

In the Heroides Ovid skillfully creates poetry that can be read from various perspectives- the author, the participants or a combination of both. My paper will focus on this final category. Many of Ovid's words, lines and phrases are laced with double meaning. It is difficult for the audience to maintain the distinction between Ovid's voice and his characters'. Slippage occurs, drawing meaning and context directly related from one reading into the sphere of the other. Try as one might, the reader is unable to maintain this distinction of textual worlds; thus a hybrid reading, in which elements of an authorial reading blend into the characterizations, results in a composite form. I will discuss examples of such slippage, considering how these broaden interpretations of the text. As Ovid's version of the story significantly alters its model (Kenney 1996: 17, Hardie 2002: 111), difficulties arise when intertext and plot seem to send divergent messages. My paper examines these issues, revealing an additional level of textual interpretation, while concentrating on the role the works of Ovid and Callimachus play in the epistles. Cydippe's self-definition as *docta* (XXI.182) illustrates this issue. Cydippe is literally an educated girl, and it is her education that leads to her downfall; but she is also *docta* in an Augustan literary sense. Her reference to Callimachus' hymns (XXI. 99-100), noted by Palmer 1967: 501 and Barchiesi *HSCP* 1993: 357, can be read as an Ovidian acknowledgement of the literary tradition or coincidence that Cydippe's description of Delos matches Callimachus. Yet for the audience it is difficult not to combine the two, and consider the implications of a girl who knows her Callimachus so well, but is unaware of her own story detailed in the *Aetia*. The letter expects its audience to know intertextual references to Callimachean and Ovidian works; this primes the reader to consider multiple interpretations of other passages in the text. Despite difficulties in the transmission of XXI.235 (Kenney 1996: 246), I propose new identifications of *deus*, *vates* and *carmina* (all editions preserve these words). Kenney interprets *deus*, *vates* and *carmina* as all relating to one figure- Apollo. Barchiesi (1993: 358-9) interprets the line in another way, still seeing Apollo as the god, but reading Callimachus as the *vates*. Barchiesi expresses his unease with the text (358 n36), and attempts to read the *carmina* as the poetry of Callimachus. Indeed both the interpretations are valid. I propose identifying Ovid himself as the *vates*, the *carmina* with Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, and Amor/Eros as *deus*. The mention of Amor/Eros as Acontius's teacher occurs in both the *Aetia* (Pf. 67.1) and epistle XX (line 28). Yet it is Acontius' use of the techniques espoused in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, so prevalent throughout the epistle, which make this identification appropriate. The actions of Acontius and vocabulary of the epistles directly link to those advocated in the A.A. This allows the audience to attribute Cydippe's defeat not only to the oath and gods, but also to Ovid and his work, which were Acontius' instructors. I conclude examining the end of Cydippe's epistle and its relationship to the intertextual 'ending' provided in the *Aetia*.