

5

The Arrangement of the Poems¹

Having excised some of the poems in the original five books, and having perhaps revised others, Ovid was left with a collection totalling slightly more than 2,400 lines. He could not publish as a single book the poems which he chose to retain. A single book could not comfortably accommodate three programmatic elegies giving three different reasons why Ovid was a love-poet (1.1, 2.1, 3.1) and two concluding σφραγίς-poems (1.15, 3.15). More importantly, convention dictated that poetry-books should contain between 700 and 1,000 lines. Of the thirty-eight books of Ovid's poetry the length of which is known, all but five observe this convention; the exceptions are *Met.* 5 (678), 12 (628), *Trist.* 2 (576), 4 (678) and the *Ibis* (642) and, if one makes no allowance for interstices, the only Augustan poetry-books to exceed 1,000 lines are Hor. *Carm.* 3 (1,004 [retaining 11.17-20]), *Epist.* 1 (1,004), Prop. 2 (1,362; but see below) and 3 (1,010). Hence, in the second edition, the poems are arranged in three books, containing respectively 776², 810 and either (omitting 3.5) 824 or (retaining 3.5) 870 lines.

Ovid may, however, have had a more creative reason for producing a three-book version. Just as Statius' division of the *Thebaid* into twelve books may be an acknowledgment of his veneration of the *Aeneid* (cf. esp. *Theb.* 12.816), so Ovid is perhaps inviting comparison with Prop. 1-3, which have as their main theme Propertius' love for Cynthia³. What the mss present as Propertius'

¹ The arrangement of the collection is studied in detail by McCaffrey (1974), Lörcher (1975) and Wille (1984), that of Book 1 by Hofstaedter (1972) and Olstein (1979), that of Book 2 by Lawrence (1973). See also Marg-Harder 166ff., Dettmer (1983) 49ff. On the arrangement of Augustan poetry-books in general, see Kroll (1924) 225ff., Port (1926), Buchheit (1962) 43ff., Froesch (1968) 55ff., Michelfeit (1969), Dettmer (1983) 1ff.

² I here include the epigram. For speculation about its position in the *uolumen*, see the introduction to that poem.

³ This possibility is enhanced if, as is suggested by Williams (1968) 479ff., Propertius' first three books received their definitive publication as a single collection; against that highly speculative view, however, see Barsby (1974).

second book, however, may be a conflation of two books⁴. If that is so, Propertius' Cynthia-elegies were published in four books, perhaps in homage to Gallus' four-book collection of Lycoris-elegies. If Catullus' poems were published in three books⁵, Ovid may have had that collection in mind, since Catullus was regarded by the Augustan elegists as a love-poet⁶. Horace's *Odes* 1-3, which seem to have been published together⁷, afford a less directly relevant precedent for a three-book collection. Hermesianax' collection of love-stories in elegiacs, the *Leontion*, was in three books, but it is not known what influence, if any, that work had on the organisation of Roman collections of love-elegies. When the *Ars Amatoria* was expanded from two books to three (see p. 77) by the addition of the advice for women (Book 3), that poem formed a companion-work to the *Amores* in scope as well as in subject. We do not know in what form the *Heroides* were published but, in the light of Ovid's practice elsewhere with regard to the length of books, it seems reasonable to speculate that the single epistles (1-15), containing about 2,350 lines⁸, may have appeared in three books⁹.

As printed in the present edition, the books contain 15, 19 and 14 poems respectively. The totals for Books 2 and 3 are not, however, certain: it is not universally accepted that 2.2 and 3 are separate elegies, or that 2.9 and 3.11 are single elegies or that 3.5 is spurious. Some modern editions print 2.2 and 3 separately, divide 2.9 and 3.11 and excise 3.5, thus producing totals of 15, 20 and 15. That greater symmetry has a certain attraction. Many books of Augustan poetry comprise multiples of five poems: Verg. *Ecl.* (10), Hor. *Sat.* 1 (10), *Carm.* 2 (20), 3 (30), 4 (15), *Epist.* 1 (20), Tib. 1 (10), Ov. *Trist.* 3 (15), 4 (10), 5 (15), *Pont.* 1 (10). (For *Trist.* 3, I accept the division of poem 4, for *Trist.* 5, that of poem 7. Propertius' third book may have 25 elegies but, as in all his other books, poem-divisions are problematic. It is reasonable to suppose that if, as speculated above, the single

⁴ See King (1980), Heiden (1982).

⁵ How Catullus' poems were published remains a matter for speculation; see Wiseman (1979) 175ff., Clausen (1982), Syndikus (1985) 52ff.

⁶ See on 3.9.61f.

⁷ See Nisbet-Hubbard's introduction to Book 1, pp. xxxvff.

⁸ I regard the *Epistula Sapphus* as spurious, but the poem which it has supplanted was presumably of much the same length as the fourteen authentic extant single *Heroides*.

⁹ See Pulbrook (1977) 33ff., who also anticipates, and provides detailed arguments in favour of, the suggestion proposed below, that each of the three books contained five epistles.

Heroides were published in three books, each book contained five epistles.) This frequency of multiples of five may seem too high to be merely coincidental, but it does not guarantee that Ovid adopted that principle in the construction of all the books in the *Amores*. Certainly, Horace has no such overall symmetry in his first collection of *Odes* for, although Book 2 contains twenty poems and Book 3 thirty, there are thirty-eight in Book 1, and Ovid himself seems to eschew it deliberately in *Pont.* 1-3, for the ten poems in Book 1 were published together¹⁰ with the eleven in Book 2 and the nine in Book 3¹¹. Since neither the independence of 2.3, nor the unity of 2.9 and 3.11 nor the authenticity of 3.5 seem capable of definitive proof or refutation, I have reserved those problems for discussion in the commentary and, in the following observations on the arrangement of the poems, I leave them unanswered.

In *Pont.* 3.9, Ovid laments that the stultifying environment at Tomis has deprived him of the incentive to compose his poetry with proper artistic rigour. Among the defects which he specifies is random ordering:

nec liber ut fieret, sed uti sua cuique daretur
littera, propositum curaue nostra fuit.
postmodo collectas utcumque sine ordine iunxi,
hoc opus electum ne mihi forte putes (51ff.).

In making this apology, Ovid recognises the aesthetic importance of a careful arrangement of the poems in a collection. *A priori*, therefore, we should expect that he has taken such care with the second edition of the *Amores*, published in more favourable circumstances than were the exile-poems¹².

In 1.1, Ovid describes how he came to be a love-elegist; in 1.2, he submits to the power of Cupid; in 1.3, he promises fidelity to a girl who has recently captivated him and begs her to allow him to write love-elegies in praise of her. This introductory sequence encourages us to expect a chronological arrangement for the collection, tracing

¹⁰ See Froesch (1968) *passim*.

¹¹ I do not accept Froesch's attempt ([1968] 141ff.) to balance the books by transplanting 2.11 to follow 3.4.

¹² In fact, *Pont.* 1-3 are subtly arranged; see Froesch (1968), esp. 36ff. and 127ff. Careful ordering is also apparent in the collections of short poems in the *Tristia* (Books 1, 3, 4 and 5); see Martini (1933) 52f., Froesch 61f., Michelfeit (1969) 364ff. Only *Pont.* 4 seems exceptional in this respect, and the poems in that book may have been collected for publication posthumously.

the progress of the love-affair¹³. Such an expectation is fostered also by the opening poems of Books 2 and 3. 2.1 announces Ovid's return to love-elegy after an abortive attempt to write a *Gigantomachia*, 3.1 his intention to compose a final number of love-elegies; the implication is that all the poems in Book 2 were written after those in Book 1, and all those in Book 3 after those in Book 2. That 2.1 marks a new beginning is suggested also by 1.15. That elegy is a *σφραγίς*, and such poems were conventionally, and most naturally, placed as the epilogue to a collection. Hor. *Carm.* 2.20, however, affords a precedent for the occurrence of a *σφραγίς* at the end of a book within a larger corpus. (Since Ovid's final poem in Book 2 forms a pair with 3.4, it seems to serve the rather different and, to some extent, conflicting purpose of emphasising the unity of the collection [but see n. 20].)

The collection cannot, however, be read as an ordered account of Ovid's amatory adventures. The position of a few poems is influenced by their dramatic setting. It is logical that the boast at 2.10.26ff.:

decepta est opera nulla puella mea;
saepe ego lasciuie consumpsi tempora noctis,
utilis et forti corpore mane fui

should precede his impotence in 3.7; in 2.17, the reference to a girl who falsely claims to be Corinna (29f.) implies that Ovid has already published poetry in Corinna's honour and, in 3.12, he refers explicitly to *libelli* in praise of her (7). The great majority of the elegies, however, have no clear reference to any particular stage in Ovid's erotic career, and could therefore have been accommodated in any of the books. There are even some elegies which seem to disrupt the chronological sequence. The similarity of 3.2.56f.:

inceptis annue, diua (sc. Venus), meis
daque nouae mentem dominae, patiaturs amari

to 1.3.3f.:

tantum patiaturs amari;
audierit nostras tot Cytherea preces

may suggest that 3.2 describes Ovid's first meeting with Corinna¹⁴. 2.2 and 3 also concern Ovid's first contact with a girl; cf. 2.2.3ff.:

¹³ For a slight flaw in the dramatic continuity of 1.1-3, however, see the introduction to 1.2.

¹⁴ See Williams (1968) 515f.

hesterna uidi spatiantem luce puellam
 illa quae Danai porticus agmen habet.
 protinus, ut placuit, misi scriptoque rogau;

if the girl is Corinna, these elegies are displaced. However, the similarity of the opening line of 2.2:

Quem penes est dominam seruandi cura, Bagoa

to that of 2.19:

Si tibi non opus est seruata, stulte, puella,

in which the mistress is not Corinna (see p. 84), may suggest that 2.2 and 3 also do not concern her. Although Corinna is certainly the mistress involved in 3.12, and presumably also in the majority of other elegies in that book in which the mistress is not named, the past tense of the verbs in lines 9ff. of 2.19, an elegy concerned with a different mistress, suggests that the Corinna-affair, if it ever happened, was over before 2.19 and its sequel, 3.4, were written. In 2.18, Ovid refers to an abortive attempt to write tragedy, but nothing is said about that attempt in 3.1 or 3.15, so it seems reasonable to assume that 2.18, or at least that passage in the poem, was written later than those poems in Book 3 (see pp. 88f.). The lament for Tibullus in 3.9 has a dramatic setting (19 or 18 B.C.) earlier than that of 1.14, in which Ovid alludes to the defeat of the Sygambri (not before 16 B.C. [see pp. 78f.]). 1.15, in which Tibullus is listed among the dead poets whose work is immortal (27f.), may also be considerably later than 3.9.

That chronological ordering is not a significant principle in the arrangement of the collection becomes clear, in fact, already in 1.4 and 1.6. In 1.3, Ovid has only recently fallen in love; cf. 1 *quae me nuper praedata puella est*. In 1.4, however, the love-affair is long-established; note especially the aside at 47f.:

saepe mihi dominaeque meae properata uoluptas
 ueste sub iniecta dulce peregit opus.

Similarly, in 1.6, it is *longus amor* which has emaciated Ovid (5f.), the time when he feared to go on a komos in the dark is long past (cf. 9 *quondam*), and he recalls earlier occasions when he did favours for the door-keeper (cf. 21 *quondam*) and when the door-keeper used to be very vigilant (cf. 43 *primo*). Ovid's lack of concern for a narrative framework for the collection perhaps accounts for the absence of a farewell to Corinna comparable to Propertius' renunciation of

Cynthia in 3.24 (= 24 and 25); in 3.15, he bids farewell to love-elegy, but, in 3.14, his last address to his mistress, he begs her to dissemble her infidelities to him so that their love-affair may continue.

Ovid names Corinna twice in Book 1, nine times in Book 2 (in seven elegies), three times in Book 3 (see p. 22). Propertius, by contrast, shows a marked decline in the frequency with which he names Cynthia (1:29, 2:22, 3:3, 4:5), consonant with his growing estrangement from her and also because, in later elegies, it was no longer so necessary for him to declare that Cynthia is his mistress¹⁵. If Ovid originally followed Propertius in giving a broadly chronological framework to his account of his affair with his mistress, it is reasonable to assume that, like Propertius, he named her with decreasing frequency. It may be, therefore, that the much greater number of references to Corinna by name in Book 2 than in Book 1 suggests a considerable change in the ordering of the poems in the second edition, and consequently the disruption of a chronological framework. (The three references to Corinna by name in Book 3, at 1.49, 7.25 and 12.16, probably have no bearing on this highly speculative hypothesis, since all those elegies seem to be relatively late [see pp. 80ff.].)

Just as there is no clear narrative framework, so it is not possible to maintain that the poems are so arranged as to display a progression from contentment to frustration and despair, such as would reflect the development of a love-affair from its joyful beginning to its bitter end. Certainly, Ovid's attack on his mistress' infidelity in 3.3 contrasts with the declaration of his own fidelity in 1.3, as does his impotence in 3.7 with his successful love-making in 1.5 and with the confidence in his virility of which he boasts in 2.10; in 3.11, he retracts his renunciation of his mistress in despondent acknowledgment of the impossibility of freeing himself from her, not, as in 2.9, in cheerful acknowledgment that she is a *dulce...malum* (26), not to be given up even were that possible; in 1.3 and 2.17, he hopes to win his mistress' love by praising her in his poetry, whereas, in 3.12, he laments that such praise has attracted other lovers to her. On the other hand, Ovid's predicament in 3.6 and his reaction to it are much the same as in 1.6, both elegies being komoi; in 1.10, just as in 3.8, his mistress is more attracted to money than to his poetry; the goddess Aurora deprives him of his mistress in 1.13 no less than does

¹⁵ Since such a high proportion of the elegies in the *Monobiblos* are addressed to third parties (see p. 25), Propertius will have had the more reason to refer to Cynthia by name in that book.

the goddess Ceres in 3.10; the plea to his mistress in 3.14, that she should dissemble her infidelities to him, is anticipated at 1.4.69f., 2.2.55ff. and 2.5.7ff. Frustration and despair are not, therefore, the prerogatives of elegies placed late in the collection. Conversely, Ovid's erotic experiences are not more blissful in Book 1 than in the later books. He presents himself as a successful lover in only three elegies, and they are distributed equally between the three books, 1.5, 2.12 and 3.2¹⁶. Apart from, of course, 3.1, which announces a final period devoted to the genre, and 3.15, the valedictory epilogue, the only poem which certainly foreshadows the end of the collection is 3.13, a non-amatory aetiological poem which shatters the conventions of love-elegy by mentioning Ovid's wife prominently in the opening line. The lament for Tibullus' death in 3.9 may also be considered to indicate that Ovid will soon give up love-elegy. With 3.13, that is the only poem in the collection which does not treat of either Ovid's own love-affairs or his love-poetry. Mythology features more conspicuously in 3.6, 10 and 12 than in any of the poems in the first two books. Since, however, mythology had already been firmly established as a standard element in love-elegy by Propertius and probably also by Gallus (see p. 32), those poems need not necessarily be regarded as foreshadowing Ovid's preoccupation with mythology in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*.

As far as their subject-matter and tone are concerned, therefore, most elegies could have been placed in any book. Their ordering is not, however, merely haphazard and arbitrary. Poems on similar themes, but dramatically unrelated, are generally placed widely apart in the collection. As noted above, each book contains one of the three elegies in which Ovid presents himself as a successful lover (1.5, 2.12, 3.2). In 1.3 and 2.17, the only poems to give prominence to the concept of *seruitium amoris*, he attempts to win or retain his mistress' love by offering her immortality through his poetry. 1.3 is also distanced from 2.4. In the former elegy, he prays that his prospective mistress should:

faciat cur ego semper amem (2),

and assures her that:

non mihi mille placent, non sum desultor amoris:
tu mihi, si qua fides, cura perennis eris (15f.);

¹⁶ In 3.2, Ovid's assumption that he has managed to persuade the girl to accept him as her lover may be merely wishful thinking.

in the latter, with a witty echo of those lines, he admits candidly that he is attracted to all sorts of women:

centum sunt causae cur ego semper amem (10).

In 1.4, he has to endure seeing his mistress' *uir* enjoy her company at a banquet; the same scenario recurs in 2.5, but with Ovid in the role of the *uir*. In 1.6, a komos, he attempts to win the support of his mistress' obstructive door-keeper; in 2.2 and 3, he attempts to win the support of a girl's obstructive chaperon; the komos-theme recurs in 3.6, but with a mountain-torrent in the role of the door(-keeper). In 1.10 and 3.8, Ovid deplores his mistress' preference for money rather than his poetry. 1.11 and 12 concern Corinna's hairdresser Nape, 2.7 and 8 her hairdresser Cypassis. 1.13 and 3.10 are both complaints directed against a goddess who deprives him of his mistress' company. 2.6 and 3.9 are laments, for Corinna's parrot and Tibullus respectively. In both 2.9 and 3.11, he renounces his mistress, only to retract the renunciation. 2.11 and 2.16 seem to afford the only marked exception to this policy of placing far apart dramatically unrelated elegies on similar themes. In 2.11, Ovid attempts to persuade his mistress not to travel abroad, leaving him behind, in 2.16, to persuade her to join him in Sulmo; in both elegies, he catalogues the dangers of foreign travel (2.11.17ff., 2.16.19ff.) and prays that the powers of nature may assist his mistress to come to him (2.11.39ff., 2.16.51f.) *quam primum* (2.11.55, 2.16.49).

The generally wide separation of such elegies shows Ovid to be observing the principle of *uariatio*¹⁷. Pliny explicitly states that he adopted that principle in a collection of *hendecasyllabi*:

his iocamur, ludimus, amamus, dolemus, querimus, irascimur, describimus aliquid modo pressius, modo elatius atque ipsa uarietate temptamus efficere ut alia aliis, quaedam fortasse omnibus placeant (*Epist.* 4.14.3)¹⁸.

Servius detects the same principle in Vergil's *Eclogues*:

transiit in eclogam plenam iurgii et conuiciorum pastoralium:
qui enim bucolica scribit, curare debet ante omnia, ne similes

¹⁷ On *uariatio* as a principle of arrangement in collections of short poems, see Port (1926), Froesch (1968) 77ff., Skinner (1981) 14f.

¹⁸ Cf. also 9.22.2 (on the lyric and elegiac poetry of Passennus Paulus) *ita Horatium ut in illis (sc. elegis) illum (sc. Propertium) alterum effingit. putes, si quid in studiis cognatio ualeat, et huius propinquum. magna uarietas, magna mobilitas. amat ut qui uerissime, dolet ut qui impatientissime, laudat ut qui benignissime, ludit ut qui facetissime, omnia denique tamquam singula absoluit.*

sibi sint eclogae. quod etiam Vergilius fecit: nam prima habet unius otium et alterius, qui de suo agro pellitur, conquestionem; secunda amantem exprimit rusticum; haec uero lites habet et altercationem (*ad Ecl.* 3.1).

In *Pont.* 3.9, Ovid himself recognises the principle:

...materiam, quam quis sibi finxerit ipse,
arbitrio uariat multa poeta suo (47f.),

but laments that the unremitting recurrence of the same theme, i.e. his desire to leave Tomis, does not permit *uariatio* in his books of poetry from exile:

Quod sit in his eadem sententia, Brute, libellis,
carmina nescioquem carpere nostra refers...
nil tamen e scriptis magis excusabile nostris,
quam sensus cunctis paene quod unus inest (1f., 33f.).

The basic purpose of *uariatio* is to prevent tedium; cf. *Pont.* 3.7.3f.:

taedia consimili fieri de carmine uobis,
quidque petam cunctos edidicisse reor,

Plin. *Epist.* 8.21.4:

liber fuit et opusculis uarius et metris. ita solemus, qui ingenio
parum fidimus, satietatis periculum fugere.

In a collection of love-elegies, however, it has the additional, more specific and constructive, purpose of emphasising the vicissitudes of the lover, his ever-changing moods of hope or despair, joy or sorrow.

Pairs of related elegies¹⁹ are normally juxtaposed: 1.11 and 12, 2.7 and 8, 2.11 and 12, 2.13 and 14 and, if they are not single elegies, 2.2 and 3, 2.9A and B and 3.11A and B. There is, however, an exception: in 2.19, Ovid laments that his mistress' husband is too negligent in guarding her, in 3.4, that he is too diligent. He may have made this exception for the sake of *uariatio*. Moreover, he may have placed 2.19 in the final position in its book for the same reason: had the final position been accorded to 2.18, all three books would not only have begun, but also have ended, with a poem in which Ovid discusses his poetic activities²⁰.

¹⁹ See the introduction to 1.11.

²⁰ However, for a reading of 2.19 as a poem about poetry, in homage to Callimachus, see Lateiner (1978). *uariatio* may perhaps be detected in the relative lengths of the poems in these pairs: 2.7 and 2.8 both have twenty-eight lines, 1.11 has twenty-eight, 1.12 thirty, but none of the other pairs display this type of balance.

1.8 is the longest poem in the collection, containing approximately twice the average number of lines (114). It may therefore have been placed in the central position in its book as a mark of distinction. Juvenal's first book offers a clear parallel for this principle of arrangement: its five poems contain respectively 171, 170, 320, 153 and 171 lines. The other elegy of exceptional length, however, 3.6 (106 lines), is not distinguished by its position, and it is not clear that Ovid uses the central position to accord special emphasis in either Book 2 or Book 3. If 2.2 and 3 and 2.9A and B are separate elegies, or if 2.2 and 3 and 2.9A and B are single elegies, there is no central poem in Book 2. If 2.2 and 3 are separate elegies and 2.9A and B are a single elegy, or if 2.2 and 3 are a single elegy and 2.9A and B are separate elegies, the central position is occupied by 2.10, a poem with no obvious claim to distinction. If 3.5 is authentic and correctly located and 3.11A and B are separate elegies, or if 3.5 is spurious and 3.11A and B are a single elegy, there is no central elegy in Book 3. If 3.5 is spurious and 3.11A and B are separate elegies, 3.9 is the central poem, and may be considered to deserve that prominence because of the exceptional seriousness of its theme, the death of Tibullus. Prop. 4.6, on the battle of Actium, is the clearest example of an elegy accorded the central position in its book because of the importance of its subject-matter. If 3.5 is authentic and correctly located and 3.11A and B are a single elegy, 3.8 is the central poem. That poem is remarkable neither in length nor in theme, the mistress' preference for money rather than Ovid's poetry (cf. 1.10).

The first position in the second half of a book could also be emphatic²¹. If there is no central elegy in Book 3, 3.9 begins the second half and, as noted above, that distinction would be appropriate. There is, however, no equivalent ordering in Book 2. If 2.2 and 3 and 2.9A and B are separate elegies, the second half begins with 2.10; if 2.2 and 3 and 2.9A and B are single elegies, it begins with 2.11. Neither 2.10 nor 2.11 seem to merit the distinction which such positioning might bestow.

If 3.5 is authentic and correctly located, a certain limited symmetry may be detected in the sequences of elegies 1.3-8 and 3.3-8. In 1.3, Ovid promises fidelity to his mistress; in 3.3, he laments her infidelity to him. In 1.4 and 3.4, a *uir* obstructs Ovid's love-affair. 1.5 recounts an enjoyable afternoon spent making love with his mistress, 3.5 a nocturnal dream which foretells her desertion of him, the setting

²¹ See Nisbet-Hubbard's introduction to Hor. *Carm.* 2.11 (p. 168).

both for 1.5 and for the dream in 3.5 being Ovid's bedroom; the very comparable opening words of the two poems:

Aestus erat mediamque... (1.5.1)

and

Nox erat et... (3.5.1)

are followed by similarly idyllic evocations of the scene, and then the action begins in the same dramatic manner:

ecce, Corinna uenit...

candida diuidua colla tegente coma (1.5.9f.)

and

ecce...

constitit ante oculos candida uacca meos (3.5.9f.).

In 3.6, in a vain attempt to persuade a mountain-torrent to subside in order that he may cross to reach his mistress, Ovid uses much the same arguments as he uses in 1.6, a more conventional komos-poem, in a vain attempt to persuade his mistress' door-keeper to open the door for him. In 1.7, he vituperates his hands, in 3.7, his penis, in both poems addressing the offending parts of his body as if they had an identity independent of him (1.7.27f., 3.7.69ff.). In 1.8, Dipsas attempts to persuade his mistress that a rich lover is preferable to Ovid, who can offer her only his poetry; in 3.8, Ovid laments that his mistress prefers a boorish but rich soldier's money to his poetry²². This symmetry, if indeed it is intended, is exceptional. It seems to occur elsewhere only on a much more modest scale, between 1.2-3 and 2.17-18. In both 1.3 and 2.17, the third and antepenultimate elegies in their respective books, Ovid declares his willingness to be his mistress' slave and promises her immortality through his poetry as a reward for her love. The conceit of Cupid's triumph over Ovid, treated in detail in the second poem in Book 1, recurs in 2.18, the penultimate elegy in Book 2.

This type of symmetry cannot, however, be insisted on very strongly. To judge by the great diversity of scholarly opinion about

²² This symmetry would perhaps account for the central position of 3.8, paralleling the central position of 1.8. The parallelism might be extended to include 1.9, a σύγκρισις βίων, comparing the way of life of a lover with that of a soldier, and 3.9, the lament for Tibullus. Tibullus' first elegy is a σύγκρισις βίων, in which he contrasts his ideal of a quiet rustic life with the active life of a soldier; note especially the imagery of *militia amoris* in line 75: *hic ego dux milesque bonus*.

the significance of, in particular, the arrangement of Vergil's *Eclogues* and of Propertius' elegies, affinities which seem self-evident to one reader will seem forced and artificial to another²³. Moreover, it is reasonable to suspect that Ovid's contemporaries would have been less prone than we are to look for such subtle balance between widely separated parts of the collection. Imprecise citations of the type *Horatius carminum lib. III: 'Quo me, Bacche, rapis tui plenum?'* (Prisc. *Gramm.* 2.259.19ff. Keil) suggest that poems were not normally numbered²⁴, and elaborate cross-reference must have been discouraged by the unwieldy *uolumina*, which allowed ready access to only a small portion of text at any one time. Ovid seems to construct individual elegies in clearly defined symmetrical units very rarely; see on 1.6.24. If that is so, it may provide an additional reason for doubting that symmetry was a significant principle in the arrangement of the collection.

In a few further cases, possible motives can be proposed for the juxtaposition of apparently unconnected elegies. The most promising such group is perhaps 3.8-10. Ovid may have juxtaposed 3.8 and 3.10 to the lament for Tibullus in 3.9 because the diatribe against modern greed at 3.8.35ff. and the hymn to Ceres in 3.10, esp. 11-14, are heavily indebted to Tib. 1.3.35ff. and 1.7.29ff. respectively²⁵. 1.6-8 may have a similar common background in Tibullus. Those elegies can all be linked, in different ways, to Tib. 1.2. Like that poem, 1.6 is a komos, Tibullus' opening words, *Adde merum*, are very similar to Ovid's in 1.7, *Adde manus*, and Ovid's description of Dipsas' magic powers at 1.8.5ff. draws substantially on Tibullus' lines 43ff. It seems at least as plausible, however, to detect a unifying factor in 1.6-8 in the unusually strong link which those three elegies have with Comedy²⁶. 1.13 and 14 may have been placed together because they draw on Prop. 2.18A and B respectively. 2.11 and 12 are listed above as forming a pair of elegies. 2.12 need not necessarily, however, be read as a sequel to 2.11, for it makes no specific reference to the dramatic setting of that poem, Corinna's plan to travel abroad. One might even infer from 2.11.7:

²³ See Rudd (1976) 119ff.

²⁴ In the absence of poem-numbering, it would also have been less obvious whether or not a book contained a multiple of five poems (see pp. 91ff.).

²⁵ It may be worth noting also that Tib. 1.5.39ff. is perhaps the only passage in earlier elegy to mention impotence, which is Ovid's theme in 3.7. (For impotence elsewhere in elegy, cf. [Tib.] 3.19.13f., Prop. 4.8.47.)

²⁶ See Reitzenstein (1906) 155ff.

ecce fugit notumque torum sociosque Penates

that Corinna lives with Ovid, whereas, in 2.12, he equips her with a *uir* and a *custos* who obstruct their love-affair. It is clear, however, that Ovid has juxtaposed the two elegies under the influence of Prop. 1.8, which treats of Cynthia's proposed journey to Illyria and her subsequent decision to stay with Propertius²⁷.

6

The Title

The chief evidence for the title *Amores* is given by *Ars* 3.343f.:

deue tribus libris, titulo quos signat AMORVM,
elige, quod docili molliter ore legas.

deue tribus *A*ç: deque tribus ç: deue cerem *R* (*ut uid.*; deie c. *r*): de ueterum
(*ex* -is in) *Y* titulo *F*!: titulos *R*: titulus *YA*ω quos *YA*ω: quo *R*
amorum *RYA*ω: amoris ç

At *SHA Ael.* 5.9, the Emperor Aelius Caesar is said to have kept *Ouidii libros Amorum* (*amorum*?) constantly under his pillow, along with his other favourite literary works, the cookery-book of Apicius and the epigrams of Martial. It cannot be ascertained, however, whether that phrase means 'Ovid's books of *Amores*' or 'Ovid's books about his love-affairs'. There is no further explicit testimony from antiquity for the title *Amores*¹, and none for any other.

If Ovid wrote that couplet in the *Ars* as it is here printed², the second edition at least was known as the *Amores*. There is no certain indication that Ovid had used that title at any stage in the composition and publication of the five books of the first edition. Within the collection itself, a possible hint at the title *Amores* is given by Ovid's announcement at 3.1.69f. that he will persist for a short time in writing love-elegies:

teneri properentur Amores,
dum uacat: a tergo grandius urget opus.

At line 41, Elegy had declared that she was accompanied by Cupid, but the antithesis with *grandius...opus* may suggest that *Amores* here signifies love-poems as much as, or rather than, the Amorini. At 3.15.1, however, in what may be an echo of this passage:

¹ Very few mss of the *Amores* show any knowledge of the true title; see the discussions by Oliver and McKie cited in n. 11.

² On the textual problems, see Jacobson (1974) 302. Sabot (1976) 87ff.

²⁷ Some editors begin a new elegy at line 27.

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 CAIRNS