

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



The First Edition of Ovid's Amores

Author(s): Alan Cameron

Source: *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Nov., 1968), pp. 320-333

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of [The Classical Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/638076>

Accessed: 12/06/2014 10:07

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

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



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

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE FIRST EDITION OF OVID'S *AMORES*

As is well known, the *Amores* of Ovid appeared in two different editions, of which only the second survives. Hence, scholars being what they are, it is hardly surprising that almost as much has been written about the first as the second. If I have ventured to add yet another contribution to the already over-long bibliography of the subject,¹ it is first because it seems to me a matter of some importance how far we can take the *Amores* as we have them as being substantially what Ovid wrote in his late 'teens and early twenties, and secondly because there is one avenue of approach which does not seem to have been fully explored.

I

In his important (if one-sided) article 'Das neue Kunstwollen in den *Amores* Ovid' (*Rhein. Mus.* lxxxiv [1935], pp. 62 f.), E. Reitzenstein discussed the significance of the 'Programmgedichte' in the *Amores*, that is to say the introductory poems to each of the three books (1. 1, 2. 1, 3. 1). He included 1. 2 in his discussion as well, observing that 'Auch dieses Gedicht gehört noch nicht zu dem eigentlichen Kern der Sammlung, sondern dient zur Einleitung' (p. 73). This strikes me as being both true and at the same time suggestive.

1. 1 explains how it was that Ovid came to write love poetry. One day when he was sketching out that everlasting epic the Augustan poets never wrote, Cupid came by and stole a foot from his second hexameter, thereby reducing the unfortunate line to a mere pentameter, fit for nothing better than love poetry. Ovid pointed out to Cupid that there was little point in this, since he wasn't even in love. It didn't take Cupid long to dispose of this objection (1. 1. 24-5):

lunavitque genu sinuosum fortiter arcum
'quod'que 'canas, vates, accipe', dixit, 'opus'.

All poor Ovid could do now was to make the best of it, and start writing love poetry. As Reitzenstein in particular underlined, this poem sets the tone for the *Amores* as a whole. There is no conventional declaration of love, no girl even, whose beauty and charms Ovid is burning to immortalize. After such a 'literary squib'² we can hardly expect serious, conventional love poetry—nor do we get it.

Now 1. 2 offers a similarly flippant and amusing, but quite *different*, explanation of how Ovid came to fall in love. Once more it is Cupid's doing, but this time Ovid was quite unaware to start with that the mischievous youth had been at work with his bow. He wonders why it is that he hasn't been sleeping of late. It can't be love, he says in a casual, confident manner, or I should have felt it. Then, having said this, he breaks off suddenly, struck by the

¹ For useful surveys with ample bibliography see R. Giomini, 'Ricerche sulle due edizioni degli "Amores"', *Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ovidiano* i (1959), 125 f., and S. d'Elia, 'Il problema cronologico degli Amores', *Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide*, ed. N. Herescu (1958), 210 f., to which add

G. Luck, *Die römische Liebeselegie* (1961), at pp. 166 f. (a section missing from the 1959 English edition, *Latin Love Elegy*). The most recent editor, F. W. Lenz, *Ovid: die Liebeselegien* (1965), at p. 164, refrains from expressing an opinion.

² L. P. Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled* (1955), 47.

thought that perhaps it might be love after all, creeping up on him unawares (1. 2. 5–6):

nam, puto,¹ sentirem, si quo temptarer amore²—
an subit, et tecta callidus arte nocet?

A moment's reflection, and he realizes that it must indeed be love: 'sic erit' (1. 6). What was he to do about it? Give in, or resist? To resist might make it worse (a point predictably illustrated by a characteristic run of similes). So he decides, on balance, *not* to kick against the pricks.

en, ego confiteor: tua sum nova praeda, Cupido:
porrigimus victas ad tua iura manus.

Showerman's Loeb rendering, 'Look, I confess. I am new prey of thine, O Cupid' hardly brings out the matter-of-fact, almost bored way in which Ovid yields to love. Better something like; 'All right, Cupid. I give in. Here's your latest victim.' Then he tries to persuade Cupid to let him off with a light sentence:

nil opus est bello: veniam pacemque rogamus;
nec tibi laus armis victus inermis ero.

That is to say, no credit will accrue to Cupid for attacking an unarmed foe. The body of the poem consists of a fantastic picture of Cupid's triumphal procession,³ concluding with an extraordinary appeal to Cupid's baser instincts:

ergo cum possim sacri pars esse triumphi,
parce tuas in me perdere, victor, opes.

'There, wouldn't you like to see me in a triumph like that?' Ovid is treating him like the spoilt little Cupid we know from Apollonius of Rhodes.

Throughout the poem, Ovid's attitude to this unexpected and inconvenient attack of love is rational and calculating. He coolly diagnoses the complaint, debates whether or not to yield, and then tries to extract concessions from Cupid! Everybody knows that a man in love does not react like this. So (of course) did Ovid. And that is why he wrote the poem this way, an ideal introduction to the new sort of love poetry that the *Amores* are. As in 1. 1 there is not so much as a mention of anything so immaterial as the *girl* he was supposed to be in love with. In 1. 1 indeed the very sex of the beloved is apparently a matter of total unconcern:

aut puer, aut longas compta puella comas!

It is *being* in love that matters: the object of this love is not of any importance for its own sake. And this is the keynote of the *Amores* as a whole—of the second, surviving, edition of the *Amores*, that is. Love is a game, for which girls are indispensable—but no girl in particular. It is the challenge that Ovid enjoys, rather than the conquest: the chase, rather than the catch. Cf. 2. 10. 17–20:

hostibus eveniat viduo dormire cubili,
et medio late ponere membra toro:
at mihi saevus amor somnos abruptat inertes,
simque mei lecti non ego solus onus.

¹ The banality of this *puto* is surely deliberate: 'I would have felt it, I suppose . . .'.
² This sudden switch in Ovid's train of thought is much better brought out by

Kenney's parenthesis after *amore* than by Munari's full stop or Lenz's semi-colon.

³ Well characterized by Wilkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 49: see also below, p. 326.

Both 1. 1 and 1. 2, then, are very suitable 'Programmgedichte' for this sort of poetry. But why *both*? It is strange enough that Ovid should have written two introductory poems for the same book. And stranger still that the second should be inconsistent with the first. The explanation is very simple. We know from the prefatory epigram to the second edition that the first edition comprised, not three, as did the second, but five books:

qui modo Nasonis fuera^mus quinque libelli, / tres sumus.

Surely 1. 2 was the introductory poem to one of the original five books of the first edition? Once Ovid had decided to cut down the number of poems in the first edition (on this point see below) and issue a second in only three books, he must have been faced with two more introductory poems than he now needed. One of these he probably felt to be inferior, like the other material he omitted from the second edition, and just omitted. The other, 1. 2, he was (understandably) loath to jettison completely, and so he included it in one of the other books. But since it was so obviously an introductory poem, he could not place it just anywhere in a book: he therefore placed it as near the beginning of the first book as he could, immediately after its own introductory poem proper.

If I am right, then 1. 2 is one of the poems we can be sure was in the first edition. This is far from being a point of merely academic interest.

II

R. P. Oliver¹ and, more recently, G. Luck,² have forcefully argued that the first edition differed from the second in at least one fundamental respect. In the first, they claim, Corinna must have been the central figure. In it Ovid must have described his affair with Corinna in much the same way as Propertius described his affair with Cynthia in his first two books. Oliver's arguments have not always been accepted, but I have never seen a formal refutation.³ His two main points are as follows:

(a) that Corinna did, contrary to popular view, exist: otherwise Ovid would not have continued to make out that she did even when in exile (e.g. *Trist.* 4. 10. 59 f.), 'when, indeed, he had everything to gain from admitting an imposture and thus adding some needed support to his dubious claim to a *vita verecunda*' (p. 207);

(b) that the *Amores* as we have them do not present what can possibly be regarded as a coherent or consistent record of an affair with anybody; in fact very few of the poems even mention Corinna. The original edition, which, so Ovid claimed, set people guessing who Corinna was (*Ars* 3. 358, 'et multi, quae sit nostra Corinna, rogant'), must have done this. But, claims Oliver, when Ovid came to prepare the second edition, he omitted some poems, added others, and jumbled up the rest until this original picture was completely broken up.

Neither of these arguments amounts to much.

All the passages which are alleged to prove that Corinna existed are quite

¹ *TAPhA* lxxvi (1945), 191 f.

² Op. cit. (n. 1), 184 f. So also Harder and Marg in their translation of the *Amores* (second edition, 1962), and cf. too Wilamowitz, *Hellenistische Dichtung* i (1924), 239 n. 1.

³ Wilkinson, for example, op. cit., p. 52 note, dismisses Oliver's arguments with a facile 'ingenious rather than convincing'. They are accepted *in toto* by J. C. Thibault, *The Mystery of Ovid's Exile* (1964), 47.

inconclusive. There are just as many which are just as good *prima facie* evidence that she did not:¹ e.g. *Trist.* 4. 10. 65–8, and note especially ib. 2. 339–40,

ad leve rursus opus, iuvenalia carmina, veni,
et falso movi pectus amore meum.

And the argument that Ovid stood to lose by maintaining the fiction even after his exile, though at first sight attractive, is in fact entirely beside the point. The *carmen* which was the cause (at most only part cause) of Ovid's exile was the *Ars*, not the *Amores*. And in any case the point at issue was *not* the morality of Ovid's private life. There cannot have been many young men in Augustan Rome who had not at some time done the sort of thing Ovid wrote about in the *Amores*. But it was not what Ovid had *done* that disturbed Augustus: it was the way he *wrote* about it. It did not matter a jot to Augustus whether Corinna existed or not.

As for Oliver's second main point, one would be much happier with the supposition that the first edition must have presented a recognizably chronological pattern of the development of Ovid's affair with Corinna, if one could be sure—the inevitable parallel—that the elegies of Propertius present such a pattern of Propertius' affair with Cynthia. It is in fact impossible to reconstruct in a wholly satisfactory manner the development of Propertius' relationship with Cynthia, nor did Propertius intend that we should. As A. W. Allen has put it recently, 'Propertius is not concerned to tell a story, but rather to impart the quality of an experience. Explicit statements of time, place, person and circumstance have meaning not as references to a private sphere of the poet's own experience . . . [but] rather as details which serve to enforce perception of the essential and typical aspects of experience in love.'² Fortunately this is not the place to argue *that* complex and controversial question. It will be enough to refer to Propertius, 1. 7. 13 f., and *Amores* 2. 1. 5 f., where both poets explicitly claim that their intention was to select those features of the experience of love that could easily be recognized because of universal relevance. The reader will be able to see himself as the *ego* of their elegies. If this is as true of Propertius as it is of the second edition of the *Amores*, then what is the justification for maintaining that it could not have been true of the first edition? Are we to suppose that the tone of the first edition was perfectly serious throughout? That it lacked completely that element of burlesque and parody so characteristic of the second?³ Most important of all, why, granted, for the sake of argument, that the first edition *was* a straightforward record of Ovid's liaison with Corinna, should Ovid have sought to obliterate this record in the manner Oliver suggests? I can think of no plausible reason—and it is significant that Oliver does not even attempt to suggest one. Certainly not to protect the good name of Corinna, now a respectable Roman matron. If so, why include *any* of the poems which mention her? Especially, for

¹ On this point see most recently J. P. Sullivan, *TAPhA* xcii (1961), 522 f. L. Herrmann's identification of Corinna with Propertius' Lycinna (*Atti* [n. 1] ii, 307 f.) hardly requires to be taken seriously—not least because Herrmann has missed the obvious point that Lycinna too is presumably a metrically equivalent pseudonym.

² In *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric*, ed. J. P. Sullivan (1962), 117; and see particularly now Brooks Otis in *Harv. Studies* lxx (1965), 1–44, especially pp. 29 f.

³ Well brought out by Brooks Otis, *TAPhA* lxix (1938), 197 f.

example, 3. 7, where it is claimed that she had once obliged him nine times in one night!

Luck cleverly argues from 3. 12 that the first edition was actually known as 'Corinna', just as Propertius 1 was known as 'Cynthia'¹ (cf. Prop., 2. 24. 2). From this he argues that Corinna must have featured much more strongly in it than she does in the second edition in order to justify this title.

While there may well be something to his point about the title 'Corinna', there are several flaws in the argument as a whole, which render the conclusion unacceptable. In the first place, it by no means follows, as Luck supposes, that all five books of the first edition were collectively known as 'Corinna', and that 3. 12 must therefore be a new poem added only in the second edition. It need only be the first (say) of the five books of the first edition that was so called. After all it was only the *first* of Propertius' four books that was known as 'Cynthia'.² And the poem from which we learn this occurs in the second book (2. 24). Despite the fact that Cynthia is mentioned in all four of the books, no one, I suppose, would wish to suggest that all four books were known collectively as 'Cynthia'—still less that 2. 24 was added in a hypothetical second edition.

It is perfectly clear that the books of the first edition were published separately,³ like Propertius' four books.⁴ Most modern writers have simply taken it for granted that they were all published together at once. There is not a scrap of evidence to support this assumption, nor is it in the least likely. For such separate publication compare the various books of Tibullus, Propertius, Horace's *Epistle* and *Satires*, and, later, Statius' *Silvae* and Martial.⁵ Indeed the simultaneous publication of Horace's *Odes* i–iii is almost the only counter-example known: and even here a fourth book was published separately later on. With regard to the *Amores*, this *a priori* probability becomes certainty when we turn to the evidence of the poems themselves. Note, for example, the first and last lines of 2. 1:

*Hoc quoque composui Paelignis natus aquosis
ille ego nequitiae Naso poeta meae;
hoc quoque iussit Amor; procul hinc, procul este, severi . . .*

*ad mea formosos vultus adhibete puellae
carmina, purpureus quae mihi dictat Amor.*

This is not merely an 'Einleitungsgedicht', it is a 'Programmgedicht'. And as such it must, surely, have heralded a book of poems published on its own—though published after at least one, and more probably two, such books had already appeared. At present, of course, the poem introduces book ii of the second edition. And Birt mistakenly inferred from it that book ii of the *second* edition was published separately from the first book.⁶ Oliver rightly objected that this is ruled out by the introductory epigram to the second edition,⁷ which clearly implies that all three books of the second edition appeared

¹ On this interpretation see W. Richter, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* ccxv (1963), 187 f.

² Cf. Butler and Barber's edition, pp. xxxi–ii.

³ As taken for granted by Munari, third edition (1959), p. x n. 5.

⁴ Butler and Barber, p. xxv.

⁵ The same is also true of all the multi-

book poems of Claudian, as I shall be showing in a study of Claudian to be published shortly by the Clarendon Press.

⁶ *Berl. Phil. Woch.* xxxiii (1913), 1228–9. On the 'hoc quoque' see Ed. Fraenkel *Horace* (1957), 137 n. 2.

⁷ *Op. cit.* 193 n. 13; cf. also W. Port, *Philologus* lxxxix (1926), 450.

simultaneously. With this possibility ruled out the only alternative is that 2. 1 originally introduced one of the later books of the *first* edition. From which it follows that they were published separately. Compare also the allusion at 3. 12. 7 to *libelli* in the plural which have publicized Corinna's charms. The first and last poems of book iii, concerned as they both are with announcing Ovid's forthcoming tragedy, and representing a closer approach to it than 2. 18 (see below), suggest again a new book issued on a separate occasion.

It is, then, at least as likely that 3. 12, the poem on which Luck's hypothesis turns, occurred in one of the last books of the first edition, as that it was only added in the second. If, as I believe (see below), the second edition is little more than a shortened version of the first, not even significantly rearranged, then it should be observed that 3. 12, coming as it now does only three poems from the end of the second edition, is likely to have been originally in the fifth book of the first. Hence the reference therein to the earlier *libelli* about Corinna.

Nor need the fact that the first book(s) of the first edition (or, even if Luck's view be accepted, the whole of the first edition) were called 'Corinna' prove any more than that Ovid was imitating Propertius. That Ovid was strongly influenced by Propertius is plain enough. That this influence took the form of a reaction, in some cases actually of parody,¹ makes it not less but more likely that Ovid would have signalled this fact by modelling the title of his counterblast to Propertius on the 'Cynthia'. Luck himself is prepared to deny that the 'Nanno' of Minnermus, the 'Lyde' of Antimachus, and the 'Leontion' of Hermesianax were 'subjective' elegies in the Propertian manner wholly devoted to extolling the charms of the ladies in question.² And to judge from such evidence as we have on this much-debated issue, he is probably right to do so.³ It is surely natural enough that *any* book of love poems should be called after the mistress—whether real or imagined—of the poet, regardless of the character of the poems or the prominence therein of the mistress.

III

From this point of view, then, there is no particular reason to suppose that the general character of the first edition was significantly different from the second. And if I am right in suggesting that 1. 2 introduced one of the original five books of the first edition, then we have positive evidence that it was not. For 1. 2 is distinguished by precisely the same burlesque air⁴ as the introductory poems to the three books of the second edition. This, as we have seen, was what led Reitzenstein to include it in his discussion of those poems. And such an introductory poem must have introduced other poems written in the same vein—poems, in short, just like the *Amores* as we now have them. If the introductory poem made no mention of the girl who inspired Ovid's sleepless nights, then there is little ground for supposing that she featured any more prominently in the rest of the book it introduced than in the second edition.

¹ See especially Otis, *op. cit.* 197 f. Luck (p. 185) strangely claims that 3. 12 (as interpreted by him) is 'dass einzige Beispiel, in den der ältere Zeitgenosse bewusst parodiert wird'.

² *Op. cit.* ch. ii.

³ In addition to Luck's own very sensible discussion, see Butler and Barber, pp. xxxvif.,

and A. A. Day's *Origin of the Latin Love Elegy* (1938).

⁴ In addition to the points discussed above, note the double *-que* in *Errorque Furorque* at line 35, normally confined to epic—and (of course) *mock-epic* (cf. Ed. Fraenkel, *Elem. Plautini* [1960,] pp. 199 f.). Obviously a deliberate touch.

In particular, 1. 2 contains a burlesque of Propertius 3. 1. Propertius, never a retiring poet, had introduced his third book with a poem in which he represents himself as riding in a chariot, his Muse by his side, like a triumphing general, with lesser poets following on foot behind. Ovid made Cupid the triumphing general, and himself one of the captives following in Cupid's train, thus turning Propertius' grandiose boast upside down. Now Propertius iii appeared some time after 23 B.C., and probably not long after.¹ We learn from *Trist.* 4. 10. 57 that Ovid first began to recite poems on Corinna when 'barba resecta mihi bisve semelve fuit'. It is now generally agreed that this means when he was about 18 years old, that is to say c. 25 B.C.² We may thus place the first book of the first edition of the *Amores* c. 25 B.C. It was an instant success (*Trist.* 4. 10. 59). It is likely, then, that at least one more book will have appeared in the course of the next two or three years. It would be attractive to suppose that 1. 2 introduced one such book which appeared c. 22 or 21 (? ii or iii), not long after Propertius iii. And that in *his* introductory poem Ovid deliberately featured this burlesque of Propertius' introductory poem, knowing that it would be immediately apparent to his audience.

But it was not only Propertius that Ovid made fun of in 1. 2. A much more important person met therein with less respect than he might have hoped for from this young iconoclast from Sulmo. At the very end of the poem, addressing Cupid, Ovid prays:

aspice *cognati* felicia Caesaris arma:
qua vicit, victos protegit ille manu.

True, Augustus liked to think that he could trace his descent right back to Aeneas, the son of Venus (cf., e.g., *Aen.* 1. 286), and Caesar himself had made the claim quite explicitly (Suet. *Div. Jul.* 6). True also that by common consent Cupid was the son of Venus. Thus in theory it could hardly be denied that Cupid and Augustus were blood-relations. But Cupid, especially as represented by Ovid, and above all in this very poem, was an irresponsible and far from respectable god. It will be remembered that by 22 Augustus had already long since embarked on his campaign for moral reform.³ Ovid's intention in referring to their relationship in this casual and allusive manner can only have been to provoke a slightly shocked amusement. And he must surely have succeeded.

Not only this. The last line was beyond doubt meant to recall Propertius 2. 16. 41-2:

Caesaris haec virtus et gloria Caesaris haec est:
illa qua vicit condidit arma manu.

A perfectly serious eulogy of the *clementia Caesaris* in Propertius. Not so in Ovid. After urging Cupid to let him off lightly now he has surrendered, Ovid cites the parallel of Cupid's 'relative' Augustus who spares and protects those *he* has conquered—in order to persuade Cupid to follow suit and spare Ovid! This is to hold the 'parcere subiectis' motif to ridicule. We may feel sure that Augustus was not amused.⁴ We happen to know from Suetonius that while

¹ Butler and Barber, p. xxvi.

² A. L. Wheeler, *AJP* xlii (1925), 11 f.

³ See in general Gordon Williams, *JRS* lii (1962), 28 f.

⁴ It so happens—and perhaps just as well

for Ovid—that Augustus was absent from Rome between 22 and 18 B.C. (cf. A. H. M. Jones, *Studies in Roman Government and Law* [1960], 12).

Augustus encouraged literature, 'componi tamen aliquid de se nisi et *serio* et a *praestantissimis* offendebatur' (*Div. Aug.* 89. 3).

It is not my purpose here to discuss 'Ovid and the Augustans'. The *Ars* is eloquent enough testimony of Ovid's attitude to the Augustan moral revival—as is its consequence, his exile. 'There can be no doubt of the view which Roman officialdom must have taken of the *Ars Amatoria*: it was an immoral and subversive work.'¹ But it is customary to lump the *Ars* and the *Amores* together—a practice encouraged by their obvious similarities of both theme and treatment, but nevertheless unsound and unhistorical. The *Ars* was written when Ovid was 40 and at the height of his fame: the first books of the *Amores* when he was an unknown in his teens. It would not be surprising if his attitude to Augustus and the Augustan regime, or at the very least the freedom he felt to express that attitude, had changed over the twenty intervening years. But if 1. 2 belonged to the first edition, then plainly it did not.

It is striking (if not wholly unpredictable) that a young poet of the immediate post-war generation should have reacted so sharply from the pious Augustanism which stamps much (if not all) of the work of the protégés of Maecenas. It is not surprising that Ovid's first efforts were fostered, not by Maecenas, but by the independent Messala.²

Granted, then, my hypothesis concerning 1. 2, it is possible to trace in the first edition of the *Amores* the same burlesque treatment of amatory themes, the same apparent unconcern about the identity of the beloved, and, not least important, the same irreverent attitude to the establishment that so characterize the second.

We have seen too that in all probability 2. 1, notable for the first two at least of these themes, introduced a book of the first edition. And probably 3. 1 and 15 as well. And if these, then (from this point of view at any rate) why not 1. 1 and, indeed, all or most of the contents of all three books of the second edition?

IV

Let us turn now to the introductory epigram to the second edition:

Qui modo Nasonis fueramus quinque libelli
tres sumus; hoc illi praetulit auctor opus;
ut iam nulla tibi nos sit legisse voluptas,
at levior demptis poena duobus erit.

Naturally, no firm editorial intention can be inferred with any degree of certainty from such a playful piece. But the *implication* is that Ovid has simply shortened the previous edition. There is certainly nothing there to warrant the common view that a substantial number of *new* poems was first included in the second edition. If this had happened, then, since the second edition is only three-fifths the length of the first anyway, it would follow that a very large number of the poems of the original first edition had been omitted: in fact that the second was an almost entirely new work. While it would certainly be rash to rule out the possibility that Ovid added the odd new poem, anything more than this is impossible to square with the introductory epigram. The most natural inference is that when he came to prepare the second edition, then at

¹ E. J. Kenney, *Ovidiana* 208.

² See B. L. Ullman, *AJP* (1912), 162 f;

B. Otis, 'Horace and the Elegists', *TAPhA* lxxvi (1945), 185.

the height of his powers, he was dissatisfied with some of what he had written in his 'teens and simply omitted it. As he explicitly says in his autobiography (*Trist.* 4. 10. 59–62):

moverat ingenium totam cantata per urbem
nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi.
multa quidem scripsi, sed quae vitisosa putavi
emendaturis ignibus ipse dedi.

These couplets follow immediately after Ovid's description of his very first recitations, and refer therefore to the first edition of the *Amores*—or perhaps rather to the first books of the first edition. The poems, then, that he burnt as being *vitiosa* are surely some of these early efforts which he later omitted from the second edition. Hardly poems which he did not consider good enough at the time for the *first* edition. Every poet must have a waste-paper basket full for every poem which satisfies him, and no one would bother to record that he burnt his first drafts: this could be taken for granted.

V

There is one further consideration which, I would suggest, though rather more tentatively, lends some support to the view that the *Amores* as we have them are little if anything more than a shortened version of the first edition.

It is well known that some of the *Amores* are written in pairs, the second poem answering or in some way complementing the first. The most notorious example is 2. 7 and 8: the one to Corinna assuring her that Ovid has *not* been carrying on with the maid Cypassis, the other to Cypassis threatening her with exposure unless she grants him her favours again. 2. 19 tells a husband to keep a closer watch on his wife or Ovid will lose interest: 3. 4 tells the husband not to bother, since she will be unfaithful if she wants to anyway, and so he might as well make the most of his new young 'friends' and the presents they will bring. In 1. 4 Ovid is at a party where his mistress is sitting next to her husband: in 2. 5 he is the husband at the same party. 1. 11 and 12 concern respectively a hopeful letter sent to Corinna and Corinna's negative reply. 2. 13 and 14 treat different aspects of abortion.

Luck suggests (p. 233, n. 41) that in some cases at least the second poem in these pairs was added in the second edition. One of the consequences of this would be that one of the more outrageous features of the second edition would not have been present in the first. And it would also square better with Luck's view of the first edition as more 'Corinna-centric' than the second. As with Luck's first suggestion discussed above, there may be some truth in it; but even if some of these second poems were written later, it by no means follows that they were first written for the second edition.

In some cases it is a most unlikely possibility. For example, it is hard to believe that either of the parts of the Cypassis diptych was written without its fellow in mind. Especially since the one is placed immediately after the other (2. 7 and 8). The same applies to 1. 11–12 and 2. 13–14. But the 2. 19/3. 4 and 1. 4/2. 5 pairs are more favourable examples. Firstly, in each case the first poem is perfectly complete, comprehensible, and indeed very amusing on its own. There is no need to suppose that Ovid was already planning the pair

when he wrote the first poem. Secondly, there is the curious fact that the second poem is in both cases so far separated from its fellow. Had Ovid specifically written the second of the pair as a complement to the first while preparing the second edition, why did he obscure its *raison d'être* in this way? Most readers would be likely to tackle a three-book work one book at a time. They would have forgotten the first poem by the time they got round to reading the next book. Why did not Ovid place the two halves of the pair closer together—at the very least within the compass of the same book? In the case of the other three pairs discussed above, the two poems were directly juxtaposed. It was in fact the regular practice for poems on a related theme to be placed together inside an ancient book of poems. Not necessarily always directly juxtaposed: often separated by another poem on a different theme, a common pattern. Clear traces of such an arrangement can be found inside the *Garland* of Meleager,¹ and the various books of the *Cycle* of Agathias² and Martial's *Epigrams*.³ Also, most obviously and relevantly, throughout the work of the Augustan poets, as shown in W. Port's useful study 'Die Anordnung in Gedichtbüchern augusteischer Zeit' in *Philologus* lxxxi (1926), pp. 280–308 and 427–68 (conclusions summarized on p. 460). For the arrangement of Propertius' *Monobiblos* see particularly the brief but illuminating paper by O. Skutsch in *Class. Philology* lviii (1963), pp. 238–9, developed now by Brooks Otis in *Harv. Studies* lxx (1965), pp. 7 f. The only exception Port can find to this very natural and sensible pattern is—the *Amores* of Ovid. Ovid, he discovers, devised the entirely new principle of placing poems on related themes not only apart from each other, but actually in different books. Now obviously it would be rash to deny the possibility that this *was* a deliberate new policy on Ovid's part, curious though it might seem. If the second poems *were* first included in the second edition, one would have to draw this conclusion. For, as we have seen, all three books of the second edition were published at once. But would not a more satisfactory explanation be that these second poems were originally written for later books of the first edition? When looking around for material to fill out his later books to the appropriate round number (multiples of 5 and

¹ See particularly A. Wifstrand, *Studien zur griech. Anthologie* (1926), 5–30: brief summary in Gow and Page, *Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* i (1965), xviii. In the course of an important and very comprehensive review of Gow and Page in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* ccxix (1967), 23–61, Luck revives the now generally discredited view of an alphabetical arrangement for Meleager's *Garland* (the system apparently followed by Philip of Thessalonica for his). The few examples he adduces could never be enough to disprove the wholly convincing illustration of the other pattern by Wifstrand and Radinger, and can in any case be adequately accounted for by the simple consideration (cf. also Gow and Page, i. xviii n. 3) that Meleager juxtaposed poems on the same theme (often imitations of each other), thus greatly increasing the probability that consecutive epigrams would open with the same word or words. It may be that when con-

fronted with this situation Meleager occasionally arranged them alphabetically, but only as one among the many other patterns that went to make up the skilful interweaving of his *Garland* (hence, of course, the name). Meleager's two consecutive addresses to Dawn (*Anth. Pal.* 5. 172–3) open "Ορθρε, τί μοι, δυσέραστε, ταχύς . . . and "Ορθρε, τί νῦν, δυσέραστε, βραδύς (because this time the girl is sleeping with someone else). Alphabetical order; but this is not why Meleager so arranged them, nor, surely, would he have reversed the order had μοι and νῦν been interchanged. The traces of alphabetical order which Luck detects in *Berl. Klass. Texte* v. 1. 75 are hardly impressive.

² A. Mattsson, *Untersuchungen zur Epigrammsammlung des Agathias* (Diss., Lund, 1942), ch. i.

³ Cf. W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (1924), 228, K. Barwick, *Philologus* lxxvii (1933), 63 f.

10 were the fashion among the Augustans),¹ did not Ovid on occasions rewrite a poem from an earlier book from the opposite point of view? If so, in the first edition these pairs would necessarily have been split up between two books. When preparing his second edition Ovid could easily have taken the opportunity of uniting the two halves of each pair, so that the link between them would be more immediately apparent. But as it happens he did not. The reason, I suspect, is quite simply because he did not go to the trouble of devising a thorough-going new arrangement for the second edition.²

A moment's reflection will suggest that it would not have been an easy task to do so. There can hardly have been any very obvious or subtle overall architecture to the original five-book edition, planned and published as its components were separately and at intervals over some ten or fifteen years. And any such pattern as there may have been inside the individual books will have been broken up by the removal of some of the original poems. So when faced with the task of preparing the second edition, Ovid did not have a free hand. He had to adapt material published at intervals over a long period, inspired by very different moods and occasions. I would suggest that all he in fact did was to strike out the poems he now considered substandard and do the minimum juggling about to give each of his three new books suitable introductory and closing poems, a round number (i—15, ii—20, iii—15), and some sort of internal balance and coherence.

This is not to say, of course, that the poems are arranged entirely at hazard. There is a clear progression over the three books from acceptance of love and love-elegy to a gradual rejection of both and turning to fresh themes. But just such a progression must surely have been present already through the successive books of the first edition, reflecting Ovid's own changing attitude to his life and craft over the years (compare, of course, the similar progression over the four books of Propertius).

In support of his view that Ovid deliberately introduced this new system of dividing pairs between two books in the second edition, Port alleges several other examples in addition to 2. 19/3. 4 and 1. 4/2. 5.³ But none constitute pairs in any significant sense of the word. They just happen to be on similar subjects: 1. 14 and 2. 14 for example do have a certain similarity in theme, but it is quite misleading to quote them as a pair, since the obvious fellow to 2. 14 is its immediate predecessor 2. 13 (both concern Corinna's abortion). Apart from the pairs 2. 19/3. 4 and 1. 4/2. 5 the only obvious pattern in the *Amores* is, as in most other Augustan poetry-books, simple juxtaposition. For example, 1. 11–12 : 2. 2–3, 7–8, 9a–9b, 13–14 : 3. 11a–11b (Port himself draws attention to this pattern, p. 454). It will be seen that book ii in particular is mainly constructed on this pattern.

I would suggest then that the only conscious pattern in the *Amores* is the normal one, and that the present arrangement of the two pairs under discussion is a trace of the original arrangement of the first edition.

¹ See Fraenkel, *Horace* (1957), 112, and Skutsch, *Class. Phil.* lviii (1963), 239, n. 6. I would follow Kenney (OCT p. x) in obtaining round numbers for the three books of the *Am.* by athetizing 3. 55 and dividing 2. 9 and 3. 11 (after L. Mueller) into two separate poems. Those who hold to the authenticity of 3. 5 (against MS. evidence as well as stylistic considerations) will have to reject the divi-

sion of 3. 11 (so Lenz, pp. 18 and 233).

² It should be noted, however, that Port (op. cit., p. 452, n. 219) draws precisely the opposite conclusion from the same phenomena.

³ So too does Luck, p. 196, though without going so far as to suggest that Ovid deliberately split such pairs between books for a special effect.

VI

Concerning the actual date of publication of both editions I have little to offer on the positive side. But one or two misconceptions about both remain to be dispelled.

Luck (p. 169) assigns to the second edition all three 'spät zu datierenden Stücke' (1. 14, 1. 15, 3. 9), and all poems which show him 'mit andern Plänen beschäftigt'.

The first criterion becomes a little less persuasive when it is realized that the three poems which Luck describes as 'late' are in fact the only three poems in the entire collection which offer any handle for dating whatever. 3. 9 is the well-known lament for Tibullus, obviously written soon after Tibullus' death, which is usually placed in 19 B.C., but by Luck (p. 168) perhaps as late as 17 B.C. 1. 15 was written after the deaths of Tibullus and of Virgil (19), but probably while Horace (died 8 B.C.) and Propertius (died some time unknown between 16 B.C. and A.D. 2) were still alive, 1. 14 after, and probably soon after, the diplomatic success over the Sugambri in 16 B.C., alluded to also by Propertius (4. 6. 77) and, especially, by Horace (*C.* 4. 14. 51 f., cf. 4. 2. 33 f.).¹

Would it not be a curious coincidence if the only three datable poems in the whole work all happened to be late additions?

And as for Luck's second criterion, this too need not be taken very seriously once we abandon the unwarranted assumption that all five books of the first edition were published simultaneously. The same applies to Oliver's objection to the taking of the first edition down to 16 B.C. (p. 193): 'It is, of course, a little astonishing that Ovid should have spent ten years in composing five books of elegies.' There is no reason whatever to suppose, nor is it at all probable, that Ovid spent all his time from c. 25 down to c. 16 writing the original five books of the *Amores*.² He may very well have written all or most of the *Heroides* during this period as well. Indeed, 2. 18 clearly implies that he did write some at least of the *Heroides* while he was still writing some of the *Amores*. It is unnecessary and even implausible to insist, with Luck, Lenz, and many others, that this poem was added for the second edition.

It is often claimed that 2. 18 was actually written after the appearance of books i and ii of the *Ars Amatoria*, i.e. c. A.D. 2. This is based on lines 19–20. After lamenting his inability to make progress with serious poetry, in particular with tragedy, Ovid says that instead:

19 . . . aut artes teneri profitemur *Amoris*
 (ei mihi, praeceptis urgeor ipse meis),
 aut quod Penelopes verbis reddatur Ulixi
 scribimus et lacrimas, Phylli relictas, tuas,
 quod Paris et Macareus et quod male gratus Iason³
 Hippolytique parens Hippolytusque legant . . .

¹ There seems little justification for the common view that the poem might equally be alluding to the final defeat of the Sugambri 8 B.C. (so, most recently, Lenz, op. cit. [p. 320. n. 1], 183). The parallels from Propertius and Horace are very much against this.

² H. Fränkel even goes so far as to calculate Ovid's rate of composition over this period (*Ovid: a poet between two worlds* [1945], 194). He estimates that ed. 1 will have con-

tained about 85 poems since ed. 2 contains 50, and thus that Ovid will have 'produced at the slow rate of 12 acceptable elegies a year'. But (a) it is hard to credit a facile composer like Ovid with such a remarkably slow rate, and (b) it is implausible to postulate such a steady uniform rate over a period of several years.

³ G. P. Goold (*Harv. Studies* lxix [1965], 14) is surely correct to write *Iason* here (and

It is obvious that lines 21 f. allude to the *Heroides*. And it is almost universally assumed that 19 refers to the *Ars*.¹ To accept this, however, would entail accepting that the second edition of the *Amores* appeared after *Ars* i–ii. And before *Ars* iii, for at line 343 of that work Ovid unmistakably alludes to the three-book edition of the *Amores*:

deve *tribus libris* titulo quae signat Amorum.

(The reading *tribus*, often suspected, has now been confirmed by Kenney.) We should have to assume, then, that Ovid prepared the second edition of the *Amores* at the same time as he was writing *Ars* iii. Not only this: 2. 18 clearly implies that Ovid was writing the *Heroides* simultaneously with the ‘artes . . . Amoris’ of line 19. And that he had *not* yet written a tragedy (lines 13 f.). Yet surely we cannot place the *Medea*, Ovid’s one and only tragedy, after both the *Ars* and the second edition of the *Amores*. Neither can we very well postpone the *Heroides* as late as this. Moreover, the first and last poems of *Am.* iii clearly represent Ovid as much nearer completing his *Medea* than 2. 18. As Giomini points out (op. cit. [p. 320 n. 1], 135) iii. 1.24, ‘cessatum satis est’, picks up ii. 18. 3, ‘ignava Veneris cessamus in umbra’. Thus 3. 1 and 15 must have been written at the very least several months after 2. 18, but still before *Ars* iii, which appeared only a year after *Ars* i–ii. And surely a great part of this bare year before the appearance of *Ars* iii must have been consumed in the drafting and writing of *Ars* iii itself (812 lines). Furthermore, 2. 18, 3. 1, and 3. 15 combined unmistakably imply that the next work Ovid had on hand was his *Medea*, or at any rate some tragedy or other. Yet clearly his major project at this time must have been *Ars* iii, itself rapidly followed by *Remedia Amoris* almost at once. More generally, it is difficult to credit that Ovid had so many so different works on hand at once. For by A.D. 2 he must have begun sketching out the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* as well.

The only alternative is to interpret the allusion to ‘artes . . . amoris’ at 2. 18. 19 as the *Amores*, not the *Ars* at all. *Am.* 1. 4 and 8 amply justify Ovid’s claim to the role of *praeceptor amoris* before ever he wrote the *Ars*.² D’Elia adduces two other excellent arguments in favour of this interpretation. (a) If 2. 18. 19–20 refer to the *Ars*, it would be a very brief and casual reference for such a major and original work compared with the much more detailed allusions to the *Heroides* and Sabinus’ replies to them over the next fourteen lines. (b) This disproportion in the scale of the allusions to the two works is perfectly comprehensible if the ‘artes . . . amoris’ mean only the *Amores*, of which several books had appeared already, while the *Heroides* was a new and original work.

If then Ovid is merely referring here to earlier books of the *Amores*, there is no reason whatever to place the second edition after the appearance of *Ars* i–ii.

elsewhere in Ovid) for Kenney’s anomalous *Iaso*. See Goold’s valuable discussion at pp. 9–14 for some very sensible remarks on orthography in general.

¹ So, most recently, Lenz, op. cit., p. 208, and Luck, p. 230, n. 5, despite the sensible remarks of d’Elia, with much of which I am in agreement. It is not relevant that ‘artes tu perlege nostras’ at *Rem.* 487 does refer to the *Ars*. For *Rem.* was indis-

putably written after *Ars*. If we knew on other grounds that *Am.* ii. 18 was later than *Ars*, then we should have to construe it as referring to *Ars* also. The question is, if *Am.* ii. 18 was written before *Ars*, could 1. 19 refer to the *Amores*? To which the answer is surely ‘yes’.

² Op. cit. 215: for another argument in favour of putting 2. 18 in the first edition, see Giomini, *Atti* i. 132 f.

Nor indeed any reason to deny that *Am.* 2. 18 could perfectly well have been present already in the first edition.¹

VII

Some poems of the *Amores* as we have them *may* have been added for the second edition. But the introductory epigram certainly does not imply this, and I cannot see that there is any adequate criterion for distinguishing such additions. And no sufficient reason has so far been produced for supposing that any of the poems discussed in sections iv to vi above are such additions.

I would suggest then that *c.* 25 B.C. Ovid published the first book of the first edition of the *Amores*. Over the next ten years or so, he published four more books of *Amores* and, before the last book or books, some or all of the *Heroides*. The last datable poem falls in 16 B.C., but naturally it does not follow from this that the last of the five books appeared precisely in that year. It was not till after this that *Medea* finally saw the light of day. Then, at some date unknown and unknowable before A.D. 1, Ovid issued a second edition of the *Amores*. 1. 15 was written before Horace died in 8 B.C., but it may well have been written ten years before then, and included already in the first edition. On grounds of general probability I should be inclined to place the second edition at least two or three years before the appearance of the *Ars*. In the *Ars* Ovid covered much of the ground he had treated already in individual *Amores*. For this reason alone it is perhaps unlikely that after writing the *Ars* Ovid should then have turned to the *Amores* again. On the other hand it is easy to see how, working through the *Amores* again for the second edition, Ovid's interest in the potentialities of the *praeceptor amoris* theme could have been reawakened and crystallized into the conception of an *Ars Amatoria*.

Bedford College, London
Columbia University, New York

ALAN CAMERON

¹ In the second edition this poem appears as 1. 14, though it must presumably have occurred in one of the last books of the first edition. I may perhaps be deemed too fanciful if I suggest that this is one of the poems Ovid transferred from one book to another to make up a round number and even pattern in each book. Obviously it is most unlikely that Ovid simply discarded two whole books *in toto*. No doubt in general it will have been the earlier books he pruned

most drastically, leaving the later books (written when he was nearly 30) comparatively intact. Thus it is natural that he should have transferred the odd late poem to an early book to even out matters.

I am grateful to Professors F. R. D. Good-year, S. Commager and O. Skutsch and to Mr. E. J. Kenney for comments on a draft of this paper. Naturally they must not be taken to endorse my views.