The Classical Quarterly 69.2 764–768 © The Classical Association (2019)
doi:10.1017/S000983881900079X

A NOTE ON OVID, *HEROIDES* 6.117–18*

At *Her*. 6.113–18 Hypsipyle lays out for Jason the advantages to be gained by marrying her: the prestige of her noble and even divine family, and the fertile island of Lemnos, which will come as her dowry. She then adds the fact that she is pregnant with twins (6.119–22); this thought introduces a new section, which extends until line 130. Here, following Dörrie's text and apparatus criticus,[1] is the central passage (6.113–20):

si te nobilitas generosaque nomina tangunt:
  en ego Minoo nata Thoante feror.
Bacchus auus: Bacchi coniunx redimita corona
  praeradiat stellis signa minora suis.
dos tibi Lemnos erit, terra ingeniosa colenti;
  me quoque dotales inter habere potes.
nunc etiam peperi. gratare ambobus, Iason —
  dulce mihi grauidae fecerat auctor onus.

118 dotales *Salmasius, coll. Verg.* Aen. *4.104*] *quod tales* Bi **D G** Gi H(txt) **L** M Of Pa Pv Sp V; *q* //// *lis* **P**; *quid tales* Gu; *quam tales* Ri; *res tales* **E F** H(vl) rell.; quot tales *N. Heinsius*; iam matres *Tanaq. Faber*; opes tales *Lindemann*

At line 118 the text is corrupt. Already Andreas Naugerius, the editor of the second Aldine edition (1515–16), expressed his bewilderment with the paradosis: 'in veteribus quibusdam libris *me quoque res tales*; in aliis *me quoque quod tales*. quodnam horum rectius sit, iudicent alii. ego quoquo modo legatur non satis quid sibi Ovidius velit, percipio.'[2] Some editors have tried to make some sense out of the transmitted text.[3] But conjecture seems to be the most reasonable solution.

* I wish to thank Professor Sergio Casali for the idea of writing this note, as well as for his constant help. I also thank Professors Caroline Cheung, Joseph Farrell, Peter Knox, Gianpiero Rosati and Fabio Stok, and my friends Bernardo Berruecos Frank, Alessia Di Marco, Andrew Horne and Scott Weiss, as well as *CQ*'s anonymous reader, for their many useful comments and suggestions.

[1] H. Dörrie, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum* (Berlin and New York, 1971).

[2] A. Naugerius, *Annotationes in Omnia Ouidii opera* (Venice, 1516), ad loc.

[3] The most successful among the various transmitted stopgaps has been *res tales*: Hypsipyle, saying 'I can count me too among such things', i.e. 'inter res ingeniosas colenti', 'among the fertile things', would be anticipating the content of the next section (in itself an unusual procedure); see J.F. Gronovius, *Obseruationum liber nouus* (Deventer, 1652), 249: '*res tales*. nempe foecundas et ingeniosas colenti: quas inter se merito censeri iubet Hypsipyle, quippe quae prolem gemellam ex concubitu Jasonis uno partu ediderat'; and so many editors and commentators, including, for example, J.F. Heusinger, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides et A. Sabini epistolae* (Braunschweig, 1786); D.J. van Lennep, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroidum epistularum liber et A. Sabini epistulae* (Amsterdam, 1809); and R. Ehwald, *P. Ovidius Naso*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1888); also E.S. Shuckburgh, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae XIII* (London, 1879), who prints *dotales*, but in his note finds that '*res tales* has some point': 'me too you may count as fertile'. Others have printed *res tales* but offered a different interpretation: the 'things' among which Hypsipyle wants to be counted would be the dowry, the nobility and the famous names themselves; see Hubertinus Clericus Crescentinas, *In Nasonis*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881900079X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Various conjectures have been advanced.[4] The most successful among them is *dotales*, which is usually attributed to Salmasius, and has been adopted by the majority of the most recent editors. With *dotales* we have only to suppose that in the archetype the syllable *do-* was illegible; *res tales* or *quid tales* are only stopgaps meant to restore the metre and some semblance of meaning.[5] But what is the exact meaning of the text if we read *dotales*? If we look at the two most authoritative recent editions of the *Heroides*, we find in fact two very different interpretations of *me quoque dotales inter habere potes*: on the one hand, Rosati translates: 'puoi includere anche me fra le donne fornite di dote';[6] on the other hand, Knox translates: 'You can have me, too, among the dotal slaves', and explains:

> … a novel application of the motif of the *seruitium amoris*. As a wedding gift to Jason she would offer herself in amorous servitude: *dotales serui* were common components of the dowry. The correction *dotales* (MSS *res tales*) restores Ovidian point to the line. The use of *dotalis* without an accompanying noun is unusual, but not unparalleled (*TLL* s.v. 2054.32ff.).[7]

Before we proceed any further, let us step back to see how Salmasius himself interpreted the text as restored by his (see n. 10 below) conjecture *dotales*. In his *De modo usurarum liber*, Salmasius cites our passage as representative of Ovid's ignorance of the fact that in the heroic age it was the men and not the women who gave a dowry to their partners.[8] Salmasius, however, is not satisfied with the vulgate text he was reading and so pauses to propose (or re-propose) an intervention in the text:

> [*me quoque dotales inter habere potes*] sic enim eum locum pridem emendavimus ex veteri scriptura, quae habuit, *quod tales*, cum sine sensu legatur in vulgatis, *me quoque iam tales*.[9]

Heroidas Commentum (Casale Monferrato, 1481): '*res tales* […] id est inter nobilitatem, et dotem, et similia', and so, for example, J.A. Amar, *P. Ovidius Naso*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1820); J.C. Jahn, *P. Ovidii Nasonis quae supersunt opera omnia*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1828); V. Loers, *P. Ovidii Nasonis et A. Sabini epistulae* (Cologne, 1829); and more recently F. Moya del Baño, *Ovidio: Heroidas* (Madrid, 1986).

[4] N. Heinsius, in the section entitled 'Nicolai Heinsii D. F. Notae in Heroidas P. Ovidii Nasonis' of his undated volume of notes to the first volume of his edition of Ovid (Amsterdam, 1658), 48–9: *quot tales …!* ('Hoc vult, paucas esse quae secum comparari possint'); T. Faber, *T. Lucretii Cari De rerum natura libri sex* (Cambridge, 1675), 399: *iam matres*; J.H. Withof, *Oratio de immodico allegandi inter eruditos abusu. Accedit insignium in Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum epistolas emendationum decas* (Duisburg, 1738), 25: *quod recolas*; and H. Lindemann, *Ovids Werke*, vol. 6 (Leipzig, 1867): *opes tales*.

[5] See H. Dörrie, 'Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids Epistulae Heroidum. Teil I', *NAWG* 5 (1960), 113–230, at 129.

[6] G. Rosati, *Ovidio: Lettere di eroine* (Milan, 1989). Cf. also M. Prévost in *Ovide: Héroïdes*. Texte établi par H. Bornecque et traduit par M. Prévost (Paris, 1928): 'me ranger parmi les femmes bien dotées'.

[7] P.E. Knox, *Ovid: Heroides. Select Epistles* (Cambridge, 1995). Cf. also, for example, Shuckburgh (n. 3): 'among those whom your marriage with me will put into your hands'; A. Palmer, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides XIV* (London, Cambridge and Dublin, 1874): 'and my person you may reckon among your slaves acquired by dowry' (= A. Palmer, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroides with the Greek Translation of Planudes* [Oxford, 1898]); G. Showerman, *Ovid: Heroides and Amores* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1914): 'and me, too, you will possess among the subjects my dowry brings'.

[8] C. Salmasius, *De modo usurarum liber* (Leiden, 1639), 138–9. Salmasius also cites Verg. *Aen.* 4.103–4 *liceat Phrygio seruire marito | dotalisque tuae Tyrios permittere dextrae* as another example of the supposedly mistaken attribution of a dowry to a woman—not, however, strictly as an argument in favour of reading *dotales* in Ovid.

[9] This is indeed the text most commonly found in the first printed editions of the *Heroides*. Micyllus, in *P. Ovidii Nasonis Poetae Sulmonensis Opera quae vocantur amatoria, cum doctorum virorum commentariis … His accedunt Iacobi Micylli annotationes …* (Basel, 1549), 72 is the only commentator who explicitly defends it: 'Quae lectio [*res tales*], ut quidem plenior est, ita tamen

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881900079X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Non solum, inquit, dos tibi erit insula Lemnos, cuius sum regina, sed me quoque non dominae et uxoris poteris habere, sed ancillae loco, et inter dotales ancillas. *dotalis servi* mentio apud Plautum, et apud Apuleium, et in iure nostro. et *res dotales* passim quae in dotem dantur.[10]

Salmasius explains the text as Knox will do some centuries later: 'not only, Hypsipyle says, will you have as a dowry the island of Lemnos, of which I am the queen, but you can have even me not as your mistress and wife but as a servant, and among the dotal servants.' The reception of Salmasius's conjecture, however, will be hindered by Heinsius's incorrect account of it in the note ad loc. of his 1658 edition of Ovid:

Salmasius libro de Usuris[11] *Me quoque dotales inter*, ut *dotales* dixerit Ovidius pro *dotatas*. Quod legem Latini sermonis ferre pernego. ille contrarium docere nos debuisset.[12]

Heinsius takes Salmasius's *dotales* as meaning *dotatas*, and denies that this would be correct Latin. How could Heinsius misunderstand Salmasius's argument in this way?[13] It is hard to tell. The most reasonable explanation is that he never actually read Salmasius's annotation, but reconstructed his argument on the sole basis of the conjecture he knew Salmasius had proposed. We might even suspect that Heinsius was not displeased at damaging the reputation of his 'enemy' Salmasius.[14]

But at this point we must face a problem: are Salmasius's emendation and explanation possible in this context? The answer in my view is no, for there is a basic difficulty with Salmasius's explanation for *dotales* which commentators have not focussed on: namely that it would be grossly inappropriate to the context for Hypsipyle to compare herself to a slave at this point. In lines 113–18, as we have seen, Hypsipyle is boasting the nobility of her family and her personal wealth and power—the things that will fall to

simplicior Aldina uidetur: quam et nos secuti sumus, ut particula Iam ἐπιλογικῶς, ut ita dicam, sumatur. Q.d. Cum ea sit nobilitas meorum, tanta dos mea, possis non immerito me quoque ob, vel inter talia ac tanta te digna esse existimare, etc.'; *contra*, see C.-G. Bachet de Méziriac, *Commentaire sur les epistres d'Ovide* (Bourg-en-Bresse, 1626), 635: 'où il est évident que le pentamètre est dépravé, et l'explication qu'en donne Micyllus est si forcée, que je ne daignerais prendre la peine de la réfuter'.

[10] I have not found where Salmasius had already advanced his conjecture ('sic enim eum locum pridem emendavimus'). It *might* be possible that, when Méziriac (n. 9) says 'et quelques autres encore [lisent], *me quoque dotales*' (proposing, on his part, to read *me res dotales inter habere potes*, 'et pour moi tu me pourras prendre comme un augment et un surcroit de ma dot'), he is referring to Salmasius, but this is far from certain, since already Antonio Volsco in his commentary on the *Heroides* (Venice, 1481) had written: 'me quoque *quod tales*, non *dotales* legendum' (he goes on: 'sed *quid tales*: poteras inquit et me habere: quae digna sum inter meos maiores annumerari'). Clearly, then, the conjecture *dotales* is much earlier than Salmasius.

[11] But, as we have seen, Salmasius discussed his conjecture in his *De modo usurarum*, and not in his *De usuris* (Leiden, 1638).

[12] Heinsius (n. 4), 49.

[13] The same misunderstanding in the apparatus criticus of Palmer (n. 7): 'Salmasius olim coni. *dotales* pro *dotatas*, sed *dotalis* nunquam idem valet quod *dotatus*.'

[14] Things become more complicated, however, when we read Heinsius's 'interpretation' of Salmasius in his note as reproduced in P. Burman's edition (*Publii Ovidii Nasonis Opera omnia*, vol. 1 [Amsterdam, 1727], 83), where Heinsius's notes are added 'minimum tertia parte ex eius autographo auctiores' (*Praef.* p. 2): 'Salmasius *me quoque dotales inter*, pro *dotatas*, ut *res dotales* subintelligatur. Hoc sensu. Non tantum Lemnos tibi dotalis erit, sed ego quoque ipsa.' Apparently something has gone wrong here with the transcription of Heinsius's note, because what follows the explanation '*dotales* …, pro *dotatas*' does not seem consistent with it. The ending of Heinsius's note—'Neque displicet tamen Salmasianum, ut se non tam *dotatam*, quam *dotalem* innuat Hypsipyle. *Dotalium servorum* frequens in jure mentio. Apud Plautum quoque, Apulejum & Claudianum'—is also difficult to understand: 'I rather like Salmasius' conjecture, provided that Hypsipyle means that she is *dotalis*, not *dotata*'? That is, is Heinsius still thinking of Salmasius's *dotales* as meaning *dotatas*?

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881900079X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jason if he agrees to be her husband. If he is moved by nobility and eminent names, she is the daughter of Thoas, grandson of Minos (through Ariadne, her mother); her grandfather is Bacchus, who transformed Ariadne and the crown he gave her into a very bright constellation.[15] If, instead, Jason is moved by wealth and power (we may add), her dowry will be the kingship of the rich island of Lemnos, a land naturally suited to those who cultivate it.[16] As the climax of this self-aggrandizement, Hypsipyle could not belittle herself by saying 'you can have me, too, among the dotal slaves'. The very point of Hypsipyle's argument is that she is a noble and powerful figure, who will transfer nobility and power to Jason, her husband; she is no slave. Even if we wanted to see in *dotales* a reference to the *seruitium amoris*, as Knox does, that would be not 'a novel application of the motif' but a flat and feeble anticlimax.

To judge from context, then, it seems clear that Rosati's interpretation is better. Hypsipyle is not presenting herself as a slave but as a woman with a dowry: 'Lemnos will be your dowry, a land kindly natured to the farmer; you can count me too among richly dowered women.' On this reading, the pentameter appropriately reiterates the concept expressed in the hexameter in an elegant 'theme and variation', and both the distich and the section reach their climax in the also metaliterary affirmation that Hypsipyle too—as many other heroines of Ovid's collection—is well dowered. Ovid's heroines often offer their beloved a dowry,[17] and Hypsipyle is clearly interested in including herself among them. Thus she contrasts herself to her rival Medea, whose idea of a dowry was somewhat original: *Her*. 12.201–4 *dos ubi sit, quaeris? campo numerauimus illo,* | *qui tibi laturo uellus arandus erat.* | *aureus ille aries uillo spectabilis alto,* | *dos mea*. In her note on this passage of *Her*. 12, Bessone—who clearly follows Rosati regarding the interpretation of *dotales* here—detects irony in Hypsipyle's words at 6.117–18: 'il plurale generico (*dotales*: Ipsipile pensa alla sola Medea) appare indovinato al lettore, che pone sulla stessa linea la terza *uxor dotata*, Creusa.'[18] That is, according to Bessone, when Hypsipyle says 'you can count me too among the richly dowered women', she is thinking only of Medea, who after all can boast some sort of dowry, but the reader recognizes in her generalizing plural *dotales* a reference also to Creusa, the *truly* well-dowered wife. Be that as it may, that Hypsipyle is very much focussed on the comparison of herself to Medea in terms of dowry is demonstrated by her words at 6.137–8 *quid refert, scelerata piam si uincet et ipso* | *crimine dotata est emeruitque uirum?*

Even if the context demands a word for 'well-dowered', however, there remains the question as to whether *dotales* can bear that interpretation. We are reminded of Heinsius's words when he (unjustly) reproached Salmasius for having proposed *dotales* as meaning *dotatas*: 'quod legem Latini sermonis ferre pernego', and in fact there is no other passage which can support such a meaning. But there remains a workable solution, which retains the desired sense without resorting to semantic anomaly: to accept

[15] But see Knox (n. 7), who prints lines 115–16 in square brackets.

[16] Cf. Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.827–31 (Hypsipyle to Jason) εἰ δέ κεν αὖθι | ναιετάειν ἐθέλοις καί τοι ἄδοι, ἦ τ' ἂν ἔπειτα | πατρὸς ἐμεῖο Θόαντος ἔχοις γέρας· οὐδέ σ' ὀίω | γαῖαν ὀνόσσεσθαι, περὶ γὰρ βαθυλήιος ἄλλων | νήσων Αἰγαίῃ ὅσαι εἰν ἁλὶ ναιετάουσιν, 'and if you yourself should wish to live here and would find it agreeable, then truly you would have my father Thoas' position of honor. Nor do I think you will find fault with our land, for it has deeper soil than all the other islands that lie in the Aegean sea' (transl. Race).

[17] So Phyllis at 2.109–14, Briseis at 3.55 *quamuis ueniam dotata*, Phaedra at 4.163 *est mihi dotalis tellus Iouis insula, Crete*, Dido at 7.149–50 *in dotem ...* | *accipe*.

[18] F. Bessone, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistula XII: Medea Iasoni* (Florence, 1997), 267.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881900079X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Heinsius's own conjecture *dotatas* instead of the transmitted *quod*/*quid*/*quam*/*res tales*:[19]

> Si coniectura nostra [that is, *me quoque quot tales inter habere potes*] in Nasonis hoc loco minus arridet, lege: *me quoque dotatas inter habere potes*. Sic *dotatae regnum vetus Hippodamiae* apud Propertium libro I. Eleg. VIII [Prop. 1.8.35].[20]

Of course, from a palaeographical point of view *dotales* would be better; but the slightly more difficult explanation of the corruption (the whole word, and not only the initial *do*-, would have become illegible for some reason and then substituted with stopgaps) should not deter us from adopting a solution which would restore perfect sense to this problematic passage.

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México / BARUCH MARTÍNEZ ZEPEDA
University of Rome 'Tor Vergata' baruch.martinez@hotmail.com

[19] While the substantival use of *dotalis* = *seruus dotalis* ('unusual, but not unparalleled': Knox [n. 7]) would find parallels only in four passages from the same *Controuersia* of Seneca the Elder (7.6.1, 3, 5, 9), in which the term *seruus* is easily supplied by the context, *dotata* for the standard *uxor* or *coniunx dotata* is attested at Plaut. *Aul*. 535 *dotatae mactant et malo et damno uiros*, Ter. *Phorm*. 937–9 *me indotatis modo* | *patrocinari fortasse arbitramini:* | *etiam dotatis soleo*, Pompon. *Atell*. 88 *nupsit posterius dotatae uetulae uaricosae uafrae*, and *Dotata* is a title of an *Atellana* of both Pomponius and Novius; see *TLL* 5.1.2057.43–6. For Ovid's use of *dotata*, besides *Her*. 6.138 quoted above, cf. *Her*. 3.55–6 *scilicet ut, quamuis ueniam dotata, repellar,* | *et mecum fugias quae tibi dantur opes* (with A. Barchiesi, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistulae Heroidum 1–3* [Florence, 1995], ad loc.); *Am*. 2.4.17 *siue es docta, places raras dotata per artes*; *Rem*. 565 *hic male dotata pauper cum coniuge uiuit*; *Met.* 11.301–2 *Chione, quae dotatissima forma* | *mille procos habuit*.

[20] *P. Ovidii Nasonis Operum Tomus II qui Metamorphoses complectitur, Nicolaus Heinsius, D. F. locis infinitis ex fide scriptorum exemplarium castigavit, & observationes adjecit* (Amsterdam, 1659), 439 ('Addenda aut mutanda notis ad Tomum Primum'). Here Heinsius considers also the possibility of reading *hanc* [*sc*. *Lemnon*] *dotales inter habere potes*, comparing *Her*. 4.163 *est mihi dotalis tellus Iouis insula, Crete*. The same proposals will be found also in Heinsius's note as reproduced in Burman's edition (n. 14).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881900079X Published online by Cambridge University Press