times is confined only to poetry, and it is frequent in elegy (*TLL* s.v. *maritus* 8.406.81ff.). As a noun used for a “wife” or “married woman” it also appears in epitaphs, but its use in elegy is rather restricted, often as a metrically convenient alternative of *uxor* and *mulier* (only in Propertius 4.7.63, *Ov. Her.* 12.175, 13.45 and *Fast.* 2.139, 429; absent from *Tib.* and *Ov. Am*). Further see Bessone on *Her.* 12.87.

soror is withheld for greater effect until the very end of the pentameter to underscore further the incestuous relationship. Juno as sister and wife (*coniunx et soror*) of Jupiter is a widespread motif in both Greek and Latin literature, ever since Homer (cf. *Il.* 16.432 Ἥρην δὲ προσέειπε κασιγνήτην ἄλοχόν τε, 18.356). The combination is widespread in Latin literature, cf. Cic. *Nat. Deor.* 2.66.2 *quae* (sc. Iuno) *est soror et coniunx Iouis*, Verg. *Aen.* 1.46-7 *Iouisque / et soror et coniunx*, 10.607 *o germana mihi atque eadem gratissima coniunx*, Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.64 *coniuge me Iouis et sorore*, Ov. *Her.* 16.166 *nupta sororque Iouis*, *Met.* 3.265f. *si sum regina Iouisque / et soror et coniunx, certe soror*, 574 *et ipsa Iouis coniunxque sororque*, *Fast.* 6.17 *sui germana mariti, 27 est aliquid nupsisse Ioui, Iouis esse sororem*, Sen. *Ag.* 348 [340] *o magni soror et coniunx*, *HF* 1 *soror Tonantis*, Arnob. 3.30, Aug. *C.D.* 4.10, Macrob. *Somn. Scip.* 1.17.15, Isid. *Etym.* 8.11.69. On the literary history of the motif see Traina (1989). For the humanization of divine (and heroic) figures as a Hellenistic poetic trope see Papanghelis (1987) 203f.

134. et fas: *fas* in the sense of “something which is right or permissible by divine law” (*OLD* s.v. *fas* 1, *TLL* 6.1.292.59ff.). Further on *fas* (and its reference to “divine law”) see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 9.551f. (...) *quid liceatque nefasque / fasque sit*, Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.25 and especially Peeters (1945).

135. coit: it picks up *priuigno coitura nouerca* at line 129, a careful choice, since the verb is a popular euphemism for sexual intercourse (see Adams (1982) 178f., *TLL* 3.1418.7ff., cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.2.63, 3.4.42, *Her.* 19.67).

firma generis iunctura...catena: cf. Prop. 2.15.25f. *atque utinam haerentis sic nos uincire catena / uelles, ut numquam solueret ulla dies!* which was later imitated by Sulp. [Tib.] 3.11. 9-16, esp. 15f. *sed potius ualida teneamur uterque catena, / nulla queat posthac quam soluisse dies*. Also cf. Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.43f. *uos collato pectore mixtos / iunxit inabrupta Concordia longa catena*. The “chains of love” is a widespread motif in Roman elegy, possibly under the influence of Greek epigram (so La Penna (1951) 187-80, cf. e.g. *AP* 5.96.2, 255, 12.132.3, 12.160.1f., also see Fedeli on Prop. 1.13.15-8). The association of erotic fetters and love bonds with the *seruitium amoris* seems to have been an addition made by the Roman elegists, Tibullus in particular, as an attempt for variation and refinement, see Tib. 1.1.55 with Murgatroyd and Maltby ad loc., also Murgatroyd (1981) 596f. - add to his list Prop. 2.15.25, Ov. *Am.* 1.2.30, 2.17.1, 3.11.3). *marita soror* (i.e. Iuno) and *iunctura catena* placed at the end of two consecutive lines could be an intentional implicit allusion to the etymological derivation of Iuno from *iungere* see Paschalis (1997) 150. O’ Hara (1999) 116f., also Feeney (1991) 133.

catena: The combination of the “chains of love” with Venus (mentioned by name) could be a learned allusion to the Venus-Mars illicit affair, which was covertly implied earlier in the letter (lines 53f.) through Phaedra’s reference to the wrath of Venus against her family. For a similar allusion to the Venus-Mars adultery at Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.17-20 *felices ter et amplius / quos inrupta tenet copula nec malis / diuolsus querimoniis / suprema citius soluet amor die*) see N-H

ad loc. If such connotations are perceptible here, then Phaedra's preference for *catena* is intentional, since in the great majority of narratives about the Venus-Mars illicit affair *catena* outnumbers the synonym *uinc(u)la*. It is true, however, that *uinc(u)la* seems to have particular associations with the bonds of marriage (cf. Catul. 61.33, Tib. 2.2.18 with Maltby).

136. imposuit nodos...Venus ipsa suos: the reference here is made to Venus' "magic knot," which according to Tupet (1976) 344 "est un lieu commun de la poésie amoureuse." Venus was considered to possess magical powers ever since Homer (cf. *Il.* 14.214-221, Pind. *Pyth.* 4.213-17). Knots, in particular, played an indispensable part in ancient magic (e.g. amulets, *deuinctiones* or *κατάδεσμοί*). On the magical powers of knots see Tupet (1976) 45-8 and 118. In Latin poetry, Venus appears in connection with *nodus* only in three other instances: Lucr. 4.1148 *et ualidos Veneris perrumpere nodos*, Tib. 1.8.5-6 *ipsa Venus magico religatum brachia nodo / perdocuit* and Verg. *Ecl.* 8.77-8 *necte tribus nodis ternos, Amarylli, colores / necte, Amarylli, modo et "Veneris" dic "uincula necto"*. For more on Venus' "magic knot" see Murgatroyd and Maltby on Tib. 1.5.5f. *nodos* also picks up Theseus' *claua trinodi* (line 115). Propertius' reference to his punishment by the *Amorini* offers an interesting parallel, since he also mentions a *nodus* put around his neck, cf. Prop. 2.29A.10 (...) *dixit, et in collo iam mihi nodus erat*. For the legal implications of *nodus* (meaning "knots of the law") see Kenney on *Her.* 20.39 with parallels.

Phaedra's reference to the erotic knots of Venus could also be seen as another instance of the heroine's Euripidean reminiscence, since in Eur. *Hipp.* knots and ties are wide-spread throughout the play (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 515, 671, 777, 779, 781, 783, 802, 828f., 1060, 1237, 1244, 1442). In fact, the knot imagery plays a prominent role both in literal and metaphorical level. On the great significance of the binding / unbinding (loosening) idiom and its multi-purpose in Eur. *Hipp.* see Segal (1965) 133 n.35, Fowler (1978) 18-20, esp. Zeitlin (1985) 58-64, 67, 194 n.33 with bibliography, Goff (1990) 7 n.10 with bibliography, 62-4. For a series of artistic representations of Venus with chains in her hands see *LIMC* s.v. *Venus* 8.1.130 145?, also *ibid* s.v. *Aphodite* e.g. 2.2.58, 89, 225, 255.

Venus: the reference to Venus by name combined with the chain imagery (*iunctura catena* 135) and the magical knots *imposuit nodos* 136) may contain a reference to the supposed etymological association of *Venus* with *uincire* (cf. Varro *Ling.* 5.61 *mas ignis...aqua femina...et horum uinctionis uis Venus*, see Maltby (1991) s.v. *Venus*, *idem* (1993) 265, Michalopoulos (2001) s.v. *Venus* (c)).

137-46. After having established her case on grounds of divine order, Phaedra now proceeds to argue her case in terms of the possible repercussions of her proposal on a social level. The fact that she devotes ten whole lines to this matter clearly indicates its importance. Phaedra initially gives the impression that she shares the same concern for *εὐκλεία* with her tragic counterpart. However, it soon becomes obvious that she is in fact less concerned with her own reputation (cf. her concern for *fama* at lines 19f., 31f.); instead, she puts all her emphasis on reassuring

Hippolytus about his own good name and his respectability. Through the employment of a remarkably perverse argumentation consisting of a series of reversals and illogical assumptions the Ovidian Phaedra aims doubly at fulfilling both the illicit passion and preserve a good name for Hippolytus. A major part of this perverse rhetoric consists Hippolytus' further elegization mainly through the erotic colouring of her *domus* and the allusions to the kommasic tradition. Further on this see pp. 37f.

137. †*pete munus ab illa*†: a *locus desperatus*. On the text see p.281.

138. Phaedra's claim for concealing the illicit affair under the protection of kinship can be traced back to relevant motifs from the sceptic literature, more specifically to the excessive intimacy among relatives, cf. Catul. 67.29 and Mart. 2.4, 4.16 (so Rosati (1985) 121 n.11).

celare amorem: for similar constructions, cf. *Her.* 12.37 *quis enim bene celat amorem?*, *Stat. Theb.* 12.631 *celauit ripis Geticos Ilissos amores*, *Ter. Andr.* 132 *bene dissimulatum amorem et celatum indicat*.

138. cognato...nomine culpa tegi: the verbal similarity with Byblis' suggestion to Caunus is noteworthy, cf. *Ov. Met.* 9.558 *dulcia fraterno sub nomine furta tegemus*), cf. also *Met.* 2.546 *detegeret culpam* with Bömer. *culpa* is often used to denote an error of sexual nature (see *OLD* s.v. *culpa* 3b, *TLL* 3.1302.67ff.); in elegy it is employed with particular reference to erotic infidelity or illicit love affairs (cf. Pichon s.v. *culpa*). Further on *tecti amores* (Greek κρύφιοι ἔρωτες) see Bömer on *Ov. Met.* 4.191.

139. uiderit amplexus aliquis: cf. Byblis' similar suggestion to Caunus, *Ov. Met.* 9.560 *et damus amplexus et iungimus oscula coram*.

laudabimur: cf. *laudemque merebere* at line 145.

140. dicar: emphatic by position, on the use of verbs in passive (cf. also *laudabimur* 139) as an indication of Phaedra's concern for her reputation see n. on *Her.* 4.35.

priuigno fida nouerca meo: a paradoxical, but ingenious, manipulation of the father-son relationship. The combination *fida nouerca* through the associations of *fida* with marital fidelity (on marital *fides* see Treggiari (2001) 237, Boucher (1965) 85-7 on the presence of *fides* in Roman elegy) glosses over the negative implications of Phaedra's marital unfaithfulness towards Theseus (the father) with the positive implications of her faithfulness towards Hippolytus (the son). On *nouerca* and the proverbial fierceness of step-mothers see n. on *Her.* 4.129.

priuigno: in Ovid it occurs again at *Am.* 2.9.47, *Her.* 4.129, 19.125 and *Met.* 9.416. In Augustan poetry it appears only three more times (cf. *Hor. Carm.* 3.24.18, *Epist.* 1.3.2, *Prop.* 2.1.51-2 *seu mihi sunt tangenda nouercae pocula Phaedrae, / pocula priuigno non nocitura suo*), later at *Mart.* 4.16.1-2 *priuignum non esse tuae te, Galle, nouercae / rumor erat* and *Juv.* 6.134, 628.

141f. Phaedra's recapitulation of the most conventional clichés of the *komos* (παρακλαυσίθυρον) tradition (the promised night, the unlocking of the door, the cruel husband, the *custos*) further contributes to the elegization of Hippolytus, who is now portrayed

in terms of the elegiac figure of the *exclusus amator* (the locked-out lover). A similar recapitulation of these komastic conventions is made by the *praeceptor* in Ovid's *Remedia amoris* (Ov. *Rem.* 505-8 *dixerit, ut uenias: pacta tibi nocte uenito; / Veneris, et fuerit ianua clausa: feres. / nec dic blanditias, nec fac conuicia posti, / nec latus in duro limine pone tuum* with Pinotti). The lover's *komos* outside the closed door of his beloved is a long-established literary theme in Roman elegy (e.g. Tib. 1.1.56, 1.2, esp. 5-17, 1.6.9-11, Prop. 1.11.15, 1.16, 2.6.2, 2.23.9, Ov. *Am.* 1.6.7, 2.2, 2.12.3, 2.19, 3.1.49, 3.8.24, 3.11.12). For concise overviews of the literary history of *komos* in Greek and Roman literature see Copley (1956), Fedeli's introduction to Prop. 1.16, Yardley (1978), Murgatroyd (1980) 72-4, McKeown's introduction to *Am.* 1.6, Maltby's introduction to Tib. 1.2.

141. per tenebras: the conventional time for the *exclusus amator* to be locked-out from the chambers of his mistress was the night, cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.25.7 with N-H, Tib. 1.6.11f., Prop. 1.12.13 with Fedeli, 2.16.6, 2.19.22, 54, 3.1.52). For house-doors being closed during the night, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.4.61, 2.19.38, Hor. *Carm.* 3.7.29. The (un)fulfilled night, in general, was a common erotic *topos* (cf. e.g. Catul. 68a. 5f. with Tromaras, 68b. 83f., 145f., Prop. 1.10.1-10, 2.15, Tib. 2.6.49 with Smith, Ov. *Am.* 1.8.73, *Rem.* 505, with the exception of Ov. *Am.* 1.5 (midday)).

duri reseranda mariti / ianua: the combined reference to the door (*reseranda...ianua*) and the difficult husband (*duri...mariti*) is perhaps reminiscent of Tib. 1.2.7 *ianua difficilis domini*. Cf. also Ov. *Am.* 2.12.3f. *quam uir, quam custos, quam ianua firma, tot hostes, / seruabant, nequa posset ab arte capi!*, *Met.* 9.750f. *hanc tibi res adimit: non te custodia caro / arcet ab amplexu nec cauti cura mariti*.

duri...mariti: in komastic contexts *durus* is often attributed to the door (both literally or metaphorically), cf. Hor. *Ep.* 11. 22 *limina dura*, Tib. 1.1.56, 1.2.6, 1.8.76, 2.6.28, 47, Fedeli on Prop. 1.16.18 and McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.6.27f., 6.62, *Am.* 2.1.22, *Ars* 2.636 *duris postibus*, 3.194 *duris...pilis*, *Rem.* 508, 677, *Met.* 14.709 *in limine duro*, *Fast.* 5.339 *durum...limen amicae*, *Stat. Theb.* 10.47, also Verg. *Aen.* 2.479, 11.890). The transposition of the hardness of the threshold to the occupant of the house, in the majority of cases to the *puella* (cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.7.32, Tib. 1.8.50, 2.6.28, Prop. 1.1.10, 1.7.6, 1.16.30, 1.17.16, 2.1.78, 2.24.47-8, 4.2.23, Ov. *Am.* 1.6.62, 1.9.19, *Ars* 2.527, *Fast.* 4.111, for the characterization of the beloved as *dura* see bibliography in Wyke (2002) 153 n.85), and to the husband (or the *leno* or the *duenna* or the *custos*) seems to have been a Roman innovation. For *durus uir*, cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 3.4.1 *Dure uir*, *Rem.* 554 *duro capta puella uiro*.

tibi...reserandi: *reserare* is almost a *terminus technicus* for opening, unfastening a door or gate (see *OLD* s.v. *resero* 1b) and is very frequent in komastic contexts, cf. Tib. 1.2.18 *fores*, Prop. 1.16.19 *ianua*, 3.19.24, Ov. *Am.* 3.1.45f. *ianua*, 3.2.77 *carcer*, *Ars* 3.577 *portae*). There seems to be a certain degree of ambiguity behind the use of the dative *tibi*. If *tibi* is taken as ethical dative, then it is Phaedra who should do the unlocking of the door from the inside; whereas, if

tibi is a dative of the agent, then it is Hippolytus who should unlock the door from the outside (the trick of unbolting a door from the outside occurs as early as with Homer (cf. *Od.* 1.441f., 21.46ff.)). The emphatic placement of *tibi* at the beginning of the line seems to suggest Hippolytus' active participation. After all, the use of *reserare* for unlocking a door from the outside is well attested, cf. Prop. 4.5.73f., Ov. *Met.* 10.384, Tib. 1.8.60. For more see Murgatroyd and Maltby on Tib. 1.8.60.

142. *ianua*: given Phaedra's eroticized version of the house door the possibility of a sexual double entendre should not be excluded, since terms meaning "door" or "gate" are common euphemisms in both Greek and Latin for female genitalia (more often for the *anus*), see Adams (1982) 89 and Henderson (1991) 137-8. In addition, "unlocking the door" can be used as metaphor for sexual intercourse, see Fruhstorfer (1986).

***custos decipiendus*:** the sleepless *custos* who guards the *puella* and the wiles of the separated lovers are stock features of the *komos* tradition. For parallels see Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.6.9-10 and Gibson on *Ars* 3.611-58. *decipere* is often applied in elegy with particular reference to the deception of the *custos* (cf. Tib. 2.3.73, Ov. *Am.* 3.1.49 *decepto...custode*, *Her.* 3.17 *decepto...custode*, Juv. 6.234 *decipit illa / custodes*).

143f. Hippolytus' elegization reaches its climax with Phaedra's eroticized version of her *domus*. In Eur. *Hipp.* the house (*οἶκος*) maintains its traditional fifth-century Athenian function as the guarantor of patriarchal continuity and of female seclusion. Phaedra, a chaste and faithful wife at first, is identified with the interior sphere (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 131f). Later, as she becomes overcome by her illicit desire, she fails to comply with her sexually prescribed confinement to the interior and the subsequent concealment. The house ultimately becomes a death trap for Phaedra, as she leaves the house at the beginning of the play and re-enters it only to find death. On the very contrary, the Ovidian Phaedra sees her *domus* exclusively as a place of love. The reversal is obvious. The ominous darkness of the inside in tragedy now becomes the darkness needed to the elegiac lover in order to overcome any obstacles and meet his beloved. The house from a death trap now turns into a place of love and sexual consummation. Further on this see 38f.

ut tenuit domus una duo, domus una tenebit / oscula aperta dabas, oscula aperta dabis: a remarkable couplet for its repetitive structure. The parallel hemistichs (both in the hexameter and the pentameter) are further associated through the repetition of the verbs in past and future (*tenuit - tenebit, dabas - dabis*). The only other example in elegy with a split hexameter and a split pentameter in sequence is found at Prop. 2.3A.43f. (possibly deriving from Gallus) *sive illam Hesperiiis, sive illam ostendet Eois, / uret et Eoos, uret et Hesperios*; however, without the verbal repetition in both lines of the couplet. Further see Willis (1996) 301. 414-18 and Maltby (1999) 382-4.

tenuit domus...domus tenebit: *tenere* denoting "hold", "contain" (*OLD* s.v. *teneo* 4) often appears in sepulchral epigrams (cf. *CLE* e.g. 1005.10 *me mea fata tenent*, 1108.3 *mater corpus*

operta tenet, 1207 *terra tenet corpus*, 1142.4 *si tumulus teneat*, 1339.3 *corpus tellure tenetur*), which makes its application here rather ominous.

una duos: picks up *una duabus* at line 63. The combination adds further to the ominous connotations of the line, since such pointed juxtapositions of numerals (popular with Ovid) appear very often in death contexts (cf. Ov. *Her.* 7.138 with Knox, *Met.* 2.609, 4.108, also cf. Prop. 2.26C.33, Ov. *Her.* 18.126, Mart. 8.43.4, Juv. 6.641).

144. oscula aperta dabas, oscula aperta dabis: cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.4.63 *oscula iam sumet, iam non tantum oscula sumet: / quod mihi das furtim, iure coacta dabis*, *Her.* 13.120 *multa tamen capies oscula, multa dabis*. *oscula dare* is one of the most frequent combinations denoting “to give kisses” in elegy (Pichon (1966) s.v. *dare*. *dare* used absolutely often means “to offer sexual pleasure” (see Booth (1981) 2692 n.36, *TLL* 5.1.1673.35-42, cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.4.64,70, 3.8.34, *Ars* 1.345, 454, 3.579).

oscula aperta: the *iunctura* appears only here. *osculum*, the diminutive of *os* (Serv. on *Aen.* 1.256 *ora diminutiue*), is the only form for “kiss” used in elegy (with the exception of Prop. 2.29.39 *opposita propellens suavia dextra*). *s(u)auium* is the principal word for kiss in Roman comedy, while *basium* (introduced to Latin by Catullus) has also a distinct colloquial character. Further see Axelson (1945) 35 with n.16, Fordyce on Catul. 5.7, Pichon (1966) s.v. *oscula*, Ross (1969) 104-5, Plepelits (1972), Kimura (1977), Moreau (1978), López López (1980), Flury (1988), Cipriani (1992). Cf. also Donat. on Ter. *Eun.* 456 *oscula officiorum sunt, basia pudicorum affectuum, saua lideminum uel amorum*. *aperta* in the sense of “unconcealed”, “undisguised” (*OLD* s.v. *apertus* 9b, *TLL* 2.221.69ff.) is a fitting choice in view of the reference to the door at line 142, since the adjective is very often attributed to doors, gates or houses meaning “open, unfastened, unlocked” (cf. e.g. Tib. 1.2.10, 1.9.58, Prop. 2.9.42, 2.31.2, Ov. *Ars* 2.245, 3.456, *Met.* 1.172, 4.439).

In terms of metrics there is a rare elision of a short *a* in the third syllable of the first half of the pentameter (again in Ovid only at *Am.* 1.11.26 *nec Veneris media ponere in aede morer*, *Ars* 3.520 *ut mea de uobis altera amica foret*). See Platnauer (1951) 88f.

145. tutus eris mecum: Hippolytus -in striking contrast with his mother (cf. line 120 *nec tanto mater pignore tuta fuit*)- will enjoy safety under the protection of Phaedra’s love. The heroine offering protection to her man through her love is a recurring motif in the *Her.*, cf. 3.117 *tutius est iacuisse toro, tenuissem puellam*, 5.89 *tutus amor meus est*, 6.147, 12.108, 20.233; the idea appears very often also in elegy (cf. e.g. Prop. 1.1.32, 2.13A.14 *domina iudice tutus ero*, possibly echoed at Ov. *Am.* 2.2.56 *iudicis illa sui tuta fauore uenit*, 65). An allusion to the widespread elegiac *topos* of the lovers’ divine protection is perhaps intended here (see Maltby on Tib. 1.2.29 *quisquis amore tenetur eat tutusque sacerque* with Maltby and Henderson on Ov. *Rem.* 29). *tutus* denoting “safe, unpunished, without consequences” (see *OLD* s.v. 1b, also Pichon (1964) s.v. *tutela*) is an adjective of high frequency in the *Her.* (23 times) and it could be associated with the existence of a Roman law, which permitted the husband to kill the adulterers

if being caught in the act (Sen. *Contr.* 1.4, 1.7, 7.5, Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.42, *Decl. min.* 286, 291 with Calp. Flacc. 48, *Digest* 48.5.25 [24]). For more see Corbett (1930) 128ff., Treggiari (1991) 272-5, 288, McGinn (1991), *idem* (1998) 143.

culpa: Phaedra never stops being conscious of her adultery (cf. 138 *culpa*, 151 *culpae*).

146. lecto...meo: a Greek loan-word (see n. on *Her.* 4.127) picking up Phaedra's reference to her marital bed with Theseus at line 127 (*meriti lectum...parentis*), which she now claims for herself. By calling the bed her own Phaedra does not only mark her detachment and liberation from Theseus' sexual and marital domination. Far more significantly, Phaedra through her appropriation of her marital bed asserts her own sexuality; she claims back her right to sexual pleasure, which is no longer dictated under the restraints of marriage, but it depends on her own free will. For the frequent references to Phaedra's bed in Eur. *Hipp.* cf. lines 153f., 160, 179f., 495. The framing of the infinitive (*conspiciare*) by the prepositional clause (*in lecto...meo*) is noteworthy.

conspiciare: "marvel at seeing", "see and admire", a strong verb for "seeing" due to its implications of admiration (see *TLL* 4.497.1ff.), favoured by Ovid in his elegiac work.

147. tolle moras: a strong imperative, emphatically placed at the beginning of the hexameter, thus giving away the urgency of her appeal. For similar phrasings, cf. Ov. *Met.* 13.556 *tolle moras*, *Hecuba*, Lucan. 1.281 *tolle moras*, also Prop. 3.13.14 *pretio tollitur ipsa mora*, possibly a variation of the "Vergilian" *rumpe moras* (*rumpe moras* appears first at *Verg. Georg.* 3.43, also at *Aen.* 4.569 with Pease and 9.13). For similar formations of *tollere* see *TLL* 8.1470.28-47 and Bömer on *Met.* 11.685.

properata foedera iunge: another instance of Phaedra's infatuation, which makes her perceive her proposed adulterous relationship with Hippolytus in terms of a marital commitment. This is a common practice of the Roman elegists, who frequently apply to their love-affairs legal terminology in an attempt to endow them with the seriousness of a *foedus* (cf. Tib. 1.3.83ff. with Smith, Prop. 2.6.42, 2.16.22). On the erotic motif of love as contract see n. on *Her.* 4.17.

148. mihi...saeuit...Amor: cf. *Verg. Aen.* 4.532 (=7.461) *saeuit amor*. *saeuire* is rare in elegy (Ov. *Am.* 0, Tib. 3 times (1.290, 1.3.70, 1.5.58), Prop. 2 times (2.8.36, 4.8.55)); in the *Heroides* it appears again only twice (2.188, 18.39). *saeuus*, however, is a conventional epithet for *Amor*, cf. Enn. *scen.* 216 Jocelyn *Medea animo aegro amore saeuo saucia*, *Verg. Ecl.* 8.47, Ov. *Am.* 1.1.5 with McKeown, 1.6.34, 2.10.19, *Her.* 7.190, *Ars* 1.18, *Rem.* 530, Lygd. [Tib.] 3.4.65-66 with N-A for similar *iuncturae*, Sen. *Med.* 136, 850, *Phaedr.* 641 (sc. *amor*) *intimis saeuit ferus / uisceribus*. For further parallels see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 13.798. For the possibility of a Hellenistic influence see Giangrande (1974) 5. For the rare construction with dative, cf. Plaut. *Rud.* 825, Tib. 1.2.90.

sic tibi parcat amor: cf. Phaedra's initial wish to *Amor* at line 16 *figat sic animos in mea uota tuos*.

149ff. As if she paid heed to the precepts of the *praeceptor* in the Ovidian *Ars amatoria* on how to write a love letter (cf. *Ars* 1.440-2 (...) *nec exiguas, quisquis es, adde preces. / Hectors donavit Priamo prece motus Achilles; / flectitur iratus uoce rogante deus*) Phaedra concludes her letter with an erotic supplication. After having appealed to Hippolytus' mind and judgement, she resorts now to targeting his emotion and sentiments and takes up the final role in her letter, that of a suppliant. In doing so, Phaedra inevitably recalls the Nurse's double supplication (both to Phaedra (lines 325-35) and to Hippolytus (lines 605-15)) in Eur. *Hipp.* Phaedra's erotic supplication to Hippolytus at Sen. *Phaedr.* 609ff. perhaps suggests a common origin from a now lost supplication to Hippolytus made personally by Phaedra in Euripides' first *Hippolytus* (see Barrett (1964) 11, 37 with n.3, Armstrong (2001) 64 n.28, for a different view see Roisman (1999) 10f.). In any case, the imagery of erotic supplication constitutes a frequent motif in Roman elegy, especially in connection with the elegiac *seruitium amoris* (cf. Pichon s.v. *supplices*).

In terms of content this section adds almost nothing to Phaedra's argumentation. Instead, Phaedra through repetitions and emotional outbursts recapitulates significant themes, which were mentioned earlier in her letter, namely her ardent struggle against the revelation of her illicit passion (151), her concern for *pudor* (154f.), her family's past and her Cretan origin (157-64), the bull motif (165f.), the amatory hunt and her erotic frenzy in the woods (169-74).

Phaedra's emotional distress is clearly reflected on the letter's grammar. Her extensive use of imperative (cf. *da* 156, *doma* 156, *miserere* 161, *parce* 162, *flecte* 165, *finge* 176) is indicative of the urgent character of her appeal, while her use of rhetorical questions (150, 166), the pathetic interjections such as *heu*, and above all the accumulation of verbal and thematic repetitions (cf. e.g. the anaphora of *quod* (157-9) and *sic* (169-73), the repeated use of terms of supplication-related vocabulary) betray her emotional turmoil and the confused state of her mind.

149. non ego dedignor: the litotes is further emphasized by the gradual increase of the number of syllables at the opening of the line (1-2-3). *dedignor* occurs for the first time at Verg. *Aen.* 4.536; in Ovid it appears 11 times, always in litotes (except *Am.* 1.10.63). In view of *digno quod adurimur igni* at line 33 Phaedra's withdrawal from her ideal of *mutuus amor* clearly manifests her despair to be with Hippolytus at any cost. Further on the elegiac ideal of *mutuus amor* see pp.20f. and n. on *Her.* 4.28.

supplex: the lover often acts as suppliant in elegy, cf. Tib. 1.2.13f., 1.9.29f. with Murgatroyd for parallels, Prop. 1.9.33, 1.16.4, 13f., 2.14.12 *at dum demissis supplex cervicibus ibam*, 4.5.37 *supplex ille sedet* (...), 4.8.71f., Ov. *Am.* 1.7.61f. *ter tamen ante pedes uolui procumbere supplex*, 2.5.49 *qui modo saeuus eram, supplex ultroque rogavi*, *Her.* 12.185f. *tam tibi sum supplex, quam tu mihi saepe fuisti, / nec moror ante tuos procubuisse pedes*. Cf. also Seneca's emphasis on Phaedra's erotic supplication (Sen. *Phaedr.* 634, 666f. (...) *en supplex iacet / adlapsa genibus regiae proles domus*, 710-2), and Byblis' determination to drop down to her

knees as means of erotic persuasion (*Met.* 9. 605-9). Erotic supplication seems to have been a popular *topos* in Hellenistic poetry (see Bömer on *Met.* 13.856 with bibliography).

Phaedra's repeated use of terms denoting supplication adds further emotion to her appeal, but at the same time is indicative of her self-awareness and her control over the situation (*humilisque precari* 149, *fastus altaque uerba? iacent* 150, *precor* 153, *genibus tuis...tendo / bracchia* 153f., *miserere* 161, *parcere, parce* 162, *per Venerem... oro, precibus* 175).

150. The combined use of the pathetic interjection *heu* with the rhetorical question help to raise the emotional pitch of the line considerably.

heu!: *heu* (the poetic and rather elevated alternative for *eheu*) is rare in Latin prose, but very popular in elegy (cf. Lyne's concise note on *heu / eheu* on *Ciris* 264, also *TLL* 6.2672.12-15 and Grassmann (1966) 99). Hiatus after interjections is frequent in elegy, see Platnauer (1951) 57). Cf. line 125 *o utinam*.

ubi nunc: for the indignant question, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.391 and 10.897, Tib. 2.3.27. In Ovid again at: *Her.* 2.31 *iura fidesque ubi nunc, commissaque dextera dextrae*, 33 *promissus socios ubi nunc Hymenaeus in annos*, *Ars* 1.703 *uis ubi nunc illa est?*, *Met.* 13.92 (...) *ubi nunc facundus Ulixes?*. In Greek, *ποῦ* is often used in a similar way, cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 1688 *ὁ δ' Οἰδίπους ποῦ καὶ τὰ κλείν' αἰνίγματα;*, Ap. Rhod. 4.358f. (...) *ποῦ τοι Διὸς Ἰκεσίοιο / ὄρκια, ποῦ δὲ μελιχραὶ ὑποσχεσίαι βεβάασιν;*

fastus: here in the sense of "pride, haughtiness" (*OLD* s.v. *fastus* a). For *fastus* meaning "opposition to love" see Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.419.

151f. Phaedra repeats the claims she made to her inner struggle and her moral inhibitions about revealing her passion at the opening of her letter (lines 7f., cf. her similar claim at Eur. *Hipp.* 392 *ἐπεὶ μ' ἔρωσ ἔτρωσεν, ἐσκόπουν ὄπως / κάλλιστ' ἐνέγκαιμ' αὐτόν*). Until the very end Phaedra is trying hard to cling to her portrayal as an innocent and chaste wife. However, her use of past tense (*fui*) to refer to her steadfast resolution ultimately gives her away, as it seems to suggest her change of mind in the present.

et...nec: the construction occurs from the classical time onwards, see K-G 2.2.49, *TLL* 5.889.48ff.

certa fui –certi siquid haberet amor: through the anaphora of *certus* Phaedra implicitly identifies herself with love! *certi siquid haberet amor* is a variation on the well-known *iunctura* of *certus amor* (cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 3.6.30, *Her.* 17.191, *Medic.* 45, *Ars* 2.248 with Janka for parallels, 3.575, *Met.* 4.156, Prop. 1.8.45, 2.29.19, 3.8.18).

amor or *Amor*? this is another instance of Ovid's favourite ambiguity on the (un)personification of the word, see n. on *Her.* 4.11.

153f. Kneeling before one's loved one and embracing their feet was a common feature of erotic supplication, cf. Tib. 1.9.29-30 *haec ego dicebam: nunc me fleuisse loquentem, / nunc pudet ad teneros procubuisse pedes*, Prop. 4.3.12, 4.8.71f. *supplicibus palmis tum demum ad foedera ueni / cum uix tangendos praebuit illa pedes*, Ov. *Am.* 1.7.61f. *ter tamen ante pedes uolui*

procumbere supplex; / ter formidatas reppulit illa manus with McKeown, *Her.* 16.271f. *nunc mihi nil superses nisi te, formosa, precari, / amplectique tuos, si patiare pedes*, 20.77f. *utque solent famuli, cum uerbera saeua uerentur, / tendere submissas ad tua crura manus!*, Sen. *Phaedr.* 666f. *en supplex iacet / adlapsa genibus regiae poles domus* with Coffey and Mayaer, 703 *iterum, superbe, genibus aduoluo tuis*. In general, the suppliant as a rule touched the knees of the person he begged. For parallels see Kenney on *Her.* 20.78, Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.271f. Also see Gould (1973) 76.

uicta: cf. Phaedra's acknowledgement of her defeat by Aphrodite during her last appearance on stage (Eur. *Hipp.* 727 *πικροῦ δ' ἔρωτος ἠσσηθήσομαι*).

precor: it picks up *humilis precari* 149.

regalia.../ brachia: the *iunctura* appears only here in Roman poetry, the enjambment is telling, since the extension of the meaning to the following line is an effective visualization of Phaedra's extended hands to Hippolytus.

155. depudui, profugusque pudor...reliquit: *depudit* picks up *dedignor* (line 149) and highlights the image of bold Phaedra in love. More importantly, her reference to the flight of *pudor* contradicts her initial claim for the compatibility of *pudor* with *amor* (line 9 *qua licet et prodest, pudor est miscendus amori*), and puts her credibility at stake. The *figura etymologica* (*depudit...pudor*) combined with the accumulation of compounds denoting separation (*depudui, pro-fugus, re-liqui*) further underscores Phaedra's abandonment by her *pudor*, hence the shamelessness of her approach. *profugus pudor* appears only here (cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.1.22 *praeterito...pudore*).

156. da ueniam: meaning "*ignoscere*" is widely used in Latin literature, ever since Roman comedy and it is particularly favoured by Ovid. For parallels see Appel (1909) 121, Janka on Ov. *Ars* 2.38 (with bibliography) and Michalopoulos on *Her.* 17.105f. *da* is a popular imperative in the opening of prayers (see Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.17). For *da ueniam* in the same metrical *sedes* see examples in Fantham on *Fast.* 4.755; *da ueniam fassae* again only at *Her.* 19.4 *da ueniam fassae, non patienter amo!*

Given the poetological implications of *ueniam* (*dare*), which often appears in poetic invocations to the reader's benevolence (see Janka on Ov. *Ars* 2.38, Sharrock (1994)a 136f.), I am tempted to read Phaedra's request to Hippolytus also as a covert invocation to the external reader to be sympathetic towards her new literary attempt, the confession of her passion in elegiac couplets.

corda: poetic plural, the alliteration of the letter "*d*" in the line implies perhaps some sense of "hardness."

157-62. Phaedra for the last time in her letter plays with the "motif of the worthy ancestors" through the repetition of her reference to her Cretan descent (further on the motif see n. on *Her.* 8.48). This time, however, she focuses exclusively on the male members of her family. Moreover, her past is no longer evoked in order to provide an explanation for her current

misfortune; instead, it serves more as a reminder of a proud heritage. Minos, Jupiter and Sun constitute an extraordinary triad of ancestors, which inevitably glorify Phaedra.

quod: the triple anaphora of *quod* has an accumulative effect (for such repetitions see Wills (1996) 408).

mihi sit genitor...Minos: it picks up *Minoia* at line 61. The reference to Minos, whose presence was only implied in the mythological list at lines 53-64 (on this see p.66) now becomes explicit. Ariadne in her letter to Theseus makes a similar contrast between her proud descent from Minos and the possibility of becoming a slave of Theseus, cf. *Her.* 10.89-92 *tantum ne religer dura captiua catena, / neue traham serua grandia pensa manu, / cui pater est Minos, cui mater filia Phoebi, / quodque magis memini, quae tibi pacta fui!* On Roman daughterhood see Hallett (1984) 76ff.

genitor: an elevated term, used almost exclusively in epic poetry, found first in Ennius, rare in prose. For more see Tränkle (1960) 39f., McKeown on *Am.* 1.13.45f. (with statistics of frequency), Knox on *Her.* 11.99. In the *Heroides* again at 11.99 and 12.109.

qui possidet aequora, Minos: cf. Sen. *Phaedr.* 149 *quid ille* (sc. Minos), *lato maria qui regno premit.* Phaedra's emphasis on her father's domination at sea is not surprising, since the thalassocracy of the Minoans, mentioned already in Thuc. 1.4, was very well-known in antiquity (see Starr (1954), Hiller (1975) 70 n.53 with bibliography). In addition, such a honorific reference is in accordance with Phaedra's strategy of family praise. In particular, the Neptune-like portrayal of Minos as the ruler of the sea, supported by the similarity in sound between *possidet* and *Ποσειδών* (the Greek for *Neptune*) offer an interesting subtle link with Hippolytus' grandfather, Neptune, who is the master of the sea *par excellence* (cf. e.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 44f. *ὁ πόντιος / ἄναξ Ποσειδῶν*, Sen. *Phaedr.* 945 *regnator freti*). Phaedra perhaps alludes to the importance of the sea in the Euripidean play see Casali (1995)b 10f. On the importance of the sea (and the sea-imagery) in Eur. *Hipp.* see Segal (1965), Lesky (1947) 246ff. **158.** Phaedra's reference to a glorious and omnipotent Jupiter stands far apart from her two less impressive references to Jupiter earlier in her letter (cf. lines 35f, 133f.). Jupiter was associated with lightning from a very early stage, judging from the attribution to him of the adjective *Fulgur* (as early as in *CIL* XI 2.1.4172) and *Fulminator*. As the god of lightning he had a sanctuary in Campus Martius and received sacrifices on October the 7th. For artistic representations of the god holding the lightning as his attribute see *LIMC* s.v. *Zeus / Iuppiter* 8.2.56-97.

proau: here in the strict sense "great grand-father" (OLD s.v. *proauus* 1). Also see n. on *Her.* 8.47.

fulmina torta: later imitated at Stat. *Theb.* 201f.

159f. The reference to Sun is emphatic both by being placed last in the list and by occupying a whole couplet, while Minos and Jupiter share the same couplet. Similarly to Minos, his implied presence behind Venus' wrath in the mythological list at lines 53-64 now becomes explicit.

From an intertextual perspective, Phaedra's reference to Sun, the god of light, picks up the thematic polarity of concealment and revelation, darkness and light, which is fundamental in the first mythological list, especially through the allusion to Sun's revelation of Venus' adultery with Mars. Cf. also Phaedra's combined evocation of both Jupiter and Sun as witnesses of her supposed rape by Hippolytus in the Senecan play (Sen. *Phaedr.* 888-90 *te te, creator caelitem, testem inuoco, / et te, coruscum lucis aetheriae iubar, / ex cuius ortu nostra dependet domus*).

159. radiis frontem uallatus acutis: the image of the crowned Sun recalls Hippolytus' similar description at line 71 *praecincti flore capilli* (with n. ad loc.). Phaedra's reference to Sun could be seen as a remote echo of the parallel between Hippolytus and Phaethon at Eur. *Hipp.* 735-41 (on this see Segal (1979) and Curley (1999) 203ff.).

160. purpureo tepidum qui mouet axe diem: the elaborate structure supports the grand presentation of the god. It appears again at Ov. *Fast.* 3.518 *purpureum rapido qui uehit axe diem* (in respect of Lucifer), also see Ov. *Am.* 1.6.65 *iamque pruinosos molitur Lucifer axes, 1.13.2 flaua pruinoso quae uehit axe diem* (Aurora). The reference to Sun's chariot combined with the imagery of the crown in the previous line further reinforces the parallel with Hippolytus (cf. Phaedra's reference to Hippolytus' chariot-driving skills at lines 79f. Also see Virbius' (Hippolytus') similar reference to the chariot in his account of his death at Ov. *Met.* 15.521-3).

purpureus: in the sense of "bright" or "shining" it is frequent in descriptions of daylight, especially of dawn (for parallels see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.13.9f.). The adjective also has certain erotic implications, because of its usual attribution to Cupid or Venus (for a list of parallels and further bibliography see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 2.1.38). The conventional association of *purpureus* with *rubor* (cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.3.14, 2.5.34, *Tr.* 4.3.70) offers a subtle link with Hippolytus' blush at line 72 (*tinxerat ora rubor*). For adjectives in *-eus* as stylistically elevated see n. on *Her.* 4.44.

axis: a common synechdoche for chariot (see *TLL* 2.1636.66ff.), ever since Verg. *Georg.* 3.107, cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.13.2, 29, *Met.* 2.59, 4.214 (Vesper), 4. 634. For literary and artistic resources for Sun's chariot see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 2.106.

161. nobilitas sub amore iacet: an emphatic repetition of line 150 (*heu! ubi nunc fastus altaque uerba? iacent*). Hypsipyle in her letter to Jason gives voice to a similar concern about the usefulness of high birth in erotic matters (cf. *Her.* 6.113 *si te nobilitas generosasque nomina tangunt*). Propertius, on the other hand, proudly asserts love's indifference towards noble birth and social titles, cf. Prop. 1.5.23 *nec tibi nobilitas poterit succurrere amanti*. Phaedra's use of *nobilitas*, a striking Roman term, reflects the social reality of Ovid's contemporary Rome, thus contributing to the heroine's Romanization. Further on Rome's social stratification see Gelzer (1969) and Richard (1978). *nobilitas* is rare in elegy (Tib. 0, Prop. 1, Ov. *Am.* 0), in the *Her.* again at 6.113, 16.52, 17.52.

161f. That her proud parentage will necessarily provide safe grounds for Hippolytus' mercy (*miserere priorum, parce meis*) is a rather weak claim.

162. mihi si non uis parcere, parce: Phaedra seems to have her doubts about Hippolytus' feelings towards her. The verbal repetition *parcere, parce* together with the enjambement are indicative of Phaedra's emotional distress. The imperative *parce* (and *parcite*) - deriving from the ritual language of prayer to the gods (Greek *φείδεο, φείδετε*)- often appears in erotic entreaties. Its use in poetry must have been a Tibullan characteristic. For more see N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.4.21 with bibliography.

163f. Phaedra returns to her reference to the political implications of Theseus' injustices against his son at lines 121-4. But this time she brings an extraordinary reversal, as she replaces Hippolytus' exclusion from power by Theseus with her proposition of the island of Crete to her beloved. Phaedra's promises are in accordance with the *praeceptor's* advice for the unsparing use of promises in the composition of a love letter (cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.443f. *promittas facito: quid enim promittere laedit? / pollicitis diues quilibet esse potest*, also 3.461 *si bene promittent, totidem promittite uerbis* with Gibson).

163. est mihi dotalis: an echo of Dido's similar offer at Verg. *Aen.* 4.103f. *liceat Phrygio seruire marito / dotalisque tuae Tyrios permittere dextrae* with Pease. For similar offers in the *Heroides*, cf. 6.117-8 *dos tibi Lemnos erit, terra ingeniosa colenti / me quoque dotalis inter habere potes* (Hypsipyle), 7.149f. *hos potius populos in dotem, ambage remissa, / accipe et aduectas Pygmalionis opes* (Dido), 12.53f. *quam tibi tunc longe regnum dotale Creusae, 103 dotis opes ubi erant?, 199 dos ubi sit, quaeris?, 201-3 aureus ille aries uillo spectabilis alto / dos mea, quam, dicam si tibi 'redde!', neges. / dos mea tu sospes; dos est mea Graia iuentus!* (Medea) with Bessone on 199-206. Cf. also Scylla's similar offer to Minos (Ov. *Met.* 8.67f.), which in turns echoes Tarpeia's offer to Tatius (Prop. 4.4.56 and 59-62), see Tsitsiou-Chelidoni (2003) 70. The offer is also repeated by the Senecan Phaedra, 617-19 *mandata recipe sceptrā, me famulam accipe: / [te imperia regere, me decet iussa exequi] / muliebre non est regna tutari urbium.*

Phaedra, in the role of *uxor dotata*, echoes the social reality of contemporary Rome, where a dowry played a major role for a young man to get married. Her offer of her dowry, however, is invalid, since, according to the Roman marriage laws, during the marriage the dowry passed to the husband's hands, to whose hands it often remained, even after the unfortunate event of a divorce. Further on Roman practices and attitudes towards dowry see Treggiari (1991) 95-100, esp. 95-98, 323-364 (on *dos* and *uxor dotata*), also Corbett (1930) 147ff., Lee (1956) 150-2, Kaser (1959) 127ff., *idem* (1965) 251ff., Watson (1967) 57-76, Gardner (1986) 97-116, *idem* (1998) 85-92, Saller (1994) 204ff., VÉrilhac and Vial (1998) 125-208, esp. 142f. For the stock characters of *uxores dotatae* in Roman Comedy see Michaut (1920) 261-269, Duckworth (1994) 255f.

Seen within the context of gift offering as an integral part of elegiac courting (see Prop. 3.13. with Fedeli, Ov. *Ars* 2.261-86 with Janka, Bömer on *Met.* 10.243-97, esp. 10.259-66) Phaedra's extravagant offer of Crete to Hippolytus stands closer to the expensive gifts offered by the rich rival rather than to the simplicity of the gifts offered by the "poor poet" (for the elegiac condemnation of the *diues amator* see Sharrock (1991)a 43-45, Spoth (1992) 132).

For Crete as a symbol of death and deception in Eur. *Hipp.* see p.9.

Iouis insula: Phaedra picks up her earlier reference to Jupiter in connection with Europa, the head of her female ancestors (lines 55f.). Jupiter was born in Crete, where his mother, Rhea, hid him in order to save him from his father Saturnus, who ate up his children in fear of an old prophecy lest one of them would overthrow him. The story is as old as Hes. *Theog.* 453-506 with West, also cf. Call. *Hymn* 1.10ff., Ap. Rhod. 1.509, Arat. *Phaen.* 30-35 (with Kidd on 31 "the story may have come originally from Epimenides"), Verg. *Georg.* 4.149f., *Aen.* 3.104 *Creta Iouis magni medio iacet insula ponto* with Servius' extensive note ad loc., Ov. *Am.* 3.10.20 *Crete nutrito terra superba Ioue*. Further on Hellenistic playfulness regarding Zeus' exact birthplace see Schwalb in *RE* (1978) Suppl. 15 s.v. *Zeus* 1210.42ff.

Crete: Ovid always uses the Greek form *Crete*, cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.10.20, *Her.* 10.67, *Met.* 8.118, 9.668, 735, 15.541 (except *Ars* 1.298, *Fast.* 3.81 (*Cretā*) for metrical convenience). The latinized version *Creta* is widely used, ever since the archaic period (cf. e.g. Enn. *Euhem.* 52, 126, 129 Warmington, Plaut. *Merc.* 646, Verg. *Aen.* 3.104, 129, Prop. 2.28.53, Sen. *Phaedr.* 85). **165f.** Phaedra's reference to her mother's unnatural love affair with the bull picks up the reference to this story in her first mythological list (lines 75f.); however, this time Phaedra does not hesitate to emphasize Pasiphae's role as a deceiver. The couplet is replete with verbal echoes from earlier parts of the letter (cf. *flecte animos* 165 ~ *fingat...animos in mea uota* 16, *animos...tuos* 130, also *animo...meo* 24, *ferox* 165 ~ *ferocis* 79, *ferox* 82, *taurum / tauro* 165f. ~ *tauro* 56 and 57, *saeuior* 166 ~ *saeuit* 148, *truci* 166 ~ *trucem* 73).

165. flecte, ferox: On Hippolytus as hard-hearted see James (2003)b 103 n.14. On cruelty of *Amor / Venus* in general see James (2003)b 105 n.22.

corrumpere: Phaedra's use of the verb with regard to Hippolytus is rather unexpected, since *corrumpere* is usually applied with reference to the seduction of women (see *TLL* 4.1056.35ff.). Further on its use in elegy see Lyne [Verg.] *Ciris* 365.

166. mater: emphatic by position (first in the line) and by the enjambment (*corrumpere taurum / mater*).

eris tauro saeuior ipse truci?: cf. Ov. *Met.* 13.798 *saeuior indomitis eadem Galatea iuencis* with Bomer. The comparison of the hard-hearted lover with a wild beast (most often a lion) is a widespread erotic *topos*, cf. Eur. *Med.* 1341f., *Bacch.* 987-90, [Theocr.] *Id.* 23.19, Verg. 4.366f. with Pease, Catul. 60.1 with Fordyce and Catul. 64.154, *Her.* 10.1f. with Knox, Ov. *Met.* 7.32f. with Bömer originating with Hom. *Il.* 16.34ff. Phaedra's specific choice for the bull is

intentional as it offers a link with the “bull imagery” and its morbid and sexual connotations (see nn. on *Her.* 4.21f.).

167. per Venerem: Phaedra’s oath to Venus could be an ironic allusion to Hippolytus’ lethal oath in Eur. *Hipp.* (cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 611, 657-8, 1025-31, 1191). On Hippolytus’ oath in the Euripidean play see Segal (1972), Zeitlin (1985)a 89f, Goff (1990)17f.,88. For oaths near the end of the letter in the collection, see *Her.* 8.117-20, 9.159f., 10.148, 12.190-2, 13.159f.; a possible influence from Roman declamations, where the *figura iusiurandi* was particularly popular (see Bonner (1969) 153f.).

parcas, oro: a variation of the ritual *parce, precor* (see n. on *Her.* 4. 162). *orare* belongs to high register and, like *parcere*, has further liturgical connotations (see McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.6.27f.)

quae plurima mecum est: cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1 Πολλή μὲν ἐν βροτοῖσι κοῦκ ἀνώνυμος, 443 Κύπρις γὰρ οὐ φορητός, ἦν πολλή ρυῆ. For the idiomatic use of *multus / plurimus* (in Greek πολὺς) as adverbs see Palmer on *Her.* 2.32 and McKeown on *Am.* 1.15.38 with parallels.

168. A rephrasal of line 148 *qui mihi nunc saeuit, sic tibi parcat Amor!*

169-174: sic.../ sic.../ sic...: Phaedra offers to her letter an elevated and imposing closure through the emphatic triple anaphora of *sic*, which mimicks the language of religious ritual. For the ritual repetition of *sic*, which is first attested at *Catul.* 17.5-7, and appears very often in cletic hymns to invite a god to appear see Maltby on *Tib.* 1.4.1-6 with ample bibliography (for parallels of similar fourfold repetitions see Wills (1996) 408 n.40). Her extensive use of optative subjunctive further supports the sacral implications of the section (cf. *adsit* 169, *praebeat* 170, *faueant* 171, *cadat* 172, *dent* 173, *leuet* 174). Phaedra’s triple wish for Hippolytus inevitably brings to mind (nevertheless in striking contrast) the three wishes granted by Neptune to Theseus, which ultimately caused Hippolytus’ death.

Hippolytus’ portrayal as hunter is carefully constructed through a series of verbal echoes from earlier parts of the letter, but more importantly through the allusion (verbal, thematic) specifically to the “amatory hunt” motif, cf. *adsit* 169 ~ *adsit* 15, *dea* (Diana) 169 ~ *dea* (Diana) 39, *siluaque...alta* 170 ~ *siluis iugosis* 85, *siluis* 93, *feras* 170 ~ *feras* 38, *ferae* 94 and 100, *montanaque numina* 171 ~ *numine...suo* 50, *Satyri...Panis ~ Faunisque* 49, *cuspidem* 172 ~ *iaculum* 43, *hastile* 81, *uenabula* 83, *aper* 172 ~ *aper* 104, *nymphae* 173 ~ *Dryades* 49, *puellas* 173 ~ *puella* 2, *puellas* 117. Phaedra’s unrealistic wishes and her concern for Hippolytus’ safety in the woods is reminiscent of Scylla’s similar concern for the well-being of Minos at *Ov. Met.* 8.62-5. Further on this see Curley (1999) 189ff and Larmour (1990) 139.

In terms of structure, the first and third couplet through the similar openings of their hexameters (*sic tibi...*) effectively frame the second couplet.

169. secretis agilis dea saltibus: Diana’s solitary woods echo Hippolytus’ secluded meadow. *agilis dea* is unique in Latin literature. The encircling word-order effectively reflects Diana’s isolation in the remote woodland.

adsit: on its ritual implications see n. on *Her.* 4.15.

170. perdendas praebeat: the jingle as a result of the accumulation of the prepositions *per-* and *prae-* is worth mentioning.

171. Phaedra's reference to the Satyrs and the Fauni invests Hippolytus' woods with an unmistakable erotic flavour. The similarity with her erotic frenzy in the wild at lines 49f. is hard to miss and it is meant either to put Hippolytus in the same place where she is or to identify Hippolytus' hunting wandering with her erotic roaming. Oenone in her letter to Paris makes a similar reference to her pursuit by the lustful throng of the Satyrs and the Fauni, while she wandered in the woods (*Her.* 5. 135-8 *me Satyri celeres –siluis ego tecta latebam– / quaesierunt rapido, turba proterua, pede / cornigerumque caput pinu praecinctus acuta / Faunus in immensis, qua tumet Ida, iugis*). For Satyrs, Panes and Silenus as Ovid's conventional entourage of Bacchus see Green on *Ov. Fast.* 1.395-400.

172. et cadat aduersa cuspide fossus aper: the line is repeated at *Ov. Rem.* 204 *aut cadat aduersa cuspide fossus aper* among the *praeceptor's* advice for erotic remedy in hunting. *cuspis* here is a synecdoche for *uenabulum*. The killing of the boar is a rather unfortunate choice in that it picks up *aper* at line 104 and its association with Adonis' tragic death by the boar (see n. on *Her.* 4.104). *fossus aper* the *iunctura* appears only here.

montanaque numina: *numen* here denotes "the deity himself" (*OLD* s.v. *numen* 6). Further on the religious connotations of the term see Bailey (1935) and N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.4.53.

173. tibi dent Nymphae: the interposition of the concessive clause (*quamuis...diceris*) by separating *dent* from its object gives the impression that the verb is used absolutely in the sense of "offering sexual pleasure" (see on n. *Her.* 4.143). Given the meaning of the Greek *νύμφη* as "bride" (cf. Servius on *Aen.* 8.336 "*nymphae*"... "*maritae*" *dicit: nam graece sponsa νύμφη dicitur*, for parallels see Michalopoulos (2001) s.v. *nympha*) Phaedra's use of *nympha* is an implicit allusion to wedding imagery. According to Kenney on *Her.* 16.127f. Ovid alone, and only in the *Heroides*, uses *nympha* in the sense of the Greek *νύμφη* ("bride"). See *OLD* s.v. *nympha* 2, Barchiesi on *Her.* 1.27, Knox on *Her.* 5.12 and Casali on *Her.* 9.50.

173f. quamuis odisse puellas / diceris: *diceris* is an "Alexandrian footnote" (see n. on *Her.* 4.51), possibly intended to recall Hippolytus' own words at Eur. *Hipp.* 664f. *ῥλοισθε. μισῶν δ' οὔποτ' ἐμπλησθήσομαι / γυναικάς, οὐδ' εἴ φησί τίς μ' ἀεὶ λέγειν. puellas* picks up Phaedra's initial programmatic self-identification as *puella* at line 2 (*Cressa puella*) and rounds-off the letter with ring-composition.

odisse puellas: an echo of Prop. 1.1.5 *castas odisse puellas*; however, given Hippolytus' outspoken hatred for the female race (see Eur. *Hipp.* 664f. *μισῶν δ' οὔποτ' ἐμπλησθήσομαι / γυναικάς*) *odisse* should be understood in the strong sense of "hatred" and not simply "annoyance" (see Fedeli on Prop. 1.1.5 and Fraenkel (1980) 263. Further see Skutsch (1910)). For similar line-endings cf. Prop. 1.1.5 *castas odisse puellas* (with Casali (1995)b 12), *Ov. Rem.* 655 *scelus est odisse puellam*.

174. arentem quae leuet unda sitim!: a possible echo of *Αἰδῶς* watering with its river waters Hippolytus' secluded meadow (Eur. *Hipp.* 78 *Αἰδῶς δὲ ποταμίαισι κηπεύει δρόσοις*) or Phaedra's erotic infatuation to drink water from a mountain spring (Eur. *Hipp.* 208f. *πῶς ἄν*

δροσεράς ἀπὸ κρηνίδος / καθαρῶν ὑδάτων πᾶμ' ἀρυσάιμαν). On the sexual implications of water and thirst imagery see De Vito (1994) 320f.

The *iunctura arens sitis* is unique in Ovid, again only at Tib. 1.4.41 (see Maltby ad loc.) and Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 6.235, cf. also Lucr. 3.197, 6.1175 (*sitis arida*); the combination is closely associated with the widespread imagery of the intensive heat and the harsh droughts caused by the dog-star Sirius (*Canis*). For parallels see Murgatroyd and Maltby on Tib. 1.1.27f.

175. addimus...precibus lacrimas... precantis: *addimus* is a poetic plural. The emphatic repetition *precibus...precantis* underscores Phaedra's supplication.

176. iam legis, et: on the text see 282f.

lacrimas finge uedere: cf. Phaedra's own reference to her tears at Eur. *Hipp.* 245 *κατ' ὄσσων δάκρυ μοι βαίνει*. The repetition of *lacrimas* from the previous line adds further pathos. Phaedra does not conclude her letter with the – somewhat conventional in the collection – death-threat or funerary inscription (cf. *Her.* 147f., 7.191ff., 8.121f., 9.165ff., 10.151f., 11.119ff., 12.212, 14.125-30, 15.219f.), but with a reference to her tears (cf. Ariadne *Her.* 10.150). For the high frequency of *lacrimas* in the collection see Baca (1971). For feigned tears as standard means of female erotic persuasion see Tib. 1.4.71f. with Smith, 1.8.29-30 and 1.10.53-6 with Murgatroyd, Lygd. [Tib.] 3.4.75f., Prop. 3.24.26 with Fedeli, Ov. *Am.* 1.7.22 and 1.8.83f. (echoing Tib. 1.9.37f.) with McKeown, *Her.* 2.51f. with Barchiesi, *Ars* 1.659ff. (with Hollis on 661f.), 2.459f., 3.291f. with Gibson, *Rem.* 689f. with Henderson, Juv. 6.273-5, Mart. 1.33, Petr. 17.2. Also see Pichon (1966) s.vv. *flere* and *lacrimae*. Further on (fe)male tears in elegy (Ovid in particular) see James (2003)b.

Phaedra's identification of her tears with her letters is another instance of her connection of her body with the text, of her sexuality with the letter's textuality (cf. her ambiguous use of *ars* ("art of loving" or/and "art of writing") at line 25, further see pp.19f.). Phaedra's claim is not unique in the collection, since signs of physical pain (usually tears and blood) are often involved by the heroines in the actual process of writing their letter, cf. (Briseis) *Her.* 3.3f. *quascumque adspicies, lacrimae fecere lituras; / sed tamen et lacrimae pondera uocis habent* with Barchiesi, (Dido) *Her.* 7.183-6 *adspicias utinam, quae sit scribentis imago! / scribimus, et gremio Troicus ensis adest, / perque genas lacrimae strictum labuntur in ensem, / qui iam pro lacrimis sanguine tinctus erit*- combination of tears with blood, (Canace) *Her.* 11.1f. *siqua tamen caecis errabunt scripta lituris, / oblitus a dominae caede libellus erit* – blood, (Sappho) *Her.* 15.97f. *scribimus, et lacrimis oculi rorantur abortis; / aspice, quam sit in hoc multa litura loco*. Also see Prop. 4.3.3-6 *si qua tamen tibi lecturo pars oblita derit, / haec erit e lacrimis facta litura meis: / aut si qua incerto fallet te littera tractu, / signa meae dextrae iam morientis erunt*. Their tears are transformed into "a kind of carnal alphabet," as "the heroines themselves reiterate this textual physicality by explicitly linking their crying with their writing" (Spentzou (2003) 111). Hence, the female body becomes a text and the bodily fluids (tears, blood) are the ink to inscribe the message. As a result, while Hippolytus reads the letter,

he is actually holding Phaedra's body in his hands. For more on the "body / text", "living / writing" identification in the *Heroides* see Kauffman (1986) 36f., Farrell ((1998) 335f., Spentzou (2003) 111.

From an intertextual perspective, Phaedra's suggestion to Hippolytus to imagine her tears (cf. *Her.* 7.183 *adspicias utinam, quae sit scribentis imago*) becomes an ominous allusion to the disastrous outcome of their story, since Hippolytus "will find himself sharing the exact viewpoint of a spectator of the Euripidean tragedy" (Barchiesi (1993) 337f. = (2001) 108f.). On the closure of the heroines' letter being at odds with the canonical, "official" end of their stories see Spentzou (2003) 183f. In addition, the high frequency of *lacrimas* and the "tear motif" in Roman epitaphs further enhances the morbid connotations of the reference (see Lattimore (1967) 234f.).

Heroides 8

[1f.]. On the spurious character of the opening couplet and the genuineness of the titular salutation (HERMIONE ORESTAE) see p.283.

3. Pyrrhus Achillides: the lack of a formal opening salutation, which is at variance with the usual epistolary practices, suggests the urgency of the situation and Hermione's distress. Hermione is trying to suppress the identity of both the sender and the receiver in case the letter gets intercepted (see p.50); however, the striking absence of any second-person terms (with the only exception of *facis* (7) and *tibi* (8)) from the beginning of the letter (Jacobson (1974) 51) is indicative of her reluctance to address Orestes in person. Given that lines 1f. are spurious, the reader gets the impression -at least momentarily- that the letter is written by Pyrrhus, who follows the conventional letter opening formula of *aliquis alicui salutem dicit* (further on letter-opening formulas see n. on *Her.* 4.1).

Pyrrhus: Neoptolemus, the son of Achilles. The name *Pyrrhus* derives either from his tawny hair (Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 2.263 *Pyrrhus...a capillorum qualitate uocitatus est*, 469 *Pyrrhus a colore comae dictus, qui Latine burrus dicitur*) or from *Pyrrha*, which was Achilles' name, when he was hiding on the island of Scyros disguised by his mother as a girl (Hyg. *Fab.* 97 *Pyrrhus est uocitatus a patre Pyrrha*). In the letter, Ovid shows his clear preference for *Pyrrhus*, instead of *Neoptolemus* (9 times to 5), since the latter is metrically intractable in dactylic poetry. Homer uses only the form *Νεοπτόλεμος*. *Pyrrhus* appears for the first time at Theocr. 15.140, but the name must have originated already in the *Cypria* (fr. 16 Davies (= Pausan. 10.26.4) *τοῦ δὲ Ἀχιλλέως τῷ παιδί Ὅμηρος μὲν Νεοπτόλεμον ὄνομα ἐν ἀπάσῃ οἱ τίθεται τῇ ποιήσει· τὰ δὲ Κύπρια ἔπη φησὶν ὑπὸ Λυκομήδους μὲν Πύρρον, Νεοπτόλεμον δὲ ὄνομα ὑπὸ Φοίνικος αὐτῷ τεθῆναι, ὅτι Ἀχιλλεὺς ἡλικία ἔτι νέος πολεμεῖν ἤρξατο*). *Neoptolemus* is completely avoided by the Augustan poets (Bömer on *Met.* 13.155).

Achillides: the application of the patronymic contributes to the epic-like introduction of Neoptolemus through his association with the heroic valour of his father. Hermione's persistent use of patronymics (cf. *Aeacide* 7, *Pelopeius* 27, *Aeacidae* 33, *Dardanius* 42, *Tantalides* 45, *Aeacides* 55, *Tantalides* 66, *Pelopeia* 81, *Pelides* 83, *Tantalidae* 122) should be seen within the context of the "heredity theme", which plays a programmatic role in the letter. In Hermione's eyes, Neoptolemus and Orestes are the doubles of their fathers (Achilles and Agamemnon respectively); hence, they have to compete not only in strength, but also on grounds of parentage. Hermione later in her letter (lines 84-6) will return to Neoptolemus' hereditary heroic valour in order to deconstruct the father-son relationship.

Neoptolemus' association with his father in terms of heroism appears, ever since Homer (*Od.* 11.505-540). In Euripides' *Andromache*, Neoptolemus in all fourteen references to him (with the only exception of line 14 *τῷ νησιώτῃ Νεοπτολέμῳ*) is mentioned as "the son of

Achilles” (*παῖς Ἀχιλλέως*), which is a frequent title for him in Greek tragedy in general (Phillippo (1995) 358 n.14. Further on the use of patronymics (and metronymics) in Eur. *Andr.* see Phillippo (1995) *passim*, esp. 367). In Latin poetry, the patronymic *Achillides* is not found before Ovid (cf. again *Ibis* 301 with reference to Pyrrhus, the king of Epirus). The association, however, between father and son is already present in Vergil’s heroic representation of Pyrrhus during the sack of Troy, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.469-558, esp. *instat ui patria Pyrrhus* 491, also *stirpis Achilleae* 3.326, also cf. Sen. *Tro.* 252 *Pyrrhum paternus* (sc. *feruor rapit*). On the unfavourable connotations of this portrayal see nn. *Her.* 8.10 and 83-6).

animosus imagine patris: *animosus* in the sense “proud”, “noble” (*TLL* 2.88.38ff., *OLD* s.v. 2). The clause in apposition further strengthens the “father-son” association implied through the use of the patronymic *Achillides*. For adjectives in *-osus* (possibly an Ovidian innovation) see n. on *Her.* 4.85.

3f. In order to complete the sense of the couplet a direct object must be understood. Such omission contributes further to the concealment (or at least the belated mention) of the identity of the sender; a technique much favoured by Ovid in the *Her.* (cf. 6, 7, 9, 10, 17, 20, 21).

4. inclusam...tenet: the absence of a direct object for the verb (*tenet*) implies bodily absence and causes a certain unclarity (see Palmer (1898) *app. crit. ad loc.*). For grammatical uncertainty as Hermione’s strategy of self-effacement see pp.50f. The framing of the pentameter by *inclusam* and *tenet* suggests effectively a sense of confinement.

contra iusque piumque: “against any human and divine justice” (cf. *TLL* 7.684.41ff., *OLD* s.v. *pious* 1c), a legal formula, found in poetry only in Ovid (always in the same metrical position), again only at Ov. *Ars* 1.200 *stabit pro signis iusque piumque tuis* (also [Ov.] *Epic. Drus.* 24 *et quoscumque coli est iusque piumque deos*). *ius* is a term with high frequency in Ovid (see Kenney (1969) 253). For the unusual caesura *contra* || *iusque* see Platnauer (1951) 13f.

5. renui...tenerer: the verb *renuere* is extremely rare in elegy (absent in Prop., Tib. 1.5.20 (only), Ov. *Am.* 2.8.23, *Her.* 17.89 and *Met.* 8.325). Note the alliteration of *re* in the line.

tenerer: Hermione’s extensive use of verbs in passive voice throughout the letter (cf. *iungar* 36, *rumpor* 57, *credar* 81, *parata fui* 82, *orba...eram* 90, *credor* 114, *exstinguar* 121) is part of her strategy of self-victimization (for more on this see pp.57f.). The passive syntax followed by her recollection of her abduction by Neoptolemus (lines 7-10) underlines her powerlessness and establishes her image as a victim of Neoptolemus’ violence. In an attempt to win Orestes’ sympathy, Hermione relegates herself from wielder of gaze to an object of male gaze. The manipulation of the power game of vision is a strategy commonly applied by the heroines in the collection (see Lindheim (2003) 111-4, 146-7, 164-5, 223 n. 86).

6. femineae...manus: for the *iunctura*, cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 2.20.24, *Nat. Deor.* 1.99.7-8, Ov. *Her.* 6.52, 11.20. *femineus* is frequent in Latin poetry (with the exception of Lucretius and Horace,

where the adjective is absent). Adjectives in *-eus*, in use ever since the archaic period, are stylistically elevated (further see n. on *Her.* 4.14 with bibliography).

The genitive *feminae* is metrically intractable; hence the poet prefers the genitive of the adjective (*femineae*). This feature (either a development by imitation of Greek epic and tragic poetry or, more likely, a development of an inherent feature of the Latin language) is common in Latin poetry (see Knox on *Ov. Her.* 1.14 with bibliography, Austin on *Verg. Aen.* 2.543). It survives until the Christian Latin authors (Löfsted (1942) 107ff., Ernout – Thomas (1964) 44-46).

ualuere: Ovid's choice of *ualuere*, instead of the type *ualuerunt*, is dictated by metrical necessity. For Ovid's use of the two forms of the third person plural of the perfect indicative see Michalopoulos (2006) 65.

7f. Hermione's quotation of her exact words to Neoptolemus adds vividness to her letter and raises the pathos considerably. It is not by chance that the only other instance of an exact quotation of Hermione's words involves her separation from her mother (lines 80f.). In this light, her abduction by Neoptolemus reiterates Helen's abduction by Paris. Hermione's entire life revolves around abduction (either her mother's or her own). For more on this see p.50.

7. Aeacide: it picks up *Achillides* (line 3). This is the usual epic term to denote a descendant of Aeacus, Achilles (cf. *Verg. Aen.* 1.99, *Sen. Tro.* 253) or Pyrrhus (cf. *Verg. Aen.* 3.296)). Vocative in *-dē* is the usual form for patronymics in *-das (-des)* in Latin; the alternative form in *-dā* is considered to be Greek and older (see Bömer on *Met.* 8.551, Skutsch on *Enn. Ann.* 167). In Ovid, the vocative of *Aeacides* is always *Aeacide* (cf. *Her.* 3.87, *Ars* 1.691, *Met.* 11.250), except *Met.* 7.798 *Aeacidā* (under the possible influence of *Enn. Ann.* 167 Skutsch *aio te Aeacida Romanos uincere posse*), also cf. *TLL* 1.904.52ff. The use of patronymics in addresses is strictly restricted to high, poetic register, possibly under Greek influence, since the majority of such formations derive from the Greek mythological tradition (Dickey (2002) 210-12, esp. 211).

non sum sine uindice: cf. *Her.* 20.149f. *elige de uacuis quam non sibi uindicet alter; / si nescis, dominum res habet ista suum*. Hermione's allusion to the *uindicatio*-process through her playful use of the legal terminology has the air of parody (so Kenney (1969) 254ff.). On *uindex* see Palmer ad loc. For Ovid's predilection for legal terminology in general see n. on *Her.* 4.12 with bibliography. The figure of *litotes (non sum sine)* adds further emphasis by drawing attention to her claim (cf. n. on *Her.* 4. 69, on *litotes* see Hofmann (1926) 147ff., Bömer (1957) a 10, LHS 2.778f.).

8. sub domino: *dominus*, an affectionate term applied to a lover (mainly since Ovid), belongs to the private amatory language and has certain sexual connotations, cf. *Ov. Am.* 3.7.11 *et mihi blanditias dixit dominumque uocauit*, *Ars* 1.314, *Met.* 7.725, 9.466, cf. *OLD* s.v. 4b). For more on *dominus / -a* in addresses and its amatory usage see Dickey (2002) 77-101, esp. 82-85. During the Principate the term was applied equally to husband and wife (Treggiari (1991) 414,

TLL 5.1924.66ff.); hence, its application to Orestes could be seen as Hermione's first hint at their relationship in terms of marriage. Furthermore, her erotic submission to her beloved unsettles the established elegiac *topos* of the *seruitium amoris*. Further on this reversal see p.54. **puella**: Hermione's self-identification as an elegiac *puella* in the opening of her letter is clearly programmatic. *puella* is an appropriate term for a young wife (Pichon (1966) s.v., Watson (1983) 135, for more on this see n. on *Her.* 4.2.), as well as for a young girl unlucky in love (Watson (1983) 137); in the latter sense the term is very common in the *Her.*, cf. 2.63, 5.155, 10.118, 12.89f., 92, 14.65, 87, 19.7, 127, 21.122.

9f. Hermione's abduction by Neoptolemus is in accordance with the main mythological tradition, according to which Hermione, during Menelaus' absence at Troy, was betrothed (or married) to Orestes by her grandfather Tyndareus. Menelaus ignorant of his daughter's betrothal by her grandfather promised her hand to Neoptolemus. For a detailed discussion of the various mythological versions of Hermione's "double marriage" see n. on *Her.* 8.31-4. Hermione mentions her violent abduction by Pyrrhus repeatedly throughout her letter (cf. lines 18, 66, 82, 103).

9. surdior ille freto: a conventional periphrasis for the indifference of a lover; the immovability and indifference of the sea to human emotions was a well-established poetic *topos* denoting indifference and emotional detachment (cf. *Ov. Ars* 1.531 *surdas clamabat ad undas*, repeated at *Rem.* 597 *surdas clamabat ad undas* with Pinotti, *Met.* 13.804 *surdior aequoribus*, [*Ov.*] *Epiced. Drus.* 108 *ad surdas tenui uoce sonantur aquas*). On the indifference of the sea to human emotions see also Pease on *Verg. Aen.* 4.366 and Fedeli on *Prop.* 3.7.18. Very often the sea appears in combination with the proverbial deafness of the (sea) rocks (cf. *Eur. Andr.* 537 *τί με προσπίτνεις, ἄλιαν πέτραν / ἢ κύμα λιταῖς ὡς ἰκετεύων*; with Stevens, *Med.* 28-9 ... *ὡς δὲ πέτρος ἢ θαλάσσιος / κλύδων ἀκούει νοθετουμένη φίλων* with Page, *Lycophron* 1451-3 *Τί μακρὰ τλήμων εἰς ἀνηκούς πέτρας / εἰς κύμα κωφὸν ἢ νάπας δασπλητίδας / βαύζω*, *Hor. Carm.* 3.7.21-2, *Epod.* 17.54-5 with Watson, *Sen. Ag.* 539 with Tarrant, see Otto s.v. *scopulis* no. 1611, pp.313-4). For another instance, where *surdus* is attributed to the sea, cf. *Her.* 18. 211 *nec faciam surdis conuicia fluctibus ulla*. The attribution of *surdus* to lovers (cf. e.g. *Hor. Carm.* 3.7.21, *Ov. Her.* 7.27 *ad mea munera surdus*), even to Venus herself, (*Ov. Am.* 1.8. 86 *commodat in lusus numina surda Venus*) is frequent.

freto: for the poetic use of *fretum* for the sea see *TLL* 6.1.1314.66ff.

clamantem nomen Orestae: Orestes is introduced in the letter rather late. Hermione's use of a third-person periphrasis, instead of a direct address in second person, is indicative of her emotional detachment. *clamantem* is later picked up in the letter at line 80, where Hermione calls upon her departing mother (*clamabam*: "*sine me, me sine, mater abis?*"). This interesting case of *προθύστερον* makes Hermione's abduction by Neoptolemus seem a reiteration of her mother's rape by Paris.

Orestae: Heinsius' emendation to genitive in *-ae* (*Orestae*) (adopted by Showerman-Goold) remedies the rarity of the Latin genitive in *-is* (*Orestis*), which is indeed very unusual for this type of Greek name. According to Housman (1972) 827f., however, no definite conclusions can be drawn in favour of either of the two. Cf. also *Orestae* at line 115.

10. traxit inornatis...comis: Ovid has in mind perhaps Eur. *Andr.* 710, where Peleus threatens Menelaus with an imaginary account of Neoptolemus' dragging Hermione by her hair out of his palace (cf. ἐλάτῃ (sc. Neoptolemus) δι' οἴκων τήνδ' (sc. Hermione) ἐπισπάσας κόμης). Violence against one's beloved is a well-established *topos* in Roman elegy. The theme was common in New Comedy, and from there (either directly or indirectly through the Hellenistic epigram and Roman comedy) it was passed on to Augustan elegy. In particular, attacks on the hair constitute an indispensable part of quarrels between lovers (cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.7.49, 2.7.7, *Ars* 2.169-70, 451, 3.570, *Met.* 2.476-8 *dixit et aduersam prensis a fronte capillis / strauit humi pronam* with Bömer for parallels). For parallels see McKeown's introduction to *Am.* 1.7. and his note on 1.7.11f. In some cases the attack is made by the mistress against her loved one, often on the latter's request (cf. Ter. *Eun.* 859-60, Tib. 1.6.71-2, Prop. 3.8.5, see also Yardley (1976)).

Dragging someone by their hair was considered to be an act of contempt and it was normally reserved for slaves (cf. Hom. *Od.* 22.187-8, Aesch. *Suppl.* 883-4, 908-12), esp. for women in captivity (for women of Troy dragged off by their hair, cf. Eur. *IA* 790-2, *Andr.* 401-2, also Verg. *Aen.* 2.403-4 *trahebatur Priameia uirgo / crinibus*). Hair-pulling as punishment is frequent in Latin poetry, cf. e.g. Pacuv. *Antiopa* 18f. Warmington *coma / tractate per aspera saxa et humum*, Ov. *Her.* 14.83, *Met.* 2.476-8, 9.317-8 *ridentem prensamque ipsis dea saeua capillis / traxit*), and it is also very popular in tales of abduction. The verbal and thematic similarities with Hypermestra (cf. *Her.* 14.83 *abstrahor a patriis pedibus, raptamque capillis*) deserve special mention (for more details see Fulkerson (2005) 103-5). If such an act derives from an old juridical action of possession, then a further subtle link is provided with the *legis actio per manus iniunctionem* process at line 16.

Hermione's emphasis on being dragged by the hair offers an interesting parallel with her mother, who was also dragged by her hair to the Greek camp after the sack of Troy. Such depictions of Helen are frequent in Euripidean tragedy, cf. e.g. Eur. *Hel.* 116 *Μενέλαος αὐτήν ἤγ' ἐπισπάσας κόμης* with Kannicht, *Tro.* 881-2 *κομίζετ' αὐτήν τῆς μαιφονωτάτης / κόμης ἐπισπάσαντες* with Biehl). In this perspective, Ovid's Hermione appears to have read her tragedy well.

Furthermore, Neoptolemus' violent behaviour echoes his disgraceful treatment of king Priam during the sack of Troy. According to the Vergilian account, Neoptolemus showed utter disrespect and committed sacrilege by dragging king Priam by his hair and killing him on the altar (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 550-53 (...) *hoc dicens altaria ad ipsa trementem / traxit et in multo lapsantem sanguine nati, / implicuitque comam laeua, dextraque coruscum / extulit ac lateri capulo tenuis abdidit ensem*, also cf. Sen. *Tro.* 44-8 *uidi execrandum regiae caedis nefas /*

ipsasque ad aras maius admissum scelus, / Aeacius armis cum ferox, saeva manu / coma reflectens regium torta caput, /alto nefandum uulneri ferrum abdidit. Further on this see Jacobson (1974) 46 n.6.

inornatis...comis: there is a touch of irony behind Hermione's reference to her dishevelled hair at the very moment of her abduction. Repeatedly throughout the letter Hermione shows a constant concern for her physical appearance (cf. *incultae...genae* 64, *non longos etiam tunc scissa capillos* 79, *non cultus tibi cura mei* 95), thus giving away some traits of a "childlike feminine vanity" (Jacobson (1974) 53).

comis: *coma* is the most frequent term for hair in elegy, as opposed to *capillus* and *crinis*. For more details see n. on *Her.* 4.71.

11. capta Lacedaemone serua: Hermione's fear of enslavement is strikingly reminiscent of Hector's epic fears about the fate of Andromache in the unfortunate event of Troy's fall to the Greeks (Hom. *Il.* 6.450-465). Similar concerns can also be found in Greek tragedy (cf. Eur. *Andr.* 12-31, *Tro.* 614f., 658-664). In the *Heroides*, similar fears are voiced by Briseis (*Her.* 3.69-80) and Ariadne (*Her.* 10.89f.). The relegation of the elegiac *domina* to the status of a slave constitutes an ingenious play on the intersection of the established elegiac *topos* of *seruitium amoris* with the pragmatics of servitude (further see Barchiesi (1992) 26-28 on Briseis' literal and metaphoric servitude, cf. also *Catul.* 64. 160-163, *Hor. Carm.* 3.27.63).

Hermione's reference to the potential threat posed by the enemy is obviously exaggerated, since the Trojans were not conducting an aggressive war, but they were fighting to defend their country.

12. Hermione's extensive use of rhetorical questions offers a more dramatic tone to her appeal (again at lines 12, 17f., 50, 59f., 65f., 88).

Graias...nurus: *Graius* is elevated compared to the alternative form *Graecus* (see Bömer on *Met.* 7.214) and it is the form most often used in poetry. The rather prosaic *Graecus* is absent from Roman epic. For more on the use of *Graius* in Latin poetry see the bibliography cited by Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.33f. *nurus* is used in the sense of "wife" (*OLD* s.v.2). Its collective use as a synonym for *puellae* (cf. Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 2.501) is particularly favoured by Ovid, especially in combination with adjectives denoting nationality, like here (*Graias*). Helen is called *Graia puella* at *Ov. Ars* 1.54 and *Graia marita* at *Ov. Met.* 12.609.

barbara turba: despite the fact that Homer never calls the Trojans "barbarians" (nevertheless, their Carian allies are mentioned as *βαρβαροφῶνοι* (*Il.* 2.867)), *barbarus* is used by Latin poets as a synonym for *Troianus* (see Fedeli on Prop. 3.8.31, Bömer on *Met.* 14. 163-4, also Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 2.504 (...) *aut uere barbaro, id est Phrygio, quia πάς μὴ Ἑλλήν βάρβαρος nam et Homerus Phrygas barbaros appellat, et Vergilius "barbara tegmina cruru"*. *turba* typically denotes unbridled crowds (see *OLD* s.v. 2, *LSJ* s.v. II.B, Bömer on *Met.* 3.529), cf. also n. *Her.* 4.101. Further on *turba* see n. on *Her.* 4.101.

13-4. The couplet has a distinctive Greek colour through the application of Greek names (*Andromachen, Achaia, Danaus, Phrygias*), the use of Greek accusative (*Andromachen*) and the accumulation of Greek sounds (*ch, ph*). Note also the alliteration of *a, u* and *x*.

Andromachen uexauit: the comparison with Andromache is perhaps intended to recall Hermione's animosity against Andromache, as treated by Euripides in his *Andromache*. In this light, the specific reference to Andromache becomes a metaliterary allusion to the homonymous Euripidean play. The imaginary reversal of roles is ironic, since Hermione is afraid of experiencing the hardships, which she herself had imposed on Andromache in the play.

Andromachen: for Ovid's predilection for Greek accusatives see n. on *Her.* 4.55.

Achaia: Achāiā, "Greece" by synecdoche, since Prop. 2.28B.53 (cf. also Ov. *Her.* 16.187, 17.209, *Met.* 4.606, 13.325); possibly echoing the synecdochic use of Ἀχαιοί in Homer (see *TLL* 1.383.39, *OLD* s.v. 3)

Achaia uictrix: the *iunctura* appears only here in Latin poetry. On the adjectival use of nouns in *-trix* (and *-tor*) see K-S 1.232, LHS 2.157.

14. Danaus Phrygias ureret ignis opes: a "golden" line, see n. on *Her.* 4.72.

Danaus...ignis: cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.276 *uel Danaum Phrygios iaculatus puppibus ignis*. *Danai* is drawing from the epic tradition, since Δαναοί was one of the names used by Homer with reference to the Greeks (others are Ἀχαιοί, Ἀργεῖοι, (Παν) Ἕλληνες). The use of nominative, instead of genitive, is emphatic, see n. on *Her.* 8.6.

Phrygias...opes: cf. Laodamia's similar phrasing in her letter to Paris, *Her.* 13.58 *quique suo Phrygias corpore ferret opes*. The wealth of Troy was proverbial; East, in general, was considered by the Romans as a place of extravagant wealth and moral corruption. For Trojan wealth see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.33f. and 177-84 and N-H on Hor. *Carm.* 2.12.20 (esp. for the legendary fertility of Asia Minor).

15. at tu: Hermione's first address to Orestes is quite abrupt and its belated appearance in the letter is noteworthy. The use of *at tu* is common in apostrophe (e.g. in the *Heroides* again at 2.23, 14.123, 17.151, 18.37). For the various elegiac uses of *at* in apostrophe see Abel (1930) 52 n.2.

For a similar use, cf. *Her.* 14.123 *at tu, siqua piae, Lynceu, tibi cura sororis*. *at tu* is often used to introduce a conclusion, usually with an imperative (Maltby on Tib. 1.2.89-90 with parallels).

pia...cura: "dutiful concern" (cf. Yardley's (1990) 568, 560 suggestion that *pious* (and *pietas*) imply "the notion of the fulfilment of obligations"). *pia* picks up *contra iusque piūmque* at line 3. The *iunctura* seems to have been an Ovidian formation, cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.16.47 *si qua mei tamen est in te pia cura relictī* with McKeown, [Tib.] 3.17.1 *Estne tibi, Cerinthe, tuae pia cura puellae*, also *Her.* 14.123 *piae...tibi cura sororis* (hypallage). *cura* covers a wide range of meanings stretching from simple worry, anxiety, to erotic concern and care (*TLL* 4.1474.80ff., *OLD* s.v. 5c), even the beloved (La Penna (1951) 199 and Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.95f. with

bibliography). Ovid often employs *cura* to indicate marital love (for parallels see Bömer on *Met.* 6.533). For *cura* as a synonym for *amor* see N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.1.19.

16. inice non timidas in tua iura manus: another instance of Ovid's predilection for legal terminology, obviously with certain degree of technical inaccuracy (La Penna (1951) 191 n.1, Kenney (1969) 254-59, esp. 254-6, Pokrowskij (1909) 395). For lovers to impose *iura* (often combined with *leges*) on their loved ones is a conventional elegiac *topos*, see Michalopoulos on 16.322 with bibliography ad loc.). Hermione urges Orestes to claim her back by means of the *manus iniectio* procedure (*legis actio per manus iniectioem*), since the line undoubtedly echoes the legal formula used during that legal procedure: *eam ob rem tibi manum inicio*. The *legis actio per manus iniectioem* for claiming back stolen property must have been an old, pre-judicial practice with ritual characteristics, already included in the Twelve Tablets (*Lex XII tab.* 1,2, Fest. p.131.7, Gaius *Inst.* 4.21, Ulpian *Dig.* 11.7.14), but it was later abolished by Augustan legal reformation (*Lex Iulia*) (Medicus in *Das kleine Pauly* 3 (1975) s.v. *manus iniectio* 984, Kaser (1955) 152, *idem* (1959) 91f., Daube (1966) 226ff.). For the emancipation of Roman women see Gardner (1998)a 55-85 and *idem* (1986) 11ff. Generally on manumission from *patria potestas* see Lee (1956) 84f., Kaser (1965) 73, 263f. This metaphor is very frequent in Roman comedy (cf. Plaut. *Aul.* 197, *Per.* 70-71, *Truc.* 762). and was extremely popular with Ovid, cf. *Her.* 12.157f. *uix me continui quin sic laniata capillos / clamarem "meus est!" iniceremque manus* with Heinze and Daube, also *Am.* 1.4.40 *dicam "mea sunt" iniciamque manum* with McKeown, 2.5.29-30 "*quid facis?" exclamo, "quo nunc mea gaudia defers? / iniciam dominas in mea iura manus, 3.9.20 omnibus obscuras inicit* (sc. Mors) *illa manus, Ars* 1.116 *uirginibus cupidas iniciuntque manus, Rem.* 73 *publicus assertor dominis suppressa leuabo / pectora: uindicate quisque fauete suae Met.* 13.170 *iniecique manum fortemque ad fortia misi, Fast.* 4.90 *quem Venus iniecta uindicat alma manu, 6.515 iniciuntque manus puerumque reuellere pugnant* with Bömer, *Tr.* 3.7.35 *iniciet manum formae damnosa senectus, Pont.* 1.6.42 *arcuit iniecta continuitque manu, also Verg. Aen.* 10.419 *iniecere manum Parcae* (possibly echoing Call. *Epigr.* 2.5-6 *ὁ πάντων / ἀρπακτῆς Ἀϊδῆς οὐκ ἐπὶ χεῖρα βαλεῖ*, cf. Ov. *Tr.* 3.7.35 above). For further examples see Bömer on *Met.* 13.170 and *TLL* 8.360.19ff. In poetry *inicare manus* is found for the first time at Catul. 35.10 *manusque collo / ambas iniciens roget morari* (so Fedeli on Prop. 1.13.15f. *uidi ego te toto uinctum languescere collo / et flerre iniectis, Galle, diu manibus*). In Ovid *inicare* is always employed with dative, except here and at *Am.* 2.5.30 *iniciam dominas in mea iura manus*. For *ius* as "one's own right" (*de ipsis rebus*) see *TLL* 7.2.691.63ff.

17f. Hermione's peculiar employment of the cattle imagery is intended to allude to Paris, who in his early youth had retrieved his stolen cattle after killing the thieves. In his letter to Helen (*Her.* 16.359f.) Paris makes a similar use of the woman/animal analogy. Furthermore, Oenone in her letter to Paris mentions Cassandra's prophecy, where Helen is ominously called a "cow" (*Her.* 5.117f.). Further on Paris' exploitation of the animal-cow-Helen link see Michalopoulos on *Her.*

16.359f. Through this allusion to Paris Hermione manages to suggest for the first time in her letter the parallel between her abduction by Neoptolemus and her mother's by Paris and thus urge Orestes to imitate Menelaus in retrieving her. In any case, the existence of a now lost tradition in which Orestes was involved in a situation similar to that of Paris is always a possibility (Jacobson (1974) 48 n.10).

Hermione's use of an "abduction and recovery" vocabulary is persistent throughout her letter (cf. *rapiat* 17, *rapta coniuge* 18, *ademptae* 18, *repetitor* 19, *repetenda* 25, *apta rapina* 66, *redita* 72, *rapta* 73, *abducta...coniuge* 86, *ademptus* 102). Apart from the obvious similarity with her mother's rape, her emphasis can be explained in terms of the erotic idea that abduction incites jealousy. Briseis constitutes an instructive example for this conceit (cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.9.33f. *ardet in abducta Briseide magnus Achilles / dum licet, Argeas frangite, Troes, opes!, Rem. 777f. hoc et in abducta Briseide flebat Achilles, / illam Plisthenio gaudia ferre uiro*).

The couplet resounds with repetitions, cf. *rapiat* 17~ *rapta* 18, *armenta* 17~ *arma* 18, *reclusis* 17~ *eris* 18 (homoeoteleuton).

reclusis: for Ovid's use of compound verbs with *re-* see n. on *Her.* 4.51 (cf. also *reclusis* 17, *repetenda* 25, *referas* 44, *regebat* 45, *referam* 67, *reduce* 97, *requirebas* 100, *reduce* 103, *relinquo* 113).

18. arma feras: for the Romans *arma* became a by-word for epic and its elevated subject matter, because of its emphatic placement in the opening line of Vergil's *Aeneid* (*arma uirumque cano*) (see Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.13 and 13f.). Hence, its emphatic position in the line can be read as a metaliterary hint at the epic treatment of Menelaus' recuperation of his wife, namely at Homer's *Iliad*. In addition to its metaliterary connotations, the possibility of sexual implications in the use of *arma* (especially in connection with *lentus*) is strong (for the sexual undertones of *arma* in Ovid see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.9.21f. with parallels, also La Penna (1951) 209, Pichon (1966) s.v., Adams (1982) 224).

feras: on the text see p.284.

rapta coniuge: cf. *abducta uiduum coniuge flere uirum* at line 86. The parallel with her mother now becomes clearer, since in Ovid the *iunctura* is often used for Helen (cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.6 *talis ab armiferis Priameius hospes Amyclis / candida cum rapta coniuge uela dedit, Met.* 12.5-6 *postmodo cui rapta longum cum coniuge bellum / attulit in patriam*). The participle *raptus*, however, has ominous connotations, because of its association with death (cf. e.g. Verg. *Georg.* 4.456, 504 (Eurydice), Ov. *Met.* 7.249 (Persephone), Ov. *Pont.* 1.9.1, Sen. *Phaedr.* 1199, [Sen.] *Oct.* 65-6, 102, *CLE* 2.1.397.1, 2.1.473.1, 2.2.1314.4, 2.2.1349.1, cf. also Call. *Epigr.* 2.6, 41.2).

coniuge: Hermione's preference for the elevated *coniunx* (cf. Axelson (1945) 57f., Adams (1972) 252-5, Dickey (2002) 276-82, *pace* Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.4.73f. who argues that in elegy both terms are used indiscriminately), instead of the rather colloquial *uxor*, offers further support to the epic undertones of the couplet. For statistics on the frequency of *coniunx* / *uxor* in Latin poetry see N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.1.26-7 with bibliography. On *coniunx* and *coniugium* in

Roman elegy see Tränkle (1990) 56, 131f. In the Paris-Helen correspondence Helen is called *coniunx* four times (*Her.* 16.275, 374, 17.109, 118) and *uxor* only twice (*Her.* 16.174, 304).

lentus: a typical elegiac term, which programmatically appears in the opening line of the first letter of the collection (*Her.* 1.1 *Haec tua Penelope lento tibi mittit, Ulixé*). The term most often refers to the male lover denoting not only his slow response to take action (*OLD* s.v. 7), but more importantly his reluctance to be erotically involved and express his feelings (Pichon (1966) s.v.). Further on this see Barchiesi on *Her.* 1.1.

19-22. On the problematic paradosis of the text see pp.284f.

19. **repetitor**: an *hapax* in Latin literature. For nouns in *-tor* see n. on *Her.* 8.13.

ademptae: later picked up at line 102 (*is quoque, ni pro se pugnet, ademptus erit*) with reference to Hermione's deprivation of Orestes. The participle *ademptus* is a common euphemism in Latin poetry for "dead" (cf. e.g. *CLE* 1141.4 (= *CIL* 3.9418, 13895), *CLE* 1178 A.1 (= *CIL* 5 Suppl. It. 732), *CLE* 1988.36 (= *CIL* 6.37965), *Catul.* 67.20, 68.92, 101.6, *Hor. Carm.* 2.4.10, 2.9.10 with N-H, *Her.* 1.99, 9.166, 13.95, 15.115, *Met.* 11.273, 331, *Fast.* 4.852). For *ademptus* as synonym for "dead, deceased" in general see *TLL* 1.683.34ff., *OLD* s.v. *cedo* 2e.

20. **pia militiae causa puella**: an explicit allusion to *militia amoris* (see n. on *Her.* 4.6). The combination *militiae causa* appears only here in Latin poetry. For similar examples, where erotic passion instigates military action, cf. *Ov. Her.* 6.140 *quamlibet ignavis iste dabat arma dolor*, also *Am.* 1.9.43f. *impulit ignauum formosae cura puellae / iussit et in castris aera merere suis*.

foret: the substitution of *foret* for *esset* is common in Augustan poetry (*LHS* 2.394f., Sicherl (1963) 192 n.6), also line 100 *ipsa requirebas quae tua nata foret*.

puella: for the use of *puella* with reference to a married woman see n. on *Her.* 4.2 and p.8.

21. **pater ignauius...stertisset**: Menelaus is portrayed in the role of the manipulative "leno-maritus", who puts up with the promiscuity of his wife (or even profits from prostituting his wife) (on the motif see Tracy (1976)); the *lenocinium mariti* was punishable under the *lex Iulia de adulteriis* (*Ulp. Dig.* 48.5.22 (33)). For more details see pp.285f. It is from this story that the phrase *non omnibus dormio* became proverbial (*Otto* 121 s.v. *dormire* 3, no. 580). Cf. also the proverbial phrases *uigilans somniat* used for "someone who talks nonsense", "a day-dreamer" (cf. *Otto* 121 s.v. *dormire*, no. 578, *Plaut. Amph.* 697, *Capt.* 848, *Men.* 395) and *uigilans dormit* for someone stupid (cf. *Plaut. Pseud.* 386).

ignauus: "sluggish", "inert", "lazy" (*OLD* s.v. 1a, *TLL* 7.280.55f.). The adjective, which is frequent in Ovid's elegiac work (*Am.* 5 times, *Her.* 3 times), appears only once in Prop. (3.11.3) and it is absent from Tibullus. Given the military implications of *ignauus* (*TLL* 7.279.19ff.), its application could be an inverted allusion to a similar application of military terms in erotic context at *Tib.* 1.5.57f. *tecum / dum modo sim, quaeso segnis inersque uocer* with Maltby.

uidua... aula: an interesting case of enallage, in that, instead of *uiduus in aula*, the adjective is transferred to *aula* (cf. line *uiduum...uirum* 86). The *iunctura* appears only here in Latin poetry; in this sense *uiduus* is commonly attributed to *lectus* (also *torus*, *cubile* see Booth (1981) 2690f. n.25). A similar case of enallage can be found at *Her.* 9.35 (*ipsa domo uidua uotes operata pudicis / torqueor*), where -according to Casali ad loc.- through the unexpected transposition of the adjective “Ovidio sopprime volutamente ogni coloritura erotica.” I am inclined to read behind Hermione’s specific reference to the “deserted halls of Menelaus’ palace” the same emphatic strategy with Deianira. For the use of *uidua* (-us) to indicate a widow(-er) see Treggiari (1991) 498-501.

aula: *aula* in the sense of “palace” is in use since Vergil. In view of the reference to stables at line 17 (*stabulis armenta recluses*), *aula* is also a double entendre for “a pen for animals” (in this sense first at Hor. *Epod.* 1.2.66, also cf. Prop. 3.13.19, Gratt. *Cyng.* 167, Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 9.59 *ad caulas munimenta et saepta ouium. est enim Graecum nomen 'c' detracto: nam Graeci ἀύλας uocant animalium receptacula*). Note also the ominous connotations of *aula*, which is often used for the Underworld (*TLL* 2.1456.72ff., cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 2.18.31 with N-H, Fedeli on Prop. 4.11.5).

22. ut ante fuit: Paris and Helen were not married, since Helen was already married to Menelaus. Paris, however, in many occasions in his letter to Helen (either under the influence of the elegiac *topos* of referring to a love-affair in terms of marriage (see Lyne (1970) 62 with n.4 and bibliography) or simply expressing a wishful thinking) refers to their affair in terms of *coniugium* (cf. *Her.* 16. 100, 173, 275, 374). For Greek references to the Paris-Helen love-affair as *γάμος* see Michalopoulos on Ov. *Her.* 16.100.

Paridi: for the dative in *-i* see Housman (1972) 827.

23. nec tu: for Ovid’s use of *nec* before consonants see n. on *Her.* 4.69.

mille rates: one thousand was conventionally considered to be the number of ships which sailed to Troy; this poetic tradition goes at least as back as Aesch. *Ag.* 45 with Fränkel, cf. also Eur. *Andr.* 106 with Σ, *IT* 141, *Or.* 352 with Σ, [Eur.] *Rh.* 262, Lycophr. *Alex.* 210. The exact number of the fleet given in the Iliadic catalogue of ships (*Il.* 2. 484-877 with Eustathius on *line* 760) is 1.186. Thucydides (1.10.4) rounds up the number to 1200 (cf. also Hyg. *Fab.* 97). This approximation of 1.000 as a poetic convention is popular among the Romans (see Wölfflin (1896) 9.180ff., cf. Varro *RR* 2.1.26, Plaut. *Bacch.* 928, Verg. *Aen.* 2.198 with Austin, Prop. 2.26C.38, Ov. *Her.* 13.97 *inter mille rates tua sit millesima puppis*, *Met.* 12.7, 13.182, Stat. *Achil.* 1.34, Sen. *Ag.* 40, 171, 430, *Tr.* 27, 274, 370, 708, 1007, 1030, *Il. Lat.* 801).

rates: *rates* for “ships” is in use, since Enn. *Ann.* 515-6 Skutsch.

sinuosaque uela: “full of folds, recesses” (*OLD* s.v. 4), in Greek *κολπώδης*. The adjective was imported by Vergil (Verg. *Georg.* 1.244, *Aen.* 11.753) from the descriptive vocabulary of rustic Latin (Knox (1986) 96); in elegy it appears only here and at Prop. 4.1.15.

24. numeros... militis: an uncommon use of the plural *numeri* for *cohorts* (pace Palmer ad loc.), which is considered to be a feature of later Latin (Knox (1995) 11 citing Heinsius).

ipse ueni!: Hermione echoes a similar claim made by Penelope in her letter to Ulysses (cf. *Her.* 1.2 *nil mihi rescribas tu tamen: ipse ueni!*). In view of the erotic connotations of *uenire* (see Pichon (1966) s.v., Reeson on *Her.* 13.102 with bibliography) Hermione, in addition to the physical presence of Orestes, is also asking for his active co-operation in love.

25. repetenda: it picks up *repetitor* at line 19.

marito: a reminder of Orestes' marital status as "husband". Hermione throughout her letter refers both to Orestes and herself in terms of "husband" and "wife" (Orestes: *uirum* [1], *coniugi* [2], *domino* 8, *uir* 28, 29, *marito* 95, *coniunx* 101, Hermione: *coniuge* 18, *uxori* 29, *uxor* 122). By underscoring their marital association she implicitly urges Orestes to stand up and fulfil his marital obligations by claiming his wife back.

26. aspera...bella: the *iunctura* appears only here in elegy; elsewhere in Latin poetry it occurs at Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.7-8 *aspera bella / componunt*, Ov. *Fast.* 2.516 *lassabant agiles aspera bella uiros* and Mart. 8.3.14 *aspera uel paribus bella tonare modis* (a generic reference to epic poetry). Cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 1.14 *diues opum studiisque asperrima belli*. Because of the coincidence of the noun *bellum* in plural with the singular feminine of the adjective *bellus*, *bella* constitutes an ingenious pun; at least for a moment the reader gets the false impression that *bella* refers to Hermione. Despite the fact that *bellus* is rare in elegy (only once in Tib. and Ov., absent from Prop.), it is frequent in Catullus (see Ross (1969) 110f.). Moreover, given the military context of the section, the presence of *bella* (the adjective) would be appropriate, since *bellum* (the noun) was etymologically associated with *bellus* (the adjective). A number of similar puns offers sufficient support (for a detailed discussion of the "bellus-bellum" association see McKeown (1987) 53f. and *idem* on Ov. *Am.* 1.9.5f. with parallels).

caro...toro: The combination is unique in Latin poetry. Hermione opts for the Roman terms for bed (instead of the Greek loan-word *lectus*, see n. on *Her.* 4.146). *torus* as metonymy for conjugal relationship (*OLD* s.v. 5b) is an Ovidian usage (cf. e.g. *Met.* 1.353, 590, 7.91, *Fast.* 1.650, 3.463, 4.602, *Tr.* 2.346, *Pont.* 3.3.50).

27-9. Hermione introduces emphatically her principal line of argumentation, namely her double relationship with Orestes. Since the common descent from Atreus makes Orestes her husband as well as her cousin, his duty to protect and claim her back is twofold. For more details on Hermione's use of the "double relationship" theme see p.57.

Orestes' double status as "cousin and husband" is reminiscent of Briseis' emotional address to Achilles in her letter (*Her.* 3.52 *tu dominus, tu uir, tu mihi frater eras*), which ultimately recalls the archetypal passionate appeal of Andromache to Hector in the *Iliad* (cf. *Il.* 6.429-30 *Ἕκτορ ἀτὰρ σὺ μοί ἐσσι πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ / ἡδὲ κασίγνητος, σὺ δὲ μοι θαλερὸς παρακοίτης*). Nevertheless, as convincingly argued by Fedeli on Prop. 1.11.23, we should be cautious not to overemphasize the importance of the Homeric text and argue for its

exclusivity as a source. The association of Hermione with Tecmessa (Soph. *Aj.* 514-9) and Electra (Williams (1997) 124) broadens the intertextual horizon of the passage significantly offering further interesting dimensions (for more on the intertextual triplet Andromache-Briseis-Tecmessa see Wilkinson (1953) 229 and Barchiesi (1992) 29-32). Cf. also Deucalion's emotional address to Pyrrha after the flood, cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.351-55, esp. 351-3 'O soror, o coniunx, o femina sola superstes, / quam commune mihi genus et patruelis origo, / deinde torus iunxit' with Bömer on 1.351.

The close association with Briseis proves to be much more significant, since Briseis and Hermione are enslaved to father (Achilles) and son (Neoptolemus) respectively (for a detailed examination of the multiple associations between the two see the most recent intratextual reading of *Her.* 3 and 8 by Fulkerson (2005) 90-102). Hermione, however, moves a step further and manipulates her close resemblance with Briseis in order to strengthen her connection with Helen. The similarity between Hermione and Helen is better understood through the intertextual reading of the Iliadic account of the Greek embassy to Achilles. Achilles in his reply to Ulysses and the rest of the embassy (*Il.* 9.307-429) is open about his feelings for Briseis, whom she loves in exactly the same way in which Menelaus loves Helen (*Il.* 3. 338-43, esp. 341-3 (...) *ἐπεὶ ὅς τις ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐχέφρων / τὴν αὐτοῦ φιλεῖ καὶ κήδεται, ὡς καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν / ἐκ θυμοῦ φίλεον δουρικτητὴν περ εὐόσσαν*). If Briseis deserves to be loved like Helen, then Hermione, who becomes a "second Briseis" by being a captive at the hands of Neoptolemus, surely deserves a similar love.

27. quid, quod: a highly rhetorical formation of transition (K-S 2.2.277 and 2.2.498-9), which is always placed at the beginning of the line (except at Ov. *Met.* 5.528 *esse Iouis fratrem! quid, quod nec cetera desunt* with Bömer).

Pelopeius Atreus: *Pelopeius* is a rare, poetic patronymic (Verg. 1, Ov. 4, Prop. 2, Sen. 11, Stat. 4, Lucan 1). The adjective, which is mostly used for other members of the house of Pelops (cf. Prop. 3.19.20 *Pelopea domus*, 4.6.33 *Pelopeum Agamemnona*, Ov. *Tr.* 4.4.67 *Pelopeia uirgo* (Iphigeneia), Lucan 7.778 *Pelopeus Orestes*), is attributed to Atreus only here. Hermione later in the letter calls herself *Pelopeia* (81 *ne non Pelopeia credar* with n. ad loc.). On the alternation of adjective endings in *-eus* and *-eius* (mainly for reasons of metrical convenience) see Bömer on *Met.* 15.296 with examples; for patronymics in *-ius* see n. on *Her.* 4.61. *Pelopeius* is a rather unfortunate choice in that it recalls Pelops' involvement in the curse on his family (cf. Soph. *El.* 10, 502-15, 1497). According to the myth, Pelops overcame Oenomaus and carried Hippodamia off with his chariot with the help of Oenomaus' charioteer, Myrtilus. However, after his victory he did not honour his word and killed Myrtilus, who in turn placed a curse upon Pelops and his descendants (Soph. *El.* 504-515). Alternatively, the curse upon Pelops came from Thyestes, the adulterous brother of Atreus (so Aesch. *Ag.* 1584-1602, *Cho.* 1068). In any case, the possibility of ominous connotations behind the use of the patronymic should not be dismissed. For Pelops as the ancestor of the Atreids cf. e.g. Eur. *Or.* 1441, *Hel.* 386-92.

28. frater: *frater* is frequently used for *frater patruelis*, “cousin on one’s father side” (cf. Gaius *Instit.* 3.10 *fratres patruales...id est qui ex duobus fratribus progenerati sunt*, *TLL* 6.1254.83ff., 1259.58ff., *OLD* s.v. 2, also Palmer ad loc.), but such use is prosaic.

29. uir: emphatic by position, Hermione’s application of the more colloquial *uxor* (instead of *coniunx*, see *Her.* 8.18n.) is indicative of her despair and the urgency of the situation.

uxori...sorori: *uxor* is the popular elegiac term for “wife” (see Axelson (1945) 57f., Tränkle (1960) 26, Adams (1972) 249ff., Watson (1985) 431f., Fedeli on Prop. 3.20.26, Hallett (1984) 221f. with nn.10f. on the multiple etymologies of the term). The repetition *uxori-sorori* underlines the association between the terms in the wider context of Hermione’s and Orestes’ double status of relationship (cousins and husbands).

succurre: a religious *terminus technicus* meaning “to come in aid, to hasten to the assistance” (*OLD* s.v. 3), cf. Hor. *Ars* 459-60, Ov. *Her.* 17.227, *Met.* 6.209, *Fast.* 6.443, *Tr.* 1.5.35. The verb is frequent in evocations of divine help or protection (cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 9.404, Tib. 1.3.27, Prop. 2.16.13, 3.15.19, Ov. *Met.* 15.632, *Fast.* 2.469, 517, Ov. *Rem.* 77 *tu pariter uati, pariter succurre medenti* (in the same metrical position) with Pinotti).

30. instant officio: the formation occurs only here in Latin poetry, a possible double entendre, since *officium* apart from “marriage as a duty, obligation” (*OLD* s.v. 3), is frequently employed as metonymy for sexual intercourse (often in Ovid, e.g. *Am.* 1.10.46, 3.3.38, 3.7.24, also see Adams (1982) 163-4, *TLL* 9.520.30ff.). The term can also be applied to all social events and ceremonies (including marriages, so Treggiari (1991) 162) see Courtney on Juv. 2.132. For further parallels see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.10.46, and Tränkle (1960) 164.

nomina bina: “both titles”, *nomen* here in the sense of “title” (*OLD* s.v. 3).

31-4. Hermione through her reference to her “double marriage” offers a short recapitulation of the pre-letter events (in a way similar to a Euripidean prologue speech), thus throwing further light into her references to her relationship with Orestes in terms of a marriage (lines 9f. and 18). Hermione seems to have followed largely the version of her story adopted by Sophocles in his play *Hermione*, possibly through Pacuvius’ *Hermiona* (fr. 168-98 Warmington) as an intermediary (see Williams (1997) 135 n.41 with bibliography). So far as we can tell from the Σ on Hom. *Od.* 4.4 (Σοφοκλήης ἐν Ἑρμιόνη φησὶν ἔτι ἐν Τροίᾳ τυγχάνοντος Μενελάου ἐκδοθῆναι τὴν Ἑρμιόνην ὑπὸ Τυνδάρεω τῷ Ὀρέστη, κατὰ δὲ ὑπόσχεσιν ἤκοντος Νεοπτολέμου ἀφαιρεθῆναι τὸν Ὀρέστην ταύτην) and Eustathius on Hom. *Od.* 4.3 (pp. 1478.60-1479.17), according to Sophocles, Hermione was betrothed (or married) to Orestes by her grandfather Tyndareus, during Menelaus’ absence at Troy. Menelaus at Troy -in complete ignorance- promised the hand of his daughter to Neoptolemus. On his return from Troy Neoptolemus took Hermione by force from Orestes. This contradicts Orestes’ account of the story at Eur. *Andr.* 967-81 in that it was not Tyndareus, but Menelaus, who had given Hermione in marriage to him. In any case, Menelaus during the Trojan war promised Hermione to Neoptolemus, provided that the latter contributed to the sack of Troy. Accordingly, upon safe

return Neoptolemus, ignoring Orestes' protestations, claimed Hermione as his bride. This version was later followed by Verg. *Aen.* 3.327-32 (... *qui* (sc. Neoptolemus) *deinde secutus / Ledaeam Hermionen Lacedaemoniosque hymenaeos / me famulo famulamque Heleno transmisit habendam. / ast illum ereptae magno flammatus amore / coniugis et scelerum furiis agitatus Orestes / excipit incautum patriasque obtruncat ad aras*) with Servius on 330, also Apollod. *Epit.* 6.14 (καὶ μανέντος Ὀρέστου ἀρπάζει τὴν ἐκείνου γυναῖκα Ἑρμιόνην κατηγορημένην αὐτῷ πρότερον ἐν Τροίᾳ) and Hyg. *Fab.* 123 (*sed postquam audiuit* (sc. Neoptolemus) *Hermione*<n> *sponsam suam Oresti esse datam in coniugium, Lacedaemonem uenit et a Menelao sponsam suam petit. cui ille fidem suam infirmare noluit, Hermionenque ab Oreste adduxit et Neoptolemo dedit*). The Σ on *Andr.* 53 preserves a different variant, according to which Menelaus decided to marry Hermione to Orestes, despite his promises to Neoptolemus at Troy (ἄλλοι δὲ ὑπὸ Μενελάου, <ἐπεὶ> ὑποσχόμενος ἐν Ἰλίῳ τὴν Ἑρμιόνην δώσειν αὐτῷ, αὐθις ἐβούλετο <δοῦναι> Ὀρέστῃ). In his version of the story Homer (*Od.* 4.1-19) is ignorant of Hermione's marriage with Orestes, prior to her marriage with Neoptolemus. Menelaus had promised Hermione to Neoptolemus at Troy and celebrated their marriage after their safe return. In like manner, at Eur. *Or.* 1653-1657 (ἐφ' ἧς δ' ἔχεις, Ὀρέστα, φάσγανον δέρι, / γῆμαι πέπρωταί σ' Ἑρμιόνην δς δ' οἶεται / Νεοπτόλεμος γαμῆν νιν, οὐ γαμῆ ποτε) Apollo prophesies that Hermione will be the wife of Orestes, and not Neoptolemus. For a concise review of the various different versions of the story see Jacobson (1974) 45f.

This section resounds with legal terminology (cf. *auctor, tradidit, arbitrium, acti, prior in ordine*), which is devoid of any sentimental value and transforms Hermione's personal plea to her beloved into a formal legal argumentation. Hermione's use of this highly technical vocabulary is indicative of her emotional detachment. Orestes is reminded of his marital duties not so much on grounds of mutual love, but rather as a result of a series of legal commitments and obligations. Further on her application of legal terminology in her letter see p.56 with n. 377 and bibliography ad loc.

31. me tibi: the emphatic juxtaposition of *me* and *tibi* at the beginning of the line and more importantly the formation of a two-word dactyl (*mē tībī*) bring the two together.

uita...auctor et annis: *auctor* is a technical term referring to the founder of a family line (*TLL* 2.1204.30ff., Nettleship (1889) s.v. 11). Its use in poetry (*auctor (sanguinis / generis)*) is elevated and first appears in Vergil (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.49, Ov. *Am.* 1.3.8 with McKeown for parallels, *Met.* 4.640, 6.172 with Bömer, 12.558, 13.142. For *auctor* alone cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.503, Ov. *Ars* 1.326, *Met.* 13.617). *auctor* in connection with *tradidit* in the following line possibly retains some of its principal meaning as "the person responsible for a sale or transference of property" (*TLL* 1.1194.62ff., Nettleship s.v. 2c). For a similar phrasing cf. Cic. *Brut.* 129.6 *asper maledicus, genere toto paulo feruidior atque commotior, diligentia tamen et uirtute animi atque uita bonus auctor in senatu*.

32. tradidit: strongly emphasised both by the enjambment and the strong punctuation. The idea of “buying” (and “selling”) seems to have been inherent to Roman marriage; however, the purchase of the bride or the bride-price in historical times must be understood purely in symbolic terms (Treggiari (1991) 164). The dotal contract (*tabulae* or *tabulae nuptiales*) sanctioned during the wedding process and the exchange of gifts between the bride and the groom (*donatio ante nuptias*) were remnants of the financial character of the Roman marriage in the old times. The emphatic use of *tradidit* offers perhaps a further hint at another trait of the financial character of marriage, namely the mancipation procedure called *coemptio*, which often (but not necessarily always) accompanied a Roman marriage (for more on this see Corbett (1930) 78-85, McCormack (1978) and Treggiari (1991) 25-8, 168. Further on the customary and legal procedures of Roman betrothal see Corbett (1930) 1ff.). These commercial implications are in accordance with the socially accepted exchange of women as commodities between men (see Greene (1998) 94f., 104f. and Wyke (2002) 160 n.15 with bibliography). The idea is already present in the Greek world (cf. DuBois (1988) 137-9 on the association of women with coinage, with special emphasis on the exchange value of women in marital context, Patterson (1991) 48-53). For an anthropological approach to women as objects of exchange in general see Lévi-Strauss (1963). Hermione in her letter clearly perceives herself as an object of exchange between the male members of her family (further on this see pp.58f.).

32. arbitrium neptis habebat auus: “he, being my grandfather, had every power over his granddaughter”.

arbitrium: a legal term with high frequency in Ovid (see Kenney (1969) 253), which is used here in the sense of “power”, “jurisdiction” (see *TLL* 2.411.37ff., *OLD* s.v. 4).

auus: cf. line 34 ...*auus*. Ovid proves to be inattentive to this rather awkward repetition of the same word in the final metrical *sedes* of two successive hexameters (or pentameters). The same happens again at lines 37, 39 (repetition of *amor*) and at lines 112 and 114 (repetition of *manus*). Further on this Ovidian “negligence” see McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 2.2.60 with bibliography and Kenney on *Her.* 16.150-152 with bibliography.

33. Aeacidae: on the use of the patronymic see n. on *Her.* 8.7.

inscius acti: *inscius* with genitive is in use since Cicero (see LHS 2.78), possibly under Greek influence (e.g. *ἀμνήμων, ἀγνώσ, ἐπιλήσμων* with genitive, see Smyth (1963) 333); the *iunctura* appears only here.

34. An obvious anachronism, since Hermione, a Greek heroine, refers to Tyndareus in terms of a *pater familias*. In the absence of Menelaus, Tyndareus takes up the role of *paterfamilias*. The typically Roman institution of paternal power (*patria potestas*) meant that all family members were under the power of their father or the oldest male ascendant in direct male line. Further on *patria potestas* see Lee (1956) 60-2, Watson (1967) 98-100, Eyben (1996) 114-6, Saller (1986), *idem* (1994) 102-32, Frier and McGinn (2004) 189-319, also Kaser (1959) 141ff. and *idem* (1965) 256ff. *paterfamilias* was a gender-specific title designating not merely a person, but

above all a legal right (*Dig.* 50.16.195.2). It was among the responsibilities of the *paterfamilias* to decide on issues of marriage of the female members of his family (see Treggiari (1991) 15-6, *idem* (1996) 31-2, Watson (1967) 99 with n.10) or even of divorce; in the latter case, however, with much limited influence (on the power of *paterfamilias* to break up a marriage see Treggiari (1991) 445, 459-60). Nevertheless, the consent of the *paterfamilias* in the majority of cases was simply assumed, and did not constitute an indispensable prerequisite for a marriage according to Augustan legislation. A daughter retained the right to marry against the will of her father, who still had the obligation to give her a dowry (Treggiari (1991) 147). For further discussions of Roman wedding and the degree of male power see Treggiari (1982)a and bibliography in Greene (1998) 127 n.22.

plus quoque qui prior est ordine: cf. Pacuvius' *Hermiona* fr. 184 Warmington *prius data est, quam tibi dari dicta, aut quam reditum est Pergamo* (so Palmer (1898) ad loc.).

ordo here denotes "the line of descent, the genealogical line" (*TLL* 9.954.48ff., *OLD* s.v. 7). In this sense it appears again at *Ov. Am.* 3.15.5, *Met.* 11.755, 13.152.

35f. That "the love offered by the heroine also affords security for her beloved" is a recurring motif in the *Heroides* (cf. *Her.* 3.117, 4.145, 5.89, 6.147, 7.89), which perhaps can be associated (but not identified) with the motif of the "lover being under divine protection". For more details see n. on *Her.* 4.145 with bibliography.

This is an arresting couplet for its skilled structure and content. The contrast between Orestes and Neoptolemus and Hermione's predilection for Orestes effectively reflect on the caferully chosen diction and word-order. Hermione's union with Orestes receives special attention by being placed first in the hexameter, while her reference to Neoptolemus comes second in the subordinate pentameter. Similarly the dative *tibi*, which refers to Orestes, is emphatically placed at the beginning of the hexameter, compared with the dative *Pyrrho* in the pentameter, which follows merely the verb. Moreover, Hermione refers to her relationship with Neoptolemus using the verb *nubere*, which is very appropriate for marital context (*OLD* s.v. 1), but she opts for *iungere* with regard to Neoptolemus, a sexually charged verb (*TLL* 7.658.60ff.), which often bears negative connotations of subjugation (*TLL* 7.53.80ff., *OLD* s.v. 1). In addition, the active voice of *nubebam* suggests Hermione's willing co-operation in the wedding, as opposed to the passive voice of *iungar*, which implies Hermione's victimization.

A similar combination appears again at *Her.* 20.215 ("*nube, precor,*" *dicet, "cui te bona numina iungunt"*), where the two verbs appear together as part of Acontius' erotic pledge. Cydippe should marry (*nube* -Cydippe is the grammatical subject) whom the good gods have decided to join her with (*iungunt* -Cydippe is the grammatical object).

35. mea taeda: the use of torches and a torch procession was such an indispensable part of the Roman wedding ceremony (see Treggiari (1991) 166ff.) that in time *taeda* was used as metonymy for the wedding itself (cf. *Verg. Aen.* 4.18, 339 with Servius, *Catul.* 64.302, *Ov. Her.*

14.10, *Met.* 1.483, 658, 763, *Sen. Ag.* 259, *Luc.* 5.766). For more on *taeda* -as opposed to *fax*- and its religious use in ceremonies see n. on *Her.* 4.121 with bibliography.

36. Pyrrho, tu: instead of *si Pyrrho iungar* Hermione chooses *si iungar Pyrrho* in order to achieve the emphatic juxtaposition of *Pyrrho* and *tu* over the caesura. Note also the change of the metrical rhythm, as the spondees of the first half of the line turn into dactyls in the second half.

laesus: the use of *laesus* for “someone wronged in love” is particularly favoured by Ovid (cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.8.79, 2.19.8, 3.4.37, also *Prop.* 2.25.20 and Pichon (1966) s.v. *laedere*). For more on its elegiac (and Ovidian in particular) use and its legal implications see n. on *Her.* 4.114.

37-42. Hermione for a second time in her letter tries to establish a close parallel between Menelaus and Orestes on grounds of heredity. Menelaus’ image as the abandoned husband (cf. lines 19-24) is now further complemented by her additional emphasis on his love for his abducted wife. *pace* Palmer on *Her.* 4.37 who finds lines 37-40 as “four inept verses”, the section is important as Hermione grabs the opportunity to offer a more intimate portrayal of her father, and thus appeal once again to Orestes’ emotions. The change of the subjunctive *sit* at line 19 to the indicative *est* at line 41 suggests Hermione’s inner change and her resolution that Menelaus actually constitutes the perfect role model for Orestes.

37. Menelaus: this is the first reference to Menelaus by name in the letter.

nostro...amori: Hermione seems to have gained more confidence, since, after establishing her marriage with Orestes on legal grounds (cf. lines 31-4), she is now referring to her relationship with Orestes in terms of a love-affair. The almost complete absence of *amor* from Hermione’s letter (again only at line 39) is indicative of her lack of strong feelings for Orestes.

38. praepetis...dei: i.e. Love, the *iunctura praepetis...dei* appears only here. The only other instance, where the adjective *praepes* is attributed to a god(dess) is at *Cn. Matius fr.* 3.1 Courtney (*ap. Gell.* 7.6.5) *dum dat uincendi praepes Victoria palmam*. On the imagery of winged Love see Maltby (2004) 263 with n.31.

praepetis: a poetic adjective in use since Ennius, which has its origins in augural technical language. The adjective initially meant “flying onward” and it was applied to favourable omen-birds in respect of their flight (cf. *Enn. Ann.* 86 with Skutsch, Nigidius Figulus *ap. Gell.* 7.6.11 ‘*praepetes*’ *appellatas quae altius sublimiusque uolitent*) or the positions, where they alighted (cf. *Enn. Ann.* 89 Skutsch, Hyginus *ap. Gell.* 7.6.3 ‘*praepetes*’ *...aues ab auguribus appellantur, quae aut opportune praeuolant aut idoneas sedes capiunt, ibid 7.6.8 nam quoniam non ipsae tantum aues quae prosperius praeuolant, sed etiam loci quos capiunt, quod idonei felicesque sunt, ‘praepetes’ appellantur, Serv. on Verg. Aen.* 6.15 *et quidam praepetes tradunt non tantum aues dici...sed etiam locos quos capiunt, quod idonei felices sunt*. Also cf. *Enn. Ann.* 457 Skutsch *Brundisium pulcro praecinctum praepete portu*, where the adjective is used to denote a “suitable” place). Nevertheless, the sense of “success” or “propitiousness” seems to be present, even when the adjective is employed outside an augural context. In broader poetic use *praepes*

means “flying, winged”; hence, the meaning “swift, fleet”, esp. Verg. *Aen.* 3.361 with Servius, 5.254-5, 6.15 with Austin (most likely a Ciceronian loan, see Wigodsky (1972) 112-3), Sen. *Phaedr.* 1061, V.Fl. 1.578). The adjective is employed here in this latter sense (“swift, fleet”), cf. also Cic. *Marius* fr.17.9 Courtney, Cn. Matius fr. 3 Courtney (*ap. Gell.* 7.6.5), Enn. *Ann.* 397 Skutsch, Verg. *Aen.* 5.254, Ov. *Met.* 5.257, Sen. *Phoen.* 423. For a concise and informative categorisation of the various meanings of the adjective see Nettleship (1889) s.v. *praepes*. As a noun *praepes* means bird (*OLD* s.v.²). Hermione’s preoccupation with omens (cf. lines 88 and 115f.) accounts for her choice of this peculiar augural term.

39. quem...amorem: in classical Latin the relative clause often comes first, which is appropriate here in that it results in the emphatic positioning of *amorem* at the very end of the line and the framing of the whole line between *quem* and *amorem*. Furthermore, the hexameter is split into two halves, each one of which contains equal number of words. This similarity in structure perhaps depicts the similarity between Menelaus and his son-in-law.

For *amorem* (39) repeating *amori* (37) see n. on *Her.* 8.32.

concedet: for the use of the intensive prefix *con-* in compounds as a colloquial feature see n. on *Her.* 4.25. See also line 8.108.

40. exemplo...suo: cf. line 19 *fsit socer exemplo nuptae repetitor ademptaef*. The expression appears for the first time at Cic. *Dom.* 125 and is popular with Ovid (again at Ovid *Am.* 2.9.47-8, *Her.* 17.214, *Met.* 15.834, *Fast.* 3.272, *Ib.* 400). For more details about the phrase see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 2.9.47f. This is the second and last time that Hermione prompts Orestes to follow the example already given by her parents (cf. 39 *proderit exemplo mater amata suo*).

41. tu mihi...matri pater: Hermione’s careful arrangement of herself and Orestes, and of Helen and Menelaus in pairs is noteworthy.

42. Dardanius...aduena: “the Dardanian stranger”, i.e. Paris. The *iunctura* occurs only here in Latin poetry. The combination of the Greek *Dardanius* with the negative connotations of *aduena* (see below) clearly indicate Paris’ role as an outsider.

Dardanius: “Trojan” (see *TLL Onomasticon D* 46.34ff., *OLD* s.v. 2a), an epic adjective (from the Greek *Δάρδανος, Δαρδάνιος*) which is in use ever since Ennius, cf. Enn. *Ann.* 358 Skutsch, Catul. 64.367, Verg. *Aen.* 3.596, Ov. *Met.* 15.431, Luc. 2.393, Stat. *Silv.* 1.1.9, Sen. *HF.* 1165. Trojans (or even Romans) are also called *Dardanidae* (first at Verg. *Aen.* 1.560, 2.59, 72 etc., in Ovid only at *Her.* 13.79 and *Met.* 13.412) or *Dardanides* (*TLL Onomasticon D* 47.33ff.). In Greek literature *Δαρδανίδης* is a stock epithet attributed by Homer to Priam (cf. e.g. *Il.* 3.303, 7.366, 22.352); nevertheless, the adjective is also attached to other Trojans, such as Ganymede (Eur. *IA* 1049, *AP.* 12.64.4, 194.6) and Anchises (*Hom. Hymn. Ven.* 177).

Dardanus, the son of Jupiter, husband of Electra, the daughter of Pleione, was considered to be the legendary founder of Troy (see Kirk on *Il.* 2.819-20, Edwards on *Il.* 20.215-8, Gantz (1993) 557-61). The line of the Trojan royal house descended from him (see Hom. *Il.* 20.215-241, Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.1-2, Diod.Sic. 5.48.2-3, Verg. *Aen.* 7.207ff., 8.134,

Acc. trag. inc. fr. 1-4 Warmington (=Schol. Bern. on Verg. *Georg.* 1.502)). For more on the descent of the Trojan royal family see Thomas (1988) and Mynors (1990) on Verg. *Georg.* 3.35-6. In later writers there seems to have been two major mythological strands about Dardanus. The one held that Dardanus, son of Jupiter and Electra, was born in Samothrace, where from he fled and came to the mainland, later Troy, either because of Deucalion's flood (Lycoph. 72-3 with Σ) or because Iasion, his brother, was killed by Zeus' thunderbolt for having slept with Demeter (cf. Hom. *Od.* 5. 125-8, Apollod. 3.12.1). According to the other one, Dardanus, son of Corythus and Electra, born in Italy, was the brother of Iasius. The two brothers were either separated or Dardanus, after killing Iasius, left Italy and came to Phrygia, later Troy (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.167-171 with Servius, 7.207). For patronymics in *-ius* see n. on *Her.* 4.61.

aduena: Hermione, like Helen in her reply letter to Paris (cf. *Her.* 17.3f. *ausus es hospitii temeratis aduena sacris / legitimam nuptae sollicitare fidem!* with Michalopoulos), calls him an *aduena*, instead of the conventional and friendlier term *hospes* (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.26 *famosus hospes*, Prop. 2.34.7 *hospes in hospitium Menelao uenit adulter*, Ov. *Her.* 13.43f. *Dyspari Priamide, damno formose tuorum, / tam sis hostis iners, quam malus hospes eras!*, 55f., 16.129, 221, 300, 303-6, 17.10, 160, 191, *Ars.* 2.5 *Priameius hospes*, 359-373, esp. 360, 362, 369, Sen. *Tro.* 70). Her choice for *aduena*, which is rare in elegy (it appears again only at Prop. 4.1A.8), is intentional and it is aimed at portraying Paris in a bad light, given the derogative implications of the term (cf. Cic. *de Orat.* 1.249 *ne in nostra patria peregrini atque aduenaesse uideamur?*, Verg. *Ecl.* 9.2, *Aen.* 4.591 *et nostris inluserit aduena regnis?* with Pease ad loc., 12.261 (Tolumnius for Aeneas), Ov. *Met.* 3.561 (Pentheus for Bacchus), 7.39 (Medea for Jason), also see Heinze (1915) 134 n.1 (possibly modelled on Call. fr. 556 Pf. *νυμφίε Δημοφῶν, ἄδικε ξένε*), Casali on Ov. *Her.* 9.121. *aduena*, as opposed to *hospes*, which is used to denote "a guest", "a visitor who receives hospitality" (*OLD* s.v. 1), most often refers to "a stranger", emphasizing his arrival from a different country (*OLD* s.v. *aduena* 1, *pace* Kenney on *Her.* 17.10 who overstresses the earliest coincidence of the meaning of the two terms). Note the careful placement of *aduena* in the line right before *Pyrrhus*.

Ovid often exploits the fine nuances in the meaning of the two terms through their witty combination even in the same line, cf. *Her.* 13.43f. *Dyspari Priamide, damno formose tuorum, / tam sis hostis iners quam malus hospes eras*, 17.10 *qui sic intrabas, hospes an hostis eras?*, *Fast.* 2.787 *hostis ut hospes init penetralia Collatini*). Also cf. Martial's playful pun at 12.2.5 *non tamen hospes eris, nec iam potes aduena dici*, where he addresses his book upon its arrival to Rome as "no stranger nor...a newcomer" (tr. Shackleton Bailey).

Pyrrhus agit: The irony in Hermione's parallel between Neoptolemus and Paris is cutting, since the son of Achilles is now playing the role of the killer of Achilles.

43-6. Hermione employs once again the "heredity theme" and compares Orestes with Neoptolemus on grounds of their parents.

44. facta parentis: Hermione refers to Agamemnon's heroic deeds, above all his victory over Paris (cf. Hom. *Il.* 3.21-32, 349-83, 449-54). The use of the generic *parentis*, instead of *patris*, is archaic and it is possibly reminiscent of a legal use of the term (for parallels on this see Mankin on Hor. *Epod.* 3.1). *parens* in Latin is used interchangeably for both male and female parent (so Jacobson (1974) 279 on *Her.* 15.61).

45f. The chiasmic arrangement of the couplet (*Tantalides* 45... *dux erat ille ducum* 46 ~ *Achillem* 45... *hic pars militiae* 46) marks the juxtaposition of the two heroes.

45. Tantalides...Achillem: Agamemnon is emphatically placed first in the hexameter, while Achilles is put at the very end of the line. Agamemnon receives more weight through the application of his patronymic (*Tantalides*) as opposed to Achilles, who is simply mentioned by name.

Tantalides: an elevated Greek patronymic, initially found only in tragedy (Acc. *trag. inc. sed.* 19-21 Warmington (=Cic. *DND* 3.90.11)) and in Ovid (cf. *Her.* 17.54, *Fast.* 2.627, *Pont.* 4.16.26); later the patronymic is picked up by Seneca (*Th.* 657), Statius (*Theb.* 10.785) and the *Priapea* 68.11. In Latin poetry, *Tantalides* refers to members of the Atreid family in general (see Bömer on *Met.* 12.626). Its application exclusively to Agamemnon is rare (again only at Ov. *Am.* 2.8.13, *Met.* 12.626, *Fast.* 5.307). In Greek literature the patronymic *Τανταλίδης* is attributed only to Agamemnon (except Aesch. *Ag.* 1468-9 *δαῖμον, ὃς ἐμπίτνεις δώμασι καὶ διφυίοισι Τανταλίδαισιν*, where Agamemnon is joined by Menelaus). For the practice of using the patronymic in the place of the patronymic see Porphyry *Isagoge* vol. 4.1 p.5.23-6.3 *τὰ δὴ πρὸ τῶν εἰδικωτάτων ἄχρι τοῦ γενικωτάτου ἀνιόντα γένη τε λέγεται καὶ εἶδη καὶ ὑπάλληλα γένη ὡς ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων Ἀτρείδης καὶ Πελοπίδης καὶ Τανταλίδης καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον Διός*, Elias *In Porphyri Isagoge* p.70.1-4 [*Πράξις κδ*]. *Τὰ δὴ πρὸ τῶν εἰδικωτάτων ἄχρι τοῦ γενικωτάτου ἀνιόντα γένη λέγονται καὶ εἶδη καὶ ὑπάλληλα γένη, οἷον Ἀγαμέμνων Ἀτρείδης Πελοπίδης Τανταλίδης.*]

Tantalus was the great grandfather of Agamemnon (for more on the genealogy of the house of the Atreids see n. on *Her.* 8.48). The gods granted him the privilege to join them in their feasts, but he was later punished by them either for revealing to the mortals their divine secrets (cf. Eur. *Or.* 10, Diod. Sic. 4.74.2, Ov. *Am.* 2.2.43f. with McKeown, 3.7.51f., 3.12.30, *Ars* 2.605f., *Met.* 6.213 with Bömer, Sen. *Thy.* 90, Hyg. *Fab.* 82) or for stealing nectar and ambrosia (Pind. *Ol.* 60) or for murdering his son, Pelops, and serving him to the gods to test their omniscience. According to one strand of the myth, his punishment involved a huge rock hanging above his head, threatening to crush him (Archil. fr. 91.14-5 West, Alc. fr. 72, Pind. *Ol.* 1.55-64, *Isthm.* 8.11, Eur. *Or.* 5-7, 982-5, Ath. 7.281B, Lucr. 3.980-3 with Kenney). Following another version, Tantalus suffered from eternal thirst and hunger in the Underworld. Being dipped in a lake, the water receded every time he was trying to reach out to drink and the trees drew back every time he was trying to grab fruits to eat (Hom. *Od.* 11.582-92, Hor. *Serm.* 1.1.68f., *Epod.* 17.65f., Tib. 1.3.77f. with Maltby, Prop. 2.17.5f., Ov. *Am.* 2.2.43f. with

McKeown and bibliography ad loc., 3.7.51-2, *Her.* 18.181f., *Met.* 4.458f. with Bömer, 10.41f.). Further on Tantalus and his role as the forefather of the Atreids see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.211f.

The ill-starred fate of the *Tantalides* was somewhat of a *topos* in Greek tragedy, esp. in Euripidean choral odes (cf. e.g. *Eur. El.* 1175-6, *IT* 199-202, *Or.* 808-42); hence, the ominous implications of *Tantalides* should be taken into consideration.

Achillem: the accusative in *-em* has by far the best authority among the Roman poets (Housman (1972) 834f.).

46. Hermione shows her preference for Agamnenon through the careful structure of the pentameter, whose metrical division is also marked by punctuation. The line is split in two unequal halves: the first (concerning Achilles) consists of three words, whereas the second one (concerning Agamemnon) consists of four words. Agamemnon is further emphasized through the framing polyptoton *dux...ducum*.

pars militiae: a high-style poetic *iunctura*, very appropriate to the epic context of the couplet, perhaps reminiscent of Verg. *Aen.* 2.5f. *...quaeque ipse miserrima uidi / et quorum pars magna fui* (and again in *Her.* 3.46 *patriae pars ego magna meae* with Barchiesi). The metonymic use of the *pars militiae* to denote “a (fellow-)comrade, a soldier” (*TLL* 8.964.28, *OLD* s.v. *pars* 7a) first appears at Prop. 1.21.4 *pars ego sum uestrae proxima militiae* with Fedeli and bibliography ad loc. For further instances in Ovid, cf. *Met.* 5.577, 7.483, 11.216, *nec pars militiae, Telamon, sine honore recessit* 14.482, *Fast.* 2.156, *Tr.* 4.10.34.

dux...ducum: a vigorous polyptoton, outdoing the Homeric formula *ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν*, which is often attributed to Agamemnon (cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.7, 442, 2.434, 9.96, *Od.* only at 8.77, 11.397, 24.121. Cf. also *Il.* 1.280f. *εἰ δὲ σὺ καρτερός ἐσσι ... / ἀλλ' ὃ γε φέρτερός ἐστιν ἐπεὶ πλεόνεσσιν ἀνάσσει*). Agamemnon is addressed as *βασιλεύτατος* at Hom. *Il.* 9.69. The same polyptoton appears again in *Ilias Latina* 983-4 with reference to Achilles (*te primum, dux ille ducum, quem Graecia solum / pertimuit...*). For similar honorific addresses attributed to Agamemnon, cf. Cic. *Sen.* 31 *dux ille Graeciae*, Ov. *Am.* 1.9.37 *summa ducum*, *Sen. Ag.* 39 (=1007) *doctor...ducum* with Tarrant.

47. **habes:** on the text see pp.286f. Note the elision at the second short at the arsis of the first foot (*quoqu(e) habes*).

proauum: *proauus* should be understood here in the broader sense of “remote ancestor, forefather” (*OLD* s.v. 2). For similar use in the *Her.*, see 16.211 *nec proauo Stygia nostro captantur in unda / poma, necin mediis quaeritur umor aquis*, 17.51 *sed genus et proauos et regia nomina iactas*, 53 *Iuppiter ut soceri proauus tacetur et omne / Tantalidae Pelopis Tyndareique decus*.

Pelopem Pelopisque parentem: a compelling polyptoton, which is further emphasized by the alliteration of *e*, *o* and *p* (*tu quoque per proauum Pelopem Pelopisque parentem*). On Pelops see n. on *Her.* 8.27. *Pelopis parens* is a heroic periphrasis (so N-H on Hor. *Carm.* 2.13.37), which is

consistent with the epic undertones of the couplet; at the same time, Hermione avoids a reference to Tantalus by name, which would inevitably recall his hideous crimes (see n. *Her.* 8.45).

Pelops is mentioned as Tantalus' son for the first time in the *Cypria* (fr. 13 Davies): *Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος* (see also Tyrt. *Eleg.* fr. 12.7 W, Paus. 5.25.10, Nonn. *Dion.* 10.261, 20.157). For the role of Tantalus and Pelops in Eur. *Orestes* in particular see Kyriakou (1998).

48. melius: for the text see pp.287f.

ab Ioue quintus eris: Hermione is right in arguing that Orestes is fifth from Jupiter, since the male line of descent of the Tantalid house is: Jupiter > Tantalus > Pelops > Atreus > (Pleisthenes, cf. *Ov. Rem.* 778 with Henderson and Pinotti, *Hyg. Fab.* 86 and 88) > Agamemnon > Orestes. For more details on the insertion of Pleisthenes in the genealogical line between Atreus and Agamemnon see pp.287f. On the divine origin of the house of Tantalus, cf. Eur. *Or.* 4-26, 345-7: *τίνα γάρ ἔτι πάρος οἴκον ἕτερον ἢ τὸν ἀπὸ / θεογόνων γάμων, / τὸν ἀπὸ Ταντάλου, σέβασθαι με χρῆ;* Also cf. Porphyry *Isagoge* vol. 4.1 p.6.3-5 *ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν γενεαλογιῶν εἰς ἓνα ἀνάγουσι, φέρε εἰπεῖν τὸν Δία, τὴν ἀρχὴν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν γενῶν καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν οὐχ οὕτως ἔχει*, David Philol. *In Porphyrii Isagoge* p.154.2 –7 *φησὶ γάρ νόησόν μοι τὸν Δία ἀρχὴν εἶναι τοῦ γένους τῶν Τανταλιδῶν καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ κατάγεσθαι Τάνταλον, ἀπὸ Ταντάλου Πέλοπα, ἀπὸ Πέλοπος Ἀτρέα, ἀπὸ Ἀτρέως Ἀγαμέμνονα, ἀφ' οὗ Ὀρέστης. καὶ τὸν μὲν Δία ὡς μὴ γεννηθέντα ἔκ τινος πατέρα μόνον λέγομεν (πατὴρ γάρ ἐστι τῶν Τανταλιδῶν), τὸν δὲ Ὀρέστην μόνον υἱόν (υἱὸς γάρ καθὼ ἐγεννήθη, οὐκ ἐγέννησε)*, also see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.207f. and 17.53f.

Boasting of one's high birth was a feature of epic pride; at the same time, however, Hermione strikes a typically Roman tone, since nobility of descent was among the most desirable criteria for a Roman when choosing a husband for a female member of his family (Treggiari (1991) 89f., also see Bettini (1990) 422-4 on the importance of kinship for the Romans in general). Near the end of her letter Hermione does not fail to make a similar claim to her own high birth (lines 117f. with n. ad loc.). Besides, given that the comparison of titles was a motif in the declamatory exercises (Sabot (1981) 2606) Ovid's predilection for degrees of kinship (*gradi cognationis*) within the wider context of his extensive use of legal terminology could be appealing to a particular taste of his time (Bettini (1990) 424ff.).

The divine ancestry of Orestes, who comes fifth from Jupiter (*ab Ioue quintus*), offers a striking parallel with Paris. According to Helen, Paris also comes fifth from Jupiter (*Her.* 16.59f. (...) *sed qui tibi Gloria magna est / quintus, is a nostro nomine primus erit* with Michalopoulos ad loc. on Helen's intentional miscalculation). Hence, the parallel between their lovers inevitably brings forth the close similarity between mother and daughter.

49-54. Hermione remains conspicuously silent about Orestes' matricide; instead, she tries to acquit him from any possible charge. For more details on Hermione's rhetorical strategy on this issue see p.55.

49. uirtute: *uirtus* is used here in the narrow sense of “bravery, physical strength, brawn” (*OLD* s.v. 1b).

arma inuidiosa: it picks up *arma feras* at line 18 (cf. also 89 *pater arma ferebat*). The *iunctura* appears only here in Latin poetry. *inuidiosus* is common in prose, but rare in poetry. The adjective, which is absent from Tibullus and appears only three times in Prop. (2.1.73, 28.10, 2.32.46), is, nevertheless, very popular with Ovid (e.g. *Am.* 1.8.55, *Her.* 2.145, 7.120, 17.126, *Met.* 4.795, 15.234, *Fast.* 1.266, 3.434, *Pont.* 2.7.73, 3.1.87, *Ib.* 122). The adjective has two meanings (active and passive) of which the active (*TLL* 7.2.208.76ff.) seems to be the older (so Barchiesi on Ov. *Her.* 2.145 with parallels), and rarest in classical period (see Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.266). I take *inuidiosus* here in its passive meaning (“hateful, horrible, spiteful”, see *TLL* 7.2.207.32ff). For more on the twofold (active and /or passive) meaning of the adjective see Bömer’s instructive note on Ov. *Met.* 5.513. Adjectives in *-osus* deriving from abstract nouns, like *inuidiosus* (<*inuidia*), were closely associated with the *sermo plebeius*, but soon became an important feature of Latin poetic diction. Their presence in epic poetry, because of their colloquial quality, is rather restricted, with the exception of Ovid (also Lucan and Statius, both following Ovid). Further on adjectives formed in *-osus* see n. on *Her.* 4.85 with bibliography.

50. sed tibi –quid faceres?– induit illa pater: Hermione tries to transfer the responsibility from Orestes to his father (see Williams (1997) 130). His matricide was not a matter of personal choice, but the result of his obedience to his familial obligations (cf. also line 52 *non lecta est operi, sed data causa tuo*). Note Hermione’s emphasis on family ties through the emphatic placement of *pater* at the very end of the line. On the Ovidian use of parenthesis, see n. on *Her.* 4.18.

Hermione’s attempt to depict Agamnenon as the sole responsible for the terrible matricide has its roots in the much-vexed issue of double (both divine and human) responsibility of Orestes’ matricide, which is discussed in many occasions throughout Greek tragedy. Her claim that it was the dead Agamnenon who asked for revenge is surely not a new one (cf. e.g. Aesch. *Ch.* 1ff., 124ff., 479ff., 577, 925, 300, 495-99, 925, *Eum.* 598, Eur. *Or.* 579-84, *El.* 678). Such claim strikingly contrasts Orestes’ own assertion at Eur. *Or.* 285-93 that it was Apollo, and not dead Agamnenon, who instructed him to avenge the murder of his father (cf. (...) *Λοξία δὲ μέμφομαι, / ὅστις μ’ ἐπάρας ἔργον ἀνοσιώτατον, / τοῖς μὲν λόγοις ἠϋφρανε, τοῖς δ’ ἔργοισιν οὐ. / οἶμαι δὲ πατέρα τὸν ἐμόν, εἰ κατ’ ὄμματα / ἐξιστόρουν νιν, μητέρ’ εἰ κτεῖναι χρεών, / πολλὰς γενεῖου τοῦδ’ ἂν ἐκτεῖναι λιτὰς / μήποτε τεκούσης ἐς σφαγὰς ὦσαι ξίφος, / εἰ μὴτ’ ἐκεῖνος ἀναλαβεῖν ἔμελλε φῶς, / ἐγὼ θ’ ὁ τλήμων τοιάδ’ ἐκπλήσειν κακά,* also cf. Aesch. *Ch.* 269-96, 900-2, 953ff., 1029ff., *Eum.* 199-200, 202, 465-6, 579-80, Soph. *El.* 32-37, 1425, Eur. *El.* 971-81, 1190-3, 1266-7, 1301-4, *Or.* 28-30, 76, 162-4, 191-3, 276, 327-31, 416, 591-9, 955-6, 971-81). For a concise discussion of this matter (with particular reference to Aesch. *Choephoroi*) see Garvie (1986) xxxi-iv and 123f. Hermione opts for the version, which best serves her argumentation.

51. materia: in the sense of “occasion, circumstance” (see *TLL* 8.462.25ff.) it often appears in Ovid (cf. e.g. *Tr.* 3.5.21-2 *di tibi posse tuos tribuant defendere semper, / quos in materia prosperiore iuues*, 4.3.73).

fortis: the arrangement of the terms in the line around *fortis* (*materia ~ meliore, uellem ~ fuisses*) underlines Orestes’ valour.

uellem...fuisses: a synonym for *utinam* (cf. also *Ov. Am.* 1.8.27, 2.7.11, 3.11.41, *Her.* 4.68, 7.139, 15.195, 209). The omission of *ut* in final clauses which denote an “unrealized wish” was such a common syntactic feature (see K-S 2.1.713, Allen – Grenough (1903) 365f.) that soon the formation “*uellem* + subjunctive” equalled the bare optative subjunctive (Allen – Greenough (1903) 281). Later it was used adverbially as a mere synonym for *utinam* (see Bömer on *Met.* 9.735).

52. non lecta...sed data: *κατ’ ἄρσιν καὶ θέσιν*. Hermione’s main line of defence: Orestes’ matricide results from his family obligation to avenge his father’s murder. The use of passive voice is indicative of Hermione’s attempt to play down her beloved’s responsibility.

53f. Hermione’s silence over Clytemnestra’s killing is conspicuous! The same happens again at line 120.

53. implesti: the use of the syncopated form *implesti* suggests Hermione’s emotional distress.

iugulo Aegisthus aperto: “Aegisthus with his pierced throat”, the verb *aperio* means “to pierce, to cut open” (*OLD* s.v. 5), especially with regard to body parts in killing contexts (*TLL* 2.214.57ff.). I am tempted to read behind the use of *iugulo...aperto* a hint at the Greek sacrificial terms *σφάζειν / σφαγή*, which were both used in Greek tragedy to denote murder within the family of the Atreids (Casabona (1966) 155f., 175 and Loraux (1987) 13f.). The verb *σφάζειν*, which means “to slay properly by cutting the throat” of a sacrificial victim (*LSJ* s.v.1), was used specifically in the context of *sacrificial* slaughter (Zeitlin (1965) 468-9 n.13). In the *Oresteia*, in particular, every single murder (or bloodshed) is described in terms of a ritual slaughter (“corrupted sacrifice”) whether by a third party in an attempt to emphasise the innocence of the victim or the cruelty of the act, or by its perpetrator in an attempt for self-justification (so Sommerstein on Aesch. *Eum.* 102. Further on the great significance of the *sacrificial* slaughter motif in Aeschylus’ *Oresteia* see Zeitlin (1965) *passim*).

The presence of *iugulum* in killing contexts is common in Latin poetry (*TLL* 7.2.637.69ff.) and the term is often used as metonymy for slaughter (see *TLL* 7.2.638.53ff., cf. also *Lucr.* 2.317, *Ov. Met.* 13.693 *hanc non femineum iugulo dare pectus aperto*, *Sen. Dial.* 3.2.2. *seruili manu regalem aperire iugulum*, *Juv.* 4.110 *Pompeius tenui iugulos aperire susurro* with Duff (1898) “surely a quotation from tragedy”, *V. Fl.* 3.154 *iugulo uulnus molitur aperto*, *Luc.* 6.555 *erumpat iugulo qui primus aperto*. Given the ritual connotations of the slaughter, a blow on the neck is very appropriate, since this kind of blow was considered to be the sacrificial blow *par excellence* (originating in Homer, cf. *Il.* 1.447ff., 2.402ff., 7.314ff., 11.240 *τὸν δ’ ἄορι πλῆξ’ ἀύχένα* (in war context), 16.331ff., 17.520ff., 24.621ff., *Od.* 3.449-50. In Greek tragedy

cf. Eur. *Heracl.* 822, *IT* 853-4, 1459-60, *Phoen.* 1421, *Or.* 1193-4, 1349-50, 1527, 1575, 1653, *IA* 1430, 1516, 1560, 1574, 1579, *Hec.* 151-3, 565, *Herc.* 319-20, *El.* 549, *Ion* 1054. Also Ap.Rhod. 4.1601-2, Theophr. *Char.* 27.5, *LSJ* s.v. *σφαγή* II. “the throat, the spot where the victim is struck”). For good bibliography on the interpretation of Greek sacrificial rituals see Heubeck – West – Hainsworth on Hom. *Od.* 5ff.

In Greek tragedy women’s throats invite death. Female throat is not only a part of female beauty, but also the spot of female vulnerability (further see Loraux (1987) 50-2 and *ibid* 52-3 on men’s throats). Iconographic representation during the archaic and classical times abounds with examples of such sacrificial blows (cutting with knife / plunging a sword in the victim’s throat), see van Straten (1995) 103-114. For artistic representations of Orestes, in particular, plunging his knife in Aegisthus’ throat see *LIMC* s.v. 6a, 8, 9, 22. It is my contention that Hermione’s detailed reference to Aegisthus’ throat actually works as a covert allusion to Clytemnestra’s killing, since the surviving sources unanimously agree that Clytemnestra received the fatal blow on her throat (cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 592, *Choeph.* 883-4, Eur. *Or.* 291, 1235, *El.* 485, 1222-3, Hor. *Serm.* 2.3.136 *in matris iugulo ferrum tepefecit*). Moreover, at Eur. *El.* 839-42 (... τοῦ δὲ νεύοντος κάτω / ὄνυχας ἐπ’ ἄκρους στᾶς κασίγνητος σέθεν / ἐς σφονδύλους ἔπαισε, νωτιαία δὲ / ἔρρηξεν ἄρθρα...) Aegisthus was not struck in the throat, but was killed by a blow on the vertebrae. Hence, Hermione’s slip of tongue, in addition to its sacrificial implications, constitutes an implicit warning to Orestes that she is aware of his matricide. However, she will protect him by offering him her help. A further indication of Hermione’s knowledge is provided through her reactions of fear and helplessness, which echo Orestes’ mental disarray after the killing of his mother (Williams (1997) 127-9).

54. tecta cruentavit, quae pater ante tuus: Hermione seems to follow Aeschylus (Aesch. *Ch.* 877-79) and Sophocles in their treatment of the story, since the killing of Aegisthus took place in the palace, at exactly the same place where Agamemnon was killed (cf. Soph. *El.* 1491-1496, esp. 1495-6 ... χῶρει δ’ ἔνθα περ κατέκτανες / πατέρα τὸν ἀμόν, ὡς <ἄν> ἐν ταύτῳ θάνης). In Euripides, the killing takes place in the countryside (Eur. *El.* 774-853, 787-9, 802), while Clytemnestra is killed in Electra’s countryhouse (Eur. *El.* 1139-40, 1166, 1172). *tecta* is a poetic plural.

55. increpat Aeacides: Ovid perhaps has in mind Eur. *Andr.* 977f. δ δ’ (sc. Neoptolemus) ἦν ὑβριστῆς εἷς τ’ ἐμῆς μητρὸς φόνον / τάς θ’ αἱματωποῦς θεᾶς ὄνειδίζων ἐμοί (sc. Orestes). *increpare* (“reproach”, “reprimand”) is a fitting choice for its legal colouring (cf. *TLL* 7.1.1055.59ff.), its use without an object as complement is rare in classical Latin (only Lucr. 3.963, Liv. 27.9.8, Sil. 10.6) and more frequent in later Latin. For the patronymic *Aeacides* see n. on *Her.* 8.7.

56. et tamen: an adversative expression, often at the beginning of a line (or a period) (K-S 2.2.98, LHS 2.495-97, Marouzeau (1949) 94ff.). The expression is used here in the sense of “and yet”, “not only that, but...” and establishes an additive (cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.505, *Fast.* 3.79 with Bömer, 4.699) rather than in a concessive relationship with the preceding clause, which seems to have been a later use of *tamen* (see LHS 2.496 β).

aspectus sustinet ille meos: “and yet he does it in front of my very face”, the combination appears only here.

57f. Hermione’s symptomatology of anger against Neoptolemus’ insulting behaviour echoes Sappho’s (fr. 31 L-P) renowned jealousy at the sight of her beloved (in the company of a rival), and of its Roman poetic adaptations (cf. Catul. 51, esp. Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.4 *difficili bile tumet iecur*, 5-6 *nec mens... / manet...et in genas*, 8-9 *lentis penitus macerer ignibus. / uror*). But, while in Sappho’s case her feelings of jealousy and envy are instigated by the presence of her beloved, Hermione’s anger is caused by the absence of Orestes. Hermione manipulates the verbal similarity in order to stress the reversal in terms of the presence / absence of her beloved, and thus further underline her erotic feelings for Orestes.

57. rumpor: emphatic by position, *rumpor* is a strong verb denoting indignation (again at *Her.* 16.223 *rumpor et invidia* with Michalopoulos). Perhaps it alludes to the proverbial expression *rumpor invidia* (Otto (1962) s.v. *rumpere* p.303 no. 1558). The expression is attested mostly in non-elevated contexts (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 7.26 *invidia rumpantur ut ilia Codro*, Catul. 11.20, Mart. 9.97.1 *rumpitur invidia*, Calp. *Ecl.* 6.80, Prop. 1.8b.27 *rumpantur iniqui!*) and is very likely to have originated in the Aesopian fable of the frog versus the ox (see Otto above, also cf. Hor. *Serm.* 2.3.314, *Phaedr.* 1.24).

ora...cum mente tumescent: for similar wording, cf. Sen. *Dial.* 4.20.3.1 *ne cibus quidem inplendi sunt; distendentur enim corpora et animi cum corpore tumescent*, Ov. *Met.* 6.377 *inflataque colla tumescent* (also Sen. *Dial.* 4.35.3.8 *tumescunt uenae* (as a symptom of anger).

58. pectoraque inclusis ignibus usta: the correspondence between content and word-order is remarkable in that the framing of the ablatives *inclusis ignis* by *pectoraque...usta* effectively reveals the burning of the erotic flames in Hermione’s breast. For similar phrasing, cf. Cic. *Pis.* 42.11. *pectoraque inclusis ignibus*, Ov. *Met.* 6.466 *nec capiunt inclusas pectora flammis* (for erotic passion). The *iunctura pectora...usta* appears again at Ov. *Met.* 7.109-10 *pectora sic intus clausas uoluentia flammis / gutturaque usta sonant*. The fire imagery, in addition to its well-known erotic implications (see n. on *Her.* 4.19f.), is also employed to denote anger, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.356 *...toto percepit pectore flammam* → frenzy, rage, madness, *Met.* 7.109 *pectora sic intus clausas uoluentia flammis*, 8.356 *spirat quoque pectore flamma*, 12.295, Petr. *Sat.* 121.1.105-6 *nec enim minor ira rebellat pectore in hoc leviorque exurit flamma medullas*, Sen. *Ag.* 723 *extingue flammis pectori infixas meo*, [Sen.] *HO* 275-6, Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.197 *at iuuenis magno flammatus pectora luctu*. The combination of love with anger is very fitting in Hermione’s case, since she is an enraged woman in love.

59. Hermione...Orestae?: one of the many rhetorical questions in the letter (see n. on *Her.* 8.11f.). With regard to the alternatives *Oresti* or *Orestae*, I prefer the latter following Showerman-Gould. For the difficulty to decipher with certainty between the dative in *-i* and *-ae* see Housman (1972) 828f. The framing of the line by the names of the two lovers is noteworthy. **coram:** the prepositional use of *coram* is rare in Augustan poetry (LHS 2.259, *TLL* 4.945.35ff.), cf. *Verg. Aen.* 2.538, *Hor. Epist.* 1.17.43, *Serm.* 1.4.95, *Tib.* 1.2.21, *Ov. Her.* 11.89. The postponement of disyllabic (and trisyllabic) prepositions is a common poetic feature (see K-S 1.586f., Norden on *Verg. Aen.* 6.329, Platnauer (1951) 97ff., Maltby (1999) 384f. with n. 16 with bibliography). In Tibullus, in particular, the postponement of *circum*, *praeter*, *propter* and *coram* is the rule (Maltby on *Tib.* 1.1.23-4 and 2.1.73-4).

Hermione's emphasis on face-to-face encounters in her letter (again at line 97 *obuia prodieram*) is indicative of her straightforward character and of her determination for a head-on approach to the problems.

obiecit: another instance of a term with legal connotations (*TLL* 9.2.56.26ff., 9.2.58.68ff.).

60. nec mihi sunt uires: despite her determination in the hexameter, Hermione maintains her initial reference to her female powerlessness at line 6 *cetera femineae non ualuere manus*.

ferus ensis: *ferus* is attributed to arms ever since Ennius, cf. *Enn. Ann.* 183-4 *fero...ferro*, also *Lucret.* 2.49 *fera tela* (see *TLL* 6.606.5ff.). *ferus ensis* seems to be an Ovidian formation, cf. *Ov. Met.* 6.557 *ense fero*, 13.343 *perque feros enses*, *Pont.* 4.7.44 *fero...ense*, *Sen. Ag.* 208 *ense...fero*, also *Am.* 1.10.19, 2.6.25 with McKeown, *Ars* 2.672, *Her.* 19.115.

61-4. Jacobson (1974) 51 finds these lines "a rather self-indulgent rehearsal of her plight." Nevertheless, in this section Hermione grabs the opportunity to raise the sentimentality of her letter more, while at the same time she depicts herself as a powerless victim in desperate need of rescue from her beloved.

61. flere licet certe: Hermione's reference to her tears is in accordance with the technique of (simulated) tears, which constitutes an indispensable component of erotic persuasion. The *praeceptor amoris* in the *Ars* strongly advises his pupils (both male and female) to employ such technique (cf. *Ov. Ars* 1.659-62 with Hollis, 2.459f., 3.291f. with Gibson). For more details on this matter see n. on *Her.* 4.176 with bibliography. The motif of (false) tears plays a prominent role in the *Heroides*, cf. esp. *Her.* 2.51f. *credidimus lacrimis -an et hae simulare docentur?- / hae quoque habent artes, quaque iubentur, eunt?*, 12.51f. *uidi etiam lacrimas -sua pars et fraudis in illis. / sic cito sum verbis capta puella tuis*). On the intersection of sexuality with textuality through tears in the collection also see n. on *Her.* 4.176.

diffundimus: a poetic plural (less common with verbs compared to pronouns) with a strong emotional effect, which is dictated here by reasons of metrical convenience (further on poetic plurals see n. on *Her.* 4.15).

certe: meaning “at least”, “at all events”, “in any case” (*OLD* s.v. 2a, *TLL* 3.935.1ff.); in this sense *certe* is frequent in Ovid, esp. in the *Met.* (cf. 8.99, 10.400, 488, 11.321, 441, 478, 12.540, 13.387, 502).

62. fluminis instar: the formation originates in Germ. *Arat.* 48-9 *has inter medias abrupti fluminis instar / immanis Serpens sinuosa uolumina torquet* (translating *Arat. Phaenom.* 45 *Τὰς δὲ δι' ἀμφοτέρας οἷη ποταμοῖο ἀπορρῶξ / εἰλεῖται, μέγα θαῦμα, Δράκων...*), later imitated by Sen. *Thy.* 870 *fluminis instar lubricus Anguis.* and Apul. *Plat.* 1.6.21-5 *secundae substantiae (...), quae mutari et conuerti possunt, labentia et ad instar fluminum profuga.* Cf. also Verg. *Georg.* 1.245 *in morem fluminis* with Servius ad loc. quoting Hesiod fr. 293 *ποταμῶι ρείοντι εἰοικῶς* M-W (in his description of the Snake - constellation). For tears as convergent streams of a river, cf. Eur. *Or.* 335-6 ... *ῶ δάκρυα / δάκρυσι συμβάλλει / πορεύων τις ἐς δόμον ἀλαστόρων* (the Schol. ad loc. quotes *Il.* 4.453, also cf. *Il.* 5.774). Further on the association of tears with rivers (most often river-streams swollen by someone's tears) see Ov. *Met.* 11.47-8 *lacrimis quoque flumina dicunt / increvisse suis* with Bömer. A cognate simile is that of tears likened to water dripping from melting snow (see *Am.* 1.7.57-8 *suspensaeque diu lacrimae fluxere per ora, / qualiter abiecta de niue manat aqua* with McKeown with parallels.)

63. semper semperque: the repetition underlines the sense of continuing failure and misery in Hermione's life.

solas (sc. *lacrimas*) **habeo:** *habere lacrimas* is a rare combination in Latin literature (again only in [Ov.] *Epic. Drus.* 72, Sen. *Thy.* 968, Stat. *Theb.* 5.594, Petr. *Satyr.* 89.1.17, Apul. *Met.* 8.7.2) and in Augustan poetry in particular, where it occurs only once more at Ov. *Tr.* 1.3.24 *inque domo lacrimas angulus omnis habet.* The adjective *solas* underlines Hermione's isolation and her abandonment by Orestes. In *Her.* 10 the adjective *sola* plays a central role in epitomizing Ariadne's solitary abandonment by Theseus (for more on this see Bolton (1994)).

64. ument incultae fonte perenne genae: the phrasing is reminiscent of the description of Lucretia's grief at Ov. *Fast.* 2.820 *fluunt lacrimae more perennis aquae.* Hermione later in her letter will make another implicit allusion to her (see n. on *Her.* 8.109). Lucretia, the chaste wife *par excellence* of the Romans, offers a fitting parallel for Hermione, since both are examples of wronged wives, violently separated from their husbands and dishonoured in their absence. The framing of *fonte perenne* by *incultae...genae* is worth mentioning.

ument...genae: stylistically elevated, it first appears in Augustan poetry (absent from Prop., only once in Tib. 1.9.38 *umentes...genas*) and in Livy *ap. Sen. Suas.* 6.17. For similar phrasing see Tib. 1.9.37 *umentes...genas* with Murgatroyd, Ov. *Am.* 1.14.34 with McKeown (also cf. 2.15.17 *umida formosae...ora puellae*), *Her.* 5.72 *madidas genas*, 7.185 *perque genas...lacrimae...labuntur*, *Ars* 1.660, 2.70, 3.378, *Met.* 8.210 *genae maduere seniles.* Lucan 5.737 *umentis miratas genas* (also 2.36-7 *madentis /...genas*), Sil. 9.30 *oculos atque ora umentia.*

incultae...genae: the adjective appears again in the *Heroides* only at *Her.* 9.125. The neglected appearance is appropriate to a captive, cf. *Her.* 9.125 *nec uenit incultis captarum more capillis*. On Hermione's concern for her physical appearance see n. on *Her.* 8.10. *genae* here refers to cheeks (*OLD* s.v.1, *TLL* 6.1763.81ff.) and not to the eyes (a later use, more common in post-Augustan poetry, see *TLL* s.v. 6.1767.63ff., *OLD* s.v. 2.).

fonte perenne: a popular *iunctura* (both in poetry and prose), it first occurs (also in a simile) at *Liv.* 42.12.10.3 *iuentutem, ut iam Macedonia deficiat, uelut ex perenni fonte unde hauriat, Threiciam subiectam esse*. Cf. also *Cic. Mil.* 34.22 *fontem perennem gloriae suae perdidit*, *Nat. Deor.* 2.98.8 *fontium gelidas perennitates*, *Ov. Am.* 3.9.25-6 *adice Maeoniden, a quo ceu fonte perenni / uatum Pieriis ora rigantur aquis* (in a simile), *Rem.* 651-2 *flumine perpetuo torrens solet altior ire, / sed tamen haec breuis est, illa perennis aqua*, *Hirt. Gal.* 8.43.5 *repente perennis exaruit fons*, *Apul. De Mundo* 4 *haec fontium perennitate recreatur*, *Min. Fel.* 17.9 *uide fons, manant uenis perennibus*, *Curt.* 6.6.23 *rupes perennem habet fontem*.

perennis is an adjective frequently applied to waters, springs, rivers, ever since Ennius' *Scipio* 4 Warmington *amnes perennes* (*OLD* s.v. 1, also add *Liv.* 1.21.3 *ex opaco specu fons perenni rogabat aqua*, 4.30.7.3 *sed terra quoque ingenito umore egens uix ad perennes suffecit amnes*, 42.54.11.3 *...et copia pluribus circumiectis fontibus perennium aquarum*, *Lucret.* 5.261-3 *quod super est, umore novo mare flumina fontes / semper abundare et latices manare perennis / nil opus est verbis...*, 5.463 *fluuiique perennes*, *Prop.* 3.5.30 *perennis aqua*, *Ov. Am.* 3.6.98 *quis dixit grata voce "perennis eas"* (address to a river), *Fast.* 3.298 *manabat saxo uena perennis aquae* with Bömer, 3.654 *amne perenne*). *fons perennis* or *uiuus* was the technical term for the everflowing water, which was used as a means of purification by the Romans (For more on such religious practices see Bömer on *Fast.* 2.35 with bibliography and parallels). These connotations of purification are not that haphazard in view of Hermione's reference to her relationship with Neoptolemus in terms of pollution (*nefas* 113, *pollutas...manus* 114). The substitution of the ablative ending *-e* in *perenne* for the usual in classical Latin ending in *-i* is dictated by reasons of metrical convenience (a frequent phenomenon in Ovid).

65-82. Hermione's sole list of mythological *exempla* in the letter. For a detailed examination of the list in terms of structure, content and rhetorical function see pp.98ff.

65f. The introduction of mythological *exempla* with a rhetorical question is not uncommon in Ovid (cf. e.g. *Ov. Ars* 1.475, 2.185). The idea that guilt, or some sort of inclination to crime (or injustice) is hereditary is very frequent in Ovid (cf. *Her.* 4.53f., 9.153ff., 14.85ff., *Met.* 1.162, cf. also *Cic. Tusc.* 4.77 *ut facile appareat Atrai filios esse*, *Sen. Ag.* 906ff. with Tarrant). Hermione's claim that all Tantalid women share the common fate of rape plays a prominent role in her argumentation; in fact, the list of mythological *exempla*, which is employed to illustrate this claim, is rounded off with a similar reference to her generation (lines 81f.). This idea of inescapability from fate is later picked up by Seneca (cf. *Sen. Ag.* 906 *uterque tanto scelere*

respondet suis: / est hic Thyestae natus, haec Helenae soror, Phaedr. 698 et ipsa nostrae fata cognosco domus).

65. nostros errat in annos: the construction *in* + ‘a time term’ is rather colloquial and it is more frequent in post-classical times (cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.19.23 with McKeown, *Ars* 3.127 *nostros mansit in annos*, *Met.* 1.411, *Fast.* 6.309 *uenit in hoc annos*, *Tr.* 1.5.59 *ille breui spatio multis errauit in annis*, 4.10.73 *seros permansit in annos*). The preposition *in* is used here temporally to denote “duration”, “length of time” (*TLL* 2.117.25ff., 7.752.33ff., 7.1.754.1ff.). *errare* echoes perhaps the wandering of female characters before being raped (see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.10.5). For *errare* in the sense “to be erroneous” see Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.468.

66. Tantalides matres: the *iunctura* is popular with Seneca, cf. *Ag.* 375 *Tantalidos...matris*, *Med.* 954, *Oed.* 613f., *HF* 390. *Tantalidis* is a Greek formation (cf. e.g. *AP.* Theodoridas 16.132.2, *AP.* Antipater of Sidon 7.743.7-8, 16.131.1, *AP.* Meleager 16.134.1). Feminine derivatives in *-is* are popular with Ovid, possibly under Callimachean influence (so Bömer on *Met.* 5.303 with copious Ovidian instances). *pace* Jacobson (1978) 54 n.18 and Knox (1995) 10 the attribution of *Tantalides* to Hermione’s female ancestors is fitting, since the patronymic is used *ἐκ τοῦ ἀποτελέσματος*. All these women are not Tantalids by origin; instead, they become members of the Tantalid house through their abduction by a male descendant of Tantalus (further on this see p.100). Such adjectival use in prolepsis was frequent in Greek (dramatic) poetry, while it is not uncommon in Latin poetry (see K-S 2.1.239f., also K-G 2.276).

matres: for the appropriateness of *matres* with regard to the women mentioned in the list, despite Palmer’s (1898) ad loc. objection, see my discussion at p.100. The generic use of *matres* meaning “matrons”, “married women” goes back to Vergil (see Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 2.501, Barchiesi on *Her.* 1.71, also cf. *OLD* s.v. 1c, *LSJ* s.v. *mater* I.B. “also, in general, a woman, a lady; usually in plural, women, ladies.”); the term in this sense often occurs in the *Her.*: 3.71 *inter Achaeiadas longe pulcherrima matres*, 13.35 *matres Phylaceides*, 15.54 *Nisiades matres*, 16.185 *Troades...matres*. Moreover, *matres* is metrically convenient as opposed to the equivalent *feminae* (cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 2.797, 6.306).

Given the use of the term specifically for “mothers”, its attribution to Hermione is meaningful in view of a -rather obscure- branch of the mythological tradition. According to the tragedians Philocles and Theognis (*TrGF* 1.24 F2, 28F 2) (Σ on *Andr.* 32: *Φιλοκλήης δὲ ὁ τραγωδοποιὸς καὶ Θεόγνις προεκδοθῆναι φασιν ὑπὸ Τυνδάρεω τὴν Ἑρμιόνην τῷ Ὀρέστῃ καὶ ἤδη ἐγκυμονοῦσαν ὑπὸ Μενελάου δοθῆναι Νεοπτολέμῳ καὶ γεννῆσαι Ἄμφικτυόνα ὕστερον δὲ Διομήδει συνοικῆσαι) Hermione was betrothed to Orestes by Tyndareus and she was already pregnant by Orestes, before her father married her with Neoptolemus. If such implications are perceptible here, Hermione’s use of *matres* could be an interesting slip of tongue implicitly hinting at her pregnancy.*

apta rapina: the isolating effect of the singular *apta rapina* which is encircled by plurals (*matres*, *sumus*) calls for attention. *rapina* is used here in the concrete sense of ‘booty’ of sexual

abduction (OLD s.v. 2). Contrary to the admonition of the *praeceptor amoris* in the *Ars amatoria* that erotic violence is not always unwelcome by women (*Ars* 1.673-5 *uim licet appelles: grata est uis ista puellis: / quod iuvat, inuitae saepe dedisse volunt. / quaecumque est Veneris subita uiolata rapina, / gaudet, et improbitas muneris instar habet*) Hermione speaks with contempt about her fate as *rapina*. The term is attributed to Helen again at *Ov. Ars* 3.759f. *Priamides Helenen auide si spectet edentem, / oderit et dicat 'stulta rapina mea est.'*, also *Stat. Achil.* 1.403, 946.

67. fluminei...cycni: *flumineus* (picking up line 62 *fluminis instar*) is a rare poetic adjective (it occurs only nine times, never in prose), stylistically elevated, like most adjectives in *-eus* (see n. on *Her.* 4.44), possibly an Ovidian coinage (*TLL* 6.968.26ff.). The adjective is attributed by Ovid to swans again at *Ov. Am.* 1.3.22 and *Met.* 2.253.

According to Hyginus, the river where the abduction of Leda took place, was river Eurotas (cf. *Hyg.* 77 *Iuppiter Ledam Thestii filiam in cygnum conuersus ad flumen Eurotam compressit*, also *AP* Antiphilus 5.307.1 *Χεῦμα μὲν Εὐρώταο Λακωνικόν*). The association of swans with rivers is a widespread poetic *topos*, ever since Homer (cf. *Il.* 2.459ff *Τῶν δ' ὡς τ' ὀρνίθων πετεηνῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ / χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἢ κύκνων* δουλιχοδείρων / Ἀσίῳ ἐν λειμῶνι Καύστριου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα / ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ποτῶνται ἀγαλλόμενα πτερύγεσσι / κλαγγηδὸν προκαθιζόντων, σμαραγεῖ δέ τε λειμῶν.), *Ap. Rhod.* 4.1300-2 *ἢ ὅτε καλὰ νάοντος ἐπ' ὄφρῦσι Πακτωλοῖο / κύκνοι κινήσουσιν ἐὸν μέλος, ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμῶν / ἐρσήεις βρέμεται ποταμοῖό τε καλὰ ῥέεθρα*, *Arat. Phaen.* 942-3 *Πολλάκι λιμναῖαι ἢ εἰνάλαι ὄρνιθες / ἄπληστον κλύζονται ἐνιέμεναι ὑδάτεσσιν* (for water-birds in general) with Kidd, *AP* Meleager 9.363.18 *κύκνος ἐπ' ὄχθαισιν ποταμοῦ*, in Latin: *Var. At. fr.* 22.1-3 *tum liceat pelagi uolucres tardaeque paludis / cernere inexplatas studio certare lauandi / et uelut insolitum pennis infundere rorem*, *Lucr.* 2.344-5 *et uariae uolucres, laetantia quae loca aquarum / concelebrant circum ripas fontisque lacusque* (birds in general), *Verg. Georg.* 1.383-7, esp. 383-4. *iamque uariae pelagi uolucres et quae Asia circum / dulcibus in stagnis rimantur prata Caystri*, 2.199 *niueos herboso flumine cycnos*, *Aen.* 7.32-3 *...uariae circumque supraque / adsuetae ripis uolucres et fluminis alueo / aethera mulcebant cantu lucoque uolabant* (birds in general), *Aen.* 7.699-702 *ceu quondam niuei liquida inter nubila cycni / cum sese e pastu referunt et longa canoros / dant per colla modos, sonat amnis et Asia longe / pulsa palus*), *Ov. Met.* 2.252-3 *et quae Maeonias celebrabant carmine ripas / flumineae volucres* with Bömer on the poetic *topos* of the Caystros swans, 539 *amanti flumina cycno*, *Mart.* 1.53.7-8 *sic, niger in ripis errat cum forte Caystri, / inter Ledaeos ridetur coruus olores* (on rivers as the habitat of swans see Gossen *RE*² (1921) s.v. 783.43ff.). In poetry, the element of water has a symbolic function and water landscapes with their ambiguous nature (between life and death, virginity / sexuality, shelter / exposure, peace / violence) often function as places of love, abduction, rape, even death. Further on these poetic symbolisms see Segal (1969) 23-33.

Ever since the ps.-Hesiodic *Aspis* (lines 314-7) swans were traditionally associated with Apollo and the Muses (further on this see N-H on Hor. *Carm.* 2.20.10 with parallels and bibliography). The swan motif soon became intrinsically linked with poetic creativity. Ovid in particular was very fond of using swans as symbols of literary criticism in his work (see Papaioannou (2005) 153-6).

cycni: the Greek loan word at a very early stage replaced the old Latin *olor* (Isid. *Or.* 12.7.19 *olores autem latinum nomen est; nam graece κύκνοι dicuntur*, further on this see André (1967) 111-3, Capponi (1979) 359). On the alternation of the guttural *c* and *g* before *n*, *m* (*cn* ~ *gn*, *cm* ~ *gm*) see n. on Her. 4.68 and p.280. I prefer the spelling *cycni*, which seems to have been the older one (cf. Kenney on Her. 17.55 “the spelling *cygnus* still found in modern editions is a barbarism”). Swans were considered to be birds of good omen (McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 2.6.53, Macer fr. 4.1 Courtney *cycnus in auspiciis semper laetissimus ales*, Isid. *Orig.* 12.7.9 *cycnus in auspiciis semper laetissimus ales*) and were in close association with Venus.

mendacia: the term is rare in elegy (absent from Tib., once in Prop. 4.5.27, eight times in Ovid (again in Her. 15.55), but it is more frequent in later poets, cf. e.g. Juv. 7.111, Stat. *Theb.* 5.659, *Silv.* 4.6.63, [Verg.] *Aetna* 21, 366, 571, *Ciris* 362).

68. querar: cf. n. on Her. 8.89 *quodue mihi miserae sidus obesse querar?*; the motif of complaint is one of the most persistent motifs in the *Her.*

Iouem: The careful placement of *cycni* and *Iouem* at the end of two consecutive lines is noteworthy.

69f. Hippodamia was the daughter of Oenomaus, king of Pisa, and of Sterope (Paus. 5.10.6). Oenomaus, either because he was in love with his daughter (Hyg. *Fab.* 253), or because of an oracle, which warned him about his killing by his son-in-law (Diod. 4.73.20), promised Hippodamia as prize in a chariot race. Whoever could carry Hippodamia off and escape Oenomaus' pursuit as far as the Corinthian Isthmus (Diod. Sic. 4.73.3.7ff, Paus. 5.14.6.8, Frazer (1921) 2.157ff. n.4) could marry her. All unsuccessful contenders had already been decapitated (on the various numbers of the unlucky contenders see Hes. fr. 259a M-W, Pind. *Ol.* 1.128, Paus. 6.21.10-1, Epimenides *FGrH* 457 fr. 14). This version of the story (attributed by the Σ on Ap. Rhod. 1.752 and Σ on Soph. *El.* 505 to Pherecydes (= *FGrH* F 37)) seems to have become in time the established, canonical version (see Willink's excellent note on Eur. *Or.* 988-94 and Stinton (1976) 68-9). Pelops won Oenomaus through bribing (either himself or Hippodamia) Oenomaus' charioteer, Myrtilus, who did not insert the linchpins in his master's chariot (Pherekydes *FGrH* 3 fr. 37b). As a result, Oenomaus found tragic death by being dragged to death entangled in the reins of his chariot (according to another version of the myth Oenomaus was killed by Pelops himself). Pelops was cursed either by Oenomaus or by Myrtilus (Soph. *El.* 504-5, Eur. *Or.* 988-996 with Willink, and Σ ad loc.) whom he drowned in the sea, thus dishonouring his initial agreement (Paus. 8.14.11, Hyg. *Fab.* 84). The curse came into effect only in the next generation. For more on the different mythological traditions about Pelops'

winged chariot, his “sea-crossing” and the drowning of Myrtilus see Willink’s informative note on Eur. *Or.* 988-94. Pelops with Hippodamia had three children (or six according to Pind. *Ol.* 1.89) and they lived in prosperity. Nevertheless, an alternative version held that at a later stage their common life ended in disaster, when Pelops killed Hippodamia during an argument (see Hyg. 85.4 *Pelops cum Hippodamiam argueret, ipsa se interfecit*. For more on the story of Pelops see Pind. *Ol.* 1.70-95, Paus. 5.13.1-7, Apollod. *Epit.* 2.4-9, Serv. on Verg. *Georg.* 3.7, Hyg. 84.

69. duo...freta distinct Isthmos: For similar stock poetic descriptions of the Corinthian Isthmus, cf. Ov. *Fast.* 6.495 *freta bina repellit Isthmos*, Sen. *HF* 336 *et bina findens Isthmos exilis freta* (on the genuineness of the line see Fitch (1987) and Billerbeck (1999) ad loc.), *Phaedr.* 1024 *et quae duobus terra comprimitur fretis* (the line is athetised by Leo), Lucan 1.102 *geminum...separat Isthmos...fretum*. For the opposite idea of the Isthmus uniting, bringing the two seas together see Stat. *Silv.* 4.3.60 *Inous freta miscuisset Isthmos*. Further on Isthmus see n. on *Her.* 4.105.

70. uecta peregrinis Hippodamia rotis: modelled on Prop. 1.2.19f. *nec Phrygium falso traxit candor maritum / aucta externis Hippodamia rotis* with Fedeli (cf. also *Am.* 3.2.15f. *a, quam paene Pelops Pisaea concidit hasta, / dum spectat uultus, Hippodamia, tuos*, *Her.* 16.266 *uenit ut in Phrygios Hippodamia sinus*). The line recurs unchanged at Ov. *Ars* 2.8 (*ucta peregrinis, Hippodamia, rotis*) in connection with Helen’s abduction by Paris (lines 5f. *talis ab armiferis Priameius hospes Amyclis / candida cum rapta coniuge uela dedit*). Further on the intertextual association between the two passages see Janka on *Ars* 2.7f.

Hippodamia rotis is an interesting case of etymological wordplay, since *rotis* is a synonym of *currus* (“chariot”, ἄρμα in Greek) and chariots were drawn by horses (ἵππος in Greek, *Hippo-damia*), cf. Soph. *El.* 504-7 ὦ Πέλοπος ἄ πρόσθεν / πολύπνοος ἰππεία, / ὡς ἔμολες αἰανῆς / τᾷδε γᾶ).

peregrinis...rotis: *peregrinus* is a prosaic adjective, rare in (classical) Latin (Plaut. 23 times, Ter. 3 times, Catul. 31.8, Verg. *Aen.* 11.772 (only), Hor. 4 times, Prop. 1.2.4, Juv. 4); however, the adjective was much favoured by Ovid (29 times, 7 in *Her.*). With reference to “foreign loves” *peregrinus* often carries negative connotations, cf. e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.18, Prop. 3.20.6, Ov. *Her.* 1.76 *peregrino captus amore*, 9.47 *peregrinos addis amores* with Casali, 12.111 *uirginitas facta est peregrine praeda latronis* with Bessone). In this light, *peregrinus amor* becomes synonymous to *externus amor*, which is used for extramarital (or in any case rival) love (see Barchiesi on *Her.* 1.76). Furthermore, *peregrinus* is noteworthy for its legal undertones, since this was the term applied to foreigners whose marriage with Roman (and non-Roman) citizens was at the centre of a huge legal concern during the Principate regarding the civil status of the offspring (see Treggiari (1991) 45-48).

Hermione through the use of *peregrinus* manages to bypass the Phrygian origin of her ancestor, since the adjective “Phrygian” was charged with connotations of effeminacy and

contempt (see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.10.1f.). The adjective is appropriate to Pelops, since Pelops originally came from Asia Minor (cf. Pind. *Ol.* 1.23-4 ... λάμπει δέ οί κλέος / ἐν εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικία, Pherec. *FGrH* 3F 37-8, Prop. 1.2.19 *Phrygium*, Ov. *Her.* 16.266 *Phrygios...sinus*).

73. Taenaris Idaeo: the juxtaposition of the first two terms (*Taenaris Idaeo*) is repeated at the end of the line by the juxtaposition of the last two terms (*hospite rapta*); furthermore, through the chiasmic correspondence of *rapta* to *Taenaris* and *hospite* to *Idaéo* the whole line is framed by these two pairs.

Taenaris means “Spartan” by synecdoche (*OLD* s.v.), since according to Pausanias 3.25.8 *Ταίναρον* or *ἡ ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ Καινήπολις* was a Spartan town. Ovid prefers the form *Taenaris* to the more frequent *Taenaria* for reasons of metrical convenience, in order to avoid elision, like here (cf. e.g. Ov. *Her.* 16.30 *Taenaris est*, 17.6 *Taenaris ora*). The adjective *Taenarius* is rare in Augustan poetry (before Ovid it appears only at Verg. *Georg.* 4.467 and Prop. 1.13.22, 3.2.11), but it appears frequently in the *Heroides* in connection with Helen, cf. Ov. *Her.* 13.45 *Taenariae...maritae*, also 16.30 *Taenaris...terra*, 276 *Taenaria...humo*, 17.6 *Taenaris ora*).

Taenaris has ominous connotations, since it is associated with cape Taenarum, the southernmost point of Laconia, which was considered to be one of the entrances to the Underworld (*OLD* s.v. *Taenarius* (a)). See Pind. *Pyth.* 4.43f., Eur. *Herc.* 23f., Liv. Andr. *trag. inc. sed.* 35 Warmington, Verg. *Georg.* 4.467, Hor. *Carm.* 1.34.10 with N-H, Ov. *Her.* 13.45 with Reeson, *Met.* 2.247 with Bömer, 10.13, *Fast.* 4.612 with Bömer, Fitch on Sen. *HF* 587, 662-72, esp. 662-667 and 813, Sen. *Oed.* 171, *Phaedr.* 1201, *HO* 1061, 1771, Stat. *Theb.* 1.96, 355, 4.214, 6.508, 7.659, Hyg. *Fab.* 79.2, Apul. *Met.* 6.18.1 (with Harrison (2002) 52), Stat. *Theb.* 2.32-44 (with Vessey (1973) 232). Further see Bölte *RE*² 4A.2 (1932) s.v. *Tainaron* 2031.42ff. and Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.30. For a list of entrances to the Underworld see Ganschietz *RE* 10.2 (1919) s.v. *Katabasis* (B2 IV) 2383-6.

On the plausibility of the alternative mss. reading *Tyndaris* see p.108.

Idaéo: Hermione, like in Pelops’ case, carefully avoids any specific reference to the Phrygian origin of Paris through the use of *Idaëus*. For *Idaëus* as a stereotypical adjective of Paris see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.303.

ab hospite rapta: while Hermione called Paris *aduena* at line 42, now that her focus is put primarily on Paris’ violation of hospitality laws she uses his conventional metonymy *hospes* (guest). For Paris as violator of Menelaus’ hospitality, cf. e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 61, 363, 399-402, Eur. *Tro.* 947, *Cypria. ap. Procl. Chrest.* Davies lines 17-22, Apoll. *Epit.* 3.3, also see Palmer ad loc. with parallels. For the use of *hospes* in context of erotic betrayal in connection with violation of hospitality see Prop. 2.24B. 43-6 *paruo dilexit spatium Minoida Theseus, / Phyllida Demophoon, hospes uterque malus*, Prop. 2.21.11 *Colchida sic hospes quondam decepit Iason rapta:* it picks up *apta rapina* (line 66).

74. Argolicas...manus: *Argolicas* means “Greek” by synecdoche (*OLD* s.v. 2). *manus* is a common collective term denoting a military force (see *TLL* 8.366.47ff., *OLD* s.v. 22).

75-80. Hermione complements the last *exemplum* in the list (65-74), namely Helen’s abduction by Paris, by offering an intimate account of its repercussions on her personal life. For a detailed examination of this supplementary section see pp. 108ff.

75. memini...memini: the double repetition of *memini* (over the third foot strong caesura) is emphatic and offers Hermione’s account a sense of autopsy and first-hand knowledge of events. As Jacobson (1974) 55 remarks: “the first clause suggests the distant childhood of Hermione (...) while the corrective second mirrors the gravity of Helen’s deed.” Moreover, the emphatic presence of *memini* strikes me as a possible intertextual signpost, since the verb is often employed in Latin poetry as an “(integrated) reflexive intertextual annotation” (see Conte (1986) 57-69 (= Conte (1985) 35-45), Miller (1993) 153-56, 163-64, Bessone on *Her.* 12.1, Hinds (1998) 3f., also *idem* (1987)c 20-21). Hermione’s abandonment by Helen was well known ever since Homer (cf. Hom. *Il.* 3.174-5 ... *γνωτούς τε λιποῦσα / παιῖδά τε τηλυγέτην καὶ ὀμηλικὴν ἐρατεινήν*, Alc. fr. 134 Page esp. line 7 *παιῖδά τ' ἐν δόμ[ο]ισι λίποις' [ἐρήμαν]*). The portrayal of Hermione in misery seems to have had its own tradition in Greek literature (so Colluthus *The Rape of Helen* 328-88, Norden on Verg. *Aen.* 6.14 (p. 121), La Penna (1979) 177). Hence, Hermione’s detailed description of her parting from her mother possibly alludes to a well-known scene from either Greek or Latin literature. Unfortunately, the dearth of surviving evidence precludes any connection with any surviving text.

omnia luctus, / omnia plena timoris: The section is thickly sown with repetitions (*omnia... / omnia* 75-6, *sine me, me sine* 80, *abis /...aberat* 80f.), which are indicative of Hermione’s upset state of mind. For the repetition *omnia - - / omnia*, cf. Lucr. 3.11-12, 3.947-8, 5.830-1, 6.528-9, Catul. 64.186-7, Verg. *Ecl.* 6.33, [Verg.] *Culex* 348. The *iunctura omnia luctus* (sc. *erant*) is common (both in prose and in poetry) in descriptions of extreme destruction and misfortune, cf. Caes. *Ciu.* 2.41.8.5 *plena...luctus*, Cic. *Sest.* 128.15 *plena luctus*, Ov. *Fast.* 4.537 *luctus...omnia plena*, Tr. 3.11.10 *omnia solliciti sunt loca plena metus*.

omnia plena: for *omnia plena* as a poetic *iunctura* denoting “indefinite breadth” (“il senso di ampiezza indefinita”) see Bessone on *Her.* 12.64 with parallels, also Verg. *Georg.* 2.4 with Thomas.

77. flebat: the accumulation of multiple subjects draws attention to the verb, which is already emphatic by position.

auus...soror...fratres: the relatives are presented in descending order from the oldest to the youngest. For Ovidian use of terms of kinship see Bettini (1990) and n. on *Her.* 8.48.

fratresque gemelli: *gemellus*, a diminutive, originating in Catullus in a reference to the Dioscuri (cf. Catul. 4.27 *gemelle Castor et gemelle Castoris* (= later imitated in [Verg.] *Catal.* 10.25, 57.6), Verg. *Ecl.* 1.14, Hor. (*Epist.* 1.10.3) and Ovid (*Her.* 6.121, 143, 13.61 (with reference to the Dioscuri)). On the use of diminutives in Latin poetry, see n. on *Her.* 4.71.

78. suumque Iouem: the use of the possessive pronoun infuses sentiment to Leda's address to Jupiter. Nevertheless, in view of the reference to her rape by Jupiter at lines 67f., there seems to be a certain degree of irony and humour in her appeal to her ravisher.

79. non longos: (sc. capillos) Hermione's short hair hints at her young age (see n. on *Her.* 8.89 below). For long hair as sign of female beauty see n. on *Her.* 4.77.

scissa: Hermione makes a similar reference to her disarrayed hair in the reference to her abduction by Neoptolemus at line 10 (*traxit inornatis in sua tecta comis*). Her reference to her torn hair is in accordance with the Greek customs of lamentation. Judging from the evidence from artistic representations and from the great number of relevant references in Greek tragedy it seems that it was expected from a woman to tear her hair as a customary indication of mourning (see Alexiou (1974) 207 with nn.22,23, to her list of literary parallels (n.27) add Aesch. *Pers.* 1056 (plucking out hair from beard), 1062, Soph. *Aj.* 310, 633, Eur. *Alc.* 101-2, *Andr.* 826-7, 1209, *Supp.* 973-4, *El.* 150, *Hel.* 368f., 372-4, *Hec.* 652-5, *Or.* 966, *Tro.* 279. Also see Garvie on Aesch. *Cho.* 22-83 with bibliography). The offering of shorn hair to the dead constituted an indispensable part of Roman ritual lament as well (cf. Cic. *Leg.* 2.64, Livy 1.13.1, Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.51, *Cons. ad Liv.* 98, 318, Luc. 2.36ff., Apul. *Met.* 5.11, *pace* Knox on *Her.* 11.116).

In addition to the ritual manifestation of wild grief, the reference to torn hair can also be associated with the multitude of similar representations of womens' dishevelled hair in elegy. Disarrayed hair enhance female beauty, since "the depiction of the dishevelled woman is primarily invoked when poets wish to stress the fact that grief makes their mistresses or heroines even more lovely, the disarray of the hair [offers] a sensual fortaste of the dishevelled pleasures of the night" (Verducci (1985) 250), also see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.7.11f. and Greene (1998) 86 citing Curran (1984) 84). Whatever the case may be, dishevelled hair is a clear sign of a woman's abandonment by her beloved (so Fedeli on Prop. 3.6.9-10).

capillos: on *capillus* see n. on *Her.* 4.73. For Roman women's concern for extravagant hairstyles see McKeown (1989) 364f. and *passim* on *Am.* 1.14, Leary (1990) 153, Nikolaidis (1994) 51-9, Gibson (2003) 148-50 with bibliography (and *passim* on lines 135-68), 191f. (and *passim* on lines 235-50), 277, 280f.

80. "sine me, me sine": despite her claim to her weak memory at line 75 (*uix equidem memini*), Hermione's recollection of her exact words contributes significantly to the dramatic character of the scene. By disrupting the linearity of the letter's narrative the quotation makes her recollection more intimate and strengthens further the authority of her testimony. The repetition is indicative of her distress, while the chiasmic arrangement of "*sine me, me sine*" (which picks up the repetition of *memini, memini tamen* at line 75) "suggests the disruption of domestic harmony" as a result of Hermione's departure (Williams (1997) 118). The inversion of *sine* occurs frequently in Ovid (cf. e.g. *Am.* 2.12.27, *Her.* 15.69 with Knox, *Met.* 10.396, *Tr.* 3.14.13).

81. nam coniunx aberat: Hermione refers to Menelaus' absence to Crete (on this see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.300). Even though she remains rather vague about the exact time of Menelaus' departure (before or after Paris' arrival), nevertheless the introduction of this short reference with *nam* is suggestive of its rhetorical purpose. In view of her close parallel with her mother, Hermione tries to acquit her mother from blame by transferring all responsibility to Menelaus, who is portrayed in the role of a *leno-maritus* (cf. n. on *Her.* 8.21). Helen's abduction by Paris is portrayed solely as the inevitable outcome of her Menelaus' prolonged absence. It is not coincidental that in the Ovidian *Ars amatoria* the perfect example for *leno-maritus* is offered by Helen's elopement with Paris as a result of Menelaus' delayed absence from his home, cf. *Ars* 2.359f. *dum Menelaus abest, Helene, ne sola iaceret, / hospitibus est tepido nocte recepta sinu, 367 cogis adulterium dando tempusque locumque* (see Janka on *Ov. Ars* 2.359-72, 367f. and Weber (1983) 97f.). Cf. also both Paris' and Helen's reference to Menelaus' absence in their erotic correspondence (*Her.* 16.299f. *ipse tibi hoc suadet rebus, non uoce, maritus, / neue sui furtis hospitibus obstet, abest, 17.153f. maior, non maxima, nobis / est data libertas, quod Menelaus abest*). For the use of the elevated *coniunx* see n. on *Her.* 8.18 above, also Dickey (2002) 278.

ne non Pelopeia credar: for similar wording in similar context, cf. *Her.* 4.61 *ne forte parum Minoia credar*. However, *pace* Palmer on *Her.* 8.75, there is no need to rewrite line 81 on the model of *Her.* 4.61. Hermione through this reference to hereditary victimization rounds off her mythological list with ring-composition (cf. 65 *num generis fato, quod nostros errat in annos*), see n. on *Her.* 8.3. *Pelopeia*: For patronymics in *-ius* see n. on *Her.* 4.61.

82. ecce: *ecce* creates a vivid dramatic effect (*OLD* s.v. 5 "calling attention to an illustrative example or other amplification of a previous statement", *TLL* 5.2.30.22) and it is employed to attract Orestes' attention to the humiliation of Hermione's present state as captive.

Neoptolemo praeda: the woman as the lover's booty (*praeda*) is a widespread *topos* in Roman elegy, see Pichon (1966) s.v. Also cf. e.g. Prop. 2.1.55, 16.2, *Am.* 1.2.19f. and 2.17.5f. with McKeown, *Ars* 1.125, 2.406, 3.84, 560, in the *Her.*: 8.82, 15.51, 16.154, 19.178). Further on this *topos* see n. on *Her.* 4.116. For the cognate *topos* of the lover as Cupid's booty with parallels see McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.2.19f.

83-86. Hermione further expands on Neoptolemus' descent from Achilles (cf. line 3 *Achillides*). This time her use of the "heredity theme" is aimed at highlighting Neoptolemus' unworthiness and his degenerate character (*degeneremque Neoptolemus* 548) as opposed to the magnanimity and moral superiority of his father. The analogy is reminiscent of a similar comparison between Neoptolemus and his father made by king Priam, moments before being killed by Neoptolemus on Jupiter's altar during the sack of Troy (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.540-43 *at non ille, satum quo te mentiris, Achilles / talis in hoste fuit Priamo; sed iura fidemque / supplicis erubuit corpusque exsanguis sepulcro / reddidit Hectoreum meque in mea regna remisit, 548f. (...) illi mea tristitia facta / degeneremque Neoptolemus narrare memento*).

83. Pelides: it picks up *Achillides* at line 3. *Pelides* is a Latin formation of the Greek *Πηλεΐδης* / *Πηληϊάδης*, a standard epic patronymic for Achilles (cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.1, 322, 16.271, 17.105, 24.406, *Od.* 8.7, 11.467, 557), *Od.* 8.75, also Pind. *Pyth.* 6.23, *Paeon* fr. 6.99 Maehler (= fr. 52f.), Bacch. 13.110, Eur. *IA* 229, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 371, Antim. fr. 84.2, Ap. Rhod. 1.558, fr. 12.19, Ap. Rhod. (?) 1.20 *ap.* Parthen. 21.3ff., Bion *Epithal. Achil. et Deid.* 6, *AP* 9.463.1 (Philemon). The patronymic *Pelides* stands alone, possibly in accordance with the Homeric practice, where *Πηλεΐδης* is mostly used alone (on the contrary *Πηληϊάδης* appears most often in the *iunctura* *Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος* (except *Il.* 16.686, 24.431, 448)). The patronymic is frequent in both classical (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.263 (as patronymic for Neoptolemus), 548, 5.808, 12.350, Prop. 2.22A.34, Hor. *Carm.* 1.6.6, 1.2.12, Sen. *Ag.* 617, 620) and later Latin (Juv. 3.280, Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.79, *Ach.* 1.721, 754, 824, *Il. parv.* 1, 81, 841). In Ovid, *Pelides* appears again only at *Met.* 12.605 and 619 (attributed to Achilles).

utinam uitasset Apollinis arcus!: there seems to have been two major mythological versions for the killing of Achilles. In the first one, it was Apollo who performed the killing alone (cf. *Il.* 21.277-8 ἦ μ' ἔφατο Τρώων ὑπὸ τείχεϊ θωρηκτῶν / λαιψηροῖς ὀλέεσθαι Ἀπόλλωνος βελέεσσιν, Hor. *Carm.* 4.6.3ff., Hyg. *Fab.* 107 *Hectore sepulto cum Achilles circa moenia Troianorum uagaretur ac diceret se solum Troiam expugnasse, Apollo iratus Alexandrum Parin se simulans talum quem mortalem habuisse dicitur sagitta percussit et occidit*). Following the other one, Achilles was killed by Apollo and Paris in co-operation (see Bömer on *Met.* 12.597-612, esp. 604-6 dixit (sc. Apollo) et ostendens sternentem Troica ferro / corpora Peliden, arcus obuertit in illum / certaue letifera derexit spicula dextra, also 13.501 cecidit (sc. Achilles) *Paridis Phoebique sagittis*), cf. Hom. *Il.* 19.416-7 (...) ἀλλὰ σοὶ αὐτῷ / μόρσιμόν ἐστι θεῶ τε καὶ ἀνέρι ἴφι δαμῆναι, 21.277-8 ἦ μ' ἔφατο Τρώων ὑπὸ τείχεϊ θωρηκτῶν / λαιψηροῖς ὀλέεσθαι Ἀπόλλωνος βελέεσσιν, 22.359-60 ἦματι τῷ ὅτε κέν σε Πάρις καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων / ἐσθλὸν ἐόντ' ὀλέσωσιν ἐνὶ Σκαιῆσι πύλῃσιν, Apollod. *Epit.* 5.3 with Frazer, *Aethiopsis ap. Procl. Chrest.* Davies p. 47.20-1 (sc. Achilles) ὑπὸ Πάριδος ἀναιρεῖται καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος. For the second version (i.e. of divine and human co-operation) being crystallised in Latin by Vergil see Norden on Verg. *Aen.* 6.57f. “*Dardana qui* (sc. Phoebus) *Paridis derexti tela manusque / corpus in Aeacidae (...)*”. For more on the different versions of Achilles' death see Escher *RE* 1 (1894) s.v. *Achilleus* 238.18ff.

84. Another fine example of the correspondence between content and word-order in the line, as Neoptolemus' shameful deeds (*nati facta proterua*) are framed by *damnaret* and *pater* (emphatically placed at the beginning and end of the line). Note also that the whole couplet is framed between *Pelides...pater*.

facta proterua: the *iunctura* appears only here in Latin poetry (and in prose only at Cic. *Fin.* 2.47.7 *et non audit cuiquam aut dicto proteruo aut facto nocere. proteruus* is a derogative adjective with moral implications (cf. Cic. *Cael.* 49 *non solum meretrix sed etiam proterua*

meretrix, Prop. 2.24c.30-1 *iste proteruus erit, / qui nunc se in timidum iactando uenit honorem*). It does not belong to high poetry (see N-H on Hor. *Carm.* 1.19.7), and its frequency in elegy is also low (Tib. 0, Prop. 1), except for Ovid (7 times). For statistics see McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.4.45. In prose, *proteruus* appears only in Cicero (10 times). The adverb *proteruiter* is in use since Ennius (cf. Enn. *scaen.* 374), while the forms *proterue* / *-ius* appear only twice in Augustan poetry (cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.4.45 and *Ars* 1.599 respectively). For positive portrayals of Neoptolemus as a brave hero see Hom. *Od.* 11.506ff., Eur. *Andr.* 342f.

85. The “present and past” repetition of the verb in the two hemistichs (*nec...placuit, nec...placuisset*, see Wills (1996) 303f.) and the emphatic placement of *Achilli* at the end of the line are noteworthy.

86. The arrangement (of the type A-B-a-b) underlines the close relationship between husband and wife, and makes the reference to abduction more emphatic.

abducta...coniuge: it picks up *rapta coniuge* at line 18 (with n. ad loc.), cf. also Ov. *Fast.* 1.451f. *ergo saepe suo coniunx abducta marito. abducere* (always in participial form, except at *Fast.* 5.477) is restricted exclusively to poetry. It first appears in Roman Comedy (cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 569, *Merc.* 616, 858, *Pseud.* 902, Ter. *Eun.* 350, *Hec.* 640, *Ad.* 359, 628, Plaut. *Pers.* 522, *Pseud.* 82) and later it is also present in Catullus in a reference to Helen’s abduction by Paris (cf. Catul. 68.103 *Paris abducta gauisus libera moecha*). In Ovid, the adjective occurs ten times in total, in most cases attributed to Briseis (cf. *Am.* 1.9.33 *ardet in abducta Briseide magnus Achilles*, *Ars* 2.403 *audierat, Lyrnesi, tuos, abducta, dolores* with Janka, *Rem.* 777 *hoc et in abducta Briseide flebat Achilles* with Pinotti, *Tr.* 4.1.15 *fertur at abducta Lyrneside tristis Achilles*). The ambiguity of the verb, which means not only “to remove by force” (*OLD* s.v. 5), but also “to seduce” (*OLD* s.v. 3), offers an interesting erotic touch to the abduction and seems to implicitly suggest the co-operation of the victim (Fulkerson (2005) 98).

Hermione’s attribution of *coniunx* (“wife”) to Briseis is an intentional exaggeration in order to serve the parallel between Achilles and Neoptolemus. Cf. Briseis’ own reference to her status in her letter to Achilles (*Her.* 3.99f.): *nec tamen indignor nec me pro coniuge gessi / saepius in domini serua uocata torum*.

The use of the participial construction for an abstract noun with genitive (*abducta...coniuge*= the abduction of the wife) was idiomatic and originated in early Latin (see Woodcock (1959) 75f.).

uiduum...uirum: “wifeless” (*OLD* s.v. 1), the adjective was used earlier in the letter in a similar context (cf. line 21 *uidua...in aula* with n. ad loc.). Hermione’s transposition of the adjective from an inanimate object (*aula*) to a person (*uirum*) is indicative of her gradually increasing sense of loneliness and emptiness. The *iunctura* appears again at Ov. *Ars* 1.102 *cum iuuat uiduos rapta Sabina uiros* in a similar context (with reference to the rape of the Sabine women). *uirum* and *Achilli* are emphatically placed at the end of two consecutive lines.

flere: The image of the crying husband echoes the crying of Helen’s relatives at her departure (see line 77 with n. ad loc.). On Achilles’ tears for the abduction of Briseis see Hom. *Il.* 1.348f. (...) *αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς / δακρύσας ἑτάρων ἄφαρ ἔξετο νόσφι λιασθείς, 357 Ὡς φάτο*

δάκρυ χέων (...), 362 τέκνον τί κλαίεις; τί δέ σε φρένας ἵκετο πένθος;, 415f. *αἰθ' ὄφελος παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀδάκρυτος καὶ ἀπῆμων / ἦσθαι (...).*

87f. A similar complaint against fate's cruelty on those in misery is voiced by Briseis at *Her.* 3.43f. *an miseros tristis fortuna tenaciter urget, / nec uenit inceptis mollior hora malis?* with Barchiesi.

87. caelestes: *caelestis* is an elevated, archaic epithet (mostly used in epic), possibly in imitation of the Greek epithet *οὐρανίωνες*, which was commonly attributed to the Olympian gods (an epic synonym for *οὐράνιοι*) or was strictly preserved for the second generation descending from Ouranos (cf. e.g. *Hom. Il.* 5.898), cf. e.g. *Od.* 7.242, 9.15, 13.41 with Hoekstra, West on *Th.* 127, 128, *Hes.* fr. 43a 53, *AP.* 14.72.13, *AP App.* Alcaeus of Messene 196.1). The epithet was used in plural as synonym for the heavenly gods (see *Enciclopedia Vergiliana* vol. 2 s.v. *caelestis*, *TLL* 3.67.37ff., also cf. Ennius *var* fr. 23, *Prop.* 1.13.23, *Ov. Ars* 1.147, 2.352).

88. quodue...sidus obesse: The ancient belief that stars can influence human lives is common in Ovid; however, not in a strictly superstitious context and more importantly not without some scepticism (cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.8.29f. *stella tibi oppositi nocuit contraria Martis. / Mars abiit; signo nunc Venus apta suo* with McKeown, 3.12.3 *quodue putem sidus nostris occurrere fatis, Ib.* 209-16, esp. 209f. *natus es infelix, -ita di uoluere- nec ulla / commoda nascenti stella leuisue fuit* with LaPenna). The concept of stars being unfavourable to mortals is widespread in Augustan poetry (cf. e.g. *Catul.* 66.73 *nec si me infestis discerpent sidera dictis*, *Verg. Ecl.* 5.23 *astra uocat crudelia mater*, *Hor. Carm.* 1.11.2f. *nec Babylonios / temptaris numeros*, 2.17.17-24, *Prop.* 1.6.36 *uiuere me duro sidere certus eris* (in erotic context), 2.27.4 *quae sit stella homini commoda quaeque mala*, 4.1.84 *et graue Saturni sidus in omne caput*, *Ov. Am.* 3.12.3 *quodue putem sidus nostris occurrere fatis*, *Tr.* 1.3.72 *stella grauis nobis, Lucifer ortus erat*, 5.10.45 *graue sidus*); Ovid must have been acquainted with such ideas (cf. *Sen. Suas.* 4.5.2 quoting Arellius Fuscus (who was Ovid's teacher in rhetoric) on astral influence on human life). For a detailed account of the increasing influence of astrology, especially on the masses, under the Augustan regime, despite official disapproval, and its effect on the literary production of the Augustan circle (Vergil, Horace, Propertius, Ovid) see Cramer (1954) 82ff., esp. 87ff., Liebeschuetz (1979) 119ff., Barton (1994) 41-4, also N-H on *Hor. Carm.* 1.11.2.

The star (zodiac sign) under which someone was born was believed to determine their character and manage their lives (cf. *Cic. Div.* 1.85 with Pease, *Nat. Deor.* 2.113 with Pease, *Hor. Carm.* 2.17.17-19 *seu Libra seu me Scorpios adspicit / formidolosus pars violentior / natalis horae seu tyrannus / Hesperiae Capricornus undae* with N-H and Kiessling-Heinze, 3.29.17-20 *iam clarus occultum Andromedae pater / ostendit ignem, iam Procyon furit / et stella vesani Leonis / sole dies referente siccus*, *Prop.* 4.1.81ff.). The association between the human soul and the stars dates back to Plato (*Tim.* 41d8ff.) *συστήσας δὲ τὸ πᾶν διεῖλεν ψυχὰς ἰσαριθμούς τοῖς ἄστροις...* *sqq.* Cf. *Arist. GA* 736b33-737a1 *διαφέρει φύσις πάντων μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῷ σπέρματι ἐνυπάρχει ὅπερ ποιεῖ γόνιμα εἶναι τὰ σπέρματα, τὸ καλούμενον*

θερμόν. τοῦτο δ' οὐ πῦρ οὐδὲ τοιαύτη δύναμις ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐμπεριλαμβανόμενον ἐν τῷ σπέρματι καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀφρώδει πνεῦμα καὶ ἢ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι φύσις, ἀνάλογον οὔσα τῷ τῶν ἀστρῶν στοιχείῳ, Pliny NH 2.5.23 *deus probatur incertus. pars alia et hanc pellit astroque suo euentus adsignat et nascendi legibus, semelque in omnes futuros umquam deo decretum, in reliquum uero otium datum*, Cic. Rep. 6.15.1-14 *quae terra dicitur, iisque animus datus est ex illis sempiternis ignibus, quae sidera et stellas uocatis, quae globosae et rotundae, diuinis animatae mentibus, circulos suos orbisque conficiunt celeritate mirabili*, 16.4-10 *ea uita uia est in caelum et in hunc coetum eorum, qui iam uixerunt et corpore laxati illum incolunt locum, quem uides, erat autem is splendidissimo candore inter flammam circus elucens quem uos, ut a Graiis accepistis, orbem lacteum nuncupatis*, 17.1. ff. Further on the various philosophical explanations (Presocratics, Plato / Platonists, Aristotle, Neoplatonists, Pythagorians, Stoics) of the divine character of stars and of stellar influence on human life see Scott (1991), Barton (1994) 102ff, esp. 109ff. on the association of the human soul with the stars. For bibliography on ancient Greek and Roman astrology see Bouché – Leclercq (1899), Cumont (1912), Riess (1933), Bayet (1957), Fraser (1972) 1.434-9, 435 n.479 with bibliography ad loc., Liebeschuetz (1979), Barton (1994), Greene (1998) 120 n.11 with bibliography ad loc.

Hermione's emphasis on astral influence could perhaps be related with the great importance given by the Romans to the *auspicia nuptiarum* (i.e. omens during the marriage ceremony, see Treggiari (1991) 164), cf. Catul. 61.19-20, 64.329-30 *adueniet fausto cum sidere coniunx*, Hor. Carm. 1.15.5)

mihi miserae: *miser(-a)* is the conventional term for the suffering lover in elegy (see Pichon (1966) s.v., Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.315, and *idem* on 420 for the combination *miserae mihi*, Fedeli on Prop.1.1.1). For the exclamatory accusative *me miseram* see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 17.181f. with parallels and bibliography.

querar: cf. line 68 *nec querar in plumis delituisse Iouem*. Hermione's reference to her lament through the use of the verb *queror* has further implications, since *queror* (and *querela*) are often used as technical terms to refer to elegy (for *queror* / *querela* as poetological terms see Saylor (1967) and Keith (1992) 141f., Maltby on Tib.1.2.9 and James (2003)a 108-21 with bibliography in 288 n.3 (for *querela* in particular). Both Greeks and Romans associated etymologically elegy (*ἐλεγεία* / *elegia*) with lamentation, cf. *Etymol. Magn.* 326.49-50 *Εἴρηται δὲ παρὰ τὸ ἔῃ λέγειν ἐν τοῖς τάφοις. Ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ εὖ λέγειν δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ θρήνου τοὺς κατοικομένους*, *ibid* 327.8 (where the elegiac metre is associated with madness), Harvey (1955) 170-72, Dover (1963) 187-9, Chantraine (1968) s.v. *ἔλεγχος*, Rosenmeyer (1968), West (1974) 7-9, Barchiesi (1987) 76, Hinds (1987) 103f., Viarre (1987) 6, Maltby (1991) s.vv. *elegia*, *elegiacus*, Keith (1992) 141f., Knox (2002) 132 n.60 with bibliography, also *TLL* 5.2.339.76ff.). This conventional etymological association is fully exploited by Sappho in her elegiac letter to Phaon, where she prefers elegy to her lyrics as the most appropriate metre for her erotic lamentation, cf. Ov. *Her.* 15.7-8 *flendus amor meus est: elegia flebile Carmen. / non*

facit ad lacrimas barbitos illa meas. Cf. also Ov. *Am.* 3.9.3-4 *flebilis indignos, Elegia, solue capillos!* / *a, nimis ex uero nunc tibi nomen erit!*, Hor. *Carm.* 1.33.2-3 *miserabilis / decantes elegos* with N-H, *Ars* 75-78 *uersibus inpariter iunctis querimonia primum, / post etiam inclusa est uoti sentential compos; / qui stamen exiguous elegos emiserit auster, / grammatici certant et adhuc sub iudice lis est).*

The “complaint theme” with its high occurrence practically constitutes a most prominent Leitmotiv in the *Heroides* (*queror / querela* appear 44 times in total). On the metaliterary character of the terms in the collection see Barchiesi on *Her.* 1.8 with bibliography. It is not by chance that *querela* ultimately becomes a synonym for the letter itself, cf. *Her.* 2.8 *non uenit ante suam nostra querela diem).*

In addition to the (meta)literary implications of the term, we should also take into account the legal colouring of *querar*, since the verb is also used for making a formal complaint in a court (*OLD* s.v. 1e; however, following Barchiesi on *Her.* 2.8 such a legal use does not appear before Valerius Maximus).

89-92. In Jacobson’s words (1978) 55-6: “undoubtedly the high point of the poem is the sympathetic and effective account by Hermione of her life without parents, a brilliantly evocative delineation of a young woman mourning her lost childhood”.

89. parua: cf. *Her.* 15.70 *filia parua*. Hermione remains vague as regards her exact age. From ps.-Apollodorus we learn that at the time of her desertion she was nine years old ([Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.3.3 *ἡ δὲ ἐνναέτη Ἑρμιόνην καταλιπούσα*).

sine matre: a calculated repetition of the emphatic anadiplosis at line 80 “*sine me, me sine*”.

pater arma ferebat: through his connection with *arma* Menelaus is portrayed in his role as *repetitor* (cf. line 18 *arma feres* with n. ad loc.). The verbal similarity with *arma inuidiosa tulisti* (line 49) adds to her suggestion for the similarity between Orestes and Menelaus.

90. duo...duobus: the emphatic polyptoton (*duo...duobus*) underlines Hermione’s deprivation.

cum uiuant: “albeit both were alive”, I take *cum* as concessive (K-S 2.2.348f., LHS 2.624f.).

orba: an archaic adjective, with ominous implications because of its high frequency in sepulchral epigrams, cf. e.g. *CLE* 398.4, 1148.1, 1534A.3, also *Catul.* 39.4f., *Ov. Her.* 6.156, 11.120, *Fast.* 2.402 (all in funerary context). *orbis* in the majority of cases is used with reference to parent-child relationship (see *TLL* 9.2.926.37ff.); here, however, the relationship is seen from the child’s perspective (see *TLL* 9.2.927.4ff.). The reversal could be intended as a parodic allusion to the excessive grief conventionally shown by parents for the loss of their children in Latin sepulchral epigrams (see Lattimore (1964) 187ff., esp. 189ff.).

91-100. Hermione elaborates on her non-existent relationship with her mother. The accumulative triple repetition of *non* effectively suggests a sense of nothingness in Hermione’s reality and the void in her personal relationship with her mother. Nevertheless, her persistent use of second-person pronouns with regard to Helen (*tibi* 91, *tua* 93, *tuo* 94, *tibi* 95, *tibi* 97, *te*

99, *tua* 100) is indicative of her love and affection towards her absent mother, and at the same time it creates the illusion of her presence (at least on grammatical level).

91-5. non.../non.../nec.../non...nec: The accumulation of negative clauses is a common rhetorical device, which is often employed in poetry (see Tarrant on Sen. *Ag.* 208ff. with parallels and bibliography). According to Fraenkel (1957) 50 n.3, the figure recalls a particular type of indignation (or lament), where a series of negative clauses is rounded off in contrast with a positive one (see also Weyman (1929) 737-9 and Fraenkel (1966) 194). In this case, the omission of the positive sentence further implies the sense of absence. Further on this repetitional pattern see Wills (1996) 405ff.

91. blanditias: the term denotes here the children's loving words to their parents, cf. Lucr. 5.1018 (...) *puerique parentum / blanditiis facile ingenium fregere superbum*, Ov. *Met.* 6.626 *mixtaque blanditiis puerilibus oscula iunxit*, 632, Sen. *Dial.* 6.5.4.3 *non* (sc. *conuertis te*) *ad pueriles dulcesque blanditias*. However, *blanditiae* in elegy is (almost) a technical term for erotic words favourable to the ear of the beloved or, more generally, for any erotic words (see Pichon (1966) s.v., Smith on Tib. 1.1.72, Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.2.91-4, McKeown on Ov. *Am.* 1.4.66, Lucke on Ov. *Rem.* 717). The term often applies to the komast's erotic complaints (cf. e.g. Prop. 1.16.16, *Am.* 1.6.15 with McKeown for further parallels, 2.9.45, 3.1.46); even more, *blanditiae* is used synecdochically as a synonym for elegiac poems (cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.1.21).

primis...in annis: the combination *primis...annis* is frequently employed by Ovid to denote "youth", "the early days" (cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.61 with Hollis, 181, *Met.* 7.216, *Tr.* 4.4.27); so is the prepositional clause *in primis annis*, cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.181, *Met.* 8.313 *primis...in annis*, 9.399 *primos...in annos*, also *Met.* 7.798 *primos...per annos*, 13.596 *primisque sub annis*, *Tr.* 4.4.27 *primis...ab armis*, *Pont.* 2.2.1 *primis...ab annis*, 2.5.43 *primis...ab annis*. The postponement of *in* (again at line 121 *primo...in aeuo*) is frequent in Ovid, cf. e.g. Ov. *Am.* 1.7.26 *poenam...in ipse meam* with McKeown, *Tr.* 5.2.75 *flammis...in Aetneae*. For the frequent postponement of prepositions in Latin poetry see n. on *Her.* 8.59.

mea mater: the distorted word-order in the line underlines the parenthetic address. *mea mater* is an emotional interjection, which adds to the dramatic character of Hermione's appeal; perhaps under dramatic influence, since the interjection *mea mater* was frequently employed in Roman drama to infuse greater emotion (cf. e.g. Enn. *trag.* 38, Plaut. *Aul.* 685, 690, 692, Ter. *Hec.* 353, 358). Hermione's preference for *mater*, instead of the elevated and poetic *genetrix* (similar to the *pater-genitor* distinction), is indicative of her emotional tension (on the use of *mater* ((non-literally) in Latin addresses see Dickey (2002) 110-2, 119-20, 270 n.37, 270-2).

92. incerto...ore: "sweet words spoken by prattling tongue", a telling hypallage. *os* here means "mouth, 'voice', 'utterance' (*OLD* s.v.2); in this sense, the *iunctura* is unique in Latin poetry.

puella: *puella* is an appropriate term for a female child (*OLD* s.v.1), but at the same time it picks up Hermione's self-identification as an elegiac mistress (for *puella* as a distinctive elegiac signpost see n. on *Her.* 4.2).

93f. The couplet is echoed at Ov. *Met.* 6.624-8 (*ut tamen accessit natus matrique salutem / attulit et paruis adduxit colla lacertis / mixtaque blanditiis puerilibus oscula iunxit, / mota quidem est genetrix*) in a similar context of maternal betrayal, where Itys offers his last embrace to Procne, his mother, moments before he is tragically killed by her own hands.

captaui breuibus...colla lacertis: Hermione advances further in her attempt to blend filial and erotic affection (cf. *blanditias* 91 with n. ad loc.), since her careful phrasing intentionally recalls similar gestures of erotic nature, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.4.35 *nec premat inpositis sinu tua colla lacertis*, *Her.* 16.221-2 *...cum me spectante / lacertos inponit collo rusticus iste tuo*, *Met.* 3.389 *ut iniceret sperato brachia collo* with Bömer for a list of parallels, 428-9 *in mediis quotiens visum captantia collum / brachia mersit aquis*, Lygd. [Tib.] 3.6.45-6 *nec uos aut capiant pendentia brachia collo / aut fallat blanda sordida lingua fide* with N-A for more examples. For further parallels see *TLL* 3.1160.25ff. and Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.4.53-56. The theme of erotic embrace is widespread in the collection, cf. *Her.* 2.93, 5.47-8, 13.106, 18.164, 19.103, 20.58. For the motif of erotic embrace in general see Zielinski (1931) 33ff.

breuibus...lacertibus: Hermione's "little arms" are another implicit indication of her young age (cf. 79 *non longos...capillos*). The *iunctura* occurs only here (for the use of *lacertus* in dactylic poetry see n. on *Her.* 4.81).

94. gremio...sarcina grata tuo: the framing of *sarcina grata* by *gremio...tuo* suggests the maternal embrace. The *iunctura sarcina grata* appears only here. I am tempted to read behind the use of *sarcina* an implicit hint at Hermione's (possible) pregnancy (see n. on *Her.* 8.66), since the term is common in the sense of "the burden of pregnancy" (see Bömer on *Met.* 6.224). For more details on *sarcina* within the context of Hermione's strategy of self-objectification see p.58. In respect of Hermione's eroticized version of imaginary meeting with her mother, *in gremio sedere* proves a fitting choice, because of its erotic implications, cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.18.6, 2.2.62, *Met.* 7.66f., also see *TLL* 6.2322.8ff.

95. non tibi cultus mei: Hermione's concern for *cultus* should be seen as a further indication of her elegiac status (for more details on Hermione's preoccupation with her physical appearance see n. on *Her.* 8.10). Given the centrality of female *cultus* in the elegiac discourse and its prominence in the erotodidaxis of the *praeceptor amoris* in the Ovidian *Ars* (cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.101-34 with Gibson with bibliography) and the *Medicamina*, Hermione's complaint for the lack of *cultus* becomes a metaliterary complaint for not having received an upbringing according to the literary and aesthetic principles of the elegiac genre.

pacta marito: *paciscor* + dative (cf. *Her.* 10.92 *quae tibi pacta fui*, 21.185 *tibi pacta puella*, and Prop. 4.3.11 *haecne marita fides et pacta haec praemia nuptae*) is the proper term for "betrothal" (see *OLD* s.v. 2, *TLL* 10.1.207.3ff., Treggiari (1991) 336-8, 357-61) and it has a distinctive legal colouring (see Bömer on *Met.* 4.703 with bibliography). For its disputed etymological derivation see Barchiesi on *Her.* 2.4 and Maltby (1991) s.v. *pactum*.

96. intraui thalamos...nouos: *intraui thalamos* is an Ovidian *iunctura* (unfortunately omitted by *TLL* 7.2.58.4ff, again at *Ov. Met.* 2.797, 4.218, 8.85, 816, later found in [Sen.] *Oct.* 276-7, 656 and at *Carm. Bell. Act.* 22 Courtney *Alexandro thalamus intrare dearum* (possibly an Ovidian influence, so Herrmann (1966) 776). *thalamus* is an elevated Grecism (in Greek *θάλαμος*) in most cases referring to the chambers of goddesses, heroines and queens (Pichon (1966) s.v.). For its distribution in Latin poetry see McKeown on *Ov. Am.* 1.5.11, while on the various meanings of *thalamus* / *θάλαμος* see Bömer on *Met.* 2.737. Here *thalamus* is used to denote specifically the marital chamber (Treggiari (1991) 164), which is possibly reminiscent of a similar use of the Greek *θάλαμος* (ever since Homer, cf. e.g. *Od.* 23.178ff. the bedroom of Ulysses and Penelope, see *LSJ* s.v.). *thalamus* appears in Latin for the first time in Catullus (61.181, 66.17, 68B.104); it is a frequent term in the *Heroides* (2.117, 3.72, 5.92, 6.95, 12.86, 14.31, 16.20). The *iunctura thalamos...nouos* is also an Ovidian formation (cf. *Ov. Met.* 7.709 *sacra tori coitusque nouos thalamosque recentes*, Sen. *Tro.* 900 *thalamis Troia praelucet nouis*).

matre parante: a similar complaint is (probably) voiced by the chorus at Eur. *Hel.* 1476-8 *ἀν οἴκοις / <ἔλειπες* (sc. Helen), *Ἑρμιόναν,* / *ἄς οὐπω πεῦκαι πρὸ γάμων ἔλαμψαν* (for the text at line 1477 see Dale (1967) ad loc., Kannicht (1969) *app. cr.*) In addition, Helen herself in many occasions throughout the play expresses her concern for Hermione's bad luck in marriage (cf. Eur. *Hel.* 283, 689, 933).

While the use of *thalamus* brings out the Greek background of the story, this is an interesting case of anachronism, since, Hermione depicts Helen in the role of a Roman *pronuba* (see also n. on *Her.* 8.107-8f.), i.e. a respectable married woman (traditionally a *uniuira*) who escorted the new bride to the bridal chamber (cf. Catul. 61.186-8 *uos, bonae senibus uiris / cognitae bene feminae, / collocata puellulam*, Ter. *Eun.* 593 with Donatus ad loc., Verg. *Aen.* 4.166 with Servius, Paul. Fest. p.244 M (= Lindsay 283.15f.) *pronubae adhibentur nuptis, quae simul nupserunt, causa auspicii, ut singulare perseueret matrimonium*, Sen. *Phoen.* 505-8 *...non te duxit in thalamos parens / comitata primos nec sua festas manu / ornauit aedes nec sacra laetas faces / uitta reuinxit*, Apul. *Met.* 4.26, 8.12 *sic faces nuptiales tuos illuminarunt thalamos. ultrices habebis pronubas*). For more on the ritual term *pronuba* and the role played by the mother during a Roman wedding see Williams (1958) 20-2, Barchiesi on *Her.* 2.117, Treggiari (1991) 163. According to the Roman customs of marriage the marital bed should have been lavishly decorated (cf. Catul. 64.47ff., Lucan 2.356-7, Juv 10.334-5).

The enjambement, which is surely indicative of her emotional turmoil, seems to echo the movement of the marital procession and more specifically Hermione's entrance to her new marital chamber.

97. obuia: a slip of tongue, since the adjective in addition to "meeting" also involves an implicit sense of confrontation (*OLD* s.v. 2). Cf. Hermione's emphasis on face-to-face confrontation at line 59 (*Hermione coram quisquamne obiecit Oresti* with note).

prodieram: in the sense “to go forth from the house, come out of the house” (*OLD* s.v. 1b), cf. e.g. Ter. *Eun.* 669, *Phorm.* 152, *Adelph.* 635, Ov. *Am.* 3.11A.13, *Fast.* 3.30.3) and further “to appear in public” (*OLD* s.v.2b). *prodire* is often attributed to a *puella* of outstanding beauty “with the sense of flaunting or showing off” (so Camps on Prop. 2.24.43, also cf. Hor. *Carm.* 2.8.7 with N-H, also Prop. 1.2.1 with Fedeli, 2.25.43, Ov. *Ars* 3.131, 171, *Fast.* 4.309, *Rem.* 666). In this light, its application constitutes a covered allusion to Hermione’s beauty, despite her claims to the contrary in the following couplet.

reduci tibi: cf. Prop. 2.32.31f. *Tyndaris externo patriam mutauit amore, / et sine decreto uiua reducta domumst*, Ov. *Pont.* 4.16.26 *Tantalidae reduces*. *redux* should be understood in its intransitive sense “someone returning from exile or captivity” (see *OLD* s.v. 1b). The adjective (either transitive or intransitive) appears as early as Naevius (cf. Naev. *praet.* 2 *uita insepulta laetus in patriam redux*) and has a constant presence throughout Latin poetry.

redux is one of the numerous compounds with *re-* in Hermione’s letter, which overall seem to imply the idea of re-turn and re-claim (cf. *reclusis* 17, *repetitor* 19, *repetenda* 25, *referas* 44, *referam* 67, *reddita* 72, *reduci* 97, *requirebas* 100, *reduce* 103). For a similar effect see Jacobson’s (1974) 202 n.23 remark on “the virtual refrain-like recurrence of words compounded of *re-*” in *Her.* 13.

- **uera fatebor** - : *uera* is a cognate accusative. For parenthesis as a Hellenistic device and its Ovidian use see n. on *Her.* 4.18.

98. **nota parentis:** Palmer’s suggestion ad loc. that *nota* is an Ovidian translation of a surviving fragment from Sophocles’ *Hermione* (*TrGF* fr. 203 (201) *γνωστός* Radt) is intriguing, though speculative. The application of the less intimate *parens*, instead of *mater* (cf. line 91), betrays Hermione’s emotional detachment.

99. **Helenen:** on Ovidian predilection for Greek accusatives see n. on *Her.* 4.55.

pulcherrima: Helen’s specific choice of *pulcherrima* is not by chance, since its elevated character (as opposed to the rather colloquial synonym *formosus*) effectively supports the grandeur of Helen’s presentation. In addition, *pulcher* also hints at Helen’s moral justification, since the adjective carries connotations of both physical and moral beauty. In this light, Helen’s beauty seems to offer valid explanation for her actions. Further on the moral implications of *pulcher* and on the stylistic differentiation between *pulcher* and *formosus* see n. on *Her.* 4.125 with bibliography. *pulcherrima* (an adjective often attributed to Venus, cf. e.g. line Enn. *Ann.* 86 Skutsch (with Skutsch on line 38), Verg. *Aen.* 12.554, Ov. *Fast.* 4.161) is often found in this metrical *sedes* in verse-endings (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.496, 4.60, 6.648, 7.761, 9.253, 11.852, *Met.* 9.9, 330, *Ars* 213, *Her.* 4.125).

Greek literature is replete with references to “beautiful Helen”, as the female beauty *par excellence* (cf. e.g. Eur. *Hec.* 269 *ἡ Τυνδαρίς γὰρ εἶδος ἐκπρεπεστάτη*, 635f *Ἑλένας ἐπι λέκτρα, τὰν / καλλίσταν ὁ χρυσοφαῆς / Ἄλιος ἀυγάζει*, Gorg. *Hel.* 4 (*ἰσόθεον κάλλος*), Isoc. 10.14, Theoc. 18.20-31, Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.7 *κάλλει διαπρεπής*). Homer in several

instances mentions Helen's sublime and incomparable beauty (cf. *Il.* 3.228, 423, *Od.* 4.305, 15.106 *δίᾳ γυναικῶν*, *Il.* 9.139f. *Τραιάδας δὲ γυναικᾶς εἰκοσὶν αὐτὸς ἐλέσθω / αἶ κε μετ' Ἀργείην Ἑλένην κάλλισται ἔωσιν*), also Sapph. fr. 195 Page *ἄ γὰρ πόλυ περσκέβοισα / κάλλος [ἀνθ] ρώπων Ἑλένα*, Theocr. 18.20: *οἶα Ἀχαιιάδων γαῖαν πατεῖ οὐδεμί' ἄλλα*. Nevertheless, he avoids attributing to her any specific details other than formulaic beauty adjectives, such as *ἠὔκομος* (3.329, 7.355, 8.82), *λευκώλενος* (3.121), *τανύπεπλος* (*Od.* 4.305, 15.171), *καλλίκομος* (*Od.* 15.58), *καλλιπάρης* (*Od.* 15.123) (cf. also *ἔσφυρος* (Eur. *Hel.* 1570) and *ρόδόχρως* (Theoc. 18.31), *ξανθή* (Ibycus fr. 1a.5 and Euripides *Hel.* 1224)), while his comment on her renowned beauty during the *Teichoscopia* scene (*Il.* 3.156-8) is conspicuous for its indirectness and restraint (see Kirk ad loc.). Helen is equally renowned for her beauty in Latin literature (cf. e.g. Prop. 2.3.32, 3.14.19, Ov. *Met.* 8.99, Hyg. *Fab.* 78.1.3, 92.3.5). In the *Heroides*, even Oenone, Helen's rival, cannot help acknowledging Helen's physical supremacy (*Her.* 5.125 *sit facie quamuis insignis*). Further on Helen's proverbial beauty see Michalopoulos on *Her.* 16.85f. with parallels.

100. Despite Hermione's allegations for the contrary, there are plenty of references to her outstanding beauty in both Greek and Latin literature (cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.13-4 *ἐπεὶ δὴ τὸ πρῶτον ἐγείνατο παῖδ' ἐρατεινήν, / Ἑρμιόνην, ἣ εἶδος ἔχε χρυσοῆς Ἀφροδίτης*, Hes. fr. 204.94 West *ἣ τέκεν Ἑρμιόνην καλλίσφυρ[ο]ν ἐν μεγάροισιν / ἄελπτον*, Sapph. fr. 197 Page *ὡς γὰρ ἄν[τι]ον εἰσίδω σ[ε], / φαίνεται μ' οὐδ] Ἑρμιόνα τεαύ[τα] [ἔμμεναι,] ξάνθαι δ' Ἑλένας σ[ε] εἰσ[κ]ήν / [οὐδ' ἐν ἄει]κες*, Prop. 1.4.6-7 *Spartanae referas* (sc. formam) *laudibus Hermionae / et quascumque tulit formosi temporis aetas*, 1.13.29f. (in connection with Helen) *nec mirum, cum sit Ioue dignae proxima Leda / et Leda partu gratior, una tribus*.

Hermione throughout her letter (and in this section in particular) says nothing at all about Helen's feelings for her as part of her strategy of self-depreciation in order to arouse Orestes' pity and sympathy. Helen even fails to recognize her own daughter. Nevertheless, Helen's warm feelings for Hermione were known to Homer (*Il.* 3.175 *παῖδά τε τηλυγέτην*), where Helen in a reference to her daughter calls her *τηλυγέτην*, an adjective used for a dearly beloved, favourite child (cf. West on Hom. *Od.* 4.11, LSJ s.v.). Furthermore, Paris in his letter to Helen mentions her kisses to Hermione (*Her.* 16.255f. *oscula si natae dederas, ego protinus illa / Hermiones tenero laetus ab ore tuli* with Michalopoulos).

101. **pars haec una mihi, coniunx bene cessit Orestes**: "this has been my only share in happiness, to have Orestes as my husband", a compressed variation of Ovid's popular phrase *pars alicuius rei est in aliquo* (for different variations of the phrase see Heinze on *Her.* 12.91). For *pars* meaning "share" see *OLD* s.v. 8b.

bene cessit: *cedere* followed by an adverb must have been prosaic and belonged to low poetic register (e.g. *Annal. max.* fr. Gell. 4.5.4 *res bene et prospere populo Romano cessit*, Sal. *Catul.* 26.5, Hor. *Serm.* 2.1.31 *si male cesserat*). In Ovid, it occurs frequently, cf. *Her.* 10.141, *Met.* 8.862 *illa dei munus bene cedere sensit*, 10.80 *quod male cesserat illi*, *Fast.* 2.380 *quod bene*

cessit, Pont. 2.7.19 with Galasso). For more examples see *TLL* 3.732.43ff. (*TLL* 3.730.67f. wrongly construes *cessit* with dative, since *cessit* here is used absolutely). See also n. on *Her.* 8.46.

coniunx: the elevated tone of *coniunx*, which is restricted almost exclusively to epic poetry, adds to Orestes' grandeur. See also n. on *Her.* 4.18, where the term is used to denote a "wife".

102. pro se pugnet: Palmer's suggestion ad loc. for *pro me* in the place of *pro se* misses the intended irony; *pro se* appears here *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* in the place of the more expected *pro me* (so Jacobson (1974) 49 n.12). More importantly, through this rhetorical twist Hermione manages to entangle her fate inseparably with the fate of her loved one. Her story now becomes an issue of vital importance for Orestes as well. His fight to claim his wife back is equated with a fight for his pride, which in the heroic code of his time ultimately means a fight for his own existence.

ademptus: it picks up Menelaus' deprivation of Helen at line 19 (*nuptae repeditor ademptae*), though in reverse sex order. For the ominous connotations of the participle see n. on *Her.* 8.19.

103. captam: this is the last of Hermione's many references to her captivity by Neoptolemus (cf. *inclusam...tenet* 4, *non inuita tenerer* 5, *traxit...in sua tecta* 10, *capta Lacedaemone serua tulisse* 11, *captaui* 93). The contrast with her mention of her victorious father in the same line is striking. For the possibility of an allusion to the elegiac topos of the *seruitium amoris* see n. on *Her.* 8.11 (on the motif see n. on *Her.* 4.22).

reduce et uictore: another remarkable anachronism, since Hermione depicts Menelaus' return from Troy in terms of the homecoming of a Roman general and his victorious legions (cf. *CLE* 19.8 (= *CIL* 12.103 *et add.* p. 805), *CLE* 260.4 (= *CIL* 13.412 *et add.* p.4), *Liv.* 1.10.5.4 *inde exercitu uictore reducto, ipse cum factis uir magnificus tum factorum ostentator haud minor...*, 2.25.6.3 *consul cum maxima gloria sua uictorem exercitum Romam reducit*, 3.23.6.1 *uictor ad Columen-id loco nomen est-exercitu reducto castra locat*, 5.47.6.1 *dictator exercitu uictore Romam reducto ...magistratu se abdicauit*, 29.27.3.3ff. *saluos incolumesque uictis perduellibus uictores spoliis decoratos praeda onustos triumphantesque mecum domos reduces sistatis*, [Ov.] *Epic. Drus. duce iam uictore caremus* (*uictore* qualifying *duce*, *OLD* s.v. *uictor* 3), *Sen. HF* 368 *pacem reduci uellem uictori expedit*, *Sen. Ben.* 5.15.5.4ff. *qui ne triumphaturi quidem inire urbem iniussu senatus deberetis quibusque uictorem exercitum reducentibus curia extra muros praeberetur*, *Vell.* 2.114.5.1 *uictor in hiberna redutitur exercitus*, also see *Stat. Silv.* 2.7.49 *reducis...Vlixis*, 4.2.4 *reducem...Ulixem*. It is surely not by chance that Hermione a few lines above also mentions Helen's return from Troy using the same term (line 97 *reduce tibi*).

104. Hermione's indifference for the epic repercussions of the great Trojan War deserves special notice. "History" for the heroines is significant only to the extent it affects their lives; hence, the fall of Troy means nothing more to Hermione than the piteous state she finds herself in, i.e. her seclusion from her beloved. In doing so, Hermione shares the same elegiac perspective with Penelope, who gives voice to a similar complaint in her letter to Ulysses (*Her.*

1.3f. *Troia iacet certe, Danais inuisa puellis; / uix Priamus tanti totaque Troia fuit, 51-2 diruta sunt aliis, uni mihi Pergama restant, / incola captiuo quae boue uictor arat.* For the opposite effect (seen this time from the Trojan side), cf. *Ov. Met.* 13.507 *solī mihi Pergama restant*, where Hecuba identifies Troy as an everlasting reminder of her former happiness and her present disaster (on the Ovidian passage as a case of self-imitation and expansion of *Her.* 1.51 see Lee (1958) 467-8)).

munus et: for the postponement of *et* see n. on *Her.* 4.99 with bibliography.

diruta Troia: for similar phrasing, cf. *Prop.* 4.1B. 113-4 (...) *tu, diruta, fletum / supprime et Euboicos respice, Troia, sinus!*, 2.28B.54 *Priami diruta regna senis*, *Her.* 1.51 *diruta sunt aliis, uni mihi Pergama restant*, 3.45 *diruta Marte tuo Lyrnesia moenia uidi*, *Met.* 13.520 *felicem Priamum post diruta Pergama dici?*

105. altus equis Titan radiantibus: the *iunctura equis...radiantibus* is unique in Latin poetry. *radiare* with reference to natural phenomena is frequent (in the majority of cases applied to the moon or the stars). For parallels see Bömer on *Met.* 4.99 and Pease on *Verg. Aen.* 4.119. To his list add [Sen.] *HO* 488-9 *non ille seros, cum ferens Titan diem / lassam rubenti mergit Oceano rotam*, *Apul. Met.* 7.1.2 *candidum solis curriculum cuncta lustrabat*, 10.35.18 *curriculum solis deflexerat*). The image of the Titan's chariot occurs in Latin poetry for the first time at *Cic. Arat.* 60-61 *quem cum perpetuo uestiuit lumine Titan, / brumali flectens contorquet tempore currum*, 264 *in quo consistens conuertit curriculum sol*, also *Cic. Tim.* 29.1 *curriculum inuentum est solis et lunae*.

Titan is an old name for the Sun-god (Wüst in *RE* 6.A2 (1937) s.v. *Titan* 1485.19ff). The identification of Titan with the sun-god has its roots in Greek literature, cf. *Anacr. fr.* 46.7-8 West ἀφελῶς δ' ἔλαμψε Τιτάν / νεφελῶν σκιαὶ δονοῦνται, *Orphica Hymn.* 8.2 [Εἰς Ἥλιον] Τιτάν χρυσαυγῆς, Ὑπερίων, οὐράνιον φῶς (on the identification of Τιτάν with multiple gods in the Orphic Hymns, see Morand (2001) 159-61, *Argon.* 512 Ἄλλ' ὅτε γ' Ἰκεανοῖο ῥόον βαπτίζετο Τιτάν, *Lyrice adespota* (CA) fr. 35.23, *AP.* 14.72 Εὐτ' ἂν ὑπὲρ γαίης ἀνέχη δρόμον ὄρθρια Τιτάν / λύσας ἀκτίσι ζοφερῆς δηλήματα νυκτός, *AP App. dedic.* 177.5 Cougny Τιτάν δ' ὅτ' ἐλάων λευκοῖσι δι' αἰθέρος ἵπποις, *Sepulc.* 217.19-20 Cougny Φαέθοντα Τιτάν οὐκ ἔκλαυσ' ὅτ' ἐκ δίφρων / ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ κατέπεσεν εἰς πέδον γαίης, *Echort.* 27.1 Cougny Χαίρε μοι, ᾧ Δ' ἡλου μεδέων, φαεσί[βρ]οτε Τιτάν, 74.5-6 Cougny Σκέπτεο τείρεα πάντα πρὸς ἄντυγα, τῆς ἐπι Τιτάν / νύκτα ταλαντεύει καὶ φάος ἐρχόμενος, *Procl. Hymn.* 1 [Εἰς Ἥλιον] Κλύθι, πυρὸς νοεροῦ βασιλεῦ, χρυσήνι Τιτάν, *Synes. Hymn.* 3.20-21 Σοὶ μὲν Τιτάν ἱππεύει, / ἦοῦς ἄσβεστος παγά. Τιτάν as an adjective is also attributed to: Apollo (cf. *Orphica Hymn.* 34.3), Phaethon (cf. *Oppian Cyneg.* 1.9 (εὐμένεοι Τιτάν Φαέθων καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων), 2.617 Φινεὶ γάρ ποτε δὴ Φαέθων ἐκοτέσσατο Τιτάν), the sun (cf. *Ezechiel Exagogue.* 217 ἐπεὶ δὲ Τιτάν ἥλιος δυσμαῖς προσῆν).

instant: an elevated, poetic use of the verb (cf. *TLL* 7.1.2003.43ff.), which is in accordance with the imposing portrayal of the Sun.

106. *perfruor infelix liberiore malo*: a striking oxymoron, which is further emphasized by the word-order in the line of the type ABab (*perfruor~ liberiore, infelix~malo*).

107. *nox*: Hermione's grief during the night alludes to the erotic motif of the "night-apart", according to which the pair of lovers have to spend the night in suffering, away from each other. The motif was present already in Hellenistic poetry, cf. e.g. Ap. Rhod. 3.616ff., 744ff., esp. 751ff., where Medea, being in love with Jason after their first encounter, spends two nights of erotic anguish and despair apart from him. Cf. also Dido's similar reaction at her separation from Aeneas for one night (Verg. *Aen.* 4.80-3).

***ubi*:** for the postponement of *ubi* see n. on *Her.* 4.12 with bibliography.

***thalamis ululantem*:** it picks up *thalamos...nouos* at line 96 with n. ad loc. on *thalamus*. The reversal is telling, since Hermione's marital chamber now turns into a place of mourning.

ululare is a strong verb associated with lamentation. In my view its application here in marital context alludes to the theme of the "tragic wedding", whose presence in the *Her.* is prominent: the theme appears 7 times in total (cf. *Her.* 2. 117-20 (Phyllis and Demophon) with Barchiesi, 6.43-6 (Hypsipyle and Jason), 7.93-6 (Dido and Aeneas), 11.103-6 (Canace and Macareus), 12.139f. (Jason and Creusa) with Bessone, 14.27 (Hypermetra with Lynceus), 21.157-72 (Cydippe with grooms) with Kenney) as a means of prefiguring the unfortunate conclusion of the story. The motif of the "tragic wedding" and the exchange between marital and funereal rituals is an old poetic *topos* dating back to Greek tragedy (see Lloyd-Jones (1969)103f., Wiseman (1969) 19f., Jacobson (1974) 392 n.392, Seaford (1987) 107, Rehm (1994), cf. e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 462, 778, Eur. *Tro.* 308 ff.); the motif was passed on to the Romans in particular through the literary mediacy of the Hellenistic epigram (for examples see Kenney on *Her.* 21.172). Further on the motif see Barchiesi on *Her.* 2.117-20, Bessone on *Her.* 12.139f., Kenney on Apul. 4.33.4, Ferri on [Sen.] *Oct.* 23-4 with bibliography.

Further ominous implications behind the application of *ululantem* are provided through its association with the sinister cry of the Nymphs during the unlucky "marriage" of Dido with Aeneas (see Verg. *Aen.* 4.168 *summoque ulularunt uertice nymphae* with Pease). Further evidence is provided by the presence of *ululare* in two similar occasions in the *Her.*, which also allude to the Vergilian account of Dido's "tragic wedding", cf. *Her.* 2.117 *pronuba Tisiphone thalamis ululauit in illis* and *Her.* 7.95 *nymphas ululasse putauit* with Knox (1995) ad loc. for this passage as an Ovidian re-interpretation of the Vergilian text). Further on the orgiastic implications of *ululare* see Theander (1915) 101-4.

An indispensable component of the "tragic wedding" motif was the presence of an ominous *pronuba* (see Keulen on Sen. *Tro.* 1132-6). Hence, Hermione's reference to her mother in terms of a Roman *pronuba* at line 96 becomes intriguing; especially, in view of Helen's ominous likeness to a *pronuba* in Polyxena's sacrifice, as narrated by Seneca in his *Troades*

(1132-6 *cum subito thalami more praecedunt faces / et pronuba illi Tyndaris, maestum caput / demissa*. “*tali nubat Hermione modo’ / Phryges precantur, ‘sic uiro turpis suo / reddatur Helena*”).

108. maesto procubuique toro: “sorrowful, doleful bed” (*TLL* 8.48.33ff.), an Ovidian *iunctura* appearing again only at *Pont.* 1.10.34 *non solet in maestos illa* (sc. Venus) *uenire toros*. For Ovid’s predilection for *torus* over *lectus* in his elegiac production see nn. on *Her.* 4.127 and *Her.* 8.26.

For an abandoned woman to fall upon the common bed and deliver a monologue seems to have been a typical gesture of despair (possibly under the influence of Greek tragedy (so Heinze (1915) 137 n.2), cf. Ap. Rhod. 3.655f. *τρίς μὲν ἐπειρήθη, τρίς δ’ ἔσχετο τέτρατον αὐτίς / λέκτροισι πρηνῆς ἐνικάππεσεν εἰλιχθεῖσα* (Medea), Parthen. *Erot.* 2.2 *ὡς δὲ τοὺς ἀνέμους ἐγκεκλεισμένους παραλαβὼν ἀπέπλευσεν, ἡ κόρη φωρᾶται τινα τῶν Τρωϊκῶν λαφύρων ἔχουσα καὶ τούτοις μετὰ πολλῶν δακρῶν ἀλινδουμένη* (Polymele), see Clausen (1976) 179. In Latin poetry, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.648-50 *hic, postquam Iliacas uestis notumque cubile / conspexit, paulum lacrimis et mente morata/ incubuitque toro dixitque nouissima uerba* (Dido), Ov. *Her.* 10.55f. *incumbo, lacrimisque toro manante profusis / “presimus”, exclamo, “te duo: redde duos!”* (Ariadne), *Her.* 12.57f. *ut positum tetigi thalamo male saucia lectum, / acta est per lacrimas nox mihi quanta fuit* (Medea) (echoing Ap. Rhod. 3.671f. *ἐκ θαλάμου θάλαμόνδε διαμπερές, ᾧ ἔνι κούρη / κέκλιτ’, ἀκχημένη, δρῦσεν δ’ ἐκάτερθε παρειάς*). On the ominous connotations of the imagery see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 8.538 *posito dant oscula lecto*.

109f. The couplet is reminiscent of Ov. *Am.* 1.4.61f. *nocte uir includet; lacrimis ego maestus obortis, / qua licet, ad saeuas prosequar usque fores*, where the *exclusus amator* is complaining about his separation from his beloved. The reversal in terms of gender is noteworthy, since the complaint now comes from the *puella* who is locked inside, and not from the locked out lover.

109. pro somno: insomnia is a common symptom of love, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.5, 522ff. (Dido), Ov. *Her.* 12.58 *acta est per lacrimas nox mihi* (Medea), *Met.* 10.369-70 (Myrrha), [Verg.] *Ciris* 174ff., 231ff. (Scylla).

lacrimis...obortis: Hermione resorts to tears for a second time in her letter (cf. line 77 with n. ad loc.), this time as an expression of her despair. *lacrimis...obortis* is a solemn, epic *iunctura*, possibly of Ennian origin (so Norden on Verg. *Aen.* 6.867), cf. Verg. *Aen.* (cf. 3.492, 4.30, 6.867, 11.41, also see Ogilvie on Liv. 1.58.7.2. It is a popular Ovidian *iunctura* (cf. e.g. *Am.* 1.4.61-2, *Her.* 15.97, *Met.* 8 times (see Bömer on *Met.* 1.350 for parallels) – almost always placed last in the hexameter, which was later picked up only by Statius (*Theb.* 6.44).

Given Hermione’s implicit parallel between herself and Lucretia at line 64 (see n. ad loc.), the fact that the combination *lacrimis...obortis* appears again at Livy 1.58.7.2 with reference to Lucretia’s reaction to her rape from Tarquinius is perhaps not that haphazard. Moreover, Hermione’s tears offer an additional link (cf. 107 *ululantem*, 108 crying over the

bed) with the Vergilian Dido through the verbal similarity with her own crying for her abandonment by Aeneas (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.30 *sic effata sinum lacrimis impleuit abortis*). In both passages the *iunctura* appears at the same metrical *sedes*.

oculi funguntur: an interesting personification of the eyes (first attested in Cicero, cf. Cic. *Nat. Deor.* 2.141.1, *Div.* 1.71.5ff. (=2.107.3ff.)), which is further underlined by the framing of *lacrimis...abortis*.

110. quaque licet: “as much as I can”; a favourite Ovidian parenthetical clause, always appearing at the same metrical *sedes* (cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.4.62, 3.8.51, *Her.* 4.9, 5.56, 16.237, *Met.* 10.164, *Fast.* 6.536, *Pont.* 2.4.34, 2.8.5, *Ib.* 30, except *Pont.* 2.8.5); it is later taken up by Seneca (only once *Dial.* 2.1.1.7).

fugio: in addition to its meaning “to avoid”, “to keep away” (*OLD* s.v. 10), the verb has further legal connotations (*OLD* s.v. 4, *TLL* 6.1.1490.45ff.).

111-16. Hermione’s erotic approach to Neoptolemus comes in striking contrast with her systematic self-portrayal as the helpless victim of his violence throughout her letter. In an attempt to rouse Orestes’ jealousy Hermione emphasizes her active role in her relationship with Neoptolemus; hence, she turns from a passive object into an active subject. The section serves as a further implicit reminder to Orestes of Hermione’s right to her sexuality and the joys of love. According to the *praeceptor* in Ovid’s *Remedia*, it was exactly Hermione’s erotic affair with Neoptolemus, which fed the fire of Orestes’ love for his wife (cf. Ov. *Rem.* 771f. *acrius Hermionen ideo dilexit Orestes, / esse quod alterius coeperat illa uiri*). Hermione’s erotic involvement with Neoptolemus recalls (by contrast) Cydippe’s own reference to her indifference towards the erotic approach of her fiancé (cf. Ov. *Her.* 21. 189-206 with Kenney, also *Her.* 20.135-70). Cf. also Andromache’s similar views on female marital devotion to only one man (even after the husband’s death) in Eur. *Tro.* 661-72.

111. saepe: the high frequency of their erotic encounters (suggested by the double repetition of *saepe*) seriously undermines Hermione’s loyalty to Orestes. The repetition of *saepe* at the opening of two hexameters in proximity is frequent in Ovid (see Sicherl (1963) 196 n.6).

112. The careful arrangement of the terms in the line (of the type A V B ab) reflects Hermione’s erotic embrace.

112. ignara...manu: a rare *iunctura* (appearing for the first time at Liv. 41.19.11.2); in Ovid it appears only here (later picked up at Stat. *Theb.* 3.98). The hypallage sounds almost comic, since it transfers responsibility from Hermione to her hands.

Scyria membra: Thetis, the mother of Achilles, in her attempt to prevent her son from being killed at Troy, disguised him as a girl and hid him on the island of Scyros. There, Achilles fell in love with Deidamia, the daughter of king Lycomedes of Scyros, and seduced her. Neoptolemus was the fruit of their love (cf. *Procli Cypriorum enarratio* p.32.51f. Davies, *Procli Iliadis Paruae enarratio* p.52.12f. Davies, *Ilias parua* fr. 4^A Davies (=Σ on Hom. *Il.* 19.326). In the *Odyssey*, Ulysses, after the death of Achilles, fetched Neoptolemus from Scyros to Troy,

where he fought on the side of the Greeks (cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.505-37, esp. 508f. αὐτὸς γὰρ μιν ἐγὼ (sc. Ulysses) κοίλης ἐπὶ νηὸς εἵσης / ἤγαγον (sc. Neoptolemus) ἐκ Σκύρου μετ' ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοῦς). It is possible that Hermione's use of *Scyrius* through its implicit allusion to Achilles' unheroic behaviour is meant to slightly undermine Neoptolemus' heroic origin (cf. line 2 *Pyrrhus* with n. ad loc.).

membra is a clever double entendre, since, in addition to its use for *corpus* (frequent in Ovid, see Kenney on Ov. *Her.* 16.224), the term (always in plural) is a common euphemism for male genitalia (see *TLL* 6.1814.9ff., 8.636.65ff, also Adams (1982) 69, 224, Booth on Ov. *Am.* 2.3.3, McKeown on 2.15.25), cf. also Ov. *Am.* 3.7.13 *tacta...mea membra*, *Met.* 10.257 *tactis...membris*.

113. nefas: *nefas* is a strong term denoting impious offence against divine and moral law ("impiety", "sacrilege", see *OLD* s.v. 1,2). Further on the term see Peeters (1945). Near the end of her letter, Hermione moves a step further and argues her case also on grounds of divine justice. The use of *nefas* combined with *pollutas...manus* (114) and *omen* (116) invests her extensive use of legal terminology with further moral and religious implications. Hermione's emphasis on her polluted hands is very unfortunate in that it recalls inevitably Orestes' matricide (see Williams (1997) 129 with n.60).

male: a clever double entendre, since *male* in addition to the meaning "wickedly, wrongfully" (*OLD* s.v.2) also makes perfect sense, if taken as "barely, scarcely" (*OLD* s.v. 5). For a similar case of a double rendering of *male* used as synonymous with *non* or *uix* see Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.559.

corpora: a poetic plural for metrical convenience.

114. credor: Hermione's use of passive voice and her emphasis on her hands help her to play down her responsibility in a similar way to the hypallage at line 112.

pollutas...manus: the *iunctura* occurs again only at [Sen.] *Oct.* 423 (...) *cruenta caede pollutas manus*. The adjective *pollutus* is often applied to bodily members (e.g. *corpus* (Catul. 62.46), *fauces* (Lucan 1.332), *dextra* (Lucan 2.114).

Hermione's initial reference to her powerless female hands in the opening of her letter (cf. line 6 *cetera femineae non ualuere manus*) adds further irony to her second reference to her hands as means of erotic betrayal. For the awkward repetition of *manu* (line 112) at line 114 (*manus*) see n. on *Her.* 8. 32.

114. saepe: again in line 115, the repetition is possibly intended to urge Orestes take immediate action. The accumulation of repetitions in the closing section (*per...//per...117,119, genus...generisque* 117, *qui...qui* 118, *aut ego // aut ego* 121f., *Tantalidae Tantalidis* 122) reflects Hermione's turmoil. For Ovid's predilection for anaphora of *saepe* see Green on Ov. *Fast.* 1.10 with parallels and bibliography ad loc.

115. Neoptolemi pro nomine nomen Orestae: the polyptoton further strengthened by the arrangement of the terms in the line (note the juxtaposition of the proper names, which are emphatically placed at the two ends) draws attention to Hermione's linguistic "mistake".

nomen Orestae picks up Hermione's very first reference to Orestes at line 9 (*nomen Orestis*), thus concluding her letter with ring-composition. The repetition, however, is unfortunate, since it seems to suggest that Hermione throughout her letter has remained emotionally unchanged towards her loved one. Orestes is still nothing but a name to her (for *nomen Orestae* as a sign of Hermione's emotional detachment see p.56); more importantly, he is a name which she can easily confuse with that of his rival. Her share in love has now become a matter of linguistic choice; her confusion is between two names rather than between two real men.

116. errorem uocis: the formation is unique in Latin poetry. Following Williams (1997) 129 the personification of *uox* works as "an untimely reminder of his (sc. Orestes') more serious *errores uocis*, or his crazed ramblings and frenetic outpourings (cf. e.g. Aesch. *Cho.* 1048-62, Eur. *Or.* 255-76) in the mad fits from which he has only recently recovered". On this see p.52 with n.362.

ut omen: *omen* repeats *n-omen* from the previous line. The wordplay occurs already at Plaut. *Pers.* 623-5, cf. also Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.18. Hermione is so prone to superstition (see n. on *Her.* 8.88) that she herself creates the omen.

amo: note the careful placement of *Orestae* and *amo* at the end of two consecutive lines.

117-22. Hermione rounds off her letter with an emphatic re-employment of the "heredity theme". Hermione, even at the closure of her letter, tries to inscribe her personal story to the disastrous history of her family.

117. per genus... // per patris ossa: for oaths as letter-closures in the *Her.* see n. on *Her.* 4.167f. Erotic oaths, where a pair of lines begins with *per*, are characteristic of Ovidian elegy (for parallels see Wills (1996) 409 n.42).

generisque parentem: a honorific formula appropriate for a *pater familias* (an anachronism). The combination echoes the epic periphrasis *Pelopis parentem* at line 47 (see Wills (1996) 35f.). Initially the impression is given that Hermione carefully avoids the identification of "the head of her line;" possibly in an attempt to avoid a reference to Tantalus by name and its negative connotations. However, the reference here is made to Jupiter. The pentameter throws further light on the identity of this ancestor, since Hermione recalls the high birth of her family and her descent from Jupiter.

The polyptoton (*genus... generis*) is emphatic.

118. The accumulative effect of the three relative clauses adds further to Jupiter's glorious presentation. Cf. Phaedra's majestic reference to her father, Minos, at *Her.* 4.157f. *quod mihi sit genitor, qui possidet aequora, Minos, / quod ueniant proauis fulmina torta manu.*

freta: fretum is a poetic term for "sea", see *TLL* 6.769.31ff.

119. patris...tui...patruis mihi...tibi: the repetition together with the use of the personal pronouns highlight their common descent.

quae tibi debent: another reminder of Orestes' horrible past, which Hermione so far has manipulated and interpreted entirely in terms of Orestes' obligations to his family (cf. lines 50 *induit illa pater*, 54 *quae pater ante tuus*). Orestes should see Hermione's recovery as another occasion for him to show his commitment to his family.

119. patruī mihi: the apposition hints at their "double relationship" (husbands and cousins).

120. fortiter: *fortiter* picks up *materia uellem fortis meliore fuisses* at line 51.

ulta iacent: Hermione carefully avoids any reference to the killing of Clytemnestra (like she did at lines 53f.); instead, she puts all her emphasis on Orestes' revenge for the death of his father.

121. praemoriar: a rare verb, in poetry it appears only in Ovid (again only at *Ov. Am.* 3.7.65).

primoque exstinguar ab aeuo: a common *iunctura*, cf. *Prop.* 3.7.7, 7.392, *Ov. Met.* 3.470 *primo exstinguor in aeuo* with Bömer, *Fast.* 4.701 *primo...in aeuo*, *Pont.* 1.2.137, 2.2.97 *primo...ab aeuo*, *Stat. Silv.* 2.7.73, (cf. *TLL* 1.1166.40ff.). *primo* following immediately after *praemoriar*, further strengthens the idea of premature death.

The idea of dying before one's allotted time seems to be Greek in origin (so Gibson on *Ars* 3.739f. *ante diem morior* with bibliography, also see Katsouris (1986)). In Latin, it first occurs at *Verg. Aen.* 4.620 *cadat ante diem* with Pease and 696f. *nec futo merita nec morte peribat, / sed misera ante diem subitoque accensa furore*. The suicide motif is particularly frequent in the *Heroides* (often at the end of the letter), cf. *Her.* 2.147f., 7.181-96, 9.146-51, 10.81-3, 152, 11.1-5, 15.175f. Further on the heroines' suicide threats in the collection see Kauffman (1986) 57ff., Rosati (1992) 75. For suicide threats in elegy in general see Navarro Antolín (1997). Given Hermione's imprisonment, her threat of suicide could be a witty reversal of the conventional similar threat, which often accompanies the erotic complaints of the *exclusus amator* (see Cairns (1979) 185 n.65, Copley (1956) 17. For the Propertian equation of love with death see Papanghelis (1987) *passim*).

exstinguar: a prosaic verb until Vergil (*Verg. Aen.* 6.527 -the only occurrence in high poetry), see *TLL* 5.2.1925.14ff. This is its only occurrence in elegy (for the high frequency of *exstinctus* in elegy, see *TLL* 5.2.1926.42ff.).

122. Tantalidae Tantalīs: *pace* Jacobson's (1974) 52 remark that the combination *Tantalidae Tantalīs* alienates Hermione from Orestes, Hermione through this emphatic juxtaposition of the two patronymics manages to strengthen their association on grounds of their common origin. Through this re-employment of the "double relationship" theme she manages to conclude her letter with ring-composition.

Tantalidae: the genitive of patronymics in *-is* was avoided by Roman poets as barbarous (so Housman (1972) 826). For *Tantalīs* (also a Greek formation) see n. on *Her.* 8.66.

ero: the use of active voice (*ero*), which is emphatically placed at the end of the line, as opposed to the double use of passive voice (*praemoriar*, *exstinguar*) in the hexameter, betrays Hermione's determination to take up active role and achieve her goal.

**Appendix
on Textual Criticism**

Appendix

on Textual Criticism

Heroides 4

PHAEDRA HIPPOLYTO. The question of the authenticity of all titular salutations in the *Heroides* is a vexed one. These superscriptions appear in the majority of the mainstream manuscripts and are found in various forms for all letters (including the double ones); however, there is no general consent among scholars in terms of their genuineness (see Kenney (1961)b 485 and (1970)a 176, Kirfel (1969) 37ff., Goold (1974) 483f., Jacobson (1974) 404-6, Farrell (1998) 321, 332 n. 46, Reeson (2001) 10-12). Following Kenney (1961) 485 (and *idem* (1970)a 176 n.28 with some reservation) who argues in favour of the antiquity of these headings I retain the superscription *PHAEDRA HIPPOLYTO* as an organic part of the poem in that it helps to underscore the epistolary character of the poem. It is true that prefixing headings to poems was not a common practice in antiquity (cf. Fraenkel (1957) 208f., Schmalzriedt (1970), McKeown (1987) 128, Schröder (1999), Krevans (2005) 86f., Obbink (2005) 103 n.13 with bibliography ad loc.). However, the *Heroides* is a special case in that the poems in the collection purport to be “real” letters and Ovid exploits every possible detail in order to reconstruct the conditions of an actual correspondence. According to ancient letter-writing practices, the name of the sender, or at least the name of the recipient, was marked on the outer surface of the tightly rolled letter-scroll, as on a modern envelope (cf. Cugusi (1983) 28f. citing ancient evidence, esp. 64-7, Trapp (2003) 195 on *Letter 1*, Görgemanns in Brill’s *New Pauly* (2004) 4.1138, Schmidt *ibid* (2005) 7.437). Hence, the presence of a titular salutation contributes considerably to the literary illusion of an actual letter, since reading the superscription in effect equals receiving a letter and unfolding it in order to read the message written in it. In this respect, the superscription ultimately becomes an invitation to the reader (either the internal or the external) to take up a more energetic involvement in the actual process of reading. Further arguments for the authenticity of the superscriptions are offered by Jacobson’s (1974) 405f. discussion of an allusion made by Sappho to the superscription in her letter (*Her.* 15.3f.) (so also Goold (1974) 484, for an opposite view see Kirfel (1969) 102f., Farrell (1998) 332 n.46). Besides, in this particular letter the presence of a titular salutation becomes all the more appropriate, since the identification of both the sender and the recipient in the opening couplet remains deliberately dubious (for more on this see pp.7f.)

1f. The authenticity of the so-called “introductory distichs” is as much disputed as the question of the epistolary headings at the beginning of each poem (discussed above). Given that their manuscript transmission varies considerably, their authenticity should be judged individually in terms of style and content. For a comprehensive critical discussion of these distichs see Kirfel (1969) with Kenney’s review (1970)b, also see Vahlen (1881), Schmitz-Cronenbroeck (1937),

Dörrie (1960) 208-21, *idem* (1971) 7f., Kenney (1961)b 485 n.2, Goold (1974) 482f., Jacobson (1974) 404-6, Tarrant (1983) 270f., Maurer (1990) 14-21, Barchiesi (1992) on *Her.* 1.1, Reeson (2001) 10-12, esp. 10 n.48 with bibliography *ad loc.*). In terms of textual transmission, lines 1f. are attested in all manuscripts (see Kirfel (1969) 93-5, Dörrie (1971), Jacobson (1974) 406, Tarrant (1983) 270). However, it is the rhetorical efficiency and thematic relevance of the opening couplet, which makes it an indispensable part of the letter. Phaedra's ingenious manipulation of the letter salutation contributes somehow to the identification of the letter's sender and recipient, while at the same time it helps to introduce some of the letter's core themes: Phaedra's self-identification as *puella* and her reference to Hippolytus as *uir* with their programmatic quality help to establish the elegiac context of the letter. The juxtaposition of *Amazonio Cressa* (line 2) alludes to the "heredity theme," while her employment of *salus* constitutes a covered allusion to the "incest theme" (for a detailed analysis of the couplet see my comments *ad loc.*). For all the above reasons, I find no reason to question the authenticity of the opening couplet.

Quam: In my view, the emphasis in Phaedra's salutation is placed more on her anticipation of Hippolytus' reply (*dederis*) rather than on her ill health (*caritura est*). Hence, following Showerman-Goold (1977) I prefer the accusative *Quam* to the ablative *Qua*. Taking *qua* as a complement of *caritura est* would make the interposition of the conditional clause (*nisi tu dederis*) rather awkward; it seems to me more natural to proceed from *Quam* to *dederis* instead of the *caritura est*. Besides, I find the framing of the opening line by *Quam* and *salutem* very attractive.

8. destitit: Diggle's (1967) 136f. suggestion that *destitit* is a corruption of an original *deficit* seems unnecessary. Goold (1974) 480 and Hall (1990) 270 (who in addition replaces *ore* with *orsa*) argue in favour of *restitit*, which appears to be rather a scribal conjecture and occurs only in a few of the *recentiores*. Since the suggested alternatives fail to provide a better reading, I see no reason to call the evidence of the manuscript tradition into question (cf. *Ov. Fast.* 2.823 *ter conata loqui ter destitit*, also *Cic. Fam.* 10.24.4.5 *nihil destiti eum litteris hortari*.)

9. qua licet et prodest: instead of *prodest* the manuscripts read *sequitur*, which is rightly obelized by Dörrie (1971), since *sequitur* is grammatically unsatisfactory either taken personally or impersonally. The construction of a monosyllable + *licet et* + verb is common in Ovid (for a list of similar formations with *licet et* see McKeown on *Am.* 2.19.31). Phaedra frustrated by her failed attempts to express herself tries to justify her erotic advances to Hippolytus on the basis of love's compatibility with shame. Her claim is further developed in the pentameter (line 10), where *amor* is dictating all the things which modesty covers with silence. It is exactly this combination of *amor* with *pudor*, which allows Phaedra to disclose her illicit passion and thus escape from her present predicament. Since she tries to combine human law (*licet*) with her own advantage, a verb denoting personal interest and gain is needed to balance *licet*. Hence, I am substituting *prodest* for *sequitur*. The combination of the two verbs is

not unattested in Ovid (cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.387 *at licet et prodest Pompeias ire per umbras* with Gibson ad loc. for parallels). In addition, *prodest*, apart from giving a better sense, also offers a good palaeographical explanation for the somewhat awkward presence of *sequitur*. My choice of *prodest* follows a suggestion initially put forward by Reeve (1973) 326, which was further developed later by Hunt (1975) 222f. According to Hunt, line 9 originally read: *qua licet et <prodest>, pudor est*, which gives a good explanation for the extrusion of *prodest* as a case of haplography because of its similarity with *pudor est*. Consequently, the insertion of *sequitur* must have been the result of a marginal adscript indicating the lacuna being incorporated to the main body of the text (Delz (1986) 81 suggests *seruit*, while Hall's (1990) 271 conjectures put all emphasis on Phaedra's attempt to convey her erotic message as discreetly as possible).

15. uorat: I adopt the conjecture *uorat* put forward by Francius (*uorat*, cited by Burman (1727) ad loc.), instead of the reading *fouet* preserved in the majority of manuscripts. I find *fouet* rather awkward, since its connotations of mildness are in complete contrast with the tension and power of love conveyed by *auido...igne* (cf. also Hall's (1990) 271 suggestion of *domat*).

16. fingat: all but two codices (see Dörrie (1971) *app. crit.* ad loc.) read *figat*. However a sense of “moulding your spirit (*animos*) so as to yield to my prayers” is much more preferable to “transfixing your heart according to my prayers.” *figere* meaning “to transfix, to pierce” appears in most cases with concrete objects (see *ThLL* 6.1.37ff.), while its construction with an abstract object (*animos*) denoting “to manufacture, to form, to build” is rather uncommon, possibly a much later usage (see *ThLL* 6.1.713.14ff.). In fact, this would be the sole instance of *figere* with an abstract object in Ovid. Furthermore, the prepositional structure “*in* + accusative” suggests an end; hence, it makes much better sense if taken with *fingere*, instead of *figere* (cf. also Ov. *Met.* 1.83 *finxit in effigium...deorum*, 14.685 *fingetur in omnes*, 15.380f. *in artus / fingit*).

19. serior: following Kenney (1970)a 172, whose suggestion is based mainly on aesthetic criteria regarding the harmonious distribution of the metrical ictus and of assonance in the line (*uenit amor grauius, quo serior –urimur intus*) I prefer *serior* instead of *serius* (so also Dörrie (1971) and Rosati (1989)).

21. urunt: Burman's (1727) advocacy of *urunt* found in the codex Ambrosianus (*Mi* Dörrie), instead of *laedunt*, seems plausible, especially when combined with the conventional elegiac imagery of “love as fire” at lines 15 (*ut nostras auido fouet igne medullas*) and 20f. (*urimur intus, / urimur*). The emphasis on “burning” is very appropriate in the context of the combined simile at lines 21-4. Phaedra's infatuation with Hippolytus sets her on fire, while Love imprints his mark on her in a way similar to the first yoke, which causes the tender neck of the inexperienced calves to become sore. This is a common use of *urere* (“to make sore, to chafe”, see *OLD* s.v. 10) originating with Hor. *Serm.* 2.7.58. For more examples see the list of similar Ovidian instances gathered by Burman (1727) ad loc. with other instances where the verb appears in similar context in Ovid (cf. Ov. *Rem.* 235 *ut prensos urunt iuga*, *Pont.* 1.5.24

subducunt oneri colla perusta boues). For an extensive list of parallels of the verb *perurere* in similar use see Gaertner on *Pont.* 1.5.24.

37. mittor: Following Palmer (1898) (followed by Goold (1974) 480) I prefer *mittor*, the reading of some secondary manuscripts, to *mutor*, which was preserved in the main tradition (the same also applies to lines 8, 27, 151). *mittor* becomes an even more appropriate choice in view of a possible Euripidean influence here (cf. Palmer on *Her.* 4.38-44, Jacobson (1974) 149, Snell (1951) 337, Wilamowitz, *Hell. Dicht.* II 59 n.2, for the “emblematic” quality of the Euripidean passage for later literature see Snell (1964) 37f., Fedeli on Prop. 1.1.9). Phaedra’s wild hunting fantasies in Eur. *Hipp.* 215-49 are packed with verbs denoting movement (cf. *πέμπετε μ’...εἶμι* 215, *βᾶσ’* 233, *έστέλλου* 234, *παρεπλάγχθην* 240, *βαίνει* 245, *τέτραπται* 246); in this light *mittor* seems to be a fitting choice, and perhaps it could be seen as a remote echo of Phaedra’s *ποῑ παρεπλάγχθην* in particular. The presence of the alternative *mutor* can be explained on grounds of its palaeographic similarity with *mittor* as well as because of the verb’s (*mutor*) high frequency in contexts of metamorphosis, ever since Verg. *Ecl.* 8.70 (see Bömer on Ov. *Met.* 1.1). Horace’s transformation into a swan in the *sphragis*-poem of the second book of his *Odes* (*Carm.* 2.20.10 *album mutor in alitem*) with its highly (meta)literary character (see N-H (1978) 332ff.) might have provided a close parallel. Burman (1727) ad loc. in support of *mutor* cites its use by Phaedra in Sen. *Phaedr.* 668f. (*respersa nulla labe et intacta, innocens / tibi mutor uni*), but fails to take notice of syntactical difference in the use of the verb between the two passages. Furthermore, as Sedlmayer (1881) 18 on line 37 nicely puts it: “Es kann sich eine Person in eine andere Person, eine ars in eine andere ars, aber nicht eine Person in eine ars verwandeln.”

Cnosia: the Greek name of the Cretan capital was *Νωσός* or *Κνωσσός*. Most editors print *Gnosia* here. Evidence from contemporary coinage attests that both *Cnossus* and *Gnossus* were in use during the Augustan period (see Fedeli on Prop. 1.3.2, N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.6.39), while in the post-classical period only *Gnossus* survives. Given the elevated tone of the periphrasis (*Cnossia...humus*), I prefer *Cnossus* which seems to have been the oldest form (in favour of *Cnossus* see Goold (1974) 481, Kenney (1974) 90, *idem* (1996) on *Her.* 17.55, Pinotti on Ov. *Rem.* 743-46, further see Norden on Verg. *Aen.* 6.23 and N-A on Lygd. [Tib.] 3.6.39 with bibliography).

81-4: Palmer in his note on *Her.* 4.82 suspects as spurious either lines 81f. or 82f. (in a self-contradictory manner Palmer in his *apparatus* suspects only lines 82f. as spurious). He grounds his justification on the fact that “there is no real distinction between *hastilia* and *uenabula*.” Palmer is mistaken in his judgement, since there is in fact a distinction in the meaning of the two terms. *hastile* is a more general, rather generic form for spear (*OLD* s.v.), while *uenabulum* is used specifically for a hunting spear (*OLD* s.v.). Judging from her careful distribution of the two terms in the lines under examination, Phaedra proves to be well informed on the distinction and takes full advantage of it. The two couplets, far from being a clumsy repetition of one

another, in effect facilitate our transition from an urban environment to the countryside. Phaedra through her careful alternation between the two signals this gradual movement. Hippolytus' competence in the javelin at lines 81f. looks backwards in the text complementing the reference to his excellence in chariot racing at lines 79f.; in this context *hastile* is fitting. In lines 81f., however, we are no longer in the arena; instead, this couplet looks forward at lines 85ff., where Phaedra deals with Hippolytus' hunting pursuits in the countryside. Her shift from *hastile* (javelin) to *uenabulum* (hunting spear) is meaningful signalling our transposition from the city to the nature; hence, there is no need for any deletion (so also Hall (1990) 271).

85f. materiam... /...durtia: Palmer's (1898) conjecture *militia* in line 86, which was later approved by Housman (1899) 172f. (= (1972) 471) and Goold (1974) 481, is preferable to *materia* found in all manuscripts. However, *militia* meaning "service, performance of duties" (*OLD* s.v.1) hardly makes good sense here, even if it is read as an allusion to the elegiac metaphor of *militia amoris* (for the Ovidian use of "the motif of childbirth as *militia*" see Knox on *Her.* 11.48, also McKeown on *Am.* 2.14.5f.). The term is perhaps more suitable if it is taken in the sense of "worries, care, concern" (*OLD* s.v.1d., *ThLL* 8.959.20ff.), but still it remains unsatisfactory. Hall (1990) 271f. accepts Tanaquil Faber's conjecture *durtia* for the pentameter and he reads *materiam* in the hexameter (so also Sedlmayer (1881) 19 on line 86). In this light, Palmer's combination of *durtiam* ~ *militia* can be explained as the result of a mutual transposition of two metrically equivalent words in two consecutive lines. In my view, Hall's conjecture is valid, since it offers a sound explanation in terms of metrics, and at the same time avoids the awkwardness of either *militia* or *materia* at line 86.

133f. The couplet belongs to the category of "distichs (or pairs of lines) which were incorporated in the main body of the text" at a later stage (cf. Kenney (1961)b 485, Tarrant (1983) 271, Knox (1995) 35). Further on this category see n. on *Her.* 8.19-22 below. It is more likely that the couplet is a later interpolation elaborating on the reference to Saturn's reign in the previous couplet (so Housman (1897)b 200 (= (1972) 388), Palmer (1898) xl, Damsté (1905) 15, Dörrie (1971) 8, Tarrant (1983) 271). Nevertheless, following the unanimous practice of all editors so far, I decided not to obelize it; instead I print it between *crucis* in order to mark the problematic state of the text.

137. nec labor est celare licet †pete munus ab illa†: the text is no doubt corrupt. The reading of the manuscript transmission *pete munus ab illa* is unintelligible both in terms of grammar and of meaning (see Palmer (1898) ad loc. and *app. cr.*). The multitude of the suggested emendations (for a list of the proposed conjectures see Palmer (1898) and Dörrie (1971) *app. crit.*, cf. also Sedlmayer (1881) 19f. on line 137, Damsté (1905) 15f. and Watt (1989) 62) fails to provide a satisfactory remedy. Kenney's (1970)a 173-5 concise discussion of the line deals successfully with its many textual problems. My only reservation concerns his emphasis on the concealment of the relationship as the governing idea of Phaedra's argumentation in this particular section of her letter. For him, the *licet*-clause calls for a verb, which will make an

antithesis with *celare... amorem*, so he rejects *peccemus*; instead he suggests *prendamur*. On the contrary, I can see nothing wrong in Palmer's *peccemus* (Goold (1974) 481 also argues in favour of *peccemus amorem*). In my view Phaedra's main preoccupation here lies more with the moral implications of her proposed incest. in case it is revealed. rather than with the possibility of the revelation *per se*. A closer examination of the diction offers further support to my claim, since the passage is packed with a carefully chosen vocabulary, which clearly underscores the importance of Phaedra's ethical concerns (cf. 132 *pietas*, 132 *rustica*, 133 *pium*, 134 *fas*, 138 *culpa*, 145 *culpa*). In addition, it seems to me that Kenney in his search for a verb meaning "the expression of the couple's affection in public" (like *prendamur*) exaggerates the importance of Phaedra's preoccupation with public praise (cf. 139 *laudabimur*, 140 *dicar*, 145 *tutus... laudemque merebere*, 146 *licet conspiciare*). Phaedra, on the very contrary, when fantasising about her union with Hippolytus locates their intimate moments in the interior of her palace, and not in public through her explicit references to the door, the guard, her bed and the house itself (cf. 141f. *non tibi per tenebras... / ianua, non custos*, 143 *ut tenuit domus una duos, domus una tenebit*, 146 *in lecto... meo*). In any case, no emendation so far offers a satisfactory reading; hence I print the line after *licet* between *cruces*.

150. heu! ubi nunc fastus altaque uerba ? iacent: Here I follow the punctuation suggested by Drakenborch and Sedlmayer (see Giomini (1957) and Palmer (1898) *app. crit.*, *pace* Goold (1974) 482), which I find more emphatic.

155. depuduit: I maintain the reading preserved in the manuscript tradition (*depuduit*), *pace* Goold (1974) 481 and Showerman-Goold (1977) who follow Bentley's emendation (*depudui*). *depuduit* here should be understood as impersonal (*ThLL* 6.1.617.60ff.), and not as personal (so *OLD* s.v.). I have some reservations about accepting Kenney's (1970)a 175f. conjecture *derubui*, which nevertheless, I believe, points in the right direction. Heinsius' suggestion of *profugusque rubor* seems to me more plausible.

176. iam legis, et: It was first noticed by Heinsius (1661) 32 ("certe illud *perlegis* subnatum videtur ex primo verbo sequentis epistolae") and later by Kirfel (1969) 95 and Kenney (1970)a 176 (*pace* Jacobson (1974) 152 n.24) that *perlege* (or *perlegito* Burman) is suspect to have been inserted to the text from the opening of the following letter in the collection (*Her. 5.1 Perlegis? an coniunx prohibet noua? perlege- non est*). Hence, any form of *perlegere* in the concluding couplet of a letter (cf. Hunt's (1975) 224 reading *perlege sed* which rounds-off the letter in ring-composition (so also Casali (1995)b 5 with n.13) and at the same time echoes the epitaph style, Watt's (1989) 62 suggestion to insert a question-mark after *perlegis* (1989) 62, Dörrie (1971) *app. crit.* and note ad loc.) is out of place. For a concise overview of manuscript readings and all emendations suggested see Ramírez de Verger (2005) 429. In the most recent discussion of the line Ramírez de Verger (2005) suggests reading *exaudi et*, which in my view seems to be a rather awkward choice. In terms of metrics the elision of *exaudi et* is not problematic. However, Phaedra's appeal to Hippolytus' *hearing* at the end of her letter, now that he has almost finished

reading it, is rather unfortunate. In fact, any reference to the sense of hearing with respect to her erotic confession sounds to be absurd given her clearly programmatic statement at the beginning of her letter that whatever shame forbade her to *say*, it was love who instructed her to *write* (line 10 *dicere quae puduit, scribere iussit amor*, 13 *ille* (sc. Amor) *mihi primo dubitanti scribere dixit*). From an intertextual perspective, Hippolytus is now called to play again not the role of the hearer (as in Euripides' first *Hippolytus*), but that of the reader (like in Euripides' surviving second *Hippolytus*). This is Phaedra's written love letter and not an oral appeal to her beloved. At the very end, Phaedra urges Hippolytus to imagine that together with her letter he is holding her tears as well. Given that the two final clauses of the letter are joined in parataxis, the presence of *uidere* in the final clause hints at a verb of similar meaning in the penultimate clause. In this light, I should think that my suggestion *iam legis* makes better sense, since the verb *legis* is appropriate for the specific context, while the temporal *iam* effectively underlines the completion of Hippolytus' reading. In addition, *legis* (contrary to *exaudi*) by corresponding to Phaedra's initial call to Hippolytus to read through the entire letter (line 3 *perlege*) concludes the poem with ring-composition. It is true that the rhetorical use of the imperative *exaudi* in urgent requests is not uncommon in Ovid (see Bömer on *Met.* 4.144). However, in all relevant instances in Ovid (cited by Ramírez de Verger (2005) 429f.) *exaudi* is used to request attention to voices or in any case oral commands (see *ThLL* 5.2.1191.29ff., "II. i.q. *auditum praebere*", esp. 79ff., 1192.67ff.) and not to written messages, like here. Besides, despite the fact that the verb is often used as "compositum pro simplici" (see Bömer on *Met.* 5.188), the preposition *ex-* undoubtedly suggests some sense of "distance" and "indirectness," which is clearly very inappropriate, when it comes to Hippolytus himself reading Phaedra's letter. Kirfel (1969) 95 following Loers (1829) 94 suspects the final couplet as the unsuccessful attempt of a later interpolator to round off the letter by complementing the threefold wishes at lines 167-74 with a concluding couplet (for a similar view see Goold (1974) 484).

***Heroides* 8**

HERMIONE ORESTI: on the genuineness of the titular salutations in the *Heroides* see my note on the superscription to *Her.* 4 above (cf. also Goold (1974) 484: letter 8 (...) was "also conceived as headed by titular salutation").

[1-2]. The opening couplet belongs to the so-called "'extra' introductory distichs," whose authenticity is intrinsically related with the authenticity of the titular salutations found before the beginning of each poem. Lines 1f. have met widespread suspicion, mainly because of their flimsy attestation in the manuscript tradition, since they belong to the minority tradition and appear only in the margins of later manuscripts (14th - late 15th c.) and in three early printed editions of the 15th c. (see Kirfel (1969) 65, Dörrie (1971) *app. cr.*). Hence, in this case, the poor

transmission of the couplet seems to argue against its Ovidian authorship (so Palmer (1898), Dörrie (1960) 216f. and (1971) 7, Goold (1974) 484, Tarrant (1983) 270f., Knox (1995) 36 n.99; for an opposite view see Kirfel (1969) 65-7). It seems very likely that the introductory couplet is a scribal interpolation inserted in the text in an attempt to facilitate the identification of the sender and the recipient of the letter (so Dörrie (1971) 7, Tarrant (1983) 270f.). The same applies to all poems in the collection, where the identification of sender and recipient is similarly less straightforward, except poems 1-4, 13-14 (and from the double letters: 16 and 19). Furthermore, the emphasis put on Hermione's and Orestes' double relationship (cousins and consorts) gives away the interpolator who read and picked up the significance of the theme through this early allusion at the very beginning of the letter (cf. 1 *fratremque uirumque*, 2 *nunc fratrem... nomen coniugis*). Hermione's agony and despair are better conveyed through the abrupt opening of her letter, which manages to transmit the urgency of her appeal vividly and efficiently. I consider the couplet to be the product of later interpolation; however, following Dörrie (1971) who prints the lines in small type, I include it in my text, though I put it in square brackets.

18. *feras*: either *feras* (so Burman (1727)) or *feres* makes perfect sense. *feres* (future indicative) is balancing the future *eris*, while *feras* (present subjunctive) as the apodosis of the conditional sentence matches the present subjunctive (*rapiat*) in the protasis. I prefer the subjunctive *feras*, because it foreshadows the recovery of the abducted wife through the contrast with the future indicative *eris*.

19-22: there is no doubt that the paradosis of the text after line 19 is lacunose (so Housman (1897)b 200 (=1972) 388, Palmer (1898) *app. crit.*, Dörrie (1971) 7f., Goold (1974) 483, Tarrant (1983) 270f.). Lines 20f. are transmitted only in the text of three manuscripts of a late date (*Bn²*, *Of*, *Vb¹* Dörrie), in two of which the distich appears in the margins of the manuscripts (*Bn²*, *Vb¹*). These lines belong to the category of "distichs (or pairs of lines) which were incorporated in the main body of the text" (cf. Kenney (1961)b 485, Tarrant (1983) 271); however, no definite conclusions can be drawn about their authenticity. It has been suggested that these lines are either genuine ((Tarrant (1983) 271, cf. also Heinsius's note: "hunc (i.e. line 20) et sequentem uersum plerique codices non agnoscunt, sed male") but omitted in the archetype (of early Carolingian time) and re-introduced laterally, or they are ancient interpolations (so Palmer on *Her.* 8.19, Goold (1974) 483). The possibility that the lines belong to a tradition independent of the main surviving one should not be excluded (Tarrant (1983) 270). Dörrie (1971) 7f. considers them either as Ovid's (so also Sicherl (1963) 192f.) or of Ovidian quality ("aut vestigium Ovidiani ingenii seruent") belonging to an apocryphal paradosis ("ex apocrypha memoria originem ducunt") of the text which did not survive. In his view, the lines seem to be the product of Ovid's earlier activity, which were later excised as a result of a revision of the text by Ovid himself at an older age. If the lines are genuine, they must (given their absence from the codex *Puteaneus*) have been lost before its time; then they found their

way into late manuscripts. If, on the other hand, the lines are the product of scribal interpolation, they were introduced into the text in an attempt to remedy a lacuna, which is now beyond recuperation (cf. Housman (1897)b 200 (=1972) 388), Sicherl (1963) 193). Palmer (1898) on *Her.* 8.19 offers an interesting theory about the multiple stages of textual corruption, scribal interpolation, excision of the original text to the margins of the manuscripts and the re-introduction of the lines to the contaminated text. Whatever the case may be, the contamination is far too extended to allow a definite resolution of the authenticity question. As Dörrie (1971) 8 nicely puts it: “Quae (i.e. 19-22) si e textu removes, aliquid deesse videtur; at si recipes, haud leves suspiciones moventur.” Hence, I print lines 19-22 between *cruces* in an attempt to mark the problematic state of the text, and at the same time to try and avoid a mental or textual disturbance in the sequence of the letter.

21. pater: *pater* seems to be the older reading compared to *socer*, which is attested only in the *codices recentiores* and in the first printed editions (see Palmer (1898) and Dörrie (1971) *app. cr.*). It is likely that *socer* at line 21 is either a scribal corruption under the influence of *socer* at line 19 or perhaps a conjecture for the genuine *pater*. *pace* Housman (1897)b 200 (=1972) 388) I find Hermione’s combination of *socer* at line 19 with *pater* at line 21 particularly interesting and far from being “a trifle clumsy”. The alternation is most successful in that it helps to underline the close connection between Hermione and Orestes. The story of Helen’s recovery by Menelaus affects both Hermione and Orestes. Hermione manipulates her reference to Menelaus in order to bring herself and her beloved closer together. Menelaus is not only Orestes’ father-in-law; he is also Hermione’s father. In fact her reference to Menelaus is twofold: first at lines 19f. in connection with Orestes, whom she exhorts to imitate the example set by his father-in-law, and second in connection with herself (21f.), where Hermione’s reference to Menelaus becomes more personal. Her use of *pater* is indicative of her affection (*pater* is much more intimate compared to the elevated *genitor*, which would be more fitting in the epic context of the passage. Further on the intimacy of *pater* see n. on *Her.* 4.157, also Knox on *Her.* 11.99). Hence, I maintain the meaningful alternation between *pater* and *socer* at lines 19 and 21 respectively. Ker’s (1958) 227f. suggestion that *socer* at line 19 refers to Agamemnon (“my father-in-law”) and *nuptae* means generally “a bride” (not “his bride”) complicates rather than simplifies the situation.

stertisset: *stertisset* is the oldest attested reading. Palmer on *Her.* 8.19 calls *stertisset* “a barbarous form,” probably because of its vulgarity. It is true that *stertere*, because of its vulgarity (“to snore”) is altogether avoided in the higher poetic registers in Augustan poetry. Nevertheless, it is frequent in comedy (usually to denote stupidity and sluggishness, cf. Ter. *Eun.* 1079 *fatuos est, insulsus, tardus, stertit noctes et dies* with Barsby) and in other popular genres (cf. Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 9.326 *toto proflabat pectore somnum periphrasis est, ne uerbo humili stertentem diceret*). In elegy it appears only here (and in Ov. *Am.* 2.2.[24] with McKeown for the possibility of an interpolation) and is completely absent from Propertius and

Tibullus (further on its frequency in Latin poetry see Galán Vioque on Mart. 7.10.6). In my view, its use is intended to strike a humorous note. This imagery of the inert sleeping husband (note the striking verbal similarities with Lucr. 3.1048 *uigilans stertis*, Juv. 1.57 *doctus et ad calicem uigilanti sternere naso* with Jocelyn) echoes Lucilius' story of the manipulative husband who is putting up with his wife's promiscuity (cf. Lucil. 1223 M = 251 W, quoted in Festus 173.5). In this light the employment of *stertisset* is understood as a pointedly comic hint at Menelaus' inertness. The alternative manuscript (or early printed) readings *plorasset* and *stetisset*, and the conjecture *sedisset* (Micyllus, Bersmann, Burman) likewise, seem to be much later emendations of the initial *lectio difficilior* (*stertisset*). Finally, Housman's conjecture (1897)b 200 (=1972) 388) *iacuisset* approved by Sicherl (1963) 193 deserves some consideration, especially in view of its similarity to *Her.* 5.106 (*nunc iacet in uiduo credulus ille toro*). On the balance, however, I prefer *stertisset* mostly because of its comic connotations, which I find very appropriate in this context.

22. ut ante fuit: the whole line is bracketed by Palmer (line 20 in his edition), while Dörrie (1971) considers as *locus desperatus* only the second half of the pentameter. It is true that "Had Menelaus been reluctant in claiming his wife back, she would still be married to Paris, *as she was before*" hardly makes any sense, since Helen in the past (*ante*) was married to Menelaus and not to Paris. In my view, the misunderstanding concerns the span of time implied by *ante*. If *ante* stretches out to the remote past, when Helen was married to Menelaus, then *ut ante fuit* is surely problematic; if *ante*, however, refers to events of the most recent past, which is the time right after Helen's abduction, then the difficulty is lifted. In the latter case, Hermione's suggestion is that Menelaus' unwillingness to claim Helen back would bring no change whatsoever to Helen's marital status as Paris' wife (*ut ante fuit*).

34. plus quoque, qui prior est ordine, posset auus: I can see nothing objectionable in the main manuscript tradition (and the older editions) either in terms of syntax or of meaning. As it is, the line is good Latin; all emendations fail to provide a better reading (cf. *plus patre quo* Bentley, *plus quo quo* Palmer, *quoque quo* Camps, *poscit* Palmer, Kenney, Showerman-Goold, *plus quo, qui* Heinsius, cf. Roncaioli Lamberti (1989) 262f., also Damsté (1905) 27, who falsely suspects the couplet (33f.) as spurious). Only Bentley's conjecture *pollet* in the place of *posset* seems to me somewhat attractive.

47. habes: In my view, Palmer offers insufficient evidence for calling the authority of the manuscripts (*habes*) into question; the fact that *habes* is absent from the *Puteanus* does not necessarily argue against its validity. *P* is, broadly speaking, our best surviving manuscript, but not the best witness always. By overemphasizing its credentials we run the risk of totally discarding Tarrant's principle that "all inherently plausible readings, whatever their source, must be taken seriously, and sense and usage are the only sure criteria for deciding among them" (see p.112 with n.754), which proves to be the safest guide in determining the best reading, especially in cases like this one. Housman (1899) 173f. (=1972) 472f.) also accepts

Palmer's *per*, but he expresses his concerns about Palmer's ad loc. arguments, which he considers to be the outcome of mere "improvised cavils." With respect to the rest of the "solecisms and absurdities" (so Palmer) of the line, suffice it to say that *proauus* here should be understood in the broader sense of "remote ancestor, forefather" (*OLD* s.v. 2, for similar uses in the *Her.* see 16.211, 17.51, 53), while Williams (1997) 135 n.31 convincingly refutes Palmer's objections to the presumably "solecistic" use of *quoque*.

48. melius: Showerman-Goold (1977) read *medios* (a conjecture suggested by Nodellius (1871) and Bentley, later adopted by Sedlmayer (1881) 32 on line 46, Palmer (1898) and Goold (1974) 481, cf. also Housman (1899) 173f. (=1972) 472f.)). Given the manipulative character of Hermione's strategy, however, the reading of all manuscripts (with the only exception of *Y* and *Ea Dörrie*) *melius* seems to be a better choice, in that it helps her maintain a certain uncertainty regarding Orestes' origin. Palmer commenting on line 47 points out the fact that Orestes - contrary to Hermione's claim (48 *ab Ioue quintus eris*)- was actually sixth in descent from Jupiter, and not fifth; hence, *melius* refers to some kind of (mis)calculation, which through the omission of Jupiter makes Orestes fifth from Jupiter. Despite his comment, however, he prints *medios*. It is my contention that Hermione's use of *melius* refers to some sort of numerical reckoning indeed, but within a much wider context than the one suggested by Palmer. According to the main mythological tradition, the male line of descent in the Tantalid house is as follows: Jupiter > Tantalus > Pelops > Atreus > Agamemnon > Orestes (on the divine origin of the house of Tantalus, cf. Eur. *Or.* 4-26, 345-7, also Porphyry *Isagoge* vol. 4.1 p.6.3-5 and David Philol. *In Porphyrii Isagoge* p.154.2 -7). There is, however, an alternative old tradition (dating back to Homer) which inserts in the line of succession between Atreus and Agamemnon the rather obscure figure of a certain Pleisthenes (cf. Ov. *Rem.* 778 with Henderson and Pinotti, *Hyg. Fab.* 86, 88. Further on literary sources about Pleisthenes and his obscure place in the genealogical line of the Tantalids see Ilberg in Roscher 3.2.2562f.). Counting Pleisthenes as Agamemnon's father in effect removes Orestes even further from Jupiter. Judging from the surviving evidence (mostly fragments of Greek and Latin tragedy) there seems to have been some sort of uneasiness among the various mythological versions about the line of succession of the Tantalid family. From this perspective, *melius* is preferable to *medios*, since in addition to the numerical counting it also carries an allusion to the different mythological traditions concerning Orestes' descent. A further argument for the rejection of *medios* is provided by reasons of rhetorical efficiency. Following Williams' (1997) 135 n. 32 acute remark, the use of *medios* would have had disastrous results on Hermione's comparison of parity between the two lovers, since *medios* draws the attention to Orestes' four, instead of Neoptolemus' three, intervening ancestors between himself and Jupiter. With respect to Bettini's (1990) 422 suggestion who rejects both *melius* and *medius* in favour of *medium* I highly doubt that his suggestion helps us move towards a better direction. His translation "e sei quinto a partire da

Giove se conti come medio il padre Pelope” fails to provide a satisfactory reading, if it does not complicate the matter even further.

50. sed tibi –quid faceres?–: Following Housman (1897)b 203f. (=1972) 394) who argues convincingly for the priority of the dative *tibi* to the nominative *tu* both in terms of meaning and in syntax I maintain the Showerman-Goold (1977) text.

63. solas habeo semper semperque: the manuscript tradition is uncertain due to the metrical convenience of most of the alternative combinations. Since the repetition *semper semperque* is common in poetry (cf. Cic. *Arati Progn.* fr. 5.1, Germ. *Arat.* 127, Verg. *Aen.* 4.466f., Sen. *Apoc.* 15.1.4, Juv. 6.273, Stat. *Theb.* 5.744f., *Silv.* 3.3.64), I prefer to follow Palmer (1898), Showerman-Goold (1977) and Rosati (1989) in their word-ordering of the verse (so earlier Burman (1727); cf. Goold (1974) 481)

[71f.]. On the disputed authenticity of this couplet see p.100f.

88. quod mihi –uae miserae!–: I find the pathetic exclamation *uae miserae!* fitting for Hermione’s moment of despair, while its colloquialism further reinforces the spontaneity of the utterance. There seems to be nothing wrong with the text as it stands (see Dörrie (1971) *app. cr.* -however, Dörrie prints *quodue mihi miserae sidus obesse querar?*- and Goold (1974) 481). In addition, this expression is well attested not only in Ovid (cf. *Am.* 3.6.101, *Her.* 3.82, 20.171, *Ib.* 203), but in other Augustan poets as well (for a list see Barchiesi on *Her.* 3.82).

101. pars: Watt (1989) 64 draws our attention to Heinsius’ conjecture of *sors*, which he finds very fitting, since Hermione, he thinks, is using here an idiomatic phrase borrowed from a game of luck. However, due to the absence of any evidence in support of this assumption I maintain *pars* in my text (cf. also Heinsius: “malim *fors*, sed obstant libri”).

110. uirum: *fugere* calls for a complement in the accusative (*uirum*), not the ablative. The ablative (*uiro*) seems to have mistakenly appeared because of its proximity to *hoste* (see also Heinsius, Goold (1974) 480).

Bibliography

I. Abbreviations of standard works of reference

Abbreviations of the names of classical authors and works follow or are more explicit than the *OCD*, *LSJ* and *OLD*. Works of secondary literature are referred to by author's name and the date of publication. In the case of editions and commentaries reference is usually by author's name alone. Periodical titles follow the conventions of *L' Année philologique* (with the only exception of *HSCP*).

- ANRW* H. Temporini et al. (1972-). *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Berlin and New York.
- AP* *Anthologia Palatina* = W.R. Paton, (1916-18). *The Greek Anthology*, with an English translation, vols. 1-5, London and New York.
- CA* Powell, J.U. (ed.) (1925). *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Oxford.
- CIL* *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum* (1862-), Berlin.
- CLE* F. Bücheler and A. Riese (eds.) (1894-1926). *Anthologia latina: sive poesis latinae supplementum*, Leipzig (with M.L. Fele et al. (eds.) (1988) *Concordantiae in Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, Hildesheim, Zurich and New York).
- EM* Gaisford, T. (1967). *Etymologicon Magnum, seu verius lexicon saepissime vocabulorum originem indagans ex pluribus lexicis scholiastis et grammaticis anonymi cuiusdam opera concinnatum*, Amsterdam.
- FGrHist* F. Jacoby (1923-). *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin and Leiden.
- K-G* R. Kühner, F. Blass and B. Gerth (1890-1904). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Hannover and Leipzig (Vol.1: R. Kühner and F. Blass (1890). *Elementar- und Formenlehre*, Hannover, Vol.2: R. Kühner and B. Gerth (1898). *Satzlehre*, Hannover and Leipzig, Vol.3: R. Kühner and B. Gerth (1904). *Satzlehre*, Hannover and Leipzig).
- K-S* R. Kühner and C. Stegmann (1912-1914). *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* (Vol. 1: Elementar-, Formen- und Wortlehre (1912), Vol. 2: Satzlehre (Teil 1:1912, Teil 2: 1914)), Hannover.
- LHS* M. Leumann, J.B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr (1965-77) *Lateinische Grammatik*, Munich (vol. 1: M. Leumann (1977). *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, Munich, Vol. 2: J.B. Hofmann-A. Szantyr (1965).

Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik, Munich, Vol. 3: *Stellenregister und Verzeichnis der nichtlateinischen Wörter*, Munich 1979).

- LIMC* H.C. Ackermann and J.R. Gisler (eds.) (1981). *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Zurich.
- LSJ* H.J. Liddell and R.Scott, rev. and augm. throughout by H. Stuart Jones (1940). *A Greek- English Lexicon*, 9th edition, Oxford 1940.
- M–W* R. Merkelbach and M.L. West (eds.) (1967). *Fragmenta Hesiodica*, Oxford.
- N-A* F. Navarro Antolín (1996). *Lygdamus: Corpus Tibullianum III 1-6*, (Mnemosyne Suppl. 154), Leiden.
- N-H* R.G.M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard (1970). *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I*, Oxford, (1978). *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II*, Oxford.
- OCD* S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth(eds.) (1996). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd edition, Oxford.
- OLD* P.G.W. Glare et al. (eds.) (1968–82). *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford.
- RE* G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, and K. Ziegler (eds.) (1893–1978). *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumwissenschaft*, Stuttgart.
- SH* H. Lloyd- Jones and P.Parsons (eds.) (1983). *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, Berlin and New York.
- TrGF* B. Snell, R. Kannicht, S. Radt (eds.) (1971-1999). *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, vols. 1-4, Göttingen.
- TLG* Stephanus, H.et al. (1831–65) *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, 3rd edition, Paris.
- TLL* E. Wölfflin et al. (1900–). *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Leipzig.
- TLL onom.* W.F. Otto. et al. (1909-23). *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. Onomasticon*, vols. II (C) and III (D), Leipzig.

II. Books and articles

With the exception of Maltby (2006) and Michalopoulos (2006), I have been unable to consult books which reached the library shelves after spring 2006.

Abel, W. (1930). *Die Anredenformen bei den römischen Elegirken*, Diss. Berlin.

Adams, J.N. (1972). "Latin Words for 'woman' and 'wife'", *Glotta* 50: 234-55.

_____ (1982). *The Latin sexual vocabulary*, London.

_____ (1984). "Female speech in Latin comedy", *Antichthon* 18: 43-77.

- Adams, J.N. and Mayer, R.G. (eds.) (1999). *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (Proceedings of the British Academy 93), Oxford.
- Albrecht, M. von (1963). "Gleichnis und Innenwelt in Silius' Punica", *Hermes* 91: 352-75.
- _____ (1964). *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion* (Spudasmata 7), Hildesheim.
- _____ (1996). *A history of Roman literature: from Livius Andronicus to Boethius: with special regard to its influence on world literature*, rev. by G. Schmeling and by the author, New York.
- Alexiou, M. (1974). *The ritual lament in Greek tradition*, Cambridge.
- Allan, W. (2000). *The Andromache and Euripidean tragedy*, Oxford.
- Allen, A.W. (1962). "Sunt Qui Propertium Malint" in J.P. Sullivan (ed.) *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric*, 107-48, Cambridge.
- Aloni, A. (2003). "Teseo, un eroe dalle molt identità" in M.Guglielmo and E.Bona (eds.) *Forme di comunicazione nel mondo antico e metamorfosi del mito: dal teatro al romanzo* (Culture antiche, studi e testi 17), 1-22, Alessandria.
- Altman, J.G. (1982). *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form*, Columbus.
- Aly, W. (1914). "Lexikalische Streifzüge", *Glotta* 5: 57-79.
- Anderson, A.A.R. (1979). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Remedia Amoris*, Edinburgh.
- Anderson, J.K. (1961). *Ancient Greek Horsemanship*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- _____ (1985). *Hunting in the Ancient World*, Berkeley and London
- Anderson, R. D. and Parsons, P.J. and Nisbet, R.G.M. (1979). "Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaşr Ibrîm", *JHR* 69: 125-55.
- Anderson, W.S. (1972). *Ovid Metamorphoses 10*, Norman.
- _____ (1973). "The Heroides" in J.W. Binns (ed.), 49-83, London and Boston.
- _____ (ed.) (1982). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses*, Leipzig.
- André, J. (1945). *Études sur les Termes de Couleur dans la Langue Latine*, Paris.
- _____ (1967). *Les noms d'oiseaux en Latin*, Paris.
- _____ (1985). *Les noms de plantes dans la Rome antique*, Paris.
- Andrews, P.B.S. (1969). "The Myth of Europa and Minos", *G&R* 16: 60-66.
- Appel, G. (1909). *De Romanorum precationibus*, Gießen.
- Arcellaschi, A. (1998). "Ovide-le-tragique", *Pallas* 47: 91-100.
- Arena, A. (1995). "Ovidio e l' ideologia augustea: I motive delle *Heroides* ed il loro significato", *Latomus* 54: 822-41.
- Arens, J.C. (1950). "-fer and -ger. Their extraordinary preponderance among compounds in Roman poetry", *Mnemosyne* 4th ser. 3: 240-62.
- Arkins, B. (1994). "Greek Myth in Latin Poetry," *SyllClass* 5: 17-28.

- Armstrong, R. (2001). *Cretan women: Pasiphae, Ariadne, and Phaedra in Latin literature*, D.Phil Oxford.
- Armour, D.H.J. (1988). "Phaedra and the chariot-ride", *Eranos* 86: 25-30.
- Arthur, M.B. (1973). "Early Greece: The origins of the Western attitude toward women", *Arethusa* 6.1: 7-58.
- _____ (1977). "Politics and Pomegranates: An Interpretation of the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*", *Arethusa* 10.1: 7-47.
- Atallah, W. (1966). *Adonis dans la littérature et l'art grec*, Paris.
- Austin, R.G. (1955). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber quartus, with a commentary*, Oxford.
- _____ (1964). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber secundus, with a commentary*, Oxford.
- _____ (1971). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber primus, with a commentary*, Oxford.
- _____ (1977). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber sextus, with a commentary*, Oxford.
- Axelsson, B. (1945). *Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache*, Lund.
- Aymard, J. (1951). *Essai sur les chasses romaines des origines à la fin du siècle des Antonins (Cynegetica)*, Paris.
- Baca A.R. (1969). "Ovid's claim to originality and *Heroides* I", *TAPA* 100: 1-10.
- _____ (1971). "The themes of *Querela* and *Lacrimae* in Ovid's *Heroides*", *Emerita* 39: 195-201.
- Bagnani, G. (1968). "Misopogon, the Beard Hater", *EMC* 12: 73-9.
- Bailey, C. (1935). *Religion in Virgil*, Oxford.
- _____ (1943). *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura libri sex. Edited with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Translation, and Commentary*, vols 1-3, Oxford.
- Baker, R.J. (2000). (2000). *Propertius I, with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Warminster.
- Baldry, H.C. (1952). "Who invented the Golden Age?", *CQ* 2: 83-92.
- Barber, E.A. (1960). *Sexti Properti Carmina*, Oxford.
- Barchiesi, A. (1986). "Problemi d' interpretazione in Ovidio: continuità delle storie, continuazione dei testi", *MD* 16: 77-107.
- _____ (1987). "Narratività e convenzione nelle *Heroides*", *MD* 19: 63-90.
- _____ (1992). *Epistulae Heroidum 1-3*, Florence.
- _____ (1993). "Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*", *HSCP* 95: 333-65 (= now in Barchiesi (2001), 105- 27).
- _____ (1994). Review of Spoth (1992), *A&R* 39: 111-2.
- _____ (1999). "Vers une histoire à rebours de l' élégie latine: les *Héroïdes* "doubles" (16-21)" in J. Fabre-Serris and A. Deremetz (eds.), *Élégie et épopée dans la poésie ovidienne (Heroides et Amours). En Hommage à Simone Viarre*,

- 15 et 16 mai 1998, 53-67, Villeneuve d'Ascq (Nord): Université Charles-de-Gaulle, Lille 3 (=also in *Electronic Antiquity* 5.1 (1999), <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/EIAnt/V5N1/barchiesi.html>, accessed on 15/06/06).
- _____ (2001). *Speaking volumes: narrative and intertext in Ovid and other Latin poets*, edit. and tr. by M. Fox and S. Marchesi, London.
- _____ and Rüpke, J. and Stephens, S. (eds.) (2004). *Rituals in ink: a conference on religion and literary production in ancient Rome held at Stanford University in February 2002*, Stuttgart.
- Barker, D. (1996). " 'The Golden Age is Proclaimed?' The *Carmen Saeculare* and the Renaissance of the Golden Race", *CQ* 46: 434-46.
- Barrett, W.S. (1964). *Euripides Hippolytos. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Barsby, J. (ed.) (1999). *Terence Eunuchus*, Cambridge.
- Barthes, R. (1978). *A lover's discourse: fragments* (transl. from French by R. Howard), New York.
- Bartholomé, H. (1935). *Ovid und die antike Kunst*, Leipzig.
- Barton, C. (2002). "Being in the Eyes: Shame and Sight in Ancient Rome" in D. Fredrick (ed.), 216-36, Baltimore.
- Barton, T. (1994). *Ancient Astrology*, London and New York.
- Basset, S. E. (1921). "The Function of the Homeric Studies", *TAPA* 52: 132-47.
- Bauman, R.A. (2003). *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome*, London and New York.
- Bayet, J. (1957). *Histoire politique et psychologique de la religion romaine*, Paris.
- Beard, M. (1993). "Looking (harder) for Roman myth: Dumézil, declamation and the problems of definition", in F. Graf (ed.), 44-64, Stuttgart.
- Beck, M. (1996). *Die Epistulae Heroidum XVIII und XIX des Corpus Ovidianum. Echtheitskritische Untersuchungen* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alterums, Neue Folge, 1. Reihe Bd.11), Paderborn.
- Belfiore, E. (1980-81). "Ovid's Encomium of Helen", *CJ* 76: 136-48.
- Ieranò, G. (2003). "Il mare d' amore" in L. Belloni, L. De Finis and G. Moretti (eds.) *L'officina ellenistica: poesia dotta e popolare in Grecia e a Roma*, Atti del convegno di Trento, 4-6 Aprile 2002 (Labirinthe 69), 199-238, Trento.
- Belsey, C. and Moore, J. (eds.) (1997). *The Feminist Reader*, Basingstoke and New York.
- Benediktson, D.T. (1985)a. "Propertius' 'Elegiacization' of Homer", *Maia* 37: 17-26.
- _____ (1985)b. "Pictorial art and Ovid's *Amores*", *QUCC* 49: 111-20.
- _____ (1989). *Propertius: Modernist Poet of Antiquity*, Carbondale Illinois.
- Benedum, J. (1967). *Studien zur Dichtkunst des späten Ovid*, Gießen.
- Benjamin, J. (1988). *The Bonds Of Love, Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and the Problem of Domination*, New York.

- Berger, A. (1953). *Encyclopaedic dictionary of Roman law*, Philadelphia.
- _____ (1983). "Language and the Female in Early Greek Thought", *Arethusa* 16: 69-95.
- Bessone, F. (1994). Review of Spoth (1992), *JRS* 84: 269-70.
- _____ (1995). "Medea's response to Catullus. Ovid, *Heroides* 12.23-4 and *Cat.*76.1-6", *CQ* 45.2:575-8.
- _____ (1997)a. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula XII: Medea Iasoni* (Le Monier. *Classici greci e latini. Testi con commento filologico*, N.S. 6), Florence.
- _____ (1997)b. "Sapere, non sapere, dire, non dire. Ignoranza, reticenza ed ironia nelle *Heroides*", *Quaderni del Dipartimento di filologia, linguistica e tradizione classica* 9: 207-23.
- Bethe, E. (ed.) (1937). *Pollucis Onomasticon, e codicibus ab ipso collatis denuo edidit et adnotavit*, Leipzig.
- Bettini, M. (1990). "*Heroides* 8,47 e i gradi di parentela in Ovidion", *RFIC* 118: 418-29.
- Biehl, W. (1989). *Euripides Troades*, Heidelberg.
- Billerbeck, M. (1999). *Seneca, Hercules Furens, Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
- Binns, J.W. (ed.) (1973). *Ovid*. London.
- Birt, T. (1877). "Animadversiones ad Ovidi heroidum epistulas", *RhM* 32: 386-432.
- Bischoff, B. (1961). "Hadoardus and the manuscripts of classical authors from Corbie", in S. Prete (ed.) *Didascaliae. Studies in honor of Anselm M. Albareda*, 41-57, New York.
- Blake Tyrell, W. (1984). *Amazons. A Study in Athenian mythmaking*, Baltimore and London.
- Blake Tyrrell and Brown, F.S. (1991). *Athenian Myths and Institutions: words in action*, New York and Oxford.
- Bloch, D.J. (2000). "Ovid's *Heroides* 6: preliminary scenes from the life of an intertextual heroine", *CQ* 50.1: 197-209.
- Blondell, R., Gamel, M.-K., Rabinowitz, N.S. and Zweig, B. (eds.) (1999). *Women on the edge. Four plays by Euripides (Alcestis, Medea, Helen, Iphigeneia at Aulis)*, New York and London.
- Blümner, H. (1911). *Die Römischen Privataltertümer*, Munich.
- Boardman J. (1982). "Herakles, Theseus and Amazons" in D.Kurtz and B.Sparkes (eds.) *The Eye of Greece: Studies in Art of Athens*, 1-28, Cambridge.
- Bömer, F. (1957)a. "Beiträge zum Verständnis der augusteischen Dichtersprache", *Gymnasium* 64: 1-21.
- _____ (1957)b. "Interpretationen zu den *Fasti* des Ovid", *Gymnasium* 64: 112-35.
- _____ (1957-8). *P. Ovidius Naso. Die Fasten*, Heidelberg.
- _____ (1969-86). *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen*, Heidelberg.
- Bolton, M.C. (1994). "The isolating effect of *sola* in *Heroides* 10", *Phoenix* 48: 42-50.

- _____ (1997). "Elegy Upside Down. The Inversion of Elegiac and Epic Elements in *Heroides III* in C. Deroux (ed.), 218-30, Brussels.
- Booth, J. (1981). "Aspects of Ovid's language", *ANRW* 2.31.4: 2686-700, Berlin and New York.
- _____ (1991). *Ovid: the second book of Amores*, Warminster.
- _____ and Maltby, R. (2005). "Light and dark: play on candidus and related concepts in the elegies of Tibullus", *Mnemosyne* 58: 124-32.
- Borneque, H. (1965). *Ovidius, Heroides*, Paris.
- Bornmann, F. (1968). *Callimachi Hymnus in Dianam. Introduzione, testo critico e commento*, Florence.
- Bothmer, D. von (1957). *Amazons in Greek Art*, Oxford.
- Bouché – Leclercq, A. (1899). *L'astrologie grecque*, Paris.
- Boucher, J.P. (1965). *Études sur Properce. Problèmes d'inspiration et d'art*, Paris.
- Boyd, B.W. (1987). "Virtus effeminata and Sallust's Sempronia", *TAPA* 117: 183-201.
- _____ (ed.) (2002). *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
- Boyle, A.J. (1987). *Seneca's Phaedra. Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes*, Leeds.
- Brazda (1977). *Zur Bedeutung des Apfels in der antiken Literatur*, Diss. Bonn.
- Bréguet, E. (1946). *Le roman de Sulpicia*, Geneva.
- Bremer, J.M. (1975). "The Meadow of love and Two Passages in Euripides' *Hippolytus*", *Mnemosyne* 28: 268-80.
- Brenk, F.E. (1986). "Phaidra's risky horsemanship. Euripides' *Hippolytos* 232-238", *Mnemosyne* 39: 385-8.
- Brink, C.O. (1963). *Horace on poetry*, vol.1. *Prolegomena to the literary epistles*, (1971) vol.2. *Ars poetica*, (1982) vol.3. *Epistles, Book II: the letters to Augustus and Florus*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1971). *Horace on poetry*, Cambridge.
- Brumfield, A.C. (1981). *The Attic Festivals of Demeter and their relation to the agricultural year*, New York
- Buchheit, V. (1962). *Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum (Zetemata 28)*, Munich.
- Bühler, W. (1968). *Europa. Ein Überblick über die Zeugnisse des Mythos in der antiken Literatur und Kunst*, Munich.
- Burkert, W. (1972). *Homo necans. Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen*, Berlin.
- _____ (1979). *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, Berkeley.
- _____ (1983). *Homo necans: the anthropology of Ancient Greek sacrificial ritual and myth*, tr. by P. Bing, Berkeley and London.

- Burman, P. (ed.) (1727). *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Opera omnia IV voluminibus comprehensa; cum integris Jacobi Micylli, Herculis Ciofani, et Danielis Heinsii notis, et Nicolai Heinsii curis secundis, et aliorum in singulas partes, partim integris, partim excerptis, adnotationibus, cura et studio Petri Burmanni, qui et suas in omne opus notas adiecit*, Amsterdam.
- Burnett, A.P. (1983). *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus and Sappho*, London.
- _____ (1986). "Hunt and Hearth in *Hippolytus*" in M.Crop, E. Fantham, S.E. Scully (eds.) *Greek Tragedy and Its Legacy, Essays Presented to D. J. Conacher*: 167-85, Calgary.
- Bushala, E. W. (1969). "Suzugiai Charites, *Hippolytus* 117", *TAPA* 100: 23-9.
- Butrica, J.L. (1994). "Myth and meaning in Propertius 3.15", *Phoenix* 48: 135-51.
- Cairns, D. (1993). *Aidos: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford.
- _____ (1997). "The meadow of Artemis and the character of the Euripidean «Hippolytus»", *QUCC* 57: 51-75.
- Cairns, F. (1972). *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh.
- _____ (1975). "Horace, *Epode* 2, Tibullus 1,1 and the rhetorical praise of the countryside", *MPhL* 1: 79-91.
- _____ (1977). "Two Unidentified *Komoi* of Propertius I.3 + II.9", *Emerita* 45: 325-53.
- _____ (1979). *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1984). "The Etymology of *Militia* in Roman Elegy" in L. Gil and R. M. Aguilar (eds.), *Apophoreta Philologica Emmanuelli Fernandez- Galiano a Sodalibus Oblata*, 211-21, Madrid.
- _____ (1996). "Ancient 'etymology' and Tibullus: on the classification of 'etymologies' and on 'etymological markers'", *PCPhS* 42: 24-59.
- Calame, C. (2001). *Choruses of young women in ancient Greece: their morphology, religious role and social function*, tr. by D. Collins and J. Orion, London.
- _____ (2003). "Fabrication du genre et identités politiques en comparaison: la création poétique de Thésée par Bachylide" in U. Heidmann (ed.). *Poétiques comparées des mythes. De l'Antiquité à la Modernité. En hommage à Claude Calame*, 13-45, Lausanne.
- Caldwell, R.S. (1974). "Selected bibliography on psychoanalysis and classical studies", *Arethusa* 7.1: 117-34.
- Cameron, A. (2004). *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, Oxford.
- Camilloni, M.T. (1986). "Su la leggenda di Pasifae". *RCCM* 1: 53-66.
- Campbell, G. L. (2003). *Lucretius on creation and evolution: a commentary on De rerum natura, Book five*, Oxford.
- Campbell, M. (ed.) (1991). *Greek Lyric III. Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, and others*, Cambridge MA and London.
- _____ (1994). *A commentary on Apollonius Rhodius Argonautica III. 1-471* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 141), Leiden.

- Camps, W.A. (1961-7). *Propertius Elegies, Books I-IV*, Cambridge.
- Cantarella, R. (1976). *Euripide, I Cretesi, con due appendici e dieci tavole fotografiche. Testi e Commento*, Milan.
- Canter, H.V. (1933). "The mythological paradigm in Greek and Latin poetry", *AJPh* 54: 201-24.
- Capecchi, E. (1967). "L'allitterazione nelle *Heroides* ovidiane", *SIFC* 39: 67-11.
- _____ (1969). "L'allitterazione nelle *Heroides* ovidiane", *SIFC* 41: 95-127.
- Carbonero, O. (1989). "La figura di Elena di Troia nei poeti latini da Lucrezio a Ovidio", *Orpheus* n.s. 10: 378-91.
- Carter, I.B. (1902). *Epitheta Deorum quae apud poetas leguntur*, Leipzig.
- Cartledge, P. (1998). "The *machismo* of the Athenian Empire- or the reign of the *phallus*?" in Foxhall – Salmon (1998)b: 54-67, London and New York.
- Casabona, J. (1966). *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en Grèce*, Aix-en-Provence.
- Casali, S. (1992). "Enone, Apollo pastore e l'amore immedicabile: giochi ovidiani su di un topos elegiaco", *MD* 28: 85-100.
- _____ (1994). "Ancora su Medea e Scilla (Ovidio, *Her.* 12.124)", *MD* 32: 173-4.
- _____ (ed.) (1995)a. *P. Ovidii Nasonis, Heroidum Epistula IX- Deianira Herculi*, Florence.
- _____ (1995)b. "Strategies of tension (Ovid, *Heroides* 4)", *PCPhS* 41: 1-15.
- _____ (1998). "Ovid's Canace and Euripides' *Aeolus*: Two notes on *Her.* 11", *Mnemosyne* 51.6: 700-710.
- Caskey, L.D. and J.D. Beazley (1931-63). *Attic vase paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston*, Boston.
- Cavallo, G., Fedeli, P. and Giardina, A. (eds.) (1989). *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica, vol. II. La circolazione del testo*, Rome.
- Cecchin, S.A. (1997). "Medea in Ovidio fra elegia ed epos" in *Atti delle giornate di studio su Medea (Torino 23-24 Ottobre 1995)*: 69-89, Turin.
- Cerrato, J.A. (2002). *Hippolytus between East and West. The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus* (Oxford Theological monographs), Oxford.
- Chadwick, J. and Baumbach, L. (1963). "The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary", *Glotta* 41: 157-271.
- Chantraine, P. (1968). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots* (v.1 A- K, v.2 Λ- Ω), Paris.
- Churchill, L. I, Brown, P. R and Jeffrey, J. E. (eds.) (2002). *Women Writing Latin. From Roman Antiquity to Early Modern Europe, vol. 1 Women Writing Latin in Roman Antiquity, Late, and the Early Christian Era*, New York and London.
- Cicerale, M.G. (1978). "Struttura e oratoria forense nella IV, 11 di Properzio", *AFLB* 21 : 19-38.
- Cipriani, G. (1992). "Il vocabolario latino dei baci", *Aufidus* 17: 69-102.

- Citroni Marchetti, S. (1999). "Il pottere e la giustizia. Presenze della tragedia greca nelle elegie ovidiane dell' esilio", *MD* 43: 111-56.
- Clark, G. (1996). "Roman women" in I. McAuslan and P. Walcot (eds.) 36-55, Oxford and New York.
- Clay, D. (1998). "The Theory of the Literary Persona in Antiquity", *MD* 40: 9-40.
- Claus, D. (1972). "Phaedra and the Socratic paradox", *YCS* 22: 223-38.
- Clausen, W.V. (1976). "Virgil and Parthenius", *HSCP* 80: 179.
- _____ (1994). *A commentary on Virgil. Eclogues*, Oxford.
- Coffey, M. (1957). "The Function of the Homeric Simile", *AJPh* 78.2: 113-32.
- Coffey, M. and Mayer, R. (eds.). *Seneca Phaedra*, Cambridge.
- Cohen, D. (1996). "Seclusion, separation, and the status of women in classical Athens" in I. McAuslan and P. Walcot (eds.), 134-45, Oxford and New York.
- Coleman, R. (1977). *Vergil. Eclogues*. Cambridge.
- Collard, C., Cropp, M.J. and Lee, K.H. (eds.) (1995). *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays, with Introductions, Translations and Commentaries*, vol. 1. *Telephus, Cretans, Stheneboea, Bellerophon, Cresphontes, Erectheus, Phaethon, Wise Melanippe, Captive Melanippe*, Warminster.
- Collins, A.J.F. and Hayes, B.J. (eds.) (1910). *Ovid, Heroides I.-X.*, London.
- Commager S. (1974). *A prolegomenon to Propertius*, Norman.
- Conacher, D.J. (1967). *Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme, and Structure*, Toronto.
- Conrad, C. (1965). "Traditional patterns of word-order in Latin epic from Ennius to Vergil", *HSCP* 69: 195-258
- Conte, G.B. (1985). *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario*, Turin.
- _____ (1986). *The Rhetoric of Imitation. Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (ed. C. Segal), Ithaca and New York.
- _____ (1989). "Love without Elegy: The *Remedia Amoris* and the Logic of a genre", *Poetics Today* 10: 414-69.
- _____ (1994). *Genres and Readers*, Baltimore and London.
- Cooper, T.F. (1895). *Word formation in the Roman sermo plebeius. An historical study of the development of vocabulary in vulgar and late Latin, with special reference to the Romance languages*, New York.
- Copley, F.O. (1947). "Servitium amoris in the Roman Elegists", *TAPA* 78: 285-8.
- _____ (1956). *Exclusus Amator. A Study in Latin Love Poetry* (Philological American Monographs published by the American Philological Association 17), Madison.
- Corbett, P.E. (1930). *The Roman Law of Marriage*, Oxford.

- Corelis, J. (1978). *Hippolytos with the Garland: Myth, Ritual and Symbolism in Euripides' "Hippolytus"*, Diss. Stanford University.
- Costa, C.D.N. (2001). *Greek Fictional Letters*, Oxford.
- Coste-Messelière, P. de la (1957). *Les Sculptures du trésor des Athéniens. Fouilles de Delphes*, vol. 4.4, Paris.
- Courtney, E. (1965). "Ovidian and non-Ovidian *Heroides*", *BICS* 12: 63-6.
- _____ (1974). "Problems in Ovid's *Heroides*", *Mnemosyne* 27: 298f.
- _____ (1980). *A commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London.
- _____ (1990). "Greek and Latin acrostics", *Philologus* 134: 3-13.
- _____ (1993). *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford.
- Craik, E.M. (1988). *Euripides, Phoenician Women, edited with translation and commentary*, Warminster.
- _____ (1993). "Aidos in Euripides' *Hippolytos*: review and reinterpretation", *JHS* 113: 45-59.
- _____ (1998). "Language of sexuality and sexual inversion in Euripides' *Hippolytos*", *AClass* 41: 29-44.
- Cramer, F.H. (1954). *Astrology in Roman law and politics*, Philadelphia.
- Cugusi, P. (1983). *Evoluzione e forme dell' epistolografia latina nella tarda repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell' Impero, con cenni sull' epistolografia preciceroniana*, Rome.
- _____ (1989). "L'epistolografia. Modelli e tipologie di comunicazione" in G. Cavallo et al. (eds.), 379-419, Rome.
- Culham, P. (1990). "Decentering the text: The case of Ovid", *Helios* 17.2: 161-70.
- Cumont, F. (1912). *Astrology and religion among the Greeks and Romans*, New York and London.
- Cunningham, M.P. (1949). "The Novelty of Ovid's *Heroides*", *CP* 44:100-106.
- Curley, D.E. (1999). *Metatheater: Heroines and Ephebes in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, PhD Diss. University of Washington.
- Curran, L. (1966). "Vision and Reality in Propertius 1.3", *YCS* 19: 189-207.
- _____ (1984). "Rape and Rape Victims in the *Metamorphoses*", in J.Peradotto and J.P.Sullivan (eds.), 263-86, Albany.
- Currie, H. MacL. (1983). "The poems of Sulpicia". *ANRW* II.30.3 1751-64. Berlin and New York.
- Curtius, E.R. (1953). *European Literature and the latin Middle Ages*, tr. from the German by W.R. Trask, London.
- Dale, A.M. (1967). *Euripides, Helen, edited with introduction and commentary*, Oxford.
- Damsté, P.H. (1905). "Ad Ovidii *Heroides*", *Mnemosyne* 33: 1-56.
- Daube, D. (1966). "No kissing, or else..." in L.Wallach (ed.) *The classical tradition: literary and historical studies in honor of H. Caplan*, 222-31, Ithaca.

- Davidson, J. (1997). "Antoninus Liberalis and the story of Prokris", *Mnemosyne* 50: 165-84.
- Davies, M. (1980). "The eyes of Love and the hunting-net in Ibycus 287 P.", *Maia* 32: 255-7.
- _____ (1988). *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Göttingen.
- _____ (2001). *The Greek Epic Cycle*. Bristol.
- Davis, G. (1983). *The Death of Procris: "Amor" and the Hunt in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Instrumentum Literarum 2), Rome.
- Davis, J. T. (1980). "Exempla and anti-exempla in the *Amores* of Ovid", *Latomus* 39: 412-7.
- _____ (1989). *Fictus Adulter. Poet as actor in the Amores*, Amsterdam.
- Davis, P.J. (1995). "Rewriting Euripides: Ovid, *Heroides* 4", *Scholias* 4: 41-55.
- Davisson, M.H.T. (1993). "Quid moror exemplis? Mythological exempla in Ovid's pre-exilic poems and the elegies from exile", *Phoenix* 47.3: 213-37.
- De Lauretis, T. (1987). *Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film and Fiction*, Bloomington Indiana.
- Del Corno, D. (2004). "Properzio e il mito come realtà poetica" in C. Santini and F. Santucci (eds.), 173-81, Assisi.
- Della Corte, F. (1969). "Perfidus hospes" in J. Bibauw (ed.) *Hommages à M. Renard* (Collection Latomus 101), vol.1: 312-21, Brussels.
- _____ (1973). *I miti delle Heroides*, in *Opuscula IV*, 39-51, Geneva.
- Del Rio, P. (1939). "Frater – Germanus", *Emerita* 7: 1-5.
- Delz, J. (1986). "Heroidibus Ovidianis argutiae restitutae" in Stache, U. J. and Maz, W. and Wagner, F. (eds.) *Kontinuität und Wandel. Lateinische Poesie von Naevius bis Baudelair. Franco Munari zum 65. Geburtstag*, 79-89, Darmstadt.
- Den Boer, W. (1969). "Theseus. The growth of a myth in history", *G&R* 16: 1-13.
- C. Deroux (ed.) (1980). *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VIII* (Collection Latomus 239), Brussels.
- Desmond, M. (1993). "When Dido Reads Virgil: Gender and Intertextuality in Ovid's *Heroides* 7", *Helios* 20.1: 56-68.
- Detienne, M. (1977)a. *Dionysos mis à mort*, Paris.
- _____ (1977)b. *The Gardens of Adonis: spices in Greek mythology*, tr. from the French by Janet Lloyd, with an introduction by J.-P. Vernant, Hassocks.
- _____ and Vernant, J.-P. (1978). *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*, Hassocks and Atlantic Highlands: 190-206.
- _____ (1979). *Dionysos Slain*, tr. by M. and L. Muellner, Baltimore and London.
- Devereux, G. (1985). *The character of the Euripidean Hippolytos: an ethno-psychoanalytical study*, Chico CA.
- De Vito, A.F. (1994). "The Essential Seriousness of *Heroides* 4", *RhM* 137.3-4: 312-20.
- Den Boer, W. (1969). "Theseus. The growth of a myth in history", *G&R* 16: 1-13.

- Devarius, M. (1960). *Index in Eustathii commentarios in Homeri Iliadem et Odysseam. Ad fidem exempli Romani correctior editus*, Hildesheim.
- Dickey, E. (1996). *Greek Forms of Address. From Herodotus to Lucian*, Oxford.
- _____ (2002). *Latin Forms of Address. From Plautus to Apuleius*, Oxford.
- Diggle, J. (1967). "Notes on the text of Ovid, *Heroides*", *CQ* n.s. 17: 136-44.
- _____ (1981). *Euripidis Fabulae, Tomus II insunt Supplices, Electra, Hercules, Troades, Iphigeneia in Tauris, Ion*, Oxford.
- _____ and Goodyear, F.R.D. (eds.) (1972). *The classical papers of A.E.Housman*, vv.1-3, Cambridge.
- Dillon, M. (2002). *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*, London and New York.
- Dindorf, G. (ed.) (1863). *Scholia Graeca in Euripidis Tragoedias ex codicibus aucta et emendata*, vols.1-4, Oxford.
- Dittenberger, W. (1915-24). *Sylloge inscriptiorum graecarum, tertium edita*, vols.I-IV, Leipzig.
- Dixon, S. (1988). *The Roman Mother*, London.
- _____ (1992). *The Roman Family*, Baltimore.
- _____ (2001). *Reading Roman Women: Sources, Genres and Real Life*, London.
- Doherty, L. (2001). *Gender and the interpretation of Classical myth*, London.
- Dodds, E.R. (1925). "The *Aidōs* of Phaedra and the Meaning of the *Hippolytus*", *CR* 29: 102-4.
- Dörrie, H. (1960). *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids Epistulae Heroidum, Teils I-II* (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Nr. 5-6), Göttingen.
- _____ (ed.) (1971). *P.Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum* (Texte und Kommentare 6), Berlin and New York.
- _____ (1972). *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids Epistulae Heroidum, Teil III* (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Nr. 7), Göttingen.
- _____ (1975). *P. Ovidius Naso: der Brief der Sappho an Phaon. Mit literarischen und kritischen Kommentar im Rahmen einer motivgeschichtlicher Studien* (Zetemata 58), Munich.
- Dover, K.J. (1963). "The poetry of Archilochos" in *Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique*, vol. X: 181-212, Geneva.
- _____ (1993). *Aristophanes Frogs, edited with introduction and commentary*, Oxford.
- Drago, A.T. (1998). "Il 'Lamento della donna abbandonata' e lo stravolgimento della tradizione: Aristaenet. *Ep.* 2, 13", *MD* 41: 207-23.
- DuBois, P. (1979). "On Horse / Men, Amazons, and Endogamy", *Arethusa* 12: 35-49.
- _____ (1982). *Centaurs and Amazons. Women and Pre-History of the Great Chain of Being*, Ann Arbor.

- _____ (1988). *Sowing the body: Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women*, Chicago and London.
- Duckworth, G.E. (1968). "A rare type of first foot dactyl (three words)", *AJPh* 89: 437-48.
- _____ (1994). *The nature of Roman comedy: a study in popular entertainment; with a foreword and bibliographical appendix by R.L. Hunter*, 2nd edition, Norman.
- Duff, J.D. (1898). *D. Iunii Iuvenalis, Saturae XIV. Fourteen Satires of Juvenal*, Cambridge.
- Dunn, F.M. (1984). "The Lover Reflected in the Exemplum: A Study of Propertius 1.3 and 2.6", *ICS* 10: 233-59.
- Du Quesnay, I.M. (1979). "Virgil's fifth Eclogue. The song of Mopsus and the new Daphnis", *PVS* 16: 18-41.
- Dyck, A.R. (1996). *A Commentary on Cicero, de Officiis*, Ann Arbor.
- Easterling, P. (1973). "Presentation of Character in Aeschylus", *G&R* 20: 5-19.
- _____ (1977). "Character in Sophocles", *G&R* 24: 121-9.
- _____ (1987). "Women in Tragic Space", *BICS* 34: 15-26.
- _____ (1990). "Constructing character in Greek tragedy" in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), 83-99, Oxford.
- Edmunds, L. (200). *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*, Baltimore and London.
- Edwards, C. (1993). *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.
- Edwards, M. W. (1990) *Homer. Poet of the Iliad*, Baltimore and London.
- _____ (1991). *The Iliad: A Commentary, vol. v: books 17-20*, Cambridge.
- Egger, B. (1994). "Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe" in J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (eds.) *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, 31-48, London and New York.
- Enk, P.J. (1946). *Sexti Propertii Elegiarum: Liber I (Monobiblos)*, Leiden.
- Dübner, F. (ed.) (1888-1927). *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et appendice nova*, vols. 1-2, vol. 3 edited by E. Cougny, Paris.
- Erhardt, C. (1971). "Hair in Ancient Greece", *Classical News and Views* 15.1: 13-19.
- Ernout, A. (1947). "Note on B. Axelson (1945), *Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache*, Lund", *RPh* 73 (Série 3, 21): 55-70.
- _____ (1949). *Les adjectives en "-osus" et en "-ulentus"*, Paris.
- Ernout, A. – Thomas, F. (1989). *Syntaxe latine*, second edition, Paris.
- Eyben, E. (1992). "Fathers and Sons" in B. Rawson (ed.) 114-43, Canberra and Oxford.
- Fabre-Serris, J. (1998)a. *Mythologie et littérature à Rome. La réécriture des mythes aux I^{ers} siècles avant et après J. – C.*, Lausanne.
- _____ (1998)b. *Literature and Religion at Rome*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1999). "L' *Héroïde* V d' Ovide. Variation sur un *topos* de la poésie romaine: l'opposition monde pastoral / monde héroïque" in J. Fabre-Serris and A. Deremetz (eds.), *Élégie et épopée dans la poésie ovidienne (Héroïdes et Amours). En Hommage à Simone*

- Viarre, 15 et 16 mai 1998, 41-51, Villeneuve d'Ascq (Nord): Université Charles-de-Gaulle, Lille 3.
- Fantazzi, C. (1966). "Virgilian Pastoral and Roman Love Poetry", *AJPh* 87: 171-91.
- _____ (1974). "Golden age in Arcadia", *Latomus* 33: 280-305.
- Fantham, E. (2004). *Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Oxford.
- Fantuzzi, M. (2003). "Pastoral love and 'elegiac' love, from Greece to Rome". *LICS* 2.3: 1-11.
- Faraone, C.A. and Obbink, D. (eds.) (1991). *Magika hiera: ancient Greek magic and religion*, New York and Oxford.
- Farrell, J. (1998). "Reading and writing the *Heroides*", *HSCP* 98: 307-38.
- _____ (1999). "The Ovidian *Corpus*: Poetic Body and Poetic Text," in P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi and S. Hinds (eds.), 127-41, Cambridge.
- Fauth, W. (1958-59). *Hippolytos und Phaidra: Bemerkungen zu religiösen Hintergrund eines tragischen Konflikts*, parts 1 and 2 (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwiss 8-9), Mainz.
- Fear, T. M. (1993). *Critical Studies in Ovid's Heroides 1, 2, 7*, MLitt University of Durham.
- _____ (1999). *Poetic Pimping: the Elegiac Paradox of Fame and Infamy*, PhD Diss. University of Southern California.
- _____ (2000). "The Poet as Pimp: Elegiac Seduction in the Time of Augustus", *Arethusa* 33.2: 217- 40.
- Fedeli, P. (1980). *Sesto Propertio. Il primo libro delle elegie*, Florence.
- _____ (1984). *Sexti Properti elegiarum libri iv*, Stuttgart.
- _____ (1985). *Propertio. Il Libro Terzo delle Elegie*, Bari.
- _____ (2004). "La retorica dell' esempio mitico in Propertio" in C. Santini and F. Santucci (eds.), 231-57.
- Feeney, D. (1991). *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*, Oxford.
- Ferguson, J. (1984). *Euripides Hippolytus. Edited with Introduction, Commentary and Vocabulary*, Bristol.
- Ferri, R. (2003). *Octavia. A play attributed to Seneca, edited with introduction and commentary*, Cambridge.
- Fiorencis, G. and Gianotti, G.F. (1990). "Fedra e Ippolito in provincia", *MD* 25: 71-114.
- Fitch, J.G. (1987). *Seneca's Hercules Furens. A Critical Text with Introduction and Commentary*, Ithaca and London.
- Fitzgerald, G.J. (1973). "Misconception, Hipocrisy, and the Structure of Euripides' *Hippolytus*," *Ramus* 2: 20-40.
- Flaschenriem, B.L. (1998). "Speaking of women: "Female voice" in Propertius", *Helios* 25.1: 49-64.
- Flaherty, S. (1994). *The Rhetoric of Female Self-Destruction: a Study of Homer, Euripides and Ovid*, PhD Diss. Yale University.

- Flaschenriem, B.L. (1999). "Sulpicia and the rhetoric of disclosure", *CP* 94: 36-54.
- Flower, H.I. (2000). "*Fabula de Bacchanalibus*: The Bacchanalian cult of the Second Century BC and Roman Drama" in G. Manuwald (ed.) *Identität und Alterität in der Frühromischen Tragödie*: 23-35, Würzburg.
- Flury, P. (1988). "*Osculum* und *osculari*. Beobachtungen zum Vokabular des Kusses im Lateinischen", in S. Krämer and M. Bernhard (eds.), *Scire litteras. Forschungen zum mittelalterlichen Geistesleben*, 149-57, Munich.
- Foley, H.P. (1987). "'Reverse similes' and Sex Roles in the *Odyssey*", *Arethusa* 11.1,2: 7-26.
 _____ (ed.) (1981)a. *Reflections of women in antiquity*, New York.
 _____ (1981)b. "The conception of women in Athenian drama" in Foley (ed.), 127-68, New York.
 _____ (1992). "Anodos Drama: Euripides' *Alcestis* and *Helen*" in R.Hexter and D.Selden (eds.), 133-60, New York and London.
 _____ (1993). *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter. Translation, Commentary and Interpretive Essays*, Princeton.
 _____ (2001). *Female acts in Greek tragedy*, Princeton and Oxford.
- Fontenrose, J. (1979-80). "Ovid's Procris", *CJ* 75: 289-94.
 _____ (1981). *Orion: the Myth of the Hunter and the Huntress* (University of California Publications in Classical Studies 23), Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Fordyce, C.J. (1961). *Catullus, a commentary*, Oxford.
 _____ (1993). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII – VIII, with a commentary*, introduction by P.G. Walsh ; edited by J.D. Christie, London.
- Formicola, C. (1988). *Il Cynegeticon di Grattio. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento* (Edizioni e saggi universitari di filologia classica 38), Bologna.
- Fornaro, P. (ed.) (1999). *Ovid, Heroides*, Alessandria.
- Foucault, M. (1988). *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality*, vol.2 (tr. by R. Hurley), New York.
- Fowler, B.H. (1978). "Lyric Structures in Three Euripidean Plays", *Dioniso* 49: 15-51.
- Fowler, D. (1983). "An acrostic in Vergil (*Aen.* 7.601-4)?", *CQ* 33: 298.
 _____ (1997). "On the Shoulders of Giants: *Intertextuality* and *Classical Studies*", *MD* 39: 13-34.
- Fowler, R.L. (1993). "The Myth of Kephalos as an Aition of Rain-magic (Pherekydes *FGrHist* 3 F 34)", *ZPE* 97: 29-42.
- Fox, M. (1998). "The constrained man" in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds.) (1998)a: 6-22, London and New York.

- Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. (eds.) (1998)a. *Thinking Men. Masculinity and its Self-Representation in the Classical Tradition* (Leicester- Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 7), London and New York.
- _____ (eds.) (1998)b. *When Men Were Men. Masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity* (Leicester – Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 8), London and New York.
- Fränkel, H. (1945). *Ovid: A Poet between two Worlds*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- _____ (1997). “Essence and Nature of the Homeric Similes” (repr. and tr. from *Die homerischen Gleichnisse* (Göttingen, 1921), pp. 98-114) in *Homer. German Scholarship in Translation*, tr. by G. M. Wright and P.V. Jones with Introduction by P.V. Jones: 103-23, Oxford.
- Fraenkel, E. (1957). *Horace*, Oxford.
- _____ (1966). “Tulliana”, *MH* 23: 194.
- Fraser, P.M. (1972). *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, vols.1-2, Oxford.
- Frazer, J.G. (1914). *The Golden Bough. A Study in magic and religion, Part IV. Adonis, Attis, Osiris: studies in the history of Oriental religion*, third edition, revised and enlarged, vols. 1-2. London.
- _____ (ed.) (1921). *Apollodorus, the Library*, vols.2, London and New York.
- _____ (1929). *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex. The Fasti of Ovid, vol. IV. Commentary on books V and VI*, London.
- Frécaut, J-M. (1972). *L'Esprit et l'humour chez Ovide*, Grenoble.
- Fredericks, S.C. (1976). “A poetic experiment in the Garland of Sulpicia (*Corpus Tibullianum* 3.10)”, *Latomus* 35: 761-82.
- Fredrick, D. (1995). “Beyond the Atrium to Ariadne: Erotic Painting and Visual Pleasure in the Roman House,” *CLAnt* 14: 266–87.
- _____ (1997). “Reading broken skin: violence in Roman elegy” in J.Hallet and M.Skinner (eds.), 172-93, Princeton.
- _____ (ed.) (2002). *The Roman Gaze. Vision, Power and the Body*, Baltimore.
- Freyburger, G. (1980). “Le foedus d’amour” in A.Thil (ed.) *L'élégie romaine*: 105-16, Paris.
- Friedemann, F.T. (ed.) (1831). *Dav. Ruhkenii dictata ad Ovidii Heroidas et Albinovani Elegiam*, Leipzig.
- Friedrich, W.H. (1953). *Euripides und Diphilos*, Munich.
- Frier, B.W. and McGinn, T.A.J. (eds.) (2004). *A Casebook on Roman Family Law* (American Philological Association Classical Resources Series no. 5), Oxford.
- Frischer, B.D. (1970). “*Concordia discors* and characterization in Euripides’ *Hippolytos*”, *GRBS* 11: 85-100.
- Frisk, H. (1960-72). *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vols. 3, Heidelberg.

- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. (1996). "Eros, Desire, and the Gaze" (tr. by N.Kline) in N.B.Kampen and B. Bergmann (et al.) (eds.) *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy*, 81-100, Cambridge.
- Fruhstorfer, M. (1986). "Fores perfringere- eine Metapher in der erotischen Dichtung?", *RhM* 129: 54-6.
- Fulkerson, L. (2000). "Quid Epistula Lecta Nocebit? 'Reading More' in Ovid's *Heroides*", PhD Diss. Columbia University.
- _____ (2003). "Chain(ed) Mail: Hypermestra and the Dual Readership of *Heroides* 14", *TAPA* 133: 123-45.
- _____ (2005). *The Ovidian Heroine as Author. Reading, Writing, and Community in the Heroides*, Cambridge.
- Gaertner, J.F. (2005). *Ovid Epistulae ex Ponto, Book I, edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Gagliardi, D. (1978). "I nunc ... Per la storia di uno stilema poetico", in E. Livrea and G.A. Privitera (eds.) *Studi in onore di Anthos Ardizzoni*, I. 373-9, Roma.
- Galán Vioque, G. (2002). *Martial, Book VII. A Commentary*, tr. by J.J. Zoltowski, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
- Galand-Hallyn Perrine (1991). "Corinne et Sappho: elocutio et inventio dans les *Amours* et les *Héroïdes* d'Ovide", *BAGB*: 336-58.
- Galasso, L. (1988). "Modelli tragici e ricodificazione elegiaca: appunti sulla poesia ovidianna dell'esilio", *MD* 18: 83-99.
- _____ (1995). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto liber II*, Florence.
- Galimberti Biffino, G. (1988), "Funzioni strutturali e stilistiche delle parentesi nelle *Metamorfosi* di Ovidio", *AevAnt* 1: 247-66.
- Galinsky, K. (1975). *Ovid's Metamorphoses: An introduction to the Basic Aspects*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- _____ (1981). "Some Aspects of Ovid's Golden Age", *GB* 10: 193-205.
- _____ (1996). *Augustan culture: an interpretive introduction*, Princeton.
- _____ (ed.) (2005). *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge.
- Gamel, M-K. (1989). "Non sine caede: abortion politics and poetics in Ovid's *Amores*", *Helios* 16.2: 183-206.
- _____ (1998). "Reading as a man: Performance and gender in Ramn elegy", *Helios* 25.1: 79-95.
- Gamman, L. Marshment, M. (eds.) (1988). *The female gaze: women as viewers of popular culture*, London.

- Gantz, T. (1993). *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, vols. 1-2, Baltimore and London.
- Gardner, J.F. (1986). *Women in Roman law and society*, London and Sydney.
- _____ and Wiedemann, T. (eds.). *The Roman household: a sourcebook*, London.
- _____ (1998)a. *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, Oxford.
- _____ (1998)b. "Sexing a Roman: imperfect men in Roman law in Foxhall- Salmon (1998)b: 136-152, London, New York.
- Garland, R. (1990). *The Greek Way of Life. From Conception to Old Age*, London.
- Garrison, E. (1989). "Suicide Note in Euripides' *Hippolytus*" in K. Hartigan (ed.) *Text and Presentation*, vol. IX (Lanham MD): 73-85.
- Garton, C. (1957). "Characterization in Greek tragedy", *JHS* 77: 247-54.
- Garvie, A.F. (1986). *Aeschylus, Choephoroi, with introduction and commentary*, Oxford.
- Gatz, B. (1967). *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen*, (Spudasmata 16), Hildesheim.
- Gelzer, M. (1969). *The Roman Nobility*, tr. by R. Seager, Oxford.
- Giangrande, G. (1974). "Los tópicos Hellenísticos en la elegía Latina", *Emerita* 42: 1-36.
- Gibson, R. K. (1995). "How to win girlfriends and influence them: *amicitia* in Roman love elegy", *PCPhS* 41: 62-82.
- _____ (1998). "*Meretrix* or *matrona*? Stereotypes in Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 3", *PLLS* 10: 295- 312.
- _____ (1999). "Aeneas as *hospes* in Vergil *Aeneid* 1 and 4", *CQ* 49: 184-202.
- _____ and Kraus, C. S. (eds.) (2002)a. *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory* (Brill, Mnemosyne Supplements 232), Leiden and Boston.
- _____ (2002). " 'Cf. e.g.' : a typology of "parallels" and the function of commentaries on Latin poetry" in R. K. Gibson and C. S. Kraus (eds.): 331-57, Leiden and Boston.
- _____ (2003). *Ovid: Ars Amatoria Book 3* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 40), Cambridge.
- Gildersleeve, B.A. and Lodge, G. (1936). *Latin Grammar*, London.
- Gilg- Ludwig, R. (1966). "Medea und Phaedra, Semiramis und Cleopatra in ihrer literarischen Überlieferung" in F. Jost (ed.) *Proceedings of the IVth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association*, II: 1068-78, The Hague and Paris.
- Gill, C. (1986). "The question of Character and Personality in Greek tragedy", *Poetics Today* 7.2: 251-73.
- _____ (1990)a. "The articulation of the Self in Euripides' *Hippolytus*" in A. Powell (ed.) *Euripides, Women and Sexuality*, 76- 107, London and New York.
- _____ (1990)b. "The character / personality distinction" in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), 251-73, Oxford.

- _____ (1995). *Personality in Greek epic, tragedy, and philosophy: the self in dialogue*, Oxford.
- Gill, C.J. (1997). "Passion as Madness in Roman Poetry", in S.M. Braund and C.Gill (eds.) *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*: 213-41, Cambridge.
- Gilleland, M.E. (1980). "Female speech in Greek and Latin", *AJPh* 101: 180-3.
- Gilula, D. (1981). "A Consideration of Phaedra's EUKLEIA," *Sileno* 7: 121-33.
- Giomini, R. (ed.) (1953). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroidas, vol. I Epistulas I-X continens*, Rome.
- _____ (1993). "Ancora sulla struttura retorica nelle *Heroides* ovidiane: l'epistola di Fedra a Ippolito." in A. Biagio (ed.) *Cultura e lingue classiche. 3. 3° Convegno di aggiornamento e di didattica, Palermo, 29 ottobre –1 novembre 1989*, Rome.
- Glenn, J. (1936). "Compounds in Augustan Elegy and Epic", *CW* 29: 65-69, 73-77.
- _____ (1976). "The Fantasies of Phaedra: A Psychoanalytic Reading", *CW* 69: 435-42.
- Görgemanns, H. (2004). "Epistle" in C.F. Salazar and D.E.Orton (eds.), 4.1138-41, Leiden and Boston.
- Godwin, J. (1995). *Catullus. Poems 61-68, edited with introduction, translation and commentary*, Warminster.
- Goff, B.E. (1990). *Noose of Words: readings of desire, violence and language*, Cambridge
- Gold, B.K. (1983). "The Literary Misuse of Mythology: Propertius and Ovid", *Stentor* (publication of the Michigan Classical Conference, Wayne State University) NS 1.3 (April 1983): 1-6.
- _____ (1993). "'But Ariadne Was Never There in the First Place': Finding the Female in Roman Poetry" in N.S. Rabinowitz and A. Richlin (eds.), 75-101, New York and London.
- Goldhill, S. (1986). *Reading Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1990). "Character and Actio, representation and Reading. Greek Tragedy and its Critics" in C.B.R Pelling (ed.), 100-27, Oxford.
- Goodwin, W.W. (1965). *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, Bristol.
- Goold, G.P. (1965). "*Amatoria Critica*", *HSCP* 69: 1-107.
- _____ (1974). Review of Dörrie (1971), *Gnomon* 46: 475-84.
- Gordon, P. (1997). "The lover's voice in *Heroides* 15: or, Why is Sappho a man?" in J.P. Hallett and M. B. Skinner (eds.): 274-91, Princeton.
- Gould, J. (1973) "*Hiketeia*", *JHS* 93: 74-103.
- _____ (1978). "Dramatic character and "human intelligibility" in Greek tragedy", *PCPhS* 24: 43-67.
- _____ (1980). "Law, custom and myth: Aspects of the social position of women in classical Athens", *JHS* 100: 38-59.
- Gow, A.S.F. (1932). "Diminutives in Augustan poetry", *CQ* 26: 150-7.

- _____ (1952). *Theocritus. Edited with a translation and commentary*, vol.1 Text, vol.2 Commentary, Cambridge.
- _____ and Schoffield, A.F. (1953). *Nicander. The poems and poetical fragments, edited with a translation and notes*, Cambridge.
- _____ and D.L. Page (eds.) (1965). *The Grek Anthology: Hellenistic epigrams*, vol.1. Text and Translation, vol.2 Commentary and Indices, Cambridge.
- _____ and D.L. Page (eds.) (1968). *The Greek Anthology : the Garland of Philip, and some contemporary epigrams*, vol.1. Text and Translation, vol.2 Commentary and Indices, Cambridge.
- Graf, F. (ed.) (1993). *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft : das Paradigma Roms*, Stuttgart.
- _____ (2002). "Myth in Ovid" in P. Hardie (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 108-21, Cambridge.
- Gransden, K. W. (ed.) (1976). *Virgil Aeneid VIII*, Cambridge.
- Grant, M. (1960). *The Myths of Hyginus*, translated and edited, Lawrence.
- Grassmann, V. (1966). *Die erotischen Epoden des Horaz. Literarischer Hintergrund und sprachliche Tradition (Zetemata 39)*, Munich.
- Gregory, J. W. (1974). *Madness in the Heracles, Orestes and Bacchae. A study in Euripidean drama*, PhD Diss. Harvard University (summary in *HSCP* 81 (1977): 300-2).
- Green, P. (1979). "Ars Gratia Cultus: Ovid as Beautician", *AJPh* 100: 381-92.
- _____ (1979-80). "The innocence of Procris: Ovid *A.A.* 3.687-746", *CJ* 75: 15-24.
- Green, S.J. (2004). *Ovid, Fasti 1: a commentary*, Leiden and Boston.
- Greene, E. (ed.) (1996)a. *Reading Sappho. Contemporary Approaches*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- _____ (1996)b. "Apostrophe and Women's Erotics in the Poetry of Sappho" in Greene (ed.), 233-47, Los Angeles and London.
- _____ (1998). *The Erotics of Domination. Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry*, Baltimore and London.
- Greenough, A.A. Howard, G.L. Kittredge and D'Ooge, B. L. (eds.) (1903). *Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar for schools and colleges*, Boston and London.
- Griffin, J. (1985). *Latin poets and Roman life*, London.
- _____ (1990). "Characterization in Euripides: *Hippolytus* and *Iphigeneia in Aulis*" in C.B.R. Pelling (ed.), 128-49, Oxford.
- Grimal, P. (1951). *Dictionnaire de la mythologie grecque et romaine*, Paris.
- Groningen von, B.A. (1977). *Euphorion*, Amsterdam.
- Gross, N.P. (1978-79). "Rhetorical wit and amatory persuasion in Ovid", *CJ* 74: 305-18.
- Grossart, P. (2001). *Die Erzählung von Meleagros. Zur literarischen Entwicklung der kalydonischen Kultlegende*, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.

- Hänninen, M.-L. (1998). "Conflicting descriptions of women's religious activity in mid-Republican Rome: Augustan narratives about the arrival of Cybele and the Bacchanalia scandal" in L. Larsson Lovén and A. Strömberg (eds.) *Aspects of Women in Antiquity*, Proceedings of the first Nordic Symposium on Women's Lives in Antiquity, Göteborg 12-15 June 1997, 111-26, Jonsered.
- Habinek, T. (1997). "The invention of sexuality in the world-city of Rome", in T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro (eds.) *The Roman Cultural Revolution*: 23-43, Cambridge.
- Häussler, R. (1968). *Nachträge zu A. Otto Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer. Eigeleitet und mit einem Register herausgegeben*, Darmstadt.
- Haley, L. (1924-25). "The Feminine Complex in the *Heroides*", *CJ* 20: 15-25.
- Hall, J.B. (1969). *De raptu Proserpinae, edited with an introduction and commentary*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1990). "Conjectures in Ovid's *Heroides*", *ICS* 15: 263-92.
- _____ (ed.) (1995). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristia*, Stuttgart.
- _____ (1997). "The Sociology of Athenian Tragedy" in P.E. Easterling (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*: 91-126, Cambridge.
- Halleran, M.R. (2000). *Euripides Hippolytus, with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Warminster.
- Hallett, J.P. (1973). "The Role of Women in Roman Elegy: Counter-Cultural Feminism", *Arethusa* 6: 103-124 (= now in J. Peradotto and J.P. Sullivan (eds.), *Women in the Ancient World: The Arethusa Papers* 1984, 241-62, Albany).
- _____ (1984). *Fathers and daughters in Roman society: women and the elite family*, Princeton.
- _____ (2002). "The Eleven Elegies of the Augustan Poet Sulpicia" in L.J. Churchill, P.R. Brown and J.E. Jeffrey (eds.) *Women writing Latin: from Roman antiquity to early modern Europe*, vol.1: 45-65, New York and London.
- _____ and Skinner, M.B. (eds.) (1997). *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton.
- Halliday, W.R. (1928). *The Greek Questions of Plutarch*, London.
- Halperin, D., Winkler, J. and Zeitlin, F. (1990). *Before Sexuality*, Princeton.
- Hardie, P. (1986). *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford.
- _____ (1997). "Virgil and tragedy" in C. Martindale (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, 312-26, Cambridge.
- _____ and Barchiesi, A. and Hinds, S. (eds.) *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and Its Reception* (PCPhS Supp. 23), Cambridge.
- _____ (2002)a. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, Cambridge.
- _____ (ed.) (2002)b. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge.

- Harlow, M. (1998). "In the name of the father: procreation, paternity, and patriarchy. Masculinity and its self-representation" in Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. (eds.), 155-69, London.
- Harmon, D. (1974). "Myth and Fantasy in Propertius 1.3", *TAPA* 104: 151-65.
- Harrison, A.R.W. (1968). *The Law of Athens: Family and Property*, 2 vols., Oxford.
- Harrison, S.J. (1991). *Vergil. Aeneid 10, with introduction, translation, and commentary*, Oxford.
- _____ (2002)a. "Ovid and genre: evolutions of an elegist" in P.Hardie (ed.): 79-94, Cambridge.
- _____ (2002)b. "Literary Topography in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", in M.Paschalis and S.Frangoulidis (eds.) *Space in the Ancient Novel* (Ancient Narrative Supplementum 1) 40-57, Groningen.
- _____ (2005). *A Companion to Latin Literature*, Malden MA.
- Hartigan, K. (1987). "Euripidean Madness: Heracles and Orestes." *G&R* 34:126-35.
- Harvey, A.E. (1955). "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry", *CQ* 5: 157-80.
- Haussoullier, B. (1898). "L'oracle d' Apollon a Claros", *RPh* 22: 257-73.
- Hawley, R. and Levick, B. (1997). *Women in antiquity. New assessments*, London and New York.
- Hawley, R. (1998). "The male body as spectacle in Attic drama" in Foxhall – Salmon (eds.) (1998)a: 83-9, London and New York.
- Heinsius, N. (1677). *Operum P.Ovidii Nasonis, editio nova, accurante Nicolao Heinsio Dan. Fil.*, Amsterdam.
- Heinze, R. (1915). *Virgils epische Technik*, Leipzig and Berlin.
- Heinze, T. (1991-3). 'The authenticity of Ovid *Heroides* 12 reconsidered', *BICS* 38: 94-8.
- _____ (1997). *Der XII. Heroidenbrief: Medea an Jason (mit einer Beilage: die Fragmente der Tragödie "Medea")* (Mnem. Suppl. 170), Leiden.
- Heldmann, K. (1974). *Untersuchungen zu den Tragödien Senecas* (Hermes-Einzelschriften 31), Wiesbaden.
- Helzle, M. (1989). *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto liber IV. A Commentary on Poems 1 to 7 and 16* (Spudasmata 43), Zürich and New York.
- Henderson, A.A.R. (1979). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Remedia Amoris, edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Edinburgh.
- Henderson, J. (1986). "Becoming a Heroine (1st): Penelope's Ovid", *LCM* 11.1: 7-10, 21-4, 37-40, 67-70, 81-5, 113-21.
- Henderson, J. (1991). *The Maculate Muse*, New York.
- Herescu, N. I. (ed.) (1958). *Ovidiana. Recherches sur Ovide, publiées à l' occasion du bimillénaire de la naissance du poète*, Paris.

- Herrmann, L. (1966). "Rabirius ou Lucilius Junior", *Latomus* 25.2: 769-83.
- Herter, H. (1940). "Theseus und Hippolytos", *RhM* 89: 273-92.
- Heubeck, A. and Hoekstra, A. (1990). *A commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol.1. *Introduction and Books I-VIII*, vol.2. *Books IX-XVI*, Oxford.
- _____ J. Russo and M. Fernández- Galiano (1992). *A commentary on Homer's Odyssey* vol.3. *Books XVII-XXIV*, Oxford.
- Hexter, R. and Selden, D. (eds.) (1992). *Innovation in Antiquity*, New York and London.
- Heyworth S.J. (1984). "Three notes on the *Heroides*", *Mnemosyne* 37: 103-9.
- Higham, T.F. (1958). "Ovid and Rhetoric", in N.I. Herescu (ed.): 32-48, Paris.
- Hilberg, I. (1899). "Ist die *Ilias Latina* von einem Italicus verfasst oder einen Italicus gewidmet?", *WS* 21: 264-305.
- _____ (1900). "Nachtrag zur 'Ist die *Ilias Latina* von einem Italicus verfasst oder einen Italicus gewidmet?'", *WS* 22: 317.
- Hill, D.E. (1985-2000). *Ovid Metamorphoses I-XV, edited with an introduction, translation and notes*, Warminster.
- Hiller, S. (1975). "Die Explosion des Vulkans von Thera", *Gymnasium* 82: 32-74.
- Hinds, S. (1987)a. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone. Ovid and the self-conscious Muse*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1987)b. "The poetess and the reader: further steps towards Sulpicia", *Hermathena* 143: 29-46.
- _____ (1987)c. "Generalising about Ovid", *Ramus* 16: 4-31.
- _____ (1990). "Medea in Ovid: Scenes of the Life of an Intertextual Heroine", *MD* 30: 9-47.
- _____ (1998). *Allusion and intertext. Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*, Cambridge.
- Hintermeier, C.M. (1993). *Die Briefpaare in Ovids Heroides: Tradition und Innovation* (Palingenesia 41), Stuttgart
- Hodge, R.I.V. and Buttimore, R.A. (1977). *The "Monobiblos" of Propertius. An account of the first book of Propertius consisting of a text, translation, and critical essay on each poem*, Cambridge.
- Hofmann, J.B. (1926). *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, Heidelberg.
- Hollis, A.S. (1970). *Ovid Metamorphoses. Book VIII, edited with an introduction and commentary*, Oxford.
- _____ (1997). *Ovid Ars Amatoria Book I, edited with an introduction and commentary*, Oxford.
- Holzberg, N. (1999). "Four poets and a poetess or a portrait of the poet as a young man? Thoughts on book 3 of the *Corpus Tibullianum*", *CJ* 94.2: 169-91.
- _____ (2002). *Ovid. The Poet and his Work*, tr. by G. M. Goshgarian, Ithaca and London.

- Hopkinson, N. (1984). *Callimachus Hymn to Demeter, edited with an introduction and commentary*, Cambridge.
- Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A. (1996). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd edition, Oxford.
- Horsfall, N. (1981). "Some problems of titulature in Roman literary history", *BICS* 28: 103-14.
- _____ (1993). "Mythological invention and poetica licentia" in F. Graf (ed.): 131- 41.
- _____ (1997). *Virgil, Aeneid 7: a commentary*, Leiden and Boston.
- _____ (2003). *Virgil, Aeneid 11: a commentary*, Leiden and Boston.
- Housman, A. E. (1897)a. "Ovid 'Heroides [I]'", *CR* 11: 102-6 (= J. Diggle and F.R.D.Goodyear (eds.) (1972), 380-87).
- _____ (1897)b."Ovid's *Heroides* [II]", *CR* 11: 200-4 (= J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear (eds.) (1972), 388-95).
- _____ (1899). "Review: A. Palmer, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides*," *CR* 13: 172-8 (= J. Diggle and F.R.D.Goodyear (eds.) (1972), 470- 80, London.
- _____ (1910). "Greek nouns in Latin poetry from Lucretius to Juvenal", *JPh* 31: 236-66 (= J. Diggle and F.R.D.Goodyear (eds.) (1972), 817-39, London).
- Hunt, J.M. (1975). Review of Dörrie (1971), *CP* 70: 215-24.
- Ieranò, G. (2003). "Il mare d' amore: elementi per la storia di un topos letterario" in L. Belloni, L. De Finis, G. Moretti (eds.), *L'officina ellenistica. Poesia dotta e popolare in Grecia e a Roma*, 199-238, (Labirinti 69), Trento.
- Iffrah, G. (1981). *Histoire universelle des chiffres. Lorsque les nombres racontent les hommes*, Paris.
- Irigaray, L. (1991). "This Sex Which Is Not One" in R.R. Warhol and D.P. Herndl (eds.), 350-6, New Brunswick.
- Jacob, D. (1998). *Η ποιητική της αρχαίας ελληνικής τραγωδίας*, Athens.
- Jacobson, H. (1968). "Ennian Influence in the *Her.* 16 and 17", *Phoenix* 22: 299- 303.
- _____ (1974). *Ovid's Heroides*, Princeton.
- _____ (1976). "Structure and Meaning in Propertius Book 3", *JCS* 1: 160-73.
- Jäkel, S. (1973). "The 14th Heroid letter of Ovid and the Danaid Trilogy of Aeschylus", *Mnemosyne* 26: 239-42.
- James, S.L. (1998)."Introduction: Constructions of gender and genre in Roman comedy and elegy", *Helios* 25.1. 3-16.
- _____ (2003)a. *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion. Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- _____ (2003)b. "Her Turn to Cry: The Politics of Weeping in Roman Love Elegy", *TAPA* 133: 99-122.
- Janan, M. (1994). *When The Lamp Is Shattered: Desire and Narrative in Catullus*, Carbondale.

- _____ (2001). *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV*, Berkeley.
- Janka, M. (1997). *Ovid Ars Amatoria Buch 2: Kommentar*, Heidelberg.
- Jeanmaire, H. (1939). *Couroi et Courètes. Essai sur l'éducation spartiate et sur les rites d'adolescence dans l'antiquité hellénique*, Lille.
- Jocelyn, H. D. (1967). *The Tragedies of Ennius. The fragments edited with an introduction and commentary*, Cambridge
- Johnson, M. (2003). "Catullus 2B : The development of a relationship in the passer trilogy", *CJ* 99.1: 11-34.
- Jolivet, J.-C. (1992). "Philologie et Mythologie dans la XIII^e Héroïde (Vv 63-100)", *R.É.L.* 70: 138-48.
- _____ (1999). "La dispute d'Ovide et des Grammariens ou Briséis 'grammatikotate': 3 problèmes homériques et une quaestio ovidiana dans la 3^{ème} Her." in J. Fabre-Serris and A. Deremetz (eds.), *Élégie et épopée dans la poésie ovidienne (Heroides et Amours). En Hommage à Simone Viarre, 15 et 16 mai 1998*, 15-39, Villeneuve d'Ascq (Nord): Université Charles-de-Gaulle, Lille 3.
- _____ (2001). *Allusion et fiction épistolaire dans les Héroïdes, Recherches sur l'intertextualité Ovidienne*, Rome.
- Joshel, S.R. and Murnaghan, S. (eds.). (1998). *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: differential equations*, London.
- Jost, F. (1968). *L'évolution d'un genre: le roman épistolaire dans les letters occidentals (Europaena. Essais de littérature comparée 2)*, Freiburg and Urbana.
- Kannicht, R. (1969). *Euripides Helena, Band I. Einleitung und Text, Band II. Kommentar*, Heidelberg.
- Kaplan, E.A. (1983). "Is The Gaze Male?" in A. Snitow et al. (eds.). *Powers of Desire: The Politics of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality*, 309-27, New York.
- Karsai, Gy. (1982-84). "Le monologue de Thésée", *AAntHung* 30: 113-27.
- Kaser, M. (1955). *Das römische Privatrecht*, vol. I, Munich.
- _____ (1959). *Das römische Privatrecht*, vol. II, Munich.
- _____ (1965). *Roman Private Law*, tr. by R. Dannenbring, Durban.
- Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (eds.) (1983-2001). *Poetae Comici Graeci*, vols.1-8, Berlin.
- Katsouris, A.G. (1976). "The Suicide Motif in Ancient Drama", *Dionysio* 47: 5-36.
- Kauffman, L.S. (1986). *Discourses of Desire: Gender, Genre, and Epistolary Fictions*, Ithaca.
- Kearns, E. (1989). *The heroes of Attica*, London.
- Keith, A. (1992). *The Play of Fictions. Studies in Ovid's Metamorphoses Book 2*, Ann Arbor.
- _____ (1994). "Corpus eroticum: elegiac poetics and elegiac puellae in Ovid's Amores", *CW* 88.1: 27-44.
- _____ (1997). "Tandem venit amor: A Roman woman speaks of love" in J.P. Hallett and M.B. Skinner (eds.), 295-310, Princeton.

- _____ (2000). *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*, Cambridge.
- Kelly, M. (1998). "Homer, Ovid and *Her.* 1.15-16", *Antichthon* 32: 24-8.
- Kennedy, D.F. (1984). "The epistolary mode and the first of Ovid's *Heroides*", *CQ* 34: 413-22.
- _____ (1993). *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*, Cambridge.
- _____ (2002). "Epistolarity: The *Heroides*" in P.Hardie (ed.), 217-32, Cambridge.
- Kenney, E.J. (1958). "Notes on Ovid", *CQ* 8: 54-66.
- _____ (1961)a. *P.Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina Faciei Feminae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris*, Oxford.
- _____ (1961)b. Review of Dörrie (1960), *Gnomon* 33: 478- 87.
- _____ (1962). "The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid's *Amores, Ars Amatoria, and Remedia Amoris*", *CQ* 12: 1-31.
- _____ (1963). "A Byzantine version of Ovid", *Hermes* 91: 213-27.
- _____ (1967). "Liebe als juridisches Problem. Über Ovids *Heroides* 20 und 21", *Philologus* 111: 212-32.
- _____ (1969). "Ovid and the law", *YCS* 21: 241-63.
- _____ (1970)a. "Notes on Ovid, III: Corrections and interpretations in the *Heroides*", *HSCP* 74: 169-85.
- _____ (1970)b. Review of Kirfel (1969), *CR* 20: 195-7.
- _____ (1970)c. "Doctus Lucretius", *Mnemosyne* 23: 366-92.
- _____ (1970)d. "Love and Legalism: Ovid, *Heroides* 20 and 21", *Arion* 9: 388-407.
- _____ (1973). "The Style of the *Metamorphoses*" in J.W. Binns (ed.), 116-53, London.
- _____ (1974). Review of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, iii, *CR* 24: 88-90.
- _____ (1979). "Two disputed passages in the *Heroides*", *CQ* 29: 394-431.
- _____ (ed.) (1990). *Apuleius. Cupid and Psyche*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1992). "Ovid" in E.J. Kenney and V.W.Clausen (eds.) *The Cambridge history of classical literature, II: Latin literature*, 420-57, Cambridge.
- _____ (1993). "Ovidiana", *CQ* 43: 458-67.
- _____ (ed.) (1995)a. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris* iteratis curis edidit E.J. Kenney (corrected), Oxford.
- _____ (1995)b. "'Dear Helen...': The pithanotate prophasis?", *PLLS* 8: 187-207.
- _____ (1996). *Ovid: Heroides XVI-XXI*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1998). *Apuleius. The Golden Ass, or, Metamorphoses, translated with an introduction and notes*, London and New York.
- _____ (1999)a. "*Ut erat novator*. Anomaly, innovation and genre in Ovid, *Heroides* 16-21" in J.N.Adams and R.G. Mayer (eds.), 399- 414, Oxford.
- _____ (1999)b. "Greek feminines in *-ias*: An Ovidian predilection", *CQ* 49.1:330-2.

- _____ (2002). "Ovid's language and style" in B.W.Boyd (ed.), 27-89, Leiden, Boston and Cologne
- Ker, A. (1958). "Notes on some passages in the amatory poems" in N.I. Herescu (ed.), 224-30, Paris.
- Kershaw, A. (1992). "On elegiac *en*", *CQ* 42: 282-4.
- Kidd, D. (1997). *Aratus Phaenomena, edited with introduction, translation and commentary*, Cambridge.
- Kiessling, A. and Heinze, R. (eds.) (1958). *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden. Neunte Ausflage besorgt von R. Heinze*, Berlin.
- Kirfel, E.-A. (1969). *Untersuchungen zur Briefform der Heroides Ovids* (Noctes Romanae Band 11), Bern and Stuttgart.
- Kimura, K. (1977). "Kiss in Plautus. *Osculum* and *savium*", *JCS* 25: 78-90.
- Kirk, G.S. (ed.) (1985-93). *The Iliad: a commentary*, G.S. Kirk (1985) vol.I: books 1-4, *idem* (1990) vol.II: books 5-8, B. Hainsworth (1990) vol.III: books 9-12, R.Janko (1992) vol.IV: books 13-6, M.W. Edwards (1991) vol.V: books 17-20, N. Richardson (1993) vol.VI: books 21-4, Oxford.
- Kirkwood, G.M. (1994). *A Study of Sophoclean Drama: with new Preface and Enlarged Bibliographical Note*, Ithaca and London.
- Knox, B.M.W. (1952). "The *Hippolytus* of Euripides", *YCS* 13: 3-31.
- Knox, P. E. (1986)a. "Ovid's Medea and the Authenticity of *Her.* 12", *HSCP* 90: 207-24.
- _____ (1986)b. "Adjectives in *-osus* and Latin poetic diction", *Glotta* 64: 90-101.
- _____ (1995). *Ovid Heroides. Select Epistles*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1999). "Ariadne on the Rocks: Influence on Ovid, *Her.* 10" in P.E. Knox and C. Foss (eds.) *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*, 72-83, Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- _____ (2002). "The *Heroides*: elegiac voices" in B.W.Boyd (ed.), 117-39, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
- Korn, M. (1989). *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica 4, 1-343, ein Kommentar* (Spudasmata 46), Hildesheim.
- Kovacs, D. (1980). "Shame, pleasure and honor in Phaedra's great speech (Euripides, *Hippolytus* 375-87)", *AJPh* 101: 287-303.
- _____ (1987). *The Heroic Muse: Studies in the Hippolytus and Hecuba of Euripides*, Baltimore.
- Kraemer, R.S. (ed.) (2004). *Women's Religions in the Greco-Roman World: A Sourcebook*, Oxford and New York.
- Kraus, W. (1968). "Die Briefpaare in Ovids *Heroiden*" in M. von Albrecht and E.Zinn (eds.) *Ovid*: 269-94, Darmstadt.

- Krevans, N. (2005). "The Editor's Toolbox: Strategies for Selection and Presentation in the Milan Epigram Papyrus" in K. Gutzwiller (ed.), 81-96, Oxford.
- Krill, R.M. (1976). "Mythology in the Amatory Works of Ovid" in N. Barbu, E. Dobroiu and M. Nasta (eds.) *Ovidianum. Acta conventus omnium gentium ovidianis studiis fovendis*, 365-71, Bucharest.
- Kühner, R. and Gerth, B. (1890-1904). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen lateinischen Sprache* (Teil 1: Elementar- und Formenlehre (1890), Teil 2: Satzlehre (Band 1: 1898, Band 2: 1904), Hannover and Leipzig.
- Kyriakidis, S. (1998). *Narrative Structure and Poetics in the Aeneid. The Frame of Book 6*, Bari.
- _____ and De Martino, F. (eds.) (2002). *Middles in Latin Poetry*, Bari.
- Kyriakou, P. (1998). "Menelaus and Pelops in Euripides' *Orestes*", *Mnemosyne* 51.3: 283-301.
- Labate, M. (1984). *L'arte di farsi amare. Modelli culturali e progetto didascalico nell'elegia ovidiana* (Bibliotheca di MD 2), Pisa.
- _____ (1988). "Elegia triste ed elegia lieta. Un caso di riconversione letteraria", *MD* 19: 91-129.
- Landolfi, L. (1997). "Le molte Arianne di Ovidio. Intertestualità e intratestualità in *Her.* 10; *Ars* 1.525-564, *Met.* 8.172-182; *Fast.* 3.459- 516", *QUCC* 57: 139-72.
- _____ (2000). *Scribentis imago. Eroine ovidiane e lamento epistolare*, Bologna.
- Lane Fox, R. (1996). "Ancient hunting: from Homer to Polybios" in G. Shipley and J. Salmon (eds.) *Human landscapes in Classical antiquity, Environment and Culture* (Leicester- Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society vol. 6), 119-53 London and New York.
- Lanham, C.D. (1975). *Salutatio formulas in Latin letters to 1200: Syntax, style and theory* (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance – Forchung 22), Munich.
- La Penna, A. (1951). "Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latina", *Maia* 4: 187-209.
- _____ (1963). *Orazio e l'ideologia del rincipato*, Turin.
- _____ (1977). *L'integrazione difficile. Un profilo di Properzio*, Turin.
- Lapp, F. (1965). *De Callimachi Cyrenaei Tropis et Figuris*, Bonn.
- Larmour, D.H.J., Miller, P.A. and Platter, C.L. (eds.) (1998). *Rethinking sexuality: Foucault and classical antiquity*, Princeton.
- Latacz, J. (1996). *Homer. His Art and his World*, Ann Arbor and Michigan.
- Lattimore, R. (1942). *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol.28, Nos. 1-2), Urbana.
- Lausberg, H. (1998). *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study*, foreword by G.A. Kennedy, tr. by M.T. Bliss, A. Jansen, D.E. Orton, edited by D.E. Orton and R.D. Anderson, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
- Laughton, E. (1948). "*Flavus pudor*", *CR* 62: 109-11.
- _____ (1950). "*Flavus again*", *CR* 64: 88-9.

- Leach, E.W. (1988). *The Rhetoric of Space: Literary and Artistic Representation of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome*, Princeton and Guilford.
- Leary, T.J. (1990). "That's what little girls are made of: the physical charm of elegiac women", *LCM* 15.10: 152-5.
- Lease, E.B. (1898). "*I nunc* and *i* with another imperative", *AJPh* 19: 59-69.
- _____ (1913). "*Neue* and *neque* with the imperative and subjunctive", *AJPh* 34: 255-75.
- Le Bonniec, H. (1958). *Le Culte de Cérès à Rome, des origines à la fin de la République*, Paris.
- Lee, A.G. (1958). "The Authorship of the *Nux*" in N.I. Herescu (ed.). 405-12. Paris.
- _____ (1990). *Tibullus: Elegies*, third edition, revised in collaboration with R. Maltby, Leeds.
- Lee, R.W. (1956). *The elements of Roman law, with a translation of the Institutes of Justinian*, London.
- Leeper, A. (1899). "Palmer's *Heroides* of Ovid", *Hermathena* 10: 409-24.
- Lefkowitz, L.H. (1997). *Textual Bodies. Changing Boundaries of Literary Representations*, Albany.
- Lefkowitz, M. R. and Fant, M.B. (eds.) (1982). *Women's life in Greece and Rome*, London.
- Leinieks, V. (1986). "The similes of *Iliad* Two", *C&M* 37: 5-20.
- Leo, F. (1878). *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*, vol. 1, Berlin.
- Leone, P.A.M. (1968). *Ioannis Tzetzae*, Naples.
- Lesky, A. (1947). *Thalatta*, Vienna.
- Leto, B. (1966). *Le eroidi* (Collezione di poesia 37), Turin.
- Lévi- Strauss, C. (1963). *Structural Anthropology*, tr. by C. Johnson and B. Grundfest Schoepf, New York.
- Lewis, C.T. and Short, C. (1879). *A Latin Dictionary* founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary, revised, enlarged and in great part rewritten, Oxford.
- Lieberg, G. (1962). *Puella divina: die Gestalt der göttlichen Gewliebten bei Catull im Zusammenhang der antiken Dichtung*, Amsterdam.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. (1979). *Continuity and change in Roman religion*, Oxford.
- Lier, B. (ed.) (1978). *Ad topica carminum amatorum symbolae* (B.Lier), *Studies in the Diction of the Sermo Amatorius in Roman Comedy* (K.Preston), *Militat Omnis Amans* (A. Spies), New York.
- Lightfoot, J.L. (1998). "The Bonds of Cypris: Nonnus' Aura", *GRBS* 39: 293-306.
- Lilja, S. (1965). *The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women*, Helsinki.
- Lindemann, H. (ed.). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides*, Leipzig.
- Lindheim, S. H. (1998). "I am dressed, therefore I am?: Vertumus in Propertius 4.2 and in *Metamorphoses* 14.622-771", *Ramus* 27.1: 1-26.
- _____ (2000). "*Omnia vincit amor*: Or, Why Oenone Should Have Known It Would Never Work Out (*Eclogue* 10 and *Heroides* 5)", *MD* 44: 83-101.

- _____ (2003). *Mail and Female. Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's Heroides*, Madison.
- Lindsay, W. M. (1894). *The Latin language. An historical account of Latin sounds, stems, and flexions*, Oxford.
- Lindsay, W. (2003). *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford.
- Lingenberg, Wilfried, (2003). *Das erste Buch der Heroidenbriefe. Echtheitskritische Untersuchungen* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums. Neue Folge. Band 20), Paderborn.
- Linse, E. (1891). *De P. Ovidi Nasonis vocabulorum inventore*, Diss. Dortmund.
- Lipka, M. (2001). *Language in Vergil's Eclogues*, Berlin and New York.
- Littlewood, A. R. (1967). "The symbolism of the apple in Greek and Roman literature", *HSCP* 72: 147-81.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1969). "Agamemnonea", *HSCP* 73: 97-104.
- Lloyd, M (1992). *The Agon in Euripides*, Oxford.
- Loers, V. (ed.) (1829). *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides et A. Sabini Epistolae*, Cologne.
- Löfsted, E. (1942). *Syntactica*. Erster Teil, Über einige Grundfragen der Lateinischen Nominalsyntax, second edition, Lund.
- Longo, O. (1985). "Ippolito e Fedra fra parola e silenzio" in Uglione (ed.), 79-95, Turin.
- _____ (1991). "Il figlio dell'Amazone: biologia e mito", *MD* 26: 9-29.
- López López A. (1980). "Léxico y género letterario. *Basium, osculum, savium*", *Sodalitas*: 113-33.
- Loroux, N. (1978). "La gloire et la mort d'une femme", *Sorcière* 18: 51-7.
- _____ (1987). *Tragic ways of killing a woman*, tr. by A. Forster, Cambridge MA and London.
- _____ (1998). *Mothers in mourning, with the essay Of Amnesty and Its Opposite* (tr. from the French by C. Pache), Ithaca and London.
- Luck, G. (1967-77). *P. Ovidius Naso: Tristia*, Heidelberg.
- Lucke, C (1982). *P. Ovidius Naso, Remedia amoris, Kommentar zu Vers 397-814*, Diss. Bonn.
- Luschnig, A. E. (1980). "Men and Gods in Euripides' *Hippolytus*", *Ramus* 9: 89-100.
- _____ (1988). *Time Holds the Mirror: A Study of Knowledge in Euripides' 'Hippolytus'* (Mnemosyne Supplementum 102), Leiden.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1970). "Propertius and Cynthia: *Elegy* I.3", *PCPhS* 16: 60-78.
- _____ (1978). *Ciris. A poem attributed to Vergil, edited with an introduction and commentary* (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 20), Cambridge.
- _____ (1979). "Servitium amoris", *CQ* 29: 117-130.
- _____ (1980). *The Latin Love Poets. From Catullus to Horace*, Oxford.
- _____ (1983). "Lavinia's Blush: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.64-70", *G&R* 30: 55-64.

- _____ (1989). *Words and the Poet: characteristic techniques of style in Vergil's Aeneid*, Oxford.
- _____ (1998), "Love and death: Laodamia and Protesilaus in Catullus, Propertius and others", *CQ* 48: 200-12.
- Lyons, D. (1997). *Gender and Immortality. Heroines in ancient Greek myth and cult*, Princeton.
- MacCurrie, H. (1981). "Ovid and the Roman Stage", *ANRW* II.31.4: 2701-42, Berlin and New York.
- Malherbe, A.J. (1988). *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* (Sources for Biblical Study 19), Atlanta.
- Magnien, V. (1938). *Les Mystères d'Éleusis. Leurs origines, le rituel de leurs initiations*, Paris.
- Maltby, R. (1980). *Latin Love Elegy*, Bristol.
- _____ (1981). "Love and marriage in Propertius 4,3", *PLLS* 3: 243-47.
- _____ (1991). *A Lexicon on ancient Etymologies* (ARCA 25), Leeds.
- _____ (1993). "The limits of etymologising", *Aeuum Antiquum* 6: 257-75.
- _____ (1999). "Tibullus and the language of Latin elegy" in J.N. Adams and R. Mayer (eds.), 377-98, London.
- _____ (2002). *Tibullus: Elegies. Text, Introduction and Commentary* (ARCA 41). Cambridge.
- _____ (2004). "The Love Gods in Plautus", *Paideia* 59: 255-70.
- _____ (2006). "Major themes and motifs in Propertius' love poetry" in H.S. Günther (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, 147-81, Leiden and Boston.
- Marouzeau, J. (1922-49). *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine*, (vol.1 *Les groupes nominaux* (1922), vol.2 *Le verbe* (1938), vol.3 *Les articulations de l'énoncé* (1949)), Paris.
- Maurer, J. (1990). *Untersuchungen zur poetischen Technik und den Vorbildern der Ariadne-Epistel Ovids* (Studien zur klassischen Philologie 49), Frankfurt, Bern, New York, Paris.
- Mayor, J.E.B. (1888). *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*, vols.1-2, London and New York.
- McAuslan, I. and Walcot, P. (eds.) *Women in antiquity* (Greece and Rome Studies 3), 134-45, Oxford and New York.
- McCarthy, K. (1998). "Servitium Amoris: Amor Servitii", in S.R. Joshel and S.L. Murnaghan (eds.) *Women and slaves in Greco-Roman culture: differential equations*, 174-92, London.
- McClure, L. (1999). *Spoken like a woman: speech and gender in Athenian drama*, Princeton.
- _____ and Lardinois, A. (eds.) (2000). *Women's Voices in Ancient Greek Literature and Society*, Princeton.
- McCormack, G. (1978). "Coemptio and marriage by purchase", *BIDR* 20: 179-99.
- McCoskey, D.E. (1999). "Reading Cynthia and sexual difference in the poems of Propertius", *Ramus* 28.1: 16-39.
- McGinn, T.A.J. (1991). "Concubinage and the *Lex Iulia* on adultery", *TAPA* 121: 335-75.

- _____ (1998). *Prostitution, Sexuality and the Law in Ancient Rome*, Oxford and New York.
- McIntosh Snyder, J. (1989). *The Woman and the Lyre: Women Writers in Classical Greece and Rome*, Carbondale.
- McKeown, J.C. (1979). "Ovid *Amores* 3,12", *PLLS* 2: 163-77.
- _____ (1987). *Ovid: Amores vol. I. Text and Prolegomena* (ARCA 20), Liverpool.
- _____ (1989). *Ovid: Amores vol. II. A Commentary on Book One* (ARCA 22), Leeds.
- _____ (1998). *Ovid: Amores vol. III, A Commentary on Book Two* (ARCA 36), Leeds.
- McLeod, C.W. (1972). *Luciani Opera, Tomus IV*, Oxford.
- McLeod, C. (1974). "A Use of Myth in Ancient Poetry", *CQ* 24: 82-93 (= *Collected Essays*: 159-70, Oxford).
- _____ (1983). *The Collected Essays of Colin Macleod*, ed. Oliver Taplin, Oxford.
- Martina, A. (1990). La Medea di Seneca, Euripide e Ovidio", *QCTCI* 8: 135-54.
- Mastrorade, D.J. (1998). *Euripides, Phoenissae, edited with introduction and commentary*, Cambridge.
- Maurer, J. (1989). *Untersuchungen zur poetischen Technik und der Vorbildern der Ariadne-Epistel Ovids* (Studien zur klassischen Philologie Band 49) Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York and Paris.
- Mayer, M. (1883). *De Euripidis Mythopoeia capita duo*, Berlin.
- Mayer, R. (1994). *Horace. Epistles Book I*, Cambridge
- Merkelbach, R. (1971). "Aeneia Nutrix," *RhM* 114: 349-51.
- Merklin, H. (1968). "Arethusa und Laodamia", *Hermes* 96: 461-94.
- Mersmann, H. (1931). *Quaestiones Propertianae*, Diss. Münster.
- Michalopoulos, A.N. (2001). *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses. A Commented Lexicon* (ARCA 40), Leeds.
- _____ (2000-2). "Ovid's mythological *exempla* in his advice on love correspondence in the *Ars amatoria* and the *Remedia amoris*", *Sandalion* 23-25: 39-48.
- _____ (2002). "Ovid *Heroides* 10.1-4: Ariadne's *Mitos*", *Mnemosyne* 55: 95-7.
- _____ (2003). "Η κυρίαρχη παρουσία της Venus στην επιστολή του Πάρη προς την Ελένη (Ov. *Her.* 16)" in *Θεμέλιος*, Τιμητικός τόμος Γεωργίου Δημητροκάλλη: 79-100, Komotini.
- _____ (2004)a. "Fighting against a witch: the importance of magic in Hypsipyle's letter to Jason (Ov. *Her.* 6)", *MHNH* 4: 97-124.
- _____ (2004)b. "Paris to Helen and back: power and reciprocity in Ov. *Her.* 16-17," paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Classical Association 2004, 1-4 April 2004, Leeds.
- _____ (2006). *Ovid Heroides 16 and 17: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (ARCA 47), Cambridge.

- Michalopoulos, C. (forthcoming). "Ovid's Phaedra, Sulpicia and the politics of *fama*".
 _____ (forthcoming). "Theseus in Ovid's *Heroides* (*Her.* 2, 4 and 10)".
- Michaut, G. (1920). *Histoire de la comédie romaine, Plaute*, vols.1-2, Paris.
- Miller, D.A. (1983). "On the Mythology of Indo-European Heroic Hair", *JIES* 26.1/2: 41-60.
- Miller, F.J. (1983), "Ennius and the elegists", *ICS* 8: 277-95.
 _____ (1993). "Ovidian allusion and the vocabulary of memory", *MD* 30: 153-64.
- Miller, J.H. (1976). "Ariadne's Thread: Repetition and the Narrative Line", *Critical Inquiry* 3: 57-77.
- Miller, N.K. (1986). "Arachnologies: The Woman, the Text, and the Critic" in N.K. Miller (ed.) *The Poetics of Gender*, 270-95, New York.
- Mills, S. (1997). *Theseus, Tragedy and the Athenian Empire*, Oxford.
- Milnor, K. L. (2002). "Sulpicia's (Corpo)reality: Elegy, Authorship, and the Body in {Tibullus} 3.13," *ClAnt* 21.2: 259-82.
- Minchin, E. (2001). *Homer and the Resources of Memory. Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey*, Oxford.
- Mitchell-Boyask, R. (1999). "Euripides' *Hippolytus* and the Trials of Manhood (The Ephebeia?)" in M.W. Padilla (ed.) *Rites of Passage in Ancient Greece: Literature, Religion, Society*: 42-66, Lewisburg.
- Momigliano, A. (1942). "'Terra marique'", *JRS* 32: 53-64.
- Morand, A.-F. (2001). *Études sur les Hymnes Orphiques* (Religion in the Graeco-Roman world 143), Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
- Moreau, P. (1978). "*Osculum, basium, sauium*", *RPh* 52: 87-97.
- Morris, L. (1999). "*Heroides*" [Review of Knox (1995) and Kenney (1996)], *CR* 49:55-7.
- Morrison, J.V. (1999). "Images of the Golden Age in Antiquity and Today: Hesiod, the Bible, and Walcott's *Omeros*" in J.N. Kazazis and A. Rengakos (eds.) *Euphrosyne. Studies in ancient epic and its legacy in honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*: 245-58, Stuttgart.
- Moulton, C. (1974). "Similes in the *Iliad*", *Hermes* 102: 381-97.
- Moya Del Baño, F. (1969). *Studio mitográfico de las Heroidas de ovidio*, Uni. Diss., Murcia.
 _____ (1986). *Heroidas, Ovidio. Texto rev. y trad.*, Madrid.
- Müller, M. (1984). *The Iliad*, London, Boston and Sydney.
- Mulvey, L. (1991). "Visual pleasure and narrative cinema", in R.R. Warhol and D.P. Herndl (eds.), 438-48, New Brunswick (= *Screen* 16 (1975): 6-18).
- Murgatroyd, P. (1975). "*Militia amoris* and the Roman Elegists", *Latomus* 34:59-79.
 _____ (1980). *Tibullus I: a commentary on the first book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus*, Pietermaritzburg.
 _____ (1981). "*Servitium amoris* and the Roman Elegists", *Latomus* 40: 589- 606.
 _____ (1984). "Amatory hunting, fishing and fouling", *Latomus* 43: 362-8.

- _____ (1994). *Tibullus Elegies II, edited with introduction and commentary*, Oxford.
- _____ (1995). "The sea of love", *CQ* 54: 9-25.
- Murphy, G.M.H. (1972). *Ovid Metamorphoses XI*, Oxford.
- Myerowitz, M.(1985). *Ovid's Games of Love*, Detroit.
- Myers, K. S. (1996). "The poet and the procuress: the *lena* in Latin love elegy", *JRS* 86:1-21.
- Mylonas, G.E. (1961). *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Princeton.
- Mynors, R.A.B. (1958). *C. Valeri Catulli Carmina*, Oxford.
- _____ (1990). *Virgil, Georgics, edited with a commentary*, Oxford.
- Nadeau, V. (1984). "Catullus' Sparrow, Martial, Juvenal and Ovid's", *Latomus* 43: 861-68.
- Nagle, B.R. (1983). "Byblis and Myrrha: Two incest Narratives in the *Metamorphoses*", *CJ* 78: 301-15.
- Navarro Antolín, F. (1997). "El suicidio como motivo literario en los elegiacos latinos", *Emerita* 65.1: 41-55.
- Nettleship, H. (1889). *Contributions to Latin Lexicography*, Oxford.
- Newman, J.K. (1998). "Saturno rege. Themes of the Golden Age in Tibullus and other Augustan Poets" in A.E.Radke (ed.) *Candide iudex. Beiträge zur augusteischen Dichtung. Festschrift für Walter Wimmel zum 75. Geburtstag*, 225-246, Stuttgart.
- Nicolet, C. (1976). *Tributum. Recherches sur la fiscalité directe sous la republique Romaine*, Bonn.
- Nikolaidis, T. (1994). *Puella Formosa. Το γυναικείο κάλλος στον Κάτουλλο και τους Ρωμαίους ελεγειακούς*, Athens.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. (1978). "How Textual Conjectures Are Made", *MD* 26: 65-91.
- _____ and Hubbard, M. (1970). *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1*, Oxford.
- _____ and Hubbard, M. (1978). *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 2*, Oxford.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. and Rudd, N. (2004). *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*, Oxford.
- Nodellius, J. A. (1781). *Observationes criticae*, Kampen.
- Norden, E. (1927). *Aeneis: Buch VI*, Leipzig and Berlin.
- _____ (1965). *Ennius und Vergilius*, Darmstadt.
- Norwood, G. (1953). *Essays in Euripidean Drama*, Los Angeles.
- Nugent, S. G. (1990). "This Sex Which IS Not One: De-Constructing Ovid's Hermaphrodite", *differences* 2.1: 160-85.
- Oakley, S.P. (1997). *A commentary on Livy, Books VI-X*, Oxford.
- Obbink, D. (2005). "New Old Posidippus and Old New Posidippus. From Occasion to Edition in the Epigrams" in K.Gutzwiller (ed.), 97-115, Oxford.
- Ogle, M. B. (1911). "The House- Door in Greek and Roman Religion and Folk-Lore", *AJPh* 32: 251-71.
- O' Hara, J.J. (1996). *True names: Vergil and the Alexandrian tradition of etymological wordplay*, Ann Arbor.

- O' Higgins, L. (2003). *Women and Humor in Classical Greece*, Cambridge.
- Oliensis, E. (1997). "Sons and lovers: sexuality and gender in Virgil's poetry" in Martindale (ed.), 294-311, Cambridge.
- Olstein, K. (1975). "Amores I.3 and Duplicity as a Way of Love", *TAPA* 105: 256-7.
- Opelt, I. (1965). *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen. Eine Typologie* (Bibliothek der klassischen Alterumwissenschaften Neue Folge 2. Reihe), Heidelberg.
- Oppel, E. (1968). *Ovids Heroides. Studien zur inneren Form und zur Motivation*, Diss. Erlangen- Nürnberg.
- Ortega, A. (1970). "Die Tragödie der Pandions- Töchter in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*" in W. Wimmel (ed.) *Forschungen zur römischen Literatur: Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Karl Büchner*: 215-23, Wiesbaden.
- Otis, B. (1970). *Ovid as an Epic poet*, second edition, Cambridge.
- Otto, A. (1962). *Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichenn Redensarten der Römer* (repr. Leipzig 1890), Hildesheim.
- Otto, W.G. (1984), *Les dieux de la Grèce*, Paris.
- Owen, S.G. (1916). "Emendations of Latin poets", *CQ* 10: 222-4.
 _____ (1936). "A manuscript of Ovid's *Heroides*", *CQ* 30: 155- 69.
- Page, D.L. (1942). *Greek Literary Papyri*, vol 1, Cambridge.
 _____ (ed.) (1968). *Lyrice Graeca Selecta*, Oxford.
 _____ (ed.) (1981). *Further Greek epigrams: epigrams before A.D. 50 from the Greek anthology and other sources not included in Hellenistic epigrams or the Garland of Philip*, revised and prepared for publication by R.D. Dawe and J. Diggle, Cambridge.
- Palmer, A. (1891). "Ovidiana", *CR* 5: 92-5.
 _____ (1967). *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides, with the Greek translation of Planudes* [Completed by L. C. Purser], Hildesheim.
- Palmer, A. and Purser, L.C. (eds.) (2005). *Ovid: Heroides*, with new introduction by D.F. Kennedy, vol. I. Introduction, Text and Greek Translation of Planudes, vol. II. Commentary, Exeter.
- Pagonari- Antoniou, F. (ed.) (1997). *Καλλιμάχου Επιγράμματα. Εισαγωγή, κείμενο, μετάφραση, σχόλια*, Αθήνα.
- Papaioannou, S. (2005). *Epic succession and dissension: Ovid, "Metamorphoses" 13.623-14.582, and the reinvention of the "Aeneid"*, Berlin.
- Papanghelis, T.D. (1987). *Propertius: A Hellenistic poet on Love and Death*, Cambridge.
 _____ (1994). *Η ποιητική των Ρωμαίων «Νεωτέρων». Προϋποθέσεις και προεκτάσεις*, Athens.
 _____ (1995). *Από τη βουκολική εντοπία στην πολιτική ουτοπία. Μια μελέτη των Εκλογών του Βιργιλίου*, Athens.

- _____ (2000). *Οβιδίου Ερωτική Τέχνη και ένα δοκίμιο για Λατίνους εραστές*, Athens.
- Paratore, E. (1952). "Sulla "Phaedra" di Seneca", *Dioniso* 15: 199-234.
- _____ (1955). "Ancora su Ovidio e la Phaedra di Seneca", *Studi Funaioli*: 339- 43, Rome.
- _____ (1970). "L'influenza delle *Heroides* sull' episodio di Biblide e Cauno nel. IX delle *Metamorphosi* ovidiane" in *Studia Florentina A. Ronconi sexagenario oblata*, 291-309, Rome.
- Parker, H.C. (1997). *Greek gods in Italy in Ovid's Fasti. A Greater Greece* (Studies in Classics 5), Lewiston, Queenston and Lampeter.
- Parry, A. (1957). "Landscape in Greek Poetry", *YCS* 15: 3-29.
- Parry, H. (1964). "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: violence in a pastoral landscape", *TAPA* 95: 268-82.
- Paschalis, M. (1994). "The Bull and the Horse: Animal Theme and Imagery in Seneca's Phaedra", *AJPh* 115: 105-128.
- _____ (1997). *Virgil's Aeneid : semantic relations and proper names*, Oxford.
- Patterson, C.B. (1990). "Those Athenian Bastards", *CLAnt* 9: 41-73.
- _____ (1991). "Marriage and the Married Woman in Athenian Law" in S.B. Pomeroy (ed.), 48-72, Chapel Hill and London.
- Patrikiou, E. (2004). "ΟΤΑΝ ΤΑ ΣΠΙΤΙΑ ΜΙΛΟΥΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΕΣ ΣΩΠΑΙΝΟΥΝ. Η Φαίδρα και η Αμαζόνα στον *Ιππόλυτο* του Ευριπίδη" in D.I. Jacob and E.Papazoglou (eds.) *Θυμέλη. Μελέτες χαρισμένες στον καθηγητή Ν.Χ. Χουρμουζιάδη*: 281-301, Herakleion.
- Patti, M. (2001). "Enone, Paride, Elena. La "triplice verità" (a proposito di Ov. *Her.*5; 16; 17), *BollStudLat* 31: 25-42.
- Pearce, T.E.V. (1966). "The enclosing word order in the Latin hexameter.I and II", *CQ* 16: 140-71, 298-320.
- Pearson, C.S. (1980). "Simile and Imagery in Ovid. *Heroides* 4 and 5", *ICS* 5: 110-29.
- Pease, A.S. (ed.) (1920-3). *M. Tulli Ciceronis, De divinatione*, vols.3, Urbana.
- _____ (1935). *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos. Liber quartus*, Cambridge MA.
- _____ (1955-8). *M. Tulli Ciceronis, De natura deorum*, vols.2, Cambridge MA.
- Peeters, C.A. (1945). *Fas en Nefas, een semantische Studie*, Diss. Utrecht.
- Pelling, C.B.R. (ed.) (1990). *Characterization and individuality in Greek literature*. Oxford.
- Peradotto, J. and Sullivan, J.P. (eds.) (1984). *Women in the ancient world: the Arethusa papers*, Albany.
- Perkell, C.G. (2002). "The Golden Age and Its Contradictions in the Poetry of Vergil", *Vergilius* 48: 3-39.
- Petropoulos, J.C.B. (2003). *Eroticism in Ancient and Medieval Greek Poetry*, London.
- Pfeiffer, R. (ed.) (1949). *Callimachus*, vol. I. *Fragmenta*, Oxford.
- _____ (1953). *Callimachus*, vol. II. *Hymni et Epigrammata*, Oxford.

- Phillippo, S. (1995). "Family ties: Significant patronymics in Euripides' *Andromache*", *CQ* 45: 355-71.
- Phillips, A.A. and Willcock, M.M (eds.). (1999). *Xenophon and Arrian. On Hunting (Κυνηγητικόν)*, edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary, Warminster.
- Phillips, C.R. (1991). "Misconceptualizing classical mythology" in M.A. Flower and M. Tohel (eds.) *Georgica. Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell* (BICS, Supplement 58), 143-51, London.
- Pichon, R. (1966). *Index verborum amatoriorum*, Hildesheim (= Pichon, R. (1902). *De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores*, Diss. Paris, 75-303).
- Pigeaud, J. (1976). "Euripide et la connaissance de soi. Quelques réflexions sur *Hippolyte* 73 à 82 et 373 à 430", *LEC* 44 : 3-24.
- Pinotti, P. (1988). *Publio Ovidio Nasone Remedia Amoris*, Bologna.
- Plepelits K. (1972). "Beobachtungen zu *Plautus*" in R. von Hanslik, A. Lesky and H. Schwabl (eds.) *Antidosis. Festschrift für Walther Kraus zum 70. Geburtstag*, 267-277, Wien.
- Pöschl, V. (1959). "Kephalos und Prokris in Ovids 'Metamorphosen'", *Hermes* 87: 328-43.
- Pohlenz, M. (1913). "Die Abfassungszeit von Ovids *Metamorphosen*", *Hermes* 48: 1-13.
- Pokrowskij, M. (1909). "Neue Beiträge zur Charakteristik Ovids" (Philologus Suppl. 11): 351-404.
- Pomeroy, S.B. (1973). "Selected bibliography on women in antiquity", *Arethusa* 6.1: 127-57.
 _____ (ed.) (1991). *Women's history and ancient history*, Chapel Hill.
 _____ (1995)a. *Goddesses, whores, wives, and slaves : women in classical antiquity*, New York.
 _____ (1995)b. "Women's identity and the family in the classical polis" in R. Hawley and B. Levick (eds.), 111-21, London and New York.
- Poole, W. (1990). "Male homosexuality in Euripides" in A. Powell (ed.), 108-50, London and New York.
- Porte, D. (1976). "Ovide et la tradition homérique dans *Her.*, I, 15 et 91", *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* SERIE 3 50: 239-46.
- Porter, D.H. (1972). "Violent juxtaposition in the similes of the *Iliad*", *CJ* 68: 11-21.
- Possanza, M. (2002). "Penelope in Ovid's *Met.* 14.671", *AJPh* 123.1:89-94.
- Postgate, J. P. (1881). *Select elegies of Propertius, edited with introduction, notes and appendices*, London.
- Powell, A. (1990). *Euripides, Women and Sexuality*, London.
- Preston, K. (1916). *Studies in the Diction of the Sermo Amatorius in Roman Comedy*, Diss., Chicago (reprinted, New York and London, 1978).
- Prior, A. (1977). "The Original published form of Ovid's *Heroides*", *Hermathena* 122: 29-45.
- Pullbrook, M. (1977). "The original published form of Ovid's *Heroides*", *Hermathena* 122: 29-45.

- Purnelle, G. (1990)a. *Ovide, Epistulae Heroidum: Index verborum, listes de fréquence, releves grammaticaux* (Série du laboratoire d' Analyse Statistique des Langues Anciennes, 19), Liège.
- _____ (1990)b. *Ovide, Amores: Index verborum, listes de fréquence, releves grammaticaux* (Série du laboratoire d' Analyse Statistique des Langues Anciennes, 19), Liège.
- Rabinowitz, N.S. (1986). "Aphrodite and the Audience: Engendering the Reader", *Arethusa* 19: 171-85.
- _____ (1987). "Female Speech and Female Sexuality: Euripides' *Hippolytos* as Model", *Helios* 13: 127-40.
- _____ and Richlin, A. (eds.) (1993)a *Feminist Theory and the Classics*, New York.
- _____ (1993)b. *Anxiety Veiled: Euripides and the Traffic in Women*, Ithaca.
- Raditsa, L.F. (1980). "Augustus' Legislation Concerning Marriage, Procreation, Love Affairs and Adultery" in *ANRW* 2.13: 278-339, Berlin and New York.
- Radke, G. (1936). *Die Bedeutung der Weisen und der scharzen Farbe in Kult und Brauch der Griechen und Römer*, Diss. Berlin.
- Rahn, H. (1958). "Ovids elegische Epistel", *A&A* 7: 105-20.
- Ramírez de Verger, A. (2005). "On Ovid, *Heroides* 4.175-6", *Mnemosyne* 58: 429-31.
- Rand, E.K. (1907). "The chronology of Ovid's early works", *AJPh* 18: 287-96.
- Rankin, A.V. (1974). "Euripides' *Hippolytus*: A psychopathological hero", *Arethusa* 7: 71-94.
- Raven, D.S. (1965). *Latin Metre*, London.
- Rawson, B. (ed.) (1986). *The Family in Ancient Rome, New Perspectives*, London and Sydney.
- _____ (ed.) (1991). *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, Canberra and Oxford.
- _____ and Weaver, P. (eds.) (1997). *The Roman Family in Italy. Status, Sentiment, Space*, Canberra and Oxford.
- Reckford, K.J. (1974). "Phaedra and Pasiphae: the pull backward", *TAPA* 104: 307-28.
- Reeson, J. (2001). *Ovid Heroides 11, 13 and 14. A Commenary*, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
- Reeve, M.D. (1973). "Notes on Ovid's *Heroides*", *CQ* 23: 324-38.
- _____ (1974)a. "Three notes on Ovid", *CQ* 24 : 116-8.
- _____ (1974)b. "Heinsius's manuscripts of Ovid", *RhM* 117: 133-66.
- Rehm, R. (1994). *Marriage to Death. The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy*, Princeton.
- Reitzenstein, R. (1912). "Zur Sprache der lateinischen Erotik" (SHA 3), Heidelberg.
- Renz, H. (1935). *Mythologische Beispiele in Ovids erotischer Elegie*, Diss. Würzburg.
- Reynolds, L.D. (1983). *Texts and Transmission. A survey of the Latin classics*, Oxford.
- Ribichini, S. (1981). *Adonis: Aspetti 'orientali' di un mito greco*, Rome.
- Richard, J.C. (1978). *Les Origines de la plèbe romaine: essai sur la formation du dualisme patricio-plébéien*. Rome.

- Richardson, L. Jr. (1977). *Propertius, Elegies I-IV, edited with introduction and commentary*, Norman.
- Richardson, N.J. (ed.) (1974). *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford.
- Richlin, A. (1992). *The Garden of Priapus* (revised edition), Oxford.
- Richmond, J. (2002). "Manuscript traditions and the transmission of Ovid's works" in B.W. Boyd (ed.), 443-83, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
- Riess, E. (1933). "The influence of astrology on life and literature at Rome" (tr. By C.Knapp) *Classical Weekly* 27 (10): 73-8.
- Rimmel, V. (1999). "Epistolarity fiction: authorial identity in *Her.* 15", *PCPhS* 45: 109-135.
- Rittenbaum, A.H. (1997). *The process of grieving in Ovid's Heroides*, Diss.Washington.
- Robert, W.R. (1902). *Demetrius On Style. The Greek text of Demetrius De elocutione* edited after the Paris manuscript with introduction, translation, facsimiles, etc., Cambridge.
- Roisman, H. M. (1999). *Nothing Is As It Seems. The Tragedy of the Implicit in Euripides' Hippolytus*, Lanham, Boulder, New York and Oxford.
- Roncaioli Lamberti, C. (1989-90), "Note al testo delle *Heroides* ovidiane", *GIFC* 20-21: 255-72.
- _____ (1994), "Interpretazioni ovidiane: *Her.* 5.16; 7.171; 9.126;16.97", *GIFC* 46: 255-66.
- Rosati, G. (1984). "*Aeolis Aeolidae...*Sull' autenticità di un distico ovidiano (*Her.* 11, 0 a-b)," *RFIC* 122: 417-26.
- _____ (1985). "Forma elegiaca di un simbolo letterario: la Fedra di Ovidio" in R. Uglione (ed.), 113-31, Turin.
- _____ (1989)a. *Publio Ovidio Nasone. Lettere di eroine, introduzione, traduzione e note di G. Rosati*, Milan.
- _____ (1989)b. *Epistola elegiaca e lamento femminile. Introduzione a Ovidio, Lettere di eroine*, 5-46, Milan.
- _____ (1990). "Note al testo delle *Heroides*", *MD* 24: 161-79.
- _____ (1991). "Protesilao, Paride e l' amante elegiaco: Un modello Omerico in Ovidio", *Maia* 43: 103-15.
- _____ (1992). "L' elegia al femminile: le *Heroides* di Ovidio (e altre heroides)", *MD* 29: 71-94.
- Roscher, W.H. (ed.) (1884-1937). *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig.

- Rosen, R.M. and Sluiter, I. (eds.) (2003). *Andria. Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity* (Mnemosyne Supplementum 238), Leiden and Boston.
- Rosenmeyer, P.A. (1996). "Love Letters in Callimachus, Ovid and Aristaenetos or the Sad Fate of a Mailorder Bride", *MD* 36: 9-31.
- _____ (1997). "Ovid's *Heroides* and *Tristia*", *Ramus* 26 (1): 29-56
- _____ (2000). "(In)versions of Pygmalion. The statue talks back" in McClure, L. and Lardinois, A. (eds.): 240-60, Princeton.
- _____ (2001). *Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, Cambridge.
- Rosenmeyer, T.G. (1968). "Elegiac and Elegos", *California Studies in Classical Antiquities* 1: 217-31.
- Rosenmeyer, T.J. (1969). *The green cabinet : Theocritus and the European pastoral lyric*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Ross, D.O. Jr. (1969). *Style and tradition in Catullus*, Cambridge MA.
- _____ (1975). *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*, Cambridge.
- Roszbach, A. (1853). *Untersuchungen über die römische Ehe*, Leipzig.
- Rouse, W.H.D. (ed.) (1940). *Nonnos. Dionysiaca*, with an English translation by W.H.D. Rouse, mythological introduction and notes by H.J. Rose and notes on text criticism by L.R. Lind, Cambridge MA and London.
- Rousselle, A. (1992). "Body politics in Ancient Rome" in Schmitt Pantel (ed.) (1992), 296-336, Cambridge MA and London.
- Roy, J. (1996). "The countryside in classical Greek drama, and isolated farms in dramatic landscapes" in G. Shipley and J. Salmon (eds.) *Human landscapes in Classical antiquity, Environment and Culture* (Leicester- Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society vol. 6): 98-118, London and New York.
- Rudd, N. (1976). *Lines of Enquiry. Studies in Latin Poetry*, Cambridge, New York and Melbourne.
- _____ (1989). *Horace. Epistles, Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ("Ars Poetica")*, Cambridge.
- Ryberg, I.S. (1958). "Vergil's Golden Age", *TAPA* 87: 112-31.
- Sabot, A.- F. (1976). *Ovide poète de l' amour dans ses oeuvres de jeunesse*, Paris.
- _____ (1981). "Les 'Héroïdes' d'Ovide: Préciosité, Rhétorique et Poésie", *ANRW* II.31.4: 2552-636, Berlin and New York.
- Salazar, C.F. and Orton, D.E. (2002-). *Brill's New Pauly. Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World*, edited by H. Cancik and H. Schneider, Leiden and Boston.
- Sale, W. (1977). *Existentialism and Euripides: Sickness, Tragedy and Divinity in Medea, the Hippolytus and the Bacchae* (Ramus Monographs I), Melbourne.
- Saller, R.P. (1986). "Patria potestas and the stereotype of the Roman family", *Continuity and Change* 1: 7-22.

- _____ (1991). "Roman heirship strategies in principle and in practice" in D.J. Kertzer and R.P. Saller (eds.) *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present*: 26-47, New Haven.
- _____ (1994). *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*, Cambridge.
- Sallmann, K. (1982-84). "Penelope oder die Anamorphose der *Heroides* Ovids", *AAntHung* 30: 283-301.
- Salvatore, A. (1959). "Motivi poetici nelle *Heroides* di Ovidio" in E. Parratore (ed.) *Atti del Convegno internazionale ovidiano, Sulmona, maggio 1958*, 235-256, Rome.
- Santini, C. and Santucci, F. (eds.) (2004). *Properzio tra storia, arte, mito*, Atti del Convegno internazionale (Assisi, 24-26 maggio 2002), Assisi.
- Santirocco, M. S. (1979). "Sulpicia reconsidered," *CJ* 74: 229-39.
- Sargent, J.L. (1996). *The novelty of Ovid's Heroides: libretti for pantomime*, PhD Thesis Bryn Mawr College.
- Saylor, C. (1967). "*Querelae*: Propertius' Distinctive, Technical Name for his Elegy", *Agon* 1: 142-9.
- Schiesaro, A. (2003). *The passions in play: Thyestes and the dynamics of Senecan drama*, Cambridge.
- Schmalzriedt, E. (1970). *ΠΕΡΙ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ. Zur frühgeschichte der Buchtitel*, Munich.
- Schmidt, E.A. (1967). "Ariadne bei Catull und Ovid (Catull. 64, 132-201, Ovid, *Heroides* X)", *Gymnasium* 74: 489-501.
- Schmidt, P. L. (2005). "Letter" in C.F. Salazar and D.E. Orton (eds.), 7.436-8, Leiden and Boston.
- Schmieg, R. (1937). *Odia novercalia*, Diss. Tübingen.
- Schmitt Pantel, P. (ed.) (1992). *A History of Women in the West. I. From ancient goddesses to Christian Saints*, Cambridge MA and London.
- Schmitz – Cronenbroeck, W. (1937). *Die Anfänge der Heroïden des Ovid*, Diss. Cologne.
- Schubert, W. (1992). *Die Mythologie in den nichtmythologischen Dichtungen Ovids*, Frankfurt, Bern, New York, Paris.
- Schultz, C.E. (1999). *Women in Roman Republican Religion*, PhD Dissertation Bryn Mawr.
- Scivoletto, N. (1976). *Musa iocosa: studio sulla poesia giovanile di Ovidio*, Rome.
- Scott, A. (1991). *Origen and the life of the stars*, Oxford.
- Seaford, R. (1987). "The tragic wedding", *JHS* 107: 106-30.
- Sebesta, L.J. and Bonfante, L. (eds.) (1994). *The world of Roman costume*, Madison.
- Sedlmayer, H.S. (1880). "Die Aufeinanderfolge gleicher oder ähnlicher Versschlüsse bei Ovid", *WS* 2: 293-5.
- _____ (1881). *Kritischer Commentar zu Ovids Heroïden*, Wien.
- Seeck, G.A. (1975). "Ich- Erzähler und Erzähler- Ich in Ovids *Heroides*. Zur Entstehung des neuzeitlichen literarischen Menschen" in E. Lefèvre (ed.), *Festschrift E. Burch*, 436-70, Amsterdam.

- Segal, C. (1965). "The Tragedy of the *Hippolytus*: The Waters of Ocean and the Untouched Meadow", *HSCP* 70: 117-65.
- _____ (1969). *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Study in the Transformations of a Literary Symbol* (Hermes Einzelschriften 23), Wiesbaden.
- _____ (1971). "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Greek Myth in Augustan Rome". *SPh* 68: 371-94.
- _____ (1970). "Shame and Purity in Euripides' *Hippolytus*", *Hermes* 98: 278-99.
- _____ (1972). "Curse and Oath in Euripides' *Hippolytus*", *Ramus* 1: 156-80.
- _____ (1978). "Ovid's Cephalus and Procris: Myth and Tragedy", *GB* 7: 175-205.
- _____ (1979). "Solar Imagery and Tragic Heroism in Euripides' *Hippolytus*" in G. Bowersock, W. Burkert, M. Putnam (eds.) *Arktouros*, 151-61, New York and Berlin.
- _____ (1981). *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral. Essays on Theocritus and Virgil*, Princeton.
- _____ (1984). "Greek Tragedy: Truth, Writing and the Representation of the Self", in H. J. Evjen (ed.) *Mnemai: Classical Studies in Memory of Karl K. Hulley*: 41-47, Chico, California (= now in C. Segal (1986), *Interpreting Greek Tragedy: Myth, Poetry, Text*: 75-109, Ithaca).
- _____ (1992). "Signs, Magic, and Letters in Euripides' *Hippolytus*" in R. Hexter and D. Selden (eds.), 420-56, New York and London.
- Seidensticker, B. (1995). "Women on the Tragic Stage" in B. Goff. (ed.). *History, Tragedy, Theory: Dialogues on Athenian Drama*: 151-73, Austin Texas.
- Sevieri, R. (1999). "Un eroe in cerca d' identità: Oreste nella *Pitica* XI di Pindaro per Trasideo di Tebe", *MD* 43: 77-110.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1954), "Ovidiana", *CQ* n.s. 4: 165-70.
- _____ (1967). *Propertiana*, Amsterdam.
- Sharrock, A.R. (1991)a. "Womanufacture", *JRS* 81: 36-49.
- _____ (1991)b. "The Love of Creation", *Ramus* 20: 169-82.
- _____ (1994)a. *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria* 2, Oxford.
- _____ (1994)b. "Ovid and the Politics of Reading", *MD* 23: 97-122.
- _____ (2000). "Intratextuality: Texts, Parts, and (W)holes in Theory" in A.R. Scharrock and H. Morales (eds.), *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, 1-39, Oxford
- _____ (2002)a. "Gender and sexuality" in P. Hardie (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 95-107, Cambridge.
- _____ (2002)b. "Looking at Looking: Can You Resist a Reading?" in D. Fredrick (ed.), 265-95, Baltimore.
- Shaw, M. (1975). "The female intruder: women in fifth-century drama", *CP*: 255-66.
- Shefton, B.B. (1962). "Herakles and Theseus on a red-figured louterion", *Hesperia* 31: 330-68.

- Showerman, G. (1977). *Heroides; and Amores*, with an English translation, 2nd edition, revised by G.P. Goold, Cambridge MA and London.
- Shuckburgh, E.S. (ed.) (1885). *P.Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistulae XIII*, edited with notes and indices, London.
- Sicherl, M. (1963). "Vermeintliche Versinterpolationen in Ovids *Heroides*", *Hermes* 91: 190-212.
- Sider, D. (1997). *The epigrams of Philodemus; introduction, text, and commentary*, New York and Oxford.
- Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: a resource book for students*, London and New York.
- Sissal, G. (1987). *Le corps virginal*, Paris.
- Skinner, M. B. (ed.) (1987). *Rescuing Creusa : new methodological approaches to women in antiquity*, Lubbock, Texas.
- _____ (1993)a. "Ego Mulier: The Constuction of Male Sexuality in Catullus", *Helios* 20: 107-30.
- _____ (1993)b. "Woman and Language in Archaic Greece, or, Why Is Sappho a Woman", in N.S. Rabinowitz and A. Richlin (eds.), 125-44, New York.
- Skutsch, F. (1901). *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (Teil I: Darstellung / Exkurse, Teil II: Gallus und Vergil), Leipzig.
- _____ (1910). "Odium und Verwandtes", *Glotta* 2: 230-46.
- Skutsch, O. (1985). *The annals of Q. Ennius, edited with an introduction and commentary*, Oxford.
- Smith, K.F. (1913). *The elegies of Albius Tibullus*, New York.
- Smith, R.A. (1994). "Fantasy, Myth, and Love Letters: Text and Tale in Ovid's *Heroides*", *Arethusa* 27: 247-73.
- _____ (1997). Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil, Ann Arbor.
- Smith, W.D. (1960). "Staging in the *Hippolytus*", *TAPA* 91: 162-77.
- Smyth, H.W. (1963). *Greek Grammar*, Cambridge.
- Snell, B. (1951). *La cultura greca e le origini del pensiero europeo*, Turin.
- _____ (1953). *The Discovery of the Mind. The Greek Origins of European Thought*, tr. by T.G. Rosenmeyer, Oxford.
- _____ (1964). *Scenes from Greek Drama*, Berkeley.
- Snipes, K. (1988). "Literary interpretation in the Homeric Scholia: The similes of the *Iliad*", *AJPh* 109: 196-222.
- Snyder, J.M. (1997). *Lesbian desire in the lyrics of Sappho*, New York.
- Sommerstein, A.H. (ed.) (1989). *Aeschylus Eumenides*, Cambridge.
- Spaeth, B.S. (1996). *The Roman Goddess Ceres*, Austin Texas.
- Spentzou, E. (2003). *Readers and writers in Ovid's Heroides. Transgressions of Genre and Gender*, Oxford.

- Spoth, F. (1992). *Ovids Heroides als Elegien* (Zetemata 89), Munich.
- _____ (1993). "Ovids Ariadne- Brief und die römische Liebeselegie". *WJA* 19: 239-60.
- Stanford, W.B. (1963). *The Ulysses Theme. A Study in the Adaptability of a traditional Hero*, Oxford.
- Stache, U. J. and Maz, W. and Wagner, F. (eds.) (1986). *Kontinuität und Wandel. Lateinische Poesie von Naevius bis Baudelaire. FrancoMunari zum 65. Geburtstag*, Hildesheim.
- Stallbaum, G. (ed.) (1960). *Eustathii, Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis, commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem. Ad fidem exempli romani editi*, vols.2, uniform with his edition of *Eustathii, Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis, commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam. Ad fidem exempli romani editi* with M. Devarius' *Index in Eustathii commentarios in Homeri Iliadem et Odysseam*, Hildesheim.
- Stehle [Stigers], E. (1977). "Retreat from the Male: Catullus 62 and Sappho's Erotic Flowers", *Ramus* 6: 83-102.
- _____ (1981). "Sappho's Private World" in H.P. Foley (ed.), 45-61, New York.
- _____ (1996). "Sappho's Gaze: Fantasies of a Goddess and Young Man" in Greene (ed.), 193-25, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- Stevens, P.T. (ed.) (1971). *Euripides: Andromache*, Oxford.
- Stinton, T.C.W. (1976). "'Si credere dignum est': Some expressions of disbelief in Euripides and others", *PCPhS* 22: 60-89.
- Stirewalt, M.L, Jr. (1993). *Studies in Ancient Greek Epistolography*, Atlanta.
- Stirrup, B.E. (1973). "Irony in Ovid, *Amores* 1.7", *Latomus* 32, 824-31.
- _____ (1976). "Ovid's Narrative Technique: A Study in Duality", *Latomus* 35: 97-107.
- Stockert, W. (1983). *T. Maccius Plautus, Aulularia*, herausgegeben und erklärt, beilage Textedition, Stuttgart.
- Stroh, W. (1971). *Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung*, Amsterdam.
- _____ (1991). "Heroides Ovidianae cur epistulas scribant" in *Ovidio poeta della memoria*: 201- 44.
- Stone, Shelley. (1994). "The toga: from national to ceremonial costume" in L.J.Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds), 13-45, Madison.
- Sergent, B. (1987). *Homosexuality in Greek myth*, London.
- Sutton, D.F. (1986). *Seneca on the Stage*, Leiden.
- Sweet, W.E. (2002). *Latin Proverbs: Wisdom from Ancient to Modern Times*, Wauconda Illinois.
- Tarrant, R.J. (1976). *Seneca, Agamnenon, edited with a commentary*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1978). "Senecan Drama and Its Antecedents", *HSCP* 22: 213-63.
- _____ (1983). "Ovid" in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), 257-84, Oxford.
- _____ (1995). "The Silence of Cephalus: Text and Narrative Technique in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 7.685ff.", *TAPA* 125: 99-111.

- _____ (1998). "Parenthetically Speaking (in Vergil and Other Poets)" in P. Knox and C.Foss (eds.) *Style and Tradition. Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*, 141-157, Stuttgart.
- Theander, C. (1915). "Ὀλολυγή und ἰά. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der aegäisch- hellenischen Kultur", *Eranos* 15: 99-160.
- Theodorou, Z. (1993). "Subject to Emotion: Exploring Madness in *Orestes*." *CQ* 43: 32-46.
- Thomas, R.F. (1978). "Ovid's attempt at tragedy (*Am.* 3.1.63-64)", *AJPh* 99: 447-50.
- _____ (1988). *Virgil, Georgics*, vol.1: Books 1-2, vol.2: Books 3-4, Cambridge.
- Thomas, Y. (1992). "The Division of the Sexes in Roman Law" in Schmitt Pantel (ed.), 83-138, Cambridge MA and London.
- _____ (1996). "Fathers as Citizens of Rome, Rome as a City of Fathers (2nd c. BC- 2nd c. AD) in A.Burgièrè et alii (eds.) *A History of the Family*, vol. 1. Distant Worlds, Ancient World (tr. by S. Hanbury Tenison, R.Morris, A. Wilson), 228-69, Cambridge.
- Thomson, D.F.S. (1997). *Catullus. Edited with Textual and Interpretative Commentary*, Toronto, Buffalo and London.
- Thompson, P.A.M. (1989). *Ovid, Heroides 20 and 21. A Commentary with Introduction*, Diss. Oxford.
- Tolkiehn, J. (1900). *Homer und die römische Poesie*, Leipzig.
- Torresin, G. (1998). "Ovid's Phaedra in der mythologischen Tradition. Ep. *Her.* 4 –der Brief einer Persona Delirans, *CM* 49: 163-235.
- Tosi, R. (2000). *Dizionario delle sentenze latine e greche*, Milan.
- Tracy V.A. (1971). "The authenticity of *Heroides* 16-21", *CJ* 66: 328-30.
- _____ (1972). "Penelope and Medea in the *Heroides*", *EMC* 16: 43-8.
- _____ (1976). "The *leno-maritus*", *CJ* 72: 62-4.
- Tränkle, H. (1960). *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Hermes Einzelschriften 15), Wiesbaden.
- _____ (1990). *Appendix Tibulliana*, Berlin and New York.
- Träufigang, H. (1960). *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Hermes Einzelschriften 15), Wiesbaden.
- _____ (1963). "Elegisches in Ovids *Metamorphosen*", *Hermes* 91: 459-76.
- Traina, A. (1989). "Sposa del gran Giove e suora. Una formula omerica in latino" in *Poeti latini (e neolatini)*, III, Bologna: 153-65.
- Traina, A. and Bini, M. (eds.) (1990). *Supplementum Morelianum*, second edition, Bologna.
- Trapp, M. (2003). *Greek and Latin letters. An anthology, with translation*, Cambridge.
- Treggiari, S. (1982)a. "Consent to Roman marriage: some aspects of law and reality", *EMC* 1: 34-44.
- _____ (1982)b. "Women as Property in the Early Roman Empire" in D.K. Weisberg (ed.)

- Women and the Law: A Social Historical Perspective* 2, 7-33, Cambridge.
- _____ (1991). *Roman marriage. Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*, Oxford.
- _____ (1996). "Divorce Roman Style: How Easy and how Frequent was it?" in B. Rawson (ed.), 31-46, Canberra and Oxford.
- _____ (2005). "Women in the Time of Augustus" in K. Galinsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, 130-47, Cambridge.
- Tromaras, L. (2001). *Κάτουλλος. Ο νεωτερικός ποιητής της Ρώμης, Catulli carmina, εισαγωγή- κείμενο- μετάφραση- σχόλια*, Thessaloniki.
- Tschiedel, H.J. (1992). "Die Gedichte der Sulpicia (Tib. 3, 13-18)—Frauenlyrik?", *GB* 18: 87-102.
- Tsitsiou- Chelidoni, C. (2003). *Ovid. Metamorphosen, Buch VIII. Narrative Technik und literarischer Kontext* (Studien zur klassischen Philologie, Bd. 138), Frankfurt am Main.
- Tupet, A.-M. (1976). *La magie dans la poésie latine, vol. I. Des origines à la fin du règne d'Auguste*, Paris.
- Turato, F. (1974). "L' *Ippolito* di Euripide tra realtà e suggestioni di fuga", *BIFG* 1: 136-63.
- Uglione, R. (ed.) (1985). *Atti delle giornate di studio su Fedra, Torino 7-8-9 maggio 1984*, Turin.
- Vahlen, J. (1881). "Über die Anfänge der *Heroiden* des Ovid", *Abhandl. Berlin. Akad* (= *Gesammelte philologische Schriften* II, 72-107, Hildesheim and New York (1970)).
- Valverde Abril, J.J. (1999). "Análisis métrico de Ovidio, *Her.* 15 ("Epistula Sapphus ad Phaonem"): *problemas de autoría*" in J.L. Moreno, P.R. Díaz y Díaz (eds.), *Estudios de métrica latina. Actes du « Seminario sobre métrica latina », Grenade, 6-9 mai 1998*, 947-61, Granada.
- van Straten, F.T. (1995). *Hiera kala. Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Religions in the Graeco- Roman world 127), Leiden, New York and Cologne.
- van Dam, H.-J. (1984). *Papinius Statius, Silvae book II : a commentary*, Leiden.
- Vangaard, T. (1972). *Phallos*, London.
- Vellacott, P. (1975). *Ironic Drama. A Study of Euripides' Method and Meaning*, Cambridge.
- Verdière, R. (1964). *Gratti Cynegeticon Libri I Quae supersunt*, vol. I *Texte et traduction*, vol. II *Commentaire (Poetae Bucolici Cynegeticique Minores 1)*, Wetteren.
- Verducci, F. (1985). *Ovid's Toyshop of the Heart: Epistulae Heroidum*, Princeton.
- Vérilhac A.-M. and Vial Cl. (1998). *Le mariage grec du VIe siècle avant J.-C. à l'époque d'Auguste* (École française d'Athènes. Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. Suppléments, 32), Paris.

- Verstraete, B.C. (1980). "Propertius' use of myth in book two" in Deroux (ed.), 259-68, Brussels.
- Vertoudakis, V. P. (2000). *Epigrammata Cretica. Λογοτεχνικοί Τόποι της Κρήτης στο Αρχαίο Ελληνικό Επίγραμμα*, Herakleion.
- Vessey, D.W.T. (1973). *Statius and the Thebaid*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1976). "A note on *latus*", *LCM* 1: 39f.
- Veyne, P. (1985). "L' Empire romain" in P.Ariès and G.Duby (eds.) *Histoire de la vie privée*, vol. I, 19-224, Paris.
- Viarre, S. (1969). "Laodamie, héroïne élégiaque" in J.Bibauw (ed.) *Hommages à M.Renard*: 768- 77, Brussels.
- _____ (1987). "Des poèmes d' Homère aux "Héroïdes" d' Ovide. Le récit épique et son interprétation élégiaque", *Bulletin de l' Association Guillaume Budé* 4E Serie: 2-11.
- Vidal- Naquet, P. (1978). "Plato's myth of the Statesman, the ambiguities of the Golden Age and of History", *JHS* 98: 132-41.
- _____ (1981). *Le chasseur noir. Formes de pensée et formes de société dans le monde grec*, Paris.
- _____ (1998). *The black hunter: forms of thought and forms of society in the Greek world*, tr. by Andrew Szegedy-Maszak, with a foreword by Bernard Knox, London and Baltimore.
- Vogt, E. (1967). "Das Akrostichon in der griechischen Literatur", *A&A* 13: 80-95.
- Volk, K. (2005). "*Ille ego*: (Mis)reading Ovid's Elegiac Persona", *A&A* 51: 83-96.
- Vout, C. (1996). "The Myth of the Toga: Understanding the History of Roman Dress", *G&R* 43.2: 204-20.
- Wagenvoort, H. (1960). "De dea Cerere deque eius mysteriis Romanis", *Mnemosyne* 13: 11-142 (= H. Wagenvoort (1980). *Pietas. Selected Studies in Roman Religion* (Studies in Greek and Roman Religion vol.1), 114-146, Leiden).
- Walde, C. (2000). "Literatur als Experiment? Zur Erzähltechnik in Ovids *Heroides*", *A&A* 46: 124-38.
- Walker, H.J. (1995)a. *Theseus and Athens*, Oxford and New York.
- _____ (1995)b. "The Early Development of the Theseus Myth", *RhM* 138: 1-32.
- Wallace- Hadrill, A. (1982). "The Golden Age and sin in Augustan ideology", *P&P* 95: 19-36.
- Warden, J. (1978). "Another would-be Amazon. Propertius 4,4,71-72", *Hermes* 106:177-87.
- Warmington, E.H. (1936-67). *Remains of old Latin, edited and translated*, London, Cambridge MA.
- Watson, A. (1967). *The Law of Persons in the later Roman Republic*, Oxford.
- Watson, P. (1983). "*Puella and virgo*", *Glotta* 61: 119-43.

- _____ (1985). "Axelson Revisited: the Selection of Vocabulary in Latin Poetry", *CQ.* 35: 430-48.
- Watson, L. (2003). *A commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford and New York.
- Watson, P.A. (1995). *Ancient stepmother: myth, misogyny and reality*, Leiden.
- Watt, W.S. (1989), "Notes on Ovid *Heroides*", *RFIC* 117: 62-8.
- Weber, M. (1983). *Die mythologische Erzählung in Ovids Liebeskunst. Verankerung, Struktur und Funktion. Verankerung, Struktur und Funktion* (Studien zur klassischen Philologie 6), Frankfurt am Main and Bern.
- Webster, T. B. L. (1966). "The myth of Ariadne from Homer to Catullus", *G&R* 13: 22-31.
- _____ (1967). *The Tragedies of Euripides*, London.
- West, D. (2002). *Horace Odes III. Dulce Periculum*, Oxford.
- West, M. L. (1974). *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin and New York.
- _____ (1982). *Greek Metre*, Oxford.
- _____ (ed.) (1984). *Carmina Anacreontea*, Leipzig.
- Weyman, C. (1929). "Bemerkungen zur 16. Epode des Horaz" in *Donum natalicium Schrijnen. Verzameling van opstellen door oud-leerlingen en bevriende vakgenoten opgedragen aan Mgr. Prof. Jos. Schrijnen bij gelegenheid van zijn zestigsten verjaardag, 3 mei 1929*, 737- 46, Nijmegen and Utrecht.
- Warhol, R.R. and Herndl, D.P. (1997). *Feminisms. An anthology of literary theory criticism*, London.
- Whitaker, R. (1983). *Myth and personal experience in Roman love-elegy. A study in poetic technique* (Hypomnemata 76), Göttingen.
- Wigodsky, M. (1972). *Vergil and early Latin poetry* (Hermes Einzelschriften 24), Wiesbaden.
- Wijsman, H.J.W. (1996). *Valerius Flaccus Argonautica, Book 5. A commentary*, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
- _____ (2000). *Valerius Flaccus Argonautica, Book 6. A commentary*, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1924). *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, vols. 1-2, Berlin.
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1953). "Greek Influence on the Poetry of Ovid" in *Fondation Hardt. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique II, L'influence grecque sur la poésie Latine de Catulle à Ovide: 223-43*, Geneva.
- _____ (1955). *Ovid Recalled*, Cambridge.
- _____ (1963). *Golden Latin Artistry*, Cambridge.
- Willis, J. (1972). *Latin Textual Criticism*, Urbana, Chicago and London.
- Wills, J. (1996). *Repetition in Latin poetry: figures of allusion*, Oxford.
- Williams, C.A. (1999). *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*, New York.

- Williams, G. (1958). "Some aspects of Roman marriage ceremonies and ideals", *JRS* 48: 16-29.
- _____ (1980). "Arbitrary Assertion of Similarity" in his *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry*: 62-94, New Haven and London.
- Williams, G.D. (1997). "Writing in the mother-tongue: Hermione and Helen in *Heroides* 8 (a Tomitan approach)", *Ramus* 26: 113-37.
- Williams, G.D and Walker, A.D. (eds.) (1997). *Ovid in Exile, I and II, Ramus 26.1 and 2, Critical Studies in Greek and Roman Literature*. Berwick, Victoria.
- Willink, C.W. (1968). "Some problems of text and interpretation in the *Hippolytus*", *CQ* 18: 11-43.
- _____ (1986). *Euripides Orestes*, with introduction and commentary, Oxford.
- Wills, J. (1996). *Repetition in Latin poetry. Figures of Allusion*, Oxford.
- Wilson, L.H. (1996). *Sappho's Sweetbitter Songs. Configurations of female and male in ancient Greek Lyric*, London and New York.
- Winkler, J. J. (1990). *The Constraints of Desire. The anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*, New York and London.
- Winnington – Ingram, R. P. (1955). "Two Latin idioms", *CR* 5: 139-41.
- _____ (1960). "*Hippolytus*: a study in causation", in *Euripide. Fondation Hardt Entretiens VI*, 171-91, Geneva.
- Wiseman, T.P. (1969). *Catullan Questions*, Leicester.
- Wistrand, M. (1982). *Entertainment and Violence in Ancient Rome: The attitudes of Roman virtues of the first century A.D. (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia LVI)*, Gothenburg.
- Wlosok, A. (1967). "Die dritte Cynthia-Elegie des Properz (Prop. 1,3)", *Hermes* 95: 330-52.
- Wölfflin E. (ed.) (1894-1908). *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik mit Einschluss des älteren Mittellateins*, 15vols, Leipzig.
- Woodcock, E.C. (1959). *A new Latin syntax*, London.
- Worman, N. (2001). "This Voice Which Is Not One: Helen's Verbal Guises in Homeric Epic" in A. Lardinois and L. McClure (eds.) *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voice in Greek Literature and Society*, 19-37, Princeton.
- Wyke, M. (1987)a. "The Elegiac Woman at Rome", *PCPhS* 33: 153-78.
- _____ (1987)b. "Written women: Propertius' *scripta puella*", *JRS* 77: 47-61.

- _____ (1994). "Woman in the Mirror: The Rhetoric of Adornment in the Roman World" in L.J. Archer, S. Fischler, and M. Wyke (eds.) *Women in Ancient Societies: 'An Illusion of the Night'*:134-51, London.
- _____ (1995). "Taking the woman's part: Engendering Roman Love Elegy" in A.J. Boyle (ed.) *Roman Literature and Ideology. Ramus essays for J.P. Sullivan*: 110-128, Bendigo.
- _____ (2002). *The Roman Mistress. Ancient and Modern Representations*, Oxford.
- Yatromanolakis, Y. (1999). *Οβίδιος Ερωτικά Αντιφάρμακα (Remedia Amoris), εισαγωγή – σχόλια - έμμετρη μετάφραση*, Athens.
- Yardley, J.C. (1976). "Lovers' quarrels: Horace *Odes* 1.13.1 and Propertius 4.5.40", *Hermes* 104: 124-8.
- _____ (1978). "The Elegiac Paraclausithyron", *Eranos* 76: 19-34.
- _____ (1981). "Catullus 11: The End of a Friendship", *SO* 56: 63-9.
- _____ (1990). "Cerinthus' *pia cura* ([Tibullus] 3.17.1-2)", *CQ* n.s. 40: 568-70.
- _____ (1991). "The Symposium in Roman elegy", in W.J. Slater (ed.) *Dining in a Classical Context*, 149-55, Ann Arbor.
- Zagagi, N. (1985). "Helen of Troy: Encomium and Apology", *WS* 98: 63-88.
- Zeitlin, F.I. (1965). "The Motif of the Corrupted Sacrifice in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*", *TAPA* 96: 463-508.
- _____ (1985)a. "The Power of Aphrodite: Eros and the Boundaries of the Self in *Hippolytus*", in P. Burian (ed.) *Directions in Euripidean Criticism: A Collection of Essays*: 52-111, Durham, N.C.
- _____ (1985)b. "Playing the other: theater, theatricality and the feminine in Greek drama", *Representations* 11: 63-94.
- _____ (1996). *Playing the Other. Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*, Chicago and London.
- Zelenak, M.X. (1998). *Gender and Politics in Greek tragedy (Artists and Issues in the Theatre 7)*, New York.
- Zielinski, F. (1931). "De topis et typis in Ovidii *Heroidibus* adhibitibus" in *Acta II. congressus philol. class. slav. Pragae* : 31-43, Prague.
- Zimmermann, B. (2000). "Properz 4,3 und Ovids *Heroides*", *MH* 57: 130-135.
- Zintzen, C. (1960). *Analytisches Hypomnema zu Senecas Phaedra*, Meisenheim am Glan.
- Zwierlein, O. (1966). *Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas* (Beitrage zur klassischen Philologie 20), Meisenheim am Glan.