A COMMENTARY ON OVID, AMORES ii. 1-10.

A thesis submitted for the degree

of Doctor of Philosophy in the

University of London

by

JOAN   BOOTH

of

BEDFORD   COLLEGE

ProQuest Number: 10098359

ProQuest 10098359

A Commentary on Ovid, Amores ii. 1-10.   Joan Booth

ABSTRACT

This thesis attempts to provide for the first time an English commentary on poems from the second book of Ovid's Amores. Included is a text of poems 1-10, to which the present commentary is confined. No independent collation of the manuscripts has been attempted in view of the meticulous work already done in this area by modern scholars, and the text offered would not claim to be a new recension; the readings of the codex Hamiltonensis 471 (Y), however, a manuscript of only fairly recently recognized antiquity, have been taken into account and are documented along with those of P and S, the other antiquiores, in a select apparatus which is intended for use in conjunction with the critical notes in the commentary.

The commentary proceeds on a line by line basis, dealing in detail with specific points of literary, linguistic and textual interest as they arise; wider issues, however, such as the conventions of poetic diction and the use of particular ranges of imagery, also find a place in discussion. The interpretations and elucidations of the older editors have been accorded special attention, and the ipsissima uerba of those such as Heinsius and Burman are regularly cited. Striking features of Ovidian style are naturally noted throughout.

Each poem has in addition an introduction which gives an outline of its content and structure, and endeavours to place the piece in its literary and contemporary social setting. Particular attention is paid to the contribution made by Ovid's work to the elegiac tradition established by Tibullus and Propertius, and an attempt is made to assess the extent of Ovid's originality and the measure of his achievement in individual elegies. A select bibliography for each poem is also offered.

The thesis as a whole, therefore, aims to illuminate and to enrich the reading of Amores ii. 1-10 in particular, and in so doing to make some contribution also to the critical assessment and appreciation of Ovid's poetry in general.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

As an undergraduate in the University of London
studying Latin elegy as a special option and feeling
particularly attracted to the amatory works of Ovid, I
often fervently wished for the assistance of an English
commentary on this most witty and appealing, but, contrary
to popular opinion, none too easy poet. In subsequently
attempting to fulfil my own wishes - partially, at any rate -
in this thesis, I hope that I have at least not done him
a disservice.

I should like to take the opportunity of recording
my gratitude to all those who have helped, some without
their even knowing it, towards the completion of this
project. I hope that the friends and colleagues in the
Universities of London and of Wales, whose store of
knowledge I have plundered and whose good nature I have
prevailed upon, will forgive me if I do not name them all,
for they are so many. I should wish to thank particularly,
however, Professor Alan Watson for making available to me
an unpublished paper on legalisms in Ovid, Professor
F.R.D. Goodyear, who first led me towards research and
of whose stimulating teaching I continue to reap the benefit,
and most of all my supervisor, Dr J.B. Hall, not only for
his scholarly guidance and wise counsel, but also for his
unfailing patience and kindness.

Department of Classics and Ancient History,   J.B.
University College of Swansea

April 1979.

ABBREVIATIONS etc.

The names of Latin authors and their works (and
modern collections) are abbreviated wherever possible as in
The Oxford Latin Dictionary, Fasc. I. ix-xxi (the works
of Ovid are generally cited without the author's name),
those of Greek authors and their works (and modern collections)
as in Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon (9th edn.
1940) xvi-xlv (with additions and corrections in the
Supplement (1968), vii-xi). References are generally to
the Oxford Classical Text or to the Teubner text, and
where confusion could arise, the name of the editor is
given.

Editions, commentaries and translations are normally
cited by the name of the editor, commentator or trans-
lator alone. References to 'Heinsius', 'Micyllus' etc.
relate to Burman's variorum edition of 1727.

References to other works by author's name alone, or
author's name and short title (after the first citation in
full),may be elucidated from the bibliography.

Titles of periodicals are abbreviated according to
the conventions of L'Année Philologique.

The abbreviations of op. cit., loc. cit., art. cit.
refer either to the select bibliography which precedes
each poem (or pair of poems) or to an item previously
cited in the same note; 'p.' and 'pp.' refer to the pages
of this thesis.

In addition the following abbreviations are used:

ALL = Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik,
ed. E. Wölfflin, Leipzig 1884-1909.

CAH = The Cambridge Ancient History 12 vols., Cambridge 1923-

CLE = Carmina Latina Epigraphica (Anthologia Latina II.
    1 and 2), ed. F. Buecheler, Leipzig 1921, 1897.

Daremberg and Saglio = C. Daremberg and E. Saglio, Diction-
    naire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après
    les textes et les monuments, Paris 1877-1919.

Hofmann-Szantyr = J.B. Hofmann. Lateinische Syntax und
    Stylistik, revised by A. Szantyr, Munich 1965.

Goold, Amat. Crit. = G.P. Goold, 'Amatoria Critica', HSCPh
    69 (1965), 1-107.

Kenney, Notes = E.J. Kenney, 'Notes on Ovid', CQ n.s.
    8 (1958), 54-66.

Kenney, Man. Trad. = E.J. Kenney, 'The Manuscript Tradition
    of Ovid's Amores, Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris',
    CQ n.s. 12 (1962), 1-31.

Kühner-Stegmann = R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, Ausführlicher
    Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 3rd edn. revised
    by A. Thierfelder, 2 vols., Darmstadt 1955 (reprinted
    1966).

LSJ = H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon,
    9th edn. revised by H. Stuart Jones and R. McKenzie,
    Oxford 1940, with a Supplement, 1968.

Neue-Wagener = F. Neue and C. Wagener, Formenlehre der
    lateinischen Sprache 3rd edn. Berlin 1892-1905.

OLD = The Oxford Latin Dictionary, Oxford 1968- .

RE = Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyclopädie des classischen
    Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart 1893- .

Roscher, Lexicon = W.H. Roscher, Ausführliches Lexicon der
    griechischen und römischen Mythologie, Leipzig, 1884-
    1937, (reprinted, Hildesheim 1965-).

ThLL = Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Leipzig 1900- .

INTRODUCTION

Ovidian Love Elegy and Modern Scholarship

'He is rather a rhetorician than a poet ... there is little feeling in his poems ... He seems to have been a very good fellow: rather too fond of women ...'

Such was the verdict of Lord Macaulay after reading 'the whole of Ovid's works'[1]. It is not difficult to see how he might have justified his remarks by reference to the Amores alone - the three books[2] of love elegies featuring a woman named Corinna[3]. 'Who

---

1. The remark is reported by W. Stroh, Ovid im Urteil der Nachwelt. Eine Testimoniensammlung (Darmstadt 1969), 112-13; the book provides a fascinating collection of judgements of Ovid from Velleius to Pound.

2. The prefatory epigram to the Amores reveals that the first edition of an Ovidian collection of poems under that title consisted of five books, the three-book collection which we know being a second edition revised by the poet himself. The possible differences between the two, together with their respective dating, have been the subject of endless scholarly speculation with very little positive result (a comprehensive survey of the major contributions and a fair statement of the problems is provided by H. Jacobson, Ovid's Heroides (Princeton 1974), 300ff; for the general question of second editions see H. Emonds, Zweite Auflage im Altertum (Leipzig 1941)). The only two poems in the Amores which provide us with any evidence at all for the date of their composition are i. 14, in which lines 45-50 are usually taken to refer to Augustus's diplomatic triumph over the Sygambri in 16 B.C. (though some have thought that the reference is to one of the later defeats of the same tribe by Drusus or Tiberius in 11 or 8 B.C. respectively), and iii. 9, a funeral elegy for Tibullus, presumably written soon after his death, which is generally thought to have occurred in 19 B.C. Thus we can at least say with reasonable certainty that Ovid was working on the collection in or around 18 B.C., the year in which Augustus's lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis was passed - a fact of some importance, I think, for the appreciation of one or two of the poems (see 2. 47-60, 5. 7-12, 13-14nn.).

3. She is generally thought to be an imaginary, composite figure, but some have firmly believed in her reality (see e.g. S. D'Elia, Ovidio (Naples 1959), 104; D'Elia provides

could dispute', he might have said, 'that a poet who one moment swears eternal fidelity to a single girl and the next claims to be attracted by every woman he sees[4], who writes of abortion, impotence and death in coitu[5], who composes a formal dirge for a dead parrot[6] and expends his energy on proving that love is the same as war[7] — who could dispute that such a poet, full of sententious wit and verbal acrobatics, deserves to be labelled shallow, raffish and rhetorical?'

Certainly nobody did dispute it in any substantial way until the earlier part of the twentieth century[8], when something of an international reappraisal of Ovid began.

---

a convenient bibliography of opinion on both sides at n. 95. We must now add P. Green, Essays in Antiquity (London 1960), 118ff., J.P. Sullivan, TAPhA 92 (1961), 522-36). I cannot help feeling that the matter has had more attention than it deserves.

4. Am. i. 3 and ii. 4; see introduction to 4 below, pp.174-7.

5. Am. ii. 13 and 14, iii. 7, ii. 10 (for the last see below, pp. 413-25

6. Am. ii. 6; see below, pp. 273-81.

7. Am. i. 9.

8. The English poet Christopher Marlowe, who translated the Amores some three centuries earlier, clearly appreciated Ovid's love elegy much more keenly; though he made mistakes (see 4. 14n.), he captured the spirit of Ovid's verse better than anyone after him until Guy Lee (Ovid's Amores (London 1968)) — surely the happiest of all Ovid's translators.

Articles by E.K. Rand[9], T.F. Higham[10] and E. Reitzenstein[11],
and a light, but sensitive, book by E. Ripert[12] showed
modern scholars looking for the first time for possible
reasons behind Ovid's aggressively unemotional treatment
of romantic love and finding them in the poet's constant
desire to create his own novel brand of humour by witty
reminiscence and subtle parody of the themes and situations
familiar to his readers from the poetry of his elegiac
predecessors, Tibullus and Propertius. Ovid's very
removal of the element of emotional involvement from the
Latin love elegy was thus recognized, as it never had been
in the nineteenth century, to be not a mark of his in-
adequacy, but an important indication of his originality.
But Ovid had not yet fully emerged as the _enfant-terrible_ of
Augustan Rome with whom we are well acquainted today; it
was left to Brooks Otis in an article of 1938[13] to point
out the special piquancy of Ovid's humour when considered
not only against the elegiac background, but also in the
wider Augustan literary and political setting.

---

9. 'Ovid and the Spirit of Metamorphosis' in Harvard Essays
on Classical Subjects (Cambridge, Mass. 1912).

10. 'Ovid, some aspects of his character and aims', CR
48 (1934), 105-16.

11. 'Das neue Kunstwollen in den Amores Ovids', RhM 84
(1935), 62-86.

12. Ovide, poète de l'amour, des dieux et de l'exil (Paris
1921).

13. 'Ovid and the Augustans', TAPhA 69 (1938), 188-229.

The ideas which emerged from the 'new criticism' of Ovid's love poetry, were eventually consummated in only the second modern study of the poet in English[14] L.P. Wilkinson's Ovid Recalled[15], one of a number of works which appeared in the years just before and after the time when the bimillennium of Ovid's birth was celebrated in 1958[16] (it could hardly have fallen more opportunely, given the renewed interest that the twentieth century had begun to show in the nequitiae poeta). Wilkinson's book, panoramic rather than detailed, succeeded in highlighting the essential element of calculated outrageousness in the face of contemporary morals and literary conventions which characterizes Ovidian love elegy; scholars who have subsequently written on Ovid have, by and large, followed in his footsteps, though there have been some changes of emphasis, notably the frequently implicit suggestion - and a very valid one too - that Ovid, for all the frivolity and playfulness he shows in the persona of the elegiac amator, deserves to be taken seriously as a creative artist.[17]

---

14. The first was H. Fränkel's idiosyncratic volume, Ovid: a Poet between two Worlds (Berkeley 1945, reprinted 1956); see the review by B. Otis, CPh 42 (1947), 57-61.

15. Cambridge 1955 (abridged as Ovid Surveyed, 1962).

16. In particular two collections of essays were published to mark the occasion: Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide, ed. N.I. Herescu (Paris 1958), Atti del convegno internazionale Ovidiano (2 vols., Rome 1959). The first is rather more valuable than the second, but both are infinitely more useful than the curious compilation which resulted from a more recent conference on Ovid in Rumania: Ovidianum. Acta conuentus omnium gentium ouidianis studiis fouendis, ed. N. Barbu et al. (Bucharest 1976).

17. This is especially true of I.M. Le M. DuQuesnay's essay, 'The Amores' in Ovid, ed. J.W. Binns (London 1973), 1-48.

Ovid's love poetry, then, has enjoyed a merited re-habilitation in relatively recent years, but there is now a danger that, having rescued him from his detractors, the modern critic will flog him to death by producing constant general re-examinations and restatements of his aims and achievements[18]. Much more useful now are studies of specific aspects of Ovid's work, such as J.-M. Frécaut's detailed investigation of his verbal wit[19] and W. Stroh's stimulating and scholarly examination of his and the other elegists' notions of the 'practical usefulness' of the type of poetry they write[20].

There is one specific aspect of Ovid's work, however, which has never lacked detailed study, and that is the quality of style and presentation which led Macaulay to comment that he was 'rather a rhetorician than a poet'[21]. Now it is true not only that Ovid's general mode of expression and procedure has a flavour which could be loosely described as 'rhetorical' in the modern sense of the word - the poet's love of the witty phrase and the clever twist of argument certainly makes the term seem apposite - but also that

18. I think particularly of A.-F. Sabot's recently published μέγα βιβλίον, Ovide, poète de l'amour dans ses oeuvres de jeunesse (Paris 1976).

19. L'Esprit et l'humeur chez Ovide (Grenoble 1972); the first half is the more helpful.

20. Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung (Amsterdam 1971). See introduction to 1 below, p. 47 and n. 18.

21. See above p. 7. Bibliography on studies of Ovid and rhetoric is supplied by D. Donnet, LEC 33 (1965), 254.

his tendency towards systematic exposition of a certain

point of view, often with a seemingly endless string

of examples and illustrations, is specifically reminiscent

of the standard method of procedure in Roman declamations,[22]

whilst his treatment of some themes seems to be very largely

in accordance with the principles enunciated in the pro-

gymnasmata[23] of the late Greek rhetoricians. In the

light of this alone, it is tempting to conclude that

Ovid was strongly influenced by contemporary rhetorical

theory and practice, but when the elder Seneca also supplies

the information that he did in fact undergo formal rhetorical

training, and indeed even declaimed in public,[24] that con-

clusion seems almost irresistible, and many have duly

arrived at it[25]. But I am by no means convinced that it

is right to have done so. First, the postulation of the

---

22. These were the advanced rhetorical exercises which were
part of a higher education designed to train a young man
for a career in oratory; see S.F. Bonner, Roman Declamation
(Liverpool 1949). Ovid's Heroides seem to have the
strongest affinity with declamation, being not unlike
suasoriae, exercises which required the argument of a case
on behalf of some particular person (often a mythological
or historical figure), but some of the poems of the Amores
have also been thought to display declamatory characteristics;
see introductions to 2 and 7 below, p. 103 n. 45 and p. 331.

23. These were elementary school exercises in rhetoric;
see S.F. Bonner, Education in Ancient Rome (London 1977),
256-60. See introductions to 6 and 10 below, p. 279 ,
n. 5 and pp. 421-2.

24. Con. ii. 2. 8-12, 9. 5. 17.

25. See e.g. A.A. Day, The Origins of Latin Love Elegy
(Oxford 1938), 71ff., P. Tremoli, Influssi retorici e
ispirazione poetica negli Amores di Ovidio Fac. di. Lett.,
Ist. di. Filol. Class. I (Trieste 1955), and, most recently,
Sabot 27ff. The alleged influence of progymnasmata on
Ovid was the subject of a dissertation by C. Brück at the
beginning of the century (De Ovidio Scholasticarum
declamationum imitatore (Giessen 1909).

influence of progymnasmata on the poetry of Ovid is very

suspect when it relies on the evidence of the nature of

such exercises provided by rhetoricians writing in the

second, third and fourth centuries A.D.[26], since we

cannot be sure how similar (if at all) are the pro-

gymnasmata they set out to those practised in the schools

in Ovid's time or how much the rhetoricians were themselves

indebted to extant literature for their catalogues of

themes and exempla[27]. And second, all that we know from

Seneca about Ovid's declamation suggests that the

'rhetorical' elements which we find in his poetry are

due to the natural inclinations of his intellect rather

than to any formal training, for Seneca implies that for

the purposes of declamation Ovid actually had to restrain

his innate facility and gave free rein to it only in his

poetry, where his imagination could work unfettered[28].

---

26. E.g. Hermogenes, Theon, Aphthonius and Libanius.

27. The same uncertainty tends to undermine the generic
theories of Francis Cairns (Generic Composition in Greek
and Roman Poetry (Edinburgh 1972)), which also rely too
heavily on retrospective application of the principles of
the late Greek rhetoricians to the poetic composition of
earlier centuries. 'Generic' labels (see introduction to
1 below, p. 45, n. 11) are useful enough if they remain
descriptive (i.e. if they are made to function simply as
a shorthand mode of reference to certain themes and forms
common in ancient literature), but when they become almost
prescriptive, as they do in the work of Cairns, it is time
to question their acceptability.

28. Tum autem cum studeret habebatur (Ouidius) bonus
declamator ... (Con. ii. 2. 9) Verbis minime licenter usus
est nisi in carminibus, in ouibus non ignorauit uitia sua,
sed amauit (Con. ii. 2. 12). Cf. introduction to 2 and 7
below, p. 103 n. 45 and p. 331.

It seems much more likely that the style of utterance
which came naturally to Ovid made him into a good student
of rhetoric than that his declamatory training made him
into a rhetorical poet[29].

Just how successful a poet is Ovid in the Amores,
how appealing his humour and how effective his 'rhetoric',
will, of course, be for the individual reader to judge for
himself. Modern works of literary criticism alone will not
enable him to do so; he will need first a sound critical
text and a helpful commentary. With the former, at least,
he has generally been well provided over the last thirty
years or so. The high standards of textual scholarship on
Ovid's Amores established by Heinsius and Burman, whose
wisdom and sensibility we still ignore at our peril, have
been revived in the twentieth century by F. Munari and
E.J. Kenney, each of whom has produced a fine edition based
on meticulous collation of the MSS and careful study
of the tradition[30]; the recent discovery of the previously

---

29. Still the most sensible discussion of the whole
question is that of T.F. Higham, 'Ovid and Rhetoric',
Ovidiana 32-48.

30. F. Munari, P. Ouidi Nasonis Amores (Florence 1951, 5th
edn. 1970); E.J. Kenney, P. Ouidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina
Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris (Oxford 1961,
corrected edn. 1965). Kenney's edition prompted an important
review article by G.P. Goold: 'Amatoria Critica', HSCPh
69 (1965), 1-107.
For discussion of the MS tradition see S. Tafel, Die
Uberlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids carmina amatoria, (Diss.
Tübingen 1910), F.W. Lenz, 'Parerga Ouidiana', RAL, Classe
sc. morali s. 6, Vol. 13 (1938), 320-410, 'Die Wiederge-
winnung der von Heinsius benutzten Ovidhss. in den letzten
50 Jahren', Eranos 51 (1953), 66-88, F. Munari, 'Sugli Amores
di Ovidio', SIFC 23 (1948), 113-52, 'Codici heinsiani degli
Amores di Ovidio', SIFC 24 (1949), 161-5, 'Manoscritti
ovidiani di N. Heinsius', SIFC 29 (1957), 98-114, 265, L. Rosa
'Sulle varianti della tradizione manoscritta degli Amores di

unsuspected antiquity of the <u>codex Hamiltonensis</u> (<u>Y</u>)[31],

however, and its affiliation to the branch of the tradition

to which the other <u>antiquiores</u>, <u>P</u> and <u>S</u>, belong, has meant

that additions might be made to the apparatus of both.

The position is not so healthy when it comes to the

modern reader's other basic requirement - a commentary.

Only Book i of the <u>Amores</u> is catered for at all in English,

and that in a volume primarily intended for undergraduates[32],

while the best commentary covering all three books is

still Paul Brandt's, published in 1911[33], which is sadly

deficient on the literary side.   It is, therefore, in

the hope of helping to meet a real need that I offer the

present commentary on poems from Book ii.

Ovidio', <u>AFLN</u> 4 (1954), 41-60, E.J. Kenney, 'The Tradition
of Ovid's <u>Amores</u>', <u>CR</u> n.s. 5 (1955), 13-14, n.s. 7 (1957),
16, 'The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid's <u>Amores, Ars
Amatoria</u> and <u>Remedia Amoris</u>', <u>CQ</u> n.s. 12 (1962), 1-31,
R.P. Oliver, 'The text of Ovid's Amores' in <u>Classical
Studies presented to B.E. Perry</u> (Urbana 1969), 138-64.

31. See E.J. Kenney, 'First thoughts on the Hamiltonensis',
<u>CR</u> n.s. 16 (1966), 267-71, G. Perl, 'Ovids <u>Amores</u> im Codex
<u>Berolinensis</u> Hamilton 471 (Y)', <u>Philologus</u> 110 (1966),
268-76, F. Munari, <u>Il Codice Hamilton 471 di Ovidio</u>
(Rome 1965).

32. J.A. Barsby, <u>Ovid; Amores Book I</u> (Oxford 1973).

33. P. <u>Ovidi Nasonis Amorum Libri Tres</u> (Leipzig 1911,
reprinted, Hildesheim 1963).   The alternatives are not
impressive; Némethy (G. Némethy, <u>P. Ouidii Nasonis Amores</u>
(Budapest 1907)) and Harder-Marg (R. Harder and W. Marg,
<u>P. Ouidius Naso, Liebesgedichte. Amores</u> (Munich 1962, 3rd
edn. 1968) are jejune, and Lenz (F.W. Lenz, <u>Ovid, Die
Liebeselegien</u> (Berlin 1965, 3rd edition revised by M.G.
Lenz, 1976) is at times unbelievably silly.

My text with select apparatus criticus, intended
for use in conjunction with the notes in the commentary,
is essentially based on Kenney's corrected Oxford edition
of 1965; occasionally, however, I have supplemented it
with material from the apparatus to Munari's edition of
1970, and I have added documentation of the readings of
the Hamiltonensis (_Y_), using Munari's collations[34]. I
follow Kenney in using the significations α and β to denote
the two main branches of the MS tradition, i.e. the
antiquiores (PSY) and the manifold _recentiores_[35], and
the term _Itali_ with reference to readings found in late
renaissance MSS, which are probably to be attributed to
humanist conjecture; with regard to orthography, I
standardize to assimilated forms following G.P. Goold[36].
My commentary is as linguistic as it is literary, and I
think justifiably so, since Ovid's usage is neither as trite
nor as facile as is generally believed, but often bold and
inventive. For each poem (or pair of poems) I offer a
critical introduction and select bibliography to provide the
reader with a sample of views and opinions against which
to measure his own. My hope is simply that those who use
the commentary will feel closer to Ovid and enjoy him more.

---

34. _Il codice Hamilton 471 di Ovidio_ 19-56.

35. The use of the term β to denote the whole class of _recc._
is purely a convenience and not intended to suggest that
all the _recc._ descend from a single source (cf. E.J. Kenney,
The Classical Text (Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1974),
134. Perhaps it may also be noted here that the descent
of all our extant MSS of the _Amores_ from a single 'archetype'
which survived the Dark Ages seems unlikely (thus Kenney,
Man. Trad. 26, but cf. Goold, _Amat. Crit._ 3, id., AJP 86 (1965)
89, R.P. Oliver in _Studies presented to B.E. Perry_ 140ff.).

36. _Amat. Crit._ 9-11; cf. G. Luck, _Gnomon_ 35 (1963) 259.

S I G L A

Codices in uno quoque loco laudentur:

P = Parisinus Latinus 8242 (Puteaneus), saec. ix/x
   p = eiusdem manus secunda (saec. xi) uel tertia
     (saec. xii/xiii)
S = Sangallensis 864, saec. xi
Y = Berolinensis Hamiltonensis 471, saec. xi
   y = eiusdem manus secunda (saec. xi/xii) uel
     tertia (saec. xiii/xiv)
   Y^c = G. Pontani in eodem marginalia (saec. xv)

Hic illic aduocantur:

A_b = Londiniensis Mus. Brit. Add. 21169, saec. xiii
A_c = Londiniensis Mus. Brit. Add. 11975, saec. xiii
B = Bernensis 478, saec. xii/xiii
D = Diuionensis 497, saec. xiii ex.
E_a = Coll. Etonensis 91 (Bk. 6.18), saec. xiii
F = Francofurtanus Barth. 110, saec. xii/xiii
H = Londiniensis Mus. Brit. Add. 49368 (olim Holkhamicus
   322), saec. xiii
N = Neapolitanus Bibl. Nat. IV. F. 13 (Borb. 261),
   saec. xii/xiii
O_b = Oxoniensis Bibl. Bodl. Canon. class. Lat. 1,
   saec. xiii
P_a = Parisinus Latinus 7993, saec. xiii
P_b = Parisinus Latinus 7994, saec. xiii
P_c = Parisinus Latinus 7997, saec. xv
P_f = Parisinus Latinus 8430, saec. xiii
P_h = Parisinus Latinus 8245, saec. xiii
Q = Antuerpiensis Plant. Lat. 68, saec. xii/xiii
T = Turonensis 879, saec. xiii in.
V_a = Vaticanus Barb. Lat. 26, saec. xiii
V_b = Vaticanus Palat. Lat. 1655, saec. xiii
W = Perpinianensis 19, saec. xiii
X = Lipsiensis Rep. I, fol. 7, saec. xiii ex.
Z = Lentiensis 329, saec. xii/xiii

ω = codices praeter P̲p̲S̲Y̲y̲Y̲^{c} omnes uel plures

ς = eorundem aliquot uel pauci

Florilegia et excerpta

e̲ = Escorialensis Q. I. 14, saec. xiv in.

p̲$_1$= Parisinus Latinus 7647, saec. xii ex.

p̲$_3$= Parisinus Latinus 17903, saec. xiii

φ = horum consensus

p̲$_6$= Parisinus Latinus 8069, x/xi

exc. Put.= excerpta Puteani)

exc. Scal.= excerpta Scaligeri) ab Heinsio laudata

P. OVIDI NASONIS AMORVM
LIBER SECVNDVS

I

Hoc quoque composui Paelignis natus aquosis,

    ille ego nequitiae Naso poeta meae.

hoc quoque iussit Amor; procul hinc, procul este, seueri:

    non estis teneris apta theatra modis.

me legat in sponsi facie non frigida uirgo   5

    et rudis ignoto tactus amore puer;

atque aliquis iuuenum, quo nunc ego, saucius arcu

    agnoscat flammae conscia signa suae,

miratusque diu 'quo' dicat 'ab indice doctus

    composuit casus iste poeta meos?'   10

ausus eram, memini, caelestia dicere bella

    centimanumque Gygen - et satis oris erat -

cum male se Tellus ulta est ingestaque Olympo

    ardua deuexum Pelion Ossa tulit:

in manibus nimbos et cum Ioue fulmen habebam,   15

    quod bene pro caelo mitteret ille suo.

clausit amica fores: ego cum Ioue fulmen omisi;

    excidit ingenio Iuppiter ipse meo.

INCIPIT LIBER SECVNDVS (.II. S) PSY   I 3 seueri PSy
(om.Y)ω: seuerae ς 12 gygen (gi- Yω) PSYω: gigem ς:
gigan HPₐ: gigam ς: giam Heinsii Palatinus; id cum
Gyan exaequauisse uidetur D. Heinsius): Gyen Scaliger,
prob. Heinsius, sed dubitanter 15 in manibus nimbos
et ς: in manibus et PY: iuppiter in manibus et Syω:
in manibusque iouem B 17 fulmen omisi yς: fulmen
amisi PYDN² (ex -mina misit): fulmina misi pSω:
fulmen abiuit Eₐ

Iuppiter, ignoscas: nil me tua tela iuuabant;

   clausa tuo maius ianua fulmen habet.   20

blanditias elegosque leuis, mea tela, resumpsi:

   mollierunt duras lenia uerba fores.

carmina sanguineae deducunt cornua lunae

   et reuocant niueos solis euntis equos;

carmine dissiliunt abruptis faucibus angues   25

   inque suos fontes uersa recurrit aqua;

carminibus cessere fores, insertaque posti,

   quamuis robur erat, carmine uicta sera est.

quid mihi profuerit uelox cantatus Achilles?

   quid pro me Atrides alter et alter agent,   30

quique tot errando quot bello perdidit annos,

   raptus et Haemoniis flebilis Hector equis?

at facie tenerae laudata saepe puellae,

   ad uatem, pretium carminis, ipsa uenit.

magna datur merces.   heroum clara ualete   35

   nomina; non apta est gratia uestra mihi.

ad mea formosos uultus adhibete, puellae,

   carmina, purpureus quae mihi dictat Amor.

19 tela T, Itali uerba PSYς: bella yς   30 quid pro
me atrides ς: quid uero atrides ς: quidue romethides
(uel quidue rome thides ut censet Munari) P: quiduero
methides Y: et quid tytides S: quid pro me aiaces ς:
quid uero aiaces ς: quidue (-que ς) mihi aiaces Yᶜς
33 at facie (corr. ex -ies), cod. Romanus Casanatensis
3227 teste Munario, Heinsius: at (et H¹) facies
codd. cett. laudata PS¹ (-a eras.): laudate Yς:
ut laudata est ς: laudata est ς: laudataque Yᶜς
saepe puellae PSYω: semper amicae Yᶜ at facie tenerae
laudata edd. plerique Heinsium secuti: ut facies
tenerae laudatast Ehwald

II

Quem penes est dominam seruandi cura, Bagoe,
    dum perago tecum pauca, sed apta, uaca. .
hesterna uidi spatiantem luce puellam
    illa quae Danai porticus agmen habet.
protinus, ut placuit, misi scriptoque rogaui;   5
    rescripsit trepida 'non licet' illa manu,   ·
et cur non liceat quaerenti reddita causa est
    quod nimium dominae cura molesta tua est.
si sapis, o custos, odium, mihi crede, mereri
    desine: quem metuit quisque, perisse cupit.   10
uir quoque non sapiens: quid enim seruare laboret
    unde nihil, quamuis non tueare, perit?
sed gerat ille suo morem furiosus amori
    et castum multis quod placet esse putet;
huic furtiua tuo libertas munere detur,   15
    quam dederis illi reddat ut illa tibi.
conscius esse uelis? domina est obnoxia seruo –
    conscius esse times? dissimulare licet.
scripta leget secum: matrem misisse putato;
    uenerit ignotus: postmodo notus erit;   20

II SVASORIVM AD SE P praecedenti continuat Y
(separauit y) 1 dominam seruandi PSYω: dominae
seruandae ς   bagoe PSω: bagoge Y (-oge in ras.y)ς:
Bagoa Kenney, fortasse recte   5 misi scriptoque
(missis Y, corr. y) PSYς: misso scriptoque ς: misi
noctemque ς   10 perisse PSYς: perire ς   11 laboret
PSς: laborat Yς: labores ς: laboras TZ   18-27 om.
PSY; add. in marg. p, in ima pag. Y^C   19 misisse
pTZ: scripsisse Y^Cω   20 erit pY^Cς: eat ω

ibit ad affectam quae non languebit amicam:

  uisat; iudiciis aegra sit illa tuis.

si faciet tarde, ne te mora longa fatiget,

  imposita gremio stertere fronte potes.

nec tu linigeram fieri quid possit ad Isin   25

  quaesieris, nec tu curua theatra time.

conscius assiduos commissi tollet honores:

  quis minor est autem quam tacuisse labor?

ille placet uersatque domum neque uerbera sentit,

  ille potens; alii, sordida turba, iacent.   30

huic, uerae ut lateant, causae finguntur inanes,

  atque ambo domini, quod probat una, probant.

cum bene uir traxit uultum rugasque coegit,

  quod uoluit fieri blanda puella facit.

sed tamen interdum tecum quoque iurgia nectat   35

  et simulet lacrimas carnificemque uocet;

tu contra obicies quae tuto diluat illa;

  tu ueris falso crimine deme fidem.

21 affectam ω: afflictam pY^{c}ς: effetam (-ectam $\underline{V}_{b}$)
$\underline{NV}_{b}$ 22 uisat iudiciis ς: uisaque iudiciis $\underline{P}_{a}\underline{P}_{c}$: uisa
et iudiciis $\underline{X}$: uisat et indiciis pY^{c}ω: uisere; iudiciis
Heinsius 23-4 seclusit Kenney, sed iniuria, ut opinor
25 linigeram ed. Ald. 1502, exc. Put., Heinsii unus
Moreti: lanigeram pY^{c}ω: niligenam $\underline{Q}$ Isin Heinsius:
isim codd. 30 potens alii $\underline{PY}$ς: potens dominae $\underline{S}$ω:
placet dominae ς sordida turba iacent $\underline{PSY}$ς: sordida
turba iacet ς: cetera turba iacet ω 31 finguntur $\underline{P}$ς:
fingentur $\underline{SyA}_{c}\underline{T}$: fingantur ς: fingunt $\underline{Y}$ inanes p$\underline{S}$yω:
honores $\underline{PYD}$ 37 obicies (ab- $\underline{Y}$, corr. $\underline{y}$) $\underline{PSY}$ω: obiciens
Itali, prob. Heinsius 38 tu ueris falso Kenney elegan-
tissime, sed res non omnino certa est: et ueri falso $\underline{P}_{c}$:
et ueri in falso $\underline{T}$: in ueri falso $\underline{A}_{c}\underline{B}$: in uerum falso
(inuerum $\underline{Y}$) $\underline{PY}$ς: in uero falso p$\underline{S}$ω: in falso uero ς:
in falso ueri $\underline{E}_{a}\underline{V}_{b}$: in falso uerum $\underline{W}$: i ueris falso
Heinsius: et ueris falso Ehwald: in ueris falso $\underline{Magnus}$

sic tibi semper honos, sic alta peculia crescent;

    haec fac, in exiguo tempore liber eris. 40

aspicis indicibus nexas per colla catenas?

    squalidus orba fide pectora carcer habet.

quaerit aquas in aquis et poma fugacia captat

    Tantalus: hoc illi garrula lingua dedit;

dum nimium seruat custos Iunonius Io, 45

    ante suos annos occidit; illa dea est.

uidi ego compedibus liuentia crura gerentem

    unde uir incestum scire coactus erat;

poena minor merito. nocuit mala lingua duobus:

    uir doluit, famae damna puella tulit. 50

crede mihi, nulli sunt crimina grata marito,

    nec quemquam, quamuis audiat, illa iuuant:

seu tepet, indicium securas perdis ad aures;

    siue amat, officio fit miser ille tuo.

culpa nec ex facili quamuis manifesta probatur; 55

    iudicis illa sui tuta fauore uenit.

uiderit ipse licet, credet tamen ille neganti

    damnabitque oculos et sibi uerba dabit.

aspiciat dominae lacrimas, plorabit et ipse

    et dicet 'poenas garrulus iste dabit!' 60

quid dispar certamen inis? tibi uerbera uicto

    adsunt, in gremio iudicis illa sedet.

39 alta PSYω: orta D peculia PYς: pecunia Syω
crescent (-ant y) PSYDF: crescet ω: crescit ς
40 fac in PY: face in V$_a$: facis Sς: face, fac,
face et, fac et ω 45 iō ω: ion PSYς 53 perdis
PSYω: prodis cod. Oxon. Bodl. Auct. F. I. 17, teste
Munario 54 officio PSYς: indicio ς 59 aspiciat
PSY: aspiciet pyω

non scelus aggredimur, non ad miscenda coimus

    toxica, non stricto fulminat ense manus;

quaerimus ut tuto per te possimus amare: 65

    quid precibus nostris mollius esse potest?

III

Ei mihi, quod dominam nec uir nec femina seruas,

    mutua nec Veneris gaudia nosse potes.

qui primus pueris genitalia membra recidit,

    uulnera quae fecit debuit ipse pati.

mollis in obsequium facilisque rogantibus esses,   5

    si tuus in quauis praetepuisset amor.

non tu natus equo, non fortibus utilis armis,

    bellica non dextrae conuenit hasta tuae.

ista mares tractent; tu spes depone uiriles:

    sunt tibi cum domina signa ferenda tua.   10

hanc imple meritis, huius tibi gratia prosit;

    si careas illa, quis tuus usus erit?

est etiam facies, sunt apti lusibus anni;

    indigna est pigro forma perire situ.

fallere te potuit, quamuis habeare molestus: 15

    non caret effectu quod uoluere duo.

III   ad eunuchum custodem dominae P (litt. grand) Sς
praecedenti continuat Y (separauit y) cod. Hauniensis
Bibl. Reg. Ny Kςl. Saml. 219b; re uera cum ea con-
iungendam censuerunt Scaliger, Bentleius, edd. nonnulli
recc.   6 quauis PYς: quamuis Sς   9 tractent PSYς:
tractant ς

aptius at fuerit precibus temptasse: rogamus,

   dum bene ponendi munera tempus habes.

IV

Non ego mendosos ausim defendere mores

   falsaque pro uitiis arma mouere meis.

confiteor, si quid prodest delicta fateri;

   in mea nunc demens crimina fassus eo.

odi, nec possum,cupiens,non esse quod odi;   5

   heu, quam, quae studeas ponere, ferre graue est!

nam desunt uires ad me mihi iusque regendum;

   auferor ut rapida concita puppis aqua.

non est certa meos quae forma inuitet amores:

   centum sunt causae cur ego semper amem.   10

siue aliqua est oculos in se deiecta modestos,

   uror, et insidiae sunt pudor ille meae;

siue procax aliqua est, capior quia rustica non est

   spemque dat in molli mobilis esse toro;

17 aptius at fuerit <u>Heinsius</u>: aptius ut fuerit (fuerat
<u>N</u>, fieret $\underline{Y^c H}$) PSω: aptus erait fuerit $\underline{Y}$ temptasse
<u>PSY</u>ω: temptare $\underline{Y^c O}_b$ rogamus <u>PSY</u>ω: rogabo $\underline{Y^c}$
IV ad se quod mult$\bar{a}$s amet <u>P</u> (<u>litt. grand.</u>) $\underline{V_a F}$ (de se)
<u>Z</u> (ad se <u>om.</u>): ad se quod multas amicas ⟨hab$\bar{e}$at⟩ <u>S</u>
<u>praecedenti continuat</u> <u>Y</u>, <u>separauit</u> <u>y</u>   5 non esse $\underline{Y^c \varsigma \varphi}$:
non nosse <u>PSY</u>ς: odisse ς: non odisse $\underline{A_c V_a}$ 9 inuitet
<u>PSY</u>ω: irritet <u>y</u> <u>uel</u> $\underline{Y^c}$ <u>in marg.</u>, $\underline{E_a}$, <u>prob.</u> Heinsius
11 in se ς, <u>prob. Heinsius</u>: in me PSYω: in humum
<u>Timpanaro, olim Heinsius dubitanter</u>

aspera si uisa est rigidasque imitata Sabinas,   15

    uelle sed ex alto dissimulare puto;

siue es docta, places raras dotata per artes;

    siue rudis, placita es simplicitate tua.

est quae Callimachi prae nostris rustica dicat

    carmina: cui placeo, protinus ipsa placet;   20

est etiam quae me uatem et mea carmina culpet:

    culpantis cupiam sustinuisse femur.

molliter incedit: motu capit; altera dura est;

    at poterit tacto mollior esse uiro.

haec quia dulce canit flectitque facillima uocem,   25

    oscula cantanti rapta dedisse uelim;

haec querulas habili percurrit pollice chordas:

    tam doctas quis non possit amare manus?

illa placet gestu numerosaque bracchia ducit

    et tenerum molli torquet ab arte latus: 30

ut taceam de me, qui causa tangor ab omni,

    illic Hippolytum pone, Priapus erit.

tu, quia tam longa es, ueteres heroidas aequas

    et potes in toto multa iacere toro;

17 es ... places (-ges $\underline{PY}$, $\underline{corr.}$ $\underline{y}$) $\underline{PSY\varsigma}$: est ... placet ω   18 placita (-da $\underline{H}$) es $\underline{A_bH}$: placita est $\underline{P_aV_b}$: places ($\underline{eras.}$ $\underline{Y}$) $\underline{PY}$: placeas $\underline{pSP_h}$[1] ($\underline{ut}$ Kenneio uid.): placeat $\underline{X}$: capior $\underline{y}$ ($\underline{in\ ras.}$) ω: tua $\underline{PSY\varsigma}$: sua ω: mea $\underline{D}$ 23 incedit ω: incessit $\underline{PSY\varsigma}$ 23-4 dura est ... mollior esse $\underline{codd.}$: dure ... mollius isse Heinsius (ire $\underline{Bentleius}$)   24 at $\underline{PY}$ω: ac $\underline{N}$: sed $\underline{SO_bX}$: et $\underline{BH}$ 25 haec $\underline{codd.}$: huic Heinsius, fortasse recte   27 habili $\underline{PSY}$ω: agili $\underline{Y^c\varsigma}$ $\underline{probb.}$ Heinsius, Burmannus   33 longa es ($\underline{non\ dist.}$ $\underline{Y}$, $\underline{corr.}$ $\underline{y}$) $\underline{PY}$ω: longas $\underline{S}$

haec habilis breuitate sua est: corrumpor utraque;   35

   conueniunt uoto longa breuisque meo.

non est culta: subit quid cultae accedere possit;

   ornata est: dotes exhibet ipsa suas.

candida me capiet, capiet me flaua puella;

   est etiam in fusco grata colore uenus.   40

seu pendent niuea pulli ceruice capilli,

   Leda fuit nigra conspicienda coma;

seu flauent, placuit croceis Aurora capillis:

   omnibus historiis se meus aptat amor.

me noua sollicitat, me tangit serior aetas: ·45

   haec melior specie, moribus illa placet.

denique quas tota quisquam probat Vrbe puellas,

   noster in has omnis ambitiosus amor.

<div align="center">V</div>

Nullus amor tanti est - abeas, pharetrate Cupido! -

   ut mea sint totiens maxima uota mori.

uota mori mea sunt, cum te peccasse recordor,

   o mihi perpetuum nata puella malum.

39 capiet semel tantum PY (add. y)   46 moribus
V‚W: corporis PSYω   placet (eras. Y) PSYω: sapit y
(in ras) ς   47 probat PSYω: probet ς
V   ad amicam corruptam S   3 peccasse pSYω: peccare
P   4 o Q, Itali, probb, Heinsius, Bentleius: ei
PSYω: in Ker

non mihi deceptae nudant tua facta tabellae   5

   non data furtiue munera crimen habent.

o utinam arguerem sic ut non uincere possem!

   me miserum, quare tam bona-causa mea est?

felix, qui quod amat defendere fortiter audet,

   cui sua 'non feci' dicere amica potest!   10

ferreus est nimiumque suo fauet ille dolori,

   cui petitur uicta palma cruenta rea.

ipse miser uidi, cum me dormire putares,

   sobrius apposito crimina uestra mero.

multa supercilio uidi uibrante loquentes;   15

   nutibus in uestris pars bona uocis erat.

non oculi tacuere tui conscriptaque uino

   mensa, nec in digitis littera nulla fuit.

sermonem agnoui, quod non uideatur, agentem

   uerbaque pro certis iussa ualere notis.   20

iamque frequens ierat mensa conuiua relicta;

   compositi iuuenes unus et alter erant:

improba tum uero iungentes oscula uidi

   (illa mihi lingua nexa fuisse liquet),

5 mihi deceptae PSYω: mihi decepto ς: mihi delatae H: mihi deletae Heinsii optimus Palatinus (Vat. Pal. Lat. 910): male deletae uel interceptae uel mi interceptae Heinsius, alii alia

qualia non fratri tulerit germana seuero,   25

    sed tulerit cupido mollis amica uiro;

qualia credibile est non Phoebo ferre Dianam,

    sed Venerem Marti saepe tulisse suo.

'quid facis?' exclamo 'quo nunc mea gaudia defers?

    iniciam dominas in mea iura manus.   30

haec tibi sunt mecum, mihi sunt communia tecum:

    in bona cur quisquam tertius ista uenit?'

haec ego, quaeque dolor linguae dictauit; at illi

    conscia purpureus uenit in ora pudor.

quale coloratum Tithoni coniuge caelum   35

    subrubet, aut sponso uisa puella nouo;

quale rosae fulgent inter sua lilia mixtae

    aut, ubi cantatis, Luna, laborat equis;

aut quod, ne longis flauescere possit ab annis,

    Maeonis Assyrium femina tinxit ebur: 40

his erat aut alicui color ille simillimus horum,

    et numquam casu pulchrior illa fuit.

27 Phoebo ... Dianam Bentleius: phoebum ...
dianae codd.   29 defers ς, exc. Scal.: differs
PSYω 34 pudor PSYω: rubor Y^cς 41 his PSYω:
is ς: hic ς alicui FP$_b$P^2_c (in ras.): aliqui
PYA$_c$: aliquis Syω 42 casu codd.: uisu
Housman

spectabat terram: terram spectare decebat;

    maesta erat in uultu: maesta decenter erat.

sicut erant (et erant culti) laniare capillos   45

    et fuit in teneras impetus ire genas;

ut faciem uidi, fortes cecidere lacerti:

    defensa est armis nostra puella suis.

qui modo saeuus eram, supplex ultroque rogaui

    oscula ne nobis deteriora daret.   50

risit et ex animo dedit optima, qualia possent

    excutere irato tela trisulca Ioui.

torqueor infelix, ne tam bona senserit alter,

    et uolo non ex hac illa fuisse nota.

haec quoque quam docui multo meliora fuerunt,   55

    et quiddam uisa est addidicisse noui.

quod nimium placuere malum est, quod tota labellis

    lingua tua est nostris, nostra recepta tuis.

nec tamen hoc unum doleo, non oscula tantum

    iuncta queror, quamuis haec quoque iuncta queror: 60

illa nisi in lecto nusquam potuere doceri;

    nescioquis pretium grande magister habet.

51 optima P̲Y̲ς: oscula S̲ω   53 senserit P̲S̲y̲ω:
senserat Y̲: sumpserit P̲_c, exc. Put., Scal., prob.
Heinsius

VI

Psittacus, Eois imitatrix ales ab Indis,

   occidit: exsequias ite frequenter, aues.

ite, piae uolucres, et plangite pectora pinnis

   et rigido teneras ungue notate genas;

horrida pro maestis lanietur pluma capillis,   5

   pro longa resonent carmina uestra tuba.

quod scelus Ismarii quereris, Philomela, tyranni,

   expleta est annis ista querela suis;

alitis in rarae miserum deuertere funus:

   magna sed antiqua est causa doloris Itys.   10

omnes quae liquido libratis in aere cursus,

   tu tamen ante alios, turtur amice, dole.

plena fuit uobis omni concordia uita

   et stetit ad finem longa tenaxque fides:

quod fuit Argolico iuuenis Phoceus Orestae,   15

   hoc tibi, dum licuit, psittace, turtur erat.

quid tamen ista fides, quid rari forma coloris,

   quid uox mutandis ingeniosa sonis,

VI psitaci alitis epitaphium P (ut Kenneio uid.;
litt. grand.) SD (e. p. a.)   1 imitatrix ales PSς:
ales mihi missus ω: ales transmissus y (in ras., Y
incert.) ς   ab indis PSYς: ab undis N² (ex oris) O_b:
ab oris ς   2 ite PSYς: ferte Y^c-ω   6 uestra PSYω:
nostra Heinsii Arondelianus unusque Mediceus   7 quod
PSNW¹ (ut Kenneio uid.): quid Yω   8 annis yω: animis
PSYς: numeris Bentleius   suis ς: tuis PSYς   9 de-
uertere Heinsius: deuertite (-ice Y) PYς: diuertite Sς
11 libratis P (ut Kenneio uid.) SYς: uibratis ς   cursus
PSω: pennas (-is Y, -as y) Yς   12 alios PSYς: alias ς
15 orestae PYN: oresti Sω

quid iuuat, ut datus es, nostrae placuisse puellae?

    infelix auium gloria nempe iaces.   20

tu poteras fragiles pinnis hebetare smaragdos

    tincta gerens rubro Punica rostra croco.

non fuit in terris uocum simulantior ales:

    reddebas blaeso tam bene uerba sono.

raptus es inuidia: non tu fera bella mouebas;   25

    garrulus et placidae pacis amator eras.

ecce, coturnices inter sua proelia uiuunt,

    forsitan et fiant inde frequenter anus.

plenus eras minimo, nec prae sermonis amore

    in multos poterant ora uacare cibos: 30

nux erat esca tibi causaeque papauera somni,

    pellebatque sitim simplicis umor aquae.

uiuit edax uultur ducensque per aera gyros

    miluus et pluuiae graculus auctor aquae;

uiuit et armiferae cornix inuisa Mineruae,   35

    illa quidem saeclis uix moritura nouem.

occidit ille loquax humanae uocis imago

    psittacus, extremo munus ab orbe datum.

---

21 fragiles P̲S̲Y̲ω: uirides N̲   25-32 u̲e̲r̲s̲u̲u̲m̲ o̲r̲d̲o̲
u̲a̲r̲i̲e̲ t̲e̲m̲p̲t̲a̲t̲u̲s̲,̲ s̲e̲d̲ f̲r̲u̲s̲t̲r̲a̲   27 sua P̲S̲Y̲ω: fera ς
28 fiant P̲Y̲: fiunt ω: fient S̲ς   30 poterant S̲y̲ς:
poteras P̲Y̲ς, f̲o̲r̲t̲a̲s̲s̲e̲ r̲e̲c̲t̲e̲   33 ducensque D̲F̲, I̲t̲a̲l̲i̲:
ducitque P̲S̲Y̲ω   34 miluus (miluius y̲ς) et P̲Y̲ς: miluus
et est (et in H̲) S̲A̲ H̲N̲V̲ graculus (grag- P̲Y̲, c̲o̲r̲r̲.
y̲) P̲Y̲ς: garrulus S̲ς   37 ille ς: illa P̲S̲Y̲ω

optima prima fere manibus rapiuntur auaris;

    implentur numeris deteriora suis: 40

tristia Phylacidae Thersites funera uidit

    iamque cinis uiuis fratribus Hector erat.

quid referam timidae pro te pia uota puellae,

    uota procelloso per mare rapta Noto?

septima lux uenit non exhibitura sequentem,   45

    et stabat uacuo iam tibi Parca colo;

nec tamen ignauo stupuerunt uerba palato:

    clamauit moriens lingua 'Corinna, uale.'

colle sub Elysio nigra nemus ilice frondet

    udaque perpetuo gramine terra uiret.   50

si qua fides dubiis, uolucrum locus ille piarum

    dicitur, obscenae quo prohibentur aues:

illic innocui late pascuntur olores

    et uiuax phoenix, unica semper auis;

explicat ipsa suas ales Iunonia pinnas,   55

    oscula dat cupido blanda columba mari.

psittacus has inter nemorali sede receptus

    conuertit uolucres in sua uerba pias.

39 manibus om. S, habent PYω: Parcis Müller
auaris PSYω: amaris cod. Vat. Lat. 1602, teste
Munario: auernis Heinsius: ab atris Baehrens
46 uacuo PSYς: uacua ω 55 ipsa suas ales
(ales om. S) PSyς: uasales ipsas Y: atque
suas ales ς

ossa tegit tumulus, tumulus pro corpore magnus,

   quo lapis exiguus par sibi carmen habet: 60

COLLIGOR EX IPSO DOMINAE PLACVISSE SEPVLCRO.

   ORA FVERE MIHI PLVS AVE DOCTA LOQVI.

VII

Ergo sufficiam reus in noua crimina semper?

   ut uincam, totiens dimicuisse piget.

siue ego marmorei respexi summa theatri,

   eligis e multis unde dolere uelis;

candida seu tacito uidit me femina uultu,   5

   in uultu tacitas arguis esse notas;

si quam laudaui, miseros petis ungue capillos,

   si culpo, crimen dissimulare putas;

siue bonus color est, in te quoque frigidus esse,

   seu malus, alterius dicor amore mori.   10

atque ego peccati uellem mihi conscius essem:

   aequo animo poenam, qui meruere, ferunt.

nunc temere insimulas credendoque omnia frustra

   ipsa uetas iram pondus habere tuam:

aspice, ut auritus miserandae sortis asellus   15

   adsiduo domitus uerbere lentus eat.

VII AD AMOREM ANCILLE PELICES **P**: ad amorem ancille
pelicis uel excusatio ancille ad dominam **S**: excusacio
amoris ancille **D**: excusacio amoris ancille ad dominam
F: excusatio ancille **Z**   1 ergo PSYϛ: ergo ego yω
7 miseros yω: misero PSY   8 culpo yω: cui pro
PY: cui do Sϛ   11 essem PSYϛ: esse ω

ecce, nouum crimen: sollers ornare Cypassis

    obicitur dominae contemerasse torum.

di melius, quam me, si sit peccasse libido,

    sordida contemptae sortis amica iuuet!   20

quis Veneris famulae conubia liber inire

    tergaque complecti uerbere secta uelit?

adde quod ornandis illa est operosa capillis

    et tibi per doctas grata ministra manus:

scilicet ancillam, quae tam tibi fida, rogarem?   25

    quid, nisi ut indicio iuncta repulsa foret?

per Venerem iuro puerique uolatilis arcus

    me non admissi criminis esse reum.

VIII

Ponendis in mille modos perfecta capillis,

    comere sed solas digna Cypassi deas,

et mihi iucundo non rustica cognita furto,

    apta quidem dominae, sed magis apta mihi,

17 nouum crimen sollers ornare PSYϛ: tuum sollers
caput exornare ϛ   19 si sit Itali, Naugerius:
sic sit PSYω peccasse PSYω: peccare ϛ   23 ornandis
ω: ornatis PSYϛ operosa ω: operata PSYN   24 per
doctas ω: perdocta est PSY, unde perdocta ... manu
Heinsius, alii alia   25 quae tam ω, probb. Naugerius,
Heinsius: quae sit BE$_a$: quierat (qui erat Y) PY,
unde quod erat y, Kenney, quia erat Palmer: quae erat Sϛ
VIII ad ancillam cuius stuprum sensit amica P (litt.
grand.) Y (in marg. dextro) P$_h$V$_a$ (domina pro amica)

quis fuit inter nos sociati corporis index?   5

  sensit concubitus unde Corinna tuos?

num tamen erubui?   num uerbo lapsus in ullo

  furtiuae Veneris conscia signa dedi?

quid quod, in ancilla si quis delinquere possit,

  illum ego contendi mente carere bona?   10

Thessalus ancillae facie Briseidos arsit,

  serua Mycenaeo Phoebas amata duci:

nec sum ego Tantalide maior nec maior Achille;

  quod decuit reges, cur mihi turpe putem?

ut tamen iratos in te defixit ocellos,   15

  uidi te totis erubuisse genis.

at quanto, si forte refers, praesentior ipse

  per Veneris feci numina magna fidem!

(tu, dea, tu iubeas animi periuria puri

  Carpathium tepidos per mare ferre Notos.)   20

pro quibus officiis pretium mihi dulce repende

  concubitus hodie, fusca Cypassi, tuos.

quid renuis fingisque nouos, ingrata, timores?

  unum est e dominis emeruisse satis.

quod si stulta negas, index ante acta fatebor   25

  et ueniam culpae proditor ipse meae,

quoque loco tecum fuerim quotiensque, Cypassi,

  narrabo dominae quotque quibusque modis.

7 num S: nam P_f: nunc P: nec D: non Yω num PSY:
num(ero collapsus in ullo) H: nec ω: non ς 9 ancilla
PSYς: ancillam ω 13 nec sum ego PSYς: non sum ego ς:
non sum ω: non ego ς. 19 puri PY, Heinsii Arondelianus:
nostri Sω 24 emeruisse PSY (domini semeruisse Y,
corr. y) ς: promeruisse ς: demeruisse W

IX (A)

O numquam pro me satis indignate Cupido,

   o in corde meo desidiose puer,

quid me, qui miles numquam tua signa reliqui,

   laedis, et in castris uulneror ipse meis?

cur tua fax urit, figit tuus arcus amicos?   5

   gloria pugnantes uincere maior erat.

quid? non Haemonius, quem cuspide perculit, heros

   confossum medica postmodo iuuit ope?

uenator sequitur fugientia, capta relinquit,

   semper et inuentis ulteriora petit.   10

nos tua sentimus, populus tibi deditus, arma;

   pigra reluctanti cessat in hoste manus.

quid iuuat in nudis hamata retundere tela

   ossibus? ossa mihi nuda reliquit amor.

tot sine amore uiri, tot sunt sine amore puellae: 15

   hinc tibi cum magna laude triumphus eat.

Roma, nisi immensum uires promosset in orbem,

   stramineis esset nunc quoque tecta casis.

fessus in acceptos miles deducitur agros,

   mittitur in saltus carcere liber equus,   20

IX   ad amorem P (litt. grand.) Y (-re, in marg. dextro)
SZ   1-2 uersus uix satis explicati   1 pro me ...
indignate PSYω: per me ... indignate ς: pro re ...
indignate Burmannus: pro re ... indignande Madvig:
per me ... indignande Hall; nil omnino placet
2 desidiose codd.: seditiose Hall, fortasse recte
4 meis PSYς: tuis ω   8 confossum (conp- P)PSYς:
confessum ς: cum petiit ς   14 reliquit Yω: relinquit
PSV_b   17-18 seclusit Bentleius   17 promosset Ysφ:
promouisset PB: mouisset Sω: misisset Q

longaque subductam celant naualia pinum,

tutaque deposito poscitur ense rudis:

me quoque, qui totiens merui sub amore puellae,

defunctum placide uiuere tempus erat.

IX (B)

'Viue' deus 'posito' si quis mihi dicat 'amore',   25

deprecer: usque adeo dulce puella malum est.

cum bene pertaesum est, animoque relanguit ardor,

nescioquo miserae turbine mentis agor.

ut rapit in praeceps dominum spumantia frustra   (5)

frena retentantem durior oris equus,   30

ut subitus prope iam prensa tellure carinam

tangentem portus uentus in alta rapit,

sic me saepe refert incerta Cupidinis aura

notaque purpureus tela resumit Amor.   (10)

21 pinum PSçp₁p₃: puppim çe: de Y incert.   22 cum
20 commutant çφ   23-4 amore puellae defunctum codd.,
puellae fortasse ex u. 15 oriundum: Amore, periclo
(periclis iam Bentleius) defunctum Goold: Amore, puella
defunctum Burmannus, puella uel ablatiuo uel uocatiuo
casu intellegens: Amore, duello defunctum Markland .
25 nouam elegiam incipere censuit L. Müller, quem
secuti sunt edd. plerique   27 animoque PSYV_b:
animique yω relanguit Itali, Heinsius ex P (ut illi
uisum est) et Arondeliano: resan/uit (resannuit Y,
n pr. exp. y)PY: reuanuit Syω: euanuit ç   31 prensa
PSYω: pressa ç

fige, puer: positis nudus tibi praebeor armis;   35

   hic tibi sunt uires, hic tua dextra facit,

huc tamquam iussae ueniunt iam sponte sagittae;

   uix illis prae me nota pharetra sua est.

infelix, tota quicumque quiescere nocte   (15)

   sustinet et somnos praemia magna uocat!   40

stulte, quid est somnus gelidae nisi mortis imago?

   longa quiescendi tempora fata dabunt.

me modo decipiant uoces fallacis amicae

   (sperando certe gaudia magna feram),   (20)

et modo blanditias dicat, modo iurgia nectat;   45

   saepe fruar domina, saepe repulsus eam.

quod dubius Mars est, per te, priuigne Cupido, est,

   et mouet exemplo uitricus arma tuo;

tu leuis es multoque tuis uentosior alis   (25)

   gaudiaque ambigua dasque negasque fide.   50

si tamen exaudis pulchra cum matre, Cupido,

   indeserta meo pectore regna gere;

accedant regno, nimium uaga turba, puellae;

   ambobus populis sic uenerandus eris.   (30)

36 hic ... hic codd.: hic ... huc Heinsius: hic ...
hac Luck facit (eras. Y)PSΥς: ualet y (in ras.)ς
37 huc Yω: hic PSA$_b$(N)E$_a$ 38 sua PSΥς: tua ς
44 parenthesi inclusit Francius   45 nectat PSΥω:
quaerat p (u.l.)ς 51 cupido PSΥω: rogantem p
(u.l.)   52 gere PYω: geret S: geras T: geris
FV$_b$: gerem O$_b$: rege p (u.l.)P$_c$(u.l.) Q: tene Itali,
prob. Heinsius

X

Tu mihi, tu certe, memini, Graecine, negabas

    uno posse aliquem tempore amare duas.

per te ego decipior, per te deprensus inermis

    ecce duas uno tempore turpis amo.

utraque formosa est, operosae cultibus ambae,   5

    artibus in dubio est haec sit an illa prior;

pulchrior hac illa est, haec est quoque pulchrior illa,

    et magis haec nobis et magis illa placet.

erro uelut uentis discordibus acta phaselos,

    diuiduumque tenent alter et alter amor.   10

quid geminas, Erycina, meos sine fine dolores?

    non erat in curas una puella satis?

quid folia arboribus, quid pleno sidera caelo,

    in freta collectas alta quid addis aquas?

sed tamen hoc melius quam si sine amore iacerem: 15

    hostibus eueniat uita seuera meis;

hostibus eueniat uiduo dormire cubili

    et medio laxe ponere membra toro.

at mihi saeuus Amor somnos abrumpat inertes

    simque mei lecti non ego solus onus;   20

X   quod duae (dñe S) simul amentur P (litt. grand.) SZ
3 ego om. Sς: habent PYω   4 turpis (eras. Y) PSYς:
solus y (in ras.)ω   7 hac ... haec ς: haec ... haec
PSYω: haec ... hac ς   9 erro uelut Camps: errant ut
PSYς: errat et ut ς: errat ut a P_b: errat ut in Z:
erramus Führer audacter: auferor uͭ Bentleius   17 uiduo
(b-P)PYς: uacuo pSyω   18 laxe (-xo S) PSYς: late pω

me mea disperdat nullo prohibente puella,

    si satis una potest, si minus una, duae,

sufficiam: graciles, non sunt sine uiribus artus;

    pondere, non neruis, corpora nostra carent.

et lateri dabit in uires alimenta uoluptas: 25

    decepta est opera nulla puella mea;

saepe ego lasciue consumpsi tempora noctis,

    utilis et forti corpore mane fui.

felix quem Veneris certamina mutua perdunt;

    di faciant, leti causa sit ista mei!   30

induat aduersis contraria pectora telis

    miles et aeternum sanguine nomen emat;

quaerat auarus opes, et quae lassarit arando,

    aequora periuro naufragus ore bibat;

at mihi contingat Veneris languescere motu,   35

    cum moriar, medium soluar et inter opus;

atque aliquis nostro lacrimans in funere dicat

    'conueniens uitae mors fuit ista tuae.'

23 sufficiam PY: sufficiant Sω: sufficiunt ς:
sufficient H 27 lasciue Pω: lasciuae SYP_cZ
consumpsi tempora PSYς: consumpto tempore ς
29 perdunt PYω, prob. Heinsius: rumpunt pSς
33 lassarit PYω: lassarat Sς: lassauit pHφ
arando Y, Heinsius ex arundo P: eundo pSωφ

[B. Otis, TAPhA 69 (1938), 194-211 (German version in
Wege zu Ovid (Wege der Forschung 92), ed. M. von Albrecht
and E. Zinn (Darmstadt 1968), 233-54); D. Korzeniewski,
'Ovids elegisches Proömium', Hermes 92 (1964), 182-213,
especially 189-91; G. Luck, 'Der Dichter zwischen Elegie
und Epos' in Antike Lyrik, ed. W. Eisenhut (Darmstadt 1970),
464-79; K. Morgan, Ovid's Art of Imitation: Propertius
in the Amores, Mnemosyne, Suppl. 47 (Leiden 1977), 12-17;
R. Neumann, Qua ratione Ouidius in Amoribus scribendis
Properti elegiis usus sit (Diss. Göttingen 1919), 47-9;
E. Reitzenstein, 'Das neue Kunstwollen in den Amores
Ovids', RhM 84 (1935), 62-86 (= Wege zu Ovid 206-32),
especially 77-81; Stroh 149-54; W. Wimmel, Kallimachos
in Rom, Hermes Einzelschriften 16 (Wiesbaden 1960), 303-5]

An elegiac manifesto. After presenting his poetic
credentials (1-2), Ovid specifies the section of the public
at which his work is aimed, i.e. the young (3-10); then
he recounts how he abandoned an epic on the battle of the
giants and the gods when he found that it had a disastrous
effect on his love-life and returned to writing elegy,
which immediately remedied the situation (11-22); this
leads to a brief eulogy of the power of carmina (23-8),
followed by a return to the theme of contrast between the
effectiveness of epic and elegy in the cause of love (29-36),
and, finally, a restatement of the nature of the poetry which
is to come, with a particular invitation to the puellae
of Rome to give it their attention (37-8).

The classical practice of announcing theme and intent
at the beginning of a poem or collection of poems in
essence dates back to the Homeric epics[1], and the poet's

---

1. Il. i. 1-2 Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω ᾿Αχιλῆος /
οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρί᾽ ᾿Αχαιοῖς ἄλγε᾽ ἔθηκε, Od. i. 1-2
῎Ανδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλά /
πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ῾ιερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε. See
further Korzeniewski, art. cit. 182.

claim to direct divine mandate has a similarly long
history[2], as too does his pose as the servant or priest
of the commissioning deity or deities[3]. These ancient
traditions, it seems, culminated,in the Augustan period,
in the 'programmatic' poem or passage with a profoundly
religious flavour[4]. The sacerdotal, or rather mock-
sacerdotal, element in the opening lines of the present
elegy is clearly perceptible and has duly been remarked
upon by Korzeniewski[5] and Luck[6], line 3, especially,
exciting comment because of its Callimachean and Vergilian
associations[7]. But unless I am mistaken, there is a
particularly close, and hitherto unnoticed, parallelism
between Ovid's opening verses (1-10) and the celebrated

---

2. See e.g. Hes. Th. 22-34 (with West's note), Call. Aet.
fr. 2 (Pfeiffer).

3. See e.g. Thgn. 769 (West) Μουσῶν θεράποντα καὶ ἄγγελον;
cf. Hor. Carm. iii. 1. 3 Musarum sacerdos, Prop. iv. 6. 1
sacra facit uates; see further Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor.
Carm. i. 31. 2.

4. See especially Prop. iii. 1. 1-4, Hor. Carm. iii.
1. 1-4.

5. Art. cit. 189.

6. Art. cit. 469.

7. See n. below ad loc.

first stanza of Hor. Carm. iii. 1:

> odi profanum uulgus et arceo;
> fauete linguis: carmina non prius
> audita Musarum sacerdos
> uirginibus puerisque canto.

For not only does Ovid, like Horace, claim divine sanction
for his work (his overlord Amor (2) being the equivalent
of Horace's patronal Musae), but, also like him, first,
with priestly utterance, warns off a section of the populace
with which he is not in sympathy (his work being no more
suitable for the seueri ('puritans', 3) than Horace's is
for the profanum uulgus ('the uninitiated')), and then
specifies his intended readers (5-6), who are in fact
precisely those whom Horace aims to reach (i.e. uirgines
puerique). And, as Horace in his newly exalted role
stresses the novel nature of the poetry he is about to
produce (carmina non prius / audita), so Ovid, the proud
nequitiae poeta[8], emphasizes his adherence to familiar
territory. The parallelism surely cannot be entirely
coincidental. Ovid's flippant, almost blasphemous,
counterpart to Horace's solemn and sacred proem[9], cul-
minating in his declared intention to address on the
subject of romantic love the very audience at which Horace
would direct his exhortations to moral purity, throws
into the sharpest possible relief the 'neue Kunstwollen' -
the introduction of a humorous and playful element into

---

8. See 2n. below.

9. See E. Fränkel, Horace (Oxford 1957), 264.

Latin love elegy, often by way of light-hearted treatment
of conventionally serious literary motifs and sober
contemporary ideals – which Erich Reitzenstein so clearly
recognized as characteristic of the Amores as a whole[10].

The new Ovidian spirit is equally perceptible in
the second section of the elegy (11-22) which takes up
another conventional topos: the so-called recusatio[11].
The Alexandrian poet Callimachus, in claiming that he was
deterred from writing epic in the grand manner by the
intervention of the god Apollo, who personally instructed
him to stick to a Μοῦσαν λεπταλέην[12], unknowingly started
a fashion among Roman writers of non-epic poetry; in
the Augustan period we almost tire of hearing how their
pastoral, elegy or lyric was produced only after they had
been warned off epic by some divine agency[13]. Callimachus
originated the motif as a picturesque expression of his
adherence to a revolutionary literary creed[14], but the

---

10. Art. cit.

11. It is worth remembering that this term, like a con-
siderable number of other 'generic' labels in fashionable
use (e.g. propempticon, paraclausithyron, anathematicon)
was not used by the ancient authors to whose work it is
applied, but belongs to the critical jargon of modern
scholars; see further general introduction p. 13, n. 27.

12. Aet. fr. 1. 24 (Pfeiffer).

13. See Verg. Ecl. 6. 3-5, Prop. iii. 3. 1-16, Hor. Carm.
iv. 15. 1-4. Wimmel's somewhat turgid volume (op. cit.)
examines the history and development of the recusatio
motif in minute detail.

14. I.e. the rejection of epic pomp and grandiloquence in
favour of a carefully refined style and miniaturist technique
See E. Reitzenstein, 'Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos',
Festschrift für R. Reitzenstein (Leipzig-Berlin 1931) 25-69,
J.K. Newman, Augustus and the New Poetry, Collection
Latomus (Brussels 1967), 43-52, Wimmel, op. cit., passim.

Augustan poets generally turned it into an urbane excuse
for not writing the national epic which Augustus apparently
so desired;[15] by allowing the admonishing deity to forbid
their epic enterprises on grounds of talent unequal to
the demands of that genre, they enabled themselves to
shelter behind a decorous, if to us utterly transparent,
show of modesty[16].   Not, however, Ovid in the Amores, as we
realize immediately on reading the opening lines of the very first poem
of his first book - perhaps his earliest variation on the
recusatio motif.   All the basic ingredients of the
recusatio - intention to write epic, divine intervention
and subsequent renunciation of epic - are present there,
but Ovid's commitment to his 'neue Kunstwollen' has led
him to replace the traditional admonitor Apollo, the
dignified god of poetry, with Cupid, the mischievous god
of love, who, instead of warning off the aspiring epic
poet in the conventional manner, allows him to write two
noble hexameters, then promptly steals a foot from the
second one to leave the author with an elegiac couplet.
In our poem, however, the gracious recusatio has been
subjected to even more irreverent treatment, for Ovid
has dispensed with the admonishing deity altogether and
substituted a mere girl (amica, 17), who deflects him

---

15. This generally accepted view of the purpose of the
Augustan recusatio is disputed by D.O. Ross, Backgrounds to
Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome (Cambridge 1975) 123-9.

16. The disclaimer of epic ability is not confined to the
context of the 'Callimachean' recusatio; see e.g. Prop.
ii. 1. 17ff., Hor. Carm. i. 6. 5-12 (with Nisbet-Hubbard's
introduction to that poem).

from his epic undertaking simply by slamming her door in his face![17]   No Callimachean ideals, no Augustan diffidence, not even a tiresome godlet here, but simply an amatory emergency - the comic deflation is superb!

Of course, the championship of elegy against epic on grounds of its greater usefulness in the cause of love is nothing new[18], and lines 29ff. here bring to mind in particular Prop. i. 9. 9-12, as most scholars who discuss this poem rightly note[19]. Stroh, however, argues with considerable plausibility that the whole of the passage 11-36 should be seen as a comic re-working of all the sentiments expressed in Prop. i. 7 and 9, where the elegist extols to the epic poet Ponticus the utility of elegy in love[20].   There is, Stroh points out,

17. The situation is similar at _Am_. ii. 18. 3ff., where Ovid presents yet another mischievous version of the recusatio:

> nos, Macer, ignaua Veneris cessamus in umbra,
>   et tener ausuros grandia frangit Amor.
> saepe meae 'tandem' dixi 'discede' puellae:
>   in gremio sedit protinus illa meo ...
> uincor et ingenium sumptis reuocatur ab armis
>   resque domi gestas et mea bella cano.

18. Stroh designates the theme 'Nützlichkeitstopik' and makes it the subject of special study in his fine book (see general introduction p. 11).

19. See Neumann, _loc. cit._, Reitzenstein, _art. cit._ 79-80 (= _Wege zu Ovid_ 225), Luck, _art. cit._ 474, n. 18, Morgan 14.

20. _Loc. cit._   The possibility is not, of course, ruled out by the fact that variation on the recusatio motif recalls different poems of Propertius as well as passages of other authors; suggestion of a number of different antecedents at the same time is common in Ovid (cf. introduction to 10, p. 424), and Morgan (8-9) rightly observes that Ovid's imitation of Propertius in his programmatic poems is particularly diverse and complex.

a subtle humour in Ovid's 'übertriebenen Veranschaulichung
und Konkretisierung' of Propertius's arguments in i. 7 and
9: while Propertius contents himself with intimating
that pretty girls are unimpressed with epic poetry, Ovid
actually demonstrates it by making his writing of epic
the cause of his becoming an _exclusus amator_ - the
encapsulation of frustrated love[21] - and while Propertius
simply asserts the utility of elegy in general terms,
Ovid makes it manifest by claiming that his resumption of
leues elegi solved the immediate and practical problem of
the closed door. Elegy in fact, Ovid gives us to under-
stand, is not merely routinely efficient in such circum-
stances - it acts like magic (23-8)[22]. But the poet
is quick to undercut his own hyperbole. The 'magical'
powers of elegy are easily explained: a pretty girl
is always susceptible to this type of poetry because it
provides her with what she most wants - praise (33-4)![23]

---

21. See 17n. below.

22. The pun on _carmina_ (both 'poems' and 'spells') makes
Ovid's point; see n. below _ad loc._

23. Ovid rarely misses the opportunity to prick the bubble
of Propertian conceit and may well be attempting something
of the kind here; for while Propertius, again dealing
with the 'Nützlichkeitstopik' (see n. 18 above), asserts
at ii. 34 (B). 57-8 that his success in love is due to his
outstanding talent as an elegist (_ut regnem mixtas inter
conuiua puellas / hoc ego, quo tibi nunc eleuor, ingenio_),
Ovid makes it clear that the efficacy of elegy is not so
much a matter of 'talent' as one of simple psychology.

Obviously, then, there is much in this poem which may
be interpreted as parody of the conventional 'Programm-
gedicht', but the piece is none the less a 'Programmgedicht'
in its own right, for it makes two points which are of
fundamental importance for the understanding of Ovid's
approach to love elegy:

(i) his concern is with the universal aspects of love[24]
rather than any unique personal experience. We see
immediately that he does not even pretend to be forced
into composing love elegy by devotion to, or admiration
for, one celebrated woman[25]; the so-called amor for an
unnamed, unsung amica which impels him to write elegy is
a far cry from the traditional grande passion of the erotic
poet.

(ii) he rejects the Augustan convention of apology
for the choice of a non-epic genre. This, of course, Ovid
does not tell us directly, but his frivolous treatment
of the recusatio motif with the substitution of the argu-
ment from expediency for the standard claim of inadequate
talent[26] leaves no alternative conclusion. It is perfectly

---

24. See 5-10n. below, and cf. O. Seel, Ovidiana 158-9.

25. Cf. especially Prop. ii. 1, a poem which Neumann (loc.
cit.) mistakenly sees as the chief model for the present
elegy.

26. Neither in this piece nor in any other of his pro-
grammatic poems (i.e. Am. i. 1, ii. 18, iii. 1) does
Ovid ever profess inability to write anything other than
elegy, but rather quite the opposite; both here and in
Am. i. 1 he claims that he had actually begun an epic -
and a good one - when he was rudely interrupted (see Am.
i. 1. 1-4 and especially 11-16, 12 nn. below).

clear that this poet chooses elegy for the moment[27]

because it suits him and is not in the least embarrassed

about it[28].

A poem which may at first seem to be not much more

than an amusing piece of nonsense thus emerges as a bold

statement of a literary and political outlook of robust

independence[29].

---

27. It may be noted that Ovid does not at any point
rule out epic for the future.

28. Ovid's initial (and final) claim to have been coerced
into writing elegy by the semi-personified Amor (see
3n. below) need not deceive us; it simply strikes a
pose and is no indication of the real extent of the
poet's emotional involvement.

29. For Ovid's generally anti-Augustan stance in his
amatory works see Otis loc. cit., Duquesnay, 40-41,
E.J. Kenney 'Nequitiae Poeta' in Ovidiana 201-9 (with
special reference to the Ars), R. Syme, The Roman Revolution
(Oxford 1939), 467-8, W.R. Johnson, CSCA 6 (1973), 174, N.
Scivoletto, Musa iocosa: studio sulla poesia giovanile
di Ovidio (Rome 1976).

1-10. Ovid's declaration of intent; see introduction above, pp. 42-5.

1-3. hoc quoque composui ... / hoc quoque iussit Amor: a clear
indication that Ovid expected his readers to be familiar
with some earlier amatory work (cf. Am. iii. 12. 7).
The reference is almost certainly to Am. i (see 3n.
below), and is generally taken to signify that the five
books of the first edition of the Amores at least (see
general introduction p. 7,n.2) were published separately
(see T. Birt, PhW 33 (1913), 1228). G. Williams, however
(Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford 1968),
517-8), points out rightly enough that there is still no
absolute proof that this was the case.

1. Paelignis natus acuosis: throughout his literary career
Ovid repeatedly drew attention to his birthplace and its
people (cf. Am. iii. 15. 3 (elegi) quos ego composui,
Paeligni ruris alumnus; Fast. iv. 685 Paelignos,
natalia rura, Tr. iv. 10. 3 Sulmo mihi patria est, Pont.
iv. 14. 49 gens mea Paeligni regioque domestica Sulmo)
and not without anticipating the fame that they would
sooner or later owe to his poetic reputation (see Am.
iii. 15. 7-8 Mantua Vergilio gaudet, Verona Catullo; /
Paelignae dicar gloria gentis ego).

   The ancient Paeligni (Paelignis here must mean
'the land of the Paeligni' (cf. Fast. iv. 685, Plin. Nat.
xi. 14. 33), though the word also regularly denotes the
people themselves (see e.g. Pont. iv. 14. 49, Caes. Civ.

i. 15, Liv. viii.6.8))inhabited a fertile valley in the

modern province of the Abruzzi, about 100 miles

east of Rome.   It is watered by three rivers, which,

unlike many of those in Italy, do not dry up in summer -

a pleasant feature which the adjective _aquosis_ will have

immediately evoked for Ovid's Roman readers (cf. 6. 50n.).

The unusual abundance of water in his native land was

obviously something which Ovid himself keenly appreciated

(cf. _Am_. ii. 16. 2. 5-6, _Fast_. iv. 685-6, _Tr_. iv. 10. 3).

(For the history of the Paeligni see E.T. Salmon, 'S.M.P.E.',

Ovidiana 1C-20, and for more general discussion of Ovid's

homeland, M. Besnier 'Sulmo, Patrie d'Ovide' in _Mélanges_

Boissier (Paris 1903),57-63, G. Highet, _Poets in a Land-_

scape (London 1957), 177ff.).

2. _ille ego_: a favourite identificatory formula of Ovid's,

used with exuberant confidence here, mock-solemnity at

_Am_. iii. 8. 23 (_ille ego Musarum purus Phoebique sacerdos_)

and unmistakable poignancy at _Tr_. iv. 10. 1 (_ille ego qui_

fuerim tenerorum lusor amorum).   It may have partially

inspired the pseudo-Vergilian _ille ego qui quondam_

gracili modulatus auena, the first line of an interpolated

prefatory quatrain to the _Aeneid_ preserved by Servius and

Donatus;   see E. Paratore, _Ovidiana_ 360-61, R.G. Austin,

'_Ille ego qui quondam_ ... ', _CQ_ n.s. 18 (1968), 107-15.

nequitiae: a word whose censorious Republican tone (see

e.g. Cic. _Catil_. i. 4. _iam me ipse inertiae_

nequitiaeque condemno,   S. Rosc. 46. 134 officina
nequitiae ac deuersorium flagitiorum omnium) had already
been somewhat weakened by Horace and Propertius (see
e.g. Hor. Carm. iii. 15. 2 (to a flirtatious wife) tandem
nequitiae fige modum tuae, Prop. i. 6. 25-6 (expressing
the poet's devotion to a life of love) me sine ... / hanc
animam extremae reddere nequitiae) before Ovid adopted it
to denote the 'naughtiness', the gay, frivolous immorality,
which he saw as the hallmark of his elegy (cf. Am. iii.
1. 17 and see further Luck, art. cit. 446-7, Otis, art.
cit. 199-200 (= Wege zu Ovid 238-9), E. Burck, Hermes 80 (1952),172

Naso: Ovid's usual form of reference to his own name.
Ouidius is intractable in dactylic verse except in the
vocative and contracted genitive, and the poet seems to
have preferred not to use these forms; Ouidi never occurs.
Other poets (including Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius)
were luckier in the metrical character of their own names,
and Propertius used his as something of a stock hexameter
ending (Properti occurs seven times at the end of the
line in his work).

Ovid, like other Latin poets, uses his own name
readily enough for formal purposes (i.e. in 'signatures'
of the kind we have here (cf. Am. Epigr. 1), dedications
(e.g. Am. i. 11. 27, ii. 13. 25), epitaph (Tr. iii. 3.
74, 76; cf. 6. 61-2n.) and letters (e.g. Tr. v. 13. 1,
Pont. i. 1. 1, 3, 1 and passim in the poems from exile)),
and the tone in a number of these cases is one of undis-
guised pride (e.g. Rem. 71-2 Naso legendus erat tum cum

didicistis amare; / idem nunc uobis Naso legendus erit;
cf. Ars ii. 744, iii. 812), but never in his amatory works
does he use his own name in pathetic self-address or
pathetic reference to himself in the third person - a
favourite device of his fellow love-poets (see e.g.
Catul. 8.1, 58.2, 72.1, 79. 2, 3, Prop. ii. 8.17). D.
Donnet (LEC 33 (1965), 261) is clearly right to see this
distinctive feature as an indication of the less emotional
tone of Ovid's love elegy in general. One may also
observe that Ovid uses his own name in the exile poems
approximately four times as often as in the rest of his
work put together; probably he took care to insert it
there as frequently as possible partly in the hope of thus
ensuring that it was not forgotten by his public in Rome
(the epistolary form was, of course, ideal for this purpose),
but no doubt he included it also for pathetic effect.

3. **hoc quoque iussit Amor:** editors are right to print Amor
and not amor, for the statement is a clear reference to
Am. i. 1. 23-4 (Cupido) lunauit ... genu sinuosum fortiter
arcum / 'quod'que 'canas, uates, accipe' dixit 'opus'
(see introduction above pp. 45-6),but Ovid undoubtedly has
'both the god and the emotion' (Morgan 14) in mind here
(cf., however, introduction above p. 50, n. 28). Kenney
comments appositely on the occasional drawbacks of modern
capital letters at Notes 61.

procul hinc, procul este seueri: 'Away, away with you,
puritans!' The phraseology recalls the ritual warning-

off of the impure or uninitiated at religious ceremonies
and sacrifices; cf. especially Call. Ap. 2 ἑκάς, ἑκάς
ὅστις ἀλιτρός, Verg. A. vi. 258 procul, o procul este
profani (for the humorous irreverence of Ovid's sacerdotal
pose (especially in the light of Hor. Carm. iii. 1. 1-4)
see introduction above pp.42-5). The general notion of
love as a religion is not new: cf. Prop. ii. 34 (B). 26
solum te nostros laetor adire deos.

The poet'swords do not necessarily indicate, as
Lenz believes, that some previously published poems
of the Amores had met with hostile criticism; Ovid says
only that the seueri will not find the present volume
to their taste and should not approach it (after his down-
fall he ventured to claim that it was not his fault if
those who were offended by his poetry insisted on reading
it: Tr. v. 1. 69-70 'at mala sunt.' fateor. quis te
mala sumere cogit? /aut quis deceptum ponere sumpta uetat?
Cf. Mart. i. pr. 15ff.).

seueri: the derogatory sense of the word, 'puritanical',
'strait-laced', is very much a usage of the erotic poets;
cf. Am. ii. 10. 16 hostibus eueniat uita seuera meis,
Catul. 5. 2 rumores ... senum seueriorum, 27. 6-7 ad seueros/
migrate, Prop. ii. 34 (A). 23 numquam uitae fallet me ruga
seuerae. Generally the adjective simply means 'stern'
or 'solemn' and sometimes even carries a tone of approbation -
'morally upright'; see e.g. Hor. Carm. iii..6. 39-40 scuerae /
matris ad arbitrium (cf. Am. ii. 5. 25 fratri ... seuero).

(The variant _seuerae_, which found favour with Heinsius
and most editors before Munari, will no doubt have arisen
from false analogy with the warning specifically addressed
to women at _Ars_ i. 31-2: _este procul, uittae tenues,_
insigne pudoris, / quaeque tegis medios instita longa
pedes; Ovid's words in lines 5-6 here make it quite clear
that he envisages his work being read by members of both
sexes, and the generalizing masculine is indubitably
right. Wimmel (_op. cit._ 305, n. 3) is alone amongst
modern scholars in his lingering regard for Merkel's
hideous conjecture _seuera_ (agreeing with _theatra_ in line 4).)

4. _teneris ... modis_: i.e. 'love elegy'. _Tener_ is a
favourite elegiac adjective. Applied to _puellae_ and
pueri and their physical attributes, and to _Amor_ and
Amores, it is largely an ornamental epithet, 'tender',
'gentle' (R. Pichon, (_Index Verborum Amatoriorum_
(Hildesheim 1966)) collects many examples s.v.), but
used of poets and poetry, it is sometimes, as here,
almost a technical term for 'erotic' or 'elegiac'; cf.
Rem. 757 _teneros ne tange poetas_, _Ars_ iii. 333 _teneri_
carmen ... Properti, Catul. 35. 1 _poetae tenero, meo sodali_.

For _modi_ = 'measures' or 'poetry' in general cf. Hor.
Carm. ii. 1. 40 _quaere modos leuiore plectro_, 12. 3-4
mollibus / aptari citharae modis.

theatra: for _theatrum_ of a reading public cf. _Pont_. i. 5. 69
hoc mea contenta est infelix Musa theatro, and see further
Luck, _art. cit_. 469, n. 7.

5-10. Ovid seems to be echoing Propertius in looking upon young
men and women in love as potentially the most appreciative
readers of his poetry and in expecting them to find some-
thing to identify with in it; cf. especially Prop. i. 7.
13-14 _me legat assidue post hoc neglectus amator, / et
prosint illi cognita nostra mala_, 23-4 _nec poterunt iuuenes
nostro reticere sepulcro / 'Ardoris nostri magne poeta,
iaces'_, ii. 34 (_B_). 81-2 _non tamen haec_ (i.e. _carmina
mea_) _ulli uenient ingrata legenti, /siue in amore rudis, siue
peritus erit_. But Ovid differs from Propertius in intimating
that it is his specific intention to depict amatory ex-
periences and emotions which are _primarily_ typical rather
than personal (see further introduction above p. 49).

5. The exact meaning of this line is not entirely clear. It
may be best to take _in sponsi facie_ very closely with _non
frigida_ and construe 'Let my reader be the girl who thrills
at her sweetheart's face' (i.e. 'on seeing her sweetheart's
face') - the construction with _in_ + ablative denoting the
object or cause of emotion is common enough; cf. _Am_. ii.
7. 9 _in te ... frigidus_, _Ep_. i. 14 _nomine in Hectoreo pallida_
(Goold supplies further parallels at _Amat. Crit_. 30; see
also 3. 6n.). This, at any rate, is how the syntax of the
line is understood by Némethy and Goold (_loc. cit_.), though

both of them seem determined to interpret _facie_ as something other than simply 'face', Némethy explaining '(uirgo) quae mouetur _pulchritudine_ sponsi' and Goold, 'the girl who blushes at the _gaze_ of her betrothed'. But I can find no parallels at all for _facies_ = 'gaze', and whilst it does sometimes mean 'good looks' as well as 'countenance' or 'appearance' (see e.g. _Am_. i. 8. 33 _est etiam facies, qua se tibi comparet, illi_, _Ars_ iii. 105 _cura dabit faciem; facies neclecta peribit_ and further _ThLL_ 6. 48. 54ff.), there is really no reason why it should do so here; a young man can arouse a girl's passion without necessarily being good-looking!

Kenney offers a completely different interpretation. He takes _in sponsi facie_ = _coram sponso_ (see his apparatus and _Notes_ 59) and would apparently construe 'Let the ardent girl read me in front of her sweetheart'. Now clearly this is open to serious objection: Prop. iii. 3. 19-20 _ut tuus in scamno iactetur saepe libellus / quem legat exspectans sola puella uirum_ (Apollo addressing the poet) suggests that the reading of love poetry was, as one would expect, a private occupation (cf. Strat. _AP_ xii. 208), and the average young girl would surely in any case have better things to do 'in the presence of her sweetheart' than read a book (cf. Lenz _ad loc._, R.P. Oliver in _Classical Studies presented to B.E. Perry_ 139, n. 4)!

It is, however, possible to understand _in sponsi facie_ as _coram sponso_ and still extract tolerable sense from the line if the phrase is construed closely not with _me legat_

but with <u>non frigida uirgo</u>:   'Let my reader be a girl who
thrills in the presence of'(or perhaps 'sight of')'her
sweetheart' (so Munari and Harder-Marg) - a girl, in other
words, who thrills when her sweetheart sees <u>her</u> (cf. <u>Am</u>.
ii. 5. 36 (<u>quale subrubet</u>) <u>sponso uisa puella nouo</u>) rather
than when she sees <u>him</u> (thus the alternative construction).

The actual difference between the two interpretations
which are not discountenanced by sense and usage is clearly
not very great and perhaps only of interest to the reader
who cares for splitting hairs.   Whether Ovid himself was
aware of the element of ambiguity in his words obviously
none can tell, but we may at least be sure that such
difficulties as there may be in this line <u>are</u> purely inter-
pretational and do not result from any kind of textual
corruption, as was seriously suggested by D.A. Slater
(<u>CR</u> 27 (1913), 257; Lenz devotes far too much space to
Slater's clumsy and unnecessary conjecture).

<u>sponsi</u>: a number of scholars have obviously been troubled
by what they take to be mention of a 'fiancé' here and
remark upon Ovid's boldness in identifying the situation of
an officially betrothed young man or woman with that of one
involved in the kind of illicit love-relationship celebrated
in the <u>Amores</u> (see e.g. Harder-Marg, Lenz <u>ad loc</u>.,   cf.
Fränkel 184-5, n. 43).   The indications are, however, that
while <u>sponsus</u> sometimes does mean 'fiancé' or 'bridegroom'
(cf. 5. 36n., Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 29. 6) it does not <u>necessarily</u>
imply any such formal attachment; Horace uses it of Penelope's
suitors (<u>Ep</u>. i. 2. 28) and Catullus of a girl's secret lover

(65. 19 <u>missum sponsi furtiuo munere malum</u> - if the
<u>sponsus</u> here had been an official fiancé, there would
hardly have been any need for the girl to hide away his
present or feel any embarrassment when it fell to the
floor in front of her mother). It may thus well be that
Ovid meant the word here to denote nothing more than
'sweetheart' or, in modern parlance, 'boyfriend'.

<u>non frigida</u>: i.e. 'responsive' (for the litotes cf. <u>Am.</u>
i. 6. 67 <u>non laetis ... capillis</u>). So accustomed are we
to the use of 'frigid' to indicate specifically sexual
unresponsiveness that it comes as a slight surprise to
learn that the equivalent use of <u>frigidus</u> is relatively
uncommon in Latin (and this despite the frequency of
metaphors of heat and fire to indicate the opposite pole
of emotion; see 8n. below). Unless one counts Verg. <u>G.</u>
iii. 97 <u>frigidus in Venerem senior</u> (of an ageing horse),
Ovid is the first to use the adjective in this way, and
even he does so sparingly - only here and at <u>Am.</u> ii. 7. 9
<u>in te ... frigidus</u> and <u>Rem.</u> 492 <u>frigidior dominae fac
uideare tuae.</u> Cf. Mart. iii. 34. 2 <u>frigida es et nigra
es</u> (and see further <u>ThLL</u> 6. 1329. 73ff.).

6. Ovid's emphasis on the special interest of his poetry for
the young man who has never been in love before reveals
that he sees himself even at this stage as something of
a <u>praeceptor amoris</u>; in contrast, Propertius's stance
at ii. 34 (<u>B</u>). 81-2 (<u>supra cit.</u> 5-10n.), a couplet which
Ovid may well have had in mind here, is not in the least
pedagogic.

<u>rudis</u>: a favourite elegiac epithet for the newcomer to
the experience of love; cf. <u>Ars</u> iii. 559 <u>hic rudis</u>
<u>et castris nunc primum notus Amoris</u>, Prop. ii. 34 (<u>B</u>).
82 <u>siue in amore rudis siue peritus erit</u>, i. 9. 8, ii. 6.
30, iii. 15. 5.

<u>tactus amore</u>: for the expression cf. <u>Ars</u> iii. 588 <u>exclusum</u>
<u>te quoque tanget amor</u>, Prop. i. 1. 2 <u>contactum nullis ante</u>
<u>cupidinibus</u>, Pl. <u>Cist.</u> 298 <u>uideo ego te Amoris ualide tactum</u>
<u>toxico.</u> The stark simplicity of this phrase also characterizes
a number of the others which the Roman elegists use in
description of the onset or departure of love; cf. <u>Am.</u>
i. 6. 13 <u>uenit amor</u>, ii. 9 (<u>B</u>). 25 <u>posito</u> ... <u>amore</u> (see
further H. Tränkle, <u>Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die</u>
<u>Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache</u>, <u>Hermes Einzel-</u>
<u>schriften</u> 15 (Wiesbaden 1960), 18).

7. <u>aliquis iuuenum, quo nunc ego, saucius arcu</u>: for the standard
portrayal of the lover as a man wounded by Cupid in action
with bow and arrows see introduction to 9 (<u>A</u>) and (<u>B</u>)
below, p. 376.

8. <u>flammae ... suae</u>: 'his own passion'; cf. <u>Ars</u> i. 525-6
<u>hic quoque</u> (i.e. <u>Liber</u>) <u>amantis / adiuuat et flammae, qua</u>
<u>calet ipse, fauet</u>, <u>Rem.</u> 734 <u>flamma redardescet, quae modo</u>
<u>nulla fuit.</u> For the very extensive use of heat and fire
imagery in descriptions of love see A.S. Pease on Verg. <u>A.</u>
iv.2.

conscia signa: not 'geheimen Zeichen' (thus Luck, art. cit. 472), but surely 'tell-tale signs'; cf. Am. ii. 8. 7-8 num uerbo lapsus in ullo / furtiuae Veneris conscia signa dedi? [Quint.] Decl. 4. 16 futuras tempestates ... conscium nemorum murmur enuntiat, Tib. i. 8. 3 conscia fibra deorum.

9. indice: there can be little doubt that Ovid was largely responsible for establishing the word index in the Latin poetic language; it is attested only once in earlier poetry (Acc. trag. 493) and then 26 times in his work. Whatever the reason for his predilection, the present instance suggests that it cannot have been entirely a desire to exploit the legal connotations of the word (cf. 4. 1-4, 8. 5, 25nn.).

casus: for casus of specifically amatory troubles cf. Prop. i. 13. 1-2 nostro laetabere casu, / Galle, quod abrepto solus amore uacem.

11-22. A mock recusatio; see introduction above pp. 45-7.

11-16. Did Ovid really write a substantial part of a Gigantomachia (for this designation see 11-14n. below)? There is no independent ancient testimony to the existence of such a work (as there is to that of Ovid's lost tragedy Medea; see Quint. Inst. x. 1. 98, Tac. Dial. 12) and

certainly none has come down to us. Nor do other passages
in which Ovid professes to have once attempted epic (Am.
i. 1. 1-2, ii. 18. 11-12, Tr. ii. 335-7) corroborate his
claim here (though a number of scholars have argued strongly
that they do; see especially H. de La Ville de Mirmont,
'La Gigantomachie d'Ovide', RPh 28 (1904), 103-21, S.G.
Owen, Ouidius, Tristium Liber II (Oxford 1924, reprinted
Amsterdam 1967), 63-81, S. D'Elia, Ovidiana 214-15). For
at Tr. ii. 335-7 Ovid's assertion is that he attempted not
a Gigantomachia, but a poem - presumably an epic - on the
deeds of Augustus: diuitis ingenii est immania Caesaris
acta / condere, materia ne superetur opus.   / et tamen
ausus eram; he simply mentions the Gigantomachia immediately
before this as an example of epic subject-matter which is
too demanding for him: Tr. ii. 333-4 at si me iubeas
domitos Iouis igne Gigantas / dicere, conantem debilitabit
onus (La Ville de Mirmont (art. cit.), however, argues
(to my mind quite unconvincingly) that the juxtaposition
of this comment with a claim to have attempted epic couched
in exactly the same terms as that in our passage (i.e.
ausus eram) is one of a number of things which suggests
that Ovid in fact celebrated the deeds of Augustus allegorical-
ly in an epic on the battle of the giants and the gods -
in other words, that his claims in our passage and at Tr.
ii. 335-7 refer to one and the same poem). And the
authenticity of the other two professions to have attempted
epic (Am. i. 1. 1-2 and ii. 18. 11-12) is immediately made

suspect by the fact that they appear in passages which
form part of Ovidian variations on the so-called recusatio
motif where claims of this kind are standard (see intro-
duction above pp. 45-7).

It is, of course, the fact that Ovid's specific claim
to have attempted a Gigantomachia occurs in precisely such
a context which gives us real cause to doubt the poet's
word on the subject in the first place (see F. Pfister,
'Hat Ovid eine Gigantomachie geschrieben?', RhM 70 (1915),
472-7; cf. E. Reitzenstein, RhM 84 (1935), 87-8). Certainly,
the traditional nature of the claim does not in itself
prove that it is entirely fictional, but there are here
additional factors which seem to point very strongly to
that conclusion: the Gigantomachia is a stock example
of the epic subject-matter which lyric and elegiac poets
traditionally reject (cf. Hor. Carm. ii. 12. 5-12, Prop.
ii. 1. 17-20, 39-42) and the parenthetical memini (line 11)
is a device regularly used by Ovid to lend an air of
authenticity to a questionable assertion (Cf. Am. i. 6. 43,
ii. 10. 1, Tr. ii. 89, and see M.S. Santirocco, 'Metamorphosis
in Ovid's Amores', CB 45 (1969), 83-4, 95, J.B. Hofmann
Lateinische Umgangssprache (Heidelberg 1926, 3rd edn. 1958),
198). It might be argued that Ovid's unequivocal claim
(ausus eram) to have actually begun a Gigantomachia rather
than to have been about to begin one, or contemplating
beginning one, when he was deterred from his undertaking
by outside interference (cf. Call. Aet. fr. 1. 21-2
(Pfeiffer), Verg. Ecl. 6. 3-5, Prop. iii. 3. 1ff., Hor.
Carm. iv. 15. 1-4) suggests that his essay at epic was indeed

substantial and not merely a conventional fiction (thus Owen,
op. cit. 69, Luck, art. cit. 476-7).   But there is an
obvious reason why Ovid may have stretched the traditional
fantasy to this length: it could easily have been in order
to emphasize his rejection of the Augustan poet's regular
excuse of inadequacy of talent for his failure to write
epic (see introduction above pp. 45-6) that he ventured to
assert that, far from being deficient in epic ingenium, he had
a fine Gigantomachia already well advanced when his girl-
friend's displeasure (not a divine admonition!) forced him
to desist.   (Ausus eram at Tr. ii. 337 is probably a
similarly conscious piece of poetic licence; Ovid may
well have been simply attempting to make the assertion of his
basic willingness to celebrate the deeds of Augustus more
effective by claiming that he had once actually tried.)

Almost certainly, then, we need not mourn even a
partially complete Ovidian Gigantomachia.   This is not
to say, of course, that Ovid never toyed with epic themes
in his youth, but only that his claim here to have made
substantial progress with a particular epic should in all
probability not be taken very seriously.

11-14. The epic which Ovid claims to have abandoned may be loosely
described   as a Gigantomachia, but he clearly has in mind
here not simply the battle of the Giants and the gods (see
Roscher, Lexicon II. 1639 ff.) but a mêlée involving the
Hekatoncheiroi (see 12n. below), the Titans (see 13n. below)

and the two Aloadae, Otus and Ephialtes (see 14n. below).
Confusion of the myths concerning two or more of these is
extremely common in Greek and Latin literature (cf. Met.
i. 151ff., Prop. ii. 1. 19-20, Hor. Carm. iii. 4. 42ff.,
Call. Del. 141ff; see further Roscher, Lexicon II.
1642-3, Owen, Ouidius, Tristium Liber II, 70-71, Bömer
on Fast. v. 35).

11. ausus eram: 'I had ventured ... ', i.e. 'I once ventured
before I undertook the present composition ... '. The
idiomatic use of the more precise pluperfect for the perfect
(or imperfect) is particularly common in elegy, where it is
often metrically convenient; cf. Am. i. Epigr. 1 qui modo
Nasonis fueramus quinque libelli, Prop. iii. 3. 1 uisus
eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra (see further Kühner-
Stegmann II. i. 140-41, Fordyce on Catul. 10. 28, 64.
158).

memini: see 11-16n. above.

12. centimanum ... Gygen: one of the three hundred-handed
giants imprisoned in the depths of the earth by their
father, Uranus, on account of their frightening power.
After being temporarily released through the intervention
of their mother, Gaia (see 13n. below), they were imprisoned
in the earth again by Cronos, but finally released by Zeus
to help in the battle against the Titans (see Hes. Th. 714ff.)

Gygen, the reading transmitted by the majority of
our MSS must be reinstated in place of Scaliger's con-
jecture Gyen, adopted by Showerman, Kenney and all sub-
sequent editors.   Forms of Gyes (Γύης) appear as MS variants
for the name of the hundred-handed giant at Tr. iv. 7. 18,
Hes. Th. 149, 618, 714 and Apollod. i. 1. 1, and some
scholars, being most immediately familiar with the name
Gyges as that of the ancient king of Lydia (see especially
Hdt. ii. 8-12), have consequently felt, with varying degrees
of certainty, that Gyes could in fact be the correct name
of the mythical giant (compare Heinsius's reservation in
accepting Scaliger's emendation ('Sed cum ceteri auctores ...
Γύγην appellent, ... Apollodorum potius ex his emendandum,
quam hos ex Apollodoro parum abest quin censeam') with
Goold's cavalier dismissal (Amat. Crit. 12) of the main-
stream of MS tradition ('The spelling of the hundred-
handed giant Gyes ... is corrupted everywhere in our
manuscripts of Horace, Ovid and Priscian')).

The case for Gyes would seem to be strengthened by the
observation that the first syllable of Gyges is normally
scanned long in both Greek and Latin poetry (see Bentley
on Hor. Carm. ii. 17. 14) whereas the metre requires a short
syllable here.   M.L. West, however, in a most informative
note on Hes. Th. 149 (with a full list of attestations of
Γύγης / Gyges as the name of the giant) points to a remark
of Herodian (ii. 678. 27 (Lentz)) which reveals that the
ancients themselves not only recognized Gyges as the name

of both the king of Lydia and the hundred-handed giant,
but also recognized a prosodical distinction between the
two: Γύγης Γύγου καὶ Γύγητος ἐπὶ τοῦ γίγαντος· ὅτε δὲ
ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Λυδίας λέγεται, σπονδειακόν ἐστι
καὶ ἰσοσυλλάβως κλίνεται; cf. Kiessling-Heinze on Hor. Carm.
ii. 17. 14.   And the occurrence of the form Γύγης at
Hes. Th. 714 and 734 in a papyrus of the first century A.D.
(P Mich, inv. 6828;   see West 51) confirms that the
appearance of Γύγης / Gyges in so many of our MSS is not
simply due to some mediaeval perversity or aberration.
All points to one conclusion: whether Gyges was or was
not ab initio the 'correct' name of the hundred-handed
giant, it was very probably what Ovid and his contemporaries
wrote.

For some suggestions on the origin of the form
Γύης see West's note on Hes. Th. 149. Gyan, incidentally, which
Daniel Heinsius (and not Jahn or Merkel, as reported by
Kenney and Munari respectively) extracted from giam, is not
a competitor; the name Gyas is quite distinct from those
discussed above, and clearly attested as that of a Trojan
character in Virgil's Aeneid (i. 222, v. 118, 152ff.),
of a Latin killed by Aeneas (x. 318), and of a minor
figure on the Theban side in Statius's Thebaid (ii. 610,
v. 223, vii. 715.).

et satis oris erat: with an untranslatable pun on os
(see A.G. Lee, CR n.s. 2 (1952), 176), Ovid declares that
he showed himself to possess the necessary qualifications
for writing epic - both 'eloquence' or here, perhaps,
'grandiloquence' (cf. Ars i. 206 magno nobis ore sonandus
eris (with Hollis's note), Tr. ii. 73 te celebrant alii,
quanto decet ore, Sil. xi. 65 praecellens Virrius ore)
and 'cheek' or 'nerve' (cf. Ep. 16. 102 nec tibi plus
cordis, sed magis oris, adest, Cic. Rab. Post. 34, quod
habent os, quam audaciam)—the latter being especially
required in the face of exacting Augustan standards!

13. Presumably a reference to the castration of Uranus by the
Titans at the instigation of Gaia, enraged by Uranus's
imprisonment of their sons, the Hekatoncheiroi (see 12n.
above); see Hes. Th. 147ff.

male: with ulcisci, something of a stock adverb, 'cruelly',
'savagely'; cf. Met. vii. 397 ultaque se male mater Iasonis
effugit arma, Am. i. 7. 9. uindex in matre patris, malus
ultor, Orestes, Hor. Carm. iv. 12. 7-8 quod male barbaras /
regum est ulta libidines.

13-14. ingesta ... Olympo / ardua deuexum Pelion Ossa tulit: one
of the most celebrated attacks on the Olympian gods (often
confused with the Gigantomachia proper; see e.g. Met. i.
152-6, Fast. iii. 439-42, Pont. ii. 2. 9-12, and cf. 11-14n.
above) was that of Otus and Ephialtes, the two gigantic sons
of Iphimedea by Aloeus (or Poseidon). They attempted to

reach the sky by piling the mountains Pelion, Ossa and Olympus on top of each other (Hom. Od. xi. 305ff.) and, according to Libanius (Narr. 37 (Foerster)) were struck down by Zeus with a thunderbolt (cf. 15-16 below); for alternative accounts of their death, however, see Eust. Comm. on Od. xi. 314, Pi. P. 4. 88ff. The mountains are generally said to have been piled up in the order given here, i.e. Pelion on Ossa on Olympus (cf. Fast. i. 307, iii. 441, Prop. ii. 1. 19-20, Hom. Od. xi. 315-16), but at Met. i. 152 Ovid gives Olympus on Pelion on Ossa, and Vergil at G. i. 281 Olympus on Ossa on Pelion (cf. Aetna 49).

15. Of the alternatives offered by the MSS to the unmetrical reading given by PY the most satisfactory is clearly ς's in manibus nimbos et ...; nimbos suits the context perfectly, complementing fulmen well (cf. Pont. iv. 8. 59-60, Verg. G. i. 328-9) and recalling the Homeric νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς (Il. i. 511 and passim), and it is easy to see how the juxta-position of -nibus nimbos could have resulted in the omission of nimbos by haplography.

There are two possible ways of interpreting this line: (i) 'I had storm clouds in hand, Jupiter and a thunderbolt', i.e. one may assume a syllepsis, with in manibus nimbos et cum Ioue fulmen = in manibus Iouem et cum Ioue nimbos fulmenque and take in manibus ... habebam in its figurative sense, 'I was occupied with' (thus Showerman, Bornecque, Munari and Lee - and also, it would seem, those scribes whose fumbling attempts to restore the metre resulted in

Sω's <u>Iuppiter in manibus et</u> and <u>B</u>'s <u>in manibusque Iouem</u>);
(ii) 'Along with Jupiter <u>I</u> held in my hands storm clouds and
a thunderbolt', i.e. one may understand <u>cum Ioue</u> ἀπὸ κοινοῦ
and take <u>in manibus</u> ... <u>habebam</u> literally (thus Kenney (<u>Man.
Trad</u>. 28, n. 1), Harder-Marg, Stroh 150, n.33). In view of what
follows, (i) on the whole seems preferable: it means that
<u>cum Ioue</u> may be taken in exactly the same sense both here
and in 17 below, which is surely desirable (but cf. Kenney,
<u>loc. cit</u>. and see further n. <u>ad loc</u>.), and it does not
disallow the pun on <u>omisi</u> in the same line ('I dropped'
(i.e. both 'let fall from my hands' and 'abandoned my writing
on') 'the thunderbolt and Jupiter as well'), which clearly
exploits the element of ambiguity in <u>in manibus</u> ... <u>habebam</u>.
Positively against (ii) may be counted the fact that the
line so construed does not cohere very well with the sub-
sequent pentameter ('Along with Jupiter <u>I</u> held in my hands ...
a thunderbolt, which <u>he</u> might launch ... ').

16. <u>quod bene</u> ... <u>mitteret</u>: Kenney (<u>Man. Trad</u>. 28, n. 1) is
probably right to dismiss the 'conventional renderings' of
<u>bene</u> (e.g. 'si à propos' (Bornecque), 'opportunamente'
(Munari), 'wohlgezielt' (Lenz)) as 'feeble', and his own
suggestion that Ovid really meant a thunderbolt of a kind
which Jupiter might <u>worthily</u> launch in defence of his heaven —
in other words, a thunderbolt of truly epic standard! —
is certainly very persuasive.

17. <u>clausit amica fores</u>: a splendid piece of bathos (see intro-
duction above pp. 46-7), and not only a dramatic gesture, of

course, but also a highly symbolic one in the light of the ancient poetical tradition of having the disappointed lover bewail his misfortunes outside the door of his beloved, which for one reason or another remains firmly closed to him (see E. Haight, The symbolism of the house-door in classical poetry (New York 1950) and further 22n. below).

Ovid's experience seems to have something in common with Tibullus's at ii. 6. 9-12:

> castra peto, ualeatque Venus ualeantque puellae:
> et mihi sunt uires et mihi laeta tuba est.
> magna loquor, sed magnifice mihi magna locuto
> excutiunt clausae fortia uerba fores.

Tibullus too, it appears, would have us believe that his grandiose plans (not for writing epic but for enlisting in the army, an equally serious and non-elegiac undertaking) were shattered by the clausae fores. Tibullus's treatment of the commonplace, however, with its conspicuous word-play and unmistakable odi et amo spirit, creates an effect of pathos of which there is not a trace in Ovid's version; he makes no attempt at all to give any impression of emotional conflict, but is clearly intent only on producing a striking and amusing picture - a fine example of his habitual treatment of stock elegiac themes in an emotionally detached manner. (Cf. E. Burck, Hermes 80 (1952), 185-6.)

amica: the use of the generic term rather than a proper name at this point is almost certainly not without significance; see introduction above p. 49.

'Saepissime uero _amica_ pro _domina_ (ponitur)' claims
Pichon s.v. _amica_ in his _Index Verborum Amatoriorum_; this is
not precisely true (it should perhaps be said here that
Pichon's index, though often helpful in providing a con-
venient list of instances of a particular elegiac term,
must be used with caution, for it is not always accurate
and some of its author's classifications, if not demonstrably
wrong, are at least questionable).

   Domina was originally closely associated with _domus_
and in pre-Augustan Latin it most frequently denotes the
mistress of a household and/or the slaves in it; e.g. Pl.
Cist. 772-3 _quid<est>nomen tuae/dominae?_ Ter. _Hau._ 300-301
disciplinast eis demunerarier / ancillas primum ad dominas qui
adfectant uiam, Catul. 68. 156 (_sitis felices_) _et domus_
<ipsa> in qua lusimus et domina. It is subsequently used often
in Latin literature with all the honorific connotations of
δέσποινα (as is clearly demonstrated by the examples of
the word used with reference to _uxor_, _mater_, _filia_, _soror_,
regina, _imperatrix_ and _dea_ given by _ThLL_ at 5. i. 1939. 40ff.).
And it remains, on the whole, a word of some dignity when
employed by the elegists as a term for 'mistress' in the
amatory sense (the elegiac usage may in fact have been
anticipated by Lucilius: see 730 (Marx) _cum mei me_
adeunt seruuli, non 'dominam' appellem meam?). On many
occasions it retains its specific associations with power
over slaves (see e.g. _Am._ ii. 17. 5 _utinam dominae miti_
quoque praeda fuissem, Tib. ii. 3. 79 _ad imperium dominae_
sulcabimus agros, 4. 1 _hic mihi seruitium uideo dominamque_
paratam, Prop. i. 7. 6 _aliquid duram quaerimus in dominam;_

for the stock elegiac image of love as a form of slavery
see F.O. Copley, 'Seruitium amoris in the Roman elegists',
TAPhA 78 (1947), 285-300, S. Lilja, The Roman Elegists'
Attitude to Women (Helsinki 1965), 76-88, J.P. Hallet,
Arethusa 6 (1973), 111-14, Stroh 217-26), and on others, at
least its basically respectful tone (see e.g. Am. i. 7. 3
nam furor in dominam temeraria bracchia mouit, Prop. i. 3.
17 non tamen ausus eram dominae turbare quietem; though
Catullus never uses domina in this way, he does so use
its synonym era (68. 136 rara uerecundae furta feremus
erae), but this word for some reason did not find favour
with the Augustan elegists).

Amica, on the other hand, is throughout its history
at best a neutral term for 'mistress' and at worst a
distinctly derogatory one. In comedy it invariably
functions as a euphemism for 'prostitute', denoting a
woman hired for money - usually on a short-term basis -
from a leno (see e.g. Pl. Mer. 545 emptast amica clam uxorem,
Trin. 651 in foro operam amicis da, ne in lecto amicae, Ter.
Eu. 494-5 haud conuenit / una ire cum amica imperatorem in
uia) and in Catullus it appears to signify an independent
kind of courtesan (see 110.1-2 Aufillena, bonae semper
laudantur amicae: / accipiunt pretium, quae facere
instituunt; cf. 41. 4). Catullus makes it quite clear
that the word does not adequately convey the esteem in which
he holds his Lesbia (72. 3-4 dilexi tum te non tantum ut
uulgus amicam / sed pater ut gnatos diligit et generos;
cf. R. Reitzenstein, SHA, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 3 (1912), 12 -
Abh.,15ff.), and Cicero exploits the coarser connotations
which it obviously must have had in a splendid pun describing

the character of the notorious Clodia (Cael. 32 _ea quam omnes semper amicam omnium potius quam cuiusquam inimicam putauerunt_). In elegy _amica_ is frequently used, like the ubiquitous _puella_ (cf. 33n. below), as a fairly neutral term for 'girlfriend' (see e.g. _Am_. i. 9. 19-20 _hic durae limen amicae / obsidet_, ii. 5. 10 _(felix) cui sua 'non feci' dicere amica potest_, _Ars_ i. 465 _quis, nisi mentis inops, tenerae declamat amicae?_ Prop. ii. 30 (_B_). 23 _una contentum pudeat me uiuere amica?_), but on a number of occasions the basically sexual associations of the word are clearly uppermost in the poet's mind (see e.g. _Am_. iii. 7. 20 _nec iuuenem nec me sensit amica uirum_, Prop. i. 6. 9-10 _illa meam mihi se iam denegat, illa minatur, / quae solet ingrato tristis amica uiro_, ii. 6. 41-2 _nos uxor numquam, numquam seducet amica: / semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris_ (what Propertius means is that Cynthia in his eyes holds the status of a wife and at the same time satisfies him sexually as fully as a professional _amica_)). The elegists do not attempt to invest _amica_ with extra dignity or tenderness by the addition of a possessive adjective as they often do with the rather colourless _puella_ (see 33n. below), and Ovid employs it once with a highly pejorative tone (_Am_. ii. 7. 19-20 _di melius, quam me ... / sordida contemptae sortis amica iuuet!_ 'God forbid that I should take to a common whore like her!'). Neither he nor Propertius uses the word with anything akin to the tone of respect and deference so often perceptible in _domina_, and the sentimental and idealistic Tibullus does not use it at all - no doubt precisely because it smacks of a kind of love

too casual and commercial for his romantic taste.

Certainly the distinction between amica and domina in elegy becomes blurred as time progresses (cf. 9 (B). 46n.), and indeed it seems to have disappeared entirely in passages such as Ars ii. 287-96:

> at quod eris per te facturus et utile credis,
>   id tua te facito semper amica roget:
> libertas alicui fuerit promissa tuorum;
>   hanc tamen a domina fac petat ille tua.
> si poenam seruo, si uincula saeua remittis,
>   quod facturus eras, debeat illa tibi.
> utilitas tua sit, titulus donetur amicae;
>   perde nihil, partes illa potentis agat.
> sed te, cuicumque est retinendae cura puellae,
>   attonitum forma fac putet esse sua.

What has happened, however, is not that amica has taken on the meaning of domina, as Pichon implies (see above p. 73), but rather the opposite: the honorific domina has been weakened until it has become synonymous with the most neutral sense of amica; cf. E. Burck, Hermes 80 (1952), 179, n.2.

ego cum Ioue fulmen omisi: cf. 15 above and see n. ad loc. Lenz is unduly impressed with Wimmel's notion (op. cit. 304) that Ovid means here not only 'I dropped the thunderbolt and Jupiter as well' (i.e. I abandoned my epic), but also 'I, like Jupiter, dropped the thunderbolt' (i.e. I dropped epic (to take up love elegy again) just as Jupiter put aside his thunderbolt (to pursue his amatory interests)). There is nothing whatsoever in the text to justify the second of these interpretations, and line 18 Iuppiter ingenio excidit ipse meo makes it perfectly clear that the first was the one which Ovid intended.

fulmen omisi: Burman firmly rejects the vulgate fulmina misi

'cum quia praecedenti uersu _fulmen_ est, quod hic non recte
in _fulmina_ transire uidetur; tum praecipue, ut ambiguitas
uitetur, quia _fulmina mittere_ sollemnis est locutio pro
jacere, ex coelo demittere, et hoc Poetae menti repugnat'
(cf. Kenney, _Man. Trad._ 28, n. 1).   Goold (_Amat. Crit._ 4)
questions with some justification Kenney's repeated contention
(preface to his edition ix, n. 1, _Man. Trad._ 28, _Gnomon_ 33
(1961), 480, n. 1) that we owe the reading _fulmen omisi_
to tradition rather than emendation; indeed, it could even
be a pure fluke, but its correctness can hardly be in doubt .
in the light of Burman's wise remarks.   Lenz (_ad loc._),
however, seems impervious to them.

19. _Iuppiter ignoscas_: Ovid's jocular plea for forgiveness from
the almighty will no doubt have been intended to amuse (and
perhaps shock) the contemporary reader who would surely
recall the seriously apologetic stance _vis à vis_ the _Princeps_
and his associates generally adopted by those Augustan poets
who chose to write light verse rather than epic (see e.g.
Prop. ii. 1. 1-42, iii. 9. 1-6, Hor. _Carm_. i. 6. 1-12, and
further introduction above pp.45-6).

For the subjunctive _ignoscas_ replacing the imperative
see 5. 1n.

tela: another reading of obvious truth (_tua tela_ here is
essential to the contrast with _mea tela_ in 21 below), but
uncertain pedigree (cf. 17n. above).   Its appearance in some
renaissance MSS could be due to humanist conjecture, but the
Itali could equally well have taken it from some lost
mediaeval MS or directly from the thirteenth century

Turonensis where it also appears, and whether there as a
result of faithful copying or fairly simple mediaeval
emendation none can tell (cf. Kenney on <u>Am</u>. ii. 18. 3 at
<u>Man. Trad</u>. 29). A similar confusion involving <u>tela</u>,
<u>bella</u> and <u>uerba</u> occurs in the MSS at <u>Ars</u> i. 592.

For <u>tela</u> of a rather different kind used to overcome
the problem of the closed door, with which the poet-lover
is so frequently confronted, see Hor. <u>Carm</u>. iii. 26. 6-8
<u>hic, hic ponite lucida / funalia et uectis et arcus / oppositis</u>
<u>foribus minaces</u>; cf. Tib. i. 1. 73-4 <u>nunc leuis est</u>
<u>tractanda uenus, dum frangere postes / non pudet et rixas</u>
<u>inseruisse iuuat</u>.

20. <u>tuo maius</u> ... <u>fulmen</u>: for the role of the ablative of
comparison in Latin poetry of the Augustan period see
E. Löfstedt, <u>Syntactica</u> I (Lund 1928, 2nd edn. 1942), 314ff.

<u>fulmen</u>: did Ovid intend, as first proposed by J. van
Wageningen ('<u>Fulmen</u>', <u>Mnemosyne</u> n.s. 45 (1917), 135-9;
cf. A.G. Lee, <u>CR</u> n.s. 2 (1952), 176), that <u>fulmen</u> here
(and at <u>Am</u>. i. 6. 16 <u>tu, me quo possis perdere, fulmen habes</u>)
should suggest <u>fulmentum</u> and hence 'bolt of a door' as well as 'bolt'
in its general metaphorical sense 'deadly weapon'? Cer-
tainly the dropping of noun-endings in -<u>tum</u> for metrical
convenience was a well established practice in Latin poetry
(we find, for instance, <u>stramen</u> for <u>stramentum</u> (<u>Met</u>. v.
447, Verg. <u>A</u>. xi. 67, Sil. x. 562) and <u>tegimen</u> for <u>tegimentum</u>
(<u>Ars</u> iii. 112, <u>Met</u>. iii. 52, Verg. <u>A</u>. iii. 594, vii. 666);
see further O. Skutsch, <u>SIFC</u> 27-8 (1956), 537 (= <u>Studia</u>

Enniana (London 1968), 145-6), and in general J. Perrot,
Les dérivés latins en -men et -mentum (Paris 1961)), but
fulmentum normally means 'prop' or 'support' (e.g. Vitr.
v. 1. 9 _contra capitula ex fulmentis dispositae pilae sunt
conlocatae_, Cels. ii. 15. 4 _uni pedi subiciendum fulmentum
est, atque ita lectus huc et illuc manu impellendus_) and
examples of it meaning 'bolt' or 'bar' are to seek. The
use of the verb _fulcire_ at _Am._ i. 6. 28 _roboribus duris
ianua fulta sera_ and _Ars_ ii. 244 _opposita ianua fulta sera_,
however, suggests that such a meaning for _fulmentum_,
and hence _fulmen_, is not impossible. One may also add
that it is difficult to imagine why at _Am._ i. 6. 16 Ovid
should have chosen to use _fulmen_ at all unless it had been
to create a pun of the kind postulated (normally when
fulmen is used simply for 'deadly weapon' we are given
a clearer idea of what the 'deadly weapon' is: see e.g.
Met. x. 550 _fulmen habent acres in aduncis dentibus apri_, Stat.
Silv. v. 2. 102 (_cum_) _castum uibraret Iulia fulmen_) and
in our passage the presence of puns and word-play in the
almost immediate vicinity (see 12, 15, 17nn. above, 23-8n.
below) would seem to make yet another pun at this point
all the more likely. (For further discussion and biblio-
graphy see Perrot, _op. cit._ 60-63, and for arguments
against assuming a pun here G. Dittmann and H. Rubenbauer,
'_Fulmen_ = Stütze?', _Philologus_ 76 (n.s. 30) (1920), 351ff.
A fascinating, but, I think, unlikely, alternative ex-
planation of _ianua fulmen habet,_ based on superstitious
ritual, is offered by K. Kerényi, 'Thunderweapon bei Ovid',
ARW 28 (1931), 395-8.)

21-2. The mock Augustan <u>recusatio</u> reaches its impudent conclusion
as this most un-Augustan poet declares that <u>he</u> abandoned
epic for elegy not because the latter was less demanding,
but because it was <u>expedient</u> in the cause of love (in
Stroh's terminology, 'nützlich'; see introduction above
pp.47-8, and cf. 29-36 below).

21. <u>blanditias</u>: the standard elegiac term for the lover's
wooing words (e.g. <u>Ars</u> i. 619 <u>blanditiis animum furtim</u>
<u>deprendere nunc sit</u>, Tib. i. 1. 71-2 <u>decebit / dicere nec</u>
<u>cano blanditias capite</u>, Prop. ii. 19. 3-4 <u>nullus erit castis</u>
<u>iuuenis corruptor in agris, / qui te blanditiis non sinat</u>
<u>esse probam</u>) and the endearments and caresses of love-
making (e.g. <u>Am</u>. iii. 7. 11 <u>et mihi blanditias dixit</u>
<u>dominumque uocauit</u>, <u>Ars</u> ii. 465-6 <u>quae modo pugnarunt,</u>
<u>iungunt sua rostra columbae, / quarum blanditias uerbaque</u>
<u>murmura habet</u>, Tib. i. 9. 77 <u>blanditiasne meas aliis</u>
<u>tu uendere es ausus?</u>). <u>Blanditiae</u> take their place in
the front rank alongside <u>Error</u> and <u>Furor</u> at the triumph of
Cupid at <u>Am</u>. i. 2.35 and are, not surprisingly, part of
the stock-in-trade of the <u>exclusus amator</u> (e.g. <u>Rem</u>. 35-6
<u>et modo blanditias rigido, modo iurgia, posti / dicat</u>
<u>et exclusus flebile cantet amans</u>, Prop. i. 16. 16 <u>arguta referens</u>
<u>carmina blanditia</u>; cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 6. 15-16, <u>Rem</u>. 507). Some-
times, as here, the word may virtually stand for 'love-
poetry' itself; cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 1. 46 <u>haec est blanditiis</u>
<u>ianua laxa meis</u>, Tib. i. 4. 71 <u>blanditiis uult esse locum</u>
<u>Venus ipsa</u> (and see Stroh 19-20).

<u>elegos</u> ... <u>leuis</u>: as the adjective <u>grauis</u> conventionally

denotes the 'higher' poetic genres of epic and tragedy
(cf. Am. i. 1. 1-2 arma graui numero uiolentaque bella
parabam / edere and see Brink on Hor. Ars 14), so leuis
regularly indicates the 'lower' ones of elegy and lyric;
cf. Am. i. 1. 19 nec mihi materia est numeris leuioribus
apta, Tr. ii. 339 ad leue rursus opus, iuuenalia carmina,
ueni, Prop. ii. 12. 22 haec mea Musa leuis gloria magna tua
est, Hor. Carm. ii. 1. 40 (Musa procax) quaere modos
leuiore plectro.

22. Ovid refers here (and at 27-8 below), of course, to the
poetic plea or lament traditionally uttered at the house-door
of the beloved by the exclusus amator (see especially Am.
i. 6, Tib. i. 2, Prop. i. 16, Hor. Carm. i. 25, iii. 10,
Asclep. AP v. 189, Posidipp. AP v. 213). Modern scholars
have designated it the genre paraclausithyron (for the use
of such terms see introduction above p. 45, n.11) and it has
been the subject of many special studies, of which the fullest
and one of the most recent, but unfortunately the most arid
and wearying, is F.O. Copley's Exclusus Amator (Baltimore,
Md. 1956); see also H. de La Ville de Mirmont, 'Le Para-
clausithyron dans la littérature latine', Mélanges L. Havet
(Paris 1909), 571-92, H.V. Canter, 'The Paraclausithyron as
a literary theme', AJPh 41 (1920), 355-68, O. Garte, Para-
clausithyri historia e litteris Graecis et Romanis illustratur
(Diss. Leipzig 1924), E. Burck, 'Das Paraklausithyron', HG
43 (1932), 186-200, Haight, The symbolism of the house-door
in classical poetry , C.M. Bowra, 'A love-duet',
AJPh 79 (1958), 376-91, C. Soria, 'El Paraclausithyron como
presupuesto cultural de la elegia latina', REC 8 (1963), 55-94,

Cairns, Generic Composition 76, 123, 152, 230-31. Cf. introduction to 2 below pp. 106-7.

Callida iunctura is at work in this line with duras cleverly placed between mollierunt (for the shortened e see W.F. Jackson Knight, Ovidiana 109) and lenia,as if the very fact of enclosing it with these words could weaken its force (cf. 5. 31, 58, 10. 7-8nn.); for the striking juxtaposition of antithetical words in general see E. Moser, Entsprechung benachbarter Worte und Begriffe in der Sprache der römischen Elegiker (Diss. Munich 1935).

duras: both 'strong' and 'obdurate'; the epithet frequently used of the owner or guardian of the door is here transferred to the door itself (cf. Am. i. 6. 62 o foribus durior ipse tuis, 74 dura ... conseruae ligna, ualete, fores).

lenia uerba: i.e. uersus elegiaci; cf. Prop. i. 9. 12 carmina mansuetus lenia quaerit Amor (some MSS give leuia). Mollis is a more common synonym for lenis in this sense; see e.g. Prop. i. 7. 19 frustra cupies mollem componere uersum and further Stroh 18-20.

23-8. carmina ... carmine ... carminibus ... carmine: Ovid exploits the double meaning of carmen - both 'poem' and 'spell' (see introduction above p. 48). The striking anaphora, which is common in passages of Latin poetry dealing with magic and witchcraft (cf. Am. i. 8. 9-10, Tib. i. 2. 47ff., 8. 19-21), may well be intended to bring to mind real magical formulae and incantations, for such meagre evidence of these as we have from the ancient world suggests that an element of verbal

repetition (often producing gibberish of the 'abracadabra'
variety) was a standard feature of them (see e.g. POsl.
I. 70-71 ιωερβηθ // ιωπακερβηθ // ιωβαλχοοηθ'// ιωαπομφ //
ιωσεσευρω // ιωβιματ, Cato Agr. 160. motas uaeta daries
dardares astataries dissunapiter, and further A.D. Nock,
PBA 17 (1931), 251ff., A.-M. Tupet, La magie dans la poésie
latine (Paris 1976), 166ff., Stroh 151, nn. 37, 38. The
use of a refrain in poems relating to magic is no doubt
intended to produce the same effect (see e.g. Theoc. 2,
Verg. Ecl. 8; for a relatively modern example of the
identical device we need look no further than the celebrated
chant of Shakespeare's witches at Macbeth Act 4, Scene 1).

23-6. Ovid's examples of the power of carmina are but a few of
the strange·phenomena conventionally attributed to the
effects of magic; its capacity to cleave open the ground,
influence the weather, and raise the dead are also fre-
quently mentioned (see K.F. Smith on Tib. i. 2. 45-6 and
49-50, A.S. Pease on Verg. A. iv. 489, Bömer on Met. vii.
199ff.). The locus classicus in Latin poetry for all forms
of magic and witchcraft is Luc. vi. 438-569.

23. Ovid seems to have confused a natural phenomenon traditionally
thought to be the result of magic, i.e. the reddening of the
moon (sanguineae ... lunae) during an eclipse (see 5. 38n.),
with the alleged use of spells to draw the moon down to earth
(cf. Ep. 6. 85, Tib. i. 2. 43, Prop. i. 1. 19, Verg. Ecl. 8.69,
Hor. Epod. 5. 45-6, 17. 77-8, Ar. Nu. 750, Pl. Grg. 513A, A.R.

iii. 533); see Tupet, La magie 93-103, G. Luck, Hexen und
Zauberei in der römischen Dichtung (Zurich 1962), 55-6,
Bömer on Met. vii. 207-8.

sanguineae: not just a graphic epithet; the redness of
the moon during an eclipse was apparently actually thought
to be caused by blood (cf. Am. i. 8. 12 purpureus Lunae
sanguine uultus erat).

24. For the power of spells to 'call back the horses of the
sun' (i.e. to cause the sudden darkness which is
the result of a total eclipse) cf. Ep. 6. 86 nititur (i.e.
Medea) et tenebris abdere solis equos; see further Tupet,
La magie 387, Bömer on Met. vii. 209.

niueos ... equos: for the horses of the sun see 5. 38n.
Niueus is a favourite poetic epithet of horses (see Bömer
on Fast. vi. 724) and is regularly applied to the team of
the sun and moon (cf. Rem. 258 in niueis Luna uehetur equis,
Fast. iv. 374 (cum) niueos Luna leuarit equos; also Theoc.
13. 11 λεύκιππος ...'Αῶς. No doubt the epithet is used here,
hard on the heels of sanguineae in 23, partly for the sake
of producing a suggestion of the red/white colour contrast
so beloved of the Roman poets (see 5. 35-42, and cf. W.
Kroll, Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur
(Stuttgart 1924, reprinted, Darmstadt 1964), 277).

solis euntis: 'the sun in its course'; for ire of the sun

cf. Met. iv. 264-5 tantum spectabat euntis / ora dei, Man. i. 186 idem Phoebus eat caeli de partibus isdem, and similarly of the moon, Luc. i. 77-8 fratri contraria Phoebe / ibit.

25. For the power of spells to split open snakes (whose bones were frequently used in magical ritual; cf. Shakespeare, Macbeth 4.1. 'Fillet of a fenny snake/in the cauldron boil and bake') cf. Met. vii. 203 uipereas rumpo uerbis et carmine fauces, Verg. Ecl. 8. 71 frigidus in pratis cantando rumpitur anguis, and see Tupet, La magie 363-4, Bömer on Met. vii. 203.

26. The miraculous phenomenon of streams and rivers flowing backwards is one of those most often alleged by the Roman poets to be the result of magic cf. Tib. i. 2. 44 fluminis haec rapidi carmine uertit iter, Am. i. 8. 6, Prop. i. 1. 23, Verg. Ecl. 8. 4, A. iv. 489, and see Bömer on Met. vii. 199-200. But this particular reversal of the laws of nature is not confined to passages dealing with magic; it is a favourite poetic ἀδύνατον in all manner of contexts (cf. Pont. iv. 5. 43-4 (prius) flumina ... in fontes cursu reditura supino / gratia quam meriti possit abire tui, Prop. ii. 15. 31ff. prius ... / ... / flumina ... ad caput incipient reuocare liquores / ... / quam possim nostros alio transferre dolores, Hor. Carm. i. 29. 10-12 quis neget arduis / pronos relabi posse riuos / montibus et Tiberim reuerti ... ? (with Nisbet-Hubbard's note for further discussion and bibliography on the device ἀδύνατον in general)).

27-8. <u>carminibus cessere fores</u> ... / ... <u>carmine uicta sera est</u>:
note the subtle transition to the perfect tense after the
presents <u>deducunt</u> (23), <u>reuocant</u> (24), <u>dissiliunt</u> (25), and <u>re-</u>
<u>currit</u> (26): the diverse power of <u>carmina</u>, Ovid implies,
is known to be remarkable, <u>and now</u> even a door with a bar
of oak has yielded to it.

    Possibly Ovid wished to bring to mind here not only
the literary pleading of the <u>exclusus amator</u> (see 22n. above)
but also an ancient 'Open sesame' type of door charm; cf.
<u>POsl</u>. 312ff. αυων νηϊ // αυων τϰελλι // ἀνύγητι / ἀνύγητι
ϰλεῖστρον. An incantation of this kind could well have
been the basic inspiration of Pl. <u>Cur</u>. 147-8 (a young man
addressing the bolts of a door) <u>pessuli, heus pessuli, uos</u>
<u>saluto lubens / uos amo, uos uolo, uos peto atque opsecro</u>
and perhaps also the hypnotic refrain in <u>Am</u>. i. 6: <u>tempora</u>
<u>noctis eunt; excute poste seram</u> (see further Copley,
<u>Exclusus Amator</u> 30-31).

29-36. The 'Nützlichkeitstopik' in a more conventional guise (cf.
21-2n. and see introduction above pp. 47-8). Tibullus (at
ii. 4. 15-20) first gave succinct expression to the elegist's
traditional view that the only worthwhile kind of poetry is
that which functions as an aid to success in love and which
can be called upon by the <u>exclusus amator</u>:

> ite procul, Musae, si non prodestis amanti:
>   non ego uos, ut sint bella canenda, colo,
> nec refero Solisque uias et qualis, ubi orbem
>   compleuit, uersis Luna recurrit equis.
> ad dominam faciles aditus per carmina quaero:
>   ite procul, Musae, si nihil ista ualent.

Ovid's phraseology and use of epic <u>exempla</u>, however, are

particularly reminiscent of Propertius's version of the
motif at i. 9. 9-12:

> quid tibi nunc misero prodest graue dicere carmen
>   aut Amphioniae moenia flere lyrae?
> plus in amore ualet Mimnermi uersus Homero:
>   carmina mansuetus lenia quaerit Amor.

Cf. Prop. i. 7. 19, ii. 34 (B). 43ff.   Ovid uses the
present passage to reiterate in theoretical fashion the
truths he has already presented dramatically in lines 11-22:
a string of traditional heroes as possible epic subject-
matter takes the place of the abandoned Gigantomachia and the
anticipation of a girl responding well to elegy contrasts
with the poet's experience of having one slam her door
on his epic pretensions (see further Stroh, loc. cit.).

Both Ovid and Propertius do in fact find a role for
Achilles, Agamemnon, Hector etc. in their poetry, but an
extremely un-traditional one: the actions of these mighty
epic heroes are impudently used as exempla in various
love-situations (see e.g. Am. i. 9. 33-8, ii. 8. 11-14,
Ars ii. 709-14, Prop. ii. 8. 29-38, 22 (A). 29-34).

29. uelox: of Achilles, of course, = ποδώκης.

30. quid pro me Atrides?:   the truth survives in ς (for the
    rare elision of a long final e before a long initial a
    see M. Platnauer, Latin Elegiac Verse (Cambridge 1951), 76),
    but a comparison of the readings of P and Y on the one
    hand and S on the other provides a clear example of the
    generally higher degree of deliberate scribal interpolation
    to be found in S (see Kenney, Man. Trad. 8-9);   the readings

of P and Y by the very fact of their being nonsensical as they stand, and yet not far from the truth, can be assumed to be reasonably faithfully copied from their exemplar.

alter et alter: i.e. duo (Agamemnon and Menelaus). This very uncommon alternative to unus alterque (see ThLL 1. 1741. 18ff.) is found twice elsewhere in Ovid: Am. ii. 10. 10 diuiduum ... tenent alter et alter amor, Fast. v. 225-6 Narcisse ... / infelix quod non alter et alter eras.

31. errando: for the popularity of the ablative of the gerund with Augustan writers see Tränkle 14. The reference is of course to Odysseus.

32. raptus: cf. Verg. A. i. 483 ter circum Iliacos raptauerat Hectora muros, and for the story see Hom. Il. xxii. 395ff., xxiv. 14ff., E. Andr. 107-8.

et: for the postponement of the connective see 10.36n.

Haemoniis ... equis: cf. Prop. ii. 8. 38 fortem illum Haemoniis Hectora traxit equis. Haemonius, 'Thessalian', is a favourite poetic epithet of heroes from Thessaly and their attributes (see OLD s.v. 2); it relates particularly

frequently (as here) to Achilles (cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 9 (A). 7, <u>Met</u>. xii. 81, <u>Fast</u>. v. 400, <u>Tr</u>. iii. 11. 28).

<u>flebilis</u>: 'piteous'; cf. Sen. <u>Tro</u>. 784-5 <u>flebilius</u> <u>aliquid Hectoris magni nece / muri uidebunt</u> (see further <u>ThLL</u> 6. 890. 83ff., Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 24. 9.).

33. <u>at facie</u> ... <u>laudata</u>: modern editors, with the exceptions of Ehwald and Brandt, adopt Heinsius's <u>at facie</u> ... <u>laudata</u>, which, by the omission of a single letter, changes the unacceptable text offered by <u>PS</u> into perfect sense. As Heinsius himself realized ('Quantilli negotii erat ueram inde lectionem nobis reddidisse'), the very simplicity of the emendation is <u>h</u>ighly persuasive. Ehwald later inclined towards acceptance of Heinsius's text (see <u>JAW</u> 167 (1914), 187), but his own <u>ut facies</u> ... <u>laudatast</u> perhaps deserves a word. For it gives good sense, and it is not difficult to imagine how it could have been corrupted in transmission: <u>at</u> for <u>ut</u> would be an easy slip (<u>a</u> and <u>u</u> are amongst the most commonly confused letters in minuscule script) and a progression of error <u>laudata est saepe</u> > <u>laudatae saepe</u> > <u>laudata saepe</u> seems likely enough. But the construction produced is undeniably more pedestrian than that which emerges from Heinsius's emendation, and the lack of an adversative particle is keenly felt, for the argument in lines 29-34 runs clearly thus: 'What good will celebrating the deeds of epic heroes do me? (i.e. It will do me no good at all.) Celebrating a woman's beauty <u>on the other hand</u> will bring me the woman herself.' <u>At</u> is plainly needed to point the very strong contrast intended here (see <u>OLD</u> s.v. 1, and cf. 10. 19, 35nn.), and Heinsius's emendation must stand. For <u>facies</u> = 'good looks', 'beauty' see 5n. above.

<u>tenerae</u>: see 4n. above.

<u>puellae</u>: by far the most common and the most versatile of the terms used by the elegists for an eligible woman, <u>puella</u> is equally capable of carrying the meretricious overtones of <u>amica</u> (see 17n. above and cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 7. 1 <u>at non formosa est, at non bene culta puella</u>?   5-6 <u>nec potui cupiens, pariter cupiente puella, / inguinis effeti parte iuuante frui</u>, Prop. iv. 8. 83-4 <u>dein quemcumque locum externae tetigere puellae / suffiit</u>; this usage is already well established in comedy (see e.g. Pl. <u>Rud</u>. 44-5 <u>ad lenonem deuenit, / minis triginta sibi puellam destinat</u>, 59 <u>puellam ab eo</u> (i.e. <u>lenone</u>) <u>emerat</u>) and Catullus (see e.g. 41. 1 <u>Ameana puella defututa</u>) and, especially when qualified by a possessive adjective, the tender or reverential ones of <u>domina</u> (see 17n. above and cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 7. 4 <u>flet mea uesana laesa puella manu</u>, Catul. 3. 17-18 <u>meae puellae /flendo turgiduli rubent ocelli</u>, Tib. i. 10. 59-60 <u>a lapis est ferrumque, suam quicumque puellam / uerberat</u>, Prop. ii. 26 (<u>B</u>). 29-30 <u>seu mare per longum mea cogitet ire puella, / hanc sequar</u>). Both within and without elegy <u>puella</u> may signify a young, as opposed to mature, woman (e.g. <u>Ep</u>. 1. 115-16 <u>certe ego, quae fueram te discedente puella, / protinus ut uenias, facta uidebor anus</u>, Prop. ii. 18 (<u>B</u>). 17 <u>cum sene non puduit talem dormire puellam</u>, Pl. <u>Cas</u>. 48-9 <u>eam puellam hic senex/amat efflictim</u>) and even a young wife (e.g. Prop. iii. 13. 23-4 <u>hoc genus infidum nuptarum, hic nulla puella / nec fida Euadne nec pia Penelope</u>, Catul.

17.14 <u>uiridissimo nupta flore puella</u>, Hor. <u>Carm</u>. iii. 22.
2-3 <u>quae laborantis utero puellas / ter uocata audis</u>),
and in epic it functions as a metrically convenient synonym
for the highly dignified <u>uirgo</u> (see B. Axelson, <u>Unpoetische</u>
<u>Wörter</u> (Lund 1945), 58 and cf. Liv. iii. 44ff.).   Clearly
<u>puella</u> is a word which very much takes its tone from the
context, and the many appearances of it in elegy simply =
'girl' or 'girlfriend' with no specially derogatory or
laudatory connotations (for a vast collection of examples
see Pichon's last category s.v.) amply testify to its
essential neutrality.

34. <u>uatem</u>: Newman (<u>Augustus and the New Poetry</u> 183) suggests
that Ovid is here directly challenging the Augustan 'concept
of <u>uates</u>' (the word is a quasi-religious one, originally
meaning 'seer', but adopted and transformed by Vergil
and the other Augustans into a special term for an inspired
poet of serious and high-flown themes; see Newman 99ff.,
Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 1. 35, Brink on Hor. <u>Ars</u>
400) by intimating that the light love-poet who succeeds
in impressing a pretty girl has a legitimate claim to this
elevated title.   I doubt it.   Though Ovid does often
show his awareness of the specialized Augustan meaning of
<u>uates</u> (see e.g. <u>Am</u>. ii. 18. 18 <u>cothurnato uate</u>, 35 <u>uati</u>
... <u>arma canenti</u>, iii. 1. 67 <u>exiguum uati concede, Tragoedia,</u>
<u>tempus</u>, <u>Fast</u>. i. 101 <u>uates operose dierum</u>), and indeed
occasionally exploits it to create a subtle self-mockery
(e.g. <u>Am</u>. i. 1. 5-6 '<u>quis tibi, saeue puer, dedit hoc in</u>
<u>carmina iuris? / Pieridum uates, non tua, turba sumus</u>',

23-4 <u>lunauit</u> (i.e. <u>Cupido</u>) ... <u>genu sinuosum fortiter</u>
<u>arcum</u> / 'quod'que 'canas, uates, accipe' dixit 'opus'),
he also uses the word sometimes as a generally honorific
term for 'poet' (e.g. <u>Am</u>. iii. 9. 17 <u>sacri uates et diuum</u>
<u>cura uocamur</u>, 41 <u>sacer uates</u> (of Tibullus, who, as Georg
Luck remarks (<u>The Latin Love Elegy</u> (London 1959, 2nd
edition 1969), 81), could hardly be considered 'a bard in
full attire, lyre in hand')) and sometimes (as, I think,
here), without any perceptible distinction from the basically
more mundane <u>poeta</u> (cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 4. 21 <u>est etiam quae me</u>
<u>uatem et mea carmina culpet</u>, iii. 15. 1 <u>quaere nouum uatem,</u>
<u>tenerorum mater Amorum</u>, <u>Ars</u> ii. 739, <u>Rem</u>. 3).

34-5. <u>pretium carminis, ipsa uenit.</u> / <u>magna datur merces</u>: <u>pretium</u>
and <u>merces</u> are virtually synonymous: 'the reward for a
poem' (which praises a girl's beauty; see 33 above) 'is
the girl herself - and a handsome reward it is!'

35-6. <u>heroum clara ualete</u> / <u>nomina</u>: Ovid's words are, as Burman
points out, strongly reminiscent of <u>Anacreont</u>. 23. 10-12
χαίροιτε λοιπὸν ἡμῖν / ἥρωες· ἡ λύρη γὰρ / μόνους ἔρωτας
ᾅδει. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that one
of these writers directly imitated the other and probably
the Greek poet should be credited with priority, but the
<u>Anacreontea</u> are of varied and uncertain date and though
the group to which 23 belongs has been thought to contain
poems from as early as the second century B.C. (see J. M.
Edmonds, <u>Anacreontea</u> (with <u>Elegy and Iambus</u> II) (London
and New York 1931), 1ff.), it has also been assigned to
the Christian era (see O. Crusius, <u>RE</u> 1. 2047). Cf. also

Am. i. 1. 28 ferrea cum uestris bella ualete modis.

36. non apta est gratia uestra mihi: 'Your gratitude is no good to me.' No mythical epic hero could ever present Ovid with a token of appreciation for celebrating him in his poetry to compete with that which a pretty girl can offer for the same service!

37-8. Ovid's repeated specification of his readers (cf. 5-10n. above) takes on a new dimension against the background of the 'Nützlichkeitstopik' (see 29-36n. and introduction above p. 48, n. 23); he directs his invitation towards young women alone rather than young people of both sexes, and we now know that it is not only their interests that he has at heart!

37. formosos: see 10. 5n. and for the whole class of adjectives in -osus, 4. 1n.

38. carmina ... quae mihi dictat Amor: a direct link with line 3, hoc quoque iussit Amor (see introduction above pp.43-5). For the expression cf. CLE 937. 1 scribenti mihi dictat Amor mostratque Cupido, Prop. iv. 1. 133 tum tibi pauca suo de carmine dictat Apollo.

purpureus: not 'dressed in purple clothes' (thus Harder-Marg and Lenz), for Amor is traditionally naked (cf. Am. i. 10. 15-16 et puer est et nudus Amor, sine sordibus annos / et nullas uestes, ut sit apertus, habet), but

'rosy'; cf. Rem. 701 purpureas pueri (i.e. Cupidinis) ... alas, Apul. Met. v. 22 (Cupidinis) ceruices lacteas genasque purpureas,Anacreont. 2. 3 πορφυρέη ᾿Αφροδίτη. When used of persons, especially deities, and their features the adjective clearly indicates a youthful vigour and radiant beauty (see OLD s.v. 3b, and for a detailed analysis of the wide range of meanings of purpureus in Latin, J. André, Études sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine (Paris 1949), 93ff.).

II

[K. Büchner, Gedenkschrift für G. Rohde (Tübingen 1961),
75-7 (= K. Büchner, Studien zur römischen Literatur
(Wiesbaden 1970), VIII. 194-5); D'Elia 122-3; K.
Jäger, Zweigliedrige Gedichte und Gedichtpaare bei
Properz und in Ovids Amores (Diss. Tübingen 1967), 25-31;
F.W. Lenz, 'Ovidio Amores II 2 e 3, una sola poesia?',
Maia 17 (1965), 119-24]

An attempt to persuade a eunuch, whose task it is to keep his mistress apart from fond admirers like Ovid, not to take his duties too seriously.

After setting the scene for his readers in his opening remarks to the eunuch-guard (1-8), Ovid tells him that he is simply stupid - as stupid as the girl's _uir_[1] who employs him - if he even attempts to do his job efficiently instead of seeking to establish a mutually advantageous relationship with his mistress (9-16). He proceeds to expatiate at length, first on the benefits to be had from aiding and abetting the mistress in her amatory adventures (17-40), the while taking care to forestall any objections from the eunuch on grounds of the risks involved (18-26, 31-8), and then conversely on the potentially dire consequences of _not_ accepting the accomplice's role (41-62). Finally, confident in the strength of his arguments, he puts forward his personal request for access to the girl in the eunuch's charge (63-6).

Scaliger (according to Heinsius), Bentley[2] and a

---

1. See p. 226, n. 1 and n. 27 below.

2. Ap. E. Hedicke, Studia Bentleiana V; Ovidius Bentleianus (Oxford 1926), 20.

number of latter-day Ovidian scholars[3] have thought that this piece and the following one, 3, which P, S and most of the recc. present as a separate elegy[4], should be conjoined, as indeed they are in Y and the fifteenth century Hauniensis, to form a single poem. And reasons in favour of such a view - other than the appearance of 2 and 3 as a continuous piece in two of our MSS[5] - are certainly not far to seek. The common form, subject-matter and addressee of the two pieces as they stand (both are dramatic monologues directly addressed to a eunuch[6], which culminate in a request for access to the woman he officially chaperons) and the unusual brevity of the second (it is in fact the shortest poem in the whole of the Amores) would seem to give cause enough for questioning the traditional presentation of them as separate elegies.

---

3. E.g. Merkel (praef. iv), G. Luck (Gnomon 35 (1963), 260), Lee (187).

4. The Vetustus Politiani and its descendants (see Munari xxxvii) give 3 after Am. ii. 16, and one fifteenth century Oxford MS (which Munari designates e; see his edition, loc. cit.) gives it after Am. i. 12.

5. No advocate of unity could rely entirely on the testimony of the late and undistinguished Hauniensis, and the evidence of Y is worthless here since that MS joins not only Am. ii. 2 and 3 but also i. 1-3, 8-11, 13-15, ii. 1-4, and 18-19.

6. See ln. below, Bagoe. Williams (Tradition and Originality 517) strangely seems disposed to think that poems 2 and 3 are not in fact addressed to the same person.

In support of retaining the conventional division
of the two poems it is argued that the second exhibits a
change of approach and tone too violent and too abrupt
to allow it to be simply a continuation of the first[7].
That there _is_ a change in approach and tone I would
certainly agree.   In poem 2 Ovid's attitude is 'matter-
of-fact' and, despite the occasional touch of menace[8],
fairly amicable, and in particular he tactfully avoids
all direct reference to the eunuch's lack of manhood[9];
in poem 3, however, I perceive a sustained note of wounding
mockery in what masquerades as pity as the poet dwells on
the eunuch's sexual deficiency in painfully emotive
language with a distinct suggestion of obscene double-
entendre[10].   But change of tone in itself no more proves
the independence of the two pieces than similarity in
subject-matter alone proves their unity, for Ovid in the
Amores can be seen to be averse neither to change of
tone within a single poem[11] nor to juxtaposition of two
poems on the same theme[12].   Clearly any decision on the
matter will also have to take into account his techniques
of structure and arrangement.

---

7. See especially Lenz, _loc. cit._   None of those who
   would join the two poems have seen fit to offer any
   arguments at all in favour of doing so, though the
   burden of proof surely lies with them.

8. See 9-10, 41-50, 61-2nn. below.

9. Only the initial vocative _Bagoe_ tells us that the
   addressee _is_ a eunuch;   see 2.1n.

10. See 3. 1, 5-6, 7-8, 11-12nn.   It should, of course,
    be acknowledged that views on the tone of any particular
    piece are to a certain extent bound to be subjective;
    there will no doubt be those who see genuine sympathy in
    Ovid's remarks to the eunuch in poem 3.

We may observe immediately that other pairs of
poems closely related in subject-matter, but different
in tone, which stand juxtaposed in Ovid's Amores re-
present two stages in a particular sequence of events,
and that the change of tone from one to the other is
directly prompted by a change of scene or circumstances;
the complimentary address to Corinna's maid, Nape, who
is to take her mistress a request from Ovid for an
assignation in Am. i. 11 is replaced by round abuse in
i. 12 where we discover that the request has been re-
fused[13]; the poet's disgust at the idea of having an
affair with a slave girl when Corinna accuses him of
consorting with her hairdresser, Cypassis, in Am. ii. 7
contrasts with his flattering and conciliatory approach
to the self-same Cypassis in ii. 8 when Corinna has
apparently departed[14]; and the distraught lover's
anxiety when his mistress lies at death's door after a
self-induced abortion in Am. ii. 13 gives way to anger
at the foolishness of girls who thus put themselves at

---

11. See e.g. Am. i. 14. 51 and especially i. 6. 27, 41.
    Jäger concedes this point and gives further examples
    (op. cit. 31, 37), but does not successfully refute
    it in arguing against unity.

12. See Am. i. 11 and 12, ii. 7 and 8, 13 and 14.

13. Infelix hodie littera posse negat (Am. i. 12. 2).

14. Sensit concubitos unde Corinna tuos? (Am. ii. 8. 6);
    see further below pp. 328-31.

risk in ii. 14 when Corinna is out of danger.[15]   Shall

we not then look upon _Am_. ii. 2 and 3 as a similar 'Klein-

drama in zwei Akten',[16] poem 2 making a particular request,

and poem 3 showing Ovid's piqued reaction to having it

refused?   It seems reasonable - especially in the light

of _Am_.i. 11 and 12, which also present a sequence of

request - refusal - reaction.

But whereas the treatment in separate poems of two

'scenes' such as those of _Am_. i. 11 and 12, between which

a substantial lapse of time must be imagined, seems natural

enough, similar treatment of two 'scenes' like those of

_Am_. ii. 2 and 3, which are more or less continuous, seems

rather inappropriate.   The situation does not change at

all from the first of these pieces to the second[17], and

the lapse of time between them can only be imagined as

momentary - just long enough for the eunuch to utter one

word or make one gesture which signifies to Ovid that his

rational arguments are getting him nowhere.   The circum-

stances are in fact almost identical to those in _Am_. i. 6,

---

15. <u>Di, faciles peccasse semel concedite tuto; / et
    satis est: poenam culpa secunda ferat</u> (_Am_. ii. 14. 43-4).

16. Jäger 31.

17. Lenz argues (<u>art. cit.</u> 122-3) that the situation <u>has</u> in
    fact changed substantially in poem 3.   He claims that
    lines 15-16 in that poem, <u>fallere te potuit, quamuis
    habeare molestus: / non caret effectu quod uoluere
    duo</u>, indicate that Ovid and the girl have already by
    this time had an assignation, whereas in the previous
    piece the poet has only just set eyes on her (2. 3
    <u>hesterna uidi spatientem luce puellam</u>).   But this seems
    to me to press the tense of <u>potuit</u> at 3. 15 much too
    closely;   I would prefer to take it not as a genuine
    aorist, 'she found it possible to deceive you', (thus
    Lenz, <u>art cit.</u> 123), but as the apodosis in an unfulfilled
    condition with protasis suppressed, i.e. 'she could
    have deceived you (if she had tried)'.

another dramatic monologue addressed to a _ianitor_ who
stands between Ovid and his _puella_. There, each of the
poet's attempts to cajole the unobliging slave into
compliance gives way to a cry of frustration when he
meets with no success, and before each outburst of
annoyance we must imagine, as between poems 2 and 3,
a momentary pause as Ovid awaits the doorkeeper's
reaction[18]. If, then, a single poem can accommodate
several changes of tone of this nature, why not the one
change which takes place in similar circumstances here[19]?

The case for unity now certainly begins to look
stronger, but the counter-arguments have not yet been
exhausted, for it may be pointed out that poems 2 and
3 display distinct traces of a technique of composition
habitually employed by Ovid in pairs of juxtaposed poems
which show two separate stages of a particular action or
treat the same theme from two different angles, i.e. the
recapitulation in the second piece of specific points
made in the first. For instance, full of hope in _Am._
i. 11, Ovid spends the first twelve lines of that poem in
elaborate flattery of Nape, the 'go-between' who is to

---

18. I.e between lines 26 and 27, 40 and 41, 60 and 61;
    for the affinities between _Am_. i. 6 and ii. 2 and 3,
    see further below p. 107.

19. Margaret Hubbard (_Propertius_ (London 1974), 51ff.)
    suggests that Roman readers acquainted with the mime,
    which presented a series of rapidly changing scenes
    without any apparent break, would not have been dis-
    turbed even to find a single poem treating in con-
    tinuous succession two (or more) scenes in which the
    situation _did_ change considerably from one to the other.

carry a message to his mistress; in i. 12, however,
following the rejection of his request, the self-same
Nape feels the sharp edge of the poet's tongue[20].
Similarly, most of _Am_. i. 12 is devoted to abuse of the
writing tablets upon which the message to Corinna was
written and which were promised everlasting gratitude and
honorific dedications in i. 11 [21]. To some extent
_Am_. ii. 2 and 3 seem to follow the same pattern. Both
pieces begin with a direct address to a eunuch which
indicates his sexual status; in the first it is simply
Bagoe[22], but in the second, the far more cutting nec uir
nec femina[23], and the link between the two openings is
reinforced by an echo in phraseology: quem penes est
dominam seruandi cura (2.1.), dominam ... seruas (3.1.).
And whilst Ovid argues in both pieces that if the eunuch
obliges his mistress the benefits will be mutual, at 2.18
he intimates that the slave's goodwill is indispensable
to her (domina est obnoxia seruo), but at 3. 12 that her
goodwill is indispensable to him (si careas illa, quis tuus
usus erit?). Never in single poems exhibiting changes
of tone does Ovid go over old ground in this manner[24].

---

20. Cf. especially _Am_. i. 11. 1-2 colligere incertos et in
 ordine ponere crines / docta neque ancillas inter
 habenda Nape with i. 12. 5-6 missa foras iterum limen
 transire memento / cautius atque alto sobria ferre pedem.

21. Cf. _Am_. i. 12. 7-30 with i. 11. 25-8. For another
 example of the 'recapitulation' technique see
 introduction to 7 below p. 330, n. 9.

22. See 2. 1n.

23. See 3. 1n.

24. Unless, of course, _Am_. ii. 9 (A) and (B) and iii. 11
 (A) and (B) are to be regarded as single poems; see
 further introduction to (A) and (B) below pp. 372-5.

The strikingly disparate length of our two pieces, however, may still seem to remain a serious objection to regarding them as a pair of separate, but closely related, elegies like Am. i. 11 and 12 and ii. 7 and 8, for the two poems of both those pairs, though antithetical in sentiment, are roughly even in length[25]. But it could reasonably be countered that there is something to be gained from disproportion in this case - that garrulity and expansiveness are in keeping with Ovid's persuasive attitude in the first piece, whilst caustic brevity is appropriate to his exasperation in the second.

For a final point we must return to the evidence of the MSS. The odds against the accidental separation of poems 2 and 3 seem not insignificant when one considers that erroneous division of poems by the vast majority of MSS, such as is postulated here, is unparalleled in the tradition of the Amores.

What, then, are we to conclude? The arguments in favour of regarding 2 and 3 as a single poem seem strong indeed, but they cannot be said to be entirely convincing, and there are enough counter-arguments to suggest that the traditional division of the two elegies should be retained, if with some reservation. That said, however, I would seriously submit that the whole issue is in fact by no means as important as it may appear to be; Ovid

---

25. Am. i. 11 has 28 lines and i. 12 30 lines, Am. ii. 7 and ii. 8 both have 28 lines. Note also that Am. ii. 9 is generally divided into two pieces of 24 lines and 30 lines, and iii. 11 into two of 32 lines and 20 lines.

clearly intended that these two pieces should be read

consecutively, and whether they are, or are not,

physically conjoined is really of little consequence

for the reader's ultimate appreciation of them[26]. At

least, though, it will be clear that in respect of their

content poems 2 and 3 can, and should, be considered

together.

The elegiac poets would have us believe that the

puellae with whom they consorted were regularly placed

under guard by their husbands, lovers, or keepers[27]; and

whilst it would be unwise to assume solely on the evidence

provided by Latin elegy, riddled as it is with conventional

motifs, that the practice actually existed[28], remarks

26. Cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Hellenistische
    Dichtung (Berlin 1924) I. 235, n.1. The matter does,
    of course, along with the problem of whether to divide
    or not to divide Am. ii. 9 and iii. 11 and whether to
    condemn iii. 5 as unauthentic, have some bearing on
    the question (much-discussed in general studies of
    the structure of the Amores; see introduction to 5
    below p. 227, n. 3) of the likely number of poems in
    each book. It would be wrong to allow any preconceptions
    in this area to dictate the relationship of our two
    poems, but we may at least note that if they are regarded
    as separate and poem 9 below is divided into two, the
    satisfying round number of twenty emerges for Book ii
    (multiples of five were standard in Augustan books of poems; cf
    A. Cameron, CQ n.s. 18 (1968), 329-30). G. Luck,
    however, who would join poems 2 and 3 (but divide poem
    9), suggests not implausibly (in Antike Lyrik, ed. W.
    Eisenhut, 464, n. 1) that the round number may have
    alternatively been made up by an epilogue, now lost,
    which corresponded with those ending Books i and iii.

27. For the purposes of the elegists it matters not which;
    see introduction to 5 below. p.226, n. 1. Pichon
    collects many examples of the custodia motif in Roman
    elegy in his Index, s.v. custos.

28. The danger of basing general conclusions about the
    life of Roman women on the dubious testimony of the

made from time to time elsewhere do suggest that the

appointment of official chaperons to guard the fidelity

of women - especially married women of dubious morality -

may not have been unknown[29]. But be that as it may,

there can be little doubt that the scene which Ovid

envisages in the present pair of poems reflects not so

much a state of affairs common in Augustan life as the

poet's interest in the themes and situations of New

Comedy. There is in particular an unmistakable similarity

between the advice and warnings which Ovid gives to the

eunuch at 2. 17ff. below and those given by the slave

Palaestrio in Plautus's Miles Gloriosus to a fellow-slave

from a different household who has been allotted the task

elegiac texts has not always been avoided; J.P,V.D.
Balsdon's Roman Women: their history and habits
(London 1962) is particularly unsatisfactory in this
respect. Lilja does at least attempt to distinguish
between the Roman women of literature and those of
real-life (see id. 18ff.), though the nature of her
generally very sound and useful book makes it
easy to lose sight of that distinction. Two fairly
recent articles examine specifically the relationship
between the traditional role of the elegiac puella
and that of the Roman woman in real-life: J.P. Hallett,
'The role of women in Roman elegy', Arethusa 6 (1973),
103-24 (a perceptibly feminist approach); G. Luck,
'The woman's role in Latin love poetry', in Perspectives
of Roman Poetry, ed. G.K. Galinsky (Austin, Texas
1974), 17-31.

29. See Hor. S. i. 2. 97-8, Juv. 6. 235, O 29-34, Tac.
Ann. xi. 35. 3. Not much store can be set by Juvenal's
references to custodia, one must admit, in view of
their appearance in a poem pullulating with topoi which,
for all their Juvenalian trappings and tone, are
in essence recognizably elegiac. I think particularly
of the themes of female willingness to follow a lover
overseas despite the discomforts of a sea voyage (92-
102; cf. Prop. i. 8 (A)), capacity to influence the

of guarding his master's concubine[30]. And the position

of power and prestige, with immunity from punishment, which

Ovid promises to the eunuch at 2.29ff., if he plays the

accomplice, was not one generally enjoyed by the con-

temporary real-life slave, but rather the prerogative

of the <u>callidus seruus</u> of New Comedy[31] - the resourceful

rogue who so very often acts as an indispensable <u>aide</u>

to his love-sick young master, or, if his master is old, to

the enamoured son of the household[32]. That there are

affinities in subject-matter between Roman comedy and

Roman love elegy has, of course, long been recognized and

much discussed[33], but nowhere are they more immediately

apparent than in the present pair of poems.

---

way a man treats his slaves (219-223; cf. 31-4 below), use
of cosmetics (461-73; cf. <u>Ars</u> ii. 209-18, <u>Rem</u>. 351-6),
abuse of hairdressers (487-93; cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 14. 13-18) and
readiness to resort to abortion (592-601; cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 13
and 14).

30. See 476-7.

31. See F. Leo, <u>Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Ge-
schichte der Komödie</u> (Berlin 1895, 2nd edn. 1912, reprinted
Darmstadt 1966), 140, G.E. Duckworth, <u>The Nature of Roman
Comedy</u> (Princeton 1952), 288-90, P.P. Spranger, <u>Historisches
Untersuchungen zu den Sklavenfiguren des Plautus und Terenz</u>,
<u>Akad. der Wissensch. u. der Lit. in Mainz, Geisten u.
Sozialwissensch. Kl</u>. 8 (1960), 36-51, especially 47ff.,
Williams, <u>Tradition and Originality</u> 294-5. Cf. 29-30n. below.

32. E.g. Trachalio in Pl. <u>Rud</u>., Pseudolus in Pl. <u>Ps</u>.,
Tranio in Pl. <u>Mos</u>., Dauus in Ter. <u>An</u>., Syrus in Ter. <u>Hau</u>.

33. The suggestion that the themes and situations of New
Comedy came to Latin elegy via a corpus of subjective
Alexandrian love elegy now lost was first advanced by Leo
(<u>Plautinische Forschungen</u> 126ff.). Most scholars, however,
in broad outline following F. Jacoby (whose justly famous
article, 'Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie', <u>RhM</u> 60
(1905), 38-105, specifically set out to challenge Leo's

But if Ovid's basic ingredients are familiar, the way in which he uses them is not. By casting his material in the form of a dramatic monologue[34] addressed by the lover himself to the slave who guards his beloved - in other words, by having the elegiac _amator_ (who contrasts sharply with the spineless _adulescens_ of New Comedy) take over the role of instructor in the art of connivance -[35] he is able to produce a new variation on the traditional

---

theory), now believe that the influence of comedy on the Roman elegists was probably direct. There is a vast bibliography on the subject (mostly dating from the earlier part of this century) from which I select some of the more notable items prompted by the work of Leo and Jacoby: V. Hoelzer, _De poesi amatoria a comicis Atticis exculta_ (Diss. Marburg 1899), R. Bürger, _De Ouidi carminum amatoriorum inuentione et arte_, Guelferbyti 1901, T. Gollnisch, _Quaestiones Elegiacae_ (Diss. Breslau 1905), P. Troll, _De elegiae Romanae origine_ (Diss. Göttingen 1911-12), E.A. Barber in _The Elegies of Propertius_, ed. H.E. Butler and E.A. Barber (Oxford 1933), introduction xlviii-l, A.A. Day, _The Origins of Latin Love Elegy_ (Oxford 1938) (with copious bibliography at 141-6), A.-M. Guillemin, 'Sur les origines de l'élégie latine', _REL_ 17 (1939), 282-92 (see also n. 35 below); for more recent studies see Stroh 197, n. 2 (Stroh himself investigates the general question of the development of Latin love elegy from a refreshingly new angle at 197-226).

34. A favourite device of the Alexandrians which became popular with Catullus, Horace and the elegists; see Williams, _Tradition and Originality_ 220-21, Nisbet-Hubbard's introduction to Hor. _Carm._ i. 27. Ovid is in general an expert at dramatic monologue, but perhaps his most accomplished pieces in this form are _Am._ ii. 7 and 8 (see introduction to 7 below pp. 228-31) and iii. 2; see further V.A. Tracy, 'Dramatic elements in Ovid's _Amores_', _Latomus_ 36 (1977), 496-500.

35. The didactic role more frequently assumed by the elegiac poet is that of _praeceptor amoris_ to those actually engaged in love. A.L. Wheeler, ('Erotic teaching in Roman elegy and the Greek sources', _CPh_ 5 (1910), 440-50, 6 (1911), 56-77) argues persuasively that in taking it up the Latin elegists directly adapted material from New Comedy, introducing an element of originality by casting themselves in the teaching role which the comic poets normally reserved for the _lena_ or _meretrix_ (cf. E. Burck, _Hermes_ 80 (1952), 186).

exclusus amator theme[36]. Ovid has already exercised

his ingenuity on this motif in Am. i. 6, where instead

of addressing himself directly to the beloved[37], or her

door[38], he turns his attention to the doorkeeper (whose

role is presumably much the same as that of the eunuch

here); now, in our two poems, he has (apparently) dis-

pensed with the doorstep setting and introduced a special

kind of custos - a eunuch[39] - whose personal shortcomings

provide the frustrated lover with a new line of attack

when all the arguments which could be addressed to any

kind of slave have been exhausted.   In this version of

the exclusus amator motif, the centre of interest has thus

been shifted from the lover himself to the custos, the

domina and the uir[40].

Ovid seems to be working on much the same principles here
in giving to himself a slightly different kind of didactic
part which had previously been played by a roguish slave
(cf. p. 105 above).

36. See 1. 17, 22nn.

37. Cf. Call. AP v. 23, Hor. Carm. iii. 10.

38. Cf. Tib. i. 2. 7-14, Prop. i. 16. 17-48.

39. See 2. 1n. below Bagoe.

40. Another different version appears in Am. iii. 4,
where the addressee of the exclusus amator is the uir himself;
at ii. 19 he is again the addressee in an even more enter-
prising version in which the visiting amator finds to
his dismay that the uir has not taken steps to guard the
domina and exclude her lovers!

Poems 2 and 3 have never been among the most highly rated of Ovid's <u>amatoria</u>[41], though they are not entirely devoid of humour or artistic merit. 2 has good moments as Ovid shows his usual penetrating insight into the psychology of heterosexual relationships[42], while 3 may amuse by its malicious mockery and sly innuendo[43]; and whether the two pieces are taken as one continuous elegy or as an unusual kind of diptych[44], the change of tone and tactics from one to the other - facilitated by the dramatic format - is an interesting feature. But on the whole they have not been unfairly judged; technically and intellectually accomplished pieces though they may be[45], they fail to excite or to charm.

---

41. See e.g. Brandt 28 ' ... die beiden Gedichte, die nicht zu den Perlen der Ovidischen Erotik gezählt werden können und deren Verlust, zumal des zweiten, wir unschwer ertragen könnten.'

42. Cf. D'Elia, <u>loc. cit.</u>

43. Ovid's special talent for 'rubbing in' painful truths is demonstrated rather more attractively in <u>Am</u>. i. 14 where, after Corinna has ruined her own hair, Ovid dwells on its former beauty with an abundance of undeniably appealing <u>Schadenfreude</u>!

44. See pp. 95-103 above.

45. Jäger (25-6) goes so far as to maintain that poem 2 is constructed along the lines of a formal <u>suasoria</u>. Certainly the arguments which Ovid produces could be utilized in the rhetorical exercise of that name, but it is arguable that the poet's presentation of them in a dramatic setting with a series of swift transitions owes more to his own facility and imagination than to any rhetorical training. See further general introduction pp. 11-14.

1-8. Ovid puts us in the picture with a brief outline of events
to date, ostensibly for the benefit of his addressee.
Though the situation he presents is different, he surely
had in mind here Propertius's lines at ii. 23. 3-6:

> ingenuus quisquam alterius dat munera seruo,
> ut promissa suae uerba ferat dominae?
> et quaerit totiens 'Quaenam nunc porticus illam
> integit?' et 'Campo quo mouet illa pedes?'

1. <u>quem penes</u>: 'You who have the special responsibility.'
The preposition is used in both mundane and elevated
contexts (see e.g. Cic. <u>Agr</u>. ii. 52 <u>eos agros quorum</u>
<u>adhuc penes Cn. Pompeium omne iudicium</u> ... <u>debet esse</u>
<u>xuiri</u>, Caes. <u>Gal</u>. vii. 21. 3 <u>quod penes eos</u> ... <u>summam</u>
<u>uictoriae constare intellegebant</u>; <u>Fast</u>. i. 119 <u>me</u>
<u>penes est unum uasti custodia mundi</u>, Verg. <u>A</u>. xii. 59
<u>decus imperiumque Latini te penes</u>) and is not, as Lenz
claims, archaic or in itself particularly grandiloquent;
if it has any special force, it is that of conveying
<u>exclusive</u> control or responsibility. For its position
following the word it governs cf. Hor. <u>Ars</u> 71-2 <u>usus /</u>
<u>quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi</u>
(with Brink's note).

<u>dominam seruandi</u>: here simply 'looking after your
mistress', but cf. 3. 1n. There is no real reason to
doubt the reading of the majority of the MSS, since the
gerund with object accusative replaces the more generally

preferred gerundive construction, particularly in the
genitive case, with increasing frequency from Sallust
onwards; see Hofmann-Szantyr 596, Kühner-Stegmann II. i.
735.

Bagoe: Bagous (or Bagoas; see below) was the name of
several notorious Persian eunuchs (see RE 2.2771-2)
which eventually became synonymous with eunuchus itself
(see Plin. Nat. xiii. 41). Ovid's use of it here serves
to tell us that his addressee is a eunuch, but relieves
him of the need to make any explicit reference to the
fact in the present poem (see introduction above p. 97 and
cf. L. Alfonsi, Latomus 23 (1964), 349, 28 (1969), 207-8).
    Eunuch slaves were common figures in the ancient
world from the earliest times to the late Roman and
Byzantine periods. In Rome they became increasingly
prominent from the end of the Republic onwards and were
influential figures in the late Empire in the east (see
M.K. Hopkins, 'Eunuchs in the later Roman Empire', PCPhS
19 (1963), 62-80, and in general RE, Suppl. 3. 449ff.).
The specific situation which Ovid presents here certainly
seems to be rooted in literature rather than reality (see
introduction above pp.103-4), but there are a number of
references not only in literary but also in historical
texts to eunuchs in demeaning roles as ladies' maids
(see e.g. Ter. Eu. 167-9, 583ff., Juv. 6. O 15-20, Claud.
in Eutr. i. 106-9, Amm. Marc. xviii. 4. 4, Hist. Aug.,

Alex. Sev. 23. 7). We may be sure that they were openly
despised (see e.g. Hor. Carm. i. 37. 9-10, Epod. 9. 13,
Sen. Ben. v. 16. 6, Mart. v. 41, Juv. 6. 513-15, 14. 91,
Claud. in Eutr. i. 330ff. - lack of physical strength is
a particularly frequent taunt (see e.g. Ter. Eu. 231, 357,
Mart. iii. 58. 32, Juv. i. 22; cf. Am. ii. 3. 7-8)), and
it comes as no surprise when Ovid's tone of at least moderate
civility in the present poem gives way to one of sneering
sarcasm in the sequel, 3 below (see introduction above p. 97).

(Kenney's emendation of the spelling of the vocative
here to Bagoa (Notes 59-60) has won the support of all
subsequent editors. There is certainly something to be
said for it; for by far the most commonly attested forms
of the name are the Greek Βαγώας (D.S. xvii. 5, Plu.
Moralia 337E, 340B, Alex. 67, App. Mith. 10, Arr. Ind.
18. 8, Luc. Eun. 4. 5, J. AJ xvii. 44, Ael. VH iii. 23,
Hld. Aeth. viii. 12, POxy I. 12. ii. 12; a minor variant
Βαγόας appears in a Greek papyrus from Egypt (Sammelb.
I. 378)), and its Latin equivalent Bagoas (Quint. Inst. v.
12. 21, Plin. Nat. xiii. 41 (genitive Bagou; for this
termination, see Neue-Wagener I.207-8), Curt. vi. 3. 12
(genitive Bagoae), 4. 10, 5. 23, x. 1. 2). Bagous, which
would give the vocative Bagoe, is to be paralleled only by
Βαγῶος at Strabo xv. 3. 23. Not much faith, it is true,
can be placed in the MSS of Strabo, which are, as Kenney
reminds us (Notes 59, n.9), of 'notorious badness'; but
though their readings cannot for that reason be used to
support readings in other texts, neither can they disable

them if the latter have independent merit. We should ex-
amine first, therefore, the credentials of the reading
Bagoe in Ovid's Amores, a text of which the tradition is,
as it happens, relatively 'good'.

Bagoe in our passage in fact has excellent MS
support (for the minor variant Bagoge, see Goold, Amat.
Crit. 12); and, what is more, error such as is postulated
here (i.e. false declension of a proper name with virtually
complete consensus codicum) is unparalleled in the tradition
of the Amores, Ars and Remedia (indeed, 'unusual' vocatives
in particular may be seen to have been faithfully transmitted
by all the MSS: e.g. Borea at Am. i. 6. 53, Aeacide at
Ars i. 691). On internal grounds, then, Bagoe would seem
to be unimpeachable, and, by virtue of its independent
strength, even to lend support to the otherwise doubtful
Βαγῶος in Strabo.

Even the external evidence is perhaps not as damning
as it might at first appear; for the name we are dealing
with is in origin neither Greek nor Latin, but Persian (see
below, and further F. Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch (Marburg
1895, reprinted, Hildesheim 1963), 59-60), and some
variation in its Hellenized, and subsequently Latinized,
form is therefore surely not at all unlikely (for some
examples of variant forms of foreign proper names found in
Greek papyri, see F. Presigke, Namenbuch (Heidelberg 1922),
'Anhang', 503-26). Clearly we must assume, leaving aside
a number of variants obviously descended from Semitic
sources (see Justi, loc. cit.), that the form in -ας / -as

had become standard by the first century A.D., but it is possible that a parallel form in -os / -us (cf. the attestation of both Ἀρκαθίας and Ἀρκάθιος, and Γουνδαβούνας and Γουνδαφοῦνδος (ap. Justi 26, 120)) was known and used at an earlier time, the two attestations of the name in Ovid and Strabo, interestingly, being amongst the earliest we possess in either form.

The case for the vulgate Bagoe, then, would seem to be strong enough to warrant its retention, and Kenney's Bagoa, though remaining a possibility, cannot be considered a necessity.)

2. 'Pay attention while I go over just a few pertinent points with you.' Ovid prepares the eunuch for an important and (he hopes!) convincing lecture. For peragere in this sense cf. Fast. v. 680 peragit solita fallere uoce preces, Liv. i. 32. 6 peragit deinde postulata, and for the absolute use of uacare (instead of the usual construction with the dative) cf. Prop. iv. 6. 13-14 Caesar / dum canitur, quaeso, Iuppiter ipse uaces.

3-4. The colonnades of Rome, where young women were apparently in the habit of taking leisurely strolls, feature prominently in Ovid's guides in the Ars to the best hunting-grounds for aspiring lovers on the look-out for a congenial partner; see i. 67-8, 71-4, iii. 387ff.; cf. i. 491ff., Rem. 627-8, Catul. 55. 6, Prop. ii. 23. 5-6, 32. 11-12,

iv. 8. 75. The particular portico to which he refers
here adjoined the temple of Palatine Apollo which Octavian
had vowed in return for his victory over Sextus Pompey in
36 B.C. and which was dedicated in October 28 B.C. (see
Suet. _Aug_. 29. 3 _templum Apollinis in ea parte Palatinae_
domus excitauit quam fulmine ictam desiderari a deo
haruspices pronuntiarant; addidit porticus cum biblio-
theca Latina Graecaque; cf. Aug. _Anc_. 19, Vell. ii. 81.
3, D.C. liii. 1. 2); we are told by the scholiast
on Pers. 2. 56 that a row of statues between the columns
of the portico represented the fifty daughters of Danaus
(cf. _Danai_ ... _agmen_, 4) and that opposite them in the
open air stood equestrian statues of the fifty sons of
Aegyptus who, with one exception, were murdered by their
wives, the Danaids (for the story see Roscher, _Lexicon_
I. 949-52, Enk on Prop. ii. 31. 4, Brandt on _Ars_ i. 73ff.).
The temple and portico, which were among the most splendid
buildings of Augustan Rome (for further description see
S.B. Platner and T. Ashby, _A Topographical Dictionary of_
Ancient Rome (Oxford 1929), 16-17, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor.
Carm. i. 31. 1), are the subject of serious appreciation
by the poets elsewhere (see _Tr_. iii. 1. 59-62 and especially
Hor. _Carm_. i. 31, Prop. ii. 31), and undoubtedly Ovid's
depiction of the portico here simply as the promenade of
eye-catching women will have done nothing to endear him to
the Augustan establishment.

4. _illa quae ... porticus ... habet_: i.e. _illa porticu quae ..._
habet. Juggling with the position of the antecedent is

one of Ovid's favourite stylistic ploys (see Barsby 26);
here its two components (illā and porticus) are split
between the main clause and the relative clause.

5-8. Ovid is at pains to make his attempt to secure an assignation
seem fraught with as much difficulty as possible, laborious-
ly reporting no less than four stages in the process:
he made his request; the girl told him she was not at
liberty to grant it; he asked why; she gave the reason.
It is a calculated build-up to cura molesta tua est (8)
which completes Ovid's scene-setting introduction.

5. placuit: see 4. 17n.

misi scriptoque rogaui: some editors have been troubled
by the use of mittere here. Brandt, Harder-Marg and
Lenz understand puerum misi (cf. Pl. Per. 165-6 puerum
uolo / mittere ad amicam meam, ut habeat animum bonum;
see further ThLL 8. 1181. 41ff.), but the absolute use
of mittere = epistulam (uel. sim.) mittere is well attested
(cf. Cic. Att. xii. 12. 2 institui cotidie mittere, and
for further examples see ThLL 8. 1184. 79ff.). For
the general use of letters in courtship cf. Am. i. 11
and 12, Ars i. 437-86, iii. 469-98.

The crudely explicit noctemque, which appears in some
later MSS for scriptoque, perhaps emanates from a gloss
on rogaui and could have been substituted in the text for
scriptoque by a scribe who understood well enough

the absolute use of _mittere_ but not that of _rogare_; the latter is, of course, frequently used absolutely as an erotic euphemism (cf. 7. 25n.).

6. '_non licet_': 'I can't', 'I'm not at liberty to (comply)'; cf. Ter. _An._ 804-5 _sic (agimus) / ut quimus ... quando ut uolumus non licet._

8. _nimium ... cura molesta tua est_: 'Your tutelage is too oppressive', 'makes things too difficult' (cf. _Ars_ iii. 601-2 _incitat et ficti tristis custodia serui / et nimium duri cura molesta uiri_). Ovid takes up this point at _Am._ii.3. 15-16, but whereas here he makes it possible for the _custos_ to believe that his vigilance is a deterrent of some significance, there he maintains that it has nuisance-value only and presents no real obstacle to determined lovers. Cf. introduction above p. 101.

9-16. The sequence of thought is (I think) as follows: 'You are a fool, _custos_, if you do not keep on the right side of those who matter (9-10) - the girl's _uir_ is a fool too in imagining that there is any point in guarding her (11-12), but let him have his silly ideas (13-14) - _she_ is the one who can reward you for your services' (15-16). The remark on the foolishness of the _uir_ seems to be the beginning of a digression which Ovid abruptly cuts short: 'Her _uir_, incidentally... but never mind about him.'

9-10. <u>si sapis</u> ... / <u>desine</u>: a note of controlled menace,
contrasting with Ovid's fairly bland tone in much of the
rest of the poem (but cf. 41-50, 61-2 below), arises from
skilful choice of words and word-order. The strong <u>odium</u>
... <u>merere</u> demands our attention in the hexameter, but
the sense is not complete until we reach <u>desine</u> at the
beginning of the pentameter - a literally and metaphorically
arresting use of enjambement (cf. 63-4 below, 6. 2nn.) -
and the admonitory tone is heightened by the use of the
impassioned <u>o</u> with the vocative (see 9 (<u>A</u>). 1-2n.) and the
basically colloquial expressions <u>si sapis</u> and <u>mihi crede</u>
(see Hofmann, <u>Lateinische Umgangssprache</u> 126, 134, 199-200),
to which the Latin poets often resort when a ring of extra
intensity is required (the precise tone varies according
to the context; see Tränkle, <u>Sprachkunst</u> 9-10).

10. The sentiment is proverbial; cf. Enn. <u>Trag</u>. 348 (Jocelyn)
<u>quem metuunt oderunt: quem quisque odit, periisse expetit</u>
(see further A. Otto, <u>Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen</u>
<u>Redensarten der Römer</u> (Leipzig 1890, reprinted, Hildesheim
1962), 252).

<u>perisse</u>: here the perfect infinitive may be preferred to
the present (which appears in some MSS) simply on account
of its temporal significance, since a 'pure' perfect is
obviously entirely appropriate (<u>perisse cupit</u> = 'wishes
him dead' (literally 'to have died')), and indeed it seems
probable that it was standard in expressions of this

particular sentiment (note the fragment of Ennius cited
above and also Lucil. 184 (Marx) <u>ut per⟨i⟩isse uelis, quem
uisere nolueris</u>.   Cf., however, 7.19n.

11. <u>uir</u>:   see introduction to 5 below p. 226, n. 1.

<u>non sapiens</u>:   the type of stupidity which Ovid sees fit
to abuse in the elegiac <u>uir</u> is, as usual, his inability to
reason out the best way of treating his <u>puella</u>.   Of course,
Ovid finds fault with whichever line of action the unhappy
man decides upon: here and in <u>Am</u>. iii. 4 his strict
vigilance is naïve and tiresome, whilst in <u>Am</u>. ii. 19 his
easy compliance spoils the fun.

11-12. <u>quid enim seruare laboret / unde nihil, quamuis non tueare</u>,
<u>perit</u>:   'Why else' (<u>enim</u>;   see below) 'should' (or 'would')
'he bother to guard what loses nothing even if one leaves
it unguarded?'   Doubtless a veiled reference to the
sexual parts of a woman's body;   cf. <u>Ars</u> iii. 89-90 <u>ut</u>
<u>iam decipiant (uiri) quid perditis?   omnia constant; /</u>
<u>mille licet sumant, deperit inde nihil</u>, <u>Priap</u>. 3. 1-2 (Buecheler)
<u>obscure poteram tibi dicere: da mihi, quod tu / des licet</u>
<u>assidue, nil tamen inde perit</u> (a piece attributed to Ovid
by the elder Seneca at <u>Con</u>. i. 2. 22).   See further Brandt,
'Anhang' 212.

11. <u>enim</u>:   an idiomatic use of the conjunction (particularly
common in rhetorical questions) to introduce an explanation

for the previous statement;   here a conditional clause
is suppressed: 'The _uir_ too has no sense, for (if he
had) why would he bother ... ';   cf. Petr. 97. 9 _scio_
te ... ad occidendum me uenisse, quo enim secures attulisti?
See further _OLD_ s.v. 3b, F. Hand, _Tursellinus seu de_
particulis Latinis commentarii (Leipzig 1829-45, reprinted,
Amsterdam 1969) II. 390.

laboret: there would seem to be little to choose between
the _laboret_ of PSς and the _laborat_ of Yς, since both suit
the rhetorical question equally well.   But _laboret_
(deliberative or potential subjunctive;   see Hofmann-
Szantyr 571, E.C. Woodcock, _A New Latin Syntax_ (London 1959),
133) seems the more elegant (also the less immediately
comprehensible and therefore the more open to corruption).

 Some of the _recc._ give second person singular
(_labores_, _laboras_) instead of third.   Doubtless the com-
bination of third person in line 11 with ideal second
person (_tueare_) in line 12 baffled not a few scribes, who
consequently resorted to 'emendation' by the most obvious
method.

13-14. Not only the _uir stultus_ but every elegiac lover is
  prone to self-delusion (cf. 47-60n. below) when the
  fidelity of his _puella_ is in doubt;   cf. _Am_. i. 4. 69-70,
  iii. 14, [Tib.] iii. 20, Prop. ii. 32. 25-6 and see
  further 5. 7-12 nn.

13. <u>gerat ille suo morem ... amori</u>:   'Let him indulge his

passion'.   For the construction cf. Cic. Quinct. 9

<u>Sex. Naeui studio et cupiditati morem gerunt</u>;   see further

<u>ThLL</u> 6. 1942. 41ff., <u>OLD</u> s.v. <u>mos</u> 6.

<u>furiosus</u>:   the description of love as <u>furor</u>, 'madness', is

a favourite poetic cliché (see Serv. <u>A</u>. iv. 69 'furor enim

est amor in quo nihil est stabile';   cf. Catul. 64. 54

<u>indomitos in corde gerens Ariadna furores</u>, Verg. <u>A</u>. i.

658-60 <u>ut ... Cupido</u> / <u>... furentem / incendat reginam</u>, Prop.

i. 1. 7 <u>mihi iam toto furor hic non deficit anno</u>, and

especially <u>Am</u>. i. 2. 35 where <u>Furor</u> takes part in Cupid's

triumph as a member of his entourage;   Pichon collects further

examples s.v.), but I have found no parallels for the

related adjectival use of <u>furiosus</u>, and probably the word

is simply meant as a hyperbolical synonym for <u>stultus</u> here

(see <u>ThLL</u> 6.1620.15ff.).   The epithet normally used of the

madness of love is <u>insanus</u> (see e.g. <u>Ep</u>. 12. 193, <u>Ars</u> i.

372, ii. 563, Tib. ii. 6. 18, Prop. ii. 14. 18, iii. 17. 3).

For adjectives in -<u>osus</u> see 4. 1n.

14. The implication is that 'fair means fickle';   cf. <u>Ep</u>.

15. 288-90 <u>hanc faciem culpa posse carere putas? / aut</u>

<u>faciem mutes aut sis non dura, necesse est; / lis est cum</u>

<u>forma magna pudicitiae</u>. Cf.Juv. 10. 293ff.

<u>castum</u>:   not 'chaste' but, as often in elegy with reference

to both wives and mistresses, 'faithful';   cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 4. 3,

Tib. i. 3. 83, Prop. iii. 12. 15 (further examples at
ThLL 3. 566. 53ff.; see also G. Luck in Perspectives of
Roman Poetry 20ff.).

quod: we might expect quae, but the more general neuter
suits the gnomic nature of the sentiment. Cf. 5. 9n.

placet: see 4. 17n.

15-16. The custos is to grant his domina freedom to indulge in
erotic adventures, with a view to getting her in return
to grant him freedom proper (cf. 39-40 below, Am. i. 6.
25-6). Ovid carefully avoids any direct qualification of
libertas in 15 in order that he may exploit fully the
humorous potential of the idea of a slave being able to
grant freedom to his mistress, and in 16 the notion of
reciprocation is neatly reflected in the construction of
the line (Christopher Marlowe renders the couplet well
in English: 'Stol'n liberty she may by thee obtain, / Which
giving her, she may give thee again'); cf. 1. 22, 5. 31,
57-8, 10. 8nn., Frécaut 35.

huic ... / ... illi ... illa: huic in 15 indicates
the puella as opposed to ille, the uir, in 13. Illi
and illa in 16, however, refer again to the puella. When
these two demonstrative pronouns are used in close proximity
they do not, generally speaking, designate the same person,
as they do in the present couplet (see Hofmann-Szantyr 475),
but the poets use them with considerable flexibility; see

E. Wölfflin, 'Zur Geschichte der Pronomina demonstrativa',
ALL 12 (1902), 239-46.

15. *furtiua*: for the clandestine element in elegiac love-
affairs see 8. 8n.

16. Though a Roman woman *sui iuris* may herself manumit a slave
with the consent of her *tutor* (see W.W. Buckland, A Text-
book of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian (Cambridge
1921), 166-9), the most likely method of obtaining freedom
for her favourite would be by interceding with the *dominus*
on his behalf. But doubtless Ovid's conception of slavery
and emancipation here owes more to literature than to
real-life (see introduction above pp.104-5).

17-40. Ovid now proceeds to emphasize for the *custos* the potential
advantages of aiding and abetting his mistress's illicit
love-affairs, with detailed instructions on how to play
the part of the accomplice without putting himself in
any danger. There is a lot that he can do in a passive
role, the poet claims, simply by turning a blind eye and
asking no questions (18-26), but he can actively help
things along a little by getting himself a reputation for
making false accusations (35-8); in return, he will be
able to lord it in his own household without fear of
recrimination (29-34), and ultimately he may hope to win
his freedom (39-40).

 The whole passage has a flavour which smacks strongly of
New Comedy (see introduction above pp.104-7).

17. <u>conscius esse uelis?</u>: a sudden direct question ensures that
the attention of the <u>custos</u> does not wander. The
'accomplice' or 'confidant' (<u>conscius</u>) in elegy is nor-
mally a woman: see <u>Ars</u> i. 353-4, iii, 621ff.

<u>domina est obnoxia seruo</u>: a startling reversal of the
conventional relationship; cf. 15-16 above, 3. 11-14nn.

18-27. These lines constitute one of three passages in the <u>Amores</u>
(the other two being i. 13. 11-14 and 33-4) which are
present in the <u>recc.</u>, but not in the original text of any
of our oldest MSS (i.e. they are transmitted by the β,
but not the α, branch of the tradition; for the use of these
significations see general introduction, p. 16). Their
authenticity has consequently been in dispute - denied on
the one hand by Munari (pref. xxii-xxiv) on the basis
of arguments presented by Lenz (<u>RAL</u> s. 6, vol. 13 (1937),
392-3 and <u>JAW</u> 264 (1939), 75-8), and defended on the
other in part (i.e. with the exception of the couplet
23-4) by Kenney (<u>CR</u> n.s. 5 (1955), 13-14 and <u>Man. Trad.</u>
9), and in entirety by e.g. K. Büchner (<u>loc. cit.</u>), Jäger
(<u>op. cit.</u> 27-9) and now, in a recantation of his earlier
view, even Lenz himself (edition 207-8).

An acute observation by Kenney has given us good
reason to suppose that at least one of the disputed lines
(27) was present in a MS from which the common ancestor
of our oldest witnesses <u>PSY</u> (i.e. α) was directly or
indirectly copied: 'At 31 <u>P</u> has <u>honores</u> for <u>inanes</u>. The
corruption is by no means an obvious one, and can have

come from nowhere but the _honores_ of 27, _which must_
therefore have stood in P's ancestor (CR n.s. 5 (1955),
14 (Kenney's italics; cf. _Man. Trad._ 9)). If Kenney's
theory is correct (see further 31n.), we may be reasonably
sure of two things: (i) that the β MSS do, as is generally
believed, descend from the 'archetypal' text independently
of the α group, which means that their testimony is
indispensable to the modern editor, and (ii) that line
27 at least was not the work of a mediaeval forger. We
cannot, however, purely on the basis of this, say anything
about 18-26, for it does not _necessarily_ follow from the
strong probability that 27 was contained in some ancestor
of P's that the rest of the disputed lines were contained
there also; nor can we even be certain that 27 is authentic,
since, theoretically at any rate, it (and indeed the whole
passage) could have been interpolated in antiquity.

But there are other grounds for believing that line
18 as well as line 27 is unlikely to have been interpolated
in mediaeval, or in fact in ancient, times; for it is
most improbable that interpolators in either period
were 'astute enough to provide a sound palaeographical
reason why their forgeries should appear liable to be
omitted by scribes' (A.G. Lee, CR n.s. 2 (1952), 175;
cf. Madvig, _Adversaria Critica_ I, 92). 'Saut du même au
même' (from _conscius_ in 17 to _conscius_ in 27) would
clearly account for the accidental omission of 18 and 27
and also, of course, 19-26 if they were present in the exempla
but _we still cannot know for certain whether they were or_
not.

Lines 19-26 in fact form a self-contained and, _prima_

<u>facie</u> at any rate, an eminently insertable passage - a
string of <u>exempla</u> inspired by <u>dissimulare licet</u> in 18 -
and the devil's advocate might easily conjecture that
19-26 were indeed interpolated, either at a pre-archetypal
stage, if these lines <u>were</u> in the exemplar of α, or, if
they were not, at a later stage and in one branch of
the tradition only.   If 18 and 27 alone were genuine,
we should read thus:

> conscius esse uelis? domina est obnoxia seruo - 17
>   conscius esse times? dissimulare licet.   18
> conscius assiduos commissi tollet honores: 27
>   quis minor est autem quam tacuisse labor?   28

The sense is quite acceptable, and anaphora at the beginning
of three successive lines is not unparalleled in Ovid's
elegiacs (cf. <u>Ep</u>. 2. 49-51, <u>Pont</u>. ii. 6. 21-3, iv. 3.
15-17, 7. 7-9).   All highly speculative, of course, but
not impossible, and enough to emphasize that only the sense
and style of the passage, as Kenney indeed has intimated,
can be decisive in the end.

In sense, lines 18-27 are perfectly apt, both in
themselves and within their immediate context: the section
17-40 shows Ovid attempting to win the eunuch's co-
operation by persuading him of the benefits to be gained
by being a confidant and of the ease with which he might
enact that role;   twice, however (18-26 and 31-8), he
breaks off to allay the slave's natural fear of being
found out and suffering accordingly (cf. Pl. <u>Mil</u>. 305-
12).   It could be argued that 28 coheres well with 17,
but how much better it coheres with 27, and how much more

pointed it is in the wake of 19-26!

In style, so typical is the disputed passage of Ovid's manner of composition that, had it come down to us under no ancient author's name, few scholars, I suspect, would have hesitated to attribute it to the poet from Sulmo. It might, for instance, be observed:

(i) that we are intended, as often in Ovid, to picture for ourselves from the poet's own words - usually a sudden direct command or question, and here conscius esse times? (18) - the reaction of his silent addressee; cf. Am. ii. 8. 9-10, 23-4, iii. 2. 21-4.

(ii) that the use of anaphora to point some kind of contrast (conscius esse uelis? ... / conscius esse times?) is a recognizably Ovidian trait; cf. Met. i. 470-71 quod facit auratumst ... / quod fugat obtusumst.

(iii) that the paratactical structure of lines 19-21 is closely paralleled by that of Am. ii. 4. 19-24 and 37-8; cf. also Ars ii. 299-304.

(iv) that Ovid is noticeably fond of (a) dissimulare (18) beginning the second half of a pentameter (14 times in all), and (b), when in didactic or semi-didactic vein, the so-called future imperative in -to (putato, 19); cf. Am. i. 4. 29 iubeto, 35 sinito, 8. 85 timeto, 95 caueto, Ars i. 139 sedeto, 353 uideto: (further examples are collected by A. Zingerle, Ovid und sein Verhältnis zu den Vorgängern und gleichzeitigen römischen Dichtern (Innsbruck 1869-71, reprinted Hildesheim 1967), I. 13).

One is almost tempted to say that any forger who was capable of producing such an accumulation of Ovidian

features within such a short space deserved to succeed; but

clearly the rational conclusion must be that these lines

present the _ipsissima uerba_ of Ovid (for a detailed defence

of 23-4, separately suspected by Kenney, see below _ad loc._).

18. _conscius esse times?_: see above p. 126.

dissimulare: see 4. 16n.

19-26. The catalogue of female ruses which Ovid here instructs

the _custos_ how to ignore he extends and instructs the

puella how to use at _Ars_ iii. 611ff.

19-20. For letters as a source of incriminating evidence against

an unfaithful _puella_ cf. _Am._ ii. 5. 5, _Ars_ ii. 543,

iii. 483ff.

misisse ... / ... _erit_: in sense there is nothing to

choose between these readings, which are given by ς, and

those which are given by ω (_scripsisse_ ... / ... _eat_);

the latter, however, produce a slightly more heavy-handed

effect, and since style is the only criterion by which we

can judge here, ς's readings may be preferred.

19. _putato_: the archaic 'future imperative' in -_to_ occurs

most frequently in legal language (see Kühner-Stegmann

II. i. 196), and Ovid makes good use of its authoritative
tone in didactic and semi-didactic contexts (see above
p. 126). <u>Putare</u> is one of the verbs which most frequently
employ this form of the imperative, though <u>puta</u> is also
found (see Kühner-Stegmann II.i.199).

20. <u>ignotus</u> ... <u>notus</u>: Ovid's verbal wit and dexterity
frequently manifests itself in the form of paronomasia
(the use of cognate terms to give a sense of balance or
antithesis); cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 9. 4 <u>senex</u> ... <u>senilis</u>, ii. 4.
21-2 <u>culpet</u> / <u>culpantis</u>, 23-4 <u>molliter</u> ... / ... <u>mollior</u>,
25-6 <u>canit</u> ... / ... <u>cantanti</u>, and see further Frécaut 37-9.

21-2. The claim to be visiting the house of a friend or relative -
especially one who pretends to be sick - is frequently
cited as one of the regular feminine ruses used to contrive
a rendezvous with a paramour (who will of course be
waiting at the house in question); cf. <u>Ars</u> iii. 641-2
<u>fallax aegrotet amica / et cedat lecto quamlibet aegra</u>
<u>suo</u>, Mart. xi. 7. 7-10 <u>aegram simulabis amicam? /</u>
<u>haerebit dominae uir comes ipse suae,/ibit et ad fratrem</u>
<u>tecum matremque patremque</u>, Juv. 6. 235-8 <u>tum corpore sano /</u>
<u>aduocat (mater) Archigenen onerosaque pallia iactat. /</u>
<u>abditus interea latet et secretus adulter / inpatiensque</u>
<u>morae silet et praeputia ducit.</u>

21. <u>affectam</u>: both <u>affectam</u> and the variant <u>afflictam</u> would
seem to give the requisite sense here, but investigation

reveals that afflictus requires a causal ablative such as
morbo when it is used adjectivally with the meaning 'ill'
(see ThLL 1. 1234. 42-50) and that the absolute use of
it as the equivalent of aegrotans is unclassical (see
ThLL 1. 1238. 65-74); affectus, on the other hand, is
used in this sense both with a causal ablative and .
absolutely, as here; cf. Prop. ii. 28 (A). 1 Iuppiter,
affectae tandem miserere puellae, Sen. Con. ii. 4. 4
misit ad me affectus, aeger (see further ThLL 1. 1206.
40ff.).

22. The general sense of this line is clear enough - the
custos is to go along with the 'sick friend' story -
but the precise wording is open to dispute.

The second foot of the verse, where the MSS are
divided between iudiciis and indiciis (a common confusion;
cf. Tr. ii. 80, and see further ThLL 7. 1145. 78), may
profitably be considered first.   'According to your
evidence, let her (the amica) be sick' (i.e. 'You can say that
she is sick') seems to be the interpretation of those
editors who favour indiciis (see e.g. the translations of
Bornecque, Munari and Lenz; that of Harder-Marg is
masterly in its ambiguity!).   This may seem unobjectionable,
but it is doubtful whether testimony favourable to the
'defendant', as that of the custos obviously would be
here, could be described as indicium, since that word,
when used in a legal or quasi-legal context such as we
should be obliged to assume if we accepted it, normally

refers to incriminating evidence (see ThLL 7. 1146. 2ff, and cf. 53n.) proffered by an index (i.e. not merely a 'witness', but an 'informer'; see indicibus, 41, and 7.25n.). Iudiciis, on the other hand ('in your eyes' or 'as far as you are concerned (let her be sick)'), allows Ovid's specific recommendation here to point to the same general expedient as all the others in the passage 19-26, namely, the undemanding practice of self-deception. For the expression cf. Ep. 3. 104 semper iudiciis ossa uerenda meis, Ars ii. 416, Pont. iii. 5. 52, iv. 3. 16 (all of which exhibit the use of the ablative plural, instead of the more common singular for metrical convenience).

Now we may return to the first foot of the line. A paratactical presentation of hypothesis (21) and reply (22) is obviously desirable (cf. the construction of lines 19 and 20) and the clumsy uisaque and uisa et can accordingly both safely be eliminated. The adoption of iudiciis rather than indiciis automatically, of course, rules out uisat et - clearly an attempt to restore the metre after iudiciis was corrupted to indiciis. We are left with the simple and perfectly tolerable uisat: 'let her make the visit; as far as you are concerned she can be sick' (for the asyndeton cf. Ars ii. 294 perde nihil; partes illa potentis agat).

Heinsius's uisere, which he supports by citation of numerous parallels for the Graecism ire uisere ad aliquem (cf. especially Ter. Hec. 188-9 aegram esse simulant mulierem. / nostra ilico it uisere ad eam), is palaeo-

graphically plausible, and undeniably attractive, but it
is not demonstrably necessary, and should perhaps
be regarded as an example of his 'weakness for those
"elegant" conjectures which seem aimed at correcting
the author rather than his copyists' (E.J. Kenney, The
Classical Text 58; cf. 4. 23-4, 6. 6n.).

23-4. The sense and Latinity of these, rather than any other,
lines within the disputed passage 18-27 (see above pp.123-7)
have given editors cause to doubt Ovidian authorship.
Lenz based his original condemnation of the whole passage
largely on the 'oddities' of this couplet (RAL s. 6,
vol. 13 (1937), 393 and JAW 264 (1939), 77; cf. Munari,
38(app. crit.)), and Kenney has seen fit to reject it
alone (CR n.s. 5 (1955), 13).

Lenz's initial objection to the sense of the couplet -
that it recommends in imposita gremio stertere fronte
something physically impossible - is surpassed in absurdity
only by his subsequent attempt, in his volte face on
the question of authenticity, to defend the recommendation
of the impossible after all (edition 207-8). Kenney's
objection on grounds of content, however, is more
substantial; he points out that 'the rest of the passage
consists of variants on dissimulare, while this couplet is
a recipe against boredom'. Certainly, the simple
meaning of 23-4 must be, 'If she is slow about it, so

that the long wait does not weary you, you can put your
head down and snore away', and one could perhaps agree
that a remark which appears prima facie to display concern
for the personal comfort of the custos seems a trifle
out of place here (though I would not find the couplet for
this reason alone as totally unacceptable as Kenney ob-
viously does; cf. id., CR n.s. 7 (1957), 16).   I do
wonder, however, whether what lies behind the suggestion
for avoiding boredom - or perhaps better 'impatience',
(see ThLL 6. 349. 73ff.) - is the thought that if the
custos should become tired of waiting, he might well go to
investigate the delay and thus inevitably discover
something which would, from his point of view, be best
left undiscovered.   If this interpretation is possible,
and, though it makes some demand upon the reader's
powers of imagination, I believe it is, the couplet 23-4
is in sense perfectly in line with the rest of the passage
in that it suggests yet another means by which the custos
can avoid direct confrontation with the truth.

Objections to the language of the couplet have con-
cerned the use of (a) si faciet tarde (23) and (b) stertere
(24).   The former has now been vindicated by one of its
erstwhile attackers (Kenney (CR n.s. 7 (1957), 16) dis-
covered that facere + adverb is not, as Lenz had claimed
(and he and Munari had agreed) unclassical; see ThLL
6. 120. 21ff., and cf. Jäger, op. cit. 27), but the latter
deserves further discussion.

Munari and Lenz originally took exception to
stertere as a word of low stylistic level, being for the
most part confined to comedy and satire.   It never occurs
in Vergil, Silver Latin epic, Seneca's tragedies,
Horace's lyrics, Catullus, Tibullus or Propertius, but is
found five times in Petronius, three times each in Plautus,
Horace's hexameter works and Martial, and once each in
Terence, Lucretius and Juvenal (in addition destertere
occurs once in Persius);   in Ovid it is attested once
elsewhere as a variant (Ep. 8.21), but within a couplet
which has also been condemned as an interpolation by
Munari amongst others (see e.g. Palmer's note ad loc.,
but contra A. Ker, Ovidiana, 227-8).   The work of
scholars such as Axelson (Unpoetische Wörter, Ch. 2)
and Tränkle (Sprachkunst, Chs. 1 and 2), however, has
shown that poets writing in the 'higher' genres of Latin
verse, Ovid included, do on occasion admit words of
a low stylistic level for reasons sometimes obvious and
sometimes not, and it would certainly be rash to adjudge
the couplet 23-4 un-Ovidian simply because it contains an
apparent vulgarism.

Is it possible to detect any special reason for
the admission of the unrefined stertere here?   Lenz has
suggested, again in his recantation (edition 208), that
the use of the word may represent a conscious attempt to
address a common sort of fellow in his own language
('in seinem Jargon'), but this seems doubtful, since,
if it were true, one might reasonably expect to find a

considerable number of vulgarisms appearing throughout
the poem; the only other word of demonstrably low
stylistic level I can identify, however, is _plorabit_ in
line 59 (see n. below _ad loc._). I think we must rather
consider whether the word was capable of carrying any
particular nuance(s) appropriate to the context. A
study of the circumstances in which this fairly uncommon
word is used elsewhere reveals that its tone is most often
contemptuous (e.g. Hor. _S_. i. 3. 17-18. _noctes_
uigilabat ad ipsum / mane, diem totum stertebat; cf.
Lucr. iii. 1048, Mart. vii. 10. 6) but sometimes simply
jocular (e.g. Mart. xi. 104. 15-16 _et quamuis Ithaco_
stertente pudica solebat / illic Penelope semper habere
manum; cf. Hor. _S_. i. 5. 19), and hence it seems possible
that Ovid could have chosen to use it here to introduce a
light-hearted, bantering note. Interestingly, _stertere_
is occasionally used to indicate not that a person is
indeed sound asleep, but that he is making ostentatious
pretence of being asleep; e.g. Juv. 1. 57 _doctus et ad_
calicem uigilanti stertere naso; cf. Pl. _Mil_. 819-20,
Petr. 22, 85 (most of us will have witnessed snoring put
to that effect!) It would certainly not be surprising
to find _stertere_ so used in a context such as the present
one where pretence is of the essence; Ovid might easily
advise the _custos_ to feign sleep in order to be able to
claim ignorance of any suspicious behaviour on the part of
his mistress. But this interpretation of _stertere_ in
line 24 does not cohere well with line 23 as we have it,

and since the textus receptus yields tolerable sense, I am content to accept it.

25-6. nec tu ... / ... nec tu: for the admonitory force of the personal pronoun cf. Hor. Carm. i. 11. 1 tu ne quaesieris, scire nefas ... (with Nisbet-Hubbard's note).

25. The cult of the Egyptian goddess Isis in Rome (for which in general see Roscher, Lexicon III.403-7, F.V.M. Cumont, Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain (Paris 1906, 3rd edn. 1929), 127-58, K. Latte, Römische Religions-geschichte (Munich 1960), 282-4, R. Merkelbach, Isisfeste in griechisch-römischer Zeit (Meisenheim am Glan 1963)) required her devotees to attend twice-daily rituals and twice-yearly festivals, for which they prepared with a period of retreat in the temple and abstinence from sexual relations (secubitus; see K.F. Smith on Tib. i. 3. 25); obviously, therefore, it was almost tailor-made for a woman who wanted to avoid obliging a lover (see e.g. Am. i. 8. 74, Prop. ii. 33 (A), iv. 5. 34) or deceive a custos, as here (cf. Ars iii. 635-6 (quid faciat custos) cum sedeat Phariae sistris operata iuuencae, / quoque sui comites ire uetantur, eat). The religion of Isis seems to have become particularly popular with women in the Augustan period (it was not, however, a cult from which males were entirely excluded: the most important priests were men (see J.G. Griffiths on Apul. Met. xi. 9)), and

there may well be some truth in the poets' explanation
of its special attraction (cf. Tac. Ann. ii. 85, J. AJ
xviii. 65-80).

linigeram: it was customary for the priests and worshippers
of Isis to wear linen garments (see Met. i. 747, Tib. i.
3. 30, Hdt. ii. 37 (with A.B. Lloyd's note.)), and the
adjective is sometimes transferred to the goddess herself;
cf. Ars i. 77, and for the Greek equivalent λινόστολος,
Hymn. Is. 1. Here we have an example of one of the early
editions preserving a true reading, which it took, perhaps,
from an original copy of the text now lost — the journey
to the printing press was at that time one from which
many MSS did not return.

ad Isin: i.e. ad templum Isidis (cf. Catul. 10. 26-7
uolo ad Serapim / deferri; see further ThLL 1.481.63ff.).
The temple stood on the Campus Martius adjoining that of
Serapis (see Platner and Ashby, Topographical Dictionary
283-5). For the spelling Isin see Kenney, Notes 60.

26. nec tu curua theatra time: cf. Ars iii. 633 quid faciat
custos, cum sint tot in Vrbe theatra? The theatre is
one of the places which Ovid specifically recommends to
men looking for a girlfriend: sed tu praecipue curuis
uenare theatris (Ars i. 89) ... theatra / nunc quoque
formosis insidiosa manent (Ars i. 133-4). But though the

girl might hope to be spotted there by some amorous
young blood (cf. Ars i. 99 spectatum ueniunt (i.e. puellae),
ueniunt spectentur ut ipsae) there could be little fear of
serious misdemeanour, since men and women were not even
allowed to sit together at the theatre in Augustan times
(something which Ovid clearly overlooks at Am. ii. 7.
3-4; see n. ad loc.).

27-8. Ovid sums up succinctly the advantages of being the passive
type of conscius: the role is profitable (27) and, moreover
(autem: for the force of the particle see OLD s.v. 3),
it is easy (28).

27. honores: 'tips'; cf. Cic. Fam. xvi. 9. 3. Curio misi,
ut medico honos haberetur (see also 39 below). What is
elsewhere acknowledged as bribery (see Ars iii. 651-6
and cf. 3. 16n.) is here represented simply as proper
remuneration.

28. quis minor est ... quam tacuisse labor?: cf. Ars ii. 603
exigua est uirtus praestare silentia rebus, and especially
Pl. Mil. 476-7 where an overconscientious custos is given
the following advice: ergo, si sapis, / mussitabis: plus
oportet scire seruom quam loqui (see further introduction
above pp.104-5). Perhaps Ovid was not entirely unaware that
one of Augustus's favourite ˍsayings (according to Plutarch,
Mor. 207c) was Simonides's ἔστι καὶ σιγῆς ἀκίνδυνον γέρας
(fr. 77 (Page)).

tacuisse: an idiomatic use of the perfect infinitive with present meaning; cf. Pont. iv. 10. 82 quis labor est puram non temerasse fidem? (see further 7. 19n.).

29-34. A further attempt to convince the eunuch that he need have no fear of punishment at the hands of the uir.

29-30. Doubtless there were a few slaves in real-life who managed to carve a comfortable niche for themselves by underhand practices, but Ovid's words evoke more readily the fictional world of New Comedy (see introduction above, pp. 104-7) and especially bring to mind the remarks of the ill-used slave Sceledrus à propos of his more fortunate colleague Palaestrio at Pl. Mil. 349-51 sed hic illi subparasitatur semper, hic eae proxumust, / primus ad cibum uocatur, primo pulmentum datur; / nam illic noster est fortasse circiter triennium / neque quoiquam quam illic in nostra meliust famulo familia.

29. Cf. CLE 1276. 5 (of a freed slave) officiis uicit [do]minum nec uerbera sens[it; the writer clearly knew Ovid.

placet: the absolute use of placere = 'to find favour', 'win approval' normally relates to sexual attractiveness (see 4. 17n.), and I have found no close parallels for the general sense in which it appears here.

uersat ... domum: 'turns the house upside-down'; for the expression cf. Verg. A. vii. 335-6 tu potes ... / ... odiis uersare domos.

<u>neque uerbera sentit</u>: flogging was one of the standard
punishments for erring slaves (see Sen. <u>Dial.</u> iii. 3. 32,
Plu. <u>Cat. Ma.</u> 21. 3, and further R.H. Barrow <u>Slavery in the
Roman Empire</u> (London 1928), 29ff., 41-2n. below) and less
easily avoided in real life than in comic drama (see 29-
30n. above), where slaves are frequently threatened with
beatings (see e.g. Pl. <u>Mil.</u> 501-3 (the addressee is the
slave Sceledrus) <u>at ita me di deaeque omnes ament / nisi mihi
supplicium uirgarum de te datur / longum diutinumque, a
mani ad uesperum</u>; cf. <u>id.</u> <u>ibid.</u> 156-7, <u>Epid.</u> 121) but
in the event rarely subjected to them (see Duckworth, <u>Nature
of Roman Comedy</u> 288-90, Spranger, <u>Historische Untersuchungen</u>
47-51).

30. 'He's the king-pin - the other servants mere dirt' (Lee).
<u>PY</u> give the correct text and the provenance of the false
readings which appear in other MSS is easily imaginable.
For the root cause of difficulty in this line seems very
likely to be the use of <u>alii</u> to contrast with <u>ille</u>, which,
though in fact fairly common (see E. Wölfflin, <u>ALL</u> 12
(1902), 244-5 and cf. 15-16n.), would doubtless not have
been immediately obvious to a copying scribe with no
editorial punctuation to help him. <u>Potens</u> + genitive
would probably have been a construction familiar to him
(though the absolute use of <u>potens</u> is of course quite normal;
cf. Prop. ii. 26(<u>B</u>). 22 <u>tota dicar in urbe potens</u>; for further
examples see <u>OLD</u> s.v. 4), and puzzled by <u>alii</u> (dare one
suggest that this could even have been mistaken for a
genitive?), he no doubt thought <u>dominae</u> in sense and syntax

an excellent emendation (cf. 17 above). In fact, not
only is it syntactically unnecessary, but also in point
of sense inappropriate, for the context shows that
Ovid is thinking of a more widely effective kind of
power than that exercised over the domina.

But this would seem to have been only the beginning
of scribal tinkering with the transmitted text; placet
for potens could be a genuine error (ille placet repeated
from the beginning of the preceding line), but it looks
much more like a particularly clumsy and misguided
attempt at further 'improvement' on potens dominae;
iacet for iacent is the inevitable result of sordida
turba being left as the only subject for the following
verb once alii has been jettisoned; and cetera for sordida
must surely represent an attempt (based no doubt on
knowledge of Ovid's liking for the collocation cetera
turba; e.g. Met. iii. 236, 564, Fast. iii. 628, Pont.
i. 8. 8, Tr. i. 1. 109) to make good the deficiency of
a word to contrast directly with ille (this too created
by the loss of alii).

Almost certainly, then, an example of a chain of
corruption begun by one false correction (cf. 6. 33-4n.).

sordida turba: sordere alicui = 'to be beneath someone'
(see e.g. Catul. 61. 129 sordebant tibi uilicae), and
so sordida turba here = 'an inferior bunch'. Turba
does not, as one might imagine, necessarily imply large

numbers, nor is it in itself derogatory: cf. _Ars_ ii.
281 _doctae, rarissima turba, puellae._

iacent: 'are laid low', 'in eclipse'; cf. _Fast_. i.
217-18 _dat census honores, / dat census amicitias_;
pauper ubique iacet, Cic. _Att_. vi. 1.18. _num igitur iacet_
Theophrastus?

31. _P_ gives the correct reading for the penultimate word of the

line (only the present indicative _finguntur_ co-ordinates

well with _atque_ ... _probant_ which follows), but we have

to turn to _S_ and the _recc_. for the last word, where _inanes_

is the only possible choice. Thus, then, the whole

verse: 'For the benefit of the _uir_' (_huic_ is an ironical

dative of advantage) 'false reasons are invented to conceal

the true ones.'

But reasons for what? Not for the mistress's own

suspicious activities and excursions, as one might perhaps

at first be inclined to think (if that were the case, the

remark would be more appropriate immediately following

lines 19-26), but for granting _honores_ to the _custos_

(note 27-30 above). These presumably would have to come

ultimately from the _uir_, and Ovid maintains that the

puella usually manages to persuade him to make donations

without letting her real reasons for wanting to favour

the slave be known (_quod uoluit fieri blanda puella facit_

(34)).

(It seems possible that an attempt to elucidate
<u>causae</u> could have resulted in <u>honoris</u> being written in
the margin or above the line in some ancestor of α
(the ninth century Oxoniensis, which contains (<u>inter al.</u>)
<u>Ars</u> i, is a good example of a MS with much explanatory
material between the lines; see the page facsimile
in E.L.M. Chatelain, <u>Paléographie des classiques latins</u>
(Paris 1884-1900) II, pl. 93), from where it could
easily have crept into the text in place of <u>inanes</u>.
The subsequent transmutation of <u>honoris</u> into <u>honores</u>
(the nonsensical reading of <u>PYD</u>) through visual confusion
with <u>honores</u> in the identical position in line 27 above
(see Kenney's remark cited on pp. 123-4 above) would then
be perfectly understandable; otherwise the wandering of
the copyist's eye from <u>inanes</u> in 31 to the completely
dissimilar <u>honores</u> in 27 must simply be counted a curious
aberration.)

32. <u>ambo domini</u>: i.e. both the <u>dominus</u> and the <u>domina</u>, <u>una</u>
later in the line referring, of course, to the latter;
cf. 8. 24n.

33. 'When her <u>uir</u> has pulled a long face and forced a frown';
a splendid picture of an adoring consort doing his best
to look stern and disapproving.

34. <u>blanda</u>: 'wheedling' or, perhaps 'disarming'; cf. 1. 21n.

35. <u>sed tamen</u>: the double adversative marks a new departure
(cf. 10. 15n.) as Ovid now turns to consider what kind
of <u>active</u> measures the <u>custos</u> should take in order to
establish himself as a reliable accomplice.

<u>iurgia nectat</u>: 'let her pick a quarrel'; cf. 9 (<u>B</u>). 45n.

36. <u>simulet lacrimas</u>: according to Ovid, an invaluable skill
for both sexes to acquire; see <u>Ars</u> i. 659-662, and for
the effects of feminine tears in particular, Lilja
193-4. Cf. 59 below.

<u>carnificem</u>: a frequent term of abuse for slaves in Roman
comedy (cf. Pl. <u>Am</u>. 518, <u>Mer</u>. 618, <u>Ps</u>. 707, Ter. <u>Ad</u>. 777),
which, like <u>carcer</u>, <u>crux</u>, <u>furcifer</u>, <u>mastigia</u>, <u>uerbero</u> etc.
(see further A. Müller, 'Die Schimpfwörter in der
römischen Komödie', <u>Philologus</u> 72 (1913), 492-502, I. Opelt,
<u>Die lateinische Schimpfwörter</u> (Heidelberg 1965), 59-61)
may have been coined because terrible punishments and
their execution did often fall to slaves; eventually,
however, these words came to serve simply as spontaneous
expressions of anger (see S. Lilja, <u>Terms of Abuse in
Roman Comedy</u> (Helsinki 1965), 56, Hofmann, <u>Lateinische
Umgangssprache</u> 85-9).

37-8. Ovid seems to be suggesting that the <u>custos</u> should make
the odd patently false accusation, pre-arranged with the
<u>puella</u>, of course (37), so as to destroy his credibility

when he is speaking the truth (cf. Phaed. i. 10. 1-2
quicumque turpi fraude semel innotuit / etiam si uerum
dicit, amittit fidem).

The text of our oldest MSS is corrupt at the beginning
of line 38, and none of the numerous variants offered by
the recc. provides the requisite sense.   Editors have
therefore generally resorted to conjecture, the suggestion
most frequently adopted being Ehwald's et ueris falso.
(The 'Sarrauianus' of Heinsius (P_c) gives et ueri falso,
and the loss of the final s of ueris by haplography seems
possible, since it and the initial f of falso could easily
have been taken for the same letter, the two being very
similar in minuscule script.)   Veris must then be taken
as dative of disadvantage with deme: 'And by a false
accusation rob the true ones of their credibility';
cf. Tac. Hist. ii.50 uulgatis traditisque demere fidem.
The plural ueris also seems better than the singular, since
Ovid would appear to be thinking of a whole string of
real misdemeanours being concealed by one occasional trumped-
up accusation.

But the future indicative obicies (37) and the im-
perative deme (38) are most unhappily joined by the con-
junction et - something only Némethy (281) has seen fit
to remark upon, though Heinsius must have realized it (see
below), and doubtless also those editors who adopt the con-
jecture of H. Magnus BPhW 19 (1899), 1019) in ueris.   'In
the case of false accusations', however, which must be the
meaning of in ueris (Lenz accordingly translates 'bei

wahren Anschuldigungen entkräfte falsche die Glaubwürdig-
keit') not only deprives deme of the desirable dative of
disadvantage but also produces nonsense, since true accu-
sations and false ones obviously could not be made
simultaneously!

Némethy himself adopts Heinsius's obiciens for
obicies in 37 and continues with et ueris in 38, inter-
preting 'Bringing up against her something she can easily
explain away, by a false accusation rob even true ones
of credibility'.   But the appearance of obiciens in a
couple of renaissance MSS is almost certainly due to
editing by the Itali, and et = 'even' is not natural or
obvious here; indeed, it is distinctly laboured.   Hein-
sius himself clearly felt this and suggested obiciens ... /
i, ueris falso - undeniably ingenious, but not, I think,
probable.

Of all the solutions offered, I find Kenney's tentative
tu ueris falso by far the most attractive; it dispenses
with the ugly et, it necessitates no tampering with
obicies, and it produces a nice rhetorical balance with
the hexameter (37) which also begins with tu. Palaeo-
graphically, it is at least plausible.   I should not
wish to assert on the strength of this that Ovid certainly
wrote tu ueris falso, but I think it possible that he
may have done; on the other hand, I feel fairly sure that
he did not write in or et ueris falso, and I have therefore
decided to adopt Kenney's conjecture.

It is, incidentally, worthy of remark that, if the text
does mean what it appears to mean here, Ovid's desire to

miss no opportunity for a new twist of argument and a
touch of rhetorical cleverness has led him into some
inconsistency; for having spent virtually the entire poem
up to this point saying, or at least implying, that the
custos should never feel obliged to tell his master the
truth about the activities of the puella, he now makes
a recommendation based on the assumption that some of the
time, at any rate, he will be doing precisely that!

37. obicies: the future indicative in commands is more in-
sistent than the imperative or perfect subjunctive; see
Tränkle, Sprachkunst 154.

39-40. Ovid finally returns to his starting point: by acting
the confidant, the custos may hope eventually to win
his freedom (cf. 15-16 above).

39. honos: see 27n. above.

sic alta peculia crescent: 'Thus will your pile (of
money) grow high.' Alta taken proleptically gives ex-
cellent sense (see Lenz, art. cit. 121-2), and the con-
jectures curta and arta (based on D's orta) made by
Heinsius and Burman respectively, are quite unnecessary.

The corruption of peculia is S and the recc. is hardly
surprising; the word is a fairly technical one (see n.
below), and the temptation to replace it with the much more

familiar <u>pecunia</u> must have been irresistible in some cases. A compounding of error results, however, (cf. 30n. above), since the loss of the plural subject makes subsequent adjustments to the verb inevitable.

<u>peculia</u>: 'savings', 'assets'. A slave's <u>peculium</u> was the nearest thing he ever had to private property (strictly speaking, it belonged to his master). Once acquired, the <u>peculium</u> might be used by a slave in a variety of ways (for one splendidly bizarre example see Petr. 75. 4), including   negotiations for obtaining his freedom. Normally only part of it needed to be surrendered to this end, and often a master made a slave a present of his <u>peculium</u> on manumission. See G. Micolier, <u>Pécule et capacité patrimoniale</u> (Lyons 1932), Barrow, <u>Slavery in the Roman Empire</u> 53, 100-104, Spranger, <u>Historische Untersuchungen</u> 67-9.

The plural of <u>peculium</u> is not normally used to refer to the assets of one person only, but metrical necessity is enough to account for it here (see Löfstedt, <u>Syntactica</u> I. 44ff.).

40. <u>fac</u>: the older editors press very strongly for <u>face</u> in preference to <u>fac</u> on every possible occasion (see Heinsius and Burman ('ubique <u>face</u> esse reponendum') on <u>Ep</u>. 2. 98, and Marius and Ciofanus on the present passage). But the imperatives <u>face</u>, <u>dice</u> and <u>duce</u> are common only in comedy

(see Neue-Wagener III.304-8, W.M. Lindsay, The Latin
Language (Oxford 1894), 518-9), and even there they are
by no means invariably used.   In classical Latin the
shortened forms fac, dic and duc become standard (Vergil's
edice at A. xi. 463 is regarded by the grammarian Diomedes
(341 Keil) as a conscious archaism), and the form face, though
it appears often enough as a variant and enjoys full MS
support at V. Fl. vii. 179 and Juv. 5. 112, is certified
by metre only once later than Plautus and Terence (i.e.
at Catul. 36. 16).   Thus, whilst it would be untrue to
say that Ovid could not have used face here or anywhere
else, there is not a scrap of positive evidence to suggest
that he did.   It seems more likely that there was at some
time a scribal 'vogue' for writing face for fac wherever
the metre would allow it.

Lenz's promotion of facis (for fac in), it should
perhaps be said, is most unpersuasive.   In + ablative
of time is not in the least 'ungewöhnlich', as Lenz
claims, (cf. Met. i. 411-12 inque breui spatio ... saxa /
... faciem traxere uirorum;   see further OLD s.v. 35c,
Kühner-Stegmann II. i. 358), and it is very difficult to
understand facis here as the equivalent of si feceris.
The simple imperative, on the other hand, frequently replaces
the protasis of a conditional sentence in Ovid (see e.g.
Am. i. 8. 45-6, 9. 9-10, 10. 64, ii. 4. 32, Ars i. 270).

in exiguo tempore: 'in no time at all'; cf. Cic. Agr.
iii.2 paruam exigui temporis usuram ... postulo, Lucr. i.
1016 exiguum ... horai ... tempus. For the construction
see n. above.

41-62. Ovid turns to consider the other side of the coin - what
the custos can expect if he does attempt to carry out his
task conscientiously.

41-2. The punishment of slaves in Roman antiquity was often
capricious and excessively harsh. Incarceration for
minor misdemeanours was only too common, and fettering
and flogging regular; see W.W. Buckland, The Roman Law
of Slavery (Cambridge 1908, reprinted, 1970), 93, Barrow,
Slavery in the Roman Empire 30-32, W.L. Westermann, The
Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity (Philadelphia
1955), 76, Spranger, Historische Untersuchungen 84-7.

41. aspicis?: a formula regularly used, particularly in
didactic contexts, to draw attention to some significant
truth; cf. Rem. 235-6 aspicis ut prensos urant iuga prima
iuuencos / et noua uelocem cingula laedat equum? and
see further E.J. Kenney, Ovidiana 203.

indicibus: 'informers'; cf. 8. 25n.

nexas per colla catenas: for the construction cf. Fast.

ii. 739 <u>fusis per colla coronis</u>, Verg. <u>A</u>. v. 558-9 <u>it</u>
<u>pectore summo / flexilis obtorti per collum circulus auri</u>.

42. <u>orba fide pectora</u>: Ovid's concept of <u>fides</u> is very
subjective here: in breaking faith with his mistress, the
<u>custos</u> would obviously be showing loyalty to his master!

43-6. Ovid is unusually restrained here in his citation of
<u>exempla</u> (cf. Wilkinson 73). He contents himself with
two - both well-known - and his use of asyndeton gives
them a striking incisiveness (see Frécaut 145-6).

43-4. Ovid mentions two of the three celebrated punishments of
Tantalus: perpetual thirst and hunger with water and food
in sight, but ever out of reach (for the third punishment
see E. <u>Or</u>. 5-7, Lucr. iii. 981, Sen. <u>Thy</u>. 76 and for a list
of occurrences of all three, separately and together, K.F.
Smith on Tib. i. 3. 77-8). Ovid naturally takes up the
version of the myth which has the tortures imposed because
Tantalus divulged the secrets of the gods (<u>hoc illi</u>
<u>garrula lingua dedit</u> (44); cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 7. 51, <u>Ars</u> ii. 605-6,
E. <u>Or</u>. 8-10, Pi. <u>Ol</u>. 1. 56ff.), but the cause of his
punishment is alternatively reported as his serving up of
the flesh of his sons to the gods (see e.g. E. <u>IT</u> 386ff.;
and for the full story Roscher, <u>Lexicon</u> V. 78-80).

Ovid's expression seems to owe something to Horace
<u>S</u>. i. 1. 68-9 <u>Tantalus a labris sitiens fugientia captat /</u>

flumina, but the witty _aquas in aquis_ is an importation of his own.

43. _quaerit_ ... _captat_: note the present tenses: Tantalus's punishment was an eternal one.

44. _garrula lingua_: _garrulitas_ need not always be a vice; cf. _Am_. ii. 6. 26!

45-6. The _exemplum_ of the precipitate death of the hundred-eyed Argus (_custos Iunonius_), whom Juno set to guard Io, a girl beloved by Jupiter and turned into a cow by him to protect her from the wrath of his wife (cf. _Am_. i. 3. 21, ii. 19. 29 and for full details, Roscher, _Lexicon_ III. 263-7), is illustrative of the penalties of over-conscientious vigilance rather than of tale-telling, and so, though appropriate enough in the wider context, is a little inapposite coupled with the Tantalus myth in 43-4.

45. _Io_: Goold (_Amat. Crit._ 13) puts forward an unanswerable case for adopting the spelling _Io_ here (a simple transliteration of the Greek accusative ᾽Ιώ). I can add nothing of importance to his general discussion of the evidence relating to the Latin orthography of third declension Greek nouns in -ω and -ων; Kenney's Oxford Classical Text of the amatory poems requires correction also at _Am_. ii. 16. 31 (_Hero_ for _Heron_) and _Ars_ i. 323 (_Io_ again for _Ion_) in the light of it.

46. <u>ante suos annos occidit</u>: 'He died before his time.'
Argus was killed by Mercury after his hundred eyes had been
charmed into sleep (for his fate after death see 6. 55n.).
For <u>suos annos</u> see 6. 8n.

<u>illa dea est</u>: with Argus dead, Io escaped, and after many
wanderings pursued by Juno's gadfly, she eventually
reached Egypt where she regained her human form and
became identified with the goddess Isis; cf. Prop. ii.
28 (<u>A</u>). 17-18 <u>Io uersa caput primos mugiuerat annos</u>: /
<u>nunc dea, quae Nili flumina uacca bibit</u>, and for the cult
of Isis in Rome see 25n. above.

47-60. Ovid now relates his general observations on the punishments
meted out to <u>indices</u> to the position of the <u>custos</u> <u>vis-à-vis</u>
the <u>uir</u>. The latter, he argues, is only too willing to
deceive himself where the fidelity of his <u>puella</u> is con-
cerned (cf. 13-14n. above) and resents it when the slave's
conscientious reporting of her misdemeanours robs him of
his refuge of self-delusion; he will even go to the
lengths of refusing to believe the evidence of his own
eyes in order to avoid acknowledging her guilt (57-8).

   If Ovid's poem was in circulation in or around 18
B.C. (and the odds are that it was; see general intro-
duction p.7, n.2), his words will almost certainly have
had a special interest for his contemporary readers.
For it is generally thought to have been in that year that

Augustus's celebrated <u>lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis</u>
was passed (see <u>dig</u>. xlviii. 5, Gaius <u>Inst</u>. ix. 9, and,
for bibliography, P.E. Corbett, <u>The Roman Law of Marriage</u>
(Oxford 1930), 133, n. 6), and we know that the law
contained a clause which stated that a husband in possession
of clear evidence of his wife's adultery must either
divorce her immediately or run the risk of being pro-
secuted himself for connivance (<u>lenocinium</u>; see <u>dig</u>.
xlviii. 5. 30, H. Last, <u>CAH</u> X. 446, Corbett, <u>op. cit</u>.
142-3). And when the husband personally witnessed the
crime, divorce proceedings were obligatory and severe
penalties imposed for failure to institute them (see 5.
13-14n.). Although the relationship of the <u>uir</u> and the
<u>puella</u> in Ovid's poem is probably not to be understood
as that of man and wife (see introduction above p. 103,n.27),
it is tempting to conclude that his remarks here provide
an impudent comment on the strong psychological disincentives
to comply with the Augustan legislation, for all its stern
penalties (see M. Pokrowskij, <u>Philologus</u>, <u>Suppl</u>. 11
(1907-10), 363ff.). The legal metaphor which runs all the
way through the passage (notice <u>crimina</u> (51), <u>indicium</u> (53),
<u>culpa ... manifesta probatur</u> (55), <u>iudicis ... fauore</u> (56)
<u>damnabit</u> (58)) perhaps lends weight to the suggestion that
Ovid had the law very much in mind as he wrote (cf. 5.
7-12, 13-14nn.).

47. <u>uidi ego</u>: a common way of introducing some admonitory

illustration, especially in didactic poetry (see E.J.
Kenney, Ovidiana 202).   It is intended to give a ring of
authenticity, but often merely reproduces a piece of
popular wisdom;   cf. Am. i. 2. 11-12 uidi ego iactatas
mota face crescere flammas / et uidi nullo concutiente
mori, Rem. 101-2 uidi ego, quod fuerat primo sanabile,
uulnus / dilatum longae damna tulisse morae, and see
Tränkle, Sprachkunst 24.   Cf. the Greek use of εἶδον
at Thgn. 915 (West), S. El. 62.

compedibus liuentia crura gerentem: for the construction
cf. Verg. A. ii. 277-8 concretos sanguine crinis / ...
gerens (further parallels at ThLL 6. 1932. 11ff.).   For
the chaining of slaves see 41-2n. above, and cf. Pl.
Mil. 294-5.

48. unde: = ex or a quo;   see Kühner-Stegmann II. ii. 284-5, cf. 7.4n.

incestum: a prosaic and technical word used especially
of the unchastity of Vestal Virgins (see e.g. Cic. Inv.
i. 73 concubuit ... cum uiro ... fecit igitur incestum,
and further ThLL 7. 895. 23ff.) and admitted in poetry only
by Ovid here, with the more general meaning 'infidelity'
or possibly 'adultery'.   The technical ring of the word
suits the legalistic context (see 47-61n. above).

49-50. Marlowe's translation captures well the brisk note pro-
duced by Ovid's sentence-structure: 'More he deserved;
to both great harm he framed; / The man did grieve, the
woman was defamed.'

51. crede mihi: see 9-10n. above.

marito: not necessarily 'husband' (the word is also
used of a 'suitor' (e.g. Verg. _A_. iv. 35 aegram nulli
quondam flexere mariti) and of a 'mate' in the animal
world (e.g. Fast. i. 451-2 ergo saepe suo coniunx abducta
marito / uritur Idaliis alba columba focis); see further
ThLL 8. 404. 70ff.), but surely chosen by Ovid here because
it may mean husband, and so will have encouraged the
Augustan reader to think in the present context ('No man
likes to hear charges made (57) and they don't do anyone
any good, even if he listens to them (58)') of the drastic
action demanded by the lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis
of the man confronted with evidence of his wife's in-
fidelity (see 47-60n. above).

53-4. seu ... / siue: see 4. 11-18n.

53. tepet: here 'cool in his love' and contrasted with amat
(54), but often used also of a growing passion; see e.g.
Hor. Carm. i. 4. 19-20 tenerum Lycidan ... quo calet
iuuentus / nunc omnis et mox uirgines tepebunt (with
Nisbet-Hubbard's note) and cf. 3. 6n. praetepuisset. For
the general use of heat imagery in amatory contexts see 1. 8n.

indicium securas perdis ad aures: I have not found any parallels for perdere ad = 'to waste on', and we should perhaps assume some kind of ellipse here, e.g. operam perdis (see CLD s.v. perdere 6b), securas ad aures indicium ferens (see OLD s.v. ad 2b): 'You waste your time telling tales to unimpressionable ears.' At any rate perdis is obviously to be preferred to prodis (adopted by Ehwald, Edwards and Showerman), a variant emanating perhaps from a misreading of the conventional abbreviations for per and pro, but possibly representing an attempt to simplify the construction (cf. Am. i. 6. 41 for the confusion of perdere and prodere).

indicium: 'information' in the fullest sense of the word; see 8. 25n.

54. officio: a nice touch of irony (completely missed by the variant indicium): 'He is made miserable by you doing your "duty".' Cf. Pl. Aul. 593-4 hoc serui esse officium reor, / (erum) retinere ad salutem.

55-6. The legalistic note perceptible in 51-4 is now sounded more clearly as Ovid proceeds to include precise legal terms; not only do we have the fairly versatile culpa, (55) and iudicis (56) - both of which, despite their juridical connections, are often found in non-juridical contexts - but also the more technical manifesta probatur 155), 'is conclusively proven' (see A. Berger, Encyclopaedic

Dictionary of Roman Law, TAPhS n.s. 43, part 2, 1953
(reprinted 1968), s.v. probationes manifestissimae).
Fauore (56), too, possibly has something of a technical
ring - 'the benefit of the doubt being given (by the
judge)' (see Berger, op. cit., s.v.).

55. ex facili: 'easily'; cf. Ars i. 356, Tac. Hist. iii.
49, Sen. Ep. 121. 5.

56. uenit: 'comes off'; cf. Prop. i. 4. 9-10 nedum ... /
inferior duro iudice turpis eat.

57-8. See 47-60n. above, and cf. Am. iii.14.43-6, Tib. i. 2.
55-6, Pl. Mil. 187-8, Truc. 190-92.

58. sibi uerba dabit: 'he will deceive himself'; cf. Am. ii.
19. 49-50 speraui saepe futurum, / cum bene seruasses, ut
bene uerba darem.

59. aspiciat: the jussive subjunctive, lectio difficilior
here, gives an elegant paratactical construction very
similar to that in line 40 above (see n. ad loc.): 'Let
him just see his mistress in tears - he will howl himself
and say ... '.

lacrimas: see 36n. above.

plorabit: plorare is a vulgar word meaning 'bawl' rather

than 'weep' and is generally avoided by the writers of
'Kunstprosa', but from time to time admitted in relatively
elevated poetry such as lyric and elegy (see Axelson,
Unpoetische Wörter 28-9 for a collection of examples).
Perhaps it is used here for special effect - to emphasize
the indecorum of the man's behaviour - but it seems that
its tone, though obviously not grandiose (the verb is excluded
altogether from epic and tragedy), cannot always be
positively derogatory, for a word which could only mean
'bawl' or 'howl' would hardly be appropriate in the first
line of Ovid's funeral elegy for Tibullus, Am. iii. 9. 1
(Memnona si mater, mater plorauit Achillem).

61. dispar certamen: 'an unfair contest'; certamen is
regularly used of legal as well as military or sporting
conflicts (see e.g. Cic. Ver. 2. 177 aequa ... contentio,
aequum certamen proponitur, Tusc. v. 78 in certamen
iudiciumque ueniunt).

uerbera: see 29n. above.

62. in gremio iudicis illa sedet: Ovid finds the action he
describes one of the most disarming of female ploys: see
Am. ii. 18. 5-12.

63-6. Ovid at last returns to his own interest in situation.
His sustained use of the first person plural (aggredimur,
coimus (63), quaerimus, possimus (65)), indicates here .
that his request is being made on behalf of the puella as well.

63-4. <u>non</u> ... <u>non</u> ... / ... <u>non</u>: the striking anaphora serves to emphasize the absence of crime and violence in what Ovid and the <u>puella</u> have in mind.

<u>non ad miscenda coimus / toxica</u>: a splendidly effective use of enjambement. Both <u>miscere</u> and <u>coire</u> may mean 'to unite sexually' (see e.g. <u>Fast</u>. iii. 193 <u>cum pare quaeque suo coeunt uolucresque feraeque</u>, Lucr. iv. 1055 <u>gestit</u> ... (<u>mulier</u>) <u>coire</u>, Cic. <u>Div</u>. i. 60 <u>cum matre corpus miscere</u>, Verg. <u>A</u>. vii. 661 <u>mixta deo mulier</u>), and we may well imagine the <u>custos</u>, on hearing <u>non ad miscenda coimus</u> at the end of the hexameter, thinking with relief, 'So they don't want to meet to make love after all!' - only to have his hopes dashed immediately when <u>toxica</u>, rather than <u>corpora</u> (<u>uel. sim</u>) follows at the beginning of the pentameter!

65. 'We ask that you grant us your permission to love unmolested.' Ovid does his best to make his request seem as innocuous as possible by choosing the blandest of words (<u>tuto</u> ... <u>amare</u>) combined with an accumulation of politenesses (<u>quaerimus</u> ... <u>per te possimus</u>).

66. The poem concludes on an unmistakable note of diminuendo. Lenz points out that Ovid's final remark complements well that addressed to the <u>custos</u> in 28 above (<u>quis minor est autem quam tacuisse labor?</u>). The two together sum up his line of argument perfectly: 'It's a little thing we ask for and it won't cost you much to oblige us; so why are you making such a fuss?'

III

Cf. introduction to 2 above pp. 95-108. Here, in a piece which, if not actually part of the preceding elegy, is obviously an exceptionally close sequel to it, Ovid attempts to secure the connivance of his beloved's eunuch-guard by a different approach.

Attributing the eunuch's unsympathetic attitude to his lack of manhood and hence his inability to enjoy the fruits of love himself (1-6), the poet argues that as all the normal manly roads to esteem and prestige are closed to him, the only worthwhile and profitable thing that he can do is oblige his mistress (by admitting her lover) (7-14); and so to give him one last chance to do himself a favour, Ovid repeats his request for access to the puella in his charge (15-18).[1]

---

1. For the position of eunuchs in general see 2. ln. Bagoe.

1-14. See introduction to 2 above pp. 97,101.

1. <u>ei mihi</u>: a strong cry of anguish or dismay freely

   used throughout the whole range of Latin poetry (see

   <u>ThLL</u> 5. ii. 300. 11ff., Hofmann, <u>Lateinische Umgangs-</u>

   <u>sprache</u> 13).   Ovid employs it often for genuinely

   pathetic effect (see e.g. <u>Met</u>. vi. 227-8 'ei mihi'

   <u>conclamat medioque in pectore fixa/tela gerit</u>; cf.

   <u>Met</u>. vii. 843, viii. 491, <u>Ep</u>. 3. 14, 11. 112, <u>Tr</u>. i.

   9. 36, <u>Pont</u>. i. 2. 7), but on several of the occasions

   when he uses it in the <u>Amores</u> and <u>Ars</u> the tone is clearly

   one of <u>mock</u> distress or dismay (see e.g. <u>Am</u>. ii. 18. 20

   <u>ei mihi, praeceptis urgeor ipse meis</u>, <u>Ars</u> i. 672 <u>ei</u>

   <u>mihi, rusticitas, non pudor ille fuit</u>; cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 14. 54,

   ii. 19. 34), and I am inclined to think that this was

   what Ovid intended to convey here (see introduction to

   2 above p. 97).

   <u>dominam ... seruas</u>: an echo of 2. 1 <u>quem penes est dominam</u>

   <u>seruandi cura</u> and similarly a reference to the eunuch's

   official duty of 'guarding his mistress', but the sub-

   sequent pentameter here, <u>mutua nec Veneris gaudia nosse</u>

   <u>potes</u>, suggests a <u>double-entendre</u> exploiting the common

   use of <u>domina</u> for 'mistress' in the amatory sense as

   well as 'mistress of a slave' (cf. 1. 17n.); 'What a

   shame!', Ovid seems to be saying, 'Here you are, with a

   <u>domina</u> in your sole charge and not able to take advantage

   of her - no wonder you're so sour!'(cf. 5-6 below).

Lee's translation (of lines 1-2) captures the tone well:
'Poor you! Neither male nor female, unable to share /
the joys of sex, and yet keeping a mistress!'.

nec uir nec femina: a particularly cruel mode of reference
to the eunuch's sexual deficiency (for the expression cf.
Ib. 453 de ... uiro fias nec femina nec uir, ut Attis
E . Or. 1528 οὔτε γὰρ γυνὴ πέφυκας—οὔτ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν σύ
γ' εἶ; also V. Max. vii. 7. 6, CLE 129. 5-6).
Cf. 2. ln. Bagoe and see further introduction to 2 above
pp. 97-101.

2. 'You are unable to share in the pleasures of love'. There
might be thought to be some special point in mutua gaudia,
for it would not be entirely impossible for the eunuch to
take part in sexual activity - Juvenal (6. 366-78) would
have us believe that some women actually preferred to
copulate with castrati - but only for him to derive any
satisfaction from it himself, whereas normal sexual inter-
course could be expected to give some pleasure to both
partners (cf. Lucr. iv. 1205-6 quod facerent numquam nisi
mutua gaudia nossent/quae iacere in fraudem possent uinctosque
tenere, v. 853-4 femina ... ut maribus coniungi possit,
habere / mutua qui mutent inter se gaudia uterque). On
the whole, however, this seems unlikely, since Ovid would
surely not have wished to imply that his own puella would
have called upon the eunuch's services; probably mutua
gaudia simply became something of a cliché (cf. Am. iii. 6.

87-8 <u>quid mutua differs / gaudia, quid coeptum, rustice,</u>
<u>rumpis iter</u>?).

<u>nosse</u>: for the syncopated form see W.F. Jackson Knight,
<u>Ovidiana</u> 109.

3-4. Abuse of the πρῶτος εὑρέτής of an implement, skill or practice
is a literary commonplace which dates back to Euripides
(see <u>Hipp</u>. 407-9 ὡς ὅλοιτο παγκάκως / ἥτις πρὸς ἄνδρας
ἦρξατ' αἰσχύνειν λέχη / πρώτη θυραίους) and one which became
particularly popular with the Roman elegists; cf. <u>Am</u>. ii.
14. 5-6, <u>Tib</u>. i. 10. 1-2, <u>Prop</u>. ii. 6. 31, and for further
references see J.-P. Boucher, <u>Études sur Properce: problèmes</u>
<u>d'inspiration et d'art</u> (Paris 1965), 419, Sabot 282-3. Use-
ful bibliography is supplied by Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 3.
12.

The practice of castration appears to have originated
in the East; according to Ammianus Marcellinus (xiv. 6. 17)
it was introduced by Semiramis, according to Claudian
alternatively by the Parthians (<u>in Eutr</u>. i. 339-45) and
according to Hellanicus (<u>ap</u>. Don. Ter. <u>Eu</u>. 168) by the
Babylonians. It was declared a serious crime and subject
to severe penalties under Domitian, Nerva and Hadrian, but
as a rule Roman hatred was directed against the victims, not
the perpetrators, of this barbarity (see <u>RE</u> 3. 1772-3,
<u>Suppl</u>. 3. 454-5) and even Ovid's apparently sympathetic comment
here is arguably ironic (cf. introduction to 2 above p. 97).
Brandt ('Anhang' 212) supplies bibliography on the technicalities
of castration.

3. <u>recidit</u>: Brandt's reference to Petr. 23 <u>Deliaci manu</u>

<u>recisi</u> (with Burman's note) supports his suggestion that

<u>recidere</u> is here being used in a technical sense as a

synonym for <u>castrare</u>; cf. also Claud. <u>in Eutr</u>. i. 47-8

<u>Armenius</u> ... <u>mucrone recisos / edoctus mollire mares</u>.

5-6. See introduction to 2 above p. 97.   Ovid teases his

readers a little here with the suggestion of a prurient

<u>double-entendre</u> in the hexameter which comes to nothing

in the pentameter.   First we may be momentarily misled

by the initial <u>mollis</u> (5), for the preceding four lines

almost inevitably bring to mind the use of the word as a

regular epithet of <u>castrati</u> (see e.g. <u>Ib</u>. 454 <u>quatias</u>

<u>molli tympana rauca manu</u>, Pl. <u>Aul</u>. 422 <u>fustibus sum</u>

<u>mollior magi' quam ullu' cinaedus</u> and further <u>ThLL</u>

8.1379.26ff.), but we soon realize, of course, that

here it means 'easily swayed' (the construction with <u>in</u>

(rather than <u>ad</u>) + accusative is apparently unique; see

further <u>ThLL</u> 8.1380.56ff.) and that the whole line may

be construed 'You would be easily persuaded into com-

pliance and responsive to requests' (for <u>facilis</u> cf. <u>Pont</u>.

iv. 6. 32 <u>supplicibus facilem, sontibus esse trucem</u>, and

see further <u>ThLL</u> 6. 63. 12ff.).   There is, however, an

obvious possibility of a second dimension, for <u>obsequium</u>

may indicate specifically sexual compliance (see e.g.

Curt. x. 1. 25 <u>Bagoae spadoni, qui Alexandrum obsequio</u>

<u>corporis deuinxerat sibi</u>), <u>rogare</u> the requesting of

specifically sexual favours (see 7. 25n.) and <u>facilis</u>

the tendency to respond positively to such requests (see

e.g. _Ars_ iii. 475 _neque te facilem iuueni promitte roganti_,
and further Pichon s.v.). We are puzzled. What can
Ovid mean by it? Where is he leading us? Up the garden
path, it seems, because when we reach the pentameter we
discover that for once there _is_ no _double-entendre_;
Ovid is simply saying that if the eunuch had ever been
in love himself he would be only too keen to help other
lovers (perhaps, though, we may still understand in
rogantibus both 'those who come to ask you a favour' and
'those who come to ask your mistress a favour'). The
type of _double-entendre_ at which Ovid hinted is
left for Claudian to capitalize upon; see _in Eutr._ i.
358-70 - a passage which Maurice Platnauer, the Loeb
translator, describes rightly enough as 'a mass of obscene
innuendo'.

6. Though Ovid implies the opposite here, Martial (iii. 91)
and Juvenal (6. 374-5) lead us to believe that castration
did not necessarily stifle the sexual appetite; for
further discussion of the subject see Brandt, 'Anhang' 213.

si tuus ... praetenuisset amor: 'if your love had grown
very warm', i.e. 'if you had felt the burning passion of
love'. The verb is a striking rarity (I have not been
able to find any other instances of it) and one of a
number of uncommon compounds in _prae_ which Ovid alone of
the Augustan poets is prepared to admit. Some, including

praetepescere, he may even have coined, for they appear
for the first time in his work (cf. praeacutus (Met.
vii. 131), praecompositus (Fast. vi. 674), praefrigidus
(Pont. iv. 12. 35), praegustare (Am. i. 4. 33), praelustris
(Tr. iii. 4. 5), praemonitus (Met. xv. 800), praenubilus
(Am. iii. 13. 7), praequeri (Met. iv. 251), praesonare
(Am. iii. 13. 11), praetingere (Met. vii. 123), praeuitiare
(Met. xiv. 55)). For Ovid's predilection for rare compounds
in general cf. 5. 36, 56, 7. 18, 9 (B). 52nn.

Tepere and tepescere and their compounds may indicate
both a waxing and a waning erotic passion; for the former
cf. Hor. Carm. i. 4. 19-20 quo calet iuuentus / nunc
omnis et mox uirgines tepebunt, Stat. Silv. i. 2. 139-40
ipsam iam cedere sensi / inque uicem tepuisse uiro and for
the latter 2. 53n. For the general use of heat and fire
imagery in love poetry see 1. 8n.

quauis: without doubt the correct reading. In +
ablative following verbs of emotion is well attested in
Horace and the elegists (see Tränkle, Sprachkunst 90-91),
and with verbs of 'burning' and 'growing warm' etc., which
are constantly used metaphorically in erotic poetry
(see n. above), it regularly indicates the object of
passion; cf. Am. i. 9. 33 ardet in abducta Briseide
maestus Achilles, and see also 1. 5n.

7-14. See p. 160 above.

7-8. Ovid's insistence on the eunuch's inability to distinguish himself in the military sphere paves the way for a variation on the standard military metaphor of the elegists in line 10 below (see n. ad loc.) and accommodates a series of obscene double-entendres hard on the heels of the one which suggested itself in the previous couplet, but failed to develop into anything coherent (cf. 5-6n.); see nn. below.

The fact of being a slave would not necessarily have prevented Ovid's addressee from serving in the army in any case; in times of emergency slaves were occasionally freed and enlisted in the legions (see P.A. Brunt, Italian Manpower 225 B.C. - A.D. 14 (Oxford 1971), 64, 228ff., 484, 499-500, 648-51). But no doubt Ovid was not troubled by such technicalities.

7. non tu natus equo: prima facie the phrase means, of course, 'You are not made for the cavalry' (natus must be understood rather loosely as 'destined', since the eunuch was obviously not born a eunuch. Ovid's phraseology was probably influenced by Prop. i. 6. 29 non ego sum laudi, non natus idoneus armis), but it also brings to mind the equestrian metaphor common in descriptions of sexual intercourse; Ovid seems to be thinking of the normal σχῆμα συνουσίας with the man as 'rider', (e.g. Ar. fr. 329 (Kock) ἀναβῆναι τὴν γυναῖκα βούλομαι), but the equestrian image is most frequently found in descriptions of the σχῆμα known as κέλης in which the positions of the man and

woman were reversed (cf. Hor. S. ii. 7. 49-50 quaecumque
excepit turgentis uerbera caudae, / clunibus aut agitauit
equum lasciua supinum, Ar. V. 501-2 ὅτι κελήτισαι 'κέλευον
(ἡ πόρνη) ὀξυμηθεῖσά μοι / ἤρετ' εἰ τὴν 'Ιππίου καθίσταμαι
τυραννίδα (with Blaydes's note), Asclep. AP v. 202, 203, and
see further J. Taillardat, Les images d'Aristophane
(Paris 1965), 105-6).

non fortibus utilis armis: not only 'unsuited to heavy
arms' (cf. Prop. iii. 9. 19 hic castrensibus utilis
armis), but also 'useless with the weapon of manhood';
for arma = mentula cf. Am. i. 9. 25-6 nempe maritorum
somnis utuntur amantes / et sua sopitis hostibus arma mouent,
Mart. vi. 73. 6 nec deuota focis inguinis arma geram,
Petr. 130 paratus miles arma non habui (the same idea
is present at Am. iii. 7. 71 tu dominum fallis, per te
deprensus inermis), and for a full discussion of the
mentula militans image see A. Spies, Militat omnis
amans, (Diss. Tübingen 1930),Ch. 4), and for fortis and
utilis = 'sexually vigorous' cf. Am. ii. 10. 28 utilis
et forti corpore mane fui (and see n. ad loc.).

8. bellica ... hasta: the 'spear' of bellum proper and also
of bellum amoris, i.e. the membrum uirile; cf. Priap. 43. 1
uelle quid hanc dicas ... hastam,   Aus. Cent. Nupt. 117
(Peiper) intorquet summis adnixus uiribus hastam (telum
and gladius are used similarly from Plautus onwards; see
further Spies, Militat omnis amans, Ch. 4).

9. <u>ista mares tractent</u>: 'Leave that kind of thing (i.e.

both war and sex; see 7-8nn. above) to Men' (some MSS give

<u>tractant</u>, but the context clearly favours the jussive

subjunctive). <u>Mares</u> is a semi-technical term meaning

'those whose manhood is unimpaired' (cf. Catul. 16. 13

<u>male me marem putatis</u>? Hor. <u>Ep</u>. i. 1. 64, Claud. <u>in</u>

<u>Eutr</u>. i. 462), and it is applied with cruel precision

here.

<u>tu</u>: for the admonitory use of the pronoun cf. Hor. <u>Carm</u>.

i. 11. 1 (with Nisbet-Hubbard's note).

<u>spes ... uiriles</u>: the expression again covers both

military and sexual ambitions (cf. nn. above).

10. The notion of <u>militia amoris</u> (see introduction to

9 (<u>A</u>) and (<u>B</u>) below, p. 376) now takes over completely from

that of <u>militia</u> proper. The participant in the war of

love is frequently presented as a carrier of standards,

but the <u>signa</u> are normally either his own (see e.g. <u>Am</u>.

i. 11. 12, ii. 12. 14) or those of Cupid (<u>Am</u>. ii. 9 (<u>A</u>).

3, 12. 28, <u>Ars</u> ii. 233-4, Tib. ii. 6. 6); all that the

eunuch can hope for is the dubious distinction of carrying

someone else's standards - and a woman's at that!

11-14. Taking up his point in the previous line, Ovid argues, as

at 2. 15-40, that the eunuch can enjoy a profitable sym-

biotic relationship with his mistress. Here, however, his

tone is harsher, as he makes it clear that it is the

eunuch who has the most to lose by opting out of it (see

introduction to 2 above p. 101).

11-12. 'Heap favours upon her' (hanc imple meritis; for the

construction cf. Met. vii. 428 muneribus ... deos implet)

... 'there's no role for you except with her'. (si

careas illa, quis tuus usus erit?).   Possibly there is

yet another indecent double-meaning here (cf. 1, 5, 7-8nn.

above), for implere + accusative may mean 'to make pregnant'

(cf. Met. vi. 110-11 ut ... pulchram / Iuppiter implerit

gemino Nycteida fetu) and usus has connotationsof speci-

fically sexual capability as well as general usefulness

(see 7n. above and 10. 28n.): 'See that your mistress

is 'served' with favours ... you can be of no 'service'

at all except to her.'

11. Cf. 2. 15-16, 27-30, 39-40. .

13. For the expression cf. Ep. Sapph. 21 est in te facies,

sunt apti lusibus anni.   For facies = 'good looks' see

1. 5n.

lusibus: 'love-making'; cf. Prop. i. 10. 9 non tamen a

uestro potui secedere lusu, Catul. 68. 156 domus ... in

qua lusimus.

14. The idea of sexual abstinence leading to the decline of

physical attractiveness (cf. Am. i. 8. 53 forma, nisi

admittas, nullo exercente senescit, Ars iii. 79-80 carpite
florem, / qui, nisi carptus erit, turpiter ipse cadet,
Stat. Silv. i. 2. 165-6 ueniet iam tristior aetas. /
exerce formam et fugientibus utere donis) is a variation
on the ancient and proverbial notion that beauty is
ephemeral; cf. Prop. iii. 25. 11-16, Hor. Carm. i. 25 (with
Nisbet-Hubbard's introduction), Call. AP v. 23. 5-6, and see
further Otto, Sprichwörter 141.

forma: see 4. 9n.

situ: 'decay' or 'disuse'; cf. Am. i. 8. 51-2 aera nitent
usu, uestis bona quaerit haberi, / canescunt turpi tecta
relicta situ.

15-18. Ovid ends with a fairly transparent piece of bluff: 'The
girl and I could have got together whether you co-operated
or not, but I thought it would be better to try asking you
nicely; so really it's up to you - I'm giving you one
more chance to make a bit of capital.'

15. fallere te potuit: the technique of deceiving guards was
an essential one for the elegiac lover to acquire; cf.
Ars iii. 611ff., Tib. i. 2. 15, 6. 9-10, ii. 1. 75-8.

quamuis habeare molestus: 'although you make yourself'
(literally 'are found to be') 'a nuisance'; for habere

in this sense cf. <u>Met</u>. v. 559 <u>optastis facilesque deos</u>
<u>habuistis</u>, Prop. iv. 11. 13 <u>non minus immitis habuit</u>
<u>Cornelia Parcas</u>, and for <u>molestus</u> see 2. 8n.

16. 'Where there's a will there's a way' is Lee's splendid
translation.

17. <u>aptius at fuerit precibus temptasse</u>: the paradosis <u>aptius</u>
<u>ut fuerit</u> ... will yield no tolerable sense, but a sur-
prising number of modern editors have clung to it. Pon-
tano (if we are right to identify the hand $\underline{Y^c}$ as his; see
B.L. Ullman in F. Munari, <u>Il codice Hamilton 471</u>
<u>di Ovidio</u>, Appendix 1, 73-6) almost rewrote the whole
line (<u>antius ut fieret precibus temptare, rogabo</u>) in the
attempt to make it intelligible, but Heinsius had a much
more economical, and surely correct, emendation to offer:
simply <u>at</u> for <u>ut</u> (a conjecture printed by Némethy (who
claims it as his own), Harder-Marg, Munari, Kenney, Lee
and Lenz). <u>Fuerit</u> will stand perfectly well independently
('It will be' (literally, 'will have been') 'more satisfac-
tory to have tried persuasion') and a strong adversative
particle such as <u>at</u> is obviously desirable after the
remarks in the preceding couplet 15-16 (for the postpone-
ment of the connective see 10. 36n.). Corruption of <u>at</u>
to <u>ut</u> will no doubt have occurred for simple palaeo-
graphical reasons (see 1. 33n.).

18. The common theme of the susceptibility of <u>custodes</u> to

monetary bribery has its origins in the myth of Danae; see Hor. <u>Carm</u>. iii. 16, Juv. 6.Q 29-34, Paul. Sil. <u>AP</u> v. 217, and cf. especially <u>Ars</u>. iii. 651-8.

<u>bene ponendi munera</u>: a metaphor from business language. <u>Pecuniam poenere</u> or <u>collocare</u> is the standard expression for 'invest money' (see e.g. Hor. <u>Epod</u>. 2. 70, <u>Ars</u> 421), and so here <u>bene ponendi munera</u> = 'capitalize on your favours'.

IV

[Luck, Latin Love Elegy 167-73; Morgan 50-54; Neumann
63-8; Sabot 410-14; Tremoli 45-6]

Ovid first declares that he has a weakness which he

cannot control (1-8); it is the attraction he feels to

women of every kind (9-10). He then proceeds to enumerate

the female types which stimulate his passion (11-46), summing

up the situation in a final succinct couplet (47-8).

The lover's susceptibility to a widely differing range

of charms is a common theme in ancient erotic poetry of all

periods. The Hellenistic and later Greek epigrammatists

muse on the attractions of various kinds of boys[1], while the

competing charms of different women claim the attention of

the Latin elegists[2]. Ovid's phraseology in his treatment of

the theme here suggests that he particularly had in mind as

he wrote Prop. ii. 22 (A): both poets call their weakness

uitium[3] and both refer to the problem in which it results

as semper amare[4]. Ovid's selective imitation of

---

1. See e.g. Rhian. AP xii. 93, Mel. AP xii. 94, 256, Strat.
AP xii. 244.

2. See e.g. Prop. ii. 22 (A). 1-18, 25. 41-6, [Tib.] iii. 8.
7-14; Tibullus uses the motif with reference to male homo-
sexual love at i. 4. 9-14. For its appearance in Greek erotic
epistolography see Aristainet. i. 1.

3. See Prop. ii. 22 (A). 17 and cf. line 2 below; Ovid, of
course, uses the plural uitiis, but perhaps only for metrical
convenience.

4. See Prop. ii. 22 (A). 18 and cf. line 10 below. Cf. also
Prop. ii. 22 (A). 5-6 and lines 29-30 below. Neumann (loc. cit.
and Morgan (loc. cit.) also see in Ovid's poem conscious
reminiscence of Prop. ii. 25, but this seems to me to be less
certain. I am sure that Ovid's intentions in imitating
Propertius were not nearly as intricate as Morgan suggests.

Propertius[5], however, produces an elegy of quite a different character. He does not, like Propertius, confess, and attempt to account for, his <u>uitium</u> to a favoured confidant[6], but publicly admits to his weakness like a defendant formally pleading guilty[7], and expresses his disapproval of his fault and his attempts to correct it with such conspicuous wit that we cannot for one moment take it seriously[8]. He sets himself up not as the helpless victim of <u>amor</u>, but as a kind of Augustan Cherubino, whose natural propensities to love are ever seeking an outlet[9]; his confession is a warning to the <u>puellae</u> at large and their <u>uiri</u> of what to expect from him[10].

But if Ovid's attitude here is amusingly impudent <u>per se</u>, it is positively outrageous seen against the background of <u>Am</u>. i. 3, where the self-same poet professes his eternal devotion to one woman and one only: <u>non mihi mille placent, non sum desultor amoris: / tu mihi, si qua fides, cura perennis eris</u>[11]. As on several other occasions in the <u>Amores</u>,

---

5. The material from Propertius ii 22. (<u>A</u>) which Ovid does <u>not</u> recall in this poem he turns to instead in <u>Am</u>. ii. 10; <u>see</u> introduction to 10 below, pp. 413-25.

6. See Prop. ii. 22 (<u>A</u>). 1-2 <u>scis here   mi multas pariter placuisse puellas;/scis mihi, Demophoon, multa uenire mala.</u>

7. See 1-4n. below.

8. See 5-6n. below.

9. See 9n. below <u>inuitet</u>.

10. See 47-8 below. Luck (<u>loc. cit.</u>) completely misconceives the nature of this poem. It is not an 'elegant specimen of self-analysis' and it certainly does not 'explore seriously the root of an almost metaphysical longing'!

11. <u>Am</u>. i. 3. 15-16.

Ovid has thus created a pair of poems which treat a particular subject from two different angles[12], and the present pair inevitably, perhaps, raises the question of which is the real Ovid. The answer is almost certainly 'neither'; the poet's intentions were not to produce a faithful portrayal of his own amatory disposition and his own experience of love, but, as he comes near to stating quite explicitly in this very poem[13], to set forth in his poetry all the amatory situations familiar to his readers both from real-life and from literature, with himself as the protagonist every time, and thus he may play the roles of the faithful and the unfaithful amator with equal facility[14].

The most memorable feature of this poem, and the one upon which it is inevitably judged, is, of course, the catalogue of contrasting types of women which Ovid produces to illustrate the all-embracing nature of his amatory tastes[15].

---

12. See introduction to 5 below, pp.227-8, n. 3.

13. See 41-4n. below.

14. Cf. introduction to 1 above p. 49, and see in general A. W. Allen, 'Sincerity and the Roman Elegists', CPh 45 (1950), 145-60.

15. The catalogue as an independent poetical form has a long history. The earliest surviving examples are Hesiod's Theogonia and the fragmentary Eoeae attributed to him. The form was particularly popular with the Alexandrians; Callimachus produced his Aetia, Antimachus his Lyde and Nicaenetus of Samos, interestingly, a Catalogue of Women .

It is a considerable <u>tour de force</u> in every respect — even

potential faults the poet manages to see as virtues[16]_and

few, I think, would dispute that Ovid nowhere writes with

more fluency and grace, more wit and ingenuity, and more

exemplary logic and lucidity. But nowhere, it has to be

admitted, is his major fault more obvious: <u>nescit quod bene

cessit relinquere</u>[18]. In this poem Ovid's intellectual

inventiveness and linguistic facility become tedious through

over-use[19].

---

16. He spells out the way to do this at <u>Ars</u> ii. 657-62 and
conversely the way to make minor imperfections seem like major
faults at <u>Rem</u>. 315ff., in both cases re-utilizing the material
he presents here (cf. Lucr. iv. 1153-72,). Cf. R. Verdière,
'L'euphémisme amoureux dans les sobriquets féminins à Rome',
<u>GIF</u> 11 (1958), 160-66.

17. See 11-46, 39-40, 45nn. below.

18. Sen. <u>Con</u>. ix. 5. 17; cf. <u>id</u>. <u>ibid</u>. ii. 2. 12, Quint.
Inst. x. 1. 98. The fault is probably to be attributed to
Ovid's own nature rather than an excessive use of the techniques
of rhetorical elaboration fostered by his education; see
general introduction pp. 11 -14.

19. Luck (<u>loc. cit.</u>), however, considers this elegy a much
better piece than <u>Am</u>. ii. 10 (see p. 174 , n.4 above). My own
view is that <u>Am</u>. ii. 10 is by far the more stimulating poem;
see introduction to 10 below, pp. 424-5.

1-8.   Ovid seems to be keeping us in suspense as to the precise
       nature of his 'weakness' (cf. pp. 225 and 426 below on the
       opening of poems 5 and 10), but mendosos mores in line 1 may
       well prompt the reader who knows him to recall sine crimine
       mores at Am. i. 3. 13 and hence to guess that we are about
       to hear the confessions of a desultor amoris (Am. i. 3. 15;
       see introduction above pp. 175-6.

1-4.   The poet expresses his feelings in legalistic terms. Si quid
       prodest delicta fateri in line 3 suggests that he may even
       have remembered that under the terms of Roman law there was
       indeed in certain types of dispute some point in admitting
       guilt, since extra-harsh treatment in the form
       of double penalties would result, if one could not prove one's
       innocence (see dig. xlii, Gaius Inst. iii. 216, iv. 9 and also
       Buckland, Textbook of Roman Law 332, 617-18), and demens (Lee
       translates 'reckless') in line 4 could indicate that he was
       thinking of the fact that such an action nevertheless had its
       drawbacks, because a confessus was to a certain extent already
       condemned by his own admission (see dig. xlii. 2. 1 confessus
       pro iudicato est, qui quodammodo sua sententia damnatur). But
       I should not wish to press the point, for in the circumstances
       the legal metaphor is a perfectly natural one for Ovid to use
       (cf. 7. 1-2n.) and any apparent reflection of the formal
       confessio may be coincidental.

           Generally, however, it has to be acknowledged that
       Ovid shows a fondness for legalistic imagery to a degree not
       noticeable in other Latin poets and that his work does appear
       to contain occasional traces of legal formulae and allusions

to legal processes (see 5. 30-32 nn.). Could there be any

particular reason for it? Two possibilities immediately

suggest themselves: (i) that Ovid was considerably influenced

by his early juristic experience (we know from his own

testimony (Tr. ii. 93-6, iv. 10. 33-4) that he once embarked

on a legal career) and (ii) that his training in the schools

of declamation (see general introduction pp.11-14),which

encouraged the working-out of quasi-legal problems

(see S. F. Bonner, Roman Declamation 31ff.), made

its mark upon him in this way. Kenney ('Ovid and the Law',

YCIS 21, (1969), 243-63) reasonably doubts that the influence

of declamation can have been very strong, 'since we have it

on Seneca's authority (Con. ii. 2. 12) that he (Ovid) tended

to shirk that type of exercise in which the argument turned

on points of law' (art. cit. 250; cf., however, id. 'Liebe

als juristisches Problem', Philologus 111(1967), 212-32), and

he argues persuasively that Ovid's own experience in the courts

is the factor most likely to account for the prominence of the

legal element in his language and thought. It should perhaps

be noted, however, that Ovid, for all his use of technical

terms, cannot have been attempting to demonstrate any juristic

expertise he may have had, for none of his legalisms require

more knowledge than the educated layman might have been

expected to possess and much of his terminology is used

imprecisely; at Ars i. 585-8, for example, he fails to

distinguish between procuratio and mandatum, processes which

were still separate in his time even though they became more

or less merged in the later second century A.D. (see A. Watson,

The Contract of Mandate in Roman Law (Oxford 1961), 50;

I am grateful to Professor Watson for information on this

point privately communicated to me), and at <u>Am</u>. ii. 5.
29-32 he seems to have two different types of property dispute
in mind at the same time (see nn. <u>ad loc</u>.). In most cases
Ovid seems to have turned to legal imagery for the sake of
novelty in expression (it can hardly be doubted that he was
responsible for giving many basically technical legalistic
words a place among the metaphors of stylistically elevated
poetry for the first time; see Kenney <u>YCIS</u> 21 (1969), 254
and cf. 1. 9, 8. 5nn. <u>index</u>, 7. 2n. <u>dimicuisse</u>), but sometimes
there is reason to suppose that he may have done so with the
intention of specifically bringing to mind pieces of
contemporary legislation (see 2. 47-60, 5. 7-12nn.).

1. <u>mendosos</u>: a rare word in poetry (<u>ThLL</u> cites only 5 classical
instances at 8. 710. 5ff.). It is used by Ovid elsewhere
only of physical imperfection (<u>Met</u>. xii. 399-400 <u>nec equi</u>
<u>mendosa sub illo / deteriorque uiro facies</u>; cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 5. 18.
<u>in toto nusquam corpore menda fuit</u>), but Horace, like our
poet here, uses it of moral shortcomings at <u>Ep</u>. i. 16. 39-40
<u>mendax infamia terret / quem nisi mendosum et mendicandum</u>?
    The adjectives in -<u>osus</u> are a very curious category
providing almost limitless scope for investigation, and only
the briefest discussion of some of the questions they raise
will be possible here.
    The exact derivation of these adjectives is uncertain,
but it is generally supposed that the termination -<u>osus</u>
attempts to represent the Greek -ώδης or -όεις in Latin
(see M. Leumann, 'Die lateinische Dichtersprache', <u>MH</u> 4 (1947),
130 (= M. Leumann, <u>Kleine Schriften</u> (Zürich and Stuttgart

1959), 148). A useful collection of most of the adjectives
in -osus is provided by A. Ernout, Les adjectifs latins en
-osus et -ulentus (Paris 1949); Ernout does not, however,
attempt to comment on the usage of individual authors).
There is evidence to show that -osus adjectives were coined
prolifically in the archaic period (Gel. iv. 9 cites the
following examples from Cato: disciplinosus, consiliosus,
uictoriosus) and in later times the technical prose of Varro,
Vitruvius, Celsus and the elder Pliny was one of the most
fertile breeding grounds for them (e.g. carnosus and oleosus).
Poetry, however, does not shun the -osus adjectives. Some of
the ones most common in general do not for metrical reasons
appear in dactylic verse (e.g. periculosus, otiosus), but some
are found throughout the whole range of Latin literature from
Vergilian epic and 'Kunstprosa' on the one hand to elegy and
satire on the other (e.g. animosus, uentosus). Some seem to
be largely avoided in epic and tragedy but relatively common
in elegy and satire (e.g. formosus, rugosus); some are popular
with certain authors but avoided by others even within the
same genre (e.g. furiosus is used 12 times by Ovid but never
by Tibullus and Propertius).

The greater general frequency of some of the -osus
adjectives is obviously partly due to the fact that the more
highly technical of them would naturally tend to appear less
often. But this does not explain the preferences of individual
authors; it does not explain why Vergil uses a total of 26
-osus adjectives some 80 times (A. Ernout supplies a complete
list at RPh 21 (1947), 65 = Philologica II (Paris 1957), 79),
why Ovid avoids a few of these altogether, uses most of them

with equal frequency in the <u>Metamorphoses</u> and the elegiac
works and admits a good many more that Vergil excludes, and
why Propertius appears to like -<u>osus</u> adjectives so much
(see Tränkle, <u>Sprachkunst</u> 59-60) whilst Tibullus and Tacitus
(see F. R. D. Goodyear, <u>JRS</u> 58 (1968), 26, 30) largely avoid
them.

Clearly as a group these adjectives defy conventional
classification as prosaic, poetic, colloquial, archaic etc.
Some scholars, however, have attempted to determine whether
they have a quality or tone peculiar to themselves which
makes them particularly appropriate or inappropriate in any
given context. Axelson (<u>Unpoetische Wörter</u> 60-61) suggests
that they have a 'trivial' ring which makes them generally
unsuitable for the higher stylistic genres, but he cites no
evidence in support of this view, and indeed the number of
-<u>osus</u> adjectives in Vergil's <u>Aeneid</u> alone would seem to tell
against it. D. O. Ross (<u>Style and Tradition in Catullus</u>
(Harvard 1969), 53-60) alternatively suggests that there may
be some difference in tone between those adjectives in -<u>osus</u>
formed on nominal stems and those formed on adjectival stems,
the latter being more colloquial, but Ovid's usage gives the
lie to this argument since neither the -<u>osus</u> adjectives which
he uses more frequently in his elegiacs (<u>damnosus</u>, <u>formosus</u>,
<u>furiosus</u>, <u>ingeniosus</u>, <u>operosus</u>) nor those which he avoids
entirely in the <u>Metamorphoses</u> (<u>desidiosus</u>, <u>famosus</u>, <u>imperiosus</u>,
<u>litigiosus</u>, <u>lucrosus</u>, <u>morosus</u>, <u>numerosus</u>, <u>odiosus</u>, <u>officiosus</u>,
<u>ruinosus</u>, <u>uentosus</u>, <u>uinosus</u>, <u>uitiosus</u>) are formed exclusively
on adjectival stems.

One is left with little choice but to conclude that in

the case of -osus adjectives it was the writer's individual taste for this formation rather than any stylistic norm which decided whether he included them freely or not. As many of these adjectives seem to have been coined in semi-literary, technical prose, the termination itself may have been felt to be new-fangled or simply ponderous by some - the generally fastidious Tibullus, for example. If this was the case, it is not surprising that Propertius, renowned for his linguistic boldness, should have been particularly fond of adjectives in -osus and that he should even have apparently coined some of the more recherché specimens himself (e.g. hederosus, paludosus, plumosus, pecorosus). Ovid, on the other hand, is neither over-fastidious nor over-audacious in his diction and could consequently be expected to take the kind of middle-line on -osus adjectives which the statistics for his work suggest.

ausim: 'I should not venture'; the archaic form of the perfect subjunctive is regularly used in so-called modest assertions (cf. Met. vi. 561 uix ausim credere and see Hofmann-Szantyr 343-4) - though there is not a lot of modesty in Ovid's assertion here!

2. falsa ... arma mouere: 'to resort to defensive action with spurious (or 'disingenuous') weapons'; arma had already been used in a similar figurative sense by Cicero at e.g. de Orat. i. 172 etiam si hac scientia iuris nudata sit (uis ingeni), posse se facile ceteris armis prudentiae tueri atque defendere, but Ovid's falsa ... arma has a more distinctly military ring; cf. Ep. i. 17 siue Menoetiaden falsis cecidisse sub armis (narrabat)

Tac. <u>Hist</u>. iv. 32 <u>ut absisteret bello neue externa falsis</u>
<u>armis uelaret</u>. Possibly there is more evidence here to suggest
that Ovid had the legal <u>confessio</u> in mind in his opening
lines (see 1-4n. above), for it appears that the penalty of
double damages against the accused, if found guilty after
pleading innocence, was designed to discourage the bringing
of groundless defences; see Buckland, <u>Textbook of Roman Law</u>
617.

<u>uitiis</u>: here simply 'faults' (cf. Prop. ii. 22 (<u>A</u>). 17
<u>uni cuique dedit uitium natura creato</u> and see introduction
above p. 174), but sometimes used more specifically of
amatory crimes; see e.g. <u>Am</u>.iii. 4. 11 <u>desine ... uitia</u>
<u>irritare uetando</u>, Prop. i. 16. 47-8 <u>sic ego nunc dominae</u>
<u>uitiis et semper amantis / fletibus aeterna differor inuidia.</u>

3. <u>confiteor ... fateri</u>: see 1-4n. above. Both these legalistic
terms are much more common in Ovid than in other poets;
there are 28 occurrences of <u>confiteri</u> in his work as opposed
to 7 in Lucretius, 2 in Propertius, 1 each in Catullus and
Vergil and none in Horace and Tibullus, and 123 of
<u>fateri</u> as opposed to 22 in Lucretius, 15 in Vergil, 11 in
Horace, 3 in Propertius, 2 in Catullus and 1 in Tibullus.

<u>delicta</u>: here simply 'crimes', but cf. 8. 9n.

4. <u>demens</u>: see 1-4n. above.

<u>in mea ... crimina ... eo</u>: probably, 'I turn to accusing

myself' (or, as Lee well puts it, 'conduct my own prosecution')
with <u>in</u> + accusative indicating the action to which one
resorts (cf. Verg. <u>A</u>. iv. 413-14 <u>ire iterum in lacrimas</u> .../
<u>cogitur</u>, Sen. <u>Ben</u>. i. 10. 2 <u>nunc in crudelitatem ibitur</u>.
<u>Mea</u> in this case must be taken to stand for an objective
genitive; cf. Cic. <u>Rab. Perd</u>. 10 <u>nam de perduellionis</u>
<u>iudicio, quod a me sublatum esse criminari soles, meum crimen</u>
<u>est, non Rabiri</u>. (I can find nothing at all to authorize
Munari's interpretation, 'ricado come un pazzo nelle mie
mancanze'.)

5. A number of scholars have misconstrued this line. Bornecque
('Je la (i.e. 'ma faiblesse') hais et ne puis m'empêcher
de désirer ce que je hais'), Munari ('Io le (i.e. 'mie
mancanze') odio ma non posso non essere bramoso di ciò che
odio') and Lenz ('Ich verabscheue, und kann nicht ohne
Verlangen nach dem sein was ich verabscheue') all take <u>cupiens</u>
<u>non esse</u> as the equivalent of <u>non cupere</u>, and <u>quod odi</u> as its
direct object, to extract the sense 'I hate (my weakness),
but I cannot be undesirous of what I hate'. But we should
surely take <u>cupiens</u> concessively, as do Showerman ('I hate
what I am and yet, for all my desiring, I cannot be but what
I hate'), Lee ('I hate what I am but can't help wanting to be
myself') and Luck (<u>Latin Love Elegy</u> 168; 'I hate what I am
and yet, for all my striving, I can only be what I hate');
cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 7. 5 <u>nec potui cupiens, pariter cupiente puella</u>,Cic.
<u>Phil</u>.1. 7 <u>urbs me cupiens retinere non potuit</u> (the use of
<u>cupiens</u> + <u>esse</u> as the equivalent of <u>cupere</u> is in fact late
and ecclesiastical; see <u>ThLL</u> 4. 1432. 83ff.).

Clearly Ovid had Catullus's celebrated odi et amo

(85. 1) in mind here, but not only does he differ from

Catullus in tone, as all scholars duly note (see especially

Luck, Latin Love Elegy 168, O. Weinreich, Die Distichen des

Catull (Tübingen 1926), 70), his characteristic verbal wit

(notice the artistic framing of the hexameter with the

repeated odi) robbing his supposed inner conflict of all

seriousness (cf. 5.51-62n.), but also - and this is not

generally recognized - in his basic sentiment; unlike

Catullus, he is not here torn between love and hate for a

woman, (this is rather the situation at Am. iii. 14. 39-40),but

frustrated by his own disapproval of what he is (i.e. an

habitual lover) and yet his inability to be otherwise. It

is not true, as Weinreich (loc. cit.) asserts - I think

misconstruing in the manner described above - that Ovid has

replaced Catullus's amo with nec possum cupiens non esse with

the intention of transferring Catullus's emotional sentiment

to the purely sensual sphere.

(The true reading non esse, incidentally, survives in a

few β MSS (from which Pontano (see 3. 17n.) was presumably

able to make his correction of Y). The erroneous non nosse

of PSY is probably the result of an initially accidental

corruption (nonesse > nonosse; misreading of the minuscule

e for o and vice versa is common enough) subsequently

prompting a deliberate scribal alteration (nonosse > nonnosse).

Other variants which appear in the recc. look like pure

interpolations).

6. heu: the elegists' favourite interjection for expressing

dismay (11 instances in Propertius, about 20 in Tibullus
(the text is in doubt in some cases) and 36 in Ovid
(excluding the Metamorphoses where heu appears 12 times)).
Heu is weaker and apparently less colloquial than eheu,
which is largely avoided in elevated poetry including elegy
(see Tränkle, Sprachkunst 149ff., Hofmann, Lateinische
Umgangssprache 14).

quam, quae studeas ponere, ferre graue est!: another
assertion which recalls an anguished comment of Catullus,
difficile est longum subito deponere amorem (76. 13) but
which is more remarkable for its conscious artistry than for
its emotional depth (cf. 5n. above); observe the witty
juxtaposition of the two antithetical terms ponere and ferre
(cf. 1. 22n.). For ponere with reference to the casting
aside of love see 1. 6n. tactus amore.

7. uires ad me ... iusque regendum: for the postponement of
-que see Platnauer 91-2. Ius, 'self-discipline', is used
here with a sense almost equivalent to that of uires with
which it is coupled; cf. Pers. 5. 176-7 ius habet ille sui,
palpo quem ducit hiantem/cretata ambitio.

8. auferor: both 'I am swept away' in anticipation of the
image of the buffeted ship which is immediately to follow
(cf. Rem. 264 abstulit aura rates, Ars ii. 91 pater o pater,
auferor) and, more generally, 'I am robbed of my reason'
(cf. Rem. 343 auferimur cultu, Verg. Ecl. 8. 41 ut me malus
abstulit error). The figurative use of auferre is particularly
common in Silver Latin; see ThLL 2. 1330. 67ff.

ut rapida concita puppis aqua: for the simile cf. Am. ii.
10. 9 erro, uelut uentis discordibus acta phaselos (and see
n. ad loc.). For marine imagery in general see 9 (B). 31-2n.

rapida: a conventional epithet of wind and water; cf. Am.
iii. 6. 80, Catul. 70. 4. Here it has obvious point, but
sometimes it is purely ornamental; see e.g. Met. vii. 6
rapidas limosi Phasidos undas.

puppis: a poetical metonym for nauis. Ovid favours puppis
rather than nauis in both the Metamorphoses and the elegiac
poems (20 instances of puppis and 9 of nauis in the
Metamorphoses, and 57 of puppis and 38 of nauis in the elegies).
Tibullus, Lucan, Silius, Statius, Valerius and Seneca (in his
tragedies) share his preference, whilst Catullus, Vergil,
Propertius, Juvenal and Martial hardly show any preference at
all, and Ennius, Lucretius, Plautus and Terence all favour
nauis (Lucretius uses puppis only in its technical sense,
'stern'). Obviously nauis was originally the regular word
for 'ship' in all types of composition, but puppis was already
making a few appearances as a synonym in Republican poetry;
in the Augustan period (notably in Vergil's Aeneid) it gained
equal footing with nauis and finally in Silver Latin epic it
ousted nauis altogether (the latter is totally excluded by
Lucan, Silius, Statius and Valerius). Never, however, did it
become generally acceptable in prose; in a fair cross-section
of prose writers (Caesar, Livy, Tacitus, Petronius, Quintilian)
there is an overwhelming preference for nauis (see Quint.
Inst. viii. 6. 20). Ovid's choice between nauis and puppis
is sometimes influenced by considerations of euphony (see

e.g. <u>Tr</u>.iv. 8. 17 with note on 9 (<u>A</u>). 21 below), but here ·
he will no doubt have consciously used it as the more
elevated word, since his level of diction frequently tends
to rise in similes and <u>exempla</u> (see 9 (<u>A</u>). 19-22n.).

9-10.   Ovid at last makes explicit the precise nature of
his <u>uitium</u>, and the rest of the poem is devoted to exhaustive
illustration of the sentiment expressed in this couplet
(see introduction above pp.176-7). Munari aptly compares
Maximian i. 75ff.

9.   <u>certa</u>: a 'set' type, i.e. one and one only. This meaning
of <u>certus</u> is largely confined to late Latin (see <u>ThLL</u> 3. 903.
78 ff.), but for similar classical usages cf. <u>Ars</u> iii. 187-8
<u>lana tot aut plures sucos bibit: elige certos,/nam non</u>
<u>conueniens omnibus omnis erit</u>, Lucr. iii. 98 <u>sensum animi</u>
<u>certa non esse in parte locatum.</u>

<u>forma</u>: a carefully chosen word which embraces several apposite
meanings here: (i) 'appearance' (cf. <u>Ars</u> i. 509 <u>forma uiros</u>
<u>neclecta decet</u>), (ii) 'beauty' (cf. Prop. ii. 33 (<u>B</u>). 33
<u>uino forma perit</u>), (iii) 'a beautiful woman', 'a beauty'
(cf. Prop. ii. 28 (<u>C</u>). 53 <u>quot Troia tulit ... et quot</u>
<u>Achaia formas</u>).

<u>inuitet</u>: Heinsius's preference for the variant <u>irritet</u>
suggests that he failed to consider this line in the wider
context of the whole poem. <u>Amores irritare</u> is certainly an
expression used by Ovid with the meaning 'to provoke love'

or 'induce love' (see <u>Met</u>. i. 461-2 <u>tu face nescioquos esto</u> <u>contentus amores / irritare tua</u> (with Bömer's note), and cf. <u>Met</u>. ix. 133 where <u>irritamen amoris</u> = 'a love-charm'), and if this were an introspective poem in which he was brooding on the fact that his susceptibility caused him to suffer excessively from the traumas of love (cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 10. 1-14), he might well have written <u>meos ... irritet amores</u> here: 'women of all kinds <u>bring on my passion</u>'; but in this elegy Ovid examines his weakness from quite a different angle, declaring that such is the natural vitality of his amorous inclinations and such the catholicity of his tastes that there is no woman alive who will not be the object of his desires (see further introduction above p.175). Thus he writes here <u>meos ... inuitet amores</u>: 'woman of all kinds <u>invite my passion</u>' (i.e. 'attract it to themselves'). For this sense of <u>inuitare</u> cf. <u>Tr</u>. iii. 14. 37 <u>librorum, per quos</u> <u>inuiter alarque</u>.

<u>meos ... amores</u>: 'my feelings of love' or perhaps, in combination with <u>inuitet</u> here (see n. above), 'my amorous advances'; the use of the plural is idiomatic in contexts such as this; cf. Tib. ii. 2. 11 <u>uxoris fidos optabis amores</u> (with K. F. Smith's note).

10. Ovid's complete reversal of the image he presented in <u>Am</u>. i. 3 (see introduction above pp.175-6) is thrown into outrageously sharp relief by direct reminiscence of that poem here: <u>centum sunt causae</u> recalls <u>non mihi mille placent</u> at i. 3. 15 and <u>cur ego semper amem</u> is an exact echo of the phrase in the

vastly different context of i. 3. 2 (the technique is a standard one in 'pairs' of Ovidian elegics; see introduction to 2 above, pp.100-101). Cf. also Tib. i. 4. 9-10 o fuge te tenerae puerorum credere turbae: / nam causam iusti semper amoris habent, Prop. ii. 22 (A). 18 mi fortuna aliquid semper amare dedit.

11-46. The catalogue of female types which occupies all the rest of the poem except for the final couplet is a show-piece for Ovid's wit, ingenuity and talent for systematic exposition (cf. introduction above p.127). Not only does he methodically divide the various sources of attraction into three distinct categories - traits of character (11-16), accomplishments (17-30) and physical appearance (33-46) - but he also for the most part arranges the differing types within these categories in antithetical pairs. A good deal of artistic variatio is perceptible in the different ways in which he presents his examples: he rings the changes agreeably with narrative (11-16, 19-26, 29-32, 35-46), apostrophe (17-18 (see n. below ad loc.), 33-4) and rhetorical question (27-8) and points contrasts by the use of siue/si/seu (11-18, 42-4) est quae/est quae (19-21) and emphatic demonstrative and personal pronouns (25-30, 33-6, 46). Sentence-length and sentence-structure too are skilfully varied throughout. Compare Ovid's management of the catalogue of poets at Am. i. 15. 9-30.

11-18. siue ... siue ... si... siue ... siue: Latin writers show a great degree of variation in the frequency with which they use siue ... siue, seu ... seu and siue ... seu (or seu ... siue) when presenting a series of alternatives. Cicero uses

siue ... siue regularly but seu ... seu only rarely, while

Caesar uses the latter frequently. Siue ... seu is more

common in the Augustan period and in poetry generally, but

poets too differ in their usage. Ovid shows a marked

preference for siue ... siue or siue ... seu (over 60 instances

altogether) rather than seu ... seu (only 11 instances).

Propertius seems equally happy with all three combinations,

but Horace and Tibullus clearly favour seu ... seu. It seems

that usage was in this case largely determined by personal

taste, some writers, as always, being more consistent in their

habits than others. With poets, however, metrical

considerations cannot be discounted and surely explain Ovid's

switch to his markedly third-choice seu ... seu at 41-4 below.

See further Hofmann-Szantyr 677, Kühner-Stegmann II. ii. 435ff.

11-14. The shy (11-12), the forward (13-14) and the prudish girl

(15-16). Cf. Rem. 329-30, Tib. i. 4. 13-14.

11. Oculos in se deiecta modestos: in me, the reading of PSYω

could only be construed 'in my case' (i.e. me ablative; see

OLD, s.v., in, 42, R. P. Oliver, CPh 51 (1956) 60-61), and

though this is not entirely impossible here (Harder-Marg and

Lenz do in fact retain it), it seems rather pointless, as Ovid

is quite obviously thinking of modest behaviour in relation to

himself. It is also more natural to take in closely with deiecta

and the word it governs as an accusative, since in + accusative

is one of the commonest constructions with deicere (see

OLD, s.v.) In se, on the other hand, which appears in a few recc. and has the support of Heinsius, allows this construction to be assumed and gives excellent sense: 'If a girl looks modestly down at herself.' Goold (Amat. Crit. 31) greets the adoption of this reading with nothing short of derision, warning no-one to cite in support of it Am. i. 8. 37 cum bene deiectis gremium spectabis ocellis, Ep. 11. 35 gremio... pudor deiecit ocellos or Ep. 20. 113 lumina ... in gremio ueluti defixa tenebam, where 'gremium(-o)', he asserts, 'is not of course the same as se'; cite them I do, however, since I fail to see how gremium(-o) could possibly be anything but the same as se (or the other appropriate reflexive pronouns) in these passages.

Goold himself, along with Munari, favours the conjecture in humum. It was first firmly advanced by S. Timpanaro (A & R 3 (1953), 98), though the possibility of it, in view of oculos in humum deiecta modestos at Am. iii. 6. 67, had also occurred to Heinsius. He, however, was wise not to press the idea as strongly as some of his twentieth century successors have done, for it is difficult to see (and Goold's palaeo-graphical postulations do not make it any easier) how in humum could ever have been corrupted to in me (or in se, for that matter). The corruption of in se to in me seems, to my mind at least, a good deal easier to imagine: the initial letter of se could simply have been difficult to read in some pre-Carolingian 'archetype' (see general introduction, p..16, n. 35) and me could have been the erroneous guess of a scribe impressed by the poem's pre-occupation with the first person up to this point. At any rate, in se has claims to authenticity a good deal stronger than those of in humum, which must surely be relegated to the ranks of unnecessary conjectures.

11-12. <u>oculos</u> ... <u>modestos</u> / ... <u>pudor</u>: a becoming shyness is
what Ovid has in mind and not an air of chastity, which is
rather the characteristic he deals with in 15-16; for
<u>modestus</u> with this meaning cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 4. 15-16 <u>uultu comes</u>
<u>ipsa modesto</u> / <u>ibis</u> and for <u>pudor</u>, <u>Am</u>. i. 5. 7-8 <u>illa</u>
<u>uerecundis lux est praebenda puellis, / qua timidus latebras</u>
<u>speret habere pudor</u>, <u>Ars</u> i. 672, <u>Tib</u>. i. 4. 14. <u>Am</u>. i. 8.
35-8 shows that Ovid was not in the habit of taking female
coyness too seriously!

<u>uror</u>: cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 1. 26 <u>uror, et in uacuo pectore regnat Amor</u>.
For fire imagery in erotic poetry see 1. 8n. <u>flamma</u>.

<u>insidiae</u> ... <u>meae</u>: here the meaning must be 'my downfall',
but I have found no parallels for a possessive adjective with
<u>insidiae</u> replacing an objective rather than a subjective
genitive (cf. 4n. above); at Mart. iv. 56. 4, for instance,
<u>qui potes insidias dona uocare tuas</u>, <u>tuas insidias</u> = 'traps
set <u>by</u> you', not '<u>for</u> you'.

13-16. For a more choosy lover than Ovid here cf. Rufin. <u>AP</u> v. 42
μισῶ τὴν ἀφελῆ, μισῶ τὴν σώφρονα λίαν·/ ἡ μὲν γὰρ βραδέως, ἡ
δὲ θέλει ταχέως.

13. <u>procax</u>: 'forward'; the tone is light-hearted here, but the
epithet is generally very derogatory when used of a woman
(see e.g. Cic. <u>Cael</u>. 49 <u>non solum meretrix sed etiam proterua</u>
<u>meretrix procaxque</u>, Liv. xxxix. 43. 4 <u>scorti procacis</u>.

capior: 'I am ensnared'; a regular figurative usage which exploits common ground between the ranges of military imagery and hunting imagery so familiar in erotic contexts (see Spies, Militat omnis amans 26); cf. Am. i. 10. 10 nec facies oculos iam capit ista meos (Pichon collects more examples s.v.).

rustica: see 8. 3n.

14. in molli ... toro: i.e. a lover's bed; see 10. 17n. cubili.

mobilis: one of a number of erotic euphemisms which Ovid seems to have invented (see 10. 25n.). It was probably suggested to him by the well-established use of mouere and motus as euphemisms for coire and coitus; see e.g. Am. i. 10. 35-6 uoluptas / quam socio motu femina uirque ferunt, ii. 10. 35 Veneris languescere motu. Tib. i. 9. 65-6 nec tu ... sentis, / cum tibi non solita corpus ab arte mouet. Lee translates splendidly here, 'lively company in bed', and Marlowe, though he blunders with procax, does as well as Lee with mobilis: 'And she that's coy I like for being no clown, / Methinks she would be nimble when she's down.'

15. aspera: cf. Hor. Carm. i. 33. 6-7 Cyrus in asperam / declinat Pholoen. The adjective sometimes stands for, or is coupled with, seuera (see e.g. Sen. Med. 87 uirginis asperae (i.e. Diana), Quint. Decl. 343 p. 357 puellam seueram uidebam et asperam.

rigidas ... imitata Sabinas: 'as prudish as a Sabine'.
Sabine chastity was proverbial; see Juv. 6. 163-4. intactior
omni/...Sabina, Mart. ix.40. 4-5. (puella simplex)/quam castae
quoque diligunt Sabinae and further Otto, Sprichwörter 304.
The tone of references to the strict morality of the Sabines
is often eulogistic (e.g. Hor. Carm. iii. 6. 37-41) but Ovid,
predictably, is especially fond of treating proverbial Sabine
chastity with scant respect; cf. Am. i. 8. 39-40 forsitan
immundae Tatio regnante Sabinae / noluerint habiles pluribus
esse uiris, Am. iii. 8. 61. Med. 11. The pièce de résistance
along these lines is Ars i. 100-132.

16. A slightly puzzling line, but it seems best to assume a
combination of hyperbaton and brachyology, i.e. uelle ex alto
(i.e. penitus) sed dissimulare (sc. uelle ex alto) puto:
'I think that deep down she is willing, but she won't show
that she is'. For ex alto = 'deep down', 'secretly', cf.
Lucr. iv. 72-4 nam certe iacere ac largiri multa uidemus, /
non solum ex alto penitusque ... / uerum de summis ipsum
quoque saepe colorem and see also Verg. A. i. 26-7 manet
alta mente repostum iudicium / Paridis (with Servius's note)
(Micyllus's alternative interpretation of ex alto as 'a
longinquo', 'superbe' is ingenious, but not probable).
Some take ex alto closely with dissimulare rather than uelle
(see e.g. Burman, 'profunde simulans', Munari 'dissimula
profondamente'), but this seems rather odd to me; 'dissimulation'
itself does not take place 'secretly' within a person, but
rather gives the superficial impression that one does not
feel what one really feels in secret.

For the ellipse of the accusative eam after dissimulare

cf. Am. ii. 7. 8. si culpo, crimen dissimulare putas,

and see n. ad loc.

uelle: a standard erotic euphemism, 'ready to make love';

cf. Ars i. 274 haec quoque, quam poteris credere nolle, uolet

(Pichon collects more examples s.v.). Cf. 7. 25, 8. 25nn.

dissimulare: Ovid regards the element of dissimulatio as

one of the stock ingredients of the elegiac love situation

(see Am. ii. 7. 8, iii. 11. 24, 14. 4, Ars iii. 210, 353),

and his comments on the matter sometimes provide a good

illustration of his insight into the psychology of love

see e.g. Ars i. 276 uir male dissimulat, tectius illa cupit.

17-32. Ovid now moves on from consideration of feminine mores to

feminine artes. First, simply the cultured and the not-so-

cultured (17-18), then, more specifically, women of literary

discernment - the fan and the critic (19-22), next the girl

with good, and the girl with bad, deportment (23-4), after

that, the musical girl (25-8), and finally the one who can

dance (29-32). The whole passage is characterized by verbal

wit, in the form of repetition and paronomasia: 17-18 places

... / ... placita es; 20 placeo ... placet, 21-2 culpet /

culpantis, 23-4 molliter ... motu ... / ... mollior, 25-6

canit ... / cantanti; see Frécaut 27-35, 37 and cf. 5. 2-3n.

17-18. Either we must adopt second person readings throughout this

couplet (following PSYç in 17, and two thirteenth century MSS

in 18, which give placita es where PY give the unmetrical
places (obviously from 17) and S gives the false correction
placeas) or third person readings throughout (following ω
in 17 and P_a V_b in 18). Both give acceptable sense, but the
desirability of artistic uariatio (see 11-46n. above) tips
the balance in favour of the second person readings. The
third persons could have all crept in accidentally (the
scribe who introduced them having line 15 at the forefront
of his mind as he wrote), or one could have come in
accidentally and the rest have been introduced deliberately
to restore consistency. Two of the wilder variants which
appear in the recc. are easily explicable: capior in 18
will have come from 13 above and D's mea at the end of the
same line will be the result of placita es being taken for a
genuine passive (the use of the past participle placitus
with active meaning is of course well attested; cf. Ars
i. 37 placitam exorare puellam, Ep. 19. 37, Met. vii. 226,
Verg. G. ii. 425, Stat. Theb. x. 769).

17. docta: the docta puella, accomplished in literature and
music (cf. raras ... artes below) is a stock character in Latin
love elegy; cf. Ars iii. 319-20 nec ... citharam tenuisse .../
nesciat arbitrio femina docta meo. Prop. i. 7. 11 me laudent
doctae solum placuisse puellae, ii. 11. 6, 13.(A) 11, [Tib.]
iii. 12. 2. Propertius's Cynthia appears to be the classic
example judging from i. 2. 27-30 cum tibi praesertim Phoebus
sua carmina donet / Aoniamque libens Calliopea lyram, / unica
nec desit iucundis gratia uerbis, / omnia quaeque Venus,
quaeque Minerua probat. See E. Burck, Hermes 80 (1952),
87 n.2, Lilja 133ff.

places: placere = amabilis uideri occurs a few times in comedy (see e.g. Pl. Per. 564 quom hanc magi' contemplo, magi' placet, Poen. 1417, Ter. Hau. 1066, Ad. 622) and in Horace (see e.g. Carm. iii. 7. 23-4 ne ... / plus iusto placeat caue, ii. 14. 21, but the elegists make it into a standard term of the sermo amatorius cf. Ars i. 42, tu mihi sola places,Am. i. 3. 15 non mihi mille placent Tib. i. 8. 15, Prop. i. 2. 26. Martial and Juvenal also use the word regularly in this manner (see e.g. Mart. i. 10. 4. quid ergo in illa petitur et placet? cf. vii. 87. 10, Juv. 3. 135).

raras ... artes: cf. Am. ii. 10. 6 artibus in dubio est haec sit an illa prior. The artes to which Ovid is alluding are those which he proceeds to describe in lines 17-32: literary sensitivity, deportment, music, dancing (cf. docta above). Here he professes himself to be indifferent to the possession or lack of these talents in women, but at Ars iii. 311-80 he cites them at much greater length (adding at 353ff. the art of successful gambling!) as almost indispensable qualities for the aspiring mistress.

Raras here = 'exceptional' and an elegiac sweetheart endowed with any or all of these accomplishments is often designated rara puella. Propertius's Cynthia,especially, is favoured with the description:i. 8. 42 Cynthia rara mea est; cf. i. 17. 16.

dotata: the adjectival use of dotatus, even in its primary sense of 'rich', is rare and appears to belong mainly to the colloquial language, occurring most frequently in comedy,

but in the broader sense 'endowed with' it is used in the
classical period only by Ovid here and at Met. xi. 301
Chione ... dotatissima forma (see ThLL. 5. i. 2057. 47ff.).

18. rudis: not here in the common elegiac sense rudis in amore
(see 1. 6n.) but in opposition to docta (17), i.e. not
accomplished in any of the rarae artes. Cf. Ars i. 111
rudem praebente modum tibicine Tusco.

simplicitate: 'simplicity' in a complimentary sense. Ovid's
use of the noun here is akin to Horace's use of the adjective
(but with reference to physical appearance) at Carm i. 5. 5
simplex munditiis (see Nisbet-Hubbard ad loc.). Sometimes
elsewhere Ovid uses the word with a more pejorative meaning
similar to that of rusticitas (see 8. 3n); see e.g. Ars iii.
113 simplicitas rudis ante fuit.

19-22. Juvenal has some harsh words for the woman with a literary
bent at 6. 434-7.

19-20. Callimachi prae nostris rustica dicat / carmina: the
adjective rustica indicates that the point of comparison
Ovid had in mind was style, not subject-matter; cf. Catul.
36. 18-20 uos .../ pleni ruris et inficetiarum / annales Volusi.
Ovid's remark at Am. i. 15. 14 à propos of Callimachus,
quamuis ingenio non ualet, arte ualet, shows that he himself
admired his Greek predecessor for this quality. Refinement in
style was, of course, one of Callimachus's own proudest claims
for his poetry; see Aet. fr. 1, 17-18 (Pfeiffer) αὖθι δὲ
τέχνῃ / κρίνετε ... τὴν σοφίην; cf. id. Ap. 105-12, and

see introduction to 1 above p. 45 , n. 14.

Ovid never directly claims Callimachus as a model, but
in <u>Am</u>. i. 15 the echoes in phraseology between lines 7-8
<u>mihi fama perennis / quaeritur, in toto semper ut orbe canar</u>
and 13 <u>Battiades semper toto cantabitur orbe</u> suggest that
Ovid hoped to vie with him in acclaim.

19. <u>prae</u>: the use of the preposition (generally + personal
pronoun, as here) = 'in comparison with' is very rare in
poetry other than comedy, though it occurs in prose of all
types and periods (see Kühner-Stegmann II. i. 513). Ovid,
however, uses it three times; cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 9 (B). 38, <u>Met</u>.
xi. 155.

20. <u>placeo</u> ... <u>placet</u>: a play on two different meanings of <u>placere</u>
used here first in its literal, and then in its amatory sense;
cf. the play on <u>apta</u> at <u>Am</u>. ii. 8. 4 (with n. <u>ad. loc</u>.).

21. <u>uatem</u>: perhaps the idea of 'poetic pretensions' is present
in the use of this word here, but see 1. 34n.

21-2. <u>culpet/culpantis</u>: see 17-32n. above and on the stylistic
device of a participle taking up a finite verb in general,
Hofmann-Szantyr 830-31.

<u>sustinuisse</u>: for the idiomatic use of the perfect infinitive
see 7. 19n.

<u>sustinuisse femur</u>: cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 14. 22 <u>nec femori impositum</u>
<u>sustinuisse femur</u>. Poetic allusions to sexual intercourse

often use _femur_ in a semi-euphemistic manner; e.g. _femur_
femori committere (_Am_. i. 4. 43) _supponere_ (_Am_. iii. 7. 10, cf.
Catul. 69. 2) _conserere_ (Tib. i. 8. 26). It seems likely,
as Brandt remarks on _Am_. iii. 2. 30, that the poets had a
definite _schema Veneris_ in mind (in late and ecclesiastical
Latin _femur_ becomes used for _membra genitalia_ proper; see
ThLL 6. 472. 68ff.).

It is difficult to judge the stylistic level of the above
expressions. Given their meaning, one might reasonably
expect that they belong to the popular erotic jargon of the
colloquial language, and the presence of one of them in a
short lampoon of Catullus (_loc. supra cit_.) amidst a number of
colloquial words and expressions would tend to strengthen
that view; on the other hand, their absence from comedy and
the epigrams of Martial and their admission by the fastidious
Tibullus would suggest the opposite.

23-4. If we read _incedit_ in 23 (_PSY_ have the obvious error
incessit, prompted perhaps by the perfect infinitive
sustinuisse in the line immediately preceding) and _at_ in 24
(an adversative particle is clearly needed, and _sed_, the only
other one offered by the MSS, looks like an attempted
correction of _ac_ or _et_, to which _at_ will easily have been
corrupted), we have a text which gives excellent sense: 'A
girl walks gracefully: her movement charms me; another is
stiff: she, however, can be loosened up by the touch of a
man.' Ovid does not specify the sense in which _altera_ is
dura ('stiff', 'clumsy'), and at first we assume it is in
her physical carriage, just as her opposite number is _mollis_

('supple', 'graceful') in the same respect; but when we
hear that the attraction of the dura puella is that she can
be made mollior 'by the touch of a man', we perceive, tacto
uiro obviously being a euphemism for sexual intercourse (and
one apparently confined to Ovid; cf. 10. 25n.), that the
adjective mollis now relates not simply to gait, but to
sexual disposition (i.e. it means 'obliging', 'complaisant';
cf. Am. ii. 5. 26 mollis amica and see Pichon s.v.) - what
'the touch of a man' will really be able to teach the 'stiff'
girl is not how to carry herself better (though this might
well be an incidental result!), but how to be more relaxed
and seductive in bed. For the verbal wit see 17-32n. above.

(Heinsius's proposal to emend the text to altera dure
(sc. incedit): / at poterat tacto mollius isse uiro (Bentley
subsequently suggested ire for isse) deserves comment if only
for its illustration of the dangers of paying more attention
to the demands of strict linguistic logic than to the evidence
of the MSS. For the proposed alteration certainly produces
a 'tidier' and 'tighter' couplet, with adverb taken up by
adverb (molliter ... dure/... mollius) and verb by (synonymous)
verb (incedit ... incedit (understood)/ ... isse), but by
insisting on absolute precision and consistency it destroys
completely the subtle transition from aesthetic appreciation
to sexual pleasure which is so clearly exhibited by the
transmitted text. The looseness which Heinsius and Bentley
seek to eliminate is to be attributed not to the carelessness
of Ovid's copyists but to the highly effective design of the
poet himself.)

23. __molliter incedit: motu capit__: for the whole question of
the importance of a graceful and seductive gait cf. __Ars__ iii.
298-306. Heinsius also aptly compares Petr. 126.

25-8. For the appreciation of musical expertise in women cf. Phld.
__AP__. v. 131. 1-3 ψαλμός, καὶ λαλιή, καὶ κωτίλον ὄμμα, καὶ ᾠδή/
Ξανθίππης...;/ὦ ψυχή,φλέξει σε, __id. ibid__. 132. (where the poet
asserts that a girl's physical attractions offset the fact
that amongst other things, she does not 'sing Sappho'!); for
the denigration of it, on the other hand, see Juv. 6. 379-88.
Singing and playing the lyre are regularly cited as the chief
branches of musical ability (cf. __Ars__ iii. 311-28, (where Ovid
deals with both in advising the __puella__ on the __artes__ she needs
to acquire), Prop. i. 2. 27-32 (where the poet maintains that
natural musical talents outweigh all artificially produced
comeliness), ii. 1. 9, 3. 19-20; the general popularity
of the lyre in particular is amply attested by the numerous
iconographical representations of lyre-players from the
ancient world [see Daremberg and Saglio III. 1438ff.]).
We may note also that Ovid considers singing a useful
accomplishment for a male lover at __Ars__ i. 595.

25. __haec__: Heinsius's __huic__, syntactically elegant and
palaeographically plausible, is very attractive. Goold
strongly supports it, asserting that __haec__, the reading of
all the MSS, 'unnecessarily deprives the sentence of
smoothness' and is 'merely the interpolation of someone who
thought a nominative necessary to balance the nominative in
verse 27' (__Amat. Crit.__ 32-3). Possibly, but (i) although,
if we read __haec__, the construction of 25-6 admittedly takes

a somewhat unexpected turn, it is nevertheless perfectly
intelligible; (ii) the examples cited by Goold of the use
of different cases of the same word to introduce separate but
related statements do not occur in passages truly comparable
with ours (and the 'identical error' at Ars iii. 145 is in
fact not identical, for huic .../hanc (as opposed to hanc .../
hanc) in 145-7 is transmitted by most of the MSS and the case
variation is confirmed by the appearance of alterius .../
altera immediately before in 141-3); (iii) several pairs of
exempla in the long catalogue (11-46) which occupies most of
our poem have each of their members introduced by precisely
the same word or words: 11-13 siue aliqua est .../siue ...
aliqua est, 19-21 est quae .../est ... quae, 41-3 seu pendent
.../seu flauent, 45 me sollicitat, me tangit; haec .../
haec in 25-7 would obviously conform to this general pattern.
I am thus inclined to retain haec, but not without some
hesitation.

dulce: the neuter accusative of the adjective is used
adverbially in classical prose only in the case of adjectives
of quality or degree such as multum, plus, tantum, but the
poets extend the usage to other adjectives (cf. Am. iii. 1. 4
dulce queruntur aues, Verg. A. vi. 288 horridum stridens,
Hor. Carm. ii. 12. 64 lucidum fulgentes (with Nisbet-Hubbard's
note)) and it even appears in prose at a later stage (see
e.g. Tac. Ann. iv. 60 falsum renidens).

flectit ... uocem: 'modulates her voice'; for the expression
cf. Tib. i. 7. 37 uoces inflectere cantu, Lucr. v. 1406

ducere multimodis uoces et flectere cantus.

facillima: the predicative adjective stands for an adverb, 'very skilfully'; cf. Hor. <u>Carm</u>.iii. 1. 34-5 <u>huc frequens /</u> <u>caementa demittit redemptor</u>, Prop. i. 6. 12 <u>a pereat, si quis</u> <u>lentus amare potest</u>! See further Löfstedt, <u>Syntactica</u> II. 368ff., Kühner-Stegmann II. i. 234ff. and cf. <u>numerosa</u> (29), <u>multa</u> (34) below.

26. <u>oscula</u> ... <u>rapta dedisse</u>: cf. <u>Ep. Sapph</u>. 44 <u>oscula cantanti</u> <u>tu mihi rapta dabas</u>. 'To give stolen kisses' seems a somewhat paradoxical expression, but it is understandable enough when one considers that there is inevitably a certain amount of 'give' and 'take' in every kiss; the English 'snatch' conveys Ovid's meaning well. For a different use of the phrase cf. Tib. i. 4. 55 (<u>oscula</u>) <u>rapta dabit primo, post</u> <u>offeret ipse roganti</u> (with K. F. Smith's note).

<u>dedisse uelim</u>: the use of the perfect instead of the present infinitive in negative expressions of wish (see e.g. Pl. <u>Poen</u>. 872 <u>nolito edepol deuellisse</u> and further Hofmann-Szantyr 351-2) seems to have been a native Latin idiom. The extension of the usage to positive expressions of wish and, eventually, many others too, may, however, have developed partly under the influence of the Greek use of the aorist infinitive in a similar manner. See further 7. 19n.

27. <u>querulas</u> ... <u>chordas</u>: 'the plaintive strings' (sc. of the lyre). Stringed instruments were introduced to Rome from

Greece, and one of the three original modes of Greek music,

the 'Lydian' was apparently characterized by its plaintive

tone (see Pl. R. iii. 398E τίνες οὖν θρηνώδεις ἁρμονίαι; ....

Μιξολυδιστί, ἔφη, καὶ συντονολυδιστὶ καὶ τοιαῦταί τινες);

hence, no doubt, the lyre is often designated querulus, but

the epithet becomes almost conventional of any kind of music

and is also applied to the sound of native Latin wind

instruments (see e.g. Hor. Carm. iii. 7. 30 querulae ...

tibiae, Prop. iv. 3. 20 querulas ... tubas).

habili ... pollice: Heinsius, comparing Mart. iii. 82. 13

percurrit agili corpus arte tractatrix, and noting MS

confusion between habilis and agilis also at Am. i. 9. 45 and

Ars ii. 661, favours the variant agili. Certainly it gives

excellent sense with percurrit pollice chordas (cf. Lucr. ii.

412-3 musaea mele, per chordas organici .../mobilibus digitis

expergefacta), but since habilis may mean 'easily put to use',

'easily performing a function' (cf. Sen. Con. vii. pr.2

nullum habile membrum est, si corpori par est, Verg. G. iv.

418 habilis membris uenit uigor), habili ... pollice virtually =

agili ... pollice (a thumb which 'easily performs a function' can hardly be

anything but 'deft'); thus habili as lectio difficilior, may

reasonably be preferred here.

Strumming the lyre with the thumb was obviously a normal

method of playing (cf. Met. v. 339 Calliope querulas

praetemptat pollice chordas, Met. x. 145 ut satis impulsas

temptauit pollice chordas, Tib. ii. 5. 3 nunc te uocales

impellere pollice chordas), but the use of a plectrum was

clearly common too (see e.g. Ep. Sapph. 198 plectra dolore

tacent, muta dolore lyra est, Stat. Ach. ii. 157-8 Apollineo

... <u>fila sonantia plectro / cum quaterem</u>).

28. <u>doctas</u> ... <u>manus</u>:   see 17n. above.

29-30. For the titillating effect of female dancing cf. Autom. <u>AP</u>
v. 129. 1-4.

τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίης ὀρχηστρίδα, τὴν κακοτέχνοις
  σχήμασιν ἐξ ἀπαλῶν κινυμένην ὀνύχων,
αἰνέω οὐχ ὅτι πάντα παθαίνεται οὐδ᾽ ὅτι βάλλει
  τὰς ἀπαλὰς ἀπαλῶς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε χέρας ...

Σχήματα, 'postures' (cf. <u>gestu</u>, 29) and δείξεις 'arm-
movements' (cf. <u>numerosa</u> ... <u>bracchia ducit</u>, 29)would seem
to have been more important than movements of the feet in
ancient dance, for they are mentioned with much greater
regularity (see e.g. <u>Ars</u> i. 595, ii. 305, iii. 350, <u>Rem</u>. 334,
Prop. ii. 22 (<u>A</u>). 4-5, Stat. <u>Silv</u>. iii. 5. 66, Autom. <u>AP</u> v.
129. 2-4 (<u>supra cit</u>.) and especially Ath. xiv. 629B, F, 631B;
see also <u>RE</u> 4. A. 2. 2244-7). It has been claimed that
ancient dancing was something akin to our classical ballet
(see e.g. Brandt on <u>Ars</u> i. 595, L. Friedländer, <u>Roman Life</u>
<u>and Manners under the Early Empire</u>, trans. J. H. Freese and
L. A. Magnus (London 1913) II, 100-117) and indeed there is
a remarkable similarity between some of the postures shown in
artistic representations of the ancient dance and those of
ballet (see especially Daremberg and Saglio IV. 1047,
fig. 6074), but one wonders whether the insistence upon supple
movement of the body and arms rather than 'steps' and the
obviously sensual qualities of the dance in Greek and Roman
literature might suggest a closer affinity with oriental,
especially Indian, dancing.

Though Ovid could have seen public exhibitions of dancing

in Rome from the latter part of the first century B.C.
onwards (see Friedländer, loc. cit.), it seems more likely
that he has in mind here the performance of dancing, usually
by professionals, both male and female, as entertainment at
private dinner parties (see Daremberg and Saglio IV. 1053-4).
Dancing by private individuals was never favourably regarded
in Rome; it was considered thoroughly contemptible in men
(see Cic. Mur. 13) and a most undesirable accomplishment for
the respectable Roman matrona (see Sal. Cat. 25. 1, G. Williams,
JRS (1962), 37-8). Ovid, however, recommends the acquisition
of expertise in dancing to both the male and the female
recipients of his instructions for success in love at Ars i.
595 and iii. 349ff. respectively.

For the expression in this couplet cf. Prop. ii. 22
(A) 4-5 siue aliquis molli diducit candida gestu / bracchia
and see introduction above p. 174.

29. numerosa: 'rhythmic'; cf. Pont. iv. 2. 33 in tenebris
numerosos ponere gestus, Prop. iv. 7. 61 numerosa fides
(i.e. the lyre). Here the adjective is used as the equivalent
of an adverb; cf. 25n. above facillima.

30. tenerum: see 1. 4n.

molli: 'supple' and perhaps also 'sensuous'; cf. 23-4n.
above.

torquet ... latus: a reference to one of the gestus of the
ancient dance (see 29-30n. above); cf. Ars iii. 351 where
artifices lateris = 'dancers'.

ab arte: a or ab + ablative appears to be used in place of
the simple modal/instrumental ablative on a number of
occasions in both prose and poetry (see Hofmann-Szantyr 435,
ThLL 1. 28. 83ff. and 34 59ff.) and with notable frequency
in Ovid (see Bömer on Fast. ii. 764). Scholarly opinion
differs on the nature of this usage: on the one hand it is
claimed to be generally indistinguishable in sense from the
modal/instrumental ablative without preposition (thus Rothstein
on Prop. i. 16. 14) and on the other to be intended on most
occasions to import an extra shade of meaning (thus K. Guttmann,
Sogenanntes instrumentales ab bei Ovid (Dortmund 1890)).
Tränkle (Sprachkunst 87ff.) argues that the latter is true of
Propertius but not of Ovid or Tibullus, who, he thinks, use
the instrumental ab largely for metrical convenience.

I do not find Tränkle's arguments convincing, at least
in the case of ab arte. The appearance of this expression
in the prose of Varro (R. i. 59. 2) and Vitruvius (v. 4. 3)
and its admission by Tibullus, who does not use a modal/
instrumental ab with any other ablative, rather suggests that
it was an established phrase sui iuris.

31-2. A brief, pithy exemplum introduces a welcome variation in
Ovid's method of exposition; cf. 6. 15-16n.

31. ut taceam de me: 'not to speak of myself ...'. An idiomatic
use of the final ut; cf. Cic. Caec. 95 ut ... nihil de
calamitate rei publicae querar ..., Mur. 87 ut leuissime
dicam ...; see Lewis and Short s.v. 5c.

qui causa tangor ab omni: 'who am impressed by every claim';
for causa in this sense cf. Liv. ix. 10. 1 mouit patres
conscriptos cum causa tum auctor. The use of ab + ablative
here with an impersonal noun is understandable enough: though
the 'claims' are impersonal, those who make them (sc. all the
puellae encountered by Ovid) are, of course, personal.

32. For the neat paratactical structure cf. Am. i. 9. 9-10
mitte puellam, / strenuus exempto fine sequetur amans, ii. 2.
40 haec fac, in exiguo tempore liber eris (with n. ad. loc.).

Hippolytum ... Priapus: the former the supreme exemplum of
chastity (cf. Prop. iv. 5 . 5 docta ... Hippolytum Veneri
mollire negantem; see also Roscher, Lexicon II. 2681-2),
the latter of lechery (see H. Herter, De Priapo (Giessen 1932),
Roscher, Lexicon VI. 2967ff). Cf. Priap. 19. 5-6 (Buecheler)
haec sic non modo te, Priape, posset / priuignum quoque
sed mouere Phaedrae.

33-46. Physical appearance is the last of the three categories of
female charms which Ovid considers. Once more he groups the
types in antithetical pairs: the tall and the short (33-6),
the unadorned and the chic (37-8), the fair and the dark
(39-44), the old and the young (45-6). Ovid shows in practice
here the theory of Ars ii. 657ff. and Rem. 317ff. that beauty
is in the eye of the beholder. (cf. Lucr. iv. 1153-72).

33-4. Ancient ideas on the ideal female figure could hardly be more
different from those of the modern western world; the petite

and sylph-like woman was not generally admired, while the
tall (longa) and well-built (multa) one certainly was (but
cf. Ter. Eu. 313ff.). This distinct preference for women of
generous proportions stems to some extent, as Ovid's own
remark ueteres heroidas aequas (33) shows, from the ancient
anthropomorphic conception of deity which distinguished gods
from men only by their greater size and strength. Thus
goddesses, who, of course, epitomized beauty, were thought of
as big, and hence largeness of stature became evocative of
divinity and so a mark of beauty in mortal women (see e.g.
Hom. Od. vi. 149ff. (Odysseus's opening words to Nausicaa)
θεός νύ τις ἦ βροτός ἐσσι; / εἰ μέν τις θεός ἐσσι .../
Ἀρτέμιδί σε ἐγώ γε, Διὸς κούρῃ μεγάλοιο, / εἶδός τε μέγεθος
τε φυήν τ' ἄγχιστα ἐΐσκω, cf. Od. xviii, 195, Nicarch. AP
v. 38. εὐμεγέθης πείθει με καλὴ γυνή, Rufin AP v. 37. and
especially Catul. 86. 1-2 Quintia formosa est multis, mihi
candida, longa, / recta est, 4 nulla in tam magno est corpore
mica salis (with Fordyce's note for further examples). Cf.
our 'Junoesque'.

33. longa es: S alone has the erroneous longas. Errors peculiar
to S (of which a fair sample may be found in the Appendix to
Kenney's edition) tend to betray in their author a basic lack
of discernment and sensibility as well as a constant readiness
to contaminate and interpolate his text. Here, for instance,
it seems that the scribe of S (or perhaps one of S's
immediate ancestors), almost certainly finding longaes in α
and being neither astute enough to introduce the correct
word-division, as did P, nor content to reproduce what he

found, as was <u>Y</u> (and probably <u>R</u> (<u>Parisinus Latinus</u> 7311,

saec. ix (see Kenney, <u>Man. Trad.</u> 6-7), since faulty word-

division is a characteristic of the portion of <u>R</u> which is

extant), he deliberately altered it to <u>longas</u>, looking no

further than <u>ueteres heroidas</u>, and so replaced a reading

only minutely incorrect with one which distorted the sense

and construction of the whole sentence.

<u>ueteres heroidas aequas</u>: cf. Stat. <u>Silv.</u> iii. 5. 44-5

<u>nota fides</u> ... /<u>qua ueteres Latias Graias heroidas aequas</u>.

For the complimentary comparison of the elegiac <u>puella</u> with

mythological heroines cf. Prop. i. 4. 5-8:

> tu licet Antiopae formam Nycteidos, et tu
>   Spartanae referas laudibus Hermionae,
> et quascumque tulit formosi temporis aetas;
>   Cynthia non illas nomen habere sinat.

34. <u>in toto ... toro</u>: see 10. 17n. <u>cubili</u>.

<u>multa</u>: Ovid means, I think, that the big woman will take up

an impressive amount of room in bed! For the adverbial use

of <u>multus</u> cf. <u>Am.</u> i. 15.42 <u>pars...mei multa superstes erit</u>,

Verg. <u>A.</u> i. 419-20 <u>collem qui plurimus urbi / imminet</u>.

The Greek πολύς is used in a similar manner; see e.g. D.H.

ii. 42 ῥώμην ... σώματος πολύς, E. <u>Ba.</u> 300 ὅταν ... ὁ θεὸς ...

ἔλθῃ πολύς. See further Kühner-Stegmann II. i. 236.

35. <u>habilis</u>: 'a "manageable" size', i.e. a woman one can easily

make love to without too much physical strain! Cf. <u>Ars</u> ii.

661 <u>dic 'habilem' quaecumque breuis</u>. Shortness of stature

always tends to provoke some half-apologetic comment;

cf. Phld. AP v. 121. 1-2 μικρὴ καὶ μελανεῦσα Φιλαίνιον,
ἀλλὰ σελίνων/οὐλοτέρη.

corrumpor utraque: 'Both types are my undoing'. The strong
corrumpere is used tongue-in-cheek here to remind us of
Ovid's original mock-serious designation of his weakness as
a uitium (2 above). Cf. the milder expressions at Prop. ii.
25.42 ducit uterque color and 44 utraque forma rapit.

36. uoto ... meo: 'my desires' or here almost 'my taste'; cf.
Ars i. 90 haec loca sunt uoto fertiliora tuo.

37-8. Cultus for Ovid means 'personal grooming' and in particular
attention to coiffure and facial make-up; he alone of the
elegists makes the distinction between these cosmetic operations
and other forms of adornment such as the wearing of expensive
fabrics and jewels and the use of perfume (see e.g. Tib. i.
8. 9-14, Prop. i. 2), recommending the one (in his Medicamina
faciei femineae and at Ars iii. 102ff.; cf. Am. i. 8. 26)
and deprecating the other (at Am. i. 10. 49ff., Ars iii. 129-32).
Here he professes to be untroubled by lack of cultus, but
at Ars iii. 121-8 he compares contemporary chic very
favourably with ancient rusticitas.

37. For the sentiment cf. Met. i. 497-8 spectat inornatos collo
pendere capillos / et 'quid, si comantur?' ait.

38. ornata est: here, I think, 'got up' in a general sense.
Ornare may be used of making up the face (see e.g. Tib. i. 8.

11), but it usually refers to hairstyling (see 7. 23n.).

dotes exhibet ipsa suas: 'shows off her natural endowments';
cf. Ars iii. 105 cura dabit faciem. For dotes of physical
endowments cf. Ars iii. 258 est illis sua dos, forma sine arte
potens. For the formulaic ipsa suas see 6. 55n.

39-44. The respective attractions of fair and dark beauty. As usual,
the colour of both complexion (39-40) and hair (41-4) comes
into consideration (for the elegiac preoccupation with these
two features see Lilja 119-32).

39-40. Cf. Prop. ii. 25. 41-2 uidistis pleno teneram candore puellam /
uidistis fuscam: ducit uterque color; see introduction
above p. 174, n. 4.

39. candida: one of the favourite complimentary epithets of the
elegiac puella, often meaning simply 'beautiful' (see 7. 5n.),
but here used with specific reference to the colour of the skin.
It signifies a 'whiteness' of a healthy kind as opposed to
the sickly pallor normally denoted by albus or pallidus
(see André, Termes de couleur 325). Cf. Fast. iii. 493
praeposita est fuscae mihi candida paelex.

me capiet, capiet me: repetition of a word in mid-line is
one of Ovid's favourite stylistic devices (it obviously
prompted a text-book error in α here; P and Y both give
capiet only once, but S has corrected the deficiency,
probably by reference to some β source). Ovid varies his

use of the device considerably, sometimes simply repeating
one word within the line immediately, either in the same
case (e.g. Am. i. 2. 41 tu pinnas gemma, gemma uariante
capillos; cf. Am. ii. 6. 59) or in a different case (e.g.
Rem. 484 et posita est cura cura repulsa noua;cf. Am. i. 8.
80), and sometimes repeating also another word in the line,
either to create a perfect chiasmus (ABBA) as here, or a
slightly distorted one (e.g. Am. ii. 5.43 spectabat terram:
terram spectare decebat (A^{1}BBA^2; see n. ad loc., and cf.
Ars i. 99), Am. iii. 2. 81 sunt dominae rata uota meae, mea
uota supersunt (AB^{1}B^{2}A). See 5. 2-3n.

flaua: flauus applied to physical characteristics is most
frequently used in description of the colour of the hair (see
André, Termes de couleur 128 and cf. flauent, 43 below) and
ThLL (6. 888. 72ff.) cites flaua here as an example of that
usage. But the question of hair colouring is dealt with in
41-4 and the present couplet obviously relates to the colour
of the complexion, candidus being used only of grey or white
hair (see e.g. V.. Fl.. vi. 60) and fuscus not being used
of hair at all. What kind of hue, then, is denoted by flaua,
the adjective often used of ripe corn (see e.g. Verg. G. i.
73; 316)? André (op. cit. 129-30) suggests that it may
indicate a bronzed or sun-tanned appearance with a rosy tinge,
H. Magnus (BPhW 19 (1899), 1022), an ivory complexion. Of the
two I would favour the latter, since such colouring is not
uncommon in Mediterranean and near-Eastern peoples
(cf. Strato's use of μελιχρώδης at AP xii. 5. 1 and μελίχρους
at xii. 244. 1 to signify an intermediate kind of skin tone).

The precise colour is of little importance, however, here;
the point is that <u>flaua</u> indicates a complexion which is
neither <u>candida</u> nor <u>fusca</u>; cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 7. 23-4 <u>at nuper</u>
<u>bis flaua Chlide, ter candida Pitho</u>, / <u>ter Libas officio</u>
<u>continuata meo est</u> (where <u>Libas</u> perhaps suggests <u>Libs</u>,
'Libyan', and hence <u>fusca</u>? See n. below), Sen. <u>Ep</u>. 58. 12
<u>(genus hominum) habet...colorum albos, nigros, flauos</u>.

40. <u>fusco</u>: 'dark', and usually not merely 'swarthy', but 'black',
with reference to negroes (see <u>Mor</u>.32-3 <u>Afra genus</u>.../...<u>fusca</u>
<u>colore</u>, André, <u>Termes de couleur</u> 123-4); Ovid's words at
<u>Ars</u> ii. 657-8 '<u>fusca</u>' <u>uocetur</u>, / <u>nigrior Illyrica cui pice</u>
<u>sanguis erit</u> (cf. <u>Rem</u>. 327) suggest that it was a more
complimentary term than <u>niger</u>. The attractions of black
girls as mistresses are frequently mentioned in Greek and
Latin erotic poetry, usually not without a note of
defensiveness on the part of the speaker (see e.g. Asclep.
<u>AP</u> v. 210. 3 εἰ δὲ μέλαινα, τί τοῦτο; καὶ ἄνθρακες: cf.
8. 22n., and for a good collection of further examples see
Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. <u>Carm</u>. ii. 4. 3), which might tend to
suggest that negroes were disliked or despised, but all the
evidence suggests that colour prejudice of this kind was
unknown in the ancient world (see F. M. Snowden, <u>Blacks in</u>
<u>Antiquity</u> (Harvard 1970), 169ff.); preference for black or
white girls must have been purely a matter of personal taste.

41-4. 'Show me a blonde, show me a brunette', says Ovid, 'and I
think of Aurora and Leda: my love adapts itself to all the stories'

(omnibus historiis se meus aptat amor, 44). Thus the
familiar motif of the attractiveness of women's hair (cf.
[Tib.] iii. 8. 9-10 seu soluit crines; fusis decet esse
capillis: / seu compsit, comptis est ueneranda comis; for
Ovid's own special interest in hair and hairdressing see
Am. i. 14, Ars iii. 133-68 and cf. 8. 1n.), as Ovid presents
it here, leads to a statement which gives his readers a clear
indication of the fundamental nature of his love poetry: we
must expect him to deal with the classic situations of love
rather than any truly individual experience and to adapt his
own persona accordingly.

41. niuea pulli ceruice capilli: note the artistic word-order
with the juxtaposition of the antithetical niuea and pulli
reflecting something of the actual colour contrast which Ovid
envisages (cf. 1. 22n.). For the respective nuances of
niueus and pullus (both poetic epithets) see André, Termes
de couleur 39-40, 71-2.

41-3. capilli/... coma/... capillis: coma is the most common word
for hair in Ovid's elegies (125 instances, as opposed to 96
of capilli and 28 of crinis) and capilli in the Metamorphoses
(64 instances as opposed to 32 of coma and 38 of crinis).
In non-Ovidian epic and tragedy, however, coma and crinis
are very much more common than capilli (see Axelson,
Unpoetische Wörter 51), whilst no marked preference for
any one of the three words is discernible in Tibullus,
Propertius and the lyrics of Horace. Obviously there can be
little difference between them in stylistic level and Ovid's

general preference for <u>capilli</u> must be attributed to personal taste (a factor which Axelson tends generally not to take into account as much as he should).

42. <u>Leda</u> ... <u>nigra conspicienda coma</u>: for Leda's chief claim to fame see <u>Am</u>. i. 10. 3-4 <u>qualis erat Lede, quam plumis abditus albis / callidus in falsa lusit adulter aue</u>, and further Roscher, <u>Lexicon</u> IV. 1922ff.) She does not seem to be elsewhere renowned for having black hair; indeed she is, as Brandt points out, on at least one occasion called ξανθή (Anon. <u>AP</u> v. 65. 2). Perhaps Brandt is right in suggesting that Ovid, following up the antithesis of <u>niuea</u> and <u>pulli</u> in the previous line, here gives her black hair to contrast with the whiteness of the swan by which she was deceived.

Black hair, being not at all singular in Mediterranean countries, is not often remarked upon in classical literature (see André, <u>Termes de couleur</u> 326 and cf. 43n. below <u>flauent</u>), but when the hair is described as <u>niger</u> the epithet is usually complimentary; see e.g. Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 32. 11-12 <u>Lycum nigris oculis nigroque / crine decorum</u>.

<u>conspicienda</u>: verbs with a gerundive in -<u>spicienda</u> appear frequently in the second half of Ovid's pentameters; <u>conspicienda</u>, for example,is used also at <u>Ars</u> iii. 308, 780, <u>Rem</u>. 680, <u>Fast</u>. ii. 310 (see Bömer's note <u>ad. loc</u>.), v. 28, 552. Cf. <u>aspicienda</u> at <u>Fast</u>. vi. 788, <u>inspicienda</u> at <u>Tr</u>. i. 5. 26.

43. flauent: this verb formed from flauus is fairly rare,
occurring most frequently in epic (see André, Termes de
Couleur 276), and there only in participial form (see e.g.
Verg. A. iv. 590 flauentis ... comas). Used of hair it
indicates fairness of an auburn rather than Nordic type and
roughly the same as the Greek ξανθός. Such colouring, rare
in Southern Europe, draws admiring comment most frequently
from Greek and Roman writers (see Pease on Verg. A. iv. 590,
André, op. cit. 326-7, 353). There is ample evidence to
show that women in the ancient world resorted to the use of
wigs and dyes to achieve the desirable effect that they saw
in fair hair; see Juv. 6. 120, Anon. AP v. 26, and further
Barsby 147, n. 1.

croceis Aurora capillis: for Aurora see 5. 35n. Croceus
technically means 'saffron', i.e. yellow tinged with red
(see André, Termes de Couleur 153-5) and so denotes much the
same range of colour as flauus. Gods and heroes in ancient
literature traditionally had blond hair, but croceus is used
of many other attributes of Aurora (e.g. genae (Fast. iii.
403), amictus (Ars iii. 179), rotae (Met. iii. 150), cubile
(Verg. G. i. 447), evoking, of course, the colour of the dawn
sky.

44. historiis: 'myths', 'legends' sc. about beautiful women:
·(cf. 41-4n. above); cf. Prop. i. 15. 24 (to Cynthia)
uti fieres nobilis historia.

The appeal of the young woman and the old one. Cf. Phld AP v.
13, Paul. Sil. AP v. 258.

45. Note the careful structure: the two antithetical clauses
    are linked by anaphora (<u>me</u> ... <u>me</u>), then verb follows
    adjective in the first (<u>noua sollicitat</u>), adjective verb in
    the second (<u>tangit serior</u>)and finally comes the subject
    which does duty for them both (<u>aetas</u>). For <u>serior aetas</u>
    cf. <u>Ars</u> i. 65 <u>sera et sapientior altas</u>, ii. 667 <u>utilis</u> ...
    <u>aut haec aut serior aetas</u>; <u>aetas noua</u>, seems to be a unique
    expression.

46. The alternative reading to that printed, <u>haec melior specie,</u>
    <u>moribus illa placet</u>, is <u>haec melior specie corporis, illa</u>
    <u>sapit</u>. Neither version is a thoroughbred offspring of α or β,
    and only 'sense and rhetoric', as Kenney rightly says
    (<u>Notes</u> 60) can decide between them. And the issue is a nicely
    balanced one, for sense seems to point one way and rhetoric
    the other.

    <u>Haec melior specie corporis, illa sapit</u> is the reading
    preferred by most editors, including Heinsius. '<u>Sapit</u>', says
    Burman, 'hic explicari debet ex II Art. Am. 675 et seqq.':
    there, women 'of riper years' (<u>serior aetas</u> (667; see 45n.
    above) are commended in the following terms:

    > adde quod est illis operum prudentia maior,
    >   solus, et, artifices qui facit, usus adest.
    > illae munditiis annorum damna rependunt
    >   et faciunt cura, ne uideantur anus,
    > utque uelis, Venerem iungunt per mille figuras:
    >   inuenit plures nulla tabella modos.
    > illis sentitur non irritata uoluptas;
    >   quod iuuat, ex aequo femina uirque ferant.

    Thus Heinsius's version of our line may be construed 'The one
    (i.e. the young woman) has the better physical appearance, the
    other (i.e. the older woman) has the "know-how" ' — excellent
    sense in the context.

But a line with corresponding clauses of such disparate length seems to follow rather unhappily the preceding verse with its perfectly balanced antithesis. Lenz (supported by G. Lörcher, Der Aufbau der drei Bücher von Ovids 'Amores' (Amsterdam 1975), 65-6) contends that the imbalance is deliberate, the shortness of illa sapit being intended to stress, nequitiae causa, a particularly important advantage offered by the older woman. This I totally fail to see.

Haec melior specie, moribus illa placet at least gives the line its expected symmetry, and the array of examples provided by Kenney (Notes 60), the champion of this version, demonstrates that mores, contrary to what Burman thought ('non recte uero Naso his pulchritudinem opponere moribus uidetur, quia illi pro pudicitia saepius sumuntur'), need not mean anything more than 'character' here. (CIL 4592, Eutychis Graeca a. II moribus bellis, certainly supplies another nail for Burman's coffin, but, to anticipate my next paragraph, it is difficult to agree that 'the case for moribus is clinched' by it (Kenney, CQ n.s. 9 (1959), 240).) Kenney's suggestion that corporis emanates from a gloss on specie is plausible enough too (and once moribus was lost, sapit could easily have come in to restore the sense).

There remains, however, the objection to this version made by Lenz that whilst 'appearance' on the one hand and 'character' on the other may be an effective antithesis in itself (see e.g. Am. iii. 11 (B). 38, Ep. 12. 177, Met. vii. 655, 696), it does not make much sense in contrasting a

young woman with an older one, since a young woman too
might have an agreeable character. There is obviously
something in this, but I wonder whether Ovid, rather than
making a simple comparison of the attractions of a young
woman with those of an older one, might be attempting to
say here, in a compressed and elliptical manner, 'Both young
women and older women attract me (because I do not insist
upon both good species and good mores): the young woman
has good looks (and consequently I am not troubled about
her character, be it good or bad), but the older woman can
win me over just by her character (if it is good, in which
case her looks are immaterial).'

In the end, then, I follow Kenney, though not with total
confidence.

haec ... illa: here = 'the former' ... 'the latter' rather
than vice versa, as is more common, but cf. 2. 15-16n.

47-8. Ovid ends on a note of exuberant bravado.

47. denique: 'to sum up'; the word signals the formal
conclusion of Ovid's exposition.

quas tota quisquam probat Vrbe puellas: with exquisite
timing, Ovid reveals that he has not simply been reflecting
on his amatory inclinations in uacuo, but imagines as the
specific setting for all his nefarious activities the city
of Augustan Rome - the Rome currently undergoing extensive
moral and religious reform (see introduction to 10 below
p.425, n.26)!

(The variant _probet_, approved by Heinsius, is weak
in comparison with PSYω's _probat_ here: Ovid's _amor_ will
embrace not 'all the girls in Rome that anybody _might_ admire',
but 'all the girls in Rome that anybody _does_ admire', i.e.
nobody's girl is safe from his advances (cf. 9n. and see
introduction above p. 175).

ambitiosus: a masterly choice of epithet; not only does
it mean generally 'eager for' (cf. _Tr_. v. 7. 28 _Musa ńec
in plausus ambitiosa mea est_), whilst suggesting at the same
time 'embracing' in the literal sense (cf. Hor. _Carm_. i. 36.
18-20 _nec Damalis nouo / diuelletur adultero / lasciuis
hederis ambitiosior_), but it also has political associations,
being applied to one who canvasses,or is canvassed, for
votes by a candidate for office (Gel. ix. 12. 1 _ut 'ambitiosus'
(dici potest) qui ambit et qui ambitur_), and so impudently
implies that _amor_, like politics, is a career which a man
can follow in Rome!

V

Ovid begins with a protracted cry of anguish, grieving
over the fact that he possesses irrefutable evidence of
his loved one's infidelity, but temporarily withholding
the details of it from the reader (1-12); at length,
however, he relieves the suspense with a vivid account
of how, at a dinner party, he saw his puella sensuously
kissing another man, which naturally provoked him to an
angry outburst (13-32); but then he recalls the sudden
melting of his anger by the girl's beauty in her state
of embarrassment, and his subsequent request for one of
her kisses for himself (33-50); his request was granted,
he tells us, but as a result he now has good reason to
believe that a rival has been enjoying not only her kisses,
but also her company in bed (51-62).

Any notion we may have had of this poem's being a
genuine cri de coeur from a man reduced to suicidal
despair by the unfaithfulness of his beloved is shattered
when we discover in lines 13-32 that the poet apparently
so sadly wronged and painfully betrayed has in fact merely
been given a stiff dose of his own medicine.   For the
situation which Ovid describes in these lines immediately
brings to mind Am. i. 4, where the poet is to be seen
giving his puella detailed instructions on how to dupe
the man to whom she is officially attached at a banquet,
so that, despite his presence, he (Ovid) and she may
enjoy each other's company.   In our passage, exchanging
the role of amator which he played in Am. i. 4 for that

of uir[1], Ovid, with splendid wit, makes himself, trick

for trick, the victim of his own ruses[2]. The poet's

liking for treating the same situation from different

angles is well known, and the pair of poems Am. i. 4.

---

1. Vir is the term used to describe the woman's escort in
Am. i. 4, and I use it for convenience here. It is frequently
argued on the strength of evidence from the text of Am. i. 4,
ii. 2, 19 and iii. 4 that the uir in those poems is to be
regarded as the lawful husband of the puella in question (see
e.g. Barsby 165, Lee 182, DuQuesnay 2, 40), but here, even
though Ovid has apparently changed places with the man in
Am. i. 4, his role is clearly not that of husband (his use of
the word amica (see 1. 17n.) in line 10 when comparing
unfavourably his own position with that of other men involved
in similar liaisons shows that he is without doubt thinking of
a non-marital situation). Here, then, is a clear indication
of how pointless it is to look for consistency in the position
of the uir (and hence, of course, in the social status of his
puella) as conceived by Ovid at least, and perhaps by the other
elegists too, though many scholars have not hesitated to do
so (see e.g. Williams, Tradition and Originality 529-42, who
thinks that the puellae of Latin elegy are to be imagined as
Roman married ladies (cf. Barsby 13-14), W.Y. Sellar, The
Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Horace and the Elegiac Poets
211-2, K.F. Smith on Tib. i. 6. 67-8, Barber in The Elegies of
Propertius (ed. Butler and Barber), introduction xxi, Copley,
Exclusus Amator 100-104, Wilkinson 25, Balsdon, Roman Women
226-9, who all take the more popular view that the elegiac
puella is to be seen as a superior kind of courtesan - either
a freeborn woman or a libertina - and her uir as the patronus
with whom she lives or the reigning lover of the moment). All
that we are really required to believe in is a character who
thinks that his relationship with the puella, official or
unofficial - it matters not which - gives him some rights to
her favours, of which he can consequently be deprived (cf.
Lilja 37-41, A.W. Allen, CPh 45 (1950), 151). The role is
thus obviously one which Ovid himself could play here as easily
as any other man. (It may, incidentally, also be noted that
the Roman distinction between marriage and concubinage was in
any case by no means as clear-cut as we might imagine; co-
habitation counted as marriage in the eyes of the law (see
H.F. Jolowitz and B. Nicholas, A Historical Introduction to
the Study of Roman Law (Cambridge 1932, 3rd edn. 1972), 234-5, J.
A. Crook, Law and Life of Rome (London 1967), 100-107), and hence
a variety of non-marital liaisons might for all practical
purposes be 'as good as ' marriage.)

2. See 13-22nn. below. Possibly Ovid's original inspiration
for the amusing turnabout was a couplet of Tibullus: ipse
miser docui, quo posset ludere pacto / custodes: heu heu
nunc premor arte mea (i. 6. 9-10). Notice too that Ovid's
reaction 29-32) to seeing kisses being given to a rival
amator is exactly that which he, as the intruding amator
himself, threatens at Am. i. 4. 39-40 if he should see
them being given to the girl's official partner.

and ii. 5 is a superb example of its comic effectiveness[3].
Not only is there humour in the fact that the tables are
turned on Ovid, but also in the revelation of the fatal
flaw in his own earlier advice - its failure to take account
of the possibility that the uir might not obligingly get
drunk and go to sleep, but be as cunning as his would-be
deceivers and simply pretend to do so.   We are amused too
to note that what Ovid himself sees as the supreme advantage
enjoyed by the uir in Am. i. 4 - his undoubted ability to
claim the girl's favours when he and she are alone[4]-is here
seen to be not such an advantage after all, for the kisses
which Ovid eventually receives do not satisfy him, but give
him new cause for concern[5].

---

3. Cf. Am. ii. 7 and 8, ii. 9 (A) and (B), ii. 19 and iii.4.
Ovid's reasons for placing the two poems of the pairs i. 4 and
ii. 5, and ii. 19 and iii. 4 apart in different books of
the collection remain a mystery.   Many attempts have been
made to explain the disposition of the poems in the Amores,
some of them resulting in the invention of preposterously
complicated schemata for the arrangement of poems within
individual books (see e.g. J. Michelfeit, RhM n.f. 112 (1969),
347ff., G. Lörcher. Der Aufbau der Drei Bücher von Ovids
Amores;   see Lörcher 1-11, however, for a
useful survey of earlier studies on the structure of the
Amores), but no wholly satisfactory answer has ever been
offered to the question of why a poet so obviously aware
of the advantages of juxtaposing a related pair of poems
(e.g. Am. i. 11 and 12, ii. 2 and 3 (see above pp. 95-103), ii.
13 and 14) should choose to place two clearly complementary
pieces in different books.   It is difficult to imagine
that Ovid did so simply for the sake of novelty or variation
(but sic W. Port, Philologus 18 (1926), 452, n.219;   cf.
G. Luck, Die Römische Liebeselegie (Heidelberg 1961) 196). A. Cameron
(CQ 18 (1969), 329-30) alternatively suggests that the
separation of the two poems of a pair may result from Ovid's
failure to rearrange his elegies completely after excising
a number of pieces from his first edition of five books
see general introduction p . 7, n. 2; ii. 5 and iii. 4,
thinks Cameron, could originally have been written to fill
out the later books of the first edition as they appeared.
But it seems to imply an astonishing lack of initiative on
Ovid's part to assume that he missed the unique opportunity
afforded by a second edition of rearranging his poems in
the most logical and effective order.   (Williams, Tradition

But the elegy's special relationship with _Am_. i. 4
is only one of two fundamental factors which prevent us from
taking its author's supposed jealousy and distress seriously;
the other is the general attitude towards infidelity which
underlies it. For the real disaster in Ovid's eyes is
clearly not the unfaithfulness of his beloved _per se_, but
the fact of being able to prove it[6]. Catullus and Pro-
pertius, it is true, from time to time assert their willingness
to tolerate their mistress's misdemeanours on certain con-
ditions[7], but Ovid has amusingly extended and distorted
this traditional notion of tolerance to form one of the
basic rules of the private, sophisticated game which he
calls love: _all_ infidelity can be cheerfully ignored
provided that the victim never actually comes face to face

---

and _Originality_ 517-18) claims that Ovid _did_ take the
opportunity of making some telling juxtapositions, one
of them being that of ii. 4 and ii. 5; of the separation
of ii. 5 and iii. 4. from their obvious partners i. 4, and
ii. 19, however, Williams amazingly says nothing!).
Cameron's suggestion is probably in the end the most
plausible.

4. See _Am_. i. 4. 61-4.

5. See 51-62 below; also M. Sappa, _RF_ (1883), 358-9.

6. See 5-6, 7-12nn. below.

7. E.g. Catul. 68. 135-7, Prop. ii. 32. 21-2, 29-30; cf.
G. Luck in _Perspectives of Roman Poetry_, ed. G.K. Galinsky
(Austin, Texas 1974), 20-23.

with clear evidence of it[8]. The humorous appeal of a moral code which makes nonsense of the standard ideal of amatory *fides*[9] (and also seems to operate on principles not entirely unlike those of a notorious piece of Augustan moral legislation[10]) is quite obvious. It is moreover Ovid's unorthodox attitude towards unfaithfulness in general which explains why at the end of the poem, where he records the suspicion that his mistress has committed an act of infidelity far more serious than that which he has himself witnessed, his mood is distinctly brighter than at the outset[11]; for by the end, the tolerable, almost pleasurable, pain of merely *suspecting* a misdemeanour, albeit a major one, has replaced the unspeakable horror of actually *knowing* about a relatively minor one[12].

---

8. This, of course, requires the co-operation of the guilty *puella* who must at least attempt to conceal her breaches of faith, as Ovid points out in *Am*. iii. 14. I cannot agree with Luck (*The Latin Love Elegy* 173-9) that this poem shows Ovid earnestly begging his mistress to preserve the appearance of fidelity so that he may have the opportunity to demonstrate his own love and loyalty by believing in it at all times (cf. Lenz *ad loc*. and *SIFC* 13 (1934-5), 228-35, Lilja 169-71). I find it impossible to accept that anything so grave and serious was ever intended to be conveyed by a poem whose ending is so much in keeping with its author's sense of, and delight in, the absurd, and is too similar for comfort to that of the patently frivolous piece *Am*. i. 4. Line 40 too is surely a pointer to Ovid's real attitude: his mistress's admissions of guilt make him wish that he were dead - provided, of course, that she were dead as well and keeping him company! Lee's translation of 37ff. captures the right spirit: 'These endless confessions bring me out in a cold sweat - / honestly, they're killing me ... I'd gladly die - if only you'd die with me.' Ovid seems to me simply to be saying that his *puella* is spoiling the fun by not abiding by the rules of the 'game'. Cf. D'Elia 107.

9. See R. Reitzenstein, 'Zur Sprache der lateinischen Erotik', *SHA Phil.-Hist. Kl*. 3 (1912), 12 Abh., Lilja 69-73.

10. The *lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis*; see 7-12, 13-14nn. below.

Ovid's humorous treatment of a traditionally serious topic, then, is one of the most original features of this poem, and the humour of individual passages (especially 13-28, 43-6 and 55-62) is duly singled out for comment in many general discussions[13], but the unusual structural features of the elegy have not on the whole been given as much attention as they deserve[14]. The poem must, I think, be understood as a soliloquy: only this form will accommodate easily the alternation between direct address to the girl (1-18, 57-8) and simple narrative in which she is spoken of in the third person (33-56; the passage 19-32 could conveniently belong to either mode). Within the soliloquy, Ovid gives an account of a dramatic episode, the events of which he makes directly responsible for his own changes of mood (13-52). Now the poet's basic theme, the lover's complaint of his partner's infidelity, is common in earlier Greek and Latin erotic poetry[15], and it is occasionally given full dramatic treatment by Ovid's Roman elegiac predecessors[16] in a type of confrontation scene

---

11. See 51-62n. below.

12. Cf. 62n. below, Jäger loc. cit. For a rather different, but I think unconvincing, interpretation of the ending of the poem see Büchner, Studien viii, 196-7.

13. E.g. DuQuesnay 5, Wilkinson 64-5, Ripert 53, D'Elia 107-8; Fränkel (30), however, has missed the humorous element altogether.

14. But see Jäger loc. cit.

15. E.g. Theoc. 2. 154-8 (on male infidelity), Mel. AP v. 175, 184, 187, Diosc. AP v. 52, Posidipp. AP v. 186, Catul. 11, 70, 72, Tib. i. 8, 9 (on the infidelity of the boy Marathus), ii. 6. 51-4, Prop. i. 15, ii. 8, 9 (A); see further Lilja 157-69.

16. See especially Tib. i. 8, Prop. i. 15; cf. introductions to 2 above and 7 below pp. 108 and 330.

which would be perfectly at home in the New Comedy of Plautus and Terence, where episodes of deception and discovery figure very largely[17]. The love-stricken man's emotional conflict or instability is similarly frequently encountered, and not least in poems which take the form of a soliloquy[18]. But Ovid's apparent combination of these conventional themes and forms, and especially his use of a progressing situation to account for his shifts of feeling[19], is a considerable stroke of invention on his part[20].

It may be noted that the 'dramatic' episode in this poem embraces two distinct scenes (the 'banquet' and the 'kiss') which one would not normally expect to form a continuous sequence in a drama proper, as they apparently do in Ovid's poem. One could perhaps argue that Ovid's own words in line 33 (haec ego, quaeque dolor linguae dictauit) indicate that his tirade lasted for some considerable time, during which we might assume that the unfortunate amator made a hasty departure, leaving Ovid and the girl more or less alone (most of the guests had already gone - iam ... frequens ierat ... conuiua (21) - and the few who remained were lost to the world - compositi iuuenes unus et alter erant (22)). But there is really no need to overwork the imagination in an attempt to manufacture some

---

17. See Duckworth, Nature of Roman Comedy 160-67.

18. E.g. Mel. (or Phld.) AP v. 24, Catul. 85, Prop. i. 1, and for the soliloquy, Catul. 8, 76, Tib. ii. 6.

19. Generally the kind of emotional vacillations which figure in a soliloquy are either totally devoid of context (e.g. Catul. 8, 76; cf. Am. ii.9 (A) and (B), iii. 11 (A) and (B)) or are sparked off by a single incident which is then allowed to fade into insignificance (e.g. Tib. ii.6).

20. Ovid's technique is similar in Am. i. 7, a piece which

kind of dramatic unity[21], for in a reflective poem of this kind it seems quite natural that once Ovid has reached the point in his recollections at which his change of attitude was supposedly triggered by the course of events he should waste no time tying up the loose ends of that particular scene but proceed straight to the incidents which initiated his next arch of emotion.

The elegy is, then, a most intricate and inventive piece in which Ovid effectively satirizes the conventional _fides_ and emotional instability of the poetic lover. Skilful structure allows an unexpectedly large amount of action and surprise, and the poem's special relationship with _Am_. i. 4 introduces an extra element of piquancy. In short, we have here a vigorous and original treatment of a hackneyed theme.

---

has some affinities with our poem in subject-matter; see 35-42, 45-50nn. below. Perhaps Prop. i. 8. should be regarded as a single poem and also placed in this category (see Hubbard, _Propertius_ 46).

21. There is certainly no need to assume, as Fränkel does (187 n. 60), that Ovid's advanced state of inebriation at the banquet he describes may be considered responsible for the 'confused nature of his morose musings'!

1-2. Ovid's initial denial of the value of _amor_ might lead us
to believe that we are to have a poem on the conventional
theme of the renunciation of love (cf. Pl. _Trin._ 256ff.,
Catul. 8, Tib. ii. 6. Prop. iii. 24; also Cairns, _Generic_
Composition 80-83. There is a hint of self-reproach in
Ovid's couplet which is reminiscent of Catul. 8. 1,
miser Catulle, desinas ineptire, but Ovid's words do
not, like Catullus's, herald a titanic struggle with
his own passions or even a statement of his determination
to renounce love for ever, but simply serve as an
opening gambit for a light-hearted _exposé_ of the
predicament of a jealous _uir_ (see introduction above
p. 226, n. 1).

The incidental address to Cupid is a fairly mild
repulse, and not much more than a mechanical aside
here (cf. _Am._ iii. 11 (_A_). 2 _cede fatigato pectore_,
turpis Amor, where the dismissal of Love is fundamental
to the whole poem), but the picture it evokes of the
incorrigible child-god of Hellenistic Greek
poetry (see below 9 (_A_). 2n. _puer_, 9 (_B_). 5ln. _matre_)
helps to establish a lightness of tone at the very
outset of the piece.

abeas: for the metrically convenient subjunctive
replacing the imperative cf. Catul. 8. 1 (with Fordyce's note),
and see further Hofmann-Szantyr 572-3.

pharetrate: see 9 (_A_). 5n.

2. <u>maxima uota mori</u>:   for the sentiment cf. <u>Am</u>. iii.
14. 40 <u>tunc ego, sed tecum, mortuus esse uelim</u> where
Ovid's wish to die is sabotaged by the parenthetical
<u>sed tecum</u> (see introduction above p.229, n.8;   Pro-
pertius presents us with a more menacing version of
the same sentiment at ii. 8. 17-18 and 25-8).
Death-wishes and suicide threats are uttered fairly
frequently by the lovelorn <u>adulescentes</u> of Roman
comedy (e.g. Charinus in Pl. <u>Mer</u>. 471-3 <u>qur ego ueiuo?</u>
<u>qur non morior?   quid mihist in uita boni?</u> / <u>certumst,</u>
<u>ibo ad medicum atque ibi me toxico morti dabo, /</u>
<u>quando id mi   adimitur qua caussa uitam cupio uiuere</u>;
cf. <u>id</u>. <u>As</u>. 606-7, <u>Cist</u>. 639-40, Ter. <u>Ph</u>. 551-2),but
the elegiac lover, when duped or disappointed, surprisingly
rarely contemplates death as the ultimate means of
escape from his amatory sorrows (see, however, Tib.
ii. 6. 19, Prop. ii. 9. 38-40, 17. 13-14)—though for
other reasons he relishes the prospect of it (see
10. 35-6, 37-8nn., E. Burck, <u>Hermes</u> 80 (1952), 180-81).

2-3. <u>uota mori</u>. / <u>uota mori</u>:   immediate reiteration of the
final words of the pentameter at the beginning of the
following hexameter is one of Ovid's favourite
stylistic ploys (a list of examples is supplied by
Platnauer 35).   For other varieties of verbal re-
petition in Ovid see 43-4, 45-6 below, 1. 23-8, 4. 39, 10.
1-8nn. and, in general, Frécaut 45-58, G. Howe, 'A type
of verbal repetition in Ovid's elegy' <u>SPh</u> 13 (1916), 81-94.

3. <u>peccasse</u>: P's <u>peccare</u>, favoured by Ehwald, Brandt,
Edwards and Showerman, may be rejected without hesitation
here, since the context unquestionably demands the perfect
infinitive with full temporal significance (cf. 2. 10n.
and <u>contra</u> 7. 19n.).   For the sense see 7. 19n.

4. The text as transmitted by virtually all the MSS and
without any editorial punctuation reads thus: <u>ei mihi</u>
<u>perpetuum nata puella malum.</u>   The general sense of Ovid's
words is reasonably clear, and it would seem natural enough
to place a comma after <u>mihi</u> and construe 'Alas, girl born to
be my everlasting torment': <u>ei mihi</u> is a standard exclamatory
phrase (see 3. 1 n.) and is regularly used as such by
Ovid at the beginning of lines.   But Alan Ker has pointed
out (<u>Ovidiana</u> 226) that <u>perpetuum nata puella malum</u> is
very curious Latin for 'girl born to be my everlasting
torment'.   <u>Nata</u> badly needs a dative of disadvantage, and
the obvious candidate for that role is the <u>mihi</u> which
stands earlier in the line.   But what then of <u>ei</u>?
Némethy clearly thinks (judging from his punctuation <u>ei!</u>)
that it is intended to stand virtually alone as at Catul.
68. 92-3 <u>ei misero frater adempte mihi / ei misero fratri</u>
<u>iucundum lumen ademptum</u> (see Kroll, ad loc.); this
usage, however, would seem to be pre-classical (see Camps
on Prop. i. 7. 16), and Ovid certainly never uses <u>ei</u>
except in the expression <u>ei mihi</u> (46 times in all).

     What are the alternatives? Lenz (see his note

ad loc.) and, judging from their silence, all other
modern editors with the exceptions of Lee and Goold
(in his revised edition of Showerman's Loeb) are content
to assume that a second _mihi_ with _nata_ may simply be
understood from _ei mihi_; but this is awkward, for if
ei mihi were to stand here, it would naturally refer
back to _te peccasse recordor_ rather to anything
which follows (cf. _Ep._ 11. 111-12 _nate, dolor matris,_
rapidarum praeda ferarum, / ei mihi! natali dilacerate
tuo; see further _ThLL_ 5. ii 301.6ff.), and that would
make it rather difficult to extract from it any support
for the subsequent _nata_ (this, I take it, is what Goold
really means when he asserts that _ei mihi_ 'cannot intro-
duce a vocative nor separate a _tu_ or a _te_ from the
vocative which these words signal' (_Amat. Crit._ 31-2) -
it should be said, however, that the doctored piece of
Shakespearian Latinity which Goold sets up as an
Aunt Sally in the attempt to make his point is hardly
valid corroboration!)

The question mark thus placed over _ei_ must inevitably
turn our attention to the late MS variant _o_ which won
the approval of Heinsius and Bentley. As Goold remarks
(_Amat. Crit._ 32), the interjection _o_ regularly intro-
duces extended vocatives, and, it might also be observed,
in the case of Ovid it is particularly common with
vocatives of a reproachful or admonitory nature; e.g.
_Am._ i. 6. 62 _o foribus durior ipse tuis_, ii. 9 (_A_). 1-2

o numquam pro me satis indignate, Cupido / o in corde
meo desidiose puer (see nn. ad loc.), ii. 17. 12 o
facies oculos nata tenere meos, Ep. Sapph. 22 o facies
oculis insidiosa meis (cf. Am. iii. 1. 16, Ep. 1. 41,
11. 121, Ep. Sapph. 189). Such a sense and tone would ob-
viously be entirely appropriate here, and it would allow
mihi to be closely construed with nata. Speculation
may be idle, but it is not difficult to see how the
error could have arisen, perhaps at a fairly early
stage in the tradition: if the first word of the
copyist's exemplar was unclear, an eye falling upon
me miserum (the sense of which is very similar to,
ei mihi) in line 8, a mind briefly taking in the con-
text and a hand not unused to writing ei mihi might
well have substituted ei for o here.

Ker's conjecture in is striking and plausible
enough to have been adopted enthusiastically by Lee,
but I have to agree with Goold that it is unnecessary;
if we understand esse with nata, perpetuum malum is
perfectly acceptable as a predicative nominative (Goold
gives an illuminating reference to Löfstedt, Syntactica
I. 194ff.). Ker's diagnosis, then, but Heinsius's
prescription, endorsed by Goold, would seem to be what
is wanted here.

malum: cf. Am. ii. 9 (B). 26 dulce puella malum est,
Prop. ii. 25. 48 una sat est cuiuis femina multa mala.

5-6. The point of this couplet telling us how Ovid has not

discovered his mistress's <u>crimen</u> does not emerge fully

until line 13 below, where the poet reveals that he <u>has</u>

discovered it in a way which leaves no room for defence

or denial on the part of the guilty <u>puella</u> - something

which, we may infer, would have been possible if Ovid's

suspicions had simply been aroused by traffic in

messages (<u>tabellae</u>) and presents (<u>munera</u>); see further

introduction above, pp. 228-9.

5. The <u>tabellae</u> which Ovid claims are not in this instance

responsible for exposing his mistress's infidelities

are, of course, the wax tablets which conventionally

carried elegiac love-letters (see especially <u>Am</u>. i. 11.

7ff, i. 12, Prop. iii. 23). But what did Ovid mean

when he said that they were <u>deceptae</u>, if indeed that

<u>is</u> what he said? Marius suggested that he meant <u>inter-</u>

<u>ceptae</u> (cf. A. Ernout, <u>RPh</u> 26 (1952), 125 'une lettre

surprise (<u>ou</u> saisie) par moi'), but one can only echo

Burman's comment 'uellem auctoritatem attulisset'

(Heinsius and Némethy, however, both considered <u>inter-</u>

<u>ceptae</u> possible as an emendation). Burman, though he

flirted with <u>delatae</u>, had his own solution (subsequently

accepted by Bornecque) in adopting the reading <u>decepto</u>

(which appears in P_c), but, as Goold points out (<u>Amat.</u>

<u>Crit</u>. 33), <u>tabellae</u> needs the epithet. Ehwald and

Martinon weighed in with unlikely conjectures (see

Munari's apparatus), but then Housman went a considerable

way towards rehabilitating <u>deceptae</u> when he observed
(<u>CR</u> 14 (1900), 259 = <u>Classical Papers</u> 521-2) that
<u>decipere</u> might in some cases be virtually synonymous
with <u>dissimulare</u>. The present passage he regarded as
a case in point, and one or two editors have agreed
with him, but unfortunately, influenced no doubt by
Housman's own words 'quomodo intellegendum sit docet
pentameter' (see his note on Man. i. 240) and passages
such as <u>Am</u>. ii. 19. 39-41, iii. 1. 56, 14. 31, <u>Ars</u> iii.
619ff. and Tib. ii. 6. 45-6, they have tended to gloss
<u>deceptae</u> with <u>furtim redditae</u> rather than simply
<u>dissimulatae</u> (<u>sic</u> Munari, Kenney, and cf. Lenz's trans-
lation, 'eingeschmuggelte Täfelchen'). I do not
object to the meaning <u>furtim redditae</u> because it is
obscure in the context (as Goold curiously claims (<u>Amat.</u>
<u>Crit.</u> 33)), but because <u>deceptus</u>, when it is more or
less the equivalent of <u>dissimulatus</u>, does not mean 'secret',
but 'camouflaged' or 'disguised'; see e.g. Sen. <u>Her. F.</u>
156 <u>deceptos instruit hamos</u>, Stat. <u>Theb.</u> ix. 425 <u>decepta-</u>
<u>que fulmina</u>. Is such a meaning acceptable here? <u>Ars</u>
iii. 483 ff. leaves me in little doubt:

> sed quoniam, quamuis uittae careatis honore,
>   est uobis uestros fallere cura uiros,
> ancillae pueriue manu perarate tabellas . . .
>
> iudice me fraus est concessa repellere fraudem,
>   armaque in armatos sumere iura sinunt.
> ducere consuescat multas manus una figuras
>   (a, pereant, per quos ista monenda mihi!),
> nec nisi deletis tutum rescribere ceris,
>   ne teneat geminas una tabella manus;
> femina dicatur scribenti semper amator:
>   'illa' sit in uestris, qui fuit 'ille', notis.

This passage, in which 'camouflaged' tabellae are
explicitly recommended for duping uiri, suggests very
strongly to me that deceptae is not merely tolerable
but highly appropriate and absolutely right in our
passage here.   (Goold's objection to the repetition of
mihi in successive lines is of no great significance;
compare, for example, Am. i. 3. 15 ff. where the repetition
of the word is equally insistent.)

Heinsius's non male deletae (based on the appearance
of non mihi deletae in one fifteenth century MS), which
won the support of Lucian Müller (Philologus 11 (1856),
70) and Goold (Amat. Crit. 33-4), at least deserves
mention, for it would seem to derive considerable support
from Ars iii. 495-6 (nec nisi deletis ... / ... tabella
manus (supra cit.)) and Ars ii. 395-6 et, quotiens scribes,
totas prius ipse tabellas / inspice: plus multae, quam
sibi missa, legunt, but I cannot help feeling that it is
too specific; Ovid in lines 5-6 here seems to be imagining
possible areas of deception which might lead to exposure
of misconduct rather than precise pieces of incriminating
evidence such as male deletae tabellae.

facta: 'conduct', a pointedly neutral word for amatory
misdemeanours; cf. Am. iii. 11 (B). 43, 14. 7, Rem.
299 , Prop. i. 18. 26.

6. munera: gifts are frequently acknowledged as standard
accessories of courtship (see e.g. Am. i. 8. 93ff.,

<u>Ars</u> i. 417ff., ii. 261ff., Prop. i. 16. 36, Tib. i. 8.
29-30) and regularly despised as such by the elegists
(see e.g. <u>Am</u>. i. 10, Prop. ii. 16. 15ff., 23. 8, iii. 13).
For <u>furtiue</u> ... <u>data</u> cf. Catul. 65. 19 <u>missum sponsi</u>
<u>furtiuo munere malum</u>.

7-12. Ovid recognizes, as is his wont (cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 2. 47-60,
iii. 14), the comfortable refuge of self-delusion for the
injured party in cases of infidelity, but only to lament,
by way of a sustained legal metaphor (for which <u>crimen</u>
in line 6 is the cue), that, for some reason as yet
unrevealed, it is not in this instance open to him.   First
he likens his situation to that of an inevitably successful,
but reluctant, plaintiff in a lawsuit (7-8); then, with
the court-room still in mind, he envies the man whose
'defence' of his <u>amica</u> is backed up by a plea of 'Not
guilty' from her (9-10); and finally he claims that there
is a cruel and masochistic streak in the man who insists
on being declared victor over the defendant (<u>palma</u> (12)
introduces a sporting metaphor; see n. below), i.e. on
establishing the truth of his accusation, even at appalling
cost (11-12).

It is by no means unusual for Ovid's reflections to
take a legalistic turn (cf. 29-32 below, 4. 1-4, 7. 1nn.),
but here I believe that there may be a special reason for
his choice of the legal metaphor.   For the poet's words
in 7-8 ('Oh, if only I could put my charge in such a way
that I could not win! Oh, woe is me, why is my case so
good?') could so easily be those of a man faced with the
dilemma of either divorcing his wife or being prosecuted
himself under the terms of the <u>lenocinium</u> clause of the

lex Julia of 18 B.C. (see 2. 46-60 n.).   Of course, Ovid's

position is not strictly parallel with that of the maritus

leno;   the guilty puella is not his wife(see introduction

above, p.226,n.1), and all he has evidence of is a conspiratorial

kiss (23ff.), but that the details do not match exactly seems

to me to be unimportant;   if our poem did appear in or

soon after 18 B.C., as it probably did (see general intro-

duction p.7, n.2), I feel that the average Augustan reader

coming upon the present couplet could hardly have failed to

think of the lenocinium clause in the lex Julia and be

shocked or amused (see Wilkinson 294) by the suggestion of

similarity between its workings and those of Ovid's own

dubious moral code.   (See further 13-14 below, 2.47-60n.,

and for Ovid's general interest in the subject of leno-

cinium mariti cf. Am. ii. 19. 51-8.)

7. o utinam: for the hiatus see Platnauer 57.

9. quod amat: 'the object of his love'.   The neuter relative

pronoun regularly provides a metrically convenient al-

ternative to the more precise feminine;   cf. Ars i. 35,

principio, quod amare uelis reperire labora, 175, 263, 741.

audet: 'dares';   the word carries a considerable amount of

emphasis here, for Ovid wishes to stress that defending the

guilty is a risky business and needs the co-operation of the

defendant.   Marlowe's translation captures the right tone:

'He's happy that his love dares boldly credit, / to whom

his wench can say, "I never did it".'

10. 'non feci':   'Not guilty'.   The expression is not included

in Berger's glossary of legal terms, but Brandt and Duff

(on Juv. 4. 12) assert that facere so used is a technical

term in the language of the law, and this would certainly

seem to be verified by its regular appearance in judicial
or quasi-judicial contexts: e.g. Juv. 6. 638-9 clamat
Pontia 'feci',/confiteor, Cic. Ver. 5. 14 fecisse uideri
pronuntiat (praetor);   cf. Cic. Lig. 30, Mart. ix. 15. 2,
Apul. Met. vii. 3.

   Ovid appears to be suggesting here that his personal
witnessing of the crime excludes the possibility of a
plea of 'Not guilty' from his mistress.   But his notion
of the limits of credulity varies from poem to poem,
for at Am. iii. 14. 48 sit modo 'non feci' dicere lingua
memor he suggests that this very response is all that
is needed to cancel out even the evidence of his own
eyes and seems to regard it as a panacea for all the con-
comitant ills of infidelity.   Tibullus, one may observe,
feels quite differently: i. 6. 7-8 illa quidem iurata
negat, sed credere durum est: / sic etiam de me per-
negat usque uiro. Cf. Mel.AP v. 184.2 μηκέτι νῦν ὄμνυε· πάντ'
ἔμαθον.

amica: see introduction above, p.226, n. 1, and for further
detail 1. 17n.

11-12.Only an abnormal man, claims Ovid, would engage in a
      bitter and distressing conflict with his mistress in order
      to prove her guilt.   The implication is, of course, that
      most lovers would be only too ready to accept their
      sweetheart's protestations of innocence, however suspect
      these might be.

Ferreus and nimium ... suo fauet ille dolori seem
to me to indicate two different kinds of abnormality:
(a) heartlessness (for ferreus (literally, 'made of iron')
in this general sense cf. Am. i. 6. 27 ferreus orantem
nequiquam, ianitor, audis — Tibullus produces an almost
Ovidian piece of word-play on the literal and figurative
meanings of the epithet at i. 10. 1-2 quis fuit, horrendos
primus·qui protulit enses? / quam ferus, et uere ferreus,
ille fuit!) and (b) masochism (confirmation of his mis-
tress's guilt can only be hurtful to the lover himself,
and thus, if he goes out of his way to seek it, he must
'take too much pleasure in his own pain'; for fauere
in this sense cf. Tib. ii. 5. 110 faueo morbo
cum iuuat ipse dolor). If my interpretation is correct,
we may observe that Ovid is here associating in an unusual
way two standard elegiac commonplaces: the poet-lover's
occasional cruelty to his beloved (see below 12, 45-50nn.)
and his tendency to wallow pleasurably in his own distress
(see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. Carm. i. 27. 11). Some
editors, however, see nimium ... suo fauet ille dolori
as indicating vindictiveness rather than masochism (see
e.g. the translations of Bornecque and Lee) and so meaning
much the same as ferreus as I interpret it, whilst H.A.
Kahn (Latomus 25 (1966), 889, n. 1) conversely feels that
even ferreus here refers to the lover's cruelty not to
his puella but to himself.

12. palma cruenta: 'a bloody victory'. Palma, properly the
emblem awarded to the victor in a sporting contest (see

Liv. x. 47. 3 _palmae_ ... _translato e Graeco more_
uictoribus datae, Suet. _Cal_. 32, and further Nisbet-
Hubbard on Hor. _Carm_. i. 1. 5), is often used, like its
English derivative, as a metonym for victory itself in
all manner of spheres; see e.g. _Ars_ ii. 3 _laetus amans_
donat uiridi mea carmina palma, Prop. ii. 9. 40 _sanguis_
erit uobis maxima palma meus, Cic. de Orat. iii. 35. 143
docto oratori palma danda est.

Some editors take _cruenta_ literally and assert that
Ovid is thinking of the 'bloody victory' a man may win in
a physical fight with his girlfriend which involves a
good deal of slapping and scratching (see e.g. Bornecque
105, n. 2 to p. 46, Munari 151, n. 1, and cf. 45-50n.
below), but it will be obvious from 7-12n. above that I
take Ovid still to be speaking figuratively here and using
'bloody victory' to symbolize the emotional pain which
inevitably attends success in proving one's mistress's
infidelity.

13-28. After his intriguing preliminary threnody, Ovid at last
begins to reveal to us the exact nature of his mistress's
crime, and we are amused to learn that in committing it
she has simply given him a taste of his own medicine
(see introduction above, pp. 225-7). The banquet scene,
which Ovid here recalls as the source of all his troubles,
is one of the most popular of elegiac commonplaces, and
its ingredients vary little; cf. _Ars_ i. 229-44, 565-78,
and see below 15-20nn.

Deception scenes of various kinds were a regular
feature of New Comedy (see introduction above pp. 230-31)
and the outwitting of a stupid and credulous husband by
his adulterous wife appears to have been a favourite
subject of the mime, a form of entertainment popular
throughout antiquity (see R.W. Reynolds, 'The Adultery Mime',
CQ 40 (1946), 77-84), but the choice of the banquet as the
setting for an amatory deception scene such as we have
here may well have been at least partially inspired by
real life, for Horace's words mox iuniores quaerit (matura
uirgo) adulteros / inter mariti uina, uttered in a very
serious context at Carm. iii. 6. 25-6 (see G. Williams,
JRS 52 (1962), 31-3), give us good reason to believe that
behaviour not unlike that described by Ovid did actually
take place at some Augustan dinner parties.

13-14. **ipse miser uidi ... / ... crimina uestra:** 'it was my
misfortune to see your crimes with my very own eyes'
(notice uidi again at 15 and 23 below, and see H.A. Kahn,
Latomus 25 (1966), 890, n. 4). Now at last we know why
the poet cannot on this occasion resort to his usual ex-
pedient of self-delusion in the face of his mistress's
unfaithfulness to him (cf. 7-12n. above).

Ovid's words again bring to mind the lenocinium
clause in the lex Julia (see pp.241-2 above), for, under the
terms of that law, it was precisely when the husband himself
caught his wife in the act that he was obliged to acknowledge
her infidelity and take appropriate steps; in other circum-
stances he might simply turn a blind eye and do nothing (see
dig. xlviii. 5. 30 pr., Corbett, Roman Law of Marriage 142).

cum me dormire putares, / sobrius: the notion of amatory
misdemeanours being committed whilst the wronged party
is asleep or in a drunken stupor is not at all uncommon
(see e.g. Am. i. 9. 25-6, Ars ii. 545-6, Tib. i. 6. 27-8,
Juv. 1. 57), but obviously the reader is here specifically
intended to recall Ovid's own advice to his puella at Am.
i. 4. 51-4:

> uir bibat usque roga (precibus tamen oscula desint),
>   dumque bibit, furtim, si potes, adde merum.
> si bene compositus somno uinoque iacebit,
>   consilium nobis resque locusque dabunt.

This very ruse, we gather, has now been tried on Ovid
himself, but, contrary to the belief of his would-be
deceivers, he has remained both awake and sober, and has
seen everything (cf. introduction above, p.232, n. 21).

14. apposito ... mero: 'when the wine was flowing'; for the
expression cf. Am. i. 4. 7 posito ... uino, Ars i. 565
positi tibi munera Bacchi.

15-20. Ovid launches into a detailed account of standard amatory
notae - secret methods of communication between lovers in
the unwelcome presence of a third party (see Zingerle I. 94).
Here, of course, if the puella and her new lover had really
believed that Ovid had lapsed into a state of drunken
oblivion, the use of a code of secret signs would have been
quite unnecessary, but Ovid appears to have overlooked the
element of illogicality in his remarks, preoccupied no doubt
with the aim of bringing to mind his own advice to the girl
at Am. i. 4. 15ff., where the code is to be employed,
reasonably enough, whilst the uir is still awake and pre-
sumably alert. Cf. Ars ii. 545-50, Ep. 16. 83-92, C. Sittl,
Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer (Leipzig 1890, reprinted,
Hildesheim 1970) 213-14.

15. <u>supercilio</u> ... <u>uibrante loquentes</u>: the eyebrow appears
    to have been particularly eloquent in the type of silent
    exchange here described: cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 4. 19 <u>uerba super-</u>
    <u>ciliis sine uoce loquentia dicam</u>, <u>Ars</u> i. 500 <u>multa</u>
    <u>supercilio</u> ... <u>loquare</u>, <u>Ep</u>. 16. 82 , Prop. iii. 8. 25.

16. <u>nutibus</u>: for the role of <u>nutus</u> in the code of signals cf.
    <u>Am</u>. i. 4. 17 <u>me specta nutusque meos uultumque loquacem</u>,
    iii. 11. 23, <u>Ars</u> i. 138, Tib. i. 2. 21 (for further examples
    see Pichon s.v.).

    <u>pars bona</u>: i.e. <u>pars magna</u>; Burman aptly compares Ter.
    <u>Eu</u>. 123 <u>magnam atque bonam partem ad te attulit</u>.

17. <u>non oculi tacuere tui</u>: eyes, as distinct from eyebrows
    (see 15n. above), generally have their own part to play in
    the secret communication system: cf. <u>Ars</u> i. 573 <u>atque</u>
    <u>oculos oculis spectare fatentibus ignem</u>, <u>Ep</u>. 16. 77, 89,
    Paul. Sil. <u>AP</u> v. 262. 2 βλέμμα τε λαθριδίως φθεγγομένων
    βλεφάρων.

17-18. <u>conscriptaque uino / mensa</u>: the elegiac poets give the
    impression that marking the table with wine was used as an
    emergency means of communication in all manner of situations;
    not only do we hear of it serving as a regular method of
    exchange in clandestine love (cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 4. 20 <u>uerba notata</u>
    <u>mero</u>, <u>Ep</u>. 16. 88, <u>Ars</u> i. 571, <u>Tr</u>. ii. 454, Tib. i. 6. 19-20),
    but also being used for the tracing of impromptu diagrams
    to illustrate battle tactics (e.g. <u>Ep</u>. 1. 30ff., Tib. i. 10.
    31-2)!

For _conscribere_, 'to cover with writing', cf. Liv. ·
xxxiv. 61. 14 tabellas conscriptas. The verb is a relatively
rare one, used in the Augustan period only by Ovid (here
and at _Pont_. ii. 9. 73), Livy and the elder Pliny
(see _ThLL_ 4. 377. 7-16), but Ovid's readiness to admit
rather uncommon compounds is one of the distinctive features
of his diction (see further 36n. below, subrubet).

18. nec in digitis littera nulla fuit: cf. _Am_. i. 4. 20
     uerba leges digitis, _Ep_. 16. 81-2, _Tr_. ii. 453, Prop. iii.
     8. 26. For the litotes cf. _Am_. i. 8. 20.

19-20. Ovid indulges in a slight variation on the original theme
     here: a verbal rather than a visual code has evidently
     been pre-arranged.

19. sermonem ... quod non uideatur, agentem: 'conversation with
     a hidden meaning'; obviously we must, as Heinsius points . .
     out, understand aliquid with agentem: 'performing a function
     which it does not appear to be performing'. I can find
     no parallels at all for the expression sermo agit aliquid,
     but the sense of it is clear enough in the context.
     Videatur referring back to sermonem need cause no anxiety
     (as it did to Micyllus); uideri is quite frequently used
     with reference to things which are audible rather than
     visible (see e.g. Verg. _A_. vi. 257 uisaeque canes ululare
     with Norden's note; also Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. _Carm_. i.
     14. 6).

          Marius comments here 'Amatores enim pluribus praesentibus
                    aut
     aut historiam/fabellam aliquam et amorem narrant, et sub

alieno nomine de se et amica praesente loquuntur, ne eorum

mores deprehendantur', and points to a splendid example

of the practice at Ep. 15. 244-6 a, quotiens aliquem narraui

potus amorem, / ad uultus referens singula uerba tuos! /

indiciumque mei ficto sub nomine feci; / ille ego, si nescis,

uerus amator eram.   Cf. also Ars i. 569-70 hic tibi multa

licet sermone latentia tecto / dicere, quae dici sentiat

illa sibi and Hollis's note on Ars i. 601.

20. Ovid has detected an arrangement for uerba to stand for

notae instead of vice versa, as is more usual (cf. Am.

iii. 11. 24 uerbaque compositis dissimulata notis i. 4. 18,

Ars i. 489-90, ii. 549, iii. 514, Tib. i. 2. 22).   Thus

notis here = not 'signs' or 'signals', as often in deception

scenes, but 'meanings'.   For certis, 'agreed', 'pre-

arranged', cf. Caes. Civ. i. 27. 6. hos certo signo reuocare

constituit, Tac. Ann. i. 25 certis castrorum locis.

21-8. The narrative now enters a new stage (effectively signalled

by iamque (21), 'by now', 'by this time'; see Hand, Tur-

sellinus III. 151-2) as Ovid proceeds from the description

of relatively innocuous antics to the climactic horror of

actual kisses - and no ordinary kisses at that (see 24-8nn.

below)!

21. frequens ierat ... conuiua: Ovid's banquet scenes invariably

conjure up the picture of a rather large gathering which

produces milling crowds when it breaks up: Am. i. 4. 55-6

cum surges abitura domum, surgemus et omnes, / in medium

turbae fac memor agmen eas, Ars i. 603-5 at cum discedet

mensa conuiua remota, / ipsa tibi accessus turba locumque
dabit. / insere te turbae. Certainly more than nine, the
regular number of people present at a Roman dinner party
(three reclining on each of three couches placed around
the table; see Daremberg and Saglio I. 1278-9), must have
been involved in the poet's imagination here, if those
departing could still be described as frequens conuiua
when five or six diners remained behind (i.e. Ovid, his
mistress, her new lover and iuuenes unus et alter (22)).

mensa ... relicta: Heinsius, with his penchant for con-
sistency (cf. 53n. below), was keen to emend relicta to
remota here in view of Ovid's use of the expression mensa
remota at Ars i. 603 at cum discedet mensa conuiua remota
and Met. xiii. 676 mensa somnum petiere remota (cf. Verg.
A. i. 216, 723), but we hear of the guests leaving the
table at the end of a meal just as often as the table leaving
the guests, i.e. being carried out by slaves (see e.g.
Catul. 62. 3 iam pinguis linquere mensas, Verg. A. iii.
212-3 postquam / ... mensas ... liquere priores,
Stat. Ach. i. 804, V. Fl. iii. 117, Plin. Nat. xxviii. 26),
and relicta obviously must stand.

22. compositi: compositus generally means 'at rest' (e.g.
Verg. A. i. 249 nunc placida compostus pace quiescit;
see further ThLL 3. 2115. 82ff.), but here it can only mean
'in a drunken stupor'; cf. Am. i. 4. 53 si bene compositus
somno uinoque iacebit.

23. A line carefully arranged for maximum impact in conveying

Ovid's sense of outrage, the two most emotional words in
it - the censorious _improba_ (here, 'shameless'; cf. _Ars_
iii. 796 _nec taceant mediis improba uerba iocis_, _Tr_. ii.
441-2 _nec sunt minus improba Serui_ / _carmina_) and the
horrified _uidi_ - being placed in the most prominent positions
at the beginning and the end.   For a general discussion of
Roman writers' exploitation of the flexibility of Latin
word-order, particularly with respect to the position of
nouns and adjectives within a sentence, see J. Marouzeau,
Traité de Stylistique appliquée au Latin (Paris 1935) 292-301.

iungentes oscula: see 59-60n. below.

24. _illa ... lingua nexa fuisse_: kissing with the tongue has
    always been regarded as the most passionate variety (see
    Scholia in Aristophanem I. 3. 1 in Nubes (ed. Koster) 51b
    εἶδος φιλημάτων περιεργότερων τὸ καταγλώττισμα);   cf. _Am._
    iii. 7. 9 _osculaque inseruit cupida luctantia lingua_, 14.
    23, Tib. i. 8. 37 (for further references see Brandt _ad loc._
    and 'Anhang' 214).

    mihi ... liquet: 'I am sure' (cf. _Pont_. ii.7.17-18 _mihi_
    fata liquet ... / per tibi consuetas semper itura uias);
    the present tense indicates that the remark is interjected
    as an afterthought and is not part of the mainstream of
    Ovid's reflections.

25-8. Two corresponding pairs of similes elaborate on the nature
    of the kisses Ovid has witnessed.   They are undoubtedly
    superfluous - intrusive even - in that they add nothing

to our knowledge of the situation while keeping us from
discovering its outcome, but almost certainly their very
superfluity is the reason for their introduction, for the
insertion of lyrical passages where lyricism is incongruous
and decorative passages where decoration is out of place
is one of the more subtle manifestations of the humour
which is a fundamental feature of Ovid's poetic art (cf.
35-42n. below and, in general, Frécaut 65-9).

tulerit ... / sed tulerit ... / ... ferre ... / ... tulisse:
Ovid's play on the basically rather colourless verb ferre
here provides a fine example of his skill in word manipulation: in lines 25-6 he varies its position in the
verse slightly whilst retaining the same mood and tense
(tulerit ... / sed tulerit), and then in 27-8 keeps the
verb in the same position in each line, but uses a different
construction from that of the preceding couplet and a
different tense of the verb in hexameter and pentameter
(ferre, tulisse). Cf. Frécaut 53-4.

25-7. qualia ... / ... / qualia: see 35-7n. below.

25. For the sentiment cf. Am. iii. 7. 21-2 sic (i.e. inuiolata)
... / surgit ... a caro fratre uerenda soror.

germana: properly 'blood sister', i.e. having both the
same mother and father, but often used by the poets without
distinction from soror, sometimes metri gratia and sometimes for the sake of uariatio (see ThLL 6. 1915. 9ff).
Here, however, it is probably used in the stricter sense

to imply an even closer relationship than that of <u>soror</u> and <u>frater</u> (cf. 27n. below) and so heighten the contrast with what follows; cf. Catul. 91. 5-6 <u>sed neque quod matrem nec germanam esse uidebam / hanc tibi, cuius me magnus edebat amor</u> (see further <u>ThLL</u> 6. 1917. 60ff.).

<u>seuero</u>: 'upright'; see l. 3n.

26. <u>sed ... cupido mollis amica uiro</u>: Ovid's words here have been carefully chosen to provide the greatest possible contrast with line 25 above: <u>cupido</u> (an adjective frequently used in erotic poetry with reference to sexual urges; cf. <u>Am.</u> iii. 7. 9 (<u>supra cit.</u> 24n.), Catul. 64. 147, Prop. i. 20. 11, and further Pichon, s.v.) stands in opposition to <u>seuero</u>, <u>uiro</u> (here clearly 'lover', not 'husband'; see introduction above, p. 226, n.1) to <u>fratri</u>, and <u>mollis amica</u> to <u>germana</u> (for the sensual applications of <u>mollis</u> see 4. 23-4nn., and of <u>amica</u>, 1. 17n.).

27-8. Ovid now repeats both similes from the previous couplet in mythological guise, Phoebus and Diana corresponding to <u>frater</u> and <u>germana</u>, and Venus and Mars to <u>amica</u> and <u>uir</u>. The threefold repetition of the basic sentiment of lines 25-8 in the form <u>qualia femina det uiro</u> makes Bentley's emendation of the paradosis in line 27 (<u>phoebum ... dianae</u>) certain.

27. <u>Phoebo ... Dianam</u>: the choice of Phoebus and Diana to reiterate the sentiment of line 25 could not be more apposite: not only are they blood brother and sister (see 25n. above,

germana), both being the children of Zeus and Leto, but
Diana is traditionally the divine paragon of chastity
(see Roscher I. 576-7;   Brandt, in referring to _Ars_ i.
745, seems to have confused her with Minerva).

28. _Venerem Marti_: Venus according to some accounts was the wife
of Vulcan and unfaithful to him with her half-brother, Mars;
(see _Ars_ ii. 561ff., Hom. _Od._ viii. 266ff.), but cf.
9 (_B_). 47-8n.

29-32. The artistic digression (25-8) ends abruptly, as Ovid
recalls, with an extra vividness produced by the use of
direct speech, his explosion of anger at the sight of his
mistress kissing a rival.   The whole outburst has a
strongly juristic flavour (see nn. below) and is one of
several passages in Ovid which have led scholars to enquire
whether he possessed, and wished to demonstrate, some
specialized knowledge of the law;   see 4. 1-4n.

29. _exclamo_: the sudden switch to the present tense high-
lights the drama of the situation.

mea gaudia: Ovid means the kisses which his mistress can
bestow and the pleasure that he derives from them (for
the frequent use of _gaudium_ to denote all kinds of amatory
delight see Pichon, s.v. _gaudere_).   The possessive ad-
jective is emphatic here; '_gaudia_ which are mine';   cf.
_Am._ i. 4. 39-40 _oscula si dederis, fiam manifestus amator_ /
et dicam 'mea sunt' and see 30n. below.

defers: differs, the reading of most of the MSS,
cannot be right; CLE 949. 1-2 cur gaudia

differs / spemque foues et cras usque redire

iubes? (to which Munari refers) clearly demonstrates that

gaudia differre = 'to put off, postpone gaudia', which

is obviously not the meaning required here.   Defers, on

the other hand, which appears in a few of the recc. and

won the approval of Heinsius, gives the excellent sense

'Where are you taking mea gaudia? (see Munari's apparatus

and Fränkel 187, n. 60) or, if deferre has its

technical legal force, as Ovid probably intended that it

should in the present context (see 30n. below), 'Who

is being allowed (by you) to claim mea gaudia?'(see E.J.

Kenney, YCIS 21 (1969), 257, n. 51).   The survival of the

truth in ς may well be traditionary, but, as often, it is

impossible to be certain (see 1. 17, 19nn.).

30. iniciam ... in mea iura manus: 'I shall lay hands upon

what is mine by right'.   Scholars of Roman law have re-

cognized in Ovid's words here (and also at Am. i. 4. 39-40

and Ep. 12. 157-8) an echo of the formula used by the

plaintiff in manus iniectio (see Gaius Inst. iv. 21, Gel.

xx. 1. 45), an archaic legal enactment apud praetorem

associated with the ancient process of uindicatio by which

one man might reclaim his rightful property from another;

see especially D. Daube, 'No kissing or else ...' in

The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies

in Honor of H. Caplan, ed. L. Wallach (New York 1966), 222-

31, and cf. B. Perrin, 'La manus iniectio chez Ovide',

Annales Uniuersitatis Sarauiensis 2 (1952), 111ff.

Kenney suggests (*YClS* 21 (1969), 259) that 'the introduction of this time-honoured, by now "quaint" phraseology into Ovid's very modern poetry was a piquant stroke of invention', and undoubtedly it was, but I believe that the humour of Ovid's legalism here lies not only in the incongruity of its language but also in the very idea of treating something as trivial and evanescent as a 'stolen' kiss (<u>mea iura</u> here = <u>mea gaudia</u> in 29) as if it were a piece of property which could be recovered by invoking the solemn and ponderous processes of the law. Daube (<u>art. cit.</u> 229) assumes that <u>iura</u> here and <u>gaudia</u> in 29 include the <u>person</u> of the beloved as well as the kisses she is able to dispense, but the assumption is, I think, unjustified and unnecessary; to speak of 'laying hands upon' kisses alone is indeed absurd, but we may be fairly confident that the absurdity is quite intentional.

<u>dominas ... manus</u>: 'a master's hands'; the epithet sustains the image of the owner of a specific item of property asserting his claim to it (for the usage cf. Juv. 3.33 <u>domina sub hasta</u>, Tränkle, <u>Sprachkunst</u> 77-8). Kenney points out (<u>YClS</u> 21 (1969), 258, n. 56) that the singular <u>manum</u> is regular in the <u>manus iniectio</u> formula (see n. above) in the legal texts, but obviously the plural is necessitated here by the demands of metre (cf., however, <u>Ep.</u> 12. 158 <u>clamarem</u> <u>'meus est' iniceremque manus</u>).

31-2. Daube (<u>art. cit.</u> (30n.) 230-31) observes, with references to the legal texts, that Ovid's phraseology now seems to reflect not <u>manus iniectio</u> (see 30n. above) but a type of

theft in cases of co-ownership where one party (in this
case the <u>puella</u>) takes it upon himself/herself to dispose
of what is not entirely his/hers (here the <u>gaudia</u> to which
Ovid feels he has a claim) or, alternatively, admits a
third person (see 32n. below) to the partnership without
the consent of the original partner. The mention of
several juristic procedures almost, as it were, in one
breath (see also <u>defers</u> 29n. above) need not, of course,
trouble us; the average educated Augustan reader for
whom Ovid was writing would in all probability neither have
demanded nor appreciated the rigid observation of authentic
legal distinctions.

31. A typically dexterous Ovidian line in which construction
mirrors sentiment (cf. 10. 8n.). <u>Communia</u> which describes
the <u>gaudia</u> as the common property of Ovid and his <u>puella</u>
is also the common property of the two clauses in the line,
i.e. it must be understood ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with <u>tibi sunt mecum</u>
as well as with <u>mihi sunt tecum</u>. The general sense of
joint possession which Ovid is at pains to stress is further
reinforced by the correlation and internal rhyme of <u>tibi
sunt</u> ... <u>mihi sunt</u> and <u>mecum</u> ... <u>tecum</u>.

32. <u>bona</u> ... <u>ista</u>: once more Ovid emphasizes that he regards
the <u>gaudia</u> as property. <u>Bona</u> in legal language also means
'rights'; see Berger, <u>Encyclopaedic Dictionary</u> s.v.

<u>quisquam</u> ... <u>tertius</u>: one might reasonably wonder whether
another legalism, 'a third party', may be detected here.
It seems likely under the circumstances, but I have not

been able to find any evidence of the use of <u>tertius</u> in the
legal texts which would substantiate that view.

33ff. Ovid abandons the mode of direct address for that of simple
narrative as he describes his girlfriend's reactions to
his outburst (see introduction above p. 230).

33. <u>quaeque dolor linguae dictauit</u>: we gather that Ovid has
reproduced verbatim only the opening words of a long tirade
and that in the heat of the moment he said a good deal
else as well (see introduction above, p. 231). For
<u>dictauit</u>, cf. 1. 38 <u>carmina purpureus quae mihi dictat</u>
<u>Amor</u>, CLE 521. 3 <u>inscripsi uersus dictante dolore</u>.

<u>at</u>: a particle which signals an important transition (see 1.33,
10. 19nn.) reinforced in this case by the emphatic position
of <u>illi</u> at the end of the line.

34. <u>purpureus ... pudor</u>: MS confusion between <u>pudor</u> and <u>rubor</u>
is very common (in Ovid it occurs again at <u>Tr</u>. iv. 3. 69-
70 <u>nec tibi, quod saeuis ego sum Iouis ignibus ictus</u>, /
<u>purpureus molli fiat in ore pudor</u>; see Owen's apparatus).
Both expressions are used for a 'blush', whether of guilt
or shame as here (cf. <u>Tr</u>. iv. 3. 70 (<u>supra cit</u>.),
Catul. 65. 24 <u>huic manat tristi conscius ore rubor</u>), or
of modesty as at <u>Am</u>. i. 3. 14 <u>nudaque simplicitas purpureus-</u>
<u>que pudor</u> (cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 8. 35 <u>erubuit! decet alba quidem pudor</u>
<u>ora</u>, iii. 6. 78 <u>Met</u>. i. 484 <u>pulchra uerecundo suffuderat</u>
<u>ora rubore</u>), but whilst <u>purpureus</u> might reasonably qualify

pudor, and uerecundus (uel sim.) rubor, the combination
purpureus rubor would be excessively pleonastic, and we
must read pudor with PSYω here.

35-42. A passage clearly inspired by Verg. A. xii. 64-9:

> accepit uocem lacrimis Lauinia matris
> flagrantis perfusa genas, cui plurimus ignem
> subiecit rubor et calefacta per ora cucurrit.
> Indum sanguineo ueluti uiolauerit ostro
> si quis ebur, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa
> alba rosa, talis uirgo dabat ore colores.

In each case the poet is describing the effect of a
blush on the white skin of a girl's face (the ancients
were captivated by the red/white colour contrast; cf.
Am. i. 8. 35 (supra cit., 34n.) Catul. 64. 308-9
candida purpurea talos incinxerat ora, / at roseae niueo
residebant uertice uittae, and see further Bömer on Met. vi.
46, André, Termes de couleur 345-7, 351), and Ovid's close
imitation of Vergil manifests itself in several ways:

(i) in similar emphasis on the suffused effect created
by the gradual progress of the blush across the girl's
face: purpureus uenit in ora pudor ... / quale ...
caelum / subrubet (34-6 below); cf. Verg. A. xii. 66
rubor ... calefacta per ora cucurrit.

(ii) in the inclusion of two of the same similes to
describe the colour of the complexion: the mixing of
lilies with roses (see 37n. below and cf. Verg. A. xii.
68 - 9) and the tinting of ivory with red dye (see 39-40n.
below and cf. Verg. Aen. xii. 67-8). Ovid adds three
other similes of which one (35) is used by Vergil in close
succession to the passage quoted above (A. xii. 76-7

*cum primum crastina caelo / puniceis inuecta rotis Aurora
rubebit*) and thus may have influenced Ovid here (it must
be admitted, however, that this particular image is the
common property of all ancient poets; see 35 below), and
another (36) could have been suggested to Ovid by the
circumstances which prompt Lauinia's blush in Vergil's
lines, i.e. her mother's reference to the dispute between
Turnus and Aeneas for her hand in marriage.

(iii) in similar sentence structure: compare the
hyperbaton in 39-40 with that at Verg. A. xii. 67-8.

(iv) in the use of a final summarizing comment:
compare 41 with Verg. A. xii. 69.

(v) in the identical effect of the girl's blush, i.e.
the prompting of passionate love in the man who witnesses
it: compare 47ff. with Verg. A. xii. 70 *illum* (i.e *Turnum*)
turbat amor figitque in uirgine uultus.

But while Vergil's catalogue of similes is in style
and tone perfectly in keeping with its context, Ovid's
reminiscence of it is as inappropriate here as a minuet
at a barn dance; a blush of virginal modesty such as
Lauinia's is a fit enough subject for lyrical elaboration,
but a blush of guilt such as that of Ovid's unfaithful
puella certainly is not. Why then did Ovid introduce
this passage? Because he had no taste or restraint
(see S.G. Owen, CR 45 (1931), 105-6)? I think not.
Frécaut (66) is surely right to see these lines as intended
to create humour by their very incongruity (for a good
general discussion of the role of incongruity in the Amores
see DuQuesnay 9-14) - as a conscious parody of the 'high'

style.   Cf. 25-8n. above and especially _Am_. i. 7. 51-8
where, after a physical rather than verbal attack on his
mistress, Ovid describes her shaken appearance in a
similarly incongruous passage of lyrical imagery which
undermines any semblance of reality the poem may have
had and points to its basically humorous nature;   see
H.A. Kahn, _Latomus_ 25 (1966), 833-5 and introduction
above, pp. 223-30. (The most useful study of the function
of imagery in Ovid is Frécaut's (60-93), but some indication
of the range, frequency and literary pedigree of his
similes may be gained from the older works of J.A. Washietl
(_De similitudinibus imaginibusque Ouidianis_, Diss. Vienna 1883) and
E.G. Wilkins ('A Classification of the Similes of Ovid',
_CW_ 25 (1932), 73-8, 81-6).)

It is tempting to suggest that Ovid may have inserted
this passage after the original completion of the poem.
It has a distinctly self-contained feel (Burman and Kenney
are clearly right to punctuate with a full stop at the
end of line 34), and it is with a perceptible effort
(quite absent from the Vergilian passage) that Ovid brings
us back to the point in his summarizing couplet 41-2.
Line 41 is very perfunctory and rather clumsy in expression
(see n. ad loc.), and 42 simply states what is to be voiced
much more forcefully in 43-5. . It is conceivable that Ovid,
on re-reading his original draft of this poem and remembering
the Vergilian passage (perhaps along with his own efforts
in _Am_. i. 7, if that poem was already written), saw the
humorous possibilities of inserting an excursus such as this.

35-7. <u>quale</u> ... / ... / <u>quale</u>: the neuter singular form of the
adjective is used as an adverbial accusative and not, as
stated by Lewis and Short (s.v. <u>qualis</u> II. B. 2), in
agreement with <u>caelum</u> in 34. Catalogues of similes
introduced by some part of <u>qualis</u> rather than any other
word indicating comparison seem to be specifically intended
to carry the reader away from reality, or the illusion of
reality, into the realms of romantic fantasy; cf. 25-8
above and especially <u>Am</u>. i. 10. 1-6, Prop. i. 3. 1-8
(see Morgan 70-72), <u>Priap</u>. 16.

35-6. <u>coloratum Tithoni coniuge caelum</u> / <u>subrubet</u>: <u>Tithoni</u>
<u>coniuge</u> = Aurora, the dawn (for her unusual marriage see
<u>Am</u>. i. 13. 35-8, Prop. ii. 18 (<u>B</u>), <u>h. Hom. Ven</u>. 218-38),
whose rosy suffusion of the morning sky has been the in-
spiration of one of the oldest and most beautiful ranges of
poetic imagery, all deriving ultimately from Homer's
ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς (<u>Od</u>. ii. 1 <u>et passim</u>; see <u>ThLL</u> 2.
1523. 78ff., Bömer on <u>Met</u>. ii. 112, H. Bardon, 'L'aurore et
le crépuscule', <u>REL</u> 24 (1946), 82-115). Cf. here <u>Met</u>.
vi. 46-9 <u>subitusque inuita notauit / ora rubor rursusque</u>
<u>euanuit, ut solet aer / purpureus fieri, cum primum Aurora</u>
<u>mouetur, / et breue post tempus candescere solis ab ortu</u>,
where the simile also describes a blush of guilt. It
is worth noting too Ovid's use of this stock image in a
brilliant pun at <u>Am</u>. i. 13. 45-6 where he says that dawn
herself 'blushed' (<u>rubebat</u>) for shame; see Barsby 145-6.

36. subrubet: one of two Ovidian instances of this relatively
rare verb (cf. Ars ii. 316 plenaque purpureo subrubet uua
mero). Ovid is always ready to admit the less common
compounds (and even to coin new ones; see 56 below, 3. 6, 7.18,
9 (B).52nn.) when precision of nuance and/or demands of
metre so require. Compounds in sub- rarely found else-
where are not at all infrequent in his work: e.g. sub-
ridere (Am. iii. 1. 33), subedere (Met. xi. 783), sub-
lucere (Am. i. 5. 5, Ep. 20 . 217), subuolare (Met. xi.
790, xiv. 507, 577), subdolus (Ars i. 598), subnuba
(Ep. 6. 153), subnubilus (Rem. 599).

36-8. There is an obvious resemblance between these lines and
those of Lygdamus at [Tib.] iii. 4. 29-34 where the
appearance of the god Apollo is described thus:

> candor erat qualem praefert Latonia Luna,
>   et color in niueo corpore purpureus,
> ut iuueni primum uirgo deducta marito
>   inficitur teneras ore rubente genas,
> et cum contexunt amarantis alba puellae
> lilia et autumno candida mala rubent.

The date and identity of Lygdamus and the exact relationship
of his poetry with Ovid's have long been matters of
speculation and dispute (see K. Büchner, 'Die Elegien des
Lygdamus', Hermes 93 (1965), 65-112 (= Studien VIII.
116-77) with copious bibliography at 89, n. 1, to which
should be added A.G. Lee, 'The date of Lygdamus and his
relationship to Ovid', PCPhS n.s. 5 (1958-9), 15-23).
No certainty in these areas seems possible, but it is
difficult to avoid the conclusion that one of the two
poets in question consciously imitated the other on a
number of occasions. Lee (art. cit.), B. Axelson

('Lygdamus und Ovid', Eranos 58 (1960), 29-111) and G.
Luck (Die Römische Liebeselegie 201-10) not only take
Lygdamus to be the imitator, as do most other scholars, but
also argue persuasively that he is to be dated to the
Flavian period.   The setting of our passage against the
lines of Lygdamus cited above certainly seems at least to
point to the priority of Ovid.   For it looks very much as
if Lygdamus, having compared the radiance of Apollo with
the radiance of the moon (29), recalled that Ovid had
compared someone's appearance with that of the moon here
and thought how clever it would be to continue with a
reminiscence of this passage.   But he was immediately
in difficulties, for the other similes which Ovid uses
Lygdamus could not use to extend his description of the
god's radiance, since they, along with the moon simile in
Ovid, describe not something white and shining, but some-
thing white tinged with red; in order to incorporate them,
Lygdamus was obliged to turn to description of the colour
of Apollo's body (30) and make this the object of com-
parison not only with a mixture of red and white flowers
(33-4) but also, rather ludicrously, with the complexion
of a blushing bride (31-2; the one simile in Lygdamus
which is absent from our passage was probably also taken
from Ovid, for at Met. iii. 482-5 he compares the com-
plexion of Narcissus with the colour of ripening apples).
One may perhaps add that it is easy to see why the un-
distinguished Lygdamus may have wished to imitate Ovid
(amongst others), but extremely difficult to see what
the brilliant and inventive Ovid could have stood to gain

by imitating him.   Büchner (art. cit.), however, argues
at length against all the views stated here.

sponso ... nouo: probably 'bridegroom' (cf. [Tib.]
iii. 4. 31-2 (supra cit. p. 264), but for sponsus
alone cf. 1. 5n.

37. rosae ... inter sua lilia mixtae: one of the most popular
Roman equivalents of our 'peaches and cream' description
of a pink and white complexion;   cf. Verg. A. xii. 68-9
(supra cit. 35-42n.) and, for an extended and more complex
version, Prop. ii. 3. 10-12.   Variations of the same
basic motif are common;   see Catul. 61. 186-8 ore floridulo
nitens / alba parthenice uelut / luteumue papauer, [Tib.]
iii. 33-4 (supra cit. 36-8n.) and, for a large collection
of further examples, H. Blümner, Philologus 48 (1889), 157-8.

   Sua is not merely a metrical stop-gap.   Lilies and roses
were as instinctively associated in the minds of Roman
poets as carnations and asparagus fern are in most of ours;
cf. Hor. Carm. i. 36. 15-16 neu desint epulis rosae / ...
neu breue lilium, Plin. Nat. xxi. 22 et interpositum (lilium)
etiam maxime rosas decet.

38. I have adopted the punctuation introduced by Kenney in an
attempt to clarify for the modern reader the very complex
construction of this line, i.e. quale Luna fulget, ubi ...
(thus Kenney in his apparatus).   Goold (Amat. Crit. 16)
complains that the commas surrounding Luna are 'technically

incorrect', but without justification, for they are merely performing within the Latin sentence the same function as we often give them in an English sentence - that of separating one clause from another. Obviously it would be 'technically incorrect', and indeed quite impossible, to retain them in an equivalent position when translating the whole sentence into English (and this, I suspect, is what Goold has in mind), for the English language simply will not tolerate the degree of hyperbaton present in Ovid's Latin (see 39-40n. below).

ubi cantatis ... laborat equis: laborare is the word generally used of the moon in eclipse (cf. **Var. Men.** 231 _eclipsis quando fit, cur luna laboret?_ Verg. **G.** ii. 478 _defectus solis uarios lunaeque labores_; see further **ThLL** 7. 793. 16ff.) during which time it is not totally dark, but, depending on the meteorological conditions on earth, takes on a reddish-brown, coppery colour as a result of some sunlight being refracted by the atmosphere. Any apparent irregularity in the course or appearance of celestial bodies was commonly believed in antiquity to be the result of black magic (see 1. 23n.), and thus here Ovid attributes the moon's colour as it is during an eclipse to the 'bewitching' of her horses (_cantatis ... equis_) - the sun, moon and personified heavenly phenomena (such as Night and Dawn) are conventionally endowed with horses and chariot in Greek and Roman art and literature; cf. **Am.** i. 8. 4, ii. 1. 24, **Fast.** ii. 314 (with Bömer's note) and see further Daremberg and Saglio III. 1388-92.

(Ovid's phraseology seems to echo Prop. ii. 34 (B). 52
nec (quaerere) cur fraternis Luna laboret equis, but I
doubt very much whether Ovid intended to parody Propertius
by removing his high-flown expression to a frivolous con-
text, as Kathleen Morgan suggests (32-3), for Propertius's
own use of it to describe the learned poetry of his friend
Lynceus, which will profit him nothing now that he has
fallen in love, is surely somewhat arch itself.)

For the simile in description of the colour of the
complexion cf. Met. iv. 332-3 (hic color est) sub candore
rubenti, / cum frustra resonant aera auxilia, lunae.

39-40. aut quod ... / Maeonis Assyrium femina tinxit ebur: sc.
aut quale fulget Assyrium ebur quod tinxit Maeonis femina,
ne longis ... ; for the postponement of the antecedent cf.
Am. i. 2. 10 cedamus: leue fit quod bene fertur onus
and for all types of hyperbaton, A.E. Housman, JPh 18
(1890), 6-8 (= Classical Papers 139-41), J.P. Postgate,
CR 30 (1916), 142-6, Platnauer 104-8.

The simile which likens the colour of skin to tinted
ivory is Homeric in origin: ὡς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ
φοίνικι μιήνῃ Μῃονὶς ἠὲ Κάειρα παρήιον ἔμμεναι ἵππων (Il.
iv. 141); cf. Verg. A. xii. 67-8 (supra cit. 35-42n.),
Met. iv. 332 (with Bömer's note for a collection of further
examples, to which may be added Claud. DRP i. 274-5).
Both Ovid and Vergil use the simile to describe an overall
reddish tinge as opposed to Homer's use of it to describe
a single splash of red colour on a white background, i.e.
blood on Menelaus's cheek.

39. <u>ab</u>: probably causal (cf. Prop. i. 16. 14 <u>supplicis a</u>
<u>longis tristior excubiis</u>, Liv. ii. 14. 3 <u>inopi tum urbe</u>
<u>ab longinqua obsidione</u>), but, as Heinsius remarks, 'paruum
refert' - the sense is perfectly clear.

40. A highly artistic verse both in its measured word order
(adjective A, adjective B, noun A, verb, noun B, i.e. almost
a 'golden' line; cf. L.P. Wilkinson, <u>Golden Latin Artistry</u>
(Cambridge 1963, reprinted 1966), 215-17) and its use of
proper names largely for their romantic associations.
<u>Maeonis</u>, 'Lydian', is simply a transliteration of the
Homeric Μηονίς while <u>Assyrius</u> is frequently used by the
Roman poets, notorious for their geographical imprecision,
to mean 'oriental' (here, perhaps, 'Indian'); see Kroll
on Catul. 6. 8, K.F. Smith on Tib. i. 3. 7.

41. A very workaday line (cf. p. 262 above) with a distinctly
prosaic ring created by the conglomeration of pronouns (for
some interesting statistics and observations, particularly
on the comparative rarity in Latin poetry of demonstrative
pronouns in the genitive plural, see Axelson, <u>Unpoetische</u>
<u>Wörter</u> 70-74). <u>His</u>, despite its vagueness, is surely
right, as Heinsius recognized, <u>hic</u>, which is retained
by Ehwald, Brandt, Némethy, Showerman and Munari (following
L. Müller, <u>RhM</u> 18 (1863), 76), almost certainly being a
false correction of <u>is</u>, which appears in some <u>recc</u>. <u>Aliqui</u>
(given by <u>PYA</u>$_c$) for <u>alicui</u> will obviously have been not a
visual error, but the result of the copyist's erroneous
transcription of the word as he silently repeated it, and

aliquis (given by S and most of the recc.) an inept attempt
at emendation (intellectually on a par with S's longas at
4.33; see n. ad loc.).

42. casu: 'by chance' or, here 'unintentionally' (Lee).
Housman's formidable powers of reason do not on this
occasion succeed in disabling the reading of all the MSS;
his conjecture uisu (recorded in Edwards's apparatus) must
be declared unnecessary in the light of Met. vii. 84 et casu
solito formosior Aesone natus (cited by Heinsius and Marius).

43-50. Ovid's anger is completely melted by his mistress's beauty
(not, as H.A. Kahn would have it (Latomus 25 (1966), 892),
by her tears, for which assumption there is no justification
in the text); her attractiveness, he mischievously suggests
(43-4), seems actually to have been enhanced by her guilty
embarrassment.

43-4. A couplet in which humorous ends are well served by Ovid's
conspicuous verbal wit (see E. .de Saint'Denis, Ovidiana 188).
In the hexameter, immediate reiteration of the same word
in mid-line produces a chiastic arrangement of corresponding
nouns and verbs (spectabat terram: terram spectare; cf.
Am. ii. 4. 39), whilst in the pentameter, the same word is
repeated at the beginning of each half of the line (maesta
... maesta; cf. Am. ii. 4. 45, ii. 10. 3); ·in addition,
decebat in the hexameter is echoed by decenter in the
pentameter (paronomasia; see Frécaut 37-9).   Cf. 4. 39n.

For the sentiment cf. Met. vii. 730-31 tristis erat:
sed nulla tamen formosior illa / esse potest tristi.

45-50. Physical ill-treatment of the _puella_, or at any rate the
contemplation of it, is not at all uncommon in elegiac
love affairs; see K.F. Smith on Tib. i. 6. 73-4 for a
list of examples, and Lilja 164-5 for the general disapproval
shown by the poets for violence resulting from jealousy.
Ovid handles the theme in some detail at _Ars_ iii. 568ff.,
and at _Am._ i. 7 constructs a whole poem around his remorse
after actually having struck his mistress (see H.A. Kahn
'Ouidius Furens', _Latomus_ 25 (1966), 880-94 and Barsby _ad loc._
for useful discussions of the piece). With that poem
the present passage has obvious affinities (cf. also Paul.
Sil. _AP_ 5. 248).

45. _sicut erant (et erant culti)_: repetition in parenthesis
is a well-marked Ovidian stylistic trait; cf. _Ars_ i. 113
in medio plausu (plausus tunc arte carebant); ii. 131-2
ille leui uirga (uirgam forte tenebat), / ... in spisso
litore pingit opus; 135 _'campus erat' (campumque facit)_.

45-6. _laniare capillos / ... in teneras ... ire genas_: the two
most common forms of violence; cf. _Am._ i. 7. 11 _ergo_
ego digestos potui laniare capillos?   49-50 _at nunc_
sustinui raptis a fronte capillis / ferreus ingenuas ungue
notare genas; see also _Ars_ iii. 568, 570. Interestingly,
at _Am._ i. 7. 49-50 Ovid thinks of tearing the hair of
his _puella_ as a more moderate form of attack!
For _tener_ (a stock epithet of _genae_) see 1. 4n.

46. <u>fuit</u>: possibly the perfect tense is used simply as a metrically convenient substitute for the imperfect, but it seems more likely that it has a special significance here. For to take <u>fuit</u> = <u>erat</u> and translate the couplet 45-6 'I felt like pulling her hair and scratching her eyes out' (Lee) suggests that the sight of his mistress's beauty <u>excited</u> Ovid's violent impulses, whereas the general import of the whole passage 33-50 is that this very spectacle in fact <u>quelled</u> them. If, however, <u>fuit</u> were to have almost pluperfect force, i.e. if it were to be taken to denote an action prior to the existing circumstances (cf. Caes. <u>Civ</u>. iii. 66. 2 <u>castrorum hic situs erat. Superioribus diebus nona Caesaris legio ... castra eo loco posuit</u>; see further Kühner-Stegmann II. i. 129-30), it would give lines 45-6 exactly the meaning required by the context: there was, i.e. 'had been', an impulse to attack the girl, but it ceased to be once her beauty asserted itself.

47. <u>fortes cecidere lacerti</u>: cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 7. 23 <u>ante meos umeris uellem cecidisse lacertos</u>; Tib. i. 6. 73, 10. 56. <u>Fortes</u> is, of course, ironic; cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 7. 37-8 <u>turba</u> ... / <u>clamet 'io, forti uicta puella uiro est!</u>'.

48. <u>defensa est armis ... suis</u>: the girl had her own special means of defence. <u>Arma</u> here possibly implies not simply 'weapons' but, as at Verg. <u>A</u>. v. 425 <u>et paribus palmas amborum innexuit armis</u> and V. Fl. iv. 326 <u>armaque ferre iuuat fessasque attollere palmas</u>, 'boxing gloves'.

49. <u>saeuus eram</u>: 'I was rough'; cf. Tib. i. 10. 65-6 <u>manibus</u>

qui saeuus erit ... / ... miti sit procul a Venere.

50. supplex: cf. Am. i. 7. 61 ter tamen ante pedes uolui procumbere supplex. The attitude is in fact a fairly common one amongst elegiac lovers; see e.g. Prop. i. 9. 3 ecce iaces supplex uenisque ad iura puellae, 16. 14, ii. 14. 11, Tib. i. 2. 13-14.

49-50. rogaui / oscula: an effective ἀπροσδόκητον: following supplex we might well have expected rogaui ueniam (uel. sim.); cf. Am. i. 2. 21 nil opus est bello: ueniam pacemque rogamus.

50. ne nobis deteriora daret: Munari (152) offers, and Lenz (ad loc.) accepts, the suggestion that there is a double meaning here, i.e. 'that she should give me (kisses) not inferior to those she used to give' and 'not inferior to those she had just given my rival', but the second meaning alone (Lee translates 'kisses as good as those I'd watched') is surely the one that Ovid intended.

51-62. A splendid finale, as the kiss of reconciliation succeeds only in arousing the poet's jealousy again, - but the usual grim seriousness of the emotion is completely sabotaged by the wit and humour of Ovid's expression.

51. risit: a clear indication that mischief is afoot; cf. Am. i. i. 3, 6. 11, ii. 18. 15.

ex animo: 'sincerely', 'heartily' (cf. Catul. 109. 4 atque id sincere dicat et ex animo)- and for Ovid alarmingly so

(see 53-62 below)!

optima: the lectio difficilior may reasonably be preferred in view of Am. iii. 7. 55-6 non optima in me perdidit oscula.

52. A line echoed very closely, as Munari points out, by Maximian at 5. 144 excutis irato tela trisulca Ioui. For tela trisulca cf. Met. ii. 848-9 ille pater rectorque deum, cui dextra trisulcis / ignibus armata est (with Bömer's note). Iconographical representations of Jupiter with three-pronged thunderbolt in hand are common, and it seems possible that the weapon was originally identical with, or became confused with, the trident of Poseidon; see A.B. Cook, Zeus: a Study in Ancient Religion (Cambridge 1914-40), II. 786ff, III. 1150 and Plate 81.

53-4. torqueor infelix ... / et uolo: Ovid returns to the graphic present tense to heighten the drama (cf. 29n. above). For infelix cf. miser (13 above); hapless indeed, we may think, is the man whose jealousy is aroused afresh in what should have been his moment of satisfaction!

53. senserit: Heinsius's constant striving for consistency (cf. 21n. above) led him to favour the variant sumpserit here in view of the frequent occurrence of the expression oscula sumere elsewhere (he cites Ars i. 669, Am. i. 4. 63, Fast. iii. 691 and Prop. i. 3. 16), but oscula sentire is perfectly acceptable; cf. Met. x. 292-3 dataque oscula uirgo / sensit.

54. ex hac ... nota: 'of this stamp'. For nota as a mark
or indication of quality (properly of wine; cf. Greek
σφραγίς), but also of people and all manner of things, cf.
Hor. Carm. ii. 3. 8 interiore nota Falerni, Catul. 68. 28
quisquis de meliore nota, V. Max. vii. 3. 10 'oderint dum
metuant' et alia huius notae (see further OLD s.v., 5).

55-62. A fresh cause for alarm, which Ovid sees with the eyes of
the practised praeceptor amoris (note docui, 55): a rival
teacher (magister, 62) will have taught (doceri, 61) his
mistress her new technique (addidicisse, 56n.) by well
known methods (see 61-2n. below).

55. multo meliora: a rueful reminder of ne ... deteriora
daret (50; see n. ad loc.). Ovid asked for kisses 'as
good as' those which were given to his rival, but those
which he got were better than they should have been!

56. quiddam uisa est addidicisse noui: the acute observation
of a true connoisseur (cf. 24-8 above); we can hardly
sympathize with Ovid - only be amused by his professional
appreciation of his former pupil's improved technique (cf.
E. de Saint Denis, Ovidiana 188).

addidicisse: a rare word in poetry (see ThLL 1. 578. 35ff.),
but Ovid's willingness to admit uncommon compounds has
already been noted (see 36n. above, subrubet). Addiscere
is used once elsewhere in his work (the text is disputed at
Met. ii. 639 and vii. 99) apparently for metrical convenience

(Met. iii. 593-4 <u>addidici regimen</u> ... <u>carinae / flectere</u>;
see <u>ThLL</u> 1. 578. 60ff.), but here the specialized sense
conveyed by the prefix is obviously extremely appropriate.

57-8. A couplet which tells us nothing new, but which shows
Ovid again indulging in the verbal wit which is the
hallmark of his style (cf. especially 43-4 above, 10.
5-8nn.) The two object clauses (<u>quod nimium placuere</u> and
<u>quod tota labellis</u> ...) are separated from each other by
the main clause <u>malum est</u> ('It's a pity' (Lee)), and in
the pentameter the construction once more mirrors the
sentiment (cf. 31n. above): <u>recepta</u> must be understood
with <u>lingua tua</u>, <u>lingua</u> with <u>nostra</u>, and <u>labellis</u> with
<u>tuis</u> - a strong syntactical reinforcement of the notion of
lips and tongues being joined together (cf. 24n. above,
and for similar descriptions of a passionate kiss, Lucr.
iv. 1108-9, 1192-4). For the juxtaposition <u>nostris</u>,
<u>nostra</u> see 4. 39n.

Note here also the return to direct address as Ovid's
new fear is articulated (see introduction above, p. 230).

59-60. <u>non oscula tantum / iuncta queror, quamuis haec quoque</u>
<u>iuncta queror</u>: for the innuendo cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 4. 63 <u>oscula iam</u>
<u>sumet, iam non tantum oscula sumet</u>, <u>Ars</u> i. 669-70 <u>oscula</u>
<u>qui sumpsit, si non et cetera sumit, / haec quoque, quae</u>
<u>data sunt, perdere dignus erit</u>. For <u>oscula iungere</u> cf.
<u>Ep</u>. 2.94.

61-2. 'Those kisses can have been taught nowhere but in bed -
so some teacher is being handsomely paid.' The gravity

of Ovid's new suspicion (the misdemeanour he has witnessed
is minor in comparison) is effectively destroyed by the
witticism.

62. _pretium_: the word neatly suggests both 'payment' for
professional services and 'reward' in a broader sense
(cf. 1. 34n.).   Lenz's notion that Ovid deliberately
arranged line 62 so as to have _nescioquis_ ... _magister_
'embracing' _pretium grande_ within the sentence itself
is very attractive, but perhaps a little too fanciful;
the case for something of this kind seems stronger at
_Am_. ii. 10. 8 (see n. _ad loc_.).

nescioquis ... _magister_: by the end of the poem Ovid
has managed to erase from his mind the image of a rival
amator with whom he has actually come face to face (see
13-28 above), and replace it with the rather less dis-
turbing one of an unidentifiable competitor whose ex-
istence he merely suspects as a result of his mistress's
new style of kiss (see introduction above pp. 228-9).

For _magister_ cf. _Ars_ ii. 744 _inscribat spoliis NASO
MAGISTER ERAT_, iii. 812.

VI

[J. Esteve-Forriol, <u>Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der</u>
<u>römischen Literatur versucht nach ihre Topik und ihrem Motiv-</u>
<u>schatz</u> (Diss. Munich 1962); Frécaut 343-5; G. Herrlinger,
<u>Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung</u> (Stuttgart 1930);
R. Kassel, <u>Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen</u>
<u>Konsolationsliteratur</u>, Zetemata 18 (Munich 1958); R.
Lattimore, <u>Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs</u> (Urbana 1962) =
<u>Illinois Studies in Language and Literature</u> 28 (1942), 1-2;
Nisbet-Hubbard's introduction to Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i.24; Sabot
268-74; E. Thomas, 'A comparative analysis of Ovid, <u>Amores</u>
ii. 6 and iii. 9', <u>Latomus</u> 24 (1965), 599-609]

A funeral elegy for Corinna's pet parrot. First Ovid
announces the bird's death and summons the appropriate mourners
to his funeral (1-16); then he praises the parrot's outstanding
virtue, lamenting the uselessness of it as a protection against
death (17-24), and protesting at the apparent injustice of the
excellent creature's premature demise whilst other less worthy
birds live on (25-42); next comes an account of the parrot's
decline and death (43-8), followed by a vision of his happy
after-life in Elysium (49-58), and finally a description of
his grave (59-62).

Ovid's poem is unmistakably affiliated to the ancient
tradition of epitaphs for dead animals[1]. There are a few
Hellenistic specimens among the pieces of this kind collected
in the Greek Anthology[2], but by far the most notable antecedent
for Ovid was Catullus's famous poem on the death of Lesbia's
sparrow[3]. Ovid's manner of treatment, however, owes nothing
to Catullus: what we have here is a full-scale funeral dirge

---

1. See Herrlinger <u>op. cit.</u>

2. <u>AP</u> vii. 189-92, 194, 197-216. Cf. <u>CLE</u> 1174-6, 1512.

3. Catul. 3.

or ἐπικήδειον. The lament for the dead has a long literary history in antiquity[4], but by the Augustan period it had become well established as a 'set-piece' with a battery of stock themes, which are easily identified in this elegy: üocatio to the mourners (1-16), laudatio/lamentatio funebris (17-24) with a σχετλιασμός against the apparent injustice of the powers that be (25-42), descriptio morbi et mortis (43-8), consolatio (49-58), descriptio tumuli (59-62). The result of Ovid's use of this formal schema as the framework for a poem on the traditional subject of the death of a pet is a superbly witty and whimsical parody of the conventional epicedion, with every standard theme brilliantly adapted and every standard technique of elaboration suitably employed.[5]

---

4. See Nisbet-Hubbard loc. cit., and for exhaustive treatment, Esteve-Forriol op. cit.

5. Cf. Am. iii. 9, a dirge for Tibullus (with the analysis of Thomas loc. cit.) and see further Nisbet-Hubbard loc. cit. The themes and techniques employed in both Ovid's epicedia correspond very closely with those which the late Greek rhetoricians recommend for use in one of the elementary school exercises known as progymnasmata (see e.g. Theon 227ff. (Spengel), and it is tempting to conclude (as many have done with no hesitation) that Ovid's treatment here (and elsewhere) is heavily indebted to his own practice of such exercises in his youth. A balanced look at the evidence, however, tends to suggest that such an assumption is not entirely justified; see general introduction pp. 11-14.

But why should Ovid have included such a piece in a collection of love poems? Lenz suggests that the answer is to be found in an allegorical interpretation of the elegy: the parrot, Corinna's pet, stands for Ovid himself, and the parrot's farewell to her (<u>Corinna, uale</u>, 48) is meant to prefigure Ovid's own farewell to elegy at <u>Am.</u> iii. 15. 19[6]. I find this totally unjustified and quite absurd. It seems much more likely that Ovid specifically intended the appearance of this poem to surprise and intrigue his contemporary readers. For most of them, we may be sure, would be well acquainted with Catullus's successful attempt to turn the animal epitaph into a love poem, and with Ovid's initial announcement, <u>Psittacus</u> ... / <u>occidit</u> (1-2), would have confidently expected something of the same kind from him, their hopes rising when he reveals that the parrot is his sweetheart's pet (19); 'What fun', then, and 'how original', Ovid will have thought, 'to give them what they do <u>not</u> expect: an <u>epicedion</u> for a parrot - no more and no less!'

There will always be those who will point to this elegy as evidence of Ovid's prodigality of talent and general dilettantism[7], but this is tantamount to saying that poetry designed to create amusement has no meaningful artistic intent, which

---

6. See the introduction to his edition 19 and, for an alternative, but equally unimpressive, allegorical interpretation, his note on 59f.; also D. Parker, <u>Arion</u> 7 (1969), 94-5.

7. E.g. P. Fargues, <u>RCC</u> 40 (1938), 150-51.

is something I would strongly challenge[8]; 1 feel sure that

Ovid looked upon his commitment to introduce the elements of

humour, surprise and incongruity to the Latin love elegy as

a serious and novel literary undertaking.   And certainly

to have managed in this poem to sustain an entertaining note

of inoffensive[9] burlesque, when it would have been only too

easy to slip into pure farce or ludicrous pomposity[10], is

no mean achievement[11].

---

8.   Cf. F. Arnaldi, 'Il mondo poetico di Ovidio', Stud. Rom. 6 (1958), 389-406, Büchner, Studien VIII, 185.

9. Some scholars seem to fear that this mock epicedion may be thought to detract from the effectiveness of Am. iii. 9, the lament for Tibullus which follows the same formal pattern (see e.g. Frécaut loc. cit., Sabot, loc. cit.), but this is surely not the case at all, for it is not Tibullus or the lament for him which is the object of parody, but the form epicedion itself.   We may laugh at the parody without scoffing at the 'straight' piece.

10.   A pitfall conspicuously not avoided by Statius in his lament for the parrot of Atedius Melior (Silv. ii. 4), which was clearly inspired by the present poem.

11. Thomas Gray's elegy On a favourite cat drowned in a tub of goldfishes provides a splendid modern example of a successful variation on much the same theme.

1-16. The bidding; cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 9. 1-16 and see introduction
above p. 279.

1. One may reasonably wonder whether the accumulation of
<u>s</u>'s and 'double' consonants (i.e. <u>ps</u>, <u>x</u>) in this line
is entirely fortuitous (as it frequently seems to be
elsewhere; cf. 8 below, (5 <u>s</u>'s + 1 <u>x</u>), Am. ii. 2. 18,
4. 15 (7 <u>s</u>'s), 7. 15, 8.2, 24, 9 (<u>A</u>).   18 (6 <u>s</u>'s)).
For we know that the ancients were well aware of the
value of onomatopoeia (see D.H. <u>Comp</u>. 20) and we are
told that an accumulation of <u>s</u>'s and 'double' consonants
which include an <u>s</u> (i.e. <u>ps</u>, <u>x</u>) make a most disagreeable
sound (D.H. <u>Comp</u>. 14. 80-82 τὸ σ καὶ πλεονᾶσαν σφόδρα
λυπεῖ ... τὸ μὲν γὰρ ζ διὰ τοῦ κ καὶ τὸ φ διὰ τοῦ π
τὸν συριγμὸν ἀποδίδωσι;   see Rhys Roberts <u>ad loc</u>.,
Marouzeau, <u>Traité de stylistique</u> 28).   We gather too
that the sound produced was considered to be more like
that of an animal than a human being (D.H. <u>Comp</u>. 14.80
θηριώδους·γὰρ καὶ ἀλόγου μᾶλλον ἢ λογικῆς ἐφάπτεσθαι
δοκεῖ φωνῆς ὁ συριγμός).   It is, then, perhaps not too
fanciful to imagine that the sound of this line may be
intended to suggest the squawking and jabbering tones
of a parrot.   But cf. 7. 10n.

<u>psittacus</u>: the parrot was well known in antiquity both
for its striking plumage and for its talent for mimicry;
see Plin. <u>Nat</u>. x. 117, Apul. <u>Fl</u>. 12, Ael. <u>NA</u> xiii. 18,
Crin. <u>AP</u> ix.562. 1 (for further detail see D'A.W.
Thompson, <u>A Glossary of Greek Birds</u> (Oxford 1895, 2nd
edn. 1936), s.v. ψιττακός).

<u>Eois imitatrix ales ab Indis</u>: the hand of the interpolator
is clearly discernible in the corrupt versions of the text
transmitted by most of the <u>recc.</u> A participle with <u>ales</u>
was obviously thought necessary to introduce <u>ab Indis</u>,
and the casualty of efforts to supply one was, not sur-
prisingly, the uncommon <u>imitatrix</u> (see n. below). The
preposition <u>ab</u>, however, indicates not the place from
which the parrot has travelled, but its ultimate place of
origin, and with this usage the omission of the participle
<u>ortus</u> (<u>uel sim.</u>) is regular; cf. Verg. <u>G</u>. iii. 1-2
<u>et te memorande canemus / pastor ab Amphryso</u>, Prop. iv.
6. 37-8 '<u>o Longa mundi seruator ab Alba / Auguste</u>' (see
further <u>OLD</u> s.v. <u>ab</u>, 17).

Statius's description of the parrot at <u>Silv.</u> ii.
4. 25 <u>plagae ... regnator Eoae</u> obviously has Ovid's words
very much in mind.

<u>Eois ... ab Indis</u>: India is regularly cited by ancient
authors as the parrot's place of origin (e.g. Plin.
<u>Nat.</u> x. 117 <u>India hanc auem mittit</u>; cf. Apul. <u>Fl</u>. 12,
<u>PLM</u> (ed. Baehrens) iv. 91. 1). Its plumage is generally
said to be green (see 21n. below, Stat. <u>Silv.</u> ii. 4.25),
and both Pliny and Apuleius mention a scarlet band around
its neck. The species of parrot which answers to this
description is the ring-necked parrakeet, which even today
is a popular pet and has the widest geographical range
of all parrots, being found in Africa, Burma, Sri Lanka
and, indeed, India (see J.M. Forshaw, <u>Parrots of the World</u>
(Melbourne 1969), s.v. <u>palaeornis torquatus</u>). But the

precise location of the parrot's place of origin was
almost certainly of no importance at all; the bird's
attraction was simply that it came from some remote eastern
land (note Pliny's observation (Nat. x. 118) that the
magpie does not enjoy such popularity quia non ex longinquo
uenit).   India was one of the furthest places east
known to the Romans and its name appears to have had an
attractively exotic ring (cf. Catul. 11. 2, Hor. Ep. i.
1. 45, 6. 6) reinforced here by the epithet Eois, which
properly means 'of the morning', and was doubtless thought
to have much the same evocative quality as we might
associate with phrases such as 'land of the rising sun'
(cf. Ars iii. 537, Verg. G. ii. 115 and see further
OLD s.v. 2).   The geography of the Latin poets was in any
case notoriously vague, and eastern places in particular
seem to have been cited largely for their romantic associations
with little attention to accuracy (see K.F. Smith on Tib.
i. 3. 7, Fordyce on Catul. 11. 5 and cf. 21n. below).

imitatrix: for imitari etc. used of birds cf. Stat. Silv.
ii. 4.2 humanae sollers imitator psittace linguae, Plin.
Nat. x. 120 turdum ... imitantem sermones hominum).   The
feminine noun imitatrix is most uncommon;   it is attested
on only four other occasions in classical Latin (Cic.
Inv. i. 2. 3, Leg. i. 17. 47, Tusc. iii. 2. 4, (all metaphorical
usages), Plin. Nat. x. 68).   Consideration of sound may
have been partly responsible for Ovid's opting for it here
in preference to imitator (see above), but the Latin words
for bird (auis, uolucer, ales) are generally treated as

feminine, and this alone could account for Ovid's choice

of the rarer feminine form of the noun.   The parrot

in this poem subsequently appears to be masculine (see

lines 19, 25-6, 29), but clearly no-one would wish to

censure Ovid for his inconsistency - I suspect that there

is many a male parrot called Polly alive today!

Talking birds obviously held the same kind of fascination

for some people in antiquity as they do in our own time

(for others besides the parrot see Plin. Nat. x. 118 (mag-

pie;   cf. Pers. Prol. 9, Mart. xiv. 76), 120 (thrush, starling,

nightingale), 121 (raven), 124 (crow; cf. Mart. xiv. 74),

and they were popular pets for this reason (see G. Jennison,

Animals for Show and Pleasure in Ancient Rome (Manchester

1937), 116-21 (for the parrot, 120-21), J.P.V.D. Balsdon,

Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome (London 1969), 151-2).

The method of teaching parrots to talk is described by

Pliny (Nat. x. 117) and Apuleius (Fl. 12).

2. occidit: the postponement of the verb to the beginning

of the pentameter holds the reader in suspense for a

second as to what precisely is to be the parrot's role

in the poem (for a similarly effective use of enjambement

between hexameter and pentameter cf. Am. ii. 2. 64, and

see D'Elia 95, n. 44).

exsequias ite ..., aues: 'come to the funeral, you birds.'

For exsequias ire cf. Ter. Ph. 1026 exsequias Chremeti

quibus est commodum ire, Sil. xv. 394-5 uos ite superbae /

exsequias animae (Heinsius rightly dismisses the variant exsequias ferte as 'minus Latinum').

The savour of parody is already strong in Ovid's bidding (see introduction above p. 279), and yet the idea of formal obsequies for a bird may not have been quite as fantastic as we would imagine: Pliny (Nat. x. 122-3) tells us that a talking raven was given a public funeral in A.D. 36 (funusque aliti innumeris celebratum exsequiis, constratum lectum super Aethiopum duorum umeros praecedente tibicine et coronis omnium generum ad rogum usque ...); as far as we know, however, there were no feathered mourners present on this occasion!

frequenter: here, 'in great numbers' (cf. Liv. xxii. 61. 14 obuiam itum frequenter ab omnibus ordinibus), but more commonly the equivalent of saepe (cf. 28 below and see ThLL 6. 1302. 50-63).

2-3. ite ... / ite: see 59n. below.

3. piae uolucres: pietas is the quality which prompts the rendering of due service and devotion to family, friends, gods or country (see Cic. Fam. i. 9. 1, H. Fugier, Recherches sur l'expression du sacré dans la langue latine (Paris 1963), 381-91, L.P. Wilkinson, The Roman Experience (London 1975), 30). It is the quality which motivates virtually all the actions of Vergil's Aeneas (see W.A. Camps, Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid (Oxford 1969), 24-5, Pease on A. iv. 382, 393), and the quality which Catullus

feels he has shown both in his relationship with Lesbia
(76. 2, 26) and with his men friends (73.2). Above
all it is a human quality (cf. Am. iii. 9. 37), which
Ovid here boldly transfers to the animal world: dutiful
birds, like dutiful men, should observe the requisite
ritual and show the requisite respect for their dead
friend (cf. 51n. below).

3-5. Beating the breast, scratching the face and tearing the
hair were conventional signs of mourning or profound grief
in antiquity (cf. Am. iii. 6. 48, 57-8, Ep. 5. 71-2,
11. 91-2, Tib. i. 1. 67-8, Stat. Silv. ii. 1. 169-73,
E. Alc. 215, El. 184; for other gestures of mourning
see Verg. A. x. 844, xii. 611 and further RE 6. 2. 2231).
The first of these Ovid simply adapts to suit his feathered
addressees, pinnis replacing palmis, manibus (uel sim.);
cf. Am. iii. 9. 10 pectoraque infesta tundat aperta manu,
CLE 398, 8 ad cineres plangit sua pectora palmis (Statius
avoids the issue at Silv. ii. 4. 17-19: plangat ... ales /
... / sturnus). With the second he makes no attempt
at adaptation but retains the stereotyped phraseology
teneras ungue notate genas (cf. Am. i. 7. 50 and see
Zingerle I. 96) to produce a deliberate absurdity:
unguis, certainly, may mean 'claw' as well as 'nail', but
by no stretch of the imagination could birds be said to
have tenerae genae! And in the case of the third sign
of human mourning, Ovid explicitly mentions the need for
adaptation when it is transferred to the avian sphere:
the birds are to tear their feathers instead of their

hair (pro maestis lanietur pluma capillis; cf. Am. iii. 6. 71). See further Thomas, art. cit. 602.

3. plangite pectora pinnis: the strong alliteration is almost certainly intended to represent the sound of blows; cf. Hor. Carm. i. 4. 13 pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas, and see Pease on Verg. A. iv. 589-90.

4. rigido teneras: for the juxtaposition of opposing terms see l. 22n.

5. maestis ... capillis: Burman was much troubled by the transferred epithet ('Sed qua figura hic capilli moesti dici possint, uix uideo'), but it is easily paralleled; cf. Fast. iv. 854 maestas Acca soluta comas, Am. i. 6. 67 non laetis detracta corona capillis.

6. For birdsong replacing funeral music cf. CLE 1549. 21-3 semper et Alcyone flebit te uoce suprema / et tristis mecum resonabit carmen et Echo /Oebaliusque dabit mecum tibi murmura cycnus, Stat. Silv. ii. 4. 23 hoc cunctae (aues) miserandum addiscite carmen. Heinsius's proposal to replace uestra with rostra (from nostra; see apparatus) illustrates again (cf. 2. 22, 4. 23-4nn.) his tendency to assume that what he thought Ovid ought to have written in any given circumstances was what in fact he wrote.

longa ... tuba: a trumpet type of instrument used in

both military and religious contexts (see RE VA. 750-51, Daremberg and Saglio V. 526-8). For the tuba at funerals cf. Prop. ii. 7. 12, 13 (B). 20, Verg. A. xi. 192 (with Servius's note), Hor. S. i. 6. 43-4, Tac. Ann. xiv. 10.

7-10. According to Greek myth, Philomela, the sister of Procne, was raped by Procne's husband, Tereus, who then cut out her tongue to prevent her telling of the outrage. She managed, however, through pictures woven into a tapestry, to convey to her sister what had happened. Thereupon Procne killed Itys, the son of Tereus and herself, served up his flesh for his father to eat and then fled with her sister. Tereus pursued them, but was foiled as Procne was changed into a nightingale and Philomela into a swallow, whilst he himself was turned into a hoopoe (see Apollod. iii. 14-15, Anon, AP ix. 451, Ovid Met. vi. 424-674, and for full discussion, Roscher, Lexicon III. 570-72, J.R.T.Pollard, Birds in Greek Life and Myth (London 1977), 164-5). The Roman poets generally tend to regard Procne as the swallow and Philomela as the nightingale (e.g. Fast. ii. 853ff., Verg. G. iv. 15), and some versions of the myth make Philomela the wife of Tereus and Procne the ravished sister (e.g. Verg. Ecl. 6. 81, G. iv. 511-15, and see Frazer's note on Apollod. loc. cit.). Ovid here seems to have this alternative tradition in mind and in his reference to Philomela's complaint (cf. Am. ii. 14. 30, iii. 12, 32, Mart. xiv. 75, Stat. Silv. ii. 4. 21) he is without doubt thinking of the song of the nightingale, which had been associated with lamentation from the time of Homer onwards (see e.g. Od. xix. 518ff., where the reference is to a different myth from that in question here, though one similar in some

details; cf. Fordyce on Catul. 65. 13). It is, of course, particularly appropriate that Philomela, herself now a bird, should be called upon to abandon her accustomed dirge in favour of a lament for a fellow bird.

7. **quod ... quereris**: 'As to your lamenting'; for the construction cf. *Rem.* 783-4 <u>nam sibi quod numquam tactam Briseida iurat / per sceptrum, sceptrum non putat esse deos</u>. *Quod* = 'as to' or 'as to the fact that' is basically a colloquial usage found mainly in comedy and Cicero's letters, but also well attested in the stylistic prose of Caesar (see Kühner-Stegmann II. ii. 277-8); Ovid is the only one of the elegists to use it. Here, as very often, a demonstrative in the main clause (<u>ista</u> (<u>querela</u>), 8) loosely refers back to the <u>quod</u> clause; cf. Cic. <u>Att.</u> xii. 30. 1 <u>quod Silius te cum Clodio loqui uult, potes id mea uoluntate facere</u>, Ter. <u>Hec.</u> 581. *Quid* ('why?'), <u>lectio facilior</u> here, will have seemed a simple and obvious emendation to any scribe who did not understand the usage of <u>quod</u>; it may thus have been made in <u>Y</u> independently of the β branch of the MS tradition, though contamination cannot be ruled out.

<u>Ismarii</u> ... <u>tyranni</u>: i.e. Tereus (see 7-10n. above). <u>Ismarius</u> is an adjective derived from Ismarus (or Ismara), the name of a mountain in Thrace, and is often used by the Latin poets for 'Thracian'; cf. <u>Am.</u> iii. 9. 21, Prop. ii. 13 (<u>A</u>). 6, Stat. <u>Silv.</u> v. 3. 6.

8. The general sense of this rather difficult line is
reasonably clear: Philomela's lament for Itys has
'had its time' (cf. 10 below _magna sed antiqua est causa_
doloris Itys); but the text from which this sense is to
be extracted is somewhat uncertain.

It seems best to read _annis ... suis_ with ω (as
most editors do) and construe 'that complaint has been
satisfied with its due allotment of years', i.e. it has
been given as much expression as is due to it; for the
sense of _annis ... suis_ cf. _Am._ ii. 2. 46. _ante suos annos_
occidit, _Ars_ iii. 18, and for that of _explere_, _Tr._ iv. 3. 38
expletur lacrimis egeriturque dolor, _Liv._ iv. 32. 12
factis simul dictisque odium explet (further examples of
this usage at _ThLL_ 5. ii. 1717. 59ff. and _OLD_ s.v. 3b).
Explere querelam annis (as opposed to _dictis_, _lacrimis_
(_uel sim._)) is possibly slightly bold, but it is perfectly
intelligible. PSYς's _animis_ looks like a simple palaeo-
graphical error (confusion between _annus_ and _animus_ occurs
in the MSS also at _Am._ i. 9. 5 and _Ars_ i. 191-2 (see
A. Ker, _Ovidiana_ 224)), and once it had crept in, _suis_
might easily have been deliberately altered to _tuis_ in
an attempt to restore some kind of sense (_animis ... tuis_
could be taken to mean 'by your zeal').

A few editors adopt _annis ... tuis_, 'by your years',
which would be acceptable enough if it could mean 'by
the years which you (Philomela) have already given to it'
(i.e. the _querela_), and that indeed seems to be the inter-
pretation of those editors who favour this reading ('Avec

les années, tu dois être lasse de gémir' (Bornecque);
'Il tuo lamentoso dolore s'è sfogato in tanti anni'
(Munari); 'Genug klagst du nun Jahr über Jahr' (Harder-
Marg)). But annis ... tuis must be rejected, since its
normal meaning is in fact either 'by your age' (cf.
Luc. viii. 496 non impune tuos Magnus contempserit annos,
Pont. ii. 2. 71 praeterit ipse suos animo Germanicus annos),
which obviously will not do here, or 'by your allotted
span of years'(see the discussion of annis ... suis above),
which is no better - though it seems to suit Lenz ('Aber
genug der Klage in den dir zugemessenen Jahren').

It should perhaps be added that Bentley's conjecture
numeris, suggested by line 40 below, implentur numeris
deteriora suis, fails to impress, and not least because
it seems a priori unlikely that Ovid would have used
virtually the same expression - and rather an abstruse
one at that (see 39-40n. below) - twice within such a
short space.

9. alitis in rarae miserum ... funus: for the tmesis see
Platnauer 103. The phrase alitis ... rarae obviously may
be taken in its literal sense 'a rare bird', but it also
brings to mind the proverbial rara auis, 'a marvel';
cf. Pers. 1. 46, Juv. 6. 165 and see Otto, Sprichwörter 51-2.

deuertere: Heinsius's correction to second person singular
imperative is essential: 'ad Philomelam enim sermo est.
quod ex uersu proxime sequenti satis apparet.' For the
'middle' use of deuertor cf. Ars ii. 425 docta, quid ad

medicas, Erato, deuerteris artes? <u>Met</u>. ix. 62, <u>Pont</u>. iv.
14. 21.   <u>Deuertere</u> ('to turn aside') is quite distinct in
meaning from <u>diuertere</u> ('to go in a different direction'),
but confusion between the two, such as is exhibited by the
MSS here, is quite common.

<u>funus</u>: see 10. 37n.

11. <u>quae liquido libratis in aere cursus</u>: an elaborate peri-
phrasis for <u>aues</u>. Its grandiloquent ring (see nn. below)
is amusingly incongruous in the context; ·Lee's 'all
feathered aeronauts' captures the tone very well.

<u>libratis ... cursus</u>: cf. Sen. <u>Oed</u>. 899-900 <u>medium senex</u> /
<u>Daedalus librans iter</u>.   <u>Librare</u>, properly 'to balance',
is often used in descriptions of flight, especially in
the 'higher' genres of Latin poetry (see e.g. <u>Met</u>. viii.
201-2 <u>geminas opifex librauit in alas / ipse suum corpus</u>,
Sil. xv. 425-6 <u>aurata puerum rapiebat ad aethera penna</u> /
<u>per nubes aquila, intexto librata uolatu</u>. The variant
<u>uibratis</u> is probably a genuine error resulting from the
visual similarity between it and <u>libratis</u>, but the hand
of the interpolator is clearly detectable in <u>pennas</u> which
which replaces <u>cursus</u> in some MSS (<u>Y</u> shows evidence of
contamination here).

<u>liquido ... in aere</u>: <u>liquidus</u> is a stock epithet of <u>aer</u>
(<u>uel. sim.</u>) and used as such chiefly in elevated poetry;

see e.g. Lucr. v. 500 <u>liquidissimus aether</u>, Verg. <u>A</u>. vii.
65 (<u>apes</u>) ... <u>liquidum trans aethera uectae</u> (and further
<u>OLD</u> s.v. 2c, <u>ThLL</u> 7. 1485, 20ff.).

12. <u>alios</u>: in terms of strict grammatical logic, the variant
<u>alias</u> should be right here after <u>omnes quae</u> in the previous
line, but it is probably correct to read <u>alios</u> with <u>PSY</u>ς,
understanding <u>amicos</u> from the vocative <u>amice</u> which follows.

<u>turtur amice</u>: for the turtle dove in antiquity see
Thompson, <u>Glossary</u> s.v. τρυγών. The mutual attachment
of the parrot and the turtle dove is well attested in
ancient authors as one of the standard friendships in
the animal kingdom: see e.g. <u>Ep. Sapph</u>. 38, Plin.
<u>Nat</u>. x. 207. Thompson (<u>loc. cit.</u>) suggests that the
concept of it may owe something to the practice of keeping
parrots and turtle doves together in aviaries.

13-16. Praise of the deceased's capacity for friendship features
in serious Latin sepulchral inscriptions (see e.g. <u>CLE</u>
477. 8 <u>unus amicus erat tantum mihi qui praestitit omnia
semper honeste</u>), reflecting the high regard in which
friendship was held by the Romans and its importance in
their social relations (see Williams, <u>Tradition and Origin-
ality</u> 408, Wilkinson, <u>Roman Experience</u> 32-3). Ovid's
lavish praise of the dead parrot for the self-same quality
thus wittily satirizes a solemn Roman ideal (cf. Stat.
<u>Silv</u>. ii. 4. 30).

14. <u>fides</u>: virtually a technical term in the language of
    <u>amicitia</u> indicating the basic loyalty between two people
    which was an essential ingredient in any Roman friendship
    (see R. Reitzenstein, <u>SHA,Phil-Hist. Kl</u>. 3 (1912), 12.
    Abh.18-19, L. Alfonsi, <u>Aevum</u> 19 (1945), 374-5).

15. <u>iuuenis Phoceus</u>: Pylades, the son of the king of Phocis.
    The bond between Pylades and Orestes (see A. <u>Ch</u>. 560-63,
    S. <u>El</u>. 16-17, E. <u>El</u>. 82-7, <u>Or</u>. 725-33, 794-806)
    became proverbial for friendship of the deepest kind; see
    <u>Tr</u>. iv. 4. 71 <u>et comes exemplum ueri Phoceus amoris</u>, Cic.
    <u>Fin</u>. ii. 26. 84 <u>Pyladea amicitia</u> and further Otto, <u>Sprich-
    wörter</u> 258, Brandt 103. The use of the lofty <u>exemplum</u>
    in a trivial context is one of Ovid's favourite sources
    of humour (see Frécaut 59ff.).

    <u>Orestae</u>: very probably this is the correct spelling;
    see Heinsius on <u>Ep</u>. 8. 9 and Housman, <u>JPh</u> (1910), 251-3
    (= <u>Classical Papers</u> 827-9).

    <u>forma</u>: see 4. 9n.

16. <u>dum licuit</u>: a reference to the rule of Fate (or the Fates)
    over human life with the power to cut it short at any moment
    (cf. Tib. i. 1. 69 <u>interea, dum fata sinunt, iungamus amores</u>).
    The sentiment frequently appears in Latin sepulchral
    inscriptions; for examples see Lattimore, <u>op. cit</u>. 156-8.

    <u>psittace</u>: for the pathetic address to the deceased cf. <u>Am</u>.
    iii. 9. 41 <u>sacer uates</u>, 66 <u>culte Tibulle</u>, Stat. <u>Silv</u>. ii.
    1. 37, 4. 1, <u>CLE</u> 606.1.

17-42. <u>Lamentatio</u> / <u>laudatio funebris</u>; cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 9. 17-46, and

see introduction above p. 279 , Thomas, <u>art. cit</u>. 601, 603-4.

Eulogy of the dead was a regular feature of the literature

of consolation and lamentation in ancient times (cf. Sen. <u>Dial</u>.

vi. 1. 24 (<u>ad Marciam</u>), Stat. <u>Silv</u>. ii. 1. 41-55, 106-36).

Ovid here dwells in turn on moral qualities (loyalty 17,

gentleness 25-6, frugality 29-32), physical beauty (stated

simply in 17, then elaborated in 21-2), and special talent

(18, 23-4).   Praise of moral qualities and special talents

is frequently found in sepulchral inscriptions; for the

former see e.g. <u>CLE</u> 81. 1-2 <u>o quanta pietas fuerat in hac</u>

<u>adulescentia</u> / <u>fides, amor, sensus, pudor et sanctitas</u> (cf.

158. 2, 237, 843) and for the latter, <u>CLE</u> 1302. 1-2 <u>docta</u>

<u>lyra, grata et gestu, formosa puella/hic iacet)</u>. Cf. Theon 227-8

(Spengel), but see introduction above p. 279, n. 5.

17-19. <u>quid</u> ... <u>iuuat?</u> for the complaint that virtue or distinction

is no proof against untimely death cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 9. 33-40,

Prop. iii. 18. 11-12, iv. 11. 11-12, Hor. <u>Carm</u>. iv. 7.

23-4, <u>IG</u> IX. ii. 367.   Ovid here is surely parodying the

commonplace in general rather than any particular author's

use of it (but see Thomas, <u>art. cit</u>. 605).

17. <u>fides</u>: see 14n. above.

18. <u>mutandis ingeniosa sonis</u>:   'talented in producing a variety

of sounds.'   The range of the parrot's voice rather than

his gift for mimicry is indicated here.   For <u>mutare</u> +

plural object = 'to change constantly from one thing to

another' cf. Sil. vii. 673 <u>mutantem saltu ramos</u> and see

further <u>OLD</u> s.v. 6.   The most common construction with

ingeniosus is ad + accusative (e.g. Met. xi. 313 furtum
ingeniosus ad omne; see further ThLL 7.1521.23ff.) but
in + accusative and in + ablative are also attested (see
e.g. Sen. Dial. xii. 19. 6 in contumelias praefectorum
ingeniosa prouincia, Plin. Nat. xiv. 150 quanto ... in
potu ingeniosior fuerit (homo)); here the gerundive
mutandis ... sonis is probably dative; cf. Am. i. 11. 4
Nape ... utilis et dandis ingeniosa sonis. For adjectives
in -osus see 4. 1n.

19. ut datus es: 'as soon as you were given.' For ut =
simulac see Kühner-Stegmann II. ii. 359-60, Hofmann-
Szantyr 635-6.

nostrae placuisse puellae: see introduction above p. 280.

20. infelix ... iaces: the wording, or a slight variation of
it, is common in sepulchral inscriptions: e.g. CLE
1205. 5 [hi]c iaceo infelix cinis, CIL 6. 35773 hic iacet
infelix Mamertinus (see further ThLL 7. 1362. 33ff.).
The formulaic iacere is frequently adopted by the poets;
see e.g. Am. iii. 9. 39, Tr. iii. 3. 73, Tib. i. 3. 55,
Prop. i. 7. 24, ii. 13 (B). 35.

auium gloria: a consciously grandiloquent, and thus
amusingly incongruous, phrase; cf. Am. iii. 15. 8 Paelignae
dicar gloria gentis ego, [Tib.] iii. 7. 208 pecoris ...
gloria taurus, Verg. A. vi. 767 Procas, Troianae gloria
gentis. Statius imitates Ovid closely at Silv. ii. 4.
24 occidit aeriae celeberrima gloria gentis.

21. <u>fragiles</u> ... <u>smaragdos</u>: some types of <u>smaragdi</u> (the term
covered a wide variety of green stones in antiquity; see
Plin. <u>Nat</u>. xxxvii. 65-75) may perhaps have been brittle
(<u>id. ib</u>. 72), but true emeralds are virtually the hardest
of all precious stones. Doubtless, though, Ovid knew
nothing of such things when he wrote <u>fragiles</u> ... <u>smaragdos</u>,
but simply thought 'delicate' emeralds an aesthetically
effective description (for the general tendency of most
Roman poets not to trouble themselves with scientific or
geographical accuracy in descriptive details see Kroll,
<u>Studien</u> Ch. 12 and cf. 1n. above). It is no doubt right
to see the variant <u>uirides</u> as a 'Verlegenheitsfüllwort'
(Lenz), introduced perhaps by a scribe unable to accept
Ovid's geological blunder or, as seems more likely, by
one who thought as Burman did: 'propter adiunctum ...
uerbum, <u>hebetare</u>, requiritur hic uox, quae colorem lucidum
notet'; the idea is mistaken, however, since the motion
of <u>lucidus color</u> is quite adequately conveyed by <u>smaragdos</u>
alone (cf. Plin. <u>Nat</u>. xxxvii. 96 <u>Indicos carbunculos
inclinatione hebetari scripsere</u> and see further <u>ThLL</u> 6.
2585. 42ff.).

    Certainty about the spelling of <u>smaragdus</u> is impossible,
but Goold (<u>Amat. Crit</u>. 11) persuades me that <u>sm-</u> is
perhaps more likely to be right than <u>zm-</u> (for the opposite
view, however, see Lachmann on Lucr. ii. 805). For the
shortening of the preceding <u>e</u> see Platnauer 62 and Bailey's
edition of Lucretius I. 126-7.

22. <u>tincta</u> ... <u>rubro Punica rostra croco</u>: a further indication

(cf. ln. above) that the bird which Ovid has in mind is a member of the parrakeet family, which is distinguished by the upper part of the beak being coloured red. Ovid's description of the parrot's beak as scarlet (Punica) tinged with orange (rubro ... croco; for the precise colour denoted by this phrase see André, Termes de couleur 154) lays very heavy emphasis on the reddish hue. (Lee's translation 'purple with saffron spots' seems a trifle garish!)

Punicus/-eus or Poenicus (for the form see André op. cit. 267) properly means 'Phoenician' or 'Carthaginian' and so comes to denote the reddish dye made from sea shells found in the Carthage area and for which Carthage was particularly renowned (see H. Blümner, Technologie der Gewerbe und Künste I (2nd edn., Leipzig and Berlin 1912) 233ff.). Propertius, like Ovid, thought the adjective apt in description of a bird's beak: see Prop. iii. 3. 31-2 columbae / tingunt Gorgoneo Punica rostra lacu. Unlike Kathleen Morgan (32), however, I do not see any attempt on Ovid's part to parody this particular line of Propertius here.

23. uocum simulantior: 'more imitative of (human) speech' - an apparently unique usage of the participle with this sense. The construction with the genitive is analogous to that which is regular with similis and dissimilis (see e.g. Cic. N.D. i. 28. 78 hominis similis (further Lewis and Short s.v.), Hor. S. i. 4. 112 'Scetani dissimilis

sis' (further OLD s.v.).   For the talking expertise of
parrots see ln. above.

24. blaeso: the adjective normally indicates an impediment
or imprecision in human speech (see e.g. Ars iii. 294,
Mart. v. 34. 8, Juv. 15. 48), but applied to the parrot's
utterances it signifies a remarkable articulateness!

25-32. A number of scholars have been dissatisfied with the order
of these lines as transmitted by the MSS and have suggested
various transpositions (see Munari's apparatus).   The
most persuasive is Markland's proposal (presented in his
note on Stat. Silv. ii. 4. 35) to take 27-8 after 32
on the grounds that the couplet in its traditional position
appears to intrude in the description of the parrot's
habits contained in 25-6 and 29-32.   The passage as it
stands, however, need not be seen in this light, but rather
as falling into two sections, 25-8 setting the parrot's
pacificism against the aggressive tendencies of quails
and 29-36 the parrot's abstemiousness against the greed
of vultures and other birds of prey (sic H. Magnus,
BPhW 19 (1899), 1019-20).   But Goold (Amat. Crit. 34)
still strongly supports Markland's suggested transposition.
He claims (i) that if the traditional order is retained,
'ecce is totally devoid of its usual function of marking
a break from the preceding';   (ii) that if 27-8 are placed
after 32, an arrangement of couplets in the order A^1 A^2 A^3
B^1 B^2 B^3 is perceptible in 25-36;   and he implies (iii)
that Ovid would not have tolerated two consecutive pentameter

endings in -or aquae (32 and 34). All these points, however, can be adequately countered.

(i) There is no reason why the use of ecce should indicate that the transition from the virtues of the parrot to the vices of other birds has been made once for all (as it is, of course, there is a return to the virtues of the parrot in 29), for the functions of this particle are many and various (see Hand, Tursellinus II. 344 'Nam ecce aut simpliciter monstrat rem apparentem, aut attentionem excitat et in rem considerandam dirigit, aut rem aliquam animo offert, quae subito ac repente comparuit, aut nouum quid et improuisum effert'). It seems to me that Ovid is using it here, as he often does, simply to register surprise or indignation that things are not as one would expect or as they ought to be; cf. Am. ii. 10. 4 n., iii. 7. 67, 9. 39.

(ii) 27-8 (B^1 in Goold's schema) might reasonably be thought to correspond with 25-6 (A^1) and 33-4 (B^2) with 29-30 (A^2), but 35-6 (B^3) certainly do not correspond with 31-2 (A^3). Furthermore the desirability of creating a 'sequence' (Goold) coturnices ... uiuunt / uiuit ... uultur etc. / uiuit et ... cornix is itself questionable, since the meaning of uiuere is different in 27 from what it is in 33 and 35: in the last two cases it means 'live' as opposed to 'die', and so constitutes a reference to the longevity of the vulture, crow etc., but in the first case it means simply 'pass life' with no reference to the length of time the quail lives, which is rather the subject

of the pentameter (see 28n. below).

(iii) Ovid was not particularly sensitive to the kind of verbal jingle to which Goold draws attention; cf. *Am.* ii. 2. 58 and 60 *uerba dabit* / ... *iste dabit* (and see D.R. Shackleton-Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge 1956), 9, 73).

25-42. σχετλιασμός: cf. *Am.* iii. 9. 17-20, 35-46 and see introduction above p. 279.

25. *inuidia*: envy or malice as the cause of death is a stock notion in ancient funeral literature of all kinds: in formal *epicedia* and *consolationes* (e.g. Stat. *Silv.* ii. 1. 121-2 *gremio puerum complexa fouebat* / *Inuidia*, 6. 68-9, Sen. *Dial.*vi.12. 6); in sepulchral epigram (e.g.Diod. *AP* vii 74. 3-4 ἤθελεν οὕτως/ ὁ φθόνος, Bianor *AP* vii. 387. 3, Erinn. *AP* vii. 712. 3) and in true epitaph (e.g. *CIE* 647. 2 *natos habere bonu est, si non sint inuida fata*; for further examples, both Greek and Latin, see Lattimore, *op. cit.* 148-9, 153-4).

26. *garrulus*: why does Ovid couple the parrot's talkativeness with his pacificism in enumerating his virtues? The answer, I think, is to be found in the poet's subsequent contrasting of the parrot with the quail, a bird well known for its noisy fights (see 27n. below). The point is that although the parrot made a lot of noise, it was in his case not a sign of aggression but merely harmless chatter.

27. *ecce*: see 25-32 above, 7. 17, 10. 4n.

coturnices inter sua proelia uiuunt: for the quail in
ancient times see Thompson, _Glossary_, s.v. ὄρτυξ.
Sua here because quails were notorious for their proclivity
to fighting; see Plin. _Nat_. xi. 268 _aliis in pugna uox,_
ut coturnicibus, aliis ante pugnam, Arist. _HA_ iv. 9. 536A
τὰ μὲν μαχόμενα φθέγγεται, οἷον ὄρτυξ (the variant _fera_
will have come from line 25 above). Quail fights were a
spectator sport in antiquity.

28. _fiant_: there is very little to choose between the indicative
given by _PY_ and the subjunctive given by most of the _recc._
Goold (_Amat. Crit_. 34) argues in favour of the indicative
fiunt (also accepted by Némethy) on the grounds that
forsitan strictly modifies _inde_ alone, while the verb
states not a possibility (which would legitimize the
subjunctive) but a fact, i.e. quails _do_ live to a ripe
old age, and their fighting tendencies _might_ be the reason
for this. But it seems very hard to me to divorce
forsitan inde from the verb in this way, and in any case
a few examples will demonstrate that Ovid's usage of
forsitan does not always observe the neat distinction of
indicative for fact and subjunctive for possibility: the
indicative is used where the sentiment expresses a
possibility at _Am_. i. 6. 45 _forsitan et tecum tua nunc_
requiescit amica and _Tr_. iii. 3. 25-6 _tu forsitan istic /_
iucundum nostri nescia tempus agis (cf. S.G. Owen on
_Tr_. ii. 20), and the subjunctive appears where the verb,
strictly speaking, states a fact at _Ep_. 7. 133 _forsitan et_

grauidam Dido, scelerate, relinquas (whether Dido is
pregnant is doubtful; that Aeneas is leaving her is cer-
tain). This last example, where the verb has been
attracted into the subjunctive by the general tone of
forsitan, has much similarity with our line and thus
suggests that it would be proper to retain the subjunctive
fiant. S's fient ('perhaps they will (live to a great
age)'), which Heinsius oddly thought to be 'proxime uerum',
gives virtually the same inappropriate sense as Goold
erroneously sees in fiant (i.e. 'perhaps they might ...');
it looks like an inept interpolation (cf. 4. 33, 5. 41nn.).

frequenter: see 2n. above.

anus: for anus of animals cf. Ars i. 766 cerua ... anus
(further ThLL 2. 200. 24ff.)

29. plenus eras minimo: Ovid attributes to the parrot what
was generally acknowledged as a human virtue, for, in
spite of the Romans reputation for gluttony, frugality in
diet seems to have been approved and practised by many
of them; see Plin. Ep. iii. 5. 10-11, 12. 1, Mart. x.
48, and in general, J. Carcopino, Daily Life in Ancient
Rome, transl. E.O. Lorimer (London 1941), 273ff.

nec prae sermonis amore: for the tmesis see Platnauer 97.
Prae here = 'because of'. It occurs most frequently with
causal meaning in negative contexts (i.e. giving the reason
'why not') and with nouns expressing some kind of emotion

(cf. Ter. _Eu._ 98 _prae amore_, _Hau._ 308 _prae gaudio_;
see further Kühner-Stegmann II. i. 513, Hofmann-Szantyr
533).   Along with other causal prepositions, _prae_ is
for some reason generally avoided by the writers of
elevated poetry;   only Ovid (here and at _Am._ ii. 9 (_B_).
38) and Lucretius (iv. 1167) admit it (see Axelson,
Unpoetische Wörter 81).

30. _poterant_: PY and a few _recc._ give _poteras_ (_ora uacare_)
which Heinsius accepted with the comment 'eleganti
Graecismo'.   It has been accepted by most subsequent
editors too, but Bornecque and Lee read _poterant_ with _S_
and some _recc._, Lee remarking (187) that '_poteras_ makes
ora a very peculiar accusative of respect'.   Peculiar it
certainly is, and especially, I feel, with the prepositional
phrase _in multos_ ... _cibos_ dependent upon it, but is it a
particularly sophisticated Graecism or a downright bar-
barism?   I suspect that only a Roman could tell us, and
I should not wish to be dogmatic about the matter, but,
though there is a great deal of evidence for the wide and
varied use of the Greek accusative of respect by Roman
writers (see G. Landgraf, _ALL_ 10 (1898), 209-24, Löf-
stedt, _Syntactica_ II. 421-2, Hofmann Szantyr 378ff.,
Kühner-Stegmann II. i. 285ff.), I have not been able to
find any parallels for _ora uacare_.   Thus, whilst I
hesitate to reject Heinsius's judgement, I would read
poterant here;   cf. _Met._ xv. 478 _ora uacent epulis._
Poteras, as Lee remarks, could have been prompted by _eras_
in the previous line.

31. <u>nux</u> ... <u>papauera</u>: not an unreasonable diet for the dead
bird, if a limited one: members of the parrot family
normally feed on vegetable matter. Again Ovid humorously
praises in the parrot a generally acclaimed human virtue
(cf. 29n. above) - adherence to a vegetarian diet; cf.
Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 31. 15 (with Nisbet-Hubbard's note), <u>S</u>.
i. 6. 114-15, <u>Ep</u>. i. 5. 2, <u>Epod</u>. 2. 54-7.

<u>causaeque papauera somni</u>: for the sporific properties of
the poppy cf. <u>Fast</u>. iv. 531-2, 547, Verg. G. i. 78, and see
Bömer's note on <u>Fast</u>. iv. 151.

32. <u>simplicis umor aquae</u>: an incongruously grandiloquent
periphrasis; cf. Lucr. i. 307, iii. 427. For the
humour of incongruity in Ovid see 5. 25-8, 35-42nn.

<u>edax uultur</u>: from time immemorial the vulture has typified
greed, presumably because of its love of carrion; see
Hom. <u>Il</u>. iv. 237, xxii. 42, <u>Od</u>. xxii. 30, and for the
expression cf. <u>Tr</u>. i. 6. 11 <u>aut ut edax uultur corpus</u>
<u>circumspicit</u>. For its figurative use of a greedy person
see Sen. <u>Ep</u>. 95. 43, Mart. vi. 62. 4.

33-4. <u>ducensque</u> ... / ... <u>aquae</u>: a compounding of error again
seems perceptible in the collection of variant readings
offered by the MSS (cf. 2. 30, 39nn.). For it looks
as if <u>ducensque</u> in 33 was first corrupted to <u>ducitque</u>,
perhaps inadvertently and probably at a fairly early stage
in the tradition (for the survival of truth in ς see 1. 17,
19nn.), but then, while the copyists of some MSS (PYω)

remained faithful to their exemplar in 34, others (S̲ς̲)

attempted to doctor the pentameter to suit the already

corrupt hexameter by introducing est. Garrulus for

graculus, which also appears in S̲ς̲, may, of course, have

come in accidentally from 26 above, but it could perhaps

represent an attempt to replace the reference to the jackdaw

(graculus) with one to the raven, more frequently thought

of (along with the crow) as the herald of rain (see e.g.

Hor. Carm. iii. 27. 10-11 imbrium diuina auis imminentum, /

... coruum); Heinsius at least considered a reference

to the raven not impossible and gave garrulus serious

consideration. For the jackdaw as the harbinger of rain,

however, see Arat. 963-6 δή ποτε καὶ γενεαὶ κοράκων καὶ

φῦλα κολοιῶν / ὕδατος ἐρχομένοιο Διὸς πάρα σῆμ' ἐγένοντο /

φαινόμενοι ἀγεληδὰ καὶ ἰρήκεσσιν ὁμοῖα / φθεγξάμενοι

(and further, Thompson, Glossary s.v. κολοιός).

34. miluus: the kite was renowned for its powerful flight

(ducens ... per aera gyros (33); cf. Mart. ix. 54. 10

rapax miluus ad astra uolat, Pers. 4. 26), but generally

disliked because of its predatory and thieving tendencies (see

Thgn. 1302 (West) ἰκτίνου σχέτλιον ἦθος, Pl. Phd. 82A,

Dionys. Av. i. 7). See further Thompson, Glossary

s.v. ἰκτῖνος, Otto, Sprichwörter 222-3.

auctor: for auctor = nuntius cf. Met. xi. 666-7 non haec

tibi nuntiat auctor / ambiguus, Prop. iv. 3. 32 lucis et

auctores non dare carmen auis.

35. <u>armiferae</u>: a stock epithet of Minerva in Ovid; cf. <u>Tr</u>.
iv. 10. 13 and see E. Paratore, <u>Ovidiana</u> 361.

<u>cornix inuisa Mineruae</u>: for the crow in antiquity
see Thompson, <u>Glossary</u> s.v. κορώνη. Two different
legends may account for Minerva's hatred of the crow:

(i) the story related by Ovid at <u>Met</u>. ii. 544ff.
in which the crow, once specially beloved of Pallas
Athene (Minerva), fell from favour through its over-
eagerness to tell her how her trust had been betrayed,
and was ousted by the owl; its <u>garrulitas</u> (unlike the
parrot's) was thus put to bad use (cf. Call. <u>Hec</u>. fr.
260 (Pfeiffer)).

(ii) the myth, oriental in origin, of a war between
the owls and the crows (the owl being sacred to Minerva);
see Thompson, <u>Glossary</u> s.v. γλαύξ, and for the
natural enmity of the owl and the crow, Arist. <u>HA</u> ix.
1. 609A.

36. <u>saeclis uix moritura nouem</u>: for the fabled longevity of
the crow cf. Hes. fr. 304 (Merkelbach-West) ἐννέα τοι
ζώει γενεᾶς λακέρυζα κορώνη, Cic. <u>Tusc</u>. i. 31. 77, Hor.
<u>Carm</u>. iv. 13. 24-5. See further Thompson, <u>Glossary</u> s.v.
κορώνη, Otto, <u>Sprichwörter</u> 93.

37-8. The couplet reiterates the sentiment of the opening line,
and, with a return to the third person after the long
passage of direct address (15ff.), concludes the variations

on the theme of contrast between the virtues of the parrot
and the vices of other birds.

37. _ille_: it is better to follow ς, taking _ille_ with _psittacus_
(38) and both _loquax_ ... _imago_ and _extremo_ ... _datum_
as appositional phrases: 'Dead is that famous parrot,
a talking replica of the human voice, a gift from the
furthermost part of the world.' _Illa_, the reading of
most of the MSS, may have come in accidentally from 36,
but it seems more likely that scribes thought that the
adjective should be feminine to agree with _imago_.

39-40. An extremely problematical couplet which, as far as I
can see, has never been satisfactorily explained. I fear
I have little, if anything, positive to contribute to
the elucidation of it, but perhaps some discussion of
the issues involved may be useful.

First consider the context. In lines 25-38 Ovid
complains that the excellent parrot is dead while other
birds of little virtue live on, and in 41-2 he draws our
attention to the fact that Protesilaus was survived by
Thersites and Hector by his brothers. In the light of
this, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that lines 39-40
will also deal with the tendency of death to take the good
first and spare the bad for longer, and thus when we read
in 39 (if the text offered by _PY_ is sound, and discrepancy
such as there is in the MSS gives no _prima facie_ reason
to doubt it), 'Greedy hands generally carry off the best
things first', we confidently expect 40 to say 'Inferior

things (deteriora) are spared for longer' or 'have a normal span of life'. But in fact, as Kenney has pointed out in a detailed discussion of this couplet (CQ n.s. 9 (1959), 240-41), it is no simple matter to extract this sense from the Latin, though many have tried to do so (Kenney gives examples of their efforts, justly rebuking Némethy in particular for his assertion (which seems to have impressed most subsequent editors and translators) that implentur numeris suis means 'implent numeros annorum suorum'; implent, as Kenney says, is not the same as implentur, and there is to my knowledge no evidence for numeri = numeri annorum suorum or anni sui (see 8n. above)).

Kenney himself, citing numerous parallels for numeri = 'parts' (of a whole) and impleri = 'to be equipped with', interprets 40 '"Inferior things are complete", i.e. remain untouched'. There is no doubt that the Latin will yield this sense, but for a proper contrast between the fate of optima and deteriora this interpretation of 40 would require in 39 a description of some process of gradual decay affecting 'the best things'; as it is, the text simply says that they are 'carried off by greedy hands', and there is nothing to suggest that when they are carried off they are not just as 'complete' (i.e. equipped with all their parts) as 'the inferior things' which are left behind.

It is perhaps worth pausing to establish that the 'greedy hands' in 39 are almost certainly those of death, since Kenney seems to doubt it. He points out, rightly

enough, that there is nothing in the Latin to indicate
that Ovid is specifically thinking of death here, but the
circumstantial evidence which suggests that he is doing
so seems to me to be overwhelming. The general rapacity
of Mors and its tendency to carry off the best are both
age-old notions well attested in literature and in in-
scriptions from the ancient world; see e.g. Am. iii. 9.
28 auidos ... rogos, Call. AP vii. 80. 5-6 ὁ πάντων /
ἁρπακτὴς 'Αΐδης and Am. iii. 9. 19 omne sacrum mors im-
portuna profanat, 35 cum rapiunt mala fata bonos, Catul.
3. 13-14 tenebrae / Orci quae omnia bella deuoratis (for
examples from Greek and Latin inscriptions see Lattimore,
op. cit. 146-7, 153-4). The 'hands' of Death are well
attested too; e.g. Am. iii. 9. 20 omnibus obscuras inicit
illa (i.e. Mors) manus, Tib. i. 3. 4 abstineas auidas Mors
modo nigra manus (the greedy hands of Death are here
explicitly mentioned). And the exempla in 41-2, as has
already been noted (see above p. 309) seem to presuppose
very strongly a reference to death in 39-40. Kenney
implies that, since Ovid's exempla are sometimes inapposite
(cf. 9 (A). 7-8n.), one need not set much store by the
implications of 41-2, but very often Ovidian exempla are
not inapposite, and we are at least entitled to consider the
evidence of 41-2 without prejudice. (Heinsius, Müller
(Philologus 11 (1856), 71) and Baehrens (on Catul. 3. 14)
attempted to supply by conjecture (see apparatus) the
explicit reference to Mors not present in the transmitted
text, but unnecessarily, I think, since it would seem
almost perverse to understand anything other than a comment

on the rapacity of death in line 39 as it stands.)

But to return now to line 40, will the text yield any sense which gives a more tolerable contrast with line 39 than that extracted by Kenney?   The only suggestion I can make is that _numeri_ might possibly mean 'numerical strength' or 'numbers' (cf. _Am_. iii. 9. 66 _auxisti numeros, culte Tibulle, pios_;   for examples of the singular _numerus_ with the same sense see _OLD_ s.v. 5).   Line 40 could then be construed (with _implentur_ taken in much the same sense as Kenney suggests) 'Inferior things have their full complement of numbers', i.e. their numbers are not depleted (whereas those of 'the best things' tend always to be at less than full strength because they are generally the first to be carried off by death).   This is not easy, and I am by no means entirely convinced that it is right, but it seems at least a suggestion worthy of consideration in circumstances where total satisfaction is so elusive.

41-2. For Ovid's use of _exempla_ from the realms of epic and tragedy for humorous effect cf. 15-16n. above.

41. _Phylacidae_: i.e. Protesilaus, so called after his home-town, Phylace, in Thessaly.   His tragic fate (_tristia ... funera_) is well known: he was the first of the Greeks to set foot on Trojan soil and was killed immediately on doing so (see Hom. _Il_. ii. 695-710).

Thersites: the notorious rabble-rouser in the Achaean ranks, and according to Homer(_Il_. ii. 216), αἴσχιστος of all the Greeks at Troy.

42. The celebrated death of Hector is related by Homer in

Book xxii of the Iliad.   For uiuis fratribus cf. Hom.

Il. xxiv.   243ff.   Ovid is probably thinking primarily

of Paris, the black sheep of Priam's family and one of

those who survived the excellent Hector.

cinis: reference to the remains after cremation regularly

describes the state of death in ancient literature;

see e.g. A. A. 434-43, Call. AP vii. 80. 3-4 (Lattimore,

op. cit. 172-3, 176, collects many further examples).

It is particularly common in Augustan poetry;   cf. Am.

iii. 9. 40, Prop. ii. 13 (B). 35-6, Hor. Carm. iv. 7.

14-16.

43-8. Descriptio morbi et mortis (cf. Am. iii. 9. 47-58 and see

introduction above p. 279).   Ovid humorously presents an

authentic death-bed scene (cf. Stat. Silv. ii. 1. 146-57,

and see Thomas, art. cit. 606-7) with prayers for the dying

from his nearest and dearest (43-4;   cf. the imagined

bedside vigil of Delia at Tib. i. 1. 59-60 and Ovid's own

prayers for the dangerously sick Corinna at Am. ii. 13.

7ff.), the final decline at the command of Fate (45-6), and

the parrot's dying words (47-8).   The pathos is heightened

by a return to direct address.

43. timidae: not 'timid', but 'fearful';   cf. Prop. iii. 8. 15

seu timidam crebro dementia somnia terrent.   Timida in

Ovid is virtually a stock epithet of puella;   see e.g.

<u>Am</u>. i. 7. 45, iii. 13. 23, <u>Rem</u>. 33.

<u>pia uota</u>: see 3n. above,<u>piae uolucres</u>.

44. <u>uota</u> ... <u>rapta Noto</u>: prayers or oaths are often said to be carried off by the winds when a writer wishes to point to their futility or invalidity (cf. 8. 20n. and see further Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 26. 2). <u>Notus</u> (see n. below) is the wind frequently mentioned in this context (cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 4. 12 and see Zingerle I. 40-41), but the specification is of no real consequence; it simply illustrates the tendency of the Augustan poets to introduce a proper name wherever possible after the manner of the Alexandrians.

<u>procelloso</u> ... <u>Noto</u>: <u>Notus</u> is often thought of as a particularly stormy south wind bringing gales and rain from November to March; see <u>RE</u> 17. 1117. For adjectives in -<u>osus</u> see 4.1n.

45. <u>septima lux</u>: the seventh day was regarded by the ancient medical writers as a critical one in the progress of an illness; see Hp. <u>Judic</u>. 58 (Littré) Ὁκόσοισιν ὑγιαίνουσιν ἐξαπίνης ὀδύναι ἐγγίνονται ἐν ταῖς κεφαλαῖς, καὶ παραχρῆμα ἄφωνοι γίνονται, καὶ ῥέγκουσιν, ἀπόλλυνται ἐν ἑπτὰ ἡμέραις, ἐὰν μὴ πυρετὸς ἐπιλάθῃ. Cf. <u>id</u>. <u>ib</u>. 6, 12, 13, 36, <u>id</u>. <u>Dieb. Judic</u>. 11. The notion is connected with the theory expounded in the lost Hippocratic treatise περὶ ἑβδομάδων, of which a Latin translation survives

(see Littré's edition of Hippocrates VIII. 634ff.),
that the number seven and its multiples are of particular
significance in the workings of the universe and the
ordering of all natural phenomena; see W. Roscher,
'Hebdomadonlehren der griechischen Philosophen und Ärzte',
Abh. der Sächsichen Gesellsch. der Wiss. 24. 6 (1906),
60ff.), H.E. Sigerist, A History of Medicine (Oxford 1961),
II. 279-80.

46. The notion of the spinning of the Fates deciding the span
of human life is one of the most popular motifs in Greek
and Latin literature (see Roscher, Lexicon II. 3095ff.,
RE 15. 2479ff., E. Steinbach, Der Faden der Schicksals-
gottheiten (Diss. Leipzig 1931), M.P. Nilsson, Geschichte
der griechischen Religion (Munich 1941) I. 363 n. 3, and
for a collection of references to the Fates in epitaphs,
Lattimore, op. cit. 157). In essence the motif may be
traced back to Homer (see e.g. Od. iv. 207, vii. 196-7),
but over the centuries it became subject to endless
variation and development. The Fates generally appear
as a threesome, either corporately spinning a single thread
and each being responsible for one stage of the process
(e.g. Pl. R. x. 617C, Isid. Etym. viii. 11. 92) or each
spinning a separate thread (e.g. Catul. 64. 311-17).
Ovid's description of the scene suggests the former notion
and seems to be in accord with those Roman iconographical
representations which depict one of the Fates holding the
distaff (see C. Robert, Die Antiken Sarkophag-Reliefs
(Berlin 1890-1919) III, Abt. III, Plates 345-6).

Though the threads of life are often said to be spun at
birth (e.g. Hom. Od. vii. 196-7, Tr. v. 10. 46,) and
occasionally at marriage (e.g. Catul. 64. 311ff.), Ovid
here represents the Fates as continuing to spin throughout
life until death intervenes, a form of the motif which
appears first at Theoc. 1. 139 (cf. Verg. A. x. 814-5).
Martial (iv. 73. 3) takes up the notion of death occurring
when there is no more wool left on the distaff (see R.
Heinze, Hermes 61 (1926), 55-6).

46. uacuo ... colo: colus has both second and fourth
declension forms and both masculine and feminine gender.
When the masculine occurs, commentators are generally
satisfied to remark that colus is 'normally feminine'
(thus Palmer on Ep. 3. 76, Fordyce on Catul. 64. 311),
but the situation is more complex than that.   Second
declension forms are predominantly masculine and fourth
declension forms predominantly feminine, but exceptions
are to be found in both cases (see ThLL 3. 1743. 69ff.,
OLD s.v.).   Ovid appears to confine himself to second
declension forms, but though feminine gender is more or
less certified in one case out of four (Fast. iii. 818)
by complete consensus codicum in respect of the adjective
which qualifies colus, in the other three (here, Ars i.
702, Ep. 3. 76) the MSS are divided between masculine
and feminine gender for the accompanying epithet.   An
original uacua here would seem more likely to have been
altered to uacuo than an original uacuo to uacua, but since
certainty is impossible on this point, it is probably
right to bow to the united testimony of PSY (with ς)

and read <u>uacuo</u>.

47-8. A superb parody of the parting words of the dying to his
loved ones; cf. Simm.<u>AP</u> vii. 647. 3-4 (a child to
her mother) 'αὖθι μένοις παρὰ πατρὶ τέκος δ' ἐπὶ
λῷονι μοίρᾳ / ἄλλαν σῷ πολιῷ γήραϊ καδεμόνα',
Stat. <u>Silv</u>. ii. 1. 149-53 <u>te uultu moriente uidet linguaque</u>
<u>cadente</u> / <u>murmurat; in te omnes uacui iam pectoris efflat</u> /
<u>reliquias, solum meminit solumque uacantem</u> / <u>exaudit</u>
<u>tibique ora mouet, tibi uerba relinquit,</u> / <u>et prohibet</u>
<u>gemitus consolaturque dolentem.</u> The parrot's power of
speech in his lifetime had been remarkable, but that he
should retain it on the point of death is nothing short
of miraculous!

47. <u>ignauo</u> ... <u>palato</u>: <u>palatum</u> most frequently denotes the
organ of taste (e.g. Hor. <u>S</u>. ii. 8. 38, Juv. 10. 203), but
occasionally that of human speech (e.g. Hor. <u>S</u>. ii. 3.
274 <u>cum balba feris annoso uerba palato</u>), and hence its
usage here. For <u>ignauus</u> = 'weak', 'sapped of energy'
cf. Sen. <u>Oed</u>. 181-2 <u>piger ignauos</u> / <u>alligat artus languor,</u>
Stat. <u>Silv</u>. iv. 4. 53. The force of the adjective is
probably concessive: 'though weak' (cf. <u>moriens</u> (48),
'though dying').

48. '<u>Corinna, uale</u>': salutations seem to have constituted
the basic repertoire of talking birds in antiquity (see
e.g. Pers. <u>Prol</u>. 8 <u>quis expediuit psittaco suum 'chaere'</u>?
Mart. xiv. 73, 74, 76 (see O. Weinreich, <u>Studien zu Martial</u>

(Stuttgart 1928), 113-14), Stat. <u>Silv</u>. ii. 4. 29-30, Plin. <u>Nat</u>. x. 117, Macr. ii. 4. 29-30), and so one might reasonably expect such talented creatures to have managed farewells too!

49-58. The <u>consolatio</u> (see introduction above p. 279) takes the form of the picturing of a pleasant after-life for the deceased (cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 9. 60-66, Stat. <u>Silv</u>. v. 3. 284-7) with Ovid substituting a birds' paradise for the conventional Elysium.

The notion of an agreeable life after death in a blissful land ('the Elysian Fields') for a privileged few dates back to Homer (<u>Od</u>. iv. 561-9); gradually it became something of a moral concept, the carefree existence in Elysium or the Islands of the Blessed (the two were virtually synonymous) being regarded as the reward for those who had lived righteously on earth (see in general <u>RE</u> 5. 2470-76, A. Dieterich, <u>Nekuia</u> (Leipzig 1893), Ch. 1, W.F. Jackson Knight <u>Elysion</u> (London 1970) and for the idea in Greek and Latin sepulchral inscriptions, Lattimore, <u>op. cit</u>. 35-6, 40-42). The description of Elysium became a literary set-piece (see especially Pi. <u>O</u>. 2. 68-83, Verg. <u>A</u>. vi. 637ff.) whose contents were fairly standard: the Elysian landscape and the activities of the Blessed, with a catalogue of some of the most famous among them. Ovid's description of the birds' paradise follows this general pattern very closely (see further nn. below), thus providing a mischievous and highly entertaining burlesque on the traditional motif.

49-50. Ovid's description of the Elysian landscape has a very
familiar ring.   The three features he mentions - the
grove of trees (<u>nigra nemus ilice frondet</u>), well-watered
terrain (<u>uda</u> ... <u>terra</u>) and lush vegetation (<u>perpetuo</u>
<u>gramine</u> ... <u>uiret</u>) - appear frequently (sometimes in
conjunction with others, e.g. caves, springs, streams,
flowers, sunshine, breezes) in descriptions not only of
Elysium (see Pi. <u>O</u>. 2. 71ff., Verg. <u>A</u>. vi. 638ff., <u>Am</u>.
iii. 9. 60 (with Brandt's note)) but also of all manner
of other idyllic landscapes in epic and bucolic poetry
(see E.R. Curtius, <u>European Literature and the Latin</u>
<u>Middle Ages</u> (London 1953), 183-202, C.P. Segal, <u>Landscape</u>
<u>in Ovid's Metamorphoses, Hermes Einzelschriften</u> 23
(Wiesbaden 1969), 20-38), and especially in scenes
associated with poetical inspiration (e.g. <u>Am</u>. iii. 1.
1-4, Prop. iii. 3. 21-30, Hor. <u>Carm</u>. iii. 13. 13-16).
Ancient poetical representations of landscapes of natural
beauty undoubtedly owe more to literary and rhetorical
convention than to personal observation (see Kroll,
<u>Studien</u> Ch. 12), and the <u>locus amoenus</u> became a show-
piece <u>topos</u> in elevated poetry (see in general G. Schön-
beck, <u>Der Locus Amoenus von Homer bis zu Horaz</u> (Diss.
Heidelberg 1962) and further Nisbet-Hubbard, introduction
to Hor. <u>Carm</u>. ii. 3).   Linguistic embellishments such
as alliteration and assonance are a regular feature of it
(see Norden on Verg. <u>A</u>. vi. 638ff., Brink on Hor. <u>Ars</u>
16-17) and Ovid does not neglect them here: note <u>nigra</u>
<u>nemus</u> (49) and cf. 54n. <u>uiuax phoenix</u>.

49. <u>colle sub Elysio</u>: Vergil (<u>A</u>. vi. 638ff.) obviously con-

ceived of Elysium as possessing the same kind of physical

features as the real world, endowing it with hills and

dales even though it was supposedly underground.   Ovid

appears to do the same, placing Tibullus 'in a valley'

(<u>in Elysia ualle</u>, <u>Am</u>. iii. 9. 60) and the parrot here 'at

the foot of a hill'.   He thus recalls Vergil too in

apparently imagining the lowlands of Elysium, where the

parrot has taken up his abode (like Anchises at <u>A</u>. vi.

679!), as the most pleasant part of an exceedingly pleasant

land.

nigra ... <u>ilice</u>:   the <u>ilex</u> or holm-oak is a stock ingredient

of the <u>amoenus locus</u>;   cf. Hor. <u>Carm</u>. iii. 13. 14, Verg.

<u>Ecl</u>. 7. 1.   The adjective <u>nigra</u>, as well as describing

the dark foliage of the ilex also suggests its provision

of a shady retreat (see 50n. below).

50. It is not difficult to see why shady spots along with

abundance of moisture and verdant pastures feature so

often in the imaginary heaven of the Greek and Latin

poets, accustomed as they were to the parched landscape

of a Mediterranean summer (cf. 1. 1n. and Nisbet-Hubbard

on Hor. <u>Carm</u>. ii. 3. 6).

51. <u>si qua fides</u>:   a conventional asseveration;   cf. <u>CLE</u>

939. 1 <u>siqua fides hominum est, unam te semper amaui</u>.

The phrase itself has some affinity with expressions such

as <u>si credis</u> and <u>mihi si credis</u>, which are poetic borrowings

from the colloquial language used to give a semblance of
authenticity to dubious statements (see Tränkle, _Sprachkunst_
9-10, Hofmann, _Lateinische Umgangssprache_ 126).

uolucrum locus ... _piarum_: the birds' paradise. _Pius_
is virtually a technical term when used of the inhabitants
of Elysium, i.e. 'blessed' (cf. _Am._ iii. 9. 66 _auxisti_
numeros, culte Tibulle, piós, _CLE_ 1165. 1-2 _umbrarum_
secura quies animaequ. pior(um)/ laudatae colitis quae loca
sancta Erebi, Stat. _Silv._ v. 3. 284 _pii manes_.

52. _obscenae_ ... _aues_: birds of evil omen; cf. Verg. _A._
    xii. 876, _G._ i. 470. For the exclusion of the un-
    righteous from Elysium cf. Pı. _O._ 2. 68.

53-6. A list of _piae uolucres_ replaces the conventional cata-
    logue of the Blessed (see 49-58n. above); cf. _Am._ iii.
    9. 60-64, Verg. _A._ vi. 645-65, Pi. _O._ 2. 78ff. Ovid
    humorously allows the avian inhabitants of Elysium to
    retain the characteristics and talents which they possessed
    on earth (see especially 57-8n. below) - as do the heroes
    and poets in Vergil's catalogue at _A._ vi. 653ff.

53. _innocui_ ... _olores_: for the swan as a bird of good omen
    see Verg. _A._ i. 393, Stat. _Theb._ iii. 524ff. Despite
    its real-life aggresssiveness (see Arist. _HA_ ix. 1. 610 A,
    Plin. _Nat._ x. 63), the swan is generally depicted in ancient
    poetry in a most favourable light with frequent references
    to the whiteness of its plumage and the sweetness of

its voice (see Thompson, Glossary s.v. κύκνος, Nisbet-
Hubbard on Hor. Carm. ii. 20. 10, 15 and introduction to
that poem).

For the guiltlessness of the conventional inhabitants
of Elysium cf. Pi. O. 2. 69-70 μείναντες ἀπὸ πάμπαν ἀδίκων
ἔχειν / ψυχάν, CLE 1165. 3-4 sedes insontem Magnillam
ducite uestras / per nemora et campos protinus Elysios.

54. uiuax phoenix: a fabulous bird of Greek and Egyptian
mythology. Ovid draws attention to two of its most
celebrated characteristics: longevity (uiuax) - it
was said to live for five hundred years or thereabouts
(see Met. xv. 395, Plin. Nat. x. 4, Tac. Ann. vi. 28,
Hdt. ii. 73) - and uniqueness (unica semper)- only one
of its kind was said to exist at any time, and that was
reported to be reborn from the remains of its own body
after death or from its own ashes (see Met. xv. 395-402,
Plin. loc. cit.); here Ovid appears to assume, somewhat
illogically, that its ghost in Elysium was similarly
unique. The phoenix's claims to pietas (and hence to
admission to the birds' paradise) probably stem from the
tradition that it always carried the nest in which its
father had died, and from which it had itself been reborn,
all the way to the temple of the Sun (see Met. xv. 405-6,
Plin. loc. cit., Hdt. loc. cit.). For further general
discussion and copious bibliography see Thompson, Glossary
s.v. φοῖνιξ, A.B. Lloyd on Hdt. loc. cit., and for
Ovid's special interest in the phoenix, R. Crahay and J.
Hubaux, Ovidiana 289-90.

Viuax phoenix is an aurally striking collocation and
may have been considered cacophonous (see Marouzeau,
Traité de Stylistique 22-3, and cf. 1n. above); possibly
Ovid intended it to stress the mysterious and outlandish
nature of the bird.

55. ipsa: certainly right against atque, an obvious and ugly
interpolation. Ipse + reflexive adjective is very much
an idiomatic phrase, and it is possible that ipsa suas
is not in any way emphatic here (Housman thought not
(CR 14 (1900), 259 (= Classical Papers 521)); cf. Am.
ii. 7. 14, Ars ii. 114, 686), but ipsa could well be meant
to indicate 'of its own accord' (cf. Verg. Ecl. 4. 21-2
ipsae lacte domum referent distenta capellae / ubera, and
further ThLL 7. 355. 75ff.), since the peacock (ales
Iunonia) is normally said to display its magnificent plumage
only when showered with praise (see e.g. Ars i. 627, Med.
33, Plin. Nat. x. 43); in the perfect world of Elysium,
however, such temperamental behaviour would naturally
cease!

ales Iunonia: the peacock, renowned in antiquity for its
beauty, but also for its pride and vanity (see Thompson,
Glossary, s.v. ταώς and cf. n. above). One might reasonably
wonder what were the claims of such a self-opinionated fowl
to a place in the birds' paradise. It was traditionally
sacred to Juno, the 'eyes' in its tail originally being
those of Argus, the hundred-eyed guard of Io; when he was

killed by Hermes, Juno transferred his eyes to the peacock's
tail (cf. 2. 45n., and see Dionys. Av. i. 28, Mosch. 2. 55-61).
The bird's history, then, would not, any more than its
habits, appear to give it much entitlement to a place in
Elysium, and Ovid probably included it in his catalogue
simply for pictorial effect.

56. columba: the dove's claims to pietas are fairly clear, for
its conjugal affection is proverbial in Greek and Latin
literature: see e.g. Catul. 68. 125-7 nec tantum niueo
gauisa est ulla columbo / compar, quae multo dicitur
improbius / oscula mordenti semper decerpere rostro, Prop.
ii. 15. 27, Plin. Nat. x. 104 (and further Thompson, Glossary
s.v. περιστερά, Otto, Sprichwörter 88-9).

blanda: see 1. 21n.

57-8. Ovid's mock consolatio reaches its climax with the picture
of a reception committee for the parrot in Elysium (cf.
Am. iii. 9. 61-4 where Calvus, Catullus and Gallus are there
to welcome Tibullus). The first thing the parrot does is
exactly what we might expect, knowing his history: he
makes a speech! (cf. Verg. A. vi. 645ff. where Orpheus
continues to play the lyre in Elysium and the descendants
of Teucer handle horses and arms exactly as they did during
their lifetime on earth; see also 53-6n. above).

57. nemorali sede: cf. 49 above. The emphasis upon the
presence of trees in this particular Elysium is probably

not entirely arbitrary, for they could be said to be
indispensable to its inhabitants as perches and roosting
places!

58. <u>uolucres ... pias</u>:   see 51n. above.

59-62. <u>Descriptio tumuli</u>;   cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 9. 39-40, Thomas, <u>art. cit.</u>
608 (and see introduction above p. 279).

59-60. Greek and Latin sepulchral inscriptions show that the
ancients considered the size and splendour of the tomb
to be of immense importance and thought that it should
befit the character and achievements of the deceased.
Apologies are frequently made if it fails to meet these
requirements;   see e.g. <u>Epigr. Gr</u>. 106. 1 Σμεικρὸς οὐ σμικρὸν
καλύπτω τύμβος ἄνδρα, <u>CLE</u> 52. 2 <u>heic est sepulcrum hau</u>
<u>pulcrum pulcrai feminae</u> (for further examples see Lattimore,
<u>op. cit</u>. 227-30).   The length of the inscription was also
important;   see <u>CLE</u> 1172 <u>hoc natum tumulo pietas pauperrima</u>
<u>texit</u> / <u>dignum maiori quem coleret titulo</u>.   But Ovid,
amusingly, needs no apology for the tiny tomb he describes,
for in this case it fits its occupant perfectly (<u>tumulus pro</u>
<u>corpore magnus</u>, 59;   cf. <u>Phaënn</u>. <u>AP</u> vii. 197. 3 and for
the expression, <u>Met</u>. iv. 412 <u>minimam ... pro corpore uocem</u>),
and the brief epitaph similarly suits the miniature
gravestone (<u>lapis exiguus par sibi carmen habet</u>, 60).   It
seems very likely that Ovid mischievously adapted the
Callimachean epigram, σύντομος ἦν ὁ ξεῖνος· ὁ καὶ στίχος
οὐ μακρὰ λέξων / θῆρις 'Αρισταίου Κρὴς ἐπ' ἐμοὶ δολιχός
<u>AP</u> vii. 447; for dispute over the meaning see Gow-Page,

\

II. 192). O. Weinreich,(Die Distichen des Catull, 5, 85, n. 12) points out that shortness in sepulchral epigrams became a fad with Callimachus and many Roman epigrammatists.

59. tumulus, tumulus: epanalepsis is a stock Alexandrian device for creating an emotional effect which varies according to context; here it is clearly one of pathos (cf. Catul. 64. 61-2, 132-3), but at 2-3 above (ite ... / ite) one of mock-solemnity. For the immediate repetition of a word in mid-line see 4. 39n.

60. Cf. Prop. ii. 1. 72 et breue in exiguo marmore nomen ero.

61-2. The Latin elegiac poets enjoyed composing epitaphs, especially for themselves; cf. Tr. iii. 3. 73-6; Tib. ii. 3. 55-6, iii. 2. 29-30 (Lygdamus), Prop. ii. 13 (B). 35-6.

61. COLLIGOR ... PLACVISSE: colligere = 'deduce' is normally used actively with the accusative and infinitive (see ThLL 3. 1617. 75ff.), but for the use of the passive with nominative and infinitive (understood) cf. Plin. Nat. ii. 58 quo argumento amplior errantium stellarum quam lunae magnitudo colligitur.

DOMINAE: cf. 19, 43 and see introduction above p. 280. For the recording of a master's or mistress's affection for a pet on a gravestone cf. Leon. AP vii. 198. 7-8 καί μ' οὐδὲ φθιμένην ἀπανήνατο· τοῦτο δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν /

ʇὠλίγον ὤρθωσεν σᾶμα πολυστροφίης.

62. 'My lips had the skill to say more than a bird (usually says).' ᵀhere are two obvious objections to Lee's fancied detection of a double-entendre in plus aue (i.e. not only 'more than a bird', but also 'more than "Hail"') of which he himself is aware (187). One of them can be adequately countered, for though there are to my knowledge no literary parallels for the iambic shortening of aue, Quint. Inst. i. 6. 21 makes it clear that it was colloquially pronounced with shortened e: multum ... litteratus, qui sine adspiratione et producta secunda syllaba salutauit (auēre est enim); see ThLL. 2. 1300. 45ff.) The other objection, however, is more substantial: the omission of quam after plus preceding an indeclinable word in direct speech is very awkward, and Hor. Carm. iv. 14. 13 acer plus uice simplici (cited by Lee) is hardly parallel. The passages cited by Kühner-Stegmann to illustrate the omission of quam in the case of numbers etc. (II. ii. 471-2) do not offer any encouragement either.

It must be concluded, I think, that whilst Lee's suggestion is attractive and quite in keeping with the spirit of Ovid's verse, the Latin will not yield the meaning he postulates.

VII

[Jäger 9-14; A.G. Lee in Critical Essays on Roman
Literature: Elegy and Lyric, ed. J.P. Sullivan (London
1962), 158; Nisbet-Hubbard's introduction to Hor. Carm.
ii. 4; P. Tremoli, Influssi retorici e ispirazione
poetica negli Amores di Ovidio, Fac. di Lett., Ist. di
Filol. Class. 1 (Trieste 1955), 33-6; Wilkinson 67-8]

Ovid is sick of always being in the dock (1-2)
with his mistress continually accusing him of consorting
with other women (3-10). It would be different if he
knew that he was guilty of the offence - but really he
does not take her accusations seriously any longer (11-16).
The latest charge, however - that he is having an affair
with her hairdresser, the slave girl Cypassis - is
simply preposterous, as she must see, if only she stops
to think (17-26), and he can give her his solemn oath
that he is innocent (27-8).

There is nothing particularly remarkable in the
form and subject-matter of Ovid's poem. Accusations
of infidelity are very much part and parcel of Greek and
Latin love poetry[1], and the dramatic monologue, which
requires us to imagine the presence of a silent addressee,
or construct for ourselves that person's words and reactions
from clues in the poet's own speech[2], is a favourite
form for the elegiac 'confrontation scene'[3]. The poet
himself, it is true, is generally the injured party in
such cases, but it is not unprecedented for his mistress

---

1. Cf. introduction to 5 above, p. 230, n. 15.

2. See p. 126 above.

3. Cf. introduction to 5 above, pp. 230-31.

to accuse <u>him</u> of unfaithfulness[4], and indeed Propertius

on one occasion, like Ovid here, has to defend himself

against the specific charge of having made love to a

slave-girl[5].   The general question of erotic liaisons

between free men and <u>ancillae</u> is a common literary <u>topos</u>[6],

and Ovid follows the general tendency of other poets in

considering the advisability of such a relationship from

a social and practical, rather than a moral point of view[7].

There is, then, it seems, in the present piece little

that is new other than the exemplary logic with which

the accused presents his defence.

---

4. See Prop. i. 3. 35-46, iii. 6. 19-34, 15.

5. See iii. 15.   The servile status of Propertius's
'old flame', Lycinna, becomes apparent when, ostensibly
with the intention of dissuading Cynthia from harassing
the girl through jealousy, he tells of the fate suffered
by Dirce, who ill-treated the slave-girl Antiope, her
husband's former lover.

6. The first traces of it are to be found in Homer; see
Il. ix. 342-3 (Achilles of the stolen Briseis) ἐγὼ τὴν /
ἐκ θυμοῦ φίλεον, δουρικτητήν περ ἐοῦσαν. For its sub-
subsequent history and development see Nisbet-Hubbard,
<u>loc. cit.</u>   Quintilian's casual reference to the subject
in illustration of the principle of <u>analogia</u> (<u>si turpis
dominae consuetudo cum seruo, turpis domino cum ancilla
(Inst. v. 11. 34))</u> suggests that it may have been a
popular point of debate.

7. At 19-26 Ovid argues that <u>amor ancillae</u> would be (a) not
respectable, and (b) (in this case) not safe.   Usually,
criticism on grounds of social impropriety is offset   .
by appeal to precedent (for examples see 8. 11-14n. below),
and the comparative safety of liaisons with <u>ancillae</u>
in general, as opposed to involvements with better-class
women, cited as the chief practical advantage of such
attachments (see e.g. Hor. <u>S.</u> i. 2. 116ff., Prop. ii. 23).
Philodemus (<u>AP</u> v. 126) and Rufinus (<u>AP</u> v. 18) make the
additional point that lowly women are cheaper!

But Ovid has a wicked surprise in store for the
reader who leaves this elegy, as well he might, missing
originality, but impressed by its vigour and eloquence.
For he will find the very next poem, 8, to be a second
dramatic monologue addressed to none other than the
lately scorned Cypassis, with the poet wondering how
his mistress can have discovered their liaison, and
attempting to redeem himself with the unfortunate girl,
who, we now realize, was actually present when he made
his insulting remarks about her in the previous 'scene'![8]

It would be difficult to imagine a more devastatingly
effective stroke of originality than Ovid's construction
of this dramatic diptych in which the second piece shows
up the first in an entirely new light, the astonishing
sequence of reappraisal and retrospection in 8 revealing
the persuasive logic and weary self-righteousness of 7
as pure humbug.[9] There is an irresistible appeal in
Ovid's utter shamelessness and in the crowning outrageousness
of his final, cool warning to Cypassis (now understandably
reluctant to oblige him) that, if she refuses to comply,
he will unhesitatingly tell all to Corinna![10]

---

8. 7. 19-22. A formal outline of the content of poem
8 will be found on p.354 below. The swift, two-scene
sequence presented by this elegiac diptych has something
of a mimic quality; see Hubbard, Propertius 52-3.

9. Cf. 8. 1-2 with 7. 23, 8.3 with 7. 28,. 8. 4 with 7. 24,
8. 9-14 with 7. 19-22, 8. 17-18 with 7. 27-8, and see nn.
below ad locc.

10. 8. 25-8. Cf. Ars i. 387ff.

Both Ovid's easy presentation of a logical argument
and his unmistakable penchant for treating the same theme
from two different angles, sometimes in widely separated
pieces, and sometimes, as here, in consecutive poems[11],
have been attributed to his familiarity with formal
rhetorical exercises designed to encourage the develop-
ment of precisely these techniques[12]. But nothing
could be less formal or stereotyped than our two elegies,
which doubtless owe quite as much to a naturally imaginative
mind as they do to Ovid's training in the schools of
declamation. And it seems, frankly, irrelevant to be
debating how like or unlike a model refutatio is Ovid's
argumentation here[13] when we have before us a pair of
elegies so obviously to be read and relished above all
for their dramatic immediacy, sparkling wit and 'sheer,
breath-taking impudence'[14].

If there could conceivably be anyone who, before
coming to these two fine poems, had failed to notice the
'neue Kunstwollen'[15] which Ovid applied to the traditional
themes and situations of Latin love elegy, he would, on
reading them, be unable to remain unaware of it for a
moment longer.

---

11. See introduction to 5 above, pp. 226-7.

12. See general introduction pp. 11-14, and with special
reference to the present pair of poems, Jäger, loc. cit.,
Tremoli, loc. cit. Cf. introduction to 2, p. 103, n. 45.

13. See e.g. Jäger, loc. cit. where we find such superfluous
observations as that poem 7 has no exordium. In contrast,
Lee's brief discussion (loc. cit.) is to be commended for
its sympathetic discernment and robust good sense.

14. Wilkinson 67.

15. See introduction to 1 above, pp. 44-5.

1-2. Ovid's opening words establish a pseudo-judicial setting
for his exchange with Corinna which is maintained
throughout the poem (notice in addition to <u>reus</u>, <u>crimina</u>
<u>uincam</u> and <u>dimicuisse</u> (see 2n. below) here, <u>arguis</u> (6),
<u>crimen</u> (8), <u>conscius</u> (11), <u>poenam</u> ... <u>ferunt</u> (12),
<u>insimulas</u> (13), <u>crimen</u> (17), <u>obicitur</u> (18), <u>indicio</u> (26)
and <u>non admissi criminis</u> ... <u>reum</u> (28)).

The metaphor is a favourite one with him, and it
could be that his unusually frequent choice of it was
to some extent occasioned by his own brief juristic
experience (see 4. 1-4n.), and yet the image
of himself as a defendant in the dock was surely simply
the most natural one for him to employ, given the subject-
matter of this poem.

1. <u>ergo</u>: 'So then ...'. As often, the particle introduces
a rhetorical question whose tone is one of high in-
dignation; cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 4. 3, iii. 11. 9-12, Prop. ii.
16. 15 (further examples at <u>ThLL</u> 5. ii. 769. 12ff.).
Placed at the very beginning of the poem, <u>ergo</u> carries
us <u>in medias res</u> and indicates that we are to hear the
writer's reaction to certain events which have preceded;
cf. <u>Tr</u>. iii. 2. 1, Prop. iii. 7. 1, and see further
Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 24. 5, Tränkle, <u>Sprach-</u>
<u>kunst</u> 159.

(Burman's preference for <u>ergo ego</u>, as given by
most of the <u>recc.</u>, is understandable; out of sixteen other
Ovidian instances of <u>ergo</u> introducing a rhetorical question
in the first person singular, there are only two (<u>Ep.</u>

20. 31, <u>Tr</u>. iv. 8. 37) in which the particle is not
accompanied by <u>ego</u>. But qualitatively speaking, there
is nothing to choose between the two readings, and modern
editors are right to follow <u>PSY</u>ς. If Ovid diverged
from his normal practice twice, clearly he may have done
so a third time.)

<u>sufficiam reus in noua crimina semper?</u>: 'Am I to be the
single and perpetual cause and target of new charges?'
(for the construction <u>sufficere in</u> + accusative =,
'to be sufficient for' cf. <u>Met</u>. vii. 613 <u>nec locus in
tumulos nec sufficit arbor in ignes</u>, Luc. vii. 608-9 <u>ast
illi suffecit pectora pulsans / spiritus in uocem</u>).
Burman alone has seen fit to remark on the economy of
Ovid's expression here: '<u>Sufficiam</u> eleganter dictum pro,
an ego solus materiam praebebo amicae, unde posset
obicere mihi crimina et nemo praeter me reus fiet.' He
does, however, attempt to squeeze a little too much out
of <u>sufficiam</u> in suggesting that it also implies 'neque
tamen succumbam', for though <u>sufficere in</u> + accusative may
sometimes mean 'to be equal to' (see e.g. <u>Tr</u>. ii. 331-2
<u>forsan</u> ... / ... <u>in paruos sufficiam</u> ... <u>modos</u> (with Luck's
note)), that sense would not allow the present line to
cohere well with the one which follows.

<u>semper</u>: in view of its emphatic position, not simply
'always', but 'perpetually', 'eternally'.

2. <u>ut</u>: concessive; cf. <u>Pont</u>. iii. 4. 79 <u>ut desint uires,</u>
<u>tamen est laudanda uoluntas</u>.

<u>uincam</u> ... <u>dimicuisse</u>: both basically military terms, but,
like many others from the same sphere (cf. 4. 1-2n.),
readily adapted to a legal context; cf. Hor. <u>S</u>. i.
2. 134 <u>Fabio uel iudice uincam</u>, Cic. <u>Sest</u>. 1 <u>reos de</u>
<u>capite, de fama</u> ... <u>dimicantis</u>.

    Ovid's admission of <u>dimicare</u> reflects his general
adventurousness in the field of vocabulary (cf. 1. 9n.
<u>indice</u>, 2. 23-4n. 48n. <u>incestum</u>, 3. 6n. <u>praetepuisset</u>,
4. 1-4n., 5. 36n. <u>subrubet</u>, 56n. <u>addidicisse</u>, 9 (<u>A</u>).
8n. <u>confossum</u>, 9 (<u>B</u>). 52n. <u>indeserta</u>, 10. 3n. <u>deprensus</u>
<u>inermis</u>, 17n. <u>uiduo</u>, 25n. <u>alimenta</u>, 28n. <u>utilis</u>). A
somewhat choice word even in prose, where it is much less
common than its synonym <u>pugnare</u> (see <u>ThLL</u> 5. 1. 1197. 38ff.),
<u>dimicare</u> is avoided altogether by poets before Ovid, but
he uses it three times in all (cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 13. 28, <u>Rem</u>.
27) and subsequently it is used once each by Seneca,
Silius and Manilius (see Axelson, <u>Unpoetische Wörter</u> 69)
The perfect form in -<u>uisse</u>, which appears only here and
at <u>Rem</u>. 27, seems to have been coined by Ovid as a
metrically convenient alternative to the usual form
in -<u>auisse</u> (-<u>asse</u>); cf. Liv. xxxvii. 58. 3 <u>quantis cum</u>
<u>classibus hostium dimicasset</u>, and see E. Bednara, <u>ALL</u>
14 (1906), 352.

<u>totiens dimicuisse piget</u>: 'Putting up a fight so often
becomes irksome.' <u>Piget</u> sets the tone of weary ex-

asperation which characterizes the first part of Ovid's defence (1-16).

3-10. Ovid claims that his mistress wilfully interprets all his looks, words and actions as indicative of his love for another woman. For the sequence _siue_ ... _seu_ ... _si_... _si_ ... _siue_ ... _seu_ see 4. 11-18n.

3. _marmorei_ ... _theatri_: Ovid means the theatre of Pompey built in 55 B.C. in imitation of the theatre at Mytilene (Plu. _Pomp._ 52). It was Rome's first permanent theatre, and its inner walls are thought to have been adorned with a covering of stucco and marble (hence _marmorei_, which may be something of a metrical stop-gap, as Lee (_loc. cit._) suggests, but it nevertheless adds a touch of local colour; cf. _Ars_ i. 103 _tunc neque marmoreo pendebant uela theatro_, _Pont._ i. 8. 35 _nunc fora, nunc aedes, nunc marmore tecta theatra_). For further description see Platner and Ashby, _Topographical Dictionary_ 515-17 and now E. Nash, _A Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome_ II (London 1962), figs. 1216-23.

summa theatri: i.e. the highest rows of seats. From 194 B.C. the front rows in the theatre had been reserved for senators and from 67 B.C. an additional fourteen rows for the _equites_; Vestal Virgins had also long enjoyed a privileged position at the front. Under Augustus, however, specific blocks of seats were allotted to several other different classes of spectators - _milites_,

mariti, praetextati, paedarogi (see Suet. Aug. 44), and
men and women were segregated, the women being allocated
the seats high up at the back of the auditorium (Plu.
Sull. 35 confirms that men and women had sat together
in the theatre before this time.   They continued to do
so at the Circus   (see Am. iii. 2. 3, Ars i. 139, Juv.
11. 202), but not at gladiatorial shows (see Suet. loc.
cit.).   It would thus be necessary for the men to
turn round (hence respexi here) to get a good view of them
(Ovid himself tells us that theatrical performances pro-
vided a wonderful opportunity for viewing the beauties at
large;   see 2. 26n.).   Here, however, Ovid speaks as if
his Corinna has sat alongside him in the theatre (if
she had, in Ovid's imagination, been sitting up above
with the other women, she could hardly have had cause for
complaint when he looked round in their direction, for
the poet could legitimately have claimed to have been
looking at her!).   The most likely explanation of this
technical lapse is that Ovid was consciously imitating a
line which Propertius gives to Cynthia at iv. 8. 77, colla
caue inflectas ad summum obliqua theatrum, where the same
difficulty does not arise because there is nothing to
indicate that Cynthia herself was present in the theatre
when making this remark.

4.   eligis ... unde dolere uelis: 'You choose one whom you
wish to make the cause of your grievance.'   Unde replaces

a causal ablative with <u>dolere</u> (cf. <u>Tr</u>. ii. 292

<u>paelicibus multis hanc doluisse deam</u>); see Hofmann-

Szantyr 492 and cf. 2. 48n. Notice the framing of the

line with the two verbs of choice, <u>eligis</u> (for the

spelling see Goold, <u>Amat. Crit</u>. 10-11) and <u>uelis</u> to

emphasize that Corinna's <u>dolor</u> is of her own making.

5. <u>candida ... femina</u>: 'a lady of some beauty'. <u>Candidus</u>,

whose basic meaning is 'shining' or 'fair' (of complexion),

is first found used of general 'good looks' in Varro

(<u>Men</u>. 432 (Buecheler-Heraeus) <u>amiculam ... proceram, candidam,</u>

<u>teneram, formosam</u>); thereafter it seems to have been

eagerly taken up by Catullus and the Augustan poets and

to have become a favourite elegiac synonym for <u>formosus</u>

(Pichon collects many examples s.v.). <u>Femina</u>, sometimes

alone, but particularly in combination with laudatory

epithets carries a respectful tone, (see J.N. Adams,

<u>Glotta</u> 50 (1972), 236, Axelson, <u>Unpoetische Wörter</u> 53-8)

and Ovid may be using it here to suggest that the 'ladies'

Corinna picks upon are really above the kind of thing

she suspects.

5-6. <u>tacito ... uultu</u> / <u>... tacitas ... notas</u>: Ovid's verbal

wit exploits the two possible meanings of <u>tacitus</u>: in line

5 it means 'silent', and in line 6, 'secret'. For the

reader acquainted with <u>Am</u>. i. 4. 17-28, there is

a splendid dramatic irony in Ovid's affected outrage at

the suggestion that a code of secret signs could possibly

exist between him and some candida femina! For the

tacitae notae themselves cf. 5. 15-20nn.

6. arguis: a legalistic word: 'you make the charge' (cf.
Pl. Mil. 389-90 arguere ... me meus mihi familiaris
uisust / me cum alieno adulescentulo ... esse osculatam);
see 1-2n. above.

7. miseros ... capillos: most modern editors read misero
with PSY, and some ask us to understand mihi with it
(Némethy, Showerman, Lenz and also Munari, in his apparatus,
though he prints miseros in his text). But the reader
cannot in truth be expected to do other than take misero
with ungue (see Kenney, Notes 60-61), which is very strange
indeed. Ovid uses unguis extensively, and the adjectives
which he attaches to it are, with one exception, of a very
concrete kind (longus, curuus, hamatus, rigidus, tenuis,
niger), the exception being auidus (Met. iv. 717, vi.
530), but auidus unguis is a good deal easier than miser
unguis.

The recc. offer us miseros, which qualifies capillos
very appositely and is surely right. As parallels for
the use of miser with a part of the body Kenney usefully
cites Ep. 6. 92 et miserum tenues in iecur urget acus and
Verg. A. ii. 215 miseros morsu depascitur artus (see
further ThLL 8. 1101. 1ff.).

petis ungue capillos: physical violence resulting from

use of the fingernails is a standard manifestation of
extreme anger in Greek and Latin literature (see Sittl,
Die Gebärden 17-18) and for the elegiac amator an occupational
hazard from which he generally derives a certain amount
of masochistic pleasure; cf. Ars ii. 451-2 ille ego sim,
cuius laniet furiosa capillos; / ille ego sim teneras cui
petat ungue genas, Am. i. 7. 63-4, Tib. i. 6. 69-70, Prop.
iii. 8. 5-6.

8. culpo: a clear example of traditionary survival of the
truth in β where α made an obvious blunder (cui pro), which
was subsequently reproduced by two of its descendants (PY)
and falsely emended (to cui do) by the third (S). The
change of tense from perfect laudaui (7) to present culpo
appears to be purely one of metrical convenience.

crimen dissimulare putas: the accusative me is to be
understood; cf. Am. ii. 4. 15-16 aspera si uisa est
rigidasque imitata Sabinas / uelle sed ex alto dissimulare
puto (with n. ad loc.), Löfstedt, Syntactica II. 262-3.

crimen: frequently used in elegy of amatory infidelity;
cf. Am. ii. 5. 6, 14, Prop. iv. 7. 70 (see further Pichon
s.v.; also 11n. below peccati, 19n. peccasse). For the
elegists' use of crime imagery in general, see E. Burck,
Hermes 80 (1952), 170.

9-10. The ancient poets would have us believe that the colour
of the complexion was one of the most notable of the

physical indicators of <u>amor</u> (for others see 9 (<u>A</u>).

13-14n.).   The notion of extreme pallor being

symptomatic of a consuming passion goes back to Sappho

χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας ἔμμι (fr. 199, 14-15 (Page)).

For a collection of subsequent instances see E. Rohde,

<u>Der Griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer</u> (Leipzig

1876, 3rd edn. 1914), 157, n. 2.   Not surprisingly, the

motif is conspicuous in Latin love elegy (cf. Prop. i.

1. 22, 15. 39)) and Ovid at <u>Ars</u> i. 729 maintains that a

suitable <u>pallor</u> is <u>de rigueur</u> for a lover who wants to

look the part: <u>palleat omnis amans: hic est color</u>

<u>aptus amanti</u>.

9. <u>in te ... frigidus</u>:   for the construction see 1. 5, 3.

6nn., and for <u>frigidus</u> = 'frigid' in the amatory sense,

1. 5n.

<u>quoque</u>:   'hic uim illam habet, ut non tantum frigidus

uidear in aliis puellis, sed etiam in te, in qua ardere

uehementissime debebam' (Burman).

10. <u>dicor amore mori</u>:   cf. Prop. ii. 1. 47 <u>laus in amore mori</u>.

Burman, finding the scribes of some of his MSS keen to

eliminate the thrice-repeated -<u>or</u> sound here, was

prompted to comment, 'Offendere hoc κακόφατον posset ...

sed ... certe non offendit ... meas aures'.   On the

face of it, Burman's ears would seem to have been less

sensitive than those of the Romans themselves, for
Quintilian (Inst. ix. 4. 41) considers it a fault to
have the same syllable ending one word and beginning the
next and Gellius (xiii. 21. 12) feels that close recurrence
of the same vowel should be avoided (see further Wilkinson,
Golden Latin Artistry 24-31), but, in fact, the practice
of ancient authors is often not in accord with the precepts
of the theorists on this point; we find in Cicero, for
example, pleniore ore (Off. i. 61) and inuisae uisae (ap. Quint. Inst.
ix.4.41)-both producing a jingle more noticeable than Ovid's
here where there is at least some variation in vowel-
length (-cŏr -mōr -mŏr) - not to mention the notorious
fortunatam natam (Cons. fr. 9). The jingle in Cicero's
line of poetry is, of course, deliberate, and an attempt,
albeit a clumsy one, to use elements of repetition,
as did the ancient Latin poets, to produce a solemn
and grandiose tone; cf. Enn. Trag. 93 (Jocelyn) Priamo
ui uitam euitari with the editor's note ad loc. and on
Trag. 5, Marouzeau, Traité de Stylistique 65ff. It is
much more difficult to judge whether Ovid or Propertius
was striving for any special effect; if they were,
it can only have been one of mock-solemnity, but more
likely the collocation was fortuitous and would have
troubled the poets' reading public no more than it did
Burman.

For the sentiment cf. Prop. ii. 3. 45-6 si quis,
acrius, ut moriar, uenerit alter amor. 'Dying of love'

is, of course, commonplace in erotic contexts; see
OLD s.v. pereo 4.

11-16. Ovid becomes openly self-righteous.

11. peccati uellem mihi conscius essem: 'I've a mind to
wish that I were conscious of having committed a crime'
(we may as well read essem with PSYς, since essē > esse
is the easiest corruption in the world, and, though
uelle most frequently takes a simple infinitive in Ovid
(and in other writers), its construction with the sub-
junctive is amply attested in his work (see e.g. Met. ix.
734-5 femina ... / uellem nulla forem, xiii. 462, 805,
xiv. 482, Am. i. 8. 27, 13. 35, iii. 11 (B).41)). For the
construction of conscius with genitive and dative of the
reflexive pronoun cf. Verg. A. i. 604 mens conscia sibi
recti; the genitive alone is much more common (see
ThLL 4. 370. 69ff.).

peccati: 'offence'. Like crimen (cf. 8n. above) the
word regularly denotes specifically erotic misdemeanour;
see 19n. below peccasse.

12. The sentiment smacks of proverbiality, but I have found
no parallels for it.

13. nunc: 'but as it is'; cf. Prop. ii. 14. 15-16 utinam non
tam sero mihi nota fuisset/condicio! cineri nunc medicina
datur. Nunc is often used with an adversative force

similar to that of the Greek νῦν δέ; see <u>OLD</u> s.v. 11,

Hand, <u>Tursellinus</u> II. 340-41, LSJ s.v. νῦν 4.

<u>temere insimulas credendoque omnia frustra</u>: the out-

rageousness of Ovid's supremely innocent pose first

becomes apparent at <u>Am</u>. ii. 8. 3-4; see n. <u>ad loc</u>.

<u>insimulas</u>: the word generally implies 'false', 'unfounded'

accusations; cf. <u>Ep</u>. 6. 21-2 <u>utinam temeraria dicar /

criminibus falsis insimulasse uirum</u>! The word is another

quasi-legal term which is common in comedy and in prose,

but which Ovid alone of poets from the late Republic on-

wards is prepared to admit; cf. 2 above, 4. 1-4nn.

<u>frustra</u>: 'without justification'; cf. Verg. <u>A</u>. xi. 715

<u>uane Ligus frustraque animis elate superbis</u>. This sense

of <u>frustra</u> is most common in late Latin; see <u>ThLL</u> 6.

1435. 5ff.

14. <u>pondus habere</u>: 'carry weight', 'make an impression'; cf.

<u>Ars</u> iii. 805-6 <u>gaudia post Veneris quae poscet munus

amantem, / illa suas nolet pondus habere preces</u>,

Prop. iii. 7. 43-4 <u>si ... / uerba ... duxisset pondus

habere mea</u>.

15-16. 'Look how slowly moves the long-eared ass who is continually

subjected to beating.' Ovid does not make the purpose

of his <u>exemplum</u> explicit, but what he means, I think, is

that just as the ass, who is used to constant ill-
treatment, becomes indifferent to it and plods on regard-
less, so he, accustomed to Corinna's continual accusations,
is no longer much affected by them. This seems to cohere
rather better with what precedes than the alternative
interpretation offered by Marius: 'ut dicat Naso, quem-
admodum asellus, dum nimium et assidue uerberatur, ut
celerius eat, it tamen tardius: sic se assiduis re-
prehensionibus et querelis Corinnae frigidiorem fieri in
illius amorem.' But Marius (whose explanation has the
support of Burman) may be right.

The obstinacy of the ass, even in the face of mal-
treatment, is proverbial; cf. Pl. _Ps._ 136-7 (of slaves)
neque ego homines magis asinos numquam uidi, ita plagis
costae callent: / quos quom ferias, tibi plus noceas, and
see further Otto, _Sprichwörter_ 40-43.

15. _aspice_: like _aspicis_?, regularly used to introduce an
    observation of a proverbial nature; see 2. 41n.

    auritus: a conventional epithet of long-eared animals,
    such as asses (cf. _Fast._ vi. 469, _Ars_ i. 547·, Afran. _com._
    404) and hares (cf. Verg. _G._ i. 308, Germ. _Arat._ 341),
    but in the present context we may remember Horace's
    comment on the ass's tendency to 'drop its ears' as a
    gesture of unresponsiveness at _S._ i. 9. 20-21 _demitto_
    auriculas, ut iniquae mentis asellus / cum grauius dorso
    subiit onus.

<u>miserandae sortis</u>: for the expression cf. Verg. <u>A</u>. vi.
331-2 <u>constitit Anchisa satus</u> ... / <u>multa putans, sortem-
que</u> ... <u>miseratus iniquam</u>, <u>CLE</u> 541.2 <u>sorte miserandus
iniqua</u>.

17-18. At last we learn the precise reason for Ovid's present
outburst, <u>nouum crimen</u> in 17 picking up <u>noua crimina</u> in
1 above.

<u>ecce</u>: see 10. 4n.

<u>crimen</u>: see 8n. above.

<u>sollers ornare</u>: '<u>ornare</u> ..., non <u>caput ornare</u> dicebant',
remarks Heinsius correctly (cf. the use of <u>ornatrix</u> for
'hairdresser' at e.g. <u>Am</u>. i. 14. 16, <u>Ars</u> iii. 239 ·). No
doubt the incorporation of a scribal gloss on <u>ornare</u>
into the text started the rot in ς.
    For <u>sollers</u> + infinitive cf. Hor. <u>Carm</u>. iv. 8. 7-8
<u>liquidis</u> ... <u>coloribus</u> / <u>sollers nunc hominem ponere, nunc
deum</u>, Sil. i. 79, viii. 258-60. The use of the 'epexegetic'
infinitive after certain adjectives is a notable feature
of Augustan poetry, particularly that of Horace; see
Hofmann-Szantyr 350-51, E.C. Wickham, <u>The Works of Horace</u>
(Oxford 1874, 3rd edn. 1896), I. 406-9.

<u>Cypassis</u>: an invented name, but not an inappropriate one
for a pretty slave-girl; the Greek κύπασσις denotes a kind

of dress, often of short length (see A.S.F. Gow, <u>CR</u> n.s.
5 (1955), 238-9), and we may deduce from Hor. <u>S</u>. i. 2.
94ff. that the class of women to which <u>ancillae</u> belonged
wore short and attractively leg-revealing garments instead
of the full-length attire of noble Roman women (see J.
Marquardt, <u>Das Privatleben der Römer</u> (Leipzig 1886, re-
printed Darmstadt 1964) II. 573 ff.). Lee's 'Kilty'
attempts to reflect the sense of Cypassis in English.
For another appropriately coined proper name cf. Dipsas
of the drunken old <u>lena</u> at <u>Am</u>. i. 8. 2.

18. <u>obicitur</u>: 'is charged with', an apparently unique
classical use of the passive of <u>obicere</u> with a personal
subject; the most common construction is <u>obicere aliquid
alicui</u> (see <u>ThLL</u> 9. 56. 26ff.).

<u>dominae</u>: the slave's word for mistress; see l. 17n.
<u>amica</u>.

<u>contemerasse</u>: an extremely rare word (attested elsewhere
only at Mart. <u>Sp</u>. 10. 2 and Rufin. <u>Hist</u>. v. 28. 15) with
a very strong meaning - 'pollute', 'defile' - and obviously
used here to intensify the supposed enormity of Corinna's
accusation. Other uncommon compounds in <u>con</u>- admitted
by Ovid are <u>concauare</u> (<u>Met</u>. ii. 195), <u>confindere</u> (<u>Fast</u>.
ii. 647), <u>confodire</u> (e.g. <u>Am</u>. ii. 9 (<u>A</u>). 8; see n. <u>ad loc</u>.),
<u>confremere</u> (<u>Met</u>. i. 199), <u>congelare</u> (e.g. <u>Met</u>. vi. 307),
<u>conscelerare</u> (<u>Met</u>. vii. 35), <u>contumulare</u> (e.g. <u>Tr</u>. iii.
3. 32), <u>conuolare</u> (<u>Fast</u>. vi. 343). For rare compounds with

various other prefixes see 3. 6, 5. 36, 56, 9. (B). 52nn.

19-26. Ovid argues that he has (a) better taste (19-22) and
(b) more sense (23-6) than to have an affair with Cypassis;
see introduction above p. 329, n. 7.

19. di melius: 'God forbid!' A shortened version of various
deprecatory formulae found in old Latin (see Hofmann,
Lateinische Umgangssprache 31-2) and an expression confined
to poetry and 'Kunstprosa'. Cf. Ars ii. 388, Prop. iv.
6. 65, and see further Tränkle, Sprachkunst 151.

si sit ... libido: 'If I should have the urge.' The
use of libido + esse as the equivalent of libet is not
common in the Augustan period (see ThLL. 9. 1330. 57ff.,
1336. 6ff.), and Ovid no doubt uses it here partly for
metrical convenience, but the common amatory significance
of libido (i.e. sexual desire) makes it particularly
appropriate in this context; cf. Am. ii. 15. 25 sed, puto,
te nuda mea membra libidine surgent, Hor. Carm. i. 25. 13
flagrans amor et libido (OLD s.v. 3 gives more examples).

(The true reading si sit appears in a few late
renaissance MSS, no doubt as a result of humanist con-
jecture, for the emendation of the solecistic sic sit
given by most of the MSS is a fairly obvious one (it did,
however, elude Heinsius).)

peccasse: though the sense seems to favour the adoption
of the present infinitive given by ς, peccasse is almost

certainly right in combination with sit ... libido, since

the Augustan poets frequently use the perfect infinitive

rather than the present with any expression of will or

desire (cf. 4. 26n.). Often the usage was metrically

convenient (see e.g. Am. ii. 4. 22, iii. 2. 30), but

it obviously became a mannerism, for it is also employed

after expressions other than those of will or desire (for

a full list see Platnauer 109-12) and where metrical necessity

is not a consideration (e.g. at Ars i. 406, 496); it even

appears in the prose of Livy and Tacitus. See Kühner-

Stegmann II. i. 133 (with bibliography), Hofmann-Szantyr

351-2, E. Bednara, ALL 14 (1906), 575, Norden on Verg.

A. vi. 78-9, Bömer on Fast. ii. 322.

Peccare, originally meaning 'to stumble', is regularly

used by Horace and the elegists, as here, with the meaning

'to commit an act of infidelity'; cf. Am. ii. 5. 3 uota

mori mea sunt, cum te peccasse recordor, Tib. i. 9. 23

nec tibi celandi spes sit peccare paranti, Prop. ii. 6. 40

quam peccare pudet, Cynthia, tuta sat est, Hor. Carm. iii.

7. 19-20 peccare docentis / fallax historias mouet.

Pichon collects many more elegiac instances s.v. and

points out that peccare occasionally means little more

than amare; see e.g. [Tib.] iii. 13. 9 sed peccasse

iuuat.

20. sordida contemptae sortis amica: 'a cheap, despicable

whore like her'; for amica with a derogatory tone see

1. 17n. Cf. 8. 1-2n.

sortis: for _sors_ referring to rank or station cf. Hor. _Carm_. iv. 11. 21-3 _occupauit / non tuae sortis iuuenem puella / diues et lasciua._

21-2. The question here, of course, is rhetorical, but it gets an answer at _Am_. ii. 8. 11-12 (see n. _ad loc._). Cf. _Cod. Theod_. vii. 1. 6, _ad sordida descendere conubia seruularum._

21. _Veneris famulae conubia:_ 'intercourse with a slave-girl'. _Veneris conubia_ = _concubitus_ (cf. Lucr. iii. 776 _conubia ... Veneris partusque ferarum_) and _famulae_ has adjectival force here (cf. Stat. _Silv_. iv. 2. 39 _famulas ... turmas_).

22. _uerbere secta:_ see 2. 29n.

23. _adde quod:_ 'there is also the fact that ...'. Axelson (_Unpoetische Wörter_ 47) points out that, despite its fairly pedestrian meaning, the expression is not prosaic.

ornandis illa est operosa capillis: Kenney alone prefers ω's _operosa_ to the vulgate _operata_, and I suspect that he has right on his side. For _operatus_, 'engaged in', is generally used to indicate devotion to a particular activity or pursuit at a precise point in time (e.g. _Met_. viii. 865 _studioque operatus inhaesi_ (a fisherman claiming to have been solely occupied with the business of fishing), _Ep_. 9. 35-6 _uotis operata pudicis / torqueor_, Verg. _A_. iii. 136 _conubiis aruisque nouis operata iuuentus_; for

further examples see OLD s.v. 1); it does not normally
describe a person's regular occupation. So here ornandis
illa est operata capillis would probably imply not simply
that Cypassis was Corinna's regular hairdresser, but
that she was actually engaged in doing Corinna's hair
as Ovid was speaking. Operosa, on the other hand, would
give the very acceptable sense 'She is meticulously
attentive to the dressing of your hair', i.e. she is
really conscientious about the job (cf. 25 below ancillam,
quae tam tibi fida). The same word is used of female
attentiveness to grooming at Am. ii. 10. 5 utraque formosa
est, operosae cultibus ambae.

24. per doctas grata ministra manus: PSY's corrupt perdocta
est ... manus has provoked a flurry of conjectures (a
selection of them may be seen in Munari's apparatus).
Heinsius's proposed emendation, perdocta ... manū, is,
predictably, by far the most elegant and persuasive (Ovid
is particularly fond of words with the intensifying per-
prefix (e.g. percoquere, perdomare, perducere, perdurare,
perlatere, permulcere, perprimere, perquirere, pertaedet,
pertimescere), and perdocere is attested elsewhere in his
work (Fast. vi. 693, Rem. 490, Pont. iv. 12. 28)). But
the text offered by ω, per doctas ... manus, is defensible
and should probably be retained. Doctae manus, 'clever
hands', is an expression attested also at Am. ii. 4. 28,
and gratus per + accusative, though apparently a unique
construction, is perfectly intelligible. The error in α
could easily have resulted from the copyist's erroneous
silent repetition of per doctas as perdoctast.

ministra: see n. below.

25. ancillam: the most common word for a slave girl in elegy,
but studiously avoided in epic and tragedy where famula
and ministra are preferred.   Cf. 8. 12n. serua.

quae tam tibi fida: Kenney's conjecture quod erat (a
modification of Palmer's quia erat), with which y has
subsequently been discovered to agree, does not, as Goold
implies (Amat. Crit. 35), produce nonsense, but the sense
which it does produce, 'I suppose I'd pick her out to ask
because she was your confidante' (Kenney, Notes 61;   the
italics are his), is hardly 'neat and pointed', as Kenney
claims;   it is, on the contrary, exceedingly awkward.
If quod erat is right, one can only say that Ovid's
attempt at sarcasm is a very clumsy one, but in fact it
seems much more likely that the correct reading is the
quae tam transmitted by most of the recc.;   it is grammatical,
metrical, immediately intelligible and exactly what is
wanted.   Indeed, Kenney's only objection to quae tam is
that it is difficult to explain its corruption to the
readings offered by the α MSS;   Goold, however (Amat.
Crit. 35), takes up the challenge and provides an explanation
which has considerable plausibility.

The kind of treatment to which we are elsewhere led
to believe that hairdressers were generally subjected by
their dominae would hardly seem to be conducive to loyalty;
see Am. i. 14. 15-18 where Ovid comments that Corinna's
hair (before she tampered with it) was so manageable that

her coiffeuse never found herself being stabbed with
hair pins (which was, we gather, what normally tended to
happen!); cf. Juv. 6. 487-94. The intimacy of the hair-
dresser with her mistress, however, made her an excellent
choice for a 'go-between' when the lover was seeking
an assignation with her _domina_; see _Am_. i. 11 and 12,
Ars i. 367-72.

rogarem: 'ask her for an assignation'; the absolute use
of _rogare_ as an erotic euphemism is common in elegy and
in the epigrams of Martial; cf. _Am_. ii. 2. 5 _misi
scriptoque rogaui_, _Ars_ i. 345 _quae dant quaeque negant,
gaudent tamen esse rogatae_ (_dare_ and _negare_ are used in
a similar fashion; see Tränkle, _Sprachkunst_ 163ff. and
cf. 8. 25n.); further examples are collected by Pichon s.v.

26. Ovid's expression is very compressed: 'Why (would I have
done it), unless I had been wanting to make sure of both
rejection (by her) and exposure (to you)'; see Hofmann-
Szantyr 645-6. Another rhetorical question (cf. 21-2n.)
which receives something of an answer in the following
poem; see 8. 25-8n.

repulsa: elsewhere Ovid counts the risk of _repulsa_ as
one of the most exciting and pleasurable features of a
love-affair; see 9 (_B_). 46n.

indicio: see 8. 5n. _index_.

27-8. Ovid's impressive oath is, as it turns out (see 8. 17-
20nn.), nothing but a typical ἀφροδίσιος ὅρκος.

27. <u>pueri</u> ... <u>uolatilis</u>: the reference is, of course, to
Cupid, who is conventionally winged in literature and
art; cf. Apul. <u>Met</u>. v. 22 <u>uolatilis dei</u>, <u>Ars</u> ii. 98
<u>deum uolucrem</u>, Tib. ii. 5. 39 <u>uolitantis</u> ... <u>Amoris</u>,
Prop. ii. 12. 5 (<u>qui pinxit Amorem</u>) <u>non frustra uentosas</u>
<u>addidit alas</u>, and for iconographical representations see
Daremberg and Saglio I. 1595ff., figs. 2142-8.

per ... <u>arcus</u>: for the bow as an attribute of Cupid see
9 (<u>A</u>). 5n., and for the practice of swearing by the
attributes of the gods rather than by the gods themselves
cf. Tib. i. 4. 25-6 <u>perque suas impune sinit Dictynna</u>
<u>sagittas / adfirmes,crines perque Minerua suos</u> (with K.F.
Smith's note).

28. The final plea of 'Not guilty'. <u>Criminis</u> and <u>reum</u> provide
a clear link with the opening line.

VIII

Cf. introduction to 7 above, pp. 328-31, to which poem the present piece is an immediate sequel. Ovid is now alone with Cypassis, his mistress's hairdresser, with whom he has just vehemently denied having an affair.

Addressing Cypassis in highly complimentary terms (1-4), Ovid asks how Corinna could possibly have discovered her liaison with him (5-6). He looks back with satisfaction, however, on the way that <u>he</u> conducted himself in the recent crisis (7-8) - though he is forced to stop and eat his derogatory words about people who have affairs with slave-girls (9-14) - but Cypassis, he alleges, almost gave the game away with her guilty reactions, leaving him to save the situation with his ἀφροδίσιος ὅρκος (15-20). In return for that act of gallantry he now requests another assignation (21-2); on finding her disinclined to comply, however, he is thoroughly affronted and threatens that, unless she thinks better of it, he will reveal everything to Corinna (23-8).

1-2. 'Cypassis, expert at arranging hair in a thousand styles,
coiffeuse/as only goddesses deserve.' An elaborately
complimentary paraphrase for <u>sollers ornare Cypassis</u> at
<u>Am</u>. ii. 7. 17, and a very far cry from <u>sordida contemptae</u>
<u>sortis amica</u> in line 20 of that poem (see n. <u>ad loc</u>.).
Though nothing is as yet revealed, Ovid's highly flattering
tone immediately prepares the reader for something of a
<u>volte-face</u> in relation to his stand in the previous poem.
Cf. introduction to 2 above pp. 100-101.

1. <u>ponendis</u> ... <u>perfecta capillis</u>: for <u>perfectus</u> construed
with the simple ablative (instead of the more common <u>in</u>
+ ablative; see e.g. <u>Ars</u> ii. 547 <u>hac ego</u> ... <u>non sum</u>
<u>perfectus in arte</u>) cf. Suet. <u>Gram</u>. 4 (127 Reifferscheid)
<u>litteratorem</u> ... <u>non perfectus litteris, sed imbutum</u>.
The closely allied <u>peritus</u> may similarly be followed by
an ablative with or without <u>in</u>; see <u>OLD</u> s.v., a.

<u>in mille modos</u>: for a few examples of the many complicated
hairstyles which became increasingly fashionable with
Roman women as time advanced see Daremberg and Saglio I.
1367ff., figs. 1855ff., and cf. Balsdon, <u>Roman Women</u>
255-60; obviously the minute attention of a skilled
<u>ornatrix</u> would be required to produce them (cf. Mart. ii.
66, Juv. 6. 495-504). Ovid himself advises on different
styles to suit different faces with the professional air
of a master coiffeur at <u>Ars</u> iii. 135-60.

2. <u>comere</u>: identical in meaning to <u>ornare</u> as used at <u>Am</u>.
ii. 7. 17 (see n. <u>ad loc</u>.), i.e. 'to dress', or 'to
"do" hair'; the poets' choice of one or the other seems
to have been largely dictated by the demands of metre
(see the examples of <u>comere</u> given by <u>ThLL</u> at 3. 1992.
23ff. and of <u>ornare</u> by <u>OLD</u> s.v., b).

<u>sed</u>: for the postponement of the conjunction see 10.
36n. <u>et</u>.

3-4. The reader's alerted suspicions (cf. 1-2n. above) are
quickly confirmed.

3. <u>mihi</u> ... <u>non rustica cognita</u>: 'whom I have found to be
no unsophisticated girl' (for the litotes cf. 1. 5n.
<u>non frigida</u>). Rusticus, properly 'of the country',
has a distinctly derogatory tone elsewhere in Augustan
poetry; see especially Verg. <u>Ecl</u>. 2. 56 <u>rusticus es</u>,
<u>Corydon</u>, Hor. <u>Ep</u>. i. 2. 42 <u>rusticus exspectat dum defluat</u>
<u>amnis</u>, where the sense is 'clown' or 'bumpkin'. Ovid,
however, gives the word a new kind of pejorative meaning:
<u>rusticitas</u> signifies for him lack of finesse, experience
or confidence <u>in sexual matters</u>; cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 8. 43-4
<u>casta est quam nemo rogauit</u>; / <u>aut, si rusticitas non</u>
<u>uetat, ipsa rogat</u>, ii. 4. 13 <u>siue procax aliqua est</u>,
<u>capior quia rustica non est</u> (Pichon collects more re-
ferences s.v.). Cf. B. Otis, <u>TAPhA</u> 69 (1938), 204-8
(see 1. 2n. for the similar way in which Ovid treats
the word <u>nequitia</u>).

furto: properly meaning 'theft', furtum is regularly
used in love elegy of any kind of illicit or surreptitious
sexual relations; cf. Ars i. 33 nos Venerem tutam
concessaque furta (i.e. love with courtesans, not married
women) canemus, Tib. i. 2. 34 celari uult sua furta Venus,
Prop. ii. 2. 4 Iuppiter, ignosco pristina furta tua; the
word is first attested with this sense in Catullus (68.
136 rara uerecundae furta feremus erae). For further
references see ThLL 6. 1649. 68ff., and cf. 8n. below.

4. apta ... dominae sed magis apta mihi: the repeated apta
produces a splendid double-entendre: 'You who suit
your mistress, but suit me better still.' (Brandt is
clearly wrong in comparing here Am. i. 4. 5 apte subiecta,
where apte = arte.)

For the sentiment cf. Ars iii. 665-6 nec nimium uobis
formosa ancilla ministret: / saepe uices dominae praebuit
illa mihi.

5. inter nos sociati corporis: a crudely realistic and
apparently unique expression for sexual intercourse (cf.
however, Ep. 3. 109-10 nulla Mycenaeum sociasse cubilia
mecum / iuro; where cubilia sociare refers simply to
the sexual act rather than to union in marriage as at
Met. x. 635 and Verg. A. iv. 16), which contrasts sharply
with the conventional euphemism and subtle double-entendre
of the previous couplet (cf. 3-4nn. above). For the
construction inter se sociari cf. Cic. Leg. i. 11. 32
omne genus hominum sociatum inter se esse.

unde: = ex quo; see 2. 47, 7. 4nn.

7. num ... ? num ... ?: the repeated interrogative particle
(corrupted to a toneless negative by virtually all the
MSS on its first appearance in this line and by most of
them also on its second) reinforces Ovid's air of self-
congratulation: 'But (you have to admit) I didn't blush,
did I? I didn't slip up in one word that I said ... ?'

(The appearance of the initial num in S alone may
be owed to tradition, but it could equally well be the
result of conjecture (even though the copyist of S, or
its immediate ancestor, does not normally shine in that
area (cf. 4. 33n.)) or, of course, pure fluke. At any
rate, it is a rare example of a true reading presented
by S in isolation (see Kenney, Man. Trad. 8, n.3.)

uerbo lapsus in ullo: for the expression cf. Plin. Ep.
ii. 33 ne uerbo quidem labitur.

8. furtiuae Veneris: cf. Mimn. fr. 1. 3 (West) κρυπταδίη φιλότης.
Ancient poetic love affairs invariably contain a clan-
destine element of some kind (see Copley, Exclusus
Amator 36-42) and furtiuus is one of the commonest epi-
thets in the Latin sermo amatorius, applied not only to
amor or Venus, as here (cf. Ars i. 275, Tib. i. 8. 57,
Verg. A. iv. 171 (with Pease's note)), but also to numerous
adjuncts of the amatory situation, e.g. munus (Catul.
65. 19), preces (Prop. i. 16. 20) and even lectus (Tib. i. 5.

7); see further ThLL 6. 1644. 42ff., Pichon s.v. Cf.
also 3n. above.

conscia signa: see 1. 8n.

9-10. quid quod ... / ... contendi?: 'What of the fact that
I maintained ...?'; for the expression cf. Cic. Sen.
83 quid quod sapientissimus cuisque aequissimo animo
moritur?

Ovid's rhetorical question skilfully keeps us in
touch with the dramatic setting of this poem (cf. 23n.
below), for it invites us to imagine the poet's glowing
review of his own performance (see 7n. above) rudely
interrupted by Cypassis who is less interested in ad-
miring his histrionic abilities than in finding out what
he meant by intimating that nobody in his right mind
would dream of having an affair with a woman as low
and disreputable as an ancilla (cf. Am. ii. 7. 19-22).

in ancilla ... delinquere: 'to have an affair with a
maid'. The use of delinquere as the equivalent of
peccare in its special erotic sense (see 7. 19n.) is
confined to Ovid; cf. Am. iii. 6. 49 delicta ... Martis.
Ancilla, as at Hor. S. i. 2. 62-3 quid inter / est in
matrona, ancilla, peccesne togata?, is the correct reading;
in + ablative with delinquere or peccare indicates the
sphere in which offence is committed (cf. Ter. Ad. 124

te plura in hac re peccare ostendam, Sen. H. Oct. 1029
in matre peccas), in + accusative, the person against
whom offence is committed (see e.g. Ter. Ph. 803 uide
ne in cognatam pecces, Ad. 725 hoc peccatum in uirginemst
ciuem).

10. illum ... mente carere bona: 'that he was out of his
mind'; for mens bona = 'sanity' cf. Petr. 61. 1 postquam
... omnes bonam mentem bonamque ualetudinem sibi optarunt
and especially Am. i. 2. 31 where the personified Mens Bona
is one of the captives paraded in the triumph of Cupid
(love of any woman generally being thought to rob a man
of his reason; see 2. 13n.).

11-14. Ovid resorts to the traditional method of defending love
between free men and slave-girls, i.e. appeal to precedent;
cf. especially Hor. Carm. ii. 4. 1-12 and see further
Nisbet-Hubbard, loc. cit. Lucian Müller (Philologus 11
(1856), 83-4) found the connection between these lines
and those which precede and follow so difficult to see
that he proposed deleting them as spurious (his detailed
arguments are too absurdly pedantic to require serious
refutation), and even Kenney has seen fit to put them in
parenthesis, regarding them, presumably, as an aside
which the poet addresses to himself. But Ovid's words
were surely intended for Cypassis's ears - he is not
trying to convince himself that there is no shame in his
having a liaison with a slave-girl but to convince Cypassis

that he did not mean it when he said that there was (Am.
ii. 7. 19-22). The sequence of thought in lines 7-16, as
I see it, is this: 'You have to hand it to me, I did
rather well in that contretemps with Corinna (7-8) - oh,
I see, you're nettled because I said that only a fool
would take up with a slave-girl! (9-10) Well, what about
Achilles and Agamemnon? They did it, and I wouldn't
think myself more high and mighty than they, would I? (11-
14) - but you, you nearly gave us away by blushing like
that when she looked at you' (15-16). To regard lines
11-14 as an aside is certainly to rob the poem of some
of its dramatic movement.

Possibly Ovid cites his impeccable precedents some-
what tongue-in-cheek, for the indirect comparison of
Cypassis with Briseis and Cassandra who were not, of
course, common ancillae, but high-born captives, is an
absurdly flattering one.

11-12. Thessalus ancillae ... arsit, / serua: Ovid's choice
of vocabulary suggests conscious reminiscence of Hor.
Carm. ii. 4. 1-12:

> Ne sit ancillae tibi amor pudori,
> Xanthia Phoceu, prius insolentem
> serua Briseis niueo colore
>   mouit Achillem;
>
> mouit Aiacem Telamone natum
> forma captiuae dominum Tecmessae;
> arsit Atrides medio in triumpho
>   uirgine rapta,
>
> barbarae postquam cecidere turmae
> Thessalo uictore et ademptus Hector
> tradidit fessis leuiora tolli
>   Pergama Grais.

Thessalus, of course = Achilles.

11. <u>facie Briseidos arsit</u>: cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 9. 33 <u>ardet in abducta</u> <u>Briseide maestus Achilles</u>, and for <u>ardere</u> + ablative without preposition, Hor. <u>Epod</u>. 14. 9-10 <u>dicunt arsisse</u> <u>Bathyllo / Anacreonta Teium</u>. For fire imagery in love poetry see 1. 8n. and for <u>facies</u> = 'beauty', 1. 5n.

12. <u>serua</u> ... <u>Phoebas</u>: i.e. Cassandra. <u>Serua</u>, the most down-to-earth term for a female slave, is not, like the masculine <u>seruus</u>, an 'unpoetical word', as Nisbet-Hubbard (on Hor. <u>Carm</u>. ii. 4. 3) imply, for it is rare even in prose, and though <u>famula</u> and <u>ministra</u> are the most favoured terms in elevated poetry, <u>serua</u> is not meticulously avoided (cf. Verg. <u>A</u>. v. 284, ix. 546, Sen. <u>Phaed</u>. 622, Sil. xvi. 568, and see Axelson, <u>Unpoetische Wörter</u> 58). Cf. 7. 25n. <u>ancilla</u>.

    <u>Phoebas</u> is a rare term for 'priestess of Apollo'; it is used by Ovid again at <u>Tr</u>. ii. 400 in exactly the same phrase as we have here, <u>Mycenaeo Phoebas amata duci</u>, by Lucan at v. 128 and 167, and by Seneca at <u>Ag</u>. 588; cf. E. <u>Hec</u>. 827 ἣ φοιβὰs ἣν καλοῦσι Κασσάνδραν Φρύγεs.

<u>Mycenaeo</u> ... <u>duci</u>: of course, Agamemnon. For the dative of agent after <u>amata</u> cf. <u>Tr</u>. i. 6. 2 <u>nec tantum Coo Bittis</u> <u>amata suo est</u>.

13. <u>nec sum ego</u>: the reading of <u>PSY</u> and a few <u>recc</u>. is per-

fectly good. Some scribes were obviously troubled by .
the elision (cf., however, <u>Tr</u>. iii. 11. 25, Prop. i. 12.
11, and see further Platnauer 78, J. Soubiran, <u>L'élision</u>
<u>dans la poésie latine</u> (Paris 1966), 413) and/or by the
presence of <u>nec</u> where a connective is not required (here,
of course, <u>nec</u> is <u>not</u> a connective, but a correlative;
cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 4.' 9, 11-12).

14. 'What goes for royalty is good enough for me' (Lee).
For <u>turpis</u> = 'degrading' cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 17. 1 <u>si quis erit</u>,
<u>qui turpe putet seruire puellae</u>.

15. <u>tamen</u>: the force of the particle is resumptive here,
indicating that Ovid is taking up again the reflections
from which he broke off in 7-8 (see n. <u>ad loc</u>. and also
11-14n.).

<u>iratos in te defixit ocellos</u>: 'gave you an angry stare'
(Lee's 'looked daggers at you' is superb!). For <u>ocellos</u>
(<u>uel sim</u>.) <u>defigere</u> cf. Verg. <u>A</u>. i. 226 <u>Libyae defixit</u>
<u>lumina regnis</u>.

15-16. <u>in te</u> ... / ... <u>te</u>: the repeated personal pronoun emphasizes
the contrast which Ovid points between Cypassis's behaviour
and his own.

16. <u>totis erubuisse genis</u>: for the expression cf. <u>Ep</u>. 20. 112
<u>sensi me totis erubuisse genis</u>.

17-20. Ovid calls into service the traditional notion of lovers
being able to perjure themselves with impunity. The
invalidity of the ἀφροδίσιος ὅρκος is one of the most
common themes in ancient erotic literature (see Nisbet-
Hubbard's introduction to Hor. Carm. ii. 8 for a comprehensive
collection of examples of the motif and an excellent
discussion of its history and development); here the
triteness of the theme is relieved by the dramatic setting
and the introduction of some new details (see 18-19nn.).
Cf. Am. iii. 3 for an extended and witty treatment of the
same topos from a different angle.

17. at: the particle marks the sharp contrast between Ovid's
reaction to the crisis and that of Cypassis just described
(15-16); cf. 10. 19n.

si forte refers: a reminder (of Am. ii. 7. 27-8) for
both Cypassis and the reader!

quanto praesentior ipse: 'how much greater presence of
mind I showed'; cf. Cic. de Orat. ii. 20. 84 animus
acer et praesens, Plin. Nat. xvii. 1. 4. Crassus, ut
praesens ingenio semper.

18. Cf. Am. ii. 7. 27-8 per Venerem iuro ... / me non admissi
criminis esse reum.

19-20. 'Ponuntur hi duo uersus uelut in παρενθέσει.' Thus,

helpfully, Micyllus, but no editor before Kenney thought
to mark the parenthetical nature of this couplet by
the use of brackets in the text.

19. tu, dea, tu iubeas ... : according to the legend (see
     Hes. fr. 124, and cf. Ars i. 635-6) it was Jupiter who,
     after swearing a false oath to Juno, originally exempted
     perjured lovers from punishment, but Venus is often pre-
     sented as the obliging deity (see e.g. Am. i. 8. 85-6 nec
     ... tu iurare timeto: / commodat in lusus numina surda
     Venus, Hor. Carm. ii. 8. 13).   On this occasion Ovid
     points out that he deliberately swore falsely in Venus's
     name (see Am. ii. 7. 27-8) - presumably for extra security!
     Cf. [Tib.] iii. 6. 48, Paul. Sil AP v. 279. 5.

     tu ... tu: for the epanalepsis cf. Am. ii. 10. 1 tu mihi,
     tu certe ... Graecine.

     dea: the vocatives dea and diua are often used in address
     to female deities, while male gods are nearly always
     addressed by proper names, the ugly vocative dee not being
     used and diue only very rarely; see e.g. Hor. Carm. i. 35.
     1 (with Nisbet-Hubbard's note), iv. 6. 1, Sil. x. 344, xv.
     159.

     animi periuria puri: Ovid's perjuries, he mischievously
     implies, are particularly worthy of divine indulgence
     because they issue from a 'pure heart' (moral purity was

conventionally claimed to afford supreme security to those who possessed it; see e.g. Hor. Carm. i. 22 (with Nisbet-Hubbard's introduction)). The wicked oxymoron (for Ovid's use of this device in general see Frécaut 42-5), understandably enough, drove some of the poet's mediaeval copyists to hasty interpolation (see apparatus).

20. The notion of lovers' oaths being carried away by the elements is one of the poets' standard ways of expressing their invalidity; cf. Ars i. 633-4 Iuppiter ex alto periuria ridet amantum / et iubet Aeolios irrita ferre Notos, Tib. i. 4. 21-2 Veneris periuria uenti / irrita per terras et freta summa ferunt (with K.F. Smith's note).

Carpathium tepidos per mare ... Notos: for the ornamental use of proper names see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. Carm. i. 35. 7. Ovid's desire for ornament here seems to have led to some confusion of ideas, for he has the periuria being carried away across a stormy sea (the Carpathian was notoriously rough;. see Mayor on Juv. 14. 278) by gentle winds (tepidos ... Notos = Zephyri, the warm spring breezes; see Housman on Lucan vii. 871, and for Notus proper, the stormy south wind, 6. 44n.).

21-2. A most unexpected development; we can only be astonished at Ovid's outrageous impudence in now asking Cypassis for another assignation as a token of gratitude for what he has done for her!

21. <u>pretium</u>:   see 1. 34n.

22. <u>concubitus ... tuos</u>:   i.e. <u>tecum concubitum</u>;   cf. 6n. above.

    <u>fusca</u>:   here probably = 'black' rather than 'swarthy'
    (cf. 4. 40n.), for there was a considerable vogue for
    coloured slaves in Rome (cf. Ter. <u>Eu</u>. 165-7 <u>nonne ubi mi</u>
    <u>dixti cupere te ex Aethiopia / ancillulam, relictis</u>
    <u>omnibus / quaesiui?</u>) and 'mixed' liaisons were certainly
    not unknown;   see Snowden, <u>Blacks in Antiquity</u> 193-5.

23. A question from Ovid again (cf. 9-10n. above) serves to
    apprise us of the reactions of his addressee (for the
    use of this device in general see W. Abel, <u>Die Anredeformen</u>
    <u>bei den römischen Elegikern</u> (Diss. Berlin 1930), 65-77),
    but this time nothing is left to the imagination: Cypassis
    refuses to oblige Ovid (<u>renuis</u>), saying that it is now
    more risky than ever to do so (<u>fingis ... nouos ... timores</u>).

    <u>renuis</u>:   shaking the head was with the ancients, as it is
    with us, a symbolic gesture of refusal;   see Sittl, <u>Die</u>
    <u>Gebärden</u> 82.

    <u>ingrata</u>:   a common term of abuse (cf. <u>Met</u>. vii. 711 <u>siste</u>
    <u>tuas, ingrate, querelas</u>, Sen. <u>Tro</u>. 658 <u>ingrata, dubitas?</u>
    and see further Opelt, <u>Die lateinische Schimpfwörter</u> 31),
    and here 'ungrateful' with specific reference to Cypassis's
    lack of gratitude to Ovid for his efforts to cover up
    for her.

24. 'It is enough to have made yourself popular with <u>one</u>
of your masters.' Ovid obviously means himself - in
this poem, as in <u>Am</u>. ii. 5, the <u>dominus</u> (or <u>uir</u>) in
Corinna's household (see introduction to 5, p.226 n. 1) -
and he is presumably intimating that Cypassis should be
satisfied to know that she can depend upon his ability
(already amply demonstrated) to protect her from the
wrath of Corinna, the <u>domina</u> (for <u>domini</u> covering both
masculine and feminine cf. 2. 32n.). But there is
probably something of a <u>double-entendre</u> here, for <u>emerere</u>
<u>aliquem</u> also suggests 'to win favour by sexual compliance';
cf. Tib. i. 9. 59-60 <u>nec lasciua soror dicatur</u> ... / ...
<u>plures emeruisse uiros</u>, and this of course, is precisely
how Cypassis has made herself popular with Ovid; thus
he tells her, 'It is enough to have "obliged" one of your
masters'.

Emerere <u>aliquem</u> ('to win someone's favour') is very
uncommon (<u>ThLL</u> (5. 2. 472. 72ff.) gives only five classical
instances of it); the normal expression is <u>promerere</u> or
<u>demerere aliquem</u>. Some of the <u>recc</u>. do indeed give
<u>promeruisse</u> or <u>demeruisse</u> here where PSYς give <u>emeruisse</u>,
but we may nevertheless reasonably assume that <u>emeruisse</u>
is right, for the usage is attested twice elsewhere in
Ovid (<u>Ep</u>. 6. 138, <u>Tr</u>. iv. 8. 52), and scribes would seem
more likely to have transmuted, accidentally or deliberately,
a choice expression into a familiar one rather than <u>vice</u>
<u>versa</u>.

25-8. Ovid reveals his trump card: Cypassis, by her previous
compliance, has put herself into a perfect position to be

blackmailed with the threat of exposure to Corinna. When
arguing at _Am_. ii. 7. 24-8 that it would be foolish in
the extreme to make advances to one's mistress's _ancilla_,
since she would be bound to refuse and tell her _domina_,
Ovid, of course, omits to mention that though there may
be some risk in approaching such a person initially, once
seduced, her own guilt would make it impossible for her to
play the informer! Cf. _Ars_ i. 389-90 (_tollitur index_, /
cum semel in partem criminis ipse uenit) and 394 (_perprime_
temptatam nec nisi uictor abi), where Ovid accordingly
advises the aspiring lover that if he _must_ seduce his
mistress's maid, for his own sake he had better make a
good job of it!

25. _stulta_: see 9 (_B_). 41n.

   negas: "refuse an assignation". _Negare_ is a standard
   erotic euphemism; see Pichon s.v. for a collection of
   elegiac examples of the usage and cf. 7. 25n.

25-6. _index ante acta fatebor / et ueniam culpae proditor ipse_
   meae: Ovid threatens to 'turn Queen's evidence'(there
   was even in antiquity some hope of reduced penalties for
   the offender who offered his services to the prosecution;
   see Berger, _Encyclopaedic Dictionary_ 498). For _index_
   see 5n. above.

   ueniam: here, = _fiam_; cf. Prop. ii. 34 (_B_). 81 _non tamen_
   haec ulli uenient ingrata legenti, i. 10. 25 _irritata uenit,_
   quando contemnitur illa.

27-8. <u>quoque loco</u> ... <u>quotiensque</u> ... / ... <u>quotque quibusque modis</u>:
the climactic force of Ovid's string of interrogatives is
magnificent; his inspiration was obviously a remark of
Tibullus (ii.6. 51-2): <u>tunc mens mihi perdita fingit / quisue</u>
<u>meam teneat, quot teneatue modis.</u>   Cf. also Juv. 6. 405-6
<u>dicet quis uiduam praegnatem fecerit et quo/mense, quibus</u>
<u>uerbis concumbat quaeque, modis quot</u> (a pale imitation
of Ovid).

<u>tecum fuerim</u>:   an erotic euphemism;   cf. <u>Ars</u> iii. 664
<u>mecum non semel illa fuit</u> (Brandt usefully quotes Var. <u>L.</u> vi.
80 (Goetz-Schoell) <u>'uiolauit' uirginem pro 'uit⟨i⟩auit' dicebant</u>;
<u>aeque eadem modestia potius 'cum muliere fuisse' quam</u>
<u>'concubuisse' dicebant).</u>

IX (A) and (B)

[Duquesnay 28-9; Jäger 148-53; Lörcher 14-25; Morgan 30-31, 37-8, 82-3; L. Müller, Philologus 11 (1856), 89-91; Neumann 34-7; Spies, Militat omnis amans]

Here we encounter Ovid remonstrating with Cupid for attacking him unfairly, as he is one of the love-god's most loyal retainers (1-4). He argues alternately that it is wrong to attack an ally (5-6, 11-12) and pointless to attack one already conquered or captured when there are many fresh victims to be seized (7-10, 13-18). He has, he claims, served his term in the army of love and wants to retire (19-24). But literally in the next breath we find him declaring the prospect of life without love intolerable (25-6) and depicting himself as totally unable to resist the power of Amor (27-34); indeed, he willingly offers himself as a prime target for Cupid's arrows (35-8). He goes on to compare the delights he experiences as a devotee of love with the sterile existence of those who reject it (39-50) and finally invites Cupid to take up residence in his heart and bring a host of girls in his train (51-4).

All our MSS present the 54 lines summarized above as a single elegy, but most editors, following Lucian Müller[1], regard line 25 as the beginning of a new poem. Müller's reasons for believing that the piece should be divided into two were, briefly, these: (i) that the

---

1. Loc. cit. Bibliography of subsequent support for Müller is provided by Jäger (148-9); Morgan 82-3 should now be added to the list.

change of attitude from rebellion against love in 1-24
to joyous acceptance of love in 25-54 is too complete
and too sudden to be accommodated within one poem; (ii)
that Ovid is fond of treating the same basic theme from
two different angles in pairs of juxtaposed elegies;
(iii) that the division of the piece along with that
of Am. iii. 11, and the excision of iii. 5 as unauthentic,
would give the total number of 50 for the poems of the
Amores and the round figures of 15, 20 and 15 for Books
i, ii and iii respectively.

Müller himself cautioned against placing too much
emphasis upon the third point, and it is rightly dis-
missed as a primary criterion[2] by Jäger, who leads the
opposition against him. Jäger argues for unity basically
on the following grounds: (i) that a sudden volte-face
within a single poem is perfectly acceptable if the piece
in question is a dramatic monologue in which the poet
consciously attempts to carry the reader with him through
the experience of a change of heart[3], and (ii) that
expressions and ideas which appear in lines 1-24 here are
taken up again in lines 25-54[4].

---

2. Cf. introduction to 2 above, p. 103, n. 26.

3. Jäger compares Am. ii. 10 and Hor. Carm. iv. 1; see
also introduction to 2 above, pp. 97ff.

4. He draws attention to uiuere in 24 echoed by uiue in
25, deposito ... ense in 22 by posito ... amore in 25
and in corde meo desidiose in 2 by indeserta meo pectore
regna gere in 52, and he notes the use of horse imagery
and ship imagery in both sections of the piece (cf. 21
and 29-30, 22 and 31-2). See also Lörcher, loc. cit.

In answer to this, however, it may be pointed out
firstly   that the re-working in the second of two
separate, but closely related, poems of a certain amount
of material from the first is a characteristic feature of
Ovid's technique of composition in the elegiac diptych
which he loves so well[5], and secondly that violent changes
of attitude in the type of dramatic monologue such as
this piece is claimed to be (i.e. one in which the addressee
is not necessarily present and is certainly not expected
to answer back) are normally signalled either by a par-
ticle marking an important transition or by the emphatic
placing of a personal pronoun to indicate that a contrast
is about to be pointed between one person's lot or ideas
and another's[6]; here, of course, there is nothing at all
to lessen the abruptness of the turnabout which comes
at line 25[7].   It is no good arguing that all is well if
we imagine a pause for reflection after line 24, for this
is precisely what in fact we do, albeit sub-consciously,
if we assume that a new poem begins with line 25; and
neither does it help when Lörcher suggests that the piece
should be seen as one continuous elegy falling into three

---

5. See introduction to 2 above, pp. 100-101. I can only assume
that Jäger and Lörcher, in confidently asserting that lines
51-4 specifically retract the complaint in lines 1-2,
find lines 1-2 less puzzling than I do (see nn. below
ad loc.), but even if the assertion is true, it does nothing
to prove the unity of the piece.

6. See e.g. sed tamen at Am. ii. 10. 15, at at Am. ii. 11.
33, sed at Prop. i. 8 (A). 17 and me (at the beginning of
the line) at Hor. Carm. iv. 1. 29.

7. The same is not quite true of Am. iii. 11, also divided
(after line 32) by Müller, following Hampk, for the couplet
33-4 luctantur pectusque leue in contraria tendunt / hac

sections rather than two (i.e. 1-18, 19-34, 35-54), the

first and the last showing Ovid making diametrically opposed

requests to Cupid, and the central one presenting him not

as asking for, but as envisaging, retirement, and then

pronouncing it undesirable, for it is virtually impossible

to look upon 19-24 as anything but the climax to the line

of argument which Ovid has presented in 1-18. These

considerations, together with the fact that the erroneous

conjoining of consecutive elegies is not unparalleled in

the tradition of the Amores[8], persuade me that it is

probably right to follow Müller in regarding lines 1-24

and 25-54 as two separate poems[9] forming the kind of con-

trasting pair for which Ovid has a distinct liking[10].

---

amor, hac odium; sed, puto, uincit amor at least gives
some kind of 'breathing-space' between Ovid's repudiation
of love in the lines which precede and his acknowledgement
of his inability to escape from it in those which follow.

8. R (Parisinus Latinus 8242; see Kenney, praef. v.) SYω
join Am. i. 1-3, Y joins i. 8-11, 13-15 and ii. 1-4, S joins
ii. 12-13 and PSY ii. 18-19.

9. I designate them 9.(A) and (B) respectively with the
majority of editors.

10. I do not consider that Morgan (82-3 and n. 24 succeeds
in providing an extra reason for dividing the present piece
by comparing Ovid's use of Propertian material in it
(see 19-24n. below) with that in Am. ii. 13 and 14, which
are obviously separate, but closely related, poems.

The poet's complaint of the relentless attack of
Love equipped with bow and arrows, which is the subject
of our first poem (A), is a common theme in Hellenistic
and later Greek epigram[11], and it makes brief appearances
in various guises in the work of Ovid's fellow-elegists[12],
sometimes overlaid with the peculiarly Roman concept of
militia amoris[13], which depicts the lover as a soldier
and the warring Cupid either as his enemy[14] or as the
general who uses his aggression to keep his troops in
order[15]. Here Ovid attempts to develop the latter notion,
presenting Cupid as a commanding-officer who attacks one
of his own men, he himself being a loyal miles amoris -
a battle-scarred campaigner in the war of love. The idea
takes a more original turn, however, when Ovid goes on
to pose as a veteran looking for an honourable discharge
from Cupid as would an old soldier from his supreme

---

11. See e.g. Mel. AP v. 198, 5-6, 215. 3-4, Arch. AP v. 58,
Paul. Sil. AP v. 268. 1-2. The motif is pre-figured in
archaic Greek lyric; see Nisbet-Hubbard's introduction to
Hor. Carm. i. 19.

12. See e.g. Tib. ii. 5. 107ff., 6. 15-16, Prop. ii. 12.
9-18, 13 (A). 1-2; cf. Prop. ii. 29 (A).

13. 'The warfare of love'; for the military motif in
Ovid see Frécaut 85-8, E. Thomas, 'Variations on a military
theme in Ovid's Amores', G & R 2nd series 11 (1964), 151-
65, and in Propertius, R.J. Baker, 'Miles annosus: the
military motif in Propertius', Latomus 27 (1968), 322-49,
and for all aspects of military imagery in love poetry,
Spies, op. cit.

14. See e.g. Prop. ii. 12. 11-12,iv. 1. 137-8; cf. Am.
i. 2, Ars i. 21-4.

15. See Tib. ii. 6. 5-6.

commander[16]. Length of military service was in fact a
bone of contention throughout the reign of Augustus with
some legionaries being kept under arms for far longer
than they were entitled to expect[17], and Ovid's imagery,
in reproducing in a completely frivolous context the
fundamental features of a serious and sensitive issue,
will almost certainly have had a special piquancy for
his contemporary readers[18].

When he turns to the other side of the coin in his
second poem (B), we see again much that is familiar, for
the assertion that a life of love, for all its hardships,
is to be preferred to any other kind of life is a
theme of great antiquity[19]. New features, however, are
Ovid's introduction of it by way of a claim that he would
not welcome a divine decree which changed his lot[20] and
his positive invitation to Cupid to direct all his

---

16. 19-24; for the general theme of retirement from love
see nn. below ad loc.

17. Their discontent culminated in the mutiny of A.D. 14;
see Tac. Ann. i. 17. 2 (with Goodyear's note), G. Webster,
The Roman Imperial Army (London 1969), 2nd edn. 1979), 42-4,
Brunt, Italian Manpower 333ff.

18. Cf. 5. 7-12, 13-14nn.

19. In essence it dates back to Mimnermus τίς δὲ βίος, τί
δὲ τερπνὸν ἄτερ χρυσῆς 'Αφροδίτης; / τεθναίην, ὅτε μοι
μηκέτι ταῦτα μέλοι, / κρυπταδίη φιλότης καὶ μείλιχα δῶρα
καὶ εὐνή (fr. 1. 1-3 (West)); cf. Am. ii. 10. 15ff.,
Hor. Carm. iii. 12. 1, Prop. i. 6. 25ff., Alph. AP xii. 18.

20. 25-6.

aggressive force against him[21]; neither motif is entirely original[22], but both are used here for the first time in a poem on the delights of _amor_.

'To love or not to love', that is the traditional question, and Ovid's two elegies, by presenting the issue as one arising from and affecting the poet's direct relationship with Cupid[23] rather than with a particular _puella_, handle it in a more detached, Hellenistic spirit than most other Latin poems on the same basic theme[24]. But these two elegies are not, on the whole, impressive pieces. There is muddled thinking in each of them: in the first, Cupid is both a malevolent force within the poet and an aggressor attacking him from the outside[25] whilst in the second, Ovid uses, to express his conscious desire to embrace love, _exempla_ which are in fact illustrative only of inability to resist its power[26]. And despite very real elements of novelty, the general effect of this pair of poems is one of cliché-ridden triteness[27].

---

21. 35-6.

22. For the divine offer of a change of circumstances cf. Hor. S. i. 1. 15-19, and for the invitation to Love to press home the attack, Posidipp. AP xii. 45. 1-2, Asclep. AP xii. 166. 5-6, and see further 25-6, 35 nn. below.

23. Ovid's relationship with Cupid /Amor throughout the Amores is much more personal than that of the other elegists; cf. Am. i, 1, 2, 6. 11-12, ii, 1. 3, 38, 12. 27-8, 18. 15-18.

24. Cf. Am. iii. 11 (A) and (B), Catul. 8, 76, Prop. ii. 5; for poems of similar detachment, however, see Am. i. 2, Hor. Carm. iii. 26.

25. The same confusion occurs in Prop. ii. 12, which suggests that Neumann (loc. cit.) may be right to see this poem as an important source for 9 (A), but cf. Morgan 82, n. 25; see further 13-16 nn. below.
26. 27-43; see nn. below ad loc.
27. See especially 5-10, 19-22, 29-32, 39-42.

1-4. An opening which, despite the obscurity of the first
couplet (see 1-2nn. below) quickly establishes the basic
theme of the lines which follow — Ovid's complaint of
Cupid's harassment.

1. If Ovid really did write, as the majority of the MSS
affirm and the majority of editors accept, o numquam
pro me satis indignate Cupido, 'O Cupid, you who have
never been indignant enough on my behalf' or ' ... who
have never been ready enough to take up the cudgels for
me', we should have to assume, I suppose, that he was
complaining of Cupid's failure to take his part in the
war of love. But though this is not unreasonable in
itself, it seems hardly the kind of grievance likely to
be aired by a man who would have us believe that he now
simply wants to quit love altogether (see Goold, Amat.
Crit. 35-6, J.B. Hall, PACA 13 (1975), 11-12). It is
difficult, therefore, to avoid the conclusion that the
vulgate text is corrupt. A few of the recc. give per
me for pro me, and S. Mariotti has consequently suggested
that indignate may have passive significance here, with
per me doing duty for a me, (see Munari's apparatus), but,
attractive though this suggestion is in itself, I have
been able to find no parallels to support it. Resort
to conjecture thus seems inescapable.

Madvig (Aduersaria Critica II, 68-9) adopted Burman's
pro re for pro me and suggested indignande for indignate.
Goold gives this suggestion his imprimatur and translates

'O Cupid, you whom no words could ever adequately revile to do justice to the facts' (Amat. Crit. 36). Indignande is certainly persuasive; in the context of the whole poem it seems appropriate that 'indignation' should be directed at, rather than felt by, Cupid, and confusion between -andus and -atus is common enough (see apparatus for 7. 23 and Brink on Hor. Ars 190). Pro re, however, impresses less; Madvig explains 'pro ueritate et rerum grauitate' and Goold, as we have seen, 'to do justice to the facts', but what 'facts'? At this stage in the poem we have no idea at all, and Hall (loc. cit.) is therefore surely right to reject pro re as hopelessly obscure (it may be observed that all the examples of pro re cited by OLD (s.v. pro, 14b) are to be found in passages where context gives ample indication of meaning). Hall himself favours the MS variant per me with Madvig's indignande, but though per me gives tolerable sense within the line (Hall translates 'As far as I am concerned, you can never be hated enough, Cupid'), it is not normally used in uacuo like this, but rather in circumstances where it is necessary, or at least desirable, for the speaker to dissociate his own attitude from any which might be held by other people (see e.g. Prop. iii. 6. 42, Pers. 1. 110). My suspicion is that the truth still eludes us in this instance, but I fear that I have no new suggestions to offer.

1-2. o ... / o: Ovid, like other Latin poets, uses o with the vocative rather than the vocative alone, which is

regular in direct address, to produce a variety of tones
according to the context; here, for instance, it is one
of reproach and indignation (cf. 5. 4n.), at <u>Am</u>. ii.
2. 9-10 <u>si sapis, o custos, odium ... mereri / desine</u>,
one of menace, at <u>Am</u>. ii. 12. 6 <u>huc ades, o cura parte
triumphe mea</u>, one of exuberant joy and at <u>Ars</u> ii. 91
<u>pater o pater, auferor</u>, one of pathos.   See Fordyce on
Catul. 46. 9.

For the hiatus in line 2 cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 1. 16 <u>o
argumenti lente poeta tui</u> and see Platnauer 57.

2. <u>desidiose</u>:   there is no evidence to suggest that <u>desidiose</u>
may ever mean anything other than simply 'idle' (see e.g.
<u>Am</u>. i. 9. 46 <u>qui nolet fieri desidiosus, amet</u>, and further
<u>ThLL</u> 5. i. 712. 41ff.), and yet it is difficult to see how
this epithet could possibly be applicable to Cupid here in
the light of lines 3ff. (<u>quid me ... laedis ...?</u>); far
from being idle, the god of love would appear to be dis-
tinctly hyperactive! J.B. Hall (<u>PACA</u> 13 (1975), 11-12)
is the only scholar who has seen fit to draw attention to
the utter inappropriateness of <u>desidiose</u> (though the
gratuitous translations of Bornecque ('établi à demeure')
and Munari ('che abiti perennemente'), which seem aimed
at reproducing the sentiment of Prop. ii. 12. 15 <u>euolat
heu nostro quoniam de pectore nusquam</u>,would seem to betray
some awareness of the difficulty in giving the adjective
its normal meaning); no doubt the incongruity has passed

largely unnoticed because the notion of Cupid being 'idle'
accords well enough with line 1 as read and construed
by most editors (see n. above ad loc.). Either, then,
Ovid himself had his ideas hopelessly confused (and
certainly his thinking in this poem is not as clear as
it might be; see introduction above p.378, 7-8, 17-18nn.
below), or desidiose, the reading of all the MSS, is
corrupt.

Hall's solution (loc. cit.) is to emend to seditiose,
'the mot juste for one who stirs up insurrection in a
military camp and doubly applicable when the guilty party
is the general himself'. Seditiosus, however (which
is not, incidentally, attested in any of the Augustan poets),
is normally used of one who stirs up sedition against some-
one else (see e.g. Tac. Ann. i. 44 seditiosissimum quemque,
i.e. the ringleaders of the rebellion in the Roman army
under Caecina in A.D. 14), and I need to be convinced
that it could be used of a person stirring up rebellion
against himself, as would be the case with Cupid here.
But Hall's suggestion is by no means unpersuasive, and
it may well be right.

puer: the portrayal of Love as a child is a development
of Hellenistic art and literature (cf. Mel. AP v. 176.
1-3 τί δέ τὸ πλέον ἦν πάλιν εἴπω / καὶ πάλιν οἰμώζων
πολλάκι, 'δεινὸς "Ερως' ; ἦ γὰρ ὁ παῖς γελᾷ and especially
A.R. iii. 111ff., and for iconographical representations
see Daremberg and Saglio II. 1600-1601, figs. 2160-62,

1604, fig. 2174); in the archaic and classical Greek periods "Ἐρως is a more fearsome figure representing the primaeval force of physical desire (see in general W. Strobel, Eros. Versuch einer Geschichte seiner bildlichen Darstellung von ihren Anfängen bis zum Beginn des Hellenismus (Diss. Erlangen 1952). The most important appearance of the child Cupid in Latin literature is at Verg. A. i. 657ff.

3-4. Quid me qui miles numquam tua signa reliqui / laedis?: for the signa of Cupid see 3. 10n. and for the military image as a whole, introduction above p. 376.

3-4. quid ... / ... in castris uulneror ipse meis: 'Why am I wounded in my own camp?' For the formulaic ipse meis see 6. 55n. (tuis, given by most of the recc. will have come from tua in line 3). Two metaphorical ideas seem to have been conflated here: (i) 'Why am I wounded by my own side?' - a simple military image which could be used in any context (ii) 'Why am I, a faithful soldier of love, wounded in Cupid's camp?' - a continuation of the militia amoris figure used in line 3 (for Cupid's camp, cf. Am. i. 2. 32 castris quidquid Amoris obest, 9. 1 habet sua castra Cupido, Ars iii. 559 castris nunc primum notus Amoris, and for militia amoris in general, introduction above, p. 376).

5. A reiteration of the sentiment of lines 3-4.

fax ... arcus: Cupid's conventional weapons; cf. Am.
iii. 9. 7-8 ecce puer Veneris fert euersamque pharetram /
et fractos arcus et sine luce facem, Tib. ii. 6. 15-16
acer Amor, fractas utinam tua tela sagittas, / si licet
extinctas aspiciamque faces! The bow and arrows of Love
are first mentioned by Euripides (IA 548-9 δίδυμ' "Ερως
ὁ χρυσοκόμας / τόξ' ἐντείνεται χαρίτων but they became established
as the standard accoutrements of "Ερως in Hellenistic
literature (see e.g. A.R. iii. 278-9 ὦκα δ' ὑπὸ φλιὴν
προδόμῳ ἔνι τόξα τανύσσας / ἰοδόκης ἀβλῆτα πολύστονον
ἐξέλετ' ἰόν, Mel. AP v. 177. 3-4 ἔστι δ' ὁ παῖς γλυκύδακρυς,
ἀείλαλος, ὠκύς, ἀθαμβής / σιμὰ γελῶν, πτερόεις νῶτα,
φαρετροφόρος), and the torch seems to have been added to
Love's armoury by Moschus (1. 22-3 πάντα μὲν ἄγρια ταῦτα·
πολὺ πλέον ἁ δαΐς αὐτῷ·/ βαιὰ λαμπὰς ἐοῖσα τὸν ἄλιον
αὐτὸν ἀναίθει; δαΐς in 22 is Wilamowitz's conjecture);
see further Spies, op. cit. Ch. 2.

Here the ravages of the fax and arcus of Cupid are
thought of as separate afflictions (cf. Ars i. 23 quo
me fixit Amor, quo me uiolentius ussit), although sometimes
the shafts themselves set the victim aflame (see e.g. A.R.
iii. 286-7 βέλος δ' ἐνεδαίετο κούρῃ / νέρθεν ὑπὸ κραδίῃ,
Mel. AP v. 180. 1-2 τί ξένον, εἰ βροτολοιγὸς "Ερως τὰ
πυρίπνοα τόξα / βάλλει); the wounds and fires of love
(for the latter see 1. 8n.), however, often go hand in

hand (see e.g. <u>Am</u>. i. 1. 25-6, ii. 1. 7-8, Verg. <u>A</u>.
iv. 1-2 (with Pease's note), Leon. <u>AP</u> v. 188).

6. 'There would have been greater glory in conquering those
who put up a fight.' Cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 2. 22 <u>nec tibi laus</u>
<u>armis uictus inermis ero</u>. Ovid varies slightly a
sentiment found in Hellenistic epigram and in Tibullus;
see Alc. Mess. <u>AP</u> v. 10. 3-4 τί πλέον, εἰ θεὸς ἄνδρα
καταφλέγει; ἢ τί τὸ σεμνὸν / δῃώσας ἀπ' ἐμῆς ἄθλον
ἔχει κεφαλῆς, Tib. i. 6. 3-4 <u>quid tibi, saeue, rei mecum</u>
<u>est?   an gloria magna est / insidias homini composuisse deum?</u>

<u>erat</u>:   the indicative with potential force here ('would
have been') is analogous to that used with words expressing
fitness or propriety (e.g. <u>iustum</u>, <u>idoneum</u>, <u>satis</u>, <u>melius</u>,
<u>longum</u>); see Hofmann-Szantyr 566, Kühner-Stegmann II. i. 171.
Cf. 24n. below <u>tempus erat</u>.

7-8. Achilles's healing of Telephus, after having struck him
down in battle, by applying to his wound the rust of the
spear with which he had inflicted it (for the story see
Roscher, <u>Lexicon</u> V. 284-5), is frequently cited to
illustrate the belief that a person who has done some
particular damage is in an excellent position to undo
it; cf. especially <u>Rem</u>. 43ff. <u>discite sanari per quem</u>
<u>didicistis amare; / una manus uobis uulnus opemque feret</u>
<u>/ ... uulnus in Herculeo quae quondam fecerat hoste, /</u>
<u>uulneris auxilium Pelias hasta tulit</u>, and for further

examples see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. Carm. i. 13. 1,
Otto, Sprichwörter 23. Here the exemplum is a trifle
inapposite, for Ovid is not asking Cupid actively to heal
him, but merely to cease attacking him (cf. 2. 45-6n).

7. quid?: 'Yes, ...'; the interrogative quid standing alone
and followed by another question is colloquial and common
in comic dialogue, Cicero's letters and Petronius (see
Hofmann, Lateinische Umgangssprache 67) and it lends a
touch of spontaneity to Ovid's remonstrances (cf. Am.
i. 7. 7, iii. 6. 29, Tr. ii. 385, Met. xv. 285, 308).
Only Ovid among the Augustan poets is keen to admit the
expression (though Propertius uses it once at ii. 8. 21).

Haemonius ... heros: Achilles; for the epithet see 1. 32n.

8. confossum: there was some reluctance amongst the older
editors to accept PSYς's confossum. Marius amazingly
supported cum petiit ('longe melior est uetus lectio'),
an obvious interpolation, and Burman inclined towards
confessum, 'having admitted defeat'. But confodire,
though a fairly rare verb, is not entirely absent from
Latin poetry (there is one other occurrence of it in Ovid
(Met. v. 176; see Bömer's note ad loc.), two in Silius
and one each in Vergil, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, Seneca
(tragedies) and Manilius), and confossum, 'pierced through',
fits the context perfectly here. (For compounds in con-
see 7.18n.).

9-10. Ovid continues to pile up the clichés in the attempt to
persuade Cupid of the futility of his attack upon him.
In the hexameter (9) he repeats the essence of an
epigram by Callimachus (AP xii. 102):

Ὠγρευτής, Ἐπίκυδες, ἐν οὔρεσι πάντα λαγωόν
  διφᾷ, καὶ πάσης ἴχνια δορκαλίδος,
στίβῃ καὶ νιφετῷ κεχρημένος· ἢν δέ τις εἴπῃ
  'τῇ, τόδε βέβληται θηρίον', οὐκ ἔλαβεν.
χοὐμὸς ἔρως τοιόσδε· τὰ μὲν φεύγοντα διώκειν
  οἶδε τὰ δ' ἐν μέσσῳ κείμενα παρπέταται

Horace had already produced a Latin version of Callimachus's
words at S. i. 2. 105-8:

           'leporem uenator ut alta
    in niue sectetur, positum sic tangere nolit'
    cantat, et apponit 'meus est amor huic similis;   nam
    transuolat in medio posita et fugientia captat'

and Ovid himself turns the idea more sententiously at
Am. ii. 19. 36 quod sequitur fugio; quod fugit ipse
sequor (cf. Ars i. 717 quod refugit, multae cupiunt;
odere quod instat, and see further Otto, Sprichwörter 81).
The pentameter (10) tacks on a proverbial notion which
first appears in Hesiod (fr. 61): νήπιος, ὅς τὰ ἑτοῖμα
λιπὼν ἀνέτοιμα διώκει; cf. Plin. Ep. viii. 20. 1 ad quae
noscenda iter ingredi, transmittere mare solemus, ea
sub oculis posita neglegimus, seu quia ita natura
comparatum, ut proximorum incuriosi longinqua sectemur,
seu quod omnium rerum cupido languescit, cum facilis
occasio, seu quod differimus tamquam saepe uisuri, quod
datur uidere quotiens uelis cernere.

10. et: for the postponement of the connective see 10. 36n.

11-12. Ovid takes up the military metaphor again after straying
into another sphere of imagery in line 7-10.

11. populus: a word whose meaning Ovid seems to have
broadened.   He is the first as far as I can see, to use
it with the sense 'a group of people', i.e. = turba
(see 2. 30n.);   cf. Ars iii. 518 nos, hilarem populum,
femina laeta capit, Met. xi. 633-5 pater e populo natorum
mille suorum / excitat.../ Morphea, xii.499 populus superamur
ab uno (afterwards it is so employed by Seneca (Ben. vi.
34. 1), Statius (Theb. ii. 28), Pliny (Ep. ix. 39, 2)
and Apuleius (Met. ii. 8)).   And only he uses it (at
54 below) to denote members of opposite sexes: ambobus
populis sic uenerandus eris.

deditus: 'devoted to';   cf. Tib. i. 2. 97-8 at mihi parce,
Venus: semper tibi dedita seruit / mens mea, and for
further examples see ThLL 5. i. 267. 73ff.

12. pigra ... manus: the adjective is proleptic: 'your hand
is slow to act'.

reluctanti cessat in hoste: 'is remiss in the case of
an enemy who resists'.   A legal metaphor is now added to
the military imagery and exempla from the fields of medicine
and hunting in the previous lines (see 3-4, 7-8, 9nn.
above).   Cessare in + ablative is the juristic expression

for 'to fail to take the necessary action' in any
given circumstances; see e.g. Scaev. dig. xl. 7. 40. 8
si in exactione nominum cessauerint, Paul. dig. iv. 4. 38
cuius tutores in solutione cessauerunt and cf. Berger,
Encyclopaedic Dictionary s.v. For Ovid's use of legalistic
language in general see 4. 1-4n.

13-18. Ovid now turns away from the injustice of attacking an
ally to argue instead the futility of attacking a man
already worn down by continual assault rather than
attempting fresh conquests.

13-14. Cf. Prop. ii. 12. 17 quid tibi iucundum est siccis habitare
medullis?

14. ossa mihi nuda reliquit amor: the elegiac lover was
traditionally emaciated; cf. Am. i. 6. 5 longus amor ...
corpus tenuauit, Ars i. 733 arguat et macies animum,
and see also Theoc. 2. 89-90 αὐτὰ δὲ λοιπὰ / ὅστι' ἔτ'
ἦς καὶ δέρμα (for other physical symptoms brought on by
love see Hor. Carm. i. 13. 3-8 with Nisbet-Hubbard's notes).

All editors before Kenney read relinquit (thus PSV_b,
probably from 9 above), but the perfect reliquit, as given
by Yω, is clearly required, for Ovid's whole point is
that love (amor and not Amor, as printed by Kenney,
since Amor presumably = Cupido, who is the addressee of
this poem - but cf. 23n. below) has already reduced him

to a skeleton, and to attack bare bones is just a waste
of good arrows!

15-16. A couplet obviously based on a well-worn sentiment
(cf. Mel. AP v. 179. 9-10 ἀλλ' ἴθι, δυσνίκητε, λαβὼν
δ' ἔπι κοῦφα πέδιλα / ἐκπέτασον ταχινὰς εἰς ἑτέρους
πτέρυγας, Prop. ii. 12. 18-19 si pudor est, alio traice
tela, puer,/intactos isto satius temptare ueneno, Arch.
AP v. 98, Maced. AP v. 224), but one which shows Ovid
giving the familiar concept of militia amoris a new
dimension, for in suggesting how Cupid may win not merely
glory but a triumphus (16), he audaciously makes fun of a
Roman military and political institution which always com-
manded awe and respect, but which was particularly venerated
by Augustus (see Aug. Anc. 4, C. Barini, Triumphalia
(Torino 1952), 13-26, K. Galinsky, 'The Triumph Theme
in the Augustan Elegy', WS 82 (1969), 75-107, especially
76-7).   His pièce de résistance along these lines, however,
is Am. i. 2, where he actually depicts Cupid as a triumphator
enjoying all the pomp and circumstance of a triumphal
procession; see further Galinsky, art. cit. 91ff., and
for Ovid's irreverent attitude towards Augustan ideals,
introduction to 1 above, p. 50, n. 29.   Cf. 17-18n.
below.

15. A highly artistic line: the two parallel clauses are
balanced by anaphora (tot sine amore ..., tot ... sine
amore) and the verb, which does duty for both and must

be understood ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with the first, is tucked away
in the middle of the line so that the two contrasting
words <u>uiri</u> and <u>puellae</u> each stand at the end of one
half of the verse.   Cf. 10. 3, 5-6, 8nn.

16. <u>hinc</u> ... <u>triumphus eat</u>:   'let this be the source of a
    triumph';   for the expression cf. Prop. i. 7. 10 <u>hinc</u>
    <u>cupio nomen carminis ire mei.</u>

17-18. Bentley wished to delete this couplet, which seems to
    draw a most incongruous parallel between the potential
    conquests of Cupid and the world-wide empire already
    won by Rome.   But the incongruity is without doubt quite
    deliberate;   Ovid, <u>exemplis in paruis grandibus usus</u>, slyly
    mocks the official commitment of the Augustan régime to
    overseas expansion and <u>gloria militaris</u> in general (see
    e.g. Aug. <u>Anc.</u> 3, 26-33).   Extremely daring too is the
    use of 'thatched huts' (<u>stramineis</u> ... <u>casis</u>, 18) to
    symbolize Rome's political insignificance in her early
    days, for the 'thatched huts' which Ovid's Augustan
    readers would have immediately thought of would be the
    pair which stood one on the Palatine and one on the
    Capitoline, the former said to be the house of Romulus
    and the latter a replica of it, and both of them objects
    of great veneration (see D.H. i. 79, Plu. <u>Rom.</u> 20).
    It seems probable, in view of the similarity in phraseology,
    that Ovid intended to parody Propertius's use of the

'thatched hut' to symbolize (much more acceptably in
official eyes) the laudable simplicity of primitive Rome
(atque utinam Romae nemo esset diues, et ipse / straminea
posset dux habitare casa (ii. 16. 19-20);   see Rothstein's
note ad loc. and also Morgan 30-31).

(I should not wish to put the couplet in parenthesis
as Kenney does, for it seems to me to be not merely an
afterthought, but an integral part of Ovid's argument:
'You should try new territory, Cupid, if you want to win
glory for yourself (15-16);   take Rome, now - there's
a splendid example of what venturing further afield can
do' (17-18).)

17. promosset: for the apt sense of promouere and the syn-
copated form see Kenney, Notes 61 (to Kenney's remark
that promosset 'has P on its side' we may now, of course,
add that it is actually transmitted by Y).

19-24. Ovid's final point in his attempt to show the unfairness
of Cupid's renewed assault upon him is that, having
served his term in the ranks of love, he should have been
due for retirement instead of finding himself called up
for new campaigns.   He is not the first to anticipate
his retirement as a lover at the end of a long career,
nor to step back from the brink (see 9 (B) below) when
faced with this very prospect (cf. Hor. Carm. iii. 26),
but his conception of it in terms of a military discharge
from the service of Cupid is a bold stroke of originality

on his part;   see introduction above pp. 376-7.

19-22. Four standard examples (Ovid uses them again at <u>Tr</u>. iv. 8.

17-24) of people and things which enjoy peaceful retirement -

a soldier (19), a racehorse (20), a ship (21) and a gladiator

(22).   The <u>florilegia</u> and some of the <u>recc</u>. transpose line

22 with line 20, presumably either because their scribes

mistakenly believed line 22, like line 19, to refer to a

soldier's retirement (see 22n. below <u>rudis</u>) or, if they did

realize that it in fact refers to a gladiator's release

from the dangers of the arena, because they simply thought

it fitted better after line 19.   But the reason for the

order of Ovid's <u>exempla</u> is, as Marius perceived, to be

found in Prop. ii. 25. 5-10:

> miles depositis annosus secubat armis,
>   grandaeuique negant ducere aratra boues,
> putris et in uacua requiescit nauis harena,
>   et uetus in templo bellica parma uacat:
> at me ab amore tuo deducet nulla senectus,
>   siue ego Tithonus siue ego Nestor ero.

There Propertius uses exactly the same <u>exempla</u> in

exactly the same order, and Ovid is deliberately imitating

him here, but whereas Propertius used the <u>exempla</u> to

illustrate what he did <u>not</u> want (i.e. to retire from love),

Ovid of course uses them to illustrate what he does

want, which is precisely the opposite - or so it seems

until we reach line 25 below, the beginning of poem 9 (<u>B</u>).

(I find it rather hard to accept Morgan's suggestion

(82-3) that Ovid's use in arguing in favour of retirement

from love of the <u>exempla</u> which Propertius used in arguing

against it, is expressly intended as a hint of Ovid's
change of heart which is immediately to follow.)

Stylistically, these lines are distinctly more
highly wrought than the rest of the poem (this is not
unusual in passages of _exempla_; cf. 10. 31-4n.).
They contain elements of high-flown diction (_fessus_, 19,
pinum, 21, (see nn. _ad locc._)), and exhibit a considerable
degree of conscious artistry in manipulation of word-order
(notice _deducitur_ towards the end of line 19 balanced by
mittitur, a verb of identical form, at the beginning of
line 20, and the near-'golden' lines, 21 and 22 (cf. 5. 40n.)).

19. _fessus_: the only appearance of this word in the _Amores_,
whilst its more colloquial synonym _lassus_ (see Axelson,
Unpoetische Wörter 29-30) appears nine times; cf. 19-22n.
above.

in acceptos ... deducitur agros: 'is settled in the land
allotted to him.' _Deducere_ is the technical term used
of 'settling' veterans in colonies (the distribution of
land to discharged soldiers was an old-established practice
in the Roman army; see Brunt, _Italian Manpower_ 294ff.);
cf. Cic. _Phil._ 5. 3 _milites ueteranos, qui cum ab Antonio
in colonias essent deducti_, _CIL_ ix. 4682 VETERANO DEDVCTO
AB DIVO VESP REATE (see further _ThLL_ 5. i. 273. 54ff.).
It is tempting to suggest, knowing that Augustus looked
upon his own settlement of soldiers as one of the greatest
achievements of his reign (see _Anc._ 16 (Ehrenberg and Jones)

Ea ⟨s⟩u⟨mma s⟩estertium circiter sexsiens milliens fuit, quam ⟨p⟩ro Italicis praedis numeraui, et ci⟨r⟩citer bis mill⟨ie⟩ns et sescentiens, quod pro agris prouincialibus solui.   Id primus et ⟨s⟩olus omnium, qui ⟨d⟩eduxerunt colonias militum in Italia aut in prouincis, ad memoriam aetatis meae feci;   cf. Brunt, op. cit. 332ff.), that Ovid's couching of his exemplum here in almost official language is to be seen as a sly 'dig' at the much-vaunted imperial munificence.

20. Whether or not the Romans did put their old racehorses out to pasture we do not know, but it seems not unlikely, judging from the appeal which this humane notion seems to have had for the poets;   cf. Tr. iv. 8. 19-20 ne cadat et multas palmas inhonestet adeptus, / languidus in pratis gramina carpit equus, Enn. Ann. 374-5 (Vahlen) sicut fortis equus, spatio qui saepe supremo / uicit Olympia, nunc senio confectus quiescit, Hor. Ep. i. 1. 8 'solue senescentem mature sanus equum'.

carcere liber: 'released (for good) from the starting stall'.

21. subductam ... pinum: a striking combination of a technical word with a distinctly poetical one.   Subducere is the standard nautical term for hauling a ship out of the water (see e.g. Liv. xlv. 42. 12 naues regiae ... in Campo Martio subductae sunt, Caes. Gal. iv. 29. 2, Pl. Cas.

557, and for the process, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. Carm.
i. 4. 2) and *pinus* a metonym for *nauis*, generally used in
highly wrought and decorative passages (see 19-22n. above
and cf. Am. ii. 11. 2, Met. ii. 185 (with Bömer's note)).
Ovid's choice of *pinus* here, however, may be due in part
to a desire to avoid the jingle which would result from
the juxtaposition of *nauem* and *naualia* (cf. the similar
use of *puppis* rather than *nauis* at Tr. iv. 8. 17 *in caua
ducuntur quassae naualia puppes*, whence, perhaps, the
variant *puppim* which is given by some later MSS in our
passage).

celant: perhaps 'shelter' rather than 'hide', since it is
the comparative safety of the dry dock which Ovid has in
mind.   The expression is grandiose; cf. Verg. A. vi.
442-4 *hic quos durus amor crudeli tabe peredit / secreti
celant calles et myrtea circum / silua tegit*.

naualia: Rome had dockyards situated on the left bank of
the Tiber; see RE 16. 2. 1888-9.

22. tuta ... rudis: the receiving of the rudis, the wooden
sword given to gladiators at the end of their career
(see RE 1. A. 1. 1179-80), often symbolizes in poetry
release from any kind of toilsome duty; cf. Tr. iv. 8. 24
me quoque donari iam rude tempus erat, Hor. Ep. i. 1. 2-3
*spectatum satis et donatum iam rude quaeris, / Maecenas,
iterum antiquo me includere ludo*, Juv. 7. 171, Mart. iii.
36. 10.

23-4. Kenney (Notes 61) explains sub amore puellae as an
example of Ovid 'personifying and not personifying a
word at the same time'; we are to understand, he claims,
both 'under Cupid as general' (sub amore) and 'led by
love of my mistress' (sub amore puellae). Certainly
Ovid is fond of 'double-meanings' (cf. 1. 15, 17, 3. 1,
5, 7-8, 11-12, 8. 24nn.), but normally both meanings are
to be extracted from precisely the same words (this is
true of praeceptor Amoris (Ars i. 17), the parallel cited
by Kenney), and I doubt very much whether Ovid would have
meant us to isolate one particular part of the phrase in
order to extract from it a meaning different from that
of the whole phrase. There is to my mind no escaping
the fact that puellae is a violent and unhappy ἀπροσδόκητον;
as Goold points out (Amat. Crit. 36-7), Ovid has built up
a picture of himself as a soldier under the standards of
Cupid (i.e. Amor; see especially line 3), not of any
puella (cf. Am. i. 9. 43-4, where the puella does indeed
seem to have her own castra - though Kenney (Notes 61
and in the apparatus to his edition) thinks otherwise),
and certainly not of amor puellae - a very strange
standard indeed!

Burman, Bentley and Markland all attempted to
emend by inserting a comma after amore (or better here
Amore (cf. 14n. above), since Cupid (= Amor), the
addressee, has now faded far enough into the background

to allow a reference to him in the third person) and
replacing _puellae_ with an ablative dependent on _defunctum_
in 24 (see apparatus; why Lee favours Burman's _puella_
as vocative, something Burman flirted with only as an
afterthought, I cannot think, for it is exceedingly ugly).
Goold (_Amat. Crit._ 37) nails his colours firmly to
Bentley's mast, but for palaeographical reasons modifies
Bentley's conjecture _periclis_ to _periclo_: 'it is high
time to quit a career of _peril_'. This, I will acknowledge,
is the best of the conjectures offered, but I cannot help
feeling that Goold's appeal to palaeography is misguided
as well as unconvincing; for if a scribe copying _Am._
ii. 2. 31 could write _honores_ for _inanes_ through accidentally
glancing at the end of line 27 before (see n. _ad loc._),
it seems even more likely that one whose eye wandered from
amore here to _amore_ in the identical position in line 15
above simply wrote _puellae_ (from line 15) for whatever word
stood in the same position here in line 23; thus it follows
that the transmitted _puellae_ may bear _no resemblance at all_
to the correct reading. It seems probable to me that what
has been lost is a word qualifying _Amore_ by pointing to
his generalship (cf. Liv. xxi. 4. 10 _sub Hasdrubale imperatore_
meruit) - possibly a noun such as _tyranno_, or a participle
such as _iubente_.

It should perhaps be said in conclusion that whilst
defungi does often take an ablative (Goold supplies examples
at _Amat. Crit._ 36), the perfect participle is used ab-
solutely often enough either with the sense 'having done

one's duty' (e.g. Verg. <u>A</u>. ix. 98 <u>ubi defunctae</u> (<u>carinae</u>)
<u>finem ... tenebunt</u>) or (and this is the more common of
the two) 'dead' (e.g. <u>Am</u>. i. 8. 108 <u>ut mea defunctae</u>
<u>molliter ossa cubent</u>, Plin. <u>Nat</u>. ix. 170 <u>defuncto illo</u>
<u>ueniere pisces</u>, Tac. <u>Ann</u>. xv. 23 <u>defuncta infante</u>); obviously
the first of these meanings is the one which seems immediately
appropriate here, but almost certainly Ovid meant to
suggest the second too (see n. below). Némethy claims
that <u>defunctum</u> in the present context is the equivalent
of <u>emeritum</u>, 'having been discharged from military service'
(cf. Aug. <u>Anc</u>. 16 (Ehrenberg and Jones) <u>milit⟨i⟩bus, quos</u>
<u>emeriteis stipendis in sua municipi⟨a dedux⟩i</u>); such a
sense would obviously be excellent here, but I have not
been able to find anything to authorize it, unless one
may count the frequent occurrences of <u>militia(m)</u> (<u>uel sim</u>.)
<u>fungi</u> = 'to do military service' (e.g. Nep. <u>Dat</u>. 1. 2
<u>militare munus fungens</u>, Tac. <u>Ann</u>. ii. 36 <u>ea militia funge-</u>
<u>bantur</u>, (figuratively) Sen. <u>Ep</u>. 93. 4 <u>functum omnibus uitae</u>
<u>humanae stipendiis</u>), which might suggest that <u>militia(m)</u>
could possibly be understood with <u>defunctum</u> in the kind
of context that we have here.

24. 'It is high time (for me) to retire and live in peace.'
Ovid's words not only provide a fitting summary of his
feelings in poem 9 (<u>A</u>), but also the cue for poem 9 (<u>B</u>),
since <u>defunctum placide uiuere</u> suggests as well as 'to live

peacefully having retired', the paradox 'to live

peacefully having _died_' (see n. above), and a life without

love, we soon discover, is in Ovid's eyes a

'living death': see 9 (_B_). 41-2n. below and cf. 10. 15n.

placide: the word has distinct associations with the

eternal peace of death; cf. Tib. ii. 4. 49-50 _placide ..._

quiescas, / terraque securae sit super ossa leuis, CLE

541. 12 _hic ego sepultus iaceo placidusque quiesco_;

see n. above.

tempus erat: 'it would have been time' (sc. if things

had been fair); for the use of the indicative with

potential force in expressions such as _longum_, _infinitum_,

tempus est / erat cf. 6n. above.

IX (B)

See introduction above pp. 372-3.

25-6. Ovid affirms his devotion to the life of love with an
adaptation of a motif apparently taken straight from
Horace S. i. 1. 15-19:

>   si quis deus 'en ego' dicat,
>   'iam faciam, quod uultis: eris tu, qui modo miles,
>   mercator; tu, consultus modo, rusticus: hinc uos,
>   uos hinc mutatis discedite partibus: eia!
>   quid statis?' nolint.

Cf. S. ii. 7. 22-4 laudas/fortunam et mores antiquae plebis,
et idem / si quis ad illa deus subito te agat, usque recuses.
DuQuesnay (loc. cit.) reasonably suggests that Ovid may have
used the topos with the specific intention of ridiculing the
standard figure of the elegiac lover 'ever wavering between
acceptance and rejection of love' just as Horace and others
writing in a moralizing vein (see N. Rudd, The Satires of
Horace (Cambridge 1966), 20-21) ridicule the constant
discontent with one's lot which is a characteristic of human
nature.

25. 'Vive' ... 'posito' ... 'amore': Ovid is extremely fond of
dividing short pieces of direct speech into three or more
fragments; cf. Am. i. 1. 24 'quod'que'canas, uates,'accipe'
dixit 'opus', Ars iii. 697-8 'quae'que 'meos releues aestus,'
cantare solebat / 'accipienda sinu, mobilis aura, ueni.',
Tr. iv. 2. 51-2, Pont. i. 6. 43-4; numerous examples from
the Metamorphoses are collected by J. Marouzeau, Ovidiana
103-5.

posito ... amore: for the expression cf. Prop. i. 9. 8
utinam posito dicar amore rudis and see 1. 6n. tactus amore.

26. deprecer: 'I should beg for mercy' (for the expression
cf. Verg. A. xii. 931 merui nec deprecor); normally, of
course, we find the elegiac lover begging mercy from a god
who inflicts love upon him rather than one who will relieve
him of it (see e.g. Am. i. 2. 21 nil opus est bello: ueniam
pacemque rogamus).

usque adeo dulce puella malum est: 'Women are such sweet
hell' (Lee). The oxymoron sets forth an ancient paradox;
cf. Sapph. fr. 238 (Page) Ἔρος ... /γλυκύπικρον ἀμαχάνον
ὄρπετον, Mel. AP v. 163. 3-4 ἤ σύ γε μηνύεις ὅτι καὶ γλυκὺ
καὶ δυσύποιστον, / πικρὸν ἀεὶ κραδία, κέντρον Ἔρωτος ἔχει,
177. 3 ὁ παῖς γλυκύδακρυς, Catul. 68. 18 (dea) quae dulcem
curis miscet amaritiem (with Kroll's note for further examples).

27-34. Ovid explains that he is quite unable to part company with
love altogether; just when he thinks himself free of it,
it takes hold of him again. Cf. introduction above p. 377.

27. cum bene pertaesum est: a strong expression with the
intensifying prefix per- reinforced by bene = ualde, uehementer:
'when I have become thoroughly sick and tired'. (cf. Pl.
St. 753 ei mihi! bene dispereo where the prefix dis- also
has intensifying force). Pertaedet, (of which only the
passive form appears in the perfect tense), along with many
other compounds in per- (for which Ovid shows a distinct

liking; see 7. 24n.), has been classed as a colloquialism
(see E. Wöfflin, Ausgewählte Schriften (Leipzig 1933), 124);
it does in fact occur in elevated poetry (see e.g. Verg.
A. iv. 18, v. 714, Sil. ii. 595) and in the artistic prose
of Sallust, Livy and Tacitus, but Ovid's use of it here
without the usual accusative of the person or genitive of
the thing involved (cf. Liv. iii. 67. 7 decemuirorum uos
pertaesum est) is suggestive of the casual manner of everyday
speech. The intensifying bene is certainly colloquial (see
Hofmann, Lateinische Umgangssprache 74).

27. animoque relanguit ardor: cf. Am. i. 10. 9 nunc timor omnis
abest animique resanuit error (resanuit PY, Heinsii
Arondelianus: reuanuit S$_\varsigma$: euanuit y$_\varsigma$ error PSY$_\varsigma$: ardor ς).
The MS readings give clear evidence of a certain amount of
scribal tinkering with each of these passages as a result of
the other being remembered. Heinsius rightly rejects resanuit
given by PY in our passage as 'hoc loco ... minus aptum':
at Am. i. 10. 9 Ovid thinks of his passion as a foolish one
(animi error) from which he has fortunately recovered- hence
resanuit - but here as a constantly smouldering one (ardor)
which has died down only temporarily - hence relanguit, the
reading of Heinsius's 'Arondelianus' (its provenance must
be regarded as uncertain). Knoche (Gnomon 8 (1932), 523)
compares Sen. Dial. v. 12. 4 ut ... primus eius feruor
relanguescat and Munari, Claud. DRP i. 68 animusque relanguit
atrox.

Heinsius in fact took P's original reading to be

relanguit ('Animoque relanguit ardor Puteaneus a manu

prima. sed emendatum resanuit'), but both Kenney and Munari

(SIFC 32 (1948), 124) see it as resan uit. Possibly a read

resannuit (thus Y), in which case the subsequent erasure of

the superfluous n (struck out by y) would account for the

reading of P (ç may be assumed to have taken the barbarous

reuanuit from some β source). Animique, of course, will have

come in for the local ablative animoque after the corruption

of relanguit.

For ardor of the passion of love cf. 1. 8n. flamma.

28.   A picturesque portrayal of the situation of one who is the

victim of a driving passion, turbo/turben meaning a 'whirl-

wind', 'spinning top' or anything with a rapid spiralling

motion. Ovid's image clearly owes something to Tib. i. 5. 3

namque agor ut per plana citus sola uerbere turben, but our

poet dispenses with the simile and places the turbo within

his own tortured mind.

29-32. An artistically engineered pair of exempla: note the anaphora

ut ... ut at the beginning of each hexameter and the framing

of the whole passage with ut rapit in praeceps in 29 and

in alta rapit in 32. cf. 9 (A). 19-22n. above.

29-30. A thoroughly Roman simile; cf. Verg. G. i. 512-14 ut ...

quadrigae /addunt in spatia, et frustra retinacula tendens/

fertur equis auriga neque audit currus habenas, and see

further Washietl, De similitudinibus 43, 140-41. Ovid uses

the same image at Tr. i. 4. 13-16 ut ... parum ualidus non

proficientia rector /ceruicis rigidae frena remittit equo,/
sic non quo uoluit, sed quo rapit impetus undae,/aurigam
uideo uela dedisse rati.

29. spumantia: a stock epithet of frena; cf. Verg. A. iv. 135
stat sonipes ac frena ferox spumantia mandit (Pease collects
further examples ad loc.).

30. retentantem: cf. Ars ii. 433-4 aspice, ut ... rector /
... admissos arte retentet equos.

durior oris: 'somewhat hard of mouth', i.e. self-willed;
The genitive is perhaps analogous to that used after
adjectives such as audax to denote nature or disposition; see
e.g. Stat. Silv. iii. 2. 64 audax ingenii. The extension
of the use of the genitive with adjectives is a development
of Augustan poetry; see Kühner-Stegmann II. i. 443-6.

31-2. The simile of the ship at the mercy of a capricious wind
may have been directly suggested to Ovid by the previous
one of the horse out of control (29-30), since the ship and
the horse or chariot are regularly compared with each other
in ancient poetry; see e.g. Tr. i. 4. 13-16 (supra cit.
(29-30n.)) with Luck's note for further examples. But the
use of nautical imagery in description of the vicissitudes
of love is generally very common (see 10. 9n.) and the ship
coming into port a favourite symbol of the lover's salvation
(cf. Rem. 609-10 praestiterat iuuenis, quidquid mea Musa
iubebat, / inque suae portu paene salutis erat, Prop. iii.
24. 15-16 ecce coronatae portum tetigere carinae, / traiectae

Syrtes, ancora iacta mihi est; for examples of the image

in other contexts see Otto, Sprichwörter 285). For Ovid's

general liking for sailing imagery see Washietl, De

similitudinibus 176, E. de Saint Denis, Le rôle de la mer

dans la poésie latine (Paris 1935), 323-83.

31.   prensa tellure: a few of the recc. give pressa; 'utrumque

quidem recte dicitur', observes Burman, 'sed diuersa

significatione: pressa enim tellus est, cui iam insistitur ...

sed prehenditur ab appellentibus nautis, cum prope tangunt

manibus, et funem religandae naui possunt inicere'. Prensa,

with its more technically nautical tone, thus seems better

here in view of tangentem portus in 32.

31-2.   carinam / tangentem portus: cf. Prop. iii. 24. 15 ecce

coronatae portum tetigere carinae, Verg. G. i. 303 ceu

pressae cum iam portum tetigere carinae. Obviously a stock

poetic turn of phrase, but deliberate mockery of Propertius's

grandiosity cannot be ruled out here (cf. introduction to 1

above, p. 48, n.23).

33.   incerta Cupidinis aura: the notion is that the behaviour

of love is as unpredictable as the veering of the wind;

cf. E. IA 69 πνοαὶ Ἀφροδίτης Hor. Carm. i. 5. 11-12 (puer)

nescius aurae / fallacis, Prop. ii. 12. 8 nostra ... non

ullis permanet aura locis (see further Shackleton Bailey,

Propertiana 85).

34.   purpureus ... Amor: see 1. 38n.

35. <u>fige, puer</u>: Ovid's words recall Posidipp. <u>AP</u> xii. 45. 1
and Asclep. <u>AP</u> xii. 166. 5 ναί, ναί, βάλλετ' Ἔρωτες, but
neither of those two poets is asking to be attacked by Love
for the sheer joy of it, as is Ovid here; Posidippus is
defying the Ἔρωτες to conquer him, Asclepiades begging them
to kill him and have done with it (cf. introduction above, pp.
377-8). <u>Fige</u> here picks up <u>figit</u> at 9 (<u>A</u>). 5 (cf.
introduction above, p. 374).

<u>positis nudus ... armis</u>: 'unarmed, having given up all
resistance'; for <u>nudus</u> = <u>inermis</u> cf. Lucr. v. 1292 <u>omnia
cedebant armatis nuda et inerma</u>, Caes. <u>Gal</u>. i. 25. 4 <u>scutum
manu emittere et nudo corpore pugnare</u>. Brandt collects
examples of the equivalent Greek use of γυμνός in his note
on <u>Ars</u> iii. 5.

<u>nudus tibi praebeor</u>: <u>praebere</u>, when used of submitting
oneself or one's body to some (often unpleasant) treatment,
is generally construed with an accusative denoting the part
of the body in question or a reflexive pronoun (see e.g.
<u>Ars</u> i. 16 <u>uerberibus iussas praebuit ille manus</u>, Liv. xxiii.
19. 6 <u>nuda corpora ad missilium telorum ictus praebentes</u>,
iv. 28. 4 <u>hic praebituri ... uos telis hostium estis
indefensi?</u>); Ovid's apparently unique construction here,
using a passive form of the verb with personal subject +
nominative of the adjective, is probably occasioned largely
by the demands of metre.

36. <u>hic tibi sunt uires</u>: 'Here you can show your strength.'

hic tua dextra facit: 'Here your right hand is effective.'
The variant ualet for facit might be thought worthy of
serious consideration, but (i) the use of facit is closely
paralleled at Ep. 2. 39 per Venerem nimiumque mihi facientia
tela (cf. also Tr. iii. 8. 23 nec caelum nec aquae faciunt),
(ii) sunt uires followed by ualet is almost tautologous,
and (iii) the corruption of facit to ualet seems much more
probable than the corruption of ualet to facit.

There is nothing wrong with the paradosis hic, 'in this
quarter'. Heinsius's huc is simply unnecessary, but Luck's
hac (RhM n.f. 105 (1962), 351), which is adopted by Goold
in his revised edition of Showerman's Loeb, is based on a
complete misapprehension: hac facere is an expression used
when the speaker wishes to indicate that someone or something
is on his side (see e.g. Pl. St. 463 augurium hac facit,
Cic. Att. vii. 3. 5 uideo ... omnis damnatione ignominiaque
dignos illac facere) and this is most certainly not what
Ovid is saying here.

37. huc: much better than hic (given by a few MSS including
P and S) here in view of the verb of motion ueniunt. Hic
(from 36) is the easiest imaginable error.

38. Cf. Mel. AP v. 198. 5-6 οὐκετι σοὶ φαρέτρη <   >
πτερόεντας οἰστούς / κρύπτει, Ἔρως ἐν ἐμοὶ πάντα γάρ
ἐστι βέλη.

prae me: the force of the preposition is comparative
(cf. 4. 19n.): 'Your arrows, Cupid, hardly know their own

quiver <u>better than</u> they know me.'

<u>sua</u>: some of the <u>recc</u>. give <u>tua</u>, but <u>sua</u> referring directly to <u>sagittae</u> (37) is undoubtedly 'lectio uenustior' (Marius).

39-50. Ovid points the standard elegiac contrast between the lot of the loveless and his own <u>vie d'amour</u>; cf. 10. 19. 31-8nn., and see introduction above pp. 377-8.

39-40. Cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 10. 17-18 <u>hostibus eueniat uiduo dormire cubili /</u> <u>et medio laxe ponere membra toro</u>.

39. <u>infelix</u>: 'poor fool'; for the pitying tone cf. Lucr. v. 1194-5 <u>o genus infelix humanum, talia diuis/cum tribuit facta ...!</u> Verg. <u>A</u>. v. 465 <u>infelix, quae tanta animum dementia cepit?</u>

39-40. <u>tota quicumque quiescere nocte / sustinet</u>: 'who can bear to spend the whole night at rest', <u>Sustinet</u> emphasizes the notion of sleep as something utterly undesirable, and <u>quiescere</u>, being regularly used not only as a synonym for <u>dormire</u> but also specifically with reference to the eternal 'sleep' of death (see e.g. Verg. <u>A</u>. vi. 371 <u>sedibus ut saltem</u> <u>placidis in morte quiescam</u>, ix. 445, Tib. ii. 4. 49, ii. 6. 30), anticipates the sentiments of 41-2 below. Cf. 9 (A). 24n. above.

40. <u>praemia</u>: 'blessings'; cf. Prop. i. 14.16 <u>nulla mihi tristi</u> <u>praemia sint Venere</u>, Lucr. iii. 956 <u>uitai praemia</u>.

41. <u>stulte</u>: an abusive form of address more common in satire
and epigram than elegy (see Opelt, <u>Die lateinische</u>
<u>Schimpfwörter</u> 116-17), but cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 19. 1-2 <u>si tibi non</u>
<u>opus est seruata, stulte, puella, / at mihi fac serues</u>.
I cannot take seriously Opelt's suggestion that the usage
may have developed from the practice of schoolmasters
addressing their less able pupils!

For the brief apostrophe cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 10. 11 and for
Ovid's use of this device in general see Frécaut 135-9.

41. <u>quid est somnus gelidae nisi mortis imago?</u>: the association
of sleep and death is an extremely ancient one stemming from
the mythological conception of Ὕπνος and Θάνατος as the twin
sons of Night (see Hom. <u>Il</u>. xiv. 231 Ὕπνῳ ... κασιγνήτῳ
Θανάτοιο and for a collection of literary references and
iconographical representations, Roscher, <u>Lexicon</u> II.
2846-7; see also Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 24. 5).

Heinsius compares with Ovid's expression here Cic. <u>Tusc</u>.
i. 38. 92 <u>habes somnum imaginem mortis eamque cotidie</u>
<u>induis</u>, and Munari notes an interesting imitation of Ovid
by Alcuin (91. 3. 4-5) <u>assiduus gelidae somnus est mortis</u>
<u>imago / longa quiescendi facient tibi fata sepulchrum</u>.

<u>gelidae</u>: a stock epithet of death; cf. Lucr. iii. 530, -
Hor. <u>Carm</u>. ii. 8. 11, and see Pease's note on <u>Verg</u>. <u>A</u>. iv.
385 for further examples.

42. Cf. Catul. 5. 6 <u>nox est perpetua una dormienda</u> (with Kroll's
note), Mosch. 3. 103-4 ἀνάκοοι ἐν χθονὶ κοίλᾳ / εὔδομες εὖ

μάλα μακρὸν ἀτέρμονα νήγρετον ὕπνον.

quiescendi: see 39n. above.

43-6.   Four lines which encapsulate Ovid's idiosyncratic conception
of love - an exciting game of which deception (uoces fallacis
amicae, 43), quarrelling (iurgia, 45) and rejection (repulsus
eam, 46) are just as agreeable a part as the prospect of
pleasure (gaudia, 44), endearments (blanditias, 45) and
sexual satisfaction (fruar domina, 46); cf. introduction
to 5 above, pp. 228-9. Cf. Morgan 37-8.

43.   With Ovid's sentiment here contrast Propertius's attitude
at ii. 24 (A). 15-16 sed me / fallaci dominae iam pudet
esse iocum. For the expression cf. Rem. 687-8 at tu nec
uoces (quid enim fallacius illis?) / crede ... pondus habere.

amicae: see 1. 17n. and cf. 46n. below domina.

44. gaudia: see 5. 29n.

45. blanditias: see 1. 21n.

iurgia nectat: although Burman presses strongly for the
variant quaerat as 'multo elegantior et ad rem accommodatior',
there is in fact nothing to choose between it and nectat in
terms of general sense and propriety; in combination with
iurgia both verbs will give the requisite meaning 'let her

pick a quarrel' (for <u>nectere</u> cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 2. 35 <u>tecum</u>
<u>quoque iurgia nectat</u>). It thus seems reasonable in this
case to read <u>nectat</u> with the majority of the MSS, including
the generally more reliable <u>PSY</u>.

46. <u>fruar</u>: a euphemism for sexual intercourse; cf. <u>Rem</u>. 537
<u>i, fruere usque tua nullo prohibente puella</u> (Pichon collects
further references s.v.). Cf. 10. 25n. <u>lateri</u>.

<u>domina</u>: generally a more complimentary term for mistress
than <u>amica</u> (line 43 above), but here obviously synonymous
with it; see 1. 17n.

<u>repulsus eam</u>: cf. Prop. ii. 4. 1-2 <u>multa prius dominae</u>
<u>delicta quereris oportet,/saepe roges aliquid, saepe</u>
<u>repulsus eas</u>. The expression conjures up not only the
general notion of the lover's rejection, but specifically
the picture of the <u>exclusus amator</u> departing in disappointment
from his mistress's door (see 1. 22n.).

47-8. Ovid's aforegoing observations on the ups-and-downs of love
allow him to introduce the standard elegiac motif of the
comparability of love and war (see introduction above, p. 376).
Here he does not merely say that the fortunes of both are
unpredictable (cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 9. 29 <u>Mars dubius, nec certa Venus</u>),
but goes so far as to assert that Mars, the god of war, in
being fickle, takes after his stepson (see below), Cupid! Meleager
suggests a more natural line of inheritance at <u>AP</u> v. 180. 7-8.
Ovid's mockery of Mars in particular will have been

amusingly shocking for his contemporary readers in view
of Augustus's special veneration of that god; in 20 B.C.
the Princeps dedicated to Mars Vltor (a title awarded in
honour of the victory over Caesar's assassins) a new temple
on the Capitol which was to house the recovered Parthian
standards previously kept in the aedes of Mars Vltor in the
Forum Augustum (cf. Aug. Anc. 12); see Platner and Ashby,
Topographical Dictionary 329-30, Nash, Pictorial Dictionary
I. 401ff.

priuigne ... / ... uitricus: here and at Rem. 27 Ovid
designates Mars the stepfather of Cupid, but at Am. i. 2. 24
he assigns the role to Vulcan (see Barsby ad loc.). Both of
these gods in turn, as Ares and Hephaistos, appear in Greek
myth as the husband of Aphrodite (see Hom. Od. viii. 266-366,
Hes. Th. 933-7), who is frequently recognized as the mother
of Eros/Cupid (he is already associated with her in Hesiod
(see Th. 201), but first positively identified as her son by
Sappho fr. 81 (Lobel-Page); cf. Simon. fr. 70. 1 (Page),
A.R. iii. 25-6, Verg. A. i. 664, and see further RE 6. 488).
Thus, assuming that Cupid was born of some illegitimate love
of Aphrodite/Venus, either Mars or Vulcan could, technically,
have been his 'stepfather' (Ovid is fond of pointing out
curious kinships: Cupid is also said to be a relation of
Augustus at Am.i. 2. 51-2 aspice (Cupido), cognati felicia
Caesaris arma). Cupid's parentage, however, was an ever-
intriguing mystery for the ancients; see e.g. Mel. AP v.
177. 5 πατρὸς δ' οὐκέτ'/φράξειν ἔχω τίνος, 180. 6 γενέτας δ' οὔτε
τις οὔτε τινός, and further D. L. Page, Sappho and Alcaeus
(Oxford 1955) 271).

49. <u>uentosior alis</u>:   'flighty' is Lee's felicitous translation
    of this phrase (literally,'more fickle than your wings'; for
    the wings of Cupid see 7. 27n.).   Ovid caps Prop. ii. 12.
    5 <u>idem</u> (i.e. <u>ille qui pinxit Amorem</u>) <u>non frustra</u>
    <u>uentosas addidit alas</u>, where the double meaning of <u>uentosus</u>,
    both 'nimble' (see e.g. <u>Fast</u>. iv. 392 <u>prima</u> ... <u>uentosis</u>
    <u>palma petetur equis</u>) and 'fickle', 'inconstant' (see e.g.
    Hor. <u>Ep</u>. i. 19. 37 <u>uentosae plebis suffragia</u>) is also
    exploited.

50. <u>gaudia</u>: see 5. 29n.

    <u>ambigua</u> ... <u>fide</u>:   'unreliably'; cf. Tac. <u>Ann</u>. xiii. 34
    <u>Armenii ambigua fide utraque arma inuitabant</u>.

    <u>dasque negasque</u>:   the double -<u>que</u>, fundamentally an epic turn
    of phrase, is probably intended to give an air of mock
    solemnity; see E. Fränkel, <u>Plautinisches im Plautus</u> (Berlin
    1922), 209-11, Norden on Verg. <u>A</u>. vi. 336.

51-4. Ovid formally invites Cupid to establish a permanent home
    in his heart; see introduction above, p.374, n. 5.

51. <u>si ... exaudis, pulchra cum matre, rogantem</u>:   <u>rogantem</u> (a
    <u>uaria lectio</u> given by <u>p</u>) has been adopted by the vast majority
    of editors in preference to <u>Cupido</u> (the reading otherwise
    universally attested), which has been thought to emanate from

scribal reminiscence of _Am_. i. 6. 11 <u>risit, ut audirem,</u>
<u>tenera   cum matre Cupido</u>. Burman's observations, however,
should make the editor think twice: '<u>Audire rogantem</u> magis
Latinum puto, quam <u>exaudire</u>, quamuis hoc uerbo omnis hodie
infulatorum turba, de precibus ad Deum emissis, quotidie uti
consueuerit, et forte a cucullato aliquo Nasoni obstrusum
fuerit ... Deesse credebat ille, <u>rogantem</u>, uel <u>precantem</u>,
ideoque pro diuersa lectione adscripsit.' The construction
<u>exaudire aliquem</u> is in fact attested <u>only</u> in late and
ecclesiastical Latin (see <u>ThLL</u> 5. ii. 1192. 23-35, 75-80);
classical authors use the verb either absolutely (see e.g.
<u>Met</u>. iv. 144 <u>exaudi, uultusque attolle iacentes</u>, Sen. <u>Ep</u>.
95. 2 <u>di ... non exaudiunt</u>) or with an <u>acc. rei</u> such as
<u>preces</u> or <u>uoces</u> (see e.g. <u>Met</u>. vii. 645 <u>uoces ... hominum</u>
<u>exaudire uidebar</u>, and further <u>ThLL</u> 5. ii. 1192. 1-6). What
is more, <u>rogantem</u> here, as Goold points out (<u>Amat. Crit</u>. 37),
would go most naturally with <u>pulchra cum matre</u>, i.e. <u>rogantem</u>
<u>pulchra cum matre rogante</u>.

In short, all seems to suggest that <u>rogantem</u> is nothing
more than the gloss of a scribe familiar with the
ecclesiastical construction of <u>exaudire</u> and perhaps suspicious
of the repetition of <u>Cupido</u> here so soon after its appearance
in line 47.

<u>pulchra cum matre</u>: Venus; see 47-8n. above.

52.   A line upon which the majority of commentators are strangely
silent, though it exhibits several peculiarities: (i) the
uncommon expression <u>regna gerere</u>, (ii) a simple local

ablative, meo pectore, in circumstances where the ablative
with a preposition is more common, (iii) the ἅπαξ λεγόμενον
indeserta.

(i) Heinsius advocated reading regna tene (given by a
few late MSS, and no doubt a humanist conjecture). Regna
tenere is certainly well attested in Ovid's work (14 instances
in all), while there are no Ovidian parallels for regna
gerere. But Tib. i. 9. 80 geret (alter puer) in regno regna
superba tuo provides a precedent for it, and gere, as lectio
difficilior, is thus to be preferred here (for the short final
-e ending the pentameter, which some scribes seem to have been
keen to eliminate, see Platnauer 64-5).

(ii) In pectore, in corde etc. are much more common than
the simple ablative in expressions comparable with the
present one throughout Ovid's work; see e.g. line 2 above,
Am. i. 1. 26 uror, et in uacuo pectore regnat Amor, Ep. 17.
90 qui calet in cupido pectore ... Amor, Rem. 108 et uetus
in capto pectore sedit amor, Tr. i. 5. 6 cum foret in misero
pectore mortis amor. The preposition seems to have been
jettisoned purely for metrical convenience; cf. Rem. 268
longus et inuito pectore sedit Amor.

(iii) Indeserta is an example of one of Ovid's favourite
forms of coinage, i.e. perfect passive participle + the
negative prefix in-; a small selection of examples from a
very long list will suffice for comparison: inattenuatus
(Met. viii. 844), incruentatus (Met. xii. 497), indefletus
(Met. vii. 611), indeploratus (Tr. iii. 3. 46), indestrictus
(Met. xii. 92), indetonsus (Met. 4. 13), indeuitatus (Met.
ii. 605), inexperrectus (Met. xii, 317).

regna: for the 'kingdom' of Cupid, a conception apparently exclusive to Ovid, cf. Am. i. 1. 26 in uacuo pectore regnat Amor, Rem. 24 decent annos mollia regna tuos, Ep. 4. 12. regnat et in dominos ius habet ille deos.

53-4. Morgan (38) points to an interesting and probably intentional contrast here between Propertius's attitude at ii. 4. 17-18 hostis si quis erit nobis, amet ille puellas: / gaudeat in puero, si quis amicus erit and Ovid's here; for all the problems of heterosexual love, Ovid, unlike Propertius, commends it wholeheartedly.

53. uaga: 'flirtatious'; cf. Prop. i. 5. 7 non est illa uagis similis conlata puellis, Thgn. 581 (West) ἐχθαίρω δὲ γυναῖκα περίδρομον.

turba: see 2. 30n.

54. populis: see 9 (A). 11n. above.

$$X^1$$

[DuQuesnay 21-2; Jäger 154-6; Morgan 50-51, 54-6;
Neumann 79-85; Sabot 414-17; Tremoli 46-8]

Ovid's professed inability to confine himself to
one woman has already been encountered in Am. ii. 4.[2]
There he claimed to be susceptible to the charms of every
kind of girl; here we find him simultaneously in love
with a mere two.

Directly addressing a certain Graecinus[3] whom he
claims to hold responsible for his current amatory pre-
dicament, Ovid begins his poem with a description of the
dilemma in which he finds himself as a result of his
dual passion (1-14); then, suddenly reflecting that
even this is preferable to a life of complete chastity,
he proceeds to declare his total commitment to erotic
activity, be it with one woman or two (15-22); from
there he goes on to boast that his physique, slight
though it is, can stand the strain of a doubly-demanding
sex-life (23-8), and finally asserts that to die in the
act of love would give him supreme satisfaction (29-38).

Simultaneous love for two or more women (or boys)

---

1. A critical study of this poem based on the introduction
and commentary offered here has appeared in G & R
2nd series 25 (1978), 126-32 (with notes at 138-40).

2. See above pp. 174-7.

3. See 1n. below.

is a common theme in Hellenistic epigram,[4] and its

reappearance in later Greek literature[5] suggests that it

was part of the stock-in-trade of erotic writers of

every period.   It was very probably, however, most

familiar to Ovid and his contemporary public from

Prop. ii. 22 (A), a piece in which the poet, addressing

one Demophoon[6], begins with an admission of his susceptibility

to the charms of every kind of girl (1-20), then, main-

taining that his frail appearance belies his sexual

stamina (21-4), claims that his general physical fitness

is in no way impaired by his erotic indulgences (25-34),

and finally argues that simultaneous involvement with

two different women has certain practical advantages

(35-42).   With this elegy the opening couplet of

the present poem clearly invites comparison, taking up

one of its basic themes, geminus amor, and adopting its

form, direct address.[7]

---

4. E.g. Polystr. AP xii. 91, Phld. AP xii. 173, Anon.
AP xii. 88, 89 (for the dating see Gow-Page, Hellenistic
Epigrams (Cambridge 1965) II. 559-60).

5. E.g. Strat. AP xii. 246, Paul. Sil. AP v.232, Aristaenet.
ii. 11.

6. The name could conceal the identity of a real person
or indicate an imaginary character;   cf. Lynceus (Prop.
ii. 34 (A). 9).

7. The similarity between the two poems has long been
recognized: see Neumann, loc. cit., and now DuQuesnay,
loc. cit., Morgan, loc. cit.   Kathleen Morgan's claim
(50, n. 12) that in Am. ii. 10 Neumann regards the
'primary influence' as a letter of Aristaenetus (ii. 11)
and Prop. ii. 22 (A) as 'a secondary influence' is a
bad slip in a generally sensible and useful monograph:
Neumann knew very well (as Mrs Morgan seems not to know)
that Aristaenetus wrote in the fifth century A.D., and
all that he was attempting to do was to refute the view

Geminus amor in lines 3-14 of our poem is apparently

no expedient possibility for Ovid, as it is for Propertius,

but a trap into which he has unwittingly been led;

Propertius thus seems for once to have approached an

amatory problem with more equanimity than Ovid. Ovid's

attitude is in fact more like that of the Hellenistic

epigrammatists, whose reaction to dual passion is in-

variably one of stylized distress[8]. Even the use of

the specific addressee is to be paralleled in earlier

Greek epigram[9] - though it does seem very likely that

Ovid adopted it here in direct imitation of Propertius.

But if the form of the poem seems to be Pro-

pertian and its outlook, at least in lines 3-14, Hellenistic,

the style of that opening section is neither. An

element of conscious verbal artistry absent from both

Propertius and the Greek epigrammatists is immediately

apparent, lines 5-8 providing a particularly impressive

example of sustained linguistic dexterity.[10] This pen-

chant for balance and antithesis and decorative word-

---

which held that there was a common source for the 'dual
love' theme as used by both Ovid and Aristaenetus in a
lost corpus of Alexandrian love elegy (cf. introduction
to 2 above, p. 105-6, n. 33.

8. See 8, 9, 10nn. below.

9. Anon. AP xii. 88. 1-2 διссоί με τρύχουσι καταιγίζοντες
ἔρωτες, /Εὔμαχε.

10. See nn. ad loc.; also 13-14nn. below.

patterning in general, though a characteristic feature of Ovid's elegiac style at all times,[11] is particularly striking also in the one other poem in the Amores which has a specific addressee, i.e. i. 9.[12]. That poem, which begins with the couplet militat omnis amans et habet sua castra Cupido; / Attice, crede mihi, militat omnis amans proceeds, with no further attention to Atticus, to discourse on the initial propositio ('Every lover is a soldier') very much in the manner of the educational exercises on 'sayings' (περὶ χρείας) and 'maxims' (περὶ γνώμης) set out in the progymnasmata of the late Greek rhetoricians[13]. It would be a mistake to press the resemblance too closely and arrive at the conclusion that Ovid was consciously striving to produce a progymnasma in verse, for it could well be that the progymnasmatists actually used pieces such as this as the basis for their precepts,[14] but it

---

11. See DuQuesnay 13-16, Barsby 23-9.

12. A named addressee is introduced not infrequently in Horace's Odes and is very common in Propertius (exactly half the poems in his first book are addressed to friends: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 20).

13. See especially Aphth. 62-7? (Spengel), Bonner Education in Ancient Rome- 256-60. Am. i. 9. could be seen thus: 1-2: the initial statement of the thesis and an immediate repetition of it; 3-30: a series of reasons for its validity (τὸ τῆς αἰτίας) incorporating (23-4) a comparative illustration (παραβολή); 31-2: an interim summing up; 33-40: a catalogue of exempla (παραδείγματα); 41-4: a citation of personal Ovidian, rather than ancient, testimony (μαρτυρία παλαιῶν) to the truth of the maxim; 45-6: the conclusion (ἐπίλογος).

14. Cf. introduction to 6 above, p.279, n.5, and see further general introduction pp. 11-14.

-can hardly be denied that the poem has a structure
and style which are recognizably 'rhetorical'. The opening
section of our elegy is very similar in that, in addition
to the meticulous attention to balance and antithesis
already noted, it also has a specific addressee who is
abandoned once the poem is under way and an initial re-
iteration of a thesis (this time first in negative, then in
positive, form: negabas / uno posse aliquem tempore amare
duas (1-2) ... ecce duas uno tempore turpis amo (4)). Cer-
tainly Ovid pays more attention to Graecinus than he does
to Atticus; he seems at least to be making some attempt
at emotional realism in the opening address to him[15], but
very soon the element of conscious verbal artistry becomes
paramount. We may begin to wonder whether the initial
evocation of a Propertian parallel in the opening address
to Graecinus was in fact a red herring and to suspect that
the introduction of a specific addressee in Ovid simply
signals a poem which will proceed to elaborate in 'rhetorical'
fashion the initial remark addressed to that person[16].

But in our poem Ovid's 'rhetorical' exposition ends
abruptly when, with a sudden volte-face at line 15, he

---

15. See 1n. below.

16. The Greek rhetoricians recommended introducing a χρεία
by way of a direct address to its originator (see Bonner,
op. cit. (n. 13), 257), and Ovid uses a more intimate ver-
sion of the same device here, humorously proceeding to
prove the falsity rather than the truth of what Graecinus
has said (negabas / uno posse aliquem tempore amare duas
(1-2)) in what follows.

declares his preference for the trials of geminus amor

rather than a life sine amore, and thus introduces the

age-old subject of the incomparable delights of love,

with all its conventional trappings[17]. It seems as if

Ovid has forgotten entirely about the dual passion he

was at such pains to describe at the outset, but in lines

21-2 we are suddenly reminded of the opening section of

the poem: 'Let woman be the ruin of me', says the poet,

' — one, if one is enough, and if not one, then two!'.

Ovid does, after all, it appears, have a pragmatic

view of geminus amor![18]

Ovid's change of attitude is the signal for a further

surprise, as, with the claim that his sexual stamina will

be equal to any extra demands (23-4), he unexpectedly

establishes contact with Prop. ii. 22 (A) once more.[19]

But no sooner has Ovid renewed contact with Propertius

than he veers away from him again and ends his poem on an

entirely different note. For his impudentia does not

stop at the limits of Propertius's, but rather continues

to gather strength until it culminates in the sentiment of

lines 29-30: 'May I die in the act; what a lovely way

to go!'. In fact the whole passage 23-8 is characterized

by an unrestrained delight in the mischievous and the

risqué, as Ovid turns elegiac commonplaces upside-down[20],

---

17. See introduction to 9 (A) and (B) above, p.377 , n. 19, 16-17nn. below.

18. Cf. 22n. below.

19. Cf. ibid. 21-4

20. See 31-4, 37-8nn. below.

introduces incongruously elevated and pseudo-religious language[21], and produces as rich a collection of erotic euphemisms as one could hope to find within such a short space.[22] Propertius's ending is a damp squib in comparison.

Not many modern critics have been impressed with this poem,[23] and it is not difficult to see why, for the sequence of thought is unnatural and the logic is hardly persuasive. But the elegy's capacity to surprise by its sudden change of attitude[24] and its suggestion of allegiance at different moments to Propertius[25], to Greek epigram and to Ovid's own 'rhetorical' inclinations, to amuse by its verbal wit and ingenuity and its humorous adaptation of conventional elegiac material, and to shock by its

---

21. See 29-30nn. below.

22. See 25n. below.

23. Neither Barsby (18, n. 8) nor Lee (in Elegy and Lyric 179, n. 9) includes it in his list of the most successful poems in Am. ii. For adverse criticism see e.g. Luck, Latin Love Elegy 170.

24. Those who know Ovid, of course, may well anticipate the volte-face, for it is a regular feature of other poems or pairs of poems of his which begin with a protest against love; cf. Am. ii. 5, 9 (A) and (B) (and introduction to those poems above pp.372-8), iii. 11 (A) and (B), and see Jäger, loc. cit., Cairns, Generic Composition 82. Ovid's initial cry of despair is here in any case too ornamental to be taken seriously.

25. It will be obvious from the above discussion that I see in the present piece only a superficial resemblance to Prop. ii. 22 (A). Morgan (54), however, argues for a high degree of structural parallelism between the two poems.

outrageous impudence and shameless commendation of

immorality in the contemporary climate of moral and religious

revival[26] deserves more recognition than it has generally

had[27]. And it may also be pointed out that Ovid's

cheerfully unrealistic solution to the traditional

'dilemma' of being in love with two women at the same time

- which in truth cannot realistically be solved - is in

a sense more appropriate than the kind of artificial

rationale which Propertius applies to the problem.[28]

---

26. Cf. 5. 7-12, 13-14nn., and see R. Syme, Roman
Revolution, Ch. 29, G. Williams, 'Poetry in the moral
climate of Augustan Rome', JRS 52 (1962), 28-46.

27. The discussions of Morgan (loc. cit.), Sabot (loc.
cit.) and DuQuesnay (loc. cit.), however, are basically
sympathetic.

28. Even Propertius, in choosing to treat such a theme, is
forced into writing with a much greater degree of
emotional detachment than is usual in his first two books;
see E. Reitzenstein, 'Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsent-
wicklung bei Properz', Philologus, Suppl. 29.2 (1936).

1-14. Ovid plunges _in medias res_ (cf. pp. 173 and 225 above on
the opening of 4 and 5) with a well-orchestrated account
of a conventional amatory predicament; see introduction
above pp. 420-21.

1-4. For the role of the addressee see introduction above pp. 420-22.

1. _tu mihi, tu certe_: a tone of indignation is immediately
established by the epanalepsis in combination with the
emphatic _certe_ (cf. 3n. below), but the cause of the
poet's outrage is so obviously ludicrous that we do not
for one moment take his affected horror seriously. For
a general survey of epanalepsis in the elegiac couplet
see Platnauer 33-5.

memini: for Ovid's frequent use of the parenthetical
memini cf. 1. 11-16n.

Graecine: probably an intimate friend of Ovid's and the
same Graecinus as the addressee of _Pont._ i. 6, ii. 6
and iv. 9. Possibly he is to be identified with C.
Pomponius Graecinus, _cos. suff._ in A.D. 16 (it was wrong
of me at _G & R_ 2nd series 25 (1978), 138, n. 2 not to
note T.P. Wiseman's observation to this effect in his
book New Men in the Roman Senate (Oxford 1971), 253).

2-4. Note the artistic manipulation of word-order: the two

most emphatic words (<u>uno</u> ... <u>duas</u>) frame the verse in
line 2 and are juxtaposed in reverse order in line 4
(<u>duas uno</u>).

3. The characteristically Ovidian balance of this line (see
introduction above p. 420 and Barsby 24), which continues
to stress the poet's humorously absurd claim that
Graecinus is directly and exclusively responsible for
leading him astray (cf. 1n. above), is achieved by (a)
the use of anaphora (<u>per te</u> ... <u>per te</u>; see 16-17n.
below) and (b) the corresponsion of two verbs in <u>de</u>-
(<u>decipior</u> ... <u>deprensus</u> (<u>sum</u>)).   Some MSS omit <u>ego</u>, and
the parallelism between the two halves of the line
would certainly be even closer without it (cf. <u>Ars</u>
ii. 204), but <u>per te ego</u> is clearly needed here to balance
<u>tu mihi</u> in line 1, which this line so obviously takes up.

<u>deprensus inermis</u>: 'caught unarmed' or 'off-guard' - a
military metaphor which Ovid seems to find particularly
to his liking in describing embarrassing amatory situations
of various kinds (cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 7. 71, <u>Rem</u>. 347); he
may even have invented it, for it is in his work that
it is first attested (see <u>ThLL</u> 7. 1307. 41ff.).

4. <u>ecce</u>: an interjection freely used by Ovid to express
a feeling of indignation, either artificial as here
(cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 7. 17) or real (cf. <u>Am</u>. ii. 6. 27 (and n.
<u>ad loc</u>.), 11. 7, iii. 7. 67, 8. 9).   It is particularly
common in direct address to a specific person, where it

retains the tone of spontaneity which stems from its origins in the colloquial language (see Tränkle, Sprachkunst 146-9, Hofmann, Lateinische Umgangssprache 33-5).

turpis: the adjective should probably be taken to mean that Ovid considers his position not 'disgraceful', but 'embarrassing' (Lee) or 'undignified' (cf. Am. i. 9. 4 turpe senex miles, turpe senilis amor, Tib. i. 4. 83-4 parce ... ne turpis fabula fiam / cum mea ridebunt uana magisteria), since there is nothing in the rest of the poem to suggest that he is in any way troubled by the immorality or the unseemliness of his behaviour (but cf. Sabot 414).

The variant solus, a particularly blatant interpolation, was no doubt first introduced by a scribe who mistakenly thought that line 4 should echo exactly, rather than simply recall, line 2 above.

5-8. See introduction above pp. 420-21. The studied symmetry of these lines is well conveyed by Marlowe's translation:

> Both are well favoured, both rich in array,
> Which is the loveliest it is hard to say.
> This seems the fairest, so doth that to me,
> And this doth please me most, and so doth she.

5-6. Note the conscious artistry in the choice and arrangement of words in this couplet. The hexameter is framed by the corresponding words utraque and ambae, and within this frame two adjectives in -osus (formosa, operosae) balance each other as well. A link is then forged between the hexameter and the pentameter (6) through the opposition of cultibus and artibus, the semantic antithesis

being reinforced by the use of words of identical formation
and the emphatic position of <u>artibus</u> in defiance of natural
word-order.

5. <u>utraque</u> ... <u>ambae</u>:   Ovid's usage here and at <u>Am</u>. i. 9. 7
<u>peruigilant ambo, terra reouiescit uterque</u> shows how
invalid is Charisius's attempt to distinguish the two
terms thus: <u>ambo autem non est dicendum nisi de his qui</u>
<u>uno tempore quid faciunt, ut puta reges Eteocles et Polynices</u>
<u>ambo perierunt, quasi una;   Romulus autem et Africanus non</u>
<u>ambo triumphauerunt, sed uterque, quia diuerso tempore</u>
(82, Barwick).   The ancient grammarians' obsession with
semantic distinctions and differences of usage led to
many inanities;   see e.g. Servius's attempt, in his note
on Verg. <u>A</u>. i. 256, to distinguish <u>osculum</u>, <u>suauium</u> and
<u>basium</u> as denoting three different types of kisses!

<u>formosa</u>:   the favourite elegiac word for 'beautiful'.   Its
appearance here inevitably raises the question of how,
if at all, it is to be distinguished from <u>pulcher</u> (cf.
7 below).

   Axelson (<u>Unpoetische Wörter</u> 60-61) attempted to draw
a distinction between the two terms on stylistic grounds,
claiming that <u>pulcher</u>, which is relatively rare in elegy
(1 instance in Tibullus, 8 in Propertius and 25 in Ovid)
but very common in epic, is more elevated in tone than
<u>formosus</u>, which is very rare indeed in epic except Ovid's
<u>Metamorphoses</u> (1 instance in Vergil's <u>Aeneid</u> and Lucan, and none
in Statius, Silius and Valerius).   But A. Ernout in his

review of Axelson's book (RPh (1947) 55-70 (= Philologica
II (Paris 1957), 66-86) points out that a purely stylistic
distinction is dubious when it emerges that pulcher is
much more common than formosus in comedy (art. cit. 80).

Any distinction that there is between the two terms
seems more likely to be one of sense.   Ernout suggests
that formosus relates exclusively to the physical beauty
of persons, animals or things, whilst pulcher may cover a
wide range of non-physical attributes as well (cf. P.
Monteil, Beau et laid en latin (Paris 1964), 48ff., 94ff.).
But it is difficult to accept these conclusions in the
light of Catul. 86:

> Quintia formosa est multis. mihi candida, longa,
>   recta est: haec ego/singula confiteor.
> totum illud formosa nego: nam nulla uenustas,
>   nulla in tam magno est corpore mica salis.
> Lesbia formosa est, quae cum pulcherrima tota est
>   tum omnibus una omnes surripuit Veneres.

Clearly the adjective formosus does not for Catullus
simply denote physical beauty; for the woman who is
formosa in his eyes is one who is not only good-looking,
but also well endowed with the non-physical qualities of
wit and charm.   Pulchritudo (which here surely must be
identified with physical beauty) is only one aspect of
Lesbia's formositas (5-6).   Ernout's distinction thus
breaks down spectacularly in this case (there are also a
few instances of formosus directly applied to abstractions
which Ernout is aware of, but sees fit to dismiss; e.g.
Cic. Att. xiv. 17 (A). 4 nihil ... uirtute formosius,
nihil pulchrius, nihil amabilius, de Orat. iii. 14. 55
species alia magis alia formosa et inlustris.

The -osus termination suggests that formosus may, originally at any rate, have been the more emotional word (see 4. 1n., Tränkle, Sprachkunst 59-60), and the emphatic antithesis of multis and mihi at Catul. 86.1 that it may also have been the more subjective one.   But by the time of Ovid any real distinction between formosus and pulcher had obviously become blurred, for both words are simply used for 'beautiful' as opposed to 'ugly' on a number of occasions;   see e.g. Ars iii. 255ff. turba docenda uenit pulchrae turpesque puellae / ... / formosae non artis opem praeceptaque quaerunt.   Almost certainly Ovid did not intend anything like the Catullan distinction here, but used the two different terms simply for the sake of uariatio.

operosae: 'attentive to';   see 7.23n.

cultibus: see 4.37n.

artibus: see 4. 17n.

7. hac illā ... haec illā: Ovid's juggling with the pronominal inflections aptly mirrors the seesaw process he would have us believe is going on in his mind.   PSYω's haec ... haec is clearly wrong, but there is little to choose between hac ... haec, offered by some recc., and haec ... hac, offered by others.   For the sake of variation, however (cf. line 6), we might reasonably prefer hac ... haec.   For the verbal repetition cf. 5. 2-3n.

8. Note the central position of _nobis_ between _et maris haec_
   and _et maris illa_; even in his verse on the page Ovid
   is caught between the two women! (cf. 5. 31n.)   For
   the sentiment cf. Phld. _AP_ xii. 173. 4 (where the poet
   is, like Ovid, in love with two different girls) οὐκ
   οἶδ' ἢν εἰπεῖν δεῖ με ποθεινοτέρην.

   placet: see 4. 17n.

9. For the navigational simile cf. 9 (_B_). 31-2n.

   erro uelut: the vulgate _errant ut_ is obviously corrupt,
   and the variants which appear in some of the _recc._ (no
   doubt early attempts at emendation rather than truly
   traditionary readings) are equally unacceptable.   Con-
   text and convention demand that it should be the poet
   himself, torn between two loves, who is compared with
   'a little boat buffeted by contrary winds': cf. _Am._
   ii. 4. 8 _auferor ut rapida concita puppis aqua_, Mel.
   _AP_ xii. 157. 3 and 167. 3 χειμαίνει δ' ὁ βαρὺς πνεύσας
   Πόθος, Aristaenet. ii. 11 ἔοικα γοῦν κυβερνήτῃ ὑπὸ
   δυοῖν πνευμάτων ἀπειλημμένῳ, τοῦ μὲν ἔνθεν, τοῦ δὲ
   ἔνθεν ἑστηκότος, καὶ περὶ τῆς νεὼς μαχομένων, ἐπὶ
   τἀναντία μὲν τὴν θάλασσαν ὠθούντων, ἐπ' ἀμφότερα δὲ
   τὴν μίαν ναῦν ἐλαυνόντων.   Bentley's _auferor ut_, though
   unpersuasive in itself (it is culled straight from
   _Am._ ii. 4. 8), shows that he at least recognized, as
   none of his predecessors - not even Heinsius - had done,

the need for a first person verb to make the simile in-
telligible. It is, however, a relatively recent con-
jecture, W.A. Camps's _erro uelut_ (_CR_ n.s. 4 (1954), 203-4),
which has won most support (see Kenney, _Notes_ 61, R.P.
Oliver in _Studies presented to B.E. Perry_, 157). The
only substantial objection to it would seem to be one of
those made by R. Führer (_Hermes_ 100 (1972), 408-10),
namely that the final -_o_ of a first person singular verb
is shortened after a long syllable only towards the end
of the line elsewhere in Augustan poetry (see _Am_. iii. 2.26,
Pont. i. 7. 56, Prop. iii. 9. 35); but, as Housman
remarked, 'every change must have a beginning' (_JPh_ 21
(1893), 160 = _Classical Papers_ 276).

Führer's own _erramus_ is not unattractive. Palaeo-
graphically it is almost as plausible as Camps's _erro_
uelut (see Kenney, _loc. cit._), and the ellipse of the
particle of comparison (_ut_ or _uelut_), though bold, is
easily paralleled (Führer cites in particular _Pont._ ii. 1.
15-16 _nos quoque frugiferum sentimus inutilis herba_ /
numen, et inuita saepe iuuamur ope, and gives references
to detailed discussions of the idiom with collections of
further examples). But, while plural verb taken up by
singular pronoun would be fairly unexceptionable (see
Rothstein's note on Prop. i. 1. 33 to which Führer refers
for support), _erramus_ here taken up by the unaccompanied
diuiduum in line 10, with no pronoun expressed at all,
seems very jarring indeed.

On balance, then Camps's conjecture remains the most convincing and is very probably right.

uentis discordibus: cf. <u>Tr</u>. i. 2. 27-30.

phaselos: a fairly small, light boat; cf. <u>Pont</u>. i. 10. 39. The term was originally one given to the papyrus vessels used on the Nile because of resemblance in shape to a bean-pod (φάσηλος). See Fordyce on Catul. 4. 1.

10. For the sentiment cf. Anon. <u>AP</u> xii. 88. 5 τμῆξατ᾽, ἐμοὶ τοῦθ᾽ ἡδύ.

diuiduum: 'torn in two' a vivid, and apparently unique, metaphorical use of the word in application to a person (see <u>ThLL</u> 5. i. 1612. 32).

alter et alter: see 1. 30n.

11-14. For the apostrophe cf. 9 (<u>B</u>). 41.

11. <u>Erycina</u>: a name given to Venus after a temple of her worship at Mt. Eryx in north-west Sicily; see further Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 2. 33. The indignant question to Venus of a man tortured by more than one love is to be paralleled in an anonymous Hellenistic epigram: <u>AP</u> xii. 89. 1. Κύπρι, τί μοι τρισσοὺς ἐφ᾽ ἕνα σκοπὸν ἤλασας ἰούς.

sine fine i.e. _assiduos_. The preposition _sine_ is worked
very hard in Ovid, and he is fond of replacing an adjective
with _sine_ + noun, as here. _Sine fine_ is one of the most
common collocations and frequently appears in this position
in the second half of the hexameter; cf. _Pont_. i. 10. 23
uigilant... mei sine fine dolores. Further examples of
this and other phrases with _sine_ are collected by Zingerle I.
18-19.

12. Cf. Prop. ii. 25. 48 _una sat est cuiuis femina multa mala_.

curas: one of the stock elegiac words for the sorrows of
love (cf. _Am_. ii. 19. 43, Tib. i. 5. 37, Prop. 1. 10. 17);
the suffering, as here, is often thought to be directly
imposed by Venus (cf. Catul. 64. 72, 68.51). In elegy
cura is frequently synonymous with love itself (e.g.
Ars ii. 357, Prop. ii. 12. 4) or with the loved one (e.g.
_Am_. i. 3. 16, Tib. ii. 3. 31, Prop. i. 1. 36). See
further Pichon, s.v.

in curas ... satis: Tränkle (_Sprachkunst_ 87) sees here
an example of a prepositional phrase replacing a case
ending (i.e. _in_ + accusative replacing the dative) to
create a more forceful expression, but _satis_ + dative is
a different idiom, the dative always indicating the person
or thing which is, or is to be, satisfied; see e.g. _Met_.
iv. 427 _idque mihi satis est?_ Prop. iv. 4. 17 _et satis
una malae potuit mors esse puellae_ and further Lewis and

Short, s.v. I. 1 a.   Satis followed by a preposition with
the accusative indicates the ultimate outcome (here curas)
of the action or situation in question;   cf. Ep. 2. 44
in poenas non satis unus eris, Met. vi. 642-3 satis illi
ad fata uel unum/uulnus erat.

13-14. Ovid now reiterates in proverbial form his indignant
questions of 11-12.   The expressions he uses are the
standard exempla of proliferation, not,strictly speaking,
illustrative of 'doubling', but simply of adding to things
already present in abundance - the equivalent of our 'carrying
coals to Newcastle';   for folia cf. Pont. iv. 2. 13 frondes
... addere siluis, Hor. S. i. 10. 34 in siluam non ligna
feras;   for sidera, Ars i. 59 quot caelum stellas, tot
habet tua Roma puellas (and further, Otto, Sprichwörter
321-2);   and for aquae, Am. iii. 2. 34 in mare fundis
aquas, Apoll. Sid. Ep. vii. 3. 1 possemus fluminibus aquas
... transmittere.   The thrice-repeated quid   binds together
the three separate exempla to make a single point in the
couplet as a whole;   cf. the repeated cur at Am. iii. 14.
31-3.

15-22. The double adversative sed tamen (15) marks a complete
change of attitude on Ovid's part (see Lewis and Short s.v. tamer
II.A), as he turns abruptly from bewailing the difficulties
of being in love with two women at once to deprecating a
life devoid of love altogether (see introduction above
pp.422-3).   Jäger (154), is, I think, wrong in saying that
we should imagine 'eine kleine Pause' between lines 14

and 15; the very suddenness of Ovid's volte-face is what
makes it most effective. As usual, the disadvantages of
a life without love are seen in terms of its effects on
a man's nocturnal hours (cf. 9. (B). 39-42nn.).

15. sine amore: for expressions with sine see 11n. above.

iacerem: for iacere = 'to lie in bed' cf. Ars ii. 359-60
dum Menelaus abest, Helene, ne sola iaceret, / hospitis est
tepido nocte recepta sinu. Here, however, there is un-
doubtedly also a suggestion of the other common absolute
use of iacere, 'to lie dead' (see 6. 20n.). For to spend
a night sine amore is for Ovid as bad as being dead: see
Am. ii. 9 (B). 39 quid est somnus gelidae nisi mortis imago?

16-17. hostibus eueniat ... / ... hostibus eueniat: anaphora
is one of the most characteristic features of Ovid's style.
It creates a variety of tones including pathos (e.g. Am.
ii. 19. 11-13), assurance (e.g. Am. ii. 12. 19-23) and
indignation (see 3n. above). It is used very often, as
here, to give extra vehemence to a particular point, but
sometimes simply as a mechanical means of balancing two
clauses (see e.g. Am. i. 9. 4). On anaphora in general,
the study of L. Otto (De Anaphora (Diss. Marburg 1906)) is
still useful.

The wishing of an unsuccessful love-life or unsatis-
factory partner on one's 'enemies' (see n. below) is a
commonplace in love-elegy; cf. Ep. 15. 219-20 hostibus eueniant
conuiuia talia nostris, / experior posito qualia saepe

mero, Prop. iii. 8. 20 <u>hostibus eueniat lenta puella meis</u>.

<u>hostibus</u>:   the elegiac poet's conventional portrayal

of himself as <u>miles amoris</u> (see introduction to 9 (<u>A</u>) and

(<u>B</u>), p. 376   above) meant that <u>hostis</u> came to be one

of the standard terms used for a 'rival' in love;   see

e.g. <u>Am</u>. i. 9. 25-6 <u>nempe maritorum somnis utuntur amantes</u> /

<u>et sua sopitis hostibus arma mouent</u>, Prop. i. 11. 7-8

<u>an te nescio quis ... hostis / sustulit e nostris, Cynthia,</u>

<u>carminibus</u>? (see further Pichon, s.v., Spies, <u>Militat</u>

<u>omnis amans</u> Ch. 4).   Here, however, and at Prop. iii.

8.20 (<u>supra cit</u>. 15-16n.) <u>hostibus</u> must mean 'enemies' in

a more general sense.

16. <u>uita seuera</u>:   'a moral life' (Lee);   for <u>seuera</u> see l. 3n.

17. <u>uiduo ... cubili</u>:   Bornecque (alone) prefers <u>uacuo</u>, the

reading of <u>S</u> and most of the <u>recc</u>., and an investigation

of elegiac usage makes it seem a reasonable preference

too.   For a bed which is described as <u>uiduus</u> is normally

one whose single occupant has, to his or her distress,

been actually or apparently deserted by lover, husband

or wife;   see e.g. <u>Ep</u>. 1. 81-2 <u>me pater Icarius uiduo</u>

<u>discedere lecto / cogit</u> (the speaker is Penelope apparently

deserted by Ulysses), 5. 106 <u>nunc iacet (Menelaus) in</u>

<u>uiduo credulus ille toro</u>, 10. 14 <u>membra ... sunt uiduo</u>

<u>praecipitata toro</u> (the speaker is Ariadne deserted by

Theseus);   cf. <u>Tr</u>. v. 5. 48, Prop. ii. 9. 16.   A bed

which is <u>uacuus</u>, on the other hand, is one whose lone

occupant's nocturnal solitude is self-imposed; see e.g. _Am._ iii. 9. 34 <u>quid (prodest) in uacuo secubuisse toro?</u> (an echo of _Tib._ i. 3. 25-6), _Prop._ ii. 2. 1 <u>liber eram et uacuo meditabar uiuere lecto</u>, _Am._ ii. 19. 42, iii. 10. 2, _Ars_ ii. 370. It may seem that _Prop._ iii. 6. 23, where Cynthia exclaims <u>gaudet</u> (i.e. Propertius) <u>me uacuo solam tabescere lecto</u>, constitutes an exception to this general rule, but Cynthia pines for Propertius in a bed which is <u>uacuus</u> rather than <u>uiduus</u> because it is her self-imposed chastity and not her desertion by the poet which is the cause of her unhappiness (there has been a quarrel as a result of which Cynthia and Propertius have both taken offence and withdrawn from each other).

On the face of it, then, <u>uacuo</u> seems more appropriate here: what Ovid wishes upon his enemies is not that they should <u>lose</u> the enjoyment of love, but that they should be foolish enough never to seek it (<u>uita seuera</u> (16) suggests a life of chosen chastity (see n. <u>ad loc.</u>) and <u>medio laxe ponere membra toro</u> the undisturbed sleep of the sexually abstinent, which Ovid so despises (see _Am._ ii. 9 (_B_). 39-42)). But U. Knoche, in his review of Bornecque's edition (_Gnomon_ 8 (1932), 523), is right to draw attention to Statius's use of <u>uiduus</u> at _Silv._ iii. 5. 60-61 <u>te nunc illa tenet uiduo quod sola cubili / otia tam pulchrae terit infecunda iuuentae</u>; he is speaking of his own daughter's virginity, and hence it is clear that <u>uiduus</u> expresses here what <u>uacuus</u> expresses every-where else, except, of course, in the present passage, if

we accept the reading of PYs (Knoche suggests that Statius

may actually be imitating the Ovidian usage). But this

is not the only reason for looking favourably on PYs 's

uiduo: the fact that Ovid apparently uses uacuus for

uiduus at Met. xi. 471 uacuum petit anxia lectum (of

Alcyone on the departure of Ceyx) makes the possibility

that he here conversely used uiduus for uacuus a very

strong one. It seems likely, we must conclude, that

Ovid was in some part responsible for making two previously

non-synonymous words interchangeable.

cubili: the elegiac bed is far more than a convenient

piece of furniture upon which to take one's rest: the

poets describe all manner of amatory attitudes and situations

in terms of it. It is the witness of their oaths and

the subject of their promises (see e.g. Am. iii. 11(B). 45, Tib.

i. 5. 7, Prop. iv. 3. 69). It is symbolic of their whole

outlook on life: Ars iii. 542 contempto colitur lectus et

umbra foro, Prop. ii. 1. 45 nos contra angusto uersantes

proelia lecto (see Rothstein ad loc.).

The bed, naturally enough, represents 'love' in

erotic poetry from the earliest times (see e.g. Mimn.

fr. 1. 2-3 (West)τεθναίην ὅτε μοι μηκέτι ταῦτα μέλοι/

κρυπταδίη φιλότης, καὶ μείλιχα δῶρα καὶ εὐνή), but the

Latin elegists in particular, by constant reference to

its type, capacity and degree of comfort, manage to keep

us remarkably well-informed on the state of their love-

life. The range of adjectives attached to cubile, lectus,

torus etc. is especially interesting.   A bed which is
mollis is indicative of happy love (Am. ii. 4. 14 (see n.
ad loc.), Ars ii. 712, Tib. i. 2. 56), whereas he whose
bed is durus or frigidus is tortured by love departed
(Prop. iv. 7. 6) or as yet unfulfilled (Am. i. 2. 1).
A luxurious bed (Tyrio ... toro, Tib. i. 2. 75) is not
necessarily a happy one for a lover, whilst a 'narrow',
i.e. 'poor' one (Prop. i. 8 (B). 33 angusto ... lecto)
obviously may be.   Adjectives properly more applicable
to the amor of the people concerned are transferred in-
stead to their bed; concors (Prop. iv. 5. 6), faustus
(Pont. i. 2. 132), legitimus (Pont. iii. 3. 50), primus
(Prop. iii. 20. 14).   The bed sometimes becomes vir-
tually personified and assumes the emotions and character-
istics of its occupants: it is maestus at Ep. 8. 108,
tristis at Prop. iii. 15. 26, fidus when it is occupied by
a fidelis uxor (Prop. iii. 12. 6) and piger when by an
impotent amator (Am. iii. 7. 4).   When the lover lies
alone in distress, the bed is not only said to be desertus
(Ep. 1. 7; cf. Prop. ii. 17. 3-4), but even caelebs,
'celibate', (Ep. 13. 107, Catul. 68. 6) or, as here,
uiduus, 'widowed' (see n. above).   And when the bed is
described as uacuus, 'empty', normally we are to understand
that its legitimate occupant has chosen to sleep alone   ·
(see n. above).

18. medio ... toro: not only the type of bed upon which a man
      lies (see n. above) but also the position in which he lies

is significant. Lying _in medio toro_ is generally a bad
sign: the man is alone and has all the room to himself,
as here (see also _Ep._ 18. 158, and cf. Prop. iii. 21. 8
extremo dormit amicta toro (of Cynthia sleeping at the
edge of the bed)), but at _Am._ i. 5. 2 Ovid lying in _medio_
toro is simply relaxing whilst he waits for his _puella_
to come. Conversely, one who spends his nights _in toto_
lecto is either indulging in feats of erotic agility with
an obliging bed-fellow (see Prop. iv. 8. 88 _et toto_
soluimus arma toro (if the text is sound; see Shackleton
Bailey, _Propertiana_ 258); cf. _Am._ i. 8. 97) or tossing
around tortured by unrequited love or the temporary absence
of the loved one (see Prop. i. 14. 21 (_Venus nec timet_)
miserum toto iuuenem uersare cubili, ii. 22 (_B_). 47, iv.
3. 31).

laxe: either _laxe_, the reading of our oldest MSS, which
is adopted by the majority of editors, or _late_, which
appears in most of the _recc._ and is preferred by Bornecque,
Munari, Harder-Marg and Georg Luck.(_Gnomon_ 35 (1963), 261)
would serve to make the point that a man who sleeps alone
is able to spread himself in bed (see Brink on Hor. _Ars_
209), but it seems very likely that Ovid also meant to
draw attention to the peacefulness of his sleep – something
which _laxe_ suggests, but _late_ does not; cf. Verg. _A._ v.
857 _quies laxauerat artus_.

19. _at mihi_: the combination of strong adversative (see Hand,

Tursellinus I. 40-21) and emphatically placed personal

pronoun registers the sharp contrast between what Ovid wishes

for his enemies and what he wishes for himself (cf. 35

below, 1. 33n., 5. 33n.).

saeuus Amor: the epithet is almost formulaic; cf. Am.

i. 1. 5, 6. 34, Tib. i. 6. 3, Verg. Ecl. 8. 47 (Pichon

collects further examples s.v.). Cf. also λάβρος "Ερως

(Paul. Sil. AP v. 268. 2, 293, 4).

somnos abrumpat: Brandt aptly compares Verg. A. vii. 458

somnum ingens rupit pauor. The compound verb abrumpere

carries an air of finality - 'put an end to' (see e.g. Rem.

495 non ego te iubeo medias abrumpere curas, Verg. A.

viii. 579 nunc, nunc o liceat crudelem abrumpere uitam,

and further OLD s.v. 5), but what Ovid really hopes here,

of course, is that somni inertes will never even begin

for him!

inertes: the adjective is heavily pejorative; cf. Cic.

Agr. ii. 91 inertissimum et desidiosissimum otium. For

Ovid's view of hours spent in sleep as hours wasted cf.

Am. ii. 9 (B). 39-40, and for the contention that a life

of love is anything but a life of inertia see Ars ii.

229 Amor odit inertes; cf. Am. i. 9. 31-2, 41-6, and see

E. Burck, Hermes 80 (1952), 172.

20. lecti: see 17n. above.

21. For the expression cf. Rem. 557 i, fruere usoue tua nullo
    prohibente puella.

    me: the emphatic position of the pronoun again stresses
    Ovid's defiance of conventionally approved behaviour (cf.
    at mihi, 19 above, and see 31-8n. below).

    disperdat: stronger than the simple verb, disperdere
    emphasizes the boldness of Ovid's sentiment (cf. Lucr.
    ii. 830-31 color.../.. disperditur omnis, Verg. Ecl. 3. 27
    stridenti miserum stipula disperdere carmen). The word
    is common only in late and ecclesiastical Latin (see
    ThLL 5. i. 1404. 8ff.), but for Ovid's liking for uncommon
    compounds see 5. 35n.

22. A completely unexpected return to the theme of the first
    14 lines of the poem - geminus amor. It has, however,
    undergone a complete metamorphosis and is no longer seen
    as a disastrous dilemma, but as a love-situation which Ovid
    can look upon with near-indifference, accepting it, if and
    when it is necessary for 'practical purposes' (see intro-
    duction above p. 423). Lilja's notion (182-3) that
    the present poem, along with Am. ii. 4, shows Ovid's ideal
    to be that of a 'monogamous relationship' is astonishing
    in the face of this line. It may have been the 'established'
    ideal, but is not Ovid's; his whole point is that as long
    as he can spend his entire life in love, the number of

women involved is immaterial. (Lilja's terminology, 'monogamous', 'polygamous' etc. is also unfortunate, for in the human rather than the animal sphere it is always suggestive of marriage, and not the kind of free love which is the subject of Roman elegy.)

23-8. Ovid now turns to discourse on his own sexual stamina; cf. Prop. ii. 22 (A). 21-34 and see introduction above pp. 423-4.

23-4. 'I shall be up to it', says Ovid forthrightly (PY alone have the correct *sufficiam* - no doubt easily misread as *sufficiant* (so most of the *recc.*); see Ker, *Ovidiana* 228). The shameless boast is followed up with a warning that frail appearance should not be taken as an indication of weakness; cf. Prop. ii. 22 (A). 21-2 *sed tibi si exilis uideor tenuatus in artus / falleris: haud umquam est culta labore Venus.* (On reflection (cf. G & R 2nd series, 25 (1978), 139, n. 28), I think Kenney (in the apparatus to his edition) is probably right to understand *sunt* ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with *graciles* (i.e. *graciles sunt, sed non sunt sine uiribus artus*), though I notice that A.G. Lee (CR n.s. 2 (1952), 176) is of my original opinion.) For the traditional slightness of the elegiac lover see 9 (A). 14n., and for the general sentiment *graciles non sunt sine uiribus artus*, Pl. *Per.* 232.

24. *neruis*: often = 'strength' in general, but the word may be used specifically, as here, with reference to sexual

potency; cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 7. 35 <u>quid uetat et neruos magicas</u>
<u>torpere per artes</u>?, Catul. 67. 27 <u>neruosius</u>
<u>illud</u> (i.e. the penis).

25. Ovid seems to have conflated two constructions to create
    an unusual food metaphor: (i) <u>lateri dabit alimenta</u>
    <u>uoluptas</u> (ii) <u>lateri dabit uires uoluptas</u> (cf. <u>Ep. Sapph</u>.
    206 <u>ingenio uires ille dat</u>). For <u>in</u> + accusative with
    virtually final or consecutive force cf. <u>Am</u>. i. 13. 46
    <u>commisit noctes in sua uota duas</u>, Prop. iv. 5. 48 (with
    Rothstein's note). The expression <u>in uires</u> here appears
    to be analogous to such phrases as <u>in maius</u>, which are
    particularly common after verbs of increasing (<u>uel sim</u>.);
    cf. <u>Met</u>. iv. 661 <u>creuit in immensum</u> (see further Kühner-
    Stegmann II. i. 567-8). Lee well translates this line
    'Pleasure's a food that builds me up'.

   <u>lateri</u>: like <u>nerui</u> (see 24n. above), <u>latus</u> may indicate
   'strength' in general (see <u>ThLL</u> 7. 1026. 82ff.), but from
   Catullus onwards it is often used to mean 'virility'
   (e.g. <u>Am</u>. i. 8. 48, <u>Ars</u> ii. 673) or, more specifically,
   as here, <u>penis</u> (<u>uel sim</u>.); cf. <u>Am</u>. iii. 7. 36, 8. 14,
   Catul. 6. 13, Juv. 6. 37. Ovid is a past-master of the
   erotic euphemism, and the following lines provide a rich
   accumulation of circumlocutory references to sexual inter-
   course (see below on <u>in uires</u>, <u>uoluptas</u>, <u>decepta</u>, <u>opera</u>
   (26), <u>lasciue</u> (27), <u>Veneris certamina</u> (29), <u>Veneris</u>
   <u>languescere motu</u> (35), <u>opus</u> (26)). Ovid's language is

never openly indelicate, and he could never be fairly

accused of the unequivocal obscenity of Catullus and

Martial, but whether his innuendo is any more or less acceptable

is for his readers to judge for themselves (on the whole

question of 'calling a thing by its name' see Cic. Fam.

ix. 22).

uires: for uires of sexual stamina cf. Ars ii. 673.

alimenta: a word excluded, even in its literal sense,

by Catullus, Vergil, Horace and Tibullus, but used relatively

frequently by Ovid (26 times in all) both literally and

figuratively, as here; cf. Met. iii. 478-9 liceat ... /

adspicere et misero praebere alimenta furori.

uoluptas: a regular Ovidian euphemism for

sexual intercourse (cf. Pont. i. 10. 33 nec uires adimit

Veneris damnosa uoluptas, Am. i. 10. 35, Ars ii.

477; Pichon collects further examples s.v.).

26. For the thought cf. Am. iii. 7. 23-6, Prop. ii. 22 (A).

23-4.

decepta: the decepta puella is here one who finds her

lover impotent (Brandt compares Petr. 129), but for decipi

= 'to be disappointed in love' in a more general sense cf.

Ep. 18. 55-6 sic ubi deceptae pars est mihi maxima noctis /

acta, subit furtim lumina fessa sopor.

opera ... mea: a less familiar erotic euphemism, apparently

confined to Ovid; cf. 36n. below, opus.

27. For the thought cf. Rem. 728 hic mihi lasciua gaudia nocte

dedit.

lasciue: 'making love' (none of the older editors seem.

even to have considered adopting this reading in preference

to lasciuae, though it is clearly superior). Lasciuia

and lasciuus are words frequently used of the mischievous-

ness and frivolity of Amor (see e.g. Am. iii. i. 43, Ars

ii. 497, Tib. i. 10. 57), but when used of the lover him-

self and his activities, they are generally suggestive

of sexual licentiousness (see e.g. Am. i. 4. 21, iii. 7.

10). And when both Ovid (Tr. v. 1. 15) and Martial

(i. 4. 8) find it necessary to defend themselves and their

work against the charge of lasciuia, it seems that the

word has become almost synonymous with 'immorality' or

'indecency'.

consumpsi tempora noctis: for tempora (uel sim.) consumere

with a personal subject cf. Prop. i. 3. 37 ubi longa

meae consumpsti tempora noctis, Tib. i. 9. 63 illa nulla

queat melius consumere noctem. Possibly it was re-

luctance to take et in 28 as a postponed connective

which led all the older editors to express a strong pre-

ference for the variant reading consumpto tempore noctis

here, but such postponement is not uncommon (see below

36n.), and there is no reason to doubt the reading of our oldest MSS.

28. <u>utilis</u>: yet another erotic euphemism (see 25n. above), but an uncommon one, and as such perhaps an Ovidian invention; cf. <u>Ars</u> ii. 709-10 <u>fecit in Andromache prius hoc fortissimus Hector / nec solum bello utilis ille fuit</u>, <u>Am</u>. iii. 7. 15 <u>truncus iners iacui, species et inutile pondus</u> (see also 3.7-8n.).

For the sentiment cf. Prop. ii. 22 (<u>A</u>). 23-32. Notice that a single line in Ovid does duty for all Propertius's mythological <u>exempla</u> at ii. 22 (<u>A</u>). 29-34 (cf. DuQuesnay, <u>loc. cit</u>.).

29-38. The ultimate proof of Ovid's total commitment to <u>Amor</u>; see introduction above, pp. 423ff.

29. <u>felix quem</u>... : Ovid's μακαρισμός is amusingly irreverent, for when used in the context of death it normally has a dignified, or even a genuinely religious tone (Ovid himself uses it of his parents at <u>Tr</u>. iv. 10. 81-2 <u>felices ambo</u> ... / <u>ante diem poenae quod periere meae</u>; it appears in Roman epitaphs (see e.g. <u>CLE</u> 394. 1-2 <u>peracto tempore uitae / felix Elysiis merito leuis umbra moraris</u>; cf. 1085. 4); and the <u>felices animae</u> are the 'souls of the blessed' at Verg. <u>A</u>. vi. 669.); here, its juxtaposition with <u>Veneris certamina</u> (see n. below) in application to the unsavoury death of a self-confessed profligate ('Blessed is he whom the battle of sex is the death of!') will have

raised many an Augustan eyebrow. (For _felix qui_ in
general see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. _Carm_. i. 13. 17.)

Veneris certamina mutua: another euphemism for sexual
intercourse (see 25n. above). _Certamen_ properly means
a contest or struggle of any kind, but it is frequently
used in particular of (a) military conflict (see _OLD_
s.v. 2) and (b) sporting competition (see _OLD_ s.v. 3).
Ovid is almost certainly thinking of (b) here and
specifically has in mind a wrestling competition, an
activity which frequently provided erotic imagery for
Greek and Latin writers (Suet. _Dom_. 22 _assiduitatem con-
cubitus uelut exercitationis genus clinopalen uocabat_);
see especially Ar. _Pax_ 894ff. and cf. the use of _rixa_ at
Catul. 66. 13 _dulcia nocturnae portans uestigia rixae_.
Mutua at first seems redundant; the struggle is naturally
between two parties, but the adjective here has the effect
of emphasizing the physical tug-of-war which Ovid associates
with acts of love; cf. _Am_. i. 5. 13-16. Lee translates
splendidly, 'love's duel'.

perdunt: Burman and Munari, who, along with Bornecque and
Harder-Marg, favour _rumpunt_ (the reading of _S_ and some
of the _recc._), point out that _amore rumpi_ is an established
expression, and so it is; see e.g. Catul. 11. 20, Prop.
ii. 16. 14 (further examples in Munari's apparatus). But
what Ovid is wishing upon himself here would seem to be,
in the light of lines 30-38 which follow, not physical
disintegration as a result of sexual over-indulgence (and

this is the implication of _amore rumpi_), but death _in opere_, which _perdunt_ suggests very well indeed; 'nihil temere mutandum' was Heinsius's judicious remark in its favour.

30. _di faciant leti ..._ : _di faciant_ is basically a colloquial expression (see Tränkle, _Sprachkunst_ 151), whilst _letum_ is very largely confined to epic and tragedy (33 instances in Lucretius, 35 in Vergil's _Aeneid_, c. 40 each in Lucan, Statius and Seneca's tragedies, 19 in Valerius Flaccus, 101 in Silius, 35 in Ovid's _Metamorphoses_; _contra_ 8 in Horace, 2 in Tibullus, 4 in Propertius, 16 in Ovid's elegiacs), and undoubtedly carries a grave and serious tone which is often perceptible even when the word occurs in an elegiac context; see e.g. _Am._ ii. 11. 26, Catul. 68. 91. The juxtaposition of colloquial and elevated diction ('By Jove, I hope I depart like that') was surely calculated to shock.

31-8. Ovid once more takes up the theme of contrast between his own ideas and those of other people (see E. Bréguet, 'Le Thème _alius ... ego_ chez les poètes latins', _REL_ 40 (1962), 128-36).

31-4. The soldier and the sea-faring merchant are regularly compared unfavourably with the lover in their mode of life (e.g. Tib. i. 1. 1-6, 10. 29-40, Prop. iii. 5. 1-6, and see E. Burck _Hermes_ 80 (1952), 173-4, Fränkel 186, n. 53), but Ovid here compares them with him in their likely manner of death – he would infinitely

prefer to die in bed rather than on board ship or in battle!

Conscious artistry in sentence-structure and word-order is again perceptible (cf. 2-8nn. above) in Ovid's treatment of the exempla: a verb of identical inflection begins and ends each couplet (induat ... emat / bibat ... quaerat), and each pair of verbs is joined by a co-ordinating et. Cf. 9 (A). 19-22n.

31. Kenney (Notes 62), in decisive correction of the mis-interpretations of the majority of editors, rightly trans-lates 'run his breast on to the enemy's weapons'. Pectora replaces a reflexive direct object; cf. Liv. xliv. 41 qui ... induissent se hastis (Kenney supplies further parallels).

32. aeternum sanguine nomen emat: Brandt aptly compares Hor. Carm. iii. 14. 2 morte uenalem petiisse laurum.

33. quaerat auarus opes: cf. Tib. i. 1. 1 diuitias alius fuluo sibi congerat auro (with K.F. Smith's note).

lassarit: for the syncopation see W.F. Jackson Knight, Ovidiana 109. For the poetic use of lassare (usually contemptuous) = 'to wear out' cf. Stat. Theb. v. 412-13 ipse grauis fluctus clauumque audire negantem / lassat agens Tiphys, ix. 723 surdas ... foris et limina lassat.

arando: Heinsius's conjecture, in support of which he cites Tr. i. 2. 76 latum mutandis mercibus aequor aro,

iii. 12. 36, Verg. <u>A</u>. ii. 780, iii. 495, Petr. 119, is now confirmed by the reading of <u>Y</u> (for ploughing words applied to sailing see further Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 7. 32).

34. Cf. <u>Ep</u>. 7. 62 <u>neu bibat aequoreas naufragus hostis aquas</u>, Prop. ii. 24 (<u>B</u>). 27 <u>taetra uenena libens et naufragus ebibat undas</u>. For the dangers of sea-faring in antiquity see Nisbet-Hubbard's introduction to Hor. <u>Carm</u>. i. 3.

<u>periuro</u> ... <u>ore</u>: for the perjuries of a merchant sailor Brandt compares <u>Fast</u>. vi. 675-92.

35. <u>at mihi</u>: see 19n. above.

<u>Veneris motu</u>: a euphemism for sexual intercourse (see 25 above, 4. 14nn.).

<u>languescere</u>: a poetic periphrasis for the approach of death; cf. <u>Tr</u>. iii. 3. 39, Catul. 64. 188.

36. <u>cum moriar</u>: cf. <u>CLE</u> 1237. 16 <u>cum moriar, maneant ossa quieta mihi</u>.

<u>medium soluar et inter opus</u>: 'May I die in the act'. The fate is not, of course, unknown, and did not go un-recorded in antiquity; see e.g. V. Max. ix. 12. 8

Cornelius Gallus praetorius et T. Haterius eques Romanus inter usum
⟨puerilis⟩ ueneris absumpti sunt (Brandt supplies further
references ad loc.). Ovid's sentiment is reminiscent of
Propertius's at i. 6. 25-8:

> me sine, quem semper uoluit fortuna iacere,
>   hanc animam extremae reddere nequitiae.
> multi longinquo periere in amore libenter,
>   in quorum numero me quoque terra tegat.

These lines, however, are very tame in comparison with
Ovid's.

soluar: cf. Prop. ii. 9. 39 hanc mihi soluite uitam.
The word implies an easy and acceptable mode of death;
see Sen. Ep. 22. 3 soluas potius (uitam) quam abrumpas.

et: for the postponement of the connective see Platnauer
96, Norden's commentary on Verg. A. vi, 'Anhang' III. 403.

opus: one of the more common euphemisms for sexual inter-
course (see 25n. above); cf. Am. i. 4. 48, Rem. 399, Tib.
i. 4. 48 (Brandt supplies further examples ad loc.). The
word seems to indicate the act itself rather than the
physical effort put into it.

37-8. The elegiac poet regularly pictures his own deathbed or
funeral with some relish (see e.g. Tib. i. 1. 59-66,
Prop. i. 17. 19-24, 19), and Propertius, at i. 7. 24, even
goes so far as to ascribe a comment to the sorrowing

mourners: 'Ardoris nostri magne poeta, iaces'; Ovid

does the same here, but his mourners will not lament the

demise of a poetical genius; they will rather simply

comment on the entirely appropriate manner of his

death (38) - Propertius's notorious conceit thus does

not escape a touch of mockery.

37. lacrimans: tears were conventionally considered a

necessary accoutrement of funerals; see K.F. Smith on

Tib. i. 1. 66.

in funere: either 'at my death', or, more probably,

'at my funeral'. Funus covers the whole panoply

of death; see Serv. A. ii. 539 funus enim est iam

ardens cadauer, quod dum portatur 'exsequias'

dicimus, crematum iam 'reliquias', conditum iam

'sepulcrum'. Quidam funere pro caede ac-

cipiunt.

38. Munari very appositely compares Aus. Prof. xx.

210. 14 (66 Peiper) et placidae uitae congrua

meta fuit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Editions and translations of the <u>Amores</u> consulted

Barsby, J.A.   <u>Ovid: Amores Book I</u>, Oxford 1973. Text with select critical apparatus, English commentary and translation.

Bornecque, H.   <u>Ovide, Les Amours</u>, (Budé Text) Paris 1930. Critical text with French translation.

Brandt, P.   <u>P. Ouidi Nasonis Amorum Libri Tres</u>, Leipzig 1911 (reprinted, Hildesheim 1963). Text with German commentary.

Burman, P.   <u>P. Ouidi Nasonis Opera Omnia</u> 'cum integris Micylli, Ciofani et D. Heinsii notis et N. Heinsii curis secundis' 4 vols. (<u>Amores</u>, vol. I), Amsterdam 1727. Text with Latin commentary.

Edwards, G.M.   <u>P. Ouidi Nasonis Amores</u> in <u>Corpus Poetarum Latinorum</u> I, ed. J.P. Postgate, London 1894. Critical text.

Ehwald, R.   See Merkel, R.

Kenney, E.J.   <u>P. Ouidi Nasonis Amores, Medicamina Faciei Femineae, Ars Amatoria, Remedia Amoris</u> (Oxford Classical Text), Oxford 1961 (corrected edition, 1965). Critical text.

Lee, A.G.   <u>Ovid's Amores</u>, London 1965. Text with brief notes and English translation.

Lenz, F.W.   <u>Ovid, Die Liebeselegien, Schriften und Quellen der Alten Welt</u>, 15, Berlin 1965 (3rd edition revised by M. G. Lenz, 1976). Critical text with German commentary and translation.

Marg, W. and Harder, R.   <u>P. Ouidius Naso, Liebesgedichte. Amores</u>, Munich 1962 (3rd edition, 1968). Text with German commentary and translation.

Marlowe, C.   <u>The Elegies of Ovid</u>, London c. 1597. English translation.

Merkel, R.   <u>P. Ouidius Naso</u>, 3 vols. (<u>Amores</u> vol. I) (Teubner Text), Leipzig 1852 (reprinted, 1887); revised by R. Ehwald, 1888 (reprinted, 1916). Critical text.

Munari, F.	P. Ouidi Nasonis Amores, Florence 1951 (5th edition, 1970). Critical text with brief notes and Italian translation.
Némethy, G.	P. Ouidii Nasonis Amores, Budapest 1907. Text with Latin commentary and critical appendix. Supplementum commentariorum ad Ov. Amores, Tristia et Epistulas ex Ponto, Budapest 1922.
Showerman, G.	Ovid, Heroides and Amores (Loeb Classical Library), London - Cambridge, Mass. 1921 (2nd edition revised by G. P. Goold, 1977). Text with select critical apparatus and English translation.

B. Bibliographical reports and surveys.

Albrecht, M. von	AAHG 25 (1972), 55-76.
Bömer, F.	'Literatur aus dem Annus Ouidianus', Gymnasium 67 (1960), 358-65.
Ehwald, R.	JAW 31 (1882), 157-205; 63 (1890), 125-282; 80 (1894), 1-118; 109 (1901), 163-302; 167 (1914), 59-200; 179 (1919), 163-86; 200 (1924), 1-69.
Gariépy, R.J.	'Recent Scholarship on Ovid', CW 64 (1970), 37-68.
Kraus, W.	RE 18. 2 (1942), 1910-86 (= Wege zu Ovid 67-166). AAHG 11 (1958), 129-46; 16 (1963), 1-14; 18 (1965), 193-208.
Lenz, F.W. (= Levy, F.)	JAW 226 (1930), 111-55; 264 (1939), 1-168. 'The Ovidian Bimillennium, Sulmona, May 1958', CW 52 (1959), 165-7.
Paratore, E.	Bibliografia Ovidiana, Rome 1958.
Pridik, K.H.	'Bibliographie zu den Carmina Amatoria', in E. Zinn, Ovid, Ars Amatoria und Remedia Amoris: Untersuchungen zum Aufbau (Stuttgart 1970), 110-16.
Radke, G.	'Fachbericht: Tibull und das Corpus Tibullianum, Properz, Ovid', Gymnasium 71 (1964), 104-8.

Riese, A.	JAW 1 (1873), 137-54; 3 (1874-5), 229-46; 6 (1876), 97-102; 10 (1877), 20-29; 14 (1878), 241-7; 27 (1881), 72-92.

6. Other Works.

A number of items not cited in the commentary, but which I have found informative or useful for comparison, are included; lexica, concordances, standard commentaries and works of reference are not included.

Abel, W.	Die Anredeformen bei den römischen Elegikern, Diss. Berlin 1930.
Alfonsi, L.	'L'Amore-amicizia negli Elegiaci Latini', Aevum 19 (1945), 372-8.
Alfonsi, L.	Die Liebeselegie Ovids, Innsbruck 1962.
Allen, A.W.	'Sincerity and the Roman Elegists', CPh 45 (1950), 145-60.
André, J.	Études sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine, Paris 1949.
Arnaldi, F.	'Il mondo poetico di Ovidio', Stud. Rom. 6 (1958), 389-406.
Arnaldi, F.	'La retorica nella poesia di Ovidio', Ovidiana 23-31.
Atti del Convegno internazionale Ovidiano	2 vols., Rome 1959.
Axelson, B.	Unpoetische Wörter, Lund 1945.
Axelson, B.	'Lygdamus und Ovid. Zur Methodik der literarischen Prioritätsbestimmung' Eranos 58 (1960), 29-111.
Austin, R.G.	'Ille ego qui quondam ...' CQ n.s. 18 (1968), 107-15.
Baker, R.J.	'The military motif in Propertius', Latomus 27 (1968), 322-49.
Balsdon, J.P.V.D.	Roman Women: their history and habits, London 1962.
Balsdon, J.P.V.D.	Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome, London 1969.
Bardon, H.	'L'aurore et le crépuscule', REL 24 (1946), 82-115.

Barini, C.   <u>Triumphalia</u>, Torino 1952

Barrow, R.H.   <u>Slavery in the Roman Empire</u>, London 1928.

Bednara, E.   'De poetarum dactylicorum usu',
                    <u>ALL</u> 14 (1906), 352.

Berger, A.   <u>Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Roman Law</u>,
                    <u>TAPhA</u> n.s. 43, part 2, 1953 (reprinted
                    1968).

Besnier, M.   'Sulmo, Patrie d'Ovide' in <u>Mélanges
                    Boissier</u> (Paris 1903), 57-63.

Birt, T.   Review of M. Pohlenz, <u>De Ovidi carmini-
                    bus amatoriis</u>, Diss. Göttingen 1913,
                    <u>BPhW</u> 33 (1913), 1223-31, 1501-2.

Blümner, H.   <u>Technologie und Terminologie der
                    Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechern und
                    Römern</u>,   Vols., Leipzig 1875-87
                    (vol. I, 2nd edn., Leipzig and Berlin
                    1912).

Blümner, H.   'Über die Farbenbezeichnungen bei den
                    römischen Dichtern', <u>Philologus</u> 48
                    (1889), 142-67, 706-22.

Bonner, S.F.   <u>Roman Declamation</u>, Liverpool 1949.

Bonner, S.F.   <u>Education in Ancient Rome</u>, London 1977.

Boucher, J.-P.   <u>Études sur Properce: problèmes
                    d'inspiration et d'art</u>, Paris 1965.

Bowra, C.M.   'A love-duet', <u>AJPh</u> 79 (1958), 376-91.

Bréguet, E.   'Le thème <u>alius ... ego</u> chez les poètes
                    latins, <u>REL</u> 40 (1962), 128-36.

Brück, C.   <u>De Ouidio Scholasticarum Declamationum
                    Imitatore</u>, Diss. Giessen 1909.

Brunt, P.A.   <u>Italian Manpower</u> 225 B.C. - A.D. 14,
                    Oxford 1971

Büchner, K.   'Ovid's Amores' in <u>Gedenkschrift
                    für G. Rohde</u> (= <u>Aparchai</u> 4) (Tübingen
                    1961,) 57-81 (reprinted in K. Büchner,
                    <u>Studien zur Römischen Literatur</u> VIII
                    (Wiesbaden 1970), 178-99).

Büchner, K. 'Die Elegien des Lygdamus', Hermes 93 (1965), 65-112 (= Studien VIII. 116-77).

Buckland, W.W. A Textbook of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian, Cambridge 1921.

Burck, E. 'Das Paraclausithyron', HG 43 (1932), 186-200.

Burck, E. 'Römische Wesenzüge der augusteischen Liebeselegie', Hermes 80 (1952), 163-200.

Bürger, R. De Ouidi carminum amatoriorum inuentione et arte, Guelferbyti 1901.

Cairns, F. Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry, Edinburgh 1972.

Cameron, A. 'The First Edition of Ovid's Amores', CQ n.s. 18 (1968), 320-33.

Camps, W.A. 'Critical notes on some passages in Ovid', CR n.s. 4 (1954), 203-7.

Camps, W.A. Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid, Oxford 1969.

Canter, H.V. 'The Paraclausithyron as a literary theme', AJPh 41 (1920), 355-68.

Carcopino, J. Daily Life in Ancient Rome, Harmondsworth 1956

Chatelain, E.L.M. Paléographie des classiques latins, 2 vols., Paris 1884-1900.

Cook, A. B. Zeus: a Study in Ancient Religion, Cambridge 1914-40.

Copley, F.O. 'Seruitium amoris in the Roman elegists', TAPhA 78 (1947), 285-300.

Copley, F.O. Exclusus Amator: A study in Latin love poetry Am. Phil. Ass. Monogr. 17, Baltimore Md. 1956.

Corbett, P.E. The Roman Law of Marriage, Oxford 1930.

Cousin, J. 'Nature et mission du poète dans la poésie latine: Ovide', RCC 39.2 (1938), 735-52.

Crahay, R. and Hubaux, J. 'Sous le masque de Pythagore', Ovidiana 283-300.

Crook, J.A. Law and Life of Rome, London 1967.

Cumont, F.V.M.	Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain, Paris 1906, 3rd edn. 1929.
Curtius, E.R.	European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, trans. W.R. Trask, London 1953.
Daube, D.	'No kissing or else ... ' in The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of H. Caplan, ed. L. Wallach (New York 1966), 222-31.
Day, A.A.	The Origins of Latin Love Elegy, Oxford 1938.
D'Elia, S.	'Il problema cronologico degli Amores', Ovidiana 210-23.
D'Elia, S.	Ovidio, Naples 1959.
De Saint-Denis, E.	Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine, Paris 1935.
De Saint-Denis, E.	'Le malicieux Ovide', Ovidiana 184-200 (= E. de Saint-Denis, Essai sur le rire et le sourire des Latins (Paris 1965), Ch. 12).
Dieterich, A.	Nekuia, Leipzig 1893.
Dittmann, G. and Rubenbauer, H.	'Fulmen = Stütze?', Philologus 76 (n.s. 30) (1920), 351ff.
Donnet, D.	'Ovide, Properce et l'élégie latine', LEC 33 (1965), 253-79.
Duckworth, G.E.	The Nature of Roman Comedy, Princeton 1952.
DuQuesnay, I.M. Le M.	'The Amores' in Ovid, ed. J.W. Binns (London 1973), 1-48.
Emonds, H.	Zweite Auflage im Altertum, Leipzig 1941.
Ernout, A.	Review of Axelson, Unpoetische Wörter, RPh 21 (1947), 55-70 (= Philologica II (Paris 1957), 66-86.
Ernout, A.	Les adjectives latins en -osus et -ulentus, Paris 1949.
Ernout, A.	Review of Munari's 1951 edition of the Amores, RPh 26 (1952), 124-5.

Esteve-Forriol, J.	Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur versucht nach ihre Topik und ihrem Motivschatz, Diss. Munich 1962.
Fargues, P.	'Ovide, l'homme et le poète: les amours d'Ovide', RCC 40 (1938), 137-51.
Ferguson, J.	'Catullus and Ovid', AJPh 81 (1960) 337-57.
Forshaw, J.M.	Parrots of the World, Melbourne 1969.
Fränkel, E.	Plautinisches in Plautus, Berlin 1922.
Fränkel, E.	Horace, Oxford 1957.
Fränkel, H.	Ovid. A poet between Two Worlds, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1945 (reprinted, 1956).
Frécaut, J.-M.	L'Esprit et l'humour chez Ovide, Grenoble 1972.
Friedländer, L.	Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire, trans. J.H. Freese and L.A. Magnus, London 1913.
Fugier, H.	Recherches sur l'expression du sacré dans la langue latine, Paris 1963.
Führer, R.	'Ov. Am. II. 10. 9', Hermes 100 (1972), 408-12.
Galinsky, K.	'The Triumph Theme in the Augustan Elegy', WS 82 (1969), 75-107.
Ganzenmüller, C.	'Aus Ovids Werkstatt', Philologus n.f. 24 (1911), 274-311, 397-437.
Garte, O.	Paraclausithyri historia e litteris Graecis et Romanis illustratur, Diss. Leipzig 1924.
Gollnisch, T.	Quaestiones Elegiacae, Diss. Breslau 1905.
Goold, G.P.	'Amatoria Critica', HSPh 69 (1965), 1-107.
Goold, G.P.	Review of Kenney's edition, AJPh 86 (1965), 89-92.
Gow, A.S.F.	'Two epigrams by Diotimus', CR n.s. 5 (1955), 238-41.
Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L.	Hellenistic Epigrams, 2 vols. Cambridge 1965.
Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L.	The Garland of Philip, 2 vols. Cambridge 1968.
Green, P.	'Venus' Clerke Ovyde' in Essays in Antiquity (London 1960), 109-35.

Guillemin, A.-M.	'Sur les origines de l'élégie latine', REL 17 (1939), 282-92.
Guttmann, K.	Sogennantes instrumentales 'ab' bei Ovid, Diss. Dortmund 1890.
Haight, E.	The symbolism of the house-door in classical poetry. New York 1950.
Hall, J.B.	'Varia Critica', PACA 13 (1975) 11-14.
Hallett, J.P.	'The role of women in Roman elegy', Arethusa 6 (1973), 103-24.
Hand, F.	Tursellinus seu de particulis Latinis commentarii, Leipzig 1829-45 (reprinted, Amsterdam 1969).
Hedicke, E.	Studia Bentleiana V: Ovidius Bentleianus, Oxford 1926.
Heinze, R.	'Zu Seneca's Apocolocyntosis', Hermes 61 (1926), 49-78.
Herrlinger, G.	Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung, Stuttgart 1930.
Herter, H.	De Priapo, Giessen 1932.
Higham, T.F.	'Ovid and Rhetoric', Ovidiana 32-48.
Highet, G.	Poets in a Landscape, London 1957.
Hoelzer, V.	De poesi amatoria a comicis Atticis exculta, Diss. Marburg 1899.
Hofmann, J.B.	Lateinische Umgangssprache, Heidelberg 1926, 3rd edition 1958.
Hopkins, M.K.	'Eunuchs in the later Roman Empire', PCPhS 19 (1963), 62-80.
Housman, A.E.	Classical Papers, ed. J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear, 3 vols., Cambridge 1972.
Howe, G.	'A Type of Verbal Repetition on Ovid's Elegy', SPh 13 (1916), 81-91.
Hubbard, M.	Propertius, London 1974.
Jackson Knight, W.F.	'Ovid's metre and rhythm', Ovidiana 106-20.
Jackson Knight, W.F.	Elysion, London 1970.
Jacobson, H.	Ovid's Heroides, Princeton 1974.

Jacoby, F.   'Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie',
                     RhM 60 (1905), 38-105.

Jäger, K.   Zweigliedrige Gedichte und Gedichtpaare
                     bei Properz und in Ovids Amores, Diss.
                     Tübingen 1967.

Jennison, G.   Animals for Show and Pleasure in Ancient
                     Rome, Manchester 1937.

Johnson, W.R.   'The emotions of patriotism: Propertius
                     4.6', CSCA 6 (1973), 151-80.

Jolowitz, H.F.   A Historical Introduction to the Study
  and Nicholas,B.   of Roman Law, Cambridge 1932, 3rd edn.
                     1972.

Justi, F.   Iranisches Namenbuch, Marburg 1895
                     (reprinted Hildesheim 1963).

Kahn, H.A.   'Ouidius furens: A revaluation of
                     Amores i.7', Latomus 25 (1966), 880-94.

Kassel, R.   Untersuchungen zur griechischen und
                     römischen Konsolationsliteratur,
                     Zetemata 18, Munich 1958.

Kenney, E.J.   'The Tradition of Ovid's Amores' CR
                     n.s. 5 (1955), 13-14.

Kenney, E.J.   'Palinode', CR n.s. 7 (1957), 16.

Kenney, E.J.   'Nequitiae poeta' Ovidiana 201-9.

Kenney, E.J.   'Notes on Ovid', CQ n.s. 8 (1958),
                     54-66.

Kenney, E.J.   'Notes on Ovid II', CQ n.s. 9 (1959),
                     240-60.

Kenney, E.J.   Review of H. Dörrie, Überlieferungs-
                     geschichte von Ovids Heroides (Göttingen
                     1960), Gnomon 33 (1961), 478-87.

Kenney, E.J.   'The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid's
                     Amores, Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris',
                     CQ n.s. 12 (1962), 1-31.

Kenney, E.J.   'First thoughts on the Hamiltonensis',
                     CR n.s. 16 (1966), 267-71.

Kenney, E.J.   'Liebe als juristisches Problem',
                     Philologus 111 (1967), 212-32.

Kenney, E.J.   'Ovid and the Law', YClS 21 (1969),
                     243-63.

Kenney, E.J.   The Classical Text, Berkeley - Los
                      Angeles - London 1974.

Ker, A.   'Notes on some passages in the
                      amatory poems', Ovidiana, 224-8.

Kerényi, K.   'Thunderweapon bei Ovid', ARW
                      28 (1931), 395-8.

Knoche, U.   Review of Bornecque's edition of the
                      Amores, Gnomon 8 (1932), 518-29.

Korzeniewski, D.   Ovids elegisches Proömium' Hermes
                      92 (1964), 182-213.

Kroll, W.   Studien zum Verständnis der römischen
                      Literatur, Stuttgart 1924 (reprinted,
                      Darmstadt 1964).

Landgraf, G.   'Der Accusativ der Beziehung',
                      ALL 10 (1898) 209-24.

Last, H.M.   'The rehabilitation of marriage'
                      Cambridge Ancient History X. 443-8.

Latte, K.,   Römische Religionsgeschichte, Munich
                      1960.

Lattimore, R.   Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs
                      Urbana 1962 = Illinois Studies in
                      Language and Literature 28 (1942), 1-2.

La Ville de   'La Gigantomachie d'Ovide', RPh 28
Mirmont, H. de   (1904), 103-21.

La Ville de   'Le Paraclausithyron dans la
Mirmont, H.   littérature latine', Mélanges L.
                      Havet (Paris 1909), 571-92.

Lee, A.G.   'Tenerorum lusor Amorum' in Critical
                      Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy
                      and Lyric, ed. J.P. Sullivan, 149-79,
                      London 1962.

Lee, A.G.   Review of Munari's 1951 edition of
                      the Amores, CR n.s. 2 (1952), 175-6.

Lee, A.G.   'The Originality of Ovid', Atti del
                      Conv. intern. Ovidiano, II. 405-12.

Lee, A.G.   'The date of Lygdamus and his relation-
                      ship to Ovid', PCPhS n.s. 5 (1958-9),
                      15-23.

Lenz, F.W.   'Ein Selbstbekenntnis Ovids? Ein Studie
                      zu Am. iii.14', SIFC 12 (1935), 227-35.

Lenz, F.W.   'Parerga Ovidiana', RAL s. 6, vol. 13
                      (1937), 320-410.

Lenz, F.W.,   'Die Wiedergewinnung der von Heinsius benutzten Cvidhss. in den letzten 50 Jahren', Eranos 51 (1953), 66-88.

Lenz, F.W.   'Ovidio Amores II 2 e 3, una sola poesia?', Maia 17 (1965), 119-24.

Leo, F.   Plautinische Forschungen, Berlin 1895, 2nd edn. 1912 (reprinted, Darmstadt 1966).

Leumann, M.,   'Die lateinische Dichtersprache', MH 4 (1947), 116-39 (= M. Leumann, Kleine Schriften (Zürich and Stuttgart 1959), 131-56.

Lilja, S.   The Roman Elegists' Attitude to Women, Helsinki 1965.

Lilja, S.   Terms of Abuse in Roman Comedy, Helsinki 1965.

Lindsay, W.M.   The Latin Language, Oxford 1894.

Lissberger, E.   Das Fortleben der römischen Elegiker in den Carmina Epigraphica, Diss. Tübingen 1934.

Löfstedt, E.   Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins, vol. I (2nd edn.), Lund 1942, vol. II Lund 1933.

Lörcher, G.   Der Aufbau der drei Bücher von Ovids 'Amores', Heuremata 3, Amsterdam 1975.

Luck, G.   The Latin Love Elegy, London 1959, 2nd edn. 1969.

Luck, G.   'Beiträge zum Text der römischen Elegiken', RhM n.f. 105 (1962), 337-51.

Luck, G.   Die Römische Liebeselegie, Heidelberg 1961.

Luck, G.   Hexen und Zauberei in der römischen Dichtung, Zürich 1962.

Luck, G.   Review of Kenney's edition of the Amores, Gnomon 35 (1963), 256-62.

Luck, G.   'Der Dichter zwischen Elegie und Epos' in Antike Lyrik, ed. W. Eisenhut (Darmstadt 1970), 464-79.

Luck, G.   'The Woman's Role in Latin Love
Poetry' in Perspectives of Roman
Poetry, ed. G.K. Galinsky (Austin,
Texas 1974), 17-31.

Lüneberg, A.   De Ouidio sui imitatore, Diss.
Jena 1888.

Madvig, I.N.   Aduersaria critica ad scriptores
Graecos et Latinos, Copenhagen
1871-84.

Magnus, H.   BPhW 19 (1899), 1019-21.

Marg, W.   'Amores, Dichter und Dichtung'
in P. Ovidius Naso, Liebesgedichte,
ed. R. Harder and W. Marg, 160-74
(= Wege zu Ovid 295-312).

Mariotti, S.   'La carriera poetica di Ovidio',
Belfagor 12 (1957), 609-35.

Marouzeau, J.   Traité de stylistique appliqué
au latin, Paris 1935. 2nd edn.
(Traité de stylistique latine) 1946.

Marouzeau, J.   'Un procédé ovidien', Ovidiana 101-5.

Marquardt, J.   Das Privatleben der Römer, Leipzig
1886 (reprinted, Darmstadt 1964).

Martini, E.   Einleitung zu Ovid, Prague 1933.

Merkelbach, R.   Isisfeste in griechisch-römischer
Zeit, Meisenheim am Glan 1963.

Michelfeit, J.   'Das Augusteische Gedichtbuch',
RhM n.f. 112 (1969), 347-70.

Micolier, G.   Peculé et capacité patrimoniale,
Lyons 1932.

Monteil, P.   Beau et laid en latin, Paris 1964.

Moody, B.A.   A commentary on parts of Ovid
Amores Book i with introductions to
individual poems. Unpublished B.
Litt. diss., Oxford 1970.

Müller, A.   'Die Schimpwörter in der römischen
Komödie', Philologus 72 (1913),
492-502.

Morgan, K.   Ovid's Art of Imitation. Propertius
in the Amores, Mnemosyne Suppl. 47,
Leiden 1977.

Moser, E.	Entsprechung benachbarter Worte und Begriffe in der Sprache der römischen Elegiker, Diss. Munich 1935.
Müller, L.	'De Ovidi Amorum libris', Philologus 11 (1856), 60-91, 192.
Müller, L.	'Zur Kritik des ersten Theils der ovidischen Dichtungen', RhM 18 (1863), 71-90.
Munari, F.	'Sugli "Amores" di Ovidio' SIFC 23 (1948), 113-52.
Munari, F.	'Codici heinsiani degli Amores di Ovidio', SIFC 24 (1949), 161-5.
Munari, F.	Manoscritti ovidiani di N. Heinsius', SIFC 29 (1957), 98-114, 265.
Munari, F.	Il codice Hamilton 471 di Ovidio, Rome 1965.
Nash, E.	A Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome, 2 vols., London 1962.
Neumann, R.	Qua ratione Ouidius in Amoribus scribendis Properti elegiis usus sit, Diss. Göttingen 1919.
Newman, J.K.	Augustus and the New Poetry, Collection Latomus, Brussels 1967.
Nilsson, M.P.	Geschichte der Griechischen Religion, 2 vols. Munich 1941.
Nock, A.D.	'Magical Texts from a biligual papyrus in the B.M.', PBA 17 (1931), 235-87.
Oliver, R.P.	'The first edition of the Amores' TAPhA 76 (1945) 191-215.
Oliver, R.P.	Review of Munari's edition, CPh 51 (1956) 58-61.
Oliver, R.P.	'The Text of Ovid's "Amores"' in Classical Studies presented to B.E. Perry, Urbana 1969, 138-64.
Opelt, I.	Die lateinische Schimpfwörter, Heidelberg 1965.
Otis, B.	'Ovid and the Augustans', TAPhA 69 (1938), 188-229 (German version of 194-211 in Wege zu Ovid 233-54).

Otis, B.   Review of H. Fränkel, Ovid: a Poet between two Worlds, CPh 42 (1947), 57-61.

Otto, A.   Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer, Leipzig 1890 (reprinted Hildesheim 1962) Supplement by R. Häussler, 1968.

Otto, L.   De Anaphora, Diss. Marburg 1906.

Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide   Ed. N.I. Herescu, Paris 1958.

Ovidianum. Acta conuentus omnium gentium ouidianis studiis fouendis   Ed. N. Barbu, E. Dobroiu, M. Nasta, Bucharest 1976.

Owen, S.G.   'Ovid's use of the simile', CR 45 (1931), 97-106.

Page, D.L.   Sappho and Alcaeus, Oxford 1955.

Paratore, E.   'L'elegia autobiographica di Ovidio' in Ovidiana 353-78.

Parker, D.   'The Ovidian coda', Arion 7 (1969), 80-97.

Perl, G.   'Ovids Amores im Codex Berolinensis Hamilton 471 (Y)', Philologus 110 (1966), 268-76.

Perrin, B.   'La manus iniectio chez Ovide', Annales Uniuersitatis Sarauiensis 2 (1952), 111ff.

Perrot, J.   Les dérivés latins en -men et -mentum, Paris 1961.

Pfister, F.   'Hat Ovid eine Gigantomachie geschrieben?' RhM 70 (1915), 472-7.

Pichon, R.   Index Verborum Amatoriorum, Hildesheim 1966 (extracted from R. Pichon, De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores (Paris 1902)).

Platnauer, M.   Latin Elegiac Verse, Cambridge 1951 (reprinted, Hamden 1971).

Platner, S.B. and Ashby, P.   A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome, Oxford 1929.

Pokrowskij, M.   'Neue Beiträge zur Charakteristik Ovids', Philologus, Suppl. 11 (1907-10), 351-404.

Pollard, J.R.T.   <u>Birds in Greek Life and Myth</u>,
                      London, 1977.

Pohlenz, M.   <u>De Ouidii Carminibus Amatoriis</u>,
                      Diss. Göttingen 1913.

Pohlenz, M.   'Nochmals Ovids Liebesgedichte',
                      <u>BPhW</u> 47 (1913), 1499-1501.

Port, W.   'Die Anordnung in Gedichtbüchern
                      augusteischer Zeit', <u>Philologus</u> 81
                      (1926), 280-308, 427-468.

Postgate, J.P.   'On trajection of words or hyperbaton',
                      <u>CR</u> 30 (1916), 142-6.

Preisigke, F.   <u>Namenbuch</u>, Heidelberg 1922.

Rand, E.K.   'The Chronology of Ovid's Early Works',
                      <u>AJPh</u> 28 (1907), 287-96.

Rand, E.K.   'Ovid and the spirit of Metamorphosis'
                      in <u>Harvard Essays on Classical Subjects</u>
                      (Cambridge, Mass. 1912),

Rand, E.K.   <u>Ovid and his influence</u>, London 1925.

Reitzenstein, E.   'Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos' in
                      <u>Festschrift für R. Reitzenstein</u>
                      (Leipzig-Berlin 1931), 25-69.

Reitzenstein, E.   'Das neue Kunstwollen in den Amores
                      Ovids', <u>RhM</u> 84 (1935), 62-86 (= <u>Wege
                      zu Ovid</u> 206-32).

Reitzenstein, E.   'Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung
                      bei Properz', <u>Philologus</u>, <u>Suppl.</u> 29. 2
                      (1936).

Reitzenstein, R.   'Zur Sprache der lateinischen Erotik',
                      <u>SHA</u> Phil.-Hist. Kl. 3 (1912), 12. Abh.

Reynolds, L.D. and   <u>Scribes and Scholars</u>, Oxford 1968 2nd
Wilson, N.G.   edn. 1974 (reprinted 1978).

Reynolds, R.W.   'The Adultery Mime', <u>CQ</u> 40 (1946),
                      77-84.

Ripert, E.   <u>Ovide, poète de l'amour, des dieux et
                      de l'exile</u>, Paris 1921.

Robert, C.   <u>Die Antiken Sarkophagreliefs</u>, Berlin
                      1890-1919.

Rohde, E.   <u>Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer</u>,
                      Leipzig 1876, 3rd edn. 1914.

Rosa, L.	'Sulle varianti della tradizione manoscritta degli Amores di Ovidio', AFLN 4 (1954), 41-60.
Roscher,	'Hebdomadenlehren der griechischen Philosophen und Ärzte', Abh. der Sächsichen Gesellsch. der Wiss. 24.6 (1906), 60ff.
Ross, D.O.	Style and Tradition in Catullus, Harvard 1969.
Ross, D.C.	Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome, Cambridge 1975.
Rudd, N.	The Satires of Horace, Cambridge 1966.
Sabot, A.-F.	Ovide, poète de l'amour dans ses oeuvres de jeunesse, Paris 1976.
Salmon, E.T.	'S.M.P.E.', Ovidiana 10-20.
Santirocco, M.S.	'Metamorphosis in Ovid's Amores', CB 45 (1969), 83-4.
Sappa, M.	'Ovidio Umorista', RF 11 (1883), 347-72.
Schönbeck, G.	Der Locus Amoenus von Homer bis zu Horaz, Diss. Heidelberg 1962.
Scivoletto, N.	Musa iocosa: studio sulla poesia giovanile di Ovidio, Rome 1976.
Seel, O.	'Von Herodot zu Ovid', Ovidiana 139-83.
Sellar, W.Y.	The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Horace and the Elegiac Poets, Oxford 1892.
Shackleton Bailey, D.R.	Propertiana, Cambridge 1956.
Segal, C.P.	Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses, Hermes Einzelschriften 23, Wiesbaden 1969.
Sigerist, H.E.	A History of Medicine, 2 vols. Oxford 1961.
Sittl, C.	Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer, Leipzig 1890 (reprinted, Hildesheim 1970).
Skutsch, O.	'De fulminum appellatione', SIFC 27-8 (1956), 536-40 (= O. Skutsch, Studia Enniana (London 1968), 145-50.
Slater, D.A.	'On three passages of Ovid', CR 27 (1913), 257-8.
Snowden, F. M.	Blacks in Antiquity, Harvard 1970.

Soria, C.	'El *Paraclausithyron* como presupuesto cultural de la elegia latina', REC 8 (1963), 55-94.
Soubiran, J.	*L'élision dans la poésie latine*, Paris 1966.
Spies, A.	*Militat omnis amans*, Diss. Tübingen 1930.
Spranger, P.P.	*Historische Untersuchungen zu den Sklavenfiguren des Plautus und Terenz*, Historisches Akad. der Wissensch. u. der Lit. in Mainz, Geisten u. Sozialwissensch. Kl. 8 (1960).
Steinbach, E.	*Der Faden der Schicksalsgottheiten*, Diss. Leipzig 1931.
Stoessl, F.	*Ovid, Dichter und Mensch*, Berlin 1959.
Strobel, W.	*Eros. Versuch einer Geschichte seiner bildlichen Darstellung von ihren Anfängen bis zum Beginn des Hellenismus*, Diss. Erlangen 1952.
Stroh, W.	*Ovid im Urteil der Nachwelt. Eine Testimoniensammlung*, Darmstadt 1969.
Stroh, W.	*Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung*, Amsterdam 1971. (Cited Stroh).
Sullivan, J.P.	'Two problems in Roman Elegy', TAPhA 92 (1961), 522-36.
Syme, R.	*The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939.
Tafel, S.	*Die Überlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids carmina amatoria*, Diss. Tübingen 1910.
Taillardat, J.	*Les images d'Aristophane*, Paris 1965.
Thomas, E.	'Variations on a military theme in Ovid's *Amores*', G and R 2nd series 11 (1964), 151-65.
Thomas, E.	'A comparative analysis of Ovid, *Amores* ii. 6 and iii. 9', Latomus 24 (1965), 599-609.
Thompson, D'A. W.	*A Glossary of Greek Birds*, Oxford 1895, 2nd edn. 1936.
Tracy, V.A.	'Dramatic elements in Ovids *Amores*', Latomus 36 (1977), 496-500.

Tränkle, H.   Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache, Hermes Einzelschriften 15, Wiesbaden 1960.

Tremoli, P.   Influssi retorici e ispirazion poetica negli Amores di Ovidio, Fac. di Lett., Ist. di Filol. Class., I, Trieste 1955.

Troll, P.   De elegiae Romanae origine, Diss. Göttingen 1911-12.

Tupet, A.-M.   La magie dans la poésie latine, Paris 1976

Verdière, R.   'L'euphémisme dans les sobriquets féminins à Rome', GIF 11 (1958), 160-66.

Wageningen, J. van   'Fulmen', Mnemosyne n.s. 45 (1917), 135-9.

Washietl, J.A.   De Similitudinibus Imaginibusque Ouidianis, Diss. Vienna 1883.

Watson, A.   The Contract of Mandate in Roman Law, Oxford 1961.

Webster, G.   The Roman Imperial Army, London 1969, 2nd edn. 1979.

Wege zu Ovid (Wege der Forschung 92)   Ed. M. von Albrecht and E. Zinn, Darmstadt 1970.

Weinreich, O.   Studien zu Martial, Stuttgart 1928.

Weinreich, O.   Die Distichen des Catull, Tübingen 1926.

West, M.L.   Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique, Stuttgart 1973.

Westermann, W.L.   The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity, Philadelphia 1955.

Wheeler, A.L.   'Erotic teaching in Roman elegy and the Greek sources', CPh 5 (1910), 440-50, 6 (1911), 56-77.

Wheeler, A.L.   'Topics from the life of Ovid', AJP 28 (1907), 287-96.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von   Hellenistische Dichtung, 2 vols. Berlin 1924

Wilkins, E.G.   'A Classification of the Similes of Ovid', CW 25 (1932), 73-8, 81-6.

Wilkinson, L.P.   Ovid Recalled, Cambridge 1955 (abridged as Ovid Surveyed (Cambridge 1962)).

Wilkinson, L.P.   Golden Latin Artistry, Cambridge 1963
                   Cambridge 1963 (reprinted, 1966).

Wilkinson, L.P.   The Roman Experience, London 1975.

Williams, G.   'Poetry in the moral climate of Augustan
                   Rome', JRS 52 (1962), 28-46.

Williams, G.   Tradition and Originality in Roman
                   Poetry, Oxford 1968.

Wimmel, W.   Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge
                   seines apologetischen Dichtens in der
                   Augusteerzeit, Hermes Einzelschriften
                   16,Wiesbaden 1960.

Wiseman, T.P.   New Men in the Roman Senate, Oxford 1971.

Wölfflin, E.   'Zur Geschichte der Pronomina demonstrativa',
                   ALL 12 (1902), 239-46.

Wölfflin, E.   Ausgewählte Schriften, Leipzig 1933.

Woodcock, E.C.   A New Latin Syntax, London 1959.

Zingerle, A.   Ovid und sein Verhältnis zu den Vor-
                   gängern und gleichzeitigen römischen
                   Dichtern, 3 vols. Innsbruck 1869-71
                   (reprinted Hildesheim 1967).

Zinn, E.   'Elemente des Humors in augusteischer
                   Dichtung', Gymnasium 67 (1960), 41-56,
                   152-5.