

2

Doctrina

est quae Callimachi prae nostris rustica dicat
carmina: cui placeo, protinus ipsa placet (2.4.19f.).

This is Ovid's only explicit declaration in the *Amores* that he aspires to the Callimachean ideal of subtle and complex poetry¹. Especially when one contrasts the frivolous manner in which this declaration is conveyed with the solemnity of equivalent passages in Propertius such as 3.1.1ff.:

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,
in uestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus!
primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos
Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros,

it may be tempting to dismiss the couplet as a mere joke. The *Amores*, as indeed the great bulk of Ovid's poetry, seem at first sight to be anything but subtle and complex. The beautifully straightforward diction and syntax seem to yield up immediately the full meaning of the subject-matter, which is almost never *recherché*.

The simplicity of the *Amores*' subject-matter is perhaps indicated most clearly by a negative observation. The elaborate and allusive narration of abstruse mythology was one of the chief means by which the Hellenistic poets displayed their *doctrina*. Parthenius dedicated his recondite Ἑρωτικά Παθήματα to Gallus, with the suggestion that he might draw on them for ἔπη καὶ ἐλεγείας (Pref. 2). Moreover, Gallus' poetry was associated particularly with that of Euphronion, whom Cicero terms *nimis...obscurus* (*Diu.* 2.133); cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 10.50 with Ps.-Probus and Servius *ad loc.*, also Servius on 6.72. It is therefore reasonable to surmise that Gallus' elegies contained much learned mythology, as do those of Propertius. Although, however, the *Heroides*, the *Fasti*, the *Ibis* and, above all,

¹ Ovid's only other explicit acknowledgments of his debt to Callimachus are at *Rem.* 381f. and, with reference only to that particular poem, *Ibis* 53ff. (quoted below).

the *Metamorphoses* are among our most important sources for classical legends, the use of mythology in the *Amores*, as in Tibullus, is very limited. It features extensively in only three elegies, 3.6, 10 and 12. The account of Ceres' love-affair with Iasius in 3.10 may be largely Ovid's own invention, developing the brief allusion to that myth at Hom. *Od.* 5.125ff. Almost all of the many myths listed in the catalogue of poetic fictions at 3.12.21ff. are commonplace. *Doctrina* is apparent only in the rather specialised catalogue of rivers in love at 3.6.25ff. Many of those myths are not recorded elsewhere, but do not seem to have been fabricated by Ovid, and that catalogue is an exception to his usual practice of eschewing abstruse mythology, a practice explicitly stated to be un-Callimachean at *Ibis* 53ff.:

nunc, quo Battiades inimicum deuouet Ibin,
hoc ego deuoueo teque tuosque modo.
utque ille, historiis inuoluam carmina caecis,
non soleam quamuis hoc genus ipse sequi.
illius ambages imitatus in Ibide dicar
oblitus moris iudiciiue mei.

The Callimachean poets regarded rapid and facile composition with suspicion and indeed derision, as being incompatible with high poetic achievement; cf. e.g. Call. *frag.* 1 *passim*, Ap. 105ff., Catull. 95, Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.9ff. Ovid, however, referring to his early poetry, records that composition came easily to him:

sponte sua carmen numeros ueniebat ad aptos,
et quod temptabam scribere uersus erat (*Trist.* 4.10.25f.)²

Moreover, in attributing to Tibullus and, by implication, to Propertius qualities which correspond to some extent to the Callimachean ideal of λεπτότης, Quintilian compares Ovid disadvantageously to them:

elegia quoque Graecos prouocamus, cuius mihi tersus atque elegans maxime uidetur auctor Tibullus. sunt qui Propertium malint. Ouidius utroque lasciuior, sicut durior Gallus.
(*Inst.* 10.1.93)³

² That passage may have inspired the marvellous apocryphal anecdote recorded in a late *Vita* (see Wheeler [1925] 7) that, while his father was beating him for his persistence in writing poetry, to the neglect of his school-work, Ovid cried out '*parce mihi! numquam uersificabo, pater!*', — a painful plea which a late antique or medieval forger would have regarded as a perfect Ovidian pentameter.

³ For criticism of Ovid's *lasciua*, cf. also Sen. *Contr.* 2.2.12, 9.5.17, Sen. *Nat.* 3.27.13ff., Quint. *Inst.* 4.1.77, 10.1.88 and 98.

Perhaps the greatest obstacle, however, to the view that Ovid's poetry is Callimachean in spirit is its great and widespread popularity, of which he boasts in numerous passages in his exile-poetry; cf. esp. *Trist.* 2.115ff. (quoted below), 4.10.121ff. (to his Muse):

tu mihi, quod rarum est, uiuo sublime dedisti
nomen, ab exequiis quod dare fama solet.
nec, qui detrectat praesentia, Liur iniquo
ullum de nostris dente momordit opus.
nam tulerint magnos cum saecula nostra poetas,
non fuit ingenio fama maligna meo,
cumque ego praeponam multos mihi, non minor illis
dicor et in toto plurimus orbe legor,

Pont. 1.9.37ff., 4.16.2ff. Such was his popular appeal that some of his poems (perhaps from the *Heroides*) were actually performed on stage; cf. *Trist.* 2.519f., 5.7B.1f.:

Carmina...pleno saltari nostra theatro,
uersibus et plaudi scribis, amice, meis,

where the phrasing may suggest that the performance involved recitation of Ovid's actual words, and not merely the mimetic portrayal of his subject-matter. Theatrical performance is not necessarily incompatible with Callimachean subtlety, for even Vergil's *Eclogues* were presented on stage⁴. Nevertheless there is a sharp contrast with Callimachus himself, for his manifestly learned and allusive poetry could be appreciated only by a very select and limited audience, and he explicitly refused to attempt to appeal to a wider public:

Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ
χαίρω, τίς πολλοὺς ᾤδε καὶ ᾤδε φέρει·
μισέω καὶ περίφοιτον ἑρώμενον, οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης
πίνω· σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια (*Epigr.* 28.1ff.).

That declaration could hardly be further removed from the boast implicit in Tragedy's criticism of the *Amores*' popularity:

nequitiam uinosa tuam conuiuia narrant,
narrant in multas compita secta uias (3.1.17f.).

The apparent simplicity of the *Amores*, however, is only a veneer ingeniously disguising Ovid's commitment to Callimachean poetic principles. Such a commitment is, *a priori*, what one would

⁴ Cf. Serv. *Ecl.* 6.11.

expect from the author not only of the *Fasti*, the most ambitious overtly Callimachean work ever attempted by a Latin poet, but also of the *Ibis*, inspired by Callimachus' poem of the same name, and of a Latin version of Aratus' *Phaenomena*, a poem highly praised by Callimachus (*Epigr.* 27). Callimachus' praise of the *Phaenomena* as Ἀρήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης (4) can be paralleled many times in Ovid's references to his own composition of poetry; cf. e.g. *Ars* 2.285 *uigilatum carmen*, *Trist.* 1.1.107f. *fratres* (sc. Ovid's poetry before the *Tristia*), / *quos studium cunctos euigilauit idem*, 2.11 *curae uigilatorumque laborum*. The implication of *Pont.* 1.5.57ff. is that Ovid took great pains to polish his poetry, before his relegation ostensibly removed the incentive to do so:

gloria uos acuat, uos, ut recitata probentur
carmina, Pieriis inuigilate choris.
quod uenit ex facili satis est componere nobis,
et nimis intenti causa laboris abest.
cur ego sollicita poliam mea carmina cura?
an uerear ne non approbet illa Getes?

The re-editing of the *Amores* was presumably carried out for aesthetic reasons (see p. 83), and is itself the clearest example of Ovid's *labor limae*. His studious approach to composition is well illustrated by *Trist.* 3.14.37f.:

non hic librorum per quos inuiter alarque
copia: pro libris arcus et arma sonant⁵,

a lament reiterated at 5.12.53 *non liber hic ullus*. His poetry did not have merely popular appeal, but was appreciated also by the *docti*, as Ovid boasts at *Trist.* 2.115ff.:

sit quoque nostra domus uel censu parua uel ortu,
ingenio certe non latet illa meo;
quo uidear quamuis nimium iuueniliter usus,
grande tamen toto nomen ab orbe fero,
turbaque doctorum Nasonem nouit et audet
non fastiditis adnumerare uiris.

This *turba doctorum* included men of such discrimination as Pompeius Macer and Julius Hyginus 'Polyhistor', both of whom were given charge of the Palatine Library by Augustus⁶, and Ovid

⁵ Even as he makes this complaint, Ovid is thinking of a literary model, Catull. 68.33ff.

⁶ For Macer, see the introduction to 2.18; for Hyginus, cf. Suet. *Gramm.* 20 *fuit...familiarissimus Ouidio poetae*.

quickly won a respected position in much the same literary circles as Propertius and Horace:

saepe suos solitus recitare Propertius ignes
iure sodalicii, quo mihi iunctus erat,
Ponticus heroo, Bassus quoque clarus iambis
dulcia conuictus membra fuere mei.
et tenuit nostras numerosus Horatius aures,
dum ferit Ausonia carmina culta lyra...
utque ego maiores, sic me coluere minores,
notaque non tarde facta Thalia mea est
(*Trist.* 4.10.45ff., 55f.).

The allegiance to Callimachus which Ovid declares so humorously in 2.4 (see p. 32) is also, in fact, declared implicitly in a rather more subtle fashion in two passages in Book 1. In the catalogue of immortal poets in 1.15, Callimachus is given the distinction of being promoted out of chronological order to follow Homer, the greatest of all poets, and Hesiod, the archetypal *doctus poeta*:

Battiades semper toto cantabitur orbe (13).

Since, as far as we can now tell, Ovid's encomium of all the other poets in the catalogue contains a detailed reference to their subject-matter with, in the case of most of the Latin poets, an allusion to their actual words, 'the reference to Callimachus would be intolerably flat unless he had made a similar claim himself'. This being so, Ovid declares his allegiance to Callimachus by expressing his own hopes for immortal fame in closely comparable terms a few lines earlier:

mihi fama perennis
quaeritur, in toto semper ut orbe canar (7f.).

As at 2.4.19f., so also at 1.3.25f., Ovid wittily integrates a statement of poetic principles into an erotic context, for there he perverts Callimachus' claim to world-wide immortal fame into an argument designed to win a girl's love:

nos quoque per totum pariter cantabimur orbem,
iunctaque semper erunt nomina nostra tuis.

⁷ Nisbet (1971) 59. Such a claim by Callimachus to world-wide immortal fame need not be considered to contradict his refusal to court popular appeal (for which, see p. 34). Compare the encomium of Cinna's highly elaborate epyllion, the *Zmyrna*, in Catull. 95.

In the following pages, I shall attempt to demonstrate the Callimachean subtlety of the *Amores* by presenting examples of two features of the poetry which display great artistry and make considerable demands on the ingenuity and sophistication of the audience: first, the practice of by-passing an immediate model to allude to the source on which that model had been drawing and secondly, the practice of making etymological word-plays⁸.

Double allusion

Since the simultaneous allusion to two antecedents, one of which is based on the other, seems not to be widely recognised as a standard technique in Latin poetry⁹, discussion of Ovid's often complex use of it in the *Amores* may perhaps best be prefaced with two simple examples drawn from other poets. In recounting how Apollo bade him write small-scale poetry:

cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthus aurem
uellit et admonuit: 'pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen' (*Ecl.* 6.3ff.),

Vergil is echoing Call. *frag.* 1.21ff.:

καὶ γὰρ ὅτ' ἐπεὶ πρὶ ὧν ἵσταντο ἑμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
γούνασι, 'Α[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος:
'.....]... αἰδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον
θρέψαι, τῇ γ' Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην.'

Callimachus is to feed fat an unspecified animal for sacrifice, whereas Vergil is a shepherd who is to graze his sheep. The more specific setting for Vergil's *Dichterweihe* is the same as in Callimachus' model, the opening passage of the *Theogony*, where the Muses

Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν αἰοιδίην,
ἄρνας ποιμαίνονθ' Ἑλικῶνος ὑπὸ ζαθέοιο (22f.)¹⁰.

⁸ For an account of etymologising as a feature of Hellenistic and Augustan poetry, with reference particularly to Tibullus, see Cairns (1979) 90ff. and via the General Index s.v. *etymology*. For a rather different approach to Ovidian etymologising from that employed here, see Ahl (1985). Porte (1985), esp. 197ff., provides much useful discussion of the etymologising in the *Fasti*.

⁹ Cairns (1979) 63 speculates that the technique was more prevalent than is yet realised and Thomas (1986) provides a stimulating discussion of related techniques of imitation in Vergil's *Georgics*.

¹⁰ For another possible example of this technique in the *Eclogues*, see Du Quesnay (1977) 55.

Horace's portrayal of the lover's enslavement to his beloved at *Sat.* 2.3.259ff. is a close reworking of the opening scene of Terence's *Eunuchus*, a dialogue between the *adulescens* Phaedria and his slave, Parmeno. The Horatian passage, in its turn, influences Persius 5.161ff. The scholiast, in his note on line 161, observes that Persius looks back beyond Horace, not indeed to Terence, but to Terence's model, Menander, as is indicated by his use of *Dauus* rather than *Parmeno* as the slave's name¹¹.

At 2.5.33ff., Ovid describes how his mistress blushed when he caught her kissing another man at a banquet:

haec ego, quaeque dolor linguae dictauit; at illi
conscia purpureus uenit in ora pudor,
quale coloratum Tithoni coniuge caelum
subrubet, aut sponso uisa puella nouo,
quale rosae fulgent inter sua lilia mixtae
aut, ubi cantatis, Luna, laborat equis,
aut quod, ne longis flaescere possit ab annis,
Maeonis Assyrium femina tinxit ebur.

The comparison of the lascivious mistress' blush to roses mixed with lilies and to dyed ivory is derived with witty incongruity from Vergil's description of the chaste Lavinia's blush at her mother's reference to her proposed marriage to Turnus:

Indum sanguineo ueluti uiolauerit ostro
si quis ebur, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa
alba rosa, talis uirgo dabat ore colores (*Aen.* 12.67ff.).

Ovid substitutes *Maeonis...femina* for Vergil's *quis*. *Maeonis* occurs in Latin first here¹², and may therefore help to alert us to Ovid's allusion to the source of Vergil's ivory-simile, Homer's comparison of the blood from Menelaus' wound to scarlet dye staining ivory:

ὥς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικι μίηνῃ
Μηονίς ἢ Κείρα, παρήϊον ἔμμεναι ἵππων (*Il.* 4.141f.).

At 3.6.43f., Ovid refers to the river Enipeus' love-affair with Tyro:

siccus ut amplecti Salmonida posset, Enipeus
cedere iussit aquam: iussa recessit aqua.

The couplet draws on Verg. *Georg.* 4.359ff., where Cyrene admits

¹¹ See Coffey (1976) 115.

¹² For such formations in *-is* used in Latin first or only by Ovid, see on 1.2.47 *Gangetide*.

Aristaeus to her underwater home:

ita iubet discedere late
flumina, qua iuuenis gressus inferret. at illum
curuata in montis faciem circumstetit unda.

That Ovid has Vergil in mind is assured by the fact that both the Enipeus and the Anio, the next river in Ovid's catalogue, are mentioned by Vergil in his catalogue of rivers a few lines later (468f.). The allusion to the myth of Cyrene may have no particular significance for Ovid's couplet. It is, however, significant that the Vergilian passage echoes *Od.* 11.243f.:

πορφύρεον δ' ἄρα κῦμα περιστάθη, οὐρεῖ ἴσον,
κρῦπτόν, κρύψεν δὲ θεὸν θνητὴν τε γυναῖκα.

There, Homer is describing how the river Enipeus forms a bower over Poseidon as he makes love to Tyro in the guise of the river-god Enipeus. It seems worth speculating that Ovid, or indeed Vergil, may have had a specific reason for linking the legends of Tyro and Cyrene. Two rivers bore the name Enipeus, one in Thessaly, a tributary of the Peneus, the other in Elis, a tributary of the Alpheus. Homer does not specify which was involved in the story of Tyro, and later accounts disagree¹³. According to one version of the story of Cyrene, narrated most fully at Ap. Rhod. 2.500ff., she was abducted to Libya by Apollo when he found her grazing sheep on the banks of the Peneus. Ovid's allusion here to the myth of Cyrene, another victim of divine rape, is possibly an oblique assertion that Homer's location for Poseidon's rape of Tyro ἐν προχοῇς ποταμοῦ...δινήεντος (*Od.* 11.242) signifies the confluence of the Enipeus and Peneus¹⁴.

At 1.14.35f., Ovid comments on his mistress' distress at becoming bald through an attempt to dye her hair:

quid male dispositos quereris periisse capillos?
quid speculum maesta ponis, inepta, manu?

¹³ See RE 2.7.1870f.

¹⁴ Compare the sophisticated manner in which Vergil identifies the Ἰσχυρίου ποταμοῦ μέγας ῥόος at Call. *Ap.* 108 as the Euphrates. That phrase occurs in the sixth line from the end of the hymn. Vergil names the Euphrates three times, at *Georg.* 1.509, 4.561 and *Aen.* 8.726 — in each case, in the sixth line from the end of a book. See Scodel-Thomas (1984). Compare also the learned point made by Gallus, that it is the Hypanis and not, as was more generally thought, the Tanais which *uno tellures diuidit amne duas* (*frg.* 1 Büchner). See Du Quesnay (1981) 78. A prose work by Callimachus himself, *On the rivers of the world*, may have done much to stimulate interest in such matters.

We are to recall Tib. 1.8.9ff.:

quid tibi nunc molles prodest coluisse capillos
saepeque mutatas disposuisse comas,
quid fuco splendente genas ornare, quid unguis
artificis docta subsecuisse manu?

Not only are both passages attacks on excessive *ornatio*, constructed as rhetorical questions introduced by *quid...?* in anaphora¹⁵, but, more specifically, *disponere* is used in poetry with reference to hair-arrangement before Ovid only by Tibullus, in this passage and at 1.9.67¹⁶. Ovid's attention may have been drawn to Tibullus' apparently novel use of *disponere* in 1.8 for a particular reason: it involves a witty adaptation of Callimachus' description of Venus' fussy preparations for the Judgement of Paris at *Lau. Pall.* 21f., echoing δῖς in the same line-position but completely changing the sense:

Κύπρις δὲ διαυγέα χαλκὸν ἐλοῖσα
πολλάκι τὰν αὐτὰν δῖς μετέθηκε κόμαν.

Ovid by-passes Tibullus to exploit Callimachus, describing his mistress as laying down her mirror whereas Callimachus' Venus picks hers up. This reference to Callimachus is anticipated by Ovid's comparison of his mistress' hair to that of Venus in the couplet immediately preceding:

illis contulerim, quas quondam nuda Dione
pingitur umentis sustinuisse manu,

where the epithet *nuda* possibly assists the allusion, since two of the most notable occasions on which Venus was naked were at her rising from the sea and at the Judgement of Paris. An awareness of the Callimachean background here enhances our enjoyment of *Ar.* 1.305f., which is closely modelled on this couplet:

quid tibi cum speculo montana armenta petenti?
quid totiens positas fingis, inepta, comas?

There, Pasiphae is hoping to win approval of her beauty from a bull in the herds on Cretan Ida (cf. 289), just as Callimachus' Venus had

hoped to win approval of her beauty from the herdsman Paris on Trojan Ida (cf. 18 τὰν Ἴδα Φρυγῆς ἐδίκασεν ἔριν).

At 2.11.55f., Ovid concludes his propemptikon to Corinna with a prayer for her early return:

haec mihi quam primum caelo nitidissimus alto
Lucifer admisso tempora portet equo.

The couplet is modelled on Tib. 1.3.93f., a concluding prayer for an early return to Delia:

hoc precor, hunc illum nobis Aurora nitentem
Luciferum roseis candida portet equis.

In that elegy, by describing himself as languishing on Phaeacia, far from Delia, who, he hopes, is waiting chastely for him, spinning with her maids, Tibullus is casting himself in the role of Odysseus¹⁷. Ovid acknowledges that feature of Tibullus' poem by altering *nitentem* to *nitidissimus*, for the superlative is drawn from Homer's account of Odysseus' return to Ithaca at *Od.* 13.93ff.:

εὐτ' ἄστὴρ ὑπέρεσχε φαάντατος, ὅς τε μάλιστα
ἔρχεται ἀγγέλλων φάος Ἡοῦς ἡριγενείης,
τῆμος δὴ νῆσῳ προσεπύλνατο ποντοπόρος νηῦς.

At 3.11.45ff., having recognised the impossibility of renouncing his love for his mistress, Ovid begs her to treat him mercifully:

parce per o lecti socialia iura, per omnes,
qui dant fallendos se tibi saepe, deos,
perque tuam faciem, magni mihi numinis instar,
perque tuos oculos, qui rapuere meos.

He is drawing on Tib. 1.5.7f., where the context is the same:

parce tamen, per te furtiui foedera lecti,
per uenerem quaeso compositumque caput.

Tibullus' couplet draws on Hom. *Il.* 15.36ff., Hera's oath prefacing her assurance to Zeus that she has not been deceiving him in order that the Greeks may gain the upper hand against the Trojans:

ἴστω νῦν τόδε Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρύς ὑπερθε
καὶ τὸ κατειβόμενον Στυγὸς ὕδωρ, ὅς τε μέγιστος
ἄρκος δεινότητός τε πέλει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσι,
σὴ θ' ἱερὴ κεφαλὴ καὶ νοῖτερον λῆχος αὐτῶν
κουρίδιον, τὸ μὲν οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ ποτε μᾶψ ὁμόσαιμι.

¹⁵ Note also the similarity of Tibullus' lines 17f. to Ovid's lines 39f.

¹⁶ See *TLL* 5.1.1422.56ff. Since, however, it is found in Vitruvius (4.1.7), a writer not remarkable for the originality of his diction, the usage may well have been established earlier. (I accept the view that the *De architectura* was largely complete by 27 B.C.)

¹⁷ See Eisenberger (1960), Wimmel (1968) 179f., Bright (1971), Cairns (1979) 44ff.

This allusion to the Homeric $\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta$ is acknowledged by Ovid through the addition of *per omnes*, / *qui dant fallendos se tibi saepe, deos*, which has no counterpart in Tibullus¹⁸.

At 3.8.23f., Ovid laments that he is locked outside his mistress' door because she prefers money to his fine poetry:

ille ego Musarum purus Phoebique sacerdos
ad rigidas canto carmen inane fores.

The couplet is inspired by Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.1ff., one of only two earlier passages in which a poet describes himself as a *sacerdos*¹⁹, and also one of only two earlier passages in which the expression *carmen cantare* is found²⁰:

Odi profanum uolguis et arceo.
faute linguis: carmina non prius
audita Musarum sacerdos
uirginibus puerisque canto.

Instead of shunning the *profanum uolguis* and singing to *uirgines*, the *sacerdos* Ovid sings to, but is shunned by, his philistine mistress. The humour of Ovid's situation is increased if we recall that the Horatian passage is modelled on the opening section of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* which, unlike Horace's stanza, has a specific setting: Callimachus portrays himself as Apollo's priest at the door of the god's temple, whereas Ovid, as Apollo's priest, is at his mistress' door.

A somewhat more intricate nexus of allusions to those same models underlies 2.1.3ff.:

procul hinc, procul este, seueri!
non estis teneris apta theatra modis.
me legat in sponsi facie non frigida uirgo
et rudis ignoto tactus amore puer.

The parody of ritual language in line 3 seems to recall specifically the cry of Apollo's priestess at Verg. *Aen.* 6.258:

procul, o procul este, profani!

which leads us back to Callimachus' second line:

¹⁸ Ovid's oblique reference to Homer may have particular point: Hera's deception involved sleeping with Zeus himself, Ovid's mistress deceives the gods presumably by swearing that she has not been sleeping with lovers other than Ovid himself.

¹⁹ The other is Prop. 3.1.3, which is probably also indebted to Horace.

²⁰ The other is Varro *ap. Non. p.* 108 Lindsay; see *TLL* 3.290.64ff., 469.42ff.

ἐκάς ἐκάς ὅστις ἄλιτρος.

Ovid's prayer in the next couplet, that his poetry should be read by the *uirgo* and the *puer*, then leads us forward again from Callimachus to Horace, who declares that he is singing his songs, of a very different kind from Ovid's, *uirginibus puerisque*.

At 3.4.29ff.:

non proba fit, quam uir seruat, sed adultera cara:
ipse timor pretium corpore maius habet.
indignere licet, iuuat inconcessa uoluptas:
sola placet, 'timeo!' dicere si qua potest,

Ovid is inverting Propertius' argument at 2.23.19f., that it is better to resort to prostitutes than to have affairs with married women:

nec dicet: 'Timeo, propera iam surgere, quaeso:
infelix, hodie uir mihi rure uenit.'

Propertius had been drawing on the farcical scene at Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.127ff.:

nec uereor, ne, dum futuo, uir rure recurat,
ianua frangatur, latret canis, undique magno
pulsa domus strepitu resonet, uepallida lecto
desiliat mulier, miseram se conscia clamet,
cruribus haec metuat, doti deprensa, egomet mi.
discincta tunica fugiendum est et pede nudo,
ne nummi pereant aut puga aut denique fama.
deprendi miserum est: Fabio uel iudice uincam.

Ovid goes on to argue paradoxically that the liaison between Ilia and Mars, part of Rome's venerable foundation-legend, makes adultery an acceptable practice:

rusticus est nimium, quem laedit adultera coniunx,
et notos mores non satis Urbis habet,
in qua Martigenae non sunt sine crimine nati
Romulus Iliades Iliadesque Remus (37ff.).

That story had not been mentioned by Propertius. Ovid is alluding wittily to Horace's lines 125f., where Ilia is referred to as a model of chastity:

haec (sc. a prostitute) ubi supposuit dextro corpus mihi
Ilia et Egeria est; do nomen quodlibet illi. [laeuom,

One final instance of this by-passing technique may be mentioned here. In this case, the *Amores*-passage involved is itself the

immediate model which is by-passed. In 3.1, Ovid describes an epiphany by the goddess Elegy and declares that she makes his love-elegies immortal:

uenit odoratos Elegia nexa capillos,
et, puto, pes illi longior alter erat.
forma decens, uestis tenuissima, uultus amantis,
et pedibus uitium causa decoris erat...
altera (sc. Elegy) das nostro uicturum nomen amoris:
ergo ades et longis uersibus adde breues! (7ff., 65f.).

There are many points of similarity with Call. *frg.* 7.11ff.:

κάλλη τε καὶ αἰόλα βεῖνδε' ἔχουσαι
..... ἀπ' ὅστυγγων δ' αἰὲν ἄλειφα ῥέει,
ἔλλατε νῦν, ἐλέγγωισι δ' ἐνιψήσασθαι λιπώσας
χαίρας ἑμοῖς, ἵνα μοι πολὺ μένωσι τιν ἔτος.

There, Callimachus is in conversation with the Graces. Like Elegy, they are wearing diaphanous dresses and their locks are perfumed. Callimachus begs them to grant immortality to his elegies, which is what Ovid declares that Elegy has done for his. Even the exhortations, ἔλλατε νῦν and *ergo ades*, are comparable. It is, however, perhaps not possible to be absolutely certain that Ovid does here have the Callimachean passage directly in mind until one considers his later account of his meeting with the goddess Flora in the *Fasti*. That episode is clearly indebted to *Am.* 3.1. The description of Flora's arrival:

mille uenit uariis florum dea nexa coronis (4.945)

echoes line 7 and, in postponing his discussion of the Floralia:

tunc repetam, nunc me grandius urget opus (4.948),

Ovid repeats *uerbatim* the final hemistich of the *Amores*-poem. Moreover, Flora is contrasted with goddesses of a censorious and puritanical disposition:

saena leuis decet hanc: non est, mihi credite, non est
illa cothurnatas inter habenda deas (5.347f.).

By describing those goddesses as *cothurnatas*, Ovid unmistakably recalls the antithesis in *Am.* 3.1 between Elegy and Tragedy. (For Tragedy's buskins, cf. 14, 31, 45, 63.) In concluding his interview with Flora, who, like the Graces in the *Aetia*, has been answering aetiological inquiries, Ovid by-passes the *Amores*-poem to echo the

prayer for immortality which Callimachus had made (note again the emphasis on perfume):

omnia finierat: tenues secessit in auras,
mansit odor; posses scire fuisse deam.
floreat ut toto carmen Nasonis in aeuo,
sparge, precor, donis pectora nostra tuis (5.375ff.)²¹.

Etymology

There are only two instances of explicit etymologising in the *Amores*. At 1.8.2ff.:

est quaedam nomine Dipsas anus.
ex re nomen habet: nigri non illa parentem
Memnonis in roseis sobria uidit equis,

the alcoholic *lena* is appropriately given a name derived from διψᾶν. At 3.9.3f.:

flebilis indignos, Elegia, solue capillos:
a, nimis ex uero nunc tibi nomen erit!,

where the goddess who personifies the conventionally mournful genre of elegy is summoned to Tibullus' funeral, Ovid refers to the derivation of her name from ἔλεος (see the note *ad loc.*).

In many other passages, the play, though not made explicit, is easily detected. At 1.15.25f.:

Tityrus et segetes Aeneiaque arma legentur,
Roma triumphati dum caput orbis erit,

Ovid is echoing Verg. *Aen.* 9.446ff.:

fortunati ambo! si quid mea carmina possunt,
nulla dies umquam memori uos eximet aeuo,
dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum
accolet imperiumque pater Romanus habebit.

Vergil's explicit reference to the Capitol ensures that we realise that Ovid is alluding to the well-known belief that the Capitol was so

²¹ It is worth adding that 3.1 also exploits the by-passing technique on a larger scale than in any of the examples discussed above. Like all Roman accounts of *Dichterweihe*, the poem is inevitably influenced by the *Aetia*-prologue. Ovid, however, by-passes that model to draw substantially on Prodicus' fable of the Choice of Heracles and on the traditional tale of the Judgement of Paris, both of which had influenced the manner in which Callimachus presented his literary principles. See the introduction to 3.1.

called because a human skull had been excavated there, a presage of Rome's world-empire; cf. Varro *Ling.* 5.41, Liv. 1.55.5f. with Ogilvie's note, 5.54.7:

hic Capitolium est, ubi quondam capite humano inuento
responsum est eo loco caput rerum summamque imperii fore²².

At 2.1.11ff., where Ovid refers to his abortive *Gigantomachia*²³:

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,

ulta est alludes to the derivation of Τῑτάν from τίσις, an etymology known already to Hesiod; cf. *Theog.* 207ff. (with West's note on 209):

τοὺς δὲ πατὴρ Τιτῆνας ἐπὶ κλησὶν καλέεσκε
παῖδας νεικείων μέγας Οὐρανὸς οὗς τέκεν αὐτός·
φάσκε δὲ τιταίνοντας ἀτασθαλίῃ μέγα ῥέξαι
ἔργον, τοῖο δ' ἔπειτα τίσιν μετόπισθεν ἔσεσθαι,

also Serv. *Aen.* 6.580:

ferunt fabulae Titanas ab irata contra deos Terra ad eius
ultionem creatos, unde et Titanes dicti sunt ἀπὸ τῆς τίσεως, id
est ab ultione.

Vergil makes a closely comparable play rather more explicitly at *Aen.* 6.570f.:

continuo sontis ultrix accincta flagello
Tisiphone quatit insultans;

cf. Serv. *Aen.* 4.609:

ultrix uero, hoc est Tisiphone: nam Graece τίσις ultio dicitur.

Hesiod's alternative derivation of Τῑτάν, from τιταίνειν, is perhaps alluded to by Horace at *Carm.* 3.4.51f.:

fratres...tendentes opaco
Pelion imposuisse Olympo.

²² See also *TLL Onom.* 1.159.50ff.

²³ I follow convention in using this title. In fact, Ovid's description of the poem contains details from the Olympians' wars against the Titans and Aloidae as well as from that against the Giants. These wars, all originally distinct, had become thoroughly confused by the Hellenistic period. The same confusion permits Horace's apparent allusion to an etymology of Τῑτάν in a reference to the Aloidae (see below).

At 2.9.17f., there can be no doubt that Ovid is referring to the derivation of *Roma* from ῥώμη:

Roma, nisi immensum uires promosset in orbem,
stramineis esset nunc quoque tecta casis;

cf. Lycophron 1232f. (of Romulus and Remus):

τοιούσδ' ἐμός τις σύγγονος λείψει διπλοῦς
σκύμνους λέοντας, ἔξοχον ῥώμῃ γένος,

Hor. *Epod.* 16.2:

suis et ipsa Roma uiribus ruit,

Tib. 2.5.57:

Roma, tuum nomen terris fatale regendis²⁴.

In characterising *Ceraunia* as *uiolenta* at 2.11.19, Ovid is alluding to the derivation of that name from κεραυνός. Here also, Vergil offers a more explicit parallel:

ille (sc. Jupiter) flagranti
aut Atho aut Rhodopen aut alta Ceraunia telo
deicit
(*Georg.* 1.331ff.).

At 2.14.11f.:

quique iterum iaceret generis primordia nostri
in uacuo lapides orbe, parandus erat,

Ovid refers to the recreation of the human race from the stones thrown by Deucalion and Pyrrha. The etymological connection made between λᾶας and λαός is fundamental to that myth. The connection had been established already in Hesiod (*frg.* 234 Merkelbach-West) and seems to have been discussed by Callimachus (cf. *frg.* 496 with Pfeiffer's note). Ovid makes the play again, more explicitly, at *Met.* 1.414:

inde genus durum sumus,

where, as here, he is echoing Verg. *Georg.* 1.62f.:

Deucalion uacuum lapides iactauit in orbem,
unde homines nati, durum genus.

Etymology is fundamental also to the brief account of the κτίσις-

²⁴ See also Opelt (1965), Cornell (1975) 17, n. 3, Macleod (1979).

myth of Falerii given at 3.13.31ff.:

Argiua est pompae facies: Agamemnone caeso
et scelus et patrias fugit Halaesus opes
iamque pererratis profugus terraque fretoque
moenia felici condidit alta manu;

cf. *Fast.* 4.73f.:

uenerat Atridae fatis agitatus Halaesus,
a quo se dictam terra Falisca putat²⁵.

As with *Dipsas* and *Elegia* (see above), the word *nomen* signals an etymological play at 3.3.23:

aut sine re nomen deus est frustra timetur.

Ovid is there alluding to the derivation of *deus* from δῆος, making the witty point that *dei* do not deserve to be so called since mortals have no reason to fear them; cf. Serv. *Aen.* 12.139:

quod Graece δῆος, Latine timor uocatur, inde deus dictus est,
quod omnis religio sit timoris.

The same play is even more obvious at *Met.* 3.290f.:

Stygii...conscia sunt
numina torrentis; timor et deus ille deorum est.

The passages discussed so far seem to offer the clearest examples of Ovid's etymologising. It should be noted that, apart from the two instances of explicit word-play (*Dipsas*, *Elegia*), it is never obvious that an awareness that Ovid is etymologising is essential to our appreciation. In all the other passages, one could fail to see the play and not feel that anything was amiss. This is at once the great charm and challenge of Ovid's etymologising and also the great difficulty in assessing whether or not word-play is actually present at all. The following lengthy, but by no means exhaustive, survey of further passages in which word-play may be detected is intended to establish that etymologising is, in fact, a constantly recurring feature of the *Amores*. Inevitably, some cases are more compelling than others, but the great frequency of passages in which etymologising may be present is itself the strongest argument for

²⁵ For etymology as a standard feature of foundation-legends, see Cairns (1979) 80f. In *RE* 7.2230, Eitrem suggests that *Halaesus* may have been thought to be cognate with ἁλῆ. That would enhance Ovid's point in *pererratis* (33), but it is not clear that that link was ever made in antiquity.

accepting that it is present in all or most of them.

According to one etymology, Jupiter's name was derived from *iuuare*; cf. Enn. *ap.* Varro *Ling.* 5.65 (= *Trag.* 359f. Jocelyn):

†haec propter† Iuppiter sunt ista quae dico tibi.
†qua† mortalis atque urbes beluasque omnis iuuat,

Cic. *Nat.* 2.64:

Iuppiter — id est iuuans pater, quem conuersis casibus
appellamus a iuuando Iouem.

The helper-god could not help Ovid when his mistress forced him to abandon his *Gigantomachia*:

Iuppiter, ignoscas: nil me tua tela iuuabant;
clausa tuo maius ianua fulmen habet (2.1.19f.)²⁶.

Once again, Vergil provides a very comparable play, in this case somewhat more subtle than Ovid's, since the phrasing does not alert us to it quite so obviously²⁷. At *Aen.* 12.813f., Juno admits:

Iuturnam...misero succurrere fratri
suasi

and, at 872, Juturna herself laments:

quid nunc te tua, Turne, potest germana iuuare?

Juturna's name was derived from *iuuare*; cf. Varro *Ling.* 5.71:

lympha Iuturna quae iuuaret,

Serv. *Aen.* 12.139:

Iuturna fons...cui nomen a iuuando est inditum.

It may also be relevant to the first Vergilian passage that Juno's name had the same derivation; cf. Varro *Ling.* 5.67:

ea dicta, quod una iuuat cum Ioue, Iuno.

Just as our attention is drawn at 2.1.19 by the similarity in sound of the words with which Ovid is playing, so also at 3.6.23:

flumina debebant iuuenes in amore iuuare

²⁶ For the etymological play in *fulmen*, meaning both 'thunder-bolt' and 'door-bolt', see on 1.6.16.

²⁷ Bartelink (1965) provides a useful introduction to Vergil's etymologising. On the play discussed here, see p. 78.

the alliteration in *iuuenes...iuuare* is noticeable. *iuuenis* was supposed to be derived from *iuuare*; cf. Censorinus 14.2 (perhaps drawing on Varro [cf. *Ling.* 5.96]):

iuuenes appellatos eo quod rem publicam in re militari possent iuuare.

Such a derivation is not apposite here: Ovid is arguing that young men should receive help from rivers, not that they should give it. In disappointing our initial expectation, however, he invites us to look more closely: on the second page of Paulus' lexicon of etymologies, which draws ultimately on the work of Verrius Flaccus, the tutor to Augustus' grandsons, we find the splendid entry:

aqua dicitur, a qua iuuamur.

At 3.7.61:

quid iuuat ad surdas si cantet Phemius aures?

where *iuuare* is used in the sense 'give pleasure', we may recall that, at Hom. *Od.* 22.330, Phemius is called Τερπιάδης. The scholiast *ad loc.* links the patronymic with the delightfulness of Phemius' singing: Τέρπιος παῖς; ἢ ὁ τέρπων, cf. 1.346f. μήτηρ ἐμή, τί τ' ἄρα φθονέεις ἐρίηρον ἀοιδόν (sc. Phemius) / τέρπειν ὅπηι οἱ νόος ὀρνυται; At 3.7.13f.:

*tacta tamen ueluti gelida mea membra cicuta
segnia propositum destituere meum,*

the derivation of *segnis* from *sine igni* enhances the point in *gelida*; cf. Serv. *auct. Aen.* 2.374:

segnis autem est proprie frigidus, sine igni.

Servius *auctus* observes a comparable play at *Aen.* 12.521ff.:

*ac uelut immissi diuersis partibus ignes
arentem in siluam et uirgulta sonantia lauro,
aut ubi decursu rapido de montibus altis
dant sonitum spumosi amnes et in aequora currunt
quisque suum populatus iter: non segnus ambo
Aeneas Turnusque ruunt per proelia; nunc, nunc
fluctuat ira intus, rumpuntur nescia uinci
pectora, nunc totis in uulnera uiribus itur.*

On *non segnus... / ...ruunt*, he comments:

bene comparationibus diuersis singula reddidit ad similitudinem

ueram, quia ambos ignibus aut fluminibus comparauerat. ergo 'non segnus' ad ignem retulit, quia segnus quasi sine igne sit. 'fluctuat' autem ad amnes eum retulisse nulla dubitatio est.

At 3.7.57f.:

*illa graues potuit quercus adamantaque durum
surdaque blanditiis saxa mouere suis,*

Ovid is echoing Prop. 1.9.31f.:

*illis (sc. blanditiis) et silices et possint cedere quercus,
nedum tu possis, spiritus iste levis.*

graues pointedly picks up Propertius' *leuis*. *grauis* is, however, a somewhat unexpected epithet for a tree. It is so used elsewhere only at *Met.* 11.244 and in Paulus' explanation (p. 309 Lindsay) of the word *quercus*:

*quercus dicitur, quod id genus arboris graue sit ac durum...
querqueram enim grauem et magnam quidam putant dici.*

Ovid's rejection of vulgar ambitions at 1.15.35f.:

*uilia miretur uulgus; mihi flauus Apollo
pocula Castalia plena ministret aqua*

will seem the more emphatic if one recalls the derivation of the god of poetry's name from ἀ-πολλών; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 393C:

Ἀπόλλων μὲν γὰρ οἶον ἀρνούμενος τὰ πολλὰ καὶ τὸ πλήθος ἀποφάσκων ἐστίν²⁸.

For a simpler play of this type, cf. Call. *Ap.* 69f.:

ὦ πολλόν, πολλοί σε Βοηδρόμιον καλέουσι,
πολλοὶ δὲ Κλάριον, πάντη δέ τοι οὔνομα πουλύ.

At 3.8.23:

ille ego Musarum purus Phoebique sacerdos,

the juxtaposition of *purus* to *Phoebique* is pointed; cf. Schol. *Ap. Rhod.* 2.302:

φοῖβον γὰρ τὸ καθαρόν, ὅθεν καὶ Φοῖβος ὁ Ἀπόλλων, διὰ τὸ καθαρόν,

Macro. *Sat.* 1.17.33:

²⁸ Cf. also Plotin. 5.5.6, Macro. *Sat.* 1.17.7.

plerique autem a specie et nitore Φοῖβον, id est καθαρὸν καὶ
λαμπρόν, dictum putant.

The association of Φοῖβος with λαμπρός is relevant to 1.5.5f., where that title is juxtaposed to *crepuscula*:

qualia sublucent fugiente crepuscula Phoebo
aut ubi nox abiit nec tamen orta dies.

That beautifully languid couplet, which contributes so much to the setting of the scene for Corinna's epiphany, is inspired by some etymological work as dry and austere as Varro's *De lingua Latina*. Ovid uses the word *crepusculum* eight times elsewhere²⁹; it occurs earlier only at Plaut. *Cas.* 40, *Condal. frg.* 1, *Paras. frg.* 1³⁰, Varro *Ling.* 6.5, 7.77, *frg. ap. Serv. Aen.* 2.268, and it is not found more than once in any subsequent classical author except Columella, who has it ten times in prose. The rarity of the word and the similarity of the phrasing of the pentameter to that of Varro's explanation of the meaning of *crepusculum* at *Ling.* 6.5:

crepusculum significat dubium; ab eo res dictae dubiae creperae,
quod crepusculum dies etiam nunc sit an iam nox multis
dubium

suggest that Ovid is thinking here of that etymology, and that suggestion is strengthened by the more obvious etymologising at *Met.* 4.399ff.:

iamque dies exactus erat tempusque subibat,
quod tu nec tenebras nec posses dicere lucem,
sed cum luce tamen dubiae confinia noctis,

and at 11.596:

dubiae...crepuscula lucis;

cf. also *Epist.* 14.21f.:

modo facta crepuscula terris,
ultima pars lucis primaque noctis erat.

This etymological play is of particular interest, because it has a close parallel at Ap. Rhod. 2.669ff.:

²⁹ At *Epist.* 14.21, four times in the *Metamorphoses* and three times in the *Fasti*.

³⁰ The Plautine fragments are known only from Varro *Ling.* 7.77, where they are quoted because they contain the word *crepusculum*.

ἤμος δ' οὐτ' ἄρ πω φάος ἄμβροτον οὐτ' ἔτι λίην
ὀρφναίη πέλεται, λεπτὸν δ' ἐπιδέδρομε νυκτί
φέγγος, ὅτ' ἀμφιλύκην μιν ἀνεγρόμενοι καλέουσιν,

where Apollonius is offering a gloss to illuminate the obscure word ἀμφιλύκη, which is found earlier only at Hom. *Il.* 7.433:

ἤμος δ' οὐτ' ἄρ πω ἥως, ἔτι δ' ἀμφιλύκη νύξ.³¹

Ovid may also be matching a Greek etymology with a Latin equivalent at 2.19.43:

mordeat ista tuas aliquando cura medullas,

where the phrasing recalls one of the ancient explanations of *cura*; cf. Paul. Fest. p. 43 Lindsay:

cura dicta est, quasi coreda³².

At *Op.* 66 γυιοβόρους μελεδῶνας, Hesiod hints at the derivation of μελεδῶνη from μέλη ἐσθίειν³³. At 2.17.18 *iusto...Numae*, there is a straightforward allusion to the derivation of the king's name; cf. Serv. *Aen.* 6.808 *Numa dictus est ἀπὸ τῶν νόμων*. At 1.9.5f., in illustration of his view that *militat omnis amans*, Ovid observes:

quos petiere duces animos in milite forti,
hos petit in socio bella puella uiro.

Although it had been frequent in Catullus, *bellus* occurs only here in Ovid and is very rarely used by the other Augustan poets (see the note). It is therefore reasonable to suppose that Ovid had a particular reason for describing the girl as *bella* rather than, as would have been more normal, *pulchra*. His motive is not hard to find. He is alluding to the derivation of *bellum*, a word readily brought to mind by the context:

bellum, quod res bella non sit (Varro *ap. Aug. Dialect.* 6 [= GRF265]).

The same play may be intended also at 2.14.1ff.:

Quid iuuat immunes belli cessare puellas
nec fera peltatas agmina uelle sequi,

³¹ For a possible allusion to Callimachus' definition of ἄγχαυρος at *frg.* 260.64 as meaning 'the time near dawn', see on 1.6.65.

³² Ovid is perhaps anticipated by Catull. 66.23 *quam penitus maestas exedit cura medullas*; cf. also *Pont.* 1.1.73f. *mea perpetuos curarum pectora morsus / ...habent*.

³³ See West (1964) and *ad loc.*

si sine Marte suis patiuntur uulnera telis...?
scilicet ut careat rugarum crimine uenter,
sternetur pugnae tristis harena tuae?

Corinna's reason for committing abortion is to preserve her beauty, but war, from which she is *immunis* and to which abortion is likened, is not a beautiful thing. At 2.14.17f., Ovid attempts to persuade Corinna that abortion is wrong by observing:

si Venus Aenean grauida temerasset in aluo,
Caesaribus tellus orba futura fuit.

Several explanations of the name *Caesar* were current³⁴. One of them will have ensured that Corinna was not unduly impressed by Ovid's argument:

auspicatius enecta parente gignuntur, sicut Scipio Africanus
prior natus primusque Caesarum a caeso matris utero dictus
(Plin. *Nat.* 7.47).

At 1.10.15f., Ovid argues that his mistress should not demand payment from him, because the god of love himself is a naked and honest little boy who has no thought for financial matters:

et puer est et nudus Amor; sine sordibus annos
et nullas uestes, ut sit apertus, habet.

The word *sordes* is not common in poetry; it is found seven times in Horace (only once in the *Odes*), elsewhere in Ovid only at *Ars* 1.519, never in Vergil, Tibullus or Propertius. Its occurrence here therefore alerts us to an etymological play. Paul. Fest. p. 248 Lindsay reports a connection between *puer* and *sordes*:

paedidos sordidos atque obsoletos, tractum uocabulum a
Graeco, quia παῖδες, id est pueri, talis sint aetatis ut a sordibus
nesciant abstinere.

Ovid has extended the meaning of *sordes* from 'filth' to 'filthy lucre'³⁵, thus wittily suggesting that the link between *paedidus* and παῖς works κατ' ἀντιφράσιν, i.e. is of the type *bellum, quod res bella non sit* (see above)³⁶. There is a similar, but simpler, play at *Rem.* 23f.

³⁴ See *TLL Onom.* 1.34.40ff.

³⁵ For *sordes* and its cognates used with reference to avarice, cf. 1.10.48 *sordida praeda*, *OLD* s.vv. *sordes* 4a and b, *sordide* 2, *sordidus* 8.

³⁶ It may be worth noting that, in two of its seven occurrences in Horace (*Epod.* 17.46, *Carm.* 2.10.7), *sordes* is juxtaposed to *obsoletus*, which appears in Paulus' explanation of *paedidus*.

where, echoing this passage, Ovid alludes to the connection between παῖς and παῖζειν in saying to Cupid:

et puer es, nec te quicquam nisi ludere oportet:
lude; decent annos mollia regna tuos.

It is tempting to detect a further etymological play in this *Amores*-couplet, in the word *apertus*. In the following lines (quoted below), Ovid emphasises that Cupid is Venus' son. Venus (Aphrodite) and the verb *aperire* dispute the etymology of *Aprilis*; cf. *Fast.* 4.61f.:

sed Veneris mensem Graio sermone notatum
auguror; a spumis est dea dicta maris

with Bömer's note, and 87ff.:

nam, quia uer aperit tunc omnia densaque cedit
frigoris asperitas fetaque terra patet,
Aprilem memorant ab aperto tempore dictum,
quem Venus iniecta uindicat alma manu.

Here, Ovid is perhaps conflating the two derivations, to suggest that Cupid has all the more reason to be *apertus* because his mother is the goddess who opens all things; for that conflation, cf. *Fast. Praen. CIL* 1 p. 316:

Aprilis a Venere...hoc mense quia fruges flores animaliaque ac
maria et terrae aperiuntur.

There is a comparably elaborate play at Hor. *Carm.* 4.11.14ff.:

Idus tibi sunt agendaе,
qui dies mensem Veneris marinae
findit Aprilem.

Horace is alluding to the derivation of *Aprilis* from Ἀφροδίτη and, as a compliment to Maecenas' descent from the Etruscan *lucumones*, to the derivation of *Idus* from *iduate*, an Etruscan word which, like *findere*, means 'divide'³⁷. At 1.10.19f.:

nec Venus apta feris Veneris nec filius armis:
non decet imbelles aera merere deos,

we may recall the derivation of the name Ἀφροδίτη from ἄβρο-

³⁷ Cf. Ps.-Acron *ad loc.*, *TLL* 7.1.238.78ff. It may be that, in choosing the word *findis*, Horace is also hinting at the derivation of *Aprilis* from *aperire*. The case for that derivation rests on the idea that the earth opens up in spring; *terram aperire* and *terram findere* are practically synonymous terms for opening the earth by ploughing.

δίατος; cf. Schol. Eur. *Tro.* 990:

οἱ δὲ Ἀβροδίτην, ἀβροδίατόν τινα οὖσαν· μόνη γὰρ οὐκ οἶδε
πολεμικὰ ἔργα.

Yet another derivation of the same goddess' name seems to be alluded to at 1.1.7f.:

quid, si praecripat flauae Venus arma Mineruae,
uentilet accensas flaua Minerua faces?

uentilare is never common in pagan Latin. It occurs elsewhere in Augustan poetry only at 1.7.54:

ut cum populeas uentilat aura comas,

where there is an obvious play on its derivation from *uentus*, and at Prop. 4.3.50, which is clearly related to this passage:

hanc Venus, ut uiuat, uentilat ipsa facem.

The assonance here and in the Propertian line suggests an association of Venus' name with *uentus*³⁸. I can adduce no direct evidence for that etymology. Varro, however, offers such a derivation for the name of Venilia, the sea-goddess who is the mother of Turnus (Verg. *Aen.* 10.76), the arch-enemy of Venus' son Aeneas:

Venilia a ueniendo ac uento (*Ling.* 5.72).

The Veronese scholia to *Aen. loc. cit.* suggest that Venilia was commonly equated with Venus:

deam Veniliam alii Venerem, quod in mari nata sit³⁹.

Once we note the link between *Venus* and *uentilet*, it is easy to detect a further play, on the name of Minerva, who is the actual subject of *uentilet*. Paul. Fest. p. 109 Lindsay reports:

Minerua dicta...quod fingatur pingaturque minitans armis⁴⁰.

That etymology was doubtless influenced by the commonplace derivation of Παλλάς from πάλλειν, which means much the same as *uentilare*; cf. e.g. Serv. *Aen.* 1.39

³⁸ For such assonance, cf. Lucr. 1.2ff. *alma Venus... /... / te, dea, te fugiunt uenti*, Tib. 1.4.21 *Veneris...uenti* and note also *Anth.* 941.29 (of Venus) *uentilat afflatu caelum*.

³⁹ The other derivation of Venilia's name given by Varro, *a uentendo*, is also applied to Venus; see on 1.10.33 *quae Venus ex aequo uentura est grata duobus*.

⁴⁰ Cf. Cic. *Nat.* 2.67, 3.62.

Pallas...Minerua ἀπὸ τοῦ πάλλειν τὸ δόρυ, id est ab hastae
concussione.

Thus, by exploiting etymological associations, Ovid has contrived to emphasise with brilliant economy both Venus' appropriateness and Minerva's inappropriateness as the goddess who brandishes the torches of love. At 1.6.59f., Ovid threatens the intransigent door-keeper:

nox et Amor uinumque nihil moderabile suadent;
illa pudore uacat, Liber Amorque metu.

He might have written *Bacchus* in the pentameter, but *Liber* is more effective; cf. Sen. *Dial.* 9.17.8:

Liber...non ob licentiam linguae dictus est, sed quia liberat
seruitio curarum animum et adserit uegetatque et audaciorem
in omnes conatus facit.

Horace hints at the equivalent association of Λυαῖος with λύειν at *Epod.* 9.37f.:

curam metumque Caesaris rerum iuuat
dulci Lyaeo soluere,

as does Propertius at 3.5.21 (see Fedeli's note):

me iuuet et multo mentem uincire Lyaeo.

Ovid's threat is perhaps made the more ominous by the etymological connotations of *nox* and *uinum*; cf. Varro *Ling.* 6.6:

quod nocet, nox

and 5.37:

uitis a uino, id a ui.

At 3.1.6:

quod mea, quaerebam, Musa moueret, opus,

the somewhat contorted word-order, juxtaposing *Musa* to *quaerebam*, perhaps suggests that Ovid is alluding to the derivation of Μοῦσα from μῶσθαι; cf. Plato *Crat.* 406A:

τὰς δὲ Μούσας τε καὶ ὅλως τὴν μουσικὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ μῶσθαι, ὥς
ἔοικεν, καὶ τῆς ζητήσεώς τε καὶ φιλοσοφίας τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο
ἐπωνόμασεν,

Cassiod. *Inst. Diu.* 2.5.1:

Musae...appellatae sunt *apo tu maso*, id est a quaerendo, quod per ipsas...uis carminum et uocis modulatio quaereretur.

Horace may intend the same play at *Carm.* 2.1.37ff.:

sed ne relictis, Musa, procax iocis
Caeae retractes munera neniae;
mecum Dionaeo sub antro
quaere modos leuiore plectro.

Socrates had derived Pelops' name from τὸ πέλας ὄρᾶν, arguing that he had been unable to foresee the consequences for his descendants of his treacherous murder of the charioteer Myrtilus, through whose connivance he had won Hippodamia in the race against her father Oenomaus; cf. Plato *Crat.* 395C:

δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ τῷ Πέλοπι τὸ ὄνομα ἐμμέτρως κεῖσθαι·
σημαίνει γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα τὸν τὰ ἐγγὺς ὄρῶντα.

Ovid may be giving that etymology an erotic application at 3.2.15f.:

a, quam paene Pelops Pisaea concidit hasta,
dum spectat uultus, Hippodamia, tuos!,

arguing that Pelops nearly came to grief in the race because he was gazing too intently at Hippodamia to escape Oenomaus. At 3.6.75f.:

cur, modo Vestalis, taedas inuitor ad ullas,
turpis et Iliacis infitianda focus?,

focus links *Vesta* with ἑστία, an etymology for the goddess' name which Ovid elsewhere presents alongside the notorious alternative *ui stando*:

Vesta eadem est et terra: subest uigil ignis utrique:
significant sedem terra focusque suam...
stat ui terra sua: ui stando Vesta uocatur;
causaque par Grai nominis esse potest
(*Fast.* 6.267f., 299f.)⁴¹.

At 2.11.3f.:

quae concurrentes inter temeraria cautes
conspicuam fuluo uellere uexit ouem,

not only does the placing of the adjective *temeraria*, trapped

⁴¹ See Bömer on 6.267, *RE* Suppl. 8.1718ff.

concurrentes inter...cautes, convey a vivid impression of the Argo's hazardous passage, but its juxtaposition to *cautes* also draws attention to an etymological play which serves to emphasise the foolhardiness of the expedition. *cautes* was thought to be derived from *cauere*; cf. *Isid. Orig.* 16.3.3:

cautes...dictae a cauendo, quasi cautae.

temerarius is opposite in meaning to *cautus*, the past participle of *cauere*; cf. e.g. *Epist.* 18.189f., *Ars* 2.83:

incautis nimium temerarius annis,

Sen. *Contr.* 2.1.38, Curt. 3.8.10, 9.8.21, Sen. *Epist.* 14.8:

temerarius gubernator...at ille cautior.

The mss-tradition apparently favours the form *cautes* in all occurrences of the word in Ovid. Here, one might have expected the form *cotes*, appropriate to the Ennian *color* of the passage; cf. *Prisc. Gramm.* 2.39.3ff. Keil:

au...transit in o productam more antiquo ut...cotes pro cautes⁴².

That form would have enhanced the archaising alliteration of the framing words: *concurrentes...cotes*. Ovid may, however, have preferred the form *cautes* in order to assist detection of the etymological play. *cautes* features in an etymological play also at *Met.* 7.418f.:

quae (sc. spumae) quia nascuntur dura uiuacia caute,
agrestes aconita uocant.

Ovid is there alluding to two derivations of *aconitum*, both from ἀκόνη, and also, as *dura* indicates, from ἀκονίτι; cf. *Plin. Nat.* 27.10:

nascitur in nudis cautibus, quas aconas nominant, et ideo
aconitum aliqui dixere, nullo iuxta, ne puluere quidem, nutri-
ente [= ἀκονίτι].

There is a further play of this type at *Epist.* 21.211f.:

mirabar quare tibi nomen Acontius esset;
quod faciat longe uulnus, acumen habes.

The play *Acontius* / ἀκόντιον assumes a link between ἀκόντιον and ἀκόνη, from which *acumen* was thought to be derived; cf. *Paul. Fest.*

⁴² See also Fedeli on *Prop.* 1.3.4.

p. 23 Lindsay:

acies, acumen, acus et acuere dicuntur ab ἀκόνη, quam Latine dicimus cotem.

Here again, Ovid may be echoing a Greek antecedent, for Callimachus seems to have made a similar play on Acontius' name; see Pfeiffer on *frg.* 70:

ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τόξου
αὐτὸς ὁ τοξευτῆς ἄρδιν ἔχων ἐτέρου.

A ship is the subject of the verb *currere* first at Prop. 1.14.3, 2.1.34, Verg. *Aen.* 5.862 and *Am.* 2.11.23f.:

sero respicitur tellus, ubi fune soluto
currit in immensum panda carina salum⁴³.

Ovid seems to be playing on the derivation of *carina* from *currere*; cf. Isid. *Orig.* 19.2.1:

carina a currendo dicta, quasi currina.

There is a simpler play in the second Propertian passage:

Actiaque in Sacra currere rostra Via.

As Enk observes, we are there to think of the *currus triumphalis*. For the derivation of *currus* from *currere*, cf. e.g. Isid. *Orig.* 18.35.1:

currus...a cursu dictus.

Both Propertius and Ovid are possibly anticipated by Catullus:

ipsa leui fecit uolitantem flamine currum,
pineae coniungens inflexae texta carinae.
illa rudem cursu prima imbuit Amphitriten (64.9ff.).

In the hexameter here, Ovid, who is warning Corinna of the perils of sea-travel, possibly intends that we should recognise the ominously funereal connotations of *funis*; cf. Serv. *Aen.* 6.224:

facem de fune, ut Varro dicit, unde et funus dictum est.

The next pentameter:

et prope tam letum quam prope cernit aquam

⁴³ See *TLL* 4.1515.25ff., and note also *Pont.* 4.3.5f. *dum mea puppis erat ualida fundata carina, / qui mecum uelles currere, primus eras.* θείν / τρέχειν is so used as early as Hom. *Il.* 1.483.

conveys a commonplace thought in a conventional manner (see the note), but we cannot be sure that it is not influenced by the wonderful explanation offered for the word θάλασσα at *Etym. Magn.* 441.28f.:

παρὰ τὸ ἄσπον εἶναι θανάτου γίνεται θάνασσα, καὶ θάλασσα.

As is clear from these two aspects of the *Amores*, the by-passing of immediate models and the making of etymological plays, the poetry is highly sophisticated. As is equally clear, however, the sophistication is not obtrusive. Ovid, unlike some other Callimachean poets, does not parade his learning. He practises what he preaches at *Ars* 2.313: *si latet, ars prodest*. The unobtrusiveness of the sophistication is itself one of his poetry's most sophisticated features, and also explains why it appealed both to the *docti* and to a wider readership. The uninitiated could enjoy the *Amores* untroubled by any suspicion of their own limitation as readers, while the *docti* will have enjoyed the challenge of probing beneath the glittering surface. Ovid acknowledges this wide range of competence in his public at *Ars* 2.281ff., with a cheerful urbanity which contrasts favourably with Callimachus' often mordant asperity:

sunt tamen et doctae, rarissima turba, puellae;
altera non doctae turba, sed esse uolunt.
utraque laudetur per carmina; carmina lector
commendet dulci quali acumque sono.
his ergo aut illis uigilatum carmen in ipsas
forsitan exigui muneris instar erit.

We should not, however, overestimate Ovid's *doctrina*. He was not a chalcenic scholar, and did not require even the most informed of his readers to be so either⁴⁴. In all the examples of the by-passing of immediate models discussed above, the sophistication lies solely with the technique; the texts alluded to are not themselves arcane. Similarly, whereas an etymological play in the poetry of Callimachus may have the serious and constructive purpose of offering an interpretation of a controversial word, based on his professional philological studies, Ovid's etymologising is based on the instruction which he had received at school⁴⁵. Just as he amused

⁴⁴ It is worth noting, however, that Ovid's contemporary, Valgius Rufus, whose poetry included laments in elegiacs (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 2.9), also published etymological studies (cf. Gell. 12.3.1f., Charis. *Gramm.* 1.108.28 Keil).

⁴⁵ For etymology as part of the educational curriculum, see Cairns (1979) 92 with n. 15, Rawson (1985) 117ff.

his friends by the exploitation in unfamiliar contexts of *sententiae* made familiar by the rhetoricians and of well-worn themes for declamation (see pp. 68ff.), so he amused them by the vitality with which he inspired the austere scholastic study of etymology. The etymologies themselves will have caused no difficulty; Ovid demanded of his readers only the ingenuity to recognise them in their new surroundings.

3

Recitatio

It is difficult to suppose that Ovid could have expected the full subtlety of the *Amores* to be appreciated without careful and leisurely study. Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that the poems were written for oral delivery as well as for private reading. Asinius Pollio seems to have made the *recitatio* fashionable at Rome in the years following his triumph in 39 or 38 B.C.¹, and Ovid greatly favoured the institution. It was to become a source of much sorrow to him at Tomis that he had no appreciative audience to whom he could recite his poetry; cf. *Trist.* 3.14.39f.:

nullus in hac terra, recitem si carmina, cuius
intellecturis auribus utar, adest,

4.1.89ff., 4.10.113f., 5.12.53f., *Pont.* 1.5.57ff. Writing poetry under such circumstances seemed pointless:

in tenebris numerosos ponere gestus,
quodque legas nulli scribere carmen, idem est.
excitat auditor studium, laudataque uirtus
crescit, et immensum gloria calcar habet.
hic mea cui recitem nisi flauis scripta Corallis,
quasque alias gentes barbarus Hister habet?

(*Pont.* 4.2.33ff.)

At *Trist.* 4.10.57ff. (quoted on p. 74), Ovid records specifically that he recited Corinna-poems in his youth. The *Amores* themselves show an awareness both of a readership and of an audience. In the epigram, the personified books of the *Amores* address their reader:

ut iam nulla tibi nos sit legisse uoluptas,
at leuior demptis poena duobus erit (3f.).

¹ Cf. Sen. *Contr.* 4 Pref. 2 *primus... omnium Romanorum aduocatis hominibus scripta sua recitauit* with Dalzell (1956), also Mayor on Juv. 3.9, *RE* 2.1.435ff., Williams (1978) 303ff., Rawson (1985) 52.

ARCA

Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs

20

OVID: AMORES

**TEXT, PROLEGOMENA AND
COMMENTARY**

in four volumes

J C McKEOWN

**VOLUME I
TEXT AND PROLEGOMENA**

General Editors: Francis Cairns and Robin Seager
Assistant Editors: Neil Adkin, Sandra Cairns, Frederick Williams

ISSN 0309-5541

X FRANCIS C