

1.5

[Lenz (1967); Frécaut (1968); Luck (1969) 160ff.; Rudd (1976) 199ff.; von Albrecht (1976); Sabot (1976) 378ff.; Nicoll (1977); Bertman (1978); Elliott (1979); Lyne (1980) 260ff.; Huntingford (1981); Giardina (1982).]



I was lying alone at mid-day in my darkened bedroom (1-8). Corinna appeared, beautiful and scantily dressed, and she made only token resistance as I pulled off her tunic (9-16). Her beauty was flawless, and I drew her to me (17-24). May I have many such mid-days (25-26).



This poem and Prop. 2.15 are the only Augustan elegies which describe a successful sexual encounter at any substantial length. The rarity of the theme is not, however, conspicuous, since the elegists, in conformity with the traditional view of the genre (see on 3.9.3 *flebilis ... Elegia*), conceived their poetry as being basically a record of their sufferings in love; cf. 2.1.7-10 (n.), Prop. 1.7.13f. *me legat assidue post haec neglectus amator, / et prosint illi cognita nostra mala*. Attention is therefore focussed primarily on the obstacles to success in love, rivals, procuresses, chaperons, the mistress' absence, arrogance, illness, infidelity etc. A further reason for the rarity of the theme will be that successful sexual encounters offer only limited scope for originality of treatment; the dramatic situation and the emotional response to it are both very closely circumscribed.

Ovid echoes Propertius in many details. Both utter ecstatic exclamations (Prop. 1ff., 9f., Ovid 19ff.); note especially the similarity of expression between Prop. 3f. *quam ...! / quantaque ...!*, 9f. *quam ...! quantum / ...!* and Ovid 21f. *quam ...! / quantum ...!* Both refer to the tantalising delay caused by the mistress' tunic (Prop. 6, Ovid 13ff.). Both draw attention to the lighting suitable for sexual intercourse (Prop. 3f., 11f., Ovid 3ff.). Ovid's paradigms (11f.) recall Propertius' (13ff.), both in the reference to *thalami* and in the formulation *dicitur et ...* Propertius praises Cynthia's breasts, which

have not been made to sag by child-birth: *necdum inclinatae prohibent te ludere mammae: / uiderit haec, si quam iam peperisse pudet* (21f.); Ovid praises Corinna's breasts, and also her unwrinkled stomach (for child-birth as a cause of wrinkles on the stomach, cf. 2.14.7f. [n.]): *forma papillarum quam fuit apta premi! / quam castigato planus sub pectore uenter!* (20f.).

Despite these affinities, however, and the scenario's inherent limitations as a subject for poetry, Ovid's handling of the theme is radically different from Propertius'. Propertius plunges frenetically *in medias res*: *O me felicem! o nox mihi candida! et o tu / lectule deliciis facte beate meis!* (1-2). By thus subordinating the dramatic context to the declaration of his own emotions, Propertius is enabled the more easily to pass on, in the latter part of the poem, to general observations on mortality, the power of love and his way of life. The narrative element in Ovid's poem is very much greater. The events in the bedroom are described in logical sequence, with no extraneous thoughts allowed to intrude. Ovid thereby gives an impression of being more in control of his emotions than Propertius is. This impression is enhanced by the poem's clear and balanced structure: three passages of eight lines describe the languorous atmosphere in the bedroom, the struggle to remove Corinna's clothing and her naked beauty, and the final couplet emphasises the poem's tightly controlled unity by means of conceptual (see on 25 *lassi requieuiamus ambo*) and verbal (see on 26 *medii ... dies*) echoes of the opening couplet. With the brief question *cetera quis nescit?* in the final hexameter, Ovid abruptly disappoints our expectations of further revelations (see Vol. 1, 71). He does not, however, use the final couplet to undermine the emotional intensity built up in the poem so far, a device found in several other elegies (see on 1.4.70 *cras*); there is nothing overtly insincere about the final prayer *proueniant medii sic mihi saepe dies!* This little elegy is one of a number of poems in the *Amores* which show that Ovid is able to write successful love-elegies without recourse to mockery of the *persona* of the lover (see Vol. 1, 18).



1-8. This opening section sets the scene; cf. 1.8.1-18, where Dipsas is characterised preliminary to an account of her attempt to corrupt Ovid's mistress, 2.16.1-10, a eulogy of Sulmo preliminary to Ovid's lament that his mistress is not there with him, and 3.[5.]1-8, which draws heavily on this passage (see the note *ad loc.*). See also below, on 9 *ecce*. The most significant parallels, however, are afforded by 3.1.1-

6, which prepares for an epiphany by the goddesses Elegy and Tragedy by describing the quiet numinosity of the grove in which Ovid is pacing about during the mid-day heat (cf. 5 *tectus nemoralibus umbris*), and by *Pont.* 3.3.5ff., a passage clearly indebted to this one, introducing an epiphany by Cupid: *nox erat et biformes intrabat luna fenestras, / mense fere medio quanta nitere solet. / publica me requies curarum somnus habebat, / fusaque erant toto languida membra toro*. Comparison with those two passages and the detail emphasised in the opening line, that it is mid-day, a time at which deities often appear to mortals, strongly suggest that Corinna's arrival is portrayed as an epiphany by a goddess; see Nicoll (1977) 42ff., Bulloch on Call. *Lau. Pall.* 72. Ovid describes his mistress explicitly as a goddess at 1.7.32, 2.11.44, 2.18.17 and 3.2.60; cf. also 3.3.12. For this conceit, see Lieberg (1962) *passim*, Kost on Musaeus 33, Sabot (1976) 388ff.

1-2. Aestus erat ... -que ...: for this introductory formula, a variation on the much commoner *nox erat et ...* (for which, see on 3.[5.]1), cf. *Met.* 5.585f. *lassa reuertebat (memini) Stympthalide silua: / aestus erat, magnumque labor geminauerat aestum, 10.126ff. aestus erat mediusque dies ... / fessus in herbosa posuit sua corpora terra / ceruus*, Fedeli on Prop. 3.15.26. Such formulas are particularly frequent in erotic contexts (cf. e.g. Hor. *Epod.* 15.1, Verg. *Aen.* 4.522, Prop. 2.29.23, 3.16.1, *Am.* 3.[5.]1, *Met.* 10.368, *Fast.* 1.421, 2.792) and in introducing epiphanies (cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 3.147, 8.26, *Pont.* 3.3.5). These two most typical uses of the formulas are here combined to introduce an erotic epiphany. The sexual connotations of *aestus* (see on 3.2.39 *an magis hic meus est animi, non aeris, aestus?*) also contribute to the marvellous economy with which Ovid sets the tone for the poem.

mediam ... dies exegerat horam: cf. [Verg.] *Moretum* 1 *Iam nox hibernas bis quinque peregerat horas*, [Sen.] *Herc. O.* 1986f. *summas exiget horas / consumpta dies*, Fedeli on Prop. 3.20.11f. *tu quoque, qui aestius spatiosius exigit ignis, / Phoebe. mediam ... horam:* the phrase occurs first here, Colum. 7.7.1 and Val. Fl. 3.417; see *TLL* 6.2960.41ff. In setting the scene at mid-day, Ovid may be influenced by Catull. 32, in which the poet, lying on his bed after lunch, requests Ipsitilla to invite him to come to her. Line 8 of that poem is echoed at 3.7.24ff., in a description of an unsuccessful sexual encounter. For day-time love-making as a decadent pursuit, cf. Plut. *Mor.* 655A (with reference to Paris' unmanly conduct at Hom. *Il.* 3.426ff.) ὥς

οὐκ ἀνδρὸς ἀλλὰ μοιχοῦ λυσσῶντος οὔσαν τὴν μεθμερινὴν ἀκρασίαν. The setting therefore suits the elegists' *uita iners*.

medio ... toro: Ovid is alone; cf. 2.10.17f. *hostibus eueniat uiduo dormire cubili / et medio laxa ponere membra toro*, *Epist.* 19.158 (Hero lamenting Leander's absence) *ponuntur medio cur mea membra toro?* By emphasising that he is alone, Ovid is not necessarily casting doubts on the expectation created by *Aestus erat* that the scene being set is amatory. In sexual encounters introduced in this way, one partner is often alone to begin with; cf. e.g. *Ars* 3.723ff., *Met.* 5.585ff., *Fast.* 1.421ff. *medio*, following so closely on *mediam*, has given offence. *mediam* is assured by the echo in line 26 *medii ... dies*; see the note *ad loc.* (Bentley's *sextam*, in the margin of his copy of Burman, is banal.) Burman tentatively proposed that *medio* be replaced by *uacuo* or *uiduo*. Kenney (1959) 248, n. 1 suggests that Ovid is possibly playing with the figure *traductio*, in using *medius* first in a temporal, then in a spatial, sense. At least to modern sensibilities, Ovid, like many Latin authors, is remarkably casual in his admission of apparently insignificant repetitions within a brief space; cf. e.g. 1.3.21 *cornibus*, 24 *cornua*, 1.8.50 *admissis*, 53 *admittas*, 1.11.19 *mora*, 21 *moretur*, 26 *morer*, 1.12.18 *duras*, 24 *duro*, 1.13.14 *saeuas ... manus*, 18 *tenerae uerbera saeua manus*, 1.14.12 *derepto*, 18 *derepta*, 28 *capiti ... tuo*, 32 *capiti ... suo*, 34 and 36 *manu*, 49 *iste*, 50 *ista* and see also on 2.2.60 and 3.9.62. I can, however, cite no parallel in Ovid for an unpointed repetition quite so obvious as that here. To the literature on the problem cited by Kenney, add Helmbold (1960) 173f., Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 2.505, Bömer on *Met.* 2.150, Diggle on Eur. *Phaeth.* 56, Fordyce on Verg. *Aen.* 7.491, Woodman on Vell. 2.100.5, Lyne [Verg.] *Ciris* p. 30, Courtney on Juv. 16.9f.

membra leuanda: for *leuare* in the sense 'rest', cf. Tib. 1.1.43f. *satis est, requiescere lecto / si licet et solito membra leuare toro*, *Rem.* 206 (*somnus*) *pingui membra quiete leuat*, *Fast.* 6.328. Contrast the sense 'raise', as at *Epist.* 21.18 *pallida uix cubito membra leuare*, *Trist.* 1.3.93f. *ut ... resurrexit ... / ... et gelida membra leuauit humo*, [Verg.] *Moretum* 5 *membra leuat uili sensim demissa grabato* (with Kenney's note).

3-8. *Pace Sen. Apocol.* 2.3 *adeo his adquiescunt omnes poetae, non contenti ortus et occasus describere, ut etiam medium diem inquietent: tu sic transibis horam tam bonam?*, descriptions of mid-day are not very common in ancient poetry; see Bömer on *Met.* 2.417. The present passage is written in the same spirit as Callimachus'

description of Helicon just before Teiresias is blinded by Athena: δὴ ποκα γὰρ πέπλων λυσαμένα περόνας / ἵππῳ ἐπὶ κράνα Ἑλικωνίδι καλὰ ῥεοῖσα / λῶντο· μεσαμβρινὰ δ' εἶχ' ὄρος ἀσυχία. / ἀμφοτέραι λῶοντο, μεσαμβριναὶ δ' ἔσαν ὦραι, / πολλὰ δ' ἀσυχία τήνῳ κατεῖχεν ὄρος (*Lau. Pall.* 70ff.). Both passages have the same artistic purpose, that of conveying an impression of the tranquillity which is to be shattered when the mortal meets the goddess.

3-6. For this detail, light, usually moon-light, coming through the window in erotic scenes, cf. Philodemus *AP* 5.123.1f., Prop. 1.3.31ff., in epiphanies, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.151f., *Pont.* 3.3.5f. (quoted on 1-8). Roman bedrooms were built to be dark; cf. Plin. *Epist.* 2.17.22 *cubiculum ... non fulgurum lumen ac ne diem quidem sentit nisi fenestris apertis*. On ancient window-shutters, see Blümner (1911) 102f., *RE* 6.2183ff.

3-4. **adaperta:** the word occurs elsewhere in classical poetry only at 3.12.12, *Met.* 5.193, 14.740, Colum. 10.145, 239, 261 and Stat. *Theb.* 1.396. It occurs in prose first at Varro *Rust.* 2.1.22 and three times in Livy. Ovid has the ἀπαξ λεγόμενα *semiadapertus* and *adapertilis* at 1.6.4 and *Trist.* 3.11.45 respectively.

quale ... lumen ... / qualia ... fugiente crepuscula Phoebo / aut ubi ...: the triple comparison is not mere *lasciuia*, but rather suggestive of the quiet, numinous atmosphere conducive to Corinna's epiphany. This effect is enhanced by the luxuriant *l-* and *u-*sounds in 4 and 5, for which cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.270ff. *quale per incertam lunam sub luce maligna / est iter in siluis, ubi caelum condidit umbra / Iuppiter*. For such multiple comparisons, cf. 1.7.53-56 (n.), 1.10.1-8 (n.), 2.5.25ff. and 35ff. *quale ... lumen* is equivalent to *tali lumine* (descriptive ablative) *quale*; for the brachylogy, Shackleton Bailey (1956) 10 compares Prop. 1.2.21f. *facies aderat nullis obnoxia gemmis, / qualis Apelleis est color in tabulis*, 3.17.39f. *haec ego non humili referam memoranda cothurno, / qualis Pindarico spiritus ore tonat*, Petron. 89.31ff., Plin. *Nat.* 11.241, 21.4, Stat. *Silu.* 2.6.39, 42, *Theb.* 2.81. In few of those passages is the idiom used quite so adventurously as here. The construction and train of thought are perhaps facilitated by the association of *fenestra* with light; cf. Nonius p. 52 *fenestrae a Graeco uocabulo conuersum est in Latinum*, ἀπὸ τοῦ φαίνειν. (*Fast.* 6.166 *lumen thalamis parua fenestra dabat* possibly echoes the explanation of the word preserved at Isid. *Orig.* 15.7.6 *alii fenestram putant dictam eo, quod domui lucem ministret*.)

quale fere ... solent: for comparisons introduced by *qualis* in combination with *solere*, an idiom which is particularly common in Ovid, cf. *Epist.* 11.27, *Met.* 2.381ff. (of the Sun) *expers / ipse sui decoris, quali, cum deficit, orbe / esse solet*, 3.293f., 6.63, 452, 10.736f., 12.50f., 15.654f., *Pont.* 3.3.19, also e.g. Catull. 97.7f., Verg. *Georg.* 2.186f., *Aen.* 6.205f., Sen. *Nat.* 1.2.1 *circa solem uisum coloris uarii circulum, qualis esse in arcu solet*, *Apocol.* 5.3. *quale fere* may be influenced by οἷον φέρε (for which, see LSJ s.v. φέρω ix 5). *fere* and φέρε were thought to be cognate; cf. Varro *Ling.* 7.92 *ferme dicitur quod nunc fere; utrumque dictum a ferendo. fere:* Ov. 21 (8), Verg. 4 (3), Hor. 5 (0), Tib. 0, Prop. 0. None of these poets uses the archaic (cf. Varro *loc. cit.*, Adams [1974] 57) form *ferme*, but Lucretius has both: *fere* 7, *ferme* 5.

5-6. For such elaborate references to dusk and dawn, cf. Sen. *Herc. F.* 671f. *nocte sic mixta solet / praebere lumen primus aut serus dies*, *Apocol.* 4.1 (vv. 25ff.), also Hom. *Od.* 11.15ff.

sublucens: the word recurs in Ovid at *Epist.* 21.219, and is found elsewhere in classical Latin only at Cic. *Arat.* 289, Verg. *Georg.* 4.275, Plin. *Nat.* 9.126 and 14.127. In choosing to use this verb here, with the sense 'glimmer', Ovid may have been influenced by the standard derivation of *lucus*, called to mind by the preceding line: '*lucus*' *quia umbra opacus parum luceat* (Quint. *Inst.* 1.6.34; see TLL 7.2.1750.74ff.). This passage may in turn have influenced Ovid's choice of the verb *subrubet* in a comparison introduced by *quale* at 2.5.36. *subrubere* occurs first there, and means 'blush', the sense which *sublucere* bears in its only other occurrence in Ovid (*Epist.* 21.219).

fugiente ... Phoebus: for the imagery, appropriate to swift Mediterranean sunsets, cf. e.g. *Fast.* 2.493, Hor. *Epist.* 1.16.7, Lucan 9.941, Sen. *Thy.* 776, *Phaedr.* 679. It is rather more commonly applied to the stars and the moon, put to flight by the rising of the sun; see on 1.13.28. *Phoebus*: 'the shining god'; see Vol. 1, 51f. For the pointed juxtaposition of *Phoebus* to *crepuscula*, cf. Stat. *Theb.* 1.344 *longa repercusso nituere crepuscula Phoebus*.

aut ubi nox abiit nec tamen orta dies is coordinate with *fugiente ... Phoebus*. The couplet means 'just as the twilight glimmers when Phoebus is fleeing, or when night has gone but day has not yet come'. Although *crepusculum* most commonly refers to the evening twilight, it occasionally denotes the morning twilight (for which *diluculum* is the more normal term); cf. Avien. *Arat.* 1352 *decedentis postrema crepuscula noctis*, TLL 4.1175.66ff. For the play on the derivation of

the word *crepusculum*, 'the doubtful time', to which the phrasing of the pentameter alerts us, see Vol. 1, 52f. As is argued there, Ovid's play seems to be inspired by Ap. Rhod. 2.669ff. It may therefore be worth noting that, just as Ovid is here introducing an epiphany by the goddess Corinna, so the Apollonian lines introduce an epiphany by the god Apollo. For a merely pedestrian description of sunset in terms comparable to this passage, cf. Lucan 3.40ff., of dawn, Sil. 5.24ff. *nox abiit*: cf. *Fast.* 4.721 *nox abiit oriturque aurora*, Catull. 61.90 (= 105, 112) *abit dies*, Stat. *Theb.* 12.231. In such passages, night and day are semi-personified; *abire* expresses the idea not only of time elapsing (for that meaning in Ovid, cf. *Epist.* 16.314 [= *Ars* 3.60], *Pont.* 3.2.95, 3.4.60, 4.2.42, 4.11.16), but also of physical departure (as of the moon and sun; cf. 5 *fugiente ... Phoebus* and e.g. *Fast.* 2.73 *Hesperias Titan abiturus in undas. nec tamen orta dies*: cf. 1.13.48 *nec tamen assueto tardius orta dies. oriri* is first used of *dies* by the Augustan poets; cf. *Paneg. Mess.* 122, Verg. *Aen.* 7.149, 12.114, *Fast.* 2.330, 453, 813, TLL 5.1.1045.82ff.

7-8. For the thought, cf. Eur. *frg.* 528 Nauck ἡ γὰρ Κύπρις πέφυκε τῷ σκοτῷ φίλη, / τὸ φῶς δ' ἀνάγκην προστιθεῖσι σωφρονεῖν, *Ars* 2.617ff., 3.807f. (quoted below), *Fast.* 6.115 (Cranae to Janus) *haec loca lucis habent nimis et cum luce pudoris*, also *Rem.* 411f.

uerecundis: the word occurs 8 (2) times in Ovid, 4 (1) times in Horace, but is not used by Vergil, Tibullus or Propertius. It is found in earlier poetry only at Enn. *Trag.* 181 *quae tibi in concubio uerecunde et modice morem gerit*, Plaut. *Amph.* 903, *Asin.* 833, Ter. *Phorm.* 1023 and Catull. 68.136 *rara uerecundae furta feremus erae*. Ovid may be thinking of the Catullan passage. At line 70 of that poem, Lesbia, on her arrival to make love, is described as *mea ... candida diua*; here, Corinna's arrival is portrayed as an epiphany by a goddess (see on 1-8) and Ovid draws particular attention to her *candida ... colla* (10).

latebras: Ovid is more cynical at *Ars* 3.754 *latebras uitii nox dabit ipsa tuis*, 807f. *nec lucem in thalamos totis admitte fenestris: / aptius in uestro corpore multa latent*.

speret habere: for *sperare* constructed with a present infinitive, cf. e.g. *Ars* 3.592 *solum se thalamos speret habere tuos*, *Trist.* 4.7.8, also *Am.* 2.4.14 *spem ... dat ... mobilis esse*, and see K.-S. 1.689f.

9-10. ecce, Corinna uenit: cf. Apul. *Met.* 2.16 *commodum cubueram et ecce Fotis mea ... laeta proxumat*. For *ecce ... uenit*, cf. *Met.* 4.96, *Fast.* 6.676, TLL 5.2.26.53ff. For the present tense inserted for dramatic

effect into a past narrative, cf. Cic. *Caecin.* 20 *cum id partim mirarentur, partim non crederent, ecce ipse Aebutius in castellum uenit, denuntiat Caecinae se armatos habere*. For *ecce* signalling the introduction of the poem's particular theme after lengthy preliminaries, cf. 2.7.17, 2.11.7, 3.[5].9, 3.8.9. *uenit*: for *uenire* used of coming to a lovers' rendezvous, cf. e.g. 1.11.5, 24, 2.1.34, 2.2.20, 3.7.80. Here, the word has sacral connotations, appropriate to an epiphany by a deity (see on 1-8); cf. 1.13.1, 13, 3.1.7, 11, 3.13.23, Hubbard (1974) 26, n. 1, on Prop. 1.5.32 *non impune illa* (sc. *Cynthia*) *rogata uenit*, citing Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 528f. (to Eros) μή μοί ποτε σὺν κακῷ φανείης / μηδ' ἄρρυθος ἔλθοις, and see also on 1.8.31 *adueniens*. *uenire* is similarly used in the context of an erotic epiphany at 2.16.51 *qua ueniet* (sc. *puella*), *tumidi subsidite montes* (see the note), 3.3.39 *si uenturo se subduxisset amanti* (sc. *Iouī*) and 3.8.33 *sapiens in munere uenit adulter* (sc. *Iuppiter*).

tunica uelata recincta: the phrase recurs at *Ars* 1.529 and *Fast.* 3.645; cf. also *tunica uelata soluta* (v.l. *recincta*) at 3.1.51 and 3.7.81. *recingere* occurs first at Verg. *Aen.* 4.518 (of the exotic eastern queen, Dido; cf. Semiramis in Ovid's next couplet) *unum exuta pedem uinclis, in ueste recincta* and 8 (5) times in Ovid. If Ovid is here echoing Vergil, the echo may be piquant; Servius comments: '*in ueste recincta*' quia ... *in sacris nihil solet esse religatum, praecipue eius, quae amore uult solui*.

candida diuidua colla tegente coma: for such descriptions, cf. Ap. Rhod. 3.45 (of Aphrodite) λευκοῖσιν δ' ἐκάτερθε κόμας ἐπιειμένη ὤμοις, Nonn. *Dion.* 10.181ff. At *Ars* 3.141, Ovid recommends: *alterius crines umero iacentur utroque*. For women's unbound hair in love-scenes, see Bömer on *Fast.* 2.772. We are to picture Corinna as having long hair; cf. 1.14.3f., 3.3.3f. and see also on 19-22 below. *candida*: a pale complexion was considered particularly attractive; cf. Porph. Hor. *Epod.* 3.9 *candoris nomine et Vergilius in significatione pulchritudinis semper utitur*, *TLL* 3.247.33ff. Elegiac mistresses are regularly so described; cf. 1.7.40 (n.), 3.3.5, 3.7.8, Pichon (1966) s.v. *candidus*. Here, where Corinna's arrival is presented as an epiphany, it is relevant that the epithet is often attributed to deities; cf. *Epist.* 18.61, *Fast.* 1.637, 3.772, *TLL* 3.241.36ff. See also on 1.4.7. *diuidua ... coma*: cf. Claud. 10.104f. *iusto diuidit orbes* (sc. *comarum*) / *ordine*, *Rapt. Pros.* 2.15f. *illi multifidos crinis sinuatur in orbes* / *Idalia diuisus acu*, also Stat. *Theb.* 8.488f. (of a warrior whose head has been sliced in two) *funduntur utroque* / *tempora diuiduique cadunt in brachia crines*. *diuiduus* occurs in Ovid also at 2.10.10, *Ars* 2.488, *Fast.* 1.292,

at Hor. *Epist.* 1.17.49, earlier only at Plaut. *Rud.* 1408, Ter. *Ad.* 241 and three times in Cicero's philosophical works as a technical term, equivalent to the Platonic μεριστός.

11-12. As in 4ff., the comparisons here delay the action, thus creating dramatic tension. They also heighten our expectation of a lively account of the meeting by their contrast with *uerecundis ... puellis* (7). *Lais* was a prostitute, as also, according to one tradition (cf. Diod. Sic. 2.20.3), Semiramis had been; for the latter's notorious lechery, cf. e.g. Euphorion *Suppl. Hell.* 415 col. 1 vv. 9ff. (quoted below), Diod. Sic. 2.13.4, Plin. *Nat.* 8.155, Aug. *Ciu.* 18.2.

qualiter occurs earlier only at *Paneg. Mess.* 84 (introducing an indirect question), elsewhere in Ovid at 1.7.58 and *Epist.* 9.128 (introducing comparisons, as here). Compare the adverbial use of *quale* at e.g. 2.5.35 and 37.

thalamos: *thalamus*: Ov. 77 (44), Verg. 23 (20), Hor. 1 (1), Tib. 0, Prop. 5 (including 2.15.14; see the introduction). It is a grand word, used with particular frequency in references to goddesses, heroines and queens; see Pichon (1966) s.v. For Semiramis' θάλαμος (in which she murdered her lovers!), cf. Euphorion *loc. cit.* καὶ δέ σ' ἐράσμιον ἄνδρα Σεμείραμις ἀγκάσσαιτο / ὄφρα σοι εὐδόμοιο παρὰ πρόδομον θαλάμοιο / παρθενίῳ χαρίεντα ποδὶ κροτέοιτο.

formosa: Heinsius preferred *famosa*. The words are often confused (as at e.g. 3.14.6, *Epist.* 9.134, Prop. 4.4.32) and *thalamos asamiramis*, the reading of *P* and probably also of *Y*, could be an error by haplography for *thalamos famosa samiramis*. In all three occurrences of the word elsewhere in Ovid (3.6.78, 3.14.6, *Epist.* 9.134), however, *famosus* bears its commonest meaning, 'infamous'. Neither that sense, despite the possible hint at Semiramis' murderous inclinations evoked by *thalamos* (see above), nor the neutral sense 'famous', is in point here; Ovid is emphasising her beauty. *formosus*: Ov. 83 (*Am.* 22, *Epist.* 12, *Ars* 11, *Rem.* 4, *Met.* 23, *Fast.* 9, *Trist.* 1, *Pont.* 1), Verg. 17 (*Ecl.* 16, *Georg.* 1), Hor. 4 (*Sat.* 2, *Carm.* 1, *Ars* 1), Tib. 6 (1:4, 2:2), Prop. 35 (1:9, 2:21, 3:3, 4:2). Although Ovid uses the word so often in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*, it is otherwise extremely rare in the higher genres, being absent from the *Aeneid*, Valerius Flaccus, Silius Italicus and Statius' *Thebaid* and *Achilleid* (*Silu.* 1), and occurring in Lucan only at 10.366, in Seneca's tragedies only at *Oed.* 508, *Phaedr.* 772 and 781. This rarity is perhaps not to be attributed to the word's low stylistic level but to its connotations of sexual attractiveness, which would not often be appropriate in epic or tragedy; see Watson

(1985) 439ff. Its frequency in the *Eclogues* and Propertius' earlier books supports Fedeli's view (on Prop. 1.2.9) that it 'sarà stato un aggettivo caro ai poeti neoterici'. Catullus, however, uses it only in one epigram, poem 86 (3 times). For adjectives in *-osus*, see also on 1.1.9 *iugosis*. The assonance in *thalamós formósa* and the sigmatism of the couplet are remarkable, but serve no obvious purpose; perhaps they make the paradigms the more impressive.

Semiramis: the semi-legendary Assyrian queen; see Bömer on *Met.* 4.47. Ovid is possibly influenced here in a very general way by the anecdote that Semiramis, on learning as she was attending to her hair that Babylon had defected, set off to quell the revolt *altera parte crinium adhuc soluta* (cf. Val. Max. 9.3 ext. 4). The orthography is uncertain. In his note on Juv. 2.108, Housman observes that *Sameramis* is the most usual form in the best mss of Latin authors, but adds *nescio quam recte*. Knoche (1932) 520 notes that that is the only form for which there is inscriptional evidence (*CIL* 14.1541), and would read it here. (The resulting κακέμφοτον *formosa Same-ramis* is not an obstacle; see on 2.2.52 *quemquam quamuis*.) Goold (1965a) 11f. favours *Semiramis* (Sω). He refers to Housman's note on Lucan 5.59 for the unreliability of inscriptional evidence, and points out that Greek sources and the mss at *Met.* 4.58 [also 5.85] and Prop. 3.11.21 support *Semiramis*.

isse / dicitur: for such appeals to authority for mythological stories, cf. 1.9.37f., 1.14.34, 2.14.29, 30, 2.17.15f., 17f., 3.2.31, 3.6.25f. *Inachus in Melie Bithynide pallidus isse / dicitur*, 31f., 41f., 81f., 3.9.13, 24, 3.13.20, *Met.* 4.57f. *ubi dicitur altam / coctilibus muris cinxisse Semiramis urbem*, Bömer on *Fast.* 2.203, Nisbet-Hubbard on *Hor. Carm.* 1.7.23, Hopkinson on *Call. Cer.* 52.

multis Lais amata uiris: Ovid is echoing Prop. 2.6.6 *Phryne tam multis facta beata uiris*. (He may have been induced to allude to that line by its similarity to the second line of 2.15 [the closest elegiac model for this poem; see the introduction] *lectule deliciis facte beate meis*.) Propertius had mentioned Lais as a popular courtesan in the first couplet of 2.6: *Non ita complebant Ephryaeae Laidos aedes, / ad cuius iacuit Graecia tota fores*. There were (at least) two famous courtesans named Lais; see *RE* 12.513ff. The professional rivalry between Phryne and the younger Lais was notorious; cf. Athenaeus 13.588E. Ovid's encomiastic reference to Lais in terms which closely echo Propertius' encomiastic reference to Phryne therefore has a certain piquancy, comparable to that at 3.9.58 *me tenuit moriens deficiente manu*, where Nemesis, in Delia's presence, echoes Tibullus'

words to Delia at Tib. 1.1.60 *te teneam moriens deficiente manu*. For this type of transference, see also on 1.7.17f. (Cassandra and Coroebus), 50 *ferreus*, 1.9.33f. (Hector-Andromache, Achilles-Bri-seis), 1.15.15 *Sophocleo ... cothurno*, 2.8.12 *serua*, 2.19.20 *saepe time insidias*, 3.10.41 *Minos ... legifer*. Although the reading *Lais* is so strongly attested and makes this excellent point, there is something to be said for the variant *Thais* (ς). Thais also had been mentioned by Propertius as a popular courtesan in that same passage of 2.6: *turba Menandreae fuerat nec Thaidos olim / tanta, in qua populus lusit Erichthonius* (3f.). Alexander was said to have burnt the palace at Persepolis at her request (cf. Diod. Sic. 17.72.2, Curt. 5.7.3ff., Plut. *Alex.* 38, Athenaeus 13.576E), whereas Phryne offered to restore Thebes after its destruction by Alexander (cf. Prop. 2.6.5, Athenaeus 13.591D) and Semiramis founded Babylon. Moreover, Thais achieved regal status by her marriage to Ptolemy Soter (cf. Athenaeus 13.576E); according to one account, Semiramis also rose from humble origins (cf. Diod. Sic. 2.20.3ff., Plin. *Nat.* 35.78, Plut. *Mor.* 753D).

13-14. deripui tunicam: swift action, expressed with appropriate brevity. Ovid is, however, playing with our expectations. It is not until line 17 that he passes on to what we naturally suppose will be the next point, the description of Corinna's naked beauty. In the rest of the passage from 13 to 16, he comments on the diaphanous nature of the tunic which he has now pulled down and describes how Corinna continued to struggle (this is presumably the implication of the imperfect *pugnabat*) to cover herself with her tunic. *deripui* (PYS) is preferable to *diripui* (yw). *posito uelamine* (17) suggests that the sense required is 'pull down' rather than the more violent 'pull apart'. For the confusion, cf. 1.14.12 and 18, and see also on 1.6.8 *derigit* and 1.7.47 *tunicam ... diducere*. The repetitions *tunicam ... / tunica, pugnabat ... / pugnaret, uincere ... / uicta est* give this passage a very compact construction and also convey a vivid impression of the struggle.

nec multum rara nocebat: Huntingford (1981) 113 suggests that 'the phrase ... has two possible senses: the poet had little difficulty in tearing off the *tunica* because it was thin, or the *tunica*, being thin, did not much mar vision of Corinna's nakedness'. *multum* is rather colloquial when used to modify an adjective; see Bömer on *Met.* 4.155 *o multum miseri!* To judge, however, from the passages cited from a wide range of authors at *TLL* 8.1616.72ff. and K.-S. 1.280, it

has no such *color* when modifying a verb, as here. For *non multum nocere*, cf. Sen. *Nat.* 4B.11.3. The juxtaposition of *multum* to *rara* is pointed. *rara*: 'loosely woven'; cf. *Fast.* 3.820 *rarum pectine denset opus*, Nonius p. 865 *ralla: uestis dicta a raritate*. Plautus in Epidico [230] *tunicam rallam, tunicam spissam*, OLD s.v. 1b. At Catull. 69.3 *rarae ... uestis*, the sense is 'exquisite'. The most fashionable of such diaphanous dresses were made of Coan silk; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.101f. *Cois tibi paene uidere est / ut nudam*, *Carm.* 4.13.13, Prop. 1.2.2 (= 4.5.56), 2.1.5, 4.2.23, 4.5.23, Tib. 2.3.53f., *Ars* 2.298.

pugnabat ... tegi: for *pugnare* in erotic contexts, cf. e.g. *Ars* 1.561, 665f. (quoted on 15-16), *Met.* 2.436, 4.358, 370, *Fast.* 2.801, Catull. 62.59f., Tib. 1.4.54. On the use of military imagery in general in erotic contexts, see the introduction to 1.9. Here, the terms *pugnare*, *uincere* and especially *proditio* may suggest that Corinna is being likened to a city under siege; for that conceit, see on 2.12.7f. *non humiles muri, non paruis oppida fossis / cincta, sed est ductu capta puella meo*. Ovid constructs *pugnare* with an (accusative and) infinitive (only here a passive infinitive) 15 (10) times. The construction seems to occur earlier only at Lucr. 2.205 and is never found in classical prose; see H.-Sz. 346.

sed tamen: the practice of postponing particles, mostly for metrical reasons, seems to have been introduced by the neoteric poets, in imitation of Hellenistic usage; see Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 4.33, Ross (1969) 67ff., van Dam on Stat. *Silu.* 2.1.78-81, Knox (1986) 88ff. For *sed tamen* postponed, cf. 3.[5].7f. (note the comparable repetitions) *ipse sub arboreis uitabam frondibus aestum, / fronde sub arborea sed tamen aestus erat*, *Epist.* 11.108. See also on 1.6.18 *ut* and 1.9.22 *et*.

15-16. For token resistance by the beloved, cf. *Ars* 1.665f. *pugnabit primo fortassis et 'improbe' dicet; / pugnando uinci se tamen illa uolet*, 699f. *uiribus illa quidem uicta est (ita credere oportet), / sed uoluit uinci uiribus illa tamen*, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.9.21f. *latentis proditor intumo / gratus puellae risus ab angulo*, Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.4.53-56. The couplet is distinctly prosaic in its syntax and vocabulary (see below). The effect is perhaps to convey an impression of Ovid's objectivity and emotional restraint, in contrast to the outburst which will follow in 19-22.

cumque (ç) is preferable to *quae cum* (PYSω). The pronoun is unnecessary and, especially with *tamquam quae ... nollet* following, clumsy. Luck (1963) 260 and Goold (1965a) 65 note the probable process of corruption: *cumque / cum quae / quae cum*.

ita: the use of *ita* in Augustan poetry is rather peculiar. It recurs in the *Amores* only in the phrase *atque ita* at 3.6.53 and 80, and becomes gradually more common in Ovid's subsequent works, whereas all but two of the twelve Propertian instances are in Books 1 and 2 and, although frequent in the *Aeneid*, it is rare in Horace's *Odes*: Ov. 98 (46), Verg. 28 (24), Hor. 27 (2), Tib. 0, Prop. 12. A large proportion of these totals involve the phrases *atque ita*, *ita fatur (uel sim.)*, *non (haud) ita*: Ov. 59 (34), Verg. 16 (15), Hor. 8 (2), Prop. 8. See Axelson (1945) 121f., TLL 7.2.518.59ff. For the prosaic construction with *tamquam*, not found elsewhere in Augustan poetry, see H.-Sz. 596, K.-S. 2.449, TLL 7.2.524.21ff., OLD s.v. *tamquam* 4b.

tamquam quae ... nollet: like *quasi* (see on 1.8.79), *tamquam* is generally rare in the higher styles of poetry: Ov. 28 (13), Verg. 1 (0), Hor. 4 (0), Tib. 0, Prop. 0, Catull. 2, Lucr. 10, Sen. *Trag.* 0, Lucan 2, Val. Fl. 0, Sil. 0, Stat. 1 (*Silu.* 2.3.9; see van Dam's note), Mart. 17, Juv. 18. The construction with a relative clause seems to occur first here and at *Ibis* 434 (*Epist.* 10.31 is corrupt); cf. Sen. *Apocol.* 12.2, *Benef.* 2.24.2, Petron. 70.4, H.-Sz. 597. See also on 1.8.79 *quasi laesa* and 1.12.11 *tamquam ... medicata. nolo*: Ov. 54 (20), Verg. 0, Hor. 20 (1), Tib. 0, Prop. 9 (8 in Books 1 and 2), Catull. 10, Lucr. 1, Sen. *Trag.* 17, Lucan 16, Val. Fl. 0, Sil. 1, Stat. 4 (*Silu.* 1), Mart. 62, Juv. 12.

non aegre here, as Lenz notes, means both 'without difficulty' and also 'not reluctantly'. *aegre* is prosaic: Ov. 9 (3), Verg. 1 (0), Hor. 0, Tib. 0, Prop. 0, Catull. 0, Lucr. 4, Sen. *Trag.* 1, Lucan 0, Val. Fl. 0, Sil. 2, Stat. 0, Mart. 0, Juv. 0.

proditione: the noun is prosaic, occurring 5 (2) times in Ovid, elsewhere in poetry only at Verg. *Aen.* 2.83, Lucan 4.221, Prud. *Psych.* 396 and three times in Claudian. *proditor* is also prosaic, occurring twice in the *Amores* (2.8.26, 3.12.30) and at *Ibis* 367, in earlier verse only at Plaut. *Rud.* 50 and Hor. *Carm.* 1.9.21 (quoted above). Claudian, with five instances, is the only later poet to use it more than once.

17-18. This objectively critical observation, which is substantially repeated in *nil non laudabile uidi* (23), serves, like the prosaic *color* of 15-16, to moderate the ecstasy of the outburst in 19-22.

posito uelamine: for the phrase, cf. *Met.* 3.192, 10.578, *Fast.* 2.379, 4.147, Calp. *Ecl.* 5.72. *uelamen*, like most neuter substantives in *-men* which have an equivalent in *-mentum*, belongs to the higher registers of poetic vocabulary; see H.-Sz. 744f., Knox (1982) 70ff. It occurs in poetry first at Lucr. 4.587, 4 (3) times in Vergil and 26 (21) times in

Ovid. It is always rare in prose, occurring first at Liv. 1.32.6 (a stray instance in a book remarkable for its poetic vocabulary; Livy has *uelamentum* seven times). (*uelamentum* occurs in poetry only at *Met.* 11.279 and Lucan 8.368.) The only other such formation in the *Amores* is *munimen* at 1.6.29 (but see also on 1.6.16 *fulmen*). *uelamen* is therefore an appropriate term to use with reference to the divine Corinna; contrast 1.6.19 (addressed to the slave-ianitor): *cum posita staret ad uerba ueste*.

in toto nusquam corpore menda fuit: cf. *Trist.* 5.13.14 *nullus in egregio corpore naeuus erit* and, for the phrasing, cf. also Prop. 2.29.37f. *aspice ut in toto nullus mihi corpore surgat / spiritus*, Mart. *Epigr.* 7.6 *in... omni nusquam corpore corpus erat*. For *menda* meaning 'physical blemish', a sense which occurs in no other author, cf. *Ars* 1.249, 2.653, 3.261, 781, *Rem.* 417. Ovid uses the word also at *Pont.* 4.1.13, of mistakes in writing. It is found elsewhere in poetry before the Christian period only at Lucil. 1213. Ovid probably everywhere uses the feminine rather than the neuter form; see Goold (1965a) 102.

19-22. This passage and 3.3.3ff., where Ovid mentions his mistress' long hair, fair complexion, small feet, tallness and sparkling eyes, provide the most extensive physical descriptions of any elegiac mistress. Neither passage, however, portrays the girl as a distinct individual. This reticence is particularly understandable if Corinna did not exist or if Ovid was at pains to disguise her identity. With the ecstatic exclamations here, cf. esp. Philodemus *AP* 5.132.1ff. ὦ ποδός, ὦ κνήμης, ὦ τῶν (ἀπόλωλα δικαίως) / μηρῶν, ὦ γλουτῶν, ὦ κτενός, ὦ λαγόνων, / ὦ μαστῶν, ὦ μοῖν, ὦ τοῦ ῥαδινοῖο τραχήλου, / ὦ χειλῶν, ὦ τῶν (μαίνομαι) ὀμματίων, / ὦ κατατεχνοτάτου κινήματος, ὦ περιάλλων / γλωττισμῶν, ὦ τῶν (θῦέ με) φωναρίων, also e.g. [Lucian] *Amores* 14, Longus 1.25, Claud. 10.264ff. For further such catalogues of physical charms, see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 2.4.21, Kost on Musaeus 55-66 (pp. 224ff.). Philodemus' repeated exclamations are parodic; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.92 'o crus! o brachia!', also Theocr. 11.19ff., *Met.* 13.789ff. No such effect is intended here; not only is the catalogue briefer, but the exclamations are elegantly varied in order to obviate Philodemus' deliberate monotony. This *uariatio* has the further purpose of disguising the artful way in which Ovid has arranged the catalogue according to the rhetorical rules for ἑκφρασις προσώπου; cf. Apthon. p. 37.9ff. Rabe ἑκφράζοντα ... δεῖ πρόσωπα μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων ἐπὶ τὰ τελευταῖα

ιέναι, τουτέστιν ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ἐπὶ πόδας, Nicolaus p. 69.12ff. Felten, Kost *loc. cit.*, Kenney on [Verg.] *Moretum* 32ff. For such descriptions which progress down the body, cf. Meleager *AP* 5.204, Hor. *Epod.* 8.3ff., Mart. 3.53 (quoted on 23-24), [Lucian] *Amores* 14, Auson. *Epist.* 14.44ff. pp. 246f. Peiper *sic certe crinem flauus niueusque lacertos / caesariem rutilam per candida colla refundis, / pectore sic tenero, plana sic iuncea aluo, / per teretes feminum gyros surasque nitentes / descendis, talos a uertice pulcher ad imos*. See also on 1.4.43f. and 3.1.7-14.

19-20. quales uidi tetigique lacertos!: ruefully echoed at 3.7.39 *at qualem uidi tantum tetigique puellam!* Like this passage (see on 19-22), that poem draws on an epigram by Philodemus (*AP* 11.30).

forma papillarum: the expression seems rather grand, and not simply equivalent to *formosae papillae*; note the similarly phrased encomia at 2.6.17 *rari forma coloris* and 3.3.7 *pedis est artissima forma*.

apta premi: *apta* is constructed with an infinitive 12 (4) times by Ovid, earlier only at *Paneg. Mess.* 62f. As with *idoneus* and (*in*) *dignus*, the construction with an infinitive is found mostly in poetry; see K.-S. 1.685, *TLL* 2.333.1ff. The *p*-sounds in the pentameter help to convey Ovid's excitement.

21-22. quam ... planus ... uenter!: *planus* may mean either 'flat' (i.e. without a paunch) or 'unwrinkled' (for the attractiveness of an unwrinkled stomach, cf. Auson. *Epist.* 14.46 [quoted on 19-22] and see on 2.14.7 *ut careat rugarum crimine uenter*). For the separation of *planus* from *quam*, cf. e.g. 20 *quam ... apta*, 1.14.25 *quam se prae-buerunt ferro patienter et igni*, 2.4.6 *heu quam, quae studeas ponere, ferre graue est!*, and see also on 1.2.1 *tam mihi dura*. The separation is here complicated by the intervention of a word (*castigato*) with which one might initially suppose that *quam* is to be construed.

castigato ... sub pectore: for *castigatus* in the sense 'taut', cf. Serenus Sammonicus 353 *si castigatas studium est praestare papillas*. Stat. *Theb.* 6.871f. is less closely parallel: *riget arta cutis durisque laborum / castigata toris*. The *pectus* is the chest area in general, of which the *papillae* are only a part; cf. e.g. Lucil. 859f. *stare papillas / pectore marmoreo*.

The first four feet of the hexameter are spondaic; see Vol. 1, 116. One might rather have expected rapid and excited dactyls. Since it is produced largely by *castigato*, which is emphasised by its insertion

between *quam* and *planus*, the slow rhythm may therefore be intended to suggest the tautness of Corinna's body. A word of four long syllables occurs at this position in only one other hexameter in the *Amores*, 2.11.3, which is likewise an impressive line: *quae concurrentes inter temeraria cautes*. For such words in pentameters, see Vol. 1, 119.

iuuenale femur: for the phrase, cf. *Ars* 3.781. Luck, on *Trist.* 2.117f., suggests that *iuuenalis* is more positively encomiastic than *iuuenilis*. If so, *iuuenalis* is the more appropriate form here. The constant confusion between the two forms in the mss, however, makes it impossible to establish a clear and certain distinction. At *TLL* 7.2.728.8ff. and 732.79ff., it is suggested only that, whatever difference there may be in sense, *iuuenalis* seems to be the more poetic form.

23-24. singula quid referam?: for the παράλειψις, a rhetorical device most often used, as here, as a means of transition, cf. 2.6.43f., 3.6.33f., 3.12.35ff., also e.g. *Ap. Rhod.* 2.390f. ἀλλὰ τί με πάλιν χρειῶ ἀλίτεσθαι / μαντοσύνη τὰ ἕκαστα διηνεκὲς ἐξενέποντα;, *Hor. Sat.* 1.8.40 *singula quid memorem ...?*, *Calp. Ecl.* 7.57 *ordine quid referam?*, *Mart.* 11.8.11 *singula quid dicam?* For *singula* in this context, cf. *Catull.* 86.2, *Hor. Sat.* 1.6.32f. *curam quaerendi singula, quali / sit facie, sura, quali pede, dente, capillo*, *Mart.* 3.53 *Et uultu poteram tuo carere / et collo manibusque cruribusque / et mammis natibusque clunibusque / et, ne singula persequi laborem, / tota te poteram, Chloe, carere*.

nil non laudabile uidi: cf. *Longus* 1.24.1 (of Chloe, seeing Daphnis naked) ἐτίκετο μηδὲν αὐτοῦ μέρος μέμψασθαι δυναμένη. For the phrasing of the sentence, cf. *Met.* 3.610 *nil ibi, quod credi posset mortale, uidebam*, *Fast.* 3.623, *Trist.* 3.1.9 *nil hic nisi triste uidebis*, 3.7.43 *singula ne referam, nil non mortale tenemus*.

corpus ad usque meum: for the word-order, noun, preposition, epithet, Platnauer (1951) 101 compares *Prop.* 4.8.53 *digitos inter ... remissos*. See also on 1.6.68 *dura super ... limina* and 1.7.26 *poenam fortis in ipse meam*. The sequence *ab (ad, in) usque* occurs first at *Catull.* 4.24 and 116.4. It was used initially only by the poets, primarily for metrical convenience, and seems not to be found in prose before Tacitus; see K.-S. 1.574f., *TLL* 1.239.47ff., 899.56ff., 7.2.274.15f., also Gow on *Theocr.* 3.17 καὶ ἐς ὅστιον ἄχρις.

25-26. cetera quis nescit?: the usual motive for the so-called 'erotic

ἀποσιώπησις' is respect for decency, as at *Epist.* 18.105f. *cetera nox et nos et turris conscia nouit, / quodque mihi lumen per uada monstrat iter*, *Philodemus AP* 5.4.5f., *Prop.* 1.13.18 *quae deinde meus celat ... pudor*, *Marcus Argentarius AP* 5.128.3f., [*Lucian*] *Amores* 16, 53, *Aristaenetus* 1.2.22ff. Here, however, Ovid, with wonderful urbanity, stops short as if to avoid boring his audience by stating the obvious; *Lucian Dial. Deor.* 19 (11) 2 οἶσθα· τί οὖν ἂν σοι λέγοιμι τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα;, *Aristaenetus* 1.16.33ff. and 2.3.15f. are somewhat comparable. Ovid is possibly influenced by *Theocr.* 2.142f. where, however, no such humour is intended: ὥς καὶ τοι μὴ μακρὰ φίλα θρυλέοιμι Σελάνα, / ἐπράχθη τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ἐς πόθον ἦνθομες ἄμφω. There is similar wit at *Ars* 3.769f. *ulteriora pudet docuisse, sed alma Dione / 'praecipue nostrum est, quod pudet,' inquit 'opus'*, where, in contrast to the present passage, Ovid declines to resort to the conventional ἀποσιώπησις and goes on to discuss sexual intercourse in detail. *cetera quis nescit?* has much the same dramatic function and stands in the same line-position as does *singula quid referam?* in the preceding couplet, and passages such as *Cic. Cluent.* 87 *sed quid ego haec pluribus quasi de re obscura disputo?*, *Nemes. Ecl.* 2.35 *quid tibi, quae nosti, referam?*, [*Sall.*] *Rep.* 2.9.1 *sed quid ego plura quasi de ignotis referam?* show how closely related the two questions are. The repetition in thought and expression is perhaps intended to emphasise the rapidity with which Ovid brings his narrative to a conclusion. On the amusingly abrupt ending of the poem, see also Vol. 1, 71.

lassi requieuiamus ambo: passion mutually spent; cf. *Ars* 2.683, 727f., *Rem.* 413f., *Theocr.* 2.143 (quoted above), *Dioscorides AP* 5.55.7, *Apul. Met.* 2.17 *lassis animis et marcidis artibus defatigati simul ambo corruimus inter mutuos amplexus animos anhelantes*. Ovid and Corinna lie resting together on the bed, as Ovid had lain resting alone in line 2. (It is perhaps worth noting that *requiescere* occurs at *Tib.* 1.1.43, in the passage on which line 2 may be modelled.) This repetition of thought and the verbal echo of line 1 in the pentameter (see below) signal the end of the poem. For *lassus* in this context, cf. 3.7.80, 3.11.13, *Adams* (1982) 196.

medii ... dies echoes *mediam ... dies exegerat horam* in line 1. (It may also be worth noting that *dies* is the final word of *Prop.* 2.15, the opening section of which Ovid echoes in this poem; see the introduction.) Such verbal echoes are a common feature of elegy. In the *Amores*, cf. 1.1.1f. *bella ... / ... modis*, 28 *bella ... modis*, 1.4.67 (n.), 1.6.1f. *dura ... / ... forem*, 74 *dura ... fores*, 1.8.2 *Dipsas*, 114 *sitim*,

1.9.1 *sua castra*, 44 *castris ... suis*, 1.13.2 *diem*, 48 *dies*, 1.14.1f. *capillos / ... coma*, 56 *coma*, 1.15.1 *Liur edax*, 39 *pascitur ... Liur*, 41 *adederit ignis*, 2.1.3f. *iussit Amor ... / non estis teneris apta theatra modis*, 36ff. *non apta est gratia uestra mihi; / ... / ... dictat Amor*, 2.7.1 *reus ... crimina*, 28 *criminis ... reum*, 2.8.1 *mille modos*, 28 *quot ... modis*, 2.9.52 (n.), 2.13.3 *tantum ... pericli*, 27 *tanto ... timore* (see the note), 2.15.2f. *dantis ... / munus eas*, 27f. *proficiscere munus / ... datam*, 3.[5.]1 *Nox ... ocellos*, 46 *oculos nox*, 3.10.2ff. *secubat ... / flaua Ceres ... / ... sacris ... tuis*, 43f. *secubitus ... dea flaua ... / ... sacris ... tuis*, 3.13.1ff. *Faliscis / moenia ... / ... Iunoni festa*, 34f. *moenia ... / ... Iunonia sacra Faliscos* and see also on 2.2.64. See further Bertini (1976) 156f. and, for this feature in the other elegists, see Shackleton Bailey (1952-3) 18, Goold (1966) 92, Nethercut (1968) 93, n. 2 and (1971) 443, n. 37.

1.6

[Copley (1956) 125ff.; Sabot (1976) 517ff.; Yardley (1978) 29ff.; Lyne (1980) 246ff.; Watson (1982).]



Door-keeper, open the door (1-2). Opening it just a little will suffice, since love has made me thin (3-6). I once feared the dangers of the night, but Cupid has emboldened me, and now I fear only you (7-16). You should oblige me, in return for previous favours and in hope of future benefits (17-26). I intend no violence, so there is no need to lock the door (27-40). Perhaps you are asleep (41-44), or with your own beloved (45-48). The door has creaked — rattled by the wind (49-52). Boreas, beat it down (53-54), or I shall attack it myself (55-60). Neither prayers nor threats move the unfeeling door-keeper (61-64). Dawn is coming (65-66). Lie on the door-step, my garland (67-70). Farewell, door-keeper and cruel door (71-74).



Futile lamentation at the beloved's locked door epitomises the wretchedness of the elegiac lover's way of life. It accounts for Tibullus' inability to emulate Messalla's brilliant military career, and it motivates both Propertius and Ovid to renounce their love-affairs; cf. Tib. 1.1.55f. *me retinent uinctum formosae uincla puellae, / et sedeo duras ianitor ante fores*, Prop. 3.24.29f. (= 25.9f.) *limina iam nostris ualeant lacrimantia uerbis, / nec tamen irata ianua fracta manu*, Am. 3.11.9ff. Like Ovid here, both Tibullus (1.2) and Propertius (1.16) treat the scenario in detail, and allusions to it are frequent throughout their poetry; cf. e.g. Tib. 1.5.67f., 2.3.73f., 2.4.19ff., 2.6.11ff., Prop. 1.5.20, 1.10.16, 2.9.41f., 4.8.48. (For Ovid's exploitation of the theme elsewhere, see below.) The lover's komos to the door of his beloved's house, there to beg for admission, was a long-established literary theme. It is found already at Alcaeus *frg.* 374 δέξαι με κωμάσδοντα, δέξαι, λίσσομαι σε, λίσσομαι and, on a larger scale, at Ar. *Eccl.* 952ff. It is naturally a prominent theme in Hellenistic sympotic epigram, the symposium being the usual starting-point for the komos; cf. e.g. Asclep. *AP* 5.145, 164, 167, 189,

Call. *AP* 5.23 (the attribution is suspect), 12.118, Posidippus *AP* 5.213. The treatment of the theme by the Augustan elegists owes most to Hellenistic epigram. Comedy, however, was also influential; cf. esp. Menander *Misoum. frg.* A, Plaut. *Curc.* 147ff., Ter. *Eun.* 771ff. (For Comic elements in this elegy, see on 25, 26, 41, 52, 64, 74, also Yardley [1987].) The erotic komos is the subject of a detailed monograph by Copley (1956). For its exploitation particularly in the Augustan period, see (with references to older studies) Cairns (1972) via the General Index s.v. *komos*, Henderson (1973), Sabot (1976) 511ff., Pinotti (1977) 59ff., Yardley (1978), Fedeli's introduction to Prop. 1.16, Murgatroyd's introduction to Tib. 1.2.

Much of the humour in the *Amores* depends on Ovid's mockery of the *persona* which he adopts. He will therefore have found the komos a particularly congenial theme: few situations are so undignified and, consequently, so conducive to humorous development, as is that of the locked-out lover. Ovid is not, however, the first to exploit the potential for humour. Theocritus parodies the theme in *Idylls* 3 and 11, in which the komasts are respectively an uncouth goat-herd who serenades a simple cave-dwelling country-girl and the grotesque Polyphemus who serenades the sea-nymph Galatea (cf. *Met.* 13. 778ff.). In Prop. 1.16, a snobbish house-door laments the indignities to which it is constantly subjected by drunken komasts, one of whom, presumably Propertius himself, is particularly troublesome, *arguta referens carmina blanditia* (16).

The most natural and usual addressee for the *exclusus amator's* laments and supplications is the beloved (him-) herself but, just as Tibullus (1.2.7ff.) and Propertius (1.16.17ff.) address the locked door, so Ovid here addresses the door-keeper. (In so doing, he is possibly influenced by Posidippus *AP* 5.213; cf. 3 εἰπὲ δὲ σημείον.) This choice of addressee gives the scenario an unusual perspective and permits Ovid to treat the theme's well-worn topoi in a novel manner. Several other poems in the collection are constructed as *suasoriae* (see Vol. 1, 69) addressed to slaves; cf. 1.11 (to Nape), 2.2 and 3 (to Bagoas), 2.8 (to Cypassis). In each of these poems, it is humorous that Ovid, a free man of equestrian status, should suffer the indignity of having to wheedle a slave. Here, however, the indignity is particularly acute: whereas hairdressers and chaperons seem to have been privileged figures of some authority in the household (cf. 1.11.2 [n.], 2.2.29f. *ille* [sc. a chaperon willing to connive at his mistress' infidelities] *placet uersatque domum neque uerbera sentit, / ille potens; alii, sordida turba, iacent*), the door-

keeper was among the most menial of the domestic staff, being unfit for other duties; cf. [Arist.] *Oec.* 1345A θυρωρός, ὃς ἂν ἢ ἄχρηστος τῶν ἄλλων ἔργων, Sen. *Epist.* 12.3 *decrepitus et merito ad ostium admotus*. At *Dial.* 5.37.2, Seneca describes an *ostiarius* as *extremum mancipium*. For the komos as a degrading activity for a free man, cf. 3.11.12 *excubui clausam, seruius ut, ante domum*, Tib. 1.1.55f. (quoted above), Plato *Symp.* 183A κοιμήσεις ἐπὶ θύραις (sc. ποιούμενοι), καὶ ἐθέλοντες δουλείας δουλεύειν οἷός οὐδ' ἂν δοῦλος οὐδεὶς. Ovid here emphasises the indignity by addressing the door-keeper in incongruous terms, as if he were a god (see on 3f., 15f. and 27). This incongruity will be all the greater if the door-keeper was conventionally a figure of fun, as may be suggested by a fragment of a marriage-song in which Sappho mocks the door-keeper's appearance: θυρώρῳ πόδες ἐμπορόγυιοι, / τὰ δὲ σάμβαλα πεμπεβόηα, / πίσσυγγοὶ δὲ δέκ' ἐξεπόναισαν (*frg.* 110A).

Ovid alludes frequently to the komos throughout the *Amores*; cf. 1.4.61f., 1.8.77f., 1.9.7f., 15f., 19f., 2.1.17ff., 2.9.46, 2.12.3f., 2.19.6, 21f., 37ff., 3.1.53f., 3.11.9ff. In 3.8, he seems to be locked outside his mistress' door (cf. 5ff., 24 *ad rigidas canto carmen inane fores*); those passages may, however, be general statements rather than indications of a specific dramatic setting and, in any case, the standard komastic motifs are not developed in that poem. In 3.6, Ovid is kept from his mistress by a mountain-torrent which he addresses in much the same terms as he employs in addressing the door-keeper here; see the introduction. Similarly, in *Epist.* 18, Leander laments in komastic fashion against the winds and waves which keep him apart from Hero. The theme recurs also in the *Metamorphoses*, at 3.442ff. (Narcissus kept from his own reflection in the pool, possibly exploiting the lament by Thrasonides at the beginning of Menander's *Misoumenos* [see above and Davis (1978)]), 4.65ff. (Pyramus and Thisbe), 13.778ff. (Polyphemus) and 14.698ff. (Iphis).



1-2. (indignum!): Ovid employs similar *captatio benevolentiae* in attempting to ingratiate himself with his mistress' slave-hairdressers at 1.11.2 *neque ancillas inter habenda Nape* and 2.8.2 *comere ... solas digna, Cypassi, deas*. At 3.6.1, the torrent which keeps Ovid from his mistress is addressed with the flatteringly grand term *amnis*. See also on 1.8.23-108. Here, we are possibly to recall Prop. 1.16.6 *pulsata indignis saepe queror manibus*: whereas the drunken komasts in that poem are themselves the cause of the door's indignities, Ovid is intent

on showing his sympathy for the door-keeper. For the parenthetic exclamation, cf. *Met.* 5.37, *Hor. Epist.* 1.6.22, H.-Sz. 728, *TLL* 7.1.1193.31ff. and see also on line 17 below.

dura religate catena: for the practice of chaining door-keepers, cf. *Afran. Com.* 392 *tintinnire ianitoris impedimenta audio*, *Tib.* 1.1.55f., *Colum.* 1 *Pref.* 10, *Suet. Rhet.* 27.1 *L. Voltacilius Plutus seruisse dicitur atque etiam ostiarius uetere more in catena fuisse*. *dura*: further sympathetic *captatio beneuolentiae*. Since *durus* and *difficilis* can both bear the sense 'obdurate' (cf. e.g. *Sen. Dial.* 5.37.3 *beati hominis iudicat ac potentis indicium difficilem ianuam: nescit durissimum esse ostium carceris*), Ovid may be attempting to gain the door-keeper's cooperation in opening the *difficilem ... forem* (2) by implying that their sufferings have much in common. He uses such an argument in invoking Boreas at 53f. and in requesting the torrent's cooperation at 3.6.23ff.

difficilem moto cardine pande forem anticipates *excute poste seram*, the refrain which occurs in every eighth line from 24 to 56. *difficilem*: cf. 17 *immitia claustra*, 28 *roboribus duris*, 54 *surdas ... fores*, 62 *o foribus durior ipse tuis*, 68 *dura ... limina*, 73f. *crudeles rigido cum limine postes / duraque ... ligna*. All of these epithets, to a greater or lesser extent, endow the door with human characteristics, much in the spirit of *Prop.* 1.16. For *difficilis* used of doors, cf. *Sen. Dial.* 5.37.3 (quoted above), also *Tro.* 404 *custos non facili Cerberus ostio*, *Juv.* 4.63 *facili patuerunt cardine ualuae*. For the sense 'obstructive to love', cf. e.g. 1.12.7 *difficiles ... tabellae*, *Ars* 2.566, *Tib.* 1.8.27, 1.9.20, *Hor. Carm.* 3.7.32, 3.10.11 and see also on 2.3.5 (to Bagoas) *mollis in obsequium facilisque rogantibus esses*. In using the term here, Ovid may be influenced by *Hor. Carm.* 1.25.4ff. *ianua ... / quae prius multum faciles mouebat / cardines* and *Tib.* 1.2.7 (where, however, *difficilis* is probably to be construed with *domini*) *ianua difficilis domini, te uerberet imber*. As is observed by Yardley (1978) 31, *pande* has an elevated ring. The verb seems to be used earlier with reference to ordinary house-doors only at *Catull.* 61.76 and *Varro Ling.* 7.108. The context is usually much grander: the Underworld (*Fast.* 4.449, *Plaut. Bacch.* 368 [a high-flown equation of a brothel with the Underworld], *Verg. Aen.* 6.574, *Prop.* 4.11.2 [in a komastic context; see below, on 27 *orantem*]); Heaven (*Verg. Aen.* 10.1); Troy (*Aen.* 2.27, 12.584); a palace? (*Pacuv. Trag.* 360); a temple (*Prop.* 4.9.34 [in a komastic context; see Anderson (1964), Pinotti (1975-6)]). Since *pandere* appears to imply opening *wide*, the request in the following couplet seems to be the more modest and reasonable. (Against that

implication, however, note the singular *forem*; only one leaf of the door need be opened.)

3-4. quod precor exiguum est: Ovid emphasises the slightness of the requested favour, as at 2.2.28 (to Bagoas) *quis minor est autem quam tacuisse labor?*, 66 *quid precibus nostris mollius esse potest?*, 3.1.67f. *exiguum uati concede, Tragoedia, tempus: / tu labor aeternus; quod petit illa, breue est*, also *Serv. Aen.* 1.551 *quamuis sit iusta petitio, tamen prope inuidiose ostendit quam sit res quam petit exigua*. Here, however, such an argument is ludicrous, since opening the door just enough to allow him to squeeze through would negate the door-keeper's function no less than would opening it fully. The joke is perhaps inspired, though not anticipated, by *Prop.* 1.16.27f. *o utinam traiecta caua mea uocula rima / percussas dominae uertat in auriculas!* The humour at 3.6.2 *siste parumper aquas* is somewhat similar; Ovid there modestly requests that the torrent halt only long enough to allow him to cross. For the phrasing here, cf. *Epist.* 19.170, *Ars* 2.515 *quod iuuat, exiguum, plus est, quod laedat amantes*, *Rem.* 715, *TLL* 5.2.1472.50ff.

fac ... / ... capiat: Ovid addresses the door-keeper as a god in 15f. and possibly also 27; see the notes *ad locc.* Watson (1982) 94f. suggests that the phrasing here may also be liturgical; cf. 3.2.46 *huc ades et meus hic fac, dea, uincat amor!*, Appel (1909) 132f. The idiom is, however, by no means confined to religious contexts; cf. 1.4.56 (to his mistress) *fac ... eas*, 1.11.16 (to Nape) *fac ... legat*, 2.19.2 (to a complaisant husband) *fac serues*, 3.2.80 (to a charioteer) *sint ... sint ... fac*, H.-Sz. 530, *TLL* 6.105.21ff. (See also on 2.10.30 *di faciant ... sit.*) *capiat* here means primarily 'admit' (= *accipiat, recipiat*), but the sense 'be wide enough for', as at e.g. 3.2.48 *me mea terra capit*, 3.6.86, is also present.

semiadaperta, by its imposing length, seems to be humorously at odds with Ovid's request that the door be opened just a little way; cf. 3.15.14 *quantulacumque estis, uos ego magna uoco*, *Ars* 3.263f. *si breuis es, sedeas, ne stans uideare sedere, / inque tuo iaceas quantulacumque toro*, *Call. AP* 9.566.5f. γένειτο / ... ἐμοί ... ἡ βραχυσυλλαβίη and see also on 2.4.35. *semiadapertus* occurs only here (cf. *semiapertus*, which occurs in classical Latin only at *Liv.* 26.39.22, *semiadapertulus*, which occurs only at *Apul. Met.* 3.14). Compounds in ἡμι- are very common in Greek, but the nearest equivalent seems to be ἡμιχανής, Meineke's conjecture at Leonidas of Tarentum *AP* 7.478.2. Ovid is particularly fond of the prefix *semi-*. (Only Apuleius,

with thirty-one such compounds, uses it more freely.) *semicremus* (*Met.* 12.287), *semilacer* (*Met.* 7.344), *semireductus* (*Ars* 2.614) and *semirefectus* (*Epist.* 7.178) are also ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, and Ovid is the first to use *semibos* (*Ars* 2.24, *Trist.* 4.7.18), *semicaper* (*Met.* 14.515, *Fast.* 4.752, 5.101), *semicrematus* (*Ibis* 632), *semideus* (*Epist.* 4.49, *Met.* 1.192, 14.673, *Ibis* 80), *semisepultus* (*Epist.* 1.55) and *semisupinus* (*Am.* 1.14.20, *Epist.* 10.10, *Ars* 3.788). He also uses *semesus*, *semianimis*, *semifer*, *semihomo*, *semimas*, *seminex*, *semiuir* and *semustus*. Neither Tibullus nor Propertius have any compounds in *semi-*, Horace only *semesus* (twice in the *Satires*). Vergil, however, has *semesus*, *semianimis*, *semifer*, *semihomo*, *seminex*, *semiputatus*, *semiuir* and *semustus*. Most adjectives so constructed are stylistically elevated. Apart from *semiputatus* (*Ecl.* 2.70), Vergil uses them only in the *Aeneid*, and the Ovidian instances occur predominantly in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti*. See also on 1.5.3 *adaperta*.

5-6. A witty exploitation of the motif that being in love makes one thin, for which cf. 2.9.14, *Epist.* 11.29f., *Ars* 1.733ff., *Met.* 11.793, Theocr. 2.89f., 11.69, 14.3, Call. *AP* 12.71.3, Prop. 1.5.22, 2.22A.21, 4.3.27, Dio Chrys. 7.78f., Plut. *Ant.* 53.3, Paulus Silentiarius *AP* 5.239. At *Ars* 1.735, Ovid suggests that the komos itself is an important cause of thinness in lovers: *attenuant iuuenum uigilatae corpora noctes*; cf. also *Met.* 3.395ff. (of Narcissus by the pool).

longus amor, like *quondam* (9 and 21) and *primo* (43), suggests that, despite its early position in the second edition, this elegy was not among the first to be composed; see Vol. 1, 94. For the phrase, cf. 3.10.42, *Ars* 1.49, *Rem.* 268, 543, Catull. 76.13, Verg. *Aen.* 1.749, 3.487, [Verg.] *Ciris* 383, Prop. 1.19.26, *CE* 444.1 and 750.3.

tales ... in usus: for this final use of *in*, cf. 1.12.15, 3.7.3, Bömer on *Met.* 6.410, and see also on 1.1.22. Ovid is possibly influenced here by Prop. 2.22A.21 *tibi si exilis uideor tenuatus in artus*.

corpus tenuauit: *tenuare* occurs 17 (8) times in Ovid, at Verg. *Georg.* 3.129, Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.84 *tenuatum corpus*, 2.4.52, *Carm.* 3.3.72, Prop. 2.22A.21 (quoted above), 3.1.5, 4.3.27 (in an erotic context) *diceris et macie uultum tenuasse*, earlier only at Lucil. 360 and Lucr. 1.312. The simple verb remained somewhat more strictly a poetic form (see Norden on Verg. *Aen.* 6.620) than was *attenuare* (see on 1.1.18). Since, however, Celsus has *corpus extenuare* at 1.3.16, 2.6.8, 3.21.8, *corpus tenuare* at 3.22.12, Ovid is possibly exploiting a technical medical term.

apta ... membra dedit: 'rendered my limbs suitable (i.e. for *tales* ...

usus)'. For *dare* so used with a proleptic adjective, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9.323 *haec ego uasta dabo*, TLL 5.1.1686.77ff.

subducto pondere: *corpore* (PYSω) would here mean 'flesh'; cf. Lucr. 1.1038f. *priuatā cibo natura animantum / diffluit amittens corpus*, Phaedr. 3.7.5 *quo cibo fecisti tantum corporis?*, Cels. 7.3.4 *cibi potionesque corpori faciendo aptae*, TLL 4.1005.64ff. Despite Ovid's tolerance, however, of apparently inconsequential repetitions (see on 1.5.1f. *mediam ... / ... medio*), it seems likely that *corpore* is an intrusion influenced by *corpus* (5) and that he wrote *pondere* (ς). For the substitution of one dactylic ablative for another, see Diggle (1980) 404f., Skutsch on Enn. *Ann.* 224, Papanghelis (1987) 179, n. 80. For *pondus* in this context, cf. 2.10.24 *pondere, non neruis, corpora nostra carent* and also *Epist. Sapph.* 178 *mea non magnum corpora pondus habent*. (For a more effective repetition of *corpus*, involving the senses 'body' and 'flesh', cf. Mart. *Epigr.* 7.5f. *uiuebant laceri membris stillantibus artus / inque omni nusquam corpore corpus erat*.) I can cite no parallel for *pondus subducere*, and *corpus subducere* bears a different sense from that required here at Petron. 98.1 and Sil. 7.622. The medical sense 'purge' may be in play here; cf. Cels. 3.4.2, Sen. *Dial.* 3.6.2, Gell. 4.11.4 *quoniam is cibus et subduceret sensim alium et leuigaret*, also LSJ s.v. ὑπάγω A iv 3.

7-8. Ovid is echoing Tib. 1.2.17ff. (of Venus, in a komastic context) *illa fauet seu quis iuuenis noua limina temptat / seu reserat fixo dente puella fores: / illa docet molli furtim derepere lecto, / illa pedem nullo ponere posse sono* and possibly also 2.1.73ff. (of Cupid) *hic iuueni detraxit opes, hic dicere iussit / limen ad iratae uerba pudenda senem: / hoc duce custodes furtim transgressa iacentes / ad iuuenem tenebris sola puella uenit / et pedibus praetemptat iter suspensa timore, / explorat caecas cui manus ante uias*. In Tibullus, Venus and Cupid teach the girl how to creep out; here, Ovid claims that Cupid has taught him how to creep in. The claim seems somewhat inappropriately addressed to the door-keeper himself, especially in the light of lines 43f., where Ovid recalls his difficulties in gaining access in the past. Perhaps the implication here is that the door-keeper need not fear punishment through Ovid's being caught in the house by the chaperon who sleeps at the door of his mistress' bedroom (cf. *Ars* 2.260). For such divine guidance, cf. also 3.1.49ff., Tib. 1.8.55ff., [Tib.] 3.12.11f.

ille ... / ... ille: for hymnic anaphora of the demonstrative pronoun, the '“Er”-Stil der Prädikation', cf. Tib. 1.2.17ff. and 2.1.73ff. (both

quoted above), Lygd. 6.13ff. and [Verg.] *Ciris* 135ff. (both of Cupid), *Fast.* 4.91ff. (of Venus), Norden (1913) 163ff. Note that *ille* (i.e. Cupid) picks up *amor* (5); the god is not named till line 11. For such combinations of personification and non-personification, see on 1.1.30 and 3.10.38.

per excubias ... ire / monstrat: cf. *Met.* 13.341f. *cur audet Vlixes / ire per excubias?*, Tac. *Ann.* 14.44.1 *excubias transire*. The construction of *monstrare* with an infinitive is largely confined to poetry; cf. *Ars* 1.649f., 2.65, *Fast.* 3.759, *TLL* 8.1442.82ff., also 5.1.507.44ff. (s.v. *demonstro*).

leniter: on the need for stealth in clandestine love-affairs, see on 49f.

inoffensus derigit ille pedes: cf. 3.1.49ff. *per me* (sc. Elegy) *decepto didicit custode Corinna / ... / ... impercussos nocte mouere pedes*. *inoffensus* has particular point here, since Ovid is drunk (37f., 59f.); cf. 1.12.5f. *limen transire memento / cautius atque alte sobria ferre pedem*. The word occurs first at Varro *Men.* 288.2, then at Tib. 1.7.62 *inoffensum rettulerit ... pedem*, Verg. *Aen.* 10.292, elsewhere in Ovid at *Trist.* 1.9.1, 3.4A.33. *derigit* is the reading of Y and, probably, of Pa, and was conjectured independently by Housman *ap. Edwards*. The rest of the tradition offers *dirigit*. Mss-authority is of no real account, for the two forms are regularly confused beyond redemption by scribes; see *TLL* 5.1.1232.32ff., 1241.30ff. Apart from *direxit* in a Tiberian inscription probably to be dated to A.D. 15-16 (see *L'Année épigraphique* [1940] No. 69), there is no certain inscriptional evidence for *dirigere* earlier than *Edict. Imp. Diocl.* S I 30. At *Diff.* 1.153, Isidore attempts to establish a distinction: *derigimus quae curua sunt, dirigimus, cum aliquo tendimus*. If *di(s)rigere* was current in the Augustan period, however, it presumably connoted motion in different directions, a sense inapposite here.

9-14. Ovid is exploiting the commonplace that lovers are sacrosanct or, more precisely, that they feel no fear; cf. Arist. *Eth. Eud.* 1229A *ἄν τε γὰρ ἐρᾷ, θρασὺς μᾶλλον ἢ δειλός, καὶ ὑπομένει πολλοὺς κινδύνους*, Posidippus *AP* 5.213.3f. *καὶ διὰ κλωπῶν / ἤλθον Ἐρωτι θρασεῖ χρώμενος ἡγεμόνι*, Anon. *AP* 12.115.3f. (quoted on 16), Philodemus (?) *AP* 5.25, Hor. *Carm.* 1.22, Tib. 1.2.23ff. (of Venus) *nec docet hoc omnes, sed quos nec inertia tardat / nec uetat obscura surgere nocte timor. / ... / quisquis amore tenetur, eat tutusque sacerque / qualibet; insidias non timuisse decet*, 1.6.51, Prop. 2.27.11ff., 3.16.5ff. See also on 2.11.51f. Though the unlit streets of any ancient

city must have been dangerous at night, this was notoriously true of Rome; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.42ff., Plin. *Nat.* 8.144, Tac. *Ann.* 13.25, Suet. *Nero* 26, Juv. 3.268ff., 10.19ff., 14.174, Courtney on 3.305. At *Eleg. in Maecen.* 1.28ff., Maecenas is praised for making the streets safe for lovers at night through his reform of the police: *num tibi non tutas fecit in Vrbe uias? / nocte sub obscura quis te spoliavit amantem? / quis tetigit ferro, durior ipse, latus?*

9-10. noctem simulacraque uana: 'insubstantial nocturnal ghosts'. *uana* has particular point, since Ovid is no longer afraid of ghosts.

mirabar ... quisquis: I can cite no parallel for this construction, but *si quis* (ς) is probably a trivialisation. For the omission of an antecedent to *quisquis*, cf. Plaut. *Men.* 717 *omnia mala ingerebat quemquem aspexerat*, also Ter. *Ad.* 197 *minime miror qui insanire occipiunt ex iniuria*. Ovid may be Grecising; cf. e.g. Thuc. 3.38.1 *θαυμάζω δὲ καὶ ὅστις ἔσται ὁ ἀντερῶν*.

tenebris occurs without qualification meaning 'through the darkness' in comparable contexts at Tib. 1.2.25, 1.6.59 and 2.1.76.

11-12. This couplet has affinities with the opening poem of the book, in which Cupid mocks Ovid (3f.) and, acting swiftly (21; cf. 13 below), imposes on him a briefly expressed command (24).

risit, ut audirem: cf. Persius 2.8 *haec* (sc. *dicit*) *clare et ut audiat hospes*, Mart. 2.44.6 *secum, sed ut audiam, susurrat*.

tenera cum matre Cupido: cf. 2.9.51 *si tamen exaudis, pulchra cum matre, Cupido, Met.* 9.482 *pro! Venus et tenera uolucer cum matre Cupido* with Bömer's note, Stat. *Silu.* 3.4.88 (of the Amorini) *accurrunt teneri Paphia cum matre uolucres*, Musaeus 39f. *τὸν Ἐρωτα ... / μητρὶ σὺν οὐρανίῃ* with Kost's note. See also on 2.1.15 *cum Ioue fulmen*. *tenera* may allude to the derivation of Ἀφροδίτη from ἄβρός; see Vol. 1, 55f. Here, where her son is inspiring Ovid to doughty deeds, the epithet is perhaps slightly paradoxical.

fortis: for bravery inspired by love, cf. e.g. 1.9.5ff., 2.16.19ff., 3.2.10.

ait: aio: Ov. 208 (186), Verg. 49 (46), Hor. 33 (0), Tib. 2, Prop. 12 (7 in Book 4), Catull. 4, Lucr. 4, Sen. *Trag.* 4, Lucan 23, Val. Fl. 78, Sil. 45, Stat. 66 (*Silu.* 7), Mart. 16, Juv. 4, Cic. 200+, Caes. 0, Sall. 13, Liv. 126, Tac. 14. In poetry, the verb is found predominantly in the higher genres. It is therefore perhaps significant that the speaker here is a god. It may be worth noting that one of the two Tibullan instances occurs in a related context: *'quid me spernis?' ait. 'poterat custodia*

uinci: / ipse dedit cupidis fallere posse deus (sc. Cupid). / ... / et possum media quamuis obrepere nocte' (1.8.55f., 59); compare Tibullus' expression with 3.7.77 *'quid me ludis?'* ait, one of only three further occurrences of the verb in the *Amores* (the others being 3.1.20 [where the speaker is the goddess Tragedy] and 3.9.57).

13-14. nec mora, uenit amor: the intentions of deities are swiftly accomplished; see on 1.1.21 *protinus*. For the assonance in *mora ... amor*, cf. *Ars* 3.436 *in nulla sede moratur Amor*, Plaut. *Poen.* 446 *ne ... meo amori obnoxim moram*, 509 *metui meo amori moram*, Prop. 1.3.43f. *querebar / externo longas saepe in amore moras*, 1.13.6 *in nullo quaeris amore moram*, *Epist.* Sapph. 169f. *nec mora, uersus amor fugit lentissima mersi / pectora. nec (haud) mora* is a rather elevated narrative formula. It occurs first in Augustan poetry, usually with asyndeton and always in the opening position of the line except at *Aen.* 3.207 and *Fast.* 5.254; Ov. 40 (29), Verg. 11 (9), Hor. 0, Tib. 0, Prop. 3 (all in Book 4). For variations on the phrase, see Bömer on *Met.* 11.160f. *in iudice ... / nulla mora est* and on 14.362. *uenit amor:* cf. e.g. *Epist.* 4.19 *uenit amor grauius, quo serior*, Prop. 1.7.26, 1.9.1, 2.3B.46, [Tib.] 3.13.1.

non ... / non: the anaphora seems to be derived from the related context at Tib. 1.2.28ff. *insidias non timuisse decet. / non mihi pigra nocent hibernae frigora noctis, / non mihi cum multa decidit imber aqua. / non labor hic laedit.*

umbras nocte uolantes: cf. Claud. 3.126 *umbrarum tenui stridore uolantum. nocte uolantes* is equivalent to a compound adjective, such as *noctiuolans* (which is not extant). For *nocte uolare*, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.184 (of Fama), *Met.* 4.415 (of bats), *Fast.* 6.135 (of striges), also 1.8.13 (of Dipsas) *nocturnas uersam uolitare per umbras.*

non timeo strictas in mea fata manus: an echo of, or the model for, Prop. 3.16.5f. (Cynthia has demanded that he come by night to join her at Tibur) *quid faciam? obductis committam mene tenebris, / ut timeam audaces in mea membra manus?* For the expression here, which recurs at *Trist.* 5.2.30 (with *non timeo* replaced by *ut taceam* [cf. Propertius' *ut timeam*]), cf. 2.14.4 *caecas armant in sua fata manus*, *Ars* 3.672, *Fast.* 3.546, *Pont.* 1.9.22 *continuit promptas in mea fata manus*, Prop. 3.9.56 *Antoni ... graues in sua fata manus*, 3.22.38 *curuatas in sua fata trabes*, *TLL* 6.359.44ff. For the final use of *in*, see also on 1.1.22 *in exitium spicula facta meum. strictas ... manus* (cf. *Epist.* 12.102, *Trist. loc. cit.*) is an easy brachylogy; the expression is rather more striking at Petron. 96.3 *stricto ... articulo*, Stat. *Theb.*

2.514 *strictos ... in uulnera dentes* and Juv. 5.169 *stricto pane.*

15-16. Ovid addresses the door-keeper as if he were a god (for details of the liturgical language, see below). In so doing, he is extending the conceit whereby the komast prays to the door as if it were divine; cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 88f. *agite, bibite, festiuae fores; / potate, fite mihi uolentes, propitiae*, 147ff., Prop. 1.16.35ff. (with Fedeli's note on 35-36), Watson (1982), esp. 95f. See also on 2.2.1, where Ovid begins his plea to Bagoas with the hymnic *quem penes*. This passage is echoed at *Met.* 8.69ff. (of Scylla) *aditus custodia seruat, / claustraque portarum genitor tenet; hunc ego solum / infelix timeo, solus mea uota moratur*, 9.547 (quoted below), 13.855ff. (Polyphemus to Galatea, in a reworking of the komos in Theocr. 11) *tantum miserere precesque / supplicis exaudi! tibi enim succumbimus uni, / quique Iouem et caelum sperno et penetrabile fulmen, / Nerei, te ueneror: tua fulmine saeuior ira est.*

te ... tibi ... / tu ...: the elegantly varied anaphora of the pronouns, each emphatically placed at the beginning of its clause, not only suggests Ovid's sense of urgency but also parodies the '“Du-Stil” der Prädikation' in prayers to deities; cf. 1.1.15, 1.2.33, 1.13.11ff., 2.8.19, 2.9.47ff., 3.6.61ff., Plaut. *Curc.* 147f. *pessuli, heus pessuli, uos saluto lubens, / uos amo, uos uolo, uos peto atque opsecro*, Prop. 1.16.35ff., Norden (1913) 143ff. The alliteration of *t*, like that of *p* in *possis perdere*, has an archaic liturgical color; see on 1.4.27f. By contrast, the *t*-sounds at Prop. 1.16.22 *turpis et in tepido limine somnus erit* seem to suggest sobbing or shivering (cf. 20 below).

lentum: the door-keeper is so called also at 41 and 72. The term is used of the beloved in a komastic context at Prop. 2.14.22 and *Met.* 13.800. It is sometimes applied to deities slow to heed prayers, as at e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 4.13.5f. *cantu pota Cupidinem / lentum sollicitas.*

tibi blandior uni: for the komast's *blanditiae*, cf. 2.1.21, 3.1.46, *Ars* 2.527, *Rem.* 35, 507, Prop. 1.16.16. At *Ars* 2.251ff., Ovid advises that the lover should not be too proud to ingratiate himself with his mistress' domestic staff, including the door-keeper. *blandior:* Ov. 12 (7), Verg. 0, Hor. 1 (*Carm.* 3.11.15f. [to the god Mercury; many editors regard this stanza as spurious] *cessit immanis tibi blandienti / ianitor aulae* [sc. Cerberus]), Tib. 0, Prop. 0 (unless *blanditaeque* be read at 4.6.72). The verb is a strong term, emphasising Ovid's undignified predicament; cf. Call. *frg.* 178.19 *ἐλεύθερος ἀτμμένα σαίνει*. For the hymnic color of *uni*, cf. 3.3.26 *nimirum solas omnia posse iubet* (n.), Bömer on *Met.* 9.547 (quoted below), Watson (1982)

96. *tibi ... uni* is possibly influenced by Tib. 1.2.9 *ianua, iam pateas uni mihi uicta querellis*. (Note the reference to Jupiter's thunder-bolts in Tibullus' line 8.)

possis perdere: for the phrase, cf. *Met.* 9.547 (Byblis to Caunus) *tu seruare potes, tu perdere solus amantem* with Bömer's note. *possis*: for praise of a deity's *potestas*, cf. 3.1.47, 3.2.55, 3.3.26, 3.10.35, West on Hes. *Theog.* 420, Fedeli on Prop. 1.14.17f. (of Venus) *illa potest magnas heroum infringere uires, / illa etiam duris mentibus esse dolor*.

fulmen: the humour of the couplet's hymnic style reaches its peak here; by attributing a thunder-bolt to him, Ovid equates the door-keeper specifically with Jupiter. He may be exploiting *AP* 12.115.3f. *κωμάσομαι· τί δέ μοι βροντέων μέλει ἢ τί κεραυνῶν, / ἦν βάλλῃ, τὸν ἔρωθ' ὄπλον ἄρρωτον ἔχων*; The date of that anonymous epigram is, however, unknown. As in the same context at 2.1.19f. *Iuppiter, ignoscas: nil me tua tela iuuabant; / clausa tuo maius ianua fulmen habet*, Ovid is punning on *fulmen* as meaning not only 'thunder-bolt' but also 'door-bolt'. The latter sense is not attested elsewhere, and depends on a derivation of the word from *fulcire* rather than *fulgere*; for *fulcire* used of bolting doors, see on line 28. There is a closely comparable pun in the frequent encomium of the Scipios as *fulmina belli*, signifying both 'thunder-bolts of war' and 'supports in war'. That play depends on the association of their name with *σκήπτω/σκήπτομαι*, from which are derived not only *σκήπτρον/σκήπων* (= *scipio*) but also *σκηπτός* (= *fulmen*). (An ingenious parallel is thereby produced for the derivation of the name of the Scipios' arch-enemies, the Barcidae, from the Punic word for 'thunder-bolt'.) See Skutsch (1956), Bartelink (1965) 67ff., Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 6.842. The sense 'support' is not attested other than in that word-play. It is, however, essentially the same as the sense 'door-bolt' in these Ovidian passages, in that it also is derived from *fulcire*. As a noun derived from *fulcire*, *fulmen* is a more elevated equivalent to *fulmentum*; see on 1.5.17 *uelamine*.

17-18. The *exclusus amator* is conventionally tearful; cf. e.g. 1.4.61, *Met.* 14.708, [Theocr.] 23.17, Asclep. *AP* 5.145.2ff., Meleager *AP* 5.191.5f., 12.72.6, Anon. *AP* 12.116.2, Lucr. 4.1177, Prop. 1.16.47f., 3.24.29 (= 25.9), Persius 5.165f. *Chrysidis udas / ebrius ante fores extincta cum face canto*, Mart. 10.14.8 *madet heul lacrimis ianua surda tuis*, Rufinus *AP* 5.103.1 *μέχρι τίνος ... παρακλαύσομαι*; Ovid ingeniously enlivens the topos here by combining it with a request that the door be opened. The goat-herd uses much the same trick at

Theocr. 3.12 *θάσαι μάν· θυμαλγὲς ἐμὴν ἄχος*, and Polyphemus is equally devious in his attempt to entice Galatea out of the sea at *Met.* 13.824ff.: *pauperis est numerare pecus! de laudibus harum / nil mihi credideris: praesens potes ipsa uidere, / ut uix circueant distantum cruribus uber*.

aspice possibly echoes Theocritus' *θάσαι μάν* (see above). The use of the term in appealing to a deity for favourable attention may be relevant here; see Watson (1982) 96f.

(uti uideas, immitia claustra relaxa): parenthesis, a stylistic device inherited predominantly from the Hellenistic poets (see Lapp [1965] 52f., Lyne [Verg.] *Ciris* pp. 30f.), is especially frequent in Ovid (see von Albrecht [1964] *passim*) and contributes substantially to the economy of his style. *uti uideas* is Ehwald's conjecture. Of the readings offered by the mss, only *et ut uideas* (ς) affords acceptable sense. (For parentheses introduced by *et*, cf. e.g. 2.5.45, *Ars* 3.673 *efficite [et facile est] ut nos credamus amari*.) That reading, however, like *ut inuideas* (S_o) and *ut et uideas* (γ) may be an attempt to repair the metre, damaged when *uti uideas* became *ut uideas* (PYHW¹), an error caused by the trivialisation of *uti* to the more common form. *uti*: Ov. 10 (4), Verg. 7 (4), Hor. 20 (3), Tib. 0, Prop. 3. The phrasing of one of the Propertian instances, *aspice uti caelo modo sol modo luna ministret* (2.22A.35), and the substance of another, *cernere uti possis uultum custodis amari* (2.23.9), suggest that either or both may have influenced Ovid here at least subconsciously. Being an archaic form, *uti* may lend Ovid's plea a touch of solemnity. Moreover, it is perhaps unlikely that, even with a difference in sense, Ovid wrote *ut* in the same position in both lines of the couplet. *immitia claustra*: cf. 2 *difficilem ... forem* (n.). For *relaxare* used of opening doors, cf. Sen. *Thy.* 902, Petron. 89.57 *Danai relaxant claustra* (echoing Verg. *Aen.* 2.259 *laxat claustra Sinon*).

uda, both here and at Persius *loc. cit.*, may be a humorous hyperbole, 'drenched' rather than simply 'wet'. *udus* is a stronger term than *umidus* (used of a door in a komastic context at Prop. 1.16.4 *captorum lacrimis umida supplicibus*); cf. Sen. *Nat.* 2.25 *dicis ... nubes attritas edere ignem, cum sint umidae, immo udae* and see also on 1.8.84.

uda sit ut ...: for the postponement of the conjunction, cf. 2.11.50 *paene sit ut mediis obruta nauis aquis*, Fast. 1.326 *una sit ut proprio littera dempta loco*, *Ibis* 28 *terra sit ut propior testificanda mihi*, Pont. 2.9.66 *terra sit exiliis ut tua fida meis*, 3.2.2 *missa sit ut uere perueniatque precor*. See also on 1.5.14 *sed tamen*.

19-20. For this appeal to good service rendered in the past, cf. Tib. 1.2.13f. (to the door) *te meminisse decet quae plurima uoce peregi / supplice cum posti mollia serta darem*, Prop. 1.16.35ff.

certe ego: although it involves a rather harsh elision (cf. 2.10.3 *per te ego* [n.], Platnauer [1951] 74) and does not otherwise occur in Augustan poetry, Ovid has this collocation 13 (4) times.

cum ... stares ad uerba: for *stare ad*, cf. *Trist.* 2.310, Sen. *Contr.* 9.2.8 (*iubet*) *miserum stare ad praebendas ceruices immotum*, Stat. *Ach.* 1.593f., Juv. 11.118. For the *adnominatio* in *uerba ... / ... uerba*, cf. *Epist.* 10.38 *uerba cum uerbis mixta fuere meis*, Plaut. *Men.* 978, *Truc.* 112 *me illis quidem haec uerberat uerbis*, Ter. *Haut.* 356 *tibi erunt parata uerba, huic homini uerba*, Cic. *Tusc.* 3.64, Varro *Rust.* 1.17.5. It may be worth noting that some detected an etymological link; cf. Varro *ap.* Aug. *Dialect.* 6.9 (= GRF p. 281), Quint. *Inst.* 1.6.34 *uerba ab aere uerberato*.

posita ... ueste: on the stripping of slaves for flogging, see Courtney on Juv. 6.476f. *ponant / cosmetae tunicas*. For the phrase here, see on 1.5.17 *posito uelamine*.

The alliteration of *u* in the hexameter (cf. Lucr. 6.114f., *Epist.* 20.79 *famuli, cum uerba saeua uerentur*) and, more especially, of *t* in the pentameter suggests the door-keeper's trembling.

21-22. The expression of the thought is somewhat obscured by the change in the terms of reference of *gratia*. In the hexameter, Ovid claims that he once enjoyed sufficient favour *with Corinna* to benefit not only himself but also the door-keeper; in the pentameter, he laments that he now does not have sufficient favour *with the door-keeper* to benefit himself.

ergo ...?: see on 1.4.3.

gratia: cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 153ff. *hoc uide ut dormiunt pessuli pessumi / nec mea gratia commouent se ocus! / respicio nihili meam uos gratiam facere*.

(heu facinus!): the exclamation occurs first here and at *Epist.* 16.215, *Ars* 1.751, *Met.* 8.85, *Epiced.* *Drusi* 174; see TLL 6.78.50ff., 2673.5ff. *heu:* Ov. 48 (19), Verg. 45 (34), Hor. 22 (14), Tib. 14, Prop. 12. Despite its frequency in elegy, the word is rather elevated (see Grassmann [1966] 99, Lyne on [Verg.] *Ciris* 264, Knox [1986] 32), and is therefore appropriate to Ovid's pose of righteous indignation here.

parum: the elegists rarely place adverbs in the final position in the pentameter; see Platnauer (1951) 40f. For *parum* so placed, cf. *Trist.*

3.8.18, 3.11.38, 4.2.26, *Pont.* 3.7.12. (At Prop. 3.7.34 [*parum est*] and *Epist.* 14.82, *parum* is used substantively.) Only one other pentameter in the *Amores* ends with an adverb, 3.14.8 *palam*; cf. also 3.[5.]28 *procul*. (At 2.8.24, 2.10.12 and 2.13.28, *satis* is used substantively.) The rarity of adverbs in this position probably does not reflect a deliberate stylistic choice. Few adverbs have a suitable prosody, and natural word-order does not often favour placing them there. Adverbs end hexameters much more freely. In the *Amores*, there are fifteen instances: 1.4.13, 45, 1.6.21, 1.14.17, 2.5.59, 2.7.1, 13, 2.9.29, 2.14.43, 2.17.21, 3.6.15, 3.11.7, 31, 49, 3.12.13. See also on 1.8.78 *amans*.

23-24. redde uicem meritis: 'return the favour'; cf. *Met.* 14.36, *Pont.* 2.10.51, 3.5.35, Curt. 4.10.29, Sen. *Med.* 482 *miserere, redde supplici felix uicem*, *Herc. F.* 1337f. *gratiam meritis refer / uicemque nostris*, Plin. *Epist.* 2.9.6, Tac. *Hist.* 3.75.3, Charis. *Gramm.* 412.11f. Barwick *uicem tibi reddam: beneficium idem repraesentabo, parem gratiam referam, aequabo te meritis*.

grato licet esse quod optas: Munari detected the most probably correct interpretation of these words in a marginal comment in *Ob:* *quod si gratus mihi fueris, hoc quod optas, sc. libertatem, habebis, sc. me intercedente pro te ad dominam*. (The same interpretation occurs almost *uerbatim* in the margin of *C*, with *esse liberum* written above *optas*.) In his *apparatus criticus*, Kenney objects that, in 25f., Ovid is merely praying for the door-keeper's freedom, not promising it. That is not a serious objection: Propertius, in the opening couplet of 3.6 (quoted on 25 *umquam*), prays for freedom for Lygdamus, who seems to be Cynthia's slave (on this problem, see Fedeli's introduction to that elegy [pp. 204f.]), but, in the final couplet, he promises it: *quod mihi si e tanto felix concordia bello / exstiterit, per me, Lygdame, liber eris* (41f.). Kenney prefers the interpretation *habes occasionem gratiae referendae, id quod optas*. There is, however, no indication anywhere in the poem that the door-keeper has any desire to show his gratitude to Ovid. Perhaps more significantly, that interpretation would require us to construe *quod optas* as appositional to *grato ... esse*, whereas Ovidian usage suggests that *esse quod optas* is to be taken as a unit; cf. 2.4.5 *odi, nec possum, cupiens, non esse quod odi*, *Met.* 1.488f. *te decor iste quod optas / esse uetat*. It may also be worth noting that Ovid rarely admits a sense-pause at the fifth trochee in a hexameter (see on 1.4.11).

tempora noctis eunt; excute poste seram: the verse recurs at regular

intervals, in lines 32, 40, 48 and 56. For such a refrain in a komos, cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 971f. and 974f. ἀνοιξον, ἀσπάζου με / διὰ τοι σὲ πόνου ἐχῶ. (952ff. and 960ff. are antiphonal.) As is noted by Stroh (1971) 151, n. 38, Ovid seems to be hinting at the practice of charming doors open by magic incantations, for which cf. 2.1.27f. *carminibus cessare fores, insertaque posti, / quamuis robur erat, carmine uicta sera est*, Prop. 3.3.49 *clausas ... excantare puellas*. Copley (1956) 29ff. detects 'a modified version of an old *carmen magicum*' in Phaedromus' door-song at Plaut. *Curc.* 147ff. For refrains in magic incantations, cf. *Pap. Gr. Mag.* 8.1, Aesch. *Eum.* 328ff., Theocr. 2.17ff., Verg. *Ecl.* 8.68ff. The balance between the two halves of the line in rhythm and sound enhances its power to charm. Only fifteen pentameters in the *Amores* (i.e. barely more than 1%) contain words of a matching numerical sequence of syllables in both hemistichs (here, 3, 2, 2). In many cases, the parallelism is clearly deliberate and pointed; cf. e.g. 60, 2.10.22, 2.11.36, 3.3.8, 3.6.48, 3.7.48 *oscula ferre: tuli; proximus esse: fui*, 3.9.32 *altera cura recens, altera primus amor*. Here, the first vowels of the corresponding words are the same: *tempora/excute, noctis/poste, eunt/seram*. Compare the use of balance and rhyme in magic charms at e.g. Varro *Rust.* 1.2.27 *terra pestem teneto, salus hic maneto in meis pedibus*, Verg. *Ecl.* 8.80 *limus ut hic durescit et haec ut cera liquescit*, Marcell. *Med.* 8.191; see also Watson (1982) 93, n. 9 and the note on 3.14.15 *quae facis, haec facito: tantum fecisse negato*. Apart from its connotations of magic, the refrain serves to maintain a convincing dramatic framework in this rather lengthy version of the komos, so as to create an impression of time passing, and to emphasise Ovid's desperation and helplessness. One might compare the repetitious nature of the ideas and language in the komastic Grenfell Fragment (Powell [1925] 177ff.). For refrains elsewhere in Hellenistic and Roman poetry, cf. Theocr. 1.64ff., 127ff., 2.69ff., Bion *Epitaph. Adon.* 1ff., [Mosch.] *Epitaph. Bion.* 8ff., Catull. 45.8ff., 61.4ff., 90ff., 117ff., 62.5ff., 64.327ff., Verg. *Ecl.* 8.21ff., [Verg.] *Dirae* 1ff., 104ff. (= *Lydia* 1ff.), Ov. *Epist.* 9.146ff., Nonn. *Dion.* 31.143ff. See also on 1.13.3 *quo properas, Aurora?*

Ovid rarely structures his poems in clearly defined symmetrical units; exceptions are 1.5, which consists of three sections of eight lines with a two-line *coda* (see the introduction to that poem), and the concluding passage of *Epist.* 9, which has the refrain *impia, quid dubitas, Deianira, mori?* four times, at six-line intervals, from 146 to 164 (see also on 1.4.15f. and 3.15.5f.). Here, the occurrence of the refrain in every eighth line from 24 to 56 might seem to create a

tightly-controlled symmetry on a somewhat larger scale. It should, however, be noted that the thought-content of the passage is not strictly limited by the arithmetical units: the door-keeper's hopes for freedom are referred to in 23 and again, after the refrain, in 25f.; Ovid protests his non-violent intentions from 29 to 39; the threats which begin at 53 extend to 60. On the structure of the poem as a whole, see on 65f.

tempora noctis eunt: the swiftness of the rhythm suggests the swift passing of the night; Ovid is desperately hoping for admission before dawn. More usually, the night seems long to the *exclusus amator*; cf. 2.19.21f. *sine me ante tuos proiectum in limine postes / longa pruinosa frigora nocte pati*, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.25.7 *me tuo longas pereunte noctes* and see also on 1.2.3 *noctem, quam longa. tempora noctis*: for the phrase, cf. 2.10.27, 2.11.51, *Rem.* 400, *Met.* 8.1f., 11.306, *Fast.* 6.384, Prop. 3.20.13. *eunt*: for *ire* used of time elapsing, cf. *Ibis* 626 *nox tibi talis eat*, Apul. *Met.* 1.14 *nox ibat in diem*, *TLL* 5.2.645.16ff. *abire* is the more normal term; cf. 1.5.6 *nox abiit* (n.), *TLL* 1.69.79ff.

25-26. *umquam* is difficult. With that reading, the couplet contains a prayer that good may befall the door-keeper provided that he accede to Ovid's request. For such conditional prayers in a komastic context, cf. 3.6.19f. *tu potius, ripis effuse capacibus amnis, / (sic aeternus eas) labere fine tuo!*, *Epist.* 18.45f. (Leander to Boreas, who is making the Hellespont impassable) *parce, precor, facilemque moue moderatius auram! / imperet Hippotades sic tibi triste nihil*. At Prop. 3.6.1f. (quoted below), the prayer for Lygdamus' freedom is framed in the same way. Cf. also *Am.* 1.13.3f., 2.13.12ff., Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.1, Bömer on *Met.* 8.857f. Although *umquam* is largely confined to negative and quasi-negative sentences (see K.-S. 1.637), Quint. *Inst.* 12.2.9 offers a fairly close parallel: *utinam ... sit tempus umquam quo perfectus aliquis ... orator hanc artem ... uindicet sibi*. (For a structurally closer, but negatively expressed, parallel, cf. *CE* 995.23 *parce, ita non unquam similem experiare dolorem*.) *umquam*, however, seems to make the prospect of freedom rather vague and therefore less tempting. The difficulty would be removed if one could suppose that Ovid wrote *dominae* (*uel sim.*); cf. Prop. 3.6.1f. *Dic mihi de nostra, quae sentis, uera puella: / sic tibi sint dominae, Lygdame, dempta iuga*. The intrusion of *umquam* in part of the tradition at 2.2.28 (for *autem*) and, probably, at 3.6.97 (for *tum*) gives little support, however, to such a drastic solution. Alton (1922) 276

proposed *inquam*, interpreting this couplet as a repetition of the argument in line 23. Goold (1965a) 21 endorses that proposal and, in his revision of the Loeb edition, translates 'thus, I say, you may be rid of your long chain, nor have to drink for all time the waters of slavery!' This use of *inquam*, as an emphasising interjection, though not unparalleled in Augustan poetry (cf. *Met.* 13.284, *Fast.* 6.608, *Hor. Sat.* 1.10.64, *Carm.* 2.8.13), is found most frequently in Comedy; see *TLL* 7.1.1782.45ff. A Comic nuance would not be out of place here; see the introduction and the notes to 26, 41, 52, 64 and 74. With the reading *inquam*, however, the verbs *releuere* ... / *nec ... bibatur* become vulnerable to much the same objection as that raised above against *umquam*: if Ovid is assuring the door-keeper that compliance will guarantee him his freedom, why does he use the remote and hypothetical present subjunctive rather than the much more positive and persuasive future indicative?

longa releuere catena echoes the commiserative description of the door-keeper in line 1 *dura religate catena*. *longa*: not simply 'long' (and therefore heavy) in the physical sense, but also 'endured for a long time'; for *longus* used with a temporal sense, cf. 5 *longus amor*, 1.3.5 *longos ... annos* (n.), 1.8.105 *longo ... usu*, 114 *longas hiemes*, 3.9.31 *longum ... nomen*, Verg. *Aen.* 2.26 *omnis longo soluit se Teucra luctu*, *TLL* 7.2.1636.71ff. *releuare* occurs 18 (10) times in Ovid, earlier only at *Ter. Ad.* 602, 7 times in Cicero's prose works and at *Prop.* 1.14.22. For the construction with the ablative, cf. *Cic. Catil.* 1.31 (*bis*), *Sen. Ag.* 460 *lassa Titan colla releuabat iugo*.

nec tibi perpetuo serua bibatur aqua: cf. *Prop.* 1.9.2 *nec tibi perpetuo libera uerba fore*, 2.26.32 *ex una saepe bibemus aqua*. The echo of neither passage, however, seems to serve any particular purpose, and may be fortuitous. *serua ... aqua*: cf. Antiphanes *frg.* 25.4f. *Kock μηδέποθ' ὕδωρ πίοιμι / ἔλευθέριον*, Xenarchus *frg.* 5 *Kock ἐμοὶ γένοιτο σοῦ ζώσης, τέκνον, / ἔλευθέριον πιοῦσαν οἶνον ἀποθανεῖν*, *Petron.* 71.1 *serui ... cito aquam liberam gustabunt*. See also Fraenkel on *Aesch. Ag.* 1041 *δουλίας μάζης*. The speaker in the Xenarchus fragment seems to be a nurse, a traditionally alcoholic character. The expression here may be similarly pointed, implying a contrast with Ovid's drunken condition (cf. 37, 59) and implying that the door-keeper, when freed, will be able to drink alcohol whenever he wishes. The use of the epithet *serua* emphasises the passage's Comic associations. *seruus* (adj.): *Ov.* 3 (0), *Verg.* 0, *Hor.* 1 (0), *Tib.* 0, *Prop.* 0, *Plaut.* 8 (7 times in the phrase *seruus homo*), *Ter.* 1. (The word's Comic *color* is more clearly illustrated by the statistics presented on

74 *conseruae*, 1.8.87 *seruus* [subst. masc.], 2.8.12 *serua* [subst. fem.].)

27-28. ferreus: for this epithet applied to persons, with the sense 'hard-hearted', cf. 1.7.50, 1.14.28, 2.5.11, 2.19.4, *Sen. Epist.* 56.3 *ferreum aut surdum*, *TLL* 6.574.31ff., and see also on 1.11.9. The word's original meaning is 'made of iron'. (For adjectives formed with the Indo-European suffix *-eyo-*, denoting material, see Ross [1969] 60f.) That primary sense is in play here; cf. 62 *o foribus durior ipse tuis*. For *ferreus* as an epithet for doors and door-fittings, see *TLL* 6.573.31ff., 58f., and note also 3.8.31f. (of Jupiter's komos to Danae) *durus pater, ipsa seuera, / aerati postes, ferrea turris erat*.

orantem: a grand word: *Ov.* 58 (39), *Verg.* 31 (27), *Hor.* 9 (1), *Tib.* 1, *Prop.* 1, *Catull.* 2, *Lucr.* 1, *Sen. Trag.* 2, *Lucan.* 7, *Val. Fl.* 16, *Sil.* 50, *Stat.* 34 (*Silu.* 4), *Mart.* 11, *Juv.* 3. It occurs elsewhere in the *Amores* only at 1.8.77 (in the same context) *surda sit oranti tua ianua, laxa ferenti*. In the sole Propertian instance, *te licet orantem fuscae deus audiat aulae* (4.11.5), the dead Cornelia conceives her separation from her husband in terms reminiscent of the komos; cf. 2 *panditur ad nullas ianua nigra preces*. Especially since the elevated tone is maintained in *nequiquam* (see below) and in the line's rather impressive rhythm (see on 1.1.23), it may be that the liturgical connotations of *orare* are perceptible here; for the door-keeper as a god, see on 15f. and below, on *audis*.

nequiquam: cf. *Tib.* 1.5.67f. *heu, canimus frustra, nec uerbis uicta patescit / ianua*, *Prop.* 2.14.21 *pulsabant alii frustra dominamque uocabant*. *nequiquam* is a grander term than *frustra*. *nequiquam*: *Ov.* 17 (16 [*Met.* 15]), *Verg.* 41 (36), *Hor.* 5 (3), *Tib.* 0, *Prop.* 2; *frustra*: *Ov.* 79 (50), *Verg.* 29 (19), *Hor.* 14 (5), *Tib.* 5, *Prop.* 7. See also *TLL* 6.1429.57ff.

audis is to be construed closely with *ferreus*; cf. e.g. 3.11.30 *lenta ... audit*. For *audire* used of deities attending to prayers, see on 1.3.4.

roborebus duris: for *durus* in komastic contexts, cf. 62, 68, 74, 1.9.19, 2.1.22, 3.1.53, 3.8.31, 3.11.10. In most of these passages, as here, Ovid plays on the literal meaning 'hard' and the sense 'obdurate'; cf. also 1.11.9, 3.7.57f. *adamanta ... durum / ... mouere*, 3.12.40. For *robur* signifying obduracy, see Nisbet-Hubbard on *Hor. Carm.* 1.3.9. Ovid makes the same play on the literal and metaphorical meanings of the term at 2.1.27f. *carminibus cessere fores, insertaque posti, / quamuis robur erat, carmine uicta sera est*.

fulta: cf. *Ars* 2.244 *erit opposita ianua fulta sera*, *Verg. Aen.* 8.227

fultos ... emuniit obice postes, and see also on 16 *fulmen*.

riget: cf. *Epist. Sapph.* 207f. *ecquid ago precibus pectusque agreste mouetur, / an riget et Zephyri uerba caduca ferunt?* and see on 73 *rigido ... limine*.

29-30. An argument *e maiore*; for this technique, cf. e.g. 1.13.43ff., 2.8.13f., 2.17.15ff., 3.14.9ff., *Epist.* 4.6, 165f., 6.129f., 19.183ff., 20.39f., *Ars* 2.221f., 241, *Rem.* 721f., *Met.* 2.60ff. For the comparison of the komos to the siege of a city, see on 1.9.19f.

clausae munimina portae: Barsby suggests that *clausae ... portae* is nominative, with *munimina* in apposition. Normally, however, the noun in apposition is equipped with a defining epithet; cf. 1.12.7 *difficiles, funebria ligna, tabellae* (n.), *Sil.* 13.251f. *cardine uerso / obnixi torquent obices, munimina sera*. It is much more likely that *clausae ... portae* is genitive; cf. *Met.* 4.773 *locum solidae tutum munimine molis*, *Lucan.* 1.517 *subitus rapti munimine caespitis agger*. *munimen* occurs earlier only at *Verg. Georg.* 2.352, elsewhere in *Ovid* at *Met. loc. cit.* and 13.212. The prosaic equivalent, *munimentum*, is found first at *Caes. Gall.* 2.17.4, eleven times in *Sallust* and ninety times in *Livy*. For such grand formations in *-men*, see on 1.5.17 *uelamine*.

prosunt: only thirty-one pentameters in the *Amores* (2.6%) begin with a spondaic word of two syllables. (I do not include 1.7.34 *laesa est*.) Only five of the other thirty (1.11.20, 1.15.18, 42, 2.2.22 and 62) have a sense-pause at the end of the first foot. Only at 2.2.21f. *ibit ad affectam, quae non languebit, amicam: / uisat, iudiciis aegra sit illa tuis* and 61f. *tibi uerbera uicto / assunt, in gremio iudicis illa sedet* does the break seem comparably strong to that here and, in both of those passages, the balance of the sentence reduces the impression of abruptness. The jerkiness of the rhythm here possibly suggests *Ovid's* impatience. He may be influenced by *Tib.* 1.2.75f. (in a komastic context) *quid Tyrio recubare toro sine amore secundo / prodest, cum fletu nox uigilanda uenit*. For diaeresis at this position elsewhere in *Augustan* elegy, see *Platnauer* (1951) 23.

in media pace: for the phrase, with or without the preposition, cf. 3.2.50, *Liv.* 36.11.2, *Curt.* 8.10.17, *Sen. Dial.* 4.2.6, *Epist.* 18.6, 91.5, *Tac. Ann.* 14.32.2 and note also *in medio Marte* in this position at *Am.* 2.18.36.

31-32. An argument *e minore* to reinforce the argument *e maiore* in the preceding couplet. For this particular argument, cf. 2.2.63ff. *non*

scelus aggredimur, non ad miscenda coimus / toxica, non stricto fulminat ense manus; / quaerimus ut tuto per te possimus amare: / quid precibus nostris mollius esse potest?, *Epist.* 18.39f. (Leander to Boreas, who keeps him from Hero) *in me, si nescis, Borea, non aequora, saeuus. / quid faceres, esset ni tibi notus amor?*, *Met.* 1.504ff. *nympha, precor, Penei, mane! non insequor hostis! / ... / ... amor est mihi causa sequendi*. For the expression of the argument, cf. 3.2.33, *Epist.* 14.120 *quid fiet sonti, cum rea laudis agar?*, 21.58 *quid facies odio, sic ubi amore nocet?*, *Cic. Phil.* 7.18, *Mart.* 10.10.1ff., *Juv.* 1.117ff., 2.65ff., *Plut. Mor.* 189C; note also *Catull.* 62.24 *quid faciunt hostes capta crudelius urbe?*, *Epist.* 3.150 *quod dederas hosti uictor, amica rogo*. For arguments *e minore* in *Ovid*, cf. also e.g. 1.7.29f., *Epist.* 7.53f., 8.17f., 16.103, 18.187f., *Ars* 1.211, 2.97f., *Met.* 3.559ff.

33-34. non ego ...: cf. *Quint. Inst.* 9.2.39 *illa quoque uocatur auersio quae a proposita quaestione abducit audientem: 'non ego cum Danais Troianam excindere gentem / Aulide iuravi' [Verg. Aen. 4.425f.]. quod fit et multis et uariis figuris cum aut aliud expectasse nos aut maius aliquid timuisse simulamus aut plus uideri posse ignorantibus*. For further examples of *auersio* introduced by *non (ego)*, cf. 2.2.63f., *Pont.* 2.9.67ff., *Pease* on *Verg. loc. cit.* For a related, but more lively, formulation of this type of argument, cf. 1.13.41f. and 3.10.45f.

militibus ... et armis: 'armed soldiers'; for the phrase, cf. *Bell. Afr.* 47.3, 97.3, *Cic. Phil.* 12.10, *Sil.* 14.277f. *muros / milite collecto uariisque impleuerat armis*, *Ammian.* 18.6.4.

comitatus: the verb, particularly in this form with a passive sense, is most commonly used with reference to the retinue of a deity or of some other such important figure; cf. *Met.* 2.441 *suo comitata choro Dictynna*, 845, 3.215, 10.9, *Fast.* 2.463, 4.425, 5.645, *TLL* 3.1815.11ff. Here, *Ovid* is accompanied by the god *Cupid*. See also on 35 *dimittere*.

solus eram: komasts often brought their friends; cf. esp. *Theocr.* 2.118ff., where *Delphis* declares that he would have brought his friends to help him break down *Simaetha's* door if that had been necessary. *Ovid* is emphasising his inoffensiveness.

saeuus ... Amor: for *Cupid* as the komast's companion, cf. 59f. (n.). For *Cupid* as cruel, cf. *Theocr.* 3.15 (in a komastic context) *ἔγνων τὸν Ἑρώτα βαρὺς θεός* and see also on 1.1.5 *saeue puer*.

adesset, following *comitatus*, might have been expected to bear the sense 'be present to give support'. (Compare the kletic prayer *huc ades*, for which see on 54.) In fact, however, *Cupid's* presence is

viewed rather as a liability. The somewhat paradoxical use of the verb here is emphasised by its juxtaposition to *saeuus*.

35-36. For the commonplace that Cupid is inescapable, cf. e.g. [Theocr.] 27.20 οὐ φεύγεις τὸν Ἔρωτα, τὸν οὐ φύγε παρθένος ἄλλη, Archias *AP* 5.59 φεύγειν δεῖ τὸν Ἔρωτα· κενὸς πόνος, οὐ γὰρ ἄλϋξω / πεζὸς ὑπὸ πτηνοῦ πυκνὰ διωκόμενος, Prop. 2.30.1ff.

si cupiam is concessive; cf. e.g. *Epist.* 7.176 *nec te, si cupies, ipsa manere sinam*, Plaut. *Aul.* 254, *Most.* 351, Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.87 *non possum disposite istum accusare, si cupiam*, 115, *Pis.* 68 *cui generi esse ego iratus ne si cupiam quidem possum*, *Phil.* 13.25.

nusquam (PYC) is confirmed by Prop. 2.12.15 (of Cupid) *euolat heu nostro ... de pectore nusquam*. For the idiom, cf. Nepos *Att.* 4.2 *ut Sulla nusquam ab se dimitteret* (sc. Pomponium), Shackleton Bailey (1956) 87f., Fedeli on Prop. 3.15.19.

dimittere: following the reference to soldiers in the preceding couplet, it is relevant that *dimittere* is the standard term for disbanding an army; see *TLL* 5.1.1210.31ff. That sense is used somewhat paradoxically here, given that the lover is more normally considered to be a soldier in Cupid's army; cf. e.g. 1.9.1f., 2.9.1ff. For this reversal of roles, see also on 33 *comitatus*.

ante uel a membris diuidar ipse meis: cf. 1.7.23f., *Trist.* 1.3.73f. (Ovid's separation from his wife) *diuidor haud aliter quam si mea membra relinquam, / et pars abrumpi corpore uisa suo est*, Cic. *Fin.* 5.33 *prius a se poterit quisque discedere quam appetitum earum rerum quae sibi conducant amittere*, Sen. *Med.* 547ff. *haec causa uitae est, hoc perusti pectoris / curis leuamen. spiritu citius queam / carere, membris, luce*.

37-38. Amor ... uinum / ... corona: for the mild syllepsis, cf. e.g. 59f., *Epist.* 12.137f. *iussa domo cessi natis comitata duobus / et, qui me sequitur semper, amore tui*, *Met.* 4.148f. *tua te manus... amorque / perdidit*, 156 *quos certus amor, quos hora nouissima iunxit*. For Cupid and wine in combination in this context, see on 59f. For the komast's garland, see on 67f.

modicum: Ovid again assures the door-keeper that his intentions are peaceful. Drunken komasts are notoriously violent; cf. Prop. 1.16.5f. and also 59 below, where *moderabile* pointedly echoes *modicum*. (On the etymological connections between the two words, cf. Nonius p. 541 *modicum ueteres moderatum et cum modo dici uolunt*, *TLL* 8.1228.35ff.)

circa mea tempora uinum: for wine at the temples, cf. Tib. 1.2.3 *multo percussum tempora baccho*, 1.7.50 *multo tempora funde mero*, Prop. 3.17.13 (to Bacchus) *tuis perferuida tempora donis*, Hor. *Carm.* 1.7.22f., *Rem.* 146, Sil. 7.201f., Athenaeus 4.168B διασειόμενοι τοὺς κροτάφους ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀκράτου. Ovid's expression here is rather striking (but cf. Hom. *Od.* 9.362 Κύκλωπα περὶ φρένας ἤλυθεν οἶνος), and recalls the much more natural use of such phrases with reference to garlands (see on 2.12.1 *Ite triumphales circum mea tempora laurus!*); it is Ovid's drunkenness which has dislodged his garland from round his brows. For the prepositional phrase attached to the noun, cf. Prop. 3.17.13 (quoted above), Shackleton Bailey (1956) 305f., and see also on 1.7.51 *sine sanguine. circa* (PYC) is preferable here to *circum* (Sω). In about two-thirds of the passages in which Ovid uses one form or the other, *circum* is, or seems to be, the more strongly attested. Euphony, however, rules out *modicum circum mea tempora uinum* here and *angustum circum fascia pectus eat* at *Ars* 3.274; conversely, Ovid avoids the κακέμφοτον *circa caua nubila* at *Met.* 5.623 and *circa caua tempora* at 7.313, 10.116 and 11.159. See also on 1.8.65 *circum atria. uinum*: this form recurs in Ovid only at 59, *Met.* 7.594, *Fast.* 1.301, 4.935 and *Pont.* 4.2.41, whereas *uina* occurs 33 times. Löfstedt (1956) 48 suggests that this preference, which is shared by the other poets of the period (see Enk on Prop. 1.14.2), may be attributable partly to an instinctive feeling that the neuter plural form in *-a* is really a collective feminine singular. See also on 1.15.11 *mustis*. None of the Augustan poets uses *uinorum*; Ovid has *uinis* as a metrically convenient equivalent to *uino* at *Ars* 1.244 and *Fast.* 6.673.

mecum est: cf. *Fast.* 2.795 *ferrum, Lucretia, mecum est*.

madidis lapsa corona comis: although rain is an occupational hazard for the komast (cf. e.g. Asclep. *AP* 5.167.1, Meleager *AP* 5.189.2, Hor. *Carm.* 3.10.19f.), and although Ovid observes that a dew is falling (*uitreo ... madentia rore / tempora* [55f.]), *madidis* here probably means 'anointed with perfume'. For *madidus* in that sense without a defining ablative, cf. *Epist.* 14.30 *flore nouo madidas impediēte comas*, Sil. 4.726, Mart. 14.24.1, 14.50.2. For the practice of perfuming one's hair, cf. 3.1.7, *Fast.* 5.340 (of a komast) *habent unctae mollia sarta comae*, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.4.9, Lilja (1972) 82ff. It may be relevant to Ovid's claim to peaceful intentions that perfumed locks were considered to indicate a lack of war-like spirit; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.215ff. (of Aeneas) *ille Paris cum semiuiro comitatu, / Maeonia mentum mitra crinemque madentem /*

subnexus with Pease's note. The slipping of Ovid's garland signifies that he is drunk (giving the lie to *modicum*). Ovid may also be hinting at the convention that a loosened garland is a sign that one is in love; cf. 3.10.36 (of Ceres, in love with Iasius) *deciderant longae spiceaserta comae*, Call. *AP* 12.134.3f., Asclep. *AP* 12.135.4, Athenaeus 15.669Cff. (an inconclusive discussion of the question διὰ τί ... λέγονται, τῶν ἐστεφανωμένων ἂν λύωνται οἱ στέφανοι, ὅτι ἐρῶσιν;).

39. arma quis haec timeat? echoes and reinforces the argument in line 30 in *media pace quid arma times?* For *arma* used metaphorically, cf. 2.5.48 (of his mistress, protected by her beauty) *defensa est armis nostra puella suis*, *Met.* 5.365 (Venus to Cupid) *arma manusque meae, mea, nate, potentia*, Anon. *AP* 12.115.4 (quoted on 16 *fulmen*), *TLL* 2.601.45ff. Here, of course, Ovid's point is that love, wine and garlands are not, in any proper sense, weapons. *haec* is emphatic: 'who would be afraid of these (things as if they were) weapons?'

eat obuius sustains the military imagery by recalling the common use of *obuiam ire* in the sense 'engage in battle' (see *TLL* 9.2.315.74ff.). The contrary sense 'welcome', however, is also in play (see on 3.9.61 *obuius huic uenies*). Whereas *obuiam ire* is common in prose at all periods, *obuius ire*, which is much more tractable in dactylic metres, occurs first at Verg. *Aen.* 10.770, 11.504, Liv. 7.37.7, 9.45.14 and elsewhere in Ovid at *Met.* 2.75, 7.111, *Fast.* 1.500; for *obuius uenire*, see on 3.9.61.

illis refers to *arma ... haec*; for the use of *hic* and *ille* interchangeably, see on 1.9.20.

41-42. A variation on the komast's normal complaint that his beloved is sleeping heedless of him; cf. Callimachus (?) *AP* 5.23.1ff. οὕτως ὑπνώσας, Κωνώπιον, ὥς ἐμὲ ποιεῖς / κοιμᾶσθαι ψυχροῖς τοῖσδε παρὰ προθύροις / οὕτως ὑπνώσας, ἀδικωτάτη, ὥς τὸν ἐραστὴν / κοιμίζεις, ἐλέου δ' οὐδ' ὄναρ ἡντίασα, Hor. *Carm.* 1.25.7f. *me tuo longas pereunte noctes*, / *Lydia, dormis?* For the door(-keeper) sleeping through the komos, cf. Plaut. *Curc.* 153f. (quoted on 21f.), Prop. 4.5.47f. *ianitor ad dantes uigilet: si pulset inanis*, / *surdus in obductam somniet usque seram*.

somnus, qui te male perdat: the mss are in disarray. *somnus, qui se male praebebat amanti* would provide a pointed contrast between the forlorn Ovid and the supposedly sleeping door-keeper. For *se praebeere*, cf. 1.3.19, 1.14.25, *Epist.* 4.95 *nec tamen Aurorae male se praebebat amandum*, *Trist.* 1.1.51, *Ibis* 109. Since, however, Heinsius'

hesitantly suggested *amantis* is needed to provide definition to *uerba*, we must accept *te ... perdat*, a reading fully attested only in *P.* For the curse, cf. Callimachus (?) and Plautus *loc. cit.*, Tib. 1.2.7f. Ovid seems to be praying that the door-keeper may be punished for sleeping on duty or, more probably, that he may never wake up. The curse is perhaps paradoxical, since sleep is conventionally soothing; cf. e.g. Soph. *Phil.* 827 "Υπν' ὁδύνας ἀδαῖς, "Υπνε δ' ἀλγέων. *male perdere* occurs elsewhere in Augustan poetry only at *Epist.* 7.8. The phrase is rather colloquial and may have a distinctly Comic color; cf. Plaut. *Aul.* 721a, *Epid.* 50, Pers. 783f. *qui illum Persam ... / male di omnes perdant!*, Catull. 14.5, Sen. *Dial.* 5.14.3, *Epist.* 95.21, Apul. *Met.* 9.21. Tiberius used it in a letter to the Senate, the style of which aroused comment; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6.6.1. (Note also the conversational *peream* [-at] *male* at Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.6 and *Epod.* 12.16, and see also on 2.14.21 *cum fuerim melius periturus amando*.) Since Ovid does not otherwise turn to threats and curses against the door-keeper until after the disappointment of the expectations raised in 49f., it may be that this curse, though addressed to the door-keeper, was delivered by Ovid as a muttered aside; for such parentheses, see Vol. 1, 67f.

amantis / uerba dat in uentos: for the wind bearing words away in vain, see on 1.4.11f. Ovid here combines that motif with the komast's standard complaint against the wind (see on 53f.), as does Propertius at 1.16.34 *mea nocturno uerba cadunt Zephyro*. The motif is also particularly apposite at Prop. 1.8.12, where Propertius is begging Cynthia not to risk a stormy sea-voyage: *neue inimica meas eleuet aura preces!* See also below, on 52.

repulsa: the participle is used of the komast's rejected love at 1.8.76, of the rejected komast himself at 2.9.46, 3.11.9, Prop. 2.4.2.

43-44. Ovid corrects the speculation expressed in the preceding couplet: he knows from previous experience that the door-keeper does not sleep when on duty.

memini is used parenthetically nineteen times in Ovid's elegiac poetry, and at *Met.* 5.585, Tib. 1.3.26, Prop. 4.2.27; cf. *si memini* at 3.1.33, *Fast.* 3.248, 5.646, Prop. 2.1.49, *si commemini* at *Fast.* 3.792, *nam memini* at *Met.* 15.160.

peruigil: the adjective occurs first here and at *Epist.* 6.13, 12.62, *Met.* 7.149, 10.369. *peruigilare* is used with reference to a komast at 1.9.7 and Prop. 1.16.40; cf. also Plaut. *Curc.* 181.

in mediae sidera noctis: a memorable phrase; cf. Val. Fl. 4.82 *clarae per sidera noctis*. The stars would naturally engage a komast's

attention; cf. e.g. Asclep. *AP* 5.189.1, *Frg. Grenfell*. 11 (Powell [1925] p. 177), Meleager *AP* 5.191.1, Prop. 1.16.23 *me (dolent) mediae noctes, me sidera plena iacentem*. We are perhaps to recall that starry nights, being cloudless, are cold. For the coldness of the night as a source of suffering to the *exclusus amator*, cf. 65, 2.19.22 *longa pruinoso frigora nocte pati*, Fedeli on Prop. 1.16.23f. For the word-order, cf. *Ars* 1.687 in *laesi uerba mariti*, *Fast.* 3.664, 4.907, *Trist.* 2.168, 3.9.2, Platnauer (1951) 97ff.

45-46. More usually, the rejected lover speculates whether, or expresses his chagrin at the fact that, his beloved is sleeping with someone else; cf. 3.8 *passim*, 3.11.1ff., Prop. 1.16.33, Yardley (1978) 20, n. 4. Ovid is here implying that the door-keeper's own experience of the delights of love should incline him to be helpful; for that type of argument, see on 53f. At Plaut. *Pers.* 25, the slave Sagaristio asks with surprise *iam serui hic amant?*; cf. also *Stich.* 446ff. *id ne uos miremini, homines seruolos / potare, amare atque ad cenam condicere; / licet haec Athenis nobis*. The speculation, however, that the door-keeper may be enjoying his beloved's company while on duty seems humorously improbable. The humour is enhanced if we may imagine that the door-keeper is either decrepit (cf. [Arist.] *Oec.* 1345A, Sen. *Epist.* 12.3 [both quoted in the introduction]) or actually a eunuch, like the chaperon Bagoas (2.2 and 3) and Callias' door-keeper (Plato *Protag.* 314C).

forsitan ... requiescit: for the erotic connotations of *requiescit*, cf. 1.5.25. For *forsitan* constructed with the indicative, see on 2.6.28.

tua ... amica: for *amica* referring to a slave's beloved, cf. e.g. Plaut. *Stich.* 701, 712, Sen. *Contr.* 7.6.15. In referring to the door-keeper's imagined beloved by a term which the elegists regularly use of their own mistresses, Ovid is emphasising the common bond between himself and the door-keeper; see on 1 *dura religate catena*.

heu, melior quanto sors tua sorte mea!: the line recurs at *Fast.* 4.520 and *Trist.* 5.4.4 (where *quanto melior* is strongly attested); for such two-fold recurrences, see Vol. 1, 110. Since the weight of the tradition in both of the later passages favours the addition of *est* at the end of the line, it is with some hesitation that I follow PYç in not admitting it here. For a similar problem, see on 2.14.32 *uirum*. *sors* here perhaps means not simply 'lot in life' but also 'turn of duty'; for the latter sense, Camps on Prop. 4.4.94 *o uigil, iniustae praemia sortis habes* cites Sil. 9.91ff. *uestigia uallo / ... uigil extulerat, dum sorte uicissim / alternat portae excubias* and Hor. *Carm.* 3.24.15f. *defunctum ...*

laboribus / aequali recreat sorte uicarius. For the *exclusus amator's* 'turn of duty', see on 1.9.8.

47-48. For Ovid's sparing use of the concept of *seruitium amoris*, see on 1.3.5 *deseruiat*. As is made clear by his use of *dummodo*, which is not common in poetry (see below), he is here echoing Tib. 1.1.55ff. *me retinent uinctum formosae uincla puellae, / et sedeo duras ianitor ante fores. / non ego laudari curo, mea Delia: tecum / dummodo sim, quaeso segnis inersque uocer*. This couplet is reworked at *Ars* 2.585f. (of Mars, ensnared with Venus by Vulcan) *hic aliquis ridens 'in me, fortissime Mauors, / si tibi sunt oneri, uincla transfer' ait* (cf. Hom. *Od.* 8.339ff., *Met.* 4.187f.).

dummodo sic: for the omission of the subjunctive verb, cf. 2.16.19f. *tum mihi, si premerem uentosas horridas Alpes, / dummodo cum domina, molle fuisset iter*, *Fast.* 5.242, *TLL* 5.1.2234.46ff., H.-Sz. 421f. For the echo of Tibullus' *dummodo sim* (1.1.58 [quoted above]), see on 1.2.17. *dummodo:* Ov. 17 (7), Verg. 0, Hor. 1 (0), Tib. 1, Prop. 1, Catull. 1 (114.6 [lect. dub.]), Lucr. 2, Sen. *Trag.* 3, Lucan 0, Val. Fl. 1, Sil. 0, Stat. 0, Mart. 1, Juv. 4.

transite: it is perhaps relevant that *transire* was used of slaves and other possessions passing from the control of one owner to that of another; cf. Ulp. *Dig.* 37.11.2.9 *si per multos dominos transierit seruus*, *OLD* s.v. 2b. On passing to Ovid, the chains would, as it were, take control of him.

49-50. For this brief illusion of success, the disappointment of which (51f.) leads Ovid to turn to threats and abuse, see Vol. 1, 66f. On Tib. 1.8.65f. (quoted there), Murgatroyd cites, as examples of similarly optimistic imaginings, *Epist.* 19.53f. (Hero, an *inclusa amica*, kept from Leander by the stormy Hellespont) *auribus interdum uoces captamus et omnem / aduentus strepitum credimus esse tui*, Verg. *Ecl.* 8.105ff., Marcus Argentarius *AP* 6.333. Clandestine lovers normally hope that the door will be opened soundlessly; cf. e.g. Ar. *Thesm.* 487f., Plaut. *Curc.* 20ff., 94, 158ff., Tib. 1.2.9f. *ianua, iam pateas uni mihi uicta querellis, / neu furtim uerso cardine aperta sones*, 31f., 1.6.12, 1.8.60, Prop. 4.5.73f. Here, although we are perhaps to suppose that Ovid has to avoid waking his mistress' *custos* and *uir*, noise matters less than usual since it would be the *ianitor* himself who would be opening the door. Ovid therefore welcomes the creaking of the door (which is emphasised by the *c-*, *q-* and *s-*sounds in the pentameter) as a small price to pay for admission. At 1.16.26,

Propertius is willing to run the same risk: *respondes* (sc. *ianua*) *tacitis mutua cardinibus*.

fallimur, an ...? for this formula, cf. 3.1.34, 3.12.7, *Met.* 13.641, *Fast.* 1.515, 2.853, 5.549 *fallor, an arma sonant? non fallimur, arma sonabant*, *Trist.* 1.2.107, *Pont.* 2.8.21, [Sen.] *Herc. O.* 1978, Val. Fl. 8.351, *Stat. Theb.* 4.596. On *Met.* 1.391ff. *aut fallax ... est sollertia nobis, / aut ... / magna parens terra est*, Haupt-Ehwald observe that 'durch das Dilemma wird die zuversichtliche Richtigkeit des zweiten Urteils betont'. See also Brink on *Hor. Ars* 42. The phrasing of the couplet in this way therefore makes our surprise all the greater when we learn that the door is not, in fact, opening.

uerso sonuerunt cardine postes: compare the stage-directions at e.g. *Plaut. Bacch.* 234 *fori* *concrepuit nostra*, *Cas.* 163, *Curc.* 156f. (in a komos) *sentio sonitum. / tandem edepol mihi morigeri pessuli fiunt*, *Men.* 523, *Mil.* 154, *Most.* 507, [Sen.] *Herc. O.* 254 *sonuere postes*. Ovid's phrase echoes *Tib.* 1.2.10 (quoted above) and either draws on, or is the model for, *Prop.* 4.8.49 (describing Cynthia's return from Lanuvium) *subito rauci sonuerunt cardine postes* (cf. also Val. Fl. 7.322 *impulso sonuerunt cardine postes*). In the line immediately preceding, Propertius had been imagining himself as a komast pining for Cynthia: *Lanuui ad portas, ei mihi* (cf. 52 below), *totus eram*.

rauca ... signa dedere: perhaps not simply 'gave a noisy indication'. Since that would be little more than a repetition of the sense of *sonuerunt ... postes*, the frequent use of *signa dare* with reference to the giving of omens (cf. e.g. *Tib.* 1.5.57 *eueniet; dat signa deus*) may also be relevant here (with *rauca* bearing a perhaps paradoxically favourable sense); cf. *Claud. Rapt. Pros.* 2.6f. *cardine uerso / praesagum cecinere fores*.

concussae most readily suggests a violent blow, as at *Met.* 2.767f. *postes extrema cuspide pulsat; / concussae patuere fores*, the only passage cited at *TLL* 4.118.56f. as a parallel for *concutere* used with reference to doors. That sense proves to be the relevant one here, since the door is blasted by the wind, but Ovid is hoping that the shaking is caused by the door-keeper as he *excuit poste seram*. Since *concutere* is rarely used of doors and since Propertius admits the word elsewhere only at 1.7.15 (see on 1.2.12) and 3.13.53, he may have been influenced by this passage in describing the conclusion of Hercules' komos (see above, on line 2) at 4.9.61 *umeris postes concussit opacos*.

51-52. impulsa est ... ianua: cf. *Met.* 1.529, *Fast.* 3.642 *querulas impulit*

aura fores, *TLL* 7.1.536.72ff., 537.81ff.

animoso ... uento: Ovid is playing with the link between *animus* and ἄνεμος; cf. *Lucr.* 3.43f., *Serv. Aen.* 1.57, *Lact. Opif.* 17.2 *anima uel animus nomen accepit quod Graece uentus ἄνεμος dicitur*. For similar plays, cf. *Verg. Georg.* 2.441 *animosi ... Euri*, *Stat. Theb.* 9.459f. *animosa ... / tempestas* and see also on 3.6.51 *Anien ... animosus*.

ei mihi: *Ov.* 46 (7), *Verg.* 3 (3), *Hor.* 0, *Tib.* 2, *Prop.* 3 (1.3.37f. *ubi longa meae consumpsti tempora noctis, / languidus exactis, ei mihi, sideribus?*, 4.1.58, 4.8.48 [see on 50]), *Enn. Ann.* 1, *Plaut.* 24, *Ter.* 19, *Acc. Trag.* 1, *Catull.* 0, *Lucr.* 0, *Sen. Trag.* 0, *Lucan* 0, *Val Fl.* 6, *Sil.* 2, *Stat.* 15 (*Silu.* 3), *Mart.* 1, *Juv.* 0. The expression does not occur in classical prose. Since Ovid has a penchant for such lively exclamations (see Vol. 1, 68), and since he uses this particular phrase so freely, we should perhaps not regard its occurrence here as contributing to the poem's Comic color (see the introduction).

quam longe spem tulit aura meam!: cf. *Tib.* 1.5.35f. *haec mihi fingebam, quae nunc Eurusque Notusque / iactat odoratos uota per Armenios*. The conceit is particularly apposite in this komastic setting; cf. 41f. (n.). In substituting *aura* for *uentus*, Ovid seems to be aiming for rhetorical point: the door was buffeted by a storming wind, but a mere breeze was enough to remove his hope. For the contrast, cf. e.g. *Ars* 3.99f. *me flaminibus uenti maioris iturum, / dum sumus in portu, prouehat aura leuis*. More commonly, however, the words were used with little distinction; cf. 1.8.106 *uentus et aura* (n.).

53-54. For the rape of Orithyia by Boreas, cf. *Met.* 6.675ff. with Bömer's introduction (pp. 180f.). Ovid's appeal for help from Boreas is most closely paralleled at *Tib.* 1.2.7f. *ianua difficilis domini te uerberet imber, / te Iouis imperio fulmina missa petant*. Normally, the komast complains about the wind, which is often specifically the North wind; cf. e.g. *Epist.* 18.39f. (quoted on 31f.), *Asclep. AP* 5.167.2, *Meleager AP* 12.167.1, *Prop.* 1.16.24, 34, *Hor. Carm.* 3.10.1ff. For attempts by the komast to enlist support, or at least remove opposition, by appealing to his addressee's own experience of love, cf. 3.6.23f. *flumina debebant iuuenes in amore iuuare: / flumina senserunt ipsa, quid esset amor*, 83, *Epist. loc. cit.*, 19.129f. (spoken by Hero, the *inclusa amica*) at *tibi flammaram memori, Neptune, tuarum / nullus erat uentis impediendus amor*, *Asclep. AP* 5.167.6 Ζεῦ φίλε, σιγήσω· καὶ τὸς ἐρᾶν ἔμαθες and note also *Epist.* 18.81f. (Leander) *Alcyones solae, memores Ceycis amati, / nescioquid uisae sunt mihi dulce queri*. For similar arguments, cf. 1.11.11f.,

1.13.39f., 3.10.17f., 43f. At 2.3.1ff., Ovid is disgusted that he cannot make such an appeal to the intransigent Bagoas, because he is a eunuch. See also on 1.13.2 *flaua*.

si satis es raptae, Borea, memor Orithyiae: citing this line and Stat. *Theb.* 12.630f. *raptae qui conscius Orithyiae / celauit ripis Geticos Elisos amores* in his note on Musaeus 322 Ἀτθίδος οὐ Βορέην ἀμνήμονα κάλλιπε νύμφης, Kost remarks that these passages are 'offenbar Nachklänge einer berühmten griechischen Formulierung'; see also Papanghelis (1987) 105f. (In referring to Boreas as Θείας ἀμνάμων 'the grandson of Thia' at *fragg.* 110.44 and 338, Callimachus may be alluding to that hypothesised archetype.) Further parallels for Ovid's thought and/or expression here are offered by Call. *Ap.* 94f. (of Apollo; Williams detects a play on the two senses of μνάσθαι, 'be mindful of' and 'woo') οὐδὲ πόλει τόσ' ἔδειμεν ὀφέλισμα, τόσσα Κυρήνη, / μνωόμενος προτέρης ἀρπακτύος, *Ap. Rhod.* 1.212 οὓς ποτ' Ἐρεχθίδος Βορέη τέκεν Ὀρείθυια, *Prop.* 2.26.51 *crudelem et Borean raptam Orithyia negauit*, 3.7.13 *infelix Aquilo, raptae timor Orithyiae*, *Met.* 7.695 *raptae soror Orithyiae*, Nonn. *Dion.* 47.308f. ποθοβλήτοιο ... κούρης (*sc.* Ariadne on Naxos) / οὐ Βορέης ἀλέγιζε δυσίμερος. *si:* the introduction of a prayer by means of a conditional clause is found already in Homer; cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.39ff. Σμινθεῦ, εἴ ποτέ τοι χαρίεντ' ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρεψα, / ἢ εἰ δὴ ποτέ τοι κατὰ πτόνα μηρί' ἔκηα / ταύρων ἢ δ' αἰγῶν, τότε μοι κρήνην ἔελδωρ. For such phrasing in a context comparable to that here, cf. *Prop.* 1.17.27f. (to the Nereids) *si quando uestras labens Amor attigit undas, / mansuetis socio parcite litoribus. Orithyiae:* for *spondiaci*, see Norden on *Verg. Aen.* 6 pp. 441ff., Platnauer (1951) 38f., Lyne on [*Verg.*] *Ciris* pp. 15f. The only other example in the *Amores* occurs at 2.13.21 which, like this couplet, is a kletic prayer: *lenis ades precibusque meis faue, Ilithyia*.

huc ades: a regular formula in kletic prayers; cf. 2.12.16, 3.2.46, Dahlmann (1975) 19f., also *Met.* 7.197f. *auraeque et uenti ... / ... adeste*.

surdas ... fores: cf. 1.8.77 *surda sit oranti tua ianua*, Stat. *Theb.* 9.723, 12.200f., Mart. 10.14.8 (quoted on 17f.), Prud. *c. Symm.* 1.65. See also on 2 *difficilem ... forem* and on 3.7.58 *surda ... saxa*.

55-56. urbe silent tota: only the love-lorn fail to find rest at night; cf. *Met.* 10.446 *tempus erat, quo cuncta silent* with Bömer's note, Theocr. 2.38f. ἡνίδε σιγῇ μὲν πόντος, σιγῶντι δ' αἴηται / ἃ δ' ἐμὰ οὐ σιγῇ στέρνων ἔντοσθεν ἀνία, *Ap. Rhod.* 3.744ff., esp. 749ff. οὐδὲ κυνῶν

ὕλακῃ ἔτ' ἀνὰ πτόλιν, οὐ θρόος ἦεν / ἡχήεις, σιγῇ δὲ μελαιομένην ἔχεν ὄρφνην / ἀλλὰ μάλ' οὐ Μήδειαν ἐπὶ γλυκερὸς λάβεν ὕπνος, *Verg. Aen.* 4.522ff. with Pease's note. (Ovid felt that Varro of Atax' version of Apollonius' lines 749f., *desierant latrare canes urbesque silebant: / omnia noctis erant placida composita quiete* [*frg.* 8 Büchner], would have been much better if *placida composita quiete* were omitted; cf. Sen. *Contr.* 7.1.27.) For the lover's sleeplessness in general, see on 1.2.1-4. For the silence of the night in a komastic context, compare the beautiful lines 77ff. of *Epist.* 18: *unda repercussae radiabat imagine lunae / et nitor in tacita nocte diurnus erat. / nullaque uox usquam, nullum ueniebat ad aures / praeter dimotae corpore murmur aquae*. The inclusion of this detail at this juncture in the poem emphasises the failure of Ovid's appeal to Boreas; had it been successful, the door would once again have creaked stridently. In his note on Theocr. *loc. cit.*, Gow observes that silence is frequently mentioned in descriptions of magic. That may be significant here, since the purpose of the komos is to charm the doorkeeper; see on line 24. *silent:* the indefinite third person plural is not common, other than with verbs of saying, thinking and calling; cf. 2.14.29f. *Colchida respersam puerorum sanguine culpant, / aque sua caesum matre queruntur Ityn*, 3.8.43 *uerrebant*, Bömer on *Met.* 8.732 *modo te iuuenem, modo te uidere leonem*, Fedeli on *Prop.* 1.7.11 *me laudent doctae solum placuisse puellae*. Some construe *tempora noctis* as the subject here, but that seems rather less natural.

uitreo ... madentia rore / tempora noctis eunt: by making the first hemistich of the refrain part of a clause begun in the hexameter and, more especially, by continuing without a break after the second hemistich, Ovid suggests that his patience has finally snapped and that he is now prepared to take rash and drastic action; see Vol. 1, 111. For the vivid integration of a refrain only in its final occurrence (*excute* in 25 is not linked syntactically with 24), cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 158f. τοῖς δ' ὁμόφωνον / αἴλινον αἴλινον εἰπέ, τὸ δ' εὖ νικάτω. The refrain in Catull. 64 is integrated only in its first occurrence: *sed uos, quae fata sequuntur, / currite ducentes subtegmina, currite, fusi* (326f.). There also, a dramatic effect is achieved; 'the words *currite ducentes* eqs. have not yet been shaped into a refrain proper, but seem spontaneously to arise from the context of the prooemium' (Fraenkel on Aesch. *loc. cit.* [p. 96, n. 1]). Ovid's striking expression here is most closely paralleled at Tib. 2.4.12 (in a komastic context, and itself an even more striking expression) *omnia nam tristi tempora felle madent. uitreus:* Ov. 4 (1), Verg. 2 (1), Hor. 3 (2), Tib. 0 (a uariant

reading at 2.4.10), Prop. 0. The word occurs earlier only at Varro *Men.* 313 and Publil. *F* 24, in prose first in Columella and the younger Seneca. For adjectives in *-eus*, see on 1.1.29 *litorea. madeo*: Ov. 27 (18), Verg. 7 (5), Hor. 1 (1), Tib. 5, Prop. 2. Like *madidus* (see on 1.14.11), the word is found predominantly in poetry.

57-58. For the komast's attempt to break or, less commonly, burn down the beloved's door, cf. 1.9.20, *Ars* 3.71, 567, *Rem.* 31, *Ar. Vesp.* 1253f. *κακὸν τὸ πίνειν· ἀπὸ γὰρ οἴνου γίγνεται / καὶ θυροκοπήσαι καὶ πατάξαι καὶ βαλεῖν*, *Eccl.* 977, Antiphanes *frg.* 195.6 Kock, Theocr. 2.128, Herodas 2.63ff., Plaut. *Pers.* 569ff., Ter. *Ad.* 88ff., 102f., Lucil. 839f., Cic. *Philos. frg.* 10.3, Tib. 1.1.73f., 1.10.54, Prop. 2.5.22, 3.24.30 (= 25.10), Hor. *Carm.* 3.26.6ff., Strato *AP* 12.252, Gell. 4.14.5, also Ulp. *Dig.* 47.2.39. The precise interpretation of the couplet is uncertain; Heinsius even went so far as to express doubts about its authenticity. There are two difficulties. *ferroque ignique*, interpreted as instrumental ablatives, seem awkwardly separated from *petam*. The force of the comparative in *paratior* is unclear; some suggest that the antithesis is with Boreas, others that it is with the door-keeper, others again that it is with Ovid's own earlier attitude. It is, however, possible to extract an interpretation which not only involves a natural word-order but also gives *paratior* a clear point of reference: 'or being now myself more ready for action than my *ferrum* [see below] and the fire which I bear in my torch, I shall attack the arrogant house'. Ovid himself, at *Met.* 3.53f., affords a fairly close parallel for this rather odd expression: (*Cadmo erat*) *telum splendenti lancea ferro / et iaculum teloque animus praestantior omni. Eleg. in Maecen.* 1.30 is somewhat more natural: *quis tetigit ferro, durior ipse, latus?* For the preparedness of the weapons, cf. *Met.* 3.697f. *dum crudelia iussae / instrumenta necis ferrumque ignesque parantur*. (I have considered whether *ferro* and *igni* might not rather be datives; cf. *Fast.* 3.215 *acies ferro mortique paratae*. If so, however, the point of reference of *paratior* would remain unclear and the *quem*-clause would be awkward.)

ferroque ignique: the terms are commonly used in combination with reference to rampaging armies (cf. *Met.* 3.549f. *utinam tormenta uirique / moenia diruerent, ferrumque ignisque sonarent!*, Liv. 3.68.2 *agros ... ferro ignique uastatos*, *TLL* 6.583.44ff., 586.6ff.), and they therefore have humorously hyperbolic connotations here. For a similar play, see on 1.14.25. The formulation *-que ... -que* is stylistically elevated; see Fraenkel (1922) 209ff., Luck (1961) 250ff., H.-Sz. 515,

Brink on Hor. *Ars* 11. This imposing diction and also the unusual elision at the caesura (see Vol. 1, 121) contribute to Ovid's attempt to intimidate the door-keeper. *ferro*: an imprecise term; in synecdoche, the word most commonly means 'sword' (see *TLL* 6.580.1ff.) and that weapon would perhaps cause least comment in the streets of Rome, but an axe (cf. Theocr. 2.128, Plaut. *Bacch.* 1118f. [quoted on 73f.]) or a crow-bar (cf. Ter. *Eun.* 774, Hor. *Carm.* 3.26.7) would be more useful to an aggressive komast. In any case, Ovid's claim to be unarmed (33) is seen now to have been deceptive.

quem face sustineo: for the distinction between the torch and the flame, cf. Varro quoted by Nonius p. 161 *cum a noua nupta ignis in face adferretur. sustineo*: Verg. 13 (10), Hor. 4 (1), Tib. 1, Prop. 2; Ovid, however, uses the verb 101 (55) times, in a wide variety of senses.

tecta superba: normally, it is the beloved's arrogance against which the komast complains; cf. e.g. Theocr. 3.36, Hor. *Carm.* 3.10.9 *ingratam Veneri pone superbiam*, Mart. 10.14.7, Rufinus *AP* 5.92.3f. Prop. 1.16 is a brilliantly humorous portrayal of a *ianua superba*; cf. also Lucr. 4.1178 *postis ... superbos*, Tac. *Ann.* 4.74.4 *noctem ac diem iuxta gratiam aut fastus ianitorum perpetiebantur*.

59-60. Ovid is threatening the door-keeper. The powerful effects of *nox et Amor uinumque* are more normally cited in palliation of misdeeds already committed, or in the process of being committed; cf. *Fast.* 4.597 *factum ... excusat amore*, *Trag. Gr. Adesp.* 570 Kannicht-Snell οἶνός μ' ἔπεισε, Demosth. 21.38 ὁ τὸν θεομοθέτην πατάξας τρεῖς εἶχεν προφάσεις, μέθην, ἔρωτα, ἄγνοιαν διὰ τὸ σκοτούς καὶ νυκτὸς τὸ πρᾶγμα γενέσθαι. ἐπειθ' ὁ Πολύζηλος ὀργῇ καὶ τρόπου προπετεία φθάσας τὸν λογισμὸν ἀμαρτῶν ἔπαισεν, Call. *AP* 12.118.1ff. εἰ μὲν ἐκῶν, Ἀρχὴν, ἐπεκώμασα μυρία μέμφου, / εἰ δ' ἄκων ἤκω τὴν προπέτειαν ἔα. / ἄκρητος καὶ ἔρω μ' ἠνάγκασαν, ὧν ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν / εἴλκεν, ὁ δ' οὐκ εἶα τὴν προπέτειαν ἔαν, *Lyr. Gr. Adesp.* 3.8ff. (Powell [1925] pp. 181f.), Plaut. *Aul.* 745, *Bacch.* 88, *Curc.* 1ff., Ter. *Ad.* 470 *persuasit nox amor uinum adulescentia*, Rhet. Her. 2.24 *qui se propter uinum aut amorem aut iracundiam fugisse rationem dicet, is animi uitio uidebitur nescisse, non imprudentia*, Prop. 1.3.13f., [Quint.] *Decl.* 309.4 (in defence against a charge of rape) *scitis quam multa faciat error, quam multa permisceat fortuna, cum praesertim ad haec accesserit et obscuritas noctis et paulo liberior usus meri* with Winterbottom's note.

moderabile: cf. 37 *modicum* (n.). The word is found only here in

classical Latin. At least twenty-one other such adjectives are found first or only in Ovid. Thirteen are used by him only in the *Metamorphoses* (*agitabilis*, *dubitabilis*, *euitabilis*, *forabilis*, *formidabilis*, *iaculabilis*, *inconsolabilis*, *ineuitabilis*, *innabilis*, *populabilis*, *resonabilis*, *reuocabilis*, *sonabilis*), one in the *Metamorphoses* and works other than the *Fasti* (*reparabilis*; see on 1.14.55), one only in the *Fasti* (*piabilis*), five only in other works (*excusabilis*, *mercabilis* [1.10.21], *narrabilis*, *seruabilis*, *uitabilis*) and one (*spectabilis*; see on 1.8.59) throughout the corpus.

illa pudore uacat, Liber Amorque metu: cf. Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.35 *est et illud repetendi genus quod semel proposita iterat et diuidit: Iphitus (et Pelias mecum, quorum Iphitus) aeuo / iam grauior, Pelias et uulnere tardus Vlixei* [Verg. *Aen.* 2.435f.]. ἐπάνοδος dicitur Graece, nostri regressionem uocant. For the figure elsewhere in Ovid, cf. e.g. 3.9.31f. *sic Nemesis longum, sic Delia nomen habebunt, / altera cura recens, altera primus amor*, *Epist.* 2.39f. *per Venerem nimiumque mihi facientia tela, / altera tela arcus, altera tela faces*. Here, however, Ovid is straining for point (perhaps in direct imitation of Call. *AP* 12.118.1ff. [quoted above]); the distinction between the shamelessness induced by the night and the fearlessness induced by wine and love is not altogether successful, since one cannot but recall the conventional antithesis between shame and love; cf. 1.2.32 (n.), *Met.* 1.618f. *pudor est, qui suadeat illinc, / hinc dissuadet amor. uacat ... Amor ... metu*: a fresh twist to the conceit that lovers are fearless (see on 9-14). **Liber**: a significant name for the wine-god in this context; see Vol. 1, 57.

61-62. omnia consumpsi: cf. *Met.* 8.106 *consumptis precibus uiolentam transit in iram*, *TLL* 4.610.57ff.

precibusque minisque: for the komast's combination of wheedling and threats (here the threats occupy only 53-60), cf. *Ars* 3.581f. *ante fores iaceat, 'crudelis ianua' dicat / multaque summis, multa minanter agat*, *Rem.* 35f. *modo blanditias rigido, modo iurgia, posti / dicat et exclusus flebile cantet amans*, Yardley (1978) 28f. For the combination in other contexts, cf. *Met.* 2.397, *Fast.* 2.805f. (of Tarquin) *instat amans hostis precibus pretioque minisque: / nec prece nec pretio nec mouet ille minis* (cf. Liv. 1.58.3 *orare, miscere precibus minas*), Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.66, *Tusc.* 5.87, *Bell. Afr.* 91.3, Lucan 5.480f.

mouimus: as at Prop. 1.16.19f. *cur numquam reserata meos admittis amores, / nescia furtiuas reddere mota preces?*, the literal meaning is felt here as much as the sense 'persuade'.

o foribus durior ipse tuis: perhaps a variation on Prop. 1.16.17f. *ianua uel domina penitus crudelior ipsa, / quid mihi tam duris clausa taces foribus?* For the phrasing, cf. 3.2.32 *sequitur fortes fortior ipsa feras*, *Epist.* 4.166, 19.188, *Eleg. in Maecen.* 1.30 (quoted on 57f.). *o*, unlike the stylistically rather more neutral *ō*, is elevated in tone; see Ross (1969) 49ff., Knox (1982) 45ff. It introduces prayers at 2.5.7, 2.9.1f., 2.11.5, 2.12.16, 2.15.9, 3.6.73, 3.8.65, 3.11.45 and is similarly high-flown at 1.14.47, 2.17.12, 3.1.16, 3.2.7. The address to Bagoas at 2.2.9, *o custos*, is especially comparable.

64. sollicito carcere dignus eras: Ovid retracts his flatteringly sympathetic cry of *indignum!* in the opening line; cf. 3.6.101f. *huic ego uae demens narrabam fluminum amores? / iactasse indigne nomina tanta pudet*. The insult here is nicely ambiguous. The context demands the sense 'you are fit (only) to be the warder of a prison', but the language suggests the further meaning 'you deserve to be in prison'; for the latter sense, cf. Lucil. 1128 (quoted below), Juv. 1.73 *aude aliquid breuibus Gyaris et carcere dignum*, *Apul. Met.* 9.21 *dignus hercules, dignus qui et ista uincula conteras et insuper carceris etiam tenebras perferas*, *Apol.* 81.5 *o subtilitas digna carcere et robore!*, *Cod. Theod.* 9.3.2 *quod dignum claustris carceris et custodiae squalore uidetur*. Both levels of meaning are influenced by Comedy. At Plaut. *Asin.* 297, Libanus insultingly addresses his fellow-slave Leonida as *custos carceris*; for *carnifex*, a much commoner term of Comic abuse, see on 2.2.36. On the second level, *carcer* means specifically the prison in which the most menial slaves, those who did the most brutal physical work, were penned; cf. e.g. Liv. 7.4.4 *quod filium ... in opus seruile, prope in carcerem atque in ergastulum dederit*, Juv. 14.24, and note also the use of *carcer* as a term of abuse at Ter. *Phorm.* 373, in his note on which Donatus quotes Lucil. 1128 *carcer, eris uix carcere dignus*. Ovid is suggesting that the door-keeper deserves to lose his comfortable position and be sent to hard labour; for deportation to hard labour as a threat to Comic slaves, cf. e.g. Plaut. *Epid.* 121ff., *Men.* 972ff., *Most.* 15ff., *Poen.* 1152ff., *Pseud.* 1099f., and see also Courtney on Juv. 8.180, Seaford on Eur. *Cyc.* 240. This implication is present also in the *suasoria* to Bagoas in 2.2, at 29f., and, more especially, 42 *squalidus orba fide pectora carcer habet. sollicito: 'vigilant', as at e.g. Met.* 11.599 *solliciti ... canes*, Cic. *Off.* 2.78 *sollicita ... custodia*, Sen. *Clem.* 1.26.2 *sollicite ... custodienda*; cf. also Courtney on Juv. 7.42. Since *sollicitus* is frequently used as an equivalent to *sollicitatus* (cf. Serv. *Ecl.* 10.6 *sollicitos: sollicitatos*,

plenos sollicitudinis), the suitably pathetic sense 'beset with supplications' may also be present; compare the memorable adaptation of Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.118ff. by Manilius at 5.619ff. (It would perhaps enhance the wit of this line if Ovid's audience knew that he had served, or was serving, as a *triumvir capitalis* [see on 1.15.5f.]; his duties would have included supervision of prisons.)

65-66. I retain this couplet with some hesitation. Its content is entirely suitable in this context; for the approach of chilly dawn and cock-crow at the end of an unsuccessful komos, cf. Theocr. 7.123f. ὁ δ' ὄρθριος ἄλλον ἀλέκτωρ / κοκκύσδων νάρκαισιν ἀνιαραῖσι διδοίη, Meleager *AP* 12.72.1f., Prop. 1.16.24, 46, 2.9.41. Following Müller (1856) 77ff., however, Goold (1965a) 48f. objects that 'these verses are exposed as counterfeit by the structure of the poem, which consists of nine stanzas of eight lines each, the central five stanzas ending with the refrain *excute poste seram*; they are isolated between the end of the eighth stanza and the beginning of the ninth. There are other signs of illegitimacy: although the distich represents the dawn as being at hand and the cock crowing, the lover tells his garland in the very next pentameter to lie before the door "all night" and then says "when my mistress sees you in the morning;" *ales* badly needs an epithet; *suum* has to refer awkwardly to *miseros*; and finally *miseros*, which ought properly to mean "the wretched," has to be stretched to mean "all (wretched) mortals." The couplet was inserted by a critic who desired some motivation for terminating the paraclausithyron; however, *omnia consumpsi* in 61 sufficiently indicates that the lover resigns himself to failure and has abandoned hope, while verses 68 and 69 prove that he has no intention of staying till dawn'.

Goold's main objection carries little weight. It would be most untypical of Ovid to construct a long poem entirely of sections of equal length; see on line 24. Even granted that the first sixty-four lines consist of eight sections of eight lines, that does not guarantee that the final section should also have eight lines. 1.5, the only other poem in the collection to display clear symmetry of this kind, consists of three sections of eight lines, followed by a two-line *coda*. Could Ovid not have intended a similar *uariatio* here, by increasing the final section by two lines? One might even detect a particular motive for the *uariatio*: the poem could have ended with the farewell to the door-keeper in the fourth couplet of the final section (71f.); by adding a further couplet, containing the farewell to the door in all its component parts, Ovid may be conveying an impression of his

reluctance to leave. Goold's observations on the awkward phrasing of the pentameter are largely justified; the context, however, perhaps helps to define both *miseros* and *ales*, and the generally rather rare construction of *suus* otherwise than with reference to the subject of the sentence (see K.-S. 1.600ff., H.-Sz. 175, Bömer on *Met.* 15.819) is not uncommon in Ovid and has a curiously close parallel at 1.13.24 (to Aurora) *lanificam reuocas ad sua pensa manum*. Goold's strongest argument lies with the apparent contradiction with the following lines. Even if one accepts the rather forced suggestion made by Stroh (1979b) 186, n. 2, that *tota ... nocte* (68) is to be construed with *dura* 'which has been hard all night', *mane* (69) will still follow awkwardly after a reference to dawn in 65f. It only seems possible to retain this couplet by emphasising that it is still night when Lucifer prepares (see below) his chariot and the cock begins to crow (cf. e.g. *Fast.* 2.767 *lucis praenuntius ales*), and by taking *tota ... nocte* to mean 'all of (what little is left of) the night'.

iamque pruinosos molitur Lucifer axes: before this passage and 2.11.56, Lucifer is represented as a charioteer only at Tib. 1.9.62; see Smith's note and Schoonhoven on *Eleg. in Maecen.* 1.132. For Dawn's chariot, see on 1.8.3f. *pruinosis* occurs first at Vitruv. 1.4.1, elsewhere in Ovid at 1.13.2 (of Aurora) *flaua pruinosa quae uehit axe diem*, 2.19.22 (in a komastic context) *longa pruinosa frigora nocte pati*, *Met.* 4.82, 5.443, *Phaenomena frg.* 2.3 Büchner, *Pont.* 1.2.54, six times in Columella (all in prose) and at Lucan 6.489 and Petron. 83.10 (in a hexameter). Very interestingly, Pfeiffer (1954) 99, n. 8 detects a possible allusion here to Call. *frg.* 260.64 σιτιβήεις ἄγχαυρος 'the frosty time near dawn'. This possibility is supported by the similarity of 1.13.2 *pruinosis ... axe*; Ovid seems to be echoing another passage from that same fragment of Callimachus (from the *Hecale*) at lines 29f. of that poem (see the note *ad loc.*). Callimachus' phrase involves an etymological play; cf. Suid. α 390 ἄγχαυρος ὁ παχνώδης ὄρθρος, παρὰ τὸ πλησίον ἔχειν τὴν αὔραν, Pfeiffer *ad loc.*, Livrea on Ap. Rhod. 4.110f. νύκτα / ἄγχαυρον. Such etymologising would have drawn Ovid's attention to the phrase. In alluding to the derivation of *crepusculum* at 1.5.5f., Ovid may be influenced by Apollonius' explanation of ἀμφιλύκη; see Vol. 1, 52f. and the note *ad loc.* *PYQ¹Z* report *pruinosis* here. That would render Callimachus' phrase more exactly. *axes*, however, has more need of an epithet than does *Lucifer*, and reading *pruinosis* provides a neat variation on the model. Moreover, *P* and *Y* have a tendency to corrupt -os to -us, as at e.g. 1.9.17 *infestus alter*, where the corruption actually destroys the

metre. *molitur*: cf. *Met.* 2.135 *nec summum molire per aethera currum*, Verg. *Aen.* 12.327 *manibus molitur habenas*, with the notes by Servius: *molitur: regit et est acyrologia: nam proprie molitur est parat*, and by Servius *auctus: alii molitur mouet intellegunt, uel arripit, uel aptat*. Here, it seems best to interpret *molitur* as equivalent to *parat* (see above). The word belongs in the higher registers of poetry: Ov. 18 (11), Verg. 20 (16), Hor. 3 (1), Tib. 0, Prop. 0. See also on 1.7.35 and 3.6.69. Although the extant instances of *pruinus* (see above) do not suggest that that particular word is grand, it should be noted that many adjectives formed in *-osus* are stylistically elevated; see on 1.1.9 *iugosis*. The rhythm of the line enhances the impressive tone; see on 1.1.23.

inque suum miseros excitat ales opus: for dawn as the time when people are roused to their unwelcome labours, see on 1.13.13-24.

67-68. Ovid lays his garland on the threshold; cf. Lucr. 4.1177f. *exclusus amator limina saepe / floribus et sertis operit*. *Ars* 3.72 *sparsa nec inuenies limina mane rosa* may refer to that same gesture, or perhaps we are to think rather of a hanging garland shedding its petals as it withers. For the pining komast pinning his garland to the beloved's door, cf. e.g. *Ars* 2.528 *capiti demptas in fore pone rosas*, *Rem.* 32, Asclep. *AP* 5.145.1f., Meleager *AP* 5.191.5f., Prop. 1.16.7.

non laetis ... capillis: cf. 2.6.5 *maestis ... capillis*, *Fast.* 4.854, Stat. *Theb.* 10.606, 12.489, Mart. 2.66.5. The *litotes* here emphasises that the garland is usually associated with joyful occasions.

The hexameter has a trochaic caesura in both the fourth and the fifth foot; see Vol. 1, 121f.

dura super ... limina: *iace* and *proiectam* (69) indicate that the phrase means 'on top of the threshold' rather than 'above the threshold', as at e.g. Petron. 28.9 *super limen ... cauea pendebat aurea*. The *limen* of a Roman door was very substantial (cf. 1.12.3ff., Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.25.4), so it is not unnatural that Ovid should describe the garland as lying on top of it, and not simply on it. For the word-order, cf. 2.11.3 *concurrentes inter ... cautes*, 3.6.63 *centum aut plures inter ... nymphas*, *Ars* 3.274 *angustum circa fascia pectus eat*, Platnauer (1951) 99, H.-Sz. 693 and see also on 1.5.24 and 1.7.26.

tota ... nocte: a difficult phrase; see on 65f.

69-70. proiectam: cf. 1.12.13 (n.), *Epist.* 21.167 *proicit ipse sua deductas fronte coronas*, Val. Max. 6.9 *ext.* 1 (of a young man

renouncing his *perdita luxuria*) *coronam capite detractam proiecit*.

temporis absumpti tam male: Asclepiades leaves his garland, wet with his tears, to drip on his beloved's head when he opens the door (*AP* 5.145); Iphis, comparing himself specifically with a garland, hangs himself at Anaxarete's door (*Met.* 14.733ff.); Clearchus suggests that lovers leave their garlands as a token of honour, either to the beloved as if he were a deity, or to Eros himself (Athenaeus 15.670D). Ovid has none of this sentimentality. Compare the urbane detachment with which Horace concludes his komos to Lyce: *non hoc semper erit liminis aut aquae / caelestis patiens latus* (*Carm.* 3.10.19f.). For the lover's accoutrements as testimony to his vigil at the beloved's door, cf. also Prop. 1.16.7f. *mihi* (sc. the door) *non desunt turpes pendere corollae / semper et exclusi signa iacere faces*. The garland may indicate that Ovid's mistress, no less than Ovid himself, has mis-spent the night; for sleep as a foolish waste of time better spent in love-making, cf. 2.9.39ff. Lenz observes that *temporis* 'erinnert noch einmal an den Refrain, aber diesmal macht der Spondeus [*absumpti*] den Vers schwerer und deutet dumpfe Resignation an'.

testis: inanimate objects are commonly cited as witnesses to (usually successful) sexual undertakings; see Kost on Musaeus 1 κρυφίῳν ἐπιμάρτυρα λύχρον ἐρώτων (esp. p. 131) and see also on 1.4.50 *conscia ... palla*. Ovid may here have in mind Prop. 2.9.41ff. *sidera sunt testes et matutina pruina / et furtim misero ianua aperta mihi, / te nihil in uita nobis acceptius umquam*.

71-72. Cf. Prop. 3.21.15f. *Romanae turre et uos ualeatis, amici, / qualiscumque mihi tuque, puella, uale!*

qualiscumque: a suitably flat and prosaic term for Ovid to use in his disappointed final address to the door-keeper: Ov. 15 (*Am.* 1, *Ars* 1, *Met.* 2, *Trist.* 6, *Pont.* 5), Verg. 0, Hor. 1 (0), Tib. 0, Prop. 4. See also on 3.15.14 *quantulacumque*. As well as 3.21.15f. (quoted above), Ovid may also have in mind Prop. 3.23.9 (of his writing-tablets) *qualescumque mihi semper mansere fideles*; he grudgingly admits that the door-keeper *mansit fidelis*.

uale ... / ... uale: for an easier instance of the pleonastic inclusion of a second *uale*, cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 3.79 *'formose, uale, uale' inquit 'Iolla'*.

senti ... abeuntis honorem: *honorem* here means 'compliment'; Ovid acknowledges that the door-keeper has done his job well. The expression seems to occur elsewhere only at *Met.* 13.287 *est animus ... uestros sensurus honores*, 'I have a mind able to appreciate

the compliments which you pay me'. The verb is perhaps pointed here; up till now, the door-keeper has remained insensitive.

lente nec admisso turpis amante: 'unyielding, and not disgraced through granting a lover admission'. For *nec... turpis* = *et non... turpis*, cf. 1.7.46 *nec nimium* (= *et non nimium*), Shackleton Bailey (1956) 279, Bömer on *Met.* 5.414 and 453. Propertius has a comparable idiom at 3.24.29f. (= 25.9f.) *limina iam nostris ualeant lacrimantia uerbis, / nec tamen irata ianua fracta manu*; the thought in the pentameter would be more fully expressed as *et ianua non fracta manu mea, quamuis sit irata*. Some prefer to construe *nec* with *admisso* but, although the word-order supports that interpretation, it seems improbable that Ovid should be referring to the door-keeper as 'disgraced through not granting a lover admission'. *turpis*: the *ianua* in Prop. 1.16 is particularly sensitive on this point; cf. 7 *turpes... corollae*, 12 *turpior... saeculi uiuere luxuria*.

73-74. For the address to the door by the komast, cf. *Ars* 3.581 '*crudelis ianua*' *dicat*, Plaut. *Curc.* 147ff., Tib. 1.2.7ff., Prop. 1.16.17ff. In the opening scene of the *Curculio*, Phaedromus greets the door of Cappadox' house with the words *salue, ualuistin?* (16), to which Palinurus, his attendant slave, responds *quid tu ergo, insane, rogitas ualeatne ostium?* (19). Despite the Comic *color* of the pentameter, however, we should probably not see an allusion to that passage in Ovid's use of *ualete* here. For the listing of the main components of the door, here the threshold, the door-posts and the door-leaves, cf. 2.1.27f., Lucr. 4.1177ff. *exclusus amator limina saepe / floribus et sertis operit postisque superbos / unguis amaracino et foribus miser oscula figit*, also Plaut. *Bacch.* 1118f. *heus Bacchus, iube sis actutum aperiri fores, / nisi mauoltis fores et postis comminui securibus*, Hor. *Epod.* 11.20ff. *ferebar incerto pede / ad non amicos heu mihi postis et heu / limina dura*, *Carm.* 1.25.3ff. Such an address, here symptomatic of Ovid's reluctance to depart, would perhaps have seemed rather more natural to a Roman than to us, given that the various parts of a door had their own tutelary deity; cf. Aug. *Ciu.* 4.8 *tres deos isti posuerunt, Forculum foribus, Cardeam cardini* (cf. *Fast.* 6.101ff.), *Limentinum limini*.

crudeles: cf. 2 *difficilem... forem* (n.), 1.4.62, *Ars* 3.581, Prop. 1.16.17f. and note also *Epist.* 10.113 (Ariadne to the winds which bore Theseus away) *uos quoque crudeles, uenti*.

rigido: cf. 28 *riget* (n.), 3.8.24 *ad rigidas canto carmen inane fores*, *Rem.* 35 *rigido... posti*, *Fast.* 1.124 *rigidae... serae*, *Pont.* 2.2.40

rigidam... forem. The puritanical attitude to komasts displayed by the door in Prop. 1.16 suggests that the sense 'strait-laced' may be in play here; see on 2.4.15 *rigidas... Sabinas*.

duraque conseruae ligna... fores: for the phrasing, cf. 1.12.7 *ite hinc difficiles, funebria ligna, tabellae* (n.). *conseruus* (-a) (subst. and adj.): Ov. 1, Verg. 0, Hor. 2 (0), Tib. 0, Prop. 0, Plaut. 23 (11 times in the *Miles Gloriosus*), Ter. 4. Note esp. *Asin.* 386f. (Libanus to the merchant) *nolo ego fores conseruas / meas a te uerberarier*. See also on 26 *serua*. *dura... fores* echoes *dura... / ... forem* (1f.); for such ring-composition, see on 1.5.26 *medii... dies*.

1.7

[Wilhelm (1902) 599ff., Fränkel (1945) 18ff.; Khan (1966); Kölblinger (1971) 75ff.; Stirrup (1973); Connor (1974) 19ff.; Büchner (1976) 276ff.; Yardley (1980a) 239ff.; Gössl (1981).]



Bind my hands till I recover from the madness which caused me to attack my mistress (1-4). I could then have attacked even my parents or the gods (5-10). Though dishevelled, my mistress remained beautiful (11-18). Others protested, but she was dumb with fear, accusing me silently (19-22). I wish I had had no hands to commit such a deed (23-28). To beat the humblest citizen is criminal, but I have attacked a goddess (29-34). Such a victory deserves a splendid triumph (35-40). Love-bites alone should have bruised her (41-42). Why was it not enough to shout, threaten and tear her clothes (43-50)? She stood pale and trembling (51-56). When she eventually began to weep, I realised my fault and begged forgiveness (57-62). Relieve your suffering by attacking me in turn (63-66), and remove the traces of my wicked act by tidying your hair (67-68).



Violence against one's mistress is a common theme in Augustan elegy; cf. 2.5.45ff., *Ars* 2.169ff., 3.568ff., Tib. 1.1.73f., 1.6.73f., 1.10.53ff., Prop. 2.5.21ff., 2.15.17ff., 4.5.31, and also Hor. *Carm.* 1.17.25ff. The theme had occurred at Ar. *Plut.* 1013ff., Herodas 2.68ff., Theocr. 14.34f., but it was particularly frequent in New Comedy; cf. Menander's *Perikeiromene* and (to judge by the title, which is almost all that survives) *Rhapiromene*, Plaut. *Bacch.* 859f., *Cist.* 523ff., *Truc.* 926f., Ter. *Ad.* 120f., *Eun.* 646.

Ovid may have been influenced by the *Perikeiromene*. The play is very similar in general outline, the plot being focussed on a lover's remorse at having attacked his mistress. As the title suggests, his violence had taken the form of an attack on her hair; Ovid gives the same prominence to hair-tearing (11ff., 49, 67f.), briefly mentioning in addition only cheek-scratching (40, 50), bruising (41f.) and the tearing of his mistress' clothes (47f.). There are striking similarities in

points of detail between this elegy and later Greek works, which suggest that the *Perikeiromene* was a common source (rather than that the later authors drew on Ovid as an intermediary; see Yardley [1980a] 239ff.). Philostratus refers explicitly to the *Perikeiromene* in the opening passage of *Epist.* 16, addressed to a boy who has cut off his own hair:

οὐδὲ ὁ τοῦ Μενάνδρου Πολέμων καλὸν μειράκιον περιέκειρεν, ἀλλ' αἰχμαλώτου μὲν ἔρωμένης κατετόλμησεν ὀργισθεῖς, ἦν οὐδὲ αὐτὴν ἀποκείρας ἠνέσχετο (κλαίει γοῦν καταπεσὼν καὶ μεταγιγνώσκει τῷ φόνῳ τῶν τριχῶν), ἐφήβου δὲ ἄρα ἐφείσατο καὶ τὸ δρᾶμα.

Compare the memorable phrase τῷ φόνῳ τῶν τριχῶν with Ovid's *caedis scelerumque ministrae* (27), and κλαίει γοῦν καταπεσὼν with *ter tamen ante pedes uolui procumbere supplex* (61). *Epist.* 61, on the same theme, is also clearly influenced by the *Perikeiromene*, and its opening passage again offers close parallels to Ovid's poem:

τίς σε, ὦ καλή, περιέκειρεν; ὡς ἀνόητος καὶ βάρβαρος ὁ μὴ φεισάμενος τῶν Ἀφροδίτης δώρων· οὐδὲ γὰρ γῆ κομῶσα ἡδὺ οὕτω θέαμα ὡς γυνὴ κατάκομος. φεῦ ἀναιδοῦς παλάμης, ὄντως πάντα τὰ ἐκ πολέμιων πέπονθας.

The exclamation ὡς ἀνόητος καὶ βάρβαρος ... is remarkably similar to *quis mihi non 'demens', quis non mihi 'barbare' dixit?* (19), φεῦ ἀναιδοῦς παλάμης again recalls Ovid's vituperation of his hands in 27f. and one may compare ὄντως πάντα τὰ ἐκ πολέμιων πέπονθας with Ovid's observation in 33f., that his violence was the more reprehensible because his mistress was not a *hostis*. On ὁ μὴ φεισάμενος τῶν Ἀφροδίτης δώρων (and ἐφήβου ... ἐφείσατο in *Epist.* 16), see on 65 *nec nostris parce capillis*. An epigram by Paulus Silentiarius (*AP* 5.248) is also comparable to Ovid's elegy:

ὦ παλάμη πάντολμε, σὺ τὸν παγχρύσειον ἔτλης
ἀπρὶξ δραξαμένη βόστρυχον αὐερύσαι;
ἔτλης; οὐκ ἐμάλαξε τεὸν θράσος αἰλινος αὐδῆ,
σκύλμα κόμης, αὐχὴν μαλθακὰ κεκλιμένος;
νῦν θαμινοῖς πατάγοισι μάτην τὸ μέτωπον ἀράσσεις;
οὐκέτι γὰρ μαζοῖς σὸν θέναν ἐμπελάσει.
μή, λίτομαι, δέσποινα, τόσῃν μὴ λάμβανε ποινήν·
μᾶλλον ἐγὼ τλαίην φάσγανον ἀσπασίως.

Paulus, like Ovid, is contrite and attempts to disclaim responsibility for his violence by casting the blame on his hands. Although there is nothing in this epigram itself which suggests that Paulus is drawing specifically on the *Perikeiromene*, it may be significant that his friend Agathias Scholasticus composed an epigram on that play (*AP* 5.218).

However convincing these affinities with later Greek works may be as proof of a direct debt by Ovid to the *Perikeiromene*, the significance of the debt should not be exaggerated. There are no certain parallels on points of detail between the poem and the very substantial fragments of the play itself which are now extant (some 450 lines); it seems that Ovid exploits it in only a general way, to give his poem a dramatic structure which allows him to develop at considerable length a theme treated on a small scale elsewhere in elegy. Menander may not indeed be the only important influence. Ovid may also be drawing on declamatory exercises on the subjects *qui patrem pulsauerit, manus ei praecidantur* (Sen. Contr. 9.4, [Quint.] Decl. 358, 362, 372, also Theon 2.130.30f. Spengel) and *sacrilego manus praecidantur* (Sen. Contr. 8.2). Here again, Ovid's debt seems too general to permit conclusive demonstration; one can only point to the comparison of his crime to that of attacking one's parents (5) or a deity (6, 10, 32), to the forensic imagery of *egit me lacrimis ore silente reum* (22), and to the description of his hands as *sacrilegae* (28). Nevertheless, it is quite in conformity with Ovid's practice in the *Amores* to eroticise themes which were familiar in the schools of declamation; see Vol. 1, 69ff. The rhetoricians drew heavily on Comedy, and especially on Menander; cf. Quint. Inst. 10.1.69 *Menander, qui uel unus meo quidem iudicio diligenter lectus ad cuncta quae praecipimus effingenda sufficiat*, Day (1938) 60ff. It may be, therefore, that Ovid was influenced to exploit the *Perikeiromene* by the frequent use made of Menander in the schools.

The tone of the poem is distinctly humorous. Ovid prevents us from taking him seriously by exaggerating the enormity of his offence: beating one's mistress is not comparable to the crimes of Ajax (7f.), Orestes (9f.) and Diomedes (31ff.) and the address to his hands (27f.) is inappropriately high-flown. Moreover, the passion of his self-recriminations is undermined and contradicted by the objective comments on the situation with which they are interspersed; note especially the lingering description of the girl's beauty even after the attack (12ff., 40), the sophistic nature of the argument that his crime is, in fact, worse than that of Diomedes (31ff.), the incongruously detached and pedantic parenthesis in 48 and, above all, the speed and abruptness with which the whole episode is finally brought into a truer and more banal perspective by the last couplet, with its implication that the offence was actually quite trivial — all that the girl need do to restore normality is to tidy her hair; see Parker (1969) 84ff.



1-2. This address to anonymous friends gives the elegy a vivid and dramatic opening. (We are perhaps to think specifically of Ovid's audience at a *recitatio*; see Vol. 1, 64.) Nothing more, however, is heard of these friends, the bulk of the poem being a static account of a past event, with only brief addresses to Ovid's hands (27f.), to himself (35ff.) and to his mistress (63ff.). The opening request in 1.12 *Flete meos casus* (sc. *amici*) is comparable; the bulk of that elegy is addressed to Nape and, more particularly, to the writing-tablets.

Addere manus in uincla meas: it was customary to bind madmen; cf. e.g. Eur. *Herc. F.* 1010 (= 1009) ff., Call. *frg.* 203.19ff. οἱ φίλοι σε δήσουσι, / κῆν νοῦν ἔχωσιν, ἐγχεῶσι τὴν κρᾶσιν / ὥς ὑγίειης οὐδὲ τῶνυχι ψαύεις, Plaut. *Men.* 845, Cic. *Pis.* 48, Cels. 3.18.21, Sen. *Ag.* 800f. *hanc fida famuli turba, dum excutiat deum, / retinete, ne quid impotens peccet furor*. It is perhaps paradoxical that the madman should be sane enough to ask for this measure to be applied to himself. Ovid achieves this paradox partly by dissociating himself from his hands — in lines 4, 23f. and 27f., only they are mad. The detachment and objectivity which pervade the poem (see the introduction) are thereby set in the opening words. For the phrasing, cf. 3.8.48 *discordes addere in arma manus*, *Ars* 2.672, *Fast.* 3.306 *uincla ... sopitas addit in arta manus*, Housman on Manil. 1.245, and see also on 1.13.14 *aptat ad arma manus*.

(meruere catenas): cf. 28 *debita ... uincla*, Calp. *Ecl.* 3.75 (in the same context) *meruit manus utraque poenas*, [Quint.] *Decl.* 10.16 *has tibi catenas, haec uincla pro merito reddidit?* For the punishment appropriately inflicted on the guilty part of the body, see on 2.10.34 *aequora periuro naufragus ore bibat*. Whereas *uincla* is merely a general term, *catenae* are specifically long and heavy chains. The purpose of this parenthesis is to emphasise the urgency of the opening request.

dum furor omnis abit: it is not until line 44 that we learn that Ovid's mad violence was caused by anger. The reason for his anger, however, is nowhere specified; as so often elsewhere, Ovid, in contrast to the other elegists, is concerned only with the immediate dramatic setting, and makes no attempt to relate it to the general context of his love-affair. For the equation of anger with madness, cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1.2.62 *ira furor brevis est*, Nisbet-Hubbard on *Carm.* 1.16.5. *abit:* cf. Catull. 63.38 *abit in quiete molli rabidus furor animi*, *TLL* 1.70.27ff.

si quis amicus ades: for the responsibility of *amici* to take care of madmen, cf. Call. *frg.* 203.19ff. (quoted above), Catull. 41.5ff.

propinqui, quibus est puella curae, / amicos medicosque conuocate: / non est sana puella, Nisbet on Cic. *Pis.* 48, Cairns (1974) 105, Fedeli on Prop. 1.1.25f. *uos, qui sero lapsum reuocatis, amici, / quaerite non sani pectoris auxilia*. At line 22 *egit me ... reum*, Ovid considers himself to be on trial. Since, however, that conceit is not given prominence in the poem, we probably should not interpret *ades* as meaning specifically 'be present to help in a law-suit'; for that sense, cf. *Ars* 2.223 *iussus adesse foro*, 3.531 *ius qui profitebitur, adsit*, *Rem.* 663, *TLL* 2.923.30ff. For the hemistich, cf. Prop. 2.4.18 *gaudeat in puero, si quis amicus erit*, *Met.* 5.179f. *uultus auertite uestros, / si quis amicus adest*.

3-4. furor ... temeraria bracchia mouit: cf. Lucan 3.249 *furor extremos mouit Romanus Orestas*, *Homer.* 511f. *iaculum, quantas furor ipse mouebat, / uiribus intorquet*. *temerare* often connotes an offence against a deity; cf. 3.9.63 (of Augustus) *temerati ... amici*, *Pont.* 2.2.13f. *nec, quod Tydidae* (cf. 31ff.) *temeraria dextera fecit, / numina sunt telis ulla petita meis*, Paul. Fest. p. 501 *temerare: uiolare sacra et contaminare*. *temerarius* itself, however, does not seem to be a grand word: Ov. 33 (20), Verg. 0, Hor. 0, Tib. 0, Lygd. 2, Prop. 1; it occurs earlier in Comedy, Cicero, Caesar, *Bell. Alex.*, Nepos and Vitruvius. *bracchia mouere* is analogous to *arma mouere*, for which cf. 1.9.26 (n.); see also below, on *uerbera ferre* (6).

flet mea uesana laesa puella manu: a cleverly abbreviated reworking of Tib. 1.10.55f. *flet teneras subtusa genas: sed uictor et ipse / flet sibi dementes tam ualuisse manus*. *uesana ... manu*: more frequently than any other author, Ovid attributes to *manus* (*uel sim.*) epithets which characterise the person to whom the hand belongs; in the *Amores*, cf. e.g. 1.11.14 *blanda*, 1.14.36 *maesta*, 2.6.39 *auara*, 2.9.12 *pigra*, 2.14.24 *crudelis*, 2.18.16 *priuata*, 3.6.36 *irata*, 58 *insana*, 71 *inimico pollice*, 3.8.22 *hoc fassas ... manus* (a particularly daring expression), 3.9.10 *infesta* and see also *TLL* 8.350.18ff. Here, however, as in 28 *debita, sacrilegae, uincla subite, manus*, the phrasing contributes ingeniously to Ovid's attempt to dissociate himself from his hands' heinous deeds. For such sophistry, cf. also 1.14.23-30 (n.), 3.7.69ff. *uesana ... manu* occurs in this position also at Prop. 2.9.10; cf. *insana ... manu* (3.6.58, Prop. 3.8.4), *insanis ... manibus* (Prop. 1.6.16), *manus demens* (*Trist.* 4.1.101).

5-6. For the rhetorical principle underlying this argument, cf. Schol. Athon. p. 35.21ff. Walz εἰ δὲ καὶ μείζονα βουλησόμεθα ἀποδείξαι,

πρότερον τὸ ἴσον ἀποδείξαντες οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον χωρήσομεν, οἶον, μοιχείας ὑποκειμένης, ὅτι μηδὲν ἔλαττον κακὸν μοιχεία ἱεροσυλίας· ἄμφω γὰρ θεῖους πατοῦσι νόμους. For its application in this context, cf. Tib. 1.10.59f. *a, lapis est ferrumque, suam quicumque puellam / uerberat: e caelo deripit ille deos*, Chariton 1.5.5 (Chaereas' self-accusation when charged with killing his beloved Callirhoe by kicking her) χείρωνα δέδρακα ἱεροσύλων καὶ πατροκτόνων, also Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 20.2 τὸν δὲ τύποντα γαμετὴν ἢ παῖδα τοῖς ἀγιωτάτοις ἔλεγεν ἱεροῖς προσφέρειν τὰς χεῖρας. The formulation here is closely paralleled at 3.9.43f. (of the flames of Tibullus' funeral-pyre) *aurea sanctorum potuissent templa deorum / urere, quae tantum sustinere nefas*; cf. also 28, 31-34, 1.12.15f. (nn.), Tib. 1.2.79ff., Sen. *Contr.* 7.2.1 *Popilli, potes ... Ciceronem occidere, potes uel patrem*, CE 1988.51. At Hom. *Il.* 5.361f., when wounded by Diomedes (cf. 31ff.), Aphrodite complains λίην ἄχθομαι ἔλκος, ὃ με βροτὸς οὐτασεν ἀνὴρ, / Τυδεΐδης, ὃς νῦν γε καὶ ἄν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο. Ovid parodies this sort of argument at *Ars* 3.463ff. *illa potest uigiles flammis extinguere Vestae / et rapere e templis, Inachi, sacra tuis / et dare mixta uiro tritis aconita cicutis, / accepto uenerem munere si qua negat*.

uel ... / ... uel: the most immediately obvious meaning for *uel* in the hexameter is 'even', as at e.g. 1.6.36, Sen. *loc. cit.* Its recurrence in the pentameter, however, suggests that the sense 'either' seems also to be present.

in sanctos uerbera ferre deos: for the expression, constructed on the analogy of the common *arma ferre in ...*, cf. *Ars* 2.533f. *nec maledicta puta nec uerbera ferre puellae / turpe*, Verg. *Aen.* 7.336f. *uerbera tectis / funereasque inferre faces*, Liv. 8.28.4 *uerbera ... adferri*, and see also on 3 *bracchia mouit*. It is perhaps significant that *uerbera* are associated particularly with the punishments inflicted on mortals by the Furies, the deities whom Ovid mentions in 9f.; cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 6.555ff., 7.336f. (quoted above), 451, Sil. 2.530, 625f., Stat. *Theb.* 3.630f., Suet. *Nero* 34.4. In using *uerbera ferre* to refer to his own attack on the gods, Ovid may be pointedly reversing the natural order of things; cf. Lucan 6.747 *uerberibus ... suis trepidam castigat* (sc. Demogorgon) *Erinyes*, with the scholiast's comment: *quibus castigare ipsa consuevit, his caeditur*. For this type of reversal, see on 1.4.45f.

7-10. For Ajax and Orestes cited together as archetypal madmen, cf. e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 3.11, Cels. 3.18.19, Juv. 14.284ff., also Plaut. *Capt.* 562

(Orestes) and 615 (Ajax), Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.132ff. (Orestes) and 193ff. (Ajax). For Ajax, cf. also Cic. *Tusc.* 4.52, Sen. *Dial.* 4.36.5, Apul. *Met.* 3.18. Orestes is much the commoner paradigm; see Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.471, Nisbet on Cic. *Pis.* 47. Especially since Ovid seems to be influenced by *controuersiae* on parricide (see the introduction), it may be of particular relevance to the present passage that Orestes was a favourite subject for debate in the schools. The somewhat paradoxical phrase *malus ultor* (9) perhaps suggests a link with the θεῖσις *an Orestes sit recte absolutus*, for which cf. Cic. *Inu.* 1.18, 92, Rhet. Her. 1.26, Quint. *Inst.* 3.5.11, 3.11.4ff., 11ff., 20, 7.4.8, *RLM* pp. 140, 196, 381, 419, 529. A reference to that declamatory exercise seems clearer at *Trist.* 4.4.69 *dubium, pius an sceleratus Orestes*; cf. esp. *RLM* p. 419.17 (Julius Victor, drawing on Cic. *Inu.* 1.31) *an sceleratus Orestes... non conuenit*. The two couplets are elegantly balanced: the appositional clauses occupy most of both hexameters, with the subject in the final position, followed by the main verb at the beginning of the pentameter.

7-8. *quid? non ...?*: for this method of introducing a mythological paradigm, cf. e.g. 2.9.7, 3.6.29, *Trist.* 2.385, Prop. 2.8.21, 2.22A.31f.

clipei dominus septemplex Ajax = *Met.* 13.2. For Ajax' shield (which was actually eight layers thick, the seven of ox-hide having an outer covering of bronze), cf. Hom. *Il.* 7.219ff. For *dominus* referring to the owner of a weapon, cf. also *Met.* 5.173, 13.389 (of Ajax), 402 (of Philoctetes; cf. Soph. *Phil.* 262 τῶν Ἡρακλείων ... δεσπότην ὀπλῶν). The usage is found earlier only at Rhet. Her. 4.43; see *TLL* 5.1.1918.46ff. For *clipeus septemplex*, cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 12.925, Val. Fl. 6.367, *Homer.* 612 (of Ajax). Although used quite freely by some prose authors (Liv. 17, Curt. 23, Plin. *Nat.* 16), *clipeus* is an appropriately elevated term in this context: Ov. 28 (23), Verg. 50 (50), Hor. 1 (1), Tib. 0, Prop. 0, Catull. 0, Lucr. 0, Sen. *Trag.* 2, Lucan 4, Val. Fl. 10, Sil. 60, Stat. 58 (*Silu.* 1 [5.2.131, in a very grand context]), Mart. 1, Juv. 4. *septemplex* renders Homer's ἑπταβόειος (*Il.* 7.220 etc.). The word occurs in classical Latin, apart from the passages cited above, only at *Met.* 5.187, *Trist.* 2.189, Stat. *Theb.* 7.310 *clipei septemplex tauro*, *Homer.* 293.

strauit: cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.202 (of Ajax) *strauit ferro pecus*.

depressos: of animals, cf. *Met.* 1.296 *summa piscem depredit in ulmo*, 11.772, *Trist.* 3.11.11, *TLL* 5.1.607.75ff. The rather more common application of the term to trapped soldiers (cf. 2.10.3, 3.7.71, *Rem.* 347, *TLL* 5.1.607.59ff.) is relevant here; in his madness,

Ajax thought that he had trapped the Greek commanders. The noun *depressa* is possibly also in play; cf. Paul. Fest. p. 71 *depressa dicitur genus militaris animaduersionis, castigatione maior, ignominia minor*.

lata per arua: at Soph. *Ai.* 29f., Ajax is described as μόνον/πιδῶντα πεδία σὺν νεορράντῳ ξίφει. The phrase here means 'over the fields far and wide'; cf. 3.10.33 *semina ... in latos ierant ... agros*, *Epist.* 12.48 *spargere ... lata per arua*, *Fast.* 1.545f. *uagantur / ... lata per arua boues*, 2.210 *sparsos lata per arua greges*, Verg. *Aen.* 2.312 (the straits are narrow) *Sigea igni freta lata relucet*. εὐρύ is perhaps to be construed in this way at Hom. *Il.* 14.144f. Τρώων ἡγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες / εὐρὺ κονίσσουσιν πεδίων.

9-10. Cf. Eur. *Or.* 268ff. δὸς τόξα μοι κερουλκά, δῶρα Λοξίου, / οἷς μ' εἶπ' Ἀπόλλων ἐξαμύνασθαι θεάς, / εἰ μ' ἐκφοβοῖεν μανιάσιν λυσσήμασιν. Note how closely the paradigm here corresponds to that in lines 5 and 6: the attack on the parent in the hexameter, the attack on the deities in the pentameter.

uindex in matre patris, malus ultor: these rather fulsome appositional phrases may be influenced by Aesch. *Ag.* 1280f. ἤξει γὰρ ἡμῶν ἄλλος αὖ τιμᾶρος, / μητροκτόνον φίτυμα, ποιινάτωρ πατρός. For *uindex* and *ultor* in combination, cf. *Met.* 5.237 (of Perseus) *uindex ultorque parentis*, Liv. 2.11.4, Curt. 5.12.5, Colum. 7.12.1, Juv. 10.164ff. There seems to be no clear distinction in meaning. *uindex*: Ov. 26 (12), Verg. 0, Hor. 3 (2), Tib. 0, Prop. 2; cf. also 63 *uindicta* (n.). On Ovid's use of legal language, see Kenney (1969). *malus ultor*: 'sinful avenger'; cf. 2.1.13 *cum male se Tellus ulta est*, *Ars* 2.408 *male peccantem Tyndaris ulta uirum*, *Met.* 7.397, Hor. *Carm.* 4.12.7f.

arcanas ... deas: *arcanus* is used of mystery-deities at Hor. *Carm.* 3.2.27 (Ceres) and Sil. 3.395 (Bacchus). Since, however, the Furies are not mystery-deities, that implication is not relevant here. In Euripides' play, the Furies are visible only to Orestes, and they are generally associated with darkness (cf. e.g. Aesch. *Choeph.* 1049, *Eum.* 370 ἀμετέραις ἐφόδοις μελανείμοσιν, Eur. *El.* 1345, *Or.* 321 μελάγχρωτες εὐμενίδες, 408 νυκτὶ προσφερεῖς). The meaning may therefore be 'unseen'. I can, however, adduce no clear parallel for that sense. Ovid may have been led to choose this epithet by association with *arcere* (cf. Euripides' ἐξαμύνασθαι θεάς [*Or.* 269]), which might, in fact, suggest that he wrote *in arcendas ... deas*; to emphasise that Orestes acted in self-defence, however, would entail an inappropriate reduction in his culpability.

poscere tela: cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9.524 *scalas in moenia poscit*, *TLL*

10.2.71.61ff.

11-12. Attacks on the hair are a standard feature of lovers' quarrels; cf. e.g. 2.5.45, 2.7.7, *Epist.* 20.83, *Ars* 2.169, 3.570, Tib. 1.6.71, 1.10.53, Prop. 2.5.23, 3.8.5, 4.5.31, Hor. *Carm.* 1.17.25ff., Menander *Perik.*, *Rhapiz.* (?), Lucian *Dial. Meretr.* 8.

ergo ego ...?: see on 1.4.3.

digestos: '(carefully) arranged'; cf. 1.14.19, Mart. 3.63.3 *bellus homo est, flexos qui digerit ordine crines*.

laniare capillos: *lanio:* Ov. 32 (19), Verg. 3 (2), Hor. 0, Tib. 0, Prop. 1. The verb occurs earlier for certain only in Cicero (prose and verse) and Sallust. Porcius Latro *ap. Sen. Contr.* 2.4.1 *laniatas capillis* may also predate this poem. *laniare* is first used of attacks on the hair in that passage, at Verg. *Aen.* 12.605f. and 14 (7) times in Ovid. See also on 3.9.52 *dilaniata comas*.

nec ... dedecuer is not simply equivalent to *et decuere*. The negative form of expression suggests the paradox that Corinna's beauty is enhanced, not diminished, by the dishevelled state of her hair; cf. 3.15.4 *nec me deliciae dedecuer meae* '(although I am of puritanical Paelignian stock,) my love-elegies have gained me glory'. See also Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 2.12.17 *quam nec ferre pedem dedecuit choris*. The sentiment here is typical of Ovid, of whom Seneca records *aiebat interim decentiorem faciem esse, in qua aliquis naeuus esset* (*Contr.* 2.2.12); cf. e.g. 1.14.21, 3.1.10 *pedibus uitium causa decoris erat*, 3.6.47f., *Ars* 3.153 (quoted on 15), 295 *in uitio decor est*, *Met.* 1.527, *Fast.* 2.755ff., 5.608. The objectivity of this observation on his mistress' beauty contradicts Ovid's claim to passionate remorse; see the introduction and 40 (n.). In the farcical account of how Cynthia discovered him with two prostitutes, Propertius similarly contradicts his claim to be panic-stricken by observing that she was *non operosa comis, sed furibunda decens* (4.8.52). At 3.7.82, Ovid uses such an aside to rather different effect in describing how his mistress leaped from the bed in disgust at his impotence: *et decuit nudos proripuisse pedes*; that comment does not contradict his claim to great embarrassment at his impotence, rather it indicates the acuteness of his frustration. *dedecere* occurs 6 (1) times in Ovid, at Hor. *Carm.* 1.38.7 and 2.12.17, earlier only in Cicero's prose (4 or 5 times). The personal construction occurs first at Cic. *Off.* 1.146 (*lect. dub.*), Hor. *Carm.* 1.38.7 and elsewhere in Ovid at 3.15.4 (quoted above), *Rem.* 410 and *Met.* 6.689.

motae ... comae: for the phrase, cf. *Epist.* 20.22, *Met.* 4.673f., 5.488,

6.303, Stat. *Theb.* 10.75f. None of those passages, however, offers a close parallel for the sense 'dishevelled'.

13-18. For the multiple comparison of the beloved to mythological heroines, see on 1.10.1-8. Note the *uariatio* in the construction: *talem ... dicam / ... sollicitasse, talis ... / fleuit, sic ... / procubuit*.

13-14. sic: Heinsius hesitantly conjectured *sic quoque pulchra fuit*, and Bentley noted *quin formosa fuit* in the margin of his copy of Burman. *sic quoque (uel sim.)* would certainly be more normal, emphasising the paradox that the girl retained her beauty despite being dishevelled; cf. e.g. 1.14.21, *Met.* 1.527 *tum quoque uisa decens*, [Theocr.] 23.14f. ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως / ἦν καλός. The paradox, however, is unexceptionable.

talem: huntresses conventionally had unkempt hair; cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 1.319 (of Venus in disguise) *uenatrix dederat ... comas diffundere uentis* and Ovid's portrayal of Daphne and Callisto in the *Metamorphoses* (quoted on 17f.).

Schoeneia: Ovid is here alluding to the Arcadian version of the Atalanta-myth (cf. *Maenalias*). She was usually regarded as the daughter of Ias(i)us (Iasion) in that version, of Schoeneus in the Boeotian version. Since they are almost certainly local variants on the same legend, the two versions cannot be fully distinguished; see Bömer on *Met.* 8.273-546 (pp. 98f.) and 10.560-707 (pp. 188f.). Schoeneus is the only name which Ovid records for Atalanta's father; cf. *Epist.* 16.265, 21.125, *Met.* 10.609, 660, *Trist.* 2.399. The form *Schoeneis* recurs at *Epist. locc. cit.*, *Priap.* 16.1, Claud. *Carm. Min.* 30.170. See also on 1.2.47 *Gangetide*.

Maenalias: the adjective occurs in Latin first in the Augustan poets, 10 times in the first refrain in Verg. *Ecl.* 8 (21ff.), at Prop. 4.9.15, 7 (3) times in Ovid and at Gratt. 19 and [Verg.] *Copa* 9. Ovid is possibly hinting at the controversy concerning the name of Atalanta's father; Apollod. 3.9.2 records that Euripides called him Maenalus.

sollicitasse feras: I can cite no closer parallels for the use of the verb in this context than Lucan 4.665 *sollicitat ... feros ... hostes* and Mart. *Epigr.* 22.1 *Sollicitant pauidi dum rhinocerotae magistri*. The expression is not, however, difficult; compare the use of *uexare* at e.g. Hor. *Epod.* 6.1f. *Quid immerentis hospites uexas canis / ignauus aduersum lupos?*, *Carm.* 3.2.3f., 4.14.22f.

15-16. talis: for Ariadne's unkempt hair when deserted by Theseus,

cf. Catull. 64.63, *Epist.* 10.16, 47f., 137, 147, *Ars* 1.530, 3.153ff. *et neglecta decet multas coma ... / talem te Bacchus ... / sustulit in currus, Cnosi relicta, suos.*

periuri: for Theseus' faithlessness in deserting Ariadne, cf. Catull. 64.58f. *immemor et iuuenis fugiens pellit uada remis, / irrita uentosae linquens promissa procellae*, 132ff. *sicine me patriis auectam, perfide, ab aris, / perfide, deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu? / sicine discedens neglecto numine diuum, / immemor a! deuota domum periuria portas?*, Bömer on *Fast.* 3.473 *periure et perfide Theseu*. In the context of his friendship with Pirithous, by contrast, Theseus is a paradigm of fidelity; cf. *Trist.* 1.3.66, *Pont.* 4.10.78, van Dam on *Stat. Silu.* 2.6.54f. For the indignant alliteration of *p* in *periuri promissaque*, cf. Catull. and *Fast. locc. cit.* With the sigmatism in the pentameter, one might compare Eur. *Med.* 476f. (where Medea complains of Jason's treacherous desertion) ἔσωσά σ', ὥς ἴσασιν Ἑλλήνων ὅσοι / ταῦτόν συνεισέβησαν Ἀργῶν σκάφος.

promissaque uelaque: for the syllepsis, cf. *Epist.* 2.25 *Demophoon, uentis et uerba et uela dedisti*, 7.8 *idem uenti uela fidemque ferent*, *Ars* 1.551 *et color et Theseus et uox abiere puellae*, *Rem.* 286 *irrita cum uelis uerba tulere Noti*, *Met.* 8.134f., *Trist.* 1.2.17f., *Epist. Sapph.* 209 and see also Kenney on *Lucr.* 3.614, Bömer on *Met.* 8.134f. and 9.134f. Callimachus offers an interestingly close precedent for the expression here: Νάξιος (Ariadne was deserted on Naxos) ... Λύκος ... / ναῦν ἅμα καὶ ψυχὴν εἶδεν ἀπολλυμένην (*AP* 7.272.1f.). See also on 1.14.55 *collige cum uultu mentem*. Although Ovid uses syllepsis so often and so adventurously, he nevertheless shows a certain restraint; for example, *Met.* 2.313f. (of Jupiter striking down Phaethon, a passage which Bömer describes as a 'kühnes und beispiellooses Zeugma') *pariter ... animaque rotisque / expulit* seems conservative in contrast to Sen. *Phaedr.* 1101f. (of Hippolytus' horses) *pariter moram / dominumque rumpunt. uela*: perhaps a particularly significant detail. Ariadne cursed Theseus for his perfidy; cf. Catull. 64.200f. *quali solam Theseus me mente reliquit, / tali mente ... funestet seque suosque*. On the voyage back to Athens, Theseus forgot to hoist white sails as a sign of his success against the Minotaur. Seeing black sails, Aegeus killed himself; see *RE Suppl.* 13.1144ff. and see also below, *praecipites* (n.).

Thesei: this Latinised form, which Ovid perhaps derives from Catull. 64.120, recurs in the same line-position at *Fast.* 6.737. For the synzesis, see on 1.8.59 *aurea*. The Greek genitive *Theseos* occurs at *Met.* 8.268; see Bömer's note.

fleuit praecipites ... tulisse Notos: for winds bearing words idly away, see on 1.4.11f. Ovid may here be influenced by Catull. 64.59 (quoted above) and 139ff. *at non haec quondam blanda promissa dedisti / uoce mihi, non haec miserae sperare iubebas, / sed conubia laeta, sed optatos hymenaeos, / quae cuncta aerii discerpunt irrita uenti. flere* is first constructed with an accusative and infinitive in the poetry of this period; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 3.78, Tib. 1.10.56 (quoted above, on line 4), Prop. 1.7.17f., 2.27.7 (*lect. dub.*), 3.9.37, *Epist.* 1.18, *TLL* 6.900.52ff. *praecipites ... Notos:* for the phrase, cf. 2.11.52, *Epist.* 10.30, Verg. *Aen.* 7.411, Stat. *Theb.* 2.194. *praeceps* occurs as an epithet for winds first in Augustan poetry; in addition to the passages cited above, cf. also Verg. *Georg.* 4.29, Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.12, *Met.* 2.185, 11.481 and see *TLL* 10.2.417.28ff. Here, as at *Epist.* 10.30 *uidi praecipiti carbasa tenta Noto*, the term suggests Theseus' precipitate departure from Naxos. An active sense 'causing to fall headlong' (see on 1.2.7 *tenuēs*), hinting at Aegeus' suicide, may also be implicit; for *praeceps* in that context, cf. Catull. 64.243f. *cum primum infecti conspexit lintea ueli, / praecipitem sese scopulorum e uertice iecit*, Ibis 491ff. *de praecipiti uenias in Tartara saxo / ... / ut qui Theseae fallacia uela carinae / uidit*.

Cressa: a poetic form, occurring in Latin first at Verg. *Georg.* 3.345, *Aen.* 5.285, Hor. *Carm.* 1.36.10, Prop. 2.1.61, 4.7.57 and 6 (1) times in Ovid; see *TLL Onom.* 4.710.21ff. In thus denoting Ariadne, Ovid may be hinting at the Cretans' reputation as liars (see on 3.10.19 *nec fingunt omnia Cretes*); i.e. a woman whom one might have expected to be deceitful has been deceived. For the conceit of 'the biter bitten', see on 1.4.45f.

17-18. The legend of Cassandra's abduction from the temple of Minerva occurs as early as Arctinus and was a favourite subject in literature and, more especially, art; see Davreux (1942), Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 2.403ff. *ecce trahebatur passis Priameia uirgo / crinibus a templo Cassandra adytisque Mineruae / ad caelum tendens ardentia lumina frustra, / lumina, nam teneras arcebant uincula palmas*. Ovid may have Vergil's account in mind here, as he certainly does at *Met.* 13.410f. *tractis ... comis antistita Phoebi / non profecturas tendebat ad aethera palmas*. Vergil goes on, in the same passage, to describe the death of Cassandra's suitor, who was killed while trying to rescue her: *Coroebus / Penelei dextra diuae arripotentis ad aram / procumbit* (424ff.). It would be quite in Ovid's manner to change the subject of the verb (*procumbere* [see below]) from Cassandra's suitor to

Cassandra herself; see on 1.5.12 *multis Laïs amata uiris* and below on 50 *ferreus*. (Note also the change in sense: Coroebus 'falls down dead', Cassandra 'prostrates herself in supplication of the goddess'.)

Vergil follows the traditional account in describing Cassandra as having her hair unbound, as does Ovid himself at 1.9.37f. and *Met. loc. cit.* A primary function of the *uitta* was to bind the hair; cf. 3.6.56 *uitta nec euinctas impedit alba comas*, Isid. *Orig.* 19.31.6 *uittae dictae quod uinciunt*. Here, therefore, Ovid is diverging from the traditional account. In so doing, however, he does not spoil the point of the comparison, since the wearing of a *uitta* need not necessarily imply an ordered coiffure; cf. *Met.* 1.477ff. (of the huntress Daphne) *uitta coercebat positos sine lege capillos / ... spectat (sc. Apollo) inornatos collo pendere capillos. / et 'quid, si comantur?' ait ... / ... leuis impulsos retro dabat aura capillos / ... crinem sparsum ceruicibus adflat (sc. Apollo), 2.411ff. (of the huntress Callisto) non erat huius opus ... / ... positu uariare comas ... / uitta coercuerat neglectos alba capillos*. Citing Smith's discussion of 'the *uitta* as an indicator of feminine status' in his note on Tib. 1.6.67f. *sit modo casta, doce, quamuis nec uitta ligatos / impediatur crines nec stola longa pedes*, Yardley (1980b) 266 suggests that Ovid is emphasising that his mistress 'is neither a married woman nor a respectable unmarried girl'. (On the vexed question of the status of elegiac mistresses, see the introduction to 1.4.) This pedantic and objective qualification of the comparison helps to throw doubt on the sincerity of Ovid's remorse at his violence against his mistress; see the introduction.

nisi ... quod: cf. *Epist.* 18.11, *Met.* 2.451, 13.486, 895 with Bömer's note, 14.784. The idiom is prosaic, and perhaps therefore symptomatic of Ovid's pedantic objectivity; see K.-S. 2.416f., H.-Sz. 587f. It should be noted, however, that Ovid's fondness for *nisi* is exceptional: Ov. 266 (109), Verg. 5 (2), Hor. 43 (7), Tib. 1, Prop. 10 (6 in Book 4); *ni:* Ov. 21 (11), Verg. 23 (19), Hor. 16 (1), Tib. 2, Prop. 1.

uittatis: the adjective occurs first here and at *Ibis* 77 (with *capillis*), once in Lucan, the elder Pliny, Martial and Juvenal, twice in Valerius Flaccus, 8 times in Statius (*Silu.* 3) and at *CIL* 6.2099.2.25 and 14.4254.2.7 (both in prose). For adjectives so formed from nouns and occurring first or only in Ovid, cf. *apicatus* (*Fast.* 3.397), *capistratus* (*Epist.* 2.80), *cothurnatus* (see on 2.18.18), *peltatus* (see on 2.14.2), *trabeatus* (*Met.* 14.828, *Fast.* 1.37).

procubuit: *procumbo:* Ov. 32 (21), Verg. 19 (15), Hor. 0, Tib. 2, Prop. 1 (4.1.4 [*lect. dub.*]). The word occurs earlier in poetry only at Catull. 64.389 and three times in Lucretius, in prose first in Caesar

(7), Vitruvius (3) and Livy (15). As noted above, Ovid seems to be echoing Verg. *Aen.* 2.426. He may also have in mind Tib. 1.2.83 *procumbere templis*. The other Tibullan instance, *ad teneros procubuisse pedes* (1.9.30), possibly influences line 61.

casta Minerva: for Minerva as a virgin goddess, see on 1.1.7f. For the epithet *casta*, see Bömer on *Met.* 4.799f. Here, it may serve to remind us that, according to one version of the legend, the Locrian Ajax raped Cassandra in Minerva's temple; see *RE* 10.2292.

19-20. It is possible to infer from Philostr. *Epist.* 61 that the hexameter may be influenced by Menander's *Perikeiromene*; see the introduction. For the contrast between the victim's own silence and the vociferous reaction of other people, cf. Chariton 1.5.1, also Call. *Lau. Pall.* 83ff. For the direct quotation, cf. *Ars* 1.665 *pugnabit primo fortassis et 'improbe' dicet*, and see also Vol. 1, 68.

demens: Ov. 22 (8), Verg. 17 (16), Hor. 7 (2), Tib. 3, Prop. 7. The word is used by these poets almost exclusively in the nominative and vocative singular. The only exceptions are Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.135 and *Carm.* 3.19.23 (*dementem*), Hor. *Carm.* 1.37.7 (but see below) and Tib. 1.10.56 (*dementes* [acc. fem. pl.]), Prop. 3.8.15 (*dementia* [nom. neut. pl.]). At *Met.* 4.259, Ovid has *dementer*, which should perhaps be read also at Hor. *Carm.* 1.37.7. *amens* (Ov. 15 [9]; Verg. 13 [13], Hor. 1 [0], Tib. 1, Prop. 1) is even more restricted. Only Ovid uses cases other than the nominative and vocative singular; cf. *Ars* 2.691 (*amentis*), *Met.* 2.398 (*amentes* [acc. masc. pl.]), *Trist.* 3.3.20 (*amenti*).

ipsa nihil: such terse phrasing is found predominantly in high-style narratives; cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 2.287, *Met.* 5.30, 7.743, 12.232, *Fast.* 2.797, Val. Fl. 6.488, 7.388, Stat. *Theb.* 8.680, 9.343, 12.367. Note also *Epist.* 11.83f. (Canace) *ipsa nihil praeter lacrimas pudibunda profudi. / torperat gelido lingua retenta metu*.

pauido ... metu: for the phrase, cf. *Ars* 2.88 and *Fast.* 1.16, and see also Bömer on *Met.* 4.228f. *pauet illa metuque / et colus et fusi ... cecidere*.

21-22. For similar conceits, cf. Cic. *Catil.* 1.18 (*patria tecum, Catilina, sic agit et quodam modo tacita loquitur*, 21 (*patres conscripti cum tacent, clamant*, *Sest.* 40, *Planc.* 46, Q. Cic. *Epist.* 16.26.1 *uerberaui te cogitationis tacito dumtaxat conuicio*, Val. Max. 4.3.14 *tam misericors continentia plebis tacitum crudelium uictorum conuicium fuit*, [Quint.] *Decl.* 260.10, Nonn. *Dion.* 36.377ff., esp. 381 τὸ ... δάκρυον ἐπλετο φωνῇ, Otto (1890) s.v. *tacere* (2). See also on

1.4.17 *uultum ... loquacem* and on 1.11.18 *tacito uultu*.

taciti ... uultus: for the phrase, cf. 1.11.18, 2.7.5, *Met.* 3.241, *Lucan.* 3.739, 6.821, *Val. Fl.* 6.584, *Stat. Ach.* 1.381.

fecere ... conuicia: the expression occurs 8 (2) times in Ovid, elsewhere in Augustan poetry only at *Prop.* 1.6.15 (see Fedeli's note). **conuicium:** *Ov.* 19 (12 [all in *Met.*]), *Verg.* 0, *Hor.* 2 (0), *Tib.* 0, *Prop.* 2. The supposed derivation of the word from *uox* perhaps emphasises the paradoxical nature of the conceit here; cf. *Ulp. Dig.* 47.10.15.4 *conuicium ... dicitur uel a concitatione uel a conuentu, hoc est a collatione uocum*.

egit me ... reum: the phrase, equivalent to *reum aliquem facere* and possibly influenced by the use of *διώκειν* in the sense 'prosecute', occurs first at *Prop.* 2.30.32, elsewhere in Ovid at *Epist.* 14.120, 20.93, *Rem.* 388, *Met.* 15.36, *Fast.* 4.308, *Trist.* 1.8.46, 3.11.2, 4.1.26, *Pont.* 4.14.38, in prose first at *Liv.* 24.25.1 and 45.37.8. Note also *reum aliquem peragere*, which occurs first at *Liv.* 4.42.6, *Trist.* 1.1.24 and *Pont.* 4.6.30. **reus (-a):** *Ov.* 37 (5), *Verg.* 1 (1), *Hor.* 4 (2), *Tib.* 0, *Prop.* 1. The forensic imagery in this line is perhaps not to be attributed simply to Ovid's penchant for legal diction (see Kenney [1969]) but, more specifically, to the influence of declamation (see the introduction).

ore silente: for the phrase, cf. *Anth.* 111.9f. (of a pantomime) *tot linguae quot membra uiro: mirabilis ars est, / quae facit articulos ore silente loqui*, Bömer on *Met.* 12.538 *tacito ... ore*.

23-24. Ovid is echoing *Tib.* 1.6.73f. *non ego te pulsare uelim, sed, uenerit iste / si furor, optarim non habuisse manus*. He is possibly also inverting *Hom. Il.* 2.259ff. (Odysseus threatening to thrash Thersites) *μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆϊ κάρη ὅμοισιν ἐπείη, / ... / εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ σε λαβὼν ἀπὸ μὲν φίλα εἴματα δύσω, / χλαῖνάν τ' ἡδὲ χιτῶνα ... / αὐτὸν δὲ κλαίοντα θοᾶς ἐπὶ νῆας ἀφήσω / πεπληγὼς ἀγορήθην ἀεικέσσι πληγῇσιν*. For echoes of that passage elsewhere in Augustan elegy, cf. *Prop.* 2.7.7, *Epist.* 16.155, *Pont.* 2.8.65f.

utilius is paradoxically combined with *carere*, benefit being more normally derived from possession than from deprivation; for the terms in antithesis, cf. e.g. *Cic. Dom.* 146 *et in utendo rationem et in carendo patientiam*. For such paradoxes in Ovid, cf. *Epist.* 1.67 (Penelope) *utilius starent etiamnunc moenia Phoebe*, *Met.* 8.56f., 15.452, *Fast.* 2.434 (quoted below), 3.464 (Ariadne) *utiliter nobis perfidus ille (sc. Theseus) fuit*. *utilius* (ω) seems slightly preferable to *utiliter* (PYC), even though the latter would enhance slightly the line's

vehement assonance of *t* (note also the violent *p*-sounds). The comparative implies a contrast: it would have been better to have been maimed than to have assaulted the girl. That contrast affords a greater parallelism with the hexameter, in which *ante* also implies a contrast: *ante* (sc. *quam eam uerberassem*). The comparative perhaps gains some slight further support from *Fast.* 2.434 *utilius fuerat non habuisse nurus*, which may be a subconscious reminiscence of this line and of *Tib.* 1.6.74 (quoted above). Although the adverb occurs elsewhere in classical poetry only at *Hor. Epist.* 1.16.70, Ovid has it 11 (4) times.

potui parte carere mei: the phrase is echoed at *Trist.* 4.10.32 *cum perit (sc. frater) ... coepi parte carere mei*. For *posse carere*, cf. *Epist.* 1.18, 16.288, 17.99, *Ars* 1.328, 2.249, *Rem.* 540, 775, *Pont.* 1.2.64, 3.7.29, *Tib.* 1.2.64, *Sen. Contr.* 9.3.8, *Mart.* 3.53.1, 5. In his note on *Ars* 1.328, Hollis observes that the phrase 'seems colloquial and sarcastic'. **carere:** *Ov.* 131 (35), *Verg.* 9 (6), *Hor.* 24 (14), *Tib.* 1, *Prop.* 1. In using the word here, Ovid is possibly making an etymological play; cf. *Isid. Diff.* 1.116 *caro (sc. dicta est) a carendo uel a cadendo* (cf. 23 *cecidisse*).

25-26. in mea ... dispendia, 'to my cost', contrasts with *utilius*. *dispendium* occurs elsewhere in Augustan poetry only at 1.14.43, where the context is somewhat comparable: *facta manu culpaque tua dispendia sentis*, *Prop.* 2.24B.15, *Verg. Aen.* 3.453. For *in dispendia*, cf. *Avien. Orb. Terr.* 687. For the construction with *habui ... uires*, cf. *Met.* 4.150 *dabit hic (sc. amor) in uulnera uires*, *Fast.* 1.17 *dederis in carmina uires*. *in poenam* is much more common; cf. e.g. *Epist.* 2.44, *Trist.* 2.342, 3.10.78, *Liv.* 21.6.8, *Manil.* 1.355, 4.85, 667, *Sen. Herc. F.* 604, *Lucan.* 3.17. For the final use of *in*, see also on 1.1.22 *in exitum ... meum*.

ualui possibly echoes *Tib.* 1.10.56 (quoted on 4). For *ualere* constructed with *in*, cf. *Met.* 13.286, *Prop.* 4.7.68 *in scelus hoc animus non ualuisse suum*, *Val. Max.* 6.1.7, *Sen. Epist.* 63.10, *Nat.* 1.14.4, 2.18, *Quint. Inst.* 4.5.16. Here, however, *poenam ... in ... meam* may be influenced also by *fortis*; for that construction, which seems not to occur earlier, cf. *Met.* 4.149f. *est ... mihi fortis in unum / hoc manus*, *TLL* 6.1161.5ff.

poenam ... in ipse meam: for the contorted word-order, which throws particular emphasis on to *ipse* and which may be influenced by phrases of the type *ἐπ' αὐτὸς αὐτόν*, cf. *Epist.* 9.96, 12.20, 13.114, *Ars* 3.668, *Fast.* 5.551, *Pont.* 3.3.46, *Ibis* 404, 584, Platnauer (1951)

100, K.-S. 1.588, H.-Sz. 692f. Passages such as *Met.* 2.524 *Argolica quod in ante Phoronide fecit* and *Trist.* 4.8.11f. *in ... sinu dominae carisque sodalibus inque / securus patria consenuisse mea* display something of the same adventurous attitude towards word-order. See also on 1.5.24 and 1.6.68.

The hexameter is mirrored in the pentameter with fine precision: *in mea ... dispendia / poenam ... in ... meam, habui ... uires / ualui ... fortis*. The impressive word-order in the hexameter (see on 1.3.9), like the high-flown address in the next couplet, helps to suggest the enormity of Ovid's offence.

27-28. Ovid's address to his hands is very grandiose, being reminiscent of tragedy; in discussing the similarities with Paulus Silentiarius *AP* 5.248 (quoted in the introduction), Yardley (1980a) 240 cites, *exempli gratia*, Eur. *Alc.* 837 ὁ πολλὰ τλᾶσα καρδία καὶ χεῖρ ἐμή, *Med.* 496, 1071, 1244, *Herc.* 268. The purpose of the address is to divert the blame from himself, as if his hands had an identity distinct from his own (see on lines 1 and 4). 3.7.69ff., where Ovid reproaches his penis as the cause of his impotence, is closely comparable. Note also the similar detachment in the form of expression employed at *Epist.* 14.59f. *si manus haec aliquam posset committere caedem, / morte foret dominae sanguinolenta suae*.

quid mihi uobiscum ...? cf. 2.19.57 *quid mihi cum facili, quid cum lenone marito?*, 3.6.87 *quid mecum, furiose, tibi?*, Mart. 9.68.1 *Quid tibi nobiscum est, ludi scelerate magister?* Such expressions, conveying impatience and disgust, are particularly frequent in Ovid; see Owen on *Trist.* 2.1, Stanton (1973). Since Ovid's hands are part of his body, the use of the idiom here is wittily inappropriate and paradoxical, drawing attention to the hopeless sophistry by which Ovid attempts to avoid responsibility for his actions. See also on 3.2.48 *nil mihi cum pelago*.

caedis scelerumque ministrae: for the hands as *ministrae*, cf. *Epist.* 18.24, Lucr. 4.830, Cic. *Nat.* 2.150, Corn. Sev. *frg.* 13.17f. Büchner, Sen. *Suas.* 6.19, Sen. *Dial.* 6.24.5. For the combination with *caedis*, cf. Curt. 8.7.6, [Sen.] *Octavia* 368, Maecian. *Dig.* 29.5.14, also Curt. 7.1.3 *occidendi ... ministro*, Tac. *Ann.* 15.51.2 *occidendae matris ... ministros*; with *scelerum*, cf. *Met.* 3.645 *me ... ministerio scelerisque artis remouei*, Lucr. 3.61, Cic. *Dom.* 6, Liv. 1.41.7, Lucan 6.573, [Sen.] *Octavia* 466 *armat ministro sceleris in caedem meam*, Val. Fl. 2.123 *scelerisque dolique ministram*, Tac. *Hist.* 4.27.2, *Ann.* 4.71.1, Claud. 15.270. For *caedes* in this context, cf. Philostr. *Epist.* 61

(quoted in the introduction); for *scelus*, cf. 67, also 1.14.27 *scelus est istos, scelus, urere crines*. Although the singular *sceleris* is so weakly attested here, it deserves some consideration. The sigmatism of *caedis scelerisque ministrae* (cf. 67 *sceleris tam tristitia signa supersint*), combined with the hard *q* and *c*-sounds in the line, would express Ovid's disgust the more vehemently. When *caedes* and *scelus* are combined at Lucan 2.192 and Stat. *Theb.* 11.153, both are in the singular; cf. also *Met.* 3.645 and Val. Fl. 2.123 (both quoted above), *Met.* 10.474 *scelus et natam*. At Plin. *Nat.* 2.159, both are plural. Nevertheless, it seems more likely that *sceleris* is a simple error by assimilation after *caedis* than that the strongly attested and less obvious *scelerum* should have displaced it (perhaps influenced by *scelerum* in line 31).

debita ... uincla: cf. 1 *meruere catenas* (n.). The actual punishment for sacrilege was normally death; cf. e.g. Sen. *Contr.* 8.1 *exc.*, Sen. *Benef.* 7.7.1, Saturn. *Dig.* 48.19.16.4. *sacrilego manus praecidantur*, the law on which Sen. *Contr.* 8.2 is based, seems to be a fiction.

sacrilegae ... manus anticipates line 32, where the girl is acknowledged to be a goddess. For Ovid's attack on his mistress as being sacrilegious, see on 5f. At Menander *Perik.* 724, Glykera seems to be describing Polemon's attack on her as ἀνόσιον. Ovid's argument in the next couplet gives some support to van Leeuwen's highly speculative supplement in that passage: ἀνόσιον χοῖον ἄν / οὐδ' ἄν, τάλαν, θεράπαιναν ἐργάσαιτό τις. For the phrase, cf. *Fast.* 3.700, Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.47, *Phil.* 12.26, Hor. *Carm.* 2.13.2, Tib. 2.4.26, Liv. 29.18.8, [Sen.] *Epigr.* 19.10, Plin. *Nat.* 2.159, also *Met.* 14.539 *sacrilega ... dextra*. For its use in this context, see on line 4 *uesana ... manu*.

subite: as at 1.13.18 *ut subeant tenerae uerbera saeua manus*, the primary sense is 'undergo', but the literal meaning, 'go under' is also felt. There is perhaps a similar play at *Ars* 2.184 *rustica paulatim taurus aratra subit*.

29-30. For the argument, cf. Menander *Perik.* 724f. (as quoted on line 28), Chariton 1.5.5 (in a similar context) τοῦτο ὥφειλον παθεῖν, εἰ καὶ θεραπαινίδα Ἑρμοκράτους ἀπέκτεινα and see also on 1.6.31f.

an ... / plecterer, ... erit?: 'adversative asyndeton ("is it true that, whereas if I had struck ... I should be beaten, I shall have greater rights ...?")' (Barsby).

pulsassem: the *uox propria*; cf. e.g. Cic. *Tull.* 47, Sen. *Contr.* 9.4 title, Quint. *Inst.* 6.1.16, [Quint.] *Decl.* 252.5 *ut pulsatus ciuis*

iniuriarum aget.

minimum: of persons, cf. *Trist.* 1.2.101 (with Diggle [1980] 407), Plaut. *Pseud.* 776, Sen. *Phaedr.* 201, Juv. 6.349, Herodas 2.30 τῶν δημοτῶν φρίσσοντα καὶ τὸν ἥκιστον. Note also *paruos* ... *Quirites*, used in a different sense at Verg. *Georg.* 4.201.

de plebe: cf. *Epist.* 16.51 *quamuis de plebe uidebar*, *Met.* 1.595, 3.583, 5.207, 6.10, 9.306, 671, 12.116, *Fast.* 5.20, 6.781, *Trist.* 2.351, Juv. 8.47 *ima plebe Quiritem*. For prepositional phrases used adjectivally, see on 51 *sine sanguine*.

Quiritem: the singular of *Quiris* is rare; cf. Porph. *Hor. Carm.* 2.7.3 *adtende singulari numero dictum, quod non facile apud ueteres inuenias*, Anon. *Gramm.* 5.588.21f. Keil *Quirites singularem numerum non habet, quamquam Maecenas dixit Quiritem. sed non recipitur*. It occurs elsewhere in Augustan poetry only at 3.14.9, *Met.* 14.823, *Trist.* 2.569, *Hor. loc. cit.* and *Epist.* 1.6.7. Here, it reflects archaic legal diction and signifies 'a citizen with full legal rights'; see Nisbet-Hubbard on *Hor. Carm.* 2.7.3.

in dominam ius mihi maius erit?: a paradox. The girl, as Ovid's *domina*, has control over him; he, as her slave, cannot have control over her. For the concept of *seruitium amoris*, see on 1.3.5. The paradox is made the more emphatic by *plecterer*, flogging being a punishment inflicted most commonly on slaves. There is a somewhat comparable conceit at *Epist.* 4.12 *regnat et in dominos ius habet ille* (*sc.* Cupid) *deos*: the gods control all things, but Cupid controls the gods. For the construction, cf. 1.1.5 *hoc in carmina iuris* (n.), *Caes. Gall.* 6.13.2 *nobilibus, quibus in hos eadem omnia sunt iura quae dominis in seruos*. For *ius* ... *maius*, cf. *Met.* 13.918f. *nec maius in aequore* (v.l. *aequora*) *Proteus / ius habet* with Bömer's note, *Fast.* 4.117f. (of Venus, immediately before a reference to Diomedes' attack on her) *quid, quod ubique potens templisque frequentibus aucta, / urbe tamen nostra ius dea maius habet?*

31-34. The wounding of Aphrodite by Diomedes is recounted by Homer at *Il.* 5.330ff. Ovid mentions the story again at *Rem.* 5f., 159f., *Met.* 14.477f., 15.769, *Fast.* 4.119f. Here, he is exploiting the *peccatorum comparatio*; cf. *Rhet. Her.* 2.49, *Cic. Inu.* 1.104, Theon 2.108.3ff. Spengel (ληψόμεθα τὰς ἐπιχειρήσεις) ἀπὸ τῆς συγκρίσεως, αὐτὴ δὲ τριπλῇ· τὸ γὰρ κατηγορούμενον ὅφ' ἡμῶν ἢ μείζονι ἑαυτοῦ συγκρίνομεν ἢ ἐλάττονι ἢ ἴσῳ. That passage of Theon makes clear the wit with which Ovid is exploiting the figure. In 31, the superlative *pessima* suggests that he is comparing his own crime with

a greater crime by Diomedes; in 32, in which he sets his mistress on a par with Venus by calling her a goddess, the comparison seems to be between equally dastardly crimes; in 33f., however, he claims that Diomedes' crime is, in fact, less reprehensible. For the *peccatorum comparatio* in the *Amores*, cf. 1.10.21ff., 2.14.29ff., 3.14.9ff. and note also *Hor. Sat.* 2.3.201ff., *Mart.* 3.66 *Par scelus admisit Phariis Antonius armis: / abscondit uultus ensis uterque sacros. / illud, laurigeros ageres cum laeta triumphos, / hoc, tibi, Roma, caput, cum loqueris, erat. / Antoni tamen est peior quam causa Pothini: / hic facinus domino praestitit, ille sibi*, *Juv.* 6.617ff., esp. 620f. *minus ergo nocens erit Agrippinae / boletus*, *Rut. Nam.* 2.57ff. (cursing Stilicho for attempting to destroy Rome) *omnia Tartarei cessent tormenta Neronis: / consumat Stygias tristior umbra faces. / hic immortalem, mortalem perculit ille: / hic mundi matrem perculit, ille suam*.

31-32. monimenta is glossed as *exempla* in several mss; cf. παραδείγματα in the Byzantine version (see Easterling-Kenney [1965] 47). Since, however, Diomedes recounts at Verg. *Aen.* 11.275ff. and *Met.* 14.477f. how he suffered for his attack on Venus, the sense 'warning' may also be in play; cf. *Cic. Off.* 3.121 *monimentis praeceptisque*, *TLL* 8.1466.40ff. The line-ending *monimenta reliquit* occurs also at Verg. *Aen.* 6.511f. *me fata mea et scelus exitiale Lacaenae / his mersere malis; illa haec monimenta reliquit*, where Deiphobus explains that he received his wounds as 'souvenirs' of the wickedness (*scelus*) of Helen. It is attractive to suppose that Ovid is echoing that passage: whereas the mighty warrior Diomedes sinfully wounds the weak goddess Venus, it is the weak woman Helen who is sinfully responsible for the wounds inflicted on the mighty warrior Deiphobus. (Helen's feminine weakness is emphasised in the account of the sack of Troy at *Aen.* 2.567ff. Aeneas would then have killed her, even though that would have brought him no glory [583f.; cf. Ovid's line 38]. Venus dissuaded him and offered to transport him out of the fighting [620], just as she had been doing when Diomedes wounded her at *Il.* 5.314ff.) Since, however, *monimentum relinquere* is an unremarkable expression (cf. e.g. *Cic. Verr.* 2.1.129, *De Orat.* 2.53, *Varro ap. Plin. Nat.* 36.91, *Liv.* 37.6.6), it would be rash to assert that Ovid is certainly echoing Vergil. Nevertheless, it may be worth observing that Diomedes' words at *Met.* 14.477ff., *antiquo memores de uulnere poenas / exigit alma Venus*, give some slight encouragement to suppose that *monimenta*, in addition to the connotations already suggested, could here also bear much the same sense as in the passage

in *Aen.* 6: 'Diomedes wounded Venus, leaving her a most awful reminder of his wickedness'.

deam: for the beloved as a goddess, see on 1.5.1-8.

primus perculit: note the violent alliteration; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11.276f. *ferro caelestia corpora demens / appetii et Veneris uiolauit uulnere dextram*. *primus* contradicts the Homeric account; at *Il.* 5.382ff., Aphrodite's mother, Dione, attempts to comfort her after Diomedes' attack by telling her that many Olympian deities, including Hera, have suffered at the hands of mortals. The divergence seems, however, to have been inspired simply by a desire for rhetorical point (*ille ... primus / alter ego*). Venus similarly disregards the sufferings of other deities at *Met.* 15.768ff. *solane semper ero iustis exercita curis? / quam modo Tydidae Calydonia uulneret hasta, / nunc male defensae confundant moenia Troiae*. *percellere* occurs 5 (3) times in Ovid (always in the form *perculit*), elsewhere in Augustan poetry only at Hor. *Epod.* 7.16, Verg. *Aen.* 5.374, 11.310 (immediately after a reference to Diomedes), *Carm. de Bell. Aeg.* 47 (*lect. dub.*).

33-34. et: Heinsius' conjecture, *at*, adopted by Lee, is unnecessary, since *et* can have an adversative or concessive force; cf. 3.3.1f. *fidem iurata fefellit, / et facies illi, quae fuit ante, manet* (n.). Even without an adversative or concessive force, *et* is still unimpeachable, if construed with the sense 'moreover' or 'indeed'.

laesa est: cf. 4, 40, *Rem.* 159 *Aetola Venus est a cuspide laesa*, *Fast.* 4.120 (*Venus*) *gemuit teneram cuspide laesa manum*.

saeuus in hoste: for the construction, cf. *Met.* 4.547f. *nimum ... in paelice saeuae / inuidiam fecere deae*, 713 *uisa fera saeuit in umbra*, Austin on Verg. *Aen.* 2.541 *talis in hoste fuit Priamo*, Luck on *Trist.* 5.2.36 *lenis in hoste fuit*. See also on 1.9.33 *ardet in ... Briseide*. *hoste* anticipates the triumph-imagery in the following lines.

35-40. For triumph-imagery in erotic contexts, see the introduction to 1.2. Ovid may here be developing a hint given by Tibullus' use of *uictor* at 1.10.55 (quoted on line 4). Possibly, however, Polemon, a professional soldier, used military language in this context in the *Perikeiromene*; see Yardley (1980a) 240f. Ajax turns much the same sarcasm against himself at Soph. *Ai.* 364ff. ὀρᾶς τὸν θρασύν, τὸν εὐκάρδιον, / τὸν ἐν δαίτοισι ἄτρεστον μάχαις, / ἐν ἀφόβοις με θηροῖσι δεινὸν χέρας; The resonant alliteration of *m* and *o* in line 35 heightens the sarcasm by suggesting grandiosity. Contrast the harsh alliteration of *c*, *q* and *t* in 36f.

35-36. i nunc: Ovid is perhaps influenced by Prop. 3.18.17 *i nunc, tolle animos et tecum finge triumphos*. *i (nunc)*, constructed with a further imperative, is always at least ironic and usually, as here, sarcastic. The expression is particularly frequent in Ovid; cf. 3.3.1 *Esse deos, i, crede*, *Epist.* 3.26, 4.127, 9.105 *i nunc, tolle animos et fortia facta recense*, 12.206, 17.59, *Ars* 2.222, 635, *Pont.* 1.3.61, Pease on Verg. *Aen.* 4.381, Gagliardi (1978).

magnificos ... molire triumphos: for the *magnificentia* of the triumph, see on 1.2.28. *molire*: cf. *Met.* 14.718ff. (Iphis, contemplating his imminent suicide) *uincis, Anaxarete ... / ... laetos molire triumphos / et Paeana uoca nitidaque incingere lauro!*, *Sil.* 16.630f. With the reference to his *currus triumphalis* following in line 37, Ovid may have been influenced by *moliri currum (uel sim.)*. For that expression, and for the verb's high stylistic level, which enhances the sarcastic tone, see on 1.6.65.

cinge comam lauro: for the *triumphator's* crown of laurel, cf. 2.12.1 *triumphales ... laurus*, *RE* 2.7.505f.

uota ... redde Ioui: the triumph-procession went to the Capitol, where the *triumphator* offered prayers and sacrifices in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus; cf. Prop. 3.4.6, *Trist.* 3.12.46, 4.2.55f., *RE* 2.7.495f.

37-38. quae ... tuos currus comitantum turba sequetur: cf. 1.2.35f. (n.). *comitantum*: this form is regularly used in dactylic verse, the proper form in *-ium* being intractable; cf. 3.10.15 *amantum* (n.), Platnauer (1951) 68, n. 4, Bömer on *Met.* 5.295 *salutantum*.

clamet 'io, forti uicta puella uiro est!': for the rhetorical principle underlying this line, cf. *Rhet. Her.* 2.49, Cic. *Inu.* 1.103 *octauus locus* (sc. *indignationis*) *est per quem demonstramus non uulgare neque factitatum esse ne ab audacissimis quidem hominibus id maleficium, de quo agatur ... haec erunt, quae ... in eos, qui neque laedere alium nec se defendere potuerint, ut in pueros, senes, mulieres; quibus ex omnibus acriter excitata indignatio summum in eum, qui uiolarit horum aliquid odium commouere poterit*. Ovid exploits this device with particular frequency in the *Heroides*; cf. esp. 2.63ff. *fallere credentem non est operosa puellam / gloria ... / sum decepta tuis et amans et femina uerbis*, 3.144 *nec tibi magnificum femina iussa mori*, 21.117ff. *improbe, quid gaudes, aut quae tibi gloria parta est, / quidue uir elusa uirgine laudis habes? / ... / sum ... parum prudens capta puella dolis*. See also on 1.2.22. Here, we should perhaps recall that impromptu verses sung by the soldiers, belittling the *triumphator's* achievement, were a

traditional feature of the triumph-procession; cf. esp. Suet. *Iul.* 49.4 *Gallico ... triumpho milites eius inter cetera carmina, qualia currum prosequentes ioculariter canunt, etiam illud uulgatissimum pronuntiauerunt: 'Gallias Caesar subegit, Nicomedes Caesarem: / ecce Caesar nunc triumphat, qui subegit Gallias, / Nicomedes non triumphat, qui subegit Caesarem'*, and see Ogilvie on Liv. 3.29.5. The word-order, with *uicta puella* enclosed by *forti ... uiro*, emphasises Ovid's domination. *uir fortis* is a standard compliment; cf. *Met.* 13.121 (of Achilles), Ogilvie on Liv. 4.3.16, *TLL* 6.1149.67ff. For the sarcastic tone here, cf. Cic. *Catil.* 1.1.2 *nos autem fortes uiri satis facere rei publicae uidemur, si istius furorem ac tela uitamus* and note also Serv. *Aen.* 2.592 *turpe est uiro forti contra feminam irasci. io: for the ritual cry 'io, triumphe!'*, see on 1.2.25 and 34. For the omission of *trumphe*, cf. Mart. 7.6.7, 8.4.1.

39-40. It is natural that a female captive being paraded in a triumph-procession should have her hair loosed and her cheeks scratched. Normally, she would herself be responsible for her condition. For loosing the hair as a sign of grief, see on 3.9.3 *flebilis indignos, Elegia, solue capillos*; for cheek-scratching, see on 2.6.4 *rigido teneras ungue notate genas*. Here, however, the triumph is to be in celebration of Ovid's success in his attack on the girl's hair and cheeks.

ante eat: captives preceded the *triumphator*; cf. e.g. *Ars* 1.215 *ibunt ante duces onerati colla catenis*, Liv. 34.52.9.

effuso ... capillo: for the singular, see on 1.14.30.

si sinerent laesae, candida tota, genae: for attacks on the cheeks in lovers' quarrels, cf. 50, 65, 2.5.46, *Epist.* 20.84, *Ars* 2.452, 3.568, Tib. 1.10.55, Prop. 3.8.6, 4.8.64, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.6.18. Ovid is not here describing the girl as pale with fear or sorrow (as he does in 51 *albo et sine sanguine uultu*). If that were the case, he would have referred to her as e.g. *pallida* (cf. e.g. *Epist.* 1.14, *Met.* 4.135, *Trist.* 3.5.12). Here, as in 12ff., he is making a detached observation on the girl's loveliness despite the unfavourable circumstances. *candida* is an encomiastic epithet (cf. 1.5.10 [n.], Serv. *Georg.* 3.82 *aliud est candidum esse, id est quadam nitenti luce perfusum, aliud album, quod pallori constat esse uicinum*), drawing attention to her attractive pale complexion, the beauty of which is enhanced by the contrast with her scratched cheeks. In such contrasts, the redness of the cheeks is normally caused by blushing or by youthful radiance, not by a lover's violence. For the phrasing of the qualification in *si sinerent laesae ... genae*, cf. *Ars* 1.292 (of Pasiphaë's handsome bull)

una fuit labes, cetera lactis erant, Met. 6.167 *quantum ira sinit, formosa*, also Rem. 475f., *Fast.* 6.9f., *Ibis* 7f. *unus, et hoc ipsum est iniuria magna, perennem / candoris titulum non sinit esse mei*, Verg. *Aen.* 6.30f. *laesae*: not only 'injured' but also 'with their beauty marred'; for the latter sense, see on 1.10.14. *candida tota*: cf. Germ. 41f. *candida tota / et liquido splendore Helice nitet*, [Verg.] *Moretum* 102ff. (quoted on 1.14.9f.).

41-42. For love-bites, especially on the neck, cf. 1.8.98 *facta ... lasciuis liuida colla notis*, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.11 and 2.12.25. A contrast is perhaps implied with the bruising caused not only by Ovid's blows but also by the chains which the girl is to wear in the triumph-procession; for bruising caused by chains, cf. e.g. 2.2.47 *compedibus liuentia crura gerentem*. Propertius makes a different point with a similar contrast at 4.3.23ff. *dic mihi, num teneros urit lorica lacertos? / num grauis imbelles atterit hasta manus? / haec noceant potius, quam dentibus ulla puella / det mihi plorandas per tua colla notas!* Line 42 is closely comparable to 3.14.33f. *cur ... / colla ... conspicio dentis habere notam?* In both passages, Ovid is in an unfortunate predicament: here, because he should have kissed the girl, not beaten her, there, because the bruises are caused, not by his own, but by a rival's kisses.

impressis ... labellis: cf. Tib. 1.6.13f. *herbas ... quis liuor abiret / quem facit impresso mutua dente uenus*, Hor. *Carm.* 1.13.12, *Trist.* 2.455f. *labellum*: Ov. 7 (*Am.* 3, *Epist.* 1, *Ars* 3), Verg. 1 (0), Hor. 0, Tib. 0, Prop. 1, Catull. 7, Lucr. 1 (4.1080 *dentes inlidunt* [sc. *amantes*] ... *labellis*); *labrum*: Ov. 2 (*Met.*, *Trist.*), Verg. 3 (1), Hor. 4 (1), Tib. 0, Prop. 5, Catull. 1, Lucr. 6. See also *TLL* 7.2.775.1ff. The diminutive may have retained something of its original sentimental nuance; see Lyne on [Verg.] *Ciris* 496. Such a nuance would be particularly apposite here and at *Ars* 1.667 *ne noceant teneris male rapta* (sc. *oscula*) *labellis*. See also Vol. 1, 84.

collum (ω) is advocated cogently by Kenney (1958) 54ff. With the reading *collo* (PYC), the girl must be understood to be the subject of the infinitives. Normal usage, however, requires that *liuere* should have as its subject not the person but the affected part of the body. That requirement is met by construing *collum* ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, as the subject of both infinitives. (*collo* also would need to be construed ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, to define the part of the girl's body which Ovid's kisses should bruise.) The subject-accusative *colla* at 3.14.34 (quoted above) possibly gives some slight support to *collum*.

blandi: for erotic *blanditiae*, see on 1.4.66. *blandus dens* is a fine oxymoron, teeth being more readily associated with aggression than with blandishments; cf. Mart. 1.14.3 (of a hare played with by a lion) *cum prensus blando totiens a dente rediret* with Citroni's note. For *blandus* as an epithet for parts of the body, cf. also 1.11.14 *blanda ... manu* (n.).

dentis habere notam = 3.14.34. Noting the similarity in content to Tib. 1.8.38 *in collo figere dente notas*, in phrasing to Prop. 1.18.8 *nunc in amore tuo cogor habere notam*, Tränkle (1960) 24 suggests that all these passages have a common source, probably in Gallus.

43-44. denique: 'at least', 'certainly'; for this sense, cf. 3.4.3 *si qua metu dempto casta est, ea denique casta est*, Brink on Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.127 *dum mea delectent mala me uel denique fallant*. The train of thought is: 'my mistress should suffer only love-bites; when I became angry with her, I should at least have kept my anger within bounds'. *denique:* Ov. 68 (29), Verg. 10 (4), Hor. 15 (0), Tib. 1, Prop. 3, Catull. 4, Lucr. 95.

tumidi ritu torrentis: the comparison may be drawn from Hom. *Il.* 5.87f. (of Diomedes; cf. 31ff.) θῦνε γὰρ ἄμ πεδίον ποταμῷ πλήθοντι ἑοικῶς / χειμάρρῳ and 11.492ff. (of Ajax; cf. 7f.) ὥς δ' ὀπότε πλήθων ποταμὸς πεδίονδε κάτεισι / χειμάρρους κατ' ὄρεσφιν ... / ὥς ἔφεπε κλονέων πεδίον ... / δαΐζων ἵππους τε καὶ ἀνέρας. For a similarly allusive exploitation of Homer, see on 61f. The alliteration of *t* perhaps corresponds to that of *π* in both Homeric passages. For the use of sound-correspondence to signal an allusion, see on 1.1.1 and note also *Met.* 13.227 *quidue domum fertis decimo nisi dedecus anno?* where, as is observed by Skutsch (1956) 536, the alliteration of *de-* may be a deliberate parallel for that of *πεμπ-* at Hom. *Od.* 5.263 τῷ δ' ἄρα πέμπτῳ (sc. ἤματι) πέμπ' ἀπὸ νήσου διὰ Καλυψώ. The *t*-sounds here express anger; cf. esp. Soph. *O.T.* 371 τυφλὸς τὰ τ' ὦτα τόν τε νοῦν τὰ τ' ὄμματ' εἶ. For the notion of swelling with anger, cf. e.g. *Epist.* 11.17 *tumidae ... irae*, *Ars* 3.503, *Met.* 2.602, 8.437, 13.559.

agebar: the passive may suggest that Ovid's actions were controlled by some external force (as were those of Orestes [cf. 9f.]); cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.471 *scaenis agitated Orestes* with Pease's note. For *agere* with reference to rivers, cf. 3.6.95 (n.), *Fast.* 1.404 *riuus agebat aquas*, Sen. *Ag.* 214 *fluctus ... Simois caede purpureos agens*. The choice of this verb may also have been influenced by the common idiom *praedam agere* (cf. Caes. *Gall.* 6.43.2, *TLL* 1.1368.80ff.).

caeca ... ira: for the phrase, cf. Liv. 38.17.7, Val. Fl. 6.422, Sil.

14.183 *pectora caeca ... atque iras. caecus furor* is rather more common; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 7.13, *TLL* 3.44.39ff.

The vivid and strong images in this couplet are humorously out of harmony with the wish for restraint expressed in the following lines — if Ovid were like a raging torrent, the victim of a fit of blind anger, he could hardly exert subtle control over the severity of his threats and of his attack on his mistress' clothing.

45-46. nonne: Ov. 5 (4 [all in *Met.*]), Verg. 5 (0), Hor. 4 (1), Tib. 0, Prop. 5 (never in Book 3 or 4). The formula *nonne uides ...?* accounts for almost half of these passages (*Met.* 3, Verg. *Georg.* 3, Hor. 3 [1]), as it does for fifteen of the eighteen passages in which Lucretius uses the word. See Axelson (1945) 89f., H.-Sz. 462. Here, Ovid may be influenced by Verg. *Ecl.* 2.14f. *nonne fuit satius tristes Amaryllidis iras / ... pati?*, a passage which seems to be echoed also at Prop. 1.17.15 *nonne fuit leuius dominae peruincere mores?* and 2.25.11 *nonne fuit satius duro seruire tyranno?*

timidae inclamasse puellae: *inclamare* occurs elsewhere in poetry in the period from Catullus to Juvenal only at *Met.* 14.179 (with much the same harsh elision as here, *uolui inclamare*), *Fast.* 2.351, 3.756, Lucr. 3.953, Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.76, Prop. 4.7.23, Gratt. 450. The construction with the dative seems to be paralleled only at Liv. 1.25.9 where, however, the sense is somewhat different: *Albanus exercitus inclamat Curatiis* (v.l. *Curatios*) *uti opem ferant fratri*. Despite the change from the perfect (*inclamasse, intonuisse*) to the present infinitive (*diducere*), Ovid clearly intends no temporal distinction between the first two and the third of these courses of action. *inclamasse* and *intonuisse* may be equivalent in sense to present infinitives; for that metrically convenient idiom, see on 1.4.38. Alternatively, and more probably, Ovid's thought-process may be that he should have been satisfied when once he had shouted at his mistress, threatened her and torn her dress; if so, it will have been the change to the present *diducere* which was made for metrical convenience. Tibullus has a comparable variation in tense at 1.10.61ff. *sit satis a membris tenuem rescindere uestem, / sit satis ornatus dissoluisse comae, / sit lacrimas mouisse satis*; see also Bömer on *Met.* 10.171ff. *non retia ferre recusat, / non tenuisse canes, non per iuga montis iniqui / ire comes*.

nec nimium rigidas intonuisse minas: 'and to have thundered threats which were not too severe'; i.e. *et tonuisse minas non nimium rigidas*. For this use of *nec*, see on 1.6.72. *rigidas ... minas*: cf. *Trist.* 1.11.42

(hieme) *rigidas incutiente minas*. *rigidas* perhaps contains a hint that Ovid's violence was caused by his mistress' infidelity; cf. 3.4.43f. (where he urges a husband to connive at his wife's adulteries) *indulge dominae uultusque seueros / exue nec rigidi iura tuere uiri*. For *minas* as an internal accusative with *intonuisse*, cf. Liv. 3.48.3 *cum haec intonuisset plenus irae*, TLL 7.2.28.42ff. The run of the sentence prevents us from construing *minas* as the subject of the verb, as it is at Sil. 5.275 *intonuere minae*.

47-48. For attacks on the beloved's clothing, see Headlam-Knox on Herodas 2.69, Fränkel (1945) 18, n. 25, Enk on Prop. 2.5.21.

tunicam a summa diducere ... ora: Kenney (1958) 56 advocates *diducere* (yJaMn) here and the weakly attested *diduxit* at Met. 3.480 *summa uestem diduxit ab ora*. He cites Juv. 13.132 *uestem diducere summam*, Calp. Ecl. 3.29f. *ambas / diduxi tunicas et pectora nuda cecidi*, Quint. Inst. 2.15.9. *de-*, however, has some mss-authority in all those passages. The strongest argument in favour of *di-* 'pull apart' rather than *de-* 'pull down' is that it suggests greater violence and is therefore the more appropriate. See also on 1.5.13 where, conversely, in the description of an amorous tussle, *deripui tunicam* is preferable to *diripui tunicam*. *a* is transmitted in the text before *summa* only in D. It also occurs superscript in several *recentiores*, apparently as a gloss, while others end the line with *ab ora*. In support of *a*, Kenney, in the same note, adduces Met. 3.480 (quoted above), 5.398 *summa uestem laniarat ab ora*, Fast. 2.347 *tunicas ora subducit ab ima*.

turpiter perhaps implies that tearing the girl's clothes not only brings shame on her, but also brings disgrace on Ovid himself; cf. Prop. 2.5.21ff. *nec tibi periuro scindam de corpore uestes / ... / rusticus haec aliquis tam turpia proelia quaerat*.

49-50. **at nunc:** *vūv δέ*, 'but in fact'; cf. Met. 3.551ff., Trist. 2.13ff. *si saperem, doctas odissem iure sorores, / numina cultori pernicioxa suo. / at nunc — tanta meo comes est insania morbo — / saxa malum refero rursus ad icta pedem*, TLL 2.999.62ff.

sustinui ... / ... notare: the construction of *sustinere* (a favourite word with Ovid; see on 1.6.58) with an infinitive occurs first in Ovid and Livy; see H.-Sz. 347. It recurs in the *Amores* at 2.9.39f. and 3.11.9f. (quoted below); see also on 3.7.25f.

raptis a fronte capillis: cf. Met. 2.476 *prensis a fronte capillis*.

ferreus echoes Tib. 1.10.59f. (immediately preceding a reference to

an attack on the mistress' clothing [see on 45]) *a, lapis est ferrumque, suam quicumque puellam / uerberat*. See also on 1.2.8 *ferus ... Amor*. Tibullus' reference to the violent lover as a *lapis* may have influenced Ovid's comparison of his beloved to Parian marble in the next couplet; for that type of transference, see on 17f.

ingenuas ungue notare genas: cf. 2.6.4 *rigido teneras ungue notate genas*, 3.6.48 *ungue notata genas*. For *ingenuae* as an epithet for *genae*, cf. 1.14.52 (n.), Epist. 20.8, Anth. 712.9 (quoted below). The meaning here would seem to be 'delicate', with a pointed juxtaposition to *ferreus*. The sense 'free-born' may also be intended, making a point akin to that in 29f., where Ovid declares that it is criminal to strike a citizen. (One need not, however, infer that Ovid's mistress is necessarily of free birth; at Silu. 2.1.44, Statius praises a slave-boy's *ingenui ... crines*, 'hair such as would do credit to a free-born person'.) Ovid plays on these two senses at 3.11.9ff. *ergo ego sustinui ... / ingenuum dura ponere corpus humo? / ergo ego ... / excubui ... seruus ut ...?* See further Shackleton Bailey (1956) 15f. and Fedeli on Prop. 1.4.13 *ingenuus color*. The jingle in *ingenuas ungue ... genas* is probably deliberate, as it certainly is at Anth. 712.8ff. *candentes dentes effigient suaui, / malas odorent ore et ingenuas genas / et pupularum nitidas geminas gemmulas*; cf. also Hymn. Hom. Ven. 229 *καλῆς ἐκ κεφαλῆς εὐγενέος τε γενείου* ('beard').

51-52. **amens** here means not so much 'mad' as 'devoid of feeling'; cf. 3.14.37f. *mens abit et morior, quotiens peccasse fateris, / perque meos artus frigida gutta fluit*.

sine sanguine = ἀναιμῶ. For the use of *sine* with a noun as an equivalent to an α-privative adjective, cf. 1.3.13 *sine crimine mores* (n.), 1.8.67, 1.10.15, 2.10.23, 3.3.19, 23, 3.9.8, Bömer on Met. 3.250, 8.518 and 14.210, Luck on Trist. 3.3.45f. and see also on 29 *de plebe*, 1.4.19 *uerba ... sine uoce loquentia*, 1.6.37 *circa mea tempora uinum*.

The alliteration of *a* in the hexameter and the sequence of five initial vowels (involving two elisions, the second of which is rather harsh) help to convey the painfulness of the scene.

caeduntur Pariis qualia saxa iugis: on the famous white Parian marble, see Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. Carm. 1.19.5f. *urit me Glycerae nitor / splendentis Pario marmore purius*. The simile not only describes the girl's paleness, but also implies her beauty (cf. e.g. 2.11.15 *marmoreis pedibus*, Hor. loc. cit.) and her impassivity (cf. e.g. Verg. Aen. 6.470f. *nec magis incepto uultum sermone mouetur / quam*

si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes, *Met.* 3.418f. *adstupet ipse sibi uultuque immotus eodem / haeret ut e Pario formatum marmore signum*). *caedere* is the regular term for quarrying; cf. *Plin. Nat.* 36.14 *candido tantum marmore usi sunt e Paro insula, quem lapidem coepere lychniten appellare, quoniam ad lucernas ... caederetur*, *TLL* 3.57.25ff. The general sense 'strike', however, comes readily to mind and makes the simile the more apposite.

53-56. For multiple similes in descriptions of a (pale) complexion, cf. *2.5.35ff.*, *Epist.* 21.217ff., *Ars* 3.703ff., *Met.* 4.331ff. Here at least, the series is not mere Ovidian *lasciua*, typical of the poet who reputedly *nescit quod bene cessit relinquere* (*Sen. Contr.* 9.5.17). It serves the same purpose as the triple comparison in 13ff., that of humorously exaggerating the solemnity of the scene. It also heightens the tension by delaying the girl's outburst of tears (57f.), thus making the outburst dramatically more effective. For these particular similes, cf. *Epist.* 11.77ff. *ut mare fit tremulum, tenui cum stringitur aura, / ut quatitur tepido fraxinus icta Noto, / sic mea uibrari pallentia membra uideres*, 14.39ff. (quoted on 55), *Met.* 4.134ff. *ora ... buxo / pallidiora gerens exhorruit aequoris instar, / quod tremuit, exigua cum summum stringitur aura*. For Ovid's use of similes, see also Bömer on *Met.* 5.604.

53-54. exanimis artus: in combination with *membra*, 'limbs', *artus* bears its strict sense, 'joints'. The two terms are frequently used together; see Bömer on *Met.* 6.352f. *non ego nostros / abluere hic artus lassataque membra parabam*. *exanimis artus* occurs at *Met.* 2.336, *Lucan.* 6.721 and *Stat. Theb.* 1.622 (*exanimos*), with the epithet meaning 'lifeless'. Here, taking the epithet to mean 'with no sign of life', it looks back to the statue-comparison just as, by contrast, *tremencia* anticipates the comparisons which follow. The primary meaning, however, is probably 'faint', 'exhausted', as at e.g. *Ars* 1.539f. *excidit illa metu ... / nullus in exanimi corpore sanguis erat. exanimis* (or -us; see *TLL* 5.2.1172.30ff.) is a rather grand word, never common in prose: *Ov.* 14 (10 [all in *Met.*]), *Verg.* 14 (14), *Hor.* 2 (0), *Tib.* 0, *Prop.* 1.

populeas ... comas: poplar-leaves were proverbially susceptible to the breeze; on *Hom. Od.* 7.106, where busy spinning-women are compared to φύλλα μακεδνῆς αἰγείροιο, the scholiast comments: τὰ φύλλα τῆς αἰγείρου — εὐκίνητα ῥαδίως καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς τυχοῦσης αὔρας, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Αἰγεί [frg. 23 Radt]: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν

φύλλοισιν αἰγείρου μακρᾶς, / κἄν ἄλλο μηδέν, ἀλλὰ τοῦκείνης κάρα / κινεῖ τις αὔρα κἀνακουφίζει πτερόν. Here, it is perhaps worth observing that the underside of the leaves of the *populus alba* are white; cf. *Verg. Aen.* 8.276, *Ps.-Acron* on *Hor. Carm.* 2.3.9. It may further enhance the appositeness of the simile in this melancholy context that the Heliades were transformed into poplars as they mourned for Phaethon; see Bömer on *Met.* 2.340. *populeus* occurs elsewhere in Augustan poetry at *Epist.* 14.40 (quoted on 55), *Hor. Carm.* 1.7.23 and 5 (4) times in *Vergil*, earlier only at *Enn. Ann.* 588 (*lect. dub.*; see Skutsch's note), in prose first at *Vitruv.* 2 Pref. 1; for such formations in -eus, see on 1.1.29 *litorea*. For the expression here, see on 1.13.23 *feminei ... labores*. κόμη had been used with reference to foliage as early as *Hom. Od.* 23.195, and the usage became common in Hellenistic poetry; see Richardson on *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 454. With the exception of *Trag. inc.* 221 and *Catull.* 4.11f., however, *coma* is first so used by the Augustan poets; see *TLL* 3.1752.75ff. The metaphor is particularly apt here, since the tree is being compared with a girl; see also on 3.10.12. Smith notes a similar aptness in *Tib.* 1.4.30, where Priapus is lamenting the transitoriness of human life and beauty: (*deperdit*) *quam cito formosas populus alta comas*.

uentilat aura: a simple etymological play; see Vol. 1, 56. The phrase recurs at *Sil.* 16.443, *Stat. Silu.* 4.3.106, *Rut. Nam.* 1.244, *Ven. Fort. Carm.* 10.9.32 *uaga pampineas uentilat aura comas*.

55. ut leni (PYC) is preferable to *utque leui* (ω). For the asyndetic grouping of comparative *ut*-clauses, cf. *Epist.* 14.39ff. *ut leni* (v.l. *utque leui*) *Zephyro graciles uibrantur aristae, / frigida populeas ut quatit aura comas, / aut sic, aut etiam tremui magis*, *Ars* 1.553f. *horruit, ut steriles agitatur quas uentus aristas, / ut leuis in madida canna palude tremuit*, *Goold* (1965a) 61. Lee's *aut* would give a more natural sequence, but loose coordination of similes is not infrequent; cf. e.g. *Prop.* 2.2.6ff. *incedit uel Ioue digna soror, / aut cum Dulichias Pallas spatiat ad aras, / ... / qualis et Ischomache, Lapithae genus, heroine*, *Verg. Aen.* 1.592f. *quale manus addunt ebori decus, aut ubi flauo / argentum Pariusue lapis circumdatur auro*, 7.718ff., *Met.* 7.106ff.

gracilis ... harundo: for *gracilis* as an epithet for plants, cf. *Epist.* 14.39 (*arista*), *Met.* 10.140 (*cacumen cupressi*), *Verg. Ecl.* 10.71 (*hibiscus*), *TLL* 6.2131.22ff. and see also on 1.14.23. *gracilis*: *Ov.* 19 (4), *Verg.* 1 (0), *Hor.* 2 (1), *Tib.* 1, *Prop.* 1. The word occurs earlier only in *Terence*, *Turpilius* and *Lucilius* (once each), in prose first in

Vitruvius and Livy.

57-58. For tears compared to melting snow, cf. Hom. *Od.* 19.204ff. (of Penelope) τῆς δ' ἄρ' ἀκουούσης ῥέε δάκρυα, τήκετο δὲ χρώς. / ὥς δὲ χιὼν κατατήκετ' ἐν ἀκροπόλοισιν ὄρεσσιν, / ἦν τ' Εὐρύς κατέτηξεν, ἐπὴν Ζέφυρος καταχέυη / τηκομένης δ' ἄρα τῆς ποταμοὶ πλήθουσι ῥέοντες. / ὥς τῆς τήκετο καλὰ παρήϊα δάκρυ χεούσης, *Epist.* 13.52 *more niuis lacrimae sole madentis eunt*, *Trist.* 3.2.19f. *nil nisi flere libet, nec nostro parciore imber / lumine, de uerna quam niue manat aqua*, *Pont.* 2.3.89f., *Epiced. Drusi* 101f., Quint. Smyrn. 7.229; for melting snow in similar comparisons, cf. Call. *Cer.* 91f., Theocr. 7.74ff., *Pont.* 1.1.67f. *mens mea tabida facta / de niue manantis more liquescit aquae*. Here, the comparison hints again at the girl's pallor (cf. 51f.).

suspensae ... lacrimae: for *suspendere* used of tears, cf. *Fast.* 4.849, *Epiced. Drusi* 114, Prud. *Cath.* 10.118.

diu: compare the dramatically convincing detail at *Epist.* 10.43 (of Ariadne, after a long search for Theseus) *tum denique fleui*.

fluxere per ora: for the expression, cf. *Met.* 3.202f. *lacrimae ... per ora / non sua fluxerunt*, 4.582 *lacrimis per adhuc humana fluentibus ora*.

qualiter: see on 1.5.11.

abiecta is suspect. If correct, it presumably means 'heaped up' rather than 'fallen (from the sky)'. For that sense, however, the simple form might have been expected, as at *Ars* 2.232 *uia per iactas candida facta niues*, *Trist.* 3.10.13f. *nix iacet et, iactam ne sol pluuiasque resoluant, / indurat Boreas*. Influenced by the nonsensical *a uieta* which he found in the margin of *Jf* (cf. also *Ma*²), Heinsius hesitantly conjectured *ab uicta (quae)* in one of the copies of his father's edition (1629) now in the Bodleian Library in Oxford (Auct. S 5 7). Madvig (1873) 67 proposed *adfecta*. Although they are both palaeographically very simple, it is doubtful whether either of those conjectures can stand without some further qualification, as at *Fast.* 2.220 *niue, quae Zephyro uicta tepente fluit*, 3.236 *pereunt lapsae sole tepente niues*. See also Rappold (1881) 802, who interprets *abiecta* as 'legend', comparing *Epist.* 7.3f. *udis abiectus in undis / ... olor*, and Oliver (1958), who argues that *abiecta* is certainly incorrect but that no satisfactory emendation has yet been proposed.

59-60. tunc ego me primum coepi sentire nocentem: perhaps a parody of the Homeric and tragic concept of ὀνιμαθία, discussed by

Rutherford (1982) with reference to, *inter alia*, Soph. *O.T.* 1182 *ιοῦ ἰοῦ· τὰ πάντ' ἄν ἐξήκοι σαφῆ* and *Trach.* 1145 *οἶμοι, φρονῶ δὴ ξυμφορᾶς ἴν' ἔσταμεν*. For the phrasing, cf. Sen. *Contr.* 1.4.2 *tunc primum sensi me perdidisse*, Juv. 13.237ff. *quod fas / atque nefas tandem incipiunt sentire peractis / criminibus*.

sanguis erat lacrimae, quas dabat illa, meus: a brilliant conflation of two distinct conceits, that tears are a sign of a wounded soul, and that lover and beloved are one soul in two bodies. For the former, cf. Ach. Tat. 7.4.5 (in an erotic context) δάκρυον γὰρ αἷμα τραύματος ψυχῆς, Macedonius the Consul *AP* 5.225.1f. ἔλκος ἔχω τὸν ἔρωτα· ῥέει δέ μοι ἔλκος ἰχθῶρ / δάκρυον, ὠτειλῆς οὐποτε τερσομένης. (For ancient speculation on the link between tears and the blood, see also Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.5.38 *dolor in lacrimas uerterat omne merum*.) For the latter conceit, cf. 2.13.15 *in una parce duobus* (n.), *Epist.* 13.77f. (Laodamia, about Protesilaus) *parcite, Dardanidae, de tot, precor, hostibus uni, / ne meus ex illo corpore sanguis eat!* The second syllable of *sanguis* was originally long, but it is almost always short in Augustan elegy; see Bömer on *Fast.* 6.488, Murgatroyd on Tib. 1.6.66. *erat* (PYEaNQ²) may be a simple error by attraction to the number of the immediately preceding predicate, *sanguis. erant* (ω), however, may be a trivialisation to the grammatically correct number. It is clear from the metre that the verb takes its number from the predicate at 2.4.12 *insidiae sunt pudor ille meae* and at *Met.* 15.529 *unum ... erat omnia uulnus*. The hemistich recurs at Lucan 9.811 with the same confusion in the tradition. The plural is assured by the metre at Stat. *Theb.* 12.555f. *hominum ... / sanguis erant homines*. Following the *uetustiores* here, as at 3.10.38 *omnia ... messis erat* (PYω) / *erant* (ς), I prefer the irregular singular. *lacrimas dare* occurs first at Verg. *Aen.* 4.370, 9.292f. and 12 (7) times elsewhere in Ovid. In many of those passages, the phrase has the particular sense 'to offer tears (in honour of the dead)'; see Bömer on *Met.* 13.489f. (Hecuba mourning Polyxena) *quas totiens patriae dederat natisque uiroque, / huic quoque dat lacrimas*. Here, it may be simply a metrically convenient equivalent to *lacrimare*. The context, however, suggests that it may be worth noting the similarity of *sanguinem / cruorem (uel sim.) dare*, phrases found first in Ovid, at *Met.* 12.30, 13.482, 14.529f., 15.423; compare the influence of the common expression *oscula dare* on Ovid's use of *lacrimas dare* at *Epist.* 3.14f. *discedens oscula nulla dedi! / at lacrimas sine fine dedi* and *Met.* 4.117 *dedit notae lacrimas, dedit oscula uesti*.

61-62. This passage may be modelled on Menander's *Perikeiromene*; see the introduction. As in 43, however, Ovid seems to be striking a grand Homeric posture. Anaphora of *ter* is commonplace, and particularly frequent in Ovid; see Bömer on *Met.* 2.270. Nevertheless, its use here seems to recall *Il.* 5.436f., where Diomedes is attempting to kill Aeneas: τρις μὲν ἔπειτ' ἐπόρουσε (contrast *procumbere*) κατακτάμεναι μενεαίνων (cf. *uolui*), / τρις δέ οἱ ἐστυφέλιξε (cf. *reppulit*) φαεινὴν ἄσπιδ' Ἀπόλλων. (For similar formulations in the *Iliad*, cf. 16.702f., 18.155ff.) Ovid has already alluded to Diomedes' ἀριστεία in *Il.* 5 at 31-34 and (probably) 43. Moreover, the striking phrase *formidatas ... manus* may recall *Il.* 24.478f. (of Priam) χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος λάβε γούνατα καὶ κύσε χεῖρας / δεινὰς ἀνδροφόνους, αἳ οἱ πολέας κτάνον υἱας. The variation on Homer is piquant: it is Ovid (= the fearsome Achilles) who is supplicating his mistress (= Priam). For further allusions to that passage in erotic contexts, see on 3.8.16.

tamen is difficult, creating an apparent *non sequitur* after the preceding lines, with which there is no obvious antithesis. Bornecque conjectured *tandem*. Munari retains *tamen*, which he translates as 'eppure' but which, on the basis of a dubious statement at Nonius p. 653, he interprets as equivalent to *tandem*. For that usage, which is not recognised by the *OLD*, he cites Ter. *Haut.* 678f. *retraham hercle opinor ad me / idem ego illuc hodie fugitiuom argentum tamen*, Val. Fl. 6.383ff. *machina muri / quae scopulis trabibusque diu confectaque flammis / procubuit tamen (tandem most mss) atque ingentem protulit urbem*. Oliver (1969) 156, n. 49 suggests that *tamen* refers forward, being in antithesis to *sed*, which is to be understood in the pentameter. The only parallel which he adduces for that usage is Cic. *Att.* 12.2.1 *Hic rumores tamen Murcum perisse naufragio, Asinium delatum uiuum in manus militum, ... sed auctor nullius rei quisquam*; there, however, Shackleton Bailey dismisses *tamen* as being 'hardly defensible'. The most satisfactory interpretation of *tamen* is that offered by Büchner (1976) 375: 'schuldig fühlte ich mich — aber ich wollte doch wenigstens ...'. For the compression of the train of thought, he cites Prop. 2.5.3ff. *haec merui sperare? dabis mihi, perfida, poenas; / et nobis aliquo, Cynthia, uentus erit. / inueniam tamen e multis fallacibus unam, / quae fieri nostro carmine nota uelit*, where the implication seems to be 'although most girls are treacherous, as you are, nevertheless I shall find one who will be faithful'. For an alternative, but unconvincing, attempt to establish an antithesis with the preceding lines, see Khan (1966) 891f.

procumbere: especially since Ovid has already referred to his

mistress as a goddess (32), it may be relevant that *procumbere* frequently means 'to do obeisance to a deity'; cf. e.g. 18, *Fast.* 2.438 *suppliciter ... procubere*, Pont. 2.2.122, Tib. 1.2.83.

supplex: cf. 2.5.49 *qui modo saeuus eram, supplex ultroque rogaui*.

formidatas: for the ponderous rhythm, here suggestive of the girl's terror, see Vol. 1, 119 and also 1.5.21 *castigato* (n.).

63-66. For this exhortation to the girl to attack his face, eyes and hair, cf. Prop. 3.8.5ff. where, however, the context is somewhat different: *tu uero nostros audax inuade capillos / et mea formosis unguibus ora nota, / tu minitare oculos subiecta exurere flamma, / fac mea rescisso pectora nuda sinu! / nimirum ueri dantur mihi signa calor: / nam sine amore graui femina nulla dolet*. For further such attacks, see Fedeli's note.

63-64. ne dubita: Ovid constructs *ne* with an imperative 31 (20) times. By the Augustan period, the construction was an archaism; cf. Serv. *Aen.* 6.544 *ne saeui ... antique dictum est, nam nunc ne saeuus dicimus*, Bömer on *Met.* 2.101. For *ne dubita*, cf. *Ars* 1.343, *Met.* 2.101, 5.335, 9.698, *Fast.* 3.641, 699, Verg. *Aen.* 3.316, Lygd. 4.75; at Calp. *Ecl.* 3.75, probably written with this passage in mind, *accipe* (sc. *manus*), *ne dubites: meruit manus utraque poenas* (cf. Ovid's line 1), *dubita* has the support of one of the most authoritative mss and of a large number of the less important. In many cases, the poets seem to have used the construction simply for its obvious metrical convenience; here, however, where Ovid is laying down conditions on which his mistress should accept his repentance, it is possibly significant that archaic diction was most frequently preserved in legal documents. The only other example of the construction in the *Amores* occurs at 3.6.65 (Anio to Ilia) *ne me sperne, precor, tantum, Troiana propago*. There also, it seems to have a particular point; like the elaborate vocative phrase, the archaism gives the line an elevated style appropriate to the deity. *dubito*: Ov. 97 (46), Verg. 10 (7), Hor. 2 (1), Tib. 1, Prop. 1. As with many other words (see on e.g. 1.1.2 *materia*, 1.2.32 *obsum*, 1.4.34 *cibus*, 35 *lacertus*, 36 *mitis*, 60 *separor*, 1.6.47 *dummodo*, 58 *sustineo*, 1.7.17 *nisi*, 24 *careo*, 1.9.6 *officium*, 1.10.60 *dos*, 1.13.42 *concilio*, 1.14.39 *paelex*), there is no obvious reason why this verb should be so much more frequent in Ovid than in the other Augustan poets. Since, however, it occurs elsewhere in the *Amores* only at 1.11.5 and 3.14.36, in the single *Heroides* only at 4.13, 7.127 and 4 times in the refrain at 9.146ff., its comparative frequency in

Ovid's later works may not be merely accidental, but depend on a conscious decision about the word's stylistic level.

(minuet uindicta dolorem): for Ovid's use of interjected parentheses, see on 1.6.17. *uindicta*: Ov. 11 (3), Verg. 0, Hor. 1 (0), Tib. 0, Prop. 0; cf. 9 *uindex* (n.). For the sense 'punishment', cf. *Met.* 1.210, 12.8, *Trist.* 2.545, 4.9.15, *Pont.* 2.8.24, *OLD* s.v. 2, also Phaedr. 3.10.28 *dum dolorem uindicet*.

in uultus ... ire meos: cf. 2.5.46, *Epist.* 11.94 *in ... meas unguibus ire comas*, [Quint.] *Decl.* 10.16 *omnes ... ire in istos oculos, in ista ora debebant*.

65-66. nec nostris oculis nec nostris parce capillis: from Philostratus' use of *φείδεσθαι* in the passages quoted from *Epist.* 16 and 61 in the introduction, one might infer that here again Ovid is influenced by Menander's *Perikeiromene*. The structure of the line, however, suggests that he may have had in mind Tib. 1.1.67f. *parce solutis / crinibus* (sc. *tuis*) *et teneris, Delia, parce genis*. (For a more certain echo of that passage, see on 1.14.28.)

quamlibet infirmas adiuuat ira manus: for strength inspired by anger, cf. *Met.* 5.32f. *contortam uiribus hastam, / quantas ira dabat*, *Trist.* 4.9.7ff., Sen. *Tro.* 672, [Sen.] *Octavia* 175f., Sil. 5.299, *Homer.* 511f., 909. Note also *Epist.* 6.140 (the reading in the first hemistich is uncertain) *qualibet ignavis ipse dat arma dolor*. Ovid uses the adverb *quamlibet* 18 (2) times. It seems to occur earlier only at Cael. Cic. *Epist.* 8.10.3 and three times in Lucretius. See also on 2.11.48 *quilibet*.

67-68. With this brief final instruction to his mistress, Ovid brusquely dismisses the incident and undercuts the tragic stance adopted in the poem so far; see the introduction. The rather unpleasant sound of the couplet, however, retains a vestige of his vehement self-recrimination; note the harsh alliteration of *t* in *tam tristia*, and the frequency of short *e*, of *i* and, especially, of *s*.

neue mei sceleris tam tristia signa supersint: cf. Sen. *Phaedr.* 731f. *crinis tractus et lacerae comae / ut sunt remaneant, facinoris tanti notae*, Petron. 137.12 *ne quod uestigium sceleris superesset, totum anserem laceratum uerubus confixit*. Lee suggests that '*tristia* has special point because dishevelled hair was a sign of mourning'.

recompositas: the combination with the simple form *pone* is striking and unusual (cf. 3.9.67 *ossa quieta, precor, tuta requiescite in urna*), but no particular effect seems to be intended. *recomponere* occurs first here and not again until Plin. *Epist.* 6.5.5; cf. *prae-*

componere, found only at *Fast.* 6.674. For verbs compounded with *re-* occurring first or only in Ovid, see on 1.8.76 *relentescat*. For Ovid's use of verbs compounded with a double prefix, see Bömer on *Met.* 7.489 *praeconsumere*, H.-Sz. 284.

in statione: cf. 1.11.1 *incertos ... in ordine ponere crines*, *Ars* 3.434 *qui ... suas ponunt in statione comas*. Barsby suggests that Ovid may be implying 'put your hair on guard, in case I repeat my attack!'; cf. e.g. Hirt. *Gall.* 8.15.3 *equites ... in statione disponit*. There is a play with military imagery at 1.14.46 *tuta triumphatae munere gentis* (sc. a German wig) *eris*. Here, however, an implication of possible further violence would be incompatible with Ovid's profession of regret.

ARCA

Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs

22

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

ISSN 0309-5541

OVID: AMORES

TEXT, PROLEGOMENA AND
COMMENTARY

in four volumes

J C McKEOWN

VOLUME II

A COMMENTARY ON
BOOK ONE

X FRANCIS CAIRNS

Published by Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd
c/o The University, Leeds, LS2 9JT, Great Britain

First published 1989

Copyright © J.C. McKeown, 1989

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the Publisher.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Ovid, 43 B.C.–17 or 18

[Amores] Ovid—Amores: text, prolegomena and commentary in four volumes.—(Arca ISSN 0309-5541; 22)

Vol. 2: A commentary on book one

1. Poetry in Latin. Ovid 43 B.C.–17 or 18. Amores

I. [Amores] II. Title III. McKeown, J.C.

IV. Series

877'.01

ISBN 0-905205-71-5

ISBN 0-905205-68-5 Set

Printed in Great Britain by
Redwood Burn Ltd, Trowbridge, Wiltshire